Appendix

Address by Hon. Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, Before the Illinois Manufacturers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered in Chicago, Ill., on December 11, 1958, before the Illinois Manufacturers' Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABSTRACT OF SPEECH DELIVERED BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, BEFORE THE ILLINOIS MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION, AT THE CONRAD HILTON HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., DECEMBER 11, 1958

These are times when prudent men should analyze the changes which are occurring against the indisputable fact that free enterprise democracy is the source of this country's greatness.

There is no doubt that developments such as those in atomic energy, rocketry, and so forth, have placed us upon the threshold of a new era.

In addition, this country is experiencing great increase in population.

While we may have unduly exploited our resources, they are still tremendous.

Our productive know-how and capacity are yet unsurpassed.

These are elements on which free enterprise democracy should thrive, and proceed soundly and constructively for the good of all mankind.

Our free enterprise democracy is the greatest system the world has ever evolved. But there is one controlling requirement, and it must never be overlooked. The system is based on solvent government and sound money.

It is in this requirement that we have allowed ourselves to become weak. This basic requirement of our system is equally vital to all of us as individuals, and to every segment of our people—labor, management, agriculture, finance, professions, government, and so forth.

With fiscal soundness I would have no fear for the future, economically or militarily. I would anticipate the period ahead with enthusiasm for my children and with pride in the contribution of my own generation.

Without solvency and sound money there will be neither solid economic progress nor national security with military preparedness.

Assurance of fiscal soundness in the future does not now exist. This is my concern.

We cannot perpetuate national solvency and integrity of the dollar through continuous deficit spending, unchecked national debt, and spiraling inflation. This situation jeopardizes our system of government and our future.

With only two bona fide exceptions, we have been on a deficit financing basis for 29 years. The fiscal situation deteriorated faster this year than in any comparable peacetime period to my knowledge.

Between January and June, we moved from estimates of virtually balanced budgets in the past and current years to combined deficits totaling $15 billion.

At the present rate, Federal agencies would spend more than $400 billion in 5 years. This would mean a Federal debt of more than $300 billion is in immediate prospect. This would be the highest national debt in the history of the world.

During the past session of Congress we were forced to raise the statutory limit on the national debt twice within 7 months. This was unprecedented. But we are forewarned. Some people are now contending the recent election was a mandate for even more dangerous Federal spending activity.

If more programs for nonessential spending should be adopted by the new Congress to be convened next month, our fiscal situation will deteriorate faster next year.

From experience it is to be expected that, if such new programs are enacted they will be long-term in nature with huge multiyear commitments for the future. It is programs of this kind that make the Federal budget so difficult to reduce when the necessity is upon us.

Contrary to general understanding, recent great increases in Federal spending have not been for defense and foreign aid. They have been for domestic-civilian programs.

Since 1954, expenditures outside of defense, atomic energy, and foreign aid categories have increased from $19.1 billion a year to $33.4 billion. This is an increase of $14.3 billion, or 75 percent.

It is in this category where we find so many Federal programs which may be popular, or even desirable, but nonessential.

Much of the domestic-civilian spending is for subsidies. And many of these subsidy programs are bottomless pits for Federal spending and contribute to sky-high inflation. Most of the proposals following the recent election were of this nature.

The Federal Government of the United States cannot now pay its bills except by increasing debt and inflation. Revenue from present tax rates does not meet our commitments.

Interest on the Federal debt is now taking more than 11 cents out of every tax dollar, and chronic inflation has reduced the purchasing power of our money 52 percent. The American dollar is now worth 48 cents by the 1939 index.

Inflation destroys fixed incomes, provident investment, prudent business, sound financing, national security, and democratic government.

More than 20 years of destructive inflation in this country to date have led to continual demands for increased subsidization.

The Federal Government is now subsidizing business, industry, private finance, agriculture, transportation, power, health, education, States, localities, individuals, and so forth.

By the process of cheapening our money and centralizing power in the Federal Government, we have descended to a level of state socialism which is obvious, if not admitted.

Social democracy is a subterfuge for sound government and constructive enterprise. Its evils are historically documented wherever nations have stooped to it.

Herein lies my concern, as I indicated before. Our free enterprise democracy is being undermined. In our present position there is no assurance of fiscal soundness for the future. In these circumstances, how can we hope fully to develop the great potentialities which lie ahead?

I think the situation is urgent. We must start Federal fiscal recovery immediately. Such recovery must start with balancing the budget, reducing the debt, and stopping inflation.

This must be our goal. Responsibility for achieving it lies equally upon the President, the Congress, and the people of the United States, individually and collectively.

The President originates budget recommendations, and the Congress enacts the authority for Federal spending. Both respond to the expressed will of the people.

The budget for the new fiscal year, beginning July 1, is being formulated at the White House now. I discussed the situation with the President last August when Congress adjourned. I have noted his actions since that time, especially his orders of the last few weeks. I hope and believe he will recommend a balanced budget for next year.

I have come to Chicago today to emphasize the seriousness of the problems confronting us. I believe by your own examination you would find I do not exaggerate the conditions we have allowed to develop, or the consequences we might expect if we continue on our present course.

The Federal position alone is bad enough, but we must keep the whole picture in view.

As background keep these facts in mind:

Total public expenditures in this country—Federal, State, and local—this year will be approximately $145 billion.

Federal, State, and local governments this year will take approximately $130 billion out of the pockets of American taxpayers in revenue receipts from all sources.

In their regular budgets Federal, State, and local governments this year will run deficits totaling some $15 billion.

Public debt—Federal, State, and local—this year will approach $350 billion.

Private debt now totals more than $500 billion.

This means our economy is burdened with indebtedness amounting to between $800 billion and $900 billion. This is close to a trillion dollars. These are figures beyond ordinary comprehension.

When individuals become insolvent, they take bankruptcy and dispose of their obligations. When governments become insolvent their money becomes worthless, and they go through some kind of a revolution wringer. The nature and the process may vary. But invariably the form of government is changed. Democratic government, as we have known it, could not survive.

Of course, I concede the necessity of deficits in extreme national emergencies.

For the first 150 years of our history we met our emergencies when they arose, but when they were over we promptly restored sound financing, characterized by balanced budgets, and began paying off the debt.

Under this practice, combined with our wealth and natural resources, this Nation grew great in the short span of a century and a half. But in our time we have not only

continued exploitation of our resources, we have abandoned our traditional policy of fiscal soundness.

For 25 years, through 1955, we were on a deficit basis without real exception. In that period the Federal debt rose from about $16 billion to $274 billion, and from 1939 the value of the dollar dropped at an average of more than 3 cents a year.

Finally, in 2 consecutive fiscal years, 1956 and 1957, we brought the Federal budget back into real balance. At the same time we financed substantial tax reduction, reduced the debt, and slowed inflation down to a virtual stop.

After a quarter century of deficit financing, rising debt and spiraling inflation these balanced budgets gave us reason to hope we were back on an even peacetime keel.

But for reasons I shall never understand, the President in January 1957 brought in his budget for fiscal year 1958 proposing an $8 billion increase in expenditures. It was the biggest peacetime spending budget to that date.

You remember that budget 2 years ago. The country was shocked. There has never been anything like the opposition which developed spontaneously from the grassroots of this Nation.

Congress responded, and reduced appropriations by billions. But in the complexities of big government, with tremendous balances remaining in prior appropriations, expenditures rose notwithstanding. They were rising before sputnik and recession appeared on the scene.

This brought us to the conditions of the past fiscal year which ended June 30 and the present fiscal year which started July 1. Original estimates for these 2 years showed a combined surplus of $2.3 billion. By the latest figures this has changed to a combined deficit of $15 billion.

I emphasize these figures to tell the story of recordbreaking deterioration in the Federal fiscal situation.

Seizing upon sputnik and recession as justification, Congress in the past session insisted upon enactment of legislation which could require Federal expenditures at an annual rate of $80 billion for years to come.

All of the New Deal recovery programs from 1933 to 1939 combined cost us only about half of the current year expenditure budget.

This year's budget was exceeded only in the 2 peak years of World War II.

The Korean war has been over more than 5 years. But Federal budgets in that costly campaign never came close to the level of Federal expenditures reached this year.

When the present administration came into office it established a commendable record. It reduced expenditures in 2 consecutive fiscal years—1954 and 1955.

But from a low point of $64.5 billion in that period, expenditures have now been increased to this year's estimate of $81.7 billion. For accurate comparison this figure includes expenditures for highways and Federal National Mortgage Association which are now financed through so-called trust funds.

To show the tremendous increase in domestic-civilian expenditures—straight from the budget documents, here is the Federal spending record for the period from fiscal year 1954 to date:

1. In categories other than domestic-civilian:

Expenditures for military functions have been increased $500 million, from $40.3 billion to $40.8 billion.

Expenditures for stockpile and defense production have been decreased $600 million from $1 billion to $400 million.

Expenditures for atomic energy have been increased $700 million, from $1.9 billion to $2.6 billion.

Expenditures for foreign military assistance have been decreased $1.4 billion from $3.6 billion to $2.2 billion.

Expenditures for foreign economic aid have been increased $400 million from $1.5 billion to $1.9 billion.

Expenditures for international affairs have been increased $100 million, from $200 million to $300 million.

From these figures, it can be seen that Federal expenditures in categories other than domestic-civilian have been decreased $300 million since 1954, from $48.6 billion to $48.3 billion.

2. But in the same period since 1954, domestic-civilian expenditures have been increased $14.3 billion, from $19.1 billion to $33.4 billion.

Federal expenditures, fiscal years 1954–59

[In billions of dollars]

	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959
National security:						
Military functions	40.3	35.5	35.8	38.4	39.0	40.8
Stockpile and defense production	1.0	.9	.6	.5	.6	.4
Atomic energy	1.9	1.9	1.7	2.0	2.3	2.6
Subtotal, national security	43.3	38.3	38.0	40.9	41.9	43.8
Foreign aid:						
Military assistance	3.6	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.2	2.2
Economic and other aid	1.5	2.0	1.6	1.7	1.9	1.9
Subtotal, foreign aid	5.1	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.1
International affairs	.2	.2	.2	.3	.3	.3
Total, other than domestic-civilian	48.6	42.8	42.5	45.2	46.3	48.3
Domestic civilian:						
Veterans services and benefits	4.3	4.5	4.8	4.8	5.0	5.2
Labor and welfare	2.5	2.6	2.8	3.0	3.4	4.3
Agriculture and agricultural resources	2.6	4.4	4.9	4.6	4.5	6.4
Natural resources	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.7
Commerce and housing [1]	.8	1.4	2.1	3.4	3.8	6.4
General government	1.2	1.2	1.6	1.8	1.4	1.7
Interest	6.5	6.4	6.8	7.3	7.7	7.6
Allowance for contingencies						.2
Total, domestic-civilian [1]	19.1	21.7	24.2	26.1	27.3	33.4
Grand total [1]	67.8	64.5	66.7	71.4	73.6	81.7

[1] For comparison, includes trust fund expenditures of Federal National Mortgage Association beginning fiscal year 1955, and highways beginning fiscal year 1957.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

I suggest the new proposal to expand the urban renewal program as an example of domestic-civilian programs which are bottomless pits for Federal expenditures.

In the first place, I think people should keep up their own property. I know of no reason why the Federal Government should absorb two-thirds of the loss entailed in cleaning up huge city subdivisions to be used for private profit.

Federal funds already available for this program total $1 billion for loans and $1.2 billion for cash grants. These tremendous sums will not be a drop in the bucket if we are to undertake these projects in cities and towns from one end of this country to the other.

Federal subsidies generally constitute a vast field of domestic-civilian expenditures. The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is contemplating a study of the subject.

At the outset we are confronted with two questions: What is a subsidy? Who is subsidized?

Nearly 40 million people will receive direct payments from the Federal Treasury this year. This includes nearly 200,000 Federal employees working overseas. Generally speaking, these 40 million people with their families could reach a number equivalent to half of the population of the United States.

Nearly $80 billion is outstanding at this moment under so-called Federal credit programs for housing, veterans, agriculture, commerce, defense production, small busines, and so forth. This has increased $12 billion in the last 3 years.

Grants to State and local governments now total $4.9 billion. There are now 62 programs for State and local subsidy.

When I came to the Senate 25 years ago, there was only one State aid program of any consequence. That was the highway program which was costing $250 million.

I mention these categories of Federal expenditures simply to illustrate the areas where there may be subsidies which do not meet the eye. There are others. For instance, who is subsidized by the postal deficit?

It may be contended that the foreign agricultural trade development programs are another subsidy to American agriculture.

Are the beneficiaries of government contracts with industry and institutions subsidized to the degree that they think they have a vested interest in the level of Federal expenditures? Reaction to justifiable reductions a year ago would indicate an affirmative answer.

A great fallacy has been built up around Federal payments, whether you call them subsidies or choose to avoid the ugly word. People have gotten the idea that they are getting something for nothing.

There is no greater mistake. American taxpayers sooner or later pay every dime of the expenditures through these programs, and more.

When we are on a sound basis we pay these costs directly from taxes. If we are on a deficit basis we charge them into the debt, pay interest on the loan until we pay off the obligation, and stimulate inflated prices in the process.

In either event, about 15 percent goes into overhead for Federal administration. Since I have been in the Senate, interest on the Federal debt has cost the taxpayers of this country more than $100 billion.

Until we get Federal expenditures down, balance the budget, and stop inflation, there is no hope for sound tax reduction. To reduce taxes when we are on a deficit basis simply charges the tax cut into the Federal debt. This aggravates the whole deficit-debt-inflation cycle.

Others may have their own programs for the coming new Congress. Mine would have two objectives. The first would be to balance the Federal budget. The second would be legislation to correct abuses practiced by unscrupulous labor leaders primarily

against labor itself, but also against management and the public.

Practices revealed by the McClellan Labor Rackets Committee are a national disgrace. I voted for legislation in the past session of Congress to correct these abuses. I shall vote for it again this year. It should have the support of the rank and file of labor, management and the general public.

I am frequently accused of being against labor. This is because I support the best interest of the laboring man; not the powerful labor czar.

I favor the right to work. But statements by certain labor leaders make it definite that when the new Congress convenes, great effort will be made to enact legislation to make States right-to-work laws invalid.

This would be another usurpation of State authority and still further concentration of power at Washington. Such an effort should be resisted to the utmost.

It is certain, too, that these same labor leaders will attempt to federalize unemployment insurance now administered by the States.

A strong effort to this end was made last year. As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I fought the proposal and it was defeated.

The purpose of the move to federalize unemployment insurance is not only to standardize the law for all States, but also the payments for all business and industry.

To federalize unemployment insurance would mean that the powerful labor lobby would be constantly applying pressure on Congress for increased benefits and extension of the payment period.

Early introduction of both of these proposals is certain, and the need to resist them is obvious. In our present condition, I think the Government of the United States is dangerously vulnerable to the influence of ruthless labor dictators.

I am fully aware that the achievement of both of my objectives—correcting abuses by labor leaders and balancing the Federal budget—will be extremely difficult. I am the only man remaining in the Senate who voted against the Wagner Act and for 25 years I have analyzed the budgets submitted by three Presidents.

Year after year I have gone over every expenditure and appropriation item, and these number some 1,100.

I know the problems involved in our outmoded appropriation procedures. I know the devices which have been developed to bypass appropriation control, such as authority to spend directly from the public debt.

I know how difficult it is to reduce expenditures when unexpended balances in prior appropriations approach or exceed the new requests to which annual congressional action ordinarily is limited.

In the current year approximately $147 billion will be available to Federal spending agencies, $75 billion or more in new spending authorizations enacted this year, and approximately $72 billion in unexpended balances carried over from prior years.

The President has a dual responsibility: First, to originate the budget with requests for the new year and, second, to administer the expenditures from both old and new money. I hope he will take the lead not only in balancing the Federal expenditure budget for the coming year, but in the full recovery of our fiscal stability.

On my own experience I submit that expenditure reductions of the necessary magnitude, if applied with care and wisdom, would strengthen our economy, strengthen our Government, strengthen our national defense and strengthen our international position.

I am certain that such reductions can be made in all of the Federal sending categories—military, foreign aid, and domestic-civilian.

With respect to defense expenditures, we should rechart the whole military program and reevaluate the objectives of our spending in view of changing methods of warfare.

I yield to no one in advocacy of national defense but, as the President has said, there is waste and duplication in the military departments.

We unified the armed services. We adopted the Eberstadt amendments for businesslike operations in the Military Establishment. We passed the Military Procurement Act. We revised military pay scales and increased survivors benefits to allow the Armed Forces to compete for capable personnel. In the past session of Congress we enacted the military reorganization bill.

It is time these actions paid off in economy and efficiency for more defense at less money.

The waste in foreign aid, especially economic aid, has been obvious from its inception. We enacted the Marshall plan in 1948 for 4 years. Postwar foreign aid expenditures have now run more than a decade. To date our gross authorizations for foreign aid expenditures have totaled more than $80 billion.

Expenditures for economic aid should be sharply curtailed. Our best interests, and those of our allies, would be better served by preserving the integrity of the American dollar to stimulate international trade.

I know basic legislation will be required for substantial reduction in domestic-civilian expenditures. This will require the exercise of statesmanlike leadership by the President and the unwavering support of Congress and the public.

But I urge the President in his January budget message to submit a blueprint for substantial expenditure reductions in all categories and to follow through with specific legislative recommendations where they are necessary. I pledge him my support and I hope this objective will have yours.

I am aware of the cynical contention that what this country wants is continuing inflation and a fast-buck economy, with no regard for the certain consequences and the next generation.

But I feel certain that the great majority of the people of this Nation want the integrity of our money protected, want their form of government preserved, and want their free enterprise system to survive, in order that we may pursue this Nation's great mission in the world.

If this is what we want, we must have a national crusade from the grassroots to save our representative democracy which is founded upon the free enterprise system.

Such a crusade must be inspired and led by the President. It must be supported by the Congress—House and Senate. Most important of all, it must be fired by the people themselves.

From long experience in the Senate of the United States I can say the voice of the people in this country, if it is loud enough, will overcome selfish and highly organized minorities and will prevail—that is the great virtue of our constitutional democracy as contrasted with dictatorship.

So the job is up to you and every other citizen.

Our people must remember that the very foundation of our democracy rests upon the fact that people must support the Government. It is not the purpose of government to support the people.

The national interest must come ahead of private gain.

So, to achieve our objectives, there must be sacrifice all down the line.

Responsibilities of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on November 11, 1958, at St. Andrew's Cathedral, Honolulu, T.H., Lt. Gen. Vernon E. Magee, U.S. Marine Corps, delivered a very important address entitled, "The Responsibilities of Citizenship." The address which was delivered on that historic occasion is such a fine presentation of an important matter that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address is ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF CITIZENSHIP, AN ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. VERNON E. MAGEE, U.S. MARINE CORPS, ON THE OCCASION OF VETERANS DAY, NOVEMBER 11, 1958

Bishop Kennedy, distinguished guests, veterans of the service of the United States, I am singularly honored this morning with the privilege of addressing you from the pulpit of this great cathedral.

This is a privilege which comes to few laymen; I accept it with humility and reverence. It is fitting that we should choose this sacred temple for our purpose this morning. My fellow veterans, of whatever religion, who have walked through the valley of the shadow of death, will not forget that we did not walk alone. We were sustained through our ordeal by a spiritual presence—by whatever name called—whose earthly abode is in our churches and our temples. Thus, in meeting here this morning, we do reverence to that Supreme Being, and honor to our mortal brothers, the veterans of the United States.

Today marks the 40th anniversary of the armistice of World War I. America's greatest and most costly war to end all wars had come to an end. Some few of us here remember all too vividly the events of those action-packed years. The then Commander in Chief, President Wilson, who had been successful in carrying the great war to a victorious conclusion, was soon to learn that it was easier to win a war than to make lasting peace. For since that war we have added to the rolls 15 million veterans of an even greater war, and 5 million veterans of Korea. It is small wonder that the original observance of Armistice Day is no longer appropriate; and that by logical evolution we now dedicate this date of November 11 to all veterans.

Here in this historic area where World War II began, the day has real meaning. For no other city of American soil has Honolulu's distinction. If our Nation should ever again be forced into general warfare, Honolulu will not be so singularly honored. It is with this in mind that we who have spent years in learning the techniques of war are now learning the more difficult task of keeping the peace.

Three times within my span of service, the United States determined that it was willing to cast its lot in the fight against aggression and went to war in support of our beliefs. It may appear to be an anomaly, but our love for peace has never been so great that we were not willing to fight for the preservation of those principles and relationships which are the only justifiable foundations of peace.

In these short hours dedicated to our veterans, it is well to recall proudly the great scenes of the past wherein our freedom was won, nurtured and maintained. In our minds we can see the battles and picture the places where freedom was tested and where freedom triumphed. We can think of the shot heard round the world at Concord and Lexington, of the bitter winter at Valley Forge, of the long lean years of the Revolution, to be terminated finally with the triumph at Yorktown.

Then there were other places like Gettysburg, San Juan Hill, Manila Bay, the Argonne Forest, and Belleau Wood; and World War II with the flaming beach at Anzio, the enervating jungle of Guadalcanal, the concentrated hell of Tarawa, Iwo Jima, and Omaha Beach on Normandy, and lastly the defense of freedom in far away Korea. These were some of the places.

Then there were the men, Washington, John Paul Jones, Grant, Lee, Pershing, Eisenhower, MacArthur, King, Arnold, Nimitz, Halsey, and Howlin' Mad Smith. The places and the men who led. Names burned forever in the mind, tattooed across the soul of freedom. With them go many other names. The lesser known places where great bravery changed history. Places where American boys were laid down forever and kept their rendezvous with death, in the hills and valleys of these United States, in the blue depths of the oceans, and in the good earth of strange foreign lands.

The boys who did these things and went to these places had names, too, be they O'Brien, Mitsuez, Ginsburg, or Smith. They came from the farms with a rifle. They came from the cities with nothing but their courage. Some were poor and some were rich. They were of all races and religions and they shared the greatest of all adventures. To them all, including you veterans, in and out of uniform, and especially to those who never came back, we owe our freedom. This annual observance of Veterans' Day gives us the opportunity to acknowledge our debt.

True to this tradition and heritage, the personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States today stand strong and ready to carry on. In numbers we are the greatest ever to serve in peacetime. In training, morale, and equipment, we are also the best fitted. It is well that this be so. Never before has freedom been so totally threatened. Across the world a tough competitor, an alien ideology called communism, continues with relentless pressures its timeless march on world domination. All of the people of America are involved in this struggle. Yet we are not alone. This burden is shared by our friends and allies, by the people of the countries of NATO, of SEATO, by those with whom we have bilateral agreements, and by millions of yet uncommitted people of the world, all of whom seek and cherish freedom. Many of these people are free and can speak out. Some are rising in their struggle for self-expression, for a better way of life. Some are silent, speaking only with their eyes and their hearts, for they lie behind a curtain of darkness.

The grave responsibilities of this battle for the minds of men and the serious threats to our security and freedom, are things shared by all of these millions, including our own people who live in these islands of strength of the free world. No one can hide in his shell, leaving the job to others. No one can go away. No longer is there any place to go. The cold war belongs to us all and the effort toward peace is indivisible. There is no one answer. No taxes will pay the price. Each life and mind must be mobilized and dedicated to service. We cannot change this godless communism, but we can change ourselves, so that with strength and a belief in God we can continue to enjoy the free sunshine of living.

Strength comes from many sources. Most of all, it is deep within man himself. Let us, therefore, look at this strength. Let us not look too long at the vast organization, the missiles, the ships, or the aircraft. Let us look rather at the people. The weapons are awesomely new and different. Great technical changes have been unfolded and continue to occur almost every day. For instance, one need only to note the nuclear submarine, the *Nautilus*. Missiles that can span oceans and continents, and satellites orbiting the world, indicate the profound change. Just ahead is the exploration and conquest of space.

Suffice it to say, our technical progress is remarkable, almost mysterious, and bows to no other. We must be thankful for it and continue its progress, making certain we never stifle the basic research that springs from the mind of man and grows to make these wonders possible.

But, we should bear in mind that men will succeed on land, in the air, over and under the sea, in space itself, only to the extent that they succeed as men. Without moral growth, technological growth is but the tinkling of cymbals and the clang of brass.

Our weakness as a Nation, our Achilles heel, is not in material things. Our danger lies elsewhere in the realm of the spiritual, in the weakening of moral fiber within our youth.

Like the Nation in general, the armed services have been plagued by a deterioration in the quality of the manpower upon whom we must depend. The services are but a cross section of our country, and we inherit inevitably some of the juvenile delinquency, cynical attitudes, greed and laziness, and even open crime that have eaten into parts of our Nation. While the percentage of our delinquents is small, we must remember that the virus of cancer starts from a tiny cell.

We of the services are facing these problems and finding solutions. Moral issues have now been clarified; the responsibilities of leadership have been impressed on each person in authority, to the end that each man may be imbued with zeal, pride in his work, efficiency, devotion to duty, and a feeling of genuine patriotism. And as a bonus, greater happiness and success in his job.

These principles of leadership are equally applicable to the civilian community, whose responsibility it is to teach our young the basic virtues of citizenship. While the process of moral decay is a vicious cycle, with each person and each level in society afflicting the others, the antidote of moral revitalization also works in ever-widening circles. Trends of moral decay can be reversed. Steps toward moral greatness can be taken. Let us then rise to the challenge and resolve to meet our obligations as citizens.

You veterans, now out of uniform, have a tremendous potential for good, both as individuals and as organizations. You are the respected citizens of your communities. Your horizons have been widened by your service. Your responsibilities as citizens are accordingly increased. It is your duty to set an example to the youth of our land, an example of patriotism, unselfishness, and moral integrity. By so doing, you will make easier our task of shaping and training our future citizens in arms. You will, by example, demonstrate to our youth that patriotism is more than 4th of July oratory, more than the pageantry of Veterans' Day. We of the armed services consider the veterans to be our most effective link with the civilian community. We depend on you to keep that link strong and effective.

Only through such effective leadership can we become strong as individuals and grow stronger as a Nation. Amid the perils and opportunities of a greatly troubled world, our strength is the shield of our freedom. We can rise to moral greatness in peace as in war, and in that greatness lies our strength.

Distinguished Service Award Presentation to Harry F. Byrd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it was very pleasing to all Virginia, as well as to a large national group of friends and admirers of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, HARRY F. BYRD, when the American Farm Bureau Federation presented to him at its meeting in Boston on December 10, 1958, its Distinguished Service Award. Throughout a long and successful political career, farming and the welfare of the farmers have been major considerations with Senator BYRD. He well merited the honor conferred upon him by the American Farm Bureau Federation, and I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the presentation.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. SHUMAN. Senator HARRY F. BYRD'S long and distinguished record in the Senate of the United States has earned him the respect of all who are concerned about the fiscal solvency of our Republic, the rights of States and individuals, and traditional American liberties.

In the Senate, he has been chairman of the Rules Committee, chairman of the Select Committee on Government Reorganization, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and the powerful Finance Committee. He has served also on the provisional committee to draft the original atomic energy legislation, the Finance Subcommittee on Inter-Governmental Taxation, and on the preparedness subcommittee which investigated Korean ammunition shortage. He has served on the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation since 1949.

Senator BYRD has been a successful apple grower since before he was 20 years of age. His public career began as early and has been even more outstanding. He was elected to the Winchester, Va., city council before he was 21, to the State senate at 27, and Governor of Virginia at 38. He has been U.S. Senator from Virginia since 1933.

A foe of nonessential Federal spending and socialistic proposals—regardless of the political party proposing them, Senator BYRD is one of the Nation's most forthright advocates of the philosophy of decentralized as contrasted with centralized government.

The noted historian and Pulitzer prize winner, Douglas Southall Freeman, wrote of Senator BYRD: "National solvency, national honor, national defense and as moderate a level of Federal taxation as decent administration permits—these are part of HARRY BYRD'S approach to his supreme goal of public service. That goal is to have government interfere as little as is possible with the citizen's effort to make a decent living, to rear and to educate his children, and to maintain a respectable home."

In the spring of 1958, HARRY BYRD announced his intention to retire from the U.S. Senate. The spontaneous and overwhelming reaction of people from all walks of life—not only from Virginia but from throughout America—caused him to reconsider and to allow the insistence for his continuance in public service to prevail over the personal considerations that prompted his plans to return to his home in Virginia. HARRY BYRD was drafted in the fullest and best sense of the word—one of the rare occasions in the history of American politics when this was literally and completely true.

Criticism of U.S. Supreme Court by Conference of State Chief Justices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, there has been a certain amount of uncertainty surrounding a portion of the report on the Supreme Court which was approved last August by the Committee of the Conference of Chief Justices of the State courts. The confusion, which arose as to whether or not the report was directed toward the Supreme Court's decisions in the school desegregation cases, recently was clarified by a newspaper article written by Mr. Gerald Griffin, Washington bureau chief for the Baltimore Sun. Mr. Griffin's article was based on an exchange of letters between Attorney General William P. Rogers and the Honorable Frederick W. Brune, Chief Judge of the Maryland Court of Appeals, who was chairman of the justices' committee. Because of the importance of the original report and the great value of this clarification, I request unanimous consent that Mr. Griffin's article, which appeared in the Sun of January 7, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COURT CRITICISM NOT AIMED AT RACIAL CASES, BRUNE SAYS

(By Gerald Griffin)

Washington, Jan. 6.—New light on a critical report on the Supreme Court, approved last August by the Conference of State Chief Justices, has been provided by an exchange of letters between William P. Rogers, Attorney General, and Frederick W. Brune, chief judge of the Maryland Court of Appeals.

In a letter to Judge Brune, Rogers asked whether the report was directed at the Supreme Court's decisions in the school desegregation cases, and what bearing the report was intended to have on the effect of those decisions to date.

KNOWS OF NO EXCEPTION

In reply Judge Brune, who was chairman of the Justices' committee which submitted the report, said the report was not directed at the school desegregation cases.

He said further that he knows of no exception to the rule that Supreme Court decisions are binding on questions arising under the Constitution. The report suggested no exceptions to that rule, he pointed out.

Judge Brune noted that before writing his letter he had confirmed these statements by consulting, by telephone, with members of the committee.

U.S.-STATE RELATIONSHIPS

Although the judges' report did not mention the school cases, it was regarded at the time, in some quarters, as a criticism of the Supreme Court's action in declaring that school segregation was contrary to the Federal Constitution.

The report dealt with Federal-State relationships as affected by judicial decisions. It held that the Supreme Court had adopted the role of policymaker without proper judicial restraint. It said the Nation's highest court was showing an unwillingness to wait for Congress to exercise its own lawmaking functions.

A resolution approving the report urged the Supreme Court to exercise one of the greatest of all judicial powers, the power of judicial self-restraint, in determining questions affecting the allocation of Federal and State powers.

Under date of October 1, 1958, Rogers sent this letter to Judge Brune:

"I am writing to you with respect to the recent report of the Committee of State Chief Justices, of which you are Chairman. That report comments upon a number of Supreme Court decisions in the field of Federal-State relationships.

"WOULD BE VERY HELPFUL

"Although the report is silent on the unanimous decisions of the Supreme Court in the school desegregation cases, some of the letters that I have received criticizing these decisions appear to imply or to assume that the report was nonetheless directed at them.

"It would be very helpful in dealing with the subject of such letters if you could indicate what bearing, if any, the report was intended to have on the school cases or on their effect as law under our constitutional system."

On October 4, Judge Brune replied:

"This letter is in reply to yours of October 1, 1958, with regard to the report of the Committee of the Conference of Chief Justices, of the State courts, on Federal-State relationships as affected by judicial decisions, of which committee I was chairman.

"FOUR SEPARATE GROUPS

"This report was presented at the meeting of the conference in Pasadena, Calif., on August 20. It was later discussed in four separate groups of the conference on that same day and was debated and voted upon on August 23 by the conference as a whole.

"As your letter notes, the above report did not mention the school desegregation cases; and it did not undertake to deal with them. In this connection, may I call your attention to the composition of the committee and its unanimity, and to the widespread geographical (as well as numerical) support which the report received in the general vote of the conference.

"COME TO QUESTION

"Insofar as the effect of the school segregation or desegregation cases as law under our constitutional system is concerned, I am sure that you have not overlooked two passages of the above report dealing generally with the power of the Supreme Court to determine questions arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States.

"Under the heading of 'Background and Perspective,' in item second the report states that 'when we turn to the specific field of the effect of judicial decisions on Federal-State relationships we come at once to the question as to where power should lie to give the ultimate interpretation to the Constitution and to the laws made in pursuance thereof under the authority of the United States.

"By necessity and by almost universal common consent these ultimate powers are regarded as vested in the Supreme Court of the United States. Any other allocation of such power would seem to lead to chaos.

"Then follows a reference to Judge Learned Hand's lectures on the Bill of Rights. As you will recall, he sets forth reasons for the controlling effect of decisions of the Supreme Court in constitutional matters.

"ARE BOUND BY THEM

"In item sixth of the committee report, under the same heading above referred to, it is also expressly recognized that even though we may find ourselves unable to agree with pronouncements of the Supreme Court we are bound by them.

"I know of no basis for any exception to the rule under which decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States on questions arising under the Federal Constitution are binding, nor does the above report suggest any.

"I may add that I have confirmed the above statements as to the scope and effect of our report by every member of our committee except one, who is ill. I am confident, however, that his is in agreement."

CONDEMNATION MOVE SEEN

Besides Judge Brune, the committee was made up of judges from New York, Michigan, Georgia, Texas, Wisconsin, Oregon, South Carolina, Massachusetts, and Minnesota.

During the discussion of the justices' report last August 23 at Pasadena, before the approving resolution was adopted, Chief Justice Charles Alvin Jones, of Pennsylvania, charged that the real purpose of the report was "to condemn the integration decision."

Chief Justice Theodore G. Garfield, of Iowa, took exception to this, saying that he failed to see the integration issue in the resolution.

AMOUNTS TO CLARIFICATION

Judge Brune's letter to Rogers amounts to an official footnote to clarify the committee's intent. It is expected to put at rest the suggestions, which have been taken up by some of the southern segregationists, that the State justices were attacking the school decisions.

Rulings of the Supreme Court in the civil-rights field—in cases dealing with antisubversion laws, security risks, contempt of Congress, and arraignment of prisoners by police—were under strong criticism in Congress during the last session, with southerners taking an active part.

Congress took no final action on the numerous bills which were put forward to restrict the Supreme Court or revise the effect of its decisions, but new bills may be introduced in the session which opens tomorrow.

The Injustice of Public Law 84–676

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like again to call my colleagues' attention to the injustice caused some Reserve officers because of the effective date of Public Law 84–676. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter with respect to this matter which was written by Hon. Robert W. Collins, of Yazoo City, Miss., an attorney and Reserve officer, to the editor of the Army-Navy-Air Force Register. Mr. Collins' letter was

dated July 15, 1958, and it appeared in the August 2, 1958, edition of that publication.

I include, also, an editorial which appeared in the September 13, 1958, issue of the Army-Navy-Air Force Register entitled "They Were Left Out."

The letter and editorial follow:

URGES CONGRESS CORRECT OWN MISTAKE

DEAR SIR: The magnificent and prompt action of the President in sending a sizable marine force to rescue the integrity and independence of Lebanon brought many serious thoughts to many like myself who was privileged to serve in the Korean war as a career reservist. Perhaps the whole Nation can now get the meaning of the Korean war in a better sense of appreciation. Reappraisals are now being called for. Congress will be expected to and will support the actions commenced today. At this time of sober reflection on the Korean war the White House and the Congress can now correct an injustice to the two-war, former Reserve career officers who were released involuntarily after the end of those recent hostilities by applying the following remedy, to wit:

Reenact and approve Public Law 84-676 with one very simple and justiciable addition, as follows: "(i) This section shall be effective on July 1, 1954."

The Congress should reenact this public law on its own motion as a simple matter of correcting an injustice. Public Law 84-676 shows on its face why it fails in its stated purpose; to provide a lump-sum benefit to the members of the Reserve components who had served in World War II and the Korean war and were released involuntarily. The fact of the matter is that on the effective date of this statute, approved on July 9, 1956, practically all of the members of the Reserve components intended by the stated purpose of the legislation to be so benefited had already been released involuntarily in 1954 and 1955.

Sad to relate this anomaly is written into the hearings on H.R. 6725 and H.R. 9952 (both of the 84th Congress), to which attention is invited. Public Law 84-676 is identical to H.R. 6725 save in one particular. It provided an effective date of July 1, 1954. H.R. 6725 was approved by the Armed Services Committee of the House on July 26, 1955. In the meantime it was withdrawn from the Rules Committee and the effective date of July 1, 1954, was deleted. On February 3, 1956, a new set of hearings commenced on H.R. 9952. What the responsible committeemen thought of the changed version was expressed by the chairman, as follows: "The committee went into the question of cost. It was a financial situation rather than wisdom." Thusly, H.R. 9952 was enacted by the House of Representatives and the Senate and Public Law 84-676 became law on approval by the President on July 9, 1956.

Congress can correct its own mistakes, particularly its admitted and recorded errors of resort to false economy in place of its stated wisdom in the premises. Accordingly, it is strongly urged that the Congress on its own motion reenact Public Law 84-676 with a change in its effective date to July 1, 1954.

ROBERT W. COLLINS,
Commander, U.S. Naval Reserve, Yazoo City, Miss.

[From the Army Navy Air Force Register, Sept. 13, 1958]

THEY WERE LEFT OUT

When Congress returns in January it will probably get letters once again from supporters of a measure to give a lump-sum payment to Reserve officers involuntarily released between July 1, 1954 and July 9, 1956 when the basic readjustment pay act became effective. These letters should be heeded.

When Public Law 84-676 was being considered in 1956, Congress was planning to make payments to those released as early as the 1954 date. But because the lawmakers were in a money-saving mood, the final law states the pay will be given to those released after July 1956. The law provides one-half month's pay for every year of active duty. Many officers who served in World War II and Korea were left out.

This affair points up the need for a strong term retention contract bill. One has been in the works for some time. While the lawmakers are considering this bill, they should reconsider the plight of the two-war reservists released before the present readjustment pay was authorized.

Washington Robs States of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Washington Robs States of Rights," delivered by Hon. M. T. Phelps, justice of the Arizona Supreme Court, and published in the Arizona Republic for November 19, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON ROBS STATES OF RIGHTS

(By M. T. Phelps, justice, Arizona Supreme Court)

Our forefathers sought to create a government with such checks and balances incorporated therein as would insure that all public officials should forever remain subservient to the will of the people.

Unfortunately, they provided no checks against the exercise of excessive powers by the Supreme Court, although most of them agreed that this constituted a great weakness in the framework of the proposed new government and expressed fears of the potential dangers that lurked therein. The only restraint that exists today against the exercise of excessive power by the Supreme Court is that restraint which the conscience dictates to the individual members of the Court. Congress has the constitutional power to limit its appellate jurisdiction but it refused to exercise such power at its last session.

It was the fear of the inadequacy of the limitation provided that prompted immediate adoption of the first 10 amendments. The 10th amendment to the Constitution reserved to the States respectively, or to the people, all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution. This was done to serve as a check against all the branches of the Federal Government, and it served its purpose splendidly for 150 years, but if the present Court is aware of its existence, it has shown no evidence of it in recent years. The present Supreme Court apparently does not feel itself bound by either precedent or by the Constitution itself. Without any qualms or apologies they have set aside previous decisions of the Court recognized by the Court itself as binding upon it for nearly 60 years.

The Supreme Court's decisions are as unstable as the shifting sands of the desert and are as unsound as they are unstable. Many of the greatest judges and lawyers in the United States condemn these decisions as being purely legislative in character, and wholly beyond the power and jurisdiction of the Court to pronounce.

The Attorney General of the United States and the President and others tell the people of the Nation that decisions of the Supreme Court are the supreme law of the land and that it is the duty of every citizen to obey them. The Supreme Court itself, in a supplemental opinion in the segregation cases, stated that the decisions in those cases are the supreme law of the land. The fact is that no individual has to obey these opinions except the parties who were litigants in court any more than you have to obey a decision of the Supreme Court of this State unless you are a party to the cause of action in which the opinion is rendered. And it has been the declared law of all courts for 150 years until Mr. Warren established his arbitrary rule of being bound neither by precedent nor the Constitution.

The Constitution, acts of Congress, and treaties with foreign nations alone constitute the supreme law of the land by which the sovereign States of the Union and the people of the United States are bound.

Not until the Supreme Court reverses its philosophy of government and takes the position that it is bound by a previous decision of that Court on the same constitutional question and that such decision is integrated into the Constitution and becomes a part of it as much so as if originally written therein, can any one justifiably and truthfully say that the decisions are the law of the land. It will then become the supreme law of the land not because it is a decision of the Supreme Court, but because it has been integrated into and become a part of the Constitution.

The Supreme Court is not alone to blame for constitutional violations and the continued centralization of power in the Federal Government. Congress enacted a law in 1935 providing that anything which affects interstate commerce is a part of an interstate transaction which has been interpreted by the court to cover window washers and elevator operators in a building where there happens to be located a business engaged in interstate commerce subjecting them to the provisions of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, and therefore under the control of the Federal Government. The Constitution only gave Congress the right to regulate interstate commerce. By the use of the term, "affect interstate commerce," it broadened its own powers, which has been construed by the Court to empower Congress to regulate transactions wholly within a State upon the theory that it affects interstate commerce.

Both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government are deliberately violating the Federal Constitution. The President violated the Constitution when he sent Federal troops into Little Rock to picket a high school there and to order citizens off of their own front lawns and that of their neighbors. There wasn't a semblance of legal authority for this action.

In 1934, at the request of President Roosevelt, Congress passed a law commonly known as the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, in which Congress delegated to the President the power to enter into reciprocal trade agreements with foreign nations. Under the present arrangement with these nations, known at GATT, tariffs on commodities imported into the United States are fixed by these 37 nations and we have only 1 vote in 37 in fixing our tariff on imports.

The power to lay taxes, imposts, duties and excises and to regulate commerce with foreign nations is vested in the Congress of the United States by the Constitution, and Congress unlawfully abdicated its constitutional powers and its Members violated their oaths of office when Congress gave the executive

the power either to lay a duty on imports, or to regulate trade with foreign nations, and the President is violating his oath to support the Constitution when he urges its violation by Congress and in exercising that power.

Perhaps one of the most outrageous of all wrongs in further centralization of power has been the creation of dozens of Federal administrative agencies, giving to them the power to adopt rules and regulations which have the same force and effect of laws.

We are now exacting of our citizens income and other taxes to meet exorbitant budgets, billions of which are wilfully wasted. Other billions are being given away even to Russian satellites. This, too, is without constitutional authority. None of the branches of the Federal Government make any attempt to function within constitutional limitations.

The collapse of constitutional government is inevitable in this country if present trends continue. The officials in the higher echelons of government have repudiated the principal concept upon which our Government was founded and the creature has become master of the creator.

Whatever States rights are left are being rapidly lost.

Please let us, through the conservative thinkers of both national parties, try to preserve America. This can only be done by demanding an adherence to the principles embodied in the declaration of an abiding faith in God.

The New Carpetbaggers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, hatebred violence is abhorrent to the South, as it must be to persons of good will everywhere. We have been shocked profoundly by vicious use of explosives against places of worship and schools. We have been shocked because we have not been calloused to such senseless violence.

Outbreaks of deadly hate have not been part of the day-to-day pattern of life in the South. We have been unable to understand that assaults and killings bred of racial animosities apparently have disturbed little those in the great cities of the North who have been quick to point fingers of scorn at us.

Let there be no mistake—we will do our utmost to bring to justice the strangers among us who give increasing evidence of malicious direction from afar. Who is behind the John Kaspers, the dynamiters, and their fellow inciters of interracial and interfaith hatreds? Could it be that the strings of these malevolent puppets stretch to Moscow?

In any event, the South is committed to calm determination in resisting the persistent attacks on the constitutional rights of its States and its people. It will not embrace violence. It will strive to provide swift justice to the scorpions in its midst.

In this connection, and under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a straightforward and praiseworthy statement included by President Philip M. Klutznick, of B'nai B'rith in his annual report to the board of governors. The statement follows:

If we examine the situation in its proper context we find that community tensions arising out of synagogue bombings and other expressions of anti-Jewish violence in the South have not changed the fundamental good relations between southern Jewry and its neighbors. There is no real rupture in the religious harmony and interaction of the southern community that southerners would share with their Jewish neighbors the same contempt and sense of outrage over the recent wave of anti-Semitic violence.

But one stubborn fact persists: the southern atmosphere will be clouded with anti-Semitic tensions so long as organized Jew-baiting movements are free to exploit the region's dilemma over desegregation.

The anti-Semite and the hate mail publisher fish in troubled waters. The social upheaval that has been sweeping across the South is tailored to the disruptive patterns of the professional bigots. It is an interesting commentary that much of the hate literature now being widely distributed throughout the South is carpetbagging stuff—northern in origin and trying to disguise itself with a southern accent.

The anti-Semitic movements by themselves are of little consequence. The danger lies in their ability to spread distrust and religious dissension in the right setting. That setting exists today in many parts of the South. It will not blow away hurriedly, not so long as a resistance to desegregation remains and it can be distorted by hate movements. The problem, then, for our ADL is to keep the anti-Semitic movements in check; to probe constantly their practices and expose their purpose. This is likely to be a drawn-out affair and we have to face up to that fact.

Address by Vice President Nixon Before the English Speaking Union of the Commonwealth at the Guildhall in London

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, during November the Vice President made a trip to England to represent the President of the United States on the occasion of the dedication of the American Chapel at St. Paul's Cathedral.

On that evening the Vice President addressed the English Speaking Union of the Commonwealth at the Guildhall in London. The Vice President made one of the best speeches of his career in explaining the responsibilities of English-speaking people in international affairs, both on home soil and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, this very thoughtful and enlightening speech is herewith appended in full:

TEXT OF ADDRESS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE ENGLISH SPEAKING UNION OF THE COMMONWEALTH, NOVEMBER 26, 1958, GUILDHALL, LONDON, ENGLAND

In the 6 years in which I have had the honor of serving as Vice President of the United States, it has been my privilege to visit many countries and to participate in many significant events. I can assure you that no occasion in that period will live more indelibly in my memory than the dedication of the American Chapel at St. Paul's which I attended this morning and the gathering in this historic hall which I am privileged to address this evening.

This meeting of the English Speaking Union dramatizes the enduring character of the friendship and alliance of our two countries. The activities of this organization have been most vital in cementing our bonds of comradeship.

I consider it a particular privilege to pay tribute to the thoughtful and inspiring leadership of His Royal Highness, Prince Philip, who has spared no sacrifices in this dedicated work. His recent visit to Canada was only one of many activities which indicate his vital interest.

You all may be justly proud, not only of the contribution you have made to better understanding between our two countries, but also the even greater work of building an enduring basis of friendship among all English-speaking peoples.

The dedication at St. Paul's this morning dramatizes the unity you have worked so hard to achieve. It was symbolic of the enduring ties that bind us. It brought to mind the dramatic events of earlier and more trying days—the magnificent leadership and the great sacrifices that made possible our victory in the Second World War.

Our thoughts went back to our great national leaders, Sir Winston Churchill and President Roosevelt, working together in intimate harmony. They will receive the ungrudging tribute of history for their capacity to marshal the forces of democracy.

Our thoughts turned also to our incomparable generals and admirals—Eisenhower and Montgomery, Cunningham and King. They were more than brilliant strategists and commanders. Because of their unwavering devotion to the concept that military ingenuity must be combined with recognition of civilian authority, they rank indeed among the great military leaders of all times.

But above all today we honored brave men, whose names are legion and whose sacrifices can never adequately be repaid. British and American—farmers and laborers, from cities and countryside, from offices and classrooms—these were the men who made possible our victory in the greatest war in history. Many events of that war will be forgotten as we turn our eyes to other tasks, but their deeds will live forever. They bequeathed to us a spirit, a sentiment, a national memory that will never fail to capture our admiration as we move side by side in the path of friendship and alliance.

As Abraham Lincoln said at Gettysburg, "The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced."

What is the unfinished work they leave for our generation? I believe that two American Presidents speaking in this same Guildhall have simply, but eloquently, answered that question.

Woodrow Wilson on December 28, 1918, said, "The peoples of the world want peace, and they want it now, not merely by conquest of arms, but by agreement of mind."

And Dwight D. Eisenhower, 27 years later on July 12, 1945 said "To preserve his freedom of worship, his equality before law, his liberty to speak and act as he sees fit subject only to provisions that he trespass not upon similar rights of others, a Londoner will fight. So will a citizen of Abilene."

To preserve freedom, to keep the peace, not only for themselves but for all people—this, then, is the cause for which the brave men we honored today gave their lives. It is the challenge and opportunity of our generation

to further the ultimate realization of this noblest goal of mankind.

Let us examine the policies we should follow if this goal is to be attained. We begin by recognizing that the free world must be militarily stronger than any potential aggressor. The existence of our military strength and our determination and ability to maintain it are the basic elements without which the objectives we seek would be impossible to realize.

But we recognize that military strength in and of itself will not keep peace unless it is combined with a wise and judicious diplomatic policy. Let us see what some of the guidelines for our policy should be.

We must retain the armed strength needed for security in a troubled world, but we should speak with the calm assurance of those who are not afraid.

We know that to the extent the law of the jungle prevails in any area of the world, weakness and indecision lead to disaster. Yet, firmness is not and should not be arrogance.

We will shun assurances based merely upon naive hope or even self-deception. But we must never tire in our search for enforceable agreements which will reduce tension.

We know that little is lost by discussion but that all may be lost by war. Yet, even in our tireless striving for peace, we must always be prepared to say that freedom and the rights of man are even more ultimate values.

Above all, our policies must represent the best thinking the free world can produce. We are indeed fortunate in the fact that in men like Macmillan and DeGaulle, Adenauer and Spaak, Fanfani and Eisenhower we have the kind of dedicated and experienced leadership which is superbly qualified for the difficult task of keeping the peace with honor for the free world.

In this connection, I wish to pay special tribute to your Prime Minister for his initiative in developing the enlightened concept of interdependence which has proved so useful in bringing about closer understanding between our two nations and which points the way for improving consultation and cooperation among all the countries in the free world.

If the struggles for peace and freedom were to be decided solely by the adequacy of our military strength and by the quality of our diplomacy, we could look to the future with justifiable confidence as to the prospects for our eventual success. But we must recognize that this is only one phase of the struggle.

Our military strength and our diplomatic policies are designed to avoid a war we might otherwise have to fight in the future. We must not overlook the fact that other policies must be designed to avoid losing the nonmilitary battle which has already begun and which is being waged in many areas of the world today.

Let us examine the battleground where this conflict is taking place—in Asia, in the Near East, in Africa, and in parts of Latin America. A great revolution is taking place among the people in these areas of the world. What I refer to is not a military or political revolt, but the revolution of peoples' expectations, the assertion of all peoples of their claim to a greater share of this world's goods.

Millions of people in these newly developing nations are determined to break the bonds of wretchedness and poverty that have enslaved them through the centuries. They wish to achieve in this very generation a decisive breakthrough in the struggle against misery and disease.

They would prefer to attain these objectives and retain their freedom. But we must make no mistake about it, if they believe they are offered no other choice, they will choose progress even without freedom.

What is their choice? On the one hand, they have the example of the Soviet Union and the Communist satellites. Here is a pattern that promises quick results. Thousands of leaders of these countries are being invited to visit the Soviet Union to see the very real changes accomplished in the 40 years since the Communist revolution.

It is not an adequate answer to this challenge to cite the far higher material standards in most western nations. To the newly developing nations of the world, this is not the point. They are not particularly impressed by achievements primarily accomplished in the century of the industrial revolution. They are far more interested in what can be accomplished in the last half of the 20th century.

What must be made clear and unmistakable for all the world to see is that free peoples can compete with and surpass totalitarian nations in producing economic progress. No people in the world today should be forced to choose between bread and freedom.

To shape the world of tomorrow in a pattern compatible with freedom and human rights we must all take our part in a great offensive against the evils of poverty, disease, and misery. We cannot, for example, afford to allow the free Government of India to fail in its heroic effort to produce economic progress and retain freedom at the same time.

We need to apply in this field the same determination, willingness, and cooperation which enabled us to build the military strength which deters aggression today.

We must not be miserly, smallminded, and negative in our approach to this problem. And while it is wrong to favor change solely because it is change, it is worse blindly to insist that we have nothing better to offer than maintaining the status quo.

We must associate ourselves with the decent aspirations of people everywhere for the better life to which they are entitled.

Just a few weeks ago, Premier Khrushchev promised his people a revolution in living standards within the next 12 years. He claimed that the Communist system would overtake and surpass the economies of the Western World.

We should be happy that such claims have been made. We would be eager to match the Soviet leaders in putting less emphasis upon armies, military research, and the costly lethal weapons of modern warfare, and more stress upon better housing, food, clothing, and the other necessities for a good life.

If Mr. Khrushchev wishes to consider these steps as a form of competition or contest, I am sure that all of us would be delighted to accept the challenge. In such a contest no one could really lose. The world would be infinitely better off if man's energies were used for the welfare of families rather than the building of armies.

But our answer to the Soviet challenge should not stop here. We say, broaden this competition and include the spiritual and cultural values that have distinguished our civilization.

Material achievements, while necessary, do not meet the deeper needs of mankind. Man needs the higher freedoms, freedom to know, to debate freely, to write and express his views.

He needs the freedom that law and justice guarantee to every individual so that neither privilege nor power may make any man subservient before the law.

He wants the freedom to travel and to learn from other peoples and cultures.

He wants freedom of worship.

To us, these are the most precious aspects of our civilization. We would be happy if others were to compete in this sphere and try to surpass our achievements.

The free world is too often made to appear to be relying on our superior military power and economic strength. It is not worthy of those with the heritage of freedom we share to appear to be resting our case on materialism alone.

I know of no better example to illustrate the point I am trying to make than through an analysis of that much-maligned institution—British colonialism. It is understandable in view of the surging rise of nationalism that we have heard all that is bad and little that is good about colonialism in the past few years.

Colonialism has had its faults, but it also has had its virtues. I speak from some knowledge on this subject. I have visited 12 countries which at one time or another have passed through the status of British colonialism.

I have known personally and admired the dedicated and effective work of your superb colonial administrators. You can indeed be proud of the contributions that have been made by men like Grantham in Hong Kong, Templer in Kuala Lumpur, MacDonald in Singapore, Crawford in Uganda, and Arden-Clark in Ghana.

Let us examine some of the benefits British colonial policy has produced in the areas in which it has operated. It brought the military strength which provided the security from external attack. It brought in many areas the technical training which assured economic progress.

But more important than either of these, it brought the great ideas which provided the basis for progress in the future, ideas which will live on for generations after the nations concerned have acquired the independent status for which an enlightened policy has prepared them.

The common law, the Parliament, the English language, freedom of speech, assembly, press, and religion, these are the institutions which are the proud legacy of the British people in lands throughout the world.

And so today let us never forget that in the momentous struggle in which we are engaged our major advantage is not in the strength of our arms or even the productivity of our factories. It is in the quality and power of the great ideals of freedom which have inspired men through the ages.

Our responsibility then is clear. Here is a cause worthy of the descendants of brave men and women who crossed boundless oceans and settled in every area of the globe.

Once again we must venture forth not to seek untilled lands, but rather to bring encouragement, aid, guidance, and partnership to those peoples who want to live in freedom and decent prosperity.

We come to them as friends, as brothers in a shrinking world. We do not seek to impose upon them our economic system or our culture. It is theirs to choose the path to the future. But it is our responsibility to see that this choice is an informed one and a free one.

Let it never be said that because of our failure to present adequately the aims and ideals of freedom others chose the often irreversible path of dictatorship.

Let us speak less of the threat of communism and more of the promise of freedom.

Let us adopt as our primary objective not the defeat of communism but the victory of plenty over want, of health over disease, of freedom over tyranny.

With such a goal we shall give the lie to those who proclaim that we are witnessing the twilight of a dying western civilization. Rather we shall see the onset of a glorious dawn of a new world based on the immortal ideals for which men have sacrificed their lives through the ages.

In this very hall, a century and a half ago an English Prime Minister gave a brief address that has been ranked by Lord Curzon as one of the indisputable masterpieces of English eloquence. After the news of Nelson's glorious victory at Trafalgar, William

Pitt was toasted as the savior of Europe. He responded in these words: "I return you many thanks for the honor you have done me. But Europe is not to be saved by any single man. England has saved herself by her exertions and will as I trust save Europe by her example."

Here is a challenge worthy of the brave men we honored today. May we, the English-speaking peoples, proud in the heritage we share, join with the friends of freedom everywhere and by our example save the cause of peace and freedom for the world.

The Sovereignty of the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, our constitutional form of government, with its inherent concept of checks and balances, has been under heavy attack in recent years.

The legislative function has been invaded by the judiciary. The powers clearly reserved to the States and to the people have been seized by those having contempt for the written law.

In this connection, and under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a significant address by J. Sloan Kuykendall, distinguished attorney of Winchester, Va., delivered last fall at the annual meeting of the Virginia Bar Association on the occasion of Mr. Kuykendall's retirement from the presidency of the association.

The address follows:

Perhaps the most momentous chapter in American history deals with the Constitutional Convention of 1787. The drama of the origin of the Constitution has frequently been overlooked, so confidently have the American people taken the Constitution as a matter of course. The Constitution of the United States is not a document divinely inspired; it was born of the travail of long, bitter debate. No one will claim that it is perfect or that its draftsmen had that degree of prophetic wisdom that would have enabled them to provide solutions to problems yet unborn.

Paramount in the deliberations of that Convention was an ever-present concern for the sovereignty of the States. Happily, those contending for a Central Government with strictly limited and defined powers prevailed. Thus, a Central Government of general powers was deliberately rejected in favor of one of limited powers. The validity of this statement is vouched for not only by the record of the proceedings of the Convention, but by a reading of the final instrument itself.

The framers put first things first. The limitations upon the three branches of the new Central Government were placed in the very first three articles, article I, section 8, specifically, in detail, and in unmistakable language defined, and thereby limited, the powers of the legislative branch of the new Government. Article II defined within narrow limits the authority and duties of the Chief Executive. Article III, section 2, established and thereby limited the jurisdiction of the Federal judiciary.

It seemed hardly necessary, therefore, to do more to assure the retention by the States of the sovereign status so recently acclaimed for them in the Declaration of Independence and won by them in war. Nevertheless, out of an abundance of precaution article IV, section 4, was included, guaranteeing to every State a republican form of government and continued sovereignty.

This would seem to be assurance enough for the people, but not so. Upon the adjournment of the Convention the delegates returned to their respective States entrusted with the responsibility of procuring the approval and ratification of the proposed Constitution. Serious opposition was encountered, largely because of the fear that the proposed new Government would eventually wrest from the States the power to govern and direct the relationships of their citizens.

For the moment they felt secure in the enjoyment of those personal liberties and freedoms referred to as unalienable rights. The people were assured and reassured that the proposed constitution would not deprive the States of their jealously guarded sovereignty.

Perhaps the anxieties of the people of that troubled time should have been allayed by the forthright and unmistakable clear appraisal of the instrument of union by that extreme Federalist, Alexander Hamilton. He said:

"In the first formation of government, by the association of individuals, every power of the community is delegated, because the Government is to extend to every possible object; nothing is reserved by the inalienable rights of mankind; but when a number of these societies unite for certain purposes, the rule is different, and from the plainest reason; they have already delegated their sovereignty and their powers to their several governments; and these cannot be recalled and given to another, without an express act."

Notwithstanding that statement, and other assurances emanating from men of equal caliber and persuasion, objections to ratification still prevailed in many of the States because the Constitution failed to include a bill of rights. It was only upon the representations of many of the advocates of ratification that a bill of rights would be added by amendment that the Constitution was finally approved.

In keeping with the promises made to the people, James Madison of Virginia in 1789, proposed to the House of Representatives a bill of rights preceded by a preamble which began:

"The conventions of a number of States had at the time of their adopting the Constitution expressed a desire in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added." Ten of the twelve amendments proposed were accepted and finally became part of the Constitution. All are important, but the one having the most direct bearing upon the sovereignty of the States is the 10th amendment, which reads:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Thus, the record of the convention of 1787, the records of the State conventions for ratification, the unmistakable language of the instrument itself, the appending of the Bill of Rights—all these make clear that powers and authority not expressly conferred by necessary implication remained with the sovereign States.

Today it is the fashion of the uninformed to refer to decisions of Federal courts, however erroneous, as the law of the land. On the other hand, a prominent lawyer and legal scholar epitomized the doctrine of State sovereignty when he wrote: "As the Government under the Constitution commenced and the United States of America took their place as a nation, it was with the constitutional doctrine of States rights as the 'law of the land'."

So, with the adoption of the Constitution the sovereign States entered into a compact whose clarity and meaning was limited only by the inadequacy of the English language. It should not be restricted or enlarged except in the manner provided in the Constitution itself and with the approval of three-fourths of the States. It is conceded, of course, that all provisions could not be expressed in hard and fast rules of law. Some standards of law had to be used, such as due process and equal protection of the laws.

Even here everyone knew what the framers had in mind. These were not newly coined phrases. They had well-defined, definite, and generally accepted meanings. Although these standards had to be interpreted and applied to specific sets of facts, it was supposed that they would be interpreted, not prostituted.

It has primarily been by the prostitution of such provisions as these that the Central Government has usurped from the States their sovereign rights and unlawfully arrogated these powers to itself. The Federal Government has performed the feat of lifting itself by its own bootstraps.

This is the only instance that I know of in any of the world's system of law, past or present, where the grantee has the exclusive, unfettered power to construe the grant of his own authority—restricted only by an exercise of self-restraint. It seems they engage in a lot of exercises in Washington these days, but the exercise of self-restraint is not one of them.

Self-restraint requires character and integrity of the highest order. One who occupies a public office is a fiduciary, upon which devolves the burden and responsibility of administering the trust, in strict compliance with the limitations upon his authority. Those who direct and administer the affairs of the three departments of our National Government have the paramount responsibility of acting within the scope of limited and prescribed authority.

Only a short while after the new experiment got underway the three departments of the Central Government began inter se struggles for power. The Supureme Court asserted its right to interpret our basic law and to decree limits upon the authority of both the legislative and the executive branches. The legislative branch considered that it had the right to legislate within the limits of its own construction of the basic law. The executive proclaimed the independence of his department and insisted that neither by legislation nor by judicial fiat could his constitutional authority, as he construed it, be confined or limited.

Each department claimed not only that it had the power to construe its own authority under the Constitution, but that it was the final authority, on the limits of the constitutional powers of the other branches of Government.

President Jefferson's distrust of the judiciary resulted in his abolition of the circuit courts, impeachment of those judges who questioned his supreme authority, and a bitter contest with Chief Justice Marshall. The philosophy of the supremacy of the executive which caused Jefferson to assert his authority over the courts was later also shared by President Jackson, who sought to assert the supremacy of the executive over the legislative branch.

History records other examples of the struggle for power within the Federal Government. These repeated, bitter, and sometimes protracted contests played important roles in the formulation of checks and balances between the departments, but one of the most significant results was that each struggle had the effects of enlarging the powers of one or more branches of the Federal Government, not at the expense of the other

branches, but at the expense of State sovereignty. The States were the primary losers.

Amaury deReincourt, a French scholar, recently published a book entitled "The Coming Caesars in America." In October 1957, a highly respected national periodical published an article by deReincourt dealing with the subject of his book, and that magazine posed these questions: Is democracy dying in the United States. Is this country heading toward rule by a Caesar? It should alarm us that these questions were answered in the affirmative. I quote briefly from that thoughtful article:

"Our Western World, America and Europe, is threatened with Caesarism on a scale unknown since the downfall of the Roman Empire. In order to see this threat in its proper perspective, we have to assess the relationship between America and Europe, and define their historical destinies. It is the contention of this book that expanding democracy leads unintentionally to imperialism and that imperialism inevitably ends in destroying the republican institution of earlier days; further, that the greater the social equality, the dimmer the prospects of liberty, and that as society becomes more equalitarian, it tends increasingly to concentrate absolute power in the hands of one single man.

"Caesarism is not dictatorship, not the result of one man's overriding ambition, not a brutal seizure of power through revolution. It is not based on a specific doctrine or philosophy. It is essentially pragmatic and untheoretical. It is a slow, often century-old, unconscious development that ends in a voluntary surrender of a free people escaping from freedom to one autocratic master.

"The power and prestige of the President have grown with the growth of America and of democracy within America, with the multiplication of economic, political, and military emergencies, with the necessity of ruling what is virtually becoming an American empire—the universal state of a Western civilization at bay.

"Caesarism is therefore the logical outcome of a double current very much in evidence today: The growth of a world empire that cannot be ruled by republican institutions, and the gradual extension of mass democracy, which ends in the destruction of freedom and in the concentration of supreme power in the hands of one man. This is the ominous prospect facing the western world in the second half of the 20th century. But just as the Caesarism could rise only in classical Rome and not in Greece, it will, if left free to develop unchecked, arise in modern America and not in Europe."

This dire prediction of an eminent political thinker of our day will not come true if we employ the tried and true system of checks and balances. There have been incidents in our history when one branch has effectively checked another. But there have been other periods when the people, clamoring for a change, have been so overwhelming in their demands that the judiciary has been ineffective in its efforts to check the legislative and executive branches by requiring them to stay within constitutional limits.

There have been still other times when the legislative and executive branches have failed to coordinate in restraint of the judiciary. Had the Supreme Court adhered to precedent it would have justified James Bryce's regard for the judiciary as "America's greatest and most original contribution to the science of government." Although some of the renowned judges of that Court have felt bound by precedent, the majority of the Court during some of the critical times in this country have departed from precedent for one stated reason reason or another—all too often to further their own political philosophies.

It is in the departure form precedent that the Court has failed to perform its function as a checkrein against the violation of the Constitution and clearly established principles.

If it be conceded that the Supreme Court through its power to interpret the Constitution is a policymaker, this does not justify its self-assumed power to be a policy changer. Once the Supreme Court has announced to the people what the Constitutstitution means, by what logic should it be permitted to change its mind and say that it means just the opposite?

Would it not be more consistent with democratic constitutional processes to follow the English doctrine that once a constitution is interpreted by the courts, that interpretation can be altered only by the people through their elected legislative representatives or, in the United States, by proper amendment of the document itself?

Although the departure from precedent has been most flagrant in recent years, time will not permit review and consideration of the cases involved. It cannot be successfully denied at this time that the Supreme Court has, of necessity, the right to adjudge violations of the Constitution. The only limit upon this authority is the clear and unmistakable meaning of that document. The Constitution was drafted with care and its words were carefully chosen so that doubt and uncertainty might be avoided.

Where doubt has arisen in the interpretation and application of our basic law, the judicial resolve of that doubt is as binding upon the Court as it is upon the people and the States. The personnel of the Court may change, but the Court remains the same institution.

The Constitution may not legally be interpreted and applied so as to carry us beyond the meaning and purpose that have acquired certainty in historical and judicial precedent. Only by gradual and studied process may we progress and justify a better and fuller life. If tradition should be abandoned for the sake of progress and the betterment of human relationships, let it come within the framework of that solemn pact wrought by the labors of our liberty-seeking forefathers.

No human sitting on the Supreme Court of this land should indulge in the feeling that he has been endowed with a superior ability to judge our present and foretell our future. His course has been clearly marked, and he is constrained by the document that created the tribunal upon which he sits. When he assumes the duty and responsibility of interpreting * * * and apply our Federal Constitution, the laws made pursuant thereto, and the prior decisions of that Court, he should feel absolutely constrained by the rules prescribed for his judicial conduct as contained in the Canons of Judicial Ethics of the American Bar Association. Canon 20 provides:

"A judge should be mindful that his duty is the application of general law to particular instances, that ours is a government of law and not of men, and that he violates his duty as a minister of justice under such a system if he seeks to do what he may personally consider substantial justice in a particular case and disregards the general law as he knows it to be binding on him. Such action may become a precedent unsettling accepted principles and may have detrimental consequences beyond the immediate controversy. He should administer his office with a due regard to the integrity of the system of the law itself, remembering that he is not a depositary of arbitrary power, but a judge under the sanction of law."

That our forefathers contemplated that the urgency of changing times would require a course not envisaged by them is clearly recognized in the last article of the Constitution, which provides for its amendment to meet the exigencies of a changing world. It is by this process that you and I are afforded the opportunity to give studied consideration to suggested changes. If we by the exercise of our democratic franchise decree a change, we will be better prepared to live with it.

Some have suggested that amendment is too slow and tedious to effect needed changes. This is not true. There have been twenty-two amendments to the Constitution. The average time required for adoption was less than one year. Only one amendment, the fourteenth, has taken more than 2 years. It took only 10 months to adopt the 13th amendment abolishing slavery.

It is significant to note that Congress and the people of the United States felt it necessary to amend the Constitution by adding the fifteenth amendment in order to give the Negro the right to vote. Can it now be said, within constitutional limits, that racially-integrated public education is one of the unalienable rights within the terms of the 14th amendment, when it was so openly conceded that the right to express one's voice in free government by the exercise of the franchise was not one of those rights?

In a rash of recent judicial opinions by our highest court, which I need not enumerate, the states have been shorn of many of the powers reserved by them. The Constitution has been given a meaning never intended by those who wrote it and certainly not justified by its language. Those opinions, reflecting the political and social philosophy of their authors, have effected radical changes in our social order—changes that admittedly could not possibly have occurred by the process of amendment.

Whatever may be our philosophy and predilections respecting the trends of rapidly changing times, we are bound to respect the conservatism and traditions of an earlier era until such time as an informed public, acting within the framework of a constitution prescribed by the wisdom of their ancestors, decrees a change.

Our Mounting Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, December 2, 1958. I do not agree with this editorial, as I think we in the Congress have suffered terribly because of the lack of leadership on the part of the administration. The present administration keeps talking economy, and then recommending record budgets after budgets, which are the highest in peacetime history. Whenever Congress tries to economize, the President or some of his captors cry, "Wolf, wolf," except that they use the term "emergency," instead of the term "wolf."

I do think, Mr. Speaker, that we Democrats, having the majority that we are going to have this year, are going to have to be careful to make sure that we are not to blame for the extravagances of a misinformed and misguided Executive.

The article follows:

THE CAUSE OF OUR MOUNTING DEBT—DEMOCRATS BLAMED FOR BIG EXPANSION OF NONDEFENSE EXPENDITURES

(By David Lawrence)

What would be thought of a man who kept on borrowing money and never paid back a dollar of it?

What shall be thought of a government that keeps on borrowing billions over a period of years and has a bigger debt today than it has ever had at any time in its history?

The annual interest now amounts to one-tenth of the United States budget. It adds up to between $7,500,000,000 and $8 billion a year. This interest payment will continue to grow unless somehow there is a beginning made toward reducing the principal.

It will be said that governments never pay off their debts. That's true. What they do instead is to cheat the citizen by devaluing whatever the purchasing power of the monetary unit happens to be.

If the millions of citizens who are thus being cheated understood it, they would not regard inflation as just a big word whose meaning they don't know. They would realize they are being robbed of their savings.

Today the dollar is worth 28 cents in comparison with what it was at the turn of the century 58 years ago.

In terms of 1930 values—when the public debt had been reduced to about $16 billion—the dollar today is worth 58 cents.

In terms of the dollar of 1939—just 2 years before America's entrance into World War II—the present dollar is worth only 48 cents.

This is a shrinkage of more than half the purchasing power of the American dollar in a period of less than 20 years.

It's true that two world wars and the Korean war have materially increased the public debt. But that's not the reason it is bigger today than when the Korean war spending was at its height in 1951 and 1952. Actually, nondefense spending also has gone up very rapidly. The politicians in both parties have been insisting that the Nation can afford guns and butter, too.

The Tax Foundation, Inc., of which Roswell Magill, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, is chairman, says in its November review that the "widely held" impression that defense spending is responsible for the growth of the public debt in recent years is inaccurate. It is pointed out that current expenses for defense are $350 million less than they were in 1954, whereas nondefense spending is up $12 billion higher than 6 years ago.

The President doesn't control the purse strings. Congress has the final word. One of the illusions spread generally is that the Chief Executive is responsible for the budget. He may suggest and recommend, but the Congress writes the appropriation bills.

As long as Congress thinks the public wants more and more spending on what is generally called welfare or social benefits, the tendency will be to spend more and more and send the public debt higher and higher.

But who is going to be cheated? There are in America more than 15 million citizens who are 65 years old or over. Of these, 11,640,000 are receiving benefits of some kind from Government. An additional 1.5 million get "old age" income from private pensions, annuities or interest or dividends on savings invested for retirement. Even allowing for some duplication, this is a sizable number.

Then there are the persons below the age of 65—the widows and orphans—who are dependent on fixed incomes from insurance policies or death-benefit funds. As the dollar fluctuates, these persons lose purchasing power each year.

The number of human beings affected directly or indirectly by the cheating process, whereby dollars originally saved are curtailed in purchasing power, may amount to at least 30 million persons.

The Congress has never felt the pressure it should from these voters, because they are unorganized. But someday the citizens will know where to put the blame for the drop in the purchasing power of the dollar, and they will express their opposition to the policy of "guns and butter, too."

Defense is all important for national safety. Luxuries and extravagances are not so essential. Yet the lobbies in Congress for bigger and better welfare appropriations are very powerful. The Democratic Party today has to accept the responsibility for the budget because, no matter what the President suggests, it is the Congress that must decide on how much shall be spent.

Supreme Court's Record on Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, the fight against subversion in the United States has been carried forward against the cunning and determined opposition of the disciplined Communist apparatus and its fellow travelers. The subverters have had the benefit of a pecular ally—the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Staunton (Va.) News-Leader performed a public service in its issue of January 4, 1959, by reprinting an article from the American Legion magazine, quoting a report of the American Bar Association's special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include this evidence of how valuable an ally the Supreme Court has been to the preachers and practicers of the Communist ideology.

The article follows:

We should like to present, without comment, a report of the American Bar Association's Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives. This deals with the Supreme Court's decisions on communism during the past 2 years:

1. *Communist Party* v. *Subversive Activities Control Board.* The Court refused to uphold or pass on the constitutionality of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, and delayed the effectiveness of the act.

2. *Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson.* The Court held that it was unlawful for Pennsylvania to prosecute a Pennsylvania Communist Party leader under the Pennsylvania Sedition Act, and indicated that the anti-sedition laws of 42 States and of Alaska and Hawaii cannot be enforced.

3. *Yates* v. *United States.* The Court reversed two Federal courts and ruled that teaching and advocating forcible overthrow of our Government, even "with evil intent," was not punishable under the Smith Act as long as it was "divorced from any effort to instigate action to that end," and ordered 5 Communist Party leaders freed and new trials for another 9.

4. *Cole* v. *Young.* The Court reversed two Federal courts and held that, although the Summary Suspension Act of 1950 gave the Federal Government the right to dismiss employees "in the interest of the national security of the United States," it was not in the interest of the national security to dismiss an employee who contributed funds and services to a not-disputed subversive organization, unless that employee was in a "sensitive position."

5. *Service* v. *Dulles.* The Court reversed two Federal courts which had refused to set aside the discharge of John Stewart Service by the State Department. The FBI had a recording of a conversation between Service and an editor of the pro-Communist magazine Amerasia, in the latter's hotel room in which Service spoke of military plans which were very secret. Earlier the FBI had found large numbers of secret and confidential State Department documents in the Amerasia office. The lower courts had followed the McCarran amendment which gave the Secretary of State absolute discretion to discharge any employee in the interests of the United States.

6. *Slochower* v. *Board of Education of New York.* The Court reversed the decisions of three New York courts and held it was unconstitutional to automatically discharge a teacher, in accordance with New York law, because he took the fifth amendment when asked about Communist activities. On petition for rehearing, the Court admitted that its opinion was in error in stating that Slochower was not aware that his claim of the fifth amendment would ipso facto result in his discharge; however, the Court denied rehearing.

7. *Sweezy* v. *New Hampshire.* The Court reversed the New Hampshire Supreme Court and held that the attorney general of New Hampshire was without authority to question Professor Sweezy, a lecturer at the State university, concerning a lecture and other suspected subversive activities. Questions which the Court said that Sweezy properly refused to answer included: "Did you advocate Marxism at that time?" and "Do you believe in communism?"

8. *United States* v. *Witkovich.* The Court decided that, under the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, which provides that any alien against whom there is final order of deportation shall give information under oath as to his nationality, circumstances, habits, associations, and activities, and such other information, whether or not related to the foregoing, as the attorney general may deem fit and proper, the attorney general did not have the right to ask Witkovich: "Since the order of deportation was entered in your case on June 25, 1953, have you attended any meetings of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.?"

9. *Schware* v. *Board of Examiners of New Mexico.* The Court reversed the decisions of the New Mexico Board of Bar Examiners and of the New Mexico Supreme Court which had said: "We believe one who has knowingly given his loyalties to the Communist Party for 6 or 7 years during a period of responsible adulthood is a person of questionable character." The Supreme Court ruled that membership in the Communist Party during the 1930's cannot be said to raise substantial doubts about his present good moral character.

10. *Konigsberg* v. *State Bar of California.* The Court reversed the decisions of the California Committee of Bar Examiners and of the California Supreme Court and held that it was unconstitutional to deny a license to practice law to an applicant who refused to answer this question put by the bar committee: "Mr. Konigsberg, are you a Communist?" and a series of similar questions.

11. *Jencks* v. *United States:* The Court reversed two Federal courts and held that Jencks, who was convicted of filing a false non-Communist affidavit, must be given the contents of all confidential FBI reports which were made by any Government witness in the case even though Jencks "restricted his motions to a request for production of the reports to the trial judge for the judge's inspection and determination whether and to what extent the reports should be made available."

12. *Watkins* v. *United States:* The Court reversed the Federal district court and six judges of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and held that the House Un-American Activities Committee could not require a witness who admitted, "I freely co-

operated with the Communist Party" to name his Communist associates, even though the witness did not invoke the fifth amendment. The Court said: "We remain unenlightened as to the subject to which the questions asked petitioner were pertinent." The Court did not question "the power of the Congress to inquire into and publicize corruption, maladministration, or inefficiency in agencies of the Government." The Court did question the right of Congress to inquire into and publicize communism and subversion, and suggested that this "involved a broad scale intrusion into the lives and affairs of private citizens."

13. *Raley, Stern, and Brown* v. *Ohio:* The Court reversed the Ohio Supreme Court and lower courts and set aside the conviction of three men who had refused to answer questions about Communist activities put to them by the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission.

14. *Flaxer* v. *United States:* The Court reversed two Federal courts and set aside the conviction of Flaxer of contempt for refusing to produce records of alleged Communist activities subpenaed by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

15. *Sacher* v. *United States:* The Court reversed two Federal courts and set aside the conviction of Sacher of contempt for refusing to tell the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee whether he was "a member of the lawyers' section of the Communist Party." In the second Sacher appeal, the Court again reversed the court of appeals and said that this question was not pertinent to the subcommittees' investigation of Communist witness Matusow's recantation. The Court refused to hear any argument from the Government lawyers representing this Senate subcommittee.

16. *Yates* v. *United States.* In the second Yates appeal, the Court reversed two Federal courts and held that the refusal of Communist Party member Yates "to answer 11 questions about Communist membership of other persons" did not constitute 11 contempts. In the third Yates appeal, the Court reversed two Federal courts and held that Yates' contempt sentence of 1 year should be reduced to the 15 days already served for this contempt.

17. *Bonetti* v. *Rogers.* The Court reversed two Federal courts and held that, although the Internal Security Act of 1950 provides that any alien, who "at any time" after entering the United States shall have been a member of the Communist Party, is deportable, Bonetti, an alien who became a Communist after entering the United States, was not deportable because he had reentered after quitting the party. The dissenting judges charged that this construction reads "at any time" out of the act and the word "last" into the statute, and "cripples the effectiveness of the act."

18. *Consul General for Yugoslavia* v. *Andrew Artukovic.* The Court reversed two Federal courts and held that Artukovic, an anti-Communist refugee from Yugoslavia who is living with his wife and children in California, could not claim political asylum in America, but had to submit to an extradition hearing which would be based on Yugoslavia's political charges.

19. *Rockwell Kent* v. *Dulles.* The Court reversed two Federal courts and held that the State Department could not require every applicant for a passport to file a non-Communist affidavit.

20. *Dayton* v. *Dulles.* The Court reversed two Federal courts and held that the State Department had to give a passport to a research physicist whose passport application to accept a job in India had been denied for security reasons. The Secretary of State had found that Dayton had lived for 8 months with a Communist who "was involved in the espionage apparatus of Julius Rosenberg" and that Dayton was going to work in India with another Communist "who recently renounced his American citizenship."

Tax on Long-Term Capital Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that revision in our tax structure is a must if we are to encourage the individual capital investment so necessary for providing jobs for our ever-increasing working force.

The amount of new risk capital required to keep our economy healthy at any given time is obviously related to population—to the demographic facts of births, deaths, longevity, retirement, and other germane matters over a period of time. As I read the figures, it now requires over $15,000 of new risk capital to bring one new little job into the world. An examination of the available data on babies growing up and wanting jobs, on automation's replacement of old jobs with more costly new ones, and on inflation's toll on the cost of maintaining and replacing wornout or obsolete machinery, it would seem that we now need annually not only over $40 billion of new risk capital to meet our new job needs, but also at least another $40 billion of new capital each year to keep in good repair the tools of the jobs we already have.

This new capital can come directly or indirectly, from only one source—the invested savings of the individual citizen. And high taxes and unwise taxes which impede incentives to thrift, savings and investment, pose a serious threat to economic growth and full employment.

On the other hand, I well realize the fiscal plight of a Federal Treasury faced with a budget deficit of $8 billion and the inflationary consequences that might result at this time from intemperate tax reduction schemes that would merely shift our tax burdens from one group to another and thereby stifle economic growth and further choke off the reservoir from which all taxes must be paid—the excess margin of real productivity over consumption, which we call savings.

Nevertheless, there is one area of Fedral tax reform which would go far toward encouraging equity investment in new and small businesses, creating new job opportunities and providing additional revenues to the Federal Government. This area exists in that portion of our Revenue Code which deals with taxation of so-called long-term capital gains. To begin with, this tax is a very poor revenue producer because of its voluntary nature and because of its unrealistic high rate.

It is my firm belief that this is an unwise, and an unfair tax. It is largely a levy on capital and not on income. It penalizes elderly owners of homes and farms who wish to sell and retire into smaller and less expensive quarters. It penalizes owners of investments who wish gradually to shift their holdings into more conservative securities as they gradually attain their less productive years. It prevents many constructive business transactions that would be in the public interest, especially the ability of small and weaker enterprises to merge with stronger organizations rather than be forced to discontinue operations which provide our citizens with jobs. And last, but not least, it has sterilized vast pools of risk capital, substantial portions of which otherwise would find their way into risk investment in new and small business ventures and thereby afford vast new employment opportunities, new productive capacity, and new sources of tax revenues to the Treasury.

It is for these reasons that I am introducing today a resolution which provides that the alternate rate of tax on long-term capital gains be reduced from 25 percent to 12½ percent.

It is my firm conviction that this bill is a revenue producing measure.

If this tax rate were so changed, investment in our economic system would receive substantial encouragement, new jobs would be created and the Treasury would actually gain revenues as a result thereof. After all, no one has to sell his capital assets, but a great many would willingly do so if the tax rate were made more realistic.

I welcome the bipartisan support of my colleagues in bringing this bill to early committee consideration, separate and apart from other revenue measures. I am sure the evidence produced before them at the attendant hearings will convince them of the wisdom of enacting this legislation.

General Practitioner of the Year, Dr. Lonnie A. Coffin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, last month the American Medical Association's house of delegates meeting in Minneapolis, Minn., named as the general practitioner of the year Dr. Lonnie A. Coffin of Farmington, Iowa.

The tribute was most highly deserved. Dr. Coffin has spent most of his 68 years working for the welfare of all residents of the Farmington area beginning in his youthful days when all trips were by horse and buggy. He has brought into this world some 2,500 babies and has been of immeasurable service to thousands of other persons.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an Associated Press story about Dr. Coffin

and the honor paid him as printed in the Des Moines Register for Wednesday, December 3, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIFE STORY OF IOWA DOCTOR: CARE FOR ALL, AT ANYTIME

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—The Nation's new outstanding family doctor of the year wishes that all physicians would practice medicine from the humane side, caring for any patient needing their services.

And that's the life story of Dr. Lonnie A. Coffin, 63, a kindly mannered doctor from Farmington, Iowa.

He was named general practitioner of the year Tuesday by the American Medical Association's house of delegates at a meeting here.

"I am worried that a small minority of doctors look at their practice from the commercial side," he told a news conference. "But it is a very small minority. The majority of doctors do a good job."

SEVEN DAYS A WEEK

To Dr. Coffin a good job has meant working days and nights as needed, 7 days a week, during his 44-year medical career in Farmington, a community of about 1,000.

When he started practice in the horse-and-buggy era he was 1 of 5 doctors serving the town. Now, with the automobile simplifying the transportation problem, he serves the area alone.

Since suffering a heart attack 8 years ago he has limited the number of night calls. But he still works on Sundays.

Dr. Coffin, who said he doubts he ever will retire, recalled he has delivered 2,500 babies—2,000 of them in their own homes—and he has helped handle many kitchen table operations, because Farmington never has had a hospital.

What's the difference between today's medical patients and those seen nearly a half century ago?

FAST-CLIP LIVING

More of today's patients suffer from psychosomatic complaints.

"It's tension caused by fast-clip living," he said.

He thinks the family doctor is well equipped to handle complaints of this type.

The patient is close to his family doctor and comes to him naturally for treatment, advice, and assurance, Dr. Coffin said.

"What is the most outstanding case or event that has occurred to you?" he was asked.

His answer was nothing more dramatic than the injecting of a hypodermic needle into a boy critically ill with tetanus infection.

But while tetanus was an old story for him even then, it was his first experience with antitoxin. The boy lived. All the others had died.

FIRST IOWAN

Dr. Coffin, a widower, was flanked at the news conference by his two daughters, Mrs. William Hols and Mrs. Floyd Miller of Farmington.

Dr. Coffin is the first Iowan to win the award.

He was born on a small farm in Clark County, Mo., and moved to Iowa at the age of 5. He was graduated from Farmington high in 1909 and 4 years later was a member of the last medical class graduated from Drake university in Des Moines.

He served as president of the Iowa Medical Society in 1956.

Cotton: A "King" in Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, two of Texas' top morning and afternoon newspapers, the Austin American and the Austin Statesman, published in their Sunday combination—the American-Statesman—of December 14 an alarmingly graphic feature involving the bleak status of our Nation's ailing cotton-producing industry.

Captioned, "Cotton: A 'King' in Trouble," the analytic feature was written by State Editor Dave Shanks, columnist and authoritative analyst of agricultural and ranching matters.

Mr. Shanks' report represents a skillfully drawn literary portrait of despair, based not on the intangibles of theory, but on the hard facts of economics, the kind of economics which are day-to-day facts to a great body of American farmers. The tragedy of agriculture, or the small farmer's share of it, simply is that farmers are expected to perform as free producers when the things they buy and sell are subject to various controls, governmental, industrial and union. Of equal importance is the threat to an agricultural culture that has given this country the only overall farm abundance enjoyed by any nation on earth.

Surely, there is a better approach than the one we now have for restoring stability and incentive to the farmers of America—prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I think every Member of Congress should be given opportunity to read and study Mr. Shanks' article; and I, therefore, under unanimous consent, include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

[From the Austin (Tex.) American-Statesman, Dec. 14, 1958]

COTTON: A "KING" IN TROUBLE

(By Dave Shanks)

The long drought that shriveled the cotton economy of central Texas' "black waxy" region was succeeded by another weather cruelty.

Rains, welcomed in the dormant winter season, stayed on too long. Chocolate-colored mud bogged tractors loaded with can-shaped planting rigs in the spring. A humid summer cheapened lint grades with rot and spots and drove impatient migrant-field laborers under barns and finally on to west Texas.

One day last week at Elgin, on the southern edge of prairie triangle spreading across Texas northward to the Red River, Ed Lundgren watched a work crew inch into place a heavy machine for a new cotton oil mill on the site of one gutted by fire just before New Year's. A frog voiced warning of the Katy's freight thundering through the crossing between the oil mill and the bank, two blocks west of Main Street, had interrupted his complaints.

"A new crop year begins, but we still have old cotton in the fields," lamented Lundgren, a short, bald man who has grown or processed cotton for most of his life.

On Monday, just as they have for the last 6 years, small farmers of the old Cotton Belt from Georgia to Texas and the newer "cotton ranchers" from Lubbock to Los Angeles will drift into courthouses and country schools to vote in another industry-wide referendum.

A CERTAIN OUTCOME

The election outcome is certain: 1959 will be cotton's seventh season of controlled acres and subsidy payments since the end of World War II.

The certainty of the outcome spotlights the precarious hold on sovereignty by King Cotton.

Vagaries of weather, dictionary-thick stacks of Government regulations, innovations of the technology that quadrupled farm output as well as launched a rocket moonward. All these plague cotton, making tragic the era for a crop once powerful enough to arm a Confederate nation with an economic weapon the equal of the Union's industries. Even now, the crop is the South's biggest industry and the West's biggest farming venture.

Squeezed round bale-to-round bale in compress warehouses across the South, the cumbersome surplus of cotton is only slightly less bulky than the commodity mountains of wheat in Great Plains elevators and bulging corncribs on Midwest farms.

The surpluses are symbols of the new farm problem just as they were of the old.

Next year, the symbols may be bigger, but the farm policy will be different.

AIMING FOR A LAW

Bearing the imprint of Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson's philosophy of free choice for agriculture, the 1959 referendum triggers a historical policy change. Substituting a new flexibility for the older rigid-type programs, Benson has maneuvered the first breakthrough in U.S. farm policy in a decade.

The current complex of Federal farm law and bureaucratic regulation began as a Government-sponsored assurance to depression-scared farmers, offering them a guaranteed price floor to boost production for World War II.

The aim was a quasi-law of supply and demand. Simple arithmetic and more sophisticated statistical guessing were to enforce the law.

U.S. Agriculture Department experts would add up these figures: (1) Last year's crop carryover; (2) a stockpile for national emergency; (3) foreign export; (4) domestic consumption.

This sum would be divided by the average per acre cotton yields.

An answer-quotient would be the number of acres required to grow cotton to meet the demand.

The quotient, in acres, has ranged from 20 to 16.5 million. The land pool was divided among States, counties, individual farms. Allotments for each were based on the history of past plantings.

For restricting production by formula, farmers got the chance to hedge their crops. They could sell in the open market or borrow at a price floor through Commodity Credit Corporation loans. Theoretically, an accurate estimate of acres and demand welded supply and demand into unity.

A strange admixture of politics and the gadgets of technology set in motion a crisis that began with the peace treaties.

Politically, the congressional farm bloc—an alliance of cotton and corn State solons—insisted the acre pool be kept constant and big. The statisticians lost the battle with Congress.

Farmers eyed the price floor, then turned to try out the efficiencies of the war-created technology. This meant new machines, a fantastic new chemical industry that turned out tons of crop-boosting fertilizers and crop-saving insecticides, irrigation wells, and a host of other expensive capital items.

As it had in industry, technology paid dividends in agriculture. In 1958 producers could grow 469 pounds of lint (just under 500-pound bales) per acre, or 52 pounds more than the past alltime record in 1955.

In central Texas, growers used the new techniques to build acre yields from 175 pounds to 250 pounds in less than 10 years. John Vernon Stiles of Taylor, the region's economic expert for the industry, says Williamson County farmers planted 30,000 acres, hauled 57,000 bales to gins this season.

Added to the political decision and the science of production was a new market enemy.

Other U.S. chemists had built a synthetic fiber industry that produced without regard of weather or insects enough fibers to spin cloth equivalent to 5 million cotton bales, or a third of the nation's fiber consumption.

Across international boundaries, peons in Mexico and peasants in South America and Africa labored in the harvests on more and more acres planted to crop. Buyers at Tokyo, Hamburg, and Liverpool bid substantially less for foreign cotton than they did for the U.S. crop.

What had happened to cotton had occurred for most other U.S. staple crops, and the surpluses cost the Agriculture Department most of its $5 billion a year budget.

After 6 years as the most controversial U.S. Agriculture Secretary in history, Benson gunned down the farm bloc. His arsenal included city-based Democrats, a Presidential veto, and a self-asserted public opinion. His victory already has forced corngrowners to discard Government controls, which may incur tremendous corn stocks next year, and will force cottongrowers to make a new choice in 1959.

Next year, a farmer can—

(1) Plant within a base acre allotment, receive a guaranteed loan of 80 percent parity (33 cents per pound, Middling 15/16-inch class);

(2) Plant the base allotment plus 40 percent more acres, receive a guaranteed loan of 65 percent of parity, or about 27 cents per pound.

Ostensibly, the choice for a farmer is simple, or if complicated, the degree is arithmetical and not algebraic.

But in the beer parlor at Niederwald, at the Farm Bureau meeting at Hutto, even after church on Sundays, central Texas farmers are making calculations for a choice they know is not simple or satisfying.

Essentially, these calculations could be typical:

A farmer with a 100-acre base allotment and prospects of growing half a bale of cotton per acre could—

(1) Plant within his base allotment, receive $8,250 for his 50 bales worth $165 a bale, or 33 cents a pound.

(2) Plant 140 acres (40 percent more than his base allotment), receive $9,450 for his 70 bales worth $135 a bale, or 27 cents a pound.

Another calculation must intervene. Farmers estimate harvest costs ranging from $35 to $45 per bale, based on paying hand labor $2 per hundredweight for the 2,000 pounds of "bollies" needed to make a 500-pound bale of lint.

Deducting these charges, 50 bales would still yield $6,250 with higher subsidy rates and 70 bales would yield only $6,650 at the lower rate.

Involved in this last calculation are all the complexities of economic theory and fact that distinguishes agriculture from most other industries.

The assumption is that harvest charges will be more and more expensive, since farm labor wage rates are tied to rising urban wages and salaries. Moreover, most farmers reason that the bulk of their other production costs (tractors, gasoline, planting seed, etc.) are fixed at a per unit level that would not vary for 1 bale, 10 bales, or 100 bales.

UNIT COST INCREASE

In short, a technology that increased production by as much as 20 to 30 percent in a decade has failed to achieve a decreasing cost production pattern that would lower unit costs less as production increased. Despite the machines, or maybe because of them, unit costs not only are constant for large or small output levels, but they are getting higher and higher.

This assumption represents a conflict, even a paradox. For strange and different results have been counted over the expanded Cotton Belt that extends now ocean to ocean. For one thing, the production units range from patch-sized farms to ranch-big factories. Typically, central Texas, in the center of the continental industry area, is characterized by middle-sized units described by agriculturists as the family sized farm.

The Texas blacklands, however, encounter two important problems in matching the technological advances: The family sized farm's optimum size is getting bigger and bigger (to use four-row instead of two-row tractors); about half the farm operations are by tenants on year-to-year tenure agreements, making impossible either long-term soil conservation practices or other investments.

Few farms in the area can utilize $6,000 cotton harvesting machines that cut harvest charges or $20,000 irrigation wells that bolster production.

Despite this snag, a piece of machinery may change the cost structure, bolstering farm income in this area. Cotton strippers have been used by some farmers in the area. Most give the machines an A–1 rating, claim they can cut harvest charges 60 percent as compared to a hand-harvested crop. Typical cost estimates are about $15 per bale (instead of $40).

This sort of saving could widen the margin of profit for a larger crop, even as soon as 1959.

THE CHOICES FOR 1959

The choices for planting a crop in 1959 have an even longer range importance than next year's production.

Some experts say the 1959 crop will be grown on more acres than the 1958 crop. This means that production will be stepped up, creating an even larger cotton surplus and requiring new cuts in acre allotments.

The record of crop controls is one of acre retrogression already. For central Texas growers this year sustained a 10- to 12-percent acre cut. Over a longer period, cotton expert Stiles cites the Williamson County acre history.

Prior to the control years, Williamson farmers planted from 175,000 to 200,000 acres of cotton. The decline has been steady. Next year, farmers in this county can plant 102,000 on base allotment acres. Even that is 13,000 acres less than there were allocated in 1958.

What choice will farmers actually make?

A poll of growers in three central Texas counties indicates that most area producers will plant fewer acres to get higher subsidies.

There are exceptions, R. H. Brookshire of Thrall and R. W. (Dusty) Rhoades of Taylor both plan to plant the maximum number of acres.

Explains Brookshire: "I would plant more acres because it would be more profitable. A cotton farmer's biggest cost is harvesting his crop. With machine harvesting, I can make more profit per bale with more cotton."

Rhoades favors planting more cotton acres "to get away from planting so much milo, which really cuts down on land production."

But Rudolph Kovar of Circleville says he plans to "plant within the base allotment to get a better price for the cotton I grow."

In Williamson County, Correspondent Vera Allan found that farmers intended to plant for the higher loan rate by a 4-to-1 margin.

One, Robert Riske of Walburg, even advocated complete abandonment of government programs. "I'd like for them to turn the farmer loose. If it ever comes to a vote on that, I'll vote to let farmers be free again."

A OPTION FOR MOST

But most others, though dissatisfied, will use the A option.

Said Martin Bergstrom of Georgetown: "The program is a mess. It's not functioning like it ought to. Seems to me the little fellow is being taken advantage of. But I don't want to plant too much cotton and get a low price for it."

Frank Simek of Jarrell believes that a farmer "will have it rough" unless he stays within the lower allotment plan.

Correspondent Henry Martindale at Lockhart said farmers favored 7-to-1 the A option. But County Agent Steve Lindsey reported farmers who had used cotton stripper machines were satisfied and some may plant under the B option.

American Investments in Foreign Ventures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Foreign Trade Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee recently completed a series of extremely important hearings designed to gain information that will be helpful to the House in determining what should be done legislatively to encourage productive American investments in foreign ventures and the reinvestment of foreign earnings.

The committee has received a great many useful and constructive suggestions from representatives of industry and Government which have been helpful to us in preparing legislation for the consideration of the House. However, time did not permit the committee to hear representatives of all the groups interested in this vital aspect of the world's economy.

However, I have a statement from Mr. Chad F. Calhoun, vice president of Kaiser Industries Corp., and many of its affiliates, which contains a number of excellent suggestions with respect to a possible approach to this problem. Consequently, I would like to have this statement made a part of the RECORD of the

House so that it will be available to many individuals in Government and industry who are interested in this problem.

The Kaiser companies are active in many areas of the world and have had practical experience in this field. I am extremely pleased that Mr. Calhoun and his colleagues have given us the opportunity to gain from their vast experience in this area of international economics.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement, as follows:

My name is Chad F. Calhoun, of Washington, D.C. I am vice president of Kaiser Industries Corp. and its various affiliated companies, including Henry J. Kaiser Co., Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., Kaiser Steel Corp., and Willys Motors, Inc.

Like many other American business firms, the Kaiser companies are working today in all parts of the world. Our engineering and construction division is presently building a large hydroelectric project in Australia, a steel plant in India, a steel plant and an automotive manufacturing plant in Brazil, and a power plant in Puerto Rico. We are making a study of the proposed Volta River dam for the Government of Ghana, and are in the planning stages of numerous other engineering projects throughout the world. Willys Motors, Inc., a Kaiser wholly owned subsidiary, is now manufacturing Universal Jeep vehicles, Jeep trucks and passenger cars, either through affiliated companies or licensees, in every continent except Africa, and we believe that an African manufacturing project is not far off. Kaiser Aluminum is now mining or searching for bauxite in many countries. It is also planning to invest in reduction and fabricating plants in India, and is considering participating in similar projects in Argentina, Brazil, and Spain. Kaiser Steel is seriously studying the feasibility of participating in the development of the rich iron ore deposits of Brazil. Permanente Cement, also a Kaiser company, obtains the raw material for its gypsum products in Mexico.

We have also joined other American investment and business firms to contribute part of the initial capital for foreign development banks sponsored by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. We are stockholders of Pakistan Industrial Credit and Investment Corporation, and with the approval of the Indian Government, we are now arranging a similar investment in the Industrial Credit and Investment Corporation of India.

The Kaiser management is aware not only of the business opportunities that may be found abroad, but also of the risks that surround these opportunities. We are equally aware that the choice between doing business at home and doing business abroad is no mere matter of dollars and cents, but a matter of the survival of our basic economic and governmental institutions. Both as businessmen and as citizens, we realize the urgent need to stimulate the greatest possible flow of western capital and technical skills to other parts of the world in time to channel the "revolution of rising expectations" into economic and governmental forms that are compatible with western ideas of a free society.

It is not our purpose to dwell on this urgent need, which has been clearly recognized by the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and by virtually all of the witnesses, both Government officials and businessmen, who have testified before this committee. We take it there is general agreement that the flow of private American capital and know-how to the underdeveloped areas must be increased as a matter of primary national interest, and that any Government measures which can help speed that flow deserve serious and urgent consideration.

Like many other American industrial firms, the Kaiser companies can contribute a part of the required capital and skills, and want to do so. We are interested not merely in the export of goods and services, but in investment of physical assets and individual skills in partnerships with foreign firms and investors in the underdeveloped areas with any financial return to us dependent on the ultimate financial success of the venture. We have found, however, that our ability to make such investments is sometimes seriously hampered by the need to pay American taxes in cash at the time the investment is made, long before the investment has created any earnings. We have also found that when foreign earnings do come in, our ability to reinvest them in other productive activities in the same or a different foreign country is seriously curtailed by the need to first pay an American income tax, even though the earnings are not being brought back to the United States, but are instead being reinvested abroad.

We therefore warmly support the objectives of H.R. 12368, and we suggest that its scope be widened as indicated below. We propose that, in order to encourage productive investments in foreign ventures and the reinvestment of foreign earnings, the United States tax on the making of such investments or on the resulting earnings be deferred until the earnings are realized and brought back to the United States for distribution. We have three specific suggestions, and we have attempted to illustrate the reasons for each of them by incidents from our own experience.

Summarized briefly, our suggestions are as follows:

(a) In order to encourage the making of productive foreign investments in the form of services, know-how, and equipment, we have the following suggestions:

1. Paper profits resulting from investment of engineering or construction services, technical assistance, or know-how in productive foreign manufacturing firms, in exchange for shares or in exchange for a deferred-payment obligation, should not be subject to United States tax until such time as the shares are sold or the deferred obligation is paid.

2. Paper profits or increase in values resulting from the investment of machinery and other assets in exchange for shares or deferred payment obligations of a foreign manufacturing firm should not be subject to U.S. tax until such time as the shares are sold or the deferred obligation is paid.

B. In order to encourage the reinvestment abroad of realized foreign earnings (including but not limited to those described in the first two suggestions), we have this third suggestion, which has already been made by Chairman Boggs and by several other witnesses at these hearings:

3. A new class of corporation, to be known as a U.S. Foreign Business Corporation, should be established under the Internal Revenue Code. To be so classified, it would have to engage primarily in the active conduct of business abroad. Its profits and gains from such foreign business activities would not be subject to U.S. taxes until they are made available to its U.S. shareholders as ordinary or liquidating dividends.

It goes without saying that all of these suggestions should be embodied in legislation so drafted as to stimulate the flow of bona fide investment in active foreign business operations, without creating loopholes for tax avoidance and without creating tax havens for investments that have no useful purpose in the struggle to improve world living standards.

We would now like to cite some specific examples from our own experience which in our opinion illustrate the need for the measures we suggest:

1. Paper profit resulting from investment of engineering or construction services, technical assistance or know-how in productive foreign manufacturing firms, in exchange for shares or in exchange for a deferred payment obligation should not be subject to U.S. tax until such time as the shares are sold or the deferred obligation is paid.

Kaiser engineers designs, engineers and supervises the construction of industrial plants in many countries. We want to expand this business. We have the men and the skills that are the true ingredients of capital formation in underdeveloped countries, often more important than the physical plants themselves. We will take the risk of participating in a project by accepting minority shares or deferred payment obligation payable in local currency for part of our engineering fees. A joint venture participation of this type is clearly a valuable contribution to the economy of an underdeveloped nation, since it not only reduces the immediate foreign exchange burden, but also brings all the tangible and intangible benefits of continuing partnership. Under present law, however, the acceptance of shares or deferred payment obligations would require us to make an immediate cash payment in dollars of income tax to the U.S. Treasury based on our anticipated engineering profit, and computed as if we had been paid in cash, instead of in securities which we cannot, or, in the interest of the project, should not immediately sell.

The tax law considerations which normally lead the Treasury to consider the receipt of marketable securities or obligations as the equivalent of cash clearly ought not to be applied to the type of transaction described above. Whether and when it will be possible to sell the securities or obligations, and for how much, is usually a matter of conjecture. Moreover, our national interest in promoting foreign investment makes it highly undesirable to liquidate the investment the moment it is made, in order to pay United States taxes. Accordingly, it would seem to be in the national interest to permit the payment of tax to be deferred until such time as a sale or liquidation, or the payment of dividends or interest, gives rise to tangible and convertible cash income.[1]

2. Paper profits or increase in values resulting from the investment of machinery and other assets in exchange for shares or deferred payment obligations of a foreign manufacturing firm should not be subject to United States tax until such time as the shares are sold or the deferred obligation is paid.

The need for such a provision is illustrated by the experience of our wholly owned subsidiary Willys Motors, Inc. Willys Motors, Inc., makes the world-famous Universal Jeep line of vehicles. The principal natural market for Jeep vehicles is in the underdeveloped countries, where the lack of paved roads creates such formidable obstacles to economic growth. Since most of these nations lack the foreign exchange to import American-made Jeep vehicles, Willys has adopted the policy of establishing foreign manufacturing plants, wherever a sufficient market and industrial base exists to support an adequate volume of production. In order to establish a firm base for the plant's operation through the participation of local investors, Willys has organized these foreign manufacturing plants with Willys owning a minority stock interest. The majority ownership, and often the principal voice in management, is held by the local people. Willys is thus in partnership with more than

[1] If this tangible income is received by an eligible U.S. foreign business corporation of the type described in our third suggestion, the tax would be levied only when the income is distributed to the shareholders of the foreign business corporation.

10,000 local stockholders in Argentina, more than 15,000 in Brazil, almost 10,000 in India, and with responsible local businessmen in Australia, Israel, Turkey, and other countries.

The principal Willys contribution to these foreign manufacturing operations has been to invest American machinery and to arrange machinery investments by others, and to supply management and technical skills and know-how under license.[2] The American equipment invested has usually been taken from an existing operation of Willys or one of its automotive suppliers in the United States, and the fair value of this equipment to the foreign manufacturing firm has been substantially above its so-called basis for United States tax purposes, because of depreciation charges during its past useful life. On some occasions the equipment has been specially made by a machinery builder and has been invested by the builder for shares in our foreign affiliate, with the investment value being the sale price of the machinery, which includes the builder's profit. In all such cases, a transfer of equipment in exchange for shares gives rise to a taxable capital gain or taxable income when the shares are received, unless the transaction qualifies as a tax-free reorganization under section 351 of the Internation Revenue Code and has the prior approval of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under section 367 of the code.

For the transaction to qualify as tax-free for the American investor, all of the persons (including foreign associates) investing money or property in the venture as part of the same transaction must end up owning at least 80 percent of each class of stock of the foreign company. This test is automatically met when the foreign company is first organized. However, after the venture has gotten started, the time almost inevitably comes to make a second or third investment of additional machinery required as the foreign plant widens the extent of its manufacturing operations. By that time, well over 20 percent of the foreign company stock may be in the hands of thousands of local investors who hold bearer shares, and it may not be feasible to arrange matters so that enough of them participate as a matter of record in the second or third investments to meet the 80-percent test. Accordingly, when the time comes for Willys or its suppliers to make a follow-up investment of machinery in one of these foreign ventures, they may face the need of paying a United States capital gains tax or income tax, not on an assured profit in hand, but on the doubtful privilege of holding new shares in a foreign company, shares which may be difficult to sell and convert into dollars, and which in any event cannot be sold and converted immediately without prejudicing the success of the venture.

Similarly, Willys has at times found it necessary to contribute working capital to its foreign affiliates by making an investment of component manufacturing parts produced in the United States, in exchange for shares or long-term deferred payment obligations of the foreign company. The component parts are then assembled by the foreign company together with locally manufactured parts and sold as completed vehicles, with a portion of the sales price representing the Willys parts thus providing a source of local working capital needed for expansion purposes. In such cases, under present tax laws, Willys faces the need of paying a United States income tax on its paper profit on the component parts, even though the reality of a cash return is a long way off in the future.

Once again, the policy reason for deferring U.S. tax until the profit has actually been realized by liquidation of the shares, discounting of the long-term deferred payment obligations, or by receipt of dividends and interest, seem very strong indeed. The present policy of taxing when shares, particularly, are received strongly discourages the making of such investments in the first place, and, when the investments are made, tends to produce the undesirable result of forcing their liquidation.[3]

3. A new class of corporation, to be known as a U.S. foreign business corporation, should be established under the Internal Revenue Code. To be so classified, it would have to engage primarily in the active conduct of business abroad. Its profits and gains from such foreign business activities would not be subject to U.S. taxes until they are made available to its U.S. shareholders as ordinary or liquidating dividends.

American business firms, including our own companies, could do far more if they were permitted to take the income received on one foreign investment and reinvest this income in the same or another development project abroad in the same or another foreign country without first having to pay a U.S. tax on these earnings, even though the earnings are not being brought back to the United States.

Under present law, any dividends or royalties received by a U.S. company from a foreign affiliate are subject to tax when received in whatever currency, so long as the currency can be converted into dollars or otherwise utilized. The amount of the U.S. tax is often substantial even after credit is taken for foreign taxes on the same income. The need to, in effect, prepay the U.S. tax greatly reduces the amount available for productive reinvestment abroad. Moreover, this need to prepay the tax tends to force the conversion of the dividend or royalty into dollars in order to provide the means, even though the exchange rate may be unfavorable at the time, and the temptation to keep the discounted balance in the United States rather than risk it abroad again is very great.

Instead of this negative disincentive to foreign investment, it would appear to be much wiser to create a positive incentive for the reinvestment of foreign earnings by subjecting them to tax only if they are brought back to the United States and distributed and not reinvested abroad. In this way, the income on U.S. foreign investment abroad would be kept at work through reinvestment abroad, thus greatly enhancing the amount of U.S. capital and know-how effectively being used to help raise the living standards of the underdeveloped peoples.

A specific example will illustrate. Through Willys Motors we own a minority interest in a Brazilian manufacturing affiliate. We are also interested in doing engineering work and iron ore development work in Brazil. We cannot use the income of our manufacturing affiliate for these purposes, because we cannot commit our fellow Brazilian shareholders to a completely different venture of our own. Accordingly, we can commit to these new ventures only our share of the dividends and royalties actually paid out to us by this manufacturing affiliate. But once the dividends and royalties are paid out to Willys, they become subject to a substantial U.S. tax. We must convert a large part of the dividends and royalties into dollars in order to pay this tax, and when we make a decision on reinvesting the balance, the decision really becomes one of deciding whether to risk fresh dollars on which we have already paid U.S. tax. We have no incentive to keep the earnings working abroad in a new investment instead of bringing them home.

We could conceivably form a foreign holding company to hold the stock and license agreements of our Brazilian subsidiary, receive the dividends and royalties free of U.S. tax, and reinvest the profits. Some firms have foreign subsidiaries which serve this very purpose. But serious U.S. tax problems would arise if we formed a foreign company to hold these foreign securities and license agreements. Furthermore, it would be much less artificial and much more convenient if we could form a domestic rather than a foreign corporation to receive and reinvest abroad our profits from our foreign subsidiaries.

Accordingly, we wish strongly to endorse as our third major recommendation the idea of a U.S. foreign business corporation to serve this purpose. A U.S. foreign business corporation would be a domestic corporation. If it met tests requiring it to engage actively in a trade or business abroad, directly or through subsidiaries, with strong safeguards against loopholes, its foreign earnings would not be subject to U.S. tax until distributed to the U.S. stockholders of the U.S. foreign business corporation. This would apply to the following major types of income:

1. Profits from the sale of merchandise for use, consumption, or resale outside the United States;

2. Royalties from the use of patents, know-how, and the like outside the United States;

3. Compensation for technical assistance rendered outside the United States;

4. Interest and dividends from a foreign corporation which is engaged in the active conduct of a trade or business outside the United States and in which the U.S. Foreign Business Corporation has at least a 10-percent interest; and

5. Gains from the sale of stock or securities of a foreign corporation which is engaged in the active conduct of a trade or business outside the United States, provided the stock or securities have been held as an investment by the U.S. Foreign Business Corporation for 2 years or more.

When the U.S. Foreign Business Corporation made a distribution to its parent, it would then include in its taxable income the amounts which had been previously deducted and deferred. Deductions and credits related to the deferred income would also be deferred so as clearly to reflect the net income over the years. Thus, the ultimate tax paid, if and when profits are repatriated, would be the same substantially as would currently be paid by United States corporations and stockholders not allowed the deferment privilege. This would create a strong incentive for foreign investment by permitting the full use of foreign earnings for reinvestment abroad.

If incentive measures along the lines we have recommended are adopted, we believe that American private industry can play a much more effective role in helping other peoples to develop their economies along western rather than totalitarian lines. We do not mean to suggest that this will be a cure-all, or a panacea. There will remain great need for protection against the risk from currency devaluation, expropriation, and other foreseeable hazards inherent in doing business abroad. Also, no matter how much can be achieved by private industry, there remains a vast area of basic public works, such as transportation and power, beyond the present means of private industry, in which investment and development must remain the primary responsibility of

[2] If patents, trademarks and know-how are invested for shares instead of being furnished on a royalty basis, the problem of a taxable capital gain arises in the same way as in the machinery example described in this paragraph.

[3] If this tangible income is received by an eligible U.S. foreign business corporation of the type described in our third suggestion, the tax would be levied only when the income is distributed to the shareholders of the Foreign Business Corporation.

governments. But a well-aimed program of incentives for private foreign investment can do a great deal to stimulate the outward flow of American capital, know-how, and enterprise. It deserves a serious try.

Gratuitous Advice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, in the Nation's Capital, where the public schools were integrated at a headlong and headless pace in a burst of official enthusiasm following the proclamation of its new legal philosophy by the Supreme Court, editors seemingly have a permanent far-away look in their eyes.

Oblivious to juvenile crime and moral laxity at home, they stare intently across the Potomac, where they see a mirage of disorder and decay in the efforts of the people of Virginia to educate their children in the face of Federal judicial interference and threats.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a pertinent editorial on this a peculiarity of editorial vision in the District of Columbia which appeared in the December 16, 1958, issue of the Northern Virginia Daily, published at Strasburg, Va.

The editorial follows:

ADVICE FROM WASHINGTON

Some of our esteemed contemporaries across the famous "line," having fully exploited the legal, moral, social, and religious aspects of racial segregation in the public schools, have now trained their guns on the economic phases of the problem. Thus the Washington Post, in an editorial captioned "Closed Schools Cost Money," discusses the economic dislocations threatened by Virginia's massive resistance program, and says the blunt facts furnish further dramatic illustration of the debacle into which the State's present official policy inevitably leads. It quotes a University of Virginia professor as warning that closed schools would halt the State's economic development.

If there have been any serious economic dislocations in Virginia, they are not observable in Front Royal, where the first school to close under the State's massive resistance program is located. There has been no wholesale exodus from the city, such as they have had in Washington, the model integrated city, where white citizens are moving into the nearby areas of Maryland and Virginia to escape the blight of integration. Bank deposits are normal, and merchants report an excellent pre-Christmas business. The entire business outlook is considered good. If the Post seeks support for its economic dislocations theory, it will have to look elsewhere than Front Royal to find it.

George Massey, secretary of the Front Royal Chamber of Commerce, says there is no tangible proof of economic dislocations, and no evidence of employee dissatisfaction or existing industries threatening to move out because of school conditions. The Post, as usual, is exercising a very vivid imagination and setting up a strawman at which to shoot in its bitter warfare on Virginia's segregation policy. And what is true in Front Royal is true throughout the State. There have been no serious economic dislocations in Virginia, and it seems very unlikely that there will be. Virginia is conducting an honorable and lawful resistance to what it believes to be both unwise and unconstitutional.

If the Post would fix its sight a little closer home, and see the moral filth and degradation in its own backyard, it would have less time to criticize what it regards as the shortcomings of Virginia, particularly in respect to racial segregation. The racially mixed schools of Washington have become notorious as hotbeds of immorality and crime. Rape and illegitimacy are of common occurrence. Educational standards have dropped. Teen-agers roam the streets in wild and reckless gangs and beat and rob innocent citizens. It would seem that the Post would have its hands full if it attempted to correct the faults in its own city, without spreading its integration propaganda into nearby Virginia.

Twenty-five Percent Minimum Pay Hike Asked—Textile Man Seeks Boost by United States Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the attached story from the Columbia (S. C.) The State, of Wednesday, December 3, 1958. It is the story in which the head of the Nation's largest textile company called for a 25 percent boost in the minimum legal wage permitted by the Federal Government for textile workers. I think the story will be of interest to everyone who might be thinking about the subject, and certainly either this issue, or ones similar, is going to be before the 86th Congress. The article follows:

TWENTY-FIVE PERCENT MINIMUM PAY HIKE ASKED—TEXTILE MAN SEEKS BOOST BY UNITED STATES LAW

GREENSBORO.—The head of the Nation's largest textile company called Tuesday for a 25 percent boost in the minimum legal wage permitted by the Federal Government for textile workers.

J. Spencer Love, chairman and president of Burlington Industries, declared in a statement that the only fair and just way of raising textile wages would be a law requiring all textile companies to fall in line.

Otherwise, he said, companies raising their workers' pay would be at a competitive disadvantage.

Competitive conditions are such, he said, "that a general wage increase cannot be made at this time, because all producers would not follow any pattern, even if set by a few leaders."

Love's company has more than 50,000 employees. The present local minimum wage is $1 an hour. Love proposed that it be increased to $1.25 in two steps.

"Our industry is operating today on much too narrow a profit margin to permit any producer to risk being seriously out of line in competitive costs," he said.

Boosting the minimum wage to $1.25 would further widen "the enormous competitive advantage held by foreign producers," the Burlington chairman said. Therefore, he declared, "realistic quotas on imports would be even more necessary to protect the job of American textile workers."

The minimum wage law applies to industrial and other workers in addition to textile employees. Some groups, including retail employees, are exempt.

In New York, President William Pollock of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, said: "We welcome the news that Burlington Industries recognizes the need for a $1.25 minimum wage. Our union has been working for such an objective since 1956. But this is no excuse for delaying an increase until Federal legislation is enacted. Nor does it remove the necessity for an immediate general wage increase for all American textile workers.

"In resisting such a step on grounds that there is no assurance his competitors would place such an increase into effect, Mr. Love is admitting that the textile industry is undisciplined and incapable of doing the right thing by its employees. * * *

"The auto, steel, oil, and rubber industries do not have this problem because they freely accept collective bargaining. Wages are not a major factor in competition."

Pollock said the times "clearly call for a general increase in the textile industry. The cost of living has gone up 5.1 percent since the last raise in the fall of 1956 and productivity has risen 18 percent in the same period. Textile workers have not been compensated on either score."

Reached at his company's New York sales office, Halbert Jones of Laurinburg, N.C., president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute and head of Morgan-Jones Inc., declined immediate comment on Love's proposal.

Other southern textile officials, however, did comment and some of them had questions to ask Love about his statement.

Amendment of Senate Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Santa Fe New Mexican, of which Mr. Robert McKinney is the editor, published a very thoughtful editorial yesterday entitled "What Limits to Debate?" The editorial supports the position taken by our majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and other Senators. Mr. McKinney is a very able and unusually progressive editor. I know that the editorial will receive wide attention. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Santa Fe New Mexican, Jan. 8, 1959]

"WHAT LIMITS TO DEBATE?"

One of the U.S. Senate's first orders of business will be to decide whether to amend its rules and, specifically, rule XXII, which governs requirements for limiting debate.

Unfortunately, many of us lose sight of the extreme importance of the prompt and sound resolution of this question, because we see it only as a tactical maneuver forerunning a showdown on civil rights legislation.

It is true, of course, that there is danger, under rule XXII in its present form, that the North versus South struggle over school integration could grow into a long battle of attrition between immoderates on both sides, destroying chances for effective congressional action on a mass of other important legislation during this critical year when we are on the defensive not only on the earth but in infinite space.

The so-called filibuster issue is at heart the question of how to modernize the machinery of legislation without taking the governor off the steam engine, without destroying the historic safeguard of minorities against sometimes fleeting and often impulsive majorities.

Traditionally, the Senate has been the open forum of the world's most successful republic—the chamber where the American philosophies of government were fully, carefully weighed. Six-year terms and the designation of only a third of the Senators in any one election are provided in our Constitution, not through chance, but to give this deliberative body insulation from the whims and tides tossing on the surface of that sea of people which the 175 million of us make up.

So it's easy to understand by moderates supporting the proposed cloture amendment have been careful not to go too far—not to destroy the last defensive beachhead of minorities.

For tomorrow's burning issues are bound to be different. The West may find itself defending a minority position on public lands; the Senator from Illinois and his neighbors may be battling the majority on inland waterways. The day could soon come when those now most anxious to cut off debate could find themselves in desperate need of the traditional open forum to stave off legislation they know to be unwise.

There have been times when unlimited debate has proved immensely valuable. As Senator CARL HAYDEN of Arizona points out, New Mexico and Arizona would have been a single State these past 46 years had not a handful of farsighted and determined Senators maintained by filibuster that their minority view was the proper one, insisted on admission of each territory under its own constitution, and finally won over the majority after long debate.

We believe that the present rule, which requires the assent of two-thirds of the total membership of the Senate to limit debate, has been outdated and should be revised.

We agree with those backing an amendment to rule XXII to permit cloture by a vote of two-thirds of those present and voting.

While the amendment would not abolish the filibuster, it would mean that an effective segment of the Senate would have to hold the minority view or a filibuster could be broken with relative ease.

We hope the moderate Senators representing the Western States will assert their leadership and bring an immediate vote—rejecting the Douglas proposal to apply cloture by a simple majority and adopting the compromise amendment—without allowing the situation to develop into the spectacle of a filibuster on the filibuster rule.

This newspaper supports LYNDON JOHNSON and the other statesmen of the Senate who are willing to face up to the civil rights issue, are purposed to modernize the Senate machinery without changing its character, and are determined to get down to the mass of other important business on which our world position demands action.

Proposed Amendment of Senate Rule XXII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Walter Lippmann concerning rule XXII of the Senate.

Mr. Lippmann has long been one of the most profound observers of the American scene. He has given serious consideration to rule XXII and how it affects our Government for many years, and I do not believe there is anyone in this country who better understands the forces which affect the operation of our Government than Mr. Lippmann. Mr. Lippmann knows from long and deep study that the complex system of Government which we operate in this country cannot be reduced to simple mechanical formulas which ignore the varying intensity of human emotions. He knows that simple principles such as majority rule, which may be quite appropriate for a city council or for the board of directors of a corporation, or even a social club are not adequate for decisions concerning the vital interests of a great federation of 49 States.

I urge my colleagues to give most careful consideration to the reasoning of Mr. Lippmann.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJORITIES AND CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Walter Lippmann)

Presumably, the first business before the 86th Congress which opens on January 7 will be the question of amending the rules to prevent filibusters. Under the existing rules which were adopted in 1949, debate can be ended by what is called cloture only when two-thirds of the entire Senate—or at least 66 Senators—vote in favor of it.

There is one exception. If the question is on amending the rules of the Senate, there can be no cloture.

Probably not more than 20 Senators in the new Congress will want to keep rule XXII exactly as it is. A great and overwhelming majority will support amendments to rule XXII. But they differ on how far they want to go. There are two main choices. The one is supported by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas and the other by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois. Under the Johnson proposal debate can be ended by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting. In theory, this could mean that cloture might be applied by as few as 34 Senators, that is to say two-thirds of a quorum which is 50 Senators.

The proposal of Senator DOUGLAS, which has the support of men like JAVITS, KEATING, HUMPHREY, and CASE, also provides that within 2 days of the filing of a cloture petition debate can only be closed by a two-thirds vote of those present. But if debate continues for as long as 15 days, cloture can then be voted by a simple majority of the whole Senate, or 50 affirmative votes. Under the Douglas proposal there could be a long debate, perhaps as much as 8 or 9 weeks, but in the end 50 Senators could bring the bill to a vote.

The choice will be between the Johnson and the Douglas proposals, and in all probability the Johnson proposal will prevail. The real issue at the bottom of this complicated argument about the rules of the Senate is, I believe, a constitutional question. It is not what the letter of the Constitution says. For it says nothing. It is about what is in accord with the spirit of the Constitution.

The question is how big a majority must there be in order to overrule the opposition of a determined minority. Rule XXII, as it now exists, says that 66 Senators must favor the legislation before a determined minority can be overruled. The Johnson proposal says that a determined minority can be overruled, in theory at least by as few as 24 Senators. In practice, on a controversial measure there is, of course, likely to be a very full attendance. So, the Johnson proposal is not substantially different from the existing rule. There is one exception to this. It does not contain the indefensible provision of the present rule, which is that there never can be cloture on any proposal to amend the rules.

The Douglas proposal, while it permits extensive debate, allows 50 Senators to close the debate and to pass a controversial bill.

Having read carefully the material being circulated by Senator DOUGLAS, I have come to think that he has not dealt with the real issue. The real issue is not whether measures shall be fully debated. The question is how they can be passed. There is no doubt that 8 or 9 weeks of debate is quite sufficient for any measure, and that after that there is no hope of anybody's mind being changed by the debate itself. The real question is what are you to do with a minority which is not open to being converted by a debate. Under what conditions should you override it?

In my mind, the proposal to decide highly controversial questions by a vote of no more than one plus one-half of the Senate is not good enough. While the Constitution itself says nothing about the question, it is a fact that the Constitution is by no means devoted to the principle that a simple majority should rule. Treaties and impeachments require two-thirds of those present and voting. Constitutional amendments, the expulsion of Members, the overriding of the President's veto, require two-thirds of all the Senators elected. What is the reason for these exceptions to simple majority rule? Is it not that what is at stake is of such great moment that it should have the concurrence of more than half of the representatives of the States?

Why should it have this concurrence? Because when controversial matters are decided by a too narrow majority, the prospect of resistance and nullification is increased. To enforce difficult laws, there should be a very large majority which concurs in them.

The issue of the rules is a hot one because filibuster is a principal instrument of obstruction against Federal legislation on behalf of the civil rights of Negroes. The substantial question is whether the indisputable rights of Negroes can be achieved

and maintained by simple majorities which overrule the South, or whether progress depends on winning the assent of the rapidly growing enlightened opinion in the South.

In addition, we must not forget that majorities are not always liberal, and may indeed be quite tyrannical. It is a short view of history to equate simple majority rule, as does Senator DOUGLAS, with the defense of civil rights. He might ponder, for example, the case of President Truman's emergency strike legislation which proposed to break the railroad strike by drafting the railroadmen into the Army. The House was stampeded into passing this bill 2 hours after the President's message by a vote of 306 to 13. But Senators Taft and Wagner held it up in the Senate, and after 6 days of debate its sponsors were compelled to omit the provisions for a draft.

That too, was a civil rights case, and a very striking example of why simple majorities are not necessarily the guardians of civil rights.

Prizewinning Essay by Miss Peggy Neal of Huntsville, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently Miss Peggy Neal, a high school student in the junior class in my home town of Huntsville, Ala., won a statewide contest in writing a paper on the subject "I Speak for Democracy."

It is an excellent statement, one which I believe will challenge the thinking of those who read it. Peggy is to be commended for the excellency of her work and the clarity of her thinking.

I ask unanimous consent that her essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Peggy Neal)

I speak for democracy when I say that down the street from me lives a German family, one of several families who came to this country as part of the missile development program. Across the street lives a family from California. And in the same block there are families from States as widely separated as Florida, Maine, Texas, Michigan, and Colorado.

This is true of every section of the city where I live because as the site of Redstone Arsenal it has drawn on the supply of technical people from all over the country.

Each family brought its own ideas and ideals. Each family's ideas and ideals were different in some respect. But, fundamentally, the merging of those different ideas makes up a better community than was here before these families came. These families are all individual, with individual tastes, individual talents, individual hopes, and yes, individual prejudices. Prejudices that to us seem strange. Strange at least, until we look into ourselves and find our own prejudices that must seem as strange to them.

And the taste is as varied as the prejudice—more so, if possible. Painters, music lovers in all degrees, botanists, bird watchers, gardeners, sports car enthusiasts, tennis players, football fans, soccer fans, and even wrestling fans. These are only a few of the many tastes that make up the community.

There are Democrats, Republicans, Independents, and probably representatives of every political idea. Religion is the same: Catholic, Baptist, Episcopalian, Methodist, Christian, Scientists, Jewish, probably an agnostic, and even possibly a Hindu.

With this much variation in personality, taste, religion, prejudice, and geographical background, there must be constant and profound difference of opinion as to what is best for the entire community. There is. And those differences sometime seem bitter. No civic leader pleases the whole population at all times. No elected official travels an easy road.

But democracy is not an easy road. It is not the road of least resistance with every turn marked clearly for the idea traveler to follow at the direction of one central committee. It is a road on which every road change is the call to discussion, disagreement, argument, and finally, admission of the majority choice.

And therein lies democracy, the respect for majority will in the major community, and the respect for minority choice by the individual.

My community is no different from thousands of communities throughout the United States. The same prejudice, taste, religion, and background exist in them all. But with them all the one common denominator pulls them together, respect for the majority will in the community and national thinking, and respect for the individual choice and right to live within the overall community frame.

We are what we are, and we shall continue to be so unless by so being we interfere with the rights of others to be the same.

Support for the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "TVA Deserves Support for Value to Nation," published in the Jackson (Tenn.) Sun of January 5, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorial sets forth in summary form the great contribution which the TVA has made to our defense.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA DESERVES SUPPORT FOR VALUE TO NATION

Proposals to sell the Tennessee Valley Authority have been rejected unanimously by directors of the Jackson-Madison County Chamber of Commerce.

Not only have sale proposals been rejected by the local chamber's directors, but they are calling for adequate financing of the TVA's operations through revenue bonds.

The local chamber of commerce by this action joins many other valley organizations in defense of TVA.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, it would be well for its opponents to know, is not just another public power project.

That charge forms the basis for attack on TVA and is the means being used to try to destroy the Authority.

Were TVA just a public power project, there would be little to commend its retention other than the low rates it charges for power.

But TVA is far more than an electric power producer.

The Tennessee and other rivers on which TVA dams have been built belong to the people.

These rivers as far back as memory goes have overflowed and damaged millions of fertile acres of land, land upon which thousands of families depend for a living.

No person nor group of persons in private business could afford the cost of harnessing these floods. Nor should individuals be called on to pay for damage caused by public agencies.

So the Federal Government properly planned a series of dams to control floods from rivers owned by the public.

In so doing, it became apparent that building of dams would make it possible to make of the Tennessee and other rivers a great waterway for industry and business. That, too, is in the public domain just as are the superhighways now being built.

With water impounded and navigation assured, it took little imagination to discover that electric power could be produced from these lakes—and thereby pay for the cost of the entire operation.

Thus were the basic functions of the Tennessee Valley Authority incorporated in the act.

With the construction of TVA dams went efforts to eliminate disease, just as they did when the Panama Canal and other Government projects were built.

Availability of low-priced electric power enabled the people of the valley to use household and farm equipment for which no power had been available. And they bought that equipment. It was no gift.

Low-priced power also served as the one element which had been lacking to make of the valley the ideal place for industry.

These factors, and more too numerous to list here, have produced in our valley an economy which yields high tax returns to the Government, which has enabled TVA to remain far ahead on its debt repayment schedule, which produced atomic fission materials to win World War II, which day by day benefits all parts of the Nation.

Dismemberment of TVA would damage our valley. It would prove disastrous to our Nation.

With the new Congress elected and soon to start its deliberations, let us make our voices heard. Let us insist that TVA be preserved, and be permitted to continue its growth by giving it adequate financing.

More Farming Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Hugh Cosline, appearing in the American Agriculturist of January 3, will be of interest to those who, like myself, are deeply interested in the plight of the neglected farmer of the Northeast.

This article is constructive in that it shows that by facing the future with courage, and adapting himself to modern methods, the farmer can still not only have a good life, but can even have a better life than his fathers had before him.

The article follows:

MORE FARMING CAPITAL

(By Hugh Cosline)

It has been said that an investment of $20,000 is necessary to keep one man employed in industry, but that the investment needed to keep one farmer profitably employed is nearer $60,000.

This rapid increase in capital needs raises serious problems. It becomes increasingly difficult—almost impossible—for a young man to start farming from scratch and hope to save that kind of capital.

It has been suggested that one solution of the dilemma is to interest outside capital in farm investments, with the idea that it will be a permanent or semipermanent debt, that the interest will become an operating expense, with little or no attempt being made to repay the capital.

It may come to this, but the question then arises as to who or what agency is to supply this permanent type of capital? One source of additional farm capital which is receiving some unfavorable comment is that provided by some agency which either sells supplies to farmers or markets farm products, in other words, what we have come to call vertical integration. Personally, I am inclined to think that the need for additional capital has caused many farmers to become interested in some type of contract farming, rather than the supposed benefits of smaller risk and less responsibility for management.

It has even been suggested that farm cooperatives and other farm organizations might be called upon to supply capital to members and patrons. To date farmers have supplied the capital to operate their cooperatives, but it may be that in years to come cooperatives will be able to tap some source of outside capital and to act as a middleman, to supply much-needed capital for farm operations.

More and more commercial banks are becoming interested in supplying farm credit, and some are doing a good job. The Farm Credit System, of course, has filled a real need. But in spite of all the good work done, the growing need for larger and larger capital investments on farms is worthy of the best thought of farmers and farm organizations.

OPPORTUNITY—NOT TRAGEDY

One result of rapid change is the necessity of unlearning much that we once considered gospel truth. For example, when I was in college I was taught that 1,000 laying hens were a full-time job for 1 man. Now, with modern poultry houses and the application of power to eliminate lifting, a man can take care of 5,000 hens without even raising a good sweat. And there is talk of a 1-man, 10,000-hen business.

Change requires dropping the old, adopting the new. For example, we have the trend toward fewer and bigger farms, a trend which we may not like, but which won't disappear because we ignore it to argue against it. To me the new lesson this teaches is that the path to satisfactory income on a family-sized farm lies in splitting up the total market for farm products among fewer producers.

To the man who plans to stay in farming, the trend to fewer farms, so long as farmers are free to stay or change, presents no tragedy. It's an opportunity. This is the American way, the path that has led to the world's best standard of living.

Of course, with changes coming so rapidly it is difficult to adjust quickly enough. But there's never a change that cannot be met. It is still possible to make a satisfactory living from full-time farming by meeting change as a challenge and an opportunity, and adjusting operations to take advantage of that opportunity.

Changes Wrought by the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, in the nature of a report, entitled "Report Lists Miraculous Changes Wrought by TVA," and published in the magazine Labor for January 10, 1959. The article summarizes the last report of the directors of the TVA.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT LISTS MIRACULOUS CHANGES WROUGHT BY TVA

The Tennessee Valley Authority this week issued a report on its 25th anniversary year, citing the achievements of the great river-development system since it was created during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The report pointed out that TVA grew out of the natural resource conservation movement founded by another President Roosevelt—F.D.R.'s cousin, Teddy.

Thus, the report said, "TVA, in the fiscal year 1958, marked a double anniversary—the golden anniversary of the conservation movement and the silver anniversary of TVA."

All three members of the TVA Board—Chairman Herbert D. Vogel, A. R. Jones, and Frank J. Welch—signed the report. Their favorable account was regarded as surprising and welcome, particularly since all were appointed by President Eisenhower, who has shown hostility toward TVA.

Speaking first of TVA's success in ending floods in its seven-State area, the report says, "This farflung flood control mechanism does more than ward off disaster. It protects land having immense economic potential. Now safe from devastating waters are waterfront sites for factories and business, for parks, resorts and homes."

HUGE GROWTH

As a result of this safety from floods, the report adds, private investment in Tennessee riverfront industries has grown from only $8 million in the first 13 years of TVA to $676 million in the 13 years since then.

Moreover, control of the river has brought a huge recreational industry into being, a teeming fish and wildlife development, and improved water supplies for municipal and industrial use.

The report points out that two of Uncle Sam's atomic plants, and other Government uses, take more than half the power produced by TVA. Also that other demands are rapidly increasing for TVA power because its low cost makes it practical for use even in heating homes.

In attempts to meet the rising demand and avert a power shortage, the report says, TVA in recent years has been forced to depend solely on its power revenues to finance new plants and facilities, because the present administration has not asked Congress to appropriate any money to lend to TVA for new construction, as always had been done in the past.

Eisenhower in 1958 proposed that Congress authorize TVA to finance expansion by selling revenue bonds to private investors, the report recalls, but it was bottled up by the House Rules Committee.

The revenue-bond bill will come up again in the new session of Congress, with its chances improved by the fact that last November's elections tossed out some strong TVA enemies and put more liberal Democrats in the House.

Among other achievements of TVA, the report declares that it has wiped out the former plague of malaria in its region, and has attracted thousands of visitors from foreign countries, who go back home telling about the wonders of Uncle Sam's great multipurpose river program of developing the resources of an entire river, its tributaries and the vast surrounding area.

TVA TAX FIGURES

With figures and facts, the report answers the Power Trust propaganda charge that TVA pays no taxes and is costly to the taxpayers of the rest of the country.

In its 25 years of operation, the report says, TVA has earned for Uncle Sam a 4 percent average annual return on his investment in the public power system itself. TVA has paid into the U.S. Treasury $250 million of power revenues and $39.6 million of nonpower income. TVA is far ahead of schedule in paying back the money it borrowed from the Government.

In addition, TVA in its 25th year paid $5.3 million in lieu of taxes to the State and local governments in its area. They also got $8.5 million taxes from the municipal and farmer co-op systems which distribute TVA power. Thus, the report points out, the TVA system as a whole paid $13.8 million in taxes and tax equivalents, which are taxes in everything but name.

That $13.8 million, says the report, was 6.4 percent of all the power revenues received by TVA during the year from all its non-Government customers. And the 6.4 percent is more than the taxes paid by many of the Power Trust companies whose propagandists shout that TVA pays no taxes.

Physicians to the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the inspiring discourses of 1958 was Dr. Gunnar Gunderson's given as his presidential address before the 107th annual meeting of the American Medical Association in San Francisco on June 24 last.

Dr. L. H. McDaniel, of Tyronza, Ark., past chairman of the American Medical Association's section of general practice, was kind enough to bring this splendid statement of principle and dedication to my attention—and, because it speaks so eloquently of the high aspirations of our American medical profession, it deserves to be more widely known. Dr. Gunderson, a resident of La Crosse, Wis., truly expresses the devotion of all our doctors and medical men to the ideals of "concern for human life and health, a respect for personal freedom and dignity" and of the "clear, logical mutuality of interest" of this concern.

The article follows:

[From the Journal of the American Medical Association, June 28, 1958]

PHYSICIANS TO THE WORLD

(President's address by Gunnar Gundersen, M.D., La Crosse, Wis.)

In accepting the office of president of the American Medical Association, I do so with deep feelings of appreciation, humility, and responsibility. My sense of responsibility is heightened by realization of the tremendous number and variety of challenges which medicine faces today. As individual physicians, members of organized medicine and citizens in the community and the Nation, we have in recent decades encountered an ever-increasing complexity of demands on our time and thought. Now, like all of our fellow Americans, we find our problems compounded by the world struggle for survival and freedom—in the new age of hydrogen bombs, ballistic missiles, and earth satellites.

In recent years the individual physician has had an increasingly difficult time in trying to keep up with the accelerated scientific advances in medicine. Now, with man probing into outer space, it appears that our scientific future will be further complicated by the development of still another specialty—space medicine. Nevertheless, right here on terra firma it is more than ever true that medicine is a lifelong study—one which actually is just beginning when the young doctor receives his doctor of medicine degree or completes his graduate training.

Meanwhile, we also are reemphasizing the emotional, personal, and spiritual factors in medical care. The age-old art of medicine—that intangible element made up of compassion and warmth—is regaining its proper place. In medicine, as in all other phases of American life, we are rediscovering that philosophy is just as important as technology, that the human personality cannot be subordinated to crisp efficiency.

The challenge of how to apply the science and art of medicine is formidable enough in itself. But it, too, has been further complicated by the changing backdrop on the American scene. Over the past 20 years we also have been called upon to consider a snowballing trend of social, economic, and political developments affecting medicine.

These problems are related to still another area—one in which we have obligations and responsibilities shared by all our fellow Americans. This is the broad arena of citizenship. We as individuals have the duty to bring our weight to bear on the vital question of whether the individual or the state shall stand supreme in America's future.

OBLIGATIONS OF THE PHYSICIAN

Certainly, one might say, all of that should be more than enough to ask of a physician or his profession—scientific excellence, concern for the patient as a human being, active effort to solve medicine's socioeconomic problems, and full discharge of the responsibilities of citizenship. I would, however, call your attention to still another challenge, still another set of demands. In this day and age—a time of terrible decision—we also must consider our obligations to all of humanity. As both physicians and citizens we must see that medicine plays its full role, not only in promoting better world health but also in helping the search for brotherhood and peace.

Some of you may be saying to yourselves, "With all our local, State, and national problems, how can we possibly find time to do anything about world health? What is the connection?" That, of course, is a natural reaction in view of the growing complexity of our professional life.

I would answer in two ways—one dealing with tradition and one with the realities of the present. The traditions of modern medicine began many centuries ago with Hippocrates, the Greek physician and teacher. Students from all over the Aegean area gathered around him on the island of Cos. From there they returned home to spread the knowledge and ethics which Hippocrates had taught them. And it is important to remember that when Hippocrates wrote the medical oath which all of us have taken he was speaking not just to and for Greeks; his words speak a universal language that applies to all men. So, ever since those distant days on the island of Cos, dedicated physicians have made their knowledge and compassion available to all who needed them.

Turning to present-day realities, I am convinced by personal experience that our medical heritage—which stems from Hippocrates—can be applied more widely, more effectively, in today's troubled world. As many of you know, I have been active for several years in the affairs of the World Medical Association. As a delegate in its General Assembly and a member of its Council, I have had the opportunity to meet hundreds of physicians from more than 50 countries. And I have learned that they sincerely desire closer understanding and cooperation—not only on scientific and professional matters but also on a human basis. There is growing recognition that medicine, with its resources and influence fully mobilized, can perhaps do more for world peace than the billions of dollars being poured into armaments. There is mounting conviction that the time has come when medical statesmanship must be used to augment the methods of political diplomacy.

I firmly believe that we can and must expand our vision and face up to this new challenge. The problems which trouble us here at home exist also for the physicians and peoples of other lands. The knowledge, ideas, and experience which we have gained can help them. But we also can benefit from learning more about their difficulties—how they might have avoided some, how they are trying to solve others. Our international obligations are simply extensions of our local responsibilities.

The common thread is a concern for human life and health, a respect for personal freedom and dignity. In my opinion, there is a clear, logical, mutuality of interest.

If we think we have difficulty in keeping up with medical advances, let us consider the thousands of physicians, nurses, and technicians throughout the world who carry on their work with only a fraction of the facilities, equipment, journals, books, exhibits, and other aids which are available to us. For many of them, just this 1-week meeting in San Francisco would be the professional event of a lifetime.

If we think that our patients should have more sympathy and understanding, we who are bestowed with the blessings of our country must consider the millions of persons in other parts of the world who are diseased, undernourished, crippled, or dying. To them, just one kind look, one gentle word, one soothing drug would be like a miracle.

If we think that we have socioeconomic problems in American medicine, let us consider the plight of physicians and patients in those countries where there are extreme shortages of doctors, where people still pay medicine men and witch doctors for their incantations, or where medical care long has been used as a political football. In the latter case, let us learn well the lesson of medical unity.

If we think that our freedoms are threatened here at home, let us consider the millions who already have been subjugated by authoritarian philosophies or who are being victimized by constant, ruthless pressure and exploitation in the cold war between communism and democracy—a war that really can be won only by ideas, not by missiles or bombs.

As physicians, our first obligation is, of course, to our patients. But as members of the medical profession, our obligation extends to all mankind.

THE PHYSICIAN AND WORLD PEACE

As American citizens our first duty is to this country. But as members of a civilization which believes in the brotherhood of man, we also have a duty toward all men who yearn for freedom, dignity, peace, and health. Physicians in America should never forget their responsibilities to all humanity or neglect their opportunities to promote the brotherhood of man.

We physicians have a unique opportunity to provide a spark of leadership which can help bring the world closer to the dream of world brotherhood. If you do not feel the compulsion of that task, I can only remind you of the sputniks, explorers, and vanguards whirling overhead. They in themselves are but the toys of grown men, compared with the potential engines of destruction which put them into orbit. If our alternative is destruction or a dream, the only sensible choice is to make the dream work.

Medicine can play a vitally effective part in bringing reality to the dream of world peace. For medicine, despite the designs of politicians or dictators, is above the harsh conflicts of ideologies and power politics. Medicine, like religion, speaks a universal language which passes all barriers of race, creed, color, and nationality. Already, great work has been accomplished by individuals, private organizations, medical associations, and official agencies. In fact, the brightest chapter in the international story since World War II is that on health and medicine. This is no uncharted course; the way is well marked.

San Francisco is a particularly appropriate place in which to stress the challenge of international cooperation. For it was here in 1945 that the United Nations was formed and the first suggestion was made for establishment of a new international health organization. Three years later the World Health Organization came into being.

While the World Health Organization was going through its formative stages, the physicians of many countries were meeting informally to discuss the need for an international medical organization. As a result, the World Medical Association was officially established in September 1947, with the American Medical Association as a founding member.

Thus, both organizations—rooted in postwar ideals of world collaboration—have just recently completed their first decade of service. From the beginning, they have maintained close liaison with one another and with many additional international groups interested in various phases of medicine, health, and general welfare. They are the main avenues for mobilizing and coordinating world medical resources for the common good of humanity.

Whereas the World Health Organization represents governments and the field of public health, the World Medical Association speaks for the medical profession. It now is composed of 53 national medical associations representing about half a million physicians throughout the world. Its principal objectives are to maintain the standards, ethics, and traditions of medical practice; to raise the standards of medical education; to promote the mutual exchange of information and ideas among the physicians of the world; to help raise the level of world health; and to promote world peace.

In pursuit of those objectives, the World Medical Association has carried out a wide variety of activities. As just one example, in 1953 the World Medical Association sponsored the First World Conference on Medical Education. More than 600 participants from over 60 countries and 127 universities and medical schools attended that London meeting, which focused attention on under-

graduate medical education. The proceedings have been widely distributed throughout the world. The Second World Conference on Medical Education—spotlighting the theme of "Medicine as a Lifelong Study"—will be held next year in Chicago, where we of the American Medical Association will be hosts to our medical colleagues from other lands.

Another new avenue of approach to help the cause of international peace is the Medicine and Health Professions committee of the people-to-people program, initiated last year by President Eisenhower. This program is designed to promote close contacts and friendships among individuals and groups who share professional, cultural, and economic interests. It is based on the idea that if the people of the world could begin to know one another—to meet, talk, correspond, and exchange visits—many of the world's troubles would be over. We might then begin to use the knowledge of the atomic age for humanity rather than in an attempt to destroy our civilization.

American doctors, medical missionaries, nurses, and technicians—serving humanity in far flung parts of the world—are contributing immeasurably to this great cause. The work of some of them was beautifully reported last January in the March of Medicine telecast called "M.D. International." They were described as unofficial American ambassadors of good will—men and women who are demonstrating the forceful good that lies in the basic brotherhood of man, who are revealing our greatest hope for the future—man's humanity to man.

President Eisenhower recently pointed out that the Armed Forces of the United States are only supports for the much larger purpose of a just peace and the advancement of human well-being at home and throughout the world. In the struggle for peace, he said, "the strength that endures rests with those who live in freedom." And he added that "tyranny is too brittle—too insecurely based—too dependent upon force and brutality—too contrary to the hopes and ideals of humanity—to last over the long pull."

Physicians, alerted here and abroad, can do much to advance the cause of freedom and human well-being. For medicine, by its very nature, speaks a universal language dedicated to scientific truth, humanitarian service, individual dignity, and world peace. In medical science there are no secrets, no iron curtains, no cold war. To physicians everywhere, atomic energy means a new way of fighting disease, not a new way of conquering the world. Medicine exists to save life, not destroy it.

The demands of these troubled times require that we perform at only one level—our very best. The time has come for medical statesmanship which will help point the way toward better health—and a better life—for all the peoples of the world.

Twenty Years of Court "Packing"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the December 12, 1958, issue of U.S. News & World Report, by David Lawrence:

TWENTY YEARS OF COURT "PACKING"

(By David Lawrence)

For 20 years now the Supreme Court of the United States has been "packed" with justices selected from a cult that believes the Constitution can be rewritten at will by the judiciary.

The late Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, once proposed a constitutional amendment "to curb the power of the Supreme Court over Congress, the Constitution, and the rights of the individual citizen." He wrote in 1924:

"Labor and the Progressives do not attack the Supreme Court or any court. Their proposal to check the present assumption of power arises wholly from two facts: first, that the Supreme Court, whether by usurpation or by a sound interpretation of the Constitution, has exercised supreme power over our entire governmental structure; and, second, that this Court is selected in the most undemocratic manner conceivable under our governmental system, namely, appointment by the President for life. * * *

"According to Thomas Jefferson, the danger to our Constitution lies, not in lessened power of the courts, but in their augmented powers. He said:

"'The germ of dissolution of our Federal Government is in the judiciary—the irresponsible body working like gravity, by day and by night, gaining a little today and gaining a little tomorrow and advancing its noiseless step like a thief over the field of jurisdiction until all shall be usurped.'

"If this process of judicial usurpation outlined by Jefferson should continue, it would inevitably lead to a revolutionary explosion. For a judicial autocracy is no better than any other form of tyranny."

Mr. Gompers pointed out that the Supreme Court is not supreme over the Constitution because Congress can at any time increase the number of Justices and, by this means, a Congress and the President "can overthrow this judicial autocracy." But the labor leader said this was a "very dangerous" method and he preferred instead a constitutional amendment limiting the powers of the Court.

The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, however, did propose in 1937 just such a plan to increase the number of Justices. He hoped to be able to appoint Justices sharing his viewpoint so as to achieve a new majority. This move failed in Congress, but Mr. Roosevelt won his victory anyway. It was a victory for the philosophy that believes in "adapting" the Constitution to the demands of the hour—ignoring the amending process.

Mr. Roosevelt gloated over his victory. Having made several appointments to the Court to fill successive vacancies, he wrote in 1941, in the introduction to the 1937 volumes of his public papers, as follows:

"By the time the Court term was over in June of 1937, it was very clear that the entire approach of the Court to the many problems confronting us had completely changed. The views of the liberal minority of 1935 and 1936 were being gradually adopted by the one or two Justices on the other side necessary to make them the views of the majority. * * *

"It was not until after the end of the judicial term in June 1937, that a single vacancy on the Court actually occurred. The about-face in the decisions of the Court had come from the very same personnel that had been on the Court since my first inauguration. The victory, therefore, cannot be attributed to the new Justices. It was rather a realization by one or two members of the Court that the Court had exceeded its powers, that it had strayed away from the Constitution itself, and that the liberal minority of the Court had been correct in its conclusions."

But the fact is that the few decisions of this brief period which did represent a change were not as fundamental as those that came afterward from the Court that Mr. Roosevelt did "pack".

This writer in 1936 wrote a book in defense of the Supreme Court as an institution and particularly emphasized the long line of decisions that had affirmed and reaffirmed what Abraham Lincoln once described as "settled law". The Court decisions prior to 1936 were commended as in accord with basic constitutional principles. But by 1941 it was apparent that settled law was being tossed aside by a new majority made up in large part of Justices appointed by Mr. Roosevelt. In an editorial here on June 13, 1941, this writer commented on the change as follows:

"The opinions handed down in the session of the Court just ended are amazing in their deviation from accepted principles of constitutional law. Words not written in the statute have been supplied by the Justices. What Congress meant to say or did not mean to say—though not revealed in the statute—are glibly interpolated through judicial legislation. Principles that have stood the test of time in their thoughtful balance of relationships between the Government and the citizen are demolished overnight. The lower courts are bewildered. The bar is stunned. The basic guide to human intercourse—that principles once settled are immutable but that details and applications of principles in specific cases alone may change—is now brushed aside. * * *

"The members of the bar who have been reading the decisions of the five 'yes men' stand aghast. For they see a Court 'packed' with men who are engaging in the very practices Mr. Roosevelt so vehemently condemned—the writing of legislation. * * * They see the Court voting almost always as a unit on New Deal issues."

There has been a lot of misrepresentation of the current criticism of the Supreme Court. It is mistakenly argued that the attack is against the Supreme Court as an institution and that this tends to undermine the prestige of the Court.

Nobody can undermine the prestige of the Supreme Court of the United States except the Justices themselves.

By their decisions they twist the Constitution out of its accustomed and natural meaning, as they assume the power to legislate or as they supply words to the law and to the Constitution which never were there in the first instance. When they do this, they provoke widespread condemnation.

An effort is being made nowadays to make it appear that the criticism of the High Court is due wholly to its decision in the desegregation cases. This simply is not true. The report which was approved last summer by a vote of 36 to 8 by the chief justices of the State supreme courts did not even mention the segregation issue. It did accuse the High Court of a lack of judicial self-restraint and cited a long list of decisions in recent years to back up the indictment.

The trouble is not wholly in the Court itself. It is in the law schools, too, where many of the new cult hold sway. Students are taught that the Supreme Court need not respect the intent of Congress nor the decisions of the past but instead can at any time ignore the law of the land and issue its own amendments to the Constitution.

Up to recent years it was accepted that the Supreme Court should make an initial interpretation of the Constitution and, once this was proclaimed as the law of the land, it would not be changed unless some new legal point was raised or new legislation passed by Congress or a new amendment added to the Constitution.

America didn't depend on Supreme Court decisions to change the Constitution in order to permit a Federal income tax to be levied

or woman suffrage to be adopted or prohibition to be imposed and later repealed. The people had an opportunity in each instance to vote on a constitutional amendment. This is as it should be.

But today we have what Judge Learned Hand of New York—perhaps the ablest of the Federal circuit court judges of our times, now retired—recently described as a "third legislative chamber."

Criticism of the Supreme Court is not only legitimate but essential to a free republic. There are voices heard which would stifle criticism and require of everybody a sycophantic obeisance.

It is healthy to discuss all phases of public questions. The American people have not yet been aroused to the dangers of judicial tyranny that face them. It is time to expose the true meaning of the philosophy of the cult which is teaching our youth that we no longer need to amend the Constitution and that the Supreme Court—nine Justices appointed for life—hereafter will perform that task for us.

How easy it is to fall into the ways of totalitarianism—to let an autocracy rule the people because presumably the people are unable to rule themselves.

The fight for constitutionalism must go on. Sam Gompers won his fight by public agitation, as Congress in 1932 passed the Norris-LaGuardia Act curbing the courts' jurisdiction over labor disputes by prohibiting injunctions in a large variety of cases.

Franklin Roosevelt won his fight when he appointed only those Justices that he knew were believers in an elastic Constitution which could be altered at any time to satisfy the whims of so-called liberalism.

Unfortunately, the Presidents who have followed him, misled by some of the same cult in the Department of Justice, have selected several Justices known to be dedicated to the belief that the Supreme Court can rewrite the Constitution at will.

Thus, we have had 20 years of Court packing and the time has come for the people to checkmate that practice by limiting its effects. This can be done by a constitutional amendment prescribing a limited tenure for Justices and requiring that, among their qualifications, they be experienced, not in party politics but at the bar or on the bench. Also, it should be provided in the Constitution itself that, once an initial interpretation is made by the Supreme Court, this interpretation can be changed only by a constitutional amendment when a provision of the Constitution is in dispute—or by a valid act of Congress when a previous Federal statute has been declared unconstitutional. This is the historic doctrine—known as stare decisis or settled law—bequeathed to us by the Founding Fathers.

U.N.'s Empty Gesture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald while the House of Representatives was not in session.

It seems a good time to call the question of Hungary and her martyrdom, so well pictured by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, to the attention of the new 86th Congress at the very beginning of its deliberations.

Certainly both the United Nations and the United States have little to be proud of in this matter. We have both passed by on the other side of the road with pious platitudes on our tongues and emptiness in our hearts:

The article follows:

U.N.'s EMPTY GESTURE—SOME MEANINGFUL ACTION ON HUNGARY IS URGED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

When it comes to taking any meaningful action whatsoever on Hungary, the United Nations General Assembly is now showing all the firmness of a cream puff in a heat wave.

And the present evidence is that the United States delegation has itself caved in and isn't even prepared to stand up for its own convictions.

It is bad enough for the United Nations to wilt and refrain from taking the one, single, practical step to show the Hungarian people that the U.N. doesn't support their Moscow-imposed government any more than they do.

It is worse still, it sems to me, for the United States to toss its convictions aside, abdicate its leadership and go quietly along with a pious resolution designed to get the Hungarian issue off the agenda and under the rug as painlessly as possible.

This is what is happening at the U.N. in New York.

It ought not to be allowed to happen without somebody protesting and I think that most Americans at least, will want to protest to President Eisenhower, to Secretary Dulles, to Cabot Lodge, and to anybody at the U.N. who will listen.

What can the United Nations do that would mean something to the people of Hungary—at least a little something?

It can perform one positive act. It can refuse to accept the credentials of the Hungarian puppet delegates to the U.N.

The U.N. is powerless to enforce a judgment against this pseudo-Hungarian regime. But it is not powerless—unless it wants to make itself powerless—to render its judgment against the regime. And it is not powerless—unless it makes itself so—to deny this imposed regime a voice at the U.N. It cannot lift this regime off the backs of the Hungarians, but it can lift from itself the opprobrium of accepting the credentials of its spokesmen.

In the judgment of Hungarian refugees and others, such an action would do these things:

It would reduce the prospect of further internal terror within Hungary.

It would provide some deterrent influence if the Kremlin should be tempted again to ride roughshod inside Hungary—or other satellites.

It would salvage the moral authority of the U.N.

It would give some moral encouragement to all peoples locked behind the Iron Curtain of satellitism and let them see that the U.N. was not neglecting at least the one thing it could do, however modest.

And what, with the good—or the bad—offices of the United States, is the U.N. headed toward doing?

It is headed toward what it calls an alternative. This means naming a U.N. agent whose duty it would be to call upon the Hungarian Government to hold free elections, and respect human rights, and to call upon the Soviet Union to withdraw its forces.

That's what it appointed Prince Wan Waithayakon to do 1 year ago. He called upon and called upon and called upon—and he couldn't even get a visa to visit Budapest. He is now being thanked for trying.

The naming of a successor to Prince Wan to do what Prince Wan couldn't do is pointless, useless, empty, and futile. It is a way of appearing to do something while doing absolutely nothing. It puts the U.N. in the worst possible light.

To deny the Hungarian puppet regime a voice at the U.N. is a small thing; but it is something. It is honorable and meaningful and within the authority of the U.N.

Then, at the next meeting of the General Assembly the name of a brave nation would stand in front of an empty chair, a blazoning symbol of what Soviet force has done to a people who committed the crime of seeking their freedom. And that chair could be reoccupied any time the Hungarian Government met reasonable conditions—free elections, political amnesty, and no more persecution.

Perhaps the U.N. cannot be persuaded to do even this much. But for the United States not to stand up in the open and try seems to me disgraceful.

How the Electric Cooperative Helps Its Members To Live Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS BASS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following prize-winning essay, which was presented by Miss Judy Wood, of Centerville, Tenn., at the 1958 annual convention of the Tennessee Rural Electric Cooperative Association. In my opinion, Miss Wood's essay is interesting, instructive, and presents a concise picture of the growth in electrical usage and its value to rural homes.

The essay follows:

HOW THE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE HELPS ITS MEMBERS TO LIVE BETTER

(By Judy Wood)

(The Meriwether Lewis Electric Co-op, typical of its sister rural electric co-ops throughout Tennessee in the rendition of services to its members and area in addition to that of distributing electricity, has for a number of years sponsored an essay contest in all high schools in its service area. The winner of this year's cooperative-sponsored contest was Miss Judy Wood, of Hickman County High School. The following is her prize-winning essay.)

Occasionally a powerline is blown down or a fuse burns out at our house. Only then do I realize how much a part of all our activities electricity is. No lights. No radio. No refrigeration. I want to iron a dress; I said, "I'll do that now." But how silly of me. The iron is also electric. At least maybe I can eat lunch. What time is it? Naturally, the clock's stopped. And I can't fix any lunch, because the hotplate is electric. So I, who ignore electricity just as I ignore the usefulness of my 10 fingers, I sink into a chair—helpless without it.

Now this is a magnificent discovery—this magic little current running through our homes. Certain manifestations of it have been known by man for centuries (e.g., lighting). Our own Franklin showed the "sameness of frictional electricity and lightning." Watson, Gilbert, Lesage, Gal-

vani, Volta, Faraday, Morse, Edison—all these and many more contributed invaluable findings in the identification of electricity. Man today uses various other kinds of energy to generate the electric current which is superior because of its lack of bulk and its efficiency. It has been harnessed to manipulate almost any mentionable household tool, even down to eggbeaters and shavers. However, perhaps as magnificent as its development and practical application is its mass distribution.

Today in America power lines are strung down our highways and are congregated in all our towns. They are the commonest of sights. Also, they are common gracing the vast miles of rural area in the United States. Needless to say, electricity first became practically utilized in cities. And there it found its main business for some time. Now, though, and at reasonable rates, country people enjoy its benefits.

As the power was transmitted further, generating plants grew larger and less numerous. A tying together of systems has lowered the costs of electricity to the consumer and has made service to him more dependable. These great regional schemes are comparable in their work to the mass production technique in manufacturing. They have the capital to provide good service and by means of their consolidation, can furnish both it and the current more cheaply than otherwise. It is true that electricity, which is furnished to cities cheaply, is more costly for rural consumers. By pure logic, the higher the number of consumers per square mile, the less the individual rate: "It has been found that the cost of serving the average farm with electricity is about five times the average cost of serving the average city customer."

Therefore there was a great need for more inexpensive rates on farms. Farmers had a hard time; their operational costs were high, their inconveniences many—they, if anyone, needed the current. Congress, in the thirties, created an agency concerned with this problem and in 1936 farmers throughout America began to congregate and to discuss the feasibility of electric cooperatives. These spread across America and they are, in fact, so recent in evolution that many of us on farms still have coal oil lamps stored away in some dusty corner. The co-ops started as local organizations and consolidated, thusly increasing efficiency and service just as the great private power schemes had done for the cities. I myself remember the lines being built in my neighborhood and the occasion of having our house wired. A great saving in farm expenditures has been in evidence. Here, for instance, are some statistics compiled from Rural English life: light; 81 lbs. saved—pumping; 684 lbs. saved—milking; 540 lbs. saved by the use of electricity.

And so we see how the farmers' co-ops, among them our own Meriwether-Lewis (which covers Hickman, Perry, Lewis, Humphreys, and Houston Counties), have brought us the electricity which otherwise would have been beyond our reach. These co-ops are nonprofit organizations. That is to say, their profits are all used for the good of the project. For example, Meriwether-Lewis takes some of its profit for a reserve fund, the rest for repaying Rural Electrification Administration loans. And of course money must be allowed for salaries, etc.

Now let's summarize the ways in which electricity has helped us live better. In every household, rural and urban, we find lights, washing machines (in most), irons, water systems (in some rural homes), refrigerators, ranges, milking machines, clocks, radios, televisions, phonographs and ten thousand other priceless items. All these devices, needless to say, are improvements over their hand-run counterparts. They are great time savers and, in the long run, are vastly more economical. And what has made such advantages possible for us of the farming areas? In 1935, only 1 out of 10 farms received electrical service. By 1950, more than three-fourths of the American farms were using electricity. This amazing increase in the use of electric power came about largely through effects of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936." Under it, private power companies, power districts, cities, and co-op groups were given funds to distribute electricity in rural areas. Over 92 percent of the funds set aside has been borrowed. And a further quote: "The REA program (of which Meriweather-Lewis is a part) has added several billion dollars worth of production goods to the national wealth of the United States."

Those of us who have seen electricity come to our homes and who remember the coal oil lamp days, can certainly appreciate the pricelessness of our shadow, the magic little current which is so very powerful, and which might not have been ours to use except for the work of the electric cooperative.

Salute to Ground Observer Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of December 4, 1958:

SALUTE TO OBSERVER CORPS

It is a high privilege for this newspaper to salute members of the Ground Observer Corps, a civilian volunteer unit of the civil defense, which will be inactivated on January 31 after 8 years of service.

The purpose of the Ground Observer Corps was to augment radar surveillance of air approach zones to the continental United States.

In 1956, the peak year, 388,000 volunteers manned 17,000 observer posts, reporting to 73 filter centers. Pennsylvania has had 511 active posts with 6,500 volunteers. In Luzerne County, there were 11 posts with 325 volunteers. Many individuals put in as much as 10,000 hours on duty in cold and heat, frequently in isolated districts and at no little personal sacrifice. Until 1955, these posts were manned by volunteers 24 hours daily.

Their devotion to their country, which they served so faithfully and unselfishly, will remain always as an example of patriotism in the finest American tradition. And that is saying a great deal in view of what has transpired since 1776.

Now it is possible to dispense with the services of these volunteers in this field and utilize them in other phases of civil defense, as the addition of the distant early warning line in northern Canada and the inclusion of our seaward extensions of radar with navy radar ships and aircraft make it possible to detect enemy-manned bomber strikes and identify them before they reach the borders of the United States. To meet the increasing speed and effectiveness of the various types of aerial weapons, the Air Force has installed and is presently using a new semiautomatic air defense system.

In a country, known for its peacetime lethargy, the record of the Ground Observer Corps is a refreshing exception to the rule.

Former Senator Davis Elkins, of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, former U.S. Senator Davis Elkins, of West Virginia, died today from an extended illness. Death came in his sleep at a hospital in Richmond, Va., where he had been a patient.

With the death of Senator Elkins there passed from the industrial scene of West Virginia one of the last of a long list of pioneers in the development of much of the natural wealth of the State. The former U.S. Senator Stephen B. Elkins, father of Davis Elkins, had collaborated with former U.S. Senator Henry Gassaway Davis, his father-in-law, in processing and marketing timber and coal and in building many of the original railroads of the State.

It was from the late Stephen B. Elkins that the city of Elkins received its name.

Senator Elkins is survived by his widow, three children and six grandchildren. His children are Mrs. Charles J. Kelly (Katherine), of New York City; Davis Elkins, Jr., of Elkins, W. Va.; and Mrs. A. Thomas Zirpolo (Maureen), of Cleveland, Ohio.

The family has been active in Republican politics in West Virginia and the Nation for three-quarters of a century.

Davis Elkins was born in Washington, D.C., in 1876 while his father was serving as a Delegate in the United States Congress representing the Territory of New Mexico. His mother, the former Hallie Davis, daughter of the then U.S. Senator Henry Gassaway Davis, met and married his father when he came to Washington as a Congressional Delegate.

He attended Lawrenceville, N.J., preparatory school; Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.; and Harvard University.

He was a veteran of the Spanish-American War, having served as a first lieutenant with Company E of the First West Virginia Volunteer Infantry. He reentered the active service of his country during World War I and served as a major in Europe. It was during his service in the Army that he was elected to the United States Senate from West Virginia in November of 1918. He did not seek reelection at the conclusion of his term in 1925.

Upon leaving the U.S. Senate, Senator Elkins undertook the active management of his coal and timber holdings, principally in northern West Virginia. He actively pursued this interest until his retirement due to ill health several years ago.

He had helped shape the Republican Party activities at the end of World War I and had played an important role in the party's financing during the period from 1920 until his health no longer permitted his active participation.

It was upon this withdrawal from a leading role that his wife, Mary R. Elkins, began to represent him in active participation on the political stage and was sent from their home Congressional District in West Virginia a sa delegate to the 1952 Republican national convention. Following that Mrs. Elkins was twice a candidate for Congress in the Second District.

The Elkins family has been one of the political and social leaders in the Nation since Stephen B. Elkins came to Washington in the 1870's. During the period of Davis Elkins' business career in West Virginia, he also maintained a home in Washington and most of the Nation's political leaders were frequent guests with him and his family.

The Davis and Elkins College in Elkins, W. Va., was an original joint gift to the Presbyterian Church by the two families who had lived in and developed that part of the State. Their original homes still serve as dormitories on the campus of the school.

Funeral arrangements are incomplete, but the body will be interred in the family plot at Elkins.

Tribute To J. L. Boal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, most of us will consider that we have enjoyed a full and successful life if we distinguish ourselves in one field of endeavor. Today I want to pay my respects to an outstanding Texan who recently retired after having rendered his neighbors and friends great service in two professions, and who has actively worked until he reached the age of 4 score years, and 15.

I refer to the Honorable J. L. Boal, who at age 95 years retired from the practice of law in Yorktown, De Witt County, Tex. He had served with distinction as county judge of De Witt County. Prior to his practice of law he was a highly respected teacher in the public schools. Thus his career of public service embraced two learned professions, and in both he did a job that won him the love of his neighbors.

Upon Judge Boal's retirement, the Bar Association of De Witt County passed a resolution to express the high esteem in which he is held.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution adopted by the Bar Association of De Witt County, Tex., on January 5, 1959.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Honorable J. L. Boal has retired from the practice of law after a half a century of honorable service to the people of Yorktown and of De Witt County; and

Whereas the said J. L. Boal has served the people of this county with distinction as county judge of De Witt County; and

Whereas, prior to his service as an attorney and judge he was a teacher in the public schools, so that his career in public service has embraced 2 learned professions in 2 centuries; and

Whereas, upon his retirement the said J. L. Boal donated his law library to the De Witt County bar for the use of the attorneys who practice and the judges who preside in the courts of this county; and

Whereas throughout his long career he has distinguished himself both by his legal attainment and by his devotion to duty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Bar Association of De Witt County, Tex., That the Bar Association of De Witt County, Tex., express to the Honorable J. L. Boal the sentiments of high esteem in which he is held by the members of his bar; that it extend to him sincere good wishes for his continued good health and happiness in his well-earned retirement; and that it express to him the bar's deep gratitude for the generous gift of his law library to the bar of this county, and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be transmitted to the said J. L. Boal by the president and secretary of this association and that a copy hereof be spread upon the minutes of this association as a permanent testimonial to the said J. L. Boal.

Adopted by unanimous vote of the association in regular meeting assembled at Cuero, in De Witt County, Tex., this the fifth day of January 1959.

FRANK B. SHEPPARD, *President*.

Bills Designed To Empower the U.S. Government To Deal With Certain Crimes of Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today, January 9, a group of seven bills designed to empower the Federal Government to deal with crimes of violence such as hate-bombings, hate-mail, and threats directed at, or attempts to intimidate, Federal officers in the performance of their duties. These bills are substantially identical to a group of bills which the Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS and the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING have advised me they intend to introduce in the Senate today. I wish to express here my wholehearted accord with those honorable gentlemen in the policy which these bills seek to effectuate. There may appear, upon committee examination and exegesis, the need for some technical revisions in some of these proposals in the interest of conformity to established Federal criminal law patterns. Such changes as may be necessary will not, I am sure, derogate from the fundamental thrust of these bills in the prevention and punishment of a program of conduct which has shocked and revolted us all.

Address by Maj. Gen. Ralph A. Palladino, Chief, Army Reserve and ROTC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Maj. Gen. Ralph A. Palladino, Chief, Army Reserve and ROTC, at a dinner held this past fall in Wilkes-Barre, by the Luzerne Columbus League: League:

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. RALPH A. PALLADINO, CHIEF, ARMY RESERVE AND ROTC

Judge Pinola, Congressman FLOOD, members of the Luzerne Columbus League and your guests, it is a great pleasure for me to be here this evening, and for this I must thank our good friend, Congressman FLOOD. I am highly flattered that he considered me for this splendid occasion.

I was happy to accept for at least three reasons:

First is for the opportunity to meet with the Luzerne Columbus League.

Second is for the sentimental reason that my father first settled in Pennsylvania when he came to America from the old country, I don't know what possessed him to move to Boston.

And third as an expression of my appreciation to Congressman FLOOD for his stanch support in strengthening America's defense.

Because of his efforts in behalf of our Reserve forces, my office has felt particularly close to him—and our working relationship with his office has always been excellent.

Some of this, I suppose, is because Mr. FLOOD is a kindred soul. As you know, I am a Bostonian, and Mr. FLOOD is a Harvard man.

In Boston we say there is little separation of the two. If you are a Bostonian, some of the Harvard influence is bound to rub off on you, and if you are a Harvard man some of the Bostonian influence is bound to rub off on you.

So you see, we in Boston make some claim to Mr. FLOOD. This much is certain, we understand each other, and this makes working with him a distinct pleasure.

When he asked if I could come to Wilkes-Barre there was some doubt that I could make it. As you know I was scheduled in Boston last night, and it looked like an extremely tight schedule might prevent me from accepting his kind invitation. However, everything developed in favor of my appearance here this evening, for which I am grateful.

For more than a year now since I joined the Army staff in Washington, I've been called upon to speak to many groups. I have talked to veterans' organizations, officer candidate schools, college students, local civic groups, Reserve Officers Associations, and many others. My talks have been on military subjects and confined generally to my work as the Army's chief of reserve and ROTC affairs. Until very recently I have had little opportunity to address Italian-American groups. Last night in Boston I addressed the Italian-American Charitable Society, and a month ago I talked to the Italian-American War Veterans at their national convention in Providence. Because I was among kindred folk, I felt that I could escape

from shop talk, and address myself to a subject close to my heart: that is, our Italian-American heritage. This is a matter which I believe commands our interest here tonight.

I developed my talks around the many Italian-Americans who made such a great contribution to America, to its culture, to its industry, to its economy, and to its character.

Much has been said and written about Italian-Americans. Some of it not good. Because it is true that wrongdoing attracts more public attention than good deeds, there has been a lot of public clamor about the small criminal element which detracts from the great contribution made to America by the millions of fine Italians like yourselves. Think what a terrific din there would be if we made as much noise when things go right as we do when things go wrong. Take your own organization, the Luzerne Columbus League—think of how much good you have done, the goodwill created, the patriotic effort you have put into community projects. Supposing all individuals, agencies and communities who benefited by your hard work applauded at once; it would be a cheer that would rock this great valley for months. But this is not likely to happen. But supposing my good friend here, Judge Pinola, makes off with your funds—then there will be a howl heard throughout the country. Of course, that's not likely to happen either.

I do not want to dwell tonight on that ugly element in our society, for whom I have no sympathy and whose way of life is abhorrent to all of us. All they deserve here tonight is this fleeting reference to point out that they are the exceptions—and few of them at that. Rather, when I consider our Italian-American heritage, as I frequently do, I am inspired by Dante's lines in the "Divine Comedy." "Consider your origin," he wrote; "you were not formed to live like brutes, but to follow virtue and knowledge."

Surely one of the truly great among many great Italians—he had us in mind when he penned those famous lines. Italians are many things to many men, but none can disagree—this Dante knew—that Italians are creative, highly individualistic and have a gift for life. These are virtues to treasure.

One of our prominent contemporaries, Prof. Angelo Pelligrini, of the University of Washington, caught the spirit of our character in a recent magazine article. He wrote, "What is there about Italians that makes them unique in their power to attract. We can say that as the English have a talent for government, the Irish for revolution, the Americans for the accumulation of wealth, so the Italians have a gift for life."

See if you don't find in yourself, or in members of your family, some of the characteristics Professor Pelligrini points out in these lines, and I quote: "A people in whom there is so much sympathy, such an abundance of passionate interest, cannot let a single moment of life escape unobserved."

He goes on to say, "Even a minor traffic accident summons them to the spot, not as spectators but as participants in a moment of life. They ask questions; they dispense advice; they quarrel; they take sides; and when the traffic officer arrives, they forget their differences and instinctively combine against him, the symbol of restraint. Only life matters."

Because, as Professor Pelligrini tells us, life matters so much, the Italians have developed, against great odds, the gift for survival.

There is an old Italian legend about the importance of life and this gift for survival. Many of you may have heard it; but for those of you who did not, let me repeat it here: "Once there was a court jester named Bertoldo who for some misdeed was sentenced by the King to die. When he was condemned he asked for and received one grace: That he may choose the tree from which he was to hang. He roamed Italy far and wide for 20 years at the King's expense, searching for just the right tree fit to be his gallows, but of course he never found it. Thus the fool Bertoldo survived." But this is legend. Let me give you a true life story closer to home.

In Japan a few years ago, a mine collapsed, trapping four Japanese coal miners. The Japanese, a fatalistic race by nature, conceded the loss. But nearby in a U.S. Army camp was a young soldier, a former Pennsylvania coal miner who heard about the disaster. He borrowed some of our Army engineer equipment and with the help of some Japanese laborers, worked without letup for 11 days. By driving a 90-foot shaft, he rescued the men who had managed to keep alive by drinking from a small stream of spring water that trickled into the trap. This dramatic rescue by a young American soldier was heralded in the Japanese press, and taught the Japanese a great lesson about Americans. That soldier's name was Salvatore Forte, an Italian-American from nearby Hatboro.

These anecdotes—one legend and one fact—tell us a lot about ourselves—the pathos and the humor, the pride and the passion, the sweet and the fortitude. To these we must add individualism, even an excessive individualism. Most of us want to be wheels rather than cogs. This is because we love life so dearly that we must be out in the sun; we do not want to be in the shade.

We resist restraint because we are a vibrant, expressive, creative breed. This accounts in large measure for why we are here today.

America offered our fathers the latitude, the freedom, the opportunity to expand, to express ourselves, to be creative. And we have responded by bringing to this great country our great vitality, our vibrance and our passion for life, our creative abilities. These have become an important part of the American character, an important part of the American scene. The Italian blood which flows here carries in its stream the stuff from which American sinews are made stronger, the stuff from which American industry and culture have grown. America gave us the opportunity for expression, and there never was a more grateful people than we.

I never think of the wonderful opportunity this land offered our immigrant fathers, without recalling the heartwarming story I once read, of Luigi Salzarulo. Some of you may know this story:

Luigi left his village of Bisaccia, Italy, about 50 years ago to come to America. When he left the village his neighbors rang the bell in the church tower. To Luigi, the bell seemed to say, "Ariverderci." Later, Luigi heard that this bell had cracked in an earthquake and the village people were too poor to have it recast.

In the summer of 1953, Luigi then a gray-haired American, returned to Bisaccia to attend a fiesta. Life in America had been kind to Luigi Salzarulo who had now Americanized his name to Louis. From a penniless immigrant he worked hard to become a freight trainmaster for the Pennsylvania Railroad in Richmond, Ind. He sent all of his six sons to college.

Even at age 70 he kept busy in civic affairs, taking a fierce pride in his citizenship and his community. Now the people in the village of Bisaccia had assembled to hear the Bishop of Conza bless the bell that Salzurola had recast for them in memory of one of his sons, an American major, killed in World War II.

After the speeches the bell rang clear and true. Salzarulo thought the ceremony was over, but there was a surprise in store for him.

In the town hall a priest unveiled a bronze plaque, and asked the guest to read the English words inscribed on the plaque. With tears in his eyes the once illiterate immigrant read: "From the people of Richmond, Ind., to the people of Bisaccia, Italy, in recognition of the high esteem in which we hold your native son, and our fellow citizen, City Councilman Louis Salzarulo."

In his absence, and much to his surprise, he had been elected to the city council.

As I look about this room I cannot help but think how easily this story could apply to many of you present here today. In all but some details this is the story of most of our citizens of Italian birth and descent.

You cannot begin to name the many great Italian-Americans who, coming from another heritage, have made so great a contribution to our American heritage. There are many Luigi Salzarulo's. One must begin with the great explorers, Columbus, whose name we honor tonight, and Cabot, to truly tell the story. Or one can turn to origins of American freedom to find there the words of Philip Mazzei, one of the early Maryland settlers, who first gave utterance to the words, "All men are by nature created free and equal to each other in natural rights," words used later by Thomas Jefferson in our Declaration of Independence. William Paca was one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Today you can go down to the Jamestown festival in Virginia where the original colony has been restored. And there, a highlight of the colony, is a copy of the glassworks set up originally in 1622 by 16 Venetians to make glass beads for trade with the Indians.

It should be expected that a people who trace their heritage to the great giants of the renaissance, Leonardo da Vinci, Michaelangelo, and Machiavelli, would produce so many fine Americans. How far need we look for great leadership? To Senator PASTORE, of Rhode Island, Governors Furcolo, of Massachusetts, and Rossellini, of Washington? Or to our cities for men like Mayor D'Allesandro of Baltimore, Mayor Cellebrezze, of Cleveland, or the late Fiorello LaGuardia, of New York? Consider for a minute the greatness of this man alone. One of his remarks which I recall most vividly—and this fully catches the character of the man—was in his tremendous appeal to the United Nations to expedite relief and rehabilitation for the war-torn countries of Europe. He was for less ceremony and more action when he said, "Ticker tape ain't spaghetti." Here again was another man of Italian descent who knew the importance of life.

There is no area in American life in which Italian-Americans have failed to make an important contribution. "The fine Italian hand" so frequently referred to, is evident everywhere.

We here are fully aware of the role played by Italian-Americans in our national defense. You know our own important role. In my own work I see everywhere, Italian-Americans working hard to develop the strength in reserve necessary to build up our Reserve components to such readiness that they would discourage aggression. It is this sort of strength I believe Machiavelli had in mind when he said, "Among other things which being unarmed brings you, it causes you to be despised." Americans will never be despised for weakness, and Italian-Americans will work hard and offer their sons that this strength be maintained.

Everyday in the Pentagon I am fully aware of the important role played in our Defense structure by these Italian sons. Just a fast review of the Army's recent promotion list to colonel reveals the following names: Sabatelli, Perella, Perrini, Grassi, Grondona, and many others. This past spring, I am proud to report, my own son graduate high in his class at West Point, and has now dedicated his life to the defense of our country.

Many times I am asked if I have achieved the highest military rank in the Army for a person of Italian descent. The answer is no. Italians have provided generalship in our Armed Forces for many years, and one of the most notable was Maj. Gen. Luigi Palma di Cesnola, a Civil War general, who not only was among the first of many Americans of Italian descent to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor, but also was the first director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York.

There are other Medal of Honor winners—names like Capezio, Borrelli, Boglione Aiello and Allegretti. Perhaps the name that comes to my mind most readily is that of the great marine hero, Sergeant Basilone. I am reminded almost daily of the great sacrifice and heroism of these men, when on my way to the Pentagon I pass the Sergeant Basilone American Legion Post in Arlington, Va.

Rarely anything of significance and importance comes out of Washington without the influence of that fine Italian hand, legislation from the Congress, or the model of a submarine that will traverse, under ice, the North Pole. In the Navy's model basin in Washington there is a skilled wood-carver named Fiori, who makes to exact scale, such precise wood models of navy craft that scientific data can be obtained from floating these in a test basin. His brotehr, also a skilled woodcraftsman does similar work for Army. When asked how they acquired these skills, the answer is simply, our father brought the talent from the old country, and we have learned from him.

It is a great part of our pride in America that we have not been content to avail ourselves of American liberty without the work and sacrifice necessary to guarantee this liberty. Never have we taken for granted the benefits of citizenships, citizenship we regard as not just a right but a privilege.

Coming as many of us did from an afflicted area of the world, we have regarded Americanism as a great goal to achieve and maintain. We have been active in the community, the schools and at the polls, because we feel strongly our responsibilities as citizens and Americans, and are not content to sit by—in the shade so to speak—while others in the sun carry the burden. I like to believe that this is something else we learned from Machiavelli who said, "When neither their property nor their honor is touched, the majority of men live content." This cannot be said of the Italian-American who must not, as Professor Pelligrini said, let a single moment of life escape unobserved.

This passion for life was carefully observed and fully recorded by the American Letitia Baldridge when she was the secretary in Italy to Clare Booth Luce, our former Ambassadress there. Miss Baldridge sees it from a different point of view, and I pass this on to you because it has so much meaning, and because I am sure your lovely ladies seated here tonight will appreciate these comments:

In writing about enchanting Italians in Italy, Miss Baldridge says, "There is no other country where 'he' feels more like a 'he' and 'she' more like a 'she'—and terribly glad of it.

"Here a woman's only qualification for being worshiped is that she be female."

Miss Baldridge gives the account of Italian men at a sidewalk cafe who on watching a 70-year-old woman go by, say "Ah, see how her legs are still good."

And then a few minutes later, a cross-eyed girl of 12 passes, hugging her school books, and the men say "Mamma mia, what a nice colt."

I can easily see among you that this appreciation for beauty in everyone and everything is another great quality Italians have brought to America.

This appreciation, this feeling for beauty, our creativity, our industry, our great sympathy, our passion for life, which has found so much unbridled expression in America are the contributions we must continue to make to our adopted land. We must never withhold, in any degree, from America and Americans our ability to help, to achieve, to share in the great national ideals of peace and democracy. We are well suited for these. Let me repeat again from Dante who said, "Consider your origin, you were not formed to live like brutes, but to follow virtue and knowledge."

Now we are Americans among the great American people to whom much of the world looks for leadership and inspiration. How much of that leadership and inspiration will again be contributed by those Americans of Italian descent depends on us, for the challenge to America is great. But borrowing again from the great Italian Machiavelli, "When the willingness is great, the difficulties cannot be great." We have that willingness.

Mindful again of our origin, that our forebears were once among the afflicted humanity of the Old World, and that now we have been so readily assimilated as Americans and so adaptable to American freedom, let us now consider the urgency and importance of the words of another great Italian—the late Pope Pius XII, the pope of peace, who left us this great thought which I would like you to take home with you:

"The American people have a genius for splendid and unselfish action, and into the hands of America God has placed the destinies of afflicted humanity."

Ladies and gentlemen, we are the American people and this is our challenge, the challenge for all Americans.

I thank you.

Herbert Kohler Named Man of the Year by Manufacturers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin is an important industrial State because of the ability and high character of its business leaders. As a result of this leadership Wisconsin ranks tenth in the Nation industrially, employing nearly a half million production workers.

One of the business leaders who has made a great contribution to manufacturing in Wisconsin is Herbert V. Kohler, chairman and president of the Kohler Co., located at Kohler near Sheboygan, Wis.

Recently, the National Association of Manufacturers gave deserving recognition to Mr. Kohler by presenting him with its Man of the Year Award. The event was ably described editorially and in a news account in the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press. Under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I insert these reports in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The articles follow:

HERBERT V. KOHLER NAMED MAN OF THE YEAR TODAY BY MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

NEW YORK.—Herbert V. Kohler, chairman and president of the Kohler Co., Kohler, Wis., today received the man-of-the-year award of the Old Timers' Council of the National Association of Manufacturers.

The Wisconsin business leader was honored at the luncheon at the opening day session of NAM's 63d Congress of American Industry at the Waldorf Astoria.

In presenting the award, Cola G. Parker, director of the Kimberly-Clark Corp., Neenah, Wis., and head of the council, said that Kohler was being recognized because of "his devotion to protecting the rights of people as individuals." He also cited Kohler's contributions to education, his "awareness of the responsibilities of good citizenship," and his "fearless leadership in industrial relations."

Referring to the Kohler Co.'s long-standing difficulties with the United Automobile Workers, Parker said that Kohler has "refused to sign away his employees' rights."

"Some 6 years ago, Mr. Kohler began fighting—and is still fighting—for the principles he believes in as a citizen and a responsible industrialist. That principle is freedom from coercion—freedom for his employees and freedom for the management of the company that bears his name."

Parker said the principle upheld by Kohler is simple and basic—that a company has no more right to force an employee to join a union in order to get or hold a job than it has to prohibit an employee to join a union.

In responding to Mr. Parker and the members of the Old Timers' Council and the NAM, Mr. Kohler said in part:

"It is, indeed, an honor to receive this award. I accept it—not for myself alone—but for many men and women of the Kohler organization who stood with me.

"Especially I appreciate the significance of this award—that you endorse the principles for which I have stood—that individual rights and individual freedoms must be preserved at all costs.

"Our American constitutional form of government and our free enterprise system both depend entirely on the rights and liberties of the individual.

"If I have played any worthy part in the fight to preserve those rights—I can only say that I am grateful that circumstances have given me the opportunity."

HERBERT KOHLER HONORED

The National Association of Manufacturers presented its Man of the Year Award today to Herbert V. Kohler, chairman and president of the Kohler Co.

The ceremonies took place at the opening of the 63d Congress of American Industry in New York City. The selection of Mr. Kohler for the award was made by Old Timers' Council of the national organization.

In presenting the award, Cola G. Parker, Neenah, head of the Old Timers' Council, cited Mr. Kohler for his contributions to education, his "awareness of the responsibilities of good citizenship, and his fearless leadership in industrial relations."

Mr. Parker said that the principle upheld by Mr. Kohler is basic—that "a company has no more right to force an employee to join a union in order to get or hold a job than it has to prohibit an employee from joining a union."

While there is wide disagreement with this principle—within unions, and among Government officials, educators, and labor relations authorities—the right to enunciate such a principle and to fight for it cannot be denied. And persons or organizations who support such a principle certainly have the right to honor a man who has remained steadfast throughout what has become the longest strike in the Nation's history. Even the strongest opponents must recognize a man who has the courage of his convictions. Every person from his own experience knows that making decisions does not come easily; sticking to them, come what may, can be far more difficult.

In mentioning Mr. Kohler's contributions to education, Cola Parker undoubtedly had in mind the former's distinguished record of service in behalf of the University of Wisconsin. Although not a graduate of the university, Mr. Kohler has been a leader in fund-raising campaigns of the University of Wisconsin Foundation. Last April he was signally honored for the successful manner in which he directed the campaign for the Wisconsin Center, which houses adult education classes, short courses, and special institutes and seminars. Under Mr. Kohler's chairmanship, contributions totalling $2,400,000 were received for the Center.

Mr. Kohler is the surviving member of the trio in whose honor plaques were erected at the Wisconsin Center during the dedication ceremonies. The other plaques are of the late Frank O. Holt, who conceived the idea for the adult education center and who served the university for 20 years, and the late Frank J. Sensenbrenner, who, as a member of the Board of Regents, regarded the Center as a personal crusade.

Mr. Kohler's deep interest in the cultural and civic life of the community, is of course, well known to the people of this area and the State as a whole. The Kohler Foundation, Inc., has been a vital factor in support of cultural projects, whether of a historical nature or for current affairs.

It is recalled that in 1955, Mr. Kohler received a special citation in behalf of the Kohler Foundation. The citation was given by the American Institute of Architects in recognition of the Foundation's restoration of Old Wade House at Greenbush.

The many friends of Mr. Kohler are greatly pleased, we are sure, that he was chosen by the National Association of Manufacturers as the recipient of the Man of the Year Award.

The Happy Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of December 29, 1958. All who knew him or read his columns mourn the passing of the genial and beloved Fred Othman who died in his sleep on Saturday, December 27, 1958, after having suffered a heart attack on December 16, 1958, while covering a news story on Capitol Hill:

THE HAPPY MAN

We mourn today the death of our colleague, Fred Othman, who died Saturday night in his sleep. He had suffered a heart attack December 16.

His passing is all the more poignant because he was such fun to be around; because, in his quiet and unfailingly good-humored way, he so enjoyed life.

As those who read his daily column in the World-Telegram knew, the way Fred made people smile was by reporting with astuteness and unfailing freshness, the didoes of scalawags, rascals, and fakes in a way that revealed the pathetically humorous fact that cheaters cheat themselves most of all.

We're sure that the engaging qualities of our modest and able friend came through in his columns to his many thousands of readers and that they, too, will share with us a sense of deep personal loss.

Needed: A Bombing Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced my bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to make the transportation and/or possession of dynamite and other explosives in interstate commerce, with the knowledge and intent that such explosives will be used to damage or destroy any building for the purpose of interfering with its use for educational, religious, charitable, or civic objectives, or of intimidating any person pursuing such objectives, a Federal crime. The bill further provides that any person guilty of these acts shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both, and, if death results from a violation of this subsection, shall be subject also to the death penalty or to imprisonment for any term of years or for life. Other important provisions are set forth in the bill.

I want to further state, Mr. Speaker, that the shocking events of last year caused by the dynamiting of a grammar school and later a Jewish recreation center at Nashville, Davidson County, Tenn., prompted me to introduce H.R. 11806 on April 1, 1958. Subsequently, similar legislation was introduced by Represenative CELLER, SULLIVAN and others, and the same bill was then introduced in the other body by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts.

Since the introduction of this legislation I regret to say there have been other similar senseless acts of violence and destruction in many other sections of the country. And yet we do not have a Federal statute under which persons who committed these acts may be apprehended, tried and punished.

The bill I propose today contains all the changes and recommendations made by Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary chairmanned by Representative WILLIS, of Louisiana, on the original bill. I want to take this opportunity to again urge the members of the Judiciary Committee, and the entire membership of the House as well as those in the other body, to act favorably upon this legislation without further delay. Time is of the essence, and it is obligatory that those of us in the legislative branch provide a Federal law to prohibit such dastardly acts of violence to life and property in our society.

I commend to your attention the following editorial from the Nashville Banner of November 15, 1958, entitled "Interstate Challenge: Needed—A Bombing Law":

INTERSTATE CHALLENGE: NEEDED—A BOMBING LAW

Bombed schools and religious institutions do come within the purview of public concern—and governmental concern, local, State, and Federal. The monstrous crime feeds on hate; beyond any question is interstate in its ramifications, and justifies the proposal of Attorney General William P. Rogers of Federal law as a weapon to combat it.

Hermitage District Representative J. CARLTON LOSER presented one such weapon, adequate to its purpose, in the measure that would have made it a Federal crime to transport dynamite in interstate commerce for criminal purpose. That bill was offered in the 85th Congress. It died in committee.

Dynamite or other explosive used in bombings, whether of schools or churches or homes, or business institutions, is of criminal purpose. And in the vast majority of cases the exponents of that are not only "outsiders," insofar as community and State are concerned, but are "outsiders" in the matter of national and ideological allegiance. They are of the sponsoring party of insurrection—doing the job of hate and terrorism, to incite American against American, group against group, and race against race.

The basic premise of this law, proposed against outlawry as clearly needed in protection of life and property and decency, is entirely apart from issues of segregation or integration. It cannot rest upon that tenuous question, or be tied to it as a legislative package—or omnibus bill—to pass or fail according to acceptance or rejection of the whole.

Details of the conglomerate "civil rights" legislation proposed inevitably would have infringement aspects which constitutional concern forbids.

There is no reason adequate law could not be enacted on its own merits to arm and coordinate these units of Government against the bombers.

By enactment of the Lindbergh Law, the FBI was enabled to move—and successfully—against kidnapers.

The Mann Act is a Federal law against the transportation of women across State lines for immoral purposes. The Dyer Act forbids interstate transit of stolen automobiles. Etc. and etc.

Federal authorities, such as the FBI, can move effectively in the program of justice to bring bombers to account—and break up this crime.

A law justly and realistically drawn to that end, without ramifications giving it any other aim or inference, would be welcomed by the law-abiding element of America, North, South, East, and West.

Reappointment of Joseph T. Kennedy as Pennsylvania Secretary of Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of December 20, 1958:

KENNEDY APPOINTMENT

With the predominantly Democratic election returns in mind, retention of Joseph T. Kennedy, of Wilkes-Barre, as secretary of mining, a post he has held in the Leader administration, will be politically acceptable in large measure in Luzerne County. It is also acceptable on a broad community basis for Secretary Kennedy stands well personally with his fellow citizens.

His fitness for the post has been demonstrated and is further attested by the fact

that he has been associated with the mining industry and with the United Mine Workers of America since 1916.

This background was taken into account by Governor-elect David L. Lawrence. As he announced the appointment, he credited Kennedy with the able performance of his duties. The Governor-elect made the sound comment that everyone concerned with the activities of this department knows how important its functions are to the great mining industry in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Kennedy has had varied experience. He has known what it was to work in the coal mines, where his career began. Then he became secretary to the president of district 1 of the United Mine Workers of America and held other posts with the union, serving as a delegate to the International Labor Organization in Dusseldorf, Germany, in 1953. It was natural that he had the UMWA endorsement for the cabinet post he now occupies and is now scheduled to fill for another 4 years.

A Citizen Speaks His Mind on the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, a few days before I left my home district in Jefferson County, Ala., to return to Washington for the convening of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, one of my constituents, a sincere, loyal, sound-thinking citizen, came to my office carrying an open letter to the Members of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives which he had prepared. This letter expresses in very forceful terms the views of this citizen and the vast majority of his fellow men in the Ninth District of Alabama on the decisions of the Supreme Court in the segregation cases.

I assured my constituent that I would be pleased to make his open letter available to the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. I insert same herewith, under permission heretofore granted, and commend its careful reading and study to the Members of this body:

To all U.S. Senators and Representatives:

Whether or not it is evident to the powers that be in Washington, D.C., nevertheless our Nation is in the throes of a dire emergency. Time is of the essence to save this Nation.

Isn't it time, and long past due, that the Senate and the Congress of these United States take into serious account this impending disaster and promulgate such laws as will leave to the States of this country complete control of the educational matters of their respective States? It appears that legislation to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court might well be the remedy.

Russia has only one dictator—the United States (in the form of the U.S. Supreme Court) now has nine in a combined dictatorship to force upon the sovereignty of the Southern States the ideas of these nine men.

Opinions are being written which disregard and abandon the law as written and interpreted for generations; and the Court has no constitutional power to make a change in the law. It bitterly condemns those who are disposed to censure its usurpation of power; and yet its actions show that it has no regard or respect for the law.

For peace and tranquillity to continue within this Nation, and particularly in the people of the Southern States, both white and colored, some immediate action is needed to make certain a constitutional provision which was certain in the minds of lawyers and laymen alike, North and South, for 86 years, until the day of this Supreme Court of the United States.

God forbid that this Nation shall be torn asunder as once it was.

A CONSTITUENT AND VOTER OF THE NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ALABAMA.

Judge Lewis Fawcett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable John Cashmore, Borough President of Brooklyn, at the dedication of the Fawcett Memorial Garden of the Brooklyn Botanic Garden held on Tuesday, September 23, 1958. It is a privilege for me to insert this moving tribute to my late and beloved friend, Judge Fawcett, who served with great distinction as a Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York. This beautiful garden to be enjoyed by all of the people of Brooklyn will keep ever bright the memory of the gentle, kindly man to whom it is dedicated:

This quiet and simple ceremony in which we dedicate this beautiful terraced garden to the memory of Judge Fawcett is one that fills me with a great deal of emotion.

I am, of course, keenly aware of the honor that is mine in being chosen to express the appreciation of the community for this lovely gift that Mrs. Osborne and Mrs. Frohne have made to the people of Brooklyn. But this dedication means something far more personal than that to me. It is an opportunity to pay a tribute—humble and sincere—to a man whom I loved and revered while he lived, and whose qualities of true greatness grow clearer as the passing years etch them in ever sharper tones upon the pages of my memory.

The personality of Judge Fawcett characterized as it was by such dignity, gentleness, and sweetness, will be well commemorated by this garden, that will in a subtle way convey the same impression of sweetness and gentleness to all people who can appreciate beauty.

Judge Fawcett and those of us who were of his time have lived in a changing world. In one brief lifetime we have seen a new civilization built from granite and steel. The world has seen the power and strength of that new civilization, but it was only the sensitive few among us like Judge Fawcett who could see that all that power and all that strength could not create the beauty of a single flower or match the priceless gifts of nature's countryside.

Today in the tradition of Judge Fawcett and his family, and in his memory, we try to preserve in this garden a concept of beauty and gracious living that will be characterized by the gentleness and the dignity that were so much a part of him.

In all ages and in all generations there will be sensitive people who will flee the civilization of granite and steel. Here they may come to refresh their souls with the beauty provided by nature and nature's God, and as they find rest and new purpose may they be mindful, as are we, that this haven of peace was preserved for them by the vision and zeal of one who personified Brooklyn at its best—Judge Lewis Fawcett.

Balance the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues confronting this Congress is the matter of balancing the budget for fiscal 1960. President Eisenhower has listed this as one of his chief objectives. Our economy cannot afford further inflation and I am convinced this should receive the most serious consideration from every Member of this body.

Our President's program is well described in an editorial which appeared recently in the Oshkosh (Wis.) Daily Northwestern, of which Mr. A. J. Mace is the chief editorial writer. I believe the editorial is of interest to all our colleagues and ask permission at this point to have it printed in the Appendix of the DAILY CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The editorial follows:

BALANCED BUDGET

President Eisenhower, earlier this week, handed John Q. Taxpayer and his family an unexpected and welcome Christmas gift. It was an attractive package, prettily decorated with dollar signs in long green. Inside was the announcement of plans for reduced Federal spending and a balanced budget for fiscal 1960.

But, in the great American tradition that permits the return or exchange of gifts after Christmas, it had hardly been unwrapped before some members of the family, notably Senators and Representatives of Democratic persuasion, were suggesting that it be changed. Some of the parts—the revenue and the expenses—didn't fit, they complained, and they didn't like the suggested postal rate and gasoline tax hikes. So, although the gift was delivered before Christmas, it is unlikely Mr. Taxpayer will actually receive it for some time and, then, it probably won't look much like the original package.

Mr. Eisenhower, in a statement issued by the White House, said the budget he will submit to Congress next month has been decided and that expenditures and revenues will be in the neighborhood of $77 billion. That is a pretty expensive neighborhood but it sounded good to Mr. Taxpayer because the budget for fiscal 1959 is running a deficit of more than $12 billion and fiscal spending is figured at a minimum of $79.2 billion. Revenues, considerably reduced by the economic recession earlier this year, are estimated at only $67 billion.

The President's announcement that his plans do not call for any general tax in-

creases was pleasing to the public but the proposed hike in postal rates, coming on top of the one this year, and call for higher gasoline taxes did not find the same welcome, either from the public or Members of Congress. There was no particular comment on the President's announcement that added revenue would accrue from some new user taxes for Government services, probably because Mr. Eisenhower did not go into detail as to what these would be.

The announcement of a balanced budget and that the balance has been achieved at levels of spending and revenue considerably different from those of fiscal 1959 came as a surprise to many. He had promised he would try to reduce nondefense expenditures in the next fiscal year but it was generally believed these cuts would be more than offset by increased spending for the military. It was, in fact, expected he would call for expenditures in the neighborhood of $79 billion or $80 billion, about the same as this year, and not $77 billion.

It is generally admitted the speedy and consistent rebound of the economy from the recession's low last April will mean increased revenues. But many economists have placed the Federal income in fiscal 1960 at about $75 billion. Mr. Eisenhower's anticipated figure of $77 billion is about $10 billion greater than the revenue estimated for fiscal 1959 last September, when the administration issued its latest budget revision.

Mr. Eisenhower, while promising a balanced budget, gave assurance this balance would not be reached because of a sacrifice of national defense. Rather, he said, such expenditures will be higher than ever before in time of peace. Whether his figure will satisfy those in Congress, whom he has termed spenders, seems unlikely because some of his critics have already labeled his proposal as a "pennywise and pound foolish" stand. He also said some domestic nondefense programs will continue at high levels while others will be held at varying levels consistent with the public interest.

Judging by the reception given the President's announcement by the Democrats, it would be too optimistic to believe he will get what he asks. Postal rates were hiked this year from 3 to 4 cents for both local and out-of-town letters as part of a program that will boost postal revenues about $550 million annually. Mr. Eisenhower's request for a 5-cent rate, however, was given a cold shoulder and it seems probable it will suffer the same fate in the next session of Congress. It has been hinted the proposed gasoline tax hike will be for a cent or a cent and a half. This, on top of the present 3-cent-a-gallon tax, represents a figure that will be fought by many in Congress as well as by the petroleum and highway lobbies. And the public certainly won't welcome any such boost.

While the liberal faction of the Democratic Party has already voiced disapproval of Mr. Eisenhower's proposals, most Republicans and the Democrat conservatives, such as Senator BYRD, of Virginia, are likely to give it support. Political observers see the balanced budget announcement as a smart political move because it will put the responsibility for further deficit spending on the shoulders of the Democrat-controlled Congress. Democratic critics see Mr. Eisenhower's estimated revenues as too high and his spending estimates as too low. Whether the balanced budget will be achieved remains to be seen but some bitter battles are assured when Congress convenes.

Charity Begins at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, charity begins at home. Who first said it, I do not know. Maybe it was out of the wisdom of King Solomon. But anyhow that old saying has always been a sparkling proverb of everlasting truth in my book and in the books of many others.

Way up in Harlan County, Ky., is a valley called Clover Fork, where I did some visiting this past December. But right now all the bloom is off the clover on Clover Fork. And no one is knee deep or even ankle deep in clover anymore up there. It is a narrow vale of mining camp dejection at present. The men look right at you out of solemn and desolate eyes. The women speak a silent, mournful language that says, "Yes, the hope is all gone but we still keep a brave front for the sake of our families." The children, the perennial chatterboxes of cheer, still hula their plastic hoops and blow their bubble gum full of air pockets. And the Kentucky cardinals still flash their bright colors in the native bushes on the mountainsides. And, too, the waters of the creek still gurgle their cheerful optimism as they roll over rough rocks, yet these waters seem to hasten along as if hurrying to leave forever Clover Fork Valley and its sad plague of poverty.

I look at that man over there with the miner's light cap and with shoulders considerably stooped by a thousand bent-over trips through low-room necks and narrow airways and long entries inside the dark, damp mines. And then I ask along with the great poet, "Is this the thing the Lord God made and gave to have dominion over sea and land; to trace the stars and search the heavens for power; to feel the passion of eternity? What to him are Plato and the swing of Pleiades? What the long reaches of the peaks of song, the rift of dawn, the reddening of the rose?" Well, enough of poetry. It is poverty, not poetry, that is claiming our attention just now.

It was exactly 2 weeks and 2 days before Christmas, but the season failed somehow. Because the bloom was off the clover; the berries were off the Christmas holly. Whenever the people are worrying over coffee and pork chops, all the Santa Claus business in the world is merely as a sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. There is just no harmony from it or jingle in it.

I stepped inside the dark hot room filled with several people and many odors. Someone with me said in a cheerful voice, "This is your Congressman come to see you." No one stirred. No one spoke. The introduction was flat. If Ike himself had come in, maybe someone would have gotten up and said, "Here, take a chair." But I have some doubt about that. The mind was on the unseen "vittles," on the unknown job out yonder in the beautiful and prosperous valley of somewhere. I tried to sound something of a hopeful note and to lift their spirits just a little bit, but I was a considerable amount of nothing and their gaze was still on the floor as I left the house. God help me. I could not raise their souls one bit. I was a failure at that undertaking. But somehow I do not believe my country nor its people would want to fail that vale up yonder on Clover Fork in Harlan County.

I am right now more interested in this valley's Evarts than Estonia and more concerned over this valley's Verda than Venezuela. It is just human nature. Maybe it is nearsightedness that makes a fellow see the thin seat of his neighbor's pants before he ever sees a faraway Arab needing a new pair of sandals for the desert road. I guess this Congressman from southeast Kentucky is just a little nearsighted.

Mr. Speaker, in my book, charity begins at home.

Letter by Northerner States Case for South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on October 13, 1958, Mr. Carleton Putnam of Washington, D.C., addressed a letter to President Eisenhower, stating in a very forceful manner the South's case for the maintenance of segregation. Mr. Putnam, prominent writer and airlines executive, has through the years been in sufficiently close contact with the South, its problems, opportunities and aspirations to be well acquainted with the situation in our part of the country.

Mr. Putnam's letter to the President was mailed, after receipt by the President, to the editors of every leading newspaper in the country. Not one single major paper north of the Mason-Dixon line considered the letter of sufficient importance to make it available to its readers. Many papers in the South ran the letter in their "Letters to the Editor" column, but nationwide distribution was not possible because of lack of interest among northern editors. As a result, a group of citizens of Birmingham, in my district, raised sufficient funds by private subscription, to finance the cost of running

the letter as a full-page advertisement in the New York Times. This advertisement appeared in the Times a few days ago.

With the thought that my efforts will lend assistance in giving the letter the type of currency it deserves, I am pleased to insert same herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under permission heretofore given.

Mr. Putnam, a member of the famous New England Putnam family of Revolutionary War days, is a native of New York City, a graduate of Princeton and Columbia, and founder and president of the Chicago and Southern Airlines (1943–48). He is presently on the board of directors of Delta Airlines. In addition to being an outstanding business executive, Mr. Putnam is also a writer of note. He recently published a widely praised biography of President Theodore Roosevelt.

The letter which follows is commended to the careful reading and study of every Member of the House:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *October 13, 1958.*

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A few days ago I was reading over Justice Frankfurter's opinion in the recent Little Rock case. Three sentences in it tempt me to write you this letter.

I am a northerner, but I have spent a large part of my life as a business executive in the South. I have a law degree, but I am now engaged in historical writing.

From this observation post I risk the presumption of a comment.

The sentences I wish to examine are these: "Local customs, however hardened by time, are not decreed in heaven. Habits and feelings they engender may be counteracted and moderated. Experience attests that such local habits and feelings will yield, gradually though this be, to law and education."

It is my personal conviction that the local customs in this case were hardened by time for a very good reason, and that while they may not, as Frankfurter says have been decreed in heaven, they come closer to it than the current view of the Supreme Court.

I was particularly puzzled by Frankfurter's remark that "the Constitution is not the formulation of the merely personal views of the members of this court."

Five minutes before the Court's desegregation decision, the Constitution meant one thing; five minutes later, it meant something else. Only one thing intervened, namely, an expression of the personal views of the members of the Court.

It is not my purpose to dispute the point with which the greater part of Frankfurter's opinion is concerned. The law must be obeyed. But I think the original desegregation decision was wrong, that it ought to be reversed, and that meanwhile every legal means should be found, not to disobey it, but to avoid it. Failing this, the situation should be corrected by constitutional amendment.

I cannot agree that this is a matter involving "a few states" as Frankfurter suggests. The picture in reality is of a court, by one sudden edict, forcing upon the entire South a view, and a way of life, with which the great majority of the population are in complete disagreement.

Although not from the legal, in fact from the practical, standpoint the North, which does not have the problem, is presuming to tell the South, which does have the problem, what to do.

To me there is a frightening arrogance in this performance. Neither the North, nor the Court, has any holy mandate inherent in the trend of the times or the progress of liberalism to reform society in the South.

In the matter of schools, rights to equal education are inseparably bound up with rights to freedom of association and, in the South at least, may require that both be considered simultaneously. (In using the word "association" here, I mean the right to associate with whom you please.)

In any case the crux of this issue would seem obvious: social status has to be earned.

Personally, I feel only affection for the Negro. But there are facts that have to be faced. Any man with two eyes in his head can observe a Negro settlement in the Congo, can study the pure-blooded African in his native habitat as he exists when left on his own resources, can compare this settlement with London or Paris, and can draw his own conclusions regarding relative levels of character and intelligence—or that combination of character and intelligence which is civilization.

Finally he can inquire as to the number of pure-blooded blacks who have made contributions to great literature or engineering or medicine or philosophy or abstract science.

We were all in caves or trees originally. The progress which the pure-blooded black has made when left to himself, with a minimum of white help or hindrance, genetically or otherwise, can be measured today in the Congo.

Lord Bryce, a distinguished impartial foreign observer, presented the situation accurately in his "American Commonwealth" when he wrote in 1880:

"History is a record of the progress toward civilization of races originally barbarous. But that progress has in all cases been slow and gradual. * * * Utterly dissimilar is the case of the African Negro, caught up in and whirled along with the swift movement of the American democracy. In it we have a singular juxtaposition of the most primitive and the most recent, the most rudimentary and the most highly developed, types of culture. * * * A body of savages is violently carried across the ocean and set to work as slaves on the plantations of masters who are 3,000 or 4,000 years in advance of them in mental capacity and moral force. * * * Suddenly, even more suddenly than they were torn from Africa, they find themselves, not only free, but made full citizens and active members of the most popular government the world has seen, treated as fit to bear an equal part in ruling, not only themselves, but also their recent masters."

I would emphatically support improvement of education in Negro schools, if and where it is inferior.

Equality of opportunity and equality before the law, when not strained to cover other situations, are acceptable ideals because they provide the chance to earn and to progress, and consequently should be enforced by legal fiat as far as is humanly possible.

Throughout this controversy there has been frequent mention of the equality of man as a broad social objective. No proposition in recent years has been characterized by more loose thinking. Few of us would care to enter a poetry contest with a top-ranking poet. And few would care to play chess with the champion.

Pin down the man who uses the word "equality," and at once the evasions and qualifications begin. As I recall, you, yourself, in a recent statement used some phrase to the effect that men were "equal in the sight of God."

I would be interested to know where in the Bible you get your authority in Scripture for the concept of potential equality in the sight of God—after earning that status, and with various further qualifications—but where is the authority for the sort of ipso facto equality suggested by your context? The whole idea contradicts the basic tenet of the Christian and Jewish religions that status is earned through righteousness and is not an automatic matter.

Frankfurter closes his opinion with a quotation from Abraham Lincoln, to whom the Negro owes more than to any other man. I, too, would like to quote from Lincoln. At Charleston, Ill., in September 1858 in a debate with Douglas, Lincoln said:

"I am not, nor ever have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races; I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes nor qualifying them to hold office. * * * I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will ever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together, there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

The extent to which Lincoln would have modified these views today, or may have modified them before his death, is a moot question, but it is clear on its face that he would not have been in sympathy with the Supreme Court's position on desegregation.

Perhaps the most discouraging spectacle is the spectacle of northern newspapers dwelling with pleasure upon the predicament of the southern parent who is forced to choose between desegregation and no school at all for his child.

It does not seem to occur to the papers that this is the cruelest sort of blackmail; that the North is virtually putting a pistol at the head of the southern parent in a gesture which every northerner must contemplate with shame.

Indeed, there now seems little doubt that the Court's recent decision has set back the cause of the Negro in the South by a generation.

He may force his way into white schools, but will not force his way into white hearts nor earn the respect he seeks.

What evolution was slowly and wisely achieving, revolution has now arrested, and the trail of bitterness will lead far.

Sincerely yours,

CARLETON PUTNAM.

"The Red Mass"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon given by the Very Rev. Robert Gannon, S.J., on September 18, 1958, at the annual mass of the Holy Spirit, known as the Red Mass, and which is sponsored by the Catholic Lawyers Guild of the Diocese of Brooklyn to mark the opening of the fall term of the courts in Brooklyn:

In the summer of 1947 President Truman reassigned Myron Taylor as his personal representative at the Vatican. On this occasion he wrote the Holy Father a beautiful letter which caused some excitement in Brooklyn. In it he said without qualification, "Your

Holiness, this is a Christian Nation." Whereupon he was promptly accused by one of your colleagues of violating the Constitution by an attack on the white elephant which is supposed not only to separate church and state but to assure their mutual hostility. The accusation was, of course, fantastic and unimportant, except for the fact that it called our attention to an interesting phase of our national development. After all, was the President right? Or was the Brooklyn lawyer right when he cried out with some heat, "The U.S.A. is not in any sense a Christian Nation." The answer is not as simple as it might be.

Certainly we are not a Christian nation by law established as England, Spain and Sweden are Christian nations. The First Amendment to the Bill of Rights takes care of that. "Congress" we read "shall pass no law respecting the establishment of religion." The words are clear enough but the background is sometimes misunderstood. Judging from developments of recent years, one would think that the Founding Fathers were taking precautions against the Pope of 1789. Actually, he was the last one in their minds. The Papacy had been declining all through the 18th Century so that the poor Holy Father was probably never weaker at any period since the Western Schism than he was in the years between the fall of the Bastile and Waterloo. The same was true of the Catholic Church. It was undergoing one of its periodic burials and most people thought this was the last. No. The church which James Madison and the rest had in mind was the church which had collected tithes in the colonies for generations—the Church of England. So that by the First Amendment the Founding Fathers wished to make it clear that the Church of England was being disestablished in America and that no other was to take its place forever. Henceforth, all religions, Mohamatan, Protestant, Jewish and Catholic would be absolutely equal before the law. Clearly then, we are not a Christian nation as England, Sweden and Spain are Christian nations.

Are we, however, Christian on the basis of population? It is certainly true that the majority of our fellow citizens would list themselves as Christians in a noncommittal sort of way. They come of Christian stock. They look like Christians, they talk like Christians and frequently out of habit act like Christians but when it comes to Christian doctrine which forms the basis of Christian life, they ignore it or openly reject it. Many will say, "Of course I'm a Christian. What else could I be? I'm not a Jew or a Buddhist and my father helped to build the main church in our town." But if you press them and ask, "Do you believe then in the Holy Trinity, the divinity of Christ and in the inspiration and inerrancy of the New Testament?", the picture changes. It would be very difficult to prove that the United States is Christian on the basis of population.

What then of its ideals—as far as these can be separated from its theology? What of its education, its philosophy, its morality? Would these still be Christian enough to justify the former President's claim, "Your Holiness, this is a Christian country." A hundred years ago, the answer would have been "Yes," and this, in spite of the fact that fewer Americans proportionately were signed up as church members. Our schools, beginning with Harvard, whose motto was "Christo et Eccesiae," were all with the exception of the University of Virginia, Christian foundations. But Horace Mann, an excellent Christian himself, in his effort to avoid offense against any particular sect, practically banished Christianity from the public schools, while the Christian private schools and colleges gradually succumbed to the influence of the Ph. D.'s who had flocked to Europe after our Civil War to Paris and Berlin and had returned eager to spread the naturalism they had learned there. As a result, the education of the United States, by and large, is anything but Christian today.

That being so, what can we expect of our philosophy? The real leaders in the field have ben men like James and Whitehead and Cohen and Dewey and Santayana, so that in spite of a liberal sprinkling of neo-Thomism our philosophers have not helped keep the United States a Christian nation and much less can be said for the arbiters of our moral standards. We may brush off as propaganda the comments that are written in the Soviet press about our business practices, our family life, and our female alcoholics, but we cannot ignore the annual reports of Edgar Hoover which invariably stress the percentage increase of crime amongst us, especially of juvenile crime. It would take an optimist to hold that, on the basis of our moral tone, the United States is a Christian nation.

And yet, Harry Truman was not altogether wrong. Ours is a country with at least a Christian past which cannot be ignored. The former President in his letter mentioned the discoverers, explorers and missionaries who were Christians and frequently heroic Christians. He mentioned the colonists, too. Many of them came over here because they wanted to practice their Christian religion and most of them brought some form of Christianity with them. When the time arrived to establish an independent government, very few of the leading citizens were deists or freethinkers. The so-called fathers of our country, the signers of the Declaration of Independence and the signers of the Constitution were almost without exception practical Christians. Franklin and Jefferson are the only exceptions cited. It is true that Jefferson was a conservative materialist, a child of the so-called enlightenment who considered God as "ethereal gas" but Franklin would protest that he was himself a true Christian. He had had a quarrel with the Presbyterian church and never joined any other but he was a deeply religious man and many of his speeches and many parts of the autobiography breathe the spirit of the New Testament. In fact, the tone of that whole generation is to be found in Washington's message to the Governors of the 13 States on resigning his commission as Commander in Chief of the Army. In it, he assumed that all the American Governors believed as he did that the future happiness of the United States depended on the imitation of Christ.

It is not surprising then that the form of democracy bequeathed to us by the Founding Fathers was a Christian form of democracy, a democracy that rests on two distinctly Christian ideals. The first of these is the supremacy of law over the ruler, the second is the equality of all men before the law based on the God-given dignity of the human person. The first, the supremacy of law over the ruler, was handed down to us through English common law which derived from custom and tradition rather than from formal codes. It recognized the existence of a higher law that was in its broadest outline knowable through reason, knowable because it could be deduced from the nature of man. Before the rise of Christianity, no one recognized a natural right. All law was positive law. For the Jews, God's chosen people, it was divine law known as revelation and collected into codes, the greatest of which was the Ten Commandments given to Moses on Mount Sinai. For the Gentiles it was positive law known by state edict and, likewise, collected into codes. But our Founding Fathers presupposed in the democracy they bequeathed to us a higher law binding rulers and ruled to which all positive law must conform. This great tradition which involves every man's right to immunity from the arbitrary leads back through John Marshall, Hamilton, and James Wilson to Edmund Burke, Lord Somers, Seldon, and medieval lawyers like Henry De Bracton, back beyond the Magna Carta to St. Ambrose and St. Augustine.

The same is true of the second great principle underlying our democracy, the principle of equality. This is not to be confused with the egalité of the French Revolution any more than Robespierre's Fraternité is to be compared with Christian charity. The French had been profoundly affected by the revival of Roman law under Philip the Fair and the subsequent weakening of the medieval tradition. Their egalité was understood in the pagan stoic sense which condemned all inequality of any sort. Our Founding Fathers not only preserved for us the English common law and the parliamentary tradition but also carried over from the Middle Ages the Augustinian concept that all men are equal under God as persons; as individuals, that is, with spiritual powers; as adopted sons of God and heirs of the kingdom of heaven. You will find nothing about personal rights in Aristotle or Cicero or the books of the Old Testament. It was because of the church's teaching on personality that we Americans fell heir to the tradition that no man has the right to impose his will on another except as God's representative. This is a tradition that might find a cool reception in Washington today. It might be thought repugnant to the rights of our National Free Thinkers Association but it would be difficult to declare unconstitutional traditions which gave rise to the Constitution.

President Truman, therefore, should have qualified his statement saying not "This is a Christian Nation" but "the two boasts of our country in which we take the deepest pride are Christian still—its origin and its special form of democracy. In its origin it is immutably Christian but the form of its democracy is subject to change. Some expect that change will come suddenly through Red revolution or conquest but violence is quite unnecessary. It can be so much more efficiently accomplished through the day-by-day decisions of our courts. There we can witness the struggle already joined between the old and the new theories of law. The old theory—your theory—the theory which is presupposed in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence which is essential to the tradition of American democracy rests on the fact that there is a superior law which tests the laws of men and that there are objective standards for weighing the validity as well as the expediency of new legislation. The new theory of law popularized by Oliver Wendell Holmes ignores the existence of God as the source of all authority, minimizes principles and precedents and makes the judicial process a thing of mere utility and force, tempered with emotion, whim and intuition. The man in the street can feel the sands shifting under him. There is no more certainty in the law since consistency is not to be expected at the summit of the law. There are no more permanent rights, no more unalienable rights, no more natural rights since English common law got out of fashion in Washington. The situation is not hopeless. There is enough of our inheritance left to fight for but you gentlemen of the bench and bar will have to do most of the fighting. The rest of us are practically in your hands. If you fail us the last link that binds us to our Christian past, our Christian concept of democracy will disappear and Truman's critics will be right in saying that the United States of America is in no sense a Christian nation.

Will Congress Save Our Priceless Heritage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the election of last November 4 gave the Democratic Party an overwhelming majority in both Houses of Congress, which, Mr. Speaker, imposes a greater responsibility on your party—and especially on you, as leader of the party in control—than you have ever experienced in all your years as Speaker of this august body. I am sure you are well aware of that fact, and that the future welfare of America depends to a very great degree on your every act and decision during this session of Congress.

The time has come to speak plainly. Many Members who had the contracted support of Reuther's so-called liberal labor party were elected last November and, of course, they are expected to blindly follow orders from the organization which contributed greatly to their campaign, since they are bought and paid for. But, I sincerely hope it is not yet too late for us to profit from the costly experience which England suffered under the Fabian Socialists, who also masqueraded under the banner of the liberal labor party, and who got control of Parliament shortly after World War II and immediately put into effect the identical program Reuther's A.D.A. and C.O.P.E. are now proposing for us here in the U.S.A. To learn the facts about the suffering of the English people, especially the laboring people, the farmers and the small businessmen who suffered first and most at the hands of the Fabian Socialists makes the blood of any good American run cold. It must not happen here.

Democrats and Republicans are hoping—yes, praying—that Congress will hold the line against those who for selfish reasons are bringing concerted pressure on us to follow their their anti-American liberal concepts. Every well informed, unbiased, American citizen knows that the true definition of a "modern Reuther liberal" is one who is primarily liberal with our constitutional rights and with our taxpayers' dollars.

Hence, under the circumstances as they now exist, were it not for my faith in you, Mr. Speaker, and in the good sense of most of my colleagues, I would shudder to contemplate the future of our blessed land. May God give us courage and the strength to meet the test, with the outspoken support of courageous men and women here in Congress and all over our broad land.

On this, the opening of the 86th Congress, I felt it in my heart to give expression—as I have here—to my innermost feelings, to be printed in the RECORD, that thousands, yea millions, might read and then do their part, and more, to preserve our precious American liberties.

Panama Canal Zone: Constitutional Domain of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during the second session of the last Congress starting on March 26, 1958, I made a series of addresses dealing with various phases of Canal Zone diplomatic and legislative history and problems. Though the writings on these subjects are voluminous and at first sight bewildering, when reduced to their essentials they are relatively simple.

At the request of Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant 3d, president of the American Peace Society, I undertook to condense into a brief article for the fall 1958 issue of "World Affairs," the quarterly magazine of that organization, the basic points in the Canal Zone sovereignty question.

The article follows:

PANAMA CANAL ZONE: CONSTITUTIONAL DOMAIN OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, Representative from Pennsylvania)

SUEZ CRISIS FOCUSED ATTENTION ON PANAMA

The dramatic but "legally unjustifiable"[1] nationalization by Egypt on July 26, 1956, of the Suez Canal was an epochal event. It has focused world attention on the other great interocean waterway, the Panama Canal, to a degree not equaled since those memorable years near the start of this century when the key canal treaties, under which it was constructed and subsequently maintained and operated, were negotiated.

Originating in the Soviet Union and its satellites, the ensuing clamor has been featured by voluminous propaganda aimed at wresting ownership and control of the Panama Canal from the United States and transferring its jurisdiction to some international or other authority. This uproar, instead of tending to clarify and stabilize conditions on the American Isthmus, has formed a sinister agitation that conforms to the well-known pattern of penetration and subversion so characteristic of the tactics of the international Communist conspiracy for world conquest. Moreover, the din is today being fanned by jingoistic elements in Panama, including high officials in the government of that republic and has created a situation that is definitely hazardous.

Meanwhile, a widespread ignorance of the most elemental facts in canal history, prolonged silence by our government with respect to the rights and responsibilities of the United States at the Isthmus,[2] and its weak policies of appeasement and giveaway, together have served to aggravate the situation, which truly needs rigorous clarification.

JURIDICAL BASE FOR ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICIES

Rooted in four centuries of history,[3] the foundations of the United States Isthmian canal policies find expression in three important canal treaties:

First. The Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 between Great Britain and the United States, which facilitated construction of an Isthmian canal across Central America. In this treaty, Great Britain relinquished its own rights for the construction and control of such canal and recognized the exclusive right of the United States thereto. The United States, in assuming this responsibility, adopted the main points in the Convention of Constantinople of 1888, concerning the Suez Canal, as rules of the operation, and regulation of the American canal.

Second. The Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of November 18, 1903, between the Republic of Panama and the United States. On the part of Panama, this treaty granted to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation and control of the Canal Zone for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of the Panama Canal, and, most significantly, as if the United States were the sovereign of the territory and to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority. On the part of the United States, the main point for the purposes of this paper was that it guaranteed the independence of the Republic of Panama, which had just seceded from Colombia and whose existence depended on the protection of the United States and the success of the canal undertaking.

Third. The Thompson-Urrutia Treaty of April 6, 1914, proclaimed March 30, 1922, between the United States and the Republic of Colombia, the sovereign of the Isthmus prior to the Panama Revolution of November 3, 1903. This treaty aimed at removal of all misunderstandings growing out of political events in Panama in November 1903, restoration of the cordial relationship that had previously existed betwen Colombia and the United States, and definition of their rights and interests with respect to the Canal and the Panama Railroad.

The negotiation of these three treaties, it should be emphasized, was not accidental. Instead, it was the result of long-range interoceanic canal policies of the United States developed over many years and having in mind always the history of the affected territory.

Here, as a matter of special interest, it should be remarked that the Panama Railroad, running through the Canal Zone and constituting the first American transcontinental rail system and the first practical step in the construction of the canal, was built by United States citizens in 1849–55. Later, it was acquired by the French, and sold to the United States as part of the French canal holdings acquired in 1904.

Throughout the period of United States operation of the canal, the requirements of these treaties have been carefully followed. Their main provisions have stood the test of experience and fully justify their adoption. They form a splendid monument to those who evolved them, and today Public Law 841, 81st Congress (1950), governing the administration of the canal enterprise and popularly known as the Thompson Act, actually mentions these treaties and specifies

[1] George A. Finch, "Navigation and Use of the Suez Canal," Proceedings of the American Society of International Law (1957), p. 42.

[2] Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, "Panama Canal Zone: Constitutional Domain of the United States," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, March 26, 1958.

[3] Miles P. DuVal, Jr., "Cadiz to Cathay," (2d ed.) and "And the Mountains Will Move" (Standford University Press, 1947) tell the story of the acquisition of the Canal Zone and building the Panama Canal.

that the levy of tolls is subject to their provisions.

PEAK OF U.S. ISTHMIAN INFLUENCE, 1903–39

Following the independence of Panama in 1903, the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty was negotiated with the new sovereign of the Isthmus, instead of Colombia, pursuant to the Spooner Act of June 28, 1902, that had authorized negotiation of a treaty for canal purposes with Colombia.

As previously stated, this treaty authorized the acquisition and perpetual control of the Canal Zone for the primary objectives of constructing the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection, all exclusively by the United States and also wholly at U.S. expense.

In addition, it is also clear from the diplomatic and legislative history of that era that the aim of both the United States and Panama was to establish and maintain complete sovereignty over the Canal Zone by the United States. This was done not only to assure the construction, efficient operation, and protection of the Canal in perpetuity, as provided in the Spooner Act of 1902 and in the 1903 treaty, but also to guarantee that Colombia could never be able to reassert successfully its sovereignty over the Canal Zone, the Panama Canal, the Panama Railroad, or the Republic of Panama.

Except for the Caesarian operation known in history as the Panama Revolution, out of which the independence of Panama resulted, and the provisions of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty, the Republic of Panama would never have been created and could never have survived. Besides, the United States would never have undertaken construction of a project as vast as the Panama Canal in a region then justly described as the pesthole of the world and long characterized as a land of endemic revolution repeatedly requiring the presence of naval vessels to maintain freedom of transisthmian transit.[4]

These points were fully understood at that time by Panamanian as well as North American leaders. Both realized that political stability in the Isthmian area was imperative for the success of the Canal enterprise—its construction and subsequent maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection. They also recognized that such stability could be obtained only by vesting complete and exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone in the United States.

The great North American statesman who developed our Isthmian policies included such eminent leaders as President Theodore Roosevelt, John Hay, John Bassett Moore, Adm. John G. Walker, William Howard Taft, and Elihu Root. President Roosevelt always viewed the Canal as the greatest accomplishment of his administration, and comparable in importance to the Louisiana Purchase. In essence, the results of their vision and efforts remained unimpaired until 1939—a period now recognized as the peak of United States influence on the Isthmus.

COLOMBIA'S INTEREST PROTECTED BY TREATY

Because of the importance of the Thompson-Urrutia Treaty, and the fact that it is not as well known as it should be, its principal provisions are summarized.

In article I, Colombia recognizes the title to the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad as "vested entirely and absolutely in the United States, without any encumbrances or indemnities whatever." Furthermore, this article provides that Colombia shall enjoy certain rights, which include:

First. Transit through the Canal of Colombian troops, materials of war, and ships of war, without paying charges to the United States.

Second. Exemption of charges on products of Colombian soil and industry, as well as mails, other than those to which the products and mails of the United States are subject.

Third. Exemption of Colombian citizens, crossing the Isthmus, from every toll, tax, or duty to which the citizens of the United States are not subject.

Fourth. Use of the Panama Railroad or any other railroad substituting therefor, in event of interruption of transit, for the transport of troops, materials of war, products, and mails of Colombia on the same basis as those of the United States.

In article II, the United States agreed to pay Colombia $25 million, which was done.

By article III, Colombia recognized Panama as an independent nation and agreed to conclude a treaty of peace and friendship and to establish regular diplomatic relations, all of which was accomplished together with a treaty agreement between the two countries as to their common boundary.

Thus, it is clear that Colombia not only has substantial rights with respect to the Canal, but also a treaty interest in the continued operation of the Panama Railroad, which is binding on the United States. As will be later shown, this treaty interest of Colombia in 1955 was overlooked or ignored in the formulation of the treaty between the United States and Panama of that year.

TREATY POWER UNDERMINES UNITED STATES AUTHORITY

With the passing of the years after opening the canal to traffic on August 15, 1914, the operation of the project became a matter of routine with decreased public interest and scrutiny in the United States and Colombia. In Panama, however, there developed determined efforts toward securing revision of major provisions in the treaty structure.

Thoughtful North American officials, stationed in the Canal Zone as early as 1931–32, recognized the dangers involved and expressed fear that such treaty revision might lead to the ultimate loss of exclusive control of the canal by the United States.

Not until 1936, however, was the first major step in this direction made with the signing of the Hull-Alfaro Treaty. This treaty, because of opposition in the Senate, was not proclaimed until July 27, 1939.

The Hull-Alfaro Treaty, unlike the 1903 treaty, was negotiated without authorization or direction by the Congress. It weakened the dike in the diplomatic setup of the Panama Canal, but without impairment of the fundamental principle of its exclusive sovereign control by the United States.

To understand better its important provisions, it should be borne in mind that, by the time of the 1936 treaty, Panamanian leaders felt, because of the 1914 treaty between the United States and Colombia, that their country's independence was secure. Thus, they sought and secured abrogation of the guarantee provision of the 1903 treaty together with the right of the United States to maintain order in the terminal cities. In addition, the 1936 treaty surrendered other important rights of the United States granted in the 1903 treaty, including the important right of the United States of eminent domain within the Republic of Panama for canal purposes, and raised the canal annuity from $250,000 to $430,000 to compensate for the devaluation of the gold dollar, all without consideration except of token character.

The crippling of United States accessory powers, however, did not stop there. After prolonged secret negotiations started in 1953, the process was advanced much further in the Eisenhower-Remon Treaty, proclaimed August 26, 1955, also negotiated without the authorization, direction, or suggestion by the Congress. This treaty gave to Panama additional valuable properties worth many millions and substantial rights, the latter including the authority of the United States to enforce sanitary ordinances in the terminal cities of Panama and Colon, which rights had been indispensable to building the canal. Moreover, the 1955 treaty increased the annuity by $1.5 million, from $430,000 specified in the 1936 treaty to $1,930,000.

The Congress, in implementing this treaty, did not accept the additional $1,500,000 as a charge on the Panama Canal enterprise but as foreign aid to Panama accorded by the Department of State as a diplomatic gesture. Thus, the annuity of $1,930,000 is now being carried as an item in the budget of that Department, with reimbursement for $430,000 of it to the Treasury, chargeable to the Panama Canal Company. This means that the annual cost of this diplomatic move ($1,500,000) is borne by U.S. taxpayers and not canal users, further illustrating the propensity of the State Department to give away tax money for purposes of political placation. What a paradox is thus presented and what a dangerous precedent for the future administration of the Panama Canal.

Because all the 1955 treaty benefits and surrenders to Panama were extended for no other than purely token considerations, their costs ultimately will have to be covered by either increased taxes or higher tolls. Furthermore, they have definitely weakened the police power of the United States in meeting its treaty responsibilities for the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the canal—a situation that might well prove fatal for the proper conduct of the canal enterprise in the future.

PANAMA RAILROAD LIQUIDATION NARROWLY AVERTED

One of the most objectionable features of the 1955 treaty was its surrender to Panama of valuable Panama Railroad property in the cities of Panama and Colon, even including the terminal freight yards and passenger station but excepting tracks in Colon necessary for Cristobal pier switching. Not only that, the treaty actually contemplated without the authority of the Congress the abandonment of the railroad itself, which, as shown previously, had been acquired with adequate compensation by the United States pursuant to both law and treaty. In addition, this move appears to have been taken with complete disregard or ignorance of the treaty rights of Colombia with respect to the Panama Railroad.

Apprised of the situation, congressional leaders intervened. An independent congressional inquiry[5] resulted in the reversal of the formal endeavor of the Directorate of the Panama Canal Company to liquidate the railroad—a congressional decision fully justified by subsequent operation of the railroad. This action, however, was too late to save the terminal facilities of this historic and strategic rail line.

Now where does this leave us? Because the treaty has no provision for replacement of the ceded facilities, we are going to have a trans-Isthmian railroad without its originally designed and adequate terminal yards and stations. Could there be anything more absurd, or more ominous for the future conduct of our Isthmian policies?

CANAL ZONE IS CONSTITUTIONAL TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES

The sustained surrenders of our Isthmian rights and prerogatives, designed for proper maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the canal, extend beyond the limits of the Canal Zone into the very foundation of our constitutional form of government.

---

[4] FLOOD, "Panama Canal Zone: Constitutional Domain of the United States—Further Supplementary," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, Apr. 2, 1958, lists many incidents of Isthmian turmoil.

[5] H. Rept. 2074, 84th Cong.

The acquisition of the Canal Zone and Panama Railroad was accomplished with adequate compensation pursuant to the Spooner Act of 1902 and the 1903 Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty. Constructed and subsequently managed according to laws enacted by the Congress, the canal enterprise symbolizes to the people of the United States the productive benefits to be derived from our system of government.

Long recognized as part of the "coastline of the United States," the Canal Zone is not an occupied territory,[6] as was once erroneously reported to the United Nations by our Department of State, but a portion of the constitutionally acquired territory of the United States.

BASIC ISTHMIAN POLICIES MUST BE REAFFIRMED

Unfortunately, the tragic surrenders culminating in the present Isthmian crisis represent a threat to our national power. In fact, the course pursued has resulted in the surrender without justification of our bargaining rights with Panama. It has created a situation that will require statesmanship of the highest order on the part of both Panama and the United States to correct.

In approaching this complicated task our leaders must realize that they are not dealing with a routine matter but one of transcendent importance for the indefinite future. History has shown that the canal question cannot safely be entrusted to minor negotiating officials of the executive departments alone but must be forthrightly faced by the Congress, which, as the ultimate authority, should reaffirm our canal policies in the light of all the basic considerations and realities involved.

The great lesson to be derived from a critical study of more than a century of experience in matters affecting security of transit, and the protection of the canal itself, is the imperative necessity for political stability on the isthmus, with no dilution or diminution of United States sovereignty and control over the Panama Canal enterprise.

[6] Senate Hearings on Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 19, Mar. 25, 1954, p. 1364.

The Starvation Diet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to present to the House of Representatives an editorial containing most valuable observations on the TVA which appeared in the Decatur Daily, Decatur, Ala., on January 4, 1959.

The editor of this newspaper, Mr. Barrett Shelton, is a distinguished journalist and an outstanding civic leader. Recently, he was elected president of the Associated Tennessee Valley Chambers of Commerce, and he is the author of this significant and thought-provoking editorial.

The editorial follows:

THE STARVATION DIET

Our old friends the private power interests and their new mouthpiece, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, have almost succeeded in putting us on a starvation diet in the Tennessee Valley in the matter of electric power generation. The 5 million people who depend on the Tennessee Valley Authority for electricity to light and heat their homes could run into a power shortage in 1961.

Who says so? The board of directors of TVA in their annual report to President Eisenhower and the Congress.

Some salient points in the board's report: Even if Congress passes the TVA self-financing bill this spring the action won't add any new generating capacity in time to keep supply ahead of demand through 1961.

Studies are being made to see how much new capacity can be financed out of power revenues, the source of funds for adding new generating units since 1953.

Units now under construction will add 1,535,000 kilowatts to the system which are expected to provide a modest margin of capacity over requirements in the winter of 1959–60 and a slight margin in the winter of 1960–61.

This is the situation produced by the starvation diet provided for 5 million Americans in the Tennessee Valley by the Eisenhower administration the result of advice from the "fat cats" who surround President Eisenhower and who hate TVA with a purple passion.

This is the result of the continuing campaign of propaganda handed out by the private power companies to people all over this Nation. Certainly if any money invested in advertising ever paid off a hundredfold, this power company investment in propaganda has done just that.

It is no wonder that the business interests, as represented by the many individual chambers of commerce in the Tennessee Valley are rising up and will make themselves heard. We have been taken to the cleaners, given this starvation diet long enough, and the Nation in general is going to know about it and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is already learning about it. We do not propose to kick over the traces and get out of the U.S. Chamber to do it, but rather we do propose to stay in that body and have our say over and over again to the end that TVA is not sold off nor starved to death.

There is a great future ahead for this valley, for the 5 million people who live and work and pay taxes in this valley, and we do not propose that any carefully planned, continuing campaign of hate against public power and distortion of facts concerning TVA and the people of this valley shall succeed.

Tax Equity for Disabled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Howard A. Rusk, M. D., which appeared in the New York Times of November 10, 1957:

TAX EQUITY FOR DISABLED—AN ANALYSIS OF MEASURE TO PROVIDE ADDED EXEMPTIONS FOR HANDICAPPED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Two recent tax rulings reported in the press have properly shocked a great many people.

The first was the denial by the Federal Tax Court of a claim for the deduction of expenses for a specially equipped automobile used by a man paralyzed from polio in traveling to and from work. The second was a ruling by the Internal Revenue Service that the expenses of caring for a Seeing Eye dog, even when used in the conduct of business, may not be deducted.

As one of a number of letters sent to this writer said:

"Surely, our Government can't need tax money that badly."

The first case involved that of a paralyzed resident of Queens. He had claimed a deduction of $1,800 for his automobile, which is equipped with hand controls, for expenses "essential to production of income." The court, however, ruled that, despite his disability, "his expenses related to that automobile are, in essence, nothing more than a commuter's expenses, which are personal in nature, and, therefore, specifically not deductible."

In its ruling on the seeing-eye dog, the Internal Revenue Service quoted a similar situation in which deduction was not permitted for the cost of maintaining a hearing and as a business expense even though the taxpayer was a lawyer. It did rule, however, that the expenses of caring for a seeing-eye dog might be deducted as a medical expense rather than as a business expense.

But the catch here is that, whereas business expenses are totally deductible, only that portion of medical and dental expenses that exceeds 3 percent of adjusted gross income is deductible.

BILL WOULD PROVIDE RELIEF

For a number of years, various organizations have sought legislation providing tax relief for certain other disabled individuals, such as the annual exemption of $600 allowed the blind.

A bill to provide such relief is now before the House of Representatives. It was introduced by Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat of Brooklyn, and bears the endorsement of a great many veteran, fraternal, and labor organizations. It would provide a disabled individual with an additional tax exemption of $600 annually and an additional $600 exemption for his spouse, and would include transportation costs to and from work by disabled persons as tax deductible business expenses.

It would seem there could be absolutely no argument against the last provision of Mr. KEOGH's proposals. Persons with physical disabilities practically always have extraordinary expenses in connection with the production of income. Many cannot use public transportation and must use taxicabs or have specially equipped automobiles. The recent case of the expenses of the seeing-eye dog and the prior ruling on hearing-aid maintenance for a lawyer are other examples.

To make these expenses tax deductible would be entirely consistent with basic income tax principles. These permit other categories of wage earners to deduct certain expenses that they incur as a necessary part of their income producing activities. This situation would be no different than that of the salesman who deducts entertainment expenses or the physician who deducts the cost of operating his car on professional calls.

INCENTIVE TO EMPLOYMENT

There is also little doubt that such a ruling would motivate certain disabled persons to seek employment. This writer knows personally of numerous instances in which disabled persons, having been placed in employment after rehabilitation, actually have less net income after their travel costs to and from employment than when they received public assistance prior to rehabilitation. It is difficult to motivate a person to work if by so doing he loses money.

The other provision of the Keogh bill—the annual exemption of $600 each for the disabled person and his spouse—is designed to aid those with extraordinary expenses that are incurred because of disability but that are not related to the production of income.

For example, not all costs incurred in the purchase and maintenance of orthopedic and prosthetic devices are completely deductible under the medical deductions provisions of the law. Wheelchairs used by active disabled persons require repairs and maintenance. Many disabled persons require custom-made clothing or alterations on clothing. Clothing of persons using orthopedic and prosthetic appliances is subjected to unusual wear.

Some disabled persons must, of necessity, live in ground-floor apartments, which command higher rentals. Others must invest in ramps and special household equipment. The severely disabled person cannot climb to the balcony; he must pay the higher cost of orchestra seats at the theater or a concert.

These are little things. But they loom large in the budget of the disabled persons when they come up 365 days a year.

The proposed additional $600 exemption for the physically disabled would be more difficult to administer than that which now exists for the blind. In the case of blindness, there are accurate measurements to determine if an individual is legally blind.

There are, however, no similar easily applied objective yardsticks to measure functional capacity in other types of disabling conditions. This must be based on the clinical opinion of a physician. Admittedly, there might be some abuses of the proposal, but evidently the medical society of the State of New York thinks they would be minimal, for it has endorsed Mr. KEOGH's bill. In any event, the moral and practical values would far outweigh possible limited abuses.

One of the first matters before the Congress when it reconvenes is hearings on our tax structure, including treatment of the physically handicapped. These will begin on January 7.

The treatment the physically handicapped ask is not favoritism or special treatment. All they want is equity and parity.

VFW Resolution Opposing Cut in Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and a resolution with respect to reduction of veterans' benefits:

ANTHRACITE COUNTIES COUNCIL,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF U.S.A.,
DEPARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA,
December 12, 1958.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congressman, 11th Congressional District, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: This has reference to the regular monthly meeting of the Anthracite Counties Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars, comprised of the 10th and 11th Pennsylvania Districts of Luzerne, Lackawanna, and Wayne Counties, held at the Nescopeck Memorial VFW Post 8227, on Sunday, December 7, 1958, with Comdr. William J. Lester presiding.

At that meeting this council adopted a resolution, which will be acted upon by our VFW council of administration of Pennsylvania, relative to vigorously opposing the proposed action of the Bureau of the Budget in Washington with regard to making recommendations, to be presented to the 86th Congress, in cutting of veterans' benefits in order to balance the budget.

The council also went on record to transmit a copy of subject resolution, a copy of which is attached, to the two Pennsylvania U.S. Senators along with Congressmen in the council area and three times past commander in chief of the VFW, JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Congressman from Altoona, Pa.

The action of this council was prompted as a result of an address by you on Veterans Day at the Captain Christian S. Stegmaier, VFW Post No. 50, advising that the Bureau of the Budget in Washington is contemplating making proposals to Congress, to severely cut veterans' benefits. This along with the council's action has been evidenced by newspaper clippings of the Wilkes-Barre Record appearing on attached document.

* * * * *

It would be greatly appreciated if you would have subject resolution, along with letter of appreciation under signature of district 11, VFW, Com. John Radko, included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when Congress convenes in January 1959. I would also appreciate 50 copies if and when same is made a matter of record for distribution throughout our council, department, and national headquarters.

Contacts are being made with other veterans organizations urging that they unite with us in counteracting any adverse moves which might materialize in having a demoralizing and financial effect upon the veteran.

On behalf of the council delegates I wish to extend my sincerest appreciation for your advice in your message at Post No. 50 and also the stand that you have already taken in connection with this matter.

Your comments on subject matter will be sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY A. FORLENZA,
Senior Vice Commander, Anthracite Counties Council, VFW, Pittston, Pa.

ANTHRACITE COUNTIES COUNCIL, VFW
RESOLUTION

Whereas in accordance with an address to veterans at a Veterans Day program, held on Veterans Day, November 11, 1958, at the Capt. Christian E. Stegmaier, VFW Post No. 50, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., by the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, Congressman of the 11th Congressional District of Luzerne County, Pa., the Bureau of the Budget in Washington is contemplating making recommendations to severely cut veterans' benefits in order to balance the Federal budget. It is expected that the administration in Washington will pressent these proposals to cut back the veterans program, on a broad front, at the next session of Congress convening in January 1959;

Whereas it is anticipated that the administration in Washington when presenting these recommendations to cut veterans' benefits to the 86th Congress that veterans housing, VA hospital services, deduction of pensions from social security benefits, and proposing small lump payments for service-connected disabilities and many other phases of the veterans program benefiting the veteran, will be affected if Congress accepts these proposals;

Whereas if Congress accepts proposals to cut back any veterans aid it will result in having a demoralizing and financial effect upon the veteran, his family and/or dependents. Many veterans are now facing a period of crisis both financially and economically in order to maintain a standard of living that should be accorded to every American citizen. If benefits are cut as contemplated, then the veteran will have a more serious crisis to face in order to make ends meet;

Whereas, mitigated by war time service, deserving veterans benefits should preclude any attempt at economies on a Bureau of the Budget school of thought;

Whereas America's one-time heralded heroes are now being sacrificed on the altar of economy in order that optimum budgetary functional responsibilities can be effected toward overseas and domestic entities: Now, therefore, it shall be

Resolved, At this meeting of the Anthracite Counties Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars, comprised of the 10th and 11th Pennsylvania districts of Luzerne, Lackawanna, and Wayne Counties, held at the Nescopeck Memorial, VFW Post 8227, on Sunday, December 7, 1958, that this council has gone on record vigorously opposing any adverse moves by the administration in Washington during the 86th Congress to cut back veterans' benefits, should such moves materialize same will have a financial and demoralizing effect upon the veteran, his family and/or dependent; it is further

Resolved, A special committee of the council VFW will make personal appearances at other district meetings of veterans' organizations urging united support to counteract and adverse moves by the administration. Copy of subject resolution will be directed to all Pennsylvania VFW district commanders, urging that they contact their Federal legislators and unite with this council in opposing cutback of veterans' benefits; be it further

Resolved, Copy of subject resolution will be directed to U.S. Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK and U.S. Senator-elect HUGH SCOTT; copy to Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, 11th Congressional District of Luzerne County, and Congressman-elect STANLEY A. PROKOP, 10th Congressional District, along with Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Altoona, Pa., three times past commander in chief of the VFW, urging that they exercise their vested authority to preclude any proposed actions that might materalize in adversely affecting veterans' benefits: Be it further

Resolved, If moneys are required to balance the Federal budget during the next fiscal year, close scrutiny of existing and contemplated requirements of monetary dole could and would suffice for realizing a balanced budget.

John R. Humphreys, Adjutant, Anthracite Counties Council, VFW; Najid Saadi, Junior Vice Commander, Anthracite Counties Council, VFW; John Radko, Commander, District 11, VFW; Harold Ulrich, Past Commander, Anthracite Counties Council; Robert Davis, Chief of Staff, Department of Pennsylvania, VFW; John Sincavage, Trustee, District 11, VFW; William J. Lester, Commander, Anthracite Counties Council, VFW; Anthony A. Forlenza, Senior Vice Commander, Anthracite Counties Council, VFW; James Gallagher, Commander, District 10, VFW; John J. Lane, Past Commander, District 11, VFW; Harry Wilkie, Sr., Commander, Kingston, VFW Post 283.

Appendix

The Leadership of Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we Democrats have long been proud of the high quality of our congressional leadership.

It has been constructive and responsible. It has been statesmanlike and forward-looking. It has been leadership of both vision and effectiveness.

As one member of the majority, I am proud at all times to be enrolled in the ranks led by the Senator from Texas. We may disagree upon occasion. But the occasions are few and they do not detract from the high standards of his leadership.

On January 7 the Democrats met to organize for this session. Upon that occasion, the Senator from Texas delivered an address which expressed the very highest aspirations of the American people.

Senator JOHNSON talked of peace; of our vibrant, growing, expanding country; of the problems we face—problems which are also opportunities. It was a speech of optimism; of confidence; of strength.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this able address by the Senate Democratic leader be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY JOHNSON TO SENATE DEMOCRATS

We start today a new year and a new Congress.

We have met now to transact the necessary business of our party, but I feel it would be inappropriate to proceed without acknowledging the context in which we assemble.

For us, this is the starting of a new era.

We have been given great strength. In all the long history of the Senate, never has one party won so many seats at a single election as we have won. For this, we are grateful—and certainly we are proud. Yet, we realize that our strength has never been, and is not now, the strength of numbers.

Our strength is what we are, and what we prove ourselves to be. What we hold we have earned. What we keep will be no more than what we deserve.

That is our special challenge.

Our strength will be deserving in proportion as we use it for the interests of all. By this standard, we have won the public trust; by this means, we shall honor the trust we have won.

JOHNSON SEES NEW ERA

New strength has brought us to a new era. Yet, as we note this, we cannot fail to note that this is, in much the same terms, the beginning now of a new era for our Nation, for the world, and for all humankind.

Our Nation is at the edge of what can clearly be its greatest age of expansion, growth, and abundance. Among the nations of the earth, we see emerging the first beginnings of a new age. Our times are yielding daily new capabilities for man.

The capabilities of government must keep pace with the capabilities of the people it serves. For this we know with certainty. There is no expense of government more costly or more intolerable than the burden of laggard government.

That is the work to which we come.

It is our purpose to fashion greater capabilities for our Government from the growing capabilities of man.

As Americans, not as partisans, we must acknowledge this reality: The capabilities of our Nation and its people are, in many vital areas, now outrunning the capabilities of our Government.

There is between the people and their Government a deficit of vigor, a deficit of confidence, and a deficit of will.

Prudence requires that we bring these books into balance.

To do so, we must seek the cause rather than tilt at the symptom. The faults of men and the failings of the system must not be confused. The one will pass; the other must be removed.

Government, if it is to serve at all, must serve the future—not the present alone, and most certainly not the past.

Today the future is already the controlling fact of these times—and of the decisions we take here.

The advent of a 200 million population, a $500 billion national income, a trillion dollar economy are all near at hand.

THE PAST IS SERVED

Throughout our system, conservative men are already working with these facts.

Yet where men are responding to this future, their Government is not. The past is served—at penalty to the present and at the danger of default to the future.

It is against this danger of default that we must work.

Responsible government is responsive government. Our urgent duty—and our special opportunity—is to undertake the labors necessary to make the Government of our land responsive to the potential and the promise of the future.

What we can do now is subject to certain limits.

We have been given great strength, but not overriding strength. The executive arm of National Government remains under control of another party.

We have—by our majority here—an obligation to lead. We do not have authority to command. We have powers to advise and consent. We do not have powers to implement and accomplish.

These facts we appreciate, yet they do not matter for much beyond the confines of the Senate.

Our mandate is a mandate for confident and creative and constructive leadership—beginning now, not 2 years hence.

We shall honor the mandate.

Our opportunity—the great opportunity of this Senate—is to marshal the considerable resources of inquiry of the legislative branch to the task of defining for America new goals for the many new capabilities of its people, its economy, its technology and its national will.

We are clearly moving to a new age—an age of new standards, new accomplishments, and new potentials.

Against the promise of this new age, American industry and business is now pouring fourth billions in research to discover new capabilities.

Government, though, is moving hardly at all.

Research is under way on instruments of national security but, beyond that, little is being done. Great minds of the Nation are not being mobilized to the challenges of self-government by free men. The intellect of the Nation is not being used where it is most needed. Thus failing imperils us, fully as much, I believe, as would a failure to pursue research in the more obvious realms of national security.

I speak only for myself, of course, but I believe this. I believe that we should, through the resources available to us in the legislative branch, undertake the rewarding work of turning our land into the campus of the West.

We are working with the future. We are working with a new dimension—the most challenging men have ever faced.

If we are to be competent even for the routine of tomorrow, we shall need vision in our preparations—and we shall need both boldness and freshness.

We do not have it now.

It is the indictment of those who presently hold the responsibility of the action arm of our leadership that in dynamic times they have exalted—and still exalt—the static.

Free men can afford much. They can never afford the price of inertia.

Today we must face this fact: We have led the free world through a time of sickness and convalescence, but we are faced now with a well and vital world. The test of our national character and capacity will be our ability to lead a well world by our vigor and purpose as we have led a sick world by our wealth and compassion.

We need new ideas in many fields. We need to forge new tools of government.

Our controls over the monetary system are now two world wars old.

Our budget processes were formed in another day.

Our tax structure is obsolescent.

Our Government is dedicated, in many areas, to programs for which the purpose is no longer pertinent.

If we are not to default the integrity of our free enterprise system, we must concentrate vigorous effort on its future—rather than hold to easy concepts of its past.

We must not surrender to inflation.

We must not surrender to poverty.

We must not surrender to educational blight or medical mediocrity or social depression in any field of our society.

We must not abandon regions or cities or classes or ages to despair.

We must not allow the obsolescence of our ideas to foredoom vital segments of our enterprise.

We must not allow ourselves to forfeit the goals of equal standards of freedom, opportunity, and equality for want of boldness.

We certainly must not abdicate progress to the rule of tension and strife.

In a world reborn—facing the new youth of a new age and a new dimension of space—we must certainly not default the leadership of vigor to the totalitarians.

THE FIRST CONCERN

Fiscal solvency concerns us all. It is a first concern, for no course is honest without the courage of financial prudence. But we cannot afford to bankrupt the national conscience to serve the ends of political bookkeeping.

Moral integrity, as well as fiscal integrity, requires that we acknowledge deficits of will and deficits of effort and undertake a united search for responsible solutions to the problems of our times.

We, here in the Senate, have within the powers open to us under the Constitution a great opportunity to reach out across the land—into the universities and colleges, into private business, into labor, the professions, all walks of our national life—and ask great minds to come here to help us seek and search.

We can reach beyond our shores—to all the Western World and especially to our neighbor republics of this hemisphere—and ask others to share this labor with us.

We can bring men together to explore tomorrow's horizons for our land, our hemisphere, and the world.

From such explorations, we will find the facts and from the ideas with which we shall work the next decade to make government responsive to the potential of the future.

The world is in a race today that is more likely to be won by minds than missiles. We neglect this at our peril.

There is much that we must do and shall do in this session, yet, for our work, we do not come with a checklist in hand to attend only the pressing problems of the present.

We are—as are the people who sent us here—looking to the future.

We know that we shall win respect by our vision, not by our vendettas; by courage, not by carping.

Our first responsibility is responsibility itself.

The era is new. The promise is new. We work with new and growing capabilities. Yet our purpose remains unchanged. Always our party has been the party of confident men and we have drawn our strength from young and confident regions of a young and confident land.

Today there is a new youth and zest and confidence across all our land and we, in consequence, find ourselves here now as party of all the Nation.

New strength is ours. With that new strength we shall—by resonsibility service—add strength to our Nation, our world, and our times.

The Objectives of International Communism Never Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, "The American people must not be fooled into thinking that Communists have changed their long-range ambition for world domination or embraced the cause of peace." In the light of Soviet Russia's recently accelerated activities on the political, scientific, and psychological warfare fronts, this admonition was contained in an inspiring address by the Honorable J. Sinclair Armstrong, Assistant Secretary of the Navy—Financial Management—which he delivered on November 25, 1958, to a joint meeting of the Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs in Baltimore. Secretary Armstrong's speech was so outstanding that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY J. SINCLAIR ARMSTONG, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY (FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT), AT THE ROTARY-KIWANIS LUNCHEON, BALTIMORE, MD., NOVEMBER 25, 1958

It is a great pleasure for me to be in Baltimore today with these Rotary and Kiwanis organizations. I am particularly honored to be with you under the auspices of your distinguished senior Senator and my friend of many years, JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, who has rendered outstanding service to the people of Maryland and of our country during his service in the U.S. Senate.

I would like to talk briefly this afternoon about some current aspects of national defense.

I propose to speak about problems which we as a nation face in dealing with the implacable and hostile forces of international communism.

To put this in historical perspective, let me turn back the clock for a moment and review briefly our U.S. national policies and aspirations during the past 40 or so years.

It has been a fact that the United States, in all of our international relations, has had as a fundamental purpose the attainment of freedom and justice for our country and all other peoples. In pursuing this fundamental objective of freedom and justice, our policy has been to maintain peace, not to wage war.

For we have believed that the best way to solve international problems is through the maintenance of peace rather than the waging of war. Never during the past 40 years and more have we ever willingly started a war. Each time we have participated in a war it has been because there was no other way by which the United States could proceed toward our purpose of establishing conditions of liberty and justice.

For example, the United States entered World War I not to accomplish any territorial gain, not to accomplish any economic domination of other people, not to secure any commercial or industrial advantage, but solely for the purpose of protecting countries whose peoples were devoted to the ideals of liberty and justice from domination by an aggressive military-minded empire.

We entered World War I with the highest ideals for which any country in modern times has gone to war. They were later expressed in President Woodrow Wilson's famous 14 points. Although the 14 points were not accomplished at the peace table at Versailles in 1919, they remain an enduring tribute to America's aspirations for freedom and justice for the peoples of all countries, small as well as large.

Twenty-three years later, because the free world was at bay and we were most grievously attacked at Pearl Harbor, on December 7, 1941, our country once more took up arms for freedom. After great efforts and great sacrifice in which our country's men and women, young and old, were mobilized either in uniform or in the tremendous war production effort at home, in which our military forces were deployed all over the globe, we succeeded by force of arms in defeating the forces of darkness and tyranny which had been almost at the point of engulfing the free world.

After the surrenders in April and August, 1945, of the Nazi-German and the Japanese Axis Governments our country again participated in strong and idealistic efforts to establish world peace. We laid down our arms. We demobilized our forces. We placed the support of our country behind the new world organization, the United Nations.

Unfortunately, once again the forces of darkness and tyranny arose, and within the space of only 5 years. By 1950 the Communists of Korea, aided and abetted by the Soviet Union, commenced overt aggression against one of Asia's free nations, the Republic of Korea. The Chinese Communists joined in. So once more our country mobilized and, under United Nation's auspices, fought to prevent the Communist conspiracy from overrunning a friendly and responsible free people. This war was brought to a successful end in 1953, after 2 long years of truce talks, because it appeared to the Communists that our intervention and determination made it impossible for them to overrun Korea. The one language Communists understand and respect is strength.

What are the problems we face today as a nation and how do they affect our national defense responsibilities? We are living in most dangerous times. Five years after the end of the Korean war, the danger is far greater than in other times. We face not just a military threat, but also a psychological attack. The force of Communist arms is no longer the only danger. The struggle of mankind toward a fuller life in freedom and liberty has assumed new dimensions. Free men today are being assailed by the Communist movement in the realm of ideas and ideals. Front-lines today are in the hearts and minds of men and women, and school children, not just on battlefields.

The insidious influences of communism seek to weaken the free will of people, to strike fear into their hearts, to undermine their moral fiber and their ability to tell the difference between right and wrong, truth and falsehood, justice and tyranny. Communism represents a danger to our philosophy and to our moral convictions about the basic institutions of our country. Worst of all, communism seeks to take away men's confidence in themselves and in their ability to see and do the right.

The Communist conspiracy has assumed tremendous world significance. No free country, least of all the United States, can afford to relax in the face of the menace of international communism.

Communists have been extraordinarily busy and at times successful snuffing out men's aspirations for freedom with the most ruthless suppression. Hungary is a recent example. And long after the brutal Soviet suppression of the Budapest uprising in November 1956, the subsequent execution, indeed the indefensible murder, of Premier Imre Nagy, despite a safe-conduct pledge to the Yugoslav Embassy, shocked the free world.

Recently the free world has been watching the Soviets draw the rope tightly around their Nobel prize author, Boris Pasternak, who dared to tell some ugly facts about Communist society.

Is it ever to be expected that the Communists will accord basic human rights and freedoms to the pepole whom they now dominate, and to the peoples the world over who are still free but whom they aspire to dominate? I think not.

Indeed the world well knows, and the Soviet Union recognizes, that the United States

stands as the great bulwark in the cause of human freedom. We are the one power in the world capable of preventing communism and its attendant slavery from engulfing the world. In this we have a great responsibility an done which we have borne manfully in the past 5 years.

In order to combat communism, in order to protect the security of our country, in order to assist other free countries in preserving their own freedom against aggression, we maintain strong United States military forces today. For after 1953, when we brought the Korean war to a conclusion, our country recognized that we must remain militarily strong.

We have kept over 2½ million men under arms. We have forged the greatest retaliatory capability against Communist nuclear attack which the world has ever known, through our Strategic Air Command. We have maintained strong, modern ground forces in our Army. We have maintained, over the seas of the world, great naval and marine forces, silent, mobile, ready and at all times capable of assuring freedom of the seas and being in trouble spots when our national policy dictates their so doing to protect American interests and fulfill our obligations to other free countries. We have participated with other free countries in forging alliances like NATO to protect free Europe, and SRATO to protect southeast Asia. Most important of all, we have lent our full power and influence to support the United Nations in the never-ceasing search for peaceful solutions of international problems.

We have succeeded in avoiding military conflict during the years of Communist-inspired tension since the Korean war ended. No American soldiers, sailors or airmen have been in battle. And in several important instances, as in Lebanon last summer and the Taiwan Straits in recent months, by showing our strength and resoltuion we have also succeeded in our efforts to assure the protection of friendly free nations against naked, brutal Communist aggression. Our resolution and strength, brilliantly shown in the Mediterranean and the western Pacific, have helped preserve peace.

For this past summer and fall the Communists have been testing our resolution and fortitude on two sides of the globe almost simultaneously. We can take great pride and have confidence for the future when we think that our standing up and facing dangerous consequences resulted in the preservation of nations of the free world which otherwise might have fallen prey to subversion and to direct aggression.

But we cannot rest on our laurels. We must not let down our guard. We must look to the future. We must seize our opportunities and at the same time recognize the dangers we face. We must be aware that the Communists are artful and clever in their use of psychological warfare, as well as their use of subversion and military aggression. We must recognize that each individual man, woman, and child is a target for Communist intrigue.

It is tremendously important that we ourselves recognize and resist the psychological pressures which the Communists will apply in months ahead, and the methods they use. How do the Communists apply psychological pressures?

It is not unusual for the Communists, with much fanfare, to broadcast blandishments to the world about the allegedly provocative nature of United States military strength. These blandishments they follow up with unenforceable and unsatisfactory proposals for disarmament or demobilization. Then, by their own acts of aggression or subversion, they create crises in which the armed power of the United States must be displayed for our own security, and for the security of our friends and allies.

Sometimes an incident of aggression is followed by an offer to confer or negotiate, noisily announced all over the world. A conference or negotiation in turn may be followed by some other aggressive maneuver. Cammunist propaganda is applied so as to bring pressure in any discussions and conferences that do occur so that the settlements arrived at will be as favorable as possible to them.

Let me illustrate just how the Communists skillfully interweave propaganda with negotiations and with the crises they create, all to serve their own best ends.

Let us look at the negotiations presently going on in Geneva on technical means to guard against surprise attack. Last March the Soviets complained against the flight procedures of our Strategic Air Command, alleging falsely that they represent a threat to the U.S.S.R. So the United States proposed in the United Nations Security Council the establishment of an Arctic inspection system against a surprise attack. This the Soviets vetoed.

Then we proposed a conference to cover technical measures of preventing surprise attack. Now at Geneva our delegation has faced political demands that our strategic bases abroad be abandoned and that our Arctic reconnaissance flights stop. Mr. Khrushchev has bitterly denounced our 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean.

This twisting of facts must be resisted by our people. Our forces abroad, our bases and our fleets, are there for one reason and one only, to secure the United States and our allies against attack. We cannot let the world believe that we maintain bases and forces abroad out of any desire on our part to attack anyone. We don't. Our forces are defensive in purpose. Yet the whole burden of Soviet propaganda, as these conferences in Geneva go on, is to attempt to show that our defensive bases and forces constitute a threat to them.

A second example of skillful Communist mixture of propaganda, crisis and conference is the Soviet handling before world public opinion of the question of the cessation of nuclear testing. Six months ago the Soviet Union announced that they were unilaterally stopping tests and challenged the United States to do the same. We replied, as we have consistently maintained when we offered the atomic secrets to the world in 1946, that we cannot do so unless an inspection system is established which will guarantee the world against one party violating the agreement. So all summer long, the Soviet propaganda mill beat out the false story that the United States was standing out against mankind's aspirations against nuclear war. Then, as we were forced to show our armed strength in the crises they created in Lebanon and Taiwan, they argued to the world that we were aggressors. We agreed to a conference on suspension of nuclear testing and agreed to stop our own tests when the conference began, on October 31. Yet by tragic and inhuman defiance of the hopes of mankind, secretly, in early November, after the conference began, the Soviets themselves once again began nuclear testing.

While these conferences on technical means of guarding against surprise attack and on cessation of nuclear tests have been going on at Geneva, during the past week the Soviets have again applied pressure, as they did 10 years ago, on one of the nerve centers of the free world, Berlin. The Soviets well recognize the importance of our "showpiece" in West Berlin. They recognize West Berlin's effect on the subjugated peoples of East Germany. They recognize the unfavorable comparison of the Communist system in Eastern Europe in the satellite countries to conditions in West Berlin, where those who live under free world auspices have achieved far higher standards of economic and human freedom. They also recognize Berlin as a place where they can apply pressure against basic policies affecting the security of the United States and our allies. So, whatever emerges in the difficult days that lie ahead in this Soviet-manufactured Berlin crisis, we must always remember that it is part of an overall Soviet purpose and plan. For the Communists remain highly flexible in their use of every possible device to achieve their ends, and their policies combine the skillful combination of crisis, propaganda, and conference—all for their own Communist aims.

The American people must not be fooled into thinking that Communists have changed their long range ambition for world domination or embraced the cause of peace. They have not, and to think so would be a dangerous delusion on our part. Indeed, the free world must win the psychological battles just as surely as we must win any military engagement. The Communist aim is world domination. This we must resist, in whatever way it appears. And we must prepare ourselves, in our own hearts and minds, to bear the struggle that lies ahead.

As our country looks into the future, looks to the negotiations, the propaganda, the pressures, the shooting that will undoubtedly from time to time be brought to bear upon the free world by the Communist world, we must have strength, courage and fortitude. We must not be fooled by the Communists, and we must not give in to them.

We must show potential aggressors that they cannot expect to win.

We in the Navy have always remembered Theodore Roosevelt, who sent the Great White Fleet around the world in 1907 and first impressed the world that the United States had become a world power and leader. A few weeks ago we celebrated Theodore Roosevelts hundredth birthday. I have often thought that he described our own personal responsibility for preserving our own freedom when he wrote this: "We, here in America, hold in our hands the hope of the world, the fate of the coming years; and shame and disgrace will be ours if in our eyes the light of high resolve is dimmed, if we trail in the dust the golden hopes of men."

So we must dedicate ourselves to the principles of liberty, justice, and love of country through which alone mankind can rise to achieve our highest human aspirations.

The Debt Limit Is Meaningless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Debt Limits If They Are Not Observed?" published in the Freemont County Chronicle-News, of St. Anthony, Idaho.

The editorial, which was written by Harry N. Beall, publisher of the Chronicle-News, points out a pugent economic fact which today our Government seems to be ignoring. It cites figures to show that in only 13 years the average American's Federal taxes have almost doubled, and that one-third of his workday is spent simply creating revenue for a profligate Government.

I should like to suggest that my colleagues read this thoughtful editorial,

because I believe it strikes at the heart of our Nation's greatest peril today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY DEBT LIMITS IF THEY ARE NOT OBSERVED?

There can be no other conclusion but that the debt limits set by Congress for our Nation are nothing but a stupid farce.

They are not being observed and apparently will not be observed. A long time ago a thoughtful Congress set a maximum which it felt the public debt must not be allowed to exceed because of the obvious danger to our economy.

That figure was reached. Did the Congress quit spending and attempt to hold the public debt within bounds? No, it simply increased the debt limit. Having done it once, it was easy to do again. Now the policy is simply to set a debt limit, pay it no mind, and raise it whenever it is reached. If memory serves, it was raised twice in recent months and now it is at $288 billion. It isn't necessary to remember the exact figure—it will be raised again shortly.

All of which is dangerously stupid. If a debt limit is necessary—and surely it is—then it must be observed. In peacetime, in fact, if we cannot live within our income and pay back a little against that great indebtedness, what sort of a future can we expect but runaway inflation, a 10-cent or a 1-cent dollar and ultimate bankruptcy—with communism ever ready to move in and take over a government we haven't sense enough to keep afloat.

The figures are frightening. Our population is increasing very rapidly—more rapidly than at any time in our history. Yet the per capita Federal debt has increased heavily. Again—in 1946 Federal taxes were $284 per capita, just after the war. Today in peace, with many millions greater population in the country in which to spread the load, the per capita tax figure is estimated at $451.

Another example of the runaway power of taxes is that despite inflation and an ever increasing national product, taxes take a higher and higher percentage of that product—not just more money each year. In 1939 taxes took 17½ percent of a national product of $83 billion. In 1946 they took 25 percent of a national product of $200 billion. And in 1957 the took 28 percent of the national product of $402½ billion.

The average man works 2½ hours of each 8-hour day just to pay his taxes—putting out far more effort for that than he does for his family's food, housing or clothing. It's time he insisted that the Congress set a debt limit and keep that limit, that it holds taxes from going higher and begins to pay off indebtedness, and that it finds and follows a financial program that will preserve instead of wreck this economy of ours.

Senator Johnson's Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator JOHNSON'S Strategy," published in the New York Times of January 12, 1959.

The New York Times is admittedly the greatest newspaper in this country, and probably the greatest newspaper in the world. It is a conservative newspaper. It is a moderate newspaper. It is a middle-of-the-road newspaper, but it is also an honest newspaper, and it analyzes the measures before Congress with keenness and with a balanced view.

I invite the attention of the Senate and the country to the concluding paragraphs of this editorial, dealing with the motions which will shortly be before this body, and dealing with the strategy of the majority leader in seeking to get his proposal through. The New York Times editorial reads in part as follows:

But this week there will be a test that should separate those who believe in majority decisions from those who do not. Senator JOHNSON'S own proposal for amending rule XXII, the closure provision, does three things: (1) It says that two-thirds of the Senators voting, instead of two-thirds of all the Senators, may order closure; (2) it repeals the clause that exempts a rule change from closure; (3) it states that the Senate is a continuing body and thus need not adopt new rules at the beginning of a session.

What this compromise adds up to this year and this session is that the minority opponents of civil rights legislation can talk the majority to death. The intent is not to debate or to educate, but to frustrate the will of the majority. Senator JOHNSON knows this. He sanctions it, apparently, because he thinks it is worthwhile to keep the Democratic Party intact at the price of letting a minority veto its program.

This may be good strategy this year and this session. We believe it will turn out to be bad strategy in the long run. The Democratic sweep last fall was a liberal victory. Senator JOHNSON'S strategy may drive multitudes of independent voters back into what is admittedly at this moment a disorganized and discouraged Republican Party.

I commend the entire editorial, and particularly its concluding paragraphs, to the attention of all Senators, on both sides of the aisle.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR JOHNSON'S STRATEGY

The strategy by which Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, is laboring to retain the filibuster as an instrument of Government has won admiration from the experts. Senator JOHNSON last week not only rounded up the expected goats but also some of the sheep against the Anderson proposal to reopen the Senate rules. He even roped in the two brandnew Senators from Alaska, whose records indicate they would go with the liberals on most questions.

This victory over Senator ANDERSON and his friends might be due in part to the belief of some Senators that it would be a dangerous precedent to start each session with a new wrangle over the entire set of rules. The belief may be right or it may be wrong—the House of Representatives, which renews its youth every 2 years, usually makes a routine job of adopting the same old rules.

But this week there will be a test that should separate those who believe in majority decisions from those who do not. Senator JOHNSON'S own proposal for amending rule XXII, the closure provision, does three things: (1) It says that two-thirds of the Senators voting, instead of two-thirds of all the Senators, may order closure; (2) it repeals the clause that exempts a rule change from closure; (3) it states that the Senate is a continuing body and thus need not adopt new rules at the beginning of a session.

What this compromise adds up to this year and this session is that the minority opponents of civil rights legislation can talk the majority to death. The intent is not to debate or to educate but to frustrate the will of the majority. Senator JOHNSON knows this. He sanctions it, apparently, because he thinks it is worthwhile to keep the Democratic Party intact at the price of letting a minority veto its program.

This may be good strategy this year and this session. We believe it will turn out to be bad strategy in the long run. The Democratic sweep last fall was a liberal victory. Senator JOHNSON'S strategy may drive multitudes of independent voters back into what is admittedly at this moment a disorganized and discouraged Republican Party.

Naval Air Overhaul and Repair Station, Corpus Christi, Tex., Shutdown Should Be Reconsidered in Fairness to All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we are all aware that the Republican administration is so wedded to the idea of government by budgetary ledger sheets that it seems willing to jeopardize the Nation's security. This is not my belief alone. It is the firm feeling of a great number of people who have considered the matter carefully.

Certainly, national security permitting, I am as desirous as anyone of securing a balanced budget. But I believe it is very foolhardy and governmentally irresponsible to set out to balance the budget at all costs, and particularly at the costs of the security of America.

Recently this administration, exercising pressure through the Department of the Navy, arbitrarily ordered the firing of 3,200 skilled workers, and the shutdown of the overhaul and repair facilities at the Corpus Christi Naval Air Station. I say arbitrarily because the Congress, after due investigation, appropriated funds for the continued operation of this facility, believing it to be a necessary part of our defense effort.

Mr. President, the Navy, under pressure from the budget department of the administration, saw fit to totally disregard the consequences to a whole city and area by this budgetary move. It does not matter to the Budget Bureau and the administration that thousands of people are in jeopardy of losing their homes by government decree. It does not matter to the administration and the Budget Bureau that many small businesses in Corpus Christi may be bankrupt by this Government order.

This step was taken in the name of economy and efficiency, but there is a great deal of evidence that the opposite is the case. Upon closing down this facility, the Navy must ship much of the equipment and all of the work being done at Corpus Christi to Pensacola, Fla. Does it sound very efficient to ship airplane engines and other parts all the way to Florida for overhaul and repairs? It certainly does not. It is likely, indeed,

that shipping costs alone would eat up any economy in such a plan.

Mr. President, so far as I have been able to determine, and I am studying the matter quite closely, the only reasonable way to fairly and efficiently cut down overhaul and repair operations would be to decrease proportionately the operations at all nine of the Navy overhaul and repair facilities across the country. This would be, I believe, the just move and the efficient move.

A large number of individuals and organizations have been studying this matter and have communicated to me their findings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD these remarks and the following:

A news story from the Corpus Christi Caller-Times of January 6, 1959, under the heading "Over 1,500 Hear Report on Fight To Keep Overhaul and Repair Here."

A letter from Mr. Bob Conwell, chairman of the public and business affairs committee of the Six Points Kiwanis Club, at Corpus Christi, Tex., and the text of a resolution adopted by that organization.

A resolution adopted on December 31, 1958, by the Gragg-Sherrill Post 248, of the American Legion, and a letter from the Corpus Christi Masters and Foremen's Association, by its secretary, Mr. William R. Tobe, dated December 20, 1958.

There being no objection, the article, letters, and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, Jan. 6, 1959]

OVER 1,500 HEAR REPORT ON FIGHT TO KEEP OVERHAUL AND REPAIR HERE

By Georgia Nelson

A crowd of about 1,500 braved cold, wet weather last night to hear a report on what has been and is being done in the fight to keep the Overhaul and Repair Division at NAS from being shut down.

The meeting in Memorial Coliseum was sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce Overhaul and Repair Committee, headed by Robert P. Wallace.

Tom Hanley, Overhaul and Repair production superintendent, gave a résumé of voluminous information that has been compiled and sent to Washington in an effort to get the Navy to rescind its order.

Russell Kirkland, Corpus Christi manager for Merrill Lynch, Pierce Fenner & Smith and local president of the Navy League, pledged assistance from the "civilian arm of the Navy" to help Corpus Christi keep the Overhaul and Repair activity.

INVESTIGATORS HERE

Hanley said two investigators from Washington spent the past week here gathering information to be used in determining whether the Navy's shutdown order will stand.

The two men, a lawyer and a CPA, are investigators for the Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness, of which Senator LYNDON JOHNSON is chairman. They left Corpus Christi for Washington yesterday afternoon.

Hanley said four copies of the report have been sent to Washington. Wallace described it as a "weighty volume filled with bludgeoning facts to back up Corpus Christi's argument that the Overhaul and Repair shutdown order was a mistake."

DETAILED REPORT

The report, Hanley said, contains detailed information on the essential work being done by the Overhaul and Repair here and the high level of efficiency with which the Bureau of Aeronautics has credited the Corpus Christi Overhaul and Repair.

Among advantages pointed out for keeping the Overhaul and Repair in Corpus Christi is the strategic location—not as vulnerable to foreign attack as other Overhaul and Repair installations in the country—and shorter material and transportation lines to all parts of the Nation.

Breakdowns were given on the skills and talents of the 2,995 persons employed in Overhaul and Repair to show that they are capable of overhauling all of the latest type of aircraft, including seaplanes.

Flexibility of expansion is another advantage mentioned in the report.

GOVERNMENT EXPENSE

The report detailed the tremendous expense the Government would incur by closing down the Overhaul and Repair. This would include the cost of moving a terrific inventory of supplies already here, the expense of moving out equipment valued at $12 million and caretaker service for the buildings which are also valued at an estimated $12 million, and the cost of moving part of the personnel elsewhere for other jobs.

The terminal pay alone for discharging all the employees of Overhaul and Repair, Hanley said, has been estimated at $1.5 million.

"This order (to close down the Overhaul and Repair) is a reversal of the Defense Department's policy of dispersal of critical defense activities," Hanley said.

He drew laughs from the serious-faced audience only once when he said, "The Government may find itself in a big real estate business before it knows it."

This was a reference to the many homes in Corpus Christi and surrounding towns that are being bought by Overhaul and Repair personnel.

Still another phase of the report details the patriotism and high morale of Overhaul and Repair employees.

Figures indicate the personnel has given wholehearted support to all management sponsored programs. Virtually all are buying Government bonds on the payroll plan. They have contributed almost 100 percent to Navy Relief, the United Fund and other civic and welfare programs. The low loss of time from work due to sickness and the safety program of Overhaul and Repair were cited.

TELEGRAMS READ

Wallace read all of the telegrams that have been exchanged among Representative John Young, Senator Lyndon Johnson, and Secretary of the Navy Thomas S. Gates.

"The biggest job has been done by giving our Senators and Representatives the ammunition they need to carry on the fight in Washington," Wallace said, "but we must maintain and step up our personal contact to support them."

He said that he talked yesterday with YOUNG by telephone and that YOUNG spent all of yesterday morning at the Navy Department.

U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH said in a letter yesterday that he has contacted a number of high-ranking Naval officers in an effort to halt the cutback but that he has "not had any results."

SENT TO NYE

The letter was sent to attorney Paul W. Nye, Nueces County Democratic chairman. YARBOROUGH pledged in the letter to continue working toward keeping Overhaul and Repair running at full blast here.

Nye said that he has received letters from JOHNSON and U.S. Representative SAM RAYBURN pledging every effort to keep Overhaul and Repair in Corpus Christi. YOUNG is coordinating the Washington attack.

"I believe we will succeed in keeping the Overhaul and Repair operations," Nye said. "There are too many people really trying on this thing."

Nye said he has contacted every official possible to line up support for the continued operation of Overhaul and Repair.

KIWANIS CLUB OF SIX POINTS,
Corpus Christi, Tex., January 8, 1959.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Enclosed is a copy of the resolution the Six Point Kiwanis Club of Corpus Christi passed at its regular meeting on January 6, 1959.

I know you are greatly interested in retaining at least a portion of the Overhaul and Repair Department of the U.S. Naval Air Station in Corpus Christi, and we would like to offer you all the assistance we have in retaining this installation.

Since the closing of the Overhaul and Repair would be a great blow to the economy of this entire area, I will appreciate all you can do on our behalf.

Yours truly,

BOB CONWELL,
Chairman, Public and Business Affairs Committee, Six Points Kiwanis Club.

RESOLUTION

We, the members of Six Points Kiwanis Club of Corpus Christi, in meeting assembled on this 6th day of January 1959, memorialize the Congress and the executive branch of our Government to reconsider the unwarranted and uneconomic proposal to close the Overhaul and Repair Department of the U.S. Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi.

The Navy Department has ordered a small cut in civilian employees across the Nation. Thirty percent of that nationwide cut is concentrated in Corpus Christi Overhaul and Repair. Such figures give us pause to wonder.

Our Overhaul and Repair Department is one of nine in the U.S. Navy. It employs approximately 10 percent of the total of all Overhaul and Repair employees and has a physical plant presently valued at approximately $30 million. Some 3,000 persons employing some 75 different crafts and skills are integrated into a smoothly functioning major industry of Corpus Christi, with an $18 million annual payroll. Overhaul and Repair employees comprise approximately 14 percent of the total labor force of Corpus Christi. Their sudden firing will dissipate a highly organized and specialized repair and overhaul facility, causing untold hardship for 3,000 Corpus Christi families and will make an indelible impression on the economy of Corpus Christi, which is unable to absorb so drastic a cut in its labor force. Impact on local business will be drastic, widespread, and prolonged.

But let all who hear, know, that this Kiwanis Club is not opposed to economy in Federal Government, nor do we oppose the reduction in military expenditures where our preparedness program requires it. We do not selfishly ask for the maintenance of a Federal facility for the sole purpose of supporting the local economy. We do not endorse pork-barreling or make-work Federal jobs in time of prosperity.

We believe it imperative, however, that all concerned recognize that the closing of Overhaul and Repair, Corpus Christi, is not an economy move by the Government and will not reduce Federal expenditures one iota, but on the contrary, augurs the prob-

able increase of unnecessary Federal expenditures. Our conviction is based on these facts:

1. There has been no indication of comparable reduction in the Navy's use of the particular types of aircraft, engines and engine components being overhauled and repaired at Overhaul and Repair, Corpus Christi. The same work now being done at Corpus Christi will therefore have to be done elsewhere, most probably by the expanding of Overhaul and Repair facilities at the other eight Overhaul and Repair Departments scattered across the Nation. The equipment and physical plant at Overhaul and Repair, Corpus Christi, is one of the most modern and efficient of all Overhaul and Repair Departments. The closing of Corpus Christi Overhaul and Repair will mean the elimination of the most efficient equipment while increasing the workload for the more antiquated equipment of other Overhaul and Repair Departments.

2. The Navy has continuously sought to disperse its facilities as a protective measure in the event of national emergency, and industry has been urged to vacate the populous areas of the East and the exposed areas of the North and west coast, easily accessible over the North Pole. Corpus Christi is, geographically, best situated in the event of national emergency.

3. The Navy Department has repeatedly faced the problem of potential budget cuts and has repeatedly determined that, in the event of any budget cutting, it will be best prepared for military emergencies by making a horizontal cut in its Overhaul and Repair facilities, rather than a vertical cut: that is, by reducing the operating level of all Overhaul and Repair Departments, rather than eliminating any one Overhaul and Repair Department. This permits the fastest expansion in time of need, and retains a nucleus of employees and a physical plant in readiness when the occasion arises.

This sudden reversal of long established Navy Department policy of making horizontal cuts in Overhaul and Repair Department activity, being economically and militarily unwise, cannot be attributed to aught but political expediency or false economy.

We condemn politics playing with national defense and a false pretense and a sham and a facade made of governmental economy.

Since the work must yet be done, closing Corpus Christi is a travesty on economy. Even if the total workload of all Overhaul and Repair's were to be reduced, a wiser and more economical reduction would be a horizontal cut reducing all facilities, or even reducing the less modern facilities, or the more exposed geographical locations ,or the facilities less capable of expanding, or those that have not produced the high degree of efficiency of Overhaul and Repair, Corpus Christi. From any point of view, the proposed closing of Overhaul and Repair, Corpus Christi, is uneconomical, unwise, and militarily dangerous.

We in Kiwanis condemn the proposed closing, and petition our Government to reconsider and review the essential facts and rescind the order to close Overhaul and Repair, Corpus Christi.

Passed unanimously by Six Points Kiwanis Club, January 6, 1959.

ALLEN S. LEWIS,
President.

EARL THOMAS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION

Whereas it has been ordered that the Overhaul and Repair Department at U.S. Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Tex., be completely closed by July 1, 1959; and

Whereas a more recent order from the Navy Department has directed the firing of 1,200 employees by March 31, 1959; and

Whereas the Committee on Appropriations of the Congress did appropriate the funds for the continued operation of the Overhaul and Repair Department at U.S. Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Tex.; and

Whereas the production record of the Overhaul and Repair Department of the U.S. Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Tex., is excellent in comparison with all other Overhaul and Repair installations in the United States, and the strategic location of the U.S. Naval Air Station is of the utmost importance to the national defense; and

Whereas in the face of threatened aggression on the part of the Communist controlled countries of the world, the members of Gragg-Sherrill Post, 248, the American Legion, Corpus Christi, Tex., believe the order to abolish the Overhaul and Repair Department, U.S. Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Tex., to be contrary to the best interests of the national defense, and do deplore this action on the part of the officials issuing said order: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Gragg-Sherrill Post, 248, the American Legion, Corpus Christi, Tex., request the support and assistance of the national security committee, Department of Texas, the American Legion, and the national defense committee of the national organization of the American Legion in an effort to have this untimely, uneconomical and unwise order rescinded; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately forwarded to the committees named and to Senators LYNDON JOHNSON and RALPH YARBROUGH and Congressmen SAM RAYBURN and JOHN YOUNG, and to Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations.

JACK E. BAIR,
Commander, Gragg-Sherrill Post, 248, the American Legion.

Attest:

MAX D. PALMER,
Adjutant, Gragg-Sherrill Post, 248, the American Legion.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION MASTER MECHANICS & FOREMEN,
Corpus Christi, Tex., December 20, 1958.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: We, the members of the Masters and Foremans Association, sincerely believe no economies would result, and the security of our Nation would be impaired by the closing of Navy's overhaul and repair facility at Corpus Christi, Tex.

We know that the chief naval operation workload exceeds the combined capabilities of all overhaul and repairs by 20 percent. This work must be done somewhere, and the records will prove that Overhaul and Repair, Corpus Christi, can do it as efficiently and economically as any concern in the country.

It is inevitable that the Navy would be forced into the full-scale aircraft maintenance business in time of war. Therefore, it is both economical and practical to maintain a continuing organization which can be geared to wartime requirements quickly and efficiently, simply by expanding an established force which is trained and experienced. The utilization of already existing facilities affords long-range economies since it avoids the great expense of tooling and outfitting in the event of unforeseen future mobilization needs.

Overhaul and Repair, Corpus Christi, is a specialized plant equipped to process any type of aircraft in operation by the Navy. It is in the utilization of this Overhaul and Repair facility that the Navy achieves the maximum defense effort at the minimum cost possible.

We support and earnestly solicit your efforts in calling for a full reconsideration and justification for this decision.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM R. JOBE,
Secretary, Masters and Foremans Association.

Newspaper Advertisement Referring to "Competition for Survival"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in today's issue of the Washington Star, one of the best newspapers in the United States, there appears a most interesting full-page advertisement with the heading, "Competition for Survival." There follow certain characters forming the Russian words which mean "Even America must be surpassed." The advertisement, which contains interesting editorial material relating to the so-called cold war, was inserted by the A. O. Smith Corp., an industrial firm engaged in the research, development, and manufacture of products ranging from residential water heaters to farm feed processing units, from line pipe to guided missile components.

Mr. President, I think that the A. O. Smith Corp. and the Washington Star deserve our gratitude for the publication of this advertisement. As the advertisement states, "A. O. Smith's research and engineering skills are ready today—to help meet the challenge of competition for survival."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the advertisement appearing in the Washington Star of January 12, 1959.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPETITION FOR SURVIVAL

(Russian words. Translation: Even America must be surpassed)

In the face of the challenge expressed by this Soviet slogan, one of our most important weapons is the power of creative production. Are we keeping this weapon sharp?

It was in the late twenties that they first started talking about surpassing America. It seemed fantastic then—fantastic that this vast, impoverished slaveland should aspire to beat us at what we do best.

TARGET FROM THE START

From the time of that first 5-year plan, the Soviets have always regarded surpassing America's productivity as the key to world domination.

They have never lost sight of the fact that our ability to produce is freedom's most potent weapon. And that is why they dream of exceeding our productive pace as a goal for totalitarian victory.

THEIR PROGRESS RAPID

Authoritative sources agree the Soviet economy is expanding at a rate roughly twice that of our own. The consumer receives less than half of total annual output.

By contrast, about two-thirds of U.S. production is in consumer goods.

Roughly, one-quarter of annual Soviet output is plowed back into expansion of heavy industries, electric power, and transportation. This rate of reinvestment is approximately 40 percent higher than the U.S. reinvestment rate.

In their all-out drive for economic mastery, the Communists have racked up notable successes. Observers report there is nothing flimsy about the Soviet industrial product, nothing haphazard about their production techniques.

OUR ANSWER: CREATIVE

Can American industry win out against the massed productivity of Soviet slave labor? Of course it can.

Creative production has always been the strength of America. Born of free competition—nurtured by recognition of the individual rights of man—this creativity thrives on challenge. Its versatile change of pace has been proved in wars, both hot and cold.

THE THREAT OF OBSOLESCENCE

In this time of competition for survival, America's creative industries are faced by the clear and present danger of obsolescence in plant and equipment.

This threat results from several factors. Increasingly high taxes and operating costs leave less and less to plow back into modernization and expansion. And the current depreciation rate is such that manufacturers often cannot write off equipment investment fast enough to capitalize on new developments. They are virtually forced to make do with outmoded production machinery.

In the face of the Soviet challenge, there's no place for withering obsolescence. Our industry has the creaative talents to push far ahead of Soviet progress. It must also get the tools to make the most of these talents.

HERE'S ONE COMPANY'S REACTION TO THE CHALLENGE

Creative production has always been the driving force at A. O. Smith. In all kinds of economic weather, this company's success has stemmed from a skillful, persistent search for a better way, a more efficient way to make products that range from residential water heaters to farm feed-processing units, from line pipe to guided-missile components. A. O. Smith's research and engineering skills are ready today—to help meet the challenge of competition for survival. Shown here are just a few results of A. O. Smith's creative search for a better way.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in addition to this text, the advertisement includes several pictures showing activities of the A. O. Smith Corp., with appropriate captions.

Oil Depletion Allowances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Minot Daily News dealing with oil depletion allowances.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINOT OILMAN FIGHTS CHAMBER STAND FAVORING OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCES

Jack Coughlin, of Minot, who is actively engaged in the three major phases of oil production, has taken issue with the Washington report of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce which favors continuing of oil depletion allowances.

Coughlin, vice president of the Westland Oil Co., through that company is directly concerned with distribution and retailing of petroleum products and, in the company's operation of a refinery at Williston, in the manufacture of products for market. He also is actively engaged with associates in oil drilling operations in Burke County.

Coughlin takes issue with the Chamber position that depletion allowance for oil drilling is a sacred cow that "can't stand tampering with."

In a letter to the U.S. chamber, he writes: "Times have changed since 1926 when the corporate tax rate was 13 percent instead of the 52 percent we now have. The incentive theory of depletion allowance has jumped 400 percent since that time. The depletion allowance theory was the outgrowth of a fear of oil shortage born in World War I, whereas since the 1930's we have had a period marked by overproduction which brought about proration laws.

"Your comments on the risk of oil production eight times out of nine he misses * * * are the most misleading of arguments for depletion and one that even the oil industry is dropping as being a wild statement. I don't know what rank wildcat area was used to produce those figures, but I do know that World Oil of Tulsa and other oil publications show that of the nearly 50,000 wells drilled each year the ratio is roughly 1½ producers to each dry hole. One has to be in the production business to appreciate that all dry holes are not necessary so since dry hole contributions will often make it wise to abandon a potential producer for fear of bringing in a marginal well and thus lose the dry hole money.

"I fail to see the comparison between depletion and depreciation. First of all, the producer is permitted to charge off the intangible costs of his well, which include drilling costs, geoloigcal, and engineering. In fact everything except storage tanks, pipelines, a pump if necessary, tubing, etc., which are all depreciable as a capital asset. How many other businesses can charge off most of their capital investments in 1 year or less? Having now charged off his investment, the producer is still permitted to take 27½ percent on his gross production. Not for a stated period of time, nor for a definite valuation such as depreciation, but for as long a time as the well produces and most likely many times the original cost of the well. You certainly can't say that adjusting depletion rates endangers depreciation; because they are so dissimilar.

"Why am I as an oil man opposed to the present depletion allowance?

"First. Because it is a tax loophole and subsidy and because I favor tax equality;

"Second. Because the subsidy is not being retained for production only, but is being used to subsidize marketing losses by major integrated oil companies;

"Third. Because the incentive is not needed. It is a contradiction to encourage production by tax subsidies while controlling price and production through proration laws and import restrictions; and

"Fourth. How are we going to balance our national budget when we close our eyes to a loss of about $1½ billion in tax money?

"I enjoy the fruits of depletion and drilling chargeoffs and I know whereof I write. I would continue to drill without such a large depletion allowance and I know the oil industry would, too, in spite of their protests that they wouldn't."

Frank P. Samford, Birmingham, Ala., Selected as Man of the South for 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, each year the publication Dixie Business, under the editorship of Hubert F. Lee of Decatur, Ga., selects as a result of balloting throughout the South the Man of the South. For 1958 the one selected was Frank P. Samford, of Birmingham, Ala., president of the Liberty National Life Insurance Co.

Mr. Samford's selection was one which met wide approval. Certainly the extensive activities of Mr. Samford for the development of the South and for civic betterment fully justify his being given this outstanding recognition.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Birmingham News of December 16, 1958, relating to Mr. Samford's selection; also, an excerpt from "Who's Who in America" regarding Mr. Samford; and, also, quotations from different persons relating to the selection of Mr. Samford.

There being no objection, the article and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Birmingham News, Dec. 16, 1958]

INSURANCE EXECUTIVE NAMED MAN OF SOUTH

Frank P. Samford, president of Liberty National Life Insurance Co., has been named Man of the South for 1958.

He is the third Birmingham businessman to receive the honor. Thomas W. Martin, chairman of the board of Alabama Power Co., was Man of the South in 1946 and Donald Comer, of Avondale Mills, in 1947.

The selection is made each year by the editors of Dixie Business at Decatur, Ga., the sponsoring magazine. Hubert F. Lee, editor, said Samford has received votes for the honor from around the world each year since 1949, particularly from fellow members of Rotary International.

He was one of the South's 50 foremost leaders picked by Dixie Business in 1949. This group is now termed the South's "Hall of Fame for the Living" honor group, and is limited to 200 living southerners.

Samford was born in Troy, Ala., in 1893, and graduated from Auburn in 1914. He has been president of Liberty National since 1934.

He was first nominated in 1948 for Man of the South by Gen. John C. Persons of Birmingham. Harry Ayers, publisher of the Anniston Star, has voted for Samford nearly every year since 1949.

At one time or another, many of the Nation's leading insurance company presidents have voted for Samford in the annual poll conducted by Editor Lee.

Earlier this year, Dixie Business selected Dr. Tom D. Spies, director of the Spies Nutrition Clinic here, for the A Great American distinguished service award.

WHO'S WHO IN AMERICA SKETCHES: FRANK P. SAMFORD

Samford, Frank Park, president, Liberty National Life Insurance Co.; born Troy, Ala.,

November 1, 1893; son of William Hodges and Kate (Park) S.; student State Normal College, Troy; B.S., Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, 1914; LL.D. (honorary), Howard College; married Hattie Mae Noland, December 23, 1919; children—Lieut. Frank P. Jr. (U.S.N.R.), Ann (Mrs. Sam E. Upchurch). Deputy insurance commissioner of Alabama, 1915–19; Alabama manager, Lumbermans Mutual Casualty Co., 1919–21; secretary Liberty National Life Insurance Co., 1921–32; vice president, 1932–34; president since 1934; director, Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co.; West Point Manufacturing Co.; Malone Freight Line; Birmingham Trust National Bank; Continental Gin Co.; Dixie Mills, Inc.; Columbus Manufacturing Co.; Equinox Mill; Lanett Bleachery & Dye Works, Wellington Sears Co.; Cabin Crafts, Inc. Member board, Life Insurance Sales Research Bureau, 1931–34. Member, board of directors and executive committee, Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, 1937; president, Industrial Insurer's Conference, 1938–40; president, Birmingham Community Chest, 1940–42; president, Jefferson Tuberculosis Sanitorium Society, 1942–44; president, Associated Industries of Alabama, 1941–42; member, board of directors, Institute of Life Insurance, 1944; member, executive committee, American Life Convention since 1948; president, Alabama State Chamber of Commerce 1946–49; U.S. Chamber of Commerce. President, board of trustees, Howard College; member, Alabama Polytechnic Institute; Southern Research Institute; Alumni Association, Alabama Polytechnic Institute (president 1943–44); Alpha Tau Omega; Omicron Delta Kappa. Democrat. Baptist. Mason (Shriner). Clubs: Rotary (president 1936–37; district governor 1940–41), Birmingham (Birmingham); Birmingham Country; Mountain Brook Country. Home: 2700 Mountain Brook Parkway. Office: Liberty National Life Building, Birmingham, Ala.

QUOTES FROM LETTERS RELATING TO THE SELECTION OF MR. SAMFORD

Robert T. "Bobby" Jones, Jr., Man of the South for 1953: "I am delighted to have you record my vote for Mr. Samford."

Bishop Arthur J. Moore, Man of the South for 1954: "I am happy to cast my vote for Mr. Frank P. Samford as the 1958 Man of the South."

Donald Comer, Avondale Mills, Birmingham, Man of the South for 1947: "I certainly approve heartily of the selection of Frank Samford for the Man of the South. Not only for himself but also for his family."

C. Hamilton Moses, Little Rock, Man of the South for 1948: I would be greatly pleased to see Frank Samford of Birmingham named as 1958 Man of the South. I don't see how a better selection could be made. As you know, I retired from the Arkansas Power and Light Co. 2 years ago and set up a law firm here in Little Rock with the son and son-in-law of Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN. It is a new experience starting over practicing law at the age of 70. Anway, we are having a big time."

Ernest L. Kurth, Southland Paper Mills, Lufkin, Tex., Man of the South for 1949: "I am most happy to cast my vote for Mr. Frank P. Samford as Man of the South for 1958."

Thomas W. Martin, Alabama Power Co., Birmingham, the first Man of the South for 1946, in telephone conversation: "I nominated Frank Samford for Man of the South for 1958. He is one of the fine leaders on your list who deserves the honor."

Reuben B. Robertson, Champion Paper & Fibre Co., Canton, N. C., Man of the South for 1950: "I am not personally acquainted with Frank P. Samford, of Alabama, but I am sure that if you and Donald Comer recommend him he is certainly worthy of recognition."

Hugh Comer, Alabama Mills, Sylacauga, Ala.: "I am mighty happy that Frank Samford has been so overwhelmingly chosen as the Man of the South for 1958. He has made tremendous contributions to our well-being."

Louis Pizitz, Birmingham: "In my opinion you have chosen very wisely in selecting Mr. Frank P. Samford as Man of the South for 1958. He has helped in every way to build a better community."

Robert Jemison, Jr., Birmingham, the world's finest example of a good realtor: "I certainly hope Frank Samford will be voted the Man of the South, as I think he is outstanding, and a very fine choice. You may use my former letter."

Federal-State Relations as Affected by Judicial Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the resolution on Federal-State relationships as affected by judicial decisions approved by the Conference of Chief Justices held in Pasadena, Calif., on August 23, 1958, by a vote of 36 to 8, with 2 abstaining and 4 not present.

Immediately following the resolution, I include the final and full text of the report of the committee on Federal-State relationships as affected by judicial decisions:

RESOLUTION ON FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIPS AS AFFECTED BY JUDICIAL DECISIONS

Resolved—

1. That this conference approves the report of the committee on Federal-State relationships as affected by judicial decisions submitted at this meeting.

2. That in the field of Federal-State relationships the division of powers between those granted to the National Government and those reserved to the State governments should be tested solely by the provisions of the Constitution of the United States and the amendments thereto.

3. That this conference believes that our system of federalism, under which control of matters primarily of national concern is committed to our national government and control of matters primarily of local concern is reserved to the several States, is sound and should be more diligently preserved.

4. That this conference, while recognizing that the application of constitutional rules to changed conditions must be sufficiently flexible as to make such rules adaptable to altered conditions, believes that a fundamental purpose of having a written constitution is to promote the certainty and stability of the provisions of law set forth in such a constitution.

5. That this Conference hereby respectfully urges that the Supreme Court of the United States, in exercising the great powers confided to it for the determination of questions as to the allocation and extent of national and state powers, respectively, and as to the validity under the federal Constitution of the exercise of powers reserved to the States, exercise one of the greatest of all judicial powers—the power of judicial self-restraint—by recognizing and giving effect to the difference between that which, on the one hand, the Constitution may prescribe or permit, and that which, on the other, a majority of the Supreme Court, as from time to time constituted, may deem desirable or undesirable, to the end that our system of federalism may continue to function with and through the preservation of local self-government.

6. That this conference firmly believes that the subject with which the committee on Federal-State relationships as affected by judicial decisions has been concerned is one of continuing importance, and that there should be a committee appointed to deal with the subject in the ensuing year.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIPS AS AFFECTED BY JUDICIAL DECISIONS

FOREWORD

Your committee on Federal-State relationships as affected by judicial decisions was appointed pursuant to action taken at the 1957 meeting of the conference, at which, you will recall, there was some discussion of recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and a resolution expressing concern with regard thereto was adopted by the conference. This committee held a meeting in Washington in December 1957, at which plans for conducting our work were developed. This meeting was attended by Sidney Spector of the Council of State Governments and by Prof. Philip B. Kurland, of the University of Chicago Law School.

The committee believed that it would be desirable to survey this field from the point of view of general trends rather than by attempting to submit detailed analyses of many cases. It was realized, however, that an expert survey of recent Supreme Court decisions within the area under consideration would be highly desirable in order that we might have the benefit in drafting this report of scholarly research and of competent analysis and appraisal, as well as of objectivity of approach.

Thanks to Professor Kurland and to four of his colleagues of the faculty of the University of Chicago Law School several monographs dealing with subjects within the committee's field of action have been prepared and have been furnished to all members of the committee and of the conference. These monographs and their authors are as follows:

1. "The Supreme Court, The Due Process Clause, and the In Personam Jurisdiction of State Courts," by Professor Kurland;

2. "Limitations on State Power To Deal With Issues of Subversion and Loyalty," by Assistant Professor Cramton;

3. "Congress, the States and Commerce," by Prof. Allison Dunham;

4. "The Supreme Court, Federalism, and State Systems of Criminal Justice," by Prof. Francis A. Allen; and

5. "The Supreme Court, the Congress and State Jurisdiction Over Labor Relations," by Prof. Bernard D. Meltzer.

These gentlemen have devoted much time, study, and thought to the preparation of very scholarly, interesting, and instructive monographs on the above subjects. We wish to express our deep appreciation to each of them for his very thorough research and analysis of these problems. With the pressure of the work of our respective courts, the members of this committee could not have undertaken this research work and we could scarcely have hoped, even with ample time, to equal the thorough and excellent reports which they have written on their respective subjects.

It had originally been hoped that all necessary research material would be available to your committee by the end of April and that the committee could study it and then meet for discussion, possibly late in May, and thereafter send at least a draft of the committee's report to the members of the con-

ference well in advance of the 1958 meeting; but these hopes have not been realized. The magnitude of the studies and the thoroughness with which they have been made rendered it impossible to complete them until about 2 months after the original target date, and it has been impracticable to hold another meeting of this committee until the time of the conference.

Even after this unavoidable delay had developed, there was a plan to have these papers presented at a seminar to be held at the University of Chicago late in June. Unfortunately, this plan could not be carried through, either. We hope, however, that these papers may be published in the near future with such changes and additions as the several authors may wish to make in them. Some will undoubtedly be desired in order to include decisions of the Supreme Court in some cases which are referred to in these monographs, but in which decisions were rendered after the monographs had been prepared. Each of the monographs as transmitted to us is stated to be in preliminary form and subject to change and as not being for publication. Much as we are indebted to Professor Kurland and his colleagues for their invaluable research aid, your committee must accept sole responsibility for the views herein stated. Unfortunately, it is impracticable to include all or even a substantial part of their analyses in this report.

BACKGROUND AND PERSPECTIVE

We think it desirable at the outset of this report to set out some points which may help to put the report in proper perspective, familiar or self-evident as these points may be:

First. Though decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States have a major impact upon Federal-State relationships and have had such an impact since the days of Chief Justice Marshall, they are only a part of the whole structure of these relationships. These relations are, of course, founded upon the Constitution of the United States itself. They are materially affected not only by judicial decisions but in very large measure by acts of Congress adopted under the powers conferred by the Constitution. They are also affected, or may be affected, by the exercise of the treaty power.

Of great practical importance as affecting Federal-State relationships are the rulings and actions of Federal administrative bodies. These include the independent agency regulatory bodies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, and the National Labor Relations Board. Many important administrative powers are exercised by the several departments of the executive branch, notably the Treasury Department and the Department of the Interior. The scope and importance of the administration of the Federal tax laws are, of course, familiar to many individuals and businesses because of their direct impact, and require no elaboration.

Second. When we turn to the specific field of the effect of judicial decisions on Federal-State relationships we come at once to the question as to where power should lie to give the ultimate interpretation to the Constitution and to the laws made in pursuance thereof under the authority of the United States. By necessity and by almost universal common consent, these ultimate powers are regarded as being vested in the Supreme Court of the United States. Any other allocation of such power would seem to lead to chaos. (See Judge Learned Hand's most interesting Holmes Lectures on "The Bill of Rights" delivered at the Harvard Law School this year and published by the Harvard University Press.)

Third. There is obviously great interaction between Federal legislation and administrative action on the one hand, and decisions of the Supreme Court on the other, because of the power of the Court to interpret and apply acts of Congress and to determine the validity of administrative action and the permissible scope thereof.

Fourth. Whether federalism shall continue to exist, and if so in what form, is primarily a political question rather than a judicial question. On the other hand, it can hardly be denied that judicial decisions, specifically decisions of the Supreme Court, can give tremendous impetus to changes in the allocation of powers and responsibilities as between the Federal and the State Governments. Likewise, it can hardly be seriously disputed that on many occasions the decisions of the Supreme Court have produced exactly that effect.

Fifth. This conference has no legal powers whatsoever. If any conclusions or recommendations at which we may arrive are to have any effect, this can only be through the power of persuasion.

Sixth. It is a part of our obligation to seek to uphold respect for law. We do not believe that this goes so far as to impose upon us an obligation of silence when we find ourselves unable to agree with pronouncements of the Supreme Court (even though we are bound by them), or when we see trends in decisions of that Court which we think will lead to unfortunate results. We hope that the expression of our views may have some value. They pertain to matters which directly affect the work of our State courts. In this report we urge the desirability of self-restraint on the part of the Supreme Court in the exercise of the vast powers committed to it. We endeavor not to be guilty ourselves of a lack of due restraint in expressing our concern and, at times, our criticisms in making the comments and observations which follow.

PROBLEMS OF FEDERALISM

The difference between matters primarily local and matters primarily national was the guiding principle upon which the framers of our National Constitution acted in outlining the division of powers between the National and State Governments.

This guiding principle, central to the American Federal system, was recognized when the original Constitution was being drawn and was emphasized by De Tocqueville. Under his summary of the Federal Constitution he says:

"The first question which awaited the Americans was so to divide the sovereignty that each of the different States which composed the Union should continue to govern itself in all that concerned its internal prosperity, while the entire Nation, represented by the Union, should continue to form a compact body and to provide for all general exigencies. The problem was a complex and difficult one. It was as impossible to determine beforehand, with any degree of accuracy, the share of authority that each of the two governments was to enjoy as to foresee all the incidents in the life of a nation."

In the period when the Constitution was in the course of adoption "The Federalist" (No. 45) discussed the division of sovereignty between the Union and the States and said: "The powers delegated by the Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite. The former will be exercised principally on external objects, as war, peace, negotiation, and foreign commerce. The powers reserved to the several States will extend to all the objects which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the internal order and prosperity of the State."

Those thoughts expressed in "The Federalist" of course are those of the general period when both the original Constitution and the 10th amendment were proposed and adopted. They long antedated the proposal of the 14th amendment.

The fundamental need for a system of distribution of powers between national and State governments was impressed sharply upon the framers of our Constitution not only because of their knowledge of the governmental systems of ancient Greece and Rome. They also were familiar with the Government of England; they were even more aware of the colonial governments in the Original States and the governments of those States after the Revolution. Included in government on this side of the Atlantic was the institution known as the New England town meeting, though it was not in use in all of the States. A town meeting could not be extended successfully to any large unit of population, which, for legislative action, must rely upon representative government.

But it is this spirit of self-government, of local self-government, which has been a vital force in shaping our democracy from its very inception.

The views expressed by our late brother, Chief Justice Arthur T. Vanderbilt, on the division of powers between the National and State governments—delivered in his addresses at the University of Nebraska and published under the title "The Doctrine of the Separation of Powers and Its Present Day Significance"—are persuasive. He traced the origins of the doctrine of the separation of powers to four sources: Montesquieu and other political philosophers who preceded him; English constitutional experience; American colonial experience; and the common sense and political wisdom of the Founding Fathers. He concluded his comments on the experiences of the American colonists with the British Government with this sentence: "As colonists they had enough of a completely centralized government with no distribution of powers and they were intent on seeing to it that they should never suffer such grievances from a government of their own construction."

His comments on the separation of powers and the system of checks and balances and on the concern of the Founding Fathers with the proper distribution of governmental power between the Nation and the several States indicates that he treated them as parts of the plan for preserving the Nation on the one side and individual freedom on the other—in other words, that the traditional tripartite vertical division of powers between the legislative, the executive, and the judicial branches of Government was not an end in itself, but was a means toward an end; and that the horizontal distribution or allocation of powers between National and State governments was also a means toward the same end and was a part of the separation of powers which was accomplished by the Federal Constitution. It is a form of the separation of powers with which Montesquieu was not concerned; but the horizontal division of powers, whether thought of as a form of separation of powers or not, was very much in the minds of the framers of the Constitution.

TWO MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS IN THE FEDERAL SYSTEM

The outstanding development in Federal-State relations since the adoption of the National Constitution has been the expansion of the power of the National Government and the relative contraction of the powers of the State governments. To a large extent this is wholly unavoidable and indeed is a necessity, primarily because of improved transportation and communication of all kinds and because of mass production. On the other hand, our Constitution does envision federalism. The very name of our Nation indicates that it is to be composed of States. The Supreme Court of a bygone day said in *Texas* v. *White* (7 Wall. 700, 721 (1868)): "The Constitution, in all its pro-

visions, looks to an indestructible Union of indestructible States."

Second only to the increasing dominance of the National Government has been the development of the immense power of the Supreme Court in both State and National affairs. It is not merely the final arbiter of the law; it is the major of policy in many major social and economic fields. It is not subject to the restraints to which a legislative body is subject. There are points at which it is difficult to delineate precisely the line which should circumscribe the judicial function and separate it from that of policymaking. Thus, usually within narrow limits, a court may be called upon in the ordinary course of its duties to make what is actually a policy decision by choosing between two rules, either of which might be deemed applicable to the situation presented in a pending case.

But if and when a court in construing and applying a constiutional provision or a statute becomes a policymaker, it may leave construction behind and exercise functions which are essentially legislative in character, whether they serve in practical effect as a constitutional amendment or as an amendment of a statute. It is here that we feel the greatest concern, and it is here that we think the greatest restraint is called for. There is nothing new in urging judicial self-restraint, though there may be, and we think there is, new need to urge it.

It would be useless to attempt to review all of the decisions of the Supreme Court which have had a profound effect upon the course of our history. It has been said that the Dred Scott decision made the Civil War inevitable. Whether this is really true or not, we need not attempt to determine. Even if it is discounted as a serious overstatement, it remains a dramatic reminder of the great influence which Supreme Court decisions have had and can have. As to the great effects of decisions of that Court on the economic development of the country, see Mr. Justice Douglas' address on "Stare Decisis" (49 Columbia Law Review 735).

SOURCES OF NATIONAL POWER

Most of the powers of the National Government were set forth in the original Constitution; some have been added since. In the days of Chief Justice Marshall the supremacy clause of the Federal Constitution and a broad construction of the powers granted to the National Government were fully developed, and as a part of this development the extent of national control over interstate commerce became very firmly established. The trends established in those days have never ceased to operate and in comparatively recent years have operated at times in a startling manner in the extent to which interstate commerce has been held to be involved, as for example in the familiar case involving an elevator operator in a loft building.

From a practical standpoint the increase in Federal revenues resulting from the 16th amendment (the income tax amendment) has been of great importance. National control over State action in many fields has been vastly expanded by the 14th amendment.

We shall refer to some subjects and types of cases which bear upon Federal-State relationships.

THE GENERAL WELFARE CLAUSE

One provision of the Federal Constitution which was included in it from the beginning but which, in practical effect, lay dormant for more than a century, is the general welfare clause. In *United States* v. *Butler* (297 U.S. 1), the original Agricultural Adjustment Act was held invalid. An argument was advanced in that case that the general welfare clause would sustain the imposition of the tax and that money derived from the tax could be expended for any purposes which would promote the general welfare. The Court viewed this argument with favor as a general proposition, but found it not supportable on the facts of that case. However, it was not long before that clause was relied upon and applied. See *Steward Machine Co.* v. *Davis* (301 U.S. 548) and *Helvering* v. *Davis* (301 U.S. 690). In those cases the Social Security Act was upheld and the general welfare clause was relied upon both to support the tax and to support the expenditures of the money raised by the social-security taxes.

GRANTS-IN-AID

Closely related to this subject are the so-called grants-in-aid which go back to the Morrill Act of 1862 and the grants thereunder to the so-called land-grant colleges. The extent of grants-in-aid today is very great, but questions relating to the wisdom as distinguished from the legal basis for such grants seem to lie wholly in the political field and are hardly appropriate for discussion in this report. Perhaps we should also observe that since the decision of *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon* (262 U.S. 447), there seems to be no effective way in which either a State or an individual can challenge the validity of a Federal grant-in-aid.

DOCTRINE OF PREEMPTION

Many, if not most, of the problems of federalism today arise either in connection with the commerce clause and the vast extent to which its sweep has been carried by the Supreme Court, or they arise under the 14th amendment. Historically, cases involving the doctrine of preemption pertain mostly to the commerce clause. More recently the doctrine has been applied in other fields, notably in the case of *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson*, in which the Smith Act and other Federal statutes dealing with communism and loyalty problems were held to have preempted the field and to invalidate or suspend the Pennsylvania antisubversive statute which sought to impose a penalty for conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States by force or violence. In that particular case it happens that the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania was affirmed. That fact, however, emphasizes rather than detracts from the wide sweep now given to the doctrine of preemption.

LABOR RELATIONS CASES

In connection with commerce clause cases, the doctrine of preemption, coupled with only partial express regulation by Congress, has produced a state of considerable confusion in the field of labor relations.

One of the most serious problems in this field was pointed up or created (depending upon how one looks at the matter) by the Supreme Court's decision in *Amalgamated Association* v. *Wisconsin Employment Relations Board* (340 U.S. 383), which overturned a State statute aimed at preventing strikes and lockouts in public utilities. This decision left the States powerless to protect their own citizens against emergencies created by the suspension of essential services, even though, as the dissent pointed out, such emergencies were economically and practically confined to a single State.

In two cases decided on May 28, 1958, in which the majority opinions were written by Mr. Justice Frankfurter and Mr. Justice Burton, respectively, the right of an employee to sue a union in a State court was upheld. In *International Association of Machinists* v. *Gonzales*, a union member was held entitled to maintain a suit against his union for damages for wrongful expulsion. In *International Union, United Auto, etc. Workers* v. *Russell*, an employee, who was not a union member, was held entitled to maintain a suit for malicious interference with his employment through picketing during a strike against his employer. Pickets prevented Russell from entering the plant.

Regardless of what may be the ultimate solution of jurisdictional problems in this field, it appears that at the present time there is unfortunately a kind of no-man's land in which serious uncertainty exists. This uncertainty is in part undoubtedly due to the failure of Congress to make its wishes entirely clear. Also, somewhat varying views appear to have been adopted by the Supreme Court from time to time.

In connection with this matter, in the case of *Textile Union* v. *Lincoln Mills* (353 U.S. 448), the majority opinion contains language which we find somewhat disturbing. That case concerns the interpretation of section 301 of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947. Paragraph (a) of that section provides: "Suits for violation of contracts between an employer and a labor organization representing employees in an industry affecting commerce as defined in this Chapter, or between any such labor organizations, may be brought in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties, without respect to the amount in controversy or without regard to the citizenship of the parties." Paragraph (b) of the same section provides in substance that a labor organization may sue or be sued as an entity without the procedural difficulties which formerly attended suits by or against unincorporated associations consisting of large numbers of persons. Section 301(a) was held to be more than jurisdictional and was held to authorize Federal courts to fashion a body of Federal law for the enforcement of these collective bargaining agreements and to include within that body of Federal law specific performance of promises to arbitrate grievances under collective bargaining agreements.

What a state court is to do if confronted with a case similar to the Lincoln Mills case is by no means clear. It is evident that the substantive law to be applied must be Federal law, but the question remains, where is that Federal law to be found? It will probably take years for the development or the "fashioning" of the body of Federal law which the Supreme Court says the Federal courts are authorized to make. Can a state court act at all? If it can act and does act, what remedies should it apply? Should it use those afforded by state law, or is it limited to those which would be available under Federal law if the suit were in a Federal court? It is perfectly possible that these questions will not have to be answered, since the Supreme Court may adopt the view that the field has been completely preempted by the Federal law and committed solely to the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, so that the state courts can have no part whatsoever in enforcing rights recognized by section 301 of the Labor Management Relations Act. Such a result does not seem to be required by the language of section 301 nor yet does the legislative history of that section appear to warrant such a construction.

Professor Meltzer's monograph has brought out many of the difficulties in this whole field of substantive labor law with regard to the division of power between State and Federal Governments. As he points out much of this confusion is due to the fact that Congress has not made clear what functions the States may perform and what they may not perform. There are situations in which the particular activity involved is prohibited by Federal law, others in which it is protected by Federal law, and others in which the Federal law is silent. At the present time there seems to be one field in which State action is clearly permissible. That is where actual violence is involved in a labor dispute.

STATE LAW IN DIVERSITY CASES

Not all of the decisions of the Supreme Court in comparatively recent years have limited or tended to limit the power of the States or the effect of State laws. The celebrated case of *Erie R. R.* v. *Tompkins* (304 U.S. 64) overruled *Swift* v. *Tyson* and estab-

lished substantive State law, decisional as well as statutory, as controlling in diversity cases in the Federal courts. This marked the end of the doctrine of a Federal common law in such cases.

IN PERSONAM JURISDICTION OVER NONRESIDENTS

Also, in cases involving the in personam jurisdiction of State courts over nonresidents, the Supreme Court has tended to relax rather than tighten restrictions under the due process clause upon State action in this field. *International Shoe Co.* v. *Washington* (326 U.S. 310) is probably the most significant case in this development. In sustaining the jurisdiction of a Washington court to render a judgment in personam against a foreign corporation which carries on some activities within the State of Washington, Chief Justice Stone used the now familiar phrase that there "were sufficient contacts or ties with the State of the forum to make it reasonable and just, according to our traditional conception of fair play and substantial justice, to enforce the obligation which appellant has incurred there." Formalistic doctrines or dogmas have been replaced by a more flexible and realistic approach, and this trend has been carried forward in subsequent cases leading up to and including *McGee* v. *International Life Insurance Co.* (355 U.S. 220), until halted by *Hanson* v. *Denckla* (357 U.S. decided June 23, 1958).

TAXATION

In the field of taxation the doctrine of intergovernmental immunity has been seriously curtailed partly by judicial decisions and partly by statute. This has not been entirely a one-way street.

In recent years cases involving state taxation have arisen in many fields. Sometimes they have involved questions of burdens upon interstate commerce or the export-import clause, sometimes of jurisdiction to tax as a matter of due process, and sometimes they have arisen on the fringes of governmental immunity, as where a State has sought to tax a contractor doing business with the National Government. There have been some shifts in holdings. On the whole, the Supreme Court seems perhaps to have taken a more liberal view in recent years toward the validity of State taxation than it formerly took.

OTHER 14TH AMENDMENT CASES

In other fields, however, the 14th amendment has been invoked to cut down State action in many fields. This has been noticeably true in cases involving not only the 14th amendment but also the 1st amendment guarantee of freedom of speech or the 5th amendment protection against self-incrimination. State antisubversive acts have been practically eliminated by *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson* in which the decision was rested on the group of preemption of the field by the Federal statutes.

THE SWEEZY CASE—STATE LEGISLATIVE INVESTIGATIONS

One manifestation of this restrictive action under 14th amendment is to be found in *Sweezy* v. *New Hampshire* (354 U.S. 234). In that case, the State of New Hampshire had enacted a subversive activity statute which imposed various disabilities on subversive persons and subversive organizations. In 1953 the legislature adopted a resolution under which it constituted the attorney general a one-man legislative committe to investigate violations of that act and to recommend additional legislation. Sweezy, described as a non-Communist Marxist, was summoned to testify at the investigation conducted by the attorney general, pursuant to this authorization. He testified freely about many matters but refused to answer two types of questions: (1) Inquiries concerning the activites of the Progressive Party in the State during the 1948 campaign; and (2) inquiries concerning a lecture Sweezy had delivered in 1954 to a class at the University of New Hampshire. He was adjudged in contempt by a state court for failure to answer these questions. The Suprme Court reversed the conviction, but there is no majority opinion. The opinion of the Chief Justice, in which he was joined by Justices Black, Douglas and Brennan, started out by reaffirming the position taken in *Watkins* v. *United States* (354 U.S. 178) that legislative investigations can encroach on first amendment rights. It then attacked the New Hampshire Subversive Activities Act and stated that the definition of subversive persons and subversive organizations was so vague and limitless that they extended to conduct which is only remotely related to actual subversion and which is done free of any conscious intent to be a part of such activity. Then followed a lengthy discourse on the importance of academic freedom and political expression. This was not, however, the ground upon which these four Justices ultimately relied for their conclusion that the conviction should be reversed. The Chief Justice said in part:

"The respective roles of the legislature and the investigator thus revealed are of considerable significance to the issue before us. It is eminently clear that the basic discretion of determining the direction of the legislative inquiry has been turned over to the investigative agency. The attorney general has been given such a sweeping and uncertain mandate that it is his discretion which picks out the subjects that will be pursued, what witnesses will be summoned and what questions will be asked. In this circumstance, it cannot be stated authoritatively that the legislature asked the attorney general to gather the kind of facts comprised in the subjects upon which petitioner was interrogated."

Four members of the Court, two in a concurring opinion and two in a dissenting opinion, took vigorous issue with the view that the conviction was invalid because of the legislature's failure to provide adequate standards to guide the attorney general's investigation. Mr. Justice Frankfurter and Mr. Justice Harlan concurred in the reversal of the conviction on the ground that there was no basis for a belief that Sweezy or the Progressive Party threatened the safety of the State and hence that the liberties of the individual should prevail. Mr. Justice Clark, with whom Mr. Justice Burton joined, arrived at the opposite conclusion and took the view that the State's interest in self-preservation justified the intrusion into Sweezy's personal affairs.

In commenting on this case Professor Cramton says: "The most puzzling aspect of the Sweezy case is the reliance by the Chief Justice on delegation of power conceptions. New Hampshire had determined that it wanted the information which Sweezy refused to give; to say that the State has not demonstrated that it wants the information seems so unreal as to be incredible. The State had delegated power to the attorney general to determine the scope of inquiry within the general subject of subversive activities. Under these circumstances the conclusion of the Chief Justice that the vagueness of the resolution violates the due process clause must be, despite his protestations, a holding that a State legislature cannot delegate such a power."

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT CASES

There are many cases involving public employment and the question of disqualification therefor by reason of Communist Party membership or other questions of loyalty. *Slochower* v. *Board of Higher Education* (350 U.S. 551) is a well known example of cases of this type. Two more recent cases, *Lerner* v. *Casey*, and *Beilan* v. *Board of Public Education* (both in 357 U.S. and decided on June 30, 1958), have upheld disqualifications for employment where such issues were involved, but they did so on the basis of lack of competence or fitness. Lerner was a subway conductor in New York and Beilan was a public school instructor. In each case the decision was by a five-to-four majority.

ADMISSION TO THE BAR

When we come to the recent cases on admission to the bar, we are in a field of unusual sensitivity. We are well aware that any adverse comment which we may make on those decisions lays us open to attack on the grounds that we are complaining of the curtailment of our own powers and that we are merely voicing the equivalent of the ancient protest of the defeated litigant—in this instance the wail of a judge who has been reversed. That is a prospect which we accept in preference to maintaining silence on a matter which we think cannot be ignored without omitting an important element of the subject with which this report is concerned.

Konigsberg v. *State Bar of California* (353 U.S. 252), seems to us to reach the high water mark so far established by the Supreme Court in overthrowing the action of a State and in denying to a State the power to keep order in its own house.

The majority opinion first hurdled the problem as to whether or not the Federal question sought to be raised was properly presented to the State's highest court for decision and was decided by that court. Mr. Justice Frankfurter dissented on the ground that the record left it doubtful whether this jurisdictional requirement for review by the Supreme Court had been met and favored a remand of the case for certification by the State's highest court of "whether or not it did in fact pass on a claim properly before it under the due process clause of the 14th amendment." Mr. Justice Harlan and Mr. Justice Clark shared Mr. Justice Frankfurter's jurisdictional views. They also dissented on the merits in an opinion written by Mr. Justice Harlan, of which more later.

The majority opinion next turned to the merits of Konigsberg's application for admission to the bar. Applicable State statutes required one seeking admission to show that he was a person of good moral character and that he did not advocate the overthrow of the National or State government by force or violence. The committee of bar examiners, after holding several hearings on Konigsberg's application, notified him that his application was denied because he did not show that he met the above qualifications.

The Supreme Court made its own review of the facts.

On the score of good moral character, the majority found that Konigsberg had sufficiently established it, that certain editorials written by him attacking this country's participation in the Korean war, the actions of political leaders, the influence of "big business' on American life, racial discrimination and the Supreme Court's decision in *Dennis* v. *United States* (341 U.S. 494), would not support any rational inference of bad moral character, and that his refusal to answer questions "almost all" of which were described by the Court as having "concerned his political affiliations, editorials and beliefs" (353 U.S. 269) would not support such an inference either. On the matter of advocating the overthrow of the National or State government by force or violence, the Court held (as it had in the companion case of *Schware* v. *Board of Bar Examiners of New Mexico* (353 U.S. 232), decided contemporaneously) that past membership in the Communist Party was not enough to show bad moral character. The majority apparently accepted as sufficient Konigsberg's denial of any present advocacy of the overthrow of the Government of the United States or of California, which was uncontradicted on the record. He had re-

fused to answer questions relating to his past political affiliations and beliefs, which the bar committee might have used to test the truthfulness of his present claims. His refusal to answer was based upon his views as to the effect of the 1st and 14th amendments. The Court did not make any ultimate determination of their correctness, but (at 353 U.S. 270) said that prior decisions by this Court indicated that his objections to answering the questions [which we shall refer to below] were not frivolous.

The majority asserted that Konigsberg "was not denied admission to the California bar simply because he refused to answer questions." In a footnote appended to this statement it is said (353 U.S. 259): "Neither the committee as a whole nor any of its members ever intimated that Konigsberg would be barred just because he refused to answer relevant inquiries or because he was obstructing the committee. Some members informed him that they did not necessarily accept his position that they were not entitled to inquire into his political associations and opinions and said that his failure to answer would have some bearing on their determination whether he was qualified. But they never suggested that his failure to answer their questions was, by itself, a sufficient independent ground for denial of his application."

Mr. Justice Harlan's dissent took issue with these views—convincingly, we think. He quoted lengthy extracts from the record of Konigsberg's hearings before the subcommittee and the committee of the State bar investigating his application. (353 U.S. 284–309.) Konigsberg flatly refused to state whether or not at the time of the hearing he was a member of the Communist Party and refused to answer questions on whether he had ever been a Communist or belonged to various organizations, including the Communist Party. The bar committee conceded that he could not be required to answer a question if the answer might tend to incriminate him; but Konigsberg did not stand on the fifth amendment and his answer which came nearest to raising that question, as far as we can see, seems to have been based upon a fear of prosecution for perjury for whatever answer he might then give as to membership in the Communist Party. We think, on the basis of the extracts from the record contained in Mr. Justice Harlan's dissenting opinion that the committee was concerned with its duty under the statute to certify as to this applicant's good moral character (p. 295), and that the committee was concerned with the applicant's disinclination to respond to questions proposed by the committee (p. 301), and that the committee, in passing on his good moral character, sought to test his veracity (p. 303).

The majority, however, having reached the conclusion above stated, that Konigsberg had not been denied admission to the bar simply because he refused to answer questions, then proceeded to demolish a strawman by saying that there was nothing in the California statutes or decisions, or in the rules of the bar committee which had been called to the Court's attention, suggesting that a failure to answer questions "is ipso facto, a basis for excluding an applicant from the bar, irrespective of how overwhelming is his showing of good character or loyalty or how flimsy are the suspicions of the bar examiners." Whether Konigsberg's overwhelming showing of his own good character would have been shaken if he had answered the relevant questions which he refused to answer, we cannot say. We have long been under the impression that candor is required of members of the bar and, prior to Konigsberg we should not have thought that there was any doubt that a candidate for admission to the bar should answer questions, as to matters relating to his fitness for admission, and that failure or refusal to answer such questions would warrant an inference unfavorable to the applicant or a finding that he had failed to meet the burden of proof of his moral fitness.

Let us repeat that Konigsberg did not invoke protection against self-incrimination. He invoked a privilege which he claimed to exist against answering certain questions. These might have served to test his veracity at the committee hearings held to determine whether or not he was possessed of the good moral character required for admission to the bar.

The majority opinion seems to ignore the issue of veracity sought to be raised by the questions which Konigsberg refused to answer. It is also somewhat confusing with regard to the burden of proof. At one point (pp. 270–271) it says that the committee was not warranted in drawing from Konigsberg's refusal to answer questions any inference that he was of bad moral character; at another (p. 273) it says that there was no evidence in the record to justify a finding that he had failed to establish his good moral character.

Also at page 273 of 353d United States Reports, the majority said: "We recognize the importance of leaving States free to select their own bars, but it is equally important that the State not exercise this power in an arbitrary or discriminatory manner nor in such way as to impinge on the freedom of political expression or association. A bar composed of lawyers of good character is a worthy objective but it is unnecessary to sacrifice vital freedoms in order to obtain that goal. It is also important to society and the bar itself that lawyers be unintimidated—free to think, speak and act as members of an independent bar." The majority thus makes two stated concessions—each, of course, subject to limitations—one, that it is important to leave the States free to select their own bars and, the other, that a bar composed of lawyers of good character is a worthy objective.

We think that Mr. Justice Harlan's dissent on the merits, in which Mr. Justice Clark joined, shows the fallacies of the majority position. On the facts which we think were demonstrated by the execerpts from the record included in that dissent, it seems to us that the net result of the case is that a State is unable to protect itself against admitting to its bar an applicant who, by his own refusal to answer certain questions as to what the majority regarded as political associations and activities, avoids a test of his veracity through cross examination on a matter which he has the burden of proving in order to establish his right to admission to the bar. The power left to the States to regulate admission to their bars under Konigsberg hardly seems adequate to achieve what the majority chose to describe as a worthy objective—a bar composed of lawyers of good character.

We shall close our discussion of Konigsberg by quoting two passages from Mr. Justice Harlan's dissent, in which Mr. Justice Clark joined. In one, he states that "this case involves an area of Federal-State relations—the right of States to establish and administer standards for admission to their bars—into which this Court should be especially reluctant and slow to enter." In the other, his concluding comment (p. 312), he says: "[W]hat the Court has really done, I think, is simply to impose on California its own notions of public policy and judgment. For me, today's decision represents an unacceptable intrusion into a matter of State concern."

The Lerner and Beilan cases above referred to seem to indicate some recession from the intimations, though not from the decisions, in the Konigsberg and Slochower cases. In Beilan the schoolteacher was told that his refusal to answer questions might result in his dismissal, and his refusal to answer questions pertaining to loyalty matters was held relevant to support a finding that he was incompetent. "Incompetent" seems to have been taken in the sense of unfit.

STATE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL LAW

When we turn to the impact of decisions of the Supreme Court upon the State administration of criminal justice, we find that we have entered a very broad field. In many matters, such as the fair drawing of juries, the exclusion of forced confessions as evidence, and the right to counsel at least in all serious cases, we do not believe that there is any real difference in doctrine between the views held by the Supreme Court of the United States and the views held by the highest courts of the several States.

There is, however, a rather considerable difference at times as to how these general principles should be applied and as to whether they have been duly regarded or not. In such matters the Supreme Court not only feels free to review the facts, but considers it to be its duty to make an independent review of the facts. It sometimes seems that the rule which governs most appellate courts in the view of findings of fact by trial courts is given lipservice, but is actually given the least possible practical effect. Appellate courts generally will give great weight to the findings of fact by trial courts which had the opportunity to see and hear the witnesses, and they are reluctant to disturb such findings. The Supreme Court at times seems to read the records in criminal cases with a somewhat different point of view. Perhaps no more striking example of this can readily be found than in *Moore* v. *Michigan* (355 U.S. 155).

In the Moore case the defendant had been charged in 1937 with the crime of first degree murder, to which he pleaded guilty. The murder followed a rape and was marked by extreme brutality. The defendant was a Negro youth, 17 years of age at the time of the offense, and is described as being of limited education (only the seventh grade) and as being of rather low mentality. He confessed the crime to law enforcement officers and he expressed a desire to plead guilty and "get it over with". Before such a plea was permitted to be entered he was interviewed by the trial judge in the privacy of the judge's chambers and he again admitted his guilt, said he did not want counsel and expressed the desire to "get it over with", to be sent to whatever institution he was to be confined in, and to be placed under observation. Following this, the plea of guilty was accepted and there was a hearing to determine the punishment which should be imposed. About 12 years later the defendant sought a new trial principally on the ground that he had been unfairly dealt with because he was not represented by counsel. He had expressly disclaimed any desire for counsel at the time of his trial. Pursuant to the law of Michigan, he had a hearing on this application for a new trial. In most respects his testimony was seriously at variance with the testimony of other witnesses. He was corroborated in one matter by a man who had been a deputy sheriff at the time when the prisoner was arrested and was being questioned. The trial court, however, found in substance that the defendant knew what he was doing when he rejected the appointment of counsel and pleaded guilty, that he was then calm and not intimidated, and, after hearing him testify, that he was completely unworthy of belief. It accordingly denied the application for a new trial. This denial was affirmed by the Supreme Court of Michigan, largely upon the basis of the findings of fact by the trial court. The Supreme Court of the United States reversed. The latter Court felt that counsel might have been of assistance to the prisoner, in view of his youth, lack of education and low mentality, by requiring the

State to prove its case against him (saying the evidence was largely circumstantial), by raising a question as to his sanity, and by presenting factors which might have lessened the severity of the penalty imposed. It was the maximum permitted under the Michigan law—solitary confinement for life at hard labor. The case was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1957. The majority opinion does not seem to have given any consideration whatsoever to the difficulties of proof which the State might encounter after the lapse of many years or the risks to society which might result from the release of a prisoner of this type, if the new prosecution should fail. They are, however, pointed out in the dissent.

Another recent case which seems to us surprising, and the full scope of which we cannot foresee, is *Lambert* v. *California* (355 U.S., decided Dec. 16, 1957). In that case a majority of the Court reversed a conviction under a Los Angeles ordinance which required a person convicted of a felony, or of a crime which would be felony under the law of California, to register upon taking up residence in Los Angeles. Lambert had been convicted of forgery and had served a long term in a California prison for that offense. She was arrested on suspicion of another crime and her failure to register was then discovered and she was prosecuted, convicted, and fined. The majority of the Supreme Court found that she had no notice of the ordinance, that it was not likely to be known, that it was a measure merely for the convenience of the police, that the defendant had no opportunity to comply with it after learning of it and before being prosecuted, that she did not act willfully in failing to register, that she was not "blameworthy" in failing to do so, and that her conviction involved a denial of due process of law.

This decision was reached only after argument and reargument. Mr. Justice Frankfurter wrote a short dissenting opinion in which Mr. Justice Harlan and Mr. Justice Whittaker joined. He referred to the great number of State and Federal statutes which imposed criminal penalties for nonfeasance and stated that he felt confident that "the present decision will turn out to be an isolated deviation from the strong current of precedents—a derelict on the waters of the law."

We shall not comment in this report upon the broad sweep which the Supreme Court now gives to habeas corpus proceedings. Matters of this sort seem to fall within the scope of the committee of this conference on the habeas corpus bill which has been advocated for some years by this conference for enactment by the Congress of the United States, and has been supported by the Judicial Conference of the United States, the American Bar Association, the Association of Attorneys General and the Department of Justice.

We cannot, however, completely avoid any reference at all to habeas corpus matters because what is probably the most far-reaching decision of recent years on State criminal procedure which has been rendered by the Supreme Court is itself very close to a habeas corpus case. That is the case of *Griffin* v. *Illinois* (351 U.S. 12) which arose under the Illinois Post Conviction Procedure Act. The substance of the holding in that case may perhaps be briefly and accurately stated in this way: If a transcript of the record, or its equivalent, is essential to an effective appeal, and if a State permits an appeal by those able to pay for the cost of the record or its equivalent, then the State must furnish without expense to an indigent defendant either a transcript of the record at his trial, or an equivalent thereof, in order that the indigent defendant may have an equally effective right of appeal. Otherwise, the inference seems clear, the indigent defendant must be released upon habeas corpus or similar proceedings. Probably no one would dispute the proposition that the poor man should not be deprived of the opportunity for a meritorious appeal simply because of his poverty. The practical problems which flow from the decision in *Griffin* v. *Illinois* are however almost unlimited and are now only in course of development and possible solution. This was extensively discussed at the 1957 meeting of this Conference of Chief Justices in New York.

We may say at this point that in order to give full effect to the doctrine of *Griffin* v. *Illinois*, we see no basis for distinction between the cost of the record and other expenses to which the defendant will necessarily be put in the prosecution of an appeal. These include filing fees, the cost of printing the brief and of such part of the record as may be necessary, and counsel fees.

The Griffin case was very recently given retroactive effect by the Supreme Court in a per curiam opinion in *Eskridge* v. *Washington State Board of Prison Terms and Paroles* (78 S. Ct. 1061). In that case the defendant, who was convicted in 1935, gave timely notice of an appeal. His application then made for a copy of the transcript of the trial proceedings to be furnished at public expense was denied by the trial judge. A statute provided for so furnishing a transcript if "in his (the trial judge's) opinion justice will thereby be promoted." The trial judge found that justice would not be promoted, in that the defendant had had a fair and impartial trial, and that, in his opinion, no grave or prejudicial errors had occurred in the trial. The defendant then sought a writ of mandate from the supreme court of the State, ordering the trial judge to have the transcript furnished for the prosecution of his appeal. This was denied and his appeal was dismissed. In 1956 he instituted habeas corpus proceedings which, on June 16, 1958, resulted in a reversal of the Washington court's decision and a remand "for further proceedings not inconsistent with this opinion." It was conceded that the reporter's transcript from the trial was still available. In what form it exists does not appear from the Supreme Court's opinion. As in Griffin, it was held that an adequate substitute for the transcript might be furnished in lieu of the transcript itself. Justices Harlan and Whittaker dissented briefly on the ground that "on this record the Griffin case decided in 1956 should not be applied to this conviction occurring in 1935." This accords with the view expressed by Mr. Justice Frankfurter in his concurring opinion in Griffin that it should not be retroactive. He did not participate in the Eskridge case.

Just where *Griffin* v. *Illinois* may lead us is rather hard to say. That it will mean a vast increase in criminal appeals and a huge caseload for appellate courts seems almost to go without saying. There are two possible ways in which the meritorious appeals might be taken care of and the nonmeritorious appeals eliminated. One would be to apply a screening process to appeals of all kinds, whether taken by the indigent or by persons well able to pay for the cost of appeals. It seems very doubtful that legislatures generally would be willing to curtail the absolute right of appeal in criminal cases which now exists in many jurisdictions. Another possible approach would be to require some showing of merit before permitting an appeal to be taken by an indigent defendant at the expense of the State.

Whether this latter approach which we may call "screening" would be practical or not is, to say the least, very dubious. First, let us look at a Federal statute and Supreme Court decisions thereunder. What is now subsection (a) of section 1915 of title 28, United States Code, annotated, contains a sentence reading as follows: "An appeal may not be taken in forma pauperis if the trial court certifies in writing that it is not taken in good faith." This section or a precursor thereof was involved in *Miller* v. *United States* (317 U.S. 192), *Johnson* v. *United States* (352 U.S. 565), and *Farley* v. *United States* (354 U.S. 521, 523). In the Miller case the Supreme Court held that the discretion of the trial court in withholding such a certificate was subject to review on appeal, and that in order that such a review might be made by the Court of Appeals it was necessary that it have before it either the transcript of the record or an adequate substitute therefor, which might consist of the trial judge's notes or of an agreed statement as to the points on which review was sought. Similar holdings were made by per curiam opinions in the Johnson and Farley cases, in each of which the trial court refused to certify that the appeal was taken in good faith. In each case, though perhaps more clearly in Johnson, the trial court seems to have felt that the proposed appeal was frivolous, and hence not in good faith.

The Eskridge case, above cited, decided on June 16, 1958, rejected the screening process under the State statute there involved, and appears to require, under the 14th amendment, that a full appeal be allowed—not simply a review of the screening process, as under the Federal statute above cited. The effect of the Eskridge case thus seems rather clearly to be that unless all appeals, at least in the same types of cases, are subject to screening, none may be.

It would seem that it may be possible to make a valid classification of appeals which shall be subject to screening and of appeals which shall not. Such a classification might be based upon the gravity of the offense or possibly upon the sentence imposed. In most, if not all, states, such a classification would doubtless require legislative action.

In the Griffin case, it will be recalled, the Supreme Court stated that a substitute for an actual transcript of the record would be acceptable if it were sufficient to present the points upon which the defendant based his appeal. The Supreme Court suggested the possible use of bystanders' bills of exceptions.

It seems probable to us that an actual transcript of the record will be required in most cases. For example, in cases where the basis for appeal is the alleged insufficiency of the evidence, it may be very difficult to eliminate from that part of the record which is to be transcribed portions which seem to have no immediate bearing upon this question. A statement of the facts to be agreed upon by trial counsel for both sides may be still more difficult to achieve even with the aid of the trial judge.

The danger of swamping some State appellate courts under the flood of appeals which may be loosed by Griffin and Eskridge is not a reassuring prospect. How far Eskridge may lead and whether it will be extended beyond its facts remain to be seen.

CONCLUSIONS

This long review, though far from exhaustive, shows some of the uncertainties as to the distribution of power which are probably inevitable in a federal system of government. It also shows, on the whole, a continuing and, we think, an accelerating trend toward increasing power of the national government and correspondingly contracted power of the State governments. Much of this is doubtless due to the fact that many matters which were once mainly of local concern are now parts of larger matters which are of national concern. Much of this stems from the doctrine of a strong, central government and of the plenitude of national power within broad limits of what may be necessary and proper in the exercise of the granted powers of the national government which was expounded and established by Chief Justice Marshall and his colleagues, though some of the modern extensions may and do seem

to us to go to extremes. Much, however, comes from the extent of the control over the action of the States which the Supreme Court exercises under its views of the 14th amendment.

We believe that strong State and local governments are essential to the effective functioning of the American system of federal government; that they should not be sacrificed needlessly to leveling, and sometimes deadening, uniformity; and that in the interest of active, citizen participation in self-government—the foundation of our democracy—they should be sustained and strengthened.

As long as this country continues to be a developing country and as long as the conditions under which we live continue to change, there will always be problems of the allocation of power depending upon whether certain matters should be regarded as primarily of national concern or as primarily of local concern. These adjustments can hardly be effected without some friction. How much friction will develop depends in part upon the wisdom of those empowered to alter the boundaries and in part upon the speed with which such changes are effected. Of course, the question of speed really involves the exercise of judgment and the use of wisdom, so that the two things are really the same in substance.

We are now concerned specifically with the effect of judicial decisions upon the relations between the Federal Government and the State governments. Here we think that the overall tendency of decisions of the Supreme Court over the last 25 years or more has been to press the extension of Federal power and to press it rapidly. There have been, of course, and still are, very considerable differences within the Court on these matters, and there has been quite recently a growing recognition of the fact that our Government is still a Federal Government and that the historic line which experience seems to justify between matters primarily of national concern and matters primarily of local concern should not be hastily or lightly obliterated. A number of justices have repeatedly demonstrated their awareness of problems of federalism and their recognition that federalism is still a living part of our system of government.

The extent to which the Supreme Court assumes the function of policymaker is also of concern to us in the conduct of our judicial business. We realize that in the course of American history the Supreme Court has frequently—one might, indeed, say customarily—exercised policymaking powers going far—beyond those involved, say, in making a selection between competing rules of law.

We believe that in the fields with which we are concerned, and as to which we feel entitled to speak, the Supreme Court too often has tended to adopt the role of policymaker without proper judicial restraint. We feel this is particularly the case in both of the great fields we have discussed—namely, the extent and extension of the Federal power, and the supervision of State action by the Supreme Court by virtue of the 14th amendment. In the light of the immense power of the Supreme Court and its practical nonreviewability in most instances no more important obligation rests upon it, in our view, than that of careful moderation in the exercise of its policymaking role.

We are not alone in our view that the Court, in many cases arising under the 14th amendment, has assumed what seem to us primarily legislative powers. (See Judge Learned Hand on the Bill of Rights.) We do not believe that either the framers of the original Constitution or the possibly somewhat less gifted draftsmen of the 14th amendment ever contemplated that the Supreme Court would, or should, have the almost unlimited policymaking powers which it now exercises. It is strange, indeed, to reflect that under a constitution which provides for a system of checks and balances and of distribution of power between National and State Governments one branch of one government—the Supreme Court—should attain the immense, and in many respects, dominant, power which it now wields.

We believe that the great principle of distribution of powers among the various branches of government and between levels of government has vitality today and is the crucial base of our democracy. We further believe that in construing and applying the Constitution and laws made in pursuance thereof, this principle of the division of power based upon whether a matter is primarily of national or of local concern should not be lost sight of or ignored, especially in fields which bear upon the meaning of a constitutional or statutory provision, or the validity of State action presented for review. For, with due allowance for the changed conditions under which it may or must operate, the principle is as worthy of our consideration today as it was of the consideration of the great men who met in 1787 to establish our Nation as a nation.

It has long been an American boast that we have a government of laws and not of men. We believe that any study of recent decisions of the Supreme Court will raise at least considerable doubt as to the validity of that boast. We find first that in constitutional cases unanimous decisions are comparative rarities and that multiple opinions, concurring or dissenting, are common occurrences. We find next that divisions in results on a five to four basis are quite frequent. We find further that on some occasions a majority of the Court cannot be mustered in support of any one opinion and that the result of a given case may come from the divergent views of individual Justices who happen to unite on one outcome or the other of the case before the Court.

We further find that the Court does not accord finality to its own determinations of constitutional questions, or for that matter of others. We concede that a slavish adherence to stare decisis could at times have unfortunate consequences; but it seems strange that under a constitutional doctrine which requires all others to recognize the Supreme Court's rulings on constitutional questions as binding adjudications of the meaning and application of the Constitution, the Court itself has so frequently overturned its own decisions thereon, after the lapse of periods varying from 1 year to 75, or even 95 years. (See the tables appended to Mr. Justice Douglas' address on "Stare Decisis," 49 Columbia Law Review 735, 756–758.) The Constitution expressly sets up its own procedures for amendment, slow or cumbersome though they may be.

These frequent differences and occasional overrulings of prior decisions in constitutional cases cause us grave concern as to whether individual views as to what is wise or desirable do not unconsciously override a more dispassionate consideration of what is or is not constitutionally warranted. We believe that the latter is the correct approach, and we have no doubt that every member of the Supreme Court intends to adhere to that approach, and believes that he does so. It is our earnest hope which we respectfully express, that that great Court exercise to the full its power of judicial self-restraint by adhering firmly to its tremendous, strictly judicial powers and by eschewing, so far as possible, the exercise of essentially legislative powers when it is called upon to decide questions involving the validity of State action, whether it deems such action wise or unwise. The value of our system of federalism, and of local self-government in local matters which it embodies, should be kept firmly in mind, as we believe it was by those who framed our Constitution.

At times the Supreme Court manifests, or seems to manifest, an impatience with the slow workings of our Federal system. That impatience may extend to an unwillingness to wait for Congress to make clear its intention to exercise the powers conferred upon it under the Constitution, or the extent to which it undertakes to exercise them, and it may extend to the slow processes of amending the Constitution which that instrument provides. The words of Elihu Root on the opposite side of the problem, asserted at a time when demands were current for recall of judges and judicial decisions, bear repeating: "If the people of our country yield to impatience which would destroy the system that alone makes effective these great impersonal rules and preserves our constitutional government, rather than endure the temporary inconvenience of pursuing regulated methods of changing the law, we shall not be reforming. We shall not be making progress, but shall be exhibiting that lack of self-control which enables great bodies of men to abide the slow process of orderly government rather than to break down the barriers of order when they are struck by the impulse of the moment." (Quoted in 31 Boston University Law Review 43.)

We believe that what Mr. Root said is sound doctrine to be followed towards the Constitution, the Supreme Court and its interpretation of the Constitution. Surely, it is no less incumbent upon the Supreme Court, on its part, to be equally restrained and to be as sure as is humanly possible that it is adhering to the fundamentals of the Constitution with regard to the distribution of powers and the separation of powers, and with regard to the limitations of judicial power which are implicit in such separation and distribution, and that it is not merely giving effect to what it may deem desirable.

We may expect the question as to what can be accomplished by the report of this committee or by resolutions adopted in conformity with it. Most certainly some will say that nothing expressed here would deter a member or group of members of an independent judiciary from pursuing a planned course. Let us grant that this may be true. The value of a firm statement by us lies in the fact that we speak as members of all the State appellate courts with a background of many years' experience in the determination of thousands of cases of all kinds. Surely there are those who will respect a declaration of what we believe. And it just could be true that our statement might serve as an encouragement to those members of an independent judiciary who now or in the future may in their conscience adhere to views more consistent with our own.

Respectfully submitted.

Frederick W. Brune, Chief Judge of Maryland, Chairman; Albert Conway, Chief Judge of New York; John R. Dethmers, Chief Justice of Michigan; William H. Duckworth, Chief Justice of Georgia; John E. Hickman, Chief Justice of Texas; John E. Martin, Chief Justice of Wisconsin; Martin A. Nelson, Associate Justice of Minnesota; William C. Perry, Chief Justice of Oregon; Taylor H. Stukes, Chief Justice of South Carolina; Raymond S. Wilkins, Chief Justice of Massachusetts.

"'Campy' Goes Home"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of November 9, 1958. This great athlete has been a courageous and fine patient and his gallant fight back from tragedy should be an inspiration to all who are physically handicapped:

"CAMPY" GOES HOME

After 9 months in the hospital Roy Campanella has gone home. He isn't entirely well yet and will have to go on with his therapy. But he has made the first big step back on the road to recovery and to the resumption of his life as a useful citizen.

The Campanella case has more than its immediate significance. Roy is something of a symbol, now, to all those who are fighting their way back from seemingly overwhelming disaster. He has shown that it can be done. He is a personal symbol, of course, because of his great good humor, his magnificent courage, and his record as an outstanding athlete. Tragedy struck a man who was already much in the public eye and high in the public esteem.

But there is more to it than that. The magnificent treatment that saved his life in the first place and that now has placed him on the way to fuller recovery is part of a great program of rehabilitation that is steadily expanding. What was done for "Campy" at Bellevue Center can be done for others, both there and throughout the world.

It is doubtful that the doctors will often get as good a patient as Roy. They will never get a better one. But they and he, working together, have demonstrated how greatly valor can be the better part of wisdom. Miracles can happen. Brave men can still live if they have the will. "Campy" has gone home, and he has come home to all of us.

Nation Pays Tribute to All War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a speech given by Judge David B. Williams, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, on the occasion of Veterans Day in Boston, Mass.

Judge David B. Williams, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, led the ceremonies in behalf of all veteran groups at Boston, Mass., on Veterans Day. This year, the rites at Boston were sponsored by the Disabled American Veterans.

Leo W. Lalley, State commander, DAV, was in charge of the ceremonies. Charles N. Collatos, Massachusetts commissioner of veterans' services, was master of ceremonies. The highlights of the day was the laying of wreaths by the State commanders of all veterans' organizations.

TEXT OF WILLIAMS TALK

Up until 4 years ago all of us called November 11 each year by its familiar name—Armistice Day—but, in 1954, the Congress officially gave this date a much broader meaning, and now this date is known as Veterans Day.

With the full approval of our most distinguished veteran, the President of the United States, citizens everywhere are asked to pause on November 11 to salute our fellow Americans who have exemplified the highest tradition of citizenship by serving in defense of this Nation.

While this salute is merited, we who are veterans, and disabled veterans at that, feel that this day is a solemn occasion in which all of us dedicate ourselves anew to the cause for which we fought, for which we were disabled, and for which so many of our comrades died. And while we look back to great sacrifices, we must at the same time look forward to the goals we all desire.

If we can demonstrate to ourselves that our children and grandchildren will live to know the honorable peace for which we all struggle, then we can feel assured that we merit the salute you are asked to give us on Veterans Day.

Yes, the very theme of Veterans Day—the permanent slogan—is "Peace With Honor." And unless we have and maintain peace with honor all will have been in vain.

Few can match veterans in their experienced understanding of what America truly seeks in the determined effort to achieve peace with honor. Few can match disabled veterans in their personal knowledge of the suffering that modern warfare brings.

They know that peace with honor lies at the very heart of our American principles. Americans have always wanted peace. But we have never been willing to accept it when it meant dishonor.

CONSIDER HISTORY

This is a good day for inventory—for reevaluation—let's look back into our history just a bit:

Long before there was a Declaration of Independence, determined men of New England were dumping tea in the harbor of Boston. It represented taxation without representation. For them it was the bitter tea of dishonor. They wanted peace. They wanted to live in friendship with the mother country overseas. But they were not willing to buy peace and friendship at the cost of their rights as free men and women.

It took a terrible war to bring to those colonists a peace with honor. But the men of America were not afraid to pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. And out of that war came an independent nation, with a peace that free Americans could accept and approve.

When the war was over, our fighting men returned, as veterans, to their homes, their shops and their farms. As our war veterans have done ever since, they settled down to hard working, peaceful life. They turned their minds and hearts to the creation of a strong and stable country for their children, and for those to come after them.

Their warlike deeds against superior odds had thrilled the world. But in the years that followed the war they outdid their victories in war by their peacetime development of the boundless resources of our land. Their productive skills rolled back the frontiers beyond the Alleghanies.

But peace with honor is not something that, once earned, remains of its own accord. The new Americans found that out when their sailing clippers entered the waters of the Mediterranean on legitimate business—and fell afoul the Barbary pirates.

Our sailormen were told: "Pay us annual tribute or we'll scuttle your ships and make slaves of you."

The proudest and strongest nations of Europe had accepted that blunt ultimatum. To pay tribute was easy; it was relatively cheap; it avoided bloodshed. But it also was dishonorable. And our forefathers knew that peace without honor is a bad investment that pays no dividends.

America's answer was presented in person by our sailors and marines. The Barbary pirates quickly saw the point. Our fighting men enforced peace with honor. Then they came home as veterans. Like the men from Saratoga and Yorktown they turned—as mechanics, merchants, doctors, lawyers, and teachers—to the peacetime development of our rapidly expanding young nation.

Once again, within a few short years, the march of events made it clear that peace with honor comes only to those who earn it and remains only with those who are willing to defend it when the need arises.

Busy in her world struggle with Napoleon, and careless of the basic human rights of others, Britain halted our ships on the high seas. She seized our sailors. She ignored our protests.

As before, America's answer was delivered in person. When the final statement was made at New Orleans by the fighting men of Andrew Jackson's command, the point became very clear indeed to our opponents. They accepted our thesis that peace with honor was America's minimum requirement—against them or anyone else.

Again our fighting men had earned the proud title of veterans. They went back to their homes and shops, and they went to work. And our country grew and spread to the westward. The steamboats and the railroads came. And we prospered.

Then came the greatest tragedy in our history. Brother against brother. A civil war—with the preservation of our Union at stake.

Much has been said—much always will be said about the most terrible of our wars. But the central point must always remain clear: In 1861, for North and South, peace with honor had become impossible. The final dreadful recourse to arms was the price we had to pay for our earlier mistakes and our earlier compromises.

But in the end, the words and deeds of men of good will prevailed. Peace with honor came to our land.

OUR COUNTRY GROWS

The fighting men returned to their homes. America's security and wealth grew as veterans turned their attention to the ways of business, industry, and commerce. As the decades passed we developed into a world power.

Through all of these changes our watchword remained as before: Peace with honor. The whole world had come to accept it as our basic American way of life. And we and the world prospered, until—in the second decade of the bloody 20th century—there was massed against our friends and allies—a vicious combination of armed power, with new threats and new aggressions.

Many books have been written about World War I. Many things have been said about America's entry into World War I, after enemy submarines began their unrestricted undersea warfare against every ship afloat on the high seas. But one fact remains clear: The terms arrogantly offered to us to remain neutral, peaceful, and safe were dishonorable.

And so, as in the case of our fathers, our grandfathers, and those before them, we had to call on our fighting men. We called on the sons of veterans of earlier days to fight for the only sure basis of our national existence as a free people—peace with honor.

They proved that when freedom is judged to be not worth fighting for, free men are left with nothing that's worth living for.

They proved that peace with honor is more than just a slogan to men and women who have been described accurately for all time, by one of our greatest Presidents, Abraham Lincoln. He said our Nation was "conceived in liberty."

They proved it anew—our fighting men, our veterans—on land, on sea, and in the air—when the challenge to peace with honor was flung down, even more brutally than be-

fore, by enemies of mankind who made good their mad promise to engulf the world in World War II.

They proved it—our fighting men, our veterans—on the bare and zero-cold mountains of Korea. They proved it, when to have hesitated in the will to oppose aggression would have been to betray the deepest qualities that make us Americans.

SPEAKS FOR DISABLED

In closing, I want to point out that there is one group of veterans who need your special attention and should be brought into special focus on this day of observance.

Bruce Catton, famous American author and editor, state it so eloquently that I would like to read you his words, rather than attempt to express any thoughts of mine that might not do justice to what I want to say. Mr. Catton said in a message written for the DAV:

"November 11 is Veterans Day: a day set aside by act of Congress and Presidential proclamation, to honor the memory of those who served in war. It has particularly reference to the living—for it is on Memorial Day that we pay our tribute to the men who never came back—and unless the day is to be a complete mockery it must include a renewed awareness of our obligation to the disabled ex-soldier. The Disabled American Veterans—the DAV—aptly points out that the disabled serviceman is asking for nothing more than a fair chance to make his own way in the world.

"He doesn't particularly want tears, and he is not demanding huge appropriations from the public treasury. What he does want is the kind of sympathetic understanding and the active support that will make it easier for him to resume his place, in spite of physical handicap, as a regular member of society. That is not too much to ask, and it is assuredly the very least that we can give.

"If we feel a sense of continuing obligation for services rendered, and make it a point to discharge that obligation in the attitude that we carry over into our regular workaday routine, life for the disabled veteran will be a good deal easier, and happier."

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, as Mr. Catton points out, there could be no better time than Veterans Day for us to renew our awareness of what we owe the veteran who took wounds in battle—for us.

Francis E. Walter, Chairman of the Special International Meeting on Refugees Held in Geneva, Switzerland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, during my most recent visit in Geneva, Switzerland, I was extremely happy to attend, on November 20, 1958, a special international meeting on refugees held by representatives of 29 governments immediately upon the termination of the ninth session of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration—ICEM.

Mr. Marcus Daly, the director of ICEM, stressed that the meeting convened at the suggestion of the U.S. Government for the purpose of exploring the present status of those refugees in Western Europe who, for a variety of reasons, have been so far unable to find new homes in the countries of resettlement.

I am informed that the result of the debates held in Geneva, as well as the results of the studies presently in progress, will be the subject of a special report to the House. Such report will be submitted at a later date, I understand, when the studies and statistical compilations are available. At the present time, however, it gives me great pleasure to submit to the attention of my colleagues that part of the proceedings of the special international meeting on refugees which pertain to the nomination and the unanimous election to the chair of our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Under leave to insert my remarks in the RECORD, I hereby submit the verbatim transcript of the pertinent part of the Geneva proceedings.

Upon the conclusion of Mr. Daly's opening remarks, the delegate of Australia obtained the floor:

Mr. JOCKEL (Australia). Mr. Director, gentlemen. As you said, Mr. Director, this is a meeting of a very special character, called by the United States or, rather, suggested by the United States, to take advantage of the presence of the representatives who are here in Geneva. It is not in the formal sense an ICEM meeting and indeed when we look around the room and we see the Governments assembled, the United Nations High Commissioner's Office, the Voluntary Agencies, rather would they be considered as representing a community of countries and organizations interested in refugee work. In this room this morning we have many men with special responsibilities in their governments for migration and refugee questions and among such a group of top-level and influential people a discussion of the remaining refugee problems and an assembly of the facts and information relating to these problems can do nothing but good in sustaining and expanding international effort.

Among us this morning we have a very distinguished gentleman who is especially well equipped by knowledge, experience and authority to direct these deliberations. It is indeed our good fortune to have with us Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, the chairman of the United States congressional delegation to the just-concluded ICEM Council. We believe we should take advantage of his presence and his interest in this work and it is my pleasure to nominate Congressman WALTER to preside over this meeting. The United States Delegation has kindly offered to make his services available for this purpose.

It is not necessary for me to dwell upon the contribution that Congressman WALTER has made to the work of ICEM, which has, itself made such a contribution to the solution of refugee problems. He continues to be a tower of strength to the organization and my country is by no means the least to appreciate what his support means for ICEM and in related matters. I feel I should, however, place before you some indication of Congressman WALTER's unflagging work in the refugee field in the last decade. For every United States legislation concerning refugees and migrants since the war, Congressman WALTER, in Congress, has been the author and the pilot. This extends from the Displaced Persons Act in 1948, through which 460,000 persons were admitted to the United States, the Refugee Relief Act providing for a further 110,000 admissions, right down to recent legislation for the admission of Dutch expellees. It includes also the 1957 legislation providing for the liberalization of the entry laws in immigrant cases involving sicknesses and diseases, thereby facilitating family reunions and the admission of refugees.

Generous ideas and practices have a way of spreading; the example of what the United States is doing and has done in this area is not lost on other Governments and indeed there has seldom been a period of such constructive general effort in the refugee field. I am sure that you will all agree that to appoint as chairman today one of the greatest architects of this international work would be the best basis we could, in this meeting, have for further fruitful effort. Thank you, Mr. Director.

Mr. HAVEMANN (Netherlands). Mr. Director, it is a great privilege to me to support the proposal just made by the Australian representative. All of us know how much we owe to Mr. WALTER in the field of refugees and migration. With his great prestige and political leadership he has very successfully directed his efforts to helping many countries, many groups of refugees and innumerable individuals to alleviate or to solve their problems. It is right that we should ask him to take the chair, not only as an expression of our gratitude but still more because we badly need his guidance in our endeavors to deal effectively with the refugee problem. As a leading and outstanding politician, Mr. WALTER is not always easy to convince; he has a sound dose of skepticism which prevents him from believing in what he is accustomed to call international social workers pipe dreams. But I have already noted many times that once Mr. WALTER is convinced of the urgency of a matter he kneads the circumstances like wax until the solution he has in mind is reached. For this reason I hope the nations represented here will call on Mr. WALTER to act as their leader and may be in a later stage their trustee. I am certain that we can then hope to reach a solution of our problems pretty soon. Thank you.

Mr. DE LIERA (Spain) (translation from Spanish). Mr. Chairman, I wished to address the meeting for the express purpose of supporting the proposal of the representative of Australia but my colleague, the delegate of the Netherlands, anticipated my intention. I should now like to associate myself with that proposal by saying that I consider that the background and exceptional ability possessed by Mr. WALTER make him the most suitable person to preside over the meeting called for this morning. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) (translation from Spanish). Mr. Chairman, the delegation of Venezuela has very great pleasure in supporting the proposal made by the representative of Australia, seconded by the representatives of the Netherlands and of Spain, that Congressman WALTER should be chairman of this special meeting on refugees.

In point of fact, my delegation is well acquainted with the efforts made by Mr. WALTER not only on behalf of expellees, but also on behalf of all the migrants in order to help them to build up a prosperous existence at the same time to contribute to the development of many countries which need the cooperation offered by these human resources. Thank you.

Mr. FALCHI (Italy) (translation from French). Mr. Chairman, I should like to give my wholehearted support to the proposal just made. The Director has told us of the importance of this meeting; we are most interested in this problem and we hope that the discussions which are about to take place will be successful. I firmly believe that there is no one who is better qualified than Mr. WALTER, by his experience and authority to preside over our work and to strengthen our hopes of achieving concrete results. In consequence, I associate myself wholeheartedly with the pro-

posal which has been made to entrust the chair to Mr. WALTER.

Mr. DALY. I would like to thank the delegates for their remarks. Are there any further remarks? Has any other representative the wish to put forward another candidate for the office of chairman? (No response.) It would appear to be the wish of this meeting that Congressman WALTER be, and he is, unanimously elected to be chairman. [Applause.] I should like to introduce our new chairman, Congressman WALTER.

Mr. WALTER (delegate of the United States). Gentlemen, in the first instance I wish to state that I deeply appreciate the very nice things that have been said about me and may I add, I trust that they will not go unnoticed by my potential political opponents in some forthcoming election campaign back home. In a more serious vein, I assure you that the purpose of this meeting is one that should stir all of us to attempt a solution of a problem that will become increasingly difficult unless solved early.

Up to now ICEM has been successfully dealing with the results of the failure to recognize a problem caused by overpopulation. I am sure that the nations of the world that are participating in an attempt to bring about a solution to that problem recognize the fact that there is another one which must be dealt with as intelligently as this great organization of ICEM dealt with the one presented to it in Brussels in 1951 when the organization was created.

I am sure that all will realize that this is merely, may I say, an exploratory meeting. First, I think it is extremely important that we know exactly what the problem is and the extent of the problem before us. After we realize just exactly what that is, then, of course, whatever steps must be taken can be taken intelligently.

I am sure that all of us are very much in the dark as to just exactly what the size and the nature of the "residual refugees" problem is, and I am sure that this informal meeting, attended by everyone who has exhibited an interest in this matter, will bear fruit. The Chair recognizes the representative of the United States to explain the position of the United States. Mr. O'Connor.

Why Do Reds Have Privileges Denied to Underworld Crooks?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of November 17, 1958:

WHY DO REDS HAVE PRIVILEGES DENIED TO UNDERWORLD CROOKS?

You can hardly pick up your newspaper nowadays without finding new proof of a double standard of ethics that favors Moscow's fifth column. Governor Harriman, of New York, recently had this to say about some hoodums: "These people have got to be forced to talk." His emotions can be approved, but if he had said that about uncommunicative Communists, he would have been denounced from coast to coast as a witch hunter.

During the McClellan Committee's hearings, Counsel Robert F. Kennedy said to the Teamsters' president James Hoffa, "Are you frightened? You're not tough enough to get rid of these people." Chairman JOHN L. MCCLELLAN repeatedly attacked Hoffa during the hearings. Senator IVES told one of Hoffa's underlings, Robert (Barney) Baker, that he was an inveterate liar.

These comments were presumably justified, but suppose similar statements had been made about Communists by members of the House Un-American Activities Committee or the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. How the country would have rung with outcries against the witch hunters. Actually, the Communist-investigating committees are notably mild. Nobody shouts epithets at the hapless and helpless Red witnesses. Instead, the Reds often shout epithets at Senators and Representatives. It is they who do the taunting and assailing, backed up by laughing and clapping Communists in the audience. Too often the press has chuckled approvingly.

A number of delegates to the gangland convention at Apalachin, N.Y., a year ago were jailed by State judges because they took the fifth amendment when asked questions by a State investigating commission. The commission promised that if they answered the questions, they would be immune from prosecution in State courts; but the witnesses pointed out that this wouldn't protect them from Federal prosecution.

Nevertheless, one judge pailed some of these men after a 3-minute hearing. Another judge said: "What went on at Apalachin that day I don't know. But the people have a right to know. * * * Organized society has at least as much right as organized crime." True enough, but hasn't society also as much right as organized communism?

The Apalachin delegates refused to become informers. The liberal press says it is monstrous to demand that Communists be informers. The gangland code is wicked for ordinary gangsters, but noble for the Communist gang. A double standard is applied to favor members of the Soviet fifth column. At a time when their masters in Moscow are whetting their knife for the throat of the United States, we give the Communists privileges which we deny to punks and union racketeers. Why?

Richard Cardinal Cushing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address of welcome to Richard Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, by Rev. James F. Cunningham, C.S.P., rector of His Eminence's new Titular Church, on Friday, December 19, when the Cardinal "took possession" of the church, which appeared in The Pilot on December 20.

The address follows:

NEW ENGLAND PAULIST GREETS HIS EMINENCE

Your Eminence, welcome to Santa Susanna's.

On behalf of the American colony here in Rome, the Santa Susanna Guild, the Cistercian nuns who, unseen, are attending this ceremony in their chapel adjoining the High Altar, on behalf of the Paulist Fathers and their parishioners, may I say you are most welcome. If I dare speak for the many friends who have joined you in this visit to the Eternal City, may I say that all of us rejoice to have you accept the title and "take possession" as Titular Cardinal of the Venerable Church of Santa Susanna.

While making history yourself, you are following in historical footsteps. Cardinal Aiello became our first recorded titular in the year 494. His successors were eminent and many—Pope St. Sergius I. Pope Leo III who was crowned Pope in the crypt of this church, Pope Nicholas V, and Pope Paul V—all were your predecessors. To list the long file of cardinal titulars is to review the history of Rome—the power and the glory of names like Barberini, Corsini, Borghese, Valentini through Barnabo and Bonzano. Your name will be joined to them and to the prelates of many nations who have acknowledged Santa Susanna as their church—Portuguese, French, English, Italian—and in 1875 one of your illustrious forebears whose origin speaks for itself bore the name of Patrick Cardinal Moran. Cardinal Bonzano, papal delegate to the United States in 1925, and the late Cardinal Mooney in 1946 rounded out a list of memorable churchmen who as you are doing today "took possession" of Santa Susanna.

I am quite sure that Cardinal Rezzonico, assuming the title of Santa Susanna's in 1776, shook his head many times on hearing of the goings on in the independence seeking America. Undoubtedly he felt it a deplorable waste of good tea when your civic minded predecessors donned war paint and introduced the world to iced tea—out of Boston Harbor. Yet in all of his fears and prayers for the future I doubt very much did he anticipate a day when an American cardinal from Massachusetts would be welcomed to an ancient and venerable church in Rome by another New Englander from the neighboring State of Connecticut. Today an American pastor in Rome for probably the first time in Roman history welcomes an American cardinal to his titular church with great joy. Accepting this title and with the "taking of possession" you become one of the Rome clergy upon whom the Pope relies for assistance and counsel; by accepting this obligation you become an elector of those who follow in the chair of Peter.

I hope we will not embarrass Your Eminence if we liken you for a moment to St. Paul. St. Paul, Roman citizen, had looked forward to Rome for many years. Here was the infant church, here was Peter and through those long journeys through the Mediterranean area he longed for the day when he might join the church in the Eternal City. Finally he came to Rome, but as a prisoner bound for Caesar's judgment seat. Long delayed on his voyage, founding the apostolic see of Malta on his way, he arrived one day at the foot of the Via Appia—an old man, a prisoner in chains. But here, for the first time in a magnificent career, there were friends, Christians, enthusiastic Christians to greet him. His eyes glistened like those of an angel as he began the march up to Rome—and then at the Three Taverns, the halfway mark another group, this time of the older people whose zeal to greet him could not match the speed of their younger contemporaries—but here they were waiting to welcome him. St. Paul, an interprid missionary, an evangelist without peer—is welcomed home. And Holy Scripture says that Paul gave thanks to God, took courage and came on to Rome—home.

Today we give thanks that you are here among friends. There are those who came with you many more thousands of miles than did Paul's, but you have some 35 Cistercian nuns who await your visit to their convent. Their prayers are the most powerful I've ever known—they are your hidden arsenal of strength day and night before the Blessed Sacrament praying for you. Here in

the church—Romans all—are the parishioners of Santa Susanna's—the Santa Susanna Guild. Why do I mention these ladies? Is it because Pope Pius the XII a few months ago granted them a private audience and commended them on their apostolic spirit? Yes—because he particularly mentioned their devotion to the Church of Santa Susanna. As Your Eminence looks at the walls of the sanctuary and the paintings of our 400-year-old roof—this new—so the nave of the church, so too the chapel of St. Lawrence where you knelt in prayer on your way to the sanctuary. The ladies have provided the funds which have made these repairs possible—the crypt where Santa Susanna, her father Gibinius, and St. Felicitus lie buried—newly restored, a new furnace which at the moment is giving some heat—a rare thing in a Roman church. A courtyard restored and, lastly, a 400-year-old roof this year repaired and renewed. The ladies of the Santa Susanna Guild and their husbands form a working crew of 60 that many a church in the United States could envy. The Paulist Fathers, already so much in your debt, are always at your service. One of your friends is not present, but I am sure looking down from heaven completely satisfied and happy at the honor accorded you is Father Gillis. I know of no other single factor which could give him more happiness than that the Paulist Fathers were able to welcome his outstanding friend and exemplary prelate—Your Eminence.

The late Cardinal Stritch, upon his return to America some years ago, told of a young priest at his side as the ship came into New York Harbor. The young man had been many years abroad and suddenly as he looked up at the Statue of Lady Liberty he realized he was home. There was silence and the Cardinal realized the young man wept. "She may have her faults, Your Eminence," he said, "but she is the best there is." Today, welcoming you as our titular cardinal, we see no faults—but we are most happy and highly honored that His Holiness has bestowed upon us a titular like yourself, a citizen of no mean city, a prelate of no mean stature, a man of God—the best there is.

A Deserved Commendation of the FBI and Its Director, Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Sunday, January 4, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Bureau of Investigation's assistance to local police in probing the recent wave of synagogue and school bombings is "reducing the threat of continued bigot-inspired violence," B'nai B'rith, the Jewish service organization, said today.

A statement by Philip M. Klutznick, of Park Forest, Ill., president of the 400,000-member organization, cited the FBI and its director, J. Edgar Hoover, for their deep concern with the bombings and threats of bombings. "Through the availability of the FBI's cooperative services, State and local law enforcement agencies have received strong support in meeting their responsibilities," it said.

Reference to the Federal law enforcement agency was embodied in Mr. Klutznick's yearend report to B'nai B'rith's board of governors.

The statement commended Mr. Hoover's initiative in having the FBI sponsor a series of law enforcement conferences to explain to police officials how to meet these assaults upon our free way of life.

Declaring that problems of enforcing the rule of law are a continuing issue of transcendent importance to the welfare of the Nation, Mr. Klutznick said that "the investigative efforts, training assistance and scientific services of the FBI have been a tremendous value in improving the efficiency and performance of law enforcement agencies in all parts of the country."

"They have had the salutary effect of strengthening law enforcement and reducing the threat of continued bigot-inspired violence that in recent months had intruded on good community relations in several parts of the Nation," the B'nai B'rith president said.

In recognizing the FBI's resolute measures to safeguard the rights and privileges of all people, Mr. Klutznick said that B'nai B'rith and others in the Jewish community have cause to appreciate that in troubled times such as these the Nation possesses an effective public servant in Mr. Hoover and the agency he heads, the FBI.

The full statement from Mr. Klutznick's report follows:

Since its founding 115 years ago, and as a natural parallel to its concern for the freedoms and the cultural and spiritual advancement of its members and their coreligionists, B'nai B'rith has been actively dedicated to the welfare of the general American community.

One continuing issue of transcendent importance to the common welfare that has been dominant these past 12 months is that of law enforcement—the challenge of domestic and foreign forces to the American concept of the rule of law as distinguished from the arbitrary rule of man.

In the strengthening of our democratic processes nothing is more important than to support unreservedly the forces of law and order. Our way of life depends on justice which must rest on an adequate appreciation of law and the orderly process of enforcing law within the meaning of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

In this connection, we have reviewed with interest the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation as set forth in the report of its distinguished director, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, to Attorney General William P. Rogers. It presents in detail the accomplishments and resolute measures of the FBI to safeguard the rights and privileges of all people.

Over the years B'nai B'rith has carefully followed the work of this Federal law enforcement agency. Invariably, in our contacts with it, we have noted the steadfastness of Mr. Hoover and his associates to protect the liberties of all individuals, without distinctions of race or creed. Nothing can be more representative of the institutions of democratic government at work.

Of particular interest to B'nai B'rith is the deep concern of the FBI with the recent wave of bombings and threats of bombings involving religious and educational institutions. Mr. Hoover, typical of the skillful leadership he has brought to the law enforcement profession, took the initiative in having the FBI sponsor a series of law enforcement conferences to explain to police officials throughout the Nation how to meet these assaults upon our free way of life.

Through the availability of the FBI's cooperative services, State and local law enforcement agencies have received strong support in meeting their responsibilities. The investigative efforts, training assistance, and scientific services of the FBI have been a tremendous value in improving the efficiency and performance of law enforcement agencies in all parts of the country. These activities helped to promote the traditions of democratic justice by protecting the innocent while safeguarding the interest of the citizenry against the criminal and subversive.

In an area of special concern to B'nai B'rith, they have had the salutary effect of strengthening law enforcement and reducing the threat of continued bigot-inspired violence that in recent months had intruded on good community relations in several parts of the Nation.

B'nai B'rith and others in the Jewish community therefore have cause to appreciate that in troubled times such as these the Nation possesses an effective public servant in Mr. Hoover, and the agency he heads, the FBI. Their proven record is a guarantee that those civil liberties which have made our Nation great will continue to command respect and observance in the years to come.

H.R. 209 and H.R. 210

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the column by Ed Wimmer in the Cincinnati Inquirer of January 5, 1959. Mr. Wimmer is vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, which has the largest individual membership of any business organization in the United States. His column is one of the widest read columns in this area of interest in the United States. I am happy to inform my colleagues that H.R. 12879 and H.R. 12878, which I introduced in the 85th Congress have been reintroduced in the 86th Congress as H.R. 209 and H.R. 210, and have been reported to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Tremendous interest in this proposed Housing legislation is being shown all over the country and I trust that the Banking and Currency Committee will schedule early hearings on the bills. Mr. Wimmer's column follows:

CONGRESS GIVEN BILLS TO HALT RESIDENTIAL BLIGHT

(Ed Wimmer)

A result of studies made by the Shinner Foundation, Chicago, were two bills introduced in the last Congress, that could send this Nation well on the road to solving the national housing problem, and at the same time start a sizable boom.

One of the bills, H.R. 12879, calls for establishment of a Housing Conservation and Rehabilitation Finance Agency to provide loan funds for conservation and rehabilitation of existing housing, while H.R. 12878 seeks to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow the taxpayer to treat expenditures for

modernization or improvement of residential property (paid by him or incurred during the taxable year) as expenses which are not chargeable to capital account.

In making his case for such legislation, Congressman O'HARA used statistics compiled by the foundation which showed hundreds of thousands of neglected housing units in the United States that are passing annually from acceptable classes into undesirable categories. Mr. O'HARA said:

"Housing is America's number one investment—over $500 billion—which is three times the investment in agriculture; more than five times the value of all life insurance companies, and literally dwarfs our huge industrial empires.

"We have poured fantastic sums into slum clearance projects these past 6 years, for example, and if the same pace was maintained, it would take us 160 years to lick the problem as it now exists. In fact, the slum problem will never be licked if we continue to pour our dollars into cures and our dimes into prevention.

"What we've got to do, is to put our emphasis on conservation and rehabilitation to bring our total housing effort into balance by arresting the further expansion of slums and blight, and this can be done only by maintenance and restoration of what is still sound. Our approach to this problem is to make it worthwhile and possible for private owners to do the bulk of the job, which is the way it should be done under our American system.

"It is time we abandon the overly optimistic view of some public housing officials that this Government can and should tear down and replace every rundown housing structure."

According to Mr. O'HARA, H.R. 12879 would provide the Conservation Agency with capital subscribed by the Federal treasury. The Agency's power would be to make loans for conservation and rehabilitation; issue debentures against or guarantee and sell outright, mortgages obtained from original capital which thereby would renew available loan funds." It would also have the power to insure private loans for the purposes mentioned.

Countless owners of residential properties in the areas hit by residential property deterioration, are unable to obtain funds to halt the blight of their buildings. They are enmeshed in antiquated ordinances. Many rental property owners say: "Why should I restore my properties to decent standards if the community stays below standard?" Then there are those who profit most on the worst kind of slum conditions.

If city ordinances are brought up to date and enforced, and if repair and modernization costs could (at least in part) be deducted from tax returns, a new wave of private enterprise spending would snowball over the Nation, and as the Shinner Foundation says:

"For every tax forgiveness of $250 million out of a $1 billion investment in modernization and conservation, there would be created no fewer than 80,000 man-years of work, and a demand for at least $500 million in materials."

The Foundation also noted that tax returns from all this activity would be greater that the suggested allowable deductions, saying nothing of the enormous social gains.

Consider that 18 million people now live in slum or semislum areas (much of which is created by the people themselves), but if these conditions are allowed to spread, more millions will be driven into already overcrowded areas and into the suburbs—creating new blight to further weaken the fabric of American family life.

Such a program as suggested in the O'Hara bills would save hundreds of thousands of small businesses involved in the supply of materials, and greatly strengthen private capitalism by putting private initiative to work on the widest possible front.

Annual Convention Banquet of Veterans of World War I, Springfield, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herein my remarks made to the annual convention banquet of the Veterans of World War I, which was held at the Hotel Leland in Springfield, Ill., on Tuesday, September 16, 1958, as follows:

It is a happy choice that our first national convention, under a Federal charter, is taking place in Springfield, Ill.

As a native of Massachusetts, I am proud of the fact that many of the early settlers who built their own homes on this new land near the "River of Men," came from such places as Salem and Springfield in Massachusetts.

On this, my first visit to the capital city of Illinois, I am aware of this historical process at work. Those of us who traveled here from New England, are impressed by the beauty and charm of Springfield, but, even more, we sense the invisible presence of the man whose immortal spirit brought unity to our Nation.

It was many, many years ago that Abraham Lincoln rose to greatness, during a critical period in our history. It was almost midway between the Revolutionary War and the cold war of 1958.

And then, before his work was done, he came home to his last resting place in the midwest. His remains are embraced by the good earth of Oak Grove Cemetery, the national shrine at Springfield, Ill.

He understood the agony that divided our Nation through four years of civil strife. Each furrow in his brow, each deepening line on that tragic face, bore witness to the pain and sacrifice that he suffered to bring freedom through that first and most awesome test of its young manhood:

Lincoln had compassion for the men in blue and the men in gray.

If death had not stilled his generous heart, just as it closed the life of another President in our own day, and in each case just before the final victory, I am sure that he would have made plans to provide for the Civil War Veterans during the sunset years of their earthly journey.

It was in the final paragraph of his second inaugural address that Lincoln said: "Let us strive * * * to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan."

A little known fact to Americans of today, is the time and study and lengthy debate given to the question of providing compensation and pensions for war veterans from the 1st Congress up to the 85th which adjourned in August of the present year.

As far as we who gather at this convention are concerned, that debate goes on.

In the 86th Congress, which convenes in January of 1959, we shall work toward our objective, which is the enactment of a $100 pension per month for all honorably discharged veterans of World War I who are over 62 years of age.

And providing that the pension to which a person is entitled under this proposed legislation shall be in addition to any compensation to which such person may be entitled for service-connected disability.

As change is the law of life, the policies of the Federal Government toward the veterans who have served it so well in the various wars, have been shaped by many experiments and many experiences.

From disability compensation to a pure pension is a rough and twisting road where many Congresses have lost their way as they tried to find the right program for the aging veterans.

Public attitudes toward veterans as a whole, have gone through quite a transformation since the end of the Revolutionary War.

The first national pension law was passed by the Continental Congress on August 26, 1776. Every officer, soldier, or sailor losing a limb in any engagement or being so disabled in the service of the United States as to render him incapable of earning his livelihood, was promised half pay for life, or during disability.

The Revolutionary Service Pension Law of 1818, introduced a new principle into this field of legislation. Before this time, disability was the firm requirement for the payment of any pension. With the new law, mere service in the Armed Forces, together with poverty, became the basis for entitlement.

Congress adopted a pure service pension schedule for the Revolutionary War survivors, on June 7, 1832. This Act granted full pay for life to veterans who had served a minimum of 2 years.

The Mexican War Pension Act of 1887, granted a pension, if the veteran was suffering from disabilities to a pensionable degree. Veterans 62 years of age or older were entitled to a pension, regardless of any disability.

The trend was plain to see. Congress was becoming more liberal with the experience of each successive war.

In the debate on the Mexican War pension act, Senator Hoar of Massachusetts, pleaded for uniformity, for consistency of action on the part of Congress. He explained that if the Government were bound, as a matter of principle, to pension soldiers or sailors who do not need the pension, and who are under no disability, then it is a universal principle, and as such, the veterans of all wars are entitled to the pension. Enactment of the bill, said the Senator, would very shortly compel the Congress to take the next step—a pure service pension for the Civil War veterans.

The Mexican War pension act was debated for 3 years.

But the arguments in favor of it finally overwhelmed the opposition, and Congress passed the bill in January 1887.

The Dependent Pension Act of 1890 was a service-pension law. Pensioners, however, were required to demonstrate their inability to perform manual labor as a means of supporting themselves.

This law spawned many abuses, and gave rise to much dissatisfaction.

Widespread agitation led to the act of May 11, 1912, setting up a formula whereby the Civil War veteran must have served at least 90 days in that conflict, and that he must be 62 years of age or older. The amounts provided for on a graduated scale according to length of service, have been increased from time to time since 1912.

The act of June 5, 1920, was entitled "An act to pension soldiers and sailors of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition."

It provided that any such person who has reached the age of 62 years, shall, upon making proof of such fact, be placed upon the pension roll.

As for pure service pensions, the Spanish American War still remains our most re-

cent conflict for which pensions have been authorized by the Congress.

Obviously, the veterans of World War I are next in order.

When Congress passed a bill to provide adjusted compensation for the veterans of 1917–18 it was vetoed by President Harding on September 19, 1922. In the message explaining his action, the President was looking to the future when he said that it is inevitable as the years pass that pension provision for World War veterans will be made, as it has been made for those who served in previous wars.

That prophecy was made 36 years ago.

When we average out the length of time that the veterans of the five wars in American history, up to and including the Spanish-American War, had to wait before service pensions were authorized, we find that it takes nearly 43 years.

We, of World War I with 40 years behind us are close to the time of our entitlement.

When we consider that our good friends, the Spanish-American War veterans, only had to wait 22 years for their pensions, it would appear that favorable action on our claim cannot be delayed much longer.

In the last session of the Congress, when my bill to provide a Federal charter for our organization was being debated, there were a few who opposed the bill. They insisted that our group was organized for the sole purpose of "lobbying through Congress a general penssion bill that would provide $100 monthly to all World War I veterans regardless of need or length of service."

We have never concealed the fact that this is one of our objectives.

There is nothing sudden or revolutionary in such a proposal 40 years after World War I and following a precedent that was established long ago.

We believe that the veteran who is 62 years of age or older is entitled to a pension of $100 per month upon proof of age and honorable service.

We are certain that this is the simplest and fairest method by which the Nation's obligation to the aging veterans of World War I will be honored.

In the school of practical experience we have learned that few people in positions of leadership and influence showed any interest in pensions for the veterans of World War I, until our organization was founded. Its astounding growth within the past few years has opened the eyes of our legislators, and is reminding a grateful but sometimes absent-minded Nation that the pension issue is approaching decision day.

As we have found unity, and strength, and inspiring comradeship through our membership in the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., we have come to realize that only by such mobilization of our forces, directed toward the goal of a pension for all veterans of that conflict, can we win to our side, the public support that is necessary to achieve victory in this campaign.

But this is not the single and exclusive purpose of our organization.

If that were so, our reason for being, and our rediscovered community of interest would melt away as soon as the pension battle is won.

We have other objectives, as well.

For the veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. have a mission to uphold the Constitution of the United States, and the individual States of the Union, and to foster the spirit and practice of true Americanism.

We must fight unceasingly for our national security in order to protect Americans from enemies within our borders, as well as those from without, to the end that our American way of life be preserved.

We are the senior veterans of our country, inheriting the responsibilities of those who preceded us.

As guardians of the home front we must be alert and positive concerning the needs of our country today in its struggle with a foe who employs unseen weapons to confuse us, and hypnotize us, weapons that are difficult to counteract if they should dull the minds and the will of the United States and its people.

The veterans of World War I fought on the field of battle, where we came to grips with the enemy, and finally defeated him after much pain and sacrifice.

Since the end of World War I, new aggressors have come to power, threatening the peace of the world. They are much more cunning in their methods. And much more dangerous.

First there was fascism, and now communism.

The evil that was hatched in Moscow and that spread over a number of independent nations before the free world took steps to contain it, wages war constantly, even while it is shaking your hand.

In the First World War, aggressors depended almost entirely upon military power. Espionage was in its infancy, largely limited to a few individual agents.

Psychology was a new word that only professors understood.

The man who was able to support a telephone in his home and an automobile in the one-stall garage that was located in the backyard was looked up to as a person of distinction.

The airplane was a fragile, one-man flying machine of doubtful speed and range.

As for radio and television, they were just dreams.

In the past 40 years, as these techniques and inventions became commonplace facts, the free nations developed them for peacetime use, and as aids to a more abundant life for their people.

The dictatorships, however, applied this knowledge to serve the aggressive purposes of the all-powerful state.

Communism, because of its long experience in conspiracy, saw the possibilities of using this new knowledge to extend its control over the minds and lives of mankind.

And so the Communists developed the cunning weapons of indirect aggression; infiltration, subversion, propaganda, and brainwashing.

While fomenting trouble in Korea and Indochina, and diverting some of our strength and attention to those areas, they were making their plans to provoke unrest elsewhere.

They are aiding and abetting Nasser in his ambition to become lord and master of the Arab world and to become a tool of the Communists, although he does not seem to realize this danger as yet. You may be sure, at this very moment, while our attention is focused on the problems of one area, the Communists are sowing the seeds of confusion and turmoil in some other area. All for the purpose of bewildering the free world, causing it to react impulsively with too little and too late, keeping us always on the defensive with jabs that are intended to wear us down.

The Communists know how deep is the yearning for peace, and so they start a so-called peace offensive, calculating that many sincere people will be taken in by the mere repetition of the word "peace." In the process, the Communists make headway on their real, though hidden, purpose. They seek in this manner, to weaken the will of the free nations, to beguile them into a reduction of expenditures for defense by appealing to individual selfishness, and to spread the fatal belief that it is somehow possible to coexist with them. Even though the record proves that this tyranny will betray anything and everything to reach its goal of world conquest.

They know that people forget.

Less than 2 years ago, they sent their armed forces into Hungary to crush the brave people who had overthrown the Red government that had been imposed upon them. Only a few months ago, they announced the execution of those who led the freedom fighters, whom they had seized in violation of a safe-conduct pledge.

This summer, they self-righteously protested the arrival of American troops in Lebanon, and British troops in Jordan, in spite of the fact that these military units were invited by the duly constituted governments of those small nations, to protect them from indirect aggression.

On the face of it, the Russian demands for the immediate withdrawal of the allied forces was a flagrant example of Red hypocrisy.

How could they protest our peaceful and temporary intervention, in the light of their bloody invasion of Hungary that wiped out its newly won independence and while their troops still occupy that unhappy land in defiance of the United Nations?

Their brazen contempt for reason, and justice, and world opinion is based on their assurance that people forget.

Unfortunately many do forget.

The Communists know that if they press their initiative and keep repeating such attractive words as "peoples' republic," "democracy," and "peace" over and over again, the ignorant and the innocent alike will be deceived by slogans into believing that: "Well, maybe we can do business with them after all."

That is exactly the response that the Communists want.

The intended victims do not realize that anyone who trusts the Communists and let's down his guard is halfway into the trap with its bait to lure the unwary and its barked wire that prevents their escape.

Never forget that it took only a handful of Bolshevik conspirators, who knew what they wanted, to secure control of Russia, when the long-suffering Russian people, further drained by military defeats, forced the abdication of Czar Nicholas.

The majority of Russians with moderate views could not get together on an effective program.

While they argued among themselves as to what they should do, the ruthless minority of Bolsheviks confused and tricked the debaters, while the Red strong-arm squads took over the war ministry, the police stations, and the communication centers.

That was in 1917.

Since then, they have built up a system of tight control over the Russian people. Mixing propaganda and terror, they have channeled and driven the energies of the Russian people in a tremendous effort to build up heavy industry, and military power.

Not content with that, they have reached out and have absorbed into their empire, a number of neighboring nations.

Operating from Moscow, communism has agents and dupes trying to subvert many other nations around the globe.

With fanatical zeal, communism has developed from a small band of conspirators in 1917, until now it is a present danger to every free nation in the world.

Back in that same year, 1917, the United States became a world power.

Since the beginning of our nation we had lived a protected existence, with two wide oceans that separated us from the problems in the rest of the world, while we concentrated on our internal growth and progress.

It was the maturing power and idealism of the United States that won victory for the Allies in World War I.

From that point on, even though we did not realize it, the burden and the responsibility of leading the free world was on our shoulders because there was no other nation

with the faith backed by the material resources, to do the job.

Many of our people, including some in high places, closed their eyes to this fact.

The pacifism of the twenties, the neutrality of the thirties—these were the symptoms of our retreat from international realities.

That is why we were unprepared, both in our thinking and in our ability to defend ourselves on December 7, 1941.

Then we had time to recover from the blow.

Now, we have none, because intercontinental missiles with hydrogen warheads will soon be able to leap across the oceans that had isolated us from direct attack in the past.

There is no turning back to the un-complicated days of our nation's adolescence.

Communist Russia is determined to forge ahead in every field, and there is disturbing evidence that the Reds have gained the lead in two critical areas: in the number of engineers, technicians, and scientists that they graduate each year; and in their development of the powerful rockets that will be the key to military supremacy, and to the control of outer space.

If our national reaction to this is a business-as-usual attitude, instead of vigilance, look-ahead policies, and extra effort, we shall find ourselves on the road to inevitable defeat.

We have some responsible leaders of government who are aware of this danger. There are competent officers in the Pentagon; and the scientists who are working on our rocket and space exploration programs are among the world's best.

All this, however, is not enough.

I am thinking of Abraham Lincoln, who would walk miles to get a book and study it by the uncertain light of the fireplace in his log cabin, to prepare himself for the time when the nation needed him.

I am thinking of the American initiative that opened up the West; that ventured into the unseen and the unknown because it was not afraid to advance beyond comfort and security in order to dare and do.

In this wonderful land of ours, with all the blessings we enjoy, there are too many people in 1958 who want to play it safe and to avoid the hard thinking and the resolute actions without which there is no leadership.

The vision, courage, and effort of the people, as it was in Lincoln's time, is required to animate our Nation.

How can our Federal Government make up its mind and go forward toward the solution of international problems, and to discover the new worlds of outer space in freedom's name, unless it hears from us?

As the Declaration of Independence states: "Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

This does not simply mean the form and organization of government; the laws which define and limit its authority; and the routine services it performs for us.

Far more important is the confident mandate that it must receive from the people to embark on those programs that are imperative if freedom is not to mark time, and fall behind the dynamic drive of communism.

That clear call for constructive action, welling up from the people of the United States sounds but faintly in Washington today.

It must speak up and it must be heard.

Demanding that we strengthen our allies and strengthen the United Nations, but, let's fact it, in the uncertain world of today, the fate of freedom depends on the leadership, or lack of leadership, of the United States and its people.

On January 23 the Preparedness Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate issued a unanimous report stating that the Soviet Union is ahead of us in missiles and in submarines. Experts testified that our competitors are producing scientists and technicians at a rate substantially greater than our own.

On August 28, American educators pointed out that Russian is putting 10 to 15 percent of its total income into educational channels, while Americans are spending only 3 to 5 percent on education.

Unless we get going, the Reds will not only catch up with us; they will overpower us.

If such should come to pass, it will do no good to think that we are far ahead of the Russians in the number of automobiles, ranchhouses, bank accounts, and insurance policies. These, together with our schools and universities, our churches and our free press, our labor unions, and our industries, would be seized, controlled, and used by the dictatorship that is communism. Such voluntary groups as the World War I Veterans of the United States of America would not be tolerated.

Our organization has the rare opportunity, because it is new, to dedicate itself to the task of rousing our Nation from its complacency.

I take the liberty of suggesting that our organization, by the united effort of our barracks that network the Nation shall organize and energize a drive to alert America.

We must have the most modern defense system; one that is constantly improving its efficiency under the realistic leadership of such men as the late Gen. Billy Mitchell, General Gavin, who recently resigned from the Army that he loved, so that he could tell the truth to the American people and Admiral Rickover, who overcame many service obstacles to develop a nuclear-powered submarine fleet.

To achieve this, and the economic system to sustain it, we must give top priority to education. For everything depends on applied knowledge; putting freedom to work, and putting science to work. We need to give more of our resources, more of our encouragement, and more of our honors to education. The old idea that education is completed by the award of a high school diploma, or a college degree, is one of the most dangerous of illusions. To keep ahead of the Russians it will be necessary for Americans, grownups as well as youngsters, to keep on learning, under an expanded educational system that will discover new ways and methods to bring forth the best in all.

Our Nation must also do a better job in reaching the peoples of this world with the truth concerning our principles and our policies. Within the United States, we have succeeded in developing the art of communication to a degree that is mutually beneficial to our people, to the economy, and to the free exchange of ideas. For some strange reason, we have not been able to communicate as effectively with our neighbors in other countries.

There is a powerful ferment at work throughout this world, as desperately poor and backward people are waking up and are reaching for the better life that should and can be theirs.

So far it is a peaceful revolution that the United States, above all nations should understand and assist.

If we fail them in their hour of need, they will have no other choice but to follow the siren call of communism.

Our Nation cannot rest upon its past.

It cannot close its eyes to new horizons if it is to be true to itself and to the submerged peoples who look to the United States for leadership.

We have the means but lack the firm and steady purpose.

This is the very heart of the problem.

We need the spirit of Paul Reve and the response of the Minutemen at Concord and Lexington. We need the humanity and courage of Abraham Lincoln. We need to measure up to the searchers in the wagon trains, the dauntless homesteaders who crossed the Mississippi to open up the unknown West.

Reviving, bringing to life within ourselves, the ability to make forward decisions.

For the rest of the world will not wait.

We have the last chance to create the most productive educational system in the world.

We have a short time left to find the serious purpose, and to start the bold actions that will lead the hunger of mankind toward the discovery of freedom and progress.

I sound the warning not to panic, but to wake up.

And I say to you, my comrades of World War I, that this is our opportunity and responsibility.

For here, in this hall, we feel close to the Great Emancipator.

With the wisdom of eternity, He is calling upon us to give the greatest service to humanity at a fateful hour in the life of man.

Out of this wealth of mind and soul, rising up from our membership, we must develop the program and the dedicated purpose that will inspire America to pioneer again.

Negroes: Big Advances in Jobs, Wealth, Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the November 28 issue of "U.S. News & World Report" entitled "Negroes: Big Advances in Jobs, Wealth, Status." This article points out how the segregation problem has overshadowed the tremendous strides the Negroes have made in both the social and economic fields and the even bigger gains which are expected in the years to come.

The article follows:

NEGROES: BIG ADVANCES IN JOBS, WEALTH, STATUS

In spite of all the furor about segregation—records show that Negroes have made tremendous progress in recent years. New and better jobs are opening to them. Economically, Negroes are gaining on the whites.

A Negro, Marian Anderson, recently was sworn in as a U.S. delegate to the United Nations. Ralph Bunche, a Negro, is an Under Secretary of the U.N. The U.S. Minister to Rumania, Clifton R. Wharton, is a Negro.

In the 1958 world series, one of the stars was a Negro, Elston Howard of the New York Yankees. Althea Gibson, a Negro, is the world's tennis champion among women.

In Washington, J. Ernest Wilkins, a Negro, was, until recently, Assistant Secretary of Labor. One out of four Government jobs in the Nation's capital is filled by a Negro. One-sixth of these Negroes hold supervisory posts.

In Detroit, Negroes are moving into sales jobs behind the counters of that city's biggest, most fashionable department store. In Maryland, an aviation company has begun to hire Negro engineers. Atlanta, for the first time, recently elected a Negro to its school board. A few weeks ago, a Negro

was nominated to be a municipal judge in Newark, N.J.

BIG ECONOMIC PROGRESS

A furor over integration of the races in schools of the South has created a widespread impression that the U.S. Negro is not sharing in the Nation's well-being. Yet quietly, almost unnoticed, America's nearly 19 million Negroes are making economic gains that would be hard to match anywhere in the world.

Says Dr. Joseph H. Douglass, a Negro sociologist who holds down a top job in the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare:

"In the last 18 years, the Negro has come further than he did in three quarters of a century after the Civil War."

In 1940, just before the U.S. became involved in World War II, the census showed four out of five Negroes lived in the South. One in three lived on a Southern farm. Negro income, per capita, was only 30 percent that of whites.

Then came the defense boom. A manpower shortage opened up jobs to Negroes as never before.

Now population reports show that only two out of three Negroes live in the South. Only one out of eight lives on a farm.

Studies by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reveal this: Since 1940, the median wage of U.S. whites has gone up about three and one half times—but the median wage of Negroes has gone up five times. Negro income, on an average per capita, has moved up to 55 percent of that of whites.

Many Negroes who have gone North have entered industry. They have moved into skilled trades, white collar job and—at times—into the professions.

Before World War II, only one Negro in 10 held a so-called good job in the crafts or professions. Now the figure is one in five.

RISE OF NEW CLASS

In that process of change, sociologists say, a sizable middle class is developing among Negroes. About 40 percent of U.S. Negro families own or are buying their homes. You find Negro neighborhoods that duplicate those of whites—down to split-level dwellings with late-model cars parked in the driveways. Luxury neighborhoods for Negroes feature landscaped homes costing anywhere from $30,000 to $100,000.

A study conducted by the Birmingham News and the Birmingham Post-Herald gives detailed information concerning the economic status of Negroes in the Alabama city. It shows this:

About 20 percent of all Negro families in Birmingham now are earning $4,000 or more annually. Fifty percent own, or are buying, their own homes. Forty-one percent own automobiles, 96 percent own mechanical refrigerators, 76.2 percent own washing machines, and 80 percent own television sets.

SOME COMPARISONS

Today, America's Negroes own more automobiles than are found in all of Soviet Russia with its 200 million people. Negro enrollment in colleges exceeds the total college enrollment of West Germany. Negro purchasing power in the United States is said to be bigger than that of Canada's 16 million people.

Negroes are getting more and better paying jobs in industry and construction as labor unions lower their racial bars. Since 1940, Negro membership in unions has gone up three times and now comes to more than 2 million. Even in the South, a majority of union locals are biracial. A substantial number have at least one Negro officer.

At one time, many unions barred Negroes from membership. And it is still true that Negroes, in practice, are restricted to inferior jobs by some unions. Barriers still exist in railroad jobs, except for porters. On New York's waterfront, few if any Negro longshoremen draw favored assignments.

Even so, the overall picture is changing rapidly. Only a few unions still maintain bans against Negro membership. There are many instances of management opening up promotion lists to Negro candidates.

Today, according to the U.S. Department of Labor, there are three times as many Negro foremen and craftsmen as in 1940. In some places, such as the automobile plants in Detroit, Negroes are found supervising white workers.

The number of Negroes in white collar jobs has gone up even more—eight times since 1940. One reason for this growth is set forth by the director of a Los Angeles employment office. He says:

"A few years ago it was almost impossible to place a Negro girl as a secretary. Now it's getting harder to find really good secretaries, so employers are beginning to ask us for anyone who can do the job well—regardless of color."

Airlines have started hiring Negro girls as stewardesses. The Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago not long ago began hiring Negroes as bank clerks. In big cities everywhere, Negroes are getting jobs as sales clerks, food demonstrators, typists, receptionists, telephone operators and in similar white-collar positions.

ROLE IN GOVERNMENT

The Department of Labor says that three times as many Negroes now hold jobs in Federal, State, and local governments as was the case in 1940. Recently Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell said that more than 300 Negroes have been appointed to responsible posts in the executive branch of the U.S. Government since 1952.

From the Department of Defense, you get this picture: About 250,000 Negroes are serving in the armed forces. Of these, an estimated 5,000 are commissioned or warrant officers. The Air Force has a Negro brigadier general. Two Negroes hold the rank of colonel in the Army. Two, in the Navy, are commanders. Eight Negro cadets are enrolled at West Point, and 11 Negro midshipmen at the Naval Academy.

In the political field, four Negroes are Members of Congress and there are Negro lawmakers in at least 15 State legislatures. A Negro justice sits on the New York State Supreme Court. An estimated 15 Southern cities have Negroes on their city councils.

Over the past 18 years, the number of Negro professional and technical workers has doubled. Today, in any big city, you find Negro doctors and lawyers—and, often, Negro chemists, engineers, architects and newspapermen.

Dr. Percy Julian, a Negro, helped develop methods for synthetic production of drugs and then set up his own laboratory in Chicago. Thurgood Marshall, counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, is ranked among the Nation's top lawyers. Dr. Peter Marshall Murray recently served as president of the New York County Medical Society. A Negro newsman, Carl Rowan, won the Pulitzer prize for reporting. Paul R. Williams of Los Angeles is an internationally known architect.

ATHLETES AND ARTISTS

Sports and entertainment are opening up new avenues of wealth to Negroes. Major-league baseball was desegregated just after World War II. Now 15 out of 16 clubs have Negroes on their rosters. Negroes also appear on the rosters of most professional football and basketball teams.

The world of boxing is dominated by Ray Robinson, Archie Moore, and Floyd Patterson. Louis Armstrong, Harry Belafonte, and many other Negroes pack theaters wherever they appear. Negro singers now are appearing on the stage of the Metropolitan Opera.

Much of the Negro's growing income is finding its way into Negro-owned business and finance. At present, there are 14 successful Negro-owned banks in the United States, with combined assets of $40 million. One such bank, in Atlanta, is a member of the Federal Reserve System. Negroes own 62 life insurance companies with more than 1 billion dollars' worth of policies in force. They also own 150 newspapers, including a daily in Atlanta, and 3 radio stations.

Such firms still do 90 percent of their business with Negroes. But some are building up white clienteles, too. Out in Los Angeles, for instance, a Negro has developed the largest paint-preservative business on the west coast

AHEAD: BIGGER GAINS

Economists foresee even bigger gains for Negroes in the years ahead. They point to Labor Department records showing that about 200,000 Negroes now are attending college or professional schools—a three-fold increase since 1940. The number studying engineering and architecture has multiplied 10 times.

Dr. Lewis K. Downing, dean of the school of engineering and architecture at Howard University, a predominantly Negro institution, says:

"There are probably 2,000 Negroes studying these subjects now in American colleges and universities. It's a new source of supply for employers—and they're exploiting it. Despite the recession last spring, about 40 industries sent men to interview our 1958 graduates."

With all their gains in recent years, U.S. Negroes still lag behind whites in earning power. Negroes continue to account for a heavy share of the Nation's unskilled labor, unemployment and relief rolls. In times of recession, the complaint is still heard that Negroes are "last to be hired, first to be fired."

Even so, America's nearly 19 million Negroes are moving up the economic ladder. And they are moving up at a pace far beyond anything foreseen a few years ago.

A Bill That Offers an Effective Way To Make This a Nation of Better Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of Congress I introduced a bill—H.R. 196—which, if enacted, would grant to an American taxpayer an income tax deduction of up to $2,000 on money he spends during a calendar year to repair or modernize his owner-occupied home.

Under my bill the first 3 percent of income spent for such home repair and modernization cannot be claimed as a deduction. Everything expended on such work above this 3 percent, up to $2,000 in any one year, is deductible.

The citizen with a $5,000 gross income would obtain no deduction on the first $150 spent on such work. The person with a $10,000 gross income would obtain no deduction until after he had spent $300. The amount spent above the $150 or $300, as the case might be, would be deductible but not more than

$2,000 by any one taxpayer in any one year.

This deduction is similar to that now allowed taxpayers on medical and hospital bills.

The obvious purpose of this proposed legislation is to speed up and increase home repairing and home modernization by homeowners. There are 6 million dwellings in the Nation that are rundown, dilapidated, and in desperate need of repair and modernization. The allowing homeowners tax credits for funds spent in improving their dwellings should encourage an enormous amount of home improvement and thereby make the Nation better housed.

How much would such a program of tax credits for home repair and modernization, as my bill proposes, cost in lost tax revenues. My reply is very little or perhaps nothing at all.

The tax credits granted, of course, will decrease the inco[illegible] taxes paid by the home owner. However, this loss in revenue quickly would be offset by creating many sources of additional income tax revenue.

First. The repair and modernization program this legislation would generate would provide tens of thouands of additional jobs for building tradesmen of all kinds—carpenters, plumbers, electricians, painters, brick masons and others—and these, because of their increased earnings, will pay more taxes.

Second. Businessmen and corporations which deal in building materials of all kinds at the manufacturing, wholesale or retail level, all, will enjoy larger sales and profits. They as a result of this program will pay more income taxes into the treasury, in the case of corporations, as much as 52 percent of their increased profits.

Third. The increased employment a great home repair and modernization program will create will lessen the drain on unemployment reserves.

Fourth. Improved homes also mean increased real estate values and automatically more tax revenues at the local level for States, counties, cities, and schools.

Fifth. The increased sales and profits and the increased employment and wages generated by such a program for the building industry and its employees will raise the general level of prosperity for all businesses which also then will pay more taxes into the treasury.

The increased revenues created by such a program from all five of these sources will in large part or entirely overcome any loss of income tax revenues the Government would experience from this tax exemption.

Most of all the program would provide millions of Americans within a very few years with better, more beautiful, and more healthy homes. This intangible benefit may be far greater and more lasting even than the financial one.

I urge that home building contractors, members of the building trades unions, and dealers in and producers of building materials of all kinds give careful study to my bill. If they believe the idea sound and desirable, I urge that they discuss this bill—H.R. 196—with their associates and through their associations and unions pass resolutions urging enactment of this bill—H.R. 196—by the present 86th Congress. I, as Congressman, will use such resolutions to promote support by Congressmen of my bill. Such resolutions, or letters, I assure you, will be most helpful in obtaining enactment of this bill, which if enacted I am sure will help add materially to the prosperity of the Nation as well as providing the American people with a vast number of better homes.

The Rehabilitation Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 1119, entitled "The Rehabilitation Act of 1958." I wish to make a few comments about this bill and about the rehabilitation program in general.

As you know, I serve as chairman of the Labor-HEW Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. In this capacity, I have reviewed the appropriation requests of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and have become intimately acquainted with the operations of the State-Federal program of rehabilitation. I have great confidence in its leadership on both State and Federal levels and in the general integrity of the program. Each year shows a greater number of handicapped persons completing their rehabilitation, 74,000 in 1958, and the quality of services is also improving, particularly for the severely handicapped.

At the same time, however, I have been conscious of the weaknesses in this program and have, from time to time, spoken out on this subject. My chief concern has been that some of the most severely handicapped persons are being denied services because such services do not appear to be feasible for them under the definition of rehabilitation found in present legislation. The present act, Mr. Speaker, is a vocational rehabilitation act. For a handicapped person to be served under this act there must be a reasonable expectation that he will be employable following services. There are many severely handicapped persons in this country who could profit substantially from rehabilitation services but who must be denied such services because of his restricted definition. This also means that many borderline cases may be rejected, because the chances of failure may be greater than the chances of success. The bill I have just introduced has been designed to correct some of the weaknesses which have been described above.

EVALUATION SERVICES

An adequate evaluation service is essential for all rehabilitation applicants, but particularly so for the most severely disabled. This evaluation is medical, psychological, social, and vocational. It takes time and is expensive, but it is essential if there is to be an adequate understanding of the rehabilitation potential of the individual. At the present time, there is no one place in most of our communities, or no one agency, which has the responsibility for providing an adequate diagnostic service for all handicapped adults. My bill would provide Federal assistance to the States to enable State rehabilitation agencies to establish such comprehensive evaluation services.

INDEPENDENT LIVING

One title of this bill sets up a program of independent living rehabilitation for severely handicapped people for whom there may not be a reasonable expectation of employability at the time they make application, but who can achieve a degree of independence which will enable them to dispense with the need for expensive institutional care or an attendant at home. This will mean that rehabilitation agencies may begin services for people who may not appear to be employable following services. Actually, experience has shown that many such individuals do achieve vocational rehabilitation.

REHABILITATION FACILITIES

At the present time, there is a program of rehabilitation facilities under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, commonly called the Hill-Burton Act. This program has been useful in establishing, in the main, medical rehabilitation facilities. Under this act it is not possible to assist in the establishment of rehabilitation workshops or many other rehabilitation facilities. As a result, there are many badly needed rehabilitation facilities for which there is no Federal assistance at this time. My bill sets up in the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a program of rehabilitation facilities which would be used to establish workshops for the mentally ill, mentally retarded, cerebral palsied, and many other severely handicapped individuals; speech and hearing centers; rehabilitation centers for the blind, and many other types. Provisions are made for the coordination of this program with the Hill-Burton program, so as to prevent any possibility of duplication.

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE

One of the provisions of my bill would increase the appropriation authority for the President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped from $225,000 to $300,000. The President's Committee is an organization of private individuals and voluntary organizations dedicated to increasing employment opportunities for physically handicapped individuals. The Federal Government makes an appropriation annually to support a small staff which guides this voluntary activity. In my judgment, the committee is doing an excellent job in creating a climate favorable to the employment of the handicapped. The small increase in appropriation authority will take care of necessary increases in costs and provide for a modest expan-

sion of services during the next 3 or 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, in this bill I have tried to fill the most significant gaps in present rehabilitation legislation. The bill provides for Federal assistance for a centralized, comprehensive evaluation system for all handicapped adults. It extends rehabilitation services to individuals for whom there cannot be at the beginning, a reasonable expectation of employability. It provides for a supplementary program of rehabilitation facilities under which will be built the many facilities which are needed to rehabilitate the handicapped. Finally, it increases the appropriation authority for the President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped. I sincerely hope that the House Committee on Education and Labor will conduct hearings on this legislation at an early date. The passage of this legislation will do much to increase rehabilitation opportunities for our most severely disabled citizens.

Address by George E. Stringfellow, Imperial Potentate, A.A.O.N.M.S., Wichita Falls, Tex., November 22, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK IKARD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a distinct privilege to pay a well-deserved tribute to Mr. Walter D. Cline, Sr., a fellow Texan and a longtime resident of my hometown of Wichita Falls, Tex. It is not an exaggeration to say that Walter Cline is one of the most distinguished men in the United States as his many accomplishments indicate. Mr. Cline married his childhood sweetheart, Miss Ella Pipes. Five children were born to the Clines, four of whom are still living. The Clines came to Wichita Falls first in 1913, and except for a 5-year period when they lived in Burkburnett, they have made their home in Wichita Falls since 1918. When Walter Cline came to Wichita Falls he started on a career of civic and fraternal service matched by few men in the Nation. Being a highly successful businessman, he served as first president of the Texas-Louisiana Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association; president of the Wichita Falls Chamber of Commerce; president and director of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce; president of the Wichita Falls Rotary Club; member of the Wichita Falls Welfare Council; first potentate of Maskat Temple, and imperial potentate of the Shrine. He was the founder and director of the first community chest in the South; represented the Wichita Falls Boy Scouts on the Scouts regional council; was organizer of the local chapter of DeMolay; chairman of the board of trustees of the YWCA and a generous contributor to the YWCA building fund in Wichita Falls. He is an honorary Blackfoot Indian chief and a member of "Who's Who in America." He holds an honorary degree of doctor of laws from Centenary College, and was decorated by King Albert of Belgium and by King George V of England. Walter Cline says:

I've lived a full, rich life; sure, I've had some disappointments but on the whole, life has been very good to me. And all through it, I've tried to live by one philosophy; I'd rather be wrong than nothing.

The following address by George E. Stringfellow, Imperial Potentate, A.A.O.N.M.S., was made on November 22, 1958, at Wichita Falls, honoring Walter D. Cline, Sr., which sets out other interesting facts concerning this remarkable man who I am proud to call my friend:

One of our greatest imperial potentates began his annual address, 18 years ago, with these words:

"My long experience in public activities and the field of business has convinced me me that many times the simple statements are the most convincing."

These words of wisdom were uttered in Memphis, Tenn., on July 11, 1940, by Imperial Sir Walter Dearing Cline, whom we honor today.

Walter D. Cline has been described as an inspiring leader, an authority on oil, an authority on sports, a great soul, a superb public speaker, an entertaining companion, a loyal friend, and a rugged individualist.

He is, in my opinion, the embodiment of all those attributes and many more.

After earning his way through college, Walter Cline helped educate his younger brothers and subsequently served as president of Centenary Alumni Association. In later years he was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Starting at a salary of $30 per month he worked as a muleskinner, a roustabout, a derrick man, a pumpman, a digger, and a driller.

Working as a driller Walter Cline was blinded several times. He saved the life of W. S. Farish, a fellow worker who was overcome with sulphur fumes, who later became chairman of the board of directors of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. During the early days, Walter Cline suffered a broken arm, a fractured hip, and numerous minor injuries.

Early in life Walter Cline learned two lessons which guided him in the years that followed: First, people will do just about anything if they know that you expect them to do it and that you have confidence in them; and, second, people are innately honest.

Forty-nine years ago Walter Cline engaged in the oil business. He made fortunes without boasting and he lost them without whimpering.

Walter Cline gave to others.
He gave to his community.
He gave to his county.
He gave of himself.
He gave of his intelligence, his wisdom, his counsel, his interest.
He gave of his energy.
He gave of his ability.
He gave of his fortune.

Walter Cline subscribes to the philosophy that we should give cheerfully and quickly, as we receive; for there is no grace in a benefit that sticks to the benefactor's fingers.

Walter Cline served his communities as president of the volunteer fire department, as a member of the school board to which he gave the site for a new high school, as first mayor under a new charter of a city government which he had helped to prepare, and as mayor in another city he offered to buy the property of any person who felt that his property had been unjustly appraised.

He was not called upon to buy a single piece of property.

Police and fire protection was improved, a modern sewer and water system established, and streets paved.

Walter Cline found time for baseball, golf, fishing, and a little loafing.

Thirty-six years ago he organized the first community chest in the South.

Walter Cline has been described as a master money raiser. His greatness is due to the fact that he gave unselfishly, generously, and magnanimously of himself and substance, often anonymously.

In addition to serving his community Walter Cline worked for the welfare of his State and his Nation. While his contributions have been numerous, I shall call to your attention a few of them.

1. He was a leader in bond drives during World War II.
2. He served as a member of the Federal Fuel Advisory Board.
3. Was director of Red Cross and a regional director of Federal housing.
4. He organized the West Texas Chamber of Commerce and the Texas Centennial Exposition.
5. Served as president and district governor of Rotary International.

He was one of Maskat Temple's ablest illustrious potentates.

Walter Cline has been designated the "Most valuable citizen of West Texas." He has been honored by the king of Belgium. He has been the guest of King George V of England.

Time does not permit of more than a casual reference to Walter Cline's fine cultural background, his many personal attributes, his appearance and affability, his excellent library, his art treasures, his flowers, and his grandchildren.

Beneficiaries of his goodness, his greatness, and his generosity are legion.

Walter Cline's devotion to Freemasonry is exemplary and his achievements on behalf of our fraternity are enduring.

I am happy to pay tribute to this man of character; God-fearing, home-loving, community-serving, dedicated to the highest ideals of Americanism, carrying in his heart the spirit of the Shrine, and exemplifying good fellowship in his daily life.

A man who is a credit to the glorious State of Texas, an honor to our great Southland, and a cherished son of one of the finest Nations in the history of mankind.

Walter Cline's modesty is equal to his valor, and that surpasses the power of any language I possess.

Walter, I bring you the greetings and best wishes of the A.A.O.N.M.S. for which you provided sterling leadership almost a fifth of a century ago.

It is the fond hope of your friends, who are legion, that the great Architect of the Universe will further reward mankind by leaving you with us as long as you want to stay.

Right-To-Work Laws—The Results Do Not Justify the Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the November 24, 1958, issue of Time maga-

zine on the subject of right-to-work laws. This article presents some very interesting facts as to the effect of these laws in States which now have these statutes. It would appear from this article that right-to-work laws have little or no effect on the size, strength or growth of organized labor except in some cases where they have tended to weaken the smaller unions by driving members to the larger unions.

The article follows:

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS—THE RESULTS DO NOT JUSTIFY THE TROUBLE

In the recent elections, right-to-work laws went down to defeat in five of the six States where they were proposed. But they are far from a dead issue. Already, unionists are getting set for a drive in Congress to outlaw State laws that forbid the union shop. The arguments over such laws have ranged all the way from the position of Labor Secretary James Mitchell that they do more harm than good to the stand of General Electric chairman Ralph Cordiner, who says his company takes right-to-work laws into consideration as a plus factor when locating new plants. But the debate has been more emotional than factual. The big overlooked question: How do right-to-work laws work in the 18 States that have them?

In Florida, which passed the first right-to-work law in 1943, the law has had little effect; it has no teeth and is largely disregarded. The building-trades unions, biggest in the State, do not protest the law simply because they fear that if they get it revoked they might get a law that would hurt them. In four other States—South Carolina, North Dakota, Georgia, and Arizona—the situation is much the same; the laws have had virtually no effect on union or labor relations. There are many ways to get around them. In Virginia unionists in the building trades have found a simple way to defeat the anticlosed-shop provisions of the State law: when a nonunion member shows up on a construction job, union members just get "sick" until he is fired. Union growth has hardly been hampered. Since the Virginia law was passed in 1947, union membership has grown from 100,000 to 150,000. There are other dodges to get around the restriction on the closed shop, such as the agency shop in which nonunion employees pay union dues.

While union leaders in Texas complain that the law has hurt them, they are hard put to find figures to prove it. Ed Burris, executive vice president of the Texas Manufacturers Association, cites union membership, which has grown from 110,500 before World War II to 400,000 today. He feels that the law has not inhibited the growth of unions or their functions as bargaining agents. Unionists charge that the law has had other bad effects. Jerry Holleman, head of the Texas AFL–CIO, says the law has weakened union discipline, causing more wildcat strikes, and that the union must take many more grievance cases, often trivial ones, to arbitration lest the union members withdraw from the local on grounds that they are not being ably represented.

Perhaps the biggest effect of the laws has been to hamper organizing by weak unions. In Iowa, says Federation of Labor President Ray Mills, "it has become almost impossible to organize areas where workers are in an especially weak position." In Utah, which has probably the only right-to-work law with real teeth in it, unionists complain that it is hard to organize workers at all. In fact, there has not been an organizing strike or picket line for the last 3 years.

Many a unionist feels that the prime purpose of most of the laws, which was to curb the power of big unions, has had the opposite effect. Some of the weak unions, said Gordon Preble, president of the Nebraska AFL–CIO, have been broken up in Nebraska and the members have joined the strong unions. Thus, says he, the effect has been to make the strong unions stronger. The strong unions have also had to mend their fences, become more responsive to their members. It has knit them together.

Whether a right-to-work law helps lure industry to a State, as proponents claim, is also debatable. Backers of the law in Indiana cite the fact that the State has gained 85 new industries since the law was passed last year. But industries were entering the State at almost the same rate before then. Moreover, 16 industries have decided to leave since the law went into effect, e.g., Chrysler Corp. will move its Evansville plant to Missouri, which has no right-to-work law.

In almost all the right-to-work States, unionists agree that where labor and management got on well before the law, they still get along well. Those who fought unions before have tried to use the laws to kill unions or to knock down union pay standards. Says Edmond McGoldrick, president of the big, active Reno local of the Musicians' Union: It is helping the chiselers.

In sum, the statutes have had little effect on labor or on business, but a considerable effect on the Republican Party's election losses. Said John W. McConnell of the U.S. Mediation and Conciliation Service: Right-to-work laws are at best symbols of the conflict between organized labor and organized management. They do not improve the organization and responsibility of labor; and make no fundamental contribution to the rights of workers or to industrial peace.

Latin Americans Not Only Our Good Neighbors but Our Best Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, during part of November and December 1958, I visited several South American countries, notably Argenina, Brazil, Uruguay, and some of the West Indies islands, in connection with my resolution to establish a Pan American Parliamentary Association—PAPA—to help unite the Western Hemisphere for its own well-being and security. On previous occasions I had visited other Latin American countries, that is, Mexico, Panama, Venezuela, and Cuba. In these countries I met with top government officials and parliamentary leaders with whom I discussed the aims and purposes of my resolution, and I also had the opportunity to familiarize myself with conditions there and with some of their pressing problems.

I came away with a feeling stronger than ever that the idea proposed in my resolution is not only most timely, but that its realization is most urgent. I am now revising and expanding the resolution on the basis of my findings durings these Latin American trips, and I plan to introduce the revised version in the very near future.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that the original resolution which I had offered before the closing days of the 85th Congress had been approved in principle by 12 of the 20 Latin American countries, with not a single objection. Furthermore, I was encouraged by our State Department to visit South America and discuss the proposal further with legislators of those countries. I am now pleased to report to you and to all my colleagues of the House that my resolution and its central purpose was very well received in the countries I visited.

The chairman of the foreign affairs committee of Argentina's Chamber of Deputies, Juan Lopez, was extremely enthusiastic about my plan, as was also President Ranieri Mazzilli of the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies. Mr. Lopez made a public statement in which he said about the proposed Pan American Parliamentary Association:

> It could mean a new stage in the relations among our countries, a new era of good friendship.

Remembering how strained relations had been between Argentina and the United States during the Peron regime and Argentina's recent $100 million loan deal with the Soviet Union, the words of Deputy Lopez were welcome indeed.

The major fault which the Latin Americans have found with us is that we have not dealt with them as equals. You must remember that Latin Americans are a very proud people. They do not want any charity from us, but neither do they desire to be looked down upon. Argentina is a striking example of this national pride. Although Peron milked the country dry, so to speak, and completely emptied its treasury before he fled, Argentina today will not accept anything from the United States or from any other country unless it be on a straight business basis.

We have been hearing a great deal in the past year regarding Communist inroads into the Latin American countries. I have found that the people of those countries do not want communism; in fact, they are very much opposed to it. Christianity is too strongly embedded all through Latin America. Those countries will take Communist help only as a last resort—that is, if we should turn our backs on them and refuse to recognize their legitimate aspirations and their desires for equality and mutual respect from their brother-Americans of the North.

There is a feeling among many of the Latin American leaders that in certain instances the United States had taken unilateral action in matters where they should have been consulted. They feel that our policy decisions have been formulated in such a way that only U.S. interests and the security of the United States alone appear to be the primary objectives, rather than the interests and the security of the whole Western Hemisphere. In seeking to promote our own self-interests, they say, we have given little or no regard to the government heads nor to the form of government of the Latin American countries. If it suited our purpose, we promoted or allowed to prosper oppressive dictators.

In such cases where we have been guilty of these practices we must revise

our thinking and refuse to deal with, or give aid and comfort to, dictators who suppress human rights. This latter course would be more expressive of the true feelings of the people of the United States. It would also prevent the exploitation of our Latin American neighbors by the communists. A policy which places the aspirations of all peoples of Latin America on a par with our own achieved goals of freedom and equal opportunity for all human beings, regardless of race, color, or creed, would be as successful in Latin America as it must be in any part of the world.

There is no doubt in my mind, based on discussions with leaders of the countries I visited, that they are strongly in favor of multilateral inter-American action against any possible foreign aggression. Furthermore, it is my sincere conviction that our neighbors to the South will enter into any agreement with us to help stem the tide of communism in the world and to join with us in any action aimed to enforce such agreement, provided it is arrived at by the joint and fair contributions of each of the participating nations of the hemisphere.

It is for these very reasons—equal treatment, fostering of human rights and joint participation—that my proposal to establish a Pan American Parliamentary Association has been not only welcomed but actually hailed by Latin Americans and called by them "the key to improved relations of the future." In PAPA each legislator will have an equal voice in the organization, whether he be a representative from the United States or from Uruguay, the smallest country in South America. This free exchange among the legislators of the Americas on all matters affecting their security, their cultural development and their economic well-being is the kind of recognition and mutual respect which they have always sought, but seldom obtained, from the United States.

In summarizing my views, I want to stress the following:

For the past few decades we have come to regard the Latin Americans as our good neighbors. But they are more than that. They are also our best friends. In Latin America today the United States has a golden opportunity of regaining much of the ground we have lost in other parts of the world, because of our failure to give due recognition to the aspirations of independent nations and by not hitting hard enough against colonialism.

The United States has a glorious chance to enhance its prestige and moral position in the eyes of all Latin Americans in becoming the champion of human rights, democratic principles, and true independence for all nations. But this must not be merely lip service. We must cooperate with them as brother-Americans and as friendly neighbors to assist them in their hour of need.

May I also offer the suggestion that in our dealings with Latin America we take advantage of the help which our very strong and devoted ally Italy can render in this direction. Latin American countries are heavily populated by people of Italian origin. The strongest influence in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay is Italian in nature. Italians occupy very important offices in these countries and are leaders in industry, business, commerce, and other phases of national life. São Paulo, Brazil, a city of 3,500,000 people—probably the fourth largest in the whole Western Hemisphere—is more than one-third Italian. This is also true in similar measure of Buenos Aires, the capital of Argentina, and Montevideo, the capital of Uruguay. The Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies of Brazil, Mazzilli, and the President of Argentina, Frondizi, are born of Italian immigrant parents.

It would seem most logical to utilize this friendly influence in the interests of democracy, and most especially in helping to cement the most cordial relationship among the nations of the Americas in a spirit of real neighborly cooperation. I might add that we should also extend the practice of utilizing our allies in other parts of the world where they are more familiar and in a better position to deal with certain problems in such areas affecting the United States and our allies, as well.

I now wish to cite some specific examples concerning Brazil, Uruguay, and Argentina—in the order that I visited them—where assistance would be appreciated, how such assistance could be most helpful, and how it would serve to achieve genuine friendship and inter-American cooperation.

BRAZIL

This is the largest country in all of Latin America, almost the size of the U.S., with a population of approximately 62 million.

Brazil has rich natural resources, which, if properly explored and utilized, could make her one of the wealthiest nations in the world. Its president, Juscelino Kubitschek, recognizes this fact and is exerting all his efforts to encourage his people to move out from the eastern areas and settle the Brazilian west, that part of the country which is today almost totally uninhabited. It is a fact that 93 percent of the Brazilian population inhabits only 36 percent of the country's territory, with their backs to the deserted hinterland. This is the area where the soil is richer than that presently explored and settled. Gold, crystals, diamonds and gems are hidden there. Throughout Brazil are also to be found rich deposits of iron ore, manganese, nickel and zinc.

In order to encourage Brazilians to leave the congested environs of Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo, Kubitschek is moving the national capital, which will be called Brasilia, from Rio de Janeiro to the interior in the hinterland. He is confronted by inadequate transportation and power, as well as many other obstacles, but present indications are that he will succeed in this effort if he obtains the necessary financing and technological assistance.

Here, then, is a country which hates communism so much so that up until this day Brazil has refused to have diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia. How long this situation will last depends largely upon our actions. Without any financial sacrifice on our part, we can help this country become self-sufficient and economically independent through reasonable loans from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, as well as by the proper exercise of our own Public Law 480, known as the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

In 1958 Brazil had a 50 percent shortage in her production of wheat. At the same time, we have wheat bulging from our warehouses and rotting away. We could easily enlarge our Public Law 480 program for Brazil to make available to her some of our surplus wheat, corn, tobacco, cotton, and other commodities which we have in surplus. A large part of Public Law 480 funds could be used by Brazil to improve her transportation, power and communications systems. Thus, her settlement of the western areas and her goal for self-sufficiency would be realized.

URUGUAY

Here is the smallest country on the South American continent with a population of only 2,200,000. Of significance to us, however, is the fact that Uruguay has recognized Soviet Russia, is doing business with the Communists and allows them to mainatin an Embassy there which is the largest in South America, much larger than our own. The Soviet Union maintains a personnel force in Uruguay of 72 people—all spies. Obviously, their interest in not merely Uruguay. Russia uses Uruguay as a base through which she hopes to penetrate Brazil, Argentina and other Latin American countries. In this respect, she is aided and abetted by the Embassies of the other iron-curtain countries in Uruguay. It is common knowledge that the Communists have complete control over the waterfront in Montevideo and that they can tie up transportation at any time.

It may be asked: Do the people of Uruguay want communism? It is significant that in the recent elections held there the Communists polled less votes than they did in previous elections. At the present time there are only 2 Communist deputies out of a total of 99 in the Chamber of Deputies. But the control of the waterfront by the Communists and their strength in labor circles, in addition to their use of Uruguay as a port of entry for the penetration and infiltration of all of South America, presents a very serious threat which we must recognize and with which we must deal immediately.

Here again it takes only sympathetic understanding of the problems facing Uruguay and simple honest dealing to check the Communists and to nullify their influence. Let me give you several examples where we have failed in our relations with this tiny country and where the Communists utilized these incidents to their advantage:

I. In 1949, under GATT—the General Agreement for Trade and Tariffs—the United States concluded an agreement with Uruguay for certain reciprocal reductions in import duties. The U.S. Government postponed action in proclaiming these duty reductions because

Uruguay was not yet formally a member of GATT. When Uruguay's membership in GATT was ratified in 1953, the Uruguayan Government also ratified the duty reductions promised by Uruguay. By that time, however, it was more difficult for the United States to put certain of its promised duty reductions on canned and preserved meats into force because U.S. producers of meat were not prospering as much as they had been in 1949. The United States, therefore, put into effect the other duty reductions it had agreed upon but did not proclaim the following duty reductions which were the ones most desired by Uruguay:

First. A reduction from 20 to 15 percent in the minimum ad valorem duty on corned beef.

Second. A reduction from 7½ cents per pound to 3¾ cents per pound duty on meat extract.

Third. A reduction from 20 to 10 percent in the minimum ad valorem duty on pickled or cured beef and veal.

The delay in proclaiming these duty reductions agreed upon in 1949 has now been the longest delay in any such pending action by the U.S. Government.

II. In 1953 the U.S. Treasury Department applied an 18 percent additional duty against Uruguayan wool tops—the longer, higher grade wool which has been combed out of the raw wool, leaving behind the short fibers or noils. The reason for this additional duty, which was called a countervailing duty, was that the combers of wool in the United States had protested that the Uruguayan Government was giving assistance to the exporters of Uruguayan wool tops by granting them a rate of exchange for their product that resulted in their receiving more pesos per dollar than the exporters of most other Uruguayan products. A calculation of this exchange benefit showed that the rate for export of wool tops provided, in fact, 18 percent more pesos than the weighted average of exchange rates on all other Uruguayan exports and imports. This is the only countervailing duty applied by the United States because of a subsidy granted by a foreign government through special incentive exchange rates.

A few years ago, the countervailing duty was decreased to 6 percent because the Uruguayan exchange rate incentive was calculated to have decreased to that amount. We now expect that it may soon be demonstrable—when certain new exchange rates are announced—that the incentive has been eliminated as compared with the average rate on all other Uruguayan exports and imports. The Treasury Department has indicated that, when that can be demonstrated, the countervailing duty will be abolished. It is the opinion of our Embassy officials in Montevideo that this measure, which the Uruguayan Government and public have considered to be discriminatory, has been prejudicial to U.S. relations with Uruguay to such an extent that serious question may logically be raised as to whether the maximum U.S. interest has been served by applying this isolated measure against Uruguayan wool tops.

III. For several years there has been in effect in the United States a tariff quota governing the importation of various classifications of textiles into the United States. The tariff quota for woolen textiles provides that a certain total quantity of these materials may be imported from all sources of supply at a 25-percent ad valorem rate of duty; when that quota is filled, which is usually in June of the calendar year, the rate of duty goes up to 40-percent ad valorem. Very good quality woolen suiting materials are manufactured in Uruguay, and since this product is made entirely out of Uruguayan raw material, it would seem to offer more hope than any Uruguayan manufactured product of finding an increasingly large market abroad with resulting obvious advantages to the Uruguayan economy. Uruguayan exporters, however, complain that they have difficulty in marketing their woolen suiting materials in the United States because their buyers can never be quite certain of the exact cost throughout the year in comparison with domestic sources of supply.

President Eisenhower requested, a year or so ago, that an interdepartmental committee be formed to determine upon a more workable system for governing the duty of this type of imports because of complaints about the tariff-quota system. It would be very beneficial for the Uruguayan economy if the tariff system could be arranged in some way that would provide some modest preference for this unique Western Hemisphere source of supply of woolen suiting materials. In fact, it would not seem unreasonable to exempt Western Hemisphere sources entirely from the higher ad valorem rate of duty on woolen textiles. Uruguay would be the only country that would profit from this and the quantity of material that could be imported from Uruguay, even with a very large increase, would probably not noticeably disturb the market for domestic manufactures of competitive materials in the United States.

Fourth. The largest Uruguayan export is wool, usually about 55 percent of total exports. The largest buyer of this wool is now the Soviet Union. In return, the Soviet Union offers crude petroleum at a bargain price—about 50 cents less per barrel than the same petroleum would cost in the regular world market. The Soviet Union has also recently sold a cargo of cotton to Uruguay—presumably cotton which Russia obtained from Egypt. The Uruguayans do not like to depend upon the Soviet Union as a market for their products, or even as a source of supply for essential imports, such as petroleum, because, first, they know that the market or the source of supply can be closed off arbitrarily at any time; second, they know that they are likely to be asked for cooperation of other kinds as a quid pro quo for continuation of this trade; and third, they do not wish to encourage the kind of relationships that naturally follow trading relationships. However, with the Soviet Union now purchasing about 20 percent of their total wool exports, and with other purchasers buying slowly at present prices and with greater demand for quality, the Uruguayans feel that they are trapped by the necessity of trading with the Soviet Union.

It has been suggested by Uruguayans that the U.S. Government might solve this problem by purchasing wool for stockpiling. Since there is no provision for such stockpiling, another possibility might be a reduction in the U.S. duty on raw wool. However, the extensive repercussions from such a measure would be obvious, and it would not seem logical to consider such a difficult solution until it has been demonstrated that the much simpler problems outlined in the preceding paragraphs can be solved.

ARGENTINA

Argentina is about half the size of the United States and has a population of approximately 20 million. It is more of a melting pot than any other Latin American republic and its population is based on European immigration rather than on indigenous people. In contrast to most Latin American countries, 96 percent of Argentina's population is Caucasian. The country is predominantly Catholic and the literacy rate is about 85 percent—the highest in Latin America.

Argentina inherited serious economic problems from the Peron regime. Dictator Peron left an empty treasury which has stagnated economic growth and real per capita income, decapitalized industrial plants, deteriorated transportation networks, and has caused a serious domestic inflation of its currency. Argentina is not to be sold short, however. It still has one of the highest per capita gross national products in Latin America, the best average level of living in the area, and the largest middle class. Agriculture is still the chief source of wealth and provides about 90 to 95 percent of the country's export earnings. Chief products are meat, grains, vegetable oils and wool.

Argentina's basic problem, at present, is one of reconstruction and rehabilitation. Perhaps the basic requirement in this situation is the securing of capital to finance here needed rehabilitation and development program. I discussed this matter with our very able Ambassador to Argentina, the Honorable Willard L. Beaulac, and I gathered from such talks that our State Department was au courant with the situation in Argentina and sympathetic to the problems of the new administration of President Frondizi. I was happy to learn, immediately after my return to the United States, that Argentina is to receive a $329,000,000 loan from the U.S. Government, from the International Monetary Fund, and from 11 private banks in the United States and Canada in order to carry out sweeping economic reforms and its development program. In my opinion this is a great forward step.

President Arturo Frondizi, whom I had the pleasure of meeting at his resi-

dence, although he was supported by the Peronists in the general elections of February 23, 1958, shows no inclination of following Peron or encouraging anything for which the latter stood. He is an ardent foe of communism and gave me the impression of being desirous of maintaining the friendliest relations with the United States.

We must always remember that the Argentineans, perhaps more than any other Latin American people, are an extremely proud people. They want loans at reasonable rates to develop their potentially wealthy oilfields and to otherwise strengthen their economy. But they want these loans with no strings attached. In this respect they are behaving like all proud, freedom-loving peoples. We would be no different. If we recognize this fact and treat the Argentineans—as we must treat all peoples—fairly and squarely as equals, they can prove to be among our best friends in Latin America.

We have lost many friends in the Western Hemisphere and elsewhere in the world by giving the impression at times that we were a superior people, or by trying to outsmart in business and otherwise those whom we regarded as inferior. The sooner we correct these impressions, the better for all concerned.

From my conversations with President Frondizi and with Dr. Federico F. Monjardin, President of the Argentine Chamber of Deputies, I got the distinct impression that the Argentines have a strong admiration for their brother Americans in the United States, but they have a high regard for themselves, too. They want to join us as partners, not as servants to a master. In my estimation, they are most fitting partners and brothers as well. If we help Argentina now we risk nothing, but we shall have gained a very strong ally and a very valuable friend.

Finally, it should be understood that as the benefits of independence and economic self-sufficiency grow and continue to increase in the Latin American countries, they will want to align themselves—not with the Soviet Union—but with the United States, in order to protect their economic gains, their political freedom, their national independence, and the security of the whole Western Hemisphere. We have a marvelous opportunity here, let's not fritter it away.

To me, the race to better all mankind and life as we know it here on earth is far more important than the race to conquer other worlds. I believe that if world opinion were permitted to properly express itself, it would compel the search into the unknown, into other planets, to be directed by the combined efforts of all nations on this earth. In this way, the benefits or losses from such exploitation could be proportionately shared without unduly wasting the resouces, human and material, of the earth.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In conclusion, I wish to express several acknowledgments of appreciation for the cooperation and assistance given me during my trip to South America. I am happy to report that our diplomatic representation in the countries visited is of the best. Ambassador Ellis O. Briggs in Brazil, Ambassador Willard L. Beaulac in Argentina, and Ambassador Robert F. Woodward in Uruguay are all careermen, each with an excellent background and understanding of Latin American affairs.

I also wish to acknowledge the inestimable assistance which I have received from the Moore-McCormack Lines, on whose ship, steamship *Brasil*, I made the trip, for allowing me to use their facilities in and out of ports in South America. Without their excellent cooperation, much of this simple report would not have been possible.

Address by George J. Feldman, Director and Chief Counsel, Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, U.S. House of Representatives, Before the Federal Bar Association, in New York City, October 9, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a splendid and informative address made by George J. Feldman, director and chief counsel of the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration on October 9, 1958, in New York City before the Federal Bar Association. Mr. Feldman is a dedicated American who, at a great sacrifice to himself, made marked contributions to the success of the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration.

The address follows:

JURISDICTION IN OUTER SPACE

We live today in a wondrous age where people and governments, and not just science fiction writers, talk of traveling to the Moon, to Mars, and elsewhere in the vast infinity that stretches all around us.

What was yesterday the figment of men's imaginations, of Jules Verne and the comic strips, bids fair today to become soon the world of reality.

Manmade satellites are orbiting around the earth, plans are underway to land an expedition on the Moon, and scientists tell us that a flight to Mars is feasible within the near future.

As satellites, space platforms, space ships and other astronautical bodies begin catapulting above us, what legal position shall be taken by the governments and peoples concerned?

The space above us is a veritable legal jungle. On Earth there is some international law. In outer space, there is none. Shall each nation decide for itself where it shall hold legal sway? Where does one nation's sovereignty begin and another's end in the limitless void above us? Will man battle one day for supremacy in the black, icy stillness, as he once did on the high seas, or will he this time peacefully agree in advance upon a set of rules to govern each nation's conduct in outer space?

These are some of the things I would like to discuss with you at this time.

The United States has recently enacted what I believe to be the world's first statute dealing with astronautics. The National Aeronautics and Space Act,[1] signed by the President on July 29, creates a new agency of government known as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In addition to planning and conducting both aeronautical and space activities, the new agency is directed to arrange for scientific observations and measurements, like those of the International Geophysical Year, and to promote the spread of scientific knowledge relating to outer space. Top policy and overall coordination will be provided by the President himself, with the advice of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, over which he presides, and which consists of high-level Government officials and distinguished private citizens. The new agency is authorized to engage in a program of international cooperation, in the interest of scientific progress and world peace. The act declares it to be the policy of the United States that activities in outer space shall be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind.

Although the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is not given regulatory powers, the appropriate committees of Congress contemplated that it would conduct legal and related research with a view to domestic legislation and regulation as well as international agreements governing the use of outer space. Witnesses before the House committee agreed that the legal regime of outer space would be the primary problem confronting the new space agency.[2] At any rate, it seems clear that space law must be developed in order to prevent anarchy in the use of outer space. The problem is grave and urgent because of the military potentialities of missiles, satellites, and space vehicles.

What is the nature of the legal problem which the new space agency will meet in considering the international control of outer space?

Flight through outer space is not expressly governed by international law. The only generally accepted international flight agreement is the Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation (1944) to which the United States, though not the Soviet Union, is a party. The Chicago Convention provides that: "the territory of a state shall be deemed to be the land areas and territorial waters adjacent thereto," and that, "every state has complete and exclusive jurisdiction over the air space above its territory."

Similar language is used in the domestic legislation of many countries, including the United States and the Soviet Union.[3] But the term "air space" is not defined in the Chicago Convention, nor is any equivalent term such as "air" or "atmosphere." Although not defined in the Convention itself, the related term "aircraft" is defined in later annexes in language adopted from the Paris Convention of 1919 as "any machine which can derive support in the atmosphere from the reactions of the air."

Most writers on the law of outer space have taken the position that the definition of "aircraft" contained in the Chicago Convention does not apply to satellites or other space vehicles.[4] This view is usually based either on a lateral interpretation or on the argument that the Chicago Convention was not intended to regulate anything but conventional aviation. Whatever the intention of the draftsmen or signers of the Chicago Convention may have been, it seems unwise to fit its definition of "aircraft" mechanically (even if literally applicable) to new and then unforseen devices and situations.

Footnotes at end of speech.

There are two reasonable analogies for space law: Air law and the law of the sea. It will be worth while to examine these parallels a little more closely. Furthermore, the discrepancies between rights of passage at sea and in the air suggest conclusions for the law of outer space.

In the 15th century, when international law was taking shape, freedom of the seas was by no means a universally accepted principle. Many claims of sovereignty were made to regions of the sea as well as to the newly discoveerd lands. Gradually, the principal maritime nations accepted the view that some exercise of dominion was necessary to sovereignty over terra nullius. In "Mare Liberum," Grotius made the converse argument that the seas must be free because they are not susceptible of dominion.

In the early 20th century, opponents of absolute air sovereignty borrowed this mare liberum argument. Their position has been questioned [6] on several counts.

1. Grotius himself later, in "Jure Belli ac Pacis," abandoned this argument on the ground that dominion can in fact be obtained over regions of the sea—for example, by fleets or coastal guns.

2. Certainly dominion can be exercised over portions of air space, even though the air cannot be occupied.

3. If sovereignty is nothing more than power, then might makes right and international law is a mere delusion.

4. The decisive consideration should be the common social and commercial interests of the international community. Though some may call this view utopian, it commends itself to commonsense and is confirmed by the historical development of maritime law.

In the end the high-seas analogy was not applied to airspace. Article 1 of the Paris Convention of 1919 recognized the complete and exclusive sovereignty of every state in the airspace above its territory.

The chief reason for applying different rules of passage to ships and aircraft appears to be the factor of national security and defense. Because of their greater speed and mobility, aircraft present a greater military threat to national territory. This consideration applies to space vehicles a fortiori.

A secondary reason historically may have been economic protection, a policy of excluding the competition of foreign airlines. In the near future, at any rate, this consideration is not likely to apply with much force to space vehicles.

No doubt these reasons for not applying the law of the sea to aircraft were sufficient. Even in their absence, however, certain difficulties would remain. The law of the sea is not a simple matter of freedom of the high seas together with a right of innocent passage through territorial waters. It recognizes a diversity of zones and regions for different conditions and purposes. Freedom of the seas is a qualified freedom. The right of innocent passage does not, for example, include freedom from reasonable rules of navigation. Furthermore, although the United States is committed to a 3-mile limit for its territorial seas, it has long claimed jurisdiction for customs purposes in a contiguous zone extending up to 12 miles from the coast.[4] The basis of jurisdiction in the contiguous zone is the right of a state to regulate and control conduct occurring entirely outside its territory which may have direct effects within its territory.[7] Such jurisdiction is not territorial or spatial but causal. On similar reasoning, defense identification zones in contiguous airspace or waters beyond the limits of the territorial sea are justified by the right of self-defense. The principle involved in customs zones and defense identification zones could well be invoked to support a claim of jurisdiction in contiguous outer space.

In this connection, it should be said that none of the various proposals for purely spatial solutions to the problem of jurisdiction and sovereignty in outer space seems to be appropriate. For example, some writers have postulated a zone of sovereignty extending into outer space from the center of the earth through the land boundaries of each State and the limits of its territorial sea.[8] It is evident, however, that with the movement of the earth and other astronomical bodies such zones of sovereignty would overlap and their content in outer space would constantly change. Other writers have proposed to divide airspace and outer space into static zones based on physical properties such as aerodynamic lift or drag.[9] Although such static divisions would at least be logical, they do not appear to be pertinent to the problem.

Another difficulty in extending the law of the sea to air space and outer space is that the terms of the analogy are not always specified. If the air space is regarded as the counterpart of territorial waters, standing in the same relation to outer space as territorial waters do to the high seas, the legal implication is that the sovereignty of a state would not be violated even by the passage through outer space above its territory of a strictly military satellite or space vehicle. A Soviet writer has in fact likened the legal status of a satellite in outer space to a vessel on the high seas.[10] In general, however, the analogy is probably intended to be more modest, implying that outer space, while not free like the high seas, is subject to a right of innocent passage.

Like the proposals for the division of outer space and airspace into static zones with different legal regimes, the crude spatial analogy with the high seas and territorial waters seem inappropriate and largely irrelevant to the problem. It is reasonable to conclude that security considerations alone are likely to preserve the principle of national sovereignty in airspace, and to prevent the use of outer space above national lands and waters by foreign vehicles except for peaceful purposes.

The acquiescence of nations to the passage of scientific satellites through outer space above their territories implies that consent to such flights is either unnecessary or has been given. It is true that other interpretations are possible. At least one deserves to be mentioned as a matter of interest. A Soviet writer has explained that the passage of satellites above national territory is not caused by the movement of the satellites but is due to the rotation of the Earth.[10] It seems fair to compare this statement with the defense of a hunter, arrested for shooting ducks out of season, that he had not shot at the ducks at all, but the ducks had flown into his bullets.

To repeat, therefore, there are only two likely explanations for the failure of nations to object to the passage of satellites through outer space above their territory: consent to such flights is either unnecessary or has been given. It is tempting to accept the first explanation,[11] which would appear to mean, for example, that President Eisenhower's open-skies proposal is an accomplished fact. However, any such assumption would be premature and unjustified. Probably no nation would agree that it has waived its right to object to the passage of every kind of satellite above its national territory at any future time. Even though the law of outer space has not yet taken definite shape, there is wide agreement that freedom of space flight is subject to some restrictions in favor of the states below.

The present satellite flights appear to be sanctioned by an implied international agreement based on the acquiescence of other governments in the announcements by the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. that satellites would be launched in connection with the International Geophysical Year. This agreement is evidently limited to the types of satellites contemplated in those governmental announcements (i.e., scientific and peaceful satellites) and (as to launching) to the duration of the International Geophysical Year.

Is it at present desirable, or for that matter possible, to broaden this temporary and limited agreement into a code of law for outer space?

Such a development seems desirable, not only for reasons of national security but in order to establish reasonable uniformity of navigational aids, radio codes, routes, landing procedures, and similar matters.

On the other hand, it has been argued convincingly that not enough facts are yet known about outer space to justify the formulation of a body of governing law.[12] Even if we accept this argument as to comprehensive international agreements, however, it does not follow that limited agreements on the uses of outer space either cannot be reached or would not be observed. In fact it is likely, for reasons of urgency, that explicit agreements will play a larger part in the historical development of space law than they have played in that of maritime or air law.

At the same time, care should be taken not to enter into international agreements (a) without adequate preparation or (b) which are more comprehensive or explicit than our present knowledge warrants.

What kinds of limited agreement might be reached in the near future is a matter for astronauts and diplomats as well as lawyers. Certainly I cannot speak for our Government, and my views on this subject are purely personal. Certain possibilities are nevertheless obvious on even brief reflection.[13] The most promising possibility is simply to continue the International Geophysical Year or some form of international cooperation similar to that. Next, it should be possible, to a greater extent than in the past, to exchange tracking data and navigation and signal codes. Agreements could be made on the use of radio frequencies. Some international projects, such as relay or postal satellites or missiles, could be undertaken bilaterally or multilaterally or by an existing or newly created international organization. The next step might be an agreement for advance notice and coordination of launching schedules. Such notice might include information on flight plans, contents and proposed activities of the satellite or space vehicle, and ultimately involve consent to international inspection prior to launching.

In addition to making such operating agreements as have just been described, the nations of the world could greatly contribute to the rule of law in outer space by announcing their adherence, as our Government has done,[14] to the twin principles of freedom of outer space for nonexclusive peaceful purposes and the prohibition of military uses, including, particularly, atomic and nuclear warheads.

It is true that the rigid enforcement of such principles would be very difficult. However, reasonably effective control could be exercised by a system of international prelaunching inspection, together with worldwide surveillance by orbiting space stations and the willingness and ability of two or more nations to destroy on sight any satellite, missile, or space vehicle that had not met the requirements of notice and inspection prior to launching.

To say that such operating agreements and principles as have just been described would be both possible and desirable is not to imply that they would be sufficient. In time, however, they might develop into a code of international space law or perhaps an explicit comprehensive agreement by accretion from particular agreements and practices. Under present world conditions, furthermore, they would constitute at least a good beginning toward the rule of law in outer space.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[3] Public Law 568, 85th Cong. (1958).

[4] See hearings before the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, 85th Cong., 2d sess., p. 1286 (also pp. 1269, 1288).

[5] Air Commerce Act of 1926, sec. 6 (44 Stat. 568, 572; 49 U.S.C. 176).

Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, sec. 1 (31) (52 Stat. 973, 980; 49 U.S.C. 401(33)).

Air Code of the U.S.S.R., Coll. of Laws. U.S.S.R. 1935, No. 43, p. 459b.

[6] E.g., Cooper, "Legal Problems of Upper Space," 23J. Air L. and Comm 308 (Sumner, 1958); Jenks, "International Law and Activities in Space," 5 Int and Comp. L.Q. 99 (1956); Pepin, "The Legal Status of the Airspace in the Light of Progress in Aviation and Astronautics." 3 McGill L.J. 70 (Autumn, 1956); Ward, "Projecting the Law of the Sea Into the Law of Space." JAG Journal, March 1957, p. 1.

[7] E.g., Goedhuis, "Sovereignty and Freedom in the Air Space," in "Problems of Public and Private International Law" (The Grotius Society, 1956).

[8] 1 Stat. 700; Anti-Smuggling Act, 49 Stat. 517, 19 U.S.C. 1701.

[9] Cf. *Missouri* v. *Illinois*, 200 U.S. 496 (1906).

[10] See Ball, "Shaping the Law of Weather Control," 58 Yale L.J. 213, 236 (1949); Jenks loc. cit., pp. 103–104.

[11] E.g., Cooper, "Missiles and Satellites"; "The Law and Our National Policy," 44 A.B.A. Journal 317 (1958); Murphy, "Air Sovereignty Considerations in Terms of Outer Space," 19 Ala. Lawyer 11 (1958).

[12] Zadorozhnyi, "The Artificial Satellite and International Law," Sovietskaya Rossiya, Oct. 17, 1957, p. 3.

[13] See for example Danier and Saporta, "Le droit aerien et les satellites artificiels," 3 Revue Generale de l'Air 297 (1955); Schachter, "The Law of Outer Space" (address to the International Law Society, Apr. 11, 1958).

[14] See testimony of Loftus Becker, legal adviser of the Department of State, hearings before the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, 85th Cong., 2d sess., 1958, p. 1273.

[15] See, for example, McDougal and Lipson, "Perspectives for a Law of Outer Space," 52 Am. J. Int. Law 407 (1958).

[16] See: H. Con. Res. 332, 85th Cong., National Aeronautics and Space Act, sec. 102(a). President Eisenhower's expression of willingness, in his 1957 state of the Union message, to enter any reliable agreement for the international control and peaceful exploration of space.

President Eisenhower's proposal to Chairman Bulganin for a ban on the production of missiles with atomic or nuclear warheads (Jan. 12, 1958).

Secretary Dulles' proposal for the use of outer space for peaceful purposes only (Jan. 16, 1958).

Ambassador Lodge's proposal in the United Nations for international inspection of satellites, intercontinental missiles, long-range unmanned weapons, and space platforms (Aug. 29, 1957).

Our Policy in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an article by Henry Hazlitt which appeared in the December 8, 1958, issue of Newsweek entitled "Our Policy in Europe." Mr. Hazlitt presents some interesting ideas on our foreign economic aid program and suggests that we should add some self-respect to the European recovery program by adopting a policy of freer trade in place of economic aid. The article follows:

OUR POLICY IN EUROPE

(By Henry Hazlitt)

A visit to seven European countries in a total of 8 weeks is apt to produce kaleidoscopic impressions, but one or two stand out clearly. The first is a striking growth in prosperity compared with 10 or even 5 years ago. Everywhere people are better dressed. Almost everywhere there is an astonishing amount of new building. This is most impressive in West Germany; but almost as remarkable is the new building in Belgium and in the northern half of Italy.

This new building has gone on in spite of—and even partly because of—rent control. All seven countries (except Belgium) have retained some sort of rent control. This usually takes the form of rent control on old houses and freedom from it on new ones. The result is increasing disrepair in old housing but some incentive to new housing, to which is commonly added the incentive of direct or indirect state subsidies. Where, because of the extent of inflation, rent control is most out of line with realities, as in France, the dilapidation of old housing and comparative lack of new housing is most noticeable.

BRANDS OF SOCIALISM

What stands out is not the differences in the economic policies of the various countries of Europe but the similarities. This applies even to Spain, which is under a dictatorship and still seems in large part cut off from the rest of Europe. Though all of Europe has been moving in the last 5 or 10 years toward a relaxation of controls, most European economies are still marked by a continuation of socialism, protectionism, deficits, and inflation. While European democratic leftists have for 20 years been denouncing the reactionary, dictatorial, and Fascistic policies of Franco, it is hard, economically, to distinguish between their policies and his.

It is not easy to describe the difference, for example, between Italy's socialism of the left and Franco's socialism of the right. The Italian Government, through its holding company, Instituto per la Ricostruzione Industriale, popularly known as IRI (pronounced Erie), controls or owns stock in most large Italian industrial companies. The Spanish Government owns or controls large industries through a similar agency, Instituto Nacional de Industria, the INI. Both organizations came into existence because of an alleged emergency, but neither government seems in any haste to sell its securities back to private hands. If Italian industry has forged ahead faster than Spanish it is partly because IRI makes more effort to emulate the principles of private enterprise than INI, and partly because Italy does not put the appalling obstacles in the way of new private industry that Spain does.

WHAT WE COULD DO

Yet what is most puzzling in Europe is American policy. Why, for example, do we give our actual support and blessing to the proposed six-nation common market? This would discriminate against American goods, make it more difficult on net balance for American exporters to sell to the countries involved, divide Europe into rival trade blocs, and tend to increase and perpetuate bureaucratic controls and protection rather than to move toward free trade. Why do we in Spain (or anywhere else) pour in American aid that obviously goes to subsidize foreign socialism and to prolong government controls, which in turn retard rather than promote economic growth and freedom?

There are two main things that we could do, in the economic sphere, for Europe and the rest of the world. The first would be to keep the dollar strong and beyond suspicion, a hitching post and a model for other currencies until they are restored to soundness. The second would be to open our markets to European goods, to encourage European industrial growth through the self-supporting and self-respecting method of trade, not aid. We are doing neither. At home we are pursuing policies of inflation, undermining the integrity of the dollar. In trade we are moving toward more protectionism, exclusionism, and quota systems. Abroad we are subsidizing, at the expense of the American taxpayer, exchange control, socialism, and inflation. Our so-called foreign economic policy is in need of thorough reform.

Final News Release of Congressman Charles A. Wolverton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we of the New Jersey congressional delegation miss the comradeship of, counsel and good works of the Honorable Charles A. Wolverton, of Camden, N.J., who retired at the close of the 85th Congress after 32 years of distinguished service to his constituency and the people of the United States. We are glad, however, to welcome as his able successor the Honorable WILLIAM T. CAHILL, former member of the New Jersey State Legislature and prominent member of the New Jersey bar.

There recently came to my attention a copy of Mr. Wolverton's final congressional news release of January 3, 1959, which read as follows:

FINAL NEWS RELEASE OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

JANUARY 3, 1959.

Frankly, as I write this, my last official news release, there is a feeling of sadness that the end has come to a long and treasured relationship that has existed for 32 years between the constituency of the First Congressional District and myself as I have served as a Member of Congress representing this congressional district.

However, there is also a feeling of happiness in the knowledge that my service has proved acceptable to the people whom it has been my privilege to represent. The expressions of satisfaction I have received with respect to the service I have rendered, together with expressions of regret that I have relinquished my duties as a Member of Congress, are most gratifying. My remembrance of these kind expressions of good will upon my leaving the office of Congressman will ever remain a pleasing memory through all the years that may remain to me. The fact that these friendly expressions have come from every section of the congressional district, and without regard to political affiliations, increases my pleasure.

My task has not always been an easy one. The problems that have arisen have at times been serious and difficult to solve. I have endeavored, as God gave me light, to solve

each with no other thought in mind than to do what was best for the people whom I represented and the Nation at large. I am conscious of the fact as I close my congressional career that at no time have I permitted my action to be dictated by political partisanship or any other unworthy motive.

My task, however, has been made easier by the helpful assistance that has so graciously been given to me by letters and words of counsel and advice, not only from my close personal friends, but also from individuals in my constituency whom I did not always have the privilege of knowing personally. These expressions have been most gratifying because underlying each, although at times differing with my own thought, there was an acknowledgment that whatever my action had been, or would be, I was sincere and honest in whatever action I took. This attitude of confidence in my having right motives has been a source of great strength to me in the performance of the many and varied activities that I have had to participate in. I am most grateful to one and all.

In this connection, I conisder it appropriate that I should also acknowledge my indebtedness to the faithful, efficient, and conscientious service rendered throughout my entire congressional service by those who have served in my secretarial force. This applies to all without any exception. Whatever success I may have had was in no small part due to their loyal and highly capable service. The quality of service that a Member of Congress, particularly a new Member, can render to his constituency can be greatly enhanced or hindered by the presence or absence of qualified secretaries, both locally and in Washington. I have been greatly helped and blessed in having this type of secretaries.

To my successor in office, the Honorable WILLIAM T. CAHILL, I extend my best wishes. The problems, both domestic and foreign, that face our Nation are numerous and important. It is my hope and prayer that each will be solved in a manner that will promote the welfare of the people and bring peace to this troubled world.

In concluding this, my final official message as your Congressman, may I again express my deep and sincere appreciation of your kindness in permitting me to be your Congressman for these many years, and be assured of my continuing interest in all that pertains to your welfare and a willingness upon my part to be helpful whenever you may call upon me for any further service that is within my power to render.

As God has richly blessed me during all my service by His helpful guidance, may He likewise give each of you His richest blessings. Au revoir.

Under date of Saturday, January 3, 1959, the Camden Courier-Post printed as a lead editorial the following editorial tribute to Mr. Wolverton captioned "Great Congressional Career Ends":

GREAT CONGRESSIONAL CAREER ENDS

With the end of the 85th Congress, a distinguished congressional career unprecedented in the history of New Jersey also comes to an end.

Charles A. Wolverton has retired from the political scene after 32 years as Representative of New Jersey's First Congressional District at Washington, the longest period of time any Jerseyman has ever served in either the House or the Senate.

Wolverton's service is notable and will always be remembered not merely for its duration but for its accomplishments. As a colleague has said, he "has contributed much to the history of our times." For many years he has been one of the outstanding members of Congress and one of the most influential on both sides of the aisle despite his quiet ways and his genuinely modest, unassuming personality.

The record shows how Wolverton first went to Washington in 1926 and how he was reelected time and again, as regularly as he submitted his candidacy to the people. It shows how he won overwhelming personal triumphs in years when the Democrats swept all else before them. The record is the best proof of the esteem in which its people have held him, the confidence they have had in his judgment and ability—esteem and confidence that were fully justified and which redounded to the enduring benefit of the First District and the Nation.

"I like to think," said Wolverton a short time ago, "that the people recognize me as an individual who was seeking to represent them in their best interest without regard to political affiliation."

Wolverton can be certain that the people did so recognize him. They knew that, as he says, he "never considered the party label on a bill—if it was good for the people I was for it." Democrats joined with his fellow Republicans at election after election to demonstrate their knowledge of these facts and enable him to set his historic 32-year record of service at the Nation's capital.

Early in his career at Washington Wolverton obtained assignment to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee because he felt he could better serve his constituency on that committee than on any other. His judgment was correct, as usual, and for many years he was either chairman of the committee when the Republicans controlled the House, or ranking minority member when the Democrats controlled it. In either role he was one of the hardest working and most invaluable Members of Congress and received the unstinting admiration of his colleagues.

As one colleague has said, as chairman or ranking member of the committee, Wolverton "has left his firm and constructive imprint on some of the most important legislation ever to be enacted into law." At the same time, he "established a reputation unsurpassed for independence, integrity, and solid legislative accomplishment."

Former Speaker MARTIN is authority for the statement that "Mr. Wolverton is without a doubt one of the best legal minds in this country." That was obvious long before he went to Congress. While he will be mainly remembered as a Congressman, he was as able and brilliant a prosecutor as Camden County ever had. Those not old enough to know that of their own knowledge will readily accept the statement when they recall Wolverton's great flair for congressional investigations and the leading part he played in the recent probe of the Federal Communications Commission during his closing months in Congress.

One of the finest aspects of Wolverton's character is his sincere solicitude for younger persons, his eagerness to aid them. This is manifest in both his public and private life, and the number of younger Members of the House who arose in its closing sessions last summer to pay tribute to the aid he gave them as neophytes in Congress is a striking testimonial to the fact.

Wolverton sponsored or played a leading part in enacting legislation in so many fields that no effort will be made to list them here. But it is probable, as more than one colleague has suggested, that his activities in the field of health legislation, his share in such things as the creation of the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health, are most truly representative of him and have given him his greatest satisfaction. Certainly the good that he has done in this field will live long after him, the Nation will be grateful to him for it, and his name will be forever associated with it.

It is ironic that just at this time, in the midst of the honors and tributes being bestowed on him, Congressman Wolverton should have suffered a deep and irreparable personal tragedy. He and Mrs. Wolverton, both ardent travelers, expected to have the opportunity to travel more extensively in the next few years than ever before. At the very moment when pleasurable anticipation was about to become realization, she has been taken from him in sudden bereavement.

No words of sympathy can temper such a blow. Suffice it to say that Congressman Wolverton does have the profound sympathy of all his constituency and his friends, just as he has their wholehearted love and affection. They at least have the consolation of knowing that he is in vigorous health, that his mental powers are at their peak, and they pray that he will be spared to us for many years. For we shall not soon see his like again.

Address by Commissioner Robert T. Bartley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a very interesting and informative address made by Commissioner Robert T. Bartley of the Federal Communications Commission, made in Boston, Mass., on October 15, 1958, before the Massachusetts Broadcasters Association, Inc.

The address follows:

Boston is renowned the world over as an educational center, but it has particular significance to me. It was here that I got my start as a practical broadcaster. It must have been amusing to have sat on the sidelines and watched but, believe me, I had some uncomfortable moments. For here I was working directly with John Shepard 3d who knew all there was to know about broadcasting, and I knew nothing about broadcasting except that it seemed that the programs I liked didn't have ratings. Shepard had a way of letting you get yourself all fouled up and enjoyed watching you try to get untangled, that is, if it didn't cost him any money. If it cost money—that was stupid—and the method of conveying the message to you was not smoke signals nor sign language but it had both heat and motion.

But we all loved the guy and broadcasting is a better service because he was a part of it. His influence is still felt not only here in New England but across the land from coast to coast. He was Mr. Broadcaster in my book and we all owe him tribute.

Most places I go to visit with broadcasters, I try to leave a message. If the area is a little weak on local news, I try to stimulate that activity. If they seem a little timid in their approach to controversial issues, I urge them to take an editorial position on matters of local importance, being careful, of course, to so label it and being fair in providing equality of exposure to opposing views. Where they are lagging a little in their cooperation in Conelrad, I explain its value as a public service and why from even a selfish standpoint they should participate. If the station is in a particularly significant area to the system, I might even resort to a little of the lifted eyebrow technique. The newest wrinkle on this is, of course, the use of Conelrad alerting for weather warning. This, incidentally, is growing like wildfire, Boston being one of the earliest to adopt it.

Then there are some of the experiences I've been pretty close to that I sort of let slide by or intentionally ignore. Like the time the eager young news hawk looked up the address in the phone book of a man charged with a robbery. Well, he had the right name, all right, but the wrong address. The upshot was that the man with the same name, but at the wrong address, had some extra income tax to pay that year. We simply settled out of court. We were like the accommodating Negro down home—I call Texas home, too. A newly employed, young and eager constable working overtime found Rastus in Widow Brown's chicken-house. The young constable wasn't too impressed with Rastus' explanation that he was simply being neighborly, that he was gathering up the eggs for Widow Brown who was feeling poorly. So, he threw Rastus in the jug. The next morning, Rastus explained the whole thing to his friend, the judge, who asked how he wished to plead. Rastus, sizing up the situation, replied, "Well, Judge, I pleads guilty and waives the hearing."

The judge quizzically asked, "What do you mean, Rastus, you waive the hearing?"

"Seeing's as how the way things look, Judge, I just don't want to hear any more about it."

I don't talk too much to them about how we laid a license on the line in the great tradition of freedom of speech in taking an editorial position and came within a gnat's hair of losing WAAB in the famous—or infamous—decision, the Mayflower case. Well, we won renewal but the dicta in the case handcuffed broadcasters for years until the Commission reversed that position in its very worthy report "Editorializing by Broadcast Licensees." You ought to make it a point to read it at least once a year.

I don't say too much either about the dither that was caused in one region when an unidentified plane set off Conelrad. There were no casualties and we got a fine exercise out of it. As soon as we get a couple of more ulcers cured, all will be back to normal.

Nor do I say much about that snow in New York the other day when it was 80 in the shade. Well, there's one boy who won't punch the wrong button again.

I don't need to tell you Massachusetts broadcasters how to make section 315 of the Communications Act work for you instead of against you. It was right here that I learned—the hard way, to be sure—that if you plan ahead for political campaigns you can make much smoother sailing for yourselves. If the candidates know the rules of the game ahead of time, they will be reasonable, and it pays to treat them right. Remember, one of them will end up an incumbent. There's just one thought I would like to leave with you on this. Don't be carried away when the networks, Broadcasting magazine, and the NAB campaign for repeal or changes in 315. Think for a moment what 315 means to you as a shield against pressures for favored treatment. It merely says treat all candidates for the same office alike. What could be fairer than that? By the way, we have just republished a notice entitled "Use of Broadcast Facilities by Candidates for Public Office." That, too, I can recommend as required reading every year, before the campaign gets under way.

Well, if I don't have a message, why did I accept this invitation? It's very simple. In the relatively short time I was here, I made many lifetime friends and I wanted to feel young again. Though many of them have gone along, I still feel their presence—people like John Shepard. Then I remember Major Armstrong and Doc Pickard upon Mount Washington when we were pioneering FM—that was 20 years ago to you who weren't around yet. I remember how gallantly they tried to tell me the difference between how FM worked and AM. Up to then, I thought AM was before noon. Then there was Ted Hill over at Worcester, Al Moffatt, and many who are still around like many of you here—also, Paul de Mars and Sam Waite. Sam and I built an entirely new air castle of broadcasting. We had FM doing binaural. Now they've fixed it so I can't pronounce it—stereophonic. While people were sleeping, we delivered their morning newspaper by FM—facsimile.

Well, here 20 years later, stereo is the hottest subject on the dealers' shevles and we are running out of FM assignments; so, we are having to hold comparative hearings for FM stations. And, I still believe facsimile will become practical sooner than most of you think.

Yes, I came up here to be with some friends. If one depended on the newspapers and other publications, congressional reports, newsletters, and so on, one might gain the impression that it would be foolish if not downright dangerous for an FCC Commissioner to appear in public. After all this adverse publicity, who would have any friends left?

Well, I've got some Dutch in me, some English, some Scotch (left over from last night), a lot of Texas and New England, and a little bit of Irish. But, I'm not going to take Pat's advice.

Pat, it seems, was on his death bed and the Father had been summoned.

"Pat, you must renounce the devil."

"But, Father, I'm feeling a wee bit weak."

But the Father kept insisting that Pat should renounce the devil. Finally, Pat, in a rather weak response said, "Father, at this late date, I'm in no condition to start making new enemies."

Well, I can't take that tack. I'm in public life and I well recall the day some 6 years ago when Senator McFarland attended my inauguration as a member of the FCC. I was brought up in the tradition that it was an honor for one to be selected to serve his fellow man. For the inauguration, there was a gathering of pretty prominent Washington officialdom. I was proud to become a member of the Federal Communications Commission. When the ceremonies were over, Senator McFarland, who had been in public life for many, many years, said to me, "Bob, you're more popular today than you will ever be again."

No truer words were ever spoken. I knew something of the job I was taking on. I wasn't out to win any popularity contest. I just wanted to do a good job with a job somebody had to do.

Our Founding Fathers had amazing wisdom in their concepts of government. Evidently, this wisdom of theirs derived from the fact that they were more experienced in the abuses of governmental power. They lived in times of monarchy, feudalism, military dictatorships, colonialism, and, yes, even anarchy.

They devised a constitution which provides for all the powers necessary to govern and yet leaves that power in the hands of the governed. Our Government has been termed one of "checks and balances." Its powers are entrusted to three branches, executive, legislative, and judicial.

Our Founding Fathers did not believe it wise to entrust the regulation of commerce to the executive branch of Government but lodged such authority as close as it possibly could as a practical matter to the people. So, the Constitution provides that the Congress shall have power to regulate commerce, that is, to prescribe the rules by which commerce is to be governed.

Well, that was all right in the early days, but commerce expanded and became so complex and changed so rapidly that it became unworkable for Congress to revise the laws rapidly enough to keep up with changes in industry or for the courts to render decisions fast enough.

How, then, was Congress to exercise its responsibility in this field? Well, after thorough deliberation and sound thinking it created a series of independent commissions. The ICC lays claim to being the first of these alphabetical agencies. It was created in 1887, 71 years ago. The stewardship of the ICC was such that the pattern was followed by Congress in establishing the FTC, FPC, SEC, CAB, and, of course, the FCC. They were to be independent of the Executive. They were to have legislative authority in the sense that they could implement the law passed by Congress by the adoption of rules to carry out the intent of the law. And they were to adjudicate cases involving complaints by users against the regulated industry, or decide between contenders for a certificate of convenience and necessity or select among applicants for licenses to engage in the service affected with the public interest. The Congress provided that the courts could reverse any action of one of these agencies which was arbitrary or capricious.

And, finally, and of immense importance was the concept that these independent agencies should be bipartisan. Congress wanted the benefits of our two-party system. It had rejected the idea of delegating these powers to the Executive or an executive department or to a single administrator. These commissions were to be composed of an uneven number (like the Supreme Court—and for the same reason—to avoid tie votes). No more than a majority of one to be from the same political party. The concept is that the commissions should have the benefit of conflicting viewpoints in order that their decisions and actions reflect not partisan political convenience, of whatever party happens to be in power, but that their decisions should be based on the merits as reflected in a record developed through bipartisan participation—just as laws are enacted by Congress. Members of these commissions are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate for fixed terms.

The six commissions which I named earlier are in daily contact with every corporation of any size in the United States. These commissions regulate the interstate rates and services for such mammoths of industry as the railroads, bus and truck land transportation, aviation, and power and gas. And practically every other corporation of any size comes within the purview of the laws administered by the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

With respect to the FCC, our rate and service jurisdiction encompasses the world"s largest corporation, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and its interstate subsidiaries, the Western Union's domestic landline system, and the several international communications carriers.

And, would you believe it, there are more than a million licensed radio transmitters.

For the regulation of these industries in the communications field, we have approximately 1,100 employees. One-third of these employees are stationed at monitoring stations throughout the country for the purpose of seeing that users of radio operate in such a manner that they do not interfere with other stations. That leaves around 700 people outside the Commissioners' offices, to handle the application processing, to carry on hearings and investigations, and advise the Commission with respect to short-term and long-term policy matters.

So far as the Commission's budget for its activities is concerned, I have in the past referred to it as the plugged nickel, which means simply this. The budget for FCC's operations amounts to less than 5 cents per annum per person in the United States. With that plugged nickel, the Commission is supposed to "regulate interstate and foreign commerce in communications by wire and radio, so as to make available so far as possible to all the people of the United States

a rapid, efficient nationwide and worldwide communication service with adequate facilities at reasonable charges for the purpose of national defense, and for the purpose of promoting safety of life and property through the use of wire and radio communication." That's lawyer language for saying "the public is entitled to fast, cheap communications service."

It is only natural that the regulator would be unpopular with the regulated—if the regulator is doing an effective job. We Americans just naturally react unfavorably to being told "No," even when we understand that must be the answer for the good of all.

One complaint against us, though, is legitimate and gives us great concern. That complaint relates to the delays encountered by the parties in securing decisions.

Remember, one of the reasons for the creation of commissions was to avoid the long delays experienced in court. Now, for a long time, these agencies were able to operate in such a way that interested parties received answers expeditiously and the public was, I believe, better served. Remember, too, that even then actions of the commissions which were arbitrary were reversible in court. But that was not enough for those who lost cases or who, for one reason or another, wanted an impending unfavorable decision delayed. So, gradually over the years, we have seen a whittling away of the powers of these commissions in providing expeditious service to the public.

Now, one of the reasons for these delays lies in the fact that the personnel force provided for these agencies has remained about the same as before the war; whereas, some of the industries regulated have doubled and trebled in size. Indeed, in the case of television, a completely new complex industry has been born, an industry in which the public has invested some 13 billions of dollars in 40 million television sets. To help us execute our duties with respect to the 4,500 standard, FM and TV stations, our Broadcast Bureau operates on a budget of approximately $1 million with only 160 people. This simply is not an adequate force to handle the innumerable problems in this field with expedition.

Another contributing factor for delay is the recent increase in the laws providing for more "due process".

Let us see how this has come about.

Back in 1938, after Congress had set up a whole administrative pattern of independent regulatory commissions, attempts were made to break down this pattern. James Landis wrote a book entitled "The Administrative Process," in which he pointed out:

"Only a year ago (meaning 1937) a distinguished group of scholars, reporting to the President of the United States—in language hardly indicative of academic restraint—described the independent administrative agencies of the Federal Government as constituting a headless fourth branch of the Government, a haphazard deposit of irresponsible agencies and uncoordinated powers, whose institution did violence of the basic theory of the American Constitution that there should be three major branches of the Government and only three."

Although this frontal attack on independent commissions was defeated, a pincers movement succeeded some years later and resulted in the enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act. I believe Congress was seeking to remedy abuses which had arisen in the functioning of certain agencies within thte executive departments which led primarily to this statute—not from abuses in the six agencies I am discussing.

But, even when early bills preceding the Administrative Procedure Act were being considered, there were warnings raised against attempting to remedy abuses by general legislation affecting all administrative agencies. And these cautions were spoken not by partisans of the agencies themselves, but by eminent judges experienced in judicial review of administrative matters, and by members of the bar practicing before administrative agencies. For example, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, whose committees on administrative law was then headed by John Foster Dulles, put itself on record as disapproving the bills. Its report pointed out that administrative law is an intricate field encompassing numerous agencies dealing with a variety of diverse subject matters; and that no one procedure is adequate or appropriate for the handling of all these different fields.

In summation—what does all this add up to?

We have seen that Congress set a statutory course for independent commissions to follow. It established what it presumed would be a fair and qualified group of people to administer an act on a bipartisan basis. For a long time, and without interference from the executive department, it provided these commissions with adequate funds and personnel to operate effectively. It prevented the courts from interfering with the decisions of the commissions on matters of judgment by limiting the power of review to those cases in which the commission had acted in an arbitrary or capricious manner.

But, what has happened in recent years?

The basic intent of Congress in creating independent commissions is slowing but surely being defeated, in my opinion, by the following factors:

First. The executive department has been extending its influence upon independent commissions in a crippling manner through restricting their budget and personnel justifications before Congress—and has been encroaching upon the important functions of certain administrative agencies. In addition, the independent regulatory agencies are required to secure prior approval from the executive department before they submit to the Congress their views concerning legislation affecting their respective agencies and the laws entrusted to them by Congress. Moreover, in certain important situations, the independent agencies must secure the prior approval of the principal legal officers of the executive department in order to petition the United States Supreme Court to review court decisions made against such independent agencies.

Second. The judiciary, through restrictive and hampering interpretations of the law and requisite procedures, has hamstrung the expeditious handling of cases and has apparently indicated in certain decisions an intent to exercise its judgment in place of the Commission's. In this connection, it is interesting to note that the Supreme Court has had occasion in a recent case to remind the lower court that the Communications Act must be read as a whole and with appreciation of the responsibilities of the administrative body charged with its fair and efficient operation. The Court also pointed out that the growing complexity of our economy induced Congress to place regulation of businesslike communication in specialized agencies with broad powers; and that courts should be slow to interfere with the agency's conclusions when they are reconcilable with the statutory directions.

Third. And, finally, Congress itself has made it difficult for the independent commissions to function effectively. Through certain basic procedural restrictions (such as the APA) and crippling amendments of the basic statutes (1952 amendments), Congress has followed a trend of removing from members of commissions their latitude of action and exercise of discretion and judgment—which tools, I believe, are essential to a fair and expeditious handling of the complex matters with which we have to deal.

Through these three means—the intervention of the Executive, the courts, and through legislative acts themselves, it has become more and more difficult for these arms of Congress to carry out efficiently, effectively, and expeditiously the very policies which Congress itself delegated to them.

The public has a direct and vital interest in the effective functioning of the FCC. All of our actions have a direct impact on the public—from the institution of service by a new local radio or television station—right through the efficient operation of your police and fire departments, public utilities, and industrial companies through the use of radio—all the way to the rates you pay for interstate and foreign telephone and telegraph service.

It is rare, however, with the exception of public utility rate cases, that the public participates directly, or voices its opinions before the Commission. Therefore, as I see it, the Commission must itself represent the public interest in its deliberations. It must, in fact, be an affirmative defender of the public's right to the best possible communication service, in carrying out the mandate of Congress in this branch of commerce.

Currently, more and more Members of Congress are becoming concerned with the declining prestige of the independent commissions and with their declining efficiency. It is interesting to note that a recent report by a House Small Business Subcommittee made five recommendations after studying the activities of independent commissions. They take a column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20, 1957, since they are written in legal language, but basically this is what they say:

1. Authority to name the chairman of these Commissions should be placed in the Commissions themselves instead of with the Executive. For years, the ICC and Federal Trade Commission rotated the chairmanship among their members and this arrangement worked very well.

2. That these agencies should not have to clear their requests for appropriations with the Bureau of the Budget.

3. That they should not have to clear their requests for information from the industries they regulate with the Bureau of the Budget.

4. That they should not have to clear their legislative proposals with the Bureau of the Budget.

5. They should be allowed to seek Supreme Court review of lower court decisions without having to go through the Solicitor General.

Subsequent to this report, Congress appropriated $250,000 to its House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make a study of the manner in which these agencies operate.

These are the basic questions being studied by the House Committee on Legislative Oversight. But the public is not being made aware of these important matters. You'd think from reading the newspapers that all the Harris committee is doing is playing cops and robbers.

Now, I would be less than candid if I did not admit that all this adverse publicity has hurt and has interfered to some extent with our efficiency but let me tell you this. I have never seen seven harder working, more conscientious men, than now make up the FCC.

These men are all dedicated public servants. They are in their prime of life. They average 53 years of age and have an average background of 22½ years in Government service.

As you know, I was recently reappointed for another 7-year term, and it was gratifying to me—after all this adverse publicity—to find the spontaneous general acceptance by, it seems like everybody. It made me proud to be a member again.

All the present members of the FCC are proud to be members and we intend to make the people of our country proud of the FCC.

Statement by Hon. Walter H. Moeller of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, on this, the second time that I have been present on the floor of the House as a Member of this distinguished body, I think it fitting to give voice to a few of the sentiments which have been in my mind and heart during the past few days, sentiments which I hope and pray will color and in a sense guide my future actions as the elected Representative of the people of the 10th Congressional District of Ohio.

First and foremost I am deeply grateful to Almighty God for having been granted the honor and entrusted with the solemn duty of helping to guide the destiny of this great Nation in these epochal times. With His constant help I shall do my utmost to prove myself worthy of that trust and to redeem the pledge that I have given to my constituents and to the whole people of the United States.

I feel also a strong sense of obligation to the voters and indeed to all of the citizens of the 10th Ohio District. I take this moment to assure each and every one of them that my door and my heart will always be open to them. Their legitimate concerns and their problems, great or small, will come first with me, either at home or here in the Nation's Capital. I ask only that they not spare me the opportunity to serve them.

I reflect also on the high privilege of being one of the chosen few to occupy these Chambers, dignified by history, by time, by the distinguished and even illustrious Members of years past, and made even more distinguished by the spirit of generations past, present, and to come which we feel in the atmosphere about us. Without thought of sacrilege I can honestly say that it is almost as though I were experiencing a second ordination. Only my life's calling as a member of the clergy can be said to have made me feel the depth of emotion and the feeling of consecration to a holy cause which now hold me, in my head and in my heart. Pray God that this spirit will abide with me always and that I do not lose it in the days and months to come.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to trespass upon the patience of my colleagues with more than these few words. I have spoken from a full heart and I pledge that whatever I may say from this floor in the future it will always be said in the same Christian spirit and with the same respect for truth and for the rights and feelings of my colleagues, my constituents, and the whole of humanity of whatever color or creed.

Omnipotent State No Guarantee of Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ed Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, in an informative and well-reasoned article appearing recently in the Cincinnati Enquirer, sets forth in no uncertain terms that the omnipotent state is no guarantee of security. I feel that the Members of the House and Senate should have the benefit of his observations at the beginning of this 86th Congress.

The article follows:

OMNIPOTENT STATE NO GUARANTEE OF SECURITY

A monthly investment letter circulated by Cincinnati's Westheimer & Co., expressed the opinion that regardless of any definitions given the words "Republican" and "Democrat," the last elections indicated no return to orthodox economics or fiscal sanity in the next year.

"We can expect to live," the letter states, "with a hybrid capitalism in which high taxes, unbalanced budgets, unrestricted labor unionism, rising production costs, and mounting farm surpluses, will be considered normal and continuing."

This view is shared by a startling number of people who are trying to be realistic, but they are not shared by those of us who see in the rising ground swell of public resentment against brink-of-war headlines; against staggering deficits; broken promises; labor racketeering; confiscatory taxation; destruction of small business; and unparalleled industrial greed—the deeper interest that exists in any proposal which could lessen these evils.

It is true that much of this interest is generated by fear, but most of the greatest reforms in history were born of fear. Today people know that a dollar that loses 50 percent of its value in 20 years, can lose more of its value every year under present inflationary trends. They are waking up also to the mounting threat of monopoly power building up in the huge chainstore systems, in colossal corporate combines, power-crazed labor unions, and overcentralized Government.

In meeting this challenge, I think our first big job is to prove that the omnipotent state is absolutely impotent when it comes to guaranteeing the freedom and security of the individual. Consider that 40 million people last year received checks paid out of tax money, with more than $11 billion going to Federal employees alone, yet all this outpouring of money didn't contribute a dime's worth of economic freedom or political liberty—to the future.

Alfred Friendly, editor of the Washington Post, put it in a nutshell when he said: "Never has an older generation had less valuable counsel to offer a younger one."

Like the Soviet Union, our whole effort, our whole life is being mobilized for military and industrial goals, and like the Soviets, we find justification for whatever loss of individual independence that may incur. This emphasis on mass production geared to militarism; on mass distribution; mass communication; mass unionism and m sive government, is the direct opposite philosophy to the emphasis on self-reliance and independent enterprise which made our country great.

It would, therefore, seem unarguable, that our second or "twin" obligation is to set in motion any force that encourages the development of an economic climate in which all persons of sound mind and body are provided a fair chance to create their own security.

According to the dictionary, capitalism is a system that "concentrates wealth and power in the hands of the few," which, of course, dooms the system. So, how else can we preserve the system and perpetuate it except through the widest possible independent ownership of farm, home, and business enterprise (wherever practical and possible), with local control over local affairs in government?

When capitalists (which includes anyone who owns anything privately) understand thoroughly this Jeffersonian approach to economic freedom and political liberty, the "power groups" who are mopping up in the corporate field, in banking, and in the labor movement, will be turned back. No other objective is more important in the New Year that lies ahead.

A Word About Charley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is fitting for me as the Representative of the congressional district in which Charles F. Kettering was born and reared, to speak a few words today in his memory and to draw the attention of my colleagues to an editorial about his life and works.

Incidentally, this editorial was written by one of my good friends, Ken Woodman, who has captured some of the spirit of Mr. Kettering in this eulogy.

In some respects, it is superfluous for me to try to add to the fame and name of Charles F. Kettering, for his was a unique genius which manifested itself in countless ways for the benefit of our industrial economy and, in fact, for the whole world. For decades, the name of Charles Kettering has been known internationally for his management skill, his inventive and creative mind, for his many philanthropies, and for his humanitarianism.

The folks in our area, who remember him as a youngster, still refer to him as a "queer duck," for his genius, even in his youth, led him to make experiments and to wear his clothes and to act in ways that caused others to smile. They did not realize, and perhaps did not appreciate, the workings of his marvelous mind in those days. But, of course, as he became famous, they understood why he had seemed to be eccentric to them.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the November 26, 1958, issue of the Mansfield (Ohio) News-Journal:

A WORD ABOUT CHARLEY

(By Ken Woodman)

The trouble with Charley was he believed a person could do almost anything he set his mind to.

Just because a rule said something wouldn't work, didn't mean there wasn't a

way to make it work. You just had to find a new way.

Another trouble with Charley was he wouldn't hurry.

He had weak eyes and he suffered from splitting headaches but he figured if he took his time that wouldn't prevent his studying. He was kind of slow in school but he plugged along until he had enough training to be a schoolteacher. On the side he studied Greek. By the time he was 28 he managed to graduate from Ohio State University.

Charley was born on a farm near Loudonville. There were no I.Q. tests in those days to warn that Charley had a mind that was something special. He was just a lad with a slow way, a big sense of humor, and curiosity you couldn't crush.

While teaching school he spent evenings hanging around a drugstore, tinkering with chemicals and electricity.

That was another thing about Charley. He loved to tinker.

His headaches forced him temporarily out of Ohio State at the end of his sophomore year. He got a job with a telephone company and started tinkering and ignoring rules and came up with a central battery system that took the resistance out of old-time phone lines.

The National Cash Register Co. heard about this and invited him to come with it as an inventor after he left Ohio State University.

Well, Charley said, "Let's get rid of that crank." And he did. Within 5 years he had produced the first electric cash register and a complex accounting machine.

Of course, he had to do a little tinkering on the side. He did it in a hayloft with a couple of other fellows and they figured out a way to improve auto ignition systems. Cadillac Motor Co. showed interest and in his own good time Charley came up with the first self-starter for automobiles.

United Motors, which later was to become General Motors, bought out Charley's hayloft project for $9 million, which was quite a chunk for a Loudonville farm boy in those days.

Charley sort of sold himself along with the deal—but on condition that he be permitted to do his own tinkering. In his deliberate way it wasn't long before he had devised the Delco-Light farm ignition plant which brought electric lights to thousands of rural areas which had depended on kerosene lamps and lanterns for a generation.

Then Charley got to puttering around with electric refrigerators, trying to make them better. That meant he had to look into chemistry a bit. Before you could say, "What have refrigerators got to do with automobiles?" Charley's chemical puttering had produced the first ethyl gasoline to take the knock out of motors. He had the help of a young engineer named Thomas Midgley on this.

Charley was now a big wheel with General Motors. He bought a yacht. The "durn" diesel motor didn't work right. Charley got to tinkering with it and came up with ideas that made GM a leader in the diesel engine field.

Every once in a while Charley would come back to Loudonville and Ashland. He would put up the money for a hospital or a college building—provided others dug in and worked a little bit too. He liked to talk with old friends.

He built himself a summer home near Loudonville overlooking the beautiful rolling country which he called Ohio's Alps. He had a private plane in which he flew up from Dayton and which he complained cost too much money.

He served on a score of boards of directors for industry and colleges. He kept right on taking ideas that wouldn't work and making them work until he had an almost uncounted list of useful inventions to his credit.

Charley took sick Sunday at his home in Dayton. It was the end.

Everywhere typewriters flew into action hailing the stupendous accomplishments of Charles Franklin Kettering, known more familiarly as "Boss Ket."

Charley would have chuckled good-naturedly at that. It would have been just like him to say, "Don't those fellows have anything better to write about?"

He once inaugurated a complicated telephone system with the jest: "Well, I guess she's gonna work." Which, when you come to think of it, was a much profounder and more practical speeech than most inaugurals.

That was the thing about Charley. He had a way of seeing through the shell to the meat of the nut.

Charley was one of the greatest geniuses of our times and it didn't faze him one bit. God rest his wondrous soul.

Reduction of Premium Rates for FHA Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, since February of 1955 I have had legislation before the House of Representatives providing for a reduction of the premium rates for FHA insurance on cooperative housing to one-fourth of 1 percent.

In June 1955 the Housing and Home Finance Agency reported unfavorably on my bill, H.R. 4443 to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and again in August of 1957 the Agency recommended that the bill, H.R. 8674 not be enacted.

At that time I had pointed out that it was obvious that the 213 cooperatives were in serious financial difficulty because of circumstances over which they had absolutely no control. Section 213 of the Housing Act was originally designed to alleviate critical shortage of housing for the middle-income group—to fill the gap between public housing for the low income group and private homes and luxury apartments for the higher income group.

Unfortunately, inflation has also affected the operation of the 213's. Heavy increases in carrying charges have occurred over the years, and these increases have forced many of the tenant-stockholders, most of whom are veterans, to vacate their apartments because of their inability to meet such increased charges. There have been practically no foreclosures of section 213 cooperatives and thus the fund created by the mortgage insurance premiums has not been touched. Section 213 cooperatives have proven to be excellent insurance risks in the past, and there is no reason to believe that this condition will not continue in the future. These people are entitled to every possible consideration, and a reduction in the mortgage insurance premiums would be a tremendous help to the tenant-stockholders.

I am reintroducing this bill in the House again today. Several years have elapsed since there has been anything done and it would be particularly bad to keep accumulating this money when it would give many people who need the help, the benefit of it.

I am very happy to see that the Committee on Banking and Currency has just announced that it would now be in favor of such a reduction in the FHA insurance premium, and agrees with my efforts to reduce the premium to one-fourth of 1 percent. The committee has stated that the FHA now has reserves more than ample to weather a real estate crisis even as serious as the great depression.

Such a position by the committee certainly would indicate that we can finally look forward to some favorable action by the Congress on this legislation which I have been advocating for the last 4 years.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in passing this legislation promptly so that we can correct a basic inequity and thus discharge our obligations and responsibilities to the people.

He's Spent 50 Years in Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK IKARD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, in July of last year, Mr. George Washington Weaver marked 50 years of outstanding service with the postal service in Denton, Tex. He is deserving of recognition for his fine and long record of service. On July 7, 1958, the Denton Record-Chronicle, in an article written by Mr. Jim Neal, recognized Mr. Weaver's half century of service to the citizens of Denton. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this article paying tribute to Mr. Weaver's postal service. It follows:

HE'S SPENT 50 YEARS IN POST OFFICE

(By Jim Neal)

Half a century of service to Denton residents and to students of what's now TWU.

That's what George Washington Weaver of 305 West Sycamore passed Sunday. The superintendent of the Denton Post Office's TWU substation, he's spent 50 years helping Dentonites and university students get their mail on time.

To celebrate the occasion, which falls on the 75th anniversary year of the Nation's civil service, Weaver's fellow civil-service employees gave him a surprise party today in the Denton headquarters of the region 5 Federal Civil Defense Administration office. Both the FCDA and the TWU substation are housed in the same building.

When he was invited upstairs for a cup of coffee, Weaver was busy trying to clean up some work so he could take some annual leave. He said later he thought it was odd that he should be invited upstairs for coffee when the TWU pub snack bar is located in the basement of the building with the substation. He had no inkling of the surprise party.

Questioned about his early days in the Denton Post Office, Weaver recalled that in

1908, all the mail coming to Denton was brought from the train station to the post office in a wheelbarrow.

"It took just two loads, one incoming and one outgoing," he said. On an average day in 1958, the Denton Post Office gets in about 250 sacks of mail and sends out about the same amount.

During his 50 years in the Denton Post Office, he's seldom missed work because of illness. He said he had accumulated a total of 1,700 hours of sick leave during that time.

Asked about his future plans, he said he just didn't know. "I have several propositions in mind. But one thing's for sure—I'm not planning to retire at the moment. There's a bill before Congress now that may allow postal employees to get paid for unused sick leave. I don't intend to quit till I know what they're going to do with that bill," Weaver chuckled.

LETTER

At the informal surprise party, Weaver was given a letter of congratulations and appreciation for his cooperation with the FCDA. The letter was signed by FCDA Regional Administrator Welcome W. Wilson.

Now 68, Weaver was 18 when he was employed as a substitute mail carrier by the Denton Post Office on July 6, 1908. Before the year was out, he had become a full-fledged carrier, a position he held until 1916 when he became a postal clerk.

In 1918 he went into the Army, but the armistice was declared before he got overseas, and he was back at his old duties in the Denton Post Office within 3 months. In 1925 he was appointed a special clerk, and 2 years later he was assistant postmaster.

During his 50 years with post office, Weaver served under seven postmasters, including John B. Schmitz, A. L. Banks, Howard Fenton, C. A. Scott, B. W. McKinzie, Ray Bishop, and M. D. Penry, the present postmaster.

"The Post Office Department considers Weaver one of its topflight men," Penry said. "He's about the only postal employee I know in Denton who's ever received a grade of 100 percent on a post-office inspection."

It was in 1934 that he was appointed station superintendent of the TSCW (now TWU) substation. He's been there ever since.

And according to students and faculty members, he's made a success in the position. The students, for example, dedicated their 1950 yearbook to him.

It came as no surprise to anyone that the students thought so much of Weaver. During the 24 years he's been there, he's helped Tessies with a number of problems—including the searching out of postage stamps whose colors won't clash with the students' specially hued stationery.

It was also Weaver who took care of another problem at the TSCW substation several years ago. When a letter from a lonesome Texas A. & M. student arrived bearing the address, "To Just Any Tessie," Weaver personally took charge of delivery.

The result led to wedding bells.

Review of U.S. Unemployment Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, John W. Vandercook, ABC commentator, has some constructive thoughts regarding improvement of our unemployment insurance law.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his article as follows:

VANDERCOOK SAYS

Twenty years have now passed since the legislative act establishing U.S. employment insurance became more or less operative. Twenty years and a couple of wars, a couple of booms, and several recessions later, we can now gain an intelligent perspective on that vitally important law—or, rather, hodgepodge group of laws.

What has been the most remarkable result of our having established an unemployment compensation system has been the truly phenomenal effect it has had on the stability of the whole American economy. Unemployment compensation was intended to lessen misfortune's load on the shoulders of individuals who had lost their jobs.

No one, until the 1957–58 recession, had imagined how astonishingly the distribution of jobless compensation checks would lessen the recession's impact upon the whole economy.

Yet, at the human, private level, experience has taught us that the present scale of unemployment benefits, in almost all States, is grossly inadequate, both in amount and in duration.

But one major fault stands out in the operation of our unemployment insurance program.

With the best of intentions, it was established that companies with good records for steadily maintained employment—to put it simply—were to get back most of the sums they had paid into unemployment insurance funds.

In the light of 20 years of practice, there's now reason to think that maintained employment in any given firm is not so much a proof of virtue as it is an accident of the economy; that perhaps we have been recklessly open-handed in rewarding corporations for circumstances over which they turned out—under the pressure of harder times—not to have as much control as they pretended.

More money, obviously, has to go into the unemployment pot. More of it, the next Congress may decide, will therefore have to come from previously favored companies.

Legislative Program of Affiliated Young Democrats of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to insert the legislative program of the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State for the year 1959. This program, which undoubtedly will be of particular interest to similar groups throughout the country, was adopted at a meeting of the organization's State executive committee on December 27, 1958. The Honorable Harold R. Moskovit, State president of the organization, presided. Following is the text of legislative program:

NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS, INC., FOR 1959, ADOPTED AT A STATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING ON DECEMBER 27, 1958

This legislative program will be introduced in the 1959 State legislature by their members, of which there are 17 in the State senate and 31 in the State assembly.

The Affiliated Young Democrats pledge ourselves to devote every effort to the enactment of the following program. We have always stated clearly and without equivocation our position on the vital issues, and we do so now.

1. Reapportionment: We support the enactment of legislation reapportioning both congressional and legislative seats in fair proportion to population, so that all segments of our State may be fairly represented both in Albany and in Washington. Only by such reapportionment can the popular will be effected.

2. Primary elections: The Democratic Party is irrevocably committed to the proposition that government belongs to the people, and that the people should have the fullest possible participation in the selection of those who fill high public office. The State of New York is today one of the few States in which candidates for U.S. Senator, Governor, and other offices filled by statewide election are not selected in primaries. The confusion which has existed with respect to the selection this year of a candiate for U.S. Senator demonstrates the wisdom and need for selecting the candidates for such offices in primary elections. We advocate the speedy passage of legislation permitting statewide primaries.

3. Presidential primaries: 2 years hence the Democratic Party will surely have the responsibility for selecting the next President of the United States. The Democratic voters in the State of New York under present law will be one of the few segments of our party who wil be unable to participate directly in that process of selection. We support the enactment of legislation permitting presidential preference primaries permitting the voters in each party to indicate their preference for candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, and to elect delegates committed to the nomination of such candidates.

4. Presidential vote: We favor the abolition of the electoral college and the election of a President and Vice President by popular vote. Pending such amendment to the Federal Constitution, and in order to achieve an equitable division of the electoral vote, we urge the enactment of legislation at Albany permitting the allocation of the State's electoral vote among the candidates for President and Vice President in direct proportion to the popular vote.

5. Voting machines: We favor the mandatory use of voting machines in all primary elections in which there is a contest.

6. State offices: We favor a clarification of the law so as to eliminate any question of the power of the Governor to fill vacancies in the office of attorney general or in any other State office.

7. Lieutenant Governor: We favor revision of the State constitution so that separate votes may be cast for Governor and Lieutenant Governor, and to permit a vacancy in the office of Lieutenant Governor to be filled at next election following the vacancy.

8. Eighteen-year-old vote: We again urge that the right to vote be given to those 18 years of age.

9. Election laws: We favor the establishment of a permanent spring primary, the mandatory direct election of district leaders, and simplification of election petition procedure.

10. Board of elections: We favor a revision of the manner in which the board of elections of the city of New York is constituted, so that its members will be selected on a nonpartisan basis, and so that residents of Queens, the Bronx, and Staten Island may be eligible for membership.

11. Board of regents: We urge that the selection of the board of regents be placed on a nonpartisan basis, so that all segments of

the population may be represented in the educational system of the State.

12. City income tax: We favor the abolition of all legislative authority permitting the imposition of an income tax by the city of New York or any other municipality.

13. Court reorganization and simplification: We favor a continuation of the program for court reform, and intensified efforts to bring about its enactment.

14. Family court: We favor the establishment of a family court in the city of New York and in other communities throughout the State so that all actions relating to the family will be centralized in a single court with adequate resources and judges of special competence and qualifications.

15. Education: We favor a substantial increase in State aid for education so that the city of New York and other municipalities will receive a fair share of the taxes paid by their residents, thus enabling them to meet the enormous shortages in adequate school facilities and teaching staff.

16. New York City Charter Commission: We urge the passage of enabling legislation permitting the appointment of a New York City Charter Commission which can submit its recommendations directly to the people.

17. Discrimination in housing: We support a bill to extend the ban on racial discrimination in housing to all multiple dwellings and to one or two family houses throughout the State.

18. Child care: We advocate a program of State aid for child day care in the public schools.

19. Rent control: We favor the extension of rent control throughout the State, and to strengthen the law by requiring landlords to provide services and maintenance equal to that provided in 1951.

20. Subway fare: We favor maintenance of the present 15-cent subway fare by requiring the State to contribute its fair share to the cost of operating the subway system.

21. Fair Sabbath law: We favor the enactment of a law permitting the city of New York to enact a fair Sabbath law. We further favor and support a policy of permitting the city of New York home rule, and ceasing efforts to govern the city from Albany.

22. Legislature: We again advocate that a printed record be published and made available to the public of the full proceedings of the legislature, including the names of all persons employed in the legislative establishment and the amount of compensation received by them, so that the public may be fully informed of what goes on in Albany and so that the abuses recently disclosed may be eliminated.

23. State taxes: We favor a reduction of State taxes to the greatest extent compatible with a solvent State government.

24. Public health: We advocate encouragement of prepayment plans for meeting the cost of medical care, by giving aid to sound voluntary plans now in existence, and stimulating the development of new plans; the development of centers for the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped; a program of State aid for the training of medical and nursing personnel to meet the shortage of physicians, nurses, and technicians; establishment of State programs for the care of the chronically ill; and expansion of the State's facilities for the mentally ill.

25. Securities dealers: We believe that persons engaged in the investment of other people's money should demonstrate affirmatively their qualifications for such responsibility by examination, and to this end we advocate the establishment of a State licensing system for securities dealers and investment advisers.

26. Juvenile delinquency: We favor vigorous continuation of the programs to combat juvenile delinquency. The State's facilities for the handling of delinquent boys and girls must be expanded, and additional funds must be made available for the probation bureaus of the criminal courts. State aid should be made available for the so-called 600 schools. We also favor an expanded rehabilitation program for young people in correctional institutions.

27. Motorists: We support the exclusive allocation of funds collected from gasoline taxes and motor-vehicle licenses to the development of the State highway system. We also support an extension of the gasoline tax to industrial users of gasoline to the same extent that it is now imposed on motorists. We favor examinations of all motor-vehicle operators to be given every 3 years to help curtail automobile accidents.

28. Science colleges: Urge a new State science college be built to meet the new advances in science.

Address by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker under permission to extend my remarks I include a very informative address made by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development of the Department of the U.S. Army, at the opening ceremonies, solar furnace dedication, Quartermaster Research and Engineering Command at Natick, Mass., on September 30, 1958.

The address follows:

Today we gather here in Natick, Mass., to dedicate a great solar furnace marking another step in man's attempt to provide new sources of power and energy for his betterment. This, along with similar efforts being made elsewhere, should teach us eventually how to harness the unlimited energy of the sun for mankind's use.

The worship of the sun by the ancients and by many peoples even today in outlying areas of the world is well known to all of us. The essentiality of its life-giving heat and light have been known to men of all ages. In the fifth dynasty of ancient Egypt, as early as the year 2500 B.C., its capital was called Heliopolis and the god it worshipped, peculiar as it may seem, was named Atum Re. The existence of this fact when associated with the brilliance of atomic explosions today is indeed one of interest, if not significance.

If we search through the history of man's development we can pick out many, but particularly several significant steps in increasing his power beyond that provided by his own muscles. The lever, the wheel, the use of draft animals, development of hydraulic power from the natural fall of streams, the development of the steam engine, the employment of electricity, and the extensive development and use of internal combustion engines and fossil fuels mark but seven of these steps.

Today we are faced with many more possibilities as mankind approaches new thresholds in scientific achievement. The employment of the atom for peaceful purposes to provide nuclear power is well underway. A companion development, using fusion instead of fission, seems likely within the foreseeable future. The scientific investigation of further energy developments through the use of chemical, thermal, electromagnetic, and thermal-ionic sources is proceeding apace. The harnessing of the energy available from the heat in the bowels of the earth and the movement of the sea from wind and tide is still to be accomplished but the massive amounts of energy available therein will undoubtedly be utilized to some greater degree in the coming decades and centuries.

In the sun, in particular, we have an obvious source of tremendous energy and most of us are convinced that substantial amounts can be harnessed for mankind's use

The need for a breakthrough into new sources of energy other than those obtainable from fossil, hydraulic, and hydrocarbon sources is readily apparent. With each passing year, the world's reserve of economically recoverable fuels is being depleted at an ever-increasing rate. Estimates have been made that maximum production of oil and gas in the United States may quite likely be reached by 1970 and that coal production in this country will peak prior to 1990. With the projected increase in our energy requirements and consumption by the turn of the century to 10 times what it is today, we are faced with a very disturbing prospect. Other nations of the world face similar problems to varying degrees. It is estimated that all fossil fuels will be exhausted within 100 years and, while such estimates are usually pessimistic, it still points up our need to develop the vast energy sources existing in the sun and the sea and the earth. Even with respect to uranium and other fissionable materials, it is estimated that within the next century projected population increases and pyramiding power requirements may consume practically all of these materials that can be made economically useful.

We have reached, therefore, in this solar furnace being dedicated here today, another milestone in man's effort to advance himself and his progeny. While this furnace has been placed here for specific purposes in connection with military uses, it need not be confined to such uses and it is my hope that it will be utilized to the maximum extent practicable for the advancement of American science and industry as well as in the interests of national defense.

This furnace will stand as a monument not only to American science and technology, but to the Army and its Quartermaster Corps which has had the vision to proceed with this important project. The value of military developments to our people as a whole is well known. The acceleration of development in the motor industry, in the aircraft industry, and in the electronics industry, including radio, television, and radar, has been a product of military necessity in earlier conflicts. Many great medical advances, including the advanced surgery of today, are also a result of military necessity. Many of the developments we are seeking today will have similar impacts on our health, economy, and way of life in the future. Two developments for which we can pay tribute to the Quartermaster Corps today are the food irradiation plant which is underway on the Pacific coast and will provide new knowledge and new techniques to our food industry as well as to the military in the handling of produce from our great agricultural resources and this solar furnace here on the Atlantic seaboard which we have the privilege of seeing unveiled today.

I am pleased that this will also serve as a focal point for those of you in science and technology who have joined us here today and who will have further deliberations regarding the important subject of solar energy during the next 2 days. I hope that you will be encouraged by our efforts here to stimulate further activity in the field of solar energy.

So while this solar furnace marks a goal, its real measure may be in its service as a

stimulus for greater breakthroughs and achievements in widely different scientific fields.

In these perilous days with our survival at stake, we need a greater sense of urgency and boldness to overcome the complacency and fear so prevalent in many circles. Accustomed as we are to the comforts and blessings we enjoy, we fail to gauge the thinness of the veneer that bonds our own civilization to the struggling mass of mankind. The cracks in the highly polished surface are widening as the stirring demands and promises of demagogs generate explosive temperatures beneath the surface.

In all the fields of science and technology we need to make vast and rapid strides as time is not on our side. The release of dangerous pressures by enlightened management of human relations and substantial improvement toward a better distribution of food and other basic essentials for sustaining life more adequately among the suffering masses of mankind is certainly as vital as the production of destructive devices in this critical period. The harnessing of the God-given rays of the sun offer great hope that in the social sciences as well as in the physical sciences we may be looking to new horizons.

I believe that one of the greatest advances in this regard will occur shortly when we attain a real capability to convert the salt water of the sea to pure water usable to meet human requirements and, particularly, to develop the wasteland on much of the world's surface to a point where it can produce the food essential to sustain the world's rapidly expanding population. The recovery of the great mineral wealth available in the oceans will not only be of real value toward meeting our industrial requirements, but will also greatly offset the cost of converting and distributing the waters of the seven seas to a thirsting and hungry mankind in the arid land areas of the world.

I am honored to be here today and to have this small part to play in the dedication of the Army's first solar furnace. May it serve America well.

Thank you very much.

"Theodore Roosevelt"—An Address by Judge Filbert L. Rosenstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the year 1958 marked the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt.

Among the personal friends and admirers of the great Teddy is former judge and Rotary governor, Filbert L. Rosenstein, of my home city of Paterson, N.J. Late last year Judge Rosenstein made seven addresses before Rotary clubs in connection with the Roosevelt centennial year, one of them before the New York Rotary Club, the members of which gave him a rising ovation of several minutes. After this address, the Reverend Norman Vincent Peale, who was present, called the address one of the most magnificent he had ever heard.

"I was thrilled both by its content and manner of presentation," he said. Mr. Peale went on to say that "Theodore Roosevelt was and is the great political ideal of my life."

Judge Rosenstein in his New York speech spoke as follows:

Theodore Roosevelt was born 100 years ago, on October 27, 1858. In that year, human slavery was still lawful in this land of liberty. But before he was 7 years old, it had been forever abolished. Thus, his earliest years beheld the striking of a mighty blow at the then free enterprise system—a system by which some men—white in color—were free to keep in slavery certain other men—black in color. Undoubtedly, this experience left a deep impress upon the future social and industrial reformer.

Of this career of reformer, however, his earliest years gave little forecast. For Theodore Roosevelt was born into the conservative family of a merchant-banker of New York City. Moreover, he was sickly as a child and timid, nervous and short-sighted as a boy. But, in his 14th year, he resolved to have a strong body, and so, he took up boxing, and later wrestling and horseback riding, with the result that, in manhood, he was able to live that strenuous life which he constantly preached "Better to wear out than to rust out."

The timid, nervous boy also grew into the fearless man. Thus, while living the life of a ranchman in the Dakotas, he personally brought in two horse thieves. At the the age of 39, he served as a volunteer in the Spanish-American War. In 1909, he went to Africa to hunt big game. In October of 1912, as he left his hotel in Milwaukee, during his campaign for President, he was shot pointblank. His friends entreated him to go to the hospital. He refused, because he was scheduled to make a speech. And make it he did. Only after he concluded, did he go to the hospital. In 1913, he went to Brazil to explore the jungle. There he discovered the River of Doubt and almost lost his life because of jungle fever. At the age of 58, he offered to raise and lead a division in France in World War I.

Roosevelt was not only a man of action, but also a man of intellect. While at Harvard, he was a member of the boxing team and of Phi Beta Kappa, national college scholastic society. He was both an omnivorous reader and an author of note. Shortly after graduation from college, he published his "Naval History of the War of 1812" and later, "The Winning of the West." And, yet this omnivorous reader and author was that same soldier who faced fire in the field in Cuba. And this soldier, in turn, won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1905 for having successfully mediated the Russo-Japanese War.

He was a born preacher. As he himself said, "My problems are moral problems, and my teaching has been plain morality." He wrapped up his whole political and social philosophy in a moral phrase—the square deal. He thundered against race suicide, corruption in government, waste of natural resources, and monopoly and greed in industry.

Yet, moralist though he was, he was always marked by a strong sense of reality. Thus, in 1897, he wrote of Russia, that, if she "chooses to develop purely on her own lines and to resist the growth of liberalism * * * she will sometime experience a red terror which will make the French revolution pale." Twenty years later came the Bolshevik Resolution to turn prophecy into reality.

However, with it all—moralist and realist that he was—he was always intensely human, a devoted family man, a man of many sides, gay and warm, full of the zest of life. Theodore Roosevelt was a composite of morality, reality, virility.

He was still a young man when he entered public life. He was only 23 years old when he was elected to the Assembly of his native New York. There, he soon attracted stateside attention by his independence and courage. Then, in 1884, in his third year in the assembly, tragedy struck him a double blow—his mother and his wife both died on the same day. Grief-stricken, he left politics and went out to the Dakotas, to live the life of a ranchman.

Two years later he returned to New York City to run for mayor, but he was defeated. In 1889, President Harrison appointed him to the United States Civil Service Commission. In 1895 he returned to New York City to serve as president of the police commission, and did much to improve a force suffering from corruption by saloonkeepers, gamblers, and prostitutes. Frequently, at midnight, the tireless police commissioner would prowl the streets of the great city to make certain that his patrolmen were on their beats.

In 1897, President McKinley named him Assistant Secretary of the Navy. With the outbreak of the Spanish-American War, he resigned in order to raise and lead the famous Regiment of Rough Riders.

Upon his return home, he was a national hero, and, in the fall of 1898, he was elected Governor of New York. In 1900, he was elected Vice President of the United States. In September of 1901, after only 6 months in that office, he became upon the assassination of William B. McKinley, President. He was only 42 years old, and he was at the top—the youngest President the United States has ever had.

The country, which had always respected him for his sincerity and independence in public life, soon came to respect him even more for his readiness to fight powerful forces opposed to the public good. And the country, which had always admired the pluck that had turned a sickly child into a vigorous man, now came to love him for his humanness. He showed himself equally at home with prizefighters and authors, cowboys and Phi Beta Kappa men, industrialists and labor leaders, military men, and statesmen. People were delighted with the President who led panting diplomats on long walks over the rocks and hills and through the fields around Washington. They were fascinated by a President who ordered Army officers on 50-mile horseback rides, because he thought they were out of condition, and then, when they grumbled, went on a 100-mile horseback ride himself.

And then, too, he was so colorful in his speech. When pleased, he was "dee-lighted." Any achievement was "bully." He created his own club, the Ananias Club, and elected to it those whom he meant thereby to call liars. He scorned alike, muckrakers, mollycoddles, and malefactors of great wealth.

When Roosevelt came to the Presidency in 1901, the country was facing, even as it is today, a time of great change and perplexity. However, the country was not long in learning that, in him, it had a leader who led.

At home, our natural resources were being dissipated at an alarming rate. Immediately he threw himself into the battle to stop exploitation of our mineral and timber resources and our waterpower. So hard and so successfully did he fight, that, when he left the White House, conservation of natural resources was a firmly fixed national policy.

An even greater domestic problem was the rise of great and powerful monopolies and the feeling of angry frustration on the part of labor. Roosevelt had entered public life as a conservative. But, soon after he finished his term as Civil Service Commissioner, he realized that mere improvement in political conditions by the removal of corruption from Government was not enough. For now he began to sense that all labor was crushable and in need of protection. Moreover,

business had become so powerful that laws were needed additionally against unfair competition, monopoly, and restraint of trade. And, noting that such regulation and control of corporations could not be done effectively by the States, because the very corporations that needed regulation all did business across State lines, he urged that the Federal Government must undertake the required regulation.

Almost immediately upon becoming President, Roosevelt embarked upon his crusade for social and industrial justice, and when he left the Presidency, he had completed a historic readjustment in the relation of government and industry. He instituted the first successful suit to break up a monopoly and went on to earn for himself the title "Trustbuster." In the fall of 1902, he entered a bitter, long-drawn-out coal strike, that was threatening the Nation with disaster, and forced a settlement. And this was at a time when the Federal Government had no recognized general authority to intervene in labor disputes.

During his 7½ years as President, he secured passage by Congress, often over great opposition, of many laws regulating industry. These included the law creating the Department of Commerce and Labor, with a Bureau within it to investigate the operation and conduct of corporations; the Hepburn rate bill, which gave the Interstate Commerce Commission power to fix the rates that railroads could charge; a Federal employer's liability law; a Federal meat inspection law; pure food laws and a District of Columbia child labor law.

By his acts and pronouncements as President and by his later preachments as ex-President, Theodore Roosevelt, because of his deep hold upon large segments of the population, largely prepared the way for the New Deal. Thus, in 1910, he said, "I stand for the square deal. But I mean not merely that I stand for fair play under the present rules of the game, but that I stand for having those rules changed so as to work for a more substantial equality of opportunity and reward." He advocated, in 1910, an income tax and an inheritance tax. He advocated price control in extreme cases of regulating corporations, such control to be similar to that of the Interstate Commerce Commission over railroad rates. In the Progessive Party platform of 1912, he advocated insurance against the hazards of old age—what we now call social security. For years, he favored collective bargaining for labor.

Theodore Roosevelt was not only the father of the Square Deal—he was also the grandfather of the New Deal.

On the international scene, the country was likewise facing change and perplexity. Long before most of his countrymen, Roosevelt realized clearly that the day of isolationism was gone forever. Accordingly, he emphatically preached preparedness. He more than doubled the U.S. Navy and sent the battle fleet around the world. No other fleet of like size had ever done it before. He thoroughly reorganized the Army and created the general staff. He settled the Alaska boundary dispute. He built the Panama Canal.

Theodore Roosevelt was only 60 years old, when, weakened by the fevers of Cuba and Brazil and the bullet in Milwaukee, worn by a lifetime of strenuous exertion, and weighed down by grief over the recent death of his youngest son, Quentin, in aerial combat in World War I, he died in the dark hours of the early morning of January 6, 1919.

And now, in this, the centennial year of his birth, we bring our tribute to the memory of this great and gallant American, even as we draw inspiration from his memory for our own times.

If we wish the strength to overcome the perils we face, let us follow his example of subordinating personal interest to service for the common welfare. The challenge he flung to his own generation is still valid in ours. Practical efficiency is common and lofty idealism not uncommon; it is the combination which is necessary and the combination is rare.

If we are distressed by the treatment of the Negro in some parts of our country today, let us recall his act in inviting Booker T. Washington to the White House. It was the first time a Negro had ever dined there other than as a menial. The South fulminated with rage. But the moral of Negro equality had been pointedly and eloquently preached to the Nation by the President of the United States.

If labor's right to collective bargaining is now firmly secured and, if industry is largely regulated by the national Government, as he desired, let us remember that he was also firmly opposed to carrying the reforms to the extreme of socialism. It is not the affair of the Government to run industry, he said, but only to see that it is run in the interest of all the people. Against his strong opposition to government by a plutocracy, he set up the counterweight of equally strong opposition to government by the mob.

If we seek guidance in the conduct of our foreign affairs, let us remember his admonition to "speak softly and carry a big stick". And never forget his passionate Americanism. In his day, he lashed out against hyphenates with their dual loyalties. Today it is not a matter of hyphenates in the literal sense that it was in his day. In certain American Communists and their sympathizers, we have people today, who are ready to advance the interests of Soviet Russia over those of America. We quarrel with no man over a difference of opinion. But we do demand of them, as we demand of every American citizen: One Nation, one flag, one language, one loyalty.

And lastly, let us follow his example of sublime courage. This is not the first time America has faced a crisis. Indeed, there have been times in the past, when our country was far weaker than she is today. And yet she triumphed, for she faced those other crises with courage, and courage is faith—faith in ourselves and faith in our destiny. And our destiny was marked with brilliance at the very birth of the Nation, for, when this Nation was brought forth, it was brought forth in a pattern that was to be a pattern of freedom for all nations, because it was a pattern wherein the rulers are selected for prescribed terms in free elections by majority vote of all the people.

Let us, then, take heart from the flaming words in which Theodore Roosevelt left to America a lasting testament of faith: "We know there are dangers ahead, as we know there are evils to fight and overcome, but, stout of heart, we see, across the dangers, the great future that lies beyond, and we rejoice, as a giant refreshed, as a strong man girt for the race. The greatest victories are yet to be won, the greatest deeds yet to be done. There are in store for our people and for the causes we uphold grander triumphs than have ever yet been recorded."

Send that message to the men in the Kremlin and bid them make the most of it.

Bombing Lawlessness Must Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 7, the opening day of the 86th Congress, I introduced my first bill of the new session. It is a bill calling for the most severe penalties for anyone bombing or attempting to bomb a house of worship, a school, a community center, or any other public building. I consider the recent wave of bomb terrorism a most serious situation which we cannot afford to tolerate, and for this reason, I feel we should adopt the most stringent means to prevent and to stop such terrorism in the future.

In October of 1958, when this wave of bombings of churches, synagogues, and schools began, I announced that I would have a bill ready for introduction at the beginning of the 86th Congress which would provide severe punishment for such crimes. The bill I introduced, if enacted into law, would amend title 18 of the United States Code relating to crimes and criminal procedures by adding a new section to chapter 39 which would provide for the following:

Whoever uses, or attempts to use, an explosive which has been imported into the United States, or which has been introduced, delivered for introduction, or transported in commerce, to damage or destroy a church, synagogue, school, community center, or other public building without the consent of the owner thereof shall be punished by imprisonment of not less than 20 years or by death.

The United States is the showcase of the world. The means of communication are such today that what we do here, good or bad, is reflected all over the world. If a synagogue or a church is bombed in any State of the Union, the criticism is directed not against the particular State for its refusal to abide by the law of the land but against the United States as a whole.

Dictators and tyrants all over the world use the incident to justify their own misdeeds, while the Communists play it up as a breakdown in law enforcement in America, as hypocrisy and insincerity toward freedom of religion, and as a clear demonstration that we are not to be trusted with the moral leadership of the world.

Recognizing the fact that one of the major differences between communism and the free world is over the issue of religion, we cannot afford to weaken our cause as the chief advocate of freedom of worship by failing to take all necessary precautions to prevent all such incidents in our own country.

While most crimes of this nature can be prevented or discouraged by long prison sentences, the right of the courts to impose the death penalty whenever warranted will act as a strong deterrent when dealing with fanatics and otherwise distorted individuals who are perfectly sane in the eyes of the law.

I strongly advocated and supported legislation calling for the death penalty in kidnaping cases and those involving dope peddlers who, for all intents and purposes, were killing children addicts of the drugs. The passage of death penalty laws to deal with such cases greatly reduced the extent of these crimes.

I feel certain that the passage of a similar law applicable to persons who place bombs in a church, synagogue, school, or other public building, endan-

gering the lives of not one but of many people, will help put an end to this new form of lawlessness and direct attack on all free institutions.

Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter I received from the general president of the Textile Workers Union of America, together with a pamphlet relating to the need for Federal action to restore the industry to prosperity and stability:

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., December 19, 1958.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LANE: The facts of life in the textile industry underline the pressing need for Federal action to restore it to prosperity and stability. They also demonstrate that the industry, on its own, is unable to cope with its many, complex problems which cast a long shadow directly upon the lives of nearly 1 million textile workers and the hundreds of communities in which they live.

The Textile Workers Union of America maintains that when management cannot act effectively to save a basic industry, the Federal Government has an obligation to provide help in the interest of the general welfare.

During the recent special investigation of textile industry problems by a Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee, our union proposed the creation of a Federal Textile Development Agency to expedite a program to rebuild and stabilize the textile industry.

The enclosed pamphlet spells out that proposal. I am taking the liberty of sending you a copy not only to acquaint you with its details, but also in the hope of enlisting your support in its behalf.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM POLLOCK,
General President.

TEXTILES: A DIAGNOSIS

Under our private-enterprise system, the problems of industry should be met through private initiative. This, of course, is the theory or ideal; but even our most prosperous industries depend heavily upon the Government for encouragement.

In the case of textiles, there has been none. Moreover, textile millowners have not demonstrated the ability, nor even a concerted willingness to cope with their complex problems.

If the textile industry operated in a vacuum, there might be some justification for labeling it "expendable" and letting it sink or swim without Government intervention. But the textile industry's ills cast a long shadow directly upon the lives of many hundreds of thousands of Americans.

Entire areas become stagnant when it is in distress and the impact is felt regionally in New England and the South. In short, the textile industry presents a problem to the Nation as a whole.

Thus, the Government cannot remain indifferent to its plight. It has a clear responsibility. In a case such as this, where management cannot act effetcively to save the textile industry, the Government must move to protect the general welfare.

The Government has a further obligation to do so because many of the basic problems which plague the textile industry stem from Government policy and action. This is not merely a case of indifference.

TARIFFS, TAXES AND RAW-COTTON PRICING

Government policy has had a depressing effect upon the textile industry in at least three areas: tariffs, taxes, and raw-cotton pricing.

In general, U.S. tariffs are aimed at promoting a liberal foreign-trade policy. The Textile Workers Union of America recognizes that need, but we see neither justice nor practical gain from a policy that singles out a basic industry as a sacrifice on the altar of foreign trade.

Even where safeguards appear in the law, they are so loosely administered that their effect is nullified. Our foreign-trade policy must take into account the difficulties faced by basic American industries, as well as the need to provide markets for foreign producers. It is not in the national interest to destroy the jobs of hundreds of thousands of textile workers to achieve such an end.

A more sensitive approach to tariff policy can help to revive and rebuild the textile industry.

As our tax laws now stand, they contain a variety of loopholes which serve as incentives for the liquidation or relocation of textile mills.

Abuses permitted under the capital-gains tax and under provisions for tax-loss carryovers permit speculators to reap much greater rewards from closing down plants than from continuing to operate them.

The exemption from taxation of interest on municipal bonds helps to provide bait for communities in luring textile mills to new locations.

Not only are workers the victims of such maneuvers, but taxpayers in general must assume the burden of making up this loss of revenue to the Treasury.

Closing up these loopholes can drive speculators out of the textile industry and stop such evasions of taxes.

Despite the objections of cotton farmers, the textile industry and our union, the Federal administration continues to support domestic raw-cotton prices at an artificial level. At the same time, it subsidizes the export of cotton at world price levels 6 cents to 8 cents a pound lower than the domestic price.

This policy has deprived domestic cotton plants of much of their market at home as well as abroad because they must compete with foreign producers who not only have the advantage of lower wage scales, but also of lower raw-cotton prices.

An end to this double standard would revive demand for domestic cotton products and help to rebuild the industry.

We are not suggesting that these steps, in themselves, would solve the textile industry's dilemma. While Government policy and indifference have contributed to the decline of the industry, many of its problems are of management's own making.

Demand for domestic textile goods has been sagging steadily. A smaller and smaller portion of the consumer dollar is going to textiles. Management has lost many markets to substitute products devised by rival industries. It has failed to meet these challenges.

It has not reacted to changes in household and industrial needs by developing new products and new uses for textiles. It relies largely upon other sources for primary research when it should be devoting an increasing portion of its capital and energy to this activity.

It has neglected new advertising and sales-promotion techniques. Even where it can otherwise hold its own with foreign competition, it often fails to initiate fashion-setting trends of its own. Domestic competition is largely a case of large textile combines waiting for smaller firms to fall by the wayside.

There is no sign of traditional American enterprise. No concerted steps have been taken to usher in a new era of growth and expansion. The trend is not to develop new techniques to meet these challenges; it appears to be largely a matter of simply riding out the storm, and that storm has yet to end.

This managerial failure has caused great suffering among the workers who rely upon the textile industry for their livelihood. To compound their dilemma, management continues to pursue a feudalistic labor policy.

It works constantly to deny its employees the right to self-organization. It resists collective bargaining, the cornerstone of labor relations in all stable and progressive industries. And, more than any other group, it employs the Taft-Hartley Act and right-to-work laws to implement this policy.

The end result is to keep wages and working conditions depressed.

Whether it realizes it or not, management is paying a dear price for this negative approach to labor relations. There is a steady drift of skilled workers from textile plants into more rewarding industries. And there is a genuine reluctance on the part of technicians, so essential to textiles, to cast their lot with an industry which is so backward in its relations with its employees.

Full acecptance of collective bargaining would provide labor-management cooperation in solving the industry's problems.

Teamwork to revive and rebuild textiles is essential, but a third ingredient is needed—the active encouragement and participation of Government in such a program.

The Textile Workers Union of America has devoted considerable thought and energy to the role Government can and should play in this direction. We long ago had proposed a Federal investigation of the textile industry's problems. This is now a reality. During the course of this study we have called upon the Government to set into motion a plan to redevelop the industry and stimulate its growth.

Our proposal calls for the establishment of a permanent Federal Textile Development Agency.

It should be an official body, with representation for industry, labor and the public.

Its members should be appointed by the President with congressional approval.

Its activities could be financed by a small levy upon the industry's products.

It could sponsor a continuing study of economic and technical developments in the industry.

It could make an annual survey of textile problems and recommend action by Congress, by the administration, or by private industry.

It could promote basic research with reference to technical and economic problems.

This could be angled at household and industrial needs, with emphasis upon consumer purchasing habits; and it could investigate the possibility of adapting textiles to such needs and habits.

It could establish a fabric library and design centers to spur the promotion of a variety of textile products.

Such facilities would stimulate textile consumption by focusing the attention of designers and decorators upon textiles in their constant search for innovations.

It could publish literature to promote textile consumption.

It could collect and distribute statistics on production, inventories, and prices so necessary to the efficient operation of the industry.

It could organize conferences to promote mutual understanding between manufacturers, suppliers, industrial users, workers, and consumers.

It could administer special legislation to help the industry and its workers.

For example, textile workers stranded by mill closings deserve protection similar to that which railway workers get under the Transportation Act of 1940. The Agency could distribute severance pay and direct retraining of these workers for new jobs.

The foregoing is but a partial index to the role such an agency can play. Its potentialities are much greater, and we intend to spell them out in detail as a formula develops to halt the contraction of the industry and usher in a new era of growth and expansion.

But beyond the establishment of such an agency, the crisis in the textile industry demands positive legislation and administrative action.

We have already set forth our proposals in the area of tariff, tax, and cotton-pricing legislation. But other measures are needed.

Surplus textiles should be distributed on a larger scale as part of our foreign-assistance program; by the same token, such goods should also be distributed to the needy at home.

Federal contracts should be allocated to distressed areas. The administration must stop blocking area redevelopment legislation.

THE MANPOWER SURPLUS CRISIS

There is a critical surplus of manpower not only in the textile industry, but in textile areas. This situation calls for a direct attack on unemployment and short time.

New production techniques are steadily eliminating jobs in the textile industry, leaving tens of thousands of workers stranded. What we actually are witnessing is a preview of what automation can do to the jobs of workers in all industries.

Technical progress is fine, but it is meaningless, and worse, if it creates unemployment and hardship. Increased man-hour productivity must be reflected in shorter hours as well as lower prices and higher wages.

THE SOLUTION: 35-HOUR WEEK

We believe an economic adjustment must be made now to deal with a situation that may grow entirely out of control, once the effects of automation are felt in all industries.

The textile industry offers an ideal starting point. The times call for serious consideration of the establishment of a 35-hour week at 40 hour's pay for textile workers.

TWUA ASKS YOUR SUPPORT

The textile industry is basic to our economy; it is essential to our national defense and to the necessities and comforts of all Americans.

We are convinced that the program we have outlined can restore this industry to full health. We do not regard it as the perfect solution. We offer it, rather, as a base upon which to develop the ultimate formula.

In that very same vein, we earnestly ask you to support this program. You can help immeasurably by enlisting the aid of your community leaders and of your State and Federal legislators in its behalf.

Given such support, the textile industry will once again take its place as a dynamic force in our Nation's economy.

Sam Rayburn Philosophizes on Election Aftermath in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, here is an editorial which appeared on November 7, 1958, shortly after the general election, in the Austin Statesman, of Austin, Tex., Texas' second oldest daily newspaper, which points out so splendidly why our beloved Speaker is held in such high esteem everywhere.

Under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is as follows:

SAM RAYBURN PHILOSOPHIZES ON ELECTION AFTERMATH IN CONGRESS

That very wise and experienced majordomo of legislation in the House, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, has reminded the country of the good old American political tradition that finds all campaigns, even sometimes the most bitter, ending in a show of good sportsmanship and fair play.

"Mr. SAM" expects no bad blood between the President and Congress as a result of the excesses of the recent campaign.

In some campaign speeches, RAYBURN sadly noted, the President "had gone pretty far in accusing us of being radicals and left-wingers." But he made it clear that that would not affect the harmonious pattern of relations between the White House and Capitol Hill, which have been established in the last 4 years of Democratic control of Congress. Now that control has been greatly broadened by the Nation's voters.

RAYBURN says that 85 percent of the President's program was just an extension of Democratic principles. He ticked some of these off as being foreign aid, reciprocal trade, and a strong defense, the three prime legislative aims of the President's program. Differences, where they occurred, were, in extent and method, not in principle.

Most Democrats accept the President's campaign stance, even when it referred to them as radicals, as a part of his obligation to his party. Some of the President's most partisan utterances rankle and may imperil, from some Democrats, the President's goals in the last 2 years of his term. Vice President NIXON will be a particular target in the next 2 years.

The individual winner in the congressional election was Speaker RAYBURN, whose district, with Bonham his home, reelected him to his eighth full term in Congress and insured his position as Speaker. This is an all-time record.

Since RAYBURN was elected by his colleagues to serve out the term of the late Speaker William B. Bankhead on September 16, 1940, he has been continuously the Speaker when his party was in control, the Democratic House leader when the Democrats were in the minority.

RAYBURN long ago passed the only other man in the Nation's history to serve more than four terms as speaker, Henry Clay, of Kentucky. Before RAYBURN, Clay held the record at six terms.

Texans, depite occasional differences over party issues, hold a deep and deserved affection for "Mr. SAM." He is one of its finest "public institutions."

Private American Capital Must Be Encouraged To Go Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks which I made before the National Foreign Trade Council on "U.S. Taxation of Foreign Source Income" on November 19, 1958:

In examining the subject of this discussion, I think we can accept the fact that it is the policy of the United States to promote the economic growth of the free nations of the world and to do all that is prudently possible to help the less developed nations to achieve that momentum of progress in agriculture and industry to make it possible for them to look forward to substantial economic growth. It would seem equally clear that it is the policy of our country to contribute to and assist our friends in the world to the largest extent possible by encouraging the unhamptered operation of our dynamic free enterprise system.

All agree that this can best be accomplished by providing incentives for private American capital to go abroad and take with it the vitality, the skill, and the imagination that has made our system the strongest economic system in the world.

Private investment of American funds abroad is preferable to Government spending for many reasons. Not the least of which is the fact that such investment assures the most economic use of limited U.S. resources. The plain truth is that the need for capital by the free nations of the world is far larger than the amounts which our taxpayers can reasonably provide. For this reason alone private American capital must be encouraged to go abroad and take upon itself the task of preserving in the world the free system which we earnestly believe deserves to be fostered and preserved.

The foreign aid program is day by day losing favor both at home and abroad. So it becomes even more essential if we are to meet the full thrust of the Soviet economic offensive to create a favorable climate for intelligent and active free enterprise abroad. The socially conscious businessman must, in a sense, supplant the bureaucrat.

The concern of the President of the United States for the free nations of the world in this regard was most recently expressed in his address to the Colombo Plan conference. I was pleased to note the great emphasis that he placed on the necessity for encouraging private United States investment abroad. Considerations such as those underlining the President's address before the Colombo Plan conference prompted the membership of the subcommittee on foreign trade policy of the Committee on Ways and Means to announce public hearings on the subject of United States private foreign investment beginning on December 1, 1958, in Washington, D.C.

We felt the need to provide a forum in which the issues involved could be fully discussed by competent witnesses and information accumulated with which to guide possible legislative implementation of the public policies which I have alluded to. In this connection the impact of United States taxation of foreign source income is of the greatest importance, and will be of great interest to the subcommittee. We of the subcommittee have come to know as a result of our studies and travels that foreign trade policy cannot be divorced from other aspects of United States foreign economic policy. We have also been impressed with the fact that uppermost in the minds of those considering private foreign investment is the impact of U.S. tax policy on foreign source income.

Among other things the subcommittee expects that the December hearings will develop information, views and recommendations with respect to the following types of questions:

What are the facts about United States private foreign investment?

What are the reasons American capital goes abroad?

What forms does such investment take?

What are the effects of such investment on the host country?

What contribution does such investment make to the development of foreign trade with the United States and other countries?

What are the effects of such development on the economic development of underdeveloped countries?

What are the obstacles that stand in the way of new and expanding investment, both here and abroad?

What are the factors that condition the climate for investment abroad?

What is the proper concern of the U.S. Government in this field?

What types of governmental programs are appropriate in the light of our national interests?

What modifications in the tax systems of the United States as well as foreign countries are indicated?

What has been the effect of existing governmental programs in this field?

These questions are by no means the only ones pertinent to our hearings. They are merely illustrative of items of specific interest in the foreign investment field. You will agree, I am sure, that this inquiry is needed and that the findings will be helpful.

As a member of the committee of the Congress which is charged with the primary responsibility of formulating the tax laws of the United States, I am particularly aware of the need for a searching review of our revenue laws as they apply to foreign-source income. A most charitable appraisal of the Internal Revenue Code as it applies to such income would find it to be capricious in result, formalistic in impact, and difficult to administer, understand, and apply. I know no one who is familiar with taxation who does not believe that a thoroughgoing legislative overhaul is long overdue and badly needed not only as a technical matter but as a matter of policy as well. How this can best be undertaken will be one of the chief concerns of my Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy.

In considering ways and means to encourage private American investment abroad we must, of course, be mindful of the fiscal condition of the United States. We will begin our hearings in December at a time when the United States is facing a potential $12 billion deficit for the fiscal year 1959. If statements of some administration officials can be taken at face value, we can expect that there will be proposals during the next Congress for increasing taxes upon some segments of the domestic economy. Further, in light of recent administration pronouncements, we cannot expect the existing level of Federal expenditures to decline. Reforms here can be made, however, in my opinion, without loss of revenue. Over the long pull, there should be substantial gains in revenue from these sources. Perhaps more important than the facts of Federal fiscal life in appraising the chances for effective implementation of a policy of encouraging private foreign investment is the incomprehensible bias found in many quarters against foreign-source income. I do not understand this bias. It arises from a lack of public education, from a lack of understanding. It is not unusual to pick up a newspaper or magazine and find an article on "Foreign Tax Havens." The gist of such stories often lumps a reputable American business with modern-day Al Capones and implies, if not fraud, at least evasion of U.S. taxes.

It is in this context which we must view the possibility of providing needed incentives for the encouragement of foreign private investment. It portends an uphill fight and behooves us, if we have the interest of the United States at heart, to at least begin by considering recommendations which, though they may not go as far as we believe and know to be necessary, have a chance of adoption. There is strong evidence to support the principle of territoriality in taxing foreign source income (which would tax foreign-source income only in the country in which is situated the principal establishment to which such income is properly allocable) or at least a rate differential such as the 14-point differential considered in connection with the 1954 code. Nevertheless, it may be necessary in the light of existing conditions for organizations and individuals who are interested in spreading the doctrine of free enterprise throughout the world to consider all approaches for achieving this end in addition to those which have received prominent attention in the past. In this regard, among other things, I would think it wise for those who have skill and competence in the field of the taxation of foreign-source income to direct their attention to the proposal of deferral of U.S. tax on foreign-source income until it is severed for domestic use. This proposal has already received some attention.

You are, of course, aware of the possibilities for the deferral of U.S. taxes on foreign-source income which now exist under the Internal Revenue Code. But the benefits of such deferrals through the utilization of foreign subsidiaries or foreign-base companies are not available except at great price in many instances. The historical development of the statute and the rather fragmentary gloss which has been placed upon it by administrative and judicial interpretation has effectively denied the benefits to many companies. Consider, if you will, two companies manufacturing similar products. Company A at great risk embarked upon the unknown of foreign investment in the 1920's. The legal advice then available to it was, by present standards, poor because of lack of experience and interpretations. The attitude of the U.S. Treasury Department was then certainly far different from now. There were few regulations or rulings to guide it. Accepting the best advice available, company A organized its foreign undertaking in the form of a subsidiary incorporated in, say, Brazil. The vision of company A has been rewarded by success. The risks have proved worthwhile. The market was there. The demand for American ingenuity and products was there and company A has known for some time that similar markets existed in Argentina, Peru, South Africa, and elsewhere. One would think it a simple matter for company A to transfer a part of its hard-earned foreign-source earnings to any one of the countries named and establish a similar successful venture for the ultimate benefit of the United States and the countries involved. We know it is not.

Now take the case of company B which manufactures a product similar to that of company A. For years company B watched the experience of company A and, convinced of the wisdom of such foreign investment, decided to move into the foreign field in 1953. It established a base company and by utilizing this third country arrangement is developing the markets in, say, Argentina, Peru, and South Africa which should be available to company A as well. Its accumulated earnings and profits in any one of these countries may be transferred without the imposition of U.S. tax to the subsidiary where they are most needed. Additional benefits accrue to company B such as the averaging of foreign tax rates for the purpose of achieving the maximum benefit of the U.S. foreign tax credit. And it may achieve many tax savings on branch or other agency operations because its base company is not subject to U.S. tax jurisdiction.

Surely if we were proceeding de novo no one would suport such an inherently unequitable and discriminatory result as exists in the case of company A. Yet we today condone it by inaction and thus prepetuate precisely this situation. History is responsible for the genesis of the laws which make this result possible, of course, but they seem to be perpetuated by an overdeveloped concern for the bare possibility of tax avoidance in some cases.

I have reference, of course, to the operation of what is today known as section 367 of the Internal Revenue Code and which began in less difficult times as section 112(K) of the Revenue Act of 1932 in a campaign against foreign personal holding companies which were then being utilized for the purpose of avoiding the U.S. capital gains tax. Section 367, as you know, applies only to exchanges which involve an inherent gain and provides that, in determining the extent to which gain shall be recognized, a foreign corporation shall not be considered as a corporation for purposes of most of the important sections of subchapter C unless, before any exchange is undertaken, it has been established to the satisfaction of the secretary or his delegate that the exchange is not in pursuance of a plan having as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of Federal income tax. Of course, with tax rates what they are today it is not difficult for the Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service to find that a purpose of a contemplated exchange is the avoidance of Federal income taxes. Deferral is so deemed. Of course, referring again to the example, company A has no desire to avoid the payment of U.S. tax. It simply wishes to compete with equality under U.S. law with company B for foreign investment opportunities. This it cannot do because section 367 has fixed not only company A but perhaps a majority of the primary companies in the field of foreign investment in the cement of organization inflexibility. Business decisions cannot prevail and are frustrated, efficiency is denied. We are thus confronted with the absurdity of a nation that prides itself in having developed the greatest industrial and commercial complex in the world denying to its entrepreneurs the fruits of their imagination and initiative because of a reluctance to rid the Internal Revenue Code of deadwood.

Even if we were to assume that rare thing which is the Commissioner's approval of an exchange involving a foreign corporation, company A is by no means out of the woods. Subchapter C of the Internal Revenue Code was framed with domestic business problems in mind. It does not take into account the vagaries of foreign law and the policy of many foreign countries requiring a high percentage of ownership therein. Thus, even assuming that company A can overcome what is almost the irrefutable presumption of section 367 it may, nevertheless, find itself unable to invest where investment is needed because of a statute which should have as one of its principal objectives neutrality of impact between similarly situated taxpayers.

It may be that we were unaware of the existence of many of the problems confronting the businessman who wishes to invest abroad when first we framed these provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. This is no longer the case. We have been informed of the existence of the problems and the manner in which the Internal Revenue Code is distorting business decisions and preventing our American system from being carried abroad by our businessmen. We must do something about this situation.

In reflecting upon these problems to which I have so briefly alluded, I have devoted some attention to the possibilities inherent in deferral of U.S. tax on foreign source income. I have wondered why it is necessary for us to force our businessmen to seek out countries such as Liechtenstein, Monaco, and Panama to achieve a business result. I have

come to the conclusion that no reason for forcing them to do so exists. It is within our power to provide the means of organizing base companies for the conduct of foreign business operations in the United States itself. We have the example of Canada's 4-K companies and Britain's overseas trade corporations. As a matter of fact we have the example of practically every other trading country in the world before us to follow.

Enactment of a law permitting the creation of a unique class of domestic corporations organized for the conduct of business abroad would achieve a great deal and do much to provide incentives to foreign investment. Such companies would be in a position to utilize the earning derived from their foreign operations for the expansion of their activities in the free countries of the world without the immediate payment of U.S. tax and would permit maximum efficiency and economy in conducting foreign business operations. Such corporations would pay U.S. tax on their foreign source income only when such income was severed from the foreign operation by a distribution to shareholders. Such corporations, and I shall refer to them hereafter as U.S. base companies for want of a better term, could and should be permitted to carry on all operations now conducted by foreign base companies. I wish to emphasize that exporting activities should in my opinion be included within permissible activities.

Provision for U.S. base companies would not in my opinion require any change in existing law providing for Western Hemisphere trade corporations. Additionally, I see no reason for not permitting any company desiring to do so to continue to operate abroad through a branch operation.

In discussing the possibilities of deferral and of establishing a special class of U.S. base companies for the purposes of achieving deferral I wish to make it clear that no member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy or the Committee on Ways and Means has a fixed mind on the subject of how best to provide the incentive which we all believe necessary to encourage foreign investment. I have merely attempted to explore one or two proposals that have been put forward that seem to me, at this stage, to have considerable merit. If tax policy affords an appropriate device for providing incentive, and I believe that it does, we have an open mind as to how best the tax system can be utilized to provide an incentive. I welcome your advice and suggestions. I have mentioned the possibilities of deferral and the potential benefits of permitting the establishment of U.S. base companies only because I believe that deferral has been neglected in much of the thinking of people concerned with this field.

It is fair to state that the present fiscal condition of the United States should make deferral attractive to those in the executive department who are responsible for securing the revenues with which to meet the Government's bills. Deferral involves no loss of U.S. revenue since by hypothesis every dollar of foreign earnings would be subject to tax when repatriated to the United States and severed from the base operation by distribution to stockholders.

Another reason why deferral and the establishment of a special class of U.S. base companies should be considered by the Treasury Department lies in the possibilities for better administration which such companies would present to those charged with enforcing the tax laws of the United States. For example, it might be provided that such companies file an annual return setting forth the results of the foreign operation for the year. At present a foreign corporation is under no obligation to inform the United States Treasury of its operation with the result that many problems are encountered in computing the proper amount of accumulated earnings and profits from the foreign operation and the amount of foreign taxes paid and creditable. These costly administrative problems could be avoided.

From the investor's point of view the benefits to be expected from such companies are so obvious that I do not need to catalog them. Suffice it to say that not the least of them arises from the fact that the stability of United States law would be available and to a degree at least it would no longer be necessary to attempt to divine the law of a foreign country in selecting a base.

If the laws of Liberia, Luxembourg, Tangiers, and Liechtenstein pose problems of understanding for the businessman and even for legal specialists, this is understandable. After all, we expect problems when we deal with other languages and peoples of diverse customs and ways of doing business. But the paucity of information available to the American businessman contemplating foreign investment from our own Government about our law is not understandable. The regulations promulgated for the purpose of implementing those provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which provide for the taxation of foreign source income are less than full. This, along with the fact that the Internal Revenue Service has issued few public rulings in the field makes it difficult for even the tax specialist to advise in this area. Here, as perhaps nowhere else, certainty is a prime requisite. It is not fair to expect a businessman to feel his way into a situation which may rob him not only of the fruits of his foreign endeavor but of his domestic profits as well. I hope, therefore, that some attention will be devoted during the course of our hearings by both administration and public witnesses to the possibility of making more information available to the public as to the policies which are guiding the Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service in administering these statutes.

It has not been my purpose this afternoon to exhaust or even to mention all the tax problems confronting those engaged in foreign business activities nor even to touch on the many ways in which the tax system of the United States affects foreign operations. My purpose has been to impress you with the seriousness of my belief that something must be done, whether through the tax system or otherwise, to encourage American capital to go abroad and to make the slogan "trade not aid," meaningful. It has also been my intention to convey to you an awareness of the fact that we in the Congress of the United States know that you have problems and our sincere desire to do something about them. I would like to impress upon you the necessity of being your own advocate; to let you know that while I appreciate all that has been done by this and other organizations, which exist for the purpose of carrying our way of life abroad, that nevertheless a great deal more has to be done by you, both at home and abroad, to create an understanding of the contributions of American business not only to the United States but to the free world; and that herein lies the world's best answer to Communist imperialism.

Thank you.

America's Answer to the Soviet Bloc's Economic Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks which I made before the International Management Division Briefing Session on "Preparing the Country for Soviet Trade Strategy in World Markets; Terms and Procedures for East-West Trade" at the Hotel Savoy-Hilton, New York City, November 5, 1958:

AMERICA'S ANSWER TO THE SOVIET BLOC'S ECONOMIC WARFARE

At the close of the 2d session of the 85th Congress, Congressman Timothy Sheehan and I introduced identical bills to create a U.S. Trading Corporation in order to cope with the Soviet Union's declaration of war upon the United States in the peaceful field of trade. The formal declaration of war was made by Nikita Khrushchev on October 19, 1957.

We would be foolish, however, to look at this declaration of war in the field of peaceful trade as confined to the field of private enterprise trading. Indeed, in a totalitarian state there is no firm line drawn between economics and politics. It is perfectly true that economic laws cannot be repealed by political action, but it is certainly true that economic mistakes can be socialized, that is absorbed by the full society rather than born by the specific segment of the economy where the mistake has been made. Likewise deliberate economic losses may be accepted in one segment of the economy and born by the full economy in order to achieve certain defined economic or political goals of the totalitarian society. Indeed, short run economic losses may be financed by the totalitarian state in an economic sector in order to destroy competition and then have the losses recouped in the same sector by raising the prices once the competition has been destroyed. This was a familiar bit of economic strategy the United States experienced in its private enterprise sector toward the end of the 19th century and brought about the passage of the Sherman antitrust law.

I believe that a calm appraisal of the private sector of our economy will reveal that strong as some of our industries are they are not strong enough to combat the concentration of economic and political power of Soviet Russia if it is directed to their area of economic endeavor.

I also believe that it is politically naive to think that American industries when confronted with this sort of threat will fail to make their situation known to those in the political government in Washington, D.C., in order to gain assistance. Indeed, there are sufficient examples both in the past and in the present where this kind of assistance has been both sought and obtained. In the past this operation at times has extended to the ultimate—a declaration of war.

I believe it is important that assistance be granted to American industries when they are being attacked by the full weight of the Soviet totalitarian state under circumstances which we would define as unfair competition, or which I should prefer to describe as uneconomic competition. That is competition which is uneconomic to the extent that it produces economic losses which are absorbed outside the particular economic segment engaged in the competition.

However, I believe that this assistance should not be granted in camera by our Federal Government based upon no fixed set of standards or rules of procedures as is presently the case. It is entirely too easy for an industry confronted with strong competition to classify this competition as "unfair" when in actuality it is fair economic competition and all that is required is for the industry involved to look into its own internal affairs to bring about needed reforms for efficiency and increased productivity. On the other hand, it is entirely possible that an industry may not know it is being attacked or from

whence it is being attacked in international trade war while the United States Government through its State Department and other intelligence sources not only can know but does know of the attack. Finally the manner in which a segment of our economy which has been placed under unfair economic attack is to be helped should be such that the competing industries within that segment can remain competitive with each other. Lack of proper standards and procedures can easily result in one competitor being favored over another within our own economy.

It is for these basic reasons that I have proposed a U.S. Trading Corporation be set up which would only come into the economic fray when certain well-defined principles of fair economic competition have been violated or are about to be violated by Soviet Russia and it would come with the fray only to keep the competition equal. Once this objective has been achieved it would retire and let competition prevail. In other words, if Soviet Russia plans to concentrate her totalitarian powers in the economic and political fields on selected areas or segments of international trade we should be ready to match such a concentration with sufficient concentration of our own economic and political powers to equalize the situation. I am satisfield if Soviet Russia knows we are set up to do this we probably will only have to demonstrate our ability to do it once or twice. That will be the end of this kind of trade war I am certain Russia contemplates.

After having introduced the U.S. Trading Act bill I have become quite disturbed about the favorable reception it has received from many prominent groups in the United States. The favorable reception has come with an accentuation on the concentration of political and economic power ensuing to the Federal Government and a minimizing, indeed an ignoring, of the basic checks I believe must accompany such a creation of power. If this power is not accompanied with strict rules setting up the circumstances under which it will apply and strict procedures for the establishment of the fact that these tests have been met, then it may indeed become a Frankenstein's monster.

I am particularly disturbed about the favorable reception this proposal has received from groups which in my opinion have viewed the Russian threat hysterically rather than realistically. I think Russia is a threat, or I would not have proposed this legislation, but I certainly do not believe it is the threat, for example, that is posed in the recent book "The Ruble War" by six top CBS news correspondents.

There are always those who will resort to "bogeyman" tactics to get through their own preconceived notions of what needs to be done to reform our society or merely to push our society ahead. For example, our regular military establishment, Army, Navy, and Air Force have found the Russian threat a very handy weapon to get appropriations out of the U.S. Congress over a period of many years. Having studied the military appropriation bills with considerable care over a period of years and the statements before congressional committees by their spokesmen as well as their public statements, I state without equivocation that there has been a deliberate and gross overplaying of Russia's military might which has damaged our own defense posture and assisted Russia in the game of bluff she has been playing with her satellites and the smaller neutral countries.

Certain groups of our scientists recently have resorted to the same tactics in order to push ahead their particular ideas of where we need more rapid scientific advancement. Just recently the most dangerous venture of all in this game of "bogeyman" has been started by some of our leaders in education. Education is the most dangerous field in which to play fast and loose with the truth. We have so much to lose. Essentially we have a system of education much superior to Russia. We can badly damage it through hysterical action instead of action stemming from healthy self-criticism. After all we have achieved something no large society has ever achieved before, a fairly close approximation of mass education. The fact that having concentrated on this goal so extensively we have somewhat neglected the important goal of quality education, should be no great cause for alarm. We seem now to be aware of the neglect and the concentration we are now making on quality should bring us into proper balance. After all the hard job was quantity and indeed quality depends upon sifting great quantities. I see no problem in having both quantity and quality education and I am satisfied we will be the first society to achieve or approximate this dual goal if we keep our heads and persevere with enlightened self-criticism.

Certainly Russia has advanced in military power, in economic power, in scientific achievement and in the field of education and it is important that we do not minimize these achievements. Indeed, it is important that we carefully appraise them. But we can do great damage, as I have suggested, by overestimating them and using this overestimation as a weapon to whip our people and the Congress into hastily conceived plans and actions. And I suggest the Congress under the lash of bogeyman techniques has badly overestimated the achievements of Russia in all of these areas.

Furthermore, it is important to see what else is happening to Russia and to the form of its society as it moves forward in economic, scientific, military, and economic achievement. Can anyone believe that these achievements can be made without changing radically the rigid and self-defeating straitjacket of political and economic communism? The straitjacket of the totalitarian state where there is no separation of economic and political powers? Can anyone believe that these achievements can be made without a separation of the powers embodied in the field of religion from those powers embodied in the field of politics and economics, no matter how hard the totalitarian state may try to hide the fact that its subjects have, as all human beings must have, a religion, a set of beliefs, a faith? As the Russian people advance in the fields of economics and education, indeed they also must advance in politics and religion and accordingly become less of a threat to a nation such as ours which is dedicated to peace through justice.

However, it is not my desire to dwell further on the subject of whether we presently are overestimating or underestimating Russia's achievements in economics, education, science, and military power. My plea is for honest appraisal of Russia's achievements. The U.S. Trading Corporation can be a bane to our society if dishonest appraisals are made of Russia's prowess, particularly her economic prowess.

Three years ago I was so disturbed about the loose talk concerning Russia's economic status and the dearth of objective information on the subject, I requested our staff of the Joint Economic Committee to have an objective appraisal made. This was done with the help of the scholars in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress and was published by the Economic Committee in 1955. This document was checked with people in and out of other sections of our Government for accuracy. Read realistically it is no cause for hysteria or the extreme statements that are constantly being made about Soviet Russia's economic development. Anymore, I might state than is the book "Soviet Professional Manpower," by Nicholas DeWitt of the Russian Research Center, Harvard University, which was published in 1955, a cause for hysteria or the extreme statements that have been made about Soviet Russia's advancement in the field of education.

I would like to revert back to the trade area. During the recent hearings by the Ways and Means Committee on the subject of the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements I asked the witnesses representing our various departments of the executive branch of Government if they did not have some suggestions for new tools they might need in the event that Soviet Russia's declaration of war in the peaceful field of trade was serious. From the State Department down through the Department of Commerce the witnesses all testified that they did not need any more powers.

I think the few cases we have had proved them to be wrong. I cited the case of Iceland, a country with population of only 160,000 people and an annual income of only $130 million based almost entirely upon the fishing industry. Under the most-favored nation clause in the reciprocal trade laws any attempt we make to treat with Iceland specially in regard to fish creates the same treatment for all other nations dealing in that fish. We have only a few weapons aside from trade treaties to assist Iceland. One is through direct aid by the U.S. Government, the other is by loans through the International Bank. These are all inadequate to keep Russia from making an uneconomic deal with Iceland to buy all her fish, absorb the economic loss in her totalitarian political economic society, in exchange for the political and military advantage of tying this strategically located island to its orbit.

Here is how the U.S. Trading Corporation could come into play. The American importers of Icelandic fish cannot meet the high uneconomic price Russia will pay to Iceland for its fish. The U.S. Trading Corporation, however, could go to them and let them bid for their customary purchases of fish and meet Russia's uneconomic price and then permit them to market the fish at their tradtional margin of profit based upon what a fair competitive price for the fish would be and make up the difference between the actual cost and the fair economic cost. As I stated, I do not believe it would be necessary to meet Russia in this area very often once Russia gets the idea her tactics can be countered. Our major difficulty will be to be certain that certain countries do not play us off against a fictitious Russian play.

A second illustration is the Sudan a few years ago straddled with an unexpectedly large cotton crop. Russia was unsuccessful in her attempts to move in with uneconomic offers for this crop, but the United States was certainly limited in its ability to meet this thrust by a lack of trade weapons at her command. The U.S. Trade Corporation could have easily met the threat.

A third illustration was the threat Russia made to undersell the aluminum market of Europe. Our aluminum companies are certainly strong companies but I doubt if they could win out in an economic war with the Russian state aluminum industry if Russia really decided to make the economic sacrifice to grab this market. In this instance the U.S. Trade Corporation could meet the uneconomic selling price of Russia by making up the differential between a fair price our aluminum companies could offer their customers and the undercut price Russia was offering.

From this latter illustration I believe the dangers of abuse by our domestic companies which I referred to can be visualized. However, if we carefully set up the standards which must be met before the U.S. Trading Corporation can act and the procedures under which these standards are found to be met, then I believe this difficulty can be minimized.

I cannot leave the subject of international trade without saying a few words for my proposal for a system of flexible tariffs designed to measure economic differentials as opposed to rigid tariffs designed for protection. If we had adhered to a system of flexible tariff differentials in the past we would be in a much easier position to administer the type of U.S. Trading Corporation I am speaking about, because we would have established considerable knowledge of economic costs of production. We would have a great store of information on the techniques of political governments subsidizing and assisting the private sectors of their economies. We would have a great store of information on the techniques of cartels and state trading devices. As it is we have little information and what we have is not assembled or sorted out.

As a matter of fact, I proposed to this administration, in order to realistically grapple with the problems involved in international trade, that they sponsor legislation for the establishment of a Department of Foreign Trade in the Cabinet where all the factors which bear on the problems involved in foreign trade could be assembled instead of having them scattered through the State Department, the Departments of Commerce, Interior, Labor, and Treasury, and only coordinated by the ineffective inter-Cabinet Trade Policy Committee. I believe that world peace is inseparably bound up in the problems of international trade and that to solve these problems we must treat them with greatly increased study and attention. A Department of Foreign Trade is the way both to do it and also to dramatize its importance to our people and the peoples abroad.

The tariff is the most unrestrictive form of trade barrier among the many kinds of trade barriers that exist in international trade. Licenses, quotas, monetary exchanges, health restrictions, subsidies, etc., are the most illiberal method of restricting the flow of trade. This rests on a very simple reason; these forms of trade restrictions depend upon bureaucratic administration. The economic unit which can present and argue its case before the Bureau is the one which will win the race. This places a premium not upon economic achievement but rather upon political achievement. Economic achievement enters only to the extent that it can be proven by words and figures which the bureaucrat will believe and understand. Even then it depends upon the bureaucrat's ability to conform his administrative action to economic laws. The tariff, on the other hand, is set for all economic units to see and abide by. Once the tariff is set, the economic units are on their own to compete with each other as best they can.

It is the setting of the rate of each tariff that becomes the crucial thing, not the tariff as a device. The tariff rate should be set to measure only economic cost differentials resulting from political actions. I suggest that these cost differentials can fit a general pattern. They can be limited to those costs which result from the imposition of certain business standards by the Government for what are deemed to be good social reasons. For example, the minimum wage law imposes certain standards upon American producers because we have felt that this is good for the entire society. So we impose health regulations, fair-trade practices, antitrust laws, and a variety of other laws designed to promote the general welfare. Many of these restrictions impose costs which must be borne by our domestic producers. If we believe these social laws are important we must be ready to reflect to some degree the added costs they create in a differential tariff imposed upon foreign producers who do not have these costs. It need not be the exact cost by any manner of means, because if our social theory is correct, that the society benefits from these standards, then our producers can do a more efficient job of production than in a society which lacks these standards. The differential need only meet the margin necessary to permit fair competition with those foreign producers who have no standards or who have lower standards. The tariff rate should be flexible so it automatically goes down as the foreign producers approximates the domestic standards.

Through this process our trade would indeed become a great weapon for raising the wages and living standard of the people abroad who want to sell this produce in our great domestic market. As their living standards rise they will find that their own domestic market will increase, as we have proved already in our own economy. This will give their producers greater markets and give our producers greater markets, too.

Only by raising our minimum wages and living standards did we develop our own great domestic market. I am satisfied that in this formula of flexible differential tariffs we will find the long-range solution to the bulk of our trade problems. At the same time, we will find world peace quite close and attainable.

Remarks of Homer Thornberry Before the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives of the United States, 86th Congress, in Nominating Hon. Sam Rayburn as the Candidate of the Democratic Caucus for Speaker, January 6, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL VINSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I incorporate therein the remarks of the Honorable HOMER THORNBERRY before the Democratic caucus of the House of Representatives, 86th Congress, in nominating Hon. SAM RAYBURN as the candidate of the Democratic caucus for Speaker, January 6, 1959.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I am afforded at this moment the greatest honor which has ever been bestowed on me, and that is the privilege of placing before you the name of the man who will be our candidate for Speaker and who on tomorrow will be elected our Speaker by one of the largest majorities ever given a candidate for Speaker in the history of the House.

There is little I can say here about him that is not already apparent to you, my Democratic colleagues.

Having served longer as Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress than any other man and having a longer record of continuous service in the House than any other man in history, he is recognized as the superb parliamentarian and is known as the foremost legislative leader throughout the free world.

No one can equal his devotion to the Democratic Party. He has through his leadership of our party insisted that we here conduct ourselves in an orderly, responsible manner and that we provide a legislative program not only responsive to the needs of the people but also one which will deserve and receive the confidence of all of the people of this Nation. As devoted as he has been to his party, he has in every crisis in this Nation's history risen above the political and partisan differences of the moment to fight with courage for the security of our country and the enduring freedom of men, women, and children throughout the world.

He has walked with kings and notables in high places and never lost the common touch.

He has talked to crowds and never lost the simple dignity which has earned for him the affection, admiration and devotion of all of us who have the privilege of being associated with him.

I have the happy privilege and the high honor on this his birthday to place before you as our candidate for Speaker of the United States House of Representatives the name of that noble American with a thoroughbred heart, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN of Texas.

I'm From Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when the State University of Iowa convincingly won the Rose Bowl game on January 1 this year it capped a long string of triumphs which has made the Iowa Hawkeyes the outstanding team in the country. Naturally all of us are proud and we search for words to express this pride so that others will know how we feel about this great State. An editorial from the Burlington Hawkeye Gazette of January 2 speaks eloquently for all Iowans and under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD. The editorial follows:

I'M FROM IOWA

Who breathes in this prairie land, with her lush fields, her golden heritage, her lovely rivers and lakes, her wonderful people—who here but doesn't feel a glow in saying, "I'm from Iowa."

It was a great day for Iowa.

Sure, the university won the Rose Bowl. It was a delightful romp, foreordained from the moment Forest Evashevski's disciplined troops took the field at Pasadena. The boys were superb. What Iowa has known all along—that the Hawkeyes have the fleet legs of gazelles, the precision of a ballet troupe, the spirit of lancers—was stunningly revealed for the biggest national audience of them all.

There was more.

In the morning, despite the carping of the smalltime critics, despite the fear of spending a dollar that might be saved, despite the inferiority complex that sometimes makes us less than bold, Iowa paraded Colorado Boulevard in Pasadena in a happy show of a great State.

There was the band, the finest. The Scottish Highlanders, unique and colorful. The Big Ten float, in a tribute to the University of Iowa. And finally, the Iowa show, lovely, warm, an emblem of a growing community.

There are those who say a problem with our State is that we have made too great a thing of such coliseum affairs as the Rose Bowl.

We can sympathize with their viewpoint, but at the same time we can bask in the glory.

For what Iowa needs is love, a love of home that brings an outpouring of both af-

fection and selflessness. The path toward any love is recognition of worth, and in at least one field, Iowa found that yesterday.

And what about the others? If we can be so good on the playing fields, may we not also be good as a strong segment of the national economy, as a producer of scholars, financiers, poets, musicians, salesmen, butchers, farmers, writers?

The answer is obvious. We can, and we are.

But the problem is whether we recognize our own strength. I suspect we don't. I suspect we are so intimidated by the cautious, by the miserly, by the Neanderthals, that we fear to move ahead into the future that is ours if we but have the courage to grasp it.

Well, we saw yesterday that greatness is within our grasp.

The reference is not alone to a football game, which after all the sentimentality, remains just a football game.

No, the lesson of this New Year's Day has been that Iowa can lead, if she only will, and that within our borders is the imagination and the strength to provide that leadership.

Defense Will Not Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of the House an article by Henry Hazlitt which appeared in the December 15 issue of Newsweek entitled "Defense Will Not Win." In his article, Mr. Hazlitt stresses the need for the United States to take the offensive in the cold war, especially with regard to the barrage of brazen propaganda pouring out of Russia today which is going throughout American press unanswered.

DEFENSE WILL NOT WIN
(By Henry Hazlitt)

During the Second World War there appeared a book called: "Defense Will Not Win the War." Its chief importance lay in the title, which stated a self-evident truth. No war is ever won by defense alone.

This applies also to a so-called cold war. We are in the present cold war whether we want to be or not; it is being persistently and relentlessly waged against us. And if we lose it, through appeasement, retreat, or by trying to pretend that it is not going on, we shall surely lose the total war if it comes or be forced to surrender before the mere threat of such a war.

The present Berlin crisis is new, and yet depressingly familiar. We accepted an arrangement in 1945 that enables Russia to put the squeeze on Berlin at any time it sees an advantage in doing so. It did so in 1948. Why were we taken by surprise by the new threats? Why did we act as if we were improvising an answer to a totally unexpected move? Why, above all, was our answer (until recently) merely defensive, and in at least one statement by Secretary Dulles, even ambiguous?

If we had warned Russia immediately that we meant to stand by our obligation to defend and maintain the status of Berlin against any breach by threat or force; if we had replied at the very beginning that we would be willing to discuss a peaceful change in the status quo in Germany but proposed that this should consist in a free and unintimidated vote of the East Germans as to whether they wanted to reunite with West Germany, much needless anxiety might have been saved.

ANSWER EVERY LIE

We might even have used the occasion to suggest that Russia keep her treaty agreements to allow free and secret elections in Poland, Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria for governments of their own choice. If Russia were shown that her diplomatic and propaganda offensives might boomerang, she might be less quick to try them.

This need to take the offensive in the cold war, for our own ultimate peace and safety, was emphasized by George F. Kennan in a lecture last year. Speaking of the way in which we often dismiss Soviet lies as just propaganda, he said:

"I'm always startled at the phrase 'just propaganda.' Why just? Is not propaganda a serious and important force in world affairs? * * * A wise Western policy will insist 'no single falsehood or distortion from the Soviet side should ever go unanswered.' This will be tiresome. We do not like repetition. But we cannot afford to dispense with it. Truth does not win over error on its merits. It, too, has to be assiduously propagated.

"I have asserted that there is nothing that could be said to Soviet leaders in the space of a few days that would change their strangely corrupted mentality. But there are things which could be said every day over the course of years which would exert a useful discipline upon them, would make it harder for them to ignore the distinction between the real and the unreal, and would place limitations on their use of falsehood as a weapon of political policy."

ABSURD OUTPUT CLAIMS

To apply this to the particular purview of this column, in recent months a flood of nonsense has been pouring almost unanswered through the American press and through scores of speeches in which increasingly absurd claims of Communist Russia and Communist China regarding not merely military, but over-all civilian production, are solemnly accepted as fact. The effect of this nonsense is to condition people to assume that the terror, force, and regimentation of communism can increase production and even living standards faster than the freedom in choice of jobs and the free consumer choice of capitalism. Many officials of our own Government seem to accept these claims at face value. Their real duty is to check the evidence, or lack of evidence, for every such claim, whenever made, and constantly present the enormous counterevidence. It is important to determine the truth about Russian military production. It is no less important not to be taken in by the brazen propaganda about production miracles and soaring living standards in Russia or Communist China.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of my newsletter "Keenotes" issued on January 5, 1959, as follows:

KEENOTES
(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

I want to preface this issue of Keenotes by extending my heartfelt thanks for the hundreds of Christmas greetings and messages which I received from friends throughout the district. It will be impossible to thank each of you personally but I want you to know that I deeply appreciate your taking the time, in the midst of a busy holiday schedule, to think of me.

Your thoughts at this time of the year are comforting and inspiring. Your confidence in my ability to represent the Fifth Congressional District in Congress makes me feel proud of the trust imposed in me and grateful for the opportunity to serve you. I trust that my actions as your Representative will never lead you to the belief that I have betrayed your confidence and trust.

As our country once again enters into a new year, it is an appropriate time for me to renew my pledge to serve all the people of the Fifth District to the very best of my ability. Our country faces many grave problems. These are indeed perilous times. It is my wish for the new year that I can contribute, in some smaller manner, to the easing of the tensions which grip the world and a lightening of the burdens which our people are called upon bear.

It is a time, too, for us as a Nation to restate our determination to carry on in a manner befitting the most powerful and wealthy Nation in history. We cannot turn our back on the rest of the world, even if we should choose such a course. History has projected the United States onto the center of the world stage. We have to keep in mind, during 1959 and the years ahead, that what we do—or fail to do—can change the course of history, that it can determine whether freedom prevails in the world.

This role of world leadership is not an easy one. Nor is it free of danger. We are facing a mighty adversary, armed with every terrible weapon known to man. We face a vigilant enemy, one who is content to work patiently over the years to have its way. Should we falter, communism could well sweep the entire world.

It is terribly expensive to develop and build new weapons and to see that nations outside the Iron Curtain are kept out of the Communist camp. No doubt we have made costly mistakes and have tried programs that were wrong.

But I firmly believe that the rest of the world is beginning to realize that our motives are unselfish. We do not want world domination or control. We desire only to create world conditions under which people can live in peace and freedom. Right now, we are the only free Nation with the substance to provide the leadership so desperately needed. I hope that in the year ahead our great country and all its people will keep this in mind.

Our people have to pay high taxes. These are burdensome. The cost of Government is high. But it would be dishonest for me to assure you, at the beginning of this new year, that the cost of Government or taxes can be substantially reduced in the year ahead. After all, it still takes about 50 cents out of every dollar paid in taxes to support the kind of defense establishments we must have.

But to say this is not to turn one's back on sincere and genuine efforts to tighten up on administration of Government, to stretch each dollar as far as it will go and to effect savings wherever possible. This is one pledge I do make for the new year—to help wherever I can to bring about sound fiscal policies.

It is not necessary, in the interest of economy, to end or stifle sound Government pro-

grams which promote the country's growth and, in the long run, help all of our citizens. For example, our area desperately needs a sound program for aiding areas with chronic unemployment. We need a sound research program to bolster the great coal industry and more research for finding new markets for farm products.

These and other things can be done within the context of a sound fiscal policy. And I pledge myself to work for them.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-six promises to be a fateful year. I hope it will be a happy and prosperous one for all of you.

We Send Hubert Scudder Our Thanks and Best Wishes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT W. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. CLEMENT W. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Rafael (Calif.) Independent Journal of January 6, 1959:

WE SEND HUBERT SCUDDER OUR THANKS, BEST WISHES

Today, 47 years of public service are coming to a close.

Since 1912, when he was first appointed superintendent of the Sebastopol water system and the town's fire chief, Hubert B. Scudder has devoted most of his life to public service. Now he retires, and a new man takes his place in Congress representing this First California Congressional District.

There is much on which Congressman Scudder can look back with pride and a feeling of accomplishment. He served his town as councilman and mayor. He served his district in the State Assembly. He served the State as its real estate commissioner. He served the Nation as a Member of Congress for 10 years.

Hubert Scudder never ran for a public office he didn't win and he never was defeated while seeking reelection.

But just winning elections and holding political jobs are not in themselves the major ingredient of a successful career. Something must be accomplished as well.

There is hardly an area in the counties of his district where tangible evidences of Scudder's public service are not in evidence.

You can see it in the big Coyote Dam near Ukiah, which will help end the damaging Russian River floods and provide water for Mendocino and Sonoma Counties, possibly even Marin. It is visible in the breakwater up north at Crescent City and in dredged Humboldt Harbor at Eureka, where more and more ocean steamers are stopping and contributing to the economic welfare of the Redwood Empire.

Here in Marin it is visible in the huge bay model the Army engineers are building at Marinship; in the dredged San Rafael Canal; in flood control studies by the engineers in many localities; in schools, cities, and districts which have won Federal lands with his aid, and many other things.

He has championed an accelerated Federal highways program, with the basic premise that gas taxes should go to highways, not elsewhere. He helped establish the principle that schools in areas where Federal activity has substantially increased enrollments should receive Federal funds. He has been stanch in support of private home building programs, veterans' benefits, adequate social security, to name just a few.

Hubert Scudder has done a fine job for the people of Marin and this district. He has reason to be both proud and satisfied.

We have much to thank him for as we wish him and his wife, long life and every happiness as they retire to their Sebastopol hilltop.

A Tribute to Col. Joseph Harvey Long

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the foremost citizens of Huntington, W. Va., Col. Joseph Harvey Long, died on December 28, 1958. Colonel Long was 95 years of age at the time of his passing. He was the dean of West Virginia newspapermen. As chairman of the board of directors of the Huntington Publishing Co., publisher of the Advertiser, and chairman of the board of radio and television stations WSAZ and WSAZ–TV, he was a towering figure in the communications field.

It is interesting to reflect that the year of Colonel Long's birth—1863—was also the year of West Virginia's birth. Of West Virginia's growth and development, part of it he saw and much of it he was. With his bare hands he forged new standards in journalism.

Many words will be written about what Colonel Long accomplished in the many fields to which he turned his able hand. But the quality I admire most is the quality of the pioneer. Only he had no road maps but his own vision.

With no tools but his own determination, he overcame obstacles which would have discouraged a lesser man. His life is a monument to the free enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include excerpts from an editorial in the Advertiser dated December 29, 1958:

JOSEPH HARVEY LONG

As a trained pressman with a native talent for mechanics, whenever need arose, he would take off his coat, roll up his sleeves, and join mechanical employees in repairs and adjustments. Throughout his career he was always also interested in acquiring the latest equipment for improving the quality of the paper.

When the Associated Press was organized as an agency for the collection and dissemination of worldwide news, he became one of the earliest members. His Advertiser was one of the first papers in this State to install an engraving plant for the reproduction of news pictures. It was also one of the early subscribers to AP Wirephoto service, receiving news pictures by wire and radio from every part of the world.

Although maintaining constant supervision over the operation of his business, Colonel Long also found time through his busy life for many outside activities.

He was one of the organizers of the company that built the Huntington-Chesapeake Bridge across the Ohio River. He was an organizer of the Ohio Valley Bus Co. and for several years served as its president. After erecting the modern building at Fifth Avenue and Tenth Street and moving the Advertiser into it in 1924, he joined with Samuel G. Biggs in leasing land on which the Keith-Albee Theater was erected.

In politics he stood high in county and State councils of the Democratic Party and attended many national conventions for closer observation of the party's leaders.

Under the administration of the late Gov. Howard M. Gore, he served as a member of a special commisison for studying and improving West Virginia's tax structure. Many of the important tax laws on the statute books today are traceable to the work and recommendations of the Gore Commission of which Colonel Long was an earnest and influential member.

Because of his devotion to good government he was honored by appointment as a colonel on the staff of the late Gov. William E. Glasscock.

When the young publisher arrived here, Huntington was a small river and railroad city feeling its growing pains and needing energetic leadership toward cleaner politics, moral advancement, civic improvement, and business and ihdustrial expansion.

Undeterred by organized opposition and sometimes threats of physical violence, he threw the weight of the Advertiser and his own personal influence into the endeavor of substantial citizens not only to enlarge but to improve the growing community. His interest and efforts in that direction continued until the last.

As chairman of the good roads committee of the chamber of commerce for many years, he was instrumental in building and improving most of the principal highways leading into the city.

He later served five terms as president of the chamber. During that time he directed efforts to acquire right-of-way and obtain Government funds for Huntington's extensive flood-wall system. The wall, erected after the disastrous flood of 1937, has already saved the city many times its cost of $8,500,000.

While serving as president of the chamber, he also took the lead in bringing about approval of a previously defeated bond issue for modernization of the physical equipment of the county school system, including the erection of East High School.

Colonel Long's interest in the community and its people also led to substantial help to its other institutions. He served as a member of the board of Morris Memorial Hospital at Milton. He had contributed substantially to Huntington galleries and to churches besides his own, the First Congregational, whose members sought his assistance.

His gifts to individuals, although numerous, were always strictly private. After the 1937 flood he asked his employees whose homes had been invaded by the water to give him an estimate of their losses. As each estimate was presented, he wrote a personal check for the amount.

Whenever sickness or misfortune overtook the family of an employee, Colonel Long always found out about it and presented a gift in proportion to the need.

His door was never closed even to the most lowly resident of the community seeking help.

As a consequence of his interest and activities, he numbered his friends among many classes. None were closer nor warmer than those of every department with whom he was associated in the publishing business.

From editors and publishers of metropolitan papers to the man who daily filled the thermos pitcher in his office with water he

was held in high esteem. Those wrestling with the same problems in the publishing business respected his judgment and not infrequently came to him for advice and instruction in operating procedures.

People who knew him best will recall that he was one of those rare men who counted it a compliment to be asked for a favor.

So while others are paying tribute to an eminently successful publisher, an indefatigable leader in community, State, and national betterment as well as the dean of West Virginia journalism and a grand old man, employees of the Huntington Publishing Co. will feel the loss of a loyal friend and counselor.

The will realize, however, that Colonel Long will never leave Huntington.

The monuments he help build during a long and active life will remain unmarred by time. Younger men whose careers and characters he helped shape will continue his work of community betterment.

His vigorous spirit and sound judgment will continue to help direct through others the policies of the business institution he joined in founding.

Voting Trends Versus Voting Myths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the average Congressman seeking reelection thinks he must be liberal in his attitude toward legislation desired by farm groups, labor groups, veteran groups, retired groups, and so forth, if he is to capture the majority of the voters in his district. That is a political myth that has been built up by both the New Dealers and the Modern Republicans, a myth that has no basis in fact nor past election returns.

I personally believe that the great majority of American voters—Democrats and Republicans alike—are still fairly conservative, still believe in private initiative as the basis of our American life, American economy, and American prosperity. When the issue is made clear-cut, most American voters will vote for the conservative candidate in preference to the so-called liberal candidate—liberal with other people's tax money.

In support of this belief I include as a part of these remarks an editorial carried in the Richmond Times-Dispatch on December 7, 1958, a Democratic newspaper of Richmond, Va.

A STRONGLY BACKED ARGUMENT THAT MODERN GOP CAN'T WIN

Notions that only modern (rather than old-line) Republicans can win elections, that organized labor was the chief factor in the Democratic sweep last month, and that the farm vote goes to the party which promises farmers the most from the Federal Treasury, are all challenged strongly by Rogers C. Dunn, of McLean, Va., whose Dunn Survey we have cited before.

Mr. Dunn gives chapter and verse to buttress his beliefs. Not only so, but his contentions are hard to refute.

An idea of his prescience can be gained from the fact that he said as long ago as last March: "We expect Vermont to commence to register a disintegration of Republican strength"—which is exactly what happened. At the same time he declared that Americans "opposed to socialism * * * should be encouraged by a general Republican setback" (in November 1958), "in spite of the inclusion of perhaps a few grievous casualties."

Over against the glib assumption that, in order to win, the Republicans have got to try to outdo the Democrats in handouts to voting blocs, and in favoritism to organized labor, Mr. Dunn argues that since 1948, when the Republicans went New-Fair Deal, "only a handful of Republicans who openly embraced the 'liberal' party line have been chosen by the voters to represent them in Congress or in other high office."

President Eisenhower ran in 1952 as a conservative Republican, and didn't go in for large Federal deficits until after his inauguration in 1957. His influence has declined ever since.

Nelson Rockefeller's astonishing victory last month in New York State is cited by many as evidence that that only a "modern" Republican has any hope of winning in the big populous areas. But the Rockefeller sweep may not prove anything much, except that he was personally magnetic and popular, and that Averell Harriman wasn't. Besides, the Democrats were split into bitterly warring factions.

In an analysis of the labor vote, captioned "The Great American Hoax," the Dunn survey points out that, entirely contrary to the popular impression, Democratic votes in labor's strongholds have not increased as rapidly as Democratic votes in the country as a whole. Here is a paragraph from his study:

"Comparison of recent off-year elections for Congressmen, 1950, 1954, 1958, reveals that the number of Democratic votes in the entire country increased 29 percent between 1950–58: and in the great labor leader citadels of Detroit, Pittsburgh, and New York increased 13 percent."

Going back to 1936, Mr. Dunn finds that between that year and 1956:

"The number of Democratic votes cast for Congressmen in the entire country increased 21 percent: in the giant industrial and labor leader citadels of Detroit, Pittsburgh, and New York City, the number of Democratic votes for Congressmen increased 12 percent."

The foregoing is true, he points out, although labor union membership grew from 4.7 million in 1936 to about 16 million in 1956, the unions were far less active politically in 1936, and the population of the three cities in question, especially of Detroit, has grown.

The Dunn survey also shows that votes by Senators and Congressmen for the Taft-Hartley Act did not handicap these lawmakers in their bids for reelection.

As for the farm vote, the survey has analyzed the balloting in 96 of Iowa's 98 counties. Its conclusion follows:

"For 20 years the vote of Iowa farmers for President and Congressmen has moved away, in growing numbers, from the administration providing Government farm subsidies and controls 1936 through 1956.'"

This is documented with actual figures. The survey says that "Republicans who bid 'high' for the farm vote fared no better than Republicans whose bid was 'low.'"

Despite such demonstrations, the Republican National Committee has been stressing modern Republicanism for years, on the apparent theory that this is the only basis on which elections can be won.

The committee might well consider whether it hasn't been proceeding in exactly the wrong direction. A political theory shown in the past to be sound is that when the voters of the United States want liberal government, they vote Democratic. Hence if the Republicans become mere carbon copies of the Democrats, they aren't likely to go anywhere much.

They'd better stay conservative, and thus give the people a real choice. Once it is made clear to the electorate that we'll be heading straight for inflation, continued deficit financing and socialism under the Democrats, there may be a nationwide revolt against such policies. The best way for the GOP to capitalize on such a revolt is to stand for fiscal sanity and private enterprise.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include copy of my newsletter "Keenotes," issued today, as follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

The opening of a new Congress is always an inspiring occasion. On January 7, 1959, I was privileged for the fourth time to be on hand for the time-honored ceremonies which date back to the founding of our beloved country. Legislative veterans, men who have served as many as 15 or 20 terms, tell me that regardless of the number of times they have participated in these ceremonies, they are always thrilled and humbled.

The oath of office, administered every 2 years, is always a reminder of the great honor it is to serve in the House of Representatives. Nothing can make one more humble than to realize that, as a Member of the House, he must speak and act for thousands of his fellow citizens. It is a responsibility that simply cannot be taken lightly.

When the 86th Congress convened at 12 noon on January 7, the country embarked upon what promised to be one of the most eventful periods in history. You will recall that in January of 1958, when lawmakers returned to Washington for the 2d session of the 85th Congress, our country was facing the threat posed by the Russian conquest of space. Greeting the new Congress this year were further Russian achievements, notably the lifting of a tremendous missile out of the range of the earth's gravitational pull and placing it in orbit around the sun.

This fact places squarely before Congress one of the most pressing problems it must face. How are we doing in the race with Russia for conquest of space? Here we are dealing with a highly complex and technical question. None of us are experts, but all of us can, I am convinced, detect a sense of uneasiness on the part of the people and a feeling that perhaps we are not doing as well as we should.

This year both the House and the Senate have permanent committees on outer space. We are in a much better position to deal with this problem than we were last year. One of the first orders of business will be for the space committees to take a look at what we have done—which is considerable, incidentally—and try to spur the executive department on to greater effort and achievement.

Also facing the 86th Congress is a tremendous national debt and the outlook for a further deficit during the fiscal year ending on June 30. The business recession brought about the deficit. Tax revenues from both business and individuals took a sharp dive.

Yet the Government had to step into the breech in certain areas—and this cost money. I am convinced that without extension of unemployment insurance benefits and other positive antirecession measures voted by Congress, the recession would have deepened. We are making good economic recovery. No doubt tax revenues will greatly increase during the year.

There will be a battle over the budget. Democrats have been classified as spenders. But I hazard the guess that the coming months will see an exhibition of fiscal responsibility by the Democrats that has been unequaled in recent years. Our record on this score during the 85th Congress was outstanding. Remember, we increased defense appropriations but reduced the overall budget by about $600 million.

Many people are worried about our defenses. They feel we are permitting the Russians to narrow the gap and threaten the superiority which we still retain on an overall basis. I am sure Congress will insist that we not skimp on defense. After all, money saved at the expense of national security is not true economy.

The Oppressed People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a splendid, in fact, a living sermon, "The Oppressed People," given by Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, D.D., Archbishop of Washington, at St. Matthew's Cathedral, Washington, D.C., on Sunday, December 28, 1958, a sermon, with its clear and correct analysis of communism and its purposes, which should be read as widely as possible.

The sermon follows:

"Be on the watch, stand fast in the faith, be the man, be full of courage. And let everything you do, be done in the spirit of charity." I Corinthians 16: 13, 14.

In the midst of this joyful Christmas season, the Catholic Bishops of the United States request us to pray for and not to forget the persecuted peoples of the world. I quote from the bishops' statement:

"The persecution of the church of God continues with undiminished savagery in the lands of atheistic materialism. Our Catholic brethren are denied the freedom to profess and to practice their religion. In some countries even the right to exist has been taken from them and they are being hounded to death in a grim, silent war of extinction.

"Many of them, only God knows how many, have already died for their sacred convictions. Many more are imprisoned and subjected to the most revolting tortures in order to force them to abjure their faith.

"In sober truth, this is the worst persecution in the 2,000 years of Christianity. * * * The enemy would cover this horror with a mantle of silence. But no Catholic may forget the long-drawn-out passion of these fellow followers of Christ. Nor may we, as we raise our voices against all other forms of injustice, allow these our suffering brethren to be consigned to oblivion."

This message speaks for itself. We are of the family of the church. Our brothers and sisters, children of the same Almighty Father, suffer today as few in recorded history have suffered. The early persecutions of the Roman emperors were indeed cruel. Yet their victims were numbered in the tens of thousands. The victims of Communist tyranny are numbered in the hundreds of millions. The Romans persecuted Christianity as a strange religion, but in a distorted and imperfect way they acknowledged the authority of a Supreme Lord. But the persecutors of today acknowledge but one allegiance: the Communist Party and the organs under its control.

The despots of old would act in a passion of fury, but then they would often forget and become preoccupied elsewhere. But the diabolical persecution of today is total, unceasing, and systematic. Our early martyrs suffered physical torture, but the refined tortures of today aim at breaking man's spirit and poisoning his soul. There are terror and threats today, but even worse is the all-pervading poison of propaganda and lies. The Christian today behind the Iron Curtain is condemned to live in an unreal world, a world of evil fantasy, without mercy, without truth, without justice.

In the Soviet Union two entire generations have lived in darkness. Since the beginning of World War II, the military power of the Red armies has trapped almost a billion people. You remember what happened in Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania? You remember what happened to Czechoslovakia, to Hungary, to Rumania, to Bulgaria, to Yugoslavia, and to Poland? You recall that half of Germany was crucified. And the hundreds of millions of China, ripening for the harvest sown by Christian missionaries, were plunged into a barbarism so savage that even European Communists quail at its excesses.

In each instance, the pattern was similar. First, there was military conquest and the ruthless extinction of all who openly opposed their loss of freedom. Next there was prison and even death for those who might be suspected of possibly leading an opposition. Then there was the leaden blanket of Marxist conformity: propaganda in the radio, in the press, in books and plays, and in the schools. Here was an unrelenting effort to form generations of robots. Communist scientists openly and admittedly tried to fashion human beings to act like the dogs in Pavlov's experiments, trained to respond to controlled stimuli of their masters.

But their special hatred was reserved for any church, and especially for the Catholic church, that dared to be independent of the all-embracing state. The pattern of persecution has varied from time to time. There were times when temporary toleration could be purchased at the price of total submission to state control. But, with the possible exception of Poland—and even here to a limited degree—no Communist state has tolerated a church that insisted that the law of God and not the decrees of man must come first. And the first victims of such persecution were the bishops and priests. "I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock will be scattered." (Matthew 26: 31.)

In the past 2 years, we have seen examples of cruelty that are almost beyond belief. First, there was the treacherous, bloody, and murderous crushing of the Hungarian revolt. This was so barbarous that even hardened Russian soldiers had to be withdrawn and replaced because they refused to mow down women and children. More recently, we have witnessed the atrocity of the commune system in China. Here entire families are separated and forced into communal barracks. Children are taken from their mothers, husbands from their wives. The old are torn from their family ties and forced to live their declining years, if indeed they are allowed to live, as cogs in a gigantic machine for production. Everyone is compelled to do physical work: Women as well as men, and even schoolchildren before and after school hours. Here is slavery in its most literal sense, and upon a scale unparalleled in history.

The victims of communism suffer almost beyond the power of human endurance. Yet we may add to their sufferings by our own conduct. We do this in two ways. First, we can betray them by forgetting their agony. Sympathy and understanding can make bearable the cruelest pains. And, in the wisdom of God, He has given us the power to help through our prayers, our penances, and sufferings those martyred souls whose names we may never know. But if we fail them, they have the added sorrow of knowing that they are forgotten, alone in the face of monstrous tyranny. And the bitterness of loneliness is as gall and vinegar.

Secondly, we can betray them by weakening in our devotion to truth, to liberty, and to the rights of man. Nearly 200 years ago, a group of courageous Americans issued a Declaration that electrified the world. They said: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." They concluded this historic document with these words: "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance upon the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Jefferson said that "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time." Patrick Henry asked: "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?" Daniel Webster told us: "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it." Another American, William Allen White, stated well our historic position: "Wherever a free man is in chains, we are threatened also. Whoever is fighting for liberty is defending America." Contrast, if you will, these noble sentiments that express the soul of our Nation with the cynical remark of Lenin: "It is true that liberty is precious—so precious that it must be rationed."

What great American statesmen expressed in ringing words, other Americans expressed in immortal deeds. At Valley Forge, Chateau Thierry, and Iwo Jima there was heroism that symbolized beyond the power of words our devotion to freedom. This is the America we have learned and loved. But questioning voices arise today to ask if there is another America, one sunk in indifference, apathy, and the pursuit of special interests? Two weeks ago a respected American, who has given much to his country, posed this question. Bernard Baruch asked why so many people have lost the capacity for indignation. He noted that "There are too many special interest groups in America today and not enough groups interested in America." He asks: "Have we grown so apathetic that we will not rouse ourselves before some terrible tragedy overwhelms us? In time of peril, apathy is the unforgivable sin, the irredeemable error."

At the same time, a distinguished Washington clergyman, Chaplain of the United States Senate, gave an example of this apathy. Dr. Frederick Brown Harris referred to those who believe that we must yield before the blackmail of Red China. He quoted a delegate to a religious convention who said: "The Chinese will soon number a thousand million. We had better make peace with them." And Dr. Harris' reply was: "Shame. When did the Christian church ever quail before mere bulk?"

Contrast, if you will, this desire for peace at any price with the plea of our holy father at his most recent consistory:

"Would that all upright men were able to hear the cries which pierce our ears. They pour forth from the lips of persons who, oppressed but not broken by most bitter trials, seek to manifest their love and fidelity for the Roman pontiff. Not for the sake of their bodies, but for the sake of their souls, do they request prayers and supplications, and by their plaintive sighs they bear witness that, no matter what happens, they will truly, sincerely, and tenaciously preserve unblemished to their dying breath their fealty to the vicar of Christ."

The Pope testifies to the courage of those who bear the cross of persecution. Is this courage to be greeted by indifference and apathy on our part? I do not wish to enter into a discussion that could be termed political. I realize that leaders of government may at times seem to be faced with a choice between evils. But surely, when the desire to stand for principles, to stand fast against tyranny and to proclaim the value of freedom for all men, they should be supported and not be undercut by the timorous and faint-hearted so-called liberals.

In this regard, our Secretary of State only last month stated moral principles that all of us can and should follow. Mr. Dulles said in Cleveland:

"We oppose international communism for its creed and practices are irreconcilable with the principles of our faith. Our faith is that each individual has his origin and destiny in God and thus has a spiritual nature and personal dignity. Therefore we must oppose the treatment of the individual as merely an animated bit of matter to be used to promote the organization of the world in accordance with materialistic principles.

"Our faith is that the basic guides of human action derive from the love of fellow man, the self-control and self-restraint imposed by the moral law. Therefore we must oppose the extension throughout the world of an iron rule that would enslave the minds and bodies of men and seek to break their spirits.

"There are some who seem to feel that, because international communism is a powerful and stubborn force, we should give way before it. Nothing could be more dangerous than to operate on the theory that, if hostile and evil forces do not readily change, it is always we who must change to accommodate them.

"Communism is stubborn for the wrong; let us be steadfast for the right. A capacity to change is indispensable. Equally indispensable is the capacity to hold fast to what is good."

These are courageous words. They express high principles that should ever be our guides when we deal with the Communist world. In expressing our unyielding opposition to communism and to its evil principles, we are not being merely negative. Much less are we indifferent to the need for firm and enduring peace in the world.

The peace we seek must be real, and it must be based upon justice. We seek not the peace of the tomb, which we can readily obtain by passivity before the threat of world communism. Nor do we seek the peace of appeasement and betrayal. Our peace is the peace of Christ. It means the law of love in place of the law of force. If we work for, and insist upon such a peace, then the world can again experience the fruits of right living under the moral law.

In such a peace, the home and the family will be safe from war and destruction. The energies of science will be channeled to bring economic abundance, physical and mental health, and a high level of culture for all peoples. Peoples then will kneel, not in submission to the conqueror, but in thanks to the Almighty giver of all good gifts. Our only wars will be wars against poverty, disease, and ignorance.

Surely the prospect of such a peace is worth our prayers and our struggles. Indeed, we may trust that, if the Communist world once realizes what true peace can bring, it too may turn from the insane path that could lead to war and world destruction. If such a hope is to be real, then we must convince the Communists that there is but one choice: we offer them true peace, or unrelenting opposition. Apathy, indifference, and lack of moral principles will only spur the aggressor. Blackmail begets blackmail and compromise begets compromise. To have real peace, we must be resolute in our principles, courageous in their application. Let us all pray to God that we may live up to the text announced at the beginning of this sermon: "Be on the watch, stand fast in the faith, be the man, be full of courage. And let everything you do, be done in the spirit of charity." (1 Cor. 16, 13, 14)

In conclusion, may I address in your name these words to those suffering peoples:

"Dearly beloved brothers and sisters, it is our hearts' desire that you believe and know that we of the free Catholic world are daily praying for your deliverance from savage slavery, and that once again you may know the blessings of liberty and peace. We pledge to you our continued, constant prayers and efforts to save you—a pledge of devotion as changeless as our changeless faith. Far greater and more precious even than our professed prayers and strivings to help you, more precious still, we say, than all our earthly efforts, is the glorious truth that Mary, Queen of Martyrs, is your constant companion in suffering and grief, your devoted intercessor with Christ, her Saviour Son, who died to redeem all men, black and white, yellow and brown, and with God our Father, looks into the soul of man."

The Plight of American Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my voice has been heard in this Chamber on many occasions concerning the plight of American agriculture. It has long been my contention that the problem has extended, and will further extend itself, into sociological as well as economical facets of our society. Many approaches have been made to the problem, none of them with any marked degree of success. I have recently heard from my good friend and constituent, Mr. John H. Harnly, a farmer near Miami in Roberts County, Tex., with several suggestions relative to the situation. I request unanimous consent to insert herein Mr. Harnly's communication that all Members may have the benefit of his excellent viewpoint, as follows:

MIAMI, TEX., *December 18, 1958.*

Congressman WALTER ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been giving considerable thought to the position of us farmers in the present day economy and what I see has no future to it. I take pencil and paper and set down my costs of operation on one side, which comes out an average cost per acre of $12, then on the other side I set down my average expected income based on average yields per acre and present prices, and I find myself losing money without any compensation for my time. I find the average income per acre to be $17 of which one-third goes to pay rent. This is today's picture and tomorrow's looks even darker, as they are already posting 5 percent increases on farm machinery, and our local taxes are to take another jump next year. The present plan seems to be that of lowering still more the support prices under our products. The picture is indeed gloomy from where I sit.

Let us then look at the other side of the picture—that of the taxpayer. He is supporting an agricultural budget of $5 billion a year plus an investment of $7 to $8 billion in surplus commodities trying to help us farmers achieve equality of income. Since the Department of Agriculture's budget is creeping upward year by year, as is the mounting surpluses, it is no wonder that the general public is becoming disgusted with the farm program.

We would conclude then that the present efforts on the part of the Government are a failure since the farmers income is still inadequate, and the taxpayers' costs are mounting. What then can be done? We think that we have a plan whereby the farmer can obtain parity of income and the cost to the Government can be reduced.

Approximately five-sevenths of the cultivated lands of this country are devoted to raising small grains, soybeans, cotton, peanuts, and tobacco. This accounts for about one-third the annual income to farmers. Part of this income of course comes from the livestock, dairy, and poultry industries, as considerable of the small grains are fed on the farm and thus never reach the cash markets in their own form. For example: One summary shows corn sold for cash to be only 2$^{8}/_{10}$ percent of the gross farm income instead of the 14$^{7}/_{10}$ percent when you figure the total corn crop harvested for grain times the average price. The difference, of course, is reflected in the income from livestock, dairy, and poultry.

You, WALTER, are well aware of what I am going to explain next, but your colleagues from the cities are not. We read and have impressed upon us daily that the farm population is shrinking, thus the problem of equality of income becomes less of a political issue since it represents a shrinking portion of our population. Due to mechanization we no longer employ as many people directly on our farms, but when you think of the invisible man who produces our machines for the farm, the invisible man who produces the fuel and oil for these machines, the invisible man who produces the repairs to keep this equipment rolling, the invisible man that finances through loans much of these operations, the invisible man that insures these operations, the invisible man that services these farm operations from local communities you have increased this population to a rather important percentage of the the total. Many of our small communities exist solely on income derived from agricultural activities. These small communities in turn help support the economy of the large cities.

When the general economy is booming along this income of the farmers is not felt or recognized, but let me point out to you what it did this year to our economy. Due to exceptionally good weather conditions the farmer produced the biggest crop on record from the fewest acres and this at a time when our general economy was lagging. Because of this many manufactures of farm equipment that had been idle or on restricted production started producing full time. This gave a shot in the arm so to speak to the general economy and help start us on the way to recovery. Had the farmer been receiving parity for his products as well as the increase in production

it would have helped the economy that much more. We are trying to point out that the welfare of our city cousin is still dependent upon our farm prosperity.

Sure, we farmers made some money this year due the large per-acre yields but when you average this year's crops into that of the past 10 years you find that we are still operating at a loss.

You ask me then what I would do about the farm problem? First I would put it on an equitable basis for all involved. The present and past programs have not given the same treatment to all producers alike. For example, anyone planting less than the 15 acres of wheat does not have to have an allotment, and yet this type of farmer, so I am told, produces nearly one-fourth of our total wheat supply. True, he is not eligible for support loans but he does benefit from the price set by these loans. Next the acreage allotted to the growing of wheat varies from State to State and county to county. When you operate farms in two counties and have a 40-percent wheat allotment in one and a 60-percent in the other you wonder at the fairness of the program. In order to insure fairness to all I would first throw out the present historical method of determining acreage controls and would substitute the following plan: I would have each farmer go to his or her farm office and designate how many acres of each crop he would like to grow on his farm. The total of these crops could not exceed the total cultivated acres of this farm. The acreages of the various crops would then be compiled and sent to Washington where they would be totaled thus giving us the acres to be produced by each of these crops. This acreage would be binding for a period of years. We would suggest 5 as a proper period at the close of which the acreage would be redetermined in the same manner as above. Any person wishing to place additional land in these crops would have to wait the expiration of this 5-year period, then he could place his acreage in the program and receive the same treatment as the rest.

The Department of Agriculture would then figure the expected yields from the acreages of the various crops using past averages with possible improved yields from new seed, fertilization, weather cycles, etc., to determine the production of the various crops. Next the Department would determine the probable market totals for each crop, taking into consideration domestic as well as export demand. Taking the ratio between this demand and the total expected production would give us the number of acres needed to maintain our present needs. Since we have large surpluses of these crops on hand it would be well to reduce this allotment of acres to where this surplus could be worked off during the next 5 to 10 years. We would decline surplus only that quantity above the needed carryover to protect the country in case of emergency.

The acreage taken out of production would be retired for the entire base period of 5 years in the same manner as now applied to soil bank land. This would prevent its rotation in the farming operation with the resultant increase of per-acre yields. We have never had a total crop control program but rather a diverted acreage program that only added to our problems. We certainly cannot solve our problem by continuing to produce more than we can use. Anyone that farmed in the late twenties and early thirties knows the fallacy of continued surplus production.

This plan of acreage control would be equitable to all concerned. It would not be hard to administer for the machinery is present from our current program. It would assure a reduction of present surpluses. It would not be as arbitrary a program as the present because the farmer could make his own plans every 5 years instead of being forced to take the past history of the farm as the base. It is also flexible in that as the needs of the country change this program will change.

Now we have reduced production to an equitable basis within the needs of the country. We must next figure out a way to bring the farmers' income up to parity with the rest of the economy. In order to do this we would classify all small grains that can be used for livestock feed into one price class. This would include corn, wheat, barley, oats, grain sorghum, etc. Since corn is the basic feed crop we would use it as a basis for our price-support program. We would price each crop on the relative feed value that it has to corn by the pound. The following is compiled from figures given by the Doane's Agricultural Service.

Corn at $1.80 per bushel at 100 percent parity equals $3.22 per 100 pounds.

Wheat at 105 percent of feed value of corn, $3.38 per 100 pounds.

Barley at 92 percent of feed value of corn, $2.96 per 100 pounds.

Grain sorghums at 90 percent of feed value of corn, $2.90 per 100 pounds.

Oats at 85 percent of feed value of corn, $2.74 per 100 pounds.

These figures would then be used to insure the farmer 100 percent of parity if he were producing all his acres. Since part of the acres would be taken out of production he would have to receive more to get his full share. In order to do this we would add to this price the percentage of acreage reduction. If we reduced the acres by 20 percent we would add 20 percent to the parity price. Corn would then be supported at $3.86 per hundred. It is obvious from this that wheat would still not receive its full share of parity as the figures show it to have a parity value of $2.50 per bushel compared to that of corn. About 500 million bushels of wheat goes into foodstuff for human consumption. If total acres of wheat asked to be planted indicated a total crop of 1,500,000,000 bushels then the domestic human consumption price of the wheat should figure out $4.12 per bushel. We used the following formula to arrive at this price: XY plus (100–Y–Z) C equals A.

X equals price of wheat for human consumption.

Y equals percentage of total production of wheat for human use.

Z equals percentage of acres taken out of production.

C equals parity price of feed wheat after allowing for reduction.

A equals parity price for full production.

Wheat would then receive $2.40 per bushel for that part used as livestock feed and export and $4.12 per bushel for that wheat used at home for human consumption. Any wheat exported under this price of $2.40 per bushel would be subsidized by the Government.

We would have to apply a two-price system to wheat in order to make it work. Each farmer of wheat would receive certificates of interest equal to the difference between support price for wheat as feed and the price for human consumption on his share of the crop raised for human consumption. This share would be figured on a bushel allotment basis and would be fixed for the 5-year base period.

Let us see how this would work applied to my own farm. Say I have 1,150 acres in cultivation and I put it all into wheat production. The average yield per acre is 10 bushels. I expect to raise 11,500 bushels of wheat at parity of $2.50 per bushel, the gross income should be $28,750. I leave out 20 percent or do not produce 2,300 bushels of wheat. I have a bushel allotment of 3,833 bushels at $4.12 or $15,790.

The balance of 5,367 bushels would bring $2.40 per bushel or $12,880. Thus I would have a total income of $28,671 or very near my parity income. Figured on a cost basis of $12 per acre to produce and one-third rent to the landowner that would leave me with a margin of $4.67 per acre for my labor and risk. This would give me an income of $5,370 per year which is not high at all for these times. Land here is valued at $80,000 per section and this farm operation includes two sections so that the gross return on the land is less than 6 percent.

Cotton has a problem all its own. It has competition from synthetics which will not allow an increase in price to compensate for reduction in acres. It would need a lower support price to meet competition and a direct subsidy to bring the income up to parity. This is justifiable in that cotton is a war material and we need a healthy production system to insure ample supply in case of war.

Rice can use the same plan as that used for feed grains and wheat only using a support floor equal to the world price of rice and a domestic price high enough to bring the total income up to parity levels.

It might be well to add here that the certificates of interests would be bought from the Government by the processors as they processed the wheat or rice. The producer would cash his certificates at the bank.

This program would add about 20 percent to the prices of the processed food items. This is justifiable in that when labor gets an increase in wages it is passed along in the price of the product that he produces.

We would go further and eliminate all Government payments that are capital improvements such as terracing, tank building, brush eradication, seeding, etc. We would do away with all soil-bank payments. We would not furnish any more drought-relief payments. The above program would insure adequate income to the farmer based on average production figures that take into account drought.

Whether we like it or not a program as outlined above is the only type of farm relief that will actually accomplish the purpose of any such program and that is parity of income.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. HARNLY.

Vice President Nixon's Trip to England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech of Vice President NIXON on the occasion of his speaking before the English-speaking Union of the Commonwealth on November 26, 1958, in London.

The results of the Vice President's trip to England were most gratifying and some of the editorial comments following that visit are appended hereto. The value which we place upon the friendship between us and Great Britain is readily attested to by the following editorials from newspapers in both countries. It is good to know that people in England are seriously interested in our viewpoint as I know we are in theirs, especially in the field of international affairs where all of our resources and ingenuity have time and again been put to a test. These editorials are appended herewith in full:

[From the Daily Telegraph (London, England), Nov. 26, 1958]

American money helped to revive the free nations, and American strength is now their shield. Yesterday, Vice President NIXON, making his first speech in London, gracefully turned the coin to show inscribed on its reverse the record of America's debt to ourselves: the free democratic institutions that are the foundation of her strength were a heritage from Britain, and—as Mr. NIXON might have added—the United States owes other debts of energy and enterprise to streams that have fed her from other countries, now also her allies. In the public relations of the alliance, sometimes ill-managed, nothing is more important than to emphasize this interdependence of tradition and ideals no less than of armed strength. This between friends. Lest others should draw false conclusions from some external similarities, Mr. NIXON did well to warn them that the recent setback of the Administration party denoted no wavering of Americans in their determination to resist aggression.

[From the Financial Times (London, England), Dec. 1, 1958]

Although the Vice President disagreed, with characteristic vigor, with the Labor Party on disengagement and with the majority of his hosts on China, one had the impression that his view on these topics had none of the principled rigidity of some other American leaders, and that he would be prepared to reconsider his position should the changing situation alter the balance of the argument. Even though the visit may not have set all doubts at rest, it has confirmed the impression that at a time when President Eisenhower is showing a growing obsession with the single issue of a balanced budget, Mr. NIXON represents the main influence inside the administration for a broader approach to both domestic and international problems.

[From the Daily Telegraph (London, England), Nov. 29, 1958]

He has treated us as friends and partners, entitled to understand the difficulties experienced by the United States as well as to realize that our own difficulties are not discounted by his countrymen. Britons and Americans share the same interests, much of the same outlook, most of the same policies. The fact that they share the same language may, in spite of Mr. NIXON'S eulogies, tend rather to misunderstanding than to perfect accord. It is always disconcerting to find that someone who uses the same words as you do possesses different categories of thought. But every sensible person in the United States realizes that they need us, and every sensible person here realizes that we need them.

The Daily Mail (London, England), Nov. 29, 1958, heads its comment "Helpful Visit." The paper emphasizes the need to maintain a firm and constant Anglo-American unity. It says that there has been a big improvement in the past year or two with London and Washington showing themselves more ready to listen to each other's points of view. Mr. NIXON'S visit should have helped in that direction. The Daily Mail writes:

"In recent months, he has rivaled Mr. Dulles in his determination to see for himself what is going on in the world. He has shown in London that these travels have broadened his mind and opened his eyes. He has in the course of the next 2 years an opportunity to influence American thinking. He can strengthen the Anglo-American Alliance and do something to strengthen his own reputation as well."

[From the Decatur (Ill.) Herald and Review, Nov. 27, 1958]

BRITISH EDITORS ON MR. NIXON

English newspapers discuss editorially the visit of Vice President RICHARD NIXON.

The News Chronicle (Liberal) feels that Mr. NIXON'S visit should be useful to himself and to Britain. The truth about Mr. NIXON, says the paper, is that he is an unknown quantity under a cloud. Unknown because he is still developing politically, and under a cloud because the mid-term election success of his fellow Republican, Nelson Rockefeller, has spoiled what looked like a near certainty for the presidency.

The Manchester Guardian (Liberal) writes:

"Vice President NIXON is welcome to Britain. We are happy to receive him not merely because he represents an ally to whom we are bound by warm friendship and respect as much as by gratitude and political necessity, not merely because of the greater understanding and confidence between our governments that may result from his visit, but also because we want to get to know him. At present he is a puzzle to us."

"At any minute he may become the leader of the non-Communist world—one of the two or three people on whom the destinies of all of us seem to depend.

"Few people in Britain would pretend that this prospect allures them. Many, indeed, have the same sinking of the heart as the idea of Mr. Bevan as British Foreign Secretary is said to bring about among many Americans; but our misgivings are certainly due in part to ignorance. In fact, most of America's allies, as well as the uncommitted nations, have reason to be grateful to Mr. NIXON. In recent years, his ideas on foreign policy are what we—actuated by self-interest—would call enlightenment."

The Daily Express (Conservative) comments on the visit of the United States Vice President, Mr. NIXON, to Britain. It says that he is a vigorous politician—intelligent as well as ambitious. He was the first member of Eisenhower's administration to recover from the American hysteria over Suez. In his own country, adds the Express, Mr. NIXON—a strong partisan—inspires mixed feelings; here he will have a warm reception from all sides.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 2, 1958]

MR. NIXON'S CONQUEST

From all accounts Vice President and Mrs. NIXON were extremely effective ambassadors on their visit to England. Mr. NIXON is at his best when talking responsibly about national policy and foreign affairs, and he seems to have won the admiration of British officials and a considerable section of the previously distant British press. The fact that Mr. NIXON can be charming, candid, and courageous on such occasions does not, of course, mean that there is no basis for the misgivings about the other side of his personality that sometimes emerges during election campaigns. But these misgivings ought not to becloud the Vice President's exemplary conduct in Britain and his well-chosen efforts on behalf of the Anglo-American alliance. Although formal visits seldom afford an opportunity for really balanced appraisals, it is well that the British public has had this chance to see a possible future President at first hand. Despite the Republican reverses, he remains a formidable practical politician whose potential is by no means eclipsed by the difficult decisions he faces on just where to chart his course.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 1, 1958]

GETTING TO KNOW HIM

Returning from his trip to England, Vice President NIXON told reporters he thinks NATO's position has been strengthened by the Berlin crisis. Whatever the fact as to this, it seems clear that Mr. NIXON definitely strengthened his own standing with the British, some of whom have been among his severe critics.

Thus, as Mr. and Mrs. Nixon took their leave after a 4-day visit, the Daily Telegraph pronounced him a "frank and engaging character." According to this journal, the Vice President "has done a good deal to cement the Anglo-American alliance." Another British paper, the Daily Mail, concluded from Mr. NIXON'S conversations in London that the Washington administration "has learned a lot about the international facts of life."

This favorable impression was not registered on the press alone, however. The Associated Press reports from London that "politicians—both Conservative and Socialist—seemed impressed with Mr. NIXON'S air of sincerity." And, again according to the AP, Labor Party Leader Hugh Gaitskell came away from two exposures to Mr. NIXON "praising him extravagantly."

None of this, we suppose, will make the slightest impression on Mr. NIXON'S dedicated and relentless critics in our own country. They will continue to portray him as a kind of subhuman embodiment of all that is evil in public life. But, for those who prefer to appraise this controversial man objectively rather than subjectively, the British reaction will confirm an already strong impression—that RICHARD M. NIXON is one of the ablest if not the ablest spokesman for the Republican Party.

C. Melvin Sharpe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to receive the permission of the House to insert in the RECORD a few thoughts about the late C. Melvin Sharpe, a lifetime resident of Washington who died on Christmas Day last. The people of the District of Columbia have lost a great and useful citizen in his death. While it was not my privilege to know him well, his devotion to the Capital City and his pride in doing what he could for its welfare was evident to all who met him. Everyone, whether they knew him or not, had the most profound respect for his sincerity and his character. Those who were in disagreement with his views frequently revised their thinking because of the aggressive and logical arguments he would put forth in support of them. He was a good fighter who made few enemies and a loyal and warm friend. His influence for good will long be felt in this city and his devotion to its welfare will never be forgotten.

He well deserved the eulogies expressed in the following editorials:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Dec. 27, 1958]

C. MELVIN SHARPE

Many Washingtonians came to know C. Melvin Sharpe best during the 18 years of his service as a member, and for half that time as president, of the Board of Education. His death on Thursday, at the age of 77, followed his retirement from the board by about a year and a half.

But an older generation of Washingtonians will remember that Mr. Sharpe's service on the Board of Education was a mere postscript to a busy and active life in Washington, first as a Federal employee, using his persuasive abilities in behalf of civil service retirement legislation, and later as an executive and public relations adviser for the old Washington Railway and Electric Co., and the Potomac Electric Power Co. In the latter capacity he became involved in numerous community organizations and undertakings, and was a man-about-town known for his delightful gift of anecdote and his shrewd judgment of human nature.

He was appointed to the Board of Education a few years before he reached retirement age at Pepco, and in 1949, when he became president of the board, he promised to bring to an end the small bickering and misunderstandings which hampered the school system. Whatever small bickering he may have had in mind, it must have seemed small indeed compared with what followed within a few years. For in his term as president the school system, quickly conforming to the Supreme Court's edict against segregation, underwent the most profound and spectacular changes in its history. That "Mel" Sharpe survived them with grace, and that retirement found him still in possession of the good will of the people of this city, are no mean tributes to his capabilities. He lived a full and useful life.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Dec. 27, 1958]

C. MELVIN SHARPE

C. Melvin Sharpe, who died Thursday at the age of 77, spent most of his years in Washington with the Potomac Electric Power Co., but he will be remembered for his conscientious civic service on the board of education and the Committee of One Hundred on the Federal City. Unlike most men who jealously guard their retirement years for themselves, Mr. Sharpe used his to serve his adopted community. He was both president of the board of education and chairman of the Committee of One Hundred after he retired from Pepco. As head of the board of education when District schools were desegregated in 1954 he helped to plan for this difficult transition. His devotion to Washington ought to set an example for other men.

[From the Washington Daily News, Dec. 27, 1958]

C. MELVIN SHARPE

It is a tribute to C. Melvin Sharpe that District public schools, which he labored so long and so hard to improve, were able to forge ahead on their own, without his leadership, when he retired as president of the school board last year.

His death Thursday, at the age of 77, is a great loss to the city he loved, but there is every indication that public education in the District will continue to advance along the trail he blazed in 16 years of active service on the board.

He was one of the world's kindliest men, true to himself and his convictions, and a tireless and selfless worker. He did not favor desegregating the schools, but he accepted the Supreme Court's decision as law and did nothing to impede the orderly process of carrying it out.

He was greatly respected by Congressmen, business leaders, teachers (he was never too busy to hear their problems) and parents—particularly those with handicapped children, which became his special concern. He was largely responsible for obtaining the new health school, which now bears his name.

He will be sorely missed.

Why United States Will Not Recognize Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an article taken from a recent address by Secretary Dulles which appeared in the December 12 issue of U.S. News & World Report. The Secretary clearly restates the administration's position with regard to the recognition of Red China and the reasons behind this policy. I strongly agree with the Secretary's statements and believe that to give political recognition to the Chinese Communist regime would be truly a disheartening and almost fatal blow to the non-Communist governments in the Far East as well as a danger to the political, economic, and security interests of the United States:

WHY UNITED STATES WILL NOT RECOGNIZE RED CHINA

(Pressure is on once more for U.S. recognition of Red China. But it isn't going to happen. Secretary of State Dulles tells why in a restatement of U.S. policy.)

Developments make it ever more clear that, if we were to grant political recognition to the Chinese Communist regime, it would be a well-nigh mortal blow to the survival of the non-Communist governments in the Far East. Such recognition, and the seating of the Chinese Communists in the United Nations, would so increase their prestige and influence in the Far East, and so dishearten the free nations, that the Communist subversive efforts would almost surely succeed.

Contrary arguments come largely from two sources. There are those who argue that, since the Chinese Communist regime exists and has power in mainland China, we ought to accord it political recognition.

There is, however, no principle of international law to this effect. Recognition is a privilege which can be accorded or withheld. There are several de facto regimes in the world that we do not recognize. We act in this respect, as our national interest dictates.

The Chinese Communist regime is bitterly hostile to the United States. It is dedicated to expelling us from the Western Pacific. It is determined to take over the free peoples and resources of the area. It violates all established principles of international law and of civilized conduct.

Why should we give aid and comfort to such a regime and to such policies? Some think we should recognize the Chinese Communist regime in the hope that large and profitable trade would follow. That is an illusion. The mainland of China has never been a large customer of the United States, and its trade is even more closely regimented under Communist rule.

The United States today is exporting to the non-Communist countries of the Far East at the rate of over $2.5 billion a year. This excludes the value of military items exported under our mutual-security programs.

We may be sure that, if the Communists should take over these free nations of the Far East, our trade with them would drastically shrink, as has been the case with our trade with the Soviet Union and its European satellites. We must also recall that, because Communist nations look on trade primarily as a political instrument, it has rarely been possible for citizens of free nations profitably or safely to engage in such trade.

Should we, then, in the quest of a few millions of dollars of unreliable trade with Communist China, jeopardize exports of $2.5 billion?

We deal with the Chinese Communist regime whenever that is expedient. We do not pretend that it does not exist. We have been in almost constant negotiations with it for particular purposes, at Panmunjom, at the Geneva Conference on Indochina, in bilateral negotiations at Geneva, and now at Warsaw.

But it is certain that diplomatic recognition of the Chinese Communist regime would gravely jeopardize the political, the economic and the security interests of the United States. The Pacific, instead of being a friendly body of water, would in great part be dominated by hostile forces and our own defenses driven back to or about our continental frontiers.

There is currently a specific threat to free-world trade in the Far East. That is the "dumping" practice of Communist China. The Chinese-mainland people desperately need for themselves all that they are capable of producing. But they are denied, so that the rulers may prosecute their expansionist designs.

When millions of Chinese are dying of starvation, rice is exported for political purposes.

Goods manufactured in China are being dumped in Southeast Asia at prices that disrupt normal trade. These include textiles, bicycles, sewing machines, fountain pens, and the like. This is particularly a threat to the trade of Japan in South and Southeast Asia. This problem as it arises in the Far East is one phase of the economic offensive now being initiated by the Sino-Soviet bloc. Your Government is intensively studying this problem. We have asked business people to study it. There is no doubt in my mind but what concrete measures will be needed to assure that, in the face of this unfair competition, free enterprise will continue to play its full role as a dynamic and expanding force in developing the economies of the free-world nations.

If the non-Communist nations hold fast to policies which deter armed aggression; if they prevent subversion through economic and revolutionary processes; and, above all, if they demonstrate the good fruits of freedom, then we can know that freedom will prevail.

A Trojan Horse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us on both sides of the aisle have en-

joyed the Sunday weekly column of Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, in the Washington Star.

It can always be said that Dr. Harris is never afraid to take a stand on an issue on which he feels strongly. I attach, in full, his very thoughful article of Sunday, December 14, 1958.

A TROJAN HORSE

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris)

From the time of the Greek siege at Troy, a Trojan horse has been the symbol of conquest from within by smuggled foes. The Communist conspiracy has used the Trojan horse technique as its most potent method of aggression. Now, from an unexpected direction—a church conference on world order, whose members belong to 33 denominations—a Trojan horse is trotted out in the name of world understanding. Of course, the architects of concord who built it did not construct it for that purpose—just the opposite—but a Trojan horse it is, planted within the lines of the free world.

No wonder the recommendation of these churchmen has been received with pained incredulity at home and abroad. No wonder anguished cables are coming from officials and missionaries in free China and free Korea asking the meaning of such an unbelievable attitude to the mounting Red peril. Of course, it ought to be made clear that these religious leaders speak only for themselves, and have no mandate to commit the various churches to their point of view. It already is evident that multitudes—especially laymen—belonging to these same churches are violently opposed to any such betrayal of the solemn trust committed to America's hands in this day of destiny. Those who know the grim facts of the international situation listen to this "message to the churches" with the feeling Paul expressed when he asked fellow Christians, "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you?"

One is reminded that in spite of Churchill's warning, "Arm! Arm!" it was because equally sincere church leaders mobilized the pacifist forces of England that Britain was unprepared when the mad dictator struck. In her finest hour she paid an awful price, largely because of church leaders who had zeal without knowledge.

Now, those in the forefront of the Cleveland conference group express the hope that our Government will listen to this message and change its firm and "inflexible" policy in dealing with the Red menace. The mood of these leaders through all their discussions seemed to be critical of America's defenses rather than of the offenses of the Red terror. It is because this "message to the churches," with all its pious verbiage, betrays the very principles which by black paganism are being denied and derided that this column joins the outraged voices of religious leaders in all parts of the country in crying out against any serious consideration of what is proposed. Spires are perpendicular—never bending—and are symbols of divine sovereignty, human dignity, and spiritual verities, of justice and morality.

From the standpoint of Spires of the Spirit, the Cleveland proposition is a Trojan horse because, first, it would make the U.N. a travesty and a mockery. The U.N. Charter defines its objective as the "furtherance of fundamental human rights." It supports the "dignity and worth of the human person." It gives a guarantee of "equal rights for all nations, large and small." In this very year, 1958, Red China, in an official publication, declared that "such bourgeois ideas must be made to thoroughly stink and must be thoroughly burnt." The very year when the most diabolical device of all, the communes, are turning continental China into one vast concentration camp, a Christian church group recommends that it be admitted to the U.N. The fact is that any person in Red China today who dared profess belief in the Charter of the U.N. would be either brainwashed or executed. Second, it is a Trojan horse because it refers to the present regime as an "effective" government. Effective. Do they not know that in response to Mao's "hundred flower" invitation, people in all walks of life by the hundred fervently berated the Communists?

Has anyone who voted for this pronouncement read the report of the chief of Red security, dated January 4 of this year, in which he admits that during the past 2 years 370,000 counterrevolutionaries surrendered, and 100,000 new ones were discovered, and that 18 million workers were undergoing investigation for anticommunism, 5,000 of these inside the Communist Party, some in "highest, inmost organs"? In a number of places excited mobs have plastered the walls with pro-Taiwan posters. The significance of all this is stupendous. Third, the Cleveland message to the churches is a Trojan horse because in addition to being a boon to Red China and a blow to the U.N., if carried out it would be a devastating breach of faith with Taiwan, whose sacred task it is to guard, preserve and perpetuate the ancient China culture which, on the mainland, is now being ruthlessly ground into the dust.

What will this message to the churches do to the growing assurance in Formosa that the hour will strike when the economic miracle under freedom that is happening there will be welcomed by millions on the enslaved mainland? Then what of Korea, one of the most promising missionary fields in all the world, half of whose sacred territory Red China still holds as an invader? An apostolic American missionary writes: "To ignore Korea and sit in the council of nations with its bitterest enemy would be an insult to all that Korea has fought and bled for since 1950." It seems to be forgotten that Red China, still unrepentant, is under condemnation for aggression by the very organization now urged to accept it as a defiant, yet equal, member. And what of the Philippines, who would regard such action as treachery? And what of the 12 million Chinese, mostly anti-Communist, scattered across Asia? If such a betrayal should take place and Red China made respectable, these valiant millions would be tempted to bow the knee to the Red Baal. All this and much more is concealed inside this Trojan horse. Out of it could come a resounding victory for the powers of darkness which plot the destruction of our liberties.

But we are grateful that already there is an American Committee of a Million Against the Admission of Red China. Its roster contains the names of thousands of churchmen in all public and private walks of life—perhaps as great a galaxy of eminent names as ever graced an organization. They also have a message to the Christian churches. We prophesy that by leaps and bounds that committee will now swell to 10 million plus, declaring in no uncertain tones, "We are set as a fint against this great denial." From all over the Nation last week men in high positions were hastening to Valley Forge for the annual meeting of Freedom's Foundation.

One of the Cleveland delegates, a layman, apparently with trembling knees, was heard to say, "The Chinese will soon number a thousand million. We'd better make peace with them." Shame. When did the Christian church ever quail before mere bulk?

There is a message to the churches in this crisis, mirrored in a recent scene in a crowded Washington church, when, at the close of the morning worship, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Army, and scores of others high in the Government councils joined the multitude in singing heartily:

Ye that are men now serve Him against unnumbered foes;
Let courage rise with danger, and strength to strength oppose.
Stand up, stand up for Jesus, ye soldiers of the Cross;
Lift high His royal banner,
It must not, it must not suffer loss.

Silent Weapon of the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of the House the following article which appeared in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Silent Weapon of the Cold War." The author, Mr. Demaree Bess, presents an interesting and arresting account of how Russia has used economic warfare in the past to gain control of certain countries such as China and Hungary, and how it is now relentlessly waging this same type of warfare against the United States. The author feels it is vital at this time to use all possible measures to stem the tide of inflation and keep this country on a sound economic and financial basis:

SILENT WEAPON OF THE COLD WAR—A POST EDITOR'S GRIM WARNING OF A DEADLY VIRUS WHICH THE REDS USE AS A TOOL: RUNAWAY INFLATION, WHICH CAN DEVASTATE A NATION

(By Demaree Bess)

Inflation can be one of the most tiresome subjects in the public domain, as a swarm of economists have demonstrated in Washington during recent months. The disputes of these specialists about inflation have shown why economics is sometimes called the dismal science. Economists have managed to make their controversy seem dull and dreary, despite the fact that it directly concerns every American, for good or evil.

For a long time inflation has fascinated me because I have seen so much of it, not as an economist, but as a foreign correspondent. During several decades of reporting abroad I had closeup views of the whole range of inflation—from the creeping type to the runaway variety—in many countries of Europe and Asia. The two aspects of inflation which have impressed me most have been largely ignored in current Washington debates. The first is inflation's shattering effects upon individual human beings. The second is the use of inflation as a frightful weapon in economic warfare—in some ways as frightful as any of the new military weapons which are getting so much publicity.

This article will undertake to show how inflation has become a major factor in the Soviet-American cold war, and how it can break the human spirit as completely as famines, earthquakes, wars or revolutions. In France I have watched creeping inflation inexorably undermine a great people's confidence in themselves and in democratic government, thus weakening their will to resist external and internal foes. In eastern Europe, after World War II, I saw runaway inflation cause a sort of universal paralysis, when Moscow deliberately permitted it to get out of control. Runaway inflation wipes out almost overnight every kind of security for

the individual: insurance, pensions, annuities, savings bonds, bank accounts, even cash. What we call "solid citizens" are hardest hit. It was runaway inflation which cleared the way for Communist rule in China after World War II, just as it had previously done in Russia, after World War I.

Up to now, Americans have been lucky about inflation because we have had so little recent experience with it. Only twice in its history has the United States known runaway inflation: Once during revolutionary days for the whole country, and later for the people of the Confederacy after their currency became worthless. While inflation has ravaged many countries since World War II, our creeping inflation has been held within comparatively narrow bounds. But Soviet strategists have given notice that they expect our luck to change, partly because of our own indifference to economic matters in general and to inflation in particular; partly because of the Kremlin's planned economic warfare against us.

Two recent developments have dramatized the fact that the cold war has reached a major turning point. First of these was the Russian sputniks and second was the recession. For several months after the original sputniks roared into space, the American press concentrated its attention almost exclusively upon military innovations, notably earth satellites and guided missiles. Washington was the chief source of this verbal outpouring, as it is of most news and comments nowadays. The administration and congressional committees consulted hundreds of scientists and other specialists working on the arms race. Nuclear physcists and spacemen got more public attention than ever before. Because the arms race also affects many kinds of vested interests, platoons of press agents and lobbyists helped Washington correspondents to keep the news flood flowing.

But then, after months of this, the uproar over sputniks and space weapons subsided almost as abruptly as it started. Now the recession dominated every news channel, as it brought to Washington a prolonged parade of economists and financial experts to advise the President and Congress about means for dealing with it. These experts sharply disagreed about almost everything connected with the recession. Some predicted that it would last for years. Others insisted that it was almost over before most people had noticed it. Some argued that big tax cuts would cure it. Others prescribed massive additional taxes. Some urged the Government to spend its way out of the recession by piling up ever-growing deficits. Others recommended wholesale Government economies. With the November elections coming, both political parties naturally were looking for vote-catching projects.

But it was inflation which most sharply divided the economists. The only unanimous agreement was that inflation has cut away more than half the purchasing power of the dollar since 1939, and whittles off more of the dollar's real value every year. That could not be disputed, although almost everything else about inflation was left in doubt. Some economists detected danger of further inflation in almost every one of the projects proposed to tide over the recession. They even warned that more inflation already is inevitable, because of the mounting demands of the arms race. But other economists pooh-poohed these warnings, and insisted that budget deficits could safely be multiplied, and should be.

The man caught in the middle of this crossfire among disputing economists was President Eisenhower, who does not pretend to be a financial expert. Disagreement among his advisers may have confused him as much as it did the rest of us, but no President of the United States can afford to admit being confused. He must keep on making the big decisions which nobody else can make for him. Moreover, under the American form of government the President's decisions do not necessarily settle issues, especially in financial controversies. Congress holds the power of the purse, and can upset plans made in the White House.

So Mr. Eisenhower has done what any President could be expected to do in this situation. He has tried to give equal attention to the controversies about inflation and about the arms race. He has stopped, looked, and listened. While he has been compelled to recognize that, under existing conditions, there is no immediate hope of balanced Federal budgets, he has vigorously opposed proposals to speed up the arms race recklessly without regard to inflationary effects. He has heeded the warnings of some of his most respected advisers that inflation could become one of the greatest threats to the security and well-being of our country.

But when Washington's news spotlight shifted so abruptly from weapons scientists to economists not one of the controversies about the arms race had been definitely settled. They only got shoved into the news background by the recession. On the surface it looked as if the recession had compelled the American Government to concentrate upon domestic affairs rather than world affairs. Some commentators even detected a return to isolationism. It was already apparent, even before the Middle East exploded again, that the men in Moscow were not going to let us off that easy.

Almost unnoticed by the American press and public, the nature of the Soviet-American conflict had been undergoing a profound change. The cold war, which had featured the arms race ever since Russia exploded her first atom bomb in 1949, has taken on a new aspect in 1958, or more accurately, revived an old one. While American eyes were still fixed on the arms race, Soviet leaders quietly stepped up economic warfare. The sputniks dramatized the fact that the arms race war more or less stalemated, at least temporarily, because both superpowers possess the means to destroy each other. But not until the recession monopolized American attention did anybody in Washington publicly recognize that Moscow's main attention had shifted from the arms race to economic warfare.

This shift has been no surprise to Americans familiar with Bolshevik policy. Even before the Russian revolution the father of Soviet communism, V. I. Lenin, predicted that economic warfare would do much more than armed force to promote Communist worldwide revolution. Ever since they seized power in 1917, Russia's Bolshevik leaders have been carefully studying economic weapons, among which inflation ranks tops. Having utilized runaway inflation to achieve their original victory in Russia, the Bolsheviks have found it equally useful in all subsequent conquests. In fact, Communists never have succeeded in entrenching themselves anywhere without the help of large doses of inflation.

As a reporter in Russia, I first learned what great importnce Soviet leaders attach to economic warfare. Almost every morning, for years, it was my painful duty to read Soviet newspapers, which rarely let a day pass without boasts of the superiority of their economic system. Even the Russian grammar I used in Moscow based its lessons upon the great American depression of the 1930's. In my efforts to learn the Russian language I had to read over and over again about how life was becoming more joyous every day for Soviet citizens while millions of Americans were allegedly living on the verge of starvation in slum cities they had built of tar paper and packing cases. That grammar was prepared for Soviet citizens studying English, not for Americans living in Russia. Its propaganda became a sad joke for us, as we watched our Soviet acquaintances frantically scrambling to supply themselves with the barest necessities.

Nevertheless, during those prewar years in Russia I decided that the Kremlin's professed faith in economic warfare was not just propaganda or wishful thinking. The Soviet creed is fashioned upon the basic belief that communism will sooner or later stand triumphant upon the ruins of rival economic systems which have been bankrupted by a combination of their own financial irresponsibility and unreelnting Soviet pressures against them. Time and again during the 40-odd years of Soviet rule in Russia, Moscow has reasserted its faith in economic warfare. As long ago as May 1921, Lenin told an assembly of foreign Communists: "Today we Russians exercise our main influence on the internationa rlevolution by our economic policy. * * * It is to this arena that the struggle has been shifted on a world scale. If we solve this problem of economics, we shall win on an international scale, decisively and permanently." Two years later, in a speech entitled "The Prospects of World Revolution," Lenin declared: "Our best forces are working on the stabilization of the ruble (Russian money), and we attach decisive importance to it. If we succeed in stabilizing the ruble for a long period, and then permanently, we shall have won."

Just before Lenin died the Soviet Government did stabilize its currency by redeeming outstanding paper rubles at the rate of 50 billion for 1 gold ruble. Those paper rubles once had been equal to gold rubles, and the appalling rate of conversion, revealed dramatically how completely the savings of thrifty Russians had been wiped out by inflation. The Czarist Government, by adopting wildly inflationary measures to pay for World War I, had started the ruble on its road to ruin before the Bolsheviks seized power. The Bolsheviks merely continued to print worthless paper money until they had won their civil war and established themselves in power. But then Bolshevik economists, having watched the effects of runaway inflation in its most virulent forms, were determined to stabilize their own currency.

The most thorough study of the Soviet financial system with which I am familiar was made by an English economist, L. E. Hubbard. In his book, Soviet Money and Finance, which has attracted much less attention than it deserves, Mr. Hubbard wrote: "The path traveled by the ruble since 1935 has shown a remarkable convergence toward orthodox capitalist principles. * * * Soviet economic theory may soon be considered reactionary by the advanced advocates of social credit schemes and the manipulation of currency in western countries." By an interesting coincidence the Hubbard book was published in the same year, 1936, as a book by a far more famous English economist, John Maynard Keynes. Soon after the First World War, in 1919, Mr. Keynes had attracted worldwide attention by a book entitled "The Economic Consequences of the Peace." In that 1919 book Mr. Keynes wrote:

"Lenin is said to have declared that the best way to destroy the capitalist system was to debauch the currency. By a continuing process of inflation governments can confiscate, secretly and unobserved, an important part of the wealth of their citizens. By this method they not only confiscate, but they confiscate arbitrarily. * * * Lenin certainly was right. There is no subtler, no surer means of overturning the existing basis of society than to debauch the currency. The process engages all the hidden forces of economic law on the side of destruction, and does it in a manner which not one man in a million can diagnose."

That is what Mr. Keynes wrote in 1919, but by 1936 he had changed many of his

ideas about currency manipulation. He had decided that under certain conditions capitalist governments were obligated to debauch their currency in a controlled manner. But Soviet economists, who had written with respectful admiration of the 1919 Keynes book, still prefered its ideas to the comparatively radical Keynes ideas of 1936. And ever since 1936, so far as their own system is concerned, Soviet economists have stubbornly clung to such old-fashioned notions as balanced budgets and sound money.

Even in today's topsy-turvy world, it is hard to believe that orthodox capitalist principles could command more respectful attention in Moscow than in a number of western countries. But there is evidence to prove it. In overcoming the tremendous destruction of the German invasion and the enormous costs of World War II, the Soviet Government has labored persistently toward a stable currency and reactionary notions of a sound economy. Almost every economic measure employed by the Kremlin since the war has been anti-inflationary inside Russia and throughout the closed Soviet economic system. At the same time Moscow has hailed inflation in non-Communist countries as evidence of the superiority of the Soviet economic system, and its eventual triumph through economic warfare.

Although the Kremlin's faith in economic warfare thus goes back to the earliest days of the Soviet regime, this subject has seldom interested Americans. Economic subjects are played up in our popular press only when something happens to make them look like news. What brought economic warfare back into the news recently was a speech by the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Allen Dulles. In one of his rare public statements C.I.A. chief pointed out that the Soviet Government had stepped up economic pressures throughout the world even before the sputniks signalized what looked like a military stalemate. So from here on out, Mr. Dulles predicted, the cold war would probably be fought mainly with economic weapons. The American press reported Mr. Dulles' remarks as fresh and exciting news, although he probably did not consider his idea new. The C.I.A. Director is supposed to have several thousand secret agents working under him all around the globe, but he didn't get material for that speech from secret agents. He got it from stoop-shouldered analysts sitting in libraries reading and studying Soviet publications, just as we correspondents in Moscow did a quarter of a century ago. As the Dulles speech revealed, Soviet publications are expressing precisely the same confidence in economic warfare today as they did in the 1930's.

Meanwhile, however, the Bolsheviks have extended their economic experiments to several additional countries, thanks to opportunities provided for them by World War II. They have learned a lot about how to control inflation inside their own system and how to turn it loose on their enemies. And Moscow's enemies often have played directly into Bolshevik hands. It is generally agreed that the conquest of China has been Soviet communism's major victory since the war. But it has not been widely understood that runaway inflation probably contributed more than anything else to the overthrow of Gen. Chiang Kaishek's Nationalist Government.

After Japan's defeat in 1945, General Chiang returned in triumph to his capital, Nanking, hopeful for the future. But Chiang and his associates apparently had little or no understanding of economic principles, and ignored the necessity of currency reforms to end the economic chaos caused by a generation of warfare. The ensuing runaway inflation wiped out all sound money values, and sapped the will of China's most substantial men and women to resist communism. It demoralized even American business communities in China. When Red armies entered Shanghai they were openly greeted by the Shanghai American Chamber of Commerce in the belief that they could not possibly be more dangerous to business interests than Chiang's inflation had been. Those Americans, like their Chinese counterparts, soon discovered how wrong they were. But then it was too late.

Japan's postwar history presents such a remarkable contrast to China's that it has inspired the sardonic comment that Japan was lucky enough to lose the war, but China was unlucky enough to win it. In 1945, defeated Japan was as completely bankrupt as China was. Economic chaos would have resulted if the Japanese Government, backed by the military occupation, had not fought inflation vigorously. The Japanese thus never were even threatened with such economic anarchy as existed in China for several years before the 1949 Communist takeover. And one reason why the Chinese Communists were given so much time to entrench themselves was that they promptly terminated the shattering effects of runaway inflation. Years passed before the Chinese people fully realized the terrible price they had paid for this temporary relief.

In Europe, Russia and the West have waged economic warfare in many different forms since 1945. West Germany provided the most humiliating defeat for the Soviets. For 3 years after the war Moscow got just what it wanted in Germany—economic paralysis—by vetoing all proposed anti-inflationary measures. But in 1948 Washington, London, and Paris decided to override Soviet vetoes and to create an economically united West Germany with a sound new currency. In an effort to checkmate this move Moscow clamped down the Berlin blockade, but the airlift broke the blockade. As a result, West Germany made one of the most spectacular economic comebacks on record. The Berlin blockade usually has been pictured as a political and propaganda contest, but its primary importance was economic. It was perhaps the most decisive postwar battle in economic warfare.

Another striking example of what economic warfare can accomplish was shown by postwar developments in Austria and Hungary. These two nations, once twin seats of a mighty empire, emerged from World War II in a terrible mess. Both served as battlegrounds for some of the war's most savage fighting, which wrecked, among other things, both capital cities, Vienna and Budapest. When I revisited these two countries shortly after Germany's surrender, they were a sorry sight. Neither had been very prosperous even between World Wars, and now both were bankrupt, having been bled white by occupying armies.

In those dark days of 1945 it seemed to me that the Hungarians were facing the future much more cheerfully than their Austrian neighbors. I couldn't decide whether they were more gallant or just more ignorant of what they were up against. The Hungarians apparently also mystified the Russians, so much so that in 1945 Moscow permitted the only genuinely free election ever held in a country controlled by the Red army. That election proved to be a humiliating defeat for Hungarian Communists, with moderate non-Communists winning an overwhelming majority of the votes. Soviet strategists apparently accepted this defeat placidly, but actually they resorted immediately to economic warfare in Hungary.

When I went back to Budapest in 1946, the Russians had unleashed the wildest currency inflation on record. That this could easily have been prevented was proved in Austria, which has experienced no runaway inflation since World War II. By wartime agreements Allied Control Councils were set up in both Austria and Hungary in which the Western Powers were supposed to have equal rights with Russia. But there was one big difference. In Hungary the Red army was the only effective military force, whereas Allied troops in Austria were at least equal to the Russians. So in Hungary the Russians contemptuously ignored American and British efforts to establish the same anti-inflationary measures which were being imposed at that time in Austria.

The Hungarian inflation was deliberately manipulated so as to demoralize the middle-class Hungarians who had dared to vote against communism. This was done by keeping the printing presses running at full speed day and night turning out more worthless paper money. The Hungarian unit of currency, the pengo, which had been worth about 20 cents before the war, suddenly took off into the stratosphere. The day I arrived in Budapest in 1946 a friend in the American mission advised me, "Don't change more than a dollar at a time. Today the dollar brings 10 billion pengo, a billion more than it did yesterday, and nobody knows what it will bring tomorrow." The next day the exchange rate was 14 billion, and a week later 33 billion. So I was getting 33 billion pengo for the same dollar which would have bought only 5 pengo a few years before.

That wild inflation was aimed at certain groups of Hungarians as deliberately as guns aimed in battles. It wiped out the savings of the country's most solid citizens, the thrifty and hard-working middle class. Then the Russian-dominated government distinguished between white-collar and manual workers.

For example, at Budapest University I found that the professors and clerical staff—mostly Catholics and anti-Communists—were being paid only in paper money while janitors and other manual workers were paid in food and clothing which no amount of paper money would then buy. Two distinguished scientists told me they were keeping their families alive only by bartering their last possessions. One of them had just exchanged his last bed sheet for food, the other said he was "eating" his wedding ring. While I was in Budapest the American mission advertised for a few English-speaking jeep drivers, offering a dollar a day. That amounted to a colossal fortune in pengö, and the hundreds of applicants included prominent lawyers, doctors, and businessmen, a composer of light opera and two formerly wealthy landowners.

After this runaway inflation had served the Russian purpose, the Russians finally agreed to introduce the same anti-inflationary measures which had prevented runaway inflation in Austria. Meanwhile, however, the Soviets had so demoralized Hungarian non-Communists that Communists had easily taken over. So the West lost its Hungarian battle in economic warfare, but at the same time it won the battle in Austria. The contrast is striking, for today Austria is one of the most stable countries in Europe, despite having fewer natural resources than Hungary. Austrian non-Communists never were submitted to the demoralizing effects of runaway inflation.

It has taken some time for most Americans to appreciate how important economic warfare has been and will continue to be in the worldwide conflict with the Soviets. How well are we prepared to wage this kind of warfare? That question reminds me of a conversation which took place a quarter of a century ago when Dictator Joseph Stalin had his first meeting with an American diplomat, Ambassador William C. Bullitt. Shortly after the United States resumed diplomatic relations with Russia, the Soviet dictator invited the American Ambassador to the Kremlin. This was a most unusual gesture, because Stalin at that time almost never received foreign diplomats. Mr. Bullitt told the small group of American correspondents working in Moscow about Stalin's invitation, and said if we would wait for him at the Embassy he would give us an immediate off-the-record report of what happened. We had to wait a long time, because Stalin kept Mr. Bullitt talking for several hours. That conversation really

was an interview, with Stalin asking most of the questions.

Stalin's chief interest was President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and he became increasingly fascinated by Mr. Bullitt's description of how the American Presidency works. The Ambassador spent a good part of the afternoon explaining the American system of checks and balances. He told how the President not only must devise a program acceptable to Congress and the Supreme Court, but also must face vigorous and continuous opposition of a rival political party, and bear in mind the political fortunes of his own party's members. It was apparent from Stalin's questions that he had never before fully understood basic American governmental principles. Finally he shook his head and commented, "You have greatly increased my respect for President Roosevelt. Speaking frankly, it seems to me that your form of government imposes almost impossible demands upon the President." After a moment's thought he added, "But it seems to work for you."

Although President Roosevelt's problems in 1934 were big enough to astonish Stalin, they seem very simple compared with President Eisenhower's today. During the intervening quarter of a century the American Government has almost incredibly expanded its activities, at home and abroad. Decisions made in Washington today have immediate and far-reaching reactions in every corner of the globe. These multiplied responsibilities have imposed tremendous new stresses and strains upon our Government, and particularly upon our economy.

Meanwhile, however, the Soviet Government also has added enormously to its own stresses and strains. It has assumed responsibility for hundreds of millions of people outside its borders, just as the United States has done. It has challenged Washington to an all-out arms race with the most costly weapons in history, and at the same time has proclaimed economic warfare against the non-Soviet world. Moscow has done all this during a period when 200 million Soviet Russian citizens, better educated, are demanding more than the bare necessities.

Today Russia and the United States are much more openly in conflict than they were in 1934, but so long as the arms race remains stalemated the outcome obviously depends upon other factors. The Soviet Government's faith in economic warfare is clearly stronger than ever. How can Moscow's self-confidence be explained? One explanation is that Soviet strategists rely upon their enemies to fall into an economic trap. Financial irresponsibility in the United States would be just what would suit Moscow best. If the Russians can force the pace of American spending to the point where inflation gets out of control, they can forget about such weapons as intercontinental missiles. For the ability of Americans to wage economic warfare on even terms will depend upon whether the American Government and people can guard against further serious inflation in our own economy. The entire non-Communist world depends, as never before upon the solidity of the American economic and financial structure.

H.R. 446

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain the provisions of the bill H.R. 446, which I introduced on the first day of this session. The purpose of the proposal is simply to treat all patrons or married savers in savings and loan associations alike throughout the United States.

The present palpable inequality of treatment arises in this way. We all remember the bank and savings and loan association closures in the early 1930's. The deposits and savings of millions of our fellow citizens were snatched away from them overnight. To its everlasting glory, Congress moved forward immediately and passed two laws to prevent a recurrence of a similar financial catastrophe in the future. It first created the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, with authority "to insure the deposits of all banks"—12 U.S.C. 1811. And then Congress created the Federal Savings and Loan Corporation, with authority "to insure the accounts of all institutions eligible for insurance"—12 U.S.C. 1725.

In order to support the bank deposit insurance program, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act provided for a uniform assessment on all member banks of one-twelfth of 1 percent per annum—12 U.S.C. 1817. And from the beginning of the program all bank depositors throughout the United States have in fact been treated alike, whether they come from common law States or community property States.

The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation Act likewise provided for "a premium charge for such insurance equal to one-twelfth of 1 percent of the total of all accounts"—12 U.S.C. 1727. But unlike bank depositors, savers in savings and loan associations are not in fact being treated alike. Although savings and loan associations located in community property States pay the same and identical premiums as those located in common law states, married savers in community property states do not enjoy the same insurance protection as those coming from common law States. Under the regulations issued pursuant to the statute, married couples living in common law States enjoy insurance of the account of a husband in the sum of $10,000, insurance of the account of a wife in the sum of $10,000, and insurance of a joint account of husband and wife in the sum of $10,000; while a married couple living in a community property State receive an insurance coverage of the account of a husband in the sum of $10,000 and insurance coverage of the account of a wife in the sum of $10,000, but no insurance benefit whatever of a joint account of both husband and wife. In other words, a married couple living in a common law State enjoy an aggregate coverage of $30,000, but a married couple living in a community property State receive an aggregate coverage of only $20,000. And yet the savings and loan associations throughout the United States, in both community property and common law States, pay the same and identical insurance premiums to support the national program. This is not only inequality of treatment but rank injustice; it is as wrong as a 2-foot yardstick and as phony as a $9 bill.

This matter has received the particular attention of the executives and attorneys of savings and loan associations in community property States, of which there are eight as follows: Arizona, California, Idaho, Louisiana, New Mexico, Nevada, Texas, and Wyoming; but the savings and loan associations throughout the United States also recognize that this situation must be corrected.

A serious attempt was made to correct this inequity by having the regulations of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation amended to provide the same amount of coverage to married savers in both common law States and community property States. The opinion of the General Counsel of the Home Loan Bank was that the desired objective could not be accomplished through amendment to the regulations, and that this would require further legislation. The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation is a part of the Federal Home Loan Bank System.

The proposed change in the law was submitted by the United States Savings and Loan League and was included in the Financial Institutions Act of 1957, known as Senate bill 1541 of the second session of the 85th Congress. The proposed change in legislation, in substance, was adopted by the Senate last year, but the bill failed of passage in the House.

The United States Savings and Loan League at its annual convention held in Philadelphia during the month of November 1956, through its legislative committee, endorsed this amendment to the law in the following language:

> This recommendation would amend title 4 of the National Housing Act to clarify and make certain that married savers in certain community property States are provided insurance coverage on an equal basis with savers in other States.

Subsequently, Henry Bubb, chairman of the Legislative Committee of the United States Savings and Loan League, testified favorably before the Senate committee on January 30, 1957, in connection with the Financial Institutions Act of 1957, Senate bill 1451 of the second session of the 85th Congress, in submitting a recommendation that the needed change be made in the law, with the comment that the whole purpose of the proposed change was to make it clear that in community property States the husband can have $10,000 of insurance coverage, the wife $10,000 of insurance coverage, and the two of them $10,000 of insurance coverage as such persons may have in common law States.

At the 1958 convention of the United States Savings and Loan League held in San Francisco during the month of November, the legislative committee of the league adopted the following:

> The league recommends amendment to the law governing insurance of accounts to make it clear that married savers in community property States are entitled to the identical protection of married savers in other States.

The United States Savings and Loan League has a membership of some 44,000 savings and loan associations located in every State of the Union.

The community property States, eight in number, and the State leagues of the associations in each have endorsed the enactment of this amendment. The associations located in the community property States are as follows: Arizona, 17 associations; California, 235 associations; Idaho, 11 associations; Louisiana, 72 associations; New Mexico, 23 associations; Nevada, 4 associations; Texas, 203 associations; and Wyoming, 10 associations.

We do not have a breakdown of savers on a State level; however, 2 associations in my district at Lafayette, La., have savings accounts as follows: Lafayette Building Association, 7,400; Home Building and Loan Association, 5,600. This gives you a good illustration of the number of people interested in this legislation.

When we consider the hundreds of thousands of savers in savings and loan associations in community property States, it is easy to understand their eagerness to have the law amended to put them on a par with savers in common law States.

For many years citizens in community property States enjoyed a very distinct advantage in income tax matters over citizens in common law States. By being permitted to file separate income tax returns for the husband and the wife covering funds owned by the community, they were enabled to remain in lower brackets and thereby pay much less income tax. After many years of continuous persistent effort, the law was amended to put persons residing in common law States on the same level as persons residing in community property States. Community property States are being differentiated against purely on account of their State laws. Since the insurance of shares in savings and loan associations is on a national basis, we desire by this bill to make the same apply equally in all of the States of the Union, just as has been done in connection with income tax matters.

A copy of bill H.R. 446 follows:

H.R. 446

A bill to amend the National Housing Act with regard to insurance of accounts so as to provide uniform protection to all married savers in savings and loan associations

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 401(b) of title IV, National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724(b)), is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including any law which would constitute an account community property), two persons who are husband wife shall each be insured under this title with respect to accounts in his or her sole name in an aggregate amount not to exceed $10,000 and, in addition to any insurance under the foregoing provisions of this sentence, they shall be insured with respect to accounts in the sole names of both of them in an amount (not to exceed $20,000) such that the total of the insurance under this sentence with respect to accounts in his or her sole name and accounts in the sole names of both of them shall not exceed $30,000; and neither of them may be additionally insured under this title with respect to any account in such institution unless such insurance is authorized by this title otherwise than by this sentence."

Introduction of Bill To Remove Dual Employment Limitation in Employment of Retired Officers of the Uniformed Services in Civilian Positions in the Federal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 7, 1959, I introduced a bill, H.R. 701, the result of which will, if enacted, make available to our Government highly trained and loyal citizens to serve our country in civilian positions under our Federal system. I refer to the opportunity we shall then have of employing some retired officers of the uniformed services in civilian positions in our Federal services who are presently barred from such employment.

Under present laws, most career retired officers of our uniformed services are entirely barred from employment by the Federal Government in civilian positions, while many others, when employable, are so severely restricted in accepting such positions as to render it impossible for them to accept such employment. Reference is made to the so-called Dual Employment Act of 1894 (act of July 31, 1894; 5 U.S.C. 62) and the restrictions contained in the Economy Act of 1932 (sec. 212 of the act of June 30, 1932; 5 U.S.C. 59(a)).

Under the Dual Employment Act of 1894, commissioned officers of the regular services are not employable by the Federal Government in civilian positions if their retired pay exceeds $2,500 per annum, unless retired for physical disability or elected to office or appointed thereto by the President with Senate confirmation. Thus, almost all retired officers of the regular military services are barred from employment by our Government, if they have not been retired for physical disability. Under this law, they may not even waive their retired pay to thus serve their country since the statute simply bars them from any civilian employment by our Government. Recently, General Quesada found it necessary to resign his earned retired status in order to serve the President of the United States in an appointment which did not require Senate confirmation.

When retired officers are employable in civilian positions under the Federal Government, unless they have been retired for physical disability as the result of combat wounds or the explosion of an instrumentality of war, they may not, under the provisions of section 212 of the Economy Act of 1932, receive a total compensation of more than $10,000 per annum. If they are employable and the compensation of the civilian position exceeds $10,000 per annum, they may waive their retired pay during their incumbency in the civilian position. Those retired for combat wounds or the explosion of an instrumentality of war may keep both their retired pay and the pay of the Federal civilian position. Prior to 1932 all retired officers who were employable by the Federal Government received both their earned retired pay and the pay of the civilian office.

It should also be noted that these restrictive provisions do not apply to retired members of the Reserve components of our armed services. For many years, under appropriate legislation, it was established that members of the Reserve components of our Armed Forces would not be in any way restricted in their civilian pursuits, including employment by our Government. That provision has been reenacted and made to apply, generally, to all members of the Reserve components in the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, which became effective on January 1, 1953. Nowadays, we have career retirement for reservists as well as for regulars. In addition, reserve officers now serve on long periods of active duty. It is entirely appropriate that they should be entirely free from restrictions in their employment opportunities like other citizens. We should have comparable legislation excluding retired officers of the Regular services from such restrictions, thus making all retired officers of the uniformed services available to the Government for civilian employment where the best interests of the country require such employment. Furthermore, such officers should be entitled to receive both their retired pay, which they have earned in active service in the Armed Forces of their country, and whatever civilian compensation may attach to any position under the Federal Government in which they may be employed.

The present situation has a twofold detrimental effect. It renders impossible employment of competent and available retired officers, highly trained and experienced in important fields of Government activity, at a time when their service would be greatly beneficial in the defense effort. It also deprives these officers of the opportunity of employment by their Government in civilian positions to which other citizens of the United States are eligible. It relegates these loyal military servants of the Government to a position of second-class citizenship.

Retirement laws, applicable to the armed services, properly provide that some officers be retired from the top of each rank each year and for enforced retirement upon the attainment of certain maximum allowable ages in each rank. This has been found essential to maintain the officer personnel of the services at the highest possible state of proficiency, both professionally and in physical health. It does, however, result in the loss of service to the Government of substantial numbers of highly trained, loyal and efficient officers whose services could and should be used in other governmental agencies. Yet far from planning for such use, especially in these times when we should be utilizing our available manpower to the best advantage in the defense effort in which we are now engaged for our very survival, there exist these outmoded and restrictive dual employment and dual compensation laws, which should be amended to make this potential source of manpower avail-

able to our national use. In this respect, it should be asked, Do our international competitors similarly bar themselves from the use of their trained military officers? The question suggests its own answer.

There is a mounting opinion, among those who are aware of this situation, that our present policy is wasteful in manpower and wrong. I am sure that Members of the House will wish to see the existing restrictions against the employment of retired career commissioned officers removed. That is what my bill, if enacted, will accomplish.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my weekly newsletter to constituents for January 10, 1959.

The newsletter follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, January 10, 1959)

"I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God." (The oath.)

Thus, for 436 Representatives (including 17 women) began the 2-year 86th Congress. There were many new faces. Republicans totaled 153 (down from 200), Democrats 283 (up from 235). The opening prayer of House Chaplain Braskamp fittingly ended with a united Lord's Prayer. Meanwhile, in the other body (Senate), Chaplain Harris included "Grant us the art of disagreeing without being disagreeable."

No. 206, Old House Office Building, is the Texas Fifth District, Dallas County, headquarters. The staff is the same—Frank Crowley, Mary Hornbeck, Dorothy Chrest, Kay Wharton—an able and unique group—unique in two ways—representing one of the Nation's largest districts and in being the original staff.

The 44th Congressman in history to be House Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, Texas, was again elected by the Democratic majority in a straight party line vote; while Republicans replaced JOE MARTIN, Massachusetts, with CHARLES HALLECK, Indiana, as minority leader. The determining factor in this contest was leadership, not political philosophy since both are conservatives.

The state of the Union message was well presented by the President (he looks fine) to the joint Houses, Supreme Court, Cabinet, Chiefs of Staff, and diplomats. Worldwide in scope, it was too general for detailed programs. These will follow. The theme was "security plus liberty."

Some of the references made are most important and thought-provoking, including: liberty and the God-given rights of man; world suspicion and tension; mass destruction possible; keeping the peace requires unrelenting effort; Communist agreements and treaties are worthless unless containing self-enforcing mechanisms; defense cost exemplified by bombers worth their weight in gold; heavy military expense requires elimination of waste and duplication; strong economy is foundation for national safety; competitive enterprise and freedom describe America; public understanding is needed; basic causes of inflation are wage-price spiral and deficit financing by Government; self-discipline and restraint are necessary; meet current costs (of government) from current revenue; balanced budget; ours is the noblest of causes—human freedom.

Some of Government's present conflicts and dilemmas can be detected in this message, including: Too often we make decisions based on trusting the Russians; security can jeopardize liberty when overzealous government overexpands its jurisdiction (abroad, foreign aid; at home, welfare programs); we don't balance the budget or pay-as-we-go; waste and duplication in Government is not sufficiently being sought out and stopped by Congress; politicians sponsor more Government spending with its crushing tax load, forgetful of the need for a strong free economy; competitive enterprise and freedom can be killed by Government regulations; self-discipline and restraint are frequently forgotten by self-seeking citizens and politicians; human freedom can perish from well-meaning but misguided Government "help" and taxation.

My forecasts include: Much bitter partisan politics with "criticism for criticism's sake" for political advantage; liberals proposing spending schemes without regard for a balanced budget; conservatives of both parties realizing their ideological kinship, their combined lack of strength, and the frustration of partisan politics between parties themselves split.

Questions the future will answer: Is this a labor-socialist Congress? Can the President save the day by the veto? Will the veto be sustained or over-ridden? Will the public understand the respective jurisdiction of the Administration and Congress and help direct the course of legislation? On the answers to these, as I see it, rest the "security and liberty" of this Nation and her people.

Finally, to Dallas County people at this Congress' outset, I pledge again to support consistently all earlier stated principles made during campaigns or in Congress and live up to the congressional oath stated above, so help me God.

Introduction of Bill To Equalize the Pay of Retired Members of the Uniformed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 7, 1959, I introduced a bill H.R. 703, which has for its purpose the re-establishment of the relationship between retired pay and the active duty pay of members of our uniformed services.

It will be remembered by Members of the House that, when the Military Pay Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-422) was enacted last year, it departed from the long-established policy that retired pay of previously retired personnel of the uniformed services be computed on the same basis as that of personnel thereafter retired.

The failure of the new pay law thus to keep faith with those who have served our country so well in war and peace has resulted in disillusionment among both active and retired personnel of the services. It has dealt a blow to what, in the past, has been the greatest single incentive to tenure in military service. If this mistake is left uncorrected, it alone may nullify the very purpose of the law itself, namely, to improve the stability of career military service and to stem the exodus from such service of our best qualified personnel.

As pointed out by the Cordiner Committee report, military retirement is a unique form of retirement, possessing characteristics not found in any other form of retirement. Career retired personnel of our uniformed services continue to "hold office" after retirement. They may be, and frequently are, involuntarily recalled to active service. They are, thus, not free agents, as are those who retire under other systems. Further, there is always a definite ceiling over their potential in reward for their service—a ceiling which we here in Congress place over them in a succession of pay laws for all to read. Until the enactment of the Military Pay Act of 1958, they could, at least, have faith that their Government would adhere to well-established standards governing their retirement rights.

Among other things, in recognition of these principles, the Cordiner committee reported as follows:

The committee has therefore concluded that the incentive value of its existing military retirement program depends to a major degree upon its integral relationship with active duty compensation and the confidence which has been built up in the military body that no breach of faith or breach of retirement contract has ever been permitted by the Congress and the American people. It is this unique characteristic which serves to counterbalance many of the limited aspects of the military retirement pay and has made it one of the most influential selling points in the recruitment efforts of the services.

Editorials have appeared in leading newspapers and periodicals throughout the Nation, urging a correction of the error which has been made. Among them are the New York Times, the Washington Star, and the authoritative spokesman of the military services, the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal. One quotation from the New York Times should be looked upon as prophetic:

Young officers who might make the services a career will not be blind to this discrimination; if officers already retired can thus be discriminated against in the interests of false economy, this can happen again.

The legislature of my own State of California petitioned Congress to maintain the time-honored policy in regard to the retired pay computation of previously retired personnel of the services—

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 1, 1958, page 5248.

The relatively modest cost of retired pay maintenance, as compared to the high costs of the newly created incentive features, provided in the Military Pay Act of 1958, is small, indeed, to the replacement costs which will inevitably result from the defections from career military service of those who, unless we restore their confidence, will leave the services. Faced with the assurance that their retired compensation will be progressively reduced, the best and most alert officers may seek other careers, unless we act now. Even worse, necessary replacements for those who thus leave the services might well result in the substitution of less qualified personnel for the best qualified of our fighting men.

In the face of this dire threat to our national safety, I am sure that Members of the House will wish speedily to correct the mistake we have made by reestablishing equality of treatment in retired pay compensation among members of the uniformed services. That is what my bill, if enacted, will accomplish.

Startling Facts About Florida's Population Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's mail I received the following copy of a very comprehensive report from Harold Colee, executive vice president of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce in Jacksonville:

STARTLING FACTS ABOUT FLORIDA'S POPULATION GROWTH

(Compiled by the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, Jacksonville)

1. Florida has a permanent population of 4,442,000, as calculated by the U.S. Bureau of the Census in mid-1958.

2. Florida is the fastest growing large State in the Nation:

Since 1950 it has gained 1,671,000 new permanent residents; only California added more.

This Florida gain is about the size of the State in 1940; also;

This Florida gain is about the same as today's size of Arkansas or Arizona or Oregon.

3. Florida gained 60 percent during the 8 years, 1950–1958.

Only little Nevada (267,000 population) with 67 percent topped this.

4. Florida's weekly gain in population averaged 5,032 persons each week during the past 3 years.

This is a net figure and was made up of 3,885 persons who moved here from other States and countries and 1,177 persons from natural increase.

This weekly gain was greatest in the year which ended June 30, 1956, and has slightly lessened since that time.

5. Florida's 3-year population gain:

Year	Number gained (in thousands)			Persons gained weekly		
	Total	Natural	Migration	Total	Natural	Migration
1955–56	289	58	222	5,385	1,122	4,263
1956–57	272	63	209	5,231	1,204	4,027
1957–58	233	63	170	4,481	1,207	3,274
3 year	785	184	601	[1] 5,032	[1] 1,177	[1] 3,855

[1] Average.

6. Florida stepped up one more rung on the population ladder last year, passing Missouri, to a rank of 12th in mid-1958. (Incidentally, Florida ranks 13th in beef cattle.)

Florida ranked 20th in population in 1950; and Census Bureau estimators affirm that Florida will take 9th place between 1965 and 1970.

7. Florida's population is approaching that of Indiana (with 4,581,000) and Massachusetts (with 4,862,000).

8. Florida's population is made up of 37 percent under 21 years of age (United States, 38 percent); 53 percent from 21 to 64 years of age (same as United States); 10 percent 65 and over (United States, 9 percent). Breakdown based on 1956 census estimates, the latest available.)

White persons account for 81 percent of Florida's population. This proportion has been increasing steadily for many years.

9. Floridians numbered 2,771,305 on April 1, 1950, the date of the last regular census. The U.S. Bureau of the Census has made the following estimates of Florida's population as of July 1 of each year:

Year	Total population		Increase from previous year		Percent increase from 1950
	Number	Rank	Number	Percent	
	Thousands		*Thousands*		
1950	2,836				20
1951	2,992	156	5.5	5.5	19
1952	3,152	160	5.3	11.1	17
1953	3,303	151	4.7	16.4	17
1954	3,464	161	4.8	22.1	15
1955	3,657	193	5.5	28.9	14
1956	3,937	280	7.6	38.8	13
1957	4,209	272	6.9	48.4	13
1958	4,442	233	5.5	56.6	12

NOTE.—Gain from Apr. 1, 1950, 60 percent; from July 1, 1950, 56.6 percent.

THE PEOPLE/THE LAND

10. Floridians numbered 51 for every square mile of land in the State in 1950 and 82 in 1958. (U.S. average, 58 persons per square mile in 1958.)

Twenty-six States had more people per square mile than Florida in 1950; 16 States were more densely populated in 1958.

There are 54,262 square miles of land area in Florida; 24 States are larger.

11. Florida's growth means more markets, more opportunities. It also creates an urgent need for more highways, more schools, more public facilities of all types. And it brings with it changes in land use and the readjustments which attend change.

Because of Florida's superior climate, the land is desired for homes. And because of this same climate, and the adaptability of the soil, the land is desired for agriculture. In recent years the rivalry between population growth and expanding agricultural pursuits has been accentuated. The 1958 Yearbook of Agriculture, titled Land, published by the United States Department of Agriculture, points up Florida's land situation in the following quotation:

"L. A. Reuss, of the Agricultural Research Service, reported that recent trends in Florida icluded a rapidly rising urban population, a moderately increasing rural nonfarm population, and a declining farm population. Projections to 1970 indicated a possible slight increase in the number of farms, a moderate increase in urban areas, and a market growth in the rural nonfarm population.

"Spreading urban and suburban areas intensify problems of providing roads, electricity, sewerage, police and fire protection, schools, and shopping facilities. Tax and zoning problems are multiplied. Premature subdivisions often do not provide for services.

"Urbanization has a strong impact on the attitudes and goals of farm people as they are brought into closer contact with nonfarm or part-time farm people, urban employment, and ways of life. This impact is greater in northern and western Florida, where the culture of the rural population is more homogeneous than in the rest of the State. Increased opportunities for nonfarm employment increases interest among rural people in education and training.

"The number of noncommercial—part-time and residential—farms has dropped in northern and western Florida and increased in central and southern Florida. In some counties there were decreases or only slight increases in the number of farm operators working off their farms 100 days or more; largest decreases in this group were reported in Duval and Nassau Counties in the Jacksonville area.

"A study in Duval County by Daniel Alleger, an economist at the Florida Agricultural Experiment Station (Gainesville), showed that two-thirds of part-time and retirement farmers were gainfully employed, one-fourth were retired, and the others were self-employed.

"Two-thirds of the home-farm units had fewer than 6 acres. More than half had fewer than 4 acres. About half of the operators planted one-half acre or less in crops. Nearly 90 percent of the enterprises were gardening types of agriculture. About 80 percent of the operators kept poultry or meat animals. The economic advantages of part-time farming came more from savings than from increased earnings.

"As population and economic activity have grown in Florida, there have been tendencies toward a gradual upgrading in the use of land: Subdivisions replace citrus groves, citrus groves replace improved pastures, and pastures replace native rangelands.

"The acreage of bearing citrus groves increased about 25 percent (an estimated 567,000 acres in 1958) and the nonbearing acreage doubled (94,500 in 1957–58) from 1949 to 1958, according to Mr. REUSS. Some established citrus groves were being cleared for subdivisions, highways, and industrial parks. Some estimates indicate that only 50,000 to 100,000 acres suitable for citrus have not been planted, and of these 25,000 to 50,000 acres would be taken up for homes. All ridgelands in some places are occupied, and new groves are being set out on flatwoods land after ditching and bedding. Demand for land for citrus in central Florida affects the supply and the cost of land available to producers of other farm products.

"The area of improved pasture in Florida was estimated at more than 1.6 million acres. Continued expansion is expected. Florida has perhaps 10 million acres that could be converted from native rangeland into improved pastures. Some loss of acreage of improved pastures occurred when new citrus groves are set out and when residential and commercial subcenters are established in open country."

The acreage of truck crops increased by 116,000 acres between 1950 and 1958 (471,000 acres planted in 1957–58 according to the Florida State Marketing Bureau).

"The demand for land for truck crops in 1958 was not in serious conflict with other uses of land. Urbanization encouraged increases in the acreages in truck crops in rural areas such as the Everglades, some expansion in acreage around urban markets, and some outward movement of production areas at the perimeter of expanding urban centers.

"The acreage in general field crops has declined slightly. Demand for land by pulp and timber companies affects the economy of general farming in northern and western Florida.

"Several examples are at hand of some of the effects of a high demand for land. Dairy farmers near Miami have sold land for subdivisions for $1,000 or more an acre and moved their operations to cheaper land north of Palm Beach or near Lake Okeechobee. The same type of movement is taking place near towns like Tallahassee. (St. Petersburg is typical of this movement.) In the process, the dairymen may increase greatly the size of their farms and boost land values at their new locations. Cattlemen are refraining from investing funds to improve pasturelands that may be in demand as sites for citrus groves or subdivisions. In areas where the land market is highly active, especially the coastal and metropolitan areas, investors are permiting much land to remain idle, pending resale or the anticipated change to a higher use. Dwellings in rural areas are in demand as housing for part-time farmers and for nonfarmworkers. Market values of tracts that have dwellings seemed in 1958 to exceed current or prospective values for agricultural purposes."

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Florida Bureau of Vital Statistics, and U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Compiled and distributed by Florida State Chamber of Commerce, P.O. Box 8046, Jacksonville, Fla., January 1, 1959.

Further, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues in the House to the results of a survey that was recently made on the district that I represent, Florida's Fourth District, which is comprised of Dade and Monroe Counties.

The 1950 census showed only 495,000 Dade County residents. The 1955 Dade census, 703,777; a 5-year increase of approximately 84 percent. A 1958 survey by the University of Miami concludes Dade now has a population of 852,000.

Monroe County, with an official 29,957 in 1950, is growing similarly and is now thought to have 65,000. It is authoritatively estimated that 1,200,000 residents will have permanently settled in Dade and Monroe by 1960.

The 1,200,000 Dade and Monroe County figure compares to a congressional district national population average of about 345,000. The district with the least people has only 159,000.

The Bureau of Census figures, recently released, confirm Florida's fabulous growth and estimate that Florida will be entitled to three additional seats in the Congress following the 1960 census.

The present permanent population of Florida's huge Fourth Congressional District—Dade and Monroe Counties—now far exceeds the entire population of each of 15 States—Arizona, 749,587; Alaska, 128,643; Delaware, 318,085; Maine, 913,774; Idaho, 588,637; Montana, 591,024; Nevada, 160,083; New Hampshire, 533,242; New Mexico, 681,187; North Dakota, 619,636; Rhode Island, 791,896; South Dakota, 652,740; Vermont, 377,747; Utah, 688,862; and Wyoming, 290,529.)

Further, the present population of the district I represent is larger than the combined population of four States.

During the year many of you will have occasion to visit and/or pass through Florida, and through my congressional district. On behalf of our chambers of commerce, our many business interests, and each and every member of our community, I take this opportunity to extend to you an invitation to visit with us and to take advantage of our salubrious climate, and any of the multitude of business and recreational facilities that are abundantly available.

John R. Reidl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my district was saddened by the recent untimely death of John R. Reidl, vice president and general manager of the Appleton Post-Crescent.

I was privileged to know John Reidl, not only as one of the Nation's outstanding newspapermen, but as a close friend and adviser. It was in this latter capacity that John Reidl will be most sorely missed. He unselfishly devoted himself to assisting people in all walks of life, in the same modest and quiet manner in which he contributed to the civic leadership of his community and State.

John Reidl was a newspaperman's newspaperman, one of the most skillful and respected practitioners of his art. He worked his way to the top, from reporter to city editor, to managing editor, to executive vice president, and general manager. On his way up, he contributed greatly to the success of the Post-Crescent, helping to make it one of the truly great newspapers of Wisconsin.

His life was aptly summed up in an editorial which appeared in the Post-Crescent after his death:

John Reidl was a real Christian, and a man who truly accomplished the objective of living the good life, and leaving the world a better place for his having lived in it.

I include the complete editorial as part of my remarks, as well as an editorial which appeared in the Green Bay Press-Gazette:

[From the Appleton (Wis.) Post-Crescent, Jan. 3, 1959]

JOHN R. REIDL

John Reidl wouldn't have wanted an editorial published about him. He would have snorted that it was a waste of good newspaper space. One of the best judges of news values we have known, he could never understand that he could be news. Several years ago he wrote his own obituary for the Post-Crescent's files; it was four paragraphs long and said, in essence, that he had been born, had lived, and died.

But John Riedl did a lot more than that. A complete list of the things he did for his newspaper, his community, and its people will never be drawn, for he never told anyone about many of them. Newspapermen knew him as a highly skillful practitioner of their craft, businessmen knew him as a topnotch executive, civic leaders knew him as a man to whom they could turn with their knottiest problems, politicians went to him to share his astute evaluation of political trends and events. But perhaps his least known side was his compassion for his fellow human beings; a deeply religious man—he went to mass daily for many years—he truly lived a Christian life. Reporters, for instance, sometimes would notice one or two rather infirm looking individuals in Riedl's office, deep in conversation with him; later they learned that Alcoholics Anonymous sent their most difficult cases to him for personal counsel. He and his wife supported a number of needy older people for many years; exactly how many will never be known. A stickler for publishing the news despite the persuasive importuning of people who didn't want some story in the paper—especially if the importuner were prominent or wealthy—he sometimes would break his own rule for, as he put it, "some poor fellow who didn't have any influential friends." To his closest associates he would occasionally relate, quietly but proudly, how some of those poor fellows had come back in later years to thank him for giving them a break when they needed it.

Over the years journalism schools sent their most promising graduates to the Post-Crescent so they could be trained under Riedl. A tough taskmaster who insisted on good writing and absolute accuracy—he was known, sometimes affectionately and sometimes fearfully, as the Bull of the Woods in his earlier days as managing editor—he would spend hours with a young reporter or editor, patiently going over copy and explaining how a story should be written or edited. One of his outstanding qualities in his later years was an unaffected sympathy with the problems of young people; unlike many older men he could really understand their ambitions and dreams, and often cautioned his department heads against discouraging their younger employees. Often he would permit his subordinates to go ahead with projects the quality of which he was personally doubtful; he would say it was better to let young men try out their ideas than to stifle their creativeness.

Riedl became irritated when someone referred to journalism as a profession; he insisted on using the term "newspaper business" and sometimes would shock more idealistic practitioners by asserting that news is a commodity—"we buy it and sell it, just like any other business." Or, he would point downstairs and comment, "The important thing is what's in the kitty (company treasury) down there." Despite this ultrapractical approach he was early a strong advocate of publishing more news columns—the kind that bring no direct revenue—buying the best news, picture and feature services, running more columnists than almost any other newspaper, and building up one of the biggest news staffs of any newspaper this size. He also pushed hard for building up the Post-Crescent's circulation in as large an area as possible, on the theory that it would bring more business to Appleton "and what's good for Appleton (later he would say the Fox Cities) is good for the Post-Crescent."

Riedl was a self-educated man. His formal education went only through high school, yet his knowledge of many subjects would put holders of doctors' degrees to shame. He read widely and learned naturally—he spent one winter, for example, reading nothing but books on constitutional law. He numbered among his close friends college and university presidents and professors and—although he was a devout Catholic—Protestant ministers. He loved to sit for hours with the latter, discussing theology and doctrine, about which his knowledge was formidable. He knew much about the history of Appleton, and was a fount of information for writers and researchers about the city's families, its industries and its early leaders.

Riedl's civic activities were many, although again he was wont to depreciate the role he played. Late in World War II when, under doctor's orders, he sat down to write letters of resignations from all the committees and commissions of which he was a member, he found he had to write more than 20 letters. He was a strong, sometimes impatient, advocate of civic progress on all fronts, taking the lead in such programs as the establishment of the Apostolate and the Visiting Nurse Association, a community fund, the county airport, an industrial development program, and the like.

A political conservative, Riedl nevertheless numbered among his friends Democrats, liberals, and labor leaders. They all came to him for advice—on one occasion three men running for the same office called on him within the space of 2 hours—and he gave it freely, even when the receiver knew that Riedl himself thoroughly opposed his policies and principles. Among his close friends were men with such varying ideologies as former Gov. Philip La Follette, the late Senator McCarthy, and former Lawrence (now Harvard) President Nathan Pusey.

It is difficult to write about a man with whom one has had such close business and personal ties. Words will not express adequately our feelings. Suffice it to say that John Riedl was a real Christian, and a man who truly accomplished the objective of living the good life, and leaving the world a better place for his having lived in it.

[From the Green Bay (Wis.,) Press-Gazette, Jan. 5, 1959]

JOHN R. RIEDL, OF APPLETON

The death of John R. Riedl, vice president and general manager of the Appleton Post-Crescent, represents a real loss to the newspaper business in Wisconsin. To the Press-Gazette it means the loss of a good friend.

During the years since 1920 when Mr. Riedl became city editor of the Appleton Post-Crescent, there has been a close relationship between the Post-Crescent and the Press-Gazette. Throughout this long period, Mr. Riedl was active successively as city editor, managing editor, as executive vice president, and as vice president and general manager. Always and regardless of the title he held, he was a firm rock of commonsense and a man ready to go halfway in any cooperative move.

He was a good newspaperman and as such was familiar with or active in almost everything of importance going on in Appleton. He preferred a quiet, behind-the-scene support for most activities to that of the public leader but he supplied the energy and drive for a great many good things that happened in his community and in the newspaper field about him. He will be missed as a friend and a counselor by many who knew him well and worked with him during his very active years as a civic leader and a newspaperman.

Statement of Policy by League of Wisconsin Municipalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the days ahead we shall be faced with serious decisions on a wide variety of issues affecting local, national, and international interests.

In considering programs for domestic progress, a major challenge will be to determine the appropriate role of the local, State, and Federal governments in the development and maintenance of these programs. Too, we must consider social, economic, population, and other factors in the overall economy.

We recognize, of course, that today there is a trend toward population concentration in urban areas.

For example, in 1850, only about 15 percent of the people lived in our cities, villages, and towns; in 1950, only 100 years later, the percentage had risen to about 65 percent.

With this tremendous growth and expansion, there arise, of course, numerous problems. These cover a wide variety of fields, including the need for more adequate highways, airports, urban renewal, adequate water and sewer systems, and other programs.

Today, I have received from Mr. Ed Johnson, executive director of the League of Wisconsin Municipalities, a statement of municipal policy by that splendid organization.

The statement outlines the views of the league on a wide variety of important programs, including intergovernmental relations, the need for an improved civil defense program, the necessity of effective Federal control over natural gas, problems of urban renewal, and other challenges of deep concern, not only to local municipalities, but also to us, in Congress.

We realize, of course, that there are different approaches to resolving these problems.

To give my colleagues the benefit of the constructive thinking of the league outlined in the statement of municipal policy, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MUNICIPAL POLICY OF THE LEAGUE OF WISCONSIN MUNICIPALITIES

This statement of municipal policy of the League of Wisconsin Municipalities is the vehicle through which the cities and villages of Wisconsin make known their aims and purposes. It sets forth broad areas of responsibility for municipal, State, and Federal governments on matters affecting local governments. It is primarily a restatement and summary of many long-standing league policies.

This policy represents the foundation upon which the league builds its legislative action program at both the State and Federal levels. It does not attempt to state the league's position on the hundreds of individual bills which will be presented to the Congress and the State legislature during the coming sessions; rather it attempts to set forth guideposts for league officials and committees to use in establishing the league's position on individual bills which may come under consideration in future years.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND MUNICIPALITIES

Each year it becomes more and more apparent to the officials of Wisconsin cities and villages that the impact of Federal Government policies on local governments is becoming greater. The effects of national legislation and administrative programs are felt in every city and village in Wisconsin. League members therefore feel that their thinking on the major Federal municipal issues of the day should be made known to Members of Congress and other Federal officers. It is for this reason that the following statements of national municipal policy are set forth:

Intergovernmental relations

The relations between the Federal, State, and local governments determine the limits of the ability of municipalities to solve their own problems and to serve their citizens. Therefore, continued progress in municipal government is dependent on a proper relationship between and understanding among the various governmental levels and units.

The league endorses the guiding philosophy of government as set forth by the Kestnbaum Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in its report to the Congress in 1955. The report states the following:

"Leave to private initiative all the functions that citizens can perform privately; use the level of government closest to the community for all public functions it can handle, utilize cooperative intergovernmental arrangements where appropriate to attain economical performance and popular approval; reserve national action for residual participation where State and local governments are not fully adequate, and for the continuing responsibilities that only the National Government can undertake."

To continue the necessary constant study of Federal-local relationships, the league recommends the creation of a permanent national commission by Congress. The members should be representatives of all levels of Government, and they should have as their primary aim the clarification and definition of the policies of the Federal Government with respect to local units.

Municipal credit

The improvement of municipal credit and the municipal bond market is a matter of much concern to local governmental officials in these days of high costs and the need for tremendous capital improvements. Because of the effect of national tax policy on municipal bonds, the league recommends to Congress that: (1) The present Federal income tax exemption of income from municipal bonds be continued; and (2) that legislation be adopted which would further broaden the market for municipal bonds by authorizing all banking institutions to participate in the municipal bond market, and the income tax exemption be clarified so as to authorize the "pass-through" principle for investment companies.

Payments in lieu of taxes

The league urges the Congress to enact legislation which will broaden the present Federal policy regarding payments to local governments in lieu of property taxes on Federal property and payment of special assessments on Federal property benefited by local improvements.

Highways

Since the greatest need for improvement in highway facilities exists in and around municipalities, the league urges the Congress to continue to expand the Federal highway program and to given even greater recognition to the needs of cities and villages. The impact of the new Interstate Highway System is yet to be felt, and the Congress should pass all legislation necessary to implement the role that cities and villages must necessarily play in the provision of adequate highway facilities to the millions of motorists in the Nation.

Airports

Airports do not serve only the residents of the municipalities in or near which they are located; they serve the traveling public of the Nation. For this reason the Federal Government has a repsonsibility for participating in any program to provide adequate terminal facilities for air travelers. The league urges that the existing Federal airport program not only be continued but be expanded in order to adequately provide facilities for the ever-increasing number of air travelers. Local units of government are financially incapable, in many instances, of financing the construction and improvement of airport terminal facilities which are and will be needed to provide an adequate network of air terminal installations.

Civil defense

Because of its very nature civil defense is a matter of national concern. Wisconsin municipal officials stand ever ready to cooperate in civil defense activities. In spite of the readiness of local officials to aid and assist in the civil defense program, they are not in a position to know the over-all needs of such a program and feel that an adequate civil defense program requires greater participation and leadership at the national level.

Natural gas

Since an adequate supply of natural gas, reasonably priced to the consumer, is essential to the citizens and industries of Wisconsin, and since natural gas consumers would be left without adequate protection if there were no Federal control over the price of natural gas as sold by the producer and supplier, the league urges Congress to reject any legislative proposals which would leave the price of natural gas unregulated by Federal authority.

Water pollution control

The pollution of rivers and streams which flow through many municipalities and States is a problem of national concern. The current Federal program for sewage plant construction has been successful in enabling local governmental units to expedite their pollution control activities. Although there may be questions in the minds of some Wisconsin municipal officials as to whether such a program was originally justified, there now remains no question that it should be continued for municipalities with limited financial ability. Discontinuance of the program would cause new sewage plant construction activities to be curtailed and be detrimental to the pollution control program. For this reason the league urges that the Congress continue to appropriate funds for sewage plant construction and research in the field of pollution control.

Urban renewal

The decay of our municipalities through blight and deterioration is a matter of concern to all residents of our Nation. The league urges that the Federal urban renewal program be continued and that funds be made available to local units of government to assist them in preserving our urban centers. Slum clearance and urban renewal are of such a nature and of such great expense that local financing of the needed programs is impossible.

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN AND ITS CITIES AND VILLAGES

The actions of the State legislature and State officers, departments and agencies have had and will have an increasingly greater impact on the residents of Wisconsin cities and villages and their local governments. Municipal governments are no longer mere creatures of the State but are active, working partners in the performance of public services and in the administration of Wisconsin government. Wisconsin has long had a reputation for good government at both the State and local levels. This reputation can be maintained only as long as the working relationship among all levels of government within the State is maintained according to sound principles and policies. It is for this reason that the League of Wisconsin Municipalities, representing the State's cities and villages, sets forth the following broad principles as a statement of municipal policy in regard to State and local relationship.

Home rule

Actions of the State legislature and State officers, departments and agencies should always conform to the spirit of the home rule amendment of the State constitution overwhelmingly ratified by the people of Wisconsin in 1924. Government close to home is a Wisconsin tradition and should be preserved. The League, representing those units of Government which have been granted broad home rule authority by vote of the Wisconsin electorate, must necessarily oppose all measures involving attempts to have the State interfere in the local affairs of Wisconsin cities and villages.

Finances

The limited taxing powers of Wisconsin municipalities, together with the Wisconsin practice of having a substantial portion of total public services performed by local governments, demands an extensive program of intergovernmental financing and a necessarily complex State-local financial relationship. It is essential that in this State-local financial relationship the integrity, home rule authority and financial stability of municipalities be preserved. The State government has the responsibility for providing the means whereby Wisconsin local governments can adequately finance necessary local governmental activities without causing undue burden on the local property taxpayer.

The league, therefore, in representing its membership must oppose all proposals which (a) impose additional costs and mandatory duties upon cities and villages, directly or indirectly, without providing new revenues to pay such costs from sources other than the general property tax; (b) take away revenue now received by cities and villages unless replaced by some source other than the general property tax; (c) exempt property from general property taxes or cause exemption from State taxes shared by municipalities without providing an equivalent new replacement revenue; or (d) create excessive restrictions in the allocation of State aids and shared taxes.

Urban growth

Cities and villages must be given the opportunity for normal expansion. The complexities of urban growth are increasing each year. Responsibility for the solution of problems caused by the urbanization of Wisconsin's population rests equally with the State and local units of government. Continuing study of urban problems at all levels of government must be encouraged and local units must be given adequate means to solve problems of urbanization through cooperative effort. In all matters relating to urban expansion the home rule authority of cities and villages must be given full consideration and what appear to be simple solutions through mandatory State legislation must be discouraged.

Highways

The members of the league anxiously await the findings of the present study of highway needs being made by the highway advisory committee of the legislative council. It is firmly believed that the results of this study will statistically prove that the greatest needs in the field of highway development are found in Wisconsin cities and villages. No major changes in the formulas for the distribution of highway aids should be made until the complete results of the study are known.

Cities and villages are now expending for street purposes several times the amount received from highway user taxes. It is now necessary to finance much of the highway costs to cities and villages from the general property tax. Certainly no consideration should be given to proposals to reduce the amount of income which cities and villages presently receive. Serious consideration should be given to proposals whereby the highway user pays a greater and more equitable share of highways costs.

Employee relations

The league does not oppose unionization of municipal employees but it does oppose State legislation interfering in matters of local governmental employment. Members of city and village governing bodies are in a far better position to understand the problems of their employees than are members of the State legislature. If home rule means anything in Wisconsin, it means that local employee relationships should be dealt with by the duly elected, local governmental officials. Therefore, the league will continue to oppose any attempt to have the legislature enact laws interfering with local government-employee relations.

Water resources

An adequate supply of water is essential to the development of any urban community. No water use should be given a higher priority than municipal public water supply. No private use should interfere with the availability of water for public purposes. For these reasons the league will oppose any attempt to enact legislation which would curtail the authority of municipalities to obtain an adequate supply of water for public use.

Education

The rapid increase in school population has caused tremendous pressures on the general property tax which provides approximately four-fifths of the funds necessary to support elementary and secondary education in Wisconsin. It is doubtful that the property tax can continue to bear such a high percentage of school costs in years to come when school enrollments are expected to increase at an even more rapid rate. If the property tax is either directly or indirectly further burdened for the financing of education, this source of local governmental revenue will make home ownership prohibitive, especially by individuals on fixed incomes.

The league believes that all children should have an opportunity for adequate education in the public schools of Wisconsin. However, educational opportunity must not be considered in a vacuum. In Wisconsin cities where education is one of many governmental services, it must be considered in relationship to all other municipal services rendered. The fragmentation of governmental services through mandatory attachment of districts outside corporate limits to school systems in cities operating under

the city school plan frequently results in curtailment of municipal expansion. For these reasons the league will oppose any attempts to enact legislation for the compulsory attachment of districts which will jeopardize the opportunity for normal growth and expansion of the municipalities for all governmental purposes if those responsible for local municipal government are denied an opportunity to participate in such decisions.

Dedication of the Wiley-Dondero Ship Channel, St. Lawrence Seaway, Massena, N.Y., September 13, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD the address made by the Honorable George A. Dondero, of Royal Oak, Mich., former Member of the House of Representatives, at the dedication of the Wiley-Dondero Ship Channel, being a part of the St. Lawrence Seaway project named in honor of Senator WILEY and himself, September 13, 1958.

The address follows:

DEDICATION OF THE WILEY-DONDERO SHIP CHANNEL, ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

(Remarks of Hon. George A. Dondero, dedication of the Wiley-Dondero Ship Channel on September 13, 1958, Massena, N.Y.)

An occasion of this kind occurs only once in a lifetime. This is the greatest red letter day of my life. We are filled with emotions of gratitude and appreciation to our fellow countrymen for the signal honor bestowed upon Senator WILEY and myself by determining that this ship channel shall bear our names.

We dedicate today an important link in one of the world's most impressive monuments to international cooperation and good will.

We are witnesses not only to the construction but the near completion of the greatest engineering project of our time. The dream of two friendly nations who speak the same language and read the same Bible will soon become a reality.

Perhaps if North America has a lesson for the world it is the lesson of the border delineated by the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes; the lesson that it is possible to divide, and yet to share; that it is possible to be independent and at the same time interdependent; and that sovereign peoples can work together to bring fulfillment to a great common dream of industry and commerce. Let the world take note of what can be accomplished when mutual trust, friendship, and understanding chart the course of nations in building a great work for the benefit of all mankind.

To have had a part in guiding through Congress the legislation that made it possible for the United States and Canada in mutual trust, friendship, and understanding to undertake the building of this colossal project is an achievement and satisfaction for Senator WILEY and myself which cannot be measured in words.

On the walls of the House of Representatives in Washington, immediately above the Speaker's chair is inscribed the only quotation in that historic chamber. It is from Daniel Webster, a legislative giant of 100 years ago. Said he, "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its power; build its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

To Lew Castle, Administrator, his staff and advisory board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Corps of Army Engineers of the U.S. Army and all who had a part in the planning and construction of this gigantic undertaking for the development of navigation and hydroelectric power on both sides of the river, the thanks of both nations are generously tendered for its benefits to commerce, prosperity and peace, and to the national defense of North America.

After many years of hesitation, consideration, negotiation, and of planning, the mighty St. Lawrence seaway will soon become a reality. Man's dream of two centuries will have come true. Here it stands an unparalleled example to the world of international understanding and good will. Because of this I believe that in the years to come the people of the United States and Canada will, for their own safety and the good of all, walk together in prosperity, in majesty, and in peace.

Item Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a concurrent resolution to implement the recommendation of President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message on January 9, 1959, for giving the Chief Executive item veto power in connection with appropriation and authorization bills.

As the President said, the responsibility either to approve or to veto specific items is one of the most important corrections that could be made in our annual expenditure program because of the savings of tax dollars that would result.

My proposal, Mr. Speaker, is an amendment to the joint rules of the House and Senate not only providing veto power of individual items in appropriation bills but also veto power of authorizations for borrowing funds direct from the Federal Treasury. This is the only answer I see for eliminating nonessential spending and unnecessary projects.

I know that when this item veto power was requested by former Presidents, the argument was advanced by some Members of Congress that in the President's hands we would place the power to use pressure on or punish individual Members of Congress who did not vote the way a President wanted them to on his administration's measures.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, there have been times when Members have been subject to pressure, and we all have legislation which could be used against us. But our first responsibility is to the Nation and any vindictive veto would boomerang under the light of publicity; or it could be overridden by Congress. Certainly Members know in their hearts that the passage of this concurrent resolution is one necessary and important way of restoring fiscal responsibility and Federal economy to our Nation.

I hope the Judiciary Committee will consider this matter.

Why Is Anyone Surprised at Soviet Maneuvers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, when the Communists turn on smiles and appeals for us to trust them one month, and switch to threats and brazen lies about us the next month, one always hears some Americans ask, What are they up to now? This is always a cause for astonishment. How long are we to refuse to read the Communist rule books? These rules books spell out in detail the pattern of deception, lullaby songs, and so on, which they follow faithfully.

There never is any mystery about the ultimate objective behind any Communist actions. The objective is to confuse, divide, soften up, and weaken us preparatory for the final kill. Whenever they urge us to follow a given course, it is because that will be good for them, not for us. How can we hope to survive, unless we wake up to the nature of this conspiracy and refuse to fall for its devious tricks, and turns?

One of the best short analyses I have seen of this consistent Communist behavior is in the enclosed column by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, in the New York Herald Tribune several weeks ago. The headlines of today, the current hotspots of Communist agitation, are different now than they were then, but the pattern never changes.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article, as follows:

REDS MAINTAINING POLICY OF TENSION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Everybody agrees that the Soviet and Chinese Communists are well embarked on a tough, tension-laden, let's-keep-everything-in-turmoil policy. What surprises me is not that the Communists are acting to lacerate every sensitive spot in the free world but that so many people in the West should in any way be startled or surprised or in any way find it unexpected.

Of course, there will be stops and goes in Soviet-Chinese tactics; there will be some pauses to catch breath, to reappraise and get ready to apply the pressure somewhere else. But the fact is that creating tension and turmoil is the norm of Communist policy—it is the built-in requirement of Communist dogma. The only time to be moderately surprised is when they let up. Let us never forget that absence of pressure from Moscow and Peiping is the interruption of the normal.

The Communist concept is not national, it is international. The Communist revolution

has neither spent itself nor come to an end after establishing its control over millions of Russians and Chinese.

What we need to realize is that the Soviet and Chinese Communist leaders are dedicated Leninists and that in the words of Lenin they are committed to carrying on a "permanent revolution" against every non-Communist society everywhere in the world until one or the other prevails.

This is not the West's cold war challenge to the Communists. We have never said that the whole world must be one thing or the other. This is communism's challenge to all who do not want communism. This is why it is well to appreciate that a tough, let's-keep-everything-in-turmoil policy from Moscow and Peiping is not a departure from the normal, is not startling, surprising, or unexpected, but is standard, by-the-book, authentic Leninist routine.

No one has more lucidly set out the Marxist-Leninist philosophy of the "permanent revolution" than Harry and Bonaro Overstreet in their new book, "What We Must Know About Communism," which is the most mature, perceptive, clear-headed, radiantly illuminating work on this subject I can imagine. On the one point I am seeking to make, let me quote from the Overstreets who, in turn, quote pertinently from Lenin:

"Peace, as Lenin saw it, was 'a respite for another war'—while the 'permanent revolution' went on; '* * * there is no other alternative: Either the Soviet Government triumphs in every advanced country in the world or the most reactionary imperialism triumphs, the most savage imperialism * * * Anglo-American imperialism, which has perfectly mastered the art of using the form of a democratic republic.

" 'One or the other.

" 'There is no middle course.' " (Lenin, "Selected Works," vol. VIII, pp. 146–149.)

So let us not be surprised when the Communists take a tough turmoil-laden line as they are now—toward Hungary, toward Yugoslavia, in Berlin, in Iran, at Geneva over ending nuclear tests, creating frontier incidents in the air (as downing the U.S. plane off-course over Armenia) and in the continued alternate-day shelling of Quemoy and Matsu.

And the revolution goes on inside the Communist strongholds. Mao Tse-tung has decapitated the flowers of criticism he urged to lift their heads into view. Khrushchev is no longer talking about "socialist legality" and has called a halt on the "rehabilitation" of past victims of socialist illegality. Premier Imre Nagy and his closest associates have been shot. Moscow's "literary thaw," which lasted about a year after Stalin's death, has ended with the attacks on Pasternak.

Moscow and Peiping are not engaged in "peaceful coexistence." They are engaged in "permanent revolution" against every non-Communist society by every measure they think has any chance of succeeding.

Amending Federal Tax Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill designed to close one of the largest and most inequitable loopholes that exist in our tax laws. Our Federal income tax law admittedly has many devices which have caused a serious erosion of the tax base. None is worse, however, than that loophole which I now wish to call to the attention of the House. I deplore any gimmick which permits one group to escape its just share of Federal tax obligations by shifting that tax burden to others. Our tax system, largely one of self-assessment, can survive only when justice is preserved as between taxpayers of the entire country.

The loophole to which I wish to direct attention today is that which permits giant, wealthy oil and gas companies to avoid hundreds of millions of dollars of taxes which should be paid to the Federal Government. I refer to that device in the Internal Revenue Code known as oil and natural gas depletion allowance. Under the present law, income for tax purposes may be reduced by 27.5 percent of the gross income from each oil and gas property, but not to exceed 50 percent of net income. For 32 years, oil and gas companies have benefited from this device at the expense of other taxpayers of the Nation. I think the time has come when Congress should no longer pamper this giant industry. Tax favoritism and discrimination are always undesirable even when rates are low. Under present high levels, they are intolerable.

How did the oil and gas interests obtain favored tax treatment? It all started back in the days of World War I when income tax rates were greatly increased. Because of the skyrocketing cost of drilling as compared with prewar costs, Congress was persuaded to introduce a new concept into the tax law. This new concept was called "discovery value depletion," and was based upon the theory that it was unfair to limit the discoverer of an oil deposit to the recovery of his costs which were largely incurred prior to the war, when the purchaser of a proven field could recover the amount paid at war prices. Under the then existing law, oil and gas companies were allowed to recover tax-free only their actual investment in depletable property. In this respect they were treated just like other industry is today. If private industry in Massachusetts, or any of the other States builds a factory to provide jobs for workers, they can recover only what is invested through depreciation allowances. Even though the property should subsequently increase in value, only what has been invested may be recovered. But this did not, and still does not, satisfy oilmen. They argued then that Congress should allow them to recover the value of the property after the discovery of oil, rather than their actual outlay. Congress went along with this in 1918. But soon great difficulty and much litigation ensued over methods of determining "discovery value." So, as a substitute, in 1926, Congress enacted the new concept of percentage depletion, which, as I have said, allows a deduction from income of 27.5 percent of the gross income from each oil or gas property limited by 50 percent of net income. The total investment may be recovered time after time, tax free. An investment of $1 million may be recovered many times over, as has been done often, with no taxes being paid on this 27.5 percent of gross income. I contend that it would make just as much sense to exempt 27.5 percent of the gross income of every actor, writer, athlete, movie star, doctor, or any other individual for that matter, who are daily depleting their creative and physical resources. Why should this special treatment be given to the largest and most wealthy corporations in our land today?

Let me emphasize this point. In classifying corporations for purposes of income statistics, the Internal Revenue Service has set up 14 categories of corporations according to the size of total assets. The highest, or 14th group includes corporations with assets of $250 million or over. In 1955, this group claimed two-thirds of all the depletion allowances taken by corporations.

I point out that, in addition to the billion dollar oil companies which benefit from percentage depletion, there are others who receive an allocable share of the deduction. I refer to lessors and royalty owners, often wealthy investors engaged in buying oil royalties from proven fields. Risks involved in oil exploration and production are sometimes cited in support of continuation of percentage depletion but certainly the buying of oil royalties from proven fields has very little risk indeed. The lessor of land on which oil is discovered usually exerts little effort or makes little contribution to a discovery; yet, he also is entitled to an allocable share of the deduction.

I may say in passing that those individuals and corporations who benefit from percentage depletion are, in effect, being subsidized by the other taxpayers of the Nation. It is a government subsidy over which Congress exercises no control. One result may well be overexploitation and waste, or exhaustion of our resources. It is my belief that normal profit incentives and the free price system are adequate to insure necesary supplies, especially where the demand for the product has nearly tripled in the last 25 years and certainly will continue to increase as more and more producing fields have been discovered.

One of the most unfortunate aspects of the legislative process develops when preferred treatment is once given to a favored group. Then others, reasoning by analogy, argue that they too should have similar preferred treatment. And Congress, instead of withdrawing it from the first, is caught in the illogic of its initial action, and extends it to a second group. Third, fourth, and succeeding groups likewise get a favorable hearing. This has been the history of percentage depletion. The oil interests have for years urged upon Congress this theory that incentives for exploration were necessary because of the risks involved and that oil was vital to our national security. In turn, the coal people argued that tax favoritism was being given to their principal competitor. Therefore, they needed relief. Now, no one will seriously contend that we are in need of additional coal fields. Estimates of available supply predict that we have enough coal for at least another 1,000 years. There is no immediate need for further exploration,

nor is there current exploration. Even so, the allowance for coal is only 10 percent as compared with 27.5 percent for oil and gas. Actually, the oil industry productivity is far in excess of current demand and the exploration argument is shopworn and unconvincing.

It is my personal belief that a much fairer tax law would result if percentage depletion were entirely eliminated. Because now, not only oil and gas are legally entitled to it, but all mineral industries receive it in varying degrees. The amounts vary from 5 percent, 10 percent, 15 percent, 23 percent, to 27.5 percent, the percentage allowed being determined to a degree by the amount of political pressure competing groups have been able to bring to bear on this body. If we could eliminate it altogether, we could add about three-quarters of a billion dollars annually to Treasury receipts.

I appreciate the fact that any proposal for the repeal of the entire idea would run into a wall of well-entrenched special interests with no possibility of passage. So, today I point out only the worst injustice and hope to appeal to those in this House who will work to correct this. I do not propose to eliminate the subsidy entirely, but seek rather to reduce the present amount from 27.5 to 15 percent.

On January 23, 1950, President Truman in his message to Congress stated:

> I know of no loophole in the tax law so inequitable as the excessive depletion exemption enjoyed by the oil and mining industries.

I want to point out that this charge was not altogether new to President Truman. President Roosevelt and his Secretaries of the Treasury long fought for the very proposal that I urge today. I must say, too, that the present administration has been less impressed with the necessity for action.

A study made by a recent Presidential Commission showed that the percentage depletion allowances taken by oil companies were 19 times as great as those which would have been allowed under cost depletion. A reduction from 27.5 to 15 percent, which I propose, would still allow these companies to write off 10 times the cost of their investment, so you can see that I can hardly be charged with being unfair to the oil and gas industry. I wish to repeat. It is not my purpose to deny oil and gas companies the opportunity to recover their investment, tax free, just as do investors in plant and machinery. But I do wish to hold that recovery to 10 times the investment instead of 19 times as can currently be done. Again, to repeat, an investor in my State who builds a factory to give jobs to workers, may recover in depreciation no more than his actual investment. Why should billion dollar oil companies be preferred, especially when small independent wildcatters do most of the exploring? The usual contribution of the major companies is the so-called pocketbook explorations where the major companies taking no exploratory risk, merely buy up the independent, together with his earned depletion allowance.

I would like to point out that in my opinion we cannot permit this kind of tax favoritism to continue. The result of large percentage depletion allowances of course greatly reduces the tax bill of the oil companies. However, oil companies can point to the tax law and say that they pay the same rates as all other corporations, namely 30 percent on the first $25,000 of taxable income and 52 percent on all over $25,000. That is true, but the effective rate is greatly reduced by the exclusion of large blocks of exempt income. Actually, most oil companies pay only one-third to one-half the rates that other corporations pay. For example, between 1947 and 1956, five big oil producers paid Uncle Sam only 5 percent of their total cash earnings. Five comparable industrial corporations paid 38 percent, or an additional 33 percent. A large number of producers pay not one dime in Federal income taxes, yet they report large net incomes and pay dividends to their stockholders. Obviously, there is a wrong here that needs correcting. I think that it is no coincidence that Fortune magazine found that more than a third of the Nation's wealthiest individuals had made their fortunes in oil. This, at the tax expense of all other industries.

The President stated that he will submit a balanced budget to the Congress. There have been grave doubts expressed that revenues are likely to be as large as estimated by the President or that expenditures will be as small. It is my thought that the goal of a balanced budget is one greatly to be desired at this time. It would generally be favorable for the economy of the Nation. Since inflation is a specter that is to continue to haunt us, we should certainly do what we can to stop it. The reduction of the percentage depletion allowance to 15 percent will yield a substantial sum of tax revenue estimated by the Treasury Department to be about $420 million annually. This is obviously a large sum of money. In fact, it almost exactly equals the total 1958 tax collections from all sources within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

I wish to be as accurate as possible in my estimate of revenues to be obtained, and for that reason offer this brief explanation. The $420 million estimate given assumes a continuance of present prices and production, and no change in foreign tax credits. It appears likely that oil and gas companies may make some changes in prices if percentage depletion is eliminated. But these changes are not capable of statistical projection. If oil prices are raised, then the yield will be greater than I have estimated. If they are lowered, the yield will decline. Included in my estimate is some $95 million of additional revenue from foreign production. The Treasury fears that this increase will be largely dissipated through an increase in foreign tax credits. If this be true, then the net yield may be more in the neighborhood of $325 million. But I say to the Members of this House, that even in days of $80 billion budgets, we must not overlook the possibility of obtaining an additional third of a billion dollars, especially when the result includes greater equity in the tax laws for all our industries. This additional revenue could be used for tax relief for the small taxpayer. It could also be used to eliminate some of the excise taxes that are helping to strangle small business. The money might also be used for national health research programs; hospital construction or educational scholarship grants which are so needed.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, enactment of my proposal will have the following desirable effects:

First. Help to close one of the largest loopholes that exist in our tax laws.

Second. Remove an inequity which is shocking both in its philosophy and its results.

Third. Add greatly needed revenue to contribute substantially toward a balanced budget.

Fourth. Reduce the probability of overexploitation and waste or exhaustion of a valuable natural resource.

Fifth. Make the availability of supplies dependent upon normal profit incentives and the free price system rather than uncontrolled subsidies.

The Drama of John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following appreciative article regarding the prodigious labors for peace by our distinguished Secretary of State. The article is by Mr. William S. White of the New York Times:

THE DRAMA OF JOHN FOSTER DULLES—SECRETARY'S PRODIGIOUS LABOR FOR PEACE BRINGS APPRAISAL OF APPRECIATION

(By William S. White)

One of the most arresting personal dramas of Washington is that of John Foster Dulles, whose permanent residence is in the eye of the hurricane.

Various observers may rationally dislike Mr. Dulles or some of his policies as Secretary of State. But nobody in possession of the facts—which, by the way, is just the kind of large, dustily legalistic phrase Mr. Dulles himself would use—could reasonably deny two things:

1. This Secretary of State has what are inelegantly called guts to a degree that few men in recent public life have surpassed. True, it may seem at times a rather tiresome, quibbling sort of courage; Mr. Dulles is not one to read from the large print when the fine print is available.

2. This Secretary of State, whose endless travels about the world would long ago have left limp and exhausted the average man of 30, has a physical industry so great as to be fatiguing even to watch.

Two years ago this month Mr. Dulles all but crawled on hands and knees from the hospital, where he had undergone an unpleasant thing—surgery for intestinal cancer. He returned to his manifold duties

stolidly silent about what most men find it impossible not to comment on—"my operation."

Never once since has he gone about holding his pulse in public. Never once has he asked quarter, on grounds of health, from the very hard world that surrounds him.

He is the oldest member of the cabinet—now in his 71st year—and yet he makes far more demands upon himself in every way than do any two of the others.

Just now, these demands are piling high about him. The Russians are glowering at the Western position in Germany, and crisis in its nastiest meaning may be in the air.

Mr. Dulles is making our policy in this infinitely tricky business, and in a sense making the policy of the whole Allied West, since we are the biggest of its partners. He is walking a high and swaying wire. His problem is not to give up any of our vital interests, but not, on the other hand, to do anything that would make it impossible for the Russians to draw back without losing face.

In all this he is carrying three buckets of water on his soberly tailored shoulders. One of these buckets represents the Allies, one the Russians themselves, and one the Congress—to which, with its huge new Democratic majorities, Mr. Dulles must pay far more heed than ever before.

How adroitly he is swaying with these buckets was well illustrated by a recent Dulles press conference. This the Secretary held on the day usually reserved for the President's own press conference, while Mr. Eisenhower himself was on holiday in Georgia.

Here Mr. Dulles grappled with explosive questions like an old Army sapper removing land mines. He spoke of the Russians without animosity or threats. His manner toward them, rather, was that of a corporation lawyer dealing with a rude and irresponsible but dangerous witness in an antitrust suit—firm, but careful and coolly detached.

The Secretary often has been—and sometimes fairly—accused of "brinkmanship," of an unduly threatening line. Whatever the past, this is in no sense now his line. It is now hardly possible, even for an observer never exactly enchanted with Mr. Dulles, not to feel some sense of security that our latest crisis, given all present circumstances, is in the hands of this possibly uncomfortably righteous but undoubtedly tough and supple man.

Amendment of the Senate Rules—The Three-Fifths Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Three-Fifths," published in the Baltimore Evening Sun of January 5, 1959. The editorial comments on the proposal I made before the commencement of the present rules debate, namely, that rule XXII be amended to enable cloture to be invoked by a vote of three-fifths of the Senators present and voting.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE-FIFTHS

The present rule in the Senate is that only two-thirds of all Senators can force cloture and bring a filibuster to an end. And by two-thirds of all Senators is meant two-thirds of the 98 Members of the Senate, not just two-thirds of those present and voting.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democratic leader, has proposed that the rule be amended so that two-thirds of those present can bring about closure, but Senator COOPER, the candidate of the more progressive wing of the Republican Party for floor leader, says that there is not much difference between the present rule and what Mr. JOHNSON offers, since on important issues nearly all Senators are present. Mr. COOPER wants to change the rule so that three-fifths of the Senators present can stop a filibuster and bring a bill to a vote.

The Cooper plan goes further toward relaxing the present rigid rule than the Johnson plan, which is good. At the same time it does not let down the barriers completely, as the so-called liberals in the Senate suggest, and this too is good. It would be a serious mistake to change the rules of a legislative body as loosely organized as the Senate in such a way as to give a mere majority control over procedure. Such a system would not promote majority rule in anything except name. In reality it would give those highly organized minorities known as pressure groups the whip hand in many crucial Senate votes.

For when Senators vote on the record, as they nearly always do, the votes often reflect their subservience to the particular pressure groups to which they owe their offices and not their own thoughtful convictions or the wishes of the great silent majorities of their constituents. And since the pressure groups are nearly always in favor of extreme measures—witness the labor group, the racial groups, and the like—the record votes often do not represent majority rule but just the opposite. This isn't always the case, but politics being what it is it often happens. And the filibuster can serve a good end in preventing the distortions of justice and reason which so often occur when extreme measures are put over.

At the same time, it must be recognized that the filibuster is a device for allowing Senators to escape public commitments, and that public commitments can serve majority ends as well as pressure group ends. Hence it is important not to keep the rules favoring filibusters too rigid. Without endorsing the Cooper proposal it may be said that it splits the difference between the too extremes.

Big Brother Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared relating to the Big Brother Week movement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

This is Big Brother Week in Tennessee and elsewhere. I would like to emphasize the importance of adult cooperation with youngsters who need kind and constructive guidance.

The principle of the Big Brother movement is the application of the one-man—one boy relationship to the treatment of boys who have problems which may be solved through adult direction.

Adult members of Big Brother organizations deserve our most sincere thanks for their efforts.

In my State of Tennessee, many Big Brothers associations have helped rehabilitate boys who are fatherless or who lack the guidance which a father should provide.

All Big Brothers are volunteers under the supervision of trained, professional staffs of Big Brother agencies.

The events which disturb the minds of young men are seldom public events. Most boys live in their own small world. It is a particular human relationship which sets their inner stresses and directs their actions.

During the years when I was chairman and a member of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, we had an opportunity of studying in detail the Big Brother program and we found it to be one of the most helpful programs to young people that is offered in our country. Many young people who would have become juvenile delinquents have been saved from this plight in this personal interest of a Big Brother. It is the human touch and personal interest that boys need more than anything else.

Let us join in supporting Big Brother organizations.

Lincoln-Douglas Debates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the year 1958 marked the 100th anniversary of the series of seven debates in Illinois between the Honorable Stephen Arnold Douglas, the then incumbent Senator, and Abraham Lincoln, a candidate for the Senate in that year. These debates provoked national interest, and every one of the seven communities where they were held fittingly commemorated this great event. It was my privilege to participate actively in three of these celebations, and I submit for printing in the RECORD the address which I delivered at Freeport, Ill., on August 22, 1958, and at Galesburg, Ill., on October 7, 1958.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAGNIFICENT MISSIONARY

(Address by the Honorable EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN at the Lincoln-Douglas ceremonies, Freeport, Ill., August 27, 1958)

I. INTRODUCTION

Today in this inspiring communion, let me salute the magnificent missionary—Abraham Lincoln.

A missionary is one with a mission.

It is customary to think of a missionary as one who goes forth to propagate a religious faith.

Very naturally we think of Jesus Christ, of Buddha, of the Apostle Paul, of Mo-

hammed, of Moses, of Francis Xavier, of Father Marquette, or others.

But a missionary can be more than this.

A missionary could be a dedicated group like the Crusaders. Or it could be an entire nation under a spirited leader.

The mission might be in any field of human activity.

The Roman emperors leading the legions of ancient Rome were missioners bent on conquest.

The French under Napoleon were missioners bent on world dominatien.

The Moors inspired by Mohammed were missioners intent on the destruction of all infidels, and that included all who did not embrace the doctrines of the Koran.

The first English in India were missioners seeking an expanding trade.

Every generation has had its individuals, it groups, its institutions, with a sense of mission in some field of human activity.

II. CIVIL MISSIONERS

Among the missionaries of mankind in the field of civil endeavor there is one who stands out above all others—that magnificent missionary—Abraham Lincoln.

He sought to propagate no religious faith.

He sought no conquest, like Caesar or Napoleon.

He neither sought nor exercised autocratic power.

He sought no material advantage.

He was a humble, common man, whose only weapons were an incandescent conviction, an unflinching zeal, an invincible logic and an unfailing sense of right and wrong.

III. THE MISSIONARY EMERGES

Not far from where we meet today, in the city of Bloomington, on May 29, 1856, the spirit of this great missioner emerged.

Two years before that date the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and also the new and hateful doctrine of popular sovereignty was breeding a strong revulsion in the land.

Heretofore the issue of slavery was essentially a policy problem.

In some quarters it was probably little more than an intellectual exercise.

When the meeting in Bloomington drew to a close, Abraham Lincoln was summoned to speak.

This was the occasion when he uttered the celebrated "Lost Speech."

The form and text may have been lost, but the spirit and the effect were imperishable.

This was the utterance which his partner, Herndon, referred to as the greatest of his life.

Until then, according to Herndon, the slavery issue had been argued on grounds of policy and not from the standpoint of eternal right.

But on this day Abraham Lincoln seemed newly baptized.

"From that day," wrote Herndon, "to the day of his death he stood firm in the right."

The smothered flame had broken forth.

A new sense of justice fired his energy.

His soul was now seasoned.

Abraham Lincoln had found his cross.

A new sense of mission was lighted.

The magnificent missionary had emerged here on the rolling prairies of Illinois destined to become one of mankind's greatest crusaders in a human cause.

IV. THE INTERIM YEARS

In that interim period between the emergence of the magnificent missionary and the time when the formal debates in this series began, not only the great moral issue of that day but also the zeal of Lincoln was being fueled.

In the presidential election of 1856 James Buchanan was elected.

In the territory called Kansas the clashes over the slavery issue were being referred to as war.

The unrestrained spirit of John Brown burst into murderous action like that of some "apocalyptical horseman of vengeance."

In that period came the amazing decision of the Supreme Court of the United States under the leadership of Chief Justice Taney in the celebrated Dred Scott case.

There came in that period a most extraordinary document called the Lecompton Constitution, under which one group expected that Kansas might enter the Union.

There was the fact of an election campaign for the United States Senate between Lincoln and Douglas and the development of sharp personalities between them as each sought a victory.

There was the fact of a growing interest beyond the boundaries of Illinois to give national significance to the contest between Lincoln and Douglas.

Thus in that period between the emergence of Abraham Lincoln's sense of mission at Bloomington 2 years before and the first of these debates at Ottawa on a hot Saturday afternoon in August of 1858, the spirit of the moral baptism was working steadily in the soul and mind of Abraham Lincoln.

V. THE MORAL LIGHT SHINES BRIGHTLY

In this great continuing discussion beginning at Ottawa and ending in Alton, few things were left undiscussed.

The debate embraced the Missouri Compromise of 1850, which sought to limit the extension of slavery.

It included the effort to repeal that compromise through the Kansas-Nebraska bill, which was piloted through a Senate committee by Judge Douglas.

It involved the Dred Scott decision in the Supreme Court of the United States.

It covered the personal life of the candidates.

But the moral issue was the overriding light.

It came in the very first discussion at Ottawa.

"I hold," said Lincoln, "there is no reason in the world why the Negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence. The right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness * * * in the right to eat the bread without the leavy of anybody else which his own hand earns, he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas and the equal of every living man."

Here was the beginning of the moral thunder which was to roll down through conflict, emancipation and victory.

On they went—these gladiators—from Ottawa to Freeport, from Freeport to Jonesboro, from Jonesboro to Charleston, from Charleston to Galesburg, from Galesburg to Quincy, from Quincy to Alton.

It was then mid-October.

Here then came the final discussion.

Slavery is wrong. It is wrong. It is wrong. The very word came tumbling from Lincoln's lips over and over.

"That is the real issue," said Lincoln in the final discussion. "That is the issue that will continue in this country when these poor tongues of Judge Douglas and myself shall be silent. It is the eternal struggle between these two principles—right and wrong—throughout the world."

VI. THE CONTAGION

Then as now editors and politicians, scholars and historians could interpret the debates as they saw and felt them against the backdrop of their own day.

It may be difficult to evaluate this great event by orienting oneself into that period and then looking backward into the past and forward into the future.

Two years before the debates the missioner had emerged.

Character and conviction had emerged.

A notion of the ultimate course which the country was to take and the moral concepts which must be asserted had emerged.

The missioner had found himself.

And so on and on he went.

The issue of principle was drawn.

It was the age old struggle of right and wrong.

At first it had to be tempered to reality.

Abraham Lincoln knew that he was dealing with an entrenched institution.

He knew he was dealing with a Supreme Court, with a Congress, and with a Constitution.

He knew that he was dealing with a divided land, with a people who were sharply divided.

He was dealing with friends and party associates interested in a political victory.

He was dealing with his own senatorial candidacy.

All these were realities.

And he knew that the people must be conditioned for this whole dose of basic moral principle and the struggle between right and wrong.

This was not a case for a thimbleful of gospel.

And as the conditioning process went on, so the conditioning of the spirit of Abraham Lincoln went on.

With it all there was the slow but inevitable contagion which developed.

The thousands upon thousands of people who attended or who read the accounts were caught up in the fervor of the occasion.

They were given a sustained chance to think, to medidate on the moral issue, and to separate the superficial from the genuine.

They had a chance to get a sharpened sense of the real issue and to reflect week after week upon the basic principle of human equality.

VII. THE ULTIMATE IMPACT

The ultimate impact of this series of debates can best be found in the utterances which came later.

On a cool November afternoon at Gettysburg in the year 1863, 5 years after the debate series came to an end there came those deathless words from the lips of Lincoln, when he spoke of a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

After 5 years the eternal truths rolled on and on.

Again, on a misty morning in the month of March 1865, in the Nation's Capital, as he stood to receive the oath for the second time, with all the agonies of carnage and death written on his rugged face and his furrowed heart, he could yet say, "It may seem strange that any man should ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces, but let us judge not that we be not judged."

Thus did a sense of mission which slowly incubated on these rolling prairies of Illinois become fashioned and shaped in these debates to carry on and on not only in the hearts of his countrymen but in the heart of a great, humble man, who to the very end dedicated himself to the spirit of what Thomas Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence so many years before, when he said, where all could behold, "We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal."

The magnificent missionary had executed the mission to which he was ordained.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

(Address by Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN at the 100th anniversary of the Lincoln-Douglas debate at Galesburg, Ill., October 7, 1958)

Ecclesiastes, so long ago remarked that "The thing which hath been, it is that which shall be and that which is done is that

which shall be done; and there is no new thing under the sun." The past is prologue. And the past is tradition.

To the Thessalonians, Paul wrote, "Hold fast to the traditions ye have been taught." And what is tradition? It is the whole body of culture and beliefs, of usages and practices, of achievements and accomplishments, of personalities which come down to us from the past.

In the American tradition, shining majestically, there are the Pilgrims and pioneers, Valley Forge and Gettysburg, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. In it looming large are William Penn and Daniel Boone, Washington and Paine, Zenger and Marshall, Jefferson and Jackson. In it are faith and hope, tears and laughter.

And high in our tradition stands Abraham Lincoln. Can he be explained in any other way than that he was an instrument of divine destiny?

History is but the unfoldment of a divine pattern. This may be amusing in highly liberal quarters. If not this, it can only be materialistic drift. If there be a creative hand behind this universe, there must be a creative hand in its unfoldment and direction. Everything in it, sun, moon, stars, planets—their distances—the calibration so that people will neither freeze nor scorch to death—the procession of the seasons—man's subsistence—all rise to testify to the amazing adjustments in the universe to preserve life. And surely the creative force would not provide it all in such meticulous detail and then ignore its ultimate destiny.

But destiny does not unfold in a vacuum. It cannot be manifested without a vehicle, without an instrument. The light falling upon Saul enroute to Damascus to convert him into the world's great salesman was a divine hand reaching for an instrument. The voice from the heavens said to Ezekiel, "Son of man, stand upon thy feet and I will speak unto thee." Destiny was seeking an instrument. The servant of the Lord commanding Joshua to be strong and of good courage and giving him assurance and instruction was but finding an instrument for the unfoldment of history.

Abraham Lincoln standing before 15,000 people on a cold, raw, windy day in Galesburg 100 years ago today may not have seemed an instrument of an all-pervading conscience to carry on in a struggle which still besets our land a century later. How could a story teller be regarded as an instrument of destiny unless it be remembered that in a day when the vagaries of the mind were not too well understood, it is easy enough to perceive that the brooding mystic introvert can so easily conceal his introvert attributes in this understandable manner?

But consider this whole moral common man moving always godward, never too fast and never too slow, walking ever slowly but never backward.

In May of 1856 in Bloomington he delivered what came to be known as the Lost Speech. The form and text may have been lost, but not the spirit and the impact. For it was here that he received a new baptism. It was here that the moral, rather than the political or intellectual aspects of the slavery issue fired his soul and his cross was found.

Two years later, at Ottawa, it became the overriding issue for on that occasion he said, "I hold there is no reason in the world why the Negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness * * * in the right to eat the bread without leave of anybody else which his own hand earns, he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas and the equal of every living man."

Here at Galesburg he said of his opponent that, "he is blowing out the moral lights around us when he contends that whoever wants slaves has a right to hold them." He continued, "I confess myself as belonging to that class in the country who contemplate slavery as a moral, social, and political evil having due regard for its existence among us and the difficulties of getting rid of it in a satisfactory way and to all constitutional obligations which have been thrown about it; but, nevertheless, desire a policy that looks to the prevention of it as a wrong, and looks hopefully to the time when as a wrong it may come to an end."

On they went in the discussion until at last, this far-reaching discussion carried them to the concluding debate at Alton. Over and over a word kept tumbling from Lincoln's lips. It was the word "wrong." And as they concluded, Lincoln said, "That is the real issue. That is the issue that will continue in this country when these poor tongues of Judge Douglas and myself shall be silent. It is the eternal struggle between these two principles of right and wrong through the world.

The moral contagion which Lincoln had created was spreading. At first, the moral issue had to be tempered to reality. He was dealing with an entrenched institution, with a Supreme Court, with a Congress, and with a certain concept of the Constitution. He was dealing with a divided land. He was dealing with people sharply divided. He was dealing with friends and party associates who were vitally interested in a political victory. He was dealing with his own candidacy. These were realities. Little by little, people must be conditioned for the whole dose of moral principle—wrong versus right. As the conditioning process went on, so the conditioning of his own spirit went on. The contagion was slow but inexorable.

Came that day in March 1861, when he took the oath as President of the United States. How careful he was with respect to the Constitution and the rights of the States. How earnest were his entreaties to preserve the Union. Yet he never lost sight of the moral issue. "If the Almighty Ruler of Nations," he asked, "with his eternal truth and justice be on your side of the North or on yours of the South, that truth and that justice will surely prevail by the judgment of this great tribunal, the American people." And he continued, "Inteligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him who has never forsaken this favored land are still competent to adjust in the best way all our present difficulty." There was no word about slavery. He knew as none other knew what the ultimate solution would be.

On the first day of January in 1863 it is said that he first regaled the Cabinet by reading from one of the quaint and whimsical lectures of the current humorist, Artemus Ward. Then in a complete change of mood, he took from a drawer what turned out to be the Emancipation Proclamation. What a spectacular way to begin a new year. Having disposed of the details, he came to the final paragraph. "And upon this act, sincerely believed to be an act of justice, warranted by the Constitution, upon military necessity, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of the Almighty God." That day there must have been unbounded joy in God's Heaven.

On a cool afternoon at Gettysburg in November of 1863, after the words of the orator of the day had faded into obscurity on the afternoon breezes, he came forth with only a few hundred words, but they were deathless. How easily and clearly he stated the issue—whether a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to equality, can endure. There followed his appeal for a new dedication of the spirit and for a new birth of freedom. Justice and morality were marching and he was in the forefront, moving ever forward—not too fast to leave public confidence behind and not too slow to invite defeatism or to frustrate the unfoldment of a divine pattern.

Came that day in March 1864 when he stood before his countrymen again to take the oath as Chief Executive. Gettysburg was behind him now. The progress of the Union forces was more encouraging.

He might have become stern and less humble. He might have fulfilled the politicians' hopes and stated what he expected to do with the sister States still in rebellion. He might have threatened. But not so. There was no passion, no spleen, no politics. It was the instrument speaking. "If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses which in the providence of God must need come, but which having continued through his appointed time, He now wills to remove and that He gives to both North and South this terrible war as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him?" What humility he concluded. "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right." There was that word again. Firmness in the right, the antithesis of wrong.

Consider finally Abraham Lincoln's last speech. It came in the evening of April 11, 1865, at the White House in response to a serenade. Lee had surrendered. There was jubilation in the land. Lincoln took the occasion to speak of the action of 12,000 voters in the State of Louisiana who had taken the necessary steps to return to the Union. Before discussing the details of the action taken by Louisiana and his obvious inclination to accept the action, even though defective in some particulars, he said to the serenaders, "In the midst of this, however, He, from whom all blessings flow, must not be forgotten. A call for a national thanksgiving is being prepared and will be duly promulgated."

Four days later, the assassin's bullet ended all that was mortal. The ages embraced him. The Lord's instrument had consummated his mission. How else shall one adjudge this exalted common man?

National Printing Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention to the fact that the mayor of Chicago, the Honorable Richard J. Daley, has designated the 7-day period beginning January 11 as Printing Week in our great city.

We of Chicago are not only grateful but indeed proud that our city is the printing center of the Nation and the printing industry constitutes one of our largest industries in Chicago.

While this Nation from time to time frequently pays tribute to the various industries of America, it is my opinion that the development of printing has been one of the most effective contributing factors in the development of our democratic process and, we, as Americans, should be grateful to the men and women occupied in this highly skilled trade and to the foresight of those great Americans who have helped develop this industry. We, as a nation, proudly proclaim that our democratic processes have survived because our people are the best informed people in the world. I doubt there will be any dissenters to the statement that, without the phenomenal de-

velopment of the printing industry in this country, we, too, would suffer the intellectual darkness that still plagues so much of the world.

I should like to call attention to the fact that in my city, the Chicago Allied Printing Trades Council, with its executive secretary, Mr. Henry Coco, has done much to raise the standards of the printing industry, and it is through the dedicated work of organizations such as the council that this Nation has been able to make extraordinary progress in improving the printing industry.

In tribute to the thousands of Chicagoans who loyally serve the printing industry daily and because this industry is so important to all Americans, I have introduced the following resolution which I hope will receive speedy approval:

H.J. Res. 25

Joint resolution designating the seven-day period beginning January 11, 1959, as National Printing Week

Whereas the printing industry has a large measure of responsibility for the advancement and dissemination of science and culture in our Nation and throughout the world; and

Whereas the printing industry in Chicago ranks highest among all printing centers in production volume; and

Whereas the printing industry in Chicago surpasses all other industries in the number of separate manufacturing establishments, number of employees, and amount of wages paid; and

Whereas, through the printed word and the growth of America's printing industry, the population of the United States of America is composed of the best informed people of the world; and

Whereas January 17, 1959, will be the two hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, the father of American printing, and the week of January 11 through January 17, 1959, will be marked by appropriate commemorative ceremonies throughout this continent in public, private, and commercial institutions, with particular emphasis upon the progress of printing and allied crafts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the seven-day period beginning January 11, 1959, and ending at the close of January 17, 1959, is hereby designated as National Printing Week in honor of the printing industry and its contributions to progress. The President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation urging the people of the United States to be mindful of the industrial, educational, cultural, and spiritual contributions which the art of printing has made and is making to the life and progress of mankind.

United States Trading Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing a bill to establish a United States Trading Corporation in order to meet the challenge of attempted Soviet penetration of world markets. This bill is not designed as a final and complete bill, but is mainly for the purpose of having it referred to the Congress so that the proper congressional committees and their staffs will get to work on this problem which the United States and the free world have to face at the present time. If this bill will be but a start toward a program which will enable the capitalist free world to properly compete with the Soviet economy, our purpose in introducing this bill at the present time will be achieved.

It is estimated that the economy of the Soviet Union, although not comparable to ours in total capacity or total production at the present time, is growing at a rate roughly twice that of ours. Allen Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, has described the Kremlin's progress in that respect as "the most serious challenge ever faced by the United States in times of peace"—a challenge making it "most probable that the fateful battles of the cold war will, in the foreseeable future, be fought in the economic and subversive arenas." Certainly, this is but another indication to prove that we should be well on our way toward making battle plans for the economic war.

There was a recent State Department report which labeled the Russian communistic tactics of economic aid and economic policy as being even more dangerous to the free world than the threat of war. We all know, in studying Marxism and communism, that it was the feeling of the founders of the philosophy of communism that ultimately capitalism would fail, and this would make it easy for socialism and communism to take over. However, we must not fall into the trap of adopting the Communist policies. We must be in a position to aid and help individual business enterprises and the capitalist system, so there will be no encroachment by government on free business; but, because of the economic war against the Communists, it makes it necessary that private enterprise and Government march together in this warfare rather than apart.

In recent months, we are getting a new insight into this trade warfare policy and we can site the example shown us in the aluminum industry. Until recently, North American exports of aluminum to European countries provided practically all of the imports of this metal to the free European countries. Just a short time ago, Russian Communist sources announced to various European aluminum purchasers that they would supply aluminum for approximately 1.7 cents per pound cheaper than it could be bought from American and Canadian sources. In other words, the Communists were not worrying about costs, knowing they have slave labor and a Socialist economy where material costs are not measured in monetary value, enabling them to sell raw material or finished products at any price they arbitrarily choose. Our American and Canadian firms cannot meet that type of competition. Are we to idly stand by while we lose those markets and our own continent has to suffer from such competition? Some methods must be found to combat this type of competition in aluminum and surely in many other products, and the operating procedures of meeting this problem must immediately be given a great deal of study.

In setting up the United States Trading Corporation, there will be losses entailed. If we are to compete with the Russian Communist bloc, the Government might have to purchase raw materials and finished products from our concerns and sell at a loss in order to vie with their slave economy. We can possibly see a time when the original capital of the Corporation might be used up, at which time the Corporation would again have to come back to Congress to receive further monetary support. At that time, the Congress would be in a position to evaluate the work and accomplishments of the Corporation, and then could decide whether the program was worth continuing or should be changed.

In the long run, the economic facts of life are bound to catch up with the inhuman and unprogressive economic system of communism. However, in the interim, such a system can badly damage, indeed like the parasite plant can destroy, the healthy and sound economic system of a free society. Just as in our own internal economy we have found that unrestrained monopolistic practices can damage the healthy growth of our own economy so must we recognize that these same practices engaged in world trade can badly damage healthy foreign trade.

In other words, Russia through its state trading can pick and choose specific areas for attack, undersell the market for whatever period of time is necessary to destroy competition and then once competition has been destroyed revert, in true monopolistic form, to increased prices to recoup the economic loss suffered in gaining the market and then go on to exploit the market and, worse still, enslave small nations dependent upon a narrow economic base.

Strong as our private businesses are, they are not strong enough to cope with this kind of operation. Accordingly, the United States Trading Corporation would be set up to respond when this kind of economic warfare becomes apparent.

In putting meat on the bones of the bill I have proposed, it will be necessary to spell out in definite terms the economic circumstances which will permit the Corporation to function. As I have stated, it would be only in answer to a clear threat by Soviet Russia resorting to state trading and monopolistic practices designed to destroy competition or enslave small nations.

If Soviet Russia does not engage in this kind of activity, the Corporation would not have to act. If Russia does, the Corporation would be there to insure the fact that through temporary underselling, though it lasts for several years, Russia could not take over any market and destroy healthy competition, or enslave the economy of some small and weak nation.

There is no question in our minds that affirmative action and positive planning

must take place now. We can compete against the Russian declaration of economic war only by intelligence and cooperation. The bill which we are introducing and which would create the United States Trading Corporation is but a step to get a workable program started.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate that we do not want our Government to take over business. We want a program in which the Government will assist private business, and only take over such functions as would be necessary in order that private enterprise and free government can march down the road of economic warfare together, and ultimately foil the aim of communism to dominate the world.

The bill I am introducing is as follows:

A bill to establish a United States Trading Corporation to meet the challenge of attempted Soviet penetration of world markets, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "United States Trading Corporation Act."

SEC. 2. The Congress recognizes that one of the most dangerous weapons currently being employed by the Soviet bloc in its struggle for world domination is the use of international trade to achieve that objective through economic means. If the United States is to continue to be the leader of the nations of the free world in their effort to resist and retard such domination by the Soviet bloc, it must prepare to utilize international trade as an instrument of our national policy. So that this may be done in the most effective manner with the greatest possible benefit to the United States and its citizens and the other free nations and their citizens there is hereby established a body corporate to be known as the "United States Trading Corporation" (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Corporation") which shall assist and supplement the efforts of private business in the United States in fostering trade between the United States and the other nations of the world.

SEC. 3. The Corporation shall have its principal office in the District of Columbia and may establish offices in such other places as it may deem appropriate in the conduct of its business.

SEC. 4. The objects and purposes of the Corporation shall be to undertake such measures, and engage in such activities, with respect to the foreign trade of the United States as will effectively meet the threat to the free world of long-range economic penetration of world markets by the Soviet bloc. In connection with and in furtherance of its objects and purposes and the policy of the Congress set forth in section 2, the Corporation is empowered—

(1) to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal which shall be judicially noticed;

(2) to adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws governing the conduct of its business and the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed on it by law;

(3) to sue and be sued in its corporate name in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(4) to determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to laws specifically applicable to Government corporations;

(5) to acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), to hold, maintain, use and operate the same, to pledge, hypothecate, sell, exchange, or otherwise dispose of the same, whenever any of the foregoing transactions are deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of activities authorized by this Act or to achieve the objectives set forth in section 2, and on such terms as may be prescribed by the Corporation;

(6) to execute all instruments necessary or appropriate in the exercise of any of its functions;

(7) to use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government;

(8) to assist citizens of the United States or any corporation at least 60 per centum of the stock of which is owned by citizens of the United States which is engaged in foreign trade and is determined by the Corporation to be achieving the objectives set forth in section 2 by loan, subsidy, or otherwise;

(9) to appoint such agents, attorneys, and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the Corporation; and to delegate to them such powers and to prescribe for them such duties as may be deemed appropriate by the Corporation; and

(10) to take such actions as may be necessary to achieve the objectives set forth in section 2, and to carry out the powers and duties granted to or imposed on it.

SEC. 5. The Corporation, including its franchise, its capital, reserves, surplus, and income, shall be exempt from all taxation (which shall, for all purposes, be deemed to include sales, use, storage, and purchase taxes) now or hereafter imposed by the United States, or any Territory, Commonwealth, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property (or buildings which are considered by the laws of any State to be personal property for taxation purposes) of the Corporation shall be subject to State, Territorial, Commonwealth, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed.

SEC. 6. (a) There shall be a President of the Corporation, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall serve as the chief executive officer of the Corporation. There shall be a Vice President of the Corporation, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall serve as President of the Corporation during the absence or disability of or in the event of a vacancy in the office of President of the Corporation, and who shall at other times perform such functions as the President of the Corporation may from time to time prescribe.

(b) The annual rate of compensation of the President of the Corporation shall be $21,000, and the annual rate of compensation of the Vice President of the Corporation shall be $20,500.

SEC. 7. (a) The Corporation shall be managed by a Board of Directors of the Corporation. The Board of Directors of the Corporation shall consist of the President of the Corporation who shall serve as Chairman, the Vice President of the Corporation who shall serve as Vice Chairman, and fifteen additional persons appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Of the seventeen members of the Board of Directors not more than nine shall be members of the same political party. Before entering upon his duties, each of the directors shall take an oath faithfully to discharge the duties of his office. Terms of the directors shall be at the pleasure of the President of the United States, and the directors, in addition to their duties as members of the Board of Directors, shall perform such additional duties and may hold such other offices in the administration of the Corporation as the President of the Corporation may from time to time prescribe. A majority of the Board of Directors shall constitute a quorum. The Board of Directors shall adopt, and may from time to time amend, such bylaws as are necessary for the proper management and functioning of the Corporation, and shall, in such bylaws, designate other officers of the Corporation and prescribe their duties.

(b) Members of the Board of Directors (other than the Chairman and Vice Chairman) shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum.

SEC. 8. (a) There shall be an Advisory Committee of the Corporation consisting of 9 members, appointed by the Board of Directors of the Corporation on the recommendation of the President of the Corporation, who shall be broadly representative of production, commerce, agriculture, and labor. The Advisory Committee shall meet one or more times per year on the call of the President of the Corporation, to advise the Board of Directors on the program of the Corporation.

(b) Members of the Advisory Committee, while attending meetings of the Advisory Committee called by the President of the Corporation, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the President of the Corporation, but not exceeding $50 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons in the service of the Federal Government who are employed intermittently.

SEC. 9. (a) The Corporation shall have a capital stock of $1,000,000,000 subscribed by the United States. Payments under this subsection of the subscription of the United States to the Corporation and the repayments thereof shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Certificates evidencing stock ownership of the United States in the Corporation shall be issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) The Corporation is authorized to issue from time to time notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations which shall be purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury; but the aggregate amount of such obligations outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $4,000,000,000. Such obligations shall be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be provided for in such obligations and shall have such maturity as may be determined by the Board of Directors of the Corporation with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Each such obligation shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the obligations of the Corporation.

(c) For the purpose of purchasing capital stock and obligations of the Corporation issued under this section the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchase of capital stock or obligations of the Corporation issued under this section.

SEC. 10. No director, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Corporation shall in any manner, directly or indirectly, participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests, or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly personally interested.

SEC. 11. The President of the Corporation in carrying out his functions shall consult from time to time with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Tax Deduction of Expenses for Transportation To and From Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill designed to allow a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work.

My bill would allow a disabled individual to deduct from gross income in arriving at adjusted gross income expenses up to $600 a year for transportation to and from work. For purposes of this provision, the term "disabled individual" is defined to mean an individual who has lost the use of a leg, or both legs, or of both arms, to such an extent that he is unable during the entire taxable year to use, without undue hardship or danger, public transportation as a means of traveling to and from work.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the deduction proposed by my bill would be a real boon to those disabled citizens who need a boost to help themselves to be useful and productive citizens.

The bill follows:

A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by redesignating section 217 as section 218 and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"SEC. 217. Transportation of disabled individual to and from work.

"(a) General rule: In the case of a disabled individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction, expenses paid during the taxable year for transportation to and from work to the extent that such expenses do not exceed $600.

"(b) Disabled individual defined: For purposes of subsection (a), the term 'disabled individual' means an individual who has lost the use of a leg, or both legs, or of both arms, to such an extent that he is unable during the entire taxable year to use, without undue hardship or danger, a streetcar, bus, subway, train, or similar form of public transportation, as a means of traveling to and from work."

(b) The table of sections for such part VII is amended by striking out

"Sec. 217. Cross references."

and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 217. Transportation of disabled individual to and from work.

"Sec. 218. Cross references."

(c) Section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of adjusted gross income) is amended by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

"(7) Transportation of disabled individuals: The deduction allowed by section 217."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1955.

Analysis of the Foreign Investment Incentive Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following section by section analysis of the Foreign Investment Incentive Act of 1959—H.R. 5—which I introduced January 7, 1959:

SECTION 1. EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 1 provides that the bill will be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1958.

SECTION 2. FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS

The efforts of American firms to expand their foreign investments have been seriously impeded by the adverse impact of United States tax laws. Despite the avowed policies of our Government to encourage private investment to supplement and ultimately replace foreign economic aid, the capital available for investment abroad by American corporations is unduly restricted by present tax policies. Moreover, our corporations are placed at a competitive disadvantage in their efforts to expand abroad because the tax policies of other countries do not hamper their own foreign investors.

For example, it is possible for corporations of the United Kingdom and Canada to reinvest foreign profits without payment of tax to the home country. No tax liability is imposed by either the United Kingdom or Canada until foreign earnings are repatriated. This is possible under legislation expressly enacted to achieve this result.

Because of these pressures, American corporations have been forced to organize their international operations in foreign corporations in those countries of the world whose laws permit profits earned in one foreign country to be invested in other foreign countries without an intervening tax. This unfortunate trend has developed in part because of the burden U.S. taxation imposes on the expansion of the foreign business activities of American corporations. There are frequent instances in which the management and control of American-owned foreign business have been transferred abroad to have an equal opportunity in foreign markets.

In order to eliminate the necessity for American firms to utilize these foreign corporate vehicles and to promote an expansion of foreign investment by American firms, it is proposed by section 2 of the bill to create a special category of U.S. corporations known as foreign business corporations. Section 2 would offer to American firms substantially the same tax treatment now obtained by the use of foreign corporations and would enable American firms to manage and control their international business in the United States where they belong.

Section 2 would also facilitate tax administration because the Treasury would have information received through the returns filed by these corporations. Any concern by the Treasury for an asserted loss of revenue is illusory. If the present trend to organize foreign business activities through foreign corporations continues, there will be in 5 years little U.S. revenue from taxes on foreign source income. Moreover, to the extent that private foreign investment can supplant foreign aid, there will be a net saving.

A foreign business corporation, under section 2 of the bill, is a domestic corporation which derives substantially all of its income from sources outside the United States and from the active conduct of trade or business, directly or indirectly through subsidiaries in which it has at least a 10-percent common stock interest. Income from the latter source, however, will qualify only if the subsidiary corporation derives substantially all of its income from business done outside the United States. A foreign business corporation may also license the use of patents abroad and render abroad technical, engineering, scientific, construction or like services.

Section 2 of the bill permits foreign business corporations to defer the payment of U.S. taxes on their income earned from sources outside the United States until that income is distributed. Thus, income earned in one foreign country may be reinvested in a new enterprise, in the same or another foreign country, without reduction by U.S. taxes. Similarly, income derived from licensing of patents and rendering of technical services may be accumulated and used to finance further foreign investments. It is just this tax treatment which has led so many American corporations to form foreign subsidiaries to operate their international business. The income accumulated by a foreign business corporation which is not distributed is described as reinvested foreign business income. When a distribution is made out of reinvested foreign business income U.S. tax becomes payable. Against the tax imposed, credit is allowed for taxes paid to foreign countries, just as the foreign tax credit is now allowed to prevent double taxation.

A broad definition of the term distribtion is adopted in order to prevent possible misuse of foreign business corporations for tax avoidance. Since the purpose of the provision is to defer the payment of U.S. taxes only so long as the income is reinvested abroad, a distribution is defined to include any withdrawal of funds from foreign business operations. This includes the distribution of a dividend or the liquidation of a foreign business corporation. To carry out this purpose, any payment made for the acquisition of property sit-

uated in the United States, other than property that is necessary for the conduct of the foreign business, is similarly treated as a distribution, and results in the imposition of U.S. tax. The continued ownership of property that is initially acquired in connection with the foreign business activities, but which is later used in the United States for other purposes, is also treated as a distribution.

The advantages of the foreign business corporation provisions are meaningful only to American firms interested in the expansion of their foreign business. Moreover, these provisions will prevent tax avoidance which has sometimes arisen in the use of foreign corporations. A foreign business corporation cannot qualify if it holds stock in subsidiary corporations which derive any substantial amount of income from investments in the United States. Money cannot be accumulated abroad and then loaned, for example, to the parent organization. Nor can such money be used to purchase plants and equipment in the United States for lease to the parent corporation.

It cannot fairly be contended that section 2 of the bill would make the United States a tax haven. A corporation organized in a foreign country need never pay U.S. taxes on earnings from from non-U.S. sources. On the other hand, a foreign business corporation organized in the United States will pay U.S taxes on foreign income when distributed. Furthermore, ordinary income taxes will be imposed even if the foreign business corporation is liquidated, whereas a corporation organized in a foreign country can be liquidated subject only to capital gains taxes.

SECTION 3. TRANSFER AND REORGANIZATIONS TO FACILITATE PRIVATE FOREIGN INVESTMENT

As presently administered by the Treasury Department, section 367 constitutes a deterrent to increased private foreign investment because of a strict interpretation of the term "avoidance of taxation" in situations involving the transfer of property from a U.S. corporation to a foreign corporation to be used in the active conduct of a trade or business abroad.

Where such a transaction involves the transfer or exchange of assets which may have appreciated in value, the taxpayer must, before completing the transaction, obtain a ruling from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that such exchange is not in pursuance of a plan having as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of Federal income taxes. Since tax rates in some foreign countries are presently lower than rates prevailing in the United States, the commissioner frequently finds an ominous purpose in a contemplated transaction, and rules that the transaction would be an avoidance of Federal income tax. Indeed, the Treasury Department views any deferral of tax as avoidance of tax.

Section 3 of the bill would facilitate private foreign investment by making expressly applicable to transfers of business property for foreign investment the usual rules for nonrecognition of gain otherwise provided in the code for corporate reorganizations. To accomplish this result, the bill provides that transfers of foreign business property are not for the purposes of tax avoidance and, hence, eliminates the necessity for an advance ruling from the Internal Revenue Service. The term foreign business property is strictly defined to include only property actually used in a trade or business, or stock of another corporation actively engaged in a trade or business. The trade or business must be one 90 percent or more of the gross income of which is derived from sources outside the United States.

To conform related provisions of the code, section 1492 is also amended to provide that the excise tax imposed by section 1491 shall not apply where stock or securities transferred to a foreign corporation are foreign business property as defined in section 367(c).

SECTION 4. EXTENSION OF WESTERN HEMISPHERE CORPORATION STATUS TO INTERNATIONAL TRADE CORPORATIONS

Since 1942 a class of corporations known as Western Hemisphere trade corporations has been taxable at a rate 14 percentage points lower than the normal tax and surtax rates applicable to other corporations. This has been accomplished by allowing a deduction to such Western Hemisphere trade corporations under section 922 of the 1954 code. Western Hemisphere trade corporation status, under existing law, is limited to a corporation which does all of its business—except for incidental purchases—in any country or countries of North, Central, or South America, or the West Indies, provided its income meets two conditions:

First. At least 95 percent of gross income for a 3-year period must be derived from sources without the United States; and second, at least 90 percent of gross income for a 3-year period must be from the active conduct of a trade or business.

The principal purpose of section 4 is to extend the tax status now enjoyed by Western Hemisphere trade corporations to domestic corporations doing business in any foreign country, if the conditions respecting kind and source of income—as somewhat modified—are met.

The justification for enactment of the Western Hemisphere trade corporation provisions in 1942 was that American corporations trading in foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere are placed at a considerable competitive disadvantage with foreign corporations. See Senate Report No. 1631, 77th Congress, 2d session, page 32. Since the same competitive inequity now exists throughout the free world, it is only fair that all U.S. corporations engaged in foreign trade should be treated alike.

The rate differential for the new International Trade Corporation provided by section 4 is fully as justifiable for corporations doing business in Pakistan as in Peru, in Burma as in Brazil, and in the East Indies as in the West Indies. Under section 4, only 90 percent—instead of 95 percent as under existing law—or more of the gross income must be derived from sources without the United States. The reason for this change is the fortuitous possibility that nonrecurring income from within the United States (for example, interest on a tax refund) may result in disqualification for as many as 5 years.

In computing the 90 percent or more of gross income derived from the active conduct of a trade or business, there would be taken into account compensation for technical, managerial, engineering, construction, scientific or like services, royalties from patents, trademarks, and copyrights, and dividends when received from a corporation which, itself, meets the conditions as to kind and source of income, if the stock ownership by the corporation receiving such income is at least 10 percent. The justification for broadening the latter definition is the recognition that foreign countries often require local incorporation and that frequently the risk to American capital is so great as to make essential the sharing of the stockownership.

Under section 4 of the bill, Western Hemisphere trade corporations will cease to exist for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1958, and for all subsequent taxable years such corporations will qualify as international trade corporations. No corporation which meets the present requirements of the Western Hemisphere trade corporation provisions will fail to qualify as an international trade corporation. International trade corporations will be permitted to file consolidated returns in the same manner and on the same basis as consolidated returns may be filed by Western Hemisphere trade corporations under existing law.

SECTION 5. ALTERNATIVE LIMITATION ON FOREIGN TAX CREDIT

Under existing law, domestic corporations, and citizens and residents of the United States, are subject to U.S. tax on total income from sources within and sources without the United States. Since income from without the United States is generally also subject to income tax in a foreign country or possession, a credit is allowed against the U.S. tax for these taxes in order to avoid double taxation of such income.

The foreign tax credit, however, is restricted by the so-called country-by-country limitation, so that the credit for foreign taxes paid to a foreign country cannot exceed the same proportion of the taxpayer's total U.S. tax liability before credit which the taxable income from that country bears to taxable income from all sources. The net effect of this limitation is that the credit for foreign taxes paid to a particular country cannot exceed the amount of the U.S. tax on taxable income from that country.

Thus, under existing law, if a taxpayer earns $100,000 in each of two foreign countries—country A, in which the tax rate is 60 percent, and country B, in which the tax rate is 40 percent, the corporate tax paid, respectively, would be $60,000 and $40,000. Since the income from each country is taxable in the United States at the rate of 52 percent, the total U.S. tax prior to the foreign tax credit is $104,000. Since the $60,000 paid to country A exceeds the $52,000 of U.S. tax on income

from country A, the excess of $8,000 is not allowable as a foreign tax credit, even though the tax paid to country B is $12,000 less than the ratable part of the U.S. tax on the income from country B. Consequently, a taxpayer in such circumstances would pay an aggregate tax of $112,000 on a total income of $200,000, whereas a corporation earning the same income from less hazardous enterprises within the United States would pay a total tax of $104,000.

Section 5 of the bill would provide for an alternative limitation upon the foreign tax credit to insure that the $8,000 of credit for tax paid to country A, which would be lost under existing law, could in effect be applied against U.S. tax upon income from other foreign countries. In no event, however, could the total of the credit for taxes paid to all foreign countries exceed the ratable part of the U.S. taxes upon total taxable income from all sources without the United States. In this manner the fundamental purpose of the foreign tax credit—to prevent double taxation of income earned abroad—which has been a basic cornerstone of Federal tax policy since 1918, would be effectuated.

SECTION 6. CREDIT FOR INVESTMENT INCENTIVE WAIVERS OF TAX BY A FOREIGN COUNTRY

This section will make it possible for American firms which do business without the United States to benefit from tax inducements offered by foreign governments to attract new capital, new technical skills, and American management. Today, if a foreign country is willing to give up tax revenues to induce an American firm to risk its capital and to provide the technical skills and know-how for industrial development, such a concession is of no benefit to the American concern. Under U.S. tax laws, income from foreign sources is fully taxable, but a credit against the U.S. tax is allowed for income tax paid to a foreign country. When a foreign country reduces its tax, the U.S. tax is correspondingly increased. Hence, any benefit of such a tax inducement is vitiated under existing tax laws.

It is not justifiable to thwart the efforts of underdeveloped countries to increase their standard of living through industrialization which cannot be provided without capital from the United States. Frequently, these underdeveloped countries are not firmly committed to either the Soviet bloc or the free world. Our national interest lies in assisting these countries in their efforts to industrialize and in impressing them with the advantages of our economic system. It is difficult to explain that tax sparing, their best opportunity for acquaintance with the free-enterprise system, is nullified by U.S. tax law.

While tax sparing is a worthwhile instrument, its scope must be limited. Safeguards are provided in section 6 by requiring that the taxpayer establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that tax waivers were not only extended in good faith by the foreign country, but were also accepted in good faith by the U.S. taxpayer, and that the taxpayer was, thereby, induced to begin, increase or continue the specified activity within the foreign country. In view of the foreign economic policy aspects of this provision, the Secretary of State is considered best qualified to make the determination under this section, just as the defense agencies have usually been delegated authority to issue certificates of necessity for accelerated amortization.

The period of credit for taxes spared is limited to 10 years.

SECTION 7. NONRECOGNITION OF GAIN ON INVOLUNTARY CONVERSION OF PROPERTY OF FOREIGN SUBSIDIARIES

Under existing law, if the property of a domestic corporation is compulsorily or involuntarily converted as a result of its destruction, theft, seizure, requisition, or condemnation, no gain is recognized by such corporation upon the receipt of insurance proceeds, if these proceeds are converted into property within 1 year after the close of the first taxable year in which any part of the insurance proceeds is received. However, this treatment does not extend to the case where a domestic corporation insures the property of its wholly owned foreign subsidiary with the result that, when the property of the foreign subsidiary is destroyed, for example by fire, the domestic parent pays a tax on the insurance proceeds received as a result of the fire at ordinary income rates.

In many foreign countries it is impossible or difficult to secure adequate insurance coverage. It is necessary for a domestic corporation to seek insurance from U.S. sources in order to protect the assets of its foreign subsidiary. Thus, such domestic corporations are deprived of the benefit of the insurance protection by the operation of existing law to the extent that the insurance proceeds are reduced by the full corporate income tax when they are received. To prevent this result, section 7 of the bill extends the nonrecognition of gain now provided by section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to cases where property of a foreign subsidiary in which the taxpayer has an insurable interest is compulsorily or involuntarily converted, if the taxpayer, first, contributes the insurance proceeds to the capital of the foreign subsidiary; or, second, purchases property similar or related in service or use to the property involuntarily converted and contributes such property to the capital of the foreign subsidiary. This rule applies whether or not the contribution of insurance proceeds is in exchange for stock. It also applies to cases where a contribution to capital is directly to the subsidiary, or indirectly through another foreign subsidiary. To prevent a double benefit to a domestic corporation as a result of the new treatment provided by the bill, section 7 specifies that the domestic corporation's basis of the foreign subsidiary's stock shall be increased only by the amount of any gain which is recognized. Similar safeguards are provided by section 7 to prevent a distortion in the earnings and profits of the foreign subsidiary. Thus, since the foreign subsidiary would be allowed a deduction in the amount of this loss arising from the involuntary conversion of its property, the bill provides that its earnings and profits are to be increased by the amount of the gain which is not recognized by the domestic parent corporation as a result of the new treatment provided by the bill.

Do We Need an Overseas Trade Monopoly in Order To Compete With the Soviet State Trading Apparatus in Critical Sectors of the World Market?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the visit of Anastas I. Mikoyan to our country to promote trade between the United States and the U.S.S.R. will have served a useful purpose if it causes us to greatly strengthen our own trading policies.

During the week of December 1, 1958, the Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy of the House Committee on Ways and Means took a look at the Russian trade monopoly when experts from seven Federal departments and agencies testified regarding it. It became clear, after hearing these witnesses, that while our Government recognizes the inherent danger to our way of life from the Russian trade offensive, it has no policy to meet or equal it. The United States is not alone in lacking such a policy. The Finish Government collapsed recently, a victim of Russian economic pressure. Brave little Finland, which fought the Russian military juggernaut almost to a standstill only 20 years ago, collapsed like a house of cards when Russia refused to trade with the Finns. About the same time the Government of Iceland resigned because of economic difficulties and the Communists were conspicuously active in bringing this about too.

John J. Powers, Jr., president of the international division of Charles Pfizer & Co., Inc., told 500 members of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association at a meeting in New York's Waldorf-Astoria Hotel that:

> The enemy has devised new techniques and is launching a major offensive on a worldwide basis, while we are still in the perilous position of preparing only for a shooting war that may never come. Recent Russian international trade disruptions in aluminum, tin, and other commodities are as much a sign of war as the shooting in Quemoy and the political maneuvering in Berlin. The Soviet bloc clearly demonstrated that it will dump, that it will sell under cost for political purposes, that it will use inflation as a political weapon, and that it will extend long-term, low-interest loans.

Mr. Powers and other able observers conclude that Russia is winning over the economically underdeveloped, politically neutral countries by linking their aspirations to Russian goods and technology.

We can only hope that as other countries come face to face with economic

realities similar to those which led to the overthrow of the Governments of Finland and Iceland that they will take a second look at the well-filled Christmas stockings offered by the Russian Santa Claus. Uncle Sam has given away over $60 billion since the end of World War II. This has not succeeded in endearing him to other nations who prefer trade to aid. With a fraction of what we have spent Russia is being phenomenally successful by a trade offensive in which aid, as we know it, has at best but an insignificant role. Somehow aid has been easier for us and we have chosen the easy way. Our best interest in the long run demands more trade and less aid. This is a task for all of us to get going on, business, President Eisenhower, and the Congress. The National Planning Association, with the aid of a Rockefeller grant, and the Business Advisory Council of the Federal Government's Department of Commerce are each making painstaking studies of how we in the United States and the free world can meet and master the Russian trade offensive. It is not a minute too soon.

According to a press report by James Reston—New York Times, December 2, 1958—the administration has been discussing quietly for the past 6 months the advisability of establishing an overseas trade monopoly to compete with the Soviet state trading apparatus in critical sectors of the world market.

The current groping for some line of action by which to counter the Soviet thrusts in selected markets must be viewed against the broad setting of recent commercial policy of the U.S.S.R. and the aggressive tactics employed by its trade monopoly as both buyer and seller.

I. RECENT TACTICS OF THE SOVIET TRADE MONOPOLY

Within the past 2 or 3 years the Soviet trading apparatus has attracted worldwide attention by a series of acts tending to draw several smaller countries into its own commercial orbit and to undermine the competitive position of a number of other trading nations. Some of the tactics used by the U.S.S.R., through the medium of its trade monopoly, may be summarized as follows:

A. BUYING UP OF PRESSING SURPLUSES

First. During 1956–57 it moved to relieve Burma of its rice surpluses by buying at the rate of 114,000 metric tons a year.

Second. In Iceland, it has made heavy purchases of fish in the past 2 years, at the rate of 45,000 tons per annum.

Third. Large-scale procurement of cotton and rice was ordered in Egypt: 60,000 tons yearly of the former and 70,000 tons of the latter.

Fourth. In Uruguay and Argentina, the U.S.S.R. recently appeared as a new, and reportedly welcome, buyer of wool, taking four to five thousand tons a year from each country.

Note: While the above commodities are of the type usually imported into the U.S.S.R., the significance of the recent pattern of procurement arises from the fact that the Soviet trade monopoly has been able to shift its buying from Western-oriented suppliers—Australia, Iran, South Africa, Norway—to more promising markets. Such shifts, moreover, can be made by the trade monopoly without regard to the usual commercial terms: price, quality, cost of transport, et cetera. It is known, furthermore, that some of these imported products were later reexported by the U.S.S.R. to other countries within the Soviet bloc.

B. PREEMPTING MARKETS OF TARGET COUNTRIES

In a number of selected markets, the Soviet trade monopoly has been pressing its initial advantage to the point of establishing its commercial dominance.

First. In Afghanistan, for example, it has succeeded in preempting a growing share of that country's total trade—now over 30 percent.

Second. The U.S.S.R. has also extended its political leverage into Finland by way of raising its purchases to about 20 percent of that country's total exports.

Third. In Egypt, Russia has recently stepped up its purchases to a point where they now account for over 20 percent of all Egyptian exports.

Fourth. Similarly, the Soviet trade monopoly now takes 22 percent of Iceland's total export trade.

By way of getting these countries more deeply involved in the Soviet commercial orbit, the trade monopoly is conducting an aggressive export campaign. As a result, the position of the established western exporters to these markets is being seriously undermined by Soviet sales of similar goods at cut-rate prices. A number of such target markets are now supplied by the U.S.S.R., for the first time, with trucks, autos, tractors, bulldozers, scrapers, cranes, machine tools, and oil equipment.

As far as can be ascertained from available trade reports, when the Soviet Government decides to introduce a particular line of machinery into an underdeveloped country, say in the Middle East, the regular western supplier to that market finds it impossible to compete.

It is interesting to note, for example, in this connection, that the Yugoslav Government reported in late November 1958, that it was under severe pressure in the Middle East from the Soviet trade agents who "with uneconomic prices and other means are trying to push us out of the Arab market"—New York Times, November 30, 1958.

C. MAKING INROADS INTO WESTERN COMMODITY MARKETS

Agents of the Soviet trade monopoly have also stepped up their activities on a number of world commodity markets. The pressure to increase Soviet sales has been concentrated especially on petroleum products and nonferrous metals—tin, aluminum, nickel, and zinc. The effect in such cases has been to depress prices and to cut the export earnings of several small producer-nations—for example, Bolivia, Malaya, and Indonesia, in the case of tin.

These practices have been characterized by Prime Minister Diefenbaker of Canada as "warfare in the market place," designed to undermine the economic strength of the free world. In this type of operation, said the Prime Minister, "the profits are measured not in the ledgers of commerce, but by the numbers of souls who trade their security and survival as freemen in the future for a temporary material advantage of the present"—New York Times, November 5, 1958.

Specifically, Canada has been affected by Soviet incursions into sensitive markets for several of its export commodities such as, among others, platinum, nickel, aluminum, soybean oil and meal.

D. PROMOTING THE POSITIVE FEATURES OF STATE TRADING

In its approach to the underdeveloped nations, the Soviet trade monopoly plays up a number of features in its state trading system calculated to appeal to the economic interest of these countries. The following features are stressed:

First. The state trading agencies of the U.S.S.R. do not require hard currencies for their exports. The purchase of Soviet goods can always be arranged on a barter basis, with the buying nation paying in goods rather than in currency.

Second. Soviet machinery is made available on the installment basis over periods as long as 5 years.

Third. Trade with the U.S.S.R. is particularly stable, because it is usually conducted on the basis of bilateral trade agreements that are renewed from year to year. Such agreements include specific lists of goods to be supplied by each side in the course of the year. Moreover, in the interest of stability, the U.S.S.R. often suggests 3- and 5-year agreements. Such formal lists have their special appeal to countries where governments are heavily involved in the conduct of foreign trade.

Fourth. The Soviet trade monopoly also recommends itself as a stabilizing influence on the prices of raw materials exported by the underdeveloped nations. As a token of its good intentions, it offers to sign purchase contracts at prices fixed to run over an extended period of time.

II. THE RECORD OF THE SOVIET TRADE MONOPOLY

The conduct of foreign commerce on a monopoly basis has enabled the U.S.S.R., over the years, to utilize trade as a weapon for the attainment of political objectives. Viewed from the other end, however, namely, from the standpoint of the nations trading with the U.S.S.R., the record of the Soviet trading system has been on the whole rather unsatisfactory. Its very utility for political pressure has made the trade monopoly a rather poor medium for the conduct of normal trade relations. More often than not it has prevented the development of a climate of mutual trust and simplified procedures. The experienced trader in the Free World has always known that only the politically motivated deal is closed promptly. By contrast, ordinary commercial transactions are inordinately time-consuming, being accompanied by excessive formalities and long periods of indecision.

While we need not here submit a full list of the liabilities of the Soviet trading monopoly, it may be useful, in the interest of perspective, to recall a few of the basic negative features of the Communist system of state trading as identified in a

recent paper by a distinguished western economist read before an East-West economic conference held in Rome in March 1958: [1]

1. The individual state-trading country of the Communist bloc does not usually aim at enlarging its international trade as such, but rather seeks to establish its other objectives and to make use of trade as a temporary convenience that may assist in carrying out some general policy objectives of the state.

2. Supplies placed on the market by a state-dominated economy tend to be marginal rather than the result of a line of continued production intended for the market. In the main, commodity trade is consciously used as a device for counteracting the mistakes of the planning mechanism and for compensating for the failures of the domestic plant to meet the goals set by the planners.

3. Because trade in a state-managed economy serves chiefly as a corrective to the planning mechanism, it tends to be discontinuous. Hence, trade which requires for its most effective operation a substantial specialized investment over a long period of time is discouraged. Trade tends to gravitate to: (a) Bulk commodities where added amounts can be easily absorbed by an already existing market; (b) large units of equipment in which sporadic transactions are normal.

4. One of the greatest obstacles to trade with countries employing a monopoly system is the ever-present risk of interruption in active contact that comes with each shift in the political orientation of the regime. Constant shifts of executive officials and of formal jurisdictions prevents maintaining long-term contact with the same individual or department. The central management of the economy, furthermore, leads to sudden changes of interest, to the launching of campaigns for dealing with an unexpected or unhedged surplus or shortage.

In short, practical experience with state trading over the past 40 years has not evolved the institution into an effective instrument for the normal, profit-motivated, and recurrent exchange of goods. What has attracted the Communist governments to this system, to be sure, is the very fact that it lends itself readily and pliably to manipulation by the political authority without the need to serve public notice, that is, by action taken through purely administrative channels. It can be used as a medium for rewarding friends and punishing enemies.

Even so, it is important to note that the instances of prompt action on the part of the monopoly in the world market have to be viewed as the exception rather than the rule in the functioning of the state trading apparatus. These are the instances in which a higher ranking authority bypasses the clogged channels of the Ministry of Foreign Trade. True, both agencies in question act in behalf of the same government, and both are free of any restraint in regard to cost. The fact remains that most of the spectacular commercial deals that have recently attracted our attention have involved the short-circuiting of the normal state trading machinery in the interest of a clear political advantage.

III. POSSIBLE DEFENSIVE MEASURES

At the present juncture in international relations, the United States may legitimately consider the adoption of certain measures to enable it to defend the national commercial interest in parts of the non-Communist world. There are two types of situations in which the U.S. Government could conceivably intervene to prevent the erosion of legitimate commercial rights:

One, in which pressure is brought to bear by the Soviet trade monopoly on an individual market in the form of uneconomic prices, or similar unfair practices, for the purpose of expelling from that market established United States sellers. The presumption in favor of action in such cases would be that the price cutting is only a temporary device employed by the trade monopoly to achieve the desired result. For the long term, even the Soviet trade monopoly is under orders to sell at the highest obtainable price.

Two, in which the purchasing power needed by some friendly countries for United States goods is frozen in the form of commodity surpluses that cannot be easily marketed to their normal nation-customers without the use of credit. Here the United States would be acting as an intermediary to keep trade flowing through ready channels, reduce the opportunity for Soviet pressure, and at the same time help unfreeze potential cash resources for the purchase of U.S. goods.

To cope with situations of this sort, it may be advisable to consider the establishment of the following instrumentalities:

First. An anti-dumping fund to enable American exporters to withstand Soviet attempts to expel them from established markets by the device of price cutting. Traders in this position may be regarded as victims of a planned Soviet political maneuver against the United States as a nation rather than against them as individuals.

Second. A U.S. commercial corporation to undertake commodity transaction with foreign countries which involve barter, credit, three-way transactions and other exchanges having a clear national economic or political objective that could not be pursued by a profit-motivated business firm.

In connection with the above, it is worthy of note that, according to the press, Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS disclosed before the American Management Association that he planned to reintroduce a bill in the next Congress calling for the creation of a U.S. trading corporation. It would grant financial assistance to American industries faced with unfair competition from the Soviet Union—New York Times, November 6, 1958.

IV. THE NEED FOR PERSPECTIVE

It would be shortsighted, however, to jump to the conclusion that the United States should establish a trading monopoly of its own to combat that of the Soviet Union, for to do so would be to recommend state trading to combat state trading. This is one case where fighting fire with fire could be disastrous.

The present foreign trade policy of the United States, which was inaugurated in the 1930's as an antidepression measure, has become too passive to offer an effective response to the Soviet trade threat. The present need is for a more vigorous foreign trade policy, one which, instead of confining itself to the multilateral reduction of trade barriers, would bring about a maximization of imports and exports by the countries of the non-Communist world. Such a policy, one that would be geared to the very real strategic needs of the United States, could be evolved only after a searching reexamination of our present and future international economic position with particular reference to the economic strategy of the Soviet Union.

BRIEF STATEMENT ON THE BULK-PURCHASE PROGRAM OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT

The British Government does not have a monopoly of foreign trade. During and after World War II, Great Britain has engaged in a form of state trading through the use of what are known as bulk-purchase contracts. These contracts, or bilateral agreements, concluded between the British Government and other governments, quasi-governmental bodies or private groups were concerned with the volume, the types and the terms of exportation and importation of specific goods for a specified period of time.

Such contracts provided that Britain would buy a fraction or a specified quantity of the exportable surpluses of the commodity produced in a given country. The price of the commodity was usually subject to revision up to a definite maximum at certain stated intervals. A program of bulk purchase was continued after World War II because it was evident that food and other commodities would have to be rationed for a period of years and the Labor Party leaders felt that the retention of central purchase would give the most effective control of distribution of supplies within the country.

The bulk-purchase contracts served several purposes: First, they served to steer trade from the dollar area to the sterling area and to soft currency areas; second, they tended to assure a fairly constant flow of imports at relatively favorable prices; since the contracts were ordinarily for a period of years they tended to promote price stability. They provided a certain amount of protection to British producers or investors since such contracts directed trade toward those British dominions or territories in which British capital was invested.

Usually the bulk-purchase contracts specified the exchange of an array of goods from Britain for raw materials and foodstuffs of equivalent value. Postwar contracts were for longer duration extending—in most cases—from 3 to 15 years.

Over 40 separate contracts were negotiated covering trade with other Commonwealth countries and possessions and with countries in Latin America, Eastern and Western Europe, and Asia. About one-half of all British imports were covered by such agreements up to 1950.

The Conservative election victory in 1950 resulted in a policy of honoring existing bulk-purchase contracts, but of negotiating no new ones.

State trading existed in the United Kingdom after World War II, but it coexisted with private trading and was not

[1] "Trade Between Countries With Different Economic and Social Systems," by A. K. Cairncross (Glasgow University) UNESCO, SS COOP, EC, 7 Paris; Feb. 17, 1958.

a monopoly. In recent years, the volume of state trading has declined.

I include here a letter I have received from Hon. Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and a letter from Harold Boeschenstein, Chairman of the Committee on World Economic Practices, Business Advisory Council, Department of Commerce, which is currently engaged in a study, at the request of President Eisenhower, of how we can meet the Russian trade threat effectively.

I also include an article by James Reston of the New York Times of December 2, 1958. I would like to say that in the development of this information I have had the assistance of Leon M. Herman, specialist in Soviet economics, Howard S. Piquet, senior specialist in international trade, and Elden E. Billings, analyst in international finance of the Library of Congress:

UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE,
FOR ECONOMIC AFFAIRS,
Washington, December 15, 1958.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Many thanks for sending me a copy of your statement of December 16 on the Soviet economic offensive. I certainly agree with your thought that this is a matter which demands our full attention.

As you have pointed out, the situation with respect to the underdeveloped countries is especially urgent. Our best estimate is that the Sino-Soviet bloc has extended credits of almost $2.6 billion to these areas since 1954. More than 90 percent of this amount has gone to seven countries.

As of possible interest, I am enclosing a copy of my recent speech before the American Management Association, which deals with the subject of Soviet foreign economic policy.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

OWENS-CORNING FIBERGLAS CORP.,
Toledo, Ohio, December 18, 1958.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I appreciate receiving the copy of your recent release on the Sino-Soviet economic offensive and concur that there is nothing more vital to our Nation than the manner in which we face up to this.

As you may know, I am a member of the committee, referred to in your release, created by the Business Advisory Council at the behest of the Government. Inasmuch as the work of the committee is not finished, I know you will understand why I should not comment at this time other than to say that such vigorous concern as yours is clearly needed among men in your position.

Sincerely,

HAROLD BOESCHENSTEIN.

[From the New York Times of Dec. 2, 1958]

TRADE POLICY QUANDARY—SOVIET ECONOMIC DRIVE BEGINS DIVISION IN ADMINISTRATION ON COUNTERMOVES

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, December 1.—The annual battle over the Nation's foreign economic policy started today with the administration more divided than ever over how to deal with the Communist world's economic offensive.

When experts from seven Federal agencies finished testifying this afternoon before a House Ways and Means Subcommittee on the challenge of Communist trade policy, Chairman HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, remarked: "They all recognize the danger but have no policy equal to it."

In the last few days several isolated incidents have illustrated the nature of the danger they were discussing:

Last week it was disclosed that the Soviet Government had concluded an agreement to sell $13,500,000 worth of benzene to the Dow Chemical Co., at a price equivalent to 24 to 25 cents a gallon. The current price in the United States is 31 cents a gallon.

Coincidentally, Augusto Frederico Schmidt, head of the Brazilian delegation to an inter-American economic conference in Washington, announced that his country was increasing its exports to the Communist nations. The British Commonwealth and the European common market nations, he observed, were "gradually closing their doors to our production," and the United States was not able to absorb Brazil's losses in those markets.

Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev, of the Soviet Union, in his latest maneuver to influence the political future of Berlin and Germany, held out once more the promise of a vast market for German products in the whole of the Communist world.

A high official of the United States Government, discussing the problem of meeting the Communist offensive, commented this afternoon:

"It is politically impossible for us to discuss in public the radical changes we shall have to make to deal effectively with the Soviet economic offensive.

A POLITICAL INSTRUMENT

"They control all of their foreign trade. They can use it as a political instrument regardless of cost. They can take losses to drive competition out of a given market precisely as large producers once were able to do to eliminate small competitors in this country.

"We have been discussing quietly inside our own Government for 6 months the need to establish an overseas trade monopoly to compete with the Soviet monopoly on equal terms, but this is so foreign to our normal way of doing business that we dare not mention it in public."

What the public hearings before Chairman Boggs' Ways and Means Subcommittee demonstrated today was that the administration was just as divided on less radical policies than the creation of a monopoly for the sale of U.S. products overseas.

Henry Kearns, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, predicted that the administration would ask the next Congress to approve tax concessions to encourage increased private investment abroad.

DIVISION IN DEPARTMENT

It is known, however, that some of Mr. Kearns' superiors in the Commerce Department are opposed to dealing with the problem through tax concessions, and the Treasury Department's chief tax expert, Dan T. Smith, refused to go along with Mr. Kearns' prediction that the administration would ask for tax concessions.

The division within the administration on this subject reflects the conflict between those who have been stating the Nation's foreign policy objectives and those who have to tend the Nation's Treasury.

The State Department and the International Cooperation Administration, concerned with the dangers of Communist economic subversion, are prepared for a radical revision of U.S. foreign economic policy to meet what they regard as a radical attempt by the Communist nations to upset the whole pattern of foreign trade.

The Treasury Department, however, faced with a $12 billion deficit in the current fiscal year, tends to oppose any new programs that might reduce revenue and create a double standard of taxation.

To minimize this dilemma, the Administration is now studying the possibility of reducing military aid to underdeveloped countries and increasing economic aid.

It is also discussing with Britain and the so-called common market countries of Western Europe ways and means of preventing the common market countries from discriminating against trade with countries outside the common market.

More than likely a compromise will be reached on this latter point under which the Common Market countries will agree not to raise tariffs against the United States, Britain, Switzerland and other nations for a period of 18 months. But this again is regarded here as merely a postponement of the problem.

The main point under discussion here is that the Soviet Union and the other Communist countries are concerting their foreign trade policies for political purposes, while the administration and the other free governments of the West are divided over how to deal with a wholly new situation.

Chairman BOGGS was not hopeful tonight that his hearings would find a way out of this problem, but he planned to carry them on in order to make clear what the problem was.

Tax Credit for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education.

The increased financial burden is a major barrier to the student's education. This bill is designed to encourage many parents to reappraise their financial ability to pay the costs of a child's education, so that more children can avail themselves of our country's rich educational opportunities.

The basic features of my bill which I believe to be sound in terms of fairness to the taxpayer and of service to the national interest are the following:

First. The bill would apply only to higher education—that above the 12th grade—including colleges, graduate schools, professional schools, junior colleges, technical institutes, teachers' summer courses, and the like.

Second. The payments involved would be only those made to educational institutions which meet the tests for special tax treatment under the present income-tax laws.

Third. In order to eliminate any possible feeling that the bill would discriminate in favor of taxpayers in higher brackets, it would provide that 30 percent of the student fees would be taken as a tax credit on the tax bill. Thereby the cost to the Government would be approximately the same as if the student fees were made deductible, but the relief

to all taxpayers would be the same regardless of their tax bracket.

Fourth. A ceiling of $450 for each student would be placed on the amount of the tax credit. This would mean that that portion of any tuition above $1,500 per year would not result in any further tax credit. It would be hoped that this ceiling would be sufficient to cover the tuition charges for graduate and professional education as well as for that at the college level.

Fifth. There would appear to be no occasion for limiting the taxpayer entitled to receive the tax credit to any particular relationships with the student. The neighbor or employer of a promising but financially poor boy or girl frequently proposes to pay his or her tuition to make higher education possible, provided the tax payment can be made deductible, but this is difficult under present laws. It would be expected that the tax credit plan would bring out more funds in the nature of scholarships to those unrelated to the taxpayer but in whom the taxpayer has some philanthropic interest.

Sixth. No tax credit would be allowed on amounts for tuition and fees supplied in the form of scholarships, fellowships or grants from sources other than the taxpayer himself. It would be assumed that payment of tuition and fees would be the first charge against such a scholarship, fellowship, or grant.

It is my opinion that such a tax credit will be a stimulus to more efficient use of private and public institutions. The result would be encouragement of broad distribution of student enrollment in all types of institutions, an objective which has always been considered to be in the public interest, and which is of even greater importance in the current emergency situation.

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a 30 percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 39. Tuition and fees paid by individuals to institutions of higher education.

"(a) General rule: There shall be allowed to an individual, as credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for the taxable year, an amount equal to 30 percent of the aggregate amount paid during the taxable year by such individual to institutions of higher education as tuition or fees for the education of such individual or of any other individual at a level above the twelfth grade.

"(b) Limitations.

"(1) Individual receiving education must be full-time student: Amounts paid for the education of any individual which (but for this paragraph) would be taken into account under subsection (a) shall be taken into account only if such individual is a student (as defined in section 151(e)(4) for the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins.

"(2) Adjustment for scholarships and certain allowances: In the case of any individual who for any period receives—

"(A) any scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117(a)(1)) which, under section 117, is not includible in gross income, or

"(B) any education and training allowance under part IV of title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952,

any amount paid for tuition or fees for such period which (but for this paragraph) would be taken into account under subsection (a) shall be taken into account only to the extent that the aggregate of such tuition and fees charged such individual for such period exceeds the sum of (i) an amount equal to all the scholarships and fellowship grants described in subparagraph (A) received by such individual for such period, plus (ii) an amount equal to 30 percent of all the allowances described in subparagraph (B) received by such individual for such period.

"(3) Maximum taken into account: Amounts paid during any calendar year with respect to the education of an individual which (but for this paragraph) would be taken into account under subsection (a) shall be taken into account only to the extent that they do not exceed $1,500. The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the application of this paragraph in cases where two or more taxpayers pay amounts with respect to the education of the same individual.

"(4) Credit not to cause refund of tax: The credit allowed by this section shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under sections 33 (relating to foreign tax credit), 34 (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals), 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest), and 37 (relating to retirement income).

"(c) Institution of higher education defined: For purposes of this section, the term 'institution of higher education' means only an educational institution—

"(1) which normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum and normally has a regularly organized body of students in attendance at the place where its educational activities are carried on;

"(2) which regularly offers education at a level above the twelfth grade; and

"(3) contributions to or for the use of which are deductible under section 170."

(b) The table of sections for such part IV is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 39. Tuition and fees paid by individuals to institutions of higher education."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1957.

Counterattack on Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to incorporate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for this the first day of the 86th Congress a very arresting article written recently by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

This article is entitled "Counterattack on Juvenile Delinquency." As all of us know this is one of the very grave problems confronting our Nation and I commend the sane, sensible thoughts of Mr. Hoover to the attention of all of you.

The article follows:

[From This Week magazine, Oct. 26, Nov. 2 and 9, 1958]

COUNTERATTACK ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

(By J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation)

PART I

America is facing an emergency, a crisis which threatens the very future of our Nation.

It is the emergency of juvenile delinquency. The tide of youthful lawlessness is rising at a terrifying pace. By 1962 one million of our teenagers will be arrested each year—at the present rate.

My considered opinion is that we must act—and promptly. The time has come for a counterattack against juvenile delinquency. Unless this counterattack is successful, no street or park in the Nation will be safe. Worst of all, every child in the Nation will be exposed to the vicious acts of the delinquent minority.

Thousands and thousands of words have been written recently about the juvenile-delinquency problem. "Are the schools to blame?" "Are the parents to blame?" "Is our whole culture at fault?" are some of the questions which have been argued at length in newspapers and magazines. But now the time has come for action.

I am delighted that This Week magazine has asked me to propose such action in this series of articles.

Medicine of two kinds

In this series, I will outline what I believe to be an effective two-pronged counterattack against juvenile delinquency designed to (1) bring existing delinquency under control and (2) prevent future delinquency.

But first let's define the scope of the problem.

During 40 years in law enforcement I have seen thousands of youths skid downward along the path from minor delinquency to vandalism, petty theft and progressively more serious crimes. Those of us who recognize juvenile delinquency as the training school for adult crime are seriously alarmed at its increase.

Here are the statistics that worry me and all law enforcement officers: During 1957 persons under 18 years of age comprised 53 percent of all arrests for the major offenses against property. Last year, more than two-thirds of the auto theft arrests, over one-half of the burglary and larceny arrests, and one-fourth of the arrests for robberies in cities involved juveniles.

No one is immune

Throughout the United States, an estimated 740,000 youngsters under 18 years of age were arrested last year. This is 3.3 percent of the population in the 10 to 17 age group, and it means that 1 out of every 30 youngsters was arrested for violating the law.

Since 1952, our juvenile population has increased approximately 22 percent. Juvenile arrests in the same period have risen 55 percent.

And the offenses committed by young people are characterized by more violence, more contempt for law and order. In every one of our cities terror runs down the street as youthful hoodlums grow increasingly bold and vicious.

This is the scope of the problem, a problem which cannot be dismissed as affecting only one area or one class. Juvenile delinquency and juvenile crime are not restricted. No child—rich, poor, city dweller, or suburbanite—is inherently immune to delinquent behavior.

Delinquency is a worldwide disease. A recent study in Great Britain disclosed sharp

increases in sex offenses, drunkenness, and crimes of violence among British teenagers, notably the "Teddy Boys." In Russia, an official Soviet Government booklet entitled "The Fight Against Hooliganism," reveals that knifings, beatings, thefts, and destruction of property by Soviet youth, constitute a menace of great concern behind the Iron Curtain.

But we're concerned with the causes of juvenile delinquency in the United States. I believe that this menacing cloud, mushrooming across the Nation with its terrifying portents for the future, is indicative of a deep-seated national illness. I am certain that here is proof once again you cannot dance without paying the piper. Over the past quarter of a century all too many Americans have been ignoring the basic traditions of work, discipline, and vigilance on which our Nation was founded.

Values are to blame

We seem to have misplaced the sense of values which made this a great Nation. Self-indulgence and the principle of pleasure before duty on a vast and growing scale have become a phenomenon of our adult world. These are warning symptoms of the "decadence disease"—which has contributed to the decay of so many civilizations throughout history.

When children, without discipline and without moral standards implanted by a stable home, are thrust into a culture in which pressures from every direction promote the principle of self-indulgence, what reaction can be expected? To such children, restraints are unbearable. When they want something, they take it.

These children are victims in a very real sense. They are the victims of a society which has substituted indulgence for discipline. They are the victims of a breakdown of authority and moral standards in the home, in the neighborhood, and—too frequently—in the entire community. And they are the victims of those practitioners of expediency who have blurred the lines between right and wrong, good and evil.

So, in large part the juvenile delinquent is a byproduct of our self-indulgent age. As such, he deserves understanding and sympathy, as well as an effort to rehabilitate him. Yet, while seeking to save those who can be salvaged, we must not make the mistake of adding to the problem by repeated, misplaced leniencies.

The treatment accorded youthful criminals must be fair, reasonable, and realistic.

I have been called an advocate of the get tough policy. To an extent, perhaps I am. I have seen too many instances in which repeated leniency has encouraged misbehavior, and I have adso seen occasions when the policies of a realistic judge proved to be very effective deterrents to crime.

The "I can get away with anything—I'm a juvenile" attitude on the part of scores of young hoodlums is a clear-cut indication of how sentiment can supplant sense. Too frequently, misguided sentimentality, along with a policy of blanketing all youthful offenders under a protective covering of anonymity, actually encourages juvenile misbehavior. The knowledge that one can get by, not once but time after time, breeds bitter contempt for law and makes a mockery of our system of justice.

Let me repeat here what I have said many times. I heartily endorse reasonable consideration for children involved in minor delinquencies and first offenses. I do not, however, believe that the umbrella of special privilege should be held impartially over all juveniles, including those who commit heinous crimes or those guilty of repeated offenses. Leniency is misdirected when it is applied repeatedly to those whose every act expresses disdain for law.

Prelude to worse crimes

When "I can get away with anything—I'm a juvenile!" becomes the scornful slogan of increasing numbers of youthful cynics, we need to be wary. Such youngsters, through actual experience, are beginning to visualize themselves as immune from the law. If they get by repeatedly with the little things, the temptation grows. All too often the little things have become a prelude to really vicious crime.

I do not exaggerate when I use the word "vicious." The appalling rise in juvenile crime is equalled only by the increase in violence and brutality displayed in the commission of such crimes.

The three most prevalent juvenile offenses are: burglary—in 1957, 54.8 percent of all arrests for burglary involved youths under 18. Example: On the west coast last fall, two boys, aged 15 and 13, were surprised by a merchant while they burglarized his store. One of the boys fired a .22 caliber pistol at the businessman, killing him instantly. The gun had been stolen in a previous burglary; larceny—in 1957, 51.3 percent of the persons arrested for larceny were youths under 18. Example: A series of burglaries and larcenies committed on the east coast was finally traced to a small juvenile gang. Among their other crimes: making bombs out of stolen explosives in order to blast open the coin boxes in telephone booths; and auto theft—in 1957, 67.6 percent of all arrests for auto theft were youths under 18. Example: Last June, a young hoodlum arrested in a stolen car admitted a number of crimes in Texas, California, and Arizona. His ambition: to "shoot it out" with the police some day. "I've taken shots at officers, and I've been shot at before," he boasted.

The three most vicious youth crimes are—

Rape: In 1957, 19.5 percent of all arrests for rape involved youths under 18. Example: On the East Coast a few months ago, a young couple in a parked car was held up by three teen-age hoodlums. The girl, aged 15, was separated from her companion and taken to a remote area where the youths attacked her.

Assault: In 1957, 7.3 percent of the persons arrested for assault were youths under 18. Example: In Washington last summer, 10 youths in two cars stopped their vehicles, jumped out, beat three young sailors, leaving one unconscious, and fled. Two of the youths were apprehended a short time later. They could give no reason for the assault.

Criminal homicide: In 1957, 6.4 percent of all arrests for criminal homicide were youths under 18. Example: Last December the robbery spree of a juvenile gang ended with the shooting of a liquor-store proprietor. None of the gang members were over 17 years old. For the youth who pulled the trigger, this killing was the culmination of a series of vicious crimes.

In many ways the second list is more frightening than the first. And for a very good reason. In recent years, reports on youth crimes have indicated a mounting savagery, a senseless brutality which makes one's blood run cold.

I will list just two examples of this nightmarish criminality:

New York—Two young men, refugees from Communist tyranny, were quietly walking along the street. When they stopped to ask directions of a trio of youths, they were attacked and beaten violently. Reason? According to the news account, the three assailants were "toughs" who had been drinking beer for hours on a tenement roof, then had descended to the street "to find some action."

Two of the perpetrators of this vicious attack, each 18 years old, were out on bail pending trial for felonious assault and malicious michief in another case. The third, 16, allegedly greeted his mother with an unprintable epithet when his parents arrived at the police station.

Philadelphia—A young foreign student was returning from mailing a letter near the campus of his university last spring when he was accosted by an 11-member juvenile gang. Two youths shackled the student's arms, others knocked off his glasses and began beating him. A blackjack, lead pipe, and hard-toed shoe were used. The young man's face was chopped to unrecognizable pulp, and his clothing was searched for the money he did not have. Within minutes after police arrived on the scene, the victim of this brutal attack was dead. And what had his 11 attackers—all teen-agers—been seeking? The admission price of 35 cents to attend a neighborhood dance.

Blind, senseless brutality. No conscience. No sense of right and wrong. Violence for the sake of violence. This is the frightening face of juvenile crime in its most terrible form.

Yes, our juvenile-delinquency problem is real, and it is growing. It may even be more serious here than in other areas of the world. Following a trip to the United States to study juvenile criminals, an Austrian educator reported in a lecture that he had found a fundamental difference between juvenile delinquency in Europe and in the United States. He indicated that the American way of life requires more self-control and discipline than the European one and that when the juvenile aggressor casts off his inhibitions, his acts are more ruthless and elemental. In short, the American juvenile delinquent is more deadly than his European counterpart.

Trigger-happy Americans

The Austrian educator said: "If someone in Austria is threatened by a juvenile gangster holding a pistol, he might be able to talk him out of it. No chance of that in America. The young rowdy would pull the trigger."

Much of the trigger-pulling in America occurs in the new urban menace—the juvenile gang.

The swift growth of these gangs holds a deadly portent for the future. The drive and purpose of the bopping gang are, with rare exception, alien to juvenile groupings of the past. Emotional intensity without moral responsibility renders these packs of young hoodlums increasingly explosive and dangerous. Vicious and arrogant, cruel and cowardly, seeking to rule a specific area of the city by fear and violence, the modern juvenile gang assembles an arsenal of zip guns, switch-blade knives, steel chains, and other deadly weapons.

The terror which exists in those areas infested by the juvenile gang reaches its ultimate in outbreaks of savage brutality and murder. Witness, for example, the gang killing of a crippled 15-year-old youth and the vicious assault on his companion in New York last year. They were kicked, beaten, and stabbed.

Another aspect of delinquency is the ever-increasing juvenile vandalism. Schools have been wrecked, cemeteries and houses of worship have been desecrated. And vandalism has led to more than property damage.

Last year a 12-year-old boy admitted starting a fire which took three lives. Police files showed that despite his youth, this boy had an impressive record. He previously had been picked up for throwing rocks, shooting an air gun and placing torpedoes on street-car tracks. He admitted starting four other fires in addition to the fatal blaze.

Terrifying picture

Senseless brutality, gang killings, vandalism—these, together with the other major crimes I have mentioned, add up to a truly

terrifying picture of juvenile delinquency today.

What can we do about juvenile delinquency? In this series, I propose the following two-part counterattack:

First, we must bring under control existing delinquency. To do this, we must launch an immediate program of decisive action by police, the courts, and parents.

Second, we must prevent future delinquency. This means a long-range but positive plan to strengthen the moral fiber of America.

We must act now to halt this spreading disease, which if not stopped, will bring the law of the jungle to every American street.

PART II

Seven steps to halt teen-age terror

"I want to be a good burglar, and I figure I'll have to go to prison to learn the business * * * but you know, I'm a pretty good burglar right now." These words were voiced last January by a 10-year-old. He was, indeed, a "pretty good burglar." This boy had admitted breaking into a bar, a machine shop, and a lunchroom. He had had other brushes with the law—including one in 1957 which had prompted his mother to complain that she could not control him.

Unable to control a 10-year-old child. What an absurd statement. Here is but one more example of a modern phenomenon which is sweeping across America—the abdication of parental responsibility that underlies the nightmare growth of juvenile delinquency.

Last Sunday, I outlined the scope of the problem.

In today's article, I wish to present a counterattack, a comprehensive plan to control delinquency, make our streets safe from gang warfare, protect our property and our very lives. It may be summed up in seven points.

We must:

1. Drive home to parents what their responsibilities toward their youngsters are.
2. Improve the effectiveness of juvenile courts and juvenile aid facilities.
3. Stop coddling known young criminals.
4. Take the protective wraps of secrecy and anonymity off juvenile hoodlums.
5. Crack down hard on the corrupters of youth—the dope peddlers, pornographers, etc.
6. Attack delinquency problems at the local level, mobilizing community resources for a unified front against immorality and crime.
7. And this is most important: begin today to reestablish a firm moral structure in America to prevent future delinquency.

The first six points in my program make up a plan to control existing delinquency. Let me elaborate on them—and on the urgent need for them—today. I will discuss the final point in next week's concluding article.

Responsibility of parents

Any program to combat juvenile delinquency can begin in only one place—the home. Abdication of parental responsibility—a malignant form of self-indulgence before duty—has gained a strange hold on all too many American households today. One jurist said recently:

"The (delinquency) problem is not so much an improper youth as it is an improper home."

Unquestionably, the very heart of the delinquency problem rests with the family. When mothers and fathers fulfill responsibilities of parenthood, juvenile crime cannot exist.

Everyone is aware of the problems confronting the children of broken homes. But how about the problems of children in "bent" homes? Let me illustrate:

The pressures of business have estranged thousands of youngsters from their fathers. The distance between office and home has grown increasingly greater, and in many families the young children are in bed before their father gets home from work. Under circumstances such as these, mothers have been forced into a role of greater authority and responsibility. The man of the house tends to be looked upon as merely a weekend handyman—a tired, silent partner.

Many fathers are forced to hold two jobs in order to make ends meet. In some families both father and mother are employed.

The result of the above situations is obvious: the children suffer. Repeated rationalizations—"After all, it's in the interest of the whole family"—are small consolation to the youngster who thirsts for the love and attention of his "too busy" parents.

These are the practical problems of what I call "bent" homes. What about the psychological factors?

A terrible degree of moral decay has infected those parents who flaunt press clippings concerning their numerous marriages and divorces. And how much further into degradattion can some mothers and fathers sink after exposing their children to wild parties and thinly veiled promiscuity? Yet, these are common occurrences with the growing ranks of those "sophisticates" who pride themselves on never permitting moral considerations to interfere with their personal desires.

In a normal child, the stamp of character is imprinted early. And it is imprinted deep. Youngsters learn quickly by the example of their parents.

And even more important, boys and girls who have known little or no real family life invariably long for the security of a genuine home. Subconsolously aware that they are being cheated, they do not understand exactly how life has failed them. So these youngsters react blindly and compulsively, striking out at society in general. This is the beginning of juvenile delinquency.

How can we relate parental neglect to delinquency? In some States there are laws under which penalties—including fines and jail sentences—have been levied against the parents of juvenile offenders. This is one way to make disinterested parents face up to their responsibilities to their children.

Where parental neglect is found to be a factor in delinquency, society has every right to demand that the parents of the young offender be called into court and be required to account for their actions. Neglectful mothers and fathers are no less a menace to the community than are their children. Let them be identified and publicly recognized as such.

Improvement of juvenile courts

Every State has special courts or special court procedures to deal with juvenile crime. Yet many of these facilities are sorely inadequate to handle the load.

One Maryland judge complained last June that in his county the juvenile court was expected to function with an inadequate staff, no juvenile detention facilities, no treatment institutions for disturbed children, and no police officers trained in handling juveniles.

In another community it was revealed that youngsters in immediate need of psychiatric care had to wait from 6 months to a year to get into one of the city's child clinics.

A metropolitan newspaper recently editorialized, "As long as young criminals can, figuratively or otherwise, thumb their noses at police and the courts because they know that usually there's no place to commit them—except in the so-called custody of their parents—just so long will our city be in a sorry and perilous fix. The inadequate facilities for neglected children are likewise a disgrace to the city."

It is a common practice to heap a greater burden upon the existing facilities than they possibly can bear. This has been true of probation and parole systems where supervision of released offenders becomes a sham when the existing staff of officers is required to supervise greater and greater numbers of cases. This also has been true of welfare departments such as the one in which a case worker complained that it was impossible for her to do an adequate job for any of the 90 children assigned to her.

We need improved and enlarged juvenile court and juvenile aid facilities to help stamp out delinquency.

Coddling of known young criminals

Frankly, I am alarmed at the extremes to which some authorities have been permitted to go in protecting young offenders. Under a pretext of rehabilitation, tragic blunders have been committed against the American people.

As I said in last week's article, I know that I have been called an advocate of the "get tough" policy. To some extent this is true. I think the time has come when we must be realistic. We must show the hard-core delinquents who have no respect for law and order that we mean business.

Sometimes the coddling of delinquents takes an ironic form. In a number of cases, misguided humanitarians have succeeded only in ruining the lives of the juveniles they were so earnestly trying to help.

Let me illustrate with an actual case. Last February a 17-year-old hoodlum was captured after a gun battle with police. He was well known to the authorities in his city, having built up an extensive juvenile record over a 5-year period. A probation officer familiar with this youth's case said that the boy idolized his father. Who is his father? A veteran criminal, now serving a 15-year sentence for burglarizing a grocery market.

Several months before his gun battle with the police, this teen-ager and his father had been arrested for grand larceny. The youth was convicted, but the charges against his father were dismissed for lack of evidence. Here was an opportunity to remove this young man from the influence of his father. Instead, he was merely placed on probation, and, in effect, permitted to continue his apprenticeship in crime.

Coddling of delinquents must be stopped—for the protection of the youths themselves, as well as the general public.

Protection of delinquents by secrecy

Closely linked to the coddling of young criminals is the widespread practice of sheltering them under a cloak of secrecy. A number of investigative agencies have been dangerously hampered in protecting the public by the secrecy which many courts attach to official proceedings involving juveniles.

For example, last Christmas four teenagers brutally beat an attendant and escaped from the detention hall in a southern city. Three of the boys were being held pending their transfer to the State reformatory. They had been picked up for robbery. The fourth boy reportedly was being held as a material witness in a sex case.

Despite the extensive records of these young hoodlums and despite their brutally executed escape, juvenile authorities were said to be powerless to identify them to the public. One juvenile court judge was quoted as stating, "If they are not recaptured within 24 hours, we may name the boys and describe their records as a matter of public welfare. But at the moment we are bound to respect the fact they are juveniles and withhold their identity."

A more realistic approach to delinquency certainly is needed when dangerous teenagers such as these are permitted to hide under an umbrella of secrecy. Youths who commit vicious crimes, as well as those who are guilty of repeated offenses, are not mere delinquents. And they should not be accorded all the special considerations which delinquents have come to expect.

We must stop shielding young hoodlums from publicity. We should use publicity positively to fight delinquency. It can be a powerful weapon. Let's bring all the names and facts about teen-age crime out into the open.

Corruption of youth

Our country is plagued today by an ugly brand of parasite who commercializes upon the immature judgment and curiosity of young people. In this category I include the filth merchants, dope peddlers, and others who make their living by corrupting youth. These furtive characters frequently are found loitering near schools, playgrounds, and juvenile hangouts. They also run the mail-order houses which blanket the Nation with promotional material such as the following letter:

"Hello!

"My name is Mary.

"I'm an art model—pose in the nude you know, and I thought maybe you would like me or my girl friends to pose for you in a very special way."

The Post Office Department, which has jurisdiction when obscene material is sent through the mails, has received thousands of complaints from parents in all parts of the country whose children have received these letters. But our youngsters do not have to send away for indecent pictures and literature. There probably is a generous supply on the shelves of a neighboring newsstand.

Dealing in pornography and other forms of filth has become a multimillion-dollar business. In one city, the police recently arrested the operator of a bookstore who had been selling indecent photographs, color slides, pamphlets, and books at prices ranging up to $75. Two squad cars were needed to haul away the filth which was found in his apartment.

As a law-enforcement officer, I am required to exercise strict control over my emotions. But frankly there are times when I cannot help feeling my blood boil. This is particularly so in cases where an adult has deliberately set out to corrupt the morals of a child.

The examples, unfortunately, are legion. In one city, the head of the juvenile bureau complained that the delinquency problem had been compounded by the fact that homosexuals were plying local teenagers with liquor and making advances toward them. In another city, 2 boys, aged 16 and 18, were taught the criminal art of stealing and forging checks by an ex-convict.

And in a third city, a middle-aged mother of 5 children was found to be the supplier of weapons for a gang of young robbers.

But of all the corrupters of youth, perhaps none is more terrible than the dope peddler. The dope pusher entices children to try narcotics, and in many cases the youngsters become addicted to drugs. It is well known that drug addiction leads directly to crime. The addict craves larger and larger doses, and the price is high. To get expensive narcotics, youths often follow the trail which leads from larceny to burglary and to more serious crimes.

All calculated assaults upon the standards of youth should be met with stern law enforcement and punishment. In communities where existing laws are inadequate to thwart the filth merchants, the dope peddlers, and the rest—let's have new laws, laws with teeth in them.

Mobilize community resources

An effective attack against the delinquency problem can be launched in only one place. That is at the community level. Crime and delinquency are essentially local problems.

In the final analysis, immoral conditions persist within a community only because the last person to recognize his responsibility and acknowledge his blame is the individual citizen. He finds fault with the police department, ignores the pleas for assistance of youth-serving agencies, berates the schools and complains, "Why hasn't the Federal Government done something about this?"

How absurd. Despite the pleas for creation of a special Federal agency to spearhead the fight against delinquency and crime, I want to assure you that the Federal Government has no vaccine or cure-all to overcome moral sicknesses which exist in local communities. If the frightening growth of youth offenses is to be stopped, the forces for good within each community must unite.

As a first step, local efforts must be coordinated. Agencies must pool their resources. Petty jealousies and differences must not stand in the way when there is vital work to be done. Church groups, parent-teacher associations, public and private youth-serving agencies, civic organizations and local law-enforcement agencies must all work together—for the benefit of all.

The second step requires a realistic appraisal of local weaknesses which are a detriment to the cause of decency. Inadequate police budgets, lack of playgrounds in crowded residential areas, obsolete juvenile detention facilities, weakness in existing laws, overcrowded schools, and lack of supervised recreational programs are among the many dangerous conditions which prevail in all too many cities across the Nation. These conditions can best be recognized—and corrected—by the local citizens themselves.

The third step is action. Not only must corrective measures be initiated but each one of them must be carried through.

There you have my plan for the basis of a counterattack on existing delinquency.

Now, what about my seventh point: that we must begin today to reestablish a firm moral structure in America to prevent future delinquency.

I feel this step is tremendously important. Any plan to control delinquency must look to the future as well as to the present. Point Seven calls for a reaffirmation of the moral values that can stop delinquency in the future.

We cannot allow this situation to continue. We must make our towns and cities safe, now and forever, from juvenile terror. Once Americans understand this, I am sure they can do it.

PART III

Where does discipline begin?

Last summer a very interesting newspaper article came to my attention. It concerned an outdoor camp for boys—one established under the sponsorship of a religious organization. This is no ordinary boys' camp. It caters to youths whom many other camps would reject as undesirable.

After school had closed for the summer, a group of about 100 boys departed for this camp from the crowded streets of a large eastern city. Their ages ranged between 14 and 21. No less than 40 of them had court records, and a number of other belonged to juvenile gangs. Heading the group as it boarded buses for a month's stay at the camp was a youth worker who was only a few years removed from childhood himself. Did this young man have any misgivings about the backgrounds and court records of these boys? Not in the least. In the following words he expressed his attitude toward the challenge presented by these boys:

"We have some of the toughest guys in the city. We know what they've done and what they're capable of doing. But we show them what toughness really is—being able to face up to problems and assume a responsible place in the community."

The man who spoke these words, and the camp in which he works, are doing an effective job in combating juvenile delinquency. I would like to contend in this article that his philosophy is our true final answer to this terrifying problem.

We must show youth what toughness really is. These are profound words. Character, pride, resourcefulness, excellence—these qualities require real toughness. It takes strength and courage to be good, to stand for the principles which we all know are right. If we can help our youth develop this moral toughness, they will become the kind of citizens America needs to survive as a free Nation.

I cannot overemphasize the urgency of the delinquency situation. The current wave of youthful crime and vandalism is mounting in both size and intensity.

In community after community across the land, youthful hoodlums are going on the rampage. Juvenile arrests are rising at such a rate that 791,000 arrests of persons under 18 years of age are predicted for 1958—and 1 million will be recorded each year beginning 1962.

As I said 2 weeks ago in my first article in this series, juvenile lawlessness must be stopped. The time has come for a counterattack against juvenile delinquency.

Last week I outlined half of a counterattack against juvenile delinquency. I presented a six-point plan to control existing delinquency by:

1. Accenting the responsibilities of parents.
2. Improving our juvenile courts and juvenile-aid facilities.
3. Stopping the coddling of young criminals.
4. Stopping the protection of juvenile hoodlums by secrecy.
5. Cracking down on the corrupters of youth.
6. Attacking delinquency at the local level.

Fighting existing delinquency, however, is only half the problem. At the same time, we must also begin today to reestablish a firm moral structure to prevent future delinquency. We must stop sowing the seeds for more frightening delinquency in the years to come.

Today, I will suggest an approach to this most difficult problem. I will try to indicate a cure for the underlying sickness of our age which I call "decadence disease." If a cure can be found, if we can restore to America the firm moral precepts of our forefathers, we can ward off future delinquency.

How can we head off future delinquency? How can we convert the arrogant toughness of our teen-agers into a moral, constructive toughness? The best way is by example—adult example. Yet, as examples thousands of American mothers and fathers are proving themselves dismal failures.

The "decadence disease"

From the examples of these parents, more and more youngsters are learning dangerously harmful lessons: "Rules are made to be broken." "If you are smart enough, you can get away with anything." "After all, you only live once."

Corrupt slogans. Parents by their own words and deeds are beckoning youngsters to abandon the principles which have made this a great country.

"Decadence disease" is infecting our children. And self-indulgence, the insistence upon pleasure before duty, the constant search for "the easy way"—are its symptoms.

When a child is exposed to dubious morality at home, he invariably becomes confused. When glaring inconsistencies exist between what he is told is right and what he sees going on, neither praise nor criticism from his parents can have any real meaning. Mothers and fathers who bask in self-indulgence are grossly ineffective at disciplining their children or inspiring them toward worth while goals.

Confronted with the charge, "You kids are making this a lousy world," one member of a tough juvenile gang replied, "Yeah? That's the way we found it." And if the adult atmosphere surrounding this young

man and other members of "bopping" gangs is taken into consideration, it probably will be impossible to disagree with his flippant remark.

Discipline is the opposite of self-indulgence. Show me a home in which the parents practice self-discipline and I'll show you a home where a mother and father hold the love and respect of their children. A youngster asks only to be taught the boundaries of acceptable behavior. Discipline, fairly and consistently invoked, breeds pride and respect. And children want—desperately—to be disciplined.

They need guideposts

Superficially, they may rebel. But on a deeper level, where character is formed, a child wants to be told what he can and cannot do. He needs guideposts to help him orient himself to the world. He looks to his parents for these guideposts. If parents are lazy or indifferent or overindulgent, is it any wonder that a child loses love and respect for them? How can a child continue to look up to a parent who continually compromises and yields to him?

No American, regardless of his age, outgrows the need for discipline and self-discipline. In a democracy, restraint and self-control are essential in all phases of life. This fact should be evident to all normal adults, and it should serve as a guide to them in rearing their children.

Frankly, I become irritated when I hear doting mothers and fathers say, "I love Junior so much that I just can't bring myself to punish him." In reality, these parents do not love their children. It is a strange kind of love indeed which turns a normal infant into a maladjusted child.

And let there be no mistake, an undisciplined child cannot help being maladjusted. Frustration, tension, and resentment confront him on all sides.

On the west coast last February, three young boys were caught in the act of letting air out of automobile tires. The father of one of the boys, an 11-year-old, was summoned to police headquarters. Told that the youths had deflated scores of tires, the father unhesitatingly said, "Son, pump them up again." After supervising as the boys inflated 16 tires with hand pumps, he yielded a bit and rented a power air pump for them to use. But he saw to it that the job was completed.

What a refreshing and praiseworthy attitude. Contrast this with the attitude other parents whom law-enforcement agencies encounter day after day:

"Oh, no. Not my Harry. You officers are always picking on him. Why don't you let him alone?"

A firm hand

Pampering, overprotection, making excuses, and cooing soft words when a firm hand across the seat of the trousers would be more appropriate are practices which create contempt for authority and obstruct decency among youth. These practices are harmful enough when they exist merely in the home. But today we even find them spreading to some of our courts.

In California last year a 17-year-old hoodlum was arrested following an attempted burglary. This young criminal cursed at the arresting officers and boasted that regardless of the kind of report they made, the courts would release him in a couple of days. What made him so certain of this? "I've been arrested and released before," he sneered in defiance.

Near the Nation's capital, a 15-year-old was attacked from behind and viciously beaten by an older boy who was wielding a milk jug. The victim's skull was fractured, his nose broken, and he required a number of stitches. The attack was unprovoked. Yet, when the assailant appeared in court, the judge dismissed the assault charge.

In another case local policemen were assaulted by two 17-year-olds who called them obscene names and shouted at a crowd of people to help kill the officers. During the fracas a gun was taken from one of the teenagers. Both of these youths had police records. Yet, for openly defying the law, each of them was sentenced to serve only 60 days in jail and a term of probation.

Let there be no mistake. I do not advocate handling all violators under the same rules which are applied to hardened criminals. I do feel, however, that the seriousness of violating the law must be impressed upon juvenile delinquents and other young offenders. They must learn that, in spite of the leniencies they may receive in the interest of rehabilitation, and in spite of their youth, society still holds them responsible for their acts. And that repeated violations will not be tolerated—no matter how young the offender may be.

Appropriate punishments

In dealing with juveniles, it is essential that the punishment fit both the offense and the offender.

Earlier this year, six boys in Virginia were convicted of savagely beating and mistreating a mule. They used planks and pummeled the poor animal so cruelly that it was feared it would lose an eye. The judge who heard the case ordered that the boys be given what many may regard as an appropriate punishment, a good, sound, old-fashioned whipping by their parents. In addition, each of the six was released to the custody of his parents on strict injunction of good behavior until he attains the age of 18.

In another case, a 17-year-old boy who had committed extensive acts of vandalism in a high school was placed on probation under the provision that he find a part-time job after school and make restitution at the rate of $20 per month for the damage he had done.

If, as a result of their sentences, the six Virginia youths learn to respect the feelings of animals and the teen-age vandal learns to value the property of others, the courts will have helped them to become better citizens. What more can we ask of our juvenile courts than a record of positive accomplishments such as this?

But we must understand that a child will never reach a juvenile court if his parents believe and practice discipline. No child will hate his parents if firm but fair discipline is consistently applied. On the contrary, the youngster will feel his father and mother care enough about him to want to teach him the differences between right and wrong. Indifference and overindulgence breed contempt. Discipline breeds love.

The deadly slogans

Our teen-agers must be taught discipline outside the home, too. Many visitors to our shores simply cannot understand, for example, how an American youth could ever strike a teacher or, for that matter, refuse to obey a teacher's command. The homelands of these people have a deep-bred respect for teachers and other public officials.

The teens are difficult years. They are a stage of life when virtually every child begins to feel new pressures. "Conform." "Give in." "Join the crowd." "Don't be a square." These are more than expressions. They are real and awesome forces in the teen-age world.

The stereotype of our modern-day troubled teen-ager is an unruly, outspoken, rock-and-roll addict who cruises the streets in a souped-up jalopy, shouting insults out the window. In appearance he aspires to looking shaggy and to leaving behind the impression that he has not been near a barbershop in weeks.

The teen-agers who fit into this general pattern are fickle, aimless and confused. Whether drag racing down a major highway or thumping a pencil in dejected boredom over their schoolwork, these boys and girls feel a basic insecurity. A void exists in their lives, and they are constantly experimenting—shifting from one fad and one "craze" to another—trying often pathetically to fill the gap.

The bravado and self-confident air of these youngsters veil only thinly a basic fear and uncertainty, an emptiness which gnaws deep in their souls. These children long for something which cannot be found without the help of adult society: discipline and direction.

We are plagued by a growing juvenile problem only because adult America has failed its youth. Rather than standing aloof and asking "What is the younger generation coming to?" we adults must establish a closer relationship with our youngsters. They need standards, goals, wholesome examples. They need vision and imagination such as burned so intensely in the hearts of our forefathers. They need adults who will help give direction to their lives.

In my book, "Masters of Deceit," I wrote: "* * * youth gravitates toward companionship with competent, generous, and experienced adults. * * * If the adults can show, in action, that it is possible to combine high idealism with solid practicality and patience, the results will enhance character and citizenship development manifold."

Our adult delinquency

Herein lies the solution to the problem. We adults must set the example for young America. Let us invade the juvenile world with ideals. Let us bring meaning and purpose into the lives of our children. Let us leave no room in their minds for ugly thoughts or vicious deeds. And they will have no need to turn to either criminality or to communism to fill a void.

If we adults succeed, if we can change destructive toughness to firm moral toughness, we will have succeeded in preventing delinquency in the future. And we will have bequeathed to our children—and to our Nation—the greatest gift of all. We will have given them the toughness, moral fiber, strength and courage to keep our Nation strong and free.

A Solemn Inaugural

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and as an adjunct to my reintroduction this week of a resolution proposing a Christian amendment to our Federal Constitution, I wish to quote the radio message of Dr. R. J. G. McKnight delivered on the Christian Amendment Hour under the title of "A Solemn Inaugural."

The message is as follows:

A SOLEMN INAUGURAL

(Radio message by the Rev. R. J. G. McKnight, D.D., Ph. D.)

This series of broadcasts is designed to reach the minds of all true Americans. These discussions are not to be political, patrisan, denominational, or sectarian—in any sense. They are addressed to loyal citizens of the United States who love their country and seek for it the "blessedness of a nation whose God is the Lord."

Life magazine, in its portrayal of the inauguration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, January 21, 1957, for a second term in office, used this caption (Feb. 4, 1957): "A Solemn Inaugural and a Gay Celebration."

The writer in Life magazine, with a keen sense of the relative importance of things, has caught and brought together in the heading of his article the two dominant emotions which surged in the hearts of 75 millions of Americans who watched the proceedings on television, or heard them by radio.

The solemnity of the induction as Mr. Eisenhower, with his left hand upon the open Bible, his finger pointing to the words, "Blessed is [in Hebrew 'Oh the blessedness of] the nation whose God is the Lord," and his right hand raised to God, in whose presence he was standing, was emphasized as he added to the words of the oath prescribed in the Constitution—the prayer, "So help me God."

It is no wonder that Mr. Eisenhower, a Christian, should say to the many reporters gathered about him, "And I will tell you this: When you stand up in front of America and take your oath * * * you can't feel anything but solemn."

Not only so but clergymen of four different faiths offered prayers that God would give the President His blessing and divine guidance in the performance of the duties which belong to the high office of the Presidency of the United States.

Furthermore, those who followed the prayers carefully, observed that three of the clergymen offered their petitions to God, the Father, and "in the name and for the sake of the Lord Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Saviour."

The Reverend Dr. Edward Elson, Mr. Eisenhower's pastor, implored Almighty God to "guard, guide, and empower Thy servants in this solemn hour of dedication."

In his first inaugural, the President prefaced his address with a prayer, which he had written. On this latter occasion, while he did not offer a formal prayer, he declared that "peace with justice" is the "bold and solemn purpose" of his second White House term. He branded "international communism and the power that it controls" as "the great divisive force" loose in a world which, he said, rarely has "known such peril as today." And closed with this petition: "May the light of freedom, coming to all darkened lands, flame brightly until at last the darkness is no more."

The whole address rose above party and above nationalism in its appeal to all men who love freedom to join with America to break the tyranny of atheistic communism.

Never before in the inauguration of our Presidents has our dependence upon God been so clearly enunciated.

The Reverend Dr. Elson, Mr. Eisenhower's pastor, in his sermon on January 20, in the presence of Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Nixon, said: "To be under God is to acknowledge that this is God's world, that He is the Sovereign Lord and Ruler of all life. He is the God of Creation * * * Americans believe that God is above the Nation."

He also said: "Rightly do we sing:

"'Our Father's God, to Thee,
Author of liberty,
To Thee we sing.
Long may our land be bright,
With Freedom's holy light.
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King.'"

To quote once more from Dr. Elson's sermon. He said: "To be under God is to be guided by Him. That nation which seeks to understand and obey His laws; that nation which seeks to discern and do His will—only that nation becomes an effective instrument of God's purpose on earth. Above all, over all, guiding and empowering all is the transcendent God. To the degree we possess His mind and spirit which is at the center of the universe, and which we Christians believe to be revealed by Jesus Christ, we are and shall remain a Nation under God.

"'In the beginning God.' On these first words of the Bible early America staked down its life."

Dr. Elson is right. And the further we go back into the beginning of our Nation the more evident it becomes that the Founding Fathers "staked down" the "very life" of the Nation they proposed to establish on these shores, on the doctrine of the Sovereignty of God and of the Kingship of Christ as the One to whom all authority in heaven and on earth has been committed.

Read the compact made on board the *Mayflower*, November 11, 1620, which reads in part as follows: "In the name of God, amen. We, whose names are underwritten, * * * having undertaken for the glory of God, and the advancement of the Christian faith * * * a voyage to plant the first Colony in the northern parts of Virginia; * * * do by these presents solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politick, for our better ordering and preservation, and furtherance of the ends aforesaid."

The charters of the 13 Colonies—"laid down authoritatively the Christian principles in accordance with which their governments were to be administered, and made suitable acknowledgments of God the Creator as their source of authority."

The effect of these firm pronouncements is found in the provision for Chaplains in Congress, our establishment of the day of Thanksgiving, our motto "In God we trust" on our coins and postage stamps and, more recently, the inclusion of the words "under God" in our pledge of allegiance to the flag.

There are evidences that Christian citizens of the United States are coming to realize that, in the turmoil of the world, there is need for a closer walk with God.

What will the next step be?

What ought the next step to be?

It seemed to many who heard the President take the oath as it was administered by the Chief Justice, as it is prescribed in the Constitution—and the Chief Justice in administering the oath felt that there was something lacking in the constitutional oath—something that should have been there and was not there.

Both the President and the Chief Justice knew the nature and the form of the prescribed oath.

They had taken the oath in the prescribed form many times.

Were they aware that the oath was not what it ought to be?

Otherwise why did the Chief Justice add to the oath the words—words which are not in the oath—"So help you God"? And did Mr. Eisenhower, by answering solemnly and firmly in words which are not in the oath, "So help me God"—did he in doing that indicate his belief that an oath is not a valid oath unless it contains an appeal to God?

A Study of the Present Russian Civilization and Its People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert an article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is perhaps a little different from the type that usually is inserted.

The title of the article is "Pasternak and the Russian Community" and was written by Charles B. McLane, professor of Russian civilization at Dartmouth College, where students desiring to do so may major in Russian civilization.

The question might be raised, What has a book review to do with legislation? The point is this: A more thorough knowledge of Russian civilization and the Russian people is very important if this Congress is to legislate intelligently in many fields from defense to education.

If the Un-American Activities Committee has run out of things to do, which I do not believe is the case, it might undertake a comprehensive study of the present Russian civilization and its people. Such a study would be invaluable to the legislative committees, including the committee concerned with studying and passing out legislation designed to cope with the threat of Communist infiltration into the United States and other countries with whom we are allied. This article by Professor McLane provides a good philosophic starting point.

I am happy to advise that the Joint Economic Committee is going to update and make more comprehensive its study of Russia's economy within the ensuing months. The last study of the committee, "Soviet Economic Growth: A Comparison With the United States," made in 1957, limited as it is, provides about the best information we have today on the Russian economy. It is when I look at the limitations of this study and realize that it is the best we have that I begin to worry.

It is important that we start discussing Russia from the standpoint of knowledge and facts instead of as a convenient bogeyman to try to get Federal appropriations for the Defense Department or for Federal research or for Federal aid to education.

As I have said many times before in speeches on the floor of the House by overestimating Russia—if we are—we enhance her reputation in the eyes of the uncommitted peoples of the world. The dangers of underestimating Russia have been sufficiently elaborated upon by people in public life and in the public relations media so that I am satisfied we have little to fear that we might go that route.

It is my personal conviction after some degree of studying the matter that we are continuing to badly overestimate Russia; and certainly in our statements in regard to Russia's accomplishments, and she has had many, we have been unanalytical.

Russia has not followed pure Marxism for several decades. In many ways she is going further and further away from communism to adopt procedures and principles which are peculiar to the private enterprise system. Khrushchev is quoted recently as laughing at one of the basic doctrines of communism "to each according to his needs, from each according to his abilities.", as well he might. Certainly Soviet Russia of 1959

is hardly a society where that principle is observed.

As a working hypothesis I suggest that Russia has been able to advance economically almost in ratio to the extent to which she has abandoned communism. If this hypothesis is true we had better start getting that information out to the peoples of the rest of the world who might otherwise be tempted to become a part of the Russian empire thinking that they were becoming part of a Communist system that had worked so well.

I have a further hypothesis that the extent to which the United States has not been going ahead is the extent to which she has been going away from the private enterprise system and adopting certain of the ineffectual programs of state socialism, or communism, if you please.

The reader will note the reference in the first paragraph of Professor McLane's article as follows:

Soviet Russia's alleged educational accomplishments (alleged, incidentally, much more noisily here than in the Soviet Union where the entire educational edifice has been undergoing an agonizing reappraisal).

At another point in the RECORD I am inserting the remarks I made last year before the subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee considering Federal scholarship programs.

Professor McLane's article follows:

PASTERNAK AND THE RUSSIAN COMMUNITY

(By Charles B. McLane, 1941, professor of Russian civilization at Dartmouth, joined the faculty in 1957, was cultural attaché with the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, 1950–52, and formerly taught at Swarthmore College)

The Pasternak affair has been on many minds in recent months and will not soon be forgotten. I think the episode met a need in the United States. It came at a time when for more than a year the news out of Russia had been too good for our peace of mind—sputniks, alleged educational accomplishments (alleged, incidentally, much more noisily here than in the Soviet Union where the entire educational edifice has been undergoing an agonizing reappraisal), and, as usual, continued success relative to ours in diplomatic gambits. It was therefore comforting to have world opinion reminded—we, of course, knew it all along—that persecution of non-conformity is a more enduring characteristic of the Soviet system than a show of free competition in the world of ideas and values.

This sense of relief is natural enough and, all things considered, not a wholly unworthy emotion. But it has made more difficult a dispassionate evaluation of Pasternak's controversial book as a work of art. The fact that few here have heard of Boris Pasternak prior to the publication of Doctor Zhivago last summer (despite the recognition long since accorded him outside the Soviet Union as one of the foremost Russian poets of this century) is far less disturbing than the general unwillingness, with the book now before us, to judge it except in a purely political context.

A colleague whose perception in literary matters I generally respect recently expressed the view that it was not really necessary to trouble with Zhivago, was it? In a season so crowded with other talent—like "that other Russian," as he called him, Loelta's Nabokov—there was hardly place for a Russian martyr whose notoriety sprang from the proffer, and his rejection, of a Nobel Prize.

The difficulty Americans have with Pasternak, even when they try, is one of access—access to his rich but immensely involved language. It is generally recognized that the present American edition of Zhivago is an inadequate translation, but it is also true that no translation of Pasternak can be entirely adequate. For he is a poet, and a particularly difficult poet, despite the fact that he has described Zhivago, whimsically, as a "novel in prose." Small wonder, then, that many honest citizens who have read the American Zhivago conscientiously have been puzzled by the acclaim it has received. So far as the Nobel Prize is concerned, they have murmured "Politics!" (murmured so as not to be mistaken for Soviet pundits who of course are saying the same thing). Others, searching further for the greatness, have attempted to locate it in Pasternak's continuation of the tradition of "War and Peace" a vast Russian panorama, in the old manner, against a background of war and social upheaval. But Pasternak is only incidentally concerned with these matters. So little is he preoccupied with the Revolution, for instance, that the reader with even modest knowledge of chronology is hard put to say at what juncture in history this or that episode in his narrative occurs.

Not revolution, but the impact of revolution on man, and more particularly the capturing of the transformations which arise from this impact in a prose that has few peers in the Russian language—this is Pasternak's business. To Soviet bureaucrats the infuriating thing about Pasternak, in Zhivago as in all his work, must be not that he is hostile to the Revolution—this they could deal with—but that in a deeper sense he ignores it. This in Russia is unpardonable.

It must be obvious then that a proper review of Zhivago is a very exacting and scientific exercise, far beyond the scope of these brief observations and beyond the capacities of the present writer, a political scientist. To qualify, one should be versed in symbolism, in Joyce and Proust (despite the fact that Pasternak has evidently turned to Proust only in recent months), and in the entire evolution of modern formalism. Zhivago is a book in this tradition. To seek mere entertainment in it, larded perhaps with a vaguely social message, is to miss the whole point of Pasternak's effort.

No writer, not even Pasternak, can be judged wholly outside his times and his community. It is currently fashionable, of course, to picture Pasternak as an indomitable David living in splendid aloofness and disdaining modern Soviet Goliaths such as Surfkov (head of the writers' union) and Semichastny (a particularly arid persecutor from the Komsomol). He is imagined as the rare flower that blooms from a barren land. Moreover, Soviet propaganda itself inadvertently supports this thesis by insisting so stridently that Pasternak was never and is not now a member of the integrated Soviet community. But Pasternak himself speaks otherwise. In declining, under pressure, the Swedish prize, he gave as his reason the opprobrium attached to this honor "in the society to which I belong." This was understood abroad to have been a gesture, necessary as a minimum stratagem for survival, but meaningless. Since, however, Pasternak is a man not easily cowed and not one to resort lightly to stratagems, it is worth reexamining his claim. Is he part of the Soviet community? More particularly, has his greatness in any sense been nurtured by this community to which he claims to belong?

In certain specific respects Pasternak unquestionably is—or was until very recently—a member in passable standing of the Soviet literary community. For instance, his home in the dacha-village of Peredelkino, a refuge and resort for established Soviet writers, testifies to this. His income was assured through translations of Shakespeare and Georgian verse. Much of his own poetry has circulated in manuscript for years and evidently has not been without influence on younger writers (though admittedly, the influence is not yet apparent). He has not been without companionship. Even his silence has been tolerated. All this suggests that Pasternak has been less in a state of absolute isolation than is sometimes fondly imagined.

Yet, when all is said and done, the question of his being truly a part of Russian society today remains unanswerable so long as he stands thus sharply opposed to its official spokesmen. One thing only is certain: he belongs to no other community. Some day, under happier circumstances, "Doctor Zhivago" will be read in Russia—where, of course, it has not yet appeared. As Edmund Wilson predicted in The New Yorker of November 15, in one of the finest reviews of the book yet to appear, the children of Pasternak's present persecutors will speak of Larisa, Zhivago and Antipov as naturally as their parents now speak of Tatiana, Onegin and Lensky, or of Natash, Pierre and Bolkonsky.

Fair Campaign Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing aspects of American political campaigns is the frequent use of smear techniques on the part of campaigners or their supporters. Vigorous political debate and honest public criticism are essential ingredients in a healthy political process, but slander, character assassination, and distortion have no place in a democracy.

In an effort to curb some of the shabby campaign practices that have been displayed in recent campaigns, the Fair Campaign Practices Committee was formed under the leadership of a number of concerned citizens of both political parties. Mr. Charles P. Taft and founding member and present chairman of the committee reviews some of the committee's observations to date in an article which appeared in the October 12, 1958, New York Times magazine which I include at this point:

CAMPAIGN TO STOP THE CAMPAIGN SMEAR

(By Charles P. Taft)

Webster defines the word "smear" thus: "To besmirch, sully, defame; specifically to vilify by applying a debasing epithet (smear word) or by secretly and maliciously spreading gross charges or imputations." Meade Alcorn, Republican National Chairman, has his own political test for defining smear, which he says has kept him out of trouble: "Is it true? And is it relevant?"

The problem of what constitutes a political smear is one that arises almost every week during national political campaigns. In 1951 the problem was etched on the public mind by the Senate Subcommittee on Elections, exploring the excesses of the Butler-Tydings campaign of 1950 in Maryland. This led to the formation, in the fall of 1954, of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee. The citizens who organized the group were outstanding men and women of

both major parties, increasingly concerned over the substitution of accusation and vilification for fact and argument by candidates. The committee set out to induce all candidates for Congress and State governorships to sign—and thus to pledge publicly to observe—a code of fair campaign practices based on the proposals of the 1951 Senate Elections Subcommittee. Among the practices the signers agreed to shun were:

Personal vilification, character defamation, whispering campaigns, libel, slander and scurrilous attacks on a candidate or his personal or family life.

Use of campaign material which misrepresents, distorts or otherwise falsifies facts, and malicious or unfounded accusations aiming to create or exploit doubts without justification as to a candidate's loyalty.

Appeals to racial or religious prejudice.

The final plank in the code committed candiates who signed it immediately and publicly to repudiate support based on such tactics.

Many candidates in 1954 signed. But not all observed the code, as political observers with any memory can vouch. Yet it represented a start in a direction that members of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee felt was not only essential but considerably overdue. The committee met in 1956, and found compliance with the code by candidates substantially above the 1954 level. Paul Butler and Leonard Hall, Democratic and Republican national chairmen, respectively, in 1956, appeared publicly in Washington to sign the code. And last month Butler and Meade Alcorn, Hall's successor, likewise signed and publicly endorsed the code that, if followed, could change the nature of much of the political campaigning that has characterized our land of the free—and the free swinging.

Why all this concern over campaign techniques? Is not electioneering in the rough-and-tumble style of the frontier an indelible part of the American tradition? After all, have not American election campaigns down through history been pretty raw?

They certainly have. No American statesman now safely ensconced—indeed, revered—in the history books has been proof against calumny on the hustings. George Washington was verbally scarred in the infant days of the Nation. Jefferson was called "worse than a traitor." In the Jackson period, handbills called Old Hickory a murderer and graphically presented the theme with woodcuts of 13 coffins. Lincoln was described as "that obscene ape from Illinois." The legitimacy of Cleveland's child was the subject of japery in the streets. Theodore Roosevelt was described—among the more charitable epithets—as "that damned cowboy." And the maledictions pronounced upon Hoover and Franklin Roosevelt are still within the memory of many adults.

If in earlier days it was commonplace for a candidate to traduce his opponent in a libelous fashion, why the concern today?

For one thing, the wrenching change in communication has altered the freedom that at one time surrounded a politician seeking votes in a small and isolated community. What once could be said free of the risk of offending a voter 50 miles away cannot be uttered now without being offered, via the press associations and television, to the whole Nation. A candidate for national office, seeking to stir voters in one of New York City's 22 congressional districts, can, if his oration is fiery enough, turn voters in California for—or more likely against—his whole party.

Another factor is the increasing self-consciousness of ethnic and religious minority groups in the United States. Negroes, Jews, Italians, Irish, Germans, Poles, and Mexicans have become numerous enough in some areas to wield significant—indeed, decisive—political power within their communities.

Occasionally they have voted as blocs, and sometimes still do. In the political world, when blocs develop, they are courted for their bloc vote. And when a bloc is large enough so its vote may elect or defeat, it not only is courted as a bloc but in some quarters is feared. Even the small extremist groups may be something to be feared, especially when they are represented by fanatical and able hate merchants.

Where do we stand today in our efforts to bring about observance of a fair campaign code? Most campaigns for major office are less offensive than the classic examples of high, wide, and anything-but-handsome electioneering in the old days. But the exceptions, while arithmetically modest, are glaring and dangerous in the light of today's communication system.

In 1950, the Nation was shocked by the Maryland senatorial campaign already referred to, in which a composograph merged one picture of former Senator Tydings with quite another picture of Communist leader Earl Browder. The end result, a seemingly candid photo showing the conservative southern Democrat in intimate conversation with the onetime Communist chief, carried much weight with Maryland votors.

In 1952 and 1953, a rash of fast and loose accusations of softness or lack of due diligence toward communism, playing on the national temper of the time, helped divert public attention from records and issues. It was the excesses of this period that stimulated the establishment of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee.

During the 1956 campaign our committee received few complaints of violation of the code, and political observers felt there was less vituperation than in recent years. But before we could congratulate ourselves we began to hear rumors from here and there that one or another candidate had been the victim of a Machiavellian smear effort.

Disturbed, we launched in 1957 what now will be a biennial, off-year, State-by-State study of the actual use of smear. To our surprise and pleasure we received the instant and enthusiastic cooperation of nearly two-thirds of the 96 State chairmen of both parties.

What we found last year did not square at all with the initial report about the ethical level of the 1956 campaign. In 26 States one or both parties claimed one or more of their candidates had been smeared. Effects varied widely. Smear elected some candidates whom it was intended to help, but in some cases it backfired and defeated some candidates it aimed to elect.

In one case, a senatorial candidate had his putative Washington romantic life explored in the style of a sensational magazine. In another, a candidate who, a generation earlier, had been indicted for embezzlement and subsequently cleared when the culprit confessed, was assailed with photo reproductions of the clipping announcing his indictment, with, naturally, no mention of his exoneration. In an Eastern State a teetotaler was described as a drunk, and in the Midwest a moderate drinker was described as a prohibitionist plotting secretly to dry up his State's resort areas.

Although the Communist issue was on the wane as an automatic vote getter, a Senate candidate was, for the third time, the target of a brochure printed on pink paper, citing parts of his voting record out of context to make him look like a slave to the Communist Party line. The gambit, which had twice kept him from the Senate, this time failed and he won election.

The antilabor issue was raised with increasing frequency and stridency in 1956. One candidate was described as the beneficiary of vast labor contributions and the recipient of detailed labor instructions. He was depicted in a prominent newspaper side by side with his State's then CIO chief, ostensibly taking orders. Investigation revealed that the photograph had been cropped to eliminate a third man—the head of a manufacturers' association. The man in the middle, the candidate, had been mediating a labor dispute.

In the same State this year, a member of the opposite party running for the same post received a telegram from a labor leader demanding that he repudiate a statement contemptuous of labor that had been attributed to him. The candidate, instead of answering by wire or mail, went personally to confront his accuser. He asked what could have prompted such a charge from a labor leader he long had counted as a friend. "I know it's a lie, you know it's a lie, and I know you know it's a lie," he said.

Nothing came of the episode for several weeks. Then, virtually on election eve, anonymously distributed handbills quote the telegram, and added the utterly false statement that the candidate had not even answered the accusation.

The Negro issue began to come to the fore in 1956. In one Midwest State a letter ostensibly on the letterhead of a southern white citizen's council (which eventually proved to be nonexistent) suggested that a vote for the Democrats would keep Southern Democrats in control of Congress, and that these men could be relied on to keep the colored in their place. The catch was that, seemingly inadvertently, the letter went to Negro voters in a heavily Democratic district.

Last year, in a special election for Congress in an eastern district, the Negro issue figured in anonymously distributed literature. Negroes were touted off the Democratic candidate with inflammatory photo reproductions of Negroes being clubbed by white men. The conditions leading to such maltreatment were ascribed to Democrats in Congress.

Already this fall, somewhat in advance of the last-minute period so commonly associated with scurrilous campaign literature, a Republican candidate for State office in a rural southern district is a target of hate literature which depicts—in this heavily prosegregation district—a Negro man and a white woman on a bed. Fully clothed, but on a bed nonetheless. This, the leaflet suggests, is to become commonplace if the candidate, a known integrationist, is elected.

Integration is not the only inflammatory 1958 issue that lends itself to such tactics. Labor always produces a hot argument, and promises to do so more and more, with a good many right-to-work proposals on the State ballots.

The Knowland-Brown-Joe Kamp affair in California has lately been in the headlines. Kamp, a notorious pamphleteer, had written a lengthy screed against Walter Reuther which seemed apt to some of the supporters of Senator Knowland, Republican candidate for Governor. Mrs. Knowland, who did not recognize Kamp's name and reputation, initially authorized some distribution of the pamphlets among proponents of the right-to-work plank of Knowland's platform in California.

Paul Butler, as Democratic National Chairman, objected in accents of righteous indignation, tempered probably only by partisan glee at being handed so eminently exploitable an issue. He demanded that Meade Alcorn repudiate the pamphlet, which Alcorn immediately did.

From this point supporters of Edmund (Pat) Brown, Knowland's Democratic opponent, took up the cry in California, bending every effort to make the Knowland team look not only like "right to work" advocates but the willing beneficiaries of neo-Fascists as well.

Where does righteous attack on a smear leave off and smearing-by-crying-smear begin? The line is difficult to draw. And in the California case it is complicated by the fact that the principals of the piece are not candidates.

Kamp's pamphlet was directed at Reuther. In much of it Reuther was described in terms for the most part quite acceptable to many conservative Republicans, and, indeed, acceptable to many Democrats fearful of increasing labor dominance of politics. But this was not enough for the pamphleteer. In addition to denouncing the labor leader in terms acceptable—or at least tolerable—in polite society, Kamp also characterized Reuther in some dreadfully intemperate language—"foul-mouthed agitator * * * vile perveyor [sic] of vicious slander * * * ruthless, reckless, lawless labor goon * * * persistent prevaricator * * * double-talking, rabble-rousing opportunist who glibly repeats the fallacious fulminations of his Red-tinged ghostwriters * * * an evil genius."

At all events, Alcorn repudiated Kamp, and Knowland stopped distribution of the pamphlet as soon as he learned of it, on the stated ground that it carried no printing trade union label. Joe Kamp could hardly get one. But this did not deter some of the Brown forces from identifying the Knowland people with every Kamp association that could be disinterred, including a jail sentence for contempt of Congress. Guilt by association has not often been a Democratic argument.

Even with the change in the national temper that has obtained on the Communist issue since the demise of Senator McCarthy, the issue is not dead in 1958. It has been raised in the campaign of a Western Congressman whose name appeared on letterheads of organizations once described by a House Un-American Activities Committee report as subversive. Despite the fact that Un-American Activities Committee members on both sides of the aisle defended the Congressman against any implication of knowing participation in pro-Communist ventures, the charge—not made by his opponent, but by an independent newsletter operator in Washington—is doing his campaign considerable harm, it is feared.

The unique thing about this case is that it has cropped up early in the campaign. Traditionally, the time for this sort of attack is the last week before election. The Congressman in this instance has already had time enough to file a libel suit, and conceivably could have it tried before election day. This might suggest that the smear artists are losing their sense of timing. If so, we can all rejoice. But if not, as is more likely to be the case, what needs to be done about the problem? Indeed, what can be done?

In my estimation, public education at every level is the only ultimate answer. The Fair Campaign Practices Committee has initiated five steps that I believe are making slow but real headway.

First, and longest range, is education in the schools. Two years ago, none of the major high school texts in American Government or the like dealt directly with smear tactics in an election campaign. This gap is being filled. We have developed a teaching-aids program which integrates material covering this subject with existing texts. Authors and publishers of textbooks have begun to use it in new books and revisions of present ones.

College political science texts, since our committee began agitating on the subject a few years ago, are beginning to deal with it at new and greater length. Our young citizens will emerge from school with a more realistic idea of the distinctions they must be prepared to make as mature and voting citizens.

Second, our State-by-State smear study enables us to keep abreast of what actually is being done, by whom, against whom and where, and to make it known in an off-year when the vision of the people is less campaign inflamed.

Third, we are working with civic and church organizations, which enjoy a unique capacity to translate latent concern among the citizens into active political and social terms. As more and more voters become more sophosticated about dirty campaigning better able to spot a smear or a whispering campaign or to suspect a rumor or half-truth or cropped photo—the profit in these tactics, which always is in proportion to the difficulty of detecting them, will dwindle. Then, more and more smears will boomerang. When this happens, obviously, they will stop—we hope. (Already we have found that one of three smears backfires.)

Fourth, in a series of public conferences undertaken this year we have found intense interest, not only among civic leaders but also among individual citizens concerned with political morality, in what steps can be taken to mitigate the evil of scurrilous electioneering. We will continue and extend such meetings.

Finally, the usefulness of working with politicians themselves must not be underestimated. Though never really true, it is no longer quite so fashionable as it once was to count all politics as a dirty business, beneath the participation of decent men and women. I have grown up among politics and politicians, from the presidential to the city council level. I know that politicians are decent and responsible citizens, with only a few exceptions—certainly no more proportionately than there are in business.

Our program is working to destroy the lethargy that leaves political control in the hands of a few and deprives the many, by default, of a voice in choosing party leaders and party platforms. Responsible political figures at every level are among the most enthusiastic supporters of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee. We intend to continue to court their support.

I might say in conclusion that the current "Don't Pass the Buck" drive is working in its own way to improve the level of citizen participation in politics—and thereby the level of politics. Yet, I cannot leave the subject without a plea for the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, which, with a small but influential membership of distinguished citizens and a small and devoted staff is working without regard for a constant and demoralizing financial problem to bring the solid but largely unspoken moral convictions of more Americans to bear more and more directly on politics.

And, after all, the quality of our politics is the way we in America claim to distinguish ourselves from and above the rest of the world today. If you are concerned give—and think, talk, and write about it.

Uniforms for Holders of the Medal of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 86th Congress, I introduced H.R. 121, a bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of uniforms to persons awarded the Medal of Honor. This is the same bill I introduced in the 85th Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include copy of letter which I received from Mr. Miles D. Kennedy, director of the legislative commission, the American Legion, together with copy of resolution adopted at the 1958 national convention of the American Legion, supporting this measure:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D.C., January 5, 1959.

Hon. ELIZABETH KEE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN KEE: Referring to your bill H.R. 12631 which you introduced on May 22, 1958, relative to furnishing uniforms to holders of the Medal of Honor, I enclose a copy of Resolution 181 adopted at our 1958 national convention supporting your bill.

In view of the enclosed resolution we would be more than pleased to have you reintroduce your bill during the early days of the 86th Congress.

Thanking you for your courtesy and with every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,
MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

RESOLUTION 181 (WEST VIRGINIA)

Committee: Military affairs.

Subject: Men receiving the Congressional Medal of Honor be furnished uniforms be consolidated with Resolution 181 and adopted.

Whereas there are approximately 340 men upon whom the Nation's highest militiary honor was bestowed who are still living; and

Whereas these men are the symbols of the highest traditions of bravery and devotion to the armed services and to our country; and

Whereas these Medal of Honor winners are asked on many occasions to participate in civic and patriotic events every year, such as Armed Servicez Day, Veterans Day, Medal of Honor conventions, conventions of civic and fraternal organizations, dedications and other memorable affairs; and

Whereas most of these men have been out of military service for many years and do not have uniforms suitable for these occasions; and

Whereas it is appropriate that these men of valor, who have earned the highest recognition within the gift of a grateful nation, be outfitted with the necessaray and appropriate uniforms to wear at the many public functions they are expected to attend: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved That The American Legion in national convention assembled in Chicago, Ill., September 1–4, 1958, support in every appropriate manner a similar bill to H.R. 12631 in the House of Representatives introduced by Representative ELIZABETH KEE, of the 5th Congressional District of the State of West Virginia in the 85th Congress which provides that, "At the request of any such person who was awarded a Medal of Honor in the name of Congress, the Secretary concerned shall, not more than once each 3 years and under such regulations as he may prescribe, furnish such a person an appropriate class a summer and winter uniform (including insignia) without charge."

Approved.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

Jim Wright's Christmas Newsletter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in the 12th District of Texas, Representative JAMES C. WRIGHT, JR., has the reputation of speaking from the heart as well as from the head. This amazing and energetic young man grew up in a small town, subsequently becoming mayor of it, and still later serving as member of the Texas Legislature. He is now a Representative in the Congress from the fourth largest city in Texas.

JIM WRIGHT has a way of speaking his mind that is both refreshing and compelling, and he is a writer, moreover, of considerable power and warmth. In his newsletter for Christmas week, JIM WRIGHT sent out a rather remarkable document that is a lesson, I think, for all of us.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD JIM WRIGHT'S Christmas newsletter, along with an excellent editorial from the Dallas Morning News commenting on Congressman WRIGHT'S proposals.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Dec. 25, 1958]

IT'S A STRANGE CHRISTMAS

It is a strange Christmas in a strange world. We send four tons of potential destruction careening around the globe and install in it a mechanism to proclaim peace on earth and good will toward men everywhere. The strange part about it is that we really mean the destruction—and we really mean the benediction.

If Ivanovich and John Doe could only sit down together, as Representative JIM WRIGHT, of Fort Worth, suggests, they would have no trouble at all finding that they could understand each other and get along with each other. But the people at the summit stand in the way. That is why all our summit conferences fail.

Speaking for John Doe, JIM WRIGHT suggests that Russia and the United States forget a part of their program for destroying each other and invest the savings in health. Health isn't dangerous. It isn't subversive. Nobody wants to shoot health or exile it to Siberia. Everybody can use health.

Well, then, says John Doe, per JIM WRIGHT, speaking to Ivan Ivanovich, why not have a new 5-year plan for Russia and for the United States, too? In 5 years Russia will spend, under this plan, the one-half amount of rubles Russia now spends each year in getting ready to wipe out the United States. And in that 5 years, the United States spends one-half the amount of dollars that it spends getting ready to wipe out Russia.

At the end of the 5 years, every town of 10,000 population in the whole world would have a hospital. There would be money left over for schools and colleges. And typhoid, smallpox, malaria, leprosy, and yellow fever would be disappearing from the earth.

And somewhere, maybe, in all this, the world would learn the lessons of peace and brotherly love and of the divine providence which sent the Christ Child to us almost 2,000 years ago.

THE WRIGHT SLANT ON WASHINGTON

"There went out a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be taxed."

As I look through the window today upon Washington—like Rome, a city from which decrees go out—I can see the severely beautiful Washington Monument. In the eye of imagination it looks like the finger of a wise man pointing to a new star in the heavens. On the Ellipse behind the White House towers the national Christmas tree, tall as a six-story building.

Aside from such landmarks, Washington is just about like any other big city at Christmastime; neither better nor worse. There is the same commercialism, the same emphasis on material things, the same congested traffic and frantic haste. And, as in every other city, the only time you can really see the light that shone over the shepherds on their hilltop in Judea is when you look closely into the eyes of a little child.

"And she brought forth her first-born son and wrapped him in swaddling clothes and laid him in a manger, because there was no room for them in the inn."

Just as it was in Bethlehem, so it is in Washington in 1958. No room under the tree for another present. No room in the post office for another package. No room on our engagement pads for an additional plan. No room in the department store aisles for another shopper. And in too many hearts—no room for Him and His message of a better way.

At the conference tables in Geneva and elsewhere men discuss more and more and settle less and less because there is no room in their minds for a new idea of peace on earth—still new and still largely untried after 2,000 years. Our thoughts are on guided missiles with nuclear warheads, and not on the star.

"And, lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shown round about them: and they were sore afraid."

Afraid? Well, yes, the average person in today's world is afraid. And maybe that's one reason we stay so busy, so we won't have time to think about it.

"And the angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people."

To all people? Even to those we don't like and don't trust? Even to those who plot and plan against us? Good tidings to Democrats and Republicans alike? To the rude motorist who squeezed you out of your lane in the Christmas traffic today? Good tidings of great joy—even to the Russians? Well, that's what the angel said.

"And on earth, peace, good will toward men."

"Peace," the word the angels sang, must have seemed as impossible a dream in those days as it does now. There was then, as now, the temporary absence of major armed conflict, the uneasy, and repressed order of a Pax Romana. But real peace must be something more than just a nervous stalemate enforced by fear. It has something to do with good will.

Is there any real basis for good will? Did the angels speak the truth? Did he who lay in the sweet straw of the manger amid the barnyard noises bring into the world a flowering promise that lives and grows in the hearts of men amid even the bitter passions of this hour?

We say he did. We who celebrate his birth state that he did. And how strongly do we feel it?

Suppose that each of us could write a sincere and searching letter to someone—average as ourselves—in Russia, a letter to those who are the victims of a cruel history and an ugly system which has turned out the lights of Christmas. Who knows what good we might accomplish could we but establish intimate communications with these people? I'd like to write such a Christmas letter to all the plain, afraid, average men who live in Russia. And here is what I'd say:

"DEAR IVAN: I've been thinking about you. I've been wondering how you were. Guess it must be mighty cold over there. It's been downright chilly here, in fact. Hope you've got a nice, warm place for the wife and kids.

"We're feeling pretty warm inside right now. It's Christmastime. You see, Ivan, a lot of us have the belief that God himself came to earth in the person of a man and taught that all of us should love each other. That may sound a little silly to you, maybe a bit overly sentimental. Anyway, that's what we celebrate at Christmas.

"Let me be painfully frank about this thing, Ivan, and admit that I haven't been feeling very kindly toward you lately. Guess you haven't felt exactly good about me, either. Truthfully, I suppose we've both been a little bit afraid. For one thing, we believe in entirely different economic systems. Now, I'm convinced that our system of capitalism or free enterprise is the best. But if you don't like it, Ivan, I certainly don't want to force it on you. That comes under the heading of your own business.

"Why can't we just look at this thing straight and agree that we have a healthy competition going on between us to prove which system can do a better job for its people—and that neither one of us is going to change just to suit the other?

"If we could agree on that, then maybe we could agree to a moratorium on trying to force the rest of the world to copy either one of us. Oh, I don't mean we wouldn't keep on telling people how great we think our system is, nor expect you to stop saying how well you like yours if you really do. But there just isn't any sense in trying to cram it down their throats. With armies, I mean. Starting wars and getting a lot of people killed. Why can't we just let them look at both of us, and listen to both of us, and then make up their own minds?

"You know, this military business can get out of hand. That's why we're both a little nervous, isn't it? And here's the reason, the big thing we have in common—I've got kids, Ivan. And so have you. My kids mean more to me than anything else in all the world. Surely you feel the same way about yours. Now there just isn't an ounce of sense in our horsing around and acting like plain fools and arranging things so that our kids will have to be killing each other some-

day. My kids are thinking about Christmas, Ivan. Little starry-eyed things, they're not mad at you or at anybody.

"You know what, Ivan? We folks over here are spending right at $45 billion this year on armaments. That's because we're scared of what you'd do if we didn't. I don't know quite what your folks are spending on this sort of thing, and I don't expect you do, either, but I figure it's just about the same as we're spending.

"Tell you what I'd do, Ivan. I'd make a binding contract with you. We'll cut down ours if you'll cut down yours. Now, of course, it would all have to be open and aboveboard, right on the top of the table, or no go. But I'm willing, if you are. We could start out easy.

"Let's do it this way. We'll cut 10 percent from our military expenditures this year if you'll do the same thing. Right out on the top of the table, now. We'll take $4½ billion out of our military spending this year if you'll do the same thing, match it dollar for dollar. We'll both put our money into the same fund. That'll make $9 billion for the first year.

"If the deal holds, we'll double it next year. We'll both cut our current military budget by another 10 percent, and each of us will put up $9 billion next year. That'll make a total of $27 billion in the fund.

"Want to help mankind, Ivan? Well, here's your chance. Here's your chance to help mankind and get rid of your fears at the same time. You like 5-year plans, so I'll make you a 5-year plan. Let's keep this up at the second year's rate for 3 additional years, and we'll have put a total of $81 billion into this fund between us at the end of 5 years. Neither one of us will have missed it, because it will have come out of what we'd otherwise have been putting into weapons which would just have made both of us more nervous.

"We could make an $81 billion gift to humanity, Ivan.

"Do you know how much $81 billion is? Well, it would build and equip a brandnew $2 million hospital for every city of 10,000 or more in the world. Our medical experts say that with $4½ billion they could absolutely eradicate malaria, typhoid, smallpox, yellow fever, and leprosy from the face of the earth. It would build 120,000 high schools or 250,000 elementary schools. It would build and stock 250,000 first-class libraries and it would provide 20 million 4-year college scholarships. It would build 20 million modern homes to replace the world's infested slums. It would build almost a million miles of modern roads—enough to circle the earth several times. Take any combination of these benefits you like—it still adds up to a whole lot more sense than spending this money on the implements that kill and destroy rather than those that build and ennoble and improve.

"Then, after 5 years we could slack off. We could reduce our contributions to the Christmas fund and give some tax relief to the folks who have been carrying the burden for so many years—yours as well as ours. Think of it, Ivan. Imagine what the effect would be in Russia if just 20 percent of all the money now being spent on military hardware were being plowed back into the economy and spent on the merchandise of peace. Think what it would mean in terms of automobiles and homes and household appliances.

"It's a wonderful dream, isn't it, Ivan? It could be a reality if we would only play fair and square with each other and do away with needless secrecy. Of course, you'd have to know that we weren't cheating. You'd be entitled to know it, just as we'd be entitled to proof of your compliance. We could use the United Nations organization to inspect and police our operation to insure good faith on both our parts. We'd have to open up our borders and let one another come and look—but what would there be to fear if we both were playing straight?

"You know, Ivan, we could give the world the greatest Christmas present since the first Christmas, 1,959 years ago. We could really bring tidings of great joy and, for the first time in two milenniums the greatly troubled people of this old world of ours could obey the angels' injunction: 'Fear not.'

"That would be the best part, that everybody could gradually stop being afraid. If we ever got together on this we could make all the old hatreds and fears and misgivings vanish like hot breath on a looking glass.

"Think it over, Ivan. We've both been trying the other way long enough. Think it over carefully. And, meanwhile, have yourself a merry Christmas.

"Sincerely,

"JIM."

Whimsy? Perhaps. Perhaps there is no way effectively to get such a message through to Ivan, insulated as he is by curtains of iron. Maybe such a plan, offered by our President, could form the basis for a major breakthrough in the diplomatic stalemate. If such a sincere and honest message could be broadcast to Ivan through the Voice of America, it might do some good. At worst, it could certainly do no harm.

Citizenship Role in American Political Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] at a dinner meeting of the National Conference on Legislative Education, held in Schenley Hall of the University of Pittsburgh on November 14, 1958, on the subject "Citizenship Role in American Political Life."

Senator RANDOLPH'S remarks on this challenging topic were both thought-provoking and profund, and I know that his many friends who missed the opportunity to hear him speak at the University of Pittsburgh will welcome the opportunity to read the speech which he delivered there in November.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENSHIP ROLE IN AMERICAN POLITICAL LIFE

(Address by JENNINGS RANDOLPH, U.S. Senator, West Virginia, at dinner meeting of the National Conference on Legislative Education, Schenley Hall, the University of Pittsburgh, Nov. 14, 1958)

I am deeply grateful for the opportunity to participate in this conference and to be a party to the development of what may well become a fresh and significant contribution to the political process.

It is particularly appropriate that this exercise in political groundbreaking, so to speak, is being initiated by the United Steelworkers, whose tradition for responsible unionism was so significantly expressed in the life and work of the late Phillip Murray. And if these sessions are successful in bringing forth a marriage between the academic and scholarly discipline of political theory and the practices of political action in organized labor, then it will have moved further toward the goals that Mr. Murray envisioned.

You have asked me to discuss tonight the question of the "Citizenship Role in American Political Life." This is a topic that one must face with some awe and humility—especially when addressing such a distinguished body of practitioners and students of the art of politics. But this is a topic on which I have had some occasion to reflect—particularly during the past few months when I have been meeting the citizens of my own State at a somewhat accelerated pace. I shall later bring to bear some of the experiences of these past few months on the questions that will arise in the examination of our problem.

But first, the problem must be defined. And since the role of the citizen in a dynamic society must change with the altering structure of society, we might best take a brief historical glance at certain of the assumptions that underlie our view of the matter. I propose to offer nothing new on the subject, but merely to establish a context within which to approach the problem.

For this purpose I believe we can agree that the role of the American citizen was first most clearly expressed in the writings of Thomas Jefferson. Here was developed the view of the American citizen as the independent freeholder, jealous of his own integrity and independence, informed on matters of public concern, and capable of exercising reasoned judgment in the light of this information. The underlying assumption of this view was that man acts of his own free will, guided by the light of innate reason, and that all men are potentially capable of exercising reason.

During the 18th century and for the first half of the 19th century, this typical American citizen found himself in a society which was predominantly rural and agrarian. And with the continual advancement of the frontier there existed in general a harmony between the public interest and the interests of the individual citizen. We need not cavil at the truth of this picture in every instance. This, I believe, is in general a fair sketch of the surrounding conditions and the basic assumptions of the historic image of the American citizen. This is still the image that governs much of the political thought and rhetoric of today. But what of the change from the conditions that gave birth to this image?

Beginning with the great immigration waves of the 1840's and continuing with the industrialization of the North after the Civil War, American civilization underwent a major reconstruction. The conditions of life changed from the rural and agrarian society to an increasingly urban and industrial one. I suggest that we have not yet accommodated ourselves to this change. We have not yet fashioned the new symbols and techniques with which to organize political life; we have not yet clarified the assumptions on which must be based the new citizenship role called for by this change.

Much of the confusion in political thinking today, even perhaps much of the so-called apathy of the voter, stems from this failure—from the failure to establish symbols and attitudes relevant to contemporary circumstances.

Let me illustrate with reference to my recent campaign experiences in West Virginia: after speaking to literally hundreds of audiences, the one characteristic that most impressed, and I might say, most troubled me as well, was the almost complete lack of people under 30. Wherever I went—whether in mining areas, in the farming areas, or in the industrial areas—I experi-

enced the same situation—audiences composed largely of the middle aged and elderly. In part, of course, this was due to the fact that the predominant campaign issues in West Virginia were economic ones—unemployment, recession, and inflation. And these are, of course, felt more keenly by older people and those with families.

But I believe there is another and perhaps deeper reason. During the primary campaign I met an alert and lively gentleman by the name of Charles L. Watkins, in Shinnston, W. Va. Mr. Watkins, a semi-invalid, who is more than 97 years young, informed me that in 76 years he had never missed voting in an election, and that he would make this one as well even if he had to take an ambulance to the polling place. Mr. Watkins is only the most dramatic example I encountered—but there were others as well.

What I am suggesting is that these citizens formed their commitments to political participation at a time when the political process was meaningful to them. They have since maintained the habit and the identification.

Somehow we have failed with our young people. We have failed to communicate to them the significance of the vote—the meaning of the franchise of freedom. Now, I am not afraid of the misuse of the ballot; a poor or unwise vote can be corrected the next time at the polls. But I do fear the nonuse of the ballot—the increasing withdrawal and isolation of the individual from the political processes, and especially as it is exhibited among our younger folks.

The failure to which I refer is a failure for which many of us bear a measure of responsibility—the politicians and public officials who too often avoid the direct issue rather than address the challenging problems that confront us, the segment of the press and communications industry which often emphasizes the sensationalism of charges and countercharges rather than the meaningful interpretation of events, and the many teachers and intellectuals who hold to the notion that politics should be shunned.

All of these have been instruments in our default—the default to communicate to the individual citizen the drama of the most important political experiment in history and his role in it.

This failure is characteristically dealt with in terms of the lack of interest of the voter. And we all recall, I am sure, the closing days of the recent campaign, when the leaders of one of the parties took themselves out to bestir the people. The resulting rhetoric, I believe, generated considerably more heat than light and apparently had small effect on the turn of events.

I would suggest, therefore, that the problem is not primarily one of apathy, but of confusion. And to define the problem as one of confusion rather than apathy is to prescribe a radically different cure. On the one hand, we attempt to launch a crusade to the roll of drums and the blare of trumpets; on the other hand we attempt to dispell the confusion in the mind of the individual and thereby enable him to identify his own interests with the policies and principles set forth by the respective parties and candidates.

It is, therefore, essentially a problem in communication. I have indicated what is considered to be one of the chief sources of this problem—that we are continuing to try to communicate in terms of a world that no longer exists and on assumptions about human behavior that we know are no longer valid. The Saturday Evening Post cover picture is no longer an accurate portrayal of the conditions of American life—nor is the notion that the individual is necessarily guided by the light of innate reason.

I would go further and submit the opinion that another, though related, source of this confusion emerges from the increasing mechanization and specialization of modern life. Although the individual citizen today is caught up in a vast web of associations—legal, commercial, social and personal—he finds no general community of values which he can share. He finds no consensus with which he can achieve harmony and direction and purpose in his contact with public affairs.

Participation in polital life first requires this identification with and sharing of some community of values. But it is this very relationship which is being eroded and chipped away by the growing complexity and specialization of modern life.

The once relatively simple functions of government to which the individual could easily relate have necessarily grown and expanded into a bewildering and complex variety of activities. In the process the individual, whose own integrity as a person is under constant assault, becomes increasingly detached and isolated from the political forces that govern his own affairs.

It would seem, therefore, that we must develop mediating institutions that can bridge the gap—restoring both a sense of wholeness to the individual and a means of enabling him once again to participate in political affairs. Such institutions must, however, embrace a certain consensus of values.

We have such organizations in embryonic form if we wish to consider the voluntary associations that devote themselves to promoting such worth aims as forestry, conservation and preservation of natural resources. These, as well as the more specifically political action groups, throughout the range of the political spectrum, all function in some measure to fill the vacuum between the citizen and the formal political structure.

However, in a larger way, the labor unions can become such mediating institutions. With the growing concern for union welfare, recreation and educational programs, unions can become increasingly the kind of institutions which will enlist the individual's loyalties over a wide range of values. They can thus assume even more fully their legitimate function of promoting the valid interests of their members.

Let me remark, in passing, that I am not one to whom the term "special interests" necessarily has evil connotations. The American Federal system is based upon the constant reconciliation of conflicting interest groups. As Arthur Fisher Bentley pointed out 50 years ago in his "The Process of Government."

"Logrolling is * * * in fact, the most characteristic legislative process. When one condemns it in principle, it is only by contrasting it with some assumed pure public spirit which is supposed to guide legislators, or which ought to guide them, and which enables them to pass judgment in Jovian calm on that which is best for the whole people. Since there is nothing which is best literally for the whole people, group arrays being what they are, the test is useless, even if one could actually find legislative judgments which are not reducible to interest-group activities. And when we have reduced the legislative process to the play of group interests, then logrolling, or give and take, appears as the very nature of the process. It is compromise, not in the abstract moral form, which philosophers can sagely discuss, but in the practical form with which every legislator who gets results through government is acquainted. It is trading. It is the adjustment of interests."

I suggest that this is at the heart of the American political process, and it is precisely this element of compromise that gives our political institutions their flexibility and durability cast.

Acknowledging, then, that special interest groups are a characteristic and essential part of mediating between the individual and the formal political structure, liberals as well as others can view favorably the growing concern in business organizations and the chamber of commerce for increased political activity of their members. For the more concrete experience that members of the business community have in practical politics the less likely they are to be critical of those who devote useful careers to the public service.

However, I cannot emphasize too strongly that politically active interest groups—whether labor unions, the chambers of commerce, trade associations, or whatever—do a grave disservice to the democratic process when they engage in wild charges of conspiracy and call for a war of extermination between the two major parties.

We had something of this (if you will pardon me for a slight partisan comment) in the closing days of our campaign in West Virginia, as well, I understand, as in some of the other States. I refer, of course, to the opposition party's innuendo that the Democratic Party has become the captive of Walter Reuther and COPE. In reply to such irresponsible nonsense I stated then and repeat now that I am mindful of the money and the support that we have received from the voluntary contributions of organized labor. And when I say that the philosophy of the Democratic Party reflects Main Street while that of the Republican Party mirrors Wall Street, I do not therein imply that either party is a captive of certain interests.

It is simply that the Republican Party, and its antecedents, the Whig and the Federalist Parties, have customarily identified the chief function of government as the protection of property interests, while the Democratic Party has sought to distribute the fruits of our society to the widest possible number of interest groups—workers, farmers, small businessmen, etc.

In closing, let me summarize by saying that we may as well recognize the fact of bigness in American life—big government, big labor, and big business. But with this, we must find the means and the techniques to prevent the individual man and woman from being lost in the shuffle. I have suggested some tentative lines that we might explore. I am confident that the papers that will follow during the rest of this conference will lay out other fresh and creative avenues. But I believe that all persons professionally concerned with government, whether in public office, in teaching, or in the labor movement, must guard always against the danger of converting the means of government into their own ends; for the only proper end of a democratic form of government is always and ultimately the safeguard and enhancement of the values of the free citizens.

Speech of Hon. Hale Boggs, of Louisiana, at Constitution Day Ceremony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Constitution Day speech I made before the Sons of the American Revolution, New Orleans, La., September 17, 1958:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure and privilege to be invited to participate in this Constitution Day ceremony here in the coun-

cil chambers of our city hall. I congratulate all of the wonderful civic, patriotic, and fraternal organizations who have made this occasion possible. I am pleased, if you will pardon a personal reference, to be numbered among the members of quite a few of the sponsoring organizations here today.

I am glad that you are meeting here at the seat of local government. The very essence of our Constitution is in its recognition of the various areas of sovereignty, and the government which is encouraged most under that system is local government because it is closest to the people and thus has a fuller appreciation of their problems, needs and difficulties. We have seen too many efforts made by too many people, especially during the last 50 years to chip away local authority and to move it to the Capitol in Washington.

Some time ago, one of the great American television networks made its facilities available to the blustering present-day leader in the Kremlin, Mr. Khrushchev. Utilizing this opportunity, he had much to say. Among other things, he told the American people that our grandchildren would live in a Socialist society. Socialism to him, of course, meaning Russian communism. He based this prediction on his assertion that this Russian communism represented progress and that our system represented reaction and the lack of progress. This prediction of the loss of liberty for all Americans will not come to pass, unless we forget the lessons of history and unless we fail to understand the overall struggle in which we are now involved.

To say that Mr. Khrushchev's premise is false is, of course to repeat the obvious. In my judgment, there can be no doubt about the fact that the men who drafted our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and our Bill of Rights were divinely inspired because they confected a system of government with precise checks and balances; of division of authority between State and Federal sovereignties, and between the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branch in the Federal structure which was not only to become the model for all democratic peoples throughout the world, but was also the most revolutionary system of government ever invented.

The Communist system, on the other hand, Mr. Khrushchev's system, is pure reaction. The Russian revolution simply substituted one form of serfdom for another. Some of you, no doubt, have read the book entitled "The New Class," written by Milovan Djilas, the Yugoslav Communist who is now in prison. There he points out the rise of a vicious new class system under communism. The American Revolution, on the other hand, actually gave people the opportunity to strive and to work in an atmosphere of maximum security and freedom and without the stultifying impediments of the class-ridden societies of Europe, or the heavy-handed interference of a ruthless central government.

This essential freedom, made possible by the American Revolution and the American Constitution, accounts for the greatness of America. But to fail to recognize the dangers we face would be inviting destruction.

And, frankly, my friends, the thing that worries me about Mr. Khrushchev's challenge is that we, like many people who have preceded us, may be becoming too self-centered, too self-satisfied, too complacent. As wrong as the Communist idea has been, they have nevertheless succeeded in obtaining dedicated people to work for that wrong idea. Believe me, we need more dedicated people.

The idea that nations are permanent, that they cannot be vanquished, is one which has never been proved in history. What happened to Rome and Greece is well recorded in ancient history, and in more recent time, we have seen the end of empires dominated at one time or another by the Dutch, the Spanish, the British, the French, the Germans, and the Japanese.

As a matter of fact, today as if by some omnipotent magic, the stage of the world has been stripped of all but two titanic actors: the Soviet Union and ourselves. It is against this background that we must ponder the future and take stock of our weaknesses as well as our strength. And, believe me, we do have many weaknesses. Some of them all of us are aware of.

In a sense, I believe that most of us are influenced by what might be called the installment plan mentality. This mentality dictates that you yourself never have to do anything for yourself, provided you make a small downpayment and pay the rest on easy terms, stretching into a vague but always rosy future.

Or, put another way, we are the victims of what is called the easy way. We see this every day all about us. Turn on your television set. Like as not, you will see an ad of a housewife in a kitchen holding a greasy skillet that within a second or two, and without any exertion on her part—merely through the application of some miracle cleaner—the skillet is brand new and shines like the sun. This easy-do-it philosophy is applied to everything.

Other advertisements tell young men and women that they can acquire the equivalent of a college education if they but buy a set of books (on the installment plan) and look at them a few minutes every day; that you really don't have to work hard to get an education.

In other words, there is always some shortcut.

Unfortunately, we have translated this so-called easy way into our national thinking and into our foreign policy. We want an easy Defense Establishment, one that does not require too many dollars, or too many hours of training, or too much research, or too much study and experimentation, or too much time, or too many young men.

We seem also to suffer from an obsession of being in a hurry. In the conduct of foreign policy, we seem to think that we can get each job done like constructing a building and then turn to some other project. The idea of patient, time-consuming negotiations seems to elude us completely. On the other hand, our antagonists unfortunately seem to understand time. To give you but one example:

During the First World War when the Germans had defeated czarist Russia, and Lenin had begun the Russian revolution, the Germans through the Treaties of Bucharest and Brest-Litovsk, practically dismembered Russia, so great were their seizures of former Russian, Polish, and Finnish territory. Because of this many Russians wanted to resume war with the Germans. But Lenin forbade it. "Let the Germans have it," he said quietly, "one day we'll get it all back."

If time is of the essence to us, it is not necessarily of the essence to our antagonists. If we like to set target dates and keep them at whatever cost in diplomacy, our antagonists are unconcerned with them. And, I might add, neither is destiny concerned with target dates.

We are in a marathon contest with people to whom the marathon distance is congenial. We must, therefore, learn to contain ourselves lest we become exhausted before the race is half run. We must revise our attitudes toward time. We must think less of target dates and more of the long range goal. We must find ways to be patient. All of this is difficult. But it is not written in the stars that our lives should be easy or that we should always live with our way uncontested by others.

Let's note another of our traits. When we are facing a concrete objective, such as fighting a war, we bring to the struggle whatever may be necessary for victory. But once the objective is achieved, once the war is over, and other qualities must come into play in order to win and to keep the peace, we falter.

Once the war is over the qualities necessary to winning and keeping the peace are patience, tact, conciliation, compromise, and above everything else—tenacity. Here we fall short. After the First World War these qualities did not assert themselves among us and so there was set in motion the train of events that led to the Second World War.

But scarcely had the guns of the Second World War stopped firing when, despite all our talk about sticking it out, we did not even hastily demobilize. We hysterically disbanded the mightiest fighting force men had ever known. We abandoned or shoved into the sea billions of dollars worth of military equipment. And in doing all this we not only left vacuums that others rushed in to fill, we also presented to the world the disquieting and revealing spectacle of a people who knew how to do a job but did not know how to complete a task.

If these are our attitudes, are they likely to fill others whom we must have as friends and allies, with confidence in our leadership?

The easy way, unfortunately, has even been translated into our educational system. We have found ourselves falling back in training scientists and technicians, engineers and physicists. We realize now that there is no easy way to get these people, that there is no substitute for hard work, hard study, and long hours.

Unfortunately, somehow or other, we have even failed to translate the picture of America to the rest of the world. No nation has ever been more generous and asked for less in return. During this century we have fought two tremendous wars and not only have we not acquired 1 inch of territory as a result thereof, but we have spent billions of dollars to rehabilitate our former enemies. We have encouraged the new nations in their struggles for self-expression and self-determination all over the world.

As a matter of fact, not a new flag flies under the sun today that in some way does not owe at least part of its liberty to the great American Revolution with its Declaration of Independence, its Bill of Rights, and its Constitution. And yet, we are unfortunately being portrayed to the world as a Nation of complacent people interested only in the accumulation of wealth and greater comforts.

In the Middle East, for example, the whole concept of freedom and liberty is the result of our people—our engineers, our businessmen, our missionaries, our American university in Beirut. The great progress made there against poverty and disease is largely the result of our work. And yet, today in that area of the world, we are pictured as greedy and grasping, interested only in exploiting the oil riches and totally unconcerned with the needs of the people.

The record of American largess and of concern for other peoples is a long and a magnificent and a glorious one. There are countries in the world where millions of people have been saved from pestilence by the work of our Government and by the work of private American institutions.

In Thailand, for instance, the dread malaria has almost been eliminated, and in Colombia the frightful and painful disease of yaws has been wiped out in a few years. The same applies in countless areas. And yet, we have demonstrations against our Vice President and other public officials in some of these countries. This means, as I see it, my friends, that we are failing dismally to portray America as it really is to other peoples of the world—to give the real picture of life on our farms, in our towns, and in our cities, and how we as Americans do more to help one another in everyday

life than probably any people on the face of the earth.

But you see, the battle for the minds of men is every bit as important as the military struggle and in this arena as in others, there is no easy answer, no quick solution.

I was amazed and astonished by the recent polls conducted by Dr. Gallup which indicated that in the opinion of most Americans it is thought that the average return on the average corporate investment runs 20 to 30 percent. Even more astonishing were surveys conducted outside of the United States which showed people in Montevideo saying that the average investment yielded 60 percent and people in Western Europe using figures as high as 47 percent. This demonstrates that American business, in general, has a real job of public relations to do!

Certainly, this is the result of the Communist party line that free enterprise means tremendous profits for a few people without passing on a fair share of earnings to the workers. This nonsense must be counteracted with the truth, not only in the United States but throughout the world.

What are the cures? Well, as the saying goes, the following are for sure:

We must adopt a long-run view of world affairs. The race is not always to the swift.

We must accept struggle and peril as part of our daily portion.

We must possess ourselves in patience.

All this may require a substantial transformation in our temperament. We are impatient. But our potential enemy is endlessly patient. Many of his ambitions of today were his ambitions 400 years ago.

The price of freedom has always been high. It was high at Valley Forge and Lexington. It was high at the Marne in 1914. It was high in France in 1944. But the price of defeat is death and slavery.

If the price of freedom is eating hoecake and molasses, I am for that.

If its price is hoecake and branch water, I am for that.

We must elect to be wise or foolish; to vacillate or persevere, to survive or perish.

Finally, we must have a genuine appreciation and understanding of American liberty and freedom; we must as individuals dispel by word and example, wherever we go, the clever Communist propaganda directed deliberately against us; and we must realize that our society will not survive unless we will it so; that our Constitution as great as it is will only survive as long as the people are dedicated to its principles.

Statement by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles Before Senate Foreign Relations Committee

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement made today by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1959

I. INTRODUCTION

The world is today changing more rapidly than ever before. But the fact that much is changing does not mean that everything has changed. There are certain values, certain principles, that are enduring. Among these are the concepts of individual human dignity and the supremacy of moral law.

In a changing world our task is to strive resolutely that change shall increasingly reflect the basic principles to which our Nation has, from its origin, been dedicated.

II. OUR BASIC PURPOSES

1. At a time when war involves unacceptable risks for all humanity, we work to build a stable world order.

2. We seek for general acceptance of the concept of individual dignity which will lead to the spread of responsible freedom and personal liberty.

3. We seek that the free nations shall attain a more rapid rate of economic growth, so that their independence will be more secure and vigorous and so that there will be greater opportunities for cultural and spiritual development.

III. THE PRIMARY THREAT

The Soviet Union and Communist China are expanding their economic and industrial power at a very rapid pace. They do so by a system which combines governmental rule of all labor with imposed austerity. This makes it possible greatly to accelerate capital developments.

There is emphasis, too, on quality. A spectacular product of Soviet material accomplishment was its recent space probe. In this field, the United States is still trying to catch up and make up for the head start of the Soviets. Our space accomplishments during the past year justify the belief that we are making good relative progress.

The Chinese Communists seem to be going into a dark night of massed regimentation and forced labor. What they call the great leap forward is in reality a tragic fall backward into the abyss of human slavery.

Asian nations are experiencing one aspect of Communist economic development: The Communist tactic of flooding their market places with goods at less than prevailing prices. This has widespread effects, some of which reach into our own country. As one example only, the dumping of cotton textiles in Southeast Asia has reduced Japanese exports in that area and is already reducing exports of cotton from the United States to Japan. As Communist economic power grows, we must anticipate and plan for further shocks to the free world economic structure from the Communist trade offensive.

Communist economic methods involve costs in human privation and misery that, for us, are not only repugnant but completely unacceptable. We believe that over the long run such a process must inevitably be altered. Already there are indications that the Soviet leaders are beginning to realize this. There is some scaling down of their heavy industry ambitions. They are beginning to heed demands by workers and peasants for more leisure and for a greater share in the fruits of their labor. Peoples sufficiently educated to operate a modern industrial state may be expected also to acquire the desire for freedom and the capacity to get it. History gives us good reason to believe that the Soviet peoples will not indefinitely submit to dictatorial rule by the International Communist Party leadership. It would appear that the Communists will encounter difficulties increasing in the long run.

But for the short run—and this may be a period of years—the situation is full of danger.

That means that we may face a period even harder than we have become used to. To get advantage from time we shall have to stand on our course. We shall need the national will to stand firm in the face of aggressive threats and probings from the Sino-Soviet bloc. We shall need to make whatever unusual sacrifices may be necessary. People respond to this kind of demand when they understand that a temporary emergency requires it. But these burdens seem to grow heavier the longer they must be borne during a period of relative peace. Our people will need to show what freedom can mean in terms of self-sacrifice and self-discipline; and in terms of fortitude and perseverance.

IV. WORLD ORDER

Let me speak now about world order. This requires an elimination of the use or threat of force to accomplish international change. This was always a bad method. It has become an intolerable method because the force at man's disposal could now practically obliterate human life on this planet.

The United States and other free world nations have, by their conduct, done much to establish, for themselves, the principle of the renunciation of aggressive force; and they have shown their ability and will to deter such use of force by others.

At the time of the Suez affair and the Israeli-Egyptian hostilities, the United Kingdom and France, and then Israel, responding to the overwhelming opinion of the United Nations, withdrew their armed forces and accepted a United Nations solution. This may well prove to be a historical landmark.

During the past year the United States and its partners have further shown their opposition to change through force or the threat of force.

When Lebanon and Jordan seemed threatened from without and appealed to the United States and the United Kingdom for emergency aid, we responded with promptness and efficiency. When the emergency was relieved by United Nations action, we promptly withdrew our forces.

Throughout the world small nations felt a profound sense of reassurance.

In the Far East the Chinese Communists, with Soviet backing, initiated military action designed, as they put it, to expel the United States from the western Pacific. We stood beside the Republic of China as it resisted what seemed the preliminaries of that attack. Our free world associates generally supported our position that change in that area should not be effected by force of arms.

The Government of the Republic of China itself made a notable contribution when, last October, it declared that it relied primarily upon peaceful principles and not upon force to secure the freeing of the mainland. This courageous and statesmanlike act has strengthened the free world's cause in the western Pacific.

Now in Berlin we face an effort to expel the small western contingents in West Berlin. Their presence constitutes an indispensable safeguard to the freedom of that city. The NATO powers, at their December meeting, unanimously vowed that such expulsion should be resisted.

Step by step, discernible progress continues to be made in consolidating a system of collective security which will effectively operate to exclude the use of force to effect international changes.

The mutual security arrangements which we have with free world countries no longer assume the aspect of mere military alliances.

They are the framework of consultative processes that, day by day, are steadily reforming the society of free nations.

In primitive and frontier societies, security is on an individual basis. Each householder defends himself by his own means. That primitive formula is now obsolete domestically. It is becoming obsolete internationally. Many free nations combine to help each other. The resulant power is not a power which can be or would be used for any aggressive or nationalistic purpose. It is a power dedicated to the common welfare as mutually agreed.

The United States has repeatedly made clear—and I said this again at the last December NATO meeting—that we regard our own military power as being a trust for the benefit of our free world partnerships; that we are ready to make known to all the defensive purposes and circumstances under which that force might be used; and that we shall heed in this respect the advice and counsel of our partners just as we would expect them to heed our advice and counsel with respect to the international use of their force.

Thus, out of what may originally have been conceived primarily as millitary alliances, there is developing an international structure which provides collective security on the basis of organized and continuous collective consultation. That is something new in history.

I might add that accomplishment is not always easy given the variety of national development and national viewpoints. Nevertheless the free world practice in this regard constantly grows in efficiency.

World order is not, however, assured merely by the elimination of violence. There must be processes of peaceful change. These, too, are rapidly developing within the Free World. The General Assembly of the United Nations is a forum where these needs find effective expression. The General Assembly does not have the power to legislate change. But it has a capacity to induce change, at least in the case of governments which have respect for, and are responsive to, world opinion.

The peace of the Free World is not a peace of political stagnation or a peace which sanctifies the status quo. It is a peace characterized by peaceful change reflecting new human aspirations and potentialities.

There is, of course, need not only for processes which permit of peaceful change, but there is equally a need for stability in adherence to basic values, including that of respecting international agreements and treaties. This requires that, unless international law and treaty engagements are changed by common agreement, they should be respected.

There has not been as great a development of international law and recourse to judicial processes as would be desirable. The United Nations General Assembly Committee on the codification of international law has made little progress. Some significant progress in law development was made at the recent Law of the Sea Conference, and that Conference will be resumed in 1960. Inadequate use has been made of the International Court of Justice. As the President said last week in his State of the Union address, we envisage further steps to encourage the greater use of that Court.

In such ways as I describe progress is being made toward establishing a world order where peace rests, not on mere expediency or on a balance of power, but on a basis of sound institutions.

This evolution is not spectacular and rarely considered "newa." What attracts attention are the aggressive probings of the Communists and the free world reactions thereto. That gives the impression that our foreign policy consists primarily of reacting to Communist initiatives.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The fact is that day by day, month by month, and year by year, we are building, quietly but steadily, in the United Nations, in NATO, in the OAS, in SEATO, and other organs of consultation, the solid foundations of an international order based upon justice and law as substitutes for force.

The Communist rulers do not share in this effort to build a stable world order based upon justice and law. International communism avowedly seeks world-wide dictatorship. The concept of justice is alien to the Communist creed, and law, in our sense of that word, is unknown. The free world and Communist concepts are mutually antagonistic.

This, however, does not mean that there cannot be useful contacts and negotiations with the Communists. We have had many such. We are striving to make progress in the field of disarmament and in that connection deal with the Soviets, particularly in relation to the controlled discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests. We also seek agreement on possible measures which might be helpful in preventing surprise attack.

At Warsaw we negotiate with the Chinese Communists.

We have made clear our willingness to negotiate about the German question.

We have now an agreement with the Soviet Union on cultural and scientific exchanges which is operating satisfactorily. Also important are the visits to and from Russia of influential citizens.

President Eisenhower urged this in his letter of February 16, 1958, to the then Soviet Premier. Following this initiative, there have been useful visits on both sides, and we are glad that the First Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union, Mr. Mikoyan, is now here learning about our country. We would like to see a broader exchange of students. We believe that in such ways false premises and miscalculations can be reduced in the interest of peace.

V. THE INEVITABLE MOVEMENT TOWARD FREEDOM

I turn now to our second major purpose.

One of the strongest forces working in the world today is the movement toward independence and freedom.

This force is notably manifest in Africa. Here change is rapid, new states are arising almost overnight. This great continent presents a challenge to the United States to do its best to assist the peoples now emerging into independence and new opportunity.

Another such area is our hemisphere to the south. The peoples of Latin America are making clear their determination to control their own destinies. One by one dictatorships have made way for governments more responsive to the popular will.

The worldwide movement toward freedom is accompanied by a growing awareness of the deadly nature of Sino-Soviet imperialism. The leaders of the new freedom are coming more and more to see international communism as an immediate threat to their liberties, not, as some have thought, a mere bogeyman of so-called western imperialism.

The Communists are paying a price for the forced growth of their material power. There is a developing fear in the less powerful nations around the world of the dangerous combination of burgeoning economic and military power with the imperialist drive of the Communists for world domination. This menacing combination brings home with force the threat which, when the Communists were not so strong, was but a matter of vague and largely academic concern.

There has recently been a surprising clarification of understanding around the world of the real purpose of Communist leaders—to subject all the world to the dominant influence and control of international communism, with its primary power centers at Moscow and Peiping.

In the Middle East the deadly designs of communism are now far more clearly realized than a year ago.

In southeast Asia liberty-loving peoples are struggling—and with success—to remain masters in their newly built national homes.

In general, I believe the leaders and peoples of Asia now understand better the sincerity of American policy favoring their independence and our willingness to support unconditionally their efforts to stay free and do so in their own way, which may indeed be a non-Western way.

In France, we are witnessing an inspiring example of national renewal.

The tide of freedom is running strong in Western Europe as Communist strength there ebbs.

Even in Communist countries there is a powerful and persistent craving for greater national freedom. Yugoslavia has been steadfast against all threats and blandishments from Moscow and has courageously maintained its independence.

Hungary's great effort to throw off its shackles, even though crushed by force, has been an inspiration and a tribute to man's unquenchable thirst for liberty. And throughout the bloc, even in the U.S.S.R., revisionism is a living force and ferment. Moscow considers it a deadly enemy, and with reason.

The pull of freedom is daily manifested in the flow of refugees from the Communist bloc to the free world.

The free people of West Berlin have, during years of uncertainty and danger, been an inspiring beacon light for all those whose liberties have been lost to Communist tyranny. We are determined that this light shall not fail, and that Berlin shall not be engulfed in the Red undertow.

As we look ahead, we see freedom as a predominant force, shaping our 20th century world. As Americans, we have faith that the aspiration, deep within the soul of man, to live freely and with dignity in a just and peaceful world is stronger than all the material forces which the Communists invoke as the pledge and promise of their power.

VI. ECONOMIC PROGRESS

I turn now to our third basic purpose.

We believe that economic progress is a necessary condition of stable and free nations. There must also be acceptance of economic interdependence of nations. No nation can live completely to itself.

Unless and until the less developed areas reach the stage of self-sustaining economic growth, the world as a whole will suffer. For the inhabitants of those areas, an increasing rate of economic development has become an essential condition of free societies. The demand for economic and social betterment is now universal, and if progress cannot be achieved in freedom, it will be sought by methods that jeopardize freedom.

The Communists are fully aware of the universal demand for progress, and they point to the Soviet and Chinese Communist accomplishments in industrialization as proof that their way is better than the way of freedom.

Our aid and investment must continue to support the efforts of the leaders of the developing free nations to sustain their peoples' confidence that economic progress can be attained in freedom.

We have not been alone in providing such support. Other highly industrialized states have made significant contributions.

These industrialized nations have also shown a growing awareness of interdependence among themselves. This is particularly gratifying to us. A common market for Europe was one of the policy objectives stated in the preamble to the European Recovery Act of 1948. Now, after 10 years, the six-

nation European common market is a fact. The Western European currencies have become more freely exchangeable and there is a strong movement for broader economic cooperation in Western Europe.

Free world economic progress does not permit complacency or relaxation. It calls instead for renewed effort to increase the forward momentum.

In the years ahead, we must through our trade and financial policies continue to promote recognition and positive use of the benefits of interdependence. These benefits, and the inevitability, of economic interdependence become more clear each year. What is being done in the European Community of Six provides an example and an inspiration for greater economic cooperation elsewhere in the world.

We must continue to apply our will, energy, treasure, and techniques to the problems of the less developed areas. The cause of freedom can be won—or could be lost—in these areas.

VII. CONCLUSION

Let me in conclusion recall the basic purposes underlying our policies:

1. The renunciation of aggressive force and the substitution of collective institutions of peace, justice, and law among nations;

2. Promotion of the concept of human dignity, worth, and freedom;

3. Stimulation of economic growth and interdependence to create enlarged opportunities for realization of cultural and spiritual values.

These goals are not attainable in a few years, but will require decades and, perhaps even generations. Why is this so? We are but one nation among nearly a hundred sovereignties, and but a scant 6 percent of the world's land surface and population. Our foreign policy is not something we can enact into world law or dictate to other peoples. It means rather constant adjustment to forces which, though beyond our control to direct, we can influence through wise statesmanship and adherence to sound principles. With our immense wealth and power, and even more because of our spiritual heritage of faith and freedom, we can exert a shaping influence on the world of the future.

The price of failure would be the destruction of all our other national objectives. While mustering all our resources, both material and spiritual, we must press on with courage to build surer foundations for the interdependent world community of which we are part. This will call for austerity and sacrifice on the part of all. We must put first things first.

Our purpose, ultimately and at all times, should be to use our great power, without abusing or presuming upon it, to move steadily toward lasting peace, orderly freedom, and growing opportunity. Thus do we achieve our constitutional purpose "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Freedom Is More Than Form

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the principal criticisms of the United States abroad has been its "we know best" attitude in talking to government officials. We must remember that local government is the best government and must be tolerant of the views of the people who would make their own laws. I might inject a note at this point that such tolerance would be welcomed in this body by the South from Senators from other sections of the country who feel that they know better than we southerners how to govern the South.

The Boston Christian Science Monitor on December 1, 1958, ran an editorial from the Toronto Globe and Mail entitled "Retreat From Democracy," pointing out that democracy is something relatively few nations in the world can afford. Also, on December 1, 1958, the Boston Christian Science Monitor commented on this editorial with one of their own entitled "Freedom Is More Than Form."

I ask unanimous consent that both of these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM IS MORE THAN FORM

A phenomenon deserving more attention is the trend toward military dictatorships. In country after country the generals are taking over from the premiers. In an adjacent column we reprint today a thoughtful analysis of this development from a distinguished Canadian contemporary. Since the Globe and Mail's editorial was written Thailand and the Sudan have been added to the list. Iraq made the shift in July.

The Toronto paper has done well to call attention to this situation. Its estimate is somewhat more somber than our own. But its warnings should be given serious consideration. For the picture was never so bright as wishful thinkers have assumed. And the retreat from democracy now is less startling mainly because the democracy in many of the nations involved has been more apparent than real. In Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East military men have often exercised the real power indirectly.

This may make the change look less dangerous—as does the fact that no great gains for communism have been involved. We believe also that a tremendously promising awakening is taking place in most of the countries which have still to learn how to make democracy work. Many which had expected the ending of foreign rule to bring utopia have been disappointed. Some are finding that foreigners are not the only exploiters and others are discovering that effective equality has to be earned and the wise use of freedom learned.

True, patterns of oppression and limitation have been broken, desires for better things awakened, new energies released. The potentialities for good are beyond calculation. As the Globe and Mail says, the peoples who have inherited democracy must be tolerant with those who are taking different paths, steps, and detours (some of them familiar in western histories).

It is heartening that free government has become almost the universal model. (Even the dictators feel it necessary to call themselves presidents.) Understanding of other peoples' difficulties in working toward freedom is essential if the maturer democracies are to be effective in helping the less experienced. Such help is one of the best ways to promote their own security and peace.

It is important for the new nations to learn that national independence provides only the opportunity to exercise freedom; it does not in itself confer either equality of opportunity or self-government upon the individual. And it is vital for the older democracies (especially for Americans with their fortunate inheritance) to realize that freedom (much less their own kind of democracy) is not something all people wish or are prepared overnight to operate successfully.

As the Globe and Mail points out, relatively small are the portions of the world where the conditions are present that are required for eeffctive free government. To its list we would add nonauthoritarian religion fostering individual spiritual growth.) This means that the need for free peoples to cooperate among themselves and to promote the love of liberty among others is far too urgent to warrant present levels of apathy and dissension.

RETREAT FROM DEMOCRACY

The recent revolutions in Burma and Pakistan have called attention to a highly significant trend in Asia—the gradual replacement of democratic systems of government by military dictatorship.

Ten years ago, nearly all the independent nations of Asia, including those which had recently secured their independence, were equipped with representative institutions on the Western European model. Their constitutions provided for universal or nearly universal suffrage, elected parliaments to which the cabinet was responsible, independent judiciaries, and sometimes guarantees of free speech, a free press and other liberties. In may cases, of course, these constitutions were made largely inoperative by internal disorder; but it was taken for granted that they would some into force once peace and stability were secured. Most Asian political leaders of the period believed—under the influence of western books or teachers—that parliamentary democracy was the highest form of government, and the only one worthy of a free and progressive nation.

Today, the picture is totally different. All across Asia—even in the non-Communist areas—the effort to make democracy work is being abandoned. The Middle East is now about equally divided between military dictatorships on the style of President Nasser's, and old-fashioned absolute monarchies such as that of King Saud of Saudi Arabia. Even Turkey, the most stable of these countries, shows signs of sliding back to autocratic rule. Parliamentary government has collapsed in Pakistan and Burma, and the army has been called in to maintain order. In Indonesia, President Sukarno's guided democracy has led to chaos and civil war. Ceylon is racked by virulent racial and religious strife, and it is questionable whether its constitution,, modeled on that of Britain, can survive the strain. * * *

In justifying the dissolution of Parliament and the abrogation of the Constitution, President Mizra of Pakistan * * * expressed skepticism as to the value of universal suffrage in a country where more than 80 percent of the population is illiterate. His words could serve as the epitaph for democracy in many another Asian state where it was attempted in the face of crushing political and economic difficulties and amid a people unprepared for it by anything in their national traditions.

The retreat from democracy, however, has not been confined to Asia. It has been equally striking in the West. Of the various parliamentary republics set up in Eastern Europe after the First World War, few survived the Second. In Germany, Italy and Austria, during the last 40 years, constitutional government has been an on again, off again affair. In Spain and Portugal, experiments in democracy ended in chaos, revolution and dictatorship. Even proud France last summer anticipated the experience of Pakistan; the strife of parties, paralyzing national life, forced her to turn to a military strong man.

In actual fact, democracy, as a stable and well-established system of government, is today confined to a surprisingly small group of nations. They include Great Britain

and its overseas offshoots: the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand; Holland, Belgium, and Switzerland; and the four Scandinavian States. Widely as these countries differ, they have certain very important characteristics in common—a system of representative institutions going far back into the Middle Ages and evolving gradually over the centuries; a large middle class tending to soften the clash between the extremes of wealth and poverty; and a tradition of moderation, compromise and respect for law in the conduct of public affairs. Where these things are missing, it is doubtful whether any experiment in democratic government can succeed. * * *

We need to realize that democracy is now, and is likely to remain, restricted to a small part of the globe. Elsewhere, other systems will continue to prevail—not because the people of these regions are stupid or depraved but because their problems, their history, and their temperament incline them to a more authoritarian type of rule. Over the centuries we have reached some degree of tolerance in religious matters. It is time we learned it in political affairs as well.—The Globe and Mail (Toronto).

The Work of Congressional Committees Detailed on the TV Program "Today"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, the National Broadcasting Co. has a very interesting and informative television program with which I like to start out my day. They call the program "Today."

Just recently they did a series on Congress and at my request their able Mr. Frank McGee let me have a transcript of his remarks of last Wednesday on what he said about the work of congressional committees.

Those who heard it may want to see this again, and for those who missed it, here is a second chance. Mr. McGee said:

Visitors often stand and look in awe upon the Chambers of Congress where they think our laws are made. There is nothing wrong with their reverence—except it is misdirected.

Our laws are not written by Congress as a whole, but by congressional committees, working far from the floors of the Chamber. And since there are 34 standing committees, we actually have 34 Congresses.

Every bill introduced goes to one of these committees where it may be amended or completely rewritten, or simply shelved. If a committee votes against a bill, it is as good as dead. If the committee approves it, the rest of the Chamber usually does.

That's why a Congressman must be assigned to an important committee if he hopes to do any real lawmaking. And who makes the committee assignments? The Committee on Committees, naturally. But the list is drawn up the way the other members of the party want it drawn up.

The most important consideration is seniority, or how long the Member has been in Congress. The last consideration often is whether he knows anything about the type of bills he'll be considering. If he keeps getting reelected, he'll learn in time.

Nothing means as much as seniority to a Congressman. It decides his committee assignments, his standing among other committee members, and his influence in the party. Herblock, the cartoonist, suggests committee members are selected by the length of their beard, and offers the thought that this is not the smartest way in the world to run a railroad.

Now, if a Congressman keeps getting reelected long enough, he becomes chairman of his committee. That's the only way he can do it, and once he has the seniority, nothing can stop him.

Only Congressmen from politically safe districts or States get reelected this often. That's why such an unusual number of southerners are committee chairmen when the Democrats are in power.

The chairman has exceptional powers. If he doesn't like a bill that's sent to his committee, he simply doesn't schedule it for action and there is little the rest of the committee or Congress can do about it.

The chairman schedules meetings and selects witnesses who testify for or against a bill. And when a measure reaches the floor, the chairman handles the debate. If he's cool toward the bill, he's not likely to argue for it very convincingly.

Far and away the most powerful committee in Congress is the House Rules Committee.

It gets every bill after another committee is through with it and even though the other committee has approved the measure, the Rules Committee can kill it, amend it, rewrite it completely, or simply pigeonhole it.

In addition, the Rules Committee decides how long and under what conditions the bill may be debated when it reaches the full House. It can cut off debate and forbid amendments—so if the House doesn't like the measure the way the Rules Committee wrote it, that's tough.

There are only 12 members on this committee. If 7 of these, a majority, oppose a bill, it is virtually dead and the other 428 Members of the House can just whistle—or go through the torturous and rarely successful process of trying to force it out of the Rules Committee.

Of course, bills are written with all these pitfalls in mind. Someone once described a camel as a horse—built by a committee. That's why some of our laws have such peculiar wrinkles.

The Nation's Television Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce expects to hold early hearings on the Nation's TV fare. In this connection, several Oklahoma newspapers have commented editorially on the subject of the slow death of good television programs. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two of these editorials: the first, originally published in the Duncan (Okla.) Banner, and reprinted in the Ada (Okla.) Evening News of December 5, 1958; the second, published in the Enid (Okla.) Morning News of December 4, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Duncan (Okla.) Banner, reprinted in the Ada (Okla.) Evening News, Dec. 4, 1958]

COLUMN OF COMMENT

Senator MIKE MONRONEY, who did a fine job investigating packing of automobile prices by dealers, is turning his attention to TV. Is there a villain? If there is, it's an economic one.

MONRONEY wants to know if the networkers aren't paying too much attention to ratings the programs receive. That's a good question.

Offhand, we would answer that in the negative. TV audiences, however, perhaps are only limited judges of the character of programs.

They love to complain about mediocre offerings, and they say they want better quality entertainment. Yet they shun educational programs like poison.

Their tastes vary, even among their favorites. Quiz shows, for instance, have hit the skids on ratings. Westerns and whodunits are popular.

Grand opera has keenly appreciative, but limited audiences. Condensed better plays win plaudits of critics, but most viewers flip the dial somewhere else. TV audiences say one thing, practice another.

The networks must make a profit to stay in business. Sponsors want big audiences, not limited ones. Networks say they try to strike a balance.

Senator MONRONEY wonders if more Federal regulation is needed to improve quality. Chances are there will be a Senate probe to develop more facts.

Live drama has been one of the casualities on TV, but we haven't heard listeners complain much. For one thing, filmed drama has fewer limitations.

MONRONEY's view is that it isn't the advertiser who controls the programing, but the ratings offered by audience testing companies.

He may have a point there. Among three accepted rating services, there frequently are varying findings each week. Each uses different methods.

One startling revelation of a newcomer in the ratings field is that, from actual visits, not telephone calls, as may as one-third of the receiving sets turned on at a given time are not watched by anyone in the home.

MONRONEY's probes resulted in posted prices on every 1959 new car offered buyers. Perhaps he can come up with something beneficial to TV viewers.

[From the Enid (Okla.) Morning News, Dec. 4, 1958]

POWER TO MONRONEY IN TRY FOR BETTER TV FARE

More power to Senator MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma.

Our Senator MONRONEY is stirring up a television fuss in Washington. MIKE is leading sort of a one-man movement to probe television practices in killing off quality television programs and placing cheaper and perhaps more profitable programs in their stead.

For example, if you've watched television at all you couldn't help but have noticed the rash of western programs appearing on the TV screen nowadays. There are more than you can shake a stick at. At the same time the information type and better quality type of programs are fading fast.

We think Senator MONRONEY is doing the public a real service if he can make the money-conscious TV networks think of something besides the almighty dollar. After all, the air waves are public property.

They are supposedly granted to television stations to be used in the public interest, convenience, and necessity. But are they?

In other words we have a great and wonderful medium in television but are we using it properly? Do the old, old movies, horror stories, crime shows, westerns of all kinds enlighten and stimulate the population of our country or do they constitute a breeding ground for crime and indifference?

The TV networks and the individual TV stations have a terrific responsibility and we think that Senator MONRONEY's efforts may help make them realize this fact. We certainly don't think the National Association of Radio and TV Broadcasters has done any kind of job in policing the industry. It doesn't even make its own members live up to the industry's code. If you want an example of this just count the commercial time on the Jack Parr show or on the news, weather, and sports half-hour shows on the stations in this area. We listened to one 5-minute sports program recently where the commercial time actually was greater than the time for sports news.

But this is the subject for another editorial. Let's get back to the fact that Senator MONRONEY as the second-ranking Democrat on the United States Senate Communications Subcommittee is asking some sharp and pointed questions of the networks in regard to the slow death of good television programs. We say, more power to Senator MONRONEY.

Final Report: Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on December 31, 1958, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report filed papers of dissolution with the secretary of state of the State of New York. This marks the end of an 11-year organized effort to reorganize the executive branch of the Federal Government.

On January 10, 1947, after extensive studies had been made, I introduced H. R. 775, a bill to establish a commission on organization of the executive branch of the Government. Before preparing this bill, I studied previous efforts to reorganize our Government and found that none had been particularly successful. Perhaps the major accomplishment from these previous reorganizations was that of President Taft's 1912 Commission, from which stemmed—almost a decade later—the Budgeting and Accounting Act of 1921.

Our intensive research showed that various factors had been responsible for these modest results from previous reorganization efforts. Some commissions had been dominated by the Congress and failed of acceptance in the Executive. Others were dominated by the Executive and did not achieve full credence in the Congress. In other cases, partisanship adversely affected the eventual results. And, further, some excellent proposals were allowed to die in Government pigeonholes because there was no participation from private citizens, and the recommendations received little public support. Therefore, in H. R. 775, a wholly new and balanced formula was provided.

The Commission was to have equal representation as between Congress, the Executive, and the public. It was to be balanced equally as to parties, and also each body of Congress was given the equal representation to the other within the congressional third of the Commission's membership of 12. .

This formula, designed to correct the deficiencies in the composition of previous Commissions, succeeded beyond the fondest hopes of those of us who prepare it. To illustrate this, I would like to quote James A. Farley, a distinguished member of the second Commission, who said of the work of this Commission chaired by former President Hoover:

> At no time did politics enter into the deliberations of the Commission. Where we differed, they were honest differences of opinion, and Mr. Hoover recognized the right of each member to give free expression of his views.

Public Law 162, approved without dissenting vote by the 80th Congress established the first Commission. It operated from 1947 through 1949. Seventy-two percent of its recommendations were put into effect.

Because of the success of this early Commission, I again, in 1953, introduced legislation, to provide for a second Commission. Again, the measure was approved by the Congress without dissent and was enacted into law on July 10, 1953. The second Commission, which operated from 1953 through 1955, again brought results far in excess of the hopes of many of us. As of late in 1958, President Eisenhower reported that 64 percent of the recommendations had been put into effect.

The Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, under the distinguished chairmanship of Mr. Clarence Francis, as I mentioned at the outset of my remarks, has now formally dissolved. That committee of 50,000 private citizens supporting our proposals should, as former President Hoover and President Eisenhower have pointed out, be very proud of its accomplishments; for the committee's efforts succeeded in bringing to the American people a realization of the need for more efficient and more economical government. As a result of the committee's efforts, 121 pieces of legislation were enacted to accomplish the Commission's objectives. This body of legislation is far and away greater than anything ever accomplished by a similar group.

Congress, too, should take great pride in its own accomplishments on this vast series of reorganization proposals. Not only did Congress create these two Commission on a wholly bipartisan basis, but Congress also acted in a highly responsible manner in putting the Commission's proposals into effect. You, Mr. Speaker, the outstanding gentleman from the 12th District of Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and our beloved friend from the 14th District of Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] played instrumental roles in all of these matters and I think we all should be pleased with the constructive and bipartisan nature of our actions.

Upon the completion of this organized effort to reorganize the Federal Government, the citizens committee has prepared a final report. This historical report give the Congress and the public an authoritative statement of what has been accomplished and what yet remains undone.

FINAL REPORT: CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE HOOVER REPORT

DEFENSE UNIFICATION AND H.R. 8002 CROWN CLIMAX YEAR AS CITIZENS COMMITTEE DISBANDS—64 PERCENT OF SECOND COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED—HOOVER RATES SAVINGS AT UPWARDS OF $3 BILLION A YEAR—"GREAT IDEAS ALWAYS GO FORWARD," FRANCIS SAYS—MANY GROUPS TO ACT ON UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Two of the most significant and far-reaching recommendations ever made in the name of the bipartisan Hoover Commissions are now the law of the land. They are H.R. 12541 for defense unification (signed as Public Law 599 by President Eisenhower on August 6) and H.R. 8002 for modernized Federal budgeting (Public Law 759 of August 25).

Thus, in the waning days of the 85th Congress, the climax year drive for governmental economy and efficiency was crowned with achievement as the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report prepared to disband. Preliminary research figures show that 64 percent—63.9 percent to be exact—of the second Hoover Commission's recommendations have been adopted and are being put into effect.

Former President Herbert Hoover estimates the eventual economies resulting from these recommendations at upward of $3 billion a year. In a message to citizens committee members, Mr. Hoover said: "Economies totaling $7 billion can be traced to the first Commission's report. And we are on our way to savings of upwards of $3 billion a year as a result of the second Commission's recommendations. * * * Your crusade has been the greatest education of the American people in civil government since the Constitution was under debate."

EISENHOWER COMMENDS COMMITTEE—PLEDGES CONTINUED INTEREST IN REPORT

Noting the disbandment of the citizens committee, President Eisenhower has addressed a message of warm commendation to its members. In a letter to Clarence Francis, national chairman, the President said: "Through its fine work the citizens committee has contributed significantly to the understanding of an interested and well-informed public—a very real and lasting source of strength as we look ahead to the future." The President said the administration would continue to implement the Commission's proposals and he predicted that the time will again come when there will be need for a new, comprehensive review such as inspired Mr. Hoover's monumental missions.

In its final assignment, the committee's research staff has drawn a comparison showing that the second Commission's record of 64 percent adoption fell somewhat short of the first Commission's 72 percent. On the other hand, a greater share of the second Commission's recommendations were of fundamental and major importance. That is because the second Commission was authorized by Congress to go into questions of policy, whereas the first was limited to problems of organization and management.

Citizen support of Commission recommendations came to a peak in 1958. Never has Congress been so impressed by the force of public interest in Commission legislation.

Never has bipartisan teamwork operated so effectively to get results. Executive branch officials, led by the President, worked closely with congressional leaders of both parties. Scores of cooperating national organizations fused their forces with those of the citizens committee to produce a heavy flow of congressional mail from every corner of the country.

At the same time, the opposition was never stronger. This applied particularly to defense reorganization (H.R. 12541) and modernized budgeting (H.R. 8002). The defense issue came suddenly to the fore in April when President Eisenhower sent a message to Congress calling for sweeping revision of the Pentagon chain of command; stronger civilian control of the military under the Secretary of Defense; central direction of defense research programs; and unified land, sea, and air commands in the field.

Based squarely on Hoover Commission proposals, the President's program was aimed at the root causes of confusion, delay, and waste in the Pentagon. Ten years earlier, the first Commission's task force had warned that "victory by bankruptcy" was an objective of the Kremlin—and that was before the era of sputniks, guided missiles, and other 5,000-mile-an-hour menaces—not only to our freedom but to our very lives. In his call for a streamlined defense structure, the President spoke for safety with solvency.

Nonetheless, it soon became clear that the diehard opponents of unification would fight the new plan to the bitter end. The battle lines were clearly drawn as a long parade of witnesses came before the House Armed Services Committee. Many asserted that the plan would create a Prussian General Staff, endanger the Navy, and abolish the Marine Corps. On May 10, National Chairman Clarence Francis gave the defense bill first priority among the objectives of the citizens committee in its climax year.

At the start it seemed that powerful House foes of the measure would succeed in blocking it altogether. Citizens went all out in their demand for action, however, and on June 12, the House adopted, after a hot floor fight, a bill containing some features of the President's plan. The bill was badly watered down, however. So the President, in one of the most strongly worded messages he has ever sent to Congress, asked for four amendments to correct the most dangerous deficiencies of the House measure.

The scene then shifted to the Senate. Again public opinion, now sharply focused on the President's amendments, was brought to bear with all its force on the Senate Armed Services Committee. And it was here that the turning point came. On July 15 the Senate committee unanimously approved a strongly amended bill which the Senate itself adopted by a vote of 80 to 6 five days later. Thus ended, successfully, the battle for the biggest single achievement in the 10-year history of the two Hoover Commissions.

Meanwhile, however, it became evident that the final adoption of H.R. 8002 was by no means assured. It should have been on March 6 when the House approved the bill after an historic 2-day floor battle by a vote of 311 to 87. But it wasn't.

H.R. 8002, as passed by the House, differed only slightly from the Senate version, S. 434, which had twice been approved unanimously by the Senate. On March 10 it went back to the Senate Calendar for final approval. This should have been routine. But it wasn't.

Instead, H.R. 8002 got "hung up" in the Senate because of a technical change in the House language which created a minor conflict with Senate rules. Day followed day, week followed week, and still the Senate took no action. The delay began to look like a triumph for the wily parliamentarians who had, from the beginning, vowed that H.R. 8002 would never become law. By May 15, in fact, they were openly proclaiming that the bill was "dead for the session" which, of course, meant dead for all time.

Aroused citizens then went to work. Soon the Senate was flooded with calls for action on H.R. 8002. On June 27 the bill was taken off the calendar and referred to the Committee on Appropriations. A hearing was held on July 8 when yet another effort to kill the measure was barely thwarted. Then back went the bill to the Senate Calendar. Its opponents strove for delay, delay, and more delay as the session neared its end. Public pressures mounted, however. Senators in increasing numbers became aware that something or somebody was stalling final action on an issue which they thought they had long since settled. Finally, on July 31, virtually the whole Senate rose up in protest and H.R. 8002, only slightly amended, was brought to the floor for a vote. It passed, 68 to 6. (About 18 of the absent Senators would have voted for it, too.)

The battle should have been over then. But it wasn't. H.R. 8002 had to go back to the House for final adoption. Again, obstructionists worked for delay. Again the bill went back to committee. Again pressures rose and, at long last, H.R. 8002 was brought to the House floor. There, on August 14, the opposition collapsed and the bill was approved by a voice vote—just 10 days before the 85th Congress adjourned.

In many ways, the story of H.R. 8002 epitomizes the history of the Hoover Commissions and the citizens committee. Briefly, they said it couldn't be done, but it was done. At all events any substantial reorganization of Government was considered impossible when the first Commission began its work in 1947—and on the evidence this was true. Since 1887, no less than seven boards, committees, and commissions had made studies and issued reports which were quickly forgotten. This discouraging trend was reversed by three principal factors: (1) Active congressional sanction (2) scrupulously bipartisan teamwork between the Executive and Congress in two administrations and (3) vigorous citizen support.

The dramatic and completely dispassionate quality of Hoover report research played a big part in the outcome, too. The Commissions gave tangible, understandable examples to support their findings; then they made specific, practical recommendations of a very clear nature. The public quickly developed confidence in the reports and the motivation behind them. Thousands of good citizens from coast to coast joined enthusiastically in support of the Commissions' proposals. Conscientious officials and Members of Congress welcomed their support. This was a pressure group of a new sort. Its members asked nothing for themselves—but much for the Nation.

HISTORICAL HIGHLIGHTS

1947: Congress unanimously created the first Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, a 12-man bipartisan body. At the suggestion of President Truman, former President Herbert Hoover was named Chairman. The Commission appointed 24 voluntary task forces composed of 300 eminent experts to perform detailed research and report back to the Commission.

1949: The Commission made its 19-volume report to Congress including 273 specific recommendations for streamlining governmental organization, improving efficiency, and eliminating overlapping duplication, and waste. Back of the Commission's report were 2,300,000 words of task force facts and figures.

In that year, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, a voluntary, bipartisan organization, was formed under the chairmanship of Dr. Robert L. Johnson, president of Temple University. Working closely with scores of organized national groups and backed up by State committees from coast to coast, the citizens committee rallied unprecedented support for the Commission's recommendations. Despite the intense opposition of powerful special groups, within and without the Government, some 72 percent of the Commission's recommendations were adopted within the next 3 years.

1952: Its work largely done, the citizens committee became virtually inoperative in order to avoid the crossfires of politics in a presidential year. The committee continued on a standby basis, however, under the interim chairmanships first of the late Morris Sayre and then of Sidney A Mitchell.

1953: Congress, again unanimously, created the second Commission on Organization and again Mr. Hoover agreed to serve as chairman. Given broader powers by Congress, the Commission, aided by 19 task forces including some 400 voluntary experts, began the 2-year job of forging an even more massive report.

1955: The second Commission made its report to Congress including 314 recommendations based on 3,500,000 words of task force research.

The citizens committee was fully reactivated under the chairmanship of Clarence Francis. Again good citizens of both parties joined forces and, aided by scores of national civic groups, threw the full weight of their support behind the second Commission's proposals, 64 percent of which were adopted and are now being implemented at eventual annual savings of over $3 billion a year.

1958: Having designated this as its "climax year," the citizens committee made the most forceful effort in its 9-year history and, as the 85th Congress adjourned, announced its withdrawal from the national scene.

THE MEN WHO FASHIONED THE FINAL REPORTS OF THE COMMISSIONS

Members of the first Commission on Organization (1947–49): Hon. Herbert Hoover, chairman; Dean G. Acheson, Senator George D. Aiken, Representative Clarence J. Brown, Arthur S. Flemming, James V. Forrestal, Joseph P. Kennedy, Senator John L. McClellan, Representative Carter Manasco, Dr. James K. Pollock, George H. Mead, and James H. Rowe, Jr.

Members of the second Commission on Organization (1953–55): Hon. Herbert Hoover, chairman; Representative Clarence J. Brown, Herbert Brownell, Jr., Senator Homer Ferguson (and Senator Styles Bridges) James A. Farley, Arthur S. Flemming, Representative Chet Holifield, Solomon C. Hollister, Joseph P. Kennedy, Senator John L. McClellan, Sidney A. Mitchell, and Robert G. Storey.

The first Commission received a congressional appropriation of $1,938,600 and returned a surplus of $31,000 to the Treasury. The second Commission had an appropriation of $2,848,534 and returned a surplus of $84,000.

The box score in brief

	1st Hoover Commission, 1947–49		2d Hoover Commission, 1953–55	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total recommendations proposed	273	------	314	------
Total recommendations adopted	196	72	200½	63.9
Recommendations accomplished by administrative action	111	41	146½	46.7
Recommendations accomplished by legislation	85	31	54	17.2
Total legislative enactments	77	------	44	------

Thus, all told, 121 pieces of enacted legislation were based in whole or in part upon

or reflected recommendations of the two Hoover Commissions. This includes 44 presidential reorganization plans and 77 public laws. The presidential plans were made possible by the Reorganization Act of 1949 (as recommended by the first Hoover Commission). Under it the President may submit reorganization plans to Congress and the plans become law unless rejected within 60 days by a majority of either House. Since 1949 the act has been renewed biennially by Congress and is still on the books, effective until March 1959.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE FIRST HOOVER COMMISSION

In addition to the Reorganization Act of 1949, the most significant gains resulting from the first Commission's report were:

1. The Military Unification Act of 1949. While this measure left our Defense Establishment far short of complete unification, it was a great stride toward that goal. And it came just in time to produce unprecedented teamwork among the armed services in the critical early days of the Korean action.

2. Creation of the General Services Agency (combining four previous agencies) for more efficient Government housekeeping through modernized purchasing, inventory control, storage, and records management in the civilian agencies.

3. Complete internal reorganization of the State Department to clarify responsibilities, expedite communications, and break down artificial staff barriers.

4. Consolidation of functions in a Labor Department of full Cabinet stature.

5. The end of political appointments in the corruption-ridden Bureau of Internal Revenue which now operates under the merit system.

6. Regrouping of welfare activities and creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

7. Separation of "hidden subsidies" from payments for carriage of airline mail.

8. Elimination of much delay, waste, and duplication in the Post Office.

Savings from these and other measures became hard to trace in the budget upsurge created by the Korean war. Special studies by the citizens committee, however, show that a total of at least $7 billion in savings was made—based on the official reports of the Federal agencies themselves.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SECOND HOOVER COMMISSION

The most important gains resulting from the second Hoover report are found in the most important—in terms of cost, national safety, or both—areas of Government.

1. Defense unification (H.R. 12541, now Public Law 599): The constitutional principle of civilian control of the military was strongly reinforced by this measure. The authority of the Secretary of Defense was greatly clarified concerning the transfer, reassignment, consolidation, and abolition of functions. The effectiveness of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a planning unit was strengthened. The number of Assistant Secretaries was reduced. Many basic causes of interservice bickering and delay were eliminated or at least diminished.

Moreover—and this bears vitally on the safety of the Nation and the very lives of its people—the measure provides for unified combat commands. Frightening evidence of confusion and dissension in the frontal sectors of our defense bastions were brought out not only by the Hoover Commissions but by highly expert witnesses in the hearings on the unification bill.

Finally, this law includes, as an amendment, an economy provision of potential great weight. The amendment authorizes the unified procurement and management, under civilian control, of common-use defense supplies such as food, clothing, and fuel. In this area the second Commission saw one of the most grievous causes of waste in the whole far-flung Defense Establishment. While the law is permissive, rather than mandatory, it does give the Defense Secretary a chance to effect enormous economies—and its passage tells him that Congress would like him to do so.

2. Modernized budgeting (H.R. 8002, now Public Law 759): The Commission found the Government operating under an obsolete budgeting system. Congress made lump-sum appropriations for long-term projects and thus rarely got a second look at the expenditures in the succeeding years. Huge sums in unexpended carryover appropriations were flowing over the dam beyond further congressional review. (The total of such carryovers was estimated at $70 billion, almost equal to 1 year's budget.) The Commission recommended and Congress finally adopted "annual accrued expenditures budgeting." This means that henceforth the Government will pay, in a given year, only for the goods and services received in that year.

Modernized budgeting would not be possible, of course, without modernized accounting. The Commission also recommended a business-like system of cost-based accounting. This the Congress had approved via Public Law 863 in 1956.

3. Reduction of Government competition with private business: No one law (though several minor laws played a part) was responsible for the results of the Commission's recommendation in this important field. But the results, stemming largely from executive branch action, are impressive.

For example, the Commission found some 2,500 business-type establishments engaged in useless and costly competition with nearby private businesses, usually small businesses, in the Defense Department alone. These included bakeries, laundries, and factories making paint, eyeglasses, ice cream, rope, and scores of other civilian products. The Commission recommended that these be closed. To date over 700 have been or are being shut down or curtailed.

4. An improved Federal career service: The gains in this field were less a matter of legislation than executive action, though some useful laws were passed. In any case the gains were notable. The Commission made a major point of the need for attracting and holding competent administrative, managerial, and scientific personnel in Federal service. Chairman Hoover said: "Government cannot be any better than the men and women who make it function." The Commission proposed the creation of a "Senior civil service."

Since then a Career Executive Board has been set up by administrative action. The Board, under chairmanship of Arthur S. Flemming, has been authorized to proceed with the establishment of a program very similar to that which the Commission proposed. Another major Commission recommendation, providing higher salaries for specialized executive, scientific, and technical personnel, was accepted by Congress in 1956 (Public Law 854).

5. Coordination and expedition of Federal research: First of all, the increase in upper-bracket salaries is showing beneficial effects in the Government's quest for scientific and specialized personnel. By far the most significant improvement in the Federal research picture, however, is provided by section 9 of Public Law 599. (See Defense unification.)

This, based on one of the most fundamental of the Commission's recommendations, amounts to a congressional mandate to the Defense Department to eliminate duplication and delay in its presently overlapping and confused research programs. Further, it establishes for the first time the office of a departmental director of defense and research and engineering with broad powers not only to centralize and coordinate the various research projects of the armed services but to initiate research programs on his own wherever he sees a gap or a lag.

The importance of this development can hardly be overstated. Recent studies have shown alarming contrasts in the time required for U.S. missile and other projects to move from the idea stage to the drawing board and then into production as compared with the record of the Russians.

OTHER ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SECOND HOOVER COMMISSION

The record of the five major achievements of the second Commission is by no means the whole story. Of lesser importance, but well worth working for, were:

Liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This not only put an end to Government loans to snake farms and juke box operators; it returned $474 million in capital funds to the Treasury. (This was also strongly recommended by the first Commission.)

Elimination of red tape in surplus property disposal. Public Law 680 ends the requirement that all transactions must be cleared with the Department of Justice for antitrust violations. This was a cause of endless delay and an inhibiting factor all along the line.

Greater coordination of military hospitals, with one branch of the service handling medical car for all military personnel within a given region. This dispels an ancient, and costly, theory that soldiers could get well only in Army hospitals, sailors in Navy hospitals, and so forth, even if it meant overfilled hospitals here and half-empty hospitals there.

Improved and simplified governmental paperwork. The Commission found that paperwork costs the Government $4 billion a year, a sum nearly equal to the whole Federal budget 25 years ago. Now a Government-wide program of simplification and better records management is in progress. Example: The 1,040 largest post offices now use 600 standardized national forms in place of 22,000 local forms.

Establishment of a National Medical Library. Priceless volumes, badly neglected and ill-housed, were scattered through many parts of the Government. On the Commission's recommendation, these have been brought together and safely stored in a place where they can be used.

These things are merely representative of the scores and hundreds of examples of genuine governmental improvement stimulated by the Hoover Commissions. Other examples include: Defense cargo to commercial carriers. Since 1954, the Department of Defense has shifted its outbound military cargoes from Government vessels to privately owned carriers until today the latter carry about 75 percent of all loadings. This has made it possible to lay up 25 large Government transport ships, transferring the personnel to other duties. Installations closed. The Interior Department sold the Bluebeard Castle Hotel in the Virgin Islands and returned $410,000 to the Treasury. Interior also discontinued its fuel demonstration plant at Louisiana, Mo., and its underground gasification plant at Gorgas, Ala. This saves $3,100,000 a year in operating costs.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS OF THE HOOVER COMMISSIONS

Many established national civic organizations have announced voluntarily their intention of following through on the Commission's recommendations. As a guide, therefore, Reorganization News lists the following:

Principal unadopted recommendations of the first Commission: (1) Reduction of the number of agencies reporting directly to the President, (2) unification of the Federal medical services, (3) elimination of interagency competition in the field of natural

resources, (4) unification of the management of public lands, (5) reorganization and streamlining of the Veterans' Administration, and (6) a clear policy on medical care for non-service-connected disabilities.

Principal unadopted recommendations of the second Commission which are largely noncontroversial: (1) Establishment of a legal career service within the executive branch, (2) adoption of a congressional policy to eliminate unnecessary Government competition with private enterprise, (3) gradual but complete abolition of the Postal Savings System, (4) investigation of defense mobilization policies regarding retention and disposition of industrial properties, (5) elimination of duplicate staffing by both military and civilian personnel in the Department of Defense, (6) authorization for the Comptroller General to assist the Appropriations Committee in reviewing budget estimates, (7) establishment, within the General Services Administration, of an overall policy authority for the disposition of surplus property, (8) investigation of the Tennessee Valley Authority fertilizer and chemical activities.

Principal unadopted recommendations of the second Commission which have aroused some degree of controversy: (1) Establishment of a coordinating Federal Advisory Council of Health, (2) reorganization of the Federal legal services by establishing a Federal Administrative Court and by other means, (3) establishment of a joint committee on intelligence matters, (4) improving the efficiency of Government lending agencies and making them self-supporting, (5) reorganization of Federal water resources and power activities and restriction of Federal activity to areas where private industry cannot operate, (6) full implementation of the senior civil service principle, (7) modernization of Federal personnel procedures to eliminate abuses, (8) improved methods of handling veterans' hospitalization problems.

"NECESSARILY A CONTINUING TASK"

(Further excerpts from a letter by President Eisenhower to Clarence Francis, chairman of the citizens committee:)

"I have had frequent evidence during the past 5 years of the enthusiasm with which the citizens committee carried on its important mission, and I have been delighted and encouraged by the effective support the committee has given to the administration in implementing recommendations of the Commission," the President said. He noted that the administration has accepted 77 percent of those Commission's proposals and that 83 percent of these are now being implemented in the executive branch. He went on to say:

"Government reorganization and administrative streamlining is necessarily a continuing task. The fact that the citizens committee has fulfilled its mission does not mean that no further effort is needed in this field. Quite the contrary. The administration will continue to put into effect recommendations not yet undertaken and will, in the operations of the Government, apply day by day many of the principles featured in the Commission's work. In addition, other reorganization plans, suggested as a result of the Hoover Commission studies, will be proposed from time to time.

"The time will again come when there will be need for a new comprehensive review such as inspired Mr. Hoover's monumental missions. Meanwhile, representative Government requires the day-by-day interest of thoughtful and able citizens who are alert to the organization and management problems of good Government and are willing to devote attention to them. * * * As the committee prepares to disband, I hope you will convey to all your associates my appreciation of the time and energy they have so generously contributed to these public affairs. Surely their work has counted in the results obtained."

HOOVER LETTER

The following letter was directed to the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report by former President Hoover:

THE WALDORF ASTORIA TOWERS,
New York, N.Y., September 17, 1958.

To the Members of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report:

The citizens committee is now closing its activites after nearly 4 years of intensive effort. Its accomplishments could be listed with four paragraphs:

1. Many of the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government have been adopted by the Departments.

2. There has been legislative enactment of important recommendations. Notably, Federal budgeting has been put on a business basis and Congress has regained control of the purse-strings. The Defense Department has been streamlined and procurement greatly simplified.

3. There has been a great saving to the taxpayers as a result of this. Economies totaling $7 billion can be traced to the first Commission's report. And we are on our way to savings of upwards of $3 billion a year as a result of the second Commission's recommendations.

4. Your crusade has been the greatest education of the American people in civil government since the Constitution was under debate.

As its Honorary Chairman, I would like to pay tribute to its Chairman, Clarence Francis; the managers of its New York and Washington offices, Charles B. Coates and Robert L. L. McCormick; its headquarters staff in New York and Washington; its State chairmen; and each individual in its State organizations. But this comprises so great a host of dedicated men and women that it is impossible.

But they can each take satisfaction in the successful issue of their work. And I add my unlimited admiration for their voluntary aid.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

FRANCIS' STATEMENT

As the citizens committee finished its work, Chairman Clarence Francis made the following statement:

"To the Members of the Citizens Committee:

"In our work together we have witnessed a memorable new demonstration of the traditional American principle of citizen participation in governmental affairs. Through two administrations we have seen how much can be accomplished by bipartisan teamwork between the Executive, the Congress, and the public. We can look back with pride today upon a great experience. The citizens committee is leaving the scene, to be sure, but this does not mean for a moment that there will be no further action on the Hoover Reports. We know that President Eisenhower will continue his interest in the remaining recommendations. We have been assured by congressional leaders of both parties that Congress will work for further action on many Commission proposals.

"Then there are the scores of national civic organizations which, all through the years, have lent such effective support to the drive for 'Better Government at a Better Price.' Many of these have already stated their intention of following on the recommendations appropriate to their own spheres of influence. Finally, I feel sure that the Nation's newspapers will carry on the splendid job of public information which they have conducted so vigorously since the very first days of the first Hoover Commission.

"Great ideas always have a way of going forward. I have faith in the spirit of the Hoover Commission, and I believe that this spirit will be reborn again and again, finding its own paths to new achievement, in the years to come.

"CLARENCE FRANCIS."

Mr. Speaker, I believe this body would be interested to have the names and occupations of those distinguished and public-spirited citizens who directed the work of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE HOOVER REPORT

Honorary chairman: The Honorable Herbert Hoover, New York City.

Chairman: Clarence Francis, former chairman, General Foods Corp.; chairman, Fund for Adult Education, New York City.

Chairman, finance committee: Colby M. Chester, honorary chairman, General Foods Corp., New York City.

Treasurer: N. Baxter Jackson, chairman, Chemical Corn Exchange Bank & Trust Co., New York City.

Assistant treasurer: Keith M. Urmy, vice president, Chemical Corn Exchange Bank & Trust Co., New York City.

Executive vice chairman: Charles B. Coates, president, Charles B. Coates & Co., Inc., New York City.

Administrative director: E. J. Ade, president, E. J. Ade & Co., Inc., New York City.

Research consultant: Robert L. L. McCormick, president, McCormick Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Vice chairmen: Charles R. Blyth, president, Blyth & Co., Inc., San Francisco, Calif.; P. B. (Jack) Garrett, former president, Texas Bank & Trust Co., Dallas, Tex.; B. E. Hutchinson, former chairman of the finance committee, Chrysler Corp., Detroit, Mich.; Frank P. Leslie, president, the John Leslie Paper Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; Julian S. Myrick, consultant, Mutual of New York, New York City; Neil Petree, president, Barker Bros., Los Angeles, Calif.; Allan Rushton, president, Birmingham Ice & Coal Storage Co., Birmingham, Ala.; Freeman Strickland, senior vice president, First National Bank of Atlanta, Atlanta, Ga.; John Stuart, former chairman, Quaker Oats Co., Chicago, Ill.; John C. Vivian, former Governor of Colorado, Denver, Colo.; Tracy S. Voorhees, counsel, President's Committee To Study the Military Assistance Programs, Washington, D.C.

Board of directors: Charles Dana Bennett, consultant, Foundation for American Agriculture, Washington, D.C.; E. LaMar Buckner, former president, United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, Salt Lake City, Utah; Mrs. Theodore Chapman, former president, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Jerseyville, Ill.; Colby M. Chester; Charles B. Coates; Gen. William Donovan, former Director of Strategic Services, Donovan, Leisure, Newton & Irvine, New York City; James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States, chairman, the Coca Cola Export Co., New York City; Clarence Francis; Clinton S. Golden, executive director, trade union program, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, Cambridge, Mass.; Richard J.

Gray, president, Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.; Robert Heller, chairman, Robert Heller & Associates, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio; Solomon C. Hollister, dean, College of Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.; Dr. Robert L. Johnson, president, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.; Henry Kearns, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs, Washington, D.C.; Oswald B. Lord, U.S. delegate to the United Nations, New York City; Neil MacNeil, former assistant managing editor, New York Times, Southampton, N.Y.; Roswell Magill, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Cravath, Swain & Moore, New York City; Sidney A. Mitchell, former Executive Director, first Hoover Commission, New York City; Adm. Ben Moreell, chairman, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Herschel D. Newsom, grand master, National Grange, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Fred D. Patterson, director, Phelps Stokes Fund, New York City; Neil Petree; Stanley Resor, president, J. Walter Thompson Co., New York City; Capt. Edward V. Rickenbacker, chairman, Eastern Air Lines, Inc.; Wallace H. Savage, former mayor of Dallas, Tex., Lane, Savage & Counts, Dallas, Tex.; Joseph P. Spang, chairman, the Gillette Co., Boston, Mass.; Steve Stahl, executive vice president, Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Robert G. Storey, dean, Southern Methodist University Law School, Dallas, Tex.; John Stuart.

Advisory board: Warren R. Austin, first United States delegate to the United Nations, Burlington, Vt.; Donald Comer, chairman, executive committee, Avondale Mills, Birmingham, Ala.; Colgate W. Darden, Jr., former president, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.; Charles Edison, chairman of the board, McGraw-Edison Co., West Orange, N. J.; Henry Ford II, president, Fort Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.; John N. Garner, former Vice President of the United States, Uvalde, Tex.; Lessing J. Rosenwald, former chairman of the board, Sears, Roebuck & Co., Jenkintown, Pa.; Dr. Robert G. Sproul, president, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Anna Lord Strauss, former president, League of Women Voters of the United States, New York City; Charles E. Wilson, former Director of Defense Mobilization, former chairman, General Electric Co., New York City; Harry H. Woodring, former Secretary of War, Topeka, Kans.

Progress and Development in Janesville, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in these days of problems and great challenges, we recognize that one of the great phenomena on the face of America is the growth and expansion of our villages, towns, and cities. In 1950 about 65 percent of our population lived in urban areas. Today it is an even higher percentage.

The future promises even greater growth for our urban centers. As a result, cities are confronted with the tremendous problems which growth and expansion create, including, among other things, ever-greater need for public services and facilities.

From time to time I have welcomed the opportunity to call attention to progress in Wisconsin—to areas which are realistically attempting to meet the challenge of today.

For example, the Janesville Daily Gazette recently published an annual program edition for its 80,000 readers. This splendid issue reviews progress during 1958 in business, industry, science, agriculture, building, government and many other fields.

Although it is not possible to highlight all the significant programs touched upon in the special edition of the Janesville Gazette, I should like to invite attention to a particular article, entitled "City Has Made Great Strides," by City Manager Joseph Lustig, of Janesville.

In his roundup, Mr. Lustig reviews the progress made in dealing with local problems, as well as on projects and overall improvements for the city itself. These include such programs as schools, highways, parks, housing, and others.

We recognize, of course, that constructive, forward-looking programs are in progress not only in Janesville but also in our villages, towns, and other cities throughout Wisconsin and the Nation.

As an illustration of the constructive effort by the Janesville community in meeting today's challenges—as well as in dealing with the many problems faced by our communities—I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article entitled "City Has Made Great Strides."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY HAS MADE GREAT STRIDES

(By Joseph Lustig, city manager)

It is again my privilege to report to the citizens of Janesville on the accomplishments and progress made in the various fields of community matters and improvements dealt with during the year 1958. Whatever has been accomplished has been made possible by the men who serve you on the city council. These men have shown a recognition of the needs of our expanding community. They have devoted many long hours of their time in discharging the responsibilities of councilmen. Their positive approach to the many projects and problems which were submitted to them has resulted in one of the largest public improvement programs ever undertaken in one season.

The outstanding achievements of the year 1958 lie in the initiation and completion of the many projects which were outlined in my message of a year ago.

The tremendous size of the public works program, amounting to $1,250,000, taxed the manpower and resources of the engineering department to the very limit. The following brief outline of the year's activities of 1958 will indicate the type and scope of the many projects carried on during the year.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND SCHOOLS

City hall: On March 21, the public was invited to inspect the completely remodeled city hall. Approximately 1,500 persons were shown the greatly expanded facilities provided to all departments in the building. The police department now occupies the entire basement level. The engineering department now has the larger quarters made possible by the removal of the municipal court to the new courthouse. The health department occupies the former council room on the second floor, with the city council and the patriotic societies jointly using the Patriotic Hall. A new six-passenger elevator provides easy access to the second floor. This entire remodeling project completed at a nominal cost of $88,000 will serve the needs of the city for a great many years.

Golf shelter: A beautiful new shelter on the golf course in Riverside Park was put into use at the start of the 1958 season. This attractive structure, built at a cost of $65,000, provides for all of the conveniences normally found in buildings on public courses—shower rooms, locker rooms, and rest rooms. Light lunches are served all day long in the large central lobby, as well as in the lounge. The new quarters have added greatly to the use of the course and have helped increase revenues approximately $6,000 over 1957.

Schools: The new 16-room Jefferson School on Mt. Zion Avenue and the 21-room Lincoln School on South Oakhill Avenue were opened for the 1958 fall term. These beautiful and functional school buildings, dedicated on November 23, will provide for the needs of these fast growing sections of the city. The financing of the schools was provided for by a $1,845,000 bond issue made in August 1957.

STREETS AND HIGHWAYS

Concrete paving program: A continuing concrete paving program has resulted in the paving of 11 blocks of North and South Academy Street, 4 blocks of Pleasant Street, one-fourth of a mile of Magnolia Avenue, three-fourths of a mile on Milwaukee Avenue to the east city limits, 2 blocks of North Main Street north of Fourth Avenue, and the long needed paving of Eastern Avenue from South Cherry Street to Center Avenue. The removal of the railroad tracks from the roadway in North Main Street and the decrease in the grade on Eastern Avenue have greatly added to the effective use of both of these important streets.

Bituminous paving: The city continued its policy of providing the newly developing areas with curb and gutter and blacktop paving. Approximately 41 miles of streets were so improved during the past year.

Interstate highway: The year 1959 should see the Janesville-Beloit section of U.S. 90 well along toward completion. We were successful in our attempts to obtain additional underpasses with this highway at Mt. Zion Avenue and east of Palmer Park. The Palmer Park underpass was granted upon the condition that easements for a new road be obtained which starts at U.S. 11 and extends easterly through the requested underpass to County Trunk J. These road easements were obtained from the five owners of the land it traverses. The underpass makes possible a new arterial road to be known as Palmer Drive.

Centerway: Centerway and the new Fourth Avenue Bridge were opened to the public on July 1, 1958. The value of this project as a principal traffic artery is apparent to all. Traffic volume has steadily increased, so that now Centerway is by far the most heavily traveled street in the city and a great convenience to east-west travel.

Arterial street system: The council, by ordinance on October 27, established a system of arterial streets. This comprehensive plan creates an orderly and functional sys-

tem of main traffic arteries and should provide for easy and safe travel in all sections of the city.

Five points overhead: The council, acting upon the recommendations of the five points council committee, asked the manager to make application to the Wisconsin Highway Commission for the rerouting of Highway 11 westerly along West Milwaukee Street over the railroad tracks and west along Pleasant Street.

A continuing study of train movements will be carried on and from time to time these results will be submitted to the council Five Points committee for its further consideration. If further studies show a marked decrease in traffic stoppages and indicate a lessening need for a grade separation project, the council can alter its position with respect to its request for the rerouting of Highway 11. The present studies have shown a 52-percent reduction since 1951 in the number of traffic stoppages caused by train movements at this important crossing. This decrease can be attributed to the increasing use of diesel engines, the decrease in passenger trains, and the general decline in the railroad freight business.

Main trunk sewers: About 12.3 miles of sanitary sewers were constructed during 1958 in which are included 3 miles of main-trunk sewers. This system of main-trunk sewers made possible the extension of sanitary sewers to all areas east and south of the city annexed since 1954 and will serve future annexations to the east and south of the present city limits.

Off-street parking: There is an acute need in the central business district for close-in off-street customer parking on the west side of Rock River. This need has been partly met by the purchase of a parcel of land at Centerway and North High Street. This land will provide a 72-car parking lot for long-time parking and makes possible an extension of meter parking in the city hall lot. In addition to the twenty-two 2-hour meter parking stalls now in use, there will be installed 22 additional metered stalls which will provide for parking from 1 hour to 24 hours with a maximum charge of 25 cents.

The capacity of the South Franklin Street parking lot, opposite the YMCA, will be increased by the council-authorized purchase of a parcel of land lying adjacent to the alley east of the Franklin Street lot to provide for a total parking of 71 cars.

ANNEXATION

On September 29, 1958, the council by ordinance extended the east city limits one-half mile east by the annexation of 120 acres of land lying south of Ruger Avenue between the existing east city limits and the east line of the proposed right-of-way of U.S. 90, the new interstate road.

PARKS

Palmer Park: Parking has long been a problem in Palmer Park. In connection with the annexation of the 120 acres of land referred to above, the owner of the land, Mr. Clarence Steinhelper, donated to the city some 22 acres of the newly annexed land lying north of Palmer Park for park purposes. A portion of this land will provide parking for 500 cars and will also provide for an extension of Palmer Park to the north and east.

Monterey Park: A historic marker was placed in the lookout on the big rock in Monterey Park. The marker, consisting of a bronze plaque mounted on a stone pedestal, was made possible by the friends of a former citizen and local teacher, Mrs. Lola Webb (deceased) and the Rock County Historical Society.

This marker points to the site of the first log cabin erected in Rock County. Mrs. Webb taught and was greatly interested in the early history of this area. The plaque was erected in her memory and hundreds of interested citizens and third grade pupils attended the dedication ceremony on November 21, 1958.

HOUSING

An indication of the general growth of the city is evidenced by the 275 homes for which permits have been issued during 1958; of this number 129 are being built in the northeast quarter of the city.

SHOPPING CENTERS

The growth or spread of our cities is a phenomenon which followed the increase in the use of the automobile and the desire for suburban living. The general prosperity which we have been enjoying has created an ever-increasing number of homeowners who are building in the outlying real estate development in the newly annexed areas of this city.

This spread of the urban areas has brought about the outlying modern shopping centers which in Janesville are represented by the newly opened Creston Park Shopping Center in the northeasterly section of the city and Sunnyside Shopping Center on the west side. There are indications of another such development on the south side of the city.

TAXES

Janesville has for a great many years enjoyed an extremely low tax rate due to large sums of money returned to Janesville from State income taxes. That happy situation has now changed. The city of Milwaukee in 1957 filed a claim against Janesville contending that $476,000 of income tax moneys was paid Janesville which should have properly been received by Milwaukee.

Your manager, together with legal and accounting counsel, fought against the validation of this claim by the Wisconsin Tax Commission. In spite of all our efforts the tax commission ruled against Janesville. Janesville has by reason of this decision suffered a loss of not only a large part of the $476,000 claim, but over $1 million which sum was deducted from Janesville's share of income tax money. This loss in a large part is responsible for the $3 raise in the 1957 rate and the $7.50 raise in the 1958 rate. Rising school and county taxes accounted for $5.26 of the $7.50 increase in the 1958 rate. It will be difficult to adjust to the higher tax rate but, needless to say, no city is immune to the rising school costs and overall general increases in costs of all services and commodities. I am sure when all the tax rates of other cities in the class of Janesville have been made public, we will again find Janesville's full value tax rate much below the average of tax rates for cities in our class.

1959

The coming year will be more nearly normal in the anticipated volume of public works projects. Projects which should be initiated in 1959 have been deferred owing to the financial crisis in which the city has found itself, resulting from the Milwaukee claim for misallocated income tax money. It is hoped that in the very near future the city will again be able to carry on the most necessary public works projects. Among such projects would be a garage to house the Janesville bus system. The city garage built in 1948 is more than half occupied by the bus department. This means that the department of public works must keep trucks and equipment out in the yard, instead of under cover. Starting motors in below zero weather is not conducive to good equipment maintenance, nor to efficient department operation during emergencies.

In conclusion, much has been accomplished during the past year that is important to the citizen's welfare and our economy. Janesville has made tremendous strides toward becoming a modern and progressive community and every citizen can look with pride upon these accomplishments.

It is hoped that this report, which of necessity is limited to a general overall picture, and includes but a few of the many varied and complex activities of your city government, will assist the citizen in understanding the operations of his government, so that he may better judge it. Your tax dollar will continue to be one of your best investments in the future of Janesville and it is the past accomplishments that have set an example of what can be achieved through the cooperative efforts of the citizens and their government.

In looking forward we hope we can continue a constructive program that will maintain Janesville as an outstanding community.

To all the residents of the city I would like to express appreciation for their interest in local government, their understanding of our mutual problems and good will shown by all in helping us deal with these problems.

Dope Peddlers in Pennsylvania Obtain Clemency Despite the Vigorous Objections of the Secretary of Internal Affairs, a Member of the Pardon Board of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the December 3, 1958, issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer reveals the red-carpet treatment accorded dope peddlers in the State of Pennsylvania by Governor Leader's administration.

Despite the opposition of District Attorney Victor H. Blanc, of Philadelphia, and Miss Genevieve Blatt, secretary of internal affairs and also a member of the pardon board, Governor Leader ordered the release of 13 Philadelphia drug peddlers and 1 addict before expiration of their terms. Such a display of leniency for drug offenders has shocked narcotic enforcement authorities and has shattered their morale, as well as, seriously threatening the program to rid the Keystone State of dope peddlers.

The article by Joseph H. Miller, of the Harrisburg Bureau of the Philadelphia Inquirer follows:

LEADER IGNORES MISS BLATT AGAIN, RELEASES 13 MORE DOPE PUSHERS

(By Joseph H. Miller)

HARRISBURG, December 2.—Gov. George M. Leader today ordered release of 13 Philadelphia drug peddlers and 1 addict before their terms expired despite the opposition of Secretary of Internal Affairs Genevieve Blatt and District Attorney Victor H. Blanc, of Philadelphia.

As had happened before, Miss Blatt's name was again rubberstamped on the commutation papers as having approved clemency for the narcotics pushers. This time, however, her name was scratched off by pardon board aids before the papers were filed with the secretary of the Commonwealth's office. She is a member of the pardon board.

SPECTACULAR PROTEST

Last week Miss Blatt created a sensation on capitol hill when she marched to the

Commonwealth office and personally struck her name from commutation papers after learning her protest against clemency had been ignored by the Governor's office and that she had been recorded as voting her approval.

Twelve narcotics pushers were ordered freed at that time by Leader before the expiration of their 3- to 5-year terms. When the pardon board ruled they were entitled to time off under good behavior law.

Those ordered released by Leader today were serving 5-year terms imposed in 1955.

OTHERS BACK RELEASE

Three other members of the pardon board recommended freedom for the drug peddlers. They were Attorney General Thomas D. McBride, Lt. Gov. Roy E. Furman, and Secretary of the Commonwealth John S. Rice.

Clemency pleas for the narcotics pushers were filed by the board of trustees of the Philadelphia County prisons and were based on their good conduct while jailed.

Petitions filed in behalf of the addict and 13 pushers were heard at the September, October, and November hearings held by the board.

The effective date of the release of 11 drug peddlers was fixed for yesterday. Another was made effective today, while the others were ordered freed December 6 and December 18.

OPPOSITION BY BLANC

During pardon board hearings in Philadelphia and Harrisburg, District Attorney Blanc served notice on the commutation agency members he was opposed to the release of drug peddlers before their terms expired, regardless of the good-behavior law.

Despite the provisions of the good-behavior law, the Governor has optional power to compel the prisoners to complete their terms.

Drug peddlers serving 5-year terms who were ordered released by Leader included: James E. Gordon, Henry Anderson, William DeLoatch, Charles Vanderhost, Dock J. Carter, James Harris, Sterling Sparkman, Cash Sutton, Earl L. Jasper, Jr., Robert Matthews, Russell Arrington, Raymond Mortorano, and Robert F. Clark, Jr.

William Marling, serving a 3-year term for use and possession of drugs, also was ordered released. His term will not expire until September 6, 1959.

Claim Farmers "Never Had It So Good" Is Illusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, throughout the months preceding last November there was a spate of publicity emphasizing apparently favorable trends in the farm situation. The Secretary of Agriculture himself remarked at a chamber of commerce meeting in Pittsburgh that "farmers never had it so good."

These claims have faded out recently. But undoubtedly, they have left the impression with many that our present farm programs are succeeding, that the farmers' situation is on the way to improvement, and that nothing much remains to be done. This is a most unfortunate illusion.

The fact is, Mr. President, that farm operators' net income has declined by a staggering one-third in the past decade, measured in terms of real purchasing power. That is, the purchasing power of net farm operators' income in 1947 totaled $18.8 billion in dollars of 1957 value; the estimated total for 1958 was down to only $12.8 billion. These figures are provided by Mr. Leon Keyserling, director of the Conference on Economic Progress, in a pamphlet just issued which is entitled "Toward a New Farm Program." Mr. Keyserling has computed the total net farm operators' income for each year in dollars of constant 1957 value, as follows:

Net farm operators' income (in 1957 dollars)

Year:	*Billions of dollars*
1947	18.8
1948	20.3
1949	15.2
1950	16.3
1951	17.4
1952	16.2
1953	14.1
1954	13.2
1955	12.3
1956	12.0
1957	11.6
1958	12.8

(Estimate based on preliminary data from U.S. Department of Agriculture.)

One of the best brief statements of the real agricultural problem that I have seen was published recently in Pure Milk News, the official journal of the Pure Milk Association. This organization of dairy farmers who provide much of the milk consumed by residents of Chicago includes several thousand in Wisconsin. It is one of the most stable, responsible, and effective dairy farmer groups in the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix the following statement by Mr. Walter E. Winn, president of Pure Milk Association, which appeared in the November issue of Pure Milk News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S FACE THE FACTS

For several weeks past, the public has been treated to a barrage of goody-goody stories stating that the American farmer was in clover. He never had it so good.

Gross farm income and per capita farm income from all sources were at an alltime high—net income 22 percent above last year. Production was breaking all previous records and prices received by farmers were 8 percent higher than last year.

These statements will bear further examination and analysis. Taken at their face value, more manpower and capital could be attracted into farming to get some of this easy money. Why not, when farmers are represented as being so prosperous that they resent having to wash their own Cadillacs. I don't happen to know a single farmer who owns one but the metropolitan press gives that impression.

The average price of things farmers raise and sell soared early this spring because of scarcity of fruit, vegetables, beef, and pork. The first two fairly skyrocketed because of the Florida freeze. Beef was scarce because several years of drought in the Southwest was finally relieved with rain, and the ranchers then bid against the meat market for animals to restock their ranges. High-priced beef supported the hog market. Most other important farm products, such as wheat, feed grains, and dairy products are selling for less than a year ago.

Certainly the orange growers who received the highest price in years welcomed their newly found prosperity. But the 20 percent of orange growers living in the area of the freeze had no income at all and did not join in the rejoicing. They will not for several years, or until their groves are rebuilt. Cattlemen in the drought area are in similar position.

Prosperity that has to be based on the misfortunes of others—or war—is poor cause for exultation. But much political credit is being garnered today for sound programs that pretend to have turned the farmers' fortunes again toward prosperity. Farmers badly need the turn in that direction but they had better understand the cause.

All those who have advocated more freedom to produce, no acreage limits, and lower price supports, are claiming the recent upsurge of farm prices and income as proof that their program is working and is in the best interest of farmers. Actually, this year's experience proves just the reverse. The high prices that were received were only on products that were severely restricted in production by disaster—frost and drought.

Almost without exception, farm economists are predicting that our surpluses in the coming years will increase, and that farm prices and income will go down. The following table tells quite a story:

[In billions]

Year	National income	Cash farm income	Net farm income
1947	$185.4	$29.7	$17.2
1948	210.0	30.3	15.9
1949	206.0	27.9	13.7
1950	221.6	28.4	12.9
1951	253.3	32.9	14.8
1952	268.8	32.6	14.3
1953	281.5	31.2	13.9
1954	280.0	29.9	12.2
1955	302.4	29.5	11.6
1956	320.0	30.4	12.1
1957	333.8	30.3	12.1

These figures explain why, in recent years, there has been the greatest migration out of agriculture the Nation has ever seen. Although 1958 gross farm income is the highest of record, costs have mounted at an even faster rate leaving a constantly lower net income which is the figure the farmer really works for.

Many farmers have found their incomes so low that it has been necessary to help out with off-farm or industrial work. This is currently bringing in $6 to $7 billion a year, or a third of total income. When this is added to farm income and divided by the lesser number of farmers, per capita income from all sources is quite a different figure than just farm income. But when a farmer works 8 hours a day in town for needed money to support his family, leaving his wife and children to do the milking and chores, his wages shouldn't be added in and announced as farm income. There are a lot of families who like living in the country well enough to be willing to put in these extra hours and that is their choice. But let's be honest in the bookkeeping and not credit farming with an added 50 percent of income earned from other sources.

Farmers are leaving for city employment because their incomes are low, not high. With rare exceptions, they have thereby improved their income and living standards. Nothing apparently is going to stem this trend to larger and more efficient farms. Those who leave agriculture are likely to solve their own income problem but not that of agriculture. Those who stay will continue to expand total production.

The unanswered question is, "Will increased production at resulting lower prices solve the farm income problem?"

Farm organization leaders and agricultural economists are not in agreement. It is a time for study, not pessimism. Clouding the picture with a distortion of the facts will not aid in finding the solution. Headlines telling our consumers that a dairy farmer never had it so rosy when his earnings for 5 years have averaged less than 50 cents per hour, can only worsen our public relations at a time when the situation cries for better understanding.

Those who favor lower price supports have made no secret of their intention to work for lower milk prices in the next session of Congress. The inescapable facts are that farmers have new-found capacity to produce which so far has not been checked by either the controls tried or 5 years of lower prices. We have a built-up storage of feed grains and wheat which can, with our probable future expanded production, raise havoc with grain and livestock prices for some years to come. On this outlook there is little disagreement among the farm economists.

It means, among other things, that many more in agriculture will continue to seek other means of livelihood. Those who claim that all that is needed is to turn agriculture free to produce to the utmost, and that all will then be well, are ignoring all the farm history of 100 years. We do need changes in our farm programs but let's courageously face the facts and build accordingly.

The Senate Debate on Rule XXII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the New York Times today contains a perceptive editorial summarizing the results of the recent Senate debate on rule XXII. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE FIASCO

Two months ago the results of the 1958 congressional elections were interpreted everywhere as a sweeping victory for liberalism, particularly in the Senate. Down to defeat went Mr. Bricker and other stalwarts on the Republican side. Into the Senate came new Democrats from the North and West, younger men with a lively interest in such matters as the cause of civil liberties. On all sides it was predicted that in these matters the new Senate would help to write a bolder and more rewarding record than its predecessor.

Perhaps that will happen eventually, but certainly the new Senate is off to a poor start in this direction. It has turned down a reasonable proposal to end debate by majority vote after it has become clear that debate has ceased to be debate and become obstruction. It had rejected a similar proposal to end such debate by a three-fifths vote. It has wound up by amending the present rule, which requires a two-thirds vote of the entire membership, only to the extent of requiring a two-thirds vote of those present and voting; but since the entire membership of the Senate is almost certain to be marshaled in a vote on ending debate on such matters as civil liberties the change is to all intents and purposes meaningless.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, who engineered this meager result, characterizes it as a democratic victory: "It is the will of the people that is reflected here."

So thinks Mr. JOHNSON. Our own estimate differs.

Old No. 4: Yesterday and Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published by the Vermont Historical Society entitled "Old No. 4: Yesterday and Today." The article was written by Dr. J. Duane Squires. Dr. Squires is a noted historian, author, and lecturer whose recent history of the State of New Hampshire is outstanding. He is head of the social-studies department at Colby Junior College, New London, N.H.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD NO. 4: YESTERDAY AND TODAY

(By James Duane Squires, Ph. D., president, Old Number Four Associates)

In an article in the New York Times for Sunday, July 27, 1958, Joseph L. Wheeler describes how amateur historian-archaeologists in Vermont are now working in charting the course of four one-time colonial or Revolutionary highways. One of these, he points out, is the Crown Point Road, which ran from the Connecticut River near old No. 4 to Chimney Point, Vt., adjacent to the Crown Point Fort. Because of plans now underway to restore old No. 4, this particular colonial highway is of special interest to us today. It is of this fort and of this highway that I write in this essay.

In the first half of the 18th century, during the lull between Queen Anne's War (1701–13) and King George's War (1744–48), the Colony of Massachusetts determined to build four frontier forts to guard the western part of the Bay Colony from Indian forays out of Canada. These were located in the modern New Hampshire towns of Chesterfield, Westmoreland, Walpole, and Charlestown, but were then called by the serial number No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4. Number 4 was at present-day Charlestown, and was the final jumping-off point for the wilderness lying between the colonies in New England and the French settlements in Canada. In 1740, by royal decree, these four forts were transferred to the jurisdiction of New Hampshire. In that year King George II made the present northern boundary of Massachusetts the definitive line between the two colonies.

Old fort No. 4 was built close to the Connecticut River and covered an area of three-quarters of an acre on a site on the main street of the present village. Archaelogical excavations in 1957 definitely established the site of the old fortification, and brought to light a number of relics of the 18th century. It was composed of 13 houses joined together to make a quadrangle. As a further protection on three sides—the west, north, and east—a stockade was built. This was made of logs a foot in diameter and about 12 feet high above ground. This was the fort which under Capt. Phineas Stevens withstood an attack of several hundred French and Indians in April 1747. This was the base which was a key point in military operations through modern Vermont during the French and Indian War, 1754–63.

In the early campaigns of that war the normal route for New England troops going to the areas around Lake George and Lake Champlain was across Massachusetts, over the Berkshire Hills to Albany, and thence north to Fort Edward and the fighting zone. For Massachusetts soldiers this meant a long tramp around two sides of a triangle. New Hampshire regiments usually went to old No. 4, thence down the river to Massachusetts, and then over the hills to the west. This meant marching or boating along three sides of a quadrilateral. However necessary this might have been in the early years of the war, after the French had lost Fort Ticonderoga, and Crown Point, a more direct road from New Hampshire to Crown Point was obviously desirable.

On July 27, 1759, the fleur-de-lis flag was pulled down at Ticonderoga, and the Union Jack went up. A few days later the same situation came about at Crown Point. General Amherst, the British commander, thereafter determined to begin construction of a military road from his new bastion at Crown Point to the Connecticut River opposite old No. 4, some 87 miles away. The preliminary orders were issued to Capt. John Stark of Rogers Rangers on August 8. Stark promptly set out to make a survey across modern Vermont. In the great central wilderness of the Green Mountains he and his men found not even a pathway or a blazed trail. Stark reported his findings to Amherst on Sept. 9. The general approved the recommended route and on October 26 sent out Maj. Zadok Hawks and Captain Stark with 250 men and proper tools to begin construction from the western end.

The two officers and their axmen started at Chimney Point and laid out the road through Addison, Bridport, and Shoreham in a southeasterly direction. In Shoreham the road changed its direction to east by south. Crossing portions of Orwell, Whiting, and Sudbury it came out on Otter Creek in the northwestern part of Brandon. From thence it went to the village of Fowler in Pittsford. From Pittsford it turned to the southeast through Rutland and into Clarendon. The Green Mountains were approached near the village of East Clarendon. The road climbed steeply to Shrewsbury and thence to Mount Holly. From this region the road turned toward Patch Pond and Lake Amherst. It is, of course, obvious that not all this could possibly have been finished in the autumn of 1759. The roadmakers were low in provisions and in morale, and were paid off at old No. 4 on November 16. Probably the first few miles only were at all adequately done, the rest being merely roughed out and blazed.

In the spring of 1760 Col. John Goffe of the New Hampshire militia with 800 men was assigned the task of completing the road from the eastern end. By the middle of June most of the regiment had assembled at old No. 4. The men, their animals, and materials crossed the Connecticut 2 miles above the fort at Wentworth's Ferry. Here they built a blockhouse for protection and storage of equipment. The road, beginning at this blockhouse on the western bank of the river, ran for about 11 miles northwesterly through Springfield and Weathersfield. From that town it crossed into Cavendish, keeping to the hills away from the Black River. At Twenty-Mile Camp in Cavendish, Colonel Goffe set up his headquarters for the final section of the road work.

Beyond Cavendish the new construction went through Ludlow and into Plymouth. In that town it descended toward Echo Lake and thence went to Lake Amherst. Here the builders reached the end of construction by the working party of 1759. No Indians had been seen during the course of the work, but Colonel Goffe was always alert. On July 28

men, wagons, and cattle began passing over the new road; and on July 31 the advance contingents of these reached Crown Point. The highway was now open, and for the first time in colonial history there was a direct route from New Hampshire across modern Vermont. Old No. 4 was the anchor point on the east, and Crown Point the terminus on the west.

Seventeen years later old No. 4 was again prominent in military affairs. This time it was the rendezvous for Gen. John Stark and his New Hampshire troops marching to Bennington. Stark and his men left the fort on August 3 and moved by the old road for part of their way across Vermont. On August 7 the force reached Peru, and on August 8 the general and his 1,000 men camped in Manchester. Throughout this crossing all supplies, reinforcements, and equipment were forwarded to Stark from his operational base at old No. 4.

These are some of the reasons why modern Americans are interested in the restoration of this important colonial and Revolutionary fort. About 10 years ago certain persons in Charleston, N.H., incorporated the Old Number Four Associates. Since then much has been done. A competent architect has been secured, and careful plans for the restoration of the fort have been made. A new site has been secured, the old one now being in the heart of the present village. But the new site is in every way comparable to the original location, and is even closer to Wentworth's Ferry than was the fort 200 years ago. Many groups in New Hampshire have endorsed the restoration effort: the State Planning and Development Commission, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Sons of the American Revolution, the New Hampshire Federation of Women's Clubs, the Society of Colonial Wars, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and numerous local clubs and historical societies.

The estimated cost of the restoration of old No. 4 is $200,000. This amount will buy the land, build the 13 houses, erect the stockade, and permit some operating capital for the first year or so. The first logs for the stockade were donated by Dartmouth College, and set in place in July 1958. A great pageant, telling the story of old No. 4, drew many people to the site on August 15 and August 16, and awakened in them a new understanding of the place and function of the old fort in colonial and Revolutionary history.

Many Vermonters have sensed the significance of this program of restoration. Vrest Orton, chairman of the Vermont Historic Sites Commission, has written to the associates as follows:

"The commission feels, and we have emphasized this in our report to the General Assembly of Vermont, that there is a new and significant point of view toward the historic site mission in the States. It is this: Geography, we say, attracts people; history holds them. Good luck and all the success you so well deserve."

Prominent citizens of the Green Mountain State who live along the Connecticut River have served, and are now serving, as officers and directors of the Old Number Four Associates.

Such places as Williamsburg, Shelburne, Old Sturbridge, and others show clearly that restorations of historic sites and areas can charm and inspire modern Americans. It is believed that the restoration of old No. 4 in exactly its original form will have the same effect upon thousands of people, not only in Vermont and New Hampshire but also among our visitors. Perhaps by the time that we celebrate the bicentennial of the completion of the Crown Point Road in 1960, the old fort will be ready for inspection. From the same place that Colonel Goffe and General Stark took off 200 years ago, contemporary Americans may begin a trip across the scenic roads of Vermont.

How America Has Benefited Through 75 Years of the Civil Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an essay entitled "How America Has Benefited Through 75 Years of the Civil Service Act," written by Donald M. Van Dyke, of Arizona State University, in a recent contest conducted by various civil service groups.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW AMERICA HAS BENEFITED THROUGH 75 YEARS OF THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT

(By Donald M. Van Dyke, Arizona State University)

The Civil Service Commission was established by the Pendleton Act in 1883. Its objectives were few and simple. The act was to—

1. Assure proper qualification of Government employees.

2. Take the Government worker out of political bondage by prohibiting political officers from extracting campaign contributions from him or making his employment subject to political support.

3. Halt the creation of Government jobs for the purpose of rewarding political support.

There is no doubt that the Civil Service Act has done far more than accomplish the limited objectives of 1883. In its first year civil service placed over 10 percent of the Federal employees under a formal merit system. Over 2 million, or nearly 90 percent, of the Federal Government employees are now protected by civil service regulations. These figures do not tell the entire story. Many State, county, and municipal governments have passed versions of the Federal Civil Service Act which cover additional millions of local government employees.

The growth of civil service has not been in numbers alone. The standards required for entry into Government employment have continued to rise since the act was passed. In its beginning the Commission took a negative approach, assuring that Government employes possessed minimum qualifications and seeing that Government workers were not dismissed for political reasons. Today the Commission, in its drive for better government in the United States, seeks the highest qualified individuals rather than the "just" qualified; it encourages training programs for prospective public employees; and seeks to improve working conditions, in an attempt to make the American Government employee the best there is.

These improvements under the Civil Service Act are unquestionable. Those mentioned are most certainly not the only, nor necessarily the most outstanding, accomplishments, but they make up a representative list against which no argument will stand. This list only serves to establish that the civil service system has made great progress toward improving government service in the last 75 years. It is a base from which to ask, "What are the benefits of this growing civil service system?"

The accomplishments of the Civil Service Act include those gained under State and municipal civil service systems. A government employee may work for the National, State, county, or city government. A civil service system may be in effect at any or all of these levels. The list of benefits from the Civil Service Act stems from all of them, not any single one. The terms "civil service system" and "government employee" include those of all governmental units in the country. These terms should be understood in this context if the full meaning of the benefits of the Civil Service Act are to be acknowledged.

Benefits from the Civil Service Act can be placed in four main categories. Civil service benefits to the Nation and the people, civil service benefits to the Government, civil service benefits to Government employees and benefits resulting for nonmerit system employees. Examples of how they have benefited from the Civil Service Act are discussed below.

CIVIL SERVICE BENEFITS THE NATION AND THE PEOPLE

Not one day goes by but what each American is affected by some governmental service. Perhaps the most impressive example is the American food supply. Grocery stores draw stock from all parts of the Nation. Florida fruit can be purchased anywhere, Idaho potatoes are eaten in Maine and corn from Iowa is used for cornpone in Alabama.

The American housewife has no fear of unsanitary packing conditions contaminating the food she buys. She does not weigh or measure each of her purchases to see if she is actually getting what is marked on the package. Government employees, working under provisions of food and drug acts, laws prohibiting false advertising and laws providing for enforcement of sanitary conditions in packing plants and canning factories, do these things. Spoilage is reduced by fast transportation of perishable foodstuffs on highways constructed by the Government, or on trains and planes regulated by Federal commissions. Lettuce purchased in St. Paul today may well have been picked in Arizona yesterday.

Americans have these services because the Civil Service Act makes it possible to have confidence in government employees who administer them. Officials who carry out these programs are capable and competent. It is the civil service system which guarantees highly qualified employees to perform these services. In this way improvements in the civil service system reach into every American home every day of the year.

Medicine, drugs, gasoline, clothes, and heating fuels are other items which are supplied to the American consumer under Government supervision and protection. These are only a few ways in which the American citizen benefits from an effective civil service system.

CIVIL SERVICE BENEFITS THE GOVERNMENT

Constitutions and laws are often regarded as government; however, constitutions and laws only set out the form and scope of government operation. People who fill the positions and perform the tasks as set out by these legal requirements are in reality the government. In the United States there are less than 500 elected Federal officials. There are over 2 million nonelected employees. These people are the government. Their competence, ability, and efficiency is the competence, ability, and efficiency of the government.

Quite obviously the government can only be as good as the individuals who perform its functions. It is by constantly raising the standards which these individuals must observe that the civil service system, for 75 years, has been improving the government. The merit system makes it possible for individuals who are dedicated to public service to devote themselves to public service rather than to political servitude. There are many who feel a sincere desire to serve the people, and it has been the civil service system which has allowed these men and women to enter the field by closing the public service to

political hacks, ward heelers, and campaign managers. As those who are in government gain higher standards and proficiency, as they become more efficient, and as more dedicated persons enter the government, the government itself improves.

CIVIL SERVICE BENEFITS GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Benefits gained by civil service employees appear to be very obvious. Tenure has been tremendously improved by placing it on a performance basis, rather than on political affiliation; civil service employees can no longer be forced to make contributions to political campaigns; hiring is based on ability, not political activity; salaries have improved greatly; and working conditions are better than in former years. These are some of the obvious improvements in Government employment brought about by the Civil Service Act. There are others just as important. The prestige of governmental workers has risen greatly. No longer does Federal employment bring the charge of "parasite." An employee's coworkers are pleasant to work with and have qualifications at least equal to his own. His superiors must meet high requirements of proficiency and ability and demonstrate these abilities in order to obtain and hold their positions of authority. As an individual gains more experience and training he can qualify himself for higher positions, with the realizaton that he will be allowed to compete fairly for promotions.

Such improvements lead to a higher level of morale, to a great esprit de corps within the Government service. This attracts even more highly qualified persons into competition for Government positions. Such improvement brings recognition to a highly qualified civil service and pride in the service motivates employees to even better performance.

The civil service system has upgraded the civil servant in the eyes of the public as a whole and has had a special effect in other instances. A young person wishing to enter Government employment can now attend colleges and universities that offer courses in public administration, courses which are designed to train outstanding young people for years of high quality service in the Government. This condition is one which tends to perpetuate and improve itself once started.

Another advantage to the public servant which has come to be realized through the Civil Service Act is the operation of governmental job classification systems. Wages paid by the Government may leave something to be desired when compared to those paid by private industry, but they have improved greatly. There is no longer an unfair wage spread among those who are performing the same or equal jobs. All employees of equal rank receive an equal salary. The more experienced ones are paid for their extra ability on an equal basis. The qualifications necessary for obtaining promotions are known and if met the employee will be promoted on the basis of his ability. Wage levels and promotions are no longer determined by political contacts. They are set according to ability on a competitive basis. Even if Government wages are regarded as low the fact that they are based according to ability demonstrates improvement already gained and indicates the possibility for future gains.

Once again space permits enumerating only a few instances of the advantages and benefits of civil service in this category. The above list is intended as only a partial sample.

CIVIL SERVICE BENEFITS EMPLOYEES NOT UNDER ITS CONTROL

Civil service has proven itself in the last 75 years as a workable, desirable way of selecting and holding good governmental employees. It has set high standards and conditions which can be compared to governmental units not using an accepted merit system. If an exempt unit does not measure up properly or suffers abuses in any way, then the public may, and with pressure, effectively demand that the concerned group of employees be brought under a civil service program.

Under these circumstances any agency wanting to avoid being placed under the civil service system must maintain comparable standards of fair employment and, above all, employ competent, able people. While such units may be able to avoid meeting some of the standards imposed by civil service their overall level has been raised simply by the existence of the civil service system. Therefore many of the benefits of the Civil Service Act have been passed on to most Government employees.

CIVIL SERVICE AND THE FUTURE

Civil service has undoubtedly improved public employment. It has not done so to the extent that there are not more improvements to be made. The job the Civil Service Act was designed to do is dohe. A great deal more has been done. There are still many jobs remaining for the civil service system to do. The problem of raising public wages to compete with private industry has been mentioned, as has the fact that there are still many employees not covered by the system. The accusation that merit system employees are slow, that it is impossible to fire them must be met and resolved. Many levels of local government lack comprehensive, functioning civil service systems and this situation demands improvement. Looking back over 75 years of civil service it is next to impossible to measure the full extent of the impact of the merit system on American government. Perhaps the nearest measurement is to state simply that it has been too great to value. But the benefits of civil service are not set in the past, they are not enumerated and forgotten. They are hard won gains which have to be defended each day, and which demand continuing improvement and expansion. The current strength of the civil service program, its public support, its past accomplishments are the basis for another 75 years of continuing and expanding benefits. The past is gone and the future belongs to those who make it. Civil service can aid America in making that future a good and a full one.

Constructive Change Versus Destructive Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the phrase "changing times" is heard again and again on the floor of the Senate. Except for the need, or in some instances the alleged need, for changes in the Nation's laws, there would not be a need for the Congress to meet.

A recent editorial in the Edgefield (S.C.) Advertiser, entitled "Constructive Change Versus Destructive Change," philosophizes on the subject, pointing out that change that does not hold to the fundamentally sound values in our way of life will be destructive. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTRUCTIVE CHANGE VERSUS DESTRUCTIVE CHANGE

There is more marked attention to the element of time, to the coming of new years and to the significance of time with relation to change. Everyone is expecting something new to happen. There are so many new things in the offing it is natural that a new year excites the imagination more than it used to.

The principal issues are between constructive change and destructive change, between two different worlds competing for supremacy.

Constructive change will still hold to certain fundamentals, and at the start of another year the Advertiser reaffirms its faith in American religious ideals and in its human values—appreciation of industriousness, of fair play, of independence, of individual freedom; respect for the rights and entitlements of others; righteous indignation, keen discernment and persevering protest against public wrongs; a willingness to accept personal responsibility and to apply the best one has to meeting the daily problems of life independent of dishonest gain and sensitive to the perils and snares of false charity.

Changes are the order of the times, but change that does not hold to the fundamentally sound values in our way of life will be destructive, not constructive. They will be changes fostered by the ill-intentioned, by the iconoclasts.

It is up to the individual whether the next year will find us nearer the fulfillment of a universal desire for peace, not only among nations, but nearer the ideal of the perfect friendship, the perfect harmony of human relations, that is the ultimate goal, or whether led further along the road of tempting but empty promises.

In the numbers of individuals who demand only constructive change as against destructive change is to be found the barometer of progress. All other manifestations are illusions.

The most embattled citizen now is he or she who is committed by natural impulse and by training to the nobler and sturdier features of our country's traditions, who looks upon change as not bad in itself but recognizes an influence of destructive intent as threatening dominance.

If there are greater numbers of people who have been induced to follow the destructive side in recent years, it has made the challenge of constructive change the most courageous that any generation of Americans has yet faced.

Governor Brown Sets Forth a Program of Responsible Liberalism for California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, California's 32d Governor, Edmund G. Brown, took office at Sacramento on January 5. In his inaugural address Governor Brown set forth a program of responsible liberalism for our growing State. The Public Printer estimates that the text will make 2½ pages of the

RECORD at a cost of $202.50. I ask unanimous consent that Governor Brown's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chief Justice, Governor and Mrs. Knight, members of the legislature, and my fellow Californians, where democracy lives, free people speak in strong voices. Last November, a free people called for a new vision for California. We begin today the solemn duty and high privilege of translating that vision into public policy and into law.

The election reaffirms our conviction that the people of California are resolved to move forward with courage and confidence. Offered reaction by the radical right, the voters emphatically declined. Offered government by retreat, the people preferred progress. Clearly then, our duty is to bring to California the forward force of responsible liberalism.

RESPECT FOR PEOPLE

The essence of liberalism is a genuine concern and deep respect for all the people. Not monuments or institutions or associations, but people. Not one race, or one creed, or one nationality, but all the people. When people come first and special privilege is scorned, government is truly liberal.

In a liberal atmosphere, the individual stands secure against invasion of his dignity or intrusion on his conscience. He has the right to require justice and fair play, the right to demand protection from economic abuse and selfish threats to his security. At the same time, government must not, in naive good intention, stifle his initiative or smother his growth. Men must indeed have freedom to breathe the air of self respect.

A liberal program must also be a responsible program, a reasonable, rational, realistic program. We must know how much it will cost and where the money is coming from. Benefits must be measured against burdens. A program which pampers the people or threatens our solvency is as irresponsible as the one which ignores a vital need. But we will always remember that there is a difference between responsibility and timidity, and we are resolved to be governed more by our hopes than by our fears.

IN WARREN'S PATH

In the path of responsible liberalism, we walk in the giant footsteps of such memorable Governors as Hughes and Roosevelt in New York, Wilson in New Jersey, La Follette in Wisconsin, Altgeld and Stevenson in Illinois, and Johnson and Warren in California. Let us mark their example and set our sights to match their achievements.

Here in California the explosive growth of our population and economy strains the fabric of government. Between election and inauguration, our population increased by 75,000 people. We must accept both the perils and the promise of this magnificent growth. No longer can we afford to stay on dead center, unresponsive and inert. I pledge a confident, pioneering leadership, ready to welcome growth, pursue its promise, and prepare for tomorrow.

A liberal's duty to be responsible has a special meaning in view of the grim crisis we face in the budget. From last year's budget, our bleak legacy is a $100 million deficit. For several years, our State has spent more than it has taken in, and now almost all of our reserves and special funds are exhausted.

ECONOMY BUDGET

I am resolved that our new administration will face our financial responsibilities without flinching. Before the end of the month, I will recommend an economy minded budget, and a courageous and fair program to obtain new revenues. I pledge, however, that we will not sacrifice essential services or narrow our vision for California.

OPPOSITION TO COMMUNISM

Throughout the world, the cynical creed of communism slanders democracy with the charge that men are too greedy, too ignorant, or too lazy to govern themselves. Let us, in our respect and concern for all the people, resolve to prove anew that representative government is the best government. Let us forge a program which will liberate our human resources and demonstrate the renewed vigor of American society. In this way, we will answer the slanders of communism and expose its evil design.

DEMOCRATIC PRIDE

This is a day of proper pride as well as earnest dedication for California Democrats. Not for 20 years, and only once before in this century, has a Democratic governor made the inaugural address to the legislature. And not since 1889 has there been a majority of Democrats in both houses of the legislature.

The job of government, however, is not a narrowly partisan undertaking. I pledge my full cooperation to Democrats and Republicans alike. I know most of you personally, and I consider this to be one of the ablest legislative bodies in the United States. My door will always be open so that we can consider together our common problems of State government. We must understand each other, trust each other, and work together in harmony. Where the good of the people is involved, I will expect the support of the distinguished members of both parties, and I hope by my actions to merit it.

THANKS KNIGHT

In this connection, I express my deep appreciation to Governor Knight, to Mrs. Knight, and to the entire executive family for the genuine cooperation afforded me in the transfer of the functions and duties of this high office.

SPECIFICS PROGRAM

In obedience to the constitution, I turn now to specific recommendations. I lay before you a program which in my considered judgment meets the test of being both liberal and responsible.

1. Guarantee equal job opportunities.

Discrimination in employment is a stain upon the image of California. We must recognize that conduct which degrades any member of society degrades society as a whole. Every man must finally see the necessity of protecting the rights of others as the most effective security for his own.

I therefore urge you to enact legislation to bar discrimination by an employer or a labor union on grounds of race, creed, national origin, or age. We should provide the means for conciliation, public education, and enforcement to insure that there are no arbitrary barriers to useful and productive employment. In truth we are, and in practice we must be, one people, equal in privilege and opportunity. This is our moral duty.

2. Protect the consumer.

We are all consumers. Yet, we have never been able to speak in a single voice because we are disorganized and our needs are so diverse. Without a forceful spokesman in government, we have little defense against highly organized special interests. I therefore recommend legislation providing for the appointment of a consumers' advocate, who should be empowered to advance the consumers' interests by public education and by representation before government agencies.

I also urge you to enact legislation to protect people from installment racketeers. Every year thousands of Californians are deceived into signing sales contracts which contain unfair provisions and result in outrageous carrying charges. We need new laws to wipe out these vicious practices. We need them fair, strong, and soon.

3. Encourage economic development.

To keep our economy strong, we need new industries, new payrolls, and new jobs for our expanding population. Accordingly, I recommend legislation for the establishment of an agency for economic development to launch a vigorous program to bring business here. By augmenting private efforts to attract new industries, this agency will invigorate our economy and enrich our lives.

LABOR PROGRAM

4. Safeguard workers' rights.

The voters have firmly rejected the so-called right to work law. In a new and objective atmosphere, let us move forward to strengthen the integrity of the collective-bargaining process. I will soon send you a special message outlining my legislative proposals in detail. May I say now, however, that I intend to recommend:

Legislation under which employees in intrastate commerce can choose a bargaining representation;

Legislation specifically outlawing bribes to union officials;

Legislation setting up safeguards concerning union meetings and elections and providing for the recall of union officers for misconduct;

Legislation preventing loans by unions to their officers, and requiring union officers and management consultants to file financial statements; and

Legislation governing the relationship between a local union and its parent organization.

Such laws would be safeguards against the irresponsible minority whose conduct damages all of labor. But there must be no punitive measures against free and responsible unions which have brought untold progress and improved living conditions to our State. Cripple the responsible union and all of the people will suffer. Strengthen the responsible union and labor can contribute its full energy to the new vision for California.

AID TO PEOPLE

5. Increase social insurance and public welfare.

In the stern judgment of history, our greatness as a state will largely depend on our sense of responsibility to the elderly, the sick, the needy, the injured, and the unemployed. I reject the outdated notion that concern for these people is not the business of government.

I believe that the level of unemployment insurance benefits clearly should be raised. At 1959 prices, no family can meet its basic needs on the $40 per week maximum. In the last year, there has been forceful evidence that thousands of workers are left stranded if benefit payments are limited to 26 weeks when recessions last longer. We should lengthen the period of coverage, at least whenever unemployment has reached a given percentage of the work force.

Turning to the workmen's compensation law, I recommend that we take prompt action to correct the striking inadequacy in the vocational rehabilitation provisions for injured workers. In addition, the amount and duration of benefits may well need to be increased. The same is true of disability benefits.

In the field of public welfare, we should improve the operation of the 1957 medical care program and insure that it fulfills its important purpose. One obvious shortcoming in the program is its failure to extend to persons now enrolled in the aid to disabled program. For the disabled person, the need for medical care is especially great and compelling.

Our new laws in the field of social insurance and public welfare must be responsible as well as liberal. Thus, we must stop short of an extreme, isolated postion which

would discourage the entry of new wealth and industry and thus injure our economy and our people alike. But short of this extreme, we will remember that social insurance and public welfare benefits go directly into our lifestream and that we serve our economy as well as our humanitarian principles by making California a leader in this field.

6. Establish a minimum wage.

I urge you to enact legislation which will establish $1.25 an hour as the minimum wage for California workers not covered by the Federal law. Minimum wage laws assure a worker that he will be paid enough to maintain himself in health and decency. Elementary fairness dictates that this protection should not be denied a person because of the happenstance that he is employed in a local business. Moreover, a minimum wage law will protect ethical employers from the unfair competition of those who would pay substandard wages.

ELECTION REFORM

7. Reform election practices.

Because elections are the strong heartbeat of democracy, the reform of election practices deserves a top priority. I urge you to abolish crossfiling in primary elections, and thus strengthen representative government by making our parties more responsible and more responsive to the will of the people.

I also urge you to strengthen our laws providing for disclosure of campaign funds. The gaps in the present law threaten the integrity of our democratic processes.

In this electronic age, we continue to count ballots by primitive methods. I recommend that existing statutes be broadened to encourage electronic tabulation of votes in all counties of the State. We must also find a way to shorten our political campaign and stop every election from being an endurance contest, both for the candidates and the voters. When we improve the election process, we strengthen democracy.

8. Promote efficiency in government.

I urge you to adopt legislation to enable us to reorganize and streamline State government. Specifically, I believe that the Governor should be authorized to prepare and transmit to the legislature plans for the reorganization of the executive branch of the State government. I also pledge my wholehearted support for your efforts to improve the organization and operation of State agencies.

Not since 1928 have we made a thorough and penetrating analysis of the structure of our State government. Today each citizen pays the price of a government which has developed haphazardly in a piecemeal response to the pressure of growth. We are burdened by layer upon layer of patchwork agencies, and confusing lines of authority. The time has come for us to modernize State government and improve its services to our people.

TO FIGHT CRIME

9. Control crime.

Crime and narcotics are ugly companions. Driven by fear and guilt, the criminal seeks escape through the use of narcotics; in turn, the addict steals to support his costly habit.

As a new approach to this complex problem, I urge you to authorize the department of corrections to establish pilot units for narcotic treatment and control in key areas of the State. This program would provide diagnostic testing and psychiatric aid for addicts released on parole or probation. By providing these new tools for control and rehabilitation, we take a promising and pioneering step toward narcotics control. We only endorse futility if we do no more in this field than renew procedures which time has already proven unsuccessful.

Our prisons are dangerously overcrowded. This not only magnifies the hazards of riots and breakouts, but inevitably produces the frustration of idleness. In meeting this problem, our first responsibility is the protection of society. We must initiate new studies to identify those prisoners who should never be released to prey again on an innocent public. We should also determine whether some prisoners are now kept confined after punishment has served its purpose. In addition, we should establish new forestry camps and industrial training programs so that after release, every man can offer society an effective skill and regular work habits.

Today's prisoners were yesterday's delinquents. The California Youth Authority has pioneered in the field of youth correction, but now we must press forward in the prevention of delinquency. To that end, I will immediately take personal leadership of the Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth to study the early causes of one of society's most difficult problems. If we can find a way to reach the promise and the core of goodness in our emotionally disturbed children, we strike at the roots of crime.

SCHOOL CHALLENGE

10. Improve quality in education.

Both our Constitution and our conscience enjoin us to invest money in young minds, our greatest natural resources. Specifically, our growth requires us to meet these needs in public education: 18,000 new teachers a year, when we now graduated 11,000; 5,000 new classrooms a year, when we now build 2,500; facilities for 400,000 college and university students in 1970, when we now have space and equipment for but 100,000.

These needs are the challenge of growth. Let us meet them with adult dedication and ingenuity. We can attract and retain good teachers, if we offer practical training, adequate professional salaries, and new levels of community confidence and respect. We must also find the means to provide the physical plants as well as the intellectual climate for learning.

In turn, we have the right to require that our schools shall provide genuine education in a well taught, disciplined curriculum. Every child deserves the chance to grow in fundamental knowledge, in special and technical skills, and in insight. I am determined that California will have the best public schools in the United States. I am persuaded, as I am confident you are, that whatever we invest in free public education is returned, manifold, to our economy and to the strength of our democratic government.

ANTISMOG FIGHT

11. Protect public health.

We live in an era marked by new cures for old diseases and by dramatic new dangers to our health. Air pollution is a statewide menace. It threatens the health of people not only in Los Angeles, but in every heavily populated region of the State. We must recognize that our attack on smog cannot stop at county lines.

I therefore ask that you supply additional funds for concentrated research on the dangerous effects of smog on people. I call upon the automobile industry to expand and accelerate its research on smog prevention. I want to serve notice on every industry and every person involved that my administration will take effective action to protect the people of the State. People are more important than dollars.

Exposure to radiation from nuclear fallout and industrial accidents now threatens all of us. We should provide funds for the State department of public health to maintain a constant guard against dangerous levels of radioactivity in air, water, food, and sewage.

In addition, I urge that California follow the example of other alert States and establish a coordinator of the many phases of atomic energy development now in process in several existing State agencies. Failure to act and plan in atomic matters which are so promising to our progress and so critical for our safety, would be both irresponsible and dangerous.

I also recommend that the legislature provide funds for the continuation of the department of public health's program to combat alcoholism and promote temperance.

Fifteen years as a law enforcement officer have convinced me that although other problems may be better publicized, none causes more suffering and despair than alcoholism.

COURT IMPROVEMENT

12. Improve the administration of justice.

There is a log jam in our California courts. In Los Angeles County alone, the backlog of civil cases climbed to nearly 16,000 in 1958. Each case has to wait in line well over a year after it is ready for trial. In other counties, the situation is even worse. Last October when Chief Justice Warren called attention to this crisis in the courts, we were forcefully reminded that justice delayed frequently is justice denied.

Automobile accidents spawn a major portion of the congestion in our courts. For the accident victims, the net result is a grave social loss. After years of delay and uncertainty, the majority will recover nothing, and financial distress will be added to their pain and suffering. Those who eventually win their cases may not be able to collect their judgments, and what they do recover will have to be shared with others.

Three decades ago, California pioneered in establishing an expert commission to handle industrial accidents. Now, the time has come for us to weigh the wisdom of an automobile accident commission to hear and determine claims arising out of auto accidents. If a commission modeled after our industrial accident commission could provide a prompt remedy and fair compensation for the accident victim, we would reduce suffering and hardship. If the commission could gain an insight into the causes of accidents and issue safety orders, we would cut down the carnage on the highways. If, through the creation of such a commission, we could enable our courts to keep abreast of their dockets, we would take a long step toward our goal of equal justice under law.

MORE ARE DUE

The limits of this inaugural occasion do not permit a detailed statement of all that is in my mind and heart today. During the course of this session, I will bring you recommendations on traffic safety, billboards, the redevelopment law, improvements in our recreational program, and other matters.

WATER PROGRAM

Before the end of January, I will send you a major message on water. Development of our water resources is crucial to every segment of our State—the ranchers in our mountain areas, the farmers who make California the Nation's leading agricultural producer, and the homeowners in our population which will grow to 20 million by 1970. No problem has occupied more of my time in the weeks since election than water. Striking progress has been made. I can tell you now that I will soon present a water program which is rational, realistic, and responsive to the needs of all the people of the State.

URBAN PROBLEMS

I will also soon announce appointment of a Governor's commission on metropolitan problems. For the 85 percent of our people who live in urban communities, local government is often inefficient, costly, and confusing because the necessary services are rendered by overlapping and competing agencies. The congestion of our streets symbolizes the necessity for a new and coordinated approach to the pressing problems in our cities. Any approach to these problems must respect our tradition of community responsibility and the high quality of our local officials, but I am convinced that

we should make a concerted attack on these acute and chronic problems.

RESEARCH PROGRAM

Looking beyond these specific matters, let us recall the warning of the Bible that where there is no vision, the people perish. Today we see successful industries accepting this judgment. They search out their most creative minds and put them to work studying distant horizons.

I propose that California follow industry's example and become the first State in the Nation to set up a specific research and development program. I propose that we seek out our most creative minds both in and out of State government and put them to work on a wide range of long-term problems, such as our crowded airways, the plight of workers frozen in their jobs by pensions which cannot be transferred, discrimination in housing, the defects of the present health insurance program, and on to new problems on the frontiers of space.

As I conclude, I would observe that providence seems intent on making us a great people in a great State. This destiny of greatness requires of us our best laws and fairest administration. Let us lead with confidence and compassion as we draw the lines for the new vision for California. May we pray to God that our virtues grow with California and be durable, and that our vision for California be liberal and responsible.

Veterans' Day Address by Stuart A. Lindman, Commander, Minnesota Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine address by Mr. Stuart A. Lindman, commander of the Minnesota Disabled American Veterans, and a well-known radio and television personality in the twin cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul.

I commend to my colleagues in the Senate Mr. Lindman's address, which was delivered at the Veterans' Day ceremonies at the St. Paul, Minn., State capitol building, on November 11, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Pastor Anderson, distinguished guests, veterans, and friends, this is Veterans Day, 1958, the fifth national Veterans Day.

Our permanent theme of these ceremonies in the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month is "Peace with honor."

Peace with honor.
Peace with dignity and courage.
Peace with integrity and uprightness.

And who personifies the peace with courage more than America's wartime defenders—her veterans of military service? Within the memory of living American war veterans today are the ferocities of San Juan, Santiago, Chateau Thierry, the Meuse Argonne, Guadalcanal, the Battle of the Bulge, Okinawa, Korea. These are the men, who—more than once—have saved America. These are the men who fought and bought peace with their courage. Is it not truly meet, right, and salutary, then, that we pay honor to the men, who—more than once—have saved America?

And who personifies the peace with uprightness more than our veterans whose leadership guards America's security in peace? I would remind you: Today there are more than 22 million living American war veterans in the United States. One out of every eight persons is a war veteran. Currently guarding America's security in peace are these war veterans: The President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, six of the nine Justices of the Supreme Court, and more than half of our Congressmen and Senators. And we must further name the thousands serving on State and local levels, and those of us who also stand and wait. Is it not truly meet, right, and salutary that we pay honor to the men who guard our security in peace?

It's been said that no one will care for you if you care not for yourself. This we can apply to our large family in veterandom.

What we have done, as veterans, will fade from America's memory if we, as veterans, allow it to fade. That is exactly what is happening.

Therefore, as veterans, we should resolve that:

It is our responsibility to let not America forget who we are and what we have done.

It is our responsibility to teach young America who we are and what we have done.

It is our responsibility to keep other world powers fearfully—and I use the word advisedly—aware of who we are and what we have done.

And because it is true that the memory of our accomplishments is fading it would seem that it is once again the veterans' responsibility to spell out how honor can be paid the victors of war, the defenders of peace, the guardians of security.

There are two major avenues:

America must adequately—adequately—care for her disabled and indigent veterans.

And America must heed the veterans' warning to keep this country bristling with defense so that there will never again be any military aggression against us.

Let's be flag wavers. Let's be flag wavers. Former President Herbert Hoover back in 1954 said: "We must realize the vitality of a great spiritual force which we call nationalism. The fuzzy-minded intellectuals have sought to brand nationalism as a sin against mankind. They seem to think that infamy is attached to the word nationalist." The spirit of nationalism springs from the deepest of human emotions. It rises from the yearning of men to be free of foreign domination, to govern themselves. It springs from a thousand rills of race, of history, of sacrifice, and pride in national achievement. In our own country, does not the word "America" stir something deeper within us than mere geography? Does not the suffering and the sacrifice of our forebears who fought for our independence flash in our minds with every mention of the word?

I say: Let's be nationalists. Let's be flag wavers.

Of the 20 some civilizations this world has known, only 1 was crushed by outside aggression; the others have decayed from within. I am sure there were no flags waving as the decadence grew.

A bristling defense will keep other world powers fearfully aware of who we are and what we have done.

Care of the wars' disabled and indigent will teach young America that their country properly and adequately cares for its defenders. So should the call to war ever come again young America will be steadfast in service, knowing full well and rightly so, that they, in their turn, will be rightly cared for.

And as our veterans' care and our sure defense increase so will also grow the American consciousness of the heroics of our wartime veterans and the honor due them.

Of America's care to disabled and indigent veterans:

Today there are nearly 3 million veterans on Veterans' Administration rolls receiving relief of one kind or another. Let me mention but some of the recompense due and paid our disabled and indigent:

Six hundred and sixty thousand veterans have been given vocational rehabilitation; 95 percent of these are gainfully employed. A grateful Government has built 172 veterans' hospitals; admissions to these installations number nearly half a million every year. There are grants for wheelchair homes, automobiles for the severely handicapped, prosthetic appliances. There are monetary benefits in the forms of compensations and pensions. Yes, a grateful Nation attempts to care for a grateful veterandom.

But to mention just two of many concurrent thoughts in this hour of honor to our veterans: (1) the majority of our veteran population is young men. What will be their needs in old age? Will our veterans' benefits keep pace? Will America's care for aged veterans be adequate? And (2) there is a current review being conducted of ratings for disabled veterans. Articulately, let me ask: Is this not simply an economy drive again at the expense of our disabled veterans? I am told that instructions have been received by the Veterans' Administration centers across the country that the review must be completed by January 1 of 1960. At this time half of the claims folders still remain to be reviewed.

I suggest this time directive means a hurried, haphazard handling of a very delicate trust.

I suggest such activity is neither adequate or accurate.

I suggest honor to our veterans through care for the disabled must be a continuing honor in all hours and not to be flirted with at any arbitrarily fixed calendar date.

As veterans we must realize that our mission is not fulfilled until all of our disabled comrades—our fellow veterans in need—their dependents and widows are adequately cared for.

As veterans we must not allow America to forget who we are and what we have done.

Of America's bristling defense, we can be sure:

There is no such thing now as a return to normalcy.

We are living within a time area wherein we are threatened with immediate annihilation.

We must prepare for any contingencies.

We are determined that our defense be maintained.

We cannot afford the luxury of not paying the defense bill.

Or, more positively, we can afford any expense in the cause of national defense.

A heavy expenditure for defense will not lead to economic collapse.

But most assuredly a heavy defense expenditure does call for the most efficient management in our Defense Department.

Of America's bristling defense, we can be sure:

America will never strike the first military blow at any time or place. So if we do not get in the first blow then we must be prepared to roll with any attack against us and make a comeback. Therefore, we need previous preparations, the capability of restoring a smashed economy, and military forces of all magnitude in being. Previous preparations call for research and development. Which things in themselves serve as deterrents to war; through advanced research can we render obsolete potential enemy weapons.

Of America's bristling defense, we can be sure:

Military forces of all magnitude in being call for many, many choices:

Should our biggest expenditure go for civil defense, conventional ground forces, guided missiles, conquest of outer space?

Note the possible clash of choices:

If too much is spent on conquest of outer-space, then would we be able to provide the mobile ground forces needed to contain and handle a local war?

If we defer dollars from civil defense and an enemy does strike, we would not lose millions of people, potential ground forces?

If we spend less on missile research might not an aggressor pass us by? If we shift from mass production of jet bombers, for example, to more advanced research, just what good would missiles on drawing boards do us in the event of an attack?

But we can be sure of this: the less we spend the fewer choices we can make, the fewer the contingencies against which we can be prepared.

Of America's bristling defense, we can be sure:

The Defense Department must be pressured from time to time to spend moneys in unacceptable ways. It might well be that local pressures prevent the services from abandoning obsolete military centers simply to relieve financially distressed areas. It might well be that local pressures dictate that the services stockpile nearly obsolete material simply to sustain particular industries.

Of America's bristling defense, we can be sure:

Duplication of efforts must be avoided among the services, but not at the expense of healthy rivalry.

Finally and positively:

Let's make military service more attractive as a career.

Let's bring more community respect to the researcher and the educator.

Let's transfer to civilian agencies, contractors, and individual workers the work areas that are better performed by civilians, and relieve the military to serve strictly military purposes.

As veterans I am sure we are all for keeping the peace at any cost or expense.

A moment ago I said there is no such thing now as a return to normalcy. Right now I want to quote from Harper's magazine, October 10. Listen:

"It is a gloomy moment in history. Not in the lifetime of any man who reads this paper has there been so much grave and deep apprehension; never has the future seemed so dark and incalculable. In France, the political cauldron seethes and bubbles with uncertainty. England and the English Empire is being sorely tried and exhausted in a social and economic struggle with turmoil at home and uprising in her teeming millions in her far-flung empire. The United States is beset with racial, industrial, and commercial chaos, drifting we know not where. Russia hangs like a storm cloud on the horizon of Europe, dark and silent. It is a solemn moment, and no man can feel indifference, which happily no man pretends to feel in the issue of events."

That is a pretty sobering excerpt from a long time accepted and respected publication, and it was written October 10—October 10, 1847—111 years ago. Things haven't changed much, have they? And how many wars has the world had in those 111 years? And what have those wars proved or decided? The utter uselessness, the folly of war. I'm for maintaining peace with honor at any cost or expense. Peace with honor is wonderful.

This day is a solemn occasion in which all of us dedicate ourselves anew to the peace for which we fought and for which so many of our comrades died. And while we look back to great sacrifices, we must at the same time look forward to the goals we all desire. If we can demonstrate to ourselves that our children and grandchildren will live to know the honorable peace for which we all struggled, only then can we feel assured that we merit a Veterans Day salute.

Unless we have and guard and maintain peace with honor, all will have been in vain.

If you take away anything of what I have said today, make it this: In our homes the spirit of patriotism should be implanted in our children; in our schools the spirit of patriotism should be so highly and strongly developed as to give our country high type individuals who will not only guard our country against decadence (of which I spoke) but will also aline it with God's plan of development and of progress.

"Three things I know must always be,
To keep a nation strong and free.
One is a hearthstone bright and dear,
With busy, happy loved ones near.
One is a strong and ready hand,
To have and serve and keep the land.
One is a worn and beaten way,
To where people go to pray.
So long as these are kept alive,
Nation and people will survive.
God keep them always everywhere,
The home, the flag, the place of prayer."

A Fine Example of Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, advocates of big Government spending frequently allege that only the Government is capable of financing huge projects, that the private investors are not willing to take the chance or spend the money. Many of these big Government advocates would have us turn to socialism, with the central government running everything in a bureaucratic method.

David Lawrence, in a column appearing in the January 8 edition of the Greenville (S. C.) News, comments at length on the recent financial story concerning the split in three parts of American Telephone and Telegraph Co. stock. Pointing out that this passed, no doubt, as a routine item in Socialist- and Communist-dominated countries, Mr. Lawrence goes on to show how A.T. & T. is the world's finest example of the superb job done by people's capitalism in the realm of economics. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lawrence's column, entitled "A Fine Example of Enterprise System," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FINE EXAMPLE OF ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Sometimes we overlook the obvious—the things for which we ought to be thankful as we come to a new year. One thing we often overlook is the success of what might be called people's capitalism.

The other day the financial tickers told the world that the stock of the A.T. & T.—the American Telephone and Telegraph Co.—had been split in three parts. It promptly rose in value on the stock exchanges. Maybe the newspapers in Moscow thought it only a routine item in the press of a country where capitalism prevails. But, actually, it was a powerful counterargument to communism, and it's unfortunate that the people of the Soviet Union can't be told what it really means.

For, without a single dollar put up by the Government of the United States, the people themselves have invested their money in and become owners of the largest and most successful single private business in the whole world. Although the vast majority of telephone systems in other countries are owned and operated by the government, the United States has more telephones than the rest of the world put together. There is no cleaner or clearer example of private enterprise than A.T. & T.

With transcontinental and overseas connections in a matter of minutes, the United States owes much to this rapid system of communication. Its efficiency of operation is a tribute to American private enterprise and private management.

True, the Government must approve the rates charged the customers and also takes a hand if any improper practices toward competitors should emerge, but basically the telephone business is a private business. Its investment in plant and equipment totals more than $23 billion, and it employs 700,000 persons. Its owners are more than 1,564,000 individuals and 61,000 institutions. This total includes more than 250,000 employees in the industry itself. No financial group owns any controlling interest. The stockholders elect their directors who, in turn, select the management. Nothing like it of such size exists anywhere else in the world.

The A.T. & T. and its affiliates comprise 23 companies, serving 55,800,000 phones. There are 3,900 independent companies. These serve about 9,700,000 phones—or nearly three times as many as in the whole of the Soviet Union. They, too, do an efficient job in the private enterprise system that provides the United States with 54 percent of all the telephones in the world.

To appreciate the great value of the modern telephone service to business, one must travel in many other countries where communication is almost primitive. The number of telephones in the entire Soviet Union is about 3,558,000 as of January 1958. This is less than New York City's 4,204,000. Moscow has 450,000 phones for its nearly 5 million population, compared with Washington's 582,000 phones for 830,000 residents.

Business moves faster in America than than anywhere else because a multiplicity of transactions is made possible through telephone communication.

Not long ago the late Robert Lincoln O'Brien, who was personal secretary to President Cleveland, was telling this correspondent how the engagements were made with persons invited by Mr. Cleveland to come to the White House for conferences and how the President gave him important messages to other Government officials to be delivered orally. Mr. O'Brien said he actually spent whole days at this task. For he had to get into a carriage and drive around the National Capital going from office to office. There was no telephone service then.

What does the telephone business mean to the American economy? The payroll and other payments to employees of the A.T. & T. totaled more than $3 billion in the first 9 months of 1958.

Here, therefore, is an enterprise managed and owned privately which is bigger than any single business in the Soviet Union and, in fact, bigger than many of the collectivist enterprises of the Soviets put together.

Who gets the benefit of this enormous investment? The people of America and some investors from abroad. For annually the A.T. & T. pays out big sums in dividends on its stock and interest on its bonds—over $600 million to shareholders in 1958. These

stockholders are for the most part persons of modest means—the vast majority are not rich people. Owners of stock include about 344,000 men and 723,000 women, with 498,000 joint account ownerships. Institutions hold only about one-fifth of the company's shares.

Plainly here is something for the American system of people's capitalism to crow about. It is an example to hold up not only to the people of the Soviet Union but to other Communist countries. Indeed, it is a lesson in economics that ought never to be brushed aside by the socialistically inclined politicians within the western countries. For private initiative is in the long run better for the worker, better for the investor and better for the people as a whole.

The Financial Institutions Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last year, as the culmination of 2 years of effort to modernize and codify the laws dealing with financial institutions, the Senate passed a bill designated as the Financial Institutions Act of 1957. Efforts to obtain action on that bill in the other body were unsuccessful, however, and it died with the 85th Congress.

Because of questions which I have been asked about the possibility of reviving that bill, and because of other indications of interest in what happened to it, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Thomas W. Miles, an experienced and well-informed writer on financial topics. This article, entitled "Reexamining the Financial Institutions Bill," was published in the December 1958 issue of the Burroughs Clearing House magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REEXAMINING THE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS BILL

(By Thomas W. Miles, Washington, D.C.)

The legacy of the ill-fated financial institutions bill in the last Congress is a public image so blurred by charges that its real job of modernizing banking and credit legislation has been lost sight of. Unless this image can be corrected, it will jeopardize any general overhauling of financial legislation in the forthcoming 86th Congress. For that reason some of the more serious charges might well be reexamined in this lull between engagements to see what substance there is to them.

There were no real problems in the Financial Institutions Bill that Congress could not have resolved in the last session. It has come up with answers to many tougher problems in shorter time. But the things that were said about the bill confused many Members of Congress and resulted in the bill being stymied in the House Banking and Currency Committee.

The charges came so thick and so fast that the answers went unheeded, crowded out of public interest by still newer charges. The net effect of this organized campaign of charges and alarms was to create a doubt—which was exactly what was intended. And when the opposition of organized labor was enlisted, that doubt took on new proportions. Added to all this was the fact that the financial community was divided over certain features. This in itself was a serious impediment.

Two themes ran through the attacks on the financial institutions bill in the House, both appealing to historic American fears and prejudices. The first exploited our deeply ingrained fear of power, in this case the alleged threat of the concentration of economic power in large financial institutions. The second capitalized on the political appeal of the consumer and small business.

Two quotations from the many in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD aptly illustrate the play on these themes. In one it was charged that provisions in the bill "will weaken the smaller banks and lead to more centralized control over banking."

And the other contended: "Many hidden booby traps against consumers, against the laboring man, against the small banks, against the Federal credit unions, against legitimate insurance agents and salesmen and against the public interest." That takes in the butcher, the baker, the candlestick-maker in a political wrapup.

Before looking more closely at the imagery in the charges we might review briefly the history of the financial institutions bill to get a better perspective. The need for codifying and up-dating banking and credit laws is generally conceded.

Recognizing that need, Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON of Virginia proposed in the summer of 1956 to meet it. Subsequently, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, named Senator ROBERTSON to make a study for the committee of all Federal statutes governing banks, savings and loan associations and credit unions. This was a formidable undertaking and one that other less intrepid members of Congress than Senator ROBERTSON had shied away from for years. Senator ROBERTSON was acting in the tradition of his predecessor, the great Carter Glass.

Senator Robertson's first step was to invite all of the Federal supervisory agencies to recommend amendments for changes in the statutes under which they function. These included the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions. Recommendations were also requested of the Treasury Department, the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office.

Then, to complete the picture in accordance with the practice on Capitol Hill in such matters, Senator ROBERTSON sought the views of a fair cross section of the financial community. He set up an advisory committee to which each of the 15 Senators on the Senate Banking Committee named 1 appointee. He appointed the other 12 to insure adequate representation of the various groups involved. This became known as the Cravens committee, so named for its chairman, Kenton R. Cravens, president, Mercantile Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo.

There was lots of work to be done. The task was described by Lee P. Miller, recently elected president of the American Bankers Association, as monumental. Senator ROBERTSON spelled it out for the record in these words:

"The study of existing statutes of necessity will be a technical one rather than a broad inquiry into financial and economic theories. The major objective will be to formulate a new banking code with obsolete provisions eliminated and new authority added in areas where need is clearly demonstrated."

The Government agencies turned in more than 180 amendments on which the Robertson subcommittee held hearings that November (1956) and the next month the Advisory Committee reported 200 recommendations. Out of all this basic material Senator ROBERTSON and his counsel, Donald L. Rogers, drew up a tentative 252-page bill which was published as a committee print. Senator ROBERTSON made this comment about the bill:

"I deliberately eliminated from the tentative bill new policy issues and limited the controversial issues as far as practical to those which had previously been considered either by the Senate or the House but on which no final action had been taken."

On this bill the Robertson subcommittee held 14 days of hearings (January 28 through February 18, 1957) and heard 39 witnesses discuss the changes proposed in the laws. In addition, 114 written statements, letters, etc., were submitted, bringing to 1,073 the number of pages in the printed record of the Senate hearings.

After that the Senate Banking Committee met in executive session and drafted the financial institutions bill, S. 1451, which it reported to the Senate March 4. The Senate debated that bill 5 days, fought over a number of amendments and in the end was content to pass it by voice vote. From the recital of the bare facts of this report of the progress of the bill it is abundantly evident that the Senate was fully aware of the controversial features of this legislation.

But if the bill ran a gamut of controversy and compromise in the Senate, it jammed smack into devastating tactics in the House. These involved delay and what was virtually a filibuster in the executive sessions of the House Banking Committee. These tactics were surprising only in the sense that they proved to be insurmountable.

Even before the bill was introduced by Representative PAUL BROWN of Georgia in the House as H.R. 7026, its proponents were on notice that it was in for trouble. Mounting the attack against the bill in the House Banking Committee were Representatives WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas and ABRAHAM J. MULTER of New York. Behind their opposition lay years of sharp criticism of banking laws. They were supported silently, for the most part, by colleagues responsive to labor criticism. Unless this is understood, it would appear that Mr. PATMAN and Mr. MULTER carried off the show alone—which was not the case.

There was another factor in their favor that is not understood very well except in Washington. And that is that Congress does not have occasion to deal with banking legislation very often—the last big banking bill was the Banking Act of 1935—and, accordingly, Congress is not so accustomed to handling this legislation as it would be in the case of a tax measure or a public works proposal. There is no ready frame of reference in which the Members of Congress can relate the technical features involved in an overhaul of banking laws. This might explain why doubts about the bill were relatively easy to raise.

The House Banking Committee fight was long, and exceedingly tedious because many of the members found so much of it repetitious. Throughout, Chairman BRENT SPENCE of Kentucky handled the sessions with judicial consideration, fairness, and restraint. He had the support of many long-suffering members of the committee but time was of the essence and time was against the bill. Indeed, many of the charges against the bill went unanswered in the record only because proponents of the financial institutions bill hesitated to do anything that might be used as a pretext for dragging the hearings on further.

There were 20 days of public hearings in July and August of 1957 and 15 more days

in January and February of this year. Promptly upon their conclusion the committee went into executive consideration of the bill. This took 15 more days and then ran out of time at Easter recess.

Because Mr. SPENCE expected his committee to finish its consideration and report out the financial institutions bill to the House, he had scheduled hearings on three antirecession bills immediately upon the return of Congress. This means that his committee had to put the financial institutions bill aside. In the pressures that developed as the session went on Mr. SPENCE never did find the time to take up the financial institutions bill again and it died with the 85th Congress.

In view of this legislative history the charge that the bill did not have adequate consideration is patent nonsense. And so was the charge that substantive changes in law were slipped into the legislation by bankers who then attempted to pass the bill off as a codification only. The record of the Senate hearings is concerned with the examination of the substantive changes. This bill was to be a recodification which would modernize the laws governing banking and credit. This meant deleting some, rewriting others and writing wholly new provisions to meet the changes that have occurred. There were no bones made about that in the Senate—which takes away the element of surprise in Mr. PATMAN'S discovery of substantive changes having been made in the financial institutions bill.

Discounting those as opening plays in a political chess game, what were some of Mr. PATMAN'S and Mr. MULTER'S more serious charges?

They boil down to two. The others involve legislative histrionics and are couched in words, phrases and, in some cases, Biblical invective that were calculated to make the charge sufficient unto itself. An answer to such rhetoric was hardly expected. Curiously enough, neither Mr. PATMAN nor Mr. MULTER concerned himself too much with some of the controversial features of the bill which the financial community was at such pains to resolve, such issues as bank mergers, savings and loan branch offices and liberalized lending authority. They completely ignored, of course, the reforms that the bill would have brought about. That angle did not fit in with their contention that this was a big bankers' bill.

To organized labor Mr. PATMAN'S most rousing charge involved one sentence in one section, namely 35(a) of title 1, which, he contended, would place a "major loophole" in Federal usury laws for conditional sales contracts and certain types of installment paper. He talked about it as a "gimmick" surreptitiously inserted by bankers to thwart Federal usury statutes.

Mr. PATMAN submitted a number of questions about it to Chairman William McChesney Martin of the Federal Reserve Board who presented his answers in the record of the House Banking Committee hearings. Let's look at what the Fed said was its understanding of these matters.

The Fed agreed that the new sentence would change the Federal law established by a decision of the Supreme Court back in 1831 in the case of *National Bank* v. *Johnson*. In that case the Court held that the acquisition by a national bank of outstanding promissory notes from the owner was a "loan or discount" and therefore subject to the limitations on the rate of interest a national bank may charge.

Then the Fed commented: "Broadly speaking, it appears that the proposed amendment would place a national bank on a basis of equality with other lenders in its State, whereas under the doctrine of the Johnson case national banks are subject to more severe restrictions in this respect, at least in some jurisdictions."

Mr. PATMAN said the 35(a) sentence would also change another more recent court decision involving conditional sales contracts. Not so, said the Fed. Here it is from the record of the public hearings:

"In *Daniel* v. *First National Bank of Birmingham* ((C.A. 5, 1955), 227 F. 2d 353), the court interpreted the transactions, as a factual matter, to have been loans by the national bank to the purchasers of certain motor vehicles, even though in form the transactions were conditional sales at a 'time price,' the conditional sales contracts then being sold by the dealer to the bank. Under the court's interpretation of the facts, in such cases there is no 'purchase of obligations * * * from the actual owner thereof,' which is the subject matter of the proposed new sentence in section 35(a). Accordingly, the statutory change that would be effected by enactment of section 35(a) apparently would not change the law as pronounced and applied by the court of appeals in the Daniel case."

The Fed commented on a number of other points in the handling of conditional sales contracts and then added:

"Apart from such exceptional situations, however, it is believed that the proposed amendment would place each national bank on a basis of equality, in this respect, with other lenders in its State, including State banks."

Mr. PATMAN continued to fight section 35(a) for months after March 18 when the House Banking Committee, rather than delay with more argument on the point, voted in executive session to strike it out.

Another doubt was created about the possibility of so-called sleeper provisions, to discredit this bill. This one was supposed to lie in section 45 of title 1 which authorized national banks located in communities of fewer than 5,000 inhabitants to act as insurance agents and real estate brokers. It was contended that this was an authorization that was repealed 40 years ago; that it is not law any more. And it was duly noted, of course, that the Senate report on the bill overlooked an alleged substantive change in law by describing the section as continuing the provisions of existing law.

Comptroller of the Currency Ray M. Gidney had no doubts about the law being in effect. His Office has regulations for administering it and has been enforcing it for years. He held that the 1916 insurance authorization was not subsequently repealed at all. The Federal Reserve Board saw it the same way. And so too did counsel for the Senate and House Banking Committees, Mr. Rogers and Robert L. Cardon.

Mr. PATMAN saw dangerous possibilities in the situation even though only 77 national banks, 1.6 percent of all of them, were engaging in this business. But the House Banking Committee was not stampeded. In executive session it agreed to permit those banks which were providing this service to continue, subject to compliance with State license requirements.

There were impassioned pleas all on behalf of the plight of the little man, so beloved politically, in such issues as cumulative voting, mergers, etc. But there was little opposition attention to the provisions that strengthen the powers of the banks' supervisory authorities.

These included such features as the prohibition against conflict of interest by supervisory agency employees; the requirement for the disclosure of the identity of major stockholders; the authority to limit dividend payments by national banks; the strengthening of the procedure for the removal of bank officers and directors for unsafe and unsound practices; the strengthening of the procedure to terminate FDIC insurance; the prohibition against political contributions by insured banks; and others.

"Who Killed Cock Robin" is a murder story, but not a mystery. It is also a record—and a written one—of tactics that could be used again and again against legislation important to the banking community and the general public.

Statement of Policy and Legislative Program of the National Consumers League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Congress and the Nation benefit when a group of thoughtful and public-spirited citizens makes known to us their views on what legislation they believe necessary. This is especially true when the group has a long and distinguished record of supporting, and even of originating, vital laws which now form a very important part of our way of life.

Such an organization is the National Consumers League. Since its founding in 1899, it has aroused consumer interest in, and concern with, the conditions under which goods are manufactured and distributed. It has used the three-point technique of making investigations, marshaling public opinion, and seeking remedial legislation to promote public health, public welfare, and fair-labor standards.

The National Consumers League has been closely associated with the major social reforms of the past six decades. For example, it introduced to the United States the idea of minimum wage and maximum hours legislation, and fought for its enactment. It was one of the foremost supporters of the pure food and drug law, when that legislation was before Congress. It pioneered in the fight for legislation prohibiting child labor. And it was among the first supporters of social security legislation.

To help the underdog and the needy, the National Consumers League pioneered with a number of techniques and institutions which now are widely accepted in America. For example, it promoted the idea of the Children's Bureau, in the Federal Government, to protect child health and welfare. It introduced the idea of a consumer label to indicate fair labor standards in production industries. It introduced "shop early" campaigns as a means of cutting down staggering Christmas season work hours and providing steadier employment for workers.

The list of National Consumers League officers, directors, and members of both the past and present reads like a "Who's Who" of important Americans. They include Felix Frankfurter and the late Louis D. Brandeis, U.S. Supreme Court Justices; Frances Perkins, former Secretary of Labor; Benjamin V. Cohen, former Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations; Sumner Slichter, economist; Sarah Gibson Blanding, presi-

dent of Vassar College; Frank P. Graham, former U.S. Senator, now an important U.N. official; Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., historian; and Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean of the Washington Cathedral.

Present officers include: President, Dr. John Howland Lathrop, Berkeley, Calif.; treasurer, Hyman Schroeder, Washington, D.C.; board chairman, Mrs. Richard A. Zwemer, Westfield, N.J.; board vice chairmen: Walter Frank, New York, N.Y.; Louise Stitt, Washington, D.C.; and Eleanor Hadley, Northampton, Mass.

The vice presidents are: Elizabeth Brandeis, Madison, Wis.; Mary Dewson, Penobscot, Maine; Mrs. Thomas Fleming, Pasadena, Calif.; Pauline Goldmark, Hartsdale, N.Y.; Alice Hamilton, M.D., Hadlyme, Conn.; John Haynes Holmes, New York, N.Y.; Alice W. Hunt, Providence, R.I.; Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, San Antonio, Tex.; Frances Perkins, Washington, D.C.; Josephine Roche, Washington, D.C.; Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Hyde Park, N.Y.; Bishop William Scarlett, Castine, Maine; and Robert Szold, New York, N.Y.

Mr. President, at its most recent annual meeting, held in Washington on December 5, 1958, this great organization adopted an excellent "Statement of Policy and Legislative Program." This statement is, in my opinion, a forward-looking and comprehensive program of vital legislation. It is very much in the tradition of National Consumers League.

I believe the league is to be commended for this program, as well as for its activities for the common good. I, for one, am proud to be a member and honorary vice president of this organization.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the "Statement of Policy and Legislative Program of the National Consumers League."

There being no objection, the statement and program were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL CONSUMERS LEAGUE STATEMENT OF POLICY AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM, 58TH ANNUAL MEETING, DECEMBER 5, 1958

In the 60 years, during which the National Consumers League has worked for the improvement of labor standards in America, the greatest economic development and some of the most remarkable social changes in our national history have taken place. We have moved from the extreme individualism and peaceful complacency of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, through two world wars, a decade of devastating economic depression, to the present era of struggle for global supremacy between two conflicting philosophies in a world of threatening unrest.

The National Consumers League was born of the industrial evils of that complacent society at the turn of the century, when the thinking, not only of economists, but of statesmen, businessmen, and jurists was dominated by the laissez-faire theory of economics. Not the State but free competition must control the economic society, and widespread poverty was believed to be inevitable. The sweatshop, child labor, long hours, unsafe and unsanitary work places were the natural outgrowth of such a society.

To combat these evils was the purpose of Florence Kelley and her small but influential band of followers who in 1899 organized the National Consumers League. The accomplishments of those early years are truly phenomenal. State by State, citizens had to be awakened to the corrupting social consequences of poverty, ignorance, and exploitation of human beings, and to their responsibilities for reforms. State by State, legislators had to be persuaded to enact the first inadequate, but important, regulations of the industrial conditions—long hours, low wages, child labor—that caused such human suffering. When laws were passed, the league worked for proper enforcement.

NCL FOUGHT IN COURTS

When unfriendly courts declared unconstitutional these modest restrictions on employers' freedoms, holding that workers were being deprived of their property without due process of law, members of the Consumers League buried their disappointments and determinedly set out to educate the courts. Cases were appealed, the aid of the best lawyers of the land was solicited.

The first brief presenting economic, scientific, and social facts in defense of a labor law ever to be presented to the U.S. Supreme Court was prepared by the National Consumers League in 1908. The case was the famous *Miller* v. *Oregon*, in which Mr. Louis Brandeis defended the constitutionality of the Oregon 10-hour law for women and the U.S. Supreme Court rendered a favorable unanimous decision. By 1915 a law restricting the employment of women to 8 hours a day was approved by the Supreme Court. But only after 23 years of litigation was the constitutionality of State minimum wage legislation for women upheld by the highest Federal Court in 1937.

The great depression of the 1930's brought unspeakable suffering to the American people. It also wrought revolutionary changes in men's and women's thinking about government responsibilities. In so major an economic disaster the Federal Government could not escape its obligation to aid its citizens to recovery and to take measures to prevent similar future catastrophes. By the end of that fateful decade, Congress had enacted a Federal wage and hour law (the Fair Labor Standards Act) which also provides restrictions on the employment of children in interstate commerce.

A sound foundation for a comprehensive Federal social insurance system was laid when the Federal Social Security Act was passed. By 1937, as a result of Federal grants to States for administrative purposes, every State in the Union had passed an unemployment compensation law. At least a principle for which the National Consumers League for nearly 40 years had endeavored to gain acceptance was established. That is the responsibility of government in a democracy, to protect its citizens against the economic consequences, over which as individuals they have no control, of a highly industrialized society.

We are holding our 58th annual meeting in a national and world atmosphere quite different from that in which the Consumers League began its work in 1899. The United States emerged from World War II, militarily strong, rich, and the leader of the free world. The consequent national responsibilities are staggering. Democracy represents a way of life in sharp contrast to that of other powerful nations. The success or failure of our experiment is of vital concern to people throughout the world, and is being watched for signs of strength or weakness by many anxious millions. Probably nothing since the founding of our Nation has done so much to force the thoughtful among us to reexamine the real meaning of democracy and the extent to which it is reflected in our personal and national lives.

Of much, which this self-examination reveals, we are proud: our great free industrial enterprise, our freedom as citizens to speak our minds, our scientific advancement in the control of disease and natural forces. It is our weaknesses that give us grave concern: our intolerable prejudices against our colored citizens, our niggardliness toward education, our false economic values, poverty in the midst of plenty, indifference to culture, our shameful neglect of our duties as citizens, and tolerance of corruption in high places.

BREAK ECONOMIC BARRIERS

These are serious charges against the leaders of the free world, and a challenge to us all to work through every available channel to bring the true meaning of democracy to every American citizen. To those of us in the National Consumers League the way is clear. We will continue to work, as we have in the past to remove the economic barriers to the full participation of millions of our people in the freedoms of which our country boasts.

There is evidence on the enormity of the task that lies ahead. In spite of our tremendous wealth, millions of our people live in poverty. In 1957 almost 3 million families, or approximately 6½ percent, had an annual income of less than $1,000. The income of almost 4 million families, or 8½ percent, was less than $2,000. President George Meany of the AFL–CIO has estimated that as many as one-fifth of the workers in our Nation are being paid less than $40 a week. Twenty million workers are unprotected by the wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The cost of adequate medical care is prohibitive for the great majority of the American people. We need a broad plan of national health insurance which would make the full services of doctors and hospitals financially available to everybody. Voluntary health insurance, even after 25 years of promotion, has brought comprehensive services to only about 3 percent of our people, has failed to reach at all a third of the people, and for the remainder covers only about half the hospitals' costs and less than a third of the physicians' bills.

The protection of workers laid off their jobs is woefully inadequate under our present unemployment compensation laws. In the winter of 1958, when more than 5 million workers were unemployed the insurance payments replaced less than 20 percent of the wage lost. Hundreds of thousands of workers drew no benefits at all either because they were not covered by the laws, or had been disqualified by State eligibility requirements, or had exhausted their benefit rights.

FARM WORKERS SUFFER

The most depressed group in the American labor force today are the migrant farm workers and their families. Estimates of their number vary from 500,000 to 2 million. They move with the crops, which they harvest, from the Gulf of Mexico to the Canadian border, working for substandard wages, sleeping in shacks and sometimes on the ground. Their children have less opportunity for education than those of any other group in the country. They are shifted from school to school, commonly missing major portions of the school year. The employment of migrants is irregular and made worse by the importation of foreign agricultural workers. Often they are exploited by unscrupulous crew leaders, at whose mercy they travel the highways in uncomfortable and frequently unsafe trucks.

They are not covered by State and Federal wage and hour laws. Their irregular periods of employment disqualify most of them for unemployment compensation and old-age benefits. Although the Fair Labor Standards Act prohibits the employment of children under 16 in agriculture during school hours, there is no minimum age requirement for the employment of these children outside school hours. Because of residence requirements migrant workers and their families are denied relief.

Adequate shelter is another of man's prime necessities which is not provided for all

American citizens today. One quarter of all housing units in the United States are substandard. Of the 13½ million substandard units, 7 million need replacement; the remaining 6½ million should be rehabilitated. In addition, we have an acute housing shortage estimated at well over 3½ million units, resulting in much overcrowding. Overall housing construction is proceeding at about half the needed rate. Replacement is failing to keep pace with obsolescence. Substandard housing blights family life, injures health, retards education, breeds crime and juvenile delinquency.

SCHOOL AID NEEDED

Probably the most serious offense of our modern society is to our schoolchildren—children who should be prepared today for the responsibilities and leadership which they must assume in the complex world of tomorrow. What do we find? Approximately 2 million schoolchildren are deprived of adequate housing in our public schools today.

According to the U.S. Office of Education estimates, in the fall of 1957, the shortage of classrooms in the United States amounted to 142,300. A shortage of 132,200 qualified teachers existed at the beginning of the 1958 school year. Of the 1¼ million people teaching in the Nation's public schools last year, 91,538 or 7 percent were teaching with substandard credentials. Seven and a half percent of the qualified teachers in the United States leave the teaching profession every year. Can we win the race for our way of life on such a record?

On the basis of the kind of evidence just presented, showing the urgent social need for greater economic well-being, increased health facilities, and improved educational opportunities for our citizens, the National Consumers League proposes the following legislative program for the ensuing year:

STRENGTHENING FLSA, STATE MINIMUM WAGE AND WAGE PAYMENT LEGISLATION

We will support amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act which will so extend coverage that the employees of all establishments which operate across State lines will be protected by the provisions of the act. Specifically, coverage should be extended to include chain service industries such as retail establishments, hotels, laundries and dry cleaning establishments, and industrialized agricultural workers. Some of the lowest paid workers in the Nation are found in these groups. We also will support amendments to increase the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour.

We believe that renewed effort must be made to secure minimum wage laws in all the States, to protect those workers in local service trades who cannot be covered by the Federal act. Wage payment laws also should be enacted in each State.

EXPANDING AND STRENGTHENING SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM

We should continue moving toward our goal of an adequate system of social security. In spite of recent progress, benefit levels are too low and many persons fail to receive sufficient protection to permit adequate standards of living.

(a) Old age, survivors and disability insurance: Congress this year will be giving serious attention to the health benefits for beneficiaries of old-age and survivors insurance. A program for paying for the cost of hospital, nursing, and certain medical services can both protect people currently and advance constructive development of such needed facilities. Our ultimate goal is a broad plan of national insurance which will make the full services of doctors and hospitals financially available to everyone.

Other urgent needs are the removal of the requirement of age 50 for the receipt of disability benefits and extension of OASDI coverage to low income groups now partly or entirely excluded, especially migrant farm workers.

(b) Unemployment compensation: The Federal-State system of unemployment insurance is far too limited. Immediate Federal action is required to assure that every State extends coverage, increases benefit amounts, pays for longer periods, and avoids overharsh provisions on eligibility and disqualifications. In addition, Federal grants should be available to assist States with high unemployment rates, and States should be permitted to adjust taxes on a statewide basis as well as on an individual rating basis.

(c) Workmen's compensation: Workmen's compensation is likewise failing seriously in meeting its purpose. Present laws, with their emphasis on blame and litigation, neglect the main objective which is rehabilitation of the injured. Weekly benefits are too low. Full medical and hospital care is too seldom provided. Thousands of workers are unprotected by any workmen's compensation law. Safety programs and preventive measures against such industrial hazards as radiation exposure are quite inadequate. Some States fail even to provide insurance against many of the diseases caused by modern industrial processes.

Our workmen's compensation program needs drastic overhauling. Whether or not State laws should be replaced by a Federal Workmen's Compensation Act or an exclusive State fund should be substituted for private carriers, it is certain new remedies must be applied to correct the basic problem, namely the present emphasis on blame for the accident instead of on rehabilitation of the injured workman, which should be the real purpose of workmen's compensation legislation.

Legislation that would provide for the improvements in our social insurance laws, which the above statement shows are so urgently needed, will be supported by the National Consumers League.

RAISING WORKING AND LIVING STANDARDS OF FARM WORKERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

Coverage of migratory and other agricultural labor by a Federal minimum wage law will be a primary goal for 1959.

Other legislative objectives for improving the plight of agricultural workers will be: 1. Inclusion of agricultural workers in the Labor-Management Relations Act; 2. the establishment of a minimum age for the employment of children in agriculture outside school hours; 3. more adequate coverage of agricultural workers by workmen's compensation, unemployment compensation and old-age and survivors insurance; 4. Federal licensing and regulation of crew leaders; 5. State and National measures to improve housing and transportation standards; 6. further, we stress the importance of laws and programs to provide more health, welfare, education, and other community services for migrants.

ESTABLISHING A COMPREHENSIVE HOUSING PROGRAM

Low income families are hardest hit by the housing problem. The difficulty of finding housing at rents or prices they can afford is growing.

The National Consumers League will support legislation that will expand the urban renewal and slum clearance programs, provide housing for the elderly and include feasible measures for assuring comfortable and sanitary shelter for migratory farmworkers and their families.

ASSISTING THE DEPRESSED AREAS TO ECONOMIC HEALTH

We will support legislation designed to aid those urban and rural areas, throughout the country, that suffer from chronic unemployment and underemployment. A bill authorizing loans for new and expanded business and commercial enterprise, loans and grants for public facilities which will help these redevelopment areas to help themselves, and such a bill containing in addition, provisions for technical assistance, retraining facilities, retraining subsistence payments, procurement contract aids and industrial rebuilding in urban renewal areas would have our enthusiastic support. However, great care needs to be exercised in assisting the relocation of establishments from one area to another to prevent increasing unemployment in the original location.

PROVIDING NEEDED FINANCIAL AID TO EDUCATION

The extent to which the democratic ideal is realized depends on the ethical and intellectual capacity of citizens to make wise decisions and choices in all human relationships. Children should be assured the opportunity to secure the kind of education which will challenge their intellectual abilities to the full.

Therefore, we will support those legislative measures which will furnish such Federal financial aid to the States as is necessary: (1) To provide programs of education for children of migratory agricultural workers; (2) to provide the number of public schools required to house adequately all children within the respective States (current estimates of need are between 140,000 and 150,000 classrooms); (3) to employ a sufficient number of qualified public schoolteachers to assure maximum effectiveness in teaching in reasonably sized classes (25 pupils to a teacher in elementary schools); and (4) to establish training programs for teachers that will qualify them to develop to his full capacity each child who comes under their instruction.

IMPROVING THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RIGHT TO BARGAIN COLLECTIVELY

We believe that the so-called right-to-work laws which have been adopted in a number of States impede organization and the development of good industrial relations and therefore seriously handicap unions in bargaining collectively for better wages and working conditions. We deplore the attempts to secure such laws in other States.

We will support amendment of section 14b of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 that will give to the Federal Government prior jurisdiction on this issue.

Boyce House on Alaska: Texas Invented Eskimo Pie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an exhaustive study into the status of Texas in folklore since the admission of Alaska to the Union has been conducted by one of the most noted authorities on the Lone Star State, Mr. Boyce House. The admission of the 49th State has caused Texas to relinquish its title as the largest State in area and, as Mr. House points out, this has given rise to some comments and questions as to Texas' status in the life and legend of the United States.

Boyce House has written 14 books and made almost 1,000 speeches about Texas, more than any other one man. He is known as "Mr. Texas" in his home State, and is noted and honored by his fellow

citizens as a much-sought-after humorist, an afterdinner speaker, and as a chronicler of the tales of Texas, both tall and true. He is, in addition, a respected author and an able news reporter. More copies of his books have been sold than those of any other Texas author. Boyce House is also an astute observer of governmental institutions, has served in public office, and has been, himself, a candidate for statewide office.

Following his study of this problem confronting Texas' new status, he has noted his findings, including the fact that the inventor of the Eskimo Pie was a Texan, in an article for the press.

Mr. House's interesting article on Texas' attitude on Alaska was recently published in the Port Lavaca Wave, an excellent weekly newspaper serving the people in one of Texas' fastest-growing areas, in the gulf coastal area.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the feature column which appeared in the Port Lavaca Wave of Thursday, January 1, 1959, under the heading "Boyce House Explains Texas' New Attitude."

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOYCE HOUSE EXPLAINS TEXAS, NEW ATTITUDE

(By Boyce House)

"What are you Texans going to do about Alaska?"

This is the question that citizens of the Lone Star State have heard many times from their friends over the Nation in the last few months.

The answer is, "Nothing—it won't be necessary."

Texas long ago became synonymous with size—and, once an idea finds lodgement in the human mind, it is next to impossible to uproot it.

If you wear a Panama, chances are that it didn't come from Panama but Ecuador; St. Patrick was not an Irishman; chili is not a Mexican food, as any Mexican will tell you, with considerable fire; no witches were burned in New England—(they were hanged); Mount Olympus, the home of the gods, would be a foothill in the Rockies; the grass in Kentucky isn't really blue and the composer of "My Old Kentucky Home" was not a Kentuckian; the Trojan War was only a minor disturbance in Asia Minor.

Billy Rose says the Venus de Milo couldn't get a job as a Broadway showgirl; and the Scotch bagpipe was invented by the Irish, who then wished it off on the Scots.

But try to convince the public of these things.

Similarly, Texas has come to be synonymous with bigness. When someone asked Dr. Wernher von Braum if there was a likelihood that two manmade satellites would collide, he replied that such a happening was highly improbable, adding, "You must remember that space is large; it is even larger than Texas."

As a matter of mere satistics, Texas never really has been the biggest. Not only is Australia larger but Canada has two territories and three provinces, each of which is bigger than Texas. But who cares?

I have made a personal investigation since statehood was conferred on Alaska and have found that Texas is just as huge as it ever was; it's still 801 miles in a straight line north and south and 773 miles east and west; and it still has 256 counties, one of which lacks only two square miles of being twice as large as Rhode Island and Delaware combined, with the District of Columbia thrown in.

But Texas is more, much more, than so many thousands of square miles. Texas has cowboys, mavericks, longhorns, mirages, horned frogs that live 31 years sealed up in a courthouse cornerstones without air, food, or water; and Texas Rangers, as all TV viewers and moviegoers throughout the world know. Texas produces more oil, cotton, and sulfur than any other State; also more sheep, though there is nothing sheepish about Texas; and more salt, which is taken by visitors—a few grains at a time—with our tall tales.

Texans, mainly new arrivals from Southern States, it is true, but Texans nonetheless, won their own independence in 1836, set up a republic and sent ambassadors to foreign countries, including the United States; then, in 1846, entered the Union of their own free will. Yes, they did, later on, try to leave the Union but, after 4 years in which to reflect, reconsidered. Even so, the last battle of the Civil War was fought in Texas, weeks after Appomattox and, of course, the Texans won it.

Texas A. & M. College contributed more officers to the Army in World War II than West Point did. Texas has the Alamo. The majority leader of the U.S. Senate is from Texas. The Speaker of the House of Representatives is from Texas. And the President of the United States is from Texas. The San Jacinto Monument is taller than the Washington Monument and the Texas Capitol is higher than the National Capitol.

And it is my understanding that the inventor of the Eskimo Pie was from Texas.

Among the 49 States, Texas is what the forward pass is to football and what the slide trombone is to the band. Texas is tradition, history, courage, energy, vision, friendliness, achievement, hospitality, and humor that is good humored.

Ask the man on the street who the present world's heavyweight titleholder is and it's better than even that he can't tell you but speak of the champ and he knows you mean the greatest of 'em all, Jack Dempsey.

So, whatever the statistical tables show, Texas will always be the champ.

A Proposal for World Peace in the Nuclear Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a very active group of citizens from my home district in Oakland County, Mich., have taken a close look at the problems our Nation faces around the world. They have come up with some conclusions in their studies which I would urge my colleagues to consider and study very carefully.

The membership of this group is varied and represents almost every facet of our community. There are members of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the Methodist Church, the Detroit and Oakland County Committees for a Sane Nuclear Policy, and the Ferndale Cooperative. They are not speaking officially for these organizations but are offering their own approach to our world problems. May I compliment the members of this group for their forthright and fearless approach.

Their views follow:

A PROPOSAL FOR WORLD PEACE IN THE NUCLEAR AGE

Tremendous strides in scientific progress in recent decades have created a potentially tragic imbalance between the technical and political growth of man. The consequence of this imbalance is that man has uncovered destructive forces of genocidal magnitude, while at the same time he is, as yet, politically inadequate to control these forces.

This political inadequacy arises from the nationalistic efforts of nations to cope with a problem of international scope; namely, the military ramifications of nuclear energy. The situation is analogous to the efforts of our original 13 colonies in meeting a common problem. Just as that situation forged new political concepts which resulted in unity around a common goal, so, too, today's dilemma is forcing new concepts on heretofore nationalistic man. Recognition and acceptance of national differences and national aspirations, as components of the larger world community, are the core features of these new concepts.

Acceptance of the concept of allegiance to the world community is a prerequisite for any nation aspiring to world leadership. It follows from this that such a nation must exhibit positive initiative in peaceful endeavors and show sincere deemphasis of military aspects.

It is our sincere concern that the United States shall show initiative and leadership in the cause of world peace, and it is to this end that we hereby submit the following studied proposals for securing world peace:

1. It is crucially important that we give full support to the work of the Geneva conference on international cessation of nuclear weapons testing. We commend the example set by our Government of banning further bomb tests and urge that this moral initiative not be lost by our resumption of tests.

2. Recognizing that at least two nations possess the power to destroy other nations (and themselves), we feel that continued expansion of the military does not increase our national security and that continued competition in the nuclear arms race is tragically illogical. The strength and security of any nation lies, in the final analysis, not in its illusory military "defensive" or "retaliatory" powers, but in its technical, economic, and moral strength. We therefore urge a continuing and progressive reduction in our military budget and a corresponding increase in the emphasis placed on education, social welfare, and peaceful research. This constructive reemphasis will, we believe, not only make a greater long-range contribution to the security of the United States, but also serve to allay the all-too-justified suspicions of the "neutral" world and reaffirm their faith in the United States as a leader in the cause of world peace.

3. A realistic recognition of the world as it exists is a vital step in alleviating cold war tensions. Diplomatic recognition and acceptance of all nations into the United Nations will place each within the framework, and subject to the discipline of an international body. This has now become a logical and necessary alternative to military settlements of international disputes. Measures which will facilitate the principle of peaceful coexistence should be encouraged. These include east-west trade and greater communication such as travel and exchange of students, educators, scientists, and other prominent sections of our respective societies. Greater emphasis on mutually beneficial economic competition and deemphasis of nonconstructive military competition and arms races will substantially ease dangerous international tensions.

In summary, we submit to you that a distinct need for a new concept in the international political arena has arisen. The concept involves recognition of the worldwide, rather than nationalist, character of the problems of modern man, and therefore the international solution to these problems. Acceptance of this concept is a prerequisite to leadership in the peace-desiring world. It behooves us in the United States to embrace this realistic philosophy for the future, and with characteristic foresight, exhibit sincere initiative in this area.

E. Julius Davis, Detroit, Methodist Minister, St. Luke's Methodist Church, Fellowship of Reconciliation; Morris Goodman, Ph. D., Oak Park, Chairman, Oakland County Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; A. Albert Johnson, Oak Park, President, Ferndale Cooperative, Inc., Oakland County Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; Isadore I. Kolman, M.D., Huntington Woods, Oakland County Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; Warner Van Hala, Royal Oak, Detroit Fellowship of Reconciliation, Detroit Sane Nuclear Policy Committee; Clifford E. Walter, Jr., Roseville, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Detroit Sane Nuclear Policy Committee; Robert Z. Willson, Ferndale, Ferndale Cooperative, Inc., Public Relations, Ferndale Kiwanis Club, Public Affairs Committee Chairman, Member of Baha'i World Faith.

Earl Warren and the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Tuesday, December 23, 1958, there was published in the Christian Science Monitor an article which expresses what I think is one of the finest of what might be called legal opinions in relation to what this Government of ours is. The article is written by Erwin N. Griswold, dean of the Harvard Law School. He takes a careful and stimulating look in this article at Earl Warren, the Chief Justice of the United States, and the context in which the 1954 decision was made, outlawing segregation in the public schools. One may not agree with this logical statement, but I suggest that one cannot fail to read it with profit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EARL WARREN AND THE SUPREME COURT

(By Erwin N. Griswold)

WARREN'S BACKGROUND

Earl Warren came to the Court with a remarkable background. He was 62 years old when he was appointed. He had been a lawyer for 39 years. He spent several years in private practice, and a period as a deputy city attorney.

After that he was, in succession, district attorney of Alameda County, Calif., for 14 years, where he made a distinguished record, and appeared before the Supreme Court of the United States on several occasions; then Attorney General of California for 4 years, and Governor of California for 10 years.

While Governor he was the Republican nomine for Vice President in 1948. All of these offices gave him intimate opportunities to observe the problems of government in action, to deal with people, and to participate in the administration and, as Governor, in the making of laws.

During his tenure as Governor the population of California increased explosively. He consistently proved himself equal to the tasks which this presented. By common consent, Mr. Warren was a first-class Governor, one of the most distinguished Governors this country has had. In the latter years of his tenure of the office he received the nominations of both major parties.

In a sense his experience was largely political. He had never been a judge, but neither had Marshall or Taney or Fuller or Hughes or Stone when they were first appointed to the Supreme Court. He had been a governor, as had Hughes just before he had been appointed to the Court as an Associate Justice. And Taft, though he had had judicial experience, had been Governor of the Philippine Islands and then President of the United States.

The task of judging in the Supreme Court is not, for the most part, like that in other courts in the country, and experience has shown in many cases that a record of high achievement in political office is excellent background for a Supreme Court post.

CONTROVERSIAL YEARS

This was an auspicious beginning. What can we say about the Chief Justice's first 5 years in office? We can surely say that they have been filled with controversy.

Speeches have been made about "Storm over the Supreme Court," and much has been written and said about "The Supreme Court Crisis." Often Chief Justice Warren has been the special object of attack, both as a symbol of the Court, and in his own right.

Are these attacks justified? What is the state of the Supreme Court today? What is the place which Earl Warren has established for himself among our Chief Justices?

Before these questions can be properly considered, it is necessary to clear away a large amount of misconception which has been evident in many of the cirticisms of the Supreme Court.

1. The United States is not a democracy, except in the special sense in which that term is used in this country. It is not even a representative democracy. The earmark of the great American plan, the contribution of the Founding Fathers to the science of government, the things that has kept us going as a great Nation over a period of more than a century and a half of dynamic and constant growth, is that our Government is one of checks and balances.

We do not have a single legislature. We have both the House of Representatives and the Senate. Even if both Houses agree on a measure, it does not become a law without the President's approval, unless there is a two-thirds vote of both Houses after his veto. Even Congress and the President together, even by unanimous vote, cannot pass laws on many subjects. Our Congress is one of limited powers.

The States, too, have limited powers, limited by what they have given up to the Federal Government, and limited by many other parts of the Constitution, notably the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments.

CLASHES INEVITABLE

Under the Constitution, the judicial power of the United States is given to the Supreme Court and the lower Federal courts. It is inevitable that the Supreme Court in exercising this judicial power will come into clash with one branch of the Government or another—with the President, when it invalidated the steel seizure in 1952, for example; with Congress, when it passes a statute beyond constitutional bounds; or with a State, as in the school-segregation cases.

But what the Court does is to decide the cases that come before it, brought there by human beings, making claims to "equal justice under the law," to use the phrase which is carved over the portal of the Supreme Court's building in Washington.

The Supreme Court does not sit to count votes. It is not its function to carry out the will of the majority. It is a fundamental basis of our governmental system that there are many things which a majority cannot do, and that there are many things on which the people of a State must yield to a greater national interest, as expressed in the Constitution. The Court interprets and applies the Constitution.

In doing so, its very purpose is, occasionally, to thwart the will of the majority of the people, either national or local. Without the Court our Government structure would surely collapse. This is a task of the highest order. And it is obviously one which cannot be carried out with universal agreement or wholly in an atmosphere of sweetness and light.

PRECISION AMID IMPRECISION

2. Many laymen have the view that the law is somewhat like mathematics, a precise subject, where everything follows inevitably from premise to conclusion if one only has the capacity or the character to think straight.

Of course, mathematics is not like that, in many of its aspects. And that is surely not the way with the law. There are many principles, rules, and standards in the law. Legal training involves an understanding of these. It also involves considerable experience with the way the law has grown and developed over a period of many years.

This is obtained by the study of cases, the record of past decisions of courts, and of statutes and other legal materials such as treaties, and administrative regulations, and decisions.

One of the great things about our law, derived from the English common-law tradition, is that the judges of appellate courts are expected to formulate the reasons for their decisions in writing. This is a great stimulus to careful thinking and expression, because the judge knows that his effort is going to be subject to the scrutiny of contemporary members of his profession and of history. It also provides an important means by which students learn the law and lawyers are enabled to advise their clients and other judges may guide themselves in coming to a decision.

But typically, and especially in cases that come before the Supreme Court, there is no one decision that is logically required.

Once I heard a Lord Chancellor of Great Britain say, at a meeting in Australia, that the function of the judge is to "follow loyally the decision which has already been come to."

QUESTIONS LEFT AMBIGUOUS

A judge of the high court of Australia who was sitting beside me turned and said, somewhat impatiently: "That's no help to me. The cases that come to my court are there because there is no case in point, or in many cases because there are two or more lines of decisions which are claimed to be controlling. The judge's function is to choose. He doesn't give me any help in doing that."

So it is with our Supreme Court. Very rarely is decision there a simple matter of finding and following precedent. We would not need great men for judges if that were the case.

Sometimes questions are left deliberately ambiguous by the legislator, so that the

Court is left to make the choice. Legislation is often a matter of compromise, and sometimes a compromise can be arrived at only if issues are not too sharply drawn.

For example, the basic question of whether or not the Supreme Court has power to declare an act of Congress unconstitutional is not specifically resolved in the Constitution itself. Yet it is clear that the problem was known to those at the Constitutional Convention of 1787, and must have been discussed by them.

To have attempted to make this matter specific might have wrecked the embryonic Constitution. Thus they left the question to the Supreme Court itself. When the Court decided the matter, left wholly open on the face of the Constitution, it was not legislating; it was performing the function that was assigned to it by the Constitution. Neither result was inevitable. The Court had to make a conscious choice. As Judge Learned Hand has pointed out in his recent Holmes lectures, the result was practically, though not legally, a necessary one.

The Court has similar problems to consider in many other areas under the Constitution. No State can pass any "law impairing the obligation of contracts." What is a contract for this purpose? Does it include a grant or charter? What sort of action constitutes an impairment?

Or, Congress has power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States." What is commerce? Is the power of Congress exclusive, or do the States have residual powers, at least until Congress has acted?

These, and many other questions like them, have occupied much of the time of the Court over a period of many years.

QUESTION OF DOUBT

Then there are the great and vague constitutional phrases like "due process of law," "privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States," and "equal protection of the laws." All of these phrases present ambiguities, questions of doubt and choice. It is the function of all courts to construe and apply these constitutional terms when they are involved in cases which come before them. But, in the nature of things, it is preeminently the functions of the Supreme Court to speak the controlling word.

And the fact that that word when spoken is not pleasing to one or more of the parties, or to a majority of the people of a State, or even to a majority of the people of the United States, is wholly irrelevant. The very purpose of a constitution is to restrict majorities, either national or local.

3. Finally, we may make reference to the problem which lies back of much of the present controversy about the Supreme Court. This is the decision first announced in 1954 through Chief Justice Warren, speaking for a unanimous Supreme Court in what are called the school-segregation cases.

Much of the criticism of the Court in connection with this decision has been on the assumption that the Court came to its conclusion out of the blue, that it willfully and suddenly made up its mind to change what had always been the law, and that it thus needlessly and unwarrantedly upset the peace of the United States.

But law is not like that; and Supreme Court Justices are not like that. They have all taken an oath to admister justice according to law, and that is an oath which they take very seriously. The Justices are confronted with many problems, in each of which there is an area of choice. But they make their choice according to law, that is, in the light of the legal materials which are available.

PROCESS OF CHANGE

One of the things that one learns about law as he studies it and works with it is that law is a process. Decisional law, in particular, grows and develops, becomes more precise, or encounters change. The judges decide each case as it comes before them, doing the best, most thoughtful, and conscientious job they can in the light of the facts and their understanding of the law applicable to that case.

As individual cases are decided, it becomes apparent that the law has changed, or is in the process of changing. When this is clear enough, an earlier decision may be expressly overruled, either on the ground that it now appears that it was mistakenly decided in the first place, or that subsequent decisions have so undermined the premises on which it was based that it can no longer stand.

This process is the essence of the common law. It involves making law in a sense, but it is not legislating. It is an essentially judicial process, an important function which courts have always carried out, and without which our legal system could not effectively function. To some extent it is a matter of trial and error.

To an even greater extent it is an illustration of the finest functioning of the human mind in the field of government, the constant searching process of striving to reach sound decisions through reason under law.

This is just what happened in the segregation cases. It is true that the Supreme Court in 1896 decided a case called *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*. This case did not involve schools but did uphold segregation in railroad trains; it gave rise to the separate but equal doctrine. A case in 1899, and one in 1925, applied this to schools.

But *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* evoked a notable dissent by the first Mr. Justice Harlan; and it sorely troubled the conscience of much of the Nation for more than 50 years. Even prior to that decision the court had held that there could not be discrimination against Negroes on juries and grand juries. And slowly, as the 20th century progressed, other cases came to be decided which marked out a pattern hardly consistent with the Plessy case.

PATTERN OF EVOLUTION

It is not posisble to go through all the cases here, but an indication may be made. In 1917, a unanimous court, including Chief Justice White, who was a Confederate veteran, held that a Kentucky city could not enforce segregation in housing through a zoning ordinance. In 1938, the court held that a State must provide a Negro a legal education within the State, and could not send him out to another State.

In later cases, in 1948 and 1950, the Court held that Negro law students could not be excluded from State university law schools. Negro students have been going to the law schools of the Universities of Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Virginia, and North Carolina, among others, under these decisions for many years—and for years before the cases involving the common schools were decided.

At the same time, a number of cases in the field of voting rights were decided, and the Court held, in several cases, that Negroes could not be excluded from primaries, even when this was sought to be done by various subterfuges and artifices.

In 1948, it was decided that private restrictive covenants, by which a purchaser of land agreed not to sell to a Negro, were unenforceable.

In the early 1950's a number of cases decided that segregation in Pullman cars, in dining cars, and finally in any way on an interstate journey, was invalid.

All of this developed over a period of a good many years. Anyone who chose to look could readily see that in the normal process of development of the law *Plessy* v *Ferguson* had already been thoroughly discredited, and was clearly on the way out—as has happened to many other cases, including constitutional cases, in the history of the Supreme Court.

A TIME OF DELIBERATION

This was the situation when the school segregation cases came before the Supreme Court. The Court was aware of the problems and exerted extraordinary care and patience in coming to its conclusion.

The cases came to the Court in 1952, while Mr. Vinson was Chief Justice. They were argued extensively on December 9, 1952. Then the Court set them down for reargument, and put certain specific questions on which it asked the assistance of counsel. The cases were reargued on December 8, 1953.

It was at this point that Earl Warren had his first official contact with the problem. The Attorney General of the United States joined in a brief filed with the Court, and the Solicitor General participated in both arguments.

Finally, the cases were decided on May 17, 1954, nearly 2 years after they had been brought to the Court.

Even that was not the end of the Court's consideration. For the cases were set down for further consideration as to the decree which should be entered, and the decision on this, following the traditional equity practice of all deliberate speed, was not announced until May 31, 1955.

All this indicated great deliberation, wise administration, and well-considered judicial conduct. But in the light of the decisions of the Court as they stood when the cases got there, the result was virtually inevitable. The Constitution prescribes "equal protection of the laws."

After some preliminary hesitation, notably in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, the cases had come to hold with great consistency that equal protection means equal protection. These decisions left the Court in 1954 with very little area of choice. To judges committed under oath to render equal justice under law, it was evident that *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* had had a shaky foundation from the beginning, and that it had already collapsed from the effect of the many other cases which had been decided in more recent times.

REVOLUTION RECOGNIZED

All of this may seem quite far removed from Chief Justice Earl Warren, and yet it is, of course, extremely close—as he would presumably testify with some eloquence if he were free to do so.

It was the function of the Court to declare the demise of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, and it fell to Earl Warren as the Chief Justice to be the Court's spokesman.

The opinion he wrote was short, simple, straightforward, calm, and clear. It did not make a revolution. It recognized that one had already occurred during the past half century of American national and legal growth. The opinion received the unanimous support of all eight of the Chief Justice's colleagues.

Anyone who was Chief Justice in 1954 would have been subject to intense criticism. Earl Warren had sustained this with dignity, grace, good humor, and with a certain distinction, which, though less Jovian, is reminiscent of Chief Justice Hughes.

For Chief Justice Warren is a warm, human man. He is friendly, genial, kindly. He has devoted most of his active life to the service of his fellow men in one capacity or another, and there are millions who have benefited by his actions, though most of them do not know it.

Even on the Court, Chief Justice Warren gives freely of his time and energy to public activities relating to the law and the administration of justice. He has brought about a reorganization of the Judicial Conference of the United States, and seeks to turn over to it supervision of some of the rulemaking

functions of the Supreme Court. He has spoken at many gatherings of lawyers and others, and many of his speeches have been of real excellence, making a contribution to public thought which is much more than routine.

Justice Frankfurter has said that Chief Justice Hughes ran a taut Court, while things were much looser under Chief Justice Stone. The situation under Chief Justice Warren may be halfway between.

Chief Justice Warren is gracious and easy-going in Court, and one may assume that he is the same in the Court's conferences. He makes lawyers feel comfortable and at ease, makes them feel that they are really welcome, and that the Court is glad—indeed anxious—to listen to them. Yet he keeps things going. No one trifles with him.

Perhaps some might think that as a lawyer he is still feeling his way. Of course, a good lawyer is always feeling his way. Any lawyer or judge who is sure he knows the answers is pretty sure to be wrong.

Resolutions of Rural Electric Cooperative Leaders From Wisconsin, Iowa, and Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on September 28, 29, and 30, 1958, some 538 rural leaders met in my home State at Madison for the annual region 5 meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. They represented the 113 rural electric cooperatives which serve 346,763 consumer-members in Wisconsin, Iowa, and Illinois. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD, some important resolutions on the rural electrification program which were passed at this meeting.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE LEADERS FROM WISCONSIN, IOWA, AND ILLINOIS

REA REORGANIZATION

Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

Whereas in June 1957 the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of $500,000 or more, and that all loans of whatever amount, to new borrowers, be reviewed by the Secretary's office; and

Whereas Secretary Benson has supported a bill in Congress which would drastically increase interest rates and drive electric and telephone cooperatives to Wall Street for their financing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA; and be it further

Resolved, That as soon as the new Congress convenes in 1959 a bill identical or similar to the Humphrey-Price bill of 1958, which would restore to the REA Administrator all of the functions and authority vested in him by the original act of 1936, be introduced and passed.

INTEREST RATES

Whereas a number of bills and proposals were presented to the 85th Congress to increase REA interest rates; and

Whereas the Congress, by enacting the Pace Act in 1944, and fixing the interest rate of 2 percent, therein made a covenant with the rural electric cooperatives to proceed with area coverage at reasonable retail rates; and

Whereas both REA Administrator David Hamil and Director of Agriculture Credit Services Kenneth Scott testified before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations this year that increased rates would have a detrimental effect on telephone loans and electric loans to systems in sparsely settled areas; and

Whereas we believe the continuance of the 2 percent interest rate is necessary to enable the rural electric systems to complete the task of providing full, efficient, and reasonably priced electric service on an area coverage basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to vigorously oppose any change or proposed change in the law, the effects of which would increase REA interest rates.

REA LOAN SOURCE

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture last February sent to the Congress a proposed bill which provided that the cooperatives secure their financing in Wall Street—for which no legislator would act as sponsor; and

Whereas such bill would double or triple interest rates to the rural electric systems; and

Whereas such bill would virtually kill the generating and transmission program and bankrupt many distribution cooperatives; and

Whereas the Congress has always evidenced its wholehearted support of the REA program by consistently providing sufficient loan funds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to oppose any and all proposals which would send the rural electric systems into the private money market for their financing, and we urge Congress to continue its fine support of the rural electric program which means so much to the people of rural America and to the country as a whole.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S RULING

Whereas a ruling by the Comptroller General of the United States on a loan made by REA to the Central Iowa Power Cooperative of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, to service Greene County Rural Electric Cooperative of Jefferson, Iowa, imperils the entire lending program of REA; and

Whereas by this ruling the Comptroller General has usurped and attempted to nullify the declared will and intent of Congress; and

Whereas under this ruling loans amounting to millions of dollars made by REA in conformity with the Rural Electrification Act would be held illegal; and

Whereas this ruling is a complete misinterpretation of the REA Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we approve and commend the counsel for the Iowa Cooperative, William Wisdom and L. F. Wilcox; the special counsel of NRECA, Wise and Potamkin; the Secretary of Agriculture and the Assistant General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, E. F. Mynatt, for their fine briefs pointing out the defects of this ruling; be it further

Resolved, That the cooperatives respectfully request the Comptroller General to rescind this ruling; and be it further

Resolved, That if the Comptroller General does not rescind this ruling, the Secretary of Agriculture and the REA Administrator be requested to actively resist the ruling and Congress be requested to nullify it.

SELLOUT PROTECTION

Whereas forces opposing the rural electrification program are moving in on cooperatives in various parts of the country, i.g., the New Jersey and Arizona cases, for the expressed purpose of buying them out; and

Whereas it is evident that the power companies instituting sellouts are being directed by executives hired and maintained by their holding companies; and

Whereas electric consumers in and outside the program will pay more for electricity if these sellouts become more widspread: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in keeping with the keynote set by our General Manager Clyde T. Ellis, we launch a counter-offensive; be it further

Resolved, That we urge REA to provide more aggressive assistance to cooperatives needing its help to continue their existence—such as was the case of cooperatives in New Jersey and Arizona; be it further

Resolved, That we urge our State legislatures to provide us with the machinery to function as public agencies or utility districts where such a step is necessary to preserve consumer ownership; be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to make all large transmission lines common carriers as a means of helping to advance the objectives of abundant, low-cost power to consumers; be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to protect rural electrics and all electric consumers by abolishing the electric holding companies; be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to investigate and expose the apparent master plan to cripple and destroy the rural electrification program; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to thoroughly investigate the sellout cases that have now occurred in order that the Rural Electrification Act may be strengthened as a means of protecting the interests of consumers and all Americans who are concerned about the contributions rural electrics are making.

ADMINISTRATION OF REA

Whereas David A. Hamil, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, has for 2 years administered the rural electrification program in an excellent manner and has gained the admiration and respect of the cooperatives throughout America; and

Whereas Mr. Hamil has carried out the duties and responsibilities of his office in the face of great difficulties; and

Whereas the rural electric cooperatives undertook the electrification of rural areas including the byways and backroads on an area-coverage basis upon the congressional assurance that adequate loan funds would be available at 2 percent interest under the Pace Act; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Comptroller General, President Eisenhower, and others, are advocating changes in the Rural Electrification Act which would increase the interest rate and send us to the Wall Street money market for at least a substantial portion of our funds; and

Whereas such changes would make it impossible to serve the remaining unserved rural people and would curtail the expansion of service to our present consumers; and

Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Benson in a letter dated August 28, 1958, to NRECA President John George, pledged that the Department of Agriculture would not try "to pressure any REA borrower into any course of action": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we heartily commend the Administrator of the Rural Electrification

Administration for the manner in which he has technically administered the program; and, be it further

Resolved, That we protest the actions of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Comptroller General, and the President of the United States in using the power and prestige of their respective offices to advance changes that would be detrimental to the rural electrification program.

THE TRIMBLE BILL

Whereas the divergent methods of allocating costs to power being applied by the various bureaus and agencies will render the future construction of many multiple purpose projects economically impossible and will affect adversely the orderly development of our national water resources; and

Whereas the Trimble bill introduced in the 85th Congress set forth an equitable formula by which cost allocations should be determined, and would fix the responsibility for making the determination in the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the introduction and early passage in the 86th Congress of a bill identical or substantially similar to the Trimble bill.

TVA SELF-FINANCING BILL

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority after 25 years of exemplary service to its region and Nation is the sole supplier of power at wholesale to 50 cooperatives whose yardstick resale rates influence power rates throughout the country; and

Whereas without the prompt construction of additional generating capacity TVA will lack sufficient power to meet the needs of its distributors by 1960, or 1961 at the latest; and

Whereas in addition to the normal and steadily increasing demand for power in its area TVA also is called upon to deliver vast blocks of power, amounting to over half its production, to national defense installations in which all of us as citizens are interested; and

Whereas in the past 5 years TVA has received no appropriations for starting additional generating stations, and construction capital from this source is not in sight; and

Whereas a plan approved by the TVA Board for financing new capacity by revenue bonds to be sold in the open market has been before Congress and will be renewed before Congress at the opening of the next session; and

Whereas we believe this plan is the best proposition ever made by a region to the Nation and would in effect wither the widely cultivated claim that TVA power is subsidized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, recognizing the supply crisis with which TVA is faced, we urge upon Congress, and upon our several Representatives individually, passage without delay early in the 86th Congress of TVA self-financing legislation on the order of the Kerr bill previously approved by the Senate and of the Davis-Jones bill favorably reported at the past session by the Public Works Committee of the House, the welfare of the 50 cooperatives that distribute TVA power and of the Nation as a whole requiring it.

PREFERENCE CLAUSE

Whereas for more than 50 years the preference clause in Federal power laws, giving preference to nonprofit public and rural electric systems, has been an important influence in insuring the continuation of a healthy competition in the electric industry; and

Whereas over four hundred of the rural electric systems are dependent either directly or indirectly upon Federal power projects for their power supply; and

Whereas constant attempts are being made to weaken the preference clause by such devices as the Case amendment and the Niagara limitations enacted in the 85th Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to reaffirm its support for the preference rights of nonprofit, consumer-owned electric systems and to oppose any repeal, watering down or evasion of the preference clause; and be it further

Resolved, That we strongly urge Congress to enact legislation to remove the effects of the Case amendment to the Rivers, Harbors, and Flood Control Authorization Act of 1958.

ATOMIC ENERGY PROGRAM

Whereas the rural electric systems have urged that the Congress provide for acceleration of the atomic energy program; and

Whereas the rural electric systems have also urged that the Congress provide the opportunity for adequate participation by rural electric and other nonprofit electric systems; and

Whereas the atomic energy program belongs to all of the people and should be protected from monopolistic abuse: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the 86th Congress to provide an atomic energy power program that will be for the benefit of all of the people and in particular will provide for Federal construction of atomic power generating plants as proposed in the Gore bill of the 85th Congress, with preference in the sale of any power therefrom being accorded to cooperatives, municipalities, and other nonprofit, consumer-owned agencies.

GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION LOANS

Whereas the demands for increased power supply for the rural electric systems pose a continuing problem for the rural electric systems; and

Whereas the cost of power to the systems has always been favorably influenced by our right and opportunity to generate and transmit our own power where this would result in lower costs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we commend the REA Administrator upon his making of the recent Mississippi and Texas generation and transmission loan and we urge him to continue to lend funds for generation and transmission when such loans are feasible; and be it further

Resolved, That the REA Administrator be urged to finance interconnections where mutually advantageous, but we oppose any return to the policy requiring the partnership arrangement with the private power companies; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to continue to provide adequate funds for this purpose.

NATIONAL TAX EQUALITY ASSOCIATION

Whereas the electric cooperatives object strenuously to the gross misrepresentations and unfair propaganda of the National Tax Equality Association; and

Whereas the NRECA board of directors has recently voted to support the suit of National Milk Producers Federation to recover damages from the NTEA: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we give our wholehearted support of the action of the NRECA board in this matter.

RURAL TELEPHONE PROGRAM

Whereas participation by cooperative organizations in the rural telephone program is at a standstill; and

Whereas the loss of this competitive element in the program can only be detrimental to the whole program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge REA to actively promote the formation and growth of rural telephone cooperatives consistent with both the language and the spirit contained in the Senate Appropriations Committee report recommending appropriations for fiscal 1959; and be it further

Resolved, That we endorse the National Telephone Cooperative Association and encourage all telephone cooperatives to join this organization for their mutual benefit.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the islands of Hawaii were an independent monarchy in 1854 when they first requested status as a State in our Nation. In 1900, when Hawaii became a Territory, it was with the promise that statehood would eventually follow.

To help the United States keep this promise, and principally because I believe the admission of Hawaii as our 50th State would benefit both Hawaii and the entire Nation, I have coauthored a bill providing for Hawaiian statehood.

These islands have been training for statehood since 1900. They have had a constitutional government for more than 60 years, and more than 87 percent of the electorate—far above the national average—voted in the recent elections. Hawaiians pay more in per capita taxes than the national average, and the per capita income in the islands is ahead of that of 23 present States. The Territory contains 6,423 square miles of land, which would make it larger than three present States, and a population of 575,771, which is larger than the present population in each of 5 States.

The House of Representatives has voted three times to admit Hawaii, but the proposal has not been passed by the Senate. I believe the Hawaiian statehood bill should be seriously considered and passed by the 86th Congress. Mr. President, to support this belief, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Sid Ross and Ed Kiester, which appeared in Parade magazine for January 11, 1959, under the heading "Hawaii Wants Statehood Now."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAWAII WANTS STATEHOOD NOW

(By Sid Ross and Ed Kiester)

HONOLULU, T. H.—Film Actress Dorothy Lamour turned up here last month. Newspapermen asked routinely about sarongs and Hollywood, but what they really wanted to know was more important: how did she feel about Hawaiian statehood?

Miss Lamour, not one to disappoint an audience announced she would send statehood plugs to every Congressman and to 700 personal friends. She will also, she said, make tape-recorded interviews on statehood for NBC-Radio.

Hawaiians could not have been more gratified. From Waikiki to Mauna Loa, the Territory is off on one of the great courtships of history. Plans for mustering support for statehood from other visitors include a sampling of visitor opinion and a "straw vote" set up at Waikiki hotels.

The question of statehood is on every tongue, in every newspaper. Last year, the half-million Americans here watched, astonished and perplexed, as Alaska became the 49th State. Their emotions were those of the bridesmaid: happiness at a friend's good fortune, frustration at their own smashed

hopes, determination never again to let love pass them by.

Hawaii wants statehood now. And this month, with Congress back in session, the campaign to win friends and influence votes begins in earnest. Here are highlights of that campaign:

A battery of guest speakers will fan out to mainland luncheon clubs, chambers of commerce, fraternal groups.

The Honolulu Junior Chamber of Commerce is trying for the support of 3,600 mainland "Jaycee" chapters.

Many pieces of mail leaving the Islands will be postmarked with a plug for statehood.

A new film on Hawaii and its history is being prepared for civic groups and women's clubs.

Students are planning "pen-pal" campaigns to line up young people's support on the mainland.

A hometown newspaper service will furnish free photos of visitors, with their views on statehood.

Wide circulation will be given endorsements of statehood by President Eisenhower, former President Truman, Vice President Nixon, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the State Department, the Defense Department, the AFL-CIO, and Dorothy Lamour.

The aim of the campaign is to whip up mainland support and thus bring indirect pressure on Congress. (A recent Gallup poll showed mainlanders eight to one for statehood.) But the real showdown, as Lorrin P. Thurston, chairman of the Hawaiian Statehood Commission, points out, will come on Capitol Hill.

"Our problem," says Thurston, "is to get Hawaiian statehood before both Houses of Congress in the same session. This has never happened in the past. We feel that if a Hawaiian statehood bill is presented on the floors of both Houses, the vote will favor us."

In 1947, in 1950, and in 1953, statehood passed the House, but died in Senate committee. Thus, perhaps the most important bit of persuasion on the Hawaiian program is to coax Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON to allow the bill to reach the Senate floor.

Some Hawaiians fear all the drum beating may antagonize, instead of winning over, congressional support. (Last summer, Alaska's admission touched off a 3 week's high-pressure campaign for a vote on Hawaii; one influential Senator reportedly complained, "This pressure has got to ease up.") But others say this is Hawaii's make-or-break year.

Hawaii, then an independent monarchy, made its first try for statehood back in 1854; became a Territory in 1900 with the promise of eventual statehood; and for 20-odd years has made statehood the big issue. "You can't keep people at fever heat forever," says one observer here.

And Hawaii is at fever heat. Of more than 200 persons interviewed, three-fourths favored statehood; 20 were opposed, and the rest had no opinion.

Says Thurston: "Who is for statehood? Over 80 percent of our sugar and pineapple executives, all our public utilities, all our transportation companies, the majority of bankers and small businessmen, all our newspapers, radio and television stations, both national political parties and the great bulk of the Hawaiian people."

Why do Hawaiians want statehood? The benefits, Hawaiians say, would run in both directions. And there's the matter of simple justice. Additionally, you hear these six reasons again and again:

Second-class citizenship: Administered from Washington, Hawaii is at the mercy of Washington, cannot completely control its own affairs.

Taxation without representation: Hawaiians now pay Federal income tax but have no vote in House or Senate on how tax money is spent; they cannot vote for President, Vice President, or even their own Governor and judges.

The cold war: Statehood for Hawaii would have a tremendous propaganda value, particularly among the former colonial nations of Asia, proving that the United States does not hold Hawaii as a colonial possession.

Foreign affairs: The Pacific is becoming increasingly important in global politics, and Hawaii is Uncle Sam's most important Pacific outpost.

War record: Hawaiian units have run up an enviable record of bravery in World War II and in Korea. World War II's most-decorated outfit, the Japanese-American 442d regimental combat team, was recruited in Hawaii from volunteers.

Island development: Statehood should attract new industry to the islands, lead to development of resources such as bauxite.

In 24 separate investigations by congressional committees, these arguments have been duly weighed. (One recent committee report called statehood "of highest importance" to the United States.) But Hawaii has lost out on other grounds.

Alaska's admission shattered two objections to Hawaii—that it was "too far away" and that its admission would upset the political alinement in Congress. More damaging to Hawaii's case, however, is the claim that the islands are menaced by communism.

Sea-locked Hawaii depends on shipping, and the labor on docks—and the plantations, too—is controlled by the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. This powerful union repeatedly has been accused of a Red taint. Its local leader, Jack Hall, was convicted, then freed, under the Smith Act; its international leader, Harry Bridges, has been a Government target for years.

Hawaiian officials, from the Republican Governor down, claim the Red threat has been overblown. ("At most," said one official, "there are 35 Communists in Hawaii—shorn of all influence.")

Less discussed, but another important objection, is Hawaii's melting pot. By one count the islands have 184,732 residents of Japanese descent; 90,079 of Polynesian-Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian; 81,911 of various Caucasian; 61,040 of Filipino ancestry; 30,566 of Chinese; 10,351 of Puerto Rican and 7,624 Korean.

Recently, an editorial in the Charleston, S.C., News and Courier asked: "These islanders may be very friendly and polite people. But how many of them know or care about the political faith of Jefferson, respect States rights, or appreciate the struggle for liberty? We suspect there are very few to understand and believe in the kind of government our forefathers created." Another newspaper was more blunt: "Do we Americans want to put a couple of Japs in the Senate?"

This argument raises hackles all over the islands. Says Gov. William F. Quinn: "They're all good Americans and have proved it in peace and war."

There still is, however, a small undercurrent of opposition to statehood. Some native Hawaiians feel statehood will mean the Japanese will take over. Another group, led by former Governor, now Hawaii Supreme Court Justice, Ingram Stainback, favors a Commonwealth system, such as Puerto Rico has. Under Commonwealth, Justice Stainback says, Federal income tax would be eliminated and thus industry might be attracted.

A small fringe group also wants to keep Hawaii as it is, an incorporated Territory. Rumors claim this group is backed by big business—"then they can run the islands as a closed corporation." The statehood commission, which includes big business members, denies that the status quo has more than a small fraction of business support. And finally, a few descendants of the original Hawaiians like the status quo because they fear losing homesteading privileges.

But these are views of only a small minority. As Parade's poll shows—and as virtually every other poll shows, too—the vast majority of Hawaiians want statehood. They want it badly—and want it now.

Riley Allen, editor of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, summed up the "No. 50 in 1959" this way recently: "If Hawaii is not ready for statehood now, after many years of Territorial, city and county government on American lines, after writing an outstanding war record in the blood of its young men, after proving its willingness and ability to combat communism, after demonstrating its industry potentials, if it is not ready for statehood now, it never will be."

You'll be hearing a lot about statehood for Hawaii in the next few months. A half-million Americans here are working constantly to see that you do.

Growth of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, each year our Federal Government grows bigger, and with this bigness freedom of the individual diminishes almost proportionately.

How ironic all this is, for it was a not-so-centralized U.S. Government which led the people to victory in World War I and World War II over regimented dictatorships, and it was largely because of individual initiative and nonregimentation that the United States achieved the world's highest standard of living.

Recently the editors of two nondaily newspapers in Camden, S.C., expressed their concern about the unfortunate trend in the United States away from a decentralized government and away from the theory of individual freedom. They do not paint a pretty picture with their words; yet, their editorials deserve the attention of all thinking men. I ask unanimous consent that both of these editorials—the first, which appeared in the January 7 edition of the Camden News, entitled "A Great Nation Dying," and the second, which appeared in the January 7 edition of the Camden Chronicle, entitled "The Question Mark"—be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Camden News, Jan. 7, 1959]

A GREAT NATION DYING

"It's heartbreaking to see a great nation dying when you know that it could have been saved."

That statement was made to the editor of the Camden News just last week by a man of national prominence, who has a thorough grasp of the situation which exists in this country today.

He had no sooner made the remark than he checked himself and asked that, because of his farflung connections, his name not be used if we quoted him.

But there was no mistaking his feelings. He spoke in solemn tone and the quiver in his voice indicated that he meant what he said and that he felt it very deeply.

He said that this was the saddest New Year in his life. He felt that progress had been made last year by those seeking to destroy a free America and make it a regimented State, and that they will make even greater headway in the year which lies ahead.

He listed as some of the reasons for feeling so hopeless:

Some of the forces which have been fighting to save the Nation have become confused and demoralized. The opposition has succeeded in dividing them on minor issues.

Political ties hold them to their parties. They lack the moral courage to make the breakaway and to form a new alliance which could save the day. He blames the politicians for this and says they are clinging desperately to their jobs and fear that any breakaway might possibly endanger their positions. If the country is going to go down, they figure they will at least hold their jobs until this happens.

Businessmen will not get out and fight because of the fear that they might lose a few dollars if they do. They don't seem to realize that in the end they may lose everything if they don't get out and fight now.

The vast majority of the people are either unaware of the dangers confronting the Nation or are unconcerned about them. If you try to point out the dangers to some of them, they shrug their shoulders, say you are an alarmist, that "things are not that bad" and then run off to chase another dollar or to go to a cocktail party. Some may sense the danger but want to leave it to others to do the fighting—and the worrying. They don't want to get mixed up in it.

The other side is united, is working day and night with a crusading spirit, individuals are giving most liberally of their time and means, taking advantage of every opportunity to confuse and divide us and are running rings around us in putting out propaganda.

And so the leak in the dam gets bigger and bigger and unless something happens quickly to awaken the masses from their lethargy and to unite those of us, who want to save this as a free America, into a band of steel, it is but a question of time until the dam breaks. Let us hope and pray that this something may happen before it is everlastingly too late.

We have often quoted the remarks made by Daniel Webster on an historic occasion and we are going to quote them again in the hope that his words may burn their way into the hearts of some who are so indifferent now:

"Other misfortunes may be borne or their effects overcome. If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhausts our treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolates and lays waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests.

"It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.

"But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government?

"Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty?

"Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with States rights, individual security, and public prosperity?

"No, if these columns fall they will not be raised again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be designed to a mournful and melancholy immortality. Bitter tears, however, will flow over them than were shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional liberty."

[From the Camden Chronicle, Jan. 7, 1959]

THE QUESTION MARK

Just about everything in this country has been getting bigger.

This trend, the economists confidently tell us with hardly a dissenting voice, is not only sure to continue but to accelerate. They blueprint a future of ever-increasing incomes, ever-improving living standards, the mass enjoyment of luxuries which would have been beyond the imagination of man not long ago.

We are on the verge of explosive breakthroughs in physical sciences. The age-old mysteries of space are being fathomed, and soon will be mysteries no more. The miracles of nuclear physics are at hand. Longer, healthier, happier lives for all are promised. And we are not alone. All over the world, peoples and nations are swept along, to varying degrees, in the same tide.

This is fine. Almost everyone wants more money, more of the things that money can buy, more of what we know by the word "progress."

Yet a nagging question arises, the biggest unanswered question that confronts the changing world. While just about everything is getting bigger, is the greatest resource of all getting smaller? That resource is the individual. Not just people in the mass, but individual people—each different, each unique, each a spirit as well as an appetite. Is the individual in very real danger of being dwarfed by the bigness around him, and of being reduced to a statistic?

It's easy enough to say that it can't happen here, even though we have all seen it happen in vast reaches of the earth. Easy enough, but untrue. This Nation was founded on certain concepts: the fullest freedom for all, an unflagging sense of the spiritual nature of man, a passionate regard for the worth of every individual human being. But these, like all other concepts and philosophies, will wither away to nothingness unless they are eternally prized beyond all else and faithfully protected. They must be supported in absolutely specific ways. They demand the highest degree of individual independence and responsibility. If, for instance, we give to government the initiative and the power to regulate and dominate our lives in the name of security, the ultimate end will be the security of the penitentiary. Power once granted to government must always be balanced against a greater power in the hands of the people.

We pride ourselves on our material achievements. But pride can result in a deadly blindness. Other nations, whose concepts are utterly opposed to ours, are producing their own wonders. Communist Russia and Communist China are, so to speak, moving mountains. The whip and the chain, used with dedicated ruthlessness, can also get out the goods, while the soul of man dies.

It took centuries of turmoil, war and revolution to establish the rights of man, the rights of the individual. They can be lost overnight by sins of omission no less than sins of commission. A people whose eyes and minds are fixed on material ends alone will not long remain a free people. They will become merely instruments of power.

There is no foreseeable limit to what we, through our economic, social and political organizations can achieve. It will be the ultimate irony if, in the light of this, we surrender the individual to material bigness, whether in government or anywhere else. We never had a more urgent need to uphold age-old principles and convictions that make for the only worthwhile kind of progress—confidence in something, faith in ideals, fairness, the determination to defend what one believes to be right.

Walt Whitman wrote, a century ago: "The whole theory of the universe is directed unerringly to one single individual; namely, to you." Man in the mass must never hide the face of the individual man.

Science and Freedom: The Continuing Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, at the November 1958 Conference of NATO Parliamentarians in Paris, important recommendations were unanimously agreed upon to further improve the State of science in the NATO Community.

These recommendations are embodied in the report of the Scientific and Technical Committee entitled "Science and Freedom: The Continuing Challenge."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address which I delivered as Chairman of the NATO Scientific and Technical Committee in presenting the report to the Conference on November 17, 1958, together with the text of the report itself.

There being no objection, the address and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON, PRESENTING THE REPORT OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL COMMITTEE TO THE NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE ON NOVEMBER 17, 1958

Only one out of every seven people in the world is a member of our North Atlantic Community. We occupy only a small fraction of the lands of the earth. Our Community's soils are not uniquely fertile. Our mineral wealth is not uniquely great. Yet our Community, small in size and numbers, has created the civilization which has dominated world history for the past thousand years.

All other societies and cultures of the past have been parochial. Their imprint has fallen on only one race, one religious group, or one limited geographical area. But the influence of the Old World Community has spread to every continent. We in North America are actively aware of this influence in our progress.

All civilizations of the past have grown and flowered, and then withered. But our own Community has so far escaped dissolution and decay.

There is only one common denominator to societies which have perished—their failure to adapt to change. The root cause of dissolution is never found in material things; it is found in matters of the mind. Nations or communities which meet new problems with new solutions and new ideas endure. Those which do not go under.

Think back to 13th-century China. The China of Marco Polo was more prosperous than the Europe of Chaucer. It had a magnificent educational system, which produced superb scholars and civil servants. But that system was based on the notion of an unchanging and already perfectly ordered society. It found its perfect expression in the Great Wall of China.

Yet the Great Wall could not keep out the ideas of the scientific and industrial revolution. Unable to resist Western technology, unwilling to adapt to it, the China of old slowly disintegrated.

In the meanwhile, our Atlantic world was eagerly embracing the revolutionary ideas of the new science. It was translating the ideas into machines which let 1 man do the work of 10. It was exporting science and technology to every corner of the earth. Science and the Atlantic world became almost synonymous.

More than any other single factor, it is the scientific leadership of our community which has created our world political and economic leadership. Through science, we have attained the world's highest standard of life. Through it also, we have built armaments which have canceled out our weakness in numbers.

But today, the very science which has made our community prosperous and strong threatens us mortally.

Once, because of our head start, our Atlantic world possessed a near monopoly of science and technology. While we did, our world leadership was almost guaranteed. But our monopoly of scientific and technical knowledge is over.

The two overriding challenges of our time are the tremendous growth of science and technology in the Soviet Union and the determination of the economically underdeveloped areas to raise their standards of life. We must find new solutions for these new problems.

The Soviets are resolved to surpass us scientifically, because in so doing they could surpass us industrially and politically as well. The Soviet Union continues to graduate scientists and engineers at a rate twice our own. It continues to raise its industrial output twice as fast as ours. It continues to close the gap in advanced weapons systems. Make no mistake: we are locked in a stern competition.

The peoples of Asia and Africa are spectators to this contest. They are determined to secure, as quickly as possible, the fruits of science—industrial progress, lightened burdens, and richer lives. They are told by Moscow that their only chance to industrialize quickly lies in following the Soviet example. Moscow is consciously and deliberately wooing the uncommitted peoples with trade and aid—ready to snap the trap shut when the time comes.

Since long before sputnik, wise men have warned that science and technology in our Atlantic world are moving forward too slowly to keep pace with the challenges of our time. The danger is present and clear, and our problem is three-fold. We are not graduating enough scientists and engineers. We are not producing enough uniquely gifted talents—the great scientific pathbreakers. And we are wasting precious talent by not employing it efficiently. As a result, it hangs in the balance whether we can continue our dynamic economic growth, meet the Soviet challenge, and convince Asia and Africa through help and example that economic progress is in harmony with freedom.

In 1956, almost a full year before the first sputnik, this conference acted. We established a special Committee on Scientific and Technical Personnel; it was my honor to be appointed chairman.

The committee was asked to report to the third annual conference on ways and means of improving the state of science within our community.

When our conference met in Paris last November, the committee made specific recommendations for positive action by the member governments and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization itself. The committee report was adopted by the third conference, and forwarded to the North Atlantic Council, the member governments, and other interested bodies including the OEEC.

A year has pased since we made our report. This has been a period of solid accomplishment. New drive has been given to our scientific effort. We are now on the right road, and traveling in the right direction.

One year ago, the general public scarcely knew there was a scientific manpower problem. Today, our citizens, acting through the civic and community organizations, are helping solve it.

A year ago, the member states were just beginning to grapple with the problem. Today, for the most part, they have programs of remedial action well underway.

A year ago, consideration of the problem within NATO was still in the study stage. Today, NATO possesses new and unprecedented regional machinery in this field. A full-time science adviser and a Science Advisory Committee are now hard at work, helping the NATO Council.

Finally, these past 12 months have seen heartening progress in translating key recommendations of last year's Parliamentary Conference into effective action.

The report now before you gives the details of what has been done concerning these recommendations; permit me to summarize the highlights of the story.

Last year's conference recommended that NATO sponsor and finance a talent development program which would produce annually at least 500 researchers with advanced training in fields of maximum importance for the defense and welfare of our Community. The NATO Council has approved a NATO science fellowship program, based on the recommendation of our Conference.

Last year's conference recommended an immediate increase in the number and the variety of advanced summer study institutes within the NATO Community. The NATO Council has just approved a program for partial financial suport of advanced study institutes.

Last year, we recommended that NATO sponsor and finance additional important cooperative training and research projects, which particularly lend themselves to international action. The NATO Science Committee is now actively considering new cooperative projects which might merit NATO support.

Last year we recommended that a NATO Defense Missile Training Center be established. Reinforced by this recommendation, AGARD, in cooperation with SHAPE, has conducted a study of available training range areas and initial steps have been taken to budget funds.

Last year's conference proposed an Atlantic Institute for Defense Studies to conduct operations research on a NATO-wide basis. Since then AGARD and SHAPE have sponsored operations research conferences. We hope these will help point the way to a permanent and broad defense studies institute.

Mr. President, every member of this conference should feel proud that so many of our recommendations have been favorably acted upon, by the NATO Council and by the member governments.

The task now is to build on the solid foundation already laid—to speed up and broaden corrective programs already started, and to find new areas for useful action.

Ever since last year, my colleagues on the Scientific and Technical Committee have continued to give close attention to this problem.

Our recommendations for further action are contained in the committee's report at your desk. This report reflects discussions and correspondence with officials of NATO, SHAPE, and the OEEC. It reflects the valuable counsel of the executive agencies of our countries and of distinguished private citizens, including many of the greatest scientists in the world.

Above all, it reflects a great deal of hard work on the part of my committee colleagues.

Let me summarize our new recommendations:

First, we recommend that the NATO Council look forward to increasing the Science Fellowship program. We believe this program is full of promise, and we are thankful it is underway. Considering the scope of the challenge, however, we think the present plan is too modest.

If the NATO fellowships discover one new giant in the scientific field, or if they give us one new revolutionary scientific idea, they will more than pay their way. We believe a reasonable annual budget would be $8 million, when the program is in full operation.

Second, we recommend that the NATO Science Committee place high on its agenda the formulation of a basic long-range policy to guide NATO research and development efforts.

As NATO gets further into the business of scientific cooperation, we must be sure our resources are not dissipated in too many directions. To achieve decisive results, we need to focus on a few urgent objectives.

The logical group to define these objectives is the NATO Science Committee.

Third, we recommend that, in launching projects for cooperative research, the NATO Council give particular attention to joint programs in three fields: materials research, oceanography and upper atmosphere and space.

In the materials field, our knowledge has been strained to the limit by recent technological advances. Unless we can achieve early breakthroughs in basic and applied metallurgy, vital peacetime and military projects will be stalled. Much excellent work on materials problems is now underway in Europe and America, but we need a joint program to make the best use of available talent.

In oceanography, the research demands far exceed the skills now available in any one or two of the NATO nations. Despite the fact that the Atlantic Community is essentially a maritime confederation, our understanding of the ocean is still primitive. For example, we have roughly accurate maps for only about two percent of the deep-sea floor. The advent of nuclear-missile firing submarines and the prospect of nuclear commercial transport underline the need for a bold program of oceanographic research—capitalizing on the most expert talent our Community can provide.

Mr. President, almost five centuries ago, the great voyagers of discovery of the Old World found and explored the New World of the Americas. But the greatest voyages of discovery are yet to come. They lie in the upper atmosphere and outer space.

Your old world, Mr. President, and my new world should now join forces for this greatest adventure of all. We should now explore the world of space together.

Specifically, my colleagues and I recommend that the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization now undertake a program of peaceful scientific and technical cooperation in upper atmosphere and outer space research, development, and exploration.

The first goal: A satellite for peaceful outer space research, bearing the emblem of the

Atlantic Community and circling the earth by 1960.

The scientific problems involved in space technology are enormously difficult and enormously expensive. Only a few members of our Community have been able to afford the great outlays of money and manpower needed to develop and build launcing vehicles for satellites.

Yet this is only one part of the total space research problem. The total problem cuts across every scientific discipline. It involves theoretical and applied mathematics, physics, meteorology, chemistry, geology, geophysics, biology, and medicine.

Scientists from every one of our countries possess skills which are urgently needed in space research. Some of the smaller members of our Community, in fact, now lead the world in specialized research areas of crucial importance.

But our problem today is this: We have embarked upon independent and uncoordinated national programs for developing space technology. There is overlapping and duplication of effort. Precious scientific talent is thereby being wasted.

The obviously desirable solution is to establish a mechanism for pooling the talents of all our 15 nations. We already have a foundation for such a joint effort—Prof. Theodore von Karman's Advisory Group for Aeronautical Research and Development. We are already cooperating in aeronautics; a logical next step is to cooperate in astronautics.

The way to start may be by inviting scientists from our entire Community to meet at an early date for the purpose of drafting a cooperative research effort.

As its first goal, this cooperative program might aim at designing an advanced peaceful research satellite which combines the best ideas of our entire scientific Community. This satellite could be sent into space with a launching vehicle supplied by a nation possessing a major missile program. I am informed that it is technically possible to design and launch such a satellite by 1960.

We are now partners on land. We are partners on the sea. We are partners in the air. It is time that we now become partners in outer space.

Mr. President, I sincerely believe that these recommendations are constructive and timely. I trust they will provoke a lively discussion from the floor today.

I cannot close these remarks without sounding a note of warning.

It took sputnik to shock us into taking a fresh look at the state of science in our Community. But we cannot count on being alerted so well again. Our problem now is to stay on the job—day in and day out—even when we do not have providential warnings like sputnik to arouse us. We must not again commit the error of thinking that our community can remain preeminent in the affairs of men without remaining preeminent in science and technology.

But in avoiding that mistake, we must not err in the opposite direction.

In every generation, there is a passionate minority which thinks it has found a magic solution for the great problems of its time. Think back to Hiram Maxim, the inventor of the machinegun, who said, "It will make war impossible." Think of our libraries, filled with thousands of dusty and now-forgotten treatises, each of which had marvelous formulas for permanent prosperity, and perfect and final harmony among all men.

Suppose our Community remains preeminent in science and technology, suppose we win all the races for discovery for advanced weapons? We can still fail in our quest for security. We may successfully bar the front door, yet if we leave the back door open our adversary can enter by that route.

As Khrushchev puts it: "We do not need war. Peaceful competition is enough * * * we will bury you."

Today the Soviets challenge us across the boards, not only in science and industry, and in military strength, but in culture, languages, standard of living, trade, politics, and diplomacy.

The Science and Technical Committee of this Conference has tackled the immediate and urgent work of improving the scientific skills in our North Atlantic world. But this is only part one of the task confronting our Community. Indeed, in may ways it is the easier part of our job. A second part, and a far more difficult one, is the improvement of our skills in dealing with the most unscientific thing in the world; namely, people.

Take the problem of the underdeveloped nations which are now moving toward self rule and trying to raise their standards of life to western levels.

Our Community is well equipped to offer these regions the scientific tools they need to bring closer their dream of a decent standard of life. It is far less well equipped to convince these areas that their cause and our cause are in harmony, that their cause and our cause are both part of one larger common cause, dignity and justice for all men everywhere.

It is right and imperative to invigorate the study and pursuit of science and technology within our Atlantic Community. Yet all our cyclotrons, all our atomic reactors, all our wondrous space missiles, all our Nobel prize winners in science will avail us naught unless, at the same time, we invigorate also those skills and vocations which determine how the fruits of science will be used.

We cannot halt the onward sweep of science and technology. New and yet more momentous discoveries altering the face of our world continue to be made at an ever-accelerting rate. Any attempt to stop or slow the clock of science would be wrong, self-defeating, and hopeless.

There is only one solution which realistic men can entertain: To develop skills and wisdom in the social sciences and the humanities which equal the skills and wisdom of our scientists.

If our age is to become a blessing and not a curse we shall need prodigious talent in philosophy, in sociology, in political science, in law, in languages, and in economics. None of these disciplines can safely be left on the sidelines.

Let me cite an example:

Language—the words and phrases of everyday intercourse—has assumed immense symbolic significance in Asia and Africa. There is a great revival of native tongues, they are becoming the language of politics and of commerce.

Yet we are not assuring ourselves even the minimum language skills in working with the emerging nations. There are over 40 important languages of Asia alone for which even our teaching tools are sketchy or nonexistent.

By contrast, Russian universities have ambitious programs in the Asian languages, including Manchurian, Uigur, Telegu, and the Burmese, Vietnamese, Malayan, and Indonesian languages. Some of the Russian grade schools now even instruct 8- and 9-year-olds in Chinese, Hindi, Arabic, Parsi, and Urdu.

One can almost foretell what countries are next on the Soviet calendar of conquest—from their language curriculum.

Meanwhile, our Atlantic Community lumbers along emphasizing the colonial languages, English, French, German, and Dutch.

How unimaginative can we be to try to build a community of interest with the former colonial peoples while our peoples speak mainly the language of the former governing nations.

Or, take one other example; economics. Moscow has declared war on us on the economic front, and the opening battle has begun. Soviet production is sufficient to support a huge arms budget, to meet the minimum demands of the civilian economy and to start major maneuvers in the markets of the world.

The Soviets doubtless desire to defeat our Community without war, if they can. They would prefer to inherit the world, rather than destroy it.

In Khrushchev's own words: "We will make war on you through peaceful trade to see which system is the best."

The Soviets can sell at a loss and buy at a premium when it suits their political purposes—concentrating their fire on the vulnerable economies in the Middle East, southern Asia, and Latin America.

Moscow has already upset world markets for timber, tin, and aluminum—by cut-rate sales. It aims to set ally against ally, friend against friend—its motto: "Divide and disrupt."

Despite the clear danger signals, our Community has barely begun to drag itself into action. Yet there is every prospect that Moscow's capacity for economic warfare will grow steadily in the future.

Obviously, the Soviets have the easier task. They accept no responsibility for making the present world economic system function smoothly and fairly.

How unwise can we be to continue discounting Russia's economic offensive, when it could prove more dangerous than its armaments build-up?

It is true that Europe is making good progress toward a freer trading area. However, in the wider Atlantic framework, article 2 of our treaty is practically forgotten.

The Atlantic Community should (1) affirm that an economic assault upon one of us, is an economic assault upon all of us; (2) rally our creative talents in economics and political science and put them to work on a joint economic strategy; and (3) use NATO-wide arrangements for economic consultations and economic diplomacy.

In conclusion, let me say:

Our conference should continue its energetic efforts to improve the scientific skills of our Community. In addition, this conference should now launch part 2 of its talent program. We should single out high priority needs in the humanities and the social sciences, such as Asian and African languages, and we should come forward with suggestions to remedy the deficiencies.

The great philosopher Whitehead once said it is the business of the future to be dangerous.

It is the business of our Community to welcome that future and to meet its new challenges successfully.

Our rivals pose as champions of the future, but they are in fact defenders of the discredited past. They advocate an outmoded idea which our Atlantic Community rejected centuries ago—that man must choose between material progress and individual freedom.

We are the real champions of the future. We are the bearers of the truly revolutionary idea of our time—that the quest for material abundance and the quest for human freedom are one and the same quest.

Ours is a privileged time. We have been given a historic opportunity to prove the superiority and power of freedom.

SCIENCE AND FREEDOM: THE CONTINUING CHALLENGE

(Report of the Committee on the Provisions of Scientific and Technical Personnel, NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, prepared by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, United States of America, chairman, and Mr. C. L. Patijn, Netherlands, rapporteur)

INTRODUCTION

The Second Parliamentarians' Conference held in November 1956 established a special Committee on Scientific and Technical Personnel. This committee was requested to

submit to last years' conference their findings and recommendations concerning these three topics:

(a) The present situation with respect to the training of scientific and technological personnel in the NATO countries.

(b) The relationship between NATO utilization of the existing potential resources in this field and the utilization of similar resources by the Soviet bloc.

(c) The development of resources of scientific and technological personnel sufficient to enable the NATO countries to maintain their individual and collective capacities to resist armed attack and to continue their economic growth essential to their strength and well-being.

The committee report submitted to the third conference made these general findings:

(a) The scientific revolution has created an unprecedented demand for highly qualified scientists and engineers.

(b) The NATO community now faces a major problem in the form of serious shortages of skilled personnel, and in underemployment of available scientific and technical talent.

(c) There is a real danger that the Soviet bloc may surpass the NATO community in science and technology. This shift in the balance of scientific power could well upset the balance of military power.

(d) NATO would urgently need more trained manpower even if there were no Soviet Union and no defense effort. More and better skills will be needed if the Atlantic nations are to take full advantage of new opportunities for industrial progress and economic well-being, and if they are to continue to be the chief exporters of science and technology to the underdeveloped areas of the world.

The committee report recognized that corrective action was primarily the responsibility of the member states. It found, however, that cooperative measures could also play an indispensable role. The report thereupon made specific recommendations for positive action to be undertaken both by national governments and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The committee report was adopted by the Third Annual Conference and forwarded to the North Atlantic Council, the member governments of NATO, and other interested bodies, including OEEC.

During the past year, the members of the Scientific and Technical Committee have continued to give close attention to this problem, focusing particular interest on progress being made in translating the recommendations of the third conference into positive action. The committee members have profited greatly from discussions and correspondence with officials of NATO, the OEEC, and SHAPE. They have also received invaluable counsel from the executive agencies of their own countries and from many private citizens.

Those who have taken part in the discussions of the Scientific and Technical Committee are:

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON (United States of America), Chairman.
Mr. C. L. Patijn (Netherlands), Rapporteur.
Mr. A. de Meerleer for Mr. Smet (Belgium).
Mr. A. G. Normann (Denmark).
Senator G. Portmann (France).
Dr. G. Kliesing (Germany).
Mr. P. Yokas (Greece).
Mr. O. Watnebryn (Norway).
Viscount Goschen, O.B.E. (United Kingdom).
Brig. O. L. Prior-Palmer, D.S.O. (United Kingdom).
Congressman R. J. CORBETT (United States of America).

Adviser to committee: Mr. Kenneth Mansfield (United States of America).

The chairman wishes to thank his committee colleagues for their extremely valuable contributions to this report, and to acknowledge gratefully the assistance of the executive secretary and staff of the conference.

A YEAR OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

Last year's Parliamentarians' Conference met less than 5 weeks after the first sputnik. The Soviet bloc, not the Atlantic Community, had taken man's first step into outer space. A country barely one generation into the industrial age had surpassed us.

A bewildered North Atlantic Community undertook a great reexamination of its course and destiny.

Much good came of this great appraisal in the realm of science and technology.

Over the past 12 months, significant progress has been made in improving the state of science within the NATO Community. Less has been done than might have been done, but we have made a good beginning.

First, there is now far greater public awareness of the importance of invigorating the study and pursuit of science. Twelve months ago, far too many of our citizens were scarcely aware of the existence of this problem. Over the long run it is our ordinary citizens, not experts, who will determine the success or failure of corrective measures. It is our citizens as parents who must encourage gifted young children to follow careers in science and engineering. It is our citizens as taxpayers who must provide the moneys needed to support remedial programs. We should therefore be immensely heartened by the fact that the general public, acting through civic and community organizations, is now beginning to participate actively in helping attack this problem.

Second, the member states of NATO have broadened the scope and accelerated the pace of national remedial programs.

Of particular importance are programs initiated to increase the supply and training of teachers in technical fields, and to invigorate the study of mathematics and science at the high school and secondary school level.

It has been apparent that the international activities this year have in many cases stimulated useful action at national and regional levels.

Third, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has set up new and unprecedented regional machinery in the science field. A science adviser and a representative Science Advisory Committee of 15 members are helping the NATO Council launch a scientific and technical program for the NATO area.

At the same time, the OEEC has strengthened its machinery in the scientific education and manpower field. A director of the new Office of Scientific and Technical Personnel and a new Governing Committee on Scientific and Technical Personnel are sponsoring practical activities to improve the quality and raise the number of able men and women in the sciences.

Fourth, solid progress has been made in implementing key recommendations of the Third Parliamentarians' Conference, relating to the provision and utilization of scientific manpower.

(a) NATO science fellowship program: Last year's Conference recommended establishment of a NATO-sponsored and NATO-financed talent development program designed to produce annually at least 500 doctoral degree holders with research experience in the fields of maximum importance for the defense and economic well-being of the NATO Community.

This proposal recognized certain disciplines to be of prime importance, among them, applied mathematics, aero and fluid dynamics, basic electronics, nuclear physics, solid state physics, physical chemistry and metallurgy. The Conference believed that a relatively small number of additional trained people of outstanding talent in these key disciplines would have a catalytic effect, accelerating the entire scientific and technological effort of the NATO Community. The suggested program would afford top-level students an opportunity to study abroad at leading centers for their particular disciplines.

The NATO Council has given final approval to a NATO science fellowship program based on the recommendation of the Parliamentarians' Conference and drawing its principal inspiration from that recommendation. (For details see Annex 1—NATO Council's Agreement on NATO Science Fellowship Program.)

The program would cost $1 million for the first year. Tentative plans call for a budget of $4 million annually when the program is in full operation in 4 years. Financial arrangements for the first year have been completed in time to publicize for 1959 fellowships.

(b) Advanced study institutes: Last year's Conference recommended that immediate steps be taken to increase the number and variety of advanced summer study institutes within the NATO Community, in order to extend the influence of outstanding scholarly talent in fields now hampered by a shortage of teachers.

The proposal called for a strong program of institutes in such fields as solid state physics, nuclear engineering, applied mathematics, high temperature metallurgy and medicine.

The proposal recognized that the summer study institute has been an important postwar educational development both in North America and in Europe.

These institutes serve various purposes: bring able students into contact with the latest and best thinking in their fields; bring together mature scholars for extended seminars in particular scientific problem areas, or offer refresher courses in sicence or mathematics to secondary school or college teachers.

Such institutes have distinct advantages: flexibility, inexpensiveness, administration by existing organizations, and an international character.

The OEEC has pioneered in holding summer institutes for high school teachers in the general sciences and mathematics. This year the OEEC sponsored three international institutes for secondary school science teachers; one in England; one in Germany; and one in France. These institutes brought together teachers and supervisors of science teacher courses to develop improved science teaching techniques.

The OEEC is now planning summer institutes during 1959 for science inspectors of high schools, for teachers of science in teacher training colleges, for representatives of high school science teacher organizations, and for science teachers from the small countries who confront special problems in shortages of equipment, etc.

Late last year, the Ford Foundation (United States of America), recognized the importance of the proposed advanced research institute program, and informed that no NATO financing would be available to support institutes as early as the summer of 1958, assisted in an experimental expansion of two already established and well known summer institutes—the French-sponsored summer school of physics at Les Houches, and the Italian-sponsored summer school of physics at Varenna.

In addition, assistance from the Ford Foundation made possible a new 1958 summer institute of solid state physics administered by the Ecole Normale Superieure in Paris. A group of French, Italian and English physicists have agreed to operate this institute in turn, in successive years, if financing continues to be available.

The NATO Council has now fully approved a NATO program for partial financial

support of advanced study institutes, such as the ones at Les Houches and Varenna. (For details see Annex 2—North Atlantic Council's Agreement on NATO Advanced Study Institute program.)

The program would cost $150,000 for the first year. Tentative plans call for an increased budget the following year. NATO financing of institutes will be available for the summer of 1959.

(c) Annual review of scientific and technical education and manpower: Last year the Conference asked the NATO Council to initiate the practice of annual reports from member countries on the adequacy of science education facilities, hoping thereby to encourage a speedup in national corrective programs.

This stock taking was proposed especially in view of the growth of population and the demand for education on the part of increasing numbers of people.

The OEEC, with the full concurrence of the NATO Council, is now conducting the first annual review of the country policies in the training of scientific and technical manpower. The review is being carried on in collaboration with the appropriate educational authorities in member countries.

No uniform set of questions is being used, rather each country is asked questions relevant to its special condition and need. It is hoped that this first year the review will discover the more glaring gaps in individual country programs and will identify the more obvious possibilities for practical improvement.

(d) Cooperative project research under NATO sponsorship: Last year the Conference recommended that NATO sponsor and finance additional important cooperative training and research projects which particularly lend themselves to international action. The Conference was impressed with the outstanding success of the NATO-supported training center for experimental aerodynamics in Brussels, and proposed that this precedent be extended to other areas where cooperative projects could be helpful.

The NATO Science Advisory Committee is now actively considering a number of new cooperative projects which might merit NATO contract support.

Meanwhile, during the last year both the Brussels Aerodynamic Center and the Air Defense Technical Center at The Hague have increased the effectiveness of their programs.

(e) The NATO Defense Missile Training Center: Last year the conference recommended that a NATO Defense Missile Training Center be established to assure the entire NATO community an opportunity for intensive and systematic training in the handling of defensive missiles.

Reinforced by this recommendation, AGARD, in cooperation with SHAPE, has conducted a study of available training range areas. Steps to budget funds for a missile training installation are in a preliminary stage.

Following the 1957 discussions, it became increasingly evident that any NATO missile center would also be useful for the education of the civilian scientific and technical personnel. Such a center might thereby aid our community in establishing a base for the sceince of astronautics in addition to the primary function of training NATO's defensive missile units.

(f) Atlantic Institute for Defense Studies: Last year the conference recommended the establishment of an Atlantic Institute for Defense Studies which would bring the techniques of modern science to bear on defense planning on a NATO-wide basis. It was suggested that this institute could be responsible to SHAPE.

This proposal recognized that effective defense planning can no longer be improvised. Today, with weapons systems and defense problems becoming more complex, there is increasing need for comprehensive programs of operational research.

The potential benefits to be derived from operational research have become increasingly recognized since our 1957 session, particularly through AGARD and SHAPE efforts in their conduct of conferences on operational research, history and methods.

We are encouraged by AGARD's recent establishment of a summer study institute in operational research methods, in which all our NATO nations are being invited to enroll students. This first course we understand will begin in the summer of 1959 and will be open to both civilian and military students.

We hope that the experience thus gained will help speed an early decision by SHAPE on behalf of a broad and permanent institute of defense studies.

THE TASK AHEAD

The job before us is to build on the solid foundation laid in the past year—to bolster and expedite remedial programs already started, and to identify new areas where further action is needed.

We believe that the member governments should again be called on by the NATO Council to maintain and enlarge appropriate programs on the national level, looking both to the removal of barriers to talent and to the employment of trained manpower in the most efficient manner.

We believe also that the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, the NATO Council, the member governments, and all nongovernmental bodies concerned should maintain and enlarge their programs for focusing public attention on the continuing importance of raising the level of scientific excellence within the Atlantic world.

Unless member states come squarely to grips with the problem and unless national programs receive widespread popular support, internatinal measures, however desirable in principle, will be of little worth.

In addition, we make the following specific recommendations for strengthening existing programs and for initiating new programs during the coming year:

1. NATO science fellowship program: It is gratifying that this promising program is now underway, and that the first fellowships will be awarded next year. But we have to measure the size of this program against the challenge. The contemplated annual cost of $4 million, when the program is in full operation, is only half the cost of one long-range bomber, and a tiny fraction of the cost of a single peace-time atomic powerplant.

Thousands of gifted students who could profit by training abroad at key centers for their particular discipline, do not now have the chance to go abroad. A $4 million fellowship program will help immensely. Considering the need, however, a larger program seems justified so that even more of the really able students can obtain the best training available, and at a time in their careers when that training can be most useful.

If this porgram discovers one truly exceptional mind—a Maxwell, a Fermi, an Einstein, or a Bohr of the coming generation—then our investment will have more than paid off. If it gives the Atlantic community one path-breaking idea we would not otherwise get we will have struck an excellent bargain.

We think that money used to discover and nurture top-flight talent is money very well spent.

Therefore, we recommend that the NATO Council look forward to increasing the Science Fellowship Program. We believe a reasonable annual budget would be $8 million, when the program is in full operation.

2. Cooperative research centers under NATO sponsorship: Here are three examples of cooperative research programs which are specially needed at this time and which would particularly benefit from the joint action of NATO members.

(a) A NATO center of materials research: Technological advances since World War II, in both peacetime and military fields, have strained metallurgical knowledge to the limit. In many cases further progress cannot be made without major steps forward both in basic and applied metallurgy.

An example: Aluminum is an excellent structural material for subsonic and transonic aircraft, but it cannot withstand the high temperatures met by ultra-high-performance aircraft now being designed. The broader application of molybdenum and columbium is essential. Our knowledge of the properties and behavior of these materials is very meager.

Another example: The phenomenon of nuclear radiation has created an entirely new and crucially important field of metallurgical research. Nuclear powerplant design is now seriously inhibited by our failure to develop economical and practical materials capable of long-life use in the high-temperature, high-radiation environment of nuclear reactors.

Still enother example: One of the major areas of concern in missile development and space research is the reentry problem, which revolves around finding materials which do not disintegrate when traveling through the atmosphere at hypersonic speeds.

Many universities and research centers, both in Europe and North America, now have excellent materials research programs under way. The OEEC is conducting a modest study in the metallurgical field. Yet no full-scale integrated program has been developed which would focus the best talents in the entire Atlantic Community on the really critical technical problems.

The possibilities of such a joint program might well be the subject of a study financed with NATO funds in 1959.

(b) An upper atmosphere and space research program: The technical problems confronting us in the new science of astronautics are immensely difficult. They will grow in magnitude and complexity as we reach further into space and as manned vehicles substitute for manned satellites. Space research and exploration will cut across every scientific discipline—theoretical and applied mathematics, physics, meteorology, chemistry, electronics, geology, biology, and medicine.

Designing and launching a carrier vehicle is an extremely complex undertaking. Large scale experiments in the upper atmosphere and outer space, in fact, might well be regarded as beyond the means of some of member states. As against this, there are numerous less costly but still critically important research projects which do lie within the competence of the smaller members of the community. Space medicine is an example. Fortunately we have among the European nations some of the world leaders in upper atmosphere studies.

Clearly, the scientific challenge in prospect far transcends the resources of even the most technically advanced members of NATO. There is work for all to do, and the job will go forward at maximum speed only if all take part. A cooperative effort in this area would seem eminently worthwhile.

(c) A NATO program for oceanographic research: Viewed in terms of political geography, the NATO Community is essentially a maritime confederation. Its survival depends upon the free transport of materials and peoples across the Atlantic basin and the littoral seas.

In time of peace, the ocean is a vast highway for commerce between the Old and the New World. In time of war, effective control of the ocean would be indispensable.

Although the continents are now giving up their last secrets, and although man has

already taken the first step into space, the knowledge of the oceans, which make up three-fouths of the earth's surface, is meager and fragmentary.

Even roughly accurate maps of the deep sea floor exist for only about 2 percent of the total ocean area. We know but little about the properties of the ocean's waters and its bottoms, including the nature of the deep sea currents, the acoustic properties of the water, and the acoustic and magnetic properties of the bottom.

Recently, the advent of nuclear submarines or submarine-launched missiles has exposed the NATO Community to the threat of devastating attack from the sea. An effective system of defense is contingent upon a thorough knowledge of the environment in which submarines operate—the ocean.

Here is another area which appears to be a natural for cooperative research.

We recommend that the NATO Council, in its consideration of projects for cooperative research, give particular attention to the desirability of establishing joint research programs or centers in one or more of these fields; in materials, in upper atmosphere and space, and in oceanography.

(3) NATO policy for scientific research and development: As the NATO Council launches programs of scientific cooperation, including fellowships and advanced research institutes, the need increases for a basic NATO policy of scientific research and development. Without such a policy there is danger that efforts will be dissipated in too many directions and on less critical programs.

It is also essential to avoid overlapping and duplicating research and development, both in peacetime and military fields. Our scientific talent is too limited to be wasted in this way.

It is important to focus on a few of the most urgent objectives to achieve decisive results. A clear overall policy established by the Science Committee would guide member states in the award of NATO fellowships. It would also guide the Science Committee in selecting subjects for advanced research institutes, and in identifying the most promising fields for NATO-sponsored research centers and research grants.

We believe that NATO funds for scientific cooperation should be used to support the healthy evolution of a carefully planned international program for research and development.

Therefore, we recommend that the Science Committee give prompt attention to the formulation of an integrated and long-range policy for scientific research and development in the NATO area.

4. A NATO program to promote the exchange of technical information: A system to facilitate the exchange of technical documentation is believed essential to an expeditious and economically sound NATO research and development effort.

It is recommended, therefore, that an appropriate mechanism be established by NATO to promote the exchange of technical information, studies, and so forth, between the member nations.

THE CONTINUING CHALLENGE

With each passing month and week, the memory of the first sputnik is receding. Yet the need for urgent action is as great as last year.

The Soviet world is determined to reach and overreach our community in scientific and industrial achievement and in advanced weapons. They are bidding for the role of chief exporter of science and technology to critical underdeveloped areas.

And Soviet policy is characterized by infinite patience.

Free nations commonly respond grandly and vigorously to the dramatic challenge, but too often they are weak on the follow-through.

Our problem now is to stay on the job even without the kind of psychological shot in the arm provided by the first sputnik.

But nothing could be more wrong than to believe that we should improve the state of science solely because of dangers from without. We live in an age when all our future hopes for economic well-being go back to successes or failures in our laboratories.

Almost two centuries ago, the industrial revolution which changed the face of the world, was born in our Atlantic Community. That revolution raised standards of life in the Atlantic world to an unprecedented new plateau.

Now we are in a new revolution—the scientific revolution. The destiny of our community in this and the coming centuries will depend upon our imagination and perseverance in devising new solutions to the new problems posed by the scientific age.

ANNEX 1

NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL'S AGREEMENT ON NATO SCIENCE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Note by the science adviser: The accompanying document describes the NATO science fellowship program that has been agreed to by the North Atlantic Council.—(N. F. Ramsey, Palais de Chaillot, Paris.)

NATO science fellowship program

The North Atlantic Council has agreed to establish a NATO science fellowship program with the joint purpose of stimulating the international exchange postgraduate and postdoctoral students of the pure and applied sciences between member countries and of increasing the scientific strength of the NATO alliance.

2. While the emphasis of the program should be on international exchange, it is appreciated that it may be necessary, and even desirable, for students or scientific workers of NATO countries who participate in this program to continue their studies in their countries of origin or in non-NATO countries. It is also appreciated that the stages of education which need to be encouraged may differ in different countries.

3. The fellowship program should be chiefly administered by the appropriate agencies within the member countries of NATO. The selection of students eligible for the program and determination of the magnitude of the stipends should be made nationally. The fellowships should be open to nationals of the participating countries and the selection of students should be made solely on the basis of scientific ability and merit. The recipient of the fellowship or his national group should arrange for the acceptance of fellowship holders.

4. The distribution of the funds by NATO is to be done by a simple formula, as given below. There will be a central organization of modest size in the office of the chairman of the science committee, to supervise the whole operation so that the chairman can report to the committee on the operation of the program. A panel of independent experts will be appointed as consultants to the science adviser to review each year the results of the program and to advise on the methods of operation of different countries. The central organization will assist the national agencies in the exchange of information about practice regarding stipends, standards, etc. Close liaison will be maintained with the AGARD and OEEC exchange and fellowship programs.

5. It is recommended that the distribution of the funds to the member countries should initially be proportionate to the population of the country concerned, with no nation receiving more than 15 percent of the total fellowship funds. This distribution formula should be subject to review by the science committee, which might at a later date recommend a different one to the North Atlantic Council.

6. The council has agreed that for the first year of the program the total amount should be for $1 million.

7. With the above procedure the magnitude of the fellowship program in each country for the first year is as follows:

Belgium	$26,900
Canada	48,300
Denmark	13,180
France	132,400
Germany	150,000
Greece	24,600
Iceland	480
Italy	149,800
Luxembourg	950
Netherlands	33,100
Norway	10,090
Portugal	26,000
Turkey	74,200
United Kingdom	150,000
USA	150,000

ANNEX 2

NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL'S AGREEMENT ON NATO ADVANCED STUDY INSTITUTE PROGRAM

Note by the science adviser: The accompanying document describes the NATO advanced study institute program that has been agreed to by the North Atlantic Council. (N. F. Ramsey, Palais de Chaillot, Paris.)

Advanced study institute program

The North Atlantic Council has agreed that there should be a program for the support of scientific study institutes for advanced or special topics. The highly successful summer institutes at Les Houches and Varenna with intensive lectures and seminars extending over a 2-week to 2-month period are examples of such activities.

2. The council has agreed that during the first year the program will be for $150,000. The distribution of the money is to be made by the office of the science adviser with the guidance of a panel of experts who will be representatives of various aspects of science rather than national representatives.

3. The money for the support of summer study institutes should be used both for direct grants to the institute, partially to cover teaching and administrative costs, and for living and travel expenses of participants from NATO countries. The grants to the summer study institutes should be made as unrestricted grants so as not to influence the policy of the institute nor its selection of students or staff.

4. The method of administration of this program will be reviewed annually.

Salute to the Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the least appreciated branch of our uniformed forces is the Coast Guard. Its peacetime mission of saving lives does not compare in glamour with the more spectacular exploits of the Army, the Navy, the Marines, or the Air Force, and public recognition of its services is far less than it deserves. It is with pleasure and pride, therefore, that I call attention to the following editorial in the January 3, 1959, Daily Advance, of Elizabeth City, N.C., entitled "Salute to Coast Guard":

SALUTE TO COAST GUARD

Elizabeth City long has been the site of a Coast Guard Air Station and we have come to take the organization here for granted. That is bad because we lose sight of the outstanding work that is done with so little to work with and with so few people to do it.

A good insight into the activities of the Coast Guard, especially as it pertains to Elizabeth City, was provided earlier this week in a fine feature story written by Jack Williams, photographer-reporter for the Daily Advance. The story has been given wide circulation by the Associated Press. In his article Williams vividly pictured the various phases of the Coast Guard's program. Too many people lose sight of the fact that the Coast Guard, on the bottom of the list so far as appropriations are concerned, is called upon daily to go to the aid of people who are sick, or lost; to ships that are in trouble, or scores of other errands.

A good example of what the Coast Guard faces appeared in a front-page story on Tuesday, along with the feature article. That story revealed that 47 crewmen aboard a Liberian tanker which had broken in two off Chincoteague, Va., had been rescued safely. Mainly responsible for the rescue was the Coast Guard which rushed planes, helicopters, and boats to the scene as soon as the call for aid was received. The fact that weather conditions were not good and that the Coast Guard men on the mission were risking their own lives didn't matter. What did matter was that the Coast Guard always stands ready. One of these days our Congressmen are going to realize and appreciate that fact and come through with much-needed funds. That time cannot come too soon.

Hawaiian Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I was happy to note that in the opening remarks of his State of the Union message, the President welcomed our distinguished colleagues from Alaska, and called for the addition of another new State—Hawaii—and a new star in the flag.

With Alaska safely in the fold, we should now proceed at the earliest possible moment to embrace Hawaii, and thus shore up our Pacific bastions, our democracy, and our ideological position in the eyes of the world.

Perhaps no individual has presented a more satisfactory brief for Hawaiian statehood than has James A. Michener, the noted author, in the December issue of the Reader's Digest.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Michener's article entitled "Hawaii—The Case for Our 50th State."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAWAII: THE CASE FOR OUR 50TH STATE

(By James A. Michener)

If the next Congress decides to welcome Hawaii into the Union our existing States are going to get as a new partner one of the loveliest spots on earth. Just barely inside the tropics, so that Hawaii will be the only place in the Union where the sun ever shines directly overhead, the islands are spectacularly beautiful. They boast great snow-covered mountains that rise abruptly from the sea to nearly 14,000 feet. They have dazzling beaches, marvelous cool forests, cliffs that drop thousands of feet sheer into the sea, areas where you can see 400 waterfalls within a short distance, and others where blazing red canyons cut deep into the earth.

But the islands are much more than a visual paradise. They are also a mature, civilized, sophisticated community, fully qualified for statehood. The best way to explain Hawaii's extraordinary accomplishments is to answer the questions which are most often asked throughout the United States. I think the replies may surprise mainlanders:

If Hawaii joins the Union won't it be a burden on the other 49 States? It's just the other way around. Americans like to think of Hawaii as a grass-skirted, ukulele-strumming poor relation. The fact is, as shown in one yearly report, that the average resident of Hawaii gets a cash income of $1,821 per year—which is just $206 less than the national average and more than the average of such wealthy States as Virginia, Texas, Kansas, or Iowa. Hawii is really loaded.

The islands pay more actual cash—taxes—into the Federal Government than many existing States. Per capita, Hawaiians pay more to Uncle Sam than the national average from all the States. In short, these islands are a gold mine. Instead of draining money out of the economy, they pump it in. But because they are only a territory they have no representation. In spite of all the taxes they pay, the people of Hawaii are not able to elect their own Governor or judges; they cannot send Senators or Representatives to Congress; they cannot vote for President. That is why Hawaii wants to become a State.

What status does Hawaii now have—in relation to the United States? In 1898 it was accepted firmly and forever as an integral part of the United States, its position being comparable to that of the former territories of Tennessee or Arizona. Since then Hawaii has used our currency, our stamps, our armed services, our FBI, and our educational system. Anyone born in Hawaii is automatically a full-fledged American citizen and may travel or live wherever he wishes in the 49 States. A boy born in Hawaii is eligible to become President of the United States.

Does Hawaii have enough people to make a State? It has 554,000 residents, which is more than the population of Alaska, or Delaware, or Nevada, or Vermont, or Wyoming. It contains more people than any previous territory gaining statehood, except Oklahoma, where the oil rush had crowded the land.

Does it have enough land? It consists of 7 major islands, and several dozen small ones, with a total land area of 6,423 square miles, which makes it larger than Delaware, Rhode Island, or Connecticut, and just a little smaller than New Jersey.

Are the people worthy of becoming American citizens? Most of them already are citizens. If you were to go down today to a Honolulu store—Sears, Roebuck, or Woolworth's—and if you were to meet 100 average islanders, they would look like this.

About three of the shoppers would be Hawaiians, tall handsome people, the original settlers of the islands and the same kind of people who now live in Tahiti and Samoa. Fifteen would be part-Hawaiian. Twenty would be ordinary-looking white people, mostly from mainland cities. Thirteen would be Filipinos, brought in to work the sugar fields. Seven would be Chinese, usually slim, attractive people with skilled jobs or professions. There would be two Puerto Ricans, one Korean and one who might be from any part of the world.

So far you have met 62 of your 100 fellow American citizens. The other 38, and the largest single group in the islands, are Japanese, who were also imported to work the sugar fields but who now do practically everything else in the islands. We will have more to say about them later on.

Here are other things Hawaiians would like you to know about their islands. The literacy rate is very high. An enormous part of the budget is spent on education. Medical services are top-notch and the general health is the same. Hawaiians go to excellent movie houses, have fine radio stations, strong newspapers, a first-rate civil government. On the mainland an election turnout is considered high if 60 percent of the eligible people vote. In Hawaii over 90 percent of the people vote.

Is life as much fun in Hawaii as the advertisements say? It's really better. You won't be in Hawaii long before you hear people confess, "We came out here on a vacation and have never gone home." Entertaining is done on broad, open lanais that link the inside dining room with the green outdoors. Food is magnificent, with emphasis on fruit and salad. Much of the charm of Hawaii stems from the wonderful Polynesians who founded the islands. Handsome, lovable, carefree people, their manner of life infects everyone, and their songs fill the islands.

Only two things make local citizens boil. Don't joke about Waikiki. Where I swim, at one of the few really good beaches, the sandy area is only 40 feet wide and I have to wade more than 200 yards before the water gets over my head. But I'd be run out of the islands if I made a crack about it.

And never, never call the islands How-why-ya. The correct name is Huh-va'-ee, with a strong accent on the second syllable, but gradually the pronunciation has become Huh-wa'-ee.

How much American culture is there in Hawaii? The Americans who settled in Hawaii came from New England, and even today any family that can afford to sends its sons to Yale. Basically, Honolulu is a New England community. Its language, manner of doing business, legal system, religious pattern, and general family life are much closer to Boston than to San Francisco.

Young people in Hawaii speak only English. They go to American schools, a fine American university and on to mainland centers for graduate work. The entire cultural pattern of the islands is increasingly American. There is an excellent symphony orchestra and, to complete the picture, a set of libraries creaking with historical materials and people who know how to use them. No Territory that has sought admission to our Union ever did so with such an impressive cultural background.

Boasts former Gov. Oren E. Long, "We had the first good schools west of the Rockies, a printing press when California was a wilderness and the first golf links west of the Mississippi."

But isn't Hawaii awfully far away from the rest of the United States? When New Hampshire became one of the original 13 States, its Congressmen required more than a week to reach Congress in Philadelphia if they hurried by ship, as much as a month if they traveled overland. One day recently I had breakfast in New York, lunch in San Francisco and cocktails in Hawaii. With jets you'll have an early lunch in New York and dinner in Hawaii.

Wouldn't admission of Hawaii with two Senators mean that the representation of States like New York and California would be diluted? Absolutely. Today the 16,021,000 people in New York elect only 1/49

of the Senate, whereas in Nevada it takes only 257,000 to do the same thing. Thus one Nevadan is worth 62 New Yorkers. Adding Hawaii would make matters worse.

Well, this inequity was foreseen by our founding fathers and it was upon their compromise between large and small States that our Union was built. Therefore, in the powerful House of Representatives, the big States would still reign supreme (New York 43 votes, Hawaii 1) as our founding fathers intended.

How will Hawaii vote if it becomes a State? From 1900, Hawaii enjoyed 54 unbroken years of Republican control. Citizens pointed out, "Everything good that has ever happened to these islands came when Republicans were in power in Washington." President Cleveland, a Democrat, refused to accept Hawaii as American territory; McKinley, a Republican, did. Many people in Hawaii could not recall ever having seen a Democrat.

Then, following World War II, thousands of young men came home determined to enter politics, but the fat and happy Republicans could find no place for them. So they became Democrats and, to the astonishment of the islands, proceeded to gain control of both House and Senate. The governor, of course, remained Republican, appointed by President Eisenhower.

A good many canny observers think this will probably be the pattern of future voting: For Governor, possibly a Republican; senior Senator, possibly Republican; junior Senator, probably Democrat; Representative, probably Democrat. In other words, Hawaii will probably split its vote the way States like Colorado and Massachusetts do.

What about the Japanese population? Sooner or later in any discussion of Hawaiian statehood, mainland people ask, "Would you want a Japanese sitting in Congress?" If democracy means what it says, and if Hawaii has so many Japanese voters—all American citizens—it is obvious that before long some Japanese will go to Washington.

My personal guess is that this won't happen during the first two congressional elections, because local Oriental politicians are not yet as far advanced as more experienced hands. But sooner or later, it will happen, and there should be no cause for alarm.

Can the Japanese in Hawaii be trusted? Before Pearl Harbor this was a sensible question, and Hawaii did not know the answer. There were over 100,000 Japanese in the islands, and by law many had been forbidden even to consider becoming American citizens. Ties with Japan were therefore strong and it is understandable that many cautious Americans questioned Japanese loyalty.

But Pearl Harbor gave the answer. The Japanese in Hawaii remained loyal to the United States. There was no sabotage, no dragging of the feet. The record of the Japanese was remarkable.

Their sons literally fought to get into uniform. When the Army announced, after understandable soul searching, that it would accept 1,500 Japanese boys on a trial basis, 10,000 rushed forward in the first 3 days, 15,000 by the end of the week. In Italy these young men rolled up an unparalleled record for bravery. For every 1,000 of the original Japanese soldiers, they and their replacements accumulated 3,146 battle wounds. Their unit picked up 18,143 individual decorations, 7 Presidential citations for the outfit and a nickname that will live in Hawaiian history: "The Purple Heart Battalion." If you count all the Hawaiian men who died on all battlefronts, Hawaii lost on a percentage basis 4½ times more men killed in action than any State in the Union. An appalling number of the dead were Japanese, and there are places in the United States where their valor is not forgotten.

Not long ago Tosh Sovetani, a Hawaiian veteran, was speeding through Texas, trying to keep an appointment in Amarillo. A Texas trooper whistled him to the side of the road and started tearing him apart. "What the hell is a Jap doing speeding across Texas?" The veteran took it for a moment, then got mad and ripped out his wallet.

Shoving a treasured card into the policeman's face, he said, "Don't yell at me. I'm a Texan."

The traffic officer looked at the card and stammered, "Are you from Hawaii? Are you one of the Japanese that saved us Texans at the Rapido?"

"I am," the veteran said.

"Mister, I'm proud to meet you." And the officer took off his cap, bowed, handed back the card and said proudly, "You follow me, son. I'm indebted to you." Then he escorted the visitor into Amarillo. By proclamation any Hawaiian Japanese who served in Italy is an honorary Texan.

Has Hawaii solved the problem of interracial tension? In a world troubled by racial worries, Hawaii proves that people of many diverse backgrounds can exist in reasonable harmony. But anyone who claimed that Hawaii had licked the problem would be naive. The three top clubs in the islands admit no Orientals and many of the better families who have always had Japanese servants would find it embarrassing to have other Japanese as guests. The Chinese maintain their own chamber of commerce, and so do the Japanese. Only this year the latter completely broke up because an Okinawah was proposed as president, and some Japanese refuse to recognize Okinawans.

Hawaii has no Fair Employment Practices Commission because we like things as they are and don't want to upset any apple carts. Newspapers are free to advertise openly: "Haoles (whites) Only," or "Japanese Only." The islands permit racial discrimination in housing in a way no northern city would because Chinese and Japanese real estate men make more money if areas are kept segregated." Socially, each race keeps pretty much to itself, but new patterns are developing slowly. Hawaii, more than any other place in the world, is trying to lick this difficult problem. Maybe an Oriental can't join the golf club or live where he wants. But he can get elected to government, or become principal of a fine high school, or make a million dollars running a supermarket. He is free where it matters, and that is what counts. The other freedoms will come later.

Now for the biggest question: Do Communists run Hawaii? Hawaii lives on four industries: sugar, pineapple, tourists, and the military. All require shipping. Also, Hawaii, like England, cannot grow enough food to feed itself, or produce enough timber to build homes. It imports these things from the mainland. Therefore, anyone who controls the waterfront controls Hawaii.

For some years the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union has controlled the harbors. And Harry Bridges, aided by a gang of supersmart associates, has controlled the ILWU; some ILWU leaders have been confessed Communists; others have been identified by their associates as such.

The problem goes one step further. Because in the old days unions were ruggedly kept out of Hawaii, when the ILWU did arrive it captured not only the harbors but also swept like a raging flood through the plantations, which it now also controls. When an ILWU man threatens, "Give us what we want, or we'll tie these islands up completely," he isn't kidding. He can do it. In fact, he did it in 1949, and the islands almost collapsed.

Two further facts demonstrate the sinister power of communism in Hawaii. When Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND led an investigating committee to Honolulu in 1956, the ILWU conducted a mass parade against the hearing. In 1955 the islands were shocked when the speaker of the house in Hawaii actually sent Harry Bridges an honorary gavel, which was interpreted locally as encouraging Bridges to take over the legislature as well as the docks and the plantations.

It was events like these that led Congressman James B. Utt of California to cry, "Hawaii is a Communist-dominated province."

Hawaii does suffer from a Communist threat. So do San Francisco and Baltimore—and all America. Hawaii's problem is no different from that of any other area. The big question is, "What's being done about it?" In Hawaii, plenty.

In 1958 the ILWU campaigned bitterly against a proposed charter form of government for Honolulu. They threatened and begged the voters: "Reject the charter!" but when the votes were in, the charter was accepted by 4 to 1.

There is one law, above all others, that the ILWU is determined to repeal. It is the one that will prevent a recurrence of the 1949 tie-up, for it gives government the right to take over the docks and operate them during an emergency. Against this law the ILWU has thrown all its massive power—and there are many local citizens in no way subservient to the ILWU who also want to see the law changed—but when the last test came the Senate voted 13 to 2 in favor of the law and the House voted 24 to 6. Hawaii is not a captive of the Communists. It is fighting back exactly like any mainland community. Its record is impressive.

Will Hawaii get statehood in 1959? Hawaii is like Brooklyn used to be before the Dodgers moved west. At the end of each disappointing year someone shouts, "Boy, wait'll next year!" When Alaska astonished the locals by gaining statehood, Hawaiians began chanting, "Next year for sure!"

Things do look better. The psychological attachment to the happy phrase "48 States" has been removed. The fair play of the American people can be counted on to support Hawaii, while both parties and most newspapers have come out in favor of statehood.

I am not hopeful. I fear there will be a strong temptation to sidetrack Hawaii. The honest fears of the South, arising from Little Rock, may encourage southern Senators once more to kill Hawaii's chances. A completely new House of Representatives and many new Senators will need to be indoctrinated with facts in the case. Attention to overseas problems will obscure Hawaii's claim. And with Russia kicking up on all fronts, it will be easy to focus on the communism issue.

I would not be surprised if Hawaii is again denied statehood. But if it is, I can say this with certainty: It will be interpreted throughout the world as an act of supreme unfairness. To deny Hawaii statehood now will injure the United States greatly.

Why is statehood important? In Asia, Hawaii has become a symbol of the fair and just manner in which we treat Orientals. Quietly, the word has circulated that in Hawaii Chinese do well, that Japanese get elected to office, that Filipinos get a fair shake. If now we slap Hawaii in the face and say, "You cannot have statehood," the slap will reverberate.

In recent years I have spent a lot of time in the former Dutch territory of Indonesia and in the former French territory of Indochina. I am really afraid that the United States will make the same mistakes the Dutch and the French made. There was a time when the people of Indonesia and Indochina dreamed only of full participation in national life, of escape from second-class citizenship and from taxation without representation. But those natural desires were

frustrated and the territories were lost in bitterness and defeat. Today Hawaii can be bound forever to the United States. To refuse to do so is to invite the dangers that overcame Indonesia and Indochina.

The specific danger is this. No one can foresee what is going to happen in Asia. Perhaps Japan and China will unite into one great empire. Or Russia may establish leadership over the entire area. Or China and India may combine. Surely, present arrangements will not continue permanently. When the new face of Asia apepars, it will be very inconvenient for the United States if we hold in the mid-Pacific a paradise of islands which we have refused either to accept or to turn loose. At that time, and I think it will come before 1990, whoever rules Asia is going to say, "If you don't want Hawaii, we'll accept it." Then there will be real trouble.

But if Hawaii, like Alaska, is bound indissolubly to America, we will have transformed a source of potential trouble into one of strength. That is the major reason why I am for Hawaiian statehood now.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Time To Come to Our Senses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a masterful sermon delivered a short time ago by my good friend, Rabbi Jacob Pressman, of Temple Beth Am, which I feel has a message for each one of us. I commend it to my colleagues:

TIME TO COME TO OUR SENSES

Thirteen years ago 125,000 human beings perished in the flame of a new, manmade hell on earth, when the most devastating toy man has ever played with was dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Today, 13 years later, the survivors are still regarded with fear and suspicion, as a greater and greater number fall prey to the "white sickness", lukemia, sicken and die. Ah, but progress did not stop there, 13 years ago. We have since harnessed the very heat of the sun and can unleash it with devastation which makes the original blasts seem like firecrackers by comparison. Stockpiled in many secret places all over the world, these blind engines of destruction await only the gentle application of civilized man's hand to blow his civilization to smithereens and poison his flesh, the soil, the very air he breathes, for an unknown length of time into the distant future. Not even when his life is at stake is man able to stop playing.

These facts, known to you and me, charge with new urgency the words most characteristic of this season, the words of the "U'nsaneh Tokef" prayer:

"We will observe the mighty holiness of this day, for it is full of awe and anxiety.

"On New Year's Day the decree is inscribed and on Yom Kippur it is sealed, how many shall pass away and how many shall be born; who shall live and who shall die; who shall attain the measure of man's days and who shall not attain it."

Was there ever a time in the history of man when these questions were more real, more immediate, more terrifying? The stage has already been set for what will happen in the next 12 months, and it would take only the eruption of one of the many volcanic trouble-spots dotting the earth—Berlin, the Middle East, Formosa, the polar regions—the unleashing of the inferno in which humanity would writhe in agony for its sins. If ever we read the U'nsaneh Tokef as a true expression of prayer coming from the very depths of our being, this is the year, and your Rabbi could no more ignore the world situation this Rosh Hashanah and refrain from troubling you with it than he could ignore the jaws of a mad dog gripping him by the throat. There is no more important matter confronting us than the question of life or death in the New Year.

How is it that in this age of enlightenment and progress, we have permitted ourselves to be pushed to the very brink of destruction? It is because of failure after failure, not so much in the political, economic, military affairs of man, but in his moral life, where he has fallen so far behind his material advances. It is to the moral near-bankruptcy of man that we must address ourselves this Rosh Hashanah, and it is for God to forgive us and help us avoid that bankruptcy and its consequences that we must pray. That bankruptcy is evident in the conduct of the nations, in the conduct of these United States, and in the final analysis, in your conduct and mine.

What is the moral failure of the nations? I remember when the call came, also 13 years ago, for the formation of the United Nations, it seemed to me the realization of the hope expressed in the U'vchen ten Pachdechah prayer we read today:

"May all Thy children unite in one fellowship to do Thy will with wholeheartedness." There was a new hope born in the world in the very midst of the ashes of world war, that the sovereign states of the world would unite, and ultimately form a world government, to preserve the peace of the world and work for the improvement of every man's lot: "Agudah echas—one fellowship."

What a beautiful dream, the dream of the ancient Hebrew prophets, and the dream of our own prayers today, but it just did not happen. The nations were not and are not ready to relinquish their sovereignty to any world government or tribunal. Every nation considers itself wise enough to suggest what other nations should do, but too wise to be told what to do in return. Without a world government, in which all of God's children unite in one fellowship and wholeheartedly put self-interest second to the international good there will never be peace.

Instead of cultivating morality in international affairs in order to keep the peace, we have put our trust in the sword, once again, in the same bankrupt policies of racing to arms which have always resulted in war in the past and must again. Our Nation, Russia, China, England, and France, as well as many smaller nations, have rationalized their frantic massing of armaments by saying, "If you want peace, prepare for war." But that rationalization simply won't stand up. If we take it as a model, then we should be able to say, "If you want to be happily married, prepare for divorce; if you want to be honest, buy yourself a set of burglar tools, if you want to enjoy good health, put disease germs under your pillow." How many times will man be able to get away with ignoring the moral imperatives of international affairs? Is the truth so complicated, so abstruse that the common man, let alone the heads of states, cannot understand it? Little Mother Hannah, praying to God in the obscurity of the little village of Shiloh 3,000 years ago, in five words we just finished reading again, stated the truth to which the nations of the world must yield, "For not by might shall man prevail."

The day must come, and soon, when not might, not bombs or missiles will hold the balance of power determining whether or not we live in peace, but submission to international law. The vision of Hannah, and Isaiah, and the author of "U'vchen ten paohdechah" was premature, impossible to realize in the ancient world, but possible to realize in our day of instantaneous communication of sight and sound and print when the world has shrunk to a neighborhood, and will destroy itself unless it becomes a brotherhood. Nothing is so powerful as an idea whose time has come, and believe me, the time is ripe for a world government, a world court, a world police force, and a world education and welfare program, when our anxious prayer of this day will be answered, "And all Thy children shall unite in one fellowship to do Thy will with wholeheartedness."

One of the principal supporters, financially and otherwise of the United Nations efforts, has been our own country, but we too, on this day of self-examination, must admit to having lost the moral leadership of the world. You and I want to think and tend to think of the United States as the leading nation of the world. Well, wherein lies its leadership? We are not the most populous; several countries have double or triple our population. We are not the largest in area by any means. We are not the richest in natural resources. Nor, and this accounts for the panic in American hearts, are we the most powerfully armed, compared with Russia's ships under the sea, her huge standing armies on land, and her sputniks carrying heavier loads, farther and faster and first.

The greatness of our country has rested on its moral leadership in the world, the principles for which it stood, the refuge it represented for the oppressed, the hope it held out to small, underprivileged peoples, the enlightenment of its people through education, and the example of human equality and human freedom it symbolized. What has happened to these principles? One by one we have retreated from them. Did we once represent a refuge for the oppressed? Indeed we did, and the descendants of the Mayflower, and the huddled immigrants who came over in steerage in more recent decades, some of you and your parents and grandparents, are equally indebted to the great heart of liberty who lifted her lamp beside the golden door. But that door is shut, sealed by acts of Congress, so that you or your forebears would not be admitted if you were applying now. The other nations know it, and wonder at it, and are disillusioned by it.

Did we once hold out hope to the small, underprivileged peoples? We did, we who had our birth in a Revolutionary War which rebelled against colonialism and tyrannical and despotic dictatorship, once were the world's greatest symbol of hope for the victims of tyranny. We, who stepped in and supported the emergence of new republics, we who first defended then freed Cuba and the Philippines, we have of late been the mainstay of feudal Arab lords and desert sheiks, of dictators in the banana republics, of corrupt and reactionary government in China and Korea, and of dictator Franco in Spain. Here is the world's foremost democracy maintaining friendly relations with governments whose basic philosophy is repugnant to us, in order to counter a Soviet threat to the free world. But we have lost the faith of Spanish liberals, and Chinese, and African, no less anti-Communist, who are trying to establish governments based on democratic principles. Uncle Sam, once the benevolent friend of the underdog, has assumed the opposite role in the eyes of a heaving world, who will still accept his gifts, but do not look to him for moral leadership any longer.

Once we were the symbol of enlightenment, the proud examples of the benefits of a universally educated populace. Suddenly the world and we ourselves are shocked to discover that our leadership in this field too is challenged. When Russia's satellite took to the skies we pushed the panic button and found we were not preparing our youth as intensively. While in terms of numbers, our educational structure may still prove more universal, in terms of curriculum it is subject to reconsideration. We were shocked to learn that in Russian secondary schools, students get three years of chemistry, four of physics, five of mathematics, and six of foreign language. Ten million Russians are learning English—10 million. Four thousand Americans are learning Russian. The debate over the ultimate advantages of one educational system over another in terms of human happiness, is a debate which will rage for a long time to come, and need not be pursued here, but the fact remains that the eyes of the world are turning elsewhere for a shining example of educational practice, especially when it is for the morally doubtful purpose of achieving supremacy, military or otherwise. Nor do I believe that the answer lies in our current hysterical emphasis upon countering this threat with the grinding out of comparable students, also capable of creating great and costly engines of destruction and propulsion. It is not only electronic engineers the world needs, but men who can attack the real problems which face the common man in Africa, India, South America—poverty, disease, crowding. We need social engineers, and men of medical science to attack the real enemies of man—the plagues, the cancers, the malnutrition, the privation. Let whoever will stand for destruction of human life in the eyes of the world. Our country could capture the imagination and fire the hope of over half the world if tomorrow she identified herself as standing for the preservation, the healing, and the enrichment of human life.

Once these United States represented a symbol of human equality. Our Constitution emphasized what our Declaration of Independence proclaimed, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among those rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Our 16th President spoke at Gettysburg of a Nation "dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Today, almost exactly a century later, our land is being torn by the issue of segregation. Out across the world go the news and the pictures of hate-contorted white faces spitting at, jeering at, striking at darker faces; of threats to close schools rather than integrate them; of beatings and bombings and harrassment of the Negro; of Jimmy Wilson, Alabama Negro, sentenced to die for stealing $1.95 from a white woman; of violent verbal, legal, and physical resistance to upholding the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. What do we suppose this has done to the position of moral leadership we would occupy, when darker pigmented peoples, a billion and a half of them, all over the world read and listen and wonder? We cannot possibly overestimate the significance of what is taking place in Little Rock at this very moment, for while Little Rock is not the only troubled spot, it has become the testing ground of America's most cherished principles and could very well become the rock upon which our hopes of retaining the admiration and the friendship of colored peoples everywhere may be shipwrecked. This great land of ours is wrestling with its conscience with greater intensity and for greater stakes than any one of us has witnessed in all his lifetime, and upon the outcome depends whether or not we shall lose or recapture the position of moral leadership we must hold in the eyes of the world's colored population in order to survive.

You and I believe in the greatness of our land, for we have experienced its privileges and understand its basic virtue, that is why we want to see it remain a land of refuge, of hope for the oppressed, of enlightenment, and of freedom. But, in the final analysis, whether or not it remains all these things depends upon us. And there is evident in our land these days a terrifying passiveness, an apathy which is incomprehensible in view of all that is at stake. Very few Americans seem to care whether or not we lose our role of moral leadership, or where or how our foreign policies are taking us. Some say this apathy is the result of a feeling of futility, a feeling that it doesn't matter what you or I say or do; the problems I have been describing are too tremendous, too overwhelming for the average man. Others say, and I among them, that this apathy is just a veneer, hiding the feeling of doom which immobilizes the little man, so that rather than go out of his mind in frustration, he just refuses to think about it.

Americanism will be as strong or as weak as you and I choose to make it. We are largely responsible for its quality and that quality will be poor only if we make it so. We elected its present leadership and by our votes approved their policies, not the citizenry of any other country. We might very well echo the words of Cassius in Shakespeare's "Julius Caesar," "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars but in ourselves, that we are underlings." In the final analysis, the blame rests within ourselves. How much are you and I prepared to sacrifice for peace and survival and morality, the things I have been talking about? How much does the principle of freedom mean to us, not in Little Rock about which we can be indignant because we are in Los Angeles—but in Los Angeles itself? You and I know we run as from a plague before the expanding Negro population, or Mexican, or oriental. The Jews deserted West Adams because of the Negro, Boyle Heights because of the Mexican, and Leimert Park because of the oriental. I am still wondering how you will react—how I will react—when the first Negro applies for conversion to Judaism and admission to this congregation, or any congregation. How much does the principle of freedom and equality, which did not begin with the American Revolution, but with the first chapter of our Bible, actually mean to you and me?

How much does learning mean to us, we who decry the lagging behind of the American school system? How many of us will permit our sons and daughters to become and remain Rabbis and teachers of the young? You all know the joke about the Rabbinate not being a proper profession for a Jewish boy. Well, it is no joke, because that is the way most parents express themselves, not only about the Rabbinate, but teaching and academic life. How many of us are encouraging our children to learn in order to be wise, to be cultured, to be sensitive? Not many. We tell them they must study, to get to college, to be a big success. How many of us will permit our children to become pure and maybe poor research scientists, nurses, case workers, philosophers, linguists, scholars?

Before we criticise our Government's coolness to new immigration, let us ask ourselves if we would sign affidavits wholesale and bring in, and house, and share our food and our money with ragged and oppressed refugees the way the last generation did, the way Jews in Israel have done? How much does America's image of welcome as represented by the Statue of Liberty mean to us? And how well do we remember our Jewish tradition of hospitality as symbolized by the man of whom we read this morning, Abraham—Abraham, who saw three travelers and ran to greet them, and invited them into his tent, and washed their feet, and killed the fatted calf for them? What do these things mean to you and me, practically speaking?

How much does peace, and the end of atom bomb testing mean to us? There is talk of an end to the armaments race. Are we prepared to take the consequences? Forty billion dollars would be lopped off our Government's expenditures. Factories would close in the airplane, electronic, missile industries. Contracts would be canceled, profits cease, jobs disappear. At the very threat of the possibility that peace might break out we have just been experiencing a recession. What would we really do if it happened? Some of us would have to reduce our standard of living, lose our homes, change our life patterns. The synagogue would suffer * * * because our economy has been undergirded by anxiety. If we are not ready to suffer the consequences of shifting from a war economy to a peace economy, then we are hypocrites every time we bless God's name or even say "Shalom"; we are morally bankrupt. But if we are prepared to make any sacrifice in order to leave an unscarred, beautiful world to the generations to come, then we have the right to come before the Lord and our conscience and pray for life in the new year.

"On Rosh Hashanah the decree is inscribed and on Yom Kippur it is sealed * * * who shall live and who shall die." Is this a fatalistic approach to life? Does it mean, with regard to all that we have been saying, that there is absolutely nothing we can do about it? Not at all. The U'Nsaneh Tokef prayer concludes with a remarkable statement:

"But repentance, prayer and righteousness avert the evil decree." Repentance means a change of conduct; prayer means an appeal for enlightenment and strength; and righteousness means a return to the high moral principles which are ours by the twin attributes of our American and Jewish heritage. Ominous as the current state of the world may be, it is not hopeless. What better time than Rosh Hashanah to meditate upon the road we are traveling, and to pray that the evil decree of strife may be averted, that the nations will submit themselves to righteous laws, that this Nation, which holds out the greatest hope and cherishes the greatest good will, may regain its primacy in the moral leadership of the nations; and that all these things may begin in our lives today, because we have examined ourselves honestly and determined that a better world, a world of peace, of freedom, and of enlightenment must begin with us, now, today, here.

I believe our Jewish sages stated the case for us when they taught that at this season each man should regard the world as "chatzi chayav, v'chatzi zakai—half guilty and deserving punishment and half innocent and deserving acquittal," and that he the individual, can swing the scale one way or the other. Without that faith in the significance of the individual, we shall abandon ourselves to despair and permit democracy and peace to be lost. With that faith, we can change ourselves, our land, our world, for that faith is our only hope in these days when the whole future hangs in the balance. So we pray,

Now, therefore, O Lord our God, let Thine awe be manifest in all Thy works, and a reverence for Thee fill all that Thou hast created. May all Thy children unite in one fellowship to do Thy will with a perfect heart, and let us say, "Amen."

Resolutions Adopted by the New Jersey Presbytery of the Bible Presbyterian Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

RESOLUTION 1: IN OPPOSITION TO RECOGNITION OF RED CHINA

The New Jersey Presbytery of the Bible Presbyterian Church, meeting in Collingswood, January 10, 1959, completely repudiates and denounces the letter of the fifth world order study conference of the National Council of Churches adopted in Cleveland, November 21, 1958, and sent down to the churches, calling for the recognition of Red China by the U.S. Government and the admission of Red China to the U.N.

This Presbytery would call attention to the fundamental principles of separation of church and state which enter into the preservation of our liberties. No church gathering presuming to speak for American people should attempt to direct or instruct our Government or its State Department in matters of national policy which are to be determined by the duly elected representatives and the democratic procedures under the order established in our State and national constitutions.

Moreover, for church leaders to call for the recognition of Communist China, with which we are still at war and which involves the assistance of atheistic, materialistic, godless communism, is a violation of Christian principles and subversion of sound morality.

Christian people in the United States who desire to influence their Government's actions may do so through the normal and proper channels of our representative form of government.

When church agencies or church bodies are constantly seeking to direct the affairs of government in its national and international decisions we are witnessing the development of a 20th century clericalism which the experience of history testifies can only bring mischief and disaster. A representative government cannot function when ecclesiastics attempt to intervene in behalf of their people whom they are not entitled to represent in government matters.

RESOLUTION 2: IN SUPPORT OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The petition published in the public press and including among its signers prominent American clergymen, declaring "the Un-American Activities Committee should be abolished * * *" and concluding "let us rid ourselves of this agent of weakness and folly," is an arrogant and insolent expression and completely misrepresents the position which God-fearing Christian people have always taken.

Among the church leaders signing the petition are Eugene Sarson Blake, chief administrative officer and stated clerk of the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.; Dr. John A. Mackay, Princeton, N.J., president of the World Presbyterian Alliance; Dr. John C. Bennett, dean of Union Theological Seminary, New York City; and Dr. Rheinhold Niebuhr, renowned theologian of Union Theological Seminary, who represent top leadership in the ecumenical movement and the National Council of Churches in this country. We call the attention of Christians to the fact that John C. Bennett is the author of the recent 5,000-word letter adopted by the Fifth World Order Study Conference of the National Council of Churches, calling for the recognition of Red China by the United States Government. When ecclesiastical leadership in this country espouses causes which give aid and comfort to the Communists in their cold war struggle, this presbytery feels that there should be strong opposition by the Lord's people.

This liberal leadership which has indeed departed from and compromised the historic position of the Christian faith is now seeking to influence the affairs of the Nation for the accomplishment of the very things the Communists at present are working for in relation to China and the Committee on Un-American Activities.

This presbytery further assures the leaders of Congress and of this committee that they shall have our prayers as the committee continues faithfully to perform its functions of investigating and exposing Communist espionage, intrigue, and subversion, and recommends to our Congress legislation appropriate for the maintenance of the security of our country and the preservation of our religious liberty.

The presbytery further directs that copies of this action be directed to the chairman of the committee, FRANCIS C. WALTER, to the two Senators and the Congressmen from the State of New Jersey.

Ukrainian-Americans Commemorate the 25th Anniversary of the Famine in the Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in Hamtramck, Mich., on October 11, 1958, a number of Americans of Ukrainian descent and representatives of Ukrainian-American organizations met to condemn one of the most vicious atrocities in the black record of Stalin, Lenin, and the Communists who have oppressed the Ukraine. At that meeting, attended by large numbers of Americans of Ukrainian descent, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF A HEINOUS CRIME, PERPETRATED BY COMMUNIST MOSCOW IN UKRAINE

The Communist empire of the Moscow dictators came into being, grew, spread, gained power, existed and exists by terror, genocide, and injustice, violating God's commandments and trampling the rights of man, enslaving, subjugating, and destroying entire nations.

Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev—different names, but the same rule; different persons, but the same methods of merciless dictatorship: an uninterrupted chain of crimes against mankind, based on relentless physical terror and mass murder.

The massacre of innocent population of the capital of Ukraine, Kiev, and her towns and villages in the spring of 1918—Lenin.

Mass deportations and murder of the population of Ukrainian villages in the fall of the thirties—Stalin.

The massacre of the population of Budapest and Hungarian towns and villages in the fall of 1956—Khrushchev.

Mass deportations of Ukrainian youth from their homeland to the deserts of Kazakhstan, now—Khrushchev.

A chain with innumerable links.

Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev—merely stages of Moscow's Communist imperialism, moves toward ever more perfect methods of aggression, toward subjugation of the entire world.

Ukraine was first to experience Communist Moscow's aggression in its most deadly form. It paid for this experience with the loss of millions of people and its nationally independent existence.

This gathering is dedicated to the memory of one of the most horrible manifestations of Moscow's aggression: Twenty-five years ago Communist Moscow, in its role as occupant of Ukraine, committed a crime unprecedented in the history of mankind. It organized and fostered an artificial famine on the Ukrainian territories, thus destroying more than 6 million Ukrainians.

Today, we observe the 25th anniversary of this tragedy. We honor the memory of the dead, and call the attention of the world to this dreadful crime perpetrated by Communist Moscow, at a moment when contemporary Moscow became a constantly growing menace to the free world and this great country of ours.

We declare:

Whereas Moscow's aggression began 40 years ago when it first attacked the then free and independent Republic of the Ukrainian people;

Whereas the Ukrainians were the first to fight the aggressor and to defend their freedom and the right to their own territory;

Whereas the Ukrainian people, by rendering staunch resistance, kept Moscow from subjugating the countries of Europe still feeble after the war, thus enabling them to live in freedom for many more years;

Whereas Communist Moscow paralyzed the resistance of the Ukrainian population by means of terror and destruction and, in order to subdue the freedom-loving people, in 1932 and 1933 staged a man-made famine that exterminated more than 6 million Ukrainians;

Whereas Communist Moscow perpetrated genocide in Ukraine and for this crime should be condemned by the free world;

Whereas one of the accomplices in this crime and the organizer of the other criminal activities committed in Ukraine, is the present dictator and responsible leader of the Communist Moscow empire;

Whereas Communist Moscow, and especially its present dictators, used similar though less extensive methods of genocide after having occupied the territories of other nations;

Whereas Communist Moscow's aggressive aspirations have become an ever-growing menace to all nations of the free world, and also to the freedom-loving and independent people in this great country of liberty; and

Whereas the Ukrainian people who still struggle for freedom from captivity and for their own, independent state, should be rendered support and assistance by the free world;

Now, therefore, we Americans of Ukrainian descent, at our gathering in Hamtramck, Mich., on October 11, 1958, in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the famine in Ukraine—

1. Denounce before the free world and history this horrible crime, perpetrated by Communist Moscow on Ukrainian territory, in consequence of which more than 6 million of our brothers and sisters starved to death.

2. Pay our tribute to the memory of their sufferings, and join the Ukrainian people in mourning the victims of the famine:

3. Call on the nations of the free world, above all the people of our great Country

of Liberty, to condemn this crime perpetrated by Communist Moscow in Ukraine, and to do everything in their power to prevent Moscow from committing like crimes on their territories.

4. Request the Government of our country and all governments in the free world to direct their representatives at the United Nations to take action pertaining to the placement of the crime of genocide, committed by Communist Moscow in Ukraine in 1932–33, on the agenda for discussion and the adoption of appropriate resolutions.

5. Call on all countries in the free world to sign the Convention of Genocide.

HAMTRAMCK, *October 11, 1958.*

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the 86th Congress will have an opportunity to perform a significant act of justice, equity, and diplomacy this coming year by granting Hawaii's request for statehood.

As a matter of justice, Hawaii meets every historical standard we have required for the admission of new States. Hawaiians have been immersed in American traditions since 1820. They have demonstrated their devotion to the principles of democracy and to the American form of government in numerous ways, including the adoption of a constitution, in 1950, which has been commended as a model among such instruments.

In 1950, about 84 percent of the Hawaiians were native-born American citizens. The record of island troops in combat is impressive testimony to their loyalty. Gen. Mark Clark described the Hawaiian organization as "the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States." They served with equal valor in Korea.

That the majority of Hawaiians desire statehood is unquestionable. In 1940 they voted two to one for admission. In 1950 they approved the proposed State constitution by more than three to one.

Hawaii has first-class qualifications insofar as population and resources are concerned. It has more people than five of the present States—more than twice as many as Alaska. It has a well-developed, prosperous economy. Its citizens support a per capita tax burden considerably higher than the national average—larger, in fact, than in 33 States.

Hawaii richly merits statehood as a matter of equity as well as justice. Permanent political inferiority for American citizens in American Territories is simply too foreign to our ideals to be tolerated for long. Hawaii is the only incorporated Territory not yet welcomed into the Union. It has been petitioning for entrance since 1903. It has more people and a better developed economy than Alaska, our newest State. Both political parties have, in their platforms, approved Hawaiian statehood. Both President Eisenhower and former President Truman are for it. According to recent polls, the people of the United States are also for it by a ratio of more than 4½ to 1.

Finally, as an act of diplomacy, the admission of Hawaii would be of incalculable value. It would reverberate to our credit throughout the Far East. It would stand as an irrefutable proof that we really live by the principles of freedom and self-government we preach.

For these and many other reasons, I shall, in Congress, support passage of a Hawaiian statehood bill, which I am introducing today.

Up to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star of January 11, 1959, entitled "Up to Congress":

UP TO CONGRESS

President Eisenhower has hurled a challenge which the Democratic-controlled 86th Congress cannot sidestep. In his state of the Union message, he called upon Congress to face up to its responsibility in helping to overcome grave hazards which beset our national economy. The President reaffirmed his determination to use the full power of his office to hold inflation in check and to provide other safeguards in the economy, but he pointed out that Congress holds the purse strings and makes the laws.

The inference was clear in the President's address that if the Democratic Congress runs wild, it will be held accountable when the Nation chooses its leadership again in 1960.

The President urged Congress to help maintain the present forward thrust of the economy by cutting the costs of Government and adopting his forthcoming balanced budget. He insisted the balanced budget of $77 billion he will submit to Congress January 19 is realistic and that its objectives are wholly attainable. The President's budget is balanced at a figure approximately $3 billion under what had been anticipated.

Whether hope for tax reduction in the foreseeable future is to be kept alive depends upon the willingness of Congress to face up to the need for economy in government, the President said. If the growing menace of inflation is to be overcome, he reminded Congress, the Federal Government must begin now to live within its means, to meet current costs from current revenue. Every item of Government expense, he said, must be examined critically. To do otherwise would be to betray our Nation's future.

President Eisenhower said 60 percent of the budget is allocated to national security, an estimate covering the Armed Forces, the Atomic Energy Commission, and foreign military aid. But, he emphasized, it is possible to maintain a strong defense and still have less expensive Federal Government. We can have everything we need, he told Congress, but we can't afford one cent for waste. He cautioned against defense overemphasis and needless duplication of quickly outdated weapons.

The President also called upon Congress to enact corrective legislation in the labor field. He asked for prompt enactment of legislation to stop corruption, racketeering, and abuse of power in labor unions. The President has made it clear that he wants intelligent labor reform, not ineffective legislation such as that embodied in the phony Kennedy-Ives bill which the Democrats supported last year as a means of courting the favor of labor in an election year.

President Eisenhower pointed to farm subsidies as a field in which Government spending can be reduced. He also called for decreases in Federal operations in areas where private enterprise can do the job.

It is up to Congress to join with the President in putting into effect these sound recommendations which are mandated by present-day conditions.

The Coast Guard Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents has written me of her concern over the present condition of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy facilities in my home State of Connecticut. Because of the nature of her appeal, I have requested unanimous consent that pertinent extracts of the letter be presented in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

JANUARY 7, 1959.

I have a son who is at present a cadet at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in New London. Therefore, I am personally interested in conditions there, particularly, and I quote directly from the "Specific Recommendations" of the Report of Visitors, "Replacement of Deteriorated Temporary World War II Structures: These buildings are old wooden structures that are dangerous to personnel, extremely costly to keep in repair and near the end of their existence." I believe that now is the time to ask Congress for additional funds, particularly in view of the recent nationwide publicity concerning the Chicago parochial school fire and the fire in a similar barracks dormitory at Syracuse University, where seven student airmen lost their lives and 13 were injured. This horrible disaster could so easily be repeated at the Coast Guard Academy, where I am told the cadets can see outside through the cracks in the walls.

It seems unjustifiable that the Air Force Academy in Denver, Colo., should be elaborately constructed, while the Coast Guard Academy, which has served our country for such a long period of time, should be so sadly neglected.

We are told that our boys at the service Academies who are dedicating their lives to the service of their country, are considered the cream of the crop of all American boys, physically, mentally, and morally. Why, therefore, must they be obliged to live under such hazardous conditions?

It is particularly important that the members of the subcommittee and committee considering Treasury Department appropriations be notified that they want the Coast Guard appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, to be increased by the sum of $6,650,000 for the necessary acquisition, construction, rebuilding and improvements to the Coast Guard Academy as recommended by the Congressional Board of Visi-

tors in their report of May 2, 1958, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, No. 151, Thursday, September 4, 1958.

Please, Representative DADDARIO, will you do all that you can for our boys at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy?

Very truly yours,

MRS. JOHN T. SULLIVAN.

Reaching for the Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I place in the RECORD a timely and thoughtful article by David Lawrence entitled "Reaching for the Moon," which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report for January 16, 1959:

REACHING FOR THE MOON

(By David Lawrence)

As we reach for the moon, shall we lose the battle on earth? Will moon gazing become a national pastime? The game is harmless so long as it is confined to those tired souls who long to get away from their earthly chores, but it becomes harmful indeed when we are asked to spend billions of dollars to win a stunt contest in outer space.

Laudable is the spirit of patriotism which seeks to win every race for our country. But we haven't always won the Olympics, and we have managed to adjust our lives to such ephemeral disappointments.

Military values are preeminent. Whatever is necessary to test out guidance systems for missiles must have a proper place in our defense budget. But a contest in launching satellites merely to outdo the Soviets makes little sense.

The sputniks last year threw us off our course and started a wave of spending in Congress. It is to be hoped that the psychological effect of the luniks will not be such as to open the floodgates to more indiscriminate expenditures for the spinning of metal balls in orbit around the sun or the moon.

Many Members of Congress seem to have become intrigued with the possibilities of space travel. They look upon the competition of our scientists with those of the Soviet Union as a gripping matter deserving priority above all else.

But the fact remains that the votes which elect our Representatives and Senators are to be found among the peoples living on the firm ground of the 49 States of the Union—not in outer space.

There is great need for a down-to-earth point of view in the present Congress. All the artificial planets that whirl around the sun will not create employment here in America where there is unemployment, nor bring taxes down from their painful heights, nor stop the raids on the American dollar.

The most important task for our legislators today is to conserve the economic strength of the United States of America. We are engaged in a "cold war" of frightening proportions. The war of missiles and nuclear bombs may never take place, but the economic war throughout the world is actually in progress now on a dozen fronts and on every continent.

This is not just a matter of distributing grants of money to buy allies, but of assuring economic stability for the United States, too. The world is a trade unit. We are dependent on continuing trade arrangements that encourage the sale of our domestic production in various parts of the world and that make possible the purchase abroad of materials needed for use here in our own country.

Our biggest concern today is the constant infiltration by the Moscow regime in certain countries of the free world by means of loans and by barter exchange of commodities. We are witnessing an economic war such as the world has never known. The stakes are high. It could mean political control of vast areas for the Communists. Their strategy is to burrow in and subvert the recipients of Soviet favors.

Once our own fiscal position is improved, we can look forward to using more and more funds to check the Soviet advances on the economic front in Asia, Africa, and Europe, as well as in Latin America. This is not a battle that will be settled in 1 year—it is a struggle that will last for many years to come.

There is already a significant counter-offensive being made by the free world with financial weapons. The expansion of the various governmental lending agencies—such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Export-Import Bank and the new Development Loan Fund, for which Congress has been appropriating relatively small sums—will mean a multiplication of private loans. The way is being opened in several countries already to sound development where foreign credit is needed and can be repaid.

But all this can be nullified unless there is respect for integrity of contracts. It is discouraging to find a government, such as the new one in Venezuela, becoming hostile to American investors after they have for decades poured their savings into that country.

If the end result after an era of lending is the emergence of nationalistic governments which, under Communist prodding, repudiate their obligations and welsh on their commitments to foreign property owners, private investors will be discouraged from again risking their savings.

Moral standards apply to nations—they must respect property, for it is never right to rob Peter to pay Paul.

We have many perplexing problems to solve in the economic field today. These involve down-to-earth questions of great difficulty. It is not a time for moongazing. We have plenty of work to do on earth.

Congress might well bear in mind that it is the people of the United States whose interests are paramount and that just now we are engaged in a battle for survival on this planet and not in the vapors of outer space.

Korkosz Brothers Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, early in December I had the distinct pleasure of participating in Korkosz Day being celebrated in Chicopee, Mass., and that evening had the honor of attending a testimonial dinner for Frank and John Korkosz who built one of the world's most unique projectors, a 3-ton, 13½-foot instrument for the Hayden Planetarium at the Museum of Science in Boston.

Frank Korkosz is director of the Springfield Museum of Natural History, and he built the smaller Seymour Planetarium at the Springfield Museum in 1937. His brother, John Korkosz, is the manager of the Chicopee Electric Light Co.

Their recently finished projector at the Hayden Planetarium will show all of the planets, including Uranus, which is not shown in any of the other major planetariums of the country. It projects more than 9,500 stars, each according to its own brightness in the skies. The system allows the brightest stars to be shown alone; then in combination with the less luminous stars, and, finally with the dimmest stars.

The Hayden Planetarium and the Korkosz projector system has been referred to as New England's first major theater of the skies, and it is the ninth major planetarium in the United States. John Patterson, director of the Boston museum, said the Korkosz projector is the world's finest and puts the Hayden Planetarium in a class by itself.

The Springfield Union of October 21, 1958, said of Korkosz projector:

Considered the most realistic projector in the world, the 3-ton instrument gives a sky show complete with nearly 10,000 twinkling stars, a satellite and even a roaring jet plane.

The Korkosz brothers first designed and built the 13-foot blue and silver instrument in their Chicopee workshop. They then took it apart and reassembled it at the museum. The projector uses over 200 camera lenses and can reproduce 25,000 years of star motions at the touch of a finger.

Museum officials even brought the Boston skyline indoors to add to the realism.

Even buildings still on drawing boards or under construction are shown as they will appear in the future.

Museum officials, not wishing to leave a dollar unturned in their zeal to finance the project, also received contributions from the firms whose miniature signs appear on the indoor skyline.

ACTUAL SITUATIONS

The optical system of the Korkosz projector simulates, for the first time in any planetarium, the actual situation in nature where even the brightest stars—the sun excepted—show only as points of light. Other planetariums make bright stars larger, the Museum of Science instrument makes them of varying intensity but still points in space.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the news story that appeared in the Springfield Union on December 11, 1958, the morning following the testimonial dinner for the Korkosz brothers:

TWO KORKOSZ BROTHERS ARE GIVEN HONOR—BUILDERS OF HAYDEN PLANETARIUM PROJECTOR ARE FETED IN CHICOPEE

CHICOPEE.—Wednesday was Korkosz Day in Chicopee as citizens honored the brothers, Frank and John, for the national recognition they have received as creators and builders of a 200 camera lens, million-dollar projector for the Hayden Planetarium at the Museum of Science in Boston. More than 400 persons feted the brothers at a testimonial dinner at the Officers' Club at Westover.

The 3-ton projector was built by the Korkosz brothers in their spare time over a 7-year period. It can reproduce 25,000 years of star motions and is complete with 10,000 twinkling stars, a satellite and a jet plane. The projector can be used by the Air Force as a training aid in celestial navigation.

The Korkosz projector optical system simulates for the first time in any planetarium the actual situation in nature where even the brightest stars, the sun excepted, show only as points of lights of varying intensity rather than having bright stars as larger bodies as other planetariums do.

The speaker at the affair was Dr. Bradford Washburn, director of Boston's Museum of Science, where the projector is set up. Dr. Washburn declared the projector is the best in the world, as well as being a thrilling piece of equipment.

Col. Edward D. Wooten, Westover Air Force Base commander, declared that the projector will some day chart our roadways into the world of tomorrow.

"The projector fits the needs of a nation during such a space age as ours," U.S. Representative EDWARD BOLAND said.

Mayor Walter M. Grocki, of Chicopee, presented the brothers with plaques commemorating their services to science and their country.

The brothers declared that the projector would never have been possible without the aid and encouragement given by Hayden Planetarium directors, consultants, craftsmen, families, and friends.

The invocation was given by Rev. Simeon Kaczmarek of St. Stanislaus Church, and benediction by Rev. Edgar Redfern of the Chicopee Falls Methodist Church. Superintendent of School John L. Fitzpatrick acted as the master of ceremonies.

Guests at the head table were: Mayor Grocki; U.S. Representative Boland; John Patterson, Hayden Planetarium director; Charles Oates, Boston Museum lecturer; Jack Wilcox, Boston Museum engineer and lecturer; Mayor Samuel Resnic of Holyoke; Representative Joseph Wisniowski, Percy Gilbert, deputy director of the Boston Museum; Mr. Redfern; Friar Kaczmarek; Mr. Washburn; Superintendent Fitzpatrick; Colonel Wooten; Col. David C. Jolly, Westover representative; William Sheehan; N. P. Ames Carter; and Dr. Lewis Ayers.

Land, Wood, and Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Sapulpa Herald, Sapulpa, Okla., for December 17, 1958. This editorial entitled "Land, Wood, and Water" relates the progress made by Oklahoma's senior Senator ROBERT S. KERR in carrying forward a dynamic program of land, wood, and water for our great State.

The editorial reads as follows:

LAND, WOOD, AND WATER

Yesterday at Rotary the cardinal philosophy of Senator ROBERT S. KERR kept running through my mind as I listened to the discussion of the Deep Fork drainage area by the speaker, Charles Evans.

Land, wood, and water.

And I thought of the sneers, jeers, and jibes that have been loosed in KERR's direction down through the years as he went over the State and Nation talking about land, wood, and water.

Where is the man or woman now who thinks that the Kerr program is "corny," a mere political hunk of baloney?

Where are those who derided land, wood, and water as being part and parcel of the same cynicism as those who expounded home and motherhood as a political dogma?

Recently I pondered over a map of eastern Oklahoma. It disclosed Sapulpa as nestling quite near the hub of a vast network of lakes and reclamational areas.

Lakes both in and projected.

Count 'em off on your fingers, going clockwise or anticlockwise. It makes no difference, for you start running into water in any direction out of Sapulpa—big water.

Keystone, Heyburn, Hulah, Oolagah, Grand, Gibson, Tenkiller, Texoma, Wister, and what is that big one that will start over by Eufaula and run almost to Okmulgee?

Water for municipalities, water for industry, water for fish and boats, water for transportation, water for irrigation—eastern Oklahoma is the last great frontier in these United States for water.

How wise Senator KERR was years ago when he jumped out in front in leadership with his land, wood, and water ideas.

As a result of his foresight, Oklahoma is years ahead of the rest of the Nation in the development of waterways and the improvement of drainage systems of innumerable creeks and streams.

I sat in a hotel room in Fort Smith, years ago, with Senator KERR and Claude Wickard, who was then the Secretary of Agriculture, and listened to their reactions to a terrible flood which swept down the Arkansas and laid scars on the fertile bottom lands west of Fort Smith that can still be seen.

We had toured the Arkansas River flood area that day.

This was before the huge stream control of Oklahoma rivers, that is now an actuality, was launched and completed.

As a matter of fact I think it was that trip down the Arkansas which solidified in KERR's mind the necessity of discipline and control of Oklahoma's waters.

Thus land and water, two prongs of his program, were either born that day or solidified in his mind and this State is enriched thereby and the benefits will snowball down through the upcoming years in a manner too vast for proper calculation.

Only trees are left—the "wood' part of his philosophy.

Oklahoma only has about three kinds of trees that are in any profusion and capable of being exploited commercially.

Two of them already are the pine and the pecan.

Only the blackjack is left for "a working over."

Does anyone wanna bet that KERR doesn't have any ideas about the blackjack?

If so, count me out.

Unwary, indeed, will be the person who gets caught out on that limb.

It might get sawed off.

For he has the ability to run his detractors out on a limb and then sawing it off.

Come to think of it this might be the "wood" phase of his three-part program.

A Challenge to Young People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley at the first convention of youth for the diocese of Ogdensburg, N.Y., held at the Olympic Arena in Lake Placid, N.Y., on September 26, 1958, together with an editorial from the Adirondack Daily Enterprise of Saranac Lake, N.Y., of September 27, 1958, entitled, "A Challenge to Young People":

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

I would not pretend to be an orator or a philosopher. I have never envied, however, those who can sway the minds of men by limpid accents and the dramatic marshaling of arguments. I can only give you the facts as I see them. Neither do I claim to be a man of special learning, because my education stopped far short of my desires. Yet I like to think I know something of my fellow men. I stand before you, too, as a Catholic, who regards his religious faith as his greatest blessing. Besides that love of my faith, I cherish with a fierce love my parents and family and, of course, I have warm affection for my political party.

In my youth I sought the company of my elders to learn the ways of life. In my manhood I was fortunate in having been part of the tremendous drama of my time. I was privileged not only to play a role, but to meet and know most of the great figures of our time. I have met and spoken with thousands of my fellow citizens. From all of them I have learned what I could. For there is no snobbery in man's greatest study, which is man. We can learn as readily from the humblest of our fellows as from the most respected among us.

My times have been eventful, indeed. I have seen the twilight of kings in World War I and the twilight of the dictators in World War II. Kings lost their thrones by establishing hell on earth in war. They perished because they treated politics and morality as things apart. In World War II the days of two of the most powerful dictators ended shamefully because they attempted to put politics above morality.

For some time, East and West have been locked in a mighty conflict. We in America know we are armed with right because we are concerned with the dignity of man. Yet, because of our concern we must not take the role of aggressor, even for the right. A world system based upon any one country's idea of freedom stifles freedom by denying others the choice which is essential to freedom.

People have often asked me why I chose a career in politics. Sometimes I ask myself, too, what inducement drew me to a life of public service. Let me try to explain today, as I have explained so often to those who questioned me, the grandeur of such a calling, as I look back on over 40 years of my life devoted to it.

Politics is a science and ethics of government. As a science it deals with the administration, organization, and regulation of political entities from the town meeting to the State in both internal and external affairs. In their best sense political ethics are as rigid as the moral code. The same ethics, it may be noted, apply alike to Catholic and non-Catholic. There is no wavering on the line of morality. In their worst sense political ethics are the artful and expeditious management of political affairs for personal or party advantage.

It must be recognized that politics and morality are one and indivisible. Merit and good works are the end of man and they are the end of politics. Power to do good is the true and lawful end of political aspiration. This power to do good is not to be confused with political zeal, which can be good but which is often mistaken. Politics should bring man ordered progress toward general convenience and usefulness.

In following politics as a career, man adopts the most dangerous as well as the most noble worldly career. It is noble be-

cause the power to do good is noble. It is dangerous because the practice of politics is beset by hazards, temptations, and delusions by which man may well lose his immortal soul. This is of gravest concern to any man.

I have no intention of turning my attention to a public examination of my own political conscience or to a dissection of the weaknesses of my fellow men. We all should be most meticulous in observing the code of our religion in our public conduct; most especially we should not treat politics and morality differently, because once we attempt to differentiate we lose understanding and honor.

Political power is a terrible force. Wisely and judiciously handled, it can do untold good. Abuse of power corrupts and destroys. By the uses of political power man can lead his fellows out of the mire of dejection into the light of freedom. And by the same uses, if unbridled, he can lead his fellow men from the light of freedom into the darkness of slavery.

So I say to you, seek power but respect liberty. In our ideal, which we as Catholics share with non-Catholics, our Government should rest upon Christian ideals of love and the brotherhood of man. This does not mean that we must all be perfect before we can have a truly free government. We can even be selfish and promote free government by allowing self-interests to balance one another. But we cannot be vicious in self-interest, even though we persuade others that we are doing so merely to advance the common good. The truth is we are trying to justify absolute, irresistible power for its own sake.

We recognize that freedom must give way to power in time of great internal or external danger. For revolution or war must find the government clothed with power to muster the resources of the country for its own protection. Once the danger is past, these powers should be returned to the people, where they belong. They should not be retained. Power feeds voraciously upon itself, growing ever hungrier until at length it imprisons reason in self-interest and destroys the capacity of judgment, to the great danger of the people.

Abuse of power is the root of all evil both for the politician who governs and for those he governs. Abuse of power encourages corruption, breeds delays, fosters incivility and makes for insincerity. Unhappily, some Catholics in power have been prone to abuse their trust. We cannot evade facts. We should not bury our heads in the sand after the manner of the fabled ostrich. What I have said does not mean that Catholics are not to be trusted in government. But it does mean that we should be careful to entrust our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor to honorable men, just as we are most careful and exacting in entrusting our watches for repair, or our jewelry, to experienced, trustworthy hands.

Political aspiring is entirely commendable—no one can quarrel with a noble ambition. But power in politics is not a license to do good and evil. Its only justifiable end is the good and it can be truly successful only when it shuns evil.

Political machines tend to grow arrogant and contemptuous of the rights of those outside their orbit. This is true whether machines are long entrenched or lately come to power as the result of a reform wave. They resort to force or threats. Too often their philosophy is that what is good for the machine is good for the people. This is just another way of saying that the end justifies the means.

In time, political machines tend to become the creatures of one man or at best a clique of men. The leader regards himself as an uncrowned king and refuses to surrender power even when his talent for leadership is impaired by the relentless course of time. He becomes capricious in the distribution of favors and scornful of interests not identified with the machine. He becomes exacting in his demand for loyalty, so much so as to confuse personal loyalty toward him with true political ethics.

Corruption is the most familiar of the evils of the abuse of power. Man has always been tempted by easy money. From early days some men have looked at bribes as the proper reward of public service. Some regard fees they collect as their own funds. In their enthusiasm to win office, men frequently spend far more than they can hope to take home. They turn then to making up the difference—and a little bit more—by demanding or accepting returns for favors.

In all fairness it must be noted that many men see so little wrong in such conduct that they scarcely cover up their crooked operations. As a result, such cases are frequently easy to press in court. Many men in public office who are entirely reputable in their business dealings are most careless in their official conduct. Too often, I am sorry to say, some Catholics in public office feel that there is one code of conduct for their private lives and an entirely different code for their public lives. Of course, one cannot be a good Catholic on Sunday and a bad Catholic during the week.

Procrastination is another evil of political power. It is so easy to delay doing a public good, especially in a nonelection year. It is so easy to forget political promises until the next election. It is so easy to put off doing what is right when courageous action might cost votes. It is so easy to keep feeding on power and to forget the public good.

Incivility is no less frequent a fault. We have all known men to grow pompous and arrogant in power. Such men come to regard themselves as masters of the people rather than as servants of the people. It is perhaps too much to ask that every man in public life be free and easy of access. Many public men are harassed by the press of their duties. It is proper even that a public man be brusque in private and resentful of any invasion of his privacy, but when he assumes his public functions he must become another man—fair, patient, understanding and, above all, just.

Insincerity is the last of the mortal sins of abuse of power. Many espouse causes, not because they believe them to be good, but solely as the road to power. Many bury convictions to retain power. Some seek temporary power in order to reap financial reward by joining with those they opposed and even persecuted while in public service. Others pretend to be friends of the poor and needy, but have only been interested in heaping power upon power. All of these evils and a host of lesser ones can be avoided by those who scrupulously preserve the single standard of morality for public office against the double standard of one code of ethics for private life and another for public life. One's aim in politics should not be personal advancement and self-exaltation. The means one uses should not be log-rolling, back-scratching, and favors for favors received.

Politics should be directed toward bringing general security and prosperity. Yet, if in politics the majority rules, it does not dictate. Not everything a majority does is right, any more than everything a leader might do would be right of itself. It is entirely possible, to give a farfetched example, that a majority might decree that we again legalize slavery, but that would not make slavery right.

Fortunately for us, I think, we have a two-party Government. Each party is made up of various groups. Some of these have interests which sharply conflict and may be difficult to reconcile. Yet, each of these interests has a voice in making and executing laws through the party. Much of what is done is achieved by compromise among the interests, which is good. There should be no compromise of principles, but there can be recognition of those who are honestly and sincerely in the opposition.

Under our system both parties must recognize and allow for the interests of farmers, labor, financiers, and industrialists, as well as for racial and religious groups. I would be less than honest if I did not think that the Democratic Party offers the most effective programs for security and welfare. Yet, I would not do away with the opposition party, nor would I see any fragmentation of the party system such as that which has brought confusion to many European nations.

Security and prosperity have been promised by dictators and are still being promised by the most powerful dictatorship of our time. In Soviet Russia the security of prison is being offered to those who dare to question the accomplishment of any of the various 5-year plans. This is the road to fear. About a hundred years ago we gave up security by force, the security of slavery, which, while for the most part benevolent, was purchased at the price of freedom.

The Socialists promise the same ends of security and prosperity. They madly throw money away and avidly confiscate private property, seemingly unmindful of the fact that the three greatest experiments in socialism ended in dictatorship in Russia, Germany, and Italy. They would have us believe that it was the fault of men rather than the fault of a system which is long on materialism and short on faith.

The people must guard their liberties most jealously. If men go wrong in public office, part of the responsibility is ours in not being more vigilant against concentration of political power into the hands of a few. It is our good fortune to be part of a nation which has given its citizens a greater degree of freedom than has been enjoyed by any other nation at any time in the history of the world. It is our responsibility to keep this torch of liberty lit in a dark world. Millions in bondage must be heartened to realize that this great candle still gives light in darkness.

We must not despair because a few men have gone wrong from time to time. It is sad that they have besmirched our code by their conduct. But the fact that they did so does not bring disrepute upon the code of the most reverend among men, any more than it should bring disrepute on the many men who have been devout and humble in the exercise of power.

I have known men who have yielded to temptation in public office. I wish that any person so tempted and so beset by insatiable ambition could see, as I have seen, these poor, miserable, shattered men. I have seen them shed bitter tears of remorse, of regret, and of repentance. I have seen them crushed by the weight of their disgraces, not so much on themselves as on those they loved—their parents, their families, and their friends. And I have seen them numbed by the realization that they had seen the value of morality too late. For them, disgrace was forever.

It is a frightening fate to contemplate. The judgment of history and the judgment of men are alike unyielding for the violator of morality in politics. It is of utmost importance that men in public life exercise power most judiciously for the common good. They must not only shun temptation but avoid the suspicion of temptation. There is no greater crowning jewel in public men than true virtue. Virtue in politics can bring eternal fame, but it always gives the reward of a clear conscience and a deep sense of accomplishment.

Leadership is a precious and favored gift. We cannot all aspire to it in politics. It is not essential that we have it in the heroic degree of a Washington, a Jefferson, a Jack-

son, a Calhoun, Lincoln, or Cleveland. Yet we can all be politicians. They truly serve who do no more than cast their votes. It is important that we be jealous in doling out power and that we be exacting in our demands on those in power, so that they will not fail us.

I hold that so long as we maintain intellectual honesty by measuring our own interests against the rights of others, we perform an important political role. We will serve by demonstrating faith in our country, by going to the polls to tell our political leaders what we think of them and their programs. In that way we exercise a vital role in maintaining our freedom and working to advance our own security and well-being.

For most of us this will be the sum total of our political activity. That is good in itself, but it is not enough for all. The great and crying need of our country is for more good men and good women—especially young men and young women—to make at least part-time careers of politics. In the earlier days in our country it was a common feeling that men of families of wealth and position owed some portion of their lives to public service. This feeling brought generations of public service from various families. We are thankful that such traditions of service still continue among us.

My generation is passing. Maybe we did not handle our problems too well. Maybe we were too tolerant of political transgressors among us. That could be. If so, as a member of an older generation, I would be most remiss if I failed to appeal to young people to take up politics. We must not shrug off our responsibility by washing our hands of politics as a dirty business. Politics is not a dirty business unless we allow it to become so. It is rather a most serious business which has need of the most high minded and the most generous hearted among us.

I cannot urge upon you too strongly the necessity for citizens to take part in politics. I appeal especially, as I said, to the young people. If you brush politics aside as unclean, as something no decent person would enter, not only our Republic but our faith would perish. Politics needs persons of high purpose and high moral courage. If high-minded and moral hearted young people enter politics we can save the Nation and perhaps the world while we keep the faith.

Over the last decade and more especially in recent months, we have been hearing much of integrity in public office. I am not being partisan in this, because charges have been leveled, not without justification, against both parties. There have been suggestions that new ethical codes be written and enforced. This, while commendable perhaps, is actually silly. The code exists in every clean heart. Each of us knows the rules of the game. What our country and every country needs is more clean players.

In this connection I am reminded of the words of the late great American philosopher, George Santayana. Santayana, whose warm Spanish ancestry and chill New England upbringing combined to give him a mind of cold judgment and sympathetic analysis, said: "If a noble and civilized democracy is to subsist, the common citizen must be something of a saint and something of a hero. We see, therefore, how justly flattering and profound, and at the same time how ominous, was Montesquieu's saying that 'the principle of democracy is virtue.'"

Politics should be a joyous, dedicated effort toward man's advancement on earth, just as religion is a glorious effort toward bringing final, happy fulfillment in eternity. Moral strength must arm the political leaders of the future if we are to keep the country free and by example set the world free.

It is our good fortune that we had among us many men and women in politics who were motivated in their public lives not only by good political considerations but by highest moral principles. To these we owe our survival amid varying difficulties, misfortunes, and calamities. We are beset by fears and doubts and difficulties of highest magnitude, although if we will but look back in history, we will find that every generation of every country was threatened by disaster. Some generations met the challenge and others succumbed. If we look closely enough we find that progress was ever forward although man at times seemed to fall back.

We today should take heart for the future. It is for our leaders today and the many noble young people we will recruit for political careers to bring us greater and more rewarding service. We must not despair. Let us dedicate ourselves for as long as our way goes here below to seeking the best among us, mentally and morally, as leaders.

[From the Adirondack Daily Enterprise, Saranac Lake, N.Y., Sept. 27, 1958]

A CHALLENGE TO YOUNG PEOPLE

James A. Farley, former chairman of the Democratic National Committee and Postmaster General of the United States, yesterday spoke to the Catholic Youth Organization Council convention at Lake Placid.

A man of great experience in politics, Mr. Farley spoke of the good that politics can do, while warning of the pitfalls of power.

"The great and crying need of our country" he said, "is for more good men and good women—especially young men and young women—to make at least a part-time career of politics. * * * Politics should be a joyous, dedicated effort toward man's advancement on earth. * * * Moral strength must arm the political leaders of the future if we are to keep the country free and by example set the world free."

"It is our good fortune", Mr. Farley declared, "that we have had among us many men and women in politics who were motivated in their public lives not only by good political considerations but by highest moral principles. To these we owe our survival amid varying difficulties, misfortunes and calamities. We are beset by fears and doubts and difficulties of the highest magnitude, although if we will but look back in history, we will find that every generation of every country was threatened by disaster. Some generations met the challenge and others succumbed."

Mr. Farley set his sights high in challenging the imagination of the young people at Lake Placid.

It is easy enough to shrug off politics and politicians as of no great account. If we do this we are condemning ourselves and our democratic way of life. Nothing is more important to our successful survival, as Mr. Farley eloquently pointed out, than that we have intelligent and courageous people in politics, in both parties.

Fighting Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I place in the RECORD a resolution approved and adopted by the United States Savings and Loan League at its 66th annual convention held in San Francisco, November 17–21, 1958, on fighting inflation:

FIGHTING INFLATION

(A resolution approved and adopted by the United States Savings and Loan League at its 66th annual convention held in San Francisco, Calif., November 17–21, 1958)

Erosion of the purchasing power of the American dollar has been a major economic problem throughout the postwar years. Despite periods of price stability in 1948–50 and 1952–55, some declines in the value of the dollar have occurred.

The business recesison which started in the fall of 1957 had less effect in restoring the purchasing power of the dollar than had been hoped for by many segments of the American economy. Inflationary tendencies, however, were arrested. There is some danger now that a resurgence of business activity will bring additional inflational pressures.

Psychological as well as economic forces are at work in relation to inflationary tendencies. In the thinking of a not insignificant number of business, agricultural, labor, and governmental leaders inflation is regarded as inevitable. Some political leaders in both parties are so convinced of this that they have proposed price and wage controls.

The United States Savings and Loan League is convinced that further inflation is not inevitable, that increasing competition will restrain future inflationary tendencies, and hence that direct Government controls of wages and prices are not now and will not be required in the future. It regards such controls as dangerous threats to the American business system. It applauds the Secretary of the Treasury in his stand for the position that inflation is manmade and can be man controlled. It pledges itself to continuous battle in what it believes to be one of the most important of all struggles to maintain a free and prosperous society.

The league suggests that an improvement in the will of the Nation to fight inflation could be aided by congressional action. The Employment Act of 1946, which has come to be regarded as the basic charter of the Federal Government's responsibility and policy in promoting prosperity, has frequently been used to defend public policies which are inflationary; at the same time other interpreters of the act hold that price stability is an implied ingredient of the economic goals there listed. The league applauds the study made by a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress of the relationship of price stability to the goals of the Employment Act. The league urges a declaration by the 86th Congress, either as an amendment to section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946 or as a separate resolution, specifically stating that maximum price stability is a goal of Federal Government policy and leaving no doubt that this goal is of equal importance with maximum employment and maximum production.

A. W. Wainwright Receives Award for Faithful Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, we have in this country a large group of faithful workers who make a tremendous contribution to our country. Their services should be recognized and ap-

preciated by the American people. I refer to the men who serve so unselfishly in the Selective Service System. From time to time a local member of a selective service board receives a Presidential citation for faithful service.

A gentleman from Bonham, Tex., with whom I have corresponded for many years, recently received a Presidential citation for 10 years of loyal and faithful service to the United States. The local paper in Bonham, Tex., should be commended for publicizing this award, and I take pleasure in quoting it for the RECORD:

A. W. WAINWRIGHT RECEIVES AWARD FOR FAITHFUL SERVICE

A. W. Wainwright, chairman of the Fannin County Draft Board, has been presented a Presidential citation for 10 years of loyal and faithful service to the United States.

The presentation was made by Charlie A. Foster, district supervisor for the Selective Service System, who was acting on behalf of President Eisenhower, Gov. Price Daniel, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, National Selective Service Director, and Col. Morris E. Schwartz, State director.

The award is in the form of a Presidential certificate of appreciation and is signed by the President, the Governor, and the National and State Directors of Selective Service.

"Mr. Wainwright has served his country and community well all these years without pay or thought of pay," Mr. Foster said. "It is my pleasure to carry out the directions of the President in making the award to him."

Panama Canal: More on "Digging the Ditch"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 9, 1958, I included a book review in the New York Times by Elting E. Morison on a recent volume on Panama Canal history by W. Storrs Lee.

Another review of that work by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, Jr., U.S. Navy, retired, was published in the September 1958 issue of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, the well-known monthly magazine for the advance of professional, literary, and scientific knowledge in the Navy.

In contrast with other reviews on Dean Lee's book, which emphasize its historical and human interest features, Captain DuVal stresses points of fundamental character and should be of special interest to the Congress, especially those committees concerned with interoceanic canal problems.

The review with an editorial note follows:

THE STRENGTH TO MOVE A MOUNTAIN

(By W. Storrs Lee—Reviewed by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, USN (retired))

(Captain DuVal is author of two important volumes on the Panama Canal, "Cadiz to Cathay," and "And the Mountains Will Move," a former captain of the Port of Balboa, C.Z., 1941–44, in charge of marine operations of the Pacific sector of the canal; and later, head of the Panama Canal Liaison Organization and Isthmian Canal Studies of the Navy Department under the Chief of Naval Operations, 1946–49, by order of the Secretary of the Navy, James Forrestal. Attention is invited to his article, "Isthmian Canal Policy—An Evaluation," in the March 1955 issue of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings.)

A most timely and instructive contribution that tells the dramatic story of building the Panama Canal, now verging toward another crucial period with respect to the type of its modernization. Consideration of this major element of our national policy, which will eventually involve the expenditure of vast sums has been immeasurably complicated by widespread agitations for wrenching canal ownership and control from the United States.

Dean Lee, recognizing the necessity for an informed public interest in interoceanic canal problems and an informed reaction, undertakes to reexamine our stake in the canal enterprise and to reassess the significance of its construction half a century ago.

Drawing upon many sources, independent as well as official, he has thus been able to capture the spirit of the times covered and to present his narrative with a refreshing degree of candor and objectivity. Listed in his references, these sources will be invaluable for those who may wish to delve more deeply into the complicated canal question.

Unfortunately, the book is not supplied with maps and schematic diagrams essential for those not intimately familiar with the subject to follow with proper understanding. For a work of its appeal, however, it is remarkably free of errors in terminology.

In a clarifying foreword, the author recognizes the advantageous geographical location of the Panama Canal, describes the impact of the Suez Canal seizure by Egypt in 1956 on the Panama Canal with resulting demands for relinquishment or reduction of U.S. jurisdiction, mentions the ill-fated 1939 Third Locks project that was suspended in 1942 after the expenditure of some $75 million, and stresses the two principal plans for major increase of canal capacity.

The first proposal described is the 1943 Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan for the economic increase of capacity and improvement of operating conditions. This solution was developed within the Panama Canal organization as the result of experience in World War II, approved in principle by the Governor of the Canal Zone, and supported by the Secretary of the Navy in a report to the President. The author obviously sensed its historical significance, for he states that it was the "kick-off for a new 'battle of the levels' almost as bitter as the controversy of 1906."

The other is the 1947 sea-level plan, recommended by the Governor of the Canal Zone primarily to make the waterway less destructible under atomic attack. Though mentioning the report of which this recommendation was based as one of the most meticulous engineering reports ever written, Dean Lee balances the description by leveling charges from eminent, independent canal, naval, and nuclear warfare experts, as summarized by George M. Wells and Representative Willis W. Bradley, which challenge the primary assumptions on which the sea-level justification was attempted. Evidently through inadvertence, he did not state the facts that the sea-level report failed to receive presidential approval, and was transmitted by the President to the Congress on December 1, 1947, quite significantly without comment, or recommendation; and that the Congress took no action thereon.

As to demands and proposals for giving up U.S. jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal, the author emphasizes the views of the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, sole surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission and former civil Governor of the Canal Zone, also a distinguished former Member of Congress, as strongly opposing any surrender of our rights and authority over the canal enterprise, either by internationalization or otherwise.

Most of Dean Lee's book concerns matters of great human interest and is fascinating reading. Yet woven through its fabric are points of fundamental character, which include explorations into the backbround of Culebra Cut, Gatun Dam, and some important facts about the long obscured history of the presently separated Pacific locks.

The author describes the location of these locks as the major weakness of the whole canal plan, a very expensive one. This error in design, which was inherited from the French, was first recognized by Chief Engineer John F. Stevens, who, early in 1906 recommended the combination of all Pacific locks in one structure as a desirable change in the adopted canal plan. On August 3 of that year, he approved an arrangement that placed these locks in three lifts south of Miraflores with the main terminal dam between two hills, Cerro Aguadulce on the west side of the present sea-level channel and Cerro de Puente on the east. This plan, afterward studied in more detail and unavailingly recommended by Col. William L. Sibert, a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, would have enabled summit-lake navigation from the Atlantic to the Pacific with a summit-level anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal to match that of the Atlantic end.

Unfortunately, an obvious lack of appreciation on the part of canal planners of marine needs and failure to seek the views of adequately experienced navigators on questions of fundamental planning continued, generally speaking, through many years. This policy was well illustrated in the design of the 1939 Third Locks Project, authorized primarily as a defense measure to accommodate larger naval vessels. Its complicated layout in the Pacific sector of the canal, tortuous channels, failure to remove the dangerous bottleneck at Pedro Miguel, and to provide other correlated operational improvements, are the bases for opposition by important navigation interests to the completion of that project as originally planned.

Though treated at some length by Dean Lee, the Pacific lock question has far-reaching angles that are not covered by him. Moreover, as was clearly foreseen by Stevens, it still remains a key problem of vital import to the future, and thus merits far greater attention.

In extending credit, the author is quite generous and just, with the result that the key figures in Panama Canal history are placed in much better perspective. Although Goethals and his associates, civilian as well as military, who took over the task of construction from Stevens, attained great fame as canal builders, Dean Lee rightly describes John F. Stevens as the basic architect of the Panama Canal.

Thus, it is most fitting that, in his conclusion, Dean Lee should revive the 1928 plan of Governor Thatcher for adequate memorialization of all who in significant ways contributed to the success of the great enterprise, for there is glory and honor enough for all.

Though not expressing his own preference as to future plans. The author ends his volume with a stirring appeal: "The United States rallied to a noble challenge in 1904. The country has another challenge now: The old canal is gradually becoming inadequate, and if the present rate of increase in shipping

through the cut continues, the waterway will be obsolescent in less than 2 decades. That leaves all too short a time to remodel the master work."

Faith: Address of Hon. James A. Farley at New York State Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley on the "State Fair Pauses Before God Program" of the New York State Fair at Syracuse, N.Y., on August 31, 1958:

FAITH

Over the years I have made many speeches. In the past, I must confess, I have never done so without some uneasiness. I have always been aware I am no orator, one who can fire the minds of men by poetic imagery and limpid accents, and that I am no philosopher, one who can elevate the minds of men by clarity of thought toward the level of angels. On this day devoted to religion, a new anxiety has been added for me to the speaking platform; I am not a theologian, skilled in matters of morals and dogma, nor am I a man of learning, versed in metaphysics, science, history, or art.

I am a man of business. In business I have been fortunate and happy. I used to be a man of politics. In politics I have had my successes and my defeats, all of which have added to my knowledge and understanding of my fellow man, including my most recent decisive venture. It is this knowledge and understanding, along with my years—a full 3 score and 10—glowing with bright memories and unsullied by bitter cynicism, that moved the planning committee to select me as speaker for the religious day ceremonies.

I am a Catholic, rooted in my faith. In speaking at these ceremonies, I follow a Jew and a Protestant. All of us are Americans and don't let anyone tell you differently. The greater our devotion to our faiths, the deeper our dedication to America; and let none of us forget that for a single instant, because if we do, we place ourselves in jeopardy to the godlessness of materialistic totalitarianism.

The days of my years have covered the appearance of virtually all the great discoveries by which man has changed the face of the earth, approached the conquest of time and space, and armed himself with the power to destroy the world. Unhappily man has not learned how to control himself as well as he has learned to harness and transmute the bounties of nature.

Man has always had the power to destroy himself, using it first when Cain slew Abel. Succeeding generations have magnified that power until in this century we have seen two terrible world conflicts and a number of lesser wars, which have taken a frightful toll of lives, destroyed staggering totals of property and culture, and squandered many bounties of nature. Today we face the threat of a third world conflict, which might not only take even more fearsome tolls but could obliterate civilization as we know it.

But horrible as destruction and such a threat may be, we are confronted with a more terrifying prospect. Man has always had the power to lose his immortal soul. Now, mankind is confronted with organized and regimented secularism or materialism, which would have him take a nonreligious view of everything. It would obliterate all faiths and have man deny God.

By nature man is religious. Man is an animal and has much in common with other animals from the ant to the elephant, not only in senses, passions, and instincts but some resemblances of body. He differs from other animals in two important respects; he has intellect and he has free will. By his intellect he can reason so as to pass from one idea to another. He can turn his intellect on himself, on the universe and on God. By his freedom of will he—and he alone of all living creatures—can subdue impulses and act against them.

At every turn as an individual or as a member of society, man is confronted by risks and must make decisions. In making decisions man alone has the power among living creatures to weigh concepts such as freedom, truth, and justice—against images.

From the beginning of time man has sought to relate himself to the unseen, the transcending power that makes for the thirst for righteousness—God. In this respect we might say that man is metephysical as well as religious, but he has not arrived at his understanding of God through intellect alone. Materialistic men would have us believe that we have created a fantasy for lulling ourselves to unreality, by pronouncing religion the opiate of the people.

No; we of the three faiths know God has spoken to man Himself and through men. To accept anything on the authority of man we must be convinced, by reason, of his credibility. Revelation is credible when we are convinced he is telling us what he knows. Faith does not ask the surrender of reason; rather, reason is what supports faith.

In opposition to faith we have the materialists and the secularists who oblige others to accept what they say as truth because they say it. Those who would oblige others to accept what they say as truth are dictators lustful for power or men swollen with the pride of intellect, the sin by which angels fell so that it is no wonder it devours their reason by the insidious flattery or egotism.

By its nature materialism is a force for slavery as faith is a force for freedom. Today we are engaged in a titanic struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of slavery. The forces for slavery have organized a powerful and lawless conspiracy which we know as communism. These would subvert the forces for freedom by lies, deceit, ridicule, distortion, hate, and treachery, with strife in reserve as a last resort.

The tyrants of world communism are strangers to truth. They were able to conclude an unholy alliance with Hitlerian forces of aggression, which loosed World War II, sealing this foul pact with the blood of an outraged nation whose security they had pledged. They were able to attack a tiny nation and scream they were protecting themselves against aggression. They were able to gorge themselves on nation after nation on a tidal wave of imperialism such as the world has never known before and pose as lovers of independence. They have posed as lovers of peace while threatening all who oppose them with destruction.

Over the 40 years they have been in control, the leaders of Red totalitarianism have broken their signed and pledged word in a thousand pacts and treaties. Their word is as changeable as it is hollow. If we had no other proof of this, the voices of the patriot dead of Hungary, led by the recently executed Premier Imre Nagy, blare their condemnation trumpet-tongued for all time down the corridors of history.

Even while professing to call for peace, the leaders of the Kremlin boast that they are now powerful enough to loose the monsters of nuclear war. They have threatened to destroy the United States and Britain while calling for a summit meeting at which they would have the great powers of the world dictate and enforce Communist imperialism on the smaller nations of the world. While professing to prefer the gentle fluttering of the wings of the dove of peace, the dictatorial oracle of the Kremlin ranted, "We bolsheviks are a ravenous people * * * we want more and more." This same leader boastfully predicted that grandchildren of those now living would live under Communists and that communism would destroy us.

Let us take a look at the situation of this proclaimed Communist enemy. It is now 40 years since the last czar of Russia was done to his death, with most of his family in a Russian cellar, by frightened bolsheviks. Leaders of this revolution have now had four decades to reconstruct Russia and make its people happy. In the same initial period we made tremendous strides toward our present prosperity. From the scraps of news that come out of Russia, it is evident that the Russian people are living on a very meager diet and in the barest of comfort. Even granting that the crudest Russian peasant and the poorest Russian worker in the cities is better off than he was under the czars, the advance has not been anywhere near the world of plenty and happiness the Communist leaders promised when they began making over Russia.

It is now evident that the Iron Curtain has been erected not so much to keep the rest of the world out of Russia as to keep the Russians satisfied within. The Soviet leaders do not want faith and the truth entering with foreign visitors. For almost 40 years the leaders of the Red revolution have been educating the Russian young people, but there is no doubt that some 60 million young Russians, whose minds have been partially awakened, are becoming more and more of a problem. These young people have been aroused to question what they are told, because their tastes have been expanded and their appetities sharpened. Some have seen the Western World in their marching in war. They have seen that the Soviet promises of a better and fuller life are a shocking disappointment by way of contrast with what the poorest people enjoy in the freer outer world.

Many Russians under the age of 40 know now that they have been getting sputniks and arms instead of bread and butter. They have been getting uniforms and drill and more work at more hours instead of better homes, simple luxuries and a peaceful life. There can be no doubt that many millions of young Russians are unhappy, to say nothing of millions upon millions of people who have been enslaved by the violent energy the Communist leaders put into building weapons to defend their regime while professing to defend Russia.

The greatest threat to Russia at it is constituted today is not what the Communist leaders rant about day and night—the alleged imperialism of the United States or the alleged belligerency of the Western Powers. The great threat to the Soviet leaders lies partly in the unhappy and disgruntled millions in Communist slavery and largely in the vigorous, hungry, and ambitious young Russians who may awaken to faith. Almost four decades ago Communist leaders told the Russian people: "You have nothing to lose but your chains; you have a world to gain." Today, from the trickle of information that comes out of Russia, we learn young Russians are awakening to a growing realization that they have not gained anything of the world's abundant freedom, but have merely added to the weight of their chains.

For this reason I am convinced that Soviet Russia does not want war. For this reason I am also convinced that Soviet Russia does not want peace. If Russia goes to war, the discontented young Russians might turn on their leaders and seize the government for themselves. It is always easier to turn upon a tormentor at home than an enemy abroad. I am certain that the Russian leaders are aware that in launching any conflict, they would risk their future and lives, just as certainly as did Czar Nicholas in 1918 and Kaiser Wilhelm in 1914.

I have said that I do not believe that the Russians will launch a war, but neither do I believe that they will ever agree to a lasting peace. They will not execute a solemn and binding treaty at any conference between the East and West, no matter how high the summit, because peace will hasten what I believe to be their inevitable destruction. Russia's present leadership cannot survive war and Russia's present leadership cannot survive peace. That is their great dilemma.

They cannot survive war because they will be destroyed by an outraged citizenry. They cannot survive peace because they will be destroyed by faith born of learning. The learning which they are implanting in the minds of their young in their desperate striving to dominate the world in the space age is the devasting time bomb that will blast the materialistic tyrants.

The tyrants of communism fear force, but more than they fear force, they fear faith. Let each of us then keep the faith, knowing that those who keep the light of faith a sacred flame on our altars of catholicism, protestantism, and judaism truly save the race, as it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be, world without end.

Jimmie John Jarnagin, of Jetmore, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of this body an article appearing in the October issue of the Kansas Future Farmer pertaining to Jimmie John Jarnagin, of Jetmore, Kans., who has received the highest possible honor in the Future Farmer organization—that of Star Farmer of America. This young man has brought great honor to the State of Kansas, and to his city and country. He is to be highly commended for the contribution he has made to agriculture.

The article follows:

A young Kansas wheat and cattle farmer by the name of Jimmie John Jarnagin, Jr., has been judged winner of the Nation's most coveted farm youth award, the 1958 Star Farmer of America.

He is 21 years old, lives near Hanston, Kans., just 20 miles north of the famed Gunsmoke town of Dodge City, Kans., and is a vocational agriculture graduate from the Hodgeman County Community High School at Jetmore.

The award, carrying with it a $1,000 check from the Future Farmers of America Foundation, Inc., was made October 14, during colorful ceremonies at the Tuesday evening session of the 30th anniversary national FFA convention in Kansas City's Municipal Auditorium.

The 1958 Star Farmer of America is a wheat and cattle farmer from the dryland farming section of southwestern Kansas where agriculture is largely influenced by the whims of nature, and prosperity depends upon the farmer's fortitude to stick when times are hard, and management foresight to strike for big stakes when the rains come.

Such is the story of Jimmie John Jarnagin, Jr., who weathered 2 years of searing drought in 1955 and 1956 and came back during the past 2 years to earn more than $30,000.

Jimmie had unusual help from his father, J. J. Jarnagin, Sr., in getting started in farming. He added unusual management ability and hard work of his own to develop a 1,600-acre farming and ranching program with a gross value of $111,071.11. His program this year included 413 head of beef cattle, 230 acres of wheat, 155 acres of silage and grain sorghums, and about 1,200 acres in grass. He owns 1,280 acres; rents the remaining 320.

Jimmie is married and has a 2-year-old son. He and his wife, Charlene, with some help from her father, have built an attractive rambler-style home on the ranch. They're still working on the development of landscaping, a garage, shop, corrals, and other structures needed around the farmstead.

Jimmie's early years as a vocational agriculture student were not particularly impressive. Even though his father had bought a 160-acre farm in Jimmie's name in 1945, the boy's supervised farming program as a freshman in Hodgeman County Community High School at Jetmore consisted of only two registered Hereford heifers to begin his beef cattle herd. As a sophomore he added 12 sheep and half-interest in 70 acres of milo. Drought got most of the milo, and he lost money on both the sheep and the cattle. His net labor income for those first 2 years was $126.

It was then, in 1954, that his high school vocational agriculture instructor, George Turnbull, got father and son together for a long and searching talk about the boy's future. The elder Mr. Jarnagin had a large farming operation. He was past 65. His older son and two daughters already were married and away from home.

Mr. Jarnagin made arrangements for Jimmie to purchase 800 acres of the home farm for $24,000 on a time-payment basis. There was a 450-acre growing crop of wheat on the land at the time of the purchase. Jimmie expanded his beef herd to 24 and his sheep to 20. The wheat crop was good, and he harvested 6,500 bushels. His labor income at the end of the year amounted to $13,889.50. With it he paid off $12,000 of the amount owed his father.

That was to be his last good wheat crop until this past summer. In 1955 he netted $142 from 400 acres. There were failures again in 1956 and 1957, although he did get returns of about $2,400 during each of those 2 years from land placed in the soil bank.

In the meantime, Jimmie sold his sheep and attempted to expand his beef herd. In 1955 he pastured and fed 70 head of his father's cows for one-half of the calf crop. Selling his share of the calves, he bought more cows. Then the drought got worse. At the beginning of 1956, Jimmie had 52 cows, 4 heifers, and 2 bulls. Because of feed and water shortage, he sold his entire calf crop and 20 of the poorer cows.

The rains came in the spring of 1957, too late for that year's wheat crop, but a blessing on the pastures. Native buffalo and bluestem grasses greened up once more and started growing. Jimmie bought 320 acres more of grassland from his father for $15,000 and leased 320 acres from his mother at $2.50 per acre per year. He got 31 calves from his 34 cows. In the fall he borrowed more money to buy 214 head of stocker steers and cows. He was so heavily in debt by this time that another failure of wheat and pasture could have resulted in his loss of the entire farm.

But the 214 cattle represented a particularly timely purchase. He paid $21 per hundred pounds for them, wintered them on wheat pasture and milo stubble. By last spring the steers had gained an average of 200 pounds each and prices had gone up. He sold 106 at a good margin, getting enough to pay off his note and still keep the remainder of the steers and cows to eat this year's good pastures.

At the time he filed his application for the FFA's American Farmer degree last spring, young Jarnagin had nearly $30,000 worth of cattle, $70,000 in land and buildings, with machinery and other miscellaneous items to bring the gross value of his holdings to $111,071.11. He still owed $33,000 on the land, $14,500 on the cattle, and $965 in other liabilities, for a net worth of $62,606.11.

Of that amount, he could count $53,634.05 gained in actual earnings from farming and other sources over a period of 6 years. The remainder represented his father's gift of the original 160-acre farm and increased inventory value of the land he had purchased.

Jimmie was graduated from high school in 1955 and in August of that year married a classmate, Miss Charlene Bamberger. They chose a site on the 800 acres he had bought, and with the help of Charlene's father in the framing, wiring, and plumbing, built their home. They have modern equipment and furniture in the house, and plans for other improvements.

"That takes a back seat to reduction of the mortgage on the farm, though," says Jimmie.

In high school, Jimmie was a leader in the FFA, student council president, captain of the football and basketball teams and played in the school band. He and Charlene are active in community affairs now, particularly in the activities of Farm Bureau and their local United Presbyterian Church.

Jimmie continues his interest in vocational agriculture by participating in a young farmers class, conducted by the present teacher, Hubert Mai, at the Jetmore School. Mai visits the Jarnagin farm frequently to help with the development of plans for improving the farm.

Jimmie has plans for joining the soil conservation district and is in the process of developing a complete conservation program for the farm. Also in the planning stage is a large farm pond where he hopes to store enough water to irrigate some of his crops.

"My immediate goal is to maintain a herd of 200 cows which will be used to produce feeder calves," Jimmie said. "I plan to continue to winter stocker steers whenever feed and pasture are plentiful."

Jimmie started building a garage last spring, and had plans ready for a machine shed. Most of the lumber needed for corrals and loading facilities was on hand.

"My farmstead will grow as rapidly as my time and funds are available," he said.

There were many times when it would have been easy for young Jimmie Jarnagin to quit, but Jimmie did not quit, and today he has received an honor which makes every FFA boy in Kansas proud to be a member of the Future Farmers of America. It is true that the Star Farmer of America had unusually good fortune in securing land which is not available to every FFA member who would be a farmer, but also it must be remembered that when that opportunity came, Jim Jarnagin was ready and waiting to accept it as the challenge of his lifetime. What Jim did when faced by this challenge in extremely adverse farming conditions will serve as a real inspiration to every FFA member in Kansas and the United States to be ready to take advan-

tage of opportunity which may come his way.

Much of the credit for Jim's success goes to his parents and vocational agriculture teacher, Mr. George Turnbull. It was through their sound advice and counsel that Jim has been able to take the giant steps to establishment in farming. Jims' wife, Charlene, has also been a major factor in his success. Not only has Charlene offered moral support and encouragement but has many times been seen in the feed lots or fields helping wherever necessary.

Attack on HUAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a fine and objective editorial "Attack on HUAC" appearing in the January 12, 1959 issue of the Daily News of New York City:

ATTACK ON HUAC

We congratulate today the House Un-American Activities Committee, hereinafter designated as HUAC, and its current chairman, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER (Democrat, of Pensylvania).

Our reason for congratulating HUAC is that it is now under ferocious attack from all the Communists in the country and a raft of pinks, liberals and habitual joiners of Red front organizations.

For example, a big advertisement was printed in a Washington newspaper last week, petitioning Congress to eliminate the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a Standing Committee.

The blast was signed by, among others, Stringfellow Barr, Eugene Carson Blake, John A. Mackay, Alexander Meiklejohn, A. J. Muste, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, and Aubrey Williams.

It accused HUAC of many things—ruining individual reputations or even lives, perverting Congress' powers of investigation, discouraging U.S. students and scholars from "studying in countries which we Americans desperately need to understand," and so on.

This advertisement was and is part of the abovementioned mass Red, pink and liberal drive to persuade the heavily Democratic 86th Congress to sack HUAC.

ENEMY OF ENEMIES OF THE REPUBLIC

The truth is that HUAC, ever since it was set up in 1945, has been a powerful and effective enemy of the Kremlin's fifth column in the United States.

HUAC took up where the old special House antisubversive committee headed by Representative Martin Dies (Democrat, of Texas) left off. Dies and his colleagues dug many a Communist and Fascist out from under the rocks and started him toward jail or oblivion—Fritz Kuhn, William Detherage, William Dudley Pelley, and Earl Browder, to mention only a few.

HUAC's most distinguished single achievement to date, we'd say, was its relentless digging into the Alger Hiss case, with RICHARD M. NIXON (now Vice President) doing most of the pick-and-shovel work. For that, U.S. leftists have never forgiven Mr. NIXON.

Under Representative WALTER's chairmanship, HUAC has continued the fight against subversives and traitors of all kinds. In doing so, it has had to steel itself against smears, character assassination and all the other dirty tactics and strategies habitually used by leftists everywhere.

Its latest work in the service of the Republic is a booklet entitled "Patterns of Communists Espionage," in which HUAC (naming names and summarizing cases) shows how widely and dangerously the United States is still infested with Soviet agents.

To repeat, congratulations to HUAC on this newest attack. The nature of its enemies is a tribute to its courage and effectiveness—and a tipoff to Congress to let HUAC go right on operating, with ample funds.

Defense of the Small Tobacco Farmer of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to the excellent presentation made by my colleague, KENNETH HECHLER, of West Virginia, before the Tobacco Division of the Agriculture Department on the controversial question of acreage allotments to burley tobacco growers of his State.

Mr. HECHLER's remarks, which appear under the caption "Defense of the Small Tobacco Farmer of West Virginia," are pertinent because they attribute the plight of the tobacco industry in the State as one of the contributing causes to West Virginia's overall sad economic situation.

Congressman HECHLER's remarks follow:

I represent the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia, along the Ohio River. In this district live virtually all of the more than 4,000 tobacco farmers in our State. It is on their behalf that I am appearing before you today.

None of these West Virginia tobacco farmers own large, prosperous farms. Their farms aren't mechanized to any great extent. None of them surveys vast tracts of land from the shade of a veranda, with a mint julep in his hand.

Instead, these are, in the main, poor people. The smallness of their farms is matched only by the smallness of the tobacco quotas assigned to them. In fact, each farmer in my district grows an average of less than six-tenths of an acre each year under the present quota system.

With an average yield of 1,600 pounds an acre, at 60 cents a pound, this means that the average farmer in my district receives only about $576 a year from the growth and sale of tobacco.

This, I am sure, sounds trivial to you. You may be asking yourselves, "Why should we concern ourselves with a small group of farmers who produce only a small amount of tobacco?"

May I answer by pointing out that for a majority of these 4,000 farmers, tobacco is the only major cash-producing crop. For many of them, it is the one crop that brings any dollar income into their homes. For a large number of these people, it is the only way they have of making cash for themselves as they eke out a rustic, precarious living in the mountains of our State.

Considering these farm families, it is possible that the actions you agree upon here will determine directly whether or not upwards of 20,000 West Virginia citizens will have their pitifully low income slashed even further.

May I offer a corollary to this problem: Other sections of our Nation have recovered from the recent recession. West Virginia has not.

In the past 18 months, 45,856 persons have exhausted the unemployment benefits they merited under West Virginia's regular job-security program.

More than 300,000 persons in the State of West Virginia are subsisting on Federal surplus commodities. This constitutes more than 15 percent of the people in the State—the highest percentage of any State in the Union.

What this all means is that if these small tobacco farmers are not permitted to continue to make a small amount of cash income from their burley crop, they have no place to go to find new sources of cash income. I sincerely trust that no action will be taken by the Department of Agriculture that would add more of these hard-working people to the relief rolls. If they are driven to the cities in search of jobs, this will make the urban unemployment problem much more acute.

The economic fate of the tobacco farmer is so closely bound to the actions you take here, I am certain you will do nothing to damage his already hazardous position.

The West Virginia tobacco farmer has stood by passively and cooperatively while acreage controls have been drastically reduced. The number of acres harvested in our State has dropped from a high of about 19,000 acres in 1910 to 2,300 acres in 1958. This is the lowest figure since records of tobacco acreage were begun in 1866.

Even more recently, we can see how the production of burley in West Virginia has declined. In 1954 the poundage marketed at our warehouses in Huntington totaled 7,930,874 pounds. By 1957 this figure had dropped to 5,633,013.

Now this all has come about because of quota cutbacks. I have been informed by Charles E. Campbell, tobacco specialist with the West Virginia State department of agriculture, that West Virginia tobacco farmers have notably good records of support for the control program.

This means that although the Government was cutting back acreage in the only money crop many of these farmers grew, they still were willing, in a spirit of cooperation and good will, to accept these controls and, indeed, roll up an enviable record of compliance with the Government's orders.

Now it would be a gross distortion of the truth to say that these small West Virginia farmers are happy with these small quotas. I don't think we can expect them to be happy with quotas that limit their cash income to an average of less than $600 a year.

But I can say that these farmers are good people; they recognize and agree with the theory behind crop controls and adjustments. They realize that maintaining a good price for tobacco is essential, and they want the burley export market to remain strong.

If it is in the best national interest to keep quotas at their present levels, I am sure the West Virginia tobacco farmers will accept them. But any effort to cut quotas below their perilously low level will cause havoc and additional economic misery in the State.

This is the general viewpoint of tobacco farmers in my district regarding the present system of figuring acreage allotments.

Now may I pass to another phase of the problem.

I would like to comment for a few moments on a series of recommendations made to the Secretary of Agriculture by a group of representatives of growers, auction warehousemen and leaf exporters of burley tobacco. These recommendations were handed to Secretary Benson on November 17, 1958.

Recommendations concerning a return to the old parity formula—that is, parity as calculated prior to the Agriculture Act of 1948—receive our understanding. Also, we might add that we support these tobacco men in advocating acreage allotments for 1959 the same as those for 1958—since there seems little prospect for any increase in quotas.

I believe this is a sound proposal, because the facts indicate that the surplus of burley tobacco is declining. I would like to point out that the production of burley tobacco has been below the level at which total stocks have been depleted for four consecutive years.

It is a third proposal put forward by these tobacco experts which disturbs me, and places me sharply at odds with the men who drafted these recommendations.

That would be the proposal which states "that the Department assign a task force to work with leaders representing various segments of tobacco production and trade, including college of agriculture personnel, in studying, developing, and preparing in legislative form an acreage-poundage control program for tobacco."

This recommendation, which would take tobacco off an acreage system and put it under a pounds-per-acre system, is a very serious mistake, in my opinion. It might prove harmful to the large tobacco farmer under certain circumstances. It would surely prove disastrous to the small farmer, such as we have in West Virginia.

And why is this so?

For one thing, the regulation of pounds per acre is a difficult business at best. It is well known that annual rainfall—or lack of it—has a powerful influence on the weight and quality of tobacco yielded by any given field.

For a more important reason, however, I must assert again that this bill would hurt the small farmer.

The small farmer has a small tract of land to nurture and coddle. Because he is so severely limited by acreage, he devotes tender care to his tobacco plot, and often is rewarded with a heavy yield. The big tobacco farmer, who uses mass-production methods, consequently is willing to forego the higher yield in order to cut production and labor costs.

I am told that acreage limitations of something in the neighborhood of 1,600 to 1,800 pounds may be advised for the 1960 crop year. This would work a serious hardship on many West Virginia farmers, who by diligent work and unstinting effort obtain a yield of 2,300 to 2,500 pounds per acre on some of their pitifully meager tracts. Sometimes their output rises into the vicinity of 2,800 to 3,000 pounds.

Surely we are not going to reward these small farmers who obtain superior production by dint of long hours and unceasing care by altering the formula for calculating the amount they may produce, so that it will wipe out the fruits of their efforts.

It also can be argued that the small farmer deserves a better break than this because he must spend a longer time cultivating his crop, regardless of the methods and yield. It is estimated that in our West Virginia mountains, a minimum of 500 man-hours must be spent in cultivation of 1 acre. In Kentucky's bluegrass area, this figure drops to a comparatively low 300 hours. Thus, the extra hours put in by the hill-country farmer will go unrewarded if we make such an alteration in the quota-figuring formula.

The pound-acre formula is specifically designed to help the large, big-quota, mass-production farmer. The Secretary of Agriculture has argued that he wants to return agriculture to the free enterprise system. But can this be free enterprise, when a system is devised that takes money from the pockets of the man who is willing to spend long hours and devote tender care to his crop, and favors the man who operates on impersonal, businesslike lines?

You must agree that this is not free enterprise, as we understand it, in any sense. It is instead, I fear, a callous and heartless policy which builds a monument to massive, factory-type, mass-production farms upon the graves of small, marginal farms. This may seem to be efficiency, but it is a false efficiency if it is achieved by driving our small farmers into bankruptcy and starvation.

But, as I said, this program was evolved by tobacco men, not Federal officials.

However, it is significant that West Virginia's tobacco farmers were not even invited to the meeting at which these policies were adopted and endorsed.

I protest against the unfeeling and cruel attitude toward the little farmer, and I strongly urge that action be taken to protect this little man in the tobacco business, who apparently is being thrown to the wolves by his big brothers.

The West Virginia tobacco farmer is, in his way, as efficient as the big men in the field. Although West Virginia rates a rather low 18th in production, it rates 13th in yield per acre. And when we consider that tobacco is the State's fifth most important crop, the effect on the already troubled West Virginia economy can be appreciated.

So stringently do West Virginia burley farmers oppose this new formula that the State's department of agriculture has informed me that "this program, if adopted, could put the State out of the tobacco business."

I do not dispute the right of the big tobacco interests to present their case before you here today. I do not dispute that their share of the tobacco economy is larger than ours.

I ask you only to remember that any action you take here which is detrimental to the small tobacco farmer will be disastrous to 20,000 people in my home State. Therefore, I urge that you take no steps which would strike another blow at West Virginia's economy.

I do not want the famous old tobacco slogan "LSMFT" to come to mean "let's starve mountaineer farmers of tobacco."

A Great Teacher Teaches Much More Than Books

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, Louis Seltzer's fame as a journalist is widespread. While the Cleveland area shares much of his talent with the rest of the world, we are fortunate in having something of a monopoly on the local sketches he writes for the Cleveland Press. In a recent profile of Dr. Harry A. Peters in that newspaper, Mr. Seltzer is particularly accurate in capturing the essence of the man who for 40 years has served as headmaster of the University School in Cleveland.

Dr. Peters probably would modestly try to deprecate the fact that he is an American Mr. Chips in the eyes of thousands of boys who attended the school. My good friend and very able colleague, Representative FRANK BOW, of the 16th District of Ohio, shares with me the good fortune of having studied under Dr. Peters.

When I needed a chairman for my Service Academy Advisory Board, which selects candidates for the service schools, Dr. Peters graciously added this duty to his many others. He has served in that post 4 years, bringing to it the wisdom, integrity, and insight into youth which continues to enrich the lives of University School boys, young and old.

Under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I insert in the RECORD the following article by Louis Seltzer from the January 13 Cleveland Press:

A GREAT TEACHER TEACHES MUCH MORE THAN BOOKS

Any man who makes of himself a tradition during his lifetime must be endowed with unusual qualities.

Harry A. Peters is a tradition.

Let me tell you why.

First, he was a druggist's son in Mauch Chunk, Pa. He had a passion for learning. To get $200 to enter Phillips Academy at Andover, Mass., he did odd jobs, worked in a railroad paymaster's office, ran errands, did whatever would help acquire enough for Phillips.

As a boy he was a stern self-disciplinarian. It became an integral part of his life and philosophy. He was sure the first challenge of a man, particularly an educated man, was supremacy over himself before he could exert influence over others.

At Andover he became from the beginning a standout scholar. He won prizes in Latin and Greek. He did the same thing at Yale, where he acquired the Phi Beta Kappa key. He entered Yale Law School, but then switched to accept an opportunity to teach French at University School in Cleveland.

This was in 1902. The school, located then at East 71st and Hough, was a single building. The football field was a sandlot. It was infested with sandburs. The bleachers were alongside the field and the ends were jammed with buggies—and a few horseless carriages. The school was only a dozen years old when Harry Peters joined its faculty.

Boys knew from the start he would tolerate no monkey business. They were there to learn. They were also there, Harry Peters believed, as he believed through a subsequent lifetime of teaching, to have strong characters, strong bodies, strong control, healthful, inquisitive, searching minds, and, above all, an enduring sense of integrity—plus the ability at all times to win and lose with equal grace.

In 1908, the young man who came to teach French became headmaster of University School and distinguished himself for 40 years thereafter in that job.

Now, that's the somewhat biographical nature of Harry Peters and University School. To it could be added the great multi-million-dollar grouping of buildings in Shaker Heights that went up in 1924 and have been steadily added to since.

To it, also, could be added that in his time 2,700 students went through University School, which, under Harry Peters' headmastership, became world renowned for its mind and character and body building. Of these, 2,200 were graduated. The score of some of his boys, as he unfailingly called all, is significant. Like a batch of 416 alumni. The

batch divided like this: Chairmen of boards or presidents at the time of his retirement in 1946 as headmaster, 111; high executive officers, 159; attorneys, 67; doctors, 31; teachers, 12; ministers, 4; engineers, 22; public officials, 10.

While statistics of current vintage as to the further progress of Harry Peters' boys are not available, they would represent an extension of those set down above.

And yet not even this tells the why of the Harry Peters-University School tradition—the inseparableness of them even a decade after his retirement.

Why, then?

There was the boy from a rich family. He had a swagger.

Anything he wanted he got. His family lived in fear of him. His fellow students not only feared but disliked him. He had thoroughly insulated himself against everything and everybody by an ego built not by his own accomplishment but by his parents' money.

Headmaster Peters booted him out of school. As he knew, the family instantly created a furor. Peters stood his ground. The boy was out. And he stayed out.

One day, again as Dr. Peters suspected would happen, the boy showed up in his office. He wanted to return to school. It was his life. It was more important than anything else.

"You come to school only on my terms," Headmaster Peters said. "You earn your own way. You take nothing from your parents. You don't ride. You walk. You don't require others to do for you. You do for them. You go on the second squad of all the athletic teams and you win your way back on them, yourself. You study yourself. You don't get or seek any help."

The boy did. He is the head of one of America's great corporations. He became—on his own, and without his family's help—completely different, and one of the most popular students and athletes in the school's history.

There was a meeting. There were about 100 students around a fireplace. Dr. Peters started it off. No punches pulled, he said. No questions barred.

"Only one condition—the usual one, we conduct ourselves as gentlemen," he said.

I was the speaker. For 2 hours, and this was in 1929, when the economic bottom dropped out of America, I was bombarded by questions. Dr. Peters let it go on. He offered me no help. On the contrary, he urged his students on.

"He's getting off light," he said. "Bear down on him."

They did. After the questions, Dr. Peters rose. He said:

"There are two things about this I want you to remember. One, you had a good time. You went at it hammer and tongs. You got answers. Maybe not all satisfied you. But even more important is this. Some of you in this school don't like to be asked questions. You offend easily. You think you know everything. Here's a man who came out today and exposed himself to a whole afternoon of questions, many of them embarrassingly personal and frank. He answered them all—without flinching, becoming mad or irritated. Go thou and do likewise. Meeting adjourned."

Harry Peters became a tradition for these and many other reasons—better reasons than I have set down here as character-revealing anecdotes. He is a great man. He is today a great and useful citizen of Greater Cleveland.

His mind is like a steel trap. He is as keen a student today as he was when he came out of Mauch Chunk to go to Phillips Academy. His outlook is youthful, his belief in the future great, his love of boys even keener than ever.

The silver haired, slightly bent figure, with the keen, intellectual countenance, and merry twinkle in his eyes, is a great university school tradition. He is an even greater tradition as one of Greater Cleveland's finest citizens.

L. B. S.

Inspection of Alcatraz and Terminal Island Prisons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, having drafted legislation affecting Federal prisons in the 85th Congress, members of the House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee No. 3, of which I am chairman, visited two Federal institutions during the latter part of August 1958, to study at firsthand the problems associated with the confinement of Federal offenders. Representatives WILLIAM M. TUCK, ROLAND V. LIBONATI, and I, accompanied by Mr. Cyril F. Brickfield, counsel to the committee, inspected the Federal correctional institution, Terminal Island, Calif., on August 25, 1958, and the U.S. penitentiary, Alcatraz, Calif., on August 28, 1958.

TERMINAL ISLAND

Terminal Island is headed by Warden Preston G. Smith and is the only Federal institution in which both men and women prisoners are confined. Terminal Island is a medium security institution located in the heart of Los Angeles Harbor on a small peninsula known as Reservation Point. On the day of our visit the total prison population was 845, with 688 men and 157 women. It has a staff of 163 persons, 129 of whom are assigned to the men's prison and 34 to the women's division. The ratio of prisoners to employees is quite excessive, especially when it is remembered that the employee staff must be spread out over a 24-hour day, 7 days a week.

Terminal Island receives men prisoners, with sentences of 5 years or less, and women prisoners, regardless of length of sentence, from the area west of the Rockies, Alaska, and Hawaii.

The largest offense group is made up of prisoners convicted of narcotic law violations. Other offenses represented most numerously in the population are forgery, car theft, and illegal entry into the United States. The average length of sentence for the men is about 39 months and for the women about 50 months. However, the committee noted the length of sentences varied over a wide range even in virtually identical car theft or forgery cases. Public Law 85–752, enacted in August 1958 by the 85th Congress, was drafted in subcommittee No. 3 to minimize such disparities, and the members of the subcommittee are hopeful that the prevalence of the noted disparities will dwindle as the new law becomes more commonly used by the Federal courts.

The subcommittee visited the recently overhauled admission-orientation unit where the men are housed during their first month in the institution. This is a clean, well-lighted and well-ventilated area consisting of a dormitory with a capacity of 46 beds, 8 individual cells, a combination day-lecture room and 2 small interview rooms. It was explained that the capacity of this unit would be increased shortly by the addition of double-deck beds, required because the population of this unit frequently exceeds the present 54-man capacity.

During the month that the men spend in this unit they are given a program of orientation geared to help them adjust to the routine of the months and years ahead and to encourage them to make the best possible use of their time in prison. A good many of the men begin various types of study courses while they are still in this unit.

At the end of their first month the men appear before the classification committee, composed of the warden, associate warden, classification and parole chief, educational supervisor, social worker, chief medical officer, and chaplain. This committee advises the inmate on the type of program considered best suited to his needs and assigns him to living quarters, work program and custody classification. For those who test below fifth-grade level one-half day school attendance is compulsory. All other school work is voluntary but the committee encourages attendance at evening classes on this basis. The school is staffed by two full-time staff instructors, two part-time instructors from the local school system and a number of inmate teachers. The program is accredited by the Los Angeles school system and certificates and diplomas are awarded for attainment of elementary or high-school graduation.

An active vocational training program and on-the-job training is carried on in the various shops, powerplant and culinary department. A concerted effort is made to install good work habits, to promote a high standard of personal appearance, to maintain excellent sanitation in living quarters and places of employment, and to discourage vulgar and profane speech.

The committee was pleased to note that Terminal Island has two full-time chaplains. These are young and vigorous men who appear to be keenly interested in their work. The Catholic chaplain speaks Spanish fluently and acts as interpreter for the classification committee in dealing with the considerable number of Mexican inmates who speak and understand very little English.

The medical staff is composed of two doctors, a dentist, and four male nurses for the men's division and two female nurses for the women's division. They are supplemented by part-time consultants in the various specialties form the local community, available on an as-needed basis.

The subcommittee visited the institution's library, and the hobby shop where men can spend their leisure hours working upon articles of handicraft. Television sets were observed in some of the

housing units and Warden Smith explained that these sets were rotated weekly among the several units on an incentive basis. Each group is anxious to have the benefit of television and competition for these sets is quite keen. One of the results of this system was seen in the extreme orderliness and sanitation in the living quarters. These sets, incidentally, were acquired partly through donation and partly through purchase from commissary profits. No appropriated funds were expended for this purpose.

The work program at Terminal Island poses some unusual problems because of the site, the dual nature of operations and the restricted area of the reservation which precludes the farming operations normally carried on at a penal institution. To offset the lack of a farm to some extent the institution has developed with neighboring government agencies working arrangements which permit the use of labor details at those installations for grounds maintenance, shop operations, and various similar services. Approximately 50 inmates are assigned to details of this type at the Coast Guard station and immigration and naturalization offices just across the street from the institution and at Fort MacArthur in San Pedro.

On industrial activity, furniture refinishing, is now operated at the prison and employs 40 to 45 prisoners. Construction of a new building to accommodate additional industrial activities is underway. It is planned to use this new space for metals industry fabricating steel shelving, lockers, and various small metals products. With institutional maintenance requirements, the services performed for other agencies, and the expanding industrial program, sufficient employment to keep approximately 700 men usefully occupied will eventually be furnished.

Keeping the women inmates usefully employed is more of a problem and an industrial activity for them is being developed. Meanwhile job training is being afforded by such activities as cooking and baking, sewing, landscape gardening, cosmetology, and various other lines.

Terminal Island uses the standard ration allowance common to the entire prison service. Its food costs are higher than those of prisons having farms but notwithstanding this circumstance the food costs slightly less than 59 cents per inmate per day, including raw food, minor equipment, repairs, and the supplies involved in meal preparation and serving.

When the institution was returned to the Bureau of Prisons in 1955—it was used by the Navy from 1942 to 1950 and by the State of California from then until 1955—funds provided for its reactivation were sufficient to cover only a part of the total job required to restore the plant to minimum standards. The dining hall, kitchen, and dormitories are in need of overhauling. The hospital also requires a number of alterations and improvements, including adequate facilities for disturbed patients, modernization of the operating room, ceiling and floor treatment in the wards and corridors. A chapel is needed to replace the present makeshift space that is being used for religious services.

The women's unit is housed in a temporary type of barracks buildings which were constructed by the Navy during World War II. These buildings offer no security and constitute a fire hazard. Replacing the women's unit with buildings of fireproof construction, designed and equipped for their intended purpose, is perhaps the most urgent need at Terminal Island at this time.

CONCLUSION

On the whole, the Terminal Island institution seemed to be operated efficiently. Morale among both staff and inmates appeared to be at a high level. Sanitation and orderliness were especially noteworthy throughout the instution and the personal appearance of employees and inmates was excellent. It was the feeling of the members of the subcommittee that the Terminal Island staff is doing a good job in attempting to rehabilitate the men and women prisoners committed to their custody and that Federal funds are being expended economically and judiciously at this institution.

The problem of disparity of sentences will, it is clear, remain an important concern of our subcommittee. The new law, we hope, will reduce the prevalence of such disparities.

THE BAR ASSOCIATION

The members of the subcommittee also had an opportunity to attend several sessions of the American Bar Association which was meeting at the same time in Los Angeles.

We attended the dinner of the section on judicial administration and some of the meetings of the criminal law section dealing with the problem of representation of indigent clients and the administration of criminal law. A very interesting paper, entitled "What Price Justice?" was delivered by the Honorable Irving R. Kaufman, of the U.S. district court of New York. A number of suggested improvements in the administration of Federal law were discussed and these doubtless will be presented later to the full committee for consideration.

ALCATRAZ

On Thursday, August 28, 1958, the members and counsel of the subcommittee, accompanied by Representative T. ASHTON THOMPSON, visited the U.S. Penitentiary, Alcatraz, Calif. This institution, of course, is much different from Terminal Island and holds some of the most hardened criminals in America.

The 290 prisoners at Alcatraz were transferred there because they were too unmanageable even for such penitentiaries as Leavenworth and Atlanta, or because they were considered to be dangerous men whose escape would represent a distinct threat to the public safety. They were convicted, typically, for committing quite serious crimes and their sentences are long, averaging well in excess of 20 years, and including about 30 life terms. Alcatraz, in the opinion of Director James V. Bennett, must be considered one of the most difficult and complex prisons in the world to administer.

The subcommittee was transported from Fort Mason to the island by the penitentiary's boat. Upon arriving at the landing the committee observed a metal detector and stepped through it to test its operations. The manner in which the inspectoscope worked was explained by the operating officer and its was obvious to the subcommittee that this type of equipment is needed for a super-security institution where both prisoners on the inside and their friends on the outside are constantly trying to devise some means of outwitting the institution's security system. This was sharply dramatized in an episode several weeks after the committee's visit when two long-term prisoners made an abortive attempt to escape from the island by overpowering their supervisory officer and swimming away with sets of makeshift waterwings.

Warden Paul J. Madigan, a veteran of over 25 years in the prison service, is in charge of operations at Alcatraz. It is run on a surprisingly economical basis, considering the fact that everything that is used and consumed, including water, must be ferried to the island. Each prisoner, for example, is fed three meals a day for the relatively small sum of 59 cents. The subcommittee learned that the Government expends an average of $10.34 a day to keep one prisoner at Alcatraz, as contrasted to $3.05 at Leavenworth and the $4.58 average for the entire Federal prison system. Yet Alcatraz is performing a valuable service for the protection of the public.

The penitentiary has a rather ancient physical plant which presents a difficult maintenance problem. The climate surrounding the island is highly damaging to physical structures, and while at other prisons, inmates can be used to make repairs, the custodial requirements of Alcatraz permit very little use of inmates outside the security of the inner compound. Consequently, practically all repairs to the physical plant must be made by civilian tradesmen.

Upon entering the cellhouse the subcommittee observed that the visiting room was being renovated. The area for the outside visitors was partitioned off solidly from that for the prisoners. Speakers were being installed which would permit two or three visitors to converse at one time with a single inmate. The subcommittee was informed that each prisoner was allowed one visit of 90 minutes duration each month. However, of the population of 290, an average of only 15 inmates received visitors each month.

The subcommittee first visited the cellhouse which contains 2 inside cellblocks, each with 168 cells. The cellhouse was immaculate, and the cells themselves were sparely but comfortably equipped. The committee then went to the kitchen area where feeding arrangements were discussed and the menu for the current 10-day period was displayed. It was obvious that although the Alcatraz prisoners have few privileges and no commissary as in other Federal prisons, they were well fed. The kitchen and dining room looked exceptionally neat and clean.

At the prison hospital the committee talked to the chief medical officer and his medical technician. The subcommittee was informed that on the average about three prisoners a day were in hospital status, which would indicate that the health of the Alcatraz population was safeguarded well. The subcommittee inspected the operating room, the outpatient clinic, and the wards which were equipped with beds recently acquired from surplus property lists. Like the rest of the penitentiary, the hospital was neat and orderly. While Alcatraz does not have a full-time dentist, a local dentist visits Alcatraz one day each week, and, according to the warden, this time has been sufficient to provide adequate dental care for the men.

The subcommittee visited the treatment unit, where men who are in punitive status or who must be segregated from the rest of the population for various reasons are housed. At the time of the subcommittee's visit, 20 prisoners were in segregation status and 1 in punishment status.

Returning from the disciplinary unit, the subcommittee stopped at the library and examined the bookshelves. The warden pointed out that Alcatraz had recently received a number of surplus books from the Navy and now had about 14,000 volumes. He explained that the average Alcatraz prisoner read about 85 books a year. The books, selected from a published list, are delivered to the cells. After the working day is over, the prisoner can also listen to the radio, if he wishes, by means of the earphones installed in each cell. The radio is turned on at 6 p.m. each night and turned off at 9:30.

Following lunch, the committee went to the industrial area and entered the laundry. This unit performs work for local government agencies; and while 40 inmates were assigned at the time of the subcommittee's visit, the laundry was being disbanded because local government agencies do not furnish enough work to keep 60 or 70 men busy.

Visiting the clothing factory next, the subcommittee observed 36 inmates working on an order from the U.S. Army for cooks' and bakers' white trousers. The members circulated through the cutting room and through the main shop, stopping occasionally to talk to the prisoners. Warden Madigan advised me that this was the most efficient industrial activity at Alcatraz and that there was little difficulty in securing enough work to keep the factory busy. The morale of the inmate workers seemed high, considering the circumstances, and few of them stopped work long enough even to inspect their visitors.

In the glove factory the members observed operations in the leather cutting department and the sewing shop, where 35 men were making leather gloves for the Army Quartermaster. According to Warden Madigan, the shop had enough orders on hand to keep the activity busy for several months.

In the furniture refinishing shop, 20 prisoners were renovating desks and chairs for Travis Air Force Base, one of several air bases in the area served by the unit. The quality of the work turned out by the prisoners was very high, with the finished product not readily detectable from a newly manufactured article. The issue of tools was carefully controlled by means of a carefully designed tool board, with the absence of a tool evident at a glance.

In the brush shop, the last industrial activity visited by the subcommittee, 22 men were making 14-inch brushes for the Navy. The brushes were turned out with rapidity, and it was obvious that the inmate workers had acquired high skill.

After leaving the work area, the subcommittee inspected the powerplant. Warden Madigan explained that the electricity supply was a source of difficulty, inasmuch as it generated chiefly d.c. current. For example, it was troublesome to operate the prison's metal detectors with only a small amount of a.c. current. The powerplant itself was operated by a chief engineer and five assistants, who rotate on shifts around the clock.

The committee was interested in noting that many of the staff lived on the island with their families and were dependent upon the institution's boats to get to San Francisco for shopping, attending school, and securing other community services. Normally a boat makes round trips every hour or two between 6 a.m. and 12 midnight. However, it is apparent that the life of the island's civilian residents is rather restricted, and the dedication of these public servants must be admired.

CONCLUSION

Although it might be considered regrettable that the United States has need for a supersecurity prison such as Alcatraz, the prisoners confined there are being accorded treatment which is as humane and reasonable as the circumstances permit. The primary function of Alcatraz is to protect the public, and this task is being performed well, under rather trying and difficult circumstances, in the opinion of the members of the subcommittee who visited the insitution.

The Military Significance of Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an informative address, "The Military Significance of Space," made by Rear Adm. John E. Clark, U.S. Navy, Deputy Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency, before the Shrine Luncheon Club of Cleveland, Ohio, on February 7, 1958:

THE MILITARY SIGNIFICANCE OF SPACE

The role of technology in the conduct of military operations has risen fantastically in relatively few years. The fighting power of the Armed Forces, as never in the past, now depends on the attainments of technology, on the potentiality for the mass production of new kinds of weapons, and on the level of the technological preparation and the education of the many millioned masses of the population.

Recognizing this fact, as well as an expression of our national desire to get on with the broad research and development necessary for scientific progress, two new agencies have been created within our Executive Government. A new National Aeronautics and Space Administration is now getting organized to pursue those of our national and international space programs which are purely scientific in character. Thus, the United States seeks to keep scientific progress within the framework of the peaceful intentions that are inherent to a working democracy.

On the other hand, the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) was established in February of this year to plan and direct advanced research projects vital to our national security.

I am not sure what you have heard about ARPA and its way of doing business, but it is a fact that we are a different kind of organization insofar as the Department of Defense is concerned.

I should like, therefore, to review for you briefly how ARPA works—its functions, its objectives, its method of operation, and its relationship with other Government agencies.

There has grown up, in the very brief period of ARPA's existence, an impression that we are a space agency. This is understandable since the specific assignments made to ARPA include the entire field of space technology, ballistic missiles defense, and related research in chemistry of propellants. Nonetheless, the directive under which we operate does not limit us to these assignments, and the Secretary of Defense does not intend that our task be as simply stated as this. ARPA is now seeking to develop this broader area of our undefined but understood responsibility.

Ordinarily projects assigned to ARPA will fall into one or more of three categories: (1) Those which, by virtue of their advanced nature, cannot be identified within the stated military mission of an individual military department; (2) those for which a military mission can be identified as being of interest to more than one of the military departments; and (3) those which, for various reasons, must be pursued by an agency not subordinate to one or more of the military departments.

Military research and development has, we believe, been hampered in the past by the requirement that funds be allocated to research only when the product could be immediately identified with a weapons system. ARPA does not have this limitation.

This means that for the first time the Defense Department is prepared to sponsor pure research against the judgment that it might lead to a valid military application without proving the judgment in advance. The pace of scientific progress is undoubtedly one of the distinguishing features of this century. As it applies to the military, the President has clearly stated the fact that the days of wholly independent ground, naval, and air forces are gone. There can be no doubt but that many present development projects and many of those to come will have application to more than one of the military departments. This is certainly true of ballistic missile defense, as an example.

Research in such areas must take the fullest advantage of all our U.S. capabilities. It cannot be limited to a portion of our laboratory skill that happens to be employed by a single service or a single company. Since we cannot, and should not, deprive ourselves of the traditional value of military decentralization, we must achieve effective management at a higher level if we are to

take advantage of all the skills and resources available.

Essentially, this boils down to a matter of personal integrity on the part of each officer and each civilian official of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. Intense service viewpoints, the outward products of which are inordinate degrees of service rivalry, competition, and duplication, must yield to thinking that is total defense in scope. We cannot—we absolutely must not—permit excessive Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps partisanships to diffuse the defense effort and dissipate resources.

We have many programs underway. I am going to show you a number of view graphs now that illustrate as an artist's conception the sort of things that might be done to enhance basic military operations and scientific exploration by means of satellites.

Often research which at first glance seems to be of no anticipated special significance militarily, works out in practice to accomplish a revolution in technology and exercises a revolutionary influence on weapons systems. As an example, one might refer to the research in semiconductors like the germanium crystals. Research has shown that the semiconductors can replace many types of electronic tubes in complex radio technical and electronic instruments. This permits the making of both very compact and reliable radio devices. From this arise great possibilities in the manufacture of guided and automatic weapons and other important types of modern military equipment.

Even such sciences as celestial mechanics and astrophysics have now acquired decisive significance for military affairs. Celestial mechanics until recent times has been interested in calculating the motion of celestial bodies. Now this science is employed to calculate the flight of long-range rockets and artificial earth satellites. Astrophysics is concerned in part with the study of the physical characteristics of cosmic space. Information about these characteristics is now used in order to forecast the environment within which artificial satellites and rockets must work. It is necessary to know how cosmic rays would act upon their delicate mechanisms, what the temperature of the rockets would be when heated by the sun, and what would happen in the event of their collision with a meteorite. The research of astrophysicists regarding the condition of the matter within the sun and the stars at temperatures of millions of degrees and pressures in billions of atmospheres has great significance for the correct understanding of the essence of the atomic explosion.

Guided and self-homing missiles are swiftly replacing guns and some types of aircraft. They have special components making possible the change of direction of the flight of the missile in flight. This is achieved in various ways. One can place instruments in the missile which sense the target and guide the missile to it, or have the missile ride a radar beam, or by following the target path one may direct the missile to it by radio command.

These things are done on the basis of a new sphere of science called cybernetics, the theory of the guidance of machines and mechanisms with the assistance of automatic devices. This science obviously has great significance for the automatization and mechanization of commercial production.

Everything that I have said up to this point leads to but one conclusion—war is no longer an art but a science. Technology and science in warfare have advanced so fast and far, and are advancing faster and farther, so that in any kind of war, be it limited—which is far more likely—or all-out nuclear, that side with the highest order of technology and science on its side will prevail.

In past wars there has been time after the war started to initiate and carry out massive, expensive crash programs in technological fields. In the last great war such things as radar, influence fuses for antiaircraft guns, and atomic bombs were developed during the course of the war. If we aren't ready to use advanced technology and have in hand superior weapons if any war starts in the future, we may not survive the first operation.

With continuing hope in the essential good in man, the United States has lived in a glass house during the International Geophysical Year. Recognizing that penetration of the secrets unfolding before us requires the efforts of philosophers and scientists the world over, the United States has sought a truly international effort.

And what has this meant to the U.S.S.R., the other national participant in earth satellite launchings? It has meant great benefit to itself with little return to others in kind. We should ask ourselves why, and we should keep putting this question to ourselves until we make the honest answer. Why are we told little or nothing about Soviet launchings, launching equipment, experimental results, and the like? Why do the Soviet leaders and scientists play coy and superior in an international effort purportedly devoted to all mankind?

We don't like the real answer because it means a long pull effort during which consumer sacrifices will be made. It means a devotion to research which will grant progress at the expense of present-day luxuries. It means intense work, resolution, and character, expended perhaps over our entire lifetimes, and a few generations beyond us. Nevertheless, the answer has not changed since the Communist Manifesto, it has not changed since Stalin, it will not change after Mao and Khrushchev.

Communism has short-term tactics; it does not have short-term strategy. Its strategy is domination of all there is to dominate, whether in earth or in space. Until communism as a way of life has faded from control over key areas on this earth, the United States and the free world must go forward by giant steps, on the long legs of advanced research.

There has been great concern throughout the free world that space will not be used strictly for peaceful purposes. There has been no such concern evident in the Communist camp. Again, why? And again, let's face up to the answer. The Communist leaders know beyond a shadow of a doubt that the free world longs with all of its collective heart to keep free space free. They rely on this longing, they abet it with hollow pronouncements, while pursuing secure programs under strict military discipline. Their few scientists who are not also generals receive laurels and medals, speak eloquently, but apparently are isolated from the actual space programs of the U.S.S.R. and the absolute military applications securely tied thereto.

Is there anyone here who doubts the grave military and political implications of a Soviet man circling the earth in a space vehicle beyond our power to counter? Does anyone doubt the military profit inherent in a manned lunar base? I can assure you, there is no doubt in Moscow.

I am certain you recognize that the effort to maintain technological leadership adds up to hundreds of millions of dollars annually and therefore demands not only the understanding of research-oriented individuals but also of the entire American people. Dollar signs cannot be placed on freedom. They cannot be placed upon a progress that leads to the basic truths of our existence.

We must have the courage to look to the future and to invest in it through research. We must further have the courage and confidence in our way of life not to scare easily; but to pursue our scientific and military programs on earth and in space with the dynamic quality of a nation seeking to express its integrity and the strength of its form of government.

Unless we as a nation can achieve this kind of deep conviction and resolution, we are surely lost. Until we are ready to make sacrifices, we cannot turn the tide unmistakably in our favor. In the situation we find ourselves today, the armed services must be ready for maximum effort at any minute. There would be no time to get ready after it starts this time. And we must be ready for any kind of war, and ready for it in any of several localities, including here at home.

Current budgets are marginal for this kind of readiness and I ask you, Where do we get the money to support the terrifically expensive competitive effort in space exploration, space travel, and space research for defense? As surely as we weaken our defense structure in some category or categories to fund a space effort, we may be sure that when trouble starts, it will make a concentrated appearance in an area previously covered by those categories.

And yet support it we must. The era of space travel is here. I expect to witness unmanned space flights to the moon and manned round trip flights into orbit in my lifetime. Truly the sky is the limit, and every paper in the country is full of questions. Also, they are full of suggestions and demands. Every conceivable idea has been advanced, and some violently championed, except one. I have yet to see one single suggestion as to how to pay for it. I have yet to hear one single person suggest that this is equivalent to wartime emergency and therefore should be supported by increased taxes. The nation that controls space may well control the world, and we will never achieve it if our first objective is an automobile for each member of the family.

Changing the Level of Imposing the Federal Tax on Gasoline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, because I feel that all segments of small business in this country should be entitled to compete equitably with larger concerns, I have introduced H.R. 1343, which is designed to give the independent oil jobber and wholesaler the same break as the major oil company has with reference to the payment of the Federal tax on gasoline.

Under existing law the 3-cent Federal tax on gasoline is imposed at the time of sale by the producer. The producer is the refiner and, from the standpoint of volume, this really means the major oil companies. The word "producer," as defined by section 4082 of the Internal Revenue Code, includes "blenders" and "importers"; however, the volume of gasoline handled by these last two categories is relatively insignificant.

When the existing language of the code—as implemented by regulations—is translated into actual operation what it means is that the refiner or major oil company does not pay the Federal gasoline tax until up to 45 days after the time of sale, whether that sale be direct to a consumer, to a service station, or to

a reseller, such as a jobber or wholesale distributor. It also means that the wholesale distributor who pays this tax at the time of purchase must not only permanently encumber approximately 20 percent of his inventory capital but, in addition, he must suffer tax losses due to evaporation and unavoidable spillage between the time of purchase and the time of delivery into the tank of the person to whom he sells. Neither of these burdens is imposed on the major oil company with whom this small, independent jobber must compete. It is estimated that the jobber's losses due to evaporation and unavoidable spillage amount to approximately 2 percent of the total volume of gasoline handled. A majority of the States imposing gasoline taxes recognize this inequity and allow the jobber varying percentages to compensate for these losses and some of them allow additional percentages for the handling of this tax burden, collection of the tax and the maintenance of the necessary records required by the collector. The Federal Government, however, has refused to either recognize or remedy this inequity.

My bill would change the definitions in the code in such a way that the independent jobber or wholesale distributor will be placed on the same basis as his major oil company competitor insofar as payment of the Federal gasoline tax is concerned. In my bill the jobber will pay the tax at the time he sells the gasoline rather than at the time of purchase. This will not only release badly needed capital which this category of small businessmen can use to improve their competitive position but, in addition, will relieve them from paying taxes on a product which has evaporated before the time of sale. This method of collection will not add any appreciable number of taxpayers to the rolls nor will it cause any loss of revenues to which the Government is equitably entitled. The bill, in brief, will at little or no cost to the Federal Government remove an existing inequity between a group of deserving small businessmen and the major integrated oil companies. I can conceive of no cheaper way to help some small businessmen than the passage of this legislation which I have introduced.

Colorful "Doc" Miller to Sea Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, among the distinguished Members of Congress who were not returned to office in November was Representative A. L. Miller, of Nebraska. "Doc" Miller served the people of Nebraska's Fourth District for 16 years and served as chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the 83d Congress. The House certainly loses one of its most respected and earnest Members in A. L. Miller. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a newspaper article on "Doc" Miller, written by John Jarrell, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Omaha World-Herald:

COLORFUL "DOC" MILLER TO SEA AGAIN

(By John Jarrell)

Representative A. L. Miller, who perhaps didn't leave enough thumbprints on enough doorknobs, left Congress in January; and Congress loses another of its more colorful Members.

"Doc" Miller wasn't a flamboyant orator, and he wasn't particularly striking in appearance, but nevertheless he had that something called color.

Most people in Washington figured Dr. Miller would continue to represent the Fourth Nebraska District as long as he lived. It didn't turn out that way. He was defeated November 4.

It was after his victory in 1956 that a national magazine asked him to outline the basis of his success at the polls, which had brought him eight straight terms in the House.

"Hard work with a smile," he replied. "Leave thumbprints on as many hands and doorknobs as possible. * * * No substitute for personal contact, telephone, friendly letter, or wave of hand."

"SCOOTED" TO CAPITOL

Dr. Miller has been a familiar figure in the subway between his office and the Capitol—breezing along on his motor scooter.

Several years ago, the several-times-daily walk between office and House Chamber became too much for the legless Nebraskan, who lost both lower legs in a hunting accident years ago, and has artificial limbs.

So he bought a scooter. Now and then an intrepid passenger would ride with him, hair flying and frightened expression on face. Not Dr. Miller, though. He thoroughly enjoyed it.

If Dr. Miller takes a long sea trip soon, as he has indicated he will, it will be history repeating itself.

When he first announced for Congress, Dr. Miller mailed receipted bills to all his patients—some $40,000 worth—then proceeded to get himself elected. Right away, and before he took office, he went around the world in a slow ship.

Dr. Miller wasn't averse to controversy. He and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association didn't see eye to eye, and Dr. Miller lashed out at it with characteristic vigor.

He feuded for several years with Representative MIKE KIRWAN, Democrat, of Ohio, because the Ohioan claimed he only voted for public power projects in Nebraska, never in other States.

QUITE A SOOTHSAYER

He was a strong supporter of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and both in 1944 and 1948, General MacArthur was his candidate for President. He corresponded at length with the general in Japan on the subject.

Every year, Dr. Miller offered his prediction of things to come. He didn't confine it to legislation—he was worldly in scope. He had a pretty good batting average, but it was by no means perfect.

Once he raised a furor when he said American battleships in foreign waters were carrying atomic bombs. Some top braid at the Pentagon blew up over that one.

Dr. Miller got along well with reporters generally, but when he differed with the press, he did not keep it a secret. Usually, he wrote a letter to the editor about it.

He displayed a lot of personal courage that people generally did not know about. There have been times when the stumps of his legs pained him greatly, from their constant rubbing against his artificial limbs. No one ever heard him complain about it.

COLUMNIST ERRED

He got one of the biggest laughs a few years ago over an item carried in the column of a widely quoted syndicated columnist.

It was at a time that the Republicans controlled Congress. Dr. Miller was chairman of the House Interior Committee. His fellow Nebraskan, the late Senator Hugh Butler, was chairman of the Senate Interior Committee.

The columnist wrote that the two chairmen from the same State were engaged in a bitter feud, so savage that they refused to speak to one another.

The day it appeared, Dr. Miller and Senator Butler were together on a hunting trip. Three days earlier Senator Butler had Christmas dinner with Dr. and Mrs. Miller. And for years the two men had got together about three times weekly to play pitch.

When he read the item, Dr. Miller exploded with laughter, called up Senator Butler and the two of them chortled together.

FOUGHT MARTIN, BENSON

He wasn't afraid to rush in where angels feared to tread. A case in point related to the almost-sacrosanct Republican House leadership of Representative JOE MARTIN of Massachusetts.

Dr. Miller decided Mr. MARTIN wasn't a good leader, so he announced it openly, rather than work in the background. He found Mr. MARTIN too solidly entrenched, however, and had no success in finding a successor—though he won some converts.

It was Dr. Miller, too, who was in the vanguard of House Members who felt the farm policies of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson would cost the Republicans House seats in the 1958 election. So he went to the President and told him that 25 to 30 GOP Members would lose if Mr. Benson remained in the Cabinet.

Whether or not Ezra Benson was responsible, as it turned out, Dr. Miller was too conservative and more than 40 GOP House Members lost their seats. Including Doc Miller.

Why Not Use Food Surplus for Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, there could be no better use of the farm surplus than to use this vast surplus in aiding our foreign allies.

I have advocated the use of surplus food for this purpose for many years, and I am glad to find my opinion on this subject agreed with by the editor of the Radio Post, of Fredericksburg, Tex., Mr. Norman J. Dietel. Mr. Dietel has written an editorial in which he quotes Senator MIKE MANSFIELD on this subject who has for many years been an advocate of a sound foreign-aid program.

In his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower stated:

Outlays of the Department of Agriculture for the current fiscal year for the support of farm prices on a very few farm products, will exceed $5 billion. That is a sum equal to approximately two-fifths of the net income of all farm operators in the entire United States.

By the end of this fiscal year it is estimated that there will be in Government hands surplus farm products worth about $9 billion. And by July 1, 1959, Government expenditures for storage, interest, and handling of its agricultural inventory will reach a rate of $1 billion a year.

This level of expenditure for farm products could be made willingly for a temporary period if it were leading to a sound solution of the problem. But unfortunately this is not true. We need new legislation.

In the past I have sent messages to the Congress requesting greater freedom for our farmers to manage their own farms and greater freedom for markets to reflect the wishes of producers and consumers. Legislative changes that followed were appropriate in direction but did not go far enough.

The situation calls for prompt and forthright action. Recommendation for action will be contained in a message to be transmitted to the Congress shortly.

I trust that in the President's future message to Congress he will recommend the use of our food surplus for foreign aid to replace the hard-earned dollars which we have heretofore voted for this purpose.

I am submitting herewith the editorial from the Radio Post of Fredericksburg, Tex., written by Mr. Dietel on this subject:

FOREIGN AID AND FARM SURPLUS

Finally, after many years of waiting, a U.S. Senator has come forth with the idea that our Nation "could scale down foreign aid costs by substituting food for dollars in hungry world areas."

Although the suggestion is many years late, the idea should be promptly promoted and put into effect as soon as possible. The statement above was made recently by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, who is assistant Democratic floor leader and a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He also serves as the Senate Democratic whip and becomes acting Senate Democratic leader when Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, the Democratic majority leader in the Senate, is out of town. JOHNSON is chairman of the Democratic policy and steering committees of which MANSFIELD is a member.

Some years ago this writer stated editorially, and in conversation or correspondence with others, that it might be a wise step if our Government would consider sending some of our farm surplus commodities (of which I understand there are millions of dollars worth, possibly billions, stored throughout the country) to the destitute people in the world who could really use this surplus.

Sending this food surplus, for which our taxpayers are paying, might be much better than sending cash or the equivalent thereof in other items to the foreign countries who have apparently been the thankless beneficiaries.

Our national debt is rising and yet our Government insists on more cash (which comes also from taxes) for foreign aid, and it is possible that very little if any of this cash, or goods, ever gets to the poor people, those who really need it. The rich people over there could not possibly use up all of our surplus food, but the poor people, those who would get most out of the farm surplus commodities, would certainly appreciate our gesture. They might even remember this Nation and speak some kind words on our behalf once in a while.

Foreign aid, as it might be, could be, and it should be, a good thing for our country if it were used wisely, for military purposes (for instance) and for purposes of adequate defense bases, but we've read and heard about too many instances where much of this foreign aid seems to go into a rathole, down which we drain our resources and our cash. Taxes are paid for the farm surpluses and they lay around in this country, rotting away. Then, instead of using this surplus and giving it to the needy (in which our people, our Nation, have always been stanch believers) they tax again so that cash will be forthcoming in order to supply the dukes and duchesses, the kings and queens, the rich and elite, those in position of power and authority, so that we might appease them and that they can go on living on a high plane, or, as is customarily and more frequently referred to, as a "high standard of living." Many people, everywhere, could no doubt go on a higher plane of social living if Uncle Sam will provide the means. A lot of people in this country might also want their standard of living raised a little. If our country really wants to check communism it could, perhaps, do much better if our surplus commodities were given to the needy instead of sending cash or other supplies to those who think we owe them a living and never really appreciate it anyway. I'm of the opinion that no one denies other more fortunate people all the wealth they possess and all the additional riches they might gather for themselves or their family in their span of life while on earth—if they actually get out and work for it, such as the average hard-working American taxpayer does. But it just does not seem to make good sense if the American taxpayer has to continue bearing the brunt, in providing luxurious living for overseas or foreign aid year after year with no apparent letup.

Senator MANSFIELD has made a suggestion which may culminate in a program of real overseas relief, real foreign aid, a program designed to foster good will and promote peace and understanding. Giving cash to those in the upper brackets and forgetting the poor, the great bulk of the masses, hasn't accomplished for this Nation the job that foreign aid was intended. Giving food and clothing could do a better job. It's worth trying, the sooner the better. Especially in view of the fact that we have a considerable farm surplus on hand, not too much cash surplus, and also in view of the fact that our national debt is not decreasing from year to year. It has been increasing at an alarming rate and many Congressmen in Washington are seriously becoming disturbed.

Are We Lagging in Atomic Ships?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the recent success of Russia in launching its moon satellite emphasizes the unpleasant fact that the United States is no longer preeminent in scientific development. Our lag in satellites and missiles seems destined to extend to the use of nuclear power at sea. While we are producing the first nuclear-powered merchant vessel, we are content to default in the continuing struggle to keep abreast of other nations in the maritime field. In this connection, the following editorial from the Twin City Sentinel, Winston-Salem, N.C., point up our present unhappy state:

ARE WE LAGGING IN ATOMIC SHIPS?

The United States will launch the *Savannah*, the first nuclear-powered merchant ship, sometime in 1960—thus repeating its triumph with the first atomic submarine. But a ship is not a fleet and Chairman BONNER of the House Merchant Marine Committee fears that we are not moving fast or far enough.

Mr. BONNER admitted that both the Department of Commerce and the Atomic Energy Commission are working in this field. But he said that there seems to be nothing firm in the way of administration policy to put these plans into execution. Other nations, he said, are going ahead of us at a faster relative rate of development. The Soviet Union, for instance, is known to be at work on a nuclear-powered icebreaker—a craft that could alter the historic Russian desire for a warm water port.

Abortive projects for a similar ship to be developed in this country, for a nuclear-powered tanker, and for private industry to take part in atomic ship development were cited by Mr. BONNER. "None of these proposals has gotten anywhere," he wrote Commerce Secretary Lewis Strauss.

He asked Mr. Strauss to inform the House committee about present and future plans for atomic shipbuilding, and for a report on possible marine uses of nuclear energy not yet in the planning stage. His point is that having forged out front in this field, the United States ought not now to mark time while other nations catch up and go on.

Whether Mr. BONNER's fears are justified or not, his point is certainly well taken. And his emphasis on the importance of nuclear ships is apparently shared by the U.S. Navy. Merchant craft and men-of-war are not strictly comparable, of course. Still, it is worth noting that the new "Jane's Fighting Ships" reports the United States to have 150 nuclear-powered warships under construction, only 75 of them submarines. The Soviet Union, France, and Britain are also working on atomic naval vessels.

Moreover, the recent voyage of the *Nautilus* under the polar ice from Pacific to Atlantic demonstrates the vast new marine capabilities of nuclear energy. There is reason to believe the United States has done more than any other nation to develop those capabilities. As Mr. BONNER has warned, however, we cannot go to sleep on our laurels. It was the indolent rabbit who lost that famous race, not the tortoise.

Washington County (Ky.) Observance of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article of December 4, 1958, from that fine newspaper, the Springfield Sun, at Springfield, Ky. This article covers the launching of Washington County's observance of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial which will be celebrated throughout the year 1959. Inasmuch as Lincoln's parents, Thomas Lincoln and Nancy Hanks, were married in Washington County, Ky., it seems fitting that this area, which is also a part of our Lincoln country,

should have a prominent part in the observances honoring our great former President on the occasion of the sesquicentennial of his birth. The Fourth District of Kentucky is truly honored to be able to claim the distinction of giving Abraham Lincoln to the Nation.

WEDNESDAY'S CELEBRATION ONLY A PRELUDE OF PLANS FOR SESQUICENTENNIAL YEAR

(By Mrs. Bennett R. Lewis)

Down Springfield, Ky., way, folks believe in making the stones they throw do double duty. For instance, the parade that turned normally quiet Main Street into Carnival Avenue on the afternoon of November 26 not only climaxed the activities of Farm-City Week but also launched Washington County's observance of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial which will be celebrated throughout the year 1959. The theme of the parade was the life of Abraham Lincoln and the floats depicted events in the lives of the Lincolns, their neighbors and relatives in the original Lincoln country in Washington County.

In 1782, 10 years before Kentucky was admitted to the Union and when all this vast territory was still a part of Virginia; Abraham Lincoln, Sr., and his family, consisting of his wife, Bersheba, and their 5 children, came to Kentucky and settled on a 100-acre tract on the Beech Ford of Salt River. There the pioneer Abraham, grandfather of the President, built the log cabin in which he lived until he was shot by an Indian, in 1788. There his son, Thomas, grew to manhood, and there his family continued to live until the year 1802.[1]

In Lincoln Homestead Park, 6 miles north of Springfield, a replica of the Lincoln cabin has been erected on the exact spot where the original homestead stood. Nearby is the Francis Berry home, a large, two-story building, in which Nancy Hanks was reared. This home was moved from its original site 2 miles northeast of the Lincoln home and carefully reconstructed within the confines of the park.

According to Washington County historians, the wedding of Thomas Lincoln and Nancy Hanks took place in the spacious Berry home and the young couple went to housekeeping in a small log cabin belonging to Richard Berry, Jr., the same cabin which some years later was sold for $50 and is now enshrined in the Pioneer Memorial Park at Harrodsburg. The date of the marriage was June 12, 1806, and the ceremony was performed by Rev. Jesse Head, a Methodist circuit rider. At least one child was born to Thomas and Nancy before they left Washington County; an infant lies buried alongside Abraham, Sr., in the family graveyard.[2]

Abraham Lincoln knew very little about the early life of his parents and less about the history of his earlier forebears. He believed that his mother and father had always lived in Hardin County, Ky., and that they had been married there. Consequently, in 1858 when his political enemies were circulating the sordid tale that his parents had never been legally married, Lincoln wrote to the clerk of the court of Hardin County asking for a copy of the marriage record. He received a reply from the clerk stating that no record was to be found. The President went to his grave believing that he was an illegitimate.

In 1878 the marriage bond of Thomas Lincoln and the minister's return of the wedding were found in the clerk's office in Washington County. There they may be seen today, along with numerous other documents pertaining to Lincoln history.

The Washington County Sesquicentennial Committee has already formulated ambitious plans for the sesquicentennial year. The high point of the celebration will be a reenactment of the marriage of Lincoln's parents on June 12 with direct descendants of the Lincoln, Berry, and Head families in the principal roles. An old time infare will follow with folk dancing on the green, games, merrymaking, and feasting. Hundreds of invitations will be sent out to former residents of Springfield and Washington County requesting their presence at the marriage and urging them to attend the biggest and most unusual homecoming the community has ever known.

Yes, it looked like just another parade at first glance, but it's really a preview of a busy and exciting year to come, here in the original Lincoln country.

[1] Early Times in Washington County, Ky., by Orval Baylor, published 1943.

[2] From the depositions made before notaries public by relatives and neighbors of the Lincoln and Berry families.

Commissioning of the U.S.S. "Independence"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to comment on the commissioning of the U.S.S. *Independence* at the Brooklyn Navy Yard on January 10 at approximately 3 o'clock in the afternoon. Secretary of the Navy Gates and Admiral Burke participated in the ceremony. The commanding officer of the *Independence*, Capt. R. Y. McElroy, Lebanon, Ky., read his orders and accepted the commission. He relayed his command to the chief executive officer, Comdr. Warren Cooper, his fellow Kentuckian from Elizabethtown, who "set the watch" and officially put the ship in commission.

Both Captain McElroy and Commander Cooper are native Kentuckians, from the Fourth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent in Congress. In addition, Commander Cooper is from my own place of birth, Elizabethtown, while Captain McElroy hails from Lebanon, my adopted home in Marion County. I am extremely proud of both of these fine officers and feel that I have been amply repaid for the wee bit of service rendered to the then young McElroy, who was seeking an appointment to Annapolis, by going to the then Representative of the Fourth District, the late Honorable Edward Creal, and urging McElroy's appointment.

The *Independence* is the world's biggest aircraft carrier, it weighs 60,000 tons, took 3½ years to build, has a 4-acre flight deck space and cost $190 million. It is big enough to hold the liners *America* and *United States*, with room to spare on its deck.

It is a proud and glorious day for the United States, for the Navy, and for old Kentucky in that two of her distinguished sons both battle-scarred in defense of their country and recipients of many service medals, have been selected to command the ship. I would like to congratulate them and all members of their staff and crew most heartily and extend my warmest best wishes for their success. May the good Lord bless and protect them—and preserve for us all—peace and happiness "forever and a day."

I would like, also, to congratulate the parents of these outstanding naval officers. They have long been my good and close personal and political friends. Commander Cooper's father is the able and prominent attorney of Elizabethtown, Mr. Damon Cooper. Captain McElroy is the son of Mr. R. Y. McElroy, Sr., a leader in the community and a retired insurance executive at Lebanon.

I would like to include this splendid editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal, under date of January 10, 1959:

OUR STATE'S PRIDE WILL RIDE WITH THE "BIG I"

Kentucky ties with the Navy will be strengthened next week when fellow Kentuckians meet in Lexington to welcome home Navy Capt. R. Y. McElroy. A native of Lebanon, Captain McElroy has just been named commanding officer of the spanking-new *USS Independence*, latest of the Navy's giant aircraft carriers and the largest and most powerful fighting ship afloat in the world today.

The occasion comes at a good time, for Kentucky's ties with the fleet have been sagging of late. Time and technological advances caught up with the battleship-hull that was to have carried our State's banner into the age of nuclear ships. Cutters' torches have long since reduced her to scrap. And today for the first time in more than half a century, no capital ship carries the name of the Bluegrass State on her prow.

But if there is no *Kentucky* to sail with the fleet, the *Independence* will have a strong Kentucky flavor. For not only is her first skipper a native of Marion County, her executive officer and second in command will be a Hardin County boy, Comdr. Damon W. Cooper, of Elizabethtown. What better reason could we ask for adopting the "Big I" as our own?

And if we have no namesake of our own, the *Independence* is an adopted son of which every Kentuckian may be proud. It is not just the largest ship in the world (stood on its bow, its stern would reach the 80th floor of the Empire State Building; afloat, its island will tower 25 floors above the keel; the flight deck is as big as two and a half football fields and could accommodate our two largest ocean liners with room to spare). It is also the most powerful. Its steam catapults can launch a plane every 30 seconds. Its 100 supersonic aircraft pack more explosive power than all of the air fleets of World War II combined. It is literally a highly mobile air base, ready and able to carry the striking power of the United States against 80 percent of the globe's surface on a moment's notice.

The name *Independence* is an illustrious one in the records of the Navy. The previous bearer of the name was sunk by the Navy after having been made dangerously radioactive in the first Bikini atom bomb tests. But before that she wrote a brave page in Navy history during the Pacific sea-air war against Japan. The two Kentuckians who will command the new *Independence* contribute equally illustrious records to their new craft, both having been highly decorated for bravery in action.

Perhaps it would be improper to contribute to the *Independence* some of the pieces from the old silver service that was returned to Frankfort after the last *Kentucky* was decommissioned. But it is good to welcome home the two native sons who have given Kentucky an interest in this new ship. Glad to have you aboard.

Few Americans Write to Their Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am presenting for the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues a recent article by Roscoe Drummond, pointing out the need for an easier mode of communication between the average voter and the average Member of Congress. I purposely put in the word "average," Mr. Speaker, because my own district, the 13th of Illinois, sends me so constant and so huge a volume of correspondence that it is admittedly an exception to the rule which Mr. Drummond lays down.

However, I am exceptionally proud of the fact that the active citizens opinion poll, which Mr. Drummond praises as one method of increasing the mutual responsitivity of a Congressman and his district, originated and has grown to subtantive usage under the direction of a distinguished professor who lives in my district. I agree with Mr. Drummond that the method provides a most useful experiment which should be developed and utilized in all areas where the average voter has not formed the habit of making his views on current problems quickly and easily available to his representative:

FEW AMERICANS WRITE TO THEIR CONGRESSMEN

(By Roscoe Drummond)

One thing which impresses a roving correspondent looking in on this congressional campaign is the lack of communication—the lack of regular contact—between Members of Congress and the voters.

Most of the time it is as though there was a dead wire between Capitol Hill and Main Street.

It seems to me for the most part:

That relatively few voters really know what their Representatives in the Senate and House did to them—and for them.

That very few Congressmen have any sustained or reliable means of knowing what their constituents are thinking.

What needs to be done? I incline to look at this matter from the standpoint of the voter, and what is needed is:

1. A better means by which the voters can keep tabs on how their Congressmen and Senators are voting—continuously, not just as a quick look before voting.

2. A better means by which the voters can regularly get their views to their Congressmen—their views of what they want done in Washington and the way they want it, and not as a lobby for anybody except the interested citizen.

A beginning is being made to do both of these things.

This fall the Congressional Quarterly, an independent research organization in Washington, provided about 100 of its newspaper clients—those who asked for it—with a meaningful boxscore of how the Senators and Congressmen of each area voted. It also provided a place for each paper to fill in the known views of the opposing candidate (if not a Member of Congress) and a convenient place for each voter to fill in how he would have voted.

This kind of reporting is particularly helpful to voters who find themselves looking over politicians who, after doing all they can on earlier ballots to kill a measure, vote for it in the end so they can stand on both sides, depending on their audience.

A greater need is to provide a good mechanism by which more voters, outside of purposeful pressure groups, can make their views heard to better effect in the Halls of Congress on major issues.

There are two main hurdles in the way. One is that most citizens, unless really worked up or responding to some organized lobby, refrain from writing their Congressmen because they do not think their letters count for much. The other hurdle is that there is rarely enough spontaneous voter expression to make up a reliable and influential guide to public opinion.

Can these two hurdles be surmounted?

It seems to me that the Active Citizens Opinion Poll in Chicago points the way. Here is a not-for-profit, nonpartisan group, headed by Prof. W. P. Cortalyou, of Roosevelt University, which does three things.

Once a month it submits a series of yes-or-no questions relating to the main aspects of such topical issues as tax reduction, postal rates, foreign aid, policy toward Red China, to all participating voters throughout the country. Anyone can participate by paying a small fee covering costs. It analyzes and tabulates the answers and then sends the results to all participants—and reports its findings to all Congressmen.

Expanded and more fully developed, this could be a valuable and continuous reflection of public opinion applied at the point where it would count most. Mr. Cortalyou does not consider that his group is necessarily the best instrument for carrying out this of-the-people, for-the-people report to Government.

It seems to me that this is a useful experiment which ought to be taken up on a larger scale, possibly with the aid of one of the foundations.

I am not arguing that Congress should abdicate its independent judgment or make its decisions solely on the basis of polls or letterwriters, I am arguing that the interested, independent voters ought to have the means of making their views visible and influential.

U.S. Marine Corps: Vital National Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in November 1958 the U.S. Marine Corps, with which I am proud to have served in both peace and war, observed its 183d anniversary. Thus, it was historically fitting that Shipmate, the alumni monthly of the U.S. Naval Academy, the great school that has sent so many of its graduates to the Marine Corps, should devote its November 1958 issue to this commemoration.

While aware of its past exploits to a unique degree, the U.S. Marine Corps has never been intellectually stationary. Instead, it has been equally farseeing and a leader in a number of fields, especially amphibious warfare.

In an informative article in the November 1958 issue of Shipmate, Vice Adm. T. G. W. Settle, USN, retired, a distinguished Naval Academy alumnus, emphasizes Marine Corps versatility. The article follows:

THREE-DIMENSIONAL MARINES

The U.S. Marine Corps has fought our country's battles magnificently "from the halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli," and in every clime and place where we could take a gun, "on the land as on the sea." These splendid words of the Marine hymn connote, however, two-dimensional warfare, on the surface of the sea and land.

In recent generations mankind has been expanding its battlefields vertically, both upward and downward. As was to have been expected, the Marines have been in the forefront of military verticalization. They have become a three-dimensional elite fighting corps. Our Nation can well be proud of them, as it was of the surface-bound Marines of former times.

Marine Corps fixed-wing aviation, its close combat integration with the surface Marines, and its splendid performances in World War II and Korea are so well known as to need no elaboration. Less well known, however, are three other varieties of three-dimensional Marines, i.e., the stratosphere, the submarine, and the helicopter ones. These will be briefly covered herein.

Twenty-five years ago, Col. (then major) Chester L. Fordney obtained cosmic ray and other research data at the highest altitude man had attained up to that time. He was the scientific observer and aid in the stratosphere balloon which, on November 20, 1933, spent 2 hours at the then record altitude of 61,237 feet.

Fordney was in charge of the Marine Corps exhibit at the Chicago Century of Progress Exposition. "Mike" Fordney, along with being a typical Marine with a splendid combat record, had mathematics as a hobby. He could translate feminine dress contours into third-power mathematical equations. So, he was also in charge of the mathematics exhibit in the Hall of Science at the exposition. He was, obviously, a natural for the stratosphere balloon research project sponsored by the exposition, the Chicago Daily News, the Marine Corps and Navy, and other organizations.

Among the eminent persons connected with the project were: Col. Frank Knox, publisher of the Chicago Daily News, and later Secretary of the Navy; Brig. Gen. Lewis Rock, USMC, retired, then business manager of the Daily News; Dr. Arthur H. Compton, Nobel price winner, scientific director of the project; Drs. Auguste and Jean Piccard; Mr. E. Howard Perkins, Dow Chemical Co., project engineer for construction of the magnesium alloy gondola, and now head of the Detroit firm which built the Vanguard's satellite; Mr. Glenn O. Carter (U.S. Naval Academy, 1905), then an executive of the Union Carbon & Carbide Chemical Corp. and later president of the Naval Academy Alumni Association; Capt. (then lieutenant) S. W. Townsend, USNR, communications officer of the project who, in World War II, had a leading role in development and service adaptation of antisubmarine warfare electronic equipment; and Fleet Adm. E. J. King, then a rear admiral and Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics. The Marine Corps recruiting and Reserve units in Chicago valuably assisted in the project.

The 600,000-cubic-foot hydrogen inflated balloon took off from Akron, Ohio, about 0900 on November 20, 1933. Its crew comprised Major Fordney, scientific observer and aid, and Lieutenant Commander Settle, pilot. Fordney had 11 categories of scientific research gear to operate including several cosmic ray instrumentations, a solar spectrograph, sky color charts, air sample flasks, vegetable disease spores, and photographic

equipment. In addition there was the log to keep, aerological and physiological observations, and ordinary ship handling and navigation.

After takeoff we stayed in low altitudes until midday when, over the Ohio River, we commenced jettisoning the lead dust ballast and started up. Arrived at peak altitude about 1400 and oscillated at and near 61,237 feet until 1600 when we started down. Throughout the flight Fordney was as busy as a squad of Marines in a good scrap, with his scientific gear. He found time, however, to talk frequently by voice radio directly with Admiral King in Washington, Colonel Knox in Chicago, and Lieutenant Townsend in Akron, giving them reports on the progress of the operation.

At dusk we made a normal "egg-shell" landing in a swampy region near Bridgeton, N.J. It was inadvisable to try to get out of the swamp and bayou area during darkness. So, after securing the balloon and gear, we rolled ourselves up in the balloon fabric, with a bottle of an old Scottish preventive against mosquitoes, and had the best night's rest we had had in weeks.

In the morning a Coast Guard plane spotted us. New Jersey State police and local inhabitants helped us get the balloon and gear, and Mike's scientific records, to dry ground.

Dr. Compton and his colleagues found Fordney's observations and records of high value in important research programs then in progress. Fordney had spent months in preparatory work and testing. I later recommended that Colonel Fordney be awarded the Distinguished Flying Medal for his outstandingly valuable work in this important pioneering project. Regrettably, departmental policy precluded an award. Nevertheless, it was a high privilege to all of us concerned to have been associated with this fine three-dimensional marine in the first U.S. manned balloon operation to reach above 50,000 feet.

The Marine submariners are the "recon" units in the amphibious reconnaissance and raiding submarines of our fleets' amphibious assault forces. Security classification precludes disclosing detailed information on these three-dimensional marines, except that they are highly specialized and intensively trained units, of high value in amphibious operations. Their potentialities in amphibious warfare far exceed their relatively small numbers.

The fleet marine forces and the amphibious forces of the Pacific and Atlantic Fleets are closely integrated teammates in the combat teams of amphibious warfare. An amphibious task force with its embarked Marine assault troops and its integral supporting units comprising most of the other fleet surface, subsurface, and air types is a combat team for assaulting an overseas enemy's defended coasts and carrying decisive offensive combat into his territory.

In World War II we fought our way back from Pearl Harbor to Okinawa, and into north Africa and Europe, by amphibious assaults projecting our Marine and Army troops into enemy territories. These were essentially two-dimensional assaults as the troops were landed preponderantly from surface craft, albeit there were some paratroop drops, fixed-wing airlifts; and air support, offensive and defensive, was indispensable.

The brilliant Inchon amphibious assault in September 1950 was excellently described by Brig. Gen. V. H. Krulak in the September 1958 Shipmate. That operation may well have been the last major amphibious assault in which the troops were landed solely by surface means. For the Marine Corps has verticalized the concept of assault landings and has developed vertical envelopment tactics, utilizing troop-carrying helicopters in lieu of, or in concert with, surface assault troop carriers.

In recent years (insofar as the few ships available have permitted) helicopter assaults and supporting operations have been tested, and tactics further developed, in amphibious exercises and by simulation. The Marine Corps now has troop helicopters designed for amphibious assault. The Corps has unremittingly urged the Navy to design from keel-up, and build an adequate number of amphibious assault ships (helicopter) (LHP). However, most of the new-construction funds have been allocated for nuclear air-raiding, submarine, and anti-submarine types. A useful step was taken, nevertheless, 2 years ago in converting an old CVE, the *Thetis Bay*, into an experimental LPH. It is to be hoped that it will be feasible in the coming few years to properly implement the Marines' vertical envelopment concept, and revitalize the obsolescent prime offensive combat arm of the fleets with keel-up designed amphibious assault ships (helicopter).

If the Marines and Navy amphibians are to keep and further develop their amphibious know-how, particularly if the vertical envelopment concept is to be brought to fruition, it is essential to design and build LPH, other combatant amphibious types, and assault helicopters, in adequate numbers and within a few years. If this should be done (which seems doubtful to this writer) we could envisage a future major amphibious operation with three-dimensional Marines swarming onto and behind enemy beaches from clouds of helicopters, from ships, boats, vehicles and submarines, as well as by parachutes and fixed wing air lifts. And one can have a certain wry symapthy for the hypothetical unfortunate enemy coastal defense commander beset with U.S. Marines assaulting him from his front, rear, flanks, and from overhead. And with their greater prelanding mobility and free choice of landing spots the assaulting Marines, doubtless, could utilize their tactical nuclear weapons more effectively than could the defenders.

The conclusion is inescapable that our present-day three-dimensional Marines of all varieties, along with the surface Marines, are as vital a national asset, if not more so, as were the valorous Marines of the two-dimensional era.

The Case of Marie Torre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the House an editorial broadcast made by a radio station in my congressional district, Station WBAB in Babylon, L. I., in regard to Marie Torre of the New York Herald Tribune who today completes her 10-day sentence for contempt after refusing to disclose a news source. The case of Marie Torre strikes very strongly at the heart of journalism, a subject which deserves serious consideration by the Congress of the United States:

New York Herald Tribune radio and television columnist, Marie Torre, was put in Federal custody today to begin serving a 10-day jail term. She had been sentenced for contempt after refusing to disclose a news source. When Miss Torre surrendered before Federal District Judge Sylvester Ryan in New York, he gave her a chance to purge herself by telling where she got a story she wrote about Judy Garland in 1957. However, she refused and was ordered turned over to a marshal to go to jail. Miss Torre said in a statement, and we quote, "I have great hope that this action will lead to legislation which will protect a newsman's sources." The Herald Tribune supported Miss Torre in her defense that she could protect a news source through the freedom of the press guaranties in the first amendment to the Constitution. When the U.S. District Court of Appeals upheld her conviction last September 30, the case was taken to the U.S. Supreme Court, but the highest tribunal in the land refused to review the case. We who are involved in the gathering of news feel that a basic principle is at stake in this issue. And that principle is the right given in the Constitution guaranteeing freedom of the press. Freedom of the press should not be limited to basically the publication of news and information but should be carried on to hold newsmen harmless in disclosing the source (whatever it may be) of the news that is published. There is no doubt that legislation is needed to remedy the law as it stands today.

Marie Torre has the backing of all members of the fifth estate in her stand not to disclose the source of a news story. One doesn't have to look too far beyond his nose to see that a restriction such as the Marie Torre case implies could have far reaching effects in the business of news gathering. At present there is no law or previous decision that extends to journalists the privilege of withholding information from the courts. If that be the case, we make a public plea for immediate legislation to protect one of our most cherished rights, freedom of the press. We in the radio industry, firmly believe that legislation be requried for the gathering of news. We affirm, at the same time, however, that the decision of our courts must be obeyed and respected. To do otherwise, would to us be anarchy. A copy of this editorial is being forwarded to Senator JACOB JAVITS, Senator KENNETH KEATING, and Congressman STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT. We will await their reaction and let you know the outcome of this legislation.

Junior Colleges Play Bigger Role Annually

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent article appearing in the Portland, Oreg., Journal provides some valuable statistics concerning the growth of the Junior Community College during the last two decades. An institution that was once viewed as an experiment is now, happily, accepted as an integral part of our educational system. Moreover, the 2-year college is becoming an increasingly important aspect of that system as witnessed by the establishment of a new community college every 2 weeks.

The advantages of this type of institution of higher learning are many. Easy accessibility coupled with low cost make the community college a natural next step in the further development of the Nation's educational opportunities.

As the sponsor of a proposal to provide Federal assistance for development of the 2-year college, I congratulate the

Portland Journal on its interest in this matter and ask permission to have the article inserted in the RECORD:

JUNIOR COLLEGES PLAY BIGGER ROLE ANNUALLY

(By Louis Cassels)

Twenty years ago junior colleges played an insignificant role in U.S. higher education. Their total enrollment for the 1938–39 school year was only 196,000 students.

Today there are 667 junior colleges in America, with an enrollment of 892,000. The 2-year institutions are springing up like mushrooms all over the country at an average of one new one every 2 weeks.

The latest directory of the American Association of Junior Colleges shows that 275 of the colleges are private institutions. Among them are several large schools, like Stephens College in Missouri and Colby College in New Hampshire, that draw students from all parts of the Nation.

A substantial majority—392, to be exact—are public institutions whose students live at home. There is an increasing tendency to refer to them as "community colleges" or "city colleges."

Most are operated as part of the community's public school system. Some are extension centers of State universities. The latter pattern is particularly prevalent in the northeast. Pennsylvania State University, for example, has 11 such off-campus branches.

Educators agree that junior colleges are destined to continue growing rapidly, both in number and in size. Last year they absorbed one out of every four students who entered higher education. By 1970 they may well enroll half of the Nation's total freshmen.

There are several reasons for their phenomenal growth. A basic one is that they make higher education financially accessible to many students who could not afford to go away to college. Many community colleges are free. Where tuition is charged, it rarely exceeds $300 a year, and often is considerably less.

And, of course, many commuting students have no room and board to pay.

By contrast, the cost of attending a regular 4-year residential college is high and increasing steadily. The latest estimate from the U.S. Office of Education put the average cost of attending a State college or university at $1,500 a year, and of a private college at $2,000 a year. Many educators believe these costs may double within a decade.

The junior college also has strong financial appeal for the public agencies charged with providing adequate higher education facilities for a college student population that is expected to grow from 3,258,000 this year to perhaps 6 million by 1970.

According to Government studies, it costs close to $6,000 a student to build dormitories, dining halls, classrooms and other necessary features of a 4-year residential college. Comparable educational facilities can be provided at a commuter college for $3,000 a student.

Money aside, community colleges are particularly appealing to the growing number of adults who want to continue their education after acquiring a family, a home, and a job.

Nearly half of those enrolled in junior colleges are adults who are attending classes on a part-time basis, or who are taking special vocational courses.

The first public junior college was established in Joliet, Ill., in 1902. The idea spread, slowly at first, to other States. Today California leads the Nation with 75 junior colleges. Texas is next with 45, and New York is in third place with 36.

Senator Humphrey After 10 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest and enjoyment Mr. Russell Baker's article on the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, which appeared in last Sunday's New York Times magazine.

Believing that this article will be of interest to the Members of Congress and many others, I, under unanimous consent, insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HUMPHREY: THUNDER, LIGHTNING?

(By Russell Baker)

WASHINGTON.—As HUBERT H. HUMPHREY rounds out a turbulent decade in the U.S. Senate, he may be justified if he sometimes feels that destiny is beckoning him into a grander decade ahead. Ten years ago this month, when he took his seat in the Senate, the patriarchs who hold the place in trust looked him over and seeing nothing but a young pipsqueak from the windy prairie, quietly passed the word that he just wouldn't do.

Nowadays, ranked among the leading Democratic contenders for the Presidential nomination, he is doing very well indeed, not only through the country but also within that small coterie of men who dominate and give character to the Senate.

At 47, dynamic of spirit and limb and long of wind, he stands among the Democratic Party's men of the future, a monument to the political virtue of pure energy and a quick tongue—in many fields. He is equally at home talking feed-grain prices to Minnesota farmers, arranging a deal with Senate horsetraders or advising Nikita S. Khrushchev on what is wrong with Soviet policy.

"Everybody writes that I talk on every subject," he told a group of newspapermen recently. "Hell—I do. I like every subject."

This is probably the most succinct thumbnail sketch it is possible to draw of HUBERT HUMPHREY. No one else in the Senate (for that matter, few others anywhere in American politics) is quite so intensely fascinated with quite so many things about this earth as he. The energy and exuberance with which he pursues his multiple interests has alarmed some, set others to grumbling that he is a vacuous headline hunter and given him in the past a reputation around the Senate—where excessive zeal is frequently regarded as bad form—for being an upstart.

The catalog of HUMPHREY'S activities is a full one. In Minnesota, he has constructed and now operates one of the most efficient political machines in the country, under the all-inclusive label "Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party." In New York and Washington, he manages to keep the most dedicated Democratic liberals convinced that he is liberalism's most effective champion in the Senate. In the Senate, where liberalism is sometimes suspect as a vaguely alien philosophy, he manages to hold the respect of and work successfully with the grandees on the conservative side.

In his various other excitements, he is applauded as a defender of civil rights, of the ailing farmer, of the embattled Supreme Court, of Israel and of liberalized immigration policies—to name a few of his causes. He has also found time to make himself expert on the incredibly intricate question of disarmament and to come up with ideas for treating every world problem from starvation in Southeast Asia to the isolation of Berlin. Passing through Helsinki recently and learning that the anti-Communist Finnish Government was about to collapse under Soviet pressure, he quickly rounded up the best local opinion on what needed to be done to save the day, then wired his proposals to Washington. The State Department was still giving them "favorable consideration" when the Government fell.

Among all the Senators who are potential Presidential material, none quite equals HUMPHREY for executive energy applied to such a global range of problems. LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, the most complex of the contenders, has built his case on a genius for getting things done through conciliation. JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, relies heavily on organization and personality. STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, has hitched his future to the single issue of national security and a quiet voting record considered perfect by Democratic liberals.

HUMPHREY is a fighter rather than a conciliator. For this era of television campaigning, he has obvious personal shortcomings in comparison with JACK KENNEDY. ("The trouble with HUBERT," complained one admiring Congressman who worries that television might hurt him, "is that he looks like a 'yakker'.") Unlike SYMINGTON, he has rarely been content to vote quietly on any issue. More often, clad in the armor of liberalism, he is on his warhorse and charging into the middle of every battle on the horizon.

The public HUMPHREY is clattering, strident, and bellicose, often a scold, sometimes a nuisance, always a nonrespecter of the proprieties. In this he has changed little from the Minnesota terror who first took his seat in the Senate a decade ago.

In rare moments when he is being the private HUMPHREY, however, it is obvious that he has changed a great deal. For one thing, he and the Senate have finally come to terms. In a private conversation recently he said that he doubted he would ever again seek the Vice Presidential nomination, as he did in 1956. "I've come to like the Senate too much to want to spend my life waiting for somebody to catch cold," he explained.

In part this may be due to LYNDON JOHNSON'S skill as tutor to Democrats eager to learn how to make the Senate work for them. Both JOHNSON and HUMPHREY started political life as New Dealers and while HUMPHREY'S Minnesota brand of liberalism is too rich these days for JOHNSON'S Texas constituents, there is a personal bond between the two men which is mutually beneficial.

Near the close of the last Congress, when JOHNSON was holding a private post mortem on a particularly delicate piece of business which HUMPHREY had managed on the floor, he was patiently analyzing HUMPHREY'S mistakes. At one point, JOHNSON noted, HUMPHREY had permitted another liberal—PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois—to get too prominently into the act. "Remember," he told HUMPHREY, "there can just be one leader—just one leader."

In all probability, HUMPHREY will emerge as the effective leader of the expanded cadre of Senate liberals in the Congress just opened. It is equally probable that his influence will be exerted behind the scenes to a larger extent than ever before. The first order of Senate business is the fight to break the old filibuster. In this, HUMPHREY is apparently destined to handle the private arrangements that will have to be made in the wings on behalf of the liberals if a solution is to be reached.

This is not to predict that the public HUMPHREY will be any less in evidence. As he confessed recently after his talk with Khrushchev, he loves to talk and is helpless

to stop himself. Each day, when the Senate is in session, he fills large segments of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Once, running through the old formula of "Mr. President, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD—," he stumbled and said, "I ask permission to insert in my record."

It is this passion for talk, he believes, that kept Khrushchev interested during their extraordinary 8-hour conversation in Moscow early last month. HUMPHREY has since said that he suspects Khrushchev shares his vocal compulsion and recognized in him a worthy match for a battle of spellbinders. "You can't help it," HUMPHREY says of the overwhelming passion to be heard. "It's just glands."

Under cover of the sound and fury, however, HUMPHREY has quietly graduated to the Senate inner sanctum, composed exclusively of men who, for reasons not clearly understood, clearly count. To borrow from George Orwell, all Senators are equal, but some Senators are more equal than others. No one has ever quite defined why this should be, but it is nonetheless true, and it is true that HUBERT HUMPHREY now holds a membership in the elite.

This is largely a southern elite with little liking for HUMPHREY's politics but with great respect for the man—regardless of his politics—who understands the Senate. Thus, while HUMPHREY will usually be at odds with these elders, and may infuriate them on civil rights, there will be channels for reaching understanding and accommodation which are available to few other Senators of the liberal persuasion.

One other point is essential in understanding the HUMPHREY of today: he remains a consummate politician. During his Minnesota apprenticeship he forged the Democrat-Farm-Labor alliance that carried him to office and gradually turned Minnesota into a Democratic stronghold. Those most familiar with Minnesota politics doubt that EUGENE J. MCCARTHY could have been elected to the Senate in November without HUMPHREY's considerable assistance.

Like all finished politicians, he is exceedingly sensitive to what is going on back home and to the message of his mail. When the question of congressional calls to the Federal regulatory agencies created a lively controversy in Washington, HUMPHREY held forth heatedly at a dinner party one night with the argument that it was a Senator's solemn obligation to his constituents to go to their aid with every device within the law when they had problems before the agencies.

Nor does his liberalism express itself in a passion for fighting to the death in lost causes. When HUMPHREY fights, it is usually to win, but part of his Senate education has been that when you cannot win the whole loaf, half is better than none.

While he follows classic form in denying all interest in the Presidency for the moment, it requires only a few minutes in his presence to sense that he is beginning to run a low-grade White House fever.

The celebrated Khrushchev interview, he realizes, was a mixed blessing for his future. Khrushchev's whim in keeping him for 8 hours was a stroke of luck in that it pulled HUMPHREY out of the wings and put him at stage center in the American political drama long enough to make politicians and public remember his face and start examining his qualifications.

At the same time, it is plain to HUMPHREY that there is limited political fuel in the Khrushchev affair and that he must see his hopes rise or fall on his record over the next 2 years.

Moreover, there are real political dangers in the method of his projection onto the stage. His office has received angry letters complaining that he was taken in by the Russians. As a shrewd politician, HUMPHREY realizes that it might be expedient to do the demogogic thing and use his visit with Khrushchev as a claim to special expertise about the menace of the Soviet Union.

Some of his critics tax him with being, at heart, a demagog; but in the Khrushchev matter HUMPHREY clearly feels that he must forgo the politically expedient thing in order to keep open what could be an important point of contact with the ruler of the Communist world.

The HUMPHREY of today is a direct if considerably more sophisticated descendant of the agrarian and Populist leaders who held the West at the beginning of the 20th century. His father, a lifelong Republican, turned Democrat after hearing William Jennings Bryan speak in South Dakota. One of four children, HUMPHREY was born in Wallace, S. Dak., May 27, 1911, and christened, after his father, Hubert Horatio.

His mother had immigrated from Norway. His father was a small-town pharmacist. "I was born over a drugstore and raised inside one," HUMPHREY once told a biographer. In high school he was—like Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON—a prize debater. (Both men suffer in their speaking style from the oratorical glibness of formal debating technique.)

He finished high school in 1929 and enrolled at the University of Minnesota. Two years later, the depression forced him to quit. He went back to his father's drugstore and, with 6 months out for a course at the Denver School of Pharmacy, stayed there for 6 years, watching the South Dakota farmers lose everything as the dust storms consumed the land.

These memories still infuriate him. Recently, discussing Washington's attitude toward Latin America, he denounced it as the smug, self-righteous posture of the well-to-do man who constantly advises his struggling neighbors to "put your house in order." It reminded him, he said, of the bankers and businessmen who had come to the ruined farmers of the Dakotas during the dust-bowl years and used the old catch phrase.

"You're not in a very receptive mood when you're penniless and your children are hungry and some rich bird, who's probably just robbed the bank and gotten away with it, tells you to put your house in order," he said. "You feel like telling him, 'Look here, mister, how are my children going to eat?' "

In 1935, at the age of 24, HUMPHREY scraped together bus fare and made his first trip to Washington. He wrote back to Muriel Buck, his fiance, now Mrs. Humphrey: "I need to do more reading, more writing, and more thinking if I ever want to fulfill my dream of being someone in this world. Maybe I seem foolish to have such vain hopes and plans but, Bucky, I can see how some day, if you and I just apply ourselves and make up our minds to work for bigger things, we can live here in Washington, and probably be in Government politics or service. I set my aim at Congress. Don't laugh at me. Maybe it does sound rather egotistical and beyond reason, but, Muriel, I do know others have succeeded."

Back at the University of Minnesota, doubling as drugstore clerk and janitor to pay the bills, he soon became a voluble New Dealer and a figure widely known and heard on campus. He moved on to Louisiana State University to do graduate work in political science. His master's thesis was "The Philosophy of the New Deal." Returning to Minnesota, he taught briefly, then became impatient with the academic approach to politics and plunged into its practical applications.

After a brief whirl through the regional offices of various Government agencies, he decided to run for mayor of Minneapolis. He was then 31. Finishing second in a 10-man field, he lost the run-off by 5,000 votes and went back to work to pay his campaign bills. He taught political science, worked as a radio news analyst, did public-relations work, and, in between, managed to weld together the diffused farm and labor elements of Minnesota's political system into the cohesive Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party.

Two years after his first race for office, he ran again for mayor and won by 31,000 votes. He promptly rocked Minneapolis with a law-enforcement program that shut down the wide-open brothels, the after-hours liquor joints, the flourishing handbooks, dice games, and punchboard operations. When labor leaders complained about his choice of a police chief, he told them: "I'm my own boss." In 1947 he was reelected by the biggest majority in Minneapolis history, and began looking toward Washington.

He began by ordering a purge of Communist elements and Henry Wallace's Progressive backers who had begun to infiltrate the Minnesota organization. His lieutenants worked over the State, pruning them out. When the State convention met in 1948, he thrashed the remnants of the Wallaceites and won the senatorial nomination by acclamation.

First, however, there was the Democratic National Convention. HUMPHREY was among the "young Turks" who that year led the civil-rights fight that put a strong libertarian plank into the platform and forced the South to bolt the party. His rallying cry to the convention is still remembered: "It is now time for the Democratic Party to get out of the shadow of States rights and walk forthrightly in the bright sunshine of human rights." This plank carried by 69 votes.

In the Minnesota campaign, he traveled 31,000 miles, made 691 speeches, milked cows, led bands, and dressed in Indian bonnets. Campaigning, he told a newspaperman, "is like running a drugstore. When people come in, you've got to do things for them, show an interest in them, take them to the door." He overwhelmed the Republican incumbent, Joseph H. Ball, by 243,000 votes.

HUMPHREY arrived in the Senate with no great fund of goodwill among the elders and promptly turned their indifference into outrage. One of his earliest efforts was an assault on the full majesty of Senator HARRY F. BYRD, the reigning patriarch from Virginia. Even veteran Senators blanched when HUMPHREY proposed abolishing BYRD's famed Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the base on which BYRD had built his reputation as the taxpayers' friend. HUMPHREY's argument for getting rid of it was that the committee was "a waste of the taxpayer's dollar."

Shortly thereafter he was openly rebuked for disrespect for the Southern elders. This time it was a debate over a fair employment practice bill and HUMPHREY, during a floor speech, impugned the motives of the opposing Southerners. Twice during the debate the Southerners had him ruled out of order for using intemperate language, and twice he was forced to take his seat, like an offending schoolboy, before he could proceed.

And so it went, the long uneasy affair between HUMPHREY and the Senate. Time has since performed its alchemy. After the early mutual suspicion and annoyance, HUMPHREY is 10 years older, graying at the temples and no longer the enfant terrible of the late 1940's. He and the Senate are at peace. Each has had to bend its neck a bit to make the accommodation possible, but neither has yielded much on principle.

A HUMPHREY story, possibly apocryphal, has it that one of his university professors told him: "If God had given you as much brains as he has given you wind, you would be sure to be another Cicero."

As one looks at HUMPHREY today, it is possible to say: "Maybe God did. Maybe HUBERT will."

Permit Lease and Transfer of Acreage Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, if the cotton farmer and the cotton industry are to survive under the economic pressures now being exerted upon them, it is mandatory that the 86th Congress act at the earliest possible moment to modify the laws regulating the allocation of cotton acreage.

I am today introducing legislation to allow transfer of commodity acreage allotments from one farmer to another, on a lease basis, within the same county.

The chief purpose of this legislation is to provide greater flexibility in the system of allocating land for farming cotton by giving to the small cotton farmer the incentive to expand and make more efficient his operation, while allowing those who no longer wish to devote themselves to cotton farming an opportunity to relinquish their allocations for valuable considerations and devote themselves to other employment.

The farmer who wants to grow cotton should have the right to do so profitably. Simply stated, this is what my bill seeks to encourage.

During the past few years, under the influence of the farm policies now in effect, there has been a mass exodus from the farm, as the incentive for farming waned in the face of mounting costs, decreasing acreage allotments, and the appeal of better paying off-farm employment. In the Fourth District of Alabama, for example, more than 40 percent of the farmers work off the farm 100 days or more each year. Many of these earn more in these jobs than the total value of agricultural products sold by them. Actually, farming has become a burden to them.

And so, in an increasing measure, the situation is leaning heavily toward part-time farming, much of which is pursued half-heartedly by individuals who have lost their interest in farming but who feel obliged to plant their allotments or else lose them. Under the rigid, inflexible allocation program, there is no practical or profitable way to yield their disinterested hold on the land.

In the cotton States, farming of cotton includes the existence of thousands of small operations where there is a woeful loss of productivity. Alabama had 119,844 cotton allotment contracts last year, of which 45,680 were for 4 acres or less. Many of these operators farm only as a sideline and would gladly give it up altogether if the Government did not make it difficult to do so.

At the same time, there are other small- and medium-size farms whose operators are truly interested in raising cotton but who are restricted from expanding their operations by the same rigid rules which encourage part-time farming.

It is clear that there needs to be flexibility in allocating cotton acreage to inspire the interested farmers to expand and to produce more efficiently, or to withdraw from the production of cotton in favor of off-the-farm employment. The result would be to attract to cotton farming those who want to farm and to give them incentive to do a better job at it.

This is the essence of my bill. The decision to stay at cotton farming or to withdraw would be left completely to the individual farmer. If he wishes to devote his time exclusively to outside employment, he could, under my bill, lease his allotment to a farmer in the same county who wishes to pursue the livelihood of cotton farming.

The farmer staying with cotton would be able to expand, on his own land, his cotton-farming operation. He would be given the encouragement to proceed with a degree of confidence to invest in equipment needed in this mechanized age to efficiently produce cotton.

The individual giving up his allotment would be free to work full time in other employment, and at the same time receive such stipend for his allotment as he and the leasing farmer may agree upon.

It is obvious that such a plan will appeal to the farmers. Now who else will like this idea? In a recent statement, Frederic H. Heidelberg, executive vice president of the North Carolina Cotton Promotion Association, pointed out that the transferability of cotton allotments should appeal to just about everybody associated with farming.

He states:

No opposition to such a provision should come from the agricultural leaders who believe small-scale farming must give way to large-scale farming enterprises. Their belief is based upon the view that developments in agricultural science and technology require large-scale farming operations in order to pay off. Flexibility in allotments which would enable regrouping of acreage would be in this direction.

Those who believe it is important to retain the traditional family scale farming enterprise of modest capitalization should welcome such legislation. If properly conceived it would rescue untold numbers of small-scale farmers from the brink of disaster.

Transferability of acreage would be welcomed by sincere agricultural educators. They have watched with dismay during the past decade the depressing results of over-diversification on small-scale farms. This trend has been particularly adverse in areas where each farm has kept a few acres in several controlled crops. An opportunity to shift acreages into volume adequate for adoption of improved practices in preferred and suitable crops could revitalize the development of individual farms.

It is right for new hope, fresh incentive, and a horizon of opportunity to be established for cotton farmers in a broad area of the Cotton Belt. Transfer of acreage allotments is an immediate step which can be taken in this direction. Opposition could be predicated only on sectional prejudice and selfishness.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT WILL BE STIMULATED

President Eisenhower, in his message to the 85th Congress on January 18, 1958, spoke of the rural development program initiated at his request by the Department of Agriculture.

This program is a cooperative one between local, State, and Federal governments. It has been in operation on a demonstration basis in 63 counties and 8 trade areas in 30 States for 3 years.

It has three major objectives: First to help families with the desire and ability to stay in farming gain the necessary tools, land, and skills to do so; second, to widen the range of off-the-farm employment opportunities; and, third, to help rural people enjoy more opportunities for adequate training and improved health.

This rural development program has been cited frequently to committees of Congress by the present administration as one of its real accomplishments for the welfare of the small-scale farmer.

When applied to areas where cotton production is an important agricultural pursuit, a close look at the first of the rural development program's objectives leaves one scratching his head. Many small-scale farmers in these areas do not need more land. They need more cotton acreage for the land they already own.

On the other hand, the second of these objectives aims to speed retirement of some small-scale farmers from active agricultural pursuits.

Would it accelerate attainment of objectives of this worthy program if the cotton acreage allotted to those who are finding off-the-farm employment satisfactory could be transferred to the agricultural programs of those who want to stay with farming full time It is certainly logical to believe so.

As matters now stand, there is no bridge for the flow of allotted acreage from farms whose owners are engaged in off-the-farm employment to those farms whose owners need and want additional acreage to meet rising costs of production and of living.

In the interest of success for its rural development program, USDA should certainly look with favor upon establishing such a bridge.

Mr. Speaker, the effect of revitalizing cotton production through an allotment transfer program will certainly be felt by the cotton industry. This great industry desperately needs the benefit of decreasing production costs and increasing production yields.

This is what the bill which I am introducing today seeks to accomplish.

Let Us Defend the Written Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on October 23, 1958, our distinguished colleague from the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia delivered a masterful address at a meeting of the American Carpet Institute in Skytop, Pa. The sound doctrine expounded by Mr. HARRISON merit serious thought and consideration. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following complete text of the address:

There is an element in the United States dedicated to the principle that the working class is the only essential class, and that wealth produced by this class and paid to private ownership is surplus. To obtain this surplus, a constant class warfare must be waged for the control of the private prop-

erty essential for the production of wealth. The control of such private property should vest in Government, and the control of Government in Socialists' hands. You are fully aware of the vast progress the Socialists have made in the past 25 years toward these objectives. Tonight in every corporation represented here, the Government is the unwanted partner to the extent of 52 percent of net income. Fortunate indeed is the executive who does not contribute 50 percent of his net earnings to Government. A galaxy of laws, State and national, have invaded and pounded down upon our free enterprise system. But, as yet, the Socialist victory has not been complete and the outcome of the struggle remains in doubt. Corporations still earn and declare dividends, farmers still maintain some control over their lands, laborers still in some places may obtain employment without paying tribute, Government control of person and property is not yet fully realized though the outcome teeters in the balance.

To obtain their objectives, the Socialists must reduce the Constitution of the United States to shambles. To the extent its written word is observed, the rights of private property and private enterprise are observed because the Constitution protects them both. An authority cited with all inclusive acceptance by Chief Justice Warren in the school segregation cases was "An American Dilemma," by the Swedish sociologist, Gunnar Myrdal. This book to which the Supreme Court of the United States has given unanimous approval contains this passage: The Constitution of the United States "is impractical and unsuited to modern conditions" and its adoption was "nearly a plot against the common people."

Speaking 2 years ago of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, Edmund W. Flynn, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Rhode Island, declared "recent decisions have departed so far from constitutional precepts that this country no longer has a written Constitution any more than England."

Judge Learned Hand, of New York, one of the most eminent men ever to sit on the bench and the kind of man who used to be appointed to the Supreme Court, in a series of lectures at Harvard University, has charged that the Supreme Court is pursuing a tendency to set itself up as a third legislative chamber. He says that the Supreme Court has one rule where property is involved and another where liberty is at issue. He says public support disappears from the Court "insofar as it is supposed permissible for the judge to smuggle into his opinions his personal notions of what is desirable." "For myself," continues Judge Hand, "it would be most irksome to be ruled by a bevy of platonic guardians."

The chief justices of 36 States in a remarkable indictment have charged "that the overall tendency of decisions of the Supreme Court over the last 25 years or more has been to press the extension of Federal power and to press it rapidly * * * the Supreme Court too often has tended to adopt the role of policymaker without proper judicial restraint. * * * It has long been an American boast that we have a government of laws and not of men. We believe any study of recent decisions of the Supreme Court will raise at least considerable doubt as to the validity of that boast."

Let me give you one more quote. The California leader of the Communist Party said: "This decision will mark a rejuvenation of our party in America. We've lost some members in the last few years, but now we are on our way again."

No outsider can match the abuse which members of the Court have heaped upon one another. For example in one case, Justices Douglas, Black, and Chief Justice Warren said the action of their colleagues was "a shocking instance of the abuse of judicial power." This is not a suggestion that the majority has made an honest mistake, it has been pointed out. A shocking abuse of authority is an intentional act; a wicked and dishonest thing. In another case, Justice Tom Clark said: "Unless the Congress changes the rule announced by the Court today, those intelligence agencies of our Government engaged in law enforcement may as well close up shop for the Court has opened their files to the criminal and thus afforded him a Roman holiday for rummaging through confidential information as well as vital national secrets * * * and all in the name of justice."

The layman cannot realize the extent to which these nine men have gone toward destroying and distorting our written Constitution. They have decreed that under our Constitution a local school board of the State of New York may not dismiss a teacher who refuses to say whether he is a Communist; that this very State of Pennsylvania may not convict Steve Nelson, a notorious Russian spy, for plotting to overthrow the State government; that the Federal Government may not convict, under the Smith Act, one who advocates the violent destruction of the Federal Union provided such advocacy is "abstract," whatever that may mean; that the State of California and New Mexico must permit subversives to practice law in their courts; that the Government of the United States may not dismiss its own employee who plots the Government's overthow unless he occupies a sensitive position; that the Cabinet head of a Government department must keep on the public payroll a person he believes should not be entrusted with confidential assignments bearing on national policy; they have so tortured the salutary provisions of the fifth amendment, that "taking the fifth" has become a part of the language of the underworld meaning a smug and effective recourse of racketeers and subversives. These nine men have opened the secret files of the FBI to the criminal; they have struck down the criminal laws of the States; they have licensed the seller of filth and obscenity to the youth; they have assaulted the rights of officers of the law to arrest for serious felonies committed in their presence; they have swept away the power of the police to fight crime by reasonable interrogation of suspects and by introduction of voluntary and truthful confessions in evidence; they have decreed that the Congress of the United States, which this year spent $40 billion of the people's money to protect against Communist invasion, has no power to control hostile Communist activity in the United States or even to make inquiry into Communist doings or to remove Communists from Government payrolls; in countless other decisions they have gladdened the hearts and built up the power of criminals and subversives.

In the South conditions threatening chaos have been produced by the decision that racial separation in the public schools violates the Constitution of the United States. This decision did not contend that Southern States had denied equal opportunity to colored children in the public school. Upon the facts, such a contention could not be made. In my State of Virginia, for example, the average salary of a public school teacher is higher for the Negro than for the white. In 10 years, the value of school property per enrollee has increased 258 percent for the Negro as against 144 percent for the white. Thirty-four percent of the State money spent on school construction since 1950 has gone for Negro schools, although Negroes represent only 25 percent of the school population. The taxpayers of Virginia—and that means, by and large, the white taxpayers—have been paying willingly for the creation of truly equal facilities for education of the white and colored child.

Does the Constitution of the United States prohibit the separation of the races in the public schools?

The judges said the acts of Congress providing for segregated schools in the District of Columbia are in violation of the fifth amendment. The 5th amendment was written into the Constitution in 1791, and under it human slavery existed for 75 years until abolished by the 13th amendment. Can any honest man say that language which permits human slavery denies the right of separate school facilities? Separate schools in Virginia, the judges said violated the 14th amendment. The 14th amendment did not give to Negroes the right to vote which was conferred by the 15th. Can any honest man say that language which does not give the right of suffrage denies the right of separate school facilities? The very Congress which submitted the 14th amendment set up a system of segregated schools in the District of Columbia and six times the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that separate but equal facilities comply with the 14th amendment. Chief Justice William Howard Taft was the most recent and expressed the opinion of the Court that "the separate but equal principle * * * is within the discretion of the State in regulating its public schools and does not conflict with the 14th amendment."

However much we may argue about legal niceties, there are certain aspects of this decision which we in the South know, and know beyond peradventure of debate. First, we know that we cannot carry it out and at the same time educate the youth of either race. In the District of Columbia the public schools were integrated in 1954. A congressional committee has established that in the wake of this action has come disciplinary problems described as appalling, demoralizing, intolerable, and disgraceful. Fighting, lying, stealing, vandalism, obscene writing, vulgar talking, absenteeism, and truancy have increased to an amazing degree. Teachers have resigned in disgust, courses of study had to be abandoned because supplies were stolen so rapidly they could not be replaced, children go to school with weapons. The committee found that the vilest sex talk, dirty writing on walls, foul and unspeakable language to teachers, and vicious and obscene tongue battles in classroom, as well as during recess. They reported an enormous increase in venereal disease, which incuded 13 colored girls of 6 years of age. A majority of the people in the District of Columbia are white, but the school population is 73 percent Negro. Where are the children of the white parents?

A second thing we know about this decision is that no civil government, Federal or local, can enforce it. Under the principles of the Declaration of Independence, governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. When you have government exercising power to which the people do not consent, and to which they are deeply opposed, you have widespread violation if you leave enforcement to civil authority, as during prohibition. The only alternative must be a substitution of government by fiat and military might for civil authority and popular government.

I earnestly contend that when constitutional liberty, the right of peaceable assembly, the right to operate local government dies anywhere in the United States, it is threatened everywhere.

What is the real reason the leftwing, with the Supreme Court as its heavy artillery, wages war on the South? In an editorial in this week's U.S. News & World Report, David Lawrence says: "If it had not been for Democratic leaders from the South in the last session of Congress * * * America now would be facing economic disaster."

The leaders of the South, such as BYRD, RUSSELL, IRWIN, and HOLLAND, for 20 years, have held the pass against the Socialist

march. When they are succeeded in the Congress by a new generation of carpetbaggers and scalawags, kept in power by Federal bayonets, the votes will be in the Congress to carry the class war to victory not only against the South but over the last vestige of written constitutional government, the last trace of private ownership of property and private enterprise. Thus, the purpose of all of the decisions discussed tonight, including the segregation decisions, is not the protection of the Negro, or the workingman, or the downtrodden individual; the purpose is the destruction of the written Constitution, the breakdown of the police power of the States, the promotion of class warfare, the establishment of Marxist socialism.

As one people of one nation, let us defend the written Constitution and say of it, as did that great New England poet:

"Sail on, O Ship of State.
Sail on, O Union, strong and great.
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years
Is hanging breathless on thy fate."

Detroit Economy To Rise 10 Percent in 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the text of the following article by John R. Stewart which appeared in The Detroiter, a weekly publication of the Detroit Board of Commerce. In his article, Mr. Stewart makes certain predictions concerning Detroit's economy in 1959 which present a much brighter picture for that area which has suffered more during the recent recession than any other part of the country:

[From the Detroiter, Dec. 15, 1958]

DETROIT ECONOMY TO RISE 10 PERCENT IN 1959

(By John R. Stewart)

All phases of business and industrial activity in the Detroit area should improve in 1959. Gains over 1958 are expected to range between 3 percent for wages and 28 percent for passenger car production. The unweighted average rise predicted for the barometers tabled below is 10 percent. (Unemployment and consumer prices are excluded from this average.) Aside from the sharp increase noted for automobile production, substantial gains include nonresidential building, up 19 percent, truck output 15 percent higher and industrial power sales, up 12 percent.

These forecasts, representing the combined opinions of 17 local economists, were presented to members of the Detroit Area Economic Forum at its annual dinner and forecasting session held December 4.

Experts from Detroit banks, utilities, government agencies, manufacturers, builders, retailers, newspapers and trade associations made forecasts for each of the 14 measures of local economic activity tabulated below. These figures represent the average answers of the 17 economists, including the undersigned, made in questionnaires prior to the meeting. The only fields wherein the writer differs materially from the group are in building, where our estimate is 5 percent lower for nonresidential construction and 4 percent higher for housing, and in department store sales.

Payrolls in 1959 are expected to top those of the current year by 11 percent (the group estimates 9.2 percent) with a smaller proportion put aside in savings. Credit outstanding should increase. If department stores secure as large a share of the money spent in the area as in 1958—a reasonable expectation—sales by these outlets should increase somewhat more than the 5.5 percent indicated in the table. A 10-percent rise seems more likely, bringing the index up to 134 for 1959.

The writer agrees with the group estimates for employment, but feels that unemployment will be lower than shown in the table, perhaps as low as 150,000. This lower estimate is based upon a drop of 25,000 in the area's labor force as it seems probable that many of the 200,000 currently unemployed will look for jobs outside the area or drop out of the labor force in marginal cases.

In summary, next year should see a continuation of the current upward trend in business and industrial activity throughout the first 6 months with perhaps some leveling off in the last half. Activity in general is not expected to reach the boom levels of 1955–57, but many barometers, notably population, wage rates and perhaps retail sales, should be at alltime high.

Detroit area	1958 estimate	1959 forecast [2]	Percent change
Population July 1	3,840,000	3,906,000	+1.7
Nonfarm employment	1,267,000	1,343,000	+6.0
Unemployment	251,000	170,000	−32.3
Hourly earnings, manufacturing	$2.65	$2.73	+3.0
Weekly earnings, manufacturing	$104.43	$107.58	+3.0
Consumer Price Index [1]	124.0	125.0	+.8
Department store sales [1]	121.8	128.5	+5.5
Retail advertising lineage	40,000,000	42,700,000	+6.8
New dwelling units, number	21,000	23,050	+9.8
Nonresidential building, value	$200,000,000	$237,500,000	+18.7
Passenger car output, United States	4,264,000	5,447,000	+27.8
Truck output, United States	880,000	1,014,000	+15.2
Power sales, Edison, kilowatt-hours	5,234,000,000	5,865,000,000	+12.1
Bank debits, Detroit banks	$70,000,000,000	$76,100,000,000	+8.7

[1] 1947–49=100.
[2] Combined average of 17 economists.

Hon. Davis Elkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with deepest sorrow that I learned of the recent passing of the esteemed and beloved former distinguished Senator of the great State of West Virginia, the Honorable Davis Elkins.

Illustrious scion and great leader of a family which for more than 75 years has been a prominent, vital force in the upbuilding and development of his great State, Senator Elkins leaves a precious legacy of devoted public service and constructive business leadership.

Educated at Lawrenceville, Andover, and Harvard College, Davis Elkins early enlisted in the Spanish-American War as a volunteer with Company E of the 1st West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and served with great distinction with that unit throughout that history-making conflict. During World War I inspired by that high sense of patriotism and civic virtue for which he and his family were noted, the Senator again enlisted in the Army and served in Europe with the high rank of major and once more distinguished himself as a gallant fighter and a devoted son of Uncle Sam.

Of his outstanding service in this war, the late famous Percy D. Haughton, famous Harvard football coach of the era, himself an officer in the American Expeditionary Force, said of Senator Elkins: "Dave Elkins was a great soldier and a great human being, respected and loved by all."

Evidently the people of his home State felt the same way about his patriotic contributions, high character and ability since, while he was still on the European battlefront, they elected him to the U.S. Senate in November 1918.

Much could be spoken of his fine service in the Senate. He early won the high regard of his colleagues and served his constituents, the State, and the Nation with unquestioned integrity, outstanding fidelity, and great ability during his term.

He did not run for reelection. His large and varied business interests, civic and family responsibilities which he had long unselfishly sacrificed to serve his country, demanded his consideration and attention and he reluctantly retired to private life.

Senator Elkins' warm friend of Senate days, President Warren G. Harding, greatly honored him by offering him an important Cabinet post, but his many business affairs and domestic duties enjoined him from acceptance, notwithstanding the persistent urgings of the President and his many friends and advisers. As the Senator put it himself: "I am grateful for the honor and wish it were possible for me to serve. But I must give some attention now to my business and my family."

Senator Elkins' family life was typically American and fabulously happy. In 1926, he married the charming, talented, and gracious Mary Regan of Washington, a young lady noted for her beauty, keen wit, and popularity, who bore him three lovely children, Katherine, now Mrs. Charles J. Kelly of New York City, Maureen, now Mrs. A. Thomas Zirpolo of Cleveland, Ohio, and Davis Elkins, Jr., now of Elkins, W. Va.

The Elkins family life was also truly ideal and brought great joy and great pride to the distinguished Senator.

Very many friends of official Washington, the Nation, and even the world, the famous and the unsung, drawn from every walk of life, moved from time to time in and out of the noted Elkins home where hospitality, graciousness, love, generosity, kindness, and a strong Christian faith always abided.

I can speak with intimate personal knowledge of this lovely Elkins family because it was frequently my privilege and pleasure to visit them in their home. Never have I known more generous hosts; never have I experienced more gracious hospitality; never have I seen a more beautiful family or a more wholesome, interesting, inspiring home environment.

The great and the humble passed through the doors of that inspiring home. It was a salon, in the very best sense, of fine culture, enlightenment and gayety. Above all, it was a home which exemplified the finest qualities of parenthood and the most appealing attributes of filial love and devotion. The home of Davis and Mary Elkins was a home to remember, as those who have ever visited it will gratefully testify.

The Elkins children were brought up with scrupulous, yet loving vigilance, care, and affection and they have lived up to high early promise. The girls are happily married, are blessed with beautiful children; the boy is rapidly making his way in the business world. Together, they brought great joy to their devoted dad and granddad and to their loving mother and grandmother—a family of which anyone could be proud—American to the core, that can "walk with kings nor lose the common touch," that shines out like a bright star in the firmament of modern life in our great Republic.

Davis Elkins was a man of rectitude and high honor, a two fisted American who up to the time of his disability attended prize fights, wrestling matches, and athletic contests. Born to the manor, so to speak, he was plain in speech, democratic in manner, kind of heart, generous of impulse.

He was a hard hitter, blunt spoken against injustice, sham, and quackery, firm in his convictions, rugged of character, stern in his sense of duty. Essentially, he was a kind and generous soul, deep in his knowledge of humanity, keenly aware of its problems, eager to do his part whether by bountiful private philanthropy or public action to lighten the burden and better the lot of all those unable to help themselves.

His loyalties and affections knew no narrow bounds of party, race, creed, or class. He was a friend to man, a public servant of whom any nation could be proud; a husband and father of whom any family could be eternally grateful, as I know his devoted family is.

In the poignant sorrow of their bereavement, I extend to Mrs. Elkins and to each and every one of them the most heartfelt sympathy of my family and myself. May the good Lord bring them strength and courage in their dark hour of sadness and travail. May they find "that peace of God, which passeth all understanding."

An able honest man, a noble statesman, and a great American, Davis Elkins, has gone to his heavenly reward. His State, the Nation, the people and his many friends join his bereaved family in mourning his lamented passing. May God bless and keep him.

Why Blame the Small Tobacco Farmer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in defense of the small tobacco farmers of West Virginia of whom there are over 4,000 in my Fourth Congressional District.

These small farmers grow burley tobacco, and their average acreage is only about six-tenths of 1 acre. Their average income is less than $600 per year, and for many of them tobacco is the only cash crop.

Over the past few years we have experienced the effects of Secretary of Agriculture Benson's policies which have driven millions of our smaller farmers off the farms. On November 18, 1958, Secretary Benson indicated he was planning a 16-percent cut in the quota for burley tobacco.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture itself stated in hearings of the Tobacco Division which I attended only yesterday morning that the Department had overestimated 1958 production of burley tobacco by some 20 million pounds. I submit that there is no surplus of burley tobacco. And even if there were, I cannot get it through my thick head why the small West Virginia tobacco farmers should be blamed instead of the big tobacco growers who have large acreages of tobacco.

I say it is about time we in Congress stand up and protect the little fellow. Many of these small tobacco farmers will go bankrupt if Secretary Benson is allowed to cut the burley tobacco quota. Then what will happen? They may go to the cities and add to our already overburdened relief facilities. But most of them cannot even do that, and they will either starve or eke out a meager existence on Federal surplus commodities, on which over 300,000 people in the State of West Virginia are now barely subsisting.

Mr. Speaker, the tobacco farmers of my district are law-abiding people. They recognize the need for quotas and controls. But I am not going to stand idly by and watch them starved by a policy of favoring the big tobacco interests. I serve notice that if there is any cut in the burley tobacco quota, I will introduce and fight for legislation to restore that quota.

Thomas Jefferson once said that farming is not only a means of making a living but a way of life itself. That is the case with our mountaineer tobacco farmers. Let us not sell them down the river.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask to print excerpts from letters I have received from small tobacco people in West Virginia.

TEAYS, W. Va., *January 12, 1959.*

DEAR MR. HECHLER: The farmers in this section of Putnam County want me to write to you in regard to the tobacco situation in this neighborhood. None of us have more than six-tenths of an acre allotment and some not more than five-tenths of an acre. And we don't earn more than an average of $500 a year, but that little bit is vital to most of us. It enables the landowner to buy his seed, fertilizer, and necessary farm machinery and repairs.

Yours truly,

MRS. DAVID WHITE.

MILTON, W. Va., *January 13, 1959.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HECHLER: You are well aware of the fact that many a poor man is dependent on his small allotment of one-half an acre of tobacco or maybe less to keep him off D.P.A. To reduce allotments would result in some having to apply for relief and, at the same time, lowering their pride and morale.

Yours truly,

H. L. WOODY.

Needed: More Defense Contracts in Indiana Areas of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to praise the action taken this week by the Rules Committee of the House in urging that the Committee on Armed Services investigate the failure by the Department of Defense to award Government contracts to areas of substantial unemployment.

I refer specifically to House Resolution 19 which, among its other purposes, authorizes the committee "to conduct a full and complete investigation" into the procurement and use of materiel, equipment, supplies, and services by or within the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, since 1953 we in the Third District of Indiana have suffered violent fluctuations in employment. Two of the four counties in my district have too often been in the substantial labor surplus or distressed area category.

Because of economic conditions within my district and because of similar conditions in other distressed areas throughout the Nation, I am glad to see the scope of the investigation covered by House Resolution 19 extended to include a study of whether or not defense contracts are properly being awarded to business firms in areas suffering from serious unemployment.

I have discussed this possibility with the Honorable RAY J. MADDEN, of Gary, Ind., who was among those members of the Rules Committee reporting H. R. 19 favorably to the House. My distinguished colleague from Indiana has in-

formed me that the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, is in agreement with the extension of the committee's power to study the relationship between first, unemployment, and second, the favoritism by the Defense Department of big companies over small firms in the granting of Government contracts.

I specifically call to the attention of the Armed Services Committee and of Congress the critical unemployment situation in the South Bend area, and I want to commend my good friend, Congressman MADDEN, for his emphasis at the Rules Committee hearing yesterday on the situation at the Studebaker-Packard plant in South Bend.

I respectfully submit that the investigation of which I speak can develop much valuable information toward the end that areas of substantial unemployment are, whenever practical, awarded more contracts by the Department of Defense.

The human and economic cost of high unemployment is ample justification for awarding more government work to such areas.

Smears and Slogans, and What They Mean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the current issue of Labor, official organ of the railway unions:

SMEARS AND SLOGANS, AND WHAT THEY MEAN

Congress is open again, the President is talking again, and however short the supply of new jobs in 1959 there's no doubt the year will bring a plenitude of one commodity—words.

Some of the glittering phrases now being tossed around don't shine quite so brightly, however, if you look beneath the chrome. Here are some undraped definitions for a few of these glittering phrases:

Better business climate: This is the slogan worked out by the giant General Electric Co., and used by some manufacturers associations too, to describe their goal in jumping into politics.

This phrase doesn't sound antilabor. But GE President Robert Paxton, speaking to an audience of industrialists recently, was much more frank. "Unless businessmen can build an effective counterforce to the alliance between the labor unions and the welfare-state politicians," he told them, "the political climate for business is going to deteriorate rapidly." For GE, a better climate means one where unions are weak or nonexistent.

Union monopoly power: This refers to the ability of unionized workers to stop work all at once, that is, to strike. A popular phrase among the heads of monopolistic corporations. It's usually coupled with a demand to put unions under the antitrust laws to prevent union monopoly power, and thus outlaw many strikes.

Monopolistic labor bosses: The ones who make use of union monopoly power by leading a strike. Nearly always, to hear the industrialists tell it, the helpless workers are dragooned into striking by the labor bosses. No mention is made of strike votes by the members.

Union crooks: This refers to the approximately 40 trade union officers against whom Senate and House committees in the last 5 years have uncovered proved or provable dishonest acts. The labor movement has 16,000 full-time paid national and international union officials and 420,000 local union officers.

Citizen Action Committee: Political front group for industrialists. In last year's elections, according to Charles R. Sligh, Jr., executive vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers: "At our suggestion Citizen Action Committees were formed, not NAM committees but committees of like-minded people who were willing to work, to organize, and to serve at their own local levels."

Conservative: A fine old English word, but not to be applied to Britain's Conservative Party, which supports national health insurance and is too radical for U.S. manufacturers. As used by big business spokesmen, a conservative is a politician who would conserve America's institutions by ripipng out all the reforms of the New Deal and Fair Deal.

Radical: What Ford calls Chevrolet's new styling this year. What the Republicans call the Democrats who won last year. Also, any politician opposed to the wrecking job urged by conservatives, as cited above.

Big spender: Any Member of Congress who's not content with voting $40 billion a year for the military but who also wants adeqaute funds for the Food and Drug Administration to stop sale of filthy foods and poison drugs, or a few million more for the Wage-Hour Administration to stop employers from cheating on the $1 an hour minimum wage, or for other measures to protect workers and consumers.

Right to work: This old chestnut is still with us, alas. Five years ago Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell nailed it as follows: "They call these right-to-work laws, but that is not what they really are. In the first place, they do not create any jobs. In the second place, they result in undesirable and unnecessary limitation upon the freedom of working men and women and their employers to bargain collectively. * * * Third, they restrict union security and thereby undermine the basic strength of labor organizations."

When you come across any of these glittering phrases, pause just a moment to think what they really mean. Nowadays, as many workers have found to their sorrow, the old nursery rhyme needs rephrasing: "Sticks and stones can break our bones, but words can hurt us too."

Dr. Felix J. Underwood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Felix J. Underwood, who contributed more to Mississippi than any other Mississippian during my lifetime, passed away on Friday, January 9. Although Dr. Underwood had officially retired last June as head of the Mississippi State Board of Health, he was still hard at work in his office when death came so suddenly.

Dr. Underwood left private practice to enter the public health service in 1917.

I can never care for more than 2,000 or 3,000 people as a private physician—

He said.

As a public health physician I can care for millions.

Dr. Underwood's own career proved this to be literally true. It was a popular saying in Mississippi that he had saved a million lives. During his administration deaths from malaria were cut from nearly 1,000 annually to less than 1 per decade. Maternal deaths were reduced from 7 for each 1,000 live births to slightly more than 1. Tuberculosis deaths dropped from 4,000 a year to rare cases. Venereal disease is down 93 percent.

Dr. Underwood received the Laska Foundation Public Health Service award and many other tributes for his great work in the health field. I was especially pleased by the fact that in the year of his retirement the editors of my State voted him the man of the year in Mississippi for 1958.

Under unanimous consent, I would like to include as part of the RECORD, first an excerpt from my book "The Yazoo River," which describes some of Dr. Underwood's work in the Mississippi Delta, and an editorial from the Clarksdale Press Register and from the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

EXCERPTS FROM THE YAZOO RIVER

(By Hon. FRANK E. SMITH of Mississippi)

A few farsighted indiyiduals began to protect themselves and their homes from mosquitoes after the Gorgas discoveries became known, but relatively little was accomplished that was not already foreordained in the interest of personal comfort—protection from the bite of the mosquito, not its consequences. The first real attack on malaria made in the delta came only after 1920, when a young man from the hills came down to Jackson to become director of the Mississippi Department of Public Health. Felix J. Underwood and the miracles he has accomplished on a threadbare budget are something of a legend in American public health services, but there is no better record than his attack on malaria in the delta. His first job was to persuade the counties to set up proper public health departments as a means of spreading health education and preventive practices. The people had to be taught that the mosquito bite brought malaria and that the mosquito could be controlled by eliminating his breeding areas. The 1920's were a period when Federal Government agencies were a long way from the idea of major health expenditures in Mississippi; Dr. Underwood had to get his pump-priming money from the Rockefeller Foundation.

Dr. Underwood was convinced that most malarial transmissions were made by night-biting mosquitoes. Homes could be screened to keep the mosquito away from sleeping victims. More than just telling about this, the State board of health established screen-door factories at strategic points in the delta. Strong screen doors were made to fit tenant houses and furnished at cost to plantation owners who would agree to screen the cabin windows, which could be done by merely tacking screen wire across the window casings.

During much of the early period of the delta's history, many of the largest life insurance companies in the country came into the area only for investment purposes. Farm mortgages produced a good income, and

eventually financing of farm operations became part of the overall insurance investment program. Some of these same life insurance companies would not write policies on delta citizens because of the high malaria mortality and other adverse health conditions. In the late 1920's the State board of health submitted the first survey of the accomplishments of the malaria control program, and the insurance companies decided they could take the risk on deltans. Today all special area rate discriminations have been eliminated.

The depression knocked out Dr. Underwood's screen funds, as well as his cooperating planters, but the depression-born WPA offered him a chance for an even more extensive program. For 7 years, beginning in 1935, a malaria control program emphasizing elimination of mosquito breeding places was in operation, with approximately 1,000 WPA workers assigned to the project in the Yazoo-delta area.

WPA ended with World War II, but the war-borne development of DDT as an antimalarial insecticide brought dividends to the delta. A Federal malaria control program was carried on 5 years after the war. Dr. Underwood allotted all of Mississippi's share of this program for the mass use of DDT as a residual spray in the interior of substandard homes in the delta. The Federal program has been ended, but many delta counties and cities today still carry on a limited spraying program in some fashion, with generally popular results.

The residual spray program, like most of the other malarial control measures, had very important secondary benefits. The spray killed flies and other pests just as it killed mosquitoes. In one county the infant death rate dropped 64 percent, largely as a result of the practical elimination of dysentery and other intestinal disorders.

Cold figures best tell the story of the antimalarial campaign which the Mississippi State Board of Health has led. In 1920 there were 65,271 reported cases of malaria in 17 delta counties, with death resulting in 477 cases. In 1951, in the same counties, with much better reporting facilities, there were only nine cases of malaria, with no deaths.

The delta feels sure that it has licked malaria, but Dr. Underwood is still on the alert. Malaria is still endemic in the area, and there is always the chance of more aggressive forms of it being brought in by returning troops. The development of rice planting is going to offer opportunities for increased mosquito breeding. Dr. Underwood and his board of health will be watching.

[From the Clarksdale (Miss.) Press Register, Jan. 10, 1959]

DR. FELIX J. UNDERWOOD

The death late yesterday of Dr. Felix J. Underwood, 75-year-old "retired" executive officer of the Mississippi State Board of Health, took from the scene a dedicated public servant.

Dr. Underwood's entire life stands as an enduring monument—a credit to the man, to his profession, and to the people of the State he dearly loved and served with an unselfish devotion.

We use the term "retired" in quotes to describe him, because for a man like Dr. Underwood there could be no such thing as retirement as long as there were battles to be fought in man's never-ending struggle with disease and death. The only kind of retirement possible for him came yesterday when he died suddenly while hard at work in an office which he no longer officially held.

For 10 years after graduating in medicine in 1908 Dr. Underwood practiced at Aberdeen, Miss., growing dissatisfied with private practice because he could "never care for more than a few thousand people." So he joined the State health board in 1917, becoming executive head 7 years later at a time when mass killers and cripplers like typhoid, malaria, dysentery, pellagra, infantile paralysis, and other mass infectious diseases still stalked Mississippi like the Horsemen of the Apocalypse.

Under his leadership in public health maternal deaths were reduced from 7 to 1 in every thousand births. Where malaria once claimed a thousand lives a year, there is now scarcely more than one case every decade. Swamps were drained and people educated to screening and sanitation under his guidance. Working with the late, great Dr. Henry Boswell he played his part in developing the sanitorium, and tuberculosis no longer claims 4,000 Mississippians every year. Venereal disease has been reduced 95 percent in the past 30 years, and pellagra, typhoid and infectious dysentery are almost unknown to this generation.

Much recognition but little material reward came to Dr. Underwood. He passed up many opportunities to improve his own position in order to fight the good fight for the general health of the people of this State.

Just last month Dr. Underwood was properly honored as man of the year in Mississippi for 1958, and next week he was to receive one of the first annual awards for distinguished service to the State, presented by the First Federal of Jackson Foundation and administered by the University of Mississippi.

Any recognition extended to Dr. Felix J. Underwood, the man who saved a million lives, was more than deserved.

[From the Memphis Comercial Appeal]

DR. FELIX J. UNDERWOOD

On the roster of those who have rendered invaluable service to the people of Mississippi in particular and the Nation in general the name of Dr. Felix J. Underwood will stand very high. When he retired, last June, as executive officer of the State board of health he had held that post for 34 years and had won the right to be called the man who saved a million lives.

Dr. Underwood had battled unceasingly against ailments such as typhoid, malaria, and diphtheria until their ravages among the people of Mississippi had been reduced to a minimum. He was of great aid to the late Dr. Henry Boswell in developing Mississippi's highly effective campaign against tuberculosis. In fact, anything that affected the public health was his concern so that he became outstanding in that field.

In addition to his immediate duties, Dr. Underwood worked with professional organizations and had been president of State, regional, and national associations. He was physician to a nation, that is to say.

It is good to know that United Press International newspaper, radio, and television editors had named Dr. Underwood Mississippi's man of the year for 1958 last month. He had also been selected to receive the University of Mississippi's "Missy" Award for Distinguished Service.

Dr. Underwood so employed his talents and energies that he left the world a far better place than it would have been without him, and the fact is an epitaph among the finest.

New Republican Leader in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a story from the Washington Sunday Star of January 11, 1959, concerning the recent change in Republican leadership:

STORY OF G.O.P. REVOLT HAS VARIED CHAPTERS

(By Richard Fryklund)

A succession of election defeats, White House standpatism and lack of dynamic leadership all contributed to the Republican discontent which exploded last week in the removal of JOE MARTIN as G.O.P. leader in the House.

So say those who did the deed. The revolution that ended in the dethronement of Mr. MARTIN and the coronation of CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, was really a composite of smaller revolutions, they say, and the only surprise was that the parts fitted together at the right time and place.

The final piece fell into place only half an hour before the fateful party caucus began last Tuesday—but that piece had been ready for years.

As a starting point, one might go back to a meeting of House Republicans at the end of the 83d Congress. Republicans had the White House, both Houses of Congress and peace, prosperity, and progress. They should have been sitting pretty for the 1954 congressional elections, but many of them thought they weren't.

MORE FIGHT DESIRED

They blamed their leaders for a lack of vigor in presenting the Republican case to the public. They wanted, specifically, more fight from then Speaker MARTIN, less friendly cooperation with SAM RAYBURN and his Democrats.

Mr. MARTIN urged caution and then said, it is reported, that if the Republicans did not win the House again in November, he would let someone else assume the leadership.

The Republicans lost, but Mr. MARTIN did not resign.

Floor leader and heir apparent was Mr. HALLECK. He not only didn't get the minority leadership post, or even the assistant's job, but he was given no post at all. The now-public Martin-Halleck feud was well under way.

The pot simmered while the White House cautioned against change.

ANOTHER BEATING DEVELOPED

"Through the 84th Congress we took a beating again," said Representative BOB WILSON, of California, one of the active leaders in Tuesday's revolt. "We were slow on debate, uncoordinated in our actions. Our floor management gave all the advantages to the Democrats."

Again, in 1956 congressional Republicans lost seats in the election. Again the word circulated on the Hill that Mr. MARTIN would step down. Again the White House advised against change. Again Mr. HALLECK was passed over for the post he thought he had earned.

During the 85th Congress, some of the newer Congressmen tried to provide new vigor on their own hook. A half dozen of them organized a research group and without any active help from Mr. MARTIN, began digging out ammunition with which to arm their colleagues in fights with the Democrats.

This was an inadequate, but significant prelude to more positive action.

LAST NOVEMBER LAST STRAW

When the Congress adjourned, Mr. MARTIN again talked of stepping down or at least naming an assistant leader. But again, no action.

The heavy loss of seats last November was the last straw. Mr. HALLECK told friends he was determined to make an open fight for the minority leadership in January. Large numbers of House Republicans obviously began to think of ways of removing Mr. MARTIN. And White House aides said quietly that the President would take no part in the fight.

There was an uncoordinated seething on the Hill, reported by many correspondents, but taken seriously by almost no one.

An organized movement was still needed. This was provided in mid-December when members of the research group decided to organize.

On December 15 Mr. WILSON, a member of that group, started to call every House Republican in town to invite them to a meeting in his office to discuss the House leadership. He rounded up only 14 men, most of them young eagerbeavers, men who had been in Congress less than 10 years.

NOMINATIONS DIVIDED

They found they agreed only that a new leader was needed. They divided their nominations for the job among Mr. HALLECK, JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin; GERALD R. FORD, Jr., of Michigan; and RICHARD M. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania—a variegated group alike only in their comparative youth and vigor.

But they decided to stick together and drum up more support for a change.

In a canvass of Members they found plenty of sentiment for a change but only one active campaigner for the position—Mr. HALLECK. They decided he would be their man.

Their canvass showed that of the large State delegations, they could carry for Mr. HALLECK, New York and California but would lose Ohio, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Illinois.

The anti-Martin States are significant. They encourage MARTIN forces now to say the old leader was the victim of a Nixon-Dewey-White House plot. The Halleck side says New York and California Congressmen were for him because they liked him—and had no important MARTIN friends to lead them in the opposite direction.

On New Year's eve the Young Turks aligned themselves formally with Mr. HALLECK and went into the fight on the assumption they could win.

On Thursday, January 1, they started committing members to vote for Mr. HALLECK. There were only about 20 active solicitors, but they soon had the 75-odd votes necessary in their pockets—they thought.

On Saturday they sent a spokesman to Mr. MARTIN to tell him he could be defeated and to offer a compromise: Mr. MARTIN was to accept an assistant leader and he was to give up his second high post of chairman of the Republican Policy Committee.

Mr. MARTIN said he knew all about the revolt and he also knew it didn't have the votes. He could win. He wouldn't bargain.

GIVEN ANOTHER CHANCE

On Monday the rebels approached Mr. MARTIN again. This time, they say, he did offer to take an assistant, rotating the job frequently among several Congressmen. This did not satisfy the Halleck side.

Later Monday, after another assurance that the White House was keeping hands off, the rebels met for the final time. About 35 Members went to the Congressional Hotel to plan for the following day's Republican caucus.

They named a strategy committee, headed by JOHN RHODES, of Arizona, and including Mr. WILSON and Mr. BYRNES, JACK WESTLAND, of Washington; MELVIN R. LAIRD, of Wisconsin; and ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, of Michigan. This group decided first to try for a secret ballot. In the open, they reasoned, Mr. MARTIN's personal friends—and the timid—would not vote for a change.

They decided also to ask for a split in the leadership: Mr. HALLECK for floor leader and Mr. BYRNES for chairmanship of the Policy Committee.

MARTIN SLOW TO SEE LIGHT

Monday night Mr. MARTIN still said "No." He said he could win. Most Capitol Hill observers agreed with him.

But Tuesday morning, before the Republican caucus, Mr. MARTIN apparently had his first doubts. The rebels say he offered a compromise—the same compromise the Halleck group had offered in their first meeting with Mr. MARTIN.

But by this time it was too late. The insurgents felt they could not turn back—and they felt they were winning.

A rebel spokesman called archconservative NOAH MASON, of Illinois, and asked him if he would nominate Mr. HALLECK for the floor leadership. He said he would. He was not a part of the movement but, he said later, he had long wanted a change and would have nominated any one of several men.

All of the pieces were in place. The fateful meeting started a half hour later.

On the issue of secrecy and splitting the leadership jobs, the rebel motion won, 96–50. Since all of the Members knew a secret ballot would help Mr. HALLECK, the rebels thought this was a good count of their strength but on the actual ballot for floor leadership, Mr. MARTIN's friends rallied enough support to hold Mr. HALLECK to 73 votes—1 short of the necessary majority. Mr. MARTIN had 72 votes. One ballot was invalid.

On the second try, the Halleck forces won, 74–70, and as one rebel put it, "We had regretfully repudiated Mr. Republican."

Today there is surprisingly little bitterness. Mr. MARTIN himself is understandably angry and deeply hurt. But even as close a colleague as CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio, says both sides should now join ranks and heal up last week's split.

Mr. HALLECK himself has gone to Mr. MARTIN's closest friends with offers of good will and promises of fairness in future party work.

Member after Member summed it up in this phrase last week:

"The king is dead. Long live the king."

A Great American Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to call attention to a great American family which now resides in Chicago and which perhaps exemplifies the very spirit which has built America.

Alexander and Mary Krol have fought hard to guide their nine children toward one uncompromising goal: to be worthy American citizens, even though Mr. and Mrs. Krol themselves came to this country as immigrants from Poland. I am inserting an excellent article by Mr. Paul Friggens which appeared in the January 11, 1959, issue of the Chicago Tribune about this remarkable family.

I am inserting this article so that we as Americans of second and third generation, and perhaps fourth, fifth, and sixth generation of immigrant parents will be reminded that this Nation today is prosperous, free, and strong only because immigrants from all over the world came here with a spirit of dedication to the dignity of man.

Too often we look upon the immigrant as a second-class citizen or even perhaps an interloper upon our shores. I am convinced that all who read this excellent account of the Krol family and the sacrifices this gallant man and woman made to make their children worthy citizens would be inspired with a new respect for these wonderful immigrants who build America.

But most important, I wish that every young American mother and father could read this article and see what great sacrifices—what determination and dedication and great responsibilities—go with parenthood. The Krol family indeed could well serve as a symbol for American parents today.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. and Mrs. Alexander J. Krol, Chicagoans of foreign birth, were awarded a citation for distinguished achievement in the field of family living by the Immigrants' Protective League of Chicago.

This particular family happens to have come from Poland but it exemplifies the spirit of immigrants who came here from Italy, Ireland, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, Hungary, the Ukraine, the Scandinavian countries and many other nations.

The article follows:

REPORT CARDS FOR MAMA

(By Paul Friggens)

In Chicago recently a modest pink-cheeked Polish couple in their seventies were hailed as the outstanding example of family life among the city's foreign born. Mama Krol looked down the speakers' table at the civic banquet—Adlai Stevenson and Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas were among the dozens of national and civic leaders present—and was overcome. "Never in my life so many look at me like this." She slipped her hand through the arm of her husband, Alex, and stood up to receive the distinguished-achievement award.

This immigrant couple had sent all nine of their children through school and college and had given Chicago four doctors, two engineers, a chemist, an electrical contractor, and a dental nurse. Later Mary Krol found words to explain something of their accomplishment:

"For more than 40 years I save my children's report cards. Always my biggest thrill was when they come home from school with fine report card. But I tell them America is a good country. They must do better because the country is better."

Alex and Mary Krol have made the most of their opportunities and have repaid America many times since the day, 51 years ago, when they took their wedding vows in St. Mary's of Perpetual Help in Chicago and entered on their new life in the United States. Alex was a skilled cabinetmaker; Mary, pretty and dark eyed, a seamstress, who earned 17 cents an hour in a garment factory. She walked 20 blocks to and from work daily to save two 5-cent carfares.

Like most immigrants at about the turn of the century, the newlyweds had no place to live except among their own people in the segregated foreign section. In this polyglot neighborhood—of which the Krols are still proud—their first four children were born—Henry, Walter, and the twins, Adam and Edward. The young mother wheeled her babies along the wooden sidewalks and dreamed of the day when her children's education would begin. Alex had to work hard for small pay. Thinking of her own pitifully poor education, Mary prayed, "God help me to raise mine different."

And so began the story of the Krols and their report cards.

Henry was the first to bring home the wonderous piece of paper. Mama had never seen one before and had difficulty deciphering the marks and symbols. "You sure it says good?" she pressed her first grader.

Henry nodded. Mama proudly showed the card to Alex.

When Henry completed the eighth grade Mama was triumphant. The Krols dressed in their homemade best and sat up front for the exercises at St. Mary's. The children wore a colored ribbon to denote promotion. Henry sported one, too. Mama nudged Alex: "Now, you see, our Henry is as smart as anybody."

In time there were other babies—Alex Jr., Zenon, and Leonard. The cabinet maker scraped together enough for a downpayment on a modest bungalow in the same neighborhood. By now Papa was making $20 a week, and Mama supplemented this by sewing at night under the new gas light.

With Henry in high school and six other young Krols following him, Mama became an authority on report cards. As the children raced home with them, she examined each card in turn. "Good. See what Walter has done, and Eddy. Now, Adam, you do it, too." One of the Krol sons told me: "Mama was always raising our sights." But she never censured because of a poor grade. "Do the best you can," she urged. At year's end Mama kept the precious cards in a cooky jar and reviewed them.

Report card day was always an occasion for celebration. For the best grades Mama awarded a new shirt, or mittens or shoes, whichever the children needed most. Then everybody scrambled for a special treat—Mama's homemade Polish pastry. Sometimes while the children were eating, she pictured how they would all grow up to make their way in the professions. "You should get good report card, and you can be anything."

Study nights for seven children became a highly organized affair. As soon as supper was over, Mama cleared the big kitchen table and work began in earnest. Papa and Mama did homework, too—Alex taking on extra jobs in his carpenter shop and Mary singing over her secondhand sewing machine. Probably no family in Throop Street in those days was happier. Neighbors recall Mama's favorite saying: "God is good to us. We are strong to work, and such a good country to raise children ana make friend."

By 1930 Henrietta and Arthur, their two youngest, had arrived and Alex now had nine children to support. Then the depression struck and Alex was among the first to lose his job. He walked the streets for months, job hunting. When he dragged himself home one night he learned that they were going to lose their home because they couldn't keep up the payments. He had paid $3,000 and only owed a few hundred dollars, but a mortgagor was foreclosing on several Throop Street homes.

Papa and mama discussed having the older boys quit school and work to save the home. At that time there were three in college. Mama decided, "They can take home away but never education. Alex, we keep boys in school."

The Krols moved their scanty furnishings (including a set of Shakespeare) to an $18 a month, second floor walkup flat in a seedy neighborhood. The children slept three in a bed, helped lug coal up two flights of stairs. In Chicago's bitter winter the Krols' only floor covering was newspapers—mama good naturedly called them Polish carpets.

Now the entire family pooled its efforts and carried on. Alex was able to pick up odd jobs and mama sewed heroic hours. The boys hustled as grocery clerks, delivery boys, and newspaper carriers. Leonard Krol recalls: "When we started out on our paper routes at 3 o'clock on winter mornings, mama put hot baked potatoes in our pockets to warm our hands."

Walter was the first of the family to earn a degree. He was graduated in architectural engineering. Mama's brown eyes still get misty when she talks about it. "I tell you it was a miracle. Come night before Walter register and still we need $50 to pay schooling. I go down on my knees and pray. And you know, next morning a neighbor come and squeeze $50 in my hand."

Not all of the neighbors were as charitable. A few ridiculed mama for keeping her oldest sons in school when they might be earning, and street gangs jeered the studious Krol children. Sometimes the Krol youngsters went to school with mustard sandwiches, while the family's mainstays were potato pançakes, Polish dumplings, and stew.

Mama Krol looks back on this period pridefully. "We were happy. Always they bring home good report cards. It was better than money."

With three boys at home doing college work now, Mama arranged a double study shift. While the younger Krols did their homework, the future medics and engineers slipped off to bed. Then when the house quieted down they got up to study until the early hours of the morning. Mama, the alarm clock, stayed up ironing, sewing, or baking. Some nights she never went to bed. These study nights became the talk of the neighborhood.

Come weekends and holidays, Mama relaxed the study discipline. The family gathered around the piano and sang, and the drab flat became a festive place. The Krol children, encouraged to bring home their friends, sometimes invited a dozen guests. Mama cheerfully set the table three times. "I always know what kind of company my children keep. No saying, 'I'm going out' as they do these days and then disappear." The Krol home welcomed Japanese, Jewish, Italian, Ukrainian, Irish, and Slavic friends of the children.

In the late thirties Papa finally found steady work. Putting the rest of the children through school proved a bit easier. And now every June found a Krol graduating, and sometimes two or three—from grammar school, high school, or college. By 1940 the determined couple had seven of their nine children through college.

The Krols saw four sons off to war, while two others gave outstanding service to their country. Edward joined as a surgeon in the Air Force Medical Corps; Henry, who used to sit up half the night studying languages, served as an interpreter for the military government in Germany; Zenon was in the Army Dental Corps in Japan; and Arthur in the Army dental school. Engineer Walter worked on the Manhattan project, helping to build the atom bomb, and Adam was called to do top secret chemical work for the Government.

"It was most happiness day," Mama recalls when, at the war's end, all returned to Paulina Street.

In 1947 Arthur finished dental school, and Papa and Mama Krol had their final victory. Mama looked wistfully at the cooky jar with the accumulation of nine children's report cards. "Those best days of all. What I give now to have few more report card." As a parting reward, the children arranged to move Mama and Papa out of Paulina Street into a newer section of Chicago.

It had been an unbelievable struggle.

For years Alex and Mary never afforded a 20-cent carfare to the Loop.

They never went to a movie.

They never bought an automobile and drive none today.

But there were bright memories, too. Senior prom night, for instance, when the twins had saved only enough money to rent one tuxedo. Eddy rushed home midevening, repressed the suit, and Adam donned it and took his turn at the affair. There was Sunday when the family faithfully attended church, but in twos and threes so as to change coats with each other. Mama was proud that there was always a Krol as altar boy.

And there was Papa's incredible Christmas tree.

Papa Krol always waited until Christmas Eve when the tree sales were over and he could get a leftover tree for nothing. Then, picking up loose branches, he went home and glued them into the trunk. It turned out the most beautiful Christmas tree in the neighborhood. Afterward, the family shared the sacred Polish wafer, oplatek, and wished each other God's care for the coming year.

Thus a Polish immigrant family grew up in the Chicago tenements and found lights to live by. "The miracle is that none of them turned out to be delinquents," declares an authority who knows the district well.

But it was never a miracle to Papa and Mama Krol.

This last year brought crowning events for the Polish couple. They celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary with their 9 children and 19 grandchildren. Mama flew to Poland to unite with brothers she had not seen since sailing to America 52 years ago. "I came back glad to kneel and kiss ground in the United States." And the Immigrants' Service league, foremost organization of foreign born in Chicago, nominated the Krols for the best example of family life among Chicago's immigrants. Papa and Mama were whisked off to a plush Loop hotel for the recognition ceremonies. Waiting in the audience were proud sons and daughter.

Mama shushed Papa in order to hear Adlai Stevenson. He was reading the children's list of achievements—Edward, senior surgeon and president of the staff of Holy Cross Hospital; Zenon, senior oral surgeon in the same hospital; Adam, fellow of the American Institute of Chemistry; Arthur, professor of dentistry at Loyola University Dental School, and down the list.

Stevenson concluded: "All I have to do is look at you and your family and I am convinced that if the United States ever loses its vitality, history will fix the date as May 1921—the year Congress passed restricted immigration quotas."

Now Justice Douglas gave the final salute. Addressing the honored couple, he told them:

"You are part of the American dream. You have been as distinctly human, as markedly individualistic in thought and achievement as Einstein, Fermi, or Toscanini."

Alex and Mary were too moved to reply. But, as a Chicago newspaper said, it didn't matter, because the standing ovation would have drowned out any thank you's.

When it was all over, reporters crowded around the Krols and Mama summed up their formula for families everywhere.

"Go to church every Sunday.

"Don't let them get sassy.

"And make sure they bring home good report cards."

The Question of German Reunification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most realistic articles that has come to my attention on the difficult question of German reunification is the article in today's Washington Post by Mr. Walter Lippmann. I believe that this distinguished commentator's views on the German question will be of interest to the Members of Congress. I include the

article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 15, 1959]

MR. DULLES MOVES

(By Walter Lippmann)

At his press conference on Tuesday, Mr. Dulles opened the door to negotiations on the future of Germany. He was scrupulously careful to say that he was not now negotiating with Mr. Mikoyan. But he has made it possible for Mr. Mikoyan to report back to Moscow that there is a desire on both sides to get together and talk.

Mr. Dulles did this by making two points. Neither of these points is entirely new. But the emphasis upon them, considering the circumstances, gives them a new importance. The first point is that while the formula of reunification by free elections is the "agreed formula" and, while we think it is "a naural method," he "wouldn't say that it is the only method by which reunification could be accomplished." The second point is his acceptance of the principle that for a reunited Germany there must be military guarantees to reassure the Soviet Union—"if there is going to be any reunification of Germany, it has got to be under conditions which take into account realistically some of those very elemental, primitive facts of life."

The record shows that the point which Mr. Dulles made about free elections was first made in our note to the Soviet Union on September 30 of last year, and was reiterated in our note of December 31. For some months at least we have not regarded free elections as the necessary first step to German reunification. And the record shows also that we have long recognized that if the Soviet Union withdraws from a reunified Germany, it is entitled to have military guarantees against the possibility of German aggression.

Nevertheless, it is important that Mr. Dulles emphasized these two points on the eve of his second round of talks with Mr. Mikoyan. It was evident at the press conference that he was acutely aware that there would be a reaction in Bonn, possibly in London and other West European capitals. To soften this reaction, he dwelt on the thoroughness of our consultations with our allies, and he spoke at length on his agreement with and admiration for Dr. Adenauer's conception of European policy.

But his remarks that free elections are not the only method by which reunification can be accomplished have, as the dispatches show, aroused Dr. Adenauer. It remains to be seen whether once again, as on several previous occasions when Mr. Dulles tried not to be entirely inflexible, Dr. Adenauer will compel Mr. Dulles to retract and reverse himself.

The real question about free elections is whether they must come first, whether they are the necessary first step to German reunification. Those who hold this view are, in effect, demanding the liquidation of the East German state and the absorption of the East Germans into the West German state. The trouble with this view is that it is absolutely impossible to achieve it in any foreseeable time. For it demands an unconditional surrender of the Soviet position in the whole of Germany, and unconditional surrender by the Soviet Union is a pipedream.

I think it is not unfair to say that those who demand free elections as the first step to German reunification are not urgently interested in bringing about reunification. Some of them want to believe, hoping against hope, that the Soviet Union will somehow collapse. Many of them do not want to have to face the enormously complicated problems which a reunified Germany will pose. In the status quo with a divided Germany there are very powerful interests which would prefer not to be disturbed.

Thus, for example, a reunified Germany with free elections would be far more to the left than Adenauer's Germany. For another example, the whole fascinating structure of the West European political and economic community which Mr. Dulles spoke of would have serious problems if it had to digest the 17 million East Germans. For still another example, a reunified Germany could not long remain the camping ground of the NATO armies, and this would raise the problem of where the NATO forces should be stationed.

Against all these difficulties there has, however, to be weighed the grave and incalculable dangers of the continuing partition of Germany. For, sooner or later, there will be uprisings against the Soviet hold on East Germany and on Poland, and if there are these uprisings, we may all be sucked into the struggle. To avert that it is necessary to proceed to the reunification of Germany which, if I understood him correctly, is what Mr. Dulles has decided that he must try to do.

If that is our purpose, there is no reason why German reunification should not begin with a provisional regime—that of a dual state with some common political institution—under a pact or constitution which promised that there should be a gradual integration over a period of years, culminating in a free election to elect a constituent assembly, which would form an all-German state.

This is only one among innumerable conceivable ways of bringing about reunification of the two Germanys. The crucial question is whetheer on the Soviet side and on our side there is in fact a genuine will to make one German state.

Segregation by Sex Might Ease Fears of Racial Intermarriage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an article which appeared in the December 6 issue of the Saturday Evening Post. This editorial presents an interesting theory that perhaps integration of races but segregation of sexes might prove to be the answer to qur school segregation problem. I felt this should be brought to the attention of the House since, in my opinion, any possible solution to this issue should be thoroughly considered:

SEGREGATION BY SEX MIGHT EASE FEARS OF RACIAL INTERMARRIAGE

An obstacle to school integration in the South is local resistance to mingling white and Negro youngsters of both sexes in institutions that are social as well as educational—as coeducational public schools are.

Many southerners consider this the basic stumbling block. However one judges that, the issue bulks large in the southern mind. To remove it might help clear the air and enable all parties, North as well as South, to make more sense on the subject.

Here and there southerners trying to observe the Supreme Court's "all deliberate speed," are experimenting with various methods of integation—for instance, starting it in the first grade instead of high school, the most sensitive area. So far, this range of integration experiments is missing one trick that could eliminate much of the sex angle from a situation already difficult enough.

Integrate the races, but segregate the sexes. Put all the boys, both white and Negro, in one set of schools; put all the girls, both white and Negro, in another set.

The scheme is not original. The late Senator Hiram Bingham, of Connecticut, suggested it a good while ago. Every year or so somebody else dreams it up and mentions it publicly. Tennessee has passed a law permitting school boards to integrate in this fashion. Macon, Ga., revised a school building program with this in mind. But at the opening of schools last September no place had actually tried it. Perhaps they fear that the Supreme Court might discover sociological support for the idea that boys separated from girls, and vice versa, develop inferiority complexes of serious dimensions.

However, separate educational institutions for boys and girls are a long-standing American tradition still persisting in most private and parochial schools and in a few public high schools. Australia, committed to this system, considers that it does much to keep down juvenile delinquency and premature romancing.

The success of the Armed Forces in mingling southern whites and Negroes indicates that somewhat younger southern white boys and Negro boys could somehow make out in the same schools. The arrangement satisfies the Supreme Court's requirements by giving youngsters equal access to the same tax-supported facilities, teachers, courses, and so on, regardless of race. It answers the formula of Mr. Thurgood Marshall, chief counsel of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, that the Negro can go along wtih any criteria for grouping youngsters for education—I.Q., aptitude, achievement, health, cleanliness—except one, race.

True, a two-ply school system costs more than a single-ply one. But this consideration never moved the South to revise the two-ply white-Negro system permitted, up to 1954, by the Supreme Court's (1896) doctrine of "separate but equal." If segregation by sex proved to be the answer, the South's education dollar would at least be buying her conformity with what now stands as the law.

Communist-Inspired Smear Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I request permission to bring to the attention of my colleagues the recent series of scurrilous attacks against the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its highly respected Director, J. Edgar Hoover.

I particularly commend to your attention the underlying forces behind this patterned campaign of vilification and abuse.

For more than a quarter century, Mr. Hoover and the FBI have been targets of malicious smear campaigns launched by subversive organizations. Communists and other unsavory groups, through distortion and deceit, have directed a wealth of misinformation, innuendoes, and smears against the FBI. But, in the light

of its past achievements it is, of course, not too difficult to understand why. Like a stuck pig, they have had good reason to squeal, and are out to get the FBI.

Mr. Hoover is a public servant who has given a lifetime of dedicated effort to unselfish public service. He has dedicated every legitimate resource to an unrelenting war upon the criminal underworld and against those whose ideologies are contrary to our American way of life.

Those whose wish it has been, and is, to unlawfully overthrow our Government are Mr. Hoover's sworn enemies. We all know this. And they leave no stone unturned in their vicious efforts to hamper his effective work. Their malicious smears, however, go on and on.

In 1940 there was a concerted wave of Communist-inspired criticism denouncing the FBI as "an American Gestapo" and a "threat to freedom." Communist demands were heard for a "sweeping investigation of the FBI."

Again in 1947, the Communists spearheaded a vicious drive to slander this agency and undermine public confidence in its operations. Behind this all-out attack were the fear and hatred of subversive groups for the then newly established Government Employees Loyalty Program, a measure clearly designed to strengthen our national security. The attack failed.

In the late 1940's, and early 1950's the FBI's investigative machinery dealt crippling blows to the Soviet spy system here in America. It was during this time, you will remember, that Judith Coplon, Valentin Gubitchev and Harry Gold were arrested and exposed; the Rosenbergs were convicted, and later executed, as atomic spies.

Following these successes, Director Hoover and his staff were subjected to renewed castigation and abuse. Through hate propaganda, and the technique of the big lie, efforts were made to dupe an unsuspecting public into the ridiculous belief that J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI were the menace to the citizenry of our Nation, not the Communists and their allies, the pseudo-liberals.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has admirably weathered periodic storms of Communist-directed scorn and contempt. Its record of past accomplishments speaks for itself. But in taking a stand for the preservation of the American way of life, Mr. Hoover has invited upon himself the wrath of experts adroit and skilled in the art of character assassination.

In more recent months, this attack has assumed a well-organized pattern of smear, slander, and hate. The leopard has not changed its spots: As in bygone years, the current hate Hoover campaign is implicit in the forces of the Communist Party, U.S.A., its willing dupes, its sympathizers, and its respectably cloaked apologists and pseudo-liberals.

"THE NATION"

The initial impetus to this rabid anti-FBI drive was sparked by the Communist-line magazine, "The Nation." Its entire issue of October 18, 1958, some 60 pages, is devoted exclusively to a highly distorted and biased attack upon J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI by Fred J. Cook, a writer who has earned the unenviable distinction of being an apologist for Alger Hiss. This article contains many of the same contradictions, falsehoods, and innuendoes characteristic of those hurled at the FBI by Max Lowenthal and others of similar ilk. The Ford Foundation's Fund For the Republic, a tax-exempt organization, was the largest single advertiser in this smear issue of "The Nation."

"The Nation" is edited by Carey McWilliams, a character whose record relating to Communist Party activities extends over a period of more than 20 years. These facts speak for themselves.

COMMUNIST PARTY U.S.A.

Blistering criticism, nurtured by a feeling of bitter resentment and hate, of those who would zealously defend the country against its internal enemies, has always been, and still is, an unceasing Communist Party tactic. Yet the very ruthlessness and violence of these attacks are a grudging acknowledgment of FBI vigilance in its relentless fight against the treacherous guiles of Communist subversion and intrigue.

One of its latest salvos appeared in the official publication of the Communist Party, U.S.A., "The Worker," on November 16, 1958, in an article brazenly captioned "Edgar Hoover's Four Decades of Fight Against Peace."

But let us not be misled. Today, the American people are being fed the phoney propaganda line that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is just another legitimate political organization. Of course, what it really is—is just what it has always been: A Soviet-dominated link in the international Communist conspiracy, dedicated to the ultimate forcible destruction and overthrow of the U.S. Government.

Soviet leader, Nikita Khrushchev, himself restated this aim in a television interview in June 1957, when he boasted your grandchildren would live under the heel of Communist socialism.

EMERGENCY CIVIL LIBERTIES COMMITTEE

Elaborately linked to the current conspiratorial chain of smear forces are the many fronts exploited by the Communist Party, U.S.A. to convey insidious propaganda designed to discredit truth. They are "the marks" of the conspiratorial con-game swindlers: the willing dupes of the Communist "roper" and "inside man."

These are the individuals whose sly and slanted writings oppose urgently needed internal security measures; present the menace of communism as a myth of hysteria, urge that we tolerate the subversive acts of Communists because the Communist Party is just another political movement; and whose outraged cries have been joined in the attack against everyone and everything related to the exposure of the Communist conspiracy.

It was back in September 1957, you may still recall, that the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee started its campaign of vilification to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Immediately, the efforts of these Communist stooges were broadened to include the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Their motives were all too obvious. The record will show that the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee was designated a Communist-front organization by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Harvey O'Connor and Corliss Lamont are its officiating heads.

For some years the name "Harvey O'Connor" has been on the Nation's list of editors as a staff contributor. It was this individual to whom the House Committee on Un-American Activities referred when it stated:

> Harvey O'Connor was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Benjamin Gitlow, the Communist Party's former secretary general, in sworn testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities on September 11 and October 17, 1939.

And this same committee, in its report on Lamont, states: "Corliss Lamont has been one of the foremost apologists for the Soviet Union in the United States," and then factually recounts his association with many Communist-front organizations.

NEW YORK POST

Next to join forces with the "hate Hoover" campaign was the New York Post whose efforts are being directed by James Wechsler, its editor, a self-admitted former member of the subversive Young Communist League.

The New York Post has probably published more character-assassination attacks on J. Edgar Hoover than any other paper except the Daily Worker. It now has assigned a staff of reporters in the United States and abroad in a farflung attempt to dig up dirt for a professed objective study of the FBI.

We should note that James Wechsler, editor of the New York Post, in the 1930's was on the National Committee of the Young Communist League, and was also formerly an editor of the Nation.

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

The latest blast in the current series of vicious attacks to discredit Mr. Hoover and the FBI was launched on December 8, 1958, by the Militant, a weekly organ of the Socialist Workers Party, in a smear bearing the warped caption, "J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of Thought-Police."

But, here again, let us not forget that the Socialist Workers Party is a militant revolutionary group advocating the immediate violent overthrow of our Government. It is an organization which was cited by the Attorney General under Executive Order 10450.

Over the years, the attitude toward law enforcement of American Communists, leftwingers, and those skilled in concealing foul and despicable acts behind the fifth amendment, has been one of deliberate hostility, coldly calculated to smear, slander, and hate. Their repeated attacks against the FBI are not rooted in a spirit of honest criticism and fact.

But we do know this: Their hostile smears are based upon wishful thinking. They want the FBI abolished. Therefore, they ridicule and vilify its personnel. They condemn its lofty purposes,

revile its methods, and rail at its lawful techniques employed to cope with their trickery. In essence, Communist hatred of democratic law enforcement is rooted in the fact that our system is a strong bastion against violent revolution by a minority of political gangsters. Because it is such a barrier, it must be destroyed.

The Communists have raised no audible objection to a system in which the whims of each new tyrant and his hierarchy become the law of the land. The citizen who survives the torture chambers, brainwashers, and firing squads is consigned to a slower death in the slave-labor camps. In the sardonic and semantic lexicon of the Communist conspiracy, this system is called the people's police.

The individual who does not recognize Communist techniques may find himself providing grist for the Red Fascist propaganda mill.

The sinister chain of smears currently being leveled against the FBI prompted Preston J. Moore, national commander of the American Legion to issue a statement in which he recently declared, in part, and I quote:

It is difficult to attribute any purpose to these attacks other than a desire to destroy this Federal law enforcement agency and its leader as an effective deterrent to undetected, unopposed Communist subversion in this country. * * * The American Legion believes that the American people will not permit their justified confidence in Mr. Hoover and the FBI to be compromised by scurrilous distortions and half-truths. Nor will they allow irresponsible journalism to blind them to the need for continued FBI investigation of the dangerous Communist conspiracy in this country.

I feel that this statement by the national commander of one of America's foremost patriotic organizations very well summarizes the issue: "FBI smears do not stick."

Public Demands More, Less at the Same Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pasadena Star-News dated December 12, 1958, written by Irving Fang:

PUBLIC DEMANDS MORE, LESS AT THE SAME TIME

As our Nation has grown, the role of government, especially the Federal Government, has expanded until today it reaches into corners of our national life undreamed of a century ago.

Whether this is an overall good trend or bad trend depends on the honest attitude of the American people toward it. The public cannot very well condemn burgeoning Government and in the same breath demand more services from it. In short, our Government is what we ask of it.

Herbert V. Prochnow, vice president of the First National Bank of Chicago, in a speech to the American Bankers Association, penetratingly analyzed the double-faced demand for more government and less government at the same time, a demand which is voiced louder and louder as the national budget grows.

He said, in part:

"The Government has now become a vital factor in most of the Nation's major economic decisions, whether they involve business, agriculture, or labor. Furthermore, there seems to be a widespread willingness to have Government assume this role.

"If a strike threatens to tie up a great industry for weeks, the Government is expected to prevent it. If the dockworkers strike and close a port, we turn to the Government for relief. If housing construction declines, the Government is expected to arrange easier credit, lower downpayments and other remedies. If we seek slum clearance, we ask the Government to provide a large part of the funds required. If some businesses grant exceptionally easy installment terms, other businesses believe Government should correct the trade practices of their competitors by installment regulations.

"If metal prices fall, there are instant demands for larger Government stockpiles, regardless of whether present stockpiles are considered adequate for national defense. If the price of an agricultural product falls, there are demands that the price be supported even though large stockpiles result. If drought burns up some farmlands, we expect the Government to deal with the problem. * * *

"We expect Government to provide security for tens of millions of us in old age. We expect Government to determine the number of hours we work, our minimum wages, and our unemployment compensation. We expect Government to provide a vast expansion of our highway system. We seek larger contributions from Government to improve our particular harbor or river.

"Some of these requests are desirable functions of Government. Others are not. We contribute time and money to an infinite number of organizations which seek to get something from the Government or urge Government to expand its activities. In countless areas we now turn to the Government where we did not do so a generation ago. * * *

"We condemn the expanding role of Government over the world, but we encourage it here. With one hand we work to reduce the role of Government in our economic life. With the other hand we work even harder to increase it. We ask for a reduction in Government expenditures, but not where it would affect our business.

"We demand that Government expense be cut, but not for Federal projects in our communities. On one day, we write our Congressman to reduce Government expenses and taxes. The next day we write urging him to bring home the Federal bacon to our communities."

'Nuf said?

Proposal To Create a Pan American Parliamentary Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a Pan American Parliamentary Association—PAPA—should be established and that the United States be authorized to participate in the parliamentary conferences of such association.

All of us are well aware of the need to establish the greatest possible measure of understanding, harmonious relations and cooperation between the nations of the Western Hemisphere. Despite our good neighbor policy of the past quarter of a century, we know that much resentment and dissatisfaction persist in Latin America with U.S. policy toward those countries. Much of this dissatisfaction, of course, is stirred up in recent years by Communist elements who seek to create chaotic conditions among our neighbors to the south in the hope of gaining a foothold in this hemisphere.

The truth of the matter is that the Latin Americans desperately need our help in their efforts to attain a higher standard of living, in the exploration and exploitation of their natural resources, in economic growth, in expanding their agriculture and industry, and most especially in giving them an equal voice and the right of joint participation in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere and in the formulation of hemispheric policy.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to visit several Latin American countries during part of November and December 1958 in connection with my joint resolution on a Pan American Parliamentary Association. A full report of my visit there, as well as my views and findings, appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 12, 1959, pages A61–64.

It is high time that we look upon the peoples of Latin America not only as good neighbors but also as our best friends, which they are. Here we have a wonderful opportunity to regain some of the ground we have lost in other parts of the world, our moral position and our international prestige in the eyes of all nations, by stressing democratic principles and championing human rights. We can do so by offering the fullest measure of aid possible in order to achieve genuine friendship and inter-American support. We must prove to them that they stand to gain more by aligning themselves with the United States in order to protect their political freedom, their national independence, their economic gains, and the security of the whole hemisphere.

Fortunately, we are in a position to be of invaluable assistance to Latin America in many ways, particularly in helping them with their economic and development problems. The standard of living in those countries is extremely low. The average per capita income for all of Latin America is reported to be only $312 per year, compared with over $2,500 average in the United States. We must help them raise this standard of living through economic development and expansion, through increased production and consumption, and by increasing their purchasing power in domestic markets.

The more we help Latin America achieve these goals, the more we too shall benefit in the long run because of increased trade relations. Even now our trade with Latin America is greater than with any other area in the world. About one-third of our imports come from this area and about one-fourth of our exports go there. They sell to us half or more of such products as copper, coffee, raw wool, petroleum, and other products, while the value of our exports to them is approaching the $5 billion mark annually. Thus, by aiding them in their economic growth and in attaining a higher standard of living we can look forward to increased trade relations which should prove mutually advantageous.

What we need today is greater unity of purpose and a program of action which, I believe, should and could best be done on a people-to-people basis. It is for this very reason that I have proposed the establishment of a Pan American Parliamentary Association. My original resolution containing this proposal was offered to Congress in the summer of 1958 when the hectic period of adjournment was approaching and no time left for consideration. Nevertheless, within a few short weeks several of our leaders in Congress approved the idea in principle, it was similarly approved in principle by statesmen from 12 of the 20 Latin American countries, and the Department of State encouraged me to undertake my visit to several South American countries to discuss the proposal in detail with leading legislators there.

Following my visit I reached the conclusion that the idea proposed in my resolution is very timely and very urgent. Thereupon, I revised it and expanded it on the basis of my findings. The resolution proposes the establishment of a Pan American Parliamentary Association which is to meet annually, or as frequently as deemed necessary, in the different capitals of the Western Hemisphere. It is to be attended by the parliamentary representatives of the 21 American nations, since they are the direct representatives of the people having been elected by them as their spokesmen.

The purposes of the association are set forth in the resolution in the form of a 12-point program, which may be expanded upon whenever necessary. This program is as follows:

1. Create better understanding and foster closer personal contact among the elected legislators of the 21 American nations.
2. Stimulate greater public knowledge of, and making more effective, the Organization of the American States (OAS) and other agencies designed to promote the best interests of the American nations.
3. Expand the educational and scientific exchange programs.
4. Develop closer cultural relations throughout the hemisphere.
5. Improve trade relations and reduce the barriers to trade between countries in the Western Hemisphere.
6. Encourage large-scale tourism between the Americas.
7. Help to provide relief in times of disaster and other emergencies.
8. Seek means to dispose of surplus commodities of all sorts in the various countries in order to help their economies.
9. Help to raise the standard of living throughout Latin America.
10. Aid in the development of plans for the sound economic expansion of the Latin American countries, including U.S. public and private investment in their economic development.
11. Assist them in modernization of their agricultural methods.
12. Seek solutions to other problems of common concern to the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

My resolution further calls for U.S. participation in the Pan American Parliamentary Association and the appointment of 18 Members of Congress from both Houses and both political parties as the delegation of the United States to the conferences of the Association. The U.S. delegation is to submit a report to Congress each year on the activities and decisions of the Association.

I am convinced that if the elected representatives of the 21 American nations could meet in person to discuss pressing problems of mutual interest to the entire hemisphere, much could be achieved in the way of better understanding and harmonious relations. We must stop taking Latin America for granted. We must develop a positive and direct people-to-people approach in our relationship, treatment and dealings with our neighbors of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, I believe sincerely that my resolution is the key to such improved relations of the future, only we must bring that future closer—not some distant tomorrow, but today. I hope and trust that the idea to set up a Pan American Parliamentary Association, as proposed in my resolution, will soon become a reality. Let us be the first to pave the way.

Amendment Offered to Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, Congress worked its will in regard to Federal aid to highways by passing H.R. 10426 which was an amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, and provided for an additional 2 years for advance purchase of rights-of-way. Notwithstanding this fact, a later enactment which was in essence a codification of basic highway law passed and became law. Thus the amendment introduced by me and passed by Congress was nullified by the subsequent passage of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958. In the final form of the codification of the highway legislation into title 23, United States Code, which was a very essential bill and one which I actively supported, my amendment was not embodied.

It is my desire in reintroducing this measure to have Congress reinstate its approval of the extended term of 2 years so that we may take full advantages of this program and to make the benefits more effective. Last year when this amendment was first introduced I pointed out to the House that additional time is justified and needed between the purchase, not only for construction of the Interstate System but also on primary, secondary, and rural and urban highways, of rights-of-way and actual construction.

The present law provides that a 5-year period is the outside limit of time between the fiscal year in which a request for reimbursement of the cost of acquired rights-of-way is made and commencement of actual construction. Under the present provisions the States are seriously hampered from purchasing rights-of-way unless construction is definitely programed to begin within the 5-year period. In many States such as Florida, where the cost of rights-of-way is daily increasing and plans for substantial highway construction are being made far in advance of the actual beginning of work this provision is not as fully helpful as was intended.

I am in fact, by introducing my amendment, asking Congress again to do that which was intended to be accomplished on August 6, 1958. Due to provisions in codification of highway legislation in United States Code, title 23, repealing all other previous passed legislation, my bill approved August 6 and becoming Public Law 85–597 of the 85th Congress was repealed by this code which was approved on August 28, 1958.

It being the obvious will of Congress that the rights-of-way time limit be extended from 5 to 7 years, I trust immediate action on my bill will be forthcoming. This being the case, I understand that the Bureau of Roads is holding in abeyance, but on active basis, State requests coming within the 5- to 7-year extension in anticipation of such favorable congressional action.

Broadening the Market for State and Local Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am joining with Mr. HERLONG, my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, in reintroducing a bill to broaden and relieve the market for State and local bonds. It will accomplish this by attracting investment companies, both regulated and unregulated, with their ever-increasing pools of investable funds, into the so-called municipal bond mar-

ket. The incentive is that they may distribute or pass through the tax-exempt interest to their shareholders. At the present time the shareholders can invest in these bonds directly, but their corporate funds are effectively sealed off from the market by the fact that the interest becomes fully taxable when distributed to the shareholders.

This bill, except for minor refinements, is the same as H.R. 8702, which I introduced in the last session. Earlier in the last session I had introduced a very narrow passthrough bill, H.R. 4380, which applied only to regulated investments and only if they were 90 percent invested in tax-exempt bonds. Thereafter I became convinced that the narrow bill would extend negligible help to State and local governments. The present bill, however, will provide substantial, essential, and inexpensive assistance by really broadening the market for State and local bonds.

I want to emphasize that we are dealing with an existing exemption. This bill makes that exemption more effective from the point of view of the issuers of tax-exempt bonds. For that reason, the legislation is actively supported by leading national organizations in the municipal, county, and educational spheres, such as the American Municipal Association, National Association of County Officials, and National Education Association.

I have been advised by a prominent economist, Mr. Harry L. Severson, that leaders in the field of municipal finance have been worried for some time about the failure of markets for tax-exempt bonds to increase as rapidly as the supply, and that more recently the underwriters who handle these bonds have been discussing most seriously how and where the ever-increasing volume of new issues can be placed.

The legislation is unique in that it grants substantial assistance to local governments at little, if any, cost to the Federal Government. For this particular reason the legislation has the support of such diverse organizations as the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Council of State Chambers of Commerce.

State and local governments are finding it increasingly difficult to finance the growing volume of new capital improvements which are required to meet the needs of our expanding economy. Traditionally, large capital improvements, with the exception of highways, have been financed largely by borrowing. Since all of the costs of government are rising, there is little reason to hope that it will be feasible for these jurisdictions to meet a significantly greater proportion of the cost of capital improvements on a pay-as-you-go basis in the foreseeable future. The problems of financing capital improvements are made more difficult by the fact that new bond issues do not sell as well as they did a few years ago.

During World War II the supply of new tax-exempt bonds was not only relatively small but it was contracting at the very time that the demand for tax exemption was expanding due to raises in the income tax rates. The result, of course, was an extremely favorable market for State and local bonds. As the volume of new issues increased following the close of World War II, this situation has gradually changed until it is now the investors who enjoy most of the advantages at the bargaining table.

Under existing law the large and growing pools of investable funds held by investment companies are effectively excluded from the municipal bond market by the fact that tax-free interest is converted to taxable dividends when paid out to the shareholders of these companies. The need for a broader market is even more pressing now than when I first introduced this bill in July 1957. The volume of new offerings of these securities continues to mount. In 1957 a total of $7 billion came to the market which was practically the same as the previous high reached in 1954 when new toll road bonds were at the heighth of their popularity. In 1958 a new high of approximately $7.5 billion was reached in spite of the tight money conditions in the last two quarters of the year which undoubtedly caused the postponement of some new offerings.

What is more, there is every reason to expect that the volume of new offerings will continue to increase. Our growing economy will make it necessary for State and local governments to install many new capital improvements all of which must be financed. The widely quoted Severson projections show a steady increase in the volume of new offerings. According to these projections the volume in 1959 will be above $8 billion, increasing to more than $16 billion in 1968. This represents a lot of bonds to place with investors. The market is choking up periodically on the present volume and this gives us some idea of the task ahead in finding permanent outlets in 10 years for a flow more than twice as large as the greatest we have known.

The enactment of the passthrough would be of material assistance in placing these new issues. Investment companies not only hold large reservoirs of funds but they are growing steadily. An important advantage of the passthrough is the fact that it would open up these new markets without upsetting existing institutional arrangements. Furthermore, the cost to the Federal Treasury would be nominal. If the aspirations of the people for new improvements are to be realized, the volume of new issues must continue to grow. In many instances the failure to sell these bonds would result in the economic strangulation of the area.

Since these bonds will be tax free in any event under existing law to whoever buys them, no tax loss of any consequence is involved. Moreover, certain offsets must be considered. By holding down the rate of interest on new issues the total volume of interest on which tax is not paid is reduced. Also by reducing the cost of debt service the passthrough will tend to reduce or hold down local taxes which are a deduction in computing the income subject to tax.

State and local governments are requesting assistance in meeting their obligations. Their burdens are heavy. About this there can be no question. In considering these requests for assistance I think it well to give real consideration to those forms of aid which would enable these governments to help themselves, since this type of assistance is likely to be the most efficient. As governments are called upon to perform more services, efficiency becomes increasingly important, and I think we will all agree that keeping the controls close to home tends toward economy. It is easier to waste a dollar which comes from Washington than one which must be raised locally.

In closing, I feel that the broad passthrough should be enacted into law at this session of Congress since it would assist State and local governments in financing their capital improvements by reducing or at least holding down the cost of debt service, and debt service will become an increasingly important item for these governments. The control of the capital improvement programs would be left with local government. The Federal Government would not be concerned over what a local community did or did not undertake. Each locality could build its improvements as simply or as elaborately as it chooses.

The bill follows:

H.R. 2341

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of dividends paid by certain corporations which hold obligations of States and local governments

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to interest on certain governmental obligations) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsections:

"(c) EXCLUSION FOR EXEMPT-INTEREST DIVIDENDS.—In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, there shall be excluded from gross income an amount equal to the aggregate amounts received during the taxable year as exempt-interest dividends. Any amount excludible from gross income under this subsection shall be treated for purposes of this subtitle as an item of interest excludible from gross income under subsection (a)(1).

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of subsection (c)—

"(1) EXEMPT-INTEREST DIVIDEND.—The term 'exempt-interest dividend' means any dividend or part thereof (other than a capital-gain dividend within the meaning of section 852(b)(3)(C)) paid by a corporation and designated by it as an exempt-interest dividend in a written notice mailed to its shareholders not later than 30 days after the close of its taxable year, if such corporation meets the requirements of paragraph (2) for such taxable year. If the aggregate amount so designated with respect to a taxable year of the corporation is greater than the amount of interest received or accrued by such corporation during such taxable year and excludible by it under subsection (a)(1), the portion of each distribution which shall be an exempt-interest dividend shall be only that proportion of the amount so designated as the amount of such interest so excludible bears to the aggregate amount so designated.

"(2) SECTION 103 CORPORATION.—A corporation shall be treated as meeting the requirements of this paragraph for a taxable year if—

"(A) such corporation is a domestic corporation other than a bank as defined in section 581 or an insurance company taxable under subchapter L,

"(B) such corporation files with its return for such taxable year an election to be a section 103 corporation or has made such election for a previous taxable year which began after the effective date of this Act,

"(C) at least 90 percent of its gross income is derived from dividends, interest, and gains from the sale or other disposition of stock or other securities (and for purposes of this subparagraph and subparagraph (D), the terms 'gross income' and 'interest' include interest excludible under subsection (a)(1), and

"(D) less than 30 percent of its gross income is derived from the sale or other disposition of stock or other securities held for less than 3 months."

SEC. 2. Section 265 of such Code (dealing with nonallowance of deduction for expenses and interest relating to tax-exempt income) is amended as follows:

(a) In paragraph (1) by deleting the period at the end thereof and substituting the following: ", or any amount otherwise allowable as a deduction which is allocable to interest received and distributed as an exempt-interest dividend by a corporation meeting the requirements of section 103 (d)."

(b) By adding at the end of the section the following new paragraph:

"(3) INTEREST RELATED TO EXEMPT-INTEREST DIVIDENDS.—Interest, on indebtedness incurred or continued after the effective date of this Act, to purchase or carry stock of any corporation, for any period during which such corporation meets the requirements of section 103(d)(2)."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to distributions by corporations with respect to taxable years of such corporations which begin after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Comments on the Visit of Anastas Mikoyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress gets a lot of mail. Part of this mail is largely inspired by the press, radio, and TV; some of our mail is due to propaganda campaigns put on by pressure groups. Once in a while we get mail that we feel is deeply sincere and an honest expression of opinion. Recently I received a lot of letters from members of a senior high school located in my district. The name of this town is Damar. The population is listed as 305. Just a small rural community but from the tone of their letters they are deeply disturbed at attention that has been given in our country to the bloody-handed "traveling salesman?" from Communist Russia, namely Anastas Mikoyan.

I append hereto the comments from their letters:

We are informed by newspaper and television that we have a Commie over here to talk (possibly about a loan). * * * I don't understand why we have to play "footsie" with them in the first place. Are we so impressed and frightened by them that we must jump to oblige their every whim?

We Americans have the privilege of petitioning our Congressmen and this is certainly a matter of national importance. * * * I am speaking of the Russian beggars coming over here on a "good will tour" in order to [probably] try to wheedle us into a trade agreement involving our extending some credit to a country whose alleged aim is to destroy us. * * * I do admire their nerve, though.

Why do we giveaway money to all these foreign countries? Surely past experience shows this is not loaning but outright giving. * * * When will our leaders find out we can't buy friendship? We've already aided Yugoslavia, a Communist outfit if there ever was one, to buy their friendship against Russia, now is there really a chance we will aid Russia? Say it isn't so, please. When is it going to stop? Only you, our Representatives, can stop it.

I think our giveaway program is getting quite disgusting, especially in actually giving to communistic countries—already Yugoslavia, and now possibly Russia. * * * What are we doing? * * * It seems our Government could give a little more thought to some of our own people who could use a little aid.

When are we going to quit playing "chicken"?

In debt $280 billion and helping the worst enemy to democracy that the world has ever seen. It's bad enough the way we throw it [money] around to our allies, but it's impossible to think we'd give it [money] to our worst enemy.

Couldn't this money be used just as well to build the needed schools, support war widows and orphans, our own poor, and help our American Indians in the Southwest; or do we just figure they're no threat so we needn't worry about them? * * * As our Congressman, please do what you can. Thank you.

In regard to a possible loan to Russia, please tell me it's out of the question.

I am writing to you to appeal to you to do everything in your power to stop this giveaway, especially to Russia. * * * If something has to break it may as well be before we help make them stronger. * * * As for some of these other "hand-grab" countries, I think we should turn our head when we meet them on the street.

To give aid to Russia would be just like putting a knife in your worst enemy's hand. As soon as your back is turned he can kill you with this knife.

Basketball and Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an interesting article entitled "Basketball and Stamps" by Kenneth E. Crouch, which appeared in Weekly Philatelic Gossip on December 27, 1958.

Basketball and baseball are two games which originated in the United States. The latter game has been recognized by the United States and various other countries by the issuance of postal stamps. According to this article basketball, which originated in Massachusetts, has spread throughout the world and received widespread recognition philatelically, yet our own country has not so honored the game.

The article follows:

BASKETBALL AND STAMPS

(By Kenneth E. Crouch)

Records state that in mid-December, 1891, the game of basketball originated in the Y.M.C.A. Training School at Springfield College in Springfield, Mass., the originator being Canadian-born Dr. James Naismith.

The game was created because of a desire for a new game for the students at the training school. Naismith was given the assignment by the dean of the physical education department, Luther Gulick, to see if he could come up with any ideas.

The new game was to be one which could be played in the winter season, between the football and baseball seasons, and one that could be played indoors or out in the open.

Dr. Naismith drew up a set of rules, assembled 18 students into which he made two teams of nine men each. He carried with him a soccer ball and asked the janitor to find two boxes to be used as goals. The janitor found two half-bushel peach baskets and thus the name of the game was established.

In the original game a man was stationed at each goal in the balcony to retrieve the ball from the basket after it had been scored and to put the ball back into play.

The first game was played between students of the "secretarial" and "physical" classes and as it was intended only as a new game at the school, the date it was played was never noted but has been established as in the middle of December.

Newspaper accounts state that the first game played as a public contest was on March 11, 1892, between the secretarial class of Dr. Naismith and the faculty, with the secretarial team winning five baskets to one.

James Naismith was born November 6, 1861, in Almonte, Ontario, Canada, a son of John and Margaret Young Naismith. He was an orphan at the age of 8 and in 1883 graduated from the Almonte High School.

In the fall fo 1883 he entered McGill University in Montreal, Quebec, Canada, and in 1887 received his A.B. degree from that university. That year he enrolled at the Presbyterian College in Montreal, Canada, graduating in 1890 and that same year was ordained into the Presbyterian ministry.

Naismith played football at McGill University and from 1887 to 1890 was director of physical education at that university. In the fall of 1890 he enrolled at the Y.M.C.A. Training School at Springfield College, graduating in 1891. He served as director of physical education at the school from 1890 to 1895.

In 1895 he became a physical director at the Y.M.C.A. in Denver, Colo., and attended the Gross Medical College (later to become the University of Colorado Medical School) in Denver from which he received his doctor of medicine degree in 1898.

In 1898 he joined the faculty of the University of Kansas at Lawrence, where he remained until his retirement as professor emeritus in 1937.

In 1939 the Presbyterian College in Montreal, Canada, awarded him the doctor of divinity degree honoris causa.

The game of basketball was included as a regular part of the Olympics in 1936 in Berlin, Germany and Dr. and Mrs. Naismith were sent to the international event.

He was the author of numerous articles on physical education and of the books "The Basis of Clean Living" in 1918 and "Basketball: Its Origin and Development" in 1941.

Dr. Naismith died November 28, 1939, of a heart attack at his home in Lawrence, Kans. Funeral services were conducted December 1 from the First Presbyterian Church in Lawrence, Kans., with burial in Memorial Park Cemetery in that city.

There is living today one man who played in the first game of basketbill that memorable day in 1891. He is Raymond P. Kaighn, 89 years old, who was a member of Naismith's "secretarial" team, and lives in Chapel Hill N.C.

A memorial to the founder of the game and to honor stars, past and present, is to be erected on the campus of Springfield College. This is to be known as the Naismith Memorial Hall of Fame for Basketball and the executive secretary of that committee is 80-year-old Edward J. Hickox.

The sport has received recognition in the philatelic world in the issuance by 19 nations of 28 postage stamps—these coming from every continent but North America (where it originated) and Australia. These postal recognitions range from 18 regular issues to 7 airmail issues and 3 semipostal issues.

CHECK LIST

Philippines, 1934, Scott, No. 382, issued to commemorate the 10th Far Eastern Championship Games.

Panama, 1938, Scott, No. C43, issued to commemorate the fourth Central American Caribbean Games.

Lithuania, 1939, Scott, No. B52–B54, issued to commemorate the third European Basketball Championship in Kaunas, Lithuania.

Ecuador, 1939, Scott, No. 379, issued to commemorate the first Bolivarian Olympics in 1938.

Bulgaria, 1947, Scott, No. 579, issued for the Balkan games.

Bolivia, 1948, Scott, No. C151, issued for the fifth Athletic Championship Meet in La Paz, Bolivia.

Bulgaria, 1948, Scott, No. 606.

Peru, 1948, Scott, No. C79, issued to publicize Peru's participation in the 1948 Olympic games in Wembley, England.

Nicaragua, 1949, Scott, Nos. 725 and C301, issued to publicize the 10th World Series of Amateur Basketball in 1948.

Hungary, 1950, Scott No. 923.

Yugoslavia, 1952, Scott, No. 363, issued to publicize the 15th Olympic Games in Helsinki, Finland.

Monaco, 1953, Scott, No. 295, issued to publicize Monaco's participation in the Olympic Games in Helsinki, Finland.

Brazil, 1954, Scott, No. 813, issued to publicize the second World Basketball Championship Matches.

U.S.S.R., 1954, Scott, No. 1715.

Poland, 1955, Scott, No. 702, issued to publicize the International Sports Games.

Ecuador, 1956, Scott, No. 308–C309, issued to commemorate the sixth South American Women's Basketball Championship.

Japan, 1956, Scott, No. 629, issued to commemorate the 11th National Athletic Meeting in Hyogo Prefecture, Japan.

Bulgaria, 1956, Scott, No. 944, issued to publicize the 16th Olympic Games in Melbourne, Australia.

Czechoslovakia, 1956, Scott, No. 748, issued to publicize the fifth European Women's Basketball Championship.

Hungary, 1956, Scott, No. 1167, issued to publicize the 16th Olympic Games in Melbourne, Australia.

France, 1956, Scott, No. 801.

Somali, 1958, Scott, No. C56.

Spanish Guinea, 1958, unnumbered (two stamps).

Statement by Andrew T. Walker With Reference to a Post Office Department Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, statement made by Andrew T. Walker, president of branch 1 of the United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen, with reference to an unfair and arbitrary Post Office Department ruling:

POSTAL BULLETIN OF NOVEMBER 20, 1958, RUPTURES EMPLOYEE MORALE—NEW POSTAL SCHEME PASSING MARK MOST UNFAIR STATES UNAPOC OFFICER

(By Andrew T. Walker, president, branch 1, UNAPOC)

The personnel division of the Post Office Department in Washington has dealt employee morale a most damaging blow causing discontent among postal clerks by its Postal Bulletin of November 20, 1958. The bulletin sets a high qualifying mark for clerks to attain in taking regular scheduled postal scheme examinations. A qualifying mark, postal clerks state, not alone high but because of it, is causing greater tension and nervous strain before and during such examinations.

For a number of recent years clerks have had to distribute 100 representative cards bearing the names of various cities out of an assigned total of 1,000 cities. These 100 cards must be distributed within 8 minutes to comply with the examination. In all of this the clerk must attain 95 percent having a margin of 5 allowable errors. In the case of schemes devoted solely to the distribution of mail according to station carrier routes the total number of numbered buildings and streets are 600. Out of this total the clerk has to distribute 100 cards to pass with a margin of 5 errors.

With the issuance of this bulletin the requirement for passing the test rose to 97 percent thereby giving the margin of three errors out of a possible 100 percent. The measure of tension and nervous strain engendered by the upward revision of the passing mark has mounted tremendously causing great discontent among the clerical force. The issuance of the bulletin was certainly ill advised or issued by someone in the department who had never taken an examination or else he would have been well aware of the tension a required passing mark of 97 percent would create.

Some years back the system had been whereby the clerk taking the examination had had to distribute all of the 1,000 cards in the examination, taking over an hour to do so, and was allowed five errors for every hundred cards. This system had been in force for a great number of years previously. With the introduction of the 100-card system by the Postal Department the general clerical force accepted it in a cooperative spirit, for the percentagewise breakdown was fair and equitable. Without a doubt the conversion from the 1,000-card system to the 100-card setup certainly saved for the postal department thousands of dollars in man-hours. The former hour-long test was reduced to 8 minutes and thereby released the clerk sooner for mail distribution. It also saved man-hours of the scheme examiners. All in all the transition was orderly with finest cooperation from the clerks. However in the issuance of the November 20, 1958, order raising the mark without any obvious savings or benefit to the department or to the postal employee has raised resentment and critical comment from the dedicated and sincere postal clerk.

My office has been besieged by phone calls, personal letters, and visits to headquarters by delegate and members objecting strongly to this new scheme requirement directive. Without a doubt this is being repeated in every UNAPOC branch throughout the Nation. Mr. Joseph F. Thomas, national president, and Joseph V. Silvestri, national secretary, have made strong representations to the officials of the personnel department of the Post Office Department. The only response has been that the matter is being given further study; however, the order is in force and every clerk has to attain 97 percent right out of studying 1,000 cards and distributing 100 cards for the test.

The spotlight of congressional interest in this matter could only result in a beneficial effect. The controversial order also contains a section setting up individual production standards, which have certain quotas also causing great concern.

The need for complete union recognition is pointedly highlighted by the fact that prior to the issuance of this order there had been no thorough consultation with employee organization representatives. The introduction of this November 20, 1958, bulletin regarding scheme passing was so far reaching, in that it touches the service life of each and every clerk, that it should have been considerably discussed before its issuance.

Again in the 86th Congress postal organizations will endeavor to secure the enactment of a suitable union recognition bill, guaranteeing full and complete discussion of all contemplated personnel orders between labor and management before these orders are activated.

Congressman PAUL A. FINO has been one of our foremost congressional friends in all of our equitable requests. When we were wrong in our requests, Congressman FINO has advised us so. Many of the Congress have been very helpful to us in a similar fashion.

Perhaps in time this objectionable order will be rescinded, but up to that time the degree of tension will continue to exist. We hope that the Department will call a meeting soon of organizations and rescind its individual production standards, along with the new scheme passing mark.

Reporting the News?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the January 12, 1959, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 549, there appears an item I clipped from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch news section which if it deserved reporting at all belonged on the editorial page as editorial comment.

I am inserting into the RECORD the pertinent portions of an item appearing under a banner headline on page 1 of the Washington Post, Thursday, January 15, 1959, which purports to report what President Eisenhower said on the subject of his attitude toward the Republican presidential candidate in 1960. I am then inserting what the President is reported to have actually said in toto on this subject, from the transcript ap-

pearing on page A18 of the same newspaper.

The question I raise is this: Is the alleged news article under these headlines, "Ike Says He Will Oppose Isolationist for Republican Nomination in 1960—Modifies Policy of Hands Off—He Makes it Clear Support Will Go to World View Sharer," news or editorializing on the news? The conclusion seems to me quite obvious that it is editorializing of an extreme and partisan nature. If this is so what do those in the newspaper profession have to say about the ethics of this kind of reporting? Both the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the Washington Post are held up as examples of the best in the newspaper world and yet the two specific articles that I have called attention to are rather common examples of the manner in which both these newspapers handle political news reporting. Nor do I wish to point a finger at these two newspapers simply because the examples I have used happen to refer to them, because this type of reporting is so common today that the ordinary citizen simply shrugs his shoulders when it is called to his attention.

The following is what the news story reported:

(By Edward T. Folliard)

President Eisenhower said in effect yesterday that he would veto the choice of an old guard isolationist for the Republican presidential nomination in 1960.

His statement was a modification of his earlier stand that he would maintain a hands-off policy with respect to the 1960 nomination.

In a 50-minute televised press conference at the National Press Club, the longest he has ever held since moving into the White House, the Chief Executive made it clear that he would give his support next year only to a Republican presidential nominee who shares his views on cooperation with other governments of the free world.

He also made it clear that he would withhold his support from any like the late Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, who voted against the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1949, and who was his rival for the GOP nomination in 1952.

The President said he could write out a list "of half a dozen, or 10, or maybe a dozen fine, virile men in the Republican Party that I would gladly support."

But if a man didn't go along with his own ideas on cooperation between the United States and other countries for preservation of freedom in the world, he said, he "couldn't possibly support him, if my influence had anything to do with the matter."

Now here is what President Eisenhower said:

QUESTION ASKED ON NOMINEE CHOICE

Mr. HORNER. Mr. President, if you will take just one more on politics, I will let you go at the press. You have indicated, sir, you will follow a strictly hands-off policy in selecting the Republican presidential nominee next year. Does that not run the risk of selection of a man with whose Republican political philosophy you do not agree?

The PRESIDENT. I'm quite sure, Mr. President, that everybody would know that if a nominee were possibly made whose basic philosophy I could not go along with, whose general attitude toward the relationship of Government to the private citizen and to the State and to the community—who did not go along with my basic idea that only in a coalition of strong governments or at least an association through cooperation with strong governments can we make certain that freedom is not lost in the world.

If any man could not go along with that kind of basic thinking, well, I would say this: I couldn't possibly support him, if my influence had anything to do with the matter. Therefore, I could—I won't, but I could—write out for you a list of half a dozen, or 10, or maybe a dozen fine, virile men in the Republican Party that I would gladly support.

But I do say this: Those are men that I'm thinking in my mind—who really want to see America go ahead, its economy sound, and to be very, very careful that our security is maintained, not only by our building, own building of armaments, with support, the cooperation of other governments that want to live in independence and in liberty.

Castro Not Fit To Rule Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I have long sought and hoped for a democratic and peaceful change in dictator governments like Cuba. The revolutionary change in Cuba, commencing with uncivilized bloodbaths, does not seem to be a change for the better. Today violence reigns in Cuba, instead of order and democracy for which the people have long prayed.

Already some 200 lives have been needlessly taken, while many hundreds more are reported facing secret trials and possible death. Although executions have been temporarily suspended by the new regime, rebel leader Fidel Castro has defended these mass executions as "necessary to purify the nation." The civilized and free world had high hopes that the Castro movement would establish a government of freedom and democracy for the Cuban people, but it has been disillusioned.

On the basis of what has taken place in the brief period since the Castro regime has come to power, we can only reach one conclusion and that is: Castro is no better than Batista. The methods he has used to attain power—and I am thinking of his kidnaping of U.S. military personnel and civilians in Cuba—and his conduct after the bloody revolution clearly demonstrate that Castro has little or no regard for human lives or human rights. In less than 2 weeks he has authorized the murder in cold blood of 200 human beings under public view and without any semblance of law or order.

At the same time, it is reported that some 500 other persons are being held in Oriente Province alone and they will soon face summary mock trials by hotheaded rebels, lasting perhaps a few minutes per person and with very little chance of defense. And this the Castro regime is trying to tell the world is legal and civilized procedure. In the United States we call these lynchings and murders.

Present-day justice in Cuba under the Castro regime is succinctly discussed in an editorial in the Washington Post of January 14, where it is stated as follows:

There is a difference between an open trial fairly conducted in a less impassioned moment and drumhead justice dispensed by hotheaded rebel troops. Capital punishment in such a situation too readily becomes lynching. Terror has a way of passing beyond control as the appetite for vengeance increases with use. * * *

According to recent press reports, Castro stated that he has no desire to run for the office of President of Cuba. By his own admission, the job of governing Cuba is too big for him and he ought to resign from active leadership or perhaps taken on some kind of professorship at the University of Habana and bide his time.

Castro cannot, by self-appointment, be the commander of the land, air, and sea forces of Cuba which by removing conscription, as he has promised, will eventually be composed of volunteers who are actually his followers. In this way he will succeed in entrenching himself in power and as such become just as dangerous and threatening as any dictator. Under such circumstances it is difficult to see how free elections can be held, except at the point of the bayonets of these self-appointed liberators. No President and no member of congress could possibly be elected or serve in office without Castro's approval.

Furthermore, Castro admits that his brother Raul has Communist leanings, having been trained in Moscow. Simultaneously, it is reported that a large number of Castro's followers are Communists, but Castro himself protests that he is not a Communist and is willing to aline himself with the United States. Here again, however, he throws in a proviso that we first show our respect for him. I should like to ask: Respect for him as what? As a kidnaper of American citizens? As a brutal murderer of his own people?

No matter how flushed he may be with victory, Castro should quickly come to his senses and realize that the United States will not take any bluff from him, just as it had not taken and still refuses to take any bluff from other dictators. He would do well to study the map of the Western Hemisphere and learn the facts of life, particularly as they affect the economy of his own country, before he makes demands on the United States. We will not stand for a Nasser or a Hitler so close to our shores.

Whatever justification may have existed for the Castro revolution has now been completely annulled by his most recent threat to kill 200,000 gringos, or Americans, should we decide to send marines to Cuba, although there has been no such suggestion on our part.

I have never forgotten Castro's unwarranted seizure of American soldiers, sailors, marines, and civilian workers, holding them as hostages for a considerable period of time, and thus humiliating the United States in the eyes of the world. I am sure that many other Americans have neither forgotten nor forgiven him for this deed. Nor do we in this country particularly like his treat-

ment of U.S. citizens who presently have to travel to Cuba for business or pleasure. Authentic reports show that Americans are forced to wait long hours at airports under the restraint of armed men and that before being admitted their bags are searched and their bodies frisked like criminals.

I think we ought to make it clear to Revolutionist Castro, for his own good and before he gets any more wild ideas, that it is we who demand respect from him. I think we should tell him in no uncertain terms that we will not tolerate any further mistreatment, friskings, kidnapings, and other indignities to U.S. citizens residing in, or traveling to, Cuba.

At the same time, let us state unequivocally that we are opposed to dictators in any form. Castro and his revolutionists in Cuba must realize that government of the people, by the people, and for the people—as the immortal Abraham Lincoln has so correctly defined the democratic form of government—must be sustained by ballots and not by bullets.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to serve notice that unless a democratic form of government is soon established in Cuba and free institutions are allowed to flourish there, I shall be the first to move before the House Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member, and before the Congress of the United States to drastically reduce the sugar quota for Cuba. Perhaps Castro will be able to understand that kind of language better, since appeals based on justice and morality do not seem to have the desired effect on him.

Bill To Repeal Certain Federal Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker on January 7 I introduced H.R. 388, a bill which will directly benefit the great majority of our people and will make greatly needed revision in our tax structure. Everyone wants a simpler and fairer tax structure. My bill goes a long way toward effectuating this desire. It accomplishes this goal by providing for repeal of the Federal retailers' excise taxes, the manufacturers' excise taxes with the exception of those levied under our highway financing program, and the excise taxes levied on facilities and services.

At the present time, the federally imposed excise taxes create a heavy burden on the American people. True, we must impose burdensome taxes to pay for our heavy expenditures needed for defense, public welfare, interest on the debt, and other necessary Government functions. But a tax structure which imposes such a hodgepodge of taxes as the excise taxes requires substantial revision. These excises have been imposed indiscriminately, largely in emergency times, without much consideration of whom they are hurting or discriminating against. Subsequently they have been repealed, restored, revised, and amended many times, but in no systematic fashion. As a result, a host of inconsistencies, incongruities, and anomalies have become imbedded in the tax structure.

Although I would like to see all the Federal excise taxes discarded immediately, I have restricted my bill to the retailers' taxes, the manufacturers' taxes which are not used to finance the highway program, and the taxes on facilities and services. My bill, therefore, will repeal the retailers' taxes imposed on toilet preparations; luggage, handbags, and other leather articles; jewelry and related items; and furs. It will eliminate the manufacturers' taxes imposed on automobiles, parts and accessories; lubricating oil; automotive and related items; household type equipment; entertainment and recreational equipment; business machines; pens, mechanical pencils, and lighters; and matches. And, it will repeal the excise taxes imposed on telephone and other communication facilities and services, which include also those levied on admissions, club dues, transportation of persons, and safe deposit boxes. Repeal will be effective after the date of the enactment of the act.

The manufacturers' taxes which are used to finance the highway program and which will not be repealed by my bill are those automotive taxes imposed on gasoline, trucks and buses, diesel fuel, tires and inner tubes, and tread rubber. These taxes provide funds which benefit the highway users, and consequently can be justified from that standpoint. Furthermore, it is a fair and expeditious way to finance an accelerated highway construction program. The bill does not affect the taxes on alcoholic beverages and tobacco, although I do believe some adjustment should be made with respect to the taxes on alcoholic beverages for it is my understanding that the additional appropriations needed to police this law offset the revenue received. Some of the miscellaneous excise taxes which impose relatively small general burdens are excluded.

Many of the excise taxes were imposed as temporary measures during emergency periods but are still with us today, many of them at even higher rates. Many industries have been hurt by the imposition of these taxes. Occasionally, after a long and bitter fight by the affected industries and individual businesses, some of these taxes were repealed or modified, but in many cases considerable damage was already done. What we need is the removal of the excise taxes that are imposed indiscriminately with no regard of the effect they have.

An important reason for my desire to repeal at least some of the excise taxes is that these taxes are contrary to our generally accepted principle of taxation in accordance with ability to pay. The greatest impact of the excise taxes falls on the consumers with the low incomes. They are regressive taxes. Through its various features, such as the progressive income tax rate schedule, our tax structure attempts to lessen inequalities in income; but the excise taxes work contrary to this objective. Regressivity results not only from taxes paid directly by the consumer on commodities and services they purchase, but also from the taxes paid by business on commodities and services it purchases. The impact of these latter taxes is felt indirectly, because they are a cost item which are reflected in higher prices charged to the consumer. We should, therefore, reduce our reliance on these regressive taxes and place more reliance on the other forms of taxes, principally the income tax which imposes tax burdens in accordance with our ability to pay.

Elimination of Federal excise taxes will be an important stride toward simplifying the problems of our Federal-State-local relations. In spite of all the studies, both official and nonofficial, on the problems of overlapping taxes in the United States the basic problems still remain with us. Essential to the solution of these problems is the removal of at least some of the Federal excise taxes. The Federal Government imposes numerous selected excise taxes on top of those imposed by the States and local governments. As a result of these multiple levels of taxation, State and local governments must limit their taxation of these sources, although they, too, are faced with increasing costs of financing their government activities. Withdrawal of the Federal Government from some of these sources would enable the States to tap some of these sources of revenue to help them be more self-sustaining and less dependent on aid from the Federal Government. This will help restore some of the sovereignty and independence which the States formerly had and should continue to have.

Some of the Federal excise taxes are imposed on what are essentially local services, such as local telephone calls and admissions. Others discriminate largely against certain sections of the country. Some discriminate against industries which are located largely in only a few geographic areas. Such discriminations should be eliminated, or at least mitigated by repealing the excise taxes enumerated in my bill.

We have recently experienced a serious economic downturn, from which we were fortunate in recovering before it reached a critical stage. One of the hardest hit areas was Detroit, the center of automobile production. This economic doldrum in Detroit had its repercussions in many sections of the country where parts and materials going into the production of automobiles come from. In spite of a serious curtailment of automobile production, no legislation was passed to reduce or repeal the 10-percent Federal excise tax on automobiles. Such action would have made it possible for the automobile industry to reduce car prices, and thereby stimulate automobile sales and general economic recovery. Repeal of this onerous tax on automobiles will be a welcome supplement to other Government action taken to avoid any recurrence of a similar depression of economic activity. The tax saving to the consumers will, I earnestly believe, help to maintain a thriving automobile industry, and, consequently, a

thriving general economy through its effect on all industries concerned with supplying automotive parts and materials.

On the whole, repeal of the taxes included in my bill will increase business activity and generate higher incomes which will provide higher income tax revenues to the Government. It will do this because it will lead to a reduction in the prices of goods and services to the consumer. Lower prices will stimulate demand for more of these products. Greater sales by these businesses will in turn have favorable effects on other businesses. Resulting higher business incomes will provide a larger income tax base. Thus, any loss in revenues from the repeal of these excises will probably be largely offset or even possibly exceeded by additional income tax revenues to the Government.

In conclusion, let me urge every Member of Congress, particularly those on the Ways and Means Committee, to act favorably on my bill. Removal of these excise taxes will corect some of the undesirable features of the present complex and unreasonable "system" of excise taxes. It will alleviate some of the burden which falls heaviest on the low income groups. And, it will contribute to a simplification of Federal-State-local relationships. Although the Government will in the short run lose revenues from the repeal of these taxes, it will recoup the loss largely from additional business induced by the removal of these taxes. At the same time, it will promote a healthier economic climate for industry. In view of these desirable benefits which will result from enactment of my bill, I urge immediate and favorable action on it.

Mikoyan, Master Spy, Is Coming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I think all of the American people are wondering why Anastas Mikoyan is in the United States. Past experience proves that there is usually an ulterior motive to a visit such as this. It behooves us to be wary.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Waterbury American of January 5, 1959, written by Julius Epstein, which gives a good background on the activities of Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues as I believe that it will give them a good picture of Mikoyan and what may be expected of him.

The article follows:

MIKOYAN, MASTER SPY IS COMING
(By Julius Epstein)

Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan has arrived in Washington, somewhat sooner than he was expected. The Soviet Government declared that it wanted Mikoyan to come to Washington in order to confer with Soviet Ambassador Menshikov. This, of course, is just a crude hoax. If the Soviet Government, meaning Khrushchev, really wants Mikoyan to confer with the Soviet Ambassador in Washington, one cable or long-distance call would have sufficed to order Mr. Menshikov by jetplane to Moscow.

The reason for Mikoyan's visit is quite another one. It is a political maneuver to probe into Washington's political climate, with the Berlin crisis looming dark over the world. What Mikoyan really hopes to discover in Washington are those "soft spots" which eventually might be skillfully used by Mr. Mikoyan's boss, Nikita S. Khrushchev. Mikoyan is an old hand in the business of Soviet espionage in the United States. His experience dates back to the year 1943.

ESPIONAGE

At that time, the Soviet Politburo of the purchasing commission had its vast offices—with more than 1,000 employees—behind an iron door at 3355 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. There, a group of top Communists, well trained in espionage and other subversive activities, worked closely together.

The group consisted mainly of the chairman of the purchasing commission, Gen. Leonid Rudenko, who later became Soviet chief prosecutor at Nuremberg; Mikhail V. Serov, the infamous organizer of countless mass and individual murders, whom Khrushchev just purged recently; Gusev, head of Amtorg (the Soviet's trading corporation in New York), a specialist in setting up covers for Soviet spies who was later expelled by the U.S. Government after the FBI had him trapped and caught redhanded in the act of esplonage. There also was a special department within the purchasing commission. Its chief was Mrs. Arutunian, the daughter-in-law of a Moscow high official. All secret papers passed through the hands of that lady.

Victor Kravchenko, who was then himself a high-ranking official of the purchasing commission, testified later before the House Committee on Un-American Activities that, "all of us knew about the functions of the special department, but we never knew who the representative of the Soviet secret police was in the purchasing commission." Today, we know who it was: Mikhail V. Serov.

Anastas Mikoyan was at that time, as he is today, a member of the Moscow Politburo and people's commissar for foreign trade. He alone was the real boss of the purchasing commission and its spies under Serov. As head of the foreign trade commissariat, Mikoyan directed the whole Soviet espionage apparatus in the United States.

AUTHORITY

One of the great authorities on Soviet espionage is David J. Dallin. He has spent a lifetime studying Soviet subversive practices all over the world, and he has written a standard work on the subject, the book "Soviet Espionage" (Yale University Press, 1955). Here, Dallin writes about Mikoyan's American espionage activities as follows:

"One day in late 1943 or early 1944 all employees of the purchasing commission who were actual members of the Communist Party were summoned to a meeting behind closed doors. Mikhail Serov presented cabled orders from Anastas Mikoyan in Moscow, which directed every Soviet Communist working in the commission to gather information on industrial developments in the United States, especially in the war industries. After the cable was read, each member of the cell signed his name to a statement that he had been informed of the order and would make every effort to carry it out.

"An orgy of information-grabbing began; among the items obtained were designs of industrial plants, special machines, parts and details; photographs and blueprints of technical processes in the aviation, arms, oil, submarine-building, and many other industries; long-range plans for the development of large industrial units; hundreds of maps of the United States, the individual States, industrial sites, bridges; descriptions of railroads; reports on the building of cities and highways."

Victor Kravchenko described in his testimony before Congress some of the activities as follows:

"We transferred to the Soviet Union, not just this one package; we transferred dozens of tons of material, not just by airplane. We also were using Soviet ships that came from lend-lease for the Soviet Union."

It was under Mikoyan's orders that members of the purchasing commission persuaded Henry A. Wallace to let the Soviets have samples of American uranium ore. Long before Klaus Fuchs betrayed to the Soviets the secret of our atom bomb, we ourselves had already helped them in their early experiments to develop the bomb.

In view of Mikoyan's forthcoming visit, it may be useful to our administration not to go overboard, but to keep these facts in mind.

Congress Should Attempt To Understand South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks and include extraneous materials, I request that the attached editorial entitled "Congress Should Attempt To Understand South," which appeared in the January 5 issue of the Florida Times Union, be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD ATTEMPT TO UNDERSTAND SOUTH

The 86th Congress convenes Wednesday, making this the season for considering possible legislative programs. Here is a conservative 11-point program that would do credit to the new Congress:

1. In the area of civil rights, the Congress should make an honest effort to understand the position of the people of the South. The legislators have the power to ease mounting tensions in the Nation's most critical domestic problem, but it can only be done with a full knowledge of the attitudes, customs, and will of the southern people.

2. Congress must address itself immediately to a labor union reform law. Such a law should apply antimonopoly regulations to unions to head off the threat of a super-union under James Hoffa. The law should return equilibrium to the business-labor relationship, protect members from gangsters and corruption, and prohibit the spending of union dues for political purposes.

3. The Congress should restore balance to national defenses by assuring necessary appropriations for ground and naval forces as well as air and missile programs. A careful eye to profiteering in gadgetry must be maintained.

4. An investigation of the Nation's economy should be originated with the purposes of arriving at the basic cause of price-push inflation and of strengthening the economy for the promised period of economic competition with communism.

5. Congress should pass a law specifying rules of conduct for legislative, executive

and regulatory officials in accepting gifts and favors.

6. The lawmakers should seek by example to rededicate this Nation in spirit and its Government in practice to the basic principles of Christianity, democratic capitalism and private enterprise.

7. The only logical approach of Congress to taxation problems is a firm belief that any program worth having is worth paying for.

8. Congress should reconsider the U.S. role in the United Nations and other foreign affairs fields with the purpose of increased emphasis on effective military arrangements.

9. New laws are required to stiffen the Nation's defenses against internal communism to repair damage done by the Supreme Court.

10. A realistic agriculture policy is long overdue. That policy should replace subsidy thinking with business logic.

11. Congress should set in motion machinery to amend the Constitution to abolish the electoral college.

Action along these lines would be to the everlasting credit to the men and women of the 86th Congress.

Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Confers Honorary Membership Upon Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me today by the House, I include the following statement of Mr. Guy L. Brown, grand chief engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, upon the bestowal of honorary membership in the brotherhood a few days ago to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Hon. J. Edgar Hoover.

Also included is a statement made by Mr. Hoover at the time of his acceptance of his honorary membership in the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

The statements follow:

Mr. Guy L. Brown, grand chief engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, today conferred upon J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a certificate of honorary membership in division 160 of the brotherhood in ceremonies held in Mr. Hoover's office.

This bestowal of honorary membership is one of the few ever made in the brotherhood's long history. Mr. Brown stated at the time of the presentation that the award is being made to Mr. Hoover, "in recognition of your great contributions to humanity and your great services to our country. We deeply appreciate the magnificent work you have done and are continuing to do in defending the civil liberties and protecting the rights of the average citizen and the laboring man in this country."

Commenting upon the FBI Director's role in America today, the grand chief engineer stated to Mr. Hoover that, "by helping thwart efforts of those who would destroy our Government and our way of life by infiltrating and seizing control of our labor organizations, you have aided not only the individual workingman but also the entire labor movement. For this, we will be everlastingly in your debt."

Making specific reference to Director Hoover's role in law enforcement, Mr. Brown said, "This country will never be able to thank you enough for your part in seeing that our internal defenses have remained fair and just and that the Nation has not become a police state in order to resist police state tactics."

In addition to the membership scroll in Division 160 of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Grand Chief Engineer Brown presented Mr. Hoover a personalized copy of the constitution and the bylaws of the brotherhood and also the brotherhood's war service lapel pin.

STATEMENT OF JOHN EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, ON RECEIPT OF A MEMBERSHIP SCROLL, A PIN, AND A COPY OF THE UNION'S CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS IN CONNECTION WITH HIS ACCEPTANCE OF AN HONORARY MEMBERSHIP IN THE BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS, JANUARY 12, 1959

It is a privilege to become an honorary member of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. The action taken by your board of directors in amending your constitution so that this membership might be granted, has touched me deeply. I am most grateful to all of you.

I take great pride in the fact that the oldest railroad labor organization in the United States—a union created with the objective of securing justice for the individual workingman—sees fit to bestow these symbols of brotherhood upon me. As a member of the law enforcement profession, the word "justice" holds a vital meaning for me and for my associates.

May I add that no one is more aware than I that the recognition afforded me today is based upon the results achieved through the ceaseless effort, dedicated spirit, and devotion to duty of the men and women of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In their behalf, I am proud and happy to accept this great honor.

Depressed Areas Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, among the 40 bills I introduced on January 7 was H.R. 830 to establish a program of Federal assistance to those areas which suffer from persistent economic depressions, an area redevelopment program.

In essence my proposal is similar to the legislation that was considered and approved by the 85th Congress.

I was shocked and amazed last year when President Eisenhower refused to sign the depressed areas bill, because the need for that type of legislation is clearly indicated. As I pointed out last year, when one segment of the Nation suffers economically, the entire country is affected. The depressed areas are not isolated islands, alone in a wide ocean with no ties to the mainland; they, like the other sections of our country should be contributing their share to the continuing prosperity of the Nation. These contributions would be not only for the benefit of the total economy but also to the Federal Government which is losing great potentials from individuals and businesses in such areas, and in addition, is faced with increased costs of unemployment compensation and welfare aid.

It is true that the country appears to be recovering from the depression of last year. However, the picture in Michigan continues to loom dark and foreboding. Last year the unemployment rate was 15.4 percent of the labor force; this year it is being predicted that one worker in eight, or 12.5 percent, will be unemployed all through 1959. One certainly cannot view that situation as recovery. I am sure this condition is repeated in the other major depressed areas in the country.

An area redevelopment program is insurance in the future of America; it will pay rich dividends by aiding the growth and prosperity of this great Nation of ours. I urge the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Congress to take immediate favorable action on this legislation.

Hans J. Hagge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the insurance industry of America has lost a great leader. The Congressional District which I represent and the city of Wausau, Wis., in particular, has lost a true friend and a great citizen. The editorial which appeared in the Wausau Daily Record-Herald on Thursday, January 8, 1959, sets forth the contribution which the late Mr. Hans J. Hagge made to Wausau, Wis., and our Nation.

The editorial is as follows:

HANS J. HAGGE

Employers Mutuals of Wausau in recent years has keyed its advertising and public relations program to the Wausau Story, an effort which has brought recognition to both the community and Employers Mutuals the breadth of the Nation and even in foreign lands.

The Wausau Story has been one, however, which was brought not only to those outside Wausau but carried an inspiring message to the people of Wausau as well.

The Wausau Story has been one of unique achievement in many respects both for Employers Mutuals and for Wausau, of teamwork, civic consciousness, and of an abiding faith in Wausau's future.

And it has occurred to us many times that the late Hans J. Hagge is as responsible for "The Wausau Story," and epitomizes it as much as is possible for any single individual. The long, distinguished, and highly productive career of Mr. Hagge in behalf of both Wausau and Employers Mutuals constitutes an inspiring chapter in the real "Wausau Story."

Coming to the firm when it was a young and struggling enterprise, he led a team which brought it to preeminence in its field. Of special significance to the people of Wausau, and for which the community should be ever grateful, is the fact that the Employers Mutuals team captained by Mr. Hagge kept in mind constantly Wausau's welfare, well-being, and future as well as its own.

Many another enterprise having grown as big and great as did Employers would have felt that it outgrew a community of Wausau's size and centered its operations in a metropolitan area, a move which has many advantages for a business of its type and magnitude. But Mr. Hagge and Employers Mutuals tied their faith in their own future with that of Wausau and remained here.

What that has meant to Wausau in purely economic terms is reflected in the fact that Employers Mutuals provides employment for more Wausau people than any other business or industry.

Besides playing a vital role in Wausau's economic well-being, the Employers Mutuals team led by Mr. Hagge has played a leading role in community affairs. It would be hard to name a community function, including that of city government, in which Employers Mutuals personnel has not played a leading role. That's not merely because there are a lot of Employers Mutuals people in Wausau, it is because Employers Mutuals is a civic-minded organization—so much so in fact that it has received national recognition for it. And Mr. Hagge, we understand, was largely responsible for that civicmindedness. He prodded and inspired Employers Mutuals personnel to work for Wausau as they worked for their own organization. His behind-the-scenes interest and activity in behalf of Wausau constituted a highly significant force for the good of the community.

The job of building he did as the leader of the team which has done so much to build both Employers Mutuals and Wausau stands as an enduring monument to Hans J. Hagge.

Bungling Benson and Bad Budgets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, when the machine age increased man's capacity to produce more per man-hour, the 40-hour week was adopted to spread the work instead of keeping some unemployed while others continued to work a 60- or 70-hour week. Farmers still work an average of over 60 hours per week. If farmers reduced their production enough to reduce the workweek to 50 hours per week, the so-called surplus problem would disappear without driving farmers into the cities to replace city workers and increase unemployment. The farm programs, properly administered, helped farmers to be able to make a living by working more nearly a normal workweek. Instead of administering those programs properly to keep farmers on the family-type farm, and instead of working toward a program which would aid in accomplishing for our agricultural economy what the wage and hour law accomplished in helping adjust our society to the machine age, the administration is still doing all it can to cause some farmers to work longer hours and produce more while other farmers are driven into the cities to complicate unemployment problems.

I invite the attention of the Congress and the country to an editorial which appeared January 4, 1959, in the Des Moines Sunday Register. It is a paper published in the heart of the feed-grain country which is now absorbing increased punishment due to several years of deplorable administration of the programs.

This editorial reviews the administration of these farm programs objectively and cites evidence that Secretary Benson has purposely bungled farm programs. While almost everyone in Iowa considers him the worst and most costly administrator in history, this editorial supports the theory that no one could make so many costly mistakes unless he intended to. Whatever the purpose of his actions, the President has permitted Secretary Benson to do more than any other person in the United States to throw both farmers' incomes and the national budget out of balance.

I commend the editorial to all who are interested in preventing more unemployment and in balanced budgets for both the farm economy and our Federal Government:

THE FARM PROGRAM MESS

The indications now are that in January 1961, after 8 years of Ezra Benson's dedicated effort to master the farm problem, the costs of the Federal programs and the size of the crop surpluses will be two to four times what they were in January 1953, when Secretary Benson came into office. This is the lead sentence of an article in the January Fortune magazine. The article goes on to ask: Why after 6 years of Eisenhower-Benson management, is the farm problem getting worse instead of better?

Fortune's answer is that Benson has made too many compromises and has not pushed harder and more consistently to dismantle the acreage control and price support programs.

Of course, if the farm problem is viewed simply as a matter of reducing the Federal budget, that is the correct solution. If the farm price support programs were abandoned, the cost of the programs would disappear. But not even Mr. Benson has recommended such a stern measure. It would mean a drastic further decline in farm income, which is already down substantially since 1947.

However, the Secretary has recommended consistently that price supports be reduced, and Congress has given him considerable authority to do so. Price supports are much lower now than in 1953.

Why has the cost of the programs gone up while price supports were going down?

One big reason is that weather has been favorable and production high. Secretary Benson hoped that as price supports were lowered, farmers would produce less of the basic crops. But it didn't work out that way. Farmers have been producing more corn and wheat than ever. Even though price supports are lower, it costs the Government more to carry out the program, because there is more grain to be covered.

In the last 2 years, by making corn loans available to everyone, Benson deliberately increased the cost of that program. Farmers who failed to comply with their acreage allotments could get loans about 25 cents below the regular rate.

Crop acreage controls never have worked very well in limiting production, but Secretary Benson has not tried to make them work even as well as in the past. The noncompliance corn loan was a strong incentive to farmers to grow as much corn as possible. The Secretary campaigned to get rid of the allotments, and this has now been accomplished as a result of the farmer referendum last November. In addition, Mr. Benson worked against limitation of production by refusing to require farmers to comply with allotments on all crops if they were to receive benefits on any. So wheat and cotton producers, for example, have been free to expand corn production.

It is paradoxical that the man who was going to get Government out of agriculture has got Government deeper into agriculture than ever before. Surpluses have mounted and are still mounting. Government expenditures for price support, storage, and disposal of surpluses have risen from less than $1 billion a year to more than $3 billion a year and are still rising.

The cost of farm programs would have been much lower in the last 3 years if Secretary Benson had done his best to make the crop acreage controls work—and had limited corn loans to those who comply with acreage allotments.

Secretary Benson has been so fanatically opposed to Government farm programs that there is considerable reason to believe that he has tried to make the programs look bad in the way he has administered them.

Baron von Steuben

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by Col. Pierre Marcel Honnell, Signal Corps, USAR, a professor of electrical engineering at Washington University in St. Louis, Mo., on the occasion of General von Steuben's birthday, Richard Barthold Unit, Steuben Society of America, on Saturday, October 11, 1958. I thought this was an excellent address and that others would enjoy reading it.

The address follows:

BARON VON STEUBEN, MAJOR GENERAL, INSPECTOR GENERAL, CONTINENTAL ARMY, 1778–84

(Address by Col. Pierre Marcel Honnell, Signal Corps, USAR, professor of electrical engineering, Washington University, on the occasion of General von Steuben's birthday, Richard Barthold Unit, Steuben Society of America, Edgewater Club, St. Louis, Mo., October 11, 1958)

Mr. Chairman, Congressman CURTIS, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a privilege to address the Richard Barthold Unit of the Steuben Society of America on the occasion of its patron's birthday, the 17th September 1730. The history of professional service of Frederick William Augustus Henry Ferdinand, Baron von Steuben, is now well known to all, and particularly to the members of this, the Steuben Society of America. Yet this history does bear repetition for the lessons it teaches: of honor; of integrity; of outstanding performance and devotion to duty; of opportunities and rewards in our land of freedom.

Baron von Steuben served with the extraordinary distinction in the Continental Army of the newly born Republic from 1777 to 1784, almost 7 years of continuous active duty. Reporting to General Washington at Valley Forge in February of 1778, he arrived at a time of dire stress for the Continental Army. Soldiers were suffering privations, were poorly fed, poorly clad, and poorly shod. The ranks were depleted by sickness, and from terminations of the short 1-year enlistments of the men. The Army lacked

stores and equipment of all descriptions. The recent campaign of 1777 had been relatively unsuccessful and the Battles of Brandywine and Germantown had been lost. The British occupied Philadelphia, the seat of government, and Staten Island and Manhattan Island.

Although the ranks could and would be refilled by drafts, and military stores and equipment were forthcoming, if slowly, General Washington and his generals well realized that the principal deficiencies of the Continental Army were its defective training, its poor military discipline, and its total lack of doctrine. A plan to remedy this situation had already been proposed: a special agency would be formed on General Washington's staff, to be known as the Inspector General, which would have as its principal function the preparation of a system of drill regulations and supervise their application to the training of the entire Army.

It was therefore a most providential set of circumstances which included his friendship with M. le Comte de St. Germain, the French Minister of War, and the acumen of Dr. Benjamin Franklin and Mr. Silas Deane, and the organization of Hortalez & Co., operated by M. Baron de Baumarchais, which finally brought the baron to Valley Forge. From his past 20 years of military service, culminating on the operations staff and as aide-de-camp to Frederick the Great, Baron von Steuben was superbly fitted by experience and by education for the office of Inspector General.

The accomplishments of the baron fully justified the judgment of his friend, St. Germain, and his American supporters, Franklin and Deane. The enthusiasm, energy, efficiency, and genius of Baron von Steuben brought a miraculous change in the state of training of the Continental Army. In the matter of 6 weeks, the new Inspector General brought the discipline and morale of the Army to such a state of proficiency that General Washington felt justified in a celebration. This he did by publishing in the General Orders of May 5, 1778, the particulars for a grand review to be held the following day in honor of the official confirmation of the French Alliance. The review was a great success; and details of the new state of training of the Army reached the British through spies.

Baron von Steuben's brilliant success at Valley Forge was known to Congress, which on May 5, 1778, appointed the Baron to the office of Inspector General, with the rank and pay of major general. General Washington communicated the appointment to General de Steuben at the reception held the evening of the Grand Review, announcing him to his guests as Major General Baron de Steuben, Inspector General of the Army of the United States.

The rebirth of the Continental Army as a disciplined, trained, powerful fighting machine is the greatest contribution of General de Steuben to the War of Independence. This he had accomplished almost as a personal tour-de-force; for, although knowing no English at the time, he himself drilled the first squad, then the platoons, then the entire company of the model company of instructors who were to carry to the Army his drill regulations learned in the Prussian Lestwitz Regiment some 30 years before. The example of the distinguished foreign general officer personally drilling troops was a lesson to both the officers and men of the Continental Army.

But these were not his only contributions. General de Steuben personally wrote the first drill regulations for the Army. They were written in French, and translated by his personal staff officers into English. These regulations were later published by congressional authority in 1779 as Regulations for the Order and Discipline of the Troops of the United States. He also instituted a much-needed system of strength reports, and established accountability and property management in the Army, thereby saving very large sums of money for our Government.

Do any of General von Steuben's accomplishments remain, after these many years? The answer is an emphatic "Yes," and in many areas of the Military Establishment. At the cessation of hostilities, the Baron put his mind to the needs of a permanent system of national defense. His recommendations to the Congress included a regular military force for the protection of the frontiers, a militia on a permanent footing, military schools, and military manufactories.

The United States Military Academy at West Point is a direct descendant of his original plans for the defense of the country. The regular service schools, and in particular the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth also stem from his original plans. It is no longer possible for a single officer, with a small personal staff, to conceive and establish the rules and regulations for a modern military nation; this now requires an enormous staff effort, almost completely unknown to the public at large. The establishment of a militia as an effective military oragnization did not take place until after the costly experiences of World War I; passage by Congress of the National Defense Act of 1920 provided for a National Guard and a Reserve Officer Training Corps, both indispensable to the success of our military efforts during and since World War II. When one visits a college or university campus and views young men in the military uniforms of the Reserve Officer Training Corps of the various branches of the military service of the United States, we witness again the fruits of General von Steuben's genius.

Full recognition of General von Steuben's achievements for the military security of the Nation has been emphasized only in recent times; but this has now changed. In 1937, John McAuley Palmer wrote: "There were two indispensable military men in the Revolutionary War, Washington and Steuben. When I say," he continues, "that their military services were indispensable, I mean that each of them contributed something essential to final victory that could not have been contributed by any other man then in the American Army. Brilliant as Greene's services were, it is conceivable that Lafayette or Wayne or some other general might have commanded the southern army successfully. But it is not conceivable that any other American soldier could have borne Washington's burden of supreme responsibility. Nor is it conceivable that any other man could have given the technical assistance, essential to military success, that Steuben gave to his chief. Washington was the indispensable commander. Steuben was his indispensable staff officer."

That these views are justified is clear from the famous letter of George Washington dated December 23, 1783, in which he wrote in part:

ANNAPOLIS, *December 23, 1783.*

MY DEAR BARON: Although I have taken frequent opportunities both in public and private, of acknowledging your great zeal, attention, and abilities in performing the duties of your office; yet, I wish to make use of this last moment of my public life to signify in the strongest terms, my entire approbation of your conduct, and to express my sense of obligations the public is under to you for your faithful and meritorious services.

* * * * *

This is the last letter I shall ever write, while I continue in the service of my country—the hour of my resignation is fixed at 12 this day—after which, I shall become a private citizen on the banks of the Potomac, where I shall be glad to embrace you, and testify the great esteem and consideration, with which, I am, my dear Baron, your most obedient and affectionate servant.

G. WASHINGTON.

"In all history, no soldier received nobler recognition of faithful and meritorious service." (J. McPalmer.)

In closing this brief account of General Von Steuben's contributions to American military security, I should like to bring your thoughts for a few moments upon one phase of the requirements of our military services for the future, in particular on the education of the officers in whose hands the destiny of our Nation will lie at the times of ultimate stress.

It was possible in Von Steuben's day to train an entire army in a matter of 6 weeks to 6 months, and to bring it to such a state of readiness that it could successfully meet the finest European military force. But that day has vanished. Today there are fission and fusion weapons and their means of delivery, intricate communication and guidance systems, and orbiting vehicles in the heavens. To utilize these military means intelligently and economically for the defense of this Nation, and to neutralize these military means in the hands of an enemy, demands an effort of the utmost magnitude on the part of this country. For, the complexities, that is, the intellectual content, of these new military weapons is extraordinarily great, and increasing at an enormous rate. It is very likely, therefore, that far-reaching changes will ultimately be required in the education of officers, the Regular and the Reserve and the Militia, so that they may better be able to conceive, develop, supervise the manufacture, and finally employ these complex weapons of the future.

The scientific content of the education required for the military services will soon be of an extraordinarily high magnitude and level. And this education cannot be acquired in a matter of 6 weeks or 6 months, but will take long years of preparation and application. Thus I earnestly beseech each and every one of you to consider these needs not merely of today but of the future. The preparations for the defenses of the Nation 20 years hence start today in the kindergarten. It will require men and women of ability, of honor, of integrity, and of education, in all the ranks, backed by a superlative economy capable of producing the complex mechanisms of defense for the future.

Support by each and every one of us of the educational processes, both civil and military, is an essential and all-important ingredient for the protection of our way of life; a way of life for which Baron von Steuben volunteered his services and which he chose to adopt by becoming an American citizen, so long ago.

REFERENCES

"General von Steuben," John McAuley Palmer, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1937.

"Proceedings Upon the Unveiling of the Statue of Baron von Steuben and Upon the Presentation of the Replica to His Majesty the German Emperor and the German Nation," compiled by George H. Carter and printed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, Government Printing Office, United States of America, 1912.

"The Life of Frederick William von Steuben," Friedrick Kapp, Masón Brothers, New York, 1859.

"Washington and His Generals," J. T. Headley, Baker & Scribner, New York, 1848.

Inflation: How Great the Danger?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of the following article from the December 1958 issue of the magazine Nation's Business entitled "Inflation: How Great the Danger?" by Jules Blackman, an economist at New York University. I feel this article is well worth reading as it certainly presents a careful analysis of the economic problem our country is facing today.

INFLATION: HOW GREAT THE DANGER?

(By Jules Backman, economist, New York University)

Warnings that we are about to experience a new substantial inflation are tempered now with statements that the immediate prospect is for a lessening rather than an increase of inflation dangers.

An analysis of the forces now at work will help to keep the picture in focus.

Among these forces are:

Psychological factors.

Price trends.

Wage inflation.

The budget deficit.

Analysis of these indicates that present inflation pressures—which are real enough—may have a limited effect.

We may, for instance, be entering another period such as the late 1920's when inflation was reflected in booming stock prices but wholesale and retail prices were relatively stable.

PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS

Underlying the present fear of inflation is a conviction that the combination of fiscal inflation, wage inflation, and a national concern over full employment could provide an irresistible combination. Many of our public policies have an inflationary bias.

The failure of prices to decline in the 1957–58 period tended to reinforce this belief as many persons overlooked the fact that such price behavior had also occurred on several occasions in the past. (See Nation's Business, July 1958.) The easing of mortgage and installment credit terms also pointed in this direction.

It is claimed that these factors have created an inflation psychology.

The importance of psychological factors cannot be ignored. What is the evidence that such a psychology exists today?

Certainly, no such evidence is available in the actions of consumers or of businessmen. Retail sales or inventory policies have indicated no flight from money.

One Federal Reserve Board official has pointed out that:

"The first signals of inflation can [manifest] themselves in distrust of the dollar and a consequent trend to unhealthy speculative tendencies."

In fact, the only area where inflation psychology can be detected is in the securities markets. Many stocks and some of the stock indexes have moved above the peaks of the summer of 1957.

Even in that area, it is not quite clear to what extent the rise in stock prices represents an optimistic appraisal of the magnitude of business recovery and to what extent a flight from money.

Similarly, it is not clear to what extent the decline in bond prices reflects tightening money and a reaction to the speculative boom of last spring and to what extent it is a flight from fixed income securities because of fears of inflation.

PRICE TRENDS

The general level of wholesale prices recorded little change between 1952 and 1955. Late in 1955 these prices began to rise. From a level of 110.7 in 1955 (1947–49 equals 100), the index rose to 118.4 in August 1957. After a year of fluctuations within a narrow range the index was 118.5 late in October 1958.

	August 1957	October 1958 (1947–49=100)	Percent change
Total index	118.4	118.5	+0.1
Farm products	93.0	91.0	−2.2
Processed foods	106.8	109.7	+2.7
Industrial	126.0	126.1	+.1

Similarly, the sensitive price index, which reflects the changes in 22 basic commodities, has shown little change. In August 1957, this index was 89.3 (1947–49=100). Since then it has fluctuated between 84.4 and 87.3. Early in November 1958, the index was about 87. In light of the responsiveness of this index to inflationary influences, its failure to record much change during this period is a significant indication that inflation has not yet taken hold.

Most of the headlines dealing with prices have been devoted to the new highs in the consumer price index, month after month. Less attention has been given to the fractional nature of these new highs. Between August 1957 and September 1958, the consumer price index rose only 2.2 percent. Most of this rise had taken place by March so that between March and September, the index actually advanced only three-tenths of 1 percent.

Clearly, the trends of wholesale and retail prices have not yet reflected a new inflationary price spiral, and upward pressures seem likely to be less in the next few months.

In much of the postwar period, there has been an insistent demand for products to overcome the shortages built up during World War II and on a lesser scale during the Korean war. We no longer have large backlogs of deferred demand which create strong upward pressures on prices.

American industry built a record volume of plant and equipment during the 1955–57 boom. In many instances the current capacity far exceeds peak levels of demand in the past. For example, the steel industry has a capacity of about 145 million tons—almost 25 percent greater than the maximum tonnage ever produced in 1 year. In varying degrees a similar situation prevails in many other industries.

Thus, while a considerable volume of plant and equipment will be built for modernization purposes, there will be less eagerness to expand total capacity as such. In this connection, it may be recalled that the vigorous plant and equipment boom created tremendous pressure for price rises from the demand side during the 1955–57 period. The large surplus capacity also presents a barrier to runaway price inflation at this time.

Possible world conflict is another factor which cannot be ignored. The recurrent crises in the Near East and in the Far East provide potential tinder boxes. Should a war break out, inflation is a certainty. However, if war is averted, there should be only minor pressures as a result of these situations. It is interesting to note that the sensitive price index which jumped some 50 percent during the first 6 months of the Korean war and rose about 7 percent during the first weeks of the Suez crisis showed little responsiveness to the developments in the fall of 1958.

Farm prices, too, have begun to decline. The current agricultural crop is the largest we have ever had. It is estimated that the output is about 10 percent above the peak years of 1948, 1956, and 1957. Large supplies of farm products usually are reflected in lower prices—and some declines have already taken place. From a level of 98.5 (1947–49 equals 100) the index of wholesale prices of farm products has declined to about 91. However, this large farm crop has one inflationary effect because it is requiring larger Government expenditures to support prices. Approximately one-fifth of the increase in the Federal deficit is attributable to higher expenditures for agriculture.

The net effect of modifications of the Federal price support and loan programs will be to permit somewhat lower prices for farm products.

WAGE INFLATION

The most important pressure on costs and prices during the 1955–57 period was the increase in labor costs at a more rapid rate than national productivity. Thus, in the manufacturing industries output per man-hour rose by only four-tenths of 1 percent in 1956 and eight-tenths in 1957—substantially below the long term rate of gain. For the nonagricultural economy the average rise for those 2 years also averaged less than 1 percent per year.

In contrast, average hourly earnings in manufacturing industries rose 5.3 percent in 1956 and 4.5 percent in 1957. Inclusive of various nonwage benefits, the percentage increases were even larger. Substantial pressure on prices was created by increases in labor costs in excess of the lagging aims in output per man-hour. The increases in steel and aluminum prices in August reflected this pressure.

The magnitude of wage inflation is likely to be somewhat smaller in the year ahead. Business recovery usually is conducive to greater gains in output per man-hour as the rise in employment tends to lag behind increasing output. There is some evidence that a similar pattern is developing during the current recovery. While precise data are not available, the recent automobile settlement appears to have increased total labor costs by about 4 percent, or less than in the 1955–57 period. Although this rise in labor costs still exceeds national gains in output per man-hour, the net rise in unit labor costs appears likely to be smaller than in recent years. Hence, the wage inflation, while still a factor, could be less important than it has been.

THE BUDGET DEFICIT

The fact that the Federal Government is faced with a large increase in deficit financing is the most important single factor behind our present fear of inflation. We properly are concerned about the inflationary effects of a budget deficit.

The Government's budgetary deficits are among the most powerful creators of inflation. However, it is not the effect of a single budget which is important. Rather it is the manner in which the price inflation created by such deficits leads to new increases in Government expenditures and thus to bigger and bigger deficits as spending outpaces tax revenues. It is this spiral which has created the most serious inflationary consequences in the past.

A budget deficit of more than $12 billion, such as that projected for the current fiscal year (July 1, 1958, to June 30, 1959) is a serious matter. Such a deficit is inflationary. How inflationary, however, depends largely on how the financing of it affects our money supply.

There have been only moderate changes in the volume of demand deposits and in money in circulation in the past 2 years.

[Billions of dollars]

	Demand deposits	Currency outside the banks	Total
August 1956	104.5	27.5	131.9
August 1957	105.1	27.8	132.9
August 1958	107.6	28.0	135.6

Between August 1957 and August 1958, total demand deposits and currency increased by only $2.7 billion or 2 percent. A smaller rise took place between August 1956 and August 1957. Thus, our money supply has been expanding at less than the 3 percent long-term rate. However, the financing of the Federal budget deficit will inflate the supply of money and credit to the extent that new Government securities are sold to the banks.

The present outlook is for the commercial banks to carry the major burden of this financing.

It is not certain, however, even if the banks finance the entire budgetary deficit, that it will result in an equivalent rise in money supply. Much of the $8 billion increase in the commercial banks' holdings of Government securities in the year ending August 1958 did not result in larger demand deposits. However, total time and savings deposits increased by $10 billion during that period. To the extent that these Government securities can be sold to others rather than to commercial banks, the attending inflationary pressure would be reduced. It is important, therefore, to create the atmosphere which will encourage these and other groups to buy Government securities. Strong measures to improve the Federal budgetary picture would be among the most helpful in achieving this objective.

Meanwhile, some of the danger in this area will be sharply reduced as a result of business recovery.

The increase in the deficit projected for the current fiscal year results from a decline in revenues ($2.1 billion) and an increase in expenditures ($7.3 billion). For the following fiscal year, the projected deficit is cut in half due largely to an anticipated rise in tax revenues. The projected large deficit, then, is not expected to pyramid into a still larger deficit in the following year if Government spending for 1959–60 can be restrained.

It should be possible to curtail spending as a result of business recovery.

Economists usually point out that it is the cash deficit or surplus which determines the inflationary or deflationary effects of a budget. The cash budget includes the operations of the various Government pension funds and of the social security and unemployment insurance funds. On balance, the operation of these funds has usually resulted in a net withdrawal of cash from the economy:

[Billions of dollars]

Fiscal year ending June 30—	Surplus or deficit		Net cash flow from funds
	Administrative budget	Cash budget	
1956	+$1.6	+$4.5	+$2.9
1957	+1.6	+2.1	+0.5
1958	−2.8	−1.5	+1.3
1959 (estimated)	−12.2	−13.7	−1.5

During the current fiscal year, in contrast, a net payment of cash by Government is anticipated so that the cash deficit is forecast at $13.7 billion or $1.5 billion higher than the administrative deficit.

With business recovery, the deficit in the cash budget should be reduced more rapidly than the deficit in the administrative budget.

An examination of the trend of unemployment compensation payments shows why.

Unemployment insurance

[Millions of dollars]

	January–May		Change
	1957	1958	
Tax collections	$1,094.5	$1,064.6	−$29.9
Benefits paid	851.8	1,875.5	+1,023.7

At the low point of the recession—the first 5 months of 1958—total unemployment benefits rose by more than $1 billion as compared with a year earlier, while tax collections fell by $30 million.

As recovery proceeds, the unemployment benefits paid will decline sharply.

At the same time, tax collections will rise because of greater employment and the probability of higher effective tax rates in States with merit rating.

The recently amended Social Security Act provided for larger benefits but also established higher tax rates to go into effect in January. These changes are expected to put the system on a self-sustaining basis. This will also act to reduce the cash deficit.

Thus various funds should provide a moderate deflationary influence instead of adding to the inflationary pressure as at present.

Business recovery through its favorable impact on tax revenues and upon the net flow of cash into the unemployment insurance and other funds also should act to moderate the threat of inflation rather than to increase it. It is vital, however, that new Government spending programs be limited and that old programs be reviewed and pruned to wipe out the deficit. It will make little economic sense of full recovery does not bring about a budgetary surplus.

As for other types of Government action, both Congress and the administration have shown awareness of the inflation problem.

Congress' unwillingness to reduce taxes last year indicated its concern over budgetary deficits.

The President's veto of several measures involving larger Government spending and the order to cut back Federal personnel by 2 percent indicate that the administration realizes the need for economy. The fact that the rise in expenditures stems largely from activities not directly related to defense or to combating the recession indicates that there is room for cutting the $80 billion projected spending. Government spending ing can and must be cut.

There is certainly no reason for complacency over the Federal budgetary situation. Nor should we ignore the difficulties of control.

The Federal Reserve Board has already given notice that it will use its powers to curb price inflation. Early in August, margin requirements on security loans were raised from 50 percent to 70 percent. In October came a further raise to 90 percent. There also have been two increases in the discount rate—from 1¾ percent to 2 percent, and then to 2½ percent. A year earlier the discount rate was 3½ percent so that these are only mild steps. The Federal Reserve, as part of its easy money policy starting in November 1957, had built up excess reserves at the member banks to about $600 million as compared with a net deficiency of reserves of about $500 million before that time. Now, as part of the tightening-up process, this situation has been reversed. Excess reserves have been almost wiped out. Just as the Federal Reserve indicated early in the recession that it would act to make credit more abundant, so it has now indicated early in recovery that it will act to tighten credit.

Many have pointed out that this creates difficulty in marketing Government bonds. They have also pointed out that monetary policy alone cannot curb price inflation, as we have seen in the past.

This is all true. But it seems equally true that we must develop a growing public awareness of the dangers that are inherent in inflation, whether it be fiscal, monetary or wage.

The national objective of a high level employment economy must be supplemented by a national objective to take vigorous action against inflation.

Recognition of Red China

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include in the RECORD the following statement issued by Mr. Harry W. Flannery, president of the Catholic Association for International Peace, on the subject of recognition of Red China.

In view of the suggestions advocated by some people, to the effect that our Government and the United Nations Organization should revise our policy with regard to the recognition of Communist China, I believe that Mr. Flannery's statement is timely and very important. It reviews briefly, but very adequately, the compelling reasons which argue against any change in our policy with respect to the recognition of Red China, and her admission as a member to the United Nations.

I have made my position on this issue clear in the past, and I am in agreement with the views outlined by Mr. Flannery. I therefore wish to commend his statement to the earnest consideration of the membership of this body.

The statement follows:

RECOGNITION OF RED CHINA, STATEMENT BY HARRY W. FLANNERY, PRESIDENT, CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

At the present time, there are demands and appeals from many sources for a revision of United States and United Nations policy with regard to recognition of Communist China. Those who are urging that the United Nations accept Communist China as a member, and that the United States establish diplomatic relations with the Peiping regime, should carefully consider the following points:

1. The Charter of the United Nations (chap. II, art. 4) sets forth that its members must be peace loving.

2. The United Nations General Assembly, on February 1, 1951, by a vote of 44 to 7, made it plain that Communist China is not peace loving. This resolution declared that "the Central Peoples' Government of the Peoples' Republic of China, by giving direct aid and assistance to those who were already committing aggression in Korea, and by engaging in hostilities against United Nations forces there, has itself engaged in aggression in Korea." Thus, Communist China was declared to be an aggressor against the forces of 17 members of the United Nations. This designation still stands.

3. Communist China also aided aggressors in Vietnam and has attacked the islands of Matsu and Quemoy. In the latter case, Communist China has asserted in Peiping broadcasts and in talks with the U.S. Ambassador in Warsaw that its real objective is the island of Formosa. Communist China declares that it will take Formosa by force if necessary, thus threatening further aggression.

4. The Communists gained control over the 600 million people of China by force. They were able to succeed because the Soviet Union turned over to them the vast military supplies taken from the Japanese in northern China after the United States had defeated Japanese imperialism. These supplies were turned over to the Communist Chinese at a time when the Soviet Union had a treaty of peace and friendship with the Republic of China.

5. The people of China have not been given the opportunity of choosing their own government, even though Mao Tse-tung, in 1937, before the Communists had taken over the China mainland, promised free elections in China.

6. Admission of Communist China to the United Nations would threaten the Repub. of China, now exiled on Formosa. Communist China, once recognized as the United Nations representative of the Chinese people, would then claim suzerainty over Formosa. It also could demand the seat on the United Nations Security Council now occupied by the Republic of China.

7. Admission of Communist China to the United Nations would conceivably threaten British control of Hong Kong. It would make it unlikely that Cambodia, Thailand, and perhaps other countries in the area would remain non-Communist.

8. Admission of Communist China to the United Nations would affect the status of 12 million overseas Chinese in southeast Asia. Since these Chinese are influential citizens in Malaya, the Philippines, Indonesia, and elsewhere, the non-Communist governments of these countries might conceivably face a new threat.

9. Admission of Communist China to the United Nations would threaten the freedom of refugees from Communist China now in Hong Kong, Formosa, and other parts of southeast Asia.

10. Article 4 of chapter II of the United Nations Charter declares that: "Membership in the United Nations is open to all peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present charter and, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

Among the obligations of members of the United Nations are the 18 essential human rights named in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, beginning with freedom of religion, and including, among others, freedom of opinion, speech, assembly, fair trial, property, education, and participation in government. Yet the leaders of Red China have consistently and continually violated the basic freedoms of the Chinese people. One has only to point out the tragic situation of Christian missionaries on the China mainland, and the persecution which they and their people have so long endured at the hands of a relentless and godless regime.

Can anyone seriously believe, on the basis of the record, that Communist China will live up to any of its obligations, and thus meet another requirement of United Nations membership?

Those who propose membership in the United Nations for Communist China cannot ignore the points here set forth, nor the tyranny that denies to the people of China the most elemental of human rights, including religion, and even life itself.

Small Business Tax Adjustment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 13, the Small Business Tax Adjustment Act, which is an identical bill to H.R. 2, introduced by my esteemed colleague, Congressman FRANK IKARD. These bills are similar to the bills that Congressman IKARD and I sponsored in the last Congress.

The passage of this legislation is urgent if we are to maintain the proper balance in our economy between small and large business. It is urgent if we are to have the growth we need to maintain a healthy and progressive economy.

The bills which Congressman IKARD and I introduced in the last Congress were the subject of extensive hearings by the Ways and Means Committee. The committee in its report accompanying a bill which sought to alleviate some of the lesser problems of small business recognized the soundness of the philosophy behind our bills, which hit at the basic problem.

Now is the time to implement the Ikard-Curtis philosophy by legislation.

What is the philosophy? That traditionally in the private enterprise system economic growth comes essentially from the small and new businesses. That the small and new businesses finance their growth essentially from retained earnings, not from bank borrowings, new equity capital or other sources which are generally not available to it.

This is the seed corn philosophy upon which America has grown great. We plant 1 acre of corn, but we retain enough seed from the harvest to plant 2 acres next year. Yet under our Federal tax structure we have been taxing the seed corn so that we are stunting the healthy economic growth we need.

There are those who are so blind to basic economics that they look upon relief from the seed corn tax as threatening the revenues of the Federal Government. It is quite the other way around. If we do not stop taxing the seed corn we will not have the economic growth from which we have been deriving our increased Federal revenues.

During the last recession we overanticipated our Federal tax revenues by about $8 billion. Why? Because we were counting upon an increased gross national product for a larger tax base. Instead of the increased GNP we had a decrease. Essentially this decrease came from the new and small businesses not going ahead with their planned expansions, because they did not have the financing necessary to do so.

Congressman IKARD and my theory of removing some of the tax on the seed corn is bound to produce more, not less, Federal revenues. The only basis upon which a business gets the tax credit in our bills is when it puts retained earnings into growth of the business. What is growth in a business other than increased payrolls, increased expenditures for capital outlays which mean increased payrolls in other businesses? The amount of tax the Federal Government obtains from this kind of expenditure is multiplied several times over.

Furthermore, there is no question but the Federal Government loses revenue when the healthy small businesses are made part of larger concerns through merger and acquisition, particularly when in many instances the purchase price of the small concern is partly paid out of tax-avoidance savings.

Many present-day mergers and acquisitions are not real economic growth. Indeed, many actually are stifling growth. There are, of course, mergers and acquisitions resulting from good economics, but the rate of mergers and acquisitions in the past few years clearly indicate reasons other than good economics lie behind this process. One does not have to look far to find the answer. The answer lies in our Federal tax laws, which discourage economic growth and place a premium on economic cannibalism of larger companies swallowing smaller ones.

The point is not whether the Treasury can stand the enactment of the Ikard-Curtis bill. The question is rather how long can the Federal Treasury stand not to have it enacted.

The bill (H.R. 13) follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. Deduction for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable.

(a) ALLOWANCE.—Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 178. Additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of any person engaged in a trade or business, there shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year an amount measured by the additional investment in such trade or business for the taxable year.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—The deduction under this section for any taxable year shall not exceed whichever of the following is the lesser:

"(1) $30,000, or

"(2) an amount equal to 20 percent of the net income of such trade or business for the taxable year (computed without regard to this section).

"(c) ADDITIONAL INVESTMENT DEFINED.—For purpose of this section, the additional investment in a trade or business for a taxable year means the amount (if any) by which—

"(1) the aggregate, computed as of the close of the taxable year, of the adjusted bases of—

"(A) all property used in the trade or business of a character which is subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167,

"(B) all stock in trade and property held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of the trade or busines,

"(C) all accounts receivable attributable to sales to customers in the ordinary course of the trade or business, exceeds

"(2) a similar aggregate, computed as of the beginning of such taxable year.

"(c) SPECIAL RULES.—Limitation on Affiliated Group.—For the purposes of this section:

"(1) All members of an affiliated group shall be treated as one taxapyer, and

"(2) The Secretary or his delegate shall apportion the limitation contained in subsection (b) of this section among the members of such affiliated group in such manner as he shall by regulations provide.

"(3) AFFILIATED GROUP DEFINED.—For the purposes of this section, the term 'affiliated group' has the meaning assigned to it by section 1504, except that, for such purposes, the phrase 'more than 50 percent' shall be substituted for the phrase 'at least 80 percent' each place it occurs in section 1504 (a)."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections for such part VI is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 178. Additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1958.

Our Impoverished Diplomats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article by David L. Cohn, from the January issue of the Atlantic Monthly:

OUR IMPOVERISHED DIPLOMATS

(By David L. Cohn)

The rich United States treats its Foreign Service career officers with pinchpenny niggardliness. It thereby, to its disgrace, exacts heavy sacrifices of devoted men and sharply lessens our diplomatic effectiveness.

Annually, at the expense of their families' welfare, these men spend upward of $200,000 of their own money in extending official hospitality to foreigners for the Nation's benefit. Large sums are spent by men in such ambassadorial posts as London, Paris, Rome, posts open only to the wealthy because the salaries and allowances attached to them fall far short of the needs. These posts are in effect bought by rich men who contribute liberally to the winning political party in a presidential election. They are therefore nearly always barred to the career diplomat, even though he be the embodiment of Franklin, Talleyrand, Metternich.

How does this affect us in the field? In Paris the informed knew that the young officer being removed from our Embassy there was exceptionally able, that his removal was the country's loss. Speaking of him, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "When I was in Paris * * * I had luncheon with some prominent French people; they said what a tragedy it was that this fellow had gone. They said, 'Why did you take this man away?' "

He was removed because he had gone broke doing his job. Mr. Dulles continued: "He just could not afford to live there. He had already gone into debt and had neglected the education, health, and dentistry of his children. * * * So we had to pull out one of our most effective persons. * * * He spoke French perfectly and was our best at the operating level, the best counterpoise to the activities of the Soviet Embassy."

Thus the land of the $80 billion budget removed an able diplomat from an important post to one politically inconsequential, because it would not spend money to enable him to do his job well.

Like Paris, like Rome. At our Embassy there an officer recently spent $1,500 of his own funds entertaining official guests for the benefit of the United States. He is without independent income and has a family of four.

Why do these men make such sacrifices? It is because they cannot bear to see America poorly represented, because it pains them that their country should appear cheap and shabby in the eyes of foreigners, because they are professionals with the passion of their kind for perfection.

The whole difficulty stems from inadequate "representation allowances" appropriated by Congress. These are funds to cover the cost of hospitality tendered for America. They are not compensation for individuals. No personal advantage accrues from them.

For fiscal 1957 these allowances were only $800,000. But although living costs are rising everywhere and our competition with the Communist world grows daily more intense, Congress sharply reduced the allowances for fiscal 1958 to $600,000. For fiscal 1959 they will be $750,000. This is less than the appropriation of 2 years ago, yet more men are in the field, and the need for money becomes acute.

The $600,000 allowance for 1958 was spread thin. It was distributed among 80 diplomatic missions, 200 consulates, and approximately 1,600 officers. Since it was insufficient, almost no one had enough money to meet his minimal responsibilities. What are these responsibilities?

Our foreign service officer ought to cultivate local leaders in all spheres so that dealings might progress on a friendly, informal basis if the need should arise. Occasionally he must entertain these leaders and acquaint them with visiting Americans. He should, moreover, be able to talk lengthily and informally with local nationals about matters of common interest away from their offices. This is especially important in Oriental countries. In Japan, for example, even businessmen conduct much of their business in teahouses and restaurants, and many Japanese regard as vulgar the foreigner who insists upon doing business in the office.

These activities require more money than the $600,000 presently provided. Many American corporations spend larger sums entertaining customers and currying good will. Corporate expense spending, it is estimated, is now about $5 billion a year. This is equivalent to one-sixteenth of the whole Federal budget and is deductible from taxable income. But the same Government that is so lavish with businessmen's expense spending grudgingly grants pennies for the same purpose to the men charged with the awesome duties of discharging the Nation's foreign policy and winning good will for it against intense Communist competition nearly everywhere.

Let us see how this policy affects one consulate general. Its consular area contains 12 million people. It is located in a key city of more than 1 million people, engaged in shipping, manufacturing, trading. Aside from routine tasks such as issuing visas, the consulate interprets to Washington local political and economic trends, advises and entertains visiting American industrialists, calls upon and entertains local officials, businessmen, labor leaders, and all who may be useful to America in its economic competition with the West and in its economic-political competition with the Communist world.

The consulate general has a representation allowance that, in the opinion of Congress, is large enough to permit it, among other things, to maintain close, friendly contacts with hundreds of persons at all social levels. It is $345 a year, or about 90 cents a day.

Our consul general does not aspire to funds sufficient for the task. He merely longs for ample "lunch money." With it he could take local leaders to lunch and, he says, "do a little brain picking. I could entertain them for entertainment received and develop close contacts with labor leaders, teachers, and professional people, all of whom are important in opinion formulation."

The people here, as in huge areas elsewhere, are largely illiterate. For most of them the purchase of a radio would be unimaginable. "But," observes our consul, "here the personal approach pays rich dividends. Marvels can be achieved provided one enjoys personal friendships in the right places; lacking such friendships, the best laid plans may fail." How much personal approach, in terms of lunches, dinners, donations to local charities, may be had for 90 cents a day?

We compete with the Soviet Union and Red China throughout the continent where this consulate general operates. But our representatives are at a great disadvantage in terms of the personal approach. The Soviet Union, unlike ourselves, does not dole out representation allowances according to rigid formula. It allots them according to the demands of the task. Hence the representation expenditures of its embassies, and those of its satellites, are limited only by the number of people of present or potential importance who will attend their dinners and entertainments.

Look at our pinchpenny policy in the small, strategic southeast Asian country of Laos. We have poured nearly $150 million of aid funds into it. But our Embassy officers in Vientiane recently dug into their own pockets for $984 to pay for hospitality extended by them to Laotian and foreign officials.

We have also poured huge sums into neighborhood Cambodia. There we are in direct, open competition with nearby Red China for Cambodia's good will. Officers assigned to our Phnom Penh Embassy recently spent $1,750 of their own money for official entertaining. Last year a touring American track team visited Cambodia. In order to obtain the maximum benefit from the visit, our Ambassador held a luncheon in the team's honor to which he invited interested Cambodians. This display of patriotism on the Ambassador's part cost him $92.50.

One of our crucial posts is at Amman, in the beleaguered desert Kingdom of Jordan. In the fiscal year ending June 1957, every officer of our Amman Embassy dipped into his pocket to do his official tasks. In this period, marked by the Suez war, nearly all Americans were evacuated from Amman for 5 months, as were all Britons and many members of our foreign communities. The prevailing blackout and curfew sharply restricted normal contacts, but even under these conditions our Amman Foreign Service officers had to use their own funds to do their work.

We have a new consulate at Kampala, Uganda, a remote African area rapidly growing in importance to us. Uganda is approaching self-government. Hence the demands upon our consulate are the greater because it must deal with the semiautonomous Government and Parliament of the Kingdom of Buganda, which is destined to play a key role in determining the constitutional future of Uganda, as well as with the protectorate Government and National Legislative Council of Uganda. Our two officers at this important, demanding post are granted a total of $500 a year (about 65 cents a day each) for representation allowance.

During the first 4 months of this fiscal year these officers spent $525 on essential representation. At this rate they will have to spend $1,000 of their own money during the year, in addition to their $500 allotment.

Consider the plight of our consul at Tabriz, Iran. He was senior to his Turkish and French colleagues at a moment when the Shah was coming to Tabriz, and protocol dictated that our man must receive the Shah on behalf of the consular community. Protocol also dictated that he wear morning clothes for the occasion. The Shah could not know when our consul stood before him that the representative of the world's richest people owed his morning clothes to the willingness of a local tailor to wait a year for his money.

Our Government requires its officials to wear the clothes prescribed by protocol, such as tails, morning clothes, and so forth, but it does not help pay for them. Thus recently an officer with a wife and five children was forced to borrow $2,500 to make essential purchase of clothing and equipment in preparation for assignment overseas. While abroad he must continue to pay income, real estate, and personal property taxes to his domiciliary State of Virginia. How much, then, of his own money can this man afford to spend for the benefit of the United States?

We are the world's largest automobile manufacturers. Yet our diplomats use many broken-down cars. Regulations forbid the spending of more than $5,000 for an ambassador's car. The need is for a seven-passenger limousine, airconditioned for the hot countries, with a window partition for privacy in talks. Such cars cannot be had for our top price. The State Department is therefore forced to purchase discarded cars of cabinet members, secondhand funeral-home limousines, and the old cars of foreign diplomats in Washington who are buying new ones.

Naturally, the rolling junk we send our diplomats causes them trouble. Some time ago Loy Henderson, deputy Under Secretary of State, was our Ambassador to Teheran. This able officer had been sent an ancient car for his use. "But," he told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, "we had so much trouble with it that we did not dare go very far from Teheran. I recall that on several occasions when we were going to the airport to meet distinguished guests it broke down on the way and we had to transfer hurriedly to other cars."

Our diplomats must do certain ceremonial entertaining. Everywhere they hold open house on the 4th of July to all Americans and invited local nationals. It may consume a year's representation allowance. The 4th of July reception in London costs the Embassy about $5,700. This is $700 more than the Ambassador's $5,000 representation allowance for a year.

The expense account is a fixed American business institution. But while we believe that it is a good thing for business to make friends by entertaining customers, we are only partially convinced that it is a good thing for our Foreign Service officers to do. Hence, while an American businessman in Rome may be spending hundreds of tax-deductible dollars dining his customers, down the street an American diplomat may be digging into his own pocket to pay for a pedestrian luncheon for an important Italian official. How can we entrust our diplomats with grave responsibilities and yet treat them with such parsimoniousness?

Our diplomatic corps is the basis of the operation of our foreign policy. Personal diplomacy is sometimes effective, and the politically appointed diplomat may be successful. Yet there can be no substitute for the well-trained, devoted diplomatic corps. As Senator LYNDON JOHNSON puts it, "A nation which does not have such a corps does not have a foreign policy." Yet no diplomatic corps can be at its best when it lacks the best tools in abundance.

A Latin American's Idea on Hemispheric Unity—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, an interesting and thought-provoking little book has recently come to my attention which contains some excellent ideas for the improvement of inter-American relations. The author is Jose A. Benitez, a 34-year-old Puerto Rican, whom I consider an up-and-coming Latin American statesman. His major thesis is the urgent need for unity, understanding and cooperation among the peoples of the Americas as a way "to solve among themselves the common problems affecting the destiny of the hemisphere."

Despite his relatively young age, Author Benitez has already achieved a notable career in several fields. He served in the U.S. Army during World War II, was a columnist for a Puerto Rican newspaper, director of a radio program, secretary to the majority leader of the Puerto Rican Senate, assistant to the Secretary of Justice, president of the Democratic Party of Puerto Rico since 1952 and chairman of its delegation to the National Democratic Conventions in the United States in 1952 and 1956, member of the mayor's committee on Puerto Rican Affairs of New York, and numerous other accomplishments.

Benitez cites Puerto Rico as an example of how best to settle hemispheric differences, in order to develop all potentialities and share in the common destiny of the Americas. He stresses the need for breaking down the barriers of misunderstanding. Once this is achieved, he visualizes a united America, free of national complexes and ancestral bitterness, a pioneering America ready to perform unselfish services and provide leadership to mankind.

I have recently had occasion to visit several Latin American countries in connection with my resolution to create a Pan American Parliamentary Association to help unite the nations of the Western Hemisphere for their well-being and security. Because of Puerto Rico's close relationship with the United States on the one hand, and its historic and ethnic origin as a Latin American community on the other hand, Puerto Rico assumes a unique position in inter-American relations and may be destined to play an important role in cementing hemispheric unity.

Mr. Speaker, Benitez' book is entitled "Puerto Rico and the Political Destiny of America." It is a challenging little volume which should be read by our policy framers, Members of Congress, Government leaders, and all students of Latin American affairs. For this reason, I am inserting excerpts from the book and commend these to the attention of my colleagues:

PUERTO RICO AND THE POLITICAL DESTINY OF AMERICA
(By Jose A. Benitez)

PROLOG

The peoples of the Americas—North, Central, and South—urgently need the unity, understanding and cooperation that will help them to solve among themselves the common problems affecting the destiny of the hemisphere. The nationalist idea has become bankrupt, confronted with the changes of a world where geography has shrunken, while a gigantic wave of complications agitate a life already threatened by international pirates. There is no greater problem facing our part of the world than that of obtaining the understanding and cooperation needed to remove the barriers of indifference and to unite us in the objectives that are historically inevitable to the brotherhood of the future.

It is evident that in the great task of establishing an intercontinental understanding, the initiative is in its preliminary stages but is impeded by perhaps too much dialectic and a too laggard approach toward the fruits that the unity of America (and by "America" I mean all the countries of the Western Hemisphere) must yield. I hope I will not be accused of meddling censure when I say that North America as well as South America has turned its back on the responsibilities of their common fate. This lack of rapport among American communities creates, feeds, and expands prejudices, which operate against the interests of these communities, thus retarding the benefit that they may obtain through their association and understanding.

I know personally many heads of governing bodies who lead the affairs of American peoples. I have talked to politicians, to individuals in various professions, to newspapermen, to people who influence public opinion in the United States and Latin America. I have found in them a feeling for intercontinental understanding, a belief in a genuine American creed, and I dare to say that the furrow is ready for the seed that will bring forth the harvest.

I am a humble student of politics, who seeks to take advantage of its teachings—of the domestic type as well as the universal. My experience has taught me to believe in the virtue of honest communication. This is a thing most likely to prevent misunderstandings and to destroy suspicious feelings, thereby giving life to causes that honor mankind and exalt history. Distrust, especially unfounded distrust, is the product of sterile passions that impel toward the renunciation of human usefulness and greatness. To my way of thinking, the American peoples are separated by imaginary barriers, by surface puerilities, whose fragile mortar will fall apart when the leaders of the hemisphere accept and act on the idea that they must get closer together and try to understand each other.

I am convinced that our America cannot escape its Americanist destiny, that the people eventually will be in accord and will recognize that they have a common fate. Why, then, delay the natural process of our fruitful understanding? And why not speed the action with catalytic agents within our reach that will help bring us out of the impasse and into prosperity?

The tendencies that today separate the democratic nations of the free world from the enslaved bloc of the Communist countries call for a calm but rapid reconsideration leading toward the strengthening of our hemisphere. The north needs the south just as much as the south needs the north. The trouble here is not a matter of mistaken pride. The great task is for the serious and real initiation of cooperation among the American nations, and it is a task for everyone to consider. It is urgent to begin the work of creating and understanding, to gather

together in conference and make agreements in an atmosphere of generosity and brotherhood. It is necessary that our fellow men of the north get to understand better our brothers of the south, and that our brothers of the south likewise come to know those of the north.

Puerto Rico is a Latin American country, which preserves its traditions, history, and culture while maintaining a political association with the United States in bonds of brotherly fellowship, which include a common U.S. citizenship. Sixty years of family relations with that great nation give the Puerto Rican testimony concerning North and South Americans and their relationships with each other the quality derived from an exceptional experience. It is obvious to say that we know Latin America, as it is obvious also to indicate that we know the United States. With this knowledge, deriving from our origin and from the understanding that has flourished in the development and promotion of our country in the friendly orbit of the United States, we Puerto Ricans are puzzled somewhat by the state of things where, time and again, nations of warm, human qualities which, despite differences in race and language, could complement one another, nevertheless are somehow driven apart. It is sad to observe when it is so clear that by the gathering together of their respective virtues they could achieve mutual greatness.

Puerto Rico provides the best example of how the two main hemispheric sections could settle their differences, so as to attain the greatest good of their respective potentialities and share their destiny. By examining the experience of Puerto Rico, both the Latin American nations and the United States will find the proof that they can and must do away with their differences and start the work of unifying the hemisphere. Unquestionably, that is the mission of America. Its leaders have the responsibility of shaking off apathy and starting the task at once.

I offer this book as my humble contribution to the great work of bringing a better understanding between the countries of America. I present in it some points which reflect the efforts, the evolution, and the social achievements, economic and political, of the Puerto Rican people during the period of their relations with the United States. Without political or literary pretensions, I submit whatever is usable to the constructive judgment of the leaders who represent the north and the south and who are concerned for the destiny of the hemisphere.

I want to point out that to make possible this contribution I received valuable help from one of the most distinguished writers of Puerto Rico, who, giving freely of his experience, knowledge, and talent, worked with me at all times, guiding me in the ordering and application of my ideas. And so I make especial mention of my debt to my good friend, the writer Luis Antonio Miranda.

If my small effort gives some aid to the mutual interests of the leaders of America, I will feel greatly rewarded. May it be God's will that what I have sown will have some part in the blooming of a great intercontinental harvest.

ANTECEDENTS

Puerto Rico was discovered by Christopher Columbus during his second voyage to America, in the year 1493. The colonization of the island started some years later, in 1508, under Don Juan Ponce de Leon, the poet of the conquistadors, who gave credence to an Indian legend and set sail in search of the fountain of perpetual youth. Don Juan Ponce was the first Governor of Puerto Rico.

The island is by all means a Latin American community; it has the same origin, historical process, culture and political development as all the other Spanish-speaking countries in the New World. Our connection with Spain was similar to that of all other Latin American countries. However, the circumstances and historical facts that determined the branching off from Spain of the various Latin American countries were different in each case.

At different times, the Spanish colonies in America felt a strong desire for independence, but it was only after much struggling and fighting that they became free nations.

Puerto Rico, with an area of 3,435 square miles and overpopulated, having few resources to depend on and no possibility of success in an adventure of secession, faced its future realistically and negotiated with Spain the Autonomic Pact of 1897. Shortly after the Puerto Ricans had begun to enjoy their autonomy, war broke out between the United States and Spain, in 1898. The American troops landed on the island under the command of Gen. Nelson A. Miles, who in a historic proclamation told the Puerto Ricans that he had come to bring liberty and to vanquish the oppressors. Although all the incumbent officials kept their municipal or insular offices, a military government was established. This lasted until May of 1900, when a civil government was formed, having a North American governor and an executive council with power to enact laws. The civil government was established by virtue of the Foraker Act, approved by the Congress of the United States without ratification by the Puerto Rican people. The government given to the island constituted a regression to the former colonial status and brought to an end the autonomic powers enjoyed by the Puerto Ricans on equal terms with the other Spanish provinces.

The struggles between Puerto Rican patriots and the authorities sponsored by the United States began here, continuing with much uproar. Increasingly, the relations between the two countries were affected by the difficulties attached to misunderstanding and indifference. This created discouragement among the leaders who fought for greater liberties for the island and whose feeling contributed to divisions in public sentiment. This was the principal cause, as the years wasted away, for the retardation of advancement and of the solution of social, economic and political problems, while our country remained stagnant.

While don Luis Muñoz Rivera, an illustrious and prominent Puerto Rican, was Resident Commissioner in Washington, the Jones Act was approved by the U.S. Congress in 1917. This law gave the Puerto Ricans American citizenship. In doing so, it set up a new regime and established, 19 years after the change of sovereignty, a government that still granted few political concessions and that was quite inferior to that established by the Autonomic Charter obtained from Spain. The improvements came, in short, with snail-like speed.

Under the Jones Act, the executive power was limited to a governor, who was appointed by the President of the United States, and to the similarly appointed judges of the supreme court of the island and several members of the governor's cabinet, among whom were the chiefs of the treasury department and the department of public instruction.

Along with the gift of American citizenship, the greatest political concession to the Puerto Ricans consisted in the establishing of the legislative power formed by two Puerto Rican legislative branches whose members occupied their positions by popular vote. However, the concession was not a great one, for the laws of the legislative branches were subject to the governor's veto and finally to the decision of the President of the United States.

It was expected that the granting of American citizenship would end the extreme estrangement and misunderstanding existing in the political relations between the two countries. This hope soon began to wane because of the prolonged continuance of restrictive and vexing conditions inherent in the colonial status of Puerto Rico. The culture, patriotism, dignity and libertarian aspirations of the people of Puerto Rico inspired brave but impotent struggles against the powerful tentacles of colonialism. Social and economic evils increased. The interests of land monopoly and absenteeism took hold of the island. The exploiters of the laborers and of the peasants strengthened their position through the practice of vote buying, thus obtaining the nomination of their candidates, who made laws that suited their purposes and favored their personal interests. Many thousands of landholders disappeared under the voracious forces of the absentee corporations, which intensified the monoculture of sugar cane. Over the country spread the evils of unemployment, of misery, of famine, and of illness, until a total impoverishment spread its roots through the island.

Under the protective covering of an unrestrained colonial system, Puerto Rico came to be an enchanted paradise for the vicious alliance of politicians and exploiters, as well as a calvary for the crucifixion of the Puerto Ricans who worked hard and produced the wealth. The axiom that colonialism is not a political system but a system of economic exploitation found its cruel proof in Puerto Rico during that tragic period, which lasted up to 1940. But it should be pointed out in all honesty that the United States did not profit from the prevailing system—as it would have under the imperialists—but the industrial vampires benefited from the inaction and incomprehension existing in the relations between the two communities.

As the island went more and more adrift, due to the indolence of our politicians and to the indifference of our continental government, a new leader arrived on the political scene with a program leading to the repair of our social and economic conditions. This leader had in mind the moral and material vindication of the people of Puerto Rico. His program was first scoffed at as utopian by many of those who now back it and bless it. Their leader is our present Governor, don Luis Muñoz-Marín. Although a Puerto Rican, he was brought up in the United States; he made a study of the political problems of Puerto Rico to promote the island's true welfare. On his return to the island he made all possible efforts to reconcile the obstacles that handicapped the cordiality and good understanding between the United States and Puerto Rico, and that added to the indignity of colonialism.

Having founded in 1938 the Popular Democratic Party, with a numerous, determined, and experienced nucleus of leaders who loved Puerto Rico deeply, Muñoz-Marín traveled throughout the island preaching the need of uniting together so as to obtain justice. He condemned the immorality of vote buying as the most degrading act a citizen could commit. He introduced to the people of Puerto Rico the much-needed reform legislation, the immediate support of which was pledged in a solemn public act by the candidates for the legislature. In the elections of 1940 and during a civic movement without precedent the Popular Democratic Party came into power.

Since 1898, when General Miles announced that the American occupation troops had come to bring liberty to the Puerto Ricans, Puerto Rico, in spite of having enjoyed a dual citizenship since 1917, had done nothing toward the solution of its colonial problems. Up to the year 1950, the Jones Act of 1917 was still in effect. The President of the United States had the power of nominating and appointing the successive Governors who exerted the executive power in our country. These Governors had no knowledge whatso-

ever of our language, of our idiosyncrasies, or of our problems, and they had not lived with the interests and ideals of our people. As was said before, it was the President's task to appoint the judges of the supreme court of the island, as well as several members of the Governor's Cabinet. The colonial status prevailed fully, as did the exasperations and frictions that hurt the self-esteem of our humble but proud people. It was necessary to overcome the lack of comprehension between the two countries in order to establish the mutual trust and cooperation that might and should contribute to both communities as a respecful tribute to their relations as adult, civilized, Christian people.

For reasons that now appear to be naive in a political atmosphere of such dark aspect, with a resentful attitude that shut out all possibility of approach and comprehension, Puerto Rico threw overboard 42 years of precious time. This time could have been increasingly fruitful to Puerto Rico's endless undertaking of development and improvement, if it had been marked by the acts of mutual confidence that today it exchanges with its excellent fellow citizens of the United States.

There is a saying which claims that "through discussion, people get to know each other." Puerto Rico, thank God, conquered its historical scruples, erased its ethnic and idiomatic prejudices and established an honest and fraternal friendship with the people of the United States. Now we can say that it shares a perfect understanding with the great Republic of North America in a communion of a bountiful fraternity which becomes more fruitful each day.

The key to this fraternal understanding rested in breaking off the vexatious and stubborn shell of misconception, the handicaps of which lead only to sterility.

NEW HORIZONS

The first step in liberalizing our government was to be directed toward the full control of public powers, so as to wage without truce on multiple fronts a war urgently demanded by the social and economic problems of the country. The Governors from North America appointed by the President of the United States were sometimes mere beneficiaries of the political sponsorship of the North who, with their lack of interest in the welfare of the people of Puerto Rico, caused the legislative assembly to be too cautious and circumspect toward enacting the needed laws for fear of arousing the opposition and resentment of the great corporations controlling the financial condition of the island. It was necessary to overcome the indolent indifference concerning Puerto Rican interests in the political circles at Washington. A beginning had to be made in cutting a path toward comprehension, and for the stimulus of a sense of responsibility still undeveloped in the apathetic National Government.

It was lucky for the Puerto Ricans that, because of his former literary activities in the progressive press of the United States which brought him into close association with writers of international renown, Luis Muñoz-Marín was well known among the members of President Roosevelt's Brain Trust, as well as to Mr. Roosevelt himself. In this favorable situation, in the fellowship of the writing craft and with reliable collaborators, the great Puerto Rican leader started a personal campaign, beginning the agitation that induced Washington to face up to the Puerto Rican problems and to give attention to the island's claims for social justice.

The first victory of this campaign was the appointment of Rexford Guy Tugwell as Governor of Puerto Rico. He was a university professor and an advocate of the New Deal program. The liberal and just philosophy of this man who was to be the last North American Governor naturally favored the immediate approval of the laws that were to solve the social and economic problems of our people. To Gov. Rexford Guy Tugwell, Puerto Rico is indebted for the comprehensive and essential understanding of a pioneer labor that made posisble the flowering of our ideals. Tugwell assumed the governorship of Puerto Rico on September 19, 1941, and turned it over to Don Jesus T. Pinero on September 3, 1946. Pinero was the first Puerto Rican Governor; his historial appointment was made by President Harry S. Truman, successor to President Roosevelt.

The first steps had been carried out in full. The seemingly unconquerable wall of the island's subjugation was crumbling. At the beginning, necessary reforms were initiated in an organic act, an interim measure for the desired liberalization. The reforms projected therein were later approved by the U.S. Congress and by President Truman and were made law on August 5, 1947. They placed the appointive powers formerly held by the President of the United States in the hands of the Governor of Puerto Rico, subject to the advice and consent of the Puerto Rican Senate. The reforms also granted to the island the power to name its own Governor by popular vote in a general election. The first elected Governor, elected in 1958, was Muñoz-Marín.

As soon as these reforms were approved, other efforts for a more liberalized form of government were started in Congress and in the White House. These reforms demanded the establishment of a complete self-government based upon the exercise of the Puerto Ricans' self-determination. However, the association between the people of Puerto Rico and the United States was to be maintained through a state of reciprocity and by the bonds of the United States citizenship.

It was a case of an extraordinary experiment, this creation of a new form of government within the system of the U.S. Federal Government. It was a product of the ideals and thought of the leading Puerto Rican minds, a raising of a guiding light which has since proved to be the source providing a form of vital political relations for fruitful understanding among the peoples of different races, languages, and histories.

The efforts of the Puerto Rican leaders echoed in the democratic and liberal conscience of the national leaders in North America. It was President Truman, himself, who addressed Congress in three special historical messages, urging it to grant the people of Puerto Rico the establishment of a complete self-government, exercising their own determination and writing their own permanent organic act. The United States Congress approved, on June 4, 1951, the act known as law 600, which was submitted for the approval or disapproval of the Puerto Rican electorate; this act had no precedent in the United States Congress. The public feeling early manifested for the legislative changes brought an overwhelming majority of votes for the congressional law that gave Puerto Rico the right of free determination for the establishment of the official juridical regime which has the name of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

By virtue of his powers, Gov. Muñoz Marín called the people to hold free elections to pick the members of the constitutional assembly. After the elections, 92 delegates occupied their positions in the inaugural session, which took place on September 17, 1951. The constitution was approved by the constitutional assembly on February 4, 1952. This document was submitted for the approval of the Puerto Rican voters, who approved it on March 3, 1952, by a very heavy volume of votes.

In accordance with U.S. Law 600, the Constitution thus approved by the people of Puerto Rico was sent to President Truman, who studied the document in all its articles and submitted it to Congress with his recommendation for approval. The Congress of the United States approved the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico as a treaty. The complete text of the constitution appears in the next chapter.

The new Puerto Rican regime was proclaimed in a solemn public act at San Juan, capital of Puerto Rico, on July 25, 1952, in the presence of the personal representative of the President of the United States, of Congressmen, and numerous other important dignitaries and personalities of North America, as well as illustrious ambassadors, politicians, and intellectuals of Latin America.

The last official act of Mr. Truman as Chief Executive of the United States consisted in addressing a message to the United Nations Organization, stating the fact that the United States was relieved from all further responsibility for reporting to the Economic Council on the social, economic, and political situation of Puerto Rico. This was due to the fact that the island had already established a complete self-government, pursuant to exercising its free determination, and was no longer a colony. President Truman requested the recognition of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico by this international organization. After a debate giving vent to continental passions, which had nothing to do with the basic considerations of the foundation and establishment of the new Puerto Rican government, the General Assembly of the United Nations by a substantial majority vote recognized formally the regime recently established by our people.

The beautiful success of the political formula that freed the people of Puerto Rico, enabling them to manage their own affairs and cope with their own fortunes in reciprocal community affairs with the people of the United States, is a splendid living realization, which, in the warmth of a dynamic understanding with the United States, has permitted us to see the miracle of the loaves and the fishes. Our political ideal is on the march, open as a fountain of fraternal cooperation to the Spanish-speaking nations and to the United States to initiate and support to fruitful completion the speedy confraternization of the hemisphere.

The Puerto Ricans stand ready, with outstretched arms.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is the regime adopted by the Puerto Rican people by means of exercising their free determination, establishing their complete self-government in social, political and economic association with the people of the United States.

The formula created and adopted by the island developed as a pact of mutual agreement worked out between the U.S. Congress, with the approval of the President of the Nation, and the Puerto Rican electorate, who expressed their will in free and democratic balloting during three different electoral processes. The first one was held to accept or to reject the law of the U.S. Congress in which that body acknowledged the right of the island to rule itself under its own constitution. The second one was carried out to elect the members of the constitutional convention. Finally, the third one took place on the occasion of the approval of the constitution. Each of the three elections elicited a very decisive number of favorable votes.

This form of government—a new creation—is offered by Puerto Rican political thought to all the people of the world who are subject to another form of government, as a guide for dignified orientation for the working out of local problems for the establishment of liberty in their own government, if the people in the case—as has been

the Puerto Rican case—are prepared for the possession of national citizenship.

The Jones Act of 1917 made the Puerto Ricans citizens of the United States. Notwithstanding this fact, historical causes of a complex diversity maintained the island in a colonial type of structure impossible to modify. There were especially difficult problems of economic or social character which made illusory the aspirations of liberty of our people.

The political parties of Puerto Rico divided their demands and efforts of emancipation between the formula of Federal statehood within the Nation—that is, the United States—and the formula of complete independence, separated from the Nation. This struggle of political tendencies, antagonistic as they were, appeared as soon as the earliest days of the North American domination of Puerto Rico, when the military occupation of the island following the Spanish-American War in 1898 was completed. The civil government of the island, following the occupation, was reestablished and the Puerto Rican political parties reorganized.

Having gone through the period of the Foraker Act, the statute which reconstituted civil government on the island in 1900, and through the period of the Jones Act, which extended in 1917 U.S. citizenship to the islanders, the Puerto Ricans engaged in an ineffectual struggle for independence or statehood. In neither of the two courses did we advance a single step; we simply regressed, losing ground in the direction of self-sufficiency, the economic base upon which the political aspirations of federation and separation had to be considered. The history of this epoch is rather tragic. The dispute between both aspirations produced a deep and resentful division of the Puerto Rican family which—although it has been ameliorated—we have not yet been able to eliminate as a whole.

In the hands of the leaders of this dispute, the crippling situation was aggravated to an alarming extent. The economic and social problems were augmented almost until asphyxia was produced, driving off to a remote distance all possibility of facing effectively the political problem. The population increased tremendously. Foreign investments and absentee parasites took hold of the marrow of our economy. The tentacles of the corporate system broke the resistance of our land. The army of peons and unemployed grew like an avalanche. Our astonished eyes saw an enormous increase in the danger of monoculture on our farmlands.

Through such evils, Puerto Ricans suffered maladjustments of income which brought privations, malnutrition, sickness, and misery. Due to the unjust distribution of the riches produced, countless Puerto Ricans in the fields, factories, and worshops were condemned to a prolonged and inhuman misery. The people of Puerto Rico were disintegrating as a living nation. The economic and social cancer was sucking our blood, gnawing our bones and tearing our flesh.

To make more effective their intervention in defense of their interests, the capitalists entered into politics and took hold of the legislative power. Consequently, Puerto Rico became a paradise for the exploiting class and a purgatory of sacrifice for the exploited class. Morally, the U.S. citizenship was strangled. The corruption of the purchase and sale of the vote undermined the strength of our traditional civilization. Puerto Rico met the enormous annual deficit of its budget with Federal help assigned to education, hospitals, roads, and other services of the public welfare.

It was in such chaos that we came to 1940, when the popular Democratic Party, with its program of social, political, and economic redemption, succeeded in destroying the ignominious chicanery of the bought vote and came to power under the inspiration and guidance of its leader.

Then, seeking ways to support the enormous population on our small territory, our people attacked their traditional hard adversity with the limited means at their disposal. They strongly hoped for a better material life and for a more secure one.

At this point, our political problem was in suspense, without any alternative. The economic and social maladjustment received prompt and industrious attention. The party which the people had created and backed for the winning of justice—as we said before—wrote emancipating laws, solemnly promising the people that these measures would be enacted at the first meeting of the legislature and would be made to take effect as rapidly as possible. This group of laws—which formed the backbone of the material and moral redemption of the island—doubtless constituted one of the most exemplary civic revolutions which a courageous people have won, standing upon the ruins of a community structure and struggling against all the handicaps of a colonial status.

These laws provided the groundwork for the best and most just distribution of the riches produced in the country. They began to redeem the Puerto Rican land and to remake the civic economy. The salaries, working conditions, living standards, employment opportunities, and essential services for the people were improved. The human dignity of the laborers and peasants was restored to them. The laws gave priority to the rescue of the Puerto Ricans as human beings.

For this continuing and dynamic battle the Government created public agencies as instruments for attaining the desired ends, and for them it selected and recruited the best available talent, providing these people also, at the beginning, with the help of wise advisers and indispensable technicians brought from outside the island. The problems that weighed upon the island were, and are still, attacked at their sources, on the basis of careful study and scientific planning.

When initial measures had appreciably improved the general welfare and the black line of the mortality graph had been brought down to a steadily lower level, the signal was given for an intensive battle of production, and, by means of plans and laws that have proved effective, the program for industrialization was begun, which, at its apogee, promises to attain the self-sufficiency of the country.

At this particular peak of the Puerto Rican achievements—let us locate it in 1948—the conflicting independence and statehood blocs were continuing their political contest, with their representative minority parties, the Independent and the Statehood, trying to reconcile their objectives with circumstances, realities and historical facts that were insuperable. Puerto Rico was—and still is, in fact—a long way from having found a modus vivendi for economic independence or from the discovery of a means to carry the expensive burdens of statehood. The annual deficit of the Puerto Rican subsistence was being covered at the stage mentioned above—and is being covered today—by the Federal aid previously referred to. On the other hand, the coldness, the incomprehension and the indifference that restricted the relations between the United States and Puerto Rico had been transformed into warm and reciprocal relations achieved by brotherly love, by the vigorous force of human equality, by civilized realism and by diminution of the xenophobia which existed on both sides.

Notwithstanding all this, much of the old colonial restriction continued in effect. The Puerto Ricans could elect their Legislative Assembly; but the President of the United States—it must be repeated—had the power of nominating the Governor of the island, several members of his cabinet and the judges of the supreme court, and he also had the last word to say regarding the possible reversal of the laws that were approved by Puerto Rico.

There is no need to say that the titanic effort of the Puerto Rican people in their struggle for social and economic emancipation required the means of political liberty, without which the whole plan would be like a ship adrift. Lacking for the time the self-sufficient resources requisite for settling the classic debate of independence or statehood, it was necessary to put aside efforts to solve this riddle. The case demanded political depth, conscientious objectivity and patriotic courage, to say nothing of a profound knowledge of the specific situation of our island. How to obtain then an honorable liberation from this unhappy voluntary confinement? The great convention of the popular Democratic Party approved in 1948 a resolution that authorized its leaders to deal with the problem. These men diligently pursued their task and obtained a substantial success when President Harry S. Truman appointed Don Jesús Piñero as the first native Puerto Rican governor of Puerto Rico. Right after this, further reforms were obtained providing positive liberation in the organic charter for the government of our country, reforms which established the right of our people to elect our own governor, and transferring to him the power of all the erstwhile presidential nominations.

While these achievements were still in the making, the most serious thought of the Popular leadership was centered on the search for the form of liberty that—without exposing to damage or destruction the gains that were giving promise of autosufficiency—would adapt itself, constructively and honorably, to the difficult and specific case of our people. It was in this manner, as though by way of a new road, that the crystallization and establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico came forth, whose constitution—published in the preceding chapter—lets the world see the form of liberty that we, the Puerto Ricans, have chosen, exercising our free determination, in unobstructed and democratic elections, so that we may deal with efforts to find solutions of the problems of our affairs, life, and destiny.

We are at present the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, voluntarily associated with the United States by economic, social, and political bonds, and free to develop the growth that will support the future security of the island. The pact of mutual agreement effected between Puerto Rico and the U.S. Congress is fraternally backed up by the nexus of a common citizenship.

But the political formula that opened a door to the complex condition prevailing in the island has the striking feature that it does not impede the growth or hinder the free will of the Puerto Ricans and the destiny that may be worked out in the future, as the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was politically designed for all sorts of growth, on all lines and on all fronts.

God will light the future.

New England Has the Best There Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the January 14 edition of the Boston Herald carried a very timely and interesting article

written by Managing Editor George E. Minot about New England entitled "Great New Era Already Here." Under leave to extend my remarks I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

The article follows:

GREAT NEW ERA ALREADY HERE

(By George E. Minot)

New England is the best place in the world to live, bring up your children, educate them and do your own business. It is the best place to spend your spare time. Nowhere else can you find the unexcelled stretches of sandy beaches, the craggy rocks where mountains meet the sea, or so many opportunities to hike in summer or ski in winter.

No other section meets the exacting requirements of those who love to pursue the little white ball over fairways or out of carefully landscaped traps. No place you can think of in the United States is better adapted to that great, new and rapidly growing sport, motorboating. Here a score of rivers wend their way seaward, and here literally thousands of safe harbors and lakes beckon those who in the last few years have found perfect weekend outings for their families.

Recreation is only a small part of life in New England. Consider another for a moment—education. If this is something you underwent as a youth, or if your own children are not yet old enough to go away to school, perhaps the tremendous growth in this field has escaped you.

AMAZING GROWTH IN SCHOOLS, COLLEGES

Within your lifetime schools and colleges have shot from under you. Thirty or forty years ago when you thought of education in New England, you considered first Harvard and Yale among the larger institutions and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Bowdoin, Amherst, and Williams among the smaller. Today MIT is one of the great institutions of the world, and right under your nose, almost out of nowhere, has come another technical school—Northeastern—now with a student body approaching 18,000—that is ready to rival it.

Tufts, only yesterday a small college, now is a great university. Brandeis, unexcelled anywhere in America where scholarship and faculty are considered, within the last few years started from scratch on an almost abandoned hillside in Waltham, and now has a student body of 1,200.

Harvard, oldest and greatest university in the United States, is well on its way to raising the unprecedented sum of 80-odd million dollars so it may be an even better place to receive an education. Boston College, which you thought of half a century ago as a small Jesuit school in Newton, now has 9,600 students, including a school of nursing. Boston University, whose dingy quarters were scattered all over Boston, has a magnificent set of buildings along the Charles and an enrollment of almost 20,000.

WORLD CENTER OF MEDICINE

Yet education is only a small part of life in New England. You might consider medicine. Once again the temptation to indulge in superlatives almost overcomes you. Yet it is hard to avoid them. The day never passes in Boston when a trans-Atlantic plane does not bring to these shores patients who have come here in the hope Boston specialists and Boston hospitals can find the answer to their ills.

You pick up your newspapers many, many times a year and read of some new operation that has been performed here, perhaps the transplanting of one organ from a relative or a volunteer to the body of another. If you have read the record of the past, you know that a great many of the "firsts" in this field took place in Boston hospitals.

If you are interested in the record of the present, as is more likely, you should know that these advances are continuing month by month, even week by week. Students from all over the world know that in no other place can you get the training that comes from the Harvard and Tufts and Boston University medical schools or from the Massachusetts General, the Beth Israel, or the Massachusetts Memorial Hospitals, to mention only a few of a great many that do equally distinguished work.

SYMPHONY, CONSERVATORY LEAD IN MUSIC

Hospitals, recreation, schools and colleges all are big businesses in New England. So is music. Critics from many cities have told us the Boston Symphony Orchestra is the best in the country. The New England Conservatory of Music for 50 years has set a standard other institutions continually try to meet.

This is a business and industrial review. It is greatly interested in the things that make New England a good place in which to live. It is equally concerned with the reasons why this is a fine and profitable place in which to work, in which to establish or conduct your business. This section points out some of the remarkable things that have been going on here and it emphasizes where we stand now and where we are headed.

Elsewhere in this section you may read what has been happening in the field of transportation and travel hereabouts. For years motorists complained about getting through Boston. The old Route 1 was a nightmare for those who wished to go somewhere in hurry. Narrow Boston streets, some said to have been laid out by the meanderings of cows pastured on the Common, plagued the unwary.

Boston's highways have gone modern. We have the best that skill and money can produce. Great new expressways lead to the north and the south. The Mystic River Bridge bears an ever-increasing load. Route 128 is a motorist's dream come true.

Or perhaps you are interested in travel by water. Then there is the great port of Boston. Or if it is by air, the Logan International Airport is the easiest to reach of any in the country's major cities. It has the runways to take care of the great new jet transport planes.

Boston is the hub of all this. Legislators from other Massachusetts communities often overlook this. So do officials from other States in this region. Without a growing and prosperous Boston there can be no growing and prosperous New England.

Here are the port and the airport, closer to Europe by air and by water than New York or Philadelphia. Here are the great parent concerns without which many of the new and fabulous shopping centers in the suburbs would be impossible. Thus Boston's rapid transit problems, its commuter problems, and its tax problems are ones that do not concern the city alone but all the rest of the area.

ONE HUGE COMMUNITY

Take your own case. If you live in the suburbs consider how much you take out of Boston and how little you may contribute. Naturally you are primarily interested in the schools, fire and police departments, town employees, tax rate and hospitals in the community where you and your family live. That doesn't mean Boston's problems are not your's, especially if that is the place where you work.

Or if you live anywhere in Maine or New Hampshire, for instance, consider how much the city of Boston influences your life, or how much you depend on what is manufactured, printed, or institutionalized in Boston. Or how often you come to great sport events for entertainment here.

It's one great community. The success of one depends on the success of the other.

Anybody going into business here, or anybody coming from another part of the country to look over the prospects here, is entitled to an answer to his most obvious questions: Why should I place my plant in New England? Why, when the area obviously is far removed from many of the sources of raw materials and from markets for finished goods, should I build in New England and thus be saddled with more costly freight charges?

Why should I situate here, instead of perhaps in South Carolina, where the taxes are lower and where perhaps I can get a better break from local authorities who often are willing to overlook such things as taxes for a period of years? Why should I build a plant in New England where obviously I will have to pay more heating and lighting bills than I would if I built, perhaps, in Florida?

UNEXCELLED SKILLS

Any good chamber of commerce man can give you any number of answers to these and other questions. You will get only the most important answer here. That is that here in New England you can get a supply of skilled labor unexcelled anywhere in America. You can get a diversification of talent undreamed of elsewhere. You can get a know-how, a dedication to the job, and a realization that because of other obstacles the worker here knows he must produce a little more and a little better quality in order to hold his job and keep his employer in business.

Oh, yes, say the unwary, that may have been true 25 or 50 years ago, but in these days of automation, when you have machines that can almost think for themselves, when your laboring man can almost stand blindfolded and punch a hole in a sheet of metal as it passes in front of him on an endless belt, not even knowing what part he plays in the process—today, the unthinking man says, skilled labor isn't as important as it used to be.

There's where you're wrong, brother, and all you have to do is to ask any manufacturer, any employer, any businessman who is running a plant. You will learn that today the percentage of engineers, technicians, scientists, trained personnel is far higher than it ever was. You will learn that ordinary run-of-the-mill labor is plentiful anywhere, but that more than in any other place in the Nation, New England offers an abundant supply of the skills.

They have smart cookies running the great industrial empires in Detroit and Pittsburgh, and they know what they are doing when they sublet hundreds of contracts to the little factories in New England—to the plants that employ 50 or 75 men—that turn out precision instruments, gears, electrical gadgets and complicated bits of machinery cheaper and better than can the big plants themselves.

And if you look at scores on end of small businesses in cities and towns in Massachusetts, southern New Hampshire and Maine and all over Rhode Island and Connecticut, you will find they are working on Government contracts for instruments so complicated, often secret, that they stagger the imagination.

And again you come back to the proximity of the big universities, the technical schools and colleges, where scores of teachers are available on a few minutes notice for consultation—men of national reputation whose services are in demand in Washington and in big plants everywhere.

It's easy to say that in this day of rapid transportation, they can fly from the Atlantic to the Pacific in a few hours, but in New England they are there—Where else is there for them to go?

It is easy but hardly correct to say that Boston and New England stand on the

threshold of a great, new era. The era is here already. Work already has started on the great new Prudential Center—a veritable city-within-a-city. It isn't enough to say that Boston has a great tomorrow. It has a great today. One look at the great new overhead highways, the beautiful new buildings in the process of going up, and you know that without being told. And with this for a start, the only way can only be up and ahead.

Bituminous Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this week's issue of the Saturday Evening Post contains an excellent article on the bituminous coal industry. It emphasizes the stability of labor-management relations, an important consideration in a consumer's long-range fuel-supply plans.

I congratulate the executives in coal companies and the United Mine Workers of America for the manner in which they have conducted contract negotiations without work stoppage. They have demonstrated conclusively that coal may be depended upon to serve the Nation in both industrial and domestic capacities. Mine owners have invested vast amounts of capital in mechanizing the mining processes. The UMWA has welcomed this progress, despite displacement of a substantial number of workers, because this union is so practical and farsighted as to realize that scientific and engineering advancement contributes to the general welfare and living standards.

The Saturday Evening Post article describes the costs of some of the machinery that has given the U.S. bituminous coal industry an output per man day of at least four times more than that of any other country in the world. The article also points out that many miners displaced by the advent of mechanization are finding new employment opportunities in plants of manufacturing and processing industries which have come to recognize the advantages of locating in coal areas.

Western and central Pennsylvania, as well as other coal-producing regions, invite industry leaders to take notice of what we have to offer in the way of guaranteed fuel supplies, manpower, and transportation facilities. Unfortunately, even this new trend toward coal will not entirely solve our surplus labor problems. We are going to have to have legislation by the Congress to remove the existing inequities responsible for so much of the unemployment that is plaguing coal communities. Immediate action is required to reduce the excessive shipments of foreign residual oil that inundates east coast amrkets defiance of an executive department order and an amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Congress must also take steps to prohibit the dumping of natural gas in industrial markets at prices below those imposed upon the homeowner for this specialty fuel.

One of the other threats to the coal industry is mentioned by Mr. Ben Pearse, author of the Post article. He mentions the high cost of producing electricity through atomic energy as compared with power generated by coal. Congress must be alert to prevent subsidization of an atomic electric industry that would place another heavy burden upon taxpayers and at the same time further impinge upon opportunities for the thousands of families dependent upon coal as a means of livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, I ask special permission to print in the RECORD the article, "The Indestructible John L.," from the Post of January 17, 1959.

The article follows:

THE INDESTRUCTIBLE JOHN L.

(By Ben Pearse)

Twenty years ago the Nation shook when he barked. Today he's a mellower man—but still able to drive a hard bargain.

"John L. Lewis," the headline writer muttered to himself as he skimmed through a sheet of press copy on his desk, "I thought he was dead. Haven't heard of him for years."

The copy announced briefly that the bushy-browed leader of the United Mine Workers of America, very much alive, had signed a new agreement with the Bituminous Coal Operators' Association. A few years before, that would have climaxed weeks of banner headlines about picket lines, court battles and factories shut down for lack of coal, illustrated with the frowning visage of the miners' chief.

But this story said nothing about strike violence, court orders, or shutdown factories. There were no ultimatums, no recriminations. With a shrug, the headline writer gave it routine treatment for wage raises and thumbed on through the copy before him for something more exciting.

Who tamed John L. Lewis? For nearly 9 years now—March is the anniversary month—his union has called no major strike against its employers. Since 1950 most of their wage agreements have been negotiated and signed with so little fanfare that they attracted only passing notice or none at all. The Senate select committee's hearings on the sad state of some labor-management relations ran for more than a year without mentioning the word "coal."

"What is this," one operator said recently, crossing his fingers, "the millennium?"

Except to students of labor relations, the question would be academic but for one surprising fact. Coal is staging a comeback. The industry so often pronounced sick and dying mined 500 million tons of bituminous coal in 1956—the point of some return on investment—and came within 2 percent of hitting that mark again in 1957, despite the recession. Barring a brief flurry during the oil shortage of 1947–48, it hasn't dug that much coal under peacetime conditions since 1929. Coal production last year fell off with the rest of industrial production, especially in steel. But electric utilities are using more coal year by year. By 1975, they expect to be burning about 490 million tons of coal, as much as total production for all purposes last year. Bank brochures recommend coal-company stocks for long-term investment, and L. Newton Thomas, retiring as president of the National Coal Association, declared, "The only thing the coal industry is sick of is being called sick."

It will probably be news to most people that they had anything to do with the industry's comeback or are even concerned. But it takes a pound of coal to make every pound of steel in your car. An increasing proportion of the aluminum all around you is made with electricity generated from coal. Except in hydropower areas, 7 chances out of 10 anything electrical you own, from your toaster or air conditioner to the band saw in your hobby room, is powered by coal. It comes into your home in other forms you never suspect—nylon stockings, medicines, plastics—and without leaving dust or ashes. Indeed, ashes are now too valuable to throw away or scatter on icy sidewalks. Fly ash makes a superior concrete. Thousands of tons of it are in Hungry Horse Dam in Montana, the huge new span over Straits of Mackinac in Michigan, in highways and in building blocks and soil pipe of new housing developments. If the coal-fired gas turbine now in the testing stage proves successful, you will again be traveling on trains and ships, perhaps even in automobiles, powered by bituminous coal.

The story behind this revolution in the Nation's basic fuel is a documentary in hard-bitten personalities. It is no coincidence that the hazardous, back-breaking business coal digging is should beget belligerent leader on both sides of the bargaining table. But neither is it a coincidence that the peace agreed upon between them in the unofficial treaty of Washington nearly 9 years ago opened an era that has since put the industry in black ink and miners' wages at an alltime high. In this about-face from open warfare to undeclared peace, the hard-bitten personalities haven't changed, except for their stance. Instead of fighting each other, both are now fighting their competition. Their banner bears a strange device, "cooperation," is a word quite foreign to the industry's vocabulary for so many decades.

Several things combined to topple bituminous coal from its 1947 pinnacle, 631 million tons. But one of the most important was the labor turmoil that cost it many of its best customers. Elimination of the strike threat has won many of them back again.

Coal salesmen today, as though they had never heard of a coal strike, are guaranteeing firm delivery schedules on long-term contracts. With, say, a 20 million ton order—1 million tons a year for 20 years—they have learned they can finance a wide variety of machinery and equipment that would be prohibitively expensive otherwise. Under a 15-year contract, for example, the Consolidation Coal Co. recently completed the first coal pipeline that will deliver 1,200,000 tons of coal a year from its mines near Cadiz, Ohio, to the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., 108 miles away. The $12 million cost will be liquidated by savings in freight. In the old days no coal operator would have had the temerity to guarantee a firm schedule for 1 year, much less 15, or spend $12 million to meet it. The introduction of new equipment has kept coal prices stable for the past 8 years, despite wage increases and inflation. President W. C. MacInnes explains why the Tampa Electric Co. built the first coal-burning generating plant in Florida and is building another, a 240,000-kilowatt plant.

"We don't buy fuel by the ton, gallon, or cubic foot any more, but by the B.t.u. (British thermal unit). Coal gives us a million B.t.u.'s for 32 cents compared to 38 cents for the competing fuels we've been using. When we start getting coal by barge instead of by rail on a 20-year contract, we expect to get the cost below 30 cents per million B.t.u.'s."

What happened and how long can it last? Could it possibly have been the coal operators, not John L. Lewis, who underwent the quick change that has made dependable delivery the industry byword instead of stabilizing periods of inaction? The answer lies behind the scenes at the last performance they appeared in together in public, when they suddenly laid aside their battle garb to

sign the treaty of Washington, officially the National Bituminous Wage Agreement of 1950. This climax came after 10 months of spirited skirmishing at the bargaining barricades, in the courts and across the front pages of newspapers from coast to coast, that accomplished nothing, but did raise blood pressures on both sides to a common high. With the mines shut down completely the blustery first week in March, President Truman asked Congress for authority to take over the mines again—for the sixth time in 7 years. The last act of this drawn-out melodrama was short.

As the curtain rises, the operator representatives, red-eyed from lack of sleep, are sitting around a conference room in a downtown Washington hotel, chewing their cigars and cussing and discussing the proposed Government seizure. A telephone rings with a call for George H. Love, who was acting as chief negotiator for the operators, exit Love. Thirty-five minutes more of cigar chewing, cussing and discussing. Enter Love, who announces that he and Lewis have agreed on terms that he will sign for his company, the largest in the industry. A pin drops. Then there is a sudden exodus for long-distance telephone booths—one operator guessed the tolls reached $10,000—as the curtain falls. The final tableau—set portentously on a sunny Sunday afternoon, as I remember—shows operators and union representatives queuing up to sign the contract that ushered in what is now frankly proclaimed as a new look in labor-management relations.

What went on offstage? Without any shouting, shooting, or hullabaloo, Lewis and Love settled a 10-month deadlock in 20 minutes—allowing 15 for the walk to a nearby hotel and back. Neither of them elaborated on their conversation at the time, but the late Harry M. Moses, head of United States Steel's captive mines—an ex-coal miner whose father and grandfather were miners before him—filled it in afterward.

"Since the first Federal commission made the first investigation of labor relations in coal back in 1902," he said, "we have been mediated, conciliated, legislated, and regulated. We had been partially seized, wholly seized, unseized, and reseized. We had been beaten over the head in all sorts of fancy places, including that famous oval-shaped office on Pennsylvania Avenue. We wanted to keep the Government out of our business."

On several past occasions, Lewis had benefited from Government intervention—the union's welfare and retirement fund was established while the mines were under Federal control—but the two fines totaling $2.1 million that had recently been imposed on the union were enough to convince him that Government intervention was a fickle thing. He wanted no more of it either. The settlement was a surrender by neither side to the other, but by both to a mutual ogre, Government control.

To make the new look permanent, Moses took the lead in organizing the Bituminous Coal Operators' Association with a permanent staff in Washington to replace the old once-a-year conference. His colleagues called him "the man who worked out a way of doing business with John L. Lewis." His formula was simple.

"Under the old joint wage conference procedure," he explained, "almost every coal operators' association and every union district were entitled to a representative, and enough of them always showed up to fill a good-sized hotel ballroom. Lewis would kick off the meeting by presenting outrageous demands and vehemently castigating the industry's shabby treatment of its underpaid and underprivileged employees. Then whoever was in best voice among the operators would arise to reject each and every one of the union's demands and plead that the industry was no more than a few days away from total bankruptcy. Finally, after several days of speeches everybody knew by heart, a couple of the leading operators would get together with Lewis and Tom Kennedy, U.M.W.A. vice president, in a hotel room somewhere and work out a deal that could be ratified by everybody.

"The new system merely eliminated the speeches. Both sides had instructions from their membership. Both sides had frequent meetings with their policy committees before and during negotiations. This businesslike method of arriving at a contract was best for all parties concerned, including the public."

He proved his point the following year, when, without any public disclosure that negotiations were going on, a new contract was signed 2 months before the old one expired.

Peace did not immediately lead the coal industry out of the financial woods. Dieselization of the railroads after World War II cut their coal consumption nearly 90 percent in a decade. The swing to oil and gas for home heating cut that market in half during the same period. Operations held up through the emergency in Korea, but in 1954 fell abruptly to the lowest point in 20 years, only 392 million tons. Labor peace did, however, lay the groundwork for the upswing that came in 1955, and has continued since, because it gave a new impetus to mechanization.

Mechanization was not new in the coal industry. Cutting machines were introduced early in the century, and loading machines in the twenties. Productivity rose gradually from 3 tons a day per man in 1900 to about 6½ tons by 1950. But in the late forties came the first continuous-mining machines, that drilled out the coal without cutting or blasting, carried it to the surface on belts and automatically dumped it onto railroad cars or barges ready for shipment. For surface or strip mining, more powerful equipment became available—45-ton trucks, for example, and a huge shovel that lifted 90 tons of overburden at a bite to a height of 100 feet or more. For mining in hilly sections augers up to 6 feet in diameter were developed that bored 200 feet into a seam and reamed out the coal like shavings from a carpenter's bit.

The only trouble was, this machinery was expensive. One continuous-mining machine cost about $100,000. That 90-ton shovel cost $2,500,000. To equip a mine of 2 million tons a year capacity with machinery like that might run up to as much as $10 million. And money tied up in machinery doesn't earn dividends unless the machinery runs steadily. Thus, peaceful labor relations were the cornerstone on which the heavy investment in modern mechanization rested. Probably some operators had their doubts about a labor millennium, but the industry as a whole took a chance and poured millions of dollars into new machines in the first 5 years after the peace pipe was smoked, a few companies as much as doubling their investment. Productivity zoomed from 6½ tons a man-day to more than 10 tons, a larger increase than in the preceding half century, and is still rising. Some mines average 25 tons a day per man, and the record is nearer 100. The European average, incidentally, is less than two.

And so, if the investment was a gamble, it paid off. The operators took their losses in the railroad market, at least temporarily, and the home-heating field, much of it permanently—together about 140 million tons a year. But the gains mechanization made possible in the electric-utility, steel and export markets have largely recouped that deficit, and offer even greater opportunities for the future. How far in the future? Can Lewis and his miners survive the advent of atomic power?

The whole coal industry has given a lot of thought to the threat of atomic power. But most of it has been devoted to maintaining the lead coal has in relative costs. The first commercial-scale atomic reactor, at Shippingport, Pa., is generating electricity for about 64 mills per kilowatt-hour, admittedly high because of its experimental nature. The most optimistic estimates are, however, that this can be reduced to from 7 to 11 mills a kilowatt-hour in the next 10 or 15 years. According to the Federal Power Commission, coal is now producing electricity in the midcontinent area for an average of eight mills and in some of the newest utility plants for as little as three mills. By still further cutting down transportation costs—that coal pipeline is the newest wrinkle—that often account for as much as 40 percent of the price of coal, the industry is providing a constantly lowering target for atomic power to shoot at. Tom Pickett, executive vice president of the National Coal Association, the industry trade organization, puts it this way:

"We recognize the need to continue development of nuclear power in view of the Nation's rising demand for energy. But the United States Bureau of Mines estimates that the country will still need a minimum of 784 million tons of coal by 1975, and may need as much as 1 billion tons—more than double the amount mined last year. Some experts forecast that atomic power will be furnishing perhaps 25 percent of our total electric energy by that date. In many parts of the world where transportation is a major factor, atomic energy may someday be the cheapest energy fuel. But in the United States we believe atomic power will supplement, not eliminate, other fuels. Barring excessive Government subsidies, the coal industry should be able to maintain a competitive price for many years to come."

A report by the Investment Bankers Association of America would seem to agree. "Atomic power," it states, "offers an early competitive threat only to the extent that it may be subsidized by the Government to accelerate its acceptance," and concludes that "the near- and long-term future of the bituminous-coal industry is a bright one."

Mechanization has not been an unmixed blessing to the union. It has raised wages, but the 200,000 miners working last year produced as much coal as roughly twice that number did 10 years. What happened to the 200,000 miners who have been displaced by technological progress? About 75,000 of the older ones have reached 60 and been placed on the pension rolls. Some have turned to other jobs, but the U.M.W.A. now numbers its unemployed at more than 100,000. It's a problem unions besides the miners' are facing today, and the solution isn't an easy one. Nevertheless, the union is maintaining the stand expressed by Lewis several years ago, that "it is better to have a half million men working at good wages and high standards of living than it is to have a million working in poverty and degradation."

The long-range prospect for absorbing these unemployed miners is better than it might seem at first glance. In the area served by the Tennessee Valley Authority, electric power has attracted new enterprises that have indirectly increased employment. The rapid expansion of electric power now going on in the Appalachian coal region is expected to produce a similar result. For example, a new mine that opened last June at Cresap Bottom, W. Va., will employ 600 men. But the new generating plant being built beside it burning coal practically at the mine mouth will employ up to 100 men, and a new aluminum plant built across the Ohio River at Clarington, Ohio, to use only half the electricity will employ more than 1,200. New factories to turn the aluminum into consumer goods will employ more men, and service industries attracted by these payrolls will contribute to the upward trend. Union officials I talked to believe that if

temporary relief can be afforded the distressed areas where unemployment is greatest, the downward trend will be completely reversed over a period of a few years.

Can the idyllic labor peace last that long or are pressures building up beneath the surface that will eventually blow the "new spirit of tolerance," as Lewis calls it, sky high? In a survey covering the twenties and thirties, rating 17 industries on the general pattern of their strike propensities, Chancellor Clark Kerr and Abraham Siegel, of the University of California, placed miners at the top of the list, followed closely by sailors and dockworkers. Those workers, the study covering 11 countries pointed out, lived in isolated groups, with their own codes, myths, heroes, and social standards, and experienced the same hazards, bad living conditions and intermittent employment. The hard, unpleasant, seasonal nature of the work, they noted, attracted tough, combative and virile workers, among whom the force of public opinion was weak because they never saw the public. In these circumstances, the authors observed, the totality of common grievances after they have been verbally shared may be greater than the sum of the individual parts. A strike for these isolated groups, they concluded, was a kind of colonial revolt against far-removed authority, an outlet for accumulated tensions.

If these were indeed the underlying causes of the notoriously bad labor relations in the coal industry, the prospect of the new look surviving would seem to be pretty good. The old company store, company houses, and company scrip the coal miner lived by in recent memory are things of the past. Mechanization is making him more of a skilled workman and less a pick-and-shovel man every year, with correspondingly better pay. Thanks to the boom in air conditioning, he works in summer as well as in winter. A health and welfare program is giving him more security for his family and his old age. More and more he is getting around in his community and becoming a part of the public he serves.

That doesn't mean John L. Lewis can now retire with no more worlds to conquer. There were enough scattered wildcat strikes last year to lose almost a million tons of production. That's a far cry from the 107 million tons lost in 1949—the last year before the new look suffused the industry's shining face. But it was enough for Lewis to impose disciplinary action and fines on more than 20 locals to enforce the contract that has made coal miners patricians of American labor groups with average hourly earnings above those in the automobile, steel, construction, and manufacturing industries. Miners' average wages broke the $100-a-week barrier—by $5.94, to be specific—3 years ago.

There have been other evidences of the cooperative spirit. When high shipping rates threatened our booming exports a few years ago, the U.M.W.A. joined with a group of coal companies and railroads to form the American Coal Shipping, Inc., subscribing a third of its $50 million capital from the union treasury. Shipping rates later slumped and most of the 30 Liberty ships A.C.S. had recommissioned from the mothball fleet were returned, but Walter Tuohy, of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, called it an unprecedented cooperative effort.

Last summer Lewis was invited to attend the American Mining Congress convention for the first time in his life; he was introduced by the former Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey, now a steel-company official, who described him as his friend for 40 years, "sometimes more friendly than others, but a friend." Lewis responded by pointing out that the Russians will surpass us in coal production this year and that the industry needs an agency composed of management, investment, and manpower to speak with one voice. His union, he said, would be glad to cooperate.

The signing of the recent contract between the union and the operators is only the latest example of cooperation. Both as U.M.W.A. and the B.C.O.A. issued bristling statements regarding the agreement, each in their separate offices, but simultaneously. Simultaneously, that is, after the contract had already been signed. That, one reporter remarked, is cooperation to the 2th degree.

You might say that John L. Lewis and the coal operators tamed each other. Now, they are bristling cooperatively.

Mr. Kaiser's Closing Remarks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in October 1958 Edgar F. Kaiser, president of the Kaiser Industries Corp., presided over one of the panels discussing the subject "Interdependence of Businessmen in the Free World," held at New Delhi, India, in connection with the annual meetings of the Boards of Governors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund.

His closing remarks to the panel are worthy of study by all those who believe in our individual enterprise system; and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert Mr. Kaiser's closing remarks to the panel, as follows:

MR. KAISER'S CLOSING REMARKS

While I have been listening, I have been impressed with the fact that our panelists were not representatives of one particular philosophy, or point of view but, rather, that they were each individually demonstrating a sincere dedication to the world in which they live.

Each of them, in his own life, has demonstrated a true definition of what is meant by the words "private enterprise."

Private enterprise is not just a way of doing business. I would define it as individual enterprise. It is made up of the qualities of individual strength, integrity, tolerance of others, courage, faith, determination, and dedication.

It is private, in the very true sense of the freedom of the individual to contribute to his world in the fullest of terms. It is not a mass movement. It is not something we have created in opposition to, or in conflict with, the institutions that men build into their societies. In my opinion, it is the freedom to create and build whatever institutions and agencies are required to best accomplish man's objectives.

Private enterprise is weakened only through the most extreme regimentation. When its power is granted only to the favored few, when the right of decisions rests only in purely autocratic or bureaucratic concepts, its vitality is infinitely lessened. It is as much a part of good government as it is of good business. And, certainly, the positions that you men here hold in the structures of your governments, in the agencies of your broad business interests, are as truly private enterprise as those functions you perform in the industrial organizations of which you are a part.

It need not be defended and protected, for it is inherent in every contribution any one individual makes, to the general welfare and advancement of the world's people. The world's progress is measured in how widespread is the belief in private enterprise. The Renaissance in Italy and France, the great flowering of Elizabethan England, were not only periods of intense literary and artistic productivity, but times of explosive free economic growth and development.

In the world of today, we may speak of the flowering of private enterprise in terms of increased national income, standards of living, and economic development. These are the shared goals of good government, an enlightened people, and a business and industrial structure dedicated to principles of private enterprise in its correct sense. Yet, these things are not private enterprise in themselves, but, rather, the result of a broad base of dedication and understanding on the part of individuals in government and industry.

ECONOMIC TOOLS

Profits, capital investment, professional skills, know-how are the tools with which we work, and are not to be confused with the driving force which we mean when we say "private enterprise." Because such tools are familiar to us, because the present shape and structure of our economic systems and our methods of doing business suit our work and progress, we have a tendency to regard them as the only possible means of achieving our objectives. We may forget that these are only tools, and our strength lies in our ability to adapt them, or create new tools if needed.

If obstacles and problems are not solvable in what we now accept, and have used in the past, we must have the courage, faith, and skill to create whatever is required for us to do the new job which always lies ahead of us. We must have the courage to explore. We must not be defenders of the past, but creators of the future. One of our responsibilities is to find the means by which our jobs can be done.

Beyond and behind the structure of what we discuss here lie the millions of the world's people who have a tremendous need, not for refrigerators and television sets, for their lives will not become suddenly richer through these, but, rather, for the rights of free choice, and free growth, which must be a part of any ordered and intelligent world.

The part that we may play in this is somewhat less and somewhat greater than we have defined. It is less, in that what we can accomplish economically may be only contributory to the goals and ambitions which a people may have. More, in that our responsibility is greater than the merchants and the builders that have gone before us. We are charged, not with simple responsibility for our own success and growth, but for contributing through our own efforts, to the understanding and potential of the peoples with whom we are privileged to work. For we, too, have much to learn from them.

WORLD CITIZENS

It seems to me that it is impossible for any of us to keep our own jobs, and ourselves, separated from the broadest and deepest problems of our world. We have accepted the responsibility of being world citizens whatever our national loyalties may be.

As businessmen from all over the world, we face certain practical problems which are tied to the specific things we would accomplish. Yet, our work is not performed in a vacuum. It is interwoven into every area of national and world life and, to succeed, we must participate in the most enlightened aspirations of the countries in which we work.

We are subject not only to economic law, but to an ultimate moral law. For, unless what we do is identified with, and made a

part of the ambitions and goals of the people of the world, unless, in building the structures of our industries we also participate in the freeing of a people's vitality, both spiritually and economically, we shall have failed to demonstrate the validity of private enterprise.

All of you know the satisfaction of building a team, building an organization that shares a common spirit. Certainly in my life in business there has been a constant realization that progress is only possible when belief in an enterprise is translated throughout our entire organization into positive action.

In the field of international business and the development of economic areas throughout the world, there is the same need for shared enthusiasm which must include every force with which we work. The spirit of the people is the essential quality and it must extend itself into the fields of government, private business, and all institutions which share the responsibility for economic development.

Each of the men who have spoken with you has given us a clearer definition of the decisions that we must make. It is not the purpose of such a panel to arrive at decisions.

The effectiveness of this conference will, like every step in the progress of man, be written in our individual decisions and actions. The translation of the broad principles of development into action and accomplishment will take place in the corridors and in the rooms and in the discussions between you, individually. And it is right that it should be this way, for here there is no regimentation. There is, instead, the dedication of each of us, as individuals, to a principle of growth and progress for all men, and the justification of our own personal existence in freedom.

"Why build these cities great
If man unbuilded goes?
In vain we build the world
Unless the builder also grows"
—EDWIN MARKHAM.

Capital Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the analysis of Roy Wenzlick, publisher of the Real Estate Analyst, in his December 18 issue, on "Capital Gains." This thought-provoking article is as follows:

CAPITAL GAINS

I am opposed to a capital-gains tax. A tax of this sort is not necessarily a part of the income-tax structure. For example, there is no such tax in Canada. I believe that our economy in the United States would be stronger and would progress more rapidly without it.

My greatest objection to the capital-gains tax is that in a large percentage of cases it is levied where there is really no capital gain. If a person invested $10,000 in 1948, today, in order to secure the same purchasing power, he would have to receive $12,000 for his investment. The $2,000 which the Internal Revenue Service claims as capital gain is merely a greater number of smaller dollars representing the original amount invested. If we use this hypothetical investment as a sample, the probability is that the $2,000 of so-called capital gain would be taxed at a 25-percent rate, or a capital-gains tax of $500. If the capital-gains tax of $500 is subtracted from the $12,000, the $11,500 left is about 4 percent less in purchasing power than the amount invested 10 years ago. Our hypothetical investor has paid a $500 capital-gains tax to come up with a loss of principal of 4 percent.

Any investment in the period ahead which does not increase at a rate faster than the loss in purchasing power will share this same experience.

My second objection to the capital gains tax is that it reduces the mobility of capital and freezes many investments. An investor in the stock market who, let us say, has a paper profit at the present time of 25 percent above his original investment, may hesitate to sell because 25 percent of his so-called profit will immediately be subtracted, and he may doubt whether he can find some alternate use for his money, paying a high enough return to compensate for the reduction in his principal.

I have always been a great believer in the freedom of the market as the most powerful factor in controlling our economy. If investors are allowed to buy and sell freely, taking their risks of loss or gain, this factor, of itself, will reduce the price swings in the market. Whenever an investor believes that an item is underpriced he will buy. Whenever he believes it is overpriced he will sell, and a large group of persons constantly trying to make a profit will keep the market from getting very far out of line on either side of normal value at the time. In 1929, the excesses of the market were not due to investors but were due primarily to the tremendous number of shares bought on very slim margins, expanding demand among ill-informed speculators to the point where the market went through the ceiling and later through the floor when these loans were called.

My third reason for being opposed to a capital gains tax is that the great need in any expanding economy is for risk capital. This last Congress was so convinced of the need for risk capital that it passed the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 setting up finance companies to finance what amounts to equity investments in small businesses, partly at the taxpayers' expense. A small business is defined in this legislation in such a way that it includes the great majority of all firms.

Equity financing should not be done at the taxpayers' expense. The small business loan provision realizes that great risk does exist in this type of financing, and tries to compensate for the risk by various tax advantages. Many of the banks of the United States are being forced against their better judgment to participate in this plan, and I have yet to find a banker who believes that the plan is fundamentally sound.

It would be far better to allow complete flexibility in the investment and reinvestment of funds by the individual, allowing him to select those companies which, in his opinion, merit his confidence. If his judgment is in error, he will lose a part of his principal, but the taxpayer will bear no part of his loss. If his judgment is good, he will make a profit, and his profit can be realized without penalty at any time he thinks it has reached its maximum.

I have said many times in these reports that if we play a heads I win, tails you lose game with the Government—where if there is a profit we keep the profit and if a loss the taxpayer pays the loss—all kinds of ill-advised plans will be foisted on the taxpayer. There is then no chance of limiting the increase in Government expenditures and in Government debt, with its resulting effect on the value of the dollar.

In my opinion, the losses which will be experienced under the new plan for financing small-business enterprises will be great if the plan is used. I am sure it will be used by many ill-advised groups who would like to expand their activities.

If sound business judgment is used as the basis for lending money to the small concerns, the money is now available without setting up new methods and new sources. This whole idea smacks of the same political philosophy which believes that if informed investors will not buy low-interest mortgages at par the solution is for Fannie Mae to buy them at par at Government expense. Any Government expenditure seems to be justified if it increases the business volume of some particular group, in spite of the fact that the taxpayers are not willing to pay the cost. The unbalanced budget which has resulted in 24 of the last 29 years levies a tax no less real than the tax collected directly by the Internal Revenue Service. Every time that currency and credit is inflated to take care of unbalanced budgets a part of the value of all bonds, savings accounts, mortgages, social-security payments, pension funds, life-insurance payments, and other dollar obligations is confiscated by the Government.

The fourth reason I am opposed to a capital gains tax is that in the past the capital gains tax has yielded highly variable amounts as a source of Federal revenue. During periods of rising capital values the tax may produce tremendous dollar revenue resulting from the fictitious capital gains brought about by inflation. On the other hand, after a persistent decline of capital values at the end of a boom period, realized capital losses may far outweigh capital gains and the gains tax may produce a negative amount.

For instance, in 1928 the Federal capital gains tax on individuals produced slightly more than half a billion dollars. This was almost as much as the tax on current income at that time, as Federal income tax rates then were still low. On the other hand, in 1931 the deductions for capital losses under the capital gains provision resulted in a net reduction in Federal revenue of $89 million from the $335 million which would otherwise have been paid on current income if these losses had not been deductible. Inconsistent and erratic movements in revenue yields make attempts at budget balancing difficult and help to further endanger the Government's credit position.

A great part of our difficulty in our economic thinking is ignoring the consumer. In the costly and unwise agricultural program which we have been following since New Deal days we have maintained the prices of farm products above world prices in order to benefit the farmer. As a result we have lost many of our foreign markets, and the consumer in the United States has had to pay higher prices for farm products than he would otherwise have paid. In addition he has been taxed to pay the billions of dollars of subsidy which this program has paid to the farmer. By reducing the income available for the purchase of food and by increasing its price the consumer pays double indemnity.

The capital gains tax also hurts the consumer. Anything limiting the accumulation and free flow of capital into the industries which need it most hampers the production of consumer goods and increases the price of the goods that are produced. Anything that wastes capital, like unwise investments under the provisions of the Small Business Investment Act, retards the progress which otherwise would be made if investments were made solely on the basis of sound business judgment.

In a country where the population is increasing as rapidly as it is in the United States it is essential that new employment possibilities be created rapidly enough to absorb the increase in the number of persons seeking employment. In many lines of busi-

ness it requires an average capital investment of $5,000 to $10,000 per employee, and anything limiting the free flow of capital to those industries that need it most will prevent greater employment.

We never seem to learn that relatively few panaceas cure the disease for which they are prescribed. They generally treat the symptom rather than the cause. It is difficult for some Congressmen and politicians to realize that the profit motive is the greatest incentive to our enterprise system, allowing the man who can build a better mousetrap a profit on his endeavor. If the profit is great, the supply of mousetraps will increase faster than the supply of mice, and the price of mousetraps will drop. However, the man who endeavors to develop a useful business finds that the incentives for success have been weakened by his less competent Government-subsidized competitor. He therefore suffers twice, once from unfair competition and again from increased taxes used to subsidize his less efficient competitors. He becomes discouraged and no longer puts forth the effort necessary for the success of his project.

Smokescreen of Cowardice and Deceit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a memorandum and white paper on the "Operations of the British-American Tobacco Co.," prepared and distributed by the foreign affairs committee of the Jewish War Veterans of U.S.A., together with a revised edition of "A Report on the Arab Boycott Against Americans," released by the presidents of major American-Jewish organizations. The text of these releases follows:

MEMORANDUM

To: Department, council and post coordinators, Arab boycott post, county and department commanders, members of the national executive committee, members of the foreign affairs committee.
From: PNC Abraham Kraditor, chairman, foreign affairs committee.
Subject: Progress report on British-American and Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corps.' reaction to white paper.

Since the national convention in Los Angeles in August, approximately 50,000 copies of JWV's white paper have been distributed by the national office to the lower echelons for dissemination in the communities. As a result of this effort, the pressures have been felt at Brown & Williamson's headquarters in Louisville, Ky. Brown & Williamson have issued statements which their sales representatives have been displaying, affirming the willingness of Brown & Williamson to sell its cigarette products to Israel. These documents purport to present evidence that Israel is to blame for the discontinuance of cigarette shipments by Brown & Williamson to Israel.

Our members should not be deceived or deterred by this propaganda. This smokescreen is identified as a half truth in the white paper (see pp. 8–10). Israel acknowledges that Brown & Williamson wants to sell its cigarettes to Israel but British-American in London, the parent organization, still refuses to sell its brands of cigarettes (the preferred brands in Israel). Israel maintains quite properly that it could not trade with Brown & Williamson while being boycotted by British-American, for in so doing, it would be condoning the action of British-American. The allegation that Israel does not have the dollars to pay for Brown & Williamson shipments is a phony issue. Actually, these cigarettes are sold mainly to tourists who bring dollars to Israel. It is to Israel's advantage to buy these cigarettes for the dollars which it earns thereby. Israel has always paid Brown & Williamson in dollars. Obviously, Israel would gain more if it could buy the British-American cigarettes in sterling exchange and sell these cigarettes for dollar exchange.

The white paper asserts that British-American refuses to ship Israel because of Arab treaties. This is once more documented by the letter of September 4, 1958, from Mr. Addison Yeaman, general counsel of Brown & Williamson in a letter to Mr. Lester Duberstein, executive director of the Department of New York, JWV, as follows: "* * * the refusal of British-American to ship its brands to Israel being the direct result of a most grievous threat made against that company by the so-called Arab nations."

To sum up, the two major arguments being advanced by Brown & Williamson are: First. Brown & Williamson is attempting to divorce itself from the actions of its parent body, the British-American Tobacco Co. This is sheer deception. Brown & Williamson is a wholly owned subsidiary and subject to complete control from the London office. Second, Brown & Williamson pleads leniency for British-American because the Arab nations threaten economic reprisal. It is this very cowardice which the white paper is attempting to expose. Let the British-American directors stand up to the Arab nations as other international companies have done and successfully too.

While Brown & Williamson is putting up this counterattack to the white paper, the Foreign Affairs Committee has reliable information that the top officials of Brown & Williamson have visited London to plead with British-American directors to reverse their policy regarding shipments to Israel. Until they do so, our energies must be directed at maintaining unrelenting pressure. Your task is to give the white paper the widest circulation and to encourage the American people to express their indignation. Use the pamphlet and this release as your source material for answering the allegations by the Brown & Williamson representatives.

Coordinators and commanders are reminded that booklets may be ordered for distribution by writing to national headquarters. The price is $33 per thousand. Refer to previous releases on how the pamphlet is to be distributed. All inquiries or questions concerning this campaign should be directed to me at 38 Park Row, New York 38, N.Y.

SMOKESCREEN OF COWARDICE AND DECEIT—A WHITE PAPER ON THE OPERATIONS OF THE BRITISH AMERICAN TOBACCO CO.

(Prepared by Foreign Affairs Committee, Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.)

I. INTRODUCTION

This white paper has been prepared by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. to inform its members and their friends of one phase of the committee's efforts to meet the challenge of the Arab boycott against Israel and Jews throughout the world.

This is not a success story. Rather, it tells of failure thus far by this committee to convince the British American Tobacco Co. to discontinue its cooperation with Arab nations in boycotting Israel, a freedom-loving nation of the Middle East and this country's most reliable ally in that troubled area.

The white paper should not be construed by its readers to be a final report. It is an interim statement on the committee's negotiations with the British American Tobacco Co. It should arm our members and their friends in the American community with the facts, enabling all of us to work in common cause to convince the British American Tobacco Co. that their present ethics in international transactions can only arouse a sense of deep moral indignation among all freedom-loving people.

The British American Tobacco Co. remains today in international trade one of the few major corporations which has admittedly changed its trade policies as a result of Arab pressures to boycott Israel.[1] But before such open admission of cooperation with the Arab boycott program, the British American Tobacco Co. attempted to create a smokescreen to conceal its motives in cutting off trade with Israel. Such cowardice and deceit in international trade should be exposed and every effort should be made to prevent other companies from appeasing those Arab nations which seek to permeate their medieval trade practices throughout the world.

The attempt by Arab nations to spread their hateful boycott against Israel and to Jews throughout the world poses a serious challenge to American security and our country's efforts to unify and strengthen the countries of the free world. For the past 25 years, our Government, with the full support of the Jewish War Veterans, has been advocating and implementing a sound foreign policy of seeking to eliminate artificial trade barriers and to promote free and unfettered trade among the nations of the free world. The major exception to this liberal trade policy has been our Government's restrictions against trade with Communist countries in strategic war materials. Through this trade program and augmented by American funds for economic and military assistance to our worldwide allies, this country has helped to forge a strong alliance of free nations of the world to resist Communist aggression. Any trade practice which establishes new artificial trade barriers among our allies or seeks to divide nation against nation, people against people, weakens our alliance, permits Communist exploitation of these differences and saps our strength against our most formidable enemy, the Kremlin rulers.

A quarter of a century ago, the Jewish War Veterans alerted the American people to the scourge of nazism by launching a boycott against German imports. History proved our judgment correct in identifying Hitler and his gangsters as the real threats to world peace. The Jewish War Veterans hold with equal firmness today that the Arab boycott is an international disease which in epidemic proportions can undermine our national security. In international affairs as in medicine, quick quarantine can spare needless deaths.

II. THE BRITISH AMERICAN TOBACCO CO. AND THE ARAB BOYCOTT

A. History of the Arab Boycott: The Arab boycott, launched 10 years ago, sought originally to prevent Arab nations and their citizens from trading with Israel or her nationals. The Arab League which directs this boycott then widened the scope of its activities to blacklist or bring "economic pressure against any company that maintains branch plants, assembly operations or agency offices

[1] On previous occasions, this committee reported to the Jewish War Veterans membership on its negotiations with the Shell Oil Co. and the American Express Co. Both companies have altered their trade policies and now resist Arab pressures regarding their trade with Israel.

in Israel, permits licensing arrangements by or has financial interests in Israel firms or provides consultant and other services to Israel. The products and services of such firms are denied admission to Arab lands."[1]

While many firms and governments throughout the world have resisted Arab approaches to boycott Israel and knuckle under to the Arab intimidations and threats, some companies, among them, the British American Tobacco Co., have capitulated to such pressures. Before discussing how British American capitulated to the Arabs, it is pertinent to report on the history of this international tobacco giant.

B. History and operations of British American Tobacco Co.: This company, operating out of London, England, was organized in 1902 to serve as an international distributor of tobacco products. It controls through stock ownership, numerous operating and holding companies throughout the world but principally in the sterling area. (The company, as a matter of policy, does not disclose the number or location of all its subsidiaries.)

In the United States, British-American conducts both a domestic and international sales operation, through its wholly owned subsidiary, the Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., which was incorporated in 1927. Brown & Williamson markets the following tobacco products in the United States:

Pipe tobacco: Sir Walter Raleigh, Granulated Tobacco, Old North State, Golden Grain.

Cigarettes: Viceroy, Raleigh, Avalon, Kool, Wings, Life, Du Maurier.

Cigarette tobacco: Bugler, Target, Kite.

Plug tobacco: Blood Hound, Sun Cured.

Snuff: Tube Rose.

C. British-American yields to Arab pressures: On March 26, 1956, Brown & Williamson wrote to Hamashbir Hamerkazi, an Israeli importer, that "We are unable to accept this order nor will we be able to accept any other orders from you until further notice." Similar letters were received by other importers seeking those tobacco products which British-American Tobacco Co. sells under license throughout the world. In explanation for this cessation of trade, a British purchasing agent[2] wrote to his Israeli correspondent, "We think you know what this means. Apparently, pressure has been brought to bear upon British-American Tobacco Co. by the Arab countries to such an extent that they have made this decision."

When officials of Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. were queried by an American correspondent in October 1956 about its failure to ship those brands where it acts as exporter for British-American Tobacco Co., Brown & Williamson officials attempted a buckpassing deceptive maneuver and were quoted as saying, "with respect to British-American Tobacco Co., Brown & Williamson was agent for export only."[4]

Israeli Government officials noted at the time that through its refusal to maintain normal business affairs with Israeli importers, British-American Tobacco Co. and its American subsidiary, Brown & Williamson, took unprecedented action in international trade by relinquishing its neutrality and supporting the Arab position to the detriment of Israel. This behavior was sheer cowardice.

[1] "Bigotry and Blackmail"—A Report on the Arab Boycott Against Americans. February 1958, p. 14.

[2] His name is held confidential at his request.

[4] Jewish Telegraphic Agency dispatch—Oct. 25, 1956.

III. NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN BRITISH-AMERICAN TOBACCO CO. AND JEWISH WAR VETERANS—1956

The foreign affairs committee, department of New York, in April 1956, initiated an investigation of the facts surrounding the report on the boycott of Israel by British-American and Brown & Williamson. It determined and reported to its department convention (June 1956) that Brown & Williamson had refused to ship its products to Israel. The convention passed a resolution asking for appropriate action on those facts by the national organization. At the national convention in August 1956, the national foreign affairs committee was requested to meet with officials of British-American and recommend further action by the national organization.

On September 5, 1956, Mr. Addison Yeaman, general counsel for the Brown & Williamson Tobacco Co.,[3] met with officials of the Jewish War Veterans. He stated that Brown & Williamson had not refused to sell and ship to Israel any of its brands—Viceroys, Kool, Raleigh, etc.—but that it could not ship to Israel brands owned by British-American. In a letter following this meeting, Mr. Yeaman wrote on September 14, 1956, "You will recall that I offered to appear before your committee at its meeting on Tuesday, September 18, should you so wish and that it was your view that such an appearance was not desirable. With that in mind, I should like to repeat that I stand ready to appear before your committee at any time you wish should your decision in that matter be altered."

On September 25, 1956, Mr. Abraham Kraditor, chairman of the foreign affairs committee, sent the following letter to Mr. Yeaman in reply:

"SEPTEMBER 25, 1956.

"ADDISON YEAMAN, Esq.,
"Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.,
"Louisville, Ky.

"DEAR MR. YEAMAN: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of September 14, 1956.

"You were kind enough to write as you did and Mr. Chasin and I appreciate the frank and forthright spirit in which you discussed the problem that concerns us both.

"The foreign affairs committee of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States met in New York on Tuesday evening, September 18, 1956. Your letter was read to the group and the consensus of opinion was that no action should be taken at a time when the British economy as a whole finds itself under stress because of the events in the Suez area. This, of course, does not in any way alter our conviction that the British American Tobacco Co.'s decision to terminate shipments of tobacco products to Israel was unworthy of a responsible business organization in a free community. We take no comfort from the unhappy fact that those states whose insistence presumably led British American to adopt its current policy are now applying to Great Britain the same epithets and overt hostility they have hitherto reserved for the State of Israel.

"Current traffic problems in Middle East waterways suggest that British American may be preoccupied just now with problems somewhat more troubling than how to get cargo through to Israel. Nevertheless, our organization continues to feel that the company's present policy richly merits revision and we hope you will find it appropriate to convey these sentiments accordingly. We find ourselves, after all, in a time when a gesture of fundamental good will from one decent, civilized country to another can strengthen bonds that will serve us all well in a time of common adversity.

"Sincerely yours,

"ABRAHAM KRADITOR."

[3] He acknowledged that he also acted as counsel for British American Tobacco Co. in this country.

IV. NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN BRITISH AMERICAN TOBACCO CO. AND JEWISH WAR VETERANS—1958

The Suez crisis of 1956 was followed immediately thereafter by the Sinai campaign, the ill-fated French and British involvement, and ensuing events which occupied the interest and attention of the Foreign Affairs Committee. In 1957 and 1958, the Committee engaged in negotiations with both the Shell Oil Co. and American Express Co. to have them reverse their policies of cooperation with the Arab boycott. Subsequently, those companies altered their practices to our satisfaction.

In the opinion of the Foreign Affairs Committee, its position with regard to British American Tobacco Co. should be reexamined.

The Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. was included among the American concerns in the pamphlet, "Bigotry and Blackmail" which had capitulated to Arab pressures to discontinue trade with Israel. Jewish War Veterans distributed over 15,000 of these booklets. Mr. Abe Shefferman, a member of the Jewish War Veterans JWV Post No. 58, Washington, D.C., who read this pamphlet, wrote an indignant letter to the "National Jewish Post and Opinion" which was printed on April 11, 1958, criticizing the Post for accepting advertisements from Brown & Williamson for Viceroys, noting that "the makers of Viceroys have become an accessory to the fact (of a boycott of Israel) with its Arab boycotters."

This letter brought a reply from Mr. Addison Yeaman, general counsel of Brown & Williamson. Excerpts of his letter of May 15, 1958, to Mr. Shefferman are reproduced below:

"Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. acts as manufacturing and shipping agent for British-American Tobacco Co., Ltd., in respect to those brands, of American-type blended cigarettes, which the British-American Co. owns (by way of owning the trademark) in various countries of the world including Israel. Among these brands are Lucky Strike and Pall Mall. As of course you know, both of those brands are owned in the United States by American Tobacco Co. There is no connection of any kind between the British American Co. and the American Tobacco Co., and the American Tobacco Co. has absolutely nothing to do with the brands, Lucky Strike and Pall Mall, in those countries where the trademarks are owned by British American.

"As I have said, Brown & Williamson manufactures these brands as agent for British-American, and Brown & Williamson ships these brands as agent for British-American and as its agent merely. Some time ago Brown & Williamson was instructed by British-American that until further notice Brown & Williamson should not ship Lucky Strike or Pall Mall cigarettes to Israel. As agent, Brown & Williamson had no part in that decision and as agent it could do nothing but comply with instruction of its principal.

"It subsequently developed that the British-American had given such instructions as a consequence of very grave and serious threats made by certain of the Arab countries. The decision was a very hard and difficult one to make. No element of prejudice, racial, religious or otherwise, entered into the decision.

"Brown & Williamson has never declined or refused to sell its own products—Viceroy, Kool, and Raleigh—to customers in Israel. We regret that the volume in these brands in Israel had always been very low and it virtually disappeared when the Israel Treasury declined to issue permits for the use of

dollar exchange for the purchase of tobacco products, as we are advised. Apparently that restriction has been somewhat eased as we have in recent months had one or two small orders from customers in Israel for Brown & Williamson's products. These orders were very promptly filled and I assure you that when we receive any more orders for our products for which payment in dollars can be made, we will just as promptly accept and fill them."

In analyzing this letter to Mr. Shefferman, the foreign affairs committee came to the following conclusions:

1. The open admission that British-American was yielding to Arab pressures should be made public knowledge. The American people should be afforded the opportunity to react to this cowardice on the part of British-American.

2. Efforts by Brown & Williamson to relieve itself of responsibility for its refusal to ship cigarettes to Israel should be denounced as a fraud and an attempt to deceive the American people. Brown & Williamson as a wholly owned subsidiary of British-American should not be permitted to weasel out of its responsibility for cooperating with the

3. The Brown & Williamson claim that

immoral Arab boycott.

the "Israel Treasury declined to issue permits for the use of dollar exchange for the purchase of tobacco products" demonstrates clever use of half-truths. The facts are that the Israeli Government formulated its policy on the basis of principle. It has always permitted its importers to pay Brown & Williamson in dollar exchange for tobacco sales in Israel. The Israelis, however, refused to permit the imports of Brown & Williamson products unless all British-American controlled brands were made available. Obviously, if Israel permitted Brown & Williamson to withhold some brands, it would indicate that the Israelis condoned British-American's yielding to Arab pressures.

On June 27, 1958, the Foreign Affairs Committee extended an invitation to Mr. Addison Yeaman to appear before the commitee to interpret his client's position in light of the above analysis. This invitation was extended based on Mr. Yeaman's written statement: "I should like to repeat that I stand ready to appear before your committee (Foreign Affairs Committee) at any time you wish should your decision in that matter be altered." (September 14, 1956.)

That invitation was respectfully declined by Mr. Yeaman on June 30, 1958. He wrote, "* * * it does not seem to me that there is anything I could usefully add before your committee and for that reason alone I believe no purpose would be served by my appearance."

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The record reveals indisputable evidence that the British-American Tobacco Co. and its wholly owned American subsidiary, the Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., have knowingly and wittingly cooperated with the Arab League nations in boycotting Israel. This act of economic cowardice in yielding to Arab pressures has been accompanied by a Brown & Williamson public relations campaign to place the burden for the severance of this trade in tobacco products on Israel rather than British-American policy.

Jewish War Veterans, through its foreign affairs committee, has not been deceived by the Brown & Williamson smokescreen. After 2 years of independent study and investigation followed by negotiations with representatives of Brown & Williamson, the foreign affairs committee believes firmly that British-American and Brown & Williamson stand guilty before the American people for their cooperation with the illegal and immoral Arab boycott. Such cooperation has only served to spread the venom of this economic weapon from Israel to the shores of our country and other freedom-loving nations.

History teaches that dictators feed on appeasement. Our country and our people, after the ill-fated Hitler appeasement before World War II, have learned that sacrifices are necessary to meet the aggression of dictators. This explains the firm and bold actions taken by our political leaders since World War II to face up to the Russian rulers in the Kremlin.

The Arab boycott and the other machinations of Nasser and his followers in the Middle East (the illegal seizure of the Suez Canal, the infiltration tactics among pro-Western countries) should serve as ample warning that the actions of these people undermine the security and welfare of our Nation and our freedom-loving allies throughout the world.

The Jewish War Veterans stands committed to combat the antidemocratic forces. Through this pamphlet, this organization appeals to its membership and the American people to bring the full force of its moral weight to convince British-American Tobacco Co. to reverse its present policy of yielding to the Arab boycott.

A REPORT ON THE ARAB BOYCOTT AGAINST AMERICANS

A STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENTS OF MAJOR AMERICAN JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS

The Arab blockade and boycott of Israel has now been extended by the Arab League to a systematic boycott and blacklisting of any American enterprise that maintains permanent business connections with Israel or with Israel firms and indeed to a worldwide effort to boycott any business owned by Jews.

The Arab League maintains a public blacklist of American and other companies that invest in Israel, maintain branches, assembly operations or distribution outlets there, or that license patents for Israel use.

American vessels that stop at Israel ports are denied permission to make calls at Arab ports.

American planes that land in Israel are forbidden to fly over Arab territories.

No American is permitted to enter an Arab land from Israel except on official business.

Americans who are Jews are a special target of the Arab boycott. Saudi Arabia, particularly, refuses to allow the Arabian-American Oil Co. or other concessionaires to employ Jews for work in Saudi Arabia. Most Arab League States refuse visas to Jewish travellers and some refuse to allow Jews to land even in transit. Saudi Arabia has prevailed upon our Government to screen American military, diplomatic, and civilian personnel so that no Jew is assigned to the United States airfield at Dhahran.

In July 1956, the U.S. Senate, in a resolution adopted unanimously, condemned religious discrimination against Americans by foreign countries. Our Government, however, not only has failed to voice vigorous objection to this discrimination but in fact thereafter renewed the discriminatory Dhahran Agreement. As a result, American Jews are no longer equally protected in their rights of citizenship.

The Arab League has been circulating questionnaires to chambers of commerce and individual companies throughout the world inquiring whether specified companies were controlled by Jews or employed Jews.

Holland, France, and Switzerland have denounced the Arab boycott and have instructed their nationals not to answer such questionnaires. West Germany has refused to yield to Arab threats to cease business with Israel. Our own Government, however, thus far has taken no public stand against the boycott.

The Arab boycott has been described recently by the Secretary General of the United Nations as a "deadweight" upon the efforts of the U. N. to achieve peace in the Middle East. The boycott is a chronic source of conflict which undermines American efforts to allay tensions in that area.

The Arab boycott of Americans is international intimidation; it thrives on appeasement and capitulation. We are confident that Americans deplore the Arab boycott and will want to resist this impairment of the rights and privileges of American citizenship. We are confident, too, that if the U.S. Government would strongly oppose this international blackmail and medieval bigotry, the Arab boycott against Americans inevitably would end.

In the light of the foregoing, we, the undersigned, declare our repugnance of the Arab boycott and urge all commercial firms to resist it with every legal means at their command. At the same time, we express our firm hope that our own Government will prohibit racial or religious discrimination against American citizens in the administration of any treaties or executive agreements to which it affixes its signature:

Dr. Philip S. Bernstein, chairman, American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs.

Mrs. Moise S. Cahn, president, National Council of Jewish Women.

Benjamin H. Chasin, national commander, Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.

Pinchas Cruso, Labor Zionists.

Dr. Maurice N. Eisendrath, president, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Moe Falikman, chairman, American Trade Union Council for Labor Israel.

Moses I. Feuerstein, president, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.

Dr. Miriam Freund, president, Hadassah, the women's Zionist organization of America.

Mrs. Rose L. Halprin, acting chairman, Jewish Agency for Israel.

Adolph Held, chairman, Jewish Labor Committee.

Bernath L. Jacobs, president, United Synagogue of America.

Philip M. Klutznick, president, B'nai B'rith.

Rabbi Irving Miller, chairman, American Zionist Council.

Dr. Emanuel Neumann, president, Zionist Organization of America.

Dr. Joachim Prinz, president, American Jewish Congress.

Rabbi Isaac Stollman, president, Religious Zionists of America, Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi.

David L. Ullman, chairman, National Community Relations Advisory Council.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Arab League boycott of Israel has now been extended to a systematic boycott of American companies maintaining business connections with Israel or Israel firms and, increasingly, of American Jews. This attack upon Americans takes various forms: The boycotting and blacklisting of American firms and vessels, the denial of entry and transit visas to American Jews, the barring of U.S. military and civilian personnel who are Jews from our airfield at Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, the obstruction of international travel by air, and similar interference with the rights and privileges of citizens of the United States.

In order to coordinate and intensify the boycott activities of its constituents, the Arab League has established a general boycott office in Damascus, Syria. Arab League boycott regulations are administered by the various branch boycott offices, whose activities usually fall within the responsibilities of each country's ministry of commerce. Blacklists are maintained in each branch office and Arab commercial and consular representatives abroad endeavor to expand the boycott. Arab diplomats accredited to the United States engage on our soil in efforts to direct the boycott against American Jews and against products manufactured or sold by them. Iraq's administration of the boycott illustrates the operating procedure. Imports

and exports to and from Iraq require special licenses, certificates of origin and destination, and endorsement by Iraqi or other Arab diplomatic personnel in the foreign countries involved. Iraq also sends to the general boycott office in Damascus lists of her exports to foreign countries, including America, so that Arab missions in these countries may check to see that none of the Iraqi goods are transshipped in violation of boycott regulations (Business International, May 31, 1957).

II. THE BOYCOTT OF JEWS AS JEWS

The Arab boycott applies to Jews as such regardless of their nationality.

The following letter, sent on November 13, 1955, to the chairman of the board of directors of Verkoopkantoor Van der Heem N. V. The Hague, Holland, is typical of similar letters sent throughout the world:

"Dear Sir: As you are aware the Arab countries are in a state of war with Israel and for this reason we are making an economical [sic] siege around Isarel. This siege is administered by a special control and investigation office with members of all the Arab States.

"An officer in said office visited us today and requested that following information be supplied about your company:

"1. Do you have any business relations with Israel, whether you sell your products there and name of your agent and address?

"2. Do you import any materials whatsoever, raw materials or parts from which your products are made, from Israel?

"3. Do you have a branch factory or utilizing any of your capital in any factory in Israel?

"4. Is any part of your capital paid by Israelites? If yes, what is the amount of said part?

"5. Do you have any Jewish employees in your company? If yes, how many and what are the positions held by them?

"6. Are there any Jews on your board of directors as members?

"7. Are any of your managers or branch manager Jews? If yes, please give name of the department headed by such a man?

"8. Is any of the persons authorized to sign on behalf of your company a Jew?

"9. What is the number of Jewish laborers in your factories and offices?

"We have been requested to give full detailed answers to each of the above questions but as we do not know each information, we are now writing this letter to you for being kind enough to give the required information so that we pass your letter to the Economical Siege of Israel Office, on your behalf.

"Your reply is to be please in two copies and signed by the chairman of the board of directors.

"We advise you to give accurate and frank information because of any difference between your answers and the information the government office may obtain by investigation will create legal complications."

Saudi Arabia has taken the lead in discriminating against Jews and any firm employing them in any capacity. The March 5, 1956 issue of the U.S. Commerce Department's Foreign Commerce Weekly reported:

"Saudi Arabia intends to boycott all Jewish or Jewish directed firms from trading with that country, according to information received by the Bureau of Foreign Commerce.

"This new policy greatly extends the provisions of the existing boycott against firms having branches, assembly plants, or general agents in Israel, as well as firms having shares in Israeli companies.

"Implementation of the new policy normally would be accomplished by Saudi Arabian Consulates, who are responsible for legalization of commercial invoices and certificates of origin."

Earlier, the New York Daily Mirror on December 29, 1955 reported that "at the Saudi Arabian Consulate in the Chrysler Building, a trade attaché admitted that American firms either owned or headed by Americans of the Jewish faith cannot do business with the Arab countries."

Letters sent by Arab importers to American exporters notify them of the restrictions. One of these letters, dated January 7, 1956, states:

"With reference to your letter No. IW:ek of the November 21, 1955, we have to inform you that you will have to get the original certificate attested and certified by the Saudi Arabian Consulate in your country to the effect that firm which exports the machine is not a Jewish firm, without which we cannot have dealings with your firm."

An editorial in Fortune magazine of August 1957, reports: "Businessmen throughout the world were in receipt some months ago of a strange questionnaire. Dated Cairo, Egypt, the questionnaire pressed them for information on whether their firms were guilty of having Jewish ownership or participation." A recent study by the Public Affairs Institute of Washington, D.C., reports that "the boycott was applied to foreign firms having Jewish directors" ("Regional Development for Regional Peace," p. 276). The London Chamber of Commerce was requested some time ago to certify that British firms wishing to deal with the Arab countries were not Jewish (New York Times, October 15, 1957).

In a debate before the Second Committee of the U.N. General Assembly, held on October 14–15, 1957, representatives of Iraq and Egypt denied the charge that the boycott applied to Jewish concerns having no connection with Israel but offered no evidence in support of their denial (A/C.2/SR. 461, 464).

Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Iraq, and Syria refuse entry or transit visas to Jews, as Jews regardless of their nationality. (Americans and other visiting Israel are not allowed to enter Arab countries directly from Israel, except on official business. They are not granted visas to Arab lands if there is evidence that they intend also to visit Israel.) The Department of State informs all passport applicants that Jews will be denied the right to visit many of the Arab lands. Passengers on cruise ships of American Export Lines touching at Arab ports are told beforehand that those of Jewish faith or with "Jewish" names will be denied certain travel privileges in Arab countries freely available to other passengers. American airlines flying regularly to the Middle East indicate in their schedules that Jewish passengers will not be allowed to leave the plane at Arab stopping points. Pan American World Airways, which flies to the Orient, informs passengers that Jews are allowed on flights to Beirut, Lebanon, but they cannot disembark or change at Iraq.

Until last year American teachers of the Jewish faith were barred from tours to a number of Arab countries sponsored by the National Education Association. As a result of protests, Jordan was dropped from the 1957 list of countries eligible for NEA-sponsored trips. Lebanon and Syria continued to receive NEA sponsorship because of "oral assurances" by their diplomatic representatives here that Jewish members of the National Education Association would receive visas if they were not Zionists.

Syria boycotts phonograph records of musicians like Yascha Heifetz and Yehudi Menuhin, solely because they are Jews. For similar reasons, Danny Kaye was barred from entering Arab lands, although on a mission for the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF).

III. DISCRIMINATION AT DHAHRAN

Although the United States has had installations at Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, since 1945, American Christians are restricted in the practice of their religion at the airfield and American Jews are totally excluded both from the field and the country. Ever since the United States first used the field there has been an atmosphere of religious bias and discrimination surrounding it. Among the clauses of the basic agreement (signed in 1951 and renewed in 1957) governing American rights and obligations at Dhahran are provisions requiring the United States Mission to submit "a detailed list of the names and identity" of its members and employees so that there will not be included individuals "objectionable to the Saudi Arabian Government." If the mission is requested by the Saudis to remove or replace any of its personnel, it must do so promptly. Furthermore all civilian contracting firms and their workers must likewise "not be unacceptable to the Saudi Arabian Government." (U.S., "Treaties and Other International Acts Series," No. 2290.)

The practical effect of these provisions is that American Jewish military personnel are never posted to the American military airfield at Dhahran. American Jews are not permitted to be employed by the Arabian American Oil Co. (Aramco) or any other private American firm. Aramco is owned jointly by the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey (30 percent), Standard Oil Company of California (30 percent), the Socony Mobil Oil Company, Inc. (10 percent) and Texas Oil Company (30 percent). American Christians may not publicly practice their religion or display the symbols and insignia of their faith. The United States forces at Dhahran are forbidden to maintain chapels.

IV. THE BOYCOTT OF AMERICAN ENTERPRISES

In the earliest stage of the boycott, the Arab League required only that all Arab nations and citizens refrain from any connection with Israel or her nationals, goods and services. But not content with preventing Israelis from dealing with Arabs and Arabs from dealing with Israel, the Arab League has extended the boycott and blockade to foreign ships.

The League now blacklists and engages in other forms of economic pressure against any company that maintains branch plants, assembly operations, or agency offices in Israel, permits licensing arrangements by, or has financial interests in Israel firms or provides consultant and other services to Israel. The products and services of such firms are denied admission to Arab lands. American and other foreign vessels may not stop at Israel ports on the same run on which they put in at Arab ports. American Export Lines, for example, must, at a considerable expenditure of time and money, operate a separate Middle East service to the Israel ports of Haifa and Tel Aviv.

An illustrative boycott decree is Regulation No. 11299 of the Saudi Arabian Ministry of Commerce which warns "all the importing merchants to notify their agents abroad not to ship their goods on Israeli ships or through Israeli navigation companies or on foreign ships which may anchor during trips to Arab countries in Israeli ports. In case of contravention of these instructions, the shipped goods will be confiscated." Some 100 vessels of foreign registry have already been blacklisted by the Arab countries for sailing to Israel (Fortune, August 1957), including the following American ships: *Anniston City, Indian Bear, Kern Hills, Memory, Mobilube, Sacconet, Steel Designer,* and *Trinity.* Many other American-owned vessels under foreign registry also have been blacklisted. American vessels carrying Israel exports and imports have been subjected by Egyptian authorities to discriminatory and illegal delays and obstructions in traversing the Suez Canal, in violation of the Security Council resolution of September 1, 1951, which condemned such "unjustified interference with

the rights of nations to navigate the seas and to trade freely with one another."

Instead of protesting the boycott restrictions on American enterpirse, our Government has notified American shippers of the regulations of the boycott office (Foreign Commerce Weekly, January 4, 1956, published by the U.S. Department of Commerce). Moreover, the United States Navy's Military Sea Transport Service has advised American tanker owners who offer their ships to MSTS that if the tankers are on the Arab blacklist and can therefore not load at Arab ports, any travel deviation caused by this fact will be at the expense of the owners.

There are similar restrictions against American and other airlines. Planes using the airports of Israel are forbidden to fly over Arab territory or to receive flight information or rescue services from Arab sources (New York Times, October 15, 1957). Saudi Arabia has even gone so far as to threaten to shoot down any aircraft flying over her territory on the way to or from Israel. All of these restrictions violate the Convention on International Civil Aviation as well as the International Air Service Transit Agreement.

American newspapers report similar experiences by American businesses throughout the world (e. g., New York Herald-Tribune, February 12, 1956; the New York Times, October 15, 1957). In a statement quoted in the New York Post of February 3, 1956, the Iraqi Consul in New York, Gen. A. K. Gailani, said:

"Our policy is that all firms, be they Christian, Jew, or Moslem, are not allowed to do business with the Arab countries if they have a subsidiary or branch in Israel. This was a decision of the Arab League not of Iraq alone, and the reason is that Israel is at war with the Arab countries."

V. RESISTANCE TO THE BOYCOTT

In the past year, the Arab League has blacklisted some 25 companies in 19 countries and coerced 50 others into discontinuing or not undertaking commercial relations with Israel (Chemical Week, Apr. 6, 1957). However, a number of firms throughout the world have steadfastly refused to yield to the boycott and have therefore been placed on the blacklist. These companies refused to be intimidated, even in the face of possible financial loss. The following American companies have been boycotted by one or more of the Arab States, according to Business International of May 17, 1957:

Air Electric Corp., American Biltrite Rubber Co., Chemical Construction Corp., Continental Import & Export Corp., Elliot Import Corp., Emerson Radio & Phonograph Co., Empire Brushes, Inc., General Shoe Corp., General Tire & Rubber Co., Herman Hollander, Inc., Hudson Pulp & Paper Co., International Latex Co., Jacques Torczyner & Co., The Lock Joint Pipe Co., Moller Dee Textile Corp., National Plastics Co., P.E.C. Diamond Corp., Pilot Radio Corp., The Plough Sale Corp., Sinclair & Valentine, Inc., United States Near East Laboratories, Willys-Overland Corp.

One of the above companies, in a letter that it insisted be confidential, recently wrote: "Ever since the advent of our support toward the Israeli economy, our products have been boycotted in every Arab country wheretofore our export sales amounted to substantially better than seven figures annually and undoubtedly would be double these figures today if it were not for the boycott. * * *" Despite these severe economic losses, the company, well known in America, still maintains its business in Israel as a matter of principle.

The American Express Co.: In February, 1956, this company closed its offices in Israel and kept them closed until the spring of 1958. On June 19, 1958, the company, after completing negotiations with the Israel Government Tourist Corporation, issued the following statement:

"The Israel Government Tourist Corporation and American Express Co. representatives have had discussions in Jerusalem resulting in a program for joint promotion of travel to Israel. American Express undertook to reorganize and improve its representation in Israel. Its agencies will be enlarged and modernized in order to provide full range of services to an increased number of both local and foreign customers.

"The Israel Government Tourist Corporation stated: 'We are pleased with the constructive outcome of these recent discussions. American Express is promoting travel to Israel, and we are confident that as a result of this new promotion effort and the improved representation of American Express in Israel, results greater than heretofore will be accomplished.'

"The joint promotion campaign will include advertising, window displays in American Express offices in the United States and around the world, posters, publicity, and a variety of other promotion activities jointly financed by the Tourist Corporation and American Express. This campaign will stress both the traditional values of Israel as the Land of the Bible and the new sun and sea vacation attractions which are being developed in Israel. The 10th anniversary celebrations have proved to be a strong stimulus to Israel tourism."

After considering the American Express-Israel Government statement, the presidents of major American Jewish organizations commented:

"We are confident that the new joint plans of the Israel Government Tourist Corporation and the American Express Co. will be as beneficial to American Express as it will to the development of Israel tourism. The action of American Express exemplifies the best traditions of the American business community. It strengthens the unhampered flow of international trade and commerce free of any extraneous considerations."

VI. YIELDING TO THE BOYCOTT

Some companies have facilitated the operations of the boycott.

The Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.: In March 1956 this wholly owned subsidiary of British-American Tobacco Co., Ltd., of London (not to be confused with the American Tobacco Co.) began refusing orders for the most important brands of cigarettes distributed by it. This is the only instance of a foreign corporation refusing orders from Israel importers. That this capitulation was due to Arab pressure is admitted by Brown & Williamson in a letter dated May 15, 1958, which says that its parent organization, the British-American Tobacco Co., was motivated by very grave and serious threats made by certain of the Arab countries. The Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. produces Viceroy, Kools, Raleigh, Du Maurier, Wings, Avalon, and Life.

Aramco: The Arabian-American Oil Co. (Aramco), in addition to denying oil to Israel, has threatened to cancel its contracts with European firms producing such innocent apparatus as floating roofs for water tanks if those firms do business with Israel (Fortune, August 1957). In addition, Aramco and its subcontractors, with the acquiescence of the State Department, have refused in New York State to hire persons of Jewish faith for work abroad or to allow their non-Jewish employees to bring into Saudi Arabia products manufactured by firms on the Arab blacklist. The New York State Commission Against Discrimination questioned the State Department about this Aramco policy. It was told of the importance of not having anything interfere with the existing relationship between the Arabian Government and the Arabian American Oil Co., explaining that this relationship was the basis for the harmony between this Government and the Arabian Government and should it be disturbed in any way the international interests of the United States would be seriously affected. (New York State Commission Against Discrimination, 1950 Progress Report, p. 48.)

VII. THE OIL COMPANIES AND THE BOYCOTT

For the last 10 years, the major American and British oil companies have yielded to the Arab boycott. These companies are the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, the Standard Oil Company of California, the Texas Co., the Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., the Shell Oil Co. and the British Petroleum Co. Their yielding to the boycott has taken various forms:

1. The flow of oil from Iraq to the petroleum refinery at Haifa was interrupted in 1948 and has never been resumed.

2. The Haifa oil refinery, owned and operated jointly by the Royal-Dutch Shell Group and the British Petroleum Co., has not been used to its full capacity. Shell and British Petroleum refused fully to utilize the capacity of the refinery even during the Korean War when the free world underwent a shortage of refined petroleum products.

3. Tapline, the pipeline carrying oil from Saudi Arabia to the Mediterranean, is owned and operated by the Arabian-American Oil Co. (Aramco). Completed in 1950, the pipeline terminates in Syria and Lebanon. Although a contract was signed with the Palestine Government scheduling the terminus of the pipeline in Acre in what is today Israel, the original terminus was deliberately by-passed because of Arab pressure.

4. Since the institution of the Arab boycott, the major oil companies have refused to send tankers with oil destined for Israel through the Suez Canal so that Israel has been compelled to pay a considerable premium for her oil shipped in other ways.

5. All the major oil companies that had been operating in Israel have withdrawn from oil marketing there in conformity with Arab boycott demands.

6. All the major oil companies declined to engage in oil exploration in Israel.

7. The oil companies have discouraged other firms connected with or dependent upon them from doing business with Israel.

VIII. THE INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Even the operation of the International Wheat Agreement has been affected by the boycott. The objective of this agreement is to insure, at equitable and stable prices, supplies of wheat to importing countries and markets for wheat to exporting countries. The United States is a member of the agreement as an exporting country, and Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia participate as importing nations.

While the International Wheat Agreement does not control the production of wheat in any member country nor the method by which wheat can be sold pursuant to the agreement, all sales under the IWA must be within the minimum and maximum prices set by the agreement. For example, under the 1956 arrangement the price range was from $1.50 to $2 per bushel (New York Times, Apr. 22, 1956).

Because the market price for wheat in the United States is higher than the maximum allowable export price under the International Wheat Agreement, our Government has since 1949 been subsidizing American wheat exporters so that we would be able to meet our quota of guaranteed annual sales. Most of this wheat is exported from their own stocks by private U.S. businessmen who are paid a direct subsidy by our Government. The terms of each sale are worked out privately by the U.S. exporter and the foreign buyer, after which the former files a notice of sale with the Government, applying for an export payment. In 1954 the Secretary of Agriculture reported that the average

wheat subsidy payment amounted to $0.47 per bushel (report of the Secretary of Agriculture, 1954). The amount of wheat and flour exported by the United States under the IWA between 1949 and 1955 to the Arab countries totaled approximately 36 million bushels (Annual Reports for the Crop Year, 1949–55). Calculating on the basis of $0.47 per bushel, this means that the United States has subsidized the export of wheat to these countries to the extent of some $17 million out of tax funds supplied by all our citizens.

The Arab League states refuse to ship their American wheat on blacklisted vessels or to buy wheat from American exporters who are Jews or who have dealings with Israel. As a result shipping costs increase. Our Government has declined to take the necessary administrative, legislative, or diplomatic action to end this discrimination. In effect, therefore, the United States submits to the operation of the Arab boycott and Americans are taxed for a wheat subsidy plan from which they are barred.

IX. THE UNITED STATES INVOLVEMENT IN ARAB DISCRIMINATION

Unlike other countries, the United States has become enmeshed in this boycott against some of her own nationals and has permitted the rights of American Jews to be placed in an inferior category. Our Government did not effectively resist the demand of Saudi Arabia that American Jews be barred from American installations at Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, nor did it resist the refusal of certain of the Arab States to grant visas to American Jews. Our Government has not encouraged American businessmen and shipowners to ignore the Arab boycott and blockade and to refuse to furnish to the Arab boycott office information as to the religious composition of American companies.

Spokesmen for our Government have sought to justify American inaction in a variety of ways. For example, as regards Jordanian and Saudi Arabian visa restrictions against American Jews, the Secretary of the Air Force on June 20, 1955, wrote to then Senator Herbert H. Lehman: "These restrictions are promulgated and enforced by the Arabic countries and are not within the prerogative of the State Department or the military to change." On May 22, 1956, the State Department's Public Services Division issued a statement which said in part:

"International law and practice recognize the fundamental right of a sovereign state to determine whether and under what conditions aliens may enter its territory. We believe that American citizens should enjoy all the rights and privileges in a foreign country which we allow the nationals of that country in the United States. However, we are obliged to recognize that any attempt by this country to force our views on a foreign nation would be considered intervention in the domestic affairs of that nation and therefore greatly resented."

At one time the State Department attempted to explain away the boycott of Jews as merely the work of a number of private individuals in the Arab countries rather than the result of official policy in the Arab League. Thus in a letter to Senator Lehman, dated December 15, 1953, the then Assistant Secretary of State, Thurston B. Morton, declared:

"The Department hopes that these instances are in the nature of sporadic, out-of-bounds actions based on excessive zeal or misunderstanding on the part of certain individuals rather than an indication of fundamental intensification of boycott practice by the Saudi Arabian Government."

As a result of widespread protest, on July 26, 1956, the U.S. Senate unanimously adopted a resolution (S. Res. 323) which stressed the primary principle of our Nation that there shall be no distinction among U.S. citizens based on their individual religious affiliations * * * [and that] any attempt by foreign nations to create such distinctions * * * generally is inconsistent with our principles. At their presidential nominating conventions in 1956, the Republican and the Democratic Parties adopted platform planks opposing foreign discrimination against Americans such as now exists in Saudi Arabia. A year ago, both the President's Committee on Government Contracts and the President's Committee on Government Employment Policy asked the Departments of State and Defense to eliminate the discriminatory practices involving Americans in Saudi Arabia.

Despite the Senate resolution and other protests, the State Department renegotiated the Dhahran agreement in April 1957 without obtaining any change in the Arabian discriminatory practices. This policy of allowing foreign governments to discriminate against American citizens on religious grounds represents a sharp reversal of earlier official attitudes by our Government. When the Czarist regime in Russia sought to deny visas to naturalized American Jews and to question visa applicants in the United States about their religion, William F. Wharton, Acting Secretary of State, informed Russia on February 28, 1893:

"It is not constitutionally within the power of this Government or any of its authorities to apply a religious test in qualification of equal rights of all citizens of the United States; and it is therefore impossible to acquiesce in the application of such a test, within the jurisdiction of the United States, by agents of a foreign power, to the impairment of the rights of any American citizen or in derogation of the certificate of this Government to the fact of such citizenship.

"His Majesty's Government, however, surely cannot expect the United States to acquiesce in the assumption of a religious inquisitorial function within our own borders by a foreign agency, in a manner so repugnant to the national sense." (U.S. Department of State, "Papers Relating to Foreign Relations," 1893 (Washington, 1894), pp. 536–537).

Despite this protest, however, the issue was not resolved and Russia continued her discrimination against American Jews. This discrimination became an issue in the presidential campaigns of the day and culminated in a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives by a vote of 300 to 1 on December 13, 1911 (J. Res. 166). In response to this overwhelming sentiment of the American people, 2 days later the State Department notified Russia, a world power, that the United States had decided to cancel the commercial treaty of 1832.

X. NONCAPITULATION BY OTHER GOVERNMENTS

The greater the capitulation to the Arab boycott, the greater are the demands made upon those who capitulate to it. First a company is simply asked not to maintain a branch or office in Israel. Then it is asked not to trade with Israel. Finally, it is warned not to hire Jews in executive capacities on pain of losing Arab favor.

Conversely, there is ample evidence that when faced with firm resistance the Arabs back down. Despite threats of economic reprisals, West Germany continues reparations payments to Israel and continues to trade with her. Yet between 1953 and 1955 the combined dollar value of German exports to Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia and Syria rose from $94,929,000 to $123,862,000. (Figures supplied by the German Consulate General in New York, June 5, 1957).

In 1956, the Central Organization for Foreign Economic Relations at The Hague advised the members of the Dutch branch of the International Chamber of Commerce not to supply Arab importers with information about the number of Jews working in Dutch export houses. On September 23, 1957, Dr. Willem Drees, Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, reiterated that his Government would resist all Arab boycott measures infringing upon Dutch interests. He declared that as a United Nations member Holland shares responsibility for Israels' existence and that the boycott is "illegal and conflicts with the armistice agreements" (Netherland News Bulletin, Sept. 21, 1957). As for resistance on the part of individual firms, the following statement by a British concern could well serve as a model for all governments and private companies beset by the Arabs:

"We vigorously contest the right of any overseas body or government, to dictate to us where we shall or shall not market our goods. Our business is that of selling our products anywhere in the world, and in this we are actuated by commercial considerations alone, politics playing no part whatever in our sales policy. We do, in fact, maintain strict neutrality in all our dealings with various countries, and that, in our opinion, is eminently more desirable than taking sides on issues completely unconnected with the affairs of England. The only edicts we obey are those of our own Government and provided they do not impose restrictions on the export of our goods to any particular destination, we regard ourselves as free to sell wherever there is a demand."

XI. CONCLUSIONS

The Arab boycott activities encroach upon the elementary American freedoms to trade, to invest, and to travel. There is a Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation between the United States and the State of Israel. But because of the Arab boycott, American business firms are compelled to assume a posture toward Israel which is not in conformity with the spirit of that treaty. American citizens in this country are questioned about their religion by consular and diplomatic officials of the Arab States. American Jews are denied, because of their religion, privileges granted to non-Jews.

Arab economic warfare places a wholly unwarranted burden upon the American taxpayer. By imposing unnecessary expenditures and losses upon all of the countries of the Middle East, the boycott subverts the purposes of United States economic assistance, making the area increasingly more dependent upon such assistance.

While the boycott lasts, progress toward peace in the Middle East is impossible. This has been resognized by Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold who at a press conference on August 8, 1957, referred to the boycott as a deadweight upon our efforts.

In the broadest sense, the Arab boycott therefore constitutes political and economic aggression. By creating and maintaining tension, the boycott helps keep the Middle East in a state of near-war, continually threatening world peace and stability.

While the boycott lasts, interests vital to America are jeopardized. On political, economic, and moral grounds, it must therefore be resisted by the U.S. Government, by American business and by American public opinion.

A Latin American's Ideas on Hemispheric Unity—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to

insert into the RECORD additional excerpts from the book by Jose A. Benitez, "Puerto Rico and the Political Destiny of America," which was published recently:

A HEMISPHERICAL REALITY

Can the difficult struggle of the people of Puerto Rico during recent years serve as a useful case history for our brothers of Latin America, so as to assist them in their approach to intercontinental relationships?

The case of Puerto Rico is one that typifies the determination of a courageous people to overcome effectively the adversities of a difficult transition, without sufficient natural resources, living in dire privation, sickness, misery, and want, depending almost exclusively on a one-crop type of agriculture, devoted to the raising of sugarcane, supplemented by a little tobacco, a little coffee, and some other minor crops. In short, a declining type of agriculture, and, what was worse, one depending on a precarious reciprocal relation with the people of the United States. This is a fight the people are determined to win and are winning.

As the politicians dedicated themselves to academic struggles, they contributed to the promotion of divisionism, which stagnated the progress of the people and increased the economic and social maladjustment suffered by our island. It is evident that the people, exploited as they were by the greedy practices of the large landowners and of absenteeism, dominated as they were by colonialism, were almost at the point of despair in their discouragement.

The hard fight that initiated the awakening of the Puerto Rican conscience began—as I said before—in the year 1938. In 1940 at the polls the Puerto Ricans gave control of power to the right type of leadership. That was the overwhelming civic action which gave origin to the emancipating revolution of Puerto Rico.

Today, after 18 years of hard struggle which the people of Puerto Rico carried out with strong determination, the island—that fraternally contributes from the treasure of its experiences to the friendly people of the free world through the various programs of technical assistance of the United States—is nothing less than a gigantic and diversified workshop, in a constant, dynamic program of activities, well planned and equitably distributed among the 76 municipalities of the country.

The instruments and agencies necessary to fight the miseries of the population were established with diligence and generosity. Public services were increased to press on the fight against privation and sickness. The welfare and hospitalization programs were enlarged. The units of the public health service were increased, as were school dining rooms, milk stations, direct relief, and social security. An unemployment insurance program was tentatively created. The urban and rural sectors were provided with abundant, pure, fresh water. The electrification program was also increased to include the rural areas. New schools, roads, and lanes were built. The enormous slums which have housed thousands of humble laborers, workers providing the sinews of our productive energy, will very soon be totally supplanted by clean living quarters in excellent housing programs, modern and comfortable. Labor legislation has provided for the care and social elevation of the laborers and has improved notably their standards of living.

The economic problems have been faced with energy. Agriculture is being diversified and strengthened by new techniques. The industrialization program to increase the wealth, wipe out unemployment, and raise wages to a point which will improve the general welfare of the people promises to bring, within a few more years, the self-sufficiency which is still lacking in Puerto Rico. Agricultural experiment stations, a scientific system of cooperatives, training centers, and the work of social education of the community stimulate and facilitate the coordinated effort toward greater production.

The program fostered by the leaders of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is controlled and directed by a planning board whose technicians pass on—approving or rejecting—the promotions suggested as features of the organized development.

The University of Puerto Rico—recently admitted to membership in the American Association of Universities—provides the lawyers, doctors, pharmacists, engineers, architects, agronomists, public administrators, accountants, teachers, and others who are constantly joining the legion of executives and various public servants who work together in the fight against poverty and for the creation of a highly civilized level of life. The university is in charge of developing continually the vocational school—the largest of its kind in the world—where men are trained in all manual and industrial occupations, and which thus serves as a generator providing power for the great shop which is the island of Puerto Rico.

In a project of similar significance, the department of public education—which expends in its work the greatest share of the budget—in addition to pursuing its plan of general education—is giving emphasis to the complete elimination of illiteracy on the island. To that end, adult education is carried on at night schools throughout the land.

Those students who, having obtained scholarships from the United Nations and the technical assistance program, come to Puerto Rico to gain the benefit of experience there, as well as various other visitors, such as intellectuals, politicians, newspapermen, and statesmen, know of the cordial anxiety of the people of Puerto Rico to share the fruit of their struggle for improvement and security with their brothers of Latin America and the people of the rest of the world.

Hundreds of students and professional men from Europe, Africa, Asia and various islands of the Pacific, and especially from many of the republics of Latin America, come to the island to study procedures, programs and techniques used in Puerto Rico by various institutions, so as to carry the wealth of the knowledge thus acquired back to their countries where it will be put to use in their respective communities and special fields of endeavor. These friendly people are the best ambassadors for the good will and the cooperative spirit of the people of Puerto Rico.

The resulting achievements, which are the fruit of the initiative and struggle of the Puerto Rican leadership, would never have been attained without the favorable disposition, the generosity, and spirit of helpfulness of the United States. It was a matter of finding avenues of understanding in the official circles at Washington, of talking to the leaders of the Nation and interesting them in the responsibility of their historical commitments. Soon the democratic, liberal, and human traditions of the great Republic of the North came to bloom. Past indifference changed to mutual cordiality in the cooperative efforts which have brought about in a short time the social, economic, and political development of our people.

Puerto Rico is a community genuinely Latin America. Its historical, ethnical, and idiomatic origin is the same found in all the nations of Latin America. Our personality preserves intact its fundamental attributes. Upon entering the political orbit of the United States, we faced the same problems of misunderstanding and indifference that still estrange South American nations from the dynamic and busy colossus of the North. We ourselves lost much valuable time in not correcting our early attitude of negligence, incomprehension, and aloofness. But new men without xenophobic complexes and conscious of the necessity to bring an end to barren apathy, soon produced proof of the capacity of generous and intelligent nations—regardless of their differences in race, traditions, history, and culture—to bring forth the mutual blessings of an understanding and fertile fellowship.

Puerto Rico broke down the barriers of misunderstanding with the United States, and has thus developed, under the cordial influence of the resulting rapprochement, its multiple and vigorous potentialities. This privileged position enables the Puerto Rican people, intellectually, politically and psychologically, to serve as a responsible spokesman to the United States concerning the values which the Latin American people could contribute on behalf of the general good of this great hemisphere of ours. In the intercontinental evolution, neither the North nor the South can evade the common duties of their destiny. Why not begin the task which is obvious before us, the logical and full completion of reciprocal arrangements, which cannot long be delayed?

The world more and more is tending to lose its nationalistic barriers. It will be ripe, in the course of time, to accept the idea of a single governmental organization administered on the concept that there is only one humanity. The leaders of the great geographic communities—as the Europeans, the Asiatics, and the Arabians have begun to do—are under the obligation of grouping and strengthening their energies, to spread the greatness that dissolves selfishness, shares potentialities, ennobles life, and perfects civilization.

Puerto Rico wishes to sow its humble portion of seed in a furrow of the planting of brotherhood that will bring forth the mighty unified America that is on its way.

Such, in short, is the hemispherical reality which may be inspired by our people, who, filled with enthusiasm for perfecting the Puerto Rican civilization and sharing it fraternally with our brothers of the globe, may hope to spread their influence even further—to building a better world.

OUR PARTICIPATION IN NATIONAL POLITICS

Puerto Ricans, because of our condition as U.S. citizens, are free to go in and out of the country, and to settle down in the U.S. territory just as the same as those who are U.S. citizens by the circumstance of birth within the States. Constitutionally—due to the fact that Puerto Rico does not pay taxes to the Federal Treasury—the Puerto Ricans who live on the island take no part in the election of the President nor in the elections of the other national officials who are named by ballot; but the Puerto Ricans who reside within the national boundaries take part in the political campaigns of the parties and cast their votes in favor of their candidates.

Higher standards of living due to better salaries have been incentives to the Puerto Ricans who have flocked to the United States, enlarging the Puerto Rican colonies there. They are established permanently today in large towns and in such cities as New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia, and in many communities throughout Florida, California, and New Jersey, taking part in all types of professional and manual activities as a leading North American productive force.

With the cooperation of the government of Puerto Rico, of the States and the Federal Government of the Republic, and of religious, civic and political organizations, the Puerto Ricans who emigrate to the national territory adapt themselves well and are soon integrated in the North American way of life. The process of adaptation has revealed to the people of the communities where Puerto Rican have settled the social, political, and economic contribution that

Puerto Ricans can give, especially because of the openhearted spirit in which they approach everything that surrounds them.

The Pureto Rican showed his importance in the democratic structure of the United States when he inscribed his name on the rolls of voters and participated in local elections and in general followed the course of other important immigrant groups who became United States citizens, became integrated in the national life and obtained advantageous positions. There is no doubt that the Puerto Rican will perform a prominent role in the politics of the nation. In support of this belief, we see that the number of Puerto Rican residents is continuously increasing and their interest in public life is constantly becoming more effective.

Probably most of the world knows that the two great political organizations of the United States are the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. Both of these organizations—who constantly contend for the ascendancy in political power, finding fortune favoring sometimes one side and sometimes the other—joined to abolish colonialism in Puerto Rico, and which ever party has the leadership of the national administration sets aside partisan considerations in maintaining a friendly understanding between government and government with the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The National Republican Party, with which the Statehood Republican Party of Puerto Rico is affiliated, not long ago had a promise in its platform of statehood for the island. It is very significant that this promise was changed in the last convention to a compromise proposal favoring social, economic, and political development under the present form of the Puerto Rican regime. Whichever party governs in Washington, the relations with Puerto Rico will be from government to government.

There exists the political realty that the Puerto Ricans are United States citizens, and, since there are Puerto Rican voters in national elections, both major United States parties have officially recognized two committees, one Republican and the other Democratic, which were organized and actually function in Puerto Rico. These committees, acting within their respective national groups in the United States, have the same essential importance and enjoy the same privileges as do the committees of the various States of the Union. The Puerto Rican committees offer constant help to the committees of their respective parties in those States where there are Puerto Rican residents.

Both political committees of the island have the same relationship to their national committees as do the State committees within the United States. Each names two national committee members, a committeewoman and a committeeman, to take part in national party activities. The committees of the island have equal rights with the committees of the States of the Union.

For those unfamiliar with the U.S. national politics, it is interesting to note how the country's principal executives are selected and how Puerto Rico and other non-States of the United States hegemony exert their influence in these matters.

Every 4 years the political parties of the United States hold conventions to nominate their candidates for the presidency and the vice presidency of the Nation. Of the 178 million citizens who live in the United States, a total of, say, 1,372 delegates of each party will vote in such conventions. The nomination is attained with only 687 votes (based on the above total), one vote over one-half the number of votes. It is also worth noting that the representation to these conventions is divided chiefly according to the number of inhabitants of each State.

The National Democratic Party—of whose Puerto Rican Committee I am the president—divides the votes of its convention as follows:

Alabama	21
Arizona	14
Arkansas	16
California	70
Colorado	18
Connecticut	22
Delaware	12
Florida	26
Georgia	23
Idaho	14
Illinois	60
Indiana	32
Iowa	26
Kansas	22
Kentucky	26
Louisiana	20
Maine	16
Maryland	24
Massachusetts	38
Michigan	46
Minnesota	28
Mississippi	15
Missouri	32
Montana	14
Nebraska	18
Nevada	12
New Hampshire	14
New Jersey	36
New Mexico	16
New York	98
North Carolina	36
North Dakota	8
Ohio	58
Oklahoma	28
Oregon	16
Pennsylvania	74
Rhode Island	16
South Carolina	20
South Dakota	8
Tennessee	32
Texas	56
Utah	12
Vermont	6
Virginia	32
Washington	26
West Virginia	24
Wisconsin	28
Wyoming	14
Alaska	6
District of Columbia	6
Hawaii	6
Puerto Rico	6
Virgin Islands	3
Canal Zone	3

The listing of vote distributions reflects the importance that the political parties of the United States give to the Commonwealth. We have, within the party, the same number of votes as the State of Vermont, the District of Columbia, Alaska, or Hawaii. We have two votes less than the States of North and South Dakota, respectively. And although Puerto Rico does not vote for a President or a Vice President, it does vote in the conventions of the political parties of the Nation, and with these votes has influence in the selection of party candidates for these great offices, and it participates jointly with the delegations of the Federal States in the resolutions, agreements, and other political actions they take in their efforts for leadership of the Republic.

No great imaginative effort is needed to envision the diversity of relations and associations through which the Puerto Ricans affect life in the United States, aside from the part they play, as indicated above, in the strife and fate of the national political parties. The successes springing from this political brotherhood enjoyed by the Puerto Ricans in North America have already borne fruit abundantly in such populous cities as New York, where the Puerto Rican votes, if not decisive in themselves, at least affect the balance in the results of the local elections.

As a result of the organization of the Puerto Ricans in New York City, the city district in which he lives has selected as its representative in the State assembly, or legislature, the Puerto Rican attorney, Felipe N. Torres. Among the New York City judges, we have the Puerto Rican, Manuel A. Gómez, and another of Spanish descent, Emilio Nuñez. There is a district leader, Antonio Méndez, who leads the Democratic Party in district No. 14 of the city. Attorney José Ramos López has served on the State workmen's compensation board. The Republican Party recently has nominated a Puerto Rican as a candidate for the U.S. Congress. The horizons promise to continue enlarging for civic duty, calling upon the capacity and strength for the Puerto Ricans in the United States in the same way in which we had the good fortune to see such opportunities arise in the more limited sphere of our land, Puerto Rico.

On the other hand, we have had powerful and enthusiastic collaborators in the national leaders, both Republican as well as Democratic. Now and then these come to Puerto Rico to learn our points of view and perhaps to study the Spanish character as it is revealed in the Puerto Rican, so as to know better their reactions, habits, and customs, and thus to learn what conduct to follow not only with the Puerto Ricans but also with the other Spanish inhabitants who live in the United States.

Through the influence of their votes in the elections of Governors, Congressmen, mayors and other public officials—an influence which is well recognized—Puerto Ricans in the United States have had the strong satisfaction of seeing direct results in benefits to their fellow Latin American immigrants.

Our condition as citizens of the United States, with the knowledge we have gained of the Nation's political life from our participation in the activities of national political parties, added to our condition as Latin American people, assuredly puts us in an exceptionally suitable position to serve between the United States and Latin America to help provide the warm and comprehending approach needed to erase old differences and misunderstandings and bring about a fellowship of all the people of the American continents.

Puerto Rico feels itself up to the task.

THE MISSION OF THE AMERICAS

I made a brief allusion in a previous chapter to the interest of such illustrious statesmen as Winston Churchill concerning the feasibility of creating a federation of Europe. I referred, also, to the consolidation of nations being carried forward by Asiatic and Arabian leaders.

In view of the forbidding political situation overshadowing the shrinking world in which we live, it is to be hoped that the great international leaders of the free world will come to recognize the necessity of strengthening and securing the life of their people, uniting them in commonwealths of maximum potentialities. The differences between nations having great territory and large population together with powerful economic resources, and the nations possessed of small territory, small population and scanty resources can be adjusted only by the unification of peoples with the same ideals, interests and common ambitions, unification directed toward the end of becoming greater through such federation.

In a world such as ours, full of driving and competitive tendencies, with some nations engaged in the barbaric domination that enslaves weaker ones, our chief problem is no other than that of assuring our survival by making ourselves the fittest, through mutual defense and cooperation with the other nations in our orbit.

From the early days of tribal life up to the present, humanity has moved always toward greater community concentrations. This beneficial tendency has proceeded, however, at a dishearteningly slow pace, a gait that

has dragged heavily on the potential advancement of civilization.

It is a shameful fact, and the fault of the peoples' leaders, that scientific progress has had its greatest and most rapid advancement in the forced culture of wartime. But such is the case. Nations that could develop with more splendor and nobility in time of peace have been very busy consuming the acid fruits of their selfishness, giving little consideration to the magnificent possibilities for their own enlargement through the fraternal growth of humanity.

The evolution toward a unique government of the human race—which is inevitable in the centuries to come—would have no civilized virtue if it were to come into being through the domination of man by man. Paradoxically, however, the present leader in the movement toward the gathering of peoples is a piratical colossus. He is indeed swiftly forming mighty conglomerates, both in population and in geographical expanse. And that being the case, prudence dictates that we face the inevitable conclusions and not delay a moment the labor that must be done for our progress toward the conquest and the fulfillment of the future.

Our hemisphere cannot ignore the realities of life at the crossroads where its nations stand today. The countries of the two Americas should earnestly and deeply meditate the historical implications of the moment in which they are immersed; the destiny that they may or may not fulfill; their weakness in their present isolation in the stormy international currents; the greatness which they could achieve in a hemispheric bloc, and the energy which could be generated in social, economic, scientific and cultural interchanges among the American nations. In a word, it is necessary to rationalize and to see the mission which a united America, pioneering and unselfish, could accomplish for the peaceful and fruitful organization of the genuinely civilized world of the future.

The incalculable natural wealth that the enormous territory of the American continents holds—still largely neglected, or unsuspected, in the soil—once developed to capacity could supply all the needs of the world.

The American nations occupy a comparatively virgin land. They are not subject to the grievous pressures for existence that bear upon communities of the Old World, where feelings of discouragement, despair, and desperation have driven the people often to take the road to war as a means of escape.

There lies before America a future free of the contamination of national psychological complexes. The hemisphere has no tares of ancestral bitterness. Its spirit is intact for the unselfish service it can give in the great intercontinental affairs of the globe. Perhaps its continued separation from the rest of the world helped it to preserve its purity. These considerations should encourage its people to accept the role of leadership that is indicated for them. The American people cannot continue divided but must join together to make the most of the wealth within their vaults, not only for themselves but for all the human race.

Our hemisphere must turn its eyes to its fitting and unexplored greatness, developing and directing it, and offering its fruits generously to the nations that now fight for a place under the sun. The contribution of America thus offered loyally for human fellowship could and should reestablish the equilibrium of those tormented nations whose construction has induced them to make war and thus to retard the advancement of civilization.

America could and should provide the rest of humanity the additional resources needed for its happiness, abandoning all reserve and hostility. Because of its youth, our hemisphere has all the conditions, qualities, riches and strength needed for the task of fraternally reconstructing the world to a degree which up to now has been spoken of only in a theoretical way. Its healthy youth, its unselfish and graceful spirit, place America in the privileged historic position to be the human bloc that will find ways of removing disputes and problems of the world through brotherly devices, doing away with the dark barbarity of violence.

The American nations could very well come to the year 2000 as leaders of the earth, exerting a leadership not to enslave or to destroy but to be useful in the building of the patterns of fraternal companionship that the world needs in its advance to greatness, spirituality and perfection. But this would require setting aside national and ethnic jealousies and recognizing the difficulties, and being conscious that only the more populous regions, regions having also territories of unlimited potentialities, could be the directors of the extraordinary and ambitious mission.

The United States very evidently is the most highly developed and efficient power in the American sphere. Its strength not only could establish its leadership from Alaska to Patagonia but also could extend it to the most distant corners of the world. As the chief defense against the antagonistic attitude shown by Russia to the nations of the Occident, dominated as Russia is by an imperialistic greed for expansion and world control, the United States is under an obligation to protect the right of liberty and the useful life, and to continue in this role, maintaining through various alliances the means to safeguard conservative and altruistic ideals. These alliances must be effected even with nations which are in many respects quite different in their character and interests, to the end that there will be a universal human fraternity and the development of a common civilization which will endure forever. But she should give first thought to the protection, security, and survival of the occidental nations that have a mutual area of interests. In this time of continuous threats to world freedom, the United States has no alternative; it must put all its resources at the service of the defense of all friendly nations, whose fortunes are tied to its own security.

Her responsibility for concern regarding affairs more distant certainly does not mean that the United States should not give first attention to the historic mission closest at hand, that of establishing a fraternal union with the Latin American nations of the hemisphere. It is to be hoped that the leaders of the great republic of the north will consider giving unrgent precedence to work for an understanding with their nation's neighbors in Latin America, so as to begin the germination of hemispheric unity as a starting point toward the greater, world wide work which destiny seems to have reserved for our hemisphere.

On the other side, I feel sure that the leaders of the Latin American countries will do no less in the vital appointment that they have with history.

All the leaders must stubbornly strive to give creative objectivity to the mission which is theirs to fulfill in their respective communities, to build the new world that is to come, even if the hemisphere does not at first accept their initative. The United States and Latin America could provide preponderantly the techniques and resources and, above all, the virtues of brotherly unselfishness which would be required for the achievement of the great task.

It is unnecessary, perhaps, to point out that the peoples of all the Americas are equally obligated not to shrink from the massive demands of the glorious gesture that the desperate, cornered state of humanity calls for.

The task is there. It is for its missionaries to carry it through to victory.

SOME LAST CONCLUSIONS

In the course of the historic mission that the America Nation could jointly fulfill to obtain the world fellowship that is advocated here, an immeidate benefit to all the nations of the hemisphere would be a rapport established with each other, erasing the frictions and prejudices that grew up in the creation of the intercontinental society. In a great measure, these prejudices and frictions are ghosts of doubts and suspicion begotten by the distrust and lack of communication which has predisposed the various races. In a lesser way—also ghosts, because they belong to errors of the past—the prejudices of Latin America are the result of the intervention of the United States on Latin American soil, prior to the time when President Franklin D. Roosevelt established a policy of hemispheric friendship.

As the two continents were drawn to each other in a cordial and loyal approach, they would remove frontiers that today separate North, Central, and South America, not geographically and politically, but with regard to interests and abstractions that are equally formidable.

Such an approach, based on fraternity and cooperation, would relieve the United States of an outside search for that which she needs to prosper and to enlarge herself and would similarly put within easy reach of Latin America all the productive resources that are lacking within its geographical limits. The two would contribute their respective potentialities—those already developed and the much more copious ones which are yet undeveloped—so that in a few years the resulting social, economic, scientific, and cultural advancement would be enormous.

It is evident that the task is work for a Cyclops, so far as it concerns the need of attaining genuine comprehension and pure magnanimity, whose breath would dissolve all the disagreements which today hold apart American nations. Both—the United States and Latin America—have their peculiar systems of life, with differences in history, customs, traditions, language and even objectives. But does this mean that they cannot get together, understand one another and share the common destiny that lies ahead?

Puerto Rico is by origin Latin American, as I said before. It entered into political relations with the United States in 1898. The island suffered from the same problems of misunderstanding and remoteness that exist today between the United States and other Latin American communities. Puerto Ricans faced incomprehension and indifference. There could be no success for us that was not based on the greatness of both the people of the United States and the people of Puerto Rico. As soon as we began to draw together, all incomprehensions and prejudices fell apart, and our association, fortified today by the bond of a common citizenship, thrives in the rich interchange on which our development is based.

If our Puerto Rican leaders succeeded in helping accomplish this American union, why could not the leaders who today orient the policies of other Latin American communities broaden and advance such diplomatic gains?

Communist Russia knows that its cunning expansionism cannot undermine, even in a clandestine way, the compact and powerful unity of the North American people. That is why it is maneuvering desperately to infiltrate its germs of anarchism, weakness and demoralization in the vital organs of the Latin American countries, through seemingly advantageous economic offers that doubtless could endanger the stability and free determination of those communities. Can we be so deceived as to yield to an economic infiltration over which hovers the steel expansionism and the grasping domination that have enslaved so many satellites in Russia's barbarous orbit?

Probably there will be a stern rejection of these devices by the Latin American leadership before the germ of the deceitful and subtle diplomacy of communism can undermine the future of Latin America and the destiny of our hemisphere.

Nothing that Latin America and the United States could wish for to improve their respective communities needs to be searched for in the Old World. They have everything needful in their own territory, or if anything is lacking temporarily it can be found by exploration of hemispheric resources. The continents, under the infinite guidance of God, must hope that the leaders of the several nations may have the vision of their enormous destiny.

The task of developing American fellowship is one for men of good will and not for Cyclopes. Both the Latin American and the North American people have equally the key that could put an end to their differences. A few examples will indicate the remedies that should be applied for the removal of causes of discontent.

Before anything else, we should go into the field of communication, not with the hauteur, reserve, and conventionalisms of diplomacy, but with a humane and brotherly attitude that assumes that all are equally dignified and useful and can exchange the most noble contributions.

After that, all practices of trade lacking equitable reciprocity and having an unfairly selfish end should be restricted until they are totally eliminated.

To the United States may be pointed out, as guides to rectifications it needs to make in the economic field, some facts that, beyond doubt, have to do with the justified suspiciousness of the Latin American people.

Development of the economic potentiality of the hemisphere should not be directed toward the north or toward the south, but to both equally.

The United States will benefit by buying more products from its neighbors of the south.

The tariff barriers that have established the existing unilateral utilitarianism should be increasingly reduced until they are abolished.

The U.S. importation quotas for Latin American products must disappear, thus establishing genuine reciprocity.

The inversion of capital should be planned to flow toward the underdeveloped countries so as to create the economic power of a distributive situation in the southern continent having neither overstrong nor overweak sides.

The program of technical assistance should be increased to incorporate the development on the southern continent of more numerous and more skillful professionals, so as to promote the growth of all productive fountains and fight the endemic misfortunes that interrupt the advancement of the countries south of the Rio Grande.

Business should be regulated by just rules and laws.

Such institutions as the Export-Import Bank should correct their lending system. In the indirect way in which the Bank offers its help it seems to favor expressly the North American industrialists, agriculturists, and businessmen in a manner mainly directed at supporting the interests of the U.S. economy, while at the same time it seems to exert an encroaching control over those countries that obtain its loans. The idea of creating an inter-American bank—actually under consideration in Washington now—to rehabilitate the Latin American economy seems to be the remedy of the obvious drawbacks of the Export-Import Bank.

Interventionist laws such as the Internal Revenue Act of 1950, which extend their fiscal collections to the independent nations of Latin America to extract revenues that are rightly the Latin Americans' income and which are needed for their full economic progress, have no possible justification and create a bitter disaffection among Latin American leaders. Such laws, besides being injurious to the promotion of the economic interests of U.S. citizens in Latin America, give aid to the penetration and competition of Old-World interests in Latin America.

In addition, the problem of Washington's relation with the dictatorships of Latin America—of which, fortunately, there are few left—deserves a complete revision, to reduce drastically the military assistance that is offered and, instead, provide cooperation in projects of social significance, such as housing projects, health projects, and programs to raise standards of living and expand public services.

It is possible also to give some hints to the Latin American countries of matters they might rectify in order to encourage the people of the United States to take a more interested attitude toward them.

Although we Latin Americans are conscious of the European blood flowing in our veins, we must think, feel, and act according to American realities. It is not a good attitude to despise the interchanges and reciprocities which we both, the Latin Americans as well as the North Americans, could cultivate, so as to promote trade among ourselves, rather than to go looking for business in distant quarters.

A thoughtless predisposition to distrust should not be directed against persons possessed of the good human endowments of the people of the United States. Latin America should recognize that the root cause of its haughtiness (presumably deriving from the hurt done by the lamentable interventions of the past or by the pressure of the old dollar politics) has been removed, and should see the actual disposition, the proved magnanimity, of the U.S. people.

The xenophobes are abundant in Latin America. Among them we find the politicians who, for personal reasons unnecessary to discuss here, cherish passionate grudges against the United States; the agitators who take a communistic line and spread discord, playing upon various feelings of inferiority to promote sentiment against the United States, or propagating the same grudge among youth of frustrated ambitions. The Latin American peoples must be very careful to guard themselves from these fanatic elements, which are their worst enemy, purveying anarchy dressed as patriotism, or injecting the microbe of communism into the blood stream.

In summary, the North and the South must end their disagreements and each one get rid of the limitations that hinder this settlement. And instead of addressing each other in stilted diplomatic language they should start to speak the vernacular of the family.

The hemisphere may hope that the United States and Latin America will gracefully accomplish the part which is required of each one. The destiny of both is the political destiny of all America.

Perhaps God will order affairs so that the lesson of Puerto Rico will guide the achievement of the task that the American nations can fulfill for the progress of human relations.

World Peace Through Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address delivered by Charles S. Rhyne, Washington, D.C., president of the American Bar Association, before the first session, the assembly, American Bar Association convention, in the Philharmonic Auditorium, Los Angeles, Calif., August 25, 1958. The text of the address follows:

WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

The privilege of serving this great association as its president is an honor for which I shall always be most grateful. These past 13 months have been an interesting, rewarding, and gratifying experience. I earnestly hope that those who evaluate the record since London will conclude that this has been a period of progress for the association's programs of service to the public and to the legal profession.

The presidential addresses of my predecessors have considered the contemporary facts of their day and the duties and responsibilities thrust upon lawyers by the great issues and problems of their time. These distinguished presidents of our association have challenged our profession to face up to those issues and to solve the legal problems which arose therefrom. In emulation of precedent I now speak of the No. 1 problem of mankind in the world of today: How to achieve and maintain world peace.

As a foundation for my thesis that peace between nations may be achieved and maintained through use of the rule of law in a new worldwide system of courts, it is helpful to recall the rapid forward rush of events in our era of unprecedented change. History teaches that these dramatic new advances are mere promises and preludes to even greater achievements in the future. One who would postulate any plan to solve any problem of our day must therefore also look beyond the present to the new horizons and the new frontiers envisioned by the world in which we now live.

1. THE WORLD TODAY

We live at a turning point in the history of civilization—in a time when the whole world is being made over socially, economically, scientifically, and even intellectually. Our era has witnessed such dramatic achievements as flight faster than sound, the splitting of the atom, miracle drugs, satellites in space, and many others. Rapid and turbulent changes in the scientific, economic, and social fields, almost too numerous to name, daily defy evaluation on the basis of prior standards and experience. Vistas of endless space have opened as man's horizons have widened to encompass the universe. At a pace beyond dreaming the whole pattern of our existence is being reshaped. As we inventory our strengths and weaknesses we must conclude that concepts of the past are no firm foothold for the dynamic present and the uncertain future.

Amid tremendous developments for good and evil, a revolution in international affairs is taking place. Due to rapid communications and transportation, ours is a physically indivisible world. Age-old barriers such as seas and mountains, weather and climate, even time and distance, are fading into insignificance. The many economic relations and intellectual exchanges between nations are steadily increasing. The birth of new nations, and the newly won independent status of other nations, have created a rising tide of intense nationalism and anticolonialism.

The whole world is involved in an accelerated industrialism and caught up in a tide of rising expectations. Yet there are vast discrepancies of economic development with widespread poverty, hunger and disease. The world Communist conspiracy is capitalizing on a growing spirit of rebellion against social and racial discriminations and low living standards. But while we can deplore

this Communist exploitation of human misery, we cannot condemn the social and economic aspirations of millions of human beings. We applaud their desire to compress centuries of social and economic development into mere decades and wish to aid them in achieving that goal.

The International Communist conspiracy has extended its colonial empire to include one-third of the people of the world, and it is working constantly to further its plan for complete world domination. The Kremlin has achieved its major conquests not by force of arms but by subverting the minds of men through political, economic and sociological warfare and other subversive tactics These tactics create an almost constant crisis and tension. Communist words are used for concealment and confusion rather than enlightenment. The peril from false Communist propaganda is putting the very idea of a free society to its greatest test in all history. In a world where strength resides in man's mind not his muscle, the loss of the fight for the minds of men could mean disaster. Yet peoples in other countries, and in our own country, all too often fail to recognize this threat to their freedom in this new guise.

The use of mass-psychology headline barrages is a major diplomatic development of our era. But people have grown weary of the constant strife and bickering in international affairs. In this situation wrong ocncepts may sometimes be unknowingly accepted. A man who gets wrong concepts, whether from reading misleading charges and countercharges, or otherwise, cannot fail to arrive at wrong conclusions. Thus many of our people are often bewildered and benumbed to the point where they react apathetically to even clear statements of the Communist menace.

We have been forced into spending billions on military expansion in an ever-accelerating arms race with Russia. Every such arms race in all history has ended sooner or later in war. We live constantly on the bring of catastrophe as we go from crisis to crisis. The Damoclean sword hanging over all the wonderful scientific achievements of our era is the knowledge that man's achievements could lead to the suicidal extinguishment of the human race. No one doubts that an all-out nuclear war today would be so incredibly destructive as to produce mass extermination.

As we listen to the roar of current history it is absolutely clear that mankind—men, and nations, and races—must learn to live together or else see civilization as we know it perish in the senseless devastation of war. The atomic and hydrogen bombs, the ICBM's, the sputniks, the explorers, and vanguards have attuned the minds of the people of the world to an overwhelming desire for peace which is stronger than such desire at any other time in all history. There is a growing realization that if the holocaust of all-out war explodes, every man, woman, and child will be in the front lines for the first time since the Indian Wars. The cause of peace is thus the cause of human survival.

Today, when man has learned how to destroy the world, his greatest need is for instrumentalities and institutions which can save mankind from the mass extermination of nuclear war. The sands of time have about run out in the hourglass of our civilization. Few will dispute that the No. 1 problem of our day is how to achieve and maintain true peace. This situation presents a unique and unparalleled opportunity to lawyers, for it is the rule of law which contains the key to a peaceful world.

2. MANKIND'S NO. 1 NEED: A WORKABLE PLAN FOR PEACE

It is obvious that to secure for mankind the marvelous benefits provided and promised by present-day civilization, and avoid the evils and dangers which hover over the earth from pole to pole, the greatest need of the world today is a workable plan to achieve and maintain peace. We must realize the inescapable fact that peace does not prevail in the world today. The existing situation has been described by Sir Winston Churchill as a "truce" maintained by "mutual terror," by President Eisenhower as a status of "balanced terror," and by others as military deterrence based upon "retaliatory terror." But no matter how it is described and by whom, it is not peace.

Peace means something more than the absence of war, something better than the truce in which we now live. The difference between a peace and a truce is that where there is peace there is no fear and no threat.

3. THE MACHINERY NOW USED HAS NOT CREATED PEACE

A look at the policy of the United States today reveals that our Government is maintaining the current truce through (1) military force, (2) diplomatic negotiations, agreements and treaties, (3) trade and aid, (4) the United Nations and alliances with friendly nations, and (5) measures designed to off-set Communist propaganda. But all of this together has not achieved true peace.

Weapons of horror cannot either guarantee the security of our Nation or form a foundation for peace.

The chessboard of diplomacy has not achieved peace.

Artificial barriers to the free flow of trade between nations present seemingly insoluble problems.

Financial aid has not always brought us friends, for friendship, among men or among nations, cannot be bought.

The United Nations has performed magnificiently within its limitations, but it is out of date, and cannot even prevent little wars, nor even slow down the ever-accelerating arms race with its threatened consequences.

We are being far outstripped in the propaganda field by adversaries who use the very cry for peace as a propaganda weapon. We have not resharpened the truth into an effective instrument of combat against the "big lie" technique utilized by the Kremlin. And even a winning effort in the propaganda war will not bring peace.

No one can successfully contend that this existing machinery, which has brought only a truce so far, is an effective plan for peace. International tensions, anxieties, fears, and threats are the lead story in nearly every news medium day by day. They are increasing rather than on the wane. And there is no prospect for improvement through the instrumentalities now in use. Man's number one problem remains how to end the buildup of hot and cold weapons in such a way that peace may prevail. The stalemate of the current standpatism of our foreign policy must be broken. And the existing apparatus of our cold-war effort certainly does not provide a formula for such a breakthrough.

To end the ever accelerating arms race before mutual doom replaces the truce of mutual terror, we must go beyond the instrumentalities and institutions used in the past and adopt a new approach—a new plan—for peace. We must look forward, not backward. We must make a new start based upon a new concept. We must think and act boldly and meaningfully to adapt our peace-seeking effort to the realities of today and tomorrow.

I do not say we should abandon our diplomacy, our weapons, our agreements, or our other present mechanisms, but simply that we must go beyond them and do the job they have not done.

We cannot stand still and let the world dissolving time bomb of all out nuclear war explode. Our circumstances are urgent. The time for forward movement toward peace and away from war is now. The opportunity to move in that direction may be lost forever if we do not grasp it while we can.

4. A UNIVERSALLY COMPREHENSIBLE NEW PLAN: THE RULE OF LAW

To pull the world out of its present drift toward destruction, and to set it on the path of progress toward peace, a dramatic new approach to peace is essential. Such a plan must capture and fire the imagination of men the world around. It must be a plan which all peoples can understand. It must be related, therefore, to their ordinary everyday knowledge and experience. Settlement of international disputes through law in the courts is such a plan.

"Law" and "courts" are universal terms all men comprehend. All peoples know the law and courts have proved their worth as a keeper of the peace within nations. They will readily grasp the concept, content, and the value of this plan of going to court instead of to war. They know what law and the courts have done nationally, and if proper leadership is given they can be brought to see what law can do internationally.

5. LAW IS CIVILIZATION'S BEST CONCEPT TO CREATE PEACE

An evaluation of the ideas, ideals, and concepts which mankind has developed since the dawn of history leads to the inescapable conclusion that the rule of law offers the best attainable route to peace. In a world sundered by differences of language, color, creed, and belief, and by background in diverse forms of government, the rule of law is the one concept universally understood as an ideal nearly all men have in common on a worldwide basis. It therefore offers a common ground which mankind possesses upon which to erect an edifice for peace.

In the beginning of social order disputes between man and man were settled under the rule of the jungle by brute strength. Later sticks and stones were used, then spears and arrows, then guns and powder. Today in all civilized nations, disputes between man and man are settled in the courts under the rule of law. But the law of the jungle still prevails as the ultimate mechanism to settle disputes between nations.

Of all human concepts, law has the best historical claim as an instrument to satisfy the need for peace and order. Man knows that peace reigns where law prevails. People everywhere experience law's use almost daily in courts in their local communities. Out on the vast new frontier of the international community disputes previously settled by the bloodbath of war must come to be settled by similar tribunals of justice.

Man has not realized what law can do for him internationally, and that is the reason why law has not been used in this field as it can and must be. The basic ungrasped fact of our time is that the lack of the rule of law in the world community is today the greatest gap in the growing structure of civilization. A community, whether local, national or international, can remain peaceful only so long as it is subject to the rule of law. Down through the ages, people have lived in terror and fear wherever the rule of law has not prevailed within nations. And this is true today in nations under Communist domination. We of our generation must find a way to implement the best answer to our number-one problem of peace—the application of the rule of law to relations between nations. We must apply this formula for living together before we dissolve together in nuclear flame.

6. THE RULE OF LAW DEFINED

The rule of law is not a new concept. There is no mystery about its principles. Throughout the recorded history of mankind the rule of law has meant the application of

reason and fairness.[1] All peoples understand it to carry such a connotation. They know it means a decision according to what is morally right to insure liberty, equality, and justice in relationships between man and man and between man and government. It will have the same meaning when applied between nation and nation.

Contrary to the thinking of many, the principles of our Constitution, including our renowned Bill of Rights, do not represent original ideas created by the draftsmen thereof. The Constitution is in fact a restatement of the principles of the rule of law as borrowed from the great lawgivers of the ages. The world and our Nation have changed beyond the imagination of the writers of our Constitution, yet their restatement in that great document of the fundamental principles of the rule of law still stands relatively unchanged. This firm foundation in the wisdom of the centuries is the reason our Constitution of basic legal principles has been able to meet the ever-changing needs of our rapidly growing and expanding Nation.

A study of Hammurabi's Babylon Code of 2100 B.C., the law of Moses in 1450 B.C., Justinian's Roman Codes of 600 A.D., and the Magna Carta in 1215 A.D. reveals that there is no basic difference in the legal principles espoused by the great lawgivers of the ages. A survey of the writings of Solon (600 B.C.), Confuscius (500 B.C.), Skotaku Taishi (600 A.D.), Bracton (1250 A.D.), Bartolus (1350 A.D.), Colbert (1165 A.D.), and other celebrated legal scholars down through the centuries, reveals that in all the great legal systems (i.e., Chinese, Hindu, Hebrew, Greek, Roman, Germanic, Japanese, Islamic, Slavic, civil and common law) there is no fundamental difference in concept of the underlying legal principles. The rule of law has no boundaries, and is of its very nature international in character.[2]

There is no need to await the writing of an elaborate new code of international law[3] before utilization of the rule of law in the settlement of disputes between nations. To wait until a written code is perfected and accepted could delay interminably the progress toward world peace through law. The fact is that utilization of the principles of the rule of law could begin today.[4]

The rule of law of which I speak is applied daily by all lawyers in assessing the legal problems they evaluate. It is not law known only to international lawyers under the mysterious title of "International Law." The fight for application of the rule of law internationally—or, to state it more bluntly, the fight for mankind's survival through law—is therefore the duty and responsibility of every lawyer. None can shirk this task on a plea of ignorance or lack of experience. All lawyers know the rule of law of which I speak. All lawyers, therefore, share the responsibility that flows from that knowledge.

7. LAW PLUS A WORLD COURT SYSTEM

History reveals that success in the use of the instrumentality of law has always required the institution of a court system.

For Moses to have received the Ten Commandments on Mount Sinai and then to have done nothing about them would have rendered them worthless. Moses realized his responsibility and set about preaching and teaching the value of living under the law. He also created an excellent system of courts. He knew that the law could not function to end friction without a court system. The message and work of Moses should be an inspiration to us lawyers of today. But unless we set up the courts to use the rule of law internationally the lesson taught by Moses will have been wasted.

History also teaches that creation of a court system must precede disarmament within nations. One excellent illustration of this lesson is what happened in England where only after the King's courts were created, and had proved their worth, did the lords and the barons dissolve their armies and let the courts decide their disputes. Another illustration is what took place in the western part of our own country where, after the courts began to function, disarmament for both the good and bad men gradually came about.

The law is in many ways like a giant river. A river can run on for generations with slight use for navigation, and it is only when the river is harnessed for hydroelectic power development that tremendous service and its greater potential for the benefit of mankind is realized. So it is with law. Law has been around since time immemorial. It has a tremendous potential value, but in any given area, until the institution of the courts is created so that law can be used there, the law is never harnessed to realize its full potential in benefits to mankind.

8. EXISTING COURT INADEQUATE

We therefore have the instrumentality of the rule of law readily available; but the sine qua non of this plan for peace is a worldwide court system to make law accessible and usable. Within nations we have thousands of courts, local, state, regional and national. But for the entire world community we have only one court. It is the International Court of Justice. The Court has 15 judges. It has decided 10 cases in the 12 years of its existence. The major nations of the world seemingly ignore its availability and utility.

Our own country—despite the American Bar Association's express opposition to this policy[5]—reserves to itself the right to decide whether complaints filed in the International Court of Justice are within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. Such a stultifying provision says to the world that we decline to trust the Court to rule correctly on such an issue. This lack of respect by us, and by other nations with similar reservations, has laregly destroyed the prestige and usefulness of the Court. The inaccessibility of the Court also contributes to the failure of nations to use it. It is the present practice of the Court to hold all of its hearings at The Hague.

The United States should assume leadership in creating respect and prestige for the Court by removing our reservation on jurisdiction. The Court can itself make its processes more useful and accessible by sitting constantly at the seat of the United Nations in New York. The Court should also announce its willingness to sit all over the world in chambers of three judges. Its charter now authorizes such action by the Court, but it has done nothing to make this provision meaningful. These are things which the United States can do, and which the Court can do, to move the Court forward toward its potential use as a mechanism for peace. But more is needed to make law and the courts serve as they can and must in this vital field.

Applying the lessons of history, we need to go beyond the present structure of the International Court of Justice and create an entirely new and additional worldwide system of courts to make law as an instrumentality for peace accessible to the people throughout the world. A system of circuit courts under the International Court of Justice is needed. Perhaps we should go beyond that and have one judge sitting constantly in a branch of the world court system in each sovereign nation. There could be intermediate courts of appeals on a regional basis with a final appeal to the International Court of Justice. Such a world legal system would parallel in the international community the setup of the Federal court system in the United States.

Without the institution of the courts the rule of law cannot be made effective internationally. An international judicial system would throw a blanket of law over the world. Any nation refusing to participate would be automatically branded as "outlaw" by world public opinion.

The cost of a world judicial system is estimated at about $10 million per year. The cost of military expenditures for our Nation alone is $40 billion, and worldwide it is more than $100 billion yearly.[7] Elimination of all military costs is not a reasonable expectation, but the small cost of a world judiciary and its great potential stand in stark contrast to the ever-mounting budgets for military needs.

9. JURISDICTION OF NEW WORLD COURT SYSTEM

The jurisdiction of the new world court system should include all disputes between nations whose resolution depends upon facts and the application of the principles of the rule of law: Such cases as our flyers who recently wandered off course behind the Iron Curtain, the truth or falsity of propaganda charges which so often bring the world to the brink of war,[8] the Suez controversy, the Spanish-Morocco boundary dispute, many of the current Middle East controversies, and hundreds of similar incidents and disagreements which are fast multiplying in our shrunken world with its rising number of international contacts. If the proposed treaty guaranteeing world investment becomes a reality, disputes thereunder could go to the international judiciary for resolution. Disputes arising under the European Economic Community already are resolved by the new international court created for that express purpose. I have not the slightest doubt that a world judicial system will prove its value once it is in operation.

10. ENFORCEMENT OF WORLD COURT JUDGMENTS

Enforcement of World Court decrees and judgments would depend in the first instance, as it does now within nations, upon voluntary compliance. The pressure of public opinion is such that very few nations would want to stand before the world branded as an outlaw for defying a decree of a world court. Full faith and credit could be granted also by national courts to the decrees and judgments of world courts, thus permitting enforcement to be sought in such national forums. If enforcement is refused, or prevented, diplomatic and economic sanctions could be imposed. Finally, some kind of world police force has been suggested for use in extreme cases under proper safeguards. The latter idea would certainly require extreme caution, care and insurance against misuse and abuse but experience with such a force already indicates it can be useful in proper situations.

11. SUPPORT FOR WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

Support of the idea of world peace through law comes from many of the leaders of the world. President Eisenhower said in his Law Day, U.S.A. message that "the world no longer has a choice between force and law; if civilization is to survive, it must choose the rule of law."

Secretary of State Dulles said in his Law Day, U.S.A. message:

"In international affairs it is impossible to sustain a just and lasting peace unless that peace is based upon law and order."

Henry R. Luce, who has done more than any other person to further world peace through law, wrote in a full-page editorial in Life magazine:

"There is a hunger and thirst for the rule of law throughout the thinking part of the world."

The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Japan, Kotaro Tanaka, has said:

"The realization of justice is a thing which interests not only one nation, but all the nations of the world."

Footnotes at end of speech.

The Chief Justice of Pakistan, Muhammad Munir, in dedicating the new Pakistan Legal Center, paid tribute to the rule of law and called upon lawyers to lead toward a lawful world, saying:

"The task is essentially one for lawyers because they are the technicians of democracy and specialists in man's relation to man."

The president of this center, Chaudri Nazir Aham Khan, said:

"For us Muslims the rule of law is like an article of faith. When we talk of the rule of law we are talking of an Islamic concept and an Islamic way of life."

Daulet Ram Prem, editor of the Indian Law Quarterly Review, in an open letter to the American Bar Association, concludes:

"Let us join hands and cooperate in the sacred trust of bringing about equality, justice, right of self-determination, and dignity of man not only in our respective countries but throughout the world."

These are illustrative only. There have been many other recent statements from leading jurists, lawyers, and laymen all over the world strongly supporting world peace through law.

In our own country many leaders of the bar and others have expressed strong support for this great ideal, and have urged the American Bar Association to intensify its work in the field. Gov. Thomas E. Dewey has headed a special American Bar Association committee on international law planning which will report to this convention on the current status and future possibilities of peace through law. State and local bar associations have created new committees to work specifically on this idea.

The International Bar Association has made world peace through law its major program. Many newspaper editorials written in connection with Law Day, U.S.A. and our association's effort in the world law field have strongly endorsed the objectives of this idea. And judging from letters to magazine and newspaper editors, as well as from other writings and discussions, the public at large is evidencing a rapidly increasing interest.

A world law conference is being planned for May of next year. Duke University has created a new world rule of law center and one of President Eisenhower's assistants, Arthur Larson, has resigned to head that center. The President retained Mr. Larson as a special Presidential consultant, however, and charged him with the responsibility of reporting on ways the Federal Government can help achieve world peace through law.

Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn have written a most outstanding book entitled "World Peace Through World Law" which presents a plan for reorganization of the United Nations. While theirs is a different, more far-reaching, and more complicated plan that that of utilizing law in a world court system the ideal is the same.

There is, therefore, a rising tide of interest throughout our country and the whole world in peace through law. But we need to get beyond words to action. The ideal of today must become the reality of tomorrow. Pious phrases and slogans will not create peace. For if mere wishing would create peace, we would have had peace years ago.

12. OBJECTIONS TO WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

World peace through law is not put forward as a Utopian scheme for a perfect world community, and the plan here espoused is limited to use of law in a world court system. But there are those who oppose even this modest beginning toward settlement of conflicts between nations in a civilized manner. The objections can be classified as follows: (1) This plan is an idealistic dream, (2) law has been around from time immemorial but has not stopped wars, (3) the international judiciary might make some wrong decisions, (4) the plan is just too difficult to create and get into operation, (5) such a plan would never work because Russia would not join in it, and (6) the world community needs more than just a judiciary.

To say that peace through law in the courts is an idealistic dream which therefore cannot be realized is to deny the facts of history. America was built on idealism. Idealism burned fiercely in the breasts of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and all of those other great forefathers of ours who founded our Nation as a government under the rule of law. They utilized law and the courts to make our rulers subject to the ruled. Such a plan was pure idealism when adopted, but it has worked. If we ever reach the stage when idealism is a curse rather than a virtue our Nation will have lost the ingredient which has made it the greatest the world has ever known. Woodrow Wilson said: "The world is run by its ideals. Only the fool thinks otherwise."

Certain it is that law has been around for many years, and granted, it has not stopped wars. The outlawing of war through the Kellogg-Briand Pact did not stop wars because that pact had no institution of a world court system to implement it. The mechanism of law plus the institution of the courts has never been tried in the way herein urged. In this respect, law is like religion. It has not failed; it has never really been tried. Within nations law plus the courts has certainly brought peace. On such a record of accomplishment it is reasonable to believe that such a mechanism can do the same if utilized in the world community.

Certain it is also that the world court system would be manned by humans and those humans may sometimes decide contrary to our wishes and even make wrong decisions. Law plus the courts is not a cure-all. It will not end disputes and quarrels between nations. It does not end them now within nations. There will still be conflicts, and there will still be lawbreakers among nations as there are now within nations. But court decisions if contrary to fact and reason are always subject to change, while the millions of gravestones all over the world are mute testimony to the unchangeability of the results of war. A few wrong court decisions do not destroy the value of this plan, any more than a few wrong court decisions destroy the value of the use of law in the courts within nations. Few will deny that it is better to have a few wrong court decisions than millions of deaths in all-out nuclear war.

As to the objection that an effective international judicial system will be too difficult to create and get into operation, 20th century man has not let difficulties prevent him from accomplishing other seemingly impossible goals. A short time ago the splitting of the atom was looked upon as an unrealizable dream but now it is a reality. A short time ago the satellite was a fantastic dream, but now it is a reality. Twentieth century man has developed a technique for concentration of the talents of many people on seemingly insoluble problems so as to achieve a "breakthrough." So it was with the atom and so it was with the satellite. And so it can be with world peace through law. We know the goal and the general outline of the mechanism just as well as we knew the goal and the general outline of the mechanisms to use in connection with splitting the atom and launching the satellite. If we move forward with the same kind of crash program, the same concentration of brainpower and money, that we utilized in reaching those goals, the achievement of this great goal of peace through law is not only possible but extremely probable.

We must face the fact that despite the interest expressed by Russian lawyers on the recent visit of the American Bar Association delegation to the Soviet Union, Russia will probably not agree to use of the rule of law in a worldwide court system as a mechanism for settlement of international disputes, particularly those in which she is involved. But to let Russia exercise a veto preventing the creation of this world court system would give the Kremlin an unthinkable control over world progress toward peace. The world court system can operate without the Soviet Union. After this court system is established, and as it demonstrates its worth by use outside the Iron Curtain, it will have a tremendous attraction for the neutral and uncommitted nations. These nations want peace so that their social and economic development plans can go forward and will want to join in any system which brings world peace. Russia's propaganda which is now directed so strongly to those nations would have no answer to the liberty, equality and justice which the world court system offers as contrasted with slaughter on the battlefield. If Russia refuses to use this mechanism, and the free world does use it, Russia's adherence to lawlessness would be crystal clear to the whole world. Here only actions would count. With the increasing education of the Russian people, and the strong desire for peace which persists in the hearts of men even behind the Iron Curtain, perhaps this plan might even reduce the depth of the Iron Curtain itself. Adherence to this plan by nations seeking freedom from the Russian Colonial Empire is certainly a very real possibility. The lawyers of Yugoslavia with whom our American bar delegation conferred in Belgrade recently indicated tremendous interest in this idea.

I quickly concede that the world community has been reluctant to make much use of law in the past, and that it needs more than just a new world court system. All I contend for here is that use of law in the courts will aid in preventing wars so that the other needs of the world community can be met through other mechanisms. It is my sincere belief that law in the courts could settle many disputes between nations and thereby create a favorable—a peaceful—climate within which better progress can be made toward solution of the other great problems of mankind. And any war that is prevented leaves more living people to work on such problems and more material strength to devote to constructive rather than destructive purposes.

13. OTHER PLANS FOR PEACE

Disarmament agreements have been given much prominence as a plan for peace. But since the failure of the London disarmament discussions last year that idea has lost much force. Disarmament conferences have been held down through the centuries but no agreement resulting from such a conference has ever contained a successful formula to maintain peace. The best evidence of this is the fact that every disarmament agreement has been followed sooner or later by an arms race—then war. A study of these agreements reveals that the reason they have failed is an inherent inability to devise a method for so weighing armed might that all participants would always feel that they were treated equally. The rule of law avoids this inherent defect, as all nations would be on a basis of equality before the law.

World government has not made progress because a world legislative assembly with weighted representation has not gained widespread acceptance. The idea of redoing the United Nations into an effective world government has now been put into a concrete proposed plan by Clark and Sohn. But a study of their plan reveals that there is too much to do, and too many stumbling blocks, to hope for rapid progress toward such a

mechanism. Applying the judicial concept on a working basis seems to be a much more realistic approach to peace in the world of today.

Religion as a moral basis for peace has strong appeal to those of us who believe in God and the natural law. But there are differences in dogma and belief which have stood as roadblocks to the use of religion as a universal foundation for peace. Separation of church and state is basic in our way of life even though our system of government is in its ultimate essence based upon strongly felt religious and moral principles. But religion is, as was said so well by Dr. Harold A. Bosley in his recent baccalaureate sermon "Pardon My Idealism" at the Duke University commencement, something beyond and above government under law. He said that religious faith "stands far beyond the forms of democracy as we now know and enjoy it and says 'come on up higher.'" Acceptance of law as a plan for peace can be a first hopeful step toward a climate for better acceptance of the great principles of religion in places where they are not now favored. After we arrive at such a step we can concentrate on "coming on up higher."

14. HOW TO ACHIEVE PEACE THROUGH LAW AND THE COURTS

We already have the principles of the rule of law, and the beginnings of a world judiciary in the International Court of Justice. Our problem is how to put this mechanism to work to achieve and maintain peace. We should begin by putting the International Court of Justice to work now while awaiting the creation of the additional world system of courts which is essential to the achievement of world peace through law.

We live in a world of ideas. Strength today resides in man's mind. When people throughout the world understand what law and courts can do to prevent the unimaginable horrors of world war III, public opinion will crystallize behind the rule of law in such a powerful way as to insure its use. When the value of going to court instead of to war is fully understood, the people of the world will demand, and get, the worldwide judicial system that effective application of the rule of law requires.

The immediate need here is for leadership—for leaders who can see beyond the turmoil of today and take the initiative to lead toward a peaceful tomorrow. Lawyers are by training and tradition leaders in the discussion of the great public issues of the day. Already our profession through Law Day, U.S.A., has laid the beginning of the foundation in public opinion for progress toward peace through law. We have identified law and lawyers with man's yearning for peace. But this is not a job for the short-winded. It is not a task which can be completed in a day, or in a month, or in a year, or even in a decade. There is an old Chinese proverb that "the longest journey begins with the first step." The sooner we take this first step and many more steps the sooner the world will move toward peace and away from its present drift toward war.

Public opinion largely controls governmental action today. Without a demand from the people new programs are rarely adopted. It is the lawyer's job to create the ground swell of public support that is needed to advance the concept of law in the courts as an answer to war. The legal profession must continue to educate our people on the value of law by another Law Day, U.S.A. We must help other nations of the free world conduct their own "law days" so as to create a favorable climate for law on a worldwide basis. We must then join hands with lawyers all over the world and stage World Law Day. Finally we must plan and execute a World Law Year to focus the attention of the people of the whole world upon what law can do for mankind. Just reflect upon what the International Geophysical Year has done for science. And remember that law, unlike science, can be used only for peace. Expansion in the use of law can mean only peace. But our people do not yet realize that great truth.

We need to convince the leaders of governments that they should assume leadership in the cause of peace through law. Governmental acceptance of this concept and governmental action toward its effectuation is obviously essential to its success. And it is governmental creation and use of a world judiciary which is our major objective.

Our Nation which prides itself upon its government under law should announce to the whole world that the rule of law is our No. 1 plan for peace. It is logical that the United States be the nation which proposes this plan and which takes the lead in an active program to make it work.

We must remind our leaders in Government of what James P. Warburg said: "The United States cannot, alone, save civilization, but by default of affirmative leadership, it can come perilously close to insuring civilization's end."

We American lawyers have a tremendous duty and responsibility. We of all groups appreciate that law used in a world judiciary is the key to world peace. We can and must explain this idea to all peoples. We must explain our mission of peace through law in such a way that it will ring a bell whose clarion call will reverberate around the entire world. President Eisenhower is correct in his thesis that if we do not adopt the rule of law, civilization cannot survive. Our job as lawyers is to make that point clear to all peoples.

The lawyer's responsibilities from the world of today therefore present the greatest challenge ever faced by any professional group. I am proud of our profession and proud of its tremendous accomplishments of the past. I feel certain that it will rise to this challenge and live up to this new responsibility. We lawyers will give to this task all the hard and arduous years of effort that are required to make peace under law a reality. We will succeed because we must. Failure is unthinkable when the result of our failure could be a world reduced to ashes.

The most important public service open to our legal profession today is this opportunity to mobilize the prestige and the power, the sanity and the skill, the judgment and the judicial temperament of the lawyers of the world in behalf of this goal of peace under law. Never in all history has the climate been more favorable for success if we but move swiftly, surely, and carefully to meet the need that exists. We must build upon the experience of the past and the possibilities of the present to insure a peaceful future for the world.

An idea can be more powerful than the atom. And nothing can deny an idea whose time has come. We lawyers must make certain that the time of this idea of peace through law arrives before atomic annihilation overtakes mankind.

I am confident that we will.

---

[1] Aristotle defined the rule of law as "intelligence without passion." Bodenheimer, "Jurisprudence" (1940), p. 44.

[2] Briely in "The Law of Nations" (1955), writes: "* * * It was out of the conception of a law of nature that the early writers on international law developed their systems * * * under a terminology which has ceased to be familiar to us the phrase stands for something which no progressive system of law ever does or ever can discard" (p. 16).

"Over against the theory of sovereignty, standing for the new nationalistic separation of the states of Europe, was set the theory of a law of nature denying their irresponsibility and the finality of their independence of one another * * * the belief that, in spite of all appearances the whole universe, and included in it the relations of sovereigns to one another, must be ruled by law, remained" (pp. 18–19).

[3] The International Law Commission is compiling and codifying the rules of law in many fields of international intercourse. Where applicable such codifications should be considered along with the principles of the rule of law in deciding any case before any international court. As Dean Pound has said so well: "The vital, the enduring part of the law is in principles—starting points of reasoning—not in rules. Principles remain relatively constant or develop along constant lines. Rules have relatively short lives. They do not develop. They are repealed and are superseded by other rules."

[4] Brierly, supra, note 2, says at page 68: "* * * International law, as well as domestic law, may not contain, and generally does not contain, express rules decisive of particular cases; but the function of jurisprudence is to resolve the conflict of opposing rights and interests by applying, in default of any specific provision of law, the corollaries of general principles, and so to find * * * the solution of the problem. This is the method of jurisprudence; it is the method by which the law has been gradually evolved in every country resulting in the definition and settlement of legal relations as well between States as between private individuals."

[5] 71 Abar 91, 316.

[6] Factfinding would be an important part of the functions of the New World court system. John Watson Foster, grandfather of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, in an address entitled "The Foreign Wars of the United States," delivered before the American Society for Judicial Settlement of International Disputes on December 15, 1910, reviewed the facts leading up to all the wars of the United States up to that date, that is the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish War. He concluded that some began under mistakes as to existing facts and that each could have been settled under the rule of law in tribunals of justice without resort to war. His final observation was, "I do not say that we shall have no more foreign wars, but I do say that our experience teaches that if we exercise justice, forbearance, and patience, and seek peace through methods proposed by this society (i.e., the law and a judiciary) an honorable way may be found of adjusting all our international differences."

The Enemy Grows Bolder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
OF
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, about a year and a half ago a nationwide drive was started by the Communists and apologists in this country to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities and to curtail the powers of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, discredit its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, and repeal the Smith Act, the Internal Security Act and the Communist Control Act of 1954.

This Operation Abolition was sparked by decisions of the Supreme Court which handcuffed investigating committees and

nullified much legislation aimed at meeting the Communist threat from within.

Members of Congress and the news media have been bombarded with anti-committee and anti-FBI propaganda, instigated by the Communist apparatus and joined in by some well-meaning and not so well-meaning people.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 7, 1959, the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, in a lead editorial entitled "The Enemy Grows Bolder," effectively analyzes this Operation Abolition. In its January 1 issue the American Legion publication Firing Line makes an equally good analysis. I feel that my colleagues in the House should have the benefit of excerpts from this editorial and the Legion publication:

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, Jan. 7, 1959]

THE ENEMY GROWS BOLDER

Although numerically small, the American Communist Party is becoming bolder and more powerful. This is no paradox. Communist influence grows because non-Communists, consciously and unwittingly, are doing the party's work.

Perhaps the greatest assistance comes from the Supreme Court, which in the past 2 years has handed down no fewer than 20 rulings favorable to the Communist conspiracy. Today' America's legal defenss against communism are a shambles, chiefly because the High Court has willfully destroyed them.

Equally helpful to the Communists are the civil libertarians who seek to repeal every antisubversion law, to hamstring the FBI, and to abolish the House and Senate investigating committees that have told the American people what little they know of the traitors in their midst.

As FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover said in his annual report: "Sensing a more favorable atmosphere, the Communist Party, USA, and its dupes and sympathizers gained further courage and became more vocal in their attacks upon law enforcement and other professions which are dedicated to preserving our freedoms." Mr. Hoover knows whereof he speaks.

The program of the Communist Party, published recently in its official organ, Political Affairs, calls for the repeal of all anti-subversion laws and the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. As an illustration of the party's mounting influence, consider the platform of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (ECLC):

"The House Un-American Activities Committee has denounced the ECLC for our avowed campaign to end it. * * * They are correct. The purpose of ECLC in 1959 is to work unceasingly for its abolition.

"We will work for congressional investigation of the FBI's unlawful and unconstitutional conduct, and we will support individuals who resist such conduct.

"We will seek the introduction and passage by Congress of bills to repeal the Smith Act, the Internal Security Act, the Communist Control Act, the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, and various industrial screening provisions."

Recognizing the chief source of their blessings, the ECLA adds:

"We will oppose * * * legislation undermining the Supreme Court decisions on civil liberties and civil rights."

On December 15, at the Hotel New Yorker, the ECLC raised $33,000 within a half an hour to accomplish its goals for 1959. Pledges rained down from such notorious fellow travelers as Corliss Lamont and from such eager liberals as Judge Hubert T. Delany, identified by the New York press as "a member of President Eisenhower's Civil Rights Commission for the State of New York." The judge gave $1,000.

Confident that the Supreme Court has been won, the ECLC is turning to Congress, where the climate has warmed encouragingly as a result of November's elections. Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, has promised the ECLC that he will work to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. So has Representative ROBERT N. C. NIX, of Philadelphia. Other stalwards praised by the ECLC include Representatives ROY WIER, of Minnesota, CHESTER BOWLES, of Connecticut, QUENTIN BURDICK, of North Dakota, and W. H. MEYER, of Vermont. * * *

Few patriotic Americans know their Communist enemy or the many guises he assumes. Only a small minority are familiar with the fully documented reports circulated by the House and Senate committees that are now under attack. And very few informed Americans, who call themselves anti-Communists, are as ready with their checkbooks as Corliss Lamont, Rockwell Kent, or Judge Delany, who do not seek tax exemption to reinforce their convictions.

Thus, the ignorance and apathy of most Americans lend immeasurable strength to the Communists, who already are bulwarked by a gullible High Court and by influential civil libertarians. Actually, in the crucial contest that looms in the 86th Congress, the pro-Communist minority is far stronger than the anti-Communist majority, for the former are fully mobilized and the latter are not. Without a swift, unyielding counterattack by those who understand America's peril, the success of the Communist blitzkrieg of 1959 is virtually assured.

[From the American Legion Firing Line, Jan. 1, 1959]

REPORT ON THE CAMPAIGNS TO DESTROY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

With the convening of the 1st session of the 86th Congress on January 7, 1959, certain subversive and leftwing organizations in the United States are expected to launch vicious attacks against the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC) for the avowed purpose of terminating the committee's existence. Activities of several of these groups which have been mentioned in previous issues of the Firing Line, while strikingly similar in purpose, do not all reflect origin from a common source.

One of the major organizations initiating an abolition campaign is the leftwing American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and its southern California affiliate. Foundation for the latest ACLU attack against the HUAC was actually laid on February 19, 1958, when the ACLU's national organization petitioned the Supreme Court of the United States "to rule conclusively that the House Un-American Activities Committee has no right to inquire into a person's political beliefs and associations." The ACLU statement was in support of Lloyd Barenblatt, a former Vassar College psychology instructor, who appealed a contempt of Congress conviction. Barenblatt was cited for contempt following his appearance before the HUAC on June 28, 1954, based upon his refusal to answer numerous questions regarding alleged membership and activities in the Communist Party. (See ACLU, Civil Liberties, March 1958, p. 1.)

Following his conviction, Barenblatt appealed to the United States Cricuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. When the court of appeals upheld Barenblatt's conviction in January 1957, he promptly took his case to the Supreme Court. On the basis of the Court's decision in the John T. Watkins case, the Supreme Court remanded the Barenblatt case to the court of appeals for reconsideration on June 24, 1957. For a second time, the court of appeals on January 16, 1958, upheld Barenblatt's conviction. Shortly after the ruling the ACLU joined in a second appeal to the Supreme Court, on which there has been no decision to date. (See HUAC, annual report, 1957, p. 10; the New York Times, Jan. 31, 1958, p. 16; and the Washington Daily News, Nov. 18, 1958, p. 14.)

According to the ACLU, "the significance of the union's petition (in the Barenblatt case) lies in its request that the High Court rule that its decision June 17, 1957, in the Watkins case specifically prohibits inquiry by the Un-American Activities Committee into political beliefs and associations. The Watkins decision, in a case also supported by the ACLU, reversed a contempt conviction because the witness was not informed of the nature of the inquiry and the 'pertinency' of the questions concerning Communist associations. However, it also criticized the committee's 'exposure' of persons accused of Communist ties and the vagueness of the term 'un-American.'" In announcing the ACLU had "assumed primary responsibility" for the Barenblatt case in February 1958, ACLU Executive Director Patrick Murphy Malin said, "the union hoped the Supreme Court would 'finally determine the unconstitutionality of the committee's (HUAC) mandate.'" (See ACLU, Civil Liberties, March 1958, p. 1.)

On July 31, 1956, Malin stated the ACLU "believes that the letter and spirit of the first amendment make the mandate of the HUAC unconstitutional or unwise, or both. That has been the union's belief ever since the committee was established in the late 1930's. * * * So this is the time to urge that no committee with such a mandate should be appointed when the new Congress convenes next January (1957)." An ACLU brief filed with the Supreme Court on September 6, 1958, on behalf of Barenblatt directly challenged the authority of the HUAC. The ACLU brief asserted that the HUAC "lacks authority to conduct any investigation or to compel testimony * * * (and that the Committee violates due process and unconstitutionally tries to restrain freedom of belief, expression, and association protected by the first amendment." (See the New York Times, Oct. 27, 1958, p. C-29.)

ENTER ACLU OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Supplementing the national ACLU's spearheading attack against the HUAC is the probing flank movements of its southern California affiliate. The September 1958 issue of the Open Forum, a monthly organ of the southern California ACLU, stated it had filed a $20,000 damage suit in the Ninth United States District Court charging that the HUAC "is an illegal committee of Congress." The suit was on behalf of Donald Wheeldin and Adm. George Dawson, who had been subpenaed by the HUAC to appear before committee hearings scheduled to commence on September 2, 1958. The complaint asked the court to "quash the subpenas issued to Wheeldin and Dawson pending a hearing on the legality" of the HUAC.

According to the Open Forum, Wheeldin and Dawson claim they would be publicly accused of disloyalty, adjudged guilty without a hearing, and rendered unemployable if forced to appear before the committee. Wheeldin left the Communist Party because of fundamental differences with it, but would not be a cooperative witness before the committee. Dawson also would not be a cooperative witness. It is noteworthy that the September 1, 1958, edition of the National Guardian reflected Wheeldin was a former employee of the People's World, "the official organ of the Communist Party on the west coast. (See HUAC, "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," 1957, p. 100.)

The Southern California ACLU, at its legislative action conference held at Baces Hall, 1528 North Vermont, Los Angeles, on November 15, 1958, launched a month-long petition

campaign urging 17 California Congressmen to offer at the opening of the 86th Congress a resolution to eliminate the Committee on Un-American Activities from the list of Standing Committee's of the House of Representatives. On the basis of the Southern California ACLU's total membership of 4,000, every member was asked to secure 25 signatures to meet the petition campaign goal of 100,000. Alan Barth, who has been an ACLU national committeeman since 1952, was the keynoter at the aforementioned conference. Currently on leave as a chief editorial writer for the Washington Post and Times Herald, Barth was identified in the March 15, 1954 Firing Line as a severe critic of the FBI. In addition to mailing out petitions to its own members, the National Guardian of November 24, 1958, p. 1, reported the Southern California ACLU has asked other organizations and individuals to do the same. The Los Angeles edition of the People's World, dated November 15, 1958, page 3, stated one organization to announce immediate support and assistance was the Los Angeles Committee to Preserve American Freedoms (accurately known as the Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms), whose central aim has been the outlawing of the Un-American Committee and similar State inquisitorial committees. Mrs. Dorothy Marshall is the citizens committee's chairman and Frank Wilkinson is the group's executive secretary. (See the Open Forum, November 1958, p. 1.)

Both Mrs. Marshall and Wilkinson described the southern California ACLU "petition campaign as 'the most important development in the country' in the move to end the 20-year reign of the un-Americans (HUAC." Accompanied by a letter, Mrs. Marshall reportedly mailed ACLU petitions to "5,000 homes" in that State. In its report entitled, "Operation Abolition," dated November 8, 1957, the HUAC stated the "major adjunct of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (ECLC) in the California area is an organization designating itself as the Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms." Full disclosures concerning the activities of the ECLC, an identified Communist front, have appeared in recent issues of the Firing Line. (See HUAC, "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," 1957, p. 38.)

On August 13, 1958, the House of Representatives cited Wilkinson for contempt of Congress and forwarded his case to the Department of Justice for possible prosecution. This action stemmed from Wilkinson's uncooperative appearance before an HUAC hearing in Atlanta, Ga., on July 30, 1958. Wilkinson has been identified as a member of the Communist Party. HUAC Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER stated on August 8, 1958, the HUAC "had information that Wilkinson is 'the guiding light' of the ECLC, and had ben designated by the Communist Party to manipulate that committee and some of its affiliated organizations." According to an ECLC mimeographed letterhead, dated August 12, 1958, Wilkinson amicably left the employ of the ECLC prior to August 1, 1958, however, remains a member of the ECLC's National Council. (See the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Aug. 14, 1858, p. A–21.)

During September 1958, the southern California ACLU inserted political advertisements in five Los Angeles newspapers attacking the HUAC for conducting hearings in that city. The ACLU statement was signed by 98 individuals who urged that letters of protest be sent to Members of Congress. In addition to the ACLU sponsored petitions and letterwriting campaigns, the Communist Party and its 600 fronts are obviously very actively engaged in similar projects to attempt to abolish the HUAC during the 86th Congress. It is reliably reported the Communist Party, "making use of their fellow travelers and dupes, plus their 'united front tactic,' can have 50,000 letters on any issue sent to Capitol Hill or the White House inside of 72 hours." As a Legionnaire or as another patriotic American who has wholeheartedly endorsed the effective anti-subversive efforts of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, What are you going to do to counteract these intensified abolition campaigns?

Failure of Britain's Experiment in Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, we hear ever increasing demands for Federal participation in management and greater Government investment in ownership of enterprises that have been privately operated.

Before we advance any further along this line we should pause and study Britain's experiment in socialism, which is now an admitted failure.

I am firmly convinced that our country grew and became great as the result of our private enterprise system.

If wise investment and sound economic practices are to continually be threatened by intervention and competition from the Federal Government we are in for some gloomy days ahead.

Let us take a lesson from Great Britain's disastrous experiment, the results of which are related in the U.S. News & World Report for January 9, 1959:

BRITAIN'S VERDICT ON SOCIALISM: IT'S A FAILURE

LONDON.—Britain's 13-year-old experiment in socialism, it now appears, is being written off as a failure. Private enterprise emerges stronger than ever.

Searching inquiries just completed by a parliamentary committee, by industrial and management organizations and by individual experts reveal that the British public has soured on Government operation of basic industries. Even the Labor Party, which brought socialism to Britain, is reversing its stand.

Facts emerging are these:

Efficiency in nationalized industries is shown to be considerably lower, over all, than in comparable private industries.

Costs are higher because managers of nationalized industries are not under pressure, as are private owners, to show a profit or even to make ends meet. Deficits are covered by huge Government subsidies.

Prices in most nationalized industries are kept artificially low by political pressure, bear no relationship to costs. The consumer gets stuck for higher taxes and inflationary financing that is required for subsidies.

Labor relations in nationalized industries turn out to be no better—and sometimes considerably worse—than in private industries, contrary to Labor Party expectations. The record of strikes and noncooperation between workers and management in the nationalized coal mines and transport industries is among the blackest in Britain.

Coal, a case report: Between 1946 and 1951, the Labor Party's program to make Britain a Socialist state took over as public enterprise coal, electricity, gas, rail and highway transport, steel, cable communications, the Bank of England, and civil aviation.

A case study of coal shows this:

One billion dollars has been poured into the mines since 1946 to modernize and maintain them.

Despite this investment program and the recruitment of 11,000 additional miners, British mines in 1957 produced slightly less coal than in 1951. Rationing of coal, held over from wartime, was in effect until a few months ago.

Red ink and strikes: A parliamentary committee that investigated the coal industry in 1958 termed the investment program for the mines a failure. It warned that a second program, now underway, also is in jeopardy.

Year after year, with a few rare exceptions, the nationalized coal industry has gone into the red in its current accounts. During a 10-year period of scarcity and a sellers' market, the mines accumulated a $75 million loss. This had to be covered by government subsidies in addition to the $1 billion provided for capital investment.

The attitude of the miners is blamed in part for the coal industry's troubles. Strikes and absenteeism are chronic problems. In 1947, production of more than 1.6 million tons of coal was lost because of labor disputes. The loss from such disputes in 1957 was slightly greater.

In steel, a contrast: Steel, an expanding industry, was nationalized for a brief period and then returned to private ownership. It provides a striking contrast to the declining coal industry.

Steel production has increased from 12.7 million tons in 1946 to 21.7 million in 1957. The target for 1962 is 29 million.

The steel industry has not only earned a profit, but has financed a substantial part of its $1.5 billion program of expansion from its own resources, while still managing to cut prices and pay its workers wages that are among the highest in British industry.

The record of labor relations in the steel industry is equally impressive. There have been no major strikes, and losses due to labor disputes are less than in almost any other industry.

A promise unkept: The promise by the Labor Party that nationalized industries would, in time, stand on their own feet without Government subsidies is proving to be as unrealistic as the party's promise of labor cooperation.

Here is the record so far:

The cumulative deficit of the nationalized coal industry in the 11-year period of 1947 through 1957 exceeded $80 million.

For the British Transport Commission, which operates railroads and all other public-transport facilities except long-distance trucking, the deficit was nearly $425 million.

British Overseas Airways Corporation lost $75 million, while British European Airways lost nearly $40 million, if direct Government grants are omitted. BEA is now in the black but BOAC continues in the red.

Cable & Wireless, another Government-operated facility, has barely broken even.

Only the nationalized gas and electricity industries show a profit over the years—$280 million for electricity and $44 million for gas.

Government to the rescue: This record, dominated by deficits, is only part of the picture. All of these industries have relied heavily on the Government for assistance in their capital-investment programs. The gas and electricity industries, between 1949 and 1956, obtained Government help in the amount of $625 million. Since 1956, these and other nationalized industries have received Government loans running into hundreds of millions.

Private industries, meanwhile, have managed to meet more than two-thirds of their capital-investment requirements from sav-

ings, and have raised the balance from private investors.

These contrasts have caused many Britons to ask: What's really wrong with nationalized industries as they've operated in Britain for the last dozen years? Why can't they pay their own way? One answer that shows up in both private and public inquiries is this:

The men who run Britain's nationalized industries are influenced more by political pressures than by commercial realities. The Government in power, whether Labor or Conservative, finds it expedient to keep consumers and workers happy.

To keep consumers happy, the Government resists price increases when they are indicated. To keep workers satisfied, the Government is loath to take a strong stand against union demands for wage increases and other concessions. Opposition might bring the risk of major strikes.

The result is that managers of nationalized industries have been forced to hold down prices while allowing wages to rise. That invariably has meant a loss at the end of the year.

Extra employees: There are other things, too, that cut profits.

The Government-operated BOAC, for example, reports a substantial deficit every year. Its management blames high costs. Yet a recent investigation revealed that BOAC employs 3,000 more workers on its engineering staff than the investigators felt are needed.

As part of a multi-billion-dollar program of modernization, the nationalized railroads are replacing steam locomotives with diesels, which can be operated by one man. Yet, under union pressure, the railroads are keeping two men in the cabs, nullifying much of the anticipated saving.

In the transport industry, there is this example: A number of bus lines in the London area have been steady money losers. The management wants to drop them and cut costs. The unions have resisted, and, until recently, political considerations prevented management from forcing a showdown..

Victory for capitalism: The experts who have been conducting inquiries into this 13-year experiment in socialism have reached the conclusion that most Britons—after watching socialism and private enterprise working side by side—have made private enterprise their choice.

Nationalized industrfes, they agree, are often wasteful and inefficient, and are kept solvent only by continuing transfusions of Government funds. Private industries, generally speaking, provide better service at lower cost without dependence on tax revenue for financial help.

One result is that political lines are being redrawn.

In effect, more and better capitalism is the new campaign slogan of Britain's Labor Party. Old-fashioned socialism is quietly being ditched.

Battle Against U.S. Bankruptcy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House will shortly be considering the President's budget for fiscal 1960, it seems wise to review information bearing on this subject.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of January 13, 1959.

BATTLE AGAINST U.S. BANKRUPTCY—NATION'S SOLVENCY SEEN ENDANGERED BY ADVOCATES OF HEAVY SPENDING

The battle of the century has begun. How it turns out will affect the future of the American dollar for decades to come. On the way the die is cast in the next few months depends the purchasing power of the pay envelopes of millions of Americans. Will the dollar remain stable or will it decline still further? For today the dollar is worth 48 cents in terms of what it was worth just 20 years ago—and if the forces of confiscation have their way, it could go down to 25 cents in another decade. The whole world is watching to see what America does. It affects trade everywhere.

The battle against a stable dollar is being waged here right now under respectable auspices by men in Congress who scorn the label "radical" but who would commit the United States to expenditures far beyond the President's budget. Already the American people are being told by the political partisans that a balanced budget means insecurity or indifference to the military safety of the country. To play upon such fears, the devotees of the doctrine of spending evidently believe, is to get sanction for big appropriations—more billions for missiles or expeditions to the moon.

The insidious argument made is that the President gives too much weight to the balanced-budget idea and that he is neglecting national defense. Will this campaign undermine the President's influence and open the floodgates in Congress so that billions more than he recommends will be appropriated even in the face of a $12 billion deficit this year?

Mr. Eisenhower has been absorbed for months formulating the new budget. He has held lengthy conferences with our military leaders and with our economic experts. Honest, patriotic, experienced military men, without any political bias, helped to make the new budget. It was no casual decision by one man that led the President to announce that he believed the budget for the next fiscal year could be balanced.

What is the biggest single fact about our military position? The intercontinental missile is not yet perfected, but the intermediate missile can be fired from bases in Europe close to Soviet Russia.

The truth is, moreover, the Soviet leaders know their country can be devastated in a matter of hours. Both sides know a mutual deterrent has come into being. There's a stalemate on the military side.

The urgent question now, therefore, is not the spending of unlimited amounts on military defense, but giving more attention than ever before to economic defense. As for those who say that military spending should be expanded, no matter what it costs, there is a simple test of sincerity. Would they support heavier taxes and—more important even than higher taxes—would they vote for Government wage and price controls? Why, if the cold war is so hot, shouldn't American labor unions and business corporations be held in check so that the price of the same bomber that the Government buys today will not be twice as much 2 years hence? For that's what has happened in the last 5 years to push a large part of our defense budget upward.

President Eisenhower's well-reasoned state of the Union message was printed in full text only here and there in a few newspapers of the country. He will have to go on the television, again and again, and issue more and more written expositions of his policy to make real headway against his opponents. The critics get more space in the press and on the air than do the defenders.

What is needed now is confidence in the Nation's Chief Executive—the very man who commanded all the Allied armies in Europe just a few years ago, and whose integrity and lifetime devotion to the military security of his country ought not to be questioned. Would Dwight Eisenhower ever fail to recommend any military proposal that was really needed? Would he neglect the defense of America?

Partisan-minded people and those Members of Congress with a vested interest in currying favor in their home States and districts through more and more spending on defense factories and local facilities, which could mean bigger payrolls for their constituents, are demanding more defense and arousing fears about the Nation's security. Only an informed public opinion can win this crucial battle against bankruptcy. For this is what the battle of the century in Washington really means.

Unless the American people can see through the maze of propaganda and alarmist talk, and put into proper perspective the selfish ambitions of some of their legislators, Macaulay's prophecy of more than 100 years ago that the American Ship of State is doomed to destroy itself because it is "all sail and no anchor" could, indeed, come true.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of the following bills which I have introduced for the benefit of our veterans:

A bill to provide that veterans age 65 shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled for pension purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 502, title 38, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c), and adding a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) For the purposes of this chapter, a person shall be considered to be permanently and totally disabled upon reaching the age of 65 years".

A bill to provide that veterans suffering from active pulmonary tuberculosis shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled for pension purposes while hospitalized.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 502 (a), title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking the period and inserting a semicolon and "or" in lieu thereof, and by adding a new paragraph (3) to read as follows:

"(3) active pulmonary tuberculosis, but only during periods of hospitalization therefor".

A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict, and their dependents.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 522(a), title 38, United States Code,

is amended by deleting "$1,400" and "$2,700" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,800" and "$3,000", respectively.

SEC. 2. Section 545(a) Title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting "$1,400" and "$2,700" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,800" and "$3,000", respectively.

SEC. 3. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month after its enactment. Pension shall not be paid for any period prior to the effective date of this Act to any person whose eligibility for pension is established solely by virtue of this Act.

A bill to provide pension for widows and children of deceased World War II and Korean conflict veterans on the same basis as is provided for widows and children of deceased World War I veterans.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 543(a)(1), title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting (a) the comma following the word "title" and (b) the words "and at the time of his death had a service-connected disability for which compensation would have been payable if 10 per centum or more in degree disabling".

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*.....6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska*.....1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*.....
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*.....
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*.....
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*.....
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*.....
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*.....
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Engle, Clair, *Calif*.....3840 Lorcom Lane, Alexandria, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*.....University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*.....
Hart, Phillip A., *Mich*.....
Hartke, R. Vance, *Ind*.....
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*.....5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*.....
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*.....1612 34th St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*.....
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*.....419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McGee, Gale, *Wyo*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*.....The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*.....
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*.....
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*.....Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*.....
Proxmire, William E., *Wis*.....
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*.....
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*.....

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Address by Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel, of California, Before National Conference on Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Public Interest Demands Clean Air," which I delivered before the plenary session of the National Conference of Air Pollution, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., on November 18, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC INTEREST DEMANDS CLEAN AIR

(Speech of U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the plenary session of the National Conference on Air Pollution, November 18, 1958, Washington, D.C.)

Several recent days of intense personal discomfort in a choking atmosphere which sometimes envelops Los Angeles make me intensely aware of the deep importance of this conference.

So, as a recently escaped smog refugee, I welcome this opportunity to engage in thinking out loud on the matter of the public interest in air pollution. I appreciate the invitation to present some personal reflections to this assembly because of the inescapable fact that the communities in which I have spent most of my entire life often are painfully plagued by contaminated air in its worst form.

This conference is unmistakably a significant event. Scientific and technical problems of great moment will be discussed and examined in the earnest hope, I am sure, of promoting the public interest and serving the public welfare.

There is no question in my mind that public interest is the overriding consideration which must be the goal of all efforts to overcome the curse of air pollution. Certainly there can be no private interest, especially from a pecuniary viewpoint, in prolonging smog and other atmospheric contamination.

All of you present are aware that this meeting is occasioned by the fact that a little more than 3 years ago the Congress enacted legislation known as Public Law 159, the Air Pollution Research Act. By that measure, the Federal Government entered the fight to identify causes of air pollution and an assortment of Federal agencies became allies of public and private, State and local bodies endeavoring to conquer this public enemy.

The enactment of this legislation was no simple accomplishment.

Unfortunately, for a number of years, smog was regarded as a unique Los Angeles phenomenon. Comedians attached to it a made-in-southern-California label.

With the passage of time, and after the laughs became strained, our Nation gradually and thankfully came to the realization that air pollution is one of the distinguishing, built-in, undesirable features of the growth and advancement which our country has been enjoying.

The progress of all agencies operating under the Air Pollution Research Act is of deep concern to me because I authored that act. The conclusions of this conference will be equally meaningful to me because my interest in removing this curse of our industrialized, motorized civilization is of long duration.

When I first came to Washington as a new Senator appointed by the then-Governor of California, Chief Justice Earl Warren, I early attempted to bring about Federal participation in the fight to eliminate smog. I did this because my experiences as a State official indicated plainly the problem has so many ramifications it must be attacked on a nationwide basis.

Personal exposure to the discomfort and the inconvenience from day-long sieges of greasy, eye-irritating murk encountered in Los Angeles undoubtedly has strengthened the determination of many of you here today—as it did me—to employ all of the resources of our great Nation in eradicating a scourge which menaces the physical health and well-being of millions of Americans, which causes vegetables and fruits to wilt and shrivel, which brings property deterioration, which adversely affects livestock, and which triggers a host of economic consequences.

The public interest in air pollution at that time was not so widely appreciated in Washington as to bring success to the first efforts in which I participated. Happily, however, the public interest had attracted the attention of people in the executive branch of our Government. It was a matter of considerable satisfaction to me, therefore, when President Eisenhower, in response to a suggestion I made in association with my colleague Senator HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana, formed what carried the formidable label of "Ad Hoc Interdepartmental Committee on Community Air Pollution."

Even though smog still occurs, millions of people should be eternally grateful for that committee, because from its deliberations resulted the legislation which I introduced, with the cosponsorship of several Senate colleagues from divergent areas who agreed something must be done.

Underlying all of my thinking and my conversations was a conviction that actual control over air-pollution sources and causes was and must be a local and a State responsibility. This view was shared by all of those who took part in framing and pushing through the Air Pollution Research Act. Throughout, the principle has been observed that the Federal Government should not and cannot impose or enforce regulations designed to prevent air pollution, regardless of how desirable such activity might at times appear.

Yet, the Federal Government has a natural and a proper role in our national war against smog and other forms of atmospheric pollution. It has unequaled resources and unmatched experience in the field of meteorology, for instance. It has immediate access to basic statistics assembled from every corner of our country on health conditions. It is in an unmatched position to coordinate investigation and research. It can mobilize from assorted sources skilled scientific and engineering personnel.

Those are among the reasons I wanted the Federal Government to play an active part in the smog fight. Those are the reasons why I am prepared to introduce next year new legislation which will implement, extend, and carry forward Public Law 159 under which present work is carried on.

As a Californian from a semiarid region, I long have been aware of the precious character and the imperative necessity of adequate water supplies. As a human being, I likewise know that clean air is basic to existence, comfort, and happiness. As a southern Californian I also realize that my section of the country, unfortunately, has encountered serious and prolonged difficulty in assuring itself of a sufficient, reliable supply of both clean air and clean water.

Those grave needs are not peculiar to California. Today they are nationwide in scope. With constant and steady increase in our population, with characteristic continuing movement of people, with development of an economy almost wholly dependent upon industrialization and motorization, the public interest demands basic factfinding which will make possible sound measures to conserve and to prevent pollution of air and water alike.

Regretably, despite startling achievements and amazing discoveries, science has not yet found a way to purify air in quantities or with the ease with which we do water. We must reduce and, to the maximum possible, prevent contamination of our atmosphere.

When a room becomes smoke-filled, one generally can open a window or turn on a blower. But no one yet has come up with a means of lifting a veritable ceiling over an entire metropolitan area which would be the only way of ventilating a community filled with smog of the sort which occasionally plagues many American cities. We still do not know how to sweep away what meteorologists call inversion layers of superheated air which serve as a lid over our steaming kettle of closely packed people.

The lack of a window to bring in sweet, fresh air to whole communities is the justification for control measures such as have been adopted in several regions of California. Such regulatory procedures have a palliative effect and have been evolved through costly and painly trial-and-error approaches. In many instances, they have been remarkably successful. Yet, they have not solved the problem because the problem itself is so complex.

Unfortunately, a permanent solution apparently still is some distance off. Hence, the significance of this conference.

Congress will be guided by the conclusions of this meeting. Our committees will be indebted for your evaluation of the progress made thus far, for your criticisms and your recommendations about the future course to be followed.

We on Capitol Hill are highly conscious that our people want relief from the curse and the menace of air pollution. Daily it is made plain to us that the human stake in this fight is great, because of the tremendous price our Nation may pay for continued contamination of the air all of us breathe, every moment of our lives.

The American people have been disturbed by reports of qualified medical observers that air pollution has harmful effects on persons with respiratory troubles. Is it any wonder

there also is grave concern among our populace which repeatedly undergoes irritations of eyes, nose, and throats?

From many quarters comes evidence that smog causes slums and upsets the balance of communities. Foul, polluted air influences our citizens in building homes and selecting places to dwell.

The public interest in the war on air pollution has reached the point where monetary, selfish aspects cannot be ignored. Take, for instance, the situation in Los Angeles County where constituted authority can order a shutdown of industry and a cessation of motor traffic when smog reaches a specified degree of intensity.

The cost of such countermeasures are incalculable, but they are beyond question tremendous. Businesses and industries, particularly small enterprises, cannot long afford to absorb the expense entailed by drastic action to curb pollution of our air. Yet, until we learn the secrets of what causes smog, we are merely fumbling in our attempts to prevent its occurrence.

Even though periodic shutdowns because of "smog alerts" may be infrequent or brief, a community which gains the reputation of being afflicted by serious air pollution inevitably loses its appeal to tourists and visitors. Unchecked continuance of atmospheric contamination undeniably and eventually will halt the growth and progress of any community as surely as a Chinese wall around its perimeter.

The urgency of identifying every single source of pollution and of laying bare all secrets about the mystic natural forces which cause smog is emphasized by the fact that effects of contamination can be and often are far reaching. Counties surrounding heavily populated cities are not immune since the vagaries of the winds can roll clouds of fumes across man-made boundaries. Contiguous territory from which come food supplies no longer is unconcerned following discovery that some 40-odd separate crops can be injured by polluted air.

Problems of such character cannot be solved at local levels. Nor can public agencies of Government—whether State, Federal, county, or municipal—cope with all the factors. Active cooperation of industries and private organizations is essential.

We are fortunate indeed that some of our leading enterprises, notably the petroleum and the automobile industries recognize the serious implications in the presence of air pollution. Their efforts to help check the menace have been substantial and are most commendable. Yet, they and others with related interests continue to have a public obligation to work unceasingly in the public interest in finding means by which aerial garbage will be eliminated from our environment.

For their own welfare, the petroleum and automobile industries cannot shirk their responsibility. Already public clamor has been heard in some quarters for action on the part of constituted authority which would have heavy consequences to those industries. Though scientists may scoff, none of us should lightly regard a wave of suggestions that certain types of motor fuels be prohibited by ordinance or regulation. We cannot overlook the resolutions now reaching Washington urging Federal promulgation of standards governing the emission of hydrocarbons and other products of combustion.

The program envisioned when Public Law 159 was enacted was to be of 5 years' duration. The authorized total expenditure was to be $25 million. Our Federal agencies now are in the fourth year of that program, for which the Congress has appropriated almost $12 million. A host of research and investigation projects has been set in motion.

This law expires at the end of fiscal year 1960. Hence, it will be incumbent upon the Congress in its forthcoming session to decide whether activities should be halted or the law extended. For my part, I am convinced the act which I sponsored should be continued in effect, and I wonder if possibly it should not be broadened.

I regret that more funds have not been made available. However, there were forceful reasons and circumstances for limiting the appropriations. But our people, especially those who undergo from time to time the irritation and inconvenience of smog occurrences, now and then wonder whether the expenditure has been sufficient. Others question whether it has been worthwhile.

It is difficult for the man in the street to appreciate the proportions and the complexity of the air pollution problem. This conference has a rare opportunity to reassure every citizen that we are expanding our knowledge and that we are pressing forward for his relief with undiminished determination.

This is vital, because the people of America, from the earliest moment of comprehension, believe in free air.

More and more, it is being demonstrated that freeness is relative.

Just as we have seen water supplies in various regions near the point of exhaustion, so must we awaken to the fact that our supply of pure air is in real danger of running out.

Public apprehension about effects of radioactive fallout—notably about what might happen when and if—has been expressed often in dramatic fashion. Yet the insidious influence of air pollution right now is a present and a continuing threat to physical and economic health.

Air is a natural resource and like all natural resources must be husbanded and conserved with all the ingenuity and determination we possess.

Public and private agencies join hands to solve the increasingly acute water problem. Local irrigation districts participate with the Federal Government in building dams and reclamation projects. Our Department of the Interior shortly will embark on an ambitious program of erecting full-scale field-test plants for converting saline water to sweet, potable supplies for municipal, agricultural, and industrial uses.

The problem of air pollution is of comparable importance and warrants similar earnest mutual attention. Perhaps it should receive a higher priority. For, without fresh, uncontaminated air, people will not congregate or remain in thickly settled communities. In that event, the demand for ever-larger water supplies might easily be altered.

The foundation for future growth and development of many American communities may well rest on solution of the smog problem. Suggestions already have been thrown out that air zoning be undertaken. This would attempt to make certain that industrial expansion—vital and welcome as it may be—is so directed as to take advantage of prevailing winds or features of terrain in reducing potential air pollution.

Likewise, the public stake in cleansing our atmosphere may warrant radical innovations in traffic engineering. Admittedly, our Nation as a whole, and most of its major cities, confronts real headaches in constructing and rebuilding streets, highways, freeways, and other arteries to handle the furiously mounting traffic volume. But unless other means can be found to control the way mechanical horses emit foul-smelling breaths, it is conceivable that we one day will ask engineers to channel fume-spouting automobiles, buses, and trucks away from smog-prone centers.

The obvious public interest in relieving air pollution appears to be multifaced. In promoting that interest, I sincerely trust this conference will be dedicated to the principle of pooling resources in the traditional American fashion so that the public welfare may be benefited to the greatest degree of which we are capable.

Address by Hon. Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia, Before American Federation of Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] last evening, Friday, January 16, 1959, addressed the annual civil service banquet of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL–CIO, at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard, in Portsmouth, Va. His address was delivered on the occasion of the 76th anniversary of the signing of the Pendleton Act, the Civil Service Act.

The distinguished Senator from West Virginia formerly was chairman of the House Committee on Civil Service and has a splendid record in support of the civil service and merit system.

I commend to the reading of all Senators this splendid address. The Senator from West Virginia has traced the history of the development of the Civil Service Act and has set before us a challenge in terms of improvement of the civil service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by the Senator from West Virginia be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT ANNUAL CIVIL SERVICE BANQUET, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL–CIO, PORTSMOUTH, VA., FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, 1959, ON THE OCCASION OF THE 76TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE PENDLETON (CIVIL SERVICE) ACT

It seems fitting to me, ladies and gentlemen, on this occasion of the 76th anniversary of the Pendleton Act, to present a brief consideration to the context out of which the act emerged—as well as the historical development of the Federal service—and thereby attempt to gain some view of the tendencies and needs of the future.

Now I do not intend merely to catalog the milestones in the advancement of the Federal service, important though such achievement may be.

I am concerned, rather, with the pattern of development and the relation of the career Federal service to the other branches within our structure of government. One might argue with considerable force that the civil service, which has grown from a few thousand people in 1883 to approximately 2½ million in 1959, has assumed the proportions of a fourth branch of the Government, equal in importance—if not in constitutional status—to the traditional branches of the executive, the legislative, and the judiciary.

It behooves us, therefore, to pause occasionally—amid our concern for the multitude of details of classification, efficiency ratings, retirement plans, health insurance, and others—and give thought to the overall condition of the civil service.

In this respect, it is worth noting—as Professor Van Riper has remarked in his "His-

tory of the U.S. Civil Service"—that the original reform movement which brought forth the Pendleton Act was animated by the desire to maintain individual liberty of opportunity in the Federal service.

Such men as Carl Shurz, John Jay, and Richard Henry Dana, among others, were strongly moved by John Stuart Mills' doctrine of liberty and by the denial of that doctrine in the spoils system of the Grant administration.

The fervor of this movement is aptly expressed in the concluding statement of the first report of the Civil Service Commission by George William Curtis in 1871, when he stated that "the improvement of the civil service is emphatically the people's case, the people's reform, and the administration which vigorously begins it will acquire a glory only less than that of the salvation of the Union."

However, this reform was not to be won by rhetoric alone. Another decade of a predatory and acquisitive spoils system and the assassination of a President were required before a merit system would be inaugurated. It is worth observing, in passing, that although the classified civil service has grown from coverage of only 10 percent of 140,000 employees in 1883 to 85 percent of approximately 2½ million employees today, the Pendleton Act has remained without any fundamental changes.

But just as the act itself was a long time in arriving, so have further improvements in the civil service been characterized by obstructionism and delay.

For example, from 1883 to the expansion of Federal activities in World War I, there existed no coherent pay-classification system in the Federal service, while the pay of Government clerks remained stationary from 1854 to 1916. And yet the New York Evening Post, at the turn of the century, editorialized that Government employees "average to receive twice as much, on a conservative estimate, as persons similarly employed on the outside world." That sounds familiar; doesn't it?

Not until 1923—40 years after passage of the Pendleton Act—was there any further basic legislation to improve the condition of the civil service. This came in the so-called Classification Act of 1923, which covered barely 10 percent of the total employees.

One could well ask: Why, in a democracy, do we handle the needs of our Federal service in such a casual and dilatory manner? Although we might find the explanation in the times, for example, in the belief then that the business of America is business or in the lack of concern on the part of the individual Chief Executives, or in the opposition by such men as Senator Smoot, the cause, I believe, lies deeper than any of these. It is to be found in the popular American attitude which places service in government in a lower category than private endeavor. Surely this is an incongruous and anomalous condition for a democratic society, the development and even the survival of which depends so heavily upon the intelligence, the integrity, and the creativeness of its Federal service.

As a Nation we can ill afford the license of ignoring the people of our civil service, much less the practice which was so widespread a few years ago—and still lingers on in some quarters—of making them the whipping boys and girls for default in our affairs as a Nation.

But in spite of the persistence of the national attitude of devaluing the Federal service, we can look back to significant advances in recent years. A number of these gains, I am pleased to report, occurred under the administrations of Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, while I was a member—and, later, chairman—of the House Civil Service Committee.

During that period we passed the Ramspeck-O'Mahoney Postmaster Act of 1937, the Hatch Act of 1939 and 1940, and the Ramspeck Act of 1940. Under the latter we authorized the President to extend the merit system to an additional 200,000 employees; we extended the authority of the President and Civil Service Commission in the field of position classification; and we provided for the revision of the efficiency rating system.

Under the provisions of the Ramspeck Act, President Truman, in 1945, extended Civil Service Commission authority of position classification and merit system to the field service.

In addition, one of the major advances during this period—one in which I took a particularly keen interest in drafting—was the first Federal Employees' Health Act of 1946.

Finally, we also passed in 1946 the efficiency rating legislation which led to the Performance Rating Act of 1950.

I have not intended, in this brief survey, to do more than touch the high spots of the developments of the past 75 years. Nor have I intended to convey the idea that the status of our civil service is satisfactory. Your own views on this matter have been noted with interest in your legislative proposals for the present Congress. And I hope that this Congress will give earnest and attentive concern to your program.

However, in the light of this summation, I believe we can safely make at least two generalizations:

First, that the principle of the merit system in our Federal Service is assured; and,

Second, that—belated though the progress has been—Federal employees are beginning to share increasingly in the welfare benefits that have come in recent years to employees in private industry.

But there is an issue more fundamental than either of these which I would now consider. I mentioned earlier that the Federal service has, in a sense, become a fourth branch of the Government. In stating this I am implying, of course, that government bureaucracy has become a permanent and integral part of American life. Therefore, rather than rail against the existence of a bureaucracy as such, it is time that we give thought to the kind of bureaucracy our society demands.

Our civil service, in recent years of relative political stalemate—when we have moved with increasingly less strength of purpose and direction—has been subjected to a degree of congressional and Executive scrutiny never before experienced in our history.

But from both sides—from Congress as well as the White House—this scrutiny has too often been of a restrictive nature, rather than a positive one. Some people believe too much attention has been given to the business of policing the actions of the Federal service and too little to finding ways of releasing the creative potential of our public servants. And herein lies one of the chief responsibilities in the years ahead—to reconstruct our ideas of administrative responsibility in keeping with the present complexion of our civil service.

My esteemed colleague, the Honorable OLIN JOHNSON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, is deeply interested in furthering a strong civil service.

We have at last achieved what Professor Mills calls a representative bureaucracy, having tried the closed system of the Federalists and the spoils system of the Jacksonians and early Republicans. We now have a bureaucracy which shares the same values and interests as the community at large—and it is time that we tap the tremendous creative potential which such a system implies.

But this can hardly be done when the basic legislation under which our civil service operates still bears the mark of a reaction to a spoils system that we no longer need. Present concepts of personnel management and administrative responsibility have outdistanced the centralized and hierarchial system of administration of our Federal service.

I would, therefore, in closing, offer the suggestion that your organization might profitably consider the question of some such study of our civil service as the Rockefeller studies of our military security system, our international economic policy, and our educational system—a study which would be made with a view toward releasing the creative potential implicit in the most responsive and representative civil service of our time.

Inaugural Address of Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on January 1, 1959, G. Mennen Williams took the oath of office as Governor of Michigan for the sixth consecutive time.

His election to this high office on six occasions sets a Michigan record and is a national achievement of considerable magnitude.

On assuming office for his newest term, Governor Williams delivered an inaugural address outlining Michigan's gains over the past 10 years and setting goals for the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Governor Williams' inaugural address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY GOV. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, LANSING, MICH., JANUARY 1, 1959

On behalf of all of us in your State government, I extend most cordial greetings for the New Year. May God bless you all in the years which lie ahead.

In electing me for the sixth consecutive term, the people of Michigan have honored me above any Governor in the history of the United States. I am profoundly grateful. I accept this honor with deep humility. And I solemnly pledge to serve all the people to the utmost limits of my ability.

We've come a long way together in the past 10 years. The magnificent Mackinac Bridge, then a fond hope, now a majestic reality, symbolizes the progress of this decade. The people have built new schools and hospitals, improved social services and health care, embarked on a mammoth highway program, gained national recognition for traffic safety, enlarged farm marketing programs, expanded the tourist industry, acted to end job discrimination, and done many other things to carry Michigan forward. At the same time, business and industry have grown and diversified and new jobs have been added. By all important measuring rods, Michigan has grown bigger and stronger.

It is my firm belief that the growth we have known in the past 10 years is only a preface to the growth we're going to achieve in the next 10 years. Ahead of us lies a

better life of almost unlimited material and spiritual abundance. I have every confidence that the people are going to realize that abundance to the full for themselves and for their children.

But to get where we want to go requires a frank recognition that we live today in a time of great change. Scientific and technological advances occur with amazing rapidity. These advances permitting new and expanded products and services open the way to a greater economic abundance. But they involve new industries and new skills and far-reaching transition.

Michigan has been vitally and heavily involved in providing the leadership for the Nation's economic successes to date. There is now a real challenge to also provide new leadership in our new and changing era.

Michigan has a history of always being in the front ranks in times of great change. We put the whole world on wheels in the first 40 years of this cenutry; and then we turned to producing the vehicles of war, and by gargantuan feats of production we brought about the ultimate victory much sooner than anyone dared dream possible at the outset of World War II.

A people who did it so magnificently before can do it again. Let me make one thing crystal clear. We're going to rise to new peaks of prosperity in this era of electronics, missiles, atomic energy and automation. We're going to add a new industrial preeminence in these new industries as great as the industrial heights of the age of the automobile.

There is no easy path from where we are to where we want to go. It will require real vision, a deep understanding of the times, and courage to act. It will require present sacrifice in order to gain future dividends. It will demand unselfish leadership from labor, business, agriculture, and Government. It will need the best ideas of people everywhere. It will require a deep understanding of the human hardships brought on by times of transition, and a compassionate determination to relieve these hardships. It will require cooperation—cooperation of labor, business, agriculture, Government, cooperation of every section of our State and every segment of our society.

It will take the same kind of productive teamwork on which we built our industrial supremacy in the age of the automobile. Inventive genius combined with managerial know-how and labor skill then brought both record profits and high wages by pouring out products at prices people could pay.

We need to strengthen that teamwork so that we can again outproduce, outsell, outprofit, and outearn any competitors in our changing world.

Today, management hesitates to utilize fully competitive automation for fear of labor reaction, and workers tend to fear automation will result in loss of jobs. We must bridge this gap, or our plants and labor skills will lose out in competition with our neighbors. We must transform any outmoded facilities and obsolescing skills into ultramodern automated plants and upgraded workers, and take care of the human problems created during this transformation. Then automation will become the friend, rather than the bogeyman, of labor and industry in Michigan.

The goals we seek are worth the effort to attain them. A Michigan of full employment, full production, and full prosperity, making possible a full and better life for everyone, can be attained if we cooperate in common effort to achieve it. I see a Michigan where diversified industry provides employment opportunity for anyone able to work, a Michigan where high wages, high profits, and high prosperity go upward together. I see a Michigan with great centers of research serving as magnets for clusters of new business enterprises. I see a Michigan of such economic size as to be able to care for the aged as they should be cared for, and for the mentally ill, the youth in trouble; a Michigan which generously supports education at every level, where recreation facilities are adequate, where discrimination is banished, where the arts flourish, and where morality and religion are cultivated.

State government has a vital role to play in all this, but to play its role financial stability must be restored to State government. We must provide funds not only to pay off the deficit, but also to permit services to keep up with the growth of our State.

This will require new taxes. Let me assure the people of this State that we will seek the fairest formula that can be devised, whatever that formula may be.

While we face the fiscal problem, we need to proceed rapidly with plans for the future.

To this end we have set up a blue ribbon commission of leading Michigan citizens, headed by an outstanding business leader, William Day, president of Michigan Bell Telephone Co., to assess realistically our present assets and liabilities. This is the Commission on Michigan's Economic Future—or COMEF for short—and from its work will come a blueprint for progress for the coming quarter of a century or more.

COMEF numbers among its members leaders of all phases of our business life, with farm and labor representation as well. It is in itself a splendid example of the kind of cooperation we need to do the job.

At the same time that COMEF develops broad plans for progress, we will be pushing for action in direct and immediate ways. Our economic development department must be strengthened. Local industrial development organizations must be encouraged. Small business opportunities must be promoted.

A science advisory board, composed of top research men from industry and the universities, is helping Michigan get more fully into the missile field and into other pioneering industries. Along this line we need to establish an institute of science and technology at the University of Michigan both to enhance our leadership in learning and to attract more new industries.

As I said at the beginning, I have every confidence that the people of Michigan are on the threshold of an era of unparalleled achievements. It will take our best cooperative efforts to get to where we want to go, but I have no doubt that such effort will be put to the task. Michigan will then enter an era more fruitful for private profit and wages, for public good and for the spiritual well-being of our people than any previous time in the remarkable history of our State.

A time of inaugural is a time of renewal. I believe the people of Michigan want to set their hands, their hearts, and their minds to the great tasks before us. I believe they want those who have been entrusted with leadership to face up to the job of leading. I believe the people are not afraid to make sacrifices today for the sake of a better life today and tomorrow for themselves and for their children.

It is with these beliefs that I pledge my administration to cooperative effort with the leaders of Michigan so that we can, with God's help, achieve the new Michigan we know lies within our grasp.

Problems of Metropolitan Area Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of the great problems presently confronting the country is what to do about the explosive metropolitan growth which is occurring all over the Nation and, indeed, all over the world. I hope very much that the 86th Congress will come to grips with this problem, particularly as regards Federal relationships to it.

The mayor of Philadelphia, the Honorable Richardson Dilworth, made a significant and timely address on the subject before a group of community leaders in Philadelphia earlier this week. The group was called together by the publisher of the Philadelphia Inquirer, Walter H. Annenberg, who has taken a great interest in the development of the Delaware River Valley. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mayor Dilworth's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY HON. RICHARDSON DILWORTH, MAYOR OF PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY 14, 1959

I have been asked to present for your consideration what we believe the next 10 years will bring to the great Delaware Valley; and especially, what Philadelphia can contribute to the Valley's growth and welfare.

Population is rapidly moving into our urban areas. Almost 95 percent of the Nation's 15 million increase in population since World War II has settled in some 140 urban areas. Those same 140 areas now contain more than 65 percent of our population and produce more than 70 percent of our wealth, and there is no doubt that the present trend to an urban civilization will continue throughout this century.

Let us just see what this will mean to the Delaware Valley. The population of the 11 county metropolitan area, which makes up the Delaware Valley is now approximately 5 million. In 10 years, it should be at least 6,100,000 persons. Ninety percent of that increase will be in the suburban counties.

A few people view this startling growth with alarm.

It does present tremendous challenges, but even greater opportunities.

Now, what must we do to meet this challenge? We must plan and think and act in terms of the entire area. We cannot permit sectionalism, or county boundaries to thwart us.

As to the basic problems, the most serious are (1) crime; (2) the problem of population; (3) the problem of housing, which is very much tied up with the population problem; (4) the problems of transportation; and finally (5) the problem of area cooperation.

First, crime: The crime situation is serious in every big city, and adds to the difficulty of reattracting people and industry. What must be done in this field is a speech in itself. Just let me say that we are moving vigorously; we are beginning to get results, but there is no use kidding anymore, it is going to take time and great concerted effort by all of our law enforcement agencies and the public's support to get the crime problem under proper control.

Second, the problem of population, and of the great increase in the nonwhite population: This problem, too, requires a speech in itself, and it is a problem which affects the entire area. I want to re-emphasize that this problem affects the entire area, not just Philadelphia. Let me just say here that certain chronic pessimists, including David Lawrence and his U.S. News & World Report, are determined that the great Northern cities are headed for disaster because of this problem. And this has been their constantly reiterated chant. But, they are people of little faith. The fact is that in the past 100 years our cities have been confronted at least

three times with a very similar situation. On each of those occasions, confronted with great migrations of persons with little education, no preparation for living in large cities, and no background of democracy, a few people of little courage literally deluged the newspapers and magazines with articles and letters predicting the death of the cities.

Let's just look at a few facts. The statement is frequently made that politicians encourage nonwhites to come here from the South. The fact is that of the five cities of over a million, Philadelphia is receiving less non-whites, both in numbers and percentages than the other four largest cities. Fear-mongers say that another 10 years will see nonwhites in the majority in our large cities. The fact is that the nonwhite population of the Delaware Valley is a little less than 14 percent, and a little less than 25 percent of the population of Philadelphia.

The fact is that less than half as many nonwhites are now coming here each year as during the war years when the demands for labor were high, and produced an inmigration of 15,000 nonwhites for a period of several years.

The fact is that better than 95 percent of the nonwhites come here to find work and freedom from oppression, not just to go on relief. The proof of this is that there is every indication that despite a continued flight from the South, Philadelphia has had no substantial increase in its nonwhite population in the last two years. Employment opportunities for nonwhites here having apparently reached the saturation point, the nonwhites are spilling over into surrounding industrial communities, such as Reading, Allentown, and Bethlehem.

It is also said that crime by nonwhites is out of hand. There is a high incidence of crime in nonwhite areas and a high incidence of senseless crimes of brutality, but the crime rate is no higher than the crime rate in corresponding very low income white districts.

In addition, there are encouraging factors. Per capita income of nonwhites is steadily rising. Ten years ago, the per capita income of nonwhites in Philadelphia was only 55 percent that of whites, today it is almost 70 percent that of whites. Twenty years ago, only 10 percent of the nonwhites owned their homes, today 45 percent of all nonwhite families own their homes. And, they are improving their homes. Ten years ago, 35 percent of the homes owned by nonwhites were in violation of housing regulations, today that has been reduced to 20 percent.

What's more, three-fourths of the total increase in population in the entire Delaware Valley area in the past 10 years has been white; and it is anticipated that the large increase in population in the Delaware Valley in the next ten years will be more than 80 percent white.

That brings us to the problem of housing. The real danger which threatens the Delaware Valley in this regard is the attempt to make of the city a sort of ghetto into which all of the low income minority groups are thrust. That would endanger the health, and growth of the entire area; but, I am confident it will not occur for several reasons: First, the increase in income and improved living conditions of all minority groups; and second, the efforts Philadelphia is making through redevelopment to hold and reattract middle and upper income residents.

Now, as to transportation. Our overall highway program is in fairly good shape. And the $2,500,000 area survey now being made of the Valley's entire transportation needs should be most helpful.

There is, however, much which must be done with regard to mass transportation. It is clear that if we are to move freely in the area, we must do something to solve our commutation problem. We are fast approaching the complete saturation point on highways and automobiles. We must, of course, have a fine and extensive highway system; but, if we let it get beyond a certain point it becomes a wasteful, consuming extravagance.

I envision in the next 10 years a rail commutation system which will carry people frequently, rapidly, and comfortably throughout the area in modern equipment. In order to accomplish this, the communities in the entire area will have to join in a plan which will make such service possible. It is our rough estimate that the annual added cost of such service should not exceed $5 million a year; and, that's little more than $1 per person in the area.

Our Operation Northwest has demonstrated that rail commutation service can be made attractive to riders at not too great a cost to the communities being served. As regards essential new equipment, we shall have to seek Federal aid, probably in the form of a Federal guarantee of long-term, low-interest purchase agreements for the acquistion of modern equipment. As you know, we are working on that now.

In addition, we must arrive at an areawide agreement for better station facilities, to be served, if necessary, by feeder buses as well as greatly increased and improved parking facilities at all commutation stations.

Finally, we have the problem of area cooperation. I feel confident that each year will see increased cooperation, not so much because we'll all be so much more enlightened, but because our problems will become more and more alike, and more and more pressing each year. The areas in which I foresee such cooperation are in planning, in air-pollution control, in sewerage and water supply, in transportation, and regional parks. And, that is one of our critical problems. A recent National Park Association survey makes it clear that the 5 southeastern Pennsylvania counties should now have a minimum of 66,000 acres of area parks; yet, today we have only 1,500 acres of such parks. Open space is one of our most precious resources, and it is rapidly vanishing; and, the price of what there is, is soaring. We must, therefore, act promptly, and in concert with the State to remedy this situation.

To conclude, we have many problems, both in our city and our area. But, there are none we cannot solve, provided we work together and have bold, courageous leadership.

Our greatest asset is our people. We are blessed with wonderful people, devoted to the area, and confident of its future.

We must not be afraid to plan, and to dream. Not just idle dreams; but fine dreams which we shall labor to translate into reality.

We can, and we must make the next 10 years the finest this grand valley has ever had.

Address by Former Representative Robert Hale, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by former Representative Robert Hale at Portland, Maine, on December 30, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, as the year draws to its end the term of office for which I was elected to serve you in Congress also draws to its end. Indeed I have spent the last few weeks closing my office here in Washington just as I closed my Portland office in September. This has not been an easy task, nor shall I pretend that it has been a pleasant one. Every file—every letter even—brings reminders of the past and oftentimes revives the memory of warm friendships with those who are no more. So some sadness is inevitable at the close of my eight terms in Congress.

The 16 years which I have passed here in your service have been crowded, crucial, and difficult ones. The responsibilities have been heavy and the work arduous. However, my service has brought me many satisfactions and rewarding experiences. I should be indeed ungrateful if I did not take this occasion to thank you again for your confidence, your support, and your consideration over all these years. No one ever represented in Congress or anywhere else a better constituency than the First Maine District. Bigger constituencies there are, and richer, but there are no people anywhere who will ever stand so high in my affections as those of Oxford, Sagadahoc, Cumberland, and York Counties. I have with them every tie of affection and spiritual kinship.

Often here in Washington, as years ago in the State legislature, have I been besought by proper means to vote for this measure or against that one, but seldom have I been pressured or threatened. The voters have not sought to put fetters on my judgment or my conscience; they have trusted to my discretion. I have exercised my discretion fearlessly, well knowing that no decision of mine or of any legislator could ever meet with unanimous approval.

If the time ever comes when a Member of Congress from this or any other district is obliged to be a mere rubber stamp for some particularly powerful or well-heeled pressure group in his constituency, membership in Congress would cease to be either an honor or a pleasure. This would be all the more true if the pressure group were one based on a selfish class or economic interest or on social or economic prejudices.

In the 16 years that I have been here, I have seen many changes in Maine, in our country, and in the world at large. I have seen the end of World War II and the tragedy which came in the wake of victory when we realized that our wartime ally, the Soviet Union, could not share our desire for a free world—was in fact opposed to anything that we hold dear. The hot war which raged when I took my seat at the beginning of 1943 was succeeded by 5 brief years of uneasy peace and then by the localized but tragic war in Korea lasting from 1950 to 1953. We are now back in a cold war which shows no sign of slackening. It imposes on any Member of Congress, and indeed on everyone connected with the Government, problems as difficult and situations as dangerous as any that ever confronted this country. In my years in the Congress I have put the objective of national security above all others. If we cannot remain a free people we shall have lost all that matters. No statesmanship that endangers our liberties or suffers them to be endangered can be anything but sterile.

In my years here I have served under two Democratic Presidents and for the last 6 years under a Republican. I have served in two Republican Congresses and in six Democratic. In Maine, Democratic Governors have succeeded Republican, though our legislature remains Republican. Through all these political changes I leave Congress as I entered it, a strong party man, believing that in a democracy such as ours responsible political parties alone can provide sound government.

It may be that the charms of television have romanticized political personalities, built up personal loyalties, and weakened concern for the principles of government, for political ideas, and for such serious and critical issues of the day as defense, foreign policy, inflation, and education. If such be the case, I hope that as television loses its novelty, the political party to which the candidate belongs will again be recognized as the major instrumentality of popular government.

Of one thing I am certain; no profession can be nobler or more rewarding than public service in a democracy. I hope that no future generation will be forgetful of this. It is easy to speak slightingly of politicians. No doubt, ignorant, selfish, and evil men seek and obtain political office. No electorate can be too vigilant in its choice of public servants. Bad men may discredit a great profession but we must see the profession above the men.

For Congress as an institution I have the highest respect. Undeserving people obtain seats in both House and Senate. Sometimes they succeed in holding office for many years. They may deceive their constituents but they seldom deceive their colleagues in the Congress. Just as the best measure of the worth of a lawyer or a doctor is the esteem which he enjoys in his profession, the best criterion of a legislator's worth lies in the appraisal of his fellows. SAM RAYBURN, after nearly half a century of service in the House, has said that every Member of the House has two constituencies; that which elects him and the House itself. This is true. Partisanship often runs high in the House, but integrity and ability never fail of recognition, regardless of party lines.

When in 1898 Thomas B. Reed made his farewell to the people of this district after moer than 20 years of service he said:

"Office as a ribbon to stick in your coat is worth nobody's consideration. Office as opportunity is worth all consideration. That opportunity you have given me, untrammeled, in the fullest and amplest manner, and I return you sincerest thanks. If I have deserved any praise, it belongs of right to you."

I am proud to have followed in the footsteps of Speaker Reed and of having served this district longer than any of his successors. With a heart full of gratitude and good will, I wish you all a happy new year and a happy succession of new years. I hoep that I shall enjoy your friendship and your society through many years to come.

Difficulty of Obtaining College Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD one of a series of reports by Erwin Knoll, education writer of the Washington Post and Times Herald, on the serious problems faced by American students who wish to continue their education beyond the high school. Mr. Knoll's article, published on January 11, 1959, highlights the discussion of a group of educators who met recently in Carmel, N.Y.

His report notes that Frank H. Bowles, president of the college entrance examination board, predicted increased use of facilities for evening classes and develment of the 2-year community college.

During the 85th Congress I proposed consideration of an emergency program of Federal aid to provide classrooms at 2-year colleges through grants-in-aid to the States. I intend to introduce similar legislation in this Congress.

The 2-year college would bring colleges to many areas where such facilities are now unavailable. For the youth who lacks either dormitory fees or tuition, or both, it may be his only chance for higher education. In general, the 2-year colleges would try to meet the needs of two groups of students: First, those seeking 2 years of college preliminary to taking 2 or more years at another institution; second, those planning to wind up their college career in the 2 years and who therefore want terminal courses in general education and vocational fields. Many colleges which now offer this kind of program have attempted further to meet the needs of the community by adding a program of adult education for those who are employed, but feel the need for additional training.

We must approach the critical problem of expanding educational facilities with the constant awareness that if we fail to act soon, the Nation will forever lose much talent and brainpower. Unless we move quickly, the chance for an adequate education for life, for a profession, and for citizenship will be denied to many of our finest youth.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLEGES SEEN FACING HUGE INFLUX IN 1968

(By Erwin Knoll)

The number of Americans going to college will triple in the next decade. By 1968, 2 out of 3 men and women in the college age group of 18 to 21 will be getting a higher education.

These predictions come from Frank H. Bowles, president of the College Entrance Examination Board. They highlight a problem that is perturbing to more and more parents—how to get their children into college and how to foot the bills.

The problem was discussed last week at a Carmel, N. Y., conference of college admissions officers, high school principals, and education writers, held under the auspices of the college board.

The consensus among the educators present was that the nature of higher education would change radically in the coming years, that costs would rise substantially, but that educational opportunities would not be denied to students who are capable of college work and flexible in their plans.

TEN MILLION STUDENTS

Within 10 years, Bowles predicted, about 10 million students will be enrolled in the Nation's colleges. It will be as customary to attend college as it is to attend high school now, he said. And many who now settle for 4 years of higher education will go on to do 2 to 4 years of graduate work.

But a college education in 1968 won't be precisely what it is today, Bowles warned. He referred to the "emergent vocationalism" in higher education, which will include the training of shop foremen, technicians, and industrial workers.

CHANGES PREDICTED

He predicted increased use of facilities for evening classes, development of many 2-year community colleges and incorporation into formal higher education of many programs now regarded as adult classes.

"The colleges which attract most of the candidates are east of the Alleghenies and west of the Rockies," he declared. "With a few exceptions, the inland colleges are not crowded."

The "prestige colleges" of the East will not be increasing their capacities very much, educators at the conference agreed, and they will be pricing themselves out of the market for many students.

The result will be an increasing realization that it is the student, not the college, that makes an education. State universities and less famous colleges will be bearing the brunt of much of the enrollment boom.

BETTER COUNSELING

The educators agreed that most colleges have done a poor job of letting the public know what standards must be met for admission. They called for better high school counseling—only one school in five now has an organized guidance program, closer liaison between high schools and colleges, and more informative college catalogs.

College admissions officers stressed that no one criterian assures acceptance or rejection by any school. Despite increased use of college entrance examinations, test scores are only one factor considered.

"There is no such thing as an ideal candidate," said C. William Edwards, director of admissions for Princeton University.

There is an ideal class, but no two boys in that class are alike. We don't want all geniuses or all athletes or all editors of school papers.

"We want some Joe Smiths—the boys who haven't been No. 1 in anything. You can't select students by formula or machine."

QUALIFICATIONS TOLD

John S. Hafer, dean of admissions at Syracuse University, outlined the qualifications considered by his school. In the order of precedence they were:

1. High school record.
2. Score on the college board examination or other standardized test.
3. High school class rank.
4. Recommendation of high school principal and teachers.
5. Geographic representation.

Admissions officers said much of the present chaos in college admissions will be eliminated as schools develop better coordination in handling applications. Some predicted eventual development of a single admissions center which would screen applications to all or most schools.

As costs of higher education continue to rise, another desperation round of tuition increases is in the offing, Bowles asserted. What of the youngsters who can't afford to pay the price?

TIPS FOR INDIGENT

He shouldn't look to too much help from scholarships, the educators agreed. Though there is a trend toward awarding them more on the basis of need than as prizes for outstanding work, no great expansion of scholarships programs is in the offing. Instead the emphasis is now on student loans—on buying education by the installment plan.

Here are some tips for students who think they can't afford to go to college. They come from Rexford G. Moon, Jr., director of the college board's scholarship service:

Consider a nearby college. It's better to go to any college than to go to none—and your money might better be spent on education than on railroad or airline fares.

Don't neglect city or State institutions. Their fees are lower because they have tax support.

Borrow. In an inflationary period, you get more by learning now and paying later than by saving now to learn later.

Work. Students now earn 30 to 45 percent of their education costs.

Write to the college of your choice for information on available financial aid.

Enter national, State, and regional scholarship competitions.

Preservation of Old Films and Prints

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Old Films and Prints Making Historic Movie," written by Grace Bassett and published in the Washington Evening Star of November 5, 1958. Last year Congress, because of the interest which has been manifested in this subject, appropriated money to the Library of Congress to refurbish priceless prints which are in the possession of the Library, but which, unfortunately, have been crumbling and are in a state of decay.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD FILMS AND PRINTS MAKING HISTORIC MOVIE

(By Grace Bassett)

A 5-year job of converting brittle film and faded prints into a motion picture record of America since 1891 has begun at the Library of Congress.

Renocare of Hollywood won the first contract for the unique operation ordered by Congress last session.

The California corporation will work within a $60,000 appropriation. Its bid was on a film footage basis. Library officials hope the contractor will finish work on about one quarter of the prints to be saved.

In all, 1,803 paper prints and 35 million feet of old-fashioned film filed between 1894 and 1912 would have disintegrated except for the congressional action.

Among the prints are pictures of the battleship *Maine*; the world's first atomic submarine, the U.S.S. *Nautilus*, and an on-the-spot record of the Klondike gold rush. The Baltimore fire of 1904 and the San Francisco earthquake of 1906—these and thousands of other headline events and personalities are saved for posterity only on paper rolls, many tattered and warped.

THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS NEEDED

Preserved on film that crumbles and gives off toxic gas are shots aboard the ill-fated Titanic and along the C. & O. Canal at the turn of the century. These old fashioned nitrate films almost beyond repair are protected in vaults at Suitland, Md.

Urged primarily by Senator KUCHEL, Republican, of California, Congress appropriated $60,000 to shift pictures onto modern film. This is the first chunk of $300,000 needed to finish the preservation chore.

The focus of fuzzy prints is sharpened by a Rube Goldberg kind of mechanism developed first by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, according to Col. Willard Webb, who heads the Library's Stack and Reader Division.

Firms bidding for the job are bound to use a similar process—which involves dunking old film into a chemical solution, watering, drying, doctoring, and then transfering picture images onto movie film that can be projected.

NO MOVIE COPYRIGHTING

Pioneering movie producers filed pictures at the Library to get copyrights. Thomas A. Edison, inventor of the moving picture, sought the first protection by filing 8-by-10-inch cards with still picture frames of his movie, "The Sneeze," printed on them.

This was in 1894 when there were no motion-picture copyright laws. So picture makers simply filed sequences of their stills as evidence of their pictures. Nobody saw any use for the filings except to win copyrights.

The practice continued until 1912, when copyrighting of motion pictures was written into law. After that the Library took only descriptions of the films, not the actual reels except in selective cases.

Fifty years later, Library officials realized their early American films were priceless. Film scenery in those days was real. Props were few. If a railroad were in a picture, it was a real railroad. Cameras caught major sociological and historical developments of the Nation in one of its most flourishing periods.

DUBBED-IN SOUND

"We are not in the entertainment business," Colonel Webb emphasized. "But because we are not does not mean that we should not make available to a biographer of President McKinley, motion pictures of his career."

He said the films, dubbed with sound recordings, could be displayed to the public, too, in educational shows like the recent Theodore Roosevelt exhibit at the Library. After they push a button, visitors hear the ringing, cultured voice of Mr. Roosevelt at the same time his career as Rough Rider, big-game hunter and statesman is flashed on the screen.

Once converted, all the old films will be stored in the basement of the Library Annex. Colonel Webb, with no money but lots of organization, has set up an ambitious file there already. When it's filled with America's film firsts, Colonel Webb—a job done for future generations—plans to retire.

Curbing the Filibuster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington News of January 14, 1959, complimenting the Senate on its solution of the controversy over the modification of rule XXII.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STOP-TALK RULE

The Senate has brought off its dispute over curbing the filibuster a good deal more peaceably than might have been expected.

The result is a compromise, the Senate's usual method of doing business, and extremists at neither end are satisfied. But it is a reasonable, workable compromise. The Senate can live with the new rule and get on with its work.

The issue was how to prevent obstructive yack-yack and still preserve the right to free debate which is the essence of the parliamentary system. The Johnson compromise permits two-thirds of the Senators present and voting to shut off a filibuster.

Under the old rule, it took two-thirds of the total membership to do this. Thus a Senator could support a filibuster by merely staying away.

There is such a thing as the tyranny of a minority, and its weapon is the filibuster. The new rule diminishes its power. There also is the tyranny of a majority. If the rule were so relaxed that a mere majority could silence a near majority, free debate, and hence the public interest, would be jeopardized.

The two-thirds rule is standard on other issues—on ratification of a treaty, on overriding a Presidential veto, on proposing a constitutional amendment. It has worked well on these questions; it should work well on the filibuster question.

We think the Senate has solved this problem with practical good sense.

Carleton Putnam Presents South's Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on October 13, 1958, Mr. Carleton Putnam, of Washington, D.C., addressed a letter to President Eisenhower, stating in a very forceful manner the South's position on the segregation-integration controversy. Mr. Putnam, prominent writer and airlines executive, has through the years been active in various business interests in the South and is exceptionally well informed on the region's problems, opportunities, and aspirations.

Mr. Putnam's letter to the President has received wide distribution through the effort of individuals and also through the editorial and letters to the editor columns of many of our leading newspapers. Last week a group of citizens of Birmingham, in my district, after having raised funds by private subscription, inserted the letter as a full-page advertisement in the New York Times. It is planned to run additional advertisements in the Christian Science Monitor and several other papers.

With the thought that my efforts will lend assistance in giving the letter the type of currency it merits, I am pleased to insert same herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under permission heretofore given.

Mr. Putnam, a member of the famous New England Putnam family, is a native of New York City, a graduate of Princeton and Columbia, and founder and president of the Chicago & Southern Airlines—1943–48. He is presently on the board of directors of Delta Airlines. In addition to being an outstanding business executive Mr. Putnam is also a writ-

er of note. He recently published a widely praised biography of President Theodore Roosevelt.

The letter which follows is commended to the careful reading and study of every Member of the House:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *October 13, 1958.*
The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A few days ago I was reading over Justice Frankfurter's opinion in the recent Little Rock case. Three sentences in it tempt me to write you this letter. I am a northerner, but I have spent a large part of my life as a business executive in the South. I have a law degree, but I am now engaged in historical writing. From this observation post I risk the presumption of a comment.

The sentences I wish to examine are these: "Local customs, however hardened by time, are not decreed in heaven. Habits and feelings they engender may be counteracted and moderated. Experience attests that such local habits and feelings will yield, gradually though this may be, to law and education."

It is my personal conviction that the local customs in this case were hardened by time for a very good reason, and that while they may not, as Frankfurter says, have been decreed in heaven, they come closer to it than the current view of the Supreme Court. I was particularly puzzled by Frankfurter's remarks that "the Constitution is not the formulaton of the merely personal views of the members of this Court." Five minutes before the Court's desegregation decision, the Constitution meant one thing; 5 minutes later, it meant something else. Only one thing intervened; namely, an expression of the personal views of the members of the Court.

It is not my purpose to dispute the point with which the greater part of Frankfurter's opinion is concerned. The law must be obeyed. But I think the original desegregation decision was wrong, that it ought to be reversed, and that meanwhile every legal means should be found not to disobey it but to avoid it. Failing this, the situation should be corrected by constitutional amendment.

I cannot agree that this is a matter involving "a few States," as Frankfurter suggests. The picture in reality is of a court, by one sudden edict, forcing upon the entire South a view, and a way of life, with which the great majority of the population are in complete disagreement. Although not from the legal, in fact from the practical, standpoint the North, which does not have the problem, is presuming to tell the South, which does have the problem, what to do.

To me there is a frightening arrogance in this performance. Neither the North, nor the Court, has any holy mandate inherent in the trend of the times or the progress of liberalism to reform society in the South. In the matter of schools, rights to equal education are inseparably bound up with rights to freedom of association and, in the South at least, may require that both be considered simultaneously. (In using the word "association" here, I mean the right to associate with whom you please, and the right not to associate with whom you please.) Moreover, am I not correct in my recollection that it was the social stigma of segregation and its effect upon the Negro's mind and heart to which the Court objected as much as to any other, and thus that the Court, in forcing the black man's right to equal education was actually determined to violate the white man's right to freedom of association?

In any case the crux of this issue would seem obvious: social status has to be earned. Or, to put it another way, equality of association has to be mutually agreed to and mutually desired. It cannot be achieved by legal fiat. Personally, I feel only affection for the Negro. But there are facts that have to be faced. Any man with two eyes in his head can observe a Negro settlement in the Congo, can study the pureblooded African in his native habitat as he exists when left on his own resources, can compare this settlement with London or Paris, and can draw his own conclusions regarding relative levels of character and intelligence—or the combination of character and intelligence which is civilization. Finally, he can inquire as to the number of pureblooded blacks who have made contributions to great literature or engineering or medicine or philosophy or abstract science. (I do not include singing or athletics as these are not primarily matters of character and intelligence.) Nor is there any validity to the argument that the Negro hasn't been given a chance. We were all in caves or trees originally. The progress which the pureblooded black has made when left to himself, with a minimum of white help or hindrance, genetically or otherwise, can be measured today in the Congo.

Lord Bryce, a distinguished and impartial foreign observer, presented the situation accurately in his "American Commonwealth" when he wrote in 1880:

"History is a record of the progress toward civilization of races originally barbarous. But that progress has in all cases been slow and gradual * * *. Utterly dissimilar is the case of the African Negro, caught up in and whirled along with the swift movement of the American democracy. In it we have a singular juxtaposition of the most primitive and the most recent, the most rudimentary, and the most highly developed, types of culture * * *. A body of savages is violently carried across the ocean and set to work as slaves on the plantations of masters who are three or four thousand years in advance of them in mental capacity and moral force * * *. Suddenly, even more suddenly than they were torn from Africa, they find themselves, not only free, but made full citizens and active members of the most popular government the world has seen, treated as fit to bear an equal part in ruling, not only themselves, but also their recent masters."

One does not telescope three or four thousand years into the 78 years since Bryce wrote. One may change the terms of the problem by mixed breeding, but if ever there was a matter that ought to be left to local option it would seem to be the decision as to when the mixture has produced an acceptable amalgam in the schools. And I see no reason for penalizing a locality that does not choose to mix.

I would emphatically support improvement of education in Negro schools, if and where it is inferior. Equality of opportunity and equality before the law, when not strained to cover other situations, are acceptable ideals because they provide the chance to earn and to progress—and consequently should be enforced by legal fiat as far as is humanly possible. But equality of association, which desegregation in southern schools involves, presupposes a status which in the South the average Negro has not earned. To force it upon the southern white will, I think, meet with as much opposition as the prohibition amendment encountered in the wet States.

Throughout this controversy there has been frequent mention of the equality of man as a broad social objective. No proposition in recent years has been clouded by more loose thinking. Not many of us would care to enter a poetry contest with Keats, nor play chess with the national champion, nor set our character beside Albert Schweitzer's. When we see the doctrine of equality contradicted everywhere around us in fact, it remains a mystery why so many of us continue to give it lip service in theory, and why we tolerate the vicious notion that status in any field need not be earned.

Pin down the man who uses the word "equality," and at once the evasions and qualifications begin. As I recall, you, yourself, in a recent statement used some phrase to the effect that men were equal in the sight of God. I would be interested to know where in the Bible you get your authority for this conception. There is doubtless authority in Scripture for the concept of potential equality in the sight of God—after earning that status, and with various further qualifications—but where is the authority for the sort of ipso facto equality suggested by your context? The whole idea contradicts the basic tenet of the Christian and Jewish religions that status is earned through righteousness and its not an automatic matter. What is true of religion and righteousness is just as true of achievement in other fields. And what is true among individuals is just as true of averages among races.

The confusion here is not unlike the confusion created by some left-wing writers between the doctrine of equality and the doctrine of Christian love. The command to love your neighbor is not a command either to consider your neighbor your equal, or yourself his equal: perhaps the purest example of great love without equality is the love between parent and child. In fact the equality doctrine as a whole, except when surrounded by a plethora of qualifications, is so untenable that it falls to pieces at the slightest thoughtful examination.

Frankfurter closes his opinion with a quotation from Abraham Lincoln, to whom the Negro owes more than to any other man. I, too, would like to quote from Lincoln. At Charleston, Ill., in September 1858, in a debate with Douglas, Lincoln said:

"I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races; I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor qualifying them to hold office. * * * I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will ever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together, there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

The extent to which Lincoln would have modified these views today, or may have modified them before his death, is a moot question, but it is clear on its face that he would not have been in sympathy with the Supreme Court's position on desegregation. Many historians have felt that when Lincoln died the South lost the best friend it had. This also may be moot, but again it seems clear that for 94 years—from the horrors of Reconstruction through the Supreme Court's desegregation decision—the North has been trying to force the black man down the white southerner's throat, and it is a miracle that relations between the races in the South have progressed as well as they have.

Perhaps the most discouraging spectacle is the spectacle of northern newspapers dwelling with pleasure upon the predicament of the southern parent who is forced to choose between desegregation and no school at all for his child. It does not seem to occur to these papers that this is the cruelest sort of blackmail; that the North is virtually putting a pistol at the head of the southern parent in a gesture which every northerner must contemplate with shame.

Indeed, there now seems little doubt that the Court's recent decision has set back the cause of the Negro in the South by a generation. He may force his way into white schools, but he will not force his way into white hearts nor earn the respect he seeks. What evolution was slowly and wisely

achieving, revolution has now arrested, and the trail of bitterness will lead far.

Sincerely yours,

CARLETON PUTNAM.

Foreign Aid Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the January 5, 1959, issue of the Concord (N. H.) Monitor Patriot newspaper.

This editorial, entitled "Foreign Aid Waste," presents clearly the situation with which Members of Congress are faced annually in connection with our spending of billions of dollars for foreign-aid programs.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID WASTE

Both of New Hampshire's Senators have from time to time cast a cold and appraising eye at items in the foreign-aid budget and even closer scrutiny should be given when demands for more funds are considered.

In the years since 1950 this country has spent more than $42 billion in its foreign assistance programs. About $20 billion was earmarked for technical and economic help and about $22 billion went to military build-up.

There is a tendency in Washington to label any cariticism of foreign-aid spending as a personal attack upon Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles. But there is ample evidence that a considerable number of foreign-aid projects have been misdirected and poorly administered.

BRIDGES and COTTON should do everything possible to halt at once, so far as they are able, the appalling waste in expenditure of money abroad. There are few areas where American aid has not produced records of shocking misuse of money taken from taxpayers.

A lot of Americans are wondering why their money is being poured into areas where there are strong indications of Communist support and equally strong evidence that heads of some countries have ample funds for their own use.

The sheik of Kuwait is boasting over construction of a new palace that will cost millions. The structure will have 90 rooms, all completely air conditioned. There will be a 20-room section for a harem whose occupants will enjoy an elaborate swimming pool. A theater will have 500 seats and a dining room will be a forest of crystal chandeliers.

Kuwait is a small British protectorate on the Persian Gulf. Its sheik would be just another Arab in a drafty tent save for the fact that his land reeks with oil. This enables him to engage in personal extravagances while most of his subjects live in squalor.

Kuwait is in a global area where American dollars are being poured out to raise living standards. It is in that part of the world where the United States is grimly fighting Soviet propaganda and promises of a better life. And it is not too far distant from where another Arab named Nasser is spreading discontent.

There seems to be agreement in both political parties that foreign aid cannot be wholly eliminated. There can and should be insistence that where and how this money is spent should be more closely watched.

The Battle in the Ether

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in thinking of that phase of the cold war usually referred to as the battle for men's minds we are usually prone to consider only United States and Soviet efforts beamed at third countries. Nevertheless, there are a substantial number of broadcasts beamed to American listeners, in English, from every corner of the world, Communist, free and neutral. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the January 1959 issue of Town and Country by Arthur Settel, director of public relations of the Metropolitan Educational Television Association—META, describing this activity.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOOD LISTENER
(By Arthur Settel)

Little did my father dream when he told me, an incurably shy and a social creature of 13, to be a good listener, that some day I would not only carry out his injunction to the letter but make it a highly enlightening if frequently expensive pastime as well.

Everyone has his weakness. Mine is listening. To this exnewsman and former expatriate, there is nothing so intriguing as the happy game of gluing myself to my radio set and listening to the nations of our allegedly civilized world screaming insults and invectives at each other through the unwalled ether.

With a simple receiving set which can be purchased at any appliance shop or department store for as little as $139, any resident of the United States or its possessions can enjoy a ringside seat on the main arena of the cold war, observing first hand the war of words, sometimes called by more succulent names such as the battle for the minds of men, the war of ideas, the truth campaign, psychological warfare, and others ad infinitum.

Call it what you will, it is a Zoilean game apparently without end, waxing and waning while one side regroups its forces, its sputniks, it muttniks, and the other builds bigger and better transmitters on land, on ships at sea—making use of leaflets, folders, balloons, musical jingles, postage stamps, trade fairs, grants-in-aid, and even match box covers to put across an idea, tell a story, convey a message, or just let people on the other side know they haven't been forgotten.

Tuning in to the correct frequency can be frustrating to the beginner in the art of listening, who sits back enjoying a charming little fireside chat in the Russian language only to discover, after a few minutes, that it isn't Moscow at all, but the Voice of America broadcasting on shortwave from Washington, D.C., beamed to the Russian listening public.

On the other hand, an English-language broadcast is likely to originate anywhere—Moscow to Dakar, and back again. Or the curiously pleading voice can just as readily be the Voice of Germany, the Voice of Spain, the Voice of Turkey, or—yes, it could even be the BBC, London.

The listener soon ascertains that the ingratiating and fawning Moscow newscasters with the New York accent aren't giving the news at all, but something far different and alien and charged with little bolts of electricity—news which is not entirely in accord either with the facts or with the best interest of anything or anybody except the policies of the Kremlin.

It is essentially for the benefit of the international eavesdropper that I've tried to unscramble the modern Tower of Babel which modern radio broadcasting has created, although my glossary will doubtless be useful to the reader of present-day political propaganda as well as to the radio listener.

The first point, then, is that content and slant, rather than language as such, are the clues to the source and origin of a broadcast. Thus, while the Voice of America in Washington addresses itself to the Soviet Union in Russian, you can readily pick up, with the right kind of shortwave apparatus, such other oddities as Spanish-language broadcasts originating in Peiping, capital of Communist China; Arabic-language broadcasts from Tel Aviv, in the State of Israel; Hebrew-language broadcasts from Cairo, Egypt; talks in French with a pure Parisian accent coming from Cologne, Germany; Indonesian from Holland, and so on.

The second point I should like to make is that no one need feel excluded from the big brainwash simply because he can't afford to own a shortwave radio. The copywriters of Agitprop, a department in the Kremlin which devotes much of its time to the business of planting subversion in the United States and elsewhere, are just as anxious as anyone else to have listeners, and so quite naturally they make it as easy as pie for Americans to tune in and be brainwashed. Thus, they are on the air daily and Sundays on a bewildering variety of wavelengths, offering a not unimpressive assortment of music, news, and commentary which reveal that the people who masterminded the transmissions were well trained for their jobs.

Once you own your set and have settled down to a quiet evening of eavesdropping, you will find that European, Asia, and even some African states are vying for your sympathetic attention and think the best way to do this is via the propaganda route, interspersed with music by Gershwin, Nat King Cole, and Elvis Presley. You will listen to Radio Sweden from Stockholm; Radio Nacional de España from Madrid; the Thai National Broadcasting Station at Bangkok; the Radio Sarawak from Broadcasting House in Kuching; and programs from a host of other cities—all bombarding you, Mr. and Mrs. Average American, with their ideas as well as their ideologies.

Thus, with our own little sputniks in the propaganda business via the unstoppable voice of radio, a conscientious listener who wants to know who is saying what may find himself hesitating before definitely identifying the source of a broadcast. Even the seasoned practitioner may find himself in difficulty, unless he has familiarized himself with the A B C of modern propaganda.

As an aid to the perplexed shortwave listener to assist in spotting instantly the subtle brainwash, in separating fact from fiction, to keep you and you and you from becoming a member of the Ananias club—I have drawn up a set of helpful suggestions which are the first, I believe, ever published. They are designed to make the battle of the ether as simple as possible to the American public, which is at one and the same time a prime target and a sideline observer of the

most decisive struggle in history and is scarcely aware of it.

LANGUAGES

As already indicated, the only language you need to know is English. If you are interested in shortwave monitoring. Of course, if you know the Russian language, you can listen to the Voice of America broadcasts, although you should be cautioned that these programs generally consist of straight news which you've probably already heard on your domestic radio program. With a mastery of English, you can listen to any of two score nations, all trying to win over the mind of America.

TUNING HOURS

The best listening time is after dark. Broadcasts are clearly audible with a good set and a radio antenna virtually any time of the day on Sundays, and during the evening on weekdays. Program schedules are obtainable from the broadcast capital of each individual country in which you are interested.

GLOSSARY OF RADIO PROPAGANDA

Aggressive bloc: Name-calling device, used by Radio Moscow and Egyptian Broadcast Service (Radio Cairo). Refers to anyone Moscow doesn't like.

Atomongers: Fell into disuse with the advent of sputnik.

Aspirations: The striving of Western nations to be liberated from the yoke of capitalism.

Baghdad Pact: Conspiracy of certain Western and Middle Eastern nations bent upon some kind of mischief not clearly defined.

Blackmail: Any action by Western (NATO) Powers taken in self-defense against the Soviet bloc.

Bourgeois rightists: Mysterious forces in the Western World conspiring to preserve the evils of capitalism against the march of utopia; phrase employed in Peiping transmissions and not heard recently from Moscow.

Bourgeois intellectuals: Misguided eggheads who resist subversion by Kremlin propagandists.

Bulwark of defense of world peace: Soviet description of its position in world affairs—not employed in radiocasts beamed to United States or Western Europe.

Capitalist rightists: Tycoons and empire builders who would just as soon crush their wage slaves as not, all for the sake of political and territorial advantage.

Colonial adventures: Any activity involving U.S. economic aid to underdeveloped countries.

Colonial servitude: The association of any country with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Also used to describe supposed attitude of an anti-Communist-oriented nation after receiving a defense appropriation.

Creative labor: Peasants working in a collective farm. Agricultural workers in capitalist countries are referred to as "subjected peoples" and "slaves of capitalistic monopolistic exploitation."

Cultural delegation: Usually a cadre of propagandists for communism.

Democracy: Loosely used term, often employed in derision as well as in praise. Impossible to define out of context. Beware of trying to fix meaning with precision.

Eisenhower doctrine: Booby trap for unsuspecting countries in the Middle East; purpose, to perpetuate their enslavement to capitalistic imperialism.

Exploitation: Bleeding an underdog nation white by plundering its wealth; e.g., Britain's exploitation of Egypt until latter country joined Soviet bloc.

Forces of peace: Members of the "peace-loving bloc" of nations (under Moscow control).

Forces of reaction: Members of war-mongering bloc of nations (under U.S. control). Also, those forces which drag modern man back.

Fraternal friendship and cooperation: Soviet economic and political penetration of a country not yet under Communist domination but willing to accept Russian grants and other economic aid and know-how.

Imperialist circles, imperialist cliques: Malodorous messengers of evil bent on enslaving independent nations of the world in some sort of imperial network, with general headquarters in Washington.

Landlords: Human birds of prey who, without a twinge of conscience, rob families of their sustenance for the benefit of capitalism.

Little peoples: Defenseless nations of the NATO bloc who can't do a thing about it.

"Long live world peace": Phrase employed by Kremlin inspired orators to punctuate every public speech.

Mendacious fabrications of the ideologists of colonialism: Expletives by anti-Communists.

Paper tiger: Sneering reference to America's military posture. (Used by Communist China. Not heard elsewhere since 1949).

Path of progress: The road to socialism (i.e., communism).

Peaceful coexistence: (The Big Socko in propaganda.) Phrase has been used tirelessly for the last 5 or 6 years in Moscow and in her political satellite broadcasts and is the supertrademark of all Agitprop output. Has hypnotic power over the unwary because of its appeal to peace-loving people everywhere.

Peace-loving countries: All captive nations within the Soviet orbit.

People's republics: Countries living under Communist utopia, supposedly with the people, rather than capitalist warmongers in charge.

Position of strength policy: America's naked military might, employed as a threat to support political and economic policies not in accord with Moscow's way of doing things.

Proletarian internationalism: Obscure, but generally meaning a workers' paradise in which monopoly capitalists have been obliterated.

Push-button war: Capitalist-engineered war.

Propaganda: When it comes from capitalist sources, it's propaganda. From Communist sources, "enlightenment" and "rectification."

Puppets: Tools of the monopoly capitalists.

Rectification campaign: Campaign currently being waged by Communist China, to rectify deviationists; e.g., ideological nonconformists and peasants who refuse to give up their land to cooperatives.

Rightists: General category; includes capitalists, monopolists, warmongers, deviationists, and even bourgeois intellectuals.

Socialist camp: The Communist-dominated bloc; includes Communist China. No relation to socialism.

Socialist realism: Recognition of the "facts of life" by writers, artists, etc., under Soviet domination; e.g., art has to be harnessed to Moscow ideology and purposes.

Solidarity: Union against the decadent capitalist states by the "forces of freedom," i.e., Soviet utopia.

Soviet satellites: Within Soviet orbit, "satellite" means sputnik; outside, "satellites" include countries in the Soviet political orbit.

War-thirsty elements: Any country not inside the Soviet political orbit which wants to defend itself against aggression; those accepting defense armament given by Western countries.

Working class: Labor within Soviet-controlled areas; any group opposed to capitalism.

Worker-peasant state: Synonym for country which has accepted Moscow ideology.

Seaton Defies Congress in Refusing To Build Powerplant on Trinity Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, while the administration talks about balancing the budget and saving money, it is preparing to cost the Federal taxpayers money by failing to request funds for the power installation on the Trinity River project. This project is currently under construction as part of California's Central Valley project, and unless the powerhouses are started now they will not be ready to operate when the dam fills with water. Every day those powerhouses are idle, when they could be operating, will cost the taxpayers of this Nation the income from power sales, which will be substantial.

The Trinity Project Act provides for a federally built powerplant. An effort is being made to amend that act and to give approval to the so-called partnership deal whereby the power-generating facilities would be turned over to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. However, this legislation failed in the last Congress, and has less chance of being passed in this Congress. The Secretary of the Interior, in failing to request funds, is in effect telling the Congress of the United States that he does not intend to build and operate the project the way Congress authorized it. An editorial in the Modesto Bee of January 11, 1959, points this up very clearly. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLOCKING TRINITY FUNDS WOULD BE IMPROVIDENT

Speaking at a convention of the California Irrigation Districts Association in Santa Barbara, Elmer F. Bennett, Undersecretary of the Department of the Interior, stated:

"The position of the Secretary of the Interior is clear. He does not propose to request funds for Federal construction of the Trinity power facilities."

He made it clear also that the Eisenhower Administration plans to continue its rear-gaurd fight for approval of the so-called partnership deal whereby the power generation facilities at Trinity would be turned over to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

And this notwithstanding the fact such legislation failed to budge out of committee in the last session of Congress and Bennett admits:

"In the coming year it will be even more difficult to obtain such legislation."

Seldom has a statement so inconsiderate of the public welfare been made by a high public official.

If the generators at Trinity are to be ready to turn when falling water is available, a start must be made this year on the powerplant.

Each year the construction of the plant is delayed means the loss of millions of dollars in potential revenue for the Federal Treasury from the sale of electricity.

And yet, by Bennett's admission, the Administration is willing to sacrifice this revenue to continue its fight for partnership, which he concedes has little chance to succeed.

From what Bennett says it is plain the Administration has no intention of including funds in the budget for Federal construction of the Trinity power facilities.

The Trinity Project Act provides for a federally built plant.

If the Administration, in its obeisance to the private power company, fails to carry out this mandate, then Congress on its own should make funds available and thus end this improvident nonsense.

The Views of the Supreme Court on Integration and Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column appearing in the December 1958 issue of Farm and Ranch magazine signed by Tom Anderson. The article is entitled "Straight Talk" and deals with the views of the Supreme Court on integration and civil rights.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRAIGHT TALK

The SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LIFERS: Just because President Roosevelt vilified the Supreme Court is no excuse for the common man to. After all, by rewriting the Constitution to suit modern life you are saving the people all the time, trouble, and expense of having to amend the Constitution.

The reactionaries who have to be pulled into the 20th century dragging their feet and clutching the Constitution to their breasts naturally can't understand you fellows. They're used to having judges on the Court. They don't realize that human values are what count today—not law—and that you Justices were appointed because of your social, economic, and political backgrounds and ambitions. How could you make America over if you were tied down to the rulings of past Courts, the laws of Congress, or that ancient Constitution?

You threw out the convictions of 14 California Communists; you ruled against firing a Government worker suspected of being a security risk; you turned loose a dope peddler because the Government agent who sold the stuff to him had to remain anonymous so he could trap other citizens; like good sports you decreed that FBI files must be opened to criminal or Communist when the contents of those files are being used to prosecute him; you ruled that past membership in the Communist Party is not a bar to the practice of law; you released three men who harbored a convicted and fugitive Communist leader because the FBI agents raided the house without a warrant; you held the Justice Department can't bar Communist activity by an alien who is under a deportation order; you destroyed the right of States to try Communists on sedition laws, saying all sedition cases must be tried by the Federal Government only. Betcha you can turn Communists loose faster'n J. Edgar Hoover can lock 'em up.

Since 1932 the Court has departed from decisions previously rendered on 35 occasions, whereas there had been only 29 such reversals in the entire history of the Court before 1932. So the recent law of the land is sorta like a movie actress' hair—whatever suits the mood and the occasion. The Constitution is your hula hoop to be played with according to your fancy.

Can't you make the States righters realize that schools and things must be federalized if we are to compete with Russian schools and things? Like the Kremlin, you must make all States under your domination conform to whatever national educational and social standards in your great wisdom you deem best for the world and us. Back when States and communities were free to run the schools any way they wanted to, they had little one-room schoolhouses where the only thing red was the schoolhouse itself and where about all they had worth having was freedom—and, of course, that's out of date now.

Let's not make the same mistake on integration and civil rights that we made on prohibition. Just because the people didn't want prohibition and it couldn't be enforced, Congress repealed it. But everybody knows people just can't drink equally, although many do separately. Separate but equal, you've ruled, is not equality. And all men are created equal as anybody who'll just look around him can plainly see. We must force togetherness in churches, parks, theaters, swimming pools, subdivisions, dancing classes, farm organizations, editorial staffs, boards of directors, garden clubs, fraternities, society pages, living rooms, and boudoirs. Twenty-four States have laws against intermarriage of whites and Negroes. Why don't you make that against the law of the land?

This head-on battle for power between the Federal and State Governments goes back to Noah. He had to bring into the ark "of every living thing of all flesh, two of every sort." If he had just forced integration on the boat, we wouldn't have all this trouble now. Just think of the possibilities: A woodpecker housed with a carrier pigeon might have produced a pigeonpecker that not only would deliver a message across a continent but would knock on the door when it got there.

The racists should take a more tolerant view of racial amalgamation (they call it mongrelization). When we're like Brazil, Cuba, and Puerto Rico everybody will be the same color. For amusement, we can have white-face musicals and books like "Old Beige Joe" and "Grey Beauty." There won't be any more Sammy Davis, Jr.'s, on TV, cause there won't be any more Sammy Davis, Jr.'s. Ain't that fabulous?

Isn't it unfair that citizens in some areas of the Nation do not have an equal opportunity to really mix with their colored brothers? Would you please pass a law requiring those little exclusive commuter towns around the big eastern cities to benefit by living with, going to school with, working with, and socializing with their share of Negroes? I am sure you'll agree that it's unmodern-American to let the Negroes be discriminated against by being forced on poor whites only. The Burning Tree and Augusta National Golf Clubs, the DAR and the Junior League, Princeton and Groton must be Little Rocked.

Aren't you worried about the clear and present danger that the southern diehards might really make a go of private segregated schools? Suppose Arkansas decided to refund to each student his or her per capita share of school tax money to be used to go to the school of his choice—couldn't you make a law of the land against that? Some pupils would choose an integrated school, some a white, some a Catholic, some a colored—what a horrible un-modern-American mess, freedom of choice.

Some people who recognize that the Supreme Court—not the Constitution—is the law of the land, say that integration is inevitable, we might as well accept it. Reactionaries say a people integrated against their will is a people unintegrated still. Abraham Lincoln said "To sin by silence when they should protest, makes cowards of men." But Abe lived a long time ago, before the Supreme Court chamber became a mixing mortar—which is a bowl in which the ingredients are broken, crushed, and ground together—with all deliberate speed.

TOM ANDERSON.

The Commuter Problem of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have heard from Mayor Thomas T. Taber, of Madison, N.J., and Mayor James M. Henderson, of Chatham, N.J., two leaders of a committee of mayors in Morris County which has been devoting a good deal of time to a study of the commuter problem in New Jersey.

I would bring to the attention of the Congress proposals developed by Mayor Taber and his committee. The program as outlined sets forth thoughtful suggestions of what might be done to preserve this indispensable service by the railroads, by government at all levels, and by an interested public.

The Newark Evening News has now commented on the efforts of the committee, applauding the industry and initiative of the mayors. The commuter problem is a matter of urgency and great importance to our people, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mayor Henderson, the suggestions of Mayor Taber and his committee, and the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter, suggestions, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOROUGH OF CHATHAM,
Morris County, N. J., January 6, 1959.

The Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: As you doubtless know, the passenger service situation with the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad has rapidly worsened to the point where its president threatens discontinuance during 1959.

I know you are, and have been, actively interested in the matter and in trying to arrange some remedy so that this catastrophe would not fall upon the many thousands of commuters who use its service to and from their places of business employment.

The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad is currently seeking permission to discontinue 42 suburban passenger trains in New Jersey and, while it does not affect our Morristown line, in which I am most principally concerned, it does have implications or forebodings of what lies ahead with Mr. Shoemaker's threat.

A number of we mayors in Morris County have gotten together on a number of occasions and discussed all phases of the problem as well as possible solutions. The chairman of our group, Mayor Taber, of Madison, has gotten what I consider as some practical remedies on what could be done in preserving this indispensible service, and I felt that particularly those as to what Congress could do would be of pointed interest to you. Personally, I think all of the suggestions make sense, and I hope that it may be feasible to put into effect at least the most significant ones.

Your thoughts on this will be greatly appreciated as well as any other comment on what has been developed on the railroad situation in Washington.

With personal regards and all good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES M. HENDERSON.

SUGGESTIONS FOR KEEPING NEW JERSEY RAILROADS IN THE SUBURBAN PASSENGER BUSINESS

(By Mayor Thomas T. Taber, Madison, N.J.)

Specific, practical proposals as to how to provide immediate and reasonable financial relief to New Jersey railroads, and to help them out of the "slough of despondency" in which they wallow, are now required. As endless talk continues without any constructive action resulting from it, railroads continue to take off trains, and further downgrade their passenger train service—and the end is not in sight.

There are two basic railroad problems. The immediate problem is that of keeping existing trains running without further deterioration of service, until the second, less-acute problem can be solved. This is equally important, however, since it relates to the future operations, coordination, and improvement of all railroad and other public transportation service in the metropolitan area, including the determination of how and by whom it shall be provided.

Although the Congress of the United States and the New Jersey State Legislature must provide the basic relief required, the railroads must show some interest in helping themselves and promptly divest themselves of the dubious distinction of being the world's worst merchandisers. All parties directly involved, or otherwise interested in the railroad problem share a common responsibility to do their part in achieving by cooperative effort, results which will be fair to all concerned and in the public interest. Everyone must contribute something—now—toward keeping the existing service operating.

The end of the road has been reached on fare increases, since the present fares are at their peak for the service rendered. Each time an additional increase is sought to bring in more revenue, more customers desert the railroad so the net gain in revenue is less than expected. More trains are then taken off to reduce expenses, and with poorer service more passengers leave the railroad—so a further fare increase is sought—further continuing the deadly, vicious cycle.

The suggestions which follow are "thought starters" and certainly can be improved or supplemented, but since they do provide a means for starting constructive action at all levels, they are preferable to the existing lack of specific, practical ideas.

WHAT CONGRESS COULD DO

1. Amend the Transportation Act of 1958 to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider and protect the public interest and human rights when interstate abandonments are applied for. Return responsibility for permitting intrastate abandonments of service or trackage to State regulatory bodies, which are closer to public local needs than the ICC.

2. Require a review of all abandonments of service, facilities, or trackage by the Department of Defense to determine if the requested abandonment will impair national or civilian defense.

3. If national or civilian defense requires the maintenance of railroad service, equipment, or facilities, a suitable cash payment for the standby service should be made to the railroads concerned and be charged against the national defense budget.

4. Reduce all foreign railroad aid programs at least 50 percent, and make this sum available for the rehabilitation of such of our railroads as need help. So far we have given over a half billion dollars to foreign railroads, and if these railroads are important certainly ours are even more so.

5. Require the Post Office Department to use railroad service whenever practical to do so.

6. Eliminate all types of subsidies now granted to airlines, steamship, or other transportation companies, or grant equal amounts, and under the same conditions, to the railroads.

7. Merge the Railroad Retirement and Social Security Acts so that railroad contributions will be the same as those paid by other forms of transportation, instead of being double.

8. Permit railroads to provide contract, incentive, or experimental rates so that they may be better enabled to attract and compete for traffic. If a railroad wants to try lower rates, do not permit a competitor to block such action, if the proposed lower rate is expected to return a profit to the railroad.

9. Prohibit consolidations or mergers of railroads, unless it is proven that the public will benefit to a reasonable degree by such action.

10. Allocate 10 percent of the funds for the Federal roadbuilding program for low-cost long-term loans to railroads needing funds for capital improvements having an estimated minimum useful life of 20 years.

11. Repeal the wartime 10-percent tax on passenger transportation so as to encourage the use of public, instead of private, transportation.

WHAT THE STATE LEGISLATURE COULD DO

1. Immediately reduce assessments standing against all railroad property in the State by 25 percent; and then make a further reduction of 25 percent in the assessment of passenger equipment, facilities, structures, and property.

2. Levy some appropriate form of franchise, gross receipts, business, user, or other type of tax against the operations, activities, and properties of the Port of New York Authority in New Jersey, and distribute the proceeds of such tax among the counties and municipalities which would lose the most revenue through reduced railroad assessments. (There appears to be no good reason why the Port of New York Authority cannot contribute financially to the problem, since their activities and facilities have been the principal cause of the railroads' loss of passengers.)

3. Seek a new basis for railroad taxation in the State, whereby a substantial percentage of the total levied will be based on gross or net earnings within the State of New Jersey.

4. Increase the scope of activities of the rate counsel in the public utilities commission to serve as a public defender in all transportation operating matters brought before the board.

5. Prohibit issuance of all free passes for travel within New Jersey, except to bona fide railroad workers whose duties require them to travel and work over the railroad. No complimentary passes to be issued to other railroads and steamship lines, nor any pass to be used for commuting to and from work.

6. Create a nonpartisan joint transportation committee of the State legislature, to be charged with the responsibility for studying, coordinating, and improving all public passenger transportation media within the State, and for working with all organized rail transportation groups.

7. Instruct the Port of New York Authority to postpone all new major projects, until the railroad transportation problems have been satisfactorily solved, and require the Port of New York Authority to do its part in achieving coordinated and improved rapid transit in the New York metropolitan area of New Jersey.

WHAT THE COUNTIES COULD DO

1. The board of chosen freeholders to create a county railroad transportation committee, made up of municipal mayors and qualified interested citizens; or designate a presently-organized and efficiency-functioning group to represent the county, to serve an official watch-dog committee for the entire country. This committee should investigate, study, and report to the board of freeholders on all railroad service matters affecting the county as a whole, or any of its municipalities.

WHAT MUNICIPALITIES COULD DO

1. Encourage the greater use of railroad service, both passenger and freight.

2. Work with the railroads to improve commuter parking facilities.

3. Participate in and support the work of the county railroad transportation committee.

WHAT COMMUNITIES CAN DO

1. Write to Congressmen and State legislators urging that immediate action be taken to preserve existing railroad transportation facilities and service, as being in the public interest as well as that of national security and civilian defense. Urge friends to write such letters and do so promptly.

2. If possible to do so, commute by train instead of private car, in good weather as well as during periods when highway travel is hazardous.

3. Encourage the use of passenger-train service, and help to build up patronage, especially on the offpeak hour trains.

WHAT RAILROAD BROTHERHOODS COULD DO

1. Work with the railroads to achieve better utilization of personnel; to eliminate waste; to achieve more productivity per worker; and to eliminate unnecessary of "featherbedding" jobs.

2. Seek ways of improving service; improving public relations; raising employee morale; increasing pride in the railroad; and obtaining more traffic for the line.

3. Purchase stock of the railroad, so that there will be an added interest in it. If the employees purchased enough stock they might be able to have representation on the board of directors, and thus have a voice in the setting of policy.

WHAT THE RAILROADS COULD DO

1. Change present retrogressive policies and thinking to a constructive determination to improve the service, and build up patronage for the line. Work to divest themselves of the distinction of being the world's worst merchandisers of the service they offer for sale.

2. Establish and maintain good public and employee relations. Try to make friends for the railroad; raise employee morale, and restore pride in the line.

3. Encourage freight and passenger traffic men to seek ways and means of improving service; and give them bonuses based on the amount of new business they obtain for the railroad.

4. Subordinating the operating department to the traffic department. Require the operating department to furnish service as requested by traffic—which then has the responsibility of making it pay. Require prior approval of traffic department before operating department can downgrade or eliminate any service, equipment, or facilities. Devote the same amount of time and effort to the

acquisition of new business as is devoted to the cutting of expenses.

5. Confer periodically with county railroad transportation committees, or other recognized organizations interested in the subject, and always before initiating any formal action which could have a deleterious effect on the service to any municipality. Seek, consider, and try to adopt all good practical constructive suggestions, and regardless of the source of such suggestions.

6. Try to improve and build up traffic through coordination with bus lines, Newark city subway, etc., in an effort to have such services complement, rather than compete with, the railroad service.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Jan. 12, 1959]

MAYOR TABER'S PLAN

Mayor Taber, of Madison, has offered 34 suggestions which he thinks would help preserve railroad commuter service in New Jersey.

They would require action by Federal, State, county, and municipal governments, by the railroads themselves, the railroad brotherhoods and the commuters. They embrace tax relief and subsidy, more progressive management, more labor productivity and better coordination of public transport.

Some of Mayor Taber's proposals are practicable, some are debatable. He would tax the facilities of the Port of New York Authority to compensate for railroad tax reduction. This would be like taxing the New Jersey Turnpike or the Brooklyn Bridge. He would use 10 percent of the Federal highway fund for railroad improvement loans. This fund is being raised by a gasoline tax on motor vehicle owners, who will find it hard to understand why they should help subsidize those who prefer to travel by rail.

But to pursue a critical analysis of Mayor Taber's program would be to obscure its valid claim to consideration. It represents a thoughtful official's earnest effort to stimulate interest in a critical situation and it accurately describes the dimensions of the problem.

Mayor Taber makes a modest presentation. He refers to his suggestions only as "thought starters" and offers them as a basis for continuing constructive action.

On this basis, his plan deserves attention. The more people who start worrying about what is happening to local railroad service, the sooner we can hope for a solution.

The Fight Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Arthur Krock entitled "A New Campaign Against a Tough Foe," appearing in the January 13 issue of the New York Times.

Mr. Krock, taking note of the President's expressed determination to halt the rising cycle of inflation, writes most penetratingly of the difficulties involved and candidly outlines the problems which must be met if inflation is to be halted. Mr. Krock echoes the point I have been making for some time that the inflationary pressures of unbalanced budgets and deficit spending must be brought home to people by examples related to the family budget. The stability of our dollar, now viewed with some concern by leading economists, depends on a public awakening to fiscal problems and the dangers of inflation.

Mr. Krock has performed a distinct public service in his clear analysis, and his article should be distributed as widely as possible.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW CAMPAIGN AGAINST A TOUGH FOE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 12.—The forecast that the President had decided to engage in house-to-house fighting against the rising cycle of inflation began as a reliable report in the press, is now semiofficial and may become official when the President speaks Wednesday to the National Press Club. But experience must now have proved to the General that a commando tactic is necessary if he is to turn the tide against the principal, enduring threat to national solvency and the stability of the dollar.

It is predicted that the President will attempt to impress this threat upon the people by homely household examples of increases in the cost of living that have followed rising costs of production. These are statistics, readily available in Government reports, which cannot be successfully assailed as politically partisan or slanted to promote the interest of special economic groups. They are well supported by analyses from private sources of equally good reputation. They have been reflected in the budgets of every individual American. If there is any method by which the people can be roused from their apathy toward unbalanced Government budgets and the endless upward cycle of production costs, this is the method. And only the President can furnish the necessary leadership.

But he cannot win this most difficult of his battles unless he strikes at his targets with the force and the constancy he employed in the military field. Special groups already are massed against him, and these are fortified by economists of great diversionary skill and by Members of Congress who are debtors to these groups for support at the polls. And because of the national doubt raised by sincere and informed critics that the President can balance the national budget without sacrificing an adequate defense, he must persuade the public he can.

He will be required to assert all his personal prestige and the unmatched prestige of his great office to accomplish the task he is reported now to have undertaken with a resolution he had not shown on some other occasions. And his cause cannot be won merely by illustrations of inflation that citizens can plainly recognize in their own economic experience.

WHAT CANNOT BE DENIED

The labor unions, their economists and their political allies deny that the unending cycle of wage increases is a root cause of the steady increases in the cost of living. But they cannot deny that constant rises have been contemporaneous in the cost of the services, rents, and food which take the largest slices of personal earnings. If this time relation can be demonstrated by facts of common experience, the burden of proof will fall on those who contend that it is a mere coincidence, the product of other causes. People who live in every street and on every country lane in the United States have had word to the contrary from the mechanic, the grocer, the butcher, etc. Each has explained his markup was due to higher costs of the producer (both of raw and fabricated materials), who in these instances has just had his own costs increased by rises in the pay of his labor.

Responsive to this same trend, the Federal Government has intensified its search for tax revenues, and maintains high tax levels because it is the largest buyer in the market and its expenses have gone up accordingly.

If the President plans, as some have forecast, to show how inexorably this inflation takes effect on the household budget, he can easily make the demonstration. But to arrest inflation he will have to specify the causes, with evidence that will bring popular support for correctives he may have in mind. And this would mean open political warfare against strong forces entrenched in politics and in the economy: labor unions which use their special legal immunities, and picket lines aided by deliberately lax enforcers of law and order, to compel employer submission in so-called collective bargaining; employers who make "sweetheart" contracts and pass the unwarranted increases on to the public; legislative wasters and the same breed in the executive establishment.

Also, in the anti-inflationary steps he proposes, the President must convince the people that he knows best what is required for the maximum military security obtainable and will provide it.

St. George never fought a fiercer dragon with more heads. But St. George's swing had followthrough.

Fallacies, Foibles, and Failures in the Halls of the Mighty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the economic fallacies, foibles, and failures of those in the seats of power in America were brilliantly dissected at the recent annual meeting of the American Economic Association, in Chicago, late last month. Yesterday, Mr. Bernard Nossiter, of the Washington Post and Times Herald, wrote a revealing and entertaining comment on what some of the top professional economists think of what has been going on in the halls of the mighty in America. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Heresy in Economics" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERESY IN ECONOMICS—LACK OF REVERENCE APPEARS GENERAL

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

If President Eisenhower, Budget Director Maurice H. Stans, Commerce Secretary Lewis L. Strauss, and Treasury Secretary Robert B. Anderson had gone to Chicago over Christmas week, they would have been mighty upset.

For there, the American Economic Association held its annual meeting. And this normally sedate academic body found heresy running rampant in the ranks. As Prof. Ben W. Lewis, of Oberlin College observed in a paper, "Recent years have witnessed the display of some questionable manners toward persons in High Places."

The capitalization is the professor's own. He was talking about the economic behavior of the citizenry—"When in due course we are admonished in the name of our way of life to stem the flood of inflation by spending less than we want to spend, we wave our checkbooks; and when we are admonished to break the bonds of recession by spending more than we are inclined to spend, we sit on our hands. All of this is very disrespectful to those in high places and may very well lead to dire consequences."

But his comments about a lack of reverence were equally applicable to his fellow sages.

For example, Robert J. Lampman of the respectable National Bureau of Economic Research was making statistical hash out of the "People's capitalism" idea. His complicated tables boiled down to findings that—

In 1953 the wealthiest 1 percent of the population owned about 30 percent of all wealth, at least 90 percent of all common stocks and virtually all State and local government and corporate bonds.

The richest group increased its share of all stocks from 70 percent in 1949, 53 percent in 1929, and 61 percent in 1922. However, the top group's holdings of all assets did decrease some from 1922, thanks to the widespread ownership of consumer goods (like TV's, autos, refrigerators and the like).

John Blair, the iconoclastic thinker for the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, was almost as disturbing. He concluded that no matter what, prices in the big concentrated industries (oil, steel, autos, aluminum and others) go up.

In depression, Blair figured, the producers cut output and hold prices steady because they figure a reduction won't generate enough offsetting extra demand; in prosperity, they go up for obvious reasons, although not as much as in highly competitive industries; in between times, like now, when plants are running well under capacity they still go up.

This, Blair contends, results from: a cost push by big unions seeking higher wages; the rising costs of nonprice competition (money spent on advertising to make similarly priced products seem different and model changeovers to make similarly priced items actually different); the drive by industrial giants like General Motors and United States Steel to earn a "target" rate of return on their investment (so that when demand falls, prices have to be increased to hit the "target" with a smaller output); and the fear by the lesser giants—Ford, Bethlehem—that if they don't raise prices to meet the leaders, the leaders will drop back to meet them and nobody will win.

Another Professor Lewis, John P. of Indiana University, said this is nothing to get very upset about.

"We are not wrestling with sin," the professor said, but "a plodding inflation" that stems from the nature of our economic institutions. He is much worried about the concentrations of power that are flowing to giant companies and unions. He wants some device to make their wage and price decisions more accountable to the general public.

The antitrust approach, he concludes, is a waste of time. He suggests some form of Government intervention before the key price-wage decisions are made. Lewis (John P.) warns against Government's trying direct orders, since the producer groups are political as well as economic power centers and the Government is in some respects an agent confronting its political superiors.

Lewis (Ben W.) also takes a dim view of antitrust, or making little ones out of big ones, as politically absurd and historically fantastic. "Bigness is here to stay," he observes, and we are being taught to love it.

He says this of the large corporations: "Tutored by its attorneys, bathed, barbered and cosmeticised by Madison Avenue, nourished and sanctified by war and cold war, and enthroned by public opinion, which sees only 'goodness' in bigness that is well mannered and well behaved, bigness exhibits the supreme confidence and gracious assurance that bespeak stature, status, and a clear conscience. Bigness was once the bad boy in Sunday school; now it sits in the vestry. It may not yet have acquired a full-sized soul, but the contract has been let and the press has been alerted."

The trouble with these fellows, an orthodox economist might say, is that they don't tend to their knitting. They are squeezing political science, sociology, psychology, empiricism, and all kinds of alien thought into what used to be a nice, specialized little discipline. In the good old days, our man might say, economists talked only to economists and nobody else either listened or understood what they were saying.

Asians Lead Among Foreign Students in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for the 1957–58 academic year there were 43,391 foreign students pursuing courses of education in United States colleges and universities among whom the greatest number were from the Far East. This number contrasts with the 1,099 students from the non-Communist world who are now studying in the Soviet Union and other nations of the Communist bloc. While the figure for the United States is the largest number in our history, the Soviet bloc can advance a similar boast, having doubled the number of free-world students from the previous year. The greater part of this increase is in students from underdevleoped areas. This is indeed a war for men's minds in which the Soviets are bending every effort.

It is also of interest that today there are 22 Americans studying in the U.S.S.R. while 17 Soviet citizens are in U.S. universities.

As the students of today are the leaders of tomorrow, it is encouraging to note the large proportion of young people from the Far East enjoying an American education. These students are following in the steps of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee, and Kwame Nkrumah, all of whom received American educations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the September 16, 1958, issue of the Asian Student detailing the facts concerning the great number of young people from the Far East studying here. It tells an important story of our efforts in preserving the spirit of freedom and free institutions throughout the world:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAR EAST SENT MOST STUDENTS IN 1957–8

During the past academic year a total of 43,391 foreign students—the largest number in history—were studying in the United States and the greatest number of these came from the Far East, according to a report of the Institute of International Education. The previous record was 40,666 in the 1956–57 academic year.

These 43,391 students and scholars attending 1,801 schools were from 145 countries and territories.

By individual countries, Canada led the group with 5,271 students. Among the top 10 countries sending students to U.S. schools, Nationalist China was second with 3,230, India third with 2,589, Korea fourth with 2,404, Japan fifth with 2,017, and the Philippines sixth with 1,882.

TOP 10 COUNTRIES

The rest of the top 10 were Iran, 7th, 1,478; Greece, 8th, 1,157; Cuba, 9th, 1,046; and the United Kingdom, 10th, 982.

Setting a record for the same year was also the number of physicians studying in the United States, with 7,622 compared to 6,741 of the previous year. The Philippines headed the list with 1,598 medical students, Turkey was second with 587, followed by Canada, 535; Mexico, 500; Germany, 319; Korea, 313; Greece, 289; Iran, 279; Japan, 275; and Italy, 230.

An analysis of the IIE report shows that the typical foreign student in the United States in the year 1957–58 was from the Far East and was more likely to be an engineering major than anything else. The number of engineering students was largest with 4,881, followed by that of the social sciences majors with 2,289.

MEN OUTNUMBER WOMEN

Men students from foreign countries outnumbered women 3 to 1. An exception was the Philippines which sent more women than men to U.S. schools.

Among the American institutions, the University of California had the largest foreign student population (1,662), the largest number of foreign faculty members on its staff (129), and the largest number of its own faculty abroad (173).

OWN FUNDS

The IIE report also shows that most of the foreign students last year studied in the United States on their own funds, not on scholarships.

When they were asked for the first time if they would be interested in employment after graduation with an overseas branch of a U.S. corporation, more than 35 percent of the foreign students said they would. Almost half of these were engineering majors and approximately a third were from the Far East.

Boys Work To Improve Themselves and Their Community in Red Cross Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, young people traditionally form clubs—usually centered around a packing box clubhouse and often lasting for only a week or two, with no particular purpose.

There are, however, some young peoples organizations which constructively

channel the energy and enthusiasm of youngsters into activities which benefit both the participants and the community. To name a few, there are the Boy and Girl Scouts, YMCA and YWCA, Campfire Girls, Junior Achievement, 4-H clubs, groups sponsored by various churches and civic organizations, and several others.

The activities of seven young men, ranging in age from 7 to 11, in Corpus Christi, Tex., illustrate how a great many of our Nation's young people are seriously working at ways to improve both themselves and their community.

They formed a club, but it had a definite purpose—work with first aid and safety. Under the guidance of wise and understanding parents such as Dr. Charles D. Dixon and Mrs. A. S. Jones, and with the help of other interested adult leaders such as Mrs. Martina Florey of the American Red Cross, the boys began last summer to seriously study first aid and to work in behalf of safety. They have been at it ever since.

Their activities recently came to the attention of a Corpus Christi newspaper reporter, Miss Margaret Ramage, who is noted for her interest in and support of young people's activities.

Mr. President, as a mark of respect and esteem for these fine young men, their parents and leaders, and for all such young people's organizations who labor to improve our Nation's youth, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, Miss Ramage's article on Red Cross Patrol 1, which appeared in the Corpus Christi Caller-Times for Sunday, January 11, 1959, under the heading: "Seven Boys Make Serious Business of Rescue Work."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED CROSS PATROL 1—SEVEN BOYS MAKE SERIOUS BUSINESS OF RESCUE WORK

(By Margaret Ramage)

One of the busiest first-aid stations in town is located at 6050 Rio Vista.

There seven members of Red Cross Patrol 1 study and demonstrate first-aid procedures during after-school hours on week ends and vacations.

When near disaster struck in the form of a late December rainstorm, Patrol 1 was on hand to direct traffic on South Alameda.

Commanding this station are seven boys who are active members of the Junior Red Cross at Montclair School. They range in age from 7 to 11.

Headquarters is located at the home of the president, Bobby Dixon, 11, an his brothers, Tommy, 8, and Chalmers (Chuckie), 7.

Vice president is Armnod (Doc) Jones, and secretary is Mike Lee, 10. Other members are Scotty Thompson and Joe McComb, both 11.

FATHER IS DOCTOR

Fortunately, the Dixon boys' father is Dr. Charles D. Dixon, medical director at Reynolds Metals Corp. This gives the headquarters a larger than usual amount of first-aid supplies.

The boys have a supply table stocked with bandages, tongue-depressers, cotton and other items, plus a stethoscope and other larger pieces of apparatus.

Later Dr. Dixon added an oxygen tank and showed the boys how it works.

Most of their other equipment came from Mrs. Martina Florey, director of the Junior Red Cross, at the Red Cross office, 1116 Laredo.

The youngsters actually started "on a shoestring," or on one bandage, as a Dixon boy explained.

It was after Little League season ended. Midsummer days were long. Then one of the Dixons cut a finger.

The doctor-father bound up the finger, to the intent interest of the patient's brothers and the neighborhood ex-little leaguers.

ASKED FOR SUPPLIES

Within a few days the boys composed a long letter to the Junior Red Cross, expressing their interest in first aid and asking for Red Cross supplies.

"It was only natural," casually explains Doc Jones, pointing out that all patrol 1 members gained initial experience in school.

Doc is Montclair representative to the elementary chapterwide council. Mike is vice president of the Montclair Junior Red Cross chapter.

The downtown office immediately dispatched first-aid books, badges, posters, and some equipment.

Next came purchase of war surplus Red Cross helmets.

Mrs. A. S. Jones, Doc's mother, made the boys a large flag. ("The red satin came from my sister's sash," confided Doc.)

All of the equipment and supplies were arranged in a small aluminum house in the backyard, formerly used as a playroom.

Sometimes the sessions are moved into the small apartment which the three Dixon members and their older brother, Jimmy, 15, share at one end of the main house, which is in a wooded area at the end of Rio Vista.

When Dr. Dixon saw that Red Cross Patrol 1 appeared to be a stable organization, he started contributing medical supplies.

STRICT ORDER OF BUSINESS

The order of business is strict. One patrol member reads aloud a lesson from the first-aid book, such as treatment for shock.

After a period for study, they put the lesson into practical demonstration, by role playing.

One member is the victim, while another finds his pulse and ascertains if his forehead, nose and chin are pale. He is stretched out and pillows placed beneath him, so that his head may be lowered.

If it is cold weather, a blanket is placed over the patient, in warmer weather, under him.

Red Cross Patrol 1 hopes to continue its work indefinitely. During the holidays members distributed safety posters to nearby stores and plan to help out where necessary and possible throughout 1959.

Effect of Recent Court Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, December 17, 1958. In this editorial some very timely comments are made upon the effect of recent court decisions.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AND THEY ALL GET OFF

Abram Flaxer, once head of a Government employees' union booted out of the CIO for being pro-Communist and one of a series of witnesses who took the fifth amendment rather than deny or affirm questions as to his Communist activity, has been acquitted by the Supreme Court.

Mr. Flaxer had been convicted of contempt of a House committee for refusing to produce records under subpena. The High Court once sent his case back for a second look, but the lower courts again upheld the conviction.

And Monday the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled out fingerprints as evidence in a robbery case because the man who was tried and convicted by a jury had been arrested and fingerprinted without just cause.

In another case, the High Court, with only Justice Tom Clark dissenting, held that it is only one crime if a man shoots once and wounds two persons. Suppose he killed them both. With two dead bodies, would there be only one homicide?

We are not disposed to nit-pick these or numerous other related cases of recent months. Although, these judgments offer ample opportunity for criticism.

What is disturbing is the trend of court decrees in criminal and subversive cases. A rapist was freed, after conviction by a jury, because the court thought he had been detained too long before arraignment. Leftists in several contempt of Congress cases have been excused on the theory they didn't understand the purpose of congressional investigations.

It seems to us that in cases of this type the chief question is the question of guilt. In most of these decisions guilt has been an incidental issue. Technical questions of procedure have prevailed.

Convictions have been upset because smart and persistent lawyers have been able to pick flaws in the process, not necessarily in the evidence. Which makes us think something is amiss somewhere—and it ought to be corrected.

Defendants are entitled to every protection against rigged or unfounded prosecution. But the public is entitled to protection from the guilty, too.

Item Veto Power Is Desirable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, for many years the Presidents of the United States have been seeking the item veto power from Congress. President Eisenhower again asked for such power in his recent message before both Houses of Congress, but, in view of more newsworthy statements by the President, this request received little mention in the newspapers.

In South Carolina, the Governor does have the authority to veto separate items in bills. During my term as Governor, I found it most helpful to veto certain items in bills which otherwise were considered sound pieces of legislation. As a result of this experience, I feel that we

should take some action to carry out President Eisenhower's recommendation for the item veto.

An outstanding summation of my sentiments is presented by the editor of the Greenville News in an editorial published in the January 15 edition of that publication. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Item Veto Power Is Desirable," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITEM-VETO POWER IS MOST DESIRABLE

In his annual state of the Union message, President Eisenhoer again asked Congress to give the Chief Executive the power to veto individual and separate items in bills presented to him for signing into law or rejection acording to the constitutional procedure.

It attracted far less attention than it deserves.

Especially with respect to the matter of balancing the budget and keeping Federal spending in line with actual needs, this could easily be the most important suggestion the President made to Congress. It would work this way:

Under the present law, the President must either accept or reject in their entirety bills passed by Congress. He cannot by the exercise of the veto, correct mistakes or eliminate appropriations which even Congress itself, on second thought, may recognize or find unnecessary or undesirable.

If he finds a single item completely obnoxious or unacceptable, he must veto the whole bill. Congress can either override the veto by a two-thirds vote, or start over and draft and enact a new bill.

Unfortunately, the bills most often laden with improper appropriations and provisions are enacted too late in the sessions for this kind of action to be taken.

Granting of the so-called item-veto power would make it possible for the President to reject undesirable portions of certain bills without jeopardizing matter that both he and the majority of Congress consider sound and desirable.

Again we note that the Governor of South Carolina has the item-veto power, and every Governor holding office in our time has used it with good effect and, more often than not, to the liking of both the public and a majority of the members of the general assembly. It has happened many times that members of the general assembly actually have asked the Governor to veto certain items which, on reflection, they themselves had decided were unwise.

The item veto power in the hands of the President would be especially valuable in dealing with appropriations bills. Take the annual rivers and harbors bill, for instance. This is the traditional and often rather smelly "pork barrel bill" in which logrolling Senators and Representatives make their grabs for "projects" for their people back home at the public expense. These bills, of course, provide for necessary functions and for creating essential projects. But they also contain much matter that should be eliminated in the public interest.

With the item veto power, the President could cull out the unnecessary and foolish from the necessary and wise. In most instances it would meet with congressional approval, for members of Congress often vote for things for political reasons that they know are not proper. In many such instances they would be glad to see a veto of such items upheld.

Mr. Eisenhower has suggested before that Congr ss grant the item veto power. Mr. Truman did so before him, and so did the late Mr. Roosevelt. As a matter of fact, if the President in his day had been able to exercise the item veto, the famous split between Mr. Roosevelt and the late Senator and Vice President Alben Barkley probably could have been avoided.

During the war years, Mr. Roosevelt rejected in its entirety an appropriations bill because he could not approve certain portions of it. He sent it back with a blistering veto message. Mr. Barkley became very angry, and the process of orderly Government suffered in a time of crisis.

Congress can grant the item veto power. It should do so without delay—although it is most unlikely that a Democratic Congress will place such a tool in the hands of a Republican President.

Light in the Darkness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, while the blind do not possess sight they do possess vision. The Sunday New York Times of January 4, 1959, carried a touching interview with a 12-year-old blind child. As the boy cannot see color, he cannot comprehend the barriers men erect on account of color. Being sightless, he appreciates the worth of seeing; however, he places one attribute even higher—understanding. I commend the article to my colleagues, and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIGHT IN DARKNESS—12-YEAR-OLD BOY BLIND SINCE HIS BIRTH, WISHES MOST FOR WORLD UNDERSTANDING

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

On occasion profound lessons come from unusual sources.

The following is a verbatim transcription of a therapeutic interview with a blind child. The child was not allowed to continue in school because he was said to be out of touch with reality.

This is a record the patient did not know was being taken—the pure, stark expression of a brilliant soul struggling to find itself.

Here is what the therapist says of the patient:

"Bob is 12 years old. He has been blind since birth. He is a bright boy, eagerly interested in the wonders of the world around him—a world that he has experienced in his own way, but has never seen. He is interested in science—especially electronics. He reads evertyhing he can get under his curious fingertips. Bob has great potential. He is sensitive, intellectually gifted far beyond his years—and he desperately wants to find his place in the world."

In Bob's own words, here are some of the things he wonders about and believes in:

"There are so many things in this world that people could all reach out and touch and keep a part of them for their very own and spread it around for everyone. Not money—because money is only good for what it can do—only good if it is used to help. But people could reach out for kindness and fair play—and could spread it around for others.

"I've heard on the radio all this talk about integration in the schools. To give all children a chance to go to school together. And there seems to be such a fuss about it because some of the children are different. And I can't understand at all what this great difference is.

"They say it's their color. And what is color? I guess I am lucky that I cannot see differences in color because it seems to me that the kind of hate these people put in their minds must chase out all chance to grow in understanding."

SENSE OF DIRECTION

Another time he had this to say: "I noticed the other day when I had an earache and had cotton in one of my ears, that I was always veering to one side and bumping into the wall. I had not realized before how much I depend on my hearing—the sound of my step, the bounceback of the sound, to keep me in time with my sense of direction.

"Then, another time, I was walking down the hall and I passed a door and inside that other room was a lot of noise. So much noise that I lost all my cues—and I lost completely my sense of direction.

"It was an awful bottomless feeling. Afraid I'd bump into something. You never know whether you are going toward good things or toward trouble. Because you never know right off if it is something you like and need and want. Or something that is just in the way.

"That is why I would not kick it or blame it, or shove it aside. I would not make up my mind ahead of time, because if I did I could be so very wrong. I could destroy something that might be one of the most important and valuable aids to me. Destroy it in ignorance. Without giving either it or me a chance. That's like prejudice."

Another time he talked about the problems of keeping a sense of direction:

"I walked down the path toward the woods by the school. And all of a sudden a dog and another boy rushed by. They threw a branch of a tree in front of me. I was startled and I jumped back and fell into some bushes. When I untangled myself and got up on my feet I couldn't find the path. I couldn't tell which direction was which. I couldn't hear any telltale sounds as a guide.

"I called. Nobody answered. I was surrounded by silence and confusion. Then after a lot of trying and a lot of falls and scratches and bumps into the bushes, I heard the chimes on the old church, that is north of the school. I knew then where I was. And I got back all right. But—that awful feeling of not knowing where I was, which way to turn, which way to go. It was a terrible feeling.

REMEMBERS CAMPANELLA

"And suddenly I thought of Campy (Roy Campanella, former Brooklyn Dodger catcher). All of a sudden he finds himself paralyzed. All his life suddenly has to change. He can't turn around any more. He can't even walk.

"I asked myself would I rather be blind like I am or would I rather be flat on my back and paralyzed like Campy. I thought about it for a long, long time. I thought of how I felt when I fell in the bushes and couldn't tell where I was. I thought of the panicky fear when I didn't know which way to turn. I was asking myself which was worse. I always said there wasn't anything worse than being blind. Then I thought of Campy again.

"He had been a great ballplayer, one of the greatest. Now all of a sudden that was over. What was he thinking about now? Probably wondering what he would do now. Probably wondering which way he would turn. And I decided the worst thing that

can happen to a person isn't being blind or being paralyzed. The worst thing is to lose all sense of direction in your life. And feel that you haven't got anyplace to go."

Bob talked about his blindness one day. "I have often wondered what it must be like to see. I have never seen light. But if I have darkness around me all the time, I must learn to know that darkness. I think I do know it very well. Sometimes as a friend. Sometimes as an enemy.

"But then it isn't the darkness that I should blame. Because darkness can be either friend or enemy. If wishes could come true, I'd wish I could see. But if I only had one wish, I wouldn't waste it on wishing I could see. I'd wish instead that everybody could understand one another and how a person feels inside."

While endless debates go on in high places and political jockeying for position is the order of the day, here is the simple solution to the basic problem this confused strife-worn world faces in this new year.

Resolution Adopted by Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware at a meeting on Pulaski Day, October 12, 1958.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, Americans of Polish descent, are assembled at Pulaski Park, this 12th day of October A.D. 1958, under the auspices of the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware, and of the Delaware division of the Polish American Congress, to commemorate on this 179th anniversary the memory of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who gave his valor, courage, and his life to the American cause for liberty and independence.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski did not sacrifice his life in vain. Our founders had given a new order to the world based upon the principle that all rights came from God and were vested in the individual; that governments among men derived just powers from the consent of the governed, and that the importance of each person was over and above the importance of the state.

Whereas the great tragedy of today is that Poland and other nations enslaved behind the Iron Curtain in Central Eastern Europe were traditionally the most persistent enemies of communism and the most faithful friends of the United States; and

Whereas the record of our betrayal at Yalta, Teheran, and Geneva for hiding the facts on the Katyn Forest massacre, for permitting ourselves to be part of the betrayal of Korea, for neglecting our own troops and citizens in the dark prisons of Red China, Soviet Russia, and their captive nations, for our many sinful compromises with godless Russia, the darkest pages in our Nation's history is written; and

Whereas more than 100 years ago, the British historian, Lord Macauley, predicted that the United States would collapse because of weaknesses and evils allowed to develop within it. His dire propheay: "Your republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid to waste by barbarians in the 20th century as the Roman Empire was in the 5th: with this difference, that the enemies that ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and that your enemies will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions"; and

Whereas the apathy, indifference, and inner decoy, fostered by self-interest, a passion for soft living and neglect of the individual responsibility has opened the way to well-financed selfish minorities, pressure groups, and unscrupulous political machines dominating our Government's systems. These groups are responsible for the present situation of confusion, tension, discontent, and discord throughout our country, endangering our unity, creating differences among the American people, who are being exploited by the advocates of socialism, internationalism, and world government, and by the Communists and their followers, to lose faith in our Constitution, Bill of Rights, and in the essential wisdom of freemen; and

Whereas we who are assembled this day are greatly concerned with:

1. Recent decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court. These decisions have more than once made it harder and harder to cope with the underground activities of the Communist Party in the United States. Avowed Communists have been freed, the powers of Congress to investigate communism have been limited, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been forced to abandon prosecution of many cases, the law passed to deal with the communistic conspiracy has been rendered harmless. We have a right to ask whether these interpretations and decisions are in accord with the traditional American constitutional principle, that our Government is one of law and not of men.

2. Reverence for truth is giving way to compromise and expediency, even among those who should be guardians of the truth.

3. Our Government's concern is directed to communism abroad. It is time for our Government to concern itself about the communism here at home.

4. The American people's minds are being molded to believe that patriotism and national independence are bad words that should be systematically discredited.

5. Our Nation is presently confronted by the deadliest, most powerful, and ruthless enemy in its history, an enemy whom we have purposely made strong at a time when the leadership of our Nation was at its weakest.

6. Our Nation has lost its way because we have failed to fulfill our sacred duties as custodians of a great Christian heritage. We have tolerated crime and wrong doing. We have ignored numerous acts of treason. We have let ourselves rot and fall apart on the basic eternal truths.

Therefore, we, Americans of Polish descent assembled this day to honor and to pay respect to the memory of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, on this 179th anniversary of his death, pledge to become more vigilant in guarding our priceless heritage left to us by the first Poles that came to this country 350 years ago, by General Pulaski, Kosciuszko. Krzyzanowski and by thousands of others of our ancestry, to uphold the Government under the Constitution of the United States, the Bill of Rights, and our American way of life: Therefore be it further

Resolved, That to remain silent in the face of present dangers is to enhance communism and to lose our liberty. If we are to survive as a free people, we must reaffirm our loyalty to American traditions, institutions, fundamental principles, and upon a great profession of faith in God. We must reject the ideology of collectivism, the welfare state, and all forms of world government. Our sacred responsibility is to fight against communism in our country. Therein lies our salvation in any and every emergency: Therefore be it further

Resolved, That copies of the resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Secretary of State, Delaware's Representatives in the United States Congress, Governor of the State of Delaware, president of the Wilmington City Council.

CASIMIR CHETKOWSKI,
Chairman.

Attest:

VINCENT J. KOWALEWSKI,
Secretary.

Appointment of Roger W. Jones as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to go on record as saying that the appointment of Roger W. Jones as the new Chairman of the Civil Service Commission is a tremendous step in the direction of a strengthened Federal service and Government.

I have had the pleasure of working with Mr. Jones on occasions in the past and can say that his ability to cope with problems is exceptional.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the January 16 edition of the Washington Evening Star, entitled "Appointment of Jones To Head CSC Hailed."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPOINTMENT OF JONES TO HEAD CSC HAILED

(By Joseph Young)

Federal employee leaders and key Members of Congress alike are hailing the appointment of Careerman Roger W. Jones as the new Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

They feel it will bring new strength and prestige of the Commission, the entire Federal service and Government employees generally.

The formal nomination of Mr. Jones, whose selection was first disclosed in this column, is expected to be sent to the Senate early next week by President Eisenhower. Mr. Jones' confirmation is regarded as a certainty. He presently is Deputy Budget Director.

Mr. Jones, 50, will succeed Harris Ellsworth, who leaves March 1 to return to his business interests in Oregon. Mr. Ellsworth did a god job as Chairman under difficult circumstances.

However, Mr. Jones' appointment is expected to bring a new era to the CSC and Government personnel administration generally. As a long-time Federal career official who has devoted considerable time to personnel matters, Mr. Jones has definite ideas

for revising Government personnel policies and operations.

Perhaps the best indications of Mr. Jones' ability is that he has served with distinction in important jobs under three Presidents—Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower—and has won the coveted National Civil Service League award as one of the top civil service careerists in Government and the President's award last year for distinguished civilian service.

A registered Republican, Mr. Jones, of course, as a career employee, has never taken an active part in politics.

The Revolutionary Farm Upsurge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it can be said that "America's business is business"; it can also be added that America's business is also agriculture. The past year has been one of record crop production while there has been a diminution of farm acreage thus making for an unprecedented high yield per acre. In addition, per capita farm income is at an alltime high of $1,020. The article from the January 12 New York Times surveys the 20th century revolution in farming, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMING UPSURGE IS REVOLUTIONARY—11 PERCENT RISE IN OUTPUT LAID TO MORE EFFICIENCY AND RAIN IN DRY AREAS

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON.—"Crop Production, 1958 Annual Summary, Acreage, Yield, Production by States by American Farmers. Compiled by the Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Services, Crop Reporting Board. Free."

This 107-page document is filled with statistics. Except for six pages of summary it consists of long, detailed tables. The index starts with apples and ends with wheat. It covers every State. It is not impressively printed, being mimeographed without an illustration.

Yet it tells one of the great stories of this or any age. As the Crop Board said, in what seems to be an understatement, farm production registered a surprising surge in a single year, a gain of 11 percent above the record highs of 1948 and 1957.

THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-ONE MILLION ACRES HARVESTED

The index of yield an acre for 59 crops reported in the annual summary reached 143.1 on the basis of 1947–49 as 100. This was surprisingly higher than the record of 127 set in 1957, the Department said.

It was the fifth successive year in which the index had moved to a new high. The 1958 index also compared with 124 in 1956, 118.6 in 1955, and 109.2 in 1954. In 1929 the index was 84.

This surge came on the smallest acreage planted since 1918, an unusually high percentage of which was harvested. The total area harvested, 321 million acres, was slightly larger than that of 1957 and 1956 and, except for those 2 years, was the smallest since 1936.

The last year brought other important developments. The cattle cycle was cut to 2 years. Traditionally, it had been 3 years. The rebuilding of cattle herds began with the end of the drought, which gripped western cattle States for more than 5 years. Grazing land came back strong under some of the best growing conditions in years.

Historically, it has taken 3 years to reverse the downward trend in cattle, after a drought or other disaster reduces breeding stock. But this time pastures and grazing lands came back fast and the decline was reversed in 2 years. A part of this was attributed to increased efficiency in handling, breeding, and growing of livestock.

Agriculture demonstrated in 1958 that it was in one of the great revolutions of our time, as many politicians told farmers during the congressional campaign.

To some observers, 1958 forecast a new breed of farmers, as yields increased under the impetus of better seeds and expanding knowledge of cultivation methods. The family farm is not likely to disappear, but the families on farms will be experts in production and management.

In 1958, farm profits climbed about 20 percent, a healthy gain after the drop in 1957, but the prospect for 1959 is a slide of 5 to 10 percent as new surpluses mount. The indicated net income for 1958 is about $13 billion for the farm community, compared with $10,800 million in 1957. Cash receipts from marketing last year were $33 billion, a gain of about 12 percent.

For the first time, the average per capita income appeared to be above $1,000, probably about $1,020. Economists reported this was an important gain in the sense that it came from marketings, rather than from a decrease in the farm population, which rose slightly last year after drastic losses in the last decade.

However, the cost-price squeeze on farmers continued, and they stepped up their use of credit, as they should in 1959. This resulted from higher costs of production and increased investments in machinery.

Large yields were reported by the crop board. Corn, the major raw material for meat, milk and other dairy products, climbed even more last year than it did in 1957, when yields soared. The national corn average rose to about 52 bushels an acre, more than 4½ bushels above 1957's adjusted figure of about 47 bushels.

Wheat shot up to 27.3 bushels an acre, 5.6 bushels more than 1957 and nearly 10 bushels more to the acre than in the decade from 1947 to 1956.

The country's most serious surplus problem is in wheat. With this year's harvest, the Nation has sufficient wheat on hand to fill all domestic and export needs for the next 2 years without any further production.

The administration and Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson attributed the glut to outmoded, unrealistic Federal price support and control programs in which the Government has $2,240,389,619 invested. And this year's bumper output will add to the problem.

Mr. Benson's view has gained wide support but the annual crop summary also tells the story of a farm-productivity revolution, resulting from better seeds, better ways of making the seeds produce and better machinery.

A measure of the surplus problem may be seen in the percentage of production to which Federal price supports were extended in the last fiscal year through the Commodity Credit Corporation, the price support agency.

For example, price supports in the fiscal year ended last June 30, were extended to 52 percent of grain sorghum production; 32 percent of the cotton output; 27 percent of the wheat production, 33 percent of rye grown, 19 percent of soybeans, and 10 percent of corn.

The administration hopes to hold the line on farm spending, which last year pushed the agriculture budget to a record total of $6,400 million, but budget revisions in January are expected to push it higher.

Dick Meskill on Satellites and Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, these days of satellites and science can sometimes seem to offer a confusing picture of the future. To a person who confines his view to only one facet, the outlook can be frightening.

However, I feel many people fail to consider the other side of the picture. The scientific advances of our day have many more peaceful uses than otherwise.

I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article by Dick Meskill which appeared in the January 8, 1959, edition of the Alamo Messenger, the oldest and largest Catholic weekly in the Southwest, under the heading, "In the Shadow of San Fernando."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE SHADOW OF SAN FERNANDO

(By Dick Meskill)

When lunik hit the headlines, many people gnashed their teeth that Russia had again outstripped the United States in what had once been a near monopoly on technological advance. A few days before, we had heartily pounded ourselves on the back because of Atlas soaring around the heavens, and rightly so.

Even though the 350-pound payload in the Atlas was considerably less than the 1½-ton payload in Sputnik III, the fact that the entire Atlas missile, weighing nearly 8,000 pounds was guided into orbit, demonstrated our undoubted ability eventually to duplicate the astonishing feats of Russian technology.

Lunik, without the insertion of the "at", is a phenomenal feat, and we certainly would not wish to underestimate its importance. It is almost incomprehensible that man, with all his genius could place an artificial planet into the solar system. A Georgetown University physicist estimates that lunik will go on spinning in its planetary orbit for more than 90 million years. In doing so, there is a possibility it will outlive the species that fathered it.

But not one of these satellites, not one of these new planets goes into orbit without overtones of doom for the species siring it. The launching pads from which they flew are the same launching pads from which intercontinental ballistics missiles fly. The rockets which launched sputnik and lunik are fully capable of firing hydrogen warheads into any part of the earth. Atlas, more familiarly known as Big Annie, in its very inception, is an intercontinental ballistics missile, fully developed to carry a hydrogen payload to distances ranging up to 8,500 miles. Big Annie was guided into her orbit merely to demonstrate her effectiveness as a vehicle for transporting a lethal payload.

Cowed trepidation must certainly be the initial reaction to the success of Big Annie and Lunik. That innate conservatism of man—a longing for the good old days—flinches from the grim reality of scientific achievement, which may eventually mean the annihilation of the species. But breaking through the fear, there may be a vague ray of possible hope. If nations channel their major efforts into scientific achievement—the exploration of space—perhaps they will step away from the development of earth-shattering devices designed for almost unfathomable destruction. Perhaps the fundamental purpose for which the missiles were perfected, can be diverted into this exploration of outer space.

The earth is grievously wearied and sick. We read, and hear, and see, with a sickening sensation of the communes in Red China, which reduces man to the status of inhabitants of the animal farm. We remember that this same species, man, sent a planet around the sun. We read and authenticate murder and torture, rape and hatred against men by tyrants in almost half of the earth, and we hear occasionally a voice crying in the wilderness for peace.

It may be that we have entered a period of world brinkmanship wherein our whole mortal fate may hinge on the pressing of a single button somewhere. Certainly this developmental age of man's scientific genius leaves most of us gasping and grasping to understand what is happening to us, why, and to what end. To emphasize the obvious: Almost nobody understands fully what is going on in the great sphere of man's genius. Equally obvious is the fact that the attainment of such vast successes as those achieved by Russia involves tremendous efficiency in planning. But what horrible price this efficiency?

And that is the point I am driving at. There is a distinct tendency in highly efficient nations to regiment people with free wills into automatons, whose sole purpose is the welfare of the state. A "free" society is hard-pressed when it is forced to compete with this highly efficient but highly immoral abuse of the genius of man. There will be, therefore—or there may already be—a trend on the part of free nations to regiment themselves toward the same end. This was the sickening picture produced in a little book I read several years ago called "Mr. Blue." This may have been the vision of Orwell in his novel "1984."

The communes in China, the "legal" deprivation of rights in Russia, the conformism in our own United States, the apathy of many people including some of our own, the haggard stopgap measures on which we must exert pressure interminably across the world, are all manifestations of the growing trend to regimentation, not only of the body of man, but of his soul, the source of his genius.

It is a sobering thought that most of the people born these days will see 2000 A.D., unless they are annihilated meanwhile by fissionable incineration. To know that in 2000 A.D. there may well be weekend trips to the moon or that tourist bureaus will feature a 2-week tour on a ferry-go-round of the sun is not fantastic speculation. It is distinctly, imminently probable. But here, today, I am wondering whether a great majority of the people in the world are not searching the far reaches of their own individual mentality for some answers about where it will all lead.

I don't know, but I do know that there is a way through the morass. We can be certain of two things: That we are here and that we are designed for eventual union with God. Therefore, using the sacraments as signposts, we should grope our way, hand over hand, toward that one end of which we are absolutely certain, the immensity of God.

Bell Gives Pro Football the Leader Baseball Lacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent in Congress the city of Green Bay, Wis., the home of the Green Bay Packers, one of the pioneer National Football League teams.

Professional football has made tremendous strides in the last decade, becoming one of our truly national sports. We in Green Bay are proud of our representation in this splendid league. Much credit for the success of the league goes to its commissioner, Bert Bell, who has provided the leadership which has given professional football such a national reputation for clean and exciting entertainment.

As part of my remarks, I include a news story which appeared recently in the Washington Daily News paying tribute to the league, its teams and Commissioner Bell:

BELL GIVES PRO FOOTBALL THE LEADER BASEBALL LACKS

(By Harry Grayson)

Next to the playoff itself, there is one thing we will remember about the 1958 football season. It is the picture of Larry MacPhail sitting in a Yankee Stadium box seat at the Colts-Giants championship game and comparing the situation to baseball.

"I never believed that pro football would catch on like this," said MacPhail, bundled in a great coat, a floppy hat covering his head. One of the great showmen of our time was looking at the third successive sell-out crowd enthusiastically responding to organized college-type cheerleaders. "I couldn't conceive the pros taking the play away from the colleges. They play so late I thought the weather would be against anything like this. But the pro owners who were around at the start deserve everything they get. They stuck with it through some lean days.

"Bert Bell, from out of its ranks, put the National Football League across. A real commissioner with unlimited authority and respect, he ignored every stupid restriction crackpots try to place on professional sports. He did what was best for the league and in his own way. He stuck to unlimited substitution, opening the door to specialists and permitting no letdown in the tempo of play. He put the goal posts back on the goal line, setting up the spectacular field goal.

"He put in the sudden-death extra period to assure the finality of the championship game."

The National Football League is paid-for television, but television where Bell wants it to be. No TV in a city where a game is being played.

Could baseball do the same?

"Of course it could," said MacPhail. "But they're so busy being silly in baseball that they don't have time to think like Bell, who acts while baseball officials talk."

Ford Frick, the baseball commissioner, contends the major leagues can do nothing about curbing the televising of their games into minor league territory because that might be in violation of antitrust laws. Bell obviously refused to listen to legal advice of that nature; ordered the ban on TV where it would hurt.

"I told Dan Topping that if the National League was ridiculous enough to leave New York the American League should put another club in Yankee Stadium," added MacPhail. "That practically would turn the National League into a western league, which is about all it amounts to now anyway."

MacPhail, currently breeding cattle and running horses, has never had a flop, except when he was one of a group which tried to kidnap the Kaiser, and then it was close. He revived the Cincinnati and Brooklyn franchises, refurbished Yankee Stadium. He introduced night baseball to the majors, campaigned against it being overdone.

So when MacPhail puts the job turned in by Bert Bell in pro football over anything baseball has done in more recent years, it is worth reporting.

Bell perhaps is the most capable administrator in sports today.

Consider the champion Colts. Five years ago, when the Dallas Texans were moved to Baltimore, Bell went to Carroll Rosenbloom, the textile, plastics and electronics magnate, and asked him to buy the defunct franchise. Bell had coached Rosenbloom as a halfback at Pennsylvania.

"He did not ask me to buy the franchise," recalls Rosenbloom. "He beat me over the head until I came up with the money."

Bell practically shoved Don Kellett into the Colts' general managership.

Rosenbloom gave the franchise financial security. Kellett got the coach, Weeb Ewbank, and the players, Johnny Unitas and Alan Ameche, for two. Baltimore got a winner and now is one of the superior professional football properties.

As Larry MacPhail stresses, baseball could use a little leadership of this type.

The Senate Filibuster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the December 27, 1958, issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Someday Freedom May Depend on a Senate Filibuster."

In my opinion this editorial presents a very keen interpretation of the situation regarding the proposed change in rule XXII, and I commend it to the reading of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOMEDAY FREEDOM MAY DEPEND ON A SENATE FILIBUSTER

(By Draper Phillips)

The Democratic liberals are swooping down upon the Senate's rule XXII, which protects free debate in the Senate. If they are successful, they will have knocked down a bulwark of the States against complete national control of local affairs. They will have destroyed a fortress which has prevented many efforts of the majority to tyrannize over the minority.

Those who would limit debate to the wishes of the Senate's majority profess to speak in the sacred name of civil rights. Actually, the

filibuster has been used scores of times by minorities of all parties and from every section of the country to defeat bills which were repugnant to localities, or were regarded as in violation of a State's constitutional rights. Even majorities have used free debate to prevent minorities from defeating legislation. A majority filibuster in 1917 was at least partly responsible for the establishment of the cloture rule under which two-thirds of the Senators may limit debate.

Senators Elihu Root and Henry Cabot Lodge looked upon the filibuster as a defense weapon against repressive majorities. Their threatened use of it was sufficient to force reconsideration of an appropriation for new post-office construction. Senator George F. Hoar, of Massachusetts, recalled that the prolonged debate against the force bill in 1890, which would have authorized Federal supervision of elections, actually altered the opinion of the majority which had proposed the bill. Progressive Senator La Follette, who held the alltime record for an individual filibuster until Senator WAYNE MORSE broke it in a filibuster which he refused to describe as a filibuster, offered to fight any cloture that would limit free and unlimited debate. Walter Lippmann, in opposing cloture in 1949, said the real issue is whether any majority, even of two-thirds, shall assume power to override the opposition of a large minority of the States.

We need have no real fear that vital national legislation will be defeated by the filibuster. If the whole people want a law badly enough, it will be passed in spite of delaying tactics. Thus, when Senator Herbert Lehman led a small group in 1952 to filibuster against the important national-origins quota system for admission of immigrants, the filibusterers were quickly routed. The vast majority in early every section of the country wanted the law and they got it.

The "liberals," in their zeal to secure the vote of, or to protect, the Negro in his civil rights, ignore history. Our Federal system was founded on the principle that the Senate represents the States, not a majority of the people of the Nation. Conditions vary among the States and among groups of States. The advantage of a federal system over a national system of government is that we can accommodate ourselves to these variations. That was the reason for allowing equal representation in the Senate and unlimited debate.

We ought to count 10 before changing the Senate rules to limit debate substantially. Such a change would rival F.D.R.'s Court-packing bill as a challenge to established concepts of government. It required hard work by leaders in both parties and "unlimited debate" to dispel that threat. It is to be hoped that there are enough Senators left with sufficient courage to resist this politically tempting assault on an important bulwark of the Federal structure.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Imagination in Government Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the inaugural address of Oklahoma's new Governor, the Honorable J. Howard Edmondson.

The text of the address is as follows:

IMAGINATION IN GOVERNMENT URGED

We meet here today, on this 15th day of January in 1959, in a time of great trouble and great challenge for free men and free women all over the world.

I would like to talk to you today, with a gravity and seriousness straight from the heart, not only as friends and not only as Oklahomans, but also as American citizens—all of us with a deep and most important obligation at this hour in history to the greatest republic in all the world—the United States of America.

During the past year, we have enjoyed once again in this State of ours a great privilege of American citizenship—the privilege of a free election, by secret ballot, after a fair and free campaign to illuminate the issues.

The campaign of 1958, like most Oklahoma campaigns, was hard fought and hotly contested, and most of our citizens became keenly interested in some candidates and took an active role in some part of the campaign.

We enjoy our politics in Oklahoma, and we are proud of the privilege of taking sides and fighting for the side in which we believe.

And we find it difficult to understand, and completely impossible to appreciate, that more than one-half of the men and women who live today on the face of the earth do not enjoy this Oklahoma privilege—the right to take sides and to campaign for one candidate against another.

More than one-half of the world's people today live under forms of government which are not democratic, in totalitarian countries which teach little children that men and women alike exist and live to serve the state, in countries where human life is cheap and human liberty is an unknown commodity.

In Communist China alone a population more than three times as large as our own has been enlisted under the banner of this kind of government.

In Soviet Russia, and in the satellite countries under Russian domination, a population more than double the American total is today enslaved by the same totalitarian system.

The existence of these other systems of government, and of these other nations, is of concern to American citizens for one reason, above all others:

We are aware of our open and declared objective to win the entire world for their way of life and government—and we know that they pursue this objective, constantly and relentlessly, by subversion, conspiracy, and revolution, in every corner of the free world.

A BIG CHALLENGE

We know that they prepare constantly for aggression, that more than 40 percent of their national energy and production go into the machines and the weapons and the manpower for war—and we know that they not only possess the terrible secrets of destruction, but also have made alarming progress in the field of long-range missiles.

We know these things, and we live each day in the shadow of this knowledge, and from this knowledge there must come to each of us a new and sharp awareness of our responsibility as Oklahomans and Americans today.

The challenge to American ideals and principles and institutions—and to the freedom and the liberty which all Oklahomans treasure—is far more serious than it was in the dark days of Pearl Harbor and the Battle of the Atlantic.

In 1959, the challenge exists not only along lines of military battle, but also in the laboratories of science, in the schools and universities, in the wheat fields and in the factories, and even in outer space—thousands of miles beyond the surface of the earth.

The challenge exists here today, in Oklahoma City and across this great and beloved State of ours, as we meet for this inauguration—and as the legislature meets in the halls of our capitol.

It is a challenge demanding the very best of all of us, not only those of us in government, but also those of us in the classroom and the pulpit, in the offices and the factories and the farms of Oklahoma—and most of all, in the homes.

In meeting that challenge, we can no longer afford to be complacent about waste, or inefficiency, or corruption, in the vital organs of our society—and this is equally true in our essential industry, in our educational system, and in our government.

The people of Oklahoma are aware of this fact.

Deep within our people, not only in our State but all over the Nation, there is an awareness today of the challenge from behind the Iron Curtain—and there is a growing impatience with political groups—and politicians—who do not move and act vigorously to eliminate waste and inefficiency, and corruption, in the machinery of government.

I firmly believe it was the awareness on the part of our people, and the desire for new leadership which went along with it, which accounted more than anything else for the record-breaking majorities of last summer and last fall.

With those majorities, and the mandate for action which they represent, the people of Oklahoma have handed a tremendous and a grave responsibility to this administration.

RECALLS WILSON

In the light of that responsibility, I can appreciate fully the feeling expressed by Woodrow Wilson 48 years ago, when the people of New Jersey inaugurated him as Governor.

At that time, Governor Wilson told the people of his State:

"No one dare be sure that he is qualified to play the part expected of him by the people—in the execution of this high trust."

And Wilson went on to say:

"It is best for him, as he sets out, to look away from himself and to concentrate his thought upon the people whom he serves and the sacred interests which are entrusted to his care."

What about these two things which Woodrow Wilson said should be of primary concern to a governor—the people whom he serves, and the sacred interests entrusted to his care?

How do they stand in Oklahoma, in this year of 1959?

In their pioneering brand of democracy, in their generosity and their simple honesty, in their courage and determination in the face of adversity, in their capacity to learn and their willingness to work hard and to build for the future, we can all be proud of the people of Oklahoma.

In every kind of competition between the young people of the Nation, our young people reflect credit upon the State.

In every time of war and crisis, our fighting men have served with bravery and with honor and distinction.

We are proud of our good neighbors, and of the neighborly spirit that is part of the Oklahoma tradition.

And yet, there is need to face squarely today the problems that exist among our people.

MANY NEED JOBS

Many Oklahomans today are in need of jobs or vocational training, or of more adequate incomes to support themselves and their families.

Many Oklahomans today are in need of better homes in which to bring up their children.

Many Oklahomans today are receiving medical care, or treatment for disease or mental illness, in institutions that urgently need improvement and enlargement of staff.

Many Oklahomans have lost confidence in some branch of our Government, or in the process of justice, because of our failure to keep pace with the needs and requirements of a modern Oklahoma.

Many Oklahomans, who have great skill and ability in the field of education, are leaving our State or leaving their profession because other fields or other States offer better opportunity, and many Oklahoma students in our schools and colleges are being short-changed in the process.

These are a few of the many problems besetting the people of Oklahoma today, and for which we hope to find, in cooperation with the Legislature and all people within the State, some substantial betterment during the next 4 years.

During the campaign of last summer, I was impressed by the appeal of one candidate for governor, who advocated a program of "government with a heart" to meet the problems of the people.

We do need "government with a heart" today, and I hope and pray that the government of Oklahoma will always be that kind of an instrument to relieve suffering wherever possible, to protect the children and assist all the victims of poverty and need. I hope our policy will not only be one of assistance, but also one of encouragement, rehabilitation, and oportunity.

IMAGINATION NEEDED

In short, I believe we not only need "government with a heart," but also "government with imagination, government with foresight, and government with commonsense."

And what about the sacred interests of Oklahoma?

In addition to the people, we need also give attention to the conservation and de-

velopment of our natural resources, to the modernization of transportation facilities, to the encouragement of new industry and new construction.

We shall do all in our power to create a climate of government that is attractive to enterprise and initiative among our citizens—and we hope the foundation for that climate will begin with respect for and confidence in our State government.

In the office of governor during the next 4 years, every possible effort will be made to work constructively with other elected State officials, and with the officers and people of our 77 counties and all communities—without special favor to any region or any person.

Every effort will be made to carry out both the letter and the spirit of the program which was presented to the people of Oklahoma in the campaign for Governor last summer and last fall, and I have been assured by the duly elected leaders of the legislature, both in the senate and the house of representatives, that they are prepared to fight for the cardinal features of that program.

They have also assured me that every effort will be made in the legislature to pave the way for a special election, within the next 90 days, on the issue of repeal of prohibition. For both of these assurances, I am deeply grateful.

In line with other campaign commitments in this same field, the new appointed commissioner of public safety has already been instructed to begin a statewide effort at uniform and effective enforcement of the State's prohibition laws, and the legislature already has before it recommendations for new laws to close the loopholes in the present enforcement statutes.

We are going to do our very best to do the job which you endorsed, with a majority of more than 200,000 last July, and which you endorsed once again, with a majority of almost 300,000, on November 1. I hope and I pray that the job can be done. It needs to be done, if Oklahoma is to resume the splendid growth and expansion with which we led the Nation in the early part of this century. It needs to be done, if this great State of ours is ever to be as strong and dynamic in its development, as our people richly deserve, and our Nation requires it to be.

NEW INDUSTRY URGENT

Let me tell you about the dream which is in my heart for Oklahoma, as I take this sacred oath of office today.

It is my prayer and my hope that we can turn the tide of economic and population trends in Oklahoma during the next 4 years.

It is my prayer and my hope that we can put into operation a program that will attract new industry into Oklahoma and inspire industrial growth as never before—providing at least 75,000 new industrial jobs for our people by 1963.

It is my prayer and my hope that we can establish educational and teaching standards which are a model for all States in this part of our country—making Oklahoma just as famous for its great schools, as institutions of learning, as we are justly famous for football, basketball, wrestling and other school activities.

It is my prayer and my hope that by these means, and others, we can once again see a population that is growing by leaps and bounds, as it did from 1900 to 1920—and I believe it is entirely possible, with a dynamic program of progress, to see the population of our State increase by at least a quarter of a million in the next 4 years.

Seventy-five thousand new industrial jobs.

A school system second to none in the Southwest.

And a population increase—by reason of new jobs and new hope—of better than 250,000.

These are 3 dreams, my fellow-Oklahomans, of a young fellow citizen you honored with election to the governorship less than 3 months ago.

They are dreams which I hope will become your dreams—and dreams that can only come true if you determine, with me, to make them come true.

When our Nation was in the middle of its first great fight for freedom and independence, more than 180 years ago, a fiery young writer and soldier named Tom Paine made an appeal to his fellow Americans for their help in a great cause.

Today, in 1959, I use the words of Tom Paine to ask for your help in making this dream of a greater Oklahoma come true. As Tom Paine said, 180 years ago: "I turn with the warm ardor of a friend to those who have nobly stood, and are yet determined to stand the matter out. I call not upon a few, but upon all, not on this one, or that one, but on everyone—lay your shoulders to the wheel. Better have too much force than too little when so great an object is at stake."

Democracy in the Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the privilege of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three essays by students of the Lynbrook High School in my district on the subject of "Democracy in the Spage Age." These make, I believe, very worthwhile reading. The first essay, by Donna Rosen, appears hereunder:

DEMOCRACY IN THE SPACE AGE

(By Donna Rosen)

"That government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth." It is doubtful that democracy has ever been defined more completely or more meaningfully in so few words.

Delving into our country's colorful past, we find that government was as much a part of the average man's daily life as was attending church on Sunday. These men had fought to keep our Nation alive and they felt it their duty to support the legislature, that America's civilization might gain a strong foundation. They had placed their faith in our Nation's leaders, yet they knew that no one man could lead an ever-expanding country singlehandedly. Therefore, each man, in his way, strove to help our leaders guide a weak nation to glory and prosperity. It was, too, a sense of loyalty which bound these men to their country. They were determined that their land, the land for which thousands before them had given their lives, might gain security. Only through proper legislation might all these things come about.

Understand this, we find that solely through faith, pride, loyalty, and fine government, may we really conceive the true meaning of democracy.

Many will claim that politics had a more direct effect on the lives of our ancestors, and, therefore, government was of vital interest to them. These same people will say that it is no longer necessary for each citizen to take an intense interest in his government, for we are not, as a nation, undergoing crises of the same nature as those which affected our country years ago. Yet, how can the affairs of our country fail to arouse the interest of her citizens? Our Government and leaders are deriving their "just powers from the consent of the governed." If we fail to give them our support we lose the entire meaning of the word "democracy" and disregard the principle on which our Government is based.

In this, the space age, many of us have a tendency to let the importance of democracy fade into the background when compared with the issue of conquering space. Yet, can missiles and rockets even come close in comparison with ideals which have been the roots of civilization for hundreds of years?

However, it is not too late for the flame of patriotism to be rekindled in the hearts of America's citizens. Once again faith, pride, and loyalty for one's country can become synonymous with democracy. This is a task which we must undertake armed with sincerity, concern, and dedication. Let us once again vow as our forefathers did, "We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Democracy in the Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, the second in this series of three essays entitled "Democracy in the Space Age" by Sandra Brainum, a student of the Lynbrook High School, is indicative of thoughtful concern with our world of today. I commend it to the notice of my colleagues in the House:

DEMOCRACY IN THE SPACE AGE

(By Sandra Brainum)

As time goes on, and science advances, it distributes its uses both to those who destroy and those who preserve. The path of the unknown world of science has no end, yet in a democracy it is the path that public opinion wishes to pursue, while in a dictatorship it is one that is dictated.

Dictatorships, and the struggle of men for freedom, existed long before science became widely applied. The modern use of science for warfare has only given them concrete forms.

Communists wish to conquer the world or die in the final struggle, and that is how it will be. A world of slaves under a single or a small group of dictators will never live. For democracy is not only a form of government, it is a want for freedom born into every man's soul. If we lose our liberties it will be because we abandoned them. A world split in two cannot live either.

What the people believe in determines the type of government they will have. Upon the government depends their progress in science. Also upon the government depends their progress in securing justice and opportunity. Upon this depends the outcome of whether life is worth living.

Another great war would be terrible. It would destroy and kill millions of people. But, it could not destroy democracy. Organizations of free men tend to become refined under stress. Free men, and democracies meet their greatest hazards in times of peace and good will.

"The best answer to communism is a living, vibrant, fearless democracy—economic, social, and political. All we need to do is to stand up and perform according to our professed ideals. Then those ideals will be safe."

A democracy which is truly responsive to the will of the people, in which freedom and individuality are preserved, shall be triumphant in the long run, for it is not only the best system, the most worthy of support, it is the strongest system in a very harsh contest.

Time will change the world down through the ages. New discoveries of science will come and go and soon lose their importance. Democracy shall never lose its importance and will live forever.

Democracy in the Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, the third in the group of three essays by students of the Lynbrook High School in my district appears hereunder. This is the work of Margaret Kaiser. Here we have some vital observations from a young mind:

DEMOCRACY IN THE SPACE AGE
(By Margaret Kaiser)

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

These words, taken from the Declaration of Independence actually are a definition of democracy.

In the past, democracy was purely political, and referred to government by the people. However, in more recent years democracy has come to mean more than that. It has broadened to include social, economic, and industrial democracy.

Today the Government aids foreign countries by means of financial assistance and the spread of knowledge. It helps the industries of this country by building dams, and alotting contracts for work. It helps the people by instituting such programs as social security and civil rights.

The democracy reviewed above would not be possible unless three basic conditions existed.

1. Every citizen must be able to express his will, without the fear of being punished for what he believes or the way he votes. True democracy must reflect the will of the majority and protect the right of the minority.

2. Those who make the laws must be subject to the will of the citizens. There must be means by which the people may replace the lawmakers if the lawmakers pass laws, that the majority of people do not like.

3. The people who enforce the law must also be responsible to the voters, because democracy could not exist if the people who enforce the law could do as they please.

Even these conditions do not guarantee true democracy. The people must be informed, must have social and political independence, must be interested, and must have an active faith in democracy.

Although it would appear that democracy today is far from being what it was originally, a close study would reveal that basically it is the same; the people still have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It has merely been changed to cover the world and conditions as they now exist.

Insofar as democracy in the space age is concerned, I cannot see that there would be any drastic change in the basic concepts of true democracy. The people will have and must continue to have their rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Changes, of course, will occur in the space age as countries and people are brought closer together, through swifter means of transportation and communication. It is hoped that by closer contact with other people in other countries we will be helped to understand one another's problems and beliefs. Perhaps we will even be able to instill in them the wish for democracy, as we know it, and the means by which it may be accomplished.

This would bring about a better, more peaceful, and happy world.

The Du Bois (Pa.) Courier-Express Reaches Its 80th Milestone in the Field of Journalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading daily newspapers of central Pennsylvania had a birthday, January 2, when the Du Bois Courier-Express celebrated 80 years of publishing news for its many readers in the Keystone State.

The observance of the fourscore anniversary provided the means for President Harold T. Gray, of the Courier-Express Publishing Co., to do a little reminiscing in an editorial titled "We Are 80," which appeared in the January 10, 1959, issue.

In addition to the editorial by Harold T. Gray, there appeared another editorial in the same issue titled "All Join Hands," which urges community cooperation in meeting the challenge of this scientific age. It is a timely appeal to the present generation to meet the future with the courage and inspiration of those who founded and developed the thriving third-class city of Du Bois.

It is a pleasure on this occasion to pay a deserved tribute to the Gray family for their fine contribution in the field of journalism in Pennsylvania through 80 years of editing and publishing a typical family newspaper that has been a daily visitor to thousands of homes in the Du Bois area. Members of the Gray family still active in publishing the Du-Bois Courier-Express include Harold T. Gray as president; Jason S. Gray, vice president; and Mrs. Rosanna Gray Shields, treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, during the past 80 years the Du Bois Courier-Express has been fortunate in having in its employ many outstanding citizens whose devotion to the ideals of journalism, as expounded by its founders, enabled this popular daily newspaper to enjoy success in the newspaper field. In this connection, the late William B. Ross and Frank I. Gillung successively filled the editorial chair in a highly acceptable manner for many fruitful years until death wrote the proverbial "30" to their journalistic careers. Until his recent retirement after many years of loyal service, the business and administrative ability of Lloyd F. Mohney as treasurer and general manager of the Courier-Express played a large part in the success achieved.

In addition to the three members of the Gray family previously mentioned as present officers of the Du Bois Courier-Express Publishing Co., the popular daily newspaper has a talented and gifted managing editor in the person of George Waylonis, a hometown boy, who has won his laurels through his initiative, perseverance, and ability to measure up to the exacting standards of modern journalism.

Over a span of 80 years, the Courier-Express had many other loyal and faithful employees who share to a marked degree the credit due for the success of this popular daily newspaper. At the present time they include Marvin L. Bloom, general manager; Athol V. Shields, secretary; Spencer L. Cross, production manager; William H. Reay, advertising manager; Samuel Kauffman, circulation manager; Shelly Moyer, Herb Martin, and one of the finest groups of faithful newsboys to be found in any newspaper office.

In offering my sincere congratulations to the officers and staff of the DuBois Courier-Express on the occasion of its 80th anniversary, I extend best wishes for continued success in the determination to serve the DuBois area with a first-class daily newspaper.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the two editorials referred to previously:

WE ARE 80

It was just 80 years ago, on January 2, 1879, that the Du Bois Weekly Courier first appeared on the streets of the little new lumbering town of Du Bois. This was followed 4 years later by a competitor, the Express, and was followed in 1888 by the first daily edition of the Courier, following the big fire of that year, which wiped out most of the town.

The baby born during that first year, is now an old man. Fourscore years have brought many changes, not only to the newspaper and the individual, but to the town and the Nation. In those days the population of the country was a hundred million less than it is today. The West was being developed, but there were none of the superhighways which stretched from coast to coast, the transcontinental trains, and certainly the jet planes which encompass the 3,000 miles of the country were not even a dream in the minds of man. Electric power and the telephone were still in their infancy, and it would be years before the first automobile would chug down the dirt streets of the little community. Men still shaved with the straight-edged razor, and women had to provide their own means of making themselves beautiful, since such a thing as a beauty parlor did not exist.

But somehow, people got along in those days, and found entertainment and recreation, even though there was no golf course, nor movies, nor radio, nor television. Street railway transportation has come and gone, passenger rail service rose to its peak in the twenties, and disappeared. Sixteen Presidents have lived in the White House, and names of our leaders in the town, State, and Nation have flamed across the sky and disappeared.

The Courier started 2 years before the borough of Du Bois was incorporated. The population of the town was little more than a thousand persons, and it was not until 6 years after the first edition that telegraph

and telephone service came to the community. It would still be 4 years, too, before the first rail service would be provided by the B.R. & P., and 7 years after the Allegheny Valley Railroad had opened a way into the wilderness. Just 7 years before, too, the population of the town consisted of but three families. Not until a year later did the Du Bois Deposit Bank open its doors for business, to bring the first banking service to the community.

Just as the town has grown through the years, so has the Courier-Express. While old age may add stature to a man, an institution, or a town, the youthful zest for life should never be lost. So, although the paper is old in years, it is still youthful in spirit. In the same way it hopes that as Du Bois approaches its centenary, it will retain the vigor of growth which characterized it during the early days. There are indications of a revival of this spirit, which for a time seemed to lie dormant.

Like the old 99th Reserve Division of the Army, let's adopt the slogan, "Ours the Future," and look forward to the next 80 years.

HAROLD T. GRAY.

ALL JOIN HANDS

The fact that DuBois is reaching its maturity came to us recently with the realization that the Courier has passed its 80th birthday.

On attaining this advanced age, we thought back over the years, not nostalgically, but to seek some of the inspiration and stamina which enabled our fathers to create a town here on the wilderness, atop the continued divide in the Alleghenies.

It is a town literally hewn out of the forest, for between 1832 when George Shaffer and his wife and six children cleared out a couple of acres on Sandy Creek until 1865 when John Rumbarger first came into the area the family had as neighbors only the deer, muskrat, and 'coon. The coming of the Allegheny Valley Railroad in 1872 jarred Mr. Rumbarger out of his complacency, and it was then that he laid out the town of Rumbarger. He was helped in his efforts by John DuBois, who came here from Williamsport about the same time to build his lumber mills.

The material advancement of the town dates from the arrival of Mr. DuBois, who from 1873 to 1876 established an industry which attracted hundreds and later thousands of people. From 3 families in 1872 the population grew rapidly; and in 1877, 1 year after completion of the large sawmill, the town boasted a population of 1,307.

Rumbarger post office was established in 1874, and in the same year passenger service was inaugurated on the Low Grade of the Pensylvania Railroad. In 1876 the post office was moved to the "East Side," and the name changed to DuBois. A year later "Rumbarger," as such, passed out of existence.

DuBois became a borough in 1881, with Louis Brady as first burgess. The town had three wards until 1892, when the fourth ward was added. After the turn of the century the fifth ward was established.

Up to this time DuBois was a typical frontier town, lacking all of those things we now consider as essential. With the creation of Sandy Township and the subsequent erection of a jail, much of the lawlessness of the early days was brought under control.

In June of 1885 the town got telegraph service, and in August of that year came the telephone. In August 1883 the B. R. & P. Railway was extended from Buffalo, through DuBois to Punxsutawney, and in 1899 was extended on to Butler, with connections with Pittsburgh. In 1870 the town got its first newspaper, and in 1880 its first bank.

The confidence of those early pioneers in the future of the city was evidenced by the almost complete rebuilding of the town after the disastrous fire of 1888. The town grew rapidly until 1900, with the addition of 180 acres of land. New industries came to town, glass, tanneries and coal, a sewage system was built, and the town acquired a municipal water system. A 50th anniversary book, published in 1922, says that DuBois, at the time, "had railroad shops employing 1,500 people, and in addition, coal mines, and factories turning out glassware, overalls, silk, soft drinks, clay products, machinery, iron and steel products, lumber and millwork, and soot cleaners for boilers."

DuBois became a third class city on January 1, 1915.

The early history of DuBois is one of hard unremitting toil against tremendous odds. For carving a city out of the wilderness our homage is due those sturdy pioneers, to whom no task was too difficult and no barrier insurmountable. If we are to prove worth the heritage handed down to us from those sturdy pioneers, we must in this generation, accomplish many things, so that our children's children may see a city of which our grandsires might well be proud.

This editorial is intended as but a channel buoy in the living stream of the town, as we note the passage of time from the ancient past to the distant future.

We who participate for a brief time together to create the DuBois of the moment, lend our hands to a project with deep traditions builded slowly by the lifelong devotion of many men and women; the teachers in our schools, our mayors and councilmen, our businessmen and professional men, and laboring men, who have dreamed and planned and toiled for an even better town. They have left the imprint of their lives in the churches, streets, public and private buildings, and marks which are ours.

We stand today, among this galaxy of builders of our town, living and dead, mindful of our responsibility, not only to them, but to the generations that lie ahead. For if we fail in our custodianship, we shall have obliterated something of these founders, and builders, shall have shattered their dreams, and destroyed something that can never be recovered.

On some future day another channel buoy in the timeless stream of life will mark another point where we take stock of ourselves. When we have reached that point, may our descendants look back on our great generation of the fifties as having maintained and advanced the deep traditions of our past, a time in which we have made our contribution to a better town and community.

In this endeavor all must participate—labor, business, professions, city council, planning commission, public and semipublic boards and commissions, social and cultural organizations, juniors and seniors, every man, woman and child of our community.

May we not fail in our endeavors.

We'll Miss You, Joe Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Life magazine, January 15, 1959:

WE'LL MISS YOU, JOE MARTIN

"I love this House," said JOE MARTIN to it once. "In this forum is worked the will of the people." That House, and everyone else who knows him well, has reciprocated JOE MARTIN'S feelings for more than 30 years. For 20 years until last week he has been its undisputed Republican leader, because he is loved, because he is a superb political tactician, and because he has never broken his word. "When you make an agreement with JOE MARTIN," said his steelier but kindred opposite number, SAM RAYBURN, "you don't have to remember it. He will."

JOE first earned his leadership by running a successful congressional campaign when the Republican membership was even smaller than it is now (89 seats, which he nearly doubled in the 1938 election). Ever since those New Deal days he has been his party's most consistent nationwide campaigner, and has chaired five (a record) Republican national conventions. He was the Republicans' thread of continuity during their painful transition from the party of Coolidge (which first sent JOE to Congress) to the party of NIXON (which has now dumped him). As Speaker of the 80th and 83d Congresses, JOE did more than any single man to prove that long and bitter exile from power had not unfitted the Republicans to govern. His legislative strategy underlay the major accomplishments of Ike's first term; he kept his Republicans in orderly rapport with the White House while BILL KNOWLAND'S Senators went off on ideological or fractional rampages. A practical mechanic of statecraft, JOE MARTIN has never been either ideologue or factionalist; he has no use for what he calls political dipsy-doo. Though F.D.R. tried to make him a symbol of reaction ("Martin, Barton, and Fish"), he has never symbolized anything but personal honesty, plus fidelity to the party line—when he could find it.

The party line got blurred somewhere between 1953 and the 1958 election. It was not for JOE MARTIN, that friendly engine of harmony, to manufacture what the White House would not. As the play-by-play makes clear JOE himself was not the real target of the revolt that overthrew him last week. Not the House leader, but the party leadership bred the dissatisfaction.

Twice did Ike, in appreciation of JOE'S great services, protect him from the assault of CHARLIE HALLECK'S ambition. Yet HALLECK somehow made more and more trips between Hill and White House, and JOE fewer. Last week Ike stood aside, and the contest was like a painted scene of a snowy antlered kingdom, when the old buck is challenged and overthrown for no clearer reason that that he can be. No policy issue, no divergence of aims; just comparative age (HALLECK, 58; MARTIN, 74). Will the White House now have a livelier band of supporters and informants in the House? Let us hope so. But CHARLIE HALLECK'S Republicanism will need at least as much guidance and backing as JOE MARTIN'S got; and that wasn't enough to crown JOE MARTIN'S long and able service to the Nation with the rewards he deserved. But he does have deep and universal affection.

The Birthday of Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on the 19th of January 1807, at Stratford on the Potomac, Westmoreland County, Va., a baby was born. His name was Robert E. Lee.

There were about 6 million people in the United States at that time—some 900,000 in Virginia at that time. That year people would be talking about Napoleon's threat to the peace of Europe. They would take sides about Aaron Burr's acquittal on a Federal charge of treason at Richmond. They would wonder at the success of Robert Fulton's steamboat *Clermont*, on its run from New York City to Albany. What was this world coming to?

The world was in turmoil when Robert E. Lee entered it. It was still in turmoil when he left. His character left an indelible imprint upon millions, during his lifetime; and upon many millions more since his death.

He has been known as an outstanding engineer. He has been known as a brilliant military tactician. He has been known as a wise educator. He has been known as a Christian gentleman.

I know him as a troubled man who searched his soul to find which of his divided loyalties he must follow to the end.

I see him the more clearly as he wrote to his son, Custis, shortly before the outbreak of the Civil War:

> The framers of our Constitution (would) never have exhausted so much labor, wisdom, and forebearance in its formation * * * if it was intended to be broken. * * * Still a Union that can only be maintained by swords and bayonets, and in which strife and civil war are to take the place of brotherly love and kindness, has no charm for me. I shall mourn for my country and for the welfare and progress of mankind.

I see him just as clearly as when, during that same period of crisis, he wrote to his friend, Markie Williams:

> If a disruption takes place, I shall go back in sorrow to my people and share the misery of my native State, and save in her defense there will be one soldier less in the world than now. I wish for no other flag than the "Star-Spangled Banner" and no other air than "Hail Columbia."

It must be said that Robert E. Lee was a stanch believer in States rights, as so many Americans are to this day. There are no geographical nor philosophical limits to this creed which guards so well the sovereignty of our several States, even to this day.

The Crimes of the Armenian Quisling Mikoyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, many views have been raised against the visit of Mr. Mikoyan to this country. One of these is Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is the chairman of the Ukranian Congress Committee of America and also a professor in Soviet economics at Georgetown University. Americans who continually study the Soviet Union know Mr. Mikoyan very well; they know his crimes as well as his purported foreign trade shrewdness.

Contrary to some reports in the press, the demonstrators and protestors against Mikoyan are not by any means just recent Hungarian immigrants and refugees to this country. This is a false notion. It should be obvious why some desire to propagate this notion. A good portion of the demonstrators is made up of Americans who have long been naturalized or were born here. Because of their intimate knowledge of the situation, these Americans have exercised their right to protest what they consider to have been a blunder in allowing Mr. Mikoyan to visit this country in the first place.

The statement and also the telegram sent by Dr. Dobriansky to President Eisenhower disclose some of the reasons why the American organization he represents has supported these demonstrations. Countless Americans, following their basic convictions, could hardly disagree with the stand taken against Mikoyan. Under leave, I request that the statement and telegram be printed in the RECORD:

THE CRIMES OF THE ARMENIAN QUISLING MIKOYAN

The telegram sent to the President by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on the subject of Mr. Mikoyan's visit to this country has produced a most favorable response. The press and other media that published it gave the American people an opportunity to learn about the real Mikoyan, not the blown-up image of a harmless foreign trade expert.

On the basis of innumerable cards and letters received from fellow Americans throughout the country we are certain that the vast majority of the American people is possessed with a sense of disgust and revulsion toward the few who are fawning over the Kremlin visitor, Mr. Mikoyan. The foremost aims of Mikoyan are clear: (1) Lull the Nation into a sense of false security; (2) prepare the way for a summit meeting where the West is expected to acquiesce to the permanent captivity of the enslaved nations in Eastern Europe and Asia; and (3) ultimately, in relation to us, divide and conquer.

These tactics are not new in Russian imperialist history. The tactics are not the creation of so-called ideologic communism. They have been in use for over 500 years by the Russians and their quislings, and have succeeded in creating an unprecedented empire. The tragedy of the current Mikoyan spectacle is that all the foolery and loss of self respect shown by the few in their entertainment of a political criminal indicate an appalling ignorance on the part of these hosts to a criminal as to how Russia ultimately conquers nations and peoples.

We are most fortunate in this country to have our Congressmen JUDDS, our George Meanys, our Cardinal Cushings. Their protests against Mikoyan and all his macabre achievements are not just in defense of basic moral and political principles. They are a defense also of our political sanity and maturity.

Some sections of the press have almost deliberately refused to disclose the crimes of the Armenian quisling. This situation indicates how easily some could be fooled by the smiles and humorous duplicity of our dedicated enemy. About 20 years ago, when the Nazi economic wizard, Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, visited this country, our industrial and economic groups offered him only the social deep freeze; this despite no criminal acts on his part. Today, the very personification of extreme cruelty, mass murder, and treason to his own nation (Armenia) is not only received but widely feted and shamelessly honored. The background of Mikoyan spells the very negation of the spiritual qualities of America and its traditions; yet some Americans who apparently lost all sight of the difference between right and wrong, courteously shower the honors of their attention upon him.

There is no doubt in our minds that this entire spectacle was well planned and indirectly financed by the Cyrus Eatons in this country. The businessmen and financiers who flocked to the circus almost seem to confirm the predictions of Marx, Veblen, and others that the weakest spiritual sinew of modern society is the pecuniary-minded business community. Following World War I the business interests of Western Europe were prepared to accommodate the Red wave from Eastern Europe. Are our business groups ready to do the same? By and large we think not.

The Mikoyan spectacle is only the opening and driving wedge of a broad plan. After his departure from these shores more and more voices should and must be raised in sober evaluation and protest against this first act of a continuous campaign. We urge that the points of the following telegram sent to the President be raised time and time again in order to offset the foolishness displayed by some of our people who think they see in Mikoyan, Menshikov, and Khrushchev any possibility for the end of the cold war:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your recent statement on good manners to be shown toward Mr. Mikoyan is somewhat mystifying. Surely this statement does not imply a desired cessation of peaceful demonstrations against Mikoyan and all that he symbolizes. We cannot believe that this was your intent in releasing your statement.

"The prime reason for our demonstrations is to make known to our fellow Americans precisely who Mikoyan is and what he has done. His genteel antics here deserve a realistic answer. In the light of his notorious record it is by no means an extreme characterization that Mikoyan is actually a political murderer on the loose—and of all places in our own America, the ultimate bastion of world freedom. If our people were to depend on the naive and dangerously misleading statements of such uninformed persons like Cyrus Eaton, Adlai Stevenson, Eric Johnston and other inadvertent tools of current Moscow propaganda, public opinion in this country would itself rapidly become a captive of Moscow.

"Among the many barbarities indulged in by this Armenian quisling, let us be mindful today of (1) his brutal annihilation of thousands of patriotic Armenians, Azerbaijani, Don and Kuban Cossacks in the period of 1917–21; (2) his callous involvement in the Russian manmade famine in Ukraine in the early thirties, shipping grains abroad while millions of Ukrainians starved to death; and (3) his bloody role in the liquidation of Hungarian patriots in this decade. It is, indeed, a travesty on our traditions to have even permitted the Armenian quisling to blemish our good earth.

"What amazes us further is that the so-called Russian desk in the State Department has informed columnists that this 'oldtime Communist never has made a violent anti-American speech' (Ted Lewis, Daily News, January 1, 1959). Yet only 2 months ago, before the Moscow City Soviet, the Armenian quisling railed against 'the stupidity and adventurism of the aggressive circles of the United States.' Quoting Lenin, he also said of the United States: 'She robs all, and she robs quite originally.'

"A code of good manners implies moral principles which in this case can best be reflected through our expressed indignation in these demonstrations. Conscience bids us

to conduct more of them. And we feel confident that most Americans share this conscience.

"Sincerely yours,

"LEV. E. DOBRIANSKY,

"Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, and Professor of Soviet Economics, Georgetown University."

Speech Delivered by Senator Gil J. Puyat Before the Rotary Club of Manila on Thursday, January 8, 1959, at the Winter Garden, Manila Hotel, Manila, Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following address delivered at the Rotary Club luncheon in Manila, Philippines, on January 8, 1959, by Senator Gil J. Puyat. The speech deals with conditions in the Philippines and in other countries recently visited by Senator Puyat. I am sure the facts pointed out will be of interest to every Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Senator Puyat is now serving his second term as a member of the Philippine Senate. He is chairman of the senate committee on finance. When he was elected to the Philippine Senate in 1951 he received the next to highest number of votes cast in the 1951 election for any candidate. In 1957, when he was reelected, he was the top-notcher—that is, he received the highest number of votes cast for any candidate.

Senator Puyat is one of the outstanding citizens of the Philippines as well as one of the leading and most successful businessmen in the islands:

I know that almost everybody here today faces the new year with this question: What is in store for us in 1959?

I have been asked to discuss what the economic trends for 1959 may be. In giving you my views, I must start by saying that I claim no prescience. I will not give you my views as a party man but as an official of the Government who fervently desires the best for the people. I will give you the picture as I see it without any furbishing and without any undertones.

Last September, on the invitation of the British Government, I spent 2 weeks in England during which I had the opportunity to talk with officials in the Government and to have a fairly comprehensive picture of the conditions of agriculture and industry as they are today in the British Isles. I was in England in 1947. I remember those days of austere rationing, of living on what I would call bare essentials. The Government and the people were beset with the problems that confronted a country that had just come out of a global war, its industrial equipment damaged and crippled, its economy threatened by the burdens of financing the most expensive war that mankind has yet seen. The people had gone through 4 years of hardships. With the strain occasioned by the war, the question was how much more could the people take and how long would the people be willing to suffer more. I saw the answer to those questions in my last trip to England. In England today, there is almost full employment. Her exchange reserves are healthy, her foreign trade has improved considerably, her industrial equipment is turning out goods running beyond prewar levels of production. The British pound is a stable currency. Cities that were almost bombed out of the map had been rebuilt and are now models of modern and planned community development. Many businessmen in England have expressed the desire to have expanded trade relations with the Philippines and to do this are agreeable to sell capital goods to the Philippines on deferred payment plans. The announcement that the sterling pound has been made freely convertible for external purposes would certainly aid in increasing the volume of trade between the so-called hard currency areas and the sterling bloc countries. England is not a rich country. Its density of population is among the highest in the world. She imports a great deal of the raw materils that she needs for her industries. In spite of these basic weaknesses, England has been able to stage a recovery that is indeed remarkable.

I visited Western Germany. I was invited by Krupp of Essen while I was in New York and the representative of this firm flew from Bonn to Paris to extend to me the official invitation. If I was impressed with what I saw in England, I will say that what I saw in Western Germany was almost unbelievable. Here is a country split into two. Western Germany represents just about 50 percent of the land area of Germany before the last World War. The population of Western Germany is about 60 percent of the population of the entire country before World War II started. That portion of Germany that is now under Soviet domination used to be the source of food for the German people. To compound the problems, there is Berlin surrounded by a Communist dominated area, a day to day problem for the free world and a potential source of threat to world peace. The industrial machinery of Germany was damaged and destroyed to the extent of 80 percent. Many of her cities were beyond recognition. Her means of transportation were almost completely wrecked. Her currency had depreciated to the extent that in 1949 the country had to effect radical monetary reforms.

In Germany today, nobody talks of unemployment. The problem of the country is what to do with the dollar reserves that are piling up every month. The levels of production have exceeded the prewar levels. She is threatening to become both the industrial and financial leader in Europe. I had a conference with the Ministry of Economic Affairs and was praising the Ministry for its economic program to which I attributed this almost unbelievable progress. The Ministry, while accepting that it undertook the initiative of preparing the program told me not in a tone of false modesty but with a ring of sincerity that if the economic program clicked the credit must be given to the sacrifice made by the German people and the capacity of the people for hard, sustained, and dedicated work. I remember the words used and I will repeat them: "This recovery has been due to the brains and brawn of the German people." Although in saying this, they also readily admitted that the help of the allies specially in furnishing food supplies was a big factor in enabling Germany to devote her genius and her energies in rebuilding her industrial machinery. And finally, these officials added: "Senator, we were able to challenge the German people to work hard and to make sacrifices because the people in the government set the example. We were working 10, 12, 14 hours a day." And one of the officials added: "I was a mayor in a small town and I remember that for almost a year my only food for lunch was a piece of bread and a piece of meat." This official further added that, "No government can ask the people to make sacrifices unless that government can by example and by actual accomplishments show that it is possessed of the integrity, the efficiency, and the vision to lead the people."

I was born in Switzerland and I saw the industrial machinery of this country working unceasingly, producing more than the country had ever produced, a country with no natural or mineral resources to speak of. Here is a country that imports practically all of the raw materials that she needs for her industries. Employment is at a peak to the extent that she has started importing technicians from other countries. I had the opportunity to talk with the officials of the Federal Reserve bank and I inquired into the mechanism and the operation of the reserves of the country. The answer was short and concise. "We keep two reserves—a dollar reserve for our dollar accounts and a gold reserve for our other currency requirements."

When I was in New York, I received an official invitation from the Government of Israel to visit that country. It meant making a change in my schedule but not only do I not regret having made the change, I feel that I was privileged to see a nation in the making. Israel is a small country. A great portion of it is rocky mountains and the south is a desert. It is surrounded by countries with which unfortunately its relations are not too friendly. In the past 10 years its population has grown from 600,000 people to its present population of 2 million. The desert areas have become productive agricultural lands and in the past 3 years millions of trees have been planted on the rocky mountains as part of a tremendous reforestation program. The army has a training program that not only makes of the people capable and competent soldiers but also equips the people with the voctional proficiency so that after a training of 2½ years in the army, a man is adequately prepared to earn a living. I was impressed by the dedication of the government officials. I could discern earnestness, a sense of mission. Get into the government service and you either suffer from ulcer or die of heart attack, is a saying amongst government officials in Israel today. Perhaps this is an exaggeration, but is indicative of the serious and dedicated attitude that government officials have when they join the government service.

A few days ago, the National Economic Council finished an updated 3-year economic program. It is the same program presented to the late President Magsaysay with certain revisions and updatings, with some change in emphasis. Broadly, it has the same basic characteristics as the previous program. It recognizes that there must be a change from a purely agricultural economy to a balanced industrial-agricultural economy. It recognizes the basic weakness of the present order, high unemployment, prevalent underemployment, low levels of production, low per capita income, as a result of which the masses by and large enjoy low standards of living. Targets of production have been set up—calculated to gradually reduce the present unemployment and absorb the annual addition to our labor force. In drawing up these targets, the investment budget was considered and the sources of investment both private and public were analyzed. I hope this program is not treated in the same way that previous programs were intentionally or unintentionally overlooked. I remember what one of the economic planners in India told me when I was chairman of the National Economic Council—that in India no economic decisions are made unless they synchronize with the economic program adopted by the

country. I do hope that the executive and Congress will examine the program and come to policy decisions so that once and for all, there may not be the lingering doubt that there is no program to follow and that the present administration is characterized by ambiguity of policies, inaction, and inertia. Of the many economic problems that await solution, time allows me to discuss with you today only a few. I adopt this approach in the conviction that clear-cut decisions on these basic problems will determine the pattern of the economic trends for 1959.

Although the President has made repeated pronouncements that he is not in favor of devaluation, the discussion goes on unabated as to whether we should devalue or not. The discussion while and so long as it lingers has been and will be a deterrent to sound investment. Of late, investments have been channeled mostly into speculative enterprises where large gains may be reaped in a matter of weeks and in real estate. The reason is understandable. You would not want to invest in long-term projects if there is the danger that your investment may shrink considerably if devaluation should come. While the discussion lingers, we can expect little, if not nothing, in the form of foreign investment. You would not want to send capital over 10,000 miles to find that investment decrease in value within a few months. Personally, I am against devaluation. I have stated my position from the very start and I have stated my position repeatedly. Devaluation is not the solution to our present economic problems. We are not a highly industrialized country. What are our most important export items that devaluation proposes to increase? Our export of sugar to the United States and other markets is limited by our quotas in these markets. For sugar, therefore, there is the so-called inelastic market. The price for copra has never been as good as in the past few years. We do not even cover our quotas for hemp and cordage not because the prices are not attractive but because through a maladjustment in the machinery of distribution, the producers do not find it profitable to increase their production because the gains of the industry accrue principally and mainly to the middlemen. I know the lumber industry and I know that the industry by and large has been reaping handsome profits. We are agreed that we should proceed with the shift in the pattern of our economy and this will require an investment which will become more expensive if we should devalue. Price increases outstrip increases in wages and salaries and God forbid if a ganta of rice in this country should come to cost ₱10 to ₱15 should we devalue. If such a situation should develop, we can expect social repercussions.

It has been pointed out that the present ratio of the peso to the dollar is no longer its real value. It has been repeatedly pointed out that the dollar is quoted at between ₱3.50 to ₱3.80 in the black market. I ask this question: Has not even as stable a currency as the American dollar depreciated since the last World War? I, for one, refuse to believe that the black market quotation for the peso as its real value. This black market quotation is established through illicit operations and by flight of capital. The problem is compounded by the fact that our economy is not in the hands of nationals, but in the hands of foreigners some of whom have been indulging in extensive flight of capital operations. I have a hunch that if these dollars that have been stashed away could be channeled into our official reserves, our reserves would increase by easily $100 million. What has happened is that instead of our dollar earnings going into the official reserves, they now are held by persons and corporations who have little faith nor care much about the future of this country. I will admit that certain industries have to be helped, like the base metal industry. But for this purpose, specific legislation can be enacted. This we have done with the tobacco industry and the marginal producers of gold. We must be guided by that established maxim in popular government, the greatest good for the greatest number. Devaluation may help a few industries, many businessmen would profit from it, but what would be the effect on the masses?

Another policy decision that we must arrive at is whether to effect decontrol or proceed with our present system of almost absolute controls, the intensity of which has increased with every recent decision of the central bank. My observation in my last trip points to the fact that those countries that have lifted controls have rehabilitated faster than those countries that have persisted in perpetuating controls. Controls breed an artificial situation, controls create artificial scarcity. Whenever such situations emerge, the temptation to indulge in black marketing, in profiteering becomes alluring. I am in favor of gradual decontrol. For this purpose I have already filed a bill in the Senate providing for the necessary exchange for essential and semiessential consumer goods and the requirements of essential and semiessential industries. I am not worried about the nonessentials and luxuries. Provided we can take care of the essentials and semiessentials, the people, I am sure, will be satisfied. But then the question is asked, how can we effect decontrol when our reserves are low? This brings me to what I have been arguing for during the past several years.

The immediate suspension of the barter trade. The barter trade has been the biggest leak in our dollar earnings. We will never be able to have healthy reserves so long as there is that big hole in our pocket. I daresay we easily lose between $50 to $100 million every year through the barter trade. The recent experience in Spain should be an eye opener to us. The government has discovered that many persons and corporations have been keeping dollar accounts in Switzerland and as a result, the exchange reserves of the country have fallen to about $57 million, whereas the aggregate amount hidden by these persons and corporations is estimated at $288 million. Unless the barter trade is immediately suspended, we will not be able to build up our reserves. There are other means of bolstering these reserves. We should undertake a well studied campaign of obtaining capital goods on deferred payment basis. We could make greater use of Public Law 480. I would even be willing to subsidize our gold mining industry to build up the country's gold reserves. These steps are passive in character. We should at the same time take positive measures. We should lose no further time in establishing connections in countries we do not trade with now. We should take vigorous steps to expand our trade relations with the countries we now deal with. In the short space of ten years, Israel has been able to sign up bilateral agreements with at least 21 countries and with the skillful and adept use of the swing balance of payment provided for in these bilateral agreements, Israel, in effect, has increased her exchange reserves by the aggregate of the credits provided for in these trade agreements. All of the countries in Europe are currently engaged in establishing footholds in Africa. We have not explored the possibilities of trading with the Latin American countries. A continuing survey of the markets we now have and the establishment of footholds in new markets require a thorough dissection of the market potentials, the currency problems, tariff, and many other related problems. This should be a major program of our government. It is imperative that we start now a bold and dynamic program of market exploration, development and exploitation.

Such a move is almost imposed on us. When we undertook the revision of the Bell Trade Agreement in 1954, we stated in Washington that as we lose preferment in the American market, we should undertake a program to develop other markets for both our exports and for the sources of our imports. Four years have elapsed and I find almost nothing in the way of implementing this policy decision.

I will now take up with you briefly another major problem that faces us. The royal road to inflation is deficit spending. I have always stood for a balanced budget. For several years now, when the budget would come to the Senate Finance Committee for review, I have repeatedly called the attention of our executive branch to the overestimated revenues and the danger of indiscriminate bond issues. There is something radically wrong in a fiscal policy that bases its estimates of revenues on the assumption of the approval of new tax measures without first ascertaining whether such tax measures would meet with congressional approval.

When I first ran for Senate in 1951, I limited my program of government to three fundamentals. I said I would lend my every effort toward establishing in this country an honest government, an efficient government and a progressive government. Without honesty in the government, we cannot expect of the people their continuing support. Without efficiency, we cannot expect the people to pay their taxes nor to contribute their share to the economic development. There must be palpable evidence that every centavo collected in the form of taxes is returned to the people in terms of services, improved services and expanded services. And a government can never be, must never be static in its concepts. It must look forward, it must be progressive.

We should profit from the experiences of other countries, adopt those measures which would fit into the local conditions and discard those that find no local application. I am confident that a people that performed so heroically in the last world war can be as heroic in these times of peace, if there would be patriotic, competent and dedicated leadership.

The President's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower budget is a remarkable achievement.

First. We have a balanced budget, with outgo matched to income. That makes sense to everybody.

Second. No important Government activities—particularly national defense—have been cut back below current levels.

Third. The present income tax rates will bring in the revenues we need, without increasing the rates.

Fourth. We can go ahead with the buildup of defense, space exploration, and general welfare programs.

And fifth, we can hold off inflation.

When you realize that the Government is in the hole this year by about $13 billion, you begin to see what a terrific job President Eisenhower and the Budget Bureau have done on the new budget.

I will be frank in saying that I did not think it could be done. As a Member of Congress, I see the terrific pressures for higher spending from all quarters. Defense costs have been going higher, and in a number of nondefense areas, such as farm price supports, the story is the same. But the President got his Cabinet officers together and told them they must hold expenses down and postpone everything that was not absolutely essential to the country right now.

So the President has given the Congress a budget that can be balanced.

If the Congress goes along with him, the budget will stay in balance, without increasing taxes and without hurting necessary public services.

Speaking for myself, I am going to give the President all the help I can on his budget. It is good business for all of us, and it will hasten the day when a prosperous economy will produce the income to finance the Government and to make possible a reduction in tax rates.

We owe the President a standing vote of confidence and thanks.

We Remember—We Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of the following editorial which appeared in the January 8 issue of the Detroit News. I believe this candid message of greeting to Mr. Mikoyan upon his visit to Detroit will prove of interest to all Members of the House:

WE REMEMBER—WE HOPE

To ANASTAS IVANOVICH MIKOYAN, FIRST DEPUTY PREMIER OF THE SOVIET UNION, *Greetings:*

Because you are a stranger, and because it is the long, proud tradition of this free Nation to offer hospitality to all strangers, we welcome you to Detroit, as other Americans have welcomed you to their cities. But because you come ostensibly to know us better, you should know first of all that the handshake of courtesy does not in the least dim our memory of your government's brutalities and particularly of your own visit to Budapest during the Hungarian uprising to support Kadar in the bloody business of crushing patriots.

We don't overlook the past, or your own responsibility for it during an extraordinary career of total devotion to self-interest at any cost. Every man, however, and every nation in a just world must be conceded to have a future as well as a past, a chance, not to be forgiven, for that is not man's business, but to go forward. While condemning unreservedly what you have done to those who wanted only to live their own lives, we resist the temptation to condemn in advance what you may do better hereafter.

You come on a mission of peace, prepared, it is said, to discuss increased trade and perhaps also diminished hostility between our countries. Most of us have long believed in maximum trade among nations, provided only that the exchange of goods for mutual profit is the mutually accepted goal.

We note with misgiving that the Soviet Union has not always bought and sold in that spirit, that rather it regards trade as one of the more effective weapons for its obstinate war against the Western democracies. For instance, we remind you of the recent dumping on the London market of Soviet metals, which were not even surplus, in order to break international prices and so try out Soviet economic power.

The fact, of which you of course are aware, is that Soviet trade is carried on only by the Soviet state with the full power of the state behind each transaction. Our free businessmen are naturally reluctant to beard such a political colossus, and cultivate markets or sources of supply so at the mercy of a dictator's whim—especially when the dictator is openly sworn to destroy them as capitalist enemies.

On the other hand we are at least as anxious as you to promote peaceable contacts between our nations. We, too, are convinced that the more we can both do to advance our mutual prosperity, the more we promote our mutual security. A high standard of living is even more potent than understanding in turning people's thoughts from war.

"Budyet mir: There will be peace," you have said over and over since you have been here. These are appealing words, as you surely know. You may also know that our own refrain has been similar for years and yet somehow the world during those years has not enjoyed peace.

We suspect both from what you do and what you say that your peace is not ours, that what you want for other men is the repose of death or the harmony of prison and for yourself the ease of unchallengeable power. Peace for your government seems to consist in your having your own way; war is what happens when the other fellow objects.

We think you are profoundly mistaken in this view, not only because we personally decline to enter your servitude peacefully but because history proves that slavery is not the way to peace. You offer the world only that total surrender which even your own satellites, prodded by roving tanks of the Red army, have refused. Your already enslaved peoples provide not even you with peace but only with those splitting headaches congenital to tyranny.

Peace, in short, like so many aspirations of the human spirit is realizable only in freedom. Until your government sees that, it will go on multiplying the hates, frustrations and fears that make war inevitable.

The tragedy in this is that all your bullying is quite unnecessary to your stated main purpose: To promote the prosperity and security of the Soviet Union. "Let us compete," you say, "in having more milk and more meat and more clothing for people. And we hope you won't complain if we do catch up with you." We say, "Try us, Anastas Ivanovich; just try us."

State Versus Federal Water Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following speech made by Mr. Burnham Emerson:

STATE VERSUS FEDERAL WATER RIGHTS

(By Burnham Enerson, Colorado River Association, 1958 annual meeting, Las Vegas, Nev., Dec. 5, 1958)

During the past several years there has been, as all of you well know, an accelerated trend toward more and more control by the Federal Government, and less and less control by the several States, in a great many areas of governmental activity. This trend toward federalism, if I may use that term, takes many forms and manifests itself in many different ways, and I am sure you all realize that it is a very significant development of our times.

Much of this trend stems from the concept that practically all commerce is interstate commerce and thus falls within the orbit of the Federal Government. Some of the trend is based on the theory that practically every body of water on the surface of the earth is navigable and so falls within the Federal Government's jurisdiction over navigable waters. When these foundations for Federal jurisdiction fail, the federalists usually fall back on the broad, vague, and comfortable cushion of the general welfare clause in the Constitution.

I am not here, however, to analyze the basis or cause of this trend toward federalism nor to discuss its history. Rather, I want to talk about its manifestation in the field of water-resource development.

As persons interested in the conservation and use of our water resources, you are well aware of the trend in this field. You have seen the Federal Government repeatedly in recent years assert the authority to control, and even to own, waters which for a century or more had been regarded as within the exclusive jurisdiction of the States.

One example, a very dramatic one, was the famous tidelands episode of a decade ago, when the Department of Justice of the United States asserted, and the Supreme Court of the United States agreed—though later reversed by the Congress—that the Federal Government, rather than the States, had paramount rights in the 3-mile strip of water and the underlying soil along the coasts of our seaboard States (*U.S.* v. *California*, 1947, 332 U.S. 19).

Another and more recent example is the so-called Pelton Dam case (*Federal Power Commission* v. *Oregon*, 1955, 349 U.S. 435), wherein the Department of Justice asserted, and again the Supreme Court of the United States agreed, that a licensee of the Federal Power Commission could build and operate a power project on Federal lands within the State of Oregon without observing the requirements of Oregon law.

The clear implications of this important decision of the U.S. Supreme Court were of very great concern to everyone in the West who is familiar with water development problems. It appeared from this decision that the United States as a property owner was to be above the law and not required to observe the laws and regulations of the States with regard to the use of water within their borders. Furthermore, it appeared that not only the agencies of the Federal Government but also their licensees, such as the power company which obtained the license for the Pelton Dam from the Federal Power Commission, would also be exempt from State regulation. By this one decision it appeared that the Supreme Court of the United States had greatly expanded the authority of the Federal Power Commission and other Federal agencies and had greatly reduced the effectiveness and value of local regulation of water resource development by the several States.

The Pelton Dam decision is only 3 years old, having been announced in 1955, but the fears which it engendered have already been justified. In a very recent ruling by the U.S. District Court in the State of Nevada the

Pelton Dam doctrine was applied to exempt the U.S. Navy from complying with Nevada laws regulating the appropriation and use of underground waters. I refer to the well-known Hawthorne case (*State of Nevada* v. *United States*, No. 1247, U.S.D.C., District of Nevada), in which a decision was announced on August 27 of this year.

The importance of this ruling to the State of Nevada and to all other Western States cannot possibly be overemphasized. Like many of the Western States, the State of Nevada depends for its water resources to a very large extent upon the conservation and careful use of its underground water supplies. In order to utilize those underground waters to the best possible advantage the State of Nevada has established, as have many other States, laws and regulations controlling the drilling and operation of wells so that the underground water reservoirs shall be carefully managed and not improperly exploited. Yet this decision in the Hawthorne case would appear to immunize the United States as a property owner from the effect of these necessary regulations. It must be obvious to anyone that the regulations cannot possibly be effective unless all water users are subject to the same control. If the United States, for instance, is one of several property owners whose lands overlie a common underground water reservoir and all of the other property owners are subject to State regulations but the United States is not, then it is clear that the United States can, if it sees fit to do so, take all of the water from the underground basin for its own use. This, of course, would leave all of the other property owners without any water, and also without recourse.

Still another example of federalism in water law is the assertion of the Department of Justice in the Fallbrook case, now pending in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, that the United States has a paramount interest in the waters of the Santa Margarita River above and beyond any interest which would be recognized under California law. One of the grounds given to support this contention was that most of the water of the stream originates in a U.S. forest reserve (*United States* v. *Fallbrook Public Utility District* (No. 1247–SD–C), a case which by coincidence bears the same clerk's number as the Hawthorne case). This last contention of the Department of Justice was rejected by the trial judge, Hon. James M. Carter, U.S. district judge at San Diego, last August. Doubtless the case will be appealed and if the contention of the Department of Justice should eventually become the law of the land, then I venture to say that practically all of the presently undeveloped waters of the Western States would become the property of the U.S. Government because most of those waters originate in mountain areas where the Federal Government owns most of the land. The result would be obvious—future water resource development in the Western States would be no longer regulated by the States themselves but by a collection of bureaucrats in Washington.

These and many other examples of the growth of Federal authority in the field of water resource development have recently been very well described and analyzed in an excellent address by Mr. Clarence A. Davis, former Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior, at the 1958 annual meeting of the American Bar Association in Los Angeles. Mr. Davis entitled his address "Federal Encroachment on State Water Rights." Copies of the address have been prepared by the Irrigation Districts Association of California, which publishes the Western Water News, and can be obtained from the office of that association at 945 Pacific Building, San Francisco. I commend Mr. Davis' address to you as an exceedingly interesting and informative discussion of this subject.

Recognizing the far-reaching consequences of the rule announced by the Supreme Court in the Pelton Dam case, a number of thoughtful statesmen, led by Senator BARRETT, of Wyoming, have made a determined attempt to obtain action by the Congress to reverse that decision. A bill was introduced for that purpose, S. 863. If adopted, that bill would require the United States and its agencies to comply with laws of the respective States governing the development and use of water resources.

Extensive hearings were held upon the bill by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in 1956. The most significant feature of the hearings was the very extreme position taken by the Department of Justice that the Federal Government owns practically all of the water rights in most of the Western States. These claims of ownership were based in large part on the theory that the Federal Government had acquired title to the water rights from Mexico under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and had never parted with title.

Following the hearings on the Barrett bill an attempt has been made to work out with the Department of Justice a compromise which would meet the primary objective of reversing the Pelton Dam decision. One of the leaders in this effort to straighten out this situation is Mr. Elmer Bennett, formerly Solicitor and now Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior, and he is to be commended for his forthright recognition of the importance of protecting the integrity of the water rights and water laws of the respective States. Mr. Bennett has worked diligently with the representatives of the Department of Justice to arrive at an acceptable solution of the problem.

So far as I am advised, the efforts to compromise the issue with the Department of Justice have not yet progressed to the point where success is assured. A tentative draft of a substitute bill has been released, and it has received a good deal of study and criticism on the part of interested citizens. The substitute bill certainly goes a long way toward correcting the Pelton Dam decision, but it contains some qualifying language which must be clarified before everyone can be sure that the bill will achieve the desired result.

I hope that the problem will continue to receive close attention and that in the forthcoming session of Congress it will be solved. Meanwhile, the Pelton Dam doctrine is still the law, and unless corrected by Congress it will certainly accelerate the trend toward federalism in the management of our water resources.

As I have said, one result of this accelerated trend toward federalism may well be a move toward the establishment of a system of Federal water right administration superimposed upon and perhaps largely replacing the present administration of water rights by the respective States. This is a development which I, for one, would view with great alarm. I trust that it shall never come to pass and I hope that it will never even be suggested. But if it should be suggested that the Federal Government ought to establish a bureau for the administration of water rights to which the United States lays claim, then I urge all of you to resist such a proposal with all of the force and strength at your command.

Let us examine very briefly some of the results which might follow from the establishment of a system of Federal water right administration.

First. It would mean abandonment of any hope of regulating the use of water by the United States and its many agencies. No one who has observed the management by the Federal Government of its own property could imagine for a moment that the Federal Government would regulate itself while regulating others.

Second. The paramount interest of the Federal Government in our undeveloped water resources would be permanently and irrevocably established. Water right permits which might be issued by the Federal Government to private citizens or to cities or local districts would probably be made expressly subject at all times to all existing and future requirements of the Federal Government and its agencies. Such a permit system would impair the ability of local interests and local governments to finance water resource development projects through normal financing channels because the purchasers of the bonds issued to pay for the construction of the water conservation facilities would know that the water rights to be utilized by the facilities could be terminated by the Federal Government if a Federal agency should later develop a need for the use of the same water. The natural result of this condition would be that the Federal Government itself would have to finance the local agencies. Thus the Federal Government would control not only the water rights but also the purse strings. There would be little left for the local interests to do except to pay their Federal taxes.

Third. All water right administration by the Federal Government would, of course, be concentrated in Washington. This would mean that persons having need for water permits, or wishing to oppose the issuance of water permits to others, would have to travel back and forth to Washington, probably at frequent intervals, in order to present their petitions or protect their interests. Not only would this add greatly to the expense at every stage of the proceeding, but also it would add greatly to the amount of time required for the processing of water right applications. All of you who have done business with the United States know that it always moves very slowly, and sometimes not at all.

Fourth. Of necessity the Federal administration of water rights would be required to establish the same criteria and follow the same policies, rules, regulations and practices throughout the country. This necessarily means that the differences in law which have been built up over many decades by the several Western States would be suppressed. It also means that the differences in geographical characteristics, climatic patterns and water requirements of various States might be disregarded. Such an effort to establish a system which would be suitable for every place and every condition would in all probability produce a system which would suit no one except the bureaucrats who designed it.

Fifth. The establishment of a Federal system of water right administration would open the regulation of our water resources to all of the social and economic theories which so often find expression in the policies of the Federal Government. Water rights would be administered not on the basis of specific projects to meet specific needs but rather on some high-sounding combination of the philosophy of the general welfare clause, the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number, the balancing of the public interests, and, of course, the lure—the pie in the sky—of Federal financing.

These are some of the conditions which might be forced upon us if the claims of the United States Department of Justice should eventually become the law of the land. I am not relying merely upon my imagination in describing these conditions, nor am I seeing ghosts. Most of these same conditions are actually present in the administration by the Federal Government of the waters which are developed by the

United States under the reclamation laws. Even if we should assume—which I for one do not—that these policies are good and proper and wise for the particular and limited field in which the reclamation laws operate, I am sure you will agree that expanding them into the administration of water rights generally would be unfortunate.

As an example, let me direct your attention for a few moments to the effect of the acreage limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation laws, and as I do so please let your own imagination tell you what would happen if these same principles were applied in the administration of practically all future water-resource development in the entire country.

As you know, the acreage-limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation laws were incorporated in the original Reclamation Act of 1902 for the purpose of curbing monopoly and preventing speculation in the development of public lands in the Western States. The basic principle had its origin in the provisions of the homestead laws which limited the area of public land to be given to a single individual. This principle was readily adaptable to the reclamation laws which were intended to provide a means for the improvement of lands within the public domain so as to encourage and facilitate their settlement. I do not know of anyone who seriously quarrels with the application of this principle to public land development.

But when this same principle is applied, as it has been, to privately owned lands, great controversy arises.

This controversy has been the subject of numerous articles, several books, much oratory, many debates in Congress, and even some litigation. It goes without saying that the Federal Government may properly impose fair and reasonable conditions in return for its financial assistance in the development of water resources. The question in dispute is: Are the acreage limitation provisions reasonable and fair conditions to impose on the owners of privately held lands who receive such help?

The effect of the provisions is that in order to receive supplemental water a farmer must reduce his landholdings to what the demagogues graciously call the family size farm. This term is a misnomer, or at best a euphemism, for subsistence farm. By its own very words, that term "family size farm" implies that the farm should be of such size that it will barely support a family and no more. If the farm will support more than a single family it obviously contains more land than a family needs and so is too large to be a family-size farm. If the farm will provide a family with more than enough income for its own support, the farm is also by definition too big. Likewise, if the farm enables the owner to make a net profit to invest in other lands or to build up a savings account the farm is also by definition too large because it is providing the family with more than a self-sustaining income.

One common complaint about the acreage limitation is that in many areas 160 acres is not nearly enough to support a farmer—to say nothing of a family—even at a subsistence level. In answer to this complaint the advocates of the rigid 160-acre limitation have said that if the farmer who lives in such an area needs more land he should take unto himself a wife, and then he and his wife together can have 320 acres. If that is not sufficient, they say, then the farmer and his wife should have some children, each of whom could add another 160 acres to the family holdings. Thus, in reality, what these spokesmen have been advocating is not a family-size farm, but rather a farm-size family.

The result of these limitations is that as the price for receiving a supplemental water supply for his land, the farmer who owns more than the prescribed unit must reduce his holdings to a bare subsistence level and must refrain from ever enlarging his farm above a subsistence level so long as he lives in the reclamation project. This continuous hand-to-mouth existence is imposed upon the farmer despite the fact that he pays his full share of the cost of construction of the irrigation facilities and his full share of all operating expenses.

As the excuse for imposing these conditions, the defenders of the acreage limitation provisions cite the fact that under reclamation law Federal funds are made available to the farmer upon an interest-free basis for a period of 40 years or more. The waiver of interest is said to be a form of subsidizing the farmer. In return for this subsidy, however, the Federal Government makes sure that the farmer shall never make enough money from farming to acquire more than the maximum amount of land which the Federal Government arbitrarily says one family may own. In other words, the Federal Government forbids the subsidized farmer from making a success of his business by enlarging his farm.

This attitude is directly contrary to the motivating ambition and the goal of every farmer in the country. Farmers traditionally have a strong desire to acquire more land with which to enlarge their operations, so as to provide farm lands for their children and their grandchildren and have adequate security for their own old age. Yet the Federal Government tells the farmer who receives water from a reclamation project that so long as he stays in the project he must suppress his ambition, abandon his goal, and content himself with remaining on a subsistence level.

Subsidies are not unknown or unusual in the farflung activities of the Federal Government, but the subsidy represented by the interest-free financing under the reclamation laws is the only subsidy which carries with it a prohibition against successful operation of the subsidized business. In no other area of subsidized activities does the Federal Government prohibit success or penalize successful operators. All other subsidies are available to all who qualify, without discrimination on account of size, wealth, or resources, but the subsidy contained in the reclamation laws discriminates against the successful operator and guarantees that all beneficiaries of the subsidy shall never make anything more than a bare living on a family size farm.

Probably the oldest Federal subsidy is that of the Post Office Department, which operates year after year at a huge deficit made up from the general funds obtained by the Federal Treasury from the Federal taxpayers. The users of the postal service thus obtain the service at substantially less than its real cost and the Government pays the difference. This is a direct subsidy. Yet the subsidy is available to the largest mail-order house in the country on the same basis as to a one-man business or to a housewife. Everyone who purchases a postage stamp is a beneficiary of the subsidy. There is no discrimination in the distribution of the benefits of the postal subsidy.

Another early form of subsidy was the land grants to the railroads. There again the subsidy carried no conditions which discriminated between the large and the small operator. No penalty was imposed upon success. The land grants carried with them various conditions which the recipients were required to observe, but those conditions fell alike upon the short and the long railroads and there was no discrimination among them. Similar subsidies are used today in developing hte country's airlines and steamship services. But these subsidies are also free from discriminatory restrictions.

There are very large governmental subsidies of various kinds in our farm price support programs, and while these are accompanied by planting restrictions, the limits are based upon historical performance and not upon any such arbitrary maximum as the family-size farm.

While not subsidies in the strict sense of the word, vast benefits are given to the people of the country in our flood-control projects and rivers and harbors improvement works. These benefits go to the rich and the poor alike. A Federal flood-control dam affords equal protection, without discrimination, to the huge industrial plant and the small cottage. The harbors and aids to navigation provided by the Federal Government are used upon exactly the same terms by the small tramp freighter and the huge ocean liner. There is no discrimination in the dispensation of these benefits. All citizens are treated alike regardless of size, or ability to pay.

Rather than discouraging expansion by imposing artificial limits, these subsidies and other benefits are calculated to aid expansion and encourage success.

But when we look at the acreage limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation law we find that success is virtually forbidden, so that the only beneficiaries of the subsidy are those farmers who are content to live at a subsistence level. They must abandon all hope of expanding their operations within the reclamation project and they must either move out of the project or be content to struggle along on a hand-to-mouth basis for the rest of their lives.

This is the rankest kind of discrimination against the farmer. It imposes conditions upon him which are not duplicated in any other field of governmental activity. For this reason, the proper name for these provisions of the reclamation laws should be the "acreage discrimination" provisions.

An earnest effort was made in the last session of the Congress to obtain an amendment of these provisions which would lessen the discrimination and make it possible for a farmer in a reclamation project to achieve real success by enlarging his farm over the subsistence size arbitrarily dictated by the present law. This amendment was presented by Senator Barrett of Wyoming in Senate bill No. 2541. If adopted it would have incorporated into the Reclamation Law the Engle formula—so named because it was originally proposed some years ago by Mr. CLAIR ENGLE, who was then a Congressman and is now our newly elected Senator from California. Under the Engle formula the owner of excess acreage in a reclamation project would be permitted to receive project water for his excess lands, without agreeing to sell the excess acreage, by obligating himself to pay interest upon his share of the repayment obligation to the United States, thus foregoing the benefit of the interest-free financing which the reclamation laws make available to owners of nonexcess lands. This plan requires the farmer to give up the subsidy as the price for rising above the subsistence level—so the formula is still discriminatory in its effect upon successful farmers, but at least it does remove the existing prohibition against success.

This bill to adopt the Engle formula came before the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation at hearings on April 30 and May 1, 1958, and it was debated extensively. However, the Senate subcommittee filed no report regarding the bill and took no action respecting it. The bill therefore died in committee upon the adjournment of the final session of the 85th Congress last August.

So the family-size farm is still with us. Even at the sacrifice of his share of the subsidy, the farmer in a reclamation project cannot escape this arbitrary limit upon his own success. He must remain at a subsistence level or get out of the project. This limitation is imposed upon him by ardent crusaders and well-meaning but poorly in-

formed do-gooders in the name of democracy and the American way of life. In my judgment, it is neither American nor democratic to hold a farmer down to subsistence farming. Rather it is paternalism and collectivism at their very worst.

Although the specific thrust of the limitation provisions is aimed at use of water, the immediate impact is upon title to land. By this means the Federal Government exerts control over land ownership patterns. To do so is to interfere directly with the State's own determination as to what land laws it shall apply to establish and stabilize its agricultural and industrial economy according to its own best judgment. Land laws are peculiarly and properly within the exclusive jurisdiction of the States. In fact, hardly any subjects of legislation are as deeply rooted in our doctrine of States rights as are the laws by which land titles are determined, land uses are regulated, land tenures are controlled, and land taxes are collected. Yet, through application of these provisions of reclamation law the Federal Government is imposing its own rules regulating land ownership patterns in many large areas of irrigated agricultural development.

This artificial control of the destiny of the individual farmer is the type of control which emanates from the Federal Government when it is given a lever and a fulcrum with which to exert its power. In this instance the lever is the Federal Treasury and the fulcrum is the farmers' need for supplemental water supplies. If the Federal Government's power should be augmented by taking over the ownership of substantially all of the remaining water resources of the Western States, the result would be an utterly unmanageable force which could compress most of our western agricultural economy into whatever mold the Washington bureaucrats might fashion.

Let us hope that none of us shall ever see the day when this shall come to pass. It can be avoided, but as for all our cherished freedoms, eternal vigilance is the price.

Thank you for your very patient attention.

One World and "The Winter Solstice"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON W. GLENN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an international broadcast over ABC network on the program "Message of Israel," delivered on Sunday, December 21, by my very dear friend, Rabbi Martin M. Weitz of Beth Israel Congregation in Atlantic City:

The winter solstice—December 21—is the shortest day and the longest night in the calendar of man. It is the seedbed of his deepest fears and greatest hopes, because of the shadow-long night, because the sun was at its lowest ebb. Primitive religions helped Mother Nature and Father Time along and tried to resolve this dilemma by festivals of light in one form or another. The Saturnalia of the Romans centered about the winter solstice to impart strength to growing things latent in the winter-night. Greeks as well as Romans, Persions as well as Mithraists, shared different observances in a common observation of the sun's return to strength, directly after the winter solstice. The Jewish Festival of Lights and the Christian Day of Nativity also suggest this endless search for light in a world of darkness, the solving of crises in a balance of forces. Crises have ever been central to the calendar of all faiths. Crises, as birth, maturity, marriage, death, are basic for the rites of the individual, while group crises are sources for the great days that aim for worldways—signsposts at the crossroads of space and time in the life of man.

The winter solstice suggests a balance of forces that may harvest light out of darkness and yield strength beyond weakness, even as a philosopher-poet phrases it, "Yea, though I stand on a heap of wreckage, I may touch the stars" or, "I love the stars too deeply to be fearful of the night."

What are current zones where religion at its ablest and bravest may throw a bridge of the spirit across the "no man's land" of contemporary crisis,. even as the winter solstice throws a torch of light across the year's deepest and longest night of darkness?

As darkness makes way for light in the winter solstice, so the no man's lands may become zones of safety, by a synthesis rather than antithesis of seeming opposites, by closing open gaps of conflict, as much as possible, and bridging them with cooperation, by surrendering "either or" to new priority of semantics in the landscape of language and for new values in human fellowship.

This balance may be sought and wrought first in striving for a synthesis of faith and health, of religion and psychiatry, so there be not a latent truce but a potent peace by them, a partnership to serve both better.

Judaism in general and progressive Judaism in particular may do much to undo the yoke of guilt, to reinterpret "sin" as "chet" ("miss the mark") for modern man to free us from creeping clinging infantile inferiorities and inadequacies, to create a climate for a spiritual Shmitah, a religio-therapeutic statute of limitations, a kind of sabbatical leave for sorrows, guilt, frustration, which we often try to drown only after they have learned us how to swim.

Varied are the interpretations in a bridging of religion and psychiatry. As Erich Fromm counsels us, "Man is not in danger of becoming a slave today as of a robot, for he has no joy while living in the midst of plenty. When man is bored he becomes vicious. When man counts so little, it is difficult for either religion or psychoanalysis to be effective." He specifies further, "Religion should aim to make a man fully human, to be able to unfold, to give love and devotion and in which psychoanalysis could play a role by helping man to overcome greed, folly, anger, fear and his illusions about nature, reality and himself."

The pathway across no man's land could be prepared with psychiatry as the bulldozer, to cleanse and remove the debris, while religion could be as a concrete mixer, with dependable fill-in of material for the precious traffic of life.

There is indeed worldwide need for much less anxiety and much more faith.

Luminous sentences from the Bible are equal to any modern prescription for mental health, as from book of Proverbs:

"If there be worry in the heart of man, let one talk it away; yea, a goodly word will even make it glad." The book of Psalms anticipates modern psychiatry when it intimates: "When I kept silence, my bones wore away through my groaning all the day long. Then I acknowledged my sin unto Thee, and my iniquity I have not hid. I said I will make confession concerning my transgressions unto the Lord, and Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sins." Both catharsis and transfer are implied in these outbursts, with God as Supreme Intelligence (in lieu of a human analyst).

Beyond soul probers of a generation ago, we find doctors and ministers, as well as psychoanalysts and religionists of our own days, together sharing a groping and growing awareness of a relationship between faith and medicine as they strive to serve the ill. The Journal of American Medical Association for April 13, 1957, emphasizes that "Today, medicine and religion are drawing together more closely than ever before. No longer as in the past, do the doctor and the clergymen find themselves in competitive roles. Instead the men in white and the men in black are aware of a relationship between faith and health." The confessional of the chaplain and the couch of the analyst have helped the patient more than ever before. The New National Academy of Religion and Mental Health—600 members of the American Psychiatric Association, 600 psychologists, as social workers and laymen, and 600 clergymen of all major faiths. This gigantic effort is paralleled by regional units, coordinating pastoral care and clinical experience.

As an Einstein beyond Copernicus, so a Fromm beyond a Freud has perceived new dimensions for the world within. The new interpreters concede the validity of ceremony for spiritual as well as emotional stability, the value of personal identity and integrity with rootage in the world, the life of faith in personal tragedy as synonymous with faith in life.

The great physician, Sir William Osler, once asserted, "Nothing in life is more wonderful than faith, the one great moving force we can neither weigh in the balance nor test in the crucible." The book of Proverbs synthesizes all this effort to balance faith and health in a simple prescription for life: "For as one thinketh in his heart, so is he. * * *"

Our second zone of safety—for more cooperation and less conflict is in a balance between individual and family.

Indeed we might paraphrase the prayerbook ala the Sabbath with, "Even as Israel has preserved the family, so the family has preserved Israel." In order to have the family survive and revive in the atomic age, religion in general and Judaism in particular may aid the family by stabilizing it on new terms even as on old values; by helping form institutes for marriage-counseling in our colleges, and even in our high schools; by dealing intelligently with such new phenomena as "going steady," "bird dogging," and other juvenile experiences; by advocating single standards of morality for men and women; by laboring for uniform divorce laws throughout the country, and in all other matters, so that the family be a preserving force not only for morality but for faith in itself in the atomic age. Marriage would not be merely a biologic mating, or a psychologic accommodatfon, or an economic partnership, but even more, a relationship through life as well as for life, sanctioned by the state, and sanctified by religion. Is it not strange that man could find no finer phraseology to beautify his most significant quest even for Deity than when he used family terminology, even for "fatherhood of God" and "brotherhood of man"?

A third zone where faith may bridge the gulf is in the emergent conflict of ruralism and urbanism. The vast network of suburbia (as overnight Levittowns), exurbia (as weekend estate villages), and interurbia (as blends of both along railroads or flightlines or turnpikes, a continuous settlement from, say, New York City to Washington, D.C.) is in itself a mobility of restlessness, a compulsive obsession for making money, a moving to and fro almost aimlessly for its own sake.

How may the new America have the standard of living—urbanism—balanced with a standard of life—ruralism? How may we spiritually integrate and physically

consolidate this mood for vast mobility, so that it be anchored, creative and responsive to its own needs here and overseas?

Here, too, a balance may be initiated by faith, to lessen the distance between Adam and atom, with vast slum clearance, atom-powered industry, garden-garlanded, school-ornamented, and culture-motivated communities, with a spiritual rather than secular base for our own permanent survival.

A final zone, for which faith may point a new way, is in the struggle of east and west. Religion may be as a lighthouse serving all points of the compass. We may live to see the ultimate reality in the cycle from war to peace, beyond blood-feuding by clans, wars by city-States and within States, dueling by individuals, crusades by religio-national empires, counteroffensives between world powers. * * * In the physical acceleration from atom to hydrogen to cobalt bomb, we may perceive the end of imperial unification, balance of power or similar techniques for control, and the beginning of world peace.

The more global, mechanistic, destructive, impersonal, war becomes, the less likely its final employment for victories. In the final analysis, there is naught but paralysis * * * for so-called victor or vanquished. The warless world may be ours—if we of faith, all over the world, will it, pray for it and work for it, free from military mentality from the past and for spiritual reality of the future, free from private animosity, major atrophy and general apathy—to employ military phraseology—for equations of war deeply laden within each of us.

"In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength. * * *" "If you confide not, ye abide not * * *" are echoes from the prophet of peace, Isaiah.

As an Albert Einstein at the end of days, and a Leo Baeck, upon liberation from a concentration camp, we, too, may share their unspoken meditations:

"For those that have mud on their feet, let us remove that mud * * * for those that have blood on their hands, let us cleanse that blood * * * for those that have fears in their hearts, let us remove those fears * * * for those that have tears in their eye, let us dry those tears."

Thus we blend faith and health, fuse individual with family, balance the rural and the urban, and bridge—through force of spirit rather than spirit of force—even east and west * * * even as the winter solstice, because of the length of its outer night, makes man shine with a profound inner light. Amen.

He's Purged Thousands of Armenians, Helped Wreck Armenian Freedom; He's No More Armenian Than Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following two articles from the January 15, 1959, issue of the Hairenik Weekly regarding our recent visitor to the United States, Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan.

This publication, Mr. Speaker, is sponsored by the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia of Boston, Mass. In view of the apparent aura of respectability and even good will with which Mr. Mikoyan has attempted to surround himself during his recent visit in this country, I think the inclusion of these two articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is of particular note. Since Mr. Mikoyan is himself an Armenian by birth, it is particularly interesting to observe the opinions that are held of him and his visit by his fellow countrymen in the United States.

HE'S PURGED THOUSANDS OF ARMENIANS, HELPED WRECK ARMENIAN FREEDOM; HE'S NO MORE ARMENIAN THAN KHRUSHCHEV

(By James H. Tashjian)

The pathological devotion to anyone or anything emanating from or smacking of the Soviet Union on the part of certain Armenian circles is being matched these days by an equally pathological fascination on the part of the American press and "intellectual strata" (to use an excellent Marxist cliche) of the abominable figure of one Anastas Mikoyan who is these days, according to Moscow, the Deputy Premier of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

As a self-invited guest of our Republic, Mikoyan is coursing through our land, from the mountains, to the prairies, to the oceans white with foam, giving nickel bits of candy to American kids in supermarkets, looking intently and wisely at packaged American donuts, asking motel owners sagely why they are in business, taking 3-mile strolls on crisp Washington mornings, making studiously quotable wisecracks—and receiving billions of dollars of free publicity for it all—free propaganda for communism.

The Hungarians had the right idea.

Instead of being met and followed around dutifully by batteries of newspapermen and photographers, Mikoyan should have been met by people, as he was met by the Hungarians, aghast that our free land can admit and entertain this Moloch, this man who disgracefully enough—and only coincidently—bears the proud Armenian name of Mikoyan.

One wonders what exactly would have happened on these shores if, back in 1939 or so, Ribbentrop, or Goebbels, or Rosenberg had come here under the circumstances which have brought Mikoyan hither. And yet, as Congressman JUDD said, Mikoyan, "a man with blood on his hands" is in the United States, he is being lionized, he is being feted—he has been admitted into the society of dignified mankind.

He ought rather to be relegated to the status of a pariah. He ought to be an outcast among freemen. He ought to be shunned like the biblical plague. The Hungarians had the right idea. They harassed him at every turn, for he is a man to be harassed. He should be given no rest for his crimes against mankind. He is Anastas Mikoyan, the symbol of dictatorship.

Amazing and astonishing things have taken place from the moment Mikoyan set foot in the United States.

Some of the baldest lies compounded by the Soviet propaganda mills have been eagerly adopted by the American press.

Let's look at some of these:

1. Mikoyan was a theological student. This is a lie. Anastas Mikoyan was never a theological student. He studied for a time as a lay student at the Gevorgian Seminary, at Etchmiadzin, but never had the intention of going on to the priesthood. The idea behind this lie of course is to leave the thought in religious or Christian minds that Mikoyan, because of his theological educational background (which he never had), certainly has a kernal of goodness within him. Said a minister to us the other day: "Well, the fellow studied for the priesthood. He must have some good somewhere in him." Soviet propaganda hitting home.

2. Mikoyan is an old bolshevik, a hero of the ramparts at Baku, where he was wounded. An interesting lie which bears a bit of treatment.

In 1915, Anastas Mikoyan was a member of General Andranik's contingents fighting against the Turks. It was about that time that he first showed signs of espousing communism. Hauled before his commanding general because he had been agitating rebellion among the Armenian troops, Mikoyan was roundly beaten up physically by General Andranik. He deserted the Armenian Army and went off and joined the Communist revolutionaries. He says he went to Baku, was given important responsibilities there, was wounded in the street fighting. This is a lie, merely an attempt to weave a legend around the fellow. Here's the truth.

In 1918, the Turkish Army was advancing steadily on the city of Tiflis, Georgia, and the Armenian Army facing it was hard pressed to resist. Meanwhile, the Armenian leaders of heavily Armenian-populated Baku, the great oil city on the Caspian, were making all attempts to keep the city in a state of quiet so that the Armenian forces before Tiflis would not have to detach contingents to fight in Baku. Armenians, Georgian, and Tartar leaders in Baku had effected a sort of uneasy truce with the large Turkish population of Baku. It was profitable to the Armenians, and to the Allies, to whom Baku's oil was important, that Baku be not made a battlefield.

There was another group in Baku which felt differently about things—the Communists. It was to the advantage of the revolution for Baku to become a battleground.

One day, the people of Baku awoke to reports of gunfire. In order to provoke the battle they so wished, the Communist bands, led by an Armenian outcast named Shahumian, had crept up on the Turkish wards and had fired on the people there. The Turks, itching for a fight anyway, had fired back. By the time the Armenian, Georgian, Tartar confederation acted to stop the fighting, it was too late. Baku was thrown into a violent holocaust.

Mikoyan says he entered Baku just before the fighting started and served at the barriers. Most Armenian leaders who knew the Communist leadership cabal say they never heard of the fellow, never saw him, never knew he existed. If he fought, he fought as an insignificant guerrilla in the streets. Few remember him, no one remembers his having been wounded; he never played a significant role in Baku. He is a fake, a forgery; he is not an old Bolshevik; he is a comparative newcomer, an opportunist who has pulled himself up through the ranks by his own bootstraps, acting the perfect dutiful Communist lackey of whatever man at the moment holds the U.S.S.R. reins.

He is a great practicing Armenian. Wrote one eager columnist: "Perhaps the power and stature of the man is shown above all in his loyalty to his native Armenia. He has never deserted it. He has always, in the teeth of heavens knows what grudging opposition seen to it that the Armenians have been, by Soviet standards, well looked after * * *."

How silly can we get? Anastas Mikoyan has not been an Armenian since he deserted the Armenian Army. When a man becomes a Communist, he loses his nationality. He adopts a new nationality and a new religion. Anastas Mikoyan is as much an Armenian as is Khruschev foday, or as was Beria or Stalin yesterday; that is, he is a Communist, and a Communist cannot be an Armenian; nor can he be Hungarian, American, French, Irish, or anything other than a Communist.

Rather than being the great practicing Armenian, Mikoyan has brought terror and hardship to his people. Here are but a few

examples of the "Armenianism" of this Moloch:

Mikoyan was the right-hand man of Lavrenti Beria when, in 1936, that murderer entered Armenia to organize the Armenian phase of the great U.S.S.R. purges which took the lives of thousands of intellectuals, leaders, and innocent people. As Beria's aide, Mikoyan devotedly executed his responsibilities—liquidating thousands of the people whom he is now supposed to adore.

It is now known that Mikoyan himself was personally involved in the assassination of Aghasi Khanchian, the Secretary of the Communist Party of Soviet Armenia, whom Beria slew in Tiflis for his temerity in demanding that the Soviet Government give Armenia a fair deal in the matter of territorial distribution and the right to retain for native use more of the products of Armenia (see Hairenik Weekly, Dec. 25, 1958).

It is also known today that Mikoyan helped actively to destroy the Independent Republic of Armenia, of 1918–20, by his behind-the-scene maneuverings in Moscow during the crucial days of the Republic.

When the delegation of the democratic state was in Moscow on a formal mission to ask aid against Turkey, Mikoyan is known to have advised his Soviet comrades to reject Armenia's request. In fact, he is known to have advised the occupation of Armenia by a joint Soviet-Turkish force—which took place November 29, 1920, and resulted in the Sovietization of Armenia.

When Mikoyan visited Armenia some years ago, speaking in Russian, he advised the Armenian people too to make Russian their everyday tongue. He praised the great Russian people to the skies.

Now there is a point here that we ought to belabor a bit. Anastas Mikoyan, they are all telling us these days, is a really big man in the Soviet Union, and has been for some time. He is, we are also told, always mindful of conditions in Soviet Armenia, and is incessantly trying to aid the land and its people.

Again how silly can we get?

If Mikoyan is the man of influence he appears to be in the U.S.S.R., how is it then that Armenia has been considered by recent foreign visitors there the poorest country we have seen? Harry Schwartz, of the New York Times was aghast at the poverty of Armenia; Christian Pineau, the former Foreign Minister of France, was appalled at the destitution of the country; the American builders' commission came back and told the people of America that Armenia was a veritable slum under Soviet rule.

"Big shot" Mikoyan certainly couldn't have spent too much time trying to straighten things out down in his beloved Armenia—which he visits once every 3 or 4 years on a special propagandistic occasion—such as when he is up for reelection in one of those curious Soviet demonstrations of the persecution of the mechanics and principles of democracy in action.

Mikoyan is an admirer of the great Russian central cadre of the Soviet Communist movement, and let's make no bones about it. There are too many Mikoyan quotes on record in this respect to here adduce. He is simply a great Russian (Mikoyan disdains speaking Armenian any more, once told an American newspaperman in Moscow that he has forgotten the language, but who needs Armenian in Russia anyway?)

He wouldn't have lasted through these years of violence in the Soviet Union if he were anything but a lover of the great Russian battery of communism.

Which makes the little anecdote told by a gullible American newspaperman even more remarkable for its naivete.

Mikoyan once asked some American press representatives in Moscow why they thought that each evening invariably he visited Joseph Stalin. They didn't know. Well, he said, "Stalin and me meet and drink a toast. And do you know what toast we always drink? We lift our glasses up and shout 'To hell with these so-and-so Russians.'"

Nonsense. A perfectly amiable newspaper story, but hardly credible. One cannot imagine the Russophile, Joseph Stalin, proposing the above toast, even in private, when, on May 24, 1945, at the great Kremlin banquet for Red Army commanders, he arose and proposed a different toast:

"I should like to drink to the health of our Soviet people, and first of all, to the great Russian people. I drink first of all to the health of the Russian people because it is the most outstanding nation of all the nations forming a part of the Soviet Union * * * it has earned a general recognition in this war as a leading force of the Soviet Union among all the peoples of our country. * * * Hail the great Russian people, the saviors of the Soviet state." (See Pravda, May 25, 1945.)

Those who were present at the banquet say that Mikoyan immediately seconded this eulogic toast, as the bones of 40,000 Armenian soldiers rotted away in the death arena of the Crimea.

As Americans of Armenian parentage, we especially ought to keep our wits about us in the matter of this Mikoyan person.

We ought to come to our senses as a matter of fact. It simply is not enough for a person to be an Armenian for us to accept him into the fold, and even go easy on him.

It is awful, incredible, awesome, and frightening, for instance, when any Armenian publication breaks out with the front page news welcoming "Mr. Anastas Mikoyan, the great Armenian official, to the United States"; or when a false Soviet Armenian Foreign Minister, an MVD agent named Balabek Martyrosian, one of the Soviet secret police who loused up the lives of our people in the Lori district of Soviet Armenia, comes to the United States on a mission, rather than proposing receptions and banquets for such a man, we ought to shun him like the plague, at least shun him if we can't get up the necessary courage to expose the rascal for what he really is.

We wonder, said a columnist of one of our pro-Soviet organs, whom Mikoyan would visit if he were to visit Watertown. We have no doubt whom Mikoyan would visit.

But meanwhile, let the American and the Armenian press stop imputing in this man and his story imagined virtues. Anastas Mikoyan simply does not warrant a single kind thought. The quicker he leaves America the sooner the air will clean, and the safer we all will be.

EDITOR OF ASBAREZ NEWSPAPER RECALLS HAVING MET GUEST ANASTAS MIKOYAN

(By John M. Bernier)

If Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan includes Fresno on the itinerary of his trip to the United States it is doubtful that he will drop in on Andre Amourian to talk over old times.

Amourian, the editor of Asbarez, an Armenian language newspaper published in Fresno and Mikoyan attended a university in Etchimadzin, Armenia, in 1917.

However, since their student days when they argued politics in the coffee shops near the Armenian Academy the men have been political foes. And Amourian suspects that ending up in a Soviet prison in 1943 may have been the work of Mikoyan.

Mikoyan is scheduled to arrive in the United States tomorrow for a 2 weeks visit. It has been reported he may include California in his tour.

Most persons who knew Mikoyan at the academy, Amourian said, expected that someday he would become a Communist leader. At the academy Mikoyan was one of the leaders among the Communist students and Amourian headed the Dashnak, the Armenian Revolutionary Federation. The federation's aim is the establishment of a free Armenian Republic.

"Mikoyan arrived at the academy about February 1917," the Fresno editor recalled. "He was with a group of other Communist students who had been studying at another school in the Province of Georgia. He moved into the same dormitory where I was living.

"The thing I remember particularly about him was that he was such a good speaker. He spent more of his time in classrooms and outside arguing in favor of Marxism. Fortunately we had some good Dashnak speakers who could keep up with him.

"Mikoyan had a hot temper and he had difficulty controlling it when he discussed politics. This quick temper may have been one of the reasons he ended up in the Communist movement.

"Previously he had been a Dashnak and served as a volunteer in 1915 in the army of the Armenian national hero General Antranik. He got in an argument with the general and the general struck him. Two years later he appeared at the academy a dedicated Communist."

Amourian describes Mikoyan as full of energy and one who never tired of debating politics.

When the Russian Revolution broke out in November 1917, he recalls, Mikoyan and the other Communist students went to join the fight in the Baku oil fields.

At this time he was about 21 years old.

This was the last direct contact Amourian had with the Russian leader. The newspaperman's work for the Dashnak movement took him to Iran and in 1943 the Red Army occupied part of that country. Following on the heels of the first Russian units were the agents of the Soviet secret police.

Amourian said he was thrown into a Russian prison by the secret police. At the time, he declared, he was accused of plotting Stalin's assassination. Two years later Amourian was released through the intercession of the United States and Iranian Governments.

He says he does not know for certain, but he believes Mikoyan may have been responsible for his arrest by the secret police.

Mikoyan, like Amourian, is of Armenian descent but the Fresno newspaperman says the Soviet leader is rarely known to speak Armenian.

Amourian said that according to a story which has circulated among Armenians throughout the world, the last time Mikoyan spoke in his native tongue was years ago when he had too many vodkas at a banquet in the Rumanian Embassy in Moscow.

Mikoyan was born in Sanahin, a small town in Soviet Armenia, but according to Amourian, he has no particular feeling for the Armenian people and usually will not admit he is Armenian.

Amourian was sent to Fresno from Iran in 1953 as the editor of Asbarez and a fieldworker for the Federation.

His memoirs now are being translated into English from Armenian and will be published in about a year. The book will tell of Amourian's lifelong efforts to help to create a free Armenian republic.

Amourian and his wife now live on their ranch near Madera.

Castro's Blood Bath for Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, with our usual inspired acumen, we seem to

have slightly misjudged Castro and his mission. He hardly seems to be the knight in shining armor, fighting for the ideals of pure freedom, depicted in our press and by many of our revered columnists.

The following article by a very fair and well informed writer on foreign affairs, Mr. Constantine Brown, raises the curtain and gives us an accurate and slightly terrifying picture of reality.

As these startling errors of judgment of ours keep recurring, one begins to believe the words of the late Senator Huey Long when he said, "You can sell any ideology to Americans by calling it Democracy."

The article follows:

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 14, 1959]

CASTRO'S BLOOD BATH FOR CUBA—MORSE CITED AS FIRST SENATOR TO PROTEST MASS EXECUTION OF BATISTA OFFICIALS

(By Constantine Brown)

Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, has the distinction of being the first Senator to raise his voice publicly against the blood bath which has been going on in the new democratic Cuba, where government officials under the regime of ousted President Batista have been murdered in batches.

It is also a strange reflection on modern political ethics that our Government not only rushed to recognize the Castro regime but has not raised its powerful voice against the recent wholesale massacres.

Modern diplomacy apparently requires that governments even formed by murderers be taken to our bosom. It is a quite different frame of mind from that at the turn of the century. When the palace guard in Belgrade murdered King Alexander Obrenovitch and his wife, Draga Machin, all the Western Governments withdrew their diplomatic representatives from the Serbian capital. And when the Okrana (the secret police of Czarist Russia) organized a pogrom in the Ukraine, also at the turn of the century, we withdrew our Minister from St. Petersburg for about 7 months.

In more recent times we refused to recognize the bloody Communist regime in Russia for 16 years and President Roosevelt recalled our Ambassador to Nazi Germany, Hugh Wilson, because of Hitler's ruthless persecution of the Jews, and left only a chargé d'affaires in Berlin until December 1941, when Germany declared war on us.

It may be that in those days when the administration were not scared of complications we were more justly called the leader of the free world than we are today. We stood for principles and did not merely talk of how nice they are.

No sooner had a Communist-inspired military junta murdered and mutilated the bodies of King Faisal of Iraq and his advisers than we rushed to recognize the regime of murderers. It was explained in Washington that it was necessary to obtain the friendship of the new regime in order to forestall its going completely to either Nasser's United Arab Republic or the Kremlin. According to the latest reports from Baghdad, our rushing did not do much good for ourselves and our remaining friends in the Middle East.

Similarly, we rushed to recognize the new Cuban regime created by Fidel Castro. Off the record explanations in Washington are that we did so because the Cuban rebels replaced the dastardly dictatorship of Batista.

Fidel Castro used to have a well-established reputation as a strong Communist sympathizer who organized the 1948 Bogota demonstrations against Gen. George C. Marshall. His brother Raoul was described as an outright Communist who had studied in Moscow the MVD techniques of guerrilla warfare against the forces of the capitalist dictators. This appeared to be the information available to the highest official quarters in Washington before Castro started his rebellion and before it seemed that he might succeed. Now all of a sudden he has been declared by the State Department to be lily white. There was nothing really tangible to go by, it was said, to show that Fidel had a hand in the anti-American uprisings in Bogota in 1948 or that Raoul had done anything more than have a good time in the Soviet Union.

The recent wholesale execution of Batista agents, of many members of the regular armed forces of the previous regime, of many other individuals whose greatest guilt was that in order to make a living they had become members of the regular police force, and others against whom the rabble which joined the rebels had scores to settle follows clearly the Russian Communist pattern.

The Communist Party which has been banned in Cuba has not only been permitted to reappear on the political scene but in the 12-man group appointed by Castro's yes man, Provisional President Urrutia, to supervise labor conditions and new legislation, five members are Communists (either Cuban or imported from Venezuela).

While the policy that we must learn to live with Communist governments which are in the eyes of our policymakers uncommitted to international communism is being argued, there is one thing that cannot be debated: That the American Government must never remain indifferent when wholesale massacres and executions without trials (except kangaroo courts) are taking place in a country whose regime we have rushed to recognize.

Richard Cardinal Cushing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in extension of my remarks, I include a noteworthy article from the Jewish Advocate of January 8, 1959, entitled "Man of the Year," and editorials of January 10, 1959, from the Boston Herald and Boston Record-American. The Jewish Advocate has conferred its Man-of-the-Year award upon Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston. Boston is proud that a Jewish newspaper has thus saluted a great Catholic prelate. Citizens of Boston and New England will say "well done." Richard Cardinal Cushing is a distinguished son of Boston, born and raised in that city. His long career as Archbishop of Boston was noteworthy not only for outstanding service to his church, but also for service to the community.

[From the Jewish Advocate, Jan. 8, 1959]

MAN OF THE YEAR

In appreciation of his contribution to interfaith understanding, civic progress, and human betterment, the Jewish Advocate bestows its second annual Man of the Year Award upon Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston.

First recipient was the illustrious Bostonian, Ralph Lowell.

In making its designation this year, the board of editors of the Advocate was reminded of the magnificent tribute to noble manhood presented to the world by William Wordsworth in his famous poem, "Character of the Happy Warrior." The poet interprets life as a battle—not necessarily a military expedition to expand territory or increase the power of an aggressive nation; not as an assault against the lives or liberties of innocent people, but as an endless and decisive struggle against every type of evil from which the human family suffers. The happy warrior is the heroic soul who meets and masters intolerance, crudeness, deceit, vanity, and violence.

Although writing more than 150 years ago, Wordsworth, with prophetic vision, might [illegible] been thinking of Richard Cardinal Cushing, who is truly a superbly generous spirit. His human impulses make his mind responsive, his heart sympathetic, and his hand helpful to the appeals and sorrows of others.

Cardinal Cushing was born 63 years ago in South Boston, reared and educated in this city, and spent his entire priestly life within a few miles of his birthplace. But there is no place in the United States—and few places abroad—where his zeal, charity, and genuine love of people do not inspire a similar love for him.

In a sense, Archbishop Cushing is many men.

As a churchman, he represents the fullness of the Catholic priesthood. His social thinking has given him place among the most vigorous prelates of the world.

As an orator, he is renowned for his preaching literally everywhere in this country and in Europe.

As an administrator, he ranks with the leaders in business and the captains of industry; his jurisdiction includes a million and a half Catholics and hundreds of hospitals, schools, churches, and homes of every description, each of which receives his personal attention regularly.

In academic circles, he holds the doctor of laws, of humanities, of canon and civil law, of philosophy, of letters, of theology and divinity. Nations honor him as count, knight, commander, and honorary citizen. He is proud of titular memberships in drum and bugle corps, in the Street Railwaymen's Union and in the Boy Scouts.

But his greatest role is played as a man of God. It is from this well that he draws his energy and incredible zeal. He is the administrator of the great Boston See, but his influence and leadership have not been restricted by arbitrary boundaries. Reason, human values, and religious faith have permeated his life and led him to crusade for the rights of people, little people, many of whom have been outside his own church.

His untiring labors for humanity and its welfare have added immeasurably to our community's riches in schools, hospitals, special homes and similar institutions. His personal drive and ceaseless devotion to brotherhood and general goodwill are worthy of imitation everywhere.

His personal appearance and address at a goodwill dinner of the Brotherhood of Temple Ohabei Shalom was a milestone in community relations. He is an ardent supporter of the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews.

His forthright statement that there is nothing in Catholic doctrine that should adversely affect the attitude of the Christian towards Jews was an inspirational pronouncement. Speaking at the 75th anniversary convention of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations when it met in Boston, he declared:

"There are many ignorant or malicious things sometimes said about our beliefs concerning Christ and their effect on the attitudes of Christians toward Jews. I ask you not to believe those things; they are lies and they are said to divide us. No man can have my faith concerning Christ, his life

and death, without loving him and loving the people who produced him, the Jews. No man could have my faith concerning Christ, without desiring to be more like He was and therefore seeking always to serve, to help, to befriend all men without exception—white, black, gentile, Jew. Always remember that a Catholic bishop took time from a busy day to come and tell you that. I did send a representative to assure you of my official friendship. I would not send a scholar to prove that our doctrines do not make us your enemies. I come myself to pledge my personal affection and officially to declare there is nothing in my faith to make us enemies of you. It is all the other way. I can and do pledge to you the friendship of my people."

In addressing the Massachusetts branch of the Jewish Labor Committee, Cardinal Cushing offered a formula for peaceful living calling for "the harnessing of forces of the spirit, power of the holy writ, the electrons of the Golden Rule and the Ten Commandments. After reviewing the crucial social and economic problems of our times, he pointed to the Ten Commandments "which are designed to meet our most modern needs," asserting "there would be no religious problems if the rulers of nations would observe the first three commandments. The problems of economic and personal relations among individuals are cared for by commandments 5, 7, 8, and 10. The 4th, 6th, and 9th care for the home unit."

The conferring of the cardinalate on the archbishop of Boston last month was an exalted honor for the diocese of Boston and for its devoted people, but was no less an honor for its illustrious spiritual shepherd. Cardinal Cushing is not a great man because he has been elevated to the sacred college; he is a member of the sacred college because he is a great man.

By the same traits—greatness of heart, mind, and soul—by which Abraham Lincoln raised himself from log cabin to White House, so has Richard Cardinal Cushing risen from poor boy to prince of his church.

He is held in affection not only by his religious kinsmen, but by all who have a grateful acquaintance with the fruits of his work.

If the cardinal's noble thoughts against racial antipathy and creedal strife could be put into the hearts of every man and child, then verily would we arrive at the long overdue recognition that we are all children of one loving Father to enjoy the pleasantness of brethren living together in peace.

[From the Boston Herald, Jan. 10, 1959]

We are proud of our community today, very proud. We are proud because a great Jewish newspaper has saluted a great Catholic prelate as the man of the year.

The Jewish Advocate has served the cause of tolerance nobly in thus honoring that indomitable fighter of intolerance, Richard Cardinal Cushing. And seldom has this ardent champion of human love and understanding been so aptly described as in the Advocate's tribute:

"Cardinal Cushing is not a great man because he has been elevated to the Sacred College; he is a member of the Sacred College because he is a great man.

"By the same traits—greatness of heart, mind, and soul—by which Abraham Lincoln raised himself from log cabin to White House, so has Richard Cardinal Cushing risen from poor boy to Prince of his Church.

"He is held in affection not only by his religious kinsmen, but by all who have a grateful acquaintance with the fruits of his work.

"If the Cardinal's noble thoughts against racial antipahty and creedal strife could be put into the hearts of every man and child, then verily would we arrive at the long overdue recognition that we are all children of One Loving Father to enjoy the pleasantness of brethren living together in peace."

[From the Daily Record, Jan. 10, 1959]

It was a nice gesture and a richly deserved one, for the Jewish Advocate, an important Boston publication, to name Richard Cardinal Cushing as the recipient of the Advocate's Man of the Year Award.

In making this designation, the board of editors of the Advocate was reminded of the magnificent tribute to noble manhood presented to the world by William Wordsworth in his famous poem, "Character of the Happy Warrior."

The poet interpreted life as a battle—not necessarily a military expedition to expand territory or to increase the power of an aggressive nation; not as an assault against the lives and liberties of innocent people, but as an endless and decisive struggle against every type of evil from which the human family suffers.

The Happy Warrior is the heroic soul who meets and masters intolerance, crudeness, deceit, vanity, and violence.

In all the land there is no finer personification of this type of leader than Cardinal Cushing, whose zeal, charity, and genuine love of people have certainly made America a better place for persons of varying races, creeds, and faiths.

The Fourth "R"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Peter B. Bart recently appeared in the Wall Street Journal. It was described by a constituent of mine, who has children in the public school system, as most disturbing.

While the article deals specifically with a situation in New York City schools, there is no doubt that the same situation prevails throughout most of the country.

We are penalizing the thrifty and the hard working, and while the children who cannot afford proper food and transportation must be given it, there seems no good reason for putting them above their fellow students who are self-supporting.

The article follows:

THE FOURTH "R": A SCHOOL ENCOURAGES PUPILS TO GET ON RELIEF EARLY AND STAY ON

(By Peter B. Bart)

NEW YORK.—"Our school has a more varied curriculum than you may imagine," says the small, graying teacher sipping coffee in the cramped little room her school provides for coffee breaks. "We teach the three 'R', all right, but our most effective training is in the fourth 'R'—relief chiseling.

This may sound like a rash statement, but the teacher advanced it in deadly earnest. Her view, which she shares with many of her colleagues: That the New York City public schools inadvertently train their pupils in the art of living off the relief rolls. "By the time they finish elementary school, many children already have gotten the idea that the city somehow owes them a living. Indeed, the schools seem to reinforce this attitude," explains the teacher.

How so? Basically, the problem lies in the ways in which the schools channel different forms of public assistance to the children. If a child asks for free lunches, for example, he automatically gets them—no questions asked; in fact, he gets a better meal served under better conditions than children of self-supporting parents.

"No one questions the overall idea of helping children whose parents cannot properly provide for them," observes another teacher. "What irks us is that, in trying to remove the stigma of relief, the schools actually have made it seem desirable and attractive—something to aspire to."

BUSES, MILK, SOUP

Visit this teacher's school on a typical schoolday and you sense what she means. First thing in the morning, for example, a special school bus picks up a large group of children living in a city low-rent housing project (many of whose families are on relief) and totes them the half mile to school. Other children who do not live in the project and whose parents are not on relief must walk to school, even though they, too, may live a good distance away.

In midmorning teachers call a break and distribute milk to the children. Pupils requesting free milk may get it without their classmates knowing—no questions asked. Others pay for their own milk.

At noontime, a majority of the children crowd into the dimly lit auditorium where they eat sandwiches brought from home—the school has no cafeteria big enough to accommodate all of them. But those children who request free lunches receive hot soup plus as many sandwiches as they desire plus ice cream or cookies for dessert. This meal is served in a comfortably furnished, sunny cafeteria at city expense.

Nor is this all. Any child asking for free medical aid, free dental care or free eyeglasses is referred by his teachers to the school nurse who in turn refers him to nearby clinics where he may get the needed services at no cost. And children requesting free clothes may choose their garments from a storeroom provided for this purpose.

In each instance, teachers are instructed to keep secret the names of children receiving these various types of public assistance. Milk money, for example, is collected in a carefully devised manner so as not to embarrass children getting free milk. "But," observes one teacher, "there's really little chance of embarrassing anyone. You never see any embarrassment when the free-lunch children go to their cafeteria. If anything, other children are a little envious."

Of course, no teacher begrudges a free meal to a needy youngster whose parents truly cannot feed him properly. But many teachers at this particular school do believe that these gratuities can be overdone.

FREE MEALS, $20,000 HOME

Moreover, they resent the stern admonitions from their supervisors not to investigate requests for free meals and the like. "School officials tell us firmly we should not question the children about any of these matters," says a teacher. "Yet no one in authority does any questioning either. I know of one boy in my class whose parents own a $20,000 house near school, but who asks for and receives free milk and free meals. If I ever talked to him or his parents my meddling would be considered with disfavor by my supervisors."

Concedes the principal of this school: "I know lots of children get free meals and free clothes who don't really need them. But I'm not supposed to check up on them. If the parents sign a note saying, for example, that they have two children and that the family weekly income is under $67, or that they have 10 children and their income is under $150 a week, we just have to take their word for it. No one even knows whether the 10 children are really theirs."

SOME ARE EXCEPTIONS

To be sure, not all schools conform precisely to the setup of the school in question. A few of the schools, for example, have cafeterias in which all the children may eat their lunches in comfort.

But most generally lean over backward to keep from bruising the sensibilities of children receiving public assistance. And, says our teacher friend: "The schools completely succeed in this mission. At the same time, however, they get children accustomed to being on the public dole—and to liking it. I wonder how many of the children leave elementary school with the idea that eventually they may try out for the really big game—adult relief checks."

New York's total public assistance grants, it's noted, already have increased by 40 percent over the last 10 years to $167.1 million despite the fact that the city's population has remained fairly stable. If these teachers are correct in their analysis, that 40-percent increase should be even greater over the next 10 years, thanks to the schools' training in the fourth "r."

Communist-Line Advances in United States, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS L. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard Cardinal Cushing:

[From the Tablet, Jan. 17, 1959]

COMMUNIST-LINE ADVANCES IN UNITED STATES, 1958

The year 1958 will be recorded in the annals of atheistic communism as a year of great progress within the United States.

There are many in the United States and, among them, a number of powerful voices, who contend that the Communist Party is practically dead in this country. We are told not to worry about that question anymore, but merely to prepare ourselves against military assault from outside. Those who argue in this fashion—there are some among them who even go so far as to argue that we should agree to every Soviet demand—point out that within America the Reds have suffered losses.

FALSE MEASURE OF STRENGTH

They no longer stage their huge Madison Square Garden meetings, where formerly at least 25,000 Reds and their friends and supporters assembled on various occasions. They have had a loss in membership partly because of Government prosecutions and partly because of the revisionist split in their ranks. They no longer conduct the Daily Worker, which was an important telegraph agency of the conspiracy to its members and sympathizers. They must now be content with the weekly edition of the Worker.

All of these contentions fail to note what the Communist Party really is, how it maintains itself, and what is the purpose of its operation. These judgments do not include a true measurement of Communist strength, which is well stated by Stalin (citing Lenin) that the party is strengthened by purging itself of opportunist elements.

They do not embrace the true understanding of the operations of the party, which were so well expressed again by Stalin when he said that up to the time when any particular country can be overthrown by violence the party must advance the Communist line. It must do this, mark you, by making "transmission belts" of as many non-Communist agencies as possible, using them to advance the Red line as though it were something non-Communist.

The true estimate of the strength of the Communist Party is to be gaged from its impact on American opinion—on how much it has succeeded in weakening our opposition to Soviet aggression. What we must ask ourselves constantly in this respect is: How far and in what features has the Communist line made progress in the views and judgments of our Nation? When we answer that question honestly we will see that we have no cause for satisfaction. By that yardstick the Communist Party of the United States is much stronger than is generally realized.

REDS ADMIT GROWING INFLUENCE

We have testimony to this effect from the chief organ of the Kremlin to its followers throughout the world, the December issue of the "World Marxist Review". It pays a warm tribute to the work of the party here, its struggle against revisionists, its regrouping of its ranks, and the extension of iron disciplines among its members and to its growing influence in American life.

It concludes by stating that the American Communists "are making a major contribution to the ideological struggle of the world forces of progress, democracy, and socialism, against the forces of obscurantism, reaction, and imperialism." Remember these are the words of the chief voice of the Kremlin in the international field.

Moscow views the Communist Party of the United States in this favorable light because that party has remained loyal to Moscow and has got rid of its so-called revisionist element. It has from the Communist viewpoint strengthened itself by getting rid of opportunist elements, so that it can dedicate itself fundamentally to the final aim of overthrowing this Government by violence, and, in the meantime, fully and faithfully forwarding the Communist line as Moscow initiates it.

In the meantime, the revisionists, represented by a former editor of the Daily Worker, still cling to their hope of establishing socialism in America and by indicating that the party is weak, actually help it to deceive a considerable section of the American people.

When this Communist Party of the United States looks back over the year 1958, it can record that the following important features of the current Communist line laid down by Nikita Khrushchev in 1956 at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union—and taken up by the Communists here—have been successfully advanced in the United States:

1. That under the name of "civil liberties" practically all our internal security safeguards under the law have been abolished by decisions which the Communists have hailed. That means that the campaign initiated by the Communist Party in 1950 against any curbing of its conspiratorial activities—and given new stimulus by Stalin's call of October 1952—has been almost 100 percent successful in paralyzing the United States so far as internal security goes.

2. That the fifth amendment has been used effectively to conceal the extent of the conspiracy in the United States by shielding witnesses in Government cases or before Congressional committees from testifying to the truth as to their associations in the Communist conspiracy.

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

3. That all the laws of the States against sedition and subversion have been nullified. This was decided by the Supreme Court in the case of Pennsylvania versus a notorious Communist agent. It was then definitely indicated that all of the anti-sedition laws of the States are unenforcible.

4. That the right to travel for the Communists freely back and forth to Moscow and to other places, to lay plans for diminishing the reputation of the United States abroad and for establishing lines of communication with the capital of world communism, has now been firmly and fully established. This complete removal of the bars on the right to travel for the Communist conspirator has led Roderick L. O'Connor, Administrator of the State Department Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, to warn the Congress and the Nation of what is taking place against the interests of the United States.

5. That this paralysis of our internal security, which leads to carelessness on the part of the American people concerning what is really transpiring to the peril of this Nation, is accompanied by a new smear attack on J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and against that Bureau itself. It is also supplemented by a new campaign for the emasculation of congressional committees against subversion.

The southern California committee of the American Civil Liberties Union is proudly pointed to by the Worker as succeeding in obtaining 100,000 signatures for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This indicates how effective has been the cry of the Communists and their sympathizers that civil liberties are violated when such committees or the FBI endeavors to protect the United States from subversion. As a matter of fact, it is only the question of the Communists and those cooperating with them which is involved in the work of these committees or of the FBI. It is a complete distortion of what is taking place to indicate that the liberties of anyone else is at stake in their work.

6. That the great campaign of the Communists for the breaking down of American vigilance by means of cultural exchanges, so emphasized by Khrushchev in his famous report of February 1956, to the 20th Congress of the Communist Part of the Soviet Union, has now reached a high point of development. This acquiescence to the Communist line demanding full cultural exchanges has gone to the extent of importing Soviet films into this country and thereby breaking down more resistance to Red propaganda from abroad.

THE MIKOYAN VISIT

7. That the concomitant campaign by Soviet Russia and its agents for East-West trade has now reached the point where many of the trade barriers toward building up Soviet strength have been broken down for the free world. This whole development has been crowned by the coming to this country of Anastas I. Mikoyan, Deputy Soviet Premier, for the purpose of persuading the United States to build up Soviet defense, thus making it more imperative that we, in turn, build up a higher wall and higher taxes for our own defense.

What is particularly ironic about the Mikoyan visit is that he has been touted as the originator of the fraudulent down-grading of Stalin, whereas in reality he was the chief creator of the Stalin cult. In 1939 he published a tribute to Stalin, calling that tyrant infallible and applauding his crimes.

In denouncing Stalin as a bloody tyrant before the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956, Mikoyan preceded Khrushchev. This is the same Mikoyan who wrote the article "Stalin: The Lenin of Our Day," glorifying "Stalin: The Infallible" on his 60th birthday in December 1939. Here are a few quotes from that article:

"Our country and toiling humanity all over the world honor their leader, father and friend—Comrade Stalin."

"He is the leader of oppressed humanity the world over."

"He created the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the role and significance of the state in socialist society and under communism."

"He eradicated the remnants of capitalism. He is the personification of profound love for mankind. He is a man of iron logic. He is ready to smash every obstacle for the sake of emancipating mankind. He is the personification of fearlessness, of indomitable will for struggle and conviction that communism will triumph."

The foregoing in a dozen pages of sickening flattery was written in December 1939, 4 months after the signing of the Hitler-Stalin Pact and the beginning of World War II and 3 months after the rape of Poland by Stalin and Hitler.

Mikoyan, who survived under Lenin, Stalin and Khrushchev, had his share in the bloody crimes of each. These included the massacre of his own free Armenian Republic, the Ukrainian massacres of 1932–33, and the Hungarian massacre of 1956.

Mikoyan's visit is unofficial. He has been free from a lot of protocol, and it is doubtful if he could have received more attention from the press were the call an affair of state.

HIS PROPAGANDA LINE

His excuse for coming here was that he wanted to confer with the Soviet Ambassador to the United States, Mikhail Menshikov. But he has talked with many Americans, almost all of them highly placed and some of them top officials.

His itinerary has taken him across the country. The press has reported that he has told influential Americans that there should be more contacts at all levels between the Russian Communists and Americans; that Moscow and Washington should not wait to agree on an agenda but should get together and talk; that it was not the Soviet regime but his fellow intellectuals that browbeat Boris Pasternak for writing "Dr. Zhivago," which won the Nobel prize; that the West should not use such words as "liberation" and "satellites" in referring to Soviet Russia's neighbors; that the Russian people would not think of overthrowing their present regime; that Stalin did centralize power too much but that the present Red leaders have developed a decentralized dictatorship of the proletariat; that there are not political prisoners in Soviet Russia; that Moscow wants Berlin to be a free city with its own police, and so forth.

All of this is the Communist propaganda line. It is all aimed at getting us to forget the true nature of communism, the Russian crimes and to deal realistically with the Reds, to accept the status quo and start from there.

Could one of our very top officials go to Russia on the pretext that he wanted to confer with our Ambassador in Moscow, then wangle talks with the top Red leaders and get his views leaked into the Communist press; make propaganda appearances from one end of the Soviet Union to the other; appear on television; hold press conferences; be the guest at dinners and lunches; mingle freely with people at all levels; get his best political arguments into Red publications and on the air? He could not.

8: That a number of American business leaders and certain American business circles are now singing the praises of Soviet Russia, thereby drowning out the cries for help and sypmpathy of the Hungarian people. In effect, we turned away from the Hungarian revolt and permitted it to be crushed by the Red army.

9. That funds from the United States are still going to bolster the Communist regimes of Gomulka in Poland and Tito in Yugoslavia, thus keeping alive the hopes of the Communist Party here that the United States will subsidize "all the Socialist countries," as the Communists here urged as early as 1946.

RECOGNITION OF RED CHINA

10. That, while the determination of the American people has so far halted the recognition of Red China, there is a trend—reported by such an important business paper as the Wall Street Journal—toward such a step. This trend is evident among happenings, especially by letting down restrictions on a number of items involved in trade of our alleged allies with the Mao Tse-tung regime.

This progress of the Communist line in our country now advanced by Mikoyan's visit (and the items I mentioned are only the most outstanding of that line) should immediately cause us to pause and appreciate the havoc that friends of the Communist Party and non-Communist "transmission belts" have wrought on our views and attitudes during the past year. The result is all the more astounding, when we consider that experience has constantly taught us that when we take a firm stand, one that is strong and unambiguous, against the aggressions of the Soviet powers, we are victorious.

Tributes to the extent of Communist activity on behalf of its own line are found in the many voices within America, represented by editorials in the press and by letters to our newspapers, echoing the Communist "warnings" about the sad fate of the United States if we do not surrender in the Far East.

No wonder that the Red organ, the Worker, for January 4, 1959, rejoiced in what has happened in 1958 for the Communist cause. Since the Communists always pretend to speak for "the people," this is represented by the leading editorial entitled "A Year of the People."

The Red organ applauds, with almost lyrical tone, the continued existence of the Soviet dictatorship in Soviet Russia and in Red China, and in general declares: "People—the people of the Socialist countries of Europe, working together—were busy advancing their economic goal."

Then, expressing its delight at the successes of the Communist line, the Worker gives this distorted view of specific world affairs:

"People—the hundreds of millions still in the rapidly shrinking capitalist world—joined with the hundreds of millions in the expanding Socialist world and the hundreds of millions in the new nations in 1958 to hold back the enemies of the people, our own Wall Street imperialists, from unleashing the dogs of war against the newly independent nations of the Middle East, over wrongfully held Matsu and Quemoy, through adventurous maneuverings over the West Berlin situation."

You will observe how arrogant the Communists are in their assessment of what happened in Hungary, how the revolt of the people is represented as "the bloody plot of the western imperialist-inspired Nagys." You will also note the contempt for the United States expressed in the calm assurance that Red Hungary, crushed by Soviet bombs and bullets, is now moving "once more along the Socialist path to the future."

You will also note how the Communists twist history for their own purposes, misrepresenting the bombing of Quemoy and Matsu and the Soviet demands on West Berlin as "our own Wall Street imperialists • • • unleashing the dogs of war."

I think that Pope Pius XI in his classical encyclical letter on communism asked the question: How is it possible that communism, long since rejected scientifically, proved erroneous by experience, and demonstrated as atheistic, merciless, a curse upon mankind, how is it that such a system could spread so rapidly in all parts of the world? The explanation lies in the fact that too few have been able to grasp the nature of communism.

FEW UNDERSTAND COMMUNISM

Within 40 years about one-third of the population of this earth have been swept behind the Iron Curtain. It is unfortunately still true that few people, especially in our own country, understand what communism is, what are its techniques, its methods, its line.

The greatest asset the Communists have at the present time is not the hydrogen bomb, certainly not Soviet satellites, but ignorance of their tactics, strategy, and objectives.

We have lost much to the Communist line in the past year. I pray that we shall be a little more vigilant, a little more pro-American and pro-God throughout the New Year.

Does Uncle Sam Always Defend the Status Quo?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Louisville Courier-Journal of January 13, 1959, entitled "Does Uncle Sam Always Defend the Status Quo?" which I think clearly illustrates a great weakness in our foreign policy:

It would be wise for Congress to look a good deal deeper into the relations of our Government with the fallen Cuban dictator, Fulgencio Batista. The New York Times has called them affectionate. Earl E. T. Smith has now resigned as our Ambassador in Havana, amid charges that his Embassy did not keep Washington fully informed of Castro's rise, that it showed a distinct partiality for Batista, and that it was inefficient in the evacuation of American citizens from Cuban trouble spots.

This paper is not prepared to judge the merit of these charges. We can only note that our own reporter on the spot, Alan Levy, felt that the handling of American nationals by our Embassy staff was entirely adequate. We also recall that in August 1957, Ambassador Smith was in trouble for actions that were considered pro-Castro. These included a visit to Santiago, then the center of rebel strength, and a protest over brutal treatment of some women demonstrators by Batista police. He was rapped over the knuckles then by some Members of Congress, though Secretary Dulles defended him as a person of flesh and blood and heart.

A FAMILIAR SITUATION

The subject would bear further investigation. Cuba during the uprising is akin to situations American diplomats must face in many parts of the world. Smith went to Habana as a political apponitee, a party contributor with no diplomatic experience. Any American is likely to find it difficult to live in a country where political passions are running at white heat, without showing the slightest warmth himself to either side in the argument.

Of course, the envoy of a foreign power is not supposed to take sides. This is especially true of envoys of the United States, which has lent or given money to so many other nations, and which is always suspected of having a selfish interest in their internal affairs.

The fact is that American representatives have tended most often to take the side of the government in power. The United States was born of a revolution, but many American officials now adopt the attitude of the Daughters of the American Revolution toward political revolts anywhere—that they are troublesome, untidy, and dangerous to our business interests.

This might easily be the bias of a business tycoon appointed to an ambassadorship because of a handsome party gift. But it is also likely to occur among the career-service men in the State Department, whose conservatism often runs far deeper than the striped pants people think they wear.

THE PROBLEM IS SERIOUS

It has been charged that American aid since World War II has sustained in office many corrupt and reactionary regimes, and has frustrated the hopes of many reform groups. It is necessary for our representatives abroad to deal with the officials of the country to which they are accredited and to direct our financial aid through Government channels. Any other method would produce pure chaos. But this necessity has increased the image of America throughout the world as the defender of the status quo, rather than the friend of healthy change and aggressive freedom. This is a problem for the Foreign Affairs Committees of Congress to ponder with deep seriousness.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter for January 17, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

Organization of the House membership topped the week's proceedings. All Members are assigned to permanent committees which by subject consider pending legislation. The majority party (Democrat, 283 Members) and minority party (Republican, 153 Members) membership ratios are decided by the House leaders so that the majority party clearly controls each committee numerically. The committees (alphabetically) are: Agriculture, Appropriations, Armed Services, Banking and Currency, District of Columbia, Education and Labor, Foreign Affairs, Government Operations, House Administration, Interior and Insular Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Judiciary, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Post Office and Civil Service, Public Works, Rules, Space, Un-American Activities, Veterans' Affairs, and Ways and Means.

The Ways and Means Committee (15 Democrat, 10 Republican limit) has jurisdiction over the fields of taxation, trade and tariffs, and social security, and is considered a choice committee. On the Democrat side this committee also names the Democrats to the other committees. I am honored indeed to be nominated to this important committee, although I shall miss the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee with its interesting transportation problems, and where I had progressed to the eighth seat.

The Chance Vought Regulus II contract termination prompted by pre-Christmas inquiry of the Secretary of Defense whether a void was created in our defense posture. The answer from Vice Admiral Pirie gave two general explanations: (1) "Regulus II missions will be reassigned to carrier heavy attack aircraft" (isn't this a backward step?); and (2) "the accelerated Polaris is scheduled to become operational in quantities at approximately the same time Regulus II was originally scheduled." Suspicion that there may indeed be a gap or void of many months up to several years not having been answered, I have asked other questions of Admiral Pirie and the Secretary of Defense. Surprisingly enough, no mention was made of economizing in the defense budget as a reason for contract termination.

As I see the Congressman's it is twofold (now that contract termination has focused attention to defense efforts within the Fifth District of Texas). First, as a Federal representative, it is important that I take by part (representing my constituents) in helping to provide the best defense for the money spent. Second, it is my duty, as I see it, to help inform my constituents so they may better understand the defense problems, and this requires Defense Department explanation, particularly in view of worker layoffs and the spending of taxpayers' money on weapons. A temperate but conscientious effort to understand is necessary, not complacency or blind acceptance of the military's decisions, no matter how able the military men making the decisions. As an economy-minded Member of Congress with voting record to match (assuming that economizing played a part in Regulus II termination) I do not intend that we sacrifice our defense needs unnecessarily while we blandly spend more on social programs. I shall not fail to accept my responsibility to the Defense Department and to my constituents. In that spirit I intend to press this inquiry.

An additional judgeship for the northern judicial district is sorely needed and I presented a bill to accomplish this, as an emergency and exceptional case. The three judges of the northern district, Judge Whitfield Davidson, Judge Joe Estes, and Judge Joe Dooley, averaged 612 new civil cases docketed in fiscal 1958 as compared to the nationwide average of 273. Further, Judge Dooley's recent accident, a broken hip, will remove him 5 or 6 months. Truly, a desperate situation. It is my hope that Congress will consider this nonpolitically, as an exceptional case, rather than get into a wrangle and delaying action over who will appoint the 45 judges needed across the land—a Republican or Democrat President.

Operation abolition of the Un-American Activities Committee spearheaded by JAMES ROOSEVELT and other avowed liberals may have been stalled by the valiant and factual work of Chairman WALTERS and Committee Members SCHERER, JACKSON, and DOYLE. It seems that a gigantic effort has been planned to discredit this committee of Congress and J. Edgar Hoover. You would think the Communist conspiracy a patriotic American movement rather than a dedicated effort to overthrow our Government and enslave our people. This also bring to mind the gala reception for Mikoyan, a leader in this worldwide conspiracy whose chief target is the United States. Why should anything beyond the barest diplomatic protocol arrangements be accorded him?

A balanced budget, the spending of no more by the Federal Government than we take in, shall be my continued interest as it has for the last 4 years. For the sake of everyone, the dollar must not be cheapened. The President promises to point the way in his budget message. Let's all get behind this effort.

JANUARY 17, 1959.

Is United States Still Aroused?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Detroit Free Press of Tuesday, October 14, 1958, which I regard as a grave warning to the people of the United States:

IS UNITED STATES STILL AROUSED?—RED SCIENCE SCARE SEEMS TO HAVE COOLED
(By Victor Cohn)

(Victor Cohn has returned from 5 weeks in Russia as the first American reporter to make an extensive tour of Russian centers of physical science, followed by 2 weeks at last month's Geneva Atomic Energy Conference. This is the third in his series of articles on Russian science.)

Americans were happily broiling hamburgers on the grill when I left for the Soviet Union, and the discjockeys were giving the old great big twirl to "The One-Eyed, One-Horned Flying Purple People Eater."

When I returned from a vast nation of dull television programs and laboratories, Americans had steaks on the grill. Americans, after 2 months, were ignoring politicians, getting ready for the world series, looking over the old clunk and the new-model fins.

I suppose I was no different. I had dinner at Charlie's, went to a football game, and tried out a hula hoop.

We Americans were aroused, aroused more than our leaders, a year ago, when the first sputnik went up.

Are we aroused today?

A scientist said: "We have not done enough—not to meet the Soviet kind of challenge."

"How have we done? I'd say medium," responded another highly placed American scientific leader a few weeks ago.

These are common opinions today among American scientists, though many are harsher. Only a few are kinder.

One year ago—when the first sputnik went up—we all said, "We must meet the challenge of Soviet science." Washington after sputnik promised a new crusade for science and education. We have done less.

"We have made a beginning on education, but still not enough," believed Dr. Edward Teller, H-bomb theorist. "I'm still dissatisfied."

"Unless we step up the pace, the race will be lost," pronounced the National Science Foundation August 29. Sighed a biologist: "The sputnik effect is dying out."

Remember the reaction to sputnik? A year ago we had to wake up.

The President November 13, 1957, proposed a program to aid output of students and teachers. Within the administration the major goal was set: $750-a-year Federal scholarship help for one-tenth of the 200,000 young people each year who should go to college but do not.

ALL BRIGHT KIDS SHOULD GO TO COLLEGE

The program would start helping about 20,000 a year, and increase until 80,000 were being aided.

There also were to be:

1. Tests for all eighth and ninth graders;
2. Grants to States to hire more science and math teachers and improve facilities;
3. Grants to colleges to improve their outdated plants.

The measure, as passed late this August, became a 4-year, $223-million-a-year program, eliminating scholarships and substituting loans.

State testing programs will be strengthened, though not as much as planned. There will be funds to help buy equipment for public school science-math-language teaching. Little was provided to help train and nothing to expand teaching staffs. Nothing is done for college plants.

The bill already has had some praise as a good start, though not so much from scientists. Many colleges still don't know where they'll get enough money to expand for new students.

BASIC SCIENCE NEEDS SUPPORT

Basic research is the stockpiling of facts. Development is applying facts to H-bombs or hair oil. Total U.S. spending on all kinds of research and development now runs between 5.4 and 10 billion dollars a year.

Between 240 and 450 million goes to basic science; may one-tenth of 1 percent of our national income.

Govenment research and development spending at last count was 3.1 billion; mostly for weapons.

Basic research—including agriculture, medicine, everything—got 279 million. Of this, physical sciences in 1957–58 got 143 million.

Our national expenditure on chewing gum every year is 280 million.

The National Science Foundation is American scientists' real hope for the agency to support basic research. It was established in 1950 (after scientists pleaded for it starting in 1945).

Vannevar Bush, wartime science chief, thought its budget should reach 125 million a year in 5 years. Its 1957–58 budget (for all purposes, training, labs, research) was 40 million.

It is getting a big boost, to 138 million (it asked for 160). Forty of this will go to basic research, a drop in the Washington bucket still, but enough to support about half of what very conservative Director Alan Waterman calls the worthwhile proposals.

Defense Department research and development barely recovered in 1958 from the severe summer 1957 economy cut (when some 80 percent of Air Force projects alone were canceled or held).

Many projects never were helped again—new, post-sputnik money went to missiles. As of mid-1958, actual defense basic research sponsorship was down 25 percent from 1952, because of inflation's effect on the dollar.

"If America is to maintain scientific preeminence and economic stability, research funds must grow 5 or 10 times in the next few years," say scientist Lloyd Berkner.

"We need about 500 million a year"—said an NSF official in Washington—"and then we could really sponsor research reactors, atom-particle accelerators, electronic computers, the big things that cost dollars."

And these the Russians are building.

LET'S LISTEN TO THE SCIENTISTS

We have taken steps to have science listened to sometimes. James R. Killian has become the President's personal science adviser.

Killian also heads the President's Science Advisory Committee, and it has become an active body. Before sputnik, it met with the President twice a year.

No step was taken, however, to give science more than this personal Presidential advisory role.

So we can still expect proposals for a Cabinet department for science and technology, or at least some permanent office or commission at Cabinet level—just as agriculture, commerce, and labor have voices at Cabinet level.

Congress did give a stronger voice in the Pentagon as part of the President's reorganization, with a director of defense research and engineering, with some authority.

We established an Advanced Research Projects Agency in the Pentagon, to push missile work, and—nearly a year after sputnik—a National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

We increased missile spending, but we did not begin to take the really radical steps here and elsewhere—requiring billions—that the Gaither and Rockefeller reports said we must take "to survive."

Defense Secretary Neil McElroy said September 2, the United States is ahead of the Soviet Union in overall military power "in being, in the here and now."

But we know the Russians have more jet aircraft, more submarines, more troops and a head start on missiles.

Retired Lt. Gen. James Gavin, who was the Army's talented research and development chief, believes: "We are in second place militarily and in second place in the exploration of space."

We have moved ahead on some other things. But a survey shows at least a half-billion dollars needed, perhaps over 5 years, to bring United States research facilities to where they should be. There are no such plans yet in the works.

In 5 weeks in Russia, I wish I could say I had seen some evidence of serious miscalculation.

When I returned from the Soviet Union, the deejays, as one, were spinning "Tears on My Pillow." On TV, "Maverick" was outpulling Steve Allen or Ed Sullivan.

The kids were back at school, and a mild national debate was still on: "Should they have to take hard courses?"

The political campaigns were in high gear all over the country, but science and education were not among the issues.

Installation of Rt. Rev. Bishop Lichtenberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. BARR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States installed its 21st presiding bishop. The first presiding bishop was installed 1 year after the beginning of our National Government in 1789. The church, which is now the fifth largest Protestant denomination in the United States, has grown up with this country.

It was my privilege to attend these installation ceremonies as the lay representative of our diocese. I attended at the invitation of the Right Reverend Richard A. Kirchhoffer, who has served our diocese with patience, intelligence and good humor for 20 years. On February 28 Bishop Kirchhoffer will retire, and I was especially pleased to be able to assist him in a ceremony that surely comes as a fitting climax to a wonderful career of spiritual leadership. Bishop Kirchhoffer married us, confirmed our children and helped bury our dead. His retirement will come with a measure of personal sadness to every member of his diocese. But the continuing life of the church will go ahead in our diocese under the leadership of a vigorous, intelligent new bishop, the Right Reverend John P. Craine.

In the person of the Right Reverend Arthur Litchenberger, the Protestant Episcopal Church will grow with this great Nation and continue its record of spiritual service. Because of its history and potential, I think it only fitting that Bishop Lichtenberger's first sermon in his new office be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is a message of hope, optimism and dedication to the religious ideals which have helped make this Nation great. Bishop Lichtenberger said:

An occasion like this in the life of the church is a moment of thanksgiving and hope. It is a time for remembrance and expectation. This double response to God's mercy and demand is always centered for us in the present moment, in the opportunities and tasks that immediately confront us, in our situation as it is now. This is what we say repeatedly in the general thanksgiving, "Almighty God, Father of all mercies, we, Thine unworthy servants, do give Thee most humble and hearty thanks for all Thy goodness and loving kindness to us, and to all men * * * And, we beseech Thee, give us that due sense of all Thy mercies * * * that we show forth Thy praise, not only with our lips, but in our lives, by giving up ourselves to Thy service." A due sense of God's mercies; the offering of our selves to His service, this is the pattern and the substance of the Christian life.

So first of all we give thanks to God that He has brought us here today. We think of God's goodness to us in our own lives, of His gift of the church and what it has meant to us to be members of Christ's body. We give thanks for our own church, for all who have served and loved her and who have made this day possible for us. In particular now we give thanks to God for the ministry of Henry Knox Sherrill as our presiding bishop these past 12 years, for his vision, his courage, his utter devotion to the work he was given to do.

This time of transition, of the induction of a new presiding bishop into his office, is not of great significance in itself. Or to put it more precisely, the focus of attention now is not the person of the presiding bishop, whoever he may happen to be, but the continuing life of the church. I do want to say, however, now that I have been given this responsibility, how grateful I am for the encouragement and support of so many friends. This encouragement and support and the strength that comes from your prayers will sustain me.

But, as I have said, it is the continuing life of the church that gives this service of installation its significance and its meaning. And we see clearly, particularly at a time of transition such as this, that whatever God calls His church to do, however impossible of accomplishment the tasks before us may seem to be, we are to face this call neither with confidence in our own strength or with fear because of our own weakness, but rather remembering what great things God has done for us already, we believe that He has better things for us in store.

In St. John's Gospel, in the 15th chapter there are some words of our Lord which say this concisely. "You did not choose me, but I chose you and appointed you that you should go and bear fruit and that your fruit should abide." These words are spoken to each one of us, and to us all together in the church. We have been chosen, we have been appointed, we are to bear fruit, and our fruit is to last.

But do you see the point, the whole point here and everywhere in the New Testament? That the initiative rests with God and not with us? Whatever we do is all response. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but

that He loved us." It is true that responsibility is laid upon us in the church. We have been chosen, and appointed, and we are to bear fruit. But it is God who has chosen us, it is God who has appointed us, it is the fruit of God's Spirit that will be produced in us. And this is the deepest root of our thankfulness. For where would we be and how would we feel, if having been chosen and appointed, we were left to our own devices?

So our hope and expectation as we look at what we must do now and in the days ahead, come out of the very nature of our gratitude to God. St. Augustine has expressed it. "It is not that we keep His commandments and that then He loves us, but that He loves us and then we keep His commandments." Without His love God's commandments are impossible; with His love they are still beyond us, but our striving is no longer losing. In the assurance and confidence of God's love there is, as T. S. Eliot has said, for us "only the trying. The rest is not our business." This is to live in faith and leave the issue to God's wisdom.

Well what then of the trying, what of the effort required of us that we may bear fruit? I speak now of the responsibilities that are before us as a Church at work in this country and in lands overseas. The opportunities are so great and all that we have now to meet these opportunities seems so inadequate. How can we do what needs to be done? This is the question we usually ask, but surely it is the wrong question. A bishop in an overseas missionary diocese tells how he visited a village for the baptism of the first group of converts. The new Christians were ragged, illiterate, slow to respond. "One of those waves of unbelief comes over me," he said. "What shall we ever make of them? Then at once I am ashamed. Who are those keen eager young men moving quietly among them? They are from the same village. A year ago they were as unpromising as these. The question what can we make of them is the question of an unbeliever; the proper question is what can the Holy Spirit make of them." And that is the proper question for us as we face our responsibilities. Not, how can we possibly do what needs to be done? But what can the Holy Spirit do through us when we are open and humble enough for his action? The answer is: He can make us witnesses to Christ, he can bring forth fruit in us, fruit that will abide.

This is our deepest need, to believe this and to live by this. All our programs, all our plans without this are what Carlyle called quaint galvanic sprawlings, and many people quickly see them for what they are: mere schemes and devices. I do not want to be misunderstood. Plans and programs and united effort are good and necessary. In our parishes and dioceses, in National Council and General Convention we must be familiar with both our resources and the opportunities before the Church and then work to develop our resources and make them available. This is not the time or the place to speak of this in any detail, but this is a necessary part of our effort; this is to clear the way so that we do not through ignorance and unreadiness hinder the work of the Holy Spirit. Yet whatever we do, we know that the fruit which we are to bear is primarily God's work, it is ours only as he works through us. So if we let the invigorating wind of the Spirit refresh and empower us, then we will think, we will decide, we will act. It is for this that we have been chosen, appointed.

There are two words which have been in my mind constantly these past few months as I have been thinking about the task of the church in our day. All that we were concerned with at the Lambeth Conference centered also I think in these two words; they are essential to the very nature of the church.

The first word is mission. The church has a mission, it is the mission, it is sent to serve God in the world. This is the only work it has: To be the channel through which God makes himself known, to be the obedient servant of God. But what does it mean for the church to obey God now in this present world, this angry world, this world so afraid, heading apparently toward self-destruction? The answer can be found only in the midst of the actual circumstances in which we live. The answer can be found only by a repentant church, a church always aware that it stands under God's judgment, that it is a means not an end, a church always living in expectation of a renewed life. But we must know how to read the signs of renewal. For example, all over the church we are building many new churches and parish houses and establishing new missions. Is this a sign that we are bearing fruit that abides? It may be. But this kind of activity in itself is not renewal. We cannot be content with this and say, here is sufficient proof of our obedience. A good many years ago during an earlier building boom one of the great denominations of our country was building a new church a day. Then when Robert Ingersoll said in a public lecture that "the churches were dying out all over the land," a telegram was sent to him by a leader of that church saying, "We'll make it two a day." If a serious critic of the church says that the church has little relevance to the daily life of its members the answer cannot be: Then double the number of communicants. How true it is that there is only one place at which a genuine renewal of the life of the church can take place, namely, at the point at which its mission of transforming the world is being fulfilled. The only real renewal is a healing and saving manifestation of the power of love in open and courageous encounter with the world.

This is the mission on which the church is sent and it carries us into every part of the world and into the whole of life. This means that the church comes to man not in his extremity at the point where all else fails. The church stands not on the outskirts but in the center of the town. We do not live in a world of worship and piety apart from the world we encounter in office or factory, at home or on the street. The gospel speaks to the totality of life; all what we do individually or together, stands under the judgment of God and all our ways are to be conformed to his will. We can establish many new missions, we can baptize and confirm large numbers of people, we can have standing room only at our services, but unless we know that we are in the church in order that we may praise and serve God in the world and that it is this effort which constitutes obedience, then what we are doing is woefully inadequate. This is to lock ourselves in, this is to make the church irrelevant. The encounter of the church with the whole man and with the whole of life brings perplexities and uncertainty and suffering, but this is also the way of joy for to obey God is to enter into an exciting adventure. So we work for the transformation of the world knowing quite well we can never accomplish it. But we make our decisions—that is live our faith—in the conviction that the world into which God has entered with His redeeming power will in His own time be transformed, and the kingdom of this world will become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ.

The mission of the church: The other word is unity. Whatever may be our convictions about the right approaches to unity, all of us surely pray that the church may be visibly one. There is one body and one spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all. The church is one in Christ Jesus. Over 20 years ago in Edinburgh at the second conference on faith and order this essential unity was affirmed. "We are one," those Christians said, "in faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, the incarnate word of God. This unity does not consist in the agreement of our minds or in the consent of our wills, it is founded in Jesus Christ Himself." This is the unity God has given us. But we have broken that unity and how greatly our witness is weakened because we are divided. How hard it is for a divided church to bear witness of the one Lord to a divided world.

Here again our part is to clear the way so that God may lead us into that unity which belongs to the church of Christ. I believe we are finding our way, by God's grace, into a deeper unity within our own communion. We are coming to understand more clearly what it means to belong to a church which is both catholic and reformed. This is not an uneasy compromise which will have to be resolved eventually one way or another. It may appear so with those who call themselves Catholics or Evangelicals, each contending for his own tradition and often contending against each other. There is a far better way. It is not necessary that some be Catholics and some Evangelicals; each of us can know and manifest in his own life that comprehensiveness which we so greatly cherish. The two parts of our heritage are not incompatible and opposed elements, but are essential aspects of God's truth. They are, as F. D. Maurice said, "signs of the Kingdom of Christ." This is a rich inheritance we have. Can we not accept it all and grow in our understanding of it? Pray, then, that God may lead us into a renewed and deepened unity among ourselves and be a worker for unity among your own brethren.

And then beyond our own church, beyond the Anglican communion, we long for the unity of all who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. The unity we desire is the fulfillment of the unity we have. This is the unity given to us by Christ in His act of self-giving: "And I if I be lifted up will draw all men unto Me." Unity is not something which is to be fashioned and put together by us. The Church of Christ in its essential nature is one, as Christ Himself is one. Yet here as in our own lives the requirement is laid upon us to become what we are. We are one body in Christ, but we must constantly pray to be delivered from fear and inertia and despair; and work that we may so enter into that unity that it becomes visible and operative in this world. Surely this is not a concern and activity for those who happen to be interested in church unity; this is inseparable from the mission of the church.

So as God's thankful people we dedicate ourselves anew to the mission of the church and to the search for unity. We have before us an opportunity unique in the history of the church. If God is the Lord of history, as we believe, then we cannot think that this time is some terrible mistake. This day, as every day, is the Day of the Lord. And so we rejoice that God has brought us to this time, for it is His time and therefore a good time and we pray that we may be penitent and humble and open so that God may use us for His purpose. When we are fearful then, or hesitant or dismayed, when the tasks seem far beyond our strength; or when we are confident and assured, let us take heart and remember that it is God who has chosen us, God who has appointed us, God who will bring forth fruit in us. And to Him be the glory and the praise for ever and ever.

The President's State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include copy of my weekly newsletter "Keenotes" which was released today:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

One of the highlights of the opening days of a new session of Congress is the President's state of the Union message. There has grown up in recent years a tradition that the President deliver this address in person before a joint session of the Senate and the House. Millions of people throughout the Nation share this experience through the magic of television.

For the most part, the state of the Union message is couched in general terms. The President tries, at the beginning of a new period in his administration, to sum up just where he thinks the country is going, how we are doing as a Nation in meeting the problems which beset us at home and abroad. He indicates, in general terms, what he wants Congress to do during the months ahead.

It is always a thrilling experience to be a part of this annual ceremony. It is history in the making. This year was no exception. The President appeared before the assembled legislators, Supreme Court Justices, Cabinet members, and foreign diplomats in the House Chamber. I was pleased to note that he appeared to be in the best of health. He delivered the 45-minute speech in a vigorous manner. To the eyes of a layman, he appeared to have bounced back from illnesses that plagued him earlier in his administration.

Because so much of the address was couched in general terms, it is difficult to arrive at any definite conclusions about the Presidential message. As everyone knows by now, the President centered his emphasis on a balanced budget. He spoke of the need to tailor all of our programs, including defense, to the objective of a balanced budget. I got the impression that his insistence that budgetary requirements transcend even defense needs received a distinctly cool reception, even from some of the Republicans. This battle between the budget and defense is shaping up as one of the major fights of the session. Democratic leaders in both Houses will insist that our defenses not be neglected to achieve a bookkeeping balance between revenue and expenditures.

The battle will be joined when the President presents his budget. He already has announced it will be in the neighborhood of $77 billion and will be in balance. However, many people are skeptically awaiting full details. For instance, can we balance a $77 billion budget without an increase of about one-third in tax revenues? And will business increase that much? Or can the President count on additional revenue from a further increase in postal rates and the gasoline tax?

Many Members will insist that urgently needed programs not be delayed or abanboned as a sacrifice to a balanced budget. For example, the West Virginia delegation is united in the belief that a depressed areas bill should be passed. How economical is it to stave off this program and allow thousands of men to continue on the unemployed rolls? Wouldn't it make better sense to invest money to creat jobs to restore these men to the tax rolls and give them an income that would create additional jobs?

The President indicated he would ask additional money for foreign aid and credits to finance economic development abroad. Many Members will balk at expanding this foreign activity while cutting back on identical programs at home.

The state of the Union message is a valuable part of our system of government. The President, as head of the executive department, has the responsibility for initiating a program of action. The old saying, "The President proposes and Congress disposes," is certainly true. But Congress has a responsibility, too. It must examine the President's proposals, abandon them and change them to fit existing conditions.

Details of the President's program will unfold in a series of special messages during the coming weeks. No doubt there will be many differences of opinion between the President and Congress. But these differences will be worked out or compromised. Emphasis may be shifted from one program to another and Congress may decide to go further than the President wants. It is the genius of the American system that these differences are never allowed to paralyze Government.

Mikoyan Did Not Answer Any Important Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. David Lawrence which appeared several days ago in the Washington Star. Mr. Mikoyan has given the expected exhibition of nimble sidestepping of specific questions like those asked by Mr. Lawrence, while oozing general assurances of trade, trust, and truce, if only we will forget the past and ignore the present. Americans must not sell out for worthless words our position of steadfast support for the captive peoples who, without our support, are helpless.

SOME QUESTIONS FOR MIKOYAN—QUERIES ON MOSCOW REPRESSIONS AND BRUTALITY URGED FOR RED

(By David Lawrence)

As the Deputy Premier of the Soviet Government, Anastas Mikoyan is entitled to a courteous reception by the officials of the U.S. Government. The American people, however, are under no obligation to embrace a man whose hands are dripping with the blood, not only of his fellow countrymen but of the people of Hungary and the other captive nations in Eastern Europe.

Indeed, this is the opportunity of a lifetime to do something for the millions of persons imprisoned even now in slave-labor camps in Russia and for the millions who are denied freedom behind the Iron Curtain. For, as Mr. Mikoyan travels around America, questions can be asked him publicly concerning the conditions inside the Soviet Union for which he, as a part of the Kremlin apparatus, is responsible.

When, for instance, will censorship be removed so that the Iron Curtain can be lifted for the more than 300 million people who today are being forbidden to learn the truth of what's going on in the world around them or outside their countries?

When will the millions of innocent men and women under Kremlin control who have been thrust into jail, without a hearing or a trial, be given a chance to regain their liberty?

When will the elderly persons in the Soviet Union who have children in the United States and other countries be permitted to leave their native land so they may visit their families abroad?

When will the people of the Soviet Union be given a chance to vote in a free election—an election in which more than the Government's own party is allowed to put up candidates?

When will the right of self-government be given once more to Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and East Germany?

When will freedom of expression be permitted for the writers of the Soviet Union, and when will an author like Boris Pasternak be allowed to accept an award given him by a nonpolitical organization abroad such as the Nobel prize for literature?

When will the Kremlin withdraw its troops from the smaller countries contiguous to it and let their peoples enjoy complete sovereignty?

Above all, when will the Soviet Government begin to honor its pledges and its promises as written in treaties, agreements, and documents of an international nature in the 13 years since the close of World War II?

For there can be no assurance of peace if one of the powerful governments, with a vast military machine at its disposal, can at any time violate its written word and plunge the world into war.

There can be no trust, moreover, as long as the basic principles of freedom and a free society are ignored by the tyrants and autocrats in the Kremlin.

Anastas Mikoyan is a symbol of dictatorship. This very week Americans generally—especially those on the "liberal" side—have been enthusiastically acclaiming Fidel Castro and expressing satisfaction that Batista, the dictator, has been overthrown in Cuba. Americans ought not to adopt one rule for dictators in this hemisphere and another for the dictators in Europe. Only a few days ago Dr. Milton Eisenhower, the President's brother, said in a report to the White House on Latin American affairs:

"I believe the suggestion of Vice President NIXON is sound and would be applauded by Latin America itself—that we have an 'abrazo' (embrace) for democratic leaders, and a formal handshake for dictators."

This expresses accurately the manner in which the United States should react to the visit of Anatas Mikoyan. He is not deserving of the social embraces which some shortsighted Americans are giving him. He could mistake this for approval of Communist methods and customs. In fact, the main reason the Deputy Premier has come here, and the main reason Premier Khruschchev sent him to urge a summit conference, is that this is one way to set in motion a dramatic distortion of America's position. It is a way of gaining prestige at home for the dictatorship.

More than anything else in the world, American approval of Communist behavior is important to the Kremlin in squelching any possible uprising inside the Soviet Union. To welcome Mr. Mikoyan in America with open arms, and without voicing any protest, is to furnish headlines in the Soviet-controlled press telling the Soviet people that the people of this country no longer disapprove of or at least are unwilling to combat the Communist philosophy.

America's moral force is the most powerful weapon in the world—it can move mil-

lions of people behind the Iron Curtain. So, on the kind of reception given the Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union as he tours this country depends the hope of the oppressed and the enslaved in whose hearts and minds the craving for freedom and liberty will never die.

Statements Before the Fourth Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements:

INTERVENTION OF DELEGATE GEORGE W. WESTERMAN BEFORE THE FOURTH COMMITTEE ON NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES, NOVEMBER 29, 1958

Mr. Chairman, the numerous historic debates conducted in the chamber of the fourth committee have furnished ample proof that since the establishment of the United Nations, chapter XI of the charter undoubtedly has brought many extraordinary benefits to the progressive development of the political, social, and economic institutions of territories whose people have not yet attained a full measure of self-government.

The population of the non-self-governing territories vary widely in race, tradition, and culture. They have, however, one thing in common; most inhabitants of many territories are of an ethnic origin and have a cultural heritage different from those of the metropolitan countries.

In the economic affairs of these territories a notable trend toward diversification is to be noted. There is also marked concern for the planning and execution of development schemes, as well as for the employment of technical advice and assistance not only in economics, but also in the social and educational fields.

Generally, improvement in the overall picture should be considered against the background of increased population pressure. In this evolutionary process we observe that increased capital investment is being made and that large-scale projects for industrialization are being undertaken. At the same time steps are being taken to stimulate agricultural production. All these measures are being adopted towards developing a balanced economy and providing a better living for these peoples.

On the other hand mention must be made of how steady is the progress in town and country planning as an effective means of solving housing problems. With this view in mind Government banks are being established to provide long-term, low interest loans for persons wishing to construct their homes.

We also observed that most public housing is undertaken directly by territorial governments or central agencies, rather than by municipal bodies. Also that some schemes had to be devised on an emergency basis to relieve urgent needs. However, broad programs aimed at creating integrated neighbors with all necessary amenities were noted to be receiving increasing attention.

Other significant advances have occurred in the development of all forms of mass media, and we all welcome the policy of encouraging a free and responsible press. It is recognized, of course, that the full utilization of mass media is still impeded by a number of problems in the non-self-governing territories, particularly in areas of high illiteracy.

In general, health conditions are said to be steadily improving, and recent advances in medicine and public health have contributed substantially to the reduction in morbidity and mortality rates.

We fully subscribe to the view that a spirit of mutual respect and cooperation is required to combat racial bias and to promote common advancement in territories where different ethnic groups live side by side. Also that advancement of any society depends on the contribution of all its members. When groups of people in a given society are not regarded as equal, progress is difficult. We applaud the recommendation that the abolition of discrimination on racial grounds should form an integral part of social policy and public administration.

My delegation notes with satisfaction that, with the expansion of community development and programs, the extension of training facilities and the provision of new administrative arrangements, a further spread and intensification of the community development movement had been recorded in many areas.

Mr. Chairman, there is sufficient proof now available from a perusal of the report of the committee on information from non-self-governing territories that the economic, social, and educational conditions are constantly improving. This is made manifest from the fact that in the case of a number of territories information on them is no longer submitted. Others have moved directly into full membership with the United Nations. These countries are well known to the members of this august body. The nearer territories reach the state of self-government the more concerned should be the United Nations about them.

Furthermore, one of the fundamental aims of chapter XI, in addition to that provided in article 73(b), is that contained in article 73(d), which is, I quote: "to promote constructive measures of development, to encourage research, and to cooperate with one another and, when and where appropriate, with specialized international bodies with a view to the practical achievement of the social, economic, and scientific purposes set forth."

A few weeks ago this committee discussed the future of French Togoland. On that occasion we were happy to join the many distinguished delegates who were pleased to commend the administering power for the advancement of the Trust Territory of Togoland. We listened with a spirit of solidarity to the words of the delegate of Ghana when he urged upon France: "That no stone should be left unturned, in these last days of their final control over the external relations of Togoland, to enable the territory to get all the assistance possible to make a vigorous and successful start on its new course of statehood." Several of our distinguished representatives expressed the hope that technical assistance would be forthcoming not only from the administering power itself, but also from the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance.

Mr. Chairman, in the course of my remarks before this committee at its session of October 17, 1957, reference was made to the non-self-governing territories in the neighboring Caribbean area—the proposed West Indian Federation. On that occasion my delegation congratulated the United Kingdom for having assisted both financially and materially in bringing the territories to that stage of constitutional advance. Since then, this Federation has become a fact. In March of the current year the West Indies, comprising 10 island territories, elected their Federal representatives, and a Federal government was inaugurated by Princess Margaret in April at Trinidad, the capital site.

We understand that provision is made in the West Indies constitution for its review within 5 years, leading to Dominion status, or independence within the British Commonwealth.

The delegation of Panama draws attention to this situation, Mr. Chairman, because it seems to us that here is a case somewhat like the present position of French Togoland or the Gold Coast before it became Ghana. Thus, as in the cast of the Gold Coast and French Togoland the West Indies are on their way toward independence, hence our interest in their relation to the United Nations. We are sure other delegates here would join us in urging the United Kingdom to do all in its power during these closing stages of its control to bring the West Indies into closer relations with international bodies. It is only in such a manner that it might be possible to facilitate the provision of technical assistance, and to give the West Indies increasing opportunity to prepare themselves so that they will be ready to participate fully in the work of the United Nations as an independent member when the time comes.

Speaking on the occasion of the inauguration of the West Indies Federation, the Prime Minister, Sir Grantley Adams, said; I quote:

"The attainment of Federation is, I think, a remarkable constructive achievement in which many have played their part. We now look to the future rather than the past. We believe that through federation the people of the West Indies can most speedily and effectively fulfill their national aspirations; and that they can look for a standing and an authority in the Commonwealth and in the world that would be denied to them as isolated units. We believe, too, that federation provides the means by which the economy of the region can be strengthened and the standard of living of its people be raised. We shall need, at every stage of the road, the help and encouragement of the British Government, and we know that our progress will be watched with close interest and practical sympathy throughout the Commonwealth and outside and in particular by the people of the Dominion of Canada and the United States."

A month or so ago it was our pleasure to listen to Prime Minister, Sir Grantley Adams here in New York when he spoke of the goals of the new nation. This West Indian scholar and statesman emphasized the need for technical assistance. "Give us the tools," he urged, "and we will do the job," he assured. It was pleasing to note from his statement the measure of assistance Canada had already made available to the West Indies, and of the invitation from the United States to his Government to come to Washington later this year for discussions on possible means of assistance.

Agreements already are in effect between the International Cooperation Administration of the United States and the individual members of the Federation. These agreements include health, housing, technical administration, communication, public administration, as well as agriculture and natural resources. Accordingly, it is now in the hands of the United Kingdom to offer the opportunity to the Federation for extending such agreements on a wider level. This can be done most effectively by encouraging the Federation to seek technical assistance so necessary for this underdeveloped area where the problems include an explosive population situation.

We are not unaware that in this changing constitutional relationship between the West Indies and the United Kingdom, the latter has already assumed an appreciable part of the financial obligations involved in the West Indies Federation. Since the problems of emerging territories have become a special concern of the United Nations, my delegation feels that in all propriety the provisions

of the Charter can equally extend to the West Indies.

While it is true that there is a difference of approach in our dealings with trust territories and the non-self-governing territories, it does seem, however, that the spirit of the Charter implies that in either type of territories the interest of the inhabitants are paramount. Therefore when approaching political independence they should be given every assistance so that they may be prepared to assume their rightful part in the community of nations.

The demonstrations of helpfulness on the part of Canada and the United States in coming to the aid of this emerging Caribbean nation, as mentioned earlier, augurs well for good neighbor relations as envisaged in article 74 of chapter XI, and to which we referred in our statement before this committee last year. In this spirit of manifest goodwill we are sure that the United Kingdom will not view with disfavor a more direct approach to the United Nations and its specialized agencies in this matter of technical assistance for the West Indies.

In invoking the principle of good neighborliness we are equally certain that the people of Latin America whose representatives on the fourth committee have championed so intently the cause of self-determination, will welcome whatever reasonable proposal is put forward that will guarantee the most effective contribution to West Indies regional development. As remarked by my esteemed colleague from Guatemala in his intervention of November 17, 1958, "a typical feature of the present era is international cooperation and the interdependence of countries * * * to which the United Nations has been attaching increasing importance."

Mr. Chairman, might we not aim at recapturing for this territory which has become a poor and deficit area, much of the substance that made it as historically productive as it once was? Furthermore, the West Indies is destined ultimately to have a full share in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere. By fostering the socio-economic advancement of these 3 million inhabitants of the Federation, we are by that fact itself promoting the solidarity of this hemisphere and envigorating the bonds of world peace and international security which the United Nations is committed to maintain.

During the course of our debates the members of this committee have never failed to demonstrate a deep concern in respect of the welfare of the inhabitants of the non-self-governing territories. This laudable attitude then has prompted the foregoing observations. Our motivation in this regard has been only that of presenting before this committee a few ideas that might contribute to improving as far as possible the efforts of this Caribbean territory toward its full independence, in harmony with the aims and objectives of the United Nations Charter.

My delegation, which shares the wide esteem in which Sir Andrew Cohen is held in this committee, has been observing the profound interest with which the Government of the United Kingdom, through its distinguished representative, has followed our deliberations. These factors represent a happy augury that formulas of positive benefits will be found to favor the West Indies Federation in its final relations with the United Kingdom.

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY SIR ANDREW COHEN TO THE FOURTH COMMITTEE, DECEMBER 2, 1958

Although I have spoken at great length already in this debate, I feel that in fairness to a number of members who have raised matters relating to territories under United Kingdom administration, I should take up a little more of the time of the committee in order to make a brief statement on one or two points.

First of all, Sir, I would like to refer to the remarks—the most helpful and constructive remarks—made by the distinguished representative of Panama with regard to technical assistance for the territories comprising the West Indian federation and other territories in the Caribbean area under United Kingdom administration. I very much appreciated the spirit in which the distinguished representative of Panama put forward his remarks.

My delegation and indeed my Government is well aware of the great interest, the great sympathetic interest taken by the present Government of Panama in the well-being and future progress of the territories in the West Indian federation. We are much encouraged by this and also by the general interest, friendly interest, taken by all the countries of the Western Hemisphere in the progress of this new federation.

My delegation, sir, fully sympathizes with the views expressed by my distinguished friend from Panama. We realize the great importance of outside aid in economic and social development to this new federation. We welcome the assistance which has already been received from various organs of the United Nations and we have been delighted to see these countries receiving this assistance.

I would like very briefly to mention that there have been a large number of schemes valued at nearly £140,000 of technical assistance of a whole variety of sorts for the countries in the Caribbean. I will not weary the committee at this stage with details of these schemes, but they cover a wide range, and I would like to emphasize their great importance.

I would also like to remind the committee that very large scale assistance had during this whole period been received by the countries in the Caribbean from the United Kingdom Government itself. For example, in the period from April 1946 to 1958 the total grants and loans approved under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act for the territories now in the federation was approximately £28 million, and during the year ended March 31, 1958, schemes of development and research costing about £4 million were approved under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act.

I think it would be agreed by everyone round this table, or, at any rate, by most people, that in considering applications for technical assistance from the United Nations obviously the extent to which United Kingdom assistance is available in the fields concerned, this clearly should be taken into account. But I would like to say this. We can, in my view, expect a steady increase in the technical assistance schemes from this whole area come before the United Nations. The United Kingdom Government will welcome this.

We are extremely grateful to my distinguished friend from Panama for having raised this matter here and to the other speakers who have spoken with sympathy on this subject. We are encouraged by the sympathy and interest, and I will say here that I will bring the views which have been expressed by the representative of Panama and others to the attention of the United Kingdom Government, and I am sure that my Government will take the views into very serious consideration.

STATEMENT MADE BY DELEGATE GEORGE W. WESTERMAN TO THE FOURTH COMMITTEE, DECEMBER 3, 1958

I regret that yesterday when the distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom intervened in the debate I was absent from this chamber. However, he has graciously presented me with a copy of his speech for which I am most grateful.

It is with much pleasure we note that in his intervention he made reference to both my delegation and the Government of Panama in complimentary terms for having taken the interest shown on behalf of the Caribbean territories.

My delegation feels greatly honored that the modest recommendations which we made last Friday, will be duly forwarded to the Government of the United Kingdom for its very serious consideration.

In view of his declarations, we express the hope that positive results soon will ensue in favor of these territories and their inhabitants.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

EXCERPT FROM SPEECH MADE BY MR. H. N. MCQUARRIE, DECEMBER 5, 1958

Mr. Chairman, at the outset of our debate on the report of the committee on information from non-self-governing territories, the distinguished representative of Panama made some very kind references to my country's offers of assistance to the West Indies, the new federation of islands in the Caribbean. My country shares the affection for the people of the West Indies expressed by my distinguished colleague from Panama. Canada has strong ties of trade and history with the islands of what have been known as the British West Indies. Canada has recently entered into a special aid program for the new federation and study is under way of how young people of the West Indies may be best assisted to acquire advanced training which may contribute to the prosperity and cultural growth of their islands. Of the more than 1,600 students from non-self-governing territories now studying in Canada, some 1,000 are from the English speaking islands of the Caribbean. Many of these students, I am happy to say, are being assisted by private Canadian sources. Canade looks forward to playing a still larger role in providing educational facilities for West Indian students.

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of this body the following entry to the I Speak for Democracy Contest prepared by Miss Anita Lanphier, a junior in the Dodge City Senior High School, in Dodge City, Kans. Anita is a well-known debater and has beeen a trophy winner on a number of occasions:

I am a student. My mind is a product of the greatest industry this Nation has ever conceived. Within my mind are the ideas which founded this country and the same ideas which have made it rise, an indestructible phoenix, from the ashes of war and depression.

I, and my companions, are the infinite, though unperfected, results of 300 years of living. We seek to improve—but, above all, to continue those principles which have made us free to walk in the sight of God as equal by right of our being.

We have grown old in the struggle to give life to this great new dream. Yet, even now, we discover that the future is forever chained to the past. The winter remembers much of what the spring should have done. Yet, if the spring should guard herself well, the winter would never be. So we must review the events which led us to this pinnacle

with as little reckoning as mourning for the barrenness of autumn.

This young country was nurtured into being and opened her wondering eyes on the great dark winter of revolution. She rose up, and slew the mighty goliath of British control. It was a battle for her very being. She stood far above the great dark clouds of oblivion and chose her pebbles well. Even as Goliath's laughter spread like a roll of thunder, she rose up and slew him with an idea and cut off his head with a dream.

She stood tall on the mountains of freedom, and she bore the child called democracy.

Then, suddenly, the warm protective cloak of peace was taken from her shoulders and she was torn with the biting cold of civil war.

The aging, defiant South reared her head above the Union, supported by proud gentlemen who cherished her and her way of life above all else. She was a lady and they donned their toy-soldier uniforms and marched away to defend her honor. To them, war was this, nothing more, an affair of honor. They did not fear or doubt, until they, as Thomas, felt the gaping ugly wounds.

The South fell, crushed and burning. Suddenly, as age comes upon an old woman, she lay broken and about to die. And the ages to come echoed in unison, "They have not died in vain."

Once again, she rose with a new name, "The Union," a new greatness within herself. She had grown in stature and in wisdom. She has much to remember and much more to learn. She stands proud and holds her head high among the stars for she, too, guides the lives of those who chart their paths by her unerring light in the skies. As long as men think and see—she is there. As long as men yearn to know—she is with them. As long as men cherish freedom above all else—she lives. For, like the spring, she is eternally reborn. She is as inevitable and unchanging as the seasons. She is your godmother and your playmate, she is the mammy who nurtured you in her honey-blossomed bosom. She is a lump in your throat and a flag flying high. She is the words of a song. She is a spirit—infinite, eternal, and unchangeable. She is democracy.

Anita won second place in the State contest and we in the Fifth District of Kansas are very proud of her.

Where Do We Stand on Missiles?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by WDSU Broadcasting Corp., New Orleans, La.:

WHERE DO WE STAND ON MISSILES?

Where does the United States stand in relation to Russia in the development of military missiles?

Three statements have come out of Washington on this subject in the past 2 days. They all come from people who should know what they are talking about. But they are hardly in agreement with each other.

First, the House Space Committee made a report that Russia is 12 to 18 months ahead of us in its space program, and it will take us 5 years to close the gap. This committee, incidentally, includes both Democrats and Republicans.

Second, Vice President NIXON made a statement, apparently intended as an answer to the committee. He pictured the United States as ahead of Russia in some aspects of the space race, and catching up in others. In regard to purely military missiles, NIXON said, we're ahead, although he admitted the Russians have more powerful rocket engines.

Now, a third statement has come from Senator STUART SYMINGTON, a former Secretary of the Air Force under President Truman. SYMINGTON says he does not know a single impartial expert who agrees with NIXON. He challenges NIXON to give a percentage comparison between the number of intercontinental missiles this country expects to have at the end of this year and the estimated number the Russians will have.

We don't know what the truth of the matter is. It would be comfortable to believe that Vice President NIXON is right. But we're inclined to believe that NIXON is engaging in the kind of soothing coverup that has been practiced in the field of national defense for several years.

Joseph Alsop has said, referring to U.S. intelligence estimates, that we will not have a single operational intercontinental missile even at the end of 1959; the Russians are expected to have 100. We know who fired the first satellite to orbit the earth, plus the first one to orbit the sun. NIXON himself admits the Russians are ahead in rocket power.

Where do we stand on missiles compared with Russia?

It's not a question anyone should play politics with.

It's a question that involves national survival, and the known facts do not furnish grounds for complacency. They suggest the urgency of providing the American people with a straight, clear answer.

Let's Throw Away the Crutch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a great many words have been voiced and written concerning the President's state of the Union address last week. My own views were expressed in my weekly newsletter. The Moore County News is published biweekly in Dumas, Tex., and contributes greatly to this flourishing, progressive, civic-minded community. The News, whose editor is my good friend, D. E. Alford, expresses editorially an approach to the state of the Union message which I heretofore have not seen, and which is most provocative. Under unanimous consent I insert herein the editorial from the January 11 edition of the Moore County News, as follows:

LET'S THROW AWAY THE CRUTCH

In his State of the Nation address Friday, President Eisenhower leveled a point-blank blast of cold, hard facts at the American people and its Government.

He talked of dollars, missiles, and war.

The words of our President reflected the frenzied era in which we live * * * a time of excitement through scientific advancement, yet overshadowed by a cloud of fears, anxieties and frustrations coming from people of a disturbed Nation.

A threat as old as man himself, that of violence and conflict with that which would challenge his survival, was ever present in the calm words of our President.

Sixty percent of our national budget is being poured into our national security program.

Moore County got a glimpse of this huge dollar theory with the establishment of two large Nike missile launching sites in our area. As we rest in Dumas and Moore County, snug within the supposed protective circle of that small, almost minute segment of air protection, we well can ask what does our freedom cost?

The President told us in dollars what price we pay for keeping the pace of our times.

New jet fighters of today, replacing the old aircraft of World War II, are costing nearly 50 times what those old war heaps cost; atomic submarines are costing as much as $150 million apiece; a bare minimum of $35 million is spent every time a mighty Atlas blasts into the sky.

And, we were told in honest reflection by our President, we have new bombers which actually cost their weight in gold, tons and tons of it, for a single weapon of defense, which, tomorrow, may be as outdated as the old prop fighters of World War II.

Freedom costs money, more money than many of us can even start to imagine, yet we are the only source of support for this age which we have helped to create for ourselves.

During the same speech, President Eisenhower said progress is security, defense and in scientific research must be our first objective, and that we must keep abreast of the world whatever the costs.

The key factor in this unknown formula of survival, we were told, is a strong, healthy economy to feed the giant brainchild that is our Government and our defense network with reduced waste in the process.

At times such as these, when Federal controls continue to reach out and spoon feed the American people, it would appear to us that the waste of which our President speaks is not in terms of dollars but in terms of wasted human energies, softened by having our jobs done for us.

The waste in dollars, no matter how high the billions pile up, is little indeed to that lying dormant within our people. Yet our selfish demands for unneeded help from Government aids and handouts will continue until a government of people, and not dollars, crumbles through its complete inability to nourish a nation of parasites instead of people.

Moore County can do its share in standing firm against the menace of our times, despite dollars. We can unleash our own abilities for the jobs to be done, without help.

We can start by using the Government as a cane instead of a crutch.

Democratic Party Advisory Council Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofor granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of statement on policy issued by the Democratic Party Advisory Council as it appeared in the print of the New York Times for Tuesday, December 9, 1958:

TEXT OF STATEMENT ON POLICY ISSUED BY THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY'S ADVISORY COUNCIL—THE DEMOCRATIC TASK DURING THE NEXT 2 DAYS

The Democratic victory in the Congressional elections this autumn provided our party with great opportunities and responsibilities.

All Democrats are concerned about the tasks which face our party in the next 2 years. We think and talk about them across the Nation, consistent with our duties as America's only national political party. We know, moreover, that the measures required of Government acquire their true effectiveness only as they rest upon the kind of public understanding and support that comes from full and free discussion.

In accordance with its practice of stating, from time to time, its view, on important issues, the Democratic Advisory Council here enumerates the elements of a program it hopes will be adopted during the next 2 years.

We do not have full prosperity at home, and desperate want still stalks most of mankind. Peace is the goal of all peoples, and yet that goal is still receding rather than drawing near. We in the United States have the technology and the institutions to make the greatest single contribution toward plenty and peace. We lack only the decisions to call forth our full power. The purpose of this statement is to help evoke these decisions, and to rally further to their support the full powers of the American people.

A wide range of actions and measures is urgently needed. The world moves rapidly in the last half of the 20th century and the need for bold and comprehensive action is urgent. Republican reaction lethargy and indecision of the past 6 years have allowed this Nation to fall woefully behind in meeting the demands of the times. Thus, we are called upon not only to keep up with the many demands of growth and change, but also to overcome the backlog of unmet needs that the Republican Administration has allowed to pile up. Our list of what is needed must perforce be an extensive one.

Under our Constitution, we will have a Republican administration for 2 more years. The Congress must of necessity cooperate with this administration. The effort must be to lead the administration into doing the best of which it is capable.

CALLED UNPRECEDENTED

The election for the third successive time of a congressional majority which is of the opposite political party from the President is without precedent in our history. It imposes an unprecedented responsibility upon the Democratic majority. It is in the nature of things difficult for congressional majorities to provide the leadership which is supposed to come from the Executive. But the Democratic leadership in the House of Representatives and the Senate has performed this difficult task with great ability and effectiveness during these past 4 years. We are confident that the Democratic majority will fully meet this responsibility during the next 2 years. To this end, we will support and help it in every way we can.

While we may expect the administration to continue to try to block some needed measures, the increased Democratic majorities in both Houses of Congress provide better means to overcome such opposition. While it will undoubtedly be impossible for the Congress to overcome administration objections to do all that should be done, it should now be possible to enact desirable legislation that the administration has previously defeated and to put through a larger portion of a clear and comprehensive Democratic program.

We are glad that Sepaker SAM RAYBURN and Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON have indicated their intention to take the initiative in formulating and obtaining consideration of such a comprehensive Democratic program. We recognize their preeminent qualifications in the legisaltive field. The Democratic party and the Nation are fortunate to have such extraordinarily able legislative leaders at a time when so much is required of the Congress.

THE ROAD TO PEACE

It must be a primary aim of our foreign policy to work at all places and in all ways to create world conditions and climates of opinion which will make it possible to prevent the destruction of our country and all civilization in a hydrogen war.

The Republican administration is on dead center on this, the most vital of the problems which confront us. The administration seems to have lost the determination to succeed in the prevention of war—and this in the day of hydrogen bombs and intercontinental missiles. The Democratic Party must and always will be committed to the conviction that peace is possible, and to the actions that are necessary to its achievement.

During these 2 remaining years of the Eisenhower administration, the Democratic opposition should insist that the Republican administration act to have a foreign policy which will make it clear to the world that the United States and its allies and friends want peace and are willing to do what is necessary to get; to develop policies which will establish a common understanding with the peoples of Asia and Africa to work with us to prevent war; to work from positions of strength at home and with our allies of Europe and of South and Central America and the rest of the world to try to persuade the Russians and Chinese Communists to agree to the peaceful settlement of disputes between them and us; to use the United Nations wherever practicable for the development of our policies; and to move with determination to seek world agreement on the regulation and control of the weapons of modern war. Mankind must get control of the weapons of modern war. The most immediate step in this direction should be for the United States to propose to the United Nations a reliable stage-by-stage plan, to be enforced by the United Nations, for substantially total disarmament down to the levels needed for local policing.

COOPERATION ON FOREIGN POLICY

Never was confidence and cooperation between this country and the free world more essential to the security of the United States than now. Never have crises broken around us so fast and so violently and caught our Government so unprepared as in the Middle East during July, in Quemoy during September, over Berlin in November.

No one questions the constitutional authority of the President to command the Armed Forces of the United States and to conduct negotiations with foreign nations. No one doubts his right to choose his own advisers. But there is much more to formulating and carrying out foreign policy than ordering troop movements and negotiating with foreign nations. There is the vast responsibility of determining our national purposes and of providing the capacity and means for attaining them. Here the legislative branch has its own constitutional task both in devising policy and in wisely exercising the power to grant legal authority for its execution, along with the necessary manpower, material resources, and funds.

If there were proper relations between the parties and within the Government, the legislative branch—and, indeed, the country—should confidently depend upon the President, acting through the State Department and its missions abroad, for information, analysis, and appraisal and leadership in foreign matters. Unfortunately, the confidence of the country, the Congress, and of our allies in the present conduct of our foreign policy has been lost.

This lack of trust has consequences which must be faced frankly and, in the national interest, stated frankly. As for the day-to-day conduct of the unforeseen crises with their threats of war, into which the administration so blindly stumbles, there is not much that our party can do. But we can and should make clear four points which might have some salutary effects:

First, that we are wholly determined that our country shall carry out solemn commitments to which it is a party. But we disapprove the tendency of the present administration to expand these commitments beyond their original intent by administrative interpretation.

Second, that we are wholly determined that so far as we can do so, we shall see that our country is prepared and able to carry out its commitments.

Third, we intend to criticize men and their actions responsible for the blunders, drift, and neglect which permit the recurrence of these crises; and we do not intend to be intimidated by the charge that to do so is to give aid to the enemy.

Fourth, the Constitution gives the President broad discretionary power to use the Armed Forces. We view with misgivings the requests by this administration for vague and imprecise extensions of this authority.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The hour is now too late to tolerate the equivocations, the suppressions of truth, the positive misrepresentations of those who tell us that what we have been doing, what we are asking of ourselves, what we are devoting to our defenses is even keeping us abreast of the tide. It is not. The time given us is very short. The security of the country can no longer afford the inaction of officials, however highly placed, who stubbornly refuse to obey the law which gives them direction of funds to be used in defense. It is the duty of our party to continue even more vigorously to legislate the expansion of our defensive capabilities and see that the law is obeyed.

More than this: We need a new attitude in our military planning and in our military budget. We need the decision and determination that this country shall have a level of deterrent military power, now and in the future, such as to leave no doubts in the minds of the Russians and the Communist Chinese that they must not start a war or allow one to start.

We must build, too, our air transport facilities for a minimum of three or four modernized divisions, to be quickly transported to where they may be needed.

Our need for these forces is more compelling than the question of their costs. Our decision should be based on national security rather than arbitrary budget figures. But at the same time we must stop vacillating about service rivalries and the organization of the Department of Defense. We must reorganize our military establishment into a single department, thereby eliminating the waste in money, manpower, and results which are inevitable under the present obsolete organization.

ECONOMIC STRENGTHENING OF THE FREE WORLD

The ultimate objective of the free world is not military strength but human well-being. The advance of this well-being, under the shelter of this military strength, offers the best single hope that the costs and dangers of the shelter itself may gradually and safely be removed. The contest of competing systems to uplift peoples can be the long-range salvation of the world; the contest merely to excel in arms is the current tragedy of the world.

The Marshall plan and point 4 won the support of the American people because we

are dedicated to human advance. The economic and political benefits of these efforts came just because the recipients saw in them a reflection of their own aspirations and of the true face of America.

In more recent years, we have neither reshaped these efforts to changing circumstances, nor maintained them at levels consistent with needs overseas and our resources at home.

This process of reshaping should now be undertaken with redoubled vigor. It involves a complex of technical assistance, private credits facilitated by public action, and public programs. These related efforts should be coordinated at home and with friendly nations, showing that our power and determination to diffuse the security of plenty is no less bold and realistic than our efforts to diffuse the security of arms. The cost of plenty is less than the cost of arms; the benefits incalculably greater. The appalling world spectacle of vast unused productive powers in the United States while others cannot make their human ends meet, needs to be succeeded by the inspiration of an America willing to use a just proportion of our marvelous technology to reinforce political freedom by reducing freedom from want.

BACKS MORE TECHNICAL AID

Specifically, we believe that the Democratic Party should give strong support first, to expansion of technical assistance under the point 4 program; second, to the authorization of at least $1 billion for each of the next 5 years for the development loan fund; and third, to the expansion and extension of the program under Public Law 480 for using our agricultural surpluses to help needy people overseas.

Our party, as in the case of the Marshall plan and point 4, can and should draw up—what the administration has not provided—a definitive program, stating concretely the objectives for a specific phase of development in undeveloped areas and the extent, duration, and cost of our country's participation, which program should be carried out to the greatest extent practicable with our allies and through the United Nations. Only in this way can a practicable program and continuity of action be achieved.

ECONOMIC GROWTH AT HOME

We must have a rapidly growing economy to support the inevitably mounting costs of an adequate national defense, to supply the economic sinews of an effective foreign policy, to meet the domestic needs of a growing population, and to make reasonable progress in the living standards of our people. During the last 6 years of the Truman administration our gross national product, measured in constant dollars, increased at an average annual rate of more than 4½ percent. During the 6 years of this Republican administration, the average annual increase has been only 1.3 percent. This is intolerable.

The population of these United States has increased by 15 million people since Mr. Eisenhower became President. The annual increase in our population is 3 million persons. The growth in output of goods and services must match this for us even to stand still. But standing still is not progress; in fact, it is failure. The Russians are not standing still. The increase in their national product during the most recent years has been estimated at an annual rate of 7 to 10 percent. They are catching up with us and have plans to pass us by. No one should fail to take their plans seriously. Their implications for our peace and security are ominous indeed. A 5 percent annual growth rate, barely above what we averaged some years ago, is moderate in terms of our new technology. We could do even better.

Government expenditures, keyed to our vital needs and resource capabilities, are in themselves a key factor in maximum economic growth. Conversely, maximum economic growth is essential to support the necessary level of vital Government expenditures. The amount and purpose of Government spending must be determined by wisely balancing needs and capability. It is elementary that a growing nation needs larger public as well as larger private expenditures, just as it costs more to support a family of five than it does a family of three. It is equally obvious, even more for a nation than for a family, that it is better to increase production and income so that needs can be met, rather than to sacrifice essentials because production, employment, and national income are far too low.

CONTROL OF INFLATION

The Republicans have given us unemployment and recurrent stagnation with persistent inflation. This, in fact, is their unique contribution.

The main key to effective inflation control is sustained full employment and full production, combined with truly competitive pricing. Actions to insure an expanding economy, in which full private and public consumption calls forth the high rate of productivity of which we are technologically capable, would facilitate the fight against inflation. Artificially restrained production has inflationary effects.

The Congress should give serious consideration to the following matters: First, the impact of the monetary and high interest rate policies of the administration which repress production and cramp economic growth; second, the lack of public machinery to air the facts of pending inflationary steps in the private economy and of debt policies that have raised the cost of financing the increasing public debt to an alltime high; and third, the more vigorous enforcement of antimonopoly laws, with a continued stress on investigations into the administered private policies of American industry. There should be constant review of tariff policies which unduly protect noncompetitive domestic industry.

A thorough going review is urgently required of the fiscal and monetary policies of the administration and the Federal Reserve Board that have contributed to a gross imbalance of the national budget; to a serious recession with continuing rising prices, and to serious problems now arising in the refinancing of a sizable portion of the Federal debt at unreasonably high interest costs to the taxpayer. It should be the object of such an investigation to determine who the beneficiaries of these policies have been, and what harm has been done to the future of the Nation's economic strength.

The problem of continuing and rising consumer costs demands congressional inquiry into such pricing policies as the farmer-consumer price spread that has resulted in rising retail food costs with a decreasing portion going to the farmers of the food dollar.

The following portions of this statement outline the specific crucial areas in which we should bring our performance into line with our needs and capabilities. The question will at once be raised as to how we can meet the costs of these economic and human advances. The answer is that we cannot meet them with an economy growing at the rate of 1.3 percent a year. But if we restore and maintain a satisfactory rate of economic growth, the increases in production which are the ultimate sources of all wealth will more than cover the costs of the programs detailed below. In fact, public budgets designed to service these needed programs would in a fully expanding economy represent no larger, and most likely a smaller, part of our total national production than the inadequate public programs of recent years have represented in a retarded economy.

EDUCATION

The administration's attempts to stop the Federal Government from assisting States by vocational education programs should be opposed. These programs are particularly important in the rural areas in which there are dramatic changes in emphasis and ways of life and where, as a consequence, the young people must be provided with help and training to meet the challenge of these transitions in our rural economy.

A Federal scholarship program to meet the truly great challenge facing the United States during the next 10 years, as the number of students eligible for colleges and universities more than doubles, should be promptly established.

We favor a program of Federal assistance to the States for school construction.

There must be a continuation of the Federal impacted areas program which has been opposed by this administration.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The Democratic Party reaffirms its traditional belief in the dignity of each individual human being and that every citizen must be guaranteed his full rights and opportunities under the Constitution.

Appropriate congressional action appears to be necessary to make the deliberations and investigations of the Civil Rights Commission meaningful.

There should be a thorough review of the enforcement by the Attorney General of rights of Americans under existing civil rights laws, including the newly enacted Federal laws to protect voting rights.

The Attorney General of the United States should be authorized to start civil injunctions suits against those who deprive persons of their rights to equal protection of the laws, on account of race, color, religion, or natural origin.

There is an obligation to meet the challenge of closed schools and potentially uneducated children as a result of the defiance of the law of the land by a few State and local officials. The present crisis over the refusals of local officials to comply with the orders and decrees of Federal courts has not been met by firm and constructive leadership from the President or his subordinates. It is to be hoped that such legislative action will be taken as will aid, assist, and encourage, the earliest possible reopening of schools now closed, and will prevent the closing of other schools.

Federal legislation is needed to outlaw the use of the mails for the distribution of literature designed to inflame racial and religious prejudices for the purpose of inciting violence such as that which has led to the recent wave of bombings and violence.

CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURES

The Senate will face a challenge that can only be met in its opening days.

The challenge is to change Senate rule XXII which now requires a two-thirds vote of the total Members to shut off debate and which provides for no limitation whatsoever of debate on proposals for changes in any rule of the Senate including rule XXII.

The Democratic Advisory Council, as it did on January 4, 1957, once again takes its stand on the relevant 1956 Democratic platform plank. The language of that plank—the Republican platform is altogether silent—unequivocally calls for improved congressional procedures so that majority rule prevails, and decisions can be made after reasonable debate without being blocked by a minority in either House.

We reaffirm this position and state these propositions:

First: We believe that every new Senate, like every new House, has the constitutional and democratic right to make its own rules of procedure.

Second: In any new rule for the limitation of debate, the need for full and searching

discussion in which all Senators may speak and in which public opinion can make its own influence felt, must be duly respected. But the new rule must also be such that after a respectable interval of time, the Senate shall be able to give relevance to the debate by bringing the matters under discussion to a terminal vote where the decision of the majority of the total membership shall close the debate. There can be no compromise with this ultimate, democratic right of the majority to say "Yes" or "No" on legislative issues.

We also favor a liberalization and democratization of the rules of the House of Representatives. The present House rules have operated to delay or block the consideration and passage of important and desirable legislative measures. We believe that in the House as well as in the Senate, the majority of the membership should have an adeqaute opportunity to vote on legislation.

IMMIGRATION

A general revision of existing immigration and citizenship laws is long overdue. Such revision, for the purpose of humanizing and liberalizing these laws, is of vital importance.

In addition, prompt consideration should be given to the problem of resettling groups of refugees and escapees which are now scattered throughout the world. The United States should give a home to its fair share of these persons.

HEALTH

The need is urgent for an enlarged program of hospital construction, and for loans to local comprehensive health insurance cooperatives. This will provide the basis for the development and enactment of a comprehensive and integrated program for the insurance, protection and improvement of the health of all of our people.

There must be a steady effort to increase the funds and resources available for a broad program of medical research and rehabilitation.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The following incresed benefits and hospital care program should be adopted as the next several steps in insuring a secure life for our people:

Increase social security tax payments by one-half of 1 percent, split 50–50 by employers and employees, to finance hospital and nursing insurance for aged persons and other social security beneficiaries, including:

Hospitals care for 50 to 60 days per year.

A limited amount of nursing service.

Increase monthly social security benefits 10 percent, as a next step, and another 10 percent in the next 3 or 4 years, to bring benefits up to an average of $100 per month.

Improve widow's benefits.

Extend the age for children to receive benefits from 18 to 21 to enable children to stay in school.

Remove the requirement that disability benefits begin only at age 50. A disabled person is disabled whether he is 25, 40 or 50 years old.

Increase the maximum earnings to which the social security tax applies from its present level of $4,800 to $6,000 within the next 2 years, and to $7,200 by 1962 or 1963, to keep the wage base in line with changing economic conditions.

Maximum benefits to families with several children should be raised.

Study should also be directed to the appropriate retirement age in view of general economic as well as personal considerations.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE—CHILD WELFARE

The Congress should now enact at least the increased public assistance payments to the States which were blocked by the administration in the last session of Congress, and broaden and improve the program to take care of anyone in actual need.

We must strive for an improved program for maternal child health and welfare.

LABOR

We favor:

An increase in the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour.

Broadening the coverage of the minimum wage program to include at least 10 million additional workers.

The enactment of minimum Federal standards for the unemployment compensation program with respect to the amount and duration of benefits and the provision of continuing Federal assistance to increase and extend benefits until such standards become effective.

The enactment of the Kennedy-Ives Labor Management and Reporting Act.

The repeal of the provision of the Taft-Hartley Act authorizing State so-called right-to-work legislation.

Neither right-to-wark laws nor differing standards of unemployment compensation should be allowed to react to the disadvantage of those States with more advanced labor laws or higher levels of unemployment compensation.

SMALL BUSINESS

Effective action should be taken to ease the credit squeeze on small business.

Continuing work is needed to insure that a fair share of the Nation's defense contracts is allotted to the smaller business firms in all parts of the Nation.

New sources of long-term credit and equity capital should be opened up for small businesses, and Congress should focus its attention on the manner in which the Small Business Administration, through its regulations and rulings, has served to weaken the implementation of the Small Business Investment Act and to subvert its purpose.

AGRICULTURE

We must have an effective, consistent, and broadgaged program for the protection and development of rural America. Farmers and their families, businessmen, and dwellers in the smaller towns, inhabitants of rural communities, all have an urgent stake in such a program. So do all our people, because the long farm depression has hurt us all. The administration through the action of Secretary Benson is now at the end of a long effort to undercut the corn program through the abandonment of acreage controls. The next step, as the result of the predictable increase in production, will be to ask for the total abandonment of corn price supports. Programs of long standing for cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and other crops are now in serious danger. This impairment of the farm programs must be arrested and reversed and measures must be adopted to assure fair farm income, to develop human and natural resources, and to protect rural communities.

These measures should include:

An expansion of domestic consumption of agricultural commodities through programs to assure an adequate diet to the undernourished portion of the population.

The increased export and foreign consumption of agricultural surpluses through the establishment of an international food agency.

The development of a program to preserve family-type agriculture from overwhelming encroachment by corporate-type farming.

An improved and workable program to use such combination of price guarantees on basic agricultural commodities and other measures as will move farm families toward parity of income with other groups.

CONSERVATION

The broadly gaged Democratic programs for the conservation and utilization of our soil, timber, mineral, and water resources have proven themselves over the years as meaningful programs for today.

The Congress must constantly be vigilant to see that the full utilization of existing laws and programs is pursued by the administration, so that these natural treasures are nurtured and expanded for the benefit and pleasure of future generations.

HYDROELECTRIC AND ATOMIC RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Goals for the Democratic-controlled 86th Congress in the greatly neglected area of full utilization of our tremendous power resources should include:

Enactment of a TVA self-financing bill.

Clarification of the "public purpose" of the atomic energy program of the Federal Government with particular attention to the broadened application of atomic power to serve mankind.

Rapid development of large-scale atomic power reactor demonstration by the AEC and increased emphasis on the use of atomic power for transportation and propulsion.

A sizable increase in funds for new power project starts in the many projects already authorized, including funds directing research be instituted for unauthorized and potentially feasible projects.

A Columbia River development program that would be self-financing.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION COOPERATIVES

The Rural Electrification Administration should be reorganized along the lines of the Humphrey-Price bill, so that the Secretary of Agriculture will be unable to subvert the REA programs. In this way, rural America will continue to benefit from expanding REA services. The administration's efforts to bring its high interest rate policies to bear on the REA program must be vigorously opposed.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES—PUBLIC WORKS

The problems of adequate metropolitan transportation, public recreation facilities, schools, and local public services of all kinds are as meaningful an area for Federal Government activity as are the great reclamation and power projects of the West.

The deficits in the public works programs in all parts of the Nation are mounting all too rapidly for a Nation of our growing and expanding population.

It is vital that the 86th Congress look at public works development as a whole. To assist our citizens in the cities and towns, it should enact a community facilities program along the lines of the one that was defeated in the last Congress. It should also enact a new and broad program for reclaiming of the land and wasted resources in all regions of our Nation.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

This bill, vetoed by the President, at a heavy loss to his party, is urgently needed. We are unwilling to see our fellow citizens forced to idleness in communities that have been hit hard by economic misfortunes not of their own making. Under the terms of this legislation, a minimum of $500 million should be made available to finance new industries in the distressed communities and to provide needed public services, and to retrain workers.

HOUSING—URBAN RENEWAL

Republican obstruction kept the last Congress from passing a housing bill. Accordingly, housing legislation is immediately necessary. Apart from extending mortgage guarantees and renewing other needed legislation, it should provide for a much-expanded public housing program and a significantly larger and vigorously administered program of urban renewal. Programs for middle income and cooperative housing should be liberalized. Explicit provision should be made to insure moderate interest rates.

AIRPORT PROGRAM

There is a pressing need for Federal aid to modernize and expand existing airport facili-

ties across the Nation, and meet the demands of the air transportation age.

TAXATION

The Congress should constantly review the total revenue-producing laws of the Federal Government. This review should not be limited to consideration of how much revenues given tax rates can yield in an economy which is not fully productive nor fully expanding. It should include consideration of taxation as a means toward full production and economic growth.

It is not conducive to a healthy growing economy to have the tax burden for the Government's programs inequitably distributed.

The Republican inspired tax programs of 1954 placed undue burdens on certain income groups of our society when viewed against the tax advantages given other groups. These inequities, together with an increasing complex of loopholes for special interests, must be readjusted. Much of the added income needed to bring our national budget into balance can be found by such adjustments of the tax burden, and by closing these loopholes.

CLEAN ELECTION LAWS

Federal election laws should be modernized along the lines proposed by the Hennings-Green bill, in order to assure more meaningful reporting of campaign expenditures, a tightening of the corrupt practices laws, and an extension of Federal regulation of elections for Federal office to include primary elections for any Federal office.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Now that Alaska has been given statehood, the claims of Hawaii to come into the Union as a State can no longer be set aside.

The representatives of Hawaii agreed to wait until the Alaska problem was resolved, and are entitled to get final action promptly.

ALASKA

We are gratified that statehood for Alaska was initiated by and largely accomplished through the efforts of the Democratic Party. We hope that the Democratic Party will give continuing attention to the special problems and pressing needs of our new State and its people.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The people of the District of Columbia are entitled to local home rule, and to elect the officials to administer their local affairs. They are also entitled to vote in Presidential elections and to have voting representation in the Congress of the United States. Legislation to achieve these objectives should be passed promptly.

OUTER SPACE

The United States should rapidly extend its exploration of outer space. We should press our efforts to place this new dimension under the international control of the United Nations.

MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, December 8.—Following are the members of the Democratic advisory council:

Jacob M. Arvey, national committeeman from Illinois.

Paul M. Butler, of Indiana, national chairman.

Mrs. Katherine M. Cullinan, national committeewoman from Rhode Island.

Mrs. Benjamin Bryan Everett, national committeewoman from North Carolina.

Camille F. Gravel, Jr., national committeeman from Louisiana.

Lee C. Graybill, national committeeman from Montana.

Governor Harriman, of New York.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

Mrs. Ione Hunt, national committeewoman from Minnesota.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

Arthur B. Koontz, national committeeman from West Virginia.

Governor-elect David L. Lawrence, of Pennsylvania.

Former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, of New York.

Gov. Stephen L. R. McNichols, of Colorado.

Mrs. Margaret Price, national committeewoman from Michigan.

Calvin W. Rawlings, national committeeman from Utah.

Mrs. Thelma Parkinson Sharp, national committeewoman from New Jersey.

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.

Mrs. Leonard Thomas, national committeewoman from Alabama.

Mrs. Marguerite Peyton Thompson, national committeewoman from Colorado.

Former President Harry S. Truman, of Missouri.

Mayor Raymond R. Tucker, of St. Louis, Mo.

Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan.

Paul Ziffren, national committeeman from California.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York, is listed as consultant to the group, and it has an administrative committee composed of Thomas K. Finletter, of New York; Philip B. Periman, of Maryland; and Mr. Butler. Charles S. Murphy is counsel, and Charles Tyroler 2d is executive director.

The FBI or the Nation—Facts To Combat Communism and Those Who Aid Its Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, in view of the pending House resolution to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee, and certain other activities of a small militant group which continues to attack the FBI, I am placing in the RECORD the October 31, 1958, issue of Counterattack. It sets forth accurately and concisely facts to combat communism and those who aid its cause. I think it would be well for every loyal American to read this particular publication:

THE FBI OR THE NATION

In September 1957 the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (ECLC)[1] headed by Harvey O'Connor and Corliss Lamont, two stanch supporters of the Soviets, began its campaign against the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC). Almost immediately this campaign was broadened to include the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Pamphlets were sent out warning "friends" they didn't need to aid the FBI and they should tell the ECLC of any attempts by the FBI to intimidate or threaten them.

In the light of the past record, a careful student could have estimated just how long it would take before the anti-FBI campaign of the ECLC erupted into "The Nation," a magazine that once upon a time was influential as a fairminded liberal organ but in recent years has become a steady follower of assorted pro-Soviet and pro-Communist causes.

For some years the name of Harvey O'Connor has been on The Nation's list of editors as a staff contributor. Mr. O'Conner, it will be remembered, is the man identified in 1939 as a Communist Party member employed by the Communist-controlled labor press service, Federated Press. Before the McCarthy Senate Investigating Committee in 1953, O'Connor refused to answer if he was a party member. Recently he refused to obey an HUAC subpena. (See Counterattack, October 3, 1958, p. 156.)

The present owners of The Nation are George G. Kerstein, publisher, and Carey McWilliams, editor.

McWilliams record in support of Communist activities goes back over 20 years and is cited on the last page.[2]

Mr. Kerstein is the moneyman whose ex-wife, Elinor Perry Kerstein, is secretary of the ECLC.

The Nation itself has been a subject of interest to the Government. R. Lawrence Siegel, general counsel of the magazine, and another lawyer from his office, Miss Hadassah R. Shapiro, were both convicted in Federal court on January 18, 1956, of conspiring to obstruct justice and of perjury. They were involved with the case of Harvey Matusow, the recanting perjurious ex-Communist who went to the Nation with his story. Attorney Siegel was convicted of having destroyed records of his conversations with Matusow and of having lied to the grand jury investigating the case. Both are appealing. Martin Solow, former assistant to the publisher, is still under indictment.

Former U.S. Attorney Thomas Bolan, in testimony in the Siegel-Shapiro case, said: "Carey McWilliams * * * had arranged certain meetings with Matusow, with members of the Communist Party * * *."

The issue dated October 18, 1958, was a special issue, sold for 50 cents, twice the regular price, and was devoted exclusively, except for a few advertisements (as you shall see later), to a blast at the FBI.

Who was assigned by the Nation to do the FBI? A man who attacked the FBI in the Nation on other occasions, one Fred J. Cook, a rewriteman for Roy W. Howard's New York World-Telegram and Sun, a Scripps-Howard newspaper.

WHO IS COOK?

Cook came to the World-Telegram from the Asbury Park (N.J.) Press and was known

---

[1] Emergency Civil Liberties Committee: To defend the cases of Communist lawbreakers, fronts have been devised making special appeals in behalf of civil liberties and reaching out far beyond the confines of the Communist Party itself. Among these organizations are the * * * Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. When the Communist Party itself is under fire these fronts offer a bulwark of protection.

[2] Carey McWilliams, chairman, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born; sponsor, Civil Rights Congress; endorser, Schneiderman-Darcy Defense Committee; member of council, American Peace Crusade; member, national council, American Peace Mobilization; signer of Call, American Writers Congress; speaker, Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America; sponsor, American Slav Congress; signer of statement, National Council of American-Soviet Friendship; subscriber, People's World, west coast Communist organ; sent greetings, International Labor Defense; sponsor, Committee for a Democratic Far-Eastern Policy; contributor, New Masses; speaker, National Lawyers Guild; endorser, public rally, International Workers Order; associate editor, Lawyers Guild Review; vice chairman, National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; speaker, Washington Book Shop; sponsor, Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade; signer, open letter to American Liberals, Soviet Russia Today.

on his job as a nonpolitical newspaperman. His main forte was crime. A police reporter calling in the details of a story of an important murder could be expected to give these details to Fred Cook. Cook was often seen in the evenings at the World-Telegram office writing stories of murders and robberies for the various crime magazines, his desk stacked with folders of clippings from the Telegram's morgue (library). His first contact with the Nation was on March 10, 1956, when he sold them an article, "Capital Punishment: Does It Prevent Crime?" His view was that it didn't. His next contact with the Nation was an article on September 29, 1956, on the case of the acid-blinded labor columnist, Victor Riesel, and Cook concluded there seemed to be no motive for the crime.

In April 1957 Cook had an article on the case of William W. Remington in the magazine Saga: True Adventures for Men. The subtitle of this piece was "An Overdose of Curiosity." It stated that Remington was led to "experiment" with communism and it finally cost him his life. (Remington was killed in prison by another inmate, after being convicted of perjury.)

Cook's article on Remington is supposed to have inspired the Nation to choose him to write a new version of the Alger Hiss case. This appeared in September 21, 1957, and took up 38 of the 45 pages in that issue. Later it was sold as a book. Like the Remington article, the Hiss piece presumed to be a dispassionate appraisal, but in both the net result was to leave the reader with the idea that an injustice was done to the convicted perjurers.

It was in the Hiss article that Cook made no attempt to prevent his readers from thinking the worst of the FBI. At one point, he wrote that Whittaker Chambers came up with some testimony only after the FBI had produced certain evidence, indicating that the agency had aided in distorting the facts in the pending trial. Later Cook quotes a "* * * pungent paragraph * * *" by Hiss' attorney Chester T. Lane, a part of which read "We search for records—the FBI has them. We ask questions—the FBI will not let people talk to us * * *." Cook then comments approvingly:

"This is probably as close as any attorney has ever come in court to accusing the FBI of Gestapo-like methods, of creating the atmosphere of a police state which is the very antithesis of democracy."

The final gist of the Cook judgment on Alger Hiss is that only if seven points are believed that were raised by Hiss' lawyers and rejected by the jury and the appeals courts, can one believe Hiss guilty. If Hiss is really innocent, says Cook:

"Could Whittaker Chambers alone and unaided have deceived the FBI and the U.S. Attorney General's Office? Or must he have had, perhaps on several levels, official collaborators in the perfection of his story and the completion of his deeds?"

Is this an implication that the FBI and/or the Department of Justice conspired with Chambers?

This is the background of the one assigned to do an objective survey of the FBI in the Nation.

THE NATION AT WORK

The Cook version of Hiss case called Hiss: New Perspectives on the Strangest Case of Our Time appealed to the Nation's editors. They couldn't wait for him to do something new. So with almost no changes, the Nation proceeded to run the warmed-over Remington story from Saga magazine. It was not rewritten except for a phrase here and there. Nor were the intellectual readers of the Nation told that they were getting a rerun of a true adventure story from Saga.

The changes are worth noting. Cook wrote in Saga:

"By 1948, however, the double-crosses of international diplomacy had created new tensions at home and abroad. Russia had made it evident that she had not relaxed her goal of a Communist-dominated world and had betrayed us in Korea."

In the Nation article the sentence about Russia (underlined) was cut out. The Saga story told about Elizabeth Bentley, the Soviet courier who testified about her contact who was still in government and it read:

"That contact, unnamed at first, was William W. Remington." The Nation changed this to read: "That alleged contact."

Cook in Saga told of Remington's claim to have paid $30 in dues through Miss Bentley to the Joint Antifascist Refugee Committee. He added:

"This was later exposed as a Communist front but he said he did not know that then."

In the Nation, this sentence became:

"This was before the organization had been labeled a Communist front."

Quite a difference in meaning.

The Saga version said that in 1948 Bentley and Remington testified before "the Senate Internal Securities Subcommittee." The Nation corrected this to read "Internal Security Subcommittee." But both versions were incorrect. The testimony was before the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department. The Internal Security Subcommittee was not constituted until 1951.

Both editions end with an implication that the FBI had tapped the phone of Remington's attorney and thus was able to prevent two witnesses from testifying.

Cook next wrote for the Nation about Boris Morros calling his article "Hero of a Myth." Morros was identified as a longtime undercover agent for the FBI when he appeared to give testimony in the case of Jack and Myra Soble, who pleaded guilty to espionage. They were members of the same Soviet spy apparatus, only Morros was working for the FBI. Cook claimed he found many contradictions in the stories Morros told the press.

Before the Nation ran the Cook attack on the FBI it made some changes. Its issue of September 6, 1958, had the list of staff contributors that had run for some years. Included in this list was Harvey O'Connor, Andrew Roth (indicted but never tried in the Amerasia case), and H. H. Wilson (professor at Princeton University, also an ECLC member), among others.

The following issue of the magazine dropped these names without any explanation to its readers.

The October 4 issue carried an article attacking the monetary policy of the Eisenhower administration. The author of this piece is Wilfred Lumer, described by the Nation as the author of "Small Business at the Crossroads," and the "Hard Money Crusade" wtih Bertram Cross, as coauthor, published by the Public Affairs Institute.

The 1958 report "Investigation of Soviet Espionage" issued by the HUAC lists the testimony of Wilfred Lumer, who was then employed by the Public Affairs Institute which he said was supported by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. The committee noted that Lumer had been identified under oath as a Communist Party member and invoked the fifth amendment when asked whether he was a member of the Communist Party at the time of his appearance before the committee, and whether he had discussed his work on legislative reports with any person known to him to be a Communist.

The Nation of October 18 devoted exclusively to the FBI, ran to 56 pages and an introduction by the editors stated that, "The last objective study (of the FBI) was undertaken in 1950." This was a book called the Federal Bureau of Investigation by Max Lowenthal, said the editors.

Just how objective Max Lowenthal's book was, is indicated by a news story in the New York Times the day it was published, November 30, 1950. The story was headed "Lowenthal Book Assails the FBI." The writer then devoted more than a column to detailing the Lowenthal assault on the FBI and its director, J. Edgar Hoover. Book reviewers recognized that the Lowenthal book was just the opposite of objective. It was a violent attack.

To get its own objective appraisal of the FBI the Nation stated it "decided to call in Fred J. Cook, one of the country's top reporters and investigators in the field of crime."

THE BUILDUP

By writing for the Nation, Cook has been steadily promoted. The capital punishment article listed Cook as an author and crime reporter on the World-Telegram and Sun. His Riesel story mentioned him as a "police reporter on a New York metropolitan newspaper." For the Hiss piece he became "one of the Nation's top crime reporters." For the Remington rerun in the Nation he was cited as "the veteran New York crime reporter." For the Boris Morros story, he was only a crime reporter again.

Actually Cook is a good rewrite man who can write a lively article from a few old clippings. He is not a veteran since he came to New York in 1945, nor is he a nationally known reporter. Two others on the World-Telegram won Pulitzer prizes while Cook was doing his daily grind. Fred Woltman won his prize for exposing the Communists. We wonder if the present Fred Cook—in the Nation at least—would approve. The other, Edward J. Mowery, won a Pulitzer prize for legitimate crime investigating and reporting. Two men were released from prison on the basis of investigation done by Mowery and stories published in the World-Telegram and Sun.

BIRDS OF A FEATHER?

It may be worth noting that there are just two columns of advertising in the FBI issue of the Nation. One is a full column ad paid for out of the tax-free funds of the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic. The other column consists of eight 1- and 2-inch ads, one of which is from the Communist Party's publishing house, New Century Publishers, advertising the latest issue of the party's theoretical organ, Political Affairs.

What has Mr. Cook, the crime writer, to say about the FBI? Appearing in "The Nation" as he does, one may be sure there will be little that is good. Whole sections are lifted in essance from Lowenthal's 559 page book of 1950. At least four columns are lifted directly, in quotes from a snide series that appeared in the New Yorker magazine in 1937. Wherever anyone has written about the FBI and has had unpleasant comment to make, Mr. Cook has seemingly found them.

If "The Nation" looked for a nonpolitical person like Mr. Cook to do its "job" on the FBI, naturally Mr. Cook looked around too. By and large he has lifted from wherever he could, and the result is that what "The Nation" has published is a slightly updated version of the Max Lowenthal book, plus the nastiest phrases by anyone else available to Mr. Cook.

In gathering together every criticism of the FBI, Cook tries to create the impression that little, if anything, in the history of the FBI or of Mr. Hoover was of the high level that Americans have found them to be. He even manages to doubt the efficiency of the FBI's huge fingerprint file because the Scotland Yard method is different and therefore better. In the end however, he admits that the FBI file is one of its few good points.

After many pages of blasting the FBI, Cook manages to find room to concede that its record during World War II was "very good indeed." Having made one concession,

he then tries to break down the record and claim it failed in point after point. He accuses the FBI of failing to cooperate with local police and ignores other parts of his story which note the ties of many local police to crooks and mobsters.

His attack on his home publication, the World-Telegram without mentioning it by name is interesting too. He writes about the Amerasia (stolen documents) case and states that it "established (the) eagerness of some of the great media that form public opinion to make the Truman administration and the Democrats the scapegoats for any failure of security. It was an attitude that was to be capitalized upon eventually" as in the Bentley case.

No papers more completely covered these two cases than the Scripps-Howard papers. It is more than likely that Cook himself may have written some of the headline-making features for the World-Telegram.

And if J. Edgar Hoover should be attacked by "The Nation's" reporter, then why not Dwight Eisenhower too? Cook obliges. He quotes a minor statement by Mr. Hoover speaking well of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy and then adds "Eisenhower tripped on his halo by embracing McCarthy in Wisconsin."

After 54 pages of slurs, and innuendoes, Cook is still not satisfied? What he has written against the FBI isn't enough. He says:

"If America is ever again to see issues clearly and to react with the powers of the mind instead of emotionally, Hoover's role and the role of the FBI, at some day and some hour, will have to be assessed."

Then Cook adds a bit later: "Little wonder that we have reached a stage where no issue—not Lebanon, not Quemoy—can be debated vigorously or reasoned on its merits."

Apparently Mr. Cook the top reporter in the field of crime, is now an expert on the subject of international politics as well.

Counterattack considers this lastest job by Fred J. Cook a fine example of the old adage about getting someone else to pull your chestnuts out of the fire. The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and its stalwarts are out to get the FBI and Mr. Cook is their current catspaw. There will be others. But as an American President said of another debunking attempt: "The monument is still there."

A FINAL WORD

The ECLC is still carrying on its drive against the FBI. As the outstanding governmental opponent of subversion and espionage, the FBI stands in the way of all who would subvert the American way of life. Promising that the October issue of its publication Rights, will be a special issue, the current number of Rights has the following notation.

"The October issue of Rights will be devoted to the subject of 'The FBI and Your Freedom.' Contributors will include Aubrey Williams, president of the Southern Conference Education Fund; attorneys Benjamin Ginzburg, Joseph Forer, Charles C. Lockwood, and Ben Margolis; and Sam Pollock, president of Local 427, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL–CIO, Mr. Ginzburg was formerly on the staff of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights."

The New York Post which has probably published more editorial attacks on J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI than any other paper in the country (except possibly the Daily Worker) has a whole staff assigned to gathering material for a series on J. Edgar Hoover according to Preston J. Moore, national commander of the American Legion. In a word of warning to patriotic citizens, Commander Moore noted that "there are some individuals in this country and certain publications determined to discredit the FBI and its Director * * *." He adds:

"It is difficult to attribute any purpose to these attacks other than a desire to destroy this Federal law enforcement agency and its leaders as an effective deterrent to undetected, unopposed Communist subversion in this country."

To this, New York Post Editor James Wechsler writes, his paper is preparing a factual study of Mr. Hoover. He objects to this warning against the Post's independent study and believes Mr. Hoover should not be immune to objective reporting.

This is the first time in 10 years that Wechsler has considered it important to be objective about J. Edgar Hoover. Counterattack believes that on the basis of the past record of the New York Post, Wechsler's idea of objective will be the same as that of the Nation.

The Nation has since published commendations of its FBI article from David L. Weissman, Roger N. Baldwin, and Rev. Stephen A. Fritchman. Weissman is a vice president of the New York chapter of the National Lawyers Guild listed by the HUAC as legal arm of the Communist Party. Reverend Fritchman is so well known as a backer of Communist fronts that nothing more need be said. Roger N. Baldwin, former head of the American Civil Liberties Union can boast that he was attacking the FBI back in 1920 when it was just the Bureau of Investigation.

Faithfully yours,

COUNTERATTACK.

Fortieth Anniversary of the Republic of Latvia—Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, a group of Latvian-American citizens met on November 16, 1958, to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the Republic of Latvia.

Although Latvia has lost her independence and the people have become inmates of the vast prison that is Soviet Russia, they still yearn as do all other captive peoples for return to the days of freedom, self-government and dignity that the Latvian people once knew.

The resolution adopted by these patriotic Americans of Latvian descent is as follows:

Resolution adopted by Latvians of Detroit, Mich., assembled at the Veterans Memorial Building on 16th day of November, 1958, to commemorate the 40th anniversary of independence of the Republic of Latvia

Whereas, in June 1940, the Soviet Union destroyed once free Latvia and other Baltic States, enslaved their defenseless populations, condemned hundreds of thousands of them to death in Siberia; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America has repeatedly denounced the subjugation of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania and continues to recognize these states and their diplomatic representatives; and

Whereas the Latvian people have their only source of true, objective information radio broadcasts from the Voice of America and other programs from the free world; and

Whereas the continued existence of these broadcasts in the Latvian language provides the Latvians with proof the United States is still aware of the intense feelings the Latvian people have toward their freedom from Soviet chains; and

Whereas any reduction in the Voice of America Latvian language programs will be doing a disservice to the persecuted and long suffering Latvian people, who look to America as their only hope, and to the United States as well, which needs as many friends in all parts of the world as it can muster; and

Whereas, since the United States has made commitments to all anti-Communist countries throughout the world, it is essential that the present policies in Asia especially not be changed with regard to Red China as an example of America's good faith toward the peoples of the world who are struggling against communism; and

Whereas the United States as the last hope of oppressed mankind—the nearly 1 billion people of the world now ruled by Communists—has been able to maintain superiority in the field of nuclear weapons, despite the exaggerated claims made by the Russians and their apologists and other dupes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we respectfully request the Government of the United States to continue to safeguard the legal existence of Latvia and to take appropriate and timely action in order to enable the Latvian people to resume the exercise of their free and independent statehood under the government of the people's own choice; and be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. Information Agency broadcasts in Latvian be increased to a number of programs to a level commensurate with the importance of the Latvian people located as they are on the sensitive Baltic coast; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States continue to withhold diplomatic recognition of Red China and prevent its admission to the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States enter into no agreements with the Soviet Union that would have the effect of reducing its power in the atomic- and hydrogen-weapons field or otherwise restricting its freedom of action in this vital defense area; and be it finally

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Secretary of State, the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, Senators and Congressmen from Michigan, Governor of the State of Michigan, and Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

Done in Detroit, Mich., this 16th day of November A.D. 1958.

Space Development Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to the fine and carefully worded editorial, entitled "Space Development Race Has But One Objective," which appeared in the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., on January 14, 1959:

SPACE DEVELOPMENT RACE HAS BUT ONE OBJECTIVE

As each new success or failure comes in the launching of satellites by the United States and Russia, neither the American people nor those who guide the Nation's military courses

in Washington should ever forget that the first objective in all this must be the development of weapons of war.

Idealistically this Nation and its people look forward to the days of new peacetime wonders through progress in science that now is going on. Perhaps some portion of the people in Russia look forward in the same way. But right now the one objective of Russia in all space development is to create Russian military supremacy over all of the rest of the world. The one objective of the United States must be to reach science success that will prevent the Russians from achieving their objective.

It is nice enough to talk of peace and treaties and agreements and disarmament and limiting or ending atomic tests. But this fact must never be lost sight of: The The existence of this Nation and of the rest of the free world as peaceful peoples rests on the ability of the United States to be able to meet and offset any attack by the Soviet and to conquer and subdue that nation completely in quick retaliation. "Shooting the moon" and accidentally getting to the sun is wonderful from the standpoint of prestige and as indicative of certain progress in certain fields of science. But the Soviet views its own accomplishments only in whatever value they may have toward creating worldwide military superiority and the United States must have the same objective.

In trying to evaluate American space progress alongside of Russian space progress, it must be kept in mind that the two nations move along different paths, even though the paths may be somewhat parellel. The United States seems to be far more deeply concerned—or at least more successful—in development of highly delicate electronic instruments for use in satellites and in other ways than Russia.

So far as public knowledge is concerned, considerable of Russia's satellite and rocket achievement has been on the side of the spectacular and of a type to bring worldwide, prestige, where the United States seems to have more definite scientific objectives in its launchings. For example, it is noticeable that in almost every instance each of the recent launchings by the United States had some particular scientific objective—sought through new electronic instruments—that was not a part of any of the other launchings.

A comparison, though not too applicable, might be found in some American agricultural procedures as compared with agricultural procedures in the Soviet. For example, sweetpotato farmers in the United States use one machine which simultaneously plows a furrow, inserts tiny sweetpotato plants into it, covers their roots with dirt, and waters them—all at one shot. The Russians, in such an activity, would first plow the furrow and then come back and put in the seedlings and then come back and go along the furrow again to cover the seedlings and finally make a fourth trip for watering—four steps taken separately where American farmers would take them simultaneously. It is somewhat the same way in space development—the United States is proceeding along several paths simultaneously where the Soviet proceeds separately.

No one can question the world prestige which the Russians have gained—and earned—by sending a rocket into orbit around the sun, even though they intended to send it into orbit around the moon. The sun achievement is far gretter than what they attempted and fate was with them in that respect. But neither should what the United States is doing and what it has succeeded in doing be sold short because it has not yet shot the moon. While the United States has not yet matched this latest Russian achievement, neither has Russia matched several scientific achievements by American satellites and rockets.

So far as any race between the two nations is concerned, it will not be won by the achievements of the American Atlas or the Soviet sun-orbiter. It will be won by the nation which can first use space experiments in the most deadly and destructive way. Russia, if it wins that race, will destroy much of the world. The United States, if it wins that race, will prevent destruction by the Soviet and certainly will not seek to use its advantage in any way of aggression.

Battler for School Aid: Frank Thompson, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I enclose a splendid article appearing in the New York Times of January 12, 1959, relating to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], entitled "Battler for School Aid." A sound progressive, FRANK THOMPSON performs his legislative duties with great ability, vision, and courage. He is a true progressive in every sense of the word, looking forward and not backward in supporting progressive legislation that is for the best interest of our people; and in the field of foreign affairs and national defense, for the best interest of our country.

The article follows:

BATTLER FOR SCHOOL AID: FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

Representative FRANK JOHNSON, JR., of New Jersey's Fourth District, had a reputation as a fighter long before he entered Congress. His 4 years at Washington have only enhanced that reputation. Ever ready to espouse a good cause, he has battled for measures as diverse as Federal aid to education and a National Culture Center, assistance for small business and more democratic congressional procedure. Not every encounter has been crowned with success but the 40-year-old legislator—"THOMPY" to his friends—has lasting qualities that match his fighting spirit. This combination of traits make him much in demand as an advocate, on and off the floor of Congress.

So it is that the National Education Association, again striving to have a multibillion-dollar aid-to-education bill passed, has entrusted its fate in the House of Representatives to Mr. THOMPSON.

HE PREDICTS PASSAGE

He steered the bill to a floor test last year, only to lose by five votes. He says he will win its passage this time "with a more sympathetic Congress."

"Whether the President will sign it or not is something else" said Mr. THOMPSON, a free-swinging Democrat who does not always treat people in high places with the usual deference.

The Congressman has all the attributes of a fighter. He is a 6-foot-3-inch 185 pounder. He has a certain brashness that complements his fighting, sticking qualities.

During World War II, he thrice was awarded combat decorations while in the Navy during action in the Pacific. When fighting in Korea broke out, he reentered service for 17 months.

MAKES EASY TRANSITION

After leaving service the first time, Mr. THOMPSON practiced law for a while in Trenton—then made what was for him the easy transition into politics. One uncle, Crawford Jamieson, had been Democratic leader and State senator in Mercer County. Another, Frank, is the special consultant and behind-the-scenes adviser to Governor Rockefeller in New York.

Mr. THOMPSON easily won election to the assembly in 1949. In his first term he was named assistant minority leader. He served only two terms before making a bid for Congress, winning the Democratic nomination in a three-way contest.

In Congress, he has taken a lot of kidding about some of the legislation he espoused. He was the author of many bills to advance national interest in the arts. Colleagues named him the "culture vulture." He surprised them last year when he was able to have passed and signed a bill setting up a National Cultural Center.

FAVORED ARTS PLANK

His interest in art centers in music where his tastes go from jazz to opera. He caused a stir in 1956 when he sought to get the Democrats to include an arts plank in their national platform.

The Congressman has a keen sense of public relations. His nose for news may be inherited. His late father and his uncle Frank were newspapermen and his brother still is.

Married in 1942 to Evelina Van Metre of Washington, D.C., he has two daughters, Ann, 14, and Evelina, 7. The family maintains a home at Parkfairfax, Va., not too far from the capital, as well as their year-round home at Trenton.

"Family life is too important to let politics give it the go-by," the Congressman insists.

U.S. Judge Thomas W. Slick: A Distinguished American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to one of the finest men I have ever known, the Honorable Thomas W. Slick, retired Federal judge for northern Indiana, who died this month in South Bend.

I knew Judge Slick for over 15 years. He was a Republican and I a Democrat and we used to joke about our party differences in a way that left me with deep respect for him and great pride in our friendship.

Judge Slick was one of Indiana's finest citizens.

I should like to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the Hammond Times of January 7, 1959, paying tribute to him:

U.S. JUDGE THOMAS W. SLICK

The death last weekend of retired U.S. Judge Thomas W. Slick, the first judge to sit in the Northern District of Indiana, removes from the scene a jurist particularly noted for

his conciliatory efforts in labor disputes that entered the courts during the thirties.

Judge Slick, 69, died at his home in South Bend. He had been seriously ill for 3 years and ill health had forced him to retire from the Federal bench in 1943 after 18 years of service. His successor was U.S. Judge Luther M. Swygert of Hammond, now the senior of two judges on the northern district bench.

Born in South Bend, Judge Slick taught school for 2 years to accumulate enough money to enter the University of Michigan law school. After he began practice in South Bend, he became active in Republican politics. He had been St. Joseph County prosecutor and South Bend city attorney, in addition to his private practice, before being named a Federal judge.

President Calvin Coolidge nominated Slick to be the northern district judge when the former single Federal court in Indiana was split into northern and southern districts in 1925.

During the thirties, nearly two dozen cases were filed against organized labor as the industrial union organizing movement sprang up. Judge Slick made it a matter of personal interest to try and settle these cases without prolonged litigation. In this he was successful. All of the cases were settled before final court decision was necessary.

Conferences in Judge Slick's chambers between the contending parties played a big part in these peaceful settlements. Judge Slick was always a champion of the idea that management and labor could settle their main differences around a conference table once all facts were properly marshaled, presented and discussed.

Cuba's Wholesale Executions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial comment by WDSU Broadcasting Station, New Orleans, La., is most timely and excellently stated. I commend it to the attention of Members of this body:

CUBA'S WHOLESALE EXECUTIONS

The firing squad executions of Batista officials in Cuba are now above the 200 mark.

The number and swiftness of these executions have provoked an eruption of criticism in this country and a backfire of blustering comment from rebel leader Fidel Castro.

Part of the shock expressed in this country may result from a basic failure to understand what the Cuban revolution was all about. We customarily pay little attention to what is going on in Latin American countries until some violent events break in on our consciousness. Then we're surprised at developments that seem to have blown up out of nowhere.

Whether it's the fault of American reporters, American diplomats, or a matter of indifference on the part of the American public, most of us were not aware until now of the bitterness and hatred underlying the Cuban revolution, or the extent of the brutality and corruption practiced by the Batista regime.

The success of the revolution itself caught us by surprise. Perhaps if we had understood the revolution a little better we would not have been totally unprepared for the violence of its aftermath.

This is not to condone the wholesale killings in Cuba. Executions on this scale must necessarily be a product more of vengeance than of justice. They are an ugly scar on the face of a revolutionary achievement that invoked the name of freedom.

We can only hope that tonight's postponement of prisoner's trials in Havana means that this unchecked outpouring of hatred has now run its course, and that more orderly processes will be adopted.

In the meantime, this country has to consider its future relationship with Cuba.

We might begin by resolving to do two things that go neatly together:

First, be more attentive to the day-to-day problems of this and other Latin neighbors.

Second, assure Cuba once again that, despite some Congressmen to the contrary, we intend to avoid interference in her internal affairs.

Despite the present agony, there is still hope that a tradition of stability and democracy may emerge in Cuba.

Drive To Destroy House Anti-Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Brooklyn Tablet of January 17, 1959:

DRIVE TO DESTROY HOUSE ANTI-REDS—LIBERALS, LEFTISTS CALL FOR HUAC ABOLITION IN WASHINGTON POST

(By James E. Greene)

The Soviet-inspired operation abolition, which seeks to cripple the antisubversive programs of Congress, discredit J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation and abolish or shackle the work of the House Un-American Activities Committee, has been given new impetus with publication in the Washington Post of an advertisement directed at the latter which "hits a new low with respect to deceit practiced in the attempt to divide our people," charged Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Un-American Activities Committee chairman.

The advertisement, placed in the Post by people who are "for the most part well-known fellow travelers or members of Communist fronts," asks the 86th Congress to eliminate the House committee as a standing or continuing body.

LIBERALS DISPUTE ON METHODS

It follows on the heels of announcements by the southern California branch and national office of the American Civil Liberties Union that they would seek to curb HUAC when the new Congress opens. These two "liberal" groups, however, disagree over their methods.

The national ACLU is fearful that an open drive to eliminate the Red hunters "might not only fail conspicuously but also close the door to other approaches." It would rather that "liberals" work to place the committee under the House Judiciary unit, headed by "liberal" Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of Brooklyn.

But the southern California ACLU wants to do the Communists' work another way, though the above method would be effective in smothering attempts by the committee to uncover the spies which it is acknowledged are responsible for the Soviet gain in the missile and outer space field. In their calling for abolition of HUAC, the western ACLU and the Post ad signers closely follow the directive issued by the Communist front Emergency Civil Liberties Committee which in September 1957 in New York City held what it called an "historical" meeting "because it opens the abolition campaign" against the House committee.

ASKS PROOF OF CHARGES

The Post advertisement states the Un-American Activities Committee has "harrassed Americans who work for racial equality and justice" and that it has "increased the bitterness between racial and religious groups of our citizens." Representative WALTER called upon "any of the people whose names are attached to that advertisement to state wherein this committee has ever done anything that even resembles remotely the things that have been charged in this advertisement."

The signers, who included Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Judge Justine Wise Polier, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, Leo Pfeffer and Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, asked that the anti-Communist group be destroyed because it has "weakened America.

"At no time in history have we needed to be stronger. At no time have we needed to be wiser. Let us rid ourselves of this agent of weakness and of folly."

They charged the House unit "has become an agency for repression. * * *

"For two decades the committee has condemned individual Americans, has wrecked the lives of some, and has denied them the due process of law. . . . It has imperiled our good relations with the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. . . . It has discouraged social and cultural contacts with our neighbors on this shrinking planet. . . . It has discouraged U.S. students and scholars from studying in countries which we Americans desperately need to understand."

Representative WALTER, noting that the operation abolition committee is seeking funds, said "it is indeed unfortunate that some people have been unwilling dupes of this group. . . . The potential contributors had better realize what movement they would be financing."

AD SIGNERS AND RECORDS

Following are the signers of the Washington Post ad: Rev. Benjamin J. Anderson, Dr. Stringfellow Barr, Dean John C. Bennett, Judge John O. Bigelow, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, Bernarda Bryson, John M. Coe, Rev. Ray Gibbons, Jesse W. Gitt, John Hammond, Prof. Fowler Harper, James Imbrie, Prof. Erich Kahler, Robert W. Kenny, Bishop Edgar L. Love, Dr. John A. Mackay, Daniel G. Marshall, Mrs. Dorothy Marshall, Stewart Meacham, Prof. Alex Meiklejohn, Rev. A. J. Muste, Rev. Claude D. Nelson, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, Leo Pfeffer, Judge Justine W. Polier, Clarence E. Pickett, Prof. Arnold W. Rogow, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Prof. Donald H. Riddle, Ben Shahn, Otto L. Spaeth, Prof. George F. Thomas, W. Q. Tilenius, Prof. Paul Tillett, Aubrey Williams.

The records of some of the signers of the advertisement, according to Representative WALTER, follow:

Stringfellow Barr, a sponsor of Communist fronts who opposed the Internal Security Act but condemned the Supreme Court conviction of the first string Communist leaders.

John M. Coe, in 1950, attorney for the Communist Party of Alabama. Has sponsored Communist fronts over a number of years.

Ray Gibbons, supported the Communist opposition to our aid to England and France during Hitler-Stalin pact in 1941.

Fowler Harper, member of national committee, Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, which is leading the drive against the committee and which was cited by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. In 1941

Harper defended the Communist Party in a statement to the President of the United States.

James Imbrie, supporter of Communist fronts over many years including the National Committee to Secure Justice for the Rosenbergs. Member of national committee of Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

Erich Kahler, supporter of Communist program of American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. Member of national committee of Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

Robert W. Kenny, former president of Communist-controlled National Lawyers Guild. Sponsor of numerous Communist fronts, including National Committee To Secure Justice for the Rosenbergs, member of national committee of Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

John A. Mackay, sponsor of Communist fronts such as the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

Daniel G. Marshall, former president of Los Angeles National Lawyers Guild. Sponsor of Communist fronts such as National Committee To Secure Justice for the Rosenbergs.

Dorothy M. Marshall, supporter of many Communist fronts, including the west coast Communist newspaper, the People's World. Defender of the Rosenbergs, she is a member of the national committee of Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

Prof. Alex Meiklejohn. Not only has he affiliated himself with Communist-front organizations, he has denounced the Supreme Court for its conviction of the top Communist leadership. He has been one of the most vocal leaders of the campaign of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee to abolish the committee.

Rev. A. J. Muste, a pacifist, he has lent his name to certain Communist organizations over the last 25 years. As chairman of the recently formed American Forum for Socialist Education, he refused to answer questions about the part Communists or the Communist Party played in its formation.

Justine Wise Polier, a onetime member of the Communist-controlled National Lawyers Guild.

Clarence C. Pickett has affiliated with Communist-front organizations over a number of years.

Ben Shahn has sponsored organizations such as the American Continental Congress for World Peace which was held in Mexico City in 1949. This congress was designed to support the Soviet foreign policy and condemn America's. An artist, he has contributed his works for use by the Communist Party in its publications.

Paul Tillett, a supporter of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee which has led the Communist campaign to abolish the committee.

Aubrew Williams, a supporter of Communist fronts who refused to answer questions when questioned by a Senate committee.

H.R. 1232: A Bill To Create a U.S. Foreign Service Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced H.R. 1232 to create a U.S. Foreign Service Academy which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

This measure is, you might say, a "pet subject" of mine. Bills identical to H.R. 1232 were introduced by me in the 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses, but no action was taken on them. It is my fervent hope that the 86th Congress will see fit to enact this legislation into law.

We have academies for every branch of our armed services so that we may have officers with the best military training available. No one will argue that this is not as it should be. However, I think we will all agree that the cold war of today is no less important to our security than the military. Upon the shoulders of our diplomatic corps rests the job of preventing a hot war. Does it not logically follow that those charged with the duty of carrying on our relations with foreign countries should be given the very best training in this field that we can provide?

In 1958 I sent a questionnaire to my constituents which included this question: "Do you favor the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy to train our Ambassadors, consular and diplomatic representatives for foreign service?" The response was 86 percent in the affirmative. In addition, many newspapers throughout the country have indicated, through editorials, their support for this legislation. The Long Island Daily Press, the leading newspaper in my area of New York, has on several occasions come out in strong support for this idea.

It is my honest belief that a Foreign Service Academy is a "must," and I am confident that the people of the United States agree. I take this opportunity to call upon the Committee on Foreign Affairs to act on this legislation and to give the members of this body an opportunity to vote on same.

The Emancipation in Retrospect Prospect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered for the Emancipation Proclamation Day celebration of the Nashville, Tenn., Baptist Ministers' Union at the Mount Zion Baptist Church, Monday, January 5, 1959, by Maynard P. Turner, Jr., Th. D., president of American Baptist Theological Seminary:

THE EMANCIPATION IN RETROSPECT PROSPECT

There is no virtue in looking back merely for the sake of looking back. In fact to "live in the past" is a symptom of emotional deficiency. On the other hand, to examine the past in order to secure sounder footing for positive action in the present, and to plan wisely for the future, is an obligation upon the leadership of any given time or place. It is hoped that this presentation shall be of some assistance to my fellow ministers of Nashville in accomplishing this purpose.

Through the years American Negro leadership has fondly regarded Emancipation Proclamation Day in a sense somewhat comparable to the Jewish regard for the first Passover. Each of these events did mark a turning point in the status of involuntary servitude of the two peoples, but other factors in the two situations prevent the analogy from being carried much further. In each instance, however, a man plays a dominant role. Abraham Lincoln, of course, is the keyman in the Emancipation Proclamation. The text of the proclamation and the date of its issuance are of immense significance, but limited when taken alone as grounds for action today. Mr. Lincoln's attitudes and motives as well as the political and social atmosphere of his day must also be examined.

Even a cursory study of Abraham Lincoln's speeches and writings reveal an astoundingly contemporary attitude, and motives which were at times more pragmatic than altruistic. Due consideration must be given to Lincoln's temperament and personality. Scholars of all opinions seem to agree that Lincoln was decidedly conservative in every respect. He was persistent but not impetuous. He was a man of deep sympathies and broad understanding but it could hardly be said that he allowed himself to be carried away at any time. For example when Lincoln campaigned against Stephen A. Douglas for Senator, (1858) Douglas rode about the State of Illinois in a private car with his political retinue. In contrast to this, Lincoln rode in crowded coaches or in freight cabooses to deliver his speeches. Now, of course, some would argue that this reflected Lincoln's superior showmanship and that he identified himself with the people, while Douglas did not. But such cannot be said of his continued disregard for his clothing and personal appearance. It was the usual thing to find him clad in an ill-fitting suit, unpolished boots, and battered stove-pipe hat in which he carried piles of papers. Clothes and social niceties simply did not interest Lincoln. Yet in his work as a lawyer he paid attention to every detail to the point of meticulousness.

When we consider Abhaham Lincoln as a man, it is quite in character for him—even at the age of 25—while a member of the Illinois State Legislature to studiously avoid association with abolitionists. The national controversy of abolitionists versus slaveholders frequently caused emotions to reach fever heat. However in 1837 when the legislature passed resolutions condemning abolition societies, Lincoln together with Dan Stone, a colleague, entered a protest in which they said slavery was "founded on both injustice and bad policy, but that the promulgation of abolition doctrines tends rather to increase than abate its evils." This statement should be considered side by side with the fact that he never allowed himself to become identified with any religious denomination, but was a constant Bible reader and his life was lived on an exceptionally high moral plain. This morality was true even during his youth on a wild frontier with ruffians as neighbors and companions. Lincoln was an anomoly. He tried to occupy a position on the burning issue of the day which became incerasingly difficult to do.

In the years 1847–49 Lincoln served in Congress from Illinois. In January 1849 he offered Congress a proposal to abolish slavery in Washington, D. C., on three conditions. They were that (1) emancipation was to be gradual, (2) compensation was to be made to slaveholders for the loss of their slaves, (3) the act would not go into force unless approved by vote of the citizens of Washington, D.C., in special election. This measure failed and his influence as a Whig

waned. His temporary setback in politics could well be attributed to his willingness to try to see both sides of an issue, and his subsequent denunciation of President Polk for the Mexican War.

Roughly 10 years later Lincoln joined the newly formed Republican Party and campaigned for Senator from Illinois. During the course of this campaign against Douglas he exhibited great skill as a politician. He tried to capitalize on the growing split in Democratic ranks, while at the same time he labored with an eye for vote-getting to unite the incompatible elements of the newly formed Republican Party. Therefore he did not advocate unconditional repeal of fugitive-slave laws. He did not oppose the admission of States in which slavery might be established. He did not endorse Negro citizenship. He did not endorse nor urge political or social equality for the races. He continued his proposal of gradualism, and compensation to masters for freed slaves in Washington, D.C. This was good politics. He welded the Republicans together and became their leader in Illinois, even though Douglas won the seat in the Senate. Lincoln was maneuvered into position to be regarded as presidential timber. It must be remembered that there was no significant Negro vote to lose.

Democrats were hard at work to identify the Republican Party with the spirit of John Brown. This was interpreted as an attempt to discredit the party, so in his Cooper Institute speech in New York in February 1860, Lincoln urged understanding and friendliness toward the people of the South. Thus he advised "yield to them if * * * we possibly can," do "nothing through passion and ill temper." After his election to the presidency, Lincoln wrote to Samuel Haycraft (a southerner) that the "good people of the South" would find in him "no cause to complain."

Upon taking office as President, Abraham Lincoln was hard pressed with numerous duties and burdens. He was inexperienced in handling an organization as large as the Federal Government with the great affairs involved and the vigorous decisions required. Crowds of job seekers and political hangers-on beset him on every hand. The social life and its demands embarrassed him. More aggressive subordinates challenged his leadership by their actions if not by their words. The rumbling of civil war was upon the horizon. Things seemed to be exploding and falling apart. There were about 5 months between his inauguration and the convening of Congress during which positive action in regard to the insurrection had to be taken. Both Congress and the Supreme Court supported his bold action, but this did not offset a sector of the population from calling him a dictator.

As the war progressed his problems naturally increased. At its best, the machinery of government as Lincoln found it was not well suited to meeting the crisis. In the area of military action there was much confusion between Federal and State handling of troops. States were either ahead of the Federal Government, or dragging their feet. Further complications set in when in 1862 an unfavorable Congress took its seat.

In September 1862 we do not see a placid humanitarian who by a flourish of his pen cut loose the shackles of an enslaved people. Instead we see a harassed man with an inflamed nation on his hands. We see a President who has been pummelled by too much of the press. We see an administrator with a self-appointed committee, the congressional Committee on the Conduct of the War, breathing down his neck and making an already hard job impossible. We see an observant man lose soldiers by the thousands. We see a wise and practical man note the contribution of refugee slaves to the Union war effort. Slavery was now only one among many burning issues. When Horace Greely wrote, "All attempts to put down the rebellion, and at the same time uphold its exciting cause, are preposterous and futile," a distressed but still conservative Abraham Lincoln countered with, "My paramount object is to save the Union, and not either to save or destroy slavery. If I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that." Thus Lincoln wrote his proclamation statement which was to become effective on January 1, 1863, with certain political and military expediences in mind. First, he realized that all northerners were not abolitionists. Secondly, he was mindful that the border States, although having Union sympathies and ties, also held slaves. This support could not be cast to the winds. Third and finally, the Union army needed 500,000 troops to replace their losses.

The Emancipation Proclamation read in part:

"All persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State the people whereof shall be in rebellion against the United States shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free."

"And I further declare and make known, that such persons of suitable condition, will be received into the armed service of the United States to garrison forts, positions, stations, and other places, and to man vessels of all sorts in said service."

This document cannot be properly evaluated apart from the times out of which it grew and the personality and temperament of the man who wrote it. Abraham Lincoln was not a moral weakling, nor was he a political neophyte. It fell his lot to attempt the always thankless task of seeing all issues within their perspective as part of a whole. He stood steadfast at a post from which lesser men (from whose ranks come most of his bitterest critics) would have run quite early in the conflict. Therefore in all the earnestness which he possessed and with all the pragmatism which the times demanded, Lincoln issued a wartime executive decree as Commander in Chief of the United States Armed Forces. Such measures, by their very nature, fail to provide a permanent and thoroughgoing solution to social problems of the magnitude of human slavery. In fact it must be remembered that Lincoln's stated purpose of the Proclamation was not to solve the social problem of slavery, but to solve the political problem of a divided Nation. Thus only those slaves in the still rebellious States were declared free. Slaves in Tennessee, parts of Virginia, all of West Virginia, and parts of Louisiana were not affected. Neither were slaves in such border States as Missouri and Kentucky affected. Freed slaves were invited into the Army and Navy but citizenship was not bestowed upon any freed men. Hence on January 1, 1863, the practical effects of the Emancipation Proclamation echo Lincoln's letter to Greeley when he said "If I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that."

Positively speaking the Emancipation Proclamation heralded the sunrise of a new day for Negro slaves in the United States. These benefits could not help but spill over to the advantage of free born Negroes in the North. The technical question of Lincoln's authority in the Confederate States presented an initial difficulty to the slaves involved, but military emancipation advanced through the South as the Union armies advanced. The paramount contribution of the Emancipation Proclamation is the fact that it paved the way for more durable final measures. Some of these measures were State action against slavery in the border States, and the 13th amendment to the Constitution which abolished slavery throughout the Nation for all time. In due time came the 14th amendment, which granted citizenship to the native born Negro, and the 15th amendment which gave the Negro the ballot. This was all part of the chain reaction which was set off by the Emancipation Proclamation. It is patently evident that the Emancipation Proclamation was not an end in itself, but a means to an end. It is conceivable that some other measure might have been devised to save the Nation.

If the Emancipation Proclamation served as a means to an end, it now falls the responsibility of enlightened Negro leadership to know that end and to examine it, and to do so in the light of today's situation. To unite our great Nation and to keep it strong is a worthy end. Such an end is no less worthy today than it was 96 years ago. The American Negro is an integral part of the citizenry of these United States. As such he has a contribution to make to the continued life and strength of this Nation. It is a disservice to the Nation and a failure to pursue the best interest of the Nation when any person or group of people, be they white or black, hinders the making of this contribution.

As of January 1, 1863, the freedman was at liberty to join the Army or Navy if he chose to do so, but his political status was the same as any other alien or immigrant. He was not a citizen. Emancipation from slavery and the right to vote is yet to come, 89 years later. The fact that the right to vote was so long coming shows remarkable lack of political acumen upon the part of the leaders of Mr. Lincoln's party. In the light of this the Negro vote belongs in nobody's vest pocket. On the other hand, keeping our great ideal of a strong nation in mind, neither should the Negro voter selfishly indulge in shopping around for a mess of pottage. Ultimately, as the Negro is benefited so is the Nation, and vice versa, as the Nation advances so should the Negro.

Today the American system of government is still one whose power to govern is derived from the people. That government is strong or weak as it represents all or only part of the people. Two insidious factors work to weaken our governmental system. The first is the organized effort of some people to deny the citizenship right to vote to those to whom that right belongs. The second is the lethargic spirit exhibited by the failure to register and to vote on the part of far too many who are not otherwise hindered in doing so. Therefore, if an Emancipation Proclamation Day Celebration is to make any sort of positive contribution to Negro life in particular and national life in general, it should mark a time of rededication to the universal realization of full citizenship. Negroes are only half emancipated and no further advanced than they were in 1863 if they are not citizens. They are only half citizens if they do not vote.

Nashville ministers, you need not be apologetic, neither in word nor deed, in identifying yourself in the struggle for full citizenship.

In fact you should be taking the initiative in such fights. You have a mandate from God to cry out, "Let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream." And no apologies are due. You have a mandate from God to cry out, "Woe to them that devise iniquity, and work evil upon their beds. When the morning is light, they practice it, because it is the power of their hand." And no apologies are due. You have a precedent from Christ Jesus to declare, "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; He hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." And no apologies are due. A gospel which closes its eyes to prejudice, hatred, malice, vengeance, and in-

justice, all those things which fill the air today, is not from God. For these are the things which enslave men even more effectively than chains and shackles. And a gospel which is not concerned with these things is not the gospel which Christ Jesus preached.

Finally, too much of Negro American are only freedmen and not citizens. You not only have to fight such satanic schemes as the attempted abolishing of Macon County, Ala., but black freedmen must be urged to register and to vote. Emancipation might well have never been if full citizenship does not follow.

Text of Address by Hon. L. H. Fountain, of North Carolina, Before the 35th Annual American Municipal Congress, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Boston, Mass., December 1, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that one of the increasingly critical situations we face today involves the need of growing metropolitan areas for more efficient means of servicing their huge populations.

One of the principal handicaps in the way of developing such improved means is the lack of coordination between the large number of Federal, State, regional, county, and local governmental units that exercise at least partial legal authority within metropolitan areas—despite the fact that their individual problems are often areawide in scope.

The challenge that this situation represents to the people and the governing bodies of such areas has been strikingly set forth in an address delivered before the 35th Annual American Municipal Congress in Boston on December 1, 1958, by our distinguished and esteemed colleague, Congressman L. H. FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina.

His address, which I include as a part of my remarks in the RECORD, is the kind of clear-minded and thoughtful analysis of a complex problem which we have come to expect from the gentleman.

His awareness of the problem, his understanding of the factors delaying progress, and his insight into the need for integrating and coordinating the activities of the various levels of government impressed me greatly.

This is a problem that concerns metropolitan areas generally, but none more than the greatest metropolitan area in the world, the tri-State region surrounding New York City, part of which I am honored to represent.

As ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, I have found it most pleasant and instructive working with our chairman, Mr. FOUNTAIN. I look forward to a continuation of this constructive association, especially in regard to the matter at hand.

Meanwhile, I commend Congressman FOUNTAIN's address to all our colleagues, particularly those Members who represent the three-fifths of our total population presently living within the 174 metropolitan areas in the United States:

CITY-FEDERAL RELATIONS

I am grateful for the privilege of being with you today. I am honored to be able to speak to so imposing an assemblage of outstanding Americans as are gathered here on the occasion of the 35th annual congress of the American Municipal Association.

I feel at home in seeing the familiar faces of so many mayors who testified last year at the hearings of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, which I have the good fortune of chairing. It is an interesting coincidence that we are meeting today in the very city where the subcommittee commenced its regional hearings in September 1957. The city of Boston is also the home of our great and universally admired majority leader in the House of Representatives—JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

We are concerned at this meeting with a fundamental problem of American government; namely, the relationship of the Federal Government to the cities. In constitutional terms, of course, the cities have no independent status in our Federal system. Although the Constitution is silent on the role of the cities, realism as well as our democratic values make it imperative that municipal problems be given appropriate attention when dealing with intergovernmental affairs.

In the context of modern-day society, it is meaningless for many purposes to speak exclusively of Federal-State relations without due recognition of the municipal level of government. By the same token, realism prompts us not to delude ourselves into believing the State government, because of its shortcomings, is an outmoded political institution that will disappear in the framework of a new federalism. What is sorely needed in these times is a candid appraisal of the facts of present-day American federalism.

Woodrow Wilson said in 1908: "The question of the relation of the States to the Federal Government is the cardinal question of our constitutional system." That observation is equally valid today. However, in ascertaining the proper Federal-State relationship, we must not lose sight of some dramatic changes that have taken place in the half century since President Wilson's time. Let us briefly review some of these developments and assess their significance for the Federal-State relationship of today.

First, the growth of urban communities, and particularly of metropolitan areas in recent years, has been nothing short of phenomenal. Although this distinguished audience certainly needs no introduction to this development, it might be useful for the purpose of perspective to indicate the magnitude of this trend.

At the beginning of the 20th century less than 40 percent of the American people were urban residents. Today, with an urban population totaling more than 104 million, nearly 2 out of every 3 Americans live in an urban community.

In 1910 only 44 population centers, with a total of 25 million people, were found to meet the census classification of a metropolitan district, although the number of such districts would have been somewhat larger under the present definition of a metropolitan area. Today there are 174 metropolitan areas containing close to 100 million people. Almost three-fifths of our total population live in these areas, and this percentage is constantly increasing. In this connection, it is estimated that roughly nine-tenths of the Nation's population growth since the 1950 census has occurred in the metropolitan areas.

With the continuing growth of new and the expansion of existing metropolitan areas, we are witnessing a development which has been described by some observers as the urban region. The largest of these regions now extends for more than 600 miles along the eastern seaboard from north of Boston through the urbanized area south of Washington, D.C. It is not difficult to envisage the extension of this continuous urban band from Maine to Florida, as well as westward, in the years to come. Needless to say, the increase in the density of our population and the formation of contiguous urban communities increases the cost of Government services and the need for intergovernmental cooperation.

While we have become largely a nation of urban dwellers, this development has not been adequately reflected in the composition of State legislative bodies, which continue, all too frequently, to retain the representative character and outlook of our earlier rural society. Despite this political lag, municipal problems continue to increase in complexity as our growing and mobile population overflows local political boundaries to form newer satellite communities. The result is an imbalance between political institutions and social and economic patterns, an imbalance which usually means financial difficulties for the core city and the inefficient or even conflicting use of governmental facilities in the metropolitan area.

What is the remedy for these problems? As a first order of business, State legislatures should enlarge the taxing and other "home rule" powers of the cities to an extent commensurate with their administrative capabilities and their fiscal needs and capacities. At the local level there is need for bold experimentation with new organizational forms and methods to relate our large cities to metropolitan area needs and resources. These are not easy tasks. In a few minutes I want to discuss the outlook for their accomplishment and the Federal Government's responsibility in this connection.

It is my firm conviction that we must have strong local self-government in this country if we are to preserve our Federal system. Monopoly is no more desirable in Government than it is in industry or science. The free competition of ideas and a broad base of participation in the political affairs of the Nation are indispensable ingredients of democracy.

Whenever the States and the municipalities are able and willing to perform a particular public function, I believe it important that the Federal Government avoid exercising monopolistic control in that field, unless it can be clearly and convincingly demonstrated that the national interest requires a highly centralized program. State and local governments, like individuals, should and must be permitted to develop their full potentialities.

On the other hand, if the States and localities neglect their responsibilities, whether we like it or not the consequences will surely be a further concentration of power in the Federal Government. I was impressed by an eloquent expression of this thought made during the hearings of our intergovernmental relations subcommittee earlier this year. The witness said:

"The real danger to our Federal system lies not in deliberate aggrandizement of the National Government but in the invitation to national action which lies in disuse or misuse of State powers. The first line of defense against complete centralization is not in Washington but in the State capitols, the county courthouses, the city and town halls, and the polling places where State and local issues are decided."

There is much wisdom in that statement.

The question of a proper division of responsibility between the Federal Government and the States and localities is a perennial one in a Federal system.

The proposal has been made that we distribute public functions in such a manner that each level of government will have complete and independent responsibility for particular activities. In my judgment, however, it is unrealistic to assume all governmental problems can be neatly compartmentalized and handled in this fashion. Certain functions by their nature can and should be performed exclusively by a single level of government. Others, however, require a high degree of intergovernmental cooperation for effective performance.

The proper balance of Federal, State, and local responsibilities is a changing one which should depend, among other considerations, on the competence, responsiveness, and the resourcefulness of the various levels and units of government.

People sometimes lose sight of the fact that cities must undertake large capital investment programs to construct the facilities necessary for providing public services. Unfortunately, too, it is ordinarily much more difficult for a city to embark upon a capital improvement or expansion program than it is for a private corporation. Not only is municipal action frequently circumscribed by rigid debt and taxing limitations, but the city fathers must also wage a successful sales campaign for public approval. And all too often it is a thankless task to convince the voter that he should agree to bear a heavier tax burden, especially if the project is something as remote and unappealing as a sewage treatment plant which might be of greater direct benefit to the people downstream than to the local community.

Yet, as the world's wealthiest nation, it is essential that we devote a portion of our resources to public capital improvements, not only for our own welfare but also as a legacy for the generations of tomorrow. As to our financial ability, although our national debt is many times larger than the combined debt of all of the other nations of the world put together, it is a sobering experience to compare the gross national product of the United States with that of less fortunate nations. For example, the total market value of all goods and services produced last year in India, with its nearly 400 million people, was under $30 billion, or less than one-fifteenth our current rate of output of almost $450 billion a year. India's total national product is not much larger than the amount of the decline in the American economy during the 1957–58 recession.

It is clear that as a Nation we have the financial ability to meet our public responsibilities. The problem is more basically one of stimulating our social consciousness. For some purposes, the use of Federal incentives is unquestionably a valid method and Federal leadership a necessary condition.

However, as a political ideal, the responsibility for public services should be decentralized to the maximum extent possible. The cities should be permitted and encouraged to perform all functions within their competence and the States likewise should assume greater responsibility for meeting public needs. When the cities cannot do the job alone in some necessary but costly programs, they should, as a general rule, first look to the States and fight at the State level for assistance. If the States cannot or will not help, the cities are then justified in seeking assistance from the Federal Government.

The theory of local responsibility most often breaks down in practice, as you gentlemen are well aware, because of a restrictive attitude at the State level. It is indefensible when State governments remain unresponsive to public needs and, at the same time, prevent their political subdivisions from acting in these areas. While some State officials complain very bitterly about centralization of authority in Washington, local officials in the same States complain about the centralization of State government. I believe that the States should endow their municipalities with adequate legal authority and taxing powers to govern themselves in local matters. The fear of abuse of power by locally elected officials, which undoubtedly motivated many of the State restrictions now in existence, is generally an anachronism as applied to the cities of today. Municipal government has come a long way since Lincoln Steffens reported on the shame of American cities in a series of articles published little more than half a century ago. Inflexible and minute limitations on the powers of local government also suggest a distrust of the local electorate, which is most unflattering to a democratic society.

While State government must assume a large share of the blame for obstructing local self-government, this does not absolve municipal officials and local citizens of an obligation to exert greater effort for the improvement of these conditions; nor does it automatically justify a reliance upon Federal aid. How many proposed bond issues and constitutional amendments, we might ask ourselves, have been defeated at the polls because local officials did not do an effective job of educating the voters as to their merits?

I must frankly question whether the cities are doing all that they might to solve their problems. Not infrequently cities, as well as States, neglect performing tasks of which they are capable with the expectation that the Federal Government will come to their assistance. It is my feeling that at times local people ask for help in providing services which they would be unwilling to pay for themselves. And I think it is equally true that groups interested in particular public services often take the easier course of seeking assistance at the national level rather than fight for effective and representative government at the State and local levels. For our Federal system to fulfill its greatest promise, it is essential that public officials demonstrate initiative, imagination, and responsibility at all levels of government.

Although in many States the cards are stacked against the urban communities in connection with obtaining an equitable voice in State policy determinations and adequate home rule powers, there is much that persistence and hard work can accomplish.

Existing conditions call for an organized action program directed to the State level. I believe that a great deal might be accomplished by an intensive effort to awaken citizen interest and support in this area. Your member organizations might take the lead in joining with other civic groups to conduct an all-out campaign for the fair apportionment of State legislatures and for State constitutional reform.

It is regrettable that a number of State legislatures have failed for so long to comply with their State constitutional requirements relating to the reappointment of election districts. Obviously, it is not an easy step for them to take, but it is a situation which can best be remedied by the States themselves. If these States persist in neglecting their duty to reapportion, such inaction may well be interpreted in some quarters as an invitation for Federal court intervention—a step which I believe many of us would dislike because of other fundamental principles involved. It is significant, I think, that last summer a Federal court panel for the first time accepted jurisdiction in a case involving apportionment, but it deferred a decision on the issues in order to allow the new Minnesota State legislature, which meets in January, an opportunity to take appropriate action.

Now let us examine the question of what constitutes an appropriate Federal policy toward the cities.

As a basic proposition, I would suggest the need for a Federal leadership role to help assure the maintenance of a strong, healthy Nation. National strength cannot exist without strength and vitality in our State and local governments. Our Nation has become so interrelated that disease, poverty, illiteracy, or crime in any of its parts in inevitably transmitted to the whole and weakens our national social fabric. The provision of research and technical assistance to the cities and States for combatting problems such as these is universally recognized as a proper Federal responsibility.

A related method by which the Federal Government can and should help the cities to help themselves is through the planning grant. It is imperative in these times that our social inventiveness keep pace with our scientific and technological achievements. This is especially true with respect to solving the traffic, mass transportation, education, urban blight, water, and other problems that plague the large cities and metropolitan areas. Planning assistance, such as that authorized for certain urban areas under the Housing Act, is a constructive approach for solving these problems which are nationwide in their impact.

Another constructive way to facilitate local self-reliance is to assure the availability of adequate revenue sources. The Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, in its recent report on Federal grants-in-aid, stressed the importance of the Federal Government's making available to the States and localities those revenue sources that are not of primary importance for Federal financing and which are well adapted for State and local use. While such Federal self-restraint would be wholesome in any event, we must recognize as a weakness of this policy the fact that it would not benefit the cities in many cases without corresponding State action.

In view of this difficulty, and also in recognition of the fact that fiscal ability does not always coincide with the need for services, the subcommittee concluded in its unanimous report that the Federal grant should be regarded as a valid method of harnessing cooperative governmental effort for the accomplishment of well-defined national objectives. The subcommittee rejected the idea that there are easy classification schemes for determining whether or not a grant program should be undertaken or continued. It concluded, instead, that each grant proposal ought to be judged completely but very carefully on its merits.

Finally, and by no means least in importance, I would suggest that the Federal Government take all reasonable steps to promote a closer and more effective cooperation and understanding between the levels of government. One move in this direction would be the establishment of a permanent Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, as was recommended by our subcommittee. Such a central body, representative of the local, State, and Federal viewpoints, would, I hope, provide needed machinery for the cooperative study and consideration of common problems. I intend to introduce an appropriate bill in the 86th Congress to implement this recommendation and invite the support of your organization for that measure.

I have no illusions that a permanent advisory body will be a panacea for all intergovernmental problems. Nevertheless, as a medium for improving communications and mutual understanding, I believe it is a step in the right direction. I sincerely believe there is an urgent and growing need for the establishment of better cooperation and closer working relations not only between the Federal Government and the States but be-

tween State and local government officials as well.

I am reminded here of Alexander Pope's couplet which says:

"For forms of government let fools contest;
Whate'er is best administer'd is best."

These lines undoubtedly overstate the case, but they contain a message worth contemplating. Organizational arrangements are useful tools for achieving objectives, but they do not guarantee the desired goals. We must still rely to a large degree on the ability and the willingness of men, and units of government, to see each others point of view and to seek better working relationships.

As a note of personal philosophy, I cannot emphasize too strongly my belief that the possession of rights entails corresponding responsibilities. States rights should not be used as an excuse for indifference to public problems. Neither should easy access to Washington be used as a means for centralizing political power, a development which could ultimately destroy our Federal System.

There are no easy solutions or automatic mechanisms for running a democratic government. Constant vigilance and hard work are the price we must pay for our democratic institutions.

I thank you.

International Salmon Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I offer for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD, a communication just received from George Johansen, secretary-treasurer, Alaska Fishermen's Union, AFL–CIO. This deals with international conservation on the high seas with particular reference to Alaska's Bristol Bay area during the 1959 season and points up strongly the need for passage of my bill, H.R. 605, to conserve our salmon resources.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the Members interested in our new sister State of Alaska will take the time to study this statement as a matter of information on this important subject:

In view of proposed regulations which will severely restrict, if not altogether abolish, fishing by commercial fishermen during the 1959 season in the Bristol Bay area, we offer the following comments, based on our experience in this district.

The 1958 salmon take in the Bristol Bay area was disappointing, to say the least. As a matter of fact, the 270,000 cases of reds packed are probably the smallest pack in the history of Bristol Bay. The total run was approximately 5,250,000 salmon with an escapement of approximately 2,250,000, leaving about 3 million salmon for the commercial fishermen's take.

There is little doubt that the destructive results can be ascribed to heavy fishing of the Japanese north of the Aleutian Islands and their take of immature salmon in the years 1956–57, which should have returned in 1958 as matures had they not been taken on the high seas.

We know the facts. The question is: What can we do about the present high-seas fishing to protect our stocks in the future? During the Tokyo Conference, held by the North Pacific Salmon Commission last fall, we presented conclusive evidence to the Japanese, showing that they were fishing on salmon stocks of North American origin. While the meetings proceeded in a friendly atmosphere and ideas were exchanged freely by all parties to the convention, nevertheless the Japanese did not officially recognize the evidence presented by the United States, and would therefore not agree to a shift of the present line presently established at 175th meridian, west.

We had advocated a shift to the 170th meridian, east, which, based upon our research, would have offered considerable protection for our salmon stocks. The present line cannot be changed, except by unanimous agreement of all of the signatories to the treaty, and so the refusal of the Japanese constitutes a bar to any change in their fishing on the high seas during the 1959 season. This means that red salmon stocks, already severely depleted, will be subject to further strains. The Fish and Wildlife Service, recognizing this condition, is trying to maintain adequate escapement by denying and restricting American fishermen the right to fish in the Bristol Bay area through regulations.

We realize that, fundamentally, it is the duty of the Fish and Wildlife Service to provide escapement. However, we believe that the obligation of providing escapement is based upon the fact that the fruits of this escapement shall accrue to U.S. citizens, who have made considerable sacrifices during the past several years in order to maintain these salmon stocks on a sustained yield level.

We cannot agree that there is an obligation upon the U.S. Government to provide the necessary escapement when the fruits of such escapement will accrue to a foreign nation. It is reasonable to presume that there will be considerable unwillingness on the part of the Japanese to agree to any conservation measures on the high seas as long as they are assured by action of the U.S. Government that adequate escapement has been provided for. One cannot reasonably expect that American fishermen consistently shall be called upon to sacrifice without any benefits returning to them from such sacrifices.

The question in regard to the fisheries in Bristol Bay can no longer be pushed aside to be decided upon some time in the distant future. A decision must be made now, and due to the inability of the North Pacific Commisison to reach a satisfactory agreement, we look to the U.S. Congress to enact legislation which will provide compliance to conservation of this immensely important natural resource. The Congress has recognized that the salmon fisheries of Alaska are not a local matter, but a matter of national concern. Aside from the financial loss to American fishermen and canners, we cannot overestimate the serious damage to our national food supply, should we lose this important salmon resource.

We are strongly in favor of enactment of the Pelly bill, introduced in the last session of the Congress. This bill would bar imports of Japanese canned salmon, unless conservation has been complied with. It is understandable that the Japanese are reluctant to restrict themselves on the high seas. The salmon fishery conducted by them has been a profitable fishery, and the following figures will show the approximate amounts of salmon caught each year since the Japanese initiated this fishery in 1952:

1952	2,100,000
1953	7,700,000
1954	20,500,000
1955	64,040,000
1956	52,066,000
1957	56,000,000
1958	50,500,000

We are not claiming that these figures represent all salmon of North American origin, but we do claim heavy inroads are made on Bristol Bay fish. The fact that the fish are caught on the feeding grounds indicates that a tremendous amount of immature fish are caught in the high seas fisheries of this kind. It can be fairly stated that the statistics as to catches made do not reflect the true picture of fish caught or destroyed.

Using gillnets on the high seas where the water is rough, many fish will be caught in these nets and later on wriggle free eventually to die due to the damage they sustained in hitting the nets. Also, many dead fish wash out from the nets, and consequently there are probably millions of fish destroyed for no purpose whatsoever, which does not show in the figures given.

This ocean fishery is wasteful in another way also. Salmon are a fish which put on nearly half of their weight during the last 4 or 5 months before spawning. The catching of immature fish means then that if the fish had been allowed to leave the feeding grounds on the high ocean, each fish would have brought a much higher yield, both in food value and in money.

It is doubtful that we will be able to maintain adequate escapement, even though we may completely deny Americans the right to fish in the Bristol Bay area if the high seas fishing continues without some safeguards being provided for. Alaska, the newest State in the Union, is dependent upon her fisheries for a large part of her revenue and income. Until such time as Alaska has had a chance to develop her other resources, the question of the salmon fisheries is of paramount importance to the State. The results of our scientific fishery research and the conclutions that can be drawn therefrom, indicate clearly that it is only a matter of time before the valuable Bristol Bay salmon runs are reduced to a point where they no longer will be economically feasible or advisable, conservationwise, to fish them.

No amount of diplomatic doubletalk and fancy language can explain away the inevitable results that will accrue if we fail to act in the best interests of the United States at this time. We had hoped that the result of our investigations would have convinced the Japanese of the need to exercise good judgment and the recognition that it isn't only the United States who will be the loser, but the Japanese as well.

I have consistently, since 1954, warned of the danger to our salmon fisheries, and I sincerely hope that now, when the critical period is upon us, we will take constructive action to enforce conservation. We bear no ill will toward the Japanese, but we feel that by refusing to recognize our position, based upon scientific facts, the Japanese are sacrificing conservation for temporary profits, and we are not agreeable to keep silent and be a party to the destruction of our salmon resource in Alaska.

Dr. Bela Fabian, an Expert in Giving Communists Some of Their Own Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edith Kermit Roosevelt from the American Legion magazine for December 1958.

It is too bad for our own country that we do not give more heed to men like Dr. Bela Fabian who know the score on Communist maneuvering and are as good at putting them on the defensive as they generally are at keeping free world leaders off balance:

HE BAITS BOLSHEVIKS

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

A few months ago Mikhail Menshikov, Russia's suave, blue-eyed Ambassador to the United States, was all smiles. The success of the Reds' Operation Butter-Up, their cover-up for worldwide subversion, reached its high point when a large group of Republican ladies from Ohio descended on the Soviet Embassy. Later they emerged gushing over the slave empire's jocular envoy.

Then suddenly Russian winter came to America. Abruptly, the Soviet Ambassador canceled all lectures, good-will tours, and television appearances, while at diplomatic receptions scowls replaced smiles. Reporters were puzzled. Why had the Red bear replaced the social lion?

Finally, Menshikov gave an explanation.

"Always there are newspapermen asking questions," he fretted. "I think I will sometime have to refuse to answer some questions."

A man who feeds reporters questions that put Russian diplomats on the hot seat is Bela Fabian, Chairman of the World Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners. Broad and short, with a powerful frame, ruddy face, cropped gray hair, and the lumbering gait of a peasant, this 69-year-old refugee has been called the "conscience of the West." The peppery Hungarian has put Russian diplomats on the defense by conducting a private truth campaign to replace Red promises of the better life under socialism.

Any time the Communists launch one of their phony peace offensives, or whenever the news breaks about a new Soviet crime, this stocky man swings into action. He can be found striding along the street carrying a battered briefcase bulging with documents. Since there are millions of people all over the world who either have relatives in slave labor camps or who have been inmates themselves, it isn't long before Fabian is surrounded by throngs of cheering men and women—many of whom have proved in war and revolution that they hold their liberties dearer than life itself.

Fabian's tactics in his little Russian counter-revolution include worldwide mass anti-Soviet demonstrations staged at strategic times; and constantly publicizing news of continuing Soviet deportations, murders, and secret trials in Hungary and other Russian colonies.

His work is not sponsored by angels, governments, or tax-exempt foundations. Prior to a demonstration, local Hungarians in the advertising business contribute labor and paint for the posters; a friendly printer, a graduate of Vorkuta or Karaganda slave labor camps, may work his presses overtime to print leaflets; and in every city where Fabian and his former Hungarian political prisoners hold a meeting generous people, some of whom have been victims of communism, offer the demonstrators a meal or a bed.

A 22-year-old ex-Hungarian freedom fighter, who marches regularly in Fabian's picket lines, has his own answer to why the aging exile accomplishes so much with so little.

"Some Americans who want to fight communism think the only way to do it is to get up a big organization sprinkled with a lot of big names who do no work. Then they hire spacious offices in Rockefeller Center and spend the long lunches at '21' discussing what they're going to do next. Bela Fabian just goes ahead and does it."

And while our leaders sit down to negotiate with the Soviets at summit conferences, somehow the voice of the "conscience of the West" is heard loud and clear urging "no trade, no aid, no dealings with the Communists."

Communist and Western diplomats may toast each other in the capitals of the world, but Fabian's posters speak out: "Don't drink champagne mixed with Hungarian blood."

The urge to kill must seize the Communists when they see his pickets. They know that here is a pro who knows how to deal with them from firsthand experience. He knows how to play on Moscow's real insecurity: fear of the smoldering nationalism of the captive non-Russian nations both within and outside the Soviet Union.

Recently the Soviets angrily asked the U.S. Government to halt the picketing of Soviet missions on American soil by Fabian and his group aided by other exiles and Americans. They denounced Fabian as the notorious leading hooligan, and leader in the United States of the antipopular neofascist and underground movement, and they charged that bandits, rowdies, hooligans, abetted by Wall Street and the Pentagon are deployed to insult and scare innocent Russian guests in America. Fortunately, Washington said "Nyet" to the Soviet demand, and the Russians were reminded that our Constitution guarantees free assembly and free expression, those rights upon which our peaceful picket lines are based.

Last spring Fabian learned that Menshikov had been invited to address the Baltimore Bar Association. The exile leader boarded a train and picketed the Ambassador's hotel with large posters that read:

"The Soviet peace dove feeds on Hungarian blood.

"You go to the stratosphere and stay there.

"You keep the moon: give us Hungary.

"Rooski, go home."

From Hungarian sources behind the Iron Curtain, Fabian was able to brief Baltimore newsmen on the Communist-conducted secret trials then underway in Budapest. After this address on Soviet jurisprudence, a reporter asked Menshikov about the Hungarian trials and the red-faced Soviet diplomat could only reply "No comment." Finally, always hounded by newspapermen asking questions, and some 700 stony-faced pickets, Menshikov made an ignominious departure from Baltimore under the watchful eye of the police.

Later, when the still ebullient Soviet diplomat was invited to a gala reception at the Plaza in New York, Fabian and his group picketed the hotel with signs that read: "Relieve Mrs. Khrushchev from Potma Concentration Camp."

Through former inmates of the Potma camp, Fabian had learned that the Soviet Premier's first wife had been dumped there under the assumed name of "Mrs. Gorskaja."

To Menshikov's extreme embarrassment, Peter Kihss of the New York Times made inquiries at a press conference concerning the convenient manner in which the Soviet diplomat's boss had disposed of his marital difficulties.

"It is a lie!" screamed Menshikov. Khrushchev, however, was so upset over the query that he had Mrs. Khrushchev paraded about in Karlovy Vary. "But it was the second Mrs. Khrushchev, and everyone knew it!" Fabian tells with a laugh.

The Hungarian David's challenge to the Red Goliath is not just to relieve a patriot's personal outrage. It has a long-range political purpose:

"America will never sacrifice a single one of her soldiers to defend Hungary, I know that," explains Fabian. "The main problem is to get the U.S. and the Western countries to defend their own countries and to show them what would happen to their countries under Soviet domination."

Picketing is only one of the methods Fabian uses in attempting to influence world opinion. He conducts a mail campaign with characteristic grim humor. For instance, on November 7, 1957, the 40th anniversary of the Bolshevik seizure of power, delegates to the United Nations, Members of Congress, and key Government officials received a formal printed invitation to a celebration honoring the "world's most powerful slave labor empire, to be held at the delegation of the U.S.S.R. to the U.N., 68th Street and Park Avenue, New York City." Items on the menu included "Borscht Lubianka (made of Reds beat), meatballs Khrushchev soaked in Vodka, o-pressed duck captive nations, and Crimean champagne mixed with Hungarian blood vintage 1956." On the entertainment agenda were listed "East Side, West Side," (sung by Tito) and "Danse Macabre, executed by Ivan Serov and his cutthroats." Ostensibly, the invitations were sent by the U.S.S.R.'s chief delegate to the U.N., Arkady Sobolev, and his wife.

A Christmas card sponsored by Bela Fabian and signed "Political Prisoners of the Soviet Union," put a damper on whatever holiday spirit Communists manage to generate. The front of the card bore a picture of shrunken, staved faces staring out from behind barbed wire. Beneath the doleful photograph were the words: "We wish you a Christmas as merry as ours." Inside the greeting card was a drawing of a Christmas tree, its branches decorated with guided missiles, a globe of the world with arrows pointing to areas of Red infiltration, and a U.N. gavel labeled veto. Beside the picture was an ominous message, hinting of a day of reckoning for Red oppressors:

"Rest ye not, merry gentlemen—
Henchmen of our nation;
Get ye out ere it be too late.
For all of ye there lies in wait
A camp or power station."

Soviet diplomats have techniques for silencing this kind of refugee activity—murder, kidnaping, and blackmail. But Fabian is impervious to threats and attempts at intimidation. On New Year's Eve, a few days after he had sent out his Christmas card, he received an anonymous telephone call. A voice said:

"Stop your activities, Mr. Fabian, or you'll be a dead man in 90 days."

Three minutes later the telephone rang again. Fabian's wife answered it, and the voice said:

"Tell your husband to stop his activities, or he will be a dead man in 1958."

A half hour later the telephone rang once more, and when Fabian picked up the receiver the familiar voice started in again.

"Look here," bellowed the Hungarian, "we know each other 40 years. I will not change; you will not change. Now why not let me sleep for the night?"

The gangster the Reds call the notorious leading holligan likes to spend quiet "bourgeois" evenings in his modest apartment in New York City. After an early supper he dictates letters to his wife or works on a book or a political article. As he paces about his sitting room, as he habitually does when planning some new anti-Soviet move, he often pauses to take a few grapes out of a fruit bowl and pop them into the cage of sputnik, the Fabians' canary. The couple named the bird after the first Soviet satellite because "he likes to fly off in orbit."

The arrival of a friend or relative from Hungary calls for a party given in the generous, outgoing manner of Hungarian country people. Mrs. Fabian, red-headed and plump, bustles in, apoligizing that "it's too bad I had no time for shopping," or "I have no food to eat because my husband ate it all," and "You must not mind if it is not much." But

the guest soon finds before him platter after platter of steaming paprika chicken, yellow rice, stuffed meatballs, cucumbers with vinegar and sugar dressing, Hungarian strudel, fruit, nuts.

A typical Fabian party ends in the singing of Hungarian folk songs. Sometimes, after a glass or two of Tokay wine, Fabian will throw an arm about a fellow exile and sing in his rich bass the beautiful air:

"I started from my lovely land,
Beloved little Hungary,
But I stop and lock back
And tears flow from my eyes
And tears flow from my eyes."

Bela Fabian owes much of his sincerity and simplicity of character to his upbringing as the son of a grower of Tokay grapes who lived in the small Hungarian town of Taliya. Lajos Fabian taught his son to put God and country first. The Fabians were not wealthy, but they managed to send each of their five children to a university.

After receiving an LL.D. degree, young Fabian became a law clerk in the office of Dr. William Vazsony, an outstanding legal authority, leader of the Democratic Party of Hungary, and later Minister of Justice.

But his law work was interrupted by the First World War. He served as an officer of the Hungarian Army, and was captured by the Russians in 1915 and confined for a year in a camp at Tashkent in Middle Asia.

Captured officers were properly treated by the authorities of czarist Russia, but the rank and file prisoners of war were worked to death on a starvation diet and succumbed by the thousands to epidemics of such diseases as typhus.

When Fabian organized a protest against their inhuman treatment, he was sent to a punitive camp at Krasnaya Riechka, 500 miles north of Vladivostok.

Early in 1918, with the help of false papers, Fabian escaped and reached Leningrad. There he lived under an assumed name and witnessed the cruel fratricidal war launched by the Communists against the followers of all other political movements.

After he returned to Hungary, he wrote about his experiences in Russian captivity, about his escape, and the revolutionary turmoil he had witnessed. His books, "Russian Inferno, Petrograd," and "Russia's Decay Under Bolshevik Rule," met with cold incredulity on the part of middle-class intellectuals and made Fabian a target of venomous attacks from the extreme left. As a result, he was one of the first to be thrown into prison when Hungary's first Communist stooge, Bela Kun, seized power in 1919.

After the collapse of this short-lived dictatorship, the other extreme, the White Terror regime, temporarily won the upper hand in Hungary. It subjected thousands of innocent victims to cruel sufferings along with the guilty. Fabian believed that a rule of law, not counter-revolutionary terrorism, should prevail, and he published three additional books, including "The Russian Counter-Revolution."

"My fight against both forms of extreme reaction was not confined to public forums," Fabian recalls, "but as was the custom of that time I had to fight numerous duels with sword and pistol in defense of my principles."

His democratic record led to his election as an executive member of the Budapest Municipal Council in 1920, and in 1922 he was elected to the Hungarian Parliament on the Independent Democratic ticket. He held this office for 17 consecutive years. In 1928 he became president of the Independent Democratic Party.

When the German hordes invated Austria and Czechoslovakia in the late 1930's, a Budapest magazine, knowing Fabian's opposition of all forms of totalitarianism, published on its front page a carton in which he was represented as a dwarf battling a tornado. The caption asked: "Little man, what now?"

The Nazis answered that question by stamping serial No. B12305 on his brawny right arm—a mark he still bears—and sent him to Auschwitz with its mass-devouring gas chambers. By a near-miracle, Fabian was not one of the thousands of gas victims. The Nazis assigned him with a group of other prisoners who were given the job of dismantling and reprocessing parts of American planes which had been shot down by the Germans. Fabian and his fellow prisoners, secretly hid radio parts from these damaged aircraft, and from them made receiving sets which brought them news from the BBC and American transmitters.

"In order to keep up the spirit of the rest of the prisoners," Fabian recounts, "a grapevine news service repeated throughout the camp what was heard at the listening posts. When the Germans discovered one of these radios, they promptly hanged anyone who had anything to do with the news transmission service. But hunger for news was so persistent that even though a radio team were hanged one day, the next day a new radio would be working."

Transferred to Ohrduf, Fabian escaped in March 1945 with three comrades, hid 10 days in the forests of Thuringia, and crept through the German lines to find refuge with General Patton's 3d U.S. Army.

At the end of the war, he was joined in Paris by his wife who succeeded in getting out of Hungary after 2½ years of maneuvering. Like true Europeans, the couple felt much at home in France. But, Fabian explains, "We believed we could be more useful to our country in America, which is the biggest force against Communist imperialism."

The couple arrived in New York on October 9, 1948, and a year later Fabian launched the opening volley of his truth campaign on these shores with his book "Cardinal Mindszenty," about the religious leader whom he had known personally. The book revealed to an indignant West how the Reds had drugged and tortured the elderly Hungarian cardinal. Fabian also founded the Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners. Almost 15,000 former Nazi and Soviet victims joined, 3,000 in this country alone.

As the United Nations began to play an increasing role in the direction of American foreign policy, Fabian insisted that it should be a truly representative forum where oppressed peoples under Soviet domination should have a voice.

Accompanied by other former Hungarian political prisoners, Fabian began attending U.N. meetings in the blue and white striped suit worn by Soviet slave-labor prisoners.

Mrs. Fabian will never forget the night of November 4, 1956, when the U.S.S.R. invaded Hungary.

"I was listening to television while cooking in the kitchen," she says, "When I heard a very penetrating voice shout 'murderers.' I rushed to the set and saw U.N. guards taking my husband away. I heard later that they put him in a room and wouldn't let him out until the end of the meeting."

But if Fabian's voice is angry and penetrating when he talks back to Reds, it becomes gentle and persuasive when he talks to non-Communists who are not yet committed to the free world's fight.

When 150 pacifists demonstrated against nuclear weapons in midtown Manhattan, Fabian persuaded the group to let him give a speech. He told them in restrained and measured words that they were mistaken in their stand.

"The problem is not peace or war, but freedom or slavery," he said.

A New York Times dispatch of April 6, 1958, showed that the Hungarian leader's tactful offensive had been a success:

"With handshakes and exchanges of mailing addresses among the two groups the meeting soon dispersed in an atmosphere of harmony."

Another example of tactful agitation by the exiled leader took place after Vice President NIXON's visit to Latin America. Fabian asked members of the Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners in every place where the Vice President was humiliated to write demonstration leaders requesting a personal interview. Then the Hungarian former prisoner would ask this man:

"If you are on our side, against what you call colonialism, why do you then work with Communists?" Then the Hungarian would proceed to give him a few facts about how captive nations are treated under communism.

Last summer Fabian went on a 6-week tour of Europe in which he successfully challenged the Russians at two large international conferences, setting up truth meetings of his own.

The first was the Fifth World Peace Congress in Stockholm in July.

At his own meeting, Dr. Fabian challenged Ilya Ehrenburg, president of the movement, and Jean-Paul Sartre, a member, to public debate. They refused. But while their meeting drew only some 250 persons out of 1,700 delegates, Fabian's rival conference drew daily crowds of more than 1,000.

At a meeting of the World Council of Churches in Utrecht, August 8, Fabian's target was the 10-member delegation representing the Russian Orthodox Church. At a widely publicized press conference he charged that the Russian Orthodox Church had become "the subservient tool of the Soviet regime."

He also challenged the Russian church leaders to "raise their voice against religious persecution * * * to demand the release of thousands of churchmen languishing in Soviet concentration camps * * * to demand the free practice of all religions in the Soviet orbit."

Although Dr. Fabian received no answer from the churchmen, he is convinced that confrontation with the facts brings an inevitable propaganda victory for the West.

"It is not enough to talk theoretically," he says. "Knowledge is the best weapon against the Soviet because when confronted with the truth, the Soviet will not reply."

Fabian's happiest moment came last summer when, at an appearance of a Russian ballet troupe in this country, he led a poster denunciation of Communist crimes, and two of the ballet's members surreptitiously told him:

"You are right; go ahead with your good fight. Wish we Russians could join you."

And Fabian has vowed he'll keep right on protesting—in his own dramatically effective kind of way—until they too will be free.

U.S. Navy's First Nuclear-Powered Missile-Launching Submarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1959, the U.S. Navy launched

its first nuclear-powered missile-launching submarine at the Mare Island Navy Yard, Vallejo, Calif.

Rear Adm. M. J. Lawrence, the commanding officer of the base, is highly commended for his able administration of this great naval yard. Admiral Lawrence and his production officer, Capt. E. H. Tilburne, have left no stone unturned to achieve this milestone in naval submarine construction.

The official and featured speaker at the launching ceremony was Rear Adm. Elton W. Grenfell, U.S. Navy, commander, Submarine Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Because of the importance of this event in terms of national security, I am asking unanimous consent to have Admiral Grenfell's speech printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Hon. and Mrs. HOLIFIELD, Admiral Lawrence, members of the Mare Island Naval Shipyard, distinguished guests, this is one of my last official acts in my current assignment as commander of the submarine force, U.S. Pacific Fleet. It is certainly one of the most momentous and proudest occasions of my tour of almost 2½ years in command. Proud because I have been asked to speak on this occasion when a *Halibut* is reborn. This new *Halibut*, however, is not just another submarine, for she will be the greatest and most powerful individual submarine weapons system in any navy in the world at this time. For the first time in our Navy's history, we will see the combination of a powerful nuclear powerplant with an equally powerful nuclear weapons system. The military capabilities of this submarine are almost beyond comprehension. Suffice to say, however, *Halibut* will have the military power backed by millions of tons of destructive ability, if required—that is the equivalent to a small size task force of World War II type.

In the event of an all-out war she will be able to prowl undetected close off the enemy's coast, position herself accurately, surface, and in minutes fire her atomic missile with great accuracy at a vital target; submerge, and speed away to a new area many hundreds of miles away. Next day the enemy, with no knowledge of *Halibut's* new position, would receive another sudden and deadly blow in like manner. In a war of the nuclear-type *Halibut* could eliminate whole industrial areas, shipyards, submarine bases, and other military targets.

It is a chilling and sobering thought to realize that this mighty submarine could, in a matter of minutes, without prior warning, reduce this great shipyard, as well as much of the surrounding area, to a vast pile of rubble.

The submarine forces have been hard at work for many years testing the two great components of this ship. *Nautilus, Seawolf, Skate,* and *Sargo* have all provided valuable data with which to refine *Halibut's* great nuclear powerplant. *Grayback, Tunny, Cusk,* and *Carbonero* have launched and guided almost 100 Regulus missiles, demonstrating the high degree of reliability of this system.

The marriage of nuclear power and guided missiles into this submarine has not been brought about through haste, accident, or guesswork. It has been a preplanned, carefully calculated wedding of two time-tested, thoroughly proven components.

Halibut, however, is not just a missile submarine to be used in the event an all-out war is forced upon us, for she will have in addition to her greatest characteristic of stealth that second most important characteristic, versatility. *Halibut* will carry a large load of vastly improved torpedoes of the latest type. She will have the most modern sonar equipment and other new electronic devices necessary to carry out effective antisubmarine warfare. She will have the ability to detect enemy submarines at long distances and more important, with her high speed and maneuverability, she will be able to close the contact and strike home with a successful attack on any enemy submarine she can hear. *Halibut* will play a most important part on the Navy's antisubmarine warfare team. For some time early in a war an enemy, with strong defensive air superiority, would have control of the air and sea adjacent to his coastline. Thus, our friendly antisubmarine warfare vessels and planes will not be able to operate in those waters. *Halibut,* however, can operate in such waters and will seek out and destroy enemy submarines close to their home bases.

Halibut will also be able to roam the enemy's seas and cut very vital and important sea lines of communications; vital and important because in the Pacific, for instance, practically all of any potential enemies' industrial centers and areas of military operations will be supported by water shipment. *Halibut,* with her high speed and powerful torpedoes can raise havoc with enemy shipping throughout the western Pacific and thus, at will, rupture these lines of communications.

Halibut can also perform air-sea rescue of friendly aviators in distress at sea close to the enemy shorelines; aviators who have been in attack groups attacking the enemy mainland and have been shot down can be rescued by submarines such as this. She will also be able to perform many other types of missions. Missions such as periscope photographic reconnaissance, landing of saboteurs and espionage agents anywhere along the enemy's coastline, mining, and so forth.

In another sense, *Halibut* may also be considered to be a forerunner of things to come in the way of new submarine mobile offensive capabilities. Her immense hangar in which she can carry a load of missiles dictated that she be built with many, many tons of carrying capacity and many thousands of cubic feet of storage space. Indeed, the interior volume of her hangars alone approximates the entire interior volume of our famous World War II fleet type submarines. This space and great capacity may be utilized to carry many other items of large size and number. For example, *Halibut* could carry hundreds of troops and their equipment at high speeds for long distances under the sea; she might carry several helicopters of various types to be utilized for a myriad of missions in enemy waters; or she could carry large amounts of badly needed supplies to beleagued outposts of our own or friendly forces.

Halibut will indeed be a powerful fighting machine with versatility greater than ever before in submarine history.

This mighty ship, soon to become a fighting part of our wonderful navy, is the masterpiece, the work of art, of the submarine naval architects and designers who built her. Thus it is appropriate at this point to pay tribute to those responsible for this wonderful submarine. This is not the work of one man, this is not the brainchild of one individual, this represents the unified effort of thousands of men and women, military and civilian personnel of the Navy, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the powerful industries of America. This submarine was conceived in the minds of submarine naval officers in the planning sections of the office of the chief of naval operations several years ago. She was designed in the workshops and on the drawing boards of the Bureau of Ships and Mare Island Naval Shipyard. Her weapons systems are products of the design sections of the Bureau of Aeronautics and the Bureau of Ordnance. The Office of Naval Research contributed much by the way of new developments and ideas. The Atomic Energy Commission contributed to the design of the powerplant. Many other Government activities had responsibilities in her building. Finally, the Congress of the United States approved of her and authorized the funds to build her. In other words, hundreds of men and women all over the United States in Government and private enterprise alike are represented here in the work and building of *Halibut.*

Last, but not least, are the workers of this fine Mare Island Naval Shipyard. The officers, the men and women of Mare Island have a right to be proud of this fine submarine today for it has been their personal blood, sweat, and tears that have gone into building the first nuclear-powered guided-missile submarine the world has ever known. Once again Mare Island has scored another first. Once again Mare Island has turned out a product that they, the Navy and the country may well be proud of for many years to come. To Admiral Lawrence and his outstanding organization, I, speaking for the submarine force, pay you all tribute for a job well done.

And now a word to the prospective captain, Walter Dedrick, the officers and men who are going to man and take this fine ship to sea. You are fortunate men, fortunate indeed to be in the crew of this wonderful and powerful new weapons system of the Navy. You have a great responsibility to your Navy and to your country, for you are the ones who must operate *Halibut* to develop her fullest and most efficient capabilities. You are the ones who will take her through the trials and tribulations of initial exercises and maneuvers. You have arduous days of hard labor ahead of you, but at the same time most interesting days, which will prove highly rewarding. You have a wonderful new ship with all of the modern advancements possible, with a high sustained speed that would have been inconceivable several short years ago, plus an endurance second to none. It is up to you to test her and to develop new tactics which will make her an important halfback on the naval varsity team.

In addition, you will prove to the world that this submarine is another partner in the democratic nations' deterrent program, for with your missile capabilities combined with your stealth and secret operations you will indeed cause any potential enemy to stop and think carefully before he might take offensive action against the United States and its allies. *Halibut,* like the future Polaris submarines, will have a deterrent capability that will give any potential aggressor much to worry about and thus because of her presence in the ocean may continue to bring peace to the world for many, many years to come.

To you officers and men who will dedicate many hours of your life to the successes of *Halibut,* I think it is fitting to remind you briefly of the fact that the first *Halibut* was a great submarine. She had terrific successes in World War II and fought the enemy for almost 2 years in the waters of the Pacific. She sank many, many enemy ships of all types. She battled ferociously and with venom. Indeed, her last patrol was so vigorous that her battle scars were beyond repair. *Halibut,* in a tenacious battle with a heavily escorted convoy on her 10th war patrol was subjected to a terrific depth charge attack. Her commanding officer, Captain Galantin, now rear admiral, U.S. Navy, stated in his report of her final war patrol and I quote, "the beating the ship took and survived brings our admiration and respect to the men who designed her, the people who built the *Halibut,* and those who recently refitted her." The endorsement to her patrol report also stated that after first aid at Saipan and more repairs in Pearl Harbor, she was sent

back to the specialists in the navy yard who decided that her injuries were far too extensive to justify funds for the necessary overhaul. Reluctantly the first *Halibut* was relieved of further duty. Commander of Submarines, Pacific Fleet, stated:

"*Halibut* was a fine fighting ship with a captain and crew who were likewise made of high-grade steel." I am sure that you, Captain Dedrick, your officers and men will be just as tough, just as brave, just as determined as those valiant men of the first *Halibut*. Thus, Captain, to you and your fine crew, I wish you all the good luck in the world, fair sailing, long, fast, and successful undersea voyages and Godspeed.

The Ideals Set Forth in the Preamble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DOWDY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, and in connection with the introduction of a resolution proposing a Christian amendment to the United States Constitution, I insert in the Appendix to the RECORD a radio address of Dr. R. J. G. McKnight delivered on the Christian amendment hour, entitled "The Ideals Set Forth in the Preamble":

"THE IDEALS SET FORTH IN THE PREAMBLE"

(By Rev. R. J. G. McKnight, D.D., Ph. D.)

We have been examining the preamble to the Constitution and we found many worthy ideals set forth: (1) To form a more perfect union, (2) establish justice, (3) insure domestic tranquillity, (4) provide for the common defense, (5) promote the general welfare, and (6) secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

"We the people" propose to attain these worthy ideals without declaring any dependence on God to guide us in their attainment. We have already pointed out how far human efforts have come short in accomplishing what we set out to accomplish; e.g., in "forming a more perfect union."

Let us look at item (5): We propose to "promote the general welfare." That is a broad term—general welfare. It embraces the crops, the weather situation, industry, wages, employment, health, and 1,000 other accidents of existence, as we call them.

We are all dependent on crops for our sustenance. Crops depend on the weather. Will our croplands turn into dust bowls, or will the topsoil be washed away by raging floods? That depends on the regulation of the rainfall. And who regulates the rainfall? We know, of course, that we can blame the administration in power, whether it be Republican or Democratic, if there is a countrywide crop failure. But who does control the forces that contribute to the general welfare?

When we turn to the Bible we find that God "causeth grass to grow for the cattle, and herb for the service of man: that he may bring forth food out of the earth" (Psalms 104: 14).

"The eyes of all wait upon Thee; and Thou givest them their meat in due season. Thou openest thine hand, and satisfieth the desire of every living thing" (Psalms 145). O the blessedness of the people in such a case. "Yea, happy is that people whose God is the Lord" (Psalms 144). It is so obvious that the general welfare of the Nation is in the hand of God.

The sixth and last thing we ourselves propose to do is to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. We cannot, apart from God, secure the blessings of liberty. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8: 32). "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed" (John 8:36.).

The ideals set forth in the preamble are high and worthy. Without God, the ability to attain to them is pitifully inadequate. Indeed, without acknowledging God or seeking His help, we the people have assumed the task of doing what only God himself can do. As a Nation we have said with Babylon of old, "I will be like the Most High" (Isaiah 14: 14). One needs no great mental ability to discern the folly of presuming to sit in the seat of God.

One thing more needs to be considered in our evaluation of the preamble to our Constitution. Ignoring, as it does, any recognition of divine authority, and assuming, as it does, the functions that belong to God alone, the preamble, as soon as the Constitution was ratified, made this Constitution the supreme law of the land. That rules out the Bible, which is the word of God, as the final source of appeal in matters of national morality. Legally it is impossible to get back of the Constitution. It is, at once, the supreme law and the ultimate source of appeal.

The noblest moral sentiments have been expressed by men who have occupied the highest positions the Nation has to offer. For example: George Washington in his "Farewell Address" said: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion, and morality are indispensable supports." He continues in the same "Farewell Address" as follows: "Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice?" He says further in this address: "Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles."

But, my friends, the sense of religious obligation has deserted the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice. The sense of religious obligation was taken out of our oaths by the amendment to article VI of our Constitution in these words: "But no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

And as national morality, which George Washington said cannot prevail "in the exclusion of religious principles," there is not now, nor was there ever, in our Constitution any mention of a standard of morals. There is but one perfect standard of morals, both for men and nations, and that is contained in the Bible, the word of God. And no mention of the Bible or of morals is to be found in the Constitution.

Whatever "we the people" in our Constitution declare to be right is ipso facto—right, regardless of any other standard. Whatever "we the people" in our Constitution declare to be wrong is wrong. And there is no room for appeal. We do have a Supreme Court to which we may appeal to interpret the meaning of the Constitution. But when once the Supreme Court hands down a decision, that becomes the law from which there can be no appeal. Nine mortal men become a Supreme Court.

And, my friends, to leave God, who is our judge, out of our decision in matters which involve morality or immorality is the most serious mistake a man or a nation can make. Listen to the words of Paul: "And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge" (retain His standard of right and wrong), "God gave them over to a mind without a standard, to do those things that are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful; who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them."

So the floodgates of all iniquity are opened up, and society becomes corrupt, which is what has happened in our own country and throughout the world. This is what happens when men operate without a divine standard of morals.

Sinking of the "Arizona"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith a very interesting account by Edward Janikowski of the sinking of the *Arizona*:

ASTORIAN SERVED ON "ARIZONA"

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Fleet Reserve Association has launched a nationwide campaign to raise funds to build a permanent memorial over the rusted hulk of the U.S.S. *Arizona*, sunk by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor. It has obtained accounts of the event from several of the 289 living men who survived the sinking. One of them is Edward J. Janikowski, 5 McCain, Astoria. Here is his account.)

"I was one of the fortunate ones to survive that fatal day of December 7, 1941, aboard the U.S.S. *Arizona*. It is a day I shall long remember," relates Edward J. Janikowski, of 5 McCain, Astoria.

"At the time of the attack, I was a coxswain in the seventh division. I had just gone on quarterdeck watch. Suddenly, planes came out of nowhere and started bombing Hickam Field.

"The officer of the day told me to pass the word that we were being atacked. Minutes later, bombs were falling all around us. The planes came so low we could see the pilots' faces.

"General quarters had been sounded, but many men never reached their stations. The bow of the ship was hit by a bomb, exploding the forward magazine. Another went down one of the stacks, so the men below hardly had a chance.

"I'd say a good thousand were trapped below plus the 200 who were killed topside from wounds and burns.

"I was sent to a compartment with a message. When I opened the hatch, another bomb exploded inside the ship. The concussion and flareback from the bomb blew me over the side.

"Burning oil was all over the water. I was fished out by a motor launch to be taken to the hospital ship U.S.S. *Solace*. We had no idea we would ever reach her. The launch also was being machinegunned.

"Once aboard, I was treated for shock and injuries. I was burned about my hands, head, face, and legs. I also had several shrapnel wounds in my chest and legs.

"I stayed on the *Solace* for 10 days. On December 20, I was transferred to the U.S.S. *Scott*. We arrived in the United States on Christmas day.

IN HOSPITAL

"I spent the next 3 months in the hospital at Vallejo, Calif. In March 1942, I was sent back to Pearl Harbor where I stayed for 38 months.

"I have a special reason for wanting to see a memorial built over the *Arizona*. I lost a lot of my shipmates in the *Arizona*.

"Everybody should have a special reason for having this memorial built. For not only will it stand in tribute to those 1,102 men still locked in the ship's decaying hulk, it will also stand as a living memorial to all those men who died on the battlefields of the Pacific.

"And it will be a lasting reminder that what happened at Pearl Harbor must never be allowed to occur again."

Small Business Tax Adjustment—H.R. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK IKARD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the President revealed to congressional leaders an administration budget of over $77 billion—the greatest peacetime budget of this or any nation. I do not wish to speak on that budget, but on the source of Federal taxes which must support that budget—our free economy.

Ours is a growing Nation. During the past year, our population increased 3 million and our Nation's work force increased about a half million. To sustain a growing population and provide jobs, a growing economy is necessary if we are to maintain our high standards of living and support increased Federal expenditures.

We have had a growing economy. The gross national product of 1957 was the highest in history, and indications are that 1958 exceeded that mark. But one segment continues to lag—that commonly referred to as small and medium-sized business.

In our analysis of small business conditions, we are fortunate indeed to have the reports of the Small Business Administration. May I call to your attention that in the 10th semiannual report for the 6-month period ending June 30, 1958, the Administrator reported that business failures through June 30, 1958, had been reported as 8,071 compared to 7,089 in the similar period for 1957.

Mr. Speaker, this is an increase of 14 percent—an alarming rate for a growing nation. May I point out that many Members of this House were alarmed last year when reports indicated that business failures in 1957 were 8 percent higher than in 1956. Why, in a period of national growth, are business failures continuing at such a high level?

The same reports show that in 1956 larger manufacturing corporations returned 12.4 percent on stockholders' equity; in 1957, 11.2 percent; and in the first quarter of 1958, 7.3 percent. The smaller manufacturing corporations, however, showed a return of 10.4 percent in 1956; 7.6 percent in 1957; and dropped to four-tenths of 1 percent in the first quarter of 1958. This is a tremendous difference.

The Small Business Administration also points up a long-term trend which is of interest to every Member of this House. The Administration reports that from 1947 to 1957 the stockholders' equity in smaller manufacturing corporations increased from $5.9 billion to $9.5 billion—an increase of 62 percent. The equity in larger corporations increased from $59 billion to $132 billion—an increase of 122 percent for the same period.

Mr. Speaker, this is only one facet of the problem. The great bulk of small business is unincorporated, and the most substantial part of it is in the distribution and service trades. While there are no accurate figures on these unincorporated concerns, all the available evidence shows similar conditions exist.

Mr. Speaker, our economy has grown during the 10-year period covered by those figures, but it is evident that the rate of growth of smaller concerns has been less than half the rate of growth of the larger ones. Certainly with a growing nation it is necessary that the economic climate be sustained which will be favorable to the growth of all business enterprises. In the construction of tax laws, the Congress must not only look for revenue but seek that revenue by methods which will continue to foster and encourage further economic growth.

A review of the economic indications leads one to the firm conclusion that the tax laws, as now construed, do not grant small business concerns the same opportunity for growth as is enjoyed by their larger competitors.

Last year, your Committee on Ways and Means held extensive hearings on the general economic conditions and the influence of taxation on the health of our economy. These hearings demonstrated one fact above all concerning the sector of our economy known as small- and medium-sized business today. It demonstrated clearly that the greatest problem faced by the smaller concerns is their inability to retain sufficient after-tax funds to finance their growth. Most small- and medium-sized concerns are unable to obtain capital required for expansion in the open market as the larger concerns can do.

Over 85 percent of the Nation's business enterprises are unincorporated and hence are not in a position to raise capital by the issuance of stock. Further, experience indicates that the smaller concerns which are incorporated and do issue additional stock are unable to compete in the capital market with their larger competitors.

During the last session, the Congress authorized the Small Business Administration to license small business investment companies chiefly for the purpose of making long-term loans to smaller concerns. These loans constitute additional liability for business enterprises. There is a limit to the amounts of money which a small business should borrow. Indeed, many firms have already borrowed all they can or should from banks and other commercial lending institutions. Right now, the greatest need of the smaller concerns is increased equity capital, the chief source of which is retained earnings.

After extensive hearings last year, the Ways and Means Committee, in Report No. 2198, dated July 16, 1958, reported to the House:

> Your committee is convinced that one of the greatest problems confronting small and medium sized business is the acquisition of sufficient capital to modernize and maintain a rate of expansion experienced by their larger competitors. In this regard your committee is aware of the fact that small and medium sized businesses must rely to a very large extent upon retained earnings for modernization and expansion. Thus, there is a need to allow such businesses to retain more earnings after taxes to provide the funds necessary for growth. To aid in achieving this end your committee has investigated thoroughly various proposals to postpone, or to reduce, taxes based upon reinvestment in inventory and depreciable property, and would have liked to have included a provision along these lines in this bill. However, it has been forced to the conclusion that the budgetary limitations under which all tax relief must now be considered are such that any tax reduction which now could be granted under a reinvestment formula is so small as not to represent any meaningful tax relief to small business.

Mr. Speaker, the small business tax adjustment bill, H.R. 2, which I have introduced, is designed to assist small and medium sized businesses to maintain a rate of expansion experienced by their larger competitors by allowing such businesses to retain more earnings after taxes. The bill provides that a person engaged in a trade or business shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year an amount equal to the additional investment in the trade or business during that year. This deduction shall not exceed $30,000 or 20 percent of the net income of the trade or business, whichever is the lesser. Additional investment is measured in the bill by the aggregate of the increase in depreciable property used in the trade or business, inventory, and accounts receivable attributable to sales to customers in the ordinary course of the trade or business.

This adjustment will make immediately available to all businesses an opportunity to obtain capital for business expansion, thus widening employment opportunities, simulating competition, and broadening the sources of revenue needed to sustain an increased budget for a growing nation.

It is my sincere hope that every Member of the House will give earnest and sincere study to conditions now confronting small and medium sized business. The principle of a tax adjustment based on the reinvestment of earnings is the most meaningful step which the Government can take to help solve this national problem. America has long been recognized as a land in which the door of free enterprise is always open. Passage of this act would reaffirm the determination of the Congress that a free government through the proper construction of tax laws can create an economic climate in which these smaller concerns can grow and prosper.

Perpetual Calendar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, on January 15 last, I introduced H.R. 2323, a bill to make the calendar fixed and perpetual. The perpetual calendar is the product of my constituent, Mr. Willard E. Edwards, electrical engineer. The great Commonwealth of Massachusetts has endorsed the calendar, as has the Legislature of Hawaii. At least 195 cities in 65 foreign countries have been made acquainted with the perpetual calendar.

I include for printing in the RECORD a statement by the originator of the calendar, Mr. Willard E. Edwards:

February has only 24 working days in usual years, not counting holidays, but the months preceding and following it can have 27. This causes much confusion and a difference of three twenty-fourths, or 12.5 percent in the number of working days in January or March, compared with February.

When both Lincoln's and Washington's birthdays are holidays, this difference becomes even greater. It can then be five twenty-seconds, or 22.7 percent. Employees paid by the hour thus earn considerably less money in February than in January or March. However, from this reduced income they may have to pay the same monthly rent and utility bills.

Conversely, employers paying employees a monthly salary may have a reduced output in February. In either case, such a short month is unfair, expensive, confusing, and unnecessary.

History says February used to have 30 days in the old Roman Calendar. It was then the 12th month of the year. September, October, November, and December were also in their Latin-numbered places as the 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th months.

The fifth month was a 30-day period named Quintilis. But during Julius Caesar's reign, its name was changed to July to honor Julius. However, Romans considered even-day months unlucky and odd-day months as lucky. Therefore, to pay further tribute to Caesar, a day was taken from February and added to July. This left February with 29 days in the Julian Calendar.

When Augustus Caesar became emperor, he was similarly honored. Sextilis, the sixth month, was renamed August. But since it had only 30 days, another day was taken from February. Vanity and superstition thus disrupted the previous order and left an awkward 28-day February in the Augustan Calendar.

Other faults were inequalities in its divisions, its lack of fixity, and its inaccurate leap-year rule. Pope Gregory corrected this latter fault in 1582, and the calendar then took his name. He also made January the first month of the year.

However, the month lengths are now exactly the same as in the Augustan Calendar. Consequently, the lack of fixity and the inequalities still exist. The inconvenience of using the Gregorian Calendar, and the cost in time lost in reference and in computations, are incalculably great.

This has been obvious for many years, yet correction is a relatively simple matter. It would affect nobody injuriously and everybody beneficially.

The calendar is an instrument in daily use for measuring time. It should be precise and fixed. It should have equality in all its divisions. In 1919 such an arrangement was devised, and it is now known internationally as the perpetual calendar.

This proposal has fixity through the simple means of counting one day each year as a day apart. It has equality in that each month has 26 working days, plus Sundays or Sabbaths. The quarters are also equal. It has regularity in that the months of each quarter always have 30, 30, and 31 days, as shown herein.

The day apart is counted outside the order of the week. It is called simply "New Year's Day," an international holiday, and the third day of an annual 3-day weekend. The second day of the year becomes Monday, January 1, the first business day of the new year.

The day apart is counted exactly as the extra day we now have when traveling from Japan to Hawaii. In crossing the International Date Line, ship captains call this extra day "Meridian Day." Just as a ship may be known as the USS *Thomas Jefferson* or the *APA–30*, so this day apart may be also known by a name or a number.

If called by a number, it would become January zero and would be easily accounted for in all computations. The logic of this is that we start all measurements with and from zero. Look at your speedometer, an engineer's scale, or a 24-hour clock.

Other advantages of the perpetual calendar are evident from its study, as shown in this article. Many holidays (all of them, if so legislated) fall on Monday; and all birthday and other anniversaries would always fall on the same day of the week.

Change is the result of natural growth, and no progress is ever made without change. Let's be progressive and adopt the Perpetual Calendar for our daily use. We can thus eliminate the lack of fixity in the present calendar and the inequalities of all the months, especially February.

A Discriminatory Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have long subscribed to the merits of the "try, try again" principle as applied to meritorious causes. Therefore, in introducing H.R. 2418, I am urging for a third time the repeal of the so-called, but misnamed, cabaret tax—the most discriminatory, ancient, and unrewarding of all the wartime emergency excises. I believe I was the first Member of Congress to initiate legislation to eliminate this discriminatory tax. This was in the 84th Congress, when on January 5, 1956, I introduced H.R. 8153, and I believe my renewed proposal to the 85th Congress was the first of some 17 such repeal bills presented at the last session.

Recent legislative history records, Mr. Speaker, that the House of Representatives, as a whole, conforms to my "try, try again" principle with respect to this sorely needed legislation. Three times has this distinguished body voted relief from this onerous excise and sent its recommendations to the Senate. Unhappily, that body has not seen fit as yet to concur. I trust that in this 86th Congress perseverance will have its reward.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that this so-called cabaret tax would have long since been repealed had it not suffered from an unfortunate christening some two-score years ago, at the time of World War I. That, Mr. Speaker, is the hoary vintage of this unjust and still uncorrected Federal taxing policy. Realistically, the cabaret has passed from the public scene; only our seniors in this body will remember it, and not too nostalgically; only a smattering of our more youthful colleagues would now know how to search out a lingering vestige of this unmourned symbol of the gay nineties or the roaring twenties. Yet the prohibitive 20-percent excise that was written for and named for the cabaret applies to the hotel dining room and the well-lighted, carefully operated supper club where dine-and-dance entertainment still survives this 20-percent impost. If, perchance, some of my distinguished colleagues are contemplating a social night out to celebrate the wife's birthday, they would have but meager choice in this Capital City of an appropriate venue affording opportunity to dine and dance. And if they are lucky enough to find a surviving establishment where they might enjoy an anniversary waltz with their ladies fair, they must face up to a 20-percent charge on top of the dinner check.

But the problem of this discriminatory tax is not to be considered lightly, because, in principal effect, it is a tax on employment. Over the last decade it has been an excise of declining return for the Treasury; it has become, in fact, a tax of no return. The paltry $40-odd million per annum this tax now returns to the Treasury likely does not pay for its policing and certainly does not compensate for the personal and business income-tax revenues lost because of the almost complete blackout this uneconomic tax imposes upon what once was and again would become a substantial segment of the entertainment business. I am impressed by the comprehensiveness and conservativeness of an independent economic survey made by a reputable national factfinding organization at the instance of the American Federation of Musicians.

The Research Co. of America reported that of the 83,000 playing musicians who earned their principal livelihood from music in 1954, 40,912 were employed in places subjected to the 20-percent tax and an additional 13,429 had part-time employment in this area—the dine-dance business representing more than half of the gainful employment for all instrumentalists. The average earnings for musicians thus employed was $3,042, making the musician one of the most economically distressed of all American workingmen.

The survey revealed that repeal of the 20 percent tax, which I seek in H.R. 2418, would immediately result in a gain of 63 percent in employed hours for 41,000 musicians working in dine-and-dance establishments and thus increase

their annual earnings by some $2,000 each. Up to 35 percent more musicians would be employed—a total employment gain of more than 100 percent for this sorely distressed category. Surely, in point of employment alone, this tax must be repealed without further damage to our national job potential.

In the event of repeal, the survey found, establishments now struggling under the 20 percent impost declared their intent to expand their business and employ more musicians to the extent that $36 million more in Federal income taxes would flow to the National Treasury. This factor, together with the resultant gain of 65 percent in the working hours of musicians already employed in 20 percent establishments thus adding some $16 million in income tax revenues, more than compensates the Treasury for the $40 million per annum now derived from an excise that stultifies business and denies employment.

These economic findings, Mr. Speaker, do not take into account other substantial gains to the Treasury that would flow from the repeal of the 20 percent cabaret tax. The survey from which I quote found that for every additional musician thus returned to work by reason of the repeal of this tax, there would be employed between five and six additional people such as other entertainers, waiters, cooks and other service help.

It happens that my personal interest and sympathy lies in great measure with the American musician upon whom we must depend for the propagation, even the survival, of a fundamental living art. In my home city of Seattle I served as a trustee and as president of our Symphony Orchestra Association. Thus I know intimately how severely the music art is beset by a chilling climate compounded of technological displacement and an indefensible Federal taxing policy.

I yield to no Member of this Congress, Mr. Speaker, in my desire for a balanced national budget. I trust that my colleagues in the House will join me in the unique privilege and opportunity of disposing of at least one of our many excises while at the same time making possible the flow of more sorely needed tax revenues to our National Treasury through the creation of employment and the stimulation of legitimate business.

Hawaii Statehood—50 in '59

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. BURNS

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, recently Hawaii was highly privileged to welcome five very able and distinguished Members of the 85th Congress who came in their capacities as Members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives pursuant to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii made of the chairmen of the respective committees.

The purpose of the visit was to scrutinize at first hand existing conditions in Hawaii and Hawaii's readiness for statehood. No one could have worked more diligently or more thoroughly than did these capable and outstanding Senators and Representatives. In accomplishment of their mission they pursued every avenue of pertinent inquiry; talked to as many people as possible; and, under the least constrained circumstances, left, in a word, no relevant stone unturned to obtain every fact.

In a New Year's message to Hawaii's people the junior Senator from Idaho, the Honorable FRANK CHURCH, has stated brilliantly and concisely the conclusions he drew from his searching inquiry. With his usual graciousness, the distinguished Senator has consented to my insertion of this message into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, the 86th Congress faces tremendous challenges. Legislation that will be considered is of grave importance to the lives and welfare of our people. It is my considered opinion, objectively, that no legislation is of greater import than Hawaii statehood. There could scarcely be a more convincing statement in support of this fact than the message of the Honorable FRANK CHURCH. I am most highly honored, therefore, to present for the consideration of the Members of the House the thoughtful, closely reasoned, and brilliantly stated report of the Honorable FRANK CHURCH on his inquiry in Hawaii:

TIME FOR STATEHOOD IS RIGHT NOW

(By Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho)

We are fast approaching the time of decision on whether Hawaii is to become our 50th State. In all likelihood, the decision will rest with the coming Congress.

If its answer is "Yes," then we will have welcomed in, as an integral part of our country, the last of our incorporated Territories.

Statehood will confer upon the people of the islands, long since citizens of the United States, fundamental rights of self-government equal to our own.

They will then elect their governor, as we do ours; they will then be entitled to two U.S. Senators and a voting Representative in the Congress; and they will participate with us, every fourth year, in the election of the President.

But if the answer should be "No," let no one be deceived that Hawaii will remain indefinitely an American Territory.

To be neither in nor out, but to stay a colony, is no more acceptable to our fellow Americans in Hawaii, than it was to our own forefathers.

They were subjects of the English king; they bore arms in his defense, and paid the taxes he levied upon them.

Again and again, they petitioned him, through his appointed governors, for redress of their grievances, but he refused to grant them more than limited rights of self-government.

So, their call to reason, "no taxation without representation," became, at last, a call to arms.

Yet, despite this national birthright, we are today denying our fellow citizens in Hawaii many of the same prerogatives refused our forefathers by George III.

TAX PAYMENTS

In 1957 the Hawaiians paid over $150 million in Federal taxes, a larger total than several of the existing States, but Hawaii had no representation in Congress to vote either on how much tax should be collected or upon how the money should be spent.

In time of war, Hawaiians shoulder arms with the rest of us, yet they cannot vote for the President who shapes their foreign policy, or for representatives in Congress who together hold the purse strings over their defense.

To remedy these inequities, the people of Hawaii want statehood. They are tired of standing, hat in hand, at the door of our Union.

But what we must understand is this: if we refuse to let them further in, they will, in due course, demand to be let further out.

That we actually face a choice between these alternatives, my recent visit in Hawaii has convinced me.

There, I was privileged, as one of five members of Congress from the Interior Committees of both Houses, to conduct a joint investigation of the statehood question.

I talked with hundreds of Hawaiians from all walks of life. I listened to every argument, pro and con.

The consensus of this opinion, together with the most current information we could gather about social, economic, and political conditions in Hawaii, left me strongly persuaded the islands are ready for statehood, and we'd best admit them now.

FOR STATEHOOD

There is no doubt but what the vast majority of Hawaiians favor statehood. Even before Pearl Harbor, a plesbiscite showed the population indorsing statehood by a margin of two to one.

Since then, support for statehood has steadily grown stronger. In 1950, a proposed Hawaii State constitution was approved by the people of the Territory by a vote of more than 3 to 1.

Today, I would judge that the Hawaiians want statehood fully as much as did the Alaskans, who a short 4 months ago, proved their sentiments when five out of six voted to ratify the bill admitting Alaska as the 49th State.

DESERVING CASE

The proponents of Hawaiian statehood believe their case just as deserving as was that of Alaska. Indeed, the islands' economy is far more developed.

Sugar and pineapple are produced in abundance by the best paid field workers in the world. The export of Kona coffee is increasing.

On the big island of Hawaii itself, the 300,000-acre Parker Ranch is next to the world's largest for Herefords, while to every island the tourists comes in burgeoning numbers, beckoned by the gentle trade winds, in quest of the dazzling beaches and inviting waters.

Hawaii, for all its tropical beauty, is bustling and prosperous. No one can charge it with being a poor relation.

MELTING POT

It is true that Hawaii is the melting pot of the Pacific. The people are a polyglot mixture of native Hawaiian, Caucasian, Japanese, Filipinos, and Chinese, and the crosses between.

But it is also true that Hawaiian life and culture, though it clings naturally to many happy phrases, songs, and customs out of its colorful past, is nevertheless essentially American.

The cities, the stores, the homes, streets, and schools, all bear the unmistakable stamp of the United States.

In fact, anyone from southeastern Idaho, accustomed to a tabernacle in his neighborhood, would not feel a bit estranged in Hawaii.

One of the most striking tabernacles I have ever seen is in the center of Honolulu, and on the windward side of Oahu there is

located a Latter-day Saints temple fully as impressive as that in Idaho Falls.

Nearby, 20 newly completed buildings on a 100-acre tract mark the site of the $3½ million Latter-day Saints College of Hawaii.

MANY TALKS

These are but a few glimpses gleaned from many I gathered during the inquiry we made in Hawaii.

We met with public officials and private citizens alike, with teachers and students, with judges and housewives.

We talked with businessmen and labor leaders. I had a morning's conference, in private, with the presidents of the Big Five, interests that were once opposed to statehood but now favored.

When we were through I came away determined to work hard for Hawaiian statehood in this coming session of Congress. Already a Commonwealth Party has been activated in Hawaii.

COMMONWEALTHERS

I talked with several of its leaders, who would like to see Hawaii set loose from the United States, absolved of all Federal taxes, and granted full rights of self-government, while the people retained for themselves American citizenship and the continued protection of the American flag.

Patterned after the British system, the commonwealth idea is alien to our American tradition of building one nation, rather than a loose-knit empire.

Today, this Commonwealth Party is small, but if statehood is refused to Hawaii, it will grow rapidly.

I shall not forget the parting shot of one prominent commonwealth proponent.

"Senator," he said to me, "right now, the people of these islands want statehood.

"If you refuse it, they will turn to our solution, and the time will come when you will have to recognize the independent Commonwealth of Hawaii."

To us on the mainland, facing westward toward an Asia awakening from its slumbers, Hawaii is much too important; not to be made an inseparable part of the United States.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.*
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.*
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 2828 Conn. Ave.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.*
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.* The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*	
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Lennon, Alton, *N. C.*	
Lesinski, John, *Mich.*	
Levering, Robert W., *Ohio*	
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.*	
Lindsay, John V., *N. Y.*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn.*	The Congressional
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*	The Washington
McCulloch, William M., *Ohio*	4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif.*	
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*	
McFall, John J., *Calif.*	507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGinley, Donald F., *Nebr.*	
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak.*	
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*	220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*	1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McSween, Harold B., *La.*	
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*	
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*	115 Dale Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*	
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*	
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*	
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*	
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*	Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*	
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*	
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.*	The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*	The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*	
May, Catherine, *Wash.*	
Meader, George, *Mich.*	3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*	
Meyer, William H., *Vt.*	
Michel, Robert H., *Ill.*	
Miller, Clement W., *Calif.*	
Miller, George P., *Calif.*	
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*	3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Milliken, William H., Jr., *Pa.*	
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*	2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*	8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga.*	
Moeller, Walter H., *Ohio*	
Monagan, John S., *Conn.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Moorhead, William S., *Pa.*	
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*	
Morris, Thomas G., *N. Mex.*	
Morris, Toby, *Okla.*	220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La.*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*	204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*	
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*	
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*	The Coronet
Murphy, William T., *Ill.*	
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*	
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*	
Nelsen, Ancher, *Minn.*	
Nix, Robert N. C., *Pa.*	
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*	
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*	2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*	
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*	The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*	The Congressional
O'Hara, James G., *Mich.*	
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass.*	
Oliver, James C., *Maine*	
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*	
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*	100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*	
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*	117 Carroll St. SE.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*	
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*	
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho*	
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*	
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*	
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*	
Pirnie, Alexander, *N. Y.*	
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*	228 2d St. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*	
Polk, James G., *Ohio*	
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg.*	
Powell, Adam C., *N. Y.*	
Preston, Prince H., *Ga.*	
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*	
Prokop, Stanley A., *Pa.*	
Pucinski, Roman C., *Ill.*	
Quie, Albert H., *Minn.*	The Coronet Apt., 200 C St. SE.
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*	
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*	
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*	
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*	
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*	
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*	
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*	The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*	1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*	6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*	5603 24th Ave. SE., Hillcrest Hgts., Wash. 21, D. C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*	
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*	3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*	
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*	
Rivers, Ralph J., *Alaska*	
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*	6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y.*	
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*	
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*	
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass.*	The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*	Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*	
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*	
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*	
Rostenkowski, Dan, *Ill.*	
Roush, J. Edward, *Ind.*	
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*	
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y.*	
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y.*	
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif.*	
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*	
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*	
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*	
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C.*	
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*	433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*	
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*	
Shipley, George E., *Ill.*	
Short, Don L., *N. Dak.*	
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*	
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*	
Simpson, Edna Oakes, *Ill.*	
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*	5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*	
Slack, John M., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*	
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif.*	
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*	204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Neal, *Iowa*	
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*	
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*	Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*	
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*	
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*	
Stratton, Samuel S., *N. Y.*	
Stubblefield, Frank A., *Ky.*	
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*	
Taber, John, *N. Y.*	
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*	
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*	
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*	6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y.*	Mayflower Hotel
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*	2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*	3301 Mass. Ave.
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*	
Thompson, T. A., *La.*	1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, Keith, *Wyo.*	
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*	
Toll, Herman, *Pa.*	
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*	
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*	
Tuck, William M., *Va.*	
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*	
Ullman, Al, *Oreg.*	
Utt, James B., *Calif.*	
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*	
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*	
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*	4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*	
Wallhauser, George M., *N. J.*	
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*	
Wampler, Fred, *Ind.*	
Watts, John C., *Ky.*	
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*	9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Weis, Jessica McC., *N. Y.*	
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*	
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*	
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C.*	
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*	5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*	
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*	
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*	1001 26th Rd. S., Arlington, Va.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*	
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*	
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*	
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*	
Wolf, Leonard G., *Iowa*	
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*	
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*	
Young, John, *Tex.*	
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*	4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*	
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*	

DELEGATES

Burns, John A., *Hawaii*	

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*	2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Series, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Place SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Appendix

Address by Hon. Spessard L. Holland, of Florida, Before the 40th Annual Meeting, American Farm Bureau Federation, Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on December 10, 1958, the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] delivered a thought-provoking and challenging address at the 40th annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation in Boston, Mass.

In order that Senators may have an opportunity to read this address, which calls attention to some of the most vital issues of our time, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TREND AND A CHALLENGE

(Address of SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, U.S. Senator from Florida, Democrat, before the American Farm Bureau Federation's 40th annual meeting, December 10, 1958, Boston, Mass.)

I am happy to be one of your speakers at this 40th annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and to join such distinguished guests as Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, my able colleague, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, and your former president, Allan Kline. I had the pleasure of addressing you at your 36th annual meeting in New York City and I am indeed glad to be with you again today.

May I express to you, and through you to all members of the American Farm Bureau Federation, my deep appreciation for your naming me to receive the American Farm Bureau distinguished service award in 1956 at Miami. This award brought to me very great pleasure and pride, and I am humbly grateful for all it signifies.

My association with your splendid organization has brought me many pleasant and helpful experiences. I have frequently sought and obtained valuable assistance from the members of your exceedingly capable Washington staff, and have always enjoyed the full cooperation of the officers and members of our Florida Farm Bureau.

I have found your thinking on agricultural legislation—and indeed on national affairs generally—in close accord with mine, in most instances, and when we have not been in complete agreement you have always been courteous and tolerant of my convictions. In my opinion, your State organization in Florida, and your national organization always approach constructively and patriotically the many difficult problems in the field of agriculture, and I congratulate you warmly for your sound leadership and your major contributions in this vital field.

I am glad to have this opportunity to talk to you this morning about a trend in our country which disturbs me greatly and which, if permitted to go unchecked, may well lead to the destruction of our American way of life—the finest yet conceived by man.

The trend I speak of is that which is now moving away from individual freedom and initiative toward an ever enlarged Federal Government and a labor supergovernment—at the expense of the rights and privileges of States, local governments, and individuals. Unfortunately, many of our people cannot understand that they themselves are the Federal Government, that they pay all of its bills, and that they the people get nothing free from their Government. They do not realize that by looking to that Government for handouts—each of which costs them certain rights and privileges—they lose each time a little more of their freedom, and that little by little they are giving away their heritage. Even as small children we heard with amazement the Bible story of a hungry Esau who carelessly sold his birthright for a mere bowl of pottage, but now—as mature men and women—some of us are willing to actually give away our heritage—since we not only pay for the small bowl of pottage we receive in return for certain of our freedoms but we also pay extra for handling charges.

Having worked closely with your officials throughout the years, I know that they and you are well aware of this dangerous trend. I know that the American Farm Bureau is moving in many ways to try to reverse that trend, but I hope that all of you, as individuals and as members of this powerful organization, will leave this meeting today determined to personally wage an unremitting fight against a situation which, if it is permitted to continue, will gradually—but surely—take away from us many of the precious liberties for which much blood was shed by our forefathers. Perhaps some of you will feel that I am unduly disturbed over this drift away from our constitutional form of government. I hope that my remarks will convince you that the situation is serious—almost perilous—and that it presents a personal challenge to every man and woman within the sound of my voice.

For a first point in this connection I mention the stand of the American Farm Bureau in the last Congress on legislation designed to curb the Federal courts by prohibiting the invalidation of State laws by Federal laws—under the doctrine of preemption—unless Congress has clearly so provided or unless an irreconcilable conflict exists between the Federal law in question and the State laws. I commend you strongly for this action, and I hope we will enact such legislation early in the next Congress. Certainly I will do my utmost toward that end.

Recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States adversely affecting States rights, have caused alarm and consternation in the minds of many of us who respect and wish to preserve both a Federal union of sovereign States and the clear separation of powers among the legislative, the judicial, and the executive branches of government.

It was heartening to note that on August 20 of this year, at a meeting of the conference of chief justices of the State courts, the alarming trend of these Supreme Court decisions was condemned by chief justices from the North, South, East, and West. The chairman of the committee that submitted the report was the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Michigan. I am happy that distinguished lawyers all over our Nation—particularly those holding positions of highest judicial responsibility—find it no longer possible to keep silent in the face of these constant invasions of the rights of the States and of our legislative branch of government. I am glad that most of the chief justices of our State courts share my belief—and your belief—that State and local governments should be sustained and strengthened.

The overall impact of U.S. Supreme Court decisions during the past two decades has been to press rapidly the extension of Federal power at the expense of our citizens' rights to govern themselves through their State and local governments in matters of primarily local concern. In my opinion, the Supreme Court has wrongly assumed the function of policymaker and has arrogated to itself the important legislative function. Under our Constitution the function of making policy is delegated to Congress, to elected representatives of the people who are directly responsible to the people. It is for this fundamental reason that all of us must feel concern that members of the Supreme Court, who hold office for life and are responsible only to themselves, have abandoned the role of judges and assumed the role of lawmakers.

The power of the Supreme Court is very great, and its decisions are not reviewable by anyone. It is, therefore, of critical importance to every American that this Court adhere strictly to the judicial role and abide by those enduring principles which are enshrined in our Constitution.

We have long boasted that in our free country we have a government of laws and not of men. Let me state here, along with most of the chief justices of our States, that a study of recent Supreme Court decisions will raise grave doubt as to the present truth of that proud boast.

No one expects a dynamic country like ours to stand still. Moreover, we expect our body of law to grow in meeting new and changing conditions. But under our Constitution it is not the duty of the men sitting on the Supreme Court to write into our law their passing notions about sociology and economics and education. Nor do they have the right to nullify and destroy the powers of our sovereign States and of our local units of self-government.

In my opinion, the recent strong pronouncement of the State chief justices is an important first step in reversing the trend which is rapidly destroying State and local governments and the fundamental principle of separation of powers. They have accepted the challenge and I am sure their courage and convictions will encourage others to face up to the serious realities of the situation. Now such organizations as this one must join in an active effort to enlighten the general public as to the seriousness of this problem. I am convinced that, when informed, the public will see to it that we return to our constitutional form of government.

A second element in the national trend away from basic freedoms—and a real challenge which must be met by organizations such as this and the rank and file of labor, is that disclosed in recent months by the McClellan committee which has pointed up

so that everyone could see—and no one could seriously deny—the appalling corruption, crime, and violence which exists in the high circles of some labor unions. Gang bosses, goon squads, bribery, and embezzlement have no more place among unions than they have among our other American institutions. Our working people themselves are the ones who are most hurt by immoral and dishonest union leadership in those unions where it exists.

Perhaps some of you saw a few weeks ago a statement by Jimmy Hoffa, the head of the giant Teamsters Union—which has been one of the main targets of the McClellan committee—predicting that he would lead a mighty Teamster Union of 4½ million members spanning virtually the entire transportation industry, and then added, with characteristic brashness, "We will not be stopped by the McClellan committee, laws, or the courts".

After listening to dozens and dozens of witnesses one of the members of the McClellan committee, Senator ERVIN, of North Carolina, stated a few days ago that "This superlaw which the teamsters attempt to interpose over the government of the United States and the arrogant implementation of their activities is something which continues to concern this committee and I believe the entire country."

This situation certainly should cause great concern to all Americans and to the agricultural producers in particular, because the trucking industry performs a vital and necessary service in getting a large part of your produce to the market place. As a matter of fact, trucking has become so highly important in the transportation of food that the Nation's total trucking bill for the shipment of food now exceeds that paid for rail shipments. An extended tieup of this industry at harvesttime could wreck entire segments of agriculture and bankrupt thousands upon thousands of farmers—as well as handlers and processors of farm products—throughout the Nation.

In the next session of Congress, I expect to join again with other like-minded Senators and Representatives in support of legislation to prevent the domination and exploitation of rank and file union members by irresponsible and greedy labor bosses. Only in this way can the workingman know that his dues will be properly spent and that he will have the traditional rights that should be accorded to American labor. Only in this way can the farmer have reasonable assurance that his products will get to market, and the millions of inhabitants of our great metropolitan areas be sure that their food needs will be supplied.

One would naturally hope that the rank and file of labor would take the lead in this fight which is of such great importance to them, but since the actual livelihood of these men can be cut off in the twinkling of an eye by the labor bosses—and human nature being what it is—the major brunt of this effort may have to fall upon shoulders such as yours and the shoulders of the general public. If this proves to be the case, I am confident that you and the millions like you in America today will meet the test. Although this is in the field of labor, it is primarily a fight for freedom—and if the fight is lost our very way of life may be lost with it. This is indeed a serious challenge which requires the attention of every American.

A third battle in which you have been engaged and in which I hope you will continue to interest yourselves, and one which illustrates possibly clearer than any other the objectives of those who continually press for an ever larger and more powerful Federal Government, is the constant effort to increase the coverage of the Federal wage-and-hour law, which already applies to approximately 24 million workers in interstate commerce.

In the last Congress bills were introduced to extend coverage of the law to activities affecting commerce which would bring under the law even the corner drugstore with one employee. Even a cursory reading of the Constitution and the debates on this act when it was first enacted will show beyond the slightest doubt that this spread of control over local mercantile and service organizations was never intended nor deemed constitutionally possible by the New Deal sponsors of the act—President Franklin Roosevelt and Senator Hugo Black—now a member of the Supreme Court.

One of these bills of the last Congress would have extended coverage to almost 10 million additional workers, including roughly 1½ million agricultural workers. The bill finally reported by the Senate Labor Committee would have added 6 million employees, and did not include the agricultural workers. Obviously those who push the measure prefer to follow a course of divide and conquer.

Fortunately, these measures were not passed, but the efforts which I have mentioned indicate so clearly the ultimate goal of their sponsors—to finally bring every employee and every business in the Nation within the scope of these laws by regulating local wages and local hours of employment.

We have defeated these efforts before, but those who keep pressing this issue are continually working to sell their phidosophy, and unless the millions of citizens who oppose this paternalistic trend join in opposition to this drive to further encroach upon our freedoms, the day will surely come when we will not be able to stem the tide.

This effort illustrates clearly the lengths to which some eager so-called ultraliberals will go, regardless of constitutional limitations, to force the Federal Government to take over the control of the everyday local activities of our people.

Of course, we are always hearing stories with reference to the relationship between agriculture and labor, and I heard one recently which may bear repeating.

A farmer in Virginia was plowing one day when his tractor turned over on him, badly injuring him. He was immediately rushed to an overcrowded hospital in the Washington area but because of the lack of a bed in the proper ward, hospital officials were forced to place his bed in the hall in the maternity wing. The farmer was in a great deal of pain and was anxiously hoping for relief. To his great delight he heard two new mothers talking about a new practice which resulted in no pain at all. This they call twilight sleep.

A few minutes later a doctor came down the hall and the suffering farmer caught him by the sleeve and said, "Doctor, I am in horrible pain. Can't I get some of that twilight sleep?" The doctor said, "Well, sir, that is used only for labor." In all his pain the farmer came back angrily, "That's the trouble with the world today—everything for labor and not a single thing for us poor suffering farmers."

I have mentioned only three of the major problems, not solely in the field of agriculture, which mark the present dangerous trend in other fields, but which are just as important to the members of this organization as are strictly agricultural problems. But I am sure that you know that the next Congress must continue to face serious problems directly in the field of agriculture, made more serious by the trend which I have mentioned, as well as by the changed makeup of the new Congress, which will contain more so-called liberals than has been the case in many years. Incidentally, the other day I heard a present-day liberal defined as one who has his feet firmly planted in the air.

Some of you may recall that several years ago in a Senate speech I brought to the attention of the Senators and the American people the seriousness of the situation then existing in some of the agricultural areas of our country where farmers were openly advocating complete dependence on the Federal Government. I said at that time that I did not want to cast any reflections on sections of our country or on organizations or individuals, but I was alarmed and felt it my duty to call attention to what I had observed.

The information upon which I based my comments was gained through my personal participation in hearings held by the Senate Agriculture Committee in many of our States, particularly in the great Northwest. I was astounded to hear witness after witness come before our committee and plead for Government support prices at 100 percent of parity on every agricultural product—across the board—on nonperishables and perishables alike—produced on a so-called "family unit farm." One witness, franker than most of the others, stated in so many words that what he wanted was to have the gravy train start running again.

I was shocked to hear numerous witnesses state that their objective was the redistribution of the land and fairer distribution of the wealth produced on the land—a philosophy which should curl the hair of all of those who have worked and fought for the preservation of the American system of free enterprise. How foreign this thinking is to that which has always characterized typical American farmers. There is no group in America today which—as a whole—has enjoyed a higher reputation than the American farmer, for being independent, conservative, and willing to stand and fight for individual opportunity, private enterprise and, in short, for our way of life. I glory in that fact and warmly commend this organization for insistently carrying forward in that noble tradition.

The Congress must take its share of the blame for the situation which I have mentioned because, almost without exception, I found that farmers in those areas which had relied heavily on high rigid price support programs—which they had used as a crutch so long that they were afraid to try to walk without it—were the ones pressing for this additional Federal assistance. It is beyond my comprehension why these people do not look around them and discover that the only major agricultural crops in real trouble today are those very ones which have been depending too long on high price support. Many other crops, not dependent on price supports, are in healthy, prosperous condition. It is so clear that the solution to their problems—and the restoration of that wonderful feeling of self-reliance and freedom—lies in the direction of less Government support and control, rather than more.

It was considered necessary during World War II that we have high rigid price supports as an incentive to achieve the necessary increase in production for our war efforts—and it was only fair to continue them briefly until agricultural producers had sufficient time to level off their production compatible with peacetime markets. But the longtime continuation of such a program in peacetime could only lead, as it has led, to a greater loss of freedom by the farmers affected and to the piling up of huge surpluses in Government warehouses which hang over market prospects like black clouds above the horizon. The complete unsoundness of price supports large enough to induce farmers to produce crops to sell to Uncle Sam for storage has been thoroughly established.

Since 1954 the Congress has been making some progress in the effort to solve this huge agricultural problem. You are familiar of course with the long-drawn-out congressional fights which produced the Agricultural Acts of 1954 and 1956, which in the main followed the American Farm Bureau recommendations. Limited flexible price supports were provided in 1954 to replace high rigid price supports, much land was taken out of production under the soil bank, set up in 1956, and other provisions of the acts of 1954 and 1956 were steps in the right direction. Great efforts to reduce surplus supplies by various export devices and by enlarged domestic grants for food and feed programs were made—with some success. Expanded research for new uses has been helpful. Cooperating with Congress several producer groups are doing helpful things for themselves, such as advertising, trade promotion, dealer service, private research and greater use of Federal marketing agreements and orders.

This year the Agricultural Act of 1958 was passed in the effort to deal on a trial basis with those three basic crops which were in worst condition—corn, cotton and rice. This act provided an opportunity for corn and cotton growers—corn producers by referendum of the whole group, and cotton producers as individual planters—to move away from some of the domination and regimentation by the Federal Government. I was greatly pleased when our corn producers accepted by overwhelming vote the challenge to do away with acreage allotments and the artificial distinction between commercial and noncommercial areas and also to accept lower and more realistic support prices. I am proud to report that our Florida corn farmers voted 97.8 percent to do away with corn acreage allotments, leading all other states in the referendum. Your organization is entitled to greatest credit for the favorable result of the corn election. I am convinced that many cotton producers who must soon make their decisions will also choose to regain much of their independence by increasing their acreage and accepting lower price supports. Only in this way can they make American cotton competitive again in world markets and also discourage the speedy growth of the synthetic industries. In the case of rice the act applied a freeze to the current acreage allotment, which otherwise faced a ruinous 50-percent cut, and also permitted reductions in price support after the first 2 years.

In the last Congress we also increased the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture under Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. With the aid of this act our exports of farm products have reached an all-time high. We extended the program from June 30, 1958, to December 31, 1959, at a rate of $1½ billion per year—or by a total of $2¼ billion. This program has proved quite helpful in reducing our surpluses and in improving our foreign markets, but I hope we will not become overly dependent upon it. It has proved to be an exceedingly fine emergency measure to handle surpluses, but it can never be regarded as a substitute for private trading.

It appears likely that in the forthcoming session, Congress will allow the temporary programs for corn, cotton, and rice sufficient time to demonstrate their value, but meantime will tackle the problems now faced by the other so-called basics—wheat, peanuts, and possibly even tobacco—and I hope the final results there will be as encouraging as the 1958 act promises to be with reference to cotton and corn.

Of this group, wheat is in the most serious trouble and will almost certainly require new legislation. With an existing surplus already on hand the wheat crop this year approaches 1½ billion bushels—53 percent larger than last year's crop and the largest in history. Without growing a single bushel of wheat next year we would be able to supply our domestic and export needs with 325 million bushels to spare on July 1, 1960.

Probably one of the first major agricultural bills to face us in the next Congress will be one to provide for direct payments to farmers out of the Federal Treasury. Several similar bills for this purpose were introduced in the last session of Congress, and I think we can anticipate their reintroduction and consideration early in the next Congress.

It was about 10 years ago that the so-called Brannan plan of direct production payments was originally proposed and the Congress has repeatedly refused to adopt it. This latest version leaves many questions unanswered and there are a multitude of reasons why it should not be favorably acted upon by the Congress. Among other things it would stimulate production and bring about a gerater surplus to depress the market prices, which in turn would increase the cost of the proposed program which is already estimated to run between $8 billion and $16 billion per year.

Because of the size of the refund payments the program would become one of the greatest political footballs of all times and because the proposed program is limited to the six basic commodities, the Congress undoubtedly would be subjected to strong political pressures to include more and more commodities.

I hope Congress will continue to disapprove such measures and will continue to enact constructive farm legislation working patiently step by step toward the new farm program which so evidently is required. But I cannot emphasize too strongly that the existence of the dangerous philosophy in other fields which we have been discussing, and some of the activities of the U.S. Supreme Court, the aggressiveness of ultraliberal Members of Congress, labor leaders and even some of our farmers, present a real challenge to every American.

We may as well realize that if Congress turns to the left generally in solving other important national problems, we must expect the leftwing philosophy to prevail in the field of agricultural legislation.

I commend the American Farm Bureau for its constant efforts to help lead us back to the highway of basic Americanism and away from the road which leads to a paternalistic welfare state.

I commend the cotton industry and corn producers for their strong desire shown in their support of the 1958 legislation and in their reactions since that time to alter their course away from more and more Government assistance and control and toward more freedom and self-reliance.

Thanks to groups such as this, we see some glimmer of hope that we will be able to reverse the trend which is leading us down the road to socialism—but let there be no mistake about it, we are still in the midst of a devastating attack in the name of so-called liberalism on individual and State rights intended to be protected by the drafters of our Constitution. These attacks must be met fearlessly and forcefully.

Unquestionably a mighty struggle is in the offing and we can win it only if those of us who feel strongly about preserving individual freedoms and private enterprise are willing to make real sacrifices. We cannot win it by sitting idly by while ultraliberals sell their unsound theories to unwitting people throughout every economically troubled area of the Nation.

As individuals I hope you will make your views known to your friends and your acquaintances and most of all to your Senators and Representatives in the Congress.

I feel particularly close to the American Farm Bureau, and I think one of the main reasons for this is that for years you have approached problems of national importance with the basic proposition always in mind that the continuance of individual freedom and responsibility, and the maintenance of strong, independent and responsible State and local governments, are all necessary to the preservation of stable, constitutional government.

I am glad that you, our strongest agricultural organization, are committed to this fundamental principle and it is fortunate for the Nation as a whole that you take an active interest in matters of general interest and importance outside of agriculture, realizing, of course, that if the political and economic structure of our Nation is unsound, agriculture will suffer along with everyone else.

As an organization you appear to have accepted the challenge to help lead the way back to our fundamental Constitution and to the way of life which has made this country great. I hope each of you as an individual will also accept that challenge. Agriculture has an opportunity—indeed a high responsibility—to return to the self-reliance which has characterized the American farmer throughout all of our history and point the way to the return of all of our people to basic Americanism. I wish for you the fullest measure of success in your dedicated efforts and I shall have a small part in working with you to bring about that success, in the best interest of agriculture and of all the American people.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an exceptionally fine editorial concerning the speech entitled "A Statesman From the Deep South," published in the Oklahoma City Times of December 23, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATESMAN FROM THE DEEP SOUTH

A refreshing breath of true statesmanship has come from Florida in recent days, and it is all the more gratifying because it is that of a Democrat speaking courageously after the recent Democratic victory in which many observers claimed to see a mandate for more spending, more labor domination, and a greater leftward shift coming out of the election returns.

Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND obviously doesn't go along with those timid souls who have been panicked into the idea that the Federal Government must now spend more money than ever, provide more gimmes for the voters, kowtow more cringingly to Walter Reuther and his cohorts, and wander still farther into the welfare state concept.

Addressing the recent annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Senator HOLLAND pulled no punches in the arena of farm policies. He said that the only major agricultural crops in real trouble today are "those very ones which have been depending too long on high price support."

He enlarged upon this theme when he said that it is clear that "the solution to the farmer's problems lies in the direction of less government support and control rather than more."

He added: "The complete unsoundness of price supports large enough to induce farmers to produce crops to sell to Uncle Sam for storage has been thoroughly established."

"Unfortunately," he said, "many of our people cannot understand that they themselves are the Federal Government, that they pay all of its bills, and that they, the people, get nothing free from their Government. They do not realize that by looking to that Government for handouts—each of which

costs them certain rights and privileges—they lose each time a little more of their freedom, and that little by little they are giving away their heritage."

Mr. HOLLAND is senior Senator from Florida and member of the strategic Senate Appropriations and Agriculture Committees. He warned his hearers that the Government "is now moving away from individual freedom and initiative toward an ever-enlarged Federal Government and a labor 'super-government' at the expense of the rights and privileges of States, local governments, and individuals."

In the field of labor-management relations, he said: "A real challenge which must be met by organizations such as this and the rank and file of labor is that disclosed by the McClellan committee, which has pointed up so that everyone could see, the appalling corruption, crime, and violence which exists in the high circles of some labor unions. Gang bosses, goon squads, bribery, and embezzlement have no more place among unions than they have among our other American institutions. This situation should cause great concern to all Americans and to the agricultural producers in particular, because the trucking industry performs a vital and necessary service in getting a large part of your produce to the market place. An extended tie-up of this industry at harvesttime could wreck entire segments of agriculture, and bankrupt thousands of farmers, as well as handlers and processors of farm products, throughout the Nation."

Undoubtedly the majority of Oklahoma voters, regardless of party, wish that equally courageous and statesmanlike utterances might come from members of the Oklahoma delegation in the House and Senate.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, inflation is a vital subject that concerns us all.

It has been the subject of much study by many persons.

In this connection, there has been brought to my attention a noteworthy dollars-and-cents appraisal of what the word "inflation" really means.

It was prepared by Sylvia Porter, a discerning observer of our economic scene, who writes a column "Your Money's Worth."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column carried in the Monday, January 19, 1959, issue of the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH
(By Sylvia Porter)

WHAT INFLATION IS AND WILL BE

This is what inflation is—this is what you have lived through if you are over 20 years old.

In 1939 a quart of milk cost under 12 cents; in 1949 a quart cost 22 cents; in 1959 the price in my neighborhood store is 29 cents. In 1939 a loaf of sliced white bread cost under 8 cents; in 1949 a loaf cost under 14 cents; a loaf now costs over 19 cents.

In 1939 a leg of lamb, per pound, cost around 28 cents; in 1949 lamb per pound was over 71 cents; it's now over 77 cents. In 1939 a pound of coffee cost a bit over 22 cents; in 1949 it was over 55 cents; the average per pound now is in the 70-cent range.

In 1939 the lowest priced, five-passenger, four-door car in the Buick line was $984; in 1949 it was $2,089; in 1959 it's $2,545.

In 1939 the wholesale price of a gallon of gas, excluding taxes, was under a nickel; in 1949 it was a dime; now it's 12 cents. And in 1939 a ton of cold rolled steel at wholesale was $62; in 1949 it was $90; in 1959 it's $146.

Meaning of inflation

This is what inflation is—a sharp rise in the prices of goods and services, an extraordinarily rapid climb in the cost of living in a relatively short period.

Only when you compare the price of milk and bread, of bus fares and meat, does the tale come through. Only as I dug through the newspapers of 1939 and 1949 did I truly understand what I'm saying when I write that the dollar which bought 100 cents of goods and services in 1939 buys less than 48 cents worth in 1959.

Because we lived through this 1939–59 inflation does it mean that we will repeat the experience between 1959 and 1979?

It does not follow. Not at all!

Just recall the background and you'll see what I mean.

In 1939 we were coming out of a decade of depression. During all those years of stagnation in the thirties we built only a picayune number of houses, plants, factories, machines. We had not only been stopped in our economic tracks by the great depression of the thirties; we had been pushed into a massive retreat.

Economy strained

On top of this stagnation came World War II. Suddenly our woefully underbuilt economy was strained to the utmost. Suddenly tens of billions of dollars were poured into the business stream as the Treasury did the equivalent of printing money to finance war production. With so much cash chasing so few goods, only wartime controls and our patriotic acceptance of them kept the price lid from blowing off.

Then came the postwar period and the removal of controls.

Under the circumstances the price levels of prewar days were utterly unrealistic. Money pent up during the war was scrambling for goods and services at almost any price. We were striving to make up for more than a decade of depression stagnation and war. The upsurge in prices and wages was simply a normal response to conditions then existing.

Now reread those little down-to-earth statistics. Notice how the pace of the price increase in most cases has slowed.

That's only logical, too. We have more than caught up with the underbuilding of the depression years and the scarcities of war.

Barring another global war, there is no basis for price rises in the next two decades to match what we've seen in the past two.

A gently rising price level is a reasonable expectation.

Steel in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it was nearly 300 years ago that Thomas Newcomen was born in England. His improvements of the steam engine were so successful that up to the time of the American Revolution it became known as the Newcomen engine.

In honor of his memory, about 30 years ago there was set up a voluntary group called the Newcomen Society. Its members meet all over the country, and it is the custom to have addresses made by persons who are experts in their line.

Mr. Roger Blough, president of the United States Steel Corp., addressed the society on the 4th of December last in New York. The title of his address was "Steel in Perspective."

Mr. President, I have been advised by the Public Printer that certain remarks on this subject which I desire to have printed will occupy about two and one-half pages of the RECORD at a cost of $202.50. I therefore ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding this cost estimate, that the remarks I send forward be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEEL IN PERSPECTIVE

(A talk by Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board, United States Steel Corp., before the Newcomen Society in North America, Hotel Pierre, New York, N.Y., Dec. 4, 1958)

Last year the steel industry of the United States observed the hundredth anniversary of the Bessemer and Kelly processes which launched the age of quantity steel production in this country. For that reason, my associates and I are particularly pleased that the Newcomen Society honors steel tonight.

It is the custom of Newcomen on these occasions to appraise and record the progress that has occurred in some particular field of human endeavor, and, in keeping with this worthy tradition, it had been my intention this evening to review the history of these past hundred years in steel, to point out a few of the myriad ways in which the almost explosive growth of this industry has influenced the growth of America.

But the more deeply I delved into the past the more clearly I seemed to hear the portentous rumble of events taking place today all around the globe, an insistent, earth-shaking rumble with profound and perplexing implications, not only for the steel industry but for all industry, and, indeed, for our Nation's future position in the world.

So it occurred to me that the mere contemplation of our yesterdays, however gratifying that may be, can provide little more than the momentary illusion of escape from the vexing realities of today and the pressing hazards of tomorrow. For history is truly meaningful only when viewed in perspective—only as we discern how past events have shaped the present and foretell the future.

Therefore, I propose that we try for a moment tonight to lift ourselves out of the earthly clay that surrounds us and to seek some vantage point in time and space whence we can look down upon the whole tableau of world progress in steel.

And from that vantage point let us glimpse in passing this land of ours as it was a hundred years ago, when the modern age of steel began.

In those days we were not far advanced from a frontier nation. Buffalo still roamed the great plains and Indian war whoops were still heard in the West. Steel, such as it was, was scarce and expensive. Its production was measured in pounds, instead of in millions of tons as it is today. And when Andrew Carnegie was born, for example, it was selling at $500 per ton.

Then came the invention and development of the processes which brought mass production to the steel mills. From the volcano-like maw of the Bessemer converter, steel poured forth in a veritable flood, and sold in the marketplace at a tiny fraction of its former cost. Except for the iron from which it was made, it became, in fact, the most inexpensive and most plentiful metal in America; and today, of course, it still is.

That the strongest and most versatile of metals should suddenly become the most economical and most available of metals was a miracle which produced a mighty surge of progress that no other nation in the world, as yet, has equaled. There was abundant steel for everyone and every purpose.

There was steel for the plowshares that transformed the vast prairies of the West into productive fields. Steel for the blades of reapers and binders that harvested our multiplying supply of grain. Steel for barbed wire to fence in great herds of cattle on our unwooded grasslands. Steel for bridges across our rivers and for rails that soon knitted thousands of isolated communities into one great, united Nation. And, above all, there was steel for the tools of industry—for machines that multiplied the strength of men many thousands of times, and raised them from muscular pygmies to productive giants.

In less than half a century—a mere wink of Father Time's eye—the United States became the foremost producer of steel in the world. And simultaneously it became the world's leading industrial nation. Never in all the annals of history had there been an equal economic advance in so short a time.

But that was as nothing compared to the progress of the last half century. Our material well-being moved to unheard of heights, and was shared by every economic group at every economic level of our society. In two world conflicts at a time when we had about 50 percent of the world's steel capacity, we were able to furnish the counterweight which swung the balance in favor of democracy. And since World War II we have shared over $60 billion worth of our wealth with our friends in many parts of the world. That is no mean accomplishment for the youngest of major powers.

Now, I do not mean even to suggest, of course, that the revolution in steelmaking was solely responsible for the spectacular growth of America's productive power in this past century. It could not have been; for we had no corner on steel's raw materials, and the processes were available to all visitors.

Clearly there were many other factors: the climate of economic and political freedom which has been our heritage, the adventurous spirit of risk and reward that uniquely motivates private initiative, and the insatiable competitive urge that is so characteristic of the American people and their enterprises.

Yet no one can doubt that supremacy in steel has been an essential ingredient in the achievement of America's productive leadership. A nation's economic wellbeing and its standard of living may be measured in terms of money, or kilowatts, or in many other ways; but one of the most reliable guides for this purpose, perhaps, is found in its per capita use of steel.

It is not accident, then, that in 1956 United States led the world with a reported 1,232 pounds of steel per person annually, followed by West Germany with 847 pounds, and the United Kingdom with 788. Soviet Russia had moved up to fifth place 481 pounds and China trailed at the bottom with 18 pounds per capita.

So if we look only at the past we might feel pretty complacent and smug about the margin of leadership that we have established; and we might even conclude that the miracle of this past century could only happen in America.

But if—well aware of the past—we look down from our imaginary vantage point in space, and view in perspective the whole of history as it is being written now, we cannot escape the fact that the same irresistible, surging force that has swept us forward during these past 100 years, has been reborn in nations all around us. It has been sired by a new awareness among people on every continent that they do not have to be hungry, shabbily clothed, or poorly housed. They insistently seek the same improvement enjoyed by the Western World—not alone as an end in itself—but primarily, perhaps, as a means of achieving the highest purposes of human freedom and culture, through an ever-rising level of life and service.

And so it is that wherever we look, we see the world in a state of ferment.

That has happened many times in the past, and when the ferment subsided, the world was no longer the same. Yet this ferment differs from all the others. It is not only global in scale but is reaching even to the firmament. It has many new ingredients—political, social, economic, scientific and technological—and they are reacting more violently than ever before. And of one thing only, I think, can we be certain: that when this ferment, too, subsides—perhaps not in our lifetime—the world will be changed again in remarkable ways. For the great tides of history are as ripples when viewed in the light of the change that impends.

In the field of metallurgy and particularly steelmaking we are only at the beginning of a revolution that will dwarf any that has preceded it. And what is happening in steel is but a part of a fast changing science and technology, moving so rapidly that it defies prophecy.

We, at once, lift our eyes to the stars in anticipation of space travel and at the same time we are discovering a whole new universe within the tiny atom. In practical terms, this means that we will conquer space and that nuclear energy will one day be universally available at any place on the globe—from pole to pole, and at the far-reaches of every ocean.

The importance of this perspective in steel was brought home by an incident which occurred at the White Sands Missile Proving Ground in New Mexico some weeks ago. After a day devoted to missiles, faster-than-sound planes and much conversation about lunar probes and the limitless thrust of man into space, an earnest young scientist, who knew we had built launching platforms, asked this very simple and revealing question:

"How far along are your plans for building a launching platform on the moon?"

Fantastic question, but which one among us deems it as fanciful now as a mere 10 years ago?

Accompanying this atom-space revolution is the up-welling desire I have mentioned of many millions of people for more knowledge, more economic tools and for more power to improve their lives and their well-being. The teachings of our own American story of how to create more for the many by providing more and better tools of production are having far-reaching effects. Those American teachings are pointing the way and providing the motivation for the earth-wide surge of peoples seeking their own better day and their own better way. We can see it in Latin America, in Europe, in the Middle East, in Africa, in Russia, in India, in China, and Japan. As a measure of this surge, let me point out to you that since World War II 20 or more new nations have come into existence.

Here we begin to gain a little perspective. This surge of peoples for economic betterment, embracing many conflicting political creeds and many different stages of industrial development, has one thing in common—the recognition of the value of steel as the foundation of physical strength, and as a basic tool of production from which is generated the many needed tools of production.

At the turn of the century, more than a quarter of all work energy in our own Nation was supplied by animal and human muscle. Today, nearly 99 percent of all useful work is performed by machines—from the giant steel rolling mills to the tiny mechanism which activates an elctrical watch. That, too, is a part of our American teaching, clearly visible to others around us.

It is significant, therefore, that since World War II, at least 20 nations have more than trebled their production of steel, while several other countries are starting to make their own steel for the first time. In fact, the only major steel producing nations which failed even to double their output during this period were the United States and the United Kingdom.

Under the auspices of the State Department, representatives of the American steel industry gained further perspective recently when they toured the steel operations of the Soviet Union and studied the methods and plants which give Russia, today, an annual capacity of only slightly less than 60 million ingot tons which compares with our 141 million tons. Much, I think, was learned on both sides, but particularly impressive to the Americans was the determination of the Soviets to narrow the gap between us with all possible speed.

In this year alone they are constructing seven new blast furnaces having a daily capacity of 3,000 tons each. And if you have read Khrushchev's announcement of the new 7-year plan, you know that Russia intends, by 1965, to increase its steel production to 100 million ingot tons per year. That is about 15 millions tons more than the American steel industry will turn out in this present year of low demand. You may have noted also that this enormous expansion of Soviet capacity will require a capital investment which—at official rates of exchange—amounts to $25 billion.

By way of another example, a recent news dispatch reports that out of more than 600 million people in Communist China, 50 million are engaged in a feverish campaign to produce iron and steel in the crudest of makeshift furnaces. Their aim is to double, within a single year, their last year's output of about 5 million tons.

It is not well to smile at these early efforts of the Chinese to build a steel industry where manpower is so plentiful and so low cost. The Chinese in ancient times had a flourishing iron industry. It is only reasonable to foresee sizable steel production in that land.

In India three new 1-million-ton-capacity mills are being built and a fourth is contemplated.

A number of other countries, since the war, have built or are planning to build their first steel plants. Among them are Pakistan, South Korea, Portugal, the Philippines, Israel, Colombia, Venezuela, Peru, and our own Hawaii. Several Latin American countries are already producing steel and together, can now supply about 50 percent of the steel needs of that entire continent.

Now what does all this industrialization in other parts of the world mean to us? Here are some significant trends. Although we have grown from 66 million ingot tons of production in 1940 to 112 million in 1957, steel producers in other lands have moved from 89 million tons to 209 million—or twice as much. In recent years, our Nation's proportion of world steel production has dropped substantially—from 54 percent in 1946 to 46 percent in 1950; from 46 percent in 1950 to 35 percent in 1957. And in this recession year of 1958, we will have produced less than 30 percent of the world's steel.

Even for so short a time as the next 5 years, we may project an increase in capacity of our own industry of about 15 million ingot tons; but any realistic appraisal for the rest of the world must be triple that amount.

Now for additional perspective. With reasonable accuracy one can project the world's population for relatively brief preiods. It is said that the United States will have 260 million people in the short span of 22 years—by 1980. By then it is estimated that world population will have increased from 2.9 billions to 4.2 billions—a tremendous growth indeed.

Now what does all this portend for us? A few things are clearly visible and they are not years away but at hand. The great bulk of the population growth will take place outside of the United States—15 times our own. That population growth will be accompanied by an increase in steel production at an accelerated rate which we cannot hope to match—pound for pound—nor should we expect to do so. For each additional pound of steel wherever it may be produced is one more pound inevitably devoted to raising the living scale of someone among these billions of people, unless—perish the thought—that pound of steel should be destined to take part in a world holocaust?

I should make it clear in passing, perhaps, that this challenge to our industrial leadership is by no means confined to the realm of steel. It is everywhere. At the beginning of World War I, for example, the United States produced 83 percent of the world's oil and had 80 percent of the known reserves in what is now the free world. Today it produces only 47 percent of the free world's oil and has but 13 percent of the known reserves.

So we must face up to the probable fact that our Nation will no longer have the preponderance either of steel production or of total production that it has enjoyed in the past—nor, let me say parenthetically but emphatically, will any other nation fall heir to that preponderance.

It is also plain to see that, in the steel industry, we will encounter tougher and tougher competition both internally and externally. We will have to compete against products made by our industrial imitators under conditions where the operators of the machines of production in foreign lands will receive only a fraction of the compensation they are paid in this Nation. And no one should underestimate either the quality of those machines or the aptitude of their operators.

Already, in steel, there is a straw in the wind. It may be only a straw, but I give it for what it may be worth. Exports of steel from the United States in 1958 will fall off roughly 40 percent from 1957. But what is more significant, in this year when our industry operated far below its capacity, our steel imports are expected to be 10 to 15 percent above those of a year ago. And may I add that while recognizing the value of such expedients as tariffs and quotas, increased tariff protection is not the ultimate or basic answer because free nations must depend upon trade. Trade is mutually beneficial. Moreover, if experience teaches us anything, then certainly we have learned that the power to erect tariff walls is not one in which America enjoys a monopoly.

All these observations are enough to induce us to do some sober thinking.

The challenges which face us, as I see them, are of two kinds and they are interrelated. One is in research and technology, and, great as that challenge is, the second is far greater. It relates to ourselves as individuals and what we are going to do, even now, as the ferment I mentioned earlier boils up around us and changes the world in which we live.

In the whole spectrum of science and technology, there is probably no more important field than metallurgy, for what we accomplish there may well determine our survival. Metallurgy is rapidly entering upon a new era. Two others preceded it. The first was that of chemical control when man began to understand the chemistry of steel and to develop steels according to chemical composition. In the second, metallurgists with the aid of the microscope, began to see and understand changes in the properties of steel which had formerly been achieved empirically. This was called "visible microstructure." But, now we are venturing into the tiny universe of the atom, the era of atomic structure.

It has been possible in the laboratory to produce a single crystal of pure iron in the form of a filament with a tensile strength approaching 2 million pounds per square inch. That is more than seven times the strength of the strongest steels that exist today. As I understand it, the problem is to find a way to get rid of the defects ordinarily existing in iron crystals, and, by rendering them more nearly perfect, to produce the super steels of tomorrow.

Why is steel of so much greater strength needed? Well, until recently, our efforts have centered around those steels which hold their strength at the exceedingly high temperatures generated by air friction on plane or rocket surfaces at supersonic speeds. Such metals are still very important—and stainless steels figure prominently among them—but the emphasis has shifted to steels of greater strength at ordinary temperatures. Why? Because with the advent of intercontinental ballistic missiles, the supersonic plane will be relatively less important in our national defense.

But beyond the stratosphere, where there is no air friction, the problem of rockets or space ships traveling at 18,000 miles an hour is not so much one of heat as of strength. A space vehicle passes through the atmosphere in a relatively short time and is not subjected to anything like the frictional heating of the slower supersonic plane. Consequently, designers want a steel of a vastly greater strength at relatively low temperatures and one with greater resistance to corrosion—especially corrosion under stress. It now takes 1,000 pounds of rocket and fuel for every pound of "payload," in the form of a satellite or what may eventually be a space ship. Obviously, if a steel could be made twice as strong as at present, the weight of the rocket could be cut in half, or the payload could be greatly increased.

There is, moreover, a need for greater resistance to corrosion under stress which has been accentuated by use of "exotic fuels" to power vehicles for space travel. Some of these fuels, such as fuming nitric acid or materials containing fluorine, are extremely corrosive, and all the more so under conditions of stress. Even if a steel can be developed that will cut the weight of a space vehicle in half, it will be of no avail if it cannot resist corrosion of fuels within the container.

What we learn of value about steel for interplanetary travel will undoubtedly be applied to great advantage on this planet we call earth. In this dawning age of nuclear energy there are certain to be countless new requirements for steel, and structures of new steels, not yet dreamed of in our most imaginative moments. Whether it be in a racket we loft a third of the way to the moon, or in a drill pipe that dips 25,000 feet into the earth or in a submarine gliding under the North Pole, steel will be there, provided we in steel and in all industry find better ways of meeting our greater challenge.

For however successful we may be in maintaining leadership in the field of scientific research, our greatest challenge relates—as I said a moment ago—to what we are going to do as individuals, as economic groups and as a nation in the face of this fermenting world.

Can we in business and industry fully grasp the meaning and the implications of this ferment? Can we aid our fellow men to understand it so that they in turn may act in the common interest? And can we bring to our elected representatives in Government a real and dispassionate comprehension of the part they must play if they are to enhance—and not weaken—our Nation's position among other nations of the world?

In the answers to these simple questions lies the destiny of America. But how shall we answer them?

We know for example that America's ability to compete successfully with these other nations in the years ahead will rest primarily upon what is known technically as the "formation of capital"—or, in simpler language, upon our capacity to acquire and to pay for new, more efficient, tools of production.

We know that the nation which equips itself most widely and wisely with the most efficient and productive tools will be the strongest nation in the world when this present ferment subsides.

We know further that when Soviet Russia—or any other Communist society—needs $25 billion for new and better steelmaking facilities, it raises the necessary capital through taxation—direct or hidden—and the people have no voice in the matter. We in America, however, rely, and happily so, only on the voluntary action of those who have saved, and are willing to invest, such sums in these tools.

The Communist governments can be ruthless in the imposition of taxes and can thus provide themselves with vast quantities of tools. We, on the other hand, must rely upon incentives if we are to keep pace in this international race for supremacy in productive facilities. So clearly we cannot afford to discourage saving and investment if we are to keep in the running. Yet that is exactly what we have been doing for years in this country.

Let's look at this picture for a moment:

In any free capitalistic society, the only way to acquire the tools of production is through profit or the expectation of profit. But how many of our people really understand the nature and the function of profit. Not one, I suspect, in a thousand.

Even if they turn to the dictionary, they are led to believe that a profit is something that is left over in the till after all the expenses of a business have been met.

But the truth is, of course, that a corporate profit, in industry, is what is left over after all expenses—except one—have been met. And the one expense that has not been satisfied is the payment we must make for the use of all the tools, machines, and other capital facilities that are necessary to the process of production. And of all the costs of doing business, this payment for the use and improvement of tools is the most important, perhaps, to our national growth and survival.

When a corporation has paid all its other expenses, provided for depreciation, met its Federal income taxes and come down to its last-line profit on the income statement, it has not yet paid 1 penny for the use of the tools that its shareowners have provided for it. And since there is nothing left but profit out of which to pay for those tools, it is clear that the size of the profit determines the quantity and the kind of tools that an enterprise can command.

Thus the simple fact of the matter is that, over the years, a profit is not something that a corporation keeps in the till. It is something that a corporation pays out of the till for the use and improvement of tools.

Yet today there are people who would tax our profits away, control them away, or bar-

gain them away. But what thoughtful American would wish to tax our tools of production away, or to control them away or to bargain them away and thus consume the basic industrial resource from whence cometh our strength? Nobody would expect us to employ men without paying them; and certainly nobody expects us to use tools, machines, and other capital facilities without paying for them also. The trouble is that people do not understand that profits mean tools and tools mean profits. They are in a very real sense the selfsame thing. You can't have one without the other.

Now this, I think, is probably the most important lesson in what might be called the economics of production. We in business and industry understand this branch of economics because we have learned it in the school of experience, and because it is our very life. But did you ever stop to think that few of our fellow men have had the opportunity to study and understand it because the school of practical business experience is really the only school in which it is being taught?

So if our labor leaders inveigh against corporate profits—and if they force uneconomic wage increases that are "costing" American products out of markets at home and abroad and American workmen out of their jobs, whose fault is that? Can we honestly say that we have done everything in our power to share with our own employees this specialized knowledge we have in the economics of production?

And if our representatives in Government impose burdensome penalties upon thrift and investment—and if they are reluctant to revise the depreciation provisions of our tax laws as the governments of all the other leading industrial nations of the world have done, is that really their fault? It is their responsibility but is it their fault? Have we done our part as fully as we should?

Gentlemen, we are only in the first skirmishes of a worldwide battle of production that is destined, I believe, to rage for many decades to come. America's resources in this economic contest include, and must include, the use of its first team both at home and abroad. And that first team is a strong, well-equipped American industry. A moment's reflection is enough to demonstrate that whether or not America will emerge triumphant from that contest depends in large measure on the virility of American industry. And industry's strength depends directly on our ability to win the understanding of Government, of labor leaders, of investors, and of all other groups in our land, in a national effort to encourage—rather than hinder—the investment of the capital necessary to develop and acquire the finest tools of production on earth.

And if America does not survive that battle, upon whom will future historians lay the blame?

Will they say that our Government officials were too engrossed in the pursuit of politics to care about production? Will they say that our labor leaders were too selfish to consider the future of their country? Will they say that our educators were too cloistered in abstract economic theory to open their minds—and their curriculums—to the basic economic facts of life as they apply to business?

Or will they say—with greater truth, perhaps—that we of business and industry—we who know and understand the facts—were too busy, too indifferent, too impatient, or too inarticulate to teach these facts in the simple, straightforward language that our fellow men could comprehend and believe? Will they record that we, who have been so successful in winning public acceptance of the products of industry, just simply didn't bother to try to gain public understanding of the profits of industry?

You know, somewhere, in some undiscovered cave, there may be some fugitive from a television set who does not know that LS/MFT—Lucky Strike means fine tobacco. But have we ever advertised the fact that LP/MFT—less profit means fewer tools? I leave that question with you.

And in doing so, let me quickly grant that within the boundaries of these economic ideas I have expressed, there are many areas within which reasonable men may differ. But upon issues as vital as these to America's future, there is surely no area within which men of patience and understanding cannot arrive at an agreement. To promote that understanding is the greatest challenge—and the gravest responsibility—that confronts us today.

Now I have led you far from those happy achievements of the past to which I had once intended to devote this talk tonight. But as we come back to earth from our vantage point in outer space let no one suppose that we in the steel industry are dismayed by the worldwide surge of competition that I have just described.

Never before have we done so much research nor had so many developments underway to meet our technological and production challenges. Never has our industry been more aware of the manmade hurdles that stand in the way of mutual understanding, industrial growth, and the preservation of our national strength. And never have we had more determination to rise above those hurdles.

In the last analysis it is all part of doing the job we know best how to do—the job of production—the task of creating more things for more people to the advantage of all.

So as we face the challenge ahead, let us always remember that, as a nation, we still have the only abiding advantages we have ever had in world affairs—the advantage of ideas and of ideals. And, curiously enough, these ideas and ideals have been of the greatest advantage to us when they have brought advantage to others. Guided by that central and simple thought, our people—armed with understanding—will not falter in their progress.

More Funds for Great Lakes Connecting Channels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared entitled "More Funds for Great Lakes Connecting Channels."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE FUNDS FOR GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS

In reviewing the 1960 budget submitted to Congress yesterday, I am deeply disappointed by the inadequate funds recommended for a particular program—the deepening and development work on the Great Lakes connecting channels.

The $23 million proposed for this work is, I'm informed, absolutely inadequate—if we are to put the target date of 1962 for completion of the work on the connecting channels.

As we recognize, the Great Lakes States beyond Lake Erie will be denied the benefit of the completed seaway until the connecting channels are deepened to handle 27-foot, deep-draft shipping to and from the lakes region.

OPENING OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY IN APRIL

As we know, the St. Lawrence Seaway itself is scheduled for opening in April of this year.

The event will mark a milestone of progress in this great joint United States-Canadian project that will open the door of the Great Lakes to deep-sea trade and commerce of the world. Until now, the seaway commerce into the St. Lawrence has, unhappily, been restricted because of limited depth—prohibiting the passing of deep-draft vessels through its channels.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence area includes many of our States of the upper Midwest, and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec in Canada. Within this area live one-third of the people of both countries.

In this Great Lakes region, too, is concentrated the greatest industrial-agricultural complex in the world. To unwisely postpone benefits of the seaway to the major portion of this region, I believe, would be detrimental to both United States and Canadian interests.

Subsequently I shall make recommendations for additional moneys, in accordance with the amount the Corps of Engineers can effectively put to work, to try to assure completion of the connecting channels by the target date of 1962.

In the days ahead, also, the Congress will be faced with a number of additional important decisions on the seaway.

SEAWAY FILM

Incidentally, I am aware that a great many Members have not had the opportunity to benefit from an on-the-spot look as the St. Lawrence development project—one of the greatest engineering and construction feats in history.

To provide an idea of the scope, magnitude, and potential of this great project, I have arranged for a film to be shown in the Old Supreme Court this afternoon.

The film, produced by the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, is the fourth in a series of many entitled "The Fourth Seacoast," portraying the most recent development in the seaway.

The film, a 14-minute, color movie, will be shown between 2 p.m. and 3 p.m. this afternoon. As necesary, it will be rerun during that period to assure interested individuals a chance to see it.

Although I know that Senators will be extremely busy, I cordially invite you to drop in to see the film, if it is at all possible.

Stephen W. Downey, Able Lawyer, Civic Leader, and Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the truly great citizens of our country are distinguished by one common characteristic: they are primarily interested in people rather than just things. California lost a great citizen last week. He was Stephen W. Downey, a prominent civic leader and lawyer of Sacramento for almost 50 years. He died on January 12. Mr. Downey had a big mind and a warm

heart; he was a friend of the people. Never a holder of high public office or a seeker of political favor, he faithfully served the people by being a great citizen in his profession and in his community life.

As the accompanying press items report, Mr. Downey gained statewide, in fact national, recognition in the field of water law. He was always on the side of the people. He represented local water districts, power districts, and public utility districts. He understood California's complex water problems and he helped solve many of them, especially in the long years of legal work and legislative effort which gave rise to the authorization of the Central Valley project in 1935, and the establishment of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District in 1948.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news item from the Sacramento Bee of January 13, 1959, and an editorial from the Sacramento Bee of January 14, 1959.

There being no objection, the news article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Jan. 13, 1959]

Stephen W. Downey for nearly half a century one of Sacramento's leading citizens, died in the Sutter Hospital last night. He was 72 years of age. Downey was a nationally recognized authority on water law and the senior partner in the law firm of Downey, Brand, Seymour, and Rohwer. He was active in many of the community's most ambitious endeavors and had gained the respect of two generations as an expert attorney and a guiding light in development of Sacramento and California.

After a year of illness begun by a stroke, he entered the hospital Sunday.

Funeral services will be conducted at 11:30 a.m., Thursday, in Trinity Episcopal Cathedral. Burial will be private. The family requests remembrances be sent to the Golden Empire Council of the Boy Scouts of America or to the Red Cross.

PUBLIC POWER SUPPORTER

He specialized in representing agencies engaged in the construction of public projects and long had been an advocate and friend of public power development.

Both the city of Sacramento and county of Sacramento called upon him in recent years as the key consultant in water and pollution problems involving the waterways of metropolitan Sacramento.

He spent much of his life as an attorney for the State reclamation board and was the chief water counsel for the Sacramento Municipal Utility District.

Legislative committees and scores of State and regional administrative agencies sought his expert testimony on the water problems of the State.

WORKED FOR FOLSOM DAM

He was selected to head the committee for the dedication of Folsom Dam in May 1956, a project which he long supported and helped to bring about.

He represented water districts, flood control districts, power districts, irrigation and reclamation districts, and similar agencies in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys.

He also represented SMUD in the legal condemnation of the electrical distribution system of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

In recent years he was engaged in attempting to work out a settlement of water rights on the Sacramento River and the completion of the Sacramento-Yolo Port District project.

He appeared before many high courts on numerous occasions with major issues regarding irrigation and reclamation districts, including the Supreme Court of the United States.

BACKER OF CIVIC PROJECTS

In spite of being deeply and continuously engaged in complicated water-law problems of great moment, Downey gave generously of his time in furthering worthwhile civic endeavors.

He headed a community factfinding committee on hospitals in Sacramento. The committee's report led directly to the successful fund campaign to enlarge the Mercy Hospital.

The Boy Scout movement was one of his abiding interests. For many years he was president of the Golden Empire Council of the Scouts which serves metropolitan Sacramento and surrounding counties. He was honored with the Silver Beaver Award for distinguished service to boyhood.

Downey was named to head the Community Chest in 1933 and during World War II he was president of the United Service Organizations in Sacramento.

From 1947 to 1950 he was a member of the Sacramento County Probation Committee. In 1953 he became a member of the California Museum Association and was named chief of the trustees in charge of special bequests of the Golden Empire Council.

ACTIVE IN POLITICS

Although he never held public office, he was active in Democratic politics in Sacramento and the Nation. He was the brother of former U.S. Senator Sheridan Downey and was active in his brother's campaigns.

He often endorsed candidates for public office.

NATIVE OF WYOMING

He was born of frontier parents in Laramie, Wyo., on June 14, 1886. His father commanded a Union regiment in the Civil War and went to Wyoming shortly after the end of the conflict. His mother, whose emigrant train to Idaho was attacked by Indians, later went to Wyoming where she met the senior Downey.

Downey was graduated from the law school of the University of Michigan. He came to Sacramento in 1909 and opened a law office with the late J. F. Pullen, who later became the presiding justice of the district court of appeal.

Downey served with the 35th, 91st, and 40th Infantry Divisions during World War I and went to France in the summer of 1918 as a first lieutenant.

WIFE SURVIVES

After he left the service in 1919 he met and married Persis McIntire who survives him.

Downey was a member of the Sutter Club and for many years was an active member of the Sacramento Rotary Club. He was made an honorary member of the latter organization 6 months ago. He also was a member of the American Legion, an affiliation dating from the end of his World War I service.

Downey's other survivors include his children, John F., a partner in his father's law firm; Stephen, Jr., an Army colonel now stationed in Paris, France, with the Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers in Europe; Mrs. Henry Teichert of Sacramento; Mrs. F. J. Boutin of Woodland, Yolo County; and sisters, Mrs. Willie Fitch of Dallas, Tex.; Mrs. Dorothy Spicer of Berkeley, and Mrs. Alice Nelson of Alexandria, Va.

He also leaves 20 grandchildren. The family home is at 1300 41st Street.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Jan. 14, 1959]

Sacramento has lost one of its most distinguished and useful citizens in the death of Stephen W. Downey.

A leading member of the city bar for many years, he long ago became known as a foremost authority on State water law and its many practical applications.

As such he gave invaluable personal service to many public and quasi-public agencies such as irrigation districts, the State reclamation board, the Sacramento Public Utilities District, and the city of Sacramento.

He was as well a lifetime supporter of public-power development.

Yet, busy as he was in his own profession, Stephen Downey found time to give of his talents to many other worthwhile activities. His lifetime interest in training youth in the way it should go was expressed in long and active association with the Boy Scout movement.

He was a devoted man and won enduring respect from all with whom he came in contact because of a personal integrity which was reflected in everything he said or did.

He exemplified in his life those characteristics associated with the highest type of citizenship.

Who can measure in mere words the good such a man achieves in service to his generation?

Happily the good lives on after he is gone and what Stephen W. Downey did will go on and on to make his community and his State better and happier places in which to live as long as there are a Sacramento and a California.

Address by Hon. George D. Aiken, of Vermont, at Plant-To-Prosper Meeting, Memphis, Tenn., December 18, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on December 18, 1958, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] delivered a most interesting address at the plant-to-prosper meeting in Memphis, Tenn. It contains a concise history of farm problems and legislative action over the past two decades.

In order that Senators may have an opportunity to read the address and benefit from the experienced analysis of this great agricultural statesman concerning the many farm problems discussed, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was 18 years ago next month that I went to Washington as a Senator from my State.

Having lived on a farm all my life up to that time, it seemed to me a bit of remarkably good luck that I was assigned to membership on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The farm I had lived on comprised some 50 acres of woodland, pasture, and cropland.

Today it would probably be called a subsistence farm.

It kept about five cows and produced some fruit and vegetables as cash crops.

We never raised any wheat or cotton or peanuts or rice.

There was usually an acres or so of corn and a half acre of cigar-leaf tobacco.

The half acre of tobacco got all the fertilizer and the buyers who came around every

fall got all the tobacco at their own price—8 cents, 9 cents, 10 cents, or whatever they were willing to pay for it.

My efforts to raise peanuts and cotton ended in frustration.

The peanut shells didn't have any peanuts inside and the cotton proved to be ornamental only as it never got past the blossoming stage.

So, you see how well prepared I was to take my place on the Agriculture Committee headed by Cotton Ed Smith and which included veterans like Bankhead, of Alabama; Reed, of Kansas; Thomas, of Oklahoma; McNary, of Oregon; and Ellender, of Louisiana.

I started to learn something about agricultural politics almost the first month, being named to a subcommittee headed by Senator John Bankhead to hold hearings on the cotton-storage program.

Of course, I knew that a good share of our cotton farmers were producing about 200 pounds to the acre and sometimes more, and that it was un-Christianlike to expect them to sell that cotton for less than 10 cents a pound.

I had never given much thought to the storage program, however.

I didn't realize that ginning and compressing and storing was quite a good-sized business by itself.

At the very outset of the hearings, I learned that cotton storage wasn't just a simple economic system of carrying cotton over from 1 year to another.

I learned right away that there were big storage fellows at the ports and little storage fellows inland—at least that's what the witnesses said—and that there was some competition between the two.

It took me a little longer to find out that some of the big fellows also had a slight financial interest in the operation of the little fellow's facilities.

However, in real orthodox fashion the subcommittee set out to protect the little fellows.

Senator Bankhead was one of the most astute and lovable southern statesmen I ever knew. That means he was one of the astutest that there was anywhere.

It may have been his intuition and it may have been just his desire to see what the Yankee farmer from Vermont would do under certain circumstances that prompted him to leave me in charge of the hearing one afternoon.

No other member of the subcommittee was present.

I sat at the head of the table—little warehousemen sat on my left—big warehousemen sat on my right.

I felt pretty good at this display of confidence in me on the part of Senator Bankhead.

The hearing got underway and warmed up as it proceeded.

Pretty soon the sparks began to fly, my doubts began to rise and the practical results of that particular hearing was zero, except that I had had my first lesson in cotton diplomacy.

Since that first hearing in the winter of 1941, I have been on hearings relating to every conceivable agricultural program here and abroad.

I have heard expounded every possible theory which its author though would promote a more prosperous agriculture for the United States—or at least provide some specific advantage for the group which he happened to represent.

I have seen candidates for public office rise and fall on the issue of national farm policies.

Farm issues have permeated every election campaign and occupied much of the time of the Congress.

Farm organizations and commodity groups have clashed with one another and frequently factions within the same commodity group have opposed each other bitterly.

The only time I have known all major farm organizations and both major political parties to work together for a single farm program was during the years 1947 and 1948.

About 6 o'clock in the morning of June 20, 1948, the Congress presented the country with a new farm program backed by President Truman and the Republican Congress and by every major farm organization.

The two main features of this program were flexible price supports running from 72 to 90 percent of parity and a new parity formula which was so constructed so that it was expected to work properly forever after.

What happened?

The flexible price supports were promptly suspended and until very recently only operated during the years 1951 and 1952, when the Korean war made price supports inoperative anyway.

The new parity formula was so completely outmoded within a few years that it became worthless as a yardstick for measuring the parity price of many commodities.

Possibly cotton is the commodity to which the new parity formula is most applicable today.

We have had some good years since 1941; we have had some lean years—but, as for developing a national farm program which will serve us successfully for an indefinite number of years ahead, we are just about as far from success as we were 18 years ago.

Of two things we may be sure:

First, that any farm program which we may devise today will not necessarily be applicable to conditions which prevail tomorrow; and, second, politics will never supplant economics as a means of promoting farm prosperity on a long-range basis.

In this year of 1958, in spite of acreage restrictions, soil-bank incentives, production controls and other devices, American agriculture is setting an alltime record for production.

Temporary surpluses of certain commodities have become greater surpluses and apparently less temporary.

Technology and biology have thwarted every effort of the Congress to control production by law.

There are basic economic laws which do not lend themselves to political maneuvering.

Personally, it makes me feel good to think that the United States is the most productive agricultural country in the world and that our troubles are caused by surpluses rather than shortages.

The other day I read a prediction that the population of the United States would increase 100 million in the next 20 years.

While this may be disputed, we do know that at the present rate of increase we will be called upon to feed and clothe this increased number in not over 30 years.

This is the reason that while we stumble over the problem of surpluses, we are also planning to not only bring more land into cultivation but also to greatly increase the productiveness of acres and animals.

Sometimes I wonder if we really have surpluses today.

Or are we, through sheer obstinacy in refusing to see the facts of life accumulating, in the name of surpluses, food and fiber which ought to be flowing freely in the markets of the world?

The United States produces exportable quantities of cotton, wheat, tobacco, and vegetable oils.

The rest of the world needs these commodities, but because we have for years refused to look at the situation realistically we have seen the tobacco capital of the world move to Africa, competitive cotton production develop in a dozen countries, and the production of wheat subsidized by people of other lands who ought to be looking to us for their requirements.

The year 1958 marks a milestone in the course of agricultural legislation.

I am not referring to the corn, rice, and cotton legislation enacted by the 85th Congress.

I refer to the fact that in 1958 we took off the blinders and recognized our farm problems for what they are.

The fact that we have surplus problems is a tribute to the American farmer.

The fact that for over 20 years we thought we could solve those problems through political action alone is no tribute to anyone.

Our political thinking simply has been unable to keep up with the technological and biological progress in the field of agriculture.

In a sense, the work of the 85th Congress was as constructive as that of any session since I have been in Washington.

It may be that the legislation we enacted will not be any panacea so far as the producer of cotton and other crops is concerned.

We did have the honesty to recognize the fact that some of the remedies we had advocated in the past had not effected cures.

We did acknowledge that medicine which might be effective in time of emergency was not always effective in maintaining the health of the patient after the emergency was past.

The 85th Congress did have the courage to break away from the orthodox political position that only high guaranteed prices and greatly restricted production can cure the ills of agriculture.

Imbued with this new found courage, the Congress enacted legislation which, with the approval of the producers, removes the restriction on corn production and will permit greater production of cotton and rice at a lower guaranteed price.

Right here, I want to pay tribute to the cotton producers and the cotton industry for taking the lead in this epic departure from a practice of 20 years' standing.

I want to pay tribute to the Memphis Commercial-Appeal and its ace farm reporter, Jerry Dearing—not only for an outstanding job of farm news coverage, but also for the fact that Jerry works constantly to improve the farming industry of the South and is frequently called upon by Members of Congress for information.

Heaven knows what a Member of Congress, with an experience with cotton as limited as mine or even a member with the experience of my chairman, Senator ELLENDER, would do if we could not call upon the Rhea Blakes, the Jerry Dearings, and other leaders of the cotton industry from California to the Atlantic coast for help and information.

Heaven knows too what we would do without the fighting leadership of men like JIM EASTLAND when it comes to cotton legislation.

No one can possibly know how many times these men have been called upon for help by Members of Congress who would otherwise be left largely in the dark in working on such legislation.

For the full 18 years I have been on the Agriculture Committee, my relationship with the southern members and the southern chairmen has been a satisfying experience.

Let me say here that much of the success in getting new legislation through the Congress last summer was due to the perseverance and the courage of Chairman ALLEN ELLENDER.

You know, we did have difficulties here and there even up to the day the conference report was finally accepted, but as members of the Senate conference committee, Senators ELLENDER and EASTLAND never wavered in the position which you folks for the most part sponsored. I stuck along with them believing their position to be sound.

As to the legislation itself, I think it is going to be beneficial.

It ought to make it possible to restore cotton to its time-honored position as an export crop, to put our domestic mills in a more favorable competitive position with the foreign industry and to ease the pressure on other farm commodities by reducing the competition which they would otherwise incur from unused cotton acreage.

I don't guarantee that the new legislation which takes effect next year will do all that we hope for it.

I do guarantee this—if, after a reasonable trial, it appears that the legislation is not in the best interest of agriculture and the national economy, I will be glad to cooperate in improving it.

There are some impatient souls who probably can't wait to find out whether this new legislation will work or not and we may expect the usual number of panacea proposals in the next Congress.

One proposal which seems to be enjoying a resurrection is the proposal for production payments on all leading farm commodities, the theory being that if production payments work for sugar and wool why aren't they good for every other farm commodity, too?

The supporters of this proposal fail to take into account the fact that in the interest of national security we are trying to increase the production of wool in this country and that we are not self-sufficient in the production of sugar.

It would be quite a different matter to apply the rule of payments to surplus commodities.

The theory is, of course, that every farmer would produce his crop, sell it for what he could get and receive a check from the Government to make up the difference between the selling price and 100 percent of parity.

This plan was formally promoted 9 years ago by the then Secretary of Agriculture, although I understand that it was originated years before that in the minds of a group of agricultural economists.

I was strongly opposed to the Brannan plan in 1949, not because of the payments themselves but because the producer in order to receive such payments would be required to operate his farm and each acre of it in a manner approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The present restrictions on the planting on cotton, rice, tobacco, and other basic crops are comparatively mild in comparison to the controls which would have to be exercised over the producer under the so-called Brannan plan.

The cost of an agricultural program which even now is creating widespread resentment would be multiplied several times over under the reincarnated payments program.

My allusion to the resentment against the cost of farm programs does not refer to an imaginary situation.

The public looks at the total amount of the agricultural appropriations legislation.

They say, "Oh, the greedy farmer is getting $6 billion or $7 billion a year out of us poor taxpayers."

They don't take into consideration and probably don't know about the two or more billion dollars a year that are charged to the farmer that is spent for the benefit of the nonfarm population.

They don't know that the loans of the REA, Farmers' Home Administration, and others are returned to the U.S. Treasury.

But, regardless of the motivation for the resentment, we must not ignore the fact that the political influence of the farmer is not what it used to be.

The urban Members of Congress, particularly in the House, have been increasing their strength and can now vote down the farmer Members whenever they wish to.

They have demonstrated this several times in recent years.

Far be it from me to say that the public resentment against farm programs is entirely unjustified.

We have worked ourselves into some ludicrous situations.

Take the case of wheat, for example.

Congress has stated that the minimum planting of wheat should be 55 million acres.

Yet, because millions of acres that used to produce 15 bushels to the acre are now producing 35 bushels to the acre, we have accumulated a surplus that is literally running out our ears.

Cotton land has been put into wheat. Hay land has been put into wheat. New land has been put into wheat.

The high-grade wheat-producing States have seen their production shift to low-grade wheat-producing areas, while the surplus owned by the Government has climbed to mountainous proportions.

It may be said that the tobacco grower is also finding himself being edged into a difficult situation.

I have been waiting for the producers themselves to come up with workable solutions to their problems.

They know the fix they are in and I hope they know how to get out of it.

Personally, I would not try to impose any specific plan on these commodity producers but would first await practical proposals from them.

I could not support proposals which would only result in making a bad situation worse.

Representatives of the cotton industry and the rice industry and the corn producers came before the Congress last summer with proposals of their own which were adopted.

There were only 11 votes in the Senate against their proposals.

If the wheat producers come before Congress with workable proposals to improve their position, I am sure they will get very sympathetic consideration, but any commodity group which proposes to improve its own position at the expense of others would probably not get very far.

Last summer, I worked very closely with Senator ELLENDER and other Senators of both parties on farm legislation.

I know we are going to work together during the coming session.

Farm legislation should not be partisan legislation and, so far as I am concerned, it will not be.

There is one particular aspect of the present agricultural revolution that concerns me very much.

That is the plight in which the small farmer finds himself.

You notice I don't say family farmer.

When farm work was done mostly by hand or mule power, the family farmer was indeed a small farmer.

That is not true any longer.

Many farm families are now producing a hundred thousand dollars a year or more of commodities without outside help except of a seasonal nature.

But, as the agricultural evolution has gone on, as developments have progressed in the field of technology and biology, large numbers of farmers on small farms find themselves in a position of being unable to make even a modest living for their families.

Even if supported at 200 percent of parity they still could not make a decent living according to present standards.

The Federal Government has taken recognition of this fact and, through the rural development program, has been undertaking to find ways to deal with the situation.

It is obvious that we cannot gear price support programs to the needs of the most uneconomic producer.

If we did this, we would impose a terrific penalty either on the taxpayer or on the consumers of the country, without adequately improving the position of the small farmer.

To produce food and fiber at excessive costs and hold it for excessive prices destroys both domestic and foreign markets and, hereby, reacts directly against the people it is planned to benefit.

By all means, we should continue and step up our research programs aimed at increasing production per acre, lowering costs, improving methods of handling, processing, and utilization and the development of new uses for farm commodities especially for those which are chronically in surplus.

I would also favor increasing our efforts to solve the problem of the uneconomic farmer, encouraging the production of specialty crops, shifting to crops which do not require extensive capital outlay, improving the available land on the small farm, increasing the number of productive acres where possible, and developing part time off the farm employment.

I know we can make progress in this direction, because I happen to live in a county where this transition has already taken place.

My own neighbors are living better than they used to and the value of the taxable property has greatly increased.

To make the rural development program successful and to enable people who love the land to continue to live on the land and to adequately support their families, we have to look beyond the matter of crop production alone.

Better rural highways, continuation of rural electrification programs without increased costs, better education and health facilities, and all these things which go to make a better living have to be part of the rural development program.

We have to do those things which will make industries want to come into our communities and provide work for our people.

The more people we can keep on the land, owning a bit of the soil and taking pride in that ownership, the more secure our Nation and our democratic form of government will be.

Finally, let me say that one reason I am here in Memphis today taking part in this great plant-to-prosper conference is because you folks of the Southern States reconciled your varying viewpoints on cotton legislation until you had something to come to Congress with.

I know you will give united support to other programs such as the rural development program.

It was a satisfaction to work with you on the constructive proposals you made last summer, and so long as I am a Member of the U.S. Senate you will continue to have my cooperation.

Address by Jose A. Benitez at the Democratic Victory Dinner at San Juan, P.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which was made at a Democratic dinner in San Juan, P.R., by Mr. Jose A. Benitez, who is the chairman of the Democratic Party of Puerto Rico. On December 15, I had the privilege of speaking before the

victory dinner of Puerto Rico's vigorous Democratic Party. Mr. Benitez, who is one of Puerto Rico's outstanding young leaders, is the author of "Puerto Rico and the Political Destiny of America," and his speech conveys the talent and imagination which characterize public affairs in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY JOSE A. BENITEZ, CHAIRMAN, DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF PUERTO RICO, AT THE GREAT DEMOCRATIC VICTORY DINNER HONORING SENATOR JOHN KENNEDY, DECEMBER 15, 1958, AT THE SAN JUAN INTERCONTINENTAL HOTEL, SAN JUAN, P.R.

Mrs. Kennedy, Senator KENNEDY, and distinguished guests, thanks to all of you present and all of you listening on the radio, for the great cooperation to the Democratic Party and to me in the organizing of this great Democratic victory dinner. We are Democrats; the Puerto Ricans are born Democrats, because we unquestionably believe in the principle of our great organization, the party of the people, for the people, and by the people.

Senator KENNEDY, Puerto Rico welcomes you. You represent our ideals of a democratic way of life to which we as a community are devoted. Puerto Rico stands out in the world as one of the most progressive places. We do not know of racial discrimination, of religious intolerance, or of social and economic oligarchy (óligarqui). Our people recognize that this progress has been achieved to a large extent to the clear understanding of our philosophy by the leaders of our great Nation, like Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and those in the U.S. Senate like Senator KENNEDY, who always have given us their effective support to the solution of our political, social, and economic problems.

The leadership of our Governor, Luis Muñoz Marín, has guided our people through the path of unprecedented achievements which have brought noticeable welfare and happiness to Puerto Rico, and prestige and respect to our great Nation throughout the world.

We have achieved only part of our goals. We are a young and struggling society ready to go beyond our geographical limits imposed by the great oceans, to work on behalf of effective democracy in our hemisphere. For example, we are not completely satisfied, because we do not have the internal threat of communism in Puerto Rico. We will be satisfied when we can say that the Communist threat is completely wiped out in all Latin America. The young and strong faces you have seen in Puerto Rico, and you see here tonight, is the best example of the decision of our new generations to actively participate in all phases of our democratic life. We do not want to lose time going back on what we have accomplished. This is past. We are anxious to devote our energies and intelligence to the job we have ahead.

In view of the forbidding political situation overshadowing the shrinking world in which we live, it is to be hoped that the great international leaders of the free world will come to recognize the necessity of strengthening and securing the life of their people, uniting them in commonwealths of maximum potentialities. The differences between nations having great territories and large populations together with powerful economic resources, and the nations possessed of small territory, small population, and scanty resources can be adjusted only by the unification of peoples with the same ideals, interests, and common ambitions, unification directed toward the end of becoming greater through such understanding.

In a world such as ours, full of driving and competitive tendencies, with some nations engaged in the barbaric domination that enslaves weaker ones, our chief problem is no other than that of assuring our survival by making ourselves the fittest, through mutual defense and cooperation with the other nations in our hemisphere.

From the early days of tribal life to the present, humanity has moved always toward greater community concentrations. This beneficial tendency has proceeded, however, at a slow pace, a gait that has dragged heavily on the potential advancement of civilization.

It is a shameful fact, and the fault of world leaders, that scientific progress has had its greatest and most rapid advancement in the forced culture of wartime. But such is a fact. Nations that could develop with more splendor and nobility in time of peace, have been very busy consuming the acid fruits of their selfishness, giving little consideration to the magnificent possibilities for their own enlargement through the fraternal growth of humanity.

The evolution toward a unique government of the human race—which is inevitable in the centuries to come—would have no civilized virtue if it were to come into being through the domination of men by man. However, the present leader in the movement toward the gathering of peoples is a piratical colossus. He is indeed swiftly forming mighty conglomerates, both in population and in geographical expanse. And that being the case, prudence dictates that we face the inevitable conclusions and not delay a moment the labor that must be committed for our progress toward the conquest and the fulfillment of our future.

Our hemisphere cannot ignore the realities of life at the crossroads where its nations stand today. The countries of the two Americas should earnestly and deeply meditate the historical implications of the moment in which they are immersed; their weakness in their present isolation in the stormy international currents; the greatness which they could achieve in a hemispheric bloc, and the energy which could be generated in social, economic, scientific, and cultural interchanges among the American nations. In a word, it is necessary to rationalize and to see the mission which a united America, pioneering and unselfish, could accomplish for the peaceful and fruitful organization of the genuinely civilized world of the future.

The incalculable natural wealth that the enormous territory of the American continents holds—still largely neglected, or unsuspected, in the soil—once developed to capacity could supply all the needs of the world.

The American nations occupy a comparatively virgin land. They are not subject to the grievous pressures for existence that bear upon communities of the Old World, where feelings of discouragement, despair and desperation have driven the people often to the road of war as a means of escape.

Our hemisphere must turn its eyes to its fitting and unexplored greatness, developing and directing it, and offering its fruits generously to the nations that now fight for a place under the sun. The contribution of America thus offered loyally for human fellowship could and should reestablish the equilibrium of those tormented nations whose constriction has induced them to make war and thus to retard the advancement of civilization.

The Americas could and should provide the rest of humanity the additional resources needed for its happiness, abandoning all reserve and hostility. Because of its youth, our hemisphere has all the conditions, qualities, riches, and strength needed for the task of fraternally reconstructing the world to a degree which up to now has been spoken of only in a theoretical way. Its healthy youth, its unselfish and graceful spirit, place the Americas in the privileged historic position to be the human bloc that will find ways of removing disputes and problems of the world through brotherly devices, doing away with the dark barbarity of violence.

The United States evidently is the most highly developed and efficient power in the American sphere. Its strength not only could establish its leadership from Alaska to Patagonia but also could extend it to the most distant corners of the world. As the chief defense against the antagonistic attitude shown by Russia to the nations of the Occident, dominated as Russia is by an imperialistic greed for expansion and world control, the United States is under an obligation to protect the right of liberty and the useful life, and to continue in this role, maintaining through various alliances the means to safeguard conservative and altruistic ideals. These alliances must be effected even with nations which are in many respects quite different in their character and interests, to the end that there will be a universal human fraternity and the development of a common civilization which will endure forever. But she should give first thought to the protection, security, and survival of the occidental nations that have a mutual area of interests. In this time of continuous threats to world freedom, the United States has no alternative; it must put all its resources at the service of the defense of all friendly nations whose fortunes are tied to its own security.

Her responsibility and concern regarding affairs more distant certainly does not mean that the United States should not give first attention to the historic mission close at hand, that of establishing a fraternal union with the Latin American nations of the hemisphere. It is to be hoped that the leaders of our great republic to the north will consider giving urgent precedence to work for an understanding with their nation's neighbors in Latin America, so as to begin the germination of hemispheric unity as a starting point toward the greater, worldwide work which destiny seems to have reserved for our hemisphere.

On the other side, I feel sure that the leaders of the Latin American countries will do no less in the vital appointments than they have with history.

All the leaders must stubbornly strive to give creative objectivity to the mission which is theirs to fulfill in their respective communities, to build the new world that is to come. The United States and Latin America could provide preponderantly the techniques and resources and, above all, the virtues of brotherly unselfishness which would be required for the achievement of the great task.

It is unnecessary, perhaps, to point out that the peoples of all the Americas are equally obligated not to shrink from the massive demands of the glorious gesture that the desperate, cornered state of humanity calls for.

The task is there. It is for its missionaries to carry it through to victory.

In the course of the historic mission that the American nations could jointly fulfill to obtain the world fellowship that I am advocating here, an immediate benefit to all the nations of the hemisphere would be a rapport established with each other, erasing the frictions and prejudices that grew up in the creation of the intercontinental society. In a great measure, these prejudices and frictions are ghosts of doubts and suspicions begotten by the distrust and lack of communication which has predisposed the various races. In a lesser way—also ghosts, because they belong to errors of the past—the prejudices of Latin America are the result of the intervention by the United States on Latin American soil, prior to the time when President Franklin D. Roosevelt established a policy of hemispheric friendship.

As the two continents were drawn to each other in a cordial and loyal approach, they would remove frontiers that today separate North, Central, and South America, not geographically and politically, but with regard to interests and abstractions that are equally formidable.

Such an approach, based on fraternity and cooperation, would relieve the United States of an outside search for that which she needs to prosper and to enlarge herself and would similarly put within each reach of Latin America all the productive resources that are lacking within its geographical limits. The two would contribute their respective potentialities—those already developed and the much more copious ones which are yet undeveloped—so that in a few years the resulting social, economic, scientific and cultural advancement would be enormous.

Puerto Rico is by origin Latin American. It entered into political relations with the United States in 1898. The island suffered from the same problems of misunderstanding and remoteness that exist today between the United States and other Latin American communities. Puerto Ricans faced incomprehension and indifference. There could be no success for us that was not based on the greatness of both the people of the mainland and the people of Puerto Rico. As soon as we began to draw together, all incomprehensions and prejudices fell apart, and our association, fortified today by the bond of citizenship, growth in the rich interchange on which our development is based.

If our Puerto Rican leaders succeeded in helping accomplish this American union, why could not the leaders who today orient the policies of other Latin American communities broaden and advance such diplomatic gains?

Communist Russia knows that its cunning expansionism cannot undermine, even in a clandestine way, the compact and powerful unity of the North American people. That is why it is maneuvering desperately to infiltrate its germs of anarchism, weakness, and demoralization in the vital organs of the Latin American countries, through seemingly advantageous economic offers that doubtless could endanger the stability and free determination of those communities. Can we be so deceived as to yield to an economic infiltration over which hovers the steel expansionism and the grasping domination that have enslaved so many satellites in Russia's barbarous orbit?

Nothing that Latin America and the United States could wish for to improve their respective communities needs to be searched for in the Old World. They have everything needful in their own territory, or if anything is lacking temporarily it can be found by exploration of hemispheric resources. The continents—under the infinite guidance of God—must hope that the leaders of the several nations may have the vision of their enormous destiny.

The North and the South must end their disagreement and each one get rid of the limitations that hinder this settlement. And instead of addressing each other in stilted diplomatic language they should start to speak the vernacular of the family.

The hemisphere may hope that the United States and Latin America will gracefully accompliah the part which is required of each one. The destiny of both is the political destiny of all America.

God will order affairs so that the lesson of Puerto Rico will guide the achievement of the task that the American nations can fulfill for the progress of human relations.

Puerto Rico broke down the barriers of misunderstanding with the United States, and has thus developed, under the cordial influence of the resulting rapprochement, its multiple and vigorous potentialities.

This privileged position enables the Puerto Rican people, intellectually, politically, and psychologically, to serve as a responsible spokesman to the United States concerning the values which the Latin American people could contribute on behalf of the general good of this great hemisphere of ours.

The world more and more is tending to lose its nationalistic barriers. It will be ripe, in the course of time, to accept the idea of a single governmental organization administered on the concept that there is only one humanity. The leaders of the great geographic communities—as the Europeans, the Asiatics, and the Arabians have begun to do—are under the obligation of grouping and strengthening their energies, to spread the greatness that dissolves selfishness, shares potentialities, ennobles life, and perfect civilization.

Puerto Rico wishes to sow its humble portion of seed in a furrow of the planting of brotherhood that will bring forth the mighty unified America that is on its way.

Senator KENNEDY. The new generations of Latin America and right here in Puerto Rico are eagerly looking forward to a new and effective foreign policy by the United States of America, based on the philosophy that we are more than good neighbors; that in our world of today we are fraternal brothers. These new generations are anxiously waiting for men like you to implement with the help of Almighty God an effective "good brother policy."

Legislation Relating to Professional Baseball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the texts of several radio broadcasts by Sportscaster Bill Stern, relating to the possibility of need for legislation in connection with professional baseball.

There being no objection, the texts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROADCASTS BY SPORTSCASTER BILL STERN

The Los Angeles Dodgers moved all the way across the country to gain 159 customers. Incredible? Maybe, but all that Walter O'Malley has gained by moving the Dodgers from Brooklyn to Los Angeles is a mere 159 additional customers. How do I figure? Listen.

To date, with 2 remaining home games, the Dodgers have drawn 1,807,000 persons to their at-home games in Los Angeles. Back in 1947 in Brooklyn the Dodgers drew that seaon for their at-home games exactly the same amount, 1,807,000 persons. And they did it in the vastly smaller Ebbetts Field in Brooklyn. In fact one of the reasons O'Malley moved west was because he thought the seating capacity of old Ebbetts Field was too small. He said that if he could move to Los Angeles and play in the huge Coliseum he would almost double his attendance. And well he might have thought so, for his old home, Ebbetts Field, seated only about 34,000 as against the Coliseum's seating capacity for baseball of 82,000. Some difference. But in actual figures so far this year, with 2 home games remaining, he has drawn 1,807,785 against the 1947 home attendance in Ebbetts Field of 1,807,526. A difference between Brooklyn and Los Angeles of exactly 159 persons.

Is this why Walter O'Malley deserted Brooklyn and moved to California. To pick up 159 persons? Is this why he fooled the public by saying one thing and doing another? Did he make himself the most disliked man in baseball for a mere handful of people?

Some will say that I shouldn't compare this year's Los Angeles figures with the 1947 Brooklyn figures. To them I say that they shouldn't use this year's Los Angeles figures, next year won't be as good, the bloom is off, the honeymoon is over. Let's see what he draws next year and compare that with last year's Brooklyn figures.

Nor can O'Malley blame it on the people of Los Angeles. Los Angeles is a wonderful sports town. Just this morning the Los Angeles Rams announced that season tickets to their games in the same Coliseum are sold out from goal line to goal line. Just think of that, every single ticket sold. In fact tickets are so hard to get for the Ram games this fall that a divorce case recently featured a battle over their season ticket. And a recent death on the Los Angeles Freeway brought calls to the Rams office requesting the driver's tickets.

Yes, sir; every single season ticket is sold in the Coliseum for the Los Angeles Rams home games. Yet Walter O'Malley's Dodgers in the same stadium have drawn, with 2 home games remaining, exactly 159 more persons than they did in little Ebbetts Field back in Brooklyn in 1947.

I wonder if O'Malley thinks it was worth moving to California for this 159 people?

WHY SHOULD BASEBALL BE AN EXCEPTION?

Yesterday in Washington there was new legislation introduced by Representatives KEATING, Republican, New York; MILLER, Republican, New York; WALTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania; and HARRIS, a Democrat of Arkansas. This new bill if passed would grant to the sport of baseball several important concessions. First of all, the so-called reserve clause in all baseball contracts would be free from any antitrust action by the Government. Secondly, the major leagues would have the right to police themselves as to how many telecasts they would allow on a national basis. Also excluded from antitrust action would be such baseball practices as, player trades, drafts, and territorial rights.

These are some exceptions. What this means in everyday language is that if this bill becomes law, that the major leagues may decide for themselves how many telecasts they will send into minor league territory, how they will draft their players, restricting a boy who signs with one club from ever selling his services to another team if they will pay him more money. It would also do something that baseball has been trying to do for years, namely, keep that reserve clause, the clause that many think is illegal, from ever being tried in a court of law.

For the life of me, I can't see the justification for such new legislation. Do other businesses get breaks like this from the Government? They sure don't. Can you imagine the average business asking the Government to say its employees could not work for anyone else? Or that if it signed an employee that employee had nothing to say about his wages. He could either accept or quit, and if he quit he couldn't work for anyone else. And why should the major leagues be permitted to make their own rules as to telecasts? They have already shown, according to the minors, that they don't care

how many minor leagues they destroy. So why let them police themselves when they have already shown tha they won't do it?

Big baseball is claiming that unless they get these concessions that they can't stay in business. First of all, I don't believe it. But even if it were true, can you imagine how far you'd get if you went to Washington and said: "I want a whole series of new laws passed favoring my particular business. It's too bad if it isn't fair to others."

Other sports aren't asking for these special laws, so why baseball? And even more to the point. Why should we have special laws for a sport when some of these proposed new laws plainly circumvent the ordinary democratic process of law.

The thing I can't get through my head is why baseball deserves special consideration. I thought we lived under one set of laws in this country that applied to everybody.

A SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE LOOKS AT BASEBALL

A Senate subcommittee in Washington has been conducting an investigation to see whether a bill, already passed by the House, should be passed by the Senate. This bill if passed would exempt baseball from Government regulation over player contracts, the highly controversial reserve clause, unlimited radio and TV broadcasts. In short this bill if passed would give baseball advantages that other businesses do not have. Naturally baseball is all for the passage of such a bill. The top brass, the owners, the commissioner, and some players have come out for it. On the surface it seems that baseball is all for this bill, but is it?

So far the subcommittee has only called those who favor it. Men such as Casey Stengel, Mickey Mantle, Eddie Yost, Stan Musial, and Robin Roberts. These men draw huge salaries and are paid by the very owners who are trying to push this bill through. Naturally these players and Stengel are going to testify for what the owners want. Don't the owners pay them, and pay them well? What's the old saying about "never biting the hand that feeds you"?

But isn't it significant that the only two ball players called to testify who are already out of baseball, namely Jackie Robinson, and Bob Feller are not so sure to testify in favor of the bill. These two are not in the pay any longer of the owners. They can both say what they really think, not what they are told they should think. They are both due to testify next week. I'll predict that neither will be for the bill.

It's all to the subcommittee's credit that they have not been stampeded by the rich men who control the game and are willing to hear the other side. But I have a suggestion to make. Not that I expect it to be accepted by the Senators, but I'm going to make it anyway, and here it is:

It would seem to me that if I were trying to find out as to whether this proposed bill should be passed to help the big brass in baseball, I would not call the Mickey Mantles, the Robin Roberts, the Stan Musials, or the Casey Stengels. They are naturally in favor of anything their bosses are. They are well paid and quite content. No, if I wanted to pass a bill helping baseball, I would not pass one to help the rich, but rather one that might help the people in baseball who need help. How about the unknowns down in class D baseball? or class C? or even B? what about these poor, underpaid, underfed ballplayers who really need some help. How about hearing from them? If we are going to hear from the best paid men in the game, how about hearing from the worst paid men too? Let the Senators hear how shabby the slums of the minor leagues are. If Congress is going to pass laws to help baseball, why help the men who are already rich, why not help the poor.

Let's see how some poor ballplayer who hasn't got enough to feed himself, let alone his family, feels about this bill with its special privileges for the rich club owners.

The Missing Science and Math Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a timely article from the Philadelphia Inquirer of Tuesday, January 13, 1959, entitled "The Missing Science and Math Teachers."

This is a subject which is of great concern to all of us, and I would exhort all the Members to read.

The article follows:

THE MISSING SCIENCE AND MATH TEACHERS

The plight of Philadelphia's public schools as the new term is about to begin shows that it isn't enough to issue an order from Harrisburg to solve a problem at the local level.

Starting in February all Philadelphia high school students are to be required to take some math and science in order to graduate. Before the change, almost half the pupils in high school did not have to study these subjects at all. Yet, even then, there weren't as many good science and math teachers as were really needed, not only in Philadelphia but in other school systems throughout the State.

This situation was as fully apparent months ago when the new State policy was formulated as it is now, yet only the vaguest of plans to deal with it have been advanced at the State level and those in the local communities for the most part are inadequate. This is especially true in Philadelphia.

The sincere efforts of Dr. Helen C. Bailey and William M. Duncan, associate superintendents, to recruit additional science and math teachers have met with little success, as it should have been known they would. The salaries they had to offer couldn't compare with those in private industry or even with what the same teachers could earn in nearby school systems, often in far more pleasant surroundings.

This, too, has been apparent from the beginning, yet the date of the pending change was permitted to arrive without any real plan on the part of the board of education to cope with it.

It seems to us that the State order, in its intent, was fully justified. We believe science and math should be taught to all students capable of absorbing the subject matter. But both the State and the city have been delinquent in failing to take the steps obviously necessary to give the order real meaning.

We think it is about time they got busy and found the needed teachers. Some of them can be lured away from less vital jobs in industry by better salary offers. The rest will have to be trained as quickly as possible, and a sound program for accomplishing this must be devised at once.

Governor Vandiver Cites Georgia Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the excellent statement on the State of Georgia's growth and progress written by Georgia's distinguished young Governor, Hon. Ernest Vandiver, for the annual new South edition of the Anderson (S.C.) Daily Mail.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR OF GEORGIA

(By Ernest Vandiver)

It is a genuine privilege and a pleasure for me to prepare a brief outline of the steady growth and expansion we are enjoying in Georgia for publication in your annual New South industrial and agricultural edition which is of such service to the people of South Carolina as well as for a large number of Georgia citizens living in your territory.

Let me say that both Georgia and South Carolina have enjoyed amazing expansion in their industrial potential in the last few years which has been of such magnitude as to attract the attention of business interests all over our country.

Here in Georgia we are enjoying a forward movement in industry which is bringing us a substantial number of new manufacturing plants. Many of these are being established here by big companies which already are established in their fields. Many others are being built by local people using local capital for development.

Economic indexes in several areas show that Georgia is ahead of the national average in the percentage rate of growth and expansion.

In the postwar years we have added an amazing number of new workers in our industrial activities. This calls for many new payrolls, increases in existing payrolls and numerous new job opportunities for workers moving into our State as well as for workers already established here.

It has been ascertained that Georgia's rate of increase in heavy industries was exceeded in the postwar years by only three States, California, New York, and Texas.

Such industries employing 100 or more persons per plant show increases in Georgia which place this State in fourth position throughout the Nation.

Business, of course, likes to go where the markets are, and it is because of the steady increase in the buying power of the people of Georgia, South Carolina, and other Southeastern States that these new plants are being located here in such large numbers.

From what our business experts say we can expect even greater growth in the industrial field in the future.

It is our policy in Georgia to bring as many new plants as possible to some of our counties which have suffered because of migrations of workers to the urban districts.

We have found that one new plant located in one of the counties suffering from temporary loss of population means that such county can enjoy immediately a complete recovery in its economy.

Hand in hand with our industry our agriculture has marched forward with steady gains which have helped materially our entire State, as far as business expansion is concerned.

Our farmers are using more diversified crops than ever before. They have brought to their farms the most modern methods used in crop raising of all characters. They have carried our a movement to put the farms on a business basis, and in this field are enjoying pleasing and surprising results.

Georgia has enjoyed a 200-percent increase in the livestock industry in the post-World War II and is rapidly forging to the front in the Nation in this activity.

Georgia has held the leadership for some years in broiler production and continues to hold first place this year.

We have won 1st place in the South and 10th in the Nation in hog production, and continue to make steady gains each year.

Steady growth is reported in the values of the corn crop, pecans, tobacco, cotton, truck products, and in tree crops. In fact, the additional trees planted are designed to bring increases in our naval stores production, already the largest in the Nation, and to enlarge the pulp industry.

Let me say that these vast gains have established a pleasant business climate throughout our whole State, and our towns and cities are getting ready to benefit from the additional incomes coming from our increased industrial and agricultural activities.

Permit me to congratulate you on the publication of this excellent New South edition and to express the appreciation of our people for your invitation to participate.

Dr. Raymond J. Quinn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, last week there died in Waterbury, Conn., Dr. Raymond J. Quinn, a beloved general practitioner who gave his life to the service of the people of his community and who was proud to be known as a family doctor. For over 40 years he was with the people of the Washington Hill district in their times of trouble and travail, and the memory of his cheerful presence in their days of crisis will long keep his memory green. He was an example of dedicated service for the younger members of his profession.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Waterbury Republican on January 15, 1959:

DR. RAYMOND J. QUINN

In an age when specialization is the order of the day in the world of medicine, Dr. Raymond J. Quinn took great pride in being a family doctor whose practice centered about the neighborhood in which he lived for more than 40 years. He was "the doctor" on Washington Hill.

Ever since 1916, when he first hung out his shingle in the Washington Hill section of the city, Dr. Raymond J. Quinn devoted the greater part of his time to the families in that area. As the city grew, so did his practice, and while it could hardly be said to have been confined to the "Hill" in later years, it was the people of that section to whom he gave his first loyalty. He took deep pride in his neighborhood practice. For many years his name was a household ward in Washington Hill.

Yet he found time to serve the entire city in one way or another. He served as city bacteriologist for a time and was also Welfare Department physician under the late Mayor Vincent Scully and former Mayor John S. Monagan. Three years ago he was the recipient of the Man of the Year Award of the Washington Hill AC, for his "outstanding contribution to the community."

Dr. Quinn also found time to be active in civic, community, fraternal and church affairs and as a veteran of World War I he had an unusual and deep interest in veterans affairs.

Although illness had curtailed his active practice in recent years, he nevertheless kept his interest in community affairs. His death Tuesday night, while not unexpected, leaves a void on the "Hill." His large family and his thousands of friends will miss him. But the Washington Hill community is a better place today because of his untiring devotion. It will be difficult, if not impossible, to find someone to fill his shoes.

Reappointment of Hon. Alan Bible, of Nevada, as Chairman of Senate Committee on the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the lead editorial which appeared in the Sunday, January 18, issue of the Washington Evening Star entitled "Washington's Good Fortune."

This editorial points out how pleased the people of Washington should be, and surely are, over the reappointment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] as chairman of the Senate District Committee.

As all Senators realize, this job is very much a labor of love. It has never succeeded in reelecting a man in his home State, no matter how well it was done. However, Senator BIBLE, realizing that the job is one of great importance, even though it does not have much political significance, has been willing to take it on once again.

Surely, we all must agree with the editorial in the Evening Star that the people of Washington are fortunate in having ALAN BIBLE head their affairs once again.

He is indeed an able and conscientious public servant, who has already won, and will continue to deserve, the affection and admiration of us all.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON'S GOOD FORTUNE

Washington has cause to be pleased with the reappointment of Senator BIBLE, of Nevada, as chairman of the Senate District Committee. Senator BIBLE has proved to be an understanding friend of the District, who properly regards his assignment as one involving an important responsibility—that of carrying out the constitutional duty of Congress to exercise legislative jurisdiction over the Nation's Capital. The Nevadan has made it plain, rightly, that he regards this as a solemn obligation of Congress toward not only the people of Washington but of the Nation as a whole.

Moreover, it is gratifying that the committee will have the services of a new Member, Democratic Senator R. VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana, whose pleasure at being appointed contrasts sharply with the attitude expressed by some other legislators who have shunned the District group. Senator HARTKE, who, with Senators BIBLE, MORSE and FREAR, make up the Democratic majority of the committee (the Republicans have not yet been named), said he looks upon the District as a symbol of American democracy—a place of which Americans are proud because it is their city. As a former mayor of Evansville, Senator HARTKE should be well qualified to consider the problems of Washington and the metropolitan area.

The Supreme Law of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last October the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch published an article entitled "The Supreme Law of the Land," written by the Honorable Ralph T. Catterall, a member of the Virginia State Corporation Commission, and who is a former president of the Richmond Bar Association and one of the ablest lawyers in my State.

In that article, Judge Catterall not only discussed the proper role of the Supreme Court in our system of government, but he also emphasized the responsibilities of Members of Congress. He pointed out that every legislative, executive, and judicial officer takes an oath to support the Constitution and that is an oath of obedience to the Constitution itself, and not to Congress or the courts. He observed also that when the Supreme Court ceases to administer justice under law and indulges in policymaking to serve alleged sociological ends, Congress has the power to curb the Court by taking away some of its jurisdiction.

Because of the merits of this interesting and well-reasoned discussion, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Oct. 10, 1958]

THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND

(By Ralph T. Catterall)

The Supreme Court of the United States is the keystone of the arch of our Federal form of government. If the keystone is destroyed the arch will fall. It would produce anarchy if each State were free to disobey every decision it disagreed with. But if the

keystone becomes rotten because of internal defects, that, too, will cause the arch to fall; and it is not unpatriotic to call attention to cracks in the keystone and recommend that they be repaired. The opinion of September 29 sounds like a reverberating crack in the keystone. It sounds ominously like Louis XIV announcing "I am the State." Americans must respect the Court but must not bow down and worship it.

Carved on the architrave of the marble building in which the Court sits are the words "Equal Justice Under Law." The Court ends its recent opinion with the words:

"Our constitutional ideal, of equal justice under law, is thus made a living truth."

That is our constitutional ideal and that is why the Constitution was reduced to writing. We want justice under law. If courts render justice outside the law we are in a state of anarchy. The Constitution does not say: "Everything that is unjust is unconstitutional." The Supreme Court seems to be saying: "Everything that we think is unjust is unconstitutional." If that be true, it was a waste of time to have a written Constitution. When a mob of cowboys hang a horsethief they do a horrible and wicked thing; but the evil is less farreaching than the evil done by a court that administers justice outside the law. With the backing of the Solicitor General the Court tears up the Constitution before our eyes and then reads us a lecture on our duty to obey all its decisions.

The Court boasts of its unanimity. The Court seems to be saying: "We so seldom agree among ourselves that when we do we must be right." Let us consider the relative importance of this unanimity. The Court cites *Bolling* v. *Sharpe*, the case in which it declared that the due process clause, adopted in 1791, forbids the Congress of the United States to establish segregated schools. While we are considering the importance of unanimity let us consider also the Court's admonition: "Every State legislator and executive and judicial officer is solemnly committed by oath taken pursuant to article VI, 3, 'to support this Constitution.'"

The same thing applies equally to every legislative, executive, and judicial officer of the United States. Prior to 1954, that oath was taken by many thousands of officeholders; by every President from Washington to Eisenhower, by every Supreme Court Justice, by John Marshall, by William Howard Taft, by James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Ulysses S. Grant, Thaddeus Stevens, Charles Sumner. It was taken by all the lower Federal court judges, by all the State judges, by all the lawyers, and all the notaries public. These countless thousands of oathtakers have disagreed among themselves on every subject that it is humanly possible to disagree about. The disagreements became so violent that one of the bloodiest wars in history was fought over one phase in the preamble of the Constitution. On one point, however, there was complete, perfect, and absolute unanimity. All agreed that the due-process clause did not require integrated public schools in the District of Columbia. Nobody even suggested such a thing. The Court pays no attention to the unanimity of millions and bids us be impressed by the unanimity of its nine members.

What is the true intent and meaning of the oath to support the Constitution? By article VI, the Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, are declared to be the supreme law of the land. A constitutional act of Congress is part of the supreme law, but an unconstitutional act of Congress is not. Judicial decisions are not mentioned in the Constitution as part of the fabric of the supreme law. The framers of the Constitution expected the Court to administer justice under law.

An act of Congress makes it a crime to remove a cigarette from the corner of a package without first breaking the revenue stamp. This law is beyond question the supreme law of the land. Fifty million loyal citizens break this commandment every day; and the Attorney General makes no effort to stop this widespread disregard of the supreme law of the land.

The oath to support the Constitution is an oath to support the Constitution. It is not an oath of obedience to the Congress or the Court. A judge does not violate his oath of office when he exceeds the speed limit on Pennsylvania Avenue. He does violate his oath of office when he pretends to believe that the framers of the 14th amendment intended it to give the Court authority to abolish segregation in the public schools. The judicial oath of office means that the judge will administer justice under law. It means that he will not substitute his notion of what the law ought to be for what he knows the law is. The oath to support the Constitution is an oath to support our Federal Government against all enemies—foreign and domestic. He who takes the oath cannot assist in overthrowing the governmental structure erected by the Constitution. If he sees wicked men pulling down the pillars of our Government it is his duty to resist. It is his duty to speak out.

The judges themselves sometimes recognize and perform this duty. Listen to the denunciation of the Court by Mr. Justice Douglas (with whom Warern and Black concurred) in *Yates* v. *United States* (Nov. 25, 1957): "This case to me is a shocking instance of the abuse of judicial authority."

He is not suggesting that his brethren made an honest mistake. A shocking abuse of authority is an international act, a wicked and dishonest act.

The Court makes many honest mistakes. The States are not free to decide which decisions of the Court they will obey. They must obey all decisions, however erroneous, that could be thought to be honestly erroneous. When, however, the Court is guilty of shocking abuse of authority, it is the duty of every man who has sworn to support the Constitution to do what he can to curb the Court.

The Constitution contains checks and balances designed to keeep any man or group of men from destroying the framework of the Federal Union. One important check is the check that Congress is given over the Court. In every appealed case that it decides, the Court recognizes that it can decide the case only because Congress has affirmatively authorized it to do so. No case is heard by the Court until the appellant's lawyer points to a specific act of Congress giving the Court authority to decide the class of cases to which the case belongs.

Each Member of Congress has taken an oath to support the Constitution and each Member of Congress represents the people of a State. When the Court ceases to administer justice under law, the Congress has the power to curb it; and it is the duty of Congress to exercise that power. Congress can restore the balance of the Constitution by passing a statute depriving the Federal courts of jurisdiction over cases involving public schools. It is no longer possible to hope that the Court will change its mind but it is possible to hope that Congress will do its duty.

The great pity is that this most fundamental of constitutional questions is viewed by so many people as an emotional or moral problem rather than as a constitutional question. We are not talking about the totally different question of whether a colored child is happier and gets a better education at Maggie Walker than at Thomas Jefferson High School. The atmosphere of public discussion is as clouded by emotion as it was when the kindest and most benevolent New England clergymen were raising funds to buy ammunition for John Brown to shoot white southerners with. I therefore despair of making my point so clear that anybody can see it who does not already agree with it.

Start with the incontestable fact that everybody without any exception during the 163 years between 1791 and 1954 was as certain that the due process clause did not keep Congress from maintaining separate schools in the District of Columbia as he was that 2 times 2 is 4. How do the Supreme Court Justices in their own minds get around that incontestable fact? They do it by saying to themselves that the framers of the Constitution meant by the due process clause to give the Justices the power and authority to decide from time to time, from decade to decade and from year to year, what is good and what is bad, and to declare null and void any act of Congress that they think is bad.

In the first place, no framer of the Constitution ever expressed any such view as that. In the second place, the framers carefully spelled out the powers of the Central Government and the things that they thought bad enough to be forbidden by the Constitution. These things were put in writing and agreed to by the people of all the States.

With respect to the powers of Congress in the District of Columbia the Constitution says that Congress shall have power "To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District. * * *" There was no sense in putting all those things in writing if the net result was to be that the Court is empowered to decide from time to time and from decade to decade and from year to year what is good and what is bad. If that is the net result, we have no effective written Constitution: instead, we have a clean slate for the Court to write on as it sees fit; we have no supreme law: we have only a supreme group of nine men. That is a fix that the framers did not intend us to be in.

If the Members of Congress would think about this question as a constitutional question they would see the importance of it and get us out of that fix.

Current Trends in Business and Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Appraisal of Current Trends in Business and Finance," written by George Shea, and published in the Wall Street Journal of January 19, 1959. The article deals with the subject of inflation and the grave dangers of inflation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OUTLOOK—APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

(By George Shea)

One of the great debates in Congress this year apparently will be on who's to blame for inflation. Some legislators will seek to prove it's all the fault of large corporations,

which they suggest are able to charge any prices they want and force the poor American public to pay them. Others blame the never-ending demands of unions for higher wages, which the monopoly power of the unions enables them to enforce.

A third group traces the whole thing to money and the Federal budget deficit. Perhaps a look at the figures related to this last factor will help determine the budget's role, and its relation to the other factors.

The Federal debt, latest figures show, is just under $283 billion, an increase of $8 billion from a year ago. If these $8 billion of additional Government securities had been bought by individuals, nonbanking businesses, insurance companies and savings banks, that wouldn't have changed the Nation's money supply in any respect. The reason for this is that these people and institutions would have paid for the bonds with bank checks, which the U.S. Treasury would have redeposited in the banks. Bank deposits, of course, are part of the money supply.

However, that isn't the way the added bonds were bought. They were, in effect, bought in large part by the banks. When a bank buys a bond, it pays for it, in effect, by crediting the seller with a new bank deposit. This process has increased the Nation's money supply by a corresponding amount. The latest figures show the holdings of Government bonds by the commercial banks up some $7 billion, and their demand deposits up close to $4 billion. The $3 billion difference between these last two totals appears to have been put by the depositors into savings-type deposits; these—with the added help of true cash savings—increased by $7 billion in the commercial banks alone.

These increases in demand deposits—and in savings-type deposits which can be quite rapidly turned into demand deposits—provide the means whereby increased economic activity could be financed. The increase, in turn, could take the form of greater physical production and sales, or higher prices, or both.

The reason for this statement is that the growth in deposits took place in a year when there was, in net terms, just about no growth in economic activity. At first a recession pulled down the total activity, then a recovery pulled it back up again, but not to the old high. And prices rose negligibly during the year.

Of course, this is all an oversimplification. An unchanged level of deposits can be used more actively by turning it over faster, and that would permit the same increases in economic activity as would an increased total of deposits with no gain in turnover. Or ample deposits can at times be accompanied by a persistent slack in economic activity—as happened in the New Deal years before World War II—because the people lack the confidence needed for enterprise.

But the point is that a steady growth in deposits through the years does provide the means whereby, under reasonably favorable conditions, economic activity will increase both physically and in terms of prices. And the current situation is undoubtedly conducive to wage rises and price rises as long as the physical volume of business done holds steady or improves.

No union leader can afford to stop demanding wage increases from time to time, unless business in his industry is flat on its back. If he does, he'll soon stop being a union leader. And with compensation of employees accounting for 70 percent of national income, and close to 60 percent of gross national output, it is obvious that pay increases must be translated into price increases.

In turn, no business can refuse to give wage increases as long as there is enough money around so customers can and will pay for the price increases. In effect, when anyone (in the Government or outside of it) asks unions and businessmen to exercise restraint on prices and wages, he is asking them to behave as if business were bad.

They can no more act in this fashion in a free system than they can turn a depression into a recovery by producing more goods than the customers will buy. That just isn't the way things happen, because it isn't the way businesses can keep out of bankruptcy. The best service successful unions and successful businesses can perform for the Nation—within the limits that are or should be set by law—is to stay in business.

The Government is almost equally helpless to prevent the growth in the supply of money which permits these things to happen. The Eisenhower administration says it's going to do its best to reduce expenditures in the fiscal year starting next July below the total spent in the current fiscal year. But the one downward step it is trying to take is as nothing in comparison with the higher spending steps which it and its predecessors have taken through the years.

If it tried to do more, the screams of protest would be deafening, not just from Democratic politicians and voters, but from the politicians and voters of the President's own party. The American people are like the proverbial spendthrift women in a department store, so intrigued by the many goodies they can see that they want them all, regardless of cost.

The writer heard this attitude well illustrated once in a line of people waiting to vote. Two items proposed by the State's governor were a veterans' bonus and a tax to pay for it. Said one man: "What's the point in getting a bonus if I'm taxed more? I'm going to vote for the bonus and against the tax." And, sure enough, the bonus passed and the tax failed.

There lies the blame for inflation.

Economic Integrity: The Hope for a Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, Mr. Lee P. Miller, the distinguished president of the Citizens Fidelity Bank & Trust Co., of Louisville, Ky., is the president of the American Bankers Association for this year. Mr. Miller is one of the Nation's outstanding bankers, and one of the keenest contemporary students of the economic problems which challenge our country. As president of the American Bankers Association, he is traveling to all parts of the Nation, addressing important and influential groups of community leaders.

In November of last year he spoke in Tucson, before the Arizona Bankers Association. In his able address he alerted this group to the danger of potential inflationary developments in this country. He condensed the remarks which he made in Tucson into an article, which appeared in Kentucky Business for January 1959, entitled "Economic Integrity: The Hope for a Free World." Kentucky Business is the monthly publication of the Kentucky Chamber of Commerce. I commend this excellent article to the attention of my colleagues. I point out that Mr. Miller has been a lifelong Democrat. I ask unanimous consent that the article appear along with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC INTEGRITY: THE HOPE FOR A FREE WORLD

(By Lee P. Miller, president, American Bankers Association)

The world is watching us. People all over the globe—in the free world, in the uncommitted countries, and behind the Iron Curtain—are observing each scene in the drama of American democracy; and certain it is that the election of a few days ago will be the basis for much analysis and comment by our friends, as well as our enemies.

The period just after a national election is always a season for sober reflection by both the victors and the defeated. Then the excitement generated by the political campaign and the voting simmers down, and the people and their institutions knuckle down to the job ahead of them. There may be disagreements over what should be done, or how it should be done; but our democratic process does find a way of pointing our Nation's efforts toward major objectives. As the smoke of the election battle clears away, therefore, we can focus our sights once again upon our overriding objectives of peace and survival in an environment of freedom. In these objectives, we are joined by those all over the world who look to us for moral, political, and economic leadership.

The banks of this country perform functions that are essential to the preservation of that leadership. It is appropriate, therefore, that I should call to your attention the challenge to banking set forth by the resolutions committee of the American Bankers Association at the recent annual convention in Chicago.

The emphasis of the report was on the responsibility of all Americans in seeking lasting national security through military strength, economic vitality, and world leadership. The committee described three requirements which I believe should be clearly understood by every citizen and by those representing groups of citizens in government and other organizations. These requirements are:

1. A vigorous and growing economy, free from threats of serious inflation or deflation which sap economic vitality and hinder progress, and in which price stability is recognized as essential to maximum employment and prosperity.

2. A proper balance between the requirements of national security and our desire for better living standards.

3. The sacrifice of partisan interest and group pressures in favor of the broad national welfare, so that economic stability and growth can be fostered while still insuring the basic freedom of the individual to make his own decisions.

As president of the American Bankers Association this year, I believe it is my duty to see that our entire membership fully appreciates the job we have to do in carrying forward the message of our Nation's needs for lasting security against aggression. As the financial leaders in our communities, each one of us must be willing to accept the responsibility for helping the people to understand how the vitality of our Nation must be preserved to win the battle for survival.

The stakes in this battle for survival are not ours alone. The world is watching us. People abroad know that the strength of the American economy is the pivot point around which revolve the hopes for continued su-

periority over those who would destroy freedom and the dignity of man.

The American people—and especially those representing them in government and other organizations—would do well to heed the lessons we have preached to other nations since World War II. To country after country of Europe, Latin America, and elsewhere in the world, our spokesmen from political parties on both sides of the aisle have emphasized the necessity of economic integrity. They have stressed the need for sound money, fiscal sanity, and other governmental policies that encourage solid national growth rather than stagnation.

Today the shoe is on the other foot. The foreign press is taking increasing note of the recent growth of inflationary sentiment in this country, and leaders in their governments are drawing attention to the importance of our economic stability for the strength of the free world.

In recent years, this country has had a remarkable growth. Our tremendous resources have permitted us to increase our national output rapidly. We have become accustomed to prosperity and the expectation of a constantly rising standard of living. Even in relative terms, the words "austerity" and "sacrifice" seem to have been lost from the American dictionary. We have joined battle after battle in the cold and lukewarm wars since World War II; but, except in the early stages of the Korean conflict, there has been little inclination to accept the wisdom and necessity of any belt tightening whatsoever.

Just a year ago, the reality of a missiles race was thrust upon us. It is interesting to observe how suddenly and dramatically the temper of political leaders shifted. Before then there were significant pressures for economy in government. The administration was being criticized for failure to achieve a better balance in the budget and for failure to cut both expenditures and taxes. But when the battle of satellites and missiles was joined last October, the tide shifted. Many of those who previously had criticized Government military spending became even more vocal in a charge that we had not been spending enough to keep even or ahead of the Russians.

Despite the demagogery and political haranguing, our people rallied to answer the challenge posed by missiles and other developments in space science dramatized by the sputniks. Yet it is hard to believe that, in the face of this challenge, little attention was paid to the economic responsibilities it imposed. As a matter of fact, even as plans were being formulated for an intensification of our defense efforts along these lines, pressures for a reduction in taxes had to be fought off.

Our Nation finds itself in a situation where a deficit of some $12 billion in the Federal budget can be expected in the current fiscal year. No other figure in many a year has had as much effect on the thinking and attitudes of people as the size of this deficit in its dramatic contrast with the President's budget of last January. It seems to be saying that we have been unwilling to seek a balance between the requirements of national security and the desire for better living standards.

The change in the budget situation has been accompanied by an equally dramatic and pervasive change toward inflationary psychology. The deficit is being widely interpreted as a symbol of inflation. On most other grounds, however, concern over inflation is unfounded. Our economic machine has tremendous productive capacity that is not being used to the fullest extent. Production is the only answer to demand, whether military or civilian. It is the only base upon which to build a higher standard of living, and it is the only way that the physical demands of national security and strength can be met.

If production, then, is the final answer to our problem of national security, we cannot afford to tolerate interference with its effectiveness. This is the crucial point at which the threat of inflation comes into play. If the budgetary situation is interpreted as a symbol of inflation, its impact upon the ability of our productive machine to operate with increasing efficiency cannot be ignored. One might well pose the question whether the distortions already created by past inflationary pressures are not, to a significant degree, responsible for the fact that some sectors are now operating below capacity.

With a yardstick before us that says we are doing a poor job, we must redouble our efforts to return the Federal budget to a basis consistent with economic stability and the avoidance of inflation. In the words of the resolutions committee, "A continuing Federal deficit under the inflationary conditions is unconscionable."

Organized banking, speaking through the American Bankers Association and other organizations, has repeatedly voiced its support of flexible monetary and credit policies. Yet we would be shortsighted if we were to stop there. It is one thing to accept a banking environment created for us by prevailing monetary policy. It is another to interpret that environment constructively through policies and actions that contribute to its effectiveness toward attaining the goals of economic stability and growth. The policies of every banker—indeed every lender—are daily being put to the test. They involve the fundamental question whether credit is being used to foster national security in the long run, or whether it is being employed as an instrument of instability, retarding economic growth and progress and thus weakening our national security.

In the administration of our credit policies, therefore, we bankers must take the lead in combatting inflationary psychology. It should continue to be clear to us that inflation in the future is not inevitable, as some irresponsible elements would have the public believe.

On every occasion, in dealing with those who seek to use our credit resources and those with whom we have contact in so many other ways, we should express our faith in the ability to conquer the inflation fears that have had a rebirth in recent months.

In conclusion, may I emphasize that this is a time that calls for leadership—not leadership from above, but a leadership movement through which the message of our needs for survival can be carried forward by local people in every community of our Nation. We must work for good government and sensible policies in the interest of our national welfare. This requires active participation by community leaders in the formulation of laws and in the development of public understanding of our Nation's problems. We bankers are among those leaders. In these challenging times, we must not shirk our responsibility to work conscientiously, through our representatives in Federal and local legislatures, for sound legislation not only in the financial field, but in other areas close to the broad public interest.

Stable Dollar a Goal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid article written by financial writer Sylvia Porter entitled "Stable Dollar a Goal?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STABLE DOLLAR A GOAL?

(By Sylvia Porter)

With a single sentence in his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower last week set the stage for congressional debate on one of the great economic questions of the postwar era—whether protection of the dollar's buying power should be a prime goal of national policy.

Today, through the Employment Act of 1946, we declare that the three major economic goals are: Maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

But, today there is no law saying dollar-stability also is an objective of policy. There is no law which declares it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to promote this stability.

Yet, today one of the greatest threats to our dollar is a spreading psychology of inflation—a growing belief that nothing can be done or will be done to keep the dollar's value from dwindling.

ACTION IS URGED

Responsible authorities have for months been urging the administration and Congress to do more about inflation than "view with alarm." The day after the November elections I reported to you that the new heavily Democratic Congress would be the first in history to tackle the problem of inflation in peacetime, and that it would debate amending the Employment Act to add reasonable price stability as a fourth national economic goal.

Now Mr. Eisenhower has put it on the line. "I shall," he said in his state of the Union message, "ask Congress to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to make it clear that Government intends to use all appropriate means to protect the buying power of the dollar."

Everything he will say about a balanced budget, tax reform, farm legislation, spending cuts, etc., will come down to this question to you: "Do you really care enough about price stability to make it a key goal?"

Of course, saying that the dollar's buying power should be protected and maintained won't protect and maintain it. But the debate about price stability will, in itself, be valuable because it will force attention to the causes of inflation.

The arguments themselves will impress upon your consciousness the fact that in this era, the tendency is for prices to rise during phases of expansion, but not to fall during cycles of recession.

The pros and cons of the legislation will compel you to realize that if we're not to cure inflation by encouraging business slumps, we had better figure out better ways to control our own economic system.

And if the goal is written into law, the warning will be clear to powers in business and in labor that if the leapfrog of prices and wages continues, Congress will take positive steps to restrain the spiral.

POSSIBILITIES OUTLINED

The background will be created against which Congress can consider new restrictions on monopolies in business and labor, the creation of watchdog commissions to report to the Nation on inflationary price-wage moves.

The country will be prepared for—will be ready for—moves that will develop and coordinate economic and monetary policies at the national level so that expansion is encouraged; inflation is discouraged.

There will be plenty of opposition to the amendment—that's already clear. Many opponents fear that once price stability is put on the books as a policy goal, some in Gov-

ernment will try to make it the goal, will try to place it ahead of maximum employment, production, income. Others fear that the amendment will be used as an excuse for reimposition of dreaded direct controls over prices and wages.

Neither fear convinces me. As a Nation, we've made it obvious that if the choice is between maximum employment-production incomes and a stable dollar, we'll take the maximum employment-production income. No one who believes in this system wants peacetime price and wage controls.

The amendment would be an invitation to find solutions to the control of inflation in a period of prosperity. We can do it. We've conquered bigger problems than this.

The Political Relevance of Moral Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday night, January 18, 1959, I was among the 4,000 persons gathered in Constitution Hall, Washington, D.C., to hear the first annual A. Powell Davies memorial address which was delivered by the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, former Governor of Illinois.

I had the great privilege of serving for nearly a year on the staff of Governor Stevenson during 1956 when he was a candidate for the presidency of the United States. I came to know Governor Stevenson and to develop a profound respect for his deep dedication to the cause of human freedom and for his conviction that America is called to give great leadership in that cause.

It is my belief that the moving and eloquent words of Governor Stevenson, one of our Nation's foremost statesmen, should be considered and heeded by the membership of Congress as well as by every thoughtful citizen in our country.

I should like therefore to insert in the RECORD the text of Governor Stevenson's address:

THE POLITICAL RELEVANCE OF MORAL PRINCIPLE

I am profoundly flattered by your invitation to inaugurate these annual lectures in memory of Dr. A. Powell Davies. It is an honor to be asked to help in any way in the commemoration of a man so eminently worthy of being remembered. But it is hard indeed to pay adequate homage in words to a man whose own words were so fresh, so apt and fitting to the important issues of the day.

But I am encouraged by one fact. Dr. Davies did not feel that his office as a minister of religion debarred him from comment upon contemporary problems. On the contrary, he saw that he could make his message relevant to his people only by showing it at work in the concrete issues of their daily lives.

I think of a story my grandfather Stevenson, a devout Scotch-Presbyterian of southern descent, told about the preacher who was driving along a back road when he espied a parishioner wearily clearing up a poor, stony field. "That's a fine job you and the Lord have done cleaning up that rocky field," he shouted. "Thank you, parson," the man replied. "I wish you could have seen it when the Lord had it all to himself."

Dr. Davies believed that God is dependent on man, as man is on God. He believed that the clergy above all were responsible for making a reality of the bond between God and man, and he was fearless in letting his congregation and the world know the truth as he saw it. He had a sensitive awareness of peril to the individual in our day of bigness, of statism and conformity. Therefore he was impelled to fight for the oppressed and the persecuted; to fight for equal justice for all and the rights inherent in our citizenship. Ardently he defended freedom of the mind, free speech, the right of the dissenter to speak and the duty of the conformist to listen. And his compassion was boundless.

It was the tardiness of the American social conscience in understanding the severity of its ordeal with authoritarianism that made Dr. Davies impatient, that made him work so hard to awaken us to the perils. He literally wore himself out trying to mobilize public opinion and induce every American to hold himself personally responsible for the preservation of freedom.

From the mountain of vision, Dr. Davies constantly proclaimed the political relevance of moral principle and of religion as a judgment of righteousness. From the dusty plain of politics I would like in my turn to reaffirm this relevance. I like to believe that there may be some value in echoing testimony from a layman who has spent his middle life in the press and confusion of great events in government service, in diplomacy and in politics.

All politics is made up of many things—economic pressures, personal ambitions, the desire to exercise power, the overriding issues of national need and aspiration. But if it is nothing more, it is without roots. It is built on shifting, changing sands of emotion and interest. When challenged, it can give no account of itself. When threatened, it is in danger of collapse.

Today, when the threat and challenge to free society seem more total and powerful than ever before, it is not a political luxury or fruitless pedantry to reexamine our fundamental principles. I think it more likely to be the condition of survival.

There is a phrase of Dr. Davies' that stays in my mind. I do not know when I have heard a more terse and pregnant summing up of our predicament. "The world," he said, "is now too dangerous for anything but the truth, too small for anything but brotherhood." This I believe to be in broad measure a correct estimate of the condition of human society, which is now capable, with a few hydrogen bombs, of extinguishing itself. Today we can all be killed by the same bombs or atomic fallout. In that sense we have a desperate physical solidarity. But moral and social solidarity in the family of man is still to be found.

No so long ago I visited Dr. Albert Schweitzer in his primitive jungle hospital in French Equatorial Africa, and he told me he considered this the most dangerous period in history, not just modern history, but all human history. Why? Because, he said, heretofore nature has controlled man, but now man has learned to control elemental forces before he has learned to control himself.

Many of us seem to rely on some mythical God-given superiority of the white Western World to save us. And my concern is that there is more evidence that the Communists accept the reality of the human condition than we do.

It is impossible to spend weeks traveling around the Soviet Union as I did this summer without taking away an overwhelming impression of thrust and purpose in most aspects of Soviet life. The revolutionary ardor has cooled with time, but even the very pragmatic political leaders seems to believe profoundly in the truth of their way of life, and they are quietly confident that it will sweep the world in time. I think they sincerely believe that their methods, their aspirations, their dreams, make up the final truth about the nature of man and society; that collective man in the collective state is the ultimate unfolding of human destiny, the end of history, the far-off divine event for which mankind has been in long travail, the vision of all things made new that has haunted men's minds ever since Christianity thrust into human thought the intoxicating ideal of a perfected humanity.

From this conviction, if I have not overstated it, flow two consequences. The first is that no effort, no dedication, no sacrifice is too great that may help to realize the Communist Party's goals in Soviet society. The second is that no corner of humanity can be a matter of indifference to the Communists, because the whole human race is destined to become one in Communist brotherhood.

These are not abstract generalizations. Russia is a vast powerhouse of energy all harnessed to the communal task of building the Soviet dream. The thrust of economic growth which adds a 9- or 10-percent increase each year to industrial expansion is one aspect of this energy. The vast sums available for science and research are another. The self-discipline and long hours put in by school children to train themselves as the scientists, technicians, administrators and linguists of the new world order are perhaps the most significant measure of the resources of energy, work, and skill upon which Soviet leaders hope to draw. In Moscow, Serge Obraztsov, the brilliant director of the famous Puppet Theater, said: "I visited China 5 years ago. It was the most extraordinary experience of my life. People in China have had nothing—nothing. Now several hundred million people are dreaming of tomorrow. I cannot describe to you the feeling of excitement there—much, much more even than here in the Soviet Union."

The energy, the drive, the dedication in the U.S.S.R. spill over into international affairs. In part, of course, this is the restless concern which all imperial powers must exercise, especially when the peoples they control are as restive and unreliable as the captive peoples in Russia's European empire. But Communist activity, planning and efforts in trade and aid are not confined to areas of Communist control. They are worldwide, and there is no corner of the earth's surface which they think too insignificant for their attention. While trade missions are busy in Latin America trading Soviet machinery and oil for coffee and wool, academic representatives are touring West Africa, Arab and Asian students are being trained in Moscow, technical advisers dispatched to India and Burma and Indonesia, and the glossy flood of propaganda depicting the Soviet millennium of bumper harvests and happy workers is pumped out all round the world.

All this we know or begin to know. But I wonder how often we try to grasp the scale of dedication that lies behind it. Why should they be so busy? Why so much work and thought? Why such diversion of resources? Why such patience through every setback, such forward thrusts through every point of Western weakness? Heaven knows, we only want to stay home. Why don't they? Why do we never meet an isolationist Communist? These are the questions that haunted me while I confronted at firsthand this iron, forceful, and formidable way of life.

And I don't think there is any doubt about the answer. Part of it is simply needed foreign trade. Part is fear, the search for secu-

rity through friends. And part is the historical centrifugal forces in Russia that have been pressing outward for a 100 years—to the Pacific, the Balkans, and the Middle East. But the important thing is that the Soviet Russians believe in their truth, as the men of the Western World once believed in theirs. They, not we, are firing the shots that are heard 'round the world, and also the satellites that orbit above it. The fact that their faith is in many ways an evil perversion of the great propositions that once made the blood course in our Western veins does not alter the fact that their tempo is dynamic and ours sluggish, even, I think, to ourselves.

The reason cannot be that we Americans have lost our vision of truth and brotherhood. No country on earth owes the sense of community more explicitly to the fact that it is united not by race or nationality but by fidelity to an idea. We were born dedicated to a proposition and our greatest leaders—the Jeffersons, the Lincolns, the Woodrow Wilsons—were not great because they achieved purely American purposes, but because they were able to speak for humanity at large and extend their vision to the whole family of man.

Nor, I believe, can we find fault with the American dream. Its truths are still self-evident. The possession of liberty and the pursuit of happiness—rightly understood—have not been overthrown as the highest goods of human society. Indeed, the ferment of our freedom works inexorably and dangerously in the Communist world. No one can have visited Poland without seeing how little the Polish people accept their servitude and how they look beyond their neighbors to the free world as the reservoir of power and hope.

But, alas, on the basis of the record, one would hardly suspect that the Western World possessed so powerful a weapon. All our talk—in diplomacy, in strategy, in aid and trade, in all the intricacies of our worldwide relations—has been to a depressing degree purely defensive. We have offered aid not to help others but to shield ourselves. We have reacted to countless Soviet initiatives; acted on our own initiative barely at all. We watch the skies for other people's sputniks and listen to the telegraph wires for other people's moves. Yet we are the free men of this universe, the children of liberty, the beneficiaries of unequalled abundance, and heirs of the highest, proudest political tradition ever known to man.

Why this lack of initiative? Why this paralysis of will? What have we done to our truth and our brotherhood, the supreme truth of freedom, the Christian truth of brotherly love? Have they failed? Or have we?

There is no more urgent duty than to discover why we have failed and to get back into the arena, aspiring, striving, fighting once more for what we believe. An examination of what you might call our collective conscience is to my mind far more important than particular projects or programs. You can have a perfect assembly of pieces for your watch, but they are worthless if the mainspring is broken. I am not basically worried about our various pieces—our technology, our science, our machines, our resources. But I am concerned, desperately concerned, about our mainspring. That it has run down, we know. But is it broken beyond repair? In the last analysis, no question is worth more consideration in America today.

And I would like to suggest some of the ways in which it seems to me we have enfeebled the great central pulse of our freedom, the great truth of liberty, which, more than any other nation, we first set working in the modern world.

The great German poet, Goethe, who also lived through a crisis of freedom, said to his generation: "What you have inherited from your fathers, earn over again for yourselves or it will not be yours." We inherited freedom. We seem unaware that it has to be remade and reearned in each generation of man. One reason for this failure is, I believe, passing at last. In recent years we were stifled with complacent self-confidence. We believed ourselves dominant in every field. We talked of the American century. We forgot the ardors and efforts that had given us a measure of preeminence. Complacency made us impervious to ideas, even the obvious idea that we are in danger. So we assumed that all we needed was to sit still and enjoy the peace and prosperity that was our right.

I believe that phase is passing. Our foolish Janguor has been shaken, if not shattered. We are more ready to examine ourselves and our record. And it is a privilege of our society that every citizen should make his own inquiry. If I stress one or other aspect of our problem, this is simply my angle of vision. You have yours. The urgent thing is to feel the need for rethinking and to set to work the ultimate energies of free society, which cannot be done by the fiat of government but only by the troubled conscience of responsible men and women.

It is simply as a citizen as concerned as you are that I want to suggest what seems to me to be the obstacles to a full understanding of our great mission in this time of testing.

I believe—as I have said before—that we have confused the free with the free and easy. If freedom had been the happy, simple, relaxed state of ordinary humanity, man would have everywhere been free—whereas through most of time and space he has been in chains. Do not let us make any mistake about this. The natural government of man is servitude. Tyranny is the normal pattern of government. It is only by intense thought, by great effort, by burning idealism and unlimited sacrifice that freedom has prevailed as a system of government. And the efforts which were first necessary to create it are fully as necessary to sustain it in our own day.

He who offers this thing we call freedom as the soft option is a deceiver or himself deceived. He who sells it cheap or offers it as the byproduct of this or that economic system is knave or fool. For freedom demands infinitely more care and devotion than any other political system. It puts consent and personal initiative in the place of command and obedience. By relying upon the devotion and initiative of ordinary citizens, it gives up the harsh but effective disciplines that underpin all the tyrannies which over the millennia have stunted the full stature of men.

But of what use is escape from external restraint if, given the opportunity, men simply stunt themselves? If freedom means ease alone, if it means shirking the hard disciplines of learning, if it means evading the rigors and rewards of creative activity, if it means more expenditure on advertising than education, if it means bachelor cooking and life adjustment courses in the schools, and the steady cult of the trivial and the mediocre, if it means—worst of all—indifference or even contempt for all but athletic excellence, we may keep for a time the forms of free society, but its spirit will be dead.

I believe we have had enough of adjustment, conformity, easy options and the least common denominator in our system. We need instead to see the pursuit of happiness in terms which are historically proven and psychologically correct. The dreary failure in history of all classes committed to pleasure and profit alone, the vacuity and misery accompanying the sole pursuit of ease—the collapse of the French aristocracy, the corruption of imperial Rome, the decline and fall of the resplendent Manchus—all these facts of history do not lose their point because the pleasures of today are mass pleasures and no longer the enjoyments of an elite. If we become a nation of Bourbons, numbers won't save us. We shall go their way. Vacuity and indifference are not redeemed by the fact that everyone can share in them. They merely restrict the circle from which regeneration can come.

I say this in no puritan or pleasure-hating spirit. On the contrary, there is no boredom or misery to equal the pursuit of distraction alone. We do not slip into happiness. It is strenuously sought and earned. A nation glued to the television screen is not simply at a loss before the iron pioneers of the new collective society. It is'nt even having a good time. No society has ever spent as much as we do on drink and tranquillizers. Can one argue that this is evidence of universal fun? I ran across a quotation of LaBruyere on the court of Louis XIV that struck me as relevant: "Les joies sont visible, mais fausse, et les chagrins cachés, mais reels"—its joys are visible, but artificial, and its sorrows hidden, but real.

But perhaps this misunderstanding of the true nature, of happiness, and of the conditions of its pursuit is simply an aspect of something else—our misunderstanding of the real nature of freedom. I recall the words of the wise Judge Learned Hood, who warned us that freedom would not survive in our Constitution if it had already died in the hearts of the people. We shall not have a free society unless we have freemen.

And how often do we reflect upon what this inner freedom entails? "Give me the man," cries Hamlet, "who is not passion's slave." But this is what we are in danger of becoming, slaves to a tyranny more intimate and inescapable than any Stalin or Mao Tse-tung could impose. We can be made slaves simply by the clutter and complexity of modern living which notoriously leaves no time for serious thought and offers every means of distraction so that we can avoid such thought. Between aircraft that take us everywhere more rapidly, newspapers that grow in weight and coverage, news that flashes round the globe, ceaseless and competitive entertainment fashions—God help us—that change from sack to trapeze and back again, we can fill up every unforgiving minute with enough trash and preoccupation to still forever the deeper voices of the soul. Like Matthew Arnold, we can

> "* * * see all sights from pole to pole,
> And glance and nod and bustle by,
> And never once possess our soul
> Before we die."

How are we to defend freedom if, for the tyranny of external control we substitute the clattering, cluttering tyranny of internal aimlessness and fuss? This freedom for our souls, freedom at the profoundest level of our being, is not a gift to us by our contemporary way of life. On the contrary, much of this life is a direct conspiracy against it. And if we cannot—by a certain discipline, by readiness for reflection and quiet, by determination to do the difficult and aim at a lasting good—rediscover the real purpose and direction of our existence, we shall not be free. Our society will not be free. And between a chaotic, selfish, indifferent, commercial society and the iron discipline of the Communist world, I would not like to predict the outcome. Outer tyranny with purpose may well triumph over the inner, purposeless tyranny of a confused and aimless way of life.

I doubt if any society in history has faced so great a moral challenge as ours, or needed more desperately to draw on the deepest source of courage and responsibility. Ours is the first human community in which resources are so abundant that almost no policies lie beyond our capacity for purely physical reasons. What we decide to do, we can do. The inhibitions of poverty—lack of resources, lack of capital, lack of power—do not hold us back. We can accomplish what we aim at. Thus, perhaps for the first time in

the world, choice, not means, ends, not instruments, are decisive.

Then again we have proved—drably and dangerously—over the last decade that defensiveness is not a sufficient reason for action. All the policies we have pursued in self-defense have left us still on the defensive. But if we do not act from fear, we must find some other motivation. In free society there is no other alternative but to tap the vigor, faith, and imagination of the people themselves. We must find out once more who we are, as the psychologists say. And I would earnestly appeal especially to the women of America to organize an Operation Wisdom and to lead the way to a new self-examination and self-discipline.

But perhaps the most urgent reason why the quality of our moral response has become the decisive issue in politics is quite simply that most of the major problems of our day present themselves in moral terms, and are probably insoluble without some stirring of generosity, some measure of vision. Let me give you three instances. In the wealthiest nation in the world, at least 5 million families still live in squalid but remediable poverty. They are a minority. They don't have the votes to force the issue of their misfortune into the front rank of public issues. They depend, for remedies, upon the alert conscience of the majority. But how do we keep the conscience sensitive and alert? By concentrating on our own concerns and adding the dishwasher to the television set to the air conditioner? By griping over taxes and attacking that great bogey we call the welfare state? By closing our minds every time our shiny car takes us through a slum? No, we shall have the dedication and drive to wipe poverty out of this rich land only if the well-to-do majority of today do not repeat the selfish indifference which, in many communities, has been the epitaph of yesterday's wealthy elite.

Or take the issue of the rights and status of our colored citizens. This is our small share of a worldwide problem. The 400 years' dominance of men of white skin is ending. The vast colored majority of mankind are seeking the opportunity and the respect which white people have been lucky enough to enjoy for so long—sometimes at the colored people's expense. But, within this worldwide crisis, we in America, with our colored minority, have a major role to play—for good or evil. The unfinished work which Lincoln left us, of creating a society in which all men can hold up their heads as equals and self-respecting citizens, can never be accomplished unless there are enough white men and women who resist in the core of their being the moral evil of treating any of God's children as essentially inferior.

Nor is this simply a question of our own national community. I come back to the painful fact that the Communists show a worldwide concern which is largely lacking among the men of the West. The whole human race is their horizon. Their brotherhood is materialist, collectivist, atheist, and we dislike it, but it embraces everybody, and it is the framework of policies which take the missionaries of their new order to the ends of the earth. I say with all the emphasis I can command that we have no corresponding commitment to our fellow men. For hundreds of years, we have preached the Christian promise of brotherhood, but today, when vanishing space and scientific revolution have turned our planet into a single neighborhood, the ideal means little in terms of concern or conviction, in terms of policy or action.

Here we are in the Atlantic world, 16 percent of the world's peoples consuming 70 percent of the world's wealth. We cannot be indifferent to the moral implications of this gap. I do not know how we can gain a new perspective about the narrow world of plenty and poverty in which we live unless moral insights of justice and compassion stir us to understand the privileged position in which we live.

We are not going to be stirred to action by our own needs. We are the cushioned, protected, fortunate minority. It is not the measure of our morals or the lesson of our history to be spurred on only by fear of Russian encroachments. What we have done has largely had this motivation, and it has left us on the defensive. Our hope is to accept the implications of our own faith, make concrete the image of brotherhood which we profess, and set to work to express our dedication in whatever effort or sacrifice the world's needs may dictate. And, if we must always think in terms of contest with the Soviets, the ability to create the good life for the greatest number will be decisive.

This age has been defined in many ways—as a time of conflict in ideology, as a time of ferment in technology, as a period of revolution in science, as an era when at last the means lie at hand to free mankind from the ancient shackles of pain and hunger. It is all these things, but I believe the true crisis of our times lies at a deeper level. We have indeed conquered means and resources unknown to earlier ages. We have had thrown open to us frontiers of choice which would leave earlier ages stupefied by their scale and scope.

But all this freedom and elbow room only thrusts onto us with more force the fundamental issue of the faith that is in us. We can use our wealth and capacity for some vision of truth, some ideal of brotherhood, or we can imprison ourselves within the selfishness of our own concerns and the limitations of a narrow nationhood. This is the dimension of our crisis.

You may argue that these qualities—of dedication and selflessness—are pretty remote from the realities of politics. They are all very well for private life, but what part can they play in the rough and tumble of partisanship, of primaries, conventions, and election campaigns? Ambition, drive, material interests, political skills, the art of maneuver—all these, you say, have their part, but do not let us pretend that the democratic process is primarily a school of virtue or an arena of moral combat.

And yet, I wonder. It has been the view of great philosophers and great statesmen that our system of free government depends in the first instance upon the virtue of its citizens. Montesquieu made virtue the condition of republican government; Washington declared that it could not survive without it. We have had 175 years of it since their time and no one can deny that the system has survived a remarkable amount of skullduggery. In fact, it is probably a tougher system than its founders imagined. Yet I believe they are right. For no democratic system can survive without at least a large and active leaven of citizens in whom dedication and selflessness are not confined to private life but are the fundamental principles of their activity in the public sphere.

Naked interest and naked ambition will carry a lot of people naturally and inevitably into politics. We do not need societies for the promotion of lobbies. Interests, good and bad, will promote themselves. Nor, in any generation do we lack politicians whose only principle of action is the advancement of their own career—the starry-eyed opportunists and all the other eager men in a hurry to the top. But into what state must politics degenerate if that is all we find active in the political arena? That any sectional interests played upon by personal ambitions? There have been such periods—the roaring nineties, the time from Harding to the Wall Street crash—but our democratic system survived because such epochs were followed and cleansed by periods of disinterested reform.

But there has never been any disinterested reform without disinterested reformers. And here we come to the essential contribution made by dedication and selflessness to the public good. No one ever did any good in politics without readiness for endless hard work, for the grinding, boring, tedious work, as well as the glamorous, high sounding, headline-hitting work. The painstaking hours collecting the facts, the hours in committee and conference, the hours in persuasion and argument, the hours of defeat and disappointment, the hours of disgust and revulsion at the darker sides of human behavior—these cannot be supported without energy and devotion. No reforms come easy; even the most obvious will have its entrenched enemies. Each one is carried to us on the bent and weary backs of patient, dedicated men and women.

They are not only dedicated in their readiness to give energy and hard work to the cause; they must also have sufficiently clear sight and open minds and hearts to see the need for reform in the first place. But clear sight and an open heart for others' needs is again something that hardly comes naturally. We have so many needs of our own; our families, our jobs, our homes, and fortunes, our prospects. We are hemmed in with needs and interests, weighty, urgent, honorable, human needs and interests, even if they are exclusively our own. It takes an extra dimension of vision to see beyond our inner circle of interest. Most people, most of the time, do not possess it—which is one reason why self-regarding interests make up so much of the stuff of politics. And this, I suppose, is why the men and women of genuine, imperturbable public spirit seem so few and far between.

I sometimes think there is a danger of this element of vision vanishing almost wholly from our political life. In the main we are so comfortable; so many evils of the past have shrunk in size and almost out of sight. At the same time, people marry much younger, have larger families, and are profoundly involved in earning a living, making careers, and safeguarding the future of their children. It is more difficult, they say, to give time to public affairs when private life is so urgent and absorbing.

Yet is it, I wonder, more urgent and absorbing than a hundred years ago when young men not only married young, had large families, and built up careers, but also opened up the new frontiers, created new cities from the wilderness, and gave to new States and communities the framework of active political life?

If one reads the life of young Abe Lincoln, it is hard to believe that his struggles as a young lawyer and his difficulties as a young parent were less than those of young men today. Yet there was no time when the deepest issues of the day did not occupy his mind or the call of statecraft make itself heard above the claims and clamor of everyday life. Nor was he alone or exceptional. Stephen A Douglas' life was no different. The prairie towns were filled with earnest, active citizens deeply, profoundly concerned with the great issues of a nation "half slave, half free." When the multitudes gathered, a hundred years ago, to listen in rapt attention for hours to the Lincoln-Douglas debates, had they fewer responsibilities and duties than the citizens of today to many of whom the great issues of politics seem to be most usefully conveyed in 15-second television flashes of subliminal advertising?

Is it not possible that the pressures of personal responsibilities are not greater but that the dedication and selflessness needed to discern and influence public issues have

shrunk? In a century in which so many of the mentors of the public mind—from the psychiatrists to the admen—speak to us in terms of what we owe to ourselves, may there not indeed have been a slackening of devotion compared with those days, not so long distant, when what man owes to God and his neighbor was a common theme of public discourse?

If so, this is a dangerous hour for our politics and for government by consent of the governed. For at no time have so many of the great issues of the day demanded clear, real moral vision to bring them into focus—the vision of A. Powell Davies, who loved the truth and believed in man's capacity and right to govern himself.

Visit to the Senate by Students From Ursuline Academy, New Orleans, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL B. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, one of the first groups of students to visit the Nation's Capitol during 1959 was a group from the city of New Orleans, La., representing the Ursuline Academy. This group took advantage of their presence here to further their studies on government and to learn many of the procedures which are followed by the Nation's lawmakers in handling the many complex problems that face us today.

The Ursuline Academy, which is staffed by an order of Roman Catholic nuns that was founded in 1535 for the purpose of the education of young girls, was established in New Orleans in 1727 and has enjoyed through the years the unique distinction of being the oldest educational institution for the education of girls within the present limits of the United States.

The Ursuline Academy has been accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools since 1926. At present, 822 students attend the school. This is the largest enrollment in its history. The graduating class will number 96 this year. Two of the girls who visited the Capitol, Peggy Hanemann and Linda Teijelo, are merit scholarship winners.

The Ursuline nuns are very closely connected with the history of New Orleans and hold a very important place in the development of the city. A great many of the fine young women graduates have records of splendid achievement down through the long history of the school.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the names of the students of Ursuline Academy and their chaperons who visited Washington.

There being no objection, the names of the students of Ursuline Academy and their chaperons were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chaperons: Miss Irma Smart, Miss Ann Corbin, Mother Mary deLourdes Bindel, O.S.U., Mother Vera Marie Wingerter, O.S.U., and Mrs. A. Wingerter.

Students: Judy Alexander, Nancy Amato, Mary Lynn Bologna, Kathleen Brown, Kay Calongne, Kay Cambre, Carroll Campbell, Catherine Cassagne, Rose Lynn Cicero, Elise Cornay, Mary Ann Cutler, Deanne Derbes, Mary Doyle, Catherine Ferrara, Adele Gaudet, Sandra Gelis, Flora Gennaro, Barbara Gilbert, Linda Haase, Peggy Hanemann, Karen Kelly, Carol Kramer, Janet Lala, Brenda Levy, Betty Jane Murtes, Catherine Richaud, Cleo Riecke, Charlotte Sanchez, Audrey Satterlee, Madeline Simmons, Kathryn Stewart, Artemise Tallon, Linda Teijelo, Ann Van Geffen, Carol Virgillio, Diana Wick, Margaret Williams, and Leanne Willoz.

Rural Electrification Benefits City as Well as Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 8, 1959, the Courier-Wedge at Durand, Wis., printed an excellent summary on what rural electrification has meant to the farmers of this country and to the American economy as a whole. In the editorial, Editor William Ender noted that the REA program has provided an extra market for $12 billion worth of city products in addition to raising the standard of living of our farmers. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include Editor Ender's editorial in the RECORD:

GROWTH WITH PUBLIC POWER

As 1958 drew to a close, Dairyland Power Cooperative issued a report which showed gains in almost all categories of operation. Twenty-six electric firms that draw from Dairyland generators marketed 735 million kilowatts of power last year, an increase of 7.6 percent. The average farmer now burns 545 kilowatts of electricity a year, almost twice as much as the average city dweller.

Cooperatives, which have about a quarter century of service behind them, deserve praise for expanding electricity into sparsely settled rural regions of America. Studies show that the rural consumer spends about $4 for each dollar his company pays to build lines to his place. Over the years, this means our rural electrification program has provided an extra market for $12 billion worth of city products.

The $12-billion expansion has been a tremendous stimulant to the American economy. Workers who manufactured equipment bought cars, rugs, houses, and boats, which helped employees in other industries as well. President Eisenhower recognized the importance of rural electrification by urging systems to step up expansion when a mild recession struck the country early in 1958.

People who watch rural electrification closely point to many intangible benefits it produces. Once a rural home has power, the standard of living for a family rises sharply. Houses and barns get new coats of paint. Before long the living room has new furniture. How can a person describe the human benefits of indoor plumbing, of hot water, of refrigeration, of electric cooking, of radio, television, and just light itself?

The rural electrification program has many critics. Yet, Government loans are repaid to Federal authorities with interest. Farmers have not been griping about direct multimillion-dollar Federal grants that help only a city resident—for public housing, slum clearance, and urban renewal. Chronic critics of REA power should think of those angles, too.

In this area, the economy is being stimulated by a $12,500,000 expansion project of Dairyland Power Cooperative facilities at Alma. An 80,000 kilowatt turbogenerator is being installed, which will raise the capacity of the Alma plant to 315,000 kilowatts on 5 units. All that work will lead to new transmission lines, new substations, new customers, new appliance sales.

Dairyland sells power on a wholesale basis to the Buffalo Electric Cooperative, the Dunn County Electric Cooperative, the Pierce-Pepin Electric Cooperative, the Eau Claire Electric Cooperative, and other concerns which are linked directly to farmers. In all, 97,000 farmers are benefiting directly because Dairyland and its associates were created.

Inaugural Address of Hon. Buford Ellington, Governor of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask to have reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD the inaugural address of the Honorable Buford Ellington, the dynamic, young, new Governor of the State of Tennessee, delivered at the capitol in Nashville, Monday, January 19, 1959.

The address follows:

HUMAN BETTERMENT IS THE PRINCIPAL JUSTIFICATION FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOVERNMENT

Governor Clement, Governor Coleman, Governor Chandler, Governor Blair, Mr. Speaker Baird, Mr. Speaker Bomar, ladies and gentlemen of the general assembly, justices of the supreme court, members of congress, distinguished guests, friends and fellow Tennesseans, this is naturally an hour of great personal happiness as I prepare, here in the presence of my family and friends, to take the oath of office as the 42d Governor of Tennessee.

But the factor that transcends all personal considerations is whether this shall also be an hour of value and happiness for all the people of Tennessee.

Long ago in our history a small band of Tennesseans on Kings Mountain gave to America the sparkling inspiration to cling tightly to freedom, independence and resourcefulness.

That spirit dominates us here today.

Great names in our history are associated with the office of Governor first held by John Sevier; and I am humble here within the shadow of the capitol as I join the ranks of chief executives of the State of Tennessee.

No other ambition possesses me except to serve the people of Tennessee in the most considerate and efficient manner of which I am capable.

Human betterment is the principal justification for the existence of government.

The welfare of all the people must dominate every thought, every plan, every action of a State administration.

The end of one administration, and the beginning of another, is an appropriate time for a look into the past and for an examination of the future. The transition from one administration to another must be accomplished with the least disruption of the normal functions of government, and with the greatest protection of our people.

Tennessee's future is normally planned and described by the actions of government on capitol hill in Nashville, but there is no planning and no action that can successfully be accomplished unless they spring from the hearts of our people in the vast and resourceful stretches of our State.

We are in a certain sense three great States in one. Each of our grand divisions possesses within itself all the human and natural resources to be a sovereign State of its own. But never from the beginning of our history has there been a division of our destiny.

We are a most unified sort of people. And that is one of the reasons we can face the long future, and that part of the future which is circumscribed by the next 4 years, with the resolute assurance that we shall make vast strides toward an economic, agricultural, industrial, civic, patriotic, and personal day of greatness far surpassing anything which we have been privileged to know in the past.

We especially want our young men and young women to put their ideas to work in the making of a greater Tennessee and thereby a greater America. We want them to roam the wide fields of their gifted imaginations. They live in a time when mankind's future seemingly is dependent upon the daring of the human mind. We must provide them with the tools and the surroundings to advance their natural gifts.

That means attention to the greatest possible advancement every hour of the future of the educational resources of Tennessee. A good State, like a good individual, is always seeking the right and opportunity of self-improvement. We shall vigorously seek new advantages for Tennessee. We shall give new industry not just an invitation—but justification for coming here. Yet in our zeal for industrial progress, we shall cling with equal fervor to the fact that our farmlands and our farm people still constitute the basic resource of our vastly expanding State.

There's no war of the scales between agriculture and industry in Tennessee. The balancing of agriculture and industry in one broad economic endeavor for the general betterment of the State is a matter of mutual desire.

Obviously we face certain financial limitations in State government in Tennessee, if we are to go into this administration without new taxation, as we are determined to do. But these limitations are not shackles. Actually, they are opportunities—opportunities for better management of your tax dollar—opportunities for wiser uses of it—opportunities for curtailing certain services of lesser critical status in favor of expanding those services of higher ranking importance to the majority of our people.

An era of readjustment in the light of our existing tax resources is upon us. Rather than fear it, I think we welcome it. A relief from new taxation is the most important contribution that the new administration can make to your welfare.

I hope that it may be said of me, 4 years from now when I stand here again as the one departing from the gubernatorial scene, that Buford Ellington kept the faith with all the people; and that of special privileges there were none.

Now, in conclusion, I have but this one simple statement to make:

The controlling ambition of my administration was embedded in me as a child when I, like so many hundreds of thousands of other farm youth in this country, came under the influence of the distinguished agricultural leader "Corn Club" Smith, the founder of the 4-H Clubs of America, whose inspiration I carry with me today in meeting my responsibilities to the people of Tennessee.

Therefore I say to you now that my sincere desire is that my heart shall always be loyally dedicated to your service; that my hands shall labor faithfully for you; that my head shall not be turned from the tasks that lie ahead; and that it shall be my good fortune to possess the good health to serve you with vigor, and that my feet shall always be planted firmly on the ground.

Mr. Chief Justice, I am now ready to take the oath of office.

Dedication of Bell Hall at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, 1959, it was my privilege to attend the dedication ceremony at Fort Leavenworth for Bell Hall. This is a new academic building for the Army Command and General Staff College.

Not only is this new $6 million structure a valuable and necessary improvement in the training of career officers, it provides needed additional space so that the regular class can be increased from 500 to possibly 750. It is estimated that 75 percent of the senior staff officers and commanders of World War II and Korea were graduates of the College. Several Members of the House also have graduated from this school during their military service.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, specifically requested that I express to you the sincere appreciation of himself and the Chief of Staff of the Army for the authorization and appropriation that made this new building possible. Representing the congressional district in which Fort Leavenworth is located, I, too, want to express my appreciation to you and the House for this important new installation. It is recognition of a continuing challenge to a changing world and a symbol of our determination to maintain the highest degree of efficiency possible in our officer-training program for the U.S. Army.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. LIONEL C. MCGARR, COMMANDANT OF THE U.S. ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE AND COMMANDING GENERAL, FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS., AT THE DEDICATION CEREMONY FOR JAMES FRANKLIN BELL HALL, JANUARY 14, 1959

Secretary Brucker, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is my privilege this morning to welcome you to Fort Leavenworth, home of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College. Here today we join in dedicating this modern academic building as a fitting symbol of the spirit of improvement and progress which characterizes today's Army.

As current commandant, I feel it appropriate I say a few words on this important and symbolic occasion. Although proud of recent accomplishments, I am acutely and humbly aware of the contribution of my illustrious predecessors in making the college what it is today.

In this tension-laden era, conditioned by the deadly clash of opposing ideologies, we remain dedicated without complacency or compromise to educating and improving the minds of the Army's future leaders. This requires changing their thought processes by increasing their ability to reason objectively, decide logically and operate efficiently in the application of the all important principles of warfare. Only by so developing flexibility of mind can the inspired leadership necessary for success on future battlefields be developed. This is our mission. There is no easy way.

It has been so truly said, that war is an art based on scholastic foundation and resting on a free and creative activity. Warfare is an art, one whose very heart and soul is service and sacrifice to the ideals of our country. The overall competence and sacrifice required of the professional military leader can be even more demanding than that required of other important professions. For the combat leader's success is not measured purely in material accomplishments such as wealth, power, and prestige, but rather in terms of victory at the least possible cost in human life and the ultimate survival of the Nation. And remember, the soldier cannot actively practice his art before he must apply it for record on the battlefield.

Realizing this significant restriction, the college is convinced that in the future, as in the past, an important part of America's preparation for war must be in the classrooms of our military schools and colleges. It is equally convinced that the protracted warfare now being waged by international communism, although not fought with bombs and bullets, is all the more deadly because it is fought with ideologies, with ideas which threaten our very way of life, and its objective is the primary objective of all autocratic rules—the minds of men. We must counter this ideology which is completely opposed to ours in religious, political, and ethical concept. We must counter it with the practical application of the ideas and ideals of humanity and the dignity of man—which, after all, are based on the simple truths of service and sacrifice our Saviour taught.

The strength of any nation lies in the moral and intellectual strength of its people. This applies with equal force to the Armed Forces. Character and a sound moral code of ethical values have always been the hallmark of the dedicated professional officer. One of the principal elements of the new college curriculum is strong emphasis on the importance of the educational intangibles—the psychological and moral factors which improve combat effectiveness. The student is taught that it is normal and realistic to integrate the intangible moral and ethical aspects of command into the more tangible tactical and administrative aspects, in his decision making and problem solving. This is because we believe the only motivations which can sustain men under the stress of battle are those of a spiritual and moral nature. Here in the Army's senior tactical school we strive to build into our students the character, integrity and intelligence required by the destructiveness and reliability which the fast-moving pace of technology is building into our weapons systems. This requires the urgent development of the full human potentialities of our students, because men properly trained, motivated and led will always remain the constant factor in success on the battlefield.

We are fortunate to be living in a most exciting era in history—when the frontiers

of science and technology are advancing at a pace beyond our boldest dreams. This advance is forcing a cosmic awakening in which it is becoming more and more evident that what the mind of man can conceive, he can develop. And, as his imagination leaps out beyond the stars, we must realize that what man can invent he can control—if he so desires. It is important that our mental processes not be dulled by automation, or be dominated by the purely technical aspects of this sweep of science. They must be geared to leading and guiding technology along purposeful lines in the resolution of our many military problems and, equally as important, in constructive human progress. This chance for progress, possibly even our very hope of survival, lies in molding the minds of our leaders in the direction of progress.

The dedication of this building as Bell Hall is a tribute to a great American, a great military educator and former Commandant—General James Franklin Bell. At the turn of the century he assisted Secretary of War Elihu Root, the father of the U.S. Army General Staff and military school systems, in establishing the basis of our modern army educational structure. General Bell's concept of relating instruction to education in the broad principles of war, rather than to specific techniques, is still valid. He believed in appealing to the intelligence, reason and patriotism of the individual soldier and his progressive thinking is shown by this famous remark, "I earnestly pray that the idea of our old Army, that a soldier was not expected to think, only to obey, has had its day and will forever be left to repose upon the scrap heap of other discarded military notions."

Our Commander in Chief, President Eisenhower, aptly described the college purpose in the following words: "In Leavenworth the tradition is hard work—hard work at the most serious of all military tasks—that of preserving American interests against aggressive force. In its classrooms war is reduced to fundamentals learned so exhaustively by the student that they become second nature. So equipped in battle, the graduate is free for the fullest exercise of inspirational leadership in shaping armies of the free world that may some day stand as civilization's last, but sure, defense." This is so because warfare is not merely a pattern of mechanical energies and nuclear forces but one of human beings, their sense of values, and their reactions under varying conditions.

True, our Nation's military forces and the professional leaders trained here have one final measure of success in war—victory on the battlefield. However, it should be kept in mind that although this is a military college, it also has the broader mission of training and educating leaders to help win the peace. In this respect our Allied Officers' Program, training officers from approximately 43 countries of the free world, contributes significantly to the solidarity of the free world.

With the addition of Bell Hall, the college now combines the most modern equipment with a reoriented, modernized curriculum based on improved instructional methods and a forward-looking educational philosophy. However, like technology this fine building and its most advanced instructional aids are of limited value if not properly oriented toward one definite objective—the security of our Nation.

In accomplishing this objective the United States Army Command and General Staff College pledges itself to educating and rededicating its students in the ideals of service and sacrifice—ideals which are the very wellsprings of the greatness of our country.

And now, it is most fitting and appropriate that we are again honored by the presence of the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, who will make the dedicatory address. It is appropriate, not only because he is a decorated combat leader of World War I, a former Governor of the State of Michigan, and an eminent member of the legal profession, but also because he is a forward-looking, dedicated civil leader, without whose interest and support Bell Hall would not have been possible. It is my pleasure and honor to present the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE WILBER M. BRUCKER, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, DEDICATION OF ACADEMIC BUILDING, COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE, FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS., JANUARY 14, 1959

The dedication of this splendid new academic building designed to further the mission of the United States Army Command and General Staff College is an event of great significance. It marks a noteworthy forward stride in the development of military education fully measuring up to the tremendous responsibilities resting upon the United States Army as a major bulwark of our country in these critical years of peril. The entire Army and the Nation at large will be the beneficiaries of this building named in honor of Maj. Gen. J. Franklin Bell, "father of the modern Army school system."

For years it was a matter of deep concern within the Army that its senior tactical school should lack adequate college facilities, and must carry out its vital educational program in a converted riding hall and stables. Efforts to remedy the situation dated back far into World War II, but actual construction of proper facilities did not get underway until November 5, 1956, shortly after the college celebrated its 75th anniversary. For those who labored so long and so well with antiquated tools, it must be gratifying indeed to see their hopes brought to fruition in a modern structure consistent with the great traditions of Leavenworth.

Bell Hall, with its twenty-four 50-man classrooms, auditoriums, faculty briefing room, conference rooms, library, archives, and staff and faculty offices, will permit the consolidation of all resident instructional facilities under one roof. It will contribute immeasurably to the ability of Leavenworth to meet the stirring challenge of the future.

The impact of technological advances, the rapid changes in organizational and operational concepts, and the worldwide multiplication of Army commitments for joint and combined staff and operational personnel are factors which necessitate the creation of as broad as possible a base of highly trained career officers.

As our senior commanders in this country and overseas have found their tasks becoming ever more complex and exacting, they have placed increasing emphasis upon Leavenworth training as a principal prerequisite in the selection of their staff officers. It has become imperative to increase attendance at this College without in any way sacrificing quality for quantity. This can now be done. Completion of this new building, and concurrent enlargement of the staff and faculty, will make it possible in the years to come for a far greater proportion of our officers to attain the stature which the Command and General Staff College confers upon its graduates. Increases in both the regular and associate courses will become effective for classes starting in September of this year.

Through the years, the Command and General Staff College has achieved an enviable standing within the United States Army School System, and among military training establishments around the world. However, there is no thought here of resting upon the hard-won laurels of the past. Leavenworth, like the entire Army, is constantly on the march toward new heights of accomplishment. I sense the stirring of a dynamic new spirit, a new perception of urgency, of which this fine academic building is a material symbol.

The dedicated staff and faculty of the college work with unremitting zeal to adopt its program to the impact upon the Army of new weapons systems and similar developments, the reorganization of the Army in accordance with the Pentomic concept, and the necessity for constant reorientation of instruction to support, under fluid conditions, the Army's functions in any kind of war—general or limited, atomic or nonatomic—as an indispensable member of our great land, sea, and air defense team.

In line with the events of recent years and the expectations for tomorrow, the curriculum was entirely rewritten for the 1957–58 academic year. In support of this revision, a major reorganization of departments along functional lines has been completed. Significant changes have been made in educational philosophy and academic methods. The college has demonstrated a keen awareness of the necessity for establishing a proper balance between the intensive training in techniques, tactics, and procedures which characterized the short courses during World War II, and the marked subsequent trend toward major emphasis upon fundamental principles as applied in the solution of problems. Instruction is designed to prepare students for their role as military problem solvers by teaching them to think, rather than merely to memorize facts and formulas. In this fashion the college equips officers to cope with the drastic reduction in battlefield reaction and decision time resulting from the new tactics of nuclear warfare. Today's tactical doctrine imposes more responsibility upon junior commanders than was borne by many senior commanders of World War II. Decisions which in the past might have waited upon a staff conference, in any future war will have to be made within minutes, and on the spot.

In its courses of instruction, this college properly gives primacy to the philosophy that we must never allow ourselves to be so preoccupied by our array of new tools of war—missiles, vehicles, electronic marvels, and all the rest science has placed in our hands—that we forget the overriding importance of men, of human mastery over material things. It would be tragic if we allowed the pressures of technology to derogate the qualities of mind and spirit which are fundamental to our national strength.

In recognition of this, the college proceeds on the conviction that the Army, if it is to fulfill its responsibilities to the Nation, must revitalize and reemphasize time-honored moral principles and standards, particularly through the personal example of those in authority at all levels of command.

The dynamic response being made by this forward-thinking, forward-moving college to the challenge of the future is in consonance with trends throughout our Army today. Modern technology demands that we continue to raise human standards all along the line, and we have started at the foundation by developing a program designed to obtain and retain high caliber men, men with a sense of responsibility who are capable of handling complicated materiel as well as complex problems. The Army's new enlisted management program contributes to this end through appropriate financial reward, prestige, and inspiring opportunities for advancement. This program was made possible to a large degree by legislation recently passed by the Congress, notably legislation which authorized the President to modify standards of induction.

By means of preinduction screening, we have been enabled to reject individuals at the outset who do not demonstrate a suitable capability for modern military training. This has resulted in a significant saving of time which would have been fruitlessly expended in attempting to train these individuals, and

of the costs involved in their eventual elimination from the service. Last year, prior to the implementation of this authority, we discharged 72,000 ineffective men with resultant improvement in the level of training, job performance, behavior, and elementary education participation. Of these, 34,000 were separated prior to the completion of their basic training.

Concurrently, we moved to put into effect the provisions of the military pay legislation passed last May. The first proficiency payments were made in November to soldiers selected by their commanders as being most proficient in critical skills. Beginning this month, our soldiers begin competing for proficiency payments against armywide standards established by our new enlisted evaluation system, which allows us to measure the capabilities of our men by a combination of written proficiency tests and commanders' evaluation reports.

Recognition of the Army's enlisted personnel who carry heavy responsibilities has been enhanced by the addition of two new pay grades at the top of the enlisted pay structure, and promotion to these grades as well as to other enlisted grades eventually will be related to the enlisted evaluation system. The Army plans to advance at least 14,500 to the two top grades during the next 4 years.

Another aim of the Army enlisted management program is to aid in the development of promising enlisted men by further training and education. Upon entering the Army, the volunteer, beginning this month, will have the opportunity of enlisting for a particular occupation of his choosing in which he can show sufficient aptitude. In addition to the many service schools available, career-motivated soldiers may now also apply for college level training in technical, scientific, and managerial areas at Government expense.

Many similar steps have been and will be taken to insure high caliber in our officer corps.

For example, new tests have been developed to identify the best possible talent for training at the United States Military Academy.

We have a program to increase the number of officers developing foreign linguistic skill in order to prepare them more effectively for vital assignments around the world.

A special program is in operation for the temporary promotion of captains, majors, and lieutenant colonels ahead of the time they would normally be eligible for consideration.

The best-qualified method of selection has been put into effect this year for all commissioned grades above captain for both temporary and permanent promotion.

In order to increase the retention of highly qualified officers, we have also provided for greater stabilization of duty tours, and extended opportunities for specialization to include a number of new career fields.

A major review of our officer education and training program was completed this year by a board of distinguished officers. This comprehensive review was conducted to determine the adequacy of the present system to meet the needs of the Army from the present to 1970. The results of this review will be announced in the very near future. I can tell you now, however, that adjustments and refinements to make our system entirely equal to the tasks ahead are already underway. A modern pattern for officer development is emerging which fully recognizes the indispensable part played by the well-trained and dedicated Army officer in building and maintaining the defenses of our Nation, both spiritual and military, in these momentous times.

Atomic weapons, guided missiles, and air transport have revolutionized strategic and tactical concepts. Their impact upon the art of war has not even yet been fully assessed. But this we do know—that the highest professional competence and the soundest possible judgment on the part of leaders charged with responsibility for the lives of men in battle, and the success of our mission, are of even more vital importance than they have been at any time in the whole past.

The Army needs, above all, leaders possessed of great imagination, mental mobility, psychological stability, and moral stamina. The best career development policy or program which might be conceived could not produce such leaders in the absence of individual initiative and interest on the part of the officers themselves. The successful Army officer today is a well-rounded person, who keeps up to date in every aspect of his profession. He has an inquiring, imaginative mind, and a great thirst for opportunities to improve his professional ability. Attitudes are tremendously important in life, and particularly so in the military service. We need healthy, positive, forward-looking attitudes which contribute to the on-going of the Army.

One of the great virtues of the courses here at the Command and General Staff College is that they are designed to stimulate creative thought. Your curriculum inspires an enthusiasm for discovering new and better solutions to old problems, and helps to develop the habit of considering every aspect of command in the light of future requirements rather than past performance. This habit is one of the most important any officer can nurture.

Because science and technology play such an increasingly important part in shaping military doctrine and operations all along the line, it behooves every officer to dig in and acquire at least a rudimentary knowledge of scientific and technological principles and applications. For example, regardless of his immediate duties, he should learn all he can about guided missiles, ballistic missiles, rockets, and similar matters of vital concern to our modern Army. Only by the fullest interchange of informed thought at all levels can the problems in this field be successfully solved. Furthermore, a reasonably thorough grounding in basic science and technology will make an officer of greater value in any assignment, and may in the course of his career open up whole new vistas of opportunity for constructive and satisfying service.

Every officer should develop a fundamental understanding, appreciation, and acceptance of the interdependence of each of our Armed Forces, and the forces of our allies, in the attainment of success either in the deterrence of aggression or the winning of any war. No longer can an Army officer at any level afford to compartmentalize his thinking, and consider only his own branch, his own service, or even the forces of his own Nation. The effectiveness of joint and combined operations stems not so much from carefully worked out plans as from a habit of mind. It is necessary that in every case we visualize the military picture as a whole, not just our particular part of it, and with that vision act in complete harmony with all concerned to achieve a single, positive result.

Students here at the Command and General Staff College are especially fortunate because they are able to attend classes side by side with outstanding officers of 44 foreign nations. Every student ought to make the most of these contacts in order to develop to the fullest degree that mutual understanding and respect which is the only solid foundation for effective mutual security.

In addition to leadership for war, leadership for peace has become a major concern of the military officer. Within the last 20 years, the soldier has evolved into the soldier-statesman. Many officers at the top levels of the Army have contributed immensely to our national security, and the realization of our national objectives, by brilliant accomplishments not only in the strictly military sphere, but also in the field of international diplomacy. During the course of your careers, many in this audience will undoubtedly be called upon to participate in high councils by means of which the nations of the world will seek some practical resolution of differences which stand in the way of enduring peace. The well-rounded officer will conscientiously prepare himself in every possible way for this great responsibility.

The necessity for good management in the Army cannot be overemphasized. Any waste or inefficiency in the employment of money, material, or manpower is directly reflected in reduced combat power—and combat power is the root and branch of the Army's ability to carry out its historic responsibilities for national security. To have the strength needed to see us through any future emergency, we must make the best possible use of every resource entrusted to us. We must also bear it firmly in mind that the Army must have the full confidence and support of the American people. These are essential to its continued effectiveness as a military instrument. To gain and maintain public confidence and support we must conscientiously apply the best management principles all along the line to insure a maximum return in defense for every dollar expended and every American boy called to the colors. However prosaic it may seem, every officer must adjust his vision to the importance of good management in every sphere, and put its precepts into practice wherever he wields authority or influence.

The truly effective Army officer will be a vocal advocate of the Army. In all his contacts with the other segments of the American community, he will endeavor to contribute in a positive way to the enlightenment of public opinion. He will seek to enhance public understanding of the vital role of the Army as a member of our defense team, and stimulate public realization of its accomplishments. The highlights of progress the Army has made during the past year alone are indeed impressive.

All active Army divisions were reorganized as pentomic divisions to insure that they will be fully capable of successful combat operation on any battlefield—conventional or nuclear.

We deployed overseas two missile commands and several separate missile battalions.

We increased the effectiveness of Nike Ajax battalions on constant guard in the United States against air attack, and also sent Nike Ajax battalions to Europe to defend depots, air bases, and vital bridges.

We began the systematic conversion of Nike Ajax battalions in the continental United States to the longer range and more powerful Nike Hercules. Hercules battalions are now deployed and operational in Taiwan, Okinawa, and Greenland.

With the addition of the Hawk to our air defense arsenal we will be able to cover the whole span of altitudes from the treetops to the highest flown by planes, and every type of aircraft now in operational use at any known speed.

The formation of STRAC, the Army's Strategic Army Corps, added immensely to our deterrent capability.

In the field of space exploration, we are tremendously proud of having placed in orbit the free world's first earth satellite, the Explorer on January 31, 1958. Then on March 26, Explorer III went up, and on July 26, Explorer IV. The coded information about space which has poured down to earth from these man-made "moons," particularly concerning high-level radiation, has proved to be of tremendous value. The latest Army achievement in this field was the instru-

mentation of the Atlas missile which the Air Force put into orbit last December 18. Intricate electronic relay equipment developed by the Army Signal Corps at Fort Monmouth, N.J., broadcast from the orbiting missile the voice of President Eisenhower delivering a Christmas message. This was the first time a human voice had ever come to us from outer space.

We should all look upon each achievement not as a goal reached, but as a milestone on the path of progress toward maximum strength for peace and security. What has been accomplished so far is only a beginning. The brightest pages of our Army's history are still unwritten—of this I am sure. What the hand of time will eventually inscribe upon them depends in large measure upon the ingenuity, the determination, the vigor, and the devotion above and beyond the call of duty each of us brings to the tasks which lie before us.

As America marches forward with courage, conviction, and confidence to meet the future, an increasing burden of responsibility is laid upon this great college as a major source of education—and, above all, of inspiration—for our Nation's military leadership. Its influence during the long years past has redounded to the tremendous benefit of our country, yet I am certain that its greatest achievements, like those of the Army as a whole, lie ahead. It is in that faith that I now dedicate, on behalf of the U.S. Army, this new building—the J. Franklin Bell Hall.

The Talmadge Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials entitled "The Talmadge Farm Bill," from the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal; "Talmadge Reoffers His New Look Farm Bill," from the Columbus (Ga.) Ledger; "Deserves a Second Look," from the Griffin (Ga.) Daily News; "Farm Equalization Has a Chance," from the Moultrie (Ga.) Observer; and a telegram from Lester J. Cranek, president of the Wharton County Farmers Union, of El Campo, Tex.

There being no objection, the editorials and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal, Jan. 15, 1959]

THE TALMADGE FARM BILL

The Nation's farmers for several years now have been caught in an impossible crossfire between the radical policies of Ezra Taft Benson and periodic piecemeal legislation by the Congress.

To say the least, it has been an unsatisfactory situation. The farmer, especially here in the Southeast, has suffered greatly. Many men of the soil have been forced to move to another field for livelihood. And as the farmer has been hurt, so has the Nation's economy.

A bill providing for a major overhaul of existing farm policies has been laid before the Congress by Georgia's Senator HERMAN TALMADGE. It deserves careful consideration.

The Talmadge proposal is relatively simple. It would allow the farmer to grow as much of any basic commodity as he wishes. The Government would pay him the difference between the market price and 100 percent of parity.

The plan has the virtue of giving the farmer a respectable measure of free enterprise, and at the same time according him safeguards similar to those extended other segments of the economy.

It is further unique in the fact that its acceptability to all sections of the country is about as great as any farm bill can be.

Agricultural experts viewed the Talmadge proposal with favor last year. The urgency accrued through another year of deteriorating farm conditions puts an even brighter glow on it now.

There has been much speculation as to what attitude this Congress would take on farm problems. But who knows, farm legislation just might be a meeting ground for the liberal and conservative wings. And the Talmadge bill could possibly be the instrument to achieve such an agreement.

[From the Columbus (Ga.) Ledger, Jan. 16, 1959]

TALMADGE REOFFERS HIS NEW LOOK FARM BILL

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE has reintroduced in Congress a farm bill which he described as designed to let the farmer farm and at the same time give him about the same degree of protection that labor enjoys through the minimum wage and industry has in the tariff.

The measure, the Agricultural Income Equalization Act of 1959, is the same which the Georgia Senator placed before the 2d session of the 85th Congress but which never was acted upon.

Senator TALMADGE's bill, if enacted, would eliminate acreage controls and Government loans. The Senator said, as he introduced the measure, that the present national program, based on controls and loans is a failure.

In place of the controls and loans, TALMADGE's farm plan would assign each grower of basic commodities—cotton, tobacco, peanuts, rice, wheat, and corn—a quota which he could produce for sale on the open domestic market.

The quota would be computed from a comparison of his production record for the past 5 years with the national consumption.

When the farmer harvested his crop, he could sell it on the open market, either domestic or foreign, at the current nonsupported price. He could then present bills for the part of his crop sold on the domestic market to which he was entitled to supports to his county agriculture committee.

The committee would notify the Government and a check would be mailed to the farmer for the difference between what he was paid on the open market and 100 percent of parity. No farmer could have more than $25,000 in sales support, however. He would get no supports for the amounts above the quotas he sold or for that sold on the foreign market.

Mr. TALMADGE told the Senate the cost of his plan would depend upon the resulting free market price levels of the basic commodities, but in any event would be considerably less than of the present program. He also advised the Senate his plan would assure that every farm-program dollar went into the pockets of the American farmers which, he said, decidedly is not the case today.

There is widespread dissatisfaction with the present costly national farm program and many, particularly farmers, will agree with the Georgia Senator that it is a failure, or very near it.

Senator TALMADGE's plan drew considerable support when he introduced it in 1958. That, he told the Senate, was why he was presenting it again for consideration.

The bill, although it is a radical departure from the present program, should receive careful consideration of Congress. If the lawmakers are convinced it will return the farmer to a free enterprise economy, protect his interests and reduce surpluses, it should be enacted without delay.

[From the Griffin (Ga.) Daily News, Jan. 15, 1959]

DESERVES A SECOND LOOK

(By Bill Knight)

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, has proposed legislation that would abolish present Federal farm programs and substitute direct Government payments to farmers for part of their output.

The proposal, probably one of the most sweeping pieces of farm legislation offered in recent years, kicked off a fight that probably will last into 1960.

The Georgia Senator estimated his plan would cost between $1,500 million and $2,500 million a year. The estimated cost of the present price support in the current fiscal year is set at more than $5 billion.

Should the Talmadge proposal work itself through the congressional maze and come out looking something like it did at the start, it very likely would help cut into national deficit spending, though only slightly.

Senator TALMADGE is no stranger to the problems of farmers. He knows their needs from firsthand experience.

Any plan that will help to lighten the backbreaking taxload without cutting into merited and needed Federal aid, deserves a second look.

Some Democratic leaders have indicated that although the administration farm program should be tossed out, it will not be practical to write a new program until next year.

But by 1960 it may be too late to save the Talmadge proposal from being trampled in the stampede to woo the farm vote.

[From the Moultrie (Ga.) Observer]

FARM EQUALIZATION HAS A CHANCE

The year 1959 may witness the passage of Senator HERMAN TALMADGE's Agricultural Income Equalization Act.

Very similar to the one which was proposed by the Georgian last summer, the 1959 version appears to have a better chance for passage than that dropped in the hopper previously. The farmers, in their decision to take corn out from under controls, gave notice that they want adequate protection in their farming gamble but at the same time want less interference from the Federal Government.

The measure which Senator TALMADGE proposes would accomplish this desired freedom by degrees. Under its provisions, the excessive and burdensome controls would be eliminated, providing for a more sound, free-enterprise type of farming while retaining the supports necessary to guarantee the growers against failures.

The first farm equalization plan died for lack of final action, but a stronger Democratic Congress may look with more favor upon the proposal in 1959.

EL CAMPO, TEX., *January 16, 1959.*

Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

At the Wharton County Farmers Union meeting January 15, 1959, 200 members resolved to commend you on your proposed bill for direct support payment to farmers at 100 percent parity price and maintenance of parity principle.

LESTER J. CRANEK,
President.

Hawaiian Statehood Would Help United States To Win Asians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Hawaiian Statehood Would Help United States To Win Asians," which was published in the May 1956 issue of Freedom and Union magazine.

Written by Mr. George Lehleitner, a New Orleans businessman, this article is even more pertinent now than when it was written.

It is my hope and expectation that this Congress will act favorably on S. 50, cosponsored by more than half the Members of this body, which would grant statehood to Hawaii.

I concur with Mr. Lehleitner's conclusion that "Statehood for Hawaii is most decidedly in keeping with the best interests of Hawaii, the United States, and of freemen everywhere."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD WOULD HELP UNITED STATES TO WIN ASIANS

(By George Lehleitner)

I have long believed that the gravest danger of Soviet world conquest stems not from its military potency but rather from the efficacy of its international machinery for the pursuit of ideological warfare. Even in those instances (China and Vietnam) where we are inclined to attribute their conquests to the sword, is it not true that the primary conquest was ideological? First, the Chinese and Vietnamese who constituted their armies had to be sold communism. And did not the military collapse of the opposed Chinese—and, recently, the Vietnamese—come about largely because the virus of communism had infected and weakened them to the point where they lost the will to resist?

Is not, then, the ideological power of communism its real warhead? It has been aptly said: "You can shoot Communists—but not communism."

AGAINST COMMONWEALTH STATUS

If this is true, why, then, should we deliberately provide Communist ideology with soil in which to root itself, in Hawaii, by forcing upon the proud and competent Hawaiians a political form—commonwealth—they do not want, and, in the process deny them that form—statehood—which they have clearly shown they do want, are qualified for, and were promised?

What manner of insanity afflicts us when, with one hand, we lavishly spend billions in a frenzied effort to tie foreign nations, with doubtful loyalties, more closely to us, while we use the other hand to slap the faces of a half million of our own loyal citizens, who ask nothing except that they be permitted to tie themselves to us indissolubly, and share our common responsibilities and perils?

To those who doubt that Hawaii could ever go Communist because of its high standard of living, I point to Czechoslovakia, which enjoyed one of Europe's highest. The West pushed the Czechs into the Communist orbit. Not in 1948, when it became a final reality in fact, but 10 years earlier when, in the disgrace that was Munich, the West reneged on its moral obligations and gave the Czechs to a rapacious Hitler in an attempt to buy peace in our time.

Are we so rich in resources, and in people, that we can afford to turn our backs upon a half million Americans, and literally invite Communist ideology to make the most of our wanton failure to accord them that basic entitlement of all Americans: the right to participate in their government at both local and national levels? Is not any measure which alleviates only part of this abuse inadequate, precisely because it still leaves communism with ground to stand on? Why should we give our mortal enemy any ground, when it is completely within our power to deny it to him?

But I believe the danger—and the opportunity—represented by Hawaii extends far beyond the borders of those lovely islands.

THREE-FOURTHS NON-WESTERN

How can we best impress the uncommitted leaders of mass opinion in Asia, Africa, and Latin America that our way is the best way for them to follow, if they would give their peoples both the material things and the dignity they seek? Especially the latter benefit, for it is that which they crave with greatest intensity.

Can this be done by impressing upon Hawaii's people—three-fourths of whom are of Oriental or Polynesian descent—an inferior and debasing political form which they have clearly shown they do not want?

Or could we better sell them our way by giving the Hawaiians the equality—and hence the dignity—possible only in statehood.

Or, to put it more positively, what single act within our power of immediate commission would create such a profoundly favorable impression upon the entire world as that of admitting to full membership in the American Union an area populated principally by men bearing names like Nomura Kaleo, and Ching?

Anyone inclined to to question the deep impression such an action would have upon the leadership of other areas need only ask returning travelers of discernment about the impact of the Supreme Court decision outlawing public school segregation. Is it not in battles such as these that the ideological war will, in Lincoln's word, "be nobly won—or meanly lost"?

Nor would the benefits to America cease with Hawaii's admission. In time, men with Oriental and Polynesian names and faces would, rightfully, occupy Senate and House seats. And each time such men took the floor to debate the issues of the day, they would, by their very presence there, testify to the truth that our way was a way all men could follow with dignity—and that neither the color of one's skin, nor the country of one's ancestors, was an impenetrable barrier to full American citizenship in fact.

TO CONTINUE U.S. REVOLUTION

And whenever such men distinguished themselves in service to the Nation—as I am confident they would—we would earn yet another dividend on our investment: their accomplishments would help us mainland Americans understand that whereas God had chosen to give them names and faces dissimilar to our own, He did not differentiate when He gave them their minds and their hearts. Thus would Hawaii help us draw a step closer to the Kingdom of God on Earth.

I have been greatly impressed with yet another report brought back from the Orient by studious travelers. Two prominent men of letters, recently returned, tell me that a reservoir of good will toward America and its institutions yet remains, despite our many blunders of recent years. I was surprised to learn that the writings of Paine, Franklin, Madison, Jefferson and Lincoln are still widely read and revered by the Orient's leaders who have not yet succumbed to communism. Yes, the American political beliefs which inspired Lafayette, Bolivar and San Martin are still valid—if only we Americans would have the faith to stand by the principles which gave initial vitality to our own Nation.

May our eyes be opened to the realization that it was Americans—not Russians—who first set into motion the great political revolution the world is still undergoing. Ours preceded theirs by almost 150 years, and we have but permitted them to seize the initiative by our own default.

May we also have the vision to see that we, and our kind of civilization, will survive only if we conduct our affairs in keeping with God's laws. Is it not mockery for us to pretend to be good Christians—or Jews—and to openly defy those laws governing the brotherhood of man?

On the face of the great seal of Hawaii there is this inscription: "Ua mau ke ea o ka aina i ka pono." Translated, it reads: "The life of a land and its people is preserved by righteousness." These words were those of Hawaii's Kamehameha III, in 1843. Yet there are some Americans today who have the effrontery to call the Hawaiians primitive.

WHO IS THE DREAMER?

Because I share with Clarence Streit his conviction that neither armament, nor armies, nor treaties, nor dollars can provide us with enduring security from communism, I also hold his view that our own salvation and that of other freemen lies in Federal political and economic amalgamation with those who share our fundamental traditions and political beliefs.

Over the years friends to whom I have expressed these views sometimes smiled and said: "You are an idealist, a dreamer." Perhaps I am. But I don't think so. Rather am I persuaded that they are dreamers who continue to place their faith in such things as treaties, pacts, and armies—which all history shows have never been adequate to preserve the peace—or a nation.

Nor need we look beyond our own lifetime to realize the complete ineffectuality of anything less than union with those who subscribe to, and practice, our fundamental political and moral philosophies. The roads which lead to every major war are littered with the wreckage of treaties which were honored only so long as they appeared to serve the best interests of their several signatories. For that matter, need we look beyond the Korean war?

Have we considered the possibility—to cite but one—that Germany, once the aged Adenauer passes on, could well come under the control of irresponsible leaders who might transfer the allegiance of that new army to the Soviets, in payment for the reunification of all Germany—the prize all Germans want most passionately?

Ten years ago—and less—we believed the atomic bomb would give us security. Today the conviction is dawning that, instead, we may have created a Frankenstein. I do not mean to say that we should not have done so—for under the circumstances then prevailing we probably had no choice but to proceed with its development; I merely wish to point out our growing disillusionment in it as a vehicle which will guarantee our security.

And even the most sanguine no longer expect the United Nations to accomplish this for us. It cannot, for the reason that only we can provide for our own security—and this we can do only by keeping ourselves morally, as well as physically, strong, in addition to recognizing that necessity (wholly aside from wisdom) requires that we grow.

It is, I believe, tragically unfortunate that most Americans look upon our national growth cycle as having been completed, now that we span the continent. This cannot

be—for then the natural order of things would ordain that we have already begun to die. What a great pity that most living Americans have never stopped to consider the extent to which our national greatness is due to our forefathers' recognition of the wisdom of providing for an ever-expanding nation. For it is a fundamental natural law that all things that have attained their ultimate ripeness have, in reality, begun to die.

I do not pretend to know the date of the point of no return—when Communist expansion will have progressed to that degree after which it would be futile for us to try to effect an amalgamation with other peoples who think and live as we do. It may be 50 or 25 years hence; perhaps it only 10—or less. But of this I am sure:

When the deadline for such action does arrive it is essential that the American mind shall, in the interim, have been conditioned to see the practicability of consolidating with lands and peoples who, though separated from us by thousands of miles of ocean, do share our essential beliefs.

What better way to accomplish this indoctrination than by the example of a successfully functioning State of Hawaii?

ATLANTIC UNION HERALD

If Hawaii, though separated from its sister States by 2,000 miles of ocean and populated largely by a people descended from different racial stocks than those who people our continental States, presents at the time of decision—a record of successful integration with our mainland States, how, then, can there remain reasonable doubt about the feasibility of political union with Canadians, Australians, Britons, or, for that matter, with any freeman who believes in—and practice—the same basic freedoms we hold dear?

I have always considered the Hawaiian bill one of the most vital pieces of legislation ever to come before Congress. The real significance of little Hawaii—to the United States and to the entire free world—is out of all proportion to its actual size. Statehood will become a reality only when Hawaii's friends fight for it with an uncompromising zeal which exceeds that which its opponents have thus far expended. Statehood for Hawaii is most decidedly in keeping with the best interests of Hawaii, the United States, and of freemen everywhere.

What Will Congress Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my remarks to the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce, at Lawrence, Mass., on January 16, 1959:

WHAT WILL CONGRESS DO?

(Preview of 1st sess., 86th Cong., for Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce, Friday, January 16, 1959, Yankee Doodle Restaurant)

Greetings, the 1st session of the 86th Congress went to work on January 7.

Thousands of bills will be introduced.

Within the next 6 or 7 months, about 1,000 will be enacted into law. Some will affect, directly or indirectly, every inhabitant of the United States and its Territories. A few will have some influence on the economies and the peoples of other nations.

A hundred or more private bills concerning immigration cases and claims against the Government will touch upon the lives of separate individuals.

The Congress is composed of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives. On some issues, their views will coincide; on others they will differ. Within each Chamber, and within each political party, there are different attitudes on social and economic problems. Out of this representative variety, the final bill that is enacted into law usually reflects adjustment and compromise.

In trying to estimate what Congress is likely to do, I shall restrict myself to the House of Representatives and the influence of its sizable Democratic majority.

In that context, I expect somewhat larger appropriations than those recommended by the President in his budget for the fiscal year of 1960 that begins on July 1, 1959.

Last year at this time, the Congress was worried by the deepening recession, and by the scientific breakthroughs achieved by Soviet Russia with their serious military, economic, and psychological challenge to the security of the free world.

The legislation passed in 1958 was shaped by our efforts to overcome these problems.

All of us are encouraged by the fact that the recession is largely over, but there is no letup in the Communist drive to master the space that surrounds the earth.

Although we have been roused from our complacency, and are making efforts to achieve leadership in the space age, there is widespread concern that the administration is not putting enough emphasis on this program.

The latest success of the Russians is a sober reminder that we are up against the most formidable competition; in education, industrial production, international trade, and in scientific progress.

We are trying to close the "missile gap"—which means that the Russians are presently ahead of us on this crucial frontier.

The plain fact is that if it comes to a choice between a balanced budget or an unbalanced budget that will not curtail our defense needs, there is no choice. We cannot afford to fall behind.

Not that the health and soundness of our domestic economy can be ignored. This is the foundation upon which all else depends. But economic activity is on the rise which means that Federal revenues will increase. If, during the fiscal year that starts on July 1, we realize a prosperity greater than we anticipate at the moment, expenditures somewhat larger than those recommended by the President can be met by the increase in Federal revenues. Even if this should not happen, we cannot gamble with national defense just for the sake of a balanced budget.

Some changes in the present tax laws are probable.

Among these are faster depreciation on capital investment to offset increasing obsolescence and inflation; revision of the rules on corporate distributions and adjustments, estates and trusts, and partnerships. There will be a move to establish a higher tax formula for life insurance companies. Other Congressmen will push legislation permitting deductions for funds put aside by the self-employed for their retirement.

Powerful lobbies will block the proposed reduction in the 27.5 oil and gas depletion allowance.

There will be proposals to raise personal income tax exemptions and to hike parcel post rates. Only the latter is apt to go through.

There is much work to be done in plugging tax loopholes and in spreading the burden in a more equitable manner, but it does not seem possible that any general revision of the Internal Revenue Code can become effective before 1961.

Some Congressmen want lower interest rates on FHA and VA housing. Others believe that an increase of interest rates on mortgages insured under Government programs is needed in order to make these mortgages more appealing to investors. The President, through his veto power, may be the determining factor on this issue.

It is likely that the administration and the Congress will both approve a higher minimum wage, and some extension of social security. Although a formula to provide hospital and medical care for those on old-age pension will be enacted into law at some future date, I doubt if a satisfactory plan can be worked out at this session.

In the area of labor legislation, the Kennedy-Ives bill to require financial accounting by unions, and the free election of union officers, is almost certain to prevail.

The problem of transportation, especially the transportation of people, is becoming more difficult every day. It is not simply the question of enabling people to travel from their homes to their places of employment in the morning, and to return in the late afternoon. In our complex society, transportation is the circulation system that sustains the life of a modern economy.

The impact of the automobile is greater than we realize, forcing crowded cities to accommodate themselves to it, and having a profound effect upon other modes of transportation.

I think all of us have been startled sooner or later by the personal observation that there are more cars on the streets than there are pedestrians on the sidewalks.

Railroads and bus lines and the merchants on our main streets have been hurt by this explosive development in the numbers and in the use of the private automobile with its resulting complications.

Responding to these pressures, a previous Congress had authorized a Federal program to relieve traffic congestion by the construction of an expanded interstate highway system.

Due to rising costs, Congress may reluctantly approve some but not all of the 1½-cent increase in the gasoline tax to be requested by the President.

Further aid to railroads, steamship subsidies, and more money for airport improvements are necessary because our economy cannot grow without a modern and efficient transportation system, public as well as private, to meet its demands. In the background but looming large is the need of facilities-in-being for emergency service to national security and civil defense.

One of the paradoxes of our national life is the farm problem or what to do with our agricultural surpluses. Various experiments over a whole generation have failed to solve it. We want to keep the farmers in business because we have to. That means we cannot dump their surpluses on the market to send the prices they receive for their products so low that they cannot earn a living by farming. At the same time, we will not jack up the price of food through extreme price supports for the farmers at the expense of the consumers. This is a very complex problem but I expect that this session of the Congress will be moderate in designing a farm aid program.

On the domestic issues that do not involve spending, the struggle over civil rights is most controversial.

This is an emotional issue on both sides. Where force will not achieve the understanding, and the cooperation, that are necessary for a solution. A law to make church and school bombings a Federal crime will be passed, for no self-respecting American, North or South, no matter what his religious faith or his racial origin, will stand for such vicious opposition to the rights of others. Steps will be taken to protect the voting rights of Negroes and other minority

groups. Congress, however, will not insist on school integration, leaving to the States the responsibility of working out the gradual adjustments under the stimulus of an enlightened public opinion.

Different sections of our country have economic interests which are of major importance to them, but not to other areas. The Middle West believes that aid to agriculture should have top priority. The Rocky Mountain States, and their representatives, work hard to assist the mining industry. Texas, Oklahoma, and California are alert in promoting legislation that will benefit the development of their oil resources.

We, in New England, are mainly concerned with the problems of our textile and fishing industries, striving to protect them from the increasing dangers of foreign competition.

Although we believe in the principle of reciprocal trade, knowing that an increase in commerce among the nations on a fairly competitive basis results in shared progress, we are aware that our textile and fishing industries are being priced out of the domestic market by low-cost imports from abroad. This is not reciprocal trade in the genuine meaning of the term. It is a form of ruthless horsetrading to open up foreign markets for selected American industries, while opening up American markets to foreign products by sacrificing a few of our basic industries.

The increasing imports of foreign textiles and foreign fish products is a threat to the New England economy, and particularly that of Massachusetts.

In the present session of the Congress, the New England delegation will have to fight persistently, against formidable odds, to win some measure of protection for these embattled industries. But we must not stop with defensive measures. A positive and affirmative program of aid to these industries, is also required to improve their competitive position.

The decline of the once dominant New England textile industry has left a gap which has been hard to fill.

The depressed areas, or labor-surplus areas, have made valiant efforts to attract new and diversified industries as replacements for the ones they have lost.

They have accomplished much, but it is apparent that they cannot do the whole job on their own.

Those of us who first proposed Federal legislation to assist in the solution of this new problem which will arise time and again in our changing economy, were opposed by those who resist any idea that is new simply because it is new.

But the public has been in a more receptive mood toward those proposals which are designed to meet problems instead of avoiding them.

At the risk of injecting a political note, I would remind you of the Senator who was defeated last year and who blamed the President's veto of the area redevelopment bill for the switch in voter sentiment.

With the influx of new Congressmen, reflecting public discontent with standpat policies, I believe that a bill that will provide Federal loans and minor grants to help redevelop labor-surplus areas will be passed this year, even if it should have to overcome another veto.

Related to this, and to slum clearance and urban renewal, and housing, is legislation to help local governments in the development of community facilities such as water systems, sewers, streets, and schools. With the dislocations resulting from industrial, military, and population shifts many communities are finding it difficult to provide or maintain adequate facilities. The President is certain to oppose this type of legislation. I would say that its prospects are no better than 50–50.

The United States is spending substantial sums in the development of atomic weapons. For reasons of security, the details are not made available to the public.

But nuclear energy, applied to peaceful purposes, holds great promise for progress in many fields. In the 13 years since the discovery of this vast potential, the Congress has repeatedly asked why greater progress in the application of atomic power to generate electricity for industrial and household use has not been realized.

This is an important issue, and a sensitive one, that will not make the headlines.

In the background, however, is the fear on the part of the private utilities that the Government may dominate development of the atom.

At last they are making a concerted effort to prove that they can do the job better than the Government. In the last 4 years they have invested more than $500 million on atomic projects.

The Congress believes that more can and should be done, either through Government assistance or through pilot plants built and operated by the Government. The former method is preferred. The Congress is determined to spur the development of atomic power for peaceful purposes and will appropriate funds for that objective.

The technical problems to be solved before atomic energy can compete with the fossil fuels are difficult, but the advantages to be reaped are even greater. Congress wants to accelerate the program.

The economic recovery of Western Europe is an encouraging fact that has helped to strengthen the free world's position. This has been accomplished, in part, by the assistance we have given to them. Now that their need is much less, economic aid to them wil be reduced. Some of our South American neighbors, however, are having difficulties, and it may be necessary to bolster their economies.

Under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, Congress recognized the special problems which handicap small- and medium-sized firms. Under the Johnson-Patman Act it is setting up a system whereby they will be able to obtain equity and long-term debt financing, heretofore unavailable, from any governmental lending authority, or through financial institutions.

As Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, coauthor of the bill, told the House, this legislation has two goals:

"First, the individual investment decisions should not be made by a bureau in Washington, but by local businessmen who will be backing their decisions with substantial amounts of their own money.

"The second goal of the system is that it should provide for private capital to come in and take over complete ownership and operation of the system."

The Small Business Committee, and the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House will make investigations and studies of further practical aids to small business. It is possible that an expanded aid program, moderate in scale, may come up for a vote at this session.

There are indications that the administration will try to curtail the program of veterans' benefits, but I am certain that it will not succeed.

There are sincere differences of opinion within the Congress. To draw the line between that which is necessary for the Nation and that which is merely desirable is not as easy as it may sound. In making up our minds, we cannot ignore political considerations, or the necessity of being guided by an informed public opinion.

There is no official within the administration, and no Member of Congress who can accurately forsee what the situation will be, as we come up to the presidential and congressional campaigns of 1960.

The administration is shaping its policies in the belief that a balanced budget will insure prosperity and peace, and will be approved by the electorate in 1960.

The Congress, that is, a majority of its Members, is not against a balanced budget. After taking stock of conditions, both at home and abroad, most Members will agree that we cannot afford the risk of a near budget that would cramp our progress and imperil our security.

Lip service to education is not enough.

When our survival depends more and more on scientific and technological skills, what was good enough in the past is not sufficient today.

A major effort is required to expand and improve our educational system.

New classrooms, laboratories, research facilities, and scholarships must be provided. We must raise the prestige, the incentives, and the rewards for the teaching profession commensurate with our country's urgent need for the very best.

Congress means business on this compelling issue.

Dozens of bills have already been introduced dealing exclusively with aids to education. We are disturbed by the fact that many American high school students would probably flunk a Russian high school examination in mathematics, and in the sciences. We intend to stimulate and assist in the building of an improved educational system that will not only develop the mental capacities of our youth, but will teach them to appreciate as never before, the rights and responsibilities of freedom.

There are no escalators to progress and security.

In this fast changing world, individuals as well as nations need ever more knowledge and better equipment to prevail over the deadly challenge of communism.

Last year we were facing up to the economic recession and to the serious fact that we were behind the Russians in missile development

We are leaving the recession behind us as there are definite signs of economic recovery in January 1959.

But we are still behind the Soviet in rocket technology and in space exploration.

As a people we have always stressed the value of competition, but in this critical area we do not seem to realize what is at stake.

One or two or six months from now we will be thrilled by the news of a U.S. success in the pioneering of space, and we will bask in self-satisfaction until the Russians rocket a man into space far beyond the earth and bring him back.

Then we will look for someone to blame.

Not realizing that complacency is our worst enemy.

We cannot stand still, content with the familiar routines because neither life nor history will mark time.

We have only to look at the experience of our own community to learn that we must keep up with progress. For generations, textiles was the dominant industry. We had become so adjusted to it that we could not foresee the day when the economic base of greater Lawrence would be entirely different, yet within a few years the pattern has been completely altered. The old textile giants have gone; and are being replaced by young and vigorous and growing industries.

It is so with our Nation.

The population and its needs are expanding.

And our responsibilities as the leader of the free world are increasing.

To meet these the attitudes, the instruments, and the yardsticks of 1939—or 1929—are obsolete.

The great virtue of freedom is its flexibility.

We have seen this at work in American industry which is never content with things as they are.

In 1940, nuclear energy was only a mathematical equation on the blackboards of the scientists.

In 1956, Americans would laugh at the suggestion that man would soon be able to send rockets hundreds of thousands of miles into space.

In 1959 both are accomplished facts.

It is my opinion that the administration is reluctant to make the hard decisions, and to exert the leadership that is required to provide for genuine progress and security.

This is human but unrealistic.

I would like to tell you that the budget is going to be slashed by billions, and that a generous tax reduction will be approved soon, and overwhelmingly. This is the news that we would prefer to hear.

But, to quote the President himself in his recent state of the Union message, we are confronted with a question which is "as old as history," whether a government based upon liberty can endure when it is ceaselessly challenged by a dictatorship with growing economic and military power.

The Congress is not satisfied with the current rate of development in our missile and space exploration programs.

There is widespread feeling among the members that we are not doing enough.

Therefore, on this issue which will overshadow all others, the Congress will vote larger appropriations than the President deems necessary, and will insist on a major and sustained program that will regain and hold the lead for the United States.

Even though there are many new and liberal Members in the House of Representatives, I do not anticipate a runaway spending spree. Under the knowing and experienced guidance of Speaker SAM RAYBURN, and Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK, I believe that the first session will legislate a program that will basically suit the Nation's needs.

It will not be a timid session nor a reckless one.

But the Congress will, in the year of 1959—and to the best of its ability—do those things which must be done under the mandate calling for the up-to-date programs and the courageous leadership that it received from the people last November.

For it is aware that a big, and growing, and changing nation like ours must not fall behind the pace of history as it is being made today.

Honoring Civil Service Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the tasks and services performed by persons in the civil service of the United States are many and varied and are quite often taken for granted. They should not be.

Civil service workers, the vast majority of them with real dedication, perform vital services for this country—both at home and abroad—in fields varying from standardizing weights and measures to atomic energy programs to teaching the children of our service men and women.

Before civil service, Government employment was a jumble of jobs under the spoils system. With each change of administration, many thousands of new, inexperienced, and frequently inefficient, people went on Government payrolls by political pull and pressure, and not by performance. Many of them had no real ability or concern for doing a good job. But civil service changed that deplorable situation almost overnight. Good service and qualifications to do the job have replaced cunning political pull as the criterion for Government employment.

This year, the Federal civil service begins its 76th year. This means a history of 75 years of devoted service to our Nation. These people seldom come to public attention. They are the workers who make it possible for our Government to function, they are the voices on the radio who speak from control towers and radar trailers to guide our aircraft traffic safely to the destination, they are the people who provide weather information which all of us use.

Others develop flood control measures and research into the natural sciences. They perform a great many services which make our Nation the finest place in which to live on this globe.

Before they can even qualify for a job, civil service workers must pass a difficult examination.

As an indication of esteem and appreciation for these people who perform so many needed jobs with so little recognition, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Randolph J. Jouno which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor for Friday, January 2, 1959, under the heading "Civil Service Marks 75-Year Devoted Job."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL SERVICE MARKS 75-YEAR DEVOTED JOB

(By Randolph J. Jouno)

The Federal civil service in 1958 celebrated its 75th year. Civic groups held luncheons, dinners, banquets, and receptions in many communities. Sixty outstanding Federal employees were named Civil Servants of the Year. Twenty-six governors and hundreds of mayors issued anniversary proclamations. Congress and many State legislatures commemorated the occasion.

Jobs in the Federal service run the occupational index from accountant to zoologist. It has the same kinds of positions that exist in private industry and the professions and a few others peculiar to government.

Federal employees carry the mail, print the mint money, control narcotics, regulate immigration, collect taxes, conserve and renew land, forecast the weather, maintain national parks and forests, insure orderly interstate commerce, prevent adulteration of food and drugs, prevent the sale of contaminated meat, maintain public health services, and protect the rights of inventors and authors.

DIVERSE DUTIES

The Federal workers operate the social security and atomic energy programs, standardize weights and measures, prevent false advertising, develop flood-control measures, engage in research in the natural sciences, and do hundreds of other services demanded by the American people.

It is an old American custom to berate Federal employees, but strangely enough the scoffer when questioned is usually unable to identify specific individuals with whom he finds fault. His friends and neighbors in the Federal service are found intelligent and capable.

Federal employees have chosen Government employment in much the same way employees in private industry have chosen their careers. The major difference is that the Federal employee has to take a stiff examination to prove his efficiency. Furthermore, he must be among the highest in the examination results. Many Federal employees have been attracted to Government service because of the objectivity in seelction—solely on merit without regard to politics, race, creed, or religion.

Many Government employees see in the public nature of their employment a genuine opportunity to serve their fellow man. Their idealism is sometimes similar to that of those in the ministry or teaching. Salary often is a secondary consideration.

SALARY FROM TAXES

The civil service employee, receives his salary from taxes. If only from a selfish point of view, the taxpayer should be vitally concerned in seeing that the Government gets its fair share of the best available workers.

The merit system does not end with appointments. To maintain an efficient, satisfied work force, the Federal Government needs to give its employees the benefits of modern personnel administration, that is fair salaries, an equitable promotion system, training for improvement, protection against unjust removals, incentive awards, and reasonable retirement benefits.

In addition to providing stability of Government and continuity of functions, Federal employees are constantly on the lookout for opportunities to save money for the taxpayer. Last year Federal employees saved the taxpayer $169,885,140. The total number of suggestions offered was 322,000, of which 86,000 were adopted.

SPOILS SYSTEM TRAGEDY

The assassination of a President jolted the Nation into establishing a merit system. The murder on July 2, 1881, of President Garfield, by Charles Guiteau, a disappointed officeseeker, focused public attention on the evils of the political spoils system, then practically the sole basis for selection to Federal jobs at all levels. Under this system appointments were given those who had contributed the most service to the victorious political party.

The spoils system had not always been the vogue. Washington insisted upon appointment by merit, although he had no formal machinery to insure appointment of the best qualified. The Four-Year Tenure of Office Act passed in 1820 limited the terms of certain officers like district attorneys and customs collectors and added impetus to the growing acceptance of the concept.

Civil service agitation after the Civil War prompted Congress and President Grant to set up in 1871 the first Civil Service Commission. Unfortunately it lapsed in 1875 due to lack of funds. Civil service reform was an issue in the fall elections of 1882, the first election after Garfield's assassination. In a number of congressional districts this issue alone decided the outcome. As soon as Congress met, civil service reform was given priority. Senator George H. Pendleton, of Ohio, wrote the law under which the Federal Civil Service now operates. President Arthur signed the bill January 16, 1883.

MERIT SYSTEM ACCENTED

Then the law covered only 10 percent of the jobs in the Federal Government. Now 86 percent of all Federal employees are in competitive civil service. Of those employees located in continental United States, 91 percent are classified.

Now practically no one seriously questions the civil service principle. The American public takes the system for granted. President Theodore Roosevelt expressed it this

way: "I am inclined more and more to feel that the observance in letter and spirit of the civil service law is the first requisite in obtaining clean, decent, efficient Government service in any branch or bureau of the Government."

President Eisenhower said, "Nowhere in the world have I met more efficiency, more dedication, more readiness to put in hours without counting them on the clock * * * than I have among the civil service."

ROLLS GEARED TO NEED

Elected and politically appointed officials are grateful too for the relief they enjoy from the lessening of patronage pressure. Top businessmen called into the high policy posts of Government, such as heads of departments, soon become impressed with the integrity, loyalty, and ability of the career civil servants who must carry the brunt of the day-to-day work of the Government while political heads come and go. Many of them have issued public statements of praise.

The number of employees varies with the amount of work the Government has to do. During World War II, Government employment rose to 3,780,000. After the war it dropped to fewer than 2 million. Korea caused another increase. Now there are 2,339,000. Big government is the product of international unrest, enormous and continuing increases in population, an increasingly complex economy, and the demand of the public for services.

It sometimes is said that it is impossible to separate a civil service employee. The number of separations last year for cause, 13,000, belies that statement. Actually, Federal employees to hold their jobs must adhere to very high standards of conduct. Like the physician with his Hippocratic oath, the Federal employee has his creed of service:

"We as members of the civil service accept our obligation and our opportunity to serve the American people well and in full measure, doing our best to further the free and democratic institutions of our country. We believe it our duty to carry out loyally the will of the people as expressed in our laws; serve the public with fairness, courtesy, integrity, and understanding; help improve the efficiency, economy, and effectiveness of our work; and thus do our part in performing the great services of the Government."

McCormack Predicts Strong Program by Democratic Congress and Democratic Sweep in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, House Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, when interviewed by John Harris, of the Boston Globe, expressed complete confidence that the big Democratic majority in the 86th Congress will legislate a sound and progressive program. With this record, the party will go before the people from a stronger position than ever before. Actually, the wealth of available talent to choose from is unprecedented. Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, is the leading contender. In any case, the Democrats are sure to elect their standard bearer to the Presidency in 1960.

Mr. MCCORMACK, whose knowledge of major issues and keen sense of public opinion trends command respectful attention, believes that the people are with the Democrats all the way.

Summing up, the "field general" of the House Democrats said:

I look for an outstanding record, and look forward to 1960 to a complete Democratic victory, including the White House and Congress.

As the 1st session of the 86th Congress faces up to its responsibilities, I believe that we should read the views of our majority leader. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the following article from the January 4, 1959, issue of the Boston Sunday Globe:

DEMOCRATIC HOUSE LEADER MCCORMACK'S PREDICTIONS—WHAT NEXT 2 YEARS WILL BRING: NO SPLIT IN DEMOCRATIC PARTY; MRS. ROOSEVELT'S ROADBLOCK WON'T STOP KENNEDY; NIXON TO GET NOMINATION, LOSE ELECTION

(By John Harris)

The topheavy 2-to-1 majority the Democrats have won in the new Congress will not lead to unwieldiness, said Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, but will mean Speaker RAYBURN and I will have a workable majority with no worry, as in the past, about coalitions between Republican and 25 to 40 Democrats, mostly from the South.

The veteran lawmaker, majority leader in the National House of Representatives, made these other highlight observations in the course of an interview on the incoming Congress, its relations with the White House and potential effect on the 1960 election:

"Of the presidential candidates, I think Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY is in the best position at the present time. The best evidence is that Mrs. Roosevelt's recent statement was an attempt to throw a roadblock in his way, but I do not think that was accomplished.

"The Berlin situation is very disturbing because of the geographical location of Berlin, isolated from the rest of the free world. But I do not conceive of the Kremlin being willing to go to general war over Berlin.

"The new Democrats elected to Congress are practically all of them progressive-minded. So the results of the last election were a good thing for the country, which is stronger and our people best served when progressive leadership is in control of the Government."

Does Congressman MCCORMACK feel that the Democratic Party will be split in 1960's national convention by the civil rights issues which have become prominent, tangles in the new Congress, with the Senate divided over the filibuster rule change, and the House confronted with the disputed seating of a segregationist from Little Rock?

"I don't expect," said MCCORMACK, "that there will be any severe difficulty or tension in the 1960 National Democratic Convention because there is a civil rights bill on the statute books.

"It is more difficult to create a split when there is a law on the statute books than when there is not. The civil rights bill was passed by the 85th Congress, a Democratically controlled Congress, the first time any such legislation passed in about 90 years.

"Even with the division in the Democratic Party on this question, a Democratic Congress did pass this historic bill. It is interesting to note that only six years ago we had a Republican Congress and President Eisenhower, a Republican, was in the White House, and the Republicans did not even report a civil rights bill out of committee in either House.

"This makes the achievement of the 85th Democratic Congress all the more significant.

"Having been chairman of the platform committee at three of the last four National Democratic Conventions, I think by hard experience I'm in a position to form an opinion on this matter.

"I do not look for any trouble—or party split—in the 1960 convention. There'll be some talk about third party and an impending split, but it will only be interesting reading in the newspapers.

"In my opinion there is no such danger. The Democratic Party will go into the 1960 election united."

With the increased progressive membership from the northern section of the nation, and particularly from the West, what legislation does Congressman MCCORMACK foresee the new Congress will enact?

"There will be housing legislation, a depressed area bill, an increase in minimum wages anywhere up to $1.25 an hour, an acceleration of the interstate highway program, modernization of airports to make them safer for passengers in the coming jet age, further consideration of amendments to the Social Security Act such as increasing the amount that can be earned after retirement, and, if the recession grows worse, there will be legislation of an antirecession nature.

"The Democratic Party above all stands for strong national defense and a firm foreign policy. We must recognize that the Communist challenge of world revolution and domination is stronger than in the past and we must be as determined as ever. We can never permit ourselves to get in a position where we lose our retaliatory power."

Will the Democratically controlled Congress exceed the pared down $77 billion budget proposed by President Eisenhower?

"If we feel it is in the interest of national security we will do so as in the 85th Congress. Then the President wanted an Army of 870,000 and we appropriated for an Army of 900,000.

"He requested 175,000 marines; we appropriated for 200,000. The President was for reducing the Armed Forces.

"The Democratic Congress felt in the world today that was too great a risk to take. I still feel that way."

What can the Congress do about a stronger foreign policy?

"The important thing is that we do not have a shifting from day to day, week to week on foreign policy because that is a sign of weakness and uncertain leadership. The only thing the Congress can do is to mold public opinion. We've certainly done that in the past. We intend to do so in the future.

"Congress, under the Constitution, cannot make foreign policy. The President is the sole repository in the field of foreign policy as he is also Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. But Congress can criticize and propose, and the Democrat Congress will do this.

"Congress will also cooperate on a bipartisan basis with the President although there has been little evidence of real bipartisan action on the part of President Eisenhower because the Democratic leadership in Congress has not been consulted before policy is made.

"In the interest of the country, the President would be following a wise course if he consulted Democratic leadership before major decisions are made. This does not mean he has to accept our opinion, but on the other hand we might be able to make excellent contributions and it would have a marked effect on our people and the world, for the world, free and Communist, would know there is real unity."

What about cooperation between the White House and Capitol Hill, now that the Democrats rule the Congress by a 2-to-1 margin?

"No difficulty on real cooperation on the part of the Democrats, because we've been giving cooperation to President Eisenhower under painful conditions.

"The matter of real cooperation rests with President Eisenhower and the Republicans. The interest of the country is greater than any political party."

Looking forward to 1960, McCormack said:

"From the Democratic angle the issues of the 1960 election will be made by the 86th Democratically controlled Congress. It will be the basis for us going before the people. I look for an outstanding record, and look forward to 1960 to a complete Democratic victory, including the White House and Congress."

On the subject of presidential contenders:

"There are a number: Senator KENNEDY, Senator SYMINGTON, Senator HUMPHREY, Senator JOHNSON, Governor Williams, Governor Meyner, Gov. Pat Brown if he has the thought in mind, Adlai Stevenson, several others.

"The Democrats have a wide field of qualified candidates to pick from.

"The Republican Party is in the opposite position. In the first place they are badly split on basic questions. The old guard Republicans are groping out of the underground and they have great strength in their national convention.

"The Republicans have only Vice President NIXON and Governor Rockefeller.

"I do not think Vice President NIXON will make a strong candidate on the voter level. He has powerful opposition in his own party and has lost prestige with the people.

"He's trying to flirt with both progressives and standpatters. That's difficult to do, particularly on the presidential level.

"The progressive-minded people do not like his policies.

"On the other hand the standpatters do not like Rockefeller. There is a bad schism in the Republican Party right across the board. This does not exist in the Democratic Party. Furthermore, President Eisenhower's influence is waning, and his strength has been personal rather than political. He has shown inability to transmit his strength to other Republicans.

"In my opinion NIXON will get the nomination because he has practical control of the party machinery, and the Republicans have no one else to select.

"I think Rockefeller is too smart to be a candidate in 1960 with the political conditions existing then, and he'll wait for a later date."

A Large Section of Hudspeth County, Tex., Is Blacked Out—It Needs Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a large section of Hudspeth County, Tex., has no electric power. These families must still rely on the methods of lighting in use before Edison invented the incandescent lamp. These people have great need of electrical power for the variety of services it performs on the farm and in the home.

The Rio Grande Electric Cooperative, Inc., located at Brackettsville, Tex., has applied for REA loan funds to serve this area. Approval has been long delayed. The people need light and power now.

The Commissioner's Court of Hudspeth County has passed a resolution requesting that all parties responsible for the granting of REA loans be urged to hasten the approval of this application. I would like to add my voice to theirs.

The splendid accomplishments of the REA are widely known. It is my belief that these vital electrical services should be made available to this area as soon as possible.

Mr. President, in support of my statement, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution passed by the Commissioner's Court of Hudspeth County on January 12, 1959, at Sierra Blanca, Tex.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas a large section of Hudspeth County, Tex., is without electric power, which is greatly needed for pumping wells, operating power tools, and many other uses including household needs; and

"Whereas application has been made to the Rural Electrification Administration for a loan to provide this section with the much needed electric power; and

"Whereas approval of this loan has been delayed on the above-mentioned section, which is section R, due to the small number of users and the distances involved: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Commissioner's Court of Hudspeth County, assembled in regular session this 12th day of January A.D. 1959, That all parties responsible for the granting of loans under the Rural Electrification Administration be urged to hasten the approval of the above-mentioned loan so that the residents of this section may be served with the much needed electric power as soon as possible."

I, Tom H. Neely, county judge of Hudspeth County, Tex., hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a resolution passed and approved in open commissioner's court on Monday, January 12, 1959.

TOM H. NEELY,
County Judge, Hudspeth County, Tex.

Attest:

BERNICE M. ELDER,
County Clerk, Hudspeth County, Tex.

Horror in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report from Cuba by Mr. Dale Francis, columnist for Our Sunday Visitor, the national Catholic Action weekly. Mr. Francis' report appears in the January 25, 1959, edition of the newspaper.

HORROR IN CUBA

(By Dale Francis)

The story I must tell you is a story that will chill your blood with horror. It is a story that rivals the worst of the atrocity stories to come from Nazi Germany, the worst of the tales of horror to come from behind the Iron Curtain—and it happened at the very doorstep of the United States on the island of Cuba.

I must tell this story because the truth must be known. The truth must be known so that Americans can understand why the trials and executions going on now in free Cuba are necessary, why in justice criminals must be punished. It is a story that must be told so that Americans can understand why it is that Cubans were sickened by our State Department's closed eyes while murder was going on before their very eyes, why it is that an ambassador who played golf while torturers slashed the living bodies of men and women only a few miles away became a symbol of American stupidity.

This is not just a story told to me by the victorious rebel leaders. It is a story I have heard firsthand from an archbishop, from priests who have seen mutilated bodies, from people I know speak the truth.

How many have been murdered in Cuba? It is difficult to make an estimate. Only yesterday a mass grave was discovered with more than 100 bodies. But I have been told by Archbishop Enrique Perez Serantes of Santiago de Cuba that in his Province alone the murdered have already certainly totaled more than 5,000.

Understand, I am not talking about casualties in war. I am talking about cold-blooded murders of men and women, murders that have been preceded by the cruelest of tortures. Men and women who have been picked up on the street, pulled from their homes. And these 5,000 murders are only the murders in 1 of the 6 Provinces of Cuba, and even that number is but an estimate that is being raised each day as new graves are discovered.

How did you spend December 28? It was, on the church calendar, the Day of Martyrs. In Cuba for five young men of the Catholic Action it was the day of their martyrdom.

They were members of Agrupacion Catolica de Universario in Habana. We told you about this group of young men when we lived in Cuba. They came to our village to help instruct the people, pass out pamphlets; one reads the Gospel aloud in Spanish at mass during the 40 hours. There are only a few members in this select Catholic Action group.

These five were seized by the secret police after Christmas. That was the last time they were seen alive. A few days ago a priest who knew them well searched through a stack of more than 60 bodies for them. They were difficult to identify, for they had been tortured brutally. This morning mass was celebrated for these martyrs of the new Cuban freedom.

I will tell you more about these young men, their names, what they were like, in the stories to come, but now—so you will never forget it—let me tell you the story their bodies told. It is not a very different story; it was repeated thousands of times during these last 2 years in Cuba.

They were shot first of all in the arm, not once but many times, rising up from their wrists. Bullets tore through their body in nonvital places, the ears, the chin, the cheeks. Their bodies were slashed with knives in a manner too horrible to detail. And then, when they could be tortured no longer, they were given the sweet release of a bullet in the temple.

This is not something out of fiction; this is not something from behind the Iron Curtain, not a belated story from Hitler's Germany. It is the truth about Batista's Cuba, and just a few short days ago it happened.

This story is cabled from Habana. I am still gathering the truth about what has happened these last terrible years. They are things that have not yet been reported in the newspapers and magazines of the United States and they are things the people must know.

I have talked with hundreds of soldiers—country boys for the first time in Habana, conquerors who do not swagger, who are polite and quiet, who want only that there should be peace and freedom in Cuba.

I have talked with leaders of the revolution. I spent an afternoon and evening in the private office of Fidel Castro. I not only talked with him but, more enlightening, watched him talk with others, watching the parade of people coming to the hero of Cuba as he works his way through the mass of complications that come with a new government.

I have talked with the other leaders of the revolution—men like Camilo Cienfuegos, another of the Barbudos, the bearded ones, who now heads up the air, sea, land, and police forces of Habana.

I have talked with the 24-year-old youngster who is the new civilian administrator of Santiago de Cuba and I have seen in his eyes he is very old—old enough to remember the group of 34 youngsters who met to discuss ways of ending tyranny, old enough to remember not a 1 of the 34 alive but himself.

Soon I will go to Oriente. There I am going to visit scenes of the atrocities. Archbishop Enrique Perez de Antes is going to take me. One place we will go is to the village of Maffo. Every home in Maffo was leveled by Batista's henchmen.

In articles to come I must detail some of the horrors. I do not like to do this but if I do not then you will never know why it is military courts are sentencing men to die in Cuba and you might be misled, as many Americans already have been misled, into believing justice is not being done.

That justice is being done and done in a reasonable and orderly manner I can testify by one incident I witnessed a few minutes before I sat down to write this article.

I was coming from Castro's headquarters with Father Francisco Guzman, a 6-foot-3 husky, bearded, Jesuit who served as chaplain with the rebels, when two young men came rushing to him. They started thanking him for what he had done for them, telling him how right he had been.

They were four young men who joined the rebels when their brother was murdered by the secret police. They fought because they wanted to avenge their brother's death. A few days ago one of the brothers captured the man who had murdered his brother.

He did nothing to the murderer. He brought him in a prisoner for trial because he knew that a revenge murder would be wrong. The man was sentenced to death, not alone for this murder but for others, and the four brothers asked to be a part of the firing squad.

"It is not right," Father Guzman told them. "You must not ask revenge, only justice."

And so he talked them out of being on the firing squad, let the death of the murderer be a death of justice, not revenge. Now the young men were thanking him, they were deeply grateful. "You were right," one of them said, "we must not ask for anything but justice."

And in Cuba justice is at last coming. It will be a hard process and many prayers and much work is needed, but it is coming.

Relations With Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the January 8 edition of the Palm Beach Daily News.

This article, written by former U.S. Ambassador to Bolivia, David E. Kaufman, is a thoughtful and timely comment upon our Latin American relations.

While I have some views not wholly parallel with the author's, I believe that Mr. Kaufman's article warrants wider attention.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORMER AMBASSADOR DAVID E. KAUFMAN SUGGESTS ANSWER

(By David E. Kaufman)

Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower has made some excellent suggestions in his report to the President, his brother, on his trip to Central America, which followed a similar tour of South America.

Because of the recent overthrow in Cuba of President Fulgencio Batista, one of the hemisphere's few remaining dictators, that part of Dr. Eisenhower's report urging a distinction in U.S. official attitude toward dictators and democratic leaders has naturally been given wide attention.

Actually, this recommendation does not go very far. It merely urges that in dealing with the heads of Latin American countries, we have an embrace for democratic leaders and a formal handshake for dictators. In other words, warmer relations toward one than toward the other.

But this appears a rather trifling alteration in U.S. policy in Latin America when it is considered that there are now only three countries in that region ruled by dictators: Paraguay, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic.

And Dr. Eisenhower is careful to qualify his statements by emphatically opposing any nonrecognition on our part of Latin American governments that happen to be ruled by dictators.

One of the basic Latin American policies is the principle of nonintervention. If we interfered, as we did some years ago, in the government of any of the Latin American countries, just because we decided that we did not like the current president or dictator, we would be inviting trouble.

Dr. Eisenhower points out rightly that nonrecognition and noncooperation will not help another nation to achieve democracy. Cooperating with a nation's people, even through dictators, allows the United States to keep open the lines of communication.

It might be added that we have recognized plenty of dictators in other parts of the world, some on our side and some against us. That does not mean that we like them personally or their kind or rule. We are merely being practical.

Underlining the unsatisfactory state of U.S. relations with most Latin American countries are two factors: our own indifference toward that area and Latin American misunderstanding of U.S. aims and policy. The second is largely an outgrowth of the first.

The Eisenhower report recognizes these faults. The United States, he says, does not comprehend the problems of Latin America. And Latin America mistakenly assumes that our economic capacity is unlimited and that the United States fixes prices on Latin American raw material exports. Many Latin Americans think the United States is spending too much on foreign aid in Europe and Asia, while neglecting its neighbors to the south. And the charge is frequently made in South and Central America that the United States treasures freedom for itself but is indifferent to dictatorial rule in Latin America.

Dr. Eisenhower sets all these things down as misunderstandings. They are largely so, although it is not easy to convince Latin America.

To eliminate policies dangerous to European and Asiatic nations, and penny-pinching in our grants to Latin America.

To eradicate misunderstandings, Dr. Eisenhower would have each nation in the hemisphere set up a commission of distinguished citizens to work out a program under the Organization of American States; each nation assume responsibility for promoting understanding by its people; the activities of the U.S. Information Agency in Latin America increased; and the exchange of persons cultural program expanded.

These are good suggestions, but to expect that all of them, or even part of them, be speedily adopted, would be naive.

It is my own opinion, based on experience as U.S. Minister to a Latin American nation—Bolivia—and on knowledge gained since in United Nations agencies dealing with Latin American affairs, that a much simpler means is available to promote better understanding between the Americas.

That is by improved conduct of our relations with Latin American countries on the embassy level.

Our ambassadors and ministers and the members of their staffs in all the capitals of Central and South American countries should have personal knowledge of what goes on in their respective countries. They should have contact with people in and out of government. They should be able to clear up misapprehensions about our policies and promote better understanding.

The trouble is that in many cases our embassies are too far above the common level to know, or care, what is going on in the various countries. The staff members talk to each other, to attachés at other foreign embassies, to government officials and the upper classes. It does not occur to some of them ever to get close to the ordinary people or to acquaint themselves with the political opposition.

The result is the deplorable lack of information furnished by our embassies, as shown especially in the case of the countries where our Vice President was subjected to stoning and calumniation.

Strong embassy staffs, acquainted with the people of the country to which they are accredited, and able and willing to work for improved relations between them and the United States, could do more good in a few months than all the commissions could accomplish in years.

Roger W. Jones, an Outstanding Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend President Eisenhower for nominating to membership on the Civil Service Commission one of the outstanding career civil servants of our time, Roger W. Jones.

In the span of three-quarters of a century since the establishment of the Civil Service Commission, there have been few commissioners better qualified by training and temperament than Roger Jones. He will bring to his new job a deep dedication, broad knowledge of governmental problems, and a certain zest for accomplishment.

Nearly 20 years ago I first met Roger Jones while he was serving as administrative officer of the Bureau of the Budget in Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration. There were several qualities which immediately stood out in his approach to his work. As a public servant in the highest sense of the word, he worked by the simple code of making the engines of bureaucracy carry out the public will.

There was a phrase which Franklin D. Roosevelt's Committee on Administrative Management used in 1939 which best describes Jones, "high competence, great physical vigor and a passion for anonymity." Working in high positions for Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower, he displayed a remarkable ability to serve the institution of the Presidency without regard to political considerations. His respect for and understanding of the Presidency have been invaluable assets.

Roger Jones knows how to cultivate the best and reject the worst in the wonderland of bureaucracy. He can give direction and cohesiveness to a program which might otherwise get tangled in the molasses of the redtape sea. He has an instinct for the jugular.

I do not ever remember seeing Roger Jones when his eyes were not sparkling. When vast quantities of paper moved across his desk, he always seemed to have a freshness of approach to each new problem. He was never bogged down with work and always kept those sparkling eyes on the forest while he was chopping down or replanting the trees.

In the Civil Service Commission, he will have a much tougher job which will demand greater energy and leadership than his previous tasks. Will he be able to measure up? I have watched him also in the role of teacher, and here he has shown that he also has the necessary talents to make him a great educator.

Down through the years there have been great and mediocre members of the Civil Service Commission. The mediocre ones have been those who have tilted their swivel chairs slightly backward and allowed the vast Federal bureaucracy to run them. I do not think Roger Jones will be that kind of Commissioner. I believe he will grasp the reins of leadership.

Mr. Speaker, as a West Virginia Democrat I rise to pay tribute to this Connecticut Republican. The career service and the country are fortunate to have a man like Roger W. Jones to head the Civil Service Commission.

Waste of Helium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOBY MORRIS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the January 15, 1959, issue of the Denver Post on the important subject of helium gas, by Roscoe Fleming:

WASTE OF HELIUM
(By Roscoe Fleming)

Once there was a man who paid no attention to a cut blood vessel—because it didn't bother him much, at first.

He is no longer with us.

There are times when your Uncle Samuel's policies as to natural resources remind one of that foolish man. Particularly does this seem true—and more serious by the hour—as to helium, the magic gas of the atomic age.

Our country has a world monopoly of this gas, indispensable for defense and for material development of the Nation and of the planet. Further, 90 percent of our supply is wasting. Yet, nowhere on earth, so far as we know, is there any more outside our own midcontinent gas fields. Almost all of our potential supply wastes into the air through our gas burners.

Does that make sense? Is that the long-range economic and conservation thinking which our Nation must ultimately do for survival? Are we the world prototype of the man who said "It ain't rainin' now" when asked why he didn't fix the roof?

The hard fact is that when our present supply of helium is gone, we shall not be able to find more save by straining it from the atmosphere at hundreds of thousands of times the cost we would incur by saving and storing it now.

How long, O Lord, for the people and the Congress to wake up? Will the new Congress do any better than the old? How many more chances shall we have?

A year ago an interagency committee headed by Colorado's own Hatfield Chilson made a report that should have had the ear of every American.

It said that when our midcontinent natural gas is gone, the world's helium is gone, save for a very little that the Government has been able to lay aside. It put the date for this as not beyond 1980–85.

It recommended a dozen extraction plants to be perched astride the pipelines leading from the richer helium fields.

One unit out of 12 proposed is underway. The Interior Department is building a new helium-extraction plant in the Oklahoma Panhandle, to join 4 now operative. But it will barely keep up with demand, providing no helium for storage.

This particular situation is, however, so specialized and the people have heard so little about it, that it is hard to see how a great fuss can be made. But it ought to be.

Wasting irreplaceable natural treasure is a national tragedy.

Veterans of World War I in Massachusetts Opposed to Closing of South Boston Naval Annex, Navy Regional Accounts Office, and Hingham Ammunition Depot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement issued to the Massachusetts delegation in Congress by Department Cmdr. Melvin D. Eddy in support of the protest registered by Cmdr. Anthony D. Tieso of Barracks No. 1240, of the Boston Naval Shipyard.

The statement follows:

VETERANS OF
WORLD WAR I OF THE U.S.A.,
DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS, INC.,
January 8, 1959.

The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

At our regular executive meeting held on Sunday, December 28, 1958, at the Aurora Hotel, Worcester, Mass., a strong protest against the proposed closing of the South Boston Naval Annex, the Navy Regional Accounts Office, and the Hingham Ammunition Depot was registered by Comdr. Anthony D. Tieso, of barracks No. 1240. He was joined in his protest by other barracks commanders.

Speaking in behalf of barracks No. 1240, which is composed of Veterans of World War I who are employed in the Boston Naval Shipyard, Commander Tieso stated: "The proposed closing of these facilities will result in the loss of approximately 2,000 Government jobs and will weaken the defense of the New England area. It does not seem to be good business thus to increase unemployment in Massachusetts by, for example, reassigning a vessel from Boston Naval Shipyard to another yard, where skilled labor might not be readily available; nor does it seem to be good business to transfer work from the shipyard to private industry, at higher cost. We, as employees of Boston Naval Shipyard, and as taxpayers, are strongly opposed to any needless Government spending, and we are firmly committed to the policy of 'greater value for least cost.' Presently available at Boston Naval Shipyard and the South Boston Annex are all the facilities and skills necessary and desirable to undertake the building, conversion, alteration, repair, and drydocking of any ship in the fleet, with the exception of the USS *Forrestal*—and for the latter, improvements to existing facilities are awaiting approval. Should the facilities of the 1,100-foot drydock at South Boston Annex be lost, work would have to be allocated to another shipyard, or to a private shipyard, and the consequence to Boston Naval Shipyard would be a reduction in force. Boston is aware that the proposed closing of facilities is not due to inferior workmanship, inasmuch as we have been commended on the quality of our work; nor is it due to excessive costs based on value received—in this regard, we welcome comparison with other shipyards."

The executive committee of the department voted unanimously to go on record in registering a strong protest at the proposed closing of South Boston Annex, Navy Regional Accounts Office, and Hingham Ammunition Depot. Therefore, the department strongly urges all of you, our Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts, to afford this serious situation your prompt and complete attention and assistance.

Sincerely yours,

MELVIN D. EDDY,
Department Commander.

BELMONT, MASS.

The Forty-ninth Star

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, now that Alaska has officially been proclaimed a

State, the American flag gets its 49th star. Just a century ago, the flag was getting its 33d star, as Oregon became the northwestern boundary of the United States.

The star symbolizes a State of immense natural wealth, breathtaking scenery, unrivaled fishing and hunting, vast mineral resources, and big tracts of farmland. The young and adventurous people of the United States have a new frontier to conquer.

To commemorate this historic event, one of my constituents has written a poem, which in sincere and simple style reflects the feeling of millions of Americans.

THE FORTY-NINTH STAR

(By Mrs. Louise Liebenow)

A 49th star in a field of blue
With bars of red and white,
A pledge of allegiance to a noble flag,
A dream of a State come true.

May we always be proud of the 49th star
As it waves in our field of blue,
United for mankind near and far
Alaska, our trust is in you.

The Saving Grace of Self-Criticism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Presbyterian denomination, although far from being the largest religious organization in the Nation, has provided many Presidents and other high officials of our Government, and therefore it is interesting to know what is being preached from its pulpits concerning our political life. On January 4, 1959, Dr. Theophilus M. Taylor, moderator of the newly consolidated United Presbyterian Church in the United States, speaking in the National Presbyterian Church in Washington, emphasized the ideological nature of the struggle in which we are engaged, as De Gaulle is now doing in France. He considered the Soviet Government's attack on Pasternak for his critical work, "Dr. Zhivago," and the high praise and ready acceptance of the similarly critical work, "The Ugly American," by our officialdom as indicating the comparative health and strength of our Nation. True to the Protestant heritage, he recognizes that self-criticism and the acceptance of criticism by our leaders, as distinguished from the attitude of the Kremlin dictators, prevents festering sores, the infection of which continues to increase until at least major surgery or death ensues to the political system.

The moderator dispels misgivings which arose last summer, resulting from the unfavorable press construction of a certain resolution, adopted by Presbyterian Church leaders as being pro-Communist. What was then considered as an attack upon our anti-Soviet policy of the past decade, and a recommendation for peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Communist dictatorship, can hardly be attributed to the present leader of that denomination. For Dr. Taylor's address is aimed at the Soviet Government, not its people. It is common knowledge that self-criticism by the Soviet people is encouraged, even to the point of being forced from them. It is the Communist Party leadership which insists that the totalitarian state set up by it can do no wrong; it is the dictatorship of that state which permits no criticism, by Pasternak or any other citizen or nation. So, also, Dr. Taylor is eulogizing the officials of this country when he speaks of their receptive attitude toward the American counterpart of "Dr. Zhivago."

THE SAVING GRACE OF SELF-CRITICISM

(Scripture: Romans 12: 3: "I bid every one among you not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think (of himself) with sober judgment.")

In the ideological conflict now raging between the East and the West, that factor which in the end will be decisive is the saving grace of self-criticism. This has been signalized recently by the publication and public reception in their native lands of two books, "Dr. Zhivago" and "The Ugly American." The two books do not belong in the same category at all by literary standards, for according to such standards "Dr. Zhivago" probably deserves to be ranked among the great epics of all time. However, the two books are similar in this respect—each is openly critical of the cultural and political milieu out of which it has come. Both books represent a healthy self-criticism by loyal citizens who love their native lands dearly. It is for this reason that they write as frankly as they do. In each case the authors are attempting to call the attention of their fellow citizens to weaknesses within their own systems and to the obvious need for reform at these points.

It is the reaction of the governments and of the general public in each case which is significant. In Russia where self-criticism cannot be tolerated, Louis Pasternak has been forced by none-too-subtle pressures to reject a well-deserved Nobel prize for his book, and he has been vilified in the public press, by party-inspired critics, as a traitor. In the United States "The Ugly American" has been widely and thoughtfully read by Americans in all walks of life. On a recent trip through the Far East and southern Asia I found Americans, both in and out of Government services, devouring it in its serialized form, and discussing it appreciatively even though they did not agree with what it is trying to say in every detail.

There is something fundamentally weak about any system, or individual, that cannot endure the bright light of criticism, whether it emanates from without or from within—from others or from oneself. Any social, economic, or political system that will neither criticize itself, nor permit itself to be criticized, is like a festering sore swathed in filthy rags in which the infection continues to increase until at last either major surgery, or death, ensues. In the same way, the unwillingness on the part of individuals to accept criticism is a fundamental weakness in personality which will ultimately prove to be their nemesis. It requires a magnanimous and healthy personality to stand up to, and benefit from, the vigorous criticism of others. Likewise it is a magnanimous and socially healthy nation that will accept and benefit from the criticism of its sister nations. But the test of a truly mature personality is that of rigorous self-criticism; and one can never become self-critical in the best sense until one has learned to accept the candid criticism of others.

A nation's ability to be self-critical must never be superficially confused with retrospective evaluations of a 5-year plan, nor with considered estimates of success, or nonsuccess, in winning friends and influencing people at the international level. Any national self-criticism worthy of the name must be free to investigate the moral, ethical, and spiritual foundations upon which the entire system rests. Communist nations today are rushing headlong into a blind alley at this point because they are unwilling to accept any criticism of their life at its roots, whether from within, or without. We in America dare not make the same mistake.

Here, upon the threshold of a new year, it is particularly appropriate that our attention should be called again to one of the most urgent admonitions of the apostle Paul: "I bid every one among you not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think (of himself) with sober judgment." With these words the apostle invites the Christians at Rome to sober self-criticism. This is good advice psychologically for anyone; but it is mandatory for the Christian.

While Paul certainly thinks of the Christian as living inescapably in the presence of God, he never thinks of him as living on a spiritual vacuum alone with God. Rather Paul always sees the Christian living in a fellowship with all other Christians, and he also sees him living inescapably in the midst of a non-Christian world. In this situation the Christian knows himself to be God's agent for the reconciliation of all mankind. These factors determine the context in which the Christian is to exercise self-criticism and self-discipline. He must judge himself soberly (1) as an individual responsible primarily to God; (2) as a member of the church which is the body of Christ; and (3) as a citizen of this world in which God has been pleased to place him.

I. OUR SELF-CRITICISM AS INDIVIDUALS UNDER GOD

First of all we are called as Christians to examine our lives in terms of our personal relationship to God. This must logically come first, as in our Lord's summary of the law: "Thou shalt love the Lord Thy God, * * * and [then] thy neighbor as thyself." Only when a right relationship is established between ourselves and God, can we be expected to have a right relationship to our fellowmen.

The question we should ask ourselves here at the beginning of a new year is, "Am I a better Christian—a more faithful and obedient Christian—than I was a year ago? Am I really living closer to God? Am I more consistently and more fully living in the center of His will for me?"

Our Christian faith has from the beginning recognized and emphasized the sanctity of the individual—his rights, privileges, and responsibilities. The gospel of the kingdom is addressed to individuals—"whosoever will, let him come." God calls individuals into his service. While it is true that God is concerned for all men, he is concerned for them as individuals, and not en masse. Moreover, when men and women become Christ's men and women they do not lose their individual identity. They are not poured into the same mold. Rather their individuality is enhanced. It is brought to full fruition. It's potentialities are more fully realized than ever before.

The Christian life in fundamentally a life of movement, of growth, of prayers and improvement, not only in this life, but in the life to come. It is a life of continuing fulfillment. Life in which this element of growth is missing cannot be Christian life in the proper sense. Paul speaks of Christ as the very image, or likeness, of God (II Corinthians 4: 4); and says that the Christian is

being changed into the same image, or likeness, from one degree of glory to another (II Corinthians 3: 18). He speaks of a man's old nature, the outer man, wasting away, while his new nature, the inner man, is going through a continual process of renewal (II Corinthians 4: 16). Thus it becomes impossible for the Christian to stand still, or to mark time. If he is truly Christian he must be in a process of growth, always moving in the direction of being changed into the likeness of Christ, who in turn bears the likeness of God.

Now what does Paul really mean when he says that the Christian is being "changed into His likeness from one degree of glory to another?" It means essentially that God-likeness, which is Christ-likeness, is demanded of us; and that it ought to be measurably greater in the Christian today than it was yesterday, a week ago, a month ago, this time last year. Jesus, himself, had a few things to say on this subject: "I say to you, love your enemies, and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be the sons of your Father who is in heaven." This agrees well with Paul's understanding of the nature of God. It was by virtue of the fact that Christ died for us while we were yet sinners, that God demonstrated, confirmed, and commended His love for mankind (Romans 5: 8). This kind of love—God-like love for men in spite of their sin—must be increasingly characteristic of the Christian. Indeed, we can say that the degree to which we genuinely love those who sin against us, those who are unlovely and unloving, will be a measure of how much the love of God has invaded our lives. Jesus also said, "If you love (only) those who love you, what reward have you? Do not even (sinners) do the same?" If we are to be pleasing to God, if we are to grow in God-likeness, if we are really being changed into His image from one degree of glory to another, then this will surely be reflected in our attitude toward other men.

Yet, one more thing more needs to be said in this connection. The improvement or growth which takes place in one Christian life is not to be measured by the growth in the lives of other Christians. Rather, it is to be measured over against itself. There should be competition in the Christian's life, but it is always competition with oneself. This is true expressly because no two Christians are alike in their natural abilities, in their spiritual endowments, in their education and experience, in the tasks to which God has called them. Thus, as we apply self-criticism, the sober judgment for which Paul calls, to ourselves, we do so in terms of what we have been, and what progress we ourselves have made. Our self-criticism must eventuate in self-discipline, or it will fall short of its goal.

II. OUR SELF-CRITICISM AS MEMBERS OF THE BODY OF CHRIST

In the second place we are called as Christians to examine our lives in terms of our relationship to other Christians, to the other members of the body of Christ. After urging Christians to consider themselves with sober judgment, Paul continues: "For as in one body we have many members, and all the members do not have the same function, so we though many are one body in Christ, and individually members one of another" (Romans 12: 4, 5).

While it is true that the life of Christ is, and should be, reincarnate in the life of each one of us, as an individual Christian, the life of Christ will best be seen by the world as a composite picture of the best in all Christians, for He dwells by His spirit in the church, which is made up of all its members.

The church can only be self-critical through the spiritual sensitivity of all its members. It is self-critical as we, its individual members, are critical of our parts in its corporate life, and of its corporate life as a whole.

We must remember that the great Protestant reformation of the church arose from a rediscovery of this principle—the saving grace of self-criticism. The Protestant reformation began as an attempt by men, like Martin Luther, John Calvin, and John Knox, to reform an existing institution. But existing institutions, whether political or ecclesiastical, usually resist reform. There is a general principle, it seems, which is at work in all human institutions, namely; that the longer an institution exists and the more developed and involved its traditions become, the more likely it is to resist attempts at reformation, the more inflexible it becomes. It is just as bad when a church becomes rigid and inflexible, as when a political state, like Russia, does so.

It is the glory of the Reformed and Presbyterian Churches that they have learned to combat this natural tendency in human institutions, by insisting upon being self-critical. We speak of our United Presbyterian Church as "reformed according to the word of God." A Presbyterian or Reformed Church is true to its heritage and its genius only when it is a continually reforming church. Reformation never ends. As individual Presbyterians, we are true to our great heritage, only when we continue to examine ourselves as members of the body of Christ—the one holy, apostolic, and catholic church which we profess in the creeds. We must continually seek to relate ourselves to that great church.

As we apply this self-criticism to ourselves at this level, we must ask, since all the members do not have the same function, whether we have, as individuals, found that particular place and function in the body which God expects us to fill, and to fulfill. We must also ask how genuinely we know ourselves as individually members one of another. In the Corinthians letter, where Paul discusses the church as the body of Christ, he points out that "if one member suffers, all suffer together; if one member is honored, all rejoice together" (I Corinthians 12: 26). We can, therefore, measure our growth at this point by determining how sincerely we are disturbed by the misfortune and persecution of fellow Christians anywhere in the world And the reality and sincerity of our sympathy may be very well measured by whether we do anything about it in the way of relief, and by whether their calamity causes us to remember them importunately in our prayers.

III. OUR SELF-CRITICISM AS CITIZENS OF THE WORLD

The third area in which we are called to think soberly of ourselves—to be self-critical, is at the point of our relationship to all men. Paul wrote earlier in the Roman letter that he counted himself a debtor, "under obligation both to Greeks and to barbarians, both to the wise and to the foolish." Here in the 12th chapter he urges the Roman Christians, "Repay no one evil for evil, but take thought for what is noble in the sight of all (men). If possible, so far as it depends on you, live peaceably with all (men)." (Romans, 12: 17, 18). But it was not enough to feel oneself obligated to all men, to refrain from retaliation, and to endeavor to live peaceably with all men, for God, who through Christ reconciled us to himself, has given us the ministry of reconciliation for all men. "We are ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal (to all men) through us" (II Corinthians 5: 18, 20). These were Paul's words, addressed not alone to ministers and missionaries, but to anyone who is a new creature in Christ.

Late in the second century an unknown Christian addressed a letter to a man by the name of Diognetus. In that letter he said, "What the soul is in the body, that Christians are in the world." There is no mistaking the fact that he had here laid hold of a great spiritual truth. Thus the church serves as the conscience of society and of all social institutions, as it seeks to lift them through its own active participation in the life of the world to their highest levels of service. And it is we Christians, as individuals inescapably involved in the social, economic, and political life of our times, who must be the voice of that conscience to humanity.

Here again we must apply a vigorous self-criticism to ourselves. The questions we must answer at this point are, first, whether we have grown as ambassadors for Christ, as holders of the ministry, and bearers of the message of reconciliation to men—"that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself"; and, second, whether we have been, by our daily behavior and testimony, that soul and conscience which Christians are meant to be in the world. Or we can frame this question in another way: As we think of ourselves with sober judgment, have we influenced the world for good, or have we allowed the world to influence us for evil?

Paul began his exhortation this way:

"I appeal to you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship. Do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewal of your mind, that you may prove what is the will of God, what is good, and acceptable, and perfect.

"For by the grace given to me I bid every one among you not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think (of himself) with sober judgment, each according to the measure of faith which God has assigned him."

Let us, then recapture and maintain for ourselves, our church, and our Nation, the saving grace of self-criticism.

Beer Cans to Moon Are Fine, but Wiser Choice Is Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the January 10, 1959, edition of the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard. Dr. Ray Ellickson, head of the University of Oregon's department of physics, is outstanding in his field. In a recent speech before members of the Oregon Association of Nurserymen, Dr. Ellickson cited his reasons for the need for pure research rather than spectacular stunts such as shooting a beer can to the moon. It made a lot of sense to me. The article by reporter Don Brown follows:

BEER CANS TO MOON ARE FINE, BUT WISER CHOICE IS RESEARCH

(By Don Brown)

Pure research, rather than spectacular stunts such as shooting a beer can to the moon is needed in the United States, a University of Oregon physics professor said in a talk in Eugene Friday.

Ray Ellickson, head of the University of Oregon Physics Department, addressed a noon luncheon attended by about 150

Oregon nurserymen and their wives. The members attended a 2-day meeting of the Oregon Association of Nurserymen here Thursday and Friday.

Too many Americans have lost their perspective since Russia's achievements in space, Ellickson said. There is too much of a keeping up with Russia complex he told the nurserymen.

It would cost the United States about $2 billion to send a missile the size of a beer can to the moon, he said. And, Ellickson asked, what would it accomplish?

If the Government put the $2 billion into education, he said, about 200 colleges the size and caliber of Reed College in Portland could be endowed.

Since Russia sent the first satellite into orbit around the earth, he said, Americans have lost their former contempt for Russians' ability to progress in science. Prior to sputnik, he added, Americans believed Russians could not do anything on their own hook.

It is typical of Americans, Ellickson believes, that they have a unique ability to swing rather violently from one end of the pendulum to the other. This applies to favoring or disfavoring football coaches, according to the coach's win-loss record—and it applies to American attitudes toward foreign powers.

Ellickson said that he is concerned with the attitude which Americans now have toward keeping up with Russian developments. For example: Russia has shot a rocket to within 5,000 miles of the moon.

POPULAR CRY

This feat has resulted in a popular cry among Americans for their Government to shoot a U.S. rocket to within at least 1,000 miles of the moon, he said. Next will come the attempt to hit the moon, and possibly to land a beer can there—at least figuratively speaking.

Perhaps it would cost the United States $2 billion to send a can-sized missile to the moon, the scientist said. But, he asked, what will have been achieved if this is done? All this competition, he said, is much like television commercials boasting of fountain pens which will write on butter or on the bottom of a bathtub filled with water. How practical are such tests? he asked.

TRADITIONALLY DIFFICULT

It has been traditionally difficult in America to get public interest aroused in research, the physicist reported. This problem prevailed at the time scientists were trying to arouse Federal officials in researching the A-bomb possibilities. Finally, after other efforts failed, he said, the late Albert Einstein prevailed on President Franklin D. Roosevelt to see what F.D.R. could do to help science and the Nation to win World War II.

F.D.R. was able to obtain only $7,500 for A-bomb research, he said.

This was due to very few persons being able even to guess what might lie ahead in atomic research.

Ellickson also cited dandelion research as once being a little-known factor. A study was undertaken on sunflowers, he said, to determine why they turned their heads to the sun. It was found that a chemical was secreted on the back of the flowers in the absence of sunlight. This led to further study which resulted in discovering dandelion-killing 2-4-D.

CALLED FOOLISH

Research on why sunflowers turn their heads, Ellickson suggested, was termed foolish by persons who did not know the tie-in. But if the sunflower study had not been undertaken, there would have been no 2-4-D. With the development of the weed killer, he said, farmers, nurserymen, and others have saved hundreds of millions of dollars by being able to kill many other weeds.

Tremendous benefits always accrue through this kind of research, Ellickson told nurserymen. At first there may be no notion by the investigator that his study will result in applications to special problems.

He criticized too much secrecy on the part of the Federal Government in research work, also. Again he cited an example: During World War II Ellickson worked on a secret infrared ray project which permitted military men to see in the dark without the enemy's knowing it.

NAVY JOB?

This, he said, started as a naval research job. Laboratory men were sworn to secrecy through fear by Navy men that the Japanese, Germans and the U.S. Army would learn about the infrared light, he added.

Yet, when the project was perfected, it developed that the Army was able to use it to better advantage, through its troops, than the Navy. The lights were used, therefore, by the very agency which the Navy had tried to keep its secret from, the physicist emphasized.

The 2-day event, the first of its kind ever held in Eugene by the 26-year-old OAN, ended Friday night with a president's banquet and ball, to honor past presidents of the OAN.

Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent editorial which appeared in the Jackson (Miss.) State Times on January 11, 1959, written by its distinguished editor, Hon. Oliver Emmerich. It follows:

NO, MY FRIEND, MISSISSIPPI IS NOT SLOWLY DYING

(By Oliver Emmerich)

The State Times is in receipt of the following message, a product of the campaign of hate waged in the East against the people of the South.

"Happy 1959, Mississippi. You are losing population. I hope you will die more slowly in 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, etc., than you have been dying up to now. Please, Mississippi, die slowly."

Harry Emerson Fosdick once said, "Prayer is dominant desire." We feel sorry for any individual whose desire stems from hate. What spiritual foundation other than hate could wish slow death to a whole State?

The savagery of the dark ages aroused such vicious feeling that men were often condemned to the excruciating pain of slow death. Once a King of England decreed that two robbers be skinned alive. Their skins were tacked to the outer walls of Westminster Abbey.

In this more enlightened age it is tragic to find any person, whose vision is so blurred and whose understanding is so blighted, as to pray for a return of the spirit of the dark ages.

Any individual who wishes slow death for Mississippi will find disappointment in the revitalized spirit of this State. Here is the true story of Mississippi.

One hundred years ago Mississippi was the fifth richest State in the Union. Then came the devastation of war, the exploitation of Reconstruction, and finally the resurrection of a triumphant faith which now is sweeping this State to new plateaus of progress and glory.

Slow death? Let's check the industrial life of Mississippi. Twenty years ago Mississippi had only 843 factories, 47,890 industrial workers and a total industrial output of only $175,000,000.

Last year the new industrial life of Mississippi had increased our industries to 2,041, our industrial workers to 113,800 and our total industrial output to $1,605,000,000, an increase of 850 percent.

No signs of rigor mortis here.

Slow death? Let's look at Mississippi's financial progress. Twenty years ago—in 1938—Mississippi banks had on deposit $195,008,000. Last year the total deposits were $1,153,157,000. We are very much alive in this category as it is easy to see.

Die slowly? Take a peep at Mississippi's agriculture. Total cash farm sales in 1938 were $134,964,000. In 1956, the total was more than 400 percent greater—$596,065,000.

Mississippi dying? Let's look at the educational picture. In 1938 Mississippi spent $24.55 per pupil in elementary schools or a total of $12,000,000. Last year Mississippi spent $81,500,000 on elementary education or $181 per school child.

Mississippi also is in the midst of a $120 million building program for new elementary and high school buildings, seeking to equalize the school facilities of the two races. This program was voluntary. It was enacted in 1953 before the U.S. Supreme Court's school segregation decision.

In addition our State has budgeted $21 million for higher education, plus $7 million for university and college buildings.

The State of Mississippi is second from the top among the States in the percentage of total tax budget spent for education. A State with this concept of learning is very much alive, forward looking, and on the march.

What's the racial situation? The answer is that racially, Mississippi is up-and-coming. This State has more Negro college presidents than all of the New England States combined; more Negro schoolteachers (7,217) than all of the Mid-Atlantic States. These teachers meet the same regulations and enjoy the same salary scale as white teachers.

Of the nearly $40 million spent annually in Mississippi for old-age assistance, aid for the blind, dependent children, and total and permanent disabilities, Negroes who represent 45 percent of the population receive 60 percent of the total. White people, representing 55 percent of the population, receive 40 percent.

Eighty percent of public health funds spent for combating venereal diseases go to Negro residents. Of the total expenditures for public health, our Negro people get a rightful share. This applies to our charity hospitals as well.

What about bombings? Unlike situations in Boston, Peoria, and some parts of the Southland, no churches or other buildings have been bombed in Mississippi. There have been no incidents of racial violence. The two races live here as friends in this, the hospitality State of America.

What about public health? In the past 20 years death from communicable diseases has been reduced more than 85 percent. Twenty years ago Mississippi suffered from widespread effects of malaria and typhoid fever. In 1957, there was not a single death from either of these diseases in Mississippi.

Other communicable diseases are being blotted out. Mississippi is a place to live long, for this is a State where good health prevails. There's nothing deathlike, slow or fast, in this progressive State

Now what is the truth about Mississippi's population? The U.S. census figures for January 1, 1959, reveal that Mississippi is gaining population. She lost 4,882 in

population between 1940 and 1950. But what mossback of the past wants to apply 1940 population figures in the year of our Lord 1959?

Mississippi had no large municipalities a few decades ago. Jackson, our capital, went from 48,282 in 1930 to 128,000 in 1959.

In the same period Hattiesburg jumped from 18,601 to 35,891; Biloxi from 14,850 to over 45,000; Greenville from 22,943 to 44,574; Pascagoula from 4,339 to more than 25,000; Natchez from 13,422 to 25,195.

This is the population trend today in Mississippi. In the next quarter of a century America will see happening in Mississippi what has happened in California during the last quarter of a century.

Remember this, friends, everywhere: The last half of the 20th century belongs to the South—and Mississippi intends to claim and acquire her share of it.

Slow death? How could any description fit less the revitalized and triumphantly growing State of Mississippi?

The Hub of the Universe and the Birthplace of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article on the historical city of Boston, Mass., which was part of the souvenir program of the 30th national convention of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks held in Boston, August 24–30, 1958:

THE HUB OF THE UNIVERSE AND THE BIRTHPLACE OF FREEDOM

One afternoon in November just a few years ago a world-famous author strolled across Boston Common. He has said that to him no place in the United States can have associations quite so stirring. A young naval ensign stopped him and said, "What place is this, sir?"

"Boston Common," was the reply.

"What is that, sir?"

"Where we all come from, in a way."

Indeed much of what America has become had its beginnings in this city of ours. We hope that you will think of it as yours also. Many of these single sentences in this short chronology have been the subjects of chapters and often entire books of history. We have set them down here in this simple fashion for easy reading and to attempt to recreate some of the atmosphere and background so that you may better enjoy the many historic shrines scattered about Boston. As you walk our streets you may also get the feeling, as countless others have, that our city's glorious present owes much to its courageous past.

In 1629 John Winthrop had been elected Governor of Massachusetts Bay and had been given a charter for the colony. He and about 700 followers sailed to America in 1630; after a long and arduous passage they made their landfall at Salem. They left there after a stay of only a few weeks, having found that small colony with its limited resources and shortage of food unable to cope with any additional problems.

They moved on to Charles Town across the Charles River, becoming neighbors of Mr. Thomas Walford, a blacksmith who had set up his forge on the slope of Bunker Hill. Though they erected here a great house for the Governor and other types of dwellings for the others of the colony, there was still much dissatisfaction. The most acute need was an adequate supply of good water.

Mr. William Blaxton (Blackstone) lived alone on the other side of the river at a place that the Indians called Shawmutt. It was also called Trimontaine because it was actually a three-hilled peninsula. Blaxton called on the Governor and told him of the existence of an excellent spring on his side of the river and invited the Governor to relocate his colony nearby. The invitation was quickly accepted; the frame of the Governor's house was carried over and the people made the transfer as quickly as they were able. The removal to Shawmutt progressed so rapidly that by the 7th day of September a court of assistants was held and it was ordered that the name of the settlement should be Boston.

Two years after being established it became the capital of the colony; the town meeting form of government was adopted and was used until Boston became a city in 1822.

In the 13 years of the great migration (1630–42) Boston added to its population many of the nearly 20,000 Englishmen who settled in and around the Massachusetts Bay Colony.

Boston now comprises the greater portion of Suffolk County and extends its jurisdiction over an area of 47.81 square miles. Much of this was acquired by the reclamation of the area known as the Back Bay and by the annexation of East Boston in 1637; South Boston, including Dorchester Heights in 1804; the cities of Roxbury in 1868, and Charlestown in 1874; also in 1874 the towns of Dorchester, Brighton, and West Roxbury; and in 1912 Hyde Park from Norfolk County.

On August 30, 1630, Governor Winthrop and his court of assistants held their first session in Charles Town and one of their first acts was to legislate a 2-shillings a day wage ceiling on building trades.

On October 3, 1632, the Massachusetts Bay General Court forbade the public use of tobacco.

Massachusetts Bay Colony established a representative form of government on May 14, 1634.

On April 16, 1635, the Public Latin School was established on what is today the site of the pulpit and chancel of King's Chapel. It was thus that School Street got its name. Philemon Pormont was the first schoolmaster.

By March 3 of 1636 the Massachusetts Bay General Court had enacted laws permitting establishment of new churches only with the consent of the court. On October 28 of that year Harvard College was founded by vote of the court and an appropriation of 400 pounds.

On November 4, 1637, Rev. John Wheelwright was banished from Boston for preaching seditious sermons. His sister-in-law, Anne Hutchinson, was likewise banished a short time later for antinomian heresy.

The first printing press in the colonies was set up at Cambridge late in 1638 by Stephen Daye. He and his son, Matthew, continued to print until 1649.

In 1639 the first post office was established in Boston in the home of Richard Fairbanks. On the wall of the Boston Globe building in Newspaper Row there is a plaque with the inscription: "Rich'd Fairbanks his house in Boston is the place appointed for all letters—and hee is to take care that they bee delivered or sent according to their directions." Order of the General Court, November 5, 1639. Placed by the City of Boston, 1924.

Also in 1639 each Massachusets Bay town was ordered by the general court to construct roadways connecting it with the next town.

In the year 1640 Stephen Daye published the "Bay Psalm Book," the first book to be published in America. By this time the estimated population of the English colonies was 28,000 and New England represented about 22,500 of that figure.

In June 1641 the General Court of Massachusetts granted the towns power to regulate wages and prices of commodities.

On November 13, 1644, the general court ordered banishment of all Baptists from the colony and the same day ordered all county courts to have instructed in the worship of God all Indians in their jurisdictions.

In the year 1648 Boston coopers and shoemakers were granted charters by the general court which were very like those of the ancient guilds.

By 1650 the population of the colonies was estimated as being approximately 52,000.

In 1652 Boston's first bookstore opened for business. Also in May of this year the general court established a mint in Boston where pine tree shillings were coined. It lasted until 1684.

In the year 1656 a library in which the public may read was opened in Boston.

The year 1660 saw the Scots' Charitable Society of Boston established. Its function was to be the relief of the poor.

One Michael Wigglesworth in 1662 published in Cambridge a work entitled "The Day of Doom." That year also saw adopted and published by the Massachusetts General Court the "Halfway Covenant." This permitted baptized persons of good character, though not church members, to present their children to be baptized. The court also appointed that year two licensers of printing presses who had final approval of everything to be printed. This same year the English Parliament passed a law allowing justices of the peace to send to the colonies rogues, vagabonds, and sturdy beggars.

In 1665 the First Baptist Church in Massachusetts was established at Charlestown.

Massachusetts Bay Colony on October 11, 1666, refused to send to England representatives to answer charges brought by the royal commissioners for annulment of the colony's charter.

John Eliot in 1669 published the "Indian Primer" in Cambridge and Michael Wigglesworth published, also in Cambridge, "Meat Out of the Eater," a discussion of the necessity of afflictions being visited upon the children of the Lord.

In May 1674 the Massachusetts Bay General Court, after granting that there may be a printing press elsewhere than at Cambridge, for its better regulation ordered that Increase Mather be one of two additional licensers of the press. In the diary of Increase Mather is the following entry: "December 25 (1674) Marmaduke Johnson the printer died in Boston. He has just fitted his press to go to work. Mr. John Foster bought the press intending to set up printing in Boston."

John Foster was the earliest engraver in what is now the United States. He was a native of Dorchester; was born there in 1648 and was graduated from Harvard in 1667. He first appeared as a printer in Boston at the beginning of the year 1675 and the earliest specimens of his imprints bear that date. In 1678 he appears to have procured a new font of long primer; after which his handsomest work was done.

On June 10, of 1676 Edward Randolph arrived in Boston to investigate the Massachusetts Bay colony. He reported that the colony was unduly independent of British authority and he recommended that its status be changed to that of royal province.

In 1677 the first medical work printed in America was a pamphlet by Thomas Thacher and it was called "To Guide the Common People of New England How To Order Themselves in the Small Pocks."

Increase Mather in 1683 organized in Boston the first scientific society in the colonies

to effect improvements in philosophy and addition to the stores of natural history.

October 23, 1684, brought the annulment of the Massachusetts charter in chancery court and with it went the requirement of church membership in order to vote.

By 1686 there were eight book shops doing business in Boston. On June 15, 1686, Angelican church worship was first set up in Boston. On December 20, Sir Edmund Andros arrived in Boston with the title of Governor-General of the Dominion of New England. He was soon to become one of the most hated men in the colonies.

The year 1689 saw Cotton Mather publish in Boston his "Memorable Providences." On April 18 the Boston inhabitants overthrew Governor Andros. On May 24 Massachusetts reestablished its government according to the old charter.

By 1690 the estimated population of Boston had reached 7,000, that of Newport 2,600, New York 3,900, Philadelphia 4,000, and Charleston, 1,100. About this time the "New England Primer" was printed in Boston. On September 25, 1690, "Public Occurrences," first American newspaper came out in Boston. It was immediately suppressed and there was no second issue. In December of this year Massachusetts issued its first paper currency to pay soldiers returning from the expedition to Quebec.

The year 1691 saw emerge the first native artist of real ability in the person of Jeremiah Dummer of Boston who had done portraits of his wife and of himself.

In 1694 Massachusetts passed a law requiring tavern keepers to sell no liquors to "person whose names appeared on a list of common tiplers."

On June 29, 1699, Massachusetts passed a law designed to prevent the spread of infectious diseases and on July 6 of the same year pirate Captain Kidd was seized in Boston and sent to England to be hanged.

In the year 1700 the population of the colonies reached 262,000. On June 24, 1700, Joseph Seward published in Boston a tract "The Selling of Joseph" which condemned the holding of slaves.

April 24, 1704, the Boston News-Letter began publication. This was the first regularly issued newspaper in America and it was to continue publication until the Revolution.

In 1709 the Quakers built a meetinghouse in Boston and in the town that year was published a "Short Introduction to Latin Tongue—Accidence Abridged," its author was Ezekiel Cheever, a colonial schoolmaster.

Cotton Mather the next year published in Boston his "Bonifacious, or Essays to Do Good"; and by the following year, 1711, town records of Boston show a complaint of too much Latin and Greek in the free schools of Boston. On July 30, 1711, a British fleet with colonial troops left Boston to take Quebec. The expedition met with failure due chiefly to the incompetence of its officers.

King's Chapel in Boston received as a gift from Thomas Brattle in 1714 the first organ to be installed in New England.

In 1716 Boston's famed lighthouse was built, the first one in America. The general court had passed an act on July 23, 1715, for building and maintaining a lighthouse, giving as a reason that the lack of a lighthouse "hath been a great discouragement to navigation by the loss of the lives and estates of several of His Majesty's subjects."

The year 1721 brought an epidemic of smallpox to Boston. Dr. Zabdiel Boylston and Cotton Mather that year introduced inoculation to combat smallpox in America. On August 7 of that year James Franklin published the first issue of the New England Courant. Also in 1721 the general court abolished the Governor's censorship of publications.

In 1722 Benjamin Franklin published anonymously "Silence Dogood Papers" in his brother's New England Courant. The following year he left Boston for Philadelphia.

In the year 1725 Nathanial Ames, a physician and maker of almanacs began publication in Boston of his "Astronomical Diary and Almanac" (1725–1775). The following year someone in the town published anonymously something called "Hoop Petticoats, Arraigned and Condemned by the Light of Nature and the Law of God."

Prof. Isaac Greenwood, of Harvard, published in Boston in 1729 the first textbook on arithmetic by an American.

"The Vade Mecum for America" by Thomas Prince, was published in Boston in 1732. It was the first guidebook in America.

The year 1735 brought to New England a severe epidemic of scarlet fever, and in 1736 Dr. William Douglass published the earliest clinical description of scarlet fever. It was published in Boston and was called "The Practical History of a New Epidemical Eruptive Military Fever, in Boston, 1735 and 1736." Also that year, in Boston, Rev. Thomas Prince published a "Chronological History of New England."

Seventeen hundred and forty-two brought the completion of Faneuil Hall, a gift to Boston from Peter Faneuil, Boston merchant.

Jeremiah Gridley was editor of the American Magazine and Historical Chronicle, which began publication in 1743 in Boston. It was the third magazine in the colonies and lasted for 3 years.

New England, on November 18, 1755, was shaken by an earthquake, and on the 20th day of March in 1760, Boston was swept by a disastrous fire. Boston had fires before, but this was the worst to date. Lacking an adequate water system for fighting a fire, it roared on, leaving thousands homeless and blowing up the Battery. In the laws that were subsequently passed for the rebuilding of the town were provisions that roofs were to of tile or slate thereafter.

On February 24, 1761, James Otis delivered a fiery address before the superior court, protesting against use of writs of assistance by British customs officers. In May he was elected to the general court.

In February of 1768, the Massachusetts House of Representatives adopted a circular letter proposed by Samuel Adams to be sent to the other colonial assemblies for the purpose of uniting in opposition to Britain by petition and discussion. On the 10th of June, riot followed the seizure of John Hancock's sloop *Liberty* in Boston Harbor; it had been charged with wine smuggling by customs officials. On July 18, John Dickinson's patriotic ballad, "The Liberty Song," was published in the Boston Gazette. Delegates from 26 towns in Massachusetts convened in Faneuil Hall on September 22 after call by Boston selectmen to draw up a statement of grievances. The 1st day of October two British regiments landed in Boston to enforce customs laws.

On the 5th of March in 1770, the Boston Massacre occurred, with three persons killed, two mortally wounded, and six injured. In October, Captain Preston and the British soldiers involved in the so-called massacre were acquitted in jury trial. They had been represented in court by John Adams and Josiah Quincy.

December 16, 1773, was the date of the Boston Tea Party when citizens dressed as Indians boarded ships in the harbor belonging to the East India Co. and dumped their cargoes of tea overboard.

On March 31, 1774, the Boston Port Act, first of several coercive acts by the British Parliament received royal assent. On May 12, Boston Committee on Correspondence recommended that all colonies suspend trade with Great Britain. May 13 saw the arrival of General Gage to replace Hutchinson as governor and to command troops. Four regiments quickly followed. By June 1, Boston Harbor was closed to export and import. On September 1, General Gage seized Massachusetts powder supply at Charlestown.

April 18–19, 1775, Paul Revere and William Dawes made celebrated midnight ride to warn of British move to capture supplies in Lexington and Concord. Siege of British in Boston began. On May 25, British Generals Howe, Clinton, and Burgoyne arrived in Boston with troops.

Battle of Bunker Hill was fought on June 17 on Breeds Hill in Charlestown with a British victory though they had the heaviest losses by far. Colonial Gen. Joseph Warren was killed in the battle.

On March 4, 1776, Washington set up fortifications on Dorchester Heights. By the 17th of March the situation of Howe and his troops in Boston had worsened to the point that he evacuated Boston that day with his army and 900 loyalists.

In 1780 the American Academy of Arts and Sciences was organized in Boston.

In 1782 King's Chapel in Boston declared for unitarianism.

On August 9, 1790, *The Columbia* with Robert Gray as captain landed in Boston—the first American ship to circumnavigate the earth.

On May 11, 1792, Captain Gray with his ship entered the Columbia River which he named for his ship.

In 1795 the first commercial paper was published in Boston, called Boston Prices Current and Marine Intelligence.

On October 21, 1797, "Old Ironsides," the frigate *Constitution* was launched at the Boston Navy Yard.

The year 1800 saw the completion of the statehouse in Boston. Its designer was Charles Bulfinch. In 1801 Paul Revere succeeded in producing the first cold-rolled copper in America. It was much needed by the Navy to cover the bottoms of ships. The dome of the statehouse was about the first place Revere's new sheet copper was used. "Old Ironsides" was also soon returned to drydock and had her bottom covered with Revere sheet copper.

Boston in 1804 helped form the Coonskin Library in Marietta, Ohio, when a group of settlers sent coonskins to Boston in exchange for books.

In 1805 Frederic Tudor of Boston was first to experiment in shipping ice to hot countries by sending cargo to Martinique.

In 1812 the word "gerrymandering" first appeared when Massachusetts with Elbridge Gerry as governor passed a bill manipulating election districts, a device to affect vote in senate contests.

William Tudor in 1815 founded the North American Review in Boston.

The Boston Recorder, first religious newspaper, was published in 1816, and in the same year the Boston Provident Institution for Savings was founded, the first savings bank in the United States.

Harvard established its law school in 1817.

Boston's Charles Bulfinch in 1818 was placed in charge of the work on the national Capitol.

English Classical School, the first high school in the United States, was established in Boston in 1821. It is known today as English High School. Also, in this year Catholics were allowed to hold office in Massachusetts for the first time.

In 1822 Boston capitalists founded the town of Lowell on the Merrimac and set up a new cotton factory.

June 17, 1825, Lafayette laid cornerstone of the Bunker Hill Monument and Daniel Webster delivered the oration.

In 1826 a high school for girls opened in Boston. It closed in 2 years. It was far too popular.

The American Society for Encouraging Settlement of Oregon Territory was founded in Boston, 1829.

William Lloyd Garrison, editor, began publication of The Liberator in Boston on the first day of 1831.

Boston in 1832 was the scene of the opening of the Perkins Institute for the Blind. Samuel Gridley Howe was the first superintendent of this remarkable institution which is still doing noble work among the sightless.

In 1835 Samuel F. B. Morse, who was born in the Charlestown section of Boston, invented the wireless telegraph.

He was also an internationally famous artist. He was a founder of the National Academy of Design and a founder of Vassar College. He aided in introducing the daguerrotype into the United States.

On April 19, 1938, a Massachusetts law was passed prohibiting the sale of spirituous liquors at retail except in quantities of 15 gallons; and the next year a man named William Harnden began a railroad express service between Boston and New York, carrying parcels in a carpet bag.

In 1842 Chief Justice Lemuel Shaw of Massachusetts ruled in *Commonwealth* v. *Hunt* that a trade union is a lawful organization, is not responsible for illegal acts of individuals and that a strike for a closed shop is legal.

On February 28, 1955, a right to work bill which was introduced to the Massachusetts Legislature received a thumping defeat. Much of the credit for the defeat of this vicious bill must go to the big turnout of organized labor and its friends who were present at the statehouse that day in a protest demonstration.

Massachusetts passed an act on March 3, 1842, requiring a minimum of education for every child and preventing a child under 12 from working more than 10 hours a day in a factory.

In 1843 Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes delivered a lecture before the Boston Society for Medical Improvement in which he contended that puerperal fever could be prevented by cleanliness. On June 17 of that year Daniel Webster delivered the oration at the dedication of the Bunker Hill Monument.

Dr. William Thomas Green Morton on October 16, 1846, performed the first public surgical operation using ether for anesthesia at the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston.

The Boston Public Library opened its first facilities on Mason Street in the year 1854. It was the first free public library in any American city. One of the greatest aids in its beginning came from a wealthy London banker named Joshua Bates who contributed $50,000 in cash plus an equal value in books. He had been born in America and as a poor boy had lived in Boston. Bates Hall in the present magnificent structure in Copley Square is an impressive tribute to his memory; being a mecca through the years of countless serious students bent on research.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, one of the world's finest technical and engineering schools, was incorporated in Boston in 1861. The first blood shed in the Civil War was Boston blood, when, on April 19, 1861 the 6th Massachusetts Regiment was attacked by a mob while passing through Baltimore.

In February of 1862 Julia Ward Howe's "Battle Hymn of the Republic" appeared in the Atlantic Monthly. The following year the Atlantic published Edward Everett Hale's "Man Without a Country."

The New England Conservatory of Music was founded in Boston in 1867. The first reading in America by Charles Dickens took place in Boston on December 2, 1867, at Tremont Temple. He had a large and enthusiastic audience, which included such notables as Longfellow, Holmes, Lowell, and Quincy.

The first invention to be patented by Thomas A. Edison was made into an operative model in Boston in 1868. It was a vote recorded intended to be used in the House of Representatives in Washington to speed up the counting of the Members' votes. Though it was practical and ingenious, it was not approved.

In 1869 Massachusetts established the first State board of health in the United States. The same year the State also established a bureau of labor statistics.

In 1870 the Museum of Fine Arts was incorporated in Boston. It was opened to the public on the 4th of July 1876.

On November 9, 1872, Boston suffered another disastrous fire with a property loss of $73 million.

On Beacon Hill May 8, 1874, the Massachusetts Legislature enacted the first effective 10-hour-day law for women workers.

The first club in the United States for the exploration of mountains was formed in Boston in 1877. It was called the Appalachian Mountain Club and its purposes have been scientific research and outdoor recreation.

In Boston in 1877 was formed the first sewing workroom for handicapped women. Known today as the Community Workshops, it is still doing excellent work rehabilitating and giving sheltered shop employment to handicapped men and women. The Gilchrist Brothers hired in 1877 the first woman clerk for their Washington Street department store. It was so bold a step for the time that a newspaper commented "Passers-by came in to view the curiosity of a young lady who was not busy with domestic, social or teaching responsibilities." Also in 1877 the first women's exchange in this country was founded in Boston. Known as the Women's Educational and Industrial Union, it provides a market place for goods made by women at home.

The first bicycle club in the United States was formed in Boston in 1878 by 14 cycle enthusiasts. By 1886, the Boston Bicycle Club had a membership of over 200 members.

The first vaudeville performance was given in 1883 in Boston when B. F. Keith opened his Gaiety Museum, and called his entertainment vaudeville. His chief attraction was Baby Alice, a midget.

In 1884 the first long-distance telephone service was inaugurated between Boston and New York.

The First Church of Christ Scientist, opened in Boston in 1895 as mother church of the Christian Scientists; that same year the Boston Public Library opened in Copley Square.

The first life-saving station of its kind in the United States for salt water service was anchored one-half mile offshore in Dorchester Bay in 1896. Two naphtha launches and later a steam-driven one were kept in its unique enclosed harbor.

Boston's subway was completed in 1897, the first in the United States. The first Society of Arts and Crafts in America was founded in Boston in 1897. It became the parent of the handicraft movement in this country.

The first automobile insurance policy written in the United States to cover a car as property was issued in Boston in 1902. Its primary protection was fire risk—$950 on the car and $50 on the tools, implements and personal effects. The State authorities ruled it marine insurance. Also in 1902 was founded in Boston the first lipreading school for adults in this country. The founder was Martha E. Bruhn. The Boston Guild for the Hard of Hearing was established by teachers and pupils in this school.

Boston was the first city in the United States to use an automobile as a police cruiser. It was placed in service at station 16 in July 1903 and covered about 60 miles a day through the Back Bay District. It was driven by a chauffer and a uniformed officer rode on a seat high enough to allow him to look over the back fences.

Britain's Grahame-White flew around Boston Light twice, 33 miles nonstop, to win $10,000 in the first international aviation meet held in America in 1910. Called the Harvard-Boston meet, it was the first time in New England when more than one plane was seen in the air at once.

In 1912 at the statehouse on Beacon Hill the legislature adopted a bill establishing minimum wages for women and children, the first legislation of this type in the United States.

In 1926 Boston Drs. George R. Minot and William P. Murphy discovered the value of using liver in the treatment of pernicious anemia, for which they received the Nobel prize in 1934.

The Boston Tercentenary Celebration held in 1930 was a program of considerable proportions. The opening address was given on Boston Common by the Right Honorable H. A. L. Fisher, warden of New College, Oxford. Perhaps a few of the professor's words are worth repeating here. "Little did the founders reckon," said Professor Fisher, "that a time would come when * * * in the fullness of years, their New England would be followed by a new Ireland, a new Italy, a new Germany, a new Poland, and a new Greece, all destined to be merged into a great and harmonious Commonwealth."

Boston is still the Boston of the Lodges, the Lowells, and the Cabots, but much of its vigor, its color, and its hope for the future derives from the newer stocks that now make up a large part of its population.

Since its tercentenary celebration Boston has marched one-quarter of the way into another century. Another Yankee division went off to another World War; other men of Boston sailed off in other ships to help win that war. Faster, larger, and more powerful ships, to be sure, but the same types of courageous men made up the crews. If there was any difference it was only that we had a greater number of nationalities now represented, but sturdy Americans all.

The port of Boston was the scene of great activity during World War II, as it had been 24 years earlier in the First World War. With its fine harbor and docking facilities and its being 200 miles nearer to Europe than any other American port, it was a very important shipping center.

The great concentration of scientific, engineering, and mathematical personnel in this area was responsible for so much of the development of new techniques, devices, and materials which helped immeasurably to shorten those wars. Those techniques and developments have given the impetus for the creation of the many new and diversified industries whose plants we see springing up all around us in the Boston metropolitan area.

This is a much more healthy condition than formerly when the closing down or relocation of the one industry in a community brought so much misery and distress to the inhabitants.

Boston has often been called the Hub of the Universe and the Birthplace of Freedom. Today, however, in earning the title of "Medical Center of the World" it may well be that our city has made its most enduring contribution to humanity.

Soviet Psychopolitics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the threat of psychopolitics, as practiced by

the Soviet Union, has been the subject of penetrating study by George Todt, able columnist for the North Hollywood, Calif., Valley Times. Mr. Todt's work in this field has attracted the attention and praise of patriots throughout the Nation. I commend it to the Members of this body.

I. MOSCOW'S PLAN TO WIN AMERICANS

"Religion is the opium of the people."—Karl Marx in "A Criticism of Hegelian Philosophy."

What is psychopolitics?

According to the official Russian handbook, it is the art and science of asserting and maintaining dominion over the thoughts and loyalties of individuals, officers, and bureaus, and masses, and the effecting of the conquest of enemy nations through mental healing.

From July 28-August 2 of this year, I wrote a series of six articles on this subject, all of which were subsequently inserted into the U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and may be found in the Appendix on pages A7286, A7287, A7356, A7357, A7576, and A7577.

That is the background for this article. Now let's go on into the matter further along the same pathway we used before.

Previously, I had quoted chapter 14 "The Smashing of Religious Groups" and chapter 15 "Proposals Which Must Be Avoided" from the Russian textbook on psychopolitics, as well as the infamous address of Beria to American quislings at Lenin University prior to the Second World War.

Nothing Adolf Hitler ever devised could have been more deadly to the Republic of the United States than the Bolshevik proposals to turn the American people into a herd of cattle.

Today we shall consider chapter 11 of the official textbook. It is called "The Use of Psychopolitics in Spreading Communism."

Here is the verbatim transcript:

"Reactionary nations are of such a composition that they attack a word without understanding it. As the conquest of a nation by communism depends upon imbuing its population with Communistic tenets, it is not necessary that the term 'communism' be applied at first to the educative measures employed.

"As an example, in the United States we have been able to alter the works of William James, and others, into a more acceptable pattern, and to place the tenets of Karl Marx, Pavlov, Lamarck, and the data of Dialetic Materialism into the textbooks of psychology, to such a degree that anyone thoroughly studying psychology becomes at once a candidate to accept the reasonableness of communism.

"As every chair of psychology in the United States is occupied by persons in our connection, or who can be influenced by persons in our connection, the consistent employment of such texts is guaranteed. They are given the authoritative ring and they are carefully taught.

"Constant pressures in the legislatures of the United States can bring about legislation to the effect that every student attending a high school or university must have classes in psychology.

"Educating broadly the educated strata of the populace into the tenets of communism is thus rendered tentatively easy, and when the choice is given them whether to continue in a capitalist or a communistic condition, they will see, suddenly, in communism, much more reasonably than in capitalism, which will now be of our own definition."

Those who would like to see the complete synthesis of the Russian textbook on psychopolitics may obtain it by writing directly to Rev. Kenneth Goff at Englewood, Colo., and enclosing $1 in check or money order form. It is an eye-opener, a real shocker.

I met the 45-year-old Goff in Los Angeles last week and found him to be a dedicated fighter against communism. He is particularly interesting in this connection because 20 years ago he had been a member of the Communist Party of the United States for a period of 3 years. Then he saw the error of his ways, repented, and came out of the party to testify concerning it before the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities. I always admire the sinner who truly repents and works hard to redeem himself later. I asked Goff why he had once upon a time embraced the Reds?

"It was because of the economic lure," he told me. "On paper, socialism and its bastard child, communism, can be made to appear good. But it doesn't work out the way it is so glibly drawn for its intended victims. Those who are not hypnotized soon recognize it as fool's gold."

II. PSYCHOPOLITICS IN RUSSIANS' WORDS

"Psychopolitics is an important if less known division of geopolitics. It is less known because it must necessarily deal with highly educated personnel, the very top strata of 'mental healing.' "—Beria, "Address to American Quislings, Lenin University, 1936.

"Have you read chapter 12 of the official Russian textbook on psychopolitics?" was the question put to me last week by Rev. Kenneth Goff. He is but one of several sources from which comes this monstrous document for the public to read for themselves. Copies may be obtained by writing to Goff at Englewood, Colo., and enclosing $1 in check or money order form.

I told him that I had indeed read it.

"Why not reprint it for your readers and let them see what the Reds have in store for them?"

"Not a bad idea," was my reply. "Chapter 12, which deals with violent remedies speaks for itself."

Try this on for size:

"As populaces, in general, understand that violence is necessary in the handling of the insane, violent remedies seem to be reasonable. Starting from a relatively low level of violence, such as straitjackets and other restraints, it is relatively easy to encroach upon the public diffidence for violence by adding more and more cruelty into the treatment of the insane.

"By increasing the brutality of treatment, the public expectance of such treatment will be assisted, and the protest of the individual to whom the treatment is given is impossible, since immediately after the treatment he is incapable. The family of the individual under treatment is suspected for having had in its midst, already, an insane person. The family's protest would be discredited.

"The more violent the treatment, the more command value the psychopolitician will accumulate. Brain operations should become standard and commonplace. While the figures of actual deaths should be repressed wherever possible, nevertheless, it is of no great concern to the psychopolitician that many deaths do occur.

"Gradually, the public should be educated into electric shock, first by believing that it is very therapeutic, then by believing that it is quieting, then by being informed that electric shock usually injures the spine and teeth, and finally, that it often kills or at least breaks the spine and removes, violently, the teeth of the patient.

"It is very doubtful if anyone from the lay levels of the public could tolerate the observation of a single electric shock treatment. Certainly they could not tolerate witnessing a prefrontal lobotomy or transorbital leucotomy. However, they should be brought up to a level where this is possible, where it is the expected treatment, and where the details of the treatment itself can be made known, thus to the increase of psychopolitical prestige.

"The more violent the treatment, the more hopeless insanity will seem to be.

"The society should be worked up to the level where every recalcitrant young man can be brought into court and assigned to a psychopolitician, be given electric shocks, and reduced into unimaginative docility for the remainder of his days.

"By continuous and increasing advertisement of the violence of treatment, the public will at last come to tolerate the creation of zombie conditions to such a degree that they will probably employ zombies, if given to them. Thus a large strata of society, particularly that which was rebellious, can be reduced to the service of the psychopolitician.

"By various means, a public must be convinced, at least, that insanity can only be met by shock, torture, deprivation, defamation, discreation, violence, maiming, death, punishment in all its forms. The society, at the same time, must be educated into the belief, of increasing insanity within its ranks. This creates an emergency, and places the psychopolitician in a savior role, and places him, at length, in charge of the society."

Remember Jane Wyman's prize-winning picture "The Snake Pit" a few years back? What is a lobotomy? A leucotomy? Do we know?

Forty-first Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Reminds Us of Plight of Captive Nations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include a letter from Mr. Lev E. Dobriansky of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc. The Urkainians are a patient, hard working people and I have the honor to have some of them as my neighbors near my ranch in southwestern North Dakota. In their homeland Ukrainians have suffered, endured unspeakable hardships, and are still suffering today as one of the captive nations under the Communist yoke. I think it is fitting that we regain some of the perspective that some Americans seem to have lost under the impact of the Mikoyan visit. Mr. Dobriansky's letter follows:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., January 14, 1959

The Honorable DON L. SHORT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHORT: On Thursday, January 22, friends of freedom everywhere will be observing the 41st anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. In the profound faith that Moscow's deceitful campaign of "smiles and trade" could never cause you to forget the aspirations of the captive nations and their fundamental importance to the security of our Nation, we respectfully ask that you join with us in this observance.

Today, more so than in years past, your statement in the RECORD commemorating this event, will help enormously to keep

the spirit of freedom alive in the hearts of 40 million Ukrainians. Your message in behalf of this captive nation will serve notice, too, of your sustained faith in the eventual liberation of all nations enslaved by imperialist Moscow. It will also clearly demonstrate to the Menshikovs, Mikoyans, and Khrushchevs that American memories of their crimes and our standards of civilized decency and justice cannot be erased by their calculated genteel antics or by spurious promises of trade.

The reception given Mr. Mikoyan by some of our wealthy Americans is food for serious thought. It indicates the spiritual climate in some quarters. Twenty years ago, the Nazi, Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, was completely ignored for what he represented. Today, despite his personal crimes, the Armenian quisling is widely feted. The thousands of patriotic Armenians, Azerbaijani, Don and Kuban Cossacks who were annihilated by his orders in 1917–21; the millions of Ukrainains who starved to death in the manmade famine of the 30's while Mikoyan shipped grains abroad; the role he played in the liquidation of Hungarian patriots—these and other facts no longer seem to bestir the consciences of some of us. Only two months ago, before the Moscow City Soviet, Mikoyan delivered a violent anti-American speech; today, without self-respect, some accept him as a deliverer of peace.

Your message on the captive nation of Ukraine will be greatly appreciated as a message with an American conscience, not to say one of political sagacity. We shall be most grateful for it and, in gratitude, shall deliver to you this Friday an interesting brochure of Ukraine's quest for freedom.

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Georgetown University.

Self-Employed Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the passage of time is beginning to afford the basis for more accurate estimates of the fiscal effects of any program for the establishment of restricted retirement funds for the self-employed. Several years ago a somewhat similar plan was established in Great Britain. The experience since the inauguration of the plan in 1956 reveals that the actual effect on the revenues has been between one-sixth and one-tenth of the original estimates. This is supported by the following letter received by Dr. Frank C. Dickinson, formerly of the American Medical Association, from R. G. Burch, director of statistics and intelligence, Inland Revenue, London:

INLAND REVENUE,
London, December 11, 1958.

Dr. FRANK G. DICKINSON,
American Medical Association,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR DR. DICKINSON: Your letter of the 26th September addressed to the Right Honorable R. A. Butler was passed to me for reply. I regret that it is only now that we have received the results of our annual survey of the tax assessments of self-employed people which enables us to make a reasonably firm estimate of the amount of the relief for premiums for retirement annuities.

In the April 1956 budget estimates the cost of the relief was given as £7 million in 1956–57, and £30–£50 million in a full year, but there was a footnote against both estimates to the effect that the cost of this relief will depend on the extent to which those eligible take advantage of it. In the event these policies were taken out much more slowly than expected, and it is clear that the cost will not rise in the forseeable future to anything like the level quoted. The amount of relief in the first year 1956–57 was under £1 million. The annual rate for 1957–58 is likely to be nearly £5 million, but new policies are still being taken out and it is clear that the amount of tax relief will continue to grow. It is difficult to forecast the level at which the relief is likely to settle down, but it is probable that this will be under £10 million.

Yours faithfully,

R. G. BURCH.

Most People Saw Through Mikoyan's Mission—He Wanted Us To Help in Our Own Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the editor of the Washington Star, appearing in its issue of January 4, 1958.

So many have asked what were the real objectives of Mr. Mikoyan's visit to the United States. This letter from a man who saw the Communist conspiracy first hand during his life in the Baltic States before coming to the United States diagnosed those purposes before the visit of the Soviet's professional revolutionary. Events while Mikoyan was here made clear the correctness of Mr. Kalnins' analysis. Furthermore, the negative reaction of almost all Americans except a few businessmen to Mr. Mikoyan's rather transparent blandishments and obvious evasions demonstrated in a heartening way the fundamental soundness of our people. No clever words unsupported by deeds, and no proffered profits, can mislead our rank and file into thinking falsehood is truth or evil is good. Maybe some benefit after all may come out of Mikoyan's visit, through the rejection of his shoddy offerings by the mass of our people despite the ballyhoo and fawning on him by a few.

Mr. Kalnins' letter follows:

BEWARE OF MIKOYAN

Russia's current long-range strategy centers around taking over the remaining countries of the free world by means of economic competition—another kind of a war against capitalism, but on a different level, and at present more promising for the Communists.

The real purpose of Mikoyan's visit to our country is intended to shorten the period of America's planned transition from capitalism to communism. Khrushchev has expressed confidence that our grandchildren will live under communism. The leading Soviet theoretician, Suslov, declared that the historical change will take place in less than 20 years. The turning point is now considered to be 1965, when, after completion of the new 7-year plan period, the Soviet Union will have outdistanced the United States in per capita industrial and agricultural production. The Soviets just need time, which they believe works for them. In addition, they certainly would appreciate it if the capitalists, by providing the Soviet economy with the needed machinery and other equipment, would aid in shortening this period of transition.

On two previous occasions America helped the Soviet Union to get out of a dead end. Our technical and material aid helped build up Soviet heavy industry, which now has become the backbone of communism construction and expansion. Then America saved the Soviet Union from military defeat during World War II by a timely massive supply of war materials and food. American taxpayers sacrificed over $10 billion to this end, and were not even thanked for it. Now, when Khrushchev experiences mounting difficulties with inner opposition, he hopes America—against her own interest—will be kind enough to help the Soviet Union again.

Mikoyan is going to talk trade. He will promise most profitable transactions to our business world. Lenin taught that capitalists, once offered economic concessions, are reluctant to fight the Soviet Union.

Khrushchev could not find a better man to cope with the problem.

Mikoyan is a resolute man. Once he played the leading role in communizing and Sovietizing the Caucasus. He worked for years in the underground, organizing party activities against the Azerbayan national government. He prepared the occupation of that country by the Red army in 1920, after provoking a Communist revolt in Baku. Later he crushed the uprising of anti-Communists in Nizhni Novgorod (now Gorky). From 1922 to 1926, together with Voroshilov, Mikoyan led the purges among the party organizations in the Don, Kban, and Terek River regions. In 1926, he was rewarded with an administrative post within the U.S.S.R. Government. Then trade became his new specialty. In this field he knows how to use trade monopoly to fight capitalism.

Mikoyan is shrewd. Let our Government beware.

KARLIS KALNINS.

Can India Do It Democratically?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent article by Mr. William H. Stringer, chief of the Washington bureau of the Christion Science Monitor, contained some excellent information concerning the problems facing India.

Mr. Stringer's column also pinpoints a problem which Americans are wont to overlook, namely, that India's problems are also the problems of the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article as follows:

CAN INDIA DO IT DEMOCRATICALLY?

(By William H. Stringer)

NEW DELHI.—Drive from here to the Himalaya foothills and see the huge Bhakra Dam abuilding and you say to yourself, "This is good." Impounded monsoon waters will irrigate 10 million acres and sluice hydroelectric power to new chemical, cement, and aluminum plants.

Then drive about the new oil refineries at Bombay and the new factories there and you conclude, "India's industrial base is coming along."

But then you thread through bullock-cart traffic on northern roads, and you hear how densely populated is southern India, including the state of Kerala, where a Communist government was elected to power. And you learn that India still has a chronic food grain shortage of 1.5 million tons annually—and you finally ask:

"Can India really make it?"

Can India indeed prove that industrial modernization and agricultural reform and the whole colossal task of moving an unwieldy peasant-based state into the 20th century will be accomplished by democratic methods? Communist China is moving ahead by police state, drastically authoritarian techniques. Can India do it while preserving civil liberties?

This is the oft-stated challenge. But it becomes real and poignant and vital here in New Delhi when, right now, hard-working Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and his government wrestle with the goals and objectives—and stark needs—of India's third 5-year plan.

For India, now completing its second plan, must move forward with a third in 1961–62, and a fourth after that. The factories below the Bhakra Dam must be built. Unemployment must diminish in Kerala. Somehow the chronic food shortage must end despite an annual increase in population. Resettlement of 9 million refugees from Pakistan—taking place almost overnight—must be completed.

What's to be done? India can project a bold third 5-year plan and maintain the headway now gained. Or it can decrease its pace of modernization and risk political disaster—and the advent of a more authoritarian form of government.

The point which must be of major interest to the United States and the West is that India's third plan must have major infusions of foreign aid or it will falter and fail. The United States, Canada, West Germany, Britain, and the international lending agencies rode to the rescue of the second plan—their aid will enable it barely to succeed.

The third plan will require as much assistance in loans and credits. One authority estimates that the United States will need to underwrite the last 2 years of the second 5-year plan and the 5 years of the third (ending in 1966) to the tune of $3 billion—plus larger allocations of surplus food grains.

Would this big underwriting—with other western industrialized countries doing their part—be worthwhile? Is it our own enlightened self-interest? Is there value and virtue in the commitment expressed by the Kennedy-Cooper Senate amendment to see India through?

There is intense interest throughout free Asia in development programs of all sorts. The Communist China experiment—communes and all—is being watched carefully. If democratic India were to stumble and fall, and Peking, with Moscow's assistance, were to succeed, there is not the slightest doubt that the repercussions would be tremendous. The United States has seen one of Asia's great nations go Communist; it would be cataclysmic if the second great populous nation went the same way.

Congress should consider the potentialities. It would be useful if it could decide this year how big a stake it ought to have here. Then India's 5-year planners would have a sounder base for their blueprinting. The Kennedy-Cooper resolution could be passed—if that is the estimate of Congress concerning the gravity of the situation—by both Houses.

Then, with other western powers sharing the investment load, a longer range program would be worked out so that too much debt repayment would not fall due during the critical years just ahead. India could decide how much effort to expend in the next forward leap on engineering and secondary industries, and how much on land reform, cooperatives, village improvement, and the whole complicated drive to boost India's agricultural output.

To Americans it should be worth a great deal to have a share in proving to Asia and to the entire watching world that communism does not offer to backward countries the only road into the 20th century.

Hungarians Trusted Mikoyan and Were Slaughtered—All Free People Must Beware Any Communist Bearing Gifts or Wearing Smiles—With Them Bad Faith Is a Virtue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following deeply moving letter to the President by a refugee from Soviet massacres in Hungary. The letter appeared in the Washington Daily News of January 16, 1959:

SOME MAY ASK WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES ONE MAN'S LIFE MAKE

When President Eisenhower receives Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan tomorrow, one young veteran of the Hungarian revolt now living here will be absent from the picket line at the White House. He has written the President a letter to explain why.

He was among the university students who met to draw up the anti-Soviet demands that started the Budapest revolt 2 years ago.

Captured after 5 weeks of fighting, he said his Russian captors decided "to beat me to death" when he refused to name comrades. But he made a frantic dash "when they got tired of beating me and went out to rest," dived into the icedotted Danube, and swam to safety. He is now a student in a Washington college.

Here is his letter:

"Dear Mr. President: I, a Hungarian refugee who hopes to be an American citizen in 3 years, shall respect your call for courtesy and not join my picketing countrymen when Mr. Mikoyan arrives at the White House. I fear I could not remain peaceful, despite the demands of courtesy, for the arrival of the man who agreed to the removal of Russian troops just before they opened an atack in which 27,000 Hungarian men, women, and children died.

"You see, this week I got a letter from home. My close, lifelong friend, George, is dead.

"He was such a little person in the scene of diplomacy and world politics. Tall, warmhearted, intelligent, he was 22, the same as I. He came from a poor family that did not have money to send him to college, but because of his brilliance he won a scholarship to the University of Budapest Law School.

He could speak eight languages fluently. I remember, we used to sit around a table and discuss politics in many languages. Or, he would recite Virgil, whom he could quote for hours. And his only dream was to see once the place where George Washington was born and lived.

"The revolution came along, and he fought with the rest of us. And suddenly, after Mr. Mikoyan visited us there were ruins and flames, and we stood above a trampled nation and a destroyed dream of freedom.

"'A man can only run so far from his fate, and then he has to take a stand,' George told us. 'Where would I go?' he asked. So he stayed on his native soil.

"They let him live, to write urging us here to come back to the university, to Hungary. We felt from the sound of his letters that he was under pressure; we wouldn't go. And so he was of no more use.

"Last week, while Mr. Mikoyan was telling Americans there are no more political arrests in Russia today and we did the same thing in Hungary the United States did in Lebanon in answering the call of a legal government, while Mr. Mikoyan said this, they came. The Hungarian secret police or the Soviet soldiers (who they were really doesn't make a bit of difference) on Wednesday, January 7, early in the morning, dragged him out of bed and shot him.

"Mr. President, some may ask, what difference does one man's life or death mean for a nation of 170 million, or for the world? You, the moralist, know what life is worth. So while we speak of courtesy, will you please ask your visitor, Mr. Mikoyan, to have the courtesy to take his Russian heel off the heart of Hungary?

"Yours respectfully,

"ROBERT SOLYMOSSI."

(The name signed here is not the young freedom fighter's real one, in order to protect his family remaining in Hungary.)

Comprehensive Conflict of Interest Bill and Government Ethics Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on January 15 I introduced two bills in Congress to strengthen the Federal conflict-of-interest laws and to enact a comprehensive code of Government employment ethics.

Testimany taken before the Antitrust Subcommittee and before other congressional bodies has revealed that a thorough revision of the Federal laws prohibiting conflicts of interest in Government employment is long overdue. Existing laws are confused and inadequate. They contain pitfalls for the unwary and loopholes for the unscrupulous.

To correct this situation, one of the bills I am introducing today revises, simplifies, and coordinates the conflict of

interest statutes and the related prohibitions against bribery. The measure should assure the Federal Government of the maximum protection against unethical practices, without unduly impairing the attractiveness of the Government service to competent persons.

Principal provisions of this bill include the following:

First. Lifetime prohibition of breaches of confidence in matters formerly worked on by employees who leave the Government.

Second. Prohibition of payments to—as well as receipts by—Government officials of compensation for services rendered before Federal agencies.

Third. Uniformity of provisions prohibiting bribery of officials, and extension of bribery provisions to witnesses before committees of Congress and before Federal agencies.

Fourth. Cancellation of Government contracts, licenses and grants consummated in violation of the conflict of interest and bribery laws.

The other bill that I will introduce would enact an overall code of ethical conduct to cover employees of all Government agencies, as well as all former employees, and members of the public dealing with the agencies. Unlike existing law, this bill would provide administrative penalties, including, first, discharge, for employees who engage in unethical conduct; second, suspension or disbarment of representatives who violate rules governing the activities of former Federal employees; and third, disqualification for contracts and grants of private parties who engage in unethical practices in dealing with the Government.

A Tribute to Congressional Secretaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, in the day-to-day press of our congressional duties we are prone to take for granted the dedicated work of our secretaries and other staff personnel who, in a real sense, keep the wheels of Congress turning so efficiently. The other night Joseph McCaffrey, the distinguished radio-TV news commentator, paid a tribute to congressional secretaries on his radio program "Today in Congress" which is presented each night, Monday through Friday, over WMAL at 6:45 p.m., as a public service by Independent Airlines Association. For the benefit of my colleagues who may have missed that particular broadcast of this oral congressional record, under unanimous consent, I include Mr. McCaffrey's tribute in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

This Congress won't seem the same to many of the oldtimers on Capitol Hill because many familiar faces will be missing.

This reporter will certainly miss at least one of the many who retired at the end of the year and won't be around for the new 86th Congress.

I'm going to miss Dorothy Woodring, a veteran of 36 years on Capitol Hill who has been with Congressman WALTER NORBLAD of Oregon since he came to Congress. Prior to that she had served his predecessor James Mott. In all, 20 of her 36 years on Capitol Hill were devoted to Oregon's First District.

And if the constituents of every district received the attention, care, and worry that those folks in Oregon's first received from Dorothy Woodring there'd be more contented voters from coast to coast.

Dorothy Woodring, to my mind, was proof of the value of a good secretary to a Member of Congress.

She knew the answers; and, if she didn't, she knew something even more important: she knew where to find the answers.

She not only knew her official Washington—which can be a jungle—but she knew the district back home and she matched the two together.

Like people who are a success in any field, Mrs. Woodring learned a little something new every day—and she was willing to learn—and that's why she was probably the best in the business on Capitol Hill. And I hope she enjoys her retirement.

But this actually is more than a few words of praise for a good friend; it's also another way of pointing out the vital role a Capitol Hill secretary plays.

It's a tough job, an important job, and the men and women who fill those jobs don't get the credit that they deserve and earn.

Progress Noted by Bureau of Indian Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues a recent news release issued by the Secretary of the Interior on the Bureau of Indian Affairs educational and economic advances made during 1958. I am pleased with the work being done by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and commend the Commissioner and his staff for their efforts expended in behalf of our American Indian citizens. The news release follows:

EDUCATIONAL AND ECONOMIC ADVANCES IN 1958 REPORTED BY INDIAN BUREAU

Both educational and economic opoprtunities for Indian people were significantly increased by Federal Government action in fiscal year 1958, Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton said in the Department's annual report released today.

One of the most important developments, the Bureau of Indian Affairs section of the annual report points out, was the launching of a new vocational training program designed to improve the job skills and earning capacity of adult Indians. During the year the Bureau reviewed and approved for purposes of the program 165 occupational courses in 65 trade or vocational schools throughout the country and 376 adult Indians were enrolled in these courses. An additional 325 applications from potential Indian trainees were on file and awaiting action at the end of the fiscal year.

Shorter-term training for specific jobs was also provided during the year for 168 Indians in industrial plants near the reservations under contracts between the Bureau and the employing companies.

Another major development was the further expansion of the adult education program which the Bureau initiated on five reservations in 1956 for the benefit of Indians who missed the advantage of schooling in their youth. By the end of the fiscal year 1958 courses of this kind were being regularly given at 72 locations on Indian reservations in the United States and among the native villages of Alaska.

Enrollment of Indian children of regular school age increased by over 3 percent as compared to the preceding year and reached a record high of 130,000. Of the total, 61 percent were enrolled in public schools, 30 percent in Federal schools operated by the Bureau, and 9 percent in mission or private schools. During the year the Bureau operated 80 boarding schools and 214 day schools including 23 trailer schools on the Navaho Reservation and 10 instructional-aid schools conducted without professional teachers in the remoter localities of Alaska. Classes were conducted for student patients in three Public Health Service Indian hospitals. Dormitory facilities were furnished by the Bureau for 2,900 Indian students who attended public schools in communities bordering the Navaho Reservation in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah.

For the benefit of Indians seeking jobs away from the reservations, the Bureau continued providing financial help and guidance in community adjustment. Offices for this purpose were maintained in Cleveland and Cincinnati, Ohio; Chicago, Joliet, and Waukegan, Ill.; Los Angeles, San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose, Calif.; Denver, Colo.; St. Louis, Mo.; and Dallas, Tex. At the end of the year the Joliet and Waukegan offices were closed and merged with the office in Chicago. Help in moving was provided during the year to 5,728 Indians. This included 4,331 individuals in 976-family units, 1,023 unmarried men, and 374 single women.

Income to Indian tribal groups and individual Indians from the leasing of their lands for oil and gas development dropped considerably from the record-breaking figure of more than $72 million for 1957 but still reached the second-highest level in history at $55,210,467. Of this amount, more than $28 million represented bonuses in a single lease sale involving lands in the Four Corner portion of the Navaho Reservation.

On the Klamath Reservation in Oregon several important steps were taken leading toward the eventual termination of Federal trust supervision in accordance with a 1954 congressional enactment. An appraisal of the tribal property was completed. Slightly over three-fourths of the tribal members elected to withdraw and receive cash payments for their individual shares of the assets. A management plan for the residual tribal estate was drawn up. At the very end of the fiscal year a division of the property between the remaining and withdrawing members was completed.

To Keep Your Dollar Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see the President's budget message so universally accepted by thinking people throughout the country and was

impressed with the content of this morning's editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times, "To Keep Your Dollar Sound." It would be my fervent hope that those who fall within the category of free-wheeling spenders would meditate seriously over the content of this editorial. It makes good sense.

The editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Sun-Times, Jan. 20, 1959]

TO KEEP YOUR DOLLAR SOUND

President Eisenhower has given Congress a big order. He has asked the Democrats, who control both Houses, to help him fight inflation and keep the cost of living down. To do this, Congress must trim Federal spending and vote some $1½ billion in new or increased taxes, in order to balance the Federal budget. The recommendations have brought cries of anguish from some Congessmen. Neither thrift nor increased taxes arouse enthusiasm on Capitol Hill.

Yet, despite the criticisms that have been evoked from Democratic leaders, the President's program is based on fundamentals that they must recognize if they keep faith with the voters who sent them to Washington. Every American is concerned about the depreciating value of the dollar—it buys about one-fourth less than it did 10 years ago. If the Government, which is going into the red more than $12 billion this year, continues to spend more than it takes in next year, the dollar will buy less and less. As the President has said, if the Government persists in living beyond its means it makes it difficult for every family in the land to balance it own household budget.

In his economic report sent to Congress yesterday, the President asked not only that Congress exercise restraint in spending, but he asked that labor, business and the consumer help the Government defend the value of the dollar. He urged labor leaders not to ask for wage increases not based on increased output of workers. He asked business to hold the price line. He told consumers they could help by shopping carefully for price and quality.

The Government itself must set a good example by holding down its spending. The President is alarmed about the possibility of further inflation because economists see 1960 as a year when inflation could go bounding up. The budget that he sent to Congress covers the last half of 1959 and the first half of 1960.

This year the Nation is expected to recover fully from last year's recession and to go on to the best business year in history.

Especially during such a period the Government should be able to live on its income, which will go up as incomes and profits go up. If instead the Government continues to operate in the red, the pressures of inflation would build up for a real explosion in 1960.

That is why the President said solemnly that if Congress does not help fight the battle of inflation by accepting his balanced budget it may be necessary to restore economic controls. These are just as abhorrent as inflation and would also be an obstacle to economic growth and development.

If the case for a balanced budget is so persuasive and clear cut, why should it be so hard to put across in Congress?

Some Congressmen do not believe that it is dangerous for the Government to continue to operate in the red. They say that the country is growing and that the Government must continue to spend huge amounts for defense and to meet the increasing needs of the people—even if this spending puts the Government deeper and deeper into debt. They belittle creeping inflation, and some even argue that 1 or 2 percent of inflation a year is not only inevitable but beneficial.

We disagree. A little inflation is like a little snowball going downhill. It gathers size and momentum. It swallows up the savings and incomes of retired people who must rely on pensions and insurance policies for their incomes.

Some Congressmen who argue against thrift also argue against increasing some revenues to pay the cost of Government. The President has asked for no general tax increase. He wants an increase in postal rates, aviation, and auto gas taxes, and on a few other special items.

No one likes to see taxes increased. But it is better that a few taxes be raised to keep the dollar sound than to pass an irresponsible budget that steals from every wallet and purse in the land by cheapening the dollars they contain.

What the South Needs Is a Strong Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a very interesting editorial written by Mr. Monroe Sweetland in the Milwaukie (Oreg.) Review. Mr. Sweetland is a leader of the Democratic Party in Oregon, being currently a State senator and having formerly been Oregon's Democratic national committeeman.

The article follows:

[From the Milwaukie (Oreg.) Review, Jan. 1, 1959]

WHAT THE SOUTH NEEDS IS A STRONG REPUBLICAN PARTY

Habit and tradition are both good and evil. While they may be fine attributes in moderation, they can become obsessions which will ruin a man or a nation.

This, we think, is what ails the American South. The fine traditionalists who operate southern business and industry, and do it now with great success, think they still have to be Democrats. Their party is no longer a reflection of their thinking on economics or government. They find themselves rejected by its conventions, outvoted in its highest councils, and at the coming session of Congress they will be cast in the role of an obstructionist minority. On many issues they are in agreement with the Republicans of the North and West, but the obsessions of habit and tradition compel them to pretend they don't even know those who wear the Republican label.

In presidential elections these southern leaders find themselves more and more on the sidelines. Every 4 years they are relegated into the unproductive role of sulking in their tents or bolting their Democratic Party. The platform and the candidates are now invariably unacceptable.

The Nation needs its two-party system. It needs a two-party system which gives the people a real choice between conservative and liberal philosophies of government. Across the North and West, with minor exceptions, this polarization of the people into their two great parties has already taken place. In the South it is confined to the Democratic primary and the November elections have become a farce. The liberal Democrats have won some southern spots, but mostly it is still an old guard area.

Already in Florida and Texas a substantial Republican Party has emerged. It should spread to South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, and Louisiana, where a large, restive conseravtive bloc of traditional Democrats should join them. There would be better government in the South, and much more honest registration of public opinion in our November elections.

Mikoyan Came; the People Saw; He Did Not Conquer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following splendid editorial from the New York Times of January 16, 1959:

MR. MIKOYAN AT THE UNITED NATIONS

Deputy Premier Mikoyan's press conference at U.N. headquarters yesterday revealed little not already familiar to persons accustomed to following the activities and arguments of the Russian delegation in that same set of buildings. The famous personality, the outer aspect of good will, the glow that followed Mr. Mikoyan's electioneering tour of the American hinterland—these were new. Mr. Mikoyan is more pliable and insidious than Mr. Sobolev, who was master of ceremonies yesterday, but the positions taken were essentially those the Soviets have already taken at the United Nations.

Mr. Mikoyan did not yield in any important particular. His expressions of good will were general. His attitudes were the same old attitudes. He was asked some questions that had obviously been prearranged, and some that just as obviously had not been prearranged. He was, at times, momentarily nonplused, but he showed the same skill in parring dangerous questions that has kept him alive and in public life in Russia, alone among the outstanding figures of the old Bolsheviks.

What did he say that was news? This was the question that most of the journalists were naturally asking themselves. He was in favor of cooperation in the use of outer space. He merely deplored that the U.N. committee set up for that peaceful purpose did not give the U.S.S.R. a commanding position. He was asked about the treatment of Jewish writers in Russia. He replied, in effect, that those who preferred to write in Yiddish in Russia were free as anybody else, but that they generally preferred to write in Russian. He accused the United States of attempting to impose a "diktat" on Russia with regard to conditions proposed for controlling tests of atomic weapons. He came out against the enslavement of the Arabs by the colonial powers, with bland indifference to the fact that the Arabs are no longer enslaved by any colonial powers.

He complained of the reluctance of the Western World to enter into a summit conference on Russian terms. He denied that Russia held captive any American fliers who had, unfortunately, come to earth on the wrong side of the boundary. He said that Hungary and the Hungarian people are happy, and that "it would be rather nice if the situation were as normal in many other countries as it is in Hungary." He accepted the business of coexistence and added that "our people do not need or want to interfere

in the internal affairs of other countries." He admitted that "the Americans today have a higher standard of living than ours."

In a moment of greater asperity, at the end of the conference, he denounced freedoms for hooligans—meaning, as we may presume, the Hungarian demonstrators in this country, who have sometimes shown more honest indignation than wisdom in embarrassing distinguished Russian visitors.

This visit to the United Nations, this press conference, well guarded by the New York City police outside and by the U.N. security staff inside, was a spectacle in which the Russian relationship to the United Nations and to the whole free world was vividly dramatized. Mr. Mikoyan made no new enemies yesterday. On the other hand, he revealed more poignantly than he had done before, the shabby nature of the bill of goods he is trying to sell in this country.

Health Insurance for Retired Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Dr. Frank G. Dickinson, Ph. D., before the American Association of University Teachers of Insurance at the La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill., on Sunday, December 28, 1958. Dr. Dickinson recently retired from his position as economist and statistician of the American Medical Association and director of its bureau of medical economic research:

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR RETIRED PERSONS

(By Frank G. Dickinson)

PREFACE

I would be less than human if I did not express at the outset my pleasure in being invited to give this paper before a growing professional organization which I helped to organize in 1932 and was later honored to serve as secretary and as president before I left the University of Illinois more than 12 years ago. I congratulate the officers of recent years who have so wisely planned the activities of the association.

The topic "Health Insurance for Retired Persons" is far too broad for a short paper. I shall present last my only suggestion for legislation; I shall confine myself largely to presenting brief and inadequate answers to seven basic questions:

1. What is the role of life insurance in financing the terminal illness or accident?
2. Does prepayment diminish in importance as one grows older?
3. Has the present generation now approaching age 65 had a greater opportunity to save than the generation which attained age 65, say, 20 years ago?
4. If accumulation during the working years of life is the ultimate solution, is the current national problem one of saving or one of insurance?
5. Will the increase from 15 to 22 million persons age 65 and over necessarily aggravate the problem?
6. Is the prospect of lengthening life much beyond three score years and ten realistic or fantastic?
7. What Federal legislation, if any, is likely to provide a sound solution to the problem of financing medical and hospital expenditures during retirement?

1. HEALTH INSURANCE VIA LIFE INSURANCE

Many years ago, a wise judge once observed, "What we know as men we must not forget as judges." Why did you and I buy life insurance? Why do we continue to pay the premiums? One of the reasons is to provide a cleanup fund at the time of our death to pay outstanding bills, including those for our last illness.[1] Typically, the last illness, especially among persons age 65 and over, is by far the most expensive illness. Last year the grand total of death benefits paid by life insurance companies on death claims of persons 65 years and over in the United States was about $1,100 million. Of the 1,600,000 deaths in the United States last year, 900,000 were among persons in this older age group.

Unfortunately, we do not know how many of the 15 million people in this older age group are currently protected against the medical and hospital costs of the last illness through life insurance. Suppose it is 10 million; it may be more. We are probably entitled to say that some two-thirds of those suffering their final illness have provided in a large measure the means for meeting the economic costs of their last illness through the institution of insurance—in this case, life insurance.

I submit that life insurance plays a major role in financing the terminal illness or accident. You who teach all branches of insurance are not likely to be so shortsighted in the treatment of health insurance for the aged as to forget this time-honored role of life insurance. As the number of persons aged 65 and over increases from 15 million to 20 or 22 million, the life insurance companies and their agents can make an enormous contribution to the social, political, and economic impact of the final illness by selling more life insurance and keeping more life insurance in force. Moreover, the availability of loans under these life insurance policies constitutes a tremendous backlog upon which our older citizens can rely in postpayment or prepayment of the costs of illnesses before their last illness.

So my answer to my own question about the role of life insurance in financing the terminal illness is that it plays a tremendous role. I trust that the life insurance industry will succeed in making this role even greater in the future.

2. PROPENSITY FOR PREPAYMENT DIMINISHES

The pressure of obligations to a family is one of the basic reasons for buying insurance, for paying in advance if you will. It is one of the reasons why we buy life insurance and health insurance. As you and I have passed through time we have shouldered the rather heavy medical and hospital costs incident to having children and frequent visits to the doctor for children at preschool ages.

As the children grow older they kick out a pair of shoes every month and seem to be hollowlegged when it comes to stowing away food. Later on they present understandable demands for recreation, better clothing, and many social activities. Then come high school and college with their heavy financial burdens. So that when we reach age 50 most of our children have left home and we have paid off all or most of the mortgage on the home. The best savings period of life begins after age 50 for many.

One turns west, so to speak, around age 50. Why should older persons over age 50, or more particularly over age 65, want to prepay the costs of health insurance? The youngsters are grown and even the grandchildren will be teen-agers or older. One reason for prepaying health care costs—that is, to protect the wife—would continue for couples in their later years. As mentioned, as we grow older we look upon life insurance as a means of clearing up our debts including the cost of the last illness when we die.

Although I have no statistical proof, it seems to me that the advancing years bring with them a decrease in desire to prepay health care costs and an increasing desire to postpay them. I daresay that even the best plan and the most attractive program of health insurance for older people may encounter sales resistance simply because the pressure to prepay diminishes after 50 years of age, and more particularly after age 65. I do not present this tendency as an impossible barrier for health insurance underwriters, but I submit that sales resistance will be encountered even where the flow of funds is sufficient to pay term premiums during retirement. Apparently one-third of them are now insured for medical and/or hospital services; and the proportion is rising.

3. A LUCKY GENERATION

Those who are approaching retirement age now are finishing their working period of life in an era favorable to savings. Contrast the situation for a person in this retiring class of 1958 with one in the retiring class of 1938, two decades ago. Those who attained age 65 two decades ago completed their working years during the depressed conditions of the 1930's. Personal savings of the American people in some of those years were negative. On the basis of 1955 prices, per capita personal savings in 1957 were seven times as great as they were in 1938. The source does not give this change by age groups. But the present generation approaching retirement is certainly more fortunate than the generation which approached retirement two decades ago. We shall avoid speculation herein regarding the relative prospects of the two retiring classes having their savings materially reduced by inflation.

This is a lucky generation that can finish out the working years of life in the period of prosperity. The point I wish to make here is that the problem of financing health care during the retired years is on its way to solution, but not for many of those who are now over 80 or 85 years of age as they finished up their working years of life during a period of depressed economic conditions. Considering the people over 65 years of age as a homogeneous group for the purpose at hand leads to generalizations which are not warranted.

4. A PROBLEM OF SAVINGS

My fourth question and fourth point is that the problem of financing health care during retirement is basically a problem of saving during the working years of life. Health insurance has been sold on a term basis. The means of providing a flow of income during retirement to pay these term premiums monthly, quarterly or annually, or to postpay these costs remains the basic economic problem. The entire savings mechanism of our society must be brought to play on this problem of financing health care during retirement. It is not exclusively a problem of insurance, but of savings during the working years of life—life insurance and annuities, mutual savings banks, savings accounts in commercial banks, direct ownership of securities, property, and so forth. The rapid expansion of pension systems is one of the more favorable factors on the horizon. Moreover, an increasing number of employers, often under collective bargaining pressure, are specifically providing for medical and hospital care during retirement over and above the pension payments.

5. FROM 15 TO 22 MILLION

Population projections indicate an increase from 15 to 22 million persons in this older age group. Those on old-age assistance

[1] The author has presented this point elsewhere. "Why People Bought Life Insurance," an editorial, The Journal of the American Medical Association, 167, 7: 866 (June 14), 1958. Reprinted as Bureau of Medical Economic Research Miscellaneous Publication M–113, Chicago, American Medical Association, June 1958.

now number about 2½ million and an unknown, but probably greater number, either do not want to buy voluntary health insurance or do not need it. A rough guess would be that 3 to 6 million of the present 15 million population in this older age group are outside the market for voluntary health insurance. Whatever the number may be, life insurance, other forms of savings and pensions accumulated during the working years of life will probably continue to grow at a faster pace than the number of older persons. I think the stress on the predicted increase in the number of persons in the age group 65 and over—from 15 to 18 to 20 to 22 million—is far too great in public and political discussions. The real problem is to increase the savings and other provisions for old age per 100 persons reaching age 65, or later retirement age, each calendar year. If sufficient progress is made, the increasing number of persons in the higher age group could actually present a smaller problem in future years than the current problem.

6. THREE SCORE YEARS AND TEN—A PLATEAU

While on this question of population forecasts, it may be helpful to examine briefly the claim that medical and scientific progress will continue to lengthen life in future decades as much as it has in recent decades. Assuming that will happen, the alarmist jumps to the conclusion that the problem of health insurance for retired persons will attain vast proportions. The expectation of life at birth has increased by an average of almost 4 years a decade in the 20th century; but the increase between 1950 and 1960 will probably be only 2 years as compared with 6 years during the 1940's. Earlier reductions in infant mortality exercise tremendous leverage on this measure of length of life. But infant mortality is now below 2½ percent and the possibility of reducing it much more is obviously a flight of fancy. Moreover, if mortality could be entirely eliminated at all ages below 45, the present expectation of life at birth of 70 years could be increased only to 74 years. Success in the management of the older diseases of life will doubtless lead to some improvements in expectation of life at ages over 45. But the evidence is clear that in the absence of fantastic medical progress, expectation of life at birth will not move much above 75 years during the balance of this century; if, indeed, it actually reaches 75 years by 1999. But my point here is that some of the scare propaganda about the future increases in length of life aggravating the problem at hand is just scare propaganda and nothing else.

7. TAX ENCOURAGEMENT

I need not give a description of the Forand bill to this audience. If the time has come to consider spending Federal tax money to provide free hospital and surgical care for the 10 to 12 million persons eligible to receive or actually receiving OASI benefits, one may question whether this is the wisest use of Federal revenues. If we consider the primary long-run problem involving savings in its broadest form for retirement, it follows that the encouragement of such savings would seem to be more in the public interest than the Forand bill proposals. Our time on this program today is too short to go into details about Federal legislation. What I have in mind is a bill somewhat similar to H.R. 10 which passed the House but not the Senate last summer—a bill commonly referred to as the Jenkins-Keogh bill—a bill to encourage self-employed persons to save for old age by providing tax deferment on reasonable amounts set aside in a taxable year for the purpose of providing income after age 65 or 70. This same device could also be used to encourage savings by any taxpayer to finance medical and hospital care during the retired years. The annual set-aside in a taxable year might be limited to $100 per taxpayer and placed only in restricted funds of the types provided in the Jenkins-Keogh bill. The accumulation of these savings in funds designated by the Secretary of the Treasury would be primarily a savings function until retirement age was attained; after that these accumulated funds could be used only to purchase health insurance on a current basis or some form of a medical or hospital care annuity, or to postpay medical and hospital bills during the retired years. Such legislation should be carefully drawn so that the savings could be used only for the stated purpose, and the deposits and accumulation of funds prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury. In the taxable year itself the set-aside of a maximum of $100 would not be taxed but the income derived therefrom during retirement would be subject to current income taxes—tax deferment, not tax free. This temporary loss in Federal income tax revenues would be for the purpose of solving a problem for young taxpayers as well as old taxpayers. For the younger taxpayers this contingency could not arise for many years. Such legislation would clearly put us on the right track, namely, encouragement of savings during the working years of life to finance medical and hospital expenditures during retirement.

Korean Government Pledges That Powers of New Security Law Will Not Be Used To Curtail Basic Freedoms but Only Against Enemy Agents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, many people in our country have understandably been concerned at news reports from Seoul that the majority party in control in the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea, after weeks of unavailing persuasion, finally used force to clear out the minority which had seized possession of the chamber in a sit-in strike to prevent passage of a new national security law. The minority expressed the belief that the law could and would be used to suppress the opposition party and the press, not just Communist infiltrators and agents.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that in both the U.S. Senate and the National Assembly of Korea, the majority has difficulty getting opportunity to work its will—in each case because of the fears of the minority that too drastic measures may be taken by the majority.

When this incident in Korea was reported in the press, I consulted responsible Korean officials and am happy to include with my remarks a summary of the new law and the reasons for its enactment, a detailed report of the incident by Dr. You Chan Yang, Korean Ambassador to the United States, along with the pledge of President Rhee and the Ambassador that "in the operation of the law there shall not be any abridgment of speech, press, and personal freedoms." This statement will be very reassuring to the American people. We are all friends of Korea and wish for it and its people freedom, reunion, peace and prosperity. We recognize that many of the problems with which it struggles came directly from our own division of the country with Communists controlling the north and determined to undermine and gain control of the south, too:

A COMMENTARY ON THE REVISED NATIONAL SECURITY LAW OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

(Dr. You Chan Yang, Korean Ambassador to the United States, made the following statement today:)

Recently, there have been a number of newspaper articles and editorials which have been appearing in the American press concerning the circumstances surrounding the passage of our revised national security law and its contents. Because some of the newspaper reports indicate fragmentary knowledge, and because some of the editorials indicate inadvertent misrepresentations, I feel that it would be helpful to the American reading public if the actual record were made known.

Why did the administration introduce the bill for this new law? What is generally not realized in the United States is that Korea is still in a state of war. During the past year, the Communists have multiplied their efforts to subvert the Republic of Korea. Hundreds of Red agents, thoroughly equipped with military weapons and tremendous sums of cash, have been sent across the 38th parallel to foment the strife and to bring about the downfall of the Korean Government.

It was to eleminate this clear and present danger that the national security law was enacted. None of our previous legislation was adequate to handle the problem. Last year, over 900 Communist agents were arrested, but went largely unpunished because of the lack of adequate legislation. The previous Korean laws were too obsolete to cope with current Red infiltration tactics, as none of them had been modified since during the early days of the U.S. military government in Korea. The Criminal Code could not be applied to North Korean Communist agents, because its punitive provisions are only for spies of an enemy state—yet North Korea cannot be considered a state but only a puppet regime. Similarly, our national defense law has jurisdiction only over military units, and, thus, is not applicable to acts of espionage committed by civilians outside combat areas. Indeed, supplying North Korea with any private, confidential or secret information or any other act abetting the Communists had not constituted a crime under then-existing legislation.

In view of these facts, the administration presented the new national security law bill to the National Assembly on November 18, 1958.

The opposition minority party, called the Democratic Party, in opposing the new bill, launched an organized program of filibuster in order to delay the orderly deliberation. On December 19, at 5:25 p.m., the opposition party members, without obtaining the permission of the Speaker of the House, physically occupied the main hall. Members of the Government majority party, called the Liberal Party, having finished their general meeting, sought to enter the main hall, together with 30 Sergeants at Arms belonging to the Secretariat. The Sergeants at Arms sought to pick up the bedclothes and bedding and other miscellaneous items scattered about upon the rostrum of the House of Representatives, whereupon the opposition drove out the guards, and destroyed the desks, chairs, and the Speaker's seat in the House of Representatives; the session then had to be adjourned.

It should be noted that these clearly were acts of violence, and Government property in

the main legislative chamber had been destroyed.

Nevertheless, the speaker of the assembly met several times with the opposition to negotiate, while the latter went on a sitdown strike in the Assembly Hall. These negotiations proved fruitless, and on December 23 the Secretary-General of the National Assembly appointed additional security guards so that order could be restored. On the next morning this security guard was asked to clear the hall. The sitdown strikers sought to block the opening of the plenary meeting by barricading the hall. In the violent action directed against the sergeants-at-arms which ensued, 15 security guards were beaten so extensively as to require hospitalization.

The whole event was a black mark upon the mature legislative processes in Korea. The administration had again and again invited the opposition to express their argument against the proposed legislation verbally, instead of through violence. My Government welcomed their early suggestions, and, indeed, incorporated several of them as amendments to the new law. The law itself was badly needed, the sitdown strikers functioned in an undemocratic and unparliamentary way, and the speaker of the house was in his legitimate right in invoking the support of the sergeants-at-arms.

Apprehension has been expressed in some quarters that the provisions of the new legislation would in some way abridge freedom of speech and press. But this has never been, and is not now, the intent of the law. President Rhee, the Government, and I personally pledge and guarantee that in the operation of the law there shall not be any abridgement of speech, press, and personal freedoms. The clear-cut intent of the law absolutely is only to allow the Government to apprehend and punish enemy agents. The world will see in the years to come the utter fairness in the applicability of the national security act.

Removal of Two-Term Limitation on Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, I introduced a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to repeal the two-term limitation imposed upon the Presidency. The constitutional amendment which first enacted this limitation was never thoroughly considered. It was never a clearly thought out proposal, used for constructive purposes, but was, in my opinion, an emotional reaction against President Roosevelt, who had succeeded in winning four elections. It was enacted by the Republican 80th Congress with unbecoming haste.

Time has proven how sorry a mistake this amendment is. The country is living with a lameduck President who, in his second term, has lost much of the political power essential to him for leadership. It hampers, in my opinion, the treatymaking powers of the President, and is disadvantageous in the delicate day-to-day operations of our foreign affairs.

In short, with such limitation—namely, that his powers terminate on a day certain—the President loses effectiveness, both at home and abroad. Moreover, this limitation is to my mind an unjustifiable expression of distrust of the electorate.

I firmly believe that the repeal of this amendment is one of the musts of the 86th Congress.

Just How Underpaid Are Our Teachers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the School Support Act of 1959—H.R. 22—is to strengthen the financial structure of our public schools by Federal grants to the States to be used to build schools or increase teachers' salaries or both, as each State sees fit.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I was impressed by a recent article in the Star. Special writer George W. Oakes asked, then answered, the question: Just how inadequate are teacher salaries?

Mr. Oakes found that the principal reason for the national shortage of some 135,000 qualified teachers is a salary scale which discourages capable people from becoming teachers, or causes teachers to leave the profession.

Mr. Oakes' article follows:

JUST HOW UNDERPAID ARE OUR TEACHERS?

(By George W. Oakes)

One of our hardiest public perennials is the question of schoolteacher pay.

Everybody admits teachers are underpaid. Everybody talks about it and a few people do something about it. Its ramifications run all the way from people who lay at its door all our scientific inadequacies to those who just say it's a shame for people who train our youngsters' minds to make less than those who fit their shoes.

Just how inadequate are teachers salaries?

The National Education Association has spent a lot of time gathering figures for the answer. Theirs are regarded generally by Government officials as the most reliable available.

They have found out these things:

There are 1¼ million public schoolteachers instructing in elementary and secondary schools throughout the United States.

About 60 percent teach in schools located in urban areas—the highest proportion in cities with a population of 100,000 to 500,000.

Nearly three-fourths of all teachers are women. They predominate in the elementary schools where only 14 percent are men.

AVERAGE MAN TEACHER

The average man teacher in the public school system is 35 years old, married, and has one or two children. He is a college graduate but usually doesn't have more than an A.B. degree. He's probably teaching in a secondary grade, has been in the profession for 8 years, most of this time in the same school system.

The average woman teacher is considerably older, with an average age of 45, is married and has one child. About a third of women teachers are unmarried, a higher proportion than is true of most workers in this country. She holds a college degree but very few have done graduate work. She's likely to have been teaching 15 years in all, 7 in her present school system.

The married woman teacher is financially best off of all as 83 percent have husbands who are employed full time.

AVERAGE EARNINGS $4,520

The average teacher earns about $4,520 per year.

Women's salaries are in general about 10 percent less than men's.

Pay also varies considerably according to different areas of the country. For example, in California the average teacher receives $5,925, and in New York $5,800 per year. In the District of Columbia it's about $5,364. It is due to be more since a pay increase was voted in July.

In Mississippi the average annual salary is only $2,650 and in Kentucky $3,125.

Despite the relatively high scale in some States one out of every four classroom teachers in this country gets less than $3,500.

In spite of his academic training and professional status, the teacher is paid just a little more than the average American wage-earner, including the unskilled.

To take some concrete cases: The average civilian employee of the Federal Government was paid $4,971 and a typical railroad clerk got $4,778 last year while the average professional person earned approximately $7,600.

The most serious aspect of the teacher's financial situation is the fact that he is infinitely worse off today that he was half a century ago in comparison with other workers. Between 1904 and 1953 teachers gained 37 percent in purchasing power but telephone operators gained 111 percent, railroad clerks 92 percent, and those in furniture manufacturing 137 percent. Yet during this period the average school term lengthened by about 23 percent while industrial and office workers reduced their working week from 48 hours in 6 days to 40 or less in 5.

OTHERS PAY MORE

The difficulty in attracting outstanding men into teaching is well illustrated by salaries offered inexperienced college graduates by 20 major Chicago corporations compared to those available in the public schools of one of Chicago's best suburbs, Winnetka. A year ago those entering accounting, sales work, industrial relations, engineering, and general business were paid from $4,800 to $5,300. But Winnetka teachers started at $3,900 a year.

In general the male teacher who must support a family is particularly hard hit financially. Therefore, 3 out of every 10 teachers' wives work full time. In order to make ends meet the typical man teacher has to take other jobs which furnish about 10 percent of his total income. Most earn their extra money during summer vacation.

What makes this serious from the viewpoint of improving teacher competence is that such outside work is generally not even professional in nature and often prevents the teacher from attending summer refresher courses. As a result he does a poorer job of teaching. Less than a third did professional work as a summer job. Most men worked as clerks and sales people, farmers or unskilled workers.

As one married high school teacher who has a $5,200 salary (about $1,000 higher than the national average) and earns $400 from outside jobs put it:

"Every summer is a major crisis for my household. In the past few summers I have been dishwasher, ditchdigger, truck driver, gardener, screendoor salesman, and tutor."

The comments of a fourth grade 36-year-old teacher illustrate how the need for extra earnings penalizes teacher training:

"I should be happy to have at least as many hours each week to devote to my own learning outside the classroom as those I must spend to supplement my inadequate teaching salary. Perhaps I would then be better qualified to help satisfy our need for better education."

SALARIES DON'T GO UP

One important factor which discourages capable people from entering teaching as a career and causes others to leave it is that teacher salaries do not increase over a 10- or 20-year period nearly as rapidly as do those in business or the professions. In the Chicago school district, where a high salary scale applies, earnings for those with a college degree will run after 10 years 52 percent above the minimum.

But a college graduate during the same period, would have had a 78 percent pay raise in engineering, 109 percent in accounting, 123 percent in sales work and 105 percent in general business. As a young English teacher in a big city junior high school sees it:

"If I could plan on sizable raises in pay over the years, which accompany success in other fields, it would add incentive to be sure. But I look at the pay schedules for our State and find it would be in vain to move (ours is average) to greener pastures."

In their living arrangements, teachers are at least in line with the national average. In fact the proportion who own their own homes—59 percent—is practically identical with the national figure. Most teacher homes—one-third—are valued at from $10,000-$15,000. Almost as many are worth less than $10,000.

Eighty-eight percent of the teachers own a car which is 17 percent higher than the national average.

DEPEND ON CREDIT

The consumer debt among teachers shows that as a group, they depend on credit a little more than most Americans. For example in the $4,000-$5,000 income bracket—above average for teachers—34 percent of all teacher families had a debt of more than $500 compared to 32 percent for the average family at that income level.

Despite the fact that teachers do have a difficult time financially and are at a considerable economic disadvantage compared to other professional people, there has been a continuing improvement in their pay. During the past decade the pay of schoolteachers, principals and supervisors has risen in general at an average anual rate of about 6 percent.

In 1957–58, their average salary was approximately 63 percent higher than it was in 1948–49. When this salary raise is translated in terms of purchasing power, however, it is estimated that the net gain for teachers is about 38 percent during these 9 years. In the 1955–56 school year, about half the teachers questioned in an extensive Nationwide survey felt their financial position had improved over the preceding year. Starting salaries have also risen about 10 percent between 1955 and 1957.

Yet it is still true that more men quit teaching because of inadequate financial compensation than for any other reason. Of all who leave the profession more than one out of three does so because of the low salary.

That's why only about half of all men teachers would go into the profession if they could start their careers over again. In the words of the Rockefeller report, "until we pay teachers at least as well as the middle echelon of executives we cannot expect the profesison to attract its full share of the available range of talent." This could well mean a raise of as much as 50 percent in the salary scale.

Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare commenting on the same problem, says the salary structure is the most serious weakness in our total educational system. He put it this way at a recent press conference:

I think the most serious weakness in our total educational system today is our salary structure. I don't care whether you are talking about elementary or secondary education, or whether you are talking about higher education, I think that as a Nation we should be ashamed of the compensation that we pay those who are willing to serve us in what is certainly one of the most important areas in which people can serve the society of today.

There are those who say that we won't correct the situation unless we are willing to double the salaries that are now being paid.

I appreciate the fact that that is a generalization that possibly is subject to, or should be subjected to, fairly close scrutiny, but personally I am willing to subscribe to it.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Citizen Looks at Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, yesterday my esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], delivered an address in Dallas, Tex., at the annual convention of the American Road Builders Association.

The Senator from West Virginia, who served 14 years in the House of Representatives, and for all of that period was a member of the Committee on Roads, delivered a thought-provoking address on this occasion before 1,200 men and women. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CITIZEN LOOKS AT GOVERNMENT

(Address by U.S. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, at national convention luncheon of the American Road Builders Association, Dallas, Tex., Jan. 20, 1959)

President Steelman, members of the American Road Builders Association, and distinguished guests, it is a pleasure to be here and to have this opportunity to renew so many of the happy associations that developed during my work with you in the past 10 years. These have been warm and enduring relationships which I trust will remain, even though I have been impelled to withdraw from active participation as an officer of the association. And you may be assured that the work of the ARBA, and the development of our Nation's highway system will always be matters of the most fundamental interest and concern to me.

I am sincerely sorry I was not here earlier to hear the excellent addresses by the able Senator from New Mexico, Senator CHAVEZ, the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, and also the address by Senator FRANCIS CASE, a longtime advocate of improved highways. A former House colleague, Representative GEORGE FALLON, of Maryland, was also a distinguished speaker, as was Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, of Florida.

It is pleasant being in the home State of two outstanding Americans, Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Senate Leader LYNDON JOHNSON. They are positive in their efforts to build a better America.

Today, although I intend to talk in part about our roads, I am going to discuss them in the context of the general topic, "the Citizen Looks at Government."

As most of you may know, I recently completed a political campaign of almost 8 months' duration for the unexpired term of the late Senator Matthew M. Neely. During that period, I traveled the highways and byways of West Virginia and talked with thousands of my fellow citizens. And I may say quite categorically that there is no substitute for a grassroots campaign in sounding the sentiments of the people.

The framers of our Constitution took this fact into consideration when they established a House of Representatives to be elected every 2 years, their theory being that the House, whose Members must counsel with the citizenry every 2 years, would thus be most responsive to the needs and the will of the electorate. Although the technological development of our communications and transportation systems have, in part, eliminated this distinction between the two Houses of the Congress, the political campaign is still a vital part of the educative process in a democracy, for the candidate no less than for the electorate.

I wish, therefore, to share with you some of the observations and reflections coined from my experiences of recent months. It is not too early to appraise the meaning of the last election. But when I say that, I am not implying any use of partisan political rhetoric. I wish to go beyond such terms to a consideration of the needs of the citizen in relation to the nature of a democratic society itself.

And, in this inquiry, it would be well for us to remember that democracy is still a rather new experiment in the history of mankind—one that has by no means embraced the loyalties of people throughout the world. We who live within the democratic tradition—we who maintain faith in the dignity of the individual—are still a minority of the human race, and it is not written in the stars nor in words of fire across the sky that our way will prevail. Our endurance will be due to our imagination, our intelligence, and our will—not to some benevolent cosmic force in history which protects us from ourselves.

In viewing our topic in generic terms we find that certain material and spiritual conditions must be satisfied in order to develop and maintain a democratic society:

First. A minimum level of material prosperity must be achieved, sufficient to fulfill the basic needs of the populace—the need for food, shelter, clothing, employment, and provision for tomorrow.

Second. An adequate system of communication, transportation, and information must be maintained in order to assure the operation of a free and informed public consensus. In the city-state of ancient Athens the scope of democracy was defined by the range of the orator's voice. This fact, in itself, should preclude any casual comparison between the Greek democracies and our own.

And, the third condition that must be satisfied is an intellectual and spiritual one—the belief that men and women are capable of being governed by reason and good will.

These are the minimal conditions of a democracy. Now, what bearing do these generalizations have on our discussion today and the findings of the recent compaign? In brief, we may state the answer in these terms:

Although the conditions necessary for a democratic society—as I have outlined them—are universal, the way these conditions are satisfied varies with the complexity of the society and the state of its technology. This, in turn, affects the citizen's view of his government's responsibility.

Thus, in a dynamic society such as ours, these conditions are in constant flux—a flux which calls for persistent and continuous reexamination of the role of government itself. I shall, therefore, use the conditions of the State of West Virginia as a laboratory example of the kind of reexamination necessary, and the degree of governmental responsibility the citizen expects.

President Lincoln and other great statesmen and political philosophers have defined the functions of government as doing that for the individual which he could not do for himself. Thus, 100 years ago, with still half a continent virtually unsettled—with free land available for the taking—the Government did not need then to concern itself with problems of unemployment, social security, retirement benefits, etc.

The hardy men and women who pioneered West Virginia— as well as the rest of America—were well able to provide for themselves from the fertile land they settled, and the close-knit family group provided for its own aged.

But what of today? Their descendants who work the coal mines of West Virginia are no less hardy than their fathers and grandfathers. But they are less independent—and through no fault of their own. They now are part of an immense industrial complex which they cannot control—an industry, the condition of which is controlled by the technology of our society as a whole, the development of new fuels, new blast furnaces for steel, and new ways of producing power, to name only a few changes.

The production of coal, incidentally, in West Virginia declined from 150 million tons in the year 1957 to a gross production of only 112 million tons in 1958.

In 1948 there were 125,000 persons who labored in the coal mines of my State. But, by 1957, coal industry employment dropped to 58,000—and as of December 15, 1958, there were only 47,000 men working in the coal mines of West Virginia.

It is not surprising, therefore, that in all of the polls taken during the Senate campaign in West Virginia the issue overriding all others in the minds of the voters was the recession and the problem of unemployment. At the present time, when we are being told that the Nation is pulling out of the recession, and business is on the road upward, in West Virginia approximately 15 percent of the labor force remains unemployed, and 300,000 people of the State are living on surplus food commodities, or are eligible to receive these Government surplus food items.

Self-righteous talk about stern measures of economy in Government thus means little to able-bodied men and women who have the will to work but are denied the opportunity. Nor is this a problem that confronts the people of West Virginia alone—as the recent figures in the rise of unemployment testify.

We are, indeed, faced with the ironic and anomalous situation of a nation at the peak of its productive capacity impelled to give thought, as a result of technological advancements, to impending unemployment in many sectors of its productive system—in the mines, in the steel industry, in the automotive industry, and in agriculture.

And this, I reiterate, is a responsibility of government, for we are here concerned with the survival of a democratic society—a concern which cuts through party divisions or

questions of moderate or liberal or conservative political philosphies.

I do not choose to be considered a prophet of doom and gloom—a Cassandra reading in the flight of birds the downfall of our society. But democracy means a certain condition of morale among the people—a condition in which the citizen walks upright, assured of his own dignity as an individual. A jobless man, whose family lives by sufferance rather than by right, does not long retain his sense of strength and freedom. And a democratic society cannot long afford the erosion of morale that follows.

Thus, through Federal planning and Federal action, as was quite clearly implied in the Full Employment Act of 1946, we must assure the material conditions of democracy by maintaining full employment. Such a view is not the product of liberal sentimentality, nor Christian charity, nor socialistic theory—it is the product of a hardheaded regard for what is necessary for our survival—and an acknowledgment that we have the material resources if we but have the imagination, the intelligence, and the will to use them.

Turning now to the second set of conditions I mentioned earlier—the need for an adequate system of transportation, communication, and information—it is interesting to note that these factors also weighed heavily in the minds of the West Virginia voters. In the same polls that showed unemployment as the chief issue, the second-ranking issue was invariably either the improvement of roads or schools. In both respects the citizen looks to the Federal Government for a contribution to the solution of the problem.

As most of you know, I have for many years been convinced of the vital importance of transportation—all forms—to the development of our expanding Nation. And of all forms, none is more important than our highway system. For highway transport not only supplements every other form of transportation, but it makes available to us the wealth of choices in where we live and work and seek our recreation.

It is important, also, to be reminded that many of the educational advancements of recent years—that have been achieved through our consolidated schools—have been made possible by an improved highway system.

It is worth considering, as well, that an adequate highway network which provides farm-to-market roads might do much toward easing the plight of the independent farmer who has contributed so much to the quality of American life. Indeed, a balanced highway program is one that not only provides for interstate superhighways between cities, but, also, for other primary arteries, and a large network of secondary roads that serve mining, agriculture, and other rural industry.

When I was a Member of the Congress in 1944, serving the sixth of my seven consecutive terms, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of that year authorized and designated 40,000 miles of a National System of Interstate Highways, but only the regular Federal-aid funds were available from the Federal Government to finance its construction. Such limited funds, of course, were utterly inadequate to complete the much-needed development in any reasonable time.

By 1956, as you are aware, Congress was in a position to pass legislation establishing a long-range program for improving the Interstate System and authorized $25 billion, to become available over a period of 13 years. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 also stepped up the regular Federal-aid highway program—often now referred to as the ABC program.

These funds, which must be matched 50–50 with State funds, are available for the improvement of two Federal-aid systems and their extension into urban areas—the 250,000-mile Federal-aid primary system and the 528,000-mile Federal-aid secondary system.

Funds for the ABC program are generally authorized by the Congress every 2 years. These averaged $500 million for the first 9 years after World War II. But the 1956 act stepped these funds up to $850 million for the fiscal year 1958, and to $875 million for fiscal 1959. Then came the 1958 Federal-Aid Highway Act, which increased the outlay to $900 million for fiscal 1960, and to $925 for fiscal 1961.

With such a large expansion as is anticipated, however, there must be close consultation between Federal, State, and local governmental agencies with the local citizenry to so plan our highway work that it will benefit local areas, rather than ruin tracts of land that would be useful for agrarian, industrial, and residential purposes.

As much as we need vast highway developments, we must do our utmost in careful planning to avoid strangling ourselves with our own improvements.

Equal in importance—in the minds of the citizen, as in the fate of the Nation—is the question of maintaining and improving our educational system in the face of the challenges of increasing population, and the growing complexities of technology and society itself.

Although the problem has recently been dramatized by our contest with Russia and the tremendous educational and scientific strides of our adversary, this contest did not create the problem. Nor should we attempt a solution by imitating the Russian example, as some have suggested.

For the greatness of a nation is shown in many ways—in its cultural and scientific achievements, in its moral responsibilities, in its art, in its national aspirations. But its ultimate strength lies in the quality of the individuals who comprise its living substance.

And the strength, the final strength, of these United States lies in our belief in the dignity of the individual, the belief that man should live in the light of reason, should exercise his own free choice, and should develop to the full the latent talents within him. To this end we have established our free public education system.

Our system is not designed merely to mold a select few into polished aristocrats of a preconceived pattern—as are the older systems of Europe; nor is it designed to make our young people servants of the state—as are the schools of Russia, China, and the satellite nations.

On the contrary, we have designated to our schools the chief responsibility for the development, in all our young people, of the emotional, moral, and intellectual capacities that will qualify them as responsible members of a democratic society.

If the schools have partially failed, as some would now maintain, it is in large measure because we, citizens and representatives alike, have failed also in providing sufficient support, moral and intellectual, as well as financial.

Forty-three million Americans—one out of every four go to school. On this basis, with the expected population in 1975 of over 222 million, our school population will have soared by that time to 55 million. While, according to the authoritative Rockefeller report, we now have 22 million in our elementary schools, by 1960–61 we will have 34 million. By 1969, high schools will be deluged with 50 to 70 percent more students than they can now accommodate; and by 1975, our colleges and universities will face at least a doubling and, in some cases, a tripling of present conditions.

To carry this tremendous burden we have, in the recent past, devoted only slightly more than 3½ percent of our gross national product. To refer again to the Rockefeller report, in 1955, with a gross national product of $391 billion, we spent—on both private and public education—a total of $14 billion, or 3.6 percent. According to the same source, the cost by 1967 will be $30 billion, or about 5 percent of an estimated gross national product of $600 billion.

To this end, more than 20 members of the Democratic majority, including myself, have joined in cosponsoring a bill introduced by Senator MURRAY, of Montana, to provide Federal support for the public schools. The bill, given the number S. 2 to indicate its high priority in the business of the Senate, authorizes assistance to the States for the purpose of helping to pay for school construction and increases in faculty salaries. Financial aid would be granted on a per capita basis of $25 per child the first year—to be increased $25 per year until the fourth year—at which time it would be stabilized at $100 per child per year. The total outlay would range from $1.1 billion the first year to $4.7 billion the fourth year—increasing thereafter with the rise in school population.

There are specific provisions in the measure guaranteeing local school board control, which is a necessary requirement.

This, if the bill is enacted into law, would be a significant contribution, but it would be no more than the national Government should do to fulfill its responsibility for what has become a national problem. But our efforts must not end here.

This should be only the beginning of a concerted program of mobilizing our resources, private as well as public, local as well as national, to assure our young people of the quality of education they deserve.

Equality of opportunity in education means not only the opportunity to be exposed to learning, but the opportunity to achieve excellence in the development of one's full potential. This, in turn, means that we cannot and must not sacrifice quality for quantity; we must have both. This will be an expensive business, one where there are no shortcuts or easy solutions, but surely the wealthiest Nation in history can afford whatever is required to preserve and utilize its most precious national resources—the hearts and minds of its youth.

It is no less true today than in Thomas Jefferson's time that the integrity of a democratic society rests upon an informed and intelligent citizenry—or, as Jefferson himself stated it, "The people are the only censors of their Governors; and even their errors will tend to keep these to the true principles of their institutions. * * * The way to prevent these irregular interpositions of the people, is to give them full information of their affairs through the channel of the public papers, and to contrive that those papers should penetrate the whole mass of the people."

These, then, are the necessary conditions of a democracy which the citizen looks to his Government to maintain:

A sufficient prosperity and employment level to satisfy the fundamental needs of the individual, an adequate communication and transportation system to maintain the vital flow of ideas and commerce, education of high quality and adequate quantity for our youth, and governmental practices that are responsive to the right of the citizen to participate in making those decisions which shape his or her own destiny.

Youth, Communist Target

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, J. Edgar Hoover is always willing to warn

the citizens of our country to beware of communism. One of the most recent examples of this is a column in Our Sunday Visitor of Sunday, January 18, entitled "Youth, Communist Target."

Mr. Hoover does not mince words in his warnings. The Communist movement is seeking out the young, impressionable people of the country, realizing that they are most apt to believe their misleading statements about a better world under communism.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hoover's latest contribution to the opponents of communism be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH, COMMUNIST TARGET

(By J. Edgar Hoover)

The English statesman, Burke, said, "Tell me what are the prevealing sentiments that occupy the minds of your young men, and I will tell you what is to be the character of the next generation." Goethe, the German poet and philosopher, expressed much the same thought in these words: "The destiny of any nation, at any given time, depends on the opinions of its young men under 5 and 20."

Today's youth are tomorrow's future. No one is more acutely aware of this fact than are the Communist conspirators—and no one is more eager to exploit the idealism, enthusiasm, credulity, and inexperience of youth than are they. Lenin pointed the way in his words: "We need young forces. • • • The youth will decide the issue of the whole struggle, the student youth and still more the working-class youth."

There has been no deviation. At this moment—all about the earth—the Communists are striving to make youth the key by which they can open the door and force the whole of mankind across the threshold of a Communist world.

To bring about this end, Communists the world over are taking advantage of two fundamental facts: the urge to experiment and improve which is common to idealistic and enthusiastic youth, and the present condition of the world.

All of us must recognize the idealism of youth—the great dreams, hopes, and aspirations which are the impetus to action. This eager idealism of the young insists on perfection, and this is a good thing for it is the spur which helps eliminate injustice. But idealism, without the checkreins of knowledge and sound judgment, may take one on a short cut to disaster.

There is always an element of rebellion against authority in the young. Every child is eager to reach the age when he can make his own decisions—when he doesn't have to do what he is told. And that which is new and novel holds great appeal for the immature, rebellious youth particularly if it differs from traditions.

Communists know that innovations appeal to the young, and they know that the more idealistic youth can be trapped by the emotional appeal of a cause presented with crusading spirit and zeal.

In past decades, the Communists have captured the minds of thousands of inexperienced youth by presenting a wholly false picture of a brave new world, while, at the same time, their most intense efforts were bent toward the creation of a menacing totalitarian monster.

This brazen and cynical exploitation of the wonderful traits of youth is one of the most vicious aspects of the whole conspiracy to enslave and dominate the world. But despite their best efforts, the Communists cannot keep the false curtain entirely closed to inquiring young minds. The freedom fighters of Hungary and a Russian poet, in their own way, made rents through which reality shone all too briefly.

Unfortunately, the very unsettled conditions of the world today—conditions created in large part by Communist activity—help the Communist in his work of subversion. This is an age of great social change. And change—the breaking of the moorings of parental control, and the breaking with past traditions—makes it much easier for exploiters to ridicule and destroy the principles, standards and morals which have proved the safeguards of freedom throughout history.

The complete amorality of the convinced Communist enables him to take full advantage of the proneness of youth to relinquish the stable moorings of principle and tradition. The young mariner too often sets sail with false charts to steer by and a false star to guide his course.

And make no mistake about it. Every child in America is an ultimate target of Communist effort in some form or other. Students and young workers, particularly those in industry, are objects of concentrated propaganda effort. This effort is extremely subtle. It consists in large part of a ceaseless, relentless campaign against our American way of life, our ideals, culture, laws, morality, religions, traditions, principles, customs, and institutions.

It seeks to destroy the respect of the young for all of these things which are termed by the Communists "petty bourgeois ideologies and influences."

It seeks to eliminate—often by means of ridicule—that patriotic love of country which at Valley Forge held a ragged, barefoot army together in a cause that many times seemed hopeless.

It seeks to weaken character, destroy individualism, and create a mass man who will offer little resistance to Communist collectivism.

Much Communist propaganda directed at youth feature a pacifist, antimilitarist theme. This, of course, is calculated to weaken the military potential of the United States.

By every posisble means, propagandists seek to present the false face of communism to inexperienced youth.

They not only seek the college campus as a forum, but they also strive with every means at their command to place Marxist members in sound, wholesome youth groups for the purpose of influencing and subverting nonparty youth.

Again and again Communist functionaries have indicated that they consider the assignment of party members to work among teenagers as vital. Every youth organization is a target. No group is immune.

In one instance we learned of the formation of a Communist-dominated youth group which had, as its main purpose, the infiltration of two specific organizations.

In another instance we learned of an individual boasting that he had succeeded in turning a youngster, met through a sound youth organization, away from the latter's religion and had nursed him along to the threshold of communism.

We are beginning to learn how the Communist conspirators exploit the natural idealism of youth to advance an unnatural brutal and godless tyranny. How do we propose to meet such a challenge here at the threshold of the nuclear age?

It is our responsibility to recognize and to understand the forces motivating our youth. Confronting the same conditions which Communists use in exploiting youth for evil ends, we must, in a positive and dynamic fashion, direct the same forces to serve the ends of justice, truth, and freedom.

The future belongs to youth. If the world of the future is to be a free one—a wholesome one, in which the word "justice" has meaning—we must offer nourishing food to build the minds and characters of youth. We must implant sound ideas, hold forth high standards, and develop the ideals essential to the preservation of freedom. We must teach true values and instill necessary disciplines. We must, by example, help our youth live up to—and preserve—the spiritual heritage which is the birthright of every American.

Our Republic is predicated upon the premise that extraordinary qualities exist in ordinary people and that freedom of opportunity enables those qualities to develop and flourish. This is traceable to the creativeness inherent in Christian metaphysics. It is the direct antithesis of the quality of negation which marks the Communist philosophy.

In no area of living can the spirit of man soar skyward when it is chained to earth by an ideology which denies man either soul or spirit.

What is to be the character of the next generation? Goethe said that the destiny of any nation depends on the opinions of its youth under 25. There is no question but that this vital group is a direct target of intense Communist endeavor. How are we going to meet that challenge?

Address by Hon. Vance Hartke, of Indiana, Before the National Political Science Conference on Urban Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on Friday, January 16, the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] gave a very thought-provoking speech on urban problems before the National Political Science Honorary and Citizens Conference on Washington Area Problems, at the American University in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the speech entitled "National Policy for Urban America" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am honored that you have asked me to speak to such a distinguished gathering. Let me make it clear that, as a freshman—a Senator, I do not want to be presumptuous. Let me add also that I do not claim to be an expert. However, as a former mayor who is now operating in higher echelons of government, I have had some experience along the lines which you folks have been discussing.

Problems of our cities can't be explored too deeply or too often. But we must do more than explore. We have to prepare to act, then act.

It is concerning the role of Federal Government in helping promote effective action for a better way of life for our urban citizens that I speak tonight.

Before continuing with this talk, "National Policy for Urban America," I want to take note of something that happened to me just 2 days ago.

As you may know, I have been appointed to the District of Columbia Committee. Now,

some Senators, frankly, do not consider this a choice assignment. However, I am as pleased with the challenge this committee offers as I am with my appointment to the Finance and Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees, which are considered major appointments.

You see, I am pleased that the Senate leadership has considered my experience as mayor of Evansville, Ind., valuable background for this work here. I consider the challenge of helping wipe out slums and traffic bottlenecks in the Nation's Capital as important—or more so—as the challenge I felt in facing these problems in Evansville.

I hope I can help bring better government to Washington. And I hope to have a part in bringing local self-government to the presently voteless residents of the District.

In addition to Washington, we have 167 metropolitan areas in our country, ranging in size from Macon, Ga., and my own city of Evansville, Ind., to the multi-million-sized centers of New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago. Around 80 percent of these metropolitan areas now have fewer than half a million inhabitants.

In the next few years, we're going to have many more metropolitan areas. By the year 2000, we are told, some 235 million persons will be living in these metropolitan areas alone in our country.

Cities which now have between 100,000 and 200,000 residents will grow far beyond their present boundaries. These areas offer us opportunity. We have opportunity to help them avoid the problems that have ravaged our largest cities.

Somehow, the meaning of population and growth figures is so simple it has escaped us. Cities, which once served as service areas for the countryside, now dominate the landscape and our civilization.

The figures are impressive. They're almost frightening. But the full significance comes in translating the figures into problems of real impact on the cities and their people.

For those of us who must travel to work in such areas and who use municipal services, metropolitan growth problems are personal problems.

But, the implications and the size of urban growth can hardly be classed as something strictly local. It is statewide. It is interstate. Indeed it is national.

The new swift means of getting from place to place, the way in which our people move from one place to another, have made the problems national in impact. Transportation needs, requirements for huge quantities of water, national defense needs, all of these have made it unrealistic to talk of metropolitan problems in terms of one community or as something less than a national situation.

With two out of three American citizens already living in metropolitan centers, no single level of government alone possesses the organization, the funds or the leadership to cope with the problem.

The sad truth is governments have not been equipped to handle the metropolitan problem. They have not been able to, or have been unwilling to, anticipate the changes which our century has brought to cities.

The impact of the car is a good example. We have been unable to move fast enough or with enough determination to prevent the problems brought to our cities by 60 million cars on their streets.

Yet, cars are simple things compared to jet planes and helicopters. They're simple compared to automation and atomic power. All of these more complicated instruments will probably be in common use in another 50 years.

We can anticipate their use and the problems they may create just as we could have anticipated the impact of the car. But if we can't turn this anticipation into action our problems will multiply. That is because we still haven't solved exhaust pollution, street congestion, and roadbuilding. On top of this we know we can expect air-transport congestion and prospects of pollution and waste disposal from atomic sources.

What's more, there will be a mass of leisure time which automation is bound to bring.

To date we have not used mobility as something creative. Instead, we have let it too often be a noose for strangulation as well as a force for growth and opportunity.

The challenge of these new scientific and technological developments lies not alone in making out life more productive, but in making it more fruitful and more decent. Why must we go through growing pains of technological advancement when advances can be anticipated?

Let's gear our policies to change and to the warning signs. As a nation, we have never been adverse to experimenting in Government programs and organizations. Indeed, our representative democracy is itself an experiment not yet in full flower.

The problems of this new technology are focused on our cities. The products of the mines, the fields, the factories, the laboratories, and of the cultural heritage of this country are stored in our cities.

Our cities are rich.

Rich in material things. Rich in human resources.

They are themselves important resources.

Our cities are our latest frontier. Unless outer space can be substituted for green space and parking space, the cities may be our last frontier.

Like earlier frontiers, our cities have been settled, exploited, and somewhat eroded. Continuing this patern means degrading the lives of millions. Yet, our goal should be continuous raising of human dignity. This is impossible in the midst of urban erosion.

Rising crime rates, social diseases, juvenile delinquency, segregation, filthy living conditions flourish partly because of uncontrolled or poorly controlled urban growth and population management.

Out in the countryside our rural residents learned some of these lessons long ago. They found out conservation is essential to growth.

Soil conservation, for instance, is widespread and national in scope. Yet, there is almost no urban conservation program.

If we can work to save and restore the resources that God has given us, surely we ought to be able to do the same with resources that have been largely of our own making. The spectacle of urban growth, then, requires anticipating needs of citizens for applying technological achievements to make life better through them. It requires stopping erosion and restoring its effects.

First, we must anticipate the problems we will soon face. I refer to anticipation in the full, active sense of the word.

Let us mobilize, for instance, all the sources of information on city problems and funnel this information into a policy. Right now the Federal Government has programs in urban renewal, highways, flood control, water and land management, economic aid, housing, school construction, and law enforcement, all of which are designed to help cities.

But there is a sad lack of coordination among these programs, just to mention a few. What's more, many cities aren't even aware of what help is available or how to get it.

Similar programs are being carried forward on other levels of government without being dovetailed with Federal programs.

They cannot be divorced. A highway linking two major cities has in itself impact on commercial and residential growth, on relocation of residents, even on crime rates. Urban renewal is related to transportation, to water supplies, to sanitation facilities, to law enforcement. All are tied into the expanding economy of the Nation. All are part of the defense system in supplying the goods and getting the goods delivered, as well as to a better standard for us to hold up as a model to our friends and allies.

We need to anticipate the net effect of these programs on specific places.

For instance, a community needs to know how, if at all, it may benefit from the distress-areas bills and from highway legislation. In Evansville, for instance, we found that by pushing a sewer-development program ahead at an accelerated pace we were able to get around $250,000 in Federal funds for planning.

To gage how well needs of individual cities are being met by existing legislation, each metropolitan area has to be studied and the national implications weighed. To do this means local, regional, and national planning.

Many conferences on metropolitan problems are held every year. But these efforts are not coordinated. So far as I know, no one community has mobilized all the forces available to cope with its problems, let alone any such national mobilization.

The Federal Government, it seems to me, can provide the incentive to pool information, talent, energy, and resources to focus attention on metropolitan problems and suggested solutions. It can help anticipate and plan. It can help gain public support and understanding.

Existing agencies might be called on to analyze present programs and their net effect, adding how these programs can be used in other places.

There also is a need for reviewing the relationship of these programs at the top level. The Council of Economic Advisers should be concerned with a new dimension in our complex economic situation—the probable consequences of trends on our civilization. Or, put another way, where are we likely to end up if we continue on the same road?

The council could perhaps tell us where this production is, from what markets and to what markets do products flow, what the effect of certain policies will be, and developments on the opportunity for a full life for citizens.

The Budget Bureau or some other agency of the executive could well review programs for urban growth and see that these are meshed in such a way as to spread their benefits. We have books on farms and their products and on such things as jobs. Why not on our cities?

It should, indeed, be the business of all agencies to report on implications to our people of new scientific developments. This could be done through urban research in the National Academy of Science or some similar group.

Such a group could make information available to local groups such as the metropolitan study group of Washington. Pooling and sharing of information then would be possible. Cities could learn from each other from an agency trying to store knowledge on problems and possible new problems.

But this anticipation and presentation is only the first phase.

We must also plan.

Now is the time for a long-range program to pool brains, energy, money, and experience which is being frittered away in separate meetings, conferences, and institutes.

It should be a goal to keep talking about problems and also to start doing something about them.

I refer to setting goals in welfare, public works, transportation, water supply, sanitation, decontamination, living standards, defense, communication, recreation, and many more. I refer also to setting up requirements to meet needs which can also serve as a yardstick to measure local achievement.

Along these lines, I understand the best guess for residential renewal requirements is $700 billion or 10 percent of the gross national product between now and 1970. The same estimate calls for quadrupling present outlays for these purposes. Yet, national urban renewal plans now propose only spending 10 percent of this amount.

Going too slowly is not economy. It isn't fair to those who suffer the consequences. We can afford what is necessary, surely. Just as surely as we cannot afford a thing that is not necessary.

But how are we to judge? If our information is correct, we are spending no more than 3 percent of what we are told is needed.

But we also need to know the effects of these goals on other programs for urban development. And we have few standards on which to base judgment.

We face similar problems in transportation and water resource development. We must project effects of present programs and anticipated needs if we are to make even an educated guess. And, with the size of the problems we have and will have, guessing ought to be reduced to a minimum.

The Federal Government should serve two-thirds of its citizens by helping them with information for rational decisions. This calls for looking into all policies affecting urban life, highways, housing, urban renewal, water supply, stream pollution, etc., to find out if they measure up to our obligations.

After anticipating and planning to meet anticipation, we must set up adequate standards.

These can be set up only with understanding of problems and with plans that require local areas to measure up. Again the Federal Government can supply both initiative in presentation and resources to accomplish the goals. It can set a pattern for planning and it can set standards.

By publicizing the problem, it can give aid to new values for the new way of life. If our cities are the just brunt of public scorn, it is a national disgrace that they should continue to be when most of our people live in them. The very vitality of democratic government is at stake in the rebuilding of our cities. If democracy fails to meet these urban problems, how can we hold out our system as one for others to follow?

Our culture, oddly, has two images of city life. One is that of Sodom and Gomorrah. The other is that of the Heavenly City.

If many of us cling to the idea that cities are dens of iniquity, we may get little more than that from many of our cities. I believe, however, from experience in Evansville, that we can raise our cities to new stature and prestige. To do otherwise is to allow erosion of great material and spiritual resources.

Our cities must provide highest standards of convenience, efficiency, service, and beauty. If they do, the cities can become monuments to our civilization. If we don't, the cities may become our tombstones.

Third, we must spell out our standards and plans in a strategy for urban development. To be meaningful, this strategy should have national leadership. I believe this can be furnished by National Government.

It could use its resources to coordinate the plans I spoke of. It could use scientific information resources to analyze trends in growth and development and the implications. It could help spell out, with all the minds and skill available everywhere, objectives and goals and standards.

This could be done through a White House conference. A joint congressional-Presidential commission is another way. Revitalizing and revamping National Resources Planning Council or some other group is another way.

We need information, digesting of this information, analysis of statistics. Without these, there can be no review of implications, no evaluations, no setting of standards.

Then these goals must be implemented. There are, perhaps, two interim approaches for constructive criticism.

We certainly can see the need for more land. And we can see the need for conservation of present resources.

Let's learn again from the farmer. We need something like an urban land bank to acquire in urban areas land for future expansion. This may take Federal assistance at least until State legislatures release cities from 18th century financial straitjackets.

Perhaps we can use a city agent—someone who can help cities help themselves as the county agent does for rural America.

Urban growth is a fact. Our metropolitan living is the dominant way of life. We can't escape it.

I know of no domestic problem which does not have a bearing on the problems of urban growth.

The solution is not one of capability. It is not one of lack of brainpower. And it certainly is not one that can be shoved from one level of government to another as someone else's problem.

It is the problem of all of us.

We cannot afford the price of undue delay.

We must develop national policy. To do so, we must plan, set standards, spell out the standards with strategy for accomplishment. Then we must provide the machinery and money to realize the goals.

In all this, we must not lose sight of the greatest goal—human dignity of high order for all.

I think it can be done.

I think we can come a little closer at least to the "heavenly city."

If we don't try, we may come closer to hell on earth.

Item Veto for President Way To Save Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last Monday the Milwaukee Journal published a forthright message to this Congress in an editorial which called for enactment of the item veto bill which President Eisenhower has requested. I especially commend the editorial to those of my colleagues who disagree with the President on this request, but who are willing to be told in blunt language why they are wrong.

The Journal put a perceptive finger on congressional motivation when it wrote:

> Congressmen don't want the President rummaging through pork barrel bills, killing the wasteful pet projects for their home districts. They don't want him knocking "riders" and "sleepers" 'off of otherwise good bills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Item Veto for President Way To Save Money," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITEM VETO FOR PRESIDENT WAY TO SAVE MONEY

The President's opening message to Congress was typically studded with climactic points at which applause was indicated if there was enough enthusiastic agreement on the floor. But one burst of applause was all unexpected, when he asked for item veto power over spending bills. Surprised and pleased, he departed from his text and gave the point added emphasis off the cuff.

The lack of enthusiasm for yielding this point in past Congresses has set some sort of record. Presidential pleading for it goes back at least to Grant, regardless of party.

Yet the ability to delete or reduce single items in appropriation bills, without risking loss of the whole bill, is thoroughly accepted as an elementary and needful part of executive power in 40 States, including Wisconsin. It was routinely included in the new Alaskan constitution, which the last Congress approved without question.

Lack of it in the Federal Government is fearfully costly. Congress lumps all sorts of spending in a bill and forces the President to approve the bad with the good, or veto the good with the bad—all or nothing.

Powerful, old Representative CANNON, of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, professes to see in the item veto proposal an invasion of the legislative "power of the purse." Nonsense; this would be no more true than it is of the existing veto power, which is one of the constitutional checks and balances between the two branches. The President can't get money from Congress unless Congress votes it—that's what the "power of the purse" means. But he can prevent congressional spending if his veto will stand up. And an item veto is just as subject to overriding as any other.

The real reason why the Cannons have historically balked at this reform is not constitutional; it is simply "pork." Congressmen don't want the President rummaging through pork-barrel bills and killing the wasteful pet projects for their home districts. They don't want him knocking riders and sleepers off of otherwise good bills. These are ignoble and unprincipled reasons.

The substantial approval shown this time when Eisenhower again mentioned the item veto is encouraging. Maybe we're getting somewhere. Nor would a Congress in earnest about the reform have to wait for a constitutional amendment, although it should start that, too. It can begin right away to specify in each appropriation bill that its items are separately subject to veto.

Texas Won More Civil War Battles Than It Lost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, although it is not generally known, the first and last military actions in the Nation's War Between the States were fought on Texas soil. In addition, a number of other sharp engagements were fought in the Lone Star State, including the defense of Sabine Pass and the recapture of Galveston by the Cottonclads.

These important events have never been fully publicized in Civil War lit-

erature. However, John W. DeVine, editor of the Nueces County News, a weekly newspaper published at Corpus Christi, has proposed that the Civil War Centennial in 1961 would be a fitting time for recognition of these important historical events.

The editor of this newspaper suggests to the Civil War Centennial Commission that that remote theater in the great conflict not be overlooked in the observances which might be had, designed, we hope, to bring the people together, rather than to disunite them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial entitled "Texas Can Obtain Recognition for Part It Had in Civil War; Coastal Battles Could Be Shown to Entire Nation as Portion of Centennial Celebration in 1961," published in the Nueces County News of Friday, January 2, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS CAN OBTAIN RECOGNITION FOR PART IT HAD IN CIVIL WAR—COASTAL BATTLES COULD BE SHOWN TO ENTIRE NATION AS PORTION OF CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION IN 1961

Texas, next year (1961) has a wonderful opportunity to see that Texans are properly credited for their efforts during the War Between the States.

It is all being brought about through the Civil War Centennial Commission, appointed by Congress to set up for reenactment a series of the early battles of the occasion on the 100th anniversary of each battle.

Congress appropriated sufficient funds to pay expenses of the Commission for the next few years, and set up its duties as supervising the efforts of individual communities so there will not be a duplication of effort; so that each community will, if it wishes, be able to again bring to life the olden days and the part it played in the struggle that for over 4 years divided our Nation. It also provides each of these communities an opportunity for much publicity that is appealing and tourist-attractive.

Here on the coastal area of Texas were enacted many dramas of nationwide interest that are completely ignored in the history books of our Nation, but which at the time were all important in the all-out war effort both by the North and South.

In chronological order, these are:

1. The capture of Fort Brown (now Brownsville) 3 months before the first gun was fired at Fort Sumter. (First actual battle of the Civil War.) It was fought by early day pioneers of both Corpus Christi and Galveston who banded together, marched from here to Brownsville, surrounded and captured it, taking the U.S. Army soldiers prisoners;

2. The capture of Padre Island by the Union, and its patrolling by Union soldiers to prevent British ships from bringing supplies to Corpus Christi to be hauled overland to New Orleans and other southern points; and to prevent smuggling of war supplies from Mexico to the South;

3. The attack on Corpus Christi, featuring the cannon balls filled with whisky;

4. The attack that resulted in the fall and occupation of Corpus Christi by Union troops;

5. The attempt to launch a land invasion of Texas at Port Arthur, defeated when a large formation of U.S. battleships were defeated at Sabine Pass by a little handful of southern soldiers stationed at Sabine Pass. The original plan called for capture of Port Arthur, a land march, and capture of Houston, San Antonio, and Corpus Christi, tearing out the entire segment of Texas that was enabling the South to obtain supplies from Mexico; and

6. The capture again of Fort Brown 3 months after the war ended and the dramatic arrival of a ship bringing news to the U.S. soldiers stationed there that the war was finally over and the South had surrendered. This attack again was made by volunteers from Corpus Christi and Galveston who were determined to oust the Union soldiers from south Texas.

These were important events in Civil War history of Texas and its part in the war. However, little is known of them outside this area, and when you get over the Texas borders you will find that nothing is known about them.

This condition can be and should be remedied.

The Commission, set up by the Government, would work with the local chamber of commerce in making them come alive, and installing them into U.S. history books. The records of the Union's part in them can be found in the records in Washington. It was not until 3 or 4 years ago that the importance of the Sabine battle was determined when an interested local historian who had "heard" of the event from ancestors, made a search of the war records and discovered the Union had meant to stage a "march from sea to sea" in Texas that would have resulted in the burning and sacking of Houston, San Antonio, and probably this city if not also Austin, Fort Worth, and Dallas. No doubt if a serious check of these records was undertaken now, it would result in many exciting incidents in the War Department records.

The Commission in charge is urging communities to get their State legislators to help by appropriating funds for some of this work.

Our local chamber of commerce could help much in engineering and developing a plan whereby these events might be pictured or televised and released to the rest of the Nation on the anniversary of their occurrence.

Few people in Texas and practically none outside of Texas know that the first and last battles of the Civil War were fought in Texas—history books made no mention of them, yet if Union soldiers had remained at Fort Brown during the war much of the goods used by the South that came from both England and Mexico could have been obtained.

We have over a year in which to develop the theme, have moving pictures of it taken for TV presentation on the dates in question, or to set up a program reenacting the events for a television audience on these dates.

Such action on our part would acquaint the rest of the Nation with a portion of Texas history of which they know nothing; would bring "reams" of publicity to this area, and, who knows, might later result in a TV series as interesting to the viewing public as present-day westerns.

We respectfully submit it to the chamber of commerce, the library, and historical associations of our city for study, thought, and action.

It wouldn't cost as much as one Buccaneer Days celebration and would bring us 10 times as much publicity.

Treatment of Negroes in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there is a tendency among newspapermen hostile to the South to seize upon isolated occurrences in the South which would show it off to the rest of the Nation and the world in a bad light. Then, exponents of so-called civil rights legislation aimed at forcing the Southern States to adhere to public opinion frequently say: "You southerners must correct your ways because you are giving the United States a bad name throughout the world."

The Greenville (S. C.) News ably portrays the latest case of this in an editorial entitled "Negro Boys Helped, Not Persecuted." This editorial appeared in the January 20 edition of the News, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGRO BOYS HELPED, NOT PERSECUTED

Antisouthern propagandists in other parts of the United States and anti-American propagandists in other parts of the world have made a cause celebre out of the affair involving the commitment of two Monroe, N.C., Negro boys, to a State training school after they had molested a small white girl.

The hatemongers couldn't have picked a worse case, if the truth could be gotten across to those who have been grossly misinformed and have chosen to believe what they wanted to believe, even after the Governor and other North Carolina officials had taken steps to correct the false impressions so wide spread about.

Naturally, the NAACP got into the act. Through its attorneys, it demanded and got a court hearing in which it sought to have the boys released. The higher court ruled against the organization.

But the truth is that the NAACP, if it is genuinely interested in the welfare of individual Negroes, should long before have been doing all it could to get the two boys into a training school where they could be retrained and rehabilitated.

And, instead of trying to get them released, it should either have been taking steps to see that they were kept there or, else, placed in a foster home where responsible members of their own race could see to their training and welfare.

The juvenile court system, which keeps records secret, and the North Carolina newspapers, which have failed to send out the full story as they should have since it came to light, are partly to blame for the distorted story which has spread around the world. (The latest incident, since the higher court refused to intervene, was the breaking of a five-column spread in an Italian Communist newspaper published in Rome.)

Around the world and throughout the United States the story has gone to the effect that two Negro boys were imprisoned because one of them was so presumptuous as to kiss a little white girl. Some accounts have said they were sentenced to life. Others have said they received an indeterminate sentence.

Here are the facts:

The two boys, 8 and 10, were turned over to the juvenile court last October after they were accused of molesting the white girl. They caught her in a culvert near her home in a white neighborhood, and one of them held her while the other kissed her. (In a few more years the pair will be old enough for rape.)

The judge of the juvenile court committed them to the State training school until such time as the officials there were convinced that they could be returned to their homes and that their parents were ready, willing and able to give them proper supervision and care. They were not imprisoned nor, in the usual sense, were they sentenced.

The clerk of the juvenile court and the superintendent of the training school both have said they will be released as soon as they and their homes are ready. Meanwhile, they are going to school regularly, which they never have done before.

The kissing incident was not the whole reason for the committal of the boys to the training school. Before that they had a long record of misdemeanors of the sort that lead to a life of crime. Both were on probation and under supervision of the court for thievery. The record shows that one one occasion they had stolen a bicycle and on another a ham.

More to the point, the court had records of their having molested little girls on at least two other occasions.

Both come from the worst sort of home environment. The mother of the older boy says she was deserted by her husband, leaving her with one child, in 1941. Since then, she admits, she has lived with a succession of men to whom she was not married and has borne nine other children.

The mother of the other boy has twice been married and has about nine children. The family lives in a neighborhood where the police constantly have trouble.

In neither instance have the children been encouraged to go to school and other children of the families have been in trouble with the police. Police officers testify that they have many times picked up the two boys in question off the streets late at night and taken them home. Usually the mothers were not at home.

The older boy is in the fourth grade at the age of 10. Yet the report of the court shows that he has failed every subject he has ever taken in school. He has been given a series of social promotions.

These are the facts, as made public by Gov. Luther Hodges after a careful investigation.

This is the case that the antisouthern and anti-American propagandists have built into a glaring example of southern mistreatment of the Negro. Actually, the kids are better off than they ever have been.

If Monroe and the State of North Carolina are in any way at fault in the affair, it is because they did not act sooner to get those boys off the streets and out of trouble into an environment where they could be trained for a useful place in society.

As for the role of the NAACP, it betrayed itself in the eyes of all thinking people when it tried to make a big thing of the case by trying to free the boys from the chain gang for publicity purposes.

Unless and until the NAACP begins to do something constructive toward the improvement of Negro institutions and educating Negroes in the ordinary decencies of family life and responsible citizenship, it had better stay out of the civil rights courts.

The episode should point out to the NAACP a great opportunity to do something really worthwhile for the "advancement of colored people." It could start by assisting, rather than impeding, law enforcement among Negroes.

But the sorriest aspect of the whole affair is the fact that white Americans, who should know better, contributed to the spreading of a false impression of race relations in the South.

Mikoyan Handling Trade Like a Gun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Ray Tucker entitled "Mikoyan Seen Handling Trade Like a Gun," which was published on January 16, 1959, in many newspapers across the country.

Mr. Tucker, one of the top columnists in the country today, calls attention to the immaturity and gullibility of captains of American industry, business, finance, and motion pictures in their lavish treatment of Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan during his visit here. Mr. Tucker asserts very strongly that the Russian Deputy Premier for Economic Affairs is "world public enemy No. 1 to those who are now extending their warm greetings to him. He is robbing the gracious hosts of present and potential markets throughout the world," Mr. Tucker points out. Mr. Tucker has performed a distinct public service with his concise, hard-hitting column regarding Mr. Mikoyan, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD as a means of distributing it as widely as possible.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIKOYAN SEEN HANDLING TRADE LIKE A GUN—CAPTAINS OF INDUSTRY SHOW GULLIBILITY IN WARM WELCOME TO RUSSIAN

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON.—The warm welcome given to Anastas Mikoyan by the captains of American industry, business, finance, and motion pictures at Washington, New York, Cleveland, Chicago, and San Francisco testifies again to their immaturity and gullibility in the presence of distinguished foreign visitors.

Although the State Department may not have warned them in advance, Russia's deputy premier for economic affairs is their World Public Enemy No. 1.

A shrewd Armenian who has managed to survive Lenin-Stalin-Khrushchev purges, he is robbing his hosts of present and potential markets throughout the world.

He is disrupting the normal flow of commerce, and destroying historic price structures.

He is executing Khrushchev's orders to handle trade like a gun and for political rather than economic purposes. He is trying to make good his master's threat that "we will bury you."

His ultimate objective is to force neutrals into the Communist camp by making them utterly dependent upon Moscow's favors and friendship.

They would then become vassal or satellite states, as Finland, Egypt, Iraq, and East Germany have become, willingly or unwillingly.

The grand design of this Khrushchev-Mikoyan trade war is to isolate the United States economically, and to bankrupt the one Nation which furnishes the resources and the leadership for the worldwide, anti-Communist coalition.

Once the United States cannot afford to finance this alliance, Khrushchev figures, he will have only to pick up the pieces of the free world bit by bit.

In welcoming Mikoyan so warmly, American businessmen are also disregarding the administration's viewpoint and attitude.

Although they could not deny him the minimum amenities, President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles have treated him with only slightly veiled unfriendliness.

They recognize the Mikoyan menace, if his private enterprise hosts do not. President Eisenhower has described the Russian and Chinese offensive in this field, as a "subtle and long-range instrument of warfare."

Secretary Dulles says that it is fully as dangerous and insidious as the Communists' military activities in Korea, Indochina, and the Far East.

Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, warns that "it is the most serious challenge that has ever confronted the United States in time of peace."

And yet, simply because Mikoyan smiles, speaks fair but meaningless words, pats children on the head and stands in line at supermarkets, the men he would destroy open their hearts—and their factories—to him.

The reception which the trade war generalissimo received from the heads of the great automobile firms in Detroit is especially ironic, in view of his planned offensive against that industry.

On the very day that they dined him, an American firm announced that it was selling steel to Russia in return for chrome. It is really the kind of primitive barter deal which Mikoyan favors in trading with nations that cannot pay in cash.

Russia needs that steel because Mikoyan plans to swamp West European and other markets with a new, small, cheap automobile. It will be called the Satellite, a reference to the Soviet's outer space triumphs rather than to the nations it has imprisoned.

Mikoyan recently crushed little Finland—again—in an unusually callous and brutal trade war strategy, forcing the Fagerholm government to fall because of the resultant hardships and actual suffering.

He did so because, after liquidating heavy reparations payments to Moscow, the conservative Finns preferred to buy western goods.

And the American commodity whose purchase precipitated Mikoyan's wrath was automobiles made in Michigan from parts manufactured in small plants throughout the United States.

Criticism of NAACP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in many quarters the NAACP is given credit for truly advancing the cause of the Negro. It has been my opinion that more often than not, the organization has agitated rather than advanced our Negro citizens.

A recent editorial, entitled "The NAACP Has Gone Too Far and Needs To Be Checked," appeared in a Negro-owned South Carolina publication, the Herald, and gives some facts seldom published about the NAACP. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Herald, Jan. 11, 1959]

THE NAACP HAS GONE TOO FAR AND NEEDS TO BE CHECKED

(By Davis Lee)

In attacking the publisher of Lee publications, last week, Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP, demonstrated to what extent that organization will go to destroy anyone who stands in its way.

Mr. Wilkins stated in news releases that our newspapers have no following, and that no one pays any attention to Davis Lee. Then why did he go out of his way to attack Lee, and to attempt to discredit him? Mr. Wilkins

underestimated Davis Lee, and may spend the rest of his life regretting his unwise act.

Roy Wilkins has set the NAACP up as the national clearinghouse for Negro thought and opinion. If a Negro leader expresses himself, and his expressions do not coincide with the policy of that organization, he will be discredited and destroyed. This has happened dozens of times.

SEEK TO DIVIDE NEGRO AND WHITE CITIZENS

The NAACP is a vicious, undemocratic, un-American organization that is dedicated to the destruction of our way of life. It is an organization that seeks to divide the Negro and white citizens of this Nation. It does not have the welfare of the masses of Negroes at heart. It seeks to exploit for the purpose of getting power, and making money.

It agreed to sponsor Mrs. Bradley, mother of Emmett Till, on a speaking tour and pay her $500 per week. The meetings were successful. At these meetings the collections ran from one thousand to twenty-five hundred. When Mrs. Bradley saw her son's death was being exploited, she demanded more money. The NAACP refused to give her more money and the tour was canceled. This also happened with other so-called victims of southern injustice.

The only cases that the NAACP enters into are those that have excellent exploitive possibilities. The organization is staffed with well-trained agitators; they agitate for pay. The Negroes in this Nation are well aware of this fact; and that accounts for the reason that the NAACP has only 300,000 members out of 17 million Negroes.

SEEK TO PUT DAVIS LEE OUT OF BUSINESS

Wilkins and company now seeks to put Davis Lee and his newspapers out of business, because Lee has the courage to speak out against their high handed methods.

Racial strife, dissension and prejudice is sweeping this Nation like a prairie fire as the result of pressure and agitation by this irresponsible organization. It is irresponsible because the heads can libel any citizen in the South, including elected officials, and there is nothing you can do about it. The organization doesn't own anything, and has nothing that you can attach.

Just last week the courts in Georgia attempted to collect $700 in court cost, and the NAACP didn't have a typewriter or a desk that could be attached to satisfy that court cost.

THOUSANDS OF NEGROES OPPOSE NAACP

There are thousands of Negroes in the South who are opposed to the NAACP's program of force and pressure. But these Negroes are afraid to speak out because they don't want to be hurt. If the South enacted adequate laws to protect these Negroes from Wilkins and company it would be a different story.

Before an insurance company can operate in a State it must put up a stipulated sum with the insurance commission or secretary of state. If the most reputable citizens want to organize a bank, they must go through the same procedure to protect the citizens.

The legislatures of the South can end all of this pressure, agitation brought on by this organization by passing legislation requiring all national organizations that engage in organizing citizens for pressure purposes to deposit with the State $250,000 in cash. This money would be held by the State for the protection of its citizens in the event some might suffer some loss brought about by said organizations.

If a State can enact financial responsibility laws to force motorists to carry such protection for others, it can enact laws to force these pressure organizations to be financially responsible for their acts to protect others.

SOUTHERN NEGRO MADE GREATEST PROGRESS

This type of legislation would bring an abrupt halt to all of this agitation, and would cut off the flow of dollars that is pouring into New York from the South, dollars that are now bringing grief, hardship, and economic pressure to millions of Negroes who are not aware of the suffering they bought.

The southern Negro has made more progress than Negroes any place else in this Nation, and he made that progress with the aid of white friends, but if something is not done quick, he will lose those friends. And this he cannot afford to do.

Roy Wilkins and no other top NAACP official is in a position to know the suffering, the hardship and pressure that has been forced upon the Negroes of the South as the result of all of this agitation. Thousands of Negroes are jobless, homeless, and are now being denied many privileges and opportunities which they enjoyed 4 or 5 years ago.

NEGRO EMPLOYMENT DROPS

Just last week this writer addressed a white group in Georgia and made an appeal for tolerance and understanding for his people. One businessman came to him afterward and stated that 1 year ago he was employing 100 Negroes. At present he is employing just 10. The others were replaced by white workers. He hated to admit it, he said, but all of this force and agitation had turned him against doing anything for Negroes.

Another businessman came up and joined in the discussion. He had 45 Negro truck drivers 2 years ago, but now he has only 11, and he intends to let them go. He is going to let the NAACP hire them, he said.

Last week this writer met another prominent Georgian who employs 100 Negroes. He has seven young Negroes in college. He is supplying all of the money, but his attitude is changing.

LEE HAS DONE MUCH TO EASE TENSION

This writer has done more to ease tensions and to convince white people that the southern Negro is not responsible for all of this racial upheaval and should not be penalized for it, than any other person alive. Mr. Wilkins and the NAACP couldn't help these defenseless Negroes, and in fact they don't want to help them.

This writer enjoys the friendship and respect of millions of white people throughout this Nation, and because of this fact is able to do more for his race peacefully than the NAACP will ever be able to do. There is no money in keeping the relationship between the two races on a friendly basis, but there is in pitting one race against the other.

The NAACP is a destructive force that needs to be checked before it causes riots between the races in the South, and before it causes the southern Negro to lose everything he has.

This writer is no stooge or an Uncle Tom; he doesn't have to be. And he is not afraid of any man alive, and that includes Wilkins and company.

Wilkins and the NAACP has caused the kind of bitterness, hatred and strife that it will take years to erase, if ever, and neither race in the South wants that.

NEGRO SHOULD BE TREATED AS A CITIZEN

The Negro is a citizen, and should be treated as such. He should enjoy every right that any other American enjoys. His color should not prevent him from the same job opportunities that others enjoy if he is prepared, and southern Negroes are working at many jobs that Negroes in other sections of the country cannot get because of race.

PRESSURE NOT THE ANSWER

There is certainly lots of injustices being perpetrated against Negroes in the South, and a big job lies ahead to correct these conditions, but you can't do it by threats and pressure. You can't uproot a well established custom over night by legislation and court decree. If the NAACP has a constructive, practical, workable solution to this Nation's racial problem, then sell it to the people, don't ram it down their throats.

NEWSPAPER DEDICATED TO SERVING THE NEGRO NEEDS

My newspapers are dedicated to serving the needs of the little Negroes, and this includes the Telegram, which Mr. Wilkins criticized, and public castigation by the NAACP cannot silence us, nor will it put us out of business.

We are for right, justice and fair play. The NAACP believes in law and order, but it wants to make the law and give the orders. It is responsible for Little Rock and the cities in Virginia that are without schools, and if something is not done immediately to curb its activities and make it financially responsible for its acts, we won't have any schools in Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, or Mississippi.

Strengthening the Cooperative Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a major challenge facing this Congress is: What action will be possible to help improve the farm situation? We recognize, of course, that economic problems cannot be entirely resolved by legislation. However, in view of the predicted 5 to 10 percent drop in farm income this year, the situation must be carefully and sympathetically examined.

At the same time, it is important to recognize the constructive efforts of the farmers themselves and their organizations in trying to work out a solution of their problems.

Over the years, a major pillar in these programs has been our cooperatives.

Dairy, wool, poultry, eggs, and other cooperatives have helped the farmers by enabling them to pool their physical, financial, and human resources for the purpose of marketing farm products, obtaining production supplies, and securing needed farm services.

Overall, these organizations have:

Improved farm income; enabled more of our farmers to weather the downtrend in prices; and provided better living on the farm.

In Wisconsin, we have more than 415,000 farm co-op members. Many farmers are members of two or three cooperatives.

Today the farm co-ops are attempting to grow, to build themselves into more efficient organizations for helping the farmers.

We recognize, of course, that at times questions have been raised as to just how big they should ultimately grow.

However, within their proportionate role in the farm economy, the cooperatives in the future—as in the past—will, I believe, continue to perform an outstanding service for the farmers.

The January 17 edition of the Wisconsin Agriculturist contained a thoughtful article on the efforts of cooperatives to improve their ability to be of maximum benefit for the farmer. I request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM COOPERATIVES MUST GROW

Speed up consolidation so farm cooperatives can bargain better for their members. That's the theme of cooperatives in Wisconsin for 1959.

Compared to giant business corporations, the baragining power of farmers is going downhill, says Milo Swanton, secretary of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperatives. "To improve this situation, cooperatives must expand their marketing facilities. They must grow at least as rapidly as the corporate firms in industry," he says.

Today many cooperatives are engaged in only one marketing function. For example, 48 percent of the net sales of dairy co-ops comes from those having practically no processing facilities. Most livestock associations also perform only a selling function.

It is only natural that large cooperatives operate more efficiently than small ones. A large organization can afford to hire more qualified personnel and can spend more money on processing equipment.

Dairy Economist Linley Juers, with the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative, points out that a large cooperative or a network of cooperatives have the advantage of being able to carry on research. By improving a product and finding new uses for it, a cooperative can expand its market. A small cooperative can't afford to venture into research even on a small scale. Take a cheese plant, for example.

If the plant has two vats and the cheesemaker decides to try a new starter, he's gambling with half the day's cheese. On the other hand, a plant with 25 vats wouldn't stand to lose more than 4 percent of its cheese.

Actually, consolidation isn't anything new in Wisconsin. Juers says that Wisconsin leads all other States in consolidation of fluid milk plants.

Lake-to-Lake Dairy Cooperative in east central Wisconsin merged with the Modern Dairy Cooperative of Sheboygan 2 years ago. Truman Torgerson, manager of Lake-to-Lake, says that both organizations benefited by the merger.

Lake-to-Lake, being a large dairy cooperative, wanted to get into the bottling business. Modern Dairy bottled milk, but didn't have a large enough volume to operate efficiently. As a result of the merger, members have a greater outlet for their milk and are more assured of a good price.

In September 1958, Jefferson Farm and Home merged with the Jefferson County Farmco Cooperative. Bob Johnson, manager of Farmco, says that it's a little early to tell, but it looks like the merger will increase buying power and help streamline the administration.

Marvin Schaars, University of Wisconsin farm economist, says that a university study of dairy marketing in six southwestern counties shows that many small dairy plants would do themselves a favor by consolidating. "Larger organizations usually have an easier time selling at a good price because they can maintain the quality of their products. They can also do a more complete job of processing," he says.

However, this doesn't mean that all small co-ops should consolidate, Schaars says.

"Take the local livestock co-ops, for example. They are rather small, but they do the job for farmers in their community. There isn't any particular economy in their consolidating," he says.

There are some small cooperatives that, because of an aggressive and efficient manager, operate just as efficiently and return just as much to their members as large cooperatives. If they can keep an efficient manager, they will probably do all right. If not, they may be in for trouble.

But Schaars points out that sometimes consolidation can eliminate some of the competition and indifference between cooperatives in the same community. "It doesn't make for an efficient operation, or add to the respect and dignity of cooperatives when there is ruthless and antagonistic competition between them," he says.

"There isn't always a need to abandon present facilities for a new plant," says Milo Swanton. Some small co-ops may be able to consolidate on paper.

They can form super pool or contractual agreements and split the profits. This way they increase their bargaining power, return more profits to their members, and operate without any change in their present facilities.

Membership in farmer cooperatives continues to increase. Latest figures show that members in marketing, farm supply, and related service cooperatives total more than 7.7 million, an increase of 1.7 percent over the previous year.

Wisconsin has more than 415,000 farm co-op members. This is 4,000 new members in 1 year. Since there are some 145,000 farms in the State, each farmer is a member of nearly 3 cooperatives.

In the same period the number of cooperatives headquartered in the State has dropped slightly—808 to 785. The national figure dropped from 9,887 to 9,876. Thus, outside of Wisconsin the number of co-ops actually increased rather than decreased.

Only Minnesota, which has 1,297, leads Wisconsin in the number of cooperatives.

Cooperatives are businesses which must be operated efficiently and kept up to date with sound, modern business practices, such as salesmanship, accounting, service, and credit extension. They must strive to be just as efficient as privately owned businesses with which they must compete.

However, cooperatives are more than just another business. They are people organized to help themselves by helping each other. They emphasize neutrality in the sense that men of all creeds, races, and classes can be members of a cooperative association.

All members share in the savings and other benefits in proportion to their participation. Cooperatives are a bulwark of democracy when they are kept free from partisan politics. They can be a common meeting ground for men of differing viewpoints.

Criticism by the Attorney General of the Association of State Chief Justices

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, early this year Attorney General William P. Rogers attempted to soft-pedal the State supreme court justices' report of last August which criticized recent decisions of the National Supreme Court. The inference was that the jurists on the State supreme courts did not mean to include in their criticism the decision which would require States to desegregate their schools.

The Greenville (S.C.) News, in a January 12 editorial entitled "Facts Show Through Rogers' Whitewash," shows that it has seen through the Attorney General's statement. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS SHOW THROUGH ROGERS' WHITEWASH

Comes now Attorney General William P. Rogers to try to apply whitewash to the report of the Association of Chief Justices of the States criticizing recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court.

That report was widely publicized because of its great significance, and even the severest lay critics of the Court were surprised at the lengths to which the dignified and even staid State justices went in taking the highest tribunal in the land to task.

In calm, judicial language the chief justices who comprised the committee which prepared the report for presentation to their association literally took the Supreme Court apart.

From the point of view of their proper concern for State-Federal relations, they deplored the fact that the Supreme Court has assumed a policymaking role and has usurped many of the powers and functions of Congress and the State courts and legislatures.

Their strongest indictment was that the Supreme Court has failed in recent years to practice the virtue of judicial restraint; that is, to refrain from trying to write into the law as they interpret it their own ideas of what it ought to be rather than what it actually is.

The report was read in the presence of Chief Justice Earl Warren and others of the Supreme Court. It not only was adopted by an overwhelming majority of those present, but the wording of the resolution which accompanied it in some respects was stronger than the language of the report itself.

Mr. Rogers now says that the report was not aimed at the Supreme Court decision attempting to overthrow the power of the States to run their own schools and to separate the races in the public schools if they see fit.

He cites as proof of his position an exchange of letters with Chief Judge Frederick W. Brune of the Maryland Court of Appeals, the equivalent of our State supreme court.

In his letter, Rogers said that letters he had received implied or assumed that the report was directed at the segregation cases.

Judge Brune replied, according to Rogers, that the "report did not mention the school cases and it did not undertake to deal with them." He went on to say that he knew of no exception to the rule that Supreme Court decisions on constitutional questions are binding.

Judge Brune replied honestly. But he did not say what Rogers says he did.

It is, of course, true that decisions of the Supreme Court on constitutional questions are binding. That is the heart of the trouble. That is why the trends the Court has established are so threatening to the proper balance of power among the branches of the Federal Government and between the Federal and State Governments.

The highly critical report adopted by the State chief justices deliberately avoided mentioning the decisions in the school cases. It did mention other more obscure and less controversial decisions in which the Court took much the same sort of course. That, too, is somewhat beside the point, for the report addressed itself primarily to the dan-

gerous and alarming trends established in a long line of Supreme Court decisions.

And if Attorney General Rogers were the lawyer he should be, rather than the politician he obviously is, he would have recognized this fact and let it go at that.

However, what he has now done makes it necessary to point out once more what everyone realized at the time: the criticism of the State chief justices applies more clearly and more directly to the antisegregation decisions than to any of the others.

It was the most clearcut instance of the Court's trying to make policy rather than to interpret the Constitution and the acts of Congress. Its actions then and, especially, in subsequent decisions have shown an utter lack of judicial restraint.

Other trends established by the Court are equally serious. For instance, there is no end in sight for the precedent established by the Court when it said that, once Congress enacts a law in a certain field, that the field of law has been preempted by the Federal Government and pertinent State laws are null and void.

In one such case the Court virtually forbade the States to enact and enforce laws against subversion, and in another it seriously weakened the power of the States to enforce laws pertaining to the purity of food and drugs.

And this despite the fact that Congress plainly had no such intentions when it enacted the Federal statutes.

In another series of decisions, the Supreme Court all but destroyed acts of Congress intended to keep the Communist conspiracy in the open and has made it almost impossible to try and punish Communists for acts which amount to sedition if not treason.

The report of the chief justices was rendered in August. Mr. Rogers waited until the public might well have forgotten the summaries of its contents published in the newspapers of that period. He then placed his own interpretation on Judge Brune's letter.

He should not be allowed to get away with it. The facts show too plainly through the whitewash.

Decline in Coal-Mine Fatalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, as the son of a former coal miner and as the elected Representative of a large coal mining district, I cannot but rejoice in the news that in 1958 the State of Illinois set the finest mine safety record in the history of the State. I congratulate Director Ben H. Schull of the State Mines and Minerals Department and Director Marling J. Ankeny of the Federal Bureau of Mines for this remarkable achievement. And while I am at it, I think that those Members of the House who were here in the 82d Congress, which passed almost unanimously the amendments to Public Law 40, are entitled to congratulations for their foresightedness and statesmanship.

For an industry that once killed as many as 2,500 miners a year and numbered its injured in five figures, we have come a long way. In 1957, 473 men were killed. It is estimated for 1958 that there will be 350 fatalities nationwide, an improvement, but still far too many. The greatest killer of all, roof falls, remains to be conquered and I am satisfied that continued cooperation between the mining States and the Federal Government will one day bring about this desirable end.

From Springfield, Ill., under a UPI heading, comes the following announcement:

Illinois, in 1958, set the finest mine safety record in the history of the State, it has been reported by the State Mines and Minerals Department.

Ben H. Schull, department director, said Thursday there was an unprecedented period of 174 consecutive days without a single mine fatality. The period was from February 21 to August 14, when 15,563,797 tons of coal were mined. October also was a death-free month.

There were nine fatalities in the mines last year, Schull said. In 1957, there were 21 deaths, he said. There were six fatality-free months in 1958. This compares with four in 1957, three in 1956, two in 1955, and the first death-free month in the history of the State, August 1954.

Schull said some 183 Illinois mines, including some of the largest in the country, produced an estimated 43,200,000 tons of coal in 1958.

Economic Relief for West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, it has become a matter of public concern in my State of West Virginia that our economy is badly crippled. Several factors enter into this, including a decline in soft coal production, our basic industry, because of competing, laborless fuels. Mechanization of our mines, too, has reduced the labor force in that industry from approximately 125,000 a decade ago to less than 50,000 at the present time.

West Virginians have always shown a capacity to solve their problems and in this instance we are making a determined effort to attract new industries to an area where there is ample transportation, power, and available labor.

However, leaders in our State administration, and our congressional delegation here have taken official notice of the situation and will neglect no opportunity to help better conditons back home. ity to help better conditions back home.

To give the true picture of West Virginia's plight, which I fervently hope is only temporary, I submit an official resolution adopted by the steering committee of the West Virginia Legislature:

Whereas a steering committee from the membership of West Virginia Legislature on the 19th day of December 1958, met and considered the economic conditions of the State of West Virginia; and

Whereas the committee ascertained that there are now 80,000 people, or 15 percent of the total population of West Virginia, drawing surplus commodities; and

Whereas the committee further determined that there were 75,000 persons, eligible for employment, that were unemployed; and

Whereas it was further shown that in the year 1948, there were 125,000 persons employed in the coal mines of West Virginia and that in the year 1957, there were 58,000 and as of December 15, 1958, there were only 47,000 men employed in the mines; and

Whereas in the industries of West Virginia, excluding mines, there has been a decline in employment, and, in the year 1957 there were 10,000 unemployed and in the year 1958 this figure was increased so that there are now 20,000 unemployed in West Virginia industries, amounting to a 100-percent increase in a 1-year period; and

Whereas there are now 42,125 people drawing unemployment compensation or benefits from the West Virginia Department of Employment Security, and it would also appear that there are many thousands others unemployed who are not eligible to draw such benefits; and

Whereas the production of coal in the State of West Virginia has declined from a gross production of 150 million tons in the year 1957 to a gross production of only 112 million tons in the year 1958, or a decrease in production of 38 million tons in a 1-year period; and

Whereas it would now appear that the revenues of the State of West Virginia are declining, and the board of public works has pointed out that State revenue has declined $3.7 million for the first 5 months of the fiscal year 1958–59; and

Whereas the per capita income of the citizens of West Virginia is at least 30 percent below the national per capita average; and

Whereas the steering committee has determined that immediate action must be taken for the benefit of business, industry, and particularly for those unemployed in West Virginia: Be it therefore

Resolved as follows—

That the steering committee does now recommend and urge that the president of the Senate of West Virginia and the speaker of the House of Delegates of West Virginia, each appoint a committee consisting of four members, with representation from the minority party, to work with his excellency the Governor of West Virginia and the West Virginia congressional delegation and the United States Senators, representing the State of West Virginia, in an effort to obtain an immediate conference with the President of the United States of America, the Vice President of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; that those persons representing the State of West Virginia request the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to take immediate action to provide help and aid to the people of West Virginia and that said committee from the State of West Virginia further request the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to take prompt action to establish public projects in the State of West Virginia in order to provide work for the unemployed, food for the starving, relief for the destitute, and to stimulate the economy of the State of West Virginia as a whole; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be promptly forwarded to Cecil H. Underwood, Governor of West Virginia; Senator-elect Robert C. Byrd; Senator Jennings Randolph; Richard Nixon, Vice President of the United States, and Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; and the congressional delegation from West Virginia in the House of Representatives of the United States.

One Was Absent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Editor's Corner of the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes for November 20, 1958:

EDITOR'S CORNER—ONE WAS ABSENT

Veterans Day, or Armistice Day—take it as you wish, was celebrated throughout the Nation on November 11, the 40th anniversary of a day which resulted in a truce between the warring powers and resulted in the end of World War I.

Veterans of our wars and our citizens generally remembered the day and held appropriate ceremonies in the big cities, the smaller ones, the towns, and the hamlets.

By far, as was to be expected, the most important observance of the anniversary was held in the amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery in Virginia.

Here, led by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, whose year it was to take charge of the rites, many wreaths were laid before the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and the last resting places of his companions in arms from World War II and the Korean war.

Despite the cold and high winds the ceremony went off in good fashion. Who, that witnessed it was not impressed by the massing of the colors in the amphitheater prior to the beginning of the exercises? Who, that listened to the words spoken by Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, was not impressed by the message he brought not only to his immediate listeners but to all the Nation—to all the world?

But something was missing. We cast about to determine just what was lacking in this tribute to the veterans of all our wars, living and dead, and finally began to understand when we were informed over the loud speaker that Sumner G. Whittier, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs had been designated to represent the President of the United States and place the President's wreath at the tombs.

Now Sumner G. Whittier, as we have been able to watch him and listen to him in his utterances on veterans' affairs since he took office, seems to us to be a fine upstanding young man—a war veteran—one whom we know to have been instilled with the spirit of patriotism from his earliest days. A good man to choose but for one thing, Sumner G. Whittier did not represent himself as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. In his position he, himself, might have appropriately laid a wreath for the great organization he heads, devoted to the care of veterans and their dependents.

No, he did not speak for the thousands of his employees whose duty it is to advise and guide veterans as to their rights under existing laws but he spoke for the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of all our Armed Forces—a veteran of two world wars who could not find time to be present.

We were informed by the local press that the President was too busy to attend—too busy at the White House. At least that's what the city dailies said.

Now, when we consider that the distance from the White House to the Arlington amphitheater would take up about 7—no, let us say 10 minutes, especially when escorted by motorcycle policemen, perhaps 10 minutes to lay the wreath, and 10 minutes to return, we wonder why our veteran President could not give up half an hour of his time to pay his respects in person to the men and women for whom he had proclaimed Veterans' Day.

A good many attended. Young and old, civilians and veterans, members of practically every veteran organization in the Nation. But one was absent. The leader, who could not spare 30 minutes of his time to join with the country in its tribute to the warriors of our Nation. The ceremony, as we have said, was an inspiring one but left us with a feeling of sadness that our leader, our Commander in Chief, was not there.

Statement by Hon. Lindsay Almond, Governor of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, Virginia and her people have had the guns of Federal judicial tyranny trained upon them. The NAACP and the liberal leftwing groups that are trying to nationalize and mongrelize our Nation have made an all-out effort to bring Virginia to her knees and to compel her to submit to judicial tyranny and unconstitutional usurpation of authority. The vast majority of our true Virginians have stood firm and refused to forsake principle. They have stood on the solid rock of sound, constitutional government and the concepts of individual liberty and freedom of our people as envisioned by our forefathers who gave us our Constitution as well as our form of Government.

This week a number of the so-called massive resistance laws enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia to prevent integration in the public schools and thus preserve public education in Virginia, were declared unconstitutional. This does not mean and will not mean that the public schools of Virginia will be integrated. It simply means that Virginians must continue to stand firm and continue more than ever to fight for constitutional government and the right of the State to govern in its own internal affairs. We cannot and we must not permit integration in a single public school in Virginia. Ways and means can be and must be found to cope with this situation and to preserve public education in Virginia. The State administration working with the general assembly, I am convinced, will find a solution. The thing needed most is to have the people of Virginia support and stand with those of us who are dedicated to the preservation of the sovereignty of our State and our way of life.

Last night, the Honorable J. Lindsay Almond, Governor of Virginia, poured out his heart to the people of the Commonwealth of Virginia and reaffirmed his determination to resist usurpation of authority to the utmost and to preserve segregated schools in Virginia. It was an outstanding analysis of the present situation facing Virginians and noble covenant with the people to preserve the rights of our people, the integrity of our State and the continued operation of segregated schools.

Realizing the importance of the Governor's statement and what it means to the people of Virginia, I include it with my remarks:

My fellow Virginians, I am grateful for the privilege of this brief appearance to discuss with you some aspects of the constitutional crisis shackled upon us by a judicial oligarchy and its shocking and terrible impact on our public school system.

Throughout this struggle Virginia has fought to preserve and defend her rights vouchsafed to her under and within the framework of the Constitution of the United States. On the highest plane of honor, inherent conviction, and loftiness of ideals and principle she has sought only to maintain those rights reserved by her and her sister States, and which have never been delegated, forfeited, or surrendered to the Federal Government. Her loyalty to our Federal system of government as ordained by the Constitution is woven with indestructible thread into the heart and fiber of her people. A combination of forces motivated by political expediency, armed with arrogated power and inimical to our constitutional system, has advanced with ruthless threat to strike down and destroy the right of the people of this State to have a voice in the education of their children. This is lamentably true, notwithstanding the indisputable fact that the fundamental law of the land embraced and protected the use and enjoyment of this right for nearly a century. The right is now denied through the process of judicial legislation amendatory of the Constitution in contravention thereof, and in violation of the oath to uphold and defend it.

VIRGINIA WON'T WEAKEN

Without reference to the people as the Constitution requires, it is demanded of Virginia by the executive and judicial departments of the Federal Government that she forsake honor, abandon principle, and eschew her loyalty to the Constitution by slavish acceptance of this travesty upon the Constitution, and grace the violated oath with a modicum of decency.

Virginia will not weaken in her allegiance to the compact which forms the basic structure of this indissoluble Union of indestructible States; she will not dilute and desecrate her concept of honor; she will not abandon or compromise with principle to have it lost never to be regained.

To those of faint heart; to those whose purpose and design is to blend and amalgamate the white and Negro race and destroy the integrity of both races; to those who disclaim that they are integrationists but are working day and night to integrate our schools; to those who don't care what happens to the children of Virginia; to those false prophets of a little or token integration; to those in high places and elsewhere who advocate integration for your children and send their own to private or public segregated schools; to those who defend or close their eyes to the livid stench of sadism, sex, immorality, and juvenile pregnancy infesting the mixed schools of the District of Columbia and elsewhere; to those who would overthrow the customs, morals, and traditions of a way of life which has endured in honor and decency for centuries and embrace a new moral code prepared by nine men in Washington whose moral concepts they know nothing about; to those who would substitute strife, bitterness, turmoil and chaos for the tranquility and happiness of an orderly society; to those who would destroy our way of life because of

their pretended concern over what Soviet Russia may think of us, to all of these and their confederates, comrades, and allies let me make it abundantly clear for the record now and hereafter, as Governor of this State, I will not yield to that which I know to be wrong and will destroy every rational semblance of education for thousands of the children of Virginia.

PEOPLE WILL DECIDE ISSUES

I call upon the people of Virginia to stand firmly with me in this struggle. Be not dismayed by recent judicial deliverances. I propose to restore the tax revenues of this Commonwealth to the control of the people. They and they alone will decide these issues. United in the common purpose of defending constitutional government and advancing the welfare of our children—with determination more relentless than ever before—we have just begun to fight.

No price is too high to pay; no burden too heavy to bear; no consequence too grave to endure in defense of the right and duty of this Commonwealth to protect the people of Virginia in the proper enjoyment of their right and obligation to mold the character and promote the welfare of their children through the exercise of their voice and judgment in their education and development.

The grave constitutional crisis which has been thrust upon us makes it imperative that our energy, resources, and efforts be launched and applied on a statewide basis. Abandonment of the principles involved anywhere is to foresake them everywhere. The inevitable result will be total engulfment with the progress of dissolution and chaos measured by the combination of forces confederated and arrayed to divide, conquer, rule, and ruin.

The people of Virginia through their elected representatives and by registering their convictions in the exercise of their franchise have repeatedly made it crystal clear that they cannot and will not support a system of public education on a racially integrated basis. I make it equally clear that I cannot and that I will not break faith with them.

PEOPLE HAVE RESPONDED

No parent of guardian is under any legal compulsion from any source to send a child to a racially mixed school. In certain areas affected by adverse Federal decrees the people have responded magnificently to the emergency created through the closing of schools. Thousands of our children have adjusted to the situation. The processes of education are being admirably and effectively administered. The hardships and sacrifices have constituted a challenge to overcome obstacles with the result that fundamentally sound educational progress is being made without chaos or undue confusion.

Amid the agony of these trying days I have been heartened and inspired by the profound spirit of dedication and determination of these citizens and their children, as well as the teachers, who have comported themselves so as to reflect immeasurable credit on the highest qualities of patriotic citizenship.

It is my purpose to appoint and convene with all practical expedition a commission composed of members of the general assembly for the purpose of assessing and evaluating the entire situation in the light of existing conditions. It is my earnest hope and desire that we may be able to formulate a sound and constructive program for submission to a special session of the general assembly. The problem is not one lending itself to an easy solution. It is most grave and difficult. It will require hard work, patience, and a deep sense of dedication.

To prevent the pyramiding of chaos, confusion, and disruption, I urgently request that private instruction now obtaining, and wherever it may become necessary, continue and go forward without interruption. I urge the wholehearted cooperation of all concerned to this end. It is my firm belief that to break the chain of continuity in the administering of private instruction and the consequent confusion of a transition which may invoke conditions justifying its termination would be productive of incalculable harm.

CALLS FOR RESTRAINT

I shall not hesitate to use every available and proper means at my command to keep the peace and good order of this commonwealth. I call upon our people to comport themselves with dignity and restraint to the end that the honor and name of Virginia be not defamed.

I have implicit faith and confidence in the genius of the people to cope with any emergency, and their loyalty and dedication to the preservation of their inherrent and inalienable rights. Our cause is sound, right, and just. With your unwavering loyalty under the guidance of Almighty God we shall go forward to higher and greater accomplishments.

Adrift in a Sea of Corn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I offer an editorial which appeared in the January 13, 1959, issue of the Jefferson Bee, Jefferson, Iowa. Let this serve to remind the Congress that the farm problem confronts us today in more serious proportions than ever before, and unless immediate action is undertaken to aid in the solution of this situation our whole national economy will suffer an irreparable setback.

The editorial follows:

ADRIFT IN A SEA OF CORN

Last fall farmers voted in a controversial corn referendum. They had two choices: a higher support price of $1.25 per bushel with corn allotments; a lower support price of $1.14 with no planting restrictions.

Farmers chose the latter. This year, for the first time since the so-called farm program was enacted by Congress in the early thirties (war years excluded), no corn acreage allotments will be issued. Voting out allotments also means the elimination of the commercial corn-growing area with whatever advantage farmers may have enjoyed under the plan.

Some people interpreted the referendum results as defiant action on the farmers' part. No choice, they said. A vote against acreage allotments was a vote against the general policy of the Agriculture Department and its administrators.

Still, powerful farm spokesmen heralded the referendum outcome as a step toward greater freedom. Farmers don't want controls, they declared. The law of supply and demand will stabilize prices, offer greater opportunity.

So, here we are at the beginning of another crop year. Corn stocks are at an all-time high—33 percent over the 10-year average in Iowa—and no relief in sight.

Indeed, if we are favored with another good growing season, and farmers take advantage of unrestricted corn planting, our present surpluses may look small.

The farm problem seems to grow each season, along with the corn.

This Monster, Mikoyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following editorial published in the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of Sunday, January 18, 1959:

THIS MONSTER, MIKOYAN

Deputy Soviet Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan is reported to have been unusually frank for a Soviet official in replying to questions from executives of the Detroit auto industry.

One of the topics was the revolt in Hungary in October–November 1956. Mikoyan's comment was that he was distressed that many Americans thought the Russians enjoyed shooting people.

The Soviet, he said, came to the assistance of a lawful government (in Hungary) just as the United States did in Lebanon last summer.

The truth of the Hungarian massacre is almost unbelievably shocking—and, of course, a far cry from Mikoyan's above explanation.

Deputy Premier Mikoyan was sent to Budapest to take charge for Moscow, when the freedom-fighters deposed the puppet regime and set up a new government under Premier Imre Nagy.

On October 31, 1956, Mikoyan personally assured Zoltan Tildy, Minister of State of the new Hungarian Government, that Soviet troops would be withdrawn from Hungary. This welcome news was announced over the Budapest radio by General Maleter, Defense Minister in the new Hungarian Government, and reported from free-world news correspondents on the scene.

Even as Mikoyan gave his pledge, however, he was calling for Soviet troop reinforcements to mass outside Hungary, in preparation for the attack of November 3–4.

Having put the Hungarian leadership off guard, Mikoyan arranged a series of conferences between Soviet and Hungarian military leaders, "to plan the withdrawal." After several sessions, an emergency "parley" was arranged for 10 p.m. November 3, at Soviet military headquarters outside Budapest.

Once inside the conference room, General Maleter and his aides were arrested, and immediately, the signal was given for a massive Soviet tank and infantry attack on Budapest. While Premier Nagy, unaware of the trap, implored over the radio for General Maleter to return to his post, the Soviet forces moved in for the kill.

A few days later, with Mikoyan still in full charge for Moscow, Nagy himself was tricked into leaving asylum in the Yugoslav embassy and taken prisoner.

Mikoyan's vital role in this bloody chapter of history has not been as widely reported as it should have been. The Soviet Government has never mentioned it, and the witnesses who would have testified to it have gone—by death in the fighting, by deportation and by execution. The voices of General Maleter and Premier Nagy were silenced by

firing squad. As is his custom, Mikoyan tried to leave no trace!

It is an insult to the American people for this arch-murderer Mikoyan to pretend to be a good-will ambassador to the United States.

Only disaster can come from American businessmen and officials fawning over this Machiavellian monster.

The Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a letter from Howard W. Burden, of Cortland, N.Y., which I feel should be read generally:

CORTLAND MEMORIAL HOSPITAL,
Cortland, N.Y., January 4, 1959.

Representative JOHN TABER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TABER: Because this is the start of the budgeting year, I am asking you to forgive a letter written in from a hospital bed on a day too rough even to have any of my business stationery brought down. Unless I send this out at once, there's no sense even writing. It's about the Federal budget, and I wish that you would see that every single U.S. Senator and Representatives gets a copy. I wanted to get one typed and maybe photocopied, but you can't do that with a broken leg, in bed.

First, let me refer you to the article, entitled "Do You Want a 10-Cent Dollar?" in this month's Reader's Digest, by Roswell McGill.

Writers have harped on this for years, and it's about time that we did something besides keeping on going in the hole.

The skids are greased. If we keep on we may start a slide we can't stop. When it does come, I don't care if you are worth $1,000 or a million, we're all in for a fall.

Read the article. It's good; it's careful. Just let me refer to a few figures from it.

First, on family debt: A $288 billion debt and 180 million people, that's $1,600 per individual or over $6,000 per family. State and county debt may run $2,000 to $4,000 and local $4,000. There you tally up $1,400 before your homeowner has bought his house, his car, and all the rest. Say you put down only $1,600 for them and you are up to $30,000. That's a lot of money for the average person to owe. The interest eats him up.

Again, I refer to page 26 of the article in the amount of time for a man earning $4,500 a year, to get certain things out of life: 2 hours 39 minutes per day for Government; 1 hour 39 minutes per day for food; 1 hour 25 minutes per day for housing; 37 minutes per day for clothes. Lopsided? You are the only hope of the people to control this rat race at the national level. This is a brandnew January. Now is the time to act. Let's do it.

Referring again, this time to page 29, left of the article each $1 billion you shave off the budget saves the average family $200. I'm for it.

Looking again at page 29, left, center: "It looks as if the Government had better take the other fork of the road, uphill and stony though it may be, and reduce expenditures and levy such taxes as are needed to pay for current costs."

I think I've said enough.

So to you, Mr. TABER, and to each of you other representatives in our two Houses of Congress, do your best to sharpen that red pencil, and thanks, we're looking for you.

Earnestly and with a personal wish to each of you for a fine 1959, and for a new sensible deal starting now for our country from here on in.

HOWARD W. BURDEN,
Cortland County Republican Committee.

Businesslike Mailman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the January 19, 1959, issue of Barron's, National Business and Financial Weekly, carries as its lead article a much-deserved tribute to a distinguished member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet, the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General.

The article points out the remarkable progress that has been made toward improved mail service under the leadership of Postmaster General Summerfield and under leave to extend my remarks I offer the magazine's comments in their entirety:

BUSINESSLIKE MAILMAN—MR. SUMMERFIELD HAS DELIVERED A BETTER POSTAL SERVICE

One of the less glorious traditions of the American Republic requires its Postmaster General to be, if not exactly a dunderhead, at best a figurehead. Down through the years, the highest office in the postal system all too often has served as a refuge for the party hack, a sinecure granted as a reward for managing a successful presidential campaign. Indeed, to call the roll of those who have held top command in the Post Office is to turn up a succession of public nonentities. Seldom does a famous name—a Benjamin Franklin or a John Wanamaker, a Will Hays, or a Jim Farley—grace the roster. The rest are blanketed today in a common obscurity.

The present incumbent, however, hardly conforms to this dreary stereotype. Since taking office 6 years ago, Arthur Summerfield has made notable progress in modernizing and streamlining the operations of his department. To be sure, owing largely to the financial obstruction of Congress, as well as that of some Federal agencies, the postal deficit in fiscal 1958 soared to an all-time high. Nonetheless, by successfully pushing through the first general increase in rates in a generation, the ex-Chevrolet dealer unmistakably has stemmed the rising tide of red ink. Meanwhile, he has increased the efficiency of the Post Office and speeded up its service. Most promising of all, he has begun to enlist the talents and energies of private industry to help find better ways of processing an ever-mounting volume of mail. Thus, to the great task of keeping the massive Federal budget under control, Mr. Summerfield has made a signal, if largely unsung, contribution.

The job has not been easy. Both the physical and financial challenges faced by the Postmaster General were, and remain, formidable, indeed. Over the years, while Congress kept postal rates at the levels set in the thirties, a steady rise in costs rolled up bigger and bigger deficits. In 1958, as the gap between income and outgo rose to a new fiscal year high of nearly $900 million, the administration, spearheaded by Mr. Summerfield, waged a last-ditch fight to raise rates. It was only partly successful. The lawmakers increased some charges less than the President asked, and ordered more generous pay raises for postal workers than he thought justified. The net result was largely to offset a gain of some $530 million a year in the Department's receipts by a payroll boost, current and retroactive, totaling over $360 million. Furthermore, after Congress adjourned, the Interstate Commerce Commission dealt another blow to postal finances by awarding the railroads huge increases, including a retroactive $54 million, for carrying the mails.

Despite these temporary setbacks, the long-range financial outlook of the Post Office plainly is improving. For one thing, the retroactive boosts in costs now are out of the way, while the higher postal rates voted last year will be swelling revenues throughout calendar 1959. Moreover, some of the rate hikes are progressive; those on third-class mail went up by one-third on New Year's Day, and second-class rates jump a second notch this year and a third in 1960. Finally, as the budget message today presumably will underscore, the administration is launching another determined effort to boost postal receipts. At the same time, the Department is working hard to cut costs. As the expense of shipment by train has climbed, for example, it has switched increasingly to transportation by truck and plane. Consequently, the deficit for fiscal 1959 will decline fairly sharply, for the first time in 6 years, to an estimated $625 million. In fiscal 1960, it is likely to drop further.

While costing the taxpayer less, the Post Office also is taking steps to improve its service. Thus in the past year, it has expanded rural deliveries, extended window hours, and stepped up its collection of mail. It has adopted such up-to-the-minute transportation facilities as Bunyan Boxes, which are huge aluminum containers designed to eliminate bag-by-bag loading of commercial cargo liners; Mailsters, small three-wheeled vehicles which enable postmen to deliver parcels along with regular mail; and Flexi-vans, loaded highway trailers which, in a refinement of piggyback railroading, can be separated from their wheel assemblies and placed aboard a flatcar in a few minutes. Such innovations are combining to speed deliveries. Indeed, Mr. Summerfield, always the optimist, talks buoyantly of eventual overnight service between any two cities in the United States.

Even more significant, in the long run, is the beginning of a drastic change in mail handling within the post office itself. To help mechanize his Department's antiquated internal operations, Mr. Summerfield has sought the aid of many a private concern in designing, producing, and testing equipment. Enlisted in this program, under the supervision of the National Bureau of Standards, are such knowledgeable enterprises as Aerojet-General Corp., American Machine & Foundry Co., Burroughs Corp., Emerson Radio & Phonograph Corp., Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., Mechanical Handling Systems, Inc., and Pitney-Bowes, Inc. Currently in experimental use in selected post offices are mechanical and electronic gadgets for sorting, facing, postmarking, and canceling huge quantities of mail—as much as 36,000 pieces an hour—with a minimum of human attention. Beyond these intermediate Rube Goldberg devices looms the more distant goal of a completely automatic post office. Intelex Systems, a subsidiary of International Telephone & Telegraph, expects shortly to receive a contract to build and equip the first such installation in the country.

Under the Summerfield management, in short, the Post Office has displayed unusual initiative and vision in coping with its difficulties. Undeniably, the service still has a long way to go, in terms of both efficiency and solvency; the postal authorities, in the latter instance especially, cannot do the job alone. Certainly, the 86th Congress should raise rates again, and thus help reduce the deficit to less burdensome proportions. Nonetheless, for the progress already achieved, and for the gains in prospect through the new partnership with private industry, Mr. Summerfield clearly deserves a belated thank-you note from the taxpayer.

The Corn Allotment Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an informative editorial on the corn allotment vote. This editorial appeared in the November 27, 1958, issue of the Des Moines Register, and offers an excellent and valuable commentary on the reasons and events leading to the farm vote on the 1958 corn referendum. The editorial follows:

THE CORN ALLOTMENT VOTE

The heavy vote by corn farmers against acreage allotments for 1959 will be widely interpreted as a vote against production controls in principle—and for freedom to plant. Secretary Ezra Benson already has attached this meaning to the vote, which is no surprise. But it would be more logical to interpret the results of Tuesday's referendum as a rejection of production controls which did not work.

There is no evidence to indicate that farmers would not welcome a production control system that would hold output in line with demand. There is some evidence that farmers in the Corn Belt, at least, prefer the soil bank method of taking land completely out of production as a means of controlling output. This has been the position of the Iowa Farm Bureau.

We fail to see how the allotment program was any more of an interference with farmers' freedom than the soil bank. It was voluntary as the soil bank is. There has been a great deal of nonsense spoken about this matter of "controls," especially by the Secretary of Agriculture himself. Mr. Benson's speeches create the impression among nonfarm people, that the Government has been ordering farmers around, telling them what to grow and what not to grow. This isn't true, and we don't believe farmers voted against any such purely imaginary control setup.

Farmers have seen that the allotment procedure, affecting corn alone, has not limited the output of feed grains. Secretary Benson has not administered this program sympathetically in an effort to make it work. He has refused to require cross compliance on other crops as a condition of eligibility for benefits. He has reduced corn allotments rigorously according to formula, with no attempt to get a minimum national allotment as in the case of wheat. He has provided a corn loan about 25 cents below the regular loan for farmers who didn't comply with allotments.

Thus everything has been geared to discourage farmers from participating in the program and to make the allotment program look bad. Allotments worked poorly enough even with the most sympathetic administration. But Benson stacked the cards against them.

The referendum offered farmers such a choice that they could hardly fail to vote against the allotments for next year. The allotments were to be reduced sharply, and the price support loan for compliance also to be cut. Benson announced that there would not be a noncompliance loan next year.

The alternative was a corn loan for everyone at a somewhat higher level than the noncompliance loan this year—with no limitation on corn acreage.

Under these circumstances it is surprising that as many as 30 percent of the farmers voting chose to stick with the allotment program.

Zeboim Lupton Patten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on December 7, Tennessee lost to eternity one of its finest native sons and loyal citizens. Zeboim Lupton Patten, of Chattanooga, died at the age of 51 years and his passing brought great sorrow to all citizens of our State and to his many acquaintances throughout the entire country.

Lupton Patten was a close friend of many years. To know him was, simply, to love him. His personality, his kindness, all of his fine qualities of heart and mind, and his great selfless service to his community and the Nation placed him a notch above other men. Born of an honorable and distinguished pioneer family of Tennessee his life was devoted to high principles and standards that brought benefit to all with whom he was associated.

This great man who has been lost to the people of Tennessee served to build one of the great family industries of our State. As president of the Chattanooga Medicine Co., and its various subsidiaries, he led his firm into a position of nationwide prominence. Under Mr. Patten's leadership, his company has conducted much original research that has contributed greatly to medical advances. His business principles were equally as exemplary as his personal life. As a national president of the Proprietary Association he contributed to development of safe and ethical practices in a field of business that affects all our lives.

The interests of Lupton Patten were as varied as his talents. He not only brought the Chattanooga Medicine Co. to a position of leadership but he was equally interested in and was given a position of leadership in civic, religious, and educational movements. He was voted the young man of the year back in 1940. He was chairman of the board of the University of Chattanooga and saw it grow to become one of the South's great educational institutions. He was a delegate to the Republican National Conventions in 1940 and 1948 and his talented widow is now a member of the Republican National Committee. He was a member of the board of the National Manufacturers' Association and president of the Tennessee Manufacturers' Association. He served as president of the Community Chest. No worthwhile civic movement was without his interest and support. One interesting example is the fact that, as busy as he was, he served as foreman of the grand jury in Chattanooga at a time when inspiring leadership was needed.

It was typical of Lupton that he would prepare his business so that his high standards of business practice would be continued. The announcement of his nephew, Alex Guerry, Jr., as president of the Chattanooga Medicine Co. to succeed Lupton Patten was in line with his wishes and I am certain the great traditions of this firm will continue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD at this time some of the editorials that were written and published in Tennessee newspapers upon the demise of Lupton Patten. I am proud of the respect and honor paid him in these editorials. The sincerity of these thoughts and the great compliments given him are well deserved. I know that Lupton Patten would bear these words of compliment humbly and honorably. He was a kindly and simple man; a trusted and beloved friend.

The editorial comments follow:

[From the Chattanooga Daily Times, Dec. 8, 1958]

LUPTON PATTEN DEAD AT 51—BUSINESS AND CIVIC LEADER—PRESIDENT OF CHATTANOOGA MEDICINE, CHAIRMAN OF UNIVERSITY OF CHATTANOOGA BOARD—BANK, INSURANCE EXECUTIVE, METHODIST—FOUNDED TENNIS CLUB

Lupton Patten, 51, civic and business leader and member of one of the city's pioneer families, died at 7 a.m. Sunday at his home, 1636 Hillcrest Road, after a heart attack.

Mr. Patten was first stricken in the fall of 1957 and after a short stay in the hospital returned to his home to recuperate. He later was able to resume most of his activities and had been at his office several times last week.

Funeral services will be held at 2 p.m. in John A. Patten Memorial Chapel of the University of Chattanooga, the Rev. Arthur H. Jones, Jr., pastor of First Methodist Church, and Dr. LeRoy A. Martin, president of Tennessee Wesleyan College, officiating. Burial will be in Forest Hills Cemetery.

Active pallbearers will be the following university students: Richard Holcomb, Bill B. Jones, Thomas A. Williams, Charles Pierce, Craig Smith, Larry Houghton, Art Grayson, and John Green.

The family asked that flowers be omitted and suggested gifts may be made to the university.

The body is at the home. Funeral arrangements are by Wann's.

Mr. Patten was president of the Chattanooga Medicine Co., one of Chattanooga's oldest and most widely known institutions. He was a guiding figure in other enterprises and movements in Chattanooga.

He made outstanding contributions to the community through his service as chairman

of the Community Chest campaign of 1939, as president of the chest in 1948 and 1949 and as chairman of the board of trustees of the University of Chattanooga and as a member of the boards of the Bright School and the Girls Preparatory School.

He also was a leader in several businesses and in worthwhile movements and organizations at both the local and national level. Active in the Republican Party, he served as a delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1940 and was an alternate delegate in 1948.

Zeboim Lupton Patten was born in Chattanooga January 29, 1907, the son of the late John A. Patten and Edith Manker Patten. His father was the nephew of the late Z. C. Patten, one of the founders of the medicine company, which Lupton Patten had headed since 1938.

BAYLOR GRADUATE

Lupton Patten was graduated from Baylor school in 1923. In 1927 he received a B.A. degree from the University of Chattanooga. He was a member of Sigma Chi fraternity, the Blue Key, and Alpha societies.

In 1927 and 1928 he served as instructor in French and philosophy at U.C.

In 1928, he became associated with the medicine company as a member of its credit department. Subsequent promotions made him assistant sales manager, sales manager, and then president. He also was chairman of the board of the Brayten Pharmaceutical Co.

At the time of his death he was chairman of the board of trustees of the university and a member of the boards of the Bright and Girls Preparatory Schools.

WAS 1940 JAYCEE MAN OF THE YEAR

In recognition of his leadership in civic affairs he was selected as the junior chamber of commerce's young man of the year of 1940. He served as vice chairman of the Greater Chattanooga War Fund in 1941, after having served as Community Chest campaign chairman in 1939. He was president of the Chest in 1948 and 1949.

He was a member of the executive committee and a director of the American National Bank & Trust Co. and a member of the board of directors of the Provident Life & Accident Insurance Co. He was the founder of the Chattanooga Tennis Club.

He received national recognition from the medicine industry when he was elected president of the Proprietary Association to serve in 1950–52. He also was a member of the board of directors of the National Association of Manufacturers and the Tennessee Manufacturers Association and on the L. G. Noel Memorial Foundation.

LAUDED AT WESLEYAN

At commencement exercises of Tennessee Wesleyan College in Athens, Tenn., in May 1957, Mr. Patten was given the honorary degree of doctor of laws. At the ceremony he was extolled by Dr. LeRoy A. Martin, the college president, as "an example of the man of business whose decisions and standards flow from an understanding of the philosophy of the Greeks and the truths of Christianity."

He served as foreman of the Hamilton County grand jury in 1949. In 1950 he was a member of the blue ribbon grand jury which looked into jury irregularities.

He was an active leader in the First Methodist Church. His clubs included the Mountain City, Fairyland, and Chattanooga Golf and Country Clubs.

He was married to Miss Mary Sanford in June 1928. He is survived by his wife and their four daughters, Mrs. Richard Winningham, Mrs. David Michael Whelchel, Mrs. Reid Douglas Hardin, and Miss Mary Fontaine Patten.

[From the Chattanooga Times, Dec. 8, 1958]

ZEBOIM LUPTON PATTEN

When Tennessee Wesleyan College conferred the honorary degree of doctor of laws upon Lupton Patten in 1957, it cited him for being, among other things, a man whose "leadership has extended beyond the boundaries of personal business interests."

Simple in its truth and profound in its implications, the statement might well be included in the epitaph this community now must write in its sorrow. For here indeed was a man whose abilities were manifold, whose concern for the betterment of the place of his birth and of his deserved success was without limit, whose willingness to give of himself in its behalf was without measure.

Lupton Patten was of a family which has contributed so richly to Chattanooga's growth that we might almost say with meaning that it would not have been possible without them. He was aware of this heritage; he accepted its privileges with humility and its responsibilities with a deep sense of obligation. He was worthy of both.

At the core of his position in this community, of course, were his business achievements which were both varied and sound. After a brief tenure as an instructor at the University of Chattanooga—a facet of his life which many of his friends never knew or tended to forget but which might explain his lifelong interest in education—he joined the family-founded Chattanooga Medicine Co. in a subordinate position in 1929.

His rise in the company was through the sales department, and at the age of 31 years he became a successor to his father, John A. Patten, as president of the firm. This was in 1938, and the 20 years since have been those of the medicine company's greatest growth.

In addition, he served on the directorates of the American National Bank & Trust Co., the Provident Life & Accident Insurance Co., and of the Brayten Pharmaceutical Co.

To say that Mr. Patten was active in civic affairs is merely to suggest the barest sort of outline of what he did and of what he gave for Chattanooga and its people. There was scarcely an area of its development in which he had not worked with ardor himself or supported with sound advice and material aid.

He had long been a trustee of the University of Chattanooga, his alma mater, and had served as chairman of the board. In addition, he was on the boards of the Bright School and Girls Preparatory School.

He had headed War Fund and Community Chest campaigns, and was active in most of the city's cultural undertakings.

In 1949, Mr. Patten served as foreman of the Hamilton County grand jury, a tenure marked by action against masked nightriders in the county.

He was a Republican, an unabashed conservative, and much of his energies in recent years have gone into serving the party's cause as he envisioned it on the local, State, and national levels.

A man with an easy smile and a soft voice, he could argue his convictions cogently and disagree with others without rancor. He had a ready wit and was an accomplished storyteller in moments of relaxation.

Lupton Patten's death at the age of 51 is a blow to this city, a grievous burden for his friends. None will doubt that his good works have erected monuments more enduring than stone and memories warmer than any engraved words.

[From the Chattanooga Observer, Dec. 12, 1958]

A GREAT AND GOOD MAN IS GONE

When the grim reaper Death stilled the voice of Zeboim Lupton Patten early Sunday morning, December 7, it carried to his eternal home a great, good man. He was good and great at the same time. He was the guiding genius of one of Chattanooga's leading enterprises, the Chattanooga Medicine Co., and also a director in many of Chattanooga's leading businesses.

He was a man of great wealth, but he used that great wealth and ingenuity to help people. He followed in the steps of his illustrious father, who preceded him in death, by giving to many worthy causes thousands of dollars to help them on their way. Lupton Patten, like his father gave much of his means to Negroes, particularly Negro ministers. When adversities knocked on Negroes' doors they made a beaten path to the Chattanooga Medicine Co. to see the little man with the big heart, Lupton Patten. When Negro churches needed a roof and other things to keep them in good repair where they may religiously educate their children Mr. Patten furnished the means by which they could do the necessary work needed to be done. In that he was following in the footsteps of his illustrious father because his father, in all probability, gave more money to Negro churches in this community than any one that I know about. Sometimes it wasn't a need for the church proper, but it was a need for the minister of the church and he also considered their pleas and helped them on their way.

It can truthfully be said of him that he lived in a house by the side of the road where the races of men go by—some were white some were black, some were rich, some were poor, some were learned and some were unlearned but he considered their cries and used much of his money in answering their prayers. Thus, in the passing of Mr. Zeboim Lupton Patten the Negroes of Chattanooga sustain the loss of one of their greatest benefactors. Yes, he was a friend to man. He was an easy man to approach; he was very understanding; he harbored no prejudice because of race, religion, or previous condition of servitude.

Hundreds of people jammed and packed the Patten Chapel on the campus of the University of Chattanooga Monday, December 8 at 2 p.m. to pay their last tribute of respect to their fallen leader—captains of industry, insurance executives, bankers, real estate men, Negroes, lawyers, doctors, preachers, and laborers, in fact people of all walks of life.

He was a great Republican. He believed in the principles of the party of Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Calvin Coolidge, and Dwight D. Eisenhower. I don't know of any one in the image of man since the days of my father that I held in higher esteem than I did Mr. Patten. He was genuinely a good man and because of his goodness, he was a great man. It has been said that the true measurement of a giant oak can best be taken when it is down. That is also true in the lives of great men. In the presence of death all people are impartial, then envy has no motive to actuate it, malice has no motive to inspire it, ambition sees no genius in its path, then history becomes the unbiased witness. Judging by every standard, whether in the full glow of his business career or at the journey's end, he served with marked ability in every position he was called upon to fill. He has gone to try the realities of another world, but his spirit will remain with us forever.

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press, Dec. 8, 1958]

LUPTON PATTEN

In the truest sense of the word, Lupton Patten was a gentleman. And the characteristics that made him so made him a great Chattanoogan.

Integrity, ability and vision were blended with an inquiring mind, an enterprising spirit, a broad horizon of interests and a deep sense of civic responsibility. These are some of the factors that make Mr. Patten's death yesterday a real loss.

President of one of Chattanooga's major industries, Mr. Patten's business acumen caused the Chattanooga Medicine Co. to develop under his direction into a larger vital concern of greater national importance, and led to the development of subsidiary companies that have increased Chattanooga's importance in the drug world.

His business activities alone were sufficient to mark Mr. Patten as an outstanding Chattanoogan. But while they were the center of his interests, business was only one of the many fields in which his influence was constructively felt.

Having assumed the presidency of the Chattanooga Medicine Co. 20 years ago at the age of 31, Mr. Patten already was active in civic affairs, so much that he was named young man of the year by the junior chamber of commerce in 1940.

The year before, the young Mr. Patten had successfully provided civic leadership through his service as campaign chairman of the community chest, an organization he was to serve as president for 2 years a decade later. In 1941 he was vice chairman of the Greater Chattanooga War Fund Campaign. He was scheduled to receive next month an honorary life membership in the United Fund.

Having received his schooling at Baylor School and the University of Chattanooga, Mr. Patten was deeply interested in the field of local education. Two of his early years were spent as a University of Chattanooga instructor. At his death he was chairman of the board of trustees of the University of Chattanooga and a member of the boards of the Bright School and Girls Preparatory School.

During the past several years the Chattanooga Tennis Club has proudly developed one of the best centers for the sport in the Nation, having built on the basis established by Mr. Patten as founder of the club and one of its most interested members.

A constitutional conservative in political outlook, Mr. Patten was active in local and national Republic affairs, serving as GOP National Convention delegate in 1940 and an alternate delegate in 1948, providing leadership in the Tennessee delegation for stanch, free enterprise Americanism.

Nor did he turn away from a call for governmetal service. He was a distinguished foreman of the Hamilton County grand jury. During his term the community was stricken by a rash of mob violence as hooded hoodlums burned crosses and flogged residents of outlying areas. Grand jury investigation under Mr. Patten's leadership helped restore the peace in that troubled period.

In his church, the First Methodist, Mr. Patten was an active member and vital leader for many years.

With all his business and civic service, Mr. Patten was a man devoted to his family. He and Mrs. Patten were the parents of four daughters.

Though his years of life were relatively brief, Mr. Patten engaged his time better than most in more endeavors than most, living fully, constructively, honorably, and in a manner that causes his death to be a real community loss.

MEDICINE FIRM ELECTS ALEX GUERRY AS PRESIDENT, PAT ABSHIRE AS DIRECTOR

Alex Guerry, Jr. was elected president of the Chattanooga Medicine Co. at a special meeting of the firm's board of directors Monday afternoon.

Guerry succeeds the late Lupton Patten, who died at his home early Sunday morning.

In other action taken by the directors, Patten Abshire, secretary of the company, was named a director to fill the vacancy created by the death of Mr. Patten.

Associated with the drug firm since 1945, Guerry was named executive vice president last September.

Guerry, 40, is one of the city's most active young executives. He is president of the Rotary Club and a leader in various organizations and civic undertakings.

Prior to his promotion to executive vice president, he had served as secretary of the company since 1948.

Guerry joined the firm after establishing a distinguished record in the Army Air Force during World War II.

He is a graduate of Baylor School and the University of the South and holds a master's degree in business and economics from the University of North Carolina.

Guerry has been active in the work of the United Fund-Red Cross campaigns. He was primarily responsible for an exhaustive 8-month study of UF operations in other cities which resulted in the adoption of a combination plan for Chattanooga.

The new president is a member of the Church of the Good Shepherd on Lookout Mountain. He resides with his wife, Louise Pemberton Guerry, and children, Alexander III, Louise Chappell, and John P., at the family home on Lula Lake Road, Lookout Mountain.

Abshire, the new director, is a member of the law firm of Wilkerson and Abshire, general counsel for the company.

A Tribute to Hon. Overton Brooks, of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL VINSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a resolution adopted unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services which pays high tribute to the distinguished Member from Louisiana, the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS:

Resolved, That the Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives, does hereby express regret at the loss from its membership of Hon. OVERTON BROOKS, a Representative in Congress from the State of Louisiana;

That the committee recognizes the valuable contributions to the national defense made by him during his long tenure in Congress;

That the committee in particular recognizes the untiring efforts he has put forth in order to build strong and effective Reserve components of the Armed Forces;

That the committee believes that both Regular and Reserve personnel of the Armed Forces are indebted to him for his endeavors to secure for them increased pay and allowances, better housing, equitable methods of promotion and retirement, and the present system of military justice;

That he is to be commended for his attention to duty and conspicuous ability in the field of military legislation, both as a member of the Military Affairs Committee and the Armed Services Committee;

That in the future the committee will sorely miss his great ability and wise counsel, but congratulates him on his selection as chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics;

That the chairman of the Armed Services Committee be, and he hereby is, authorized to take appropriate steps to have this resolution made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A Bill To Assist in Relieving the Shortage of Housing for Elder Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to assist in relieving the shortage of housing for elderly persons which became part of the housing bills passed by both the Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees last year and, I am hopeful, will become part of the omnibus housing bill this year. However, in order to bring this matter to the attention of the House and Senate, I am introducing a separate bill along with the statement I made before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee at the time I suggested this bill as an amendment to the housing bill:

A bill to amend the National Housing Act to assist in relieving the shortage of housing for elderly persons and to increase the supply of rental housing for elderly persons—It is the further purpose of this bill to assist in provision of urgently needed construction of nursing homes, renovation, and equipping existing licensed nursing homes for the care and treatment of persons, particularly elderly persons

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to carry out the purpose of this bill section 201(a), title II of the National Housing Act, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 229.(a) The purpose of this section is to assist in relieving the shortage of housing for elderly persons and to increase the supply of rental housing for elderly persons. It is further the purpose of this bill to assist in the provision of urgently needed nursing homes for the care and treatment of persons, particularly elderly persons.

"For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'housing' means eight or more new or rehabilitated living units, not less than 50 per centum of which are specially designed for the use and occupancy of elderly persons;

"(2) The term 'elderly person' means any person, married or single, who is sixty years of age or more;

"(3) The term 'nursing home' means a facility which is or will be licensed or regulated by law, which provides continuous

nursing care, under medical supervision or direction, to the long-term, convalescent, infirm, or elderly patient in a home-like atmosphere, furnishing facilities and comforts normally found in a patient's home, and which provides, in addition thereto, such specialized service, equipment, and safety features as may be required for the safe, proper, and adequate care of patients at all times; and

"(4) The terms 'mortgage', 'mortgagee', 'mortgagor', and 'maturity date' shall have the meanings respectively set forth in section 207 of this Act.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to insure any mortgage (including advances on mortgages during construction) in accordance with the provisions of this section upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and to make commitments for insurance of such mortgages prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon.

"(c) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage to provide housing for elderly persons shall—

"(1) involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed $12,500,000 or, if executed by Federal or State instrumentalities, municipal corporate instrumentalities of one or more States, or nonprofit development or housing corporations restricted by Federal or State laws or regulations of State banking or insurance departments as to rents, charges, capital structures, rate of return, or methods of operation, not to exceed $50,000,000;

"(2) not exceed, for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use, $9,000 per dwelling unit: Provided, That the Commissioner may, in his discretion, increase the dollar amount limitation of $9,000 per unit to not to exceed $9,400 per unit to compensate for the higher costs incident to the construction of elevator-type structures and may increase each of the foregoing dollar amount limitations by not to exceed $1,250 per room in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require;

"(3) if executed by a mortgagor which is a private nonprofit corporation or association or other acceptable private nonprofit organization regulated or supervised under Federal or State laws or by political subdivisions of States, or agencies thereof, or by the Commissioner under a regulatory agreement or otherwise, as to rents, charges, and methods of operation, in such form and in such manner as, in the opinion of the Commissioner, will effectuate the purpose of this section, involve a principal obligation not in excess of the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the replacement cost of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed (the replacement cost may include the land, the proposed physical improvements, utilities within the boundaries of the land, architect's fees, taxes, interest during construction, and other miscellaneous charges incident to construction and approved by the Commissioner);

"(4) if executed by a mortgagor approved by the Commissioner but which is not a nonprofit organization, involve a principal obligation not in excess of the Commissioner's estimate of the replacement cost of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed (the replacement cost may include the land, the proposed physical improvements, utilities within the boundaries of the land, architect's fees, taxes, interest during construction, and other miscellaneous charges incident to construction and approved by the Commissioner, but shall not include any allowance for builder's and sponsor's profit and risk): *Provided*, That the Commissioner may in his discretion require such mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to rents or sales, charges, capital structure, rate of return and methods of operation, and for such purpose the Commissioner may make contracts with and acquire for not to exceed $100 stock or interest in any such mortgagor as the Commissioner may deem necessary to render effective such restrictions or regulations; such stock or interest shall be paid for out of the section 207 Housing Insurance Fund and shall be redeemed by the mortgagor at par upon the termination of all obligations of the Commissioner under the insurance;

"(5) provide for a complete amortization by periodic payments within such terms as the Commissioner shall prescribe;

"(6) bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4½ per centum per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time;

"(7) cover a property or project which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction, with 50 per centum or more of the units therein specially designed for the use and occupancy of elderly persons in accordance with standards established by the Commissioner, and which may include such commercial and special facilities as the Commissioner deems adequate to serve the occupants.

"(d) In order to carry out the purpose stated in the second sentence of subsection (a), the Commissioner is authorized to insure any mortgage which covers a new or rehabilitated nursing home, subject to the following conditions:

"(1) The mortgage shall be executed by a mortgagor approved by the Commissioner. The Commissioner may in his discretion, require any such mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to charges and methods of operation, and, in addition thereto, if the mortgagor is a corporate entity, as to capital structure and rate of return. As an aid to the regulation or restriction of any mortgagor with respect to any of the foregoing matters, the Commissioner may make such contracts with and/or acquire, for not to exceed $100, stock or interest in any such mortgagor as he may deem necessary. Any stock or interest so purchased shall be paid for out of the section 207 Housing Insurance Fund, and may be redeemed by the mortgagor at par upon the termination of all obligations of the Commissioner under the insurance.

"(2) The mortgage shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed $12,500,000, and not to exceed 75 per centum of the estimated value of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed.

"(3) The mortgage shall—

"(i) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such terms as the Commissioner shall prescribe; and

"(ii) bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4½ per centum per annum of the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time.

"(e) In carrying out the provisions of this section with respect to the insurance of mortgages on properties or projects designed for use as nursing homes, the Commissioner shall consult with and secure the advice and recommendations of the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(f) The Commissioner may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property or project from the lien of any mortgage insured under this section upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, and shall prescribe such procedures as in his judgment are necessary to secure to elderly persons a preference or priority of opportunity to rent the dwellings included in such property or project.

"(g) The provisions of subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), and (p) of section 207 shall apply to mortgages insured under this section and all references therein to section 207 shall refer to this section."

(b) Section 212(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The provisions of this section shall also apply to the insurance of any mortgage under section 229 except that compliance with such provisions may be waived by the Federal Housing Commissioner in such cases or classes of cases in which laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time on the project, voluntarily donate their services without compensation for the purpose of lowering the costs of construction and the Federal Housing Commissioner determines that any amounts thereby saved are fully credited to the nonprofit corporation, association or other organization undertaking the construction."

SEC. 213. This bill shall take effect sixty days after this enactment.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS B. CURTIS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

I first want to thank the chairman for the opportunity of testifying before the committee on this important subject of adequate facilities for the aged.

No subject seems to be receiving more attention today than the problems that face our older citizens. It is very important that their problems receive attention. Indeed, the point has been raised of what value has been this increased lifespan given to us through the achievements of our medical and pharmaceutical professions if the years added to the lives of our people are to be spent in unhappiness.

What should be one of the greatest boons to mankind has in some respects become a bane. I believe it is well within our power to give the boon real meaning. However, it requires some clear thinking of what should be done. What has been done, although done with good intentions, has often produced poor results.

The problem of the aged is to a large degree a financial problem. Most older people are on fixed incomes, pensions, social security, or retirement of some sort. Their plans for financing their retirement have been thrown out of kilter by two major economic and social forces.

1. Instead of living 10 years they now are living 20 years. This is the boon that has become a bane, because they have not prepared themselves for this financial burden. The cost of staying alive is great—unnecessarily great. The drugs and medical care are available, but their cost is burdensome.

2. Inflation has hit this group of people most cruelly. What they had set aside has been cut in half. Although we have sought to alleviate this damage through granting double personal exemptions to persons over 65 in our income tax laws, and in other ways, this has amounted to too little for those who get it and has been of no help to those in the lower economic brackets who do not have enough income to be on the income tax rolls.

One way in which we can help these older citizens is to analyze with some care just what their needs are and see if we cannot provide the facilities that are tailored to their needs. What we have been doing, I suggest, is trying to convert the facilities that already exist in our society to fit their needs or, equally as bad, to distort their needs to fit what facilities exist. This does not work, and it is costly.

Let me illustrate. Older people need more medical attention than younger people but do not need constant doctor care, nor do they need constant nursing care. Yet, ofttimes, they are confronted with the choice of either staying at home or going to a hospital. They do not need hospitalization. They need something much less expensive, something in between. The result is we tend to overload

our hospitals and inadequately meet the needs of the aged and unnecessarily burden them financially.

I am going to make a confession. I was the first member of the male sex to serve on the board of the Visiting Nurses Association of St. Louis. I was deeply interested in the work that the visiting nurses were doing. I observed how their caseload had changed over the years. The primary caseload of the visiting nurses used to be instructing young mothers in prenatal and postnatal care, because most births took place in the homes and not in the hospitals. Today, there are very few maternity cases in the home. In place of maternity care, the visiting nurses now find their primary caseload is geriatrics—teaching the families of older people in the home how to care for the aged person in the home; how to administer a hypodermic shot; how to handle other problems of chronic illness or just old age.

I regret to state that the use of the visiting nurse approach, which is so much less costly than the hospital approach and much more suitable, has not received the attention and the development that it should. But it illustrates the point I am trying to make that facilities geared to the problems of the aged should be set up specifically for them rather than to try to make the aged problems fit into the facilities we have been using for the general society.

So I come to the specific question at hand—the encouragement and implementation of nursing homes designed to take care of the aged. As a matter of fact, the very terminology I am using—nursing homes—confesses that I am guilty of the very thing I am urging that we avoid. What we need is not nursing homes in the traditional way we know nursing homes to be. Nor do we need old folks' homes as we have known them. We need an entirely new type of facility. It may be a village of old folks, such as I have read has been established in Arizona. It may be just homes clustered around a medical facility that is set up to care for older people. Frankly, I am not certain just what kind of facilities we should be talking about.

And so we come closer to the question at hand. How do we go about providing the type of facilities that will most adequately fit the problem of our aged citizens? Do we do it by establishing a commission to study the matter, or a congressional committee? All this may help, but I suggest that there is a more direct way, a quicker way, a more satisfactory way—indeed, a way which is being followed to some extent in the natural course of events, whether the Government is aware of it or not.

The way is the private enterprise system. What Government should be doing is encouraging what is already coming about.

So many people misunderstand the private enterprise system. To me it is essentially a trail-and-error system, a system which permits individual citizens or groups of citizens to follow out their ideas of how to sell to or service certain social needs. The best way I know to provide adequate facilities to the older people is to allow various people to go ahead and provide what they think the older people would like at the price they can best afford to pay.

Ninety-seven percent of the nursing homes for the aged today are private institutions. These institutions are under State regulations, and the regulations are improving as experience with the operation of nursing homes grows. All that is needed now is to give some encouragement to private enterprise to move more effectively into the area of administering to the needs of our aged people. The Federal Government is in a very logical position to do just this through the FHA program.

I am familiar with the testimony of George T. Mustin, the head of the American Nursing Home Association, before your committee on May 14, 1958. I want to endorse what he has said wholeheartedly.

I believe that in this area the most can be done for the money to assist our older people, and this can be done right now. The plans, thousands of them, are in existence; all they need is financial implementation. Why we have not extended the FHA program to include private nursing homes before now is hard for me to understand. These are not fly-by-night operations. They all must qualify under State standards. Indeed, the Federal Government through the use of FHA funds can encourage the growth of the State-approved "Nestorian" facilities—I am coining a new term; Netser was the respected older citizen in Homer's "Iliad"—and give impetus to the growth of qualified private facilities for our older citizens.

I urge this committee to give consideration to amending S. 3497, an act to expand the public facility loan program of the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency or whatever proposed legislation would be most appropriate to include proprietary Nestorian facilities that meet adequate State standards.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Abuse of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which appeared in the Washington Post of January 17, 1959:

ABUSE OF FREEDOM

Throwing eggs and spitting at a visitor from abroad, you venture, are not good manners ("Abuse of Freedom," editorial, January 10). Indeed they are not. Tossing temple-de-filers out of the place on their ears is not good manners either, but some people think well of the practice: people who hold certain things to be more important than good manners. Such people tend to be particular about who is treated as a guest of the Nation and who is not.

Would you invite just anyone into your house? A murderer? A rapist? A race agitator? A hard anti-Communist? Presumably a line must be drawn somewhere. Presumably there is a point at which good manners toward perpetrators and symbols of the things we despise implies condonation of the things we despise. Would you have welcomed Adolf Hitler to our shores as a guest of the Nation and have attended a dinner in his honor?

You sneer at these small minorities, these refugees from behind the Iron Curtain. I regard them as the chief defenders, at this moment, of our national honor and our national ideals. You say their conduct has no place whatever in a free society. I say their spirit is the only hope of free societies. You have the cheek to assert that they—they—have not yet learned the meaning of freedom. I throw eggs at you and spit.

BRENT BOZELL.

Time To Check Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Stars and Stripes of September 4, 1958:

TIME TO CHECK AGAIN

This editorial is written to all veterans of United States wars and to the dependents of those veterans.

In our issue of June 26 we addressed an editorial to veterans of World War I primarily and to their dependents. In it we called attention to the attitude of Congress on the aspirations of this group and urged them to consider carefully their choice of Members of Congress when the coming election arrived.

We suggested that they pay particular attention to the voting records of the incumbents and endeavor to ascertain just who were their friends in Congress in both the House and the Senate.

We suggested that despite party predilections they set aside partisanship and send Representatives to Congress who would more understandingly speak for them when the time arose for a vote in both Houses of Congress on the question of benefits for veterans and their dependents.

We went so far as to suggest certain questions that might be asked of candidates in order that the veterans at home might know, in advance, the stand these candidates took on veterans' affairs, and be guided accordingly when it came time to cast their votes on election day.

We also suggested that we would discuss this subject again and believe that now is an excellent occasion to bring the question up in order that veterans may see to it that at voting day men and women will be chosen for the National Legislature who will truly represent them.

Just a few weeks remain before candidates for the 86th Congress will be chosen but in that time we believe that interested veterans can determine whom to vote for in order that their interests may not be lost sight of when the new Congress convenes.

In order that our veteran group may learn as promptly as possible just how each candidate stands we repeat our earlier suggestion that each candidate—those seeking reelection and the newcomers, be asked direct questions as to their stand on this important question and that the inquirer not accept pious lip service but a plain statement of fact in order that the veterans will know how to vote on election day.

We suggest that these inquiries be made now and be continued up until the time the veterans go to the polls in order that this vast potential strength might be definitely informed on the subject and thus know how to cast its vote when the proper time arrives.

On the question of service pensions the direct question should be asked, "Do you believe that men who served their country in time of war and who, in their old age find themselves in need of aid from their country are entitled to a pension in the true tradition of the United States of America?"

In response to such a question the veteran should not be satisfied with any wishy-washy reply or any beating around the bush,

but should insist upon as straightforward an answer as was the question.

Department leaders of the various veterans organizations in each State should know by now just who of the candidates seeking reelection have proven friendly to the veteran cause and can inform their members.

If they do not possess this knowledge we feel sure they can secure it by communicating with the national legislative representatives of the organizations and thus prepare their members with the knowledge to guide them at election time.

All other groups seem to have no qualms in determining those in Congress who are favorable to them or who oppose them and act accordingly.

For this reason veterans should try to find out those who will have the power to vote for or against them in the 2 years beginning next January and see to it that only friends are sent to Washington in order that veterans and their dependents may be assured of a fair break on the subject of veterans legislation.

Every veteran must remember that there are powerful influences in our land who would deny any and all benefits to ex-servicemen.

The one sure way to combat such influences is to send friends of veterans to Congress and the best way to find out your friends is to make certain of their position before the vote is cast.

Federal Employees: Time Off To Enable Them To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to allow 2 hours' time off to Federal employees for the purpose of voting in person. My bill directs the head of each department, agency, or establishment in or under the executive branch of the Federal Government to excuse from duty each employee under his jurisdiction, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave or loss of other employment benefit, for a period of 2 hours for the purpose of voting in person in primary or general election for Federal, State, or local office. Also, additional time may be granted when, in the discretion of the head of the department, it is necessary.

There was much confusion and difficulty in my own congressional district in the past election because of the conflict in the various regulations in effect concerning time allowed employees for voting. Federal employees were allowed only 1 hour, whereas other employees in the State of New York were given 2 hours off. A number of Federal employees got in touch with me and complained that they had difficulty in getting more than the hour off, and in some instances the additional time was denied them, although because of great distances they had to travel to their Federal jobs it was absolutely necessary for them to have the additional time requested. I presume this same situation must have prevailed in other areas as well.

Rather than leave the question of necessary voting time to the discretion of the heads of the Federal departments, provision for sufficient voting time should be made by law. In my opinion, at least 2 hours' time off should be granted Federal employees, to prevent any inability to exercise their franchise; this is only reasonable if our Federal employees are to be spared hardship. Surely they should be permitted to enjoy their privilege of voting, a right guaranteed them, without being penalized by the Federal Government, their employer.

Decade Brought Jersey's Biggest Boom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include the following article, "Decade Brought Jersey's Biggest Boom," by Mr. Richard O. Shafer, which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger, January 18, 1959:

DECADE BROUGHT JERSEY'S BIGGEST BOOM
(By Richard O. Shafer)

New Jersey had the greatest boom in its history during the last 10 years.

Everything that indicates a growing, healthy economy went up, up, up—population, employment, manufacturing, sales, buying income, farm production, bank deposits, housing, motor vehicle registrations, schools.

And all indications are that the next 10 years will equal or exceed the phenomenal rate of growth of the last decade.

In fact, economic forecasters predict that by 1969 there will be a 100-mile strip city the length of New Jersey between New York and Philadelphia, teeming with industry, business, and homes. Such a strip city actually is well under way.

The greatest factor in New Jersey's past and present growth is its location between those two cities, the Nation's first and fourth largest. It is at the center of distribution for nearly all consumer goods for the Atlantic seaboard and overseas market. It is in the highest density of development in the Middle and North Atlantic States.

It is one of the most heavily industrialized of the 49 States. While only 45th in area, it ranks 6th in industrial activity, measured in total value added by manufacture, according to New Jersey Business Review magazine.

It is first among all the States in production of chemicals and plays a leading part in the manufacture of petroleum products, rubber goods, electrical machinery, foods, textiles, and ceramics.

The economic growth of New Jersey has produced a living standard for its citizens that is one of the highest in the Nation, according to a recent survey.

INCOMES UP 43.4 PERCENT

For example, the average net buying income per family in the Garden State rose 43.4 percent in the last 10 years—from $4,961 in 1948 to $7,115 in 1958.

Thanks mostly to ever increasing job opportunities, the population rose at the rate of 100,000 a year, a total increase of 16 percent during the decade, and now is 5¾ million.

Latest available figures show total employment in New Jersey is 2,258,050, a jump of 13.6 percent, with 850,000 employed in manufacturing.

The State Chamber of Commerce reports 8,383 new manufacturing plants located in New Jersey between 1948 and the end of 1957, the latest year for which figures are available, and that factory payrolls jumped from $2,214,159,000 in 1947 to more than $4 billion in 1957. The total net buying income for the State rose more than 100 percent.

RETAIL SALES SOAR

During the 1947–57 decade, retail sales in the State increased 76.1 percent from $4,034,374,000 in 1947 to $7,104,475,000 in 1957, and bank deposits 53.1 percent from $4,879,073,000 to $7,468,101,000.

Motor vehicle registrations, which numbered 1,252,000 in 1947, today are well over 2 million.

The purchasing value of the dollar in New Jersey, based on a 100-cent value in 1939, dropped from 53.7 cents in 1948 to 46.9 cents in 1958.

In the last 10 years, New Jersey municipalities have made stupendous and costly efforts to keep pace with the growing population and school enrollment. The number of public school children in the State jumped from 616,000 in 1948 to 971,000 last year.

MILLIONS FOR SCHOOLS

To meet this increase, $630 million was spent on new school construction, raising the total number of classrooms from 25,950 to 33,700 and the number of teachers from 26,121 to 41,500. Today, 62 more new public schools are under construction or authorized costing another $57 million.

Teachers' salaries have risen along with other education costs. The minimum salary has gone from $2,000 in 1948 to $3,600 in 1958; the average salary for teachers from $3,263 to $5,530; the highest salary from $5,600 to $8,000, which now is earned by 351 teachers. These statistics were furnished by the State education department.

In the decade just ended, the total cost of public education jumped from $126,970,457 to $339 million.

In housing, despite herculean efforts, private builders and public agencies have been unable to keep pace with the population growth. It is estimated New Jersey will need 333,000 more dwelling units by 1968, to augment the 491,000 built in the last 10 years. The population growth for the next decade is estimated at 750,000 persons, or 250,000 families.

NORTH OF RARITAN

New Jersey's greatest growth in the last 10 years has been north of the Raritan River, but experts say the same factors that promoted that growth are at work in the southern sections of the State today.

Opening of the George Washington Bridge was one of the main factors for development of Bergen County and adjacent sections.

Today, south Jersey is benefiting from such projects as the Walt Whitman Bridge linking Camden and Philadelphia, the New Jersey Turnpike and Garden State Parkway and the Delaware Memorial Bridge.

The turnpike and the Walt Whitman Bridge place Philadelphia today in the same position as the George Washington Bridge placed New York City.

SOUTH JERSEY BOOM

One industrial expert says the pressures of growth from the Philadelphia area are causing it to spill over in such volume as to spell the same kind of boom for south Jersey as north Jersey experienced in the last decade.

This same expert cites New Jersey's tremendous inherent qualities of being a good place to live as certain to stimulate continued growth of the State.

Its easy accessibility to seashore and mountains and the cultural centers of New

York and Philadelphia attract many new residents, he points out.

"An industrialist who moved to New Jersey recently told me he was amazed at his ability to get anywhere in the State within 2 hours," he said.

HIGH FARM INCOME

In agriculture, New Jersey has maintained its rank as No. 1 among the States for cash receipts per acre—$197. Connecticut is second, $145, while such large agricultural States as California and New York are 6th and 12th respectively—$74 and $55.

U.S. census figures show New Jersey has 22,686 farms averaging 73.4 acres each.

Like all other phases of our economy, agriculture has undergone drastic changes during the past decade, said the State agriculture department.

These changes include increased mechanization due to greater use of electricity as a means of meeting higher labor costs, increased output and yield per plant as well as per acre, introduction of chemical weed control, vastly better control of animal diseases, and larger flocks of poultry and herds of cattle.

Fewer farms with less help are maintaining production levels despite the encroachment of residential and industrial developments into rural areas.

The department believes agriculture will survive in New Jersey despite the onward march of industry—total value of production on the State's farms rose from $320,079,000 in 1948 to $343,062,000 in 1957.

New Jersey agriculture is geared to the production of eggs, milk, vegetables, poultry, fruits, hay, grain, and berries, for nearby urban, industrial, and commercial centers.

Consequently, it is dependent on prevailing industrial activity and payrolls. Prosperity or depression on the farm is determined by business trends.

Could It Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, we have always heard that truth will out. On Wednesday, January 7, 1959, there appeared a very pertinent editorial in the Richmond Times-Dispatch, an outstanding newspaper published in Richmond, Va. The editorial comments very briefly but cogently upon the news item stating that Mr. Chief Justice Warren has dropped his membership in the American Bar Association. The question is raised that perhaps the Chief Justice now realizes that he is not a lawyer. The editorial is as follows:

COULD IT BE?

Chief Justice Earl Warren has dropped his membership in the American Bar Association, according to word received by the association's executive director from Justice Warren's office in Washington. No explanation was given.

Could it be that Chief Justice Warren no longer considers himself a lawyer?

The Air Force-Industry Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the remarks of Maj. Gen. Kenneth P. Bergquist, USAF, Commander of the Air Defense Systems Integration Division, Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass., on the occasion of the Seventh Annual Massachusetts Aviation Conference at the Andover Country Club, Andover, Mass., on September 25, 1958:

THE AIR FORCE-INDUSTRY FAMILY

(By Maj. Gen. Kenneth P. Bergquist, Air Defense Systems Integration Division, Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass., at the Seventh Annual Massachusetts Aviation Conference, sponsored by Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce, September 25, 1958)

I appreciate this opportunity of speaking with you on the Air Force-industry family, and hope to convey some of the significant things that are happening with respect to this family association—particularly as regards the defense of this country against enemy air attack.

Never, in the history of military planning and operations has the industrial relationship, and support needed, to successfully achieve military objectives been so pronounced as it is today. This trend will unquestionably continue indefinitely with the military-industrial association becoming an ever closer and interdependent relationship.

This type of relationship also applies to the scientific community, particularly as represented by the research analysis activities conducted under the aegis of educational institutions. Thus most of our equipment problems are tackled by teams of military, scientific, and industrial personnel.

There are great numbers of different military requirements and programs that, in the field of research and development alone, depend on technological and scientific assistance from outside the military.

The areas I refer to utilize weapons systems and supporting systems that are so technically involved they are difficult to describe in normal, everyday terms. However, the amount of time devoted to the research and development of these systems, taking into account the smallest details, becomes a controlling factor when expressed in terms of having an operational weapon in the time period required. The performance of the research and development effort within the military departments alone will not satisfy the requirement. We must depend on the scientific and engineering skills of the scientific community and industry to participate in weapons systems research and development in order to meet stated operational needs. What this really means, is that in current and future concepts for military planning, full consideration must be given to the role industry plays in order to reach the objectives specified in these plans. We, that is, both military and industry, are, in effect, a team, whose efforts are directed toward a common objective best described as "maximum defense, and maintenance of offensive capability so strong as to make any attack by a possible enemy against the United States completely unprofitable."

You have no doubt heard the foregoing remarks expressed in a number of different ways by various individuals both in the military and the industrial environment.

Regardless of what interpretations may have resulted, there is really only one conclusion—we are in an era of great scientific achievement. We, as a nation, are dedicated to the establishment of permanent peace and complete harmony between all nations. We respect the rights of nations to be self-governing and to be completely free of aggression in any form that denies nations their freedom of government and political, social, and economic way of life. As long as there are nations whose policies and objectives are in direct conflict with these basic desires, and whose scientific achievements are exploited for the purpose of furthering their campaign of world domination, we must develop our military forces to counteract this threat to the best of our ability and capability.

I stated that the task of research and development is tremendously involved from a technological standpoint. I also indicated that industrial assistance is needed, but don't let me give the impression that the job ends with the completion of the research and development task. In reality, this is only the beginning.

Of equal importance, if we are to have military forces in being, is the production and procurement of the hardware. We find, in most cases, that the industrial organization performing the research and development job on a particular weapon, or weapon system, is also the production organization. Then, on the other hand, there are also industrial organizations, laboratories, and institutions confined solely to the research and development area and whose findings are used by the production people in the building of weapons and weapon systems.

An example of this is the work performed by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology at their Lincoln Laboratory in the field of research and development of air defense systems. Lincoln Laboratory has played a big role in the development of a semiautomatic system for air defense and continues to do research on this system so that it can be continually improved in keeping with the objective of providing maximum air defense capability.

The production phase of the program is highly important to obtaining our military goals. In general terms, it involves money, time and people. In the Air Force, as an example, we must keep in constant touch with all industries producing our hardware to assure that production schedules are in phase with our implementation plans for equipping our forces. This requires the utmost care in arranging budgets, financial plans, and fund expenditures to make certain that production and procurement is properly supported by the required money. This is primarily the job of the Air Materiel Command located at Dayton, Ohio.

Let me get a little more specific on what the production and procurement programs mean in terms of dollars. Since you gentlemen would be principally interested in how this expenditure affects the New England States and, even more specifically, how it affects Massachusetts, here are some facts. In Boston, the Air Material Command of the Air Force has established the Boston Air Procurement District whose job is to administer certain Air Force contracts with various industries in the New England States.

I would like to point out, however, that these contracts and figures I am about to give you do not include such things as local procurement by individual air bases for supplies and other support needed for daily operations. Also, they do not include Air Force contracts at the Pratt and Whitney plant at Hartford, Conn., which are administered by the Department of the Navy. The contracts I'm referring to are those the Air Force has with New England industry. As of June 30, 1958. the total dollar value of these contracts administered by our Boston office totaled $552,683,000. This total was divided among 97 large contractors and 122 small contractors for a total of 119.

I'm sure you would be interested in how this is further divided among each of the New England States. In Maine, the contract dollar value totals $44,000 involving four small contractors. In Vermont, there are two large and two small contractors with a total dollar value of $1,192,000. Rhode Island has eight large and seven small contractors with a total dollar value of $496,000. In New Hampshire the total amount is $5,259,000 with four large and eight small contractors. Connecticut has 32 large and 34 small contractors with $105,772,000 of the total.

Last, but not least, and of most interest to you is Massachusetts. Here there are 53 large and 67 small contractors with a total value of $439,917,000. This is approximately four times the total amount of all the other New England States combined.

As you can see, the Air Force dependence on New England industry, particularly that located in Massachusetts, is of large proportions. As a matter of fact, over a span of about 5 years, the dollar value of these contracts has increased from $266,636,000 in November of 1953 to the $552,683,000 figure I previously mentioned, or an increase of $286,046,000, which averaged to $57,209,000 per year. It is most indicative of the relationships expressed in my earlier remarks where I referred to the Air Force industry family.

Within all of these programs, relationships, objectives, and work performance is the one underlying task—management. In the Air Force we view the management job as that which holds the key to success. When considering that the funds contained in the Air Force fiscal year 1959 budget total $17,800,000,000, the management within an enterprise of this size must be nothing short of the best. We have made considerable progress toward this objective. Our management program, however, is not confined exclusively to the military structure. Many of the programs of weapons and weapons system development, production, and operation have management techniques which directly involve industry. This, I hope you have gathered, has been implied in some of my previous remarks. But now let me get a little more specific by covering some air defense aspects of the Air Force industry family.

In this connection I would like to discuss the development of the Air Force management approach to the tasks and problems associated with the overall air defense system. The industrial relationship in this endeavor will, I am sure, be self-evident.

Air defense is, within the Air Force and the Department of Defense, perhaps the most technically involved program of all. It is a multibillion-dollar enterprise. The management task involved is a challenge to one's imagination.

So that you may better grasp the scope of the air defense management job let me identify some of its component parts for you. There are long-range search radars and associated gap-filler radars and height-finding radars, subsonic and supersonic manned interceptor aircraft, ground-launched and air-launched air defense missiles, airborne and seaborne radar search equipment to extend our search boundaries, automatic data-processing equipment for assembling and displaying essential information, and for calculating and directing air defenes battle actions, people representing every known skill in the military inventory—bases and installations from which operations must be conducted and supported—a communications network covering the entire Northern Hemisphere and, in some cases, beyond, and the coordination and correlation of all civilian aviation through air traffic control facilities with the air defense mission.

These are the broadest possible expressions of the main components of the air-defense system. The management job involved is concerned with one prime objective—how to get all these things together and make them work.

In recognition of the problem, the Air Force recently established an organization known as the Air Defense Systems Integration Division, which I command. We are located on Hanscom Field at Bedford, Mass., with Lincoln Laboratory as our next door neighbor. Our task is to insure that the overall air defense system is technically compatible. That the implementation of the system and the integration of improvements are properly time phased, and that the system is effective. To do the job we have assigned highly qualified officers and civilian employees from Air Research and Development Command, Air Materiel Command, and Air Defense Command, all working toward the common objective I have just outlined.

This, however, is not enough to get the full job accomplished. The various components, and other related systems requirements are so technically involved that engineering support must be provided from scientific and industrial sources. The Air Force has, for several years, recognized that this situation exists, but, due to the various ramifications of the total management effort required, purposely withheld from making basic decisions until the problem areas could be sufficiently defined and a management course of action developed in line with the total air defense management job. This has now been done. Secretary of the Air Force Douglas recently invited the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to undertake the furnishing of engineering services to my organization. The Air Force Air Defense Systems Integration Division, utilizing professionally qualified personnel and facilities of Lincoln Laboratory.

This arrangement has been accomplished by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and it is now in operation. However, this is only an interim and partial step toward the provision of full engineering support to fully and effectively accomplish the management of systems implementation and integration. The fine talent and capabilities of Lincoln Laboratory must be complemented with other skills and endeavors. It is also interim due to the MIT desire, as an educational institution, to have its Lincoln Laboratory revert to a strictly research activity.

Recognizing the relationship of industry to the air defense system and the extent to which industry participates in the research, development, production, installation, and maintenance of Air Defense Systems, the Air Force has agreed to having MIT sponsor the formation of a separate corporation to be under contract to the Air Force. The purpose of this nonprofit organization is to provide the engineering support required to assist ADSID in solving the intricate and technically involved problems of system compatibility, integration, and effectiveness. The new corporation is called the MITRE Corporation. The chairman of the board of trustees is Mr. H. Rowan Gaither, Jr., who is also chairman of the board of the Ford Foundation. The corporation's president is Mr. C. W. Halligan, formerly head of the military engineering division of Bell Telephone laboratories. The MITRE Corporation is now being organized and a phased program of personnel assignment and project action is being established.

The MITRE Corporation will be the chief engineering agency for all Air Defense Systems problems which require top-level solutions and management control. In this capacity they will coordinate their studies, and in most cases, actually work with industrial organizations participating in air defense matters. This greatly simplifies the mangement procedure and that industry can now look to one primary organization within the military structure on air defense integration matters. Many of you who have dealt with the military will certainly recognize that this procedure is one that will promote better military-industrial relations.

Annuities for Federal Employees Engaged in Hazardous Duties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation in the House of Representatives to increase the amount of annuity for those employees of the Federal Government engaged in hazardous duties, whose annuities were not increased at the time Public Law 854 was passed October 1, 1956. Included in this class of employees are those of the Federal Government such as FBI agents, members of the Bureau of Prisons, Treasury enforcement officers, Customs enforcement agents, U.S. marshals, and employees of the Criminal Investigation Division of the Immigration Service, whose primary duties include the investigation, apprehension or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States, or whose duties involve frequent direct contact with such persons.

In introducing this legislation, I call to the attention of my colleagues that in 1956 when Public Law 854 was enacted into law, the deduction from salaries of all Federal employees was increased from 6 to 6½ percent for payment into the civil service fund. Simultaneously with this increase the annuities of employees of the Federal Government was increased from 2 to 2½ percent. In spite of the fact that the employees performing hazardous duties were obligated to pay an additional one-half of 1 percent into the retirement fund they were unfairly omitted from the law which would increase their benefits the additional one-half of 1 percent.

To compound this inequity further, Public Law 85–157 was passed during the 2d session of the 85th Congress increasing the retirement annuities for employees in hazardous occupations for the District of Columbia. While legislation was introduced in the 85th Congress to rectify this inequity, the bill never saw

the light of day and no action was taken thereupon.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for me to understand why this kind of injustice should be suffered to continue despite the fact that all other employees of the Federal Government are receiving increased retirement annuities. This bill will simply place those in the enumerated hazardous occupations on a par when they retire with those covered in the act cited as the Policemen's and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act of 1957.

I am completely convinced that no Member of Congress will want to oppose this bill and I most respectfully urge my colleagues to give it a full measure of support.

Keep This Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including an editorial, entitled "Keep This Committee," which appeared in the Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., on January 13, 1959.

This editorial, concerning the need for continuing the House Un-American Activities Committee, will be of interest to everyone interested in a free America. I commend it to your reading.

The editorial follows:

KEEP THIS COMMITTEE

Whether it is an enforcement arm, like the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a congressional investigative agency—like the Senate Internal Security Committee—any unit of government that challenges subversive conspiracy makes enemies. The House Committee on Un-American Affairs also is distinguished for the foes it has made, some of whom periodically and constantly for 20 years have been after its scalp.

Its chief antagonists of course, have been the subversives themselves. Martin Dies, of Texas, was the chief target of these when this congressional agency started out, as the Dies committee.

Significantly enough, the loudest critics are the superliberal dupes whose theory apparently is that if Uncle Sam will play ostrich, and stick his head in the ground, internal dangers will just go away.

It is a characteristic oddity of these elements that with the 86th Congress less than a week old—and its work sheet filled with essential business—they leaped to the floor of the House, Monday, to demand that the committee be abolished. It was as if they just couldn't wait; as if, to quote a glib maxim, time was of the essence—for what they declined to say.

That Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT headed this assault is no particular recommendation; nor is his pretext, the glib assertion that in the light of court decisions, the House cannot possibly continue the life of the committee.

Actually it is more than a shade peculiar that he should cite a Supreme Court decision of 1957 as the basis for this conclusion, when the liberal antipathy from which his opposition stems goes back two decades.

Nobody ascribes to the House Committee on Un-American Activities a record of perfection. But it could match for value, and fundamental address to national security, any of the committees that over the years have functioned to that end. It has pulled no punches in sifting and revealing facts; its revelations in case after case have been authenticated.

It has been the target of smear and of frontal assault because of the job it was doing.

It is a needed weapon in the internal security kit. The majority of America knows that and will not willingly consent to its abolishment.

A Portion of a Speech by Abraham Lincoln on "Internal Improvements"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, next month we will be celebrating the 150th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth. At the same time and later in this session the House will be considering many bills for increased Federal spending for a variety of purposes. It is timely therefore to place in the RECORD, a portion of the speech delivered by Mr. Lincoln on "Internal Improvements" on the floor of this House, June 20, 1848. That speech was printed in full on pages 28 to 48 of volume 2 of the "Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln," edited by Nicolay and Hay. The portion I quote is from pages 47 and 48:

I would not borrow money. I am against an overwhelming, crushing system. Suppose that, at each session, Congress shall first determine how much money can, for that year, be spared for improvements; then apportion that sum to the most important objects. So far all is easy; but how shall we determine which are the most important? On this question comes the collision of interests. I shall be slow to acknowledge that your harbor or your river is more important than mine, and vice versa. To clear this difficulty, let us have that same statistical information which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vinton] suggested at the beginning of this session. In that information we shall have a stern, unbending basis of facts—a basis in no wise subject to whim, caprice, or local interest. The prelimited amount of means will save us from doing too much, and the statistics will save us from doing what we do in wrong places. Adopt and adhere to this course, and, it seems to me, the difficulty is cleared.

One of the gentlemen from South Carolina [Mr. Rhett] very much deprecates these statistics. He particularly objects, as I understand him, to counting all the pigs and chickens in the land. I do not perceive much force in the objection. It is true that if everything be enumerated, a portion of such statistics may not be very useful to this object. Such products of the country as are to be consumed where they are produced need no roads or rivers, no means of transportation, and have no very proper connection with this subject. The surplus—that which is produced in one place to be consumed in another; the capacity of each locality for producing a greater surplus; the natural means of transportation, and their susceptibility of improvement; the hindrances, delays, and losses of life and property during transportation, and the causes of each, would be among the most valuable statistics in this connection. From these it would readily appear where a given amount of expenditure would do the most good. These statistics might be equally accessible, as they would be equally useful, to both the Nation and the States. In this way, and by these means, let the Nation take hold of the larger works, and the States the smaller ones; and thus, working in a meeting direction, discreetly, but steadily and firmly, what is made unequal in one place may be equalized in another extravagance avoided, and the whole country put on that career of prosperity which shall correspond with its extent of territory, its natural resources, and the intelligence and the enterprise of its people.

Net Farm Income Has Lost Its Stretch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the February issue of the Missouri Farmer features an illuminating discussion of inflation and its effect on our farm families.

Under unanimous consent, I include herein this article, as follows:

The "old grey mare ain't what she used to be," and neither is the Yankee dollar. It has just as much silver in it and the same inscription, but when it comes to trading it for things, it just doesn't stretch as far.

Folks in this country have had to learn to live with inflation—to make adjustments here and there. It's been our national policy to help those with fixed incomes. Special tax deductions for those over 65, fast depreciation for big business, capital gains provisions for investors, increases in social security, and so on, tend to soften the brunt of a shrinking-dollar economy.

Farmers have been hit hard by inflation. They are of course entitled to many of the income tax deductions listed above, but the catch is that farmers' incomes are such that they are not often subject to the income tax. One out of five farm families had a net income in 1957 of less than $1,000. Three out of 5 farm businesses had a total income of from $1,000 to $5,000.

On the other hand, inflation catches farmers square on the chin every time they purchase a production tool or meet a living expense. When you brush aside all the financial statistics and take a close look at the economic position of the Nation's farm-production plant it is certainly not reassuring. * * *

Farm income reached a peak of $17.8 billion in 1948, fell sharply to $12.9 in 1949, topped out again at $16.3 in 1951, and then began the steady decline to the 1957 level of $11.6 billion.

But there is more to it than that—inflation has further eroded the dollar's value, until in 1957 a total net farm income of $11.6 billion would buy no more of the things farmers use than would the $4.5 to $5 billion income they received in the late thirties. Note the accompanying table. Even in the hard-time thirties there were 2 years—1935 and 1937—when agriculture had a greater purchasing power than in 1957.

It's true, of course, that this income must go for both family living expenses and for farm improvement and upkeep, and there are fewer families in agriculture today than in the earlier part of this period.

But, on the other hand, there is a much greater investment in land, machinery, and supplies to maintain and replace. Farmers now have invested $177 billion in these items. (Much of this figure is an inflated value. USDA estimates, for instance, that farmers have 6 percent more invested in real estate than last year—but it has also been reported by USDA that farmland prices over the past year increased on an average of 6 percent.) Local taxes are assessed accordingly, and replacement costs continue to increase.

U.S. farmers total net income for years 1935 to 1957 and purchasing power in terms of 1947–49 dollars

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Total net income	Purchasing power [1]
1935	5.3	10.6
1936	4.3	8.6
1937	6.0	11.5
1938	4.4	8.8
1939	4.5	9.2
1940	4.6	9.2
1941	6.6	12.5
1942	9.9	16.2
1943	11.8	17.3
1944	11.8	16.2
1945	12.4	16.3
1946	15.2	18.3
1947	15.5	16.1
1948	17.8	17.1
1949	12.9	12.9
1950	14.0	13.6
1951	16.3	14.4
1952	15.3	13.3
1953	13.3	11.9
1954	12.7	11.2
1955	11.8	10.5
1956	11.6	10.2
1957	11.6	9.8

[1] Calculations based on index of prices paid by farmers, all items, 1947–49 equals 100.

Remarks of the Chief Justice of Pennsylvania on Resolution of the Committee on Federal-State Relationships as Affected by Judicial Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last August, the Conference of State Chief Justices adopted a resolution, introduced by the Committee on Federal-State Relationships as Affected by Judicial Decisions. The report of the majority of chief justices has already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The distinguished chief justice of Pennsylvania, the Honorable Charles Alvin Jones, one of the great judges in the country, in my opinion, made at that time a forceful and convincing statement in opposition to the majority opinion. I ask unanimous consent that the views of this distinguished Pennsylvania jurist be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF CHIEF JUSTICE CHARLES ALVIN JONES, OF PENNSYLVANIA, ON THE RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIPS AS AFFECTED BY JUDICIAL DECISIONS AT THE CONFERENCE OF CHIEF JUSTICES IN PASADENA, CALIF., AUGUST 23, 1958

Mr. Chairman and members of the Conference of State Chief Justices, for this intrusion upon your time to speak in opposition to the pending resolution, I shall neither apologize nor palliate. The matter is of such transcendent importance constituting, as it does, an unwarranted attack on the constitutional structure of our Federal Union of such shocking portent in the circumstances as to warrant the fullest and freest discussion before definite action with respect thereto is taken by this body.

My only embarrassment in speaking, as I shall on this occasion, stems from the pleasant social relations I have heretofore enjoyed with the members of the committee, as well as other of the conference, which relationships I trust may continue to endure unimpaired. But, however that may be, a stern duty confronts me which requires me to do all that I can within my limited capacity to help bring about, if possible,, the defeat of the resolution now before us.

The committee report, which the resolution approves, concludes that the overall tendency of decisions of the Supreme Court in more recent years has been to press the extension of Federal power; that, to an extent, the Supreme Court has assumed the function of policymaking; that, too often, the Supreme Court has tended to adopt the role of policymaker without proper judicial restraint, particularly in respect of the extent and extension of Federal power and the supervision of State action by the Supreme Court by virtue of the 14th amendment; and that the result of all this is that a study of recent decisions of the Supreme Court will raise at least considerable doubt as to the validity of the longtime American boast that we have a government of laws and not of men.

These strictures on the Supreme Court are entirely uncalled for and certainly are not justified on the basis of the decisions, which the report cites for criticism, such as *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson* (350 U.S. 497), designated by the report as an example of "the wide sweep now given to the doctrine of preemption"; or *Schware* v. *Board of Bar Examiners of New Mexico* (353 U.S. 232); *Konigsberg* v. *State Bar of California* (353 U.S. 252); *Watkins* v. *U.S.* (354 U.S. 178), and *Sweezy* v. *New Hampshire* (354 U.S. 234). Each of the latter decisions afforded appropriate judicial protection to the rights of the individual involved against hostile State action violative of the 14th amendment. Regardless of one's point of view, none of those cases can, in my opinion, be logically cited as an extension of Federal power or a contraction of States rights. Each was merely a judicial application of a long-ordained Federal power to a new set of circumstances.

Judging from the public prints and the agitation in Congress ever since *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson* was handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States on April 2, 1956, it has been evident that the doctrine of Federal preemption, as applied in that case, was being made the special bête noir of the bitter critics of the present-day work of our Supreme Court. As it happened to fall to my lot to write the majority opinion in the Nelson case for the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, whose judgment, incidentally, was affirmed and not reversed, I beg your indulgence while I endeavor to demonstrate that the ruling in the Nelson case was in no sense "a wide sweep of the doctrine of preemption" or any extension whatsoever of Federal power. It was but the enforcement of a power inherent in our Federal Government ever since the adoption of the Constitution in 1787, namely, the right to protect itself most efficiently and effectively against all enemies, foreign or domestic.

The curt observation with which the committee report dismisses and implicitly condemns the Nelson decision derives from a monograph by a law professor whose services, as the report indicates, were specifically enlisted by the committee for the purposes of its work. While the monographer, himself, devoted 14 of his total 28 pages of writing to treatment of the Nelson case, the committee report disposes of that decision, as the primarily designated object of its criticism, in one brief paragraph with the palpable and irrelevant nonsequitur that the fact that the Supreme Court's decision was an affirmance of the State court "emphasizes rather than detracts from the wide sweep now given to the doctrine of preemption."

And, while we are considering State complaints of Supreme Court decisions, fairness compels it to be recognized that in the Nelson case the Supreme Court of the United States did not ascribe to the Federal Government any greater power than what Pennsylvania's highest court had considerately conceded to be the Federal Government's. But, before getting into the established constitutional principle, which the Pennsylvania Supreme Court deemed to be decisive of Nelson's appeal, let me make the following plain beyond misunderstanding.

The ruling in the Nelson case will not impede or interfere with the detection, prosecution or conviction of a single Communist or other subversive who advocates the overthrow of our Government by force and violence, and no one can authentically assert to the contrary. What the Nelson decision did was to recognize in the Federal Government the unrestricted right to control its defense against internal subversion, unhampered by meddlesome or officious interference from any subordinate sovereignties or political subdivisions. At the same time, the Nelson decision does not deny to the States the right to condemn sedition against themselves. But, of course, it is fanciful to contemplate sedition against a State which is not at once sedition against the Federal Government, whose constitutionally imposed duty it is to guarantee the maintenance of a republican form of government in each of the several States.

Any information as to possible offenders against the Federal Sedition Act which a State obtains can, and should be, promptly transmitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. And, if sedition cases should, perchance, become numerous, Congress can constitutionally confer concurrent jurisdiction on State courts to try such cases in relief of Federal court administration. But—and this is basically essential—information against alleged seditious offenders must be made under the Federal statute and the prosecution of indictments therefor conducted at the direction and under the supervision of the Department of Justice.

In Nelson's appeal to our court, he contended that the Pennsylvania Sedition Act of 1939, under which he had been convicted of conspiracy with others to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence, had been superseded by the Smith Act of 1940. We accredited the contention on the authority of the Supreme Court's decision some 13 years earlier in *Hines* v. *Davidowitz* (312 U.S. 52). In that case the Supreme Court had held that the Pennsylvania Alien Registration Act of 1939 had been superseded by the alien registration provisions of title III of the same Smith Act of 1940. The Nelson case cannot rationally be distinguished on constitutional principle from *Hines* v. *Davidowitz;* and no one, so far as I am aware, ever objected to the decision in the Hines case. The difference

between the two cases which the monograph advances is a factual immateriality which does not point a legal distinction.

Four of the five members of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court who sat for the argument of the Nelson appeal accordingly held that the Smith Act of 1940 superseded the Pennsylvania Sedition Act of 1939. That the opinion of the court was fully concurred in by all the members of the majority was not left to inference. Chief Justice Stern, joined by Justice Allen M. Stearne and Justice Chidsey, filed the following succinct and cogent joinder: "We concur in the foregoing opinion [for the court] in its entirety. Sedition against the United States is not a local offense. It is a crime against the Nation. As such, it should be prosecuted and punished in the Federal courts, where this defendant has been prosecuted and convicted and is now under sentence. It is not only important but vital that such prosecutions should be exclusively within the control of the Federal Government, and we are of the opinion that this is required in order to harmonize the respective constitutional powers of the Nation and the several States."

Responsible Pennsylvania newspapers of wide circulation understood and approved the Supreme Court's affirmance of the State court's Nelson decision. A Washington correspondent of the Philadelphia Inquirer in a special article of April 15, 1956, wrote, "In the Steve Nelson case, the court ruled the protection of the Nation against sedition is a Federal, not a State, responsibility, and that, therefore, the State antisedition laws are unconstitutional [i.e., superseded]. This decision does not mean that the States can't help the Federal Government guard against subversion. It does mean that the responsibility for investigation belongs to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the responsibility for prosecution belongs to the Department of Justice."

The Pittsburgh Post Gazette of April 3, 1956, editorialized that "* * * the Federal Government, having entered the field of sedition control, has preemptory interest in that field and is the agency to prosecute therein. This view is endorsed by the U.S. High Court, which says further that 'a State sedition statute is superseded regardless of whether it purports to supplement the Federal law.' Commonsense as well as law argues thus. The control of sedition is tricky business; it calls for timing, tact, and central direction. The intrusion of State governments in this field could impede the work of Federal agents, confuse the issues, and even discredit laws against sedition."

The New York Times in an editorial of April 16, 1956, entitled "Three Decisions," said: "In the second of this series of decisions, the Nelson case, the court spelled out its view that the area of national security belongs primarily to the Federal Government rather than to the States. * * * The decision, which seems to us to be a simple matter of commonsense, puts the responsibility for internal security where it belongs, and in fact the only place where it can be effectively exercised, with the Federal Government."

Thus far, I have endeavored to prove to those of you who would vote for the pending resolution, in the belief that the Supreme Court was guilty of an unconstitutional extension of Federal power in its decision in the Nelson case, would do so on a fallacious assumption and give aid and comfort to those who are striving in Congress and out of it to curtail the powers of the Supreme Court to interpret, expound and apply the Constitution.

On August 8 last, the New York Times said editorially, "The consistently liberal decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the general area of civil liberties have produced a reaction in Congress which may have been inevitable but can and should be thwarted. The reaction has taken the form of several bills designed in one way or another to override or to turn back the rulings at which they are aimed. The worst of these bills to have passed the House is the one that would wreck the historic doctrine of Federal preemption by providing that no Federal law could supersede a State law on the same subject unless Congress specifically so stated or unless the two were absolutely irreconcilable." And then, speaking with special reference to H.R. 3, the editorial continued, "This bill grew out of the decision in the Nelson case in 1956, in which the Supreme Court agreed with the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in invalidating a State statute aimed at sedition against the Federal Government, on the sensible grounds that Congress had already preempted the field by the Smith Act of 1940."

Whence, then, comes the impetus behind the movement to obviate by congressional action the effect of the ruling in the Nelson case? Is it possible that that decision is the whipping boy (to employ a somewhat mixed metaphor) of those who would flay the doctrine of Federal preemption to extinction? Let us stop beating around the bush about this thing. Let us come out in the open and acknowledge the decision which is the real basis for the current widespread criticism of the Supreme Court. Only in that way can we deal fairly and above board with the recent civil liberties decisions of the Supreme Court which share the report's criticism. The preponderant backing of the attack on the decision in the Nelson case is made up of those who would undo the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* (347 U.S. 483). That statement finds confirmation, as lately as night before last, in the vote in the Senate on the motion to recommit H.R. 3, which was admittedly introduced in an effort to nullify the doctrine of Federal preemption as applied in the Nelson case.

It is true that nowhere in the report is the public school segregation decision mentioned. According to reliable newspaper account of the introduction of the resolution and the report whereon it is based, "It was explained that Committee members felt that to inject this into the study would stir sectional feelings and defeat the overall purpose of the study." I readily and wholeheartedly concede the good faith of the Committee's desire and intent in such regard, but the fact remains that no matter how meticulously reference to the school segregation case is avoided, it must be recognized that the principal cause of the present-day criticism of the Supreme Court is that decision. And, thus, the Committee report, quite unintentionally but nonetheless actually, exploits a hostility to the Supreme Court bred of a decision (involved in current litigation) which the report does not, and could not properly, discuss.

Of course, the segregation issue has no proper place in determining whether the decision in Pennsylvania *v.* Nelson constituted an extension of Federal power by the Supreme Court in its application of the doctrine of preemption, or whether civil liberties cases above referred to worked a deprivation of States' rights because of the Supreme Court's interpretation of the protection afforded the individual by the 14th amendment against hostile State action. The segregation issue is here nevertheless, inextricably imbedded in the background of the resolution you are asked to adopt. You might as well face that fact.

If prosecution for sedition against the Federal Government were permitted to State courts acting under State statutes (and that is what the pending resolution envisions), confusion amounting to chaos in the hunt for and prosecution of alleged subversives would result to the detriment and peril of the internal security of our citizenry. In such a deplorable situation, I would hold with Judge Learned Hand that "Risk for risk, for myself, I would rather take my chance that some traitors will escape detection than spread abroad a spirit of general suspicion and distrust which accepts rumor and gossip in the place of undismayed and unintimidated inquiry."

Coming, then, to the matter of procedure to be pursued with respect to the pending resolution, it is my opinion that the best thing to do would be to dispose of it without reference to its substance. Consequently, I shall move that the resolution be tabled. If that motion should fail and a vote is taken on the resolution, I desire that I be recorded as having voted against it. Indeed, it seems no more than appropriate that, in a matter of such grave importance, a rollcall vote should be had.

I now move that the resolution be tabled.

A Bill To Amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 To Provide a Special Method of Taxation for Real Estate Investment Trusts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real estate investment trusts. This particular bill was reported favorably during the last session of Congress by our Ways and Means Committee but unfortunately did not pass Congress. This bill provides substantially the same tax treatment for real estate investment trusts as present law provides for regulated investment companies. Real estate trusts are organizations specializing in investments in real estate and real estate mortgages, while the regulated investment companies specialize in investments in stocks and securities. Under present law regulated investment companies which distribute 90 percent or more of their ordinary income are taxed only on their retained earnings. Thus, the distributed earnings of these companies are taxed only to the shareholders. This same type of tax treatment is accorded by this bill to real estate trusts.

Mr. Speaker, the equality of tax treatment between the beneficiaries of real estate trusts and the shareholders of regulated investment companies is desirable since in both cases the methods of investment constitute pooling arrangements whereby small investors can secure advantages normally available only to those with larger resources. These advantages include the spreading of the risk of loss by the greater diversification of investment which can be secured through the pooling arrangements; the opportunity to secure the benefits of expert investment counsel; and the means of collectively financing projects which the investors could not undertake singly.

In addition to providing equality of tax treatment between the trust beneficiaries

and the investment company shareholders, I believe it is also desirable and so did the Ways and Means Committee to remove taxation to the extent possible as a factor in determining the relative size of investments in stocks and securities on the one hand, and real estate equities and mortgages on the other. This is particularly important at the present time because of the countrywide complaints about the shortage of private capital and mortgage money for individual homes, apartment houses, office buildings, factories, and hotels. At the present time the financing of these real estate equities and mortgages is dependent largely on Government-guaranteed money, and investments by special groups, such as insurance companies and pension trusts.

The text of the bill follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subchapter M of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to regulated investment companies) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"PART II—REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS

"Sec. 856. Definition of real estate investment trusts.
"Sec. 857. Taxation of real estate investment trusts and their beneficiaries.
"Sec. 858. Limitations applicable to dividends received from real estate investment trust.
"Sec. 859. Dividends paid by real estate investment trust after close of taxable year.

"SEC. 856. Definition of real estate investment trust.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subtitle, the term 'real estate investment trust' means an unincorporated trust or an unincorporated association—

"(1) which is managed by one or more trustees;

"(2) the beneficial ownership of which is evidenced by transferable shares, or by transferable certificates of beneficial interest;

"(3) which (but for the provisions of this part) would be taxable as a domestic corporation;

"(4) which does not hold any property primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of its trade or business;

"(5) the beneficial ownership of which is held by 100 or more persons, and no 5 individuals own (directly or indirectly) more than 50 percent of such beneficial ownership; and

"(6) which meets the requirements of subsection (b).

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—A trust or association shall not be considered a real estate investment trust for any taxable year unless—

"(1) It files with its return for the taxable year an election to be a real estate investment trust or has made such election for a previous taxable year which began after December 31, 1956.

"(2) At least 90 percent of its gross income is derived from—

"(A) dividends;

"(B) interest;

"(C) rents from real property;

"(D) gain from the sale or other disposition of stock, securities, and real property (including interests in real property and interests in mortgages on real property); and

"(E) abatements and refunds of taxes on real property.

"(3) At least 60 percent of its gross income is derived from—

"(A) rents from real property;

"(B) interest on obligations secured by mortgages on real estate;

"(C) gain from the sale or other disposition of real property (including interests in real property and interests in mortgages on real property);

"(D) dividend or other distributions on, and gain from the sale or other disposition of, transferable shares in (or transferable certificates of beneficial interest in) other real estate trusts or associations; and

"(E) abatements and refunds of taxes on real property.

"(4) The amount by which the gains from the sales and other dispositions of stock or securities held for less than 6 months exceed the losses from such sales or other dispositions is an amount less than 30 percent of its gross income.

"(5) The amount by which the gains from voluntary sales and other voluntary dispositions of real property held for less than 5 years exceed the losses from such sales and dispositions is an amount less than 30 percent of its gross income.

"(c) RENTS FROM REAL PROPERTY DEFINED: For purposes of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (b), the term 'rents from real property' does not include—

"(1) any amount received or accrued with respect to any real property, if the trust or association makes any expenditure which is properly allocable to such real property while rented (or to the rentals from such real property), other than—

"(A) expenditures properly chargeable to capital account;

"(B) expenditures for taxes, interest, or insurance;

"(C) expenditures for the collection of, or the accounting for, income; and

"(D) expenditures properly allocable to the entering into, renewal, or termination of any lease;

"(2) any amount received or accrued with respect to any real property, if the amount to be derived from such property depends in whole or in part on the income or profits derived by any person from such property (except that any amount so received or accrued shall not be excluded from the term 'rents from real property' solely by reason of being based on a fixed percentage or percentages of receipts or sales);

"(3) any amount received or accrued directly or indirectly from any person if the trust or association owns, directly or indirectly—

"(A) in the case of any person which is a corporation, stock of such person possessing 10 percent or more of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote, or 10 percent or more of the total number of shares of all classes of stock of such person; or

"(B) in the case of any person which is not a corporation, an interest of 10 percent or more in the business, assets, or net profits of such person.

For purposes of paragraph (3) of this subsection, the rules prescribed by section 318(a) for determining the ownership of stock shall apply in determining the ownership of stock, business, assets, or net profits of any person. For purposes of the preceding sentence, section 318(a)(2)(C) shall be applied without regard to the 50 percent limitation contained therein.

"SEC. 857. Taxation of real estate investment trusts and their beneficiaries.

"(a) REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS.—The provisions of this part shall not apply to a real estate investment trust for a taxable year unless—

"(1) it distributes to its shareholders or holders of beneficial interests an amount not less than 90 percent of the amount by which the real estate investment trust taxable income for the taxable year exceeds the sum of its net long-term capital gain and net short-term capital gain for such year; and

"(2) the real estate investment trust complies for such year with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate for the purpose of ascertaining the actual ownership of the shares or certificates of beneficial interest of such trust.

"(b) METHOD OF TAXATION OF REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS AND HOLDERS OF SHARES OR CERTIFICATES OF BENEFICIAL INTEREST.—

"(1) IMPOSITION OF NORMAL TAX AND SURTAX ON REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS: There is hereby imposed for each taxable year on the real estate investment trust taxable income of every real estate investment trust a normal tax and surtax computed as provided in section 11, as though the real estate investment trust taxable income were the taxable income referred to in section 11. For purposes of computing the normal tax under section 11, the taxable income and the dividends paid deduction of such real estate investment trust for the taxable year (computed without regard to capital gain dividends) shall be reduced by the deduction provided by section 242 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest).

"(2) REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUST TAXABLE INCOME: For purposes of this part, the term 'real estate investment trust taxable income' means the taxable income of the real estate investment trust, adjusted as follows:

"(A) There shall be excluded the excess, if any, of the net long-term capital gain over the net short-term capital loss.

"(B) The deductions for corporations provided in part VIII (except section 248) in subchapter B (section 241 and following, relating to the deduction for dividends received, etc.) shall not be allowed.

"(C) A deduction shall be allowed for the dividends (other than capital gain dividends) paid during the taxable year computed in accordance with the rules provided in section 562.

"(D) The taxable income shall be computed without regard to section 443 (b) (relating to computation of tax on change of annual accounting period).

"(E) The net operating loss deduction provided in section 172 shall not be allowed.

"(3) CAPITAL GAINS.—

"(A) IMPOSITION OF TAX: There is hereby imposed for each taxable year in the case of every real estate investment trust a tax of 25 percent of the excess, if any, of the net long-term capital gain over the sum of—

"(i) the net short-term capital loss; and

"(ii) the amount of capital gain dividends paid during the taxable year.

For the purposes of this subparagraph, the amount of dividends paid shall be computed under the rules provided in section 562.

"(B) TREATMENT OF CAPITAL GAIN DIVIDENDS BY SHAREHOLDERS: A capital gain dividend shall be treated by the shareholders or holders of beneficial interests as a gain from the sale or exchange of a capital asset held for more than 6 months.

"(C) DEFINITION OF CAPITAL GAIN DIVIDEND: For purposes of this part, a capital gain dividend is any dividend, or part thereof, which is designated by the real estate investment trust as a capital gain dividend in a written notice mailed to its shareholders or holders of beneficial interests at any time before the expiration of 30 days after the close of its taxable year. If the aggregate amount so designated with respect to a taxable year of the trust (including capital gain dividends paid after the close of the taxable year described in section 859) is greater than the excess of the net long-term capital gain over the net short-term capital loss of the taxable year, the portion of each distribution which shall be a capital gain dividend shall be only that proportion of the amount so designated which such

excess of the net long-term capital gain over the net short-term capital loss bears to the aggregate amount so designated.

"(c) EARNINGS AND PROFITS: The earnings and profits of a real estate investment trust for any taxable year (but not its accumulated earnings and profits) shall not be reduced by any amount which is not allowable as a deduction in computing its taxable income for such taxable year.

"SEC. 858. Limitations applicable to dividends received from real estate investment trust.

"(a) CAPITAL GAIN DIVIDEND: For purposes of section 34(a) (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals), section 116 (relating to an exclusion for dividends received by individuals), and section 243 (relating to deductions for dividends received by corporations), a capital gain dividend (as defined in section 857(b)(3)(C) received from a real estate investment trust shall not be considered as a dividend.

"(b) OTHER DIVIDENDS:

"(1) GENERAL RULE: In the case of a dividend received from a real estate investment trust (other than a dividend to which subsection (a) applies)—

"(A) if such real estate investment trust meets the requirements of sections 856 and 857(a) for the taxable year during which it paid such dividend; and

"(B) the aggregate dividends received by such trust during such taxable year are less than 75 percent of its gross income,

then, in computing the credit under section 34(a), the exclusion under section 116, and the deduction under section 243, there shall be taken into account only that portion of the dividend which bears the same ratio to the amount of such dividend as the aggregate dividends received by such trust during such taxable year bear to its gross income for such taxable year.

"(2) NOTICE TO SHAREHOLDERS: A real estate investment trust to which paragraph (1) applies for any taxable year shall, in a written notice to shareholders or holders of beneficial interests mailed not later than 30 days after the close of the taxable year, designate the portion of the dividends paid by the real estate investment trust during such taxable year which may be taken into account under paragraph (1) for purposes of the credit under section 34, the exclusion under section 116, and the deduction under section 243.

"(3) DEFINITIONS: For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) The term 'gross income' does not include gain from the sale or other disposition of stock or securities or of real estate (or interests therein).

"(B) The term 'aggregate dividends received' includes only dividends received from domestic corporations other than dividends described in section 116(b) (relating to dividends excluded from gross income). In determining the amount of any dividend for purposes of this subparagraph, the rules provided in section 116(c) (relating to certain distributions) shall apply.

"SEC. 859. Dividends paid by real estate investment trust after close of taxable year.

"(a) GENERAL RULE: For purposes of this chapter, if a real estate investment trust—

"(1) declares a dividend before the time prescribed by law for the filing of its return for a taxable year (including the period of any extension of time granted for filing such return); and

"(2) distributes the amount of such dividend to shareholders or holders of beneficial interests in the 12-month period following the close of such taxable year and not later than the date of the first regular dividend payment made after such declaration,

the amount so declared and distributed shall, to the extent the trust elects in such return in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his designee, be considered as having been paid during such taxable year, except as provided in subsections (b) and (c).

"(b) RECEIPT BY SHAREHOLDER: Amounts to which subsection (a) applies shall be treated as received by the shareholder or holder of a beneficial interest in the taxable year in which the distribution is made.

"(c) NOTICE TO SHAREHOLDERS: In the case of amounts to which subsection (a) applies, any notice to shareholders or holders of beneficial interests required under this part with respect to such amounts shall be made not later than 30 days after the close of the taxable year in which the distribution is made."

SEC. 2. Subchapter M of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended:

(1) by striking out the heading thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Subchapter M—Regulated Investment Companies and Real Estate Investment Trusts

"Part I. Regulated investment companies.

"Part II. Real estate investment trusts.

"PART I—REGULATED INVESTMENT COMPANIES";

(2) by striking out "this subchapter" in section 852(a) and inserting in lieu thereof "this part"; and

(3) by striking out "A capital gain dividend means" in section 852(b)(3)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof "For purposes of this part, a capital gain dividend is".

SEC. 3. (a) The table of subchapters for chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by inserting "and real estate investment trusts" after "Regulated investment companies".

(b) Section 11(d)(3) of such Code (relating to tax on corporations) is hereby amended by inserting "and real estate investment trusts" after "regulated investment companies".

(c) Section 34(d) of such Code (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) A dividend received from a real estate investment trust shall be subject to the limitations prescribed in section 858."

(d) Section 116(c) of such Code (relating to an exclusion for dividends received by individuals) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) A dividend received from a real estate investment trust shall be subject to the limitations prescribed in section 858."

(e) Section 243(b) of such Code (relating to deduction for dividends received by corporations) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) A dividend received from a real estate investment trust shall be subject to the limitations prescribed in section 858."

(f) Section 318(b) of such Code (relating to constructive ownership of stock) is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (4), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) section 856(c)(3) (relating to definition of real estate investment trusts)."

(g) Section 443(d) of such Code (relating to computation of tax on change of annual accounting period) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) The taxable income of a real estate investment trust, see section 857(b)(2)(D)."

(h) Section 1504(b)(6) of such Code (relating to consolidated returns) is hereby amended by inserting "and real estate investment trusts" after "Regulated investment companies."

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956.

School Legislation in the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I introduced two major education bills on the day Congress convened. I am deeply interested in education and have been since the days when I served on the State university committee of the New Jersey State Assembly—a committee which was concerned with the problems of Rutgers University and other educational matters. In the last Congress I introduced President Eisenhower's own school construction bill, the one he had recommended to the Congress on three separate occasions. This measure had been brought to the floor of the House; it lost by only 5 votes when the President's own party leaders failed to support it. To my mind, however, this was no reason for not continuing to work for it.

One of my bills provides Federal scholarships, which had been recommended by the President. The other bill provides Federal aid for school construction and to raise teachers' salaries. Both are strongly supported by the teaching profession and the leading educational organizations. Federal grants to the States would be on the basis of each State's school-age population and would amount to $25 per child during the first year, $50 the second, $75 the third, and $100 for the fourth and succeeding years. Written into the bill is the assurance that "no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction or the administration of any school or school system." To make sure that the States and local school districts do not slacken their own efforts, the bill provides for a reduction of the grants if a State's educational program is below the national average. The effective date of this reduction provision would be delayed for 3 years to give State legislatures two sessions to work on their programs.

Federal officials have estimated that we are short 140,000 classrooms and 135,000 teachers. It is a shocking thing to realize that only one-half cent of every Federal tax dollar goes to support public schools. This must be compared with the 43 cents out of every local tax dollar and the 31 cents out of every State tax dollar which goes to public education. Our school children must have the support of the one level of government which to date has been resting on its oars where education is concerned—the Fed-

eral Government. It is time that we began putting first things first. A nation which does not put a top priority on education will not remain a first-class power very long. At the present time we have launched a multi-billion-dollar Federal road-building program; we spend $40 billion plus on defense, and several million dollars apiece for our missiles. Our citizens spend hundreds of millions of dollars each year on liquor, tobacco, advertising, automobiles and other luxuries. Our materialistic culture can and it must find funds for education which is essential to our survival as a free nation.

I include here an article from the New York Times and an article from the Washington Sunday Star on the subject of education for the information of my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 21, 1959]

G.O.P. PUSHES AID FOR NEW SCHOOLS—WHITE HOUSE SESSION IS TOLD OF FUND-MATCHING PLANS FOR STATE'S BUILDING

(By Bess Furman)

WASHINGTON, January 20.—The projected administration proposal for a deferred-payment school-construction bill was put before Republican congressional leaders at the White House today.

The existence of a school-construction plan that would not affect the current budget previously had been indicated both by Budget Director Maurice H. Stans and Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Details of the plan became known today. As worked out in Secretary Flemming's department, this grant Federal money on a matching basis with the States for payments on debt services, both interest and amortization.

A time-lag of a year to 18 months would be involved between the time a school board asked for a bond issue and the time the first payment fell due.

At the end of the White House session today, Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, House minority leader, said that no conclusions on school legislation had been reached.

Whatever proposals the Republicans may make will have to meet the competition of a determined drive by liberal Democrats for school construction.

The plan would run on an amortization basis over a period of years.

Its proposed cost would be about the same as that of previous administration proposals on school construction. It might later be expanded to include the building of college classrooms.

LOAN PLANS SUGGESTED

On the subject of college housing, President Eisenhower recommended in his budget message a limited loan guarantee program to bridge the gap between the current limited Federal building program on college campuses and whatever new plan Secretary Flemming might propose.

Such a drive, however, could be blocked by the conservative majority in the House Rules Committee.

Some of the Republican leaders said today that the President would send up a special education message. This presumably would be for the purpose of starting the new school-construction legislation.

The budget message made few new proposals along this line. It urged Congress to approve two proposals that failed last year, one would have required the States to take over all education costs in nongovernmental areas having large Federal installations, and the other would have had the States take over vocational education through a tax-adjustment plan.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 4, 1959]

CONGRESS TO GET NEW SCHOOL BILLS

(By George W. Oakes)

Passage of significant new education legislation by the next Congress is considered more likely because of the liberal Democratic sweep in the November elections.

As projected now, the school aid campaign will focus on passage of bills for school construction and teachers' salaries and something to help improve the college housing situation.

Friends of school legislation are quick to point out that success of such legislation depends to some extent on the ability of the so-called liberal bloc in Congress to break the power of the House Rules Committee, perhaps the greatest hurdle education legislation has faced at the Capitol.

The House has been the traditional foe of education legislation. In 1957 the administration's school construction bill was defeated on the floor by only five votes. In the last session Senator HILL, longtime leader in the Senate for education legislation, let the House take the lead in passing the National Defense Education Act by arguing that the Senate would adopt any program that passed the House.

HOUSE BATTLEGROUND

This year the House may again be the major battleground but the election has radically altered the traditional lineup of opponents to Federal support of education. For example, of the 62 new Democratic Members, it is estimated that 50 are likely to support Federal funds for school construction or teachers' salaries or both.

In fact, high administration officials concede privately that Congress will certainly pass school construction legislation. The enthusiasm of leading Democratic Congressmen who will direct the fight for school construction and teachers' salaries leads them to the conclusion that the real issue may be whether Congress can override a presidential veto.

The administration's current economy-mindedness in education—as in other things—apparently has reached the point that funds to operate several important sections of the National Defense Education Act signed by the President only last September may be entirely omitted in the coming budget.

When Congress adjourned at the end of August it appropriated only enough money to get most of the program started. Specifically, it is reliably reported that there may be no request for funds to put into effect that important section of the law authorizing payments of $70 million a year in matching grants to the States for the purchase of equipment to be used in teaching science, mathematics and foreign languages.

Of the two most serious needs for the Nation's public schools—a rise in teachers' salaries and the building of classrooms and related facilities—Secretary Flemming, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has said that he regards the salary structure as our most serious weakness and believes that the teachers' salary scale should be doubled. The average teacher in the public school system earns about $4,520 a year. This year there are 1,292,000 public school-teachers in our elementary and secondary schools to instruct 34,642,000 students. It is projected that the public school population, which rose 38 percent between 1946 and 1957, will probably increase, due to the continuing extraordinary population rise—another 24.5 percent by 1965.

CLASSROOM SHORTAGE

For the same reason, the classroom shortage is and will remain acute. There is a present need for approximately 132,800 additional classrooms, even on the assumption that 70,500 instruction rooms scheduled to be built this year were in fact completed. In the last 12 months it is estimated that an extensive building program could only have reduced the shortage by 9,500 classrooms.

Probably the most comprehensive proposal that will receive massive backing in the coming session is the Murray-Metcalf bill, to be introduced by the Democratic Senator and Representative from Montana. Since Senator MURRAY is close to the leadership, it is probable that priority will be given to early Senate hearings on his bill. He may attract a large number of cosponsors, including his fellow Montanan, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, the Democratic whip. In the House, the subcommittee of the Education Committee reported favorably a similar proposal during the last session.

The bill, to be known as the School Support Act of 1958, proposes Federal financial grants to the States on the basis of each State's estimated school-age population, to be expended either for public school construction, teachers' salaries in the public schools, or for academic equipment in any proportion the State's education authority may determine.

On the basis of an initial appropriation of $25 per child of school age, the first annual appropriation would cost $1.1 billion. The amounts would increase proportionately during the following 3 years to an annual figure of $4.7 billion, at which rate it would continue. This would mean that the District of Columbia, for example, would receive $3,657,000 in the first year on the basis of 135,000 children in public schools.

THE FEDERAL ROLE

The sponsors state in the bill that there will be no Federal interference in the program of instruction or administration since the Federal Government will merely channel funds to the States which the States will distribute according to their individual requirements.

To provide maximum congressional support, many Democratic proponents of large-scale Federal aid to education, like Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, will withhold separate bills. Also, the National Education Association plans to put the active grassroots support of its 700,000 members throughout the country behind the Murray-Metcalf bill. Postelection inquiries of its national membership reveal that in many election contests, especially in the Midwest, opponents of Federal aid were defeated. For example, Representative GEORGE MCGOVERN, South Dakota Democrat, believes that his 14,000 vote margin was due in considerable part to his ardent backing of increased Federal support to education, a clear-cut issue in his campaign.

Authoritative sources suggest that the administration may recommend a Federal-loan program for school construction, perhaps along the lines of the Hobby plan of 1953. The new proposal might provide that the Federal Government guarantee bonds of local districts that have been unsuccessful in floating their own issues so that they could proceed with building programs already planned. Or the Federal Government might support additional financing for local school districts that have reached the limit of their indebtedness.

For colleges, Congress undoubtedly will hear a renewal of last year's demand for federally financed scholarships. However, it appears now that there may be considerably less support for this program than a year ago.

STUDENT LOAN PROVISION

First of all, the administration will argue that at least a year of operation must elapse before there can be a fair test of the student loan provision of the National Defense Education Act. So far 883 colleges and universities already have indicated their desire to seek the full amount of Federal

funds authorized for this purpose under the law or $47.5 million. Large universities as well as small colleges are anxious to participate. Many institutions are particularly attracted by the "forgiveness" feature which provides that half the college student's loan will be canceled if he enter school teaching full time for 5 years.

Enthusiasm for Federal college scholarships also has waned in academic circles because the colleges and universities have not the facilities to absorb a larger student body. Many programs in recent years have stimulated a rise in the college population—now 3,258,556 or 6.2 percent higher than last year—which is severely taxing college capacity.

Therefore higher education authorities are pushing the Federal college loan program, started in 1950, under which almost $1 billion has been loaned to the colleges and universities for the construction of dormitories, dining facilities, and student unions at a reasonable rate of interest. Since its inception the program has provided essential expansion on 650 college campuses in 46 of the 49 States, plus Hawaii and Puerto Rico, even though it only serves 5 percent of the current college enrollment in the United States.

In the last session the College Housing Loan bill of $200 million to finance the program for the current fiscal year was lost when Congress failed to pass an omnibus housing bill. However, applications for $65 million have been filed since last June 30. The President has said he will request, and Congress will probably approve, the necessary $200 million in the coming session.

The American Council on Education regards such legislation as the most useful support Congress can give now to higher education. In addition the council will again urge passage of a $250 million Federal loan program for the construction of college academic facilities, such as classrooms, libraries, and scientific laboratories.

Garnishment of Salaries of Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States.

Good government is based upon the theory that through the discipline of all members of a society the individual members of society gain rights and freedoms they did not possess before.

Regrettably many Federal employees have looked upon the power to garnish their salaries for a judgment debt as taking away certain rights and freedom they presently possess. Upon analysis, however, just the reverse is true. Because of the lack of discipline in this area Federal employees enjoy poorer credit ratings than do nongovernment employees who are subject to garnishment proceedings.

The reason for this is very apparent. The Federal employees who exercise self-discipline when it comes to paying their bills are paying the load for the license exercised by the small percentage of Federal employees who do not pay their bills. All Federal employees lose certain benefits to make up for the shortcomings of this small group.

The attitude of certain governmental bureaus against garnishment proceedings of Federal employees likewise is based upon a misconception of the true nature of the garnishment discipline. Certain bureau heads are of the opinion that handling garnishment proceedings would add to the work of the Federal agency garnished. They state they prefer to exercise discipline themselves over employees who fail to pay their bills. Most business executives will tell them from experience that the mere existence of the power of garnishment provides the best way for them to exercise voluntary discipline; so true is this that the use of the power of garnishment seldom has to be resorted to.

I am satisfied that an objective review of the time and effort spent by Federal agencies in trying to exercise the necessary discipline over their employees to pay their just bills will reveal that they could use to good advantage the existence of the power of garnishment in bringing their employees into line.

Certainly the power to garnish is much less harsh than the present power to discharge a Federal employee for nonpayment of bills. There needs to be this less harsh and intermediate power of garnishment to have a workable system.

Everyone benefits by the discipline of garnishment as we have learned long since in the nongovernmental sector of our society. The creditors will benefit. The Federal employees will find their credit rating is improved. The Federal administrators will find that the administrative time they have to spend on the failure of their employees to pay their bills will be lessened.

The bill follows:

A bill to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the wages and salaries of all civil officers and employees, including Members of the Congress, the judiciary, and all other elected and appointed officers, of the United States, its instrumentalities and agencies, shall be subject to the remedies of garnishment, execution, and trustee process in the same manner as may be applicable in the case of wages or salaries due from private employers in the State or Territory in which is located the court wherein such remedies are sought, but said right of garnishment, execution, or trustee process shall be limited to and based upon a final judgment only after personal service upon the debtor and the writ, summons, and other process shall be accompanied by a certified copy of such judgment. The writ, summons, or other process shall be served personally or by registered mail upon the officer by or through whom the debtors wages or salaries are paid and the said writ, summons, or other process shall be accompanied, in addition to said certified copy of said judgment, by a statement under oath of the judgment creditor suing out such writ, summons, or other process that he is an original creditor of the debtor in such proceeding and that the judgment upon which such process is sought does not include interest in excess of 6 per centum per annum computed upon the original indebtedness. The said writ, summons, or other process shall likewise be accompanied by the sum of $2.50 if the judgment is $100 or less, and $5 if in excess of that amount, to be paid by the judgment creditor at the time of the service of said writ, summons, or other process to the officers so served for and on account of the United States and to be covered into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. It shall be the duty of the officer so served as herein provided within thirty days from the service thereof, to respond to said writ, summons, or other process by causing to be delivered by registered mail or in person to the party designated, or to the officer specified in said writ, summons, or other process, a certificate stating the amount, if any, of the wages or salary due such officer or employee on date of service thereof, which amount shall be held subject to the further order of the court. Said certificate shall be conclusive evidence of the facts therein stated, but in no event shall a person so served be required to leave his office to testify in any proceeding hereunder: *Provided, however,* That there shall be deducted from said amount to be so certified such deductions from such wages or salary as may by law be authorized to be made. There shall also be deducted from said amount to be so certified, such amount as the debtor may have designated for purchase of war bonds under the plan of the department, agency, or organization in which the debtor is employed. It is provided further that such officer shall not be required to respond to more than one such writ, summons, or other process in any one calendar month in respect to the wages or salary of any debtor and that in the event more than one such writ, summons, or other process is served within such calendar month upon such officer in respect to the same debtor it shall be the duty of such officer to respond to the first of the writs, summons, or other process so served.

SEC. 2. (a) That the earnings, salary, insurance, annuities, or pension or retirement payments, not otherwise exempted, not to exceed $100 each month, of any person residing in such State or Territory, or of any person who earns the major portions of his or her livelihood in such State or Territory, regardless of place of residence, who provides the principal support of a family, for two months next preceding the issuing of any writ or process against him, from any court or officer of and in such State or Territory, shall be exempt from garnishment, execution, or trustee process, upon such writ or process, and the same shall not be seized, levied on, taken, or reached, by writ of garnishment, execution, trustee process, or any other process or proceedings of any court, judge, or other officer of and in such State or Territory: *Provided, however,* That where the husband and wife are living together, the aggregate of the earnings, salaries, insurance, annuities, and pension or retirement payments of the husband and wife shall be the amount which shall be determinative of the exemption of either in cases arising ex contractu.

(b) The earnings, salary, insurance, annuities, or pension or retirement payments, not otherwise exempted, not to exceed $60 each month for two months preceding the date of attachment of all persons residing in such State or Territory, or of persons who earn the major portions of their livelihood in such State or Territory, regardless of place of residence, who do not provide for the support of a family, shall be entitled to like exemption from garnishment, execution, or trustee process.

SEC. 3. The officer served as provided in section 1 shall cause to be delivered and paid over the amount of any wages or salary after deductions as provided in sections 1 and 2 of any such officer or employee afore-

said, in accordance with the order of the court or justice having jurisdiction in such proceeding, and any payment so made shall constitute a complete and valid acquittance of the United States for the amount of the wages or salary of any such officer or employee of the United States so paid.

SEC. 4. That the said right of garnishment, execution, or trustee process shall apply not only to civil officers and employees, including Members of the Congress, the judiciary, and all other elected and appointed officers of the United States, its instrumentalities and agencies, but also to employees of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. That the term "Territory" as used in this act shall include political subdivisions of the United States of America.

SEC. 6. This act shall not affect, curtail, or in anywise limit the right of garnishment against officers or employees of Government owned or controlled corporations as such right now exists.

SEC. 7. This act shall take effect immediately but shall not apply to a final judgment prior to the date of its approval.

Trading Away Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe the following remarks are important at this time:

There have been some questions put to me lately that are hard to answer. Mainly they deal with the question of foreign and mutual aid, reciprocal trades, automation, and unemployment.

Of course, the question of personal, corporate, and business taxes is inseparable from these questions since it is the money that comes in from taxes that makes the wheels go around, in any of our governmental activities.

I visited a local bank lately and the president asked me a question that many of you would probably ask if I had the opportunity to talk to you.

He wanted to know why a local manufacturer was planning a trip to Europe to set up a production facility to produce the goods now produced here at home. He would be able to ship said goods into the United States cheaper and, with the operations of our income tax schedule, he would make more money with less headaches than he could by keeping his factory operating here.

A side line of his conversation was very interesting. This manufacturer said he could also travel to Europe at will and charge it off his income tax because he would be presumably visiting his business operation.

One wonders how far we can carry this kind of operation. How long can we go on taxing our local industries and people to subsidize foreign production and competition.

All of us want to help our neighbors raise their standard of living, but do we raise their standards by financing their productive facilities if the goods produced are sold here instead of over there where the people need it?

We do not need glassware, rubber goods, steel products, clothing, and other consumer goods; they need these things.

We can make all the typewriters, hi-fi's, televisions, refrigerators, cars, glassware, dishes, and so forth, that we need.

However, we cannot undersell them in our markets because our producers have to pay taxes to put them in business.

If nothing else, the import duty ought to take into consideration the taxes assessed against our own products, and give protection against subsidized goods coming into our country.

The argument that our wages are too high does not hold water. Our factories could produce goods for our consumption at a competitive level if we were to eliminate the many hidden taxes, and open, those that are assessable against our consumer goods.

It is reasonable to assume that if the Government gives incentive to foreign competition that our own people will believe it to be proper and patriotic to buy foreign made goods in preference to our own productions.

In the old days most of the imports, competing in the bulk consumer goods markets were inferior to our own. That day has passed. With the advent of automation, any unskilled person can soon learn the duties of mechanized production and with labor and taxes at a minimum, the competition is out and the products are equal or better in quality.

I recently purchased a set of heavy, well patterned, stainless steel tableware consisting of five pieces—two forks, one knife, and two spoons for 69 cents at a chain food store.

Just for comparison, I put it along side an American made set of the same pieces. The imports were heavier, better polished and finished, and cost less than half as much.

This may be good, but I cannot see it. The American producer paid higher wages, including hospitalization, vacations, social security, pension funds, paid holidays, time and a half for overtime, full lunch periods, break periods, clean rest rooms, supervised first aid, donations to local and national charity and worthy causes, Government records, real estate, State, and local taxes.

He was supervised, checked on, and kept books for Government deductions made voluminous reports, and a hundred and one other disturbing, costly items that make up numerous production costs today.

We have these provisions, safeguards, and regulations because we believe them to be necessary for both the economic and the employee welfare of our country.

How much did the Japanese manufacturer have to add on his selling price for these or any other Government mandated expense?

One fears the criticism of the welldoers and therefore one does not talk about these things, but if someone does not soon start paying attention to this situation we will surely be without prosperity and more serious—without allies.

Basically, most of our allies and friends are becoming kept relatives. Kept relatives are not usually your best friends.

One incident I cannot forget is the refusal of Saudi Arabia to allow us to use our own airport and the Israeli ban on flying over Israel with supplies for our Lebanese occupation and our British allies in Jordan.

Kept relations are not always your best friends is again proven by the furor in Cuba and the anti-American sentiments being formed by the rebellious winners. The three main income sources of Cuba are sugar, tobacco, and American tourists. American taxpayers are the mainstay, financially, of Cuba's economic credit.

Out of 89 nations in the world, we have been and are still giving money out of our so-called mutual aid to 72 nations.

Any nation that depends upon mercenary troops for its security will find itself as useless as a ship in drydock; it looks good, but it is not going anyplace.

Our aid to other countries should come out of surplus, not out of deficiency financing.

How long can we keep up going into deficit financing for foreign spending?

I found in Europe and the Caribbean that we are respected about as much as a sheepherder at a western rodeo.

The only reason he was tolerated was because he had the price of admission.

Not all we are doing or have done is wrong, but certainly a closer look at our program is overdue.

We started out in 1948 with the clear-cut assumption that $15 billion would do the complete job on mutual aid. We are spending $89 billion and powerful voices are demanding more.

We have heard a great deal about the European free market area and agreement, and yet a close study of the proposal shows that not one competitive article can be imported into any country without a compensating tariff to protect local productive costs.

It seems to me that if a government puts extra costs by way of regulations, supervisions, or taxation upon the costs of any article the least it can do is to see to it that the same extras are put on competitive goods.

No sane person wants to close our borders; yet no sane person can expect to finance his competition and stay in business.

It is still a competitive world; and, if we want to help others have a better way of life, let's do it without jeopardizing our own standards.

If we have war with Russia, we must win; and, if we then build Russia and its satellites up to the economic well-being we have established for Japan and West Germany, the question might come up as to whether we can afford the victory.

Victory today means rehabilitation, not reparations.

It is a good Christian doctrine and would be excellent if we were all Christians and lived up to the credo of the Prince of Peace.

Time may prove our system and program to be right; however, I am reminded of the story my father told of the man with the mule.

He figured if he cut down on the mule's fodder he could have more profit from the mule's work.

He was down to three straws a day, but the inconsiderate mule died.

Let us hope we can be around when we have built up the whole world and our shelves have nothing to sell but foreign subsidized goods.

In a community such as mine, the pressures are getting worse and if it were not for the props built into our economy by unemployment compensation, social security, pension plans, United Funds et cetera, there would be less light on Main Street and more personal misery per square foot than at any time in our recent history.

Recently, I read of a hardware manufacturer who shut his plant in this country, opened up in Italy and is shipping his ware into the United States and selling through his old channels at a greater profit.

Under our new formula he is a very patriotic man.

One of my old friends from days in the labor movement, now associated with a rubber company, called and told me of the serious threat of foreign-made goods to their particular field.

One of their good customers who has started producing raincoats in Japan has cancelled a sustaining order for 1½ million yards of rubber fabric and is now cutting the throat of his American competitors who have not moved to Japan yet.

A few years ago it was clothespins and toys, now it is getting into the heavy consumer goods field.

The time has come for a select committee to look into the apparently chronic unemployment.

I shall introduce such a resolution if a committee now in existence cannot take this matter under consideration.

Voices Raised in Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Advocate, official publication of the archdiocese of Newark, N.J.:

VOICES RAISED IN PROTEST

You're just an ordinary person, an average citizen with little influence, but you do have an opinion or two. You express them on occasion, but to other ordinary persons, average citizens with no more influence than you have.

You follow the suggested pattern of writing letters to your Congressmen and to the editor of your local paper. Yet get a stock reply from Washington and often wait in vain for your letter to appear in print.

Somehow, in someway, you feel, the ordinary person must have his voice heard, his opinion listened to; otherwise he tends to lose interest after a while. What good does it do to have an opinion, he reasons. Who cares?

Take all this hullabaloo—public demonstrations, big banquets held in honor of the Soviet First Deputy Premier, Anastas I. Mikoyan.' Headlines, feature stories, and press interviews for the "Butcher of Budapest." The leaders in Government, big businessmen, and big bankers laying out the red carpet from coast to coast for this smooth talker from the Kremlin.

But you can't help remembering that this is the man who spawned the famous double-cross of a few years ago. He promised to have the Russian forces withdrawn from Hungary as he endorsed Imre Nagy as the new Premier. All the while the Red Army was being reinforced to crush the Hungarian revolt and plans were being made to have the Communist puppet Kadar take over as Premier.

You want to shout a protest with a voice loud enough to be heard all over the land. But your voice is a small one, and who would listen?

Then you're heartened as two strong voices are raised in protest against honoring Mikoyan. Voices that can be heard.

Turning down an invitation to a dinner honoring the Soviet visitor, Representative WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, said, "The ghosts of too many enslaved, tortured, and murdered human beings will be looking down on the dinner. Private negotiations with tyrants in power in a country are one thing. Conferring of respectability on them and increasing their prestige and power by acceptance into civilized society is quite another."

And the other, the voice of Richard Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, who charged that American business leaders "now singing the praises of Soviet Russia (are) drowning out the cries for help and sympathy of the Hungarian people, upon whom, in effect, the American nation has turned its back * * * the year 1958 will be recorded in the annals of atheistic communism as a year of great progress within the United States."

A voice from the past might well be recalled at this time—that of the late Pius XII. The statesmen, businessmen, and bankers who are falling all over each other to make Mikoyan's visit among us so pleasant, would do well to remember the words of the late Pontiff: "Our paternal heart is deeply moved by the sorrowful events which have befallen the people of Eastern Europe and especially of our beloved Hungary who is now being soaked in blood by a shocking massacre. And not only is our heart moved, but so too are the hearts of all men who cherish the rights of civil society, the dignity of man and the liberty which is due to individuals and nations."

The Most Unique Plan in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Assistant Federal Housing Commissioner Roy F. Cooke:

THE MOST UNIQUE PLAN IN THE WORLD
(By Roy F. Cooke, Assistant Commissioner, Title I)

It is always a pleasure for a Washington Government official to be so pleasantly and generously received.

I find some businessmen outside of Washington are a little skeptical of Government men, but I promise you, I have no forms for you to fill out, at your own expense, nor any inquiries about how you conduct your business.

Instead, I bring you the greetings and warm wishes from Federal Housing Commissioner, Norman P. Mason. We, in Title I, look upon Mr. Mason as "Mr. Housing," because he is the spearhead of our many programs. The FHA home improvement program is only one of a number under his jurisdiction; the others are home mortgage insurance, homes for servicemen, cooperative housing, rental housing, housing for the elderly, military housing, trailer courts, and the urban renewal programs. The outstanding feature about all of these efforts is that none of these programs would be possible without the complete cooperation of private industry in this great free-enterprise system of ours.

On the other hand we are oldtimers in the field of urging better housing for all. The Federal Housing Administration has been tested by time and criticism and this year we are entering our silver anniversary. We have been in business for 25 years, tempus fugit.

My responsibility is FHA Title I. I am here to tell you how FHA Title I—the Government's home improvement loan insurance program—does business, and how you can profit by doing business with Title I. I believe no banker objects to making money, especially when the net proceeds of the loan is insured by the Federal Treasury.

We like to refer to the FHA home improvement program as the "3 R's." These "3 R's" for us in Title I symbolizes three little, but mighty important words: "Remodel, repair, repay."

Wrapped up in these "three little words" is an $8 billion industry—home improvement. This is not a one-shot expenditure of $8 billion, but the yearly outlay by American homeowners to maintain their properties. A great portion of this money to maintain homes comes out of savings or income. On the other hand, at least 20 percent of this home-repair investment must be financed by lenders.

The FHA Title I loan insurance program began in 1934. It was a depression device to stimulate our sagging economy. In those days very few lenders, especially banks and savings and loans, had any experience or interest in installment credit lending.

It developed that it was up to FHA Title I to lay down the broad principles of consumer credit and guarantee loans until lenders gained experience. All this was done to induce lenders to make unsecured loans to homeowners to promote our industrial recovery.

Today I am proud to report that FHA Title I is a going business. We have 12,800 approved Title I lenders engaged in installment credit lending in about every county of the Nation and in every possession. We are self-supporting; paying all of our overhead—salaries, claims, rent, equipment, etc.—and have a sizable reserve for insurance. There are more than 60 new lenders entering the FHA Title I program each month.

Title I pays its own way by charging a one-half of 1 percent insurance premium on each dollar of the net proceeds of the loan. This insurance premium has been reduced three times since 1954 when the rate was lowered from 0.75 to 0.65 percent, in August 1957 to 0.55 percent, and in April 1958 to one-half of 1 percent. But the rate to the borrower has remained the same, $5 discount. This rate gives the lender a good net profit, plus 90 percent insurance on the unpaid balance in event of claim.

During this period of premium reduction, the average loan has increased from $200 to nearly $1,000. These larger loans have re-

sulted in bigger profits to lenders because the initial cost of putting sizable loans on the books is the same as for smaller loans.

At this time, Title I has 1¼ million active loans in its insurance portfolio valued at $1½ billion. New loans are being insured at the rate of about 5,000 per day and the amount insured each month often reaches $100 million. These are all consumer loans.

We consider consumer credit as the most modern advancement in banking and truly one of the greatest creative ideas of this era because it enlarged the buying power of the average man who lacked cash for purchases. Title I is pleased to be one of the outstanding pioneers in this business revolution.

Now what does this huge home improvement market mean to all lenders engaged in our Title I program? Already we have insured 21 million loans valued at more than $11 billion. There are over 50 million homes in this Nation and more than 1 million new ones are being built each year. This presents an inexhaustible market for home improvement loans because people always want improvements—additions, alterations, decorations, air conditioning, etc.—whether a house is 1 or 50 years old. It is well to remember, "A home is only as modern as the last improvement."

Of the 50 million houses I just referred to, it is of interest to analyze them. The most recent survey shows that 66 percent are from 20 to 30 years old and that 45 percent of them were built before 1920; 30 million have not been painted in 10 years; 16 million have no central heating; 9 million no hot water; 9½ million no bath tubs, but still, 23½ million are owner-occupied. What a market. Let your own good business sense and imagination evaluate this tremendous market especially in view of the new technological developments and the young family formations seeking to establish a modern home.

Many modern families—you, and the families of your sons and daughters—have been reared in the use of consumer credit. We know it's the way to buy and obtain possessions which would otherwise be impossible if it were purely a cash transaction. However, a recent Federal Reserve survey showed that 50 percent of all families have no installment credit obligation. Also, it showed that of families with annual incomes from $3,000 to $7,500 per year only 40 percent used consumer credit which leaves a 60 percent market to be developed. The basic function of consumer credit is to aid the purchaser, and in view of these figures there is a lot of pent-up purchasing power available in this country. However, on the other hand, sales promoted by unwise and risky credit use are dangerous to the economy of the Nation.

Often the question is asked, "What rules for granting consumer credit should a good lender use?" The criteria I use, and this is based on experience in both banking and manufacturing, are (1) consumer credit is intended to serve the buyer rather than the producer; (2) consumer credit should be granted on a sound basis to create an asset and not a liability; (3) consumer credit should be sold on a commonsense basis; and (4) consumer credit should be extended in accordance with the accepted code of ethics perfected by industry and the banking profession. Good consumer credit builds character in the borrower; it does not destroy it.

So that FHA title I may keep all fingers on the pulse of its program from a practical operating approach, we have created two advisory committees who meet periodically to give us advice. The members of these committees are appointed by Commissioner Mason.

One advisory committee consists of 25 of the leading consumer credit bankers in the country. These lenders represent each geographical area of the Nation. We are in constant communication with our Lenders Advisory Committee and find its advice from the practical operating point of view most helpful and useful. We have the same regard and admiration for the local title I lenders groups which have been organized in the larger banking communities throughout the Nation.

Our other committee has a membership of men on the president or vice president level representing business, building material manufacturers, retail dealers, the National Better Business Bureau, and a credit rating organization. This group is known as the Industry Advisory Committee. It advises title I on how the program is working for the dealers and consumers.

All in all, we have a balanced program that operates for the benefit of all—the lender, the manufacturer, the dealer, and the homeowner.

To give an indication of how title I is growing, 4 months ago the Federal Reserve reported title I as insuring 63 percent of all home improvement loans; now their figures show we are insuring 71 percent of all loans. The same reports show that title I business has increased $100 million in outstandings compared to $20 million for lenders on their own plan."

The American Bankers Association survey of delinquencies reports "own plan" delinquency at 1.48 percent and title I at 1.37 percent. Our own call report, as of March 31, reveals title I delinquency to be 1.11 percent in 1958 as compared with 1.29 percent in 1957. This low ratio indicates that people have been paying on their title I loans even though there is some unemployment.

To assist lenders in collecting on delinquent accounts, we have begun the use of a communication to delinquent borrowers known as the preclaim letter. This preclaim letter is sent at the request of the lender by the local FHA office to the homeowner advising that his account is overdue and the lender is about to file a claim with the Government for the unpaid balance. The results of this letter have been amazingly successful; 55 percent of all delinquent accounts, where this letter has been used, have been paid in full or made active again. This letter is now in nationwide use and is available to all title I lenders.

Another assistance given approved title I lenders is the policing of unethical dealers and contractors, commonly known as "suede shoe boys" or "dynamiters." After thorough investigation, we have listed over 6,500 such operators who are out to cheat and swindle homeowners by not installing material according to contract or exorbitantly overpricing the job. A disappointed homeowner is not a good payer on a loan. This type of contractor or dealer is put on our precautionary measures list which to all intent and purposes because him from doing title I business because no lender will buy his paper except under certain regulatory conditions.

This precautionary measures list program is most effective because legitimate contractors can serve the homeowner without the shadow of suspicion which a few morally low ones can cast on the 165,000 contractor-dealers participating in the title I program.

To help our contractor-dealers further, we have an educational program underway. Our dealer relations unit and financial representatives, which are spotted throughout the Nation, meet with and address manufacturers' sales meetings, conventions of trade associations, State, and local groups to advise them on the operation of title I.

This program is paying big dividends. It has met with such an enthusiastic reception that the Governors of the States of West Virginia and Vermont have issued Home Improvement Month proclamations urging all citizens of their respective States to remodel and repair their homes.

About the biggest compliment paid the title I program came by way of a visitor from Australia. After sitting in on one of our title I Industry Advisory Committee meetings he spoke: "I have visited all countries of Europe studying housing but this is the first and only country in which I've seen bankers, industry, and Government sit down together and work for the common good of the homeowner.

"It is truly 'the most unique plan in the world,'" he said.

A Good Year—And Its Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal on Friday, January 2.

The thought-provoking editorial calls attention to the good year experienced in 1958 by the livestock farmer. It well points out that the solution to our farm problem lies in affording the farmer freedom and not in the imposition of rigid and penalty-bearing governmental controls.

The editorial follows:

A GOOD YEAR—AND ITS EXAMPLE

Before turning the ledger to a fresh, clean page marked "1959," the livestock farmer pauses for a look at the totals on the page representing his 1958 efforts.

"A good year," he notes with satisfaction. Costs were high, but returns on cattle, sheep, and hogs were higher.

Almost never in his memory has the ratio of feed costs to livestock prices been as favorable for an entire year as in 1958. Seldom has the margin between purchase price and selling price of livestock been as wide. Rarely have the markets been stabilized at such relatively favorable levels during a year. Hardly ever has there been so little red ink in evidence on a year's page.

Seldom, too, he notes, has there been a time when the position of livestock farmers contrasted so sharply with that of grain farmers. Swamped in the heavy seas of record production despite everything the Government did to hold down output, the grain producer eyes cost-price ratios that look anything but good. The comparison of results with livestock and with grain emphasizes once again the frustrating difficulties which lie in wait for him who would substitute artificial control of an industry for the natural control imposed by supply and demand.

Livestockmen, by refusing to be stampeded into submission to Federal aid and control when prices have tumbled in the postwar years of cyclically heavy production, have paved the way for years of really profitable operations like those of 1957–58.

Grain, on the other hand, enmeshed in the web of controls and artificial stimuli designed to guarantee producer prosperity, has struggled along painfully in surplus-influenced markets that never had a chance to show their true colors.

Several times in the last 10 years, when the production of livestock had exceeded demand and forced prices to temporary new

lows, a clamor for Government price supports and production controls arose. But wiser heads staved off the help.

There was financial hardship for all livestock producers while the economic penalty was being paid, but always it resulted in adjustments which brought the market price level back to normal. There is every good reason to suspect that had the livestock industry exchanged its freedom for Government largess, it might today be in exactly the same position as the grain industry.

These thoughts seem particularly appropriate as the farmer begins a new year, inasmuch as experiences of the past seem to offer some reliability as guidance for the future. There are those who scoff at the archaic system of supply and demand, often referring to it in scornful terms as "the law of the jungle." They conveniently overlook the sterling examples which prove the wiseness of reliance on the free enterprise system. And they will be in the forefront of those who will demand of the new 86th Congress, soon to be organized, that new schemes be formulated to guarantee prosperity for the farmer.

During the year just ended, advocates of firm Government control of agriculture took several setbacks at the hands of a Congress convinced that controls were discredited and would never be feasible. Although jolted severely, the diehards have by no means given up. They regrouped their forces and, bolstered by a seeming vote of confidence in the November election, are ready for a fresh onslaught against free enterprise. They are prepared to overwhelm the new Congress with suggestions of panaceas of every sort, including subsidies, quotas based on bushels and pounds instead of acreages, marketing orders two-price plans, and whatnot.

But the weakness that has characterized all such similar schemes in the past will still be there—inability of any man or group of men to devise controls that can supplant and suppress natural economic forces. All will lead to renewed dominance by Government over the farmer and lead eventually to greater socialization of agriculture.

It is argued that all they want is for the farmer to have the same chance that other segments of the American economy have. That is, indeed, a proper goal. The farmer is the No. 1 producer from the standpoint of primary importance. But has he been given any real help toward that goal by Government programs of the past 25 years? Have those programs improved his lot in comparison with others? Or have they merely led him into a straitjacket of regulations that prevented him from realizing his fair share from the abundance he has produced?

A noted farm leader said recently that the way to a healthy, prosperous agriculture is not to make farm income dependent upon congressional appropriations. He declared that 175 million people must eat and wear clothing—they will pay prices that will return a good income to farmers if we produce what they want and keep farmers free to make the changes that are indicated by changing demand.

The need for pliability to permit needed changes is something politicians and farm programs never recognize. In the last 25 years the rigidity imposed by Government programs has caused farmers to produce large quantities of crops for which there was no market. Under the guise of helping, such programs actually slowed farm progress and reduced farm income. They have kept the farmer from adjusting to meet the changes of his market and, instead of giving him a fairer shake, have helped keep him at a disadvantage with other segments of the economy.

One has only to look at the vigorous free economy of livestock production and compare it with those of commodities that have been under Federal (and political) control to see the truth in this statement.

It's time to turn the page in the ledger to "1959." Will we forget the lesson that 1958's page conveys?

Russian Invasion of Hawaii Evident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 19, 1959, I inserted for the information of the Members of the Congress the statement of the Honorable FRANK CHURCH, junior Senator from Idaho. I include for printing in the RECORD a news item from the Washington Star of January 18, 1959, which is most interesting from the point of view of the statement of the able and distinguished junior Senator from the State of Idaho, as well as from the point of view of the psychology of the Russian whose operations in the 1800's bear remarkable resemblance to his undertakings today, the middle of the 20th century.

The Members of the Congress will find the article of interest in relation to the many problems before them.

The article follows:

RUSSIAN INVASION OF HAWAII EVIDENT

WAIMEA, ISLAND OF KAUAI, T.H.—The only evidence of a zany Russian's scheme to seize the Hawaiian Islands for the Czar, a century and a half ago still stands near this sun-drenched town on the south coast of this island.

It is the ruin of one of two Russian forts built in the area by a Dr. Yegor Scheffer, who came to Hawaii ostensibly to retrieve the cargo of sandalwood from the wrecked ship *Bering* belonging to the Russian-Alaskan Co.

Dr. Scheffer turned out to be a sort of "Man Who Came to Dinner" with a Russian accent. At the time, King Kamehameha the Great had unified all of the Hawaiian Islands by conquest except Kauai. There was no love lost between Kamehameha and the Kauai king, Kaumualii.

The latter fell in with the doctor's grandiose scheme to recover the Hawaiian Islands for Russia. This was at a time when several of the great powers were interested in Hawaii. The doctor began purchasing land, building forts, and changing names of Hawaiian villages into Russian. Waimea (red water) became Alexandrovosk and Hanalei (most beautiful) became Yelisabetinsk.

FAST TALKERS

In 1816, King Kaumualii was talked into trying to put his little domain under Russian protection and agreed to try and conquer Kamehameha's domain on the island of Oahu in return for the *Bering* and 200,000 rubles.

This agreement suddenly fell apart at the seams as the Russian trading company repudiated Scheffer and his scheme and King Kamehameha ordered him to move on and to stay away from the major part of the kingdom he ruled. That ended the doctor's dream of conquest. Kauai later was united with the rest of the kingdom, which became a Territory of the United States in 1898.

Today, Waimea basks in the warm Hawaiian sun and the reflected glory of its historic past. Long before the advent of the white men, it was the seat of island government. Capt. James Cook made his first landing in the Hawaiian Islands at Waimea. The final union of Kauai with the Hawaiian kingdom took place there. It was the favored port of the sandalwood traders.

MAGIC PEOPLE

Nearby is visible evidence of the magic of Hawaii's legendary little people, or elves, called Menehunes. Alongside the highway is the Menehune ditch, a watercourse of cut stone blocks reportedly built by the Menehunes in one night to bring water to taro patches.

Some 200 feet of the wall remains intact. Archeologists maintain that the carefully cut stones were not hewn by early Hawaiians, but by a race that preceded them, possibly the Menehunes.

On this south coast of the island there are dozens of interesting and scenic spots which are part of regular tours. These include the Spouting Horn, a geyser in the shoreside rocks that trumpets as it spouts forth water, sands that bark, and the "Grand Canyon of the Pacific" called Waimea Canyon.

The south side of the island is part of a 2-day itinerary on Kauai. The lushly tropical north shore, a favorite location for motion picture companies, provides the second day's tour. There are two resort hotels on Kauai, which is one-half hour by air from Honolulu.

Proposal To Increase Postage Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I disagree most emphatically with President Eisenhower's proposal to increase first-class postal rates to a rumored 5 cents.

As a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I will not go along with another first-class postal rate increase; I think it is unfair to ask the average American, the small taxpayer and small businessman, who are already overburdened with taxes, to assume this additional tax load. This proposal of the President's is another clear indication of his complete subservience to the big business interests.

Take a look at the following statistics showing the differences between first-class mail, which is used by the average American when he writes a letter, and second-class mail, which is used by the big magazine publishers. The figures are for fiscal year 1958:

	First-class mail	*Second-class mail*
Pieces handled	32,218,319,000	7,147,956,000
Total weight	921,402,000	2,695,076,000
Total revenue	$1,092,441,000	$65,622,000

Total income from all classes of mail, $2,314,038,000.

Therefore, of the total income to the Post Office Department in fiscal year 1958—which, incidentally, was before the 4-cent rate went into effect—first-class mail was already producing over 47 percent, while the big business users of second-class mail contributed only a little over 2 percent. Add airmail revenue of

$136,580,000 to first-class mail revenues and you will see that the everyday users of the 4-cent and 7-cent stamps are the ones who are carrying the burden of postal costs, while the postman who delivers your mail has to shoulder the burden of one-third of a pound on an average for each piece of second-class mail, but only one-thirty-second of a pound for each average piece of first-class mail.

I think that President Eisenhower would do well to devote his efforts toward closing the tax loopholes and special concessions to big business in order to get additional revenue for the Federal Government, instead of constantly trying to milk the small individual taxpayer and small businessman.

Reactions to Visit of Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Mikoyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I call attention to the following ably written editorial, entitled "Mikoyan's Tour of the United States and Nikolai Lenin's Prophecies," which appeared in the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., on January 18, 1959:

MIKOYAN'S TOUR OF THE UNITED STATES AND NIKOLAI LENIN'S PROPHECIES

Nikolai Lenin, father of Russian communism, wrote a book around the turn into the 1920's telling Red leaders of that day and days to come how to bring about communism's dream of world conquest.

Lenin specified that weak and backward countries of Europe and Asia could be overcome and held beneath the Red heel by murder purges and military might. But, he wrote, Russia must never enter into a shooting war with the United States for, no matter how bright the prospects of Red victory, Red annihilation would be the result.

Lenin pictured the American people, in effect, as a big fat sow rushing always to the slop trough of greed for easy life, quick wealth, and disregard of national or personal responsibilities. Such a nation, in Lenin's view, should be encouraged to spend itself to death, to psychologically disarm itself through viewing with less and less discernment the dangers to itself from the world Communist movement.

That has been and is the Soviet policy toward the United States—to force this Nation into peacetime spending beyond any previous wartime spending; to thus compel it to maintain peacetime taxation beyond previous wartime taxation; to seem to be constantly crying "Wolf!" in a manner to lull the people into belief that no external danger existed; to create shooting wars or threats of shooting wars involving the United States but with Soviet participation only in cold war.

As Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Mikoyan completes his tour of the United States, he well may be mulling in his mind the possibility of reporting back to Premier Khrushchev that the United States is doing quite well in psychologically disarming itself. Mikoyan may be dead wrong, yet much has happened on his tour to justify serious thoughts along this line.

Mikoyan has been greeted with some eggs and tomatoes and jeering pickets here and there. Mostly they have been from Hungarians who were driven from their native land and their relatives slaughtered by the Kremlin murder crew in which Mikoyan is and has been, since the first days of Stalin, a leading factor. But there has been much to offset those comparatively minor demonstrations.

Mikoyan has been a feted guest of honor at banquets and luncheons in such cities as Detroit, Chicago, San Francisco, and Los Angeles.

His hosts have been some of America's leading industrialists. In California, university students gathered to cheer him. Everywhere, some of the finest people of business, industry, and politics—and often of culture—have formed his audiences and given him applause which seemed to be more than perfunctory.

Quite a few movie stars in Hollywood were described in one press dispatch as virtually "going wild" in the warmth of their greeting to the Soviet second-in-command.

All of this seems to have gone far beyond desire to be courteous to a visitor who is the second highest official in a powerful foreign nation. It has gone beyond the point of mere curiosity of people to look upon a man belonging to a group operating a political dictatorship built on murder or willingness to commit it.

Some press dispatches have described fellow guests of Mikoyan at some of these banquets and luncheons as openly approving Mikoyan's views—meaning, presumably, the views he professionally expresses as he travels. But, there is the seeming inference that these people seem to think—or at least give the impression—that if President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles were not such stupid old fatheads, and if all the American people could understand Mikoyan, the troubles between the Soviet and the United States would end.

Against this welcome for Mikoyan are these facts:

Only 2 years ago Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia had to cancel his planned trip to Washington because of uproar in Congress and in the press over letting a Communist dictator come to this country. Tito has played footsie-wootsie with Moscow even as he played footsie-wootsie with Washington, but he never conducted or ordered mass murder of Hungarians or any other people; he has not instigated wars between nations or persuaded and backed any nation to war against the United States—as the Soviet did with Red China and Korea in the Korean war. He has not attempted to bring new war in the Middle East nor does he conduct a spy system covering the globe.

Yet, Tito was told by the government of this country that he should not come here, while, only 2 years later Mikoyan comes and gets, to a certain degree, an open-arms welcome.

Only 6 months ago Khrushchev made it plain that he would like to come to the United States. But the threats of demonstrations, and the reported warnings by the U.S. Government that it could not be certain of guaranteeing his physical safety, caused cancellation of the planned visit.

Even as Mikoyan walked the streets of Washington, the House Committee on Un-American Activities issued a report on the Russian spy system in this country which a few years ago would have had eight-column headlines all over the nation and indignant outbursts from political leaders of both parties. It has gained virtually no attention anywhere.

Many of the Nation's self-styled liberal newspapers have greeted Mikoyan with editorial warmth, as have many of the press and air commentators.

So far as available press dispatches show, only one man in public life has arisen in blunt protest. He is GOP Representative WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, who refused to attend a wining and dining of Mikoyan by a big American industrialist, publicly stating that he refused because:

"Only harm to our country and to humanity can come from entertaining here men whose hands drip with the blood of millions already dead, still dying, or being crushed in slave camps."

Perhaps America is psychologically disarming itself in a manner to fulfill the Lenin prophecies and to make happy such as Khrushchev. Mikoyan should be greeted with official courtesy, but not as a man decent people should admire.

It Was 1947 and the Pope Spoke of Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include an excellent article written by the distinguished editor of the Nashville Tennessean, the Honorable Coleman A. Harwell, following the death of Pope Pius XII.

Mr. Harwell was 1 of 10 American newspaper editors and writers touring Allied-occupied areas at the time of the audience with the Pope. The memorable experience is indelibly stamped on the mind of Mr. Harwell and he now shares it with everyone. He said of the late Pope Pius XII:

I felt strongly, and still do, that his personality was enough to make him stand out in any place among any group, though he had been unknown and unheralded.

I believe you will want to share Mr. Harwell's experience.

The article follows:

IT WAS 1947 AND THE POPE SPOKE OF FAITH

(By Coleman A. Harwell)

Looking back to 1947, it seems much longer ago than 11 years.

Italy was still on its knees, groping for a place to stand and for light with which to see. Rome was a dark, quiet city.

January of that year was the coldest in modern history. This, added to hunger, created great misery in a land that loves sunshine and laughter.

We were a group of 10 American newspaper editors and writers on an Army-conducted tour of Allied-occupied areas.

There were still many American soldiers on duty there. There were signs of war in the ruins of Cassino and in the lines of white-faced children who gathered around the kitchens of American Army units and held out their cups and plates hopefully for morsels of food.

Even the luxurious surroundings of the Excelsior Hotel on the Via Veneto seemed drab that chill postwar day.

We bundled up in heavy overcoats and mufflers and shivered into the American limousines which were to take us on a notable assignment.

As we followed the staff member of the U.S. Embassy through the chill halls of the Vatican's great museum, up the vast marble

stairway, we continued to experience a sense of unreality.

These were not the scenes of war we had known 3 years before, nor was this the happy land we recalled from any almost forgotten era of the 1920's.

We were ushered from the great hall into a small, simple but beautiful room, in which ancient tapestries hung from the ceiling. There was 1 chair toward the center of the room and 12 or so others in a small circle facing it.

We stood about for a few minutes, chatting quietly.

The huge doors opened and a man walked in. He was simply dressed in white cassock, a cap upon his head. He had the kindest and yet the most penetrating eyes I ever saw.

His presence seemed almost a benediction in itself. His serenity suggested great strength.

I realized then and do now that all I had known about Pope Pius XII was in my mind as much as was my impression of him at the moment. I also realized that what I knew of his spiritual power and his high place in the worldwide Catholic Church came to bear upon that scene. And yet I felt strongly, and still do that his personality was enough to make him stand out in any place among any group, though he had been unknown and unheralded.

He sad down and beckoned to us to do likewise.

He picked up a piece of paper about letter-size, adjusted his plain spectacles, and began to read in English. His voice was thin but very firm. When he came to the bottom of the paper he turned it to the other side and continued to read.

This was surprising to me because I would have thought his every word was put upon paper by a precise secretary. I would have expected it to be on engraved paper, large and impressive. But this paper was plain. At a distance of several feet, it was clear that the typing was not professional.

(It was explained to us later that the Pope writes every message he delivers on his own typewriter whether it be in Italian, French, Spanish or Portuguese.)

Suddenly the war was forgotten. The fact that we had flown in less than a day from bustling Washington to awestruck Rome was unimportant. The scene we were witnessing was as much of the past as it was of the 20th century. The man might have lived a thousand years ago or he might be facing the problems of today. This was the Vatican, the center of a church that encircles the world and spans 20 centuries. Here was the successor to those who had kept Christianity alive through the Dark Ages, one to whom millions look for spiritual guidance.

The message we were hearing suddenly brought me back to reality. I realized that Pope Pius was not speaking of something in the long ago but was dealing with the world today.

He said to us, "Ruthless persecution of man's civil and religious rights has not ceased."

He praised the generosity of the American people who were aiding Europe's war sufferers in the struggle to revive.

"Yet Americans who came to the assistance of the victims who survived the appalling holocaust little thought that the food and clothing which they were so lavishly shipping overseas would be in some countries tagged with a price—the price of adherence to a political party," the Pope read.

"Denial of men's civil and religious rights has not ceased," he continued. "Ruthless persecution of men's conscience has not abated. Nor is it surprising. But it is tragic.

"But one dare not be discouraged. Leaders will not be wanting, they are not wanting, men of sterling character, not self-seeking but genuinely devoted to the physical and social betterment of all classes, who in the light of Christian principles will gladly and effectively recognize that religion and morality are the indispensable supports of political prosperity."

"You have come," he said to us, "desirous of getting first hand knowledge of postwar conditions * * * little is of greater interest to the millions who compose your reading, listening public than to get at the facts."

"Must you tell them that their hope has been shattered against a succeeding tyranny?"

At that time, the cold war was being intensified. We saw evidence of this in several places, such as Austria, where Soviet officers were placing obstacles in our officers' way constantly. The Pope's great concern, of course, was the growing persecution of the church in Communist areas.

He emphasized that there was hope in the world—the hope of Christian faith.

After he completed his message, the Pope chatted affably with each of us, recalled his visit to the United States while he was Vatican secretary of state, and asked that his greetings be conveyed to President Truman and the American cardinals.

One of our group asked if we might have copies of the statement. Yes, he said, he would have copies made available for us as soon as possible.

Then he answered questions and sent messages of affection and blessings to all of America. As he spoke to us I could not let pass unnoticed the appearance beneath his white brocade frock of a warm woolen undershirt, which served to remind me that to him all these ornate surroundings were historic rather than personal, and that he lived the sparse life of a priest dedicated to leadership of a vast following.

These recollections come alive today as the world mourns one of its great religious leaders.

Milwaukee Police Aid Program Solves Department's Recruiting Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Milwaukee, Wis., has developed a sound means of recruiting able young men to serve on its police force. The plan, Milwaukee's smoothly operating police department apprenticeship program for high school graduates, benefits both the force and our city.

The apprentices become familiar with the full scope of the department's activity by serving for a time in its various offices. They are initially trained for and assigned to clerical tasks allowing the city's experienced officers and men to devote full time to their law enforcement assignments. In addition the apprentice program gives the city an exceptionally well trained manpower pool for its police force.

Much of the credit for the program must go to Richard Block, chairman of the fire and police commission in Milwaukee in 1952 when the police aid program was established.

Mr. Block described its inception and development in an outstanding article for the October 1958 issue of Public Personnel Review. May I suggest to my colleagues that the police departments in their own constituencies might find this article an extremely valuable source of ideas.

The article follows:

MILWAUKEE POLICE AIDE PROGRAM A SUCCESS—APPRENTICESHIP PLAN OFFERS HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES CAREER OPPORTUNITIES IN THE POLICE SERVICE

(By Richard Block)

Because of entrance-age requirements in the police service, many well-qualified young men who have indicated an interest in entering law-enforcement work as a career have been forced to take up other employment. Later, when attaining the age necessary for police-entrance examinations, these young men have become entrenched in, and satisfied with, the positions they occupy, and thus have been lost to the police profession. The problem has long been recognized by many police authorities.

In 1952 a group of Milwaukee citizens was called together by myself, then chairman of the fire and police commission, to discuss the problem and to consider a proposal to establish an apprenticeship program within the police department. The committee consisted of John W. Polcyn, then chief of the Milwaukee Police Department; Dr. William Rasche, director of the Milwaukee Vocational and Adult Schools; Judge Robert Hansen, then secretary and chief examiner of the commission; and Robert Garnier, classification examiner of the commission. As the result of this and other meetings, the police aide program was set up as operative in the Milwaukee Police Department, the first of its kind in the United States. With 6 years of valuable experience now behind it, the Milwaukee Police Department has been able to help other police organizations throughout the country in adapting its successful apprenticeship plan.

Originally the number of candidates was limited to 2 boys from each of the 20 high schools in the city of Milwaukee; the principals recommending the boys who were to be considered. These candidates were given an aptitude test and a thorough medical examination, and the 12 highest qualifiers in these examinations were appointed to positions in 1952.

OFFICE SKILLS ARE IMPORTANT

Because of the vast amount of clerical work necessary in a police operation, the police aids are assigned to this function. During the first year of their service they attend school half days at the Milwaukee Vocational School, where they take courses in typewriting, shorthand, business English, office practice, etc. Afternoons they report to their respectively assigned police offices where they perform varied tasks, dependent upon the office involved.

The program provides for a rotation of the police aids, each 6-month period, so that they obtain a broad knowledge of the functions of the various police divisions in which they work. Upon completion of their 1 year of service, and upon obtaining a passing grade in their vocational school courses, they are assigned to full-time duty, again on a rotating basis, office to office and shift to shift.

"Today," observes Chief Howard Johnson, "a young man entering upon a police service career has the opportunity of learning about the detective bureau, traffic, youth aid, identification and records.

"He understands communications because he has worked there; he understands criminal procedures because he has worked in detective clerical; he understand criminal process and court procedures because he has worked for the city attorney preparing warrants and briefs.

"It is the apprentice program in this country that has elevated the American workman

to his position as the best skilled worker in the world. Why not a similar program for young men who might want to become policemen?"

METHOD OF RECRUITMENT CHANGED

Each succeeding year a new group of aids has been recruited and our present authorized strength calls for 48 positions in the department. To further expand the program, a change in the method of recruitment was inaugurated in 1956—the field was thrown open to all Milwaukee high school graduates of the current year on a competitive basis. Also, at this time, the entrance exam was expanded to embrace all the requirements of intelligence tests, medical examinations, physical agility tests, and an oral examination comparable to the entrance examination for all police officers.

This action resulted in a broader selection of candidates, and created increased interest among the young men in our high schools.

BENEFITS

The 1958 Police Aide salary begins at $3,251.16 annually, with increments each 6-month period of the 4-year apprenticeship to a maximum at the fourth year of $4,191.36.

While at work in the offices, the aides wear a regulation Milwauke Police Department uniform shirt and a special badge for police aides with a number designation. In addition, they wear a black four-in-hand tie and blue serge trousers.

They are members of the city employees pension unit and, after completion of one year of service, are entitled to two weeks' vacation. They also participate in the Blue Cross insurance plan and other departmental fringe benefits. They are required to live up to the rules and regulations laid down for employees of the Milwaukee Police Department and are expected to set the proper example in all of their on-duty and off-duty associations.

PROGRAM'S PROGRESS

The original group of police aides completed their 4-year apprenticeship on June 24, 1956, at which time eight of the original group were appointed as regular police patrolmen in the department. In 1957, a second group completed the program and have graduated from the recruit school with other candidates for the police service.

The administrators of the Milwaukee Police Department report that the young policemen who completed the police aide apprenticeship have adjusted remarkably well and are competent officers. It is anticipated that the knowledge they acquired in their work in the rotation plan through the various police offices and bureaus has given them a background of information, that will be of tremendous value to them in their police careers, and that this background will give them many advantages in promotional examinations as they progress in the department. Their knowledge of shorthand and typing is of tremendous value to them as police officers, the quality of their reports and their increased knowledge of the reports' functions will, in time, greatly increase the efficiency of police operations.

During the apprenticeship period the police aides perform a valuable and necessary function in the department. Many clerical positions in the clerk-stenographer and clerk-typist classifications have been eliminated and the work carried on by police aids. Their work in the offices also enables many policemen to return to the field duties for which they were intended.

SOME OF THE PROBLEMS

Some of the problems we have encountered in the police-aide program might be of interest. Probably the largest of these is the matter of military service, in that a large percentage of the young men have been called to serve their 2-year military obligation during the apprenticeship period, and this interruption has handicapped both the department and the individual to some extent.

Another problem that, at the present time, has been largely overcome, was the acceptance of the police aids both by the regular police personnel and our civilian clerical force. As mentioned, the boys have largely overcome this problem by carrying out their assignments satisfactorily and being of great value to the operation of the office to which they are assigned.

FOLLOWTHROUGH

The police training school staff is generally charged with the broad responsibility of overseeing the police aide program. During the first year of service, they are in close liaison with the vocational school instructors and assist in setting up situation examinations, etc., to provide a realistic program. After the first year in the program, all of the aids are called to the training school semiannually and are given typewriting and shorthand tests to insure that they are maintaining a satisfactory performance level. In addition, the rating reports of their immediate supervisory officers are received in the training school and the police aids' progress is carefully noted in this area also.

In a few instances it has been necessary to terminate a police aide for cause. It is necessary from time to time that all persons be reminded that the program must be looked on as a training and development program, and in order to be successful, must have the full cooperation of all supervisory officers of the department in that regard.

The training division carefully watches the tranfers and adjustments of the police aides, as the interest of the candidate sometimes varies with his assignment. In some offices the opportunities and diversified activities are more interesting than others.

It is our belief, in the Milwaukee Police Department, that the police aide program is a valuable asset to our department and that similar programs should be valuable to other law-enforcement agencies. We feel that the program, as operative in Milwaukee, will eventually improve the quality of personnel and will, to an extent, solve a portion of our recruitment problem. As a result of this program, the citizens of our community will have the benefit of better informed and more efficient police officers.

The Late Bernard Austin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the late Assemblyman Bernard Austin, who represented the 4th assembly district of Brooklyn in the State assembly in Albany since 1935, was a very dear and close friend of mine. His assembly district was a part of my congressional district, and we often not only campaigned together but collaborated in helping constituents and the community in general. His passing is a great personal loss to me.

Assemblyman Austin died under very tragic circumstances. His death occurred on January 6, 1959, in the city court of Kings County—Brooklyn—during induction ceremonies for our former colleague, the Honorable Louis B. Heller, who was being sworn in that day as city court justice. Assemblyman Austin had just completed a congratulatory address, when he collapsed and within moments died of a heart attack.

On Monday, January 12, 1959, memorial services were held at the city court for the late Bernard Austin at which Justice Heller presided. I wish to insert into the RECORD the proceedings at these services as published in the New York Law Journal:

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR ASSEMBLYMAN AUSTIN—CITY COURT, KINGS COUNTY, N. Y.

Memorial services were held last Monday in the city court, Kings County, for Assemblyman Bernard Austin, who died of a heart attack the previous Tuesday, a few minutes after having delivered an address at the induction ceremonies for city court Justice Louis B. Heller.

Justice Heller presided at the memorial services. The speakers were Assemblyman Max M. Turshen, domestic relations Justice Nathaniel Kaplan, former Deputy Comptroller Abraham L. Doris, Raymond Reisler, vice president of the Brooklyn Bar Association, and Harold Jacobs, president of the Crown Heights Yeshiva.

The proceedings, in greater part, follow:

"Judge HELLER. It is my sad duty to record a great tragedy which occurred in this building on January 6. While induction ceremonies were being conducted for me that day, as a justice of this court, and within a matter of minutes after he had delivered a beautiful congratulatory address, Assemblyman Bernard Austin died of a heart attack.

"As soon as the veteran assemblyman collapsed, county Judge Nathan R. Sobel, who was chairman of the ceremonies, brought them to a close.

"The sudden and untimely death of Assemblyman Austin, whom we all so fondly called 'Bernie,' took from our community a man greatly believed in and most highly esteemed. For a quarter of a century he had the complete and unswerving confidence of the people of the Fourth Assembly District of Kings County, whom he so ably represented in Albany.

"They came in droves to his funeral to pay their last respects to their trusted and dedicated representative.

"He was a very dear and personal friend of mine for over 20 years. We worked together in the State legislature in 1943 and 1944, when we served on the Commission Against Discrimination, which is credited with laying the ground work for the introduction and passage of the Ives-Quinn law, commonly referred to throughout the country as the F. E. P. C. Bernie, in his remarks at my ceremonies last week, briefly touched upon this law, which was close to his heart.

"And I can bear witness to the magnificent contribution he made in the many deliberations, debates, and conferences the commission conducted. He missed not a single meeting. He put his heart and soul into this labor of love, for he was deeply concerned with the elimination of discrimination in every field of human endeavor, in employment, in housing, in education, and in the realm of public accommodations. Working closely with him on this commission, I could observe that he was a foe of intolerance; that he was intensely human in all his aspects of life. He looked only for the uplifting and the welfare of all the people of the State, without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin.

"Over the years many honors came to him. Bernie wore his honors modestly, without arrogance or ostentation, and humility and kindness marked his course. He can best be described as a true friend, a man of dedicated public service, of gentleness and com-

passion, and of selfless devotion to the welfare of his fellow men. He was a man without cant, without hate. He was a wise man, and a good man, a man of much learning. He had an intense love of God and His law.

"It lifts my spirits to recall today that I was honored to be the last man to shake his hand, and as he looked into my eyes I could sense that deep in his heart Bernie felt that he would rather be a servant in the House of the Lord than sit in the seat of the mighty.

"When this court adjourns today, it will do so out of respect to the memory of Assemblyman Bernard Austin.

"Assemblyman TURSHEN. The State of New York has lost a very distinguished citizen. It was my privilege to know Bernard Austin for upward of 22 years. He was a great patriot. He loved his country with an intensity that was only matched by his love for his fellow man. He was an organizer of the American Legion post of the Williamsburg district.

"He was a follower of that great army that has the utmost faith, and many a time in the intimate walks and talks that I had with Bernard Austin, that faith came to the fore. He was a brilliant Talmudical scholar. He knew every book of the Old Testament by heart. He was extremely well versed in the Hebrew cuture. His wisdom was enormous. But he sought no rewards, and, as the judge has already said, he was a man who sought no ostentation and no publicity and no limelight; but he loved his fellow man with a great intensity.

"He came to this country as a young immigrant. He mastered the language and he was so intense an American that not only did he enlist in the First World War but he was in the frontline and was decorated for bravery; when the war was over, he went back to the frontlines in the fight between Russia and Poland, in order to save human beings. And the experiences of Bernie Austin—and it was almost impossible to get him to talk about them—were something remarkable to hear, how he risked his life time and time again to save a fellow human being.

"The same spirit of valiance and valor and brilliancy for others was manifested in all his work and doings. He was a cosponsor of the Austin-Mahoney bill, which was a bill to prevent discrimination in public accommodations. He was the most ardent sponsor in working for the first State university and first State medical school.

"Bernard Austin was one of the most conscientious and hard-working legislators that Albany ever know. That man stayed up nights and days, long after his fellow legislators had left the capitol, working on legislation and humanitarian work for human beings.

"And you could never get from him a word of self-praise or a word of self-satisfaction. He sought no rewards, except the pure reward of seeing beneficience performed for the human race.

"Yes; his district, and the county of Kings of the State of New York, is greatly impoverished in the loss of this great man, this great citizen, this great legislator. It is not going to be easy to fill that great void. We have lost a dear friend, a great American, and I know that the community, State, and Nation, and the human race, will be poorer for his passing.

"Justice KAPLAN. I join today in this tribute to a departed friend, both as a personal friend and as a justice of the domestic relations court.

"It was my good fortune to know Bernie for many years, as a personal friend—warm, simple, kindly—one who sought no praise, but whose friendship really meant something. And as we go through life, the only assets that we really gain are our friends, and we suffer a real loss when one of them departs. As a personal friend, I have lost someone that I cherished deeply, and as a justice of the domestic relations court, we in the court have lost a true friend of that court.

"Every year Bernie used to come to the judges of the domestic relations court and ask: 'Is there anything that the legislature can do to help your court?' He was deeply interested in the unfortunate youngsters and others who came into that court, and it was for that reason that Bernie always sought to do something by way of legislation to improve the lot of those people.

"Not only we in the court, but many thousands and thousands who appear there, have lost a true friend; and we mark this sad occasion with the consolation that Bernie had lived a useful life.

"Former Deputy Comptroller DORIS. I appear here today not only on behalf of the Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Association of Williamsburg, of which Assemblyman Austin was a director for many years, but as an old friend.

"In 1934, when Assemblyman Austin was elected from his district here in Brooklyn, it was my privilege to have been a deputy comptroller of the State for approximately 7 or 8 years. And, like others in the legislature, Bernie, as I came to know him, used to meet with me for aid of one kind or another; because the State comptroller was, as he still is, the chief fiscal officer of the State, and has always been in a position to help on many occasions. I got to know Bernie very intimately. And very frequently, when I was invited to attend a meeting of the brotherhoods of various congregations in Albany, I would take Bernie by the hand, and he would regale the brotherhoods of these various congregations with the law in the Talmud, with the fine stories in the Perek, the Ethics of the Fathers, in the vernacular.

"It was Assemblyman Bernard Austin who always stole the show in Albany. Yes, he did deserve higher honors, and if he had lived, I have no doubt they would have come. But, as the previous speaker has said, Bernie Austin was a modest man. I think the poet Gray, in his "Elegy in a Country Churchyard" put it very aptly when he said:

" 'The boast of heraldry, the pomp of power,
" 'And all the beauty, all that wealth e'er gave,
" 'Await alike the inevitable hour,
" 'The paths of glory lead but to the grave.'

"We in the YMHA knew Bernie Austin as an indefatigable worker, not only on behalf of our project for the aged, because he was deeply interested in that during his official career, but we can note that during a long span of official life in Albany he was, for approximately 18 years, a member of the important committee on ways and means, which is the committee that initially passes on the approval of the budget of the State of New York.

"Judge Heller has alluded to the fact that he was very active in the committee on discrimination, which ultimately led to the unit known as SCAD. I note, too, that Bernie was a member of the important committee on rent control.

"But beyond that, I think it is even more noteworthy that during the course of approximately a quarter of a century this man served his community, served the State, and served people of all races and creeds.

"He goes to his Maker not only with an excellent record, officially, and as a good citizen, but as he, perhaps, undoubtedly would have liked it, to earn his eternal reward.

"And so I conclude by paraphrasing William Cullen Bryant in that great poem of his entitled "Thanatopsis." I believe that Bernie has lived so that when the summons came to him to join the innumerable caravan that moves to that mysterious realm where each finds his chamber in the silent halls of death, Bernie Austin went, not like the quarry slave scourged at night to his dungeon, but sustained and soothed by an unfaltering trust, he approached his grave like one who wraps the drapery of his couch about him and lies down to pleasant dreams.

"Your Honor, I thank you for this privilege of paying my tribute to Bernie Austin."

"Vice President REISLER: A lawyer of distinction, of ability, of integrity, and with all quiet dignity has passed to his reward, and on behalf of the Brooklyn Bar Association it is my privilege and my wish to join in the sorrowful tribute to him here today, and in an expression of deep sympathy to the members of his family.

"Bernard Austin's sudden passing brought not only a great shock but a very real sense of loss to all who were acquainted with him and, particularly, I think, to the many members of the bench and bar who knew Bernie so long, and so favorably, and so well, not only socially but professionally.

"I have lapsed into referring to this great man as Assemblyman 'Bernie' so quickly because that is indicative of Bernie's character, his genial and warm personality. I think we all thought of him that way.

"Bernie Austin had a vitality of presence, a warm smile and that wonderful character that makes it difficult to realize that this shining light has been extinguished. Indeed, in a very real sense, I think we can say that it burns on, for Bernie has influenced many for the good, as you have heard here this morning, and these will influence others, as a ripple in the water seems never to end.

"It is customary to think that the encomiums and eulogies that are embodied in most services sometimes overstate the point, as in a great drama, for emphasis; but in Bernie Austin's case, it is not true. What we heard here this morning does in reality bear justice to his true merits, his very fine qualities, for Bernie was a distinguished legislator, an able lawyer, a devoted worker in many philanthropic causes, in many communal causes, and a loyal member of the organized bar, and of the Brooklyn Bar Association, of which he was a member for a long, long time.

"I had the privilege of knowing Bernie personally for many years, as a friend, as a fellow lawyer and bar association member, and as a fellow director and officer of the Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Association of Williamsburg. I know in my own heart and in my own knowledge that genial smile, that modesty, that warmth, that fine character, that ever-ready willingness to help all who called upon him; and I know that those many fine qualities that you have heard referred to today will form a memory that will long live in the hearts and mind of Bernie Austin's associates at the bench and the bar.

"May his soul rest in peace.

"HAROLD JACOBS: I speak as a layman not working with Bernie Austin in the field of law work or legislation, but in the field of communal work for all races and creeds, and particularly members of his own faith.

"Those of you who were here last week remember that a somber silence ruled the courtroom last Tuesday. It was a silence of impending doom which enveloped all of us who were gathered here to participate in the induction ceremonies of a distinguished jurist. For, in the midst of the festivities, a fire bolted out from heaven and struck with stunning suddenness one of our most respected and distinguished civic leaders, Bernard Austin, who served his people with distinction for more than a quarter of a century.

"When the sad news finally reached us, everyone was shocked beyond words, for here was a man who had endeared himself in the hearts of all who were privileged to know him. He was blessed with those rare qualities of leadership that commanded the

admiration and affection of the entire New York community. These qualities spring from the richness of his life, the wealth of religious inspiration which he absorbed in his childhood, and which throughout his life constituted the core and bulwark of his unflagging and unswerving loyalty to his God and to his people.

"There is no better way of describing the essence of his short but distinguished life than by referring to that Biblical chapter that was read during the very same week in which Bernie was torn out from our midst. It describes the growth and development of a great leader of men—Moses. Moses grew up and went out among his brethren. The popular concept today of growing up, of becoming big, is one that implies climbing on the ladder of success, from which one looks down with disdain upon his humble origin and beginning, refusing to mix with old friends, trying to avoid his brethren, rather than becoming a part of them. But Moses, we are told, became great because he went to his brethren, not away from them. He saw their sufferings, and what did he do? Did he just preach words of comfort and hope? No—he did something more. He put his shoulders to everyone's load. He ran from one unfortunate to another, and helped to carry his burden, and bear his suffering, and when he saw his fellow men persecuted, hurt, humiliated, he championed his cause and helped to redeem him from his plight. Whoever had a heavy heart and was crushed under a heavy burden knew that he would find a receptive ear, a tender heart and helping hand, in Bernie Austin—a man who was ever ready to put his shoulder to someone's burden.

"In the years of Nazi tyranny, when waves of refugees were seeking a haven from their tormentors, he plunged headlong into this adventure of rescue, disregarding personal convenience—risking popularity and position to save his fellow men.

"Many a man who enjoys today the blessing of liberty and freedom will look back with undying gratitude to Bernie for enabling him to live in the land of the free.

"Here was indeed a man worthy of leadership. He won his following not by preaching of the lips, but by noble deeds. He will be remembered as a leader of his synagogue, as a parton of institutions of learning and charity, and as a singularly effective leader of his party, where his deep and abiding love for his country found a wholesome expression. His constituents, irrespective of color or creed, will long remember him as a leader of men whose services will be enshrined forever.

"May his soul rest in peace."

Confusing Their Enemies Is Main Communist Tactic—Only Clear and Courageous Leadership Is Adequate for Our Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Sign of November 1958:

CONFUSION AND LEADERSHIP

There are two ways to paralyze a man's will to action. One is to throw him into jail. The other is to throw him into confusion. The latter is the more effective way. It is as old as mankind. Jungle tribes used it when they sneaked up on the enemy camp, howled and screamed and beat their drums in order to collapse the enemy's will to resist. Roman statesmen did it with the programs of divide and conquer. Moscow does it today, annually pouring billions of dollars into world propaganda schemes.

Confusing their enemies is the special business of contemporary Communists. They do not use language as a means of communication between intelligent people. They use language as a weapon of deceit, deliberately designed to confuse and divide all who oppose their drive for world conquest. Such books as J. Edgar Hoover's "Masters of Deceit," Louis Budenz' "Techniques of Communism," and recently Lin Yutang's "The Secret Name," describe the inhuman system.

How successful the Soviet strategists have been is, in some measure, attested by the periodic fumbling of NATO in presenting a vigorous united front to Communist arrogance; the uncertainty in the foreign policies of Britain and France; the general scarcity of great statesmen in postwar Europe; the periodic markdown of the United States in many areas of world public opinion.

Communist Party conquests of Russia and China, Russia's conquest of the captive nations of Eastern Europe, were not won from positions of strength. They were won by wresting easy victories from people who were misinformed, divided, and confused. At times, the Communist victories were aided and abetted by the miscalculations and indecisions of the strong Western nations.

America needs a clear and definite voice as she finds herself passing through her gravest hour. It is not merely a political defeat we face. Nor is it merely a matter of a military defeat. It is a question of losing our way of life to an enemy which is ruthless—an enemy that boastfully operates in defiance of law, of morality, of international agreement, of decency, honor, and truth. Annually the Nation sweats to pay up $45 billion of tribute to hold this menace in check. Thousands of American boys are ready and poised to meet this enemy at any point on the globe. Yet too many statesmen are acting like mere politicians—intent on telling the people how wonderful everything is—that business is not merely as good as usual but even better—that they should eat, drink, and be merry for tomorrow social security will take care of them.

The people need great leadership. It is not leadership that sickeningly follows popular whim or artificially cooked up public opinion. It is not leadership to make wild and rosy promises (never to be kept) merely for the sake of votes. Leadership is of sterner stuff.

True leadership knows what to do when some arrogant labor leaders threaten the common welfare of the Nation. True leadership knows what to do when the decisions of the Supreme Court open up gaps in the law, to the aid and comfort of Communist conspirators in our midst; true leadership knows what to do when business executives show no desire to cooperate in holding down inflation; true leadership knows what to do when the national debt keeps mounting dangerously while people are encouraged to live ever more comfortably, charging it up to the future generations. True leadership knows what to do when the moral fiber of a nation is weakening; when crime overruns the land.

America is passing through her most critical hour. Wise leadership and not political cunning; firm leadership and not demagoguery, are the great needs of the hour.

Diplomacy Cannot Remain Static

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, probably never before in our history have the people of this country felt the need of clarity in everything related to our foreign policy. They want a clear explanation and sane comment. In the Christian Science Monitor of January 12, the editor, Mr. Erwin D. Canham, has given a very thoughtful presentation entitled "Diplomacy Cannot Remain Static." Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the editorial, as follows:

DIPLOMACY CANNOT REMAIN STATIC
(By Erwin D. Canham)

What is the Soviet Government up to? On the one hand, it proposes a peace conference and treaty on Germany which might have been drafted—and in important respects probably was—by V. M. Moltov 5 years ago. It is a stiff, unchanging note which would perpetuate the division of Germany and imperil the freedom of Berlin. But the Soviets dispatched a second note today: a proposal that the Geneva Conference on Surprise Attack be resumed although Soviet policy at that Conference had also been unyielding. The American Government agrees the Conference should be resumed. Perhaps its own policy will be more creative on the second time around.

On the other hand, the Soviet Government's No. 2 man, Anastas Mikoyan, continues to sing a song of peace and sweet reasonableness in California, after his journey across the American Continent. In the words of Governor Brown, of California, the first State executive to greet Mikoyan, "he seems to be fighting hard for understanding." Whether this is really what Mikoyan is fighting for may well be doubted. Just how significant is his trip if the Moscow Government remains unyielding on the fundamentals which the West must have to reach agreement?

SALESMAN MIKOYAN

It is very easy to overestimate the job of salesmanship Mikoyan is performing. He is being received politely by the civic groups he addresses. At press conferences, reporters sometimes applaud his skillful debating and shrewd dialectic. Americans are flattered and pleased at his interest in their typical institutions, such as supermarkets and middle-class homes. But all this does not go very deep. Americans know Mikoyan was one of Stalin's right-hand men, through the blood purges and repressions of the past 40 years. They know he must be very skillful to have survived. They know he is in the United States for one purpose alone—to serve the interests of the Soviet Union. And most of them are determined not to fall into any traps, however amiably and hospitably they may react to Mikoyan the tourist and even to Mikoyan the salesman.

In informed circles there are many questions: Is the Mikoyan visit more than a diplomatic and public relations stunt? Apart from being an effort to cultivate American good will, to gather firsthand information about the United States, and perhaps to confuse American policymakers, is there any more important motive? Are the Soviets really prepared to negotiate seriously and reasonably about the grave issues which di-

vide East from West? Of that there is no tangible hint. But perhaps that is the unexpressed meaning of the Mikoyan visit.

The only way to tell would be to negotiate.

It would seem, therefore, that some kind of negotiation on Germany is both inevitable and desirable. Safeguards are necessary. It is vital that the United States does not get drawn by the Soviet Union into a two-power peace conference to solve the world's problems. The strength of the Western World depends upon understanding and cooperation between all the western powers. Thus, Washington is keeping the allied western capitals fully informed of all Mikoyan says to American officials.

NO TWO-POWER SUMMIT

There is going to be no two-power summit. Moscow has long sought the beguiling prospect of the two great powers settling the world between them. That would be one way to destroy western unity. A second safeguard is that no settlement on Germany should neglect the interests of the German people. Those interests will best be served by free elections.

This position, on which the United States has long insisted, can be approached in various ways. If we accuse the Soviets of inflexibility, we must watch our own rigidity. If the price of free elections and free choice for the Germans were to be limitations on German armament, especially on nuclear armament, this is an agreement that should be very seriously considered. German unification, on anything like acceptable terms, would automatically solve the Berlin question. And the possession of atomic armaments by Germany becomes decreasingly important if (a) long-range missiles take over the defense job or (b) we obtain any enforceable limitation on armaments. As Chancellor Adenauer has freely said, a general agreement on armaments would certainly preclude German rearmament. And perhaps limitation on German armament might be a first step on the road toward general agreement. There are many in Germany, as well as in the West, who have their doubts about extensive German rearmament, especially with nuclear weapons.

For the West to agree to a peace treaty which perpetuates the division of Germany would also perpetuate communism's present penetration to within a few miles of Hamburg. It would perpetuate grave injustice to the 17 million Germans who must now live under Communist rule. There are better ways of contributing to a peaceful role for Germany than by continuing its division any longer than is unavoidable. So it is up to the West now to produce forthright and vigorous approaches to the question of Germany.

Diplomacy cannot remain static. Moscow has entered a highly volatile phase of its diplomacy. The West should be equally effective. Instead of merely reacting to successive Soviet stages—notes, visits, ultimata, speeches—it is time the West came up with strong and persuasive plans of its own to solve German problems. The status quo is no solution.

Mikoyan's San Francisco visit began with egg throwing and ended with apologies from Governor Brown.

Soon we shall see what he has to say to President Eisenhower, after he returns to Washington. Is there any serious content to his visit? Will he propose a Khrushchev visit to the President? And what will we say then? Can we refuse the No. 1 man what we have granted the No. 2 man? And should we especially if we keep a Khrushchev visit from turning into an effort to divide the world between the two great powers?

Is this kind of contact wrong? Surely it is not, if it does not produce illusions and misunderstanding and public or diplomatic confusion. A precept of American thinking and action has always been the value of contact. This we believe. Can we repudiate that belief now? And can we turn whatever is delusive in the Mikoyan or prospective Khrushchev visit into sober realism? Beyond such visits, can we negotiate seriously and realistically for the peace agreements to which Mikoyan is giving abundant lipservice?

A CONSERVATIVE CONGRESS

Congress is underway with some rather sound defeats for the liberals in both parties who wanted to change leadership or rules. Clearly there is a conservative majority in this Congress, as there were in the last ones, when it is organized and manipulated by as skillful a political operator as Senator LYNDON JOHNSON.

President Eisenhower's message was also conservative, in the true sense of the term, and directed toward constructive policies. Though Democratic leaders criticized it, the President's position may in general be one which will readily gain congressional majorities.

Moreover, the President and Vice President intend to take the administration's program to the country. They plan a series of dramatic television-radio programs on such key issues as cost of living, adequacy of defense and space programs, and other controversies. Indeed, the Vice President asserts the United States is ahead of the Soviet Union in developing military missiles, and is catching up fast in other aspects—such as the power of rocket engines—in which the Soviet Union is now admittedly ahead.

There is wide divergence of authority on this question, but the Vice President's views are not to be dismissed lightly. His position is in sharp opposition to the report of the committee headed by JOHN W. MCCORMACK, the House Democratic leader. That report, to which Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, the recent Republican leader did not dissent, pictured the United States as being behind the Soviets in the struggle for space mastery by a year or more, and said it might take 5 years to catch up.

The President and Vice President apparently seek to convince the country that utmost efforts are being made, both in missilery and in conquest of space, and that no new and expensive crash programs are required.

In more general terms, the Democratic majority as led by Senator JOHNSON and Speaker RAYBURN is unlikely to dissent far from the Eisenhower program. The Democratic left will break away sharply, but the heavy majority, including most of the Republicans, is with the more conservative position.

According to all evidences, this will not be a do-nothing period for administration leadership. The President cannot run to succeed himself, but he is deeply committed to the country's well-being. He knows that a vigorous program will not only help the country but his party as well. And the crux of the program is not merely the national defense. It is also the Nation's defense against value-destroying inflation. A balanced budget, a curb on marginal spending, an improvement in administrative practices and expenditures—all these things are essential. But above all policy is needed which can help to hold down the mounting wage-cost spiral. Here the combined efforts of both political parties will be needed if the deeper inroads of inflation are to be checked.

A Report Mikoyan Could Well Make to Khrushchev as They Proceed With Their Plans To Bury Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Michael Padev, foreign editor of the Arizona Republic, published in Phoenix:

MIKOYAN MAY WELL BOAST OF UNITED STATES VISIT

(By Michael Padev)

An important diplomatic dispatch must have reached Moscow late last night. Marked "urgent and top secret" and addressed personally to the Soviet Prime Minister, the dispatch must have said in part: "Most Esteemed Comrade Khrushchev:

"The first week of my visit to the United States can only be described as an unqualified success for the Communist cause and for foreign policy of the Soviet Government. Here are its most notable achievements:

"First, nobody paid any attention to the so-called unofficial character of my visit. As you had anticipated, Comrade Khrushchev, I was treated with the greatest possible official courtesy by every top-ranking U.S. official, and I have been able to conduct official business all of the time. On the first day of my visit, I saw Secretary of State Dulles for an official talk lasting 90 minutes. Dulles had been stricken by a virus infection the previous day, but in spite of the fact that he had a fever and was confined to bed, he came to the State Department especially to welcome me. Yet a few hours before he met me, Dulles had canceled his long-awaited official trip to Canada, on the grounds of ill health.

"I also had official talks with Vice President Nixon and practically every top-ranking congressional leader, especially those interested in foreign affairs. I am seeing President Eisenhower next week. Only one congressman refused to meet me. He is Representative Judd, a reactionary Republican from Minnesota and a well-known friend of that Fascist beast Chiang Kai-shek. Nobody paid any attention to Judd's unfriendly act, however. It was barely noticed in the press and only a handful of newspapers throughout the United States supported his anti-Soviet behavior.

"Second, generally speaking, the U.S. press has welcomed my visit. Unfavorable comments against me personally and against the Soviet government have been very, very rare. You can literally count on the fingers of one hand the U.S. papers that took an editorial position against my visit. By contrast, President Eisenhower's public request that I be greeted everywhere with courtesy and attention was given the greatest possible publicity and most newspapers have endorsed it. You remember the vicious capitalist press propaganda against your visit to London in 1956? Well, the situation has very much improved now, from the Communist point of view. On the whole we have every reason to be very satisfied by the attitude of the capitalist press toward my visit.

"Third, the only people who protested against my visit and staged demonstrations

against me in several of the cities I visited were Hungarian warmongers and former East European landlords and capitalists now living in the United States as refugees. No American organization of any importance supported these anti-Communist refugee activities. On the contrary, in every city where these demonstrations were organized, the local community leaders went out of their way to disassociate themselves from these anti-Communist refugee outbursts. Many important Americans asked me not to pay any attention to these protests, pointing out that most of the demonstrators were not even American citizens.

"Fourth, I have proved a great success with the American capitalists, and this includes not only such dear friends as Cyrus Eaton, of Ohio, and Eric Johnston, of Washington, D.C., and Hollywood, who have been really wonderful to me. Everywhere I go, the leaders of big business, among them the presidents and owners of some of America's biggest corporations, do their utmost to wine and dine me and to organize sumptuous receptions in my honor. This development was really unexpected, for, frankly, I feared that these people might perhaps remember what we Communists do to capitalists everywhere we come to power. The more I watch the behavior of American capitalists toward me, the more I am convinced that Karl Marx was quite right when he said that most capitalists are so stupid that they could easily be made to work for their own destruction.

"As Communists, we should cetrainly welcome and encourage the efforts of U.S. capitalists to destroy themselves. For this reason I have made many speeches requesting the immediate increase of Soviet-American trade. What could be better than to enlist the help of American capitalists in the building up and strengthening of Soviet industrial and military power? If American capitalists continue to show such friendly feelings toward us Communists, the day will not be far, Comrade Krushchev, when, in your own memorable and prophetic words, we shall, indeed, be able to bury all capitalists in the world.

"As ever, your obedient,

"ANASTAS MIKOYAN."

Sounds fantastic? Hardly.

Mikoyan may not have sent the above dispatch in the form you have just read it. But the sad truth is that a similar report must have been sent by him to Moscow over the weekend. And the sadder truth is that more and more such dispatches, reporting Mikoyan's success in capitalist America, will be forthcoming—to the comfort and delight of the Kremlin bosses.

We Farm Folks Must Take the Lead Ourselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States will soon receive the annual report and recommendations on America's agricultural situation from the administration.

The report, if it follows the form of other such promulgations of the past few years, will focus on the light in the center of the room and will not peak into the dark corners of American agriculture. It will speak of favorable trends, of challenging goals to be met and of farm prosperity which is just around the corner or across the barnyard. But nowhere, using candid facts and figures, will a showing be made that the farm policies of the present administration have been anything other than a wretched failure.

In the February 1959 issue of the Missouri Farmer, an accurate appraisal of the farm situation is given by one of the clearest thinkers on American agriculture, Fred V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers Association.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Heinkel's editorial:

WE FARM FOLKS MUST TAKE THE LEAD OURSELVES

Unless its purpose is to lift the standard of living of farmers, a farm program is not worth the paper on which it is written.

Yet our farm laws continue to be so directed as to reduce farm prices and the incomes of farmers.

If you could have known 10 years ago that by 1958 the population of this country would increase by 25 million, that the national level of prosperity would be the highest ever known, and that farmers would make heretofore unparalled strides in cutting costs and improving efficiency, would you have predicted a dismal decade for agriculture?

Would you have guessed that with nearly 20 percent more persons to feed, the prices of meat, milk, and grain would be sharply reduced?

Could you have believed that despite this boost in efficiency, profits from farming would become so slim that 1 million farm families wold find it necessary to give up the job for which they had been trained and go elsewhere in search of a living wage?

Would anyone have imagined that during a period of such unprecedented prosperity, this Nation would continue to wrangle over whether or not to aid agriculture and would pile up millions; yes, billions, of bushels of grain while hungry nations restlessly looked on?

It has happened.

It is history that from a peak of $17.8 billion in 1948, total agricultural income has fallen to an annual level of about $12 billion. Inflation has further eroded this until presently total farm income will buy scarcely more than one-half of what it would in 1948.

There can be no doubt about the effect of this lack of purchasing power on the financial condition of the Nation's rural economy. The Census Bureau reports that 2.8 million families in this Nation have total earnings of less than $1,000 per year—and 60 percent of them live in the country.

Some have said that this has nothing to do with farm prices, because these low-income families don't sell many products anyway. But in order to net $1,000 a farm would have to produce, say, $3,000 worth of farm products. If prices to the farmer were but 10 percent higher—and this would be substantially below their value 10 years ago—the farmer selling $3,000 worth of commodities would receive $300 more.

It does not take a lot of imagination to think up ways in which such families would put this additional income to use. It could mean a water system in the home, better medical care, needed farm tools, etc.

All of us recognize that wherever found, poor living conditions stunt the physical, mental, and spiritual growth of people. We have made little attempt to eliminate poverty in our rural areas, and have too long tolerated this condition.

It is time to end the bickering in Congress, time to conclude the debate among economists and college professors, time to stress unanimity between farm organizations.

Events of the last decade make it obvious that conditions will not right themselves until farmers force through badly needed reforms in farm legislation and take the lead in seeing to it that this Nation develops a national farm policy which will assure full prosperity to agriculture.

There Will Never Be Another Curley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Sunday Globe of November 16, 1958:

THERE WILL NEVER BE ANOTHER CURLEY

(By Richard D. Grant, former secretary of J. M. Curley)

I saw James M. Curley at close range. I've seen him riding the high clouds of happiness and I've seen him racked by grief.

I saw him angry, in those towering rages that sweep away perspective. And I've seen him so softly sympathetic in the presence of tragedy as to completely forfeit his composure.

Dealing with Curley, it is difficult to write subjectively—to separate the myriad human qualities from the bronze legend of the demigod.

When I was stranded with him for 3 hours on a tiny island on Eagle Lake, in the afternoon shadow of Mount Katahdin, I was sure he was the most charming and approachable man I had ever met.

At other times, I have thought he might be Brian Boru, or Cond of the Hundred Battles, or some other legendary Hibernian—a throwback of the age of giants.

In his prime, nobody ever looked twice at Curley to be sure of his identity.

As was said of Maurice Barrymore, the actor, if they didn't know who he was, they asked.

I heard of him for the first time 43 years ago, as I sat in athletic costume on the floor of rackety old Mechanics Building, waiting to race. Tall and faultless in formals, with the blue-black hair and high color of the fair-skinned Irish, Curley was impressive enough before he began to speak.

But that voice—ranging from deep organ quality to the screaming crescendo of a whipcrack—that could only be a gift direct from the gods.

As in the case of most controversial men, a mass of mythology has grown up about Curley—some of it invented by himself, some by detractors, but all, or nearly all, so apocryphal as to distort a true image of the man.

Actually, James M. Curley was an intensely human kind of fellow, one who loved a good time, who was fond of a joke, who was dedicated to his family—one who, in other settings, might have been a great actor, a world-famous promoter, perhaps a cardinal.

I remember something said by his Jesuit son, then little Franny, 11 years old, as the governor was dashing away from the dinner table to some official function, attired in cutaway and high silk hat.

"You may not realize it, father," said the deadpan youngster to the first citizen of the commonwealth, "but in that outfit you're wearing, you look just like W. C. Fields."

If I were asked to rate Curley as a politician, I would have to say he was the most

dynamic campaigner of an era that began without loud speakers, without quick transportation, and which ended with television, jet plane travel and audiotape commercials.

No one in our time ever brought to the field of campaigning the boundless energy with which Curley hurled himself into every fight that commanded his attention.

The Old Man must be chuckling in his grave over the self-assurance of those who take satisfaction from the fact that the overwhelming success of the Democratic Party was achieved this year without him.

In my opinion, present Republican weakness has come about because, for 50 years, the Republicans made Curley their only target—exhibit A in the chamber of political horrors.

What they forgot to notice was that the Democrats meanwhile were spawning a whole new generation of leaders, a new organization of voters, a new order of objectives in Massachusetts.

Jim Farley's memory for names and faces is legendary, but Curley's was no whit inferior.

Forty-three years ago, a red-headed kid named Arthur L. Palmer delivered milk to the Curleys in Mount Pleasant Avenue, Roxbury. It was a brief acquaintance.

Recently, Mr. Palmer, now 70 and completely gray, met Mr. Curley passing the Parker House, said "Hello, Governor," then moved to one side.

Curley turned around, his eyes flashing recognition, put his hand on Palmer's shoulder and replied, "Why hello, 'Red', how's the North Dorchester A.A.?"

There's a sequel to this.

The North Dorchester club was Clarence H. DeMar's first sports affiliation and "Red" Palmer rode the bicycle behind DeMar when he won his first Boston Marathon on April 19, 1911.

As a fellow reared in the newspaper tradition, to me, Governor Curley's most outstanding gift was his appreciation of news values, his wonderful sense of timing, and his flair for the dramatic. No Governor, before or since his time, has made more news.

I recall one press conference at which Curley told statehouse reporters he knew of nothing that might be of special interest to them.

Nevertheless, they hung around in casual conversation for half an hour.

Then, just at the breakup, the Governor observed quite casually that he had just notified Eugene C. Hultman, chairman of the metropolitan district commission and former Boston police commissioner, that he was removing Hultman from office.

The gallery was so stunned that, for a moment, nobody moved a whisker. Then they dashed back to their seats and the ensuing interview made headlines for weeks in every newspaper in the State.

Curley's sense of humor was extraordinary and broad-gaged, like everything else about him. Some people would have you believe he had an appreciation only of slapstick, but that was not so.

While Governor, he had for a legislative secretary a well-tanned, baldheaded lawyer who wore gold spectacles, usually pushed back on his forehead. His name was John H. Backus and he was forever trying, without much success, to direct the Governor's attention to bills enacted by the legislature.

One day, when the Governor's chamber was full of visitors, Backus made his usual move, with the usual result. "No, John, no—not now," said Curley with a regal wave of the hand that commanded Mr. Backus to shuffle out again behind a gently closed door. Curley turned to his company. "You know," said the Governor, "he's getting to look more like an old Spanish cardinal, every day."

I wonder how many remember the day reporters begged Mr. Curley for a story to fill what was apparently a news vacuum on the hill, and the boss came through with the smasher about the two $100 million luxury liners he was planning to get from Roosevelt.

Yes, indeed, these immense ocean greyhounds were to be built with Government help, would sail from the port of Boston and would carry 5,000 passengers each to Europe for $50 a head.

The boys all nudged each other—what a yarn.

Typical Curley promotion stuff.

Right now, a corporation has been formed and financed, headed by a New York hotelman, which seeks to do just that.

Build two huge, oceangoing ships with Government aid, carrying at least 5,000 passengers each at a rate just about as low as the tourist rate pegged by Curley 23 years ago.

Mr. Curley's long foresight was uncanny.

His critics scoffed at this ability to see beyond the present, they said Curley was just a big blowhard who was lucky enough to have some of his daffy schemes land right side up.

Frankly, I don't agree.

I've seen too many of his pipedreams realized, with credit for Curley's ideas going to people who were not fit to hold his coat.

If space wasn't so tight, I could expand this to book length.

Tell about Curley's distribution of silver dollars, for instance—not in the manner of largess, like the Duke of Burgundy to the peasants, as has been claimed, but as a morale builder for the ladies during the great depression.

With a pocket full of cartwheels, the Governor never was at a loss in meeting women voters.

Pressing a dollar into the hand of an admirer, he would say: "There are two things, dear lady, that every woman needs and now you have both—money and good looks."

One day on the way to lunch, we were walking down Beacon Street past the old Houghton and Dutton Building when an ancient female panhandler popped out and barred the way.

For sheer decrepitude and filth, her appearance would be hard to match.

Her age might have been anything from 75 to 100.

The Governor reached for his pocket, the one in which he kept the silver, and I found myself flinching from what was apparently about to happen.

"Oh, no," I groaned in nearly audible tones. "Not this one."

But I had underestimated Curley. He gave the old dame the dollar with the usual flourish and she followed us all the way to the Tremont Street corner shouting, "God bless you, Governor. God bless you and keep you. I'll pray for you every night for the rest of my life."

There'll be a lot of epitaphs suggested for this intensely human, rugged individual but, having in mind Mr. Curley's favorite author, the Bard of Avon, I can't think of a better one to signalize his passing than to quote Hamlet's familiar comment from the first act—his observation on the passing of his father:

"He was a man, take him for all in all,
"I shall not look upon his like again."

The Space Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID S. KING
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, while I am deeply pleased to be a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, I am also greatly sobered by the gravity of this assignment. I believe that this committee, despite its newness, bears one of the heaviest responsibilities of our time.

Overtaking the Russians in space will be no easy task, but I am confident the United States has the capacity to accomplish it. We will not do it with the checkbook alone. We will not do it with anything short of a maximum effort in every relevant area of human activity.

The astronautical challenge has been widely described as the space race. This is an apt expression. We Americans must realize that what we are engaged in is, in every sense of the word, a race.

Speed and time are essential elements of every race. We must recognize their particular importance in this race.

A distinguished Philadelphia scientist, Dr. I. M. Levitt, said, in an Associated Press story which appeared in the Washington Star, that by 1980 men may be living in the plastic-domed villages on the moon. Imagine, if you will, how quickly 1980 will be upon us. In my memory I find it no more than a quick step back to the outbreak of World War II, which was almost 20 years ago. Within a similar span men could be living on the moon.

Dr. Levitt, who is the director of the Fels Planetarium at Franklin Institute, said, in fact, that his estimate of 1980 may be too conservative. With another breakthrough in our progress in nuclear energy, and with atomic fuels installed in space vehicles, men, he said, could put settlements on the moon even sooner.

This is indeed a sobering possibility.

It is even more sobering to ponder the possibility that the men who settle the moon might be Russians—perhaps only Russians. We do not need Dr. Levitt to tell us—as he has—that control of the moon by a hostile military power will give it an alarming logistic advantage.

Clearly, time has favored the Russians up to now. Experts agree they have a substantial lead in space. Exactly how wide the gap is, no one knows. But certainly the Russians, believing as they do about the importance of space leadership to their goal of world supremacy, will never willingly allow that gap to be closed, and their advantage lost.

In a race which runs just 20 years, and perhaps less, in its first important heat—in what actually may be the only important heat—a handicap of a year is plainly critical. A gap of 3 years could be insurmountable.

I see a parallel between the race in space and the contest on the seas which engaged the world in the 15th and 16th centuries, climaxed by the colonization of the Americas.

The exploits of Columbus and Magellan, which proved the earth round, opened great frontiers to exploration and development. Spain and England had the imagination to recognize the political, military and economic importance of these frontiers, and set out to conquer them. By their unremitting efforts to colonize and develop the New World, England and Spain became formidable sea powers, and fixed for them-

selves places of eminence in global affairs for several centuries.

The New World today is space.

Concern about whether the American people are taking this challenge seriously enough is not mine alone. I am certain it is shared by my congressional colleagues, as well as by many other American citizens. Unfortunately, there are, however, many who do not share it.

Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, has voiced deep concern about American apathy toward the space race. In a United Press International story carried by the Washington Post, Mr. Waterman was quoted as saying:

As a Nation, we appear to forget that we live in a competitive world and shall continue to do so. It seems abundantly clear that we shall rapidly lose in competition unless we can show more determined and constructive efforts than we have during the past years.

Mr. Waterman deplored the post-sputnik response of the American public. He warned that other countries, and especially Russia, are showing a determination and a national spirit on the part of the people which seems to be relatively absent from the American scene.

We do not seem to understand—

He said in the article—

that it will be impossible to maintain our own prosperity and world peace unless we do and do promptly the things necessary to compete in a modern world.

He went on to say that American educators who have toured Russia have been alarmed at the clarity of purpose they find there. He said the Russians believe that by winning the race in space, and by emphasizing science and education, they will achieve leadership over the entire world, and without the cost of a destructive war.

As Mr. Waterman points out, the Soviet challenge really is more than a race in space. It is a contest in technology, whose fruitage is not only better space vehicles, but better bathtubs and better automobiles. This reflects, of course, a more basic contest in education.

Our answer to this challenge must be the effective use of those qualities and resources which have enabled Americans to successfully meet every other crisis in their history; namely, imagination, initiative, and ingenuity.

These qualities are inherent in, and cultivated by, our democratic way of life. They are the bread and butter of our free enterprise system.

The society which cultivates and nurtures these qualities in the greatest abundance is, in reality, the truly liberal society. I am confident our society has, and always will have, these qualities in greater abundance than is possible in any regimented Communist society.

And with them, Americans can win the space race.

We will win it, if we will but cease to grumble about the challenge, put aside our partisanship and our doubts, and apply our best brainwork and teamwork—along with the proper measures of elbow grease and midnight oil—to the task.

Business and Government Meet at the Cleveland Department of Commerce Field Office

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in an article in the December issue of the Clevelander, monthly magazine of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, Arthur W. Zimmerman says:

If Ed Higbee has anything to say about it—and he does—the Cleveland field office of the U.S. Department of Commerce is one Government office where the taxpayer will get a dollar's worth of information and help for a tax dollar spent.

Col. Edwin C. Higbee has been manager of this hard-working office since 1957 and heads a staff of 12. As evidence of the work handled by this small group, Mr. Zimmerman points out that between 2,500 and 3,500 personal contacts are made with business people each month by telephone calls, letters and personal visits. In addition, Manager Higbee makes an average of three speeches each month and attends as many meetings of special groups as he possibly can. The office personnel, aside from their regular duties, run booths at trade shows, such as the recent Metal Show, and put on educational programs.

Believing my colleagues will be interested in reading Mr. Zimmerman's article, "Business and Government Meet at the Commerce Department Field Office," under unanimous consent, I include it with my remarks.

The article follows:

BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT MEET AT THE COMMERCE DEPARTMENT FIELD OFFICE

(By Arthur W. Zimmerman, secretary, Cleveland Seaway Committee, the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce)

If Ed Higbee has anything to say about it—and he does—the Cleveland field office of the U.S. Department of Commerce is one Government office where the taxpayer will get a dollar's worth of information and help for a tax dollar spent.

"We can be of great assistance to business people of all kinds in supplying the information necessary to back up management decisions," says Mr. Higbee. "We want not only to help the local businessman select precisely the facts he is seeking from our vast storehouse of information, but we want also to act as his personal spokesman to the Federal bureaus, telling them in Washington where Government studies can be made more useful to private interests.

"This is a two-way street we're running. One of the major obstacles to better use of Commerce Department facilities, however, is that so often the private citizen simply doesn't realize what a large mass of aids is available to him."

Edwin C. Higbee became manager of the Cleveland field office of the U.S. Department of Commerce on March 25, 1957. He heads a 12-man office where the workload is divided approximately in half between domestic and foreign business.

Lendall E. Jones is chief of the domestic commerce division, assisted by John D. Kishler, business analyst, and Miss Helen Kostuk, secretary.

Charles B. Stebbins, heads the world trade division, with Miss Ann G. Semerer, business analyst, and Miss Helen Green, secretary, assisting.

Mrs. Zelda W. Milner carries the title of library and research division chief, but actually she is Girl Friday to anyone seeking a specific piece of information among the maze of statistics always on tap in the office.

Miss Margaret Farrel is head of publication sales for the office. As such, she administers one of the most valuable services offered by the field office. Here, for a matter of pennies, the businessman can buy the study which bears on his particular problem, take it back to his office, work with it, pencil it, cut it up, tear it apart, or file it—a great advantage over getting only a hurried look at it some place outside his office.

The staff of the local field office is rounded out by Miss Betty Lenahan, librarian, Miss Edith Mashman, secretary to Mr. Higbee, and Mrs. Ellen Hannon, secretary to Mrs. Milner.

One benchmark of the amount of work handled by this small group is the 2,500 to 3,500 personal contacts made each month. That includes only telephone calls, letters, and personal visits. In addition, Manager Higbee makes an average of three speeches every month and the office personnel runs booths at trade shows, such as the recent metal show, and educational programs.

Besides that, Mr. Higbee makes a definite effort to attend as many meetings of special groups as he can. "I catch a meeting practically every noon, sometimes two or three in a day. When you get to three meetings in a day, that can be pretty rugged," he admits.

It's all part of Mr. Higbee's personal conviction that the community should be alerted to the help awaiting it at the end of a local telephone call or a short visit. But it's not a one-man show.

In truth, no one person could know the details of everything the Commerce Department has to offer. Within this Federal department is the Business and Defense Services Administration, Office of Business Economics, Bureau of the Census (largest single factfinding agency in the world), Civil Aeronautics Administration, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Bureau of Foreign Commerce, Maritime Administration, and Federal Maritime Board, the Patent Office, Bureau of Public Roads, National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, and, just recently, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

All this makes the Commerce Department sound awesome and overpowering but it's not. The one irreplaceable advantage offered by the local field office is that, while they have an inside access to the marble halls of Washington, the field office personnel are here, on the local scene, knowing the importance of information to the consumer of that information.

Just two examples.

A producer of brick and common clay products was wiped out by fire. To collect damages from his insurance, he had to support his claim that he lost a certain amount of business during the time he was out of operation. Commerce Department indexes give the month-by-month production rate of these products for years. The claim could easily be verified.

Dr. U. T. Greene, assistant director of commercial development, Diamond Alkali Co., says: "* * * information, such as your field office has furnished us on many occasions, is so much a part of our regular stock in trade that we use it almost continuously in the market analysis part of our work. It is really part of the warp and woof of the fabric from which we assemble many of our studies and reports. Perhaps one report that was of outstanding help to us was the special bichromate report in the October 1955, Chemical and Rubber Industry Report. That article, issued at a time when we were assembling end use information on our own sales, was

especially helpful to us in setting up categories and giving us an overall check on U.S. sales of bichromates."

The man sitting on top of the world trade division in Cleveland, which threatens to mushroom in the next few years, is Charlie Stebbins. A graduate of Ohio State University with a major in foreign trade and one-time employee of the combination export managing firm of Curtis E. Wagner, Akron, Mr. Stebbins has been with the Commerce Department for 12 years, long enough to pick up a lot of know-how in foreign trade matters.

"We can be and are of help to the little company just considering entering world trade and to the large corporation with years of background in the field," says Mr. Stebbins. "One reason is that we are the local outlet for information being funneled back to the United States by the American Foreign Service. The American Foreign Service is a sort of on-the-spot overseas observer for domestic businessmen."

This on-the-spot reporting is demonstrated by the World Trade Directory reports, designed to furnish American firms with sales information on overseas companies. The obscure titles of the reports, plus the relatively cheap price of $1 per copy, are misleading. Information in the World Trade Directory reports is not more than a year old and obtained by trained American personnel in the country where the foreign firm operates. There are close to 500,000 such reports on individual overseas companies on file in Washington.

"We find information in these World Trade Directory reports to be very helpful," states C. D. Newcomer, export manager, Harshaw Chemical Co., "especially in that they disclose the relative size of the foreign firm, number of salesmen, number of branches, and number of technical employees, if any."

Trade Lists, available for $2 each, give names and addresses of all known importers and exporters in a given product classification for a particular country. Trade Contact Surveys, costing $10 per investigation, dig deeper for prospective overseas agents or distributors or licensee firms.

Besides these tailored reports, there is a growing practice of having American consular officials and commercial attachés from foreign countries visit the Cleveland field office to talk directly with businessmen. One such visit was made recently by A. Guy Hope, American consul at Istanbul, Turkey.

Among the industry delegations to meet with Mr. Hope was one from Thompson Products export division, Thompson Ramo Wooldridge Inc. Says Frank L. Williams, of Thompson Products, about the visit: "Our discussions with Mr. Hope were mainly concerned with the present and future import and dollar exchange situations, the size of the market, their sources for automotive, truck, and industrial engine spares, and other matters. Mr. Hope's firsthand information from an American businessman's point of view is, we feel, the next best thing to actually visiting the market ourselves."

Next such overseas visitor scheduled to come to Cleveland is J. L. Dougherty, consul and commercial officer at Sidney, Australia, who will be here at the local field office, January 21–22, 1959.

Often the Department of Commerce is the only source for certain types of information on world trade matters. More frequently, the local field office is simply the most convenient and efficient place to get it.

That's why Cleveland is among the top five offices in volume of World Trade Directory reports in the country.

That's why Manager Higbee of the Cleveland field office, says: "The development of the port of Cleveland and all international trade will have a major effect on the work of this office in the years immediately ahead."

Delawareans Support McDowell Resolution To Investigate High Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been pleased to receive numerous letters from my constituents in Delaware approving House Resolution 42 introduced by me on January 7, 1959. It is my sincere belief that it is the responsibility of the Congress, as well as the President and the executive department of our Government, to do something, and do it now, about the high cost of living and inflationary prices. It is not enough just to issue reports and to make glowing statements about the necessity to stop the threat of further inflation. It is the duty of the Congress to find out, to get the facts, and then to act intelligently to combat this evil threat to the economic well-being and security of the Nation. I submit as example of the correspondence I am receiving from the wonderful people of my State who support my position on this important question the following letters, also a statement appearing in the Wilmington Journal-Every Evening under date of Thursday, January 15, 1959:

STATEMENT APPEARING IN THE WILMINGTON, DEL., JOURNAL-EVERY EVENING, THURSDAY, JANUARY 15, 1959

Congressman HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR., Democrat, of Delaware, on the first day of the new session of the 86th Congress introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution to investigate the reasons for the high cost of living. The proposed act, now known as House Resolution 42, titled "Creating a Select Committee on Consumer Interests," calls for the appointment by the Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, of a seven member committee, one of whom shall be designated as chairman.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation by means of research and investigation of all problems affecting consumer interests in the present national emergency and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation, and to report to the House from time to time the results of such studies and investigations, together with its recommendations.

In carrying out its duties the committee shall give special attention to prices received by the producer and to prices charged the consumer for food, fuel, and clothing, and the costs and methods of producing, processing, and distributing these and other consumer goods and their component parts.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned; to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants, and to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government; to hold such hearings; to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee thereof, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Congressman McDOWELL issued the following statement with regard to his resolution:

"House Resolution 42 is the answer to my campaign pledge to fight the high cost of living and inflation. I am going to do everything I possibly can as a Member of Congress to urge my colleagues to pass this proposed act in this session of Congress. There is much talk today of the danger of inflation. The President in his state of the Union message had this to say: 'We will not tolerate inflation in the years to come. But history makes clear the risks inherent in any failure to deal firmly with the basic causes of inflation. * * * It strikes hardest those millions of our citizens whose incomes do not quickly rise with the cost of living. When prices soar, the pensioner and the widow see their security undermined, the man of thrift sees his savings melt away; the white collar worker, the minister, and the teacher see their standards of living dragged down.'

"I agree with this statement by President Eisenhower, but by and large the public knows little or nothing about the causes of inflation and too many of them think the consequences are desirable. Even among some businessmen and professional people, there exists an alarming state of ignorance and apathy as to its consequences and yet a rather fatalistic acceptance that continuing inflation is inevitable. As I see it, the battle against inflation must be waged on the educational front. We shall win the battle only when the mass of our voters come to understand at least the fundamentals of the causes and consequences of inflation.

"Obviously a great need exists for ascertaining, analyzing and interpreting the facts bearing on inflation. Both the executive department and the Congress have a great responsibility to the Nation at large to present and analyze these facts for the general public. This is not going to be an easy task. Inflation is a mysterious phenomenon, both in its nature and its source. Experts violently disagree. We must try to isolate and focus attention on the fundamental causes.

"If we can all recognize even mild inflation for what it is—a symptom of failure—failure on our part to govern ourselves wisely, if we can all recognize that for the community as a whole there is no hedge against inflation, and, finally, if we can all recognize the price paid to avoid inflation is much less than the price exacted by further inflation, then, and only then, shall we have laid the groundwork for a successful anti-inflation campaign.

"It is my belief that House Resolution 42 is the best approach to a need for factfinding in order to share our experiences and to discuss the best ways and means for Congress to carry the fight forward against the high cost of living and inflation."

LETTERS INDICATING APPROVAL OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 42

WILMINGTON, DEL., *December 30, 1958.*

DEAR HARRIS: I want to take this opportunity to wish you a happy and successful session in the U.S. House of Representatives. I know you will live up to your campaign promises and I'll be rooting for you in your

all-out battle to stem the high cost of living. No doubt you are well aware that the cost of living is still soaring and being unchecked. Everyone seems to be concerned about it, but no one seems to be doing anything about it.

As a father who is trying earnestly to raise three young children, I find it quite difficult to make ends meet. The price of children's shoes and clothes is outrageous. Why should you have to pay the same price for a child's outfit as you would an adult's? To prove that this pricing business is dishonest just let me cite an example for you. When buying tires for an automobile you pay less for size 600 by 15 than you would for size 760 by 15—why? Because naturally the manufacturer uses less material and time to make same. It seems this theory does not apply to children's clothing. The legalized crooks claim it takes just as long to make children's shoes and clothes as it would for an adult's. To me this sounds like a plain lie. Also, Harris, I wish you would check into the price of drugs. A previous investigation down in Washington in reference to drugs discoverd that the drug companies were making 200-percent profit on their pills and medicines. It seems the drug lobby was successful in killing this investigation as according to the newspapers no action was taken.

Your efforts in stemming the tide of inflation will be noted and appreciated by the voters who supported you in the recent election. Upon closing may I wish you a happy and prosperous New Year, and when you find time, keep me posted on what is going down there in our Nation's Capital.

Best regards.

NICHOLAS (MICKEY) FIGUN.

WILMINGTON, DEL., *January 15, 1959.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCDOWELL: From the news item in tonight's Journal Every-Evening, you are certainly making an auspicious start.

As one of many thousands of retired persons in Delaware, I know what inflation has done to my life insurance and savings and pension. You have attacked the most dangerous problem facing us today.

Instead of Democrats being the spenders, which creates a cheaper dollar, your action creates confidence in the American dollar here and abroad, and keeps this country first in world stability.

I wish you success in the continuance of your career.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM J. MALONEY.

WILMINGTON, DEL., *January 17, 1959.*

DEAR MR. MCDOWELL: As a member of that group of your constituents whose incomes are fixed, we wish to express our appreciation of your efforts to combat the high cost of living and inflation through the introduction of House Resolution 42, and we pray for the success of your efforts.

While you are familiar with this situation in Delaware, we mention a few that seriously affect the lives of those of us in the fixed income groups.

Foods: Especially all meats.

Telephone and tax: A telephone almost a necessity to pensioners. Recently increased, with another further increase in prospect, further increasing the Federal tax we are paying, which for benefit of all should be repealed.

Hospitalization: Now almost prohibited for persons in our group.

Home upkeep: Repairs, etc.

Bus fares: All transportation.

Miscellaneous items: Hair cuts, shoe repairs, postage, papers, service charges, fuel, etc.

Sincerely yours,

E. E. ALEXANDER.

The Real Mikoyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, having listened to the television program on Sunday, January 18, when members of the press queried Mr. Mikoyan, I am in complete agreement with the views of Mr. David Lawrence and commend to you his editorial, which appeared in the news on January 20:

U.S. PEOPLE SEE REAL MIKOYAN—RED'S INTERVIEW CALLED DEMONSTRATION OF TACTICS AMERICAN OFFICIALS FACE

(By David Lawrence)

The American people were given on a television program Sunday a vivid demonstration of what the U.S. Government is up against in its relations with the Soviet Union.

Evasion, indifference to truth, arrogance, and brazen misrepresentation of facts came from the Soviets' Deputy Premier, Anastas Mikoyan, along with a very plain implication that, if the U.S. Government wants peace, it must surrender unconditionally to the Soviet Union on all issues now in dispute.

Never in all history has any high official of a foreign government visiting this country displayed such effrontery and defiance of the American Government and its policies.

Not a single question asked on world policy was answered forthrightly or with the slightest regard for what the past record shows. To the Soviet Deputy Premier, the brief and limited stay by a small detachment of American forces in Lebanon—where not a single native citizen was killed or injured by American troops, and where withdrawal came in 3 months—is the same thing as the continued occupation of Hungary by Soviet troops, who have killed nearly 20,000 Hungarians in the 2 years since the people rose up in an attempt to regain their liberty.

Again and again the panel members of the Meet the Press interview, which was televised over a nationwide network of the National Broadcasting Co., tried to get Mr. Mikoyan to answer whether any American high official would be allowed to go to the Soviet Union and speak as directly to the people of Soviet Russia in criticism of the Soviet Union as he has to the American people about the U.S. Government. The evasive reply was that the visitor would be given the best reception.

When the Soviet Deputy Premier was asked why, inside Russia, criticism of the men in the Kremlin is not permitted and there is such a rigid censorship maintained on all the newspapers and radio stations, he replied—without even a smile—that, of course, there is nothing for anybody to criticize, as the Soviet Government is working well. This is the stock answer of Communist officials.

Did Mr. Mikoyan really think his listeners in America were so gullible or so naive as to accept such an untrue statement? He would have been more logical if he had said frankly that, under the Communist system, the policy calls for censorship and that other countries may do it differently. He did try to explain away the censorship of Khrushchev's lengthy speech denouncing Stalin which was read to a Communist meeting 3 years ago but never published in the Soviet press. Mr. Mikoyan inadvertently conceded that the Government seemed to be afraid of the people, since, as he said, there were some enemies who might get argumentative material out of the speech and cause internal difficulty.

The American audience, indeed, learned far more about the troubles of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in talking with Soviet officials from watching that television show than they will learn from the speeches of those luminaries on Capitol Hill who insist that all that's needed to deal with the Soviets are bold and imaginative ideas and policies.

The fact is that the dictators in the Kremlin are as cruel and inhumane, as indifferent to the wishes of human beings for freedom, as were Hitler and Stalin. Far from reassuring the American people that the Soviet Union really wants peace, there was a frightening aspect in Mr. Mikoyan's attitude. He seemed totally indifferent to the possibility that a world war could break out some day because of the difficulty of coming to any agreement with the inflexible Communist mind as some untoward incident arises or some adventure in bluffing strategy—like that now enveloping the status of Berlin—is undertaken by Moscow.

Mr. Mikoyan—the No. 2 man in the Kremlin—sits adamantly across the table, making no concessions but demanding counter proposals, which can be only of one kind—surrender—if the Soviet Government is to be appeased.

Under the circumstances, any suggestions of disengagement or negotiation or of reaching an agreement at a summit conference seem worthless. The only policy apparently that will succeeed in deterring war is one that keeps up American armament to full strength while refusing to be bluffed by Soviet maneuvers in Europe or Asia.

It's a game of watchful waiting. It means a stalemate that can last for years unless misguided persons here, weaken and cause the policy of the United States also to weaken. It is firmness alone that will win out. For, in the end, appeasement only brings on war.

Address of Samuel Rose, Chief Contact Officer, Veterans' Administration, Before Delegates of 31st National Convention of the Fleet Reserve Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Samuel Rose, chief contact officer of the Veterans' Administration before the delegates to the 31st national convention of the Fleet Reserve Association:

I am happy to be here today—my shipmates of the Fleet Reserve Association—to take part in this 31st national convention of your fine organization. I feel that we are old friends as well as shipmates. None has made this feeling stronger in my heart than your splendid national officers. I treasure their friendship.

These are some of the deeply felt personal reasons why each year I mark the Fleet Reserve Association's national convention on my calendar as a must. But there is another reason why I derive pride in coming here to greet you, and to assist you so far as VA benefits are concerned.

Yours is a very special organization. Your qualifications for membership are truly unique. Tom, Dick, and Harry may be nice people—but Tom, Dick, and Harry can't get into the Fleet Reserve Association unless they have completed 6 years of active service in the Navy or Marine Corps.

Another thing, there's no use knocking on the Fleet Reserve door for admission, unless you were that king among men when you were afloat on the salty sea—an enlisted man.

Does anyone think that's the whole story of how you are dedicated to Uncle Sam and to your shipmates and their dependents? No sir. Your key officials know their business. The record proves it. Schuyler Pyle, 15 years of active service; Russell Langdon, 27 years of active service; Charlie Lofgren, 21 years of active service; Charlie McCarthy, 30 years of active service. That's an impressive record.

Yes, yours is an exclusive organization, yours is a growing organization, yours is a willingness to fight for the best interests of your shipmates, their widows, their orphans, and their families. You have also fought for measures to keep America free, to keep America strong, to keep it growing. I think you can take a great measure of pride in the fact that you have never made membership in the Fleet Reserve Association a requirement before you extend a helping hand to a shipmate.

I want to pay personal tribute to your national secretary, Russell Langdon. "Lucky" Langdon we call him. I don't think that happy nickname has a thing to do with him. I think it means that whoever gets to know and to work with Russell Langdon is truly fortunate. I know it is so in my case.

It's the same story with Schuyler S. Pyle, your national financial secretary. We've known each other a long time. And the longer we know each other, the more we like each other. He radiates sunshine in your executive offices, and I've seen him on some cloudy days.

And let's not forget Charlie McCarthy, your editor of naval affairs. To come to any anchorage of the Fleet Reserve Association, and not see Charlie around—well, that would be almost like going to a World Series and not seeeing the Yankees.

And Charlie Lofgren. We might as well have a Navy without an ocean, as to come here for a Fleet Reserve convention and miss him. If a seagoing outfit like this can be said to have a cornerstone—Charlie is it.

And may I tell you this: Your zeal for the good of veterans everywhere is matched by the zeal of the Veterans' Administration for that all-important cause. I know, because I know the zeal that inspires our dynamic and hard-working Administrator, Mr. Sumner G. Whittier.

I wish Mr. Whittier could have been here in person. His warm and magnetic personality would have thrilled you. He has a big task. There are many calls on his time and energy. I hope the day may come soon when both of us—Mr. Whittier and myself—may be privileged to stand together on this platform to assure you that the VA is in business to serve veterans and their dependents to the best of its ability.

I said that Sumner G. Whittier is doing a marvelous job. Let me shoot a few machinegun facts at you, to show you I'm not using words carelessly.

VA's budget today—$5 billion. Number of employees, fellows just like me, trying to do our best to serve you—over 170,000. And the cost of operating the VA during the fiscal year 1958 was less than 4 cents of each tax dollar that the VA spent in that year.

The VA operates the biggest hospital and medical program in the Nation, and the largest ordinary life insurance business in the world. We administer a multi-billion-dollar compensation and pension program. We conduct a bigger home-loan mortgage operation than any private institution in the country. We operate the greatest education program ever undertaken with Federal funds. These programs have had a profound effect on the national welfare.

Think of what America is today as the result of VA-sponsored education—hundreds and thousands of desperately needed scientists, engineers, doctors, schoolteachers—making America mentally and morally strong, because the benefits the Congress has provided war veterans have proved to be a gilt-edged investment. The billions of dollars spent have resulted in social and economic advantages to the Nation that will return the cost many times over, both in this generation and in generations yet to come.

The Administrator's recent announcement of a liberalization of Korean GI bill regulations gives many thousands of Korea veterans, who were forced to interrupt their training for more than 12 consecutive months, the chance to complete their GI education.

And think of what VA hospitals and clinics mean to the veteran who needs medical help—prompt help, real help—to treat an ailment, suffered by many through no fault of their own, except patriotic desire to help our country.

During this very year of 1958 the Congress has passed, and the President has signed into law, many measures of benefit to veterans and their dependents. These laws have broadened direct benefits. They have increased compensation and pension rates. This year, in a warm action that symbolizes America's evergrowing unity of freedom, we have provided pensions for Confederate veterans and their widows. Further, the hundreds of veterans' laws have been codified into a single act.

This year Congress passed and President Eisenhower signed the law extending the loan guaranty program for World War II veterans to July 25, 1960.

I can report to you with pride that net claims paid on defaulted home loans actually amounted to only about 7 cents out of every $100 of the mortgages guaranteed. What's more, our veterans have already repaid in full more than 1 million loans having a face value of more than $8 billion. One more proof of the A-1 credit risk of veteran home-loan borrowers.

Our 171 VA hospitals, serving every area and section of the United States, now care for the highest number of veterans in history, nearly 111,000. We have an alltime high in the number of doctors, nurses, technicians and others, to restore our veterans to health, so far as human skill can help. And to seek divine guidance in our healing mission, we have many dedicated, hard-working chaplains, of all faiths, serving in our hospitals.

And so—as the days pass, and the years follow one another, our work at VA goes on. Soon, more than 685,000 Korean conflict veterans will be able to convert their previously nonconvertible term GI insurance to permanent plans. Over 5 million World War II and Korean conflict veterans who hold G.I. insurance, may now attach a new type of total disability income provision to their policies, in return for a small additional premium, provided the insured is in good health and under 60 years of age.

The past year has also witnessed liberalization of social security laws regarding certain veterans receiving disability payments. There has been an increase in VA disability compensation rates. VA benefit checks may now be forwarded under certain circumstances to your bank for deposit to your personal account. The term "widow" has been redefined for VA benefits. There have been increases in the pension rates for certain widows of wars before World War I. Also enacted was an increase in the Government allowance toward burial expenses for certain deceased veterans.

To every shipmate present, as well as to all who are not present, I want to assure you that the VA stands ready to extend every assistance to veterans and their dependents, and to do it in a cheerful, warmhearted, and sympathetic manner. Your shipmates in your executive offices in Washington, D.C., will tell you so.

We don't manufacture anything at VA. We're in business to serve. What's more, we are in business to serve human beings. And we are at all times aware that the human beings we serve are veterans—men and women who have displayed the highest type of citizenship in a free nation.

Whether you have a question or not, will you do me a favor? If you meet me anywhere, in this hotel or on the street, will you please say "Hello"? I know a great many of you, but even though I may not know your name I do hope you will stop me and say "Hi" whenever we may meet. I am proud of my shipmates of the Fleet Reserve Association.

May God bless all of you, my shipmates and my friends.

"Dear Mr. Mikoyan"—An Open Letter to the Deputy Premier by the Spring Valley (Minn.) Tribune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, on January 15 there appeared in the Spring Valley (Minn.) Tribune an editorial which, I believe, admirably summarizes the feelings of millions of Americans to the visit here by the Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union, Anastas I. Mikoyan.

The editorial, which appears in the newspaper edited by Bob Lind and published by Walt Babineau, certainly reflects what should be the view of this Government as it agrees to discuss policy at any time with the Soviet Union—but which, nevertheless, keeps careful scrutiny on that Nation's actions due to a history of broken pledges and dishonored agreements.

The editorial reads as follows:

DEAR MR. MIKOYAN

Mr. ANASTAS I. MIKOYAN,
Deputy Premier of the U.S.S.R.,
Somewhere in the United States.

DEAR MR. MIKOYAN: While traveling around our country last week, you said we Americans don't trust you Russians enough.

Mr. Mikoyan, we don't trust you Russians at all.

We wish we could, of course. We Americans are generally a trusting crowd of optimists. We're usually ready to think well of the other fellow.

But you and all your comrades-in-atomic-arms have done everything possible to make us doubt every word you utter and every promise you make.

You have talked about free elections in East Germany; but they haven't taken place.

You've talked about stopping atomic bomb tests; then you tested some more bombs.

You told the people of Budapest you were pulling out; then you sent tanks back in to slaughter them.

You've violated promises, treaties, and law with flagrant disregard.

Yet, Mr. Mikoyan, you wonder why we don't trust you, Mr. Khrushchev, and the other Soviet leaders "enough."

Now you're spreading the Soviet cry for peace while you tour America.

If we had real peace, could you be trusted to keep it?

Mr. Khrushchev has expressed extreme displeasure over our bases which encircle your country. He doesn't approve of our placing missile bases, airfields for long-range aircraft, and large numbers of troops all around your homeland.

This is evidence of the deep lack of trust we have for you, Mr. Mikoyan.

A father will tell his 2-year-old son to keep his fingers out of the candy bowl—but, nevertheless, he keeps a wary eye on him.

We're keeping a wary eye on you, too.

Because, to date, you're just about as trustworthy as that 2-year-old boy.

Sincerely.

Right-To-Work Laws Hurt the GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the elections of last autumn the reaction of the electorate to the so-called right-to-work laws was the most significant development.

As a matter of fact, the greatest Democratic victories occurred in those States in which right-to-work was an issue. The voters of these communities manifested their understanding of this complex issue in spite of confusing argument and unprecedented pressures.

The following article from the Democratic Digest of November–December 1958, entitled "Right-To-Work Laws Hurt the GOP," expertly analyzes the election result. Those who think in terms of a Federal right-to-work law should give the election results careful consideration:

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS HURT THE GOP

When Republican leaders picked right to work as a winning issue in 1958, they demonstrated anew how completely out of step they are with the 20th century. In all but one (Kansas) of the six States where the issue was on the ballot November 4, the voters overwhelmingly rejected the antiunion measure along with a healthy majority of the Republicans who spoke out in favor of it.

Before the election opponents of the so-called right-to-work bill admitted that the title was going to be difficult to overcome. Far from providing the right to a job, which the fraudulent phrase implies, the so-called right-to-work law denies both organized labor and management the right to negotiate a union shop and opens the door to the unfair practices of an earlier era that fostered hostile labor-management relations, sharp conflict, and sometimes violence.

Under the Taft-Hartley law, enacted by the Republican 80th Congress, the union shop is permitted; that is, contracts requiring union membership after employment are legal. But as a result of this same law, which the Republican Congress enacted, the door was opened to flagrant antiunionism by giving State laws precedence over the Federal law, thus permitting the States to ban the union shop by State statute.

Antilabor forces which backed the measure, recognized that what they could not accomplish in the U.S. Congress under the glare of national publicity, might well be achieved on a local level. These forces included the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Farm Bureau Federation, Big Business Republican supporters along with GOP leaders.

IKE HEDGES

While politically astute Labor Secretary Mitchell termed the right-to-work law unwise, President Eisenhower hedged on the controversial issue in the 1958 campaign. "I have never urged any State to vote for the so-called right of work law," Mr. Eisenhower told his October 1 press conference, "for the simple reason that I believe it's the State's business, and I'm not going to get into it."

When a news reporter tried to question the President further, he turned the newsman away abruptly with a "thank you very much. I have answered it."

Vice President NIXON continually doubletalked his way around the delicate issue—especially in California where GOP Senator Knowland based his gubernatorial campaign on the State right-to-work law, while GOP Governor Knight, running for the Senate, opposed it. Mr. NIXON begged off, when asked for his stand, explaining that he did not want to influence California voters and then proceeded to try to influence them on two equally controversial issues on the California ballot.

Former President Truman, who vetoed the Taft-Hartley law in 1948, and was one of the most outspoken campaigners against right-to-work laws in this year's campaign, warned of their danger.

"To outlaw the union shop," Mr. Truman told a Cleveland, Ohio labor audience on October 3, "will undermine the responsibility and the standing of the great unions on whom the stability of our productive industrial life depends."

Further, he pointed out, "the union shop is good for the employer as well as the workers—and enlightened employers know this."

Recognizing that the title was designed to deceive, Mr. Truman said that "some people will tell you that they are against the union shop but they are for unions. That is like saying you are for motherhood but don't like children."

Mr. Truman's claim of support for his stand from enlightened employers was verified in more than one instance. For example, in Colorado, one of the States where the issue was on the ballot, leading representatives of industry opposed the right-to-work amendment with their plea to the voters that Colorado has experienced a minimum of strikes and labor strife over the past several years and management preferred to keep it that way. The measure went down to defeat—315,683 to 200,027.

THE COUNTRY AGREES

Democratic political leaders and candidates, respected labor leaders and rank-and-file union members around the country were in agreement. Religious and community leaders joined in speaking out in support of a healthy union movement and its contributions to a democratic society, including the National Council of Churches, the Methodist Church, leading Catholic clergymen and rabbis. The National Conference for Industrial Peace, with such distinguished members as Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and Senator Herbert H. Lehman, mobilized public opinion through a nationwide educational campaign, hammering away at the fact that banning the union shop would open up a long period of labor unrest and social conflict which the Nation could ill afford.

National Chairman Paul M. Butler saw the real purpose of the right-to-work law as an effort "to bust unions—once and for all time, with the result that wages will suffer, working conditions will deteriorate. And in the long run we all will suffer, because the welfare of all of us in America is interdependent with the welfare of working men and women."

The national chairman warned that if Senator Knowland of California, campaigning on a right-to-work platform, were elected, the cause of organized labor in this country would be set back at least a generation. The stunning defeat of the amendment—2,903,309 to 1,934,911—and the overwhelming victory of Democratic Gov. Pat Brown, clearly indicated that California's citizens want no part of Republican Old Guard policies.

The story was repeated in Ohio, where Democratic candidates and organized labor were joined by all six bishops of the Catholic Church to help defeat the anti-union measure on the ballot—2,007,291 to 1,080,266. Unseated were Old Guard veterans Senator John Bricker and Gov. William O'Neill.

A similar drive in the State of Washington, where a right-to-work proposal was defeated 2 years ago, again was slapped down by a healthy margin—2,106,055 to 1,303,882.

In Idaho, where the right-to-work proposal was defeated 124,147 to 117,923, a Republican Governor was victorious, while in predominantly agricultural Kansas, the right-to-work measure won approval—369,511 to 280,325—and Democratic Gov. George Docking who opposed it was re-elected to his second term.

While there were both national and State issues contributing to the sweeping Democratic victory nationwide November 4, the defeat of the right-to-work measure in five of the six States where it was on the ballot points up the fact that the majority of the voters reject 19th century policies for 20th century problems.

Location of Federal Prison in Southern Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release:

GRAY OPTIMISTIC ABOUT CHANCES FOR $10 MILLION FEDERAL PRISON FOR AREA—FUNDS INCLUDED IN BUDGET

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Congressman KENNETH J. GRAY, Democrat, West Frankfort, said today that chances for locating the proposed $10 million Federal prison in southern Illinois look good.

GRAY said the new budget presented to Congress to operate the Department of Justice for the next fiscal year contains a $10 million request for funds with which to construct the new maximum security, escape proof, prison. He said he will go before Congress early next month to urge that southern Illinois be given the new prison.

According to GRAY, the site selection has narrowed down considerably and southern Illinois is one of the remaining favorable locations.

"I believe our area has more to offer than other sites still under consideration and I feel very optimistic about our chances," GRAY said.

"If we can get the prison for our area, it will mean hundreds of jobs during construction and several hundred permanent jobs in the operation," he said.

GRAY said the prison will be a model institution and a great asset to the area.

GRAY said he expects some definite word as to a location within the next 30 days.

The Responsibilities of Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the following message is one in a series of programs being prepared and presented by the Christian Amendment Movement. I commend it to the attention of Members of this body:

"THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEADERSHIP"

(By the Reverend R. J. G. McKnight, D.D., Ph. D.)

From our studies of the preamble to the Constitution four things are apparent:

1. It ignores God the Father as the source of all authority.

2. It ignores the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations.

3. It assumes for the people the powers and the functions that belong to God alone.

4. It retires the Bible from its rightful place in our national life as the only standard of civic morality.

We cannot excuse ourselves on the ground that the preamble simply says nothing about these matters. The trouble is that it says nothing about them at the place where it ought to state all of them definitely. The fatal thing is that it leaves them out.

A man who leaves God, Christ, and the Bible out of his life is not a Christian. He may be a gentleman. It may be possible to say many nice things about him. But whatever else he may or may not be, he is not a Christian. And a nation that leaves God, Christ, and the Bible out of its fundamental law is not a Christian nation, however much we may praise its legal excellencies.

Many years ago Japan sent out a delegation to various countries to study the different religions of each country. In their report they said that Christianity was the best religion but that there were no Christian nations. How did they arrive at this conclusion? Manifestly not by reading the individual statements relative to divine guidance in national affairs such as were made by such outstanding men as George Washington who said in his Farewell Address: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports."

The Japanese did not base their conclusions on the words of John Adams, Washington's first successor, who said in his inaugural address: "If a veneration for the religion of a people who profess and call themselves Christians, and a fixed resolution to consider a decent respect for Christianity among the best recommendations for the public service," I can accept this responsibility.

Noble utterances such as these can be found by the dozens in the speeches and writings of strong Christian men who have served in high places in our Government. These are but personal opinions of men whose vibrant Christian faith found expression in their lives and service. The Japanese did not consider these things as evidence that the Nation was founded on the Christian religion or pervaded by it. They rested their verdict on the written Constitution of the country, and in it they read: "But no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." So, notwithstanding the part Christianity had played in laying the foundations of our great Nation, our Constitution—the supreme law of the land—the legal instrument which is the standard by which all national political actions are to be determined, did not regard the Christian religion as worthy of mention.

The judgment of the Japanese was right when they said: "There are no Christian nations." They could find in our Constitution—the supreme law of our land—no acknowledgment of Christianity as a factor in our growth and development as a nation. If the Japanese had found in our Constitution the acknowledgment that God is the source of all authority, that Jesus Christ is the ruler of nations, and that the Bible is the infallible guidebook for men and nations—and if they had recommended to their people the doctrines of Christianity as indispensable factors in the growth of a nation, and if Japan as a nation had embodied these principles in their instruments of government—would there have been a Pearl Harbor attack?

No man liveth to himself, and in this world which is daily growing smaller, no nation liveth to itself. The United States has reached the position of leadership in the world. This high position involves great responsibilities. If there is ever to be a Christian world order, some nation must lead in the movement to establish it. To lead in the movement, some nation must take the first step by establishing a Christian government within its own borders.

Despite our failure to make Christian acknowledgments in our Constitution, the United States has a social order in which the Christian belief dominates. The majority of our people, in some form, profess the Christian religion. It is true, of course, that many who profess the Christian faith do not live up to the high ideals of Christianity. But, on the other hand, the majority of our people sing the sentiment of the song: "Faith of our fathers, living still, we will be true to thee till death."

Now, it is axiomatic that in the long run a nation will have the kind of government the majority of the people in that nation want. It may be a long, long run, but ultimately, if a majority in a nation wants a change in government, the change will come. They may have to break the shackles of a dictator. It may take a lake a long time. But in the end it will come. Not only so, but the character of the majority of the people will be reflected in the character of the government.

But someone may say, "What about minorities?" Well, there is this to be said about minorities who disagree with the Christian belief in the United States of America: In no other nation under the sun are the rights of minorities, whether religious or political, so legally protected and morally safeguarded as in this land of liberty we call the United States.

Why is it that the oppressed of every nation on earth yearn for the day when they can set foot on American soil? They know they will be minority groups, but they know also that here, regardless of race, color, or creed, they will have unlimited possibilities for advancement in every way. And they know their rights will be protected, their schooling will be provided, and they may live as freemen. This is what America has to offer to the oppressed. But why does America offer it? The answer is plain. It is because the predominant religion of America is Christian, and the religion that is dominant—Christianity—is the religion that fosters the spirit of brotherhood as no other religion can do.

Minority groups regard America as the safest haven because of the prevalence of the Christian religion.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Inaugural Address of Gov. Ralph Herseth, of South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the excellent inaugural address of South Dakota's able new Governor, the Honorable Ralph Herseth:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GOV. RALPH HERSETH, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, 36TH SESSION, SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE—CONSERVANCY DISTRICT LAW, STRICTER CURB ON MOTORISTS IS PROPOSED

President of the senate, speaker of the house and members of the 36th session of the South Dakota Legislature:

In keeping with a provision of the South Dakota Constitution it is now my privilege and duty to address this distinguished body. To share with you some of my thinking on the affairs of a great State and to make such recommendations as are deemed advisable.

In the tradition of election years our two political parties have again engaged in a contest for the voters' favors to determine in the true pattern of a democracy who the men and women should be to represent the people in government. That is now history of 1958. Much of value was attained in the old year. Some scars and some bruises were also acquired, not all of which have any connection with political struggles. As I give you my hearty wish for a wonderful and productive 1959; I also ask that you take with you from 1958 those memories which showed profit and contained a good moral. By the same token, in the name of progress and for a better tomorrow, we should leave behind that which has shown a loss or divided our efforts toward making South Dakota a better State in which to live.

During the weeks that have intervened since you choose me as your chief executive I have become increasingly aware of the responsibilities we face together. I am sure that as legislators you have experienced a similar reaction. Let me assure you that I am today a most humble and grateful person. Also, that my most earnest desire is to conduct myself in a manner which will command the esteem of all South Dakotans, not just those who may share my political views. I am aware, as you are, that we will make mistakes. May we discipline ourselves to the extent that such mistakes as are made will be completely honest. I am convinced that there has never been, nor will there ever be, a good substitute for constant vigilance in any business. This is most certainly true in the State's business where many people are involved. I ask you to alert yourselves to the need of assessing your own performance in this respect, as well as that of our fellow men.

This being our attitude, I am confident that with the divine assistance I shall earnestly seek, and with a genuine humbleness of spirit, a desire to adhere to the abiding principles of the Golden Rule, our State will move united toward the high destiny a merciful God has provided for us.

With these preliminary statements I shall discuss with you in a general manner some of the paramount problems facing us in this session. We have reached the point where we must, to the best of our ability, interpret tangibly what the majority of our voters spelled out in the past election. No one can dictate nor guarantee results. However, I am obligated as you are to accomplish some reforms and some new endeavors. In this respect conflicts of interest and thinking will be encountered. In the final analysis I do not anticipate a perfect score. I am most hopeful for a high average as a testimony to honest efforts and the wisdom of our legislative process.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

An exciting challenge confronts this 36th legislature and this new administration. We have a golden opportunity to increase the efficiency of the executive branch of the State government and at the same time achieve substantial savings for the taxpayer. The people of our State want their government operated in a businesslike manner and they have a right to expect that we will promptly and aggressively move toward real progress in that direction.

The challenge to all of us lies in the fact that for the past 35 years there has been talk of this problem, but for the most part very little has been done about it. Approximately 30 years after statehood and partly as the result of the experience and actions of other States, it was realized that the organization structure of the executive branch was defective. Thus, during 1921–22, consultants were engaged, at a cost of $25,000, to study the executive branch and to recommend a plan for improvement. Few of the many recommendations arising from that study were ever adopted. In 1925, however, two Departments, Finance and Agriculture, were established and several independent offices and boards were abolished.

During the intervening years, the volume and variety of functions have increased greatly and, largely by statute, there has been a piecemeal, uncoordinated enlargement of the State government. The new study of the executive branch authorized by the 1953 legislature revealed the extent to which our governmental structure has overgrown. The 90 State agencies, boards, and commissions of the 1921 study had by 1954 increased to 125. The 1900 State employees of 1921 had by 1958 increased to over 7,000. The 1921 general appropriation of about $6½ million had by 1957 increased to about $32½ million. Thus, if the 1921 legislature saw a need for reorganization, it is crystal clear that the need has by now become a necessity. The time has come when the consideration of measures designed to improve the efficiency of State government can no longer be delayed. While every reasonable effort must be made to maintain and improve the quality of essential governmental services, the State of South Dakota cannot move forward under the handicap of obsolete governmental structures, nor can the taxpayers be expected to continue indefinitely to provide increased financial support for duplicative activities and overlapping functions. As a result of the 1954 study, we have the benefit of the recommendations of the "little Hoover" committee drawn from the membership of the 1953 legislature. This committee was, of course, named after the National committee which pioneered this work in our Federal Government, a committee headed by former President Herbert Hoover, who accepted his post as a civic service at the request of President Harry Truman. Too, we have the benefit of the report and recommendations of the bipartisan efficiency and economy committee, whose membership came from the 1955 legislature. The entire reorganization program is, in my view, completely bipartisan and one which has only the objective of reducing the cost of operating our State government by increasing its efficiency. In order to provide improved public service and to promote efficiency in State government, I earnestly recommend that this legislature:

1. Establish a State department of commerce which would consolidate the existing functions of the insurance department, the banking department, the securities commission, the fire marshal, the aeronautics commission, and the corporate supervision function of the secretary of State. This in brief would bring the regulation of business agencies into one department. I think you would be interested to know that former Gov. M. Q. Sharpe made practically the same recommendation in his 1945 inaugural message. I now quote from that part of Governor Sharpe's message wherein he recommends consolidation of the department of banking, insurance, and securities: "This would be a propitious time, therefore, to unite these two departments into one single State department to be designated as the department of banking and insurance and headed by a single commissioner of banking, securities, and insurance. I have held conferences with officials of both departments and have found that this can be done with a considerable saving of expense and at the same time an increase of efficiency in both fields of regulation and inspection. The plan has been in effect for years in other States and, in my opinion, would be advantageous in South Dakota. It can be effected with one or two simple amendments to present laws and without interfering with operations of either department. The last session of the legislature authorized placing the securities commission in the insurance department and this was effected and is now operating with saving of expense and increased efficiency for the State. The three departments are closely related to one another in their operations and should now be united into one."

NO ACTION

Unfortunately, this excellent recommendation was not favorably acted upon by the 1945 legislature and has not since been resubmitted in any subsequent inaugural message.

2. A reorganization of the department of agriculture is in order. It must be strengthened to become a real force in aiding the welfare of agriculture, our No. 1 industry in South Dakota. The new department of agriculture should consolidate and centralize the many different boards, agencies, and commissions now dealing with various agricultural phases but without any real coordinating or executive direction from any source. I therefore recommend that you give full consideration to bringing into the department of agriculture the horticulture agency, the office of State veterinary, the South Dakota State Horticultural Society, the dairy industry commission, the State brand board, the State weed board, the State soil

conservation committee, the State weather control commission, the State livestock sanitary board, the seed certification board, and the State fair board. The incorporation of the administrative functions of the above agencies into one department and the merger of the several boards will simplify administrative direction, coordinate the work, and eliminate duplication of effort. It will reduce much of the current confusion in the minds of the farmers and ranchers served by these agencies and make for savings of administrative costs. A replacement of the abovementioned boards by a single board of agriculture upon which were represented leaders in all of the different phases of farm and ranch activities, would insure that the viewpoint of all interests affected would be fully and adequately considered.

3. I recommend that the duties of the State bond board, the South Dakota Rural Credit Board, the State surplus property committee, and the State travel commission be included within the department of finance and that these boards be abolished. This recommendation places before you one of the reforms suggested by the 1954 executive branch study authority by the 1953 legislature.

4. The need for executive branch reorganization is a continuing one. Thus our Federal Government and several of the State governments have already vested in the executive the authority to institute such further reorganization measures as may seem advisable, subject, however, to the right of the legislature to disapprove such administrative reforms. A statute of this nature recently passed in the State of Michigan has been hailed by students of State government as a model step in the right direction. I therefore recommend for your consideration a statute patterned after the Michigan law but tailor made to fit the special needs of our own State of South Dakota in the field of governmental reform.

FISCAL AFFAIRS

It is my firm belief that our people want State Government operated on a pay-as-you-go basis. However, we are now spending more than we are taking in. Last month's printed report of the State auditor covering the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, reveals that the State's general fund balance of about $13 million, June 30, 1957, had dropped to less than $10 million, June 30, 1958. A study of figures and public records now available in the offices of the State treasurer, auditor and comptroller further indicates that the general fund balance at the end of the present biennium, June 30, 1958, will be $6 million or less.

While we view the long range future of our great State with confidence, we must also be on guard against the time when our tax revenues and other receipts may be temporarily decreased by a period of drought or business depression. If we continue spending beyond our income until all our reserves are gone, only to run unexpectedly into a period of general economic distress we could conceivably find our State in the unhealthy position of paying 6 percent interest on unpaid State warrants, unpaid because of a lack of money in the State treasury to pay them. In short, the time has now come when we must consider most seriously the question of whether the general fund of our State can in safety be permitted to go much below the expected $6 million mark of June 30, 1959.

It is obvious that we can operate under a balanced budget for the next 2 years only if the total appropriation for the coming biennium do not exceed receipts and revenues conservatively estimated for the same period. To put it another way, we have now come to the point where we cannot any longer spend the State's money unless we have already provided for the raising of revenues sufficient to meet such expenditure. No one is more anxious than I to see our institutions, departments and functions of State Government adequately and reasonably supported. This desire, however, can never be used as an excuse for retreating from the fundamental principle that any unit of Government can spend only such funds as it exacts from its citizens by way of taxes and that for every tax dollar spent we must insist upon a dollar's worth of services or goods.

TAXATION

Monumental problems face us in the general field of taxation. Property taxes have been carried to dangerously high levels, with recent sharp increases in many cases exceeding 50 percent, particularly on real estate. On the other hand, demands upon State and local governments for new services and for drastic increases in services traditionally rendered have sent governmental budgets to new highs in this inflationary period in which we now live. Surely the time has come to take a long, searching look at the whole structure of taxation in South Dakota. Our taxpayers are willing to pay for those States, local, and educational services they consider essential, but only if the tax law is one generally considered fair and equitable, properly assessed and economically administered. The complexity of the problem and the lack of a ready answer from any legislative source is pointed up by the report of the assessment, taxation, and finance committee of the legislative research council, drawn from the membership of the 1957 legislature, which report is dated October 1958. In point 1 of the summary of the report, the committee gives this summary of its study and I now quote from the report:

The committee concludes "that at this time it cannot present any satisfactory recommendation for a tax that would be either in lieu of or provide any relief for personal and real property taxation and recommends that the matter of property tax relief again be studied in the light of actions taken by and demands made on the 1959 legislature." Clearly, the time has come to take a new look at the whole field of taxation, both State and local, in South Dakota. This thorough, comprehensive, year-long study can best be made by a bipartisan citizens committee representing all walks of life, such group to receive the fullest cooperation of all sources of State government, but to be completely free to reach its own conclusions from its own independent study. I am sure that many of you know that this form of tax study by an independent citizens group has already been successfully conducted in the State of Minnesota. It is most interesting to note that although the citizens of this committee came from all types of business, agriculture, and industry that after thorough study the committee was able to unanimously recommend to the Minnesota Legislature a number of worthwhile and needed reforms. The same method has been successfully followed in at least one other Midwestern State.

Sometimes we of the executive and legislative branch can be too close to the problem. A citizens committee of leaders in the various fields, having no connection with the State government, can bring a new approach or a keen reevaluation of our present revenue-raising methods.

I, therefore, respectfully suggest that legislation to carry the foregoing recommendation into effect be enacted by this legislature and that such such legislation carry an emergency clause with the provision that the group begin its studies by April 1 and that the full report of the group be placed on file in the office of the Governor by January 1, 1960. At such time I will carefully study the report and if the report contains recommendations having the support of the great majority of the committee and recommendations which can be of immediate value to our State and its taxpaying citizens I will give full consideration to the question of immediately calling the legislature into special session for the purpose of enacting such recommendations into law. I do believe that out of a thorough tax study now we can bring forth in the future, when and if they are needed, taxation measures that will find true popular support because they are as fair and equitable as possible to all taxpayers.

Up to know I have not seen the proposed budget for the next biennium. I am therefore unable to make any statement concerning any of its items at this time. Our law provides the incoming Governor a period of 10 days after receipts of the budget message of the retiring Governor, within which to send a supplemental budget message to the legislature. In the short period thus allotted to me, and after the fullest consideration possible, if necessary, I will send to you my supplemental message on this vital part of State government.

EDUCATION

The people of South Dakota are justifiably proud of our State's educational achievements. The public school system and the institutions of higher education, together with the many excellent private educational institutions, have established an enviable record in training the youth of our State for positions of leadership in South Dakota, and in the Nation. But the needs and standards of education are constantly advancing and South Dakota must move forward with other States, or see its school system relegated to an inferior position.

The contribution of the real and personal property taxpayer in South Dakota for education on the local level is substantially greater than the national average. While I know that South Dakotans want better than average education for the children of this State, we must make renewed efforts to achieve all possible economics, consistent with sound educational practices. The presence of inefficiencies in the South Dakota public school system is suggested by the fact that we have a higher number of school districts, and a lower average number of pupils per district than many of the other States. The resulting high cost per pupil is perhaps responsible for the fact that even with property taxes at an extremely high level a number of South Dakota school districts are still operating in the red.

In order to maintain and improve the quality of educational services in South Dakota, to equalize the costs of education among the several categories of taxpayers, and to promote economy and efficiency in the operation of our school system, I earnestly suggest that this legislature consider:

1. Revision of the appropriate school laws to achieve a more workable plan of school district reorganization, always keeping in mind the traditions of local control and the right of appeal to the courts.

2. I recommend the adoption of a minimum foundation program which will establish formulas for the distribution of school aid, which will encourage adequate educational standards, efficiency in operations, and a more equitable distribution of public school costs. The quality of education and the efficiency with which educational services can be provided are not exclusively and uniquely determined by the size of the school. Area, transportation, distances and time, adequacy of the tax base, and the population density—as well as number of students enrolled, must be taken into account in the determination of the ideal size of school districts. However, there is rather clear and unmistakable evidence that costs per pupil are excessive in very small school units, particularly in the smaller high schools. The extent to which all of the people of the State should be required to subsidize the continued operation of such

high cost units through existing or increased State aid is a debatable question. But I respectfully suggest that the time has come when the chosen representatives of all the people should arrive at a clearcut policy decision on this vital matter. In considering the general matter of the minimum foundation plan, this legislature should undoubtedly be mindful that one of the objectives of such a plan is the relief of local property taxes and any such plan should contain safeguards to insure attainment of this goal.

No school system is any better that the quality of the teachers comprising its faculty. The exodus from South Dakota of well-qualified teachers is truly alarming. While most of our schools cannot establish salary schedules as attractive as those found in other States, we can provide other inducements for teachers to remain in South Dakota. Therefore, I recommend that this legislature give full consideration to adoption of a teacher retirement system. Such a system could be financed jointly by the school district, the participating teacher, and the State.

Defense Education Act

I also suggest that this legislature consider adoption of measures necessary to implement the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This act recently passed by Congress provides for loans to college students, grants for equipment, national defense fellowships, the screening of exceptionally well qualified students, guidance counselor training, technician training centers, and foreign language training programs. South Dakota's allocation for the current fiscal year is estimated to be nearly $220,000. For the State appropriation of only $20,000, approximately $237,000 would be available for student loans among our colleges.

We are happy to note the steady enrollment increases at our State institutions of higher learning even though this may indicate a need for more staff and physical plant. We must meet this challenge to provide a college education for all South Dakota youth who desire it. I think there is no area of governmental activity where we can more truly think of our expenditures as investments rather than expenses, than in the field of education. In training the leaders and citizens of tomorrow, in research, and in the development of agricultural and industrial improvements, our institutions of higher learning repay the people of the State many times what they invest in them.

During the campaign and since the election I have visited most of our State institutions, in order to gain firsthand knowledge of their needs and problems. Recently I was surprised and shocked to learn of the loss of accreditation of the Engineering School at South Dakota State College. I intend to immediately inquire into all of the facts surrounding this matter, and to do everything possible to bring about prompt reinstatement of the school.

In connection with the administration of higher education I have always felt that our board of regents should be composed of the best qualified persons in South Dakota. I'm sure we all realize that under present law, no resident of a county in which any State institution of higher learning is located may be appointed to the board. This means that by residence alone, nearly one-fourth of the citizens of this State are denied the opportunity of ever serving on the board, even though they may otherwise be eminently well qualified. I recommend that this statute be amended and that the board of regents be reconstituted so that the new board membership can be selected from the most qualified persons over the entire State.

The need for relocation of the school for the blind has been apparent for some time. The easy way would be to sidestep this knotty problem or simply make no mention of it. But these young people are entitled to better than that—from those of us fortunate enough to be blessed with good health.

I therefore recommend that appropriate legislation be enacted to relocate the South Dakota School for the Blind.

NATURAL RESOURCES

One of the oldest resources will soon become our newest frontier. As such it offers our State virtually limitless possibilities for power, irrigation, industry and recreation. I refer to what will be when completed one of the largest bodies of fresh water in North America. This chain of lakes in Central South Dakota will be formed by the Missouri River dams, stretching in one continuous line from our northernmost tip to our southern boundary.

It is perhaps even more noteworthy that when these reservoirs are filled South Dakota will rank fourth in the Nation in the amount of usable water in storage. The price we have paid for this is the loss of one-half million acres of agricultural land. Whether or not this sacrifice has been worthwhile will in considerable measure depend on the action taken at this legislatitive session and upon the action taken by this administration. For simple logic will tell us that there will be a great demand from all the States to our south for the right to use and appropriate this vast water supply. Unless we move immediately and vigorously to lay claim to our rightful share of the river water we will awake one day to find that while we slept our water rights floated down the river.

I therefore earnestly recommend that this legislature enact permissive water conservancy district legislation to prove unmistakably to Congress, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Interior that we intend to claim and utilize water rights for all of the water we will need within our State. The legislation enacted should be enabling legislation. It should provide a given area or group of people a choice between irrigation or dryland farming. It should give cities and towns a right to reject or accept municipal water supply from the reservoirs. At the time it should protect the rights of all the people of our State to use the water for any desirable purpose.

As the sponsor of a Senate bill early in the 1955 session calling for creation of a strong industrial promotion agency with a full-time director and staff, I can assure you that my interest in business and industrial promotion in South Dakota is not something which has developed overnight. I am keenly aware of the fact that this new water supply and electric power source could make our State far more attractive to industry than ever before. To my best ability I will make the office of Governor the spearhead and coordinator of all State offices working on any phase of Missouri River development, whether it be power, irrigation, industrial, or recreation. If this legislature will provide the tools, including a conservancy act, and adequate funds for carrying on the work of industrial promotion, we will rise to the inspiring challenge of South Dakota's new frontier. This, of course, is not to say that we should neglect other aspects of the business and industrial potential of the State. We must shape our development program to give technical and marketing assistance to the hundreds of promising small business firms in the State, aiding them to expand their out-of-State markets in the knowledge that all of our citizens will benefit, directly or indirectly, from the new money thus brought into South Dakota.

The outdoor recreation potential of our State is certainly one of our greatest natural resources. We must make the benefits of our mountains, our lakes, our parks, and other game and recreation areas readily available to the greatest possible number of our own citizens. Let us also recognize that South Dakota can become the vacation land of ever-increasing numbers of visitors from other States, for the recreation potential of our new lake system is as yet practically untapped. Vacationers leave millions of dollars annually in our State and make substantial contributions to our sales and gas tax revenues. But many other States are competing with us in the tourist field. Thus we must use all legitimate means to invite our fellow Americans to visit and vacation with us in South Dakota. In this connection, it appears that a closer coordination of our recreational and industrial advertising program can eliminate costly duplication of effort and advertising space, and at the same time fully acquaint the Nation with South Dakota's attraction in both important fields.

HIGHWAYS

There is plenty of elbow room in South Dakota and that is one of the things which makes our State a fine place in which to live and raise a family. But with our "wide open spaces" we need good roads, not only to get farm products to market but for many other business and recreational purposes today considered a necessary part of modern living. It is therefore important that we provide adequate funds for both our primary highway system, and our farm-to-market road program.

As a part of the national military road network inaugurated by our Federal Government approximately 2½ years ago, all of the 48 States of the Union are now busy with the construction of their assigned share of this Interstate Highway System. Ninety-one and eight-tenths percent of the cost of construction of the Interstate Highway is paid by the Federal Government. Fifty-six percent of the cost of construction of the State primary and secondary system is borne by the United States. If South Dakota should ever fail to provide sufficient funds for matching the Federal funds allocated to this State, there is no doubt that our share would simply be passed to other interested States. It is for this legislature to determine whether South Dakota shall secure its share of this increased Federal aid for highway purposes.

As chairman of the State highway commission I intend to commence a close study of the administrative and engineer operation of the State highway department to determine whether savings can be effected within the department. Full consideration will be given to the adoption of advanced methods of highway planning and design which I am informed other midwestern States have already instituted, with a substantial saving in operation costs and an increase in efficiency. Among other things, this can include the fullest use of aerial mapping, and installation of electronic equipment in the planning section. Study will also be given to the question of letting major maintenance projects to the lowest bidder, the same as new construction. This might make it possible to reduce the number of large, expensive road machinery units presently maintained by the State, but in use only part of the time.

From inquiry which I caused to be made, it appears substantial savings can be achieved in the purchase of materials used to reflectorize our motor vehicle license plates. Use of an alternate material which would apparently be just as effective could save the State of South Dakota $161,000 in the manufacture of these plates, under the present system. I recommend serious consideration of a return to the annual license plate. Originally South Dakota went to the 3-year plate because of the high cost of reflectorizing. Economies which we believe can now be effected in the method of manufacture, would be sufficient to enable a return to the annual plate system.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

The tragic loss of lives on South Dakota highways is a matter of grave concern to all

of us. It is a shocking fact that South Dakota's 1958 traffic death toll was the highest in the Nation. Actually, the rate of deaths per mile traveled on South Dakota highways is nearly double the national average, and more than twice that of many of our neighboring States. While there is no way of measuring the grief and anguish of the family of the traffic victims, the total cost of all traffic accidents in South Dakota in 1958 was estimated by the National Safety Council at more than $31 million, in other words, more than our entire State budget for a 1-year period. The public has now rightly come to expect that this legislature will move resolutely to curb and punish careless driving and to promote and encourage highway safety. Yet there is no magic formula or single piece of legislation which will automatically make our highways safe. The problem is a complex one and a satisfactory solution requires a coordinated attack along the following lines: First of all, any serious scheme proposed for reducing the traffic toll must include education and the educational tools we possess. We must expand our drivers education program to make the licensing of drivers under 18 years of age contingent on their successful completion of an approved course in drivers education in one of our public or private high schools. The value of this training is best shown by the fact that insurance companies grant a 15-percent premium reduction to all persons who have completed such a course. We should emphasize traffic safety education in primary and secondary schools and expand teacher preparation for such courses.

2. South Dakota is the only State in the Union which does not require any sort of drivers examination as a condition to driving on the public highways. We need a drivers licensing law which will provide for a knowledge test of traffic laws and safe driving practices, a vision test, and a behind-the-wheel driving test. This should and will improve traffic safety by upgrading driver quality and by eliminating certain drivers who cannot be trusted with the privilege.

3. The establishment of a point system of driver improvement and control. The average person will make a special effort to drive within the law if he realized the penalty for not doing so could be the loss of his driving privilege. This program is already in successful operation in many of our neighboring States.

4. In the field of engineering, traffic safety should become an even greater factor in our planning and construction. Prompt construction of the Interstate System to adequate standards in the shortest possible time without neglects of the other rural and urban systems will help make driving safer.

For the present, at least, I make no recommendation for any further increase in the size of the State motor patrol. It is my belief that the utilization and deployment of this force in the most efficient manner will enable us to do the job without an increase in their numbers.

LABOR

The adaptability of South Dakota's labor force is one of our greatest resources of economic expansion. The contributions made by organized labor to the welfare of our entire community are too little recognized. South Dakota labor has a record of working consistently for the extension of educational opportunity, for the raising of our standard of living and the mass purchasing power on which business prosperity depends, and it had been in the forefront of the battle to safeguard the processes of democratic society.

In the field of workmen's compensation, the obligation toward the injured worker has long been recognized. But South Dakota has failed to keep up with the established standards in this field, as our economy and our industry have moved ahead. Our workmen's compensation law must be modernized and brought up to date with a liberalization of benefits in accordance with the formula which was stated as the objective of this program when it was created many years ago.

WELFARE

We are all indebted to the hardy pioneers who led in the early development of our great State. Now in the sunset of their life, many of these senior citizens need our help and unfortunately the spiraling increase of living costs has far outdistanced the modest increases we have granted in assistance payments. The result has been in far too many cases substandard living quarters and too little to eat. And worst of all our assistance program has actually penalized them for helping themselves; when one of our older people was able to earn an extra dollar or two, the State has in effect taken it away from him by reducing his allotment an equal amount.

I recommend that consideration be given to amending this law so that they will have more opportunity to help themselves by earning a little extra money.

Many of these elderly citizens are in need of medical care and attention. When it is provided, under the present system, the burden is upon our counties to bear the cost. Recognizing the acute need for better medical care for our indigent senior citizens, and in an effort to give some relief to the local governments, the Federal Government has had in effect for several years a grant-in-aid program in this field. Twenty-six States now participate in this program.

I recommend that thorough consideration be given to the question of our participation.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

Our Indian people are America's first citizens. As such they leave some special problems which are not much closer to solution today than 25 years ago. Our South Dakota Indian Affairs Commission is the logical agency of State government to study this field. The membership includes both persons of white and Indian blood. Unfortunately the statute creating this body has in the past tended to handicap its operations. I suggest that the Commission be revitalized and given all necessary means to thoroughly consider the area of the State's responsibility to our Indian citizens. This Commission should make and file its report by January 1, 1960 for the appropriate action.

I have by this message sought to outline the fundamental program of the new administration. The desirability of keeping my remarks within reasonable time limits has made it impossible for me to cover all of the wide range of subjects with which you will be concerned during the legislative session. Therefore, I may from time to time during the session submit for your consideration one or more special messages on subjects of paramount interest which could not be fully treated at this time.

In conclusion I wish to express to Governor Foss and members of his administration, my personal thanks for the courtesy and cooperation they have extended. Having been on opposite sides in two recent political campaigns has not interferred with our desire and ability to be friendly and to view important matters with regard to the greatest good for the people and our State. I maintain that no problem which may divide us into separate groups can withstand solution provided we approach it with reverence and determination. My ancestors have imbued me with a sincere and deep conviction that it is man's prerogative and duty to determine, to some extent, what his destiny may be, so long as he shows respect for others concerned. The words which are spoken during this inauguration are intended to provoke constructive thoughts along the lines of some legislation which I feel merits your consideration. Ultimately the combined efforts of your joint meditation will write the lasting record from which historians will determine the extent to which the 1959 South Dakota Legislature gave the greatest benefit to the greatest possible number of our people. You have obligated yourselves as I have to carry out great responsibility with honor and with adherence in your decisions to the principle of the Golden Rule. May we never be too proud or confident to counsel together or to seek the aid of divine providence. I have profound confidence that you will enact a program which will reflect favorably on the two-party system of government. As we proceed from here, let us pledge to protect and promote this State and its government. Let us be guided in word and deed by the motto which has stood the test of time: "Under God the people rule."

The History and Development of the Louisiana Civil Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, as is well known Louisiana is the only State in the Union governed by the civil law, as embodied in the Louisiana Civil Code. The Louisiana Civil Code was modeled after the code Napoleon, and the latter, in turn, was based on Roman law, as exemplified by the Justinian Code.

The first Louisiana Civil Code was promulgated in 1808. A very impressive ceremony was held in the new supreme court building in New Orleans on October 13, 1958, celebrating the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Civil Code. On that occasion I was privileged to hear an address by Hon. John T. Hood, Jr., judge of the 14th judicial district court of Lake Charles, La., on the subject of the "History and Development of the Louisiana Civil Code." I commend the address of this eminent jurist to all my colleagues in this body and especially to students of law and history, and ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD for permanent future useful reference and historical research material.

The address of Judge Hood follows:

THE HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE LOUISIANA CIVIL CODE

The Louisiana Civil Code has been called the most perfect child of the civil law. It has been praised as "the clearest, fullest, the most philosophical, and the best adapted to the exigencies of modern society." It has been characterized as "perhaps the best of all modern codes throughout the world." Based on Roman law, modeled after the great Code Napoleon, enriched with the experiences of at least 27 centuries, and mellowed by American principles and traditions, it is a living and durable monument to those who created it. After 150 years of trial, the Civil Code of Louisiana remains venerable, a body of substantive law adequate for the present and capable of expanding to meet future needs. At this sesquicentennial it is appropriate for us to review the history and development of the Louisiana Civil Code.

The event which we celebrate is the passage of an act by the Legislature of the Territory of Orleans, approved on March 31, 1808, promulgating a compilation of laws, now commonly referred to as the Civil Code of 1808. To adequately appreciate the significance of this legislative enactment, it is necessary to review the circumstances which existed at that time, and the events which led up to the adoption of this code.

Civil government actually began in Louisiana in 1712. The French laws governed from that date until 1769, when O'Reiley abolished those laws and established in their stead the Spanish law. The United States took formal possession of the province of Louisiana on December 20, 1803, about 8 months after the Louisiana Purchase had been concluded. France had assumed sovereignty for a period of only 20 days prior to that date, during which time nothing was done to repeal the Spanish laws or to establish the laws of France, so at the time the United States assumed sovereignty the laws of Spain were still in force.

The first official act performed by William C. C. Claiborne, 1 of the 2 commissioners appointed by the President to take possession of this Province, was to provide for the retention of the "laws heretofore in force," which of course were the Spanish laws.[1]

The laws of Spain at that time were multitudinous, composed of 11 different codes, and containing more than 20,000 laws, with many conflicting provisions. Even in Spain there was a great diversity of opinion as to which of these codes or laws should prevail in case of conflict.[2] Relatively few civil law treatises were available, and those which could be obtained in the territory were not translated into the English language.

The population of Louisiana at that time was estimated by Claiborne to be about 72,000, one-half of whom were slaves. The city of New Orleans had a population of only 10,000. A great majority of the white inhabitants were of French descent, and a substantial portion of the remainder were Spanish. Only a few lawyers were located in this Province prior to the Louisiana Purchase, and most of those had theretofore limited their activities to advising the Spanish officials.

The formal delivery of Louisiana to the United States had not been completed, however, before a host of emigrants, both American and foreign born, flocked to New Orleans—intent on making a fortune. Among them were a number of lawyers, most of whom were of common law origin, and many of whom were ignorant of the language of the people among whom they had settled. Fortunately for the future of the State, however, the lawyers who were located here during these early years, whether emigrant or native born, with few exceptions, were men of remarkable ability. The names of Martin, Derbigny, Matthews, Lewis, Hennen, Duponceau, Brown, Porter, Moreau-Lislet, Workman, Carleton, Livingston, and Mazureau are but a few of the great names which would have adorned the legal history of any time. But, even these able lawyers and the newly appointed judges could not properly interpret and apply the complex and conflicting Spanish law. The need for some immediate clarification of the laws which governed Louisiana was urgent.

Claiborne was a common law lawyer, a native of Virginia. He began practicing law in Tennessee when he was 20 years of age, served on the supreme court of that State when he was 21, and as a Representative in Congress at the age of 22. He was only 28 years of age when he, as a commissioner of the United States, took possession of Louisiana. Claiborne was loyal to his country and disposed to be fair to the people of his new trust, but he was handicapped in that he understood neither French nor Spanish. His early proclamation that the Spanish laws should remain in effect was intended as a temporary measure only, because Claiborne planned eventually to establish the English common law as the basic law for this new territory, just as had been done in all of the States which had been admitted to the Union up to that time.

Many inhabitants of Louisiana, already displeased over the arbitrary powers conferred by Congress on the president and his appointees in the territory, became alarmed when they learned that the newly appointed American officials intended to institute the common law system. Their experience with Spanish judicial proceedings had left them with little or no respect for the courts, and they were afraid of the common law system where the decisions of the courts became law, and where they would be required to search through English jurisprudence to determine what laws applied. They preferred to continue to be governed by the laws of Spain, with which they were familiar, where all enforceable laws were required to have some statutory origin, and where the decisions of the courts did not assume the status of laws but were considered merely as judicial interpretations of statutory provisions.

There is little question but that the common law system would have been established here shortly after the United States assumed sovereignty, and that Louisiana would be a common law state today, were it not for the fact that Edward Livingston, a New York lawyer who emigrated to Louisiana in 1803, emerged as a leader in opposing this action, and as a champion for the cause of retaining a civil law system in the territory.

Livingston was a man of unusual ability. The history of his life and his remarkable accomplishments in political and professional fields, in New York, in Louisiana, in the Nation's Capital and in France, are well known and need not be recounted here. Although educated in common law traditions, Livingston had made a study of the civil law before his arrival in Louisiana and felt for it an effection which is evidenced all through his literary and professional activity.

Claiborne had the misfortune shortly after his arrival in Louisiana of acquiring as bitter political enemies Edward Livingston and Daniel Clark, a wealthy and influential citizen of New Orleans. Their personal dislike for each other was such that Claiborne in his official letters referred to Livingston and Clark as unprincipled and as having views hostile to the interests of the United States.[3] On one occasion in 1805 when Governor Claiborne accused Daniel Clark of being implicated in the Burr conspiracy, a duel ensued in which Claiborne received a bullet wound through his thigh. Because of this intense political fued, the controversy between Livington and Claiborne as to which of the two rival legal systems should be established in this new territory was sparked with a great deal of bitterness.

On March 26, 1804, Congress divided the area included in the Louisiana Purchase into two parts, that portion which is now substantially the State of Louisiana being called the Territory of Orleans. The law provided that the governing authority of this territory should be a legislative council, consisting of 13 members appointed by the President. The need for adopting some system of substantive law for the territory was urgent, so Claiborne, as the first Governor of that Territory, was anxious for the legislative council to convene as soon as possible for that purpose. For a number of reasons, however, he experienced considerable difficulty and delay in assembling the first legislative council.

One reason for the delay was that a yellow fever epidemic struck New Orleans at that time taking the lives of a large portion of the population of that city. Claiborne's wife and only child died on the same day—victims of the fever—and his private secretary, his brother-in-law, and several members of his staff also perished. Claiborne himself became infected and was bedridden for 3 weeks.

Also, a slave insurrection was threatened, which required Claiborne's attention in organizing a volunteer militia.[4]

A third reason for the delay was that Livingston, fearing that this first legislative council selected by Claiborne would establish the common law as the basic law of the territory, prepared a memorial urging Congress to grant statehood immediately to the Territory of Orleans in order that it might thereafter be governed by elected representatives.[5] This memorial was adopted at a public meeting held in New Orleans in October, 1804, and thereafter with the help of Daniel Clark it was distributed throughout the territory for signatures, and was then presented to Congress.[6] It thus received wide publicity. The feelings aroused by this memorial caused several men to refuse to serve on the legislative council, caused others to withdraw the consent they had previously given, and created stronger opposition to Claiborne's plan to change the basic laws of the territory.[7]

The legislative council was convened on December 5, 1804, however, as soon as Claiborne was able to locate eight men who were acceptable to him and who would agree to serve, one more than was needed for a quorum. At its first meeting this council appointed three of its members as a committee to prepare a civil code and a criminal code, and "to employ two counselors-at-law to assist them in drafting the said codes."[8]

This committee was disposed to appoint James Brown and Edward Livingston as the two counselors-at-law to assist in drafting these codes, and agreed on a fee of $5,000 for that work,[9] but Governor Claiborne, although favorable to Brown, opposed the appointment of Livingston. The passions raised by this disagreement paralyzed the work of the committee appointed to draft a civil code, and consequently it did nothing.

The memorial prepared by Livingston did not accomplish its avowed purpose, but it was one of the principal reasons why Congress, a few months later, provided that the governing authority of the territory thereafter would consist of a legislature, composed of an elected house of representatives and an appointed legislative council.[10]

In 1806, the first legislature of the Territory of Orleans convened and, apparently siding with Livingston, promptly adopted an act providing that the Territory of Orleans should be governed by the Roman and Spanish laws which were in effect at the time of the Louisiana Purchase.[11] This act was vetoed by Governor Claiborne on May 26, 1806. The legislature, in obvious annoyance, then passed a resolution for adjournment, assigning as the reason therefor that, "Their best acts were rejected by the Governor."[12]

A few days later several members of the legislature signed and published a manifesto, purporting to be a resolution for the dissolution of the general assembly because of Claiborne's veto. This document revealed the attitude of a majority of the legislators toward the two rival legal systems. Here are some of the statements contained in this manifesto:

"We certainly do not attempt to draw any parallel between the civil law and the common law; but, in short, the wisdom of the civil law is recognized by all Europe; and this law is the one which nineteen-twentieths of the population of Louisiana know and are accustomed to from childhood, which law they

Footnotes at end of speech.

would not see themselves deprived without falling into despair * * *.

"The debate in the Chamber of Representatives and even the refusal of the sanction of the Governor, do they not seem * * * [to raise] the presumption that there is a secret intention of throwing us, despite ourselves, into the frightful chaos of the common law?" [13]

On June 7, 1806, just a few days after this manifesto was issued and published, the legislature adopted a resolution appointing James Brown and Louis Moreau-Lislet "to compile and prepare jointly a civil code for the use of this territory." The resolution provided that:

"The two jurisconsults shall make the civil law by which this territory is now governed the groundwork of said code." [14]

Governor Claiborne at that point apparently decided to bow to the will of the majority, because he approved the resolution, in spite of the fact that it specifically directed that the laws of Spain, or the civil law, rather than the common law, should be used as the basis for the proposed code.

Brown and Lislet had entirely different backgrounds in law, one being bred in the intricacies of the common law, and the other trained in the principles of the civil law. Brown was born in Virginia, but practiced law in Kentucky and served as secretary of State there before coming to Louisiana. After establishing himself here he served as the first secretary of the Territory of Orleans, as district attorney, as a member of the convention which framed the first constitution for Louisiana, as U.S. Senator, and as Minister to France.

Lislet was born in Santo Domingo, a French dependency. He received his education and legal training in France, and came to New Orleans about the time of the Louisiana Purchase, while he was in his thirties. After settling in America, he perhaps contributed more to the legal literature of this State than has any other one person. During his busy career, he participated in more than 200 cases before the State supreme court, and also served at various times as a member of the State house of representatives, a State senator, as a parish judge, as attorney general, and as a Representative in Congress.

Brown and Lislet were eminent lawyers. They were well versed in both French and Spanish, and for some time they had advocated the adoption of a code of laws for the territory.

They completed the work assigned to them in less than 2 years, and the civil code which they prepared was formally adopted by the legislature on March 31, 1808.[15] Governor Claiborne approved the adoption of this code, but in a letter which he wrote to the secretary of State a few months later he stated that it was still his object "to assimilate our system of jurisprudence as much as possible to that of the several States of the Union." [16] On October 11, 1808, Claiborne also wrote to one of the judges in the territory that:

"The Code will probably be greatly censured by many native Citizens of the United States who reside in the Territory. From principle and habit, they are attached to that system of Jurisprudence, prevailing in the several States under which themselves and their fathers were reared: For myself, I am free to declare the pleasure it would give me to see the Laws of Orleans assimilated to those of the States generally, not only from a conviction, that such Laws are for the most part wise and just, but the opinion I entertain, that in a Country, where a unity of Government and Interests exists, it is highly desirable to introduce thro'out the same laws and Customs. * * *" [17]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Claiborne obviously was sincere in his belief that the common law system was superior to that of the civil law, and in his attempts to establish the common law in the Territory of Orleans it has never been questioned but that he was motivated solely by a desire to do what he considered to be best for his country and for the inhabitants of that Territory.

The official title given to the code of laws which was adopted in 1808 was "Digest of the Civil Laws Now in Force in the Territory of Orleans, With Alterations and Amendments Adapted to Its Present System of Government." Although these compilers described their work as a digest of the laws then in force, it actually was a complete civil code, divided into three books, each of which was broken down into titles, chapters, and articles, similar to our present code, except that in numbering the articles a new series of numbers was used in each title.

The resolution authorizing the preparation of this code provided that "the indemnity justly due to the jurisconsults shall be determined by the legislature at their next session," but that in addition thereto Brown and Lislet each should be paid the sum of $800 per year for 5 years after the code was completed, in consideration of which it should be their duty to attend the courts in order to take notice of the imperfections in the new code and to report their observations to the legislature.[18] A different agreement must have been entered into later, however, because in 1807 the legislature authorized the payment of $2,000 to each of these attorneys in full compensation for the services performed by them, three-fifths of which was to be paid immediately and the balance becoming due after completion of the code.[19]

The civil code prepared by Brown and Lislet, however, was not based on the Spanish law, as the legislature had directed, but it was based instead on the then newly adopted French Code, the Code Napoleon. No satisfactory explanation has been offered to this date as to why this was done. It is probable, however, that these two attorneys and the legislature had a high regard for the codification experience in France, not only as to form but also as to content, since both the French and the Spanish systems had many common sources in Roman law, and for that reason they may have used the Code Napoleon as a model without any intent to displace the Spanish law.[20] This theory is supported by the fact that there are many differences between the Code Napoleon and the Louisiana Code of 1808, due largely to the fact that there were incorporated into the Louisiana Code a substantial number of Spanish laws, which had not been included in the French Code. The Louisiana Code contained 2,127 articles, a little less than the number contained in the Code Napoleon.[21]

There is some speculation among legal scholars as to whether Brown and Lislet modeled the Civil Code of 1808 on the Code Napoleon, as finally adopted, or whether they used only the projet or preliminary drafts of such code. Judge Martin, K. A. Cross, and the late Henry P. Dart are among those who contend that only the projet of the French Code was available to the redactors at the time the Louisiana Code was adopted.[22] They base that conclusion principally on the fact that the Louisiana Code contains a number of articles which were in the projet, but were omitted from the Code Napoleon as finally adopted, and that the numbering of articles in the Louisiana Code corresponds to that in the projet, but does not correspond to the numbering system used in the final form of the French Code. Other more recent scholars contend that the final and official draft of the Code Napoleon also was used by Brown and Lislet in compiling the first Louisiana Civil Code.[23] To support that view they point out that the French Code was promulgated in 1804, 2 years before the redactors of the Louisiana Code were appointed, so they reason that it must have been available to them, and that the Louisiana Code contains some articles which correspond to those in the Code Napoleon, but differ from the text on the same subject which appears in the project.

No attempt will be made here to resolve those differences of opinion. The answer to that particular question, however, may well lie in a very interesting leather-bound book owned by the family of the late Charles de la Vergne, of this city. It is a first edition printing of the Civil Code of 1808, which appears to have been owned by Moreau-Lislet himself, since his name is printed in gold letters on the outside front cover. In this volume, written in pen and ink in French, on pages interspersed for that purpose, is an extensive commentary on the articles of that code, purporting to give the source of each such article. These handwritten comments and notations are voluminous and appear to have been written in 1814 by Lislet or by someone who had intimate knowledge of the work done in drafting this first code. No study of this volume has ever been made, and it is possible that a thorough analysis of it will reveal the actual French sources which were used by Brown and Lislet in drafting this first code, and it may affect the interpretation which has been placed on some of the articles which have been carried over into our present code.

Regardless of the French sources used by the redactors, the primary significance of the adoption of the Civil Code of 1808, of course, was that it constituted the formal recognition and establishment of the civil law, and not the common law, for the Territory.

The resolution appointing Brown and Lislet to prepare a civil code did not specify the language in which that document was to be drafted, but it did authorize the payment of expenses incurred for translations. They actually prepared their digest or code in the French language, and it was translated into English by two other persons appointed for that purpose. For their services each of these translators was paid $750.[24] In formally adopting the code, the legislature directed that it be printed in the French and English languages, and further provided that "if * * * there should be found any obscurity or ambiguity, fault or omission, both the English and French texts shall be consulted, and shall mutually serve to the interpretation of one and the other." [25] Inaccuracies in the translation did appear, and it is significant to note that in a written brief submitted in the case of Dufour v. Camfranc, in 1822, Lislet himself disclaimed any responsibility for errors in translating the code into the English language.[26] The Supreme Court has consistently held, of course, that in case of conflict the French text shall prevail, since the original draft was in French.[27]

The act of the legislature adopting the civil code of 1808 repealed only those ancient laws of the territory which were contrary to or irreconcilable with this digest. The Supreme Court, thereafter, in 1817, and in spite of Livingston's arguments to the contrary, held that all of the Spanish laws which formerly were in effect and which were not contrary to the code were still in force.[28] This had the effect of revising the Spanish law, and again throwing the substantive law of Louisiana into a state of chaos. In an effort to remedy this situation the legislature authorized the translation and publication of such parts of the "Partidas" as were in force in Louisiana, which translation was done by Moreau-Lislet and Henry Carleton in 1820. This translation did not eliminate the conflicts and confusion in the Spanish law, however, so a restatement of the law was viewed as a necessity.

On March 14, 1822, the legislature adopted a resolution appointing Moreau-Lislet, Edward Livingston, and Pierre Derbigny "to revise the civil code (of 1808) by amending the same in such manner as they will deem it advisable, and by adding unto * * * (it) * * * such of the laws that are still in force and not included therein * * *."

Pierre Derbigny, a linguist, an orator, and an able lawyer, was born in France, of French nobility, but was forced to leave that country during the revolution to avoid political persecution. He came to Louisiana while in his thirties, and shortly thereafter he joined Livingston in actively opposing Claiborne's plan to institute the common-law system here. He, in fact, was one of the three bearers who presented to Congress the memorial prepared by Livingston seeking statehood for the Territory of Orleans. He later served as a justice of the Supreme Court, as Secretary of State and as Governor.

One year after this appointment was made, Lislet, Livingston and Derbigny submitted a report to the legislature in which they made it clear that in performing the task assigned to them it would be their purpose to prepare a code which would be complete and would relieve the courts "in every instance, from the necessity of examining into Spanish statutes, ordinances and uses." [29] The legislature approved this plan and ordered the printing and distribution of the code as soon as it was ready for the press.[30]

Later that same year, 1823, these three attorneys completed and had printed a project of their proposed revision, which they labeled "Additions and Amendments to the Civil Code of the State of Louisiana, Proposed in Obedience to the Resolution of the Legislature of the 14th March 1822, by the Jurists Commissioned for That Purpose." As this title indicates, only the additions and amendments which they recommended were included in the report, the articles of the civil code of 1808 which they did not propose to amend being omitted.

This project also was prepared originally in the French language, and was then translated with some inaccuracies into English. The French text was printed in one volume and the English translation was printed separately in another. Following the text of each proposed article were printed the comments and observations of the redactors, often indicating the reason for the proposed amendment and citing the authorities upon which it was based.[31]

Although there seems to have been no act passed by the legislature for the express purpose of adopting this civil code, the legislature did authorize the printing and promulgation of the code, as amended, by act approved on April 12, 1824. The act provided that the text should be printed in English and French on opposite pages, and that the jurists who had revised the code were to superintend the printing of it, were to number the articles consecutively throughout, and were to add a complete index to it.[32]

In February 1825, the legislature granted additional time to the printer to complete the printing of the civil code,[33] and on May 20, 1825, the Secretary of State issued his certificate to the effect that the printing had been completed, and that the code should be deeemd promulgated 1 month from that date.[34]

The title of this completed code, as promulgated, is "Civil Code of the State of Louisiana." Included in it were provisions originating from Spanish law which were not contained in the code of 1808. It also contained some provisions from territorial statutes, and others from common law sources. There were a total of 3,522 articles in this code, more than 1½ times as many as were contained in the code of 1808.

In order to make certain that all of the old Spanish laws were repealed, and to eliminate the necessity of ever having to refer to them again, this code contained an article providing that:

"From and after the promulgation of this code, the Spanish, Roman, and French laws, which were in force in this State when Louisiana was ceded to the United States, and the acts of the legislative council, of the Legislature of the Territory of Orleans, and of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, be and are hereby repealed in every case, for which it has been especially provided in this code, and that they shall not be invoked as laws, even under the pretense that their provisions are not contrary or repugnant to those of this code." [35]

In spite of this provision, however, the Louisiana Supreme Court, in 1827, held that the Spanish laws which were not contrary to the civil code were still in force, and that the articles of the civil code of 1808, which had been omitted from the 1825 code, also were still in effect.[36]

These decisions led the legislature to adopt two acts in 1828, one of which provided that "all the civil laws which were in force before the promulgation of the civil code lately promulgated, be and are hereby abrogated," and the other act specifically repealed all articles of the civil code of 1808, except certain provisions therein excepted.[37]

Even these acts did not have the effect of eliminating further reference to the Spanish laws, because the supreme court shortly thereafter held that they repealed only the positive, written, or statute laws of Spain, and that they did not abrogate those principles of law which had been established or settled by the decisions of courts of justice.[38] That apparently has remained the status of the Spanish law in Louisiana to this date.

Changes brought about by the Civil War, together with the adoption of a new constitution, made it necessary to again revise the civil code. Consequently, the legislature, in 1868, authorized a joint committee to select one or more commissioners to revise the civil code.[39] John Ray, of the Monroe Bar, who already had been selected to revise the general statutes of the State and the code of practice, also was commissioned to revise the civil code. Ray thereupon employed three attorneys to assist him in this undertaking,[40] and he and his assistants submitted a project of a revised civil code which was printed in English in 1869. The revised code which they proposed was adopted as Act 97 of the legislature of 1870, and it was given the official title of "The Revised Civil Code of the State of Louisiana." The civil code of 1870 is substantially the code of 1825, except for the elimination of all articles relating to slavery and those which had been repealed, and the incorporation of all acts passed since 1825 amending the civil code of dealing with matters regulated by the code.

There have been no other revisions of the Louisiana Civil Code since 1870, although an unsuccessful attempt to revise it was made 50 years ago. In 1908, the legislature authorized the appointment of a commission to revise and reenact the Civil Code of Louisiana.[41] These commissioners were appointed, and they prepared a project of a revised civil code which was submitted to the legislature in 1910. Action on this project was first postponed, however, and later the proposed revision was rejected, after the Louisiana Bar Association had formally recommended against the adoption of this new code.

During the 88 years which have elapsed since our civil code was last revised, many articles have been amended, repealed, or added, and a number of statutes have been enacted relating to matters which properly should be incorporated into that code. These considerations caused the State Legislature, 10 years ago, in 1948, to adopt an act directing the Louisiana State Law Institute to prepare comprehensive projects for the revision of the civil code and the code of practice.[42] The project for the revision of the code of practice is almost complete and soon will be ready to submit to the legislature. It is expected that the difficult and long-term task of preparing a proposed revision of civil code will soon get underway.

The fact that the Louisiana Civil Code has been revised twice during the past 150 years, and a third revision is being contemplated, does not indicate a weakness in that work, but, on the contrary, it evidences an orderly evolution of the law. In the course of time consolidated statements of law in a civil code become overgrown with additional data in amendments and other statutes on the subject matter. Also, new inventions and discoveries present problems which are difficult to settle by reference to older rules or principles. So it is necessary from time to time that such a code be reexamined and perhaps revised or rewritten in order to incorporate all of these changes and to keep it virile and up to date.

The Civil Codes of Italy, Venezuela, Peru, Mexico, Argentina, and Brazil have been revised recently. The French Code itself, on which our code was modeled, is in the process of being revised at this time. The revision of the Civil Code of Holland, which was originally adopted 120 years ago, is almost complete, and the Legislature of the Province of Quebec has authorized the revision of the 90-year-old Quebec Civil Code.

The Louisiana Civil Code is not simply an adaptation of the Code Napoleon. Neither is it a digest of the Spanish laws which were in force in 1808, as the title of the code adopted during that year seems to indicate. It includes many provisions having a basis in common law, but the common law system does not prevail in this State—despite arguments advanced by some to the contrary. The simple truth of the matter is that Louisiana has developed a legal system of its own, and although grounded on civil law, it must be classified as sui generis.

The civil law and the civil law method of thinking are deep rooted here, and there is an emotional attachment to it in the minds of the people of this State. The civil code is defended today with the same vigor which characterized the actions of Livingston, Brown, Lislet, Derbigny and others who defended it 150 years ago.

The affection which lawyers throughout this State have for the Louisiana Civil Code now is no less than that which Napoleon expressed for the code of laws which bears his name, when he wrote: "What nothing will destroy, what will live eternally, is my civil code." [43]

---

[1] Proclamation issued on surrender of Louisiana, Dec. 20, 1803; 1 Claiborne, Official Letter Books of W. C. C. Claiborne, 1801–1816, (Rowland ed., 1917, p. 307).

[2] John H. Tucker, Jr., "The Code and the Common Law in Louisiana," "The Code Napoleon and the Common Law World" (New York University Press, 1956, p. 350); Schmitt, "The Civil Law of Spain and Mexico, p. 102; Flory, "Edward Livingston's Place in Louisiana Law" (Louisiana Historical Quarterly, vol. 19, p. 344 (1936)).

[3] See letters from Claiborne, 9 U.S. Department of State, "The Territorial Papers of the United States (Carter, composer and editor, 1940, pp. 242, 245, 246, 261, 310, 320, 348, 385, 395).

[4] Petition to Governor Claiborne by inhabitants of Point Coupee, November 9, 1804, and letters from Claiborne, 9 U.S. Department of State, op. cit., supra Note 3, pp. 326, 298, 325.

[5] Louisiana Gazette, July 24, 1804; Annals 8 Cong., 2d sess., 1597–1603.

[6] See Letters from Claiborne, 9 U.S. Depart-

ment of State, op. cit., supra Note 3, pp. 245, 261, 246, 310, 314.

[7] 9 U.S. Department of State, op. cit., supra Note 3, pp. 334, 344, 348, 426.

[8] Joint resolution approved Feb. 4, 1805, acts passed at the first session of the Legislative Council of the Territory of Orleans (1805), p. 458. The committee consisted of Dr. John Watkins, Benjamin Morgan, and George Pollack.

[9] Louisiana Gazette, February 5, 1805.

[10] Act of Congress of Mar. 2, 1805. This memorial was presented to the House Dec. 3, 1804, and referred to a committee appointed to consider improvements in the Orleans government. A report was made Jan. 25, 1805, denying some of the assertions made by the petitioners, but recommending self-government for the Territory. The petition was presented to the Senate Dec. 31, 1804, and referred to a committee Jan. 4, 1805. The bill reported by the committee was passed as the act approved Mar. 2, 1805.

[11] Franklin, "The Place of Thomas Jefferson in the Expulsion of Spanish Medieval Law From Louisiana," (XVI T.L.R., pp. 323–326); Brown, "Legal Systems in Conflict," (The American Journal of Legal History, vol. I, No. 1 (Jan. 1957, pp. 35, 47)).

[12] Brown, op. cit., supra, note 11, pp. 48–49.

[13] Le Telegraphe, June 3, 1806; 9 U.S. Department of State, op. cit., supra, note 3, pp. 643–657.

[14] Resolution approved June 7, 1806, acts passed at first session of first legislature of the Territory of Orleans (1806), pp. 214–218.

[15] Ch. XXIX, approved Mar. 31, 1808, acts passed at the first session of the second legislature of the Territory of Orleans (1808), pp. 120–128. This act is entitled, "An act providing for the promulgation of the Digest of the Civil Laws now in force in the Territory of Orleans."

[16] Claiborne to Secretary of State, Oct. 7, 1808 (9 U.S. Department of State, op. cit., supra, note 3, p. 802).

[17] Claiborne to Judge J. White, Oct. 11, 1808, 4 Claiborne, op. cit., supra, note 1, p. 225. Also see letter from Claiborne to Judge Wyckoff dated Oct. 22, 1808, Report of the Louisiana Bar Association for 1909, pp. 129–130.

[18] See supra, note 14.

[19] Ch. XXXI, approved Apr. 14, 1807, acts passed at the second session of the first legislature (1807), pp. 190–192.

[20] Dainow, "Introductory Commentary to the Louisiana Civil Code," West's Louisiana Civil Code, vol. 1, pp. 1, et seq. Tucker, op. cit., supra, note 2, pp. 347, 355.

[21] There were 2,281 articles in the French code.

[22] Martin, "History of Louisiana, James A. Gresham, publisher, 1882, p. 344; introduction, Cross, "Treatise on Successions, L. Graham & Son, 1891, p. XXIV; Dart, "The Source of the Civil Code of Louisiana," Saunder's Lectures on the Civil Code, Upton, 1925, p. XXXV.

[23] Dainow, op. cit., supra, note 20, p. 9.

[24] See supra, note 19.

[25] See supra, note 15.

[26] *Dufour* v. *Camfranc*, 11 Martin O.S.) 675, 701.

[27] *Phelps* v. *Reinach*, 38 La. Ann. 547 (1886); *Straus* v. *City of New Orleans*, 166 La. 1035, 118 So. 125 (1928); *Sample* v. *Whitaker*, 172 La. 722, 135 So. 38 (1931). See also Dubuisson, "The Codes of Louisiana," Report of Louisiana Bar Association for 1924, pp. 143–157.

[28] *Cottin* v. *Cottin*, 5 Martin O.S.) 93 (1817).

[29] "Preliminary Report of the Code Commissioners," Feb. 18, 1823, reprinted in "Louisiana Legal Archives," Thomas J. Moran's Sons, 1937, vol. I, pp. LXXXV–XCV.

[30] Louisiana Acts of 1823, p. 88.

[31] This project has been reprinted in vol. I, "Louisiana Legal Archives."

[32] Louisiana Acts of 1824, p. 172. See also Louisiana Acts of 1824, p. 446, relating to compensation of the jurisconsults, translators and copyists.

[33] Louisiana Acts passed at the first session of the seventh legislature (1824–25), pp. 126–130. The printer was granted 6 months from the date of that act.

[34] Tucker, "Source Books of Louisiana Law" (vol. I, "Louisiana Legal Archives," pp. XXIV–XXV).

[35] Art. 3521, Civil Code of 1825.

[36] *Fowler* v. *Griffith*, 6 Martin (N.S.) 89 (1827); *La Croix* v. *Coquet*, 5 Martin (N.S.) 527 (1827).

[37] Act 40 of 1828 and Act 83 of 1828.

[38] *Reynolds* v. *Swain*, 13 La. 193 (1839); *Hubgh* v. *New Orleans & Carrollton Railroad Co.*, 6 La. Ann. 495 (1851); *Moulin* v. *Monteleone*, 165 La. 169, 115 So. 447 (1928).

[39] Act 162 of 1868, approved Oct. 21, 1868. The joint committee consisted of C. W. Lowell, chairman, Hugh J. Campbell, W. F. Blackman, Frank Morey, and C. B. Pratt.

[40] Isaiah Garrett, Franklin Garrett, and Col. F. A. Hall.

[41] Act 160 of 1908.

[42] Act 335 of 1948.

[43] 1 Planiol, Traité Élémentaire De Droit Civil 33 (3d ed.).

Inaugural Address of Hon. John Patterson, Governor of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the members of our Alabama congressional delegation had the great pleasure of attending the inauguration of our new Alabama Governor, Hon. John Patterson, in Montgomery, Ala., on Monday, January 19, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of Governor Patterson's inspiring address:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN PATTERSON, GOVERNOR OF ALABAMA, JANUARY 19, 1959

Governor Folsom, Lieutenant Governor Hardwick, Lieutenant Governor Boutwell, constitutional officers, members of the legislature, distinguished guests, and my fellow Alabamians, it is with a deep sense of humility that I stand before you on this historic occasion and express to the people of Alabama my gratitude for the high honor that they have bestowed upon me. We all sense the greatness and the traditions of our State of Alabama today when we realize that we are standing on the same spot where Jefferson Davis took the oath of office as the first President of the Confederate States of America. We sense the greatness of our State when we realize the many important events of history which have taken place in this capitol building and on these grounds on which we stand.

Our forefathers by their sweat and blood and toil have passed on to us a great heritage and you and I are charged with preserving it, improving upon it and passing it on to our children untarnished.

STATES RIGHTS

There are serious times facing us here in Alabama and in the South. Coping with the multitude of serious problems facing us during the coming 4 years will require ingenuity, fortitude and sacrifice on the part of all of our citizens. We have serious domestic problems within our State, our Nation is being attacked from without, and we are being undermined from within by the usurpation of the rights of the States through the unconstitutional encroachment of the Federal Government. The Federal courts have decreed that we must send our children to integrated schools contrary to our customs and traditions. They have told us how we must sit on city buses in Montgomery. We have seen paratroopers with bayonets try to ram integration of the races down our throats. We should bear in mind that the Federal Government is a government of delegated powers only—that it has only those powers that were granted to it by the States—and that any encroachment by the Federal Government on these rights of the States is tyranny.

I think we should pause a moment and pay tribute to a great American whose birthday is today—Robert E. Lee. Lee, a southerner, was a champion of States rights and saw in them, as did Jefferson and the other drafters of our Constitution, a means by which the people would be protected against the tyranny of an all-powerful centralized government. He so believed in this that he gave up a bright career in the U.S. Army and gave his life and fortune to defend these principles. I think we should also pay tribute to a great Alabamian, a former Governor of our State, who served on General Lee's staff, Hon. Thomas Goode Jones. We are honored by the presence of his son and daughter here today, Hon. Walter B. Jones, and Mrs. William B. Griffin, of Montgomery.

The present trend, as reflected in the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and actions of the executive branch of the Federal Government, shows that they are bent upon a policy of destroying the powers of the States, reducing the States to mere counties under a central government, thus creating an all-powerful central government in Washington. We face the greatest constitutional crisis in the history of our country. The attack that is being made upon us is devastating, nor is it limited to any particular State or region. New Hampshire and Pennsylvania have been told by the U.S. Supreme Court that they may not inquire into subversive activities within their borders. New Mexico and California have been told by the Court that they cannot fix qualifications for the practice of law in their States. New York has been told by the Court that it cannot fire a professor in the public schools of that State who refuses to answer certain questions under oath because the answers would tend to incriminate him. Oregon has been inhibited in the regulation of nonnavigable waters within her borders. Alabama has been hindered by the Supreme Court in the regulation of the activities of foreign corporations doing business within the State.

The Supreme Court has rendered other decisions of the same import. The Court has ordered integration on public golf courses, parks and swimming pools. It has turned loose Communists by the wholesale. It has been severely criticized by the overwhelming majority of the chief justices of our State supreme courts.

Every section of the country is feeling the heel of the Federal Government. To all of us who believe in constitutional government and who want to preserve the sovereign powers of the States and protect our democratic way of life, this is an alarming situation.

I want to pledge to you that as your Governor, I will be unyielding in my opposition to this wrongful usurpation of power by the Federal Government and I will use every power at my command to prevent any further usurpation by the Federal Government of the sovereign powers of Alabama. My administration will be dedicated to the preservation of our constitutional form of government.

I will work in every way possible with the other States, particularly the Southern States, to form a common front, so that we can better protect ourselves from the unlawful actions of the Federal Government.

EDUCATION

As your Governor, I will preserve and promote the cause of public education in Alabama. I want to see every child in this State afforded the best education possible irrespective of race or color. The well-being of this State and our Nation depends on the education of our children. Our children must come first.

As your Governor, I promise you that I will do everything possible to increase the salaries of our schoolteachers, commensurate with salaries paid teachers in other States, and provide adequate school facilities for our children.

The white and Negro pupils should have equal school facilities, but they must be segregated. I will oppose with every ounce of energy I possess, and will use every power at my command to prevent any mixing of the white and Negro races in the classrooms of this State. I dedicate every capacity to preserving segregation in the schools.

The people of this State are overwhelmingly in favor of good public education and they are overwhelmingly against integration of the races in the public schools. The people of this State will not tolerate nor support integrated schools and any attempt by the Federal Government or anyone else to integrate the schools of this State by force would cause turmoil, chaos, and violence and would result in the destruction of our public school system.

There can be no compromise in this fight. There is no such thing as a "little integration." The determined and ruthless purpose of the race agitators and such organizations as the NAACP is to bring about as fast as possible an amalgamation of our society. They seek to destroy our culture, our heritage, and our traditions. If we compromise or surrender our rights in this fight, they will be gone forever, never to be regained or restored.

I call upon the people of this State and our representatives in the legislature to support me in this fight to preserve our public school education system, and maintain segregation of the races in our schools.

I recommended for the consideration of the legislature the enactment of the law authorizing the Governor to close any public school where military or other forces are employed by the Federal Government to police their operations. I further recommend the enactment of a law cutting off all public funds to any public school which is integrated.

I am well aware that as Governor of Alabama, I am the Governor for all the people of Alabama, white and Negroes alike. The overwhelming majority of the Negro citizens of this State are opposed to integration of the races. They, like everyone else, want their children to have a good public education. The trouble between the races is being caused by a handful of race agitators who are not natives of this State, but who have been sent here to stir up racial trouble and strife.

I would like to say to the Negro citizens of this State that I am interested in your welfare and that my administration will be working to protect your interests as well as the interests of all of the citizens. However, I would like to say further to the Negro citizens, that if you wish to preserve your public education system and educate your children, you should stand up and speak out against the agitators of your own race whose aim is to destroy our school system. If you do not do so, and these agitators continue at their present pace, in a short time you will have no public school system at all. Our public schools once destroyed and closed down, may not be reopened in your lifetime and mine. Our children will suffer the consequences.

Our race problems will never be solved by court decrees, injunctions, and Federal troops. They will only be solved through mutual understanding and good will between the races without outside interference and agitation.

On May 6, June 3, and November 4, last year, the people of Alabama with an overwhelming voice gave expression to their convictions that the rights and powers of the State of Alabama must not be abandoned, and that segregation of the races must be maintained. This expression by our people was a mandate to me as Governor and to the legislature to defend and preserve the rights, customs, and traditions of our State. I shall observe and carry out that mandate and I call upon the legislature, with the utmost confidence in their loyalty and devotion to duty, to stand firmly with me in carrying out the will of the people. We must put life and meaning into the motto of our State: "We dare defend our rights."

LAW ENFORCEMENT

You know that I am a strong believer in good law enforcement. Your laws will be enforced diligently during the next 4 years. During my administration, there will be no room for gangsters to operate in this State and vice and corruption will be stamped out wherever they rear their head.

Since I have been your attorney general I have waged an unrelenting attack against those in our State who prey upon the working man by extracting from him unlawful usurious rates of interest. One of the worst of problems confronting us today in Alabama is the open, arrogant and flagrant violation of the law by "loan sharks." Our laws are inadequate to protect our citizens from this outrage. I call upon the Legislature of Alabama to enact laws which will prevent these wrongs from being practiced on our people.

FARMERS

I will work constantly as your Governor to improve the life and working conditions of our Alabama farmer. I will work to see that he has a market for his products and gets a fair price for the things that he sells. My administration will be dedicated to helping the farmer and the working man of this State to have a more comfortable living for himself and his family.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

One of the great needs of our State is new industrial plants. I pledge the State government's full cooperation to our citizens in their efforts to attrack desirable new industries to their communities. I have appointed a capable, outstanding, experienced businessman to head the department of industrial development and I propose fresh and vigorous efforts to attrack and bring new industry to our State and to encourage the expansion of industries presently in our State.

LABOR

I am a strong believer in organized labor. Organized labor has helped build this State and Nation. I want them to know that they have a friend in the Governor's office. During my administration I will not allow labor to be mistreated in any manner and I will work untiringly throughout my administration toward insuring good labor-management relations in Alabama.

RIVERS, DOCKS AND HARBORS

Of great importance to us is the continued development of our rivers, docks and harbors. Alabama is blessed by an abundance of natural resources of which our rivers and harbors form a most important part. We have made great progress toward the development of our rivers systems and it has brought prosperity and industry to many sections of our State. Much remains to be done, and I pledge the full resources of the Patterson administration toward pushing the program.

ROADS AND HIGHWAYS

One of the fine things that we have to look forward to is the splendid development of our system of highways and roads. We have made great strides in roadbuilding during recent years, but we still have a long way to go. We must keep our highways modern and up to date and abreast of the era of progress in which we live. We must continue to expand our farm-to-market road program to meet the needs of our rural communities, and I will see that our roads are kept in good all-weather repair.

If we are to keep pace with progress and get our fair share of the industrial growth and expansion of our Nation, the development of our highways is of prime importance. Urban areas are critically in need of relief from traffic congestion. Many areas of Alabama offer complex highway problems that will command ingenuity, boldness and money to resolve.

The Federal Interstate Highway program is barely under way in Alabama, and, when completed, it will be a wonderful addition to our highway system. During my administration, we will have available for matching purposes approximately $379 million in Federal money for the building of roads; $275 million of this sum will be for the Interstate Highway System, for which the State matches $1 to every $10 of the Federal Government. In order to keep pace with other States and carry out our duty to the people of Alabama, we cannot fail to take advantage of this great opportunity to build highways for the future. To do so, we must issue bonds to raise money to match with Federal funds for the building of roads. This bond issue can be financed from present gasoline-tax revenues without any additional taxes levied on our people. In fact, there are ample funds coming into the State treasury to finance the entire roadbuilding program throughout my administration without any additional taxes being levied. With money from the bond issue and other funds coming into the highway department, we can take full advantage of every Federal dollar available during the next 4 years and leave the highway department in excellent financial condition when I go out of office, 4 years from this day.

I call upon the people of this State and our representatives in the legislature to support this vitally needed highway program.

TOURIST TRADE

The great importance of tourist trade is evident in Alabama. No single industry contributes so much to the economy of our State. I will put into effect a program whereby every department of the State government will lend its every effort in a coordinated plan to advertise the attractions of our State throughout the country and encourage tourists to visit Alabama.

PENSIONS AND SECURITY

The public welfare and pensions of the State is an important function. Through this program the State discharges its obligation to people who are in need. This program which is carried out by the department of pensions and security is designed to protect and safeguard the State's human resources which are its most valuable assets. Much progress has been made in this field during recent years and we have seen the average monthly payments to our senior citizens, the blind, dependent children and disabled persons steadily rise. In spite of this, these payments are still low and woefully inadequate.

I stated during my campaign that we should pay an average old age pension payment of $75 per month, as well as increase substantially the payments to the blind, dependent children, and disabled persons. This can be done. I am going to put into effect a program to bring this about. When we cut out the graft and corruption and waste in State government, cut out the padding of public contracts, cut out payments

of commissions to political favorites who render no services to the State of Alabama, require competitive bidding on contracts and purchases of property, and get our moneys worth for every tax dollar spent, we will have enough money, without more taxes, to increase the old age pensions and other benefits, as well as expand the other programs of the State.

ELIMINATION OF GRAFT AND CORRUPTION

You know how strong my feelings are against the waste of the taxpayers' money. I made that clear on the stump throughout this State during my campaign. I promise you that tonight at midnight when I take over the reins of this State government that a program will go into effect to cut out the waste and squandering of your tax money. I am sick and tired of seeing your money go down the drain and into the pockets of political favorites of every administration. We have had enough of that kind of government.

I assure you that I will stop up the holes in the public treasury and get you your money's worth for every tax dollar spent. With the money saved from cutting the fat out of public spending, we can expand every program the State now has underway, without increasing the taxes on our people. We are going to operate every department of the State government in an honest and efficient manner. We are going to put the State docks department back on a businesslike basis, and we are going to operate the conservation department, as well as all the other department, as well as all the other departments, in the interest of all the citizens of this State.

There are many other serious and important matters that I would like to discuss with you today, but time does not permit me to do so. To do so would trespass further on your kindness and patience.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to all of you for coming here today and helping to make this inauguration such a memorable occasion.

In closing, I want to say to you that I deeply appreciate the interest that you have shown in me and in our program. I deeply appreciate your support and I am looking forward with pleasure to working with you all to make our State a better place in which to live. I wish to say to the members of the legislature that I am honored to be privileged to work with you in a spirit of confidence and mutual respect during the next 4 years for the betterment of our State. I assure you that every ounce of my energy, and every moment of my time during my administration will be dedicated to serving the people of the State of Alabama, and in doing everything within my power to further the interests and traditions of our great State and its people.

We all realize that stormy days lie ahead and that our sacrifices will be great; nevertheless, with a firm belief in the integrity of the people of Alabama, and placing our trust in Almighty God to guide and direct us through the trials that lie ahead, I am sure that we will succeed in our endeavors, and shall pass on to our children a greater Alabama.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, Thursday, January 22, marks the 41st anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine.

Friends of Ukrainians throughout the world are remembering this date and I am honored and privileged to add my voice in commemoration of it.

The Ukraine is the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain and one wherein the spirit of freedom lives in the hearts of 40 million Ukrainians.

The Ukrainian proclamation of independence took place on January 22, 1918, after centuries of oppression and foreign domination. It is sad to recall that the joyous event of independence was so short lived and that the fine and courageous Ukrainian nation was overrun and crushed by the oppressive forces of communism.

We in America, who have been so fortunate to enjoy the precious fruits of liberty, cannot help but have our hearts saddened at the spectacle of tyranny which prevails in the Ukraine.

We respect and admire the Ukrainian nation and its people who have continued in their steadfast resolve to attain their freedom and independence and who have stood as a shining example, for us the fortunate, of the eternal dignity of man and of his desire to be free.

We can take courage that the spirit of the Ukrainian nation and its people will eventually prevail and that the Ukraine will again be a free and independent nation. I know that all Americans join with me in saluting these brave people and extending to them our friendship and encouragement.

Education, Democracy, and Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, two excellent editorials by the editor of the Rapid City Journal have come to my attention recently. The first, entitled "Ultimate Challenge," draws the grim alternatives facing modern man—the choice between peace or virtual destruction of the civilized world. The other editorial raises the important question of how a free society can best meet the cost of the kind of quality education which is called for by our modern world. Under unanimous consent, I include these two editorials at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Journal, Jan. 13, 1959]

ULTIMATE CHALLENGE

In the First World War the German Navy made use of a phrase with chilling overtones. When one of the dreaded U-boats made a kill, it was reported that the victim had been "spurlos versenkt"—that is, sunk without a trace.

The phrase sometimes echoes in the minds of thoughtful men as they reflect on what would happen if there were to be an all-out nuclear conflict. Above all they fear this, that the great ship of civilized human society would be "spurlos versenkt" by such a conflict.

To entertain that fear, to think prayerfully of means of preventing this tragedy that would dwarf all the other tragedies mankind has suffered, cannot be taken as evidence of cowardice. It springs, rather, from a profound, loving concern for men, and for all that has lifted man above the level of savagery. To think of nuclear warfare as a solution of international troubles does not reflect bravery. It reflects unimaginative, irresponsible foolhardiness.

The nature of things has compelled us to develop nuclear weapons, as well as others which may be as terrible, though they seem less dramatic. The nature of things will compel us, and rival powers, to go on developing ever more fearful means of destruction. The only hope one can realistically attach to this is that these weapons may be enough of a deterrent to hold warfare in check.

Logic decrees that the real hope of keeping civilization from being "spurlos versenkt" lies in devising the machinery to settle disputes without going to war. In the past this has been more or less true. Our generation is the first to be faced with the absolute alternatives of peace or virtual destruction of the civilized world. No previous generation of human beings was ever thus challenged.

[From the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Journal, Jan. 9, 1959]

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR EDUCATION?

Just about any way you look at school proposals submitted for the consideration of the 1959 legislature, one question sticks out: Who should be responsible for the education of South Dakota's youth?

South Dakota's claim to infinite variety applies not only to her scenic beauties but also to the distribution of her school age population. At one extreme are the heavy concentrations of youngsters in booming centers like Rapid City, Sioux Falls, Aberdeen, and other cities which have been harassed for several years to keep building new facilities for their constantly growing school enrollments.

On the other extreme are sparsely settled rural areas, particularly in the West River, where population was scarce to begin with and continues to decline as farms and ranches are combined into larger units.

Between the rural areas and the larger cities are the smaller cities and towns, a few making population gains because of some specialized industrial or agricultural development but most of them becoming smaller as improved transportation facilities shrink distances to the growing urban centers.

Shifting populations are only a symptom of what has taken place and is continuing to take place in American (and South Dakotan) life. Education becomes more and more a key to success in the competitive life of our Nation.

The educational needs of our youth who choose agriculture as an occupation are much greater today than they were even 20 years ago. Agriculture is now more than just production and hard work; it is a competitive business that calls for understanding of conditions far beyond the local situation. It demands knowledge of markets, animal and plant nutrition, entomology, soil and water conservation, government, and many other factors far removed from the farm itself.

Not only that, our generation of farmers is producing another even more significant crop: the young people themselves. From 40 to 50 percent of a community's farm youth may be expected to move to urban communities. This means that high schools have the responsibility of preparing young people to meet competition for occupations in cities as well as in agriculture.

Much as we may regret to see this change from a predominantly rural to a predominantly urban character in American life, the

trend is not one which can be reversed. It is not merely a situation which must be lived with; it is a change which can be adjusted to—and taken advantage of.

But before this is possible, we need to recognize the adjustments which must be made in our philosophy of public education.

One premise behind the establishment of free public education decades ago was that an educated populace is essential to the democratic process. If that was true in the early days of our Nation, it is even more true in the age of rockets, satellites, and missiles in which we live. The very survival of our Nation and of the democratic system in years ahead will in large measure depend on how well we are able to marshal the brainpower to harness our country's human and physical resources.

As a Nation we cannot afford to permit any budding scientist, philosopher, or statesman—even the potential poet, artist, or musician—to be denied the opportunity to develop his abilities to the fullest possible extent—regardless of where he may be born and schooled, even to the most remote corner of our West River cattle country.

Providing the opportunity for one of these potential von Brauns, Salks, or Sandburgs to reach the full flower of his genius is not just the responsibility of the immediate locality in which the child lives. Too much is at stake. This is the responsibility which all of us must shoulder.

Two main proposals are to be brought before South Dakota's lawmakers during the legislative term which opened Tuesday. Both, essentially, are wrapped in the premise that more South Dakotans need to become involved in the task of supporting our State's public educational system. Their authors' conclusion, obviously, was that more must be done to provide every child in the State with a maximum possibility for schooling.

One proposal, sponsored by the committee for education in South Dakota, would increase State support of schools through a minimum foundation program. The committee's plan is based on the assumption that the wealth of the entire State should support a minimum program of education for every child wherever he lives. The State and local school districts would share as partners in providing the minimum.

While this plan cannot be permitted to become a leveler, standardizing education at a minimum level throughout the State, its backers contend it could provide the shot in the arm which poor districts must have to meet their educational responsibilities. The committee for education also calls for a teacher retirement program and a strengthened State department of public instruction.

Finding a method to finance the minimum foundation program may prove an impossible task since its cost is estimated to run as high as $18 million. Several possible sources of money have been suggested: a broadened sales tax to apply to sales of services as well as to goods, an additional 1-cent tax on the present or an expanded base or a State income tax.

The second proposal, advanced by an informal association of county boards of education, calls for reenactment of many of the 1955 school law measures with regard to reorganization of the State's present system of school districts. The county board members contend reorganization would enable local school districts to better bear the financial burden of education by spreading the property tax load to all areas and would enable a reduced number of local districts to operate more economically by centralizing administration.

The committee for education and the county boards have no particular argument with each other. Each group agrees that the other's proposal could mean better schools.

The job of the legislators is to give both proposals serious study and enact new laws which will provide what seems an inevitable answer to the question of "Who's responsible for education?" The answer, as we see it, is "everybody."

Let's Take the Lead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me to so do, I present to the attention of your own distinguished self and all others who may read the same, the text of two editorials appearing in one of the important daily newspapers in the great 23d congressional district which I represent, this my 13th year, in this great House of Representatives.

First, the editorial in the Daily Signal, Huntington Park, Calif., under date of Monday January 12, 1959, as follows:

DON'T BE TAKEN IN

The American public must not be taken in by the "live and let live" pitch delivered in Beverly Hills last night by Soviet Supersalesman Anastas Mikoyan.

Unimpeachable evidence over the years has shown repeatedly that "friendly" talk from any representative of the Soviet Union can be as deadly as a cup of hemlock if accepted at face value.

And particularly has this been true in the case of Deputy Premier Mikoyan, whose leadership in the betrayal of Hungary 2 short years ago properly has earned him the appellation "butcher of Budapest."

While we join with President Eisenhower in deploring mob-like demonstrations and the throwing of eggs and assorted vegetables we cannot but feel a deep sympathy and understanding of the feelings of those refugee Hungarian Freedom Fighters who have been largely responsible for such demonstrations.

And we deplore just as thoroughly the fawning attitude of many Americans, in official position and elsewhere, toward Mr. Mikoyan and his American mission.

TEMPER TREATMENT WITH FACT

Treat him courteously to be sure, for he is a guest in this country. But certainly the treatment he receives must be tempered by the cold realism of fact.

Communist Russia, its diplomats and its leaders cannot be trusted in any regard.

Read, if you will, the foreward by Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, to this month's report of the House Committee on un-American activities.

"Let those of our citizenry who flutter and rejoice in response to the blandishments and smiles of suave Communist diplomats," WALTER writes, "take stock of the simple, awful truth that these blandishments and smiles are a facade behind which operate the deadly tentacles of a human meatgrinder that has already consumed millions upon millions of human beings.

"May those who accept at face value the pretense of 'peaceful coexistence' with the masters of international communism justify, if they will, the deceit, intrigue, blackmail, espionage, subversion, and mass murder which characterizes the program of communism for no less than complete world domination."

Second, an editorial in the Daily Signal, Huntington Park, Calif., under date of Monday, January 5, 1959, as follows:

LET'S TAKE THE LEAD

The United States once again has been forced into the wings while Communist Russia stands in the spotlight receiving well deserved bows for scientific achievement apparently beyond the ken of our most able scientists.

Once again Communist Russia has scored immeasurable gains in the race for world leadership at the expense of American prestige at home and abroad.

Once again our complacent national administration has been content to sit back and congratulate itself on its fiddling while Rome burns.

Frankly, this newspaper does not like it.

We do not like sitting in the back seat while Communist Russia sits behind the wheel.

UNITED STATES MUST LEAD TO SURVIVE

The United States, if it is to survive the inevitable final showdown, cannot afford to be pushed into obscurity in the field of space exploration or any other so closely allied to world politics and national defense.

Just a little more than 2 weeks ago this country put into orbit around the earth a voice-transmitting Atlas missile—an accomplishment we were told had equaled and perhaps even bettered anything Iron Curtain scientists could do.

This weekend we found out with certainty we still are lagging behind. But just a year behind, some America authorities optimistically insist.

And perhaps they are right. But we belong at least a year ahead.

We hope this latest Russian push into space will have the same effect on the American people the sputnik embarrassment of 1957 had. We even more fervently hope it will convince our national administration that world leadership and a peace-assuring national defense effort are worth far more than a balanced national budget.

And also, Mr. Speaker, I present the text of an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., on Friday, January 16, 1959:

GROWTH: GOVERNMENT'S PART

Just what are the real differences between the spenders and the budget balancers? If the American people are to think usefully on the issue and if Congress is to make wise decisions, the two cases must be presented in sharper focus. Useful light on the size of the difference—in terms of Federal expenditures—came out of President Eisenhower's appearance at the National Press Club.

In answer to one question he said that in the reasonable future the Nation could expect a gross national product of $500 billion, while the 1959 budget is set at $77 billion. Should the gross national product go no higher than $460 billion in 1960, the Federal budget Mr. Eisenhower proposes would amount to about one-sixth of it. It is unlikely that the forces favoring spending would add more than 10 percent to the budget. Related to the gross national product that is only one-sixtieth—say $7.5 billion.

Is this the amount advocates of spending rely on to make the difference between stagnation and growth in the national economy? Is this the amount the President believes can make the difference between inflation and stability?

Perhaps the difference cannot be measured fully in terms of money; perhaps attitudes are also important. The advocates of spending would point out that continued unemployment incurs an irrecoverable loss; they would put extra emphasis on the urgency of more effective economic competition

with the Soviet. Mr. Eisenhower points to the importance of fiscal responsibility and to the possibility of growth through price stability.

The public may reasonably ask of both sides: Just how big a part can the Government play and just how will its actions affect the national economy? It should ask the advocates of spending about what kind of spending might be expected to boost the gross national product most effectively. Are they chiefly interested in equipment, such as highways and better schools, or are they talking about welfare programs?

Likewise the President may be asked in what way an unbalanced budget may be expected to promote inflation. There is a $12 billion deficit this year. Would another $7.5 billion next year shake confidence in the dollar and increase the prices Government must pay for money, materials, and labor? Would it give a decisive nudge to the inflation spiral in the whole economy?

The President has rightly said that the Government is not the author of prosperity—although politicians often seem to say it is. Quite possibly more emphasis should be placed on private responsibility for recession or inflation—as in the wage-price spiral. But Government is the largest single force. It takes more than half the profits of corporations, tosses $40 billion a year into the market for military hardware, and subsidizes other sections of the economy with tariffs and farm price supports.

So its influence extends beyond the immediate question of adding or not adding something like $7.5 billion to the budget. Yet it is imperative that the public should have more definite information as to what effect that sum would have if used in different ways. Only then will it be equipped for essential decisions.

Freedom and Independence for Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, friends of freedom everywhere will be observing today the 41st anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. In the profound faith that Moscow's deceitful campaign of "smiles and trade" could never cause us to forget the aspirations of the captive nations and their fundamental importance to the security of our Nation, and with the hope of helping to keep the spirit of freedom alive in the hearts of 40 million Ukrainians, I join in their celebration. I hope, too, that these words will serve notice of my sustained faith in the eventual liberation of all nations enslaved by imperialist Moscow. They should also demonstrate to the Menshikovs, Mikoyans, and Khrushchevs that American memories of their crimes and our standards of civilized decency and justice cannot be erased by their calculated genteel antics or by spurious promises of trade.

The reception given Mr. Mikoyan by some of our wealthy Americans is food for serious thought. It indicates the spiritual climate in some quarters. Twenty years ago, the Nazi Dr. Hjalmar Schacht was completely ignored for what he represented. Today, despite his personal crimes, the Armenian quisling is widely feted. The thousands of patriotic Armenians, Azerbaijani, Don and Kuban Cossacks who were annihilated by his orders in 1917–21; the Millions of Ukrainians who starved to death in the manmade famine of the thirties while Mikoyan shipped grains abroad; the role he played in the liquidation of Hungarian patriots—these and other facts no longer seem to bestir the consciences of some of us. Only 2 months ago, before the Moscow City Soviet, Mikoyan delivered a violent anti-American speech; today, without self-respect, some accept him as a deliverer of peace.

I wish to pay my respects today to the many Ukrainians of American descent for keeping high their hopes and aspirations for the restoration of freedom and independence to the land of the birth of their forefathers, and to assure them that all true Americans are solidly behind them in their endeavors.

Forty-first Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 22, friends of freedom everywhere will be observing the 41st anniversary of the independence of Ukraine.

On January 22, 1918, the Ukraine declared itself an independent republic. This was literally the first time since the 17th century that this land and its people had known freedom.

Their liberty, alas, was short lived. In 1920 the Ukrainian Republic was destroyed by the Red army and it has borne the brutalizing tyranny of the Russian bear ever since.

It is difficult, if not virtually impossible for us in this country to have a realistic conception of what this means. Much is said of America taking her freedom and her way of life for granted. I believe that this is less so today than ever before because of the never-ending peril of communism. Nevertheless, the awareness of an enemy, and understanding the reality of living under that enemy's political system are two entirely different things. It is partially for this reason that I call to your attention this 41st anniversary of Ukrainian independence. We cannot know what the Ukrainian people have lived through. It is my sincere hope that we will never have this knowledge. We can, however, take this moment to pay tribute to a subject people who have been terrorized without letup for almost 40 years. The Ukrainian people obviously have not sunk into servile apathy. The Soviet Union has been forced to maintain its rule by force. The intangible quest for liberty—for the freedom of mind and action—never dies. It is the Russian knowledge of this truth that demands their rule by terror as the only way of dominating their subject peoples. Herein lies the tragedy of the Ukraine. Those two free years from 1918 to 1920 cannot be wiped from memory.

Today then, I wish to express my awareness and appreciation of the spirit of the Ukraine, January 22, 1918. I am aware and appreciative, because it is also the Spirit of 1776.

Responsibility of Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS F. JOHNSON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, recently there have occurred significant developments connected with the inauguration of the Governor of Maryland, who has lived in my congressional district during the period of his outstanding service to the State. While his installation marked the return of control of the executive department from Republican to Democratic, it had additional far-reaching significance. It signalized the reestablishment of executive authority in one who had already proven his worth through the conduct of the fiscal agencies of the State over a span of 20 years, thus giving reassurance to the citizenry of well-considered plans for the maintenance of solvency throughout his administration.

Our Governor, J. Millard Tawes, enters upon his high post with the greatest vote of confidence ever given to a Governor of Maryland and with unprecedented majorities in the State senate and house of delegates, assuring the adoption of programs of progressive legislation. At the same time he will adhere to sound fiscal measures eliminating excessive spending and assuring the public the fullest measure of value for every dollar expended. The beginning of his term which marks this return to the statehouse of businesslike administration was interestingly commented upon by the Baltimore News-Post in a most enlightening editorial, which I ask to have included in my remarks as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WELCOME, GOVERNOR TAWES

In a mood generally cordial and hopeful, Maryland's some 3 million people today are welcoming into office the State's 59th Governor, J. Millard Tawes.

The cordiality is largely genuine and the ceremonies unusually gay and elaborate, because the courteous Eastern Shore man is personally popular.

The spirit is hopeful because an overwhelming majority of the voters have expressed at the polls their belief that he may be the man to pull the State out of the morass of overtaxing and overspending. They remain sanguine that he will make good.

The inaugural address of Governor Tawes today is couched in generalities, but it reflects a deep feeling of responsibility and opportunity to serve the people of the State well.

He exhibits awareness that the next 4 years are likely to bring a record boom in industrial and business activity and mushrooming population and a readiness to cope with the expanded need for public facilities of many kinds.

He may well keep in mind that increase in the taxable bases, rather than any increases in the tax rates, should meet the need for more money for public services.

Of great importance, Governor Tawes asserts that "matters of State no longer can be handled in a day-to-day manner, without plan or program. We must project our designs many years in advance to achieve the best results."

How true. The State and city, too, long have suffered because of hand-to-mouth spending and taxing.

Also, the Tawes aim to increase the public awareness of what is going on in the State government, and to furnish advance information of the likely effect of proposed programs, is all to the good.

So is his recognition that 70 percent of the population now live in urban areas, that the ratio will increase, and that new metropolitan areas will be created and existing ones expand. His awareness that new problems posed by their interdependence must be solved, beginning now, is a hopeful sign.

With the bulk of the State's population, we are pulling for Governor Tawes to make a shining success of his administration, with the aid of a legislature so predominantly of his Democratic Party.

But a word of warning. Just balancing the budget for the coming year and the next three, with tax levels remaining static, will not be accepted as success.

The State taxload, with its 50-percent increases in income and sales taxes adopted last year, is just too big to be borne without severe distress to the taxpayers.

What the public demands is so searching a streamlining of the taxing and spending pattern of the State that not just balancing of income and outgo but reduction of taxes will be achieved.

That would give the Tawes administration a rare and real glory.

Forty-first Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 41st anniversary of the declaration of Ukrainian independence and on this solemn occasion I wish to pay tribute to the courageous and freedom-loving people of the Ukraine.

To these brave people who have kept alive the spirit of freedom and independence through long enslavement and oppression by the cruel and unrelenting Russian Communists, we in America offer our deep and enduring friendship.

Like them, we look forward to the day when the Ukraine once again will become an independent nation, free of the Russian Communist yoke and free of the indignities and cruelties that have been their lot under domination by the savages of the Kremlin.

The desire and love of freedom of the people of the Ukraine cannot be ignored and must not be denied, even though the road to its achievement is a long and hard one. We and all other God-fearing peoples cherish with the people of the Ukraine the significance of this proudly remembered anniversary day and we join in looking ahead to that future date when Ukrainian independence shall live again in reality, as it lives today in the hearts of the Ukrainian people.

Economy Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared recently in the Rockford, Ill., Morning Star, entitled "Economy Budget."

ECONOMY BUDGET

Most of the provisions in the budget President Eisenhower has submitted to Congress should have solid public support. In this budget, the President is keeping his pledge to fight to hold down Government spending.

The fight which must be made to overcome grave hazards besetting our economy can be won if the taxpayers let Congress know that they stand with the President on the side of economy.

President Eisenhower believes that his budget of $77 billion for the fiscal year beginning next July 1 will allow for a surplus of $70 million at the end of the year, contrasted with an anticipated deficit of $12.9 billion at the close of the current fiscal year June 30. The President pointed out that whether he can keep the budget balanced will depend on Congress, public support, and developments in our economy and in the world.

The biggest share of the overall budget is the $40.9 billion allocated to defense. Despite the expanding missile program, the defense budget represents an increase of only $145 million over the figure for the current year. The President recognizes that there is a vast opportunity for saving in the Defense Department and he has called for curtailment of elements of the military program which do not meet present-day needs and for elimination of military waste.

The administration's budget places heavy emphasis on curtailment of subsidy programs. Thus, the President proposes to reduce the farm budget from the current $7.3 billion to $6.4 billion; to refuse to approve any new low-rent housing projects or flood control, navigation, and irrigation programs; to cut new spending for local hospital grants, health research facilities, and waste treatment works.

He also calls for modification of legislation providing benefits to veterans for disability not related to military service; puts the brakes on the new science education program; gives school construction advocates no comfort.

The President is moving in the right direction in asking for legislation to encourage more private financing of veterans' and college housing and rural electrification and telephone projects.

By calling for an increase in the Federal gasoline tax from the present 3 cents to 4½ cents, the administration concedes that it can't get the Federal highway program back on a pay-as-you-go basis without handing the motorist another substantial tax increase. By proposing new taxes on aviation gasoline and reducing airport subsidies, the President is calling on the airlines to be contributors as well as to pay their own way, something the railroads have been doing all along.

The President's request for a $350 million increase in postal revenue, evidently through a 5-cent stamp for first-class letters, needs closer study. It isn't fair to raise the first-class rate and not air mail. The public expects better service in return for the substantial postal increases granted by Congress last year.

President Eisenhower has called for a 10-percent reduction in foreign aid. There is room for a much bigger cut than that.

Maybe We Don't Worry Enough About Pride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the January 15, 1959, issue of the Daily Intelligencer, a Bucks County newspaper, which contains some thoughts that we could all heed:

MAYBE WE DON'T WORRY ENOUGH ABOUT PRIDE

Quite a few who examine American life closely today wonder whether our people, generally speaking, take a sufficient pride in achievement.

As a nation we continue to get high marks for ingenuity, resourcefulness, technical mastery. Yet there is evidence in a good many places that as individuals some Americans show little interest in, or respect for, solid accomplishment.

Dr. James R. Killian, President Eisenhower's top scientific adviser, took note of this matter recently when he said Americans need to develop a higher regard for learning and a fuller pride in achievement.

What counts, he said, is the importance Americans attach to the factor of excellence in our society.

Disquieting signs exist that a lot of us don't worry nearly enough about excelling in the things we do, whether it's running a business, making a product, trying a lawsuit, clerking in a store, holding down a Government job, or keeping house.

There are at least a couple of things involved in this.

One is how we as individuals feel about trying not simply to do what we may vaguely define as our best, but to meet clear standards of excellence. If we do not think it is good or necessary to succeed by that test, then our pride of accomplishment is indeed sadly limited.

The game of getting through the day, the week, and the month, of drawing pay for routine effort, is one that may lure us all at times. But nothing great was ever built or sustained that way.

The day that becomes the American's general philosophy of life, the Russians can lick us without firing a shot.

The second thing is how we look upon others who excel. Do we respect them for their attainments? Or do we try to downgrade and belittle them, to treat them with suspicion because they are not like us?

If we should ever, as a people, seriously entertain the idea that to be superior in any endeavor is to be odd, to be deserving of scorn and ridicule, then we might as well fold up our tents. For this world will prove too tough for us.

More than ever, the race today is to the swift. We not only had better be swift, but if we wish to gain that end we had better learn to think well of those among us who already are.

Foreign Aid for Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, in the coming months the Congress will be considering legislation which will continue our foreign aid program. As we all know, it is most difficult for the average Member of Congress to know exactly where and how the money we vote for foreign aid is eventually spent.

The Indianapolis Star in its lead editorial of December 23, 1958, does an excellent job in summarizing for us how much foreign-aid money has gone to Communist countries during the last 12 years.

I would like to hear from the proponents of foreign aid just how such expenditures to these Communist countries have been justified and how in the present state of world affairs we can continue to pour taxpayers' money in the form of so-called mutual aid into Communist countries.

The excellent Indianapolis Star editorial follows:

FOREIGN AID FOR COMMUNISTS

President Eisenhower is asking for an extra $1 billion for foreign aid next year. A rundown of new Democratic Senators in U.S. New & World Report shows that almost to a man these men will vote to continue the foreign aid program. But we will bet that not 1 man in 10 in Congress knows how U.S. foreign-aid funds are spent, who gets the money, or why. How can they? The State Department will not make an item-by-item report.

We are no more able than Congress to get the facts and details of foreign spending. But we do have some figures on who got how much money during the last 12 years from the U.S. taxpayer. They come from the Library of Congress.

Communist Albania got $20,444,000 between 1946 and 1957.

Communist Czechoslovakia got $185,827,000 plus $29,583 credits.

Communist Germany (yes, that's what we said) got $17,339,000.

Communist Hungary got $17,723,000 plus $15,917,000 credits.

Communist Poland got $365,017,000 plus $88 million credits.

Communist Yugoslavia got $789,732,000 plus $55,900,000 credits.

That total for Communist countries outside the Soviet Union since 1946 is $1,585,482,000 from the American taxpayer. Did it ever occur to you that this is almost as much as the Communists have spent since 1946 for their entire foreign aid program outside the Soviet captive states? Did it ever occur to Congress and the President that the United States has provided enough money to finance the entire Communist economic offensive announced by Communist boss Khrushchev? Man, what fools we are.

As late as 1955 we sent $2,374,000 to Communist Czechoslovakia. Between 1954 and 1958 we sent a total of $17,339,000 to Communist Germany. In 1955, before the Hungarian revolt we sent $3,496,000 to Communist Hungary. Then after the Hungarians revolted and were smashed by the Reds we sent the Red Hungarian Government $11,867,000. Apparently it pays in American foreign aid to smash a revolt against communism with Soviet troops.

Between July and December of 1957 we sent Communist Poland $49,890,000 of the U.S. taxpayers' money and more was sent in 1958. Note that Red boss Gomulka has just lined up solidly with Red boss Khrushchev and damned the United States publicly.

From 1955 to 1958 we sent $170 million to Communist Dictator Tito. He is still a Communist. He still votes with the Soviets in the U.N. He still sells the Communist line in the Middle East and Asia. He still imprisons anti-Communist critics.

Is this the foreign aid program the new Congress will support? Is this what is being described as the answer to the economic offensive of the Communist world? Do we intent to send to Communist countries just the amount of money they say they are spending in order to bury us?

What sort of inverted thinking produces such insanity? Why doesn't Congress stop it? What is wrong with the President and Secretary of State who permit this betrayal of American interests?

We wish somebody in Congress or the administration would find out.

Working Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

EDITOR, DAILY NEWS:

Some time ago the uptown merchants in cooperation with the chamber of commerce sponsored a campaign to stimulate uptown business. During this project, the public was offered free maps of Lebanon, city and county. I received one of these maps and upon close examination I was amazed at the large area owned by the Bethlehem Steel Co.

Lebanon may be the home of the bologna but Bethlehem Steel must sure be paying the taxes. I also thought of all the people employed at this plant and the importance of the payroll to the community. The thought clung to my mind and I brought up the subject with some of my fellow workers from the steel plant. They had a different point of view. In a disgusting manner they informed me that the local plant is so small it could be set inside the main offices at Bethlehem. This may be true but you could hide Coleman Memorial Park in New York's Central Park. Statements such as these prove nothing but they could reveal a frame of mind which is not in the best interests concerning the progress of our community.

We all realize that Lebanon has had its share of the recent recession. According to newspaper reports, many of the steel mills in other parts of the country are recovering quite satisfactorily. Again I hear pessimistic and even ridiculous remarks referring to conditions at our local plant. First I was informed that employment would improve after recent elections. Next it was the shutdown of automobile industries. Now it will be shortly after New Year. Production workers are so sure they know what is going on in the front office. Managament doesn't pretend to always know what is going on in the plant, but they do try. It would be to everyone's advantage if we, the production workers would only try to understand the problems of management. No manager worth his salt would allow good employee relations go to pot while his competitors are doing a brisk business down the street. Management has nothing to hide. The director meetings behind pulled shades are a thing of the past. Industry's financial reports are for the public. Years ago companies made progress but they overlooked the human problems. Modern management is a highly skilled profession interested in working with and through people. They, too, are paid to perform a job.

It is my firm belief that if the production worker would understand the structure of big business he readily realizes some of his duties and not just his rights. Our local plant like all large business ventures started as an idea. This idea had to be kindled with tremendous courage. A great many people had to risk money. Stockholders had no guarantee that there would be buyers. They did not know if costs could be met much less have a profit left. If business does not grow it dies. If it stands still it will be trampled by its competitors in the stampede for progress. When business is good, Uncle Sam taps the till. When business is poor, the stockholders face ruin. Management is under constant pressure from three fronts. They must see that the worker gets a fair wage. The stockholder wants a return on his investment. The customer wants a quality product within a time limit at a low price.

Waste is our vulnerable spot. This could be waste of man-hours or material. Both are figured in dollars and cents and added to the cost of the product. If you would be in business for yourself and intend to stay in business you would soon realize the value of a satisfied customer. The plant worker has a customer also. This customer may be miles away but only minutes by wire or phone, and he does keep in touch constantly.

I like to think of the average worker as a pretty shrewd fellow. Give him the facts and I have faith in his reasoning. He should recognize false ideologies which look good on paper. One of these making the rounds tells you that the more you earn, the more you will spend. This is only part of the story. Read the fine print and see how much you can purchase with cheap abundant cash.

I do not promise a pay raise next week for a few hours burst of energy. Progress is a slow, long, hard climb. Perhaps only our children will benefit.

If you still consider the local steel plant small and insignificant, think of the company salesman. He can bat his brains out convincing a customer that you can and will do the job, but if we punch a time clock and would rather discuss last night's bowling scores this customer will find the fellow who builds that better mousetrap. Since the recession has caused a decrease in the working force and the man with more seniority can claim another man's job, there is a ruling of ability to perform the job. You may have ability but are you willing? You should not be working for Bethlehem Steel—you should be working with Bethlehem Steel.

Yours,

A STEELWORKER.

A Bill Relating to Withholding, for Purposes of the Income Tax Imposed by Certain Cities on the Compensation of Federal Employees

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to permit withholding on the compensation of Federal employees for purposes of income taxes imposed by certain cities. I have been in favor of this legislation for some time for several reasons. It provides for good reciprocal relations between the Federal Government and our city governments which already withhold Federal taxes from the wages of their employees. It is economical in that it provides a less costly way of collecting legal taxes, overall. It is a real convenience to the Federal employees.

I want to dwell on this last point a little bit because at one time many Federal employees thought that this legislation was unfriendly to them. Some, but fortunately a very small minority, through misunderstanding still think so.

The reason certain Federal employees thought the legislation was unfriendly stemmed from the fact that the city earnings tax was unpopular, as most taxes are, to many, particularly to nonresidents of the city who worked in the city. As a matter of fact this form of taxation was considered by some to be unconstitutional, as taxation without representation. However, regardless of the unpopularity of this kind of tax, or its merits, the courts throughout the United States have upheld its legality. This is no longer a question. This form of tax has become an important source of revenue for many of our cities and is rather obviously here to stay.

Federal employees are liable for the tax just as any other person living in or working in a city which imposes such a tax. The present bill has nothing to do with whether a Federal employee is liable for the tax or not.

Federal employees soon found out that when they failed to pay the tax the cities allowed the amounts owed to accumulate until they were sizeable enough to warrant the expense of collection. Then when the employee was forced to pay, he had a sizeable sum to pay, instead of a modest amount. It included not only the accumulated amount but interest and collection costs.

As a result the Federal employees found, as do all taxpayers find, that it is really a favor to them to have the amounts owed withheld in weekly or monthly amounts where they have none of the nuisance of making returns or the embarrassment of having to budget a sizable accumulated amount.

Most Federal employee unions are on record as favoring this legislation. The officials of the city of St. Louis, part of which I represent, have long requested this legislation. Other cities through their officials and representatives in Congress have urged this legislation. I am hopeful that the Congress will act on this this year.

The bill referred to follows:

A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act relating to withholding, for State income tax purposes, on the compensation of Federal employees", approved July 17, 1952 (Public Law 587, 82d Congress; 5 U.S.C., sec. 84b), is hereby amended—

(1) by striking out "State or Territory" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "State, Territory, or city"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For the purposes of this section, the term 'city' means only a city which is incorporated under the law of a State or Territory and which had a population (according to the last decennial census) of seventy-five thousand or more individuals."

The International Law of Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Diario Las Americas is an outstanding Spanish language daily published in Miami Springs, Fla. It has been very instrumental in bringing to Latin America a better understanding of our country. It also has been extremely helpful in developing the Latin American point of view here in this country.

Diario Las Americas, under the editorship of Francisco Aguirre, and the management of Horacio Aguirre, has always taken the course of strengthening the bulwark of the free world which lies in the solidarity of the Western Hemisphere.

Recently they commented with considerable force and logic on a major problem confronting the people of the Americas and the free world as we move headlong into the space age. The thoughts, observations and recommendations of the editorial which follows merit consideration and action:

THE INTERNATIONAL LAW OF THE SPACE

In view of the advancements achieved lately by science in the conquest of space, following is a reproduction of our editorial of April 9, 1958, which at this moment acquires special interest:

"If there is any science wherein permanent dynamic constitutes an essential element, that is international law, because it is a matter of daily recourse, so to speak, with every new situation faced by the countries, by the people and by science, and in the different existing conditions. International law is not like a body of dead water, nor is it of the static kind. The law of the seas had to be gathered here and there and had to accommodate gradually to the new needs created by the steamship, or by modern warships or submarines. Later came the international law of the air, with the conquer of air by man.

"In this atomic era it is no longer a fantasy to say that man is in the threshold of the conquer of space. The United States and Russia have launched manmade satellites that now circle the globe; and interplanetary travel, starting with the trip to the natural satellite of the earth, seems to be far nearer to realization than the human mind could conceive a few years back. Thus, in this era, when man is almost on the verge of establishing physical contact with space regions that before seemed to be pieces of abstract mathematics, the human forces will have to cope with the problem of regulating the conduct of the States and of the people in the face of these new achievements. Naturally, the man of sound mind wishes that everything be encouraged through instruments meaning broader progress for humanity and to destroy every possibility of those new instruments ever being used from the open spaces to dominate the earth.

"It is a case similar to that of the atomic energy, which together with the incalculable benefits its discovery and conquer represent for humanity, it can also be the source of unthinkable horrors when in the hands of mental deviates who aspire to world domination.

"A few days ago this paper published an article by George Marden on the 'Regulation of Space Control,' saying that Russia is trying to negotiate an arrangement with the United States on the regulation of space control, on condition that the United States abandon their military bases overseas. A dangerous proposition this is, to set a matter of pure war strategy as a condition prior to an agreement on laws that have already become a necessity. Precisely for the contrary, to prevent that any nation may try to control our planet from the spaces above, it is why this matter must be focused. It is not for reasons of space politics that the problem must be coped with. Ample discussions in the United Nations, where the most outstanding international jurists may study this undeferrable topic from all scientific and impartial aspects, will undoubtedly provide a sensible solution.

"Such discussions may lead to the laying of the fundamental principles of the international law of the space."

Rumanian Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 100th anniversary of the reestablishment of Rumanian freedom and independence under the protection of the Western powers. On this anniversary I wish to express my warm sympathy for the aspirations of the Rumanian nation and for their present struggle against Soviet-Communist domination.

This commemoration is a reminder of the political importance and historical reality of Eastern Europe, where old and fiercely independent peoples have developed their own cultures and national entities. These peoples, with their cultures, are a vital part of Europe, which, without their free contribution and participation within its boundaries, is reduced to

a strangled existence, as is the case today. The problem today is not to accept the limited area of discussion imposed on us by the Soviet maneuvering, but to raise the whole question of that part of Europe on which the peace and security for the future so largely depend.

It is obvious to me that the main source of tension and insecurity for the Atlantic Community stems from the inability of the West to exploit this whole unpleasant situation in Soviet-dominated Europe. This situation, as long as we condone it, constitutes an immense benefit to the Soviets, whereas, instead, if we would turn the tables and exploit this situation ourselves against them it would be a terrible thorn in the Soviet flesh.

The inevitable objection that this would increase the cold war is totally untrue. The free hand enjoyed by the Soviets in their controlled part of Europe has in no way lessened the tensions between the Soviets and the United States; on the contrary, it has actually increased them. When we do not use a weapon at our hand, such as the subjugation of a good part of Europe by the Soviets, we are actually encouraging them to continue and even increase their pressure for the advancement of their global Communist aims of world infiltration, subversion, and eventual domination.

This is what is happening right now, when Mikoyan, unlike us, is using every means at his disposal, even kissing American babies, to push us out of Europe.

It is my conviction that the American people will not be taken in by this latest Soviet, Mikoyan propaganda stunt. I believe that, together with the highly deterring defense advocated by Congress, we are going to adopt the policy which would put us on the ground of reality concerning Soviet tactics.

Must TV Booster Stations Be Shut Off?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following editorial from the Wenatchee Daily World of January 11, 1959, entitled, "Why the Hurry in Barring Reflectors From the Air?"

Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have been interested in the efforts by the residents of many small, isolated communities in the mountainous areas of the West to provide themselves with television reception. Because the Federal Communications Commission had no answer to their problem and showed no inclination to help them solve it, these people have taken the initiative by erecting community-sponsored VHF booster stations or reflectors which pick the television signals out of the air from surrounding hilltops and redirect them into the homes in the valleys. Several hundred of these booster stations are now operating satisfactorily throughout the mountainous areas of the West.

Last month the Federal Communications Commission peremptorily ordered these stations off the air. It gave the operators of the stations 90 days in which to apply for licenses to convert to a more costly facility, the UHF translator, or else face legal proceedings to shut them down. Yet it has been apparent for some time that UHF translators are not the answer for many of these communities, so the FCC order confronts them with the possibility of a television blackout.

The editorial from the World properly asks the two key questions, will UHF translators on the higher channels be able to serve the people now being served, and how can the funds be raised to finance the costly installations? Until these questions are answered, what is the hurry in taking reflectors off the air?

The editorial follows:

WHY THE HURRY IN BARRING REFLECTORS FROM THE AIR?

The long arm of the Federal Communications Commission has reached out from Washington, D.C., and held up a pronouncement saying to north central Washington television reflector associations: "Get off the air. Change to UHF."

The public notice, as the new rule is officially called in the FCC's voluminous set of regulations, says the community groups who now operate the dozen and a half reflectors in this area, must notify the FCC within 90 days that they intend to comply with the order.

If they don't, they're going to be hauled into court.

The FCC decision has long been expected. It nevertheless came as a shock. It put squarely before reflector leaders two major problems: (1) Will UHF translators on the higher channels be able to serve the people now being served? and (2) how can the funds be raised to finance the costly installation?

As to problem No. 1, the UHF translators which the FCC recommends have never been tested in mountainous areas here. A Daily World representative saw one tried at Quincy but there the terrain is ideal, with the transmitting antenna on a high hill and the entire area to be served a flat plateau.

Manson has one in operation on a limited basis but its situation doesn't match conditions in many of our areas—Entiat and the Methow Valley, for instance.

At Oroville one company selling one of the better types of translators refuses to test its equipment there because of fear it won't do the job. Oroville has a receiving antenna 10 miles from town, which reflects to a transmitting antenna on a high hill above Oroville.

Every area has a different engineering condition to face. In some narow valleys the UHF device may not work at all, who knows.

Problem No. 2—financing the installation—is also far away from solution. Raising a relatively small amount of money by donation to operate the current VHF stations has proven a headache almost everywhere. A lot of people are getting a free ride—that is, a free picture, and nothing can be done to collect from them.

To pay for the more expensive UHF—figures up to $73,000 are being bandied about—a hit and miss collection system won't work. Something like State Senator Wilbur Hallauer's bill whereby a television district could charge everyone getting the picture from the district's reflector a service fee may be the answer.

Surely it will be kicked around a long time in the legislature before it becomes law. The cable companies who kept bottled up in committee a suggested State law to legalize VHF reflectors during the last session, probably will oppose the measure because of its possible encroachment on areas that they feel can best be served by cable.

Hallauer told the Daily World, in announcing his proposal, that the bill-drafting service at Olympia found it an exceedingly difficult measure to draw. There is no precedent for it, although the idea resembles one on which the hospital district law is based. The proposal may be found to be completely illegal.

In the face of these two major difficulties—and we've skipped over a lot of side problems associated with both—the year's delay in filing of the intention to comply with the FCC rules, as requested by the Washington State Television Reflector Association, seems a just one.

The various community television groups face having to accept an FCC proposal that neither they nor the FCC for that matter, really know will work in each individual instance. They're being forced to sign on the dotted line for something they don't know will work. Experimentation, required in every local situation, can't possibly be begun satisfactorily until ready access is available to the high points where reflectors are located.

The people bringing reflector TV to our valleys are ordinary citizens donating their time and energy without pay. Their work is difficult enough without saddling them with the added burden of having to face blizzards and freezing weather where the elements are at their worst. They also face months of efforts in raising funds and testing equipment.

It seems to us that the FCC has never squarely faced up to the problem of bringing television to mountainous areas. It started in the direction of legalizing VHF reflectors, and then turned about and went another direction—toward UHF—under the pressure of the lobbyists for the cable corporations.

Now it has ruled VHF must go. The little people in the remote valleys can't afford any longer to fight the powerful Federal agency. They must comply or else get off the air.

We hope the FCC will prove an understanding arm of Government and be lenient in allowing plenty of time for a big job to be done, if it must be done.

Anyway, what's the hurry? We have yet to see any proof of consequence that the VHF reflectors in our areas are interferring with anyone.

Ukraine Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, Thursday marks the 41st anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. We are all likely to forget the history of the individual countries which are now involuntarily held in the U.S.S.R. The independence which was declared by the Ukrainians in 1918 was short lived. The new bolshevik Russia wrenched freedom from the militarily weak Ukrainians only 3 years after it had been proclaimed. The Ukraine harbors a hate for Communist oppression as great

in fervor as their love of freedom. It is the hope of all free men that the taste of freedom which was so fleeting in their mouths will serve to whet their appetite for liberty. The Communists can prohibit public demonstrations, but nothing can suppress the patriotism which lives on in every Ukrainian heart.

The Spending Issue Arises Early

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 19, 1959, entitled "The Spending Issue Arises Early":

THE SPENDING ISSUE ARISES EARLY

The Democratic leadership in Congress has marked for early action a series of spending bills which challenge the basic premises of President Eisenhower's fiscal policy as it was outlined in general terms in his message on the state of the Union. Two of the three measures which the Senate majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, described as issues clamoring for resolution were vetoed by Mr. Eisenhower at the last session of Congress.

In his message to a joint session of Congress January 9, Mr. Eisenhower enunciated these rules: (1) The budget must be kept in balance; (2) current costs must be met from current revenue; (3) deficit financing must not contribute to further inflation.

"If we cannot live within our means during such a time of rising prosperity," the President said, "the hope of fiscal integrity will fail. If we persist in living beyond our means, we make it difficult indeed for every family in our land to balance its own household budget. But to live within our means would be a tangible demonstration to ourselves and to others of the self-discipline needed to assure a stable dollar."

It is already clear that the Democrats with their largest majorities in both House and Senate since 1940, do not agree on the need for self-restraint. The three spending measures they propose even in advance of submission of the administration's budget Monday would knock the President's proposed limit of $77 billion out of kilter, adding some 3.3 billion to the bill.

The major Democratic spending measure is a housing bill, offered in varying forms by Representative RAINS, of Alabama, and Senator SPARKMAN, of Alabama. The administration will propose a housing bill of its own which is considerably more modest.

The Rains and Sparkman proposals contemplate larger grants for urban slum clearance than the administration will seek. Provisions for restoration of authority for direct mortgage purchases by the Federal National Mortgage association would, in themselves, account for a quick outlay of several hundred million dollars. Democratic loans for college housing run $200 to $300 million more than the administration thinks feasible. Several other proposals involving large outlays will also encounter opposition from the administration.

An airport construction and improvement bill calling for $575 million in Federal aid in a 5-year period is similar to a measure vetoed last year by Mr. Eisenhower. At that time he said that, while Federal assistance may have been appropriate when civil aviation was growing to maturity, the Government had done its part and the time had arrived for an orderly Federal withdrawal.

The success of Mayor Daley, of Chicago, in persuading commercial airlines to assume the principal expense in developing O'Hare International Airport shows the soundness of the President's contention that airports should be considered a responsibility of local governments and the airlines.

The Democrats are also renewing the measure vetoed last year to alleviate unemployment in depressed areas. Spending of $275 million is envisioned. In his veto message last year, Mr. Eisenhower maintained that the major responsibility for planning and financing economic redevelopment should remain with local citizens; that the proposed bill provided little or no local participation, and that it would mean the assumption of responsibility by the Government for the direct support of local economies.

It is certainly unwise to use Federal money to freeze conditions of chronic hardship in communities where economic opportunities have become exhausted. Instead, the unemployed should be encouraged to seek work and a promising future in areas which can offer them.

It is said that Mr. Eisenhower is determined to hold the fiscal line even if he must fight off the Democratic majorities with the veto power. As things are shaping up, the first of these tests will be presented to him perhaps as soon as early March. His response will demonstrate to the people whether he means what he has said.

The President a Spender?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an article which appeared in the Noveber 21 issue of U.S. News & World Report entitled "The President a Spender?" The author, Mr. Gabriel Hauge, cites the President's spending record and feels that the major portion of blame for increased Government expenditures rests squarely on the Congress, not the President:

THE PRESIDENT A SPENDER?

(By Gabriel Hauge, former special assistant to President Eisenhower for economic affairs)

It should be understood that the deterioration in the budget situation is not, of course, solely, or even mainly, a reflection of increased spending. The net change in the January budget as officially revised early in the autumn is $12.7 billion. Of this total, $7.4 billion are accounted for by lower receipts almost entirely due to the recession.

Increased expenditures account for the remaining $5.3 billion. Of these increased expenditures it is perhaps fair to say that about $2 billion can be attributed to conscious antirecession policy—mainly in the fields of housing, unemployment insurance, and accelerated public works. Looming large in the remainder are about $1.8 billion more for the Department of Agriculture and about $500 million for added defense outlays.

It is a little bewildering today, in listening to some critics of the President as a spender, to recall the scene 6 months ago when many voices, from many quarters, were calling upon him to do something, to do anything—whatever the cost—to deal with the recession. That he did act, selectively and prudently, is now a matter of record. As far as the increase in farm spending is concerned, responsibility will have to be assigned elsewhere, including the weather. And with regard to defense spending, the majority of critics complain he is spending too little rather than too much.

Second, in evaluating some of the more partisan attacks on the President, this salient fact should be remembered: In the last session Congress enacted specific appropriation items, authorizations and tax adjustments involving a total budgetary burden of $7.5 billion beyond the President's January budget recommendations.

Adjusted for reductions made by Congress in other parts of his budget, such as in mutual security, the additional net budgetary burden to be borne in succeeding years amounts to about $5 billion over and above his recommendations. Regrettably he was not equipped with such tools as the item veto to help avoid such a result.

Third, in the last session the President's vetoes of spending authorizations and his effective opposition to other appropriations and authorizations that had passed one House of Congress resulted in the avoidance of legislation involving an added budgetary burden of $5.5 billion which would have had to be borne over succeeding years. These facts suggest that the President's budget posture was a lot better than the alternative Congress sougth to impose upon him.

Fourth, it should be recalled that the Presidents' January budget contained 16 legislative proposals for economy, both for decreasing expenditures and for increasing nontax receipts. These, if enacted, would have produced estimated future annual budget savings of $3.5 billion. Congress failed to act at all on eight of these proposals, went the other way on four by increasing rather than diminishing the programs involved, and acted only partially on the others. The result was that net benefits to the budget amounted to only about $500 million.

Fifth, the President was the leader of the forces, drawing strength from both sides of the aisle in Congress, which held the line against a general antirecession tax cut. Such action, if taken, would probably have avoided little of the additional spending which did result and would have added substantially to the $12.2 billion deficit now projected for this fiscal year. Subsequent events have already begun to prove his judgment right.

These five facts entitled the President, in my opinion, to speak with authority as well as conviction on the matter of public spending. These facts make clear how much more serious the budget stituation would have been if he had not been both courageous—and right—earlier this year. The facts entitle him to the support of every throughtful American in his efforts to build a sound and sensible budget position.

Colorado 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include in the RECORD, a poem

entitled "Colorado 1959," written by the State's distinguished poet laureate, Milford E. Shields. This year, Colorado is observing the centennial of the gold rush of 1859 which resulted in the settlement of Colorado and its eventual entrance into the Union as a State. Mr. Shields' poem is a worthy contribution to Colorado's "Rush to the Rockies" observance. The poem follows:

COLORADO 1959

Our mountains rise up in the sky,
In high and holy air;
They kiss the clouds that blow on by,
Drink virgin raindrops there.

Our plains put on a fragrant green
That ripens into grain;
Above them is a vibrant sheen
Of rainbows after rain.

Beneath the richness of our soil
We have a wealth untold,
A vast uranium and oil
More precious than pure gold.

We have our factories and mills
That call for eager hands;
They use the highest of the skills
That excellence commands.

Yet more than this we have our men,
Our giants in the sun,
Who serve our State again, again
Till time and tide are won.

Thank God for Colorado great,
Our Century Sublime;
God bless and keep our Four Square State
Throughout all future time.

—MILFORD E. SHIELDS

We Have No Right To Meddle in Cuba's Internal Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, recent events in Cuba have stirred up all kinds of critical comments and discussions by Americans. The result has been that the leader of the Cuban revolution, Dr. Fidel Castro, has personally undertaken to defend himself and Cuba's new government against Americans generally.

I agree with the analysis recently written by Bill Baggs, editor of the Miami News. Bill Baggs is an outstanding newspaperman. He has remarkable objectivity in reporting on events as they transpire. He is well oriented on international affairs, particularly in Latin America.

I think what he says in this article makes sense and is the best course for the United States:

WE HAVE NO RIGHT TO MEDDLE IN CUBA'S INTERNAL AFFAIRS

A crazy rumor was shot into orbit last week.

No one seems to know who launched the piece of gossip, or from where.

But all of a sudden there was a grumbling on the sidewalks of Havana that the United States might send in the Marines to halt the trials and executions which are being conducted under the auspices of the new Cuban Government.

Fidel Castro recognized the rumor and commented on it.

If the Marines came he said, 200,000 gringos would die.

In Miami, the telephone rang incessantly. The callers were outraged. Every one of them. They were outraged by what they identified as a threat of sorts from Castro.

AIR, NOTHING ELSE

Put into place, what Castro said was a counter-threat to a threat born of a rumor made out of air and nothing else.

Thie weird bit of business rode across the headlines and took away the play from something real, something which did happen and is a fact. As a truth, however, it is almost as fantastic as the rumor.

In Washington, a Congressman on a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee suggested an economic reprisal against Cuba fashioned to stop those trials and executions.

Perhaps, he said, U.S. credit for the country of Cuba could be shut off or Cuban sugar could be barred from the trade in our Nation.

This is a truly exotic thought.

NOT OUR BUSINESS

Since when did the Congress of the United States acquire the job of managing the domestic affairs of Cuba?

For too many generations, too many individuals in this country have stuck or tried to stick their thick paws into the domestic affairs of other countries in this hemisphere.

Every morning, afternoon, and evening, we are beat around in the conversations of Latin America because a few among us try or have tried to steer the purely domestic affairs of Latin American countries.

You know and I know that most people in our country have not even a passing notion to have an arm in running Cuba, Mexico, Argentina, or any foreign country. We know it, but the Latins don't.

DEMOCRACY AT LAST

It is rather tragic that this old kink curls into view at the moment. Fidel Castro is perhaps the best thing which has happened to Cuba since the Spanish fleet was sent to the bottom outside Santiago Bay in the summer of 1898.

He represents a fresh prospect for the establishment of democratic institutions in Cuba.

His strength is altogether inherited from the people, who swelled his pitifully small ranks as the rebels came out of the hills and marched across Cuba to take it away from a dictator.

He seems to know what self-government means, and what morality in government means.

PRESS IS NOW FREE

He sent the rebels into Habana to chop up the gambling wheels and the dice tables, and to put them off limits for the people of Cuba, and these are the people who can hardly afford to gamble a peso.

He restored a complete freedom of press, and in all history, there has never been a free society which did not have a free press—and in all history there has never been a free press in a dictatorial society. The two can't live together.

But.

What about those trials and executions?

Earlier, we have commented that a trial out in the field under a tree in the atmosphere of an angry people coming out of a revolution is wrong.

The fact that these people in the crowd have been tortured, their brothers and even their sisters killed, does not make this kind of trial right.

JOB FOR COURTS

The fact that the press is invited to these trials does not make the trials and the executions which seem to inevitably follow right.

In our opinion.

We would prefer that Fidel Castro jail the accused from the Batista gang and try them after the courts are reorganized.

But if the U.S. Government has a complaint against the field justice in Cuba, the United States should present its complaint to the Cuban Government or to the United Nations for a hearing.

No one can condone these trials, exhaustive as the trials may be, in the mood of revolution. We have seen pictures of the men, the women and the children killed by Batista's thugs and still we cannot condone the trials of these thugs by semimilitary jurors who are still wet from the revolution.

FOOLISH MEDDLERS

In spite of them, everything Senor Castro has done makes him look mighty like a bearded angel compared to the procession of dictators before him.

And, as declared in this comment, no one ever gave any citizen of the United States any right to preside over the domestic affairs of Cuba.

And anyone who assumes the right, a Congressman or anyone else, is a foolish meddler in a nervous world.

BILL BAGGS, *Editor.*

The Late Attorney General of Massachusetts a Martyr to Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, George Fingold was attorney general of Massachusetts, and one of the best vote-getters of the Republican Party in my home State.

Even though his political allegiance differed from mine, I was but one of the many Democrats who admired his ability, his character, and his marvelous energy.

George was a bighearted man in every way.

To all outward appearances, he seemed the picture of health.

But the toll of public life, as he cheerfully endeavored to meet the impossible demands of the people who liked him, and wanted him to be here, and there, and everywhere was breaking him inside.

George never complained because he was inspired by the sincere belief that his mission in life was to help others.

Unanimously endorsed by the Republican State convention to be its nominee for Governor of Massachusetts, he was engaged in an intensive campaign for that high honor when he was suddenly stricken.

Even now, nearly 5 months later, it is difficult to believe that he has passed away, so vivid is the memory of him.

He was the first member of the Jewish faith to be elected to State office in Massachusetts. He earned the confidence of all races and creeds and he vindicated that trust by his devotion to duty, finally sacrificing his life in the service of that ideal.

There is no finer tribute to his memory than the eulogy given by Rabbi Charles Weinberg, of the Congregation Beth Israel, Malden, Mass., that appeared in the Boston Daily Globe on September 2, 1958. Under unanimous consent, I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ATTORNEY GENERAL FINGOLD EULOGIZED AS CHAMPION OF LITTLE MAN—COURAGE AND INITIATIVE CITED BY RABBI WEINBERG

The following is the eulogy given by Rabbi Charles Weinberg of the Congregation Beth Israel, Malden:

"With grieving hearts we are gathered with the beloved family of the late attorney general, George Fingold, to pay our last respects to an eminent leader in the political arena of our Commonwealth.

"The shock of the sudden death of George Fingold has barely subsided. The spontaneous reaction to this tragedy that befell the family and the citizenry of our Commonwealth is in itself a great tribute to a great leader.

"Cut down in the midst of life, George Fingold exemplified the product of this land of opportunity, wherein a young man of modest circumstances was able to reach the loftiest positions in public service.

"Reared in a traditional Jewish home he learned early the great attributes of humility and trust. These virtues accompanied him throughout his brilliant career. Though he achieved quick eminence, he never forgot his past with its struggles and hardships.

"He was therefore recognized as the champion of the little man whom he loved and respected. The dignity of man was a venerated ideal in George Fingold's heart.

"He held sacred the right of every human being, regardless of their station in life, race color, or creed.

"In his search for strengthening our system of government he was guided by the ideal of a community of equals. His radiant personality warmed the hearts of those who crossed his path.

"ENEMY OF LAWLESSNESS, DEVOTED TO FAMILY

"George Fingold early in his career declared courageously with great moral conviction his unmitigated enmity against lawlessness. He had a passion for justice and sought always to secure the rights of the citizens of this Commonwealth.

"He long ago recognized that the state was a vehicle through which the godly attributes of justice and mercy, righteousness, and truth must be served.

"There was a continuous process in his life of the unfolding of the spirit of a man whose humanity, morality, and ethics were based upon the profound teachings of Judaism.

"His ethical standards of leadership filtered through his relations with his fellowman.

"George Fingold met the challenges of life and achieved greatness because he had confidence in the validity of his dreams and projects.

"He had courage and initiative. He knew clearly what he wanted to do and went right to it. Above all, he felt the hand of God guiding him, and so he had faith.

"We were the benefactors of these attributes of our late attorney general. There is, however, another great quality which is perhaps little known, for which indeed his soul is blessed.

"George Fingold had a deep attachment to his family. The Fifth Commandment, 'Honor thy father and thy mother,' took precedence over all. In the busiest of days, he took time out to visit with his father and these were frequent visits.

"The memory of his late mother abided with him throughout his career. It was a unique type of family devotion whose exemplification should inspire us all.

"VICTIM OF STRAIN ON PUBLIC SERVANTS

"Mrs. Fingold, you shared your husband with us far beyond the call of duty. You and his beloved family were a real source of inspiration to him in his career.

"Though his years were brief in number, his record of achievement was great. The presence of all the distinguished leaders of our Commonwealth from all walks of life, the many thousands of messages that arrived from all over the Nation, bear testimony to the high esteem in which George was held.

"George Fingold was about to embark on the gubernatorial race. His service as a public servant took its toll and he was stopped short of an attempt to achieve the crowning success of his career.

"Should not his untimely death serve as notice to the public of the strenuous demands made upon our public officials? Through technical advances we have eased the burden of our daily tasks while at the same time the burdens of public servants have increased immeasurably.

"What a pity to have lost in the prime of life a leader whose guidance brought blessings to so many.

"Dear friends, we are faced now with the transition of a noble being from mortal to immortal life. George Fingold has achieved immortality. He will long be remembered by his beloved wife, his devoted family, and the hosts of friends.

"May his soul be bound up in the bond of eternal life."

Ormonde A. Kieb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to pay tribute to the devoted and unselfish service rendered to our Government by Ormonde A. Kieb, who has just resigned as Assistant Postmaster General. Mr. Kieb, a resident of New Jersey, is a personal friend of mine whom I have known for some years, and at considerable sacrifice to himself he accepted his appointment to the Post Office Department, thereby meeting the challenge to reorganize and revitalize the service.

In the 5 years of his administration which will come to a close on January 31, 1959, Mr. Kieb reorganized the operations of the Bureau of Facilities of the Post Office Department by reducing it from nine divisions to three functional line divisions known as Real Estate, Supplies, and Motor Vehicles. In addition a great part of the operations of these divisions was decentralized by being assigned to field offices. In the acquisition of post office space he introduced sound business practices in the commercial leasing technique and this was made possible by his long training in the real estate business in Newark, N.J. He brought about reduced costs in the supply system of the postal service together with reduced delivery schedule time and streamlined various operational procedures. These are only a few of the constructive features that "Toni" Kieb installed for the benefit of the postal service.

Mr. Kieb deserves the heartfelt thanks of all American citizens for his devotion to duty and he leaves his office operating with far greater efficiency and effectiveness than when he first entered into it. He received from the Postmaster General in 1956 the Distinguished Service Award of the Post Office Department in recognition of his untiring zeal and constructive achievements.

I am glad to append herewith Mr. Kieb's letter of resignation to the President dated December 31, 1958, and the President's reply thereto of January 7, 1959. I include also an editorial dated January 10, 1959, from the Newark Evening News entitled "Public Service":

DECEMBER 31, 1958.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with deep regret that I tender to you my resignation as Assistant Postmaster General to be effective January 31, 1959. It has been a rewarding experience to have completed almost 6-year tour of duty in Government service during your administration as President and under the direction of Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield. I now find the time has come when I must return to private business.

It is a comfort and satisfaction that the responsibilities assigned to me have been completely reorganized.

The Real Estate Division through a competent and able staff, using modern real estate techniques, has obtained modern space for the Department at lower average rentals. Over 2,600 new modern buildings have been erected through public bidding by private investors for lease to the Department. Even though paying local real estate taxes to the communities out of the rent, they reflect lower annual costs to the taxpayers than the occupancy costs of postal space in traditional monumental Government-owned buildings. This modernization program is well underway and ready for rapid acceleration when the Congress provides the funds for your program.

The Department's supply system has been completely revamped. It is operating with much improved efficiency and better administrative control.

The Government-owned motor vehicle fleet has been almost completely changed over to standard production-line trucks in the new red, white, and blue color scheme. This, combined with modern fleet operating standards, shows lower initial costs and lower operating costs per mile. The motor vehicle service facilities are adequately equipped and have been fully redesigned with but a few exceptions in Government-owned garage buildings.

Please understand my appreciation for the opportunity to have contributed a small part to the many accomplishments of these years. It is with keen regret that I now write you to terminate my official assignment.

Mrs. Kieb and I shall always be devoted to Mrs. Eisenhower and yourself, as well as to the kind of Government service your able and dedicated leadership have provided for the Nation.

Sincerely yours,

ORMONDE A. KIEB.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 7, 1959.

The Honorable ORMONDE A. KIEB,
Assistant Postmaster General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KIEB: I have your letter of December 31, 1958, and regretfully accede to your wishes by accepting your resignation to be effective January 31, 1959. I am aware of the splendid service you have rendered to the Post Office Department since you first assumed your duties in 1953. You have certainly earned the appreciation of your coworkers in Government and the people of the United States for your contribution to the work of the administration.

As you leave Government service to return to private life, you take with you my best wishes for your future health and happiness.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

[From the Newark Evening News, Jan. 10, 1959]

PUBLIC SERVICE

Career men in government are inclined to be disdainful of the businessman who enters public service. The practice of bureaucracy is supposed to be full of things he just doesn't understand.

The businessman in Government does have his limitations, but on the whole he has been more effective than the professionals will admit and has been able to show them that government has something to learn from business.

The Eisenhower administration has drawn heavily on business in filling key posts requiring a knowledge of accounting and finance, personnel policies, purchasing and managerial techniques. Most conspicuous among them are Secretary of Labor Mitchell of Elizabeth and C. Douglas Dillon of Far Hills, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

Ormonde A. Kieb, Newark realtor, has just resigned after serving 5 years as Assistant Postmaster General. As chief of his department's Bureau of Facilities, Mr. Kieb's long experience in real estate was of much use to the Government. Among other achievements, his leasing policies produced a substantial reduction in the average rent the Government is paying for post offices.

He returns to private life with the President's thanks for splendid service, a commendation which has been well earned.

Most Unkindest Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial which appeared in the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes on November 20, 1958:

MOST UNKINDEST CUT

Our readers will note that the heading to this editorial contains two superlative adjectives modifying a single noun. This use has been condemned by grammarians of recent years as redundant. At the time Shakespeare, in his drama Julius Caesar, wrote the line from which these words were taken, the custom of strengthening the thought to be expressed by two such superlative adjectives was accepted as grammatically correct.

We would like to point out that the noun described as most unkindest is the noun cut. Undoubtedly the Bard of Avon was anxious to bring home to his readers and to his hearers, the extent of the cut which brought an end to the life of one of Rome's greatest warriors, a man who had brought glory to the standards of the empire. So much for grammar.

All this discussion is brought about by a recent story which appeared in the columns of a Washington, D.C., newspaper.

The story goes on to say that President Eisenhower discussed new veterans spending with top aides yesterday (Saturday, November 8) in the first big test of his postelection pledge to fight for reduction in Federal spending.

The story continues: The session was held shortly before the President left by air on a weekend business and pleasure trip. Veterans' benefits, it was stated, which will cost slightly more than $5 billion this fiscal year, are one of the big spending items of the Federal budget.

And the story continues: The President said in his budget message to Congress last January that the time had come to "reconsider the laws providing veterans' benefits and services." He is reported to have said that many of these now overlap other Government welfare programs.

Over the years the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes has always tried to go along reasonably with the Chief Executive of our country, regardless of party, but we have found ourselves in a quandary to reconcile certain of his statements with other public utterances when it comes to a question of reducing Federal expenditures.

Certainly we would like to see certain Federal costs reduced. It might result in a reduction of the income tax which all of us have to pay, for which, we are sure, all our citizens would be grateful.

We have racked our brains for some years past in an endeavor to understand the mentality of the President when it comes to the consideration of the cost of veterans' benefits.

Unhappily, we have come up with but one answer. President Eisenhower is not interested in veterans, as such, and may perhaps be influenced by the leaders of big business who, certainly, have no desire to add to their taxes by repaying the debt they owe to our war veterans.

It may be all very well for the President to proclaim Veterans' Day on November 11 in high-sounding phrases, such as are contained in his recent decree which, among other things speaks "of our obligation to the veterans of the armed services, who have contributed immeasurably to the realization of those ideals of a free society which we cherish," and that "we should give nationwide expression to our high and enduring esteem for these veterans."

These are all pretty words but when we compare them with the fact that the first item to be considerd in the reduction of Government costs is the cost of benefits to veterans and their dependents, we are inclined to think of these beautiful phrases as a mockery—something to be used once a year and then forgotten.

Up to now we must admit we have indulged in words of criticism alone. Now we would like to cite some statistics compiled by Col. Leonard P. Ayres, onetime Chief of the Statistics Division of the General Staff of the Army on the subject of our war with Germany from 1917–19.

At the outbreak of World War I on April 6, 1917, there were, in round figures, 200,000 men serving in the Regular Army of the United States.

By the end of the war approximately 4 million men had either enlisted or been drafted for service in the Army. Of this group, 2,810,296 men were draft inductees. Others included the National Guard troops which were taken into the armed forces.

After the war was declared, the size of the Regular Army jumped from 200,000 to 500,000. Thus, 300,000 were volunteers who joined the service before being drafted. Naturally, all of these came from civilian life.

According to Colonel Ayres, 20 divisions of the Regular Army served during World War I. Of these division, 12 reached France. Three of these divisions, again according to Colonel Ayres, never served in combat.

The average strength of a division in World War I was 28,000, including officers and men. Considering the Regular Army divisions who really fought the war, we find that nine of such divisions saw combat. Multiplying nine times 28,000 we find that 252,000 Regular Army men saw combat and some of these divisions did not enter the lines until late in October 1918.

So we are inclined to ask ourselves who won World War I insofar as American troops were concerned? Further study of Colonel Ayres' statistics brings us to the mathematical conclusion that of the men who actually saw combat service, 1,190,000 came from civilian life. These figures are interesting but the facts sustain them.

So again we ask ourselves: What does President Eisenhower have against the men who fought and won World War I? Is it the fact that all his military training has brought him to the belief that civilian fighting men are men to be used in time of need and then discarded, left to make their own way in the world?

Has our President become obsessed with the thought that only the man who follows a military career all his life should be considered when it comes time to repay him for such service?

We could go on quoting statistics to show that civilians won World War II and acquitted themselves nobly in the Korean war. These were not professional fighting men, but men who realized that when their country called it was time to serve, as their forefathers had done from the days of the Minute Men of Massachusetts down through all the wars our country has fought.

It has been said in these columns from year to year that the cost of veterans' care must be considered as the cost of the war in which they fought.

We can understand the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Chamber of Commerce taking potshots at war veterans. The cost of aiding such veterans hits their pockets, and when you hit the pockets of the NAM members and the members of the National Chamber of Commerce you hit their hearts.

But when a President of the United States, himself a veteran of two world wars, makes it his first objective of business to seek a way to cut benefits from the very men who made our Nation possible, we must agree with Shakespeare, "This is the most unkindest cut of all."

Florida's Governor Has the Right Slant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Gov. LeRoy Collins, of Florida, has demonstrated his rare ability as the State's chief executive on many occasions. He has been one of Florida's outstanding Governors.

His attitude on the recent visit of Russia's Deputy Premier is reported with observations by John B. McDermott. As political writer, John B. McDermott has a very high reputation. He has traveled all over the world and has for many years been a very keen student of international affairs. He just recently returned from an extended trip to Russia. His observations and conclusions are sound and merit much consideration.

His recent article in the Miami Herald follows:

COLLINS HAS RIGHT SLANT

(By John B. McDermott)

The proposal made by Sumter L. Lowry, of Tampa, former gubernatorial candidate, that Gov. LeRoy Collins try to block a visit to Florida by Russian Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan represents isolationist thinking.

One pertinent fact this writer learned from his trip to the U.S.S.R.—we just got back—is that the U.S. Government should encourage Russian leaders to come to this country and see how we live.

The Russian people have no real concept of conditions in the U.S.A., and the only way they can learn is to have representatives come here and find out. An example of this was brought home to me during a chance meeting in Red Square when, through an interpreter, I had a conversation with some dozen or more passersby.

THEY NEED FACTS

These men and women, representing the average man-in-the-street, were concerned about the fact that unemployment is rampant in this country. They had read of this condition repeatedly in the highly censored Russian press. They were obviously surprised by my assurance that most people who want to work have jobs in our country.

I feel sure that General Lowry's intentions in wanting Mikoyan to be kept out of Florida are well meaning. But if we put an "iron curtain" around our country, how will the Soviets get a true picture of just how good conditions are here?

We live in a land of luxury which, to the Russians, is almost beyond the realm of belief. The greatest luxury I experienced in Russia were the plush accommodations and delectable dinner aboard the KLM Royal Dutch airliner over the U.S.S.R. on the last leg of a flight from New York to the snow-draped Moscow airport.

REMEMBER NIXON?

This is not to imply that I experienced hardship of living while there. I didn't. The hotels were adequate, clean and well heated. The food was plentiful and good, although not particularly inspiring with the exception of chicken Kiev.

The Russians tried hard to be friendly to the foreign visitors—a factor which we would do well to emulate when Russians or other foreigners are in our country.

Most of us recall the revulsion which swept this Nation when Vice President Nixon was spit on and insulted during his good will tour of Latin America.

Yet, has not Mikoyan been given comparable treatment during some of his stops at American cities?

Admittedly, these demonstrations are being sparked by Hungarian refugees or sympathizers who have good reason to hate the U.S.S.R. and its official functionaries. But do these demonstrations against Russia's No. 2 man do any good? I think not.

LET OTHERS COME

Governor Collins told Lowry he sees no need for urging the U.S. State Department to keep Mikoyan out of Florida. He does not feel, as does Lowry, that Mikoyan may lull us to sleep.

Lowry claims that allowing Mikoyan to visit here would be an insult to every patriotic citizen, a betrayal of the memory of Florida men who lost their lives in Korea.

Collins advised Lowry he felt Floridians were able to take care of themselves during Mikoyan's visit—that he did not feel Floridians were in danger of being contaminated by communism simply because the Kremlin's No. 2 man was passing through.

And, pointedly, he suggested to Lowry that if the former National Guard general felt a danger of being improperly influenced, he and any other person of like thinking could:

Keep away from airports or any other places where Mikoyan might be during his visit.

Refrain from listening to radio broadcasts or watching television shows which might feature the Russian bigwig.

Skip over newspaper accounts which describe his visit or which report on interviews with him.

In the opinion of this writer, based on his own experiences in Russia and covering the cold war in Europe for some 8 years, I'd say that our best weapon against communism is to expose the Communist leaders to what this land of democracy has to offer.

And where else but Florida can we show a better example of American living at its best?

Eggheads and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article, written by Leon Keyserling, which appeared in the October 27, 1958, issue of the New Republic.

Leon Keyserling, consulting economist and attorney and president of the Conference on Economic Progress, was Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers from 1950 to 1953. His experience in government began as assistant to Senator Herbert Lehman and has included work on legislation relating to housing, social security, banking and currency, public works, labor relations, and unemployment. He is presently a member of the Advisory Committee on Economic Policy of the Democratic Advisory Council.

The article follows:

EGGHEADS AND POLITICS

(By Leon Keyserling)

Recent writers in the New Republic, commencing with Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., on September 15 ("The Death Wish of the Democrats"), have discussed the egghead's contribution to politics and especially Democratic politics. But only the surface has been scratched thus far.

First of all, how valid is Mr. Schlesinger's thesis that by excluding intellectuals and creative liberalism, the Democratic Party is "blowing out its own brains"?

1. In support of this thesis, Mr. Schlesinger says that the party in the 1920's was a "dreary alliance of northern city bosses and southern Bourbons," that Roosevelt and the New Deal transformed this situation, and that Mr. DeSapio in New York and others elsewhere are now part of a revolt against this splendid transformation. I had thought that, at the level of practical political operations, Roosevelt's New Deal victories in Congress (not to speak of his electoral victories on domestic issues in 1932 and 1936) were forged of this dreary alliance, and that F.D.R. lost his power to put through domestic legislation circa 1937, when the southerners in Congress withdrew their support.

2. Mr. Schlesinger says that Al Smith's Liberty League affiliation after 1933 "showed the feebleness of even the best of the party whose [presidential] nominee he was in 1928." But I had thought that this same feeble party had nominated F.D.R. for Vice President in 1920, when it also nominated the highly literate and then liberal (pro-League of Nations) James M. Cox for President. In the State of New York, about which Mr. Schlesinger is now particularly worried, the same feeble party in 1928 nominated F.D.R. for Governor and Herbert H. Lehman for Lieutenant Governor. In the same State, the great Robert F. Wagner was first nominated for the U.S. Senate in 1926. Turning from history to logic, I suppose that James F. Byrnes might now be deemed as conservative as Al Smith appeared to be when he joined the Liberty League. Does this demonstrate retroactively the feebleness of the best of the Democratic Party at the time when Roosevelt made Byrnes his chief lieutenant in the Senate, then made him a Justice of the Supreme Court, and after that made him a forerunner—and much better version—of Sherman Adams during World War II?

3. In addition to Senator Wagner—who was neither an Ivy League man nor an egghead, but who climbed straight up the political ladder from boyhood without skipping a single rung—the men whom the Democratic Party in New York State nominated and elected to the Senate during the height of the New Deal were Royal S. Copeland and James M. Mead. They were both good men and true, and my respect for their records is genuine. But assuredly they were not eggheads, and there are no indications that Mr. Finletter would have received the party preferences had he then been available. I must add that Mr. Finletter was my preference for this year, but that is beside the point. So much for New York. As for Connecticut and Pennsylvania, to which Mr. Schlesinger also calls attention, I cannot recall that a majority of the Democratic Senators from these States during the early New Deal were a composite of Messrs. Benton, Bowles, and Dilworth. I hasten to add that these three men are also among by favorites, but again this is beside the point. The Democratic Party today, and the role of the liberals in it, may be different from a generation ago, but Mr. Schlesinger's evidence to this effect is not very convincing.

What is important is not that so brilliant and accurate a historian as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., may have taken a temporary holiday from his discipline. It is that his article in the New Republic raises implicitly the whole issue of the appropriate and feasible role of the intellectual concerned with the substance of political programs.

Let us return for guidance to the early New Deal era. I was in Washington then, in a spot where it was easy to observe what was going on. There were indeed some New Deal intellectuals who dabbled and squabbled, and even connived, with respect to the choice of candidates for governor, Senator, and even perhaps the Presidency. This they were perfectly entitled to do. But I can think of few, if any, of the bold economic and social measures of the early New Deal which shot from the fertile brains of these gentlemen. Quite to the contrary, some of the most important of these measures were originated by New Deal era intellectuals who did not concern themselves with who got nominated for what, and who remained so much in the background that they may not receive much space in the best histories of the New Deal.

I do not imply that intellectual innovators cannot, when they are uniquely gifted, successfully combine their intellectual activity with embroilment in more proximate political maneuvers. When they can, so much the better. But I do mean to say that this combination is not their most likely forte, and that when they attempt it they usually lose more than they gain. This is because the embroilment itself distracts them from the work which is their special challenge and responsibility. If it be true that the Democratic Party of today is programatically as much behind the New Deal as Mr. Schlesinger believes—which I do not personally feel—the fault seems to me not to rest primarily with the political nominees or officeholders. The trouble, primarily, is that these nominees and officeholders have had no sufficient source from which to draw the inspiration and ideas which many of them seek.

This brings us to the most important point of all. If there has recently been a shortfall

of creative liberalism in America, it has not been primarily on the straight political, but rather on the intellectual, or egghead, level. I take as illustrations Mr. Schlesinger himself, and also John Kenneth Galbraith, of Harvard, whose ideas seem rather closely allied to Mr. Schlesinger's. This selection seems fair enough, since there are probably no two eggheads writing about public affairs who are more widely read, influential, gifted, and useful. It does embarrass me somewhat to say what I am going to, for I regard these men as two of my best friends, and my admiration for them is immense. But the cause may be worth the pain. Besides, my two good friends have on occasion swung their intellectual cudgels lustily against some of the cherished ideas of some of their friends, and one of their largest merits is that they are aware of the public and private good to be served from doing this on occasion. The method I shall follow is to state what seems to me a defensible liberal position on a few key issues, and then examine what my two friends have said on these issues.

In my view, foreign policy, and especially foreign economic policy, is or should be the dominant concern of American liberalism today. The recent observation of Mr. Nehru, that the gap is widening in the world between the living standards of the few who have and the many who have not, is statisically correct. It is also of supreme human and political importance to us in the United States. For even if we avoid atomic holocaust, which we shall have a far better chance of doing if we correct this gross inequity than if we do not, we would nonetheless in the course of time become an isolated system surrounded by an ever-rising wall of totalitarianism, if the dictatorships should help to raise the living standards of the underdeveloped peoples outside their own borders much more than we do.

Our default on this score is stupendous. The percentage of our total national product which has been flowing in recent years into international economic cooperation and assistance is by now so imperceptible that one blushes to mention it. And while this decline has many roots, the debate as to how much we can do overseas has been almost entirely in terms of the effect upon our domestic economy. In this context, a high rate of economic growth at home would not per se provide the will to spend abroad, but it would at least provide the means and some better foundation for popular assent for what we need to do.

For example, a high rate of economic growth (about 5 percent annual average) from the start of 1958 through the end of 1964 would yield about $400 billion more of national product for the 7-year period as a whole, or an average of nearly $60 billion more per year, than if we continued the low annual average rate of economic growth (somewhat above 2 percent) registered during the period 1953–57 and which has meant a gradually rising level of chronic unemployment of manpower and plant. Past experience, and especially current productivity developments, indicate that a higher growth rate is entirely feasible in relative peacetime. If we allocated even 5 or 10 percent of this high-growth increment to our overseas economic responsibilities, we could without feeling any pinch at home carry forward the most ambitious international economic programs envisaged by the best informed. There is nothing extreme about this objective; it has frequently been expressed by outstanding Republican businessmen, outstanding labor leaders, and Democratic public servants.

But Galbraith's new book, "The Affluent Society," fairly read as a whole, has been written virtually as if there were no economic world outside of the United States; in fact, he sometimes uses the phrase "in an affluent world." He ridicules those who stress the rapid expansion of American production as a high priority, on the ground that we are already affluent. But in fact we are far from sufficiently affluent, even at home, to justify this derision. And even if we were later to achieve at home everything that we need and want, or think we need and want, it would not do for us to become an island of indescribable plenty surrounded by oceans of deprivation and envy. If we should for the first time in history register a technological breakthrough which could help enormously to erase the worst poverty from the face of the earth, should we not use this capacity to the full?

But in the May 3, 1956, issue of the Reporter, Mr. Schlesinger seemed to have argued that liberals should be wary of attending to international duties until America itself has been made a shining example for the world to follow. I grant that we have plenty to do at home; but the attitude of the rest of the world toward us must be affected at least as much by what we do with or to them as by what we do for ourselves. In fairness to Mr. Schlesinger, his idea about going slow on the international front probably reflected his view of practical strategy for the 1956 political campaign. But when the egghead gets preoccupied with this kind of business, he is not keeping his own store. His big job is to discover what programs are of vital national importance and why, and then to try to persuade the political spokesmen—and through them the country—accordingly.

Domestically, in addition to civil rights and civil liberties, the two prime political problems of our times, it seems to me, are: the vast impoverishment of millions of our citizens even today in their private economic lives and the vast impoverishment of our public services—relative to our current actual national wealth and product, and far more so relative to our current and rapidly growing technological potentials.

What does Professor Galbraith have to say on these matters? With respect to private property, chapter 23 of "The Affluent Society" says that it is "no longer a massive affliction" in the United States. The statistics supporting this assertion are limited to those families with annual incomes below $1,000. He says that such poverty is of the "case" variety, attributable mostly to individual shortcomings, or "insular" poverty, due largely to the desire of people to stay in the locality of their birth. The remedy for most of this, he says, is in more public services like health and education, so that the next generation may not suffer for the sins of their fathers. Based on this analysis, Galbraith says that such poverty cannot be reduced much nor quickly enough by overall economic growth, and consequently that such growth at a high rate is no longer very important.

It is unnecessary at this point to show why this is far too narrow an attack upon even this poorest sector of the American community. For the truly startling thing is Galbraith's identification of the problem itself, which in turn weakens fatally the remedies proposed. For in 1957, we had more than 7 million consumer units (multiple-person and single person families) with annual incomes below $2,000, and we had more than 19 million with annual incomes below $4,000. An affluent society? Looking only at multiple-person families, there were almost 3.5 million below $2,000 and almost 12 million below $4,000—a figure considerably below that usually established by competent agencies as the bare minimum required today for a healthy and decent standard of living. This comes to more than a quarter of all multiple-person families. These families may be living in "affluence" compared with people in India, or compared with an even larger number of people in the United States a generation or two ago. But thy are certainly living in poverty by any standard that should have meaning for us today.

Galbraith's statement (ch. 8) that social security is "finished or largely finished business" is equally neglectful of the incomes and living conditions of an aged population about two-thirds of whom in the case of individuals living alone have money incomes from all sources including social security of less than $1,000 a year, and more than four-fifths of whom are below $2,000. Similarly, Arthur Schlesinger, in the New York Times magazine of August 4, 1957, intimates that we have outlived the New Deal in part because we have outlived private poverty in its gross and extensive form.

Now, it is perfectly clear that an expansion of public services such as education and health, while urgently desirable, cannot—in the absence of economic growth—remedy the truly massive problem of private poverty. Better education and better health may awaken the latent productivity and ambitions of a large portion of the poorest. But in the final analysis, their incomes can rise significantly (except for those employed by the Government only through the expansion of those parts of the economy which provide private employment and pay wages and salaries. An increase of almost $17 billion in annual national income would be required to lift all of the multiple-person families now below $4,000 up to even this meager level. While redistributing income might help to correct some inequities, obviously so huge a sum must come predominantly from a rapid increase in total production and total national income. Much of the reduction in private poverty in the past generation has resulted from the extremely high rate of economic growth and full employment during and immediately after World War II, and this occurred despite the heavy take of the war for noneconomic purposes. Since 1953, with our overall economic growth averaging only about half of what it should, there has been considerably less progress toward the lessening of poverty.

Furthermore, all historic experience shows that a low rate of economic growth has had a regressive effect upon income distribution, while a high rate of economic growth has had a progressive effect. So whatever Professor Galbraith may intend, his conclusion that a high rate of economic growth is not of prime importance would give comfort to the view that the further substantial reduction of private poverty in short order is not of prime importance. And his proposals to expand local sales and to acquiesce in a moderately high level of unemployment—which are perhaps the two most important specific proposals in his book—would cramp economic growth, have a high regressive effect upon income distribution, and perpetuate rather than reduce poverty. (Parenthetically, it is interesting that another distinguished Harvard economist, Arthur Smithies, has just found "evidence that satiety is being approached and that the utility of additional consumption is diminishing" (Challenge magazine, Oct. 1958). He adds that, if the high costs of the cold war continue, it might be desirable to modify consumer standards rather than to press for the high growth rate which the Rockefeller report urges. Evidently, the problem of poverty is not massive in the Widener library. And on purely economic grounds, there is something remote about economists who want to restrain consumption, when a slightly rising level of total consumption was the main reason why the economic recession did not get much worse, and when consumption will need to rise much faster than it is rising now to reactivate a healthy resumption of business investment in producer facilities and to restore full prosperity—even if public outlays are increased greatly.)

In addition to the families now below $4,000 a year, there are now almost 20 million multiple-person families, or about 45 percent of the total, with annual incomes between $4,000 and $7,500. Thus, almost three-quarters of all multiple-person families are now below $7,500. Can these families now afford trips abroad, cultural enjoyments, university educations for their children—which those who say we are now so affluent regard as modest for themselves? These families need economic growth, and so do those who produce what they buy.

Let us turn to our basic public services, including both national defense and domestic welfare programs. Putting aside national defense, Galbraith's view is that much or even most of the needed domestic expansion should be taken care of, at least for the short run, through the redistribution of the existing expenditures and product, with less going into private consumption and more going into domestic public services. I would agree fully that, at any recent or current level of total national product, some redistribution away from luxuries and toward essential public services would be highly desirable.

But it is too bad that Galbraith has not in his book quantified the amounts of additional domestic public services we need. Had he done so, it would have been shown that to meet these needs reasonably well (while assuring a sufficient level of expenditure for national security and international economic cooperation) our total public outlays—Federal, State, and local—must be lifted to an annual rate by 1964 of about $33 billion, or 38 percent, above the recent annual rate. To attempt to do this primarily by redistribution of expenditures—from private consumption to public needs—rather than primarily through high economic growth, defies history and reason. Any such attempt would knock our whole economy for a loop, and would be unthinkable from the viewpoint of popular and political consent. In contrast, for the whole 7-year period from early 1958 through 1964, a high as against a low rate of economic growth would yield, as already indicated, a differential of about $400 billion in our total national product. About $70 billion of this differential would flow during these 7 years into enlarged national security programs, international economic cooperation, and domestic welfare services—housing, education, health. Moreover, granted a high rate of economic growth, adequate total government expenditure would represent a smaller part of our total national product than the starved governmental expenditures have represesnted in a retarded economy during recent years. Galbraith's allegation that other liberals have been impervious to our public needs passeth understanding.

We come to the old argument about who pays for all this growth. The method of financing domestic public programs is vital. On this, Galbraith in general argues that needed additional programs cannot be financed mainly out of the Federal budget, partly because of the heavy national defense burden, and partly because the new taxation required for this purpose could not be raised because liberals and conservatives would not agree as to who should bear the tax burden. He therefore proposes that the increased domestic public services be financed largely through local sales taxes, covering food and necessities as well as luxuries (ch. 18 and especially 22). How sound is this? In the first place, as already indicated, we probably would not need the additional taxes at all, if we had a high enough rate of economic growth. In the second place, is it wise or expedient to slide over the profoundly basic question of the proper imposition of whatever tax burden we have? And in the third place, is it practical to suggest that this political and social argument of principles of taxation could be reduced by turning the question back to local authorities, or that an attempted resolution of the argument locally would result in more equity or social balance than resolution at the Federal level?

Even the late Senator Taft, especially in his housing and educational efforts, recognized the equalization principle which imposes upon the Federal Government heavy and increasing responsibilities. Can we as a nation afford the view that the improvement of education and health services for children in the States bordering on the Gulf of Mexico be no faster than these States can afford? We can find better ways to expand our domestic public services than to take more pennies in sales taxes from the depleted pockets of the poor. And these kinds of sales taxes, by further repressing private consumption among low- and middle-income families, would aggravate the imbalances in our economy which at all times save those associated with war have caused undue economic slack.

The other main proposal contained in the Galbraith book is that we should acquiesce in a moderately high level of unemployment. The reason advanced (ch. 15) is that this is probably the best defense against inflation, the ultimate enemy of social balance. This has been for years the chief weapon of ultraconservative groups in their fight against full employment. My answer is that even if it were true that a moderately high level of unemployment were one way to repress inflation, I could hardly imagine anything more antithetical to the concept of social balance than that the affluent college professor or the wealthy foundation president should enjoy somewhat more price stability at the expense of the unemployed. Nor can I accept the notion that higher unemployment benefits are a tolerable substitute (ch. 21) for the opportunity to use one's talents for constructive purposes, and thus to enjoy full economic as well as political citizenship. From a worldwide perspective, the surrender of the goal of full employment in the United States would stun those elsewhere who properly believe that the right to work in its true sense is a fundamental human right.

Furthermore, the theory that a moderately high rate of unemployment is conducive to price stability is invalid. Galbraith's statements (ch. 15) that inflation "can occur only when the demands on the economy are somewhat near the capacity of the plant and available labor force to supply them," and is most likely only "when demand is strong and rising, and unemployment below 3 or 4 million," seem curiously remote from the actual conditions of 1957–58. For this most recent experience, and in fact all experience save under conditions emerging from war, has demonstrated that high unemployment and economic slack—short of a real depression—produce more price inflation than a high rate of economic growth with very low unemployment. The data on this is abundantly available. And the reasons are clear: a slack use of plant and manpower increases costs per unit, or at least makes costs per unit higher than they would be with reasonably full use of resources, and these increased costs are indeed inflationary. Galbraith is correct in stating that the expansion of production in itself does not prevent inflation, as war experience shows. But such inflation occurred when expanded production and incomes led to civilian buying power growing much faster than goods available for civilian consumption. There is little analogy between such a situation and a sustained and well-balanced program of full employment and full production in relative peacetime.

Moreover, Galbraith's proposal that unemployment benefits be lifted close to the wage level when unemployment becomes relatively high (an eminently desirable proposal on other grounds) would certainly be more inflationary and on all scores less desirable than productive job opportunity for these people. His proposal that unemployment reaches lower levels does not exhibit much "social balance" toward those who remain unemployed, and who are not one whit better off because they are part of a smaller rather than a larger total number of unemployed. This manipulation of the treatment of the unemployed, in the name of economic stabilization, seems to me a mechanistic disregard for the human element.

In the New York Times article to which I have already referred, Mr. Schlesinger says that "the economic problem at home seems to be fixed up for the moment." He suggests that "the liberal must recover his deeper roots in the American cultural traditions—in Whitman, Emerson, Thoreau, Melville, William and Henry James * * *." I am fond of these authors, but insofar as we are concerned with the means for improving the society's translation of liberalism I can hardly imagine a candidate thumping for dear old William James. The liberal's political task is still to discover ways of making available to all Americans better incomes, better housing and health services, better education, more freedom from economic insecurity, and more effective participation by our country in worldwide advance toward peace, freedom and plenty, all of which involve the mobilization of appropriate economic energies through the political process. The concern of the egghead in politics is a social concern. I would let each citizen decide for himself whether he prefers Melville to Mary Roberts Rinehart, or whether he would rather listen to the Fifth Symphony than Elvis Presley.

Mr. Schlesinger goes on to say, also in the same Times article, that, while the flight against poverty was the heart of the New Deal, "it has not been the central issue of traditional American liberalism," nor has it been "the heart of Jeffersonian democracy, nor of Jacksonian democracy, nor of the antislavery movement, nor of the Progressive movement." I beg to differ; it seems to me that these movements, and Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom as well, were directed toward the improvement of the relative and absolute economic and social status of the common man; they were not interested in what he read.

As I thus contemplate some of the ideas of some of the eggheads, I am mindful of the passages in Schlesinger's magnificent first volume of "The Age of Roosevelt," which point out how unprepared the most famous of the economist eggheads were to make any substantial contribution to the challenge of those days. His evidence tends to confirm my conviction, growing during the past quarter-century, that I would rather trust a good part of our political programs to the seasoned politicians than to the eggheads. Because they are closer to life, as it is commonly lived, these politicians may be better economists than those who belong to the guild. There are not many seasoned politicians today who advocate a moderately high level of unemployment or more sales taxes on food, or who tell us that we have pretty well gotten over the problem of massive poverty, or that unemployment insurance is ever a desirable substitute for jobs, or even that most of us are sufficiently affluent. Perhaps our political system is not so bad after all. Perhaps we should let the politicians continue to pick the candidates, and let the voters continue to decide who wins. And some of the eggheads, if they are not satisfied with things as they are, might consider afresh whether they might benefit by the words of Cassius: "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves."

The First Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial on the newest veterans' organization which is the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., under the leadership of Lewis Brake, national commander. This editorial appeared in the Stars and Stripes, National Tribune on September 11, 1958:

THE FIRST STEP

Beginning next Sunday, the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. will open their annual convention in Springfield, Ill.

It is pleasant to be able to say that this comparatively young veterans' organization has made splendid steps forward during the past year. It has had a sound leadership, a steadfast program, and its story of accomplishment is worthy of recording.

Under the leadership of Lewis Brake, together with the cooperation and support of the auxiliary, the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. has achieved one of its goals—the granting of a congressional charter, recognizing it as a veteran group to be considered and worthy of recognition in its own right, along with other major veteran organizations.

That congressional charter carries with it many privileges, much to be desired, and naturally certain obligations which we feel the group will fulfill.

The organization now has the right to represent its membership before the various claims bodies of the Veterans' Administration and to speak to congressional committees with an authority which it did not heretofore possess.

The delegates to the national convention will meet in Springfield in a few days and they will have before them two important problems to consider and act upon.

Naturally, the first and most important subject which will come up before the voting strength of the convention will be the choosing of leaders for the coming year.

Serious thought should be given by the delegates in their choice of national leadership for 1958–59. A successful surge forward has been made in many directions during the past few years of leadership and the delegates should see to it that those who are to lead and advise the organization for the coming 12 months be chosen wisely and with a view to advancing the interests of the membership they represent.

We would not consider it proper for us to advise the delegates as to how they should vote on any subject—election of officers or anything else—but we like to present to them our thoughts at this time, based on the experience of many years relating to the affairs of war veterans.

Setting aside the question of election of new officers, which is strictly the business of the organization, we would like to offer a few suggestions for the coming year's activities which we feel will aid the members and their new leaders in the guidance of the organization.

First, we recommend steadfastness of purpose. Up to the present time the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. have set definite goals—happily, not too many—and thus the organization has been able to confine itself to the furtherance of those goals with success partially accomplished.

We would, therefore, suggest that they retain this steadfastness of purpose and not go off on many tangents and facets which affect our national life, action which might tend to weaken their effort in reaching the goal which still remains to be accomplished—that is, an adequate pension for our veterans of World War I who are aged and needy and who deserve the consideration of the Government of the United States and its people.

It has been said that "constant dropping wears away a stone." This is certainly true, and if the organization brings to bear all its effort on the one plan which has been its reason for existence, then that constant dropping is certain to have the influence it merits.

Our next thought is membership. It is remarkable how this new group has grown, once proper leadership has been established. With its membership well over the 100,000 mark at this time and with new barracks being formed at the rate of about 4 a week all over the country, a stimulus has been provided for next year's work along this line which should excite the interest of every member and encourage every member to go out into the highways and byways and preach the doctrine of membership until all eligible veterans have joined the ranks.

The vast potentiality in membership may appear appalling but not to men of stout hearts and men of determination. The field is there—some 2,800,000 strong and the reason for joining among the class involved is sound.

We therefore urge that this year—and particularly these coming months, before the next Congress convenes—be used to build up such a membership that when the leaders of the organization appear next year before the appropriate committees of Congress they will be able to present statistics to prove that they truly represent a vast segment of the men who served in 1917–19, and that they express the will of these veterans with such figures that Congress will listen and take heed of their plea for the needy and aged comrades of that early war and grant the relief so much desired.

It should be a comforting thought to the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. to know that little by little, the two largest veteran organizations in the land are coming around to the new group's way of thinking.

True, there may be some divergence of opinion in the manner in which benefits should be granted to the needy veterans involved, but the basic fact remains that these two large groups recognize the need of aid and are willing to support legislation to grant such aid.

Our last thought brings up the question of auxiliaries. Happily for your organization the women who are eligible have responded nobly in their support of the organization. Almost as fast as a new barracks is formed, there you will find alongside it a new auxiliary, ready to carry on in ways which the men may not always understand but which seem to bring results just the same.

It has been said, "never underestimate the power of a woman," and, bearing this in mind we suggest that the veterans themselves encourage the formation of auxiliaries, for the combination of steadfast men and devoted women is a hard one to beat.

Therefore, we recommend that auxiliaries be built up as quickly as possible in order that the combined effort of the men and women involved may be exercised to the best possible advantage of all concerned.

As we have pointed out the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., have achieved their first goal—the granting of a congressional charter.

May we therefore offer as the slogan of the group for the coming year: Steadfastness of purpose, increased membership, and auxiliaries throughout the land. It's a winning combination.

Passports for U.S. Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an address by Mr. Roderic L. O'Connor, Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State, which he made in Washington to leaders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. In his address, which appeared in the December 5 issue of U.S. News & World Report, Mr. O'Connor tells how Communists are freely going abroad and how the State Department is helpless to do anything about this dangerous situation. The author stresses the urgent need for tighter regulations in the issuing of passports to Communists, and appeals to Congress for legislation to provide this security measure which I too feel is so vital to the interests of our country:

In our view, control over the issuance of passports has been an important part of our defenses against indirect Communist agression. Under the law today, that part of our defenses against Communist subversion no longer exists. Your Government is today powerless to deny passports to known Communists who are going abroad for the purpose of assisting and supporting the international Communist conspiracy. This dangerous situation exists because in June of this year the Supreme Court said that the State Department did not have adequate authority, without specific legislation, to deny passports to Communists of Communist supporters.

As a result of that decision, the State Department has received as of early this week 596 applications for passports from persons who have records of activity in support of the international Communist movement. Before the Supreme Court's decision, many of those persons had been refused passports or had abandoned their applications when asked to identify themselves as Communists. Since the decision, these persons have moved promptly to take advantage of the breach in our defenses. They are getting their passports while the getting is good.

We believe that this is a dangerous situation and one which needs to be cured promptly. It can be cured by legislation giving to the State Department authority to deny passports to Communist supporters. The Department sought to obtain such legislation in the last session of Congress. Although the House passed a bill, the Senate failed to act. With your help and active support, we hope to obtain such legislation in the next Congress.

In our view, the unrestricted travel of these 596 persons abroad represents a real danger to the security of the United States. Although the State Department promptly abided by the decision of the Supreme Court, there is a respectable body of informed opinion that does not agree with the philosophy of that decision. The majority opinion summarized the philosophy behind the decision by saying that a passport applicant need not state under oath whether or not he is a Communist because that question deals "with beliefs, with associations, with ideological matters."

This view seems to some unrealistic because it fails to take into account all of

the facts of the situation. The Communist Party and its supporters are an activist organization engaged in a worldwide conspiracy which seeks in every way to undermine and weaken the U.S. Government. I believe that our Government has a clear obligation to defend itself against that conspiracy. In doing so, scrupulous regard must, of course, be given to the rights of the individual and to the traditions of civil liberty. However, the courts should give equal weight to a realistic analysis of the danger that the Communist conspiracy presents to the American people.

After the Supreme Court decision, the administration promptly submitted legislation to the Congress. In an effort to meet the objections raised by the Supreme Court, the legislation proposed by the administration provided authority for the denial of passports to those persons whose records over the past 10 years showed activities in the Communist movement rather than mere beliefs or associations.

The administration recommended that Congress make certain findings of fact to show that Congress viewed the Communist Party as more than an organization reflecting political associations and beliefs. The proposed legislation also provided that a record of active support of the Communist Party justified a conclusion that an applicant was in fact going abroad to further the interests of the Communist Party. After a number of hearings, the House passed a shortened version of the bill on the next to the last day of the session. Unfortunately, it proved to be impossible to obtain any action in the Senate before Congress adjourned.

Much of the credit for the passage of the bill in the House must go to Congressman VORYS, of Ohio, and Congressman SELDEN, of Alabama. These two men were most persistent and effective in their efforts to bring the bill out of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and get it adopted on the floor.

But, among some of their colleagues, I repeatedly heard doubts expressed as to the need for such legislation. Through several days of hearings, I was frequently asked the question: "Why was it dangerous for American Communists to travel abroad? Why can they do more harm abroad than they can do here? Why, if the mails and the diplomatic pouch are open to these people, is it so important that they be prevented from actually traveling abroad in person?"

These are good questions and I should like to give you gentlemen the answers as I see them.

HOW COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY WORKS

To answer these questions requires an understanding of what the Communist conspiracy is and how it operates. I do not need to explain to this group the aims of the Communists or their political objectives. I should say, however, that the dependence of the Communists on direct armed aggression has in recent years lessened. The emphasis today is on indirect aggression. That type of aggression places a much heavier reliance than heretofore on subversion and espionage and on all forms of political agitation and political propaganda.

The principal instrument of the Soviet Communists for carrying out these tactics of subversion and political agitation abroad is, of course, the apparatus of the international Communist conspiracy. This international apparatus exists in almost every part of the world and is directed and supported from Moscow. It is a vast and complex organization, partly overt and partly covert. Much of its activity is public and can be seen in a variety of forms in every capital of the world.

Perhaps even a more important part of this activity is hidden from view and relies on secret communication and correspondence, on covert financing, and on hidden means of resupply. In such a worldwide organization there must be hundreds, and thousands, indeed probably millions, of persons in all the countries of the world who have their valued place in the party machinery. A fair share of these persons are here in the United States. Let me tell you about some of the worst cases who have recently applied for passports.

One of our recent applicants was born in Czechoslovakia and is now a naturalized American citizen. It was his job to furnish his contacts in Czechoslovakia with the names of active anti-Communists in the United States whose relatives were living back in Czechoslovakia. What the Czech Government probably did to those relatives would not be hard to imagine.

Another client of our Passport Office was thought by the Canadian Government to be so dangerous to the public security that the Canadians refused him entry to that country to attend a Communist rally featuring the famous "Red" Dean of Canterbury. Yet your Government is powerless to deny him a passport.

Perhaps one of the hardest cases for us to stomach, and I am sure this group of veterans will agree with me, is that of William Lorenzo Patterson.

Mr. Patterson boasts that he is a Communist. He is the general manager of the weekly Communist newspaper, "The Worker." In 1950, when he was visiting his fellow Communists in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, he gave press interviews in which he accused this Government of being a Government of criminals and cannibals. He accused us of using germ warfare in Korea. He repeatedly advocated the overthrow of the U.S. Government. He made a speech in New York City in 1952 in which he is reported to have urged his listeners to write to American soldiers in combat in Korea and to incite them to go over to the other side.

Patterson now wants a passport to go to Europe and to the Soviet Union on business and pleasure. It is not difficult to imagine what Mr. Patterson's business and pleasure will be. For the United States it will be dirty business. Yet Mr. Patterson travels with our official blessing and protection.

Another case involves a Communist labor leader who went to England some years ago during a strike at the port of London and had to be expelled by the British Government because of his activities as a Communist agent in blocking settlement of the strike. We have now been obliged to give him a passport which asks the British authorities to let the bearer pass safely and freely.

You all recall the name Julius Rosenberg, convicted of espionage for the Soviets and executed. The man who recruited Julius Rosenberg into the Communist Party in 1939 has applied for and received a passport since the Supreme Court's decision. Still a party member, his job has been to recruit chemists and other scientists into Communist-dominated organizations.

There is the case of Victor Perlo who has been identified in sworn testimony as a Communist who passed documents from the sensitive wartime Office of Strategic Services to a courier for the Communist apparatus. His application is now under consideration.

WHEN AMERICANS BERATE AMERICA

We have had to give passports to such ardent Communist supporters as Hugh Hardymen and Anita and Henry Willcox, all of whom attended a Commie peace conference in 1952 at Peiping, in Red China, in evasion of passport restrictions. All of them made statements accusing the United States of using germ warfare in the Korean conflict.

Finally, there are the more notorious cases of Earl Browder and Anna Louise Strong. Browder, onetime head of the Communist Party in this country, who had previously been convicted of misusing his passport, promptly applied again in order to renew his international travels. Anna Louise Strong, upon receiving a passport this year promptly visited her friends in the Soviet Union and, despite the passport restriction against travel to Communist China, she went from there to Peiping, where she is still visiting and talking.

These are but a few examples on our list. The list now numbers 596. These people are from every profession and every walk of life. Legally, I cannot show that they are all members of the Communist Party. I cannot prove in a court of law that all, or even a large portion of them, are espionage agents or even trained subversives. However, as a group, they share one thing in common. Most of them are disciplined and obedient to the policies and directives of international communism. Many of them perform the most humble tasks of party organization. We are convinced that the effective functioning of the international party machinery depends to a very great degree on the freedom of many of these persons to travel.

One does not have to be a student of Communist Party organization to realize the truth of what I have said. To illustrate this truth each one of you needs only to think of the organization for which he works. Everyone in business today travels almost constantly. You all know that personal contact is an invaluable way of doing business. You all know that the telephone and the mails are not an adequate substitute in carrying on your own business for personal contacts. If this is true of normal business operations, how much more true is it of the enormously complex operation of the international Communist conspiracy.

Imagine, if you can, carrying on a worldwide business where virtually all of your communication must be kept secret. Imagine, if you will, carrying on a worldwide operation, the very essence of which is espionage, subversion, and sabotage.

The necessity of personal assessment, of personal recruitment—indeed, of all forms of personal contact—will be obvious to you at once. In an organization of this sort, to hamper the movements of any members of the organization is a crippling blow and puts the operations of the organization under a most heavy handicap.

I think, once these facts are understood, the reasons for our insistence on the urgent need for legislation to control the issuance of passports to Communists become much clearer. We do not say for a minute that we can prevent all communication between Communist supporters in this country and their counterparts abroad by not issuing passports. That would be ridiculous. We do not say that we can stop Moscow direction of the Communist Party in this country. We do say that we can very seriously hinder the effective operation of the Communist Party both here and abroad by making it difficult for the supporters of that party to depart from the United States.

It is this same reasoning that lay behind the enactment of the visa provisions of the Walter-McCarran Act. Those provisions effectively prevent foreign citizens who are supporters of the Communist Party from traveling to this country.

If those laws were enacted for sound reasons, and I am convinced that they were, surely it is equally sound to pass laws which prevent Communist supporters in America from traveling abroad.

No one of these restrictive measures will of itself destroy the international Communist apparatus. Perhaps no single one of these measures will even seriously cripple that apparatus. But there is no doubt in my mind that the cumulative effect of all such measures does most seriously weaken the effec-

tiveness of the efforts of the international Communist movement.

From what I have already said, I hope you gentlemen will feel as I do about these 596 passport applicants. They are soldiers in the cold war—but they are the soldiers of the enemy. They are just as clearly the enemy as were the troops abroad that shot at you and me in World War II. They are going abroad under instructions to render service to the Communist conspiracy.

In a hot war they call this giving comfort and support to the enemy. But under the law today, your Government is forced to extend to these travelers the protection, the convenience and the dignity of a United States passport. Your Government today must not only allow them to leave the country on their infamous tasks, but must expedite their travel abroad.

This situation would be ludicrous if it were not so dangerous. It cries out for solution, and with your help the solution should be within reach. The administration will again next year request legislation from Congress to allow us to close this gap in our defenses. With the support of each of you and other like-minded citizens, I would hope that our request will receive prompt action. Until such legislation is passed, your Government remains helpless to prevent American Communists from traveling abroad to conspire against our national interest, and in some cases even against our national security. I am confident that we can count on you to help us remedy this dangerous situation.

"Mr. India"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that to the citizens of the United States, "Mr. India" in the United States means J. J. Singh, of New York, president of the India League. J. J. Singh means this to us here in America, as surely as we think of Mr. Nehru, as "Mr. India," on the scene in India.

We in America salute our good friend, J. J. Singh, of New York City, who has done so much to improve and develop the good relations now existing between the United States and India.

"J. J." as he is known to so many American friends has not only been a successful businessman among us for many years but he has been an eloquent and tireless exponent of friendly relations between our two great countries. He deserves our lasting gratitude and sincere thanks for his unswerving loyalty to this cause during many difficult times over the years.

We wish J. J. Singh and his wife and two sons the best of everything in their new home in New Delhi. We will look forward to their continued friendship and interest in these good United States of America, and the relations between the Indian and American people.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 18, 1959]

UNITED STATES LOSES ENVOY TO CALL OF INDIA—J. J. SINGH, A NONOFFICIAL AMBASSADOR, WILL RETURN HOME AFTER 33 YEARS

(By Joseph Morgenstern)

A man from India who got to be "ambassador extraordinary" without the benefit of an ambassadorship or an embassy is going home to New Delhi after 33 years in the United States.

J. J. Singh, president of the India League of America, has decided to leave his handsome house on East 61st Street and raise his children in New Delhi.

Until now, he has divided his time between an import business and anyone or anything offering him the opportunity to explain India and the United States to each other.

The 61-year-old Sikh from nothern India, who wore a turban and a beard in his early days here, began acting like an ambassador to the United States when India had no official envoys of her own. He continued doing so, to the advantage of both countries, after India won her freedom.

NONOFFICIAL ADVANTAGE

"A nonofficial has an advantage over an official in this kind of work," he said. "People often open up more and speak frankly."

In addition to being a nonofficial, Mr. Singh was a nondrinker until 1942, is still a nonsmoker, and not the sort of person who stays inactive. Lobbying in Washington, writing articles and scores of letters to newspapers, sitting in on United Nations meetings, appearing on radio and television forums and presiding over informal dinner forums in the quiet elegance of his own home: these have helped to keep him from inactivity's clutches.

When Mr. Singh leaves New York in March with his wife and two sons, the India League will be dissolved. He became its president in 1941.

"I do hope that some other organization will continue the league's work of friendly interpretation between the United States and India," he said.

EXPOSITION FAILS

When he is asked about himself, Mr. Singh usually replies by discussing India. He said he had been gratified by the steady growth of knowledge about India in the United States.

"Originally, when people found out that I came from India, they were disappointed that I couldn't do the rope trick or produce a snake," he said.

That was in 1926 and shortly thereafter, when Mr. Singh arrived as one of the organizers of the Indian section of the Philadelphia Sesquicentennial Exposition.

"The exposition was a flop and I lost my shirt," he recalled, "so I decided to stay and recover that shirt."

Moving to New York, Mr. Singh opened the wholesale office of an importing firm specializing in Indian textiles. Subsequent business success enabled him to revive the India League with money and new ideas.

NEHRU HIS IDOL

At the center of his political convictions is a belief that India and the United States have a common bond in freedom.

During the period of British rule in India, which Mr. Singh calls the era when we were not free, he sought to rally supporters for the cause of Indian independence.

"You were once under British rule," he used to tell Americans, "and the British are ruling us." The response, he said, was usually quick and affirmative.

Convinced that India will not take orders from world communism, Mr. Singh says that modern India would long ago have torn itself into pieces, but for Nehru. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru is one of Mr. Singh's idols.

DENTS IN VITAL ISSUES

A private citizen dealing with governments "can only make dents on vital issues," Mr. Singh said. One of the many substantial dents he made in Washington legislative circles led to congressional approval of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration aid for victims of the Bengal famine of 1943.

Another of his campaigns to influence the influencers led to an amendment of U.S. immigration laws permitting a hundred Indians a year to enter this country and become permanent residents and citizens.

In 1951, Mr. Singh married the former Maiti Saksena, the daughter of the high commissioner for India in Canada and consul general for India in New York. Although Mr. Singh and his wife both speak Hindustani and English, their two sons will have to learn an Indian language in India.

A STUDY OF INDIA

Before he came to the United States by way of Britain, Mr. Singh was active in Indian politics. As a young man he did what many young men did, leading mobs, getting beaten up, getting shot at, the privileges of those who fought for India's freedom. At 24 he was the youngest member of the All-India Congress Committee.

Whether he will reenter the political life of his country is a decision for the future. "My first job will be to study India," Mr. Singh said.

"With small disappointments," he said "my faith in the United States has not been shaken."

In a few months, when Mr. Singh's new home is completed in New Delhi, the United States will, in its turn, have an unofficial Ambassador to India in an unofficial embassy.

A Tuition Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the provision of adequate education for the youth of this country is one of the great problems facing those who have the stewardship of our national affairs. The rising cost of education has made this problem more acute than it otherwise might be. Not the least difficult of all situations is that of the privately endowed educational institution whose costs have continually risen, while its capacity to offer its facilities to the able students who cannot pay has been held in check. A most thoughtful discussion of this problem has been made by Dr. John S. Dickey, president of Dartmouth College, in a recent letter to the New York Times. I believe that he had made a valuable contribution to this discussion.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith Dr. Dickey's letter which appeared in the New York Times on December 7, 1958:

A TUITION PROGRAM

As a citizen who cares greatly about the excellence of all education, public as well as private, I feel the overwhelming need is to get more of our total national income into education at every level and through every possible channel, and especially to get more of our available tax dollars into the base of our national educational pyramid, the public elementary and secondary schools. Our great public universities have a direct stake in such an effort.

Many public educators testify that nothing would lift most public colleges more swiftly and solidly than better prepared students coming to these colleges from the public schools. This in most States means freeing up every educational tax dollar possible for

use at the elementary and secondary public school level.

I suggest for careful, dispassionate study the possibility that higher college tuition charges for those who can pay at least part of their way and the assurance of adequate financial aid for those who demonstrably cannot pay is today the path of educational wisdom and well-being for both the public and the private institutions in our mixed system of higher education. Such a program could:

Get a greater share of the national income for all education;

Free up tax dollars for public education at the lower levels where it is most needed by most of our people today;

Keep both our public and private colleges strong in a mutually beneficial mixed system;

Protect the public colleges and the taxpayers from having all higher education progressively, unnecessarily, and, I think, unwisely dumped onto their presently badly bent backs;

Protect the American college opportunity as quality education in either public or private institutions for any student who demonstrably needs a scholarship or loan.

I have no doctrinaire or trick answers for this difficult problem, but I see no prospect whatsoever of finding adequate finances now for the kind of education we profess and need on any either/or basis and do urge that all who care about American education work at this problem with realism and resourcefulness and not try to kill each other off with polemics about who among us is the more democratic; democracy is always the first victim in such a Donnybrook.

The growing public and professional discussion of tuition charges at public and private colleges is a healthy thing and long overdue. It will, however, waste much energy unnecessarily if the issues are stated in terms of the student paying the full cost and of worthy students being barred by higher tuition charges in either the public or private colleges.

Full-cost fees are not a realistic possibility for any major college today because, directly or indirectly, all higher education requires both public and charitable support. However, higher tuition fees for those who can afford to pay at least part of their way is a realistic necessity for all quality institutions unless some very unattractive alternatives are to be accepted. Among these are:

Higher and higher taxes to subsidize many who do not require educational subsidy at the college level, at least in present amounts;

Poorer and poorer elementary and secondary school systems because the available tax take for public education is going in part for increasingly unnecessary subsidy at the college level;

Private higher education progressively forced down and out by its inability to compete for students and teachers with nominal-tuition colleges.

The predictable result is an ever higher burden of numbers and costs pushed over into the public colleges and onto the tax subsidy, with the taxpayers' inevitable reaction at the expense of all education after the strength of the mixed system has been irreparably damaged by the induced weakness or disappearance of many private colleges.

No worthy student need be kept out of a public college because it raises its tuition charges from a nominal to a realistic level, provided always that financial aid in the form of scholarship grants or loans or employment is made available to that student on a basis of demonstrated need, as is fairly and competently done today in nearly all private colleges. The trouble comes when we unnecessarily subsidize all students, and often without the studen' the parent, or the public being aware of the subsidy.

JOHN S. DICKEY.

A Bill To Protect Farmers and Other Persons Who Are Required To Treat Patronage Dividends as Income for Federal Income Tax Purposes by Providing for the Collection of Income Tax at Source on Such Dividends and To Provide Tax Equity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced today a bill designed to protect farmers and other persons who are required to treat patronage dividends as income for Federal income tax purposes by providing for the collection of income tax at source on such dividends and to provide tax equity.

My bill provides a method of collecting some tax from cooperatives that I have advocated for several years. I have been particularly interested in it from the standpoint of the cooperative member, particularly the farmer who does not have a great deal of cash at his disposal. It is only through a withholding device like this that he will not have his personal cash position burdened with a taxpayment as the result of a noncash patronage dividend. This bill will, of course, produce revenue for the Treasury Department and will bring about a highly desirable equality of taxation among various types of business, some of which are now suffering quite unduly from the competition of the untaxed cooperatives.

A bill to protect farmers and other persons who are required to treat patronage dividends as income for Federal income tax purposes by providing for the collection of income tax at source on such dividends and to provide tax equity

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 39. Credit for income tax collected at source on certain patronage dividends.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The amount withheld under section 7901 as tax on patronage dividends shall be allowed to the recipient of the income as a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle.

"(b) YEAR OF CREDIT.—The amount so withheld during any calendar year shall be allowed as a credit for the taxable year beginning in such calendar year. If more than one taxable year begins in a calendar year, such amount shall be allowed as a credit for the last taxable year so beginning."

(b) The table of sections for such part IV is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 39. Credit for income tax collected at source on certain patronage dividends."

SEC. 2. (a) Subtitle F of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 81—COLLECTION OF INCOME TAX AT SOURCE ON CERTAIN PATRONAGE DIVIDENDS

"Sec. 7901. Income tax collected at source.

"Sec. 7902. Patronage dividend defined.

"SEC. 7901. Income tax collected at source.

"The Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations provide for the deduction and withholding on patronage dividends of a tax equal to 20 percent of the amount of each patronage dividend (as defined in section 274 and subject to the limitation in amount contained therein) paid in a form other than coin, currency or check dated and payable no later than the date of delivery thereof, and paid after September 30, 1956."

(b) The table of chapters for subtitle F is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Chapter 81. Collection of income tax at source on certain patronage dividends."

Deductibility of patronage dividends

SEC. 3. There shall be added to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 following section 273 a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 274. Patronage dividends paid by cooperative corporations.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—No deduction or other reduction of taxable income shall be allowed to cooperative corporations for amounts paid as 'patronage dividends' by such corporations except to the extent such dividends increase the taxable income of the recipient for the taxable year of receipt. For the purposes of this subsection.

"(1) Such dividends shall be deemed to have been received in the ordinary course of a trade or business carried on by the recipient, and

"(2) No exemption, exclusion, credit or deduction available to the recipient shall be taken into account.

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—

"(1) COOPERATIVE CORPORATION.—For the purposes of this section the term 'cooperative corporation' means a corporation (A) that calls itself a 'cooperative' or 'co-op', or (B) that represents to any persons or classes of persons which deal with it that their patronage will or may entitle them (i) to the payment, either actually or constructively, of patronage dividends, or (ii) to an equity interest in any of the corporations' assets, or (C) that is otherwise operated for the mutual benefit of persons or classes of persons that deal with it; but such term does not include a mutual insurance company or any corporation otherwise exempt under this chapter.

"(2) PATRONAGE DIVIDEND.—For the purposes of this section the term 'patronage dividend' means an allocation or a distribution paid or payable (whether or not in money and whether described as a refund, rebate, price adjustment, or payment of a balance due under a marketing agreement) to member patrons or to member and nonmember patrons on some basis related to their sales to, purchases from, deposits with, investments in, loans from, or other transactions with the corporation during the taxable year, if (A) the allocation or distribution is conditional (i) upon profits or margins being earned by the corporation from all its operations or a class of its operations during its fiscal year, or (ii) upon income attributable to the resale of the producer's product along with products or a class or classes of products of some other producers less any deductions, determination of which is within the discretion of the corporation, or (B) the amount of the allocation or distribution can be determined only with reference to the amount of the profits, margins, or income earned, or (C) the amount of the allocation or distribution can be determined

only after declaration or payment of dividends on any class of stock of the corporation or only after the fixing of sums to be transferred to capital, reserves, or surplus."

Taxation of farmers' cooperatives

SEC. 4. Section 522 (b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall be amended to read as follows:

"(b) COMPUTATION OF TAXABLE INCOME.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—In computing the taxable income of such an organization there shall be allowed, subject to the limitations provided in section 274, as deductions from gross income (in addition to other deductions allowable under this chapter)—

"(A) amounts paid as dividends during the taxable year on its capital stock, and

"(B) amounts allocated during the taxable year to patrons with respect to its income not derived from patronage (whether or not such income was derived during such taxable year) whether paid in cash, merchandise, capital stock, revolving fund certificates, retain certificates, certificates of indebtedness, letters of advice, or in some other manner that discloses to each patron the dollar amount allocated to him. Allocations made after the close of the taxable year and on or before the 15th day of the 9th month following the close of such year shall be considered as made on the last day of such taxable year to the extent the allocations are attributable to income derived before the close of such year."

Some Sound Advice to Parents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert an article into the RECORD which, I believe, should be brought to the attention of all parents because of its sound advice. The article is entitled "Rose Flynn and Youth." It was published in a recent issue of the Christian Family, and was written by Ralph Land.

Mrs. Flynn is a well-known educator and psychologist in Brooklyn. She is a pioneer in the field of juvenile delinquency and has devoted many years—nearly two decades—in dealing with youthful offenders or potential offenders, both in the classroom and outside the school. She is credited with having rescued at least 1,000 young people from the perils of juvenile delinquency. Her motto is: "Prevention is better than cure," and she lives up to it by proving that teaching the three "R's" is in itself not sufficient.

The article on Rose Flynn has a lot of merit and contains excellent advice to parents on youth problems. It is for this reason that I am inserting it into the RECORD:

ROSE FLYNN AND YOUTH

(By Ralph Land)

At a recent special seminar in New York City a group of top police officials were thoroughly briefed how best to handle juvenile delinquents after they ran afoul of the law. Their instructor was Mrs. Rose R. Flynn, an educator-psychologist of Brooklyn, who has reaped national recognition as an expert on curbing juvenile lawlessness. Hundreds of radio stations throughout America have been broadcasting her advice via tape recordings on how to cope with this rampant nationwide problem.

In her late forties, Mrs. Flynn is a vigorous brown-haired woman who reminds one more of a busy office executive. Her sparkling blue eyes and radiating sympathy have won over many a rebellious juvenile. Assertive, but not boisterous, calm yet firm, she has dedicated her life to uphold human values. Father James Keller has commended her true Christopher spirit: to light up a candle where there is darkness.

When she and her husband, Frank Flynn, a veteran New York City newspaperman and cousin to the late Archbishop Michael J. Curley, of Baltimore, once approached their parish priest about adopting children since they were childless, the advice was negative: "You have a special mission in this world," he told her. "God has meant that you should be mother to many."

A sixth-grade teacher at the William E. Cottle School in Tuckahoe, N.Y., Mrs. Flynn uniquely utilizes her clinical psychology training to detect and stem the growth of any delinquent tendencies among any of her pupils. "Prevention," she says, "is far better than rehabilitation. The classroom is the place where a child's mind takes shape for life. So it's up to the school to eliminate the seeds of misbehavior."

Although she has been diligently teaching the three R's since 1932, it was only 11 years ago she first turned to the study of clinical psychology because of disturbing classroom problems. She began to effectively apply psychotherapy to the juvenile delinquent, the potential delinquent and troubled children.

Stressing that the main cause of delinquency is a poor family relationship, Mrs. Flynn says: "I achieved success by being warm and human—a permissive classroom mother. When things go wrong at home, the child may be moody and depressed. I let him air his gripes before a panel of his classmates. They in turn declare how they would have behaved in a like situation. I have found the reaction amazingly beneficial.

"Maybe his demands are unreasonable," Mrs. Flynn adds. "But unless an understanding person shows the child this, he will continue to believe his parents are against him. This rejection will pile up in his mind, and then he will resent all authority. Finally, he may wind up stealing cars to get his freedom, or act out his aggression by attacking another person."

Encouraged by the initial results, she extended her after-school aid to various New York anti-juvenile-crime organizations. She became active in the New York City Police Department's Youth Squad. She undertook a challenging assignment: to reduce juvenile delinquency in a certain Brooklyn street known then as the worst in the city. Stealing, vandalism, school absenteeism, molesting, gang fights—these were common occurrences.

As a psychologist, Mrs. Flynn could easily pinpoint the underlying causes of these behaviors. The offenders came from homes steeped in family discord. Lacking love and attention, it was inevitable they would join gangs to seek the admiration they craved.

She set about combatting juvenile delinquency like a doctor a plague. Acting as a permissive mother, she visited the homes of these neglected children and effected bonds of understanding between them and their parents. Shortly after, the city built a sorely needed park for recreational facilities. Before long, the problem dwindled considerably in that area.

A high police official in charge then of the Brooklyn West Detective Bureau commented afterward, "Mrs. Flynn used methods that were effective. She achieved marvelous results. * * * In my opinion, she was responsible for breaking up teen-age gangs in Brooklyn."

Why does she believe that school is the best place to arrest delinquency development? "A teacher has a child 6 hours a day," says Mrs. Flynn. "She knows how he plays, reacts to other pupils, his weaknesses, what he is capable of achieving. It's up to the teacher to reach that child and to find out the reason for his maladjusted behavior. The next step would be to enlist the parents' cooperation in working out a solution for the emotional disturbances that lead to errant actions."

Admitting that a happy home, managed by intelligent parents, should keep a child from going astray, she points out, "Millions of homes are not happy. And unless schools apply psychotherapy, the child from an unhappy home will be scarred for life and a liability to society."

Since 1950 Mrs. Flynn attends twice weekly the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital's neuropsychiatric clinic as a clinical psychologist. And on every St. Patrick's Day the predominantly Jewish staff in appreciative tribute to a wonderful Irish lady sport shamrocks.

Three of her evenings she devotes to the Brooklyn Association for the Rehabilitation of Offenders. Here she conducts clinical tests on both juvenile and adult delinquents. She is also a consultant for St. John's Home in Rockaway Park, N.Y., for boys, ages 12 to 16. Her regular delight is to rotate her invitation to a pair of boys from the home to spend a remembered weekend with the Flynns at their Brooklyn apartment.

She belongs to the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae and is active in many civic, social, teachers, and psychological groups. The Flynns are in Queen of All Saints Parish in Brooklyn.

One of nine children, six boys and three girls, she was born in Riverdale, N.Y. Her father and mother were devout Catholics. Every night the rosary was recited as a family group. "My parents would check and double check on each of our whereabouts and activities," she recalls. "There was only one key in the family. They knew when we came home and met us. She has a sister, Mother Freehill, religious of the Sacred Heart, professor of mathematics at Manhattanville College in Purchase, N.Y. Her aunt is Sister Mary Balthassar, a Franciscan nun, stationed at the mother house, Our Lady of Angel Convent at Glen Riddle, Pa.—at 91, the oldest one in that particular order, having served 68 years.

After majoring is psychology at the College of Mount St. Vincent, Mrs. Flynn continued at New York University and received her master's degree in 1942. She studied psychotherapy at the New School for Social Research in New York, and later took advance courses in Europe.

Establishing a reputation as an educator, lecturer, certified psychologist, juvenile delinquency authority, and guidance director, she built up an increasing demand for her services. She was one of the organizers of the Police Athletic League, the first of its kind in the country with a program to enroll teenagers and wean them away from delinquency. Her brother-in-law, the late Judge Joseph C. H. Flynn, was one of the pioneers in the creation of the adolescent court in Brooklyn and, as a result, she became active in the work.

Mrs. Flynn thinks that children under 7 years of age should be included in the drive on juvenile delinquency as well as those who are older. "If a child is forever stealing, cheating, bullying, and has unusual sexual interests and behavior regardless of age," she says, he is a potential delinquent.

"I feel that the strongest factor in molding a child's personality is his relationship with his parents. If they love him with a generous, even-flowing, nonpossessive affection, and treat him as a person who, like them-

selves, has both rights and responsibilities in the family group, then his chances of developing normally are excellent."

In the treatment of juvenile delinquency, she has found that adolescents have a feeling they are lost and have little hope. Successful advances in this movement cannot only restore human beings as useful members of society, but perhaps save the community huge funds in fighting crime.

Parental obligations? "It has been my experience," says Mrs. Flynn, "that too many parents are shirking or evading their responsibility by leaving their job of raising their child to someone else outside the home."

She recently devised a plan for American Legion leaders in which she suggested that Legionnaires throughout the country be enlisted to act as big brothers to youths who are potential juvenile delinquents.

"Every youngster," said Mrs. Flynn, "looks for a hero to worship. He may be a noted baseball player or boxer, or any other celebrity famed for prowess and achievement.

"Youth needs a strong male identification and he must feel that he is wanted. It is because he feels ignored and unwanted that he takes to juvenile delinquency."

In an address before a group of social workers in New York, she advocated the setting up of youth work programs. She proposed that local organizations like the Lions, chambers of commerce, and the like, compile a brochure of names listing the qualifications of youths and helping them either in regular, summer-vacation, or after-school jobs.

"When all is said and done," said Mrs. Flynn, "youths get into trouble because of idleness. Inexperienced at finding work on their own and unable to be guided by their parents, many of them drift into crime without forethought. They innocently get in with bad companions—oftentimes older, hardened criminals. And before they realize, they are enmeshed in the law. It is especially the older criminals who are the dangerous recruiters for crime."

A world-traveled woman, she visited last summer several European countries and carefully observed their clinical techniques with juvenile delinquents. She has been to Rome three times and had an audience once with the late Pope Pius XI and more recently met twice with Pope Pius XII.

How does juvenile delinquency develop? Here are three cases culled from hundreds referred to Mrs. Flynn for rehabilitation.

The first, that of a 15-year-old boy with average intelligence. He had a penchant for stealing cars. Outwardly the patient was excessively polite, orderly, compliant, with normal reactions to everyday situations.

His parents, both professional people, were financially comfortable, and he lived with them in an exclusive suburban area.

Upon examination, it was found the boy had very hostile feelings toward his parents. He asserted they were overbearing, punitive, nongiving, and faultfinders to the extreme. They rejected everything he did or said, disapproved of all his friends, and consequently drove him into a lonesome life.

His feelings of self-worthlessness brought on by repressive parents led him to attempt to restore his self-concept by committing delinquent acts like stealing cars. This he thought would gain him social acceptance with his peers and environment.

The second case: A girl, 16, of middle class socio-economic status. She had grown up in a family where her mother did not understand her and criticized her friends. She felt that her sister, who was older than she, was idealized and that she was the "poor Cinderella."

Since she was dependent upon her mother and confided in her at times, she felt her trust was prone to abuse. Her mother had the habit of embarrassing her in front of her friends.

The patient stated she had frequent arguments with her mother, but she felt more adequate to contend with her mother than she did with her father. Her father lost control and became violent, but ended up contrite. There were many arguments between her parents about money in her presence.

Although she had good intelligence, she did not like school and cut classes frequently. She would round up 20 teen-age girls, go to a park and have her group fight an innocent cluster of teen-agers who would be on an outing to the park. When arrested, she said, "I gelt good that I was in a gang fight and the facts were reported in newspapers."

The last case: a young man of 18 with superior intelligence. He had stolen a large sum of money from his employer. His history revealed a compulsion for stealing since the age of 6.

Both mother and father worked. He saw them before leaving for school in the morning, was usually in bed when they returned home in the evening. Father worked 7 days a week. Mother was free on Saturday and Sunday, but she went out with her friends on those days.

At the age of 15 his mother took him into court because he was unmanageable and was doing poorly in high school and was rejecting the control and authority of his parents.

Subsequently, he moved out of his home and got a job. He lived alone.

The patient stated that he has always been embarrassed to tell his friends about his family. The impact of his present offense had made him realize his life had been one of lies and deceptions.

After her tape recordings on juvenile delinquency were aired nationwide, Mrs. Flynn received an avalanche of mail and phone calls. Chiefly the requests were: "What can we do for my child or children? What would you suggest?"

One particular missive evoked a chuckle. It was a proposal of marriage from a widower in Michigan who had three lively teen-age sons. He wrote he would like to have a wife like her to solve not only his personal problems but his sons' as well.

HER ADVICE TO PARENTS

1. The home should be a place of love, unity, and devotion. Religious training strengthens the moral fiber of a child exposed to many temptations. A sound home life begins with family prayer.

2. Parents should run their children or they will take the reins and run them.

3. Take time to listen to your children. You may assist in the solution of their problems. At least you'll find out what they are thinking about or what makes them tick.

4. Parents should set a good example of affectionate marital relationship. Discord in the family causes delinquency.

5. Teach discipline, respect for authority and elders, consideration for the comfort and rights of others, courtesy.

6. Teach your child on his own age level—not as an adult one day and a baby the next.

7. Give credit and praise when due. Reprimand your child privately.

8. TV and movies play an important part in forming the mental and moral outlook of impressionable minds. Have children only see productions which are inspiring, educational, and entertaining.

9. Guard the morals of your children by having them read good clean literature.

10. Too much money, too much free time, and a car at their disposal only invites disaster.

11. Guide your children in the selection of their friends and take out time to meet them.

12. Guard your child in the home and on the street. Know where they are going and with whom.

13. Be alert to know when your child goes out and the time he returns home. Don't trust him implicitly with the key.

14. Guard your children in dress. Stress decency in your daughter's appearance and proper attire for your son.

15. Too much freedom is given children at an early age, and they aren't able to use it intelligently. Remember, a child is a reflection or mirror of his home training.

Big Business in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of the House the following article entitled "Big Business in Russia" which appeared in the December 1958 issue of the Atlantic. This article by Mr. Edward Crankshaw, a noted authority on Russia, tells the inside story of the recent economic reorganization which took place in that country in the summer of 1957. It is indeed an interesting account of the maneuvering Khrushchev did in curbing the power of the big industrialists in Russia:

BIG BUSINESS IN RUSSIA

(By Edward Crankshaw)

(The enormous growth of Russian industry has built up Soviet business tycoons, and in this penetrating paper Edward Crankshaw shows how the power of these industrialists has been curbed and redirected by Khrushchev. Mr. Crankshaw is recognized here and in Britain as a leading authority on the U.S.S.R. His earlier books have grown out of his residence in that country, and he is on his way back to Moscow as this article goes to press.)

Few people outside the Soviet Union have ever had a clear image of the magnitude of the several branches of Soviet industry or of the power and stature of the largely unknown men who run them. Thus the news of the radical economic reorganization pushed through by Khrushchev in the early summer of 1957 evoked very little response in the West, which simply did not understand the issues involved. Indeed, at that time all interest was centered on the downfall of Malenkov, Molotov, Kaganovich, and Shepilov, and most people did not realize that Khrushchev's victory over the antiparty group (which meant the anti-Krushchev group) was inextricably bound up with an economic and administrative revolution which was at that moment, in the grand Russian manner, convulsing the whole country.

More than a year has gone by since that revolution was made. An immense upheaval, full of grief and bitterness for a host of able and formidable individuals, has left scarcely a surface sign. Khrushchev has consolidated his position more thoroughly, although it is still erroneous to see him as an absolute tyrant, or dictator, respensible to himself alone. Soviet industry, moving ponderously and magnificently along its new lines, continues to deliver the goods, as far as can be seen, no more and no less efficiently than before. And now that the shouting has died down, it is a good time to contemplate the operation in retrospect and consider what

it tells us of the workings of the Soviet system, of the Soviet leadership, and, in particular, of Khrushchev's mind.

The outward story is quite simple. In February of 1957 Khrushchev, as first secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bulganin was still Prime Minister), convened a plenum of the party's Central Committee. He put before the assembly an explosive set of proposals. The development of Soviet industry, he said, was being impeded by an outdated ministerial structure. If production was to continue at the required rate, there must be a radical reform of this structure, and the central bureaucracy must be broken up.

He therefore proposed that most of the gigantic industrial ministries, the chiefs of which sat on the Council of Ministers, should be abolished at a stroke. The necessity of referring everything back to the central ministries in Moscow, the rivalries produced by the conflicting interests of individual ministries, and the absence of close cooperation between concerns working side by side in the various regions, but answerable to separate ministries at the center, were strangling initiative, impeding dispatch, and resulting in excessive waste and duplication. The highly centralized bureaucratic system had been adequate, he said, in the early days of industrial expansion, when drive and close coordination from the center were a vital necessity. But it was no longer the best system.

In place of the all-union and republican industrial ministries, there should be set up a number of regional authorities, to be known as national economic councils (Sovnarkhozy), with the task of coordinating and controlling the total industrial activity of the various regions. The underlying idea was that the various industries in each separate region should be integrated into a harmonious system based on mutual interdependence within each region. In the interests of the national economy, as expressed in the state plans, there would have to be a controlling body to give directives to the Sovnarkhozy in the regions. This body, Khrushchev said, should be the State Planning Commission, strengthened for the purpose; its directives should have the force of law.

These proposals, put forward in February 1957, were first made public on March 30. From the beginning they were associated exclusively with Khrushchev and were known as the Khrushchev theses. No other member of the Central Committee or the Council of Ministers put his name to them.

The debate was, nevertheless, sharp, far-ranging, and unusually outspoken. Although the higher leadership said nothing, the debate was reflected in the party press, and there was some fairly drastic criticism of Khrushchev's proposals from highly placed individuals, usually from the ministers affected and from factories. At the same time, factory directors seemed to enjoy letting off steam about their pet anomalies, and the press was full of ludicrous examples of the muddle and waste behind the imposing industrial facade.

At the May session of the Supreme Soviet the Khrushchev theses, with certain important modifications, became law, and their author characteristically demanded speed. The whole structure of administration, covering most of the vast industrial machine, slowly built up over the years, was to be torn down and rebuilt by July 1, just 7 weeks from the promulgation of the decree. That is to say, some 20 Ministries were to be abolished (fewer than Khrushchev had originally demanded), their buildings evacuated, the Sovnarkhozy set up all over the Union, housed and manned, all in 7 weeks.

There was clearly something more than Khrushchev's impatient ebullience behind this demand for speed at all costs. The obvious deduction was that he had met with heavy opposition behind the scenes, that he was now hustling his opponents, and that he could afford to give them no time to regroup themselves. Within a month Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich, and Shepilov were dismissed from office, banished to remote regions, accused of antiparty activity, and, in the case of Malenkov, charged with a capital crime: complicity in the Leningrad plot.

So much for the outward story; expanding Soviet industry was being freed from redtape and bureaucratic centralization carried to the point of lunacy. The great Moscow hives of unproductive and often obstructive officials battening on the active producers were overturned. The officials were scattered to all points of the compass. The ministerial overlords, men of formidable caliber and heavily entrenched vested interests, some of them as powerful as the president of General Motors, were suddenly out of their jobs. The directors of industrial trusts, the individual factory managers, the chief engineers would no longer have to wait on Moscow's decisions before varying their appointed routine in the smallest degree. Thousands of lesser officials would be freed from paperwork for productive labor. The ceaseless and time-consuming journeys between Moscow and the distant Provinces would be cut down. It all sounded wonderful.

A dozen or more great industrial ministries—steel, oil, chemicals, heavy machines, and so on—had, over the years, taken to manufacturing for themselves and in their own factories everything that might conceivably be needed in their work. They had done this partly in the ordinary way of empire building, partly according to the Soviet version of Parkinson's Law, but more particularly in a very natural and, indeed, necessary effort to make sure that their own plans were fulfilled and their own productions schedules carefully insulated from the effects of failures and bottlenecks outside their control. Thus the ministry of coal, for example, would build its own cement works, set up its own building trusts (there were numerous separate building trusts run by different Moscow ministries in a single small provincial town), manufacture its own bulldozers and excavators and electrical machinery.

These ministerial empires, run by men who were born tycoons, were also beginning to represent centers of power which seriously threatened the one permissible center of power, the Communist Party.

Khrushchev did not mention this. Nor did he mention another aspect of the system which must also have been giving him grave cause for concern: the development of what amounted to a private enterprise network within the elephantine and rigidly controlled state network—the development and proliferation of a new kind of Soviet man not prescribed in the textbooks, the tolkach, or fixer.

Khrushchev had a good deal to say about the worst anomalies, with examples from real life. "The existing structure of the industrial and construction ministries," he said in section II of his theses, "is a multistage and complicated one. Ministries and departments exercising leadership from the center over enterprises situated throughout the country inevitably accumulate round themselves numerous parallel organizations—various offices for sale and supply, depots, trusts, and so forth. The ministries have many different central administrations, departments, divisions.

* * * The territorial central administrations in charge of enterprises in Siberia, central Asia, the Far East, and other remote regions are, as a rule, situated in Moscow. * * * The workers of the ministries are forced to spend much time on interdepartmental correspondence * * * reports and memorandums * * * The huge streams of paper coming from the ministries divert a large number of workers at enterprises from practical work. Many specialists are called to the center from the localities * * * and spend months at the ministries."

And so on. All this is a pale image of the situation vividly reflected in Dudintsev's novel, Not by Bread Alone. Khrushchev was correct in concluding that the 200,000 industrial establishments and 100,000 construction sites scattered over the face of the Soviet Union could not be efficiently guided and controlled from Moscow. What he did not say, or even hint at, was how this ludicrous system had managed to work as well as it did.

The answer, very largely, lay with the fixer. It was this merry soul who made the wheels go 'round. He inhabited a sort of shadowland between the law and the labor camp—that shadowland which is the true reality of the Soviet Union, where people show their real faces and behave like human beings and where everything gets done. The state bureaucracy left to itself, left to develop unhindered to its logical conclusion, would long ago have ground to a virtual standstill. But the Russians, for all their love of theorizing, are a practical race with a heavy dash of cynicism; and they are also brilliant improvisers. Thus it was that hard-pressed factory directors spontaneously developed a system to keep the wheels turning, a system which amounted to a private enterprise network operating under cover of the state enterprise network and short-circuiting it at all points.

Factory directors, the heads of trusts and combines, even the heads of ministries are not interested in the state plan as a whole. They are interested in their own careers and in making a success of their jobs. Each and every one of them is bound by his appointed plan, imposed by Moscow with the force of law and stretching his capacities to the limit. Heavy bonuses are earned by exceeding the plan; on the other hand, if the excess is too marked, planned production is increased for the following year: Today's surplus becomes tomorrow's norm. To fulfill the plan at all, each concern depends on the punctual delivery of raw materials and components or machines from other factories; but in the vast civil service network, smothered in redtape and abounding in bottlenecks, punctual delivery was rare. To provide against emergencies, the directors and managers made sure that they had adequate reserves of everything they needed; but this sort of hoarding was frowned on by the center.

The answer was to circumvent the center; and this was where the fixer came in. Often he was a highly respectable and trustworthy individual, although, naturally, the profession attracted its spivs. He was the contact man in excelsis. He was usually paid a salary and commission, but the interesting thing is that he was often paid by two or more concerns. On the books of an electrical components factory in Kharkov, he would appear as "our representative in Ivanovno"; but on the books of a textile mill in Ivanovno, he would appear as "our Kharkov representative." His job was to insure that the electrical factory received direct consignments of insulating cotton from Ivanovno and that the textile mill received direct supplies of electrical equipment from Kharkov, the relevant ministries being bypassed and the central planners confounded.

This is a very simple case of the fantastic and complicated barter system which flourished within the rigid framework of the state plan. On top of all this, the tolkach, the fixer, was often an expert at rigging books, at concealing reserves, at influencing important officials, at ministerial lobbying. He was, in effect, the unsung hero of the Soviet economic system. And he made the system work by the simple expedient of ignoring it. Khrushchev, undoubtedly, had the fixers in

mind when he put forward his celebrated theses. For the fixer, proliferating, was making nonsense of the planned economy. More seriously, he was making a mockery of party control.

In one way and another, and from top to bottom, the Soviet industrial system had for years been developing an autonomous life of its own and moving ever further away from party control. If the party was to reassert itself after Stalin's death, it had to take action against the new managerial class, as in 1953 it had taken action against Beria's police empire. The man who had decided to take everything on controlling and reactivating the party machine was Khrushchev. The man who was most closely associated with the new managerial class was Malenkov.

Many failed to perceive this fundamental opposition, because Malenkov himself had risen to power, no less than Khrushchev, inside the party apparatus; for years he was regarded as the arch apparatchik. Further, most of the leading figures of the managerial class were themselves party members, some of them standing quite high in the hierarchy. But there is all the difference in the world between being a party member, even a senior party member, for reasons of convenience, and being a professional party functionary, or apparatchik.

As for Malenkov, at some time during, or soon after, the war, he seems to have decided that the future lay not with the party secretaries but with the new industrial bosses and technocrats, who were beginning to consolidate themselves into the fourth center of power—the other three being the party, the police, and the army—all held in check by Stalin personally. At any rate, he was seen to be ever more closely associated with the outstanding figures of this new class, who, in the first years after the war, during the tremendous drive for reconstruction, began to invade the higher echelons of government, quite manifestly to the disgust of the professional party functionaries. I am referring to people like Tevosyan, the man who created Russia's steel industry and who was regarded with limitless admiration by old Krupp, and Malyshev, who before his death was in charge of the automation drive. There were many more. They formed a great new class, which had suffered much and won. They were less interested in politics and ideology than in managing and making and in securing a better life for their children than they had themselves enjoyed. They had been created by Stalin's industrial revolution, and, having survived all the purges, they had built up the great industrial machine, which they alone knew how to run. They considered themselves indispenable. And they were the spearhead of what amounted to a new bourgeoisie, a brandnew middle class such as Russia had never known before, with a vested interest in stability.

Malenkov, perhaps as a result of his especially close contact with these men during the war, had evidently decided that they formed the future ruling class of the Soviet Union, a class which had moved right, away from Leninism. Khrushchev, whether from conviction or ambition or a combination of both, took his stand on the party apparatus—on the cadres, that is to say, of a revitalized party (the party, in Stalin's last years, had lost its coherence, its drive, and its authority, and was good for nothing; there was no other authority than Stalin).

This opposition was visible even before Stalin's death, when, at the 19th party congress in the autumn of 1952, Khrushchev came forward as the champion of party purity and integrity; the party was to be purged of bureaucracy and careerism and restored to its pristine glory. It began to manifest itself in action almost immediately after Stalin's death, when Malenkov, yielding to pressures which are not yet understood, gave up his great office of first secretary of the party and took his stand as Prime Minister, or chairman of a formidable council of ministers. After Beria had been removed, in the summer of 1953, the conflict became ever more marked, as Malenkov continued to stress the need for a more prosperous and tranquil Soviet Union and Khrushchev began to invoke the spirit of Leninism and demand that party functionaries all over the country should give more time and thought to the supervision of every aspect of life, especially industry and economics. This was not a conflict between reactionary Stalinism and liberalizing Khrushchevism, although it was made to appear so. It was a conflict between Khrushchev and Malenkov, between the man who was determined to revive the party as the force which would carry him to supreme power and the man who had hitched his wagon to the new apolitical managers, the men who were running Soviet industry on the lines I have roughly sketched.

Thus Khrushchev's 1957 theses were by no means exclusively concerned with the promotion of efficiency. They were concerned with the reassertion of the party's grip on the economy of the U.S.S.R., and of Khrushchev's own grip on the party.

Khrushchev won his second round against Malenkov (the first was when he took the party secretaryship from him) in February 1955, when Malenkov retired from the premiership in favor of Bulganin, still remaining, however, an active figure and a member of the party Presidium. Almost at once Khrushchev indicated that radical changes were in store for Soviet industry. When the attention of the Western World was concentrated on the summit conference at Geneva in July 1955, he caused to be published a long and detailed report on the state of industry, which, it turned out, had been delivered some weeks earlier by Marshal Bulganin to the Central Committee. This report, which told the world more about certain aspects of Soviet industry than it had ever known before, was overlooked in the West at the time because the summit obscured it.

For some time, however, things went on as they were, although Bulganin had demanded a radical overhaul of the whole industrial setup. Khrushchev was then very busy improving his own position, developing his foreign policy, packing the party with his supporters, and so on. There was also agriculture. Industry was at least delivering the goods; agriculture was not, and it had to be put right first. It was not until December 1956 that it became finally clear that Khrushchev was fighting his heaviest and most critical battle on the industrial front and was within an ace of losing it.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-six was the year of the de-Stalinization. It was the year in which the Polish rebellion, the Hungarian uprising, and incipient revolt inside the Sovet Union itself brought Khrushchev very close to defeat. And the first major sign that he had lost much ground and that Malenkov was working for a comeback in alliance, not so much with his own friends as with Khrushchev's enemies (Molotov and Kaganovich) was the announcement of a far-reaching reform of the central planning apparatus for industry. It was not the sort of reform which would have appealed to Khrushchev. It left the industrialist ministries intact, reduced in importance and authority the State Planning Commission, and provided for the setting up of a new body with virtually dictatorial powers over the whole industrial front—the State Economic Committee, with the Deputy Premier, Pervukhin, as its chairman. This reform, which was agreed to at the December plenum of the Central Committee in the closing days of 1956, marked a clear victory for what is loosely called the bureaucracy (Malenkov's private army) over the party apparatus—thus over Khrushchev himself.

But the new body never got into action. For it was only 2 months later that Khrushchev, by processes which remain totally obscure (though Marshal Zhukov evidently played a part in them) made his own comeback and surprised everybody and shocked many by convening another central committee plenum and confronting it with his revolutionary theses. Under his plan the newly formed state economic committee was to be abolished, the industrial ministries were to be abolished, the bureaucracy was to be scattered, the party was to be supreme. In May, with certain modifications, his theses became law. In july they were put into effect. And Malenkov, Molotov, Kaganovich were banished. With them went Khrushchev's own proud protege, Dimitri Shepilov, who had clearly tried to change sides in the heat of the quarrel and paid for it with his career.

With this background, it is not surprising that the Khrushchev reorganization, as finally put into practice, left a good deal to be desired when seen from the blinkered point of view of the professional efficiency expert. The idea of breaking up the Moscow ministries was good, up to a point. There was no doubt a great deal to be said for establishing, or developing, regional complexes of industry grouped around local centers enjoying some autonomy and cutting across all departmental lines. I am not qualified to discuss such matters, except in very general terms. The task facing any individual desirous of rationalizing Soviet production is complex in the extreme. In the first instance he is confronted with the problems involved in making modern large-scale organizations work, of energizing them without allowing them to get out of hand, of directing them centrally without bringing them to a standstill—problems faced and only partly solved by the huge capitalist combines of Britain and America and the nationalized industries of Britain. In the second place any solution he arrives at must fit, or appear to fit, into the theoretical framework of the Soviet system as a whole.

But the solution imposed on the Soviet Union by Khrushchev and his friends is so patently bad, and so irrelevant to the real problems it purports to tackle, that it is permissible to doubt whether it was ever intended as a serious contribution to the rationalization of industry and to ask whether the whole reorganiaztion, or revolution, was not distorted out of recognition for political ends.

The task of the Sovnarkhozy is to exploit and develop the industries of their separate regions as a balanced whole. Obviously it would be impossible to make each region entirely self-supporting, and in any scheme there would have to be export and import trading between regions, particularly in the matter of raw materials. But if the regional division of the vast territory of the Soviet Union were to make any sense at all from the economic point of view, the regions themselves would have to be large, and every effort would have to be made to draw the dividing lines between regions with economic considerations heavily emphasized. For example, some regions would be contrived to offer every opportunity for something approaching self-sufficiency. Where this was impossible—for instance, in the great oil, coal, iron, and timber producing areas—the region would be contrived to concentrate, for easy export, the greatest possible aggregate of individual raw materials. There would be specialist regions, with economic councils staffed by specialists, and mixed regions.

But do we find anything like this? We do not. We find in the first place 105 separate regions; we find that the map of these regions has little or no relevance to the map of the industrial economy—instead, in almost all cases the economic regional boundaries coincide with the existing local gov-

ernment boundaries: in the case of small republics, the republican boundaries; in the case of large ones, the oblast, or provincial boundaries.

Why this total disregard for economic geography? Why this rigid adherence to the local government territorial divisions which largely date back to Imperial Russia? The answer, surely, is that the virtual ruler of each region is the party secretary, appointed and controlled by the first secretary in Moscow, Khrushchev himself. The chairman of each Sovnarkhoz must be appointed or approved by Moscow. Either he is a local industrialist bureaucrat, already used to working under the local party secretary, or he is sent out from one of the dissolved Moscow ministries, a stranger to his region and entirely dependent for support and guidance on the established party organization. At a single blow, Khrushchev took control of industry away from the new managerial class and put it into the hands of his own party functionaries in a hundred and five separate regions.

The Sovnarkhozy, scarcely more than a year old, are now, we are told, working smoothly. Certainly, according to the official figures, production has not suffered from the revolution. Equally certainly the creation of the Sovnarkhozy has not made an end of anomalies and waste in Soviet production.

It is very hard to find out exactly what is happening. In the first place, Moscow is full of senior bureaucrats who should by rights have gone off to the regions, far or near, to take up posts in the Sovnarkhozy. They have blandly refused to leave Moscow, and most of them have found other jobs—many in the inflated Gosplan organization, the separate departments of which are, in many cases, already disguised ministries. The great industrial ministries have been abolished, it is true; but innumerable trusts and combines have kept their Moscow offices, and, on top of that, each of the hundred and five Sovnarkhozy seems to have its own Moscow office for liaison with the State Planning Commission, innumerable government departments, the defense and transport ministries (which were excluded from last year's reorganization, and remain intact), and each other. There are already springing up in Moscow new bureaucratic agglomerations. These have absorbed many of the displaced bureaucrats, and they perform many of the coordinating functions of the old ministries.

On the other hand, the regional Sovnarkhozy are staffed, especially in the remoter areas, largely by local men, already strongly imbued with regional pride. I am not suggesting that there have been no transfers from Moscow to the provinces: on the contrary, there have been a great many. But the operation as a whole has produced nothing like the clean sweep that a stranger, unfamiliar with Russian ways, might expect from the terms of the Supreme Soviet's directive.

Until just over a year ago, waste and duplication arose largely from interdepartmental jealousy and distrust, from ministerial empire building, from lack of cooperation between ministries operating, as it were, in parallel in the same territory. Today waste and duplication are arising from interregional jealousy and distrust, from regional empire building, from lack of cooperation between the new Sovnarkhozy. Already there are telltale indications in the press. The Sovnarkhozy are proving to be reprehensibly selfish and more interested in building up their own regions than in the national economy as a whole. One particular outcome of this is that distribution, always one of the weakest features of the Soviet economy (especially in the matter of consumer goods), has become more chancy than ever before. Certainly the tolkach, the fixer, is still very much in evidence; but now he acts as a contact man between regions instead of between ministries.

Khrushchev has broken the growing power of the great industrial ministries; he has removed some of the more crippling anomalies of the ministerial system; without really decentralizing the Soviet economy he has given a much-needed impetus to the big provincial centers; he has provided a new framework for industry which could be invaluable in time of war and is susceptible of being modified to form a sensible and flexible adaptation to the economic facts of life. But much remains to be done, particularly in the way of reducing the number of regions and redrawing their boundaries. Meanwhile, the outstanding feature of the reorganization is the political aspect: the reassertion of party power over industry.

What do we mean by "the party?"

The party, first and foremost, is Khrushchev himself. But who are the hundred and five republican and provincial party secretaries who now play so big a part in controlling and guiding, through the Sovnarkhozy, their local industries? Are they Communist fanatics who think of their work exclusively in terms of the greater glory of the Communist revolution? I do not think they are. Do they see themselves, and the great regions they control, and everything they produce in those regions, simply as part of a great ideological design? I do not think they do. Is there in fact a fundamental difference between the preoccupations and aims of the dethroned bureaucrats from the central ministries and the higher party chieftains in the provinces? I do not think there is.

The division, insisted upon by Khrushchev himself, between the bureaucracy and the party is, it seems to me, an artificial one. It has misled many, and continues to do so, in their application of the forces at work inside the Soviet Union today. The late ministerial chieftain, now working in the provinces or creating a new job for himself in Moscow, and the average party functionary, developing his career inside the ruling body of the U.S.S.R., are very like each other: both are ambitious individuals sharing the characteristics of ambitious men everywhere in the world, both are good at managing, both enjoy the exercise of power. There may be differences of emphasis. The typical industrial bureaucrat may have a slightly more concrete approach to life, may be slightly more technically minded; the typical party careerist may be slightly more interested in ideas than in things. But both are nearer in interests, attitude, and attack to able men in the West than they are to the old-fashioned Leninist revolutionary.

In a word, Soviet industry continues to move, in spite of its new labels, in the direction it has followed since the war. The fight between the industrial bureaucracy and the party officials was, in a sense, a phony war. The real struggle was between individuals. And the real issue was whether the party organization, the ruling body, subordinated absolutely to the central secretariat, should allow individuals, splinter organizations—a whole class outside the party hierarchy—to develop into an organized pressure group, or whether, at the cost of some broken heads, some disorganization, some sacrifice of proved and valuable ability, the party organization should seek to absorb into itself the accumulated power and experience of the great industrial network.

Khrushchev chose the latter course. But he must know very well that his party secretaries all over the country will, in consequence, find themselves being pulled ever more strongly into the orbit of the makers and the producers and away from the doctrinaires. Probably he does not mind this so long as he controls the machinery which comprehends them all.

Remarks of the Honorable C. Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, at the ICA All Employees Meeting, Hotel Mayflower, Washington, D.C., Wednesday, December 10, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, because of its general interest, I am including in my remarks a recent speech made by our able Under Secrtary of State for Economic Affairs, Mr. Douglas Dillon.

This address was given at a meeting held last month of employees of the International Cooperation Administration. Mr. Dillon spoke in his capacity as the individual charged with responsibility for coordinating all matters relating to mutual security, but he shows real understanding of the problems faced by Members of Congress, who must act on requests for authorizing and financing these programs. He shows too a clear recognition of the importance of a proper attitude in our dealings with newly independent, and in many cases uncommitted, countries.

Mr. Dillon's address follows:

I am delighted to be here with you this morning and to take part in honoring 32 of our fellow ICA employees for their outstanding services. I refer to them advisedly as our fellow employees. For I have felt that I am one of you ever since Secretary of State Dulles charged me with responsibility for coordinating mutual security matters, of which ICA is so important a part.

I wish that by some miracle of transportation, we could have with us for this important hour today, the thousands of dedicated men and women who are serving ICA overseas, where I have seen them operating under difficult conditions and even under extreme hardship. For I want to tell all of you in ICA, whether at home or abroad, what a magnificent service I think you are performing for your country.

I can testify that my feelings are shared by every official of the executive branch who plays a major part in the shaping and conduct of our foreign policy, and, I am sure, by many distinguished Members of the Congress as well. This is especially true of Secretary Dulles, who has asked me to give you his warmest personal greetings and to remind you of something he said in this same room at the first ICA all-employees meeting a little over a year ago. At that time, you may recall, he told you:

"You do not have the job security of other Government positions, or the remuneration which you could obtain in private life. What keeps you on the job is patriotism and loyalty to your country. Such patriotism is usual in times of war, but especially exceptional and laudable in times of peace."

What the Secretary said is as profoundly true today as it was a year ago. Nothing I could say would add to his tribute.

After the Congress reconvenes in January, there will be honorable men on both sides of the aisle who will want to take a hard look at our entire foreign aid program. It is my hope that they will examine it vigorously, but unemotionally and without undue

partisanship. I personally applaud such a full and frank discussion. For we are constantly seeking ways to streamline and revitalize our programs, to increase their breadth and flexibility, and to enlarge our objectives.

As you know, we are now preparing to present our next budget requests to Congress. In drafting our requests, we have constantly borne in mind our overriding responsibility to the American people to insure that every cent of their tax money will be expended with scrupulous care and maximum efficiency. I am confident that when the proper time comes, we can, and shall, justify our requests. For the cost of our foreign-aid programs represents only a modest portion of our national product. And every penny spent on foreign aid is an investment in free-world security.

I should now like to touch upon a point which must disturb you as much as it disturbs me. This is the fact that too many of our people are coming to think of our mutual security and other assistance programs solely as instruments of the cold war and answers to the massive economic drive the Soviet bloc is directing against the underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America.

Actually, as you well know, we have been in the foreign-aid business a long time. Our programs began in Latin America 15 years ago and were made worldwide 8 years ago. We are the defending champions in this field. The Communist bloc's technical-aid offensive, which began only 4 years ago, it is a response to your efforts and a tribute to your many successes.

The reasons behind the Communist bloc's offensive are readily apparent: The Communist leaders are aware that a great cooperative free-world effort to improve economic conditions in the underdeveloped areas will erect the most powerful possible barrier to the spread of communism. Rest assured that they will do everything to discredit you and the country you represent.

We can triumph over the Communists by helping the peoples of the underdeveloped nations to help themselves. But in the extension of our assistance, we must use discretion and forbearance and demonstrate true statesmanship.

In this connection, I was struck by a remark made the other day in New York by Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to this country, who said:

"A way of life determined by a specific set of political or economic doctrines has no meaning as such to Asian peoples. The struggle which interests them is rather the constant and bitter struggle for life itself, the struggle against hunger, poverty, disease, and ignorance."

What he meant, I believe, is that in the ideological struggle between communism and the West, most of the peoples of the newly emerging nations are uncommitted * * * so far. They need our assistance. But they are jealous of their new-found independence. They will be reluctant to accept the idea that either the Communist or the free world way provides a desirable blueprint for the good life until they have seen concrete results close at hand. The challenge to us to help them to achieve progress under freedom is clear.

The manner in which we extend our assistance can have a very great bearing upon the path they ultimately choose. We must offer aid in an unobtrusive way, working discreetly in the background. We are so accustomed to self-rule that we sometimes fail to realize how truly staggering a burden is the exercise of political responsibility for the first time.

I should now like to say a word regarding the role which each and every ICA employee must play in the conduct of our foreign policy:

Yours is a responsibility which rests squarely upon the shoulders of each individual, whether here or 10,000 miles away. It is, in part, a responsibility to help create a better understanding of our objectives at home and abroad. Each of you must also play an explicit and conscious role in the actual conduct of our foreign relations. To do so will require maturity, tolerance, and a widening appreciation of the complexities of our relations with other peoples. Let me urge you never to lose sight of the idealism in which our foreign-aid program was born. For, in the final analysis, the succes of our efforts will be measured as much in terms of reaching the minds and hearts of the peoples of the less-developed nations as in helping them to achieve material progress. It is a difficult role, but it can be as rewarding as it is challenging. I have every confidence that you will prove equal to it.

Effective Labor Regulation Legislation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer for printing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in this morning's New Herald Tribune, commenting on Senator KENNEDY's labor bill:

SENATOR KENNEDY IS OVERLY OPTIMISTIC

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY is off to a fast start with a labor reform bill that would "virtually put Mr. Hoffa and his associates out of business."

That, of course, is only what the Massachusetts Democrat says. For it is hard to see just how KENNEDY reasons that this bill would stop the boss of the Teamsters Union. What the Senator offers is pretty much a re-run of last year's legislation, which failed in the closing days of Congress chiefly because some Members of the House thought the bill wasn't strong enough and others didn't want to annoy the unions in an election year with even a pale variety of regulation.

Now the problem is still not so much what is in the Kennedy bill. Nobody can seriously argue with its content, which could almost be described as noncontroversial. But the real rub is about what KENNEDY has left out.

For instance, among the most potent weapons of Hoffa and his kind are:

1. The phony picketing where, for instance, a storekeeper can't get goods delivered unless he signs up with the union;

2. The secondary boycott where an innocent third party is made to suffer in a labor hassle.

KENNEDY's bill does nothing to strike down these two evils. There is more of this kind of omission, but that's enough to show that Hoffa & Co. needn't fear yet about losing the franchise.

Of course KENNEDY hardly approves of the aforementioned malpractices. He just says these ought to be handled sometime later when Congress gets around to amending the Taft-Hartley Act. This, however, is extremely tenuous assurance.

Meanwhile the Senator says the hearings on his bill, beginning next week, should be completed in 9 days at most. Not long thereafter, one assumes from KENNEDY's prediction, Jimmy Hoffa will be hastening to abdicate.

Want to bet, Senator?

Integration in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting address concerning integration in Washington, D.C., was delivered by Isaac Franck before the 85th annual forum of the Conference on Social Welfare in Chicago, Ill., in May 1958. Mr. Franck, a member of the faculty of American University, is executive director of the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington. The address was reprinted in the August 15, 1958, issue of Commonweal and I am pleased to commend it to our colleagues:

INTEGRATION IN WASHINGTON

By Isaac Franck

In dealing with the subject of racial desegregation in the Nation's Capital we confront not only one of the most interesting theoretical problems of our time but one of our most imperative practical problems; and the social changes which have taken place in Washington within the last decade are of particular moment at this juncture in our national history. Washington is a Federal city, marked off by artificial and arbitrary boundary lines from a large and expanding hinterland of suburbia in contiguous counties of Maryland and Virginia. At the end of 1957 the total population of the metropolitan area was about 2 million. Somewhat less than half this number live within the boundaries of the District of Columbia, and of those within the District proper about 45 percent are Negroes.

These figures take on new meaning when we realize that they show the population to have doubled in some 17 years. The sheer doubling of the metropolitan population in such a short period is in itself impressive. What is most relevant here, however, is the growth of the Negro population in Washington proper during this period. The growth in the Negro population of Washington is, of course, nothing exceptional. Similar and even greater increases in the Negro populations in urban centers are reflected all across the country. This is part of the general trend toward urbanization in the United States. That many of the Negro immigrants into Washington have come from southern rural areas with inferior schools for Negroes is particularly relevant to our school situation, and to the glaring inequalities between the Negro and the white schools brought to light after integration.

A graphic description of some of the aspects of the Washington situation about 10 years ago is contained in the 1947 report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, entitled "To Secure These Rights":

"If a Negro stops in Washington * * * with a very few exceptions, he is refused service at downtown restaurants, he may not attend a downtown movie or play, and he has to go into the poorer section of the city to find a night's lodging. The Negro who decides to settle in the District must often find a home in an overcrowded, substandard area. He must often take a job below the level of his ability. He must send his children to the inferior public schools set aside for Negroes, and entrust his family's health to medical agencies which give inferior service. In addition, he must endure the countless daily humiliations that the system of segregation imposes upon the one-third of Washington that is Negro."

Let me fill in a number of additional details. Ten years ago Negroes and whites were assigned separate recreational facilities, public facilities, including the playgrounds and swimming pools of the District of Columbia Recreation Department and the swimming pools under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, as well as such private facilities as bowling alleys. In addition to separate movie houses for Negroes and whites, the crazy-quilt pattern of segregation made it possible for Negro performers to appear on the stage of legitimate theaters, but barred Negroes from the audiences; while in Constitution Hall the reverse was the case: concert audiences were admitted without distinctions of color, but no Negro performers were allowed to appear on the stage.

Segregation was the practice in private social agencies. The Police Boys' Clubs were rigidly divided into white and Negro units. No Negro physicians were admitted into the District of Columbia Medical Society; no Negro lawyers were given membership in the District of Columbia Bar Association; no Negro nurses could be members of the District Nurses' Association. The Fire Department was strictly segregated into Negro and white companies. Hiring and promotions of Negroes in the Metropolitan Police department left much to be desired. The public transportation system refused to employ Negroes as motormen or bus drivers. Except for Federal Government agencies, employment of Negroes in other than low level jobs was almost unknown, either in the District of Columbia government, or in public utilities, or in private employment in department stores, offices, or other businesses. No Negro architects were employed by white architectural firms. Churches were, on the whole, separated into Negro and white churches, and it became a cliche to say that the greatest amount of segregation in Washington took place on Sunday mornings at 11 o'clock.

Many other details could be added to this melancholy recital of the unmistakably "Jim Crow" character of our Nation's Capital a decade ago. These objective facts were accompanied by a widespread assumption that this situation had existed from eternity, and would continue to exist as part of the essential nature of the city and its patterns.

However, much has changed in the intervening 10 years. And while there is still much segregation, while there are still multitudinous discriminations, while it is not possible to assert dogmatically that there has been a great change in mass attitudes, it is unmistakably true that a major social revolution has taken place in Washington. Today, Negro and white youngsters attend the same public schools. Negroes and whites go to the same movie houses, theaters, and Constitution Hall, on the stage as well as in the audience. Recreation facilities, including playgrounds, swimming pools, and privately owned bowling alleys, are unsegregated. Negroes and whites eat in the same restaurants. The public transportation system employs Negroes as motormen and bus drivers. Some of the public utilities have begun employing Negroes in such positions of high visibility as secretaries and account clerks in the front offices. The district government has instituted a nondiscrimination employment policy. Police Department hiring and upgrading of Negroes has shown marked improvement. Some beginnings have been made in desegregating the fire department. Negro physicians are admitted into the District of Columbia Medical Society. Negro nurses are members of the District of Columbia Nurses' Association. The District of Columbia Bar Association is still in the throes of deciding about admitting Negro lawyers, but there is little question about the outcome.

Voluntary social agencies are in a process of transition, and many of them are now completely integrated. There are a number of integrated churches in Washington, and more on the way. The staff and all activities of the Council of Churches, including its many, well-attended institutes and seminars, are completely integrated. We have reason to believe that in the next few weeks a number of large department stores will begin hiring Negroes as sales people. Hospitals accept Negro patients, and Negro doctors are free to practice their profession in the hospitals. At the drawing boards of a number of architectural firms Negro and white architects work side by side. Negroes, on the whole, have no problem in obtaining lodging in first-class downtown hotels.

It is easy to rattle off, machinegun fashion, this cavalcade of progress. But only those who have personally known Washington during this past decade can fully appreciate the revolutionary character of the changes; and only those who have themselves participated in bringing about these changes can know what went into this exciting and inspiring process.

Almost every one of these social changes was preceded by dire predictions about the consequences of the change. At best, people were sure that the change just would not work. At worst, disturbances and violence were predicted. It is important to note, however, that this decade of progress was punctuated by only 3 minor disturbances connected with swimming pools and high schools. Firm and intelligent police handling and public statements by the Superintendent of Schools, with helpful editorializing by the city's three newspapers, brought the students back to their classes within 3 days.

What were some of the ingredients which made possible this relatively peaceful transition? First, there were a large number of individuals and organizations who refused to accept three myths, and who succeeded in persuading others to refuse to accept these myths: the myth of unchangeability of any situation; the myth of the inevitability of violence if integration is effectuated; and the myth that there is a necessary order of priority which must be followed in a program of integration.

I recall vividly the conferences with our newspaper editors in the summer of 1950, after they had editorialized on the Interior Department's decision to integrate its swimming pools, and had expressed fears that such integration would result in riots by irresponsible elements. We argued that the newspapers must liberate themselves from the myth of the inevitability of violence; that in predicting violence they were contributing to the creation of an atmosphere permissive toward violence, and thus giving encouragement to the irresponsible elements whose inclinations they deplored; that as community institutions the newspapers had a responsibility to create an atmosphere conducive to the maintenance of law and order and to the acceptance of progressive social change. The newspapers were persuaded, and since then have on the whole been an affirmative force in the history of desegregation in Washington. Other institutions, elected representatives, and community leaders also had to be persuaded, and this process of persuasion did not proceed without considerable resistance. Moral suasion, careful social and psychological analyses of the problem, and dedicated persistence contributed to the lowering of resistance.

The second ingredient worthy of note is the cooperation of and preparation by various community organizations and institutions. In 1951, when the litigation took place which established the validity of 19th-century civil rights laws, and resulted in the desegregation of Washington's restaurants, community groups joined together in filing briefs as "friends of the court," in support of the validity of these laws. Later, in the school desegregation case, community organizations joined in submitting an amicus curiae brief to the Supreme Court, in support of desegregation. These groups included leading Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish religious and civic organizations, such as the Council of Churches, the Jewish Community Council, the Catholic Interracial Council, the American Friends Service Committee, as well as other citizens' groups such as the Urban League and NAACP. Each time the newspapers and newscasters made public the fact that a large and heterogeneous group of community organizations supported racial desegregation, public opinion was affected. Nor must one slight the moral impact of the three religious groups, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, speaking out jointly, in conferences, in legal briefs, and in public pronouncements, in support of desegregation.

There were other kinds of preparation also. The Catholic parochial schools quietly initiated integration 3 years before the Supreme Court decision. The religious leadership, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, carried on educational work within their respective constituencies, and preached from their pulpits. The Park Police and the Metropolitan Police Departments gave their men training in intergroup relations, and in the professional responsibilities of police officers maintaining law and order, and protecting the life and safety of all human beings in the community. Intergroup relations and intergroup education workshops, for teachers and community leaders, were conducted by universities and by community organizations, such as the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and the Friends Service Committee. These and other groups thus made sure that the preparation consisted not merely of exhortative appeals but of cooperative community action, and of professional training for those involved in the day-to-day business of human relations.

The third ingredient, particularly in the peaceful process of school integration, was clarity, authoritativeness, moral firmness, and lack of ambiguity in the pronouncements of the Board of Education and the implementation of the desegregation plans. It is to the credit of the District of Columbia Board of Education that it issued a clear and unequivocal policy statement shortly after the Supreme Court decision, and that it approved a carefully worked out desegregation plan, and proceeded to carry it out with dispatch and determination. When the Board of Recreation, on the day following the Supreme Court's decision, finally integrated all the District of Columbia facilities at once, the action was accepted by the community without a ripple of protest.

It should also be noted that Washington's status as the Capital of the United States made possible in this instance the added voice of moral authority and rightness behind the process of integration in the public statements of the President of the United States and of other high Federal officials. Thus Washington's experience furnishes additional evidence in support of the contention that morally right, authoritative decisions on desegregation, announced by high-level leadership, and carried out without equivocation, ambiguity, or delay, will be accepted by the community without disturbances or violence.

There is much work still to be done before Washington begins to approximate the full realization of the goals of American democracy, and of healthy intergroup relations. The progress we have made must not blind us to the need for further progress. But we must also be realistically aware of the impediments to further progress.

There are these difficulties: First, Washington's geographic location makes it a border city, between North and South, in whose population ambivalences concerning race relations will persist for some time to

come. Second, the phenomenon of suburbia reinforces in the minds of some people the fantasy or delusion that one can escape desegregation through joining the flight to the suburbs. As long as these delusions persist, as long as people fail to ask themselves realistically how far they can continue to flee, and how long they can continue to escape the inherently American trend toward integration, our progress will be impeded. The third impediment is contained in the fact that Washington is a city whose residents have no franchise. Washington has no home rule, and its citizens have no power to make their own decisions. The legislative body for the city of Washington is the Congress of the U.S., which has a few other things of importance to be concerned about. Some Congressmen, from some Southern States, seem to want to maintain a Washington which conforms to their cherished image of a Jim Crow town in their native State. Finally, there are still some elements in the power structure of the community who fear that integration will lead to changes in the power structure, and to consequent uncertainties about their own position within it.

However, in spite of these impediments, progress will continue. The most recent episode in this decade of progress was the official order issued several weeks ago by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia (the three Commissioners perform functions similar to those of a mayor in a normal municipality), creating a Human Relations Council in the Government of the District. This council will deal with problems of discrimination, segregation, and intergroup relations. And to the extent to which the element of right governmental authority is a factor of importance in facilitating the process of integration, to that extent the creation of the Human Relations Council gives us additional reason for looking forward to further progress in the Nation's Capital.

Tipping Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which requires that the amount of tips be considered as wages for the purposes of computing social security benefits. This bill, which is No. H.R. 1342, received serious consideration in the 85th Congress, and is being considered by the Ways and Means Committee in this 86th Congress.

An article by Tom Brooks regarding tipping practices spells out the nature of tips and the reactions by the tipper and the serviceman. I believe a reading of this article will prove informative and enlightening:

The obscure 18th century English innkeeper who posted a box at the foot of the stairs labeled "To insure promptness" hardly could have realized the change he was initiating in the customs of mankind. Before the coming of the tip box, the good servant might have picked up an occasional windfall in a hastily flung coin according to a master's mood. But the standard practice of tipping was introduced by an English innkeeper systematically seeking an extra coin for better service.

Today, tipping is a widespread practice. Some 2 million Americans depend upon it for much of their livelihood. Most of these earn their money by offering some kind of service. Those who receive tips in the course of their duties run the gamut from altar boys at a wedding to waiters; their ranks include taxi drivers, caddies, mailmen, movers, delivery boys, expressmen, messengers, janitors, barbers, bartenders, busboys, beauticians, porters, garage attendants, pinboys, and an occasional organ grinder. Some of them of course get only an occasional tip, such as the annual Christmastime gifts to the postman and to apartment-house building service employees. For most, tips are the hard coinage of a living wage.

To the tipper, tips are an added cost not always easily or cordially borne. One out-of-town executive estimates that a business trip to New York City costs at least $20 a day in tips. He breaks it down this way: Redcap, 50 cents; bellhop, 50 cents; 5 taxis, $1.25; 4 doormen, $1; 3 hatcheck girls, 75 cents; 2 bartenders, $1.25; luncheon waiter, $2; dinner waiter serving 4 people, $7; captain, $5; wine butler, $1; cigarette girl, 25 cents. This does not take into account the shoeshine boy, the barber, chambermaid, or valet, if he should need their services.

A market-research company spokesman once estimated that in 1 year, the average businessman pays about five times the original price of his hat to hatcheck girls. This is vigorously disputed by another spokesman—for the Hat Research Foundation—who says, "I just don't believe that anyone except an occasional playboy would spend that much (about fifty dollars a year) for hat- and coat-check tipping."

Both gentlemen might be dismayed to know that those quarters don't go to the lovely blonde who takes his coat and hat at his favorite night spot—nearly all hatcheck girls get a straight salary from a concessionaire.

A Diamond Jim Brady leaving a one-hundred-dollar bill in the hand of a Delmonico waiter is a thing of the gay nineties past. Even in this expense-account age, no company treasurer or auditor would ever approve a three-figure tip. "It's the nickles, dimes, and quarters that add up," says a waitress at a fast-service restaurant. "But the dough ain't always there," says her glum-faced sister behind the counter, pointing to the bare space next to the dirty dishes left by a retreating customer.

"There are peaks and valleys in this business," says an old-time hackie. "Some days, you think you never had it so good. Others—?" Another cab driver, picking up a rider just after a downpour, tells this story: "I see this dame in a mink coat standing on Broadway; it's pouring, and she hails me. 'Grand Central,' she says, as grand as you please. When we get there, the meter says 75 cents. And, you know what? She hande me a nickle tip. A stinking nickle. So I throw it out on the sidewalk after her. And, you know what she does?" He shakes his head in wonder. "She bends down and picks it up."

Waiters, and others who earn their living from tips, are understandably upset over the lack of tipping savvy on the part of callow youths and out-of-towners, as well as lavishly dressed women. The harassed tourist worrying over a handy pocket tipping computer or a frugal man's guide to tipping isn't any more frustrated than the waiter who picks up a dime tip after serving a $2 meal. "New Yorkers," says one waiter, "are educated." A spokesman for the New York State Restaurant Association says, "The public usually tips about 10 percent in inexpensive places, 15 in a better spot, and 20 for special service or in entertainment spots."

"But," says a New York waiter, "the 15-percent habit is only wishful thinking. When you take into consideration, the 'stiffs' and the 5 percenters, we're happy if we make 10 percent of our total sales before paying the busboy."

Emily Post, however, warns that the "10 percent of yesterday is today anywhere from 12 to 15 percent." A minimum permissible tip, according to that impeccable guide to etiquette, is 25 cents for one person and 30 cents for two. "In a restaurant," she says, somewhat indignantly, "where the serving is done by waitresses, patrons are inclined to be very unfair in giving them no more than half (and even less) than the amount they would think of giving to waiters." This may be blind justice balancing her scales; for among tiptakers, women are generally rated poor tippers. "A woman can't do percentages," explains a philosophical hotelman. "She can figure out 10 percent in her head, but certainly not 15. So she leaves 10." Psychiatrist Gregory Zilboorg says, "In her traditional protected role, woman is not man's equal, but a plaything who does not consider it her business to tip."

Tiptakers rate salaried men, especially those in the liquor, tobacco, and advertising businesses, out-of-town buyers, and stockbrokers as among the most generous of men. Doctors, dentists, college boys, actors, politicians, musicians, company presidents, and expensively dressed people are poor tippers, according to those who ought to know. "Tips are expected according to appearance," says one authority, so, perhaps, in the last instance, clothes lead to higher expectations and greater disappointments. The most generous tippers, considering their income, are waitresses and taxi drivers.

How much is earned from tips? The Internal Revenue Service would like to have a hard and fast answer to that one. According to a restaurant-industry spokesman, the minimum that agency will accept for income-tax purposes is a report of at least $3 a day earned by waitresses in a chain restaurant of middling range. Internal Revenue denies the use of any such formula. In any case, such a rule-of-thumb estimate cannot be a reliable guide to earnings among the uncertain and inconstant byways of tipping.

Earnings from tips are hard to pin down. Unions representing workers who depend on tips for a living are reluctant to discuss the question. Tippers almost always overestimate the take of what they often consider "grapsing, outstretched hands." And the tip earners, themselves humanly fallible, frequently underestimate the amount of their take-home.

A waiter's minimum wage, as specified in the contract of a New York City hotel and restaurant worker's union, is $32.40 a week. An informed guess is that the average take-home in that segment of the food-service industry would run about double that or somewhere around the average weekly wage of a factory worker—about $80 a week. Other estimates, however, give the average waiter four times his daily wage in tips. In the swankiest white-tie hotel dining room, a waiter may make upwards of $200 a week. At the other end of the tipping scale, the average chambermaid will earn very little from tips.

Most bartenders and taxi drivers earn about half their living from tips, although cabmen also earn in commissions a percentage of the meter take. Here's what one cab driver calls an "average day." He puts $20 on the clock by picking up about 30 rides. He gets in commission, "say about eight bucks; the boss gets 12." He averages about $4 in tips. "Some days, I do better; others, worse."

Service captains and doormen earn about two-thirds of their income from tips. Very few live on tips alone, although a doorman of one very fancy nightclub is reported to

live very well on just tips. Apartment-house elevator men and doormen, janitors, and superintendents, who are tipped generally once a year, of course, do not depend on this source for income. One middle-income housing co-op—with 294 families—taxes each room a dollar, once a year, to raise about $1,200 to be divided among a superintendent, 2 guards, a firekeeper, 2 handymen, and 3 porters. This gives each man roughly $130, which may be some kind of average for this kind of tipping.

Tipping, from time to time, comes under attack from various quarters. For example, when unions were first organizing the restaurant industry, liberal-minded people used to leave a card reading, "I do not believe in tips; organize for a living wage," in place of the usual coins. But, neither the waiters nor the unions representing them were out to abolish tipping; they were seeking a "floor" under wages, and improvements in working conditions.

Nonetheless, opposition persists and is shared by persons of otherwise divergent views. An out-of-town businessman puts it this way: "It's not my responsibility to pay other people's wages. I only tip when I get extra favors." Some riders of taxicabs express their hostility by leaving the door open when they get out, if the driver fails to say "Thank you" when tipped. A union official says that the employer charges the customer for food and service, then pays waiters such low wages that he forces the customer to pay part of his wage bill.

In a backhanded sort of way, psychiatrist Zilboorg agrees with the critics. "Tipping," he says, "has nothing to do with service. There is a long, silent tradition that humans are either master or slave. The moderate tipper caters to frugality, but he thinks: 'Don't spoil the slaves.' The lavish tipper says money means nothing and believes all men are beggars."

Recently, a number of tip-wage earners have found that while they had to pay income taxes on the money they earned—whether in tips or wages—they only get social-security payments based on their wages, excluding tips. For many this has meant hardship. The Government, for its part, points out that it hasn't been able to collect social-security taxes on tips so there is nothing to do but pay benefits only on wages earned, which, in many cases, are very low.

The problem has become more acute as more people are now coming up for retirement. It was highlighted neatly in a recent case involving a banquet waiter for a New York hotel.

A banquet waiter earns his tips in a slightly different fashion from, say, an a la carte waiter. The latter depends wholly on the whim of the customer, who may or may not leave a tip as he chooses. But the banquet waiter is guaranteed his tip in the charge the hotel makes for the meal served. Actually it is more a surcharge than a tip. When someone contracts for a banquet, a menu is picked, a price agreed upon, and then the hotel adds a 15-percent charge to cover tips. This 15 percent is divided among the people who service the meal. A record of this is kept by the hotel.

When this particular banquet waiter retired, he found that he was only to get minimum social-security payments—a figure based on his wages alone. Believing he was entitled to the full benefit, based on his wages plus tips, the waiter appealed. It was decided that where service charges are placed on the bill, tips come under the Internal Revenue Service's definition of wages or moneys that may be credited for social-security purposes. Tips can be counted as wages, however, only if the employer requires from the employee an accounting of the actual or estimated amount of such tips. The ruling extended this narrow regulation to cover the banquet waiter's case. The court held that it was clearly evident the banquet department had the equivalent of such an accounting.

However, the same cannot be said of other restaurant employees, the a la carte waiters, or the many others who depend upon tips for a living. They still must pay income taxes on what they earn; but since most employers do not demand an accounting of what they earn in tips, they are not taxed for social security on wages plus tips. In effect, they suffer a loss when retirement takes place.

New York State encountered the same kind of problem many years ago in administering unemployment compensation. How much compensation is an unemployed worker, who earns part of his living in wages and part in tips, entitled to? If his employer is taxed on wages alone, the worker is entitled to a limited benefit, and certainly not the amount he would be entitled to if he worked in another job where he earned an equal amount of pay.

New York's solution was to empower the Industrial Commissioner to make rules concerning the value of board and lodging, tips, and gratuities. The value of tips is determined by a code that covers beauty-parlor operators; garage, gas station, and parking attendants; service employees in restaurants; dining-room employees in American-plan hotels and eating clubs; hotel-service employees; taxicab drivers; barbershop employees; baggage porters; pin-boys; checking-room attendants; and maritime-service employees. The rules covering each situation were worked out after a full public hearing in which employees, union representatives, businessmen, and others were heard. They have been in effect now for over 10 years.

The rules vary and were drawn up on the basis of tipping experience in the respectvie trades covered. For example, the value of tips to beauty-parlor operators, for unemployment-compensation purposes, is determined on the basis of an amount equal to 10 percent of the wages paid to them by their employers. The value of tips to banquet waiters is assessed at 100 percent of cash wages.

Applied to a la carte waiters, the procedure works like this. The waiter has a choice. He can declare in a signed statement to his employer the true value of what he has earned in tips or he can simply forget it. In the latter case, the employer must file a report in which the value of the tips is arbitrarily fixed at 7½ percent of the total table sales. The employer must pay his unemployment-compensation tax on wages plus this allowance for tips—or on the declared true value. Thus, the unemployed waiter gets the unemployment compensation to which he is entitled according to the intent and purpose of the law.

The hotel and restaurant unions in this State have urged that the Federal Government adopt a similar approach and apply it to the financing and payment of social security benefits. The problem has been discussed before congressional committees. Hotel and restaurant associations have testified that such formulas are not workable. "We cannot find how much the tips to our employees amount to," one hotel spokesman declared.

The Social Security Administration has been devoting considerable time and effort to studying the question of counting tips as wages. The agency is alive to the element of social injustice in the situation and has asserted its desire to find a just and satisfactory solution.

One of the difficulties in applying the New York administrative system of assessing the value of tips is the variation in tipping practices throughout the country. New York State had the same problem initially. The amount people leave as a tip in Buffalo is likely to be somewhat different from the amount left in a comparable New York City restaurant. But, considering the administrative headaches saved by the system—and the relative absence of resulting conflict between employers and employees—New York felt it was worth the risk of an imbalance. But the Federal Government would have a far greater disparity to cope with; therefore, Federal experts tend to favor some sort of compulsory reporting by tip earners.

In New York, more and more tip earners report true value rather than count on the employer's report and the arbitrary percentage-basis assessment. Perhaps one of the reasons for this has been the increased tightening in Federal enforcement of income tax collecting. Keeping the necessary records for a true report of tipping value to the New York State Division of Employment facilitates the accurate report of income to a Federal agency. With the same degree of compulsion, a Federal system of true value reporting would most likely set true retirement benefits.

The Crime of Bombing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of December 29, 1958:

CRIME OF BOMBING: SHOULD FEDERAL LAW APPLY?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

There is good reason to give serious second thought to the proposal which will come up in the new Congress that the bombings of schools and churches be made a Federal crime.

This legislation will have reputable sponsorship from Democrats and Republicans alike—from Democratic Senators KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and IRVIN, of North Carolina, Republican Senators SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, and KEATING, of New York, and others.

It is an easy solution. It is an attractive solution. It will be politically painless to support it and, perhaps, for a time politically embarrassing to oppose it.

But is it the wise solution? And is it the effective solution? I am not assuming that I have the final answer, but I do know that there are high officials in Washington close to this problem who question whether there is merit in making the bombings of schools and churches a Federal offense, and whether by so doing the law-enforcement agencies could perform a better job in coping with them.

The arguments which these officials would like the country and Congress to ponder are these:

1. Crime is primarily a local problem, and the primary, first line of defense must be at the local level.

2. Unless the local citizenry and local police have the authority and legal obligation to secure the peace, they cannot be expected to accept the responsibility. To dilute the obligation is to dilute the responsibility.

3. If the bombings of schools and churches be made a Federal crime—crimes which especially stem from local conditions—the effect of such a shift of authority is to cause local

officials to wash their hands of their duty. This makes it harder, not easier, to enforce the law.

4. Obviously there is much which the FBI can do in working with local authorities in dealing with this special kind of crime. But those who have first hand expeirence in these matters are convinced that the FBI can actually accomplish more without a new statute than could be accomplished under the terms of any new legislation thus far proposed.

The sum of these judgments is that to make such bombings exclusively a Federal offense or to divide enforcement responsibility would hurt the cause of law enforcement rather than help it.

No doubt the Senate and House will hold full hearings before Congress takes any such step. They will undoubtedly seek the opinions of Attorney General William Rogers and FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, and I would expect that they would testify to views very similar to the foregoing.

Mr. Hoover, for example, is already publicly committed to the proposition that the Federal Government ought not to weaken local responsibility. In the December issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, he says: "Just as experience proves that crime is a local problem, so the present threat from bombings can be most effectively diagnosed and combated on the local level."

Mr. Hoover puts a very high value upon an aroused public as a needed tool in dealing with all kinds of crime and it seems to me to be implicit in his recent statement that he thinks that making bombings a Federal offense would make it far more difficult to rally public opinion since responsibility would be shifted from the scene of the crime to Washington.

"There is," Mr. Hoover says, "no more powerful weapon against hatred and bigotry than overwhelming public indignation—embracing all creeds and races—against those individuals who by their vile deeds would desecrate our way of life."

It needs to be understood that the FBI can and is giving full-scale cooperation to local authorities in connection with these bombings, whether the FBI has jurisdiction or not. It is free to cooperate and it does. Can the FBI do more than it is now doing without taking over too much authority? And to divide authority tends to weaken, not strengthen, law enforcement.

On the Rounds With the General Practitioner of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in Iowa all of us are proud of the honors conferred upon Dr. Lonnie Coffin, of Farmington, Iowa, who was selected by the American Medical Association as the General Practitioner of the Year 1958. I am especially proud because Dr. Coffin is a constituent of mine, and it pleases me to see this recognition come to a man who has unselfishly devoted himself to serving his fellow man.

An article by William Barry Furlong, of the Chicago Daily News, was printed in the magazine section of the New York Times for Sunday, January 11, 1959. It is a wonderful tribute to Dr. Coffin, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article follows:

ON THE ROUNDS WITH THE GENERAL PRACTITIONER OF THE YEAR

(By William Barry Furlong)

FARMINGTON, IOWA.—On a recent weekend Dr. Lonnie A. Coffin, of Farmington, worked as usual—he saw 15 patients on Saturday, 4 on Sunday. "But I took Saturday night off to go to a party," he says, a little apologetically. The reason for the hometown party was Dr. Coffin's selection by the American Medical Association as the general practitioner of the year 1958.

At 68, Dr. Coffin is an anachronism in modern medicine. His career has spanned the eternity from horse-and-buggy medicine to the rocket age, but his philosophy has remained serenely unchanged: To take care of sick people, whether it's day or night, whether they're near or far, whether they're rich or poor. "That's the job of the doctor," he says firmly. "That's the least he can do."

For 10 to 12 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year for 42 years, Dr. Coffin has done his job. He has done it by horseback, buggy, by mule team, by rowboat, and by railroad handcar, as well as by auto. "One New Year's Eve," he says, "I took a mule team up to about 5 miles from a town named Croton. Then I got on a handcar and pumped 5 miles to town to deliver a baby." He grunted and half smiled. "That was a helluva New Year's Eve party."

He has done this kind of thing even when he knew there was little or no chance of payment. "All the time I stayed at their house," says a girl who formerly lived with the doctor's family, "I don't think he got a full night's sleep. Every night he had to go out on a sick call, sometimes going 30 miles on muddy, back-country roads. And that was during the depression, when he knew he wasn't going to get paid."

To the 899 people of Farmington, Dr. Coffin (for years he has met all humorous remarks about his name with, "Well, that's what they carry you off in and you don't have to worry about that") is as much a part of life as the frigid winters or the pine forests near town. He has spent almost his entire life in Farmington, delivered some 2,500 babies—2,000 of them, at homes, he says, "where babies should be born"—healed people when they were sick, advised them when they were unsure, solaced them when they were grieved.

His selection by the AMA, meeting in Minneapolis, touched off a celebration by the whole town. Hundreds of townspeople, along with the high school band, drove the 90 miles round-trip to the airport in Burlington to greet him when he returned from Minneapolis. Scores of others painted long, red-white-and-blue banners ("Welcome home, Doc" or "Home of doctor of the year") and hung them above the town's snow-packed streets.

"I couldn't have been prouder if it was my own father," said one woman.

"He's not just the outstanding general practitioner of the year," said one man. "He's the outstanding general practitioner of our time."

The attachment of the doctor to his town is deep and moving to see. He has observed the best and worst in its people and every home, every doorway, stirs up memories—some tender, some wry, all pleasant. Not long ago, on a 12-mile drive into the country to take care of a 72-year-old woman who had suffered a stroke, Dr. Coffin recalled a case and laughed. "About 4:30 one morning, the wife of this man calls and asks me to come out. He's a pretty old man—80-some—so I get out there right away. 'What's the matter?' I ask him. 'Got a cough, Doc. Got a bad cough,' he says. 'Uh-huh, how long you had it?' I ask. 'Since I was about 3 years old,' he says."

Dr. Coffin, a warm, happy man, laughed again. "Well, a lot of doctors who don't like night calls say that people are sick all day but never call you till it's night," he said. "That may be so—but that's because they feel a lot worse at night. And that's when you've got to go to them. You won't ever have to worry about socialized medicine as long as the doctors go to the sick when they need 'em."

Vigorously independent—and in no way a simple rustic—Dr. Coffin maintains a trenchantly practical attitude toward a problem which most physicians treat as gingerly as a third-degree burn.

In 10 or 15 years, if we don't change, we're going to see socialized medicine, he says. "I don't want it and I don't think most people want it. But it's going to come unless we do one thing to stop it: If the medical profession will go and see sick people and charge 'em a decent fee, you'll never hear any more about socialized medicine. That's all it takes—go and see the sick people and charge 'em a decent fee. Now, I might get cussed out by some of the big boys for saying that, but I don't give a damn."

What fees does Dr. Coffin charge? "Well, when I started it was $1 for an office call, including drugs," he says. "I make up my own prescriptions. Then it was $1.50 for house calls and $2 for night calls. Today it's $3 for office calls, including medicine, and $4 for house calls and $5 for night calls. But I don't charge 'em extra for night calls."

Obstetrics? "When I got started, the fee was $10," he says. "Then we"—the doctors in the county medical society—"got it up to $15 and then $25 or $30 and finally $50. Well, I thought $50 for delivering a baby was just wonderful."

Through the years, Dr. Coffin has maintained a certain insouciance toward financial matters. "I never ask 'em for money. I never send out bills," he says. "If they aren't able to pay, then I don't want 'em to pay. If people are honest, they'll pay eventually. If they're not honest, they won't pay—I don't see that it's worth while worryin' about."

The duties of the country doctor go far beyond medicine. Dr. Coffin has straightened out marital problems, picked up and delivered the groceries ("and paid for them if he knows his patients can't pay," says a friend), bought tickets for basketball games for youngsters who couldn't afford them and bought gowns for high-school girls who couldn't go to the junior-senior banquet without them.

Similarly, payment to the country doctor goes far beyond money. It is expressed in a muted gratitude and sometimes a depth of friendship that transcends the awkwardness over money. "When the bank failed in Farmington back in the depression, I lost everything but the money in my pocket," says Dr. Coffin. The next day, an old friend and patient dropped into his office. "I'd delivered 10 babies to his wife, 1 every year for 9 years, then skipped a year, then the 10th one," recalls Dr. Coffin. The friend said that if Dr. Coffin ever needed money, not to worry; just go to the bank in Keokuk, identify himself and everything would be taken care of.

A few days later, another friend and patient made the same arrangement. As it happened, Dr. Coffin needed $500 to pay a bill immediately. So he went to the bank in Keokuk and found his patients were as good as their word. "You just don't find that relationship in city doctoring," he says.

But Dr. Coffin concedes that city doctoring has become the trend in medicine. When he opened his practice in Farmington, four other doctors were already here. The other four have all since died—and no young doctors have arrived to replace them. "Today they all train for work in hospitals and

when there are no hospitals in a town they just turn thumbs down on it," he says. (Farmington has never had a hospital. The nearest such medical facility is a 23-bed hospital 18 miles away.)

Human nature stays pretty much the same, says Dr. Coffin, but medicine does not. The two most important advances in his time, he feels, are wonder drugs and transportation. "When I started a practice in Farmington, all five of us doctors together couldn't treat in a day the number of patients I handle alone now. We'd make one or two house calls a day and our whole day would be shot."

When he was born—on a farm 7 miles from Farmington on June 13, 1890—he weighed only 3 pounds. "His grandma put him in a shoe box on the open door of a warm oven to keep him alive," says a relative. When he was 5, the family moved to town and his father went to work as a clerk in a hardware store for $10 a week. Sometime later, his mother went to work in the woolen mills. So did young Lonnie. "That was my first trade, operating a loom in the woolen mills," he says.

The family had one dream in common: to send Lonnie to medical school.

By the time he had graduated from high school, the family had saved $2,000. "That's all it took—$2,000 to get through medical school," he says. At the Drake University Medical School in Des Moines, long since discontinued, he attended lectures and labs from 8 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. daily and for 4 hours on Saturday. In his spare time he earned his meals by washing dishes in the YMCA.

He interned at the Iowa Methodist Hospital and there met a nurse, Gretta Harmon, whom he married. (He has two daughters. His wife died in 1957.) In 1914 he returned to Farmington to set up practice. He borrowed $200 from the bank for an office and a second-hand Overland automobile. "I guess I've used up 15 or 20 cars since then," he says. "Those old high-wheeled model T's—they were the mud cars. Could go through anything. You'd upset 'em, then get out and set 'em back on their wheels and they were as good as ever." Today Dr. Coffin drives a red-and-white Ford.

Except for 2 years of service in the Army Medical Corps in World War I, Dr. Coffin has been in Farmington ever since 1914. There were good times and bad times.

"I delivered a lot of babies by coal-oil lamps and assisted at a lot of kitchen-table operations lit only by a lantern," he says. "I'd go to one house out in the country and all the folks out that way would come over to meet me there. That was the only way to get around to all of them."

Eight years ago, just after Dr. Coffin recovered from a heart attack, 26 local youngsters (including 3 of his 4 grandchildren) were stricken with polio. By that time he was the only working doctor in town. "That was a pretty strenuous time," he says. "In a polio epidemic, everybody is watching to get sick, and when they do they all think they're getting polio. So you've got to work harder than ever to take care of them."

As a general practitioner, Dr. Coffin can treat about 80 percent of all his patients without the help of a specialist. He deplores the rush toward specializing among doctors and among medical schools.

Nevertheless, medical education has greatly improved in Dr. Coffin's view. "I'll say this: The men who come out today are brilliant. But they're awfully dependent on a laboratory and a lot of equipment. I came out with my stethoscope and that was it."

Through the years, Dr. Coffin has developed some highly epigrammatic views on life, its pleasures and its temptations.

On liquor: "There are only two classes of people who should drink: Those who can control it and those who can afford it."

On hunting and fishing: "I used to like to hunt, but I can't walk so much in the cold air since my coronary. So I like to go out on a lake and fish—I can do that sitting down. If you catch something, fine; if you don't, you can lie about it."

On smoking: "Oh, no doubt in my mind it's bad for you. I gave it up for a year, after my coronary." He paused to light a cigar. "And I've given it up several times since then, too."

Dr. Coffin has lived a full, vigorous life in addition to one dedicated to taking care of the sick. He has been president of his county and State medical societies, and served 15 years on the Farmington School Board and 4 years in the town council. He has also known what it is to be one of the sick, himself; in addition to his heart attack in 1950, he suffered a cerebral hemorrhage in 1944, and he has been plagued by spinal arthritis for about 30 years.

"But you can't stop to think about how sick you are or when you're going to retire," he says. "All you can do is keep on going out to take care of the sick. That's what you're a doctor for."

The Businessman's Moral Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Dr. Louis Finkelstein which appeared in the September 1958 issue of Fortune magazine.

Dr. Finkelstein is chancellor and professor of theology at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York City. He is a student of the civil and ritual law of the Talmud and was the pastor of a congregation in the Bronx before taking up his assignment with the seminary. One of the seminary's interests is the Institute on Ethics, in which many Protestant and Roman Catholic leaders participate. These include F. Ernest Johnson, study consultant of the department of church and economic life of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.; R. M. MacIver, Lieber professor emeritus of political philosophy and sociology, Columbia University; and George N. Shuster, president, Hunter College of the city of New York. The article reflects numerous conferences Dr. Finkelstein has had with these men, as well as with outstanding business leaders.

The article follows:

THE BUSINESSMAN'S MORAL FAILURE—A DISTINGUISHED RABBI ARGUES IT IS A FAILURE THAT MAY DESTROY OUR SOCIETY

(By Louis Finkelstein)

If American businessmen are right in the way most of them now live, then all the wise men of the ages, all the prophets and the saints were fools. If the saints were not fools, the businessmen must be.

Too many businessmen never stop to ponder what they are doing; they reject the need for self-discipline; they are satisfied to be clever, when they need to be wise. They worry about their place on the economic ladder, but are not concerned sufficiently with whether the civilization in which they work is likely to collapse. They can defeat a local competitor, but may well be defeated by the competitor of us all, which is moral decay.

Now the American executive is very often a man of some vision, motivated by a spirit that generates great energy. Underlying the efficiency of our business community there is the principle of teamwork, cooperation, a reasonable degree of pleasure in the success of coworkers, a comparatively broad welcome to talent, and freedom in human relationships. Granted, these are virtues of no mean order. But the American businessman is losing his insight into the moral sources of American economic strength.

Our country could not have reached its present heights without the blessing of natural resources; but the United States would have failed at the outset without a philosophy developed by men more concerned with the betterment of the human spirit than the comforts of the body. These men were inspired by the writings of immortal philosophers and religious thinkers. The modern business leader is more often than not bewildered at the suggestion that the future of the Republic is in some way related to the ideals and ideas of John Locke, not to mention Spinoza, the medieval scholastics, the rabbinic sages, and the ancient Greek philosophers.

Ask the U.S. businessman why he is successful today, and he may explain to you the advantages of capitalism, the profit motive, and the American system. He may, with due modesty, point out the superiority of his own products and marketing. But he will largely ignore the philosophic foundations of the American system. He tends to ignore the great ethical laws as they apply immediately to his work. The truth is that he is preoccupied chiefly with gain, coasting on the spiritual momentum of the past, divorced from our sources of inspiration. He is the leading citizen of a largely hedonistic nation propelled by meaningless drives toward materialistic and frequently meaningless goals.

Clearly no institution will survive if it is dedicated only to self-preservation. A business has a goal beyond simple success. It is not a biological organism whose survival is a virtue in itself. Rather, it is a man-created institution, an integral part of our culture, and as such must make a contribution of service to society (as well as a profit for itself) if it hopes to survive. It cannot do this out of a focus on self gain or pride.

Why do I single out the American businessman for indictment, when he is probably no more materialistic than any of the rest of us? I do so because of the responsibility he bears, because his role in American society is so great. Ours is an industrial society, and the customs and morals and attitudes of businessmen pervade our whole life. Virtually all of us in America have adopted in some degree the pragmatic ethical standards of our business society; and to that degree we have abandoned our ethical and religious traditions.

THE AMERICAN TRAGEDY

Our American tragedy is that we fail to see the signs of our decay. But the signs are apparent in the vulgar ostentation all around us, in the sexual laxity revealed by the Kinsey studies, in the demoralization of American captives in the Korean war, in the widespread defiance of law. The signs are apparent in our general tolleration of wrongdoing, which is itself an evil and corrupting force.

Curiously, this breakdown of moral discipline has occurred when institutionalized religion is flourishing as never before. But even religion in America now tends to be superficial. For many laymen it consists of writing an occasional check and sporadic attendance at church or synagogue, rather than in personal commitment. There is a dearth of saints, and many ministers themselves are

unduly concerned with security in this world. While the percentage of truly dedicated pastors may be no smaller than in previous generations, today they suffer a special disability—a failure to communicate with the members of their flocks.

Human history is studded with the ruins of empires that came to a similar pass. Nations have been wrecked because they lacked an overriding moral goal to which individuals could commit themselves. History shows us that when we become success-dominated, we lose sight of our real reasons for living.

In its youth, America was ideal dominated. Both individual citizens and the country as a whole had an impelling motive in life that was not limited to industrial, political, or economic growth. The men who gathered in 1787 could muster all their intellectual energies to formulate the national charter, overcome differences of background and interest—all because these men were laboring for a larger goal.

An equally vital role awaiting the American businessman today will be suggested at the end of this article. Time and again in American history the businessman has transcended his industrial role and become the buttress not only of Government but of the public welfare. Today's crisis demands of him leadership in still another dimension—one where he has thus far conspicuously failed.

THE BOY IN THE DITCH

A young executive rapidly moving up the financial ladder unequivocally stated in private conversation with me: "It is impossible to conduct business in the United States today without breaking the law."

If the statement is exaggerated, it nevertheless retains distressing validity for one like myself who was educated in New York City and has resided there over half a century. A considerable portion of my time has been spent with men engaged in a great variety of businesses, who keep an equal variety of balance sheets.

The most casual observer is aware of the transgressions that go on daily in the American business community. He hears of tax returns that are outright perjury; he hears of purchasing agents who are taking bribes from suppliers, of businessmen offering bribes for false testimony or for police protection of some dubious enterprise. He reads of industries attempting to suborn State legislators for favorable legislation. He reads of businessmen bestowing favors on government officials to win special privileges. Even in my ivory tower on Morningside Heights, I have been urged by businessmen to accept a gift for the theological seminary in return for admitting a student—and have been threatened by withdrawal of contributions to the school if I failed to do so.

We hear of businessmen using wiretaps to obtain information about their competitors, of management acting in collusion with racketeers, of men using prostitution to promote the sale of their goods. We hear of businessmen violating the most elementary requirements of city building codes and profiting from rat-infested tenements. We hear of financiers deliberately lying about their operations and the financial condition of their companies to mislead investors so that insiders can make killings in stock.

There are less overt practices in the business community that may appear to be only on the borderline of unethical behavior: for example, concealing the true price of goods behind time-payment schemes that are actually usurious; employing advertising that is actually a flagrant misrepresentation of a product's worth. These and other clever dodges are accepted by many as normal phases of competition.

I would not deny that competition is the basis of our free enterprise and of our industrial success. Competition surely induces better efforts and greater production. But to compete in ways that are designed to destroy someone else is very different from competing in terms of doing better than your rival. Years ago in Lithuania, Rabbi Israel Salanter found two boys quarreling over which was the taller. One forced the other to stand in a ditch to settle the argument. Seeing this, Rabbi Israel sadly commented, "Isn't this characteristic of the world where to prove his superiority man must prove others inferior? After all, the same purpose could have been achieved by standing on a chair."

When two companies are each trying to produce superior values, one may well be more successful than the other, and deservedly earn greater profits. But to seek a crippling advantage over another company is hardly fair competition and is certainly miserable ethics.

It seems to me that a management which is worthy of success is very different from a management which just wants success. One management conducts its affairs in the spirit of contribution, the other in the spirit of selfishness. Contributions to the general good have of course been made by men seeking only their own advantage, but selfishness cannot be made a principle of life and in our time might easily be fatal. Management worthy of success remembers that the true justification for profit is an incentive to serve the community. Success is paid to business by the community for the services it renders. In this sense, profits must clearly be an earned increment.

THE PRACTICAL VALUE OF ETHICS

This reasoning can certainly be understood if stated in terms of the individual. We understand the meaning and value to the individual of a good reputation. Every businessman knows that his reputation for integrity is one of his major assets. Certainly, a man's progress in a corporation depends in large measure on the reputation he earns through his daily behavior. It is immensely difficult to falsify such a reputation over any extended period of time. We are soon known by those around us for who we are rather than what we would like others to think about us. This is a man's character in the profoundest sense of the word.

I was interested to hear a major executive point out that the criteria he uses for selecting employees run in this order: character, intelligence, experience. "A really bright executive picks up experience very quickly," he told me. "But the man we need and want most, in important places, is a man with character sufficient to resist many kinds of pressures when the going gets rough. We find, then, that character is the most important ingredient of all, particularly if the man is to be responsible for policymaking. An executive can buy brains and can buy experience, but character is something he must supply himself."

And what is a man's character but his personal moral dimension, the goals he sets for himself, his sense of honesty and of responsibility, his relations with others? This does not mean, however, that the value of character derives from its contribution to success.

Unquestionably, ethics have a practical value, inseparable from their ultimate one: the creation of better men and women. Rivalry for goodness should, in the long run, make for pragmatic gain. But it is not enough for the individual or the corporation merely to mean well. Men as individuals and as corporations must make an effort to understand what they are doing, and why they are doing it.

The first step in the ethical life is self-criticism. As the Talmud puts it, "Cleanse yourselves, and then cleanse others." Ethics is a branch of thought starting with self-discipline. Discipline, whether among children or adults, whether self-imposed or external, is not popular in America today. And a welter of codes—in companies, in industries, in combines of industries, in labor—do not meet the situation.

Before anyone can think creatively about the moral life, he must feel in his bones a few principles that are part of any civilized ethic, without which civilization would be meaningless. I wish I could say with hope of being understood that of these the most important is awareness of God and love for Him. But as those words tend to become cliches, I say instead that we have to feel the wonder and significance of life and its unique opportunity for achievement. Each of us has only one life on earth. When that life is used unwisely, the loss is irreparable for oneself and for one's fellows.

A businessman who understands these truths will develop an almost automatic pattern of behavior. Certain ancient rules apply with equal force to Jew and Christian, atheist and agnostic, to all men in all situations. These immutable laws are expressed in various ways. The Pentateuch reveals the Decalog and the Golden Rule of Leviticus 19: 18: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," which the Gospels restate in Matthew 7: 12: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." Similar commandments are promulgated in the literature of the other great traditions of East and West.

Yet these and other binding commandments are often violated in the American business community. A man fears he may be risking his business if he obeys them, forgetting, however, that if he violates them he risks the world.

Business leaders who generously advised me in the preparation of this article said, "The majority of the American business community are not evil men, and want to do right. Let us say we admit the indictment and accept our responsibility—what can we do?"

To begin with, a businessman can develop an awareness that every decision of his life involves moral considerations. He can help develop this sensitivity in employees and associates, through example, through discussing with them the moral implications of company actions, through constant reminders that he has values in life above profit or economic security.

There are some corporations which insist that their executives assume responsibility for civic and community improvement. But the businessman can go further. In his training school for management he can introduce students of ethics, as well as management experts and psychologists, to consider the responsibilities of the business executive. He can overcome his anti-intellectualism. He can try to gain knowledge that will clarify the problems of wise decisionmaking.

WITHOUT MORALIZING

The businessman must realize that the inculcation of moral sensitivity starts in early childhood and continues throughout life. American society has achieved this kind of indoctrination in other fields. To take two familiar examples: virtually every American child is brought up with a concern for personal hygiene; virtually every female child is indoctrinated with the need to be as physically attractive as possible. Our culture is probably unique in the emphasis it places on these two patterns of education.

The businessman can, without moralizing (which would be deadening and self-defeating), transform his home into a school for moral responsibility. Avoiding precept, the businessman can make even his conversation at table serve the vital end of character education for himself, his wife, his children, and his guests. The stories he tells, the gestures he makes, the conversation he

chooses and avoids, can all show that he has at least some notion of what life, America, and freedom are about. Without being in the slightest degree priggist, and eventually without self-consciousness, he may help his family and friends obtain insight into the ethical life.

The American businessman, then, should literally place ethics on the agenda—for himself at home and in the office, for his company and trade association:

His calendar should include regular meetings of management to discuss the moral dimensions in his specific business. One firm that instituted such meetings finds it continually gains valuable insights into new relationships with the many other organizations with which it does business.

He should seek expert advice on ethics. Existing resources in the field will gladly be made available to him.

He should put moral health on the same level as mental and physical health, indeed above them. This means he should read literature dealing with ethics; devote time to the study of ethics, alone and with colleagues and scholars; work for the establishment of research in ethics, as he has worked magnificiently for the development of research in science and technology.

THE BEGINNING OF WISDOM

Whatever else may or may not be involved in the application of such principles, it will demand direction of effort—not merely doing what one happens to like at a given moment and following the easy path of self-indulgence. Wisdom begins with sacrifice of immediate pleasures for long-range purposes. There is a widespread view that belief in God and personal immortality leads to this discipline. The fact, however, is that the discipline itself is also indispensable to real belief in God and human immortality. That is why the role of the businessman in American ethics is no less crucial than that of the religious leader or scholar.

Today's crisis demands the businessman's leadership in the area of human behavior. The kind of criticism with which enlightened businessmen could confront philosophers and theologians could be a challenge. Then superficiality in religion would cease to be fashionable, and laymen would soon detect its shallowness. Morally sensitive and informed businessmen can compel American philosophy and religion to focus on the basic problems troubling mankind.

We Americans will then no longer warrant William James' description of us as worshipers of "the bitch goddess, Success." Our best young minds would strive for genuine, rather than apparent, achievement. If we can overcome the tendency to measure intellectual productivity by quantity rather than quality, America might produce works and insights into the ethical realm comparable to the eternal creations that have emerged from other civilizations. Without such creations, rallying the spiritual energies of all men, America and the free world will not endure.

ONE MODEST STEP

Civilization needs men and women whose every act and decision will bear the stamp of responsibility. The world cannot long survive, at least in freedom, if decisions are made irresponsibly—that is, without disciplined consideration of individual and general consequences. At the present moment, this may seem almost impossible to achieve. Yet without many dedicated men and women exercising disciplined consideration of each of their actions, none of the great philosophic or religious traditions could have survived.

Modest steps to focus different types of experience on the complex issues of our day have been taken in various ways, one of which is the work of a group of scholars who drew together in 1939 in New York. The group includes physical scientists, social scientists, philosophers, and theologians of different faiths, who were stirred by the apparition of nazism but recognized it as a symptom of a chronic disease of our time rather than the disease itself. They hoped they could clarify today's moral problems. Once a year, sometimes once in 2 years, these scholars have met. Some participants are frankly agnostic, some atheistic, others devout. For a long time their discussions were at cross-purposes. There were frequent outbursts when varied types of mind and experience confronted one another. Gradually, they arrived at an astoundingly simple conclusion: the problem of their concern may be summed up in a single word—"responsibility."

This conference of scholars is hopeful of establishing nothing less than a World Academy of Ethics and an Institute for Practical Ethics for Everyday Living, drawing on the wisdom not only of Christianity and Judaism but of Islam, Buddhism, Confusianism, and other traditions. The scholars need the help and participation of businessmen.

Does all of this sound as though the American businessman had to take on new burdens, and rush even more prematurely to his grave? On the contrary, one of man's primary duties to himself, his family, the community, and to God is preservation of his life on earth, so that he can realize his potentialities for good. The businessman who will take time to contemplate and to ponder the ethical dimension of life will discover new realms in which he can develop his talents, freeing himself from the bondage to private gain that menaces the maturing business executive. Clearly understanding the principles of a meaningful life, he will share them with his family, especially with his wife. He will accept philosophically the occasional defeats and frustrations of his business career. He will carry his burdens serenely and thus preserve his own life, as well as that of the community.

A POTENTIAL MOSES?

Before he decides that the moral discipline required to build a better society is too arduous for him and that he is too busy to master a new dialect of thought, before he flees his responsibility, he might do well to ponder the story of Moses in the third chapter of Exodus.

The father of prophecy was heavy of tongue. He, too, preferred the ease of Midian and the pleasures of shepherd life to the burdens imposed by the leadership of men. He could not believe that the task presented to him could not be done by another. For a moment he doubted that it could ever be accomplished. But sometimes, because of unique combinations of circumstances surrounding him, an individual is indispensable for a specific role in history. Whether or not he wished it, Moses was one of the great spiritual leaders of mankind. He could neglect his duty, but he could not assign it to anyone else.

To rise to his full stature, the American businessman—who at his best embodies many of the prophetic virtues—must also shoulder a unique burden of responsibility. The fate of the world hangs on his decisions, for above all the world needs ethical leadership from those it respects as supremely practical.

The words spoken by Moses to his contemporaries more than 3,000 years ago apply literally to us in this latter day: "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil." If the American businessman can bring himself to choose life and good, he can save not only our own but future generations. Surely he will heed the ancient Prophet's plea. "Therefore, choose life, that thou mayest live, thou and they seed."

Hail Columbian Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 21, 1958, was a historic day in the annals of the legal profession of New York. Fifty-three members of the Columbian Lawyers Association were admitted to the U.S. Supreme Court. Two of them were women.

The Columbian Lawyers Association is a young bar association operating in the first judicial department of the State of New York. Its membership consists of more than 500 lawyers and is composed of lawyers of Italian origin who practice principally in the city of New York. Many of them are leaders in their respective communities. They are guardians of our traditions and the architects of our future.

This organization has among its aims the maintenance of a high standard of conduct for the legal profession and the selection of capable and learned judges to serve in our courts. They believe that in order to realize the American goal of equal justice before the law, lawyers must be skilled advocates with high standards of conduct and justices of courts must be learned and experienced.

I had the high honor and privilege of sponsoring 28 of these members for admission to the U.S. Supreme Court. My former associate in the New York County district attorney's office, now a justice of the domestic relations court, Louis A. Pagnucco, sponsored the admission of the other 25 Columbian members.

I was not surprised to note that Judge Louis Pagnucco, who guided and coached me when I was a fledgling assistant district attorney in the office of Frank Hogan, still befriends and guides other attorneys in their aspirations and endeavors. It was a pleasure for me once again to be with my dear friend, Judge Pagnucco, who was one of the greatest assistant district attorneys in the homicide bureau during the administration of District Attorneys Thomas E. Dewey and Frank S. Hogan. Judge Pagnucco, who possesses a doctorate of laws, is not only a brilliant lawyer and judge but also has the unusual talent of speaking seven languages fluently.

This journey to Washington was the realization of a dream of Thomas Cartelli, the first president of the Columbian Lawyers Association. Much planning and work was done to transport 53 active lawyers to Washington from the city of New York to house them and to prepare a program. Great credit goes to Mr. Cartelli and Sylvester Cosentino, the second president of this vigorous bar association.

Prior to being sworn in by Chief Justice Earl Warren, this bar group had the distinct privilege of meeting with As-

sociate Justice Tom C. Clark at a private hearing. Justice Clark renewed old acquaintances with some of the candidates. One of them, Arthur R. Martoccia, served as a U.S. assistant when Justice Clark was U.S. attorney.

Justice Clark addressed the candidates and enlightened them as to the workings and practices of the members of the court in arriving at a determination of an appeal before the highest court. As a consequence, the Columbian group can understand events which would otherwise have been mysteries.

One newly admitted member of the group was August Massa, who despite his complete blindness, is an active and successful barrister. Mr. Massa was a classmate of Justice William Douglas at Columbia Law School in the early twenties. It was a thrill to see Justice Douglas greet his blind classmate. They had not met each other in over 30 years.

My colleagues, JOHN J. ROONEY, Democratic Representative, of New York, and ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Democrat, of South Carolina, were present at the Supreme Court to witness this historic occasion and to lend their moral support.

After the admission to the Supreme Court, the Columbian lawyers had luncheon at the Congressional Hotel. Several Members of Congress attended the luncheon. Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO, of Brooklyn; PAUL A. FINO, of the Bronx; JOHN J. ROONEY, of Brooklyn; JOHN DENT, of Pennsylvania; GEORGE P. MILLER, of California; ROLAND LIBONATI, of Chicago; ROBERT GIAIMO, of Connecticut; and I, ALFRED SANTANGELO, addressed the group pointing out the significance of their membership in the U.S. Supreme Court and the pride that we felt in this legal demonstration. Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, sent greetings.

On the evening prior to their swearing in, Mr. Gaspar Morell, a successful Washington builder, formerly of New York, held a reception for the Columbian lawyers at his beautiful home on Kalorama Road on Embassy Row. His Excellency, Manlio Brosio, the Italian Ambassador, was an honored guest. He was accompanied by Dr. Paolo Savina, labor counselor of the Italian Embassy. Also greeting the lawyers was Commissioner Joseph Minetti. I cannot express fully the appreciation I and the Columbian lawyers feel for the hospitality of Mr. Gaspar Morell and his lovely wife, Anita Morell.

The roll of the newly admitted members to the Supreme Court is as follows: Andrew A. Adinolfi, Italo Henry Ablondi, Pasquale J. Amico, Anthony J. Cannistraci, Joseph Captain, Vito A. Cardo, Thomas Cartelli, Vincent S. Conti, John Copertino, Sylvester Cosentino, Gennaro L. Crispino, Joseph F. Cuccia, Mario J. Cusati, Alexander A. Delle Cese, Leonard P. DeNatale, Joseph F. Periconi, Vincent John deRosa, Vincent J. DiStefano, Anthony J. Edwards, Angelo C. Ninivaggio, Adolph C. Orlando, Edward Papantonio, Christopher L. Ribaudo, Henry D. Sforza, Frank C. Termini, Joseph J. Verdicchio, Miss Theresa E. DiCrocco, Lawrence N. Fariello, Miss Josephine Ferro, Joseph F. Fichera, Joseph W. Genzardi, Joseph N. Giamboi, Vincent A. Giaquinto, Michael A. Greco, Philip A. Greco, Nicholas P. Iannuzzi, Michael W. LaPenna, Salvatore A. Locurto, Richard D. Magro, Arthur R. Martoccia, Augustine F. Massa, Michael F. Mazzola, Anthony J. Mercorella, Mario Merola, Alexander Minella, Ferdinand J. Mondello, Richard J. Nardi, Louis C. Palella, Lino J. Pietrantoni, Joseph A. Robustelli, Thomas A. Signorelli, Vincent J. Velella, Frank J. Zeccola, and Ray V. Manfredi.

The president of the organization is Ferdinand J. Mondello.

Now that these lawyers have returned home to New York, leaving Washington richer because of their visit, I say to them, "Congratulations and Hail Columbia."

The Bipartisan Seminar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, a new institution began this year on Capitol Hill and I, for one, hope that it will grow and become a part of the permanent orientation process for new Congressmen. The purpose of this institution, which is called the Bipartisan Seminar, is to encourage the confidence of new Members by broadening their understanding of the legislative process. The meetings, held at the Coolidge Auditorium of the Library of Congress, were exciting and informative. Answers were given to perplexing problems which many times vex, annoy, and frustrate the freshman Congressman. Insight was given to us from our senior colleagues on the workings and the meanings of the rules by our beloved parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler; the problems of committee work for junior Congressmen by worthy and distinguished alumni of this body, Senator Engle, of California, and Senator Keating, of New York; the House as a changing institution was brilliantly analyzed and discussed by Senator McCarthy, of Minnesota, Senator Scott, of Pennsylvania, and George Galloway, of the Library of Congress. Particularly informative was the discussion by Congressman Baldwin, of California, Congressman Coffin, of Maine, Congressman Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey, and Congressman Udall, of Arizona. Participating in the opening session was the chief of the Washington Bureau of the New York Times, James Reston.

From this list of impressive and brilliant people one is quickly able to ascertain the importance of these meetings. I commend these gentlemen and I thank the bipartisan sponsoring committee: JOHN F. BALDWIN, Republican, of California; FRANK M. COFFIN, Democrat, of Maine; CARL ELLIOTT, Democrat, of Alabama; GERALD R. FORD, JR., Republican, of Michigan; PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., Republican, of New Jersey; JAMES G. FULTON, Republican, of Pennsylvania; MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois; and STEWART L. UDALL, Democrat, of Arizona.

I also thank the distinguished foreign policy expert, Dr. Jay Cerf, of the Foreign Policy Clearing House; the distinguished political scientist William Gibbons, formerly associate director of the American Political Science Association and now director of the Foreign Policy Index; and Dr. Paul David, of the Brookings Institution. Mr. Speaker, I thank these men and the organizations they represent for helping to make this seminar a success.

Simple Justice—House Joint Resolution 20, by Representative Philbin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House an editorial appearing on the front page of today's issue of the National Tribune-Stars and Stripes, renowned weekly newspaper devoted to the interest of veterans of all wars, which endorses legislation being sponsored by our valued colleague and my good friend, the Honorable PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

This measure is House Joint Resolution 20, which designates and defines veterans pensions as partial repayment of a debt owed by a grateful nation to its fighting men. The National Tribune-Stars and Stripes, which has raised its voice so effectively time and time again in the veteran's cause down through the years, signals the need for spelling out into law that our veterans are entitled to pensions, not simply as gratuities but as a matter of right.

Congressman PHILBIN has gained an enviable reputation as the devoted friend of the veteran. In this bill, once again he has shown his warm and humane, and ever active, interest in the needs and problems of the veteran and his dependents.

I am happy to join the National Tribune-Stars and Stripes in its endorsement of House Joint Resolution 20 and ask that the text of today's editorial be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The material follows:

PENSIONS ARE A RIGHT

In reading through the bills introduced in the early days of the 86th Congress relating to veterans and their dependents we ran across one particular bill with which the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes is in complete agreement. The proposed measure is a short one but its language is clear as crystal.

It was introduced by Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, and is known as House Joint Resolution 20 and the text of the resolution follows:

"That all monetary benefits awarded veterans of the wars of the United States,

and/or their dependents, by the Congress of the United States, on account of physical or mental disabilities incurred by said veterans in defense of their country, are hereby declared to be, both in law and in fact, a partial repayment of a debt owed by the Nation to such veterans and/or dependents.

"That the common-law doctrine holding such awards to be, as a matter of law, a gratuity, is hereby abrogated and annulled."

The bill in question speaks of physical or mental disabilities incurred by veterans in defense of their country. Even the most biased antiveteran group will agree with this.

But we would go a step farther and include the payment of pensions to aged and physically disabled veterans as a right earned honorably by reason of their service in time of war.

In the past we have traced the history of pension payments to war veterans from the time of Solon to the present day, and we have always found that a grateful country was quite willing to care for its old war veterans as a recompense for their service when their country needed them.

We say this down to the present day, but this is not correct for the past 20 years there has been raised a great outburst at the possible costs of pensions to needy war veterans. The opponents of pensions have cited astronomical figures as to this cost but when these figures are analyzed it will be found that they have little or no foundation of fact.

With our curious mind we looked up the definition of pensions in Webster's Unabridged Dictionary and find the following:

Pension: A stated allowance or stipend made in consideration of past services, specially a regular stipend paid by Government to retired public officers, disabled soldiers, the families of soldiers killed in service, etc.

Another definition of the word pension is something paid to one by way of subsidy or allowance whether as a means of securing goodwill, cooperation, or the like, or as a gratuity at to royal favorites or to men of eminence in art, literature, or science.

The definition as furnished by our authority is quite interesting. It speaks of a pension as something paid * * * to disabled soldiers, the families of soldiers killed in battle, etc.

It then goes on to speak of another type of pension which it calls "something paid to one by way of subsidy or allowance whether as a means of securing goodwill, cooperation, or the like, or as a gratuity, as to royal favorites or to men of eminence in art, literature, or science."

Now this second definition speaks of payment as some sort of gratuity, quite distinguished from the first definition.

Surely it cannot be said that the payment of a just pension to aged and disabled war veterans is a means of securing good will, cooperation or the like or as a gratuity to royal favorites. As a matter of fact, a check of the situation would indicate that if there exists such a thing as royal favorites in the United States of America, they cannot be counted in the ranks of the aged and needy veterans. The truth is that the very highest authorities in the land are opposed to granting pensions to such veterans.

This brings us down to January 14 when we were privileged to attend a dinner tendered by the National Legislative Commission of the American Legion to Members of Congress. Only one speech was made after the introduction of distinguished guests and that was made by Preston J. Moore, national commander of the Legion. We can truthfully say that our heart was warmed by his expressions on the policy of the Legion as it relates to war veterans.

After welcoming the distinguished visitors National Commander Moore gave the Legion's stand on national defense. Commander Moore went on to say:

"Building America's military, economic and moral strength for peace is our first obligation. To recognize this is not to deny the American Legion's historic and continuing responsibility to disabled veterans, their dependents and survivors.

"Nowhere are the needs of these Americans more completely understood than in the Congress of the United States. Nowhere is their entitlement to essential help more readily appreciated than in the Congress.

"You have built a sound structure of veteran benefits in response to the expressed will of a grateful people. In the veteran's hour of need you have extended America's heart and hand to him who served our Nation in its greatest hour of need. You have accomplished these things while advancing the best interests of our country.

"This service to America and its veterans requires and reflects a kind of statesmanship that merits the applause and appreciation of every citizen. We in the American Legion are especially grateful that you have given to our Nation's veterans and their loved ones your greatest understanding, wisdom, and leadership. As long as they are the beneficiaries of such responsible representation in the Congress we never need to fear for their future.

"America's future as a land of freedom and opportunity can be secured if we rely upon guided principles instead of guided missiles. We can safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy if we have faith in God, in ourselves, and in you who lead us."

As we have said, it was heartwarming to hear the leader of such a powerful veteran organization as the American Legion state in clear language the knowledge and understanding of the needs of our veterans and that his organization would not stand idly by if the veterans' cause was threatened from any source.

We are quite sure that all right-thinking men will agree that the veteran in need, who served his country in time of war, sometimes against his own desires but always with honor, is deserving of the Nation's gratitude when the time comes that he is no longer able to care for himself. If Webster's definition of pensions can be accepted then pensions become a right and not a gratuity as some sophists would have us believe.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, the legislature of the State of Nebraska has recently adopted unanimously a resolution memorializing Congress to enact a statehood for Hawaii bill. For the information of my colleagues, I wish to enclose that resolution, which follows:

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii is vital to the defense of the United States; and

Whereas said Territory has greatly contributed to the economic and cultural life of the United States; and

Whereas the people of said Territory have demonstrated their maturity, responsibility, and willingness to accept in full, and ability to discharge, the responsibilities that accompany citizenship in one of the States of the United States; and

Whereas not only principles of fairness, but also considerations of mutual benefit to said Territory and the States of the United States demand that said Territory be granted immediate statehood: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 69th session assembled—1. That the Members of Congress are hereby memorialized to grant immediate statehood to the Territory of Hawaii.

2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States.

DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
President of the Legislature.

Stop the Use of U.S. Mail To Spread Hatred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, the opening day of the 86th Congress, I introduced a bill calling for the most severe penalties for anyone bombing or attempting to bomb a house of worship, a school, or other public building. Closely associated with the recent wave of bomb terrorism is the dissemination of hate material through the U.S. mails which is a major factor in stirring up race hatred and inciting acts of lawlessness.

I am, therefore, now introducing two more bills which are intended as companion measures to my earlier bill to outlaw bombings. One of these measures seeks to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the transmission through the mails of communications which are intended to incite hatred on account of race, creed, color, religion, or national origin. A fine of $1,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or both, is prescribed in this bill for anyone who knowingly uses the U.S. mails for delivery of cards, pamphlets, circulars, books, or other matter wihch is regarded as nonmailable under this act.

The other bill is very similar in language, except that it prescribes that material which is intended to incite racial or religious hostility shall not be conveyed in the mails, and shall be withdrawn from the mails under such regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe. In other words, this bill is intended to give the Postmaster General the authority to withdraw such matter from the mails or refuse to convey it, while the first bill makes it unlawful to mail such matter and prescribes a fine.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make it clear that my bills are not intended to hurt basic American freedoms, especially freedom of the press and freedom of expression. They are intended primarily and solely to strike against the peddlers of racial and religious hatred, the crackpots and the lunatic fringe who are

spreading poison against various segments of our people, without realizing how they themselves by their own vicious tactics are undermining American democracy, our way of life, our free institutions, and our religious faiths which are the strongest bulwarks and the most powerful influence in the struggle against communism.

The purpose of these hate sheets which are flooding the country is only to foment trouble and to arouse hatred of Negroes, Jews, Catholics, foreigners, and others. We live in a crucial era when unity of the American people is the crying need of the hour in order to be able to cope with a godless enemy who seeks to destroy us. At such a tragic period in human history, these irresponsible rabble rousers are playing right into the hands of the Communists by spreading dissension, mistrust, and hatred in our own ranks.

Our laws forbid the distribution of seditious literature through the mails because it is treasonous. They forbid the dissemination of pornographic literature because it corrupts our youth and incites them to criminal acts. What can be more treasonous or criminal than this hate material which is equally destructive of everything that America stands for? Pitting race against race, inciting one segment of our people against another, is no less seditious because it serves only the interests of America's enemies.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time to put a stop to the deliberate use of the U.S. mails for spreading race hatred and to use it as a medium for hate propaganda. This is not what the mails are intended for. The demagogs and hatemongers are exploiting a major medium of communication to serve their own sinister purposes. Postal authorities report that in recent years the volume of hate material going through the mails has increased substantially, but under existing laws they are powerless to prevent the distribution of this material through the mails.

It is for this reason that I am introducing my bills. I believe that this problem can and should be dealt with through legislation. I urge the Congress to give these measures early consideration.

Protest on Federal Tax on Motor Fuels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication I received from representatives of member organizations of the Connecticut Highway Conference:

Representatives of member organizations of the Connecticut Highway Users Conference, present and voting at meeting today in Hartford, went on record unanimously as strongly protesting President's proposal for further increase of 1½ cents per gallon in Federal tax on motor fuels and/or any increase in any of the Federal automotive excise taxes.

They adopted a resolution stating "The highway user is already carrying an excessive burden on taxation, at both Federal and State levels, and has borne the entire cost of the Federal trust fund since it was established in 1956."

Connecticut motor vehicle owners now paying grand total of $51.8 million a year in special Federal taxes levied upon them, including $23 million in present Federal tax on motor fuels alone. This in addition to State gasoline taxes and licensing fees and all the general taxes, Federal and State, that everyone pays.

Proposed increase in Federal gasoline tax would add more than $11 million annually to Connecticut motor vehicle owners' taxes.

The Neglected Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which follows is, I think, pertinent to our situation in West Virginia, as it relates to the depressed condition of our coal industry.

I submit this in the hope that it will continue to call attention to a situation which has thoughtful residents of our State involved in consideration of the basic problem of how to survive in an economy based largely on the coal industry.

The article I submit is from the Charleston Daily Mail of January 19. It was written by Mr. John D. Maurice, the able editor of the newspaper, and whose views command wide respect in my State.

FOR SAGGING PEANUTS SOME PROMPT RELIEF—FOR AILING COAL THE BACK OF THE HAND

When the price of peanuts begins to sag, something happens in Washington. The farm bloc goes into action, and something is done to spare the peanut farmer the severest consequences of overproduction in peanuts. Much the same is true of wheat, cotton, and corn.

If Wisconsin's dairy farmers can't sell all the cheese they can make—and they make plenty—the Government takes action. It doesn't necessarily make good sense, but the Wisconsin dairy farmer is not left alone to subsist on his miscalculations.

When the Bolivian economy begins to fall apart, thanks to expropriation of the tin mines, Washington takes notice. In the interests of solidarity and to shore up the Bolivian economy, the Federal Government is spending millions of dollars on and in Bolivia.

In all the free world, in fact, it would be hard to find a place where the American Government is not dedicated, for one reason or another, to relieving or countering the normal and often harsh application of strict economic law. Among the world's underprivileged nations, there is scarcely a one which has not appealed to Washington and received there some ointment for its economic bruises.

Indeed, it is now economic doctrine in the Nation's foreign policy, supported by both parties, that it is the inescapable mission of the United States to assist to the limit of its abilities in raising the living standards of the whole world. The only remaining question is not whether or no, but how much.

Let the coal business hit the skids, however, let the coal miner go on relief, and what happens? The answer is very nearly nothing.

Washington sends polite word that what West Virginia needs is new industry and ought to set about getting some. As advice this is excellent. But it does not go unnoticed that only a short time ago Secretary Dulles offered to build the Aswan Dam for the Egyptians and would have done it, too, if Nasser had not overplayed his hand.

It leads to a question which may be stated something like this:

Why is it that Washington will consider almost any answer, including some palpably foolish and even ruinous ones, as an answer to the farm problem, and fairily dismiss the coal problem as something of no concern?

Or, why is it that Washington will program almost any form of technical assistance and outright subsidy, so long as it is headed overseas, and wash its hands of the depressed coal miner?

What is the difference?

The answer, we suggest, lies almost wholly in the kind of voice and appearance West Virginia makes in the Nation's Capital. For reasons which lie deep in the State's political history what happens to West Virginia counts considerably less in the determination of national economic policy than what happens in Wisconsin or Bolivia.

When the farm economy sags, the farm bloc goes into action. Something must be done to see that the farmer receives for what he has to sell a price commensurable with the price of what he has to buy.

When the Bolivian economy goes into a tailspin, the State Department takes notice. If at all possible, Bolivia must be propped up.

But when the coal business goes into a prolonged decline, throwing thousands of families on permanent relief, West Virginia cannot even get the audience normally extended as a matter of diplomatic courtesy to the bandit chieftain of some hostile tribe.

Address by Stanislaw R. J. Suchecki

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an address delivered in the Lowell Auditorium, Lowell, Mass., by Stanislaw R. J. Suchecki, national director, Polish American Congress, and president of the eastern Massachusetts division, at the ceremonies commemorating the 350th anniversary of the arrival of the first Polish settlers in Jamestown, Va., on October 1, 1608. These ceremonies were held on October 19, 1958. The address follows:

The Polish nation from its earliest beginnings, about 965, has been linked very closely with the Western World and its culture and civilization. By the earliest part of the 16th century, Polish culture was representative of the best of the European renaissance. This was the heritage which gave the world

such notable figures as General Kosciuszko, Count Pulaski, Henryk Sienkiewicz, Joseph Conrad, Chopin, Paderewski, and Madame Maria Sklodowska Curie.

Recently when restrictions were eased in Poland, the people again turned to the West to renew their old bonds of friendship. For centuries, the West, and particularly the United States of America, have been a symbol of the freedom the Poles cherish so deeply. In fact, fully 12 years before the Mayflower came to Plymouth, the first Poles, attracted by these same ideals, landed on American soil in Jamestown, Va., on October 1, 1608.

The Poles are credited by historians with:

1. Helping save the first English settlement in America from total failure.

2. Building the first industry in the New World.

3. Saving the life of the colony's first president, Capt. John Smith.

4. Calling the first strike in America. This they won. But it should be noted that the strike was called to gain their right to vote in the new settlement along with the Englishmen, and not for economic gain. The first strike in America—not for higher wages but for civil liberties.

5. Manufacturing of the first export goods in America. Within 2 months of the arrival of the Poles in Jamestown, an English ship returned to England carrying the first export of manufactured goods, soap ashes, tar, pitch, green glass bottles, and vases.

All this and far more about the contributions of Polish craftsmen and workers are to be found in the dusty annals of American history, hidden far too long.

In reviewing the glorious history of the Americans of Polish descent in our Nation, let us not forget Poland today. If Kosciusko and Pulaski were alive today, they would say: "Fight for the freedom of Poland. Do everything in your power to bring justice to Poland, because Poland is now the test case of freedom, as was your nation in 1776." Let us all repeat in our hearts the opening words of the Polish national anthem, "Poland is not lost, ere we live." "Jeszcze Polska nie zginela, poki my zyjemy."

Let us forever cling to our great traditions of freedom and never cease to fight for the freedom of Poland.

Today, when totalitarian tyranny from the East has again overwhelmed Poland and threatens the peace and security of the entire world, this spirit, the unconquerable spirit of men like Count Pulaski, whose anniversary we celebrated only last week, not only inspires the resistance movement of his fellow countrymen, but serves as a reminder to all mankind that there can be no compromise with evil.

If freedom fails in Poland, it will fail in all of Europe. Let us remember the great heritage of those who went before us so that it may guide us in our determination to defend the dignity of man everywhere as a creature of God.

Hon. George H. Christopher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., Holden, Mo., containing an editorial from the Pleasant Hill Times, Pleasant Hill, Mo., relating to Congressman CHRISTOPHER:

HOME SWEET HOME

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

Miss Martha F. Redford recently wrote "Holden, 1858–1958, Town of the Prairie." It is a very fine book, but only those who have lived in the community will appreciate it completely. If anything, the community has become sweeter with the passing of the years. Many of the residents have followed the "Discipleship Pledge":

"I will live my life under God for others rather than for myself; for the advancement of the kingdom of God rather than for my personal success.

"I will do my utmost by prayer, investigation, meditation, and service to avoid drifting in my work in life, and to seek out the place and form of work where I can become of the largest use to the kingdom of God.

"As I find my place of largest usefulness, I will prepare for it and follow it, under the leadership of Christ, wheresoever it takes me, cost what it may."

My mother, Mrs. G. S. Reuter, and I enjoyed the celebration very much, but we liked the pageant the best. "The First Hundred Years" was directed by Mrs. E. Ben Cast. It was divided into the following scenes:

1. "New Frontier."
2. "A Town Is Born."
3. "Singing Rails."
4. "Strutting Our Stuff."
5. "Nineties So Gay."
6. "Turn of the Century."
7. "From Holden to Tipperary."
8. "Roaring Twenties."
9. "Turbulent Times."
10. "Vision of the Future."
11. "Happy Birthday."

Holden has always appreciated greatness and is quick to note it. One such example is cited from the Holden Progress of Thursday, October 16, 1958, page 2. This editorial was quoted from the Pleasant Hill Times, and it was very fitting. The editorial read:

"OUR EXTRAORDINARY CONGRESSMAN

"GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER, the Bates County dirt farmer who represents the Fourth District in Congress, is an extraordinary man.

"A horny-handed son of toil, this Congressman can hold his own in debate with the sharpest wits in the House and is an interesting man to listen to anytime he takes the platform.

"He has never been downed by adversity, either the kind that put him on the WPA in the early thirties or the kind that forced surgeons to amputate one of his legs early this year.

"He is a battler, and one of the greatest fighting advocates of true farm parity the Congress has.

"He is a liberal Democrat in the Roosevelt tradition and never a fence straddler, a Congressman who can always be depended upon to take the part of the small businessman and the laborer as well as the farmer.

"The Fourth District, mixture that it is of metropolitan and rural Missouri, is one of the few districts of its type in this country that is represented by a real farmer. The rural counties are particularly fortunate in having GEORGE CHRISTOPHER as their Congressman.

"It ought to be a whopping big majority they give him in November—just as they did in the August primary."

Holden was right again and Congressman CHRISTOPHER won by a large majority. This community of public-spirited citizens, fine homes, healthy businesses, productive farms, superior schools will continue to progress. The next hundred years will be even greater.

Britain's Fears of Two-Power Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following views of Mr. Walter Lippmann which appeared in the news on January 20, "Today and Tomorrow—The Morning After":

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Jan. 20, 1959]

TODAY AND TOMORROW—THE MORNING AFTER

(By Walter Lippmann)

Mr. Anthony Nutting, writing from London on Mr. Mikoyan's visit, has succeeded in demonstrating how hard it is for even the friendliest nations to understand one another. Mr. Nutting reports that it is being seriously debated in London whether the United States is moving toward a two-power deal with the Soviet Union. After a long report on how much our motives are suspected in Europe, he proceeds to lecture us on what we must do to make our European friends feel better about us. What we must do, according to Mr. Nutting, is precisely what in fact we have been doing day by day, namely, to make a full and reassuring report to all our NATO partners, and to discuss and agree with them on future policies and procedures. "A failure to do these things, which we are doing," says Mr. Nutting quite solemnly, "would be playing Russia's game beyond the point of safety."

If this is the kind of uninformed suspicion which exists in London, it is enough to make anyone despair of the effectiveness of a free press. Here are two allies, both speaking the same language, both enjoying free institutions, both able to print and to read whatever they choose, both committed to the same international ideals, and yet a writer with connections in official quarters in London suspects us of being so foolish and so disloyal that we are contemplating a two-power deal at the expense of Europe.

For my part, I do not expect us to be understood or trusted in Moscow. But we have, I submit, earned the right to be trusted by our closest allies. We do not betray our friends, and the suspicion that we are so gullible that Mr. Mikoyan can sell us into betraying our friends is an affront to the honor of America and an insult to its intelligence.

The public part of Mr. Mikoyan's visit seems to me to show that between the Communist world and ours there can on the great issues be little free and open communication. We live in very different worlds. We see things with very different eyes. We judge them with very different minds. The best we can do is to negotiate cautiously more or less at arm's length. But the kind of full understanding needed for political cooperation is a very long way off. It is, therefore, absurd to invite Mr. Mikoyan to subject himself to a public exhibition like "Meet the Press" and it is absurd for Mr. Mikoyan to accept the invitation to do that. The show on Sunday was as useful as an attempt to mate a whale which lives in the sea with an elephant which lives on the land.

Those who have studied carefully the problem of communication between the Soviet Union and the West know that the communication cannot be general but must be specialized. The mathematicians and the physical scientists can communicate with one another. So can the engineers or the

agriculturists. So can artists. So can experienced and sophisticated statesmen. So can ordinary tourists meeting ordinary people. But Mr. Mikoyan cannot talk to the American people in the mass nor could Mr. NIXON talk, even if he had the freedom of the Soviet radio, to the Russian people in the mass.

As to the results of Mr. Mikoyan's tour, they cannot be measured by the crowds and the headlines, by the curiosity of the people who saw him or by their courtesy. The results of the visit will be tested as we see whether or not we are moving toward negotiations on the whole German question. For surely that was the real objective of Mr. Mikoyan's visit, as it is the objective of the Soviet gambit in Berlin.

His purpose cannot have been to enter a popularity contest, for which he is at little qualified as he would be for a beauty contest. If the purpose of his visit was to open up the German question, he is not going home empty handed, For the President and Mr. Dulles have shown that they hope to make the German question negotiable if Moscow is seriously interested in negotiating.

The Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Paul Ord, editor of the Childress Reporter, at Childress, Tex., has posed a provocative and age-old question for the new year. In the January 15 issue of the Reporter, he has editorially submitted the question of the hour as well as his studied answer. The Reporter is a weekly newspaper which has served Childress and surrounding Childress County well for approximately 12 years. Under unanimous consent, I insert herein the editorial that all Members may have the benefit of Mr. Ord's splendid comments:

THE QUESTION

Just about everything in this country has been getting bigger.

This trend, the economists confidently tell us with hardly a dissenting voice, is not only sure to continue but to accelerate. They blueprint a future of ever-increasing incomes, ever-improving living standards, the mass enjoyment of luxuries which would have been beyond the imagination of man not long ago.

We are on the verge of explosive breakthroughs in physical sciences. The age-old mysteries of space are being fathomed, and soon will be mysteries no more. The miracles of nuclear physics are at hand. Longer, healthier, happier lives for all are promised. And we are not alone. All over the world, peoples and nations are swept along, to varying degrees, in the same tide.

This is fine. Almost everyone wants more money, more of the things that money can buy, more of what we know by the word "progress."

Yet a nagging question arises—the biggest unanswered question that confronts the changing world. While just about everything is getting bigger, is the greatest resource of all getting smaller? That resource is the individual. Not just people in the mass, but individual people—each different, each unique, each a spirit as well as an appetite. Is the individual in very real danger of being dwarfed by the bigness around him, and of being reduced to a statistic?

It's easy enough to say that it can't happen here, even though we have all seen it happen in vast reaches of the earth. Easy enough, but untrue. This Nation was founded on certain concepts—the fullest freedom for all, an unflagging sense of the spiritual nature of man, a passionate regard for the worth of every individual human being. But these, like all other concepts and philosophies, will wither away to nothingness unless they are eternally prized beyond all else and faithfully protected. They must be supported in absolutely specific ways. They demand the highest degree of individual independence and responsibility. If, for instance, we give to government the initiative and the power to regulate and dominate our lives in the name of security, the ultimate end will be the security of the penitentiary. Power once granted to government must always be balanced against a greater power in the hands of the people.

We pride ourselves on our material achievements. But pride can result in a deadly blindness. Other nations, whose concepts are utterly opposed to ours, are producing their own wonders. Communist Russia and Communist China are, so to speak, moving mountains. The whip and the chain, used with dedicated ruthlessness, can also get out the goods, while the soul of man dies.

It took centuries of turmoil, war, and revolution to establish the rights of man—the rights of the individual. They can be lost overnight by sins of omission no less than sins of commission. A people whose eyes and minds are fixed on material ends alone will not long remain a free people. They will become merely instruments of power.

There is no foreseeable limit to what we, through our economics, social, and political organizations can achieve. It wil be the ultimate irony if, in the light of this, we surrender the individual to material bigness—whether in government or anywhere else. We never had a more urgent need to uphold age-old principles and convictions that make for the only worthwhile kind of progress—confidence in something, faith in ideals, fairness, the determination to defend what one believes to be right.

Walt Whitman wrote, a century ago: "The whole theory of the universe is directed unerringly to one single individual—namely, to you." Man in the mass must never hide the face of the individual man.

The Administration's Development Loan Fund Request: Shirking Our International Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the aspiring peoples of Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America—those with the greatest need for help along the road toward economic development—may be our best friends in the future. Congress set up the Development Loan Fund 2 years ago in order to assist underdeveloped peoples by loans—not by grants—to help themselves.

The Congress felt that the "revolution of rising expectations" of people emerging from backwardness should be assisted by us for its own sake. But we well know that the Communists are also exploiting this revolutionary surge in the underdeveloped countries for their own purposes. In less than 3 years, Communist Russia has extended $1.7 billion in long-term low-interest loans for economic development. Communist trade agreements with underdeveloped countries increased from 49 in 1953 to 147 in 1957. Trade between the Soviet bloc and the underdeveloped areas is 50 percent greater than it was 2 years ago. Today, more than 2,000 students from these areas are studying in Moscow and other Soviet centers. Some 2,300 Soviet technicians are now at work in the underdeveloped areas.

The Development Loan Fund was off to a good start. Two years ago Congress gave it a needed 2-year authorization, to insure some continuity of administration. The congressional authorization for the Development Loan Fund for the current fiscal year, that ending June 30, 1959, is $625 million.

Since the Development Loan Fund began operations just a year ago in January 1958, it has had a profoundly constructive, although limited, effect on the health of the underdeveloped world. Of the $3 billion of applications made in the last year, to the end of January 1959, $700 million have been committed in loans, $500 million have been rejected as not sufficiently worthy, and $1.8 billion of applications which are deemed worthy but for which no funds are available, are on file. Applications for further developmental loan capital are still pouring in. It is anticipated that valid applications on the order of $3 billion will be on hand before the Development Loan Fund in a matter of weeks.

The Development Loan Fund is financing basic economic facilities, such as roads, ports, power, communications, and irrigation, and is loaning to private industry. The Development Loan Fund will also be a source of United States contributions and support to regional development institutions as they come into being.

Here are some illustrations of the type of loans being made by the Development Loan Fund:

In Taiwan a loan of $21.5 million to assist in financing the cost of the Shihman Dam project in the northwest to produce power needed for further industrialization, flood control, and water supply. Shihman will increase the total power available to Taiwan by 15 percent and provide a water supply for 340,000 persons and irrigation of 140,000 acres.

In Pakistan a loan of $4.2 million to assist the privately owned Pakistan Industrial Credit and Investment Corporation in extending loans to private borrowers for the purchase abroad of machinery, equipment, materials, and services for economic development purposes.

In Liberia a loan to a joint American-Liberian private company of $190,000 to assist in financing the costs of expanding existing sawmill operations.

In Honduras a loan of $5 million to a large-scale road program being under-

taken by the Government of Honduras. Proceeds of the loan are being used to help construct a new 45-mile paved highway serving one of the most populated regions of Honduras and to improve a highway linking the capital with the Pan-American Highway and Pacific ports. The DLF financing supplemented a $4,500,000 loan by the World Bank for the import of equipment, materials, and services required in this project.

In Ceylon a loan of $1.6 million toward the purchase abroad of equipment and materials required to continue Ceylon's irrigation and land development program and to assist in rehabilitating 29 major reservoirs and 1,200 village reservoirs breached in the winter floods of 1957–58.

In Paraguay a loan to a private U.S. firm, the International Products Corp., of $2.6 million to assist in modernizing and expanding its operations of ranching, meat packing, and production of quebracho extract.

In Turkey a loan of $10 million to assist privately owned Industrial Bank of Turkey to make small- and medium-sized loans for the expansion of industry.

For many months now, the administration has been telling the people of this country, and of the world, that America's international responsibilities require, for the 1960 fiscal year, a considerably expanded use of the Development Loan Fund. It must be set up on more than a 2-year basis, the administration has rightly proclaimed, and it must have loanable funds at its disposal at a rate of $1 billion a year.

Thus Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs C. Douglas Dillon, testifying before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on March 11, 1958, said:

You may ask why, if the executive branch believed last year that long-term financing was needed for the Fund, we, have not renewed the request this year.

We have not done so through any belief that the need has diminished. In fact, international developments during the last year have convinced us even more firmly, if possible, that long-term assurances of funds is necessary to obtain the maximum results and so is essential to the future peace and security of our country and the free world. However, we recognize that the House of Representatives determined last year that the Fund should be established with capital sufficient for only 2 years as a trial and that consideration of longer term financing should be postponed until the Congress can have for it the record of requirements and performance for this initial period.

We are abiding by that decision, and we are deferring until next year proposals for the longer term financing which I had said we are more than ever convinced is essential. In the meantime, our experience, thus far, has demonstrated overwhelmingly that the appropriation of the full $625 million now authorized, is needed for the coming fiscal year.

Under Secretary Dillon, in an address to the Foreign Policy Association at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on May 21, 1958, said:

The less-developed countries are fully prepared to bear the major burden of their own economic development. But to acquire the industrial techniques and the machinery and equipment which they cannot yet make for themselves they need help from the industrialized countries. As the greatest industrialized country of the world we must accept the responsibility for leadership in this field.

This means that we must lift our sights. In the fields of international development assistance, international finance, world trade and private investment we must find ways of doing more than we are doing now. For unless we meet the challenge of the times, our own safety, let alone our economic well-being, will surely be placed in the gravest danger. * * *

For the future, I believe that we should contemplate a higher level of lending from the Development Loan Fund, something on the order of $1 billion a year. I believe that such an amount could be spent wisely in stimulating development abroad and would be warranted by considerations of our national security.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles spoke movingly to the United Nations General Assembly at New York City on September 18, 1958:

Economic development is, of course, an aspiration shared by all peoples. In the newly independent nations, and indeed in many long independent, there is a burning desire for economic and social progress, for higher levels of living, for freedom from the slavery of poverty.

Much has been accomplished already. The American people admire the vigorous efforts of the leaders and the peoples of less developed countries to help themselves. Yet much remains to be done.

The United States believes the time has come for the nations of the world to take stock of accomplishments to date and to chart anew long-term courses of cooperative action.

We propose that the nations dedicate the year 1959 to these purposes.

Let me mention some of the major steps that the Uinted States would be prepared, subject to action by Congress as appropriate, to take or support in the coming year:

1. The United States will carry forward its existing development financing programs on a vigorous and effective basis. * * * The great challenge of poverty and disease can only be met by vigorous realistic action. The United States stands ready to play its full part in this great peaceful crusade.

Again, on November 7, 1958, Under Secretary Dillon, addressing the World Affairs Council of Northern California at San Francisco, said:

In my view a most serious threat of all is the Soviet economic offensive. * * * I believe that we must place our chief reliance in meeting the Soviet challenge on the mobilization of our economic and technical resources, both public and private, to help raise the living standards of the less privileged nations of the world. * * *

During the past 12 months, our country's responses to their needs has taken many forms. Perhaps the most striking is the Development Loan Fund, which has added a whole new dimension to foreign loan program. The Fund, which began operation early this year, represents a new hope for the underdeveloped countries. * * *

At the present rate of operations the Fund will have committed all of its available resources within a few months which means an annual rate of operations of about $700 million. I believe that we should contemplate a still higher level of lending from the Development Loan Fund, something on the order of $1 billion a year.

Three days later, in his address to the Colombo plan meeting at Seattle, Wash., on November 10, 1958, President Eisenhower joined the crusade:

Our task is a great one. It will take many years to fulfill. Yet if we undertake it boldly, with wisdom and determination, we can and will succeed.

What are the steps that we should take?

First, we must keep in mind our goal. That goal is to enable free nations to achieve a momentum of economic progress which will make it possible for them to go forward in self-reliant growth.

Next, we must determine the means by which we are to achieve that goal. To this end, Secretary of State Dulles suggested at the meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on September 18 that all countries of good will should chart anew their long-term courses of action to promote the growth of less developed areas.

If both the less developed and the more developed countries move vigorously to carry out this proposal, their action could pave the way for the 1960's to become a decade of unprecedented progress toward our common goal.

The United States stands ready to play its full part in this great peaceful crusade to achieve continuing growth in freedom.

And on November 13, 1958, Acting Secretary of State Christian A. Herter told the International Cooperation Workshop in Washington, D.C.:

Among the five specific measures proposed by the President at Seattle, I should like to place some special emphasis on the Development Loan Fund.

This Fund is a major instrument in our effort to assist the less developed nations to carry forward their own plans for progress. It is important to realize that the Development Loan Fund will be substantially out of funds available for new commitments by January 1, 1959. Yet it will have a backlog of over $1.5 billion of applications for loans to help on important projects in many countries. If the Development Loan Fund is to be an effective instrument for peaceful development, it must have resources for substantial increased activity on the order of $1 billion a year. It must also have continuity over a period of years.

Only under such circumstances can the wastefulness of inadequate planning be avoided.

But in the last 2 months, something has happened. The administration has been seized by the magnificent obsession for balancing the budget at a low level, by whatever arithmetic tricks it can get away with, and with a fine unconcern for the future of the free world. Nowhere does this show up more shamelessly than in the Development Loan Fund budget request.

As Secretary Herter said, "If the Development Loan Fund is to be an effective instrument for peaceful development, it must have resources for substantial increased activity on the order of $1 billion a year." The 1960 budget request is for a mere fraction of this, $700 million a year. As Secretary Herter said, only if the Development Loan Fund has "continuity over a period of years, can the wastefulness of inadequate planning be avoided." Yet the budget request is for only a 1-year authorization, not even for the 2-year authorization which the administration had the courage to request, and Congress granted, back in 1957.

If there is one clear lesson in the politics of foreign-aid requests, it is that

in order to get at least part of what is adequate, the administration must ask what is adequate. How easy it would have been to have requested a 2-year authorization, now that the Development Loan Fund has proved its worth, as was successfully done in 1957, when the Fund was a fledgling. How easy it would have been to have asked for a $1 billion authorization for fiscal 1960, as the administration has been saying for many months was vitally necessary. While the additional $300 million request would have thrown the administration's paper budget out of balance by $200 million, 10 times this $200 million could readily be recouped, and a substantial surplus shown, if the administration were willing to plug some of the more outrageous loopholes in the tax laws.

And what nonsense it is to say that the country's economy could not stand the administration's sticking to its guns on the need for $1 billion for the Development Loan Fund. More than 4,100,000 Americans are unemployed, some 6.1 percent of the working force; less than 75 percent of our manufacturing capacity is being used. Why shirk our international responsibilities just to keep our unemployed unemployed, and our unused industrial capacity still unused?

Mr. Speaker, the President movingly pointed to the need for "the 1960's to become a decade of unprecedented progress." His administration can practice what it has so eloquently preached by amending its budget request for the Development Loan Fund for 1960 to include authorization for more than 1 year, and for more than the $700 million requested.

Five-Minute Rule of the House Should Be Universal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there are few columnists in the United States, if any, who hit the target more frequently than Morris Kaplan in his "To the Point" column in the South Side News-Courier in the district that I am privileged to represent. My colleagues all will agree with me, I know, that Morris Kaplan is writing straight to the point in his column of January 14, 1959, which, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include.

Most chairmen at gatherings I attend do a pretty good job in brevity of introductions and holding speakers to reasonable time limitations, but when a chairman occasionally goes the other way all one can do is to sit and take it, silently hoping that the happy day will soon come when the 5-minute rule of the House is the law of this and every other land. One can say so very, very much in 5 minutes if he really has to put his mind to it, and he can lose audience appeal as rapidly as falling off the top of a mountain when he has said all he has on his mind and keeps on talking.

The greatest chairman I ever knew was Harriet Taylor Treadwell, who worked with Catherine Waugh McCulloch, mother of the able and dedicated administrative assistant of the senior Senator from Illinois, in bringing suffrage to the women of America by getting passed in Illinois the partial suffrage State enactment that opened the door. Harriet Taylor Treadwell was the chairman of a league of women in Chicago, some 2,000 or more, and operated strictly under the 3-minute rule. If it were the Governor of the State, or the mayor of Chicago, or anyone else speaking, the very second the 3 minutes was up down went Harriet Taylor Treadwell's gavel, and there was not one more word said, even if the Governor or the mayor, or whoever he was, was left hanging in the middle of a sentence. The fact that Harriet Taylor Treadwell, working with Catherine Waugh McCulloch, won the battle of the votes for women is pretty good proof that even in the yesterdays Morris Kaplan's column had a point.

The column follows:

THE ORGANIZATION MAN

Every time I attend a meeting I am struck anew by the way in which presidents and chairmen flounder through the business at hand, allowing lengthy repetitious speeches from the floor, even when they are not germane to the issue being discussed. With a good chairman many of these meetings could transact their business in half the time. But it needs a firm hand, which knows when to loosen the reins and when to pull up short.

When an organization—be it civic, fraternal, service or social—selects a new presiding officer, the nominating committee or the membership-at-large usually bases its choice on the personality of the man or woman candidate. A reasonable amount of intelligence, warmth, ability to speak are usually considered necessary. How often, however, is knowledge of how to conduct a meeting, or the ability to keep a tight hold on proceedings taken into account?

A good chairman is strong enough to stop the man who loves the sound of his own voice, or the wisdom of his own set ideas. He doesn't allow the member with the most imperious manner and voice dominate every debate. Once any member is allowed to take over the prerogatives of the Chair, that organization is leaderless.

Memorial: "Gus" Cook

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of an individual who served for many, many years in an important position in the Capitol of the United States and whose death has brought sadness to all of those who knew him, and particularly to those such as myself who had the privilege of knowing him closely through a period of many years. "Gus" Cook was one of those rare individuals whose conscientiousness and devotion to duty set an example for all who came in contact with him. Through close personal relationship over a long period I had the opportunity to observe in him those characteristics which deserve emulation by all who serve our Government. My sincerest condolences go to his surviving family.

New Price Policy of American Can Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the growing importance of rising prices and their effect on the value of the dollar, and the concern of responsible officials over this trend, as expressed by President Eisenhower in his economic report, I would like to call attention to the efforts of one of the Nation's large concerns that recently instituted a new price policy that is expected to result in substantial savings to its customers. This program, instituted by the American Can Co., supplier of containers for much of the Nation's food and other commodities, involved an expenditure of $32 million in a new coil-processing program which permits processing of tin plate and steel plate in their own plants.

Mr. Speaker, this is a large sum of a private company's investment capital, spent in a way which promises to reduce the cost pressures of recent years on food prices. It is evidence of a forward-looking company's faith in the future of American business and the soundness of the economy.

American Can Co. President William Stolk said when he announced the new price structure that it would eliminate the method of averaging metal can prices over broad geographic areas and, instead, establish separate f.o.b. prices at each of the company's plants for each type and style of container. This company has about 50 can-manufacturing plants strategically located near large agricultural areas in all parts of the country.

At this point, I would like to insert into the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Stolk, presented to the press at the time the company instituted its new price policy:

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM C. STOLK, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN CAN CO., NEW YORK, N. Y., NOVEMBER 19, 1958

I have called this meeting to have the opportunity of discussing with you a number of drastic and far-reaching actions the American Can Co. is announcing today.

They are completely unprecedented in the metal can industry and are bound to have tremendous advantages for all of the can-using industries we serve.

I felt it was important to talk personally with you about these actions not only because of the widespread interest they will

arouse but also because of the many ramifications that are involved.

As I think all of you know, we formally opened our newest coil processing center at Hillside, N.J., 2 weeks ago. That was the eighth such facility we have installed in this country in the past 18 months and it completes the network of coil plants outlined in our original planning more than 2 years ago.

Our coil program is a revolutionary development in the can industry. It was undertaken by Canco—at a total investment of $32 million—in order to effect substantial reductions in our can-making costs.

We decided to invest this sum after exhaustive studies convinced us we could accomplish important savings by processing tinplate and steel plate in our own plants. As a result, we are now doing the inspecting, shearing, stacking, and sorting operations which previously had been performed by the steel mills.

This undertaking dramatically illustrates our belief that unremitting action to hold down the cost of metal cans is essential. Cans represent 70 percent of American Can Co.'s business. Our cans are faced with competition as vigorous and determined as any you can name.

It is obvious that every possible economy must be injected into our operations if we are to serve our own interests and the best interests of our can-using customers.

It is most gratifying to be able to report to you today that the coil program already has amply justified our faith in the economies we believed it could produce.

More than that, the tremendous amount of study that has gone into this project has revealed other areas in our business where worthwhile economies can be accomplished. We are taking steps to effect these economies also. In so doing, we are eliminating certain pricing policies that long have been standard in the can industry.

As background, let me illustrate why we believe all of these courses of action are necessary.

Our two key costs are tinplate and labor, which represent as much as 85 percent of the cost of a can.

Since 1946 the base price of quarter-pound electrolytic tinplate, the type most commonly used for cans, has been raised 11 times, increasing its cost 109 percent.

In the same period, the average hourly wage in our company has gone up from $1.08 in 1946 to $2.63½ today. In addition, employee benefits have increased 46 cents per hour. These latter two figures represent an increase of more than 166 percent.

The two upper lines of this chart show the rise in these two costs during the past 12 years.

But since World War II, the price of a standard No. 2 can, made from the quarter-pound plate, has increased only 93.5 percent, as shown here on this line.

It is obvious from the spread between our two major can costs and can prices that we have been absorbing substantial proportions of these cost increases.

This situation, of course, has resulted in part from the intense competition in the can industry.

It has been necessary to find every means to help offset these drastically increased costs. Through technological improvements, new processes and new manufacturing and can-handling methods, we have made considerable progress. Had it not been for the economies that have been made, for example, a can that costs three and a half cents today might well have cost 15 cents if it were made by the same processes used in earlier years.

These accomplishments, of course, have been extremely valuable to us and to our customers. But they have not been enough to stay even with inflation, much less move ahead of it. It was apparent that we still had to find new ways of cutting costs without sacrificing quality or service.

Over the past few years, we have made a searching reexamination of every phase of our operations. These studies have shown that some existing practices, which have grown up over the years in the metal container industry, have clearly outlived their usefulness. To us, they appear to be archaic and unrealistic. We are consigning them to the junk heap.

These are policies dealing with the pricing of cans that came into being in the earlier years of the present century. They reflect the industry concept of former times that "cans is cans."

There is a vast difference between the metal can industry today and 50 years ago. In the early years, there was one basic can, used primarily for packing food. Today, the industry produces tremendous quantities of cans—more than 40 billion of them a year—for a vast and growing number of products, each of which requires its own set of can specifications and features.

Whole new concepts have been evolved, for new cans, new techniques, new markets. New methods of processing and merchandising have appeared. In short cans and the services they perform have taken on a new look. We at American Can believe it is time to take a new look also at pricing policies.

In making these changes, we are following a company philosophy that every outmoded and impractical method or system should be junked just as quickly as an obsolete piece of machinery.

The practices we are discarding undoubtedly served a good and useful purpose in other times. Why or how they came into being is no longer important. In our view, they have no place in our business today.

Instead, we are adopting an entirely new pricing philosophy.

Our approach, frankly, is revolutionary. It will mean two basic and far-reaching changes in our existing practices.

The first is that every can will be priced in more direct and closer relationship to the process and the differing costs of raw material and labor involved in its manufacture.

We have already put this plan into effect, and will continue to reflect it in our pricing.

As you may recall, we announced this new method of the specific pricing of cans on September 25. Under the previous practice, when there was a change in can prices, a single, average percentage figure was applied uniformly across the board to all types of cans. Now we determine a separate price for each type and style of can.

The second pricing change, which we are announcing today, is also a clean break with industry tradition.

We are putting into effect on next January 1 for each type and style of can a separate f.o.b. price at each of our plants. This is in contrast to the previous policy of having two general pricing areas dividing the country east and west of the Rockies.

Under the new plan, our can prices no longer will be averaged over these two broad geographic areas. Instead, our prices will reflect to customers the freight-cost advantage of their nearness to the steel mills supplying our basic raw material.

The recent large increases in transportation costs on raw materials make the use of wide area pricing no longer fairly adaptable to the needs of our customers. From January 1 on our can prices will give effect to differences in freight charges on tinplate between a can plant located near a steel mill and one located farther away.

At the same time, we are eliminating the free delivery of cans which exists in certain metropolitan areas.

It is our conviction that all of these changes will provide long-range benefit to our customers. Together they will mean more equitable pricing for the many can-using industries we serve.

The economies we have achieved through the coil program and the new pricing policies which the coil operation has made possible have given us the opportunity of making what in these days and times is an unusual, even startling, announcement.

We are passing economies resulting from all of these actions on to our customers.

On January 1 we will put into effect this new and more equitable pricing system which will mean lower can costs for most of our customers.

We will hold the line on these prices until October 1, 1959, except for adjustments that may be necessary to reflect any increases the steel companies might make in their tinplate prices.

In the aggregate, the price reductions we are making will mean a total saving to our can-using customers of more than $9 million.

This will mark the first time in my recollection that any can prices have been cut voluntarily by a can company as the direct result of economies it has been able to achieve.

The action is all the more startling, we believe, because it comes at a time when our costs are still rising.

We are particularly gratified about our ability to pass on these savings to our customers for two reasons.

As I have indicated, we believe this to be the soundest sort of business practice. It is a virtual truism to say that the broader the economies we build into our operations, the stronger will be our competitive position and the greater the service to our customers.

The second reason is that it is in the public interest. We believe that under present conditions any voluntary reduction in the price level of a product as widely used as metal cans is a contribution to the economy as a whole.

Government leaders have made it abundantly clear that management, labor and Government itself share the responsibility for halting inflation. The American Can Co. endorses these views 100 percent.

To us at American Can, the action we are taking today stands as a clearcut example of the company's traditional policy of service in the interests of its customers and the Nation. It is on this philosophy of service that the growth of our business has been based. We are determined to continue to serve these interests, with all the strength and vigor we can apply.

Thirty of Thirty-four Schools Overcrowded in Gary, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following news item from the Gary, Ind., Post-Tribune will give the Members some idea of the school crisis in the industrial Calumet region of Indiana. Gary is taxed to the limit to keep pace with school construction considering the influx of population during and since World War II. Federal defense industries have contributed greatly to this influx of population and overcrowded schools in Gary and other localities in this industrial area:

Overloading Reported in 30 of 34

The frightening problem of overcrowding in Gary public schools was presented to the school board last night by Alden H. Blankenship, superintendent.

Blankenship gave each board member a 10-page summary of information on the school-building situation which showed that 30 of the city's 34 schools are overcrowded.

Fourteen of the schools are crowded more than 25 percent over their capacity.

The report was termed "frightening" by Robert E. Penn, board member. Other members of the board agreed with Penn that the report should be publicized as much as possible to make citizens aware of the real problems facing the board in trying to find money and land to build the necessary new schools.

A related difficulty was pointed out by Chris Retson, board member, who said the city will be continually faced with overloaded schools and increasing enrollment unless something is done about new housing developments springing up in various areas of Gary, with no provisions made for schools to handle the children of the subdivision.

"This is the basic cause of tax troubles in Gary," Retson said.

Retson said that every day he drives past a new subdivision which displays an advertising sign: "Come to Gary and live in this subdivision; near new schools."

The Gary school system is asked to absorb people from neighboring communities, many of which have no open land like Gary, Retson said.

"The taxes from low cost homes don't produce enough money to educate the children from that home," he said.

"It's fiscal suicide," Retson said.

Blankenship, in his report last night, made special mention of the 14 schools which are crowded more than 25 percent over their capacity.

Heading the list of five heavily overcrowded high schools was Froebel, which is 122 percent over its capacity. This is expected to be relieved somewhat next fall with the completion of the Norton Park School.

Tolleston is overcrowded 63 percent; Roosevelt, 49 percent; Lew Wallace, 43.5 percent; Emerson, 42 percent.

Edison is 21 percent over capacity.

The other two city high schools are under capacity: Mann, 7.8 percent, and Wirt, 7.3 percent.

Leading the list of overcrowded elementary schools is Garnett, which is 70.6 percent over capacity. Others more than 25 percent overloaded are Banneker, Beveridge, Carver, Douglas, Lincoln, Nobel, Pittman Square, and Pulaski.

Blankenship pointed out that three elementary school areas will have special potential problems next fall.

The Aetna School was 4.3 percent above capacity in October 1958. Four hundred new homes are scheduled in an area between present homes and Lake Street. Sewers and streets are in, and exterior shells have been completed for many of these units.

In the Nobel School area, on Gary's far East Side, much of the area at Inland Manor has been prepared for new homes. Long-range plans include some 1,500, and eventually 2,500 units, Blankenship said. Nobel is now 26 percent overcrowded.

At Pittman Square in Glen Park, many new homes are being built east of the school. The school site is too small for another addition.

Pittman Square is 36.6 percent overcrowded, counting the addition which will be completed next month.

Blankenship said six new elementary schools are needed now.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*	
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*	
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*	
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*	The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*	The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*	
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*	
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*	4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*	2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*	
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Engle, Clair, *Calif*	3840 Lorcom Lane, Alexandria, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*	
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*	
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*	
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*	University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*	
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*	
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*	
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*	1612 34th St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*	4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*	
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Langer, William, *N. Dak*	2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*	419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*	4545 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	5020 Lowell St.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*	The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*	
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*	Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*	
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*	
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*	
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Javits, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Bridges, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Keating.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Green (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Keating.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Martin.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Javits, and Morton.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Bass of Tennessee, Jennings, Matthews, McGovern, Coad, Breeding, Stubblefield, McSween, Hogan, Hoeven, Dague, Belcher, McIntire, Dixon, Smith of Kansas, Teague of California, Quie, Short, Mrs. May, Messrs. Pirnie, Latta, Burns of Hawaii, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Evins, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Steed, Alexander, Boyle, Santangelo, Montoya, Taber, Jensen, Andersen of Minnesota, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Ford, Ostertag, Bow, Jonas, Laird, Cederberg, Lipscomb, Rhodes, Pillion, Weaver, Minshall, Thomson of Wyoming, Michel, and Conte.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Doyle, Bennett, Lankford, Huddleston, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Morris of Oklahoma, Kitchin, Anderson of Montana, Brewster, Kowalski, Wampler, Stratton, Cohelan, Arends, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Bates, Hess, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson, Osmers, Mrs. St. George, Messrs. Gubser, Becker, Chamberlain, Burns of Hawaii, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, Mrs. Sullivan, Mr. Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Healey, Rutherford, Barr, Burke of Massachusetts, Moorhead, Miller of California, Johnson of Colorado, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Hiestand, Bass of New Hampshire, Siler, Fino, Mrs. Dwyer, Messrs. Derwinski, Halpern, and Milliken.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson, Williams, Wier, Multer, Dowdy, Matthews, Loser, Harmon, Foley Irwin, Morris of New Mexico, Auchincloss, Kearns, Broyhill, Springer, Nelsen, ———, ———, ———, ———.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, Holland, Teller, Dent, Pucinski, Daniels, Brademas, Giaimo, O'Hara of Michigan, Kearns, Hoffman, Bosch, Holt, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Ayres, Griffin, Lafore, and Hiestand.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Morgan (chairman), Carnahan, Zablocki, Burleson, Mrs. Kelly, Messrs. Hays, Selden, Pilcher, O'Hara of Illinois, Fountain, Fascell, Coffin, Farbstein, Saund, Diggs, Beckworth, McDowell, Murphy, Meyer, Gallagher, Bowles, Chiperfield, Mrs. Bolton, Messrs. Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Bentley, Curtis of Massachusetts, and Wainwright.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Brooks of Texas, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Brooks of Louisiana, Mrs. Kee, Mrs. Granahan, Messrs. Monagan, Smith of Iowa, Hoffman, Riehlman, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Mrs. Dwyer, Messrs. Holt, Griffin, Wallhauser, Mrs. Weis, Mr. Langen, ———.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, Elliott, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Everett, Slack, Casey, Carter, Schenck, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Lipscomb, Halleck, Ray, Mailliard, Curtin, and Mrs. Simpson of Illinois.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Aspinall (chairman), O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Powell, Edmondson, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Rutherford, Baring, Ullman, Anderson of Montana, Saund, McGinley, Morris of New Mexico, Rivers, Burdick, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Westland, Hosmer, Chenoweth, Collier, Withrow, Wilson, Cunningham, Langen, Mrs. Simpson of Illinois, Messrs. Burns of Hawaii, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Harris (chairman), Williams, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Jarman, O'Brien of New York, Moss, Dingell, Kilgore, Rogers of Florida, Hemphill, Rostenkowski, Brock, Bennett of Michigan, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Derounian, Younger, Avery, Collier, Glenn, Devine, Nelson, and Keith.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Rodino, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Dowdy, Holtzman, Whitener, Libonati, Loser, Toll, Kastenmeier, Kasem, McCulloch, Miller of New York, Poff, Cramer, Moore, Smith of California, Meader, Bosch, Henderson, Lindsay, and Cahill.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Dingell, Rivers of South Carolina, Macdonald, Lennon, Nix, Anfuso, Oliver, Downing, Flynn, Casey, Johnson of Maryland, Tollefson, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Baumhart, Gross, Curtin, Glenn, and Hoffman of Illinois.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Lesinski, Holifield, Mrs. Granahan, Messrs. Porter, Scott, Shipley, Levering, Dulski, Prokop, Foley, Irwin, Harmon, Alford, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Gross, Broyhill, Johansen, Cunningham, Wallhauser, Barry, ———.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Thompson of Louisiana, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Edmondson, McFall, Brown of Missouri, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Young, Hargis, Burke of Kentucky, Johnson of California, Cook, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Dooley, Broomfield, Robison, Taylor, and Mumma.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen, Brown of Ohio, Reece of Tennessee, and Budge.

Committee on Science and Astronautics

Messrs. Brooks (chairman), McCormack, Miller of California, Teague of Texas, Anfuso, Sisk, Mitchell, Quigley, Hall, Wolf, Karth, Hechler, Daddario, Moeller, King, Roush, Martin, Fulton, McDonough, Chenoweth, Osmers, Van Pelt, Baumhart, Bass of New Hampshire, ———.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Willis, Tuck, Jackson, Scherer, Miller of New York, and Johansen.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Boykin, Christopher, Haley, Baring, Mitchell, Everett, Nix, Quigley, Slack, Flynn, Dulski, Carter, George, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Ayres, Adair, Fino, Saylor, Smith of California, Teague of California, ———, ———.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Mills (chairman), Forand, King, O'Brien, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison, Karsten, Herlong, Ikard, Machrowicz, Frazier, Green of Pennsylvania, Watts, Metcalf, Reed, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Mason, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Baker, Curtis of Missouri, Knox, Utt, Betts, and Alger.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Oliver 2–3263
	Circuit Judges	
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Emerson 3–6017
	Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		North 7–8109
	David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Emerson 2–5047
	Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Emerson 3–6267
	George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Emerson 2–8653
	John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Emerson 3–8315
	Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Emerson 2–4343
	Warren E. Burger, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Jefferson 3–1347

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone, National 8–4696)

Acting Chief Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—Giles S. Rich, of New York, 4949 Linnean Ave.
Judge—I. Jack Martin, of Ohio, 9614 Hillridge Dr., Rock Creek Hills, Kensington, Md.
(Vacancy)

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7–0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Rd., Sumner, Md.
(Vacancy)

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
(Vacancy)
(Vacancy)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge F. Dickinson Letts

Judges

James W. Morris	Charles F. McLaughlin
David A. Pine	Burnita S. Matthews
Matthew F. McGuire	Luther W. Youngdahl
Alexander Holtzoff	Joseph C. McGarraghy
Richmond B. Keech	John J. Sirica
Edward M. Curran	George L. Hart
Edward A. Tamm	(Vacancy)

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5–6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Homer Ferguson
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.*
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.*
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah* 2828 Conn. Ave.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.*
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.* The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*	
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Lennon, Alton, *N. C.*	
Lesinski, John, *Mich.*	
Levering, Robert W., *Ohio*	
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.*	224 C St. NE.
Lindsay, John V., *N. Y.*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn.*	The Congressional
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*	The Washington
McCulloch, William M., *Ohio*	4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif.*	
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*	
McFall, John J., *Calif.*	507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGinley, Donald F., *Nebr.*	
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak.*	
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*	220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*	1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McSween, Harold B., *La.*	
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*	
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*	115 Dale Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*	
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*	
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*	
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*	
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*	Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*	
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*	
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.*	The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*	The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*	
May, Catherine, *Wash.*	
Meader, George, *Mich.*	3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*	
Meyer, William H., *Vt.*	
Michel, Robert H., *Ill.*	
Miller, Clement W., *Calif.*	
Miller, George P., *Calif.*	
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*	3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Milliken, William H., Jr., *Pa.*	
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*	2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*	8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga.*	
Moeller, Walter H., *Ohio*	
Monagan, John S., *Conn.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Moorhead, William S., *Pa.*	
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*	
Morris, Thomas G., *N. Mex.*	
Morris, Toby, *Okla.*	220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La.*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*	204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*	
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*	
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*	The Coronet
Murphy, William T., *Ill.*	
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*	
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*	
Nelsen, Ancher, *Minn.*	
Nix, Robert N. C., *Pa.*	
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*	
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*	2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*	
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*	The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*	The Congressional
O'Hara, James G., *Mich.*	
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass.*	
Oliver, James C., *Maine*	
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*	
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*	100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*	
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*	117 Carroll St. SE.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*	
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*	
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho*	
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*	
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*	
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*	
Pirnie, Alexander, *N. Y.*	
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*	228 2d St. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*	
Polk, James G., *Ohio*	
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg.*	
Powell, Adam C., *N. Y.*	
Preston, Prince H., *Ga.*	
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*	
Prokop, Stanley A., *Pa.*	
Pucinski, Roman C., *Ill.*	
Quie, Albert H., *Minn.*	The Coronet Apt., 200 C St. SE.
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*	
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*	
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*	
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*	
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*	
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*	
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*	The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*	1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*	6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*	5603 24th Ave. SE., Hillcrest Hgts., Wash. 21, D. C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*	
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*	3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*	
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*	
Rivers, Ralph J., *Alaska*	
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*	6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y.*	
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*	
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*	
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass.*	The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*	Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*	
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*	
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*	
Rosténkowski, Dan, *Ill.*	
Roush, J. Edward, *Ind.*	
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*	
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y.*	
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y.*	
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif.*	
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*	
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*	
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*	
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C.*	
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*	433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*	
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*	
Shipley, George E., *Ill.*	
Short, Don L., *N. Dak.*	
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*	
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*	
Simpson, Edna Oakes, *Ill.*	
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*	5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*	
Slack, John M., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*	
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif.*	
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*	204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Neal, *Iowa*	
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*	
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*	Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*	
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*	
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*	
Stratton, Samuel S., *N. Y.*	
Stubblefield, Frank A., *Ky.*	
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*	
Taber, John, *N. Y.*	
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*	
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*	
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*	6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y.*	Mayflower Hotel
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*	2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*	3301 Mass. Ave.
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*	
Thompson, T. A., *La.*	1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, Keith, *Wyo.*	
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*	
Toll, Herman, *Pa.*	
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*	
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*	
Tuck, William M., *Va.*	
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*	
Ullman, Al, *Oreg.*	
Utt, James B., *Calif.*	
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*	
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*	
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*	4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*	
Wallhauser, George M., *N. J.*	
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*	
Wampler, Fred, *Ind.*	
Watts, John C., *Ky.*	
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*	9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Weis, Jessica McC., *N. Y.*	
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*	
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*	
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C.*	
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*	5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*	
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*	
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*	1001 26th Rd. S., Arlington, Va.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*	
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*	
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*	
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*	
Wolf, Leonard G., *Iowa*	
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*	
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*	
Young, John, *Tex.*	
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*	4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*	
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*	

DELEGATES

Burns, John A., *Hawaii*	

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*	2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Series, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Place SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Appendix

The Partnership of the Private Citizen in the Field of Social Service—Address by Dr. Frederick M. Lange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a distinguished Texas citizen, Dr. Fred M. Lange, executive vice president of the Dallas Community Chest trust fund, served as a member of the U.S. delegation to the Ninth International Conference of Social Work, in Toyko, Japan, last November 30 to December 6.

Dr. Lange was invited by several organizations in Tokyo to discuss the work of the Community Chest movement in America. As one of this Nation's outstanding Community Chest leaders, he has special qualifications for speaking on this subject. Among the organizations he addressed were the Central Community Chest of Japan, the Tokyo South Rotary Club, and the Tokyo Lions Club.

This eminent Texan has given high praise to the hospitality extended to him and Mrs. Lange in Japan, including assistance given by American Government personnel stationed there, particularly Mr. Robert J. Boylan, Chief of the Exchange of Persons Branch of the American Embassy, and his assistant, Miss Nancy Downing.

Dr. Lange was truly an ambassador of good will to Japan. Evidence of that is the fact that after his return to his home in Dallas, Tex., he was notified that the Central Community Chest of Japan had awarded him a special citation for his contribution to the Japan Community Chest movement. He is the first foreigner ever to receive a national Community Chest and welfare award in Japan.

Mr. President, Dr. Lange's address, as delivered in Tokyo, on "The Partnership of the Private Citizen in the Field of Social Service" is a scholarly discussion of a subject on which he is an expert. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PARTNERSHIP OF THE PRIVATE CITIZEN IN THE FIELD OF SOCIAL SERVICE

(Address delivered by Frederick M. Lange, L.H.D., LL.D., executive vice president, Dallas Community Chest Trust Fund, while in the Far East as a member of the U.S. delegation to the Ninth International Conference of Social Work, held in Tokyo, Japan, November 30 to December 6, 1958, before the representatives and leaders of the Central Community Chest of Japan, Imperial Hotel, Tokyo, Japan, November 26, 1958, Tokyo South Rotary Club, December 3, 1958; Lions Club, Tokyo, Japan, December 4, 1958)

Based upon the English poor law, which the English colonists brought to America, for roughly 300 years the major source of the necessities of life (food, clothing, shelter, and medical care) for needy residents in the United States, was the local government unit. This responsibility was written into the State constitutions of many U.S. States.

As the population and the welfare problem grew in the United States during the first two centuries, it became more and more difficult for the local governmental units to provide certain social services, such as institutions for the care of the feebleminded, the mentally ill, the criminal, the tuberculous, and institutions for the education of the blind, and the deaf. Also, it became more difficult for the local governmental units to provide adequate health services alone. For these reasons, about 100 years ago, the State governments in the United States began to assume responsibility for these services. For many years longer, however, the National Government continued to limit its social welfare activities severely, especially in the area of financial assistance.

The business depression of the 1930's forced a change in this situation. The inability of both the States and the local units of government to provide for the needs of the millions of unemployed made it necessary for the National Government, which had taken over the taxing power with regard to many of the major tax sources, to assume responsibility for most of the financial assistance to needy U.S. citizens. This became a permanent responsibility of the National Government with the establishment of the social security program in 1935.

Early in American history voluntary agencies began to develop, some to do things not considered the responsibility of the governmental agencies, and some out of dissatisfaction with the inadequacies of some welfare services under governmental auspices. Voluntary agencies have continued to grow in numbers and importance throughout American history for these and other reasons. Many times voluntary agencies have closed down or altered their functions when the time came that their former services were no longer needed or were assumed by some level of government. It is some indication of their continuing health that this fall Community Chests and United Funds in 2,100 U.S. cities and towns will raise more than $400 million to help finance a major part, but only part, of the voluntary health and welfare agencies in the United States.

From the beginning of American history to this hour, there has been an important and indispensable partnership between the Government and the private citizen in welfare matters.

We now have voluntary and government agencies at all levels working side by side, one helping the other. Since 1935, the major role of our private agencies has shifted from providing primarily relief in the form of food, clothing, and shelter, to supporting and carrying on new or pioneer programs, mostly in the prevention field. As newer methods were discovered, or as new services were needed, it was usually the voluntary agencies in the 1930's which experimented and started them. As their value was proved, and as the new programs expanded, they were often incorporated into the methods and services of the large governmental programs. More recently the national governmental agencies, too, are experimenting, pioneering, and carrying on much research. In general, the governmental agencies have taken responsibility for the large mass programs directed toward providing food, shelter, clothing, and medical aid for those who cannot provide these things for themselves. The size of the national government programs is now far larger than that of the voluntary programs.

This, however, does not mean that the partnership between national and State governments and the private citizen is weakened. Particularly at the local and State levels, the governmental agencies try to keep close to the thinking of private citizens through the establishment of advisory boards and auxiliaries. Most government agencies are anxious to know what private citizens think and go out of their way to explain their programs, invite comments, and provide for citizen participation.

The private citizens, then, not only control the private agencies, but by serving on the advisory boards and committees of the Government agencies, influence and guide them too. Many of these citizens have been active in both kinds of agencies, therefore they know intimately what each does and what each is responsible for. This helps to coordinate the whole pattern of welfare service, keeps it close to the real needs and sees that the total effort is as efficient as possible.

I recently read a paper entitled "Social Welfare Services in Japan in 1957," by Mr. Chujiro Kimura, vice president of the National Council of Social Welfare. I was pleased to see the many similarities between the Japanese and American systems. You, too, have national, state or prefectural, and local government participation in welfare programs. You, too, have government agencies cooperating with voluntary agencies. The article gave me the impression that in Japan, as in America, the National Government is carrying the largest part of the financial responsibility. I also received the impression that your local councils for social welfare, voluntary organizations, are charged with much responsibility, even with the administration and provision of some services that are government financed.

I have the impression that while in the United States the role of the volunteer agency has long been very strong, the role of the voluntary agency in Japan apparently is only recently growing important. However, I was pleased to learn from the article how much your Government relies on your local voluntary welfare councils not only for the planning of local welfare services, but for coordinating them and actually giving some of the services.

The partnership between the Government and the private citizens in matters of welfare in the United States takes many forms. Most tax supported welfare programs were established because private citizens active in private welfare projects knew so well the need for the programs that they became their spokesmen. After public programs are established, private citizens working in private groups keep in close touch with them,

because Government and private agencies cooperate so closely on so many projects. Private groups know well the strength and weaknesses of the total effort. Private groups, through social action, through encouraging helpful welfare legislation, work for changes, expansions, or reductions in the government effort. These efforts are based on knowledge and facts gathered as results of working together. For instance, improvements in the services of our local Dallas County Welfare Agency was brought about because voluntary agencies working with some of the same families became aware of the severe limitations of the county program. Some members of the advisory board of the county agency were also active in the voluntary agencies. Their firsthand knowledge of the facts made changes possible in the country program.

Another way in which the private citizen keeps in touch with the Government agency is by volunteering his services. Many people in America are members of auxiliaries or voluntary committees whose members visit and donate their time, doing useful work in the agency, ranging all the way from helping to care for children to helping beautify the agencies grounds. This visiting and volunteer service enables the private citizen to become acquainted with the service. Then, he can better influence not only the agency, but the Government which supports and controls it. The most outspoken and infiluential supporters of our Dallas Juvenile Department are the women and men who donate their time to help in certain phases of the work. In this way they know what the agency needs and can speak intelligently and forcefully to officials who control it.

We, too, have local welfare councils, which bring together all organizations, government and private, so that local services can be planned and coordinated. Here the government agencies and the voluntary ones map out who will do what, so that the total effort wil produce most benefit. Here the partnership is very close. Some services are too broad and burdensome for voluntary agencies to carry, and government must be encouraged to assume responsibility.

As conditions change, some new services, never tried before, may be needed. They often must be started with private funds from campaigns such as the Community Chest or United Fund compaign, or perhaps by funds from a private foundation. America has increasing numbers of private foundations established with gifts from well-to-do persons, who wish to assure that the income from their gifts will be used for beneficial philanthropic endeavors.

In all this the total patern of welfare services is kept in mind. As needs change, services change, and both government and private agencies work hand in hand. Each knows what is needed. Each does his part, without duplication. This is possible because the private citizen, working in private agencies, helping to raise money for voluntary causes, donating his help in the work of private organizations, is often the same citizen who serves on an advisory board or an auxiliary, or a voluntary group in the government agency. He is the same person, who through his activities in the local welfare council, knows who can and should do what.

This partnership with government keeps the Government agency close to the people who support it and use its services. This partnership encourages efficiency. It encourages a total welfare system which provides those services which the people are convinced are really needed.

A large proportion of the United States giving goes to support what we call prevention programs. By this we mean social services which can help to prevent problems which may require extensive help. When, at the invitation of the Austrian Ministry of Welfare, I spoke in Vienna to welfare leaders, and also when I spoke in Stockholm to Swedish welfare leaders, there was much interest in this. They asked why Americans support so many services such as Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, YMCA, YWCA, youth centers, recreation centers, day camps, overnight camps, etc. They questioned whether such services could be classed as necessary welfare programs. We believe they are vital welfare programs because through constructive youth activities, they help to build sounder bodies, minds and personalities. Such youth have a better chance of growing into independent adults who can better cope with life, and therefore be less damaged by problems which require extensive aid. We look upon such programs as an investment in people, an investment which will strengthen them, not only to lessen their later dependence on welfare services, but to increase their ability to live happier, more productive lives, from which they and all people around them will benefit.

Our youth programs are largely voluntarily supported and directed. However, here again we have cooperation with government at all levels, for many of the physical facilities which these voluntary youth agencies use are provided by government. These voluntary groups use public school facilities, public playgrounds, parks, campsites leased for $1 a year from government, etc.

While government cooperates, we prefer to leave the direction of such programs to voluntary groups directed by private citizens. This removes the temptation which may sometimes appear, for a particular political group to influence or exploit youth programs for political ends.

We feel that a welfare program which only provides social services to remedy or repair damage after it has happened is incomplete. While we must, of course, give first emphasis to helping people who are in trouble, we must also look ahead and try to help people so that they will not get into serious trouble. Obviously, this is not always possible because of accident, misfortune, etc., but by helping to develop strong minds and bodies we can lessen their vulnerability to trouble. In this way we help to preserve human values, which in the long run, is the objective of a welfare program—to increase the well-being of our people, mental, physical, and spiritual.

Although I have said little specifically about the activities of our religious bodies, they are the backbone of our voluntary effort. Our welfare efforts have grown from religious roots, and spiritual values are the foundation of our whole program, regardless of whether the program is directed by a religious or a secular organization.

While taxes in America, as in Japan, provide the bulk of support for welfare activities, the total of American voluntary aid is nevertheless tremendous. In addition, the role of foundations and trust funds is growing. More and more of our people with means are giving large sums of money which are used to finance needed services. Here, too, we have a partnership with government, since our laws and tax provisions encourage this practice.

I can speak to the role of the voluntary agency and of the trust with some authority, since I now direct such a trust. Also, during my 25 years of experience in social welfare, I have directed or influenced the gathering of over $50 million in voluntary gifts for welfare purposes. This could not have been accomplished without the teamwork of the Government which believes that the dignity of every man should be upheld and preserved. Human dignity is enhanced through providing for human well-being. In this vital endeavor there is a place for government and for the private citizen. They need each other if the job is to be done right.

I have recently reviewed a report on "Public Health and Welfare in Japan" published by your information service in New York City. Again, I was impressed with the similarities between your services and ours. Perhaps this is because human beings all over the world, basically, have similar needs and require similar services.

Perhaps the most significant research in the welfare field in America in the last quarter century concerns work done by Bradley Buell & Associates in St. Paul, one of our large midwestern cities. Painstaking study indicates that the great variety of problems which plague people can generally be divided into four groups. Also, the great variety of needed services can in general be divided into four groups. I found that your problems and services can be classified similarly.

The first of the four categories relates to dependency, or the need for basic living essentials: food, shelter, and clothing. The second category relates to ill health, or the need for necessary medical care. The third category relates to social maladjustments, or the need for counseling or guidance services for personal difficulties. The fourth category relates to recreation, or the need to provide leisure time, adult education, and recreation activities, so that people can refresh themselves and maintain mental health.

I was struck in reading reports of your programs that each one of your services could be classified under one of these categories, too. However, there was different emphasis placed on them. Most emphasis in your program seems to be placed on provision of living essentials and providing health and medical services. The other two categories, counseling and recreation, were mentioned, but infrequently. I wonder if this is because the disruption of life due to the war has created such great needs for essentials of living, and for health services, that you have not yet been able to devote as much emphasis to counseling and recreation. It is obvious that living essentials and medical services must come first, but I would predict that as needs in these two basic areas are met more adequately, you will become more increasingly aware that problems and services in all four areas are interrelated. Lack of counseling for a personal problem may lead to a more severe problem which needs medical care and basic assistance, just as inability to provide living essentials can cause a health problem, or a health problem can cause inability to provide living essentials.

Much research is being carried on concerning how best to help families who have so many problems that they require help from a large number of specialized agencies, both government and private. Although most of this research is supported by private trusts and foundations, the results will be of greatest importance to the government agencies, since they are now giving the most help to these families.

So, here again, we have an example of teamwork. The government agency, which we call the public agency gets its support from taxes. It is controlled by law. It is set up by a city, county, State, or the National Government. It is administered by employees paid from taxes collected from the people. This government agency works cooperatively at every turn with the voluntary or private agency. When private citizens join together unofficially and voluntarily to help their fellow citizens in other ways than the government agencies provide, they do their work through voluntary or private agencies. These private agencies are administered and financed voluntarily by private citizens.

In our system, through the influence and activity of private citizens in both types of agencies, the overall program meshes smoothly, as gears in a machine. There is no competition, duplication, or waste. We are ever alert to preserve this teamwork, and would not permit a system where the government agencies could not readily be influenced by private citizen leaders.

We believe this sensitivity and response to what our private citizens think is best, is our guarantee that our future welfare services are not exploited for political or undemocratic purposes. We believe that this is the best way to assure that these services will strengthen human dignity through increasing human well-being.

Spiritual Ends Must Motivate the Deeds of Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last Wednesday evening a consecration service for our colleagues in the Congress of the Jewish faith, was held in Washington at Adas Israel Congregation. Along with many other Members of Congress, I was most honored to attend to witness a service of deep religious significance, and to hear Rabbi David H. Panitz deliver a splendid, moving sermon, which I want my colleagues, and those who read the RECORD, to share.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the sermon delivered by Rabbi David H. Panitz be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERMON DELIVERED AT CONSECRATION SERVICE FOR MEMBERS OF THE 86TH CONGRESS OF THE JEWISH FAITH ON JANUARY 21, 1959, AT ADAS ISRAEL CONGREGATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., BY RABBI DAVID H. PANITZ

At the end of the third century of the common era, the Jewish community in Palestine was guided by the members of the rabbinical schools and academies. These teachers served as religious mentors, as pedagogs for young and old, as legislators in civil matters, as judges in the courts, and as advisers in intracommunity and in intercommunity affairs. They were rabbis in the fullest extension of the meaning of that term.

The head of the major academy in Jerusalem, the Nasi Rabbi Judah the Second, once sent three rabbis to traverse the land of Israel in order to survey the work of the local communal academies. They came to one town where there were no teachers, contrary to the tradition that one may not dwell in a city which has no teachers. The visiting delegation assembled the inhabitants and said, "Bring us the protectors of the city." The townspeople immediately summoned the military guard; "these are our guardians." "O no," said the rabbinical visitors, "these are not your protectors; in fact, these may be your destroyers." "Who then are our guardians?" The answer was brief and pointed: "Your teachers" are your guardians, your teachers who serve as legislators and judges, as the goad to your consciences, as your mentors in moral and ethical decisions, as your guides to the fulfillment of God's will. And then they cited the opening verse of Psalm 127: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it; except the Lord guard the city, the watchman wakes but in vain."

While these ancient rabbis were aware of the need to provide physical protection for their towns, cities, and country, they stressed and reiterated the message that sheer power of arms and that even the ultimate conquest of universal nature will not suffice to bring peace and fulfillment to the individual hearts and colletcive lives of men and peoples.

This teaching, of course, is not limited to Judaism. It has become the common heritage of all religiously oriented men, and of all whose values stem from a divinely inspired message. It is a lofty legacy which impels us to view our every act and decision in terms of its consistency with God's will. Not material purposes, but rather spiritual ends should motivate the deeds of man, and the very use of material and physical properties of man and nature must be directed toward the ennoblement of human life and the sanctification of God's name. Habits and practices in the family and home, forms and norms in business realtionships, broad interpersonal acts, indeed, the ideas we utter and votes we cast in the public forum, the halls of legislature and the sanctuaries of the courtrooms—all are potential moments of fulfilling the yearnings of the spirit and the quest for uninhibited truth and justice. This means, for example, that a vote in Congress should be viewed as a sacred opportunity to "labor in the vineyard of the Lord" and to obey the noblest promptings for the implementation of our spiritual ideals. The legislator is a teacher; he helps establish a moral and ethical tone; he points the way to amity and understanding for his fellow citizens near and far; he leads his neighbors in the path of cooperation for mutual advancement. He is a "guardian of the city."

We share the belief in one God. This means that there is a unity to all creation, there is a unity amongst all the children of men, there is a unity to our joint worldwide striving. Because God is one, man can be one. My brother's welfare is my concern because I am not complete without him, who like me comes from Him. This is man's role in the scheme established by the universal God. We have no alternative, then, but to find ways in which to help our fellow men to secure the freedoms and the blessings which may be achieved on this earth.

The Congress of the United States is the greatest forum, tribunal, and academy yet devised on this globe. As the sessions of the 86th Congress open, we lift our voices in joint prayer that its deliberations may be of lasting benefit to the people of our country, that its concerns may be a boon to all the nations, and that its actions may serve to strengthen the hands of all men of good will and lead in the path of meaningful peace and amity. May the Members of the Congress never falter in pursuing the will of God, and may the blessings of the Almighty be upon them. Amen.

Reclamation in South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, with the taming of the Missouri River, which bisects South Dakota, a new era has been opened to our State.

It is an era which holds the promise not only of power and recreation but also of tremendous irrigation potential.

Recently, Mr. W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of Reclamation, addressed the South Dakota Reclamation Association and outlined the progress which has been made in developing past irrigation projects in our State as well as the steps taken to develop new ones.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Dexheimer's speech.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY COMMISSIONER OF RECLAMATION W. A. DEXHEIMER BEFORE THE SOUTH DAKOTA RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION AT PIERRE, JANUARY 12, 1959

It was with a great deal of pleasure that I accepted the invitation of Raymond Lund to participate in this meeting of the South Dakota Reclamation Association.

South Dakota and its problems of irrigation are not new to the Bureau of Reclamation, nor is the Bureau new to you in the western part of the State. We have not, however, gotten so well acquainted with you who come from east of the Missouri, but that is the direction in which reclamation seems to be moving as the need for greater water conservation develops all across the country.

Soon after the passage of the Reclamation Act in 1902, work began on the Belle Fourche project. Of all the investigations made in the State in those early days, this is the only project that showed feasibility. It has been constructed and has served the local area and the State for many years.

Because other areas did not appear feasible for development, not only was there no construction for many years, but even the collection of basic data was largely discontinued. The drought and depression of the thirties caused a renewal of interest in reclamation and under the Water Conservation and Utilization Act, Deerfield Dam was constructed.

MISSOURI BASIN PROJECT

During this period the Pick-Sloan plan evolved and the Missouri River Basin project was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944. Changing values and increased needs opened the door and made additional projects. The lack of continuous data collection meant that some features were included in the Missouri River Basin project without adequate knowledge of conditions, and some mistakes were made.

We are just now reaching the point where the evidence many support a decision to irrigate from Shadehill Reservoir. We were obliged to abandon Bixby Dam because of poor quality of the water.

On the other hand, Keyhold Reservoir is beginning to serve its function of supplying supplemental water to the Belle Fourche project, and Pactola Reservoir has become the primary source of water for Rapid City and the Air Force base.

ANGOSTURA UNIT

The Angostura unit is a development to which you can point with pride as a remarkable example of the effect of the more intensive use of the resources of the State. Crop production and farm income from this unit are probably six times what they were prior to the availability of water for irrigation. This has made possible a quadrupling of the number of farms in the area, besides increasing the amount and stability of the income per farm.

This has been achieved early in the development period before the time that construction charges become payable under the irrigation district contract. A few years ago there was concern among the water users as to whether they could make a go of farming in the area.

I understand that at the recent annual water-users' meeting the story had completely changed. Now the comments are, "We

have licked the production problem and now are trying to improve our markets."

With respect to further development west of the Missouri, the outlook, frankly, is not too good. There is no feasible development on the Bad River and only a minor amount on the White. A small amount of new land along Rapid Creek can be served from Pactola Reservoir. Action there is dependent on wishes of the local people.

The real new value to South Dakota in the construction of the Missouri River Basin project can come from development along the Missouri River and in the eastern part of the State. The Corps of Engineers has been engaged in harnessing the river itself for flood-control and power purposes and has the job well along.

Since the first reservoir was completed at Fort Peck, the Garrison, Fort Randall, and Gavins Point Dams have been constructed; closure was made at Oahe last year, and work is beginning at Big Bend. South Dakotans have made a major contribution in this river-control job by furnishing the sites for Fort Randall and Big Bend Reservoirs and much of the area needed for Oahe Reservoir and Lewis and Clark Lake.

DRAMATIC MOMENT

One of the dramatic moments and major events in the State's history occurred on March 15, 1954, when President Eisenhower pressed a button in the White House signaling former Governor Anderson to throw a switch at Fort Randall. This was the first generation of power from a Missouri River dam in South Dakota. In addition to Fort Randall, generators are spinning at Gavins Point and Garrison Dams, producing power for the benefit of South Dakota and the other States in the area.

The program of powerplant, transmission line, and substation construction has stimulated strong immediate economic activity both in the area and in the places where the materials have been produced and fabricated. But more important is the lasting impact of wide distribution of hydroelectric power throughout the Plains States. This impact is felt in city and country, in industry and on the farms where the farmer and rancher and their wives can produce more efficiently and with less drudgery and with opportunity for progressive, fuller living in the home and community.

The impact is also felt in areas where the relatively low-cost power is used for irrigation. This offers some real possibilities in your State. Along the Missouri River are a dozen or more small pumping units in South Dakota on which we are now completing a general report. These units vary in size from 500 acres to 7,000 acres, and will require pumping from the Missouri or one of the reservoirs. It developed they can provide a reliable feed base for livestock herds in the area, and stabilize agriculture well beyond the unit limits.

CHARLES MIX, BON HOMME

As a part of the investigation of these South Dakota pumping units we looked at land in Charles Mix and Bon Homme Counties, and found areas near Wagner and Geddes which appeared to offer possibilities. Here there is strong local interest in irrigation, and also in the possibility of restoring Lake Andes as a fishing and recreation center. We are making more detailed studies of the Wagner unit and should it or a larger unit prove physically and economically feasible it might be a good pilot development to demonstrate the value of irrigation in the subhumid area of South Dakota.

The impact of power development is also being and will be increasingly felt as the revenues from power sales assist in paying the construction cost of irrigation features. This is one of the basic features of the Missouri River Basin project.

OAHE UNIT STUDIED

The greatest benefit in the State can be realized if the Oahe unit is constructed. This is one of the largest potential irrigation projects remaining to be built in the United States. Since work began on firming up the Pick-Sloan plan we have been studying this unit. Investigations have been expensive and there have been many setbacks.

We have learned a great deal about the glacial till and the lakebed soils east of the river. In 1956 we issued an interim information report which indicated about 550,000 acres of land were suitable for irrigation in the James River Valley, and which showed a favorable benefit-cost ratio for the Oahe unit. The current studies are for the purpose of firming up the earlier figures, both as to the amount of land suitable for irrigation and as to the cost and benefits.

The investigation will culminate in a report, scheduled for completion in the summer of 1960, which will have a firm economic and financial analysis and will definitely establish whether the entire Oahe unit is feasible. It will also give the farmers a firm plan for irrigation, and tell them within reasonably close limits what the operation and maintenance and construction charges will be. At that time the extent to which power revenues will assist in repayment will become apparent.

NEED LOCAL SUPPORT

This is the situation on Oahe unit as far as the bureau's work is concerned. The other principal facet is that of local interest and support. No reclamation project, however, small, has any chance of authorization by Congress without local support, the larger the project, the stronger and more widespread is the support needed. The construction and development of the Oahe unit is an undertaking which would require the constructive effort and foresight of many individuals and organizations in South Dakota.

The magnitude of the project will require that it be constructed in several stages over a considerable period of time. Some works would be built to full capacity initially. Construction of water supply works larger than needed to serve the first irrigation districts that may be organized poses an operation and maintenace financing problem that must be faced before construction work can be started.

Irrigation districts, organized in the usual fashion, can underwrite the reimbursable cost of distribution works in their districts. This would not meet the financial requirements of a project of this magnitude, particularly in the early years.

We can foresee that an organization such as a conservancy district will be necessary to coordinate the promotion and development of the entire project. Additional moneys will be needed to pay a portion of the operation and maintenance costs, particularly of water supply works, and a portion of the construction costs. Because of the widespread benefits a conservancy district is the logical answer.

Such a district must have the power of assessment and must be broadly based to provide the financial assistance necessary until irrigation districts covering the entire irrigable area attain their ultimate development.

NORTH DAKOTA EXAMPLE

You are fortunate in having the model and experience of your neighboring State of North Dakota in considering a conservancy district type of organization. The Garrison Diversion Conservancy District in that State covers 25 counties in entirety. Its authorized 1-mill assessment enables, on present valuation, the financing of a budget of more than $300,000 per year, if necessary. This financing authority of the conservancy district has been very useful in its educational activities and in hiring technical and legal counsel.

The existence of the conservancy district has also warranted organizing irrigation districts where there was not unanimous acceptance of irrigation at this time, on the assumption that the objectors would ultimately come into the irrigation district. Without the conservancy district it would have been necessary to include in the irrigation districts nearly everyone within their exterior boundaries, and strong opposition to district formation might have developed.

Along with the six irrigation districts now organized in that State, the conservancy district will be a key entity for purposes of contracting with the United States for the financing of a portion of operation and maintenance cost during the early stages and repayment of a portion of the construction cost of the irrigation facilities.

The benefits of reclamation development to industrial development, wholesale and retail business, and professional services have long been recognized. Diversified irrigated farming brings greater wealth and opportunity.

The businessman and the farmer need to know what irrigation can mean to the area and the State. Getting the facts across to them will require a full measure of foresight, understanding, and hard work. I commend your leaders who have been active in this field of endeavor.

In considering the need and importance of further irrigation development in South Dakota, you should look to the experiences in other States. Take a trip through the North Platte project in western Nebraska and Wyoming, for example, and see the results of long-time irrigation development there and how it has released that area from a one-crop economy.

A recent economic survey showed that the irrigated area and towns therein support 27 times as many people and provide 40 times the income of adjacent prairie areas. What's more, the irrigated area provided 40 times the income. It is worth remembering that during the drought of the 1930's, the dryland areas lost 12 percent of their population and the irrigated areas gained 18 percent.

POPULATION NEEDS

Remember, too, that the United States is experiencing a population growth that will put us over the 200 million mark by 1970 and 220 million by 1975. At the same time, we are losing more than a million acres of farmland per year to urban and industrial expansion and associated needs. These two facts mean a constantly increasing demand for food and fiber from existing farmlands and also sharply increased water needs for all purposes.

Recent population estimates show South Dakota gaining only 12.9 percent by 1975 compared to a national increase of 35 percent. That means many of your young people—your sons and daughters—probably will leave the State for better economic opportunity unless new industry and diversified agricultural opportunities are created here.

You have one of the Nation's most valuable resources flowing through your State. For centuries it has been a liability, alternately flooding many sections of the State and then drying up to the point where it would hardly justify the nickname, "The Big Muddy." River control has been accomplished. The Missouri has been mastered. Potential irrigation, power, and recreation are possible sources of great economic expansion in South Dakota. Future use, as a resource of your State, lies in your hands.

The Challenge of Metropolitan Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on January 16, 1959, the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] delivered a most interesting and educational address before the Citizens Conference on Metropolitan Area Problems, which was held at American University.

In order that Senators may have an opportunity to read the address and benefit from the experienced analysis of our great chairman of the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ALAN BIBLE, CHAIRMAN, JOINT COMMITTEE ON WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS, TO THE CITIZENS CONFERENCE ON METROPOLITAN AREA PROBLEMS, AMERICAN UNIVERSITY, JANUARY 16, 1959

Commissioner McLaughlin, President Anderson, and ladies and gentlemen of the Citizens Conference on Washington Area Metropolitan Problems, you are meeting today to consider not only the problems of the National Capital region, but problems typical of our modern America, where some 60 percent of the people live in the 168 standard metropolitan areas. Of this metropolitan population, more than half live in 14 of the 168 areas. Washington is one of them. Of our city dwellers, nearly 9 out of every 10 live in a metropolitan area. The outlook for the future growth of our burgeoning population is for further concentration in a handful of large cities. If we expect in the year 1975 a total population of about 220 million persons, urban areas will have to face the absorption of 50 million more people.

When we speak of metropolitan areas we are talking about large aggregations of population living in politically fragmented areas. The metropolitan trend is a suburban trend. Over the last 10 years, at the rate of 4,000 people a day, our population has moved into the suburbs. That is where 14 million of them have moved since 1948. And again there is no expectation that this trend will slacken.

But it is not with these facts of growth alone but the problems that they imply that conferences like this are concerned. What are some of these problems? The pressure of increasing urban populations against limited natural resources, such as water, is certainly one of them. In my dry section of the country it is probably the principal problem. But even here in the humid East we are concerned with it. The problem of metropolitan mobility is another one. By 1975 there may be 88 million passenger cars and a two- and a three-car family will be commonplace. The shortage of school buildings is evident to everyone who lives in suburban communities. The increase of our school population by approximately one-third or 13 million pupils is expected in all our elementary school population by 1975 and a high school enrollment of 5 million is also contemplated.

These are some of the things that our increasing population will demand if the American standard of living is not to be lowered and if the prospect of metropolitan growth is not to be stifled.

I repeat that these are national problems when looked at in their true perspective. Senator LYNDON JOHNSON has recently called attention to the need to know more about this vital sector of American life. He has recommended the creation of a broad study commission to survey these emerging problems and how they are affecting our great metropolitan centers. The widespread congressional interest in these matters may be further described. In the last session not less than four bills proposing the creation of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs, or, as one Representative phrased it, of "urbiculture," were introduced in the House. Earlier this week Representative OSTERTAG introduced in the House the first of what may be a series of proposals for a study of national metropolitan problems. Senators KENNEDY and CLARK have already voiced their concern with these problems and the need to do something about them in the present session of Congress. Even the President has recognized this need in his message earlier this week.

I think that we can take it, without further demonstration, that the subject of this conference is not only one of national importance but one of congressional concern.

What you are going to discuss here today and tomorrow may seem, to many, a local problem. But I would like to begin by setting it in a broad frame and by reminding you that what is done in Washington will have a far-reaching significance in other metropolitan areas throughout the Nation.

The position of our city as a prototype of the ideal American city, as a pilot plant of metropolitan area government, has frequently been urged upon us, and with good reason. The government of the District of Columbia is a national problem, made such by the Constitution of the United States which confers upon Congress the exclusive legislative jurisdiction in all cases whatsoever for the government of the District of Columbia. It is the inseparable relationship between the government of the District of Columbia and its rapidly growing surrounding area that gives rise to the concern of the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems. In the studies of the last year much has been learned of this relationship.

We know, for example, well over half of the area's population is now located outside the boundaries of the District of Columbia. What is more surprising, one-third of the Federal employees in the area are working in establishments located in the environs rather than in the Capital City itself. The Federal Government has tremendously increased its land holdings in the metropolitan region and is today by far the largest single economic factor in all four metropolitan counties. While the entire metropolitan area constitutes one market, of course, I think it is with some interest, in illustrating the dispersal of Federal employees throughout the area, to note that of the Federal payrolls in the fiscal year 1958 which totaled $1,350 million, nearly 30 percent was paid to those employed in adjacent counties of Maryland and Virginia.

Let me return to the hope that has been voiced over many years that the Federal Government exercise its unique responsibilities in the National Capital region to create an ideal metropolitan area. This has been forcefully stated by Prof. Daniel Grant of Vanderbilt University in the following terms, "If the Federal Government could achieve an effective integration of the government of the District of Columbia with its suburbs by some method also available to other metropolitan areas, the result would be new hope for metropolitan integration the country over." Another scholar, Victor Jones, has urged, "The least that the Federal Government should do is to study the problems of its own metropolitan area. Here Congress has exclusive jurisdiction over the central city. The Federal Government has an opportunity and I believe a responsibility to act as a model to the rest of the country by recognizing that the National Capital is a metropolitan community spilling over into several counties and independent cities of two States. It also has an opportunity to develop a model approach to a comprehensive and cooperative study of the problems and to the development of solutions."

My purpose in marshaling these facts and citing these quotations is to inspire and encourage your efforts at this conference by reminding you of its broader significance. Let me now turn to another aspect of this subject which I believe you will also find invigorating.

Washington has an enviable record in recognizing and dealing with the problems of metropolitan growth and expansion, and Congress has been prompt in recognizing the appearance of these problems and supporting enlightened measures for dealing with them. This record over nearly a century is one reason why the creation of the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems was a logical and altogether consistent step for Congress to take, and why I believe that the recommendations of the committee in its final report (which will be handed Congress the end of this month) should receive favorable consideration.

Let me review this record. Over a century ago, Congress acted to protect the metropolitan area water supply by creating the Washington Aqueduct, one of the first large-scale regional water supply undertakings in the United States. They planned on such a large scale that with minor repairs and alterations this system has lasted until the present day, when it provides treated Potomac water not only for the District of Columbia and the whole of Arlington County, but for other local and intermittent needs as well. In 1902 the Senate Park Commission, headed by Senator McMillan, of Michigan, drew together a team of outstanding national figures who produced the great McMillan Report which retrieved the original conception of the Capital city left by our Founding Fathers from its 19th century obscurity and laid the foundations for the Capital city that we know today. The National Capital Planning Commission and the Fine Arts Commission, to say nothing of innumerable parks, monuments, and building projects all derive from the McMillan Commission Report. This is well known. But it is not so well recognized that the scope of the Commission's work was not limited to the National Capital but extended up the Potomac River to Great Falls and down the Potomac to embrace that great historic shrine, Mount Vernon.

Large portions of the metropolitan area also acted independently to deal with the problems of metropolitan growth in an orderly fashion. This was conspicuously true in 1918 when the Maryland Legislature established the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, and a few years later the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission. For the Maryland portion of the suburban area these two agencies have rendered invaluable service. Today it is apparent that they have not only helped plan the orderly development of the Maryland suburbs but by the provision of waterlines and sanitary sewers have tended to structure the development of these areas in such a way that they are inherently more economical to provide with local government services than would otherwise have been the case, and is tragically the case in so many suburban areas in American cities. A good beginning in the same direction has also been made in Virginia through the establishment of the Northern Virginia Regional Planning

Commission, which this year is being greatly strengthened. Our committee has contemplated the proposed establishment of a Northern Virginia Sanitation Authority as a natural and beneficial step.

In 1952 Washington became the second metropolitan area in the United States to establish an official regional planning agency. In 1955 Congress authorized the creation of a metropolitan area mass transportation survey which, in method and in boldness of conception, has already set the pace for similar studies in other areas.

The organization of the Washington Metropolitan Conference, under the leadership of Commissioner McLaughlin, 2 years ago, was a major step forward in developing a political organization that reflects the interests of local governments throughout the area. It has other characteristics which are unique and valuable. These include the membership in the conference of the State legislative delegations in Maryland and Virginia. (I was interested to read in last week's New York Times a proposal to strengthen the only other comparable metropolitan body in the United States, the New York Metropolitan Conference, in a report prepared by Prof. Wallace Sayre of Columbia University. His recommendations impress me as mild, indeed, compared with the role for the conference proposed by our committee's own staff consultants.)

May I claim, too, the establishment and activities of our own Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems as another milestone in metropolitan area progress. There have been, of course, other studies of a broadly similar nature in other American cities. But, I know of none that compares to what we have undertaken—in its unique combination of broad scope and the consideration of metropolitan areawide problems and solutions in an institutional sense, and considerable depth in the analysis of the specific problems selected by the committee for detailed study.

Earlier I have referred to the final report of our committee which will be given Congress the end of this month. The committee also proposes to continue its work through the summer in order to receive the report of the mass transportation survey and hold such hearings on it as may be necessary. When that remaining task has been completed, our work is done. But, however useful, the report of a temporary committee is far from all that is needed if our enduring metropolitan problems are to yield to continuous attack. We need, both in Congress and in this community, organizations that will bring continuity to our efforts to deal with area problems. In this very real sense, it is up to you, the people who have demonstrated their interest in working on these continuing problems by your attendance here. The many legislative acts and administrative decisions required by regional problems will gain unity if there is a regionwide and fully representative citizens organization at work in this field. At the least, let me voice the hope there will be further regional conferences of this sort.

This record of metropolitan progress, taken as a whole, is one, I claim, that any American metropolitan area would take pride in, and sets a high mark for our present and future efforts. In particular, it allows me to hope that we have already made substantial progress toward the goal of that municipal ideal and national example that we have been urged to create.

Now from these heights where, in the role assigned me as keynoter of your conference, I have tried to look ahead and behind and to either side, to provide a framework for your deliberations, and to inspire your efforts, let me descend briefly to the level where you will find yourself working in the next 2 days. I would like to say a word or two about the political problems of the National Capital region. Many of the things people want to accomplish cannot be achieved through existing local governments. Many of the things that metropolitan growth and expansion require, if indeed growth is not to be frustrated altogether, are beyond the capacity of the existing instrumentalities of government. We must choose whether to take the necessary forward step and create new institutions of government that can deal with problems on a regional scale, or to submit to the consequences of inaction. These consequences are formible but the difficulty of moving ahead seems to me to have been exaggerated in most of the solutions that have been offered.

I can concur with those who believe that a general purpose regional authority is too remote from the people to be a realistic solution to what is, in the end, a problem of local government. I also share the fears of those who object to the proliferation of a number of separate functional authorities and special districts, lacking relationship to each other or to the established local governments of cities and counties in the region.

The opportunity which is open—in theory, at least—in most American cities, of annexing the adjacent suburban development or of consolidating cities and counties, appears to me barred by the provisions of our written Constitution. The course of retrocession, ardently urged by Professor Franchino of the Georgetown University Law School, on the precedent of the retrocession of Arlington County to Virginia in 1846, also seems to me politically unlikely, to say the least.

I suspect that in this area we will have to find some new means of organizing to undertake the unique tasks of metropolitan government. I suggest that the eventual solution should be one in which local interests can find effective representation, giving them not only a voice, but some control. I am sure that, given the unique congressional responsibility for our central city in the District of Columbia, and the great and growing Federal interest in the surrounding area, the desirable structure of regional government must be one in which the Federal interest will be effectively represented.

Perhaps this does not sound like the tidy administrative conceptions that have been offered in some metropolitan areas of the United States, and chiefly by those concerned with administrative efficiency and economy. It does not pretend to respond merely to those aims. Earlier I said that, "Many of the things people want to accomplish cannot be achieved through existing local governments." The reason we have governments is to allow people to do things, some of them perhaps unreasonable things, but things which are wanted and often desperately wanted to reflect their ambitions, to support their standard of living, to enrich their life. The glowing words of our great national documents were not written to voice platitudes but the aspirations of a free people. We have now become an urban people and our destiny now must be worked out in urban terms. It will not be easy. Politics never is. The result in the end may not be neat. That is not the way of legislation. But I am supremely confident that the forces of modern life, as we see them written here typically in the Washington metropolitan area, cannot be denied, and in finding expression for them I am equally confident that even in this unfortunately disinfranchised central city, the dominant interests of our people will seek and find appropriate recognition.

Matthew Fontaine Maury, the Pathfinder of the Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, one of the most erudite Members of the Senate and one of its greatest students of history is the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

On last Monday, January 19, the birthday of Gen. Robert E. Lee, the Senator from Virginia delivered a beautiful and most informative address on Matthew Fontaine Maury, "The Pathfinder of the Seas," to the Albemarle Chapter, No. 1, United Daughters of the Confederacy, at Charlottesville, Va. In his address the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] not only gave us a picture of Maury and of his monumental work, but he also spoke words of appreciation of Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson.

The Senator's paternal grandfather was a captain of infantry in the Stonewall Brigade and was killed at the bloody Battle of Cold Harbor. His maternal grandfather and nine of his grandfather's brothers served in the Army of Northern Virginia under General Lee, and five of them were killed.

In 1922 the junior Senator from Virginia, as a member of the State Senate of Virginia, sponsored a bill to provide for the erection of a monument to Matthew Fontaine Maury in his beloved Goshen Pass. The legislature passed the bill and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] was named chairman of the commission to select the monument and to arrange the exercises for its dedication. The dedication took place in 1923 and was a historic occasion.

The Senator from Virginia is himself a veteran of World War I, in which he served with honor and distinction.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Senator's eloquent address on Matthew Fontaine Maury printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON BEFORE THE ALBEMARLE CHAPTER, NO. 1, UNITED DAUGHTERS OF THE CONFEDERACY, CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA., JANUARY 19, 1959

My life, as most of you well know, has been lived within the shadows of the Blue Ridge Mountains. By inheritance, environment, and training, I am devoted to the memory of Confederate leaders and the principles of government for which they made sacrifices, never surpassed in the history of our Nation.

No one in the South could be more grateful than I for the wonderful work of the United Daughters of the Confederacy in preserving the memory of southern leaders. In doing so, they have not only helped to perpetuate in the hearts of all sons and daughters of the Confederacy the principles of States rights for which men like Lee, Jackson,

and Maury made great personal sacrifices, but the Daughters of the Confederacy, through high idealism, and in refusing to admit that it was a lost cause, have set a standard of true greatness which both our Nation and the world have finally been willing to accept.

In all of recorded history, there never was a nobler man than Robert E. Lee and none who has left a greater imprint upon succeeding generations. Yet, shortly before his death, Lee, in his great humility, indicated he felt he had done nothing worthwhile saying, "Life is gliding away and I have nothing to show for mine. I pray I may be spared to accomplish something for the benefit of mankind and the honor of God." There is at least one historian who still lists Lee as a failure simply because he was the commander in chief of an army that suffered total defeat and the leader of a cause which that historian listed as a lost cause. But most historians, including the great Virginian, Douglas Southall Freeman, and the people generally of the entire Nation endorse the opinion of Lee expressed by Senator Ben Hill, of Georgia, when he said: "He was a foe without hate, a friend without treachery, a soldier without vices, and a victim without murmuring. He was a public officer without vices, a private citizen without wrong, a neighbor without reproach, a Christian without hypocrisy, and a man without guilt. He was Caesar without his ambition, Napoleon without his selfishness, and Washington without his reward. He was as obedient to authority as a servant and royal in authority as a king. He was as gentle as a woman in life, pure as a virgin in thought, watchful as a Roman vestal, submissive to law as Socrates, and grand in battle as Achilles."

Military experts throughout the world now rank Lee as one of the greatest military leaders of the English speaking peoples and second only to him, Thomas J. Stonewall Jackson, the great lieutenant on whom Lee so heavily relied. In the quiet and reserved VMI professor, in the consecrated Presbyterian deacon, who each Sunday morning taught a class of Negro slaves, no one in Lexington could visualize the military genius later to be displayed by Jackson in his famous valley campaign. Even his own soldiers at first misunderstood him. They thought him harsh, even cruel; but as their experience increased they recognized the wisdom of his severity and when they looked upon that kindly face, grave and determined as it was, they realized how closely his firmness was allied to tenderness. No one could, like him, unless it was Napoleon, establish and maintain discipline worthy of the best in the Anglo-Saxon nature, which had honor for its principle and glory for its reward. From him his soldiers and the people of his Southland learned the self-denial, which is the root of all religion, the self-control which is the root of all manliness. It was this discipline which enabled the first brigade to turn the tide of battle at Bull Run, or first Manassas. McDowell's men were carrying all before them and by an impetuous rush had carried Henry Hill which was a commanding point in the very center of the Confederate lines and the key of the battleground. Bee, Bartow, Evans, and Hampton were driven in and Jackson alone stood fast. General Bee, with his hat off, his sword in hand, covered with dust and his horse foaming, dashed up to Jackson and said: "General, they are beating us back." "Then, sir, we will give them the bayonet," said Jackson, as his thin lips closed like a vise. Bee, inspired by Jackson's confidence, galloped back to his broken lines and shouted: "Look, there is Jackson, standing like a stone wall. Rally behind the Virginians."

Notwithstanding military achievements of Confederate leaders which in themselves are proof of greatness, the United Daughters of the Confederacy have taught the South and the Nation the fundamental truth that true greatness is not based upon physical strength, political power, mental brilliancy, or accumulated wealth, but rather upon the type of sacrificial service that a man renders to his day and generation. Their test of unselfish love and devotion to duty as applied to our Confederate leaders goes beyond the political idealism of Pericles' tribute to the young men of Athens when he said: "So they gave their bodies to the commonwealth and received, each for his own memory, praise that will never die, and with it the grandest of all sepulchers, not that in which their mortal bones are laid, but a home in the minds of men, where their glory remains fresh to stir to speech or action as the occasion comes by. For the whole earth is the sepulcher of famous men; and their story is not graven only on stone over their native earth, but lives on far away, without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives * * *."

Jackson gave his life for the cause and as a professional soldier who had suffered a major defeat it would have been easier for Lee to have done likewise because it will be recalled that he said shortly before he surrendered at Appomattox: "How easily I could be rid of this and be at rest. I have only to ride along the line and all will be over. But it is our duty to live. What will become of the women and children of the South if we are not here to protect them?" It was in that devotion to duty, to protect the women and children of the South and to train the youth of the South to repair the ravages of a fraternal war that Lee made his greatest contribution not only to his day and generation but to all succeeding generations.

We are now in a period when the heritage of constitutional liberty in which both North and South believed, although they were divided on how it should be preserved, is threatened anew by so-called liberals at home, who wittingly or not would take us down the road to socialism, and by Communists abroad who threaten to impose their will by force upon a free world. Therefore, for the preservation at home of those priceless principles of political and economic freedom that were born of the brain and purchased with the blood of our Founding Fathers we have never had a greater need to be reminded of the example set us by Confederate leaders like Lee, Jackson, and Maury.

We also live in a time when men are challenging the statement of the Roman philosopher, Seneca: "There is no easy road from the earth to the stars." Rockets are shot into outer space and brought back with data which scientists assure us will chart a pathway through the skies. Manmade missiles have penetrated beyond the moon and our Government is appropriating millions of dollars to continue these studies and experiments. Hence, the appropriateness of the request of your program committee that I speak primarily tonight concerning the greatest scientist of the Confederacy, Matthew Fontaine Maury. While these annual celebrations normally are held on January 19, the well-known birthday of the immortal Lee, it perhaps is not so well known that the birthday of Maury was January 14 and that of Jackson, January 21. Like Lee and Jackson, Maury's claim to immortality rests more securely upon his qualities of Christian character and his unselfish and constructive contributions to humanity than upon public recognition of his scientific achievements.

Maury was born in Spottsylvania County, Va., January 14, 1806. He entered the Navy as a midshipman in 1825 but 14 years later, when he was 33, he was thrown from the top of a stagecoach, having yielded his seat in the coach to a lady, and suffered a permanent lameness, which disqualified him for further active service at sea. In 1841 he was placed in charge of the Depot of Charts and Instruments, out of which grew the U.S. Naval Observatory and the Hydrographic Office. The weekly reports published by the Hydrographic Office in Washington are headed with this statement: "Founded upon the research made and the data collected by Lt. M. F. Maury, U.S. Navy." This is a recognition paid to no other naval officer.

When he was only 25 years old, Maury became convinced that the waves, the winds, the storms, the currents, the depths and temperatures of the sea constituted a system so mathematically interrelated that the mind of man could understand its phenomena and forecast its processes. The Prophet Job had written an explanation of God's power "Which alone spreadeth out the heavens, and treadeth upon the waves of the sea." Then David had written Maury's favorite passage, in the 107th Psalm:

"For He commandeth, and raiseth the stormy wind, which lifteth up the waves thereof. They mount up to the heaven, they go down again to the depths; their soul is melted because of trouble. They reel to and fro, and stagger like a drunken man, and are at their wit's end. Then they cry unto the Lord in their trouble, and He bringeth them out of their distresses. He maketh the storm a calm, so that the waves thereof are still."

The young Maury was firmly convinced that the same God who had made nature's laws for the dry land which man was beginning to understand also made them for the waters of the earth which likewise, through patient study and observance, could be understood. And so it was that Maury was able to discover the tradewinds and the ocean currents which reduced weeks of sailing time in Atlantic waters, and around the Cape of Good Hope to the Pacific, resulting in savings of millions of dollars to American shippers. Because of that monumental work, Maury was given the sobriquet "The Pathfinder of the Seas."

Maury's pinnacle moment was yet to come. His system of sea lanes had been utilized chiefly by American ships, his coworkers being chiefly Americans, but Maury wanted all nations to cooperate with the U.S. observatory for the benefit of the maritime interests of the whole world. So, he called an international conference to meet in Brussels in August 1853. That might properly be termed the first League of Nations. It included Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Russia, France, Portugal, Great Britain, and the United States—representing 95 percent of the shipping of the world. The conference lasted 16 days, Maury's charts were unanimously adopted, and for the next 50 years those nations cooperated in exchanging maritime information along the lines proposed by Maury. But typical of Maury's modesty in declining to accept the presidency of the league was the reply he made to the praise that was given to the value of his scientific research: "I am extremely grateful for the sympathy you have expressed and the praise you have been pleased to bestow on my humble efforts. On my part I beg to thank you for the kind assistance that you have afforded me. Allow me to add that we are taking part in a proceeding to which we should vainly seek for a parallel in history. Heretofore, when naval officers of different nations met in such numbers, it was to deliberate at the cannons' mouths upon the most efficacious means of destroying the human species. Today, on the contrary, we see assembled the delegates of almost every maritime nation for the noble purpose of serving humanity by seeking to render navigation more and more secure. I think, gentlemen, we may congratulate ourselves with pride upon the opening of this new era."

Time will not permit me to enumerate the details of Maury's remarkable career but

they can be summarized by saying that in addition to founding the Naval Observatory, his magazine articles resulted in the founding of the U.S. Naval Academy, he furnished the data necessary for the laying of the first transatlantic cable and he was the real father of the Weather Bureau which grew out of his recommendations to the Government when he was a professor of physics at the Virginia Military Institute.

Maury had formulated the plan for the weather bureau for the benefit of farmers as well as mariners when he was head of the naval observatory but war came before he could perfect his plans. We find this significant statement, however, in one of his sailing directions to accompany the wind and current charts published in 1858: "As much as we have accomplished at sea, more yet can be accomplished through the magnetic telegraph on land. With a properly devised system of meteorological observations to be made at certain stations wherever the telegraph spreads its meshes, and to be reported daily by telegrams to a properly organized office, the shipping in the harbors of our seaport towns, the husbandman in the field, and the traveler on the road may all be warned of every extensive storm that visits our shores and while yet it is a great way off."

When Virginia seceded from the Union in 1861, Maury, like Lee, threw in his lot with the South and became head of coasts, harbors, and river defenses. He invented the electric torpedo for harbor defenses and because of his international fame as a scientist, President Jefferson Davis sent him to England in 1862 to procure torpedo materials. Maury remained in England until 1868 where he received signal honors, including an honorary degree from Cambridge. Both Russia and France offered him the directorship of their imperial observatories. But Maury loved his native Virginia, and like Lee, he felt he owed a duty to the youth of the South. So, turning down offers that would have meant international fame as a scientist, a life of wealth and ease, Maury returned to a professorship at VMI where he labored for the rest of his life seeking to solve the riddles of nature, particularly for the benefit of the farmer in connection with weather reports and passing on to younger men his thirst for scientific knowledge.

In utilizing his chair of physics as a sounding board for a national program in behalf of a weather bureau, Maury overtaxed his strength. Returning from a lecture in St. Louis, he knew that his career was near its close. He knew that the task of interpreting nature in terms of help rather than of hindrance for mankind had been permanently advanced by his efforts. The end came quietly on February 1, 1873. "Do I drag my anchors?" he asked with a smile. "Yes," said his son. "All is well," he replied.

Maury loved the beauty of Goshen Pass and his last wish was that he be carried through the pass when the Rhododendron and Laurel were in bloom. It was the flowers that blossom in Goshen Pass in the spring that he wished placed upon his coffined body as the last and only tribute of affection:

"Wait till the Laurel bursts its buds,
And creeping ivy flings its graces
About the lichen'd rocks, and floods
Of sunshine fill the shady places.

"Then, when the sky, the air, the grass,
Sweet nature all, is glad and tender,
Then bear me through the Goshen Pass
Amid its flush of May-day splendor."

Careless of monument by the grave he built it in the world—a monument by which man might be taught to remember not where he died but where he lived.

Maury was truly, as Dr. C. Alphonso Smith said at the dedication of the Goshen Pass monument, "founder of a new science, pilot of every ship that sails and herald of a new era of international cooperation."

If we of the present generation join with the Daughters of the Confederacy in Charlottesville and throughout our beloved Commonwealth in being true to the principles of Lee, Jackson, and Maury, there will undoubtedly be heard again the Bull Run battle cry, "Rally behind the Virginians."

The Food Crisis of Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Floyd E. Dominy, Associate Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, stated on January 20, 1959, before the Kansas Conservation Contractors Association in Hutchinson, Kans., that "Kansas is confronted with an obligation to the Nation and to the world." In his excellent address before this organization he stressed the growth of population, both in the Nation and in the world, together with increased demands for food that must be met within the next few decades.

Kansas will play an important part in this program, but in my opinion our part in the program will be largely determined by the amount of water we can conserve and use for beneficial purposes.

We have made great progress, but there is much more work to be done in controlling the water runoff of our State. With increased water supplies both for agriculture and industry, Kansas will be in a position to maintain its place among the States of the Union.

I ask unanimous consent that Commissioner Dominy's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOOD CRISIS OF HUMANITY

(Address by Associate Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy, Bureau of Reclamation, before the Kansas Conservation Contractors Association in Hutchinson, Kans., Jan. 20, 1959)

I was a little astonished, on receiving the invitation of your association to address this meeting tonight, to read that a suggested topic was "The Food Crisis of Humanity."

Here in the center of the Wheat Belt where, every year, we grow more grain to put in more warehouses with more subsidy from Uncle Sam to finance the growing of more wheat, in a seemingly endless circle, it may seem strange to be talking about a food crisis. Nevertheless, there is a continuing crisis which sends a good share of the world's population to bed hungry every night. You people are to be congratulated on your interest and foresight in discussing this problem even though it seemingly has no immediate relationship to your situation here.

A century and a half ago, the Reverend Thomas Robert Malthus forecast a catastrophe for the human race. He contended that, in time, the rise of population would ultimately overtake and pass the food supply.

His prophecy brought consternation to the world of his day. Then the industrial and agricultural revolution so stimulated food production that the Malthusian theory fell into disrepute, and its author with it.

Today, some economists, sociologists, and demographers—the people who forecast population trends—are finding many reasons for believing that the theory might yet come true. These people figure old Malthus was a pretty smart fellow, just a few centuries ahead of his day.

The world is divided between optimists and pessimists. When the pessimists examine the present world crisis in food, they become prophets of doom, subscribers to the Malthus theory. I prefer to be an optimist—I prefer to believe that man will continue to find ways to solve his problems.

But an optimist would be foolish to belittle or run away from reality. The reality is potentially ominous and spells out the gravity of the problem. A genuine crisis in food supply does confront the world. It is here—now—not in the future. It is real. The United States, the land of plenty has no immediate shortages but we must share world responsibility. And we must also keep an eye on that future time when our population growth outstrips our farm productive capacity and we become a potential land of want. As an optimist, I prefer to think that day will never come. As a realist, I prefer to take steps to insure that it does not come.

I think you will be interested in some figures that will indicate where present trends are carrying us.

In 1650, the world population was somewhere around 600 million. During the next 300 years, this population more than quadrupled to 2,700 million. The current trends are still upward—and from a constantly broadening base. Some demographers foresee another quadrupling within the next 100 years. There may well be 9 billion people in the world by the year 2050.

Put the problem in different and current terms. Population growth is the difference between births and deaths. Since this hour last night, the world population has increased by 123,000 hungry mouths. Since this hour last night the net increase in U.S. population is 8,000, or roughly one-fourth the population of Hutchinson, Kans.

Simple multiplication, at such rates, produces frightening totals. Within just 4 years the world population will increase by about 175 million people, the equivalent of the present United States population. The present world population of 2,700 million would nearly double in about 40 years, and the United States in the year 2000 would have more than 300 million citizens.

Now, all of this multiplication needs to be put into frames of reference to our topic tonight. The figures are meaningful if related to ability to produce food, fiber, and fuel, to standards of living, and to levels of subsistence.

Without assuming the role of pessimist, it can be stated simply that some 60 percent of the present inhabitants of the world are undernourished—certainly one-third of them seriously so. Peter Drucker, the economist, has pointed out that three-fourths of the world population have only one-tenth of the world's goods and income. Conversely, the North American Continent, with less than one-tenth of the population, enjoys up to three-fourths of the world's income and goods.

This gap between the underdeveloped portions of the globe and the more favored areas is not narrowing; rather it is widening—even in the last 10 years. The have-nots are getting less food and income and the haves are getting more. The effect must be that the 60 percent of people who are existing on less than 2,200 calories a day are those who day by day are being forced to drop further below the subsistence level.

Decline in death rates, rather than increase in births, is making the big difference in present population growth in the under-

developed lands. Each time these countries take a step forward in public health measures their population soars. In Ceylon, after the jungles were sprayed with DDT to reduce the incidence of malaria and other diseases of the tropics, the death rate dropped nearly 35 percent in 2 years. Food production remained constant. So in a few years famine struck. Once again population growth had outstripped food supply.

However, we should not limit ourselves to the underdeveloped areas in considering future food and population balance. The United States, for example, requires sustenance for 3 million additional people every year. Yet every year the United States is experiencing the loss of more than 1 million acres annually that hitherto had been devoted to agricultural production. Despite this annual loss in productive acres, our total area in farms has been relatively the same for the last 40 years, thanks to diligent efforts by private and public enterprise to bring new lands into production. Parenthetically, I might remark that the lands brought under irrigation or given supplemental water supplies by the Bureau of Reclamation have been averaging about 175,000 acres a year.

In spite of the annual land loss to new roads, industries, and community expansions, the United States continues to be a Nation having surpluses of certain foods. This paradox is caused partly because of technological advances in plant breeding, in mechanization, and in uses of insecticides, pesticides, and fertilizers. As an outstanding "have" Nation insofar as food supply is concerned, we Americans owe a real debt of gratitude to our soil scientists and to our free agriculture and its related businesses and producer cooperatives.

I am sure that most of you in this group are aware that the United States' production per acre has increased sharply during the last 2 decades. But it is also a matter of record that the rate of increase of production was greater during the earlier decade than in the second; in fact, the rate of increase during the last 10 years has been only about two-thirds that of the preceding period.

The Agricultural Research Service, the source of this comparison, adds that the rate of increase of crop production per acre per year must be more than twice the increase experienced during the last 10 years, if we are to meet our requirements by 1975. In the face of our glutted warehouses of basic agricultural commodities, this observation is generally unknown or unappreciated.

Commenting on these statistics, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the 1958 National Rivers and Harbors Congress, declared:

"Even if we are able to increase our total farm land 30 million acres by 1975, the rate of increase in crop production until then must be 50 percent greater than the rate of increase in the last 10 years. Furthermore, this projection of 30 million additional acres of farm land by 1975 is predicated upon the assumption that 5 million of these new acres will be irrigated.

"That is more new land than the Bureau of Reclamation has brought under irrigation during its 56 years of existence. Therefore, it is plain to see that if we are to meet 1975 and subsequent conditions we must have more land under cultivation, or the rate of increase in production per acre per year will have to be far greater than it has been in recent years."

We get concurrence from a Department of Agriculture source. Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, has said:

"In our time we shall see the rising population and the dwindling amounts of farm land meet. From that day on, you and your children can no longer be assured of the healthy balanced diet to which we have become accustomed."

This is the situation that portends here in food-rich America. Robert C. Cook, Director of the Population Reference Bureau, emphatically summarizes what it means. Said Dr. Cook: "The population bomb is as great a threat to mankind as the nuclear bomb. Fortunately, its fuse is longer."

Now, what are the implications that would particularly concern and interest this gathering? One long-range effect is extremely significant in this area, dominated as it is by production of grain and livestock. That is, that production of domestic animals for work purposes is a luxury that the world ultimately will not be able to afford. In the future—and I hope it is in the far, far distant future—production of domestic animals for meat consumption purposes may follow the same course to oblivion. Even today, in industrialized and rich western Europe, beefsteak from a prime steer is almost a rarity.

Dr. J. Murray Luck, Stanford University biochemist, points out that cattle, sheep, poultry, and swine consume about three times the amount of food calories that are consumed by man. Only a small part of this is food refuse, unfit for human consumption. In a world of 9 billion people, it seems certain that the number of domestic animals raised for meat will be reduced. Mankind may have to go more largely to a cereal diet with the amino acids of the animal proteins being substituted by laboratory synthesis. Again I emphasize the hope that any such substitute for a good beefsteak is a long way off.

Dr. Luck also reminds us that less than one-tenth of the earth's land area of 36 billion acres is under cultivation, and one-sixth of the earth's land surface is now used as pasture. Some of the pastureland and another billion acres of marginal land in the north and in the tropics could conceivably be brought into cultivation in the coming world struggle against hunger. Through such recourse to lands not now cultivated, existing techniques would permit possibly a doubling of world food production. But even this increase will hardly keep up with exploding population increases.

Says Dr. Luck:

"To feed 9 billion people in the year 2050, even at minimum levels, it is reasonably certain that vast sums will have to be expended in land reclamation, in the prevention of further erosion, in the manufacture of fertilizers, in the husbanding of nitrogenous and phosphorus-containing wastes, and in irrigation and water conservation.

"Domestic animals, whether used for food or for work will be displaced—the former by the synthetic products of the food industry, and the latter by the machine. The harvesting and cropping of food from the oceans and from the fresh waters of the earth will be carried out much more efficiently, and the cultivation of bacteria, yeasts, and photosynthetic algae for human food will be further developed where regional conditions are appropriate."

Aldous Huxley observes that "world output of mineral fertilizers could easily be doubled, with immense benefit especially to backward countries," and that the average wheat yield per acre is less than one-fifth of that of the best farms in the best countries. The world average of milk yield per cow probably could be trebled.

Irrigation, multiplication of the effective yield of grasslands, reduction of loss because of weeds, pests and animal disease, genetics and chemical production of synthetic foodstuffs all are waiting to be exploited, Huxley points out.

He concludes:

"Thus, if we really set our minds, our muscles, and our machines to it, it would clearly be possible, one way or another, to increase the world's food supply very appreciably in the space of a few decades, and probably to multiply twofold or threefold in the space of a few generations."

Certain measures that can be considered immediate are equally obvious. Foremost among these is irrigation but this, in turn depends upon conservation and wise development and use of our water resources. The United States wastes water flagrantly, and at a time when the water consumption per individual is skyrocketing.

Today's national demand for water—250 billion gallons a day—will be double that amount in 20 years. A possible remedy close to you conservation contractors is the urgent requirement for reducing water loss attributable to seepage, weeds, and phreatophytes. We, as a Nation, cannot afford this deplorable waste; neither can we go on wasting the substance of our lands by letting erosion continue at its present rates.

Current experiments toward enlarging our available water supply are encouraging. In this field are studies to retard evaporation on bodies of stored water; conversion of sea water and brackish water; and means of encouraging greater precipitation from the atmosphere.

Not only in the 17 western reclamation States, of which Kansas is one, but elsewhere in the Nation, there are numerous opportunities for private and public sources to develop both surface and ground waters. Such enterprises takes much time, planning, and money and the year 2000 is really much closer to us than it seems. When we refer to the year 2000, we are expressing concern for the welfare of our own children and grandchildren—and you parents all know how amazingly fast those youngsters grow to adulthood.

The Colorado River storage project, which includes both mainstem storage and participating projects, will require between 30 and 50 years to complete. The Missouri River basin project, from which Kansas benefits, was authorized 15 years ago and only now are we beginning to realize some of the positive benefits by irrigation. Any large scale irrigation on this project is still some years away.

Although requiring fewer years for completion, other smaller reclamation projects also emphasize that the 41 years until the year 2000 is a short span of time because many of those proposed, surveyed, and needed soon, haven't even been authorized.

I am one who believes that the principles on which the Reclamation structure has rooted and grown strong should be perpetuated. I believe in the continuation of the family-size farm as a means of individual agricultural enterprise. I believe in the principle of reimbursability, a credo of Reclamation since its inception in 1902. I believe in the worth to the Nation of reclamation enterprise. I believe—yes, I know—that reclamation projects stabilize, develop, and enhance not only the economy of the local area in which each exists, but also yield important benefits to the respective States and the Nation.

These being my convictions, I remain firmly of the belief that all water resource development groups—private, local, State, and Federal—should cooperate to develop surface waters for agricultural, municipal, and industrial purposes at a rate equal to or, if possible, even beyond that of recent experience. The population pressures of our times—to say nothing of the population pressures of the immediate future—should be recognized for the inexorable force that they are.

Meanwhile, urgent water requirements conflicting with the development of irrigated agriculture are with us at this moment. An example is found along the Kansas-Oklahoma border. The city of Wichita has an urgent need for domestic water supply. Cooperatively, the city and the Federal Gov-

ernment are proposing the construction of the Wichita project on the Ninnescah River. If authorized by the Congress, the Bureau would build the dam and multiple-purpose reservoir, and the city would, in addition to amortizing the cost of the dam, construct the pipelines to deliver water to the urban users.

Other projects along the Kansas-Oklahoma border contain prospects for agricultural developments. These developments will come, just as surely as hopes of a quarter century ago have become realities near the Kansas-Nebraska border. The Kirwin and Webster Units of the Missouri River Basin project on the Solomon River, and the Bostwick Division on the Republican River in Kansas, are new irrigation developments which will diversify dryland agriculture and aid the struggle for adequate diets the world over.

Collectively, these same projects will have facilities by the next crop year to deliver water to about 23,500 acres. Actually, on the Bostwick division in Kansas and the Kirwin unit, about 19,500 acres received irrigation water during 1958.

These Federal projects represent a rather small proportion of the total of irrigated acreage within your State. Kansas State College calculated that the irrigated acreage of the State of Kansas in 1957 was 644,000 acres. This is a total acreage, including lands receiving water from both surface and underground sources, from both gravity and sprinkler applications. It is a rather dramatic threefold increase from the total irrigated acreage in 1949 of only 248,000 acres.

There are prospects for important expansion of irrigation and of food production in Kansas and in others of the semiarid reclamation States. To deal with the problems of the imminent future, however, we should not confine our thinking to the irrigation States. In all of these United States, water for irrigation must compete with demands for water for domestic and industrial purposes, and indeed with water for navigation and for carrying off the wastes of our urban and industrial civilization.

Wise men of the immediate and the more distant future must concern themselves with the problems of competition for the available water supplies. Where water exists as surplus today, these wise men should devote their abilities to the end that the water is put to use, and at least part of it to enhance the productivity of the land.

It is such an approach that is involved in the development of irrigated agriculture outside the semiarid areas of the West. Arkansas' irrigation totaled nearly 900,000 acres in 1956. Florida irrigated 600,000 acres in 1957. Even Iowa has risen to 40,000 irrigated acres, Michigan to 68,000, Missouri to 32,000, South Carolina to 62,000, and Virginia to 37,000 acres. As you know, these are all States of relatively high annual rainfall.

In those areas of the populous East and South in which water can be devoted to agricultural production, some striking production results have been achieved. Gov. George D. Clyde, of Utah, told the recent convention of the National Reclamation Association about some net increases in crop yields in experiments with irrigation. After taking all irrigation costs into account, he said, sweetpotato production in Georgia increased in value about $400 an acre; tobacco in Virginia increased $282 per acre; cotton in Missouri $242 an acre, and even pasture land in Tennessee gained in value by $122 an acre.

Kansas is confronted by an obligation to the Nation and the world. It is blessed by having productive land, precipitation which is adequate for agriculture during most years, and water supplies which are greater than are needed in some places for current municipal, industrial, and irrigation demands.

You contractors, whose purpose is to assist residents of this State to conserve their water and land resources, should be among the first to accept Kansas' obligations for leadership in this coming battle against worldwide hunger.

Kansas is likely to be spared some of the greater problems inherent in population growth—the concomitant urbanization and industrial pressures that now confound smaller States and those with less productive soil and water. This really is a most fortuitous position. You Kansans have the opportunity and the responsibility to use your most abundant resources to help others who have and will have more complex and greater population pressures.

You might be distracted by the shibboleth—yes, shibboleth—of grain surpluses. Such surpluses, today and more so in the future, are transitory, even so far as United States needs are concerned. Right now, your grain production seems to be a problem to yourselves and to the National Government.

In the light of world needs, take pride in your 1958 production, overwhelming as it was. Take pride, and hope that future years will be as productive: In your winter wheat yield of 291 million bushels, 54 percent above the average; your record grain sorghum yield of 129 million bushels; your record soybean crop of 9.3 million bushels; your corn and your alfalfa hay crops, one-third and two-thirds greater respectively than the 10-year average for Kansas.

In the interests of conservation—of husbanding of Kansas' soil and water—each of you bears his individual obligation to mankind. The conservation work you perform now will help assure bountiful harvests for future generations.

Thank you for your courtesy in extending to me this invitation, and my very best wishes to you in your present and future efforts to develop the abundant soil and water resources of the great State of Kansas.

Highway Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two speeches which I recently delivered before groups interested in highway construction. The first one was given December 1, 1958, at San Francisco before the American Association of State Highway Officials and the second one, January 19, 1959, before the American Road Builders Association in Dallas, Tex.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE PROBLEMS AHEAD

(Remarks of U.S. Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, ranking Republican member, Senate Subcommittee on Roads, at 44th annual meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials, San Francisco, Calif.)

Roadbuilding in the United States is the outstanding example of a working partnership between the several States and the Federal Government. You are the people who carry out the program of that partnership. We Members of Congress may write the charter of the partnership—but if the program is to be successful, the terms and the modifications must be based upon an understanding of the conditions which you encounter at the grassroots of action.

That is why, Mr. President, your representatives are so welcome at congressional hearings. It is also why we welcome these opportunities to rub shoulders and exchange views with you at these annual meetings of your association. All of us have our responsibilities in the partnership.

To illustrate the responsibilities of partnership or teamwork in a negative way, I like the story told me by an old prospector friend in the Black Hills. His search for the elusive El Dorado took him, some years ago, into the northern part of Canada. There he employed as guide a native who was part Indian, part French in blood.

The guide told him one night that they were near the place where the British Hudson Bay Company had lost a fur trader some years before. The trader had died during a hard winter and those with him buried his body in the frozen earth. Next summer, the Hudson Bay Company sent a party into the northlands in an effort to find the grave and recover the body. They employed some of the natives to assist them. The guide of my prospector friend, however, was employed that time not as a guide, but as a cook.

The party searched for several weeks in vain. They did not recover the body of the lost fur trader. My prospector friend from the Black Hills said to his half-breed guide, "That was sure too bad. I wonder where he could have been buried."

"Oh," the guide said to him, "You want to see the grave? I show you."

"What," my prospector friend said, "Do you know where it is?"

"Sure do," the guide replied, "I show you."

"But," my friend said, "Why didn't you lead the Hudson Bay party to it?"

"Oh," his guide came back, "On that trip I not hired to guide. My job to cook, so I cook, not guide."

DIFFERENT APPROACH NEEDED

Needless to say, such an approach to a Federal-State partnership in roadbuilding would leave many problems unsolved. Unless there be an understanding at the Federal legislative level of your problems in the field at the roadbuilding level, and at your end an understanding of our legislative problems, and at both levels a spirit of, and freedom in, teamwork, we would not get the job done. That there has been good progress, outstanding progress in the past year on all Federal-aid systems is evidence of excellent understanding and teamwork.

During the last session of Congress, three bills were passed which were the result of outstanding teamwork, teamwork within our congressional committees, teamwork with the Bureau of Public Roads, and teamwork with the highway officials of the several States. The three were:

1. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958.

2. The General Highway Act of 1958, which codifies and brings together all of the Federal highway legislation in one compact statute.

3. The act to amend the Federal Aid Act of 1958 by extending for an additional year, 1960, the estimate of costs on the Interstate System so that apportionments could be made for the customary biennium.

This last act would not have been passed without the help given by your association officers in bringing out the inconvenience and delay that would have been created in the several States had the many legislatures which meet in January not known the Federal aid apportionment for the second year of the biennium for which they customarily provide.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHT AID ACT NOTABLE

In addition to the usual features of the regular biennial Federal aid act, the first bill that I cited, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1958 was notable, I think, for these things:

1. Acceptance of the new cost estimates as the basis for making apportionments of funds for the Interstate System. That was a definite break from the old area-mileage-population basis.

2. Establishment of a modified form of billboard regulation on the new right-of-way portions of the Interstate System.

3. Creation of the emergency fund of $400 million for auxiliary construction of roads not on the Interstate System, the so-called "D" fund of the Bureau which States might use on the other Federal aid systems in the way best calculated to meet their emergency needs with matching "L" funds advanced, if needed, on an automatic repayment or deduction basis.

4. Provision for hearings for rural people on highway locations, giving them the same right previously accorded bypassed towns and cities.

Those were all notable legislative accomplishments, I think, and they reflected teamwork in the field of roadbuilding for the United States.

NEW PROBLEMS AHEAD

The coming session of Congress opening in January will bring some very definite problems. On them we will need your counsel and help. Of many that might be mentioned, I shall discuss briefly three:

1. Adequate financing for the trust fund.

2. A demand for greater highway safety.

3. Requests by States for recognition of money they have put into free roads and toll roads that are on the Interstate System.

I will take them up in reverse order.

First, then, as to the requests by States for recognition of the money they have put into both free roads and toll roads that have become a part of the Interstate System.

I must frankly admit that I did not realize the importance of this matter to some States until I drove to New York, up the Thruway, and into Connecticut and into Massachusetts and saw what splendid and expensive modern highways were being or had been built on the initiative of those States without getting apportionments on a 90-to-10 basis of Federal aid, yet which would be parts of the Interstate System.

In New York, for example, I was told that 540 miles of the 1,210 miles of interstate in that State, are on that toll road—a project with a construction cost of $800 million absorbed into the Federal system without earning as of this time any credit in the apportionments to that State. Also, that an additional $100 million would be put into bridges and traffic separations as a part of the Interstate System but financed by tolls and getting no recognition in apportionments.

In Kansas, I am told, one-half of her toll road system is similarly incorporated into the Interstate System without reimbursement. And a similar point could be made for toll roads in New Jersey, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Virginia, West Virginia, Ohio, Illinois, and Indiana.

INTEGRATION OF STATE ROADS

But if this point can be made for States with toll roads that are incorporated into the Interstate System without reimbursement, what about the same States and other States which see many miles of roads that have been paid for on a regular 50–50 matching basis and are put into the system without either tolls or apportionment to reimburse the States? Obviously, they are entitled to consideration, too.

During a hearing on this matter, last spring, we were told by the Bureau of Public Roads that $4.83 billion would be required to reimburse the several States if they were to be reimbursed at this time for the depreciated value of all the roads, toll and free, that are being made a part of the Interstate System.

That figure illustrates the difficulty of doing anything with the problem at this time. It would take the funds equal to 2 years of past apportionments to fully reimburse the States on that basis. I am sure that no one wants to suspend the construction program for 2 years in order to do that.

The Bureau of Public Roads, however, is under a congressional directive to report to the next Congress on possible formulas for reimbursement. While recognizing there is merit in the principle of reimbursement, I for one believe we cannot accept any formula which would interrupt or delay the construction program now underway. I hope your association will feel the same way about it.

HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPORTANT

A second problem which I predict will receive increasing attention in Congress is that of highway safety. Public opinion will not forever tolerate the casualty lists that papers carry today of fatalities and injuries due to highway accidents.

In the last Congress, no less than 30 bills were introduced which proposed to deal with highway safety in one way or another. Five of them proposed studies and investigations—notwithstanding the parts of existing law which place upon the Bureau of Public Roads the responsibility for a continuing study of accidents and efforts to reduce them by methods of design and construction.

The Bureau of Public Roads has studied and analyzed and is installing electronic equipment better to catalog types and causes of accidents—but no mere classifying of accidents is going to correct the situation unless we have the courage to enact necessary legislation at State and Federal levels.

Three separate bills proposed requiring safety belts to be installed on automobiles sold in interstate commerce. Three others proposed speed limitations with speedometer control or other devices.

One bill would sanction interstate compacts to promote highway safety while another would encourage the establishment of uniform traffic laws throughout the several States. Another would require luminous buttons or strips on freight cars in an effort to prevent broadside crashes into trains stopped at or passing highway crossings. Another would reward acts of heroism by drivers of motor vehicles under carrier regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

This review does not exhaust the list or the approaches to the problem but should suffice to indicate a growing consciousness on the part of Members of Congress that something should be done to reduce the accidents that, in round figures, are killing 40,000 people a year in the United States and injuring three to four times that number, with a terrible cost in pain, suffering, lost time, broken families, maimed and crippled people—to say nothing of high insurance rates.

STUDIES UNDERWAY

Executive agencies are making studies of accidents. In addition to the activities of the Bureau of Public Roads under section 117 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 in attempting to classify accidents by types, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has completed 1 year of fieldwork in an effort to evaluate national well-being in terms of highway accidents.

I am told that these studies bring out a lack of uniformity in definition and reporting of accidents and their causes. The Bureau of Public Roads is trying to get statistics on a fairly uniform basis from 11 States. This data will be put through an electronic high-speed computer in an attempt to determine accident rates by speed, type of vehicle and kind of driver. An intensive accident investigation project is underway at Northwestern University. The President's Committee for Traffic Safety plans to present legislative needs to the several State legislatures.

These steps are all to the good—but it is becoming increasingly clear, I believe, that mechanical devices in the cars and safety designs in highway construction will not of themselves prevent many of the most tragic accidents which are catalogued under the head of reckless driving.

I was impressed some months ago to see an article in the Saturday Evening Post with this title: "We Jail Drunken Drivers." The article was by Goodwin J. Knight, Governor of California—so in the State which is host to this convention, I offer my commendation for his frank statement of a policy which other States might well adopt.

DRUNKEN DRIVING

Somehow since the repeal of the Prohibition amendment it has seemed to be regarded as politically unethical to propose legislation to deal with excessive use of liquor and dangerous to report that an accident in early morning hours was due to careless driving by a drunken driver. That, of course, is not always the cause but many an innocent life has been snuffed out in an accident labeled as reckless driving where the circumstances clearly indicate a more precise cause could be given.

We can design and build roads and intersections for greater safety but all this will be for naught unless the man or woman, the boy or girl at the wheel has the competence and the sense of responsibility necessary to drive safely for those they meet on the road as well as those who ride with them.

Police powers under the Constitution rest with the States—but I do not hesitate to say that if the States fail to enact adequae and effecive legislation on car inspection, driver tests and driver performance, the Federal Government will find a way to do so. An aroused public opinion will demand that it do so.

ADEQUATE HIGHWAY FINANCING

I come now to the first problem that I listed—perhaps the one that is first in priority as a mechanical matter of highway legislation—namely, that of adequate financing for the highway trust fund.

We are told that revenues accruing to the trust fund during the fiscal year 1957 and 1958 totaled $3,526 million, or $41 million more than the original estimates. During the first 4 months of this fiscal year, the revenues have been slightly below estimates.

Last spring and summer Congress passed, and the President approved, legislation directing that the full amount for the several Federal aid systems should be apportioned to the States notwithstanding the provisions of the so-called Byrd amendment which is found in section 209(g) of the 1956 Highway Act. That is the portion of law which says that apportionments for Interstate System aid for any fiscal year may not exceed the amounts expected to be available in the trust fund to liquidate obligations resulting from such apportionments.

As a result of that waiver of the Byrd amendment, full apportionments were made for 1959 and 1960. Under present law, money will have to be borrowed from the general funds of the Treasury to meet the obligations that will accrue under the apportionments. But also, under existing law, amounts so borrowed must be repaid and those repayments must be provided for before apportionments can be made for 1961 and subsequent years.

I am advised by the Bureau of Public Roads, then, that on the basis of present

estimates, there will be no funds available to make apportionments for the Interstate System for the fiscal year 1961. And that the interstate apportionment for fiscal 1962 could not exceed $600 million and that thereafter the interstate apportionment would range from $1.3 to $1.5 billion per year in accordance with amounts estimated to be available in the highway trust fund for the interstate program, instead of the $2.5 billion authorized in the basic legislation if available. Congressman FALLON told us this morning that the prospective shortage in the fund may even reduce the apportionment for ABC roads by $200 million for 1 year if the fund is not rehabilitated.

FIVE POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

This creates a situation which must engage the attention of the public works committees and roads subcommittees in the next Congress. One does not have to be a prophet to predict that there will be a variety of opinions on what to do about it. At least five possible solutions suggest themselves:

1. Place the burden of rehabilitating the trust fund on the general funds of the Treasury.

2. Increase the present tax levies which go into the trust fund, meaning most likely an increase in the Federal gasoline tax.

3. Adopt some new or additional levies and dedicate the revenue to the highway trust fund.

4. Authorize a special bond issue to cover the anticipated shortage in the trust fund and extend the period of time for which the special levies are now authorized from a total of 16 years to 17 or 18 years, or whatever may be needed to retire the bonds.

5. Modify the scope of or standards required in the Interstate System; in other words, a stretchout.

I shall give only a sentence or two of comment upon each of these possibilities. I have no doubt each one present has some idea about them.

Resolution No. 1

On solution No. 1, the taking of funds from the Treasury, we can expect vigorous opposition, not only from the Treasury Department but from powerful Members of Congress in both parties who resist any move to increase the national debt. Many of these people are members of the House Ways and Means Committee or of the Senate Committee on Finance who would pass upon any legislation dealing with the subject.

To propose the assigning to the trust fund of any revenues from levies or excise taxes not now dedicated to that fund would be regarded as equivalent to taking the deficit money from the general funds of the Treasury and would meet the same opposition.

Such a solution, in my judgment, could not be enacted into law. If it should pass Congress, which is doubtful, I would expect a Presidential veto that could not be overridden in the face of the present high national debt and the prospect of $10 or $12 billion deficit in the current fiscal year.

Resolution No. 2

With regard to solution No. 2, an increase of the Federal gas tax, there will be some support, possibly administration support. For myself, I cannot be enthusiastic about such a solution. Many States either raised their gasoline tax in the last legislature or faced that possibility for next year. Public opinion would react badly to another Federal gasoline-tax increase—at least, until the new highway building, and particularly the Interstate System, has had more of a chance to show the economies and benefits that can flow from this development.

In passing I would make this observation: people who travel toll roads and pay 1½ cents per mile for the privilege are paying the equivalent of a 22-cent gas tax, assuming that the average car makes 15 miles per gallon.

In time, if the Interstate System achieves the acceptability that toll roads have won, an increase in the gas tax may be popular as a means of expediting conclusion of the system. That time is not yet.

It must be kept in mind that a great many people do not travel and will not be near to any part of the Interstate System. An increase in the gas tax will be paid by them as well as by Interstate Highway users. True the ABC roads come out of the trust fund but the Interstate apportionments take more than twice as much money as do the ABC roads. It is also to be kept in mind that an increase in gas taxes also makes a levy on those who use and pay for the toll roads.

Thus a solution based upon increasing the Federal gas tax will have its problems even though the method is appealing from the standpoint of easy administration and costs of collection.

Resolution No. 3

As for solution No. 3: New levies or sources of revenue. Only one comes to my mind, the possibility of employing a windshield sticker as a highway use fee to be collected by selling a stamp at the postoffices as was done during the war.

Publicity on the fact that the proceeds from the windshield stamp were to be used to pay for the road program would help but could hardly make this plan popular. A $5 stamp for passenger cars and a graduated stamp for pickups, trucks and buses could raise from $400 million to $900 million per year, depending, of course, upon the size of the stamps required for trucks and buses.

Even at the lower figure, with an even $5 stamp for all motor vehicles on the highways, the receipts if continued for the remaining period of the original 16-year levy period would probably retire or liquidate any shortage in the trust fund. This approach to the problem should be explored along with other possible solutions.

Resolution No. 4

Solution No. 4: The authorization of a special bond issue with the bonds to be retired by extension of the period of time for existing levels dedicated to the trust fund is the one for which I have heard most congressional support.

It has the defect, of course, of adding to the national debt, either directly or indirectly. However, it would have the virtue of carrying a specific plan for retirement of that debt increase which cannot be said for most other increases of the debt. Certainly this proposal deserves serious consideration.

Resolution No. 5

As for No. 5—modification of the scope or standards now required for the Interstate System, you may expect this answer to be pushed by some influential people.

An example came to my attention on my way to this gathering. The Deseret News-Salt Lake Telegram for November 29, 1958, devoted its major editorial to the subject and closed with these questions:

"Why can we not slow down the construction program, in other words, to fit the receipts rolling in? Those receipts amount to staggering totals—$8 billion by 1960, for example, which is just eight times the largest yearly amount ever spent by the Federal Government for highways before this highway program was adopted. Are expenditures of that magnitude really so inadequate?"

With a Federal budget facing a $12 billion deficit and new taxes unpopular, this attitude will develop support in many places.

So—we who are engaged in the building of a modern highway system for the people of the United States face some problems as we approach the year 1959 and a new session of Congress.

It would be possible for members of your association to say, "O, well, it is the business of Congress to find answers to these problems."

Similarly, members of the Committees of Public Works could say, "O, well, it is the business of the Finance and Ways and Means Committees to find the revenue to pay the bills. We are only supposed to map programs that will develop the country."

To such attitudes, however, I respectfully recall the story of the guide my prospector friend found up north. If he was hired to cook, he felt no obligation to be a guide, he had no feeling about teamwork. None of us desires a stretchout in the interstate program but if that is to be avoided, there must be an answer to the question: where do we get the money for the trust funds? We cannot dispose of it by saying that we were only hired to cook. Someone must guide.

I said at the first of my remarks that road building in the United States has been the outstanding example of a working partnership between the several States and the Federal Government.

Under the inspiration of the message of President Eisenhower to the Governors' conference in 1955, the greatest road-building program for this or any other nation in the history of the world was authorized and begun.

Each year, the dollar volume for that program is 10 times greater than the original cost of the Panama Canal. Everyone who has a part in this program, every-day worker, contractor, engineer, highway official, legislator or Congressman has a right to take pride in the program.

It is a constructive program not a destructive one. While valuable for national defense, its primary benefits are from day to day in adding to the pleasures, conveniences and welfare of the people in peacetime.

It is a partnership job—and I am confident that the Congress will have in the future, as it has had in the past, the counsel and the support of the American Association of State Highway Officials.

HIGHWAY FINANCING

(Remarks of Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, before the American Road Builders Association, Dallas, Tex., January 19, 1959)

The big road program is rolling. In 1958 $6.2 billion went to work on roads in the United States, an all-time high.

Congress passed its regular biennial highway act with approval of the revised cost estimates and authorized using them for making apportionments for the Interstate System for 1960 and 1961, at a rate of $2.5 billion for each year, started an annual increased increment of $25 million per year on the ABC roads, provided a new D program with $400 million for emergency or problem areas within the States, and wound up with a single act codifying all highway acts and their amendments into one compact document.

It was a notable year for roadbuilders in Congress, at the Bureau of Public Roads, in the several State highway departments and out on the highways and byways where the people want—and now are getting—better roads.

WHERE TO GET THE MONEY

But, as Federal Highway Administrator Bert Tallamy said to the American Association of State Highway officials at San Francisco a month ago, "It would be near the truth to say that all our problems are practically solved except the big one."

That big one, of course, is that old pocketbook problem—where are you going to get the money? The highway trust fund will, prospectively, be out of cash when the ABC apportionments are made in June this year for fiscal year 1961 and there will be nothing on which to make the 1961 apportionments for the Interstate System.

That will be due to the operation of section 209(b) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, known as the Byrd amendment.

Similarly, only $600 million will be available for the authorized $2.5 billion for 1962. Thereafter the interstate apportionment would range from $1.7 billion to $1.8 billion per year, roughly three-fourths of the authorizations.

BILLIONS SHORT

Put another way, over the span of the remaining years of the interstate program, the highway trust fund will be short a gross total of $13.3 billion, under present estimates. It adds up this way:

	Billions
Increased cost estimates on Interstate System (including the added 1,000 miles to 41,000)	$10.4
Increase ABC apportionments by $25 million per year up to an annual $1 billion per year	1.5
Allowance for the Federal or public land road items	1.0
New D program for problem areas	0.4
Total	13.3

Or, if we allow for contingencies, we could add $200 million and round off the problem at $13.5 billion for the 10 years.

To meet the immediate problem of apportionments for fiscal 1961 and 1962, I understand that the President's budget message being sent to the Congress today will probably recommend an additional gas tax levy of 1½ cents per gallon. That, it is estimated, will yield $1.7 billion per year, and supply the three-fourths deficiency indicated for those years.

The Bureau of Public Roads, by congressional directive, is presently engaged in making comprehensive studies from coast to coast to get a better idea of the distribution of benefits from improved highways. We in Congress directed the study in the belief that it would give guides which would be useful in future legislation, particularly in any reshifting of taxes or increase of levies.

ALTERNATIVE FINANCING METHODS

An increase in the gas tax is not the only method of meeting the problem which has been suggested. Other approaches mentioned include:

1. Taking funds from the general Treasury, which, of course would add to the Treasury's current deficit prospects.

2. Allocating to the trust fund the proceeds of certain excise taxes already levied, which, of course, would have the same effect on the Federal deficits and debt.

3. Giving special borrowing authority to the trust fund to go into the market and sell short- or long-term obligations to meet actual cash requirements and extending existing levies beyond 1972 to meet them.

4. Extension or readjustment of the authorized building program.

There is one other complication which I think has not been faced but which I foresee; namely, that Alaska at once, and Hawaii in the near future, will be asking for an allocation of some funds on a 90-percent Federal basis for the construction of some part of their highways, with controlled access design to connect principal points, even though a strictly interstate connection may not be possible. The new States will be paying the same Federal gas tax that other States do.

So, there is the big problem. I could discuss it further, but I anticipate that the question and answer plan for the panel will bring out the particular phases of the problem and possible solutions that are of most interest to you.

I assure you, President Steelman and delegates, that it is always a pleasure to meet with you and to get the benefit of your counsel as well as to share your enthusiasms in the great job of building better roads for a better America.

Grass as a National Floral Emblem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I believe that all of my colleagues are aware of the wide interest currently prevailing for the Congress to designate an appropriate flower as the national floral emblem of the United States. Just this past Wednesday the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] introduced a joint resolution which would make the golden corn tassel our national floral emblem.

That same day I received correspondence from two organizations in Kentucky supporting the selection of grass for the honor spot on the floral design. The Kentucky Bankers Association has approved, by resolution, a grass floral emblem, and Mr. William C. Johnstone, agricultural representative of the association, has responded to the corn tassel proposal with a highly interesting rebuttal and counterproposal which I should like to commend to your attention.

He says that he might go along with an ear of corn but not the tassel. As a matter of fact he even rates an ear of corn behind cotton. It is proposed that grass—all grass—should be considered for the floral tribute. Kentucky is noted for its grasses, its lush rich bluegrass from which stems the State's nickname as the "Bluegrass State," and its Kentucky 31 Fescue, a hardy grass popular for pasturage and conservation. We also have plenty of crabgrass in Kentucky, but I prefer to have some other State take the credit for it.

In order that my colleagues may further familiarize themselves with the merits of the grass proposal, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution adopted by the Kentucky Bankers Association, a statement by the association, the conservationist's response by Mr. Johnstone, and a letter dated January 15, 1959, from Mr. L. W. Murdock, chairman, Graves County Soil Conservation District.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION IN FAVOR OF GRASS AS A NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM

Whereas it has been suggested that the Kentucky Bankers Association, along with all other State bankers associations, endorse the adoption by the U.S. Congress of the corn tassel as our national floral emblem; and

Whereas joint resolutions have been introduced in Congress to make the corn tassel the national floral emblem; and

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the Kentucky Bankers Association that the corn tassel is not a perfect flower but is only the staminate, or male flower, and in itself is of little value; and that the pistillate, or female flower—the ear of corn—is the part that produces the valuable grains; and

Whereas the Kentucky Bankers Association recognizes the value of corn to the economy of our country, both in the past and present; but at the same time it is cognizant of the destruction of land and the terrible losses in fertility brought about by leaching and erosion due to the improper culture of corn on hilly, rolling, and unadapted land; and

Whereas the Kentucky Bankers Association has considered the merits of other plants as the national floral emblem and has found that grass, with its beautiful blooms and artistic seed heads, more nearly represents, than any other plant, the ideals and aspirations of the American people. (It is grass that was mentioned first, of all living things, in the story of creation; it was grass with its deep, penetrating rots that gave fertility and protection to the great plains and prairie soils of America; it was grass that sustained the buffalo whence came our forefather's food. It is grass that feeds the lowing cattle, the gentle sheep, the patient horse; it is to grass that we turn to heal our fields after they have been eroded and ravished by the plow and the cultivator. Grass is truly the hope of the conservationist and the dream of the naturalist): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Kentucky Bankers Association through action of its executive committee, meeting on December 17, 1958, and after much consideration, endorse the adoption of grass as the floral emblem of the United States and urge its adoption by the United States Congress and request the President of the United States to declare such fact by proclamation; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions and supporting documents be entered in the minutes of this meeting and copies be sent to the U.S. Senators and Congressmen from Kentucky, State bankers associations, State and National farm organizations, conservation associations, and the farm press and other individuals, groups, and organizations interested in the conservation and welfare of our country's greatest natural resource—its soil.

MAURICE KIRBY,
President.
RALPH FONTAINE,
Executive Secretary.

KENTUCKY BANKERS SEE GRASS AS BEST NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM

The Kentucky Bankers Association, always vigilant of the welfare of the State and solicitous of the conservation of its natural resources, has endorsed grass as the national floral emblem, urged its adoption by Congress and requested President Eisenhower to proclaim it, according to Ralph Fontaine, executive secretary of the association.

The action of the bankers' association was taken at a recent meeting of its executive committee as a result of a campaign originating in another State to make the corn tassel the national floral emblem. "The Kentucky Bankers Association is opposed to this," Mr. Fontaine said, "because, in the first place, the corn tassel is not a perfect flower. The corn flower is borne in two parts: The male part is the tassel and the female part is the ear". "Furthermore," continued Mr. Fontaine, "the culture of corn on unadapted land has caused serious erosion and untold damage to millions of acres of land in the United States."

"The adoption of the male corn flower is in direct opposition to the goal of conservationists and lovers of nature," according to Mr. Fontaine. The Kentucky Bankers Association has for years cooperated with agricultural leaders and organizations in promoting a grass-type agriculture in this State, putting emphasis on pastures and pasture-

using livestock. Only this month did the bankers association adopt the phrase "Conservation Is Everybody's Business" as their theme of the year and approved conservation as the major agricultural activity for 1959.

"Bankers believe in conservation," said Mr. Fontaine, "and grass is the hope of the conservationist. For over 10 years the Kentucky Bankers Association has been using scenes of livestock grazing on beautiful pastures with the phrase, "Kentucky, the Center of the Pasture Belt," as a part of its agricultural letterhead, and they are not ready to change at this time. There is nothing more beautiful and satisfying than lush, green pastures with occasional seed heads of bluegrass, orchard grass and fescue waving in the breeze. The adoption of grass as our national floral emblem would pay tribute to a worthy family and encourage its wider usage."

Copies of the bankers' resolutions have been sent to Kentucky's Senators and Congressmen, other State bankers' associations, and to State and National farm and conservation organizations. Many other groups are expected to join with the bankers in behalf of grass.

A Conservationist's Response to an Appeal To Make the Corn Tassel Our National Floral Emblem

Why the corn tassel? The American floral emblem should be a perfect and complete flower, representing all that is best in both men and women, a united family—a united country. The corn tassel is not a perfect flower. It is only the male organ of the corn plant. It blooms, it sheds pollen, it dries up and leaves nothing to show for its existence.

The male corn flower? No. It towers over the female, it waves in the wind and dominates the field. For only a few days it is virile and then, in its last wild rampage, it scatters its pollen to the wide ranges of the compass—then fades and dies and is gone forever.

The female corn flower? Yes. Well, maybe yes. Although not so showy as the tassel, it represents stability—food (and drink), clothing, warmth, beauty, fertility, and motherhood.

The corn tassel? No. They are in surplus production. Even though nine-tenths of the tassels were lost, the harvest would not be diminished. The tassels serve one purpose only—to bear, for a few hours, the pollen to fertilize the ovaries of the ear. They leave nothing to posterity.

But the female flower, the ear? Yes, well, maybe yes. The female flower and its three component parts; the cob, the grain and the husk, has intrinsic and historic values. The cob, from which emerges the golden, silver, and ruby silks, is the symbol of peace. From it is fashioned the oldtime corncob pipes; the pipes of peace, so to speak. And how we need them today. The grain—each one a veritable package of atomic energy which no human can produce without the help of the Almighty, might well be the symbol of immortality. They are the links between the past and the future. In them are those sparks of God-given life which, even though buried for thousands of years will grow again and reproduce themselves a thousandfold. And the shucks that wrap the cob and precious grain—even they might well symbolize protection and care. They protect those intricate parts, the tiny embryos and fragile silks until from them the kernels have developed. From these shucks our forefathers wove their chair bottoms, braided their welcome doormats and fashioned their mattresses. Even the silks that wither and dry so soon after fulfilling their purpose have a nostalgic remembrance for those country boys who used them, wrapped in the thin tissues of shuck, to enjoy their first venture into youthful freedom—the pleasure of smoking a cornsilk cigarette.

And what is more beautiful than an ear of corn? Fresh buttered sweetcorn; golden rich, yellow dent corn; rich, silvery, white corn. What child does not enjoy the mysteries of the exploding popcorn, and who does not admire the beauties of the colorful squaw corn?

The tassel? Never. The ear—yes—maybe, yes.

But why the rush? Why not consider other flowers? The cotton flower, for exemple, is a perfect combination of the male and the female blossom, the product of which represents food and fiber. Cotton has, from our early days, been the bulwark of trade and commerce. It has paid more foreign debts and brought over more foreign money than any other single American product.

But above all, why not consider grass as a national floral emblem? Not just one grass—any grass—all grass.

No more fiting tribute could be paid to any plant than that composed by the beloved late Senator from Kansas, John James Ingalls, who, in 1872, under the title "Bluegrass," wrote these immortal words:

"Next in importance to the divine profusion of water, light and air, * * * may be reckoned the universal beneficence of grass. * * * Grass is the most widely distributed of all vegetable beings, and is at once the type of our life and the emblem of our mortality. * * * Our earliest recollections are of grass; and when the fitful fever is ended, and the foolish wrangle of the market and forum is closed, grass heals over the scar which our descent into the bosom of the earth has made, and the carpet of the infant becomes the blanket of the dead.

"Grass is the forgiveness of nature—her constant benediction. Fields trampled with battle, saturated with blood, torn with the ruts of cannon, grow green again with grass, and carnage is forgotton. Streets abandoned by traffic become grass-grown like rural lanes, and are obliterated. Forests decay, harvests perish, flowers vanish, but grass is immortal. * * * Its tenacious fibers hold the earth in its place, and prevent its soluble components from washing into the wasting sea. It invades the solitude of deserts, climbs the inaccessible slopes and forbidding pinnacles of mountains, modifies climates, and determines the history, character, and destiny of nations. Unobtrusive and patient, it has immortal vigor and aggression. Banished from the thoroughfare and the field, it bides its time to return and when vigilance is relaxed, or the dynasty has perished, it silently resumes the throne from which it has been expelled, but which it never abdicates. It bears no blazonry of bloom to charm the sense with fragrance or splendor, but its homely hue is more enchanting than the lily or the rose; it yields no fruit in earth or air, and yet would its harvest fail for a single year, famine would depopulate the earth."

What more can we add? And what could be more beautiful than a colorful floret of grass waving gently in the breeze above a carpet of emerald green?

As for us—we cast our vote, first for grass, next for cotton, third for the ear of corn—but as for the corn tassel—we vote "No."

Wm. C. Johnstone,
Agricultural Representative, Kentucky Bankers Association.

Graves County Soil Conservation District,
Mayfield, Ky., January 15, 1958.

Senator Thruston Morton,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morton: The Graves County Soil Conservation District Supervisors would like to urge you to do everything possible to get grass adopted as the national floral emblem.

We know that grass is one of the most important tools we have in Kentucky for conservation of all natural resources. We feel that nationwide, it is the most important crop of all plants that are being grown in the United States.

Sincerely yours,

L. W. Murdock,
Chairman, Graves County Soil Conservation District.

Senator Alan Bible—A Good Man To Have Around

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record two recent editorials praising the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], for his work on the Senate District of Columbia Committee and expressing relief that he has decided to remain on the committee.

The first entitled, "A Good Man to Have Around," was the lead editorial in the January 22 issue of the Washington Daily News.

The second, entitled, "D.C.'s Aldermen," appeared in the January 16 Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objecion, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 22, 1959]

A Good Man To Have Around

District citizens can feel considerably relieved that Senator Alan Bible, Democrat of Nevada, has agreed to stay on the Senate District Committee.

Many politicians consider this a relatively thankless job. Senator Bible has served most conscientiously. His insight into District problems and his realization of the Federal Government's responsibilities to the city which it inhabits have made him particularly valuable to all those who share his concern for our town.

The fact that he now is serving on the Senate Appropriations Committee, too, should strengthen his hand in District affairs.

The Senate District Committee has had its membership cut from nine to seven. It has suffered from quorum troubles and this should enable it to get more business done. All seven are able men. They should accomplish much for the District in the months ahead. We need their best efforts and we wish them well.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Jan. 16, 1959]

D.C.'s Aldermen

It is good news indeed that Senator Alan Bible will continue as chairman of the Senate District Committee. He led it energetically and capably in the last Congress. His recommendation, which was adopted, that the Committee be reduced from nine to seven members to make it more manageable, seems to bespeak a determination to get some business done in this Congress, too. The appointment of Senator R. Vance Hartke, of Indiana, a former mayor of Evansville, as the only new Democratic member of the Committee is also welcome. In happy contrast to the attitude of some new Members of Congres, he seems to recognize the crying need for sincere congressional attention to

the affairs of the Nation's Capital. Senators MORSE and FREAR, each with long experience in District affairs, will also be back, and the prospect is for the appointment of well-qualified Republican members. While we'd rather be congratulating a Washington city council, these men have our sincere good wishes as they undertake their aldermanic chores.

Splendid Junior Achievement Program in Southeastern Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I rise to invite attention to the splendid program which is helping to train our young people in knowledge and skills of our free enterprise system—that is, the junior achievement program. During the week of January 25 through 31 special recognition will be given to this outstanding program designed to educate our young people on the working principles of our economic system.

Last week I was delighted that the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], introduced a concurrent resolution requesting the President to declare a week in January as National Junior Achievement Week. Unfortunately, the Judiciary Committee, before which this is pending, has not as yet had an organizational meeting. Consequently it has not been possible to act on the resolution.

I hope that the committee and the Congress will find it possible to take early and favorable action on this resolution, encouraging our young folks to learn more about our free enterprise system and thus be better able to cope with the problems of the future.

The program itself is a constructive learn-by-doing system of planned activities in which our youth, guided by advisers, become familiar with the many problems and challenges in setting up a business. Among others, these include acquiring a charter, deciding upon a product, planning production schedules, figuring production costs and operating expenses, paying wages, keeping accounts and other aspects of business operations. In addition, the junior achievers are required to plan for purchasing raw materials, leasing machinery, advertising, marketing, and other decisions necessary in conducting private enterprise.

Recently, I received from Mr. Ken Weidt, program director of the Junior Achievement of Southeastern Wisconsin, Inc., a résumé of their fine work in junior achievement. In recognition of the sound principles upon which this program is based, I invite their work to the attention of my colleagues and request unanimous consent to have the résumé printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT WEEK, JANUARY 25–31

One thousand six hundred and seventy-five teen-agers known as achievers and 350 volunteer business leaders known as advisers will be celebrating Junior Achievement Week January 25–31.

The junior achievement program constitutes the one movement in America, among our youth 15–19, that is really doing something to stem the tide of thinking that "the Government owes us a living" and that is realistically educating the coming generation to the false concepts in the philosophies of socialism and communism.

It is a practical business education program, a laboratory for developing business know-how in our teen-agers of today who will be the business men and women of tomorrow. It's better understanding and appreciating American free enterprise economic system.

During an 8-month period these teen-agers experience every facet of a corporate business. This includes acquiring a charter, deciding on a product, planning production schedules, figuring production costs, operating expenses, pay wages, selling costs, mark-up, profits, and account to their stockholders.

These achievers are also called upon to plan for purchasing raw materials, leasing machinery, inventory control, promotion, advertising, marketing the product, deciding on policy at board meetings and any and all of the other thousands of decisions, activities and worries that go with conducting a business private enterprise system.

The program in southeastern Wisconsin ranks nationally seventh in 152 areas operating in more than 235 cities.

Junior Achievement operates in Milwaukee, 3800 West Wisconsin Avenue, with 53 companies; West Allis, 1964 South 86th Street, with 13 companies; South Milwaukee, 914 Rear Madison Avenue, with 4 companies; Wauwatosa, 8830 West Bluemound Road (House of Good Shepherd), with 5 companies; Fort Atkinson, Wis., 1 company; and Lake Geneva, Wis., 1 company.

Products range from children's toys, clothes trees, auto accessories, household articles, outdoor tools, chemical products, and transistor radios.

A typical Junior Achievement company has 4 advisers and 20 achievers. Average capitalization, $105; average income, $342.31; average wages, $101.74; average sales income, $339.67.

The Plight of Our Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I recently received a most compelling letter from one of our senior citizens. I was so impressed with the depth and sensitivity of the letter that I felt it should be read by the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that excerpts of the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM LETTER TO SENATOR CLAIR ENGLE

I am one of those so-called senior citizens, nearly 70 years of age and about ready to retire from active practice of law, due to my inability to compete with the younger lawyers before the bar, as my memory along with rest of my body has "balanced wear."

Since the will to survive continues, even in spite of these handicaps which the senior citizens have, I am naturally interested in some things that when I was younger I did not let my mind dwell on. When we are young, life seems endless, and the ability to compete and make a good living seems sure. It is then that we feel that only the poor are deserving of poverty, and if they are poor it is all their own fault and their own planning. If they fail to use good judgment, due to a poorer and weaker mentality, that also is their own fault, and we are our brother's keeper, so what?

Now I am about down to what I want to say to you. We have some laws that are neither fish nor fowl, and no one can understand that kind of law enactment by our great Government. For instance, the Social Security Act administered through the Social Security Administration. Does this act provide charity or insurance? If it is insurance why do we have to actually retire first after we reach the handicapped age and cannot compete anyway for a living? If it is charity, why do we call it insurance and pay the full value for the protection? Is it half charity and half insurance? If it is insurance, why does it provide about one-fourth the amount required for a person to live? If it is charity, why do we have to retire from all our labors to get one-fourth the amount required on which to live? We are our brother's keeper, at least to the extent of being consistent and rational, even if we have no charitable inclinations, or emotions. Everyone gets old and helpless at the extreme end of life, both the rich and the poor share the same fate. All our mothers and fathers reach this position in life, if they live long enough. It doesn't matter what their personal opinions are when they are young and vigorous. They change them when the hour of disability and death draws near, and the bell in the graveyard tolls.

Financing of the Interstate Highway Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, entitled "Somebody Must Pay for Those Highways," published in the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of January 22, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOMEBODY MUST PAY FOR THOSE HIGHWAYS

Already the Connecticut motorist pays a 9-cent gasoline tax—6 cents to the State and 3 to the Federal Government. That means that if you can find a pump to sell you gas for 27 cents, one-third of it goes for taxes. though some goods, like cigarettes, are taxed even more outrageously, this is still pretty steep.

In view of all this, who is there who will not join the protest against President Eisenhower's budget recommendation that the Federal gas tax be raised by one-half, from 3 to 4½ cents? Certainly we do not lack for protests. Local newspapers and radio, for example, yesterday got a shower of six of them. They came from the Connecticut Petroleum Council, the Connecticut Motor

Stage Association, the Connecticut Conference of Farm Organizations, the New England Bus Association, the Connecticut State Grange, and the Motor Transport Association of Connecticut. Nor does the fact that all came in the same envelope, on the same paper, and presumably from the same mimeograph machine, necessarily mean that these pleas are not valid. They are part of the modern American way of mobilizing various conflicting pressures, out of which we shape our legislation.

At the same time it is questionable whether it is wise to protest the Eisenhower tax proposal. The budget balance is, as the President himself noted, precarious at best. What if this tax is rejected? What will that do to the dollar, and to our whole economy?

It is curious, too, that the same people who protest that Uncle Sam is reducing them to wearing a barrel ride their oversized, overcostly, 300-horsepower automobiles with much pleasure over such sections of the new Interstate Highway System as have been built. The 13-year program for criss-crossing the country with a network of modern highways is going to be barely enough to bring our roads up to our own motoring habits. If these roads are good enough for us to want, then they are good enough for us to pay for. There isn't any Santa Claus beside the taxpayer, whether you call him the Federal Government or not. And who is a better one to pay for the new roads than the man who uses them?

The same philosophy applies to other budgetary fields. The other day the first district's new Congressman [Mr. DADDARIO] was lamenting that the Eisenhower budget omitted a new Federal office building for Hartford. This is indeed regrettable. And no doubt the omission is a popular issue on which to make votes. But again, if this building is good, doesn't somebody have to pay for it? And if we don't want to pay for it to the tune of unbalancing the budget, as we shouldn't, maybe we can get along for awhile without.

After all, we are in a cold war. And as the $42 billion defense item in a $77 billion budget makes clear, a cold war is the most expensive thing you can have short of a hot war. Here we are, trying to compete with totalitarian peoples who work a 60- to 70-hour week, and like it because they have a sense that they and their country are going places. We want a 4½-day week, and we want even more good things from our Government. But we scream when it comes to paying for them. It doesn't make sense.

Most Young Citizens Are Better Than We Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, although numerous newspaper headlines recently have dealt with juvenile delinquency, investigation reveals that most American young people are not included in this category. By far the number of young people today are working seriously at being good citizens and becoming better ones. This is evidenced not only in their studying to prepare themselves for the future, but in what they are doing now.

Young people today are doing volunteer work in hospitals and nurseries, helping to collect funds for charities, working for better government by supporting for public office persons in whom they believe, joining church and civic work projects to better their own community or to assist someone else, and participating in a number of other worthwhile activities to make this a better world.

They do this work earnestly and quietly and are seldom recognized for their service.

Mr. President, in recognition of the vast majority of the fine young people in our Nation today, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Young Citizens," which was published in the Corpus Christi Caller of January 8, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUNG CITIZENS

Not all schoolchildren are little monsters, according to the National Education Association, despite the impression that may have been created by the publicity given to juvenile delinquency. The NEA finds a higher percentage of those in school lead exemplary lives than do members of the older generations.

In a handbook for parents and teachers entitled "Juvenile Delinquency—Research, Theory, and Comment," the education association goes into some detail in analyzing the age groups of the most susceptible and the influence of schools on the problem. It even categorizes delinquency into two parts: Cultural and emotional delinquencies.

Less than 5 percent of school-age children were found to be other than normal, reasonably healthy and law-abiding citizens, and of this 5 percent a remarkably large number were found to be not in school. Of delinquents, 95 percent of those 17 years old, 85 percent of those 16 years old, and 50 percent of those aged 15 do not attend schools, according to the NEA's survey.

"The big stumbling block—for the general public as well as for teachers—is the scarcity of reliable information on the subject compared to the abundance of medicine-man prescriptions," complains the NEA. Despite the lack of material and proper guidance, the schools seem to have done a commendable job in promoting citizenship among their students.

In dividing juvenile delinquency into two parts, the educators have eliminated from the hard core of hoodlums the passively antisocial cultural delinquent. He is described as the otherwise normal child who shows antisocial tendencies only so far as is necessary to conform to the code of his gang.

The emotional delinquent is the bully, the sadist or the violent hoodlum who is motivated by inner urges. He is the true delinquent, the menace to society, and the one responsible for the shadow of guilt cast wrongly on many of his youthful contemporaries. He is also the one in need of psychiatric or psychological help.

It is both gratifying and revealing to note the small percentage of youths who have earned themselves the label of juvenile delinquent. Even this small group, however, is responsible for some of the most heinous crimes and it is to the eradication of this element, and not the blackening of youthful reputations, that the fight against juvenile delinquency must be waged.

Civil Rights Legislation in the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, yesterday the Washington Post's lead editorial, entitled "Coup on Civil Rights," opened the substantive discussion of civil rights legislation in the 86th Congress.

I do not believe that the scope of the civil rights bill of 1957 has the immutability of the laws of the Medes and the Persians. S. 499 presents some new ideas, which I intend to study thoroughly, and I commend to the Senate the Post editorial in the thought that consideration of civil rights legislation should never be approached from fixed, or doctrinaire positions.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

We should ever strive not for civil rights issues, but for the enactment of feasible civil rights legislation, marking progress in this field.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUP ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Senate Majority Leader JOHNSON has prepared a coup of potentially great significance in the introduction of a moderate and thoughtful civil rights bill. Senator JOHNSON has taken the lead away from the administration with a bill which, as the President indicated on Wednesday, may be similar in several particulars to what the Department of Justice is expected to recommend.

It is significant also that Mr. JOHNSON intends to use the bill as a test of the revision of rule XXII which he sponsored. Having persuaded the Senate to adopt his compromise plan for curbing filibusters, he wants to demonstrate that a civil rights bill can be passed without prolonged paralysis in the Senate. This strongly indicates that the bill is offered as a practical piece of legislation rather than as political window dressing.

Major discussion no doubt will be focused on the section of the bill establishing a Community Relations Service "to provide conciliation assistance" in communities in which peaceful relations among citizens might be threatened by disagreements over interstate commerce or "disagreements or difficulties regarding the laws or Constitution of the United States." In plain language, this means conciliation in such situations as the Montgomery bus boycott.

Whether such efforts by an independent Federal agency actually would be helpful in reestablishing communication between disputants on civil rights issues still must be proved. The idea is an appealing one borrowed from the work of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service in labor disputes. But there is a basic difference between the adjustment of wage disputes and the enforcement of law.

Basic human and legal rights of course cannot be compromised or bargained away. Obviously it would require a very special type of conciliation to find means of bridging such community gaps in conformity with the Constitution, and a prerequisite

probably would be a basic anxiety on both sides actually to reach a settlement.

The least controversial sections of the bill are likely to be those extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission to January 31, 1961, and giving the Department of Justice subpena powers in voting rights cases. The CRC of course will have to be continued if it is to carry out the mandate Congress gave it. And the effective protection of voting rights is in many ways the key to respect for other civil rights.

The new subpena power would enable the Department of Justice to examine registration books and other documents without going through the cumbersome process of impaneling a grand jury. That power would not be used when documents could be voluntarily obtained, but it would assure the Department ample data on which to make cases when voting rights are denied. With the facts thus at hand, the Attorney General could go into court and seek an injunction against further denial of voting rights.

Some question may be raised about the possibility that another section of the bill might weaken local law enforcement in bombing cases. This section consists basically of a prohibition against transportation of explosives across State and National lines with intent to destroy property. It will need close examination to avoid collision between Federal and local authority and duplication of the present law under which the FBI cooperates generally with local police in such cases.

Irrespective of any controversy over particular emphasis in the bill, Mr. JOHNSON not only has advanced a novel idea on community conciliation but also has sought to keep all his proposals within the realm of the possible. His invitation to wide debate with the objective of passing an effective civil rights bill is a challenge that merits constructive response.

An Early Skirmish in the Global War Against Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the continuing world struggle against the ravages of chronic disease is a subject which I am sure will be considered in this session of Congress. The distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is sponsoring legislation to develop greater world cooperation in this never-ending struggle. The senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] reports that Mr. Khrushchev is disposed toward cooperation in this area that knows no politics or power blocs. An address by John T. Connor, president of Merck & Co., Inc., of Rahway, N.J., provides a vivid illustration of the kind of effort that is beginning in this field and should be expanded.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech of Mr. Conner be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN EARLY SKIRMISH

(Address by John T. Connor, president, Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, N.J.)

It may be helpful to you who are interested in the economic offensive of the Communist bloc if I explore the ramifications of a lively skirmish between the Russians and a single American company that took place recently about 9,000 miles east of New York.

I do not contend that this skirmish was typical, or even that it was inherently significant. But as we explore it, we will pick up the footprints of Soviet aggressors probing the defenses of freedom among the hungry, the sick, and the hopeful in the underdeveloped parts of the globe.

Our story starts on a plane high above the Bay of Bengal, at 11 a.m., Calcutta time, January 26, 1957. Two officials of an American pharmaceutical company, bound for New Delhi, were reading the latest report from India, handed them early that morning at the Bangkok Airport. The report contained two surprises. One was an opportunity; the other, a threat.

The opportunity was a list of drugs, just announced, that the Indian Government wanted produced locally under its second 5-year plan, in order to provide employment, build up native skills, and save precious foreign exchange. From the point of view of these two men, the timing could not have been better. Anticipating this development, their company had sent them to India to try to negotiate an agreement to establish manufacturing facilities there. The officials ran quickly down the list, checking off the drugs their company could make and putting them in rough order of priority. By the time their plane reached New Delhi, they had worked out their strategy.

Their sense of urgency sprang from the threat in the report. A team of Soviet experts, having surveyed India's pharmaceutical needs, was on the spot, ready with a proposal to replace Western imports with a state-owned and managed drug manufacturing industry. As most of you in this room will instinctively understand, few situations could quicken the competitive pulse of an American businessman more rapidly than a team of Russians in possession of the ball with first down and goal to go.

SOVIET PROGRESS IN MEDICINE

Now, before I tell you the outcome of this early skirmish in what is fast becoming a global war against disease, let me sketch in the background of the Soviet skirmishers. We have to start almost 40 years ago. The civil war that followed in the wake of the Russian Revolution let loose a series of epidemics that killed several million persons, demoralized the country, and threatened the hold of the new Communist government. The devastation of these epidemics taught Lenin the importance of human capital in the development of a backward country.

Taking stock of the human capital at his disposal, Lenin discovered that Russia's death rate was nearly twice that of the West and that the average citizen had a life expectancy of only 40 years. Though there is no record that he was distressed from a humanitarian point of view, it is clear that the Soviet leader could translate these figures into national output. Financial capital for development of Russia, he knew, could come only from the production of the workers and peasants. First, they had to be educated and trained. If, after that investment, they were weakened by disease and doomed to a short life, the rate of capital accumulation would be so slow that the Communists would never build a modern industrial state short of a hundred years.

When Lenin acted on these conclusions, health became, along with education, the outstanding exceptions to the rule of human exploitation that has marked the Soviet Union since the beginning. For the past 40 years the Russians have been campaigning for better sanitation, public health, and preventive medicine. They have been diverting scarce materials for hospitals, clinics, and medical schools. And they have been turning out enormous numbers of new doctors; their current annual rate of 16,000 is more than twice that of the United States.

What have been the results? They startled me, when I first learned them. I shall not go into the reasons for being skeptical of official Soviet statistics. I shall merely report them with two comments: first, that the ones I am about to use seem to be within the realm of probability, and, second, that we have gone further astray when we ignored Russian claims than when we took them seriously. The number of hospital beds per thousand population, according to these statistics, multiplied four and a half times between 1913 and 1956. The per capita number of doctors jumped 10 times—from about 17 for each 100,000 Russians before World War I to about 164 in 1956. The comparable figure for the United States that year was only 130. This means that, in proportion to the population, which in their case is just over 200 million, the Soviet Union now has 25 percent more doctors than we. Though their quality is still well below ours, we cannot feel smug about the future.

This mammoth Soviet health establishment now boasts 2,750,000 employees and is one of the Communist Party's proudest achievements. What has it been able to accomplish? The best single measures of a nation's physical well-being can be found in the mortality and longevity rates. The Kremlin recently broke its long silence on this subject and announced the figures. Let's take a look at them.

The Soviet Union, the announcement said, had raised the health of its people up to the level of the West. It had slashed the crude mortality rate about 75 percent since before the revolution and by 1956, at 7.7 per 1,000 population, it was comparable to ours. At the same time, it had lengthened average life expectancy from about 40 years at the beginning of World War I to a claimed 67 years in 1956. This was within reaching distance of longevity in the United States, which in the same year stood at 69.5.

This is an extraordinary achievement. What does it mean? Some persons will say that it is a natural consequence of industrialization. The Soviets have already told us, as you might expect, that it is a natural consequence of communism—a claim, incidentally, that is effectively destroyed by the even more spectacular health progress of our own capitalist neighbor, Puerto Rico, which added 50 percent to the average length of life in only 15 years.

THE CONCEPT OF HUMAN CAPITAL

What it means to me is something else. It means that the Bolshevik planners were right when they decided to pour enormous effort into their human capital on the theory that better health as well as better education would have to precede better output. This is a point that we often overlook in our own plans for the underdeveloped countries. We tend to think too much, I believe, in terms of dams and roads, farm machinery and steel mills, money and credit—and not enough in terms of the people who will build them and for whom they are to be built.

Because of our concentration on physical and financial capital, we are inclined to forget the importance of human capital, which is both the means and the end of industrialization. This concept of the relation between human capital and economic growth could turn out to be decisive as the Soviet sets forth to meet the rising expectations of

Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and even Latin America with a program of health, development, and communism.

This brings me back to the skirmish in New Delhi with which I opened this talk. The two gentlemen, as you doubtless had surmised, were officials of Merck Sharp & Dohme International, a division of my own company, Merck. In common with most of the pharmaceutical industry, Merck Sharp & Dohme is no stranger to international business. It is selling today in 80 foreign countries, in 11 of which it has manufacturing plants. Out of total company sales of nearly $200 million last year, 27 percent were outside the United States.

Merck, however, had never been up against quite the situation that confronted these two men when they arrived, after proper introductions from Ambassador Bunker's helpful staff, at the ministry of commerce and industry. They were immediately confronted with two problems: first, Russian competition, and second, a danger that the Indian Government would build its new pharmaceutical industry in what is called the public sector, which means that it would be state-owned and controlled.

INDIA'S PROBLEM

After the formal atmosphere had been thawed by some frank conversation it turned out that the Indians were glad to see these Americans. Near the top of their list were facilities for the production of streptomycin and its important derivative, dihydrostreptomycin, both of which Merck had pioneered.

The streptomycins were vital to India because they are leading drugs in the treatment of tuberculosis. TB is one of the great scourges of Asia. It kills more than half a million Indians a year. More than five times that many are currently suffering from it. The director of the Central Drug Research Institute in Lucknow recently estimated that this disease cost his nation almost a billion man-days of lost work per year.

Here is a typical problem of an underdeveloped country, desperately trying to raise the standard of living of its people against considerable odds. A disease like TB not only kills enormous numbers, but it saps the will and the ability to work, forcing countless human beings to live off the production of others.

The rout of the debilitating disease of tuberculosis, therefore, ranks high among the objectives of India's second 5-year plan. To reach their goal, the Indians need, among other things, the modern drugs with which we in this country have cut our TB death rate down to about a fifth of what it was before World War II. India has been importing these drugs from the West at a cost of millions of dollars annually in precious foreign exchange.

Just before the two men from Merck arrived on the scene, the team of Russian experts had recommended that India build a state-owned basic chemical-pharmaceutical manufacturing industry to free itself from dependence on the West. It would—though this had not yet been made explicit—be designed by Soviet engineers, financed by Communist bloc loans, and, of course, politically motivated. Every ruble that goes through the Iron Curtain is bound on a political mission. In this case, the mission would be to build a showcase to display communism as the friend of the sick and disabled.

THE INDIAN NEGOTIATIONS

Within this context, the meeting between Merck and the Indian Government representatives quickly produced a proposal. The Indians suggested we go into partnership with a government-owned corporation to produce a long list of needed drugs. In view of the realities of the situation, we agreed to consider this proposal, even though it meant indirect partnership with socialism. Our refusal to be rigid and our willingness to look at India's problems from the Indian point of view have, I believe, been major contributing factors in stalling the Russian offensive for almost 2 years.

The Indians have not been rigid, either. Though they are extremely good at bargaining, they have always been willing to take our problems into account, and we have found integrity, frankness, and fairness in all our contacts with the Indian Government.

The Indian proposal, in the end, proved impractical from our point of view, mainly because we thought there would be too many basic conflicts of interest in a partnership with a government agency in such a broad enterprise. But we were able to offer them a creative alternative. We split the problem into two parts. The first is an agreement that was signed last April. Under it, we are now helping the Indians build what will probably be the most modern streptomycin plant in the world.

The plant will be owned by Hindustan Antibiotics, a government corporation already producing penicillin by the fermentation process. It will be built with our plans and the help of our engineers, and it will be operated by Merck-trained Indian technicians using our know-how. The needed machinery and equipment will be financed by means of a loan from the U.S. Export-Import Bank. This new plant will supply all the country's requirements for the drug at an initial saving of nearly $2.5 million annually in foreign exchange. For our help, we are receiving a modest fee to be paid out of sales over a period of 10 years.

Under the second agreement, which was just announced 3 days ago, Merck and a partner, the well-known Indian firm, Tata Sons Private Limited, have set up a new corporation to manufacture several Merck specialties, such as vitamin B_{12}, certain steroid hormones, our new drug, "Diuril," and other discoveries as they come from our own laboratories and are needed in India. We will build a basic medicinal chemical plant, and, as far as possible, use indigenous materials. Our part of the capital investment will be about $3,500,000, and we expect to earn a reasonable profit from the operations.

We will be criticized—perhaps by some persons in this room—because we are helping build a streptomycin plant in the public sector. If it succeeds—and we are doing our best to make it a success—won't this encourage the Indians to produce more medicines and other products in the public sector?

We took a long, hard look at this question before we made our decision. It is not easy for a believer in private enterprise to swallow a Socialist deal. There are several reasons why we did it.

First, this is the way the Indians wanted it. They made this perfectly clear to us after we had done our best to dissuade them. We finally concluded that, if we really meant to help the Indians, we would have to help them in the way they wanted to be helped. To have insisted that we do it our way or not at all would have been transparently arrogant, a quality the Asians find less than endearing, as is so dramatically illustrated in the revealing new novel, "The Ugly American."

Second, by devising our plan, we forestalled the Russians, who, in the midst of our negotiations, offered the Indians a $20 million, 40-year loan at the incredibly low interest rate of 2 percent to finance several basic units for a pharmaceutical-chemical industry, including a streptomycin plant. I used the word "forestalled" because the Soviets have not given up. They are making new proposals to India and may still build some plants in this industry.

Third, our willingness to be flexible enough to adapt our resources to their needs undoubtedly helped make Merck seem a reasonable company with which to do business in the private sector. The fact is, we now will build a private sector pharmaceutical and medicinal chemical plant. Other Western producers in our industry are doing the same. There is therefore a possibility that what started out to be a government-owned industry may end up being mostly in the private sector. This will probably hinge on whether we and the other producers do a good job for India.

Let us remember that some people in this world have a hard time believing that the American corporation deserves a major share of the credit for the social benefits and the high standard of living that we enjoy in the United States. They have known businessmen mainly as traders and exploiters, which is perhaps part of the explanation why so many countries have turned to socialism. If we can perform as well in the underdeveloped countries as we have at home, and do it with humility and understanding, perhaps we can persuade them that we have found a way of improving the welfare of their citizens, that makes socialism obsolete.

In reality, what we have done in India is only a small beginning. I have told the story about it, not because I think it is significant but in the hope that it might suggest a few useful ideas that you could adapt to fit the problems and opportunities your own company and industry are facing in the underdeveloped countries.

MEDICINE AND FREEDOM

Our big job, however, is not just to sell understanding of private enterprise; our big job is to sell freedom. We are in the midst of a war that stretches eastward almost all the way around the globe. It is not a cold war; that adjective describes nothing but the absence of shooting. It is a war against poverty and disease. In the past few years, the rising expectations of the peoples of Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America for a better and a longer life have become the most dynamic human force at work in the world today. Four years ago it lured the Soviet Union out of its lair and the West now finds itself pitted against the Communist bloc in a struggle to see which system can do a better job of economic and social development.

The Soviet economic offensive is being more than adequately described by the other participants in this conference, so I shall confine myself to the coming Russian drive on the other front—the war against disease—an opening skirmish of which we have seen in India.

The Soviet is at least as well equipped medically as it is economically to match us in the underdeveloped countries. It already has 25 percent more doctors in relation to the population than we have and its medical schools are still producing new ones at the rate of 16,000 a year compared with our 7,000. All its physicians and other health personnel work for the State and can be sent where the Kremlin thinks they should go, in or outside the country. The Russian doctor's training in foreign languages and his familiarity with relatively crude living and working conditions put him in a better position than his American counterpart to adapt to service in most parts of Asia or Africa.

And when this well-staffed army sallies forth from its borders—as it will—carrying the nostrums of communism in its medical kit, it will have a proposal to make that could be quite appealing. Reorganize your state along our lines, the proposal would go, and you, too, can do what we did—make the fastest progress in health achieved by any large nation in modern times.

This may not seem appealing to many in this room. But what about someone who was born with a life expectancy of only 35 years and who can never forget that death may visit him or his family at any time, and does, without even bothering to knock

on the door? Most of mankind is surrounded by sickness and is helpless against disease. Whoever provides the tools to fight it will earn the gratitude and might win the allegiance of the multitude.

The Soviets, at no cost to their ideals, can set out to buy the allegiance of people with the promise of good health, because they believe that the end justifies the means. But we cannot. We cannot deflect our great system of medicine from its historic mission—service to humanity—and use its fruits to buy the allegiance of anybody to anything—even to the United States or to the noble idea of freedom.

The population of a large area of Burma feels friendly toward the United States today because of the activities of a single American—Dr. Gordon Seagrave, the famed Burma surgeon. He won this friendship for his country not so much by the healing he dispensed as by the way he did it, and most important, the concern for the individual that was so transparently his motivation.

It might be argued by some that we should not concern ourselves with what might appear to be only the fine points of philosophy when we are in the midst of a long tough fight for survival against a ruthless enemy. But in the long run we can win only if we concentrate more on what we are fighting for—which is the rights of man—than on what we are fighting against.

We can win if we can learn how to export the spirit of the West, not just the material creations of the society that was built with that spirit. Charles Malik, the Lebanese philosopher who is now President of the U.N. General Assembly, put it this way in a magnificant address at the Harvard Business School in September:

"Freedom, independence, respect, equality, fellowship—these spring from the inmost soul of the western tradition; and the question is how much the West can be existentially true to them. And there is in the faithful observance of these things all that is needed, and more, to meet the challenge of communism."

The faithful observance of the things that Dr. Malik mentions requires, it seems to me, that we export American medicine to the underdeveloped countries and that we do it in the form that it is wanted by them, in a modest desire to share our good fortune and with no strings attached.

As we all know, we have been doing precisely this for several generations now. Medical missionaries established clinics in these areas before the turn of the century. They were followed by the foundations, notably Rockefeller, and by scores of individuals, such as Dr. Thomas Dooley. The Russians have only just begun, and, as I have pointed out, they are there for a different reason.

A FOREIGN MEDICAL AID PROGRAM

The haphazard system we have used in the past has been made obsolete by the speed of events—the advent of the Soviets and the rapid rise in the expectations of the peoples in this area. The logic of survival requires that we now make a concerted effort on a broad front. As a beginning, I should like to suggest the following:

1. Alert the public to the challenge of Soviet medicine in the underdeveloped countries: Intelligence and sustained action will have to be based on public understanding. The facts about Soviet progress in medicine and about Russian moves in the underdeveloped countries should be more widely known. One way to do this would be through a commission of leading experts who would find the facts and report them.

2. Develop a bold new foreign medical aid program of our own: This can be built around the excellent bill that Senator LISTER HILL and Congressman JOHN FOGARTY introduced at the end of the last session of Congress to set up an international medical research program. Their bill might be enlarged to provide for scholarships and fellowships in the United States to train students from the underdeveloped countries who would then return home to practice and teach as well as do research on the indigenous diseases that plague their native lands.

Several agencies of the Federal Government are developing a program for the next session of Congress. Part of it should be, I think, continued and expanded support of World Health Organization activities in the underdeveloped countries.

We need at the same time to enlarge our own facilities for medical education so that we can take care of added foreign students and also train American doctors for service abroad.

3. Support private organizations that are working in the foreign medical field: In many ways nongovernmental agencies, such as Medico, the people-to-people program, Dr. Howard Rusk's World Rehabilitation Fund, the World Medical Association, Columbia University's newly formed Institute of Nutrition Sciences, and several of the foundations, with help from our medical profession and our medical schools, are or can be more effective as emissaries of our way of life than official bodies. Though the job to be done is too enormous to be carried out through private support alone, these agencies, which can be more imaginative and flexible than Government, will serve the additional purpose of pioneering promising new projects.

4. Encourage participation by our pharmaceutical industry: It is in the interests of firms such as ours as well as of the Government for the two to work together on a program that would make more drugs available in these countries. In many countries the commercial incentives are strong enough for pharmaceutical firms to take the financial risks themselves. In such cases, support such as the State Department gave Merck throughout its negotiations in India would be helpful. But in some countries, where private incentives are inadequate, the alternative to Russian plants in the public sector is some form of U.S. Government help to make the know-how of American corporations available.

In this connection, we should explore the merits of the imaginative plan proposed by Dean Donald David at the 50th anniversary of the Harvard Business School. He suggested that Federal funds be used to retain corporations, rather than just individual technicians, to build foreign facilities or even develop whole industries in areas where the risk is too great or the reward too small to justify the use of private capital. As Dean David pointed out, this is the way we tooled up to win World War II.

A global war against disease is a vast undertaking. At this stage of public awareness and with the resources presently at our command, we can make only a small beginning, which is why the program outlined above is a modest one. But the urgency of the problem in the underdeveloped countries requires that we make an immediate start.

When we do, we should do it, not because we are worried about what the Soviet Union will do, but because we cannot abandon these people to a mortality rate that is twice our own and a life expectancy of only 35 years.

We should do it because the day has passed when either a man or a country can live with either moral comfort or physical safety on an island of plenty and good health surrounded by a sea of poverty and sickness.

We should do it in the hope that loosening the bonds that bind most of mankind to hunger and disease will be a major step in helping to liberate the human spirit.

The President's Budget—The Inside-Out Straitjacket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, entitled "The Inside-Out Straitjacket," published in the Wall Street Journal of January 22, 1959, dealing with the President's new budget.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INSIDE-OUT STRAITJACKET

The President's new budget, in one view, rests on "the assumption that there is some magic figure into which the budget should be forced, like putting a man in a straitjacket."

The words are LYNDON JOHNSON'S, the so-called moderate Senate majority leader, but they reflect the attitude of many liberals in and out of Congress. For instance, the Democratic Advisory Council, which includes former President Truman and Adlai Stevenson and other important Democrats, declares that the budget puts "pocketbook before people" and proceeds to contend that "what is bad for people is also bad for pocketbooks, both private and public."

Now what all these people are really saying is that a budget should not be a budget at all. For a budget is meaningless if it is not in fact a straitjacket of sorts. A real budget, whether it is yours or ours or the Government's, is a financial discipline based on the ancient and certain knowledge that people and governments that consistently live beyond their means are headed for real trouble.

Rejecting this accumulated knowledge, the statists of today who unjustifiably call themselves liberals propound a reverse theory. In one version it goes like this: Closing the "deficit of needs" is far more important than closing any fiscal deficit; indeed, they speak of balanced budgets with ill-concealed contempt. Their idea is to decree the things they think Government should do and ignore the problem of paying for those things.

And they have been applying their theory with a vengeance—abetted, unhappily, at times by the Republican administration. During the fiscal years 1932 through 1959—28 years—the Federal budget has been in the red 23 years. To be sure, there was World War II, in which the deficits were extremely heavy, but that war comprised only 5 of those 23 years of red ink.

As a result of these almost uninterrupted deficits the public debt has risen from less than $20 billion in 1932 to an estimated $285 billion at the end of the current 1959 fiscal period. And the debt is rapidly soaring out of control. President Eisenhower felt impelled to request, in his budget message, still another increase in the permanent debt ceiling—that most impermanent of ceilings.

Since the deficits have been largely financed, in effect, by the printing presses, in them lies the chief explanation of the inflation which has destroyed more than half the value of the dollar in that same generation. And in their continuation lies the menace of the future inflation which could destroy all value. This menace the inflationists even now blandly propose to study; they intend to search assiduously for its

causes almost everywhere except in the Federal Government.

But inflation, monstrous though its mien can be, is not the only outcome of the theory that a budget should not be a budget. The rejection of financial discipline must also mean Government by chaos.

This can be seen even in expenditures for defense, which hardly anyone dares say might be cut. If the military were permitted to have all they want, the existing waste and duplication would be multiplied a hundredfold. Not only that; without discipline, innovation and development would be retarded, for a certain amount of stringency is a goad to invention. Without financial discipline the defense effort would be impaired and finally wrecked.

For the Government as a whole, one result of the denial of discipline is to destroy selectivity. The question becomes not whether this program is better than that; instead, any program anybody thinks of is embraced. Thus, Government becomes a leviathan, speeding the inflation and in the whole process suppressing the individual.

So what kind of nonsense is this about putting the pocketbook before people? The inflationists, the spoiled children who resent discipline, are the ones who are antipeople. For what they propose would ruin the people.

Fortunately there are still some who reject the inside-out budgeting theory and realize that a budget must be a firm control. It would also be well if reason could put a straitjacket on folly.

Ham Operators' Service Is Important

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in our modern world, the field of communications is especially valuable and important. This is particularly brought to our attention in times of emergency.

And there is one group of people who are always on hand to help in any way possible in this field. They are the amateur radio operators of this Nation.

The services this group provides are innumerable and invaluable. They have assisted law enforcement officers both in the apprehension of criminals and finding persons who are lost. Amateur radio operators have received distress messages from ships at sea and downed aircraft and have notified authorities so help can be sent. During times of serious fire and flood, these people—often endangering their lives and valuable equipment which they purchased with their own funds—have stood by authorities, relaying emergency messages for help and supplies and assuring anxious relatives that their loved ones are safe. They have also crossed many miles with their radio beams to bring messages from home to our servicemen and scientists in remote outposts.

As an example of the type of service these "hams" render, it was an amateur radio operator who first got out word of the disaster which had befallen Cameron, La., and parts of my own State when struck by Hurricane Audrey in 1957. As a result, aid was quickly dispatched to the scene.

Wherever these amateur radio operators are needed, they are on hand, helping in any way possible. They specifically prepare themselves to be able to give highly mobile assistance in any emergency.

Mr. President, in recognition of the outstanding services performed by these people, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Woody Montgomery which appeared in the Temple, Tex., Daily Telegram for Sunday, January 11, 1959, under the heading "Central Texas Hams Set for Emergency Work."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL TEXAS HAMS SET FOR EMERGENCY WORK

(By Woody Montgomery)

In some circles when a fellow is called a big ham he's liable to resent the implications, but in amateur radio circles being called a big ham is a compliment.

Temple has about 25 active hams, the radio variety, as members of the Temple Amateur Radio Club and they're ready for any emergency.

Central Texas has not called for their services to a great extent since the Waco tornado a few years back, but the Temple club hasn't relented in preparing for any emergency.

And the rigs, a term the amateurs fondly call their transmitters and receivers, range from a small mobile job to the near-maximum 1-kilowatt jobs.

The Temple club is equipped to move on short notice to any location and is ready to set up to aid in flood, fire and any disaster.

The local club at one time had a fully equipped mobile unit for use in emergencies but the van truck had its limitations and was abandoned.

Now, according to Club President Paul Gardner, the club has a portable generator mounted on a small trailer that can be towed behind any car.

On another trailer, furnished by the Red Cross, can be mounted at a moment's notice a fully-equipped transmitter and receiver.

"With the separate units they can be moved by any member when needed and as a number of the hams have mobile units in their cars it makes the operation doubly effective," Vernon Starnes, a club member said.

"Right now things are running smoothly but no one knows just when the amateurs may be pressed into emergency service," Gardner said.

Amateurs never seem to be satisfied with their equipment and are always either working on it or building something new to add to their present rig.

And the hams are the "tradingest" bunch of people in the Nation. They never buy a part if they can trade someone out of what they need.

The Temple club meets the first and third Tuesday of each month; the members engage in a swap session, swapping either information or radio parts.

The Temple club, boasting members from the radio, photography, medical, electrical and just about every field, is getting ready for their annual nationwide field day.

It isn't until June, but then the members of central Texas clubs will journey to the Ed Brod farm near Cameron and set up camp.

During the field day, operated only on emergency power, the clubs across the Nation vie for the honors in contacting the most other stations over the world.

It's a fascinating hobby and pastime, but as one ham put it, "It takes up a lot of time."

Educational TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles which describe an educational television series which is being conducted in my hometown of Fayetteville, Ark.

Fayetteville does not have a television broadcasting company; but through the cooperation of Radio Station KHOG, The Trans Video Corp., which operates a local community antenna system, the Fayetteville Public Schools, and the University of Arkansas, it has been possible to establish Arkansas' only closed circuit educational television program. I believe that the series may be the forerunner to a wider and more effective use of television in schools throughout the Nation.

The articles which I would like to have inserted in the RECORD are "TV Goes to Public School," which appears in the January issue of Arkansas Alumnus. The second article appears in the November 1958 issue of the Journal of Arkansas Education and is entitled "A Look at Educational TV."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Alumnus, January 1959]

TV GOES TO PUBLIC SCHOOL—ART, MUSIC, AND SCIENCE PROGRAMS ARE VIEWED BY ELEMENTARY CLASSES

Now that everybody agrees television is here to stay, educators are searching for ways to use it to the best advantage.

On the University of Arkansas campus that search is headed by Norman DeMarco, associate professor of speech, who spent 9 months of last year studying and observing in the New York network studios and at educational station WGBH–TV in Boston. The study was made possible by a Leadership Training Award from the Fund for Adult Education.

Bringing back to the campus both know-how and a belief in the value of TV as a teaching aid, Professor DeMarco this fall initiated TV Classroom, a series of educational programs for elementary schoolchildren.

Countless persons of both the town and gown communities have cooperated to bring these art, music, and science programs into the public school classroom once a week. Each Wednesday at 2:15 the second-grade children all over the city view the music program for 30 minutes; on Thursday the sixth-graders watch art; on Friday the fifth-graders see the science program.

Those in the community who have helped include Superintendent Wayne White (BSE '40, MS '45), the school principals, and the teachers who make the classroom arrangements, prepare the children, and offer constructive criticism. The school board and the PTA's have provided two television sets for each of the five elementary schools; Trans-Video Corp., installed cable service in

each school without charge (cable users normally pay for installation and a monthly service charge); and radio-TV station KHOG gives time and studio space. Although the university owns one TV camera and accessories, it has no studio space. Fred Stevenson, manager of the station, offered the studio, and KHOG and the university combined equipment.

The university has contributed the planning and production. The teachers are faculty members; the members of Professor DeMarco's TV production class do everything from operating the cameras to announcing the programs. In addition to his roles as director and producer, DeMarco himself usually operates the control board.

Faculty members receive no credit or extra pay for the time given to TV—and that time involves preparing a 30-minute lecture on a special subject, attending at least two rehearsals (one called a "dry rehearsal," which is outside the studio, and another a before-camera rehearsal), as well as the actual TV airing.

In advance of each program the classroom teachers whose children will be observing receive an outline so that they can discuss it together before and after. They also receive an evaluation sheet on which they assess the quality of each program: Whether the children were interested, whether the aural and visual qualities were good, whether they have suggestions for improvement. Through such evaluations the producers discovered, for example, that their first art programs were too difficult for the third-graders who were viewing them; they switched to the sixth-graders, who were fascinated.

The art presentations are under the supervision of David Durst,, head of the art department. He has also done most of the on-camera teaching. He has discussed the art of cartography and the art of costume in the time of Columbus, both as prefaces to Columbus Day. Aided by Charles McGimsey, assistant curator of the museum, who brought art examples from the university museum displays, he has discussed art work of various American Indian tribes. At Christmas, with Lothar Krueger and Ed Albin, also of the art department, he demonstrated how to make Christmas decorations out of common objects.

Miss Catherine McHugh, associate professor of music, is in charge of the music programs. Usually she has in the studio second grade guests from different schools; occasionally she talks alone about music, demonstrating on the piano and with blackboard.

In setting up a whole year's schedule of the science TV Classroom, Dr. R. F. Kruh of the chemistry department has called upon scientists in a number of departments. Topics have included Insects and Their Work, Controlling Fires, Streams at Work, and Warm Weather Indoors.

Since TV cable service is used by so many adults, Professor DeMarco would like to start a language program, preferably a class in Russian. He also hopes to produce a series for adults on the creative process, which would be viewed in the evenings.

He, along with other faculty members, would also like to experiment with TV in the university classroom, but that will have to wait upon the provision of a campus studio and more equipment.

In the budget request for the next biennium President Caldwell commented that "television will be used more and more in higher education, for both on-campus and off-campus instruction. The university has been able to qualify at least three splendid members of its faculty for developing institutional use of this medium—but we have not had the space nor the 'seed-money' to begin experimental use of TV."

[From the Journal of Arkansas Education, November 1958]

A Look at Educational TV

(By Don Murphy, Jr.)

The big news in the fall roundup of television is neither the newest adult western, nor the old comedian making a comeback, nor the singer with the most cleavage in her gown, nor the most extravagant spectacular with a galaxy of talent and peacock color. The big news this fall is television for the classroom.

While autumn leaves litter Arkansas lawns, video waves are beamed into homes and classrooms bringing shows that are designed to teach. In eastern Arkansas many high schools are participating in a program of TV physics broadcast from a Memphis station. In Fayetteville viewers are offered three regular weekly educational television shows, one designed for public information, the other two for classroom work. And every commercial channel in the State is giving time to educational television which is aimed either at classroom enrichment for students or at informing the public about what goes on in schools.

Let's take a look at the various programs throughout the State to see what they are doing and how they came about.

Eastern Arkansas Physics Program

Thirteen high schools in six cities in eastern Arkansas are taking part in the physics program offered by Memphis station WKNO-TV, channel 10. In films being shown by WKNO-TV, Dr. Harvey E. White, professor and vice chairman of the department of physics at the University of California at Berkley, teaches physics. The 30-minute film series was prepared especially for high school level work by Dr. White. The schedule each week allows for three lecture and two laboratory periods. For the convenience of all the schools in making their class schedules, the films are televised four times a day; at 9, 10:30, and 11:30 a.m., and at 1 p.m. By having a choice of telecast times, each school can schedule its physics to suit its school day.

High schools offering the course in television physics include those at West Memphis, Parkin, Wynne, Marianna, Osceola, Leachville, West Ridge, Lepanto, Weiner, Trumann, and Forrest City. In both Parkin and Forrest City there are two schools bringing the televised lessons into their classrooms.

The series, inaugurated September 8, 1958, includes not only the Arkansas schools listed above, but also schools in Mississippi and Tennessee. The series will continue throughout the school year.

Preliminary Planning

Considerable preparation was poured into the program long before it went into operation. Station WKNO-TV questioned high schools within its broadcasting range concerning their interest in the plan. After contacting those schools interested, the station telecast test patterns to determine the quality of reception in each area.

In practice, the size of the classes averages 26 pupils. A crew of engineers determined the best television screen size for classroom viewing to be 21 to 24 inches.

Reports from teachers concerning the success of the program are most gratifying. With few exceptions the teachers are pleased with the classes by television. Many praise the program, pointing out that their students have made more progress in the study of physics than in previous years. They report that the films on laboratory work are especially useful because no time is wasted in having to set up the materials, and students can actually see the experiments better on the screen than in a laboratory.

Station WKNO-TV has scheduled preview showings of the films at night a week prior to the time they are to be used in the classroom in order that teachers may familiarize themselves with the material to be covered and plan their classroom procedure. The 30-minute showings leave sufficient class time for teachers to answer questions about the filmed lesson for that day and to emphasize important points.

Dr. White's series on high school physics is no stranger to Arkansas schools. Last year the same films were put on 16-millimeter projectors and shown in many high schools within the State. In some instances specific films in the series were used; in others several of the units were used.

College Series

A similar physics film series, made by Dr. White for use on the college level is also being televised in the State. Several colleges, including Little Rock University, Henderson State Teachers College, Arkansas State Teachers College, Arkansas A. and M., and Arkansas A. M. and N. are currently offering credit for successful completion of the course.

The films are telecast over KARK–TV, Little Rock, at 6:30 every morning, Monday through Friday. The series covers 32 weeks or the equivalent of 2 college semesters, and is good for 4 hours' credit.

Using the program of Little Rock University as an example, here is how one college conducts its physics-by-television course. At the beginning of the school year the students enrolling in the course were given a syllabus containing daily textbook assignments plus problems to be solved. With the syllabus as a guide, class members view the filmed lecture-demonstration in their own homes. They meet for class at 7:30 each Wednesday evening during the semester, at which time the regular professor answers questions arising from the filmed lectures. At these weekly class periods, students turn in their homework and take periodic tests. When a student has successfully passed his examinations, his grade for the course is placed on his transcript.

Joint Project in Fayetteville

In Fayetteville, where the State's only closed-circuit educational channel is located, the television teaching is being tried out on the elementary level. While attending past national administrative conferences and meetings, Superintendent Wayne White had heard the subject of television discussed at great length in connection with schools. When Fayetteville got its station last year and free time became available to the local schools, Mr. White was anxious to accept.

Gaining the support of the school board, the staff of station KHOG–TV, and faculty members of the University of Arkansas, he referred to a committee the matter of setting up a schedule of local educational television shows. The committee, consisting of educators, professional television men, and the lay public started its work by drafting plans for two 30-minute shows each week.

One of these shows is an informational program about the Fayetteville schools planned and conducted by Mr. White every Tuesday morning at 10:30. It may feature students and teachers in a discussion of classroom activities, or parents and PTA members discussing supervised play periods or the school lunchroom. Any issue of importance to the public school system is a must for airing on his program.

The second program drafted by the committee was a weekly 30-minute instructional program directed to third-grade art. A team of two third-grade teachers and members of the University of Arkansas art department decided on a program schedule and selected the material to be covered. This weekly show is viewed by the third-grade art classes under the supervision of their regular

teacher and is a supplement to their daily instruction.

These informational and instructional programs were begun in late September. Since that time the program has been expanded by adding, in mid-October, a 30-minute show on elementary music similar to the existing one on art. The committee hopes to expand the television series further to include additional instructional programs before the end of the school year. On the agenda for next year is a plan to include the junior high school level in the television series.

A great deal of community cooperation and spirit was displayed in putting the television shows on the air in Fayetteville. Faculty members from the university volunteered their time as television teachers. Norman De Marco, cochairman of the planning committee and the university's representative on the committee, supervised his undergraduate students in the university's television classes in producing and directing the shows and operating the cameras. Anxious to do its part, station KHOG–TV saved the school system the expense of hooking onto the coaxial cable by installing the connections at the schools without charge.

The school board and PTA combined forces in procuring television sets for the six schools. Both 21- and 24-inch console and table models were purchased and installed in the auditorium and lunchroom at each elementary school. Each set was placed in an elevated position to facilitate maximum viewing by the classes.

STATE LEVEL ALSO

On the State level, also, experimentation in the use of educational television is being encouraged by the State department of education. It began last spring, when the State department of education was approached by the representatives of the seven commercial television stations in the State about the possibility of endorsing a project in educational television. The State department of education acted favorably on the offer, and work commenced.

Under the plan the State department of education is sponsoring a weekly 30-minute program over each of the seven participating stations for a period of 6 months. To expedite the plan and put it into working order a local committee has been selected for each station. Membership on these program planning committees includes school administrators, school board members, employees of the TV stations, business and civic leaders, and interested laymen. A State department coordinator, selected by the State commissioner of education, is working with each of the local committees.

The primary duty of each local committee is to plan the programs to be presented over its station for the 6-month period. Each station's programing includes some adult information and some enrichment shows.

Four of the stations had their programs on the air by the middle of October, and by the first of November two others had joined them.

Telecast times for the State department of education sponsored programs are as follows: KARK–TV, Little Rock, Sunday at 1:30 p.m.; KTHV, Little Rock, Saturday at 11 a.m.; KNAC–TV, Fort Smith, Sunday at 11 a.m.; KRBB–TV, El Dorado, Tuesday at 4 p.m.; and KCMC–TV, Texarkana, Tuesday at 5 p.m.

The new activity in educational television in Arkansas is quite pronounced and is an indication of the recognition of its potential as a teaching device. The future of its use in the classroom is very much wrapped up in the pilot projects that are now underway in many parts of the State. Whether it will ultimately become a mature influence and an effective teacher for Arkansas youth as well as an effective interpreter of the schools to their patrons, depends to a great extent upon the experimentation now taking place.

Soviet Barriers to Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, on December 2, 1958, the Hon. George McGregor Harrison, U.S. representative to the United Nations General Assembly, spoke before the Special Political Committee. The subject of his address was "Peaceful and Neighborly Relations Among States."

The address is an excellent one, but I feel that it is too long for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I do, however, ask unanimous consent that part V entitled "Soviet Barriers to Friendship" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD following these remarks of mine.

For the benefit of any of my colleagues who might be interested in reading the entire address it can be obtained from the U.S. delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations and is listed as "Press Release No. 3099."

There being no objection, the excerpt from the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

V. SOVIET BARRIERS TO FRIENDSHIP

To avoid bitterness in this debate, I prefer not to burden the record with examples of the ceaseless flow of official propaganda within the Soviet Union, consistently portraying my country and other non-Communist countries in false and hostile terms. Nor shall I go into details here about the elaborate system of control which prevents anything from being published within the Soviet Union that disagrees with the official line.

But I do wish to describe briefly how the Soviet leaders, having created this artificial and fearful climate of opinion within their country, then attempt to seal it off from contamination by any different facts or opinions from the outside world.

This is done chiefly by two techniques. The first is exclusion of foreign radio broadcasts by jamming. The second is censorship and control of the printed word, both incoming and outgoing. I shall discuss both.

A. RADIO JAMMING

It may be well for us to remember just what jamming is, because very few countries represented here engage in this practice.

Jamming is deliberate interference with a radio broadcast, to prevent it from being listened to, by drowning it out with noise from another transmitter using the same frequency.

Soviet jamming of Russian language news broadcasts on the Voice of America began in 1948. Since then the Soviet jamming operation has grown by leaps and bounds. The number of radio transmitters operated by the Soviet Union and the other countries of the Soviet bloc for jamming foreign broadcasts has risen as follows: Spring of 1948, about a dozen jamming transmitters; April 1949, about 150; December 1950, over 1,000; 1952, over 1,500; 1956, about 2,000; 1958, about 2,500.

This army of jammers is one the the largest radio systems in the world. It represents a capital investment of some $250 million, and an annual operating cost of about $100 million.

It is 5 or 6 times more expensive than all the broadcasting of the Voice of America, in all languages, to all parts of the world. Yet it broadcasts nothing but meaningless noise.

Its purpose, which it partly accomplishes, is to shut off the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Communist bloc from outside broadcasts in all their native languages. This includes broadcasts not only by the United States but by other countries too—and even by the United Nations itself.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has opposed radio jamming from the beginning. In April 1949 the United States made a written protest against Soviet jamming to the Secretary General of the International Telecommunications Union, a special agency of the United Nations. We pointed out that this practice was a violation of articles 11, 13, 19, and 44 of the Atlantic City Telecommunications Convention, to which the United States and the Soviet Union are both parties. Our protest was duly forwarded to the Soviet Government, which never even replied to it.

The United Nations General Assembly has taken a position against jamming. On December 14, 1950, after a full debate in the third committee, the assembly adopted Resolution 424 (V). This resolution declared jamming to be "a violation of the accepted principles of freedom of information" and condemned it as "a denial of the right of all peoples to be fully informed concerning news, opinions, and ideas regardless of frontiers." It invited member states "to refrain from such interference with the right of their peoples to fredom of information." It further invited member states "to give every possible facility so that their peoples may know objectively the activities of the United Nations in promoting peace and, in particular, to facilitate the reception and transmission of the United Nations official broadcasts."

The vote on this resolution was 49 to 5, the Soviet bloc alone in opposition. Since it was adopted, the Soviet Union has increased its jamming network from about 1,000 stations to 2,500.

It is not just United States programs that are jammed by the Soviets. The British Broadcasting Corporation and the Vatican radio, among others, get the same treatment. In fact, all radio broadcasts to the Soviet Union, in any of the languages of that country, are jammed.

Even the Russian language radio transmissions of the United Nations Secretariat have been jammed. They are beamed to the Soviet Union every day for 25 minutes on a transmitter in Geneva. They consist of summaries of developments at the United Nations, with special attention to the statements of the Soviet representatives here. They are edited by officials of the impartial U.N. Secretariat. And yet it seems that even these broadcasts must be prevented from reaching the ears of the Russian people.

Last August the United Nations General Assembly held an emergency session on the situation in the Middle East. Its proceedings were broadcast—the full proceedings, word for word, not just summaries—in all five of the official languages of the United Nations: English, French, Spanish, Russian, and Chinese. The U.S. Government made available its own powerful transmitters for this purpose. The voice which was broadcast in each language was the actual voice either of the original speaker or of the United Nations simultaneous translator.

Those historic debates were clearly heard by radio in English, French, Spanish, and

Chinese, in the countries where those languages are spoken. But the Russian language version was jammed by the jammers of the Soviet Union.

Not only did the Soviets jam the speech of the President of the United States in the General Assembly, they jammed all the speeches. They jammed the speeches of the Foreign Minister of the United Arab Republic and of the delegates of all the other Arab States. They jammed the speeches of the delegates from the countries of Africa, the Americas, Asia, and Europe.

And they even jammed the speech of their own Foreign Minister, Mr. Gromyko.

In 1955, when a Soviet agricultural delegation and a delegation of Russian churchmen visited the United Kingdom, their remarks were broadcast by the B.B.C. to the Soviet Union—where they were jammed. And in the same year, when the heads of government met at Geneva, messages by Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Bulganin were broadcast in the original Russian to the Soviet Union—where they were jammed.

Can it be that the Soviet Government sometimes does not even want the Soviet people to know what their own representatives abroad are saying to the rest of the world?

The newspapers recently printed a report by a leading American, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, on his trip to the Soviet Union last summer. In his report Mr. Stevenson said this:

"We kept a careful log on foreign broadcasts with a shortwave radio. Never once were we able to hear more than the first few seconds of Russian-language broadcast from the Voice of America, the B.B.C. or even the United Nations before the jamming drowned them out. They go to great trouble and expense to see to it that the people hear only one side of a story and to keep them in ignorance of the United States and its motives."

One last comment before I leave the subject of jamming. The Soviet Union, in the first half of 1958, transmitted an average of 938 broadcast hours every week to foreign countries. That means five or six radio programs going at the same time at any hour of the day or night.

Of those broadcasts, 112 hours a week, or 16 hours a day, are English language broadcasts originating in Moscow and beamed at North America.

No Soviet broadcasts to other countries are jammed as far as we know, Mr. Chairman. Certainly none of those aimed at the United States are jammed. Anybody in the United States is free to listen to them—no matter how much they falsify U.S. policy. We believe in the old principle of Thomas Jefferson: "Error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

Now I turn to the matter of censorship.

B. CENSORSHIP AND CONTROL OF THE PRINTED WORD

The Soviet Union has the same "closed door" policy with regard to the printed word.

In the Soviet Government there is an organization almost unknown to the outside world, called Glavlit. Its full title is "Main Administration for Safeguarding Military and State Secrets." Its duties are broader than its name implies. It exercises censorship over all publications, motion pictures, etc.—not only those which originate in the Soviet Union, but also those which enter from the outside.

Glavlite, among other functions, controls both the importing and exporting of publications and films. It may confiscate any publication which it considers unsuitable for distribution. Every book, pamphlet, newspaper or periodical, whether it originated in the Soviet Union or outside, must have the Glavlit imprint before it is allowed to be published in the Soviet Union.

The only exception to this rule is the monthly illustrated magazine Amerika, which I mentioned a moment ago.

Censorship applies also to dispatches of foreign news correspondents in the Soviet Union. Every dispatch must be submitted to the central telegraph agency for scrutiny by the Glavlit censors. Their decisions are final. They refuse even to discuss them with correspondents.

Here are a few examples of how that power of censorship is used:

In Moscow last August 1, the Japanese delegate to the Assembly of the International Geophysical Year made a speech in which he reported that most of the radioactive fallout over Japan had been caused by Soviet atomic explosions. There was nothing secret about his speech. But foreign correspondents' reports about it were stopped by the Glavlit censors.

Recently a correspondent in Moscow was forbidden by the censors to send out of the country the text of a biography of Charles de Gaulle, now the Premier of France, taken word for word from the "Great Soviet Encyclopedia."

The censors also stopped dispatches reporting that the birthday of former Premier Bulganin went by this year without any official observance.

When an American delegation of physicians, visiting the Soviet Union, gave a news conference in Moscow, foreign correspondents were allowed to report everything favorable that the doctors said about Soviet medicine—but everything they said which was unfavorable was cut out by the censors.

A Ukrainian Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1959, marks the 41st anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

There is an irony of history here. The Ukrainian people have not known liberty since they were mercilessly incorporated into the Russian Empire in 1920. Their long-sought freedom from the yoke of Russian domination lasted but 2 years, from 1918 to 1920.

Today it is only fitting that we salute this brave and valiant nation that ceaselessly retains the desire to be free. The Ukrainian people are proud, individualistic, and have a tremendous amount of resilience to the present fates of history. Even though they are once again under the hated heel of historic domination, and have been under Soviet domination longer than any other nation now under Kremlin control, there is no shadow of doubt but that the interlude of a 2-year span of freedom immediately after World War I was enough to make the reality of freedom the ultimate national goal.

Since 1920 the Ukraine has been one of the bloodiest battlefields of modern history. The people of this rich agricultural land have died by the hundreds of thousands. Neither the dead nor the living can celebrate the 41st anniversary of Ukrainian independence. The Iron Curtain, so obvious to the rest of the world, is also within the segments of the Russian Empire.

Thus it is up to us who live in freedom not to let this day pass without recognizing its significance to those brave men and women who make such an event meaningful. I, for one, am happy to be able to give this recognition. To the peoples of the Ukraine and those of Ukrainian descent in this country, I give my respect and my admiration.

The Importance of Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the importance of foreign trade to the economy and prosperity of our country generally is recognized much more fully by residents of ocean port areas than by citizens of other sections. However, the benefits of this trade are spread widely throughout the inland industrial and agricultural areas, to such an extent that it may well be said that every single person in the United States participates in some way or other in the fruits of foreign commerce.

An editorial in the January 17 issue of the Marine Digest points this out most effectively. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPS ARE YOUR PARTNER

How important is foreign trade to this country?

An individual and an organization have recently provided answers. President Eisenhower says: "World trade makes jobs for at least 4.5 million American workers." The U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce reports: "Foreign trade provides more direct employment in the United States than the textile, auto, chemical and steel industries combined."

Moreover, the employment thus created is spread throughout the whole country; it isn't concentrated in the seaports or along the oceans. As an example, an official of the Committee of American Steamship Lines recently described what foreign trade means in terms of income and employment to two States which are far from any sea—Kansas and Missouri. In a late year, their share of the U.S. exports of six industries alone amounted to $330 million. And their share of farm exports in the same year added another $270 million.

Putting it another way, the Kansas-Missouri work force totals 2.1 million persons. Some 750,000 of them are affected directly or indirectly by foreign trade. And imports, it should be noted, are as important as exports. We must go overseas for all manner of raw materials used in our factories—iron ore, long staple cotton, animal skins, and so on.

All but a small fraction of foreign trade moves by ship. That makes the U.S. merchant marine the active partner of industry and agriculture.

BENEFITS FOR EVERY COMMUNITY

"Every community in America benefits from American shipbuilding."

That statement comes from the head of one of the leading American steamship lines, and is based on a study of purchases made for the construction of two luxury passenger cargo ships. Five hundred job classifications were involved in filling those orders. All manner of raw materials, parts and services were required.

These two ships cost more than $50 million. And they are only part of this particular company's $400 million shipbuilding program. That program, in turn, is only part of the $3.5 billion rebuilding program now underway for the American merchant marine as a whole.

The point is that the economic benefits of shipbuilding aren't confined to the seacoasts and the port communities. The money flows out to every section of the country. It's a fact that many a man who has never seen an ocean-going vessel owes a part of his livelihood to its existence.

The building of ships is only the beginning. The jobs of close to five million of us depend on import and export trade.

The Dollar and the Next Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the largest problem the U.S. Senate faces as we meet to begin the 1st session of the 86th Congress is the problem of inflation. Our great need is to determine what fiscal policies will insure a strong and stable economy. A balanced budget will be a strong force in maintaining a sound fiscal structure in our Nation. It is not the final answer; but it is one which will determine, in a large measure, whether we keep a sound dollar, an expanding economy, or whether we panic and take the road to runaway inflation.

In the December 8, 1958, edition of Life there is a reasonable and convincing editorial on the importance of working out a budget which will reduce spending and k.ep inflation under control. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DOLLAR AND THE NEXT BUDGET

For the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget, these are the busiest days of a critical year. Preparing the budget that goes to Congress in January, they are vetting the multitudinous Federal claims on the taxpayer's dollar—that 1959–60 dollar which he has yet to earn. Heroically and against a tide of political cynicism—but with Eisenhower's support—they are striving to balance that budget. What difference does it make?

The current deficit (fiscal 1959) is some $10 to $12 billion, the recession having knocked last January's budget into a cocked hat. Expected tax revenues fell by $7 billion, while spending rose $5 billion. The Pentagon budget, which Eisenhower and McElroy were wrestling over in Augusta last week, takes about half of the whole Federal expenditure, but it is not responsible for the current deficit; the biggest increases in spending have gone to farmers, the unemployed, housing and other welfare items. And on such items the new Democratic Congress is widely expected to be even more openhanded with our money than the last.

"The time for a showdown with inflation is now," declared Anderson before setting to work. But would another deficit (even of $5 billion or so) mean inflation? Not necessarily. The Federal budget is only one of the factors that influence prices. There are at least four other major factors to watch:

The cost-price push, chiefly the force of steadily rising wage rates. But this is not an urgent problem at the moment, since a recent spurt in productivity has offset (temporarily anyway) its inflationary effect.

The policies of the Federal Reserve. It has delicately but firmly been restricting credit since last August and, if necessary, could create anything from a mild deflation to a full depression overnight.

The way the Treasury manages our huge Federal debt—now a record $283 billion. If he wanted to raise interest rates high enough, Secretary Anderson could stop the housing boom in its tracks and sequester the lion's share of our savings.

The tax structure, which influences how people spend their money. The present structure is probably inflationary; but it could be reformed in the direction already suggested by Vice President NIXON and others, from emphasis on income taxes to excise taxes, thus increasing Federal revenues and production.

In addition the Government has many other unused weapons against price increases, as a speech by Arthur Burns recently pointed out. It could reduce or even jettison price supports, import duties, import quotas, wage regulations, stockpiles, and subsidies. In short, the Government has enough power to drive prices through the floor.

Nobody expects it to drive prices through the floor. But the surprising thing is the number of people who expect the Government to do nothing at all.

The idea that inflation is inevitable is fomented by many sophisticated people, including Harvard economists, the Kiplinger letter, and half the professionals on Wall Street. The cynical syllogism goes like this: big labor controls Congress; big labor means higher wages, more Federal spending, cheaper credit, soak-the-rich taxes, and every other cause of inflation, which is therefore bound to come. A good example is the remark in Kiplinger's last letter: "Eisenhower won't stop this trend toward more spending. Truth is he probably couldn't even if he wanted to." Wall Street market letters echo this wise-guy certitude; the active market in stocks probably reflects as many bets on inflation as bets on prosperity.

Yet the plain fact is that most prices (other than stock prices) are not rising; businessmen, unlike Wall Streeters, are not buying as though they expected prices to rise; and indeed the whole fear of inflation, as a Federal Reserve man has put it, is "a state of mind rather than a state of facts." The state of mind assumes that U.S. democracy is incapable of self-discipline and that you can fool most of the people most of the time. This assumption has been disproved so often that it is odd to find smart men betting on it. Our advice is: don't.

A balanced budget for fiscal 1960 will not in itself determine whether we have more inflation or not. But it will make a big difference—and it could do a lot to wake up the wise guys about the real strength of our economy and our democracy. Most people are smart enough to want a sound dollar. The Government has plenty of ways to give it to them. In trying to keep the 1960 budget within bounds, Ike, Anderson and company are using one of the most important of these ways. They are fightinog one of the worst sources of inflation—what an earlier Budget Director called the "peculiar tendency in Government to add but never to subtract." They deserve all the support they can get.

The Talmadge Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, entitled "The Talmadge Plan," from the Sunday, January 18, 1959, issue of the Winston-Salem, N.C., Journal and Sunday Sentinel.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TALMADGE PLAN

With the Department of Agriculture's budget standing at $6.9 billion for the current fiscal year and with nearly $9 billion in Government funds already tied up in surplus commodities, the farm program has become a matter of increasing concern in Washington.

In his State of the Union message President Eisenhower said that Government outlays for the support of prices on a very few farm products for the current fiscal year will exceed $5 billion—a sum equal to two-fifths of the net income of all farm operators in the United States. He said annual Government expenditures just for storage, interest, and handling of the surplus will reach a rate of $1 billion by July 1.

These mounting costs and our obvious failure to control production, and thereby stabilize the market, challenge Congress to seek more realistic approaches to the whole problem. Legislation proposed last week by Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, could be a step in this direction.

Senator TALMADGE would abolish the present farm program and substitute direct Government payments to farmers for part of their output. This is a Brannan plan type of subsidy which the Government now provides for woolgrowers.

Under the TALMADGE program all Government planting controls and price supports would be wiped out. In their place farmers would be given quotas covering their individual shares of the U.S. domestic market. The farmers would grow as much as they wanted to and sell their products in the open market for whatever consumers would pay. The difference between the open market prices and 100 percent of the "fair earning power" parity price—on domestic quota sales only—would be paid to the growers by the Government. But no individual farmer would be allowed to collect more than $25,000 a year in such parity payments. According to TALMADGE, his plan would cost between $1.5 billion and $2.5 billion a year, as compared with $5 billion for the current fiscal year under the present farm program.

Theoretically, both the farmer and the consumer would benefit. In the absence of a created scarcity economy or artificial price supports, the old law of supply and demand would come back into the marketplace. Supplies would be more plentiful and prices to the consumer would be lower. This in turn should result in more purchases and greater public consumption. In time the

expanding domestic market might eliminate the necessity of any Government subsidy to the growers. But in the meantime, the payment of the subsidy on part of the growers' crop would assure them of a fair earning power income.

In actual practice the TALMADGE program might not work as well as theory makes it appear. Congress may not even give it a chance to prove itself. It embraces the main features of the never used (except for wool) but long abused Brannan plan which has become a bogeyman of welfare statism to some politicians. The fact that it is offered by a southern Senator, who can hardly be termed a radical, may gain for it serious congressional study.

Certainly, as both Senator TALMADGE and the President have emphasized, the time has come to deal realistically and effectively with the farm problem. It is clear now that neither the costly Benson policies nor the old rigid parity price support and acreage control program afford adequate relief from mounting Government costs and increasing surpluses. Courageous experimentation with the TALMADGE plan (call it the Brannan plan, if you will) might be worth an early try. At least it deserves earnest study, if only to get congressional thinking out of the mental straightjacket which has bound it to rigid parity and control concepts for so long.

Visit of Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thought-provoking article entitled "We Are Deeply Disturbed," written by Milton Berliner and published in the Washington Daily News of January 17, 1959. The article deals with the visit to the United States of Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan. What the writer has to say in this article is most important. I thoroughly and completely concur in what he has to say.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE ARE DEEPLY DISTURBED

(By Milton Berliner)

In the poorly lighted corridor outside the Capitol's old Supreme Court chamber were four former members of the last Free Hungarian government.

Not far away, in the committee's handsome hearing room, waiters were prettying up the table for Chairman Theodore F. GREEN's luncheon in honor of one of Free Hungary's mortal enemies—Anastas I. Mikoyan.

The four Free Hungarians waited patiently for the meeting to end. They had what they called an "aide memoire" on the Mikoyan visit, and they wanted the Foreign Relations Committee members to read it before they joined the Red envoy at lunch.

"We are deeply disturbed by the exaggerated hospitality being accorded to Mr. Mikoyan in some American circles," the statement said. "Knowing the part played by Mr. Mikoyan during the Hungarian revolution of 1956 we can fully understand those who have been expressing their passions against him. * * * For us East Central Europeans, Mikoyan is a trader of raw materials and slave labor."

The statement begged the U.S. Government to let the Soviet Union know that without freeing of the subjugated nations no peace could be maintained.

One of the four who waited was Ferenc Nagy, Free Hungary's last Prime Minister who was vacationing in Switzerland when the Reds took over. In exchange for his resignation, they promised to send him his little son who was still in Budapest. The trade was made on the Swiss-Austrian border.

"I know Mikoyan from the Kremlin," Mr. Nagy said, keeping an eye on the old Supreme Court chamber door. "In 1946 I visited the Soviet Government. The occupying Red Army had presented the Hungarian Government with a bill for $15 million for repairing railroad lines.

"At the end of my official discussion with Stalin, I mentioned this bill. First of all we didn't ask the Red Army to repair our railroads. Secondly, the railroads enumerated were almost all in Czechoslovakia and Jugoslavia, not Hungary. Stalin said, 'Don't pay it.' The next morning I talked with Mikoyan. He said, 'If Stalin said "Don't pay it," don't pay it.' And we didn't."

Mr. Nagy said he believed that Mr. Mikoyan was more a politician than an economic man.

"That's why I feel his coming to the United States is first of all not for trade but for political arrangements," he said. "Probably he would like to prepare for a summit conference."

Mr. Nagy thought Soviet leadership was much more firm under Stalin; that now it wavers between liberalization and aggressiveness.

The Senators began to emerge and each was handed a copy of the Hungarian committee statement. Then they walked down the hall to the Mikoyan luncheon which consisted of fresh fruit cocktail, steak and mushrooms, baked potato, broiled tomato stuffed with peas, tossed salad, an oversized rum tart, and coffee.

The New Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the provisions of the President's budget for fiscal 1960 affecting the various phases of Government operations will be a main topic of discussion this week and for many weeks to come, we may be sure. And few of these provisions, I am certain, have been awaited with more interest and trepidation than those which have to do with Government's participation in the upbuilding and the operation of the American merchant marine.

As is so well pointed out in an editorial that appeared in the January 16 issue of the Journal of Commerce, the American merchant marine is one of the real and rare bargains the Government has come by in the years since it became official Government policy to foster and develop a merchant marine adequate to the needs of peace and war. The net costs of assistance to our shipping, as cited by the Maritime Administrator in his recent report, have been more than balanced, in my belief, by the savings to the Government and to our export industries in the lower freight rates made possible by the fact that we were not at the mercy of foreign shipping as we had been too often in the past.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Journal of Commerce be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW BUDGET

(By Edward P. Tastrom)

The American-flag steamship industry is awaiting with more than usual interest the budget message of the President for the coming fiscal year, which is due next week.

On the basis of grapevine reports, there seems to be considerable fear that the sums to be suggested for operating and construction subsidies for the merchant marine may either be short of actual needs or, at the very least, leave so little margin for reduction by congressional committees as to imperil the assistance program.

It is quite apparent that the battleground from the start at this session is to be the budget. The Democratic majority is not seeing eye to eye with the White House on balancing accounts, but is insisting on expanded defense expenditures even though another deficit results.

Industry feeling was expressed by Ralph E. Casey, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, this week when he declared "too many times in the past the merchant marine has been treated as the most expendable item from the standpoint of governmental financial support."

As a matter of fact, the shipping industry is going to need more money this year to maintain its position than was the case in the 1958–59 fiscal period when $160 million was allowed for construction subsidies and $120 million for operating aid.

Many of the presently subsidized lines are well along in their fleet replacement programs, all of which hinge on the grant of construction aid. In addition, the Federal Maritime Board has on its docket several applications from American flag lines for operating subsidy contracts. In two instances, the applications cover several essential trade routes and would require substantial aid.

Assistance to shipping has not proved to be much of a financial burden to the Government since instituted in its present form back in 1937.

Figures just released by the Federal Maritime Board show that total cost for operating aid through June 30, 1958, was $808 million. Eliminating the five war years, when no Government subsidies were paid, this brings the average annual bill to the taxpayers to about $47 million.

The final figures covering this period, actually may be reduced, for, as FMB pointed out, they are subject to recapture where earnings have exceeded the statutory limit.

As for construction subsidies, the picture is complicated by the fact that some ships were requisitioned by the Government during the war and others sold to operators later under the Ship Sales Act.

Thus, while the Government's account shows a total amount paid out of $477 million, these offset credits bring the residual cost down to $183 million for the period, or about $10.7 million annually for the same 17-year period. This is just about the cost of one good cargo ship today.

Considering the fact that we now have a good competitive merchant fleet of some 300 ships operated in foreign trade by the subsidized lines, the investment can truthfully be said to have paid off handsomely.

This is not the time for Congress or the administration to take a pinchpenny stand

on shipping. The industry has proved its ability to competently handle aid funds, competition today is keener than ever and our merchant fleet under present high costs cannot operate without Government aid.

The International Significance of Alaskan Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, our colleague, the distinguished Senator from our newest State, Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], has recently written a most interesting article entitled "The International Significance of Alaskan Statehood," which appears in the winter 1958 edition of World Affairs. This article very ably illustrates the striking contrast that statehood for Alaska presents to the eyes of the world in comparison with the Soviet Union's treatment of its satellites. I commend to the reading of all Senators this splendid article.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by the distinguished Senator from Alaska be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF ALASKAN STATEHOOD

(By ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senator from Alaska)

The admission of Alaska to the Union as a State has substantial significance in international affairs.

It demonstrates that the United States practices what it preaches. It proves that the United States, true to its professions and to its best traditions, does not practice colonialism. It augurs a corresponding treatment for the Nation's only other incorporated Territory, Hawaii, and for the maximum of self-government of all other of the remaining dependent areas, Puerto Rico having already been granted the status its people desired. It shows that the United States is willing to break other precedents in order to extend to a noncontiguous area—for the first time in history—the full equality and sovereignty previously conferred on 35 States subsequent to the formation of the Nation.

Statehood for Alaska advances the frontiers of democracy to the continent's farthest North and West. It extends these frontiers of freedom for the first time into the Arctic and into the Eastern Hemisphere—for the Alaskan terrain reaches into both these parts of the globe.

What is particularly striking about this liberating action is that Alaska was once Russian-America. But for the vision and wisdom of William H. Seward, Alaska might still be groaning under the tyranny of Moscow.

Historically, not only was Alaska once part of what now has become the most brutal totalitarian regime in modern times, but, geographically, Alaska lies within naked-eye view of the Soviet police state. Only 54 miles separate Alaska and Siberia across Bering Strait. The Siberian headlands which rise to 11,000 feet are clearly seen from the Alaskan mainland. They are visible also from St. Lawrence Island, an Alaskan island in the Bering Sea.

Two other islands, Little Diomede and Big Diomede, the former American, the latter Russian, lie within 2½ miles of each other. Thus Alaska is the nearest free country to the Soviet State and the contrast between these two adjacent systems of government and the two ways of life is revealed for the whole world to see.

This contrast and this difference may be specifically illustrated by what has happened on the two Diomedes. Both islands were formerly inhabited by Eskimos, there being a small village on each, both extant before the coming of the white man. The American Eskimos continue to live there, following their peaceable pursuits, enjoying the blessings of liberty, as loyal and patriotic a group of Americans as can be found under the flag. I was happy to enlist those who were not in the Armed Forces in our Alaska Territorial Guard in the early days of World War II; and they are now active members of the Alaska National Guard, enrolled in its scout battalions.

In contrast, Russia's Eskimos on Big Diomede have been uprooted from their ancestral homes and forcibly deported to the mainland of Siberia. With that deportation, the friendly visiting that had taken place between the inhabitants of the two islands for generations, ceased abruptly.

Thus we have in those far northern latitudes a striking illustration of contrasting freedom and serfdom. It is to be hoped that our Voice of America will make clear to the world the profound difference between Uncle Sam's treatment of its dependencies—for Alaska was such a dependency prior to statehood—and Russia's treatment of its satellites.

Alaska versus Hungary. Gaze on this pictufe and on that.

In the one case there is the grant of full equality. There is application by due process of law of that most basic of American principles, the principle of government by consent of the governed. In the other case we have, by a dictatorial exercise of power, forcible deportation and the suppression of freedom which in varying degree all Russian subjects suffer.

In the continuing struggle for the understanding and sympathy of the wavering and uncommitted peoples of the earth, Alaskan statehood should be of great value as a shining example.

"By their deeds ye shall know them." The deed of making Alaska the 49th State in the American Union speaks far more loudly than words could.

That the 49th State was once Russian-American, that it is, geographically, Russia's nearest neighbor belonging to the free world—for all Russia's other neighbors have been subverted to the Kremlin's rule—sounds a clarion call to all mankind.

Alaskan statehood exceeds the propaganda value of a dozen sputniks. It is a missile—an intercontinental missile suggests itself—which cannot be intercepted and carries its message to the ends of the earth for all time.

VHF Translator Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing with minor amendments a bill, designated as H.R. 1913 in the 85th Congress, which directs and requires the Federal Communications Commission to authorize VHF translator facilities under proper rules and regulations to be established by the Commission. The amendments in the bill I am introducing, which differs from H.R. 1913, are that I have incorporated the language of the Senate report providing that, in denying a VHF translator application, interference with other facilities is not to be assumed but must be proven and must be shown to be so significant that it cannot be permitted a license or cannot be permitted to continue.

Action was not taken on H.R. 1913 in the last session because of the fact that the FCC was in the process of holding hearings on the entire problem of translators, boosters, repeater stations, etc. About 3 weeks ago the FCC handed down their decision, a decision which is devastating to the western half of the United States. It declares VHF television boosters and translators to be illegal and gives communities 90 days from the time of the order in which to make application for a license under UHF.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it makes illegal receiving television programs in 50 percent of the Congressional district which I represent. It makes law violators out of peaceful people because, since the distance is so great and the population so sparse, it is not possible for a large percentage of the peoples in towns and communities on the prairies of western South Dakota to receive television reception except by some kind of booster facilities. The FCC has failed to take jurisdiction of VHF boosters and at the same time, through lack of enforcement, have permitted, although not authorized, almost every community on the prairies of the West to spend several thousand dollars in installing VHF boosters. Under the new order these facilities would be completely voided and these communities would be required to spend three or four times the amount they have invested in VHF boosters in a UHF booster.

Another problem that apparently is of no concern to the FCC is the fact that UHF is a line-of-sight reception. A large portion of the West, including the Black Hills area of western South Dakota, is mountainous. The primary reason those communities need boosters is because of the fact that most of the population live in the valleys where line-of-sight television is not possible. They must have translators or boosters on a frequency which will permit reception on other than line of sight.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that the UHF boosters are, by far, the least expensive means of bringing television reception to these remote areas. They ordinarily consist of an antenna located on a windmill tower or sometimes on a grain elevator through which a normally weak signal from a distant station is picked up. It is then amplified and rebroadcast at low power on the same or another channel from an antenna many times located on the city water tower. In most towns and communities where such facilities have been installed, contributions are solicited in the community or memberships are sold in a television

club in order to finance maintenance and operation of this simple system. Because it is cheap and yet because it brings television to that community in this simple manner, thousands and thousands of communities throughout the West have availed themselves of television through this system. The signal goes out only a very few miles, but farmers living near the town get the benefit of television thereby.

Two or 3 years ago the Commission wrote to many individuals and mayors of small cities and towns, advising them that this type of booster was unauthorized and must cease. Although their action was proper under their authority, their inaction to authorize some other service or to authorize any VHF facilities, whether they interfere with any other facility or not, was unrealistic and stopped nothing. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Commission failed and refused to step in and provide a sound scheme of regulation whereby communities so situated that VHF might interfere would be required to install UHF, and authorizing communities where there was no possible chance to interfere with anything, that those communities be authorized under VHF. In other words, they sought simply to stamp out the whole operation without provising any means for people of the West to have television service. Law-abiding residents felt that the good resulting from the booster systems was so evident and the alleged dangers so theoretical that they continued their operation.

It should be pointed out that the Commission is not unanimous in its thinking. After a thorough investigation of the problem in the West, Commissioner T. A. M. Craven dissented from the majority opinion, calling it unduly rigorous and unrealistic and based upon a narrow interpretation of the Communications Act. His statement is in part as follows:

Because the Commission failed to recognize promptly the overwhelming public interest factor involved in providing practicable procedures for establishing television service to small communities in the mountainous areas of the West, it is my opinion that this agency has failed thus far to discharge its statutory obligation to make available, insofar as possible, to all the people in the United States, a rapid, efficient, nationwide radio system. Apparently, the Commission did not recognize soon enough that these low-powered boosters are the only practicable way in which the people residing in those isolated areas can secure any television service whatsoever. We have been shortsighted in this connection, as remedial steps could have been and should have been taken long ago. If necessary, changes in legislation should be requested.

No hearings were held in the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on this subject because of the heavy schedule of this committee, but the Senate committee did hold hearings making four very specific recommendations:

First. The Commission has a statutory duty to provide television service for as many of the people in this country as it possibly can.

Second. If VHF boosters are technically feasible, as seems demonstrated by their operations to date, the Commission should accept them as one available tool for achieving this end—which means authorizing such facilities under proper rules.

Third. The enunciating rules to regulate boosters, the Commission should go as far as is practicable in modifying its general rules to permit unattended installations incorporating the simplest possible equipment so that the service can continue to be an extremely inexpensive one within the reach of even very small communities.

Fourth. The Commission is not only entitled to insist that boosters not create objectionable interference, but is charged by statute to do so. However, it should operate on the principle that interference is not to be assumed, but must be proved—and must be shown to be so significant that it cannot be permitted to continue.

To me the decision of the FCC is unauthorized and unwarranted. The law makes it the duty of the FCC to authorize services which will provide television reception to the people of America. In many instances the only means of providing that service is through VHF translators. In many more instances the only practical means of providing service to thousands of communities is through VHF translators. Where VHF translators provide the service and cannot cause any disruption in other television or radio or commercial or radar or defense services, it seems to me to be not only a neglect of duty and of the law for the Commission to refuse to recognize and legalize through licensing these VHF facilities.

The bill I am introducing does direct and does require the FCC to authorize these small community translator facilities where they do not interfere, and provides further that the burden of proof shall be upon the FCC to show interference where application for such facilities is under consideration.

I Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues a sermon delivered by Rabbi Leon A. Jick at the Free Synagogue of Westchester on May 16, 1958. Rabbi Jick's sermon will be of interest to all peace-loving freemen.

The sermon follows:

I PROTEST

(Sermon delivered by Rabbi Leon A. Jick at the Free Synagogue of Westchester, May 16, 1958)

Traditionally the Sabbath is and has been for our people a period of refreshment and joy. Sometimes the Sabbath which is above all a day for finding perspectives, a day for withdrawing somewhat from the immediate task and looking at the long-range objective becomes the opportunity for confronting a disagreeable reality.

Our tradition preserves the examples of many men who have had to speak of such realities. Perhaps the one closest to the mood and the problem of our own times was Jeremiah who lived in an age of dread and destruction—a time when the threat of a war hung like a heavy and oppressive cloud over the heads of his people—indeed, of all his world. Jeremiah warned his people against a short-range viewpoint which disregarded the danger. He warned them against greed and selfishness which could only doom them to destruction. He denounced the shortsighted, the apathetic, the smug, and the indolent in high places and low.

"To whom shall I speak and give warnings that they may hear? For their ear is dull and they do not attend," he cried. "Behold the word of the Lord is become unto them a reproach. They have no delight in it. Therefore, I am full of the fury of the Lord. I am weary with holding it in." (Jeremiah 6.)

"Woe is me. My bowels, my bowels, I writhe in pain. The chambers of my heart moan within me. I cannot hold my peace because I have heard the sound of the horn—the alarm of war. Destruction followeth upon destruction. The whole land is spoiled and suddenly are my dwellings gone in a moment." (Jeremiah 4.)

And so this man, Jeremiah, writhing with pain because of the foolishness around him went about preaching the message that peace could only come from righteousness. "Beware of war—beware of evil."

In the end, the message of the prophet, Jeremiah, was not heeded and his predictions were fulfilled. The state of Judea, together with large numbers of its citizens were destroyed just as he had said they would be destroyed. But the nation was not utterly destroyed. A remnant survived and this remnant remembered Jeremiah's warning and learned a painful and frightfully expensive lesson. And, therefore Jeremiah's idea of the primacy of justice and righteousness survived and the people survived.

Not much has changed since the times of Jeremiah. The plot is still the same and so are the characters. So is, indeed, the background and the whole framework within which the play takes place. There are still shortsighted statesmen immersed in the maze of their own folly, frantically racing around the same little goalless track. There are still apathetic masses—smug, sure they are safe—not listening, not heeding, unaware of what goes on around them. There are still lying prophets of all kinds with smooth and glib tongues who say, "Peace, peace"; say what people want to hear, and are not concerned with truth.

All of this is the same. But one factor has changed. One terrible factor has changed and this makes all the difference. Weapons have become so much more powerful and the stakes have become so much higher that mankind cannot afford the luxury of another lesson like the one the generation of Jeremiah learned. Now, war and the preparation for war threaten all human life with extinction. At this very moment forces which can cripple mankind are being unleashed and are dropping upon our planet in ever increasing quantity.

There are so many conflicting reports concerning the threat that it is difficult to know what to think, or whom to believe. Before beginning any analysis or offering any suggestions or even comments, let me simply review some of the facts which I have attempted to sift from the accounts which come to us from such diverse sources and with such differing content.

I wonder how many of us are aware of the facts? The first fact is that there are enough nuclear weapons in the world today to des-

troy all life that exists on this planet. Concerning this, there is no difference of opinion. Even if not another nuclear bomb is manufactured, there are enough bombs stockpiled to destroy all life on this planet of ours with possibly the exception of a few spores that are resistant to radioactivity. This is the first fact that we must keep in mind.

The second fact is this: Atomic weapons have now been developed and controlled to a point where they vary in size from small artillerylike shells, to 10-megaton bombs. One of these 10-megaton bombs represents fives times the explosive power of all of the bombs which were dropped on Germany during the 4 years of World War II and 100 times the power of those which were dropped on Japan, including the two atomic bombs which were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Is such destruction conceivable? Can the human mind possibly grasp the extent of such disaster power? Such a weapon exists. Ostensibly it has been made for the purpose of possible use. This is the second fact.

The third is this: In addition to the fantastic destructive power of such bombs, power of sheer pulverization, each of these weapons fills the atmosphere with deadly radioactive poison. Concerning this, too, there is no difference of opinion. A 10-megaton bomb produces 1,000 pounds of radioactive materials as compared with 2 pounds produced by the atomic bomb which fell on Hiroshima and which killed and maimed hundreds of thousands of people.

Three nations today possess these weapons and have been testing them. The tests conducted to date by the United States, Russia, and Britain have caused a sufficient disturbance in the balance of radioactivity in this world so that within the last 2 weeks the Times reported that radioactive mud fell on the city of Rome and that there is now a measurable quantity of strontium 90 in the milk which is being drunk in New York and in the whole of the northeastern portion of the United States. The Atomic Energy Committee admits that the United States is, and I quote, "the hottest radioactive place in the world." This, too, is a fact.

Some of this poison persists in the atmosphere for 20 years, and will, therefore, continue to fall in small quantities even if no further tests are made. Everyone agrees that there is a threat to life from the amount of radioactivity alrady released. The only difference of opinion is whether 2,000 or 10,000 will as a result die this year of leukemia and bone cancer. This is due to the amount of radioactivity which has already fallen. How much more will fall in the next 20 years from the bombs heretofore exploded, we can only guess since, in such matters, we have no experience.

One final fact to keep in mind. The rate of technical advance is so great that to quote one responsible scientist, "In the next quarter of a century, there will be manned satellites, television and observation satellites, radar satellites, bomb carrying satellites and, as we are driven relentlessly into space, we will also be driven relentlessly into the oceans and there will be missile carrying submarines and underwater vehicles driven by remote control that will carry several nuclear explosives to the shores of any land in the world." These are the facts. About these, there is no question. Manifestly, because of these facts, we face a situation which man has never faced before in all of human history. We are called upon to make decisions that will have vastly greater effect upon mankind and mankind's destiny than those that have been made in all of human existence. No decisions in the past—no decisions made by Alexander The Great or Caeser or even by Hitler could possibly have determined whether mankind as a whole would live or die. These men could make decisions which could determine the destinies of their own cultures and their own civilizations. They could speed up progress or slow it down but they did not have the power of decision which could have excluded the possibility of the emergence of later civilizations. No decisions on their part could have resulted in the destruction of humanity.

Albert Gyorgi-Szent, Nobel Prize winner who heads the Marine Biological Laboratory in Woods Hole, Mass., has stated the problem for us. Where is the way out? Where shall we go? What is the political, economic and military structure in harmony with this reality? Nobody knows. Nobody knows, but there is a way to find out. First the question has to be asked. First we must recognize that the question is—How shall we find a way out? Then we must concentrate all of our energies and efforts and abilities to answering this question—not the question of how to build a bigger bomb. "The men to answer this question," he concludes "are the men who know more than how to be elected or how to make war." Alas, that our leaders are men who know "how to be elected—how to make war."

By contrast, the decisions made today can result in precisely this kind of cataclysm. A mistake—a rash move by some second line military commander somewhere around the Arctic Circle or in a North African base—a false reading of a radarscope, a meteorite that crosses an antenna somewhere—any of these kinds of technical errors in judgment can lead to a war—a war in which both sides possess enough to poison and contaminate the whole world and destroy all life. The capacity of both camps to achieve such destruction changes not just the stakes—it changes the entire nature of war—the entire nature of strategy. In the image which Robert Oppenheimer drew, "There are two scorpions trapped in a box—both poisonous and both capable of delivering a deadly sting."

This is the situation. Under such circumstances—war can no longer be a matter of advantage—a matter of gain and loss—a matter of winning or losing a campaign. Under such circumstances, I submit that there is one overwhelming question which confronts our Nation and mankind: Can we devise means of forestalling this terrible catastrophe which has become a real and living possibility? Can we find a way of ending the creeping contamination which defiles and despoils this earth? Can we find a way of preserving life?

The answer to such questions is infinitely difficult. I would not minimize all of the complexities—all of the social and political problems. I remember what the Russians are and what they have done in recent decades. But, in God's name, I protest that this question is not being asked. Let the question be asked. In God's name, I say, "Woe unto those who are wise in their own eyes and sure that they know the way—who are wise to devise violence but to do good they have no knowledge." Instead of considering how we can secure peace, instead of exploring how we can reduce the dread, we continue the rat race of missiles and antimissile missiles and explosives whose power is past the ability of comprehension.

Since World War II the United States and Russia have spent $1,000 billion on safety. One thousand billion dollars on safety—with the result that we have fear and jitters and the risk of mass extermination, that we are involved in an insane round of launchings and testings—all in the name of necessity. We have to do it—we have to keep ahead—we can't fall behind in the race.

Admittedly, the problem is complicated. Albert Einstein was humble enough to understand this when he was asked, "How is it that man could invent an atom bomb and then couldn't learn how to control it?" He answered, "This is because politics is more difficult than physics." He was right. Human affairs are more difficult than the physical conquest of nature. But there comes a time when politics and human affairs become so complex that they call for a new look—a long-range look which acknowledges that in the end the best new weapon is stupid, the best new force is dangerous. Such a new look must recognize that war is obsolete because any war means mutual annihilation and, therefore, war as a realistic vehicle or means of policy is out of the question.

In the second place, I protest that the immoral and insane process of poisoning the world continues without so much as a serious attempt to bring about a temporary halt. What enrages me is not so much what has already happened, as the callousness of the men who are responsible for it, men who are reluctant to admit that there is a danger or that contamination is serious or that it is despicable. If there is any hope of stopping this madness, man must first be filled with a sense of guilt and shame that great wrongs are being done. Only then can they find a desire to stop these wrongs. Men like Dr. Teller who, by all accounts, is very proud of being known as the father of the H-bomb, does not seem to have the sensitivity to acknowledge the problem. Would that Dr. Teller said, "Woe is me because of this radioactivity." Then I would say I am willing to entrust him with leadership. He does not say so. Instead, he acts as though he were living in the days of King Arthur and the Round Table and looks forward to a little nuclear sport.

Men like this tell us that only 2,000 will die of leukemia and bone cancer this year in the world and they sugar-coat this statistic in such a reassuring way. They say that only a few minutes will have been taken off the life of every human being. What a pleasant statistical way to conceal a horrible truth. Other scientists maintain that the toll will be 10,000. Whether it is 10,000 or 2,000, I would like to see Dr. Teller explain his complacency to Red Skelton who buried his child this week with leukemia.

Only when we think in terms of an individual can we begin to understand the magnitude of the misery which is being brought into the world. I protest this kind of callousness which disregards this misery. I protest the fact that such callous men—not elected, not chosen by us, not subject to any controls by us—wield power of life and death over us, indeed over all mankind.

We have to shake ourselves to understand what it is that is involved and what the real question is: Where can this race take us? What if we get ahead? What will we do then? Explode the bomb on Russia? Were we helped during those 5 years after World War II when we were ahead and had the atom bomb and they didn't? These were the 5 years of the biggest Communist expansion in the whole history of mankind, the years during which they consolidated their position in Eastern Europe and in Asia and in the Near East and everywhere else in the world. What then are we going to get ahead for? Where is the race to lead? What is it we are running after?

I protest the shortsightedness of leaders who do not ask, "Why?" but only run around the track which has been laid out by past error in a race to which there is no end—and no goal.

I protest too against the misinformation, the deception and the deceit which has been practiced by those who are responsible for our nuclear development program. Everyone should know that the Atomic Energy Commission deceived the American people concerning the possibilities of detecting underground explosions. Only when the facts were revealed through the congressional investigation, did the A.E.C. reluctantly admit that this underground explosion had been detected a thousand miles away.

We must be aware too of the distortion which takes facts and twists them in such a way that they say only what the people who give them want to say. This is unfair. This is indecent. The American people are being deceived and deprived of the knowledge which they need to make intelligent decisions about their own future.

And, finally, I protest against the slander which is being heaped upon those who are questioning government policies, and are raising the issues of survival in this nuclear age. Time magazine has fired the first salvo in the campaign by implying that those who signed petitions asking for a stoppage of nuclear testing are people with suspicious backgrounds, perhaps Communist sympathizers. Such tactics have been used to discredit men like Paul Tillich, Eric Fromm, Norman Cousins and Norman Thomas, men who, in Norman Cousins' words, "were fighting communism before Henry Luce opened shop." Admiral Strauss has joined in this campaign casting slurs upon the intention, the credibility and the patriotism of those who would speak out against government policy. Such slander must be protested vigorously and vehemently.

Let us now draw to a conclusion. I hope it is clear that I am not trying to underestimate the problem—not trying to underestimate the difficulties of dealing with a totalitarian government, which is, at best, not trustworthy.

And yet, if we want to preserve peace and at the same time, save freedom, we must define our goal clearly. Peace is our goal—the relaxation of tensions and not their intensification. This is the way that leads to peace. As a demonstration, to ourselves and to the world, that we are indeed a peace-loving and peace-pursuing people, let us volunteer to stop nuclear testing for a period of time while exploring means of controlling and checking the permanent stoppage of testing.

Can it be that the minds which could invent the atom bomb cannot invent means of detecting atomic tests? Can anyone really believe that if one one-hundredth of the effort going into the production of missiles and antimissile missiles went into means of perfecting a way of detecting bomb tests that such means could not be found? Let us, therefore, as a token of our belief in peace, volunteer to suspend atomic tests for a period during which means of control and means of detection would be explored and let this breathing spell be the first step toward a policy of disarmament—a policy of control—of coexistence—a policy which would lead us to explore every means to achieve settlements and to settle those scores which cannot be absolutely resolved on economic and political social fronts.

We Americans have little enough to be afraid of if we go forth with the banner of freedom and peace and democracy. There is ample evidence of weakness behind the Iron Curtain and in the Kremlin itself. There is ample reason to believe that the Iron Curtain could not stand up under a bombardment of peace and righteousness and democracy and hope for a new life and a new world which we alone can give to mankind.

This program is not impossible. It is not utopian. Indeed, it is the only practical and the only sane answer. The time has come in this world when the so-called practical men are pursuing an insane policy. And when the so-called idealists are holding up the only policy which is sane for mankind.

We, as intelligent citizens have as our first responsibility, to be informed, reading carefully, gathering information—thinking, observing, sifting all of the evidence which comes before us. Our second is to write to our Congressmen and our Senators and our President, to write to newspapers, to make our voices heard in the organizations to which we belong, to support the newly organized National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, to seek out other human beings, other intelligent and concerned men and women in our community and to bring to them the question and the suggestion which may begin the sweep and the surge for the new understanding and a new way.

In a recent article in the Saturday Review, Norman Cousins, who is one of the cochairmen of this National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, wrote an article in which he called for 2 billion angry men—2 billion angry men who will make it clear to their national leaders that the world does not exist for the purpose of being a stage for the total destruction of man—2 billion angry men can insist that the world's resources be utilized for human good.

Let us begin with 200—200 angry men and women, angry and zealous, zealous for life—which means for God and, incidentally, for country—200 angry men and women zealous for the fulfillment of the vision of the prophets, a vision which we have the power to fulfill in our day that "nations shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore but they shall dwell every man under his vine and under his fig tree and none shall make them afraid."

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Cecil B. De Mille

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, California and the Nation lost a great man last week.

Cecil B. De Mille, first citizen of Hollywood, came west from New York in 1913 to make the first feature-length motion picture. He stayed on to build an industry and a personal reputation that will survive him as long as men seek diversion from the cares of life in the motion picture theater; perhaps longer.

He was a pioneer in practically every phase of his industry, constantly developing, changing, adapting new ideas, many of them his own. But in his personal life he was a traditionalist, clinging to the morality, religion, and ethics taught at his mother's knee.

He once remarked that when he was a boy, there were no motion pictures, and that for entertainment his mother read each evening one chapter from the Old Testament and one from the New. His selection of religious themes for many of his productions reflects this early training. His "King of Kings," produced some 30 years ago, is still showing in far corners of the world. His latest of two "The Ten Commandments," it has been estimated, will play for 50 years.

Although his own success was seldom if ever in doubt, De Mille was never at ease when the industry was in trouble. He gave freely of his wise counsel and often acted as financier to companies suffering the stress of a young and sometimes erratic industry.

Young De Mille ran away from school at 15 and tried to enlist in the Army to fight in the Spanish-American War. In World War I he organized a company of the California Home Guard. During World War II he personally accounted for the sales of millions of dollars worth of war bonds, and millions more through bond-selling shows utilizing actors and actresses under contract to him.

His concept of patriotism extended beyond service in wartime. He was a leader of public affairs and political thought in peacetime as well. At the height of his career in radio, he was thrown off the air for refusing to pay a $1 union assessment which he found incompatible with his sure sense of freedom. The assessment was to be used by the union to fight right-to-work legislation. De Mille, who favored right-to-work, contended that the involuntary assessment forced him to support a belief contrary to his own. He lost the court battle but fought for the principle for the rest of his life.

Cecil B. De Mille was honored by his contemporaries. Industrial awards, including the coveted Oscar, honorary degrees, and organization and Government awards came his way, justly earned. He received one of the first of 9 great living American awards bestowed by the United States Chamber of Commerce in 1957.

I mourn the passing of Cecil B. De Mille. He was a great man.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following, my newsletter of January 24:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The 1960 budget, 1,275 pages, 2 inches thick, more than 4 pounds in weight, lists $77 billion in Federal Government expenditures for fiscal 1960 (July 1959 to July 1960). Comparatively, this is $3.9 billion less than this year, fiscal 1959. Receipts will be an estimated $77.1 billion, which is $9.1 billion more than this year. (However, total expenditures to the public are listed as $92.9 billion and total receipts $93.5 billion as distinguished from budgetary.) The President's 78-page budget message, a condensed explanation, discussed expenditures and receipts by Government departments, by military and civilian, and by specific legislative program.

Commendable, as I see it, are these thoughts: (1) We must have a balanced budget, live within our means, pay as we go; we must foster initiative and free enterprise, a sound economy and currency; (2) we need to review existing programs; (3) Congress, not the administration, is constitutionally responsible for the appropriation of money, and the size of the budget results from earlier congressional legislation; (4) Federal programs, wherever possible, should be shifted back to the States (along with tax jurisdiction); (5) we must assure maximum defense for each dollar spent; (6) research in many fields, particularly military, is continually being increased; (7) a better agricultural program is needed with less cost to the taxpayer and less control of the farmer; (8) Government whenever possible should sell surplus property; (9) more user charges and less subsidies are needed so that users, not the general public, foot the bill; (10) private financing, not Government loans, should be stimulated, through flexible interest rates.

Criticisms include: (1) Is a budget balanced and the Federal Government controlled when projects are deferred, rather than canceled; when 43,000 new employees are to be hired; when more money is to be spent in aid to education, vocational rehabilitation, public works, urban renewal, public housing, and almost every welfare program? (2) since 1955 the budget has grown two to one in welfare over defense needs, when we know military requirements are paramount; simultaneously politicians assure us budget growth results from defense requirements; (3) increased population (as reason for budget growth) puts more strain on local government (utilities, schools, etc.) than on Federal Government; (4) Congress is offered additional opportunities to lose control. Example: (a) Foreign aid development loan fund is a revolving fund outside Congress' direct control; (b) other revolving funds are proposed; (c) item veto would transfer to the President great new authority; (d) foreign aid and Public Law 480 (Food Disposal Act) each transfer jurisdiction to the President; (e) requested presidential blanket emergency funds take the purse strings from Congress. (5) The foot-in-the-door programs where great spending increases follow program inception include: (a) Defense education bill; (b) public assistance under social security; (c) urban renewal; (d) world loans through various international banks; (e) many others; (6) the Federal Government intends to foster local initiative by offering more Federal money and control; (7) built-in growth factors and fixed costs are skyrocketing costs without new programs. (Example: Public works will be at an all-time high without even adding any new projects.) (8) Tax incentives to encourage private investment abroad—isn't this tax bribery? Will this weaken investment at home as greater gains can be had in other countries? Is this fair or constitutional? (9) Non-service-connected disabilities of veterans are soaring.

The big question really seems to be, Has the budget gotten beyond all control? After all, it is almost $8 billion higher than the $70 billion budget of 2 years ago that precipitated a nationwide furor. And why the increase? Perhaps Budget Director Stans said it best—"Why is it that some business leaders join taxpayers' organizations to bring pressure on the Government to cut expenses, yet support industry groups seeking more Government subsidies? Why is it that some labor leaders press hard for wage increases to keep up with the cost of living, and then urge a massive program of legislative action which, if adopted, would lead to more deficit spending, higher taxes, and inflation—all of which could only demoralize the value of wages earned?"

Now the battle of the budget begins politically. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.) Mr. CANNON, of Missouri, Appropriations Committee chairman, said, "All fiscal recommendations start with the President. Congress does not make the budget—he is at complete liberty to recommend a cut of $5, $10, $15, or $20 billion." Mr. JENSEN, of Iowa, said, "The President cannot spend one penny which the Congress does not appropriate. We all know that." Mr. HALLECK, of Indiana, said, "The chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations referred to the increase from $65 billion to $79 billion over the past 4 years. During those 4 years he has been chairman of that committee, and Congress holds the purse strings over expenditures." So it goes—expenditures are voted by Congress, Democrat controlled, whose leaders now try

to shift the blame to the President, who can only administer the law, which Congress passes. "The President proposes, but Congress disposes." We here know this, yet it is the people who are to be hoodwinked. True, the President could be a more forceful leader, but liberal Democrat spending critics offer only, "We must spend more." (First day of Congress, six Democrats put in bills with a 5-year price tag of $117 billion.)

Why not review all existing programs, as the President suggested we do in the military, to be sure we get maximum value received for each dollar spent in the Federal Government? For maximum value in the military, let's get the Defense Department out of business operations. Why not apply evaluation yardsticks to every Government program now? (1) Is this a function of Federal Government? (2) Can we afford it?

Mikoyan and Russian propaganda experts will now demonstrate over and over the reason for his visit and the gullibility of American people. Mikoyan will speak for American people as set apart and opposed to their Government. Let's review a few Russian comments. Khrushchev called Mikoyan to his face a professional traitor. Khrushchev, speaking of the United States and Russia, "We cannot coexist externally. One of us must go to his grave. We must push them to their graves." Khrushchev again, "We Bolsheviks are a ravenous people. What we achieved in the past is very little" (enslavement of half the world). "We want more and more." On Manuilsky, Russian instructor of political warfare, "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep, so we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fists." Need more be said?

The Thinking of One of Our Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the following is copy of a letter received this morning. It is well worth reading:

BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICH.,
January 10, 1959.

Senator PAT MCNAMARA,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Received your letter on your stand, and report to the people of the State of Michigan.

Regarding Federal aid to education: More and more some people are inclined to let the Government handle all our problems for us. But that destroys initiative and self-government, and freedom; besides entailing excessive taxation. Federal aid to education would involve adding more employees to the Federal payroll, adding office equipment and buildings or space, new printing forms, and redtape.

All this would increase the cost of building more schoolrooms with Federal aid than if done by local talent alone. The local talent are right on the job, know the community needs, and can better determine, alone and without Federal restrictions and redtape, what to do in solving the educational problems in a way least burdensome to the taxpayers.

From your letter I gather you favor big government, inflation, and more and bigger taxes.

The only advantage I can see in higher wages and inflation is to the Government in the portion of taxes it collects.

I think it's a shame and a crime for our Government to sell bonds by advertising a return of $4 (in 10 years) for every $3 invested. A buyer of bonds, over the 10-year period, loses one-half or more of the money he invested in Government bonds, because the dollars he receives after 10 years, due to inflation, are worth only half as much as the ones he invested. In other words, the borrower profits and the lender loses. Is that fair?

You seem so favorable to admitting Hawaii to statehood. I'm surprised you'd even think of such a thing as long as Harry Bridges (an admitted Communist) is in charge of things over there. Are you trying to enthrone communism?

Our Government is committing treason against its citizens by confiscating property (including bank accounts) of private individuals whose only crime is exercising their God-given right to grow what they please on their own property for the purpose only of feeding to their own flocks and herds.

"Oh, but they are disobeying the law," you may say. In free America the Government has no business passing such a law, and certainly no constitutional authority for so doing. It just makes my blood boil at what our Government is doing. I supposed the victory over that kind of injustice was gained back in 1776. The Yankuses and Stanglands are the real patriots and Paul Reveres and Patrick Henrys of today.

Government agents coming around to confiscate your property or to boss you around on your own property is barefaced communism in its rawest form. And to think our own Government is doing that.

The way our Government is trampling all over our Constitution (especially articles 7 and 8 of the amendments) and Bill of Rights, and our Supreme Court making decisions of "policy"; also the way our Government is throwing away our hard-earned money like a drunken sailor on shore leave—why, if the Spirit of '76 were still alive, we'd all rise up as one man and put our Government in its rightful place—as servant of the people, not the master.

Our State governments and Federal Government, when they discover they've overrun their budgets, their first idea is to levy more taxes—always more taxes. Instead of bobsting taxes, they should reduce their expenditures to fit the budget.

It's a very ominous statement you make in telling of your desire to close up the loopholes in taxes. This is merely a politician's way of saying you are out to levy all the new taxes everywhere you possibly can.

You men who have some say in the Government would do well to take a lesson from the Cuban revolt. It's the man in the street (whom you're supposed to represent) who is important, and not the Government.

Yours very truly,

AMERICAN FREEDOM FIGHTER
ALFRED MCCAULEY.

You and Your Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include for the RECORD a brief talk entitled "You and Your Chamber of Commerce," given by Leland H. Jones, president of the Phenix City-Russell County Chamber of Commerce, at their annual meeting November 7, 1958, Phenix City, Ala.:

YOU AND YOUR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

(A brief talk given by Leland H. Jones, president of the Phenix City-Russell County Chamber of Commerce, at their annual meeting November 7, 1958, Phenix City, Ala.)

It has been said, the strength of America today is the sum total of the strength of its local communities, whether they be small towns or large cities, and to us a community is more than just houses, factories, paved streets or places of business. A community is people, people like you and me and others. People who live in these houses and work and operate these places of business.

Therefore, we believe for a community or a city to grow and become stronger people must ban together in an organized effort, and one effective way to have this organized effort is through a city's chamber of commerce. Here is where the business and civic leaders work together to make a better place in which to live and carry on your business in a safer and a cleaner city.

The chamber of commerce is a place where the businessman, the farmer, professional man, industrialist, educator, and others can pool their ideas around the table that make their city a challenge and a source of pride. A community with an active chamber of commerce not only promotes progress, but helps to dissolve discontent among its citizens, and tries to promote harmony, peace and good will among men.

A chamber of commerce, first, must have an active membership; second, it must have an adequate budget before it can carry on its work to help community improvement, help to encourage good citizenship and sound business development.

Some of their duties today are to help business expand, try to attract new industry, promote tourist trade, keep in touch with local, State and National legislation, encourage citizens to vote, work with 4-H Clubs, build closer relationship among all the people, and to help build the community socially, politically, and culturally. These are only a few. There are also public relations, which is very important, hundreds of meetings, and hundreds of letters. There are all kinds of phone calls for information on many various subjects.

The remarkable thing I see in a chamber of commerce is this: Whatever is achieved is through the democratic methods, with voluntary membership and financial support—also contributed time and effort.

Your chambers of commerce financial support comes solely from the business community. Unfortunately, we are lacking some in this respect. Too many of our people are not members. The chamber needs your support, your enthusiasm, your suggestions and your association.

It is known a chamber of commerce cannot achieve its usefulness if we do not maintain perspective, faith, and enthusiasm. Chamber of commerce effort is that way. Its work is not the result of machine, not the result of muscles, or the pushing of buttons. Chamber success is achieved in its finest form through constructive thought, compelling spirit, and convincing action by men and women who are willing to devote part of their time and effort to build a better town.

It is basically a local institution. It embodies as no other agency its urge for community progress. Its genius lies in organizing the energies of men in the community who believe their city has a place in the sun—remember before Man made us citizens, great Nature made us men. It gave us a place to live. Its progress is in our hands.

One chamber of commerce executive has said "as business prospers, this great country gains in strength," and as you know, business thrives from individual initiative and citizenship. You might say—I cannot do much alone—and this could be true, but by joining hands much can be done. Your membership in the chamber of commerce will be investing something in your business and your community where you might reap a better living.

As you know, all communities have lots of problems, and will always have problems. The problem of growth and the problem of development, but we must keep working at these to build the kind of community in which we would like to live.

Last year State and local development agencies are estimated to have spent $40 million trying to attract more industry—even so—some industrial executives say many towns are not ready. Communities may be seeking new industries mainly to gain new payrolls, but also industry last year paid $7 billion in taxes that otherwise the local citizens might have had to foot themselves.

Imagine, if you can, a city without a chamber of commerce, a community chest, a parent-teachers' association, improvement clubs, civic organizations, and others too numerous to mention. I'm sure this would not be to your liking.

What would happen to a city of this kind? It would soon die of dead rot. It would be a collection of buildings and people who would be existing, but not really living. Yes, my friend, the miracle makers of a community are its citizens. Live, wide awake people who are upcoming planners and builders.

I would like to add this tonight, if I may: the next 4 years may be the most trying times in Alabama's history. A time when the Federal Government is invading the sovereign rights of the States, and many other pressing problems, but let us be proud that the man who will be at the helm of our government understands the problems facing us today and is not afraid to act for a just solution. Tens of thousands of people over this State supported John Patterson so he could continue his battle from the Governor's chair, not only to carry the banner of this State, but to place its prestige back where it belongs in this Nation.

It would be well that Americans be warned today—not to water down our free enterprise system for a form of socialism, or have it completely destroyed by communism. And to help keep down these movements they need the backing of local chambers of commerce—the backing of local citizens. They are heavily depending upon men who have interest in their investments and the future of this State and this country.

Let us organize our efforts as citizens, as well as you do your business. Keep informed on politics, sift platforms, check leaders, especially those who are interested in their own personal interest and personal gain. Not only on a State, but also a local level, because if these United States ever lose their present form of government and become a Socialist, welfare state, we think the world will blame the American businessman because they are the most influential group in our Nation today.

And in closing may I say when all is said and done, a city needs a strong chamber of commerce or development board, because as it grows—a city will grow, but it is not created by subscription alone. It primarily exists upon good leadership, constructive thought, enthusiasm, convincing action, and the participation of strong men. Men who operate banks, grocery stores, factories, furniture stories, law offices, physicians, all kinds of businesses. They are the ones who must provide the leadership—people who believe their city has a place in the sun and will devote part of their time to its development as many of you are doing today.

Television Booster Stations Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, television has become an important part of American life. It offers educational, recreational and entertainment values that are appreciated by millions of citizens. Although it is a comparatively new communications media, methods have been devised to bring television not only to the population centers, but to rural areas and to families living in mountainous, rugged terrain.

In my own State of South Dakota, it has been necessary to make use of low-power booster stations so that television could be feasible in the rugged Black Hills and in some of the more thinly populated sections of the State. The people living in these sections are equally entitled with other citizens to enjoy the benefits of television.

It is an established fact that the use of ultra high frequency stations in such areas is not feasible either financially or from the standpoint of effective operation.

It is thus a matter of great concern to the people of western South Dakota and many other communities that on December 31, 1958, the Federal Communications Commission ruled that all booster stations must apply for conversion to high frequency operation within 90 days or cease operation. This order, if allowed to stand, can only mean that many communities will lose their television reception entirely.

Mr. Speaker, I am joining a number of my colleagues in the House and in the other body in sponsoring legislation to bring about a reversal of this unfortunate decision by the Commission.

The South Dakota State Legislature has recognized the serious nature of the FCC ruling and has passed a bipartisan resolution calling upon the Congress to intercede. The resolution was offered in the senate by Senators Al Roesler and Art Jones and in the house of representatives Carl Furchner and James Jelbert.

Under unanimous consent, I include this excellent resolution of the South Dakota Legislature in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such remedial action as deemed necessary to preclude the closing of low power booster stations necessary for television reception in certain areas of the State of South Dakota

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):

Whereas there are many communities and farm areas within the State of South Dakota whose people depend upon low power booster stations as their only means of receiving television programs; and

Whereas the rugged terrain of the Black Hills region makes the use of ultra high frequency translator stations impractical, if indeed not impossible, according to the opinions expressed by competent and qualified broadcast engineers, as well as by certain members of the Federal Communications Commission; and

Whereas it is economically impossible for these communities and farm areas to support, construct, or operate any other form of duly authorized television service; and

Whereas there is ample proof that low power booster stations can be regulated so as to preclude interference with licensed television services or other services; and

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission did summarily dismiss, without formal hearing, its own rulemaking proceedings relating to repeater or booster stations operating in the VHF television band of frequency assignments; and

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission did on December 31, 1958, make formal announcement of its dismissal of petitions for reconsideration, all of which sought to procure reasonable rules which would permit the continued operation of said booster stations under the regulatory power of the Federal Government; and

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission did also announce on December 31, 1958, that all booster stations would be given a period of 90 days in which to apply for conversion to ultra high frequency translators or some other authorized television operation, and upon failure to do so would be ordered to cease operation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 36th Legislature of the State of South Dakota, That this legislature hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States for such remedial action within such 90-day period as the Congress deems fit through the exercise of its authority over the Federal Communications to insure the continued operation of low power booster stations, to the end that the people in the nonmetropolitan areas of the State of South Dakota shall not be denied their basic right to quality of access to the informational, educational, inspirational, cultural, and entertainment service of the American system of free television broadcasting; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States.

JOHN F. LINDLEY,
Lieutenant Governor.
D. K. HOLLAND,
Secretary to Senate.
ARCHIE GUBBRUD,
Speaker.
W. J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk.

Also under unanimous consent, I include the text of the resolution which I am sponsoring in the RECORD:

Whereas VHF television repeater of booster stations provide the least expensive and in many cases the only existing means of providing television service to many areas of the United States; and

Whereas the public in areas served by such stations is satisfied with the service provided; and

Whereas the replacement of such stations with other means of providing television service would involve considerable expense on the part of the public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Federal Communications Commission should (1) authorize the operation of VHF television booster or repeater stations in all cases where the operation of such stations is a public convenience and necessity and where such operation does not actually cause objectionable interference with other communications or does not endanger the public safety, and (2) modify such of its rules and orders as may be necessary to carry out the policy expressed in this resolution.

Bring a Soviet Crew to Lake Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of easing international tensions in the cold war the State of Washington, the city of Seattle, the University of Washington, and civic leaders throughout our State have enthusiastically supported the program of conducting sporting events with the Soviet Union.

Last year our fine University of Washington crew accepted an invitation to compete against crews of other nations in London and Moscow. Although the Husky crew defeated the Soviet crews in Moscow, the contest was viewed in a true spirit of good sportsmanship by the Russian athletes. Because of the good will and better understanding which resulted from this sports rivalry, Greater Seattle, Inc., has proposed that the University of Washington reciprocate by inviting a Soviet crew to race on Lake Washington in August.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution, passed unanimously by the Washington State Legislature, calling upon the Secretary of State to give the greatest amount of consideration and cooperation to this proposal:

RESOLUTION BY REPRESENTATIVES WES C. UHLMAN, PAT NICHOLSON, AND CHARLES P. MORIARTY, JR.

Whereas the University of Washington is a recognized leader of the world in all phases of eight-oared crew racing, its oarsmen, coaches, shells, methods, its consistency in winning national, international and Olympic championships, all attest to its universal preeminence in one of the few remaining sports untainted by any touch of professionalism; and

Whereas in furtherance of this highly desirable sport, the University of Washington crew accepted an invitation to compete against the crews of other nations at London and Moscow and was accorded full hospitality by the governments of the host nations; and

Whereas officials of the civic promotional organization known as Greater Seattle, Inc., have proposed to the U.S. Department of State that the University of Washington reciprocate with a like invitation to crews representing the Soviet Union to compete with the University of Washington and other invited American crews as part of the 1959 Seattle Seafair celebration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Government and particularly the Secretary of State of the United States consider and give the greatest amount of cooperation possible to the submitted plans and assist in bringing about the realization of this highly desirable international contest; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State of the United States, the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Chief Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Members of the U.S. Congress representing the State of Washington.

I hereby certify this to be a true and correct copy of resolution adopted by the House January 14, 1959.

S. R. HOLCOMB,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

An Oil Grab in Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID S. KING
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Utah public is incensed over an injustice which they believe was dealt their State by the last Congress in the passage of Public Law 85–868.

The basis of their alarm is clearly and concisely explained in a recent column by Robert W. Bernick, business editor of the Salt Lake Tribune, and in an editorial in the Deseret News, in which the latter urged the Utah Members of Congress to make every effort to correct the injustice.

As these articles point out, the law may cost Utah millions of dollars in oil royalties which would possibly have accrued to the State but for the provisions of section 1(d), which is the focal point of the problem. In addition, the law may cheat the Federal coffers of even greater sums—sums which, ironically, would have been spent in large measure on reclamation and perhaps on the very project the bill was meant to help, the Glen Canyon development.

State officials have advised me that they had received assurances from the Department of the Interior, through the Senate, that the disputed section, which was slipped into the bill in the closing hours of the last session, would jeopardize neither oil-lease applications which then were pending before the Department, nor other State interests in the public domain. I have been told that the same assurances had been given the westerners in Congress who supported the legislation.

Utahans who are alarmed over this oil grab believe it behooves the 86th Congress not only to reexamine the law and the legislators' intent in passing it, but also to investigate the relationship between certain Interior officials and the Indians' legal counsel. The same Utahans suggest that unless a relationship of unwarranted closeness had existed, the Department likely would never have permitted such damaging provisions as those contained in section 1(d) to be enacted into legislation at such a crucial moment, at a time when the lawmakers, under the press of last-minute congressional business, were without means to weigh those provisions carefully.

The Deseret News editorial of January 13, explaining the problem reads as follows:

SAVE UTAH'S OIL ROYALTIES

Congressman DAVID KING has made a good start in representing Utah's interests by challenging the Interior Department's ruling on a complicated, tremendously important question of oil and mineral rights within the Navajo Indian Reservation.

The way this question is finally settled can mean upward of $9 million in oil royalties to the State of Utah, in addition to other benefits. We hope the entire delegation will join in a terrierlike effort to shake out a just decision on this point.

The problem arises because of "sleeper" language that was slipped into the legislation last year that authorized an exchange of land with the Navajos because of land necessary for construction of Glen Canyon Dam and filling of the reservoir.

That particular exchange, giving the Indian land in the McCracken Mesa area adjoining the northern edge of the reservation, created no particular problem, since mineral rights did not go with the exchange. But an amendment slipped into the bill and dealing with other lands can cause no end of trouble.

This amendment declares that all public lands, or lands in the public domain, within the reservation should be held in trust for the benefit of the Navajos. And it includes as public lands all original claims or withdrawals that have, over the years, been relinquished or abandoned.

Until the uranium-oil strike in the Four Corners area, ownership of those claims made precious little difference. It was land fit only for grazing, and little enough of that. But with one of the country's major oil booms developing in that area, ownership has become tremendously important.

If the lands are public domain, the claims filed by a number of Utah and other developers are valid; if ruled Indian lands, then the claims of two or three major oil companies take precedence.

Far more important from the State's point of view, if the lands are public domain, Utah will get 37½ percent of the Government's oil royalties, and other royalties will go into the Federal general fund and into the reclamation fund, from which Utah also benefits. If Indians lands, neither the Federal Government nor Utah will get a dime in royalties.

This dispute, it should be emphasized, has been developing for some time. As Congressman KING pointed out to the Interior Department the new law has the effect of deciding the dispute unilaterally, without a fair, just court decision. Utah's congressional delegation insists this was not the intention of Congress, as far as they could tell at the time.

The great bulk of the Four Corners oil and gas boom is centered on lands already part of the reservation. The Indians are doing fine. This new law, if allowed to stand, would have the effect of stripping away some of the relatively few benefits Utah expected to get.

As always in such cases, the issues are complex and neither the rights nor wrongs are all concentrated on one side. Certainly the morality as well as the legality of the issue is in enough doubt—and the matter is of such importance to Utah—that the law cannot be allowed to stand unchallenged. Mr. KING and others, keep hammering away.

Mr. Bernick's column from the Salt Lake Tribune, published January 21, reads as follows:

NAVAJOS' SUIT ASKS GAINS IN SAN JUAN

The Navajo Tribe Tuesday laid claim to all right, title, and interests the State of Utah has on State and other domain within the Navajo Reservation of San Juan County.

At immediate issue are two State school sections which in the last 16 months have poured nearly a quarter of a million dollars into the Utah school fund.

Ultimately, thousands of additional acres—much of it productive of oil—and millions of dollars of royalty payments to the State are involved in the action filed with the Bureau of Land Management of the U.S. Department of Interior.

The lawsuit is based on wording of a bill passed by the last (85th) Congress which had as its apparent purpose the indemnification of the Navajos for lands to be covered by the lake created by Glen Canyon Dam.

But the Indians apparently are getting more than 60,000 acres of additional ground in San Juan County.

Their counsel now maintains the law wiped out all interests of the State in these two school sections and transferred all public domain within the Navajo Reservation to Indian trusteeship.

Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican, of Utah, was active in sponsorship of the measure in the final days of the 85th Congress.

The Indians, in their process served Tuesday on Frank J. Allen, State land board director, also asserted that the State school sections were rightfully Navajo because the Indians trod the lands prior to admission of the State into the Union.

They cite a number of decisions of the Federal courts backing up this finding.

One other recently publicized effect of the Littell bill was to wipe out the claims of several Utahans who had filed Federal oil and gas leases on lands which had been made subject to a prior mineral entry before extension of the Navajo Reservation in March 1933.

NINETEEN THIRTY-THREE LAW BARRED NAVAJO SAN JUAN EXPANSION

(An interesting portion of this bill creating the Aneth extension north of the San Juan River was its assertion that nothing in the 1933 law would constitute liquidation of prior entry on what was then Federal public domain. That 1933 law asserted that in no case were the Navajos to be given any more land in San Juan County. A quarter of a century later, the Congress repudiated its pledge, enlarged the reservation, and voided the articles on prior mineral entry.)

The assertion as to trusteeship of the Navajo on Federal public domain within the reservation raises an important and as yet unsettled question as to ownership of the bed of the San Juan River which traverses the oil-rich general Aneth area.

The State of Utah has been pressing—without any noticeable reaction by the office of the U.S. district attorney at Salt Lake City—for a quiet title action involving ownership of the bed.

Originally, the Navajos had no interest in this suit. If navigable, the San Juan bed belongs to the State. If not navigable—based on history of travel—the river bed is Federal public domain.

But the new assertion of trusteeship apparently would turn the river bed mineral rights to the Indians.

The Tribune was advised that the section of Public Law 85–868 (the Navajo Glen Canyon indemnity bill) dealing with Tuesday's assertion of interests on the part of the Indians was prepared by Normal Littell, general counsel for the Navajo Tribe at Washington, D.C.

The Littell amendment apparently was accepted by Elmer Bennett, then Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, and western Senators, including the Utah delegation.

The Department of the Interior currently is resisting any change in this section by the present Congress on moral grounds.

Mr. Allen told the Tribune—and Roger Ernst, an Assistant Secretary of the Interior has stated—that the acceptance of the amendments by the Senate was a "package deal involving the Indians, the Department, and the State of Utah."

However, "the State of Utah has been no party to any package deal involving the Indians or anyone else which would wipe out our rights and interests—and the interests of our schoolchildren—in oil production in San Juan County or any other county," Mr. Allen declared Tuesday.

WALLACE WIRE ASSURED NO ADVERSE EFFECTS

Mr. Allen said that all he had received from anyone in connection with the so-called Littell amendment was a telegram signed "Wallace" that the proposed changes in the legislation would have no adverse bearing on Utah's rights in the oil area.

Mr. Allen Tuesday called for "immediate amendment of Public Law 85–868 so as to remove all doubt as to the title, rights, and interests of the State in its oil holdings in San Juan County."

He also asserted that the action of the Indian counsel before the U.S. Bureau of Land Management on the two State school sections would be vigorously resisted.

Specifically involved in this latest move by Navajo counsel are section 16, township 40 south and range 24 east (Aneth Pool), on which lease was granted to Shell Oil Co., and section 16, township 40 south, range 26 east (Ismay Pool), on which a lease was granted to Carter Oil Co.

Legislative Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have today offered seven bills for consideration by the House of Representatives. These bills, in my judgment, should be promptly considered by the appropriate committees and reported out for final approval at the earliest possible date.

The legislative proposals which I am making may be briefly summarized as follows:

I. EXCISE TAX REPEAL

One of the bills provides for the repeal of the excise tax on communication services and facilities, and another provides for the repeal of such taxes upon the transportation of persons.

Further collection of these excise taxes seems to me to be unwarranted in view of the fact that they were originally imposed as war-time tax-raising devices. These taxes constitute an undue burden upon individuals of small businesses. Repeal would result in very little loss of revenue to the Government and would serve as a stimulus to small business and individual savings.

In the 85th Congress we repealed the excise tax upon the transportation of property, and it now seems highly proper that we should do the same with reference to transportation tax upon persons.

II. ADDITIONAL INCOME TAX DEDUCTIONS AND EXEMPTIONS

One of the bills which I have offered will increase the amount which a taxpayer may deduct on account of expenses paid for the care of his or her dependents who are under the age of 16 years. The other measure would increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer, including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age or blindness.

The working mothers in our country are being heavily penalized under the present Internal Revenue Code by reason of their inability to deduct the costs of care for dependents while the mother is necessarily working to earn a livelihood for her family. To fail to give the consideration which this bill offers for taxpayers who must pay for the care of their dependents while gaining their livelihood will constitute the compounding of a wrong which has long been experienced by the working mothers of our country. I believe that this legislation is long overdue and entertain the hope that others in the House will concur with that thought.

An increase in the personal tax exemption for taxpayers from $600 to $1,000 will give tax relief to the lower income citizens and, thereby, should have a great stimulus upon business as well as personal savings by those in the lower income brackets. The increase in personal exemption which is envisioned will result in very little overall loss of revenue to the Federal Government and could, in the long pull, result in an increase in the revenue by reason of the stimulation which it will give to business.

III. SOCIAL SECURITY

Another bill which I am offering will amend title II of the Social Security Act by removing the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder.

This legislation is made essential by reason of the inflationary spiral in which those who are receiving benefits find themselves. Those recipients who are physically able to carry on gainful employment should not be penalized for their diligence and energy, but rather should be encouraged to continue to make their contribution to the business, economic, and industrial life of their country.

Those who have attained all eligibility requirements except the reduction of their own income should not be penalized but should be given the encouragement which this legislation proposes.

IV. WORLD WAR II AND KOREAN WIDOWS AND ORPHANS

Another bill that I am offering today provides that pensions for non-service-connected death shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II and Korean veterans under the same conditions as apply to the widows and children of deceased World War I

veterans. This legislation, if enacted, will meet one of the real needs in the field of veterans' affairs in this country. Since 1934 the provision has been made for widows and children of deceased World War I veterans in the manner now sought to be extended to widows and orphans of deceased World War II and Korean veterans. Certainly it can be said that these individuals should receive the same consideration as now extended to those similarly situated by reason of casualties of World War I.

This legislation will mean a great deal to many needy and worthwhile widows and children in this land of ours.

V. SENATE AND HOUSE PAGES

I am also offering a bill to provide a residence for pages of the Senate and of the House of Representatives under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board.

It has alarmed most Members of Congress that young boys are being brought from their homes throughout the country to Washington to serve as pages in the two bodies of Congress without having any provision made for their supervision and housing upon their arrival in the Nation's Capital.

This is a situation which should not be permitted to exist beyond the current session of the United States Congress.

To establish a pages' residence would not require any tremendous appropriation, particularly in view of the fact that it is contemplated that the pages will pay such rates and fees, as far as practicable, as are sufficient to make the operation and maintenance of the residence self-sustaining.

This residence idea is not a new one. It has been discussed with and by many of my colleagues, and it seems to be uniformly agreed that something should be done immediately to eliminate the failure of supervision which we now observe in the handling of housing arrangements for our splendid young boys.

Mr. Speaker, I again reiterate that I entertain the hope that the legislative proposals which I am today making will be seriously and promptly considered by the House of Representatives through the appropriate committees and that action may be taken upon them with the greatest possible dispatch.

Tribute to Representative Herman P. Eberharter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, may I also join my colleagues from Pennsylvania, and other Members, in paying a brief tribute to the memory of the Honorable Herman P. Eberharter. He was a great Democrat and a most able representative of the people of his district and his State. He possessed a wonderful personality and served with great distinction as a member of the Ways and Means Committee. We miss him and will continue to miss him.

May I extend an expresion of my sincere sympathy to the members of his family.

A Problem Confronting the Indian People of South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose today to bring before the Congress one of the most vexing problems confronting the Indian people of South Dakota, confronting the counties and the State of South Dakota.

The problem results from a policy of the Indian Department established at the Washington level, that when an Indian has been away from a reservation for 1 year, the Department is no longer responsible for him or his family, either for medical care, for relief, or any other benefits intended by Congress for the Indian people, including such benefits as trades training, on-the-job training, educational loans, and so forth.

These latter programs, however, do not cause too great disruption between Federal and local governments, they have only a detrimental effect upon the welfare of the individual Indian.

One of the serious problems, however, arises from the fact that most States, including the State of South Dakota, have a statute providing that an indigent person or an indigent family moving from one county to another may not become a resident of the new county, and, therefore, become a county ward or a financial burden upon that new county, if the new county into which the individual or the family moves, does, within a certain time, serve upon him a notice to prevent acquiring a legal settlement.

Such notice in South Dakota provides that the individual coming into such county from another county or another State who is likely to become a public charge, is thereby warned to depart therefrom, and that service of such notice shall apply to all members of such family.

Through the years, the law has been upheld and interpreted many times by the Supreme Court. Families have been returned to their original county several years after leaving that county, if they should attempt to become a public charge upon the new county.

The Indian Department, however, refuses to recognize the laws of the State of South Dakota. When an Indian has been off of the reservation for a year, the Department washes its hands of him, regardless of whether the county into which he has moved serves a notice to prevent acquiring legal settlement or not. Public Health follows the policy of the Indian Department. The result is that counties in South Dakota located near Indian reservations, where Indian people congregate for employment, find themselves in an unbearable position, with the Indian Department refusing assistance and the country unable to provide the assistance. The Indian finds himself caught in the bind.

One serious example is the hospitals in Rapid City, S. Dak., where many thousands of dollars of hospital bills each year go unpaid by either the county or the Federal Government. Indian people are brought to the hospital in serious condition, an emergency exists and they must be given treatment. Because the Indian is indigent and unable to pay, the hospital is required to carry the cost of treatment and hospitalization.

I would quote from a letter under date of January 19, 1959, from the St. John's McNamara Hospital of Rapid City, S. Dak., with regard to the hospital bill of one Bert Guy Eagle Horse, age 41, an indigent taken to that hospital for emergency treatment and hospitalization. Part of the letter follows:

> He was found lying in the street, a tire iron lying nearby and with severe lacerations about the head. A severe blow across the base of the man's head caused a state of unconsciousness requiring immediate attention. I called Dr. Sicher, the Indian public health physician, at the clinic in the city of Chamberlain, S. Dak., for authorization. This was refused. I explained that he had authorized treatment for the man for rattlesnake bite at a previous admittance, August 1, 1958, and that they had recognized him as being eligible for authorization. He advised me that this was true, but that he had discovered that this was a mistake and that he should not have given it.

When the hospital called Pennington County Welfare Office they were advised that Bert Guy Eagle Horse was not a resident of Pennington County and apparently was prevented from becoming a resident, because of the South Dakota law. The county in which the home reservation of Bert Guy Eagle Horse is located will, of course, not pay the bill.

This, Mr. Speaker, creates a no-man's land with the individual Indian and the hospital caught in the bind. The Congress appropriates millions of dollars annually in the belief that the Indian people are being cared for. The fact is, the policy of the Indian Department makes of these people, who are encouraged by the Department to leave the reservation, a man without a country and ineligible for any assistance. This, in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, is a field in which the Congress must act. It is unfair to the Indian people that a vacuum should exist in which these people now find themselves at the mercy of non-Indian hospitals located adjacent to an Indian reservation.

We are advised that the Public Health hospitals on the reservation will give service to Indian people regardless of the fact that they have left the reservation for a time, but there is no provision for their return and no provision for emergency treatment. Worse than that, there is no provision for any public assistance to these families who having been encouraged to leave the reservation in search of work and to integrate into the white society, then find themselves destitute in a county which has served legal notice upon them to prevent their acquiring a legal settlement.

Excerpts From an Address by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include excerpts from an address given by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, at the 38th annual meeting of the Philippine American Chamber of Commerce, India House, Hanover Square, New York, N.Y., January 21, 1959:

After having mentioned some of the efforts and achievements of the present administration in the Philippines, I wish to refer to recent newspaper articles published in this country about the Philippine Government which, to say the least, give a distorted picture of conditions as they are now in the islands. Regarding the lurid charges of graft and corruption, of shortages and inflation, of unemployment and low wages, of insufficient faith in government, I will not attempt to gloss over them. But I feel bound to declare in the interest of truth and fairness that most of these criticisms are made in disregard of the facts which condition the existing situation.

American correspondents who go to the Philippines seem to forget when writing about us that our country was twice ravaged and laid waste in the space of 4 years, that we were not unscathed by the ruthless acts of a brutal occupation, that while in true Christian spirit we are exerting every effort to forgive and forget, 15 years cannot completely efface the moral trauma that was the result of that occupation. A sense of proportion would seem to dictate that conditions in the Philippines be viewed in the proper perspective and that the faults of government be considered against the background of the almost total collapse and disorganization of Philippine life as the result of enemy occupation which, it must be stressed, was entirely different from the friendly and benevolent occupation of Germany and Japan by the United States and allied governments. Without condoning instances of corruption or incompetence, such an attitude would give praise or blame as the facts require. Judgment would be tempered by sympathetic understanding, and a nation that has been sick, no more than a man still recovering from the effects of his illness, would not be required to give performance equal to that of one who is entirely hale and sound.

We should not forget also that the inadequacies of Philippine life today are not peculiar to the Philippines. Most countries have them in a greater or lesser degree, including those that suffered no direct physical or moral damage from the war. There certainly is hardly any criticism now being leveled at the Philippines by visiting American newspapermen which cannot with equal justice be leveled also at Chicago or New York or Mississippi or Arkansas or Washington, and these latter without the partial justification which exists in the case of the Philippines.

Furthermore, the American correspondents would most certainly have a much sounder basis for judging the conditions in my country if they were to read up on the history of other countries, like the United States, for instance, say, 15 years after July 4, 1776. They will find that the picture was nowhere pretty at any time; certainly not of the United States, where there was great insecurity of life and property and where conditions became so intolerable there was a movement supported by respectable people to replace the Republic with a monarchy and make George Washington a king.

It is not my purpose to excuse the faults of our Government by citing the faults of another. My purpose rather is to show that we Filipinos are ourselves sharply aware of these deficiencies, and that our frank recognition of their existence is in itself a beneficent act of conscience, which constitutes the first step in the process of healing. We know these shortcomings to exist, we do not avert our eyes from them, nor do we wish to conceal them from the eyes of others. We are confident that the conscience of the nation, reacting to every evidence of negligence or incompetence, corruption, or abuse, will fashion the necessary remedies, as they in fact are now being fashioned, in accordance with our laws and constitution and in the interest of a more perfect democracy.

The present administration in the Philippines has undertaken a vigorous campaign against those accused of being guilty of malfeasance in office. The Manila newspapers are, therefore, filled with news about cases of graft and corruption because the evildoers are now being identified and exposed. As an earnest of his determination to eradicate this cancer from our body politic, President Garcia has proposed the creation of an anti-graft court to form part of our judiciary in order that it may be above the influence of both the executive and the legislative.

Rising from the wreckage of a destructive war, our people have wrestled with the problems of political reorganization, economic reconstruction, and social regeneration with high resolve and enthusiasm. The Government of our Republic is functioning on a sound constitutional basis. The will of the people continues to be expressed in periodic elections as provided by law. The basic civil liberties which are guaranteed to the citizens by the Bill of Rights are meticulously respected by the agencies of the state and by the courts. Freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly remains unimpaired. We have a bipartisan system and we have a real party of the opposition whose existence is generally recognized to be essential to any genuine form of representative government.

Philippine economy is basically sound. What we need in the Philippines today is foreign exchange and the reason for the low level of our international reserves is simple: Five years ago we were supporting 150 industries; now we are supporting more than 1,000 industries. If anything can show the fundamental soundness of our economy it is these figures, aside from the fact that we have registered remarkable growth in our agriculture, in manufacture, and in our export trade. Inflation in the Philippines is quite low compared with that of other countries, our per capita income has increased considerably as well as our national production.

We had hoped we could get more American aid than what had been given us to help us bolster our economy. The general impression that we have been beneficiaries of extra-lavish American assistance must be corrected for, aside from war damage payments which were certainly due us who suffered incredible destruction from any enemy attack aimed at the United States—the Philippines was American territory at the time—the actual receipts of economic help are much less than those given to other countries in Asia, some of them former enemy countries, others neutral or uncommitted, certainly none linked by political, military, and economic ties as closely to the American people as we Filipinos are.

Here are the figures: According to the report of the U.S. Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1958, the Philippines received during the postwar period a total of $145 million in mutual security aid from the United States. In contrast, Japan received a total grant of $2,897 million; Korea, $2,160 million; Formosa, $2,373 million, Vietnam, $795 million; India, $310 million; Pakistan, $343 million; and Indonesia $139 million. I do not include in the total Philippine aid the amounts given the Philippine rehabilitation, UNRRA, agricultural commodities, Red Cross, and others which were for relief immediately after the war since certainly they were emergency measures necessitated by the terrible destruction we suffered.

As the Philippine Ambassador to the United States whose every effort has been to foster closer Philippine-American friendship and who has all these years endeavored to present the case for my people and plead their cause, I feel it is my duty to make known to our American friends the feeling that is unfortunately growing among my fellow countrymen that Philippine friendship is being taken for granted here. It is necessary for America to make and cultivate new friends; it is wiser for her to keep and maintain old ones. We who as a people have cast our lot unreservedly with yours and have always stood up to be counted thus assuming all the concomitant risks of such a forthright stand, we who as a nation have refused, unlike others, to sit comfortable on the fence, or stand on the sidelines, my people feel they deserve a more sympathic understanding of their pressing needs and problems. The truth is that we have not asked for any handouts nor have we sought charity. We have claims against the United States amounting to $972 million and these claims had been officially presented to your Government on January 14, 1955, 4 years ago. To date, these claims remain unsettled.

Then again Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER of California, introduced in your Congress, only last year, a bill authorizing the appropriation of $100 million for additional war damage payments which is one of the items in our claims against the United States. Speaking on the floor of the House on May 19, 1958, he said:

"As we are all aware, to our embarrassment and sorrow, only slightly more than half of the amounts awarded to claimants in the Philippines for their war damage losses were actually paid, and even after reducing the amounts of the awards in excess of $500 by 25 percent as provided by the Rehabilitation Act, still 22½ percent of each award remains unsatisfied."

There is also the long-delayed payment to us of the gold devaluation fund amounting to nearly $24 million which the present administration is committed to redeem and which, we have been promised, will be submitted in a bill to your Congress at its session early this year.

The other claims are as follows: coconut oil processing tax, $173 million; sugar excise tax, $75 million; claims of Philippine customs duties of imports by the U.S. Army and Navy, $1 million; various military claims, $600 million.

If your Government can only see its way clear to settling these claims, we need no financial aid from the United States. It is not for me to make invidious comparisons. But if your leaders fear that the failure of democracy in certain countries of Asia would be a grave loss to the free world and for this reason you are giving them generous financial aid, would it not be a severe blow to American prestige if the democracy that was born under its aegis and which it helped create in the Philippines breaks down and turns out to be a tragic failure for lack of that economic support which America is granting to others with largesse?

There are two avenues which we can follow right away, through which the Philippines can be given a boost by the United States without extraordinary procedures or steps which call for anything but ordinary, sound business practice and equitable treatment.

First, in connection with the war damage

awards to Philippine victims of World War II provided by the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946: Only 52½ percent of the awards allowed by the War Damage Commission have been paid whereas the law itself specifies that 75 percent of the fact amount of the awards in excess of $500 each should be paid. The holders of the awards have always felt that they were judgment holders against the United States and, in fact, the awards may well be considered the moral obligation of the United States. The payment of the balance remaining unpaid of 22½ percent on each award would constitute a substantial source of economic assistance for the Philippines which can be effected by the Congress without further consideration of new loans or assistance programs; only as a discharge, indeed, of an undertaking commenced in 1946 and long overdue in fulfillment.

Second, in connection with sugar imports from the Philippines: When the Sugar Act of 1948 was amended 3 years ago the excess amount of sugar consumption in the United States above a basic supply of 8,350,000 tons was apportioned between domestic sugar producers to the extent of 55 percent and foreign suppliers, 45 percent. But the Philippines was not included in either category. However, both the President and the State Department said at the time that in a further extension of the Sugar Act, which comes up in 1960, the Philippines should be considered.

A consideration of the Philippines to the extent of a portion of the excess United States sugar consumption will create necessary dollar reserve and bolster the whole Philippine economy in the direction of employment of labor, replacement of sugar machinery, and the like.

Since the President and the Secretary of State have already indicated approval of participation by the Philippines, all that needs to be done is for Congress to include the Philippines in the next revision of the Sugar Act.

Heretofore, the Philippine American Chamber of Commerce has been most helpful by sending telegrams to congressional committees requesting favorable action on such Philippine legislation as the chamber felt merited its support. These telegrams are usually inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Since the chamber specializes exclusively in the enhancing of trade between the Philippines and the United States, it would be much more helpful if we could enlist the assistance of your 134-member firms having financial, industrial trade, business or professional interest in either or both countries to write letters to the Representatives and Senators from the district in which their plants are actually located pointing out the writer's interest in the Philippines together wtih the amount of business they do annually in this area and finally enlisting the Congressman's and/or Senator's support for the legislation in question.

Thomas S. Gordon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of the sudden passing of our former friend and colleague, Thomas S. Gordon, of Illinois, who served with distinction in the 78th through the 85th Congress.

I was privileged to be associated with him as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. During the 85th Congress, Tom Gordon, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, made notable contributions of which we are all very well aware. As a Member of this great body he has diligently served in the best interests of his constituency, the Nation, and the free world.

Tom Gordon was a man of amiable personal traits and no one who ever knew him could fail to be impressed by his quiet modesty and sincere humility. He was a man of the highest integrity who stood firmly by his convictions. His sincerity of purpose and friendliness of nature compelled deep respect and enduring affection. Tom Gordon's untimely death leaves a profound impression on us. We shall miss him. I join my colleagues in extending my sympathy to his loved ones.

In the Quality and Integrity of Our Young People Lies the Strength and Future of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, each year the Kentucky Junior Chamber of Commerce names its three outstanding young men and an outstanding young farmer of the year. On January 20 the selections for 1958 were made and it was with a great deal of gratification and pride that I learned that two of the four young men chosen for this distinguished honor are from the Second Congressional District of Kentucky which I have the honor to represent.

Thomas B. Hagerman, selected by the Kentucky Junior Chamber of Commerce as one of its three outstanding young men, is a native of Bowling Green, my hometown in Warren County. And William T. Roark, chosen as the outstanding young farmer, is from Franklin, Simpson County. These two men exemplify, in the truest sense, the tradition of selfless service to community and fellow citizens which has played such an important part in the growth of Kentucky and this great country of ours.

The choice of Thomas B. Hagerman is quite appropriate as the variety of activities in which he participates with excellence makes him indeed worthy of the appellation "outstanding." As an agent for Aetna Oil Co., in Bowling Green, Mr. Hagerman gives freely of his time, energy, and leadership to the various groups whose common denominator is the betterment of the community and the instilling of worthy ideals of service and integrity in the youth of that community. In these troubled times when the newspaper headlines scream of juvenile crimes, I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal appreciation for young men such as Thomas B. Hagerman. I can think of no better way to inspire the youth of our Nation with the ideal of service to their fellowman than by example. The emulation of men such as Thomas Hagerman cannot help but produce finer citizens of tomorrow.

Mr. Hagerman, who graduated from Western Kentucky State College, is a Jaycee, is active in church work, is a coach of the Small Fry Football Conference, a member of the Two Gallon Blood Donor Club, is a Warren County jury commissioner, a veteran participating in the Army Reserve program, and a high-school football official. The scope of his interests ranging from church work, youth direction, service to community as a jury commissioner, to Army Reserve activities indicates the fullness and maturity of character possessed by Mr. Hagerman.

As service to community enhances the facilities of our urban centers, so excellence in farming contributes to the productivity of our rural areas upon which this Nation was built. It is to men such as William T. Roark that we can look with pride and confidence to the further development of agriculture. During the past 11 years in which Mr. Roark has engaged in farming, he has increased the productivity of his 985-acre farm by 166 percent. He raises beef cattle and seed. In addition to his truly outstanding farm work, young Roark is active in his church, the Rotary Club, Kentucky Chamber of Commerce, Masons, soil-conservation work, county extension council, Simpson County Farm Bureau, and Simpson County Tobacco Association. When so many of our young men are leaving the land with the idea of quick success in the city, the example set by William T. Roark should serve as an inspiration to the youth who elect to remain on the farm and achieve a full and satisfying life in agricultural pursuits.

I am justifiably proud in being able to place in the RECORD a brief tribute to the accomplishments of these two fine young men from the Second Congressional District of Kentucky. In the quality and integrity of our young people lies the strength and future of America and certainly Thomas B. Hagerman and William T. Roark are worthy of the trust placed in them.

Thomas S. Gordon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, although we knew that Tom Gordon retired from Congress because he was not in good health, none of us recognized how few were the days left to him on this earth. Certainly I was shocked when I learned of his passing.

Tom Gordon had a long and honorable record of public service. He held several important positions in his native

city of Chicago. In those offices his devotion to duty and to the public welfare won for him a host of friends. Sixteen years ago his district first sent him to this House. Until he voluntarily retired he was returned in each election by large majorities.

Throughout his congressional career he served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He brought to his committee assignment an unusual interest in and knowledge of conditions in Europe, particularly in the countries of Eastern Europe. He had a deep sense of indignation at the treatment accorded the people in those countries under Communist rule and over the years became an acknowledged spokesman for them. Several times he engaged in lengthy study missions for the committee. His reports of these trips to his colleagues and to his constituents showed an understanding of the problems we faced in the countries he visited.

Tom Gordon's long service appropriately culminated in his election as chairman of the committee in the 85th Congress. Until overtaken by illness in late 1957, he provided the committee with a dignified, impartial, and objective leadership. I will always regard it as a privilege to have served with him for so many years.

Tom Gordon had many wonderful human qualities. He was quiet, patient, and understanding. He was a man with deep religious convictions, whose very devotion to his religion gave him a compassionate understanding of human nature that I much admire.

To his family I extend my deepest sympathy upon the passing of a wonderful husband and father.

Importation of Firearms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing a bill which would prohibit the importation into the United States of certain firearms.

I had introduced similar legislation in the 83d and 84th Congresses, but these measures prohibited members of the armed services and their dependents from bringing into this country pistols, revolvers, and other types of small firearms. The Department of the Army had submitted an adverse report on this legislation, primarily due to the fact that they felt that the bill would discriminate against military personnel and their dependents.

Last year I eliminated the provision restricting the ban to members of the Armed Forces only, and have asked that the prohibition be extended to everyone—civilian and military alike—who would bring such weapons into the country.

I have been in touch with many law-enforcement officers throughout the United States, and the vast majority of them have endorsed this legislation and have agreed that any attempt to keep dangerous weapons out of the hands of criminals, potential criminals, children, and irresponsible individuals should receive the full support of all those interested in combating crime, and minimizing tragedy which results when some of these guns are accidentally fired. Our own district attorney, in Queens County, N.Y., one of the most heavily populated counties in the country, the Honorable Frank D. O'Connor, has agreed with me that the supply of illicit weapons should be stopped at its source, and fully supports the proposed measure.

Statistics have shown that as many as 50,000 of these contraband weapons have been brought into the United States on just one troopship returning from the European theater. Multiply that by the number of troopships and the number of civilians bringing such weapons into the country and we have an astounding figure.

I have been informed that in one county of New York City 75 percent of the crimes of violence have been and are being committed with these so-called souvenirs. Every day we read in the papers or hear over the radio and television of tragic accidents which occur, and of crimes which have been committed with these weapons. Just the other day Police Commissioner Kennedy issued a report indicating a substantial increase in crimes of violence in the city of New York.

The time has come to put an end to this potentially explosive situation. We simply cannot afford to wait any longer and must make a determined effort to prevent these crimes and mishaps at their source. I can think of no better way than by banning the importation of these weapons and by preventing them from getting into the hands of those who might be tempted to use them illegally or carelessly.

I urge my colleagues to give this legislation every possible consideration.

Five Fallacies About Spenders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Denver, Colo., Post, there appeared a timely article by Roscoe Fleming, on the subject of taxation and spending. In the light of current discussion of budget expenditures and Federal spending I believe Mr. Fleming's analysis, "Five Fallacies About Spenders," deserves careful reading. Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have the article printed in the RECORD. The article follows:

FIVE FALLACIES ABOUT SPENDERS
(By Roscoe Fleming)

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat of Pennsylvania, former mayor of Philadelphia, recently addressed the American Municipal Congress in Boston, and made the case for a strong, forward-looking national policy as well as anyone has done.

It might be taken as the answer of the "yes-sayers" to the "no-sayers," who insist above all on a balanced budget and cutting Federal expenditures in all fields save defense.

The nub of Senator CLARK's argument follows:

"The election was not a mandate to stand still. It was a mandate to move forward. What stands in the way?"

The answer we always get—whether the issue is national defense, or mutual security, or education, or housing, or urban renewal, or social security, or the development of Asia and Africa—is: "We can't afford it," or: "We must cut costs and balance the budget."

Now let me admit that most, although not all, of the problems that confront us do cost money. And let me also state my own strong belief that governmental budgets at all levels, local, State, and National, should be brought into balance.

So the issue of whether we master our problems becomes, in concrete form, the issue of taxation and spending.

I want to enter that debate by chopping away some of the folklore that surrounds the subject of public spending. Perhaps no topic in our time has been the victim of so much nonsense.

There are five main fallacies:

1. That private spending is inherently good and public spending inherently bad.

This fallacy is assiduously cultivated by conservative molders of opinion. The word "government" is equated with other nouns having an evil connotation, such as "waste," "extravagance," "socialism," "bureaucracy."

This is a pernicious tendency. Taxation and public spending are the means by which we divide resources between the public and private sectors of the economy.

Those activities which are in the public sector are there not because they are naughty and ought to be destroyed, but because they are essential, and cannot be adequately performed by private enterprise.

2. That the Federal Government is crushing people and endangering the economy with a growing burden of taxes, expenditures, and debt—and that this endangers the health of our free enterprise system.

What is overlooked is of course that the ability to carry taxes and debt is related to income. Other things being equal, a man making $10,000 can pay at least twice as high taxes, and carry without hardship twice as large a debt as a man making $5,000.

The same is true of the country as a whole. And taxes, expenditures, and debts are actually less today—as a proportion of the gross national product—than at the end of World War II.

3. The notion that Government spending is inflationary.

Government spending is no more inflationary than private spending—provided the Government balances its budget.

4. That all Federal expenditures are alike.

If a private bank makes a loan, that is called an investment; if the Small Business Administration makes a loan, that is called spending.

It may be that for bookkeeping purposes, we must continue to lump all accounts of Government disbursement together.

But there is no reason why intelligent people, for purposes of public discussion, should not distinguish between operating expenses, loans which create accounts receivable, and

investments which are offset by created assets.

5. If the Federal Government shoves its functions back to the States and cities, this means economy.

There are good reasons for decentralized administration. But that does not mean that the financial burden should be thrown back on the States and cities, too.

The Federal tax system is far superior in justice and efficiency to those of State and local governments, and there is great merit in using it for urban functions.

The Federal tax burden falls evenly across the land, based in large part on ability to pay. There is every reason to use it in preference to State and local systems, where the choice exists.

Great Lakes Water Diversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, several proposals have already been introduced in this session which would permit the diversion of additional amounts of Lake Michigan water into the Illinois Waterway.

No more graphic account of the damaging effects of such action has come to my attention than that contained in a letter written August 11, 1958, by N. G. Damoose, city manager of Traverse City, Mich., to Jay Smith, editor of the Traverse City Record-Eagle.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Damoose's letter:

CITY OF TRAVERSE CITY, MICH.,
August 11, 1958.

DEAR JAY: I just read that the Senate subcommittee approved the water diversion bill passed by the House. This just isn't right. I thought we had a chance in the Senate but I guess politics or something takes precedence over the preservation of the country's natural resources and the welfare of 50 million Americans and Canadians in the Great Lakes area. What a shameful and disgraceful sense of values.

I wonder if the politicians down there know or ever tried to figure out how much water 2,500 cubic feet per second amounts to? It's deceiving to talk about 2,500 cubic feet and stop there? Certainly, someone somewhere must have converted this innocent little figure to quantities that people can appreciate and visualize. If they haven't, it borders on subterfuge; surely it is not straightforward.

Look Jay:

1. 2,500 cubic feet of water per second is more than a million gallons a minute; 67.5 million gallons an hour and more than 1.6 billion gallons a day.

2. Under the new authorization Chicago will steal, every day, four times the water that Detroit used (about 400 million gallons), for all purposes, every day. In about 6 hours Chicago will waste as much water as all Detroit used in 1 day.

3. Five hundred thousand gallons of water will cover a city lot 60 feet wide and 120 feet long to a depth of 10 feet.

4. The amount of water Chicago will divert, in 1 day, will cover 3,240 lots of this size to a depth of 10 feet.

5. One billion six hundred and twenty million gallons of water per day will fill a trench 20 feet wide to a depth of 10 feet and extending a distance of 204 miles or the distance from Traverse City to 4 miles this side of Kalamazoo.

6. In 15 days Chicago's diversion of 216 million cubic feet per day would make a river 20 feet wide and 10 feet deep all the way across the United States (3,000 miles) in just 15 days.

7. Let's go a little further. We found that in 1 day we could build a river 204 miles long with Chicago's unique and unorthodox sewage treatment plan.

8. It's 25,000 miles around the earth at the equator. In about 123 days Chicago's daily diversion of Lake Michigan water would extend our imaginary river all the way around the earth (20 feet wide by 10 feet deep).

9. In 1 year—just 1 year's water grab—this river would wind itself around the earth three times. Or, if you prefer, we could have a river 60 feet wide by 10 feet deep by 25,000 miles long in 1 year. It's gotta be a leap year, though.

10. At the rate of 2,500 cubic feet of water per second, an area of 7.8 square miles would be covered with 1 foot of water in 24 hours.

11. In other words, the amount of water Chicago will swipe from Lake Michigan in 1 day, under the new authority would virtually cover the incorporated area of our city to a depth of 1 foot.

12. In 31 days, the amount of water diverted would inundate Traverse City to a depth of 31 feet, covering virtually ever home in the city and the downtown section to the height of the new street lights.

13. The whole Nation uses, for all purposes, in 1 day, only 143 times as much (231 billion gallons) water as Chicago will drain out of Lake Michigan in 1 day.

14. The Nation's entire industry uses 80 billion gallons of water per day which is only 50 times more than Chicago will chisel every day. Her water diversion for only 1 minute would process almost 19 tons of steel or rubber; 28 tons of craft paper pulp; wash 112.5 tons of laundry or test 22 aircraft engines—that is 1 minute of water diversion (1,125,000 gallons).

15. The amount of water Chicago will drain in 1 day would last Traverse City almost 1.5 years at our average rate of 3 million gallons per day. In 3 minutes they will take enough water to supply our city for 1 day.

16. The 1-day Chicago grab is equivalent to 8 times the average aggregate daily water requirements, for all purposes, of Michigan's 10 largest cities, excluding Detroit. Less than 3 hours of diversion would be enough to supply these 10 cities for 1 day.

17. The 1,620 million gallons of water Chicago will "rob" each day would weigh more than 13,500 million pounds, or 6,752,000 tons.

18. This weight (almost 7 million tons of water per day) translated into coal supply, would meet the requirements of the city light and powerplant for about 335 years, at its present rate of use.

Jay, 2,500 cubic feet of water per second is an innocent little figure as we read it and dismiss it without converting it into more familiar terms.

Most of the 50 million people in the Great Lakes area have expended millions upon millions of dollars to treat their sewage and return it to the public water in clean, safe condition. We've met our moral obligation. Why even a cat has enough conscience to recognize its moral obligation. Where is Chicago's sense of decency and duty?

As of 1955 it is estimated that 40 million Americans are face to face with water problems of either quality or quantity or both, and Chicago is going to pollute 7 million tons of it every day of the year. Nuts.

In one area I heard about (there may be others) an industry has to use sewage plant effluent (treated sewage) for its processing or cooling water—this is good and safe and it represents conservation in the finest and most commendable sense of the word, but Chicago is getting ready to pollute over a million gallons of beautiful Lake Michigan water every minute of every day of every year. Nuts.

I had to blow my top someplace with someone and you have always been so charitable as to give me your ear. Thanks—a million gallons worth every minute.

Respectfully yours,

N. G. DAMOOSE.

Justice for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a statement made by me before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in support of the admission of Hawaii as a State of the Union.

The statement follows:

JUSTICE FOR HAWAII

Mr. Chairman: In the last Congress, Alaska came of age; it is now long past the hour to end Hawaii's apprenticeship. It is an indisputable fact, that Hawaii met the traditional threefold test of eligibility for statehood.

Before analyzing Hawaii's eligibility, permit me to remind my colleagues of the three basic requirements demanded by tradition and precedent for admission. First, the people of the Territory must evince love for the ideals of American democratic government. Second, a majority of the electorate must express a clear desire for statehood. And third, the Territory must possess sufficient resources and population to support the cost of State government. I shall demonstrate that Hawaii has passed these tests with high honors.

The Hawaiian people have been drawn to America almost from the very dawn of their modern history. In 1820, 17 New England missionaries arrived in the archipelago; and before the passage of many years the natives in large measure were converted to Christianity and made familiar with the ways of the West. White whalers, traders, speculators, and sugar planters migrated to the islands in progressively greater numbers.

By 1842, five out of six ships calling at Hawaii were American; and Yankee cultural influence, despite strong British competition, rapidly assumed predominance. In 1842 a constitution modeled in part after that of the United States was adopted. Fourteen years later the people of this constitutional monarchy urged their king to negotiate for annexation to the United States. He complied, but the project was abandoned with his untimely death.

In 1893 Hawaii became a republic, and negotiations for annexation were immediately undertaken. A treaty linking the two republics was soon fashioned, but it was withdrawn from the American Senate by President Cleveland, who had not been in office when the Hawaiian revolution erupted and who disapproved of what he considered the unseemly haste by which the annexation convention had been drafted.

Four years later a new treaty of annexation was signed, but it, too, failed of ratification. Finally, sponsors of the treaty abandoned it in favor of submitting to Congress a joint resolution of annexation, the passage of which required only a simple majority vote.

The resolution was approved, and President McKinley signed it on July 7, 1898. Two years later, on April 30, 1900, the Organic Act for Hawaii was approved (to take effect June 14, 1900), and Hawaii thereby became an incorporated Territory.

Since 1903 the Hawaiian Legislature has petitioned Congress for statehood nearly a score of times; and from 1920 to the present time, approximately 50 bills providing for statehood have been introduced in successive Congresses. In 1947 substantive, if incomplete, action was finally taken. On June 30 of that year the House passed the statehood bill, but it died in the Senate. The same melancholy story was repeated on March 7, 1950 and March 10, 1953.

In 1954 the Senate saw fit to combine the Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood bills, and on April 1 of that year approved the dual measure. There are some who still maintain that passage was obtained only because assurance had been given the antistatehood bloc that the House would reject the joint bill, despite the fact that House support for Hawaiian admission alone was overwhelming. Whatever the reason, the prophets of disaster were vindicated.

In 1955, during the succeeding Congress, another dual bill was introduced, this time in the House. On May 10 of that year it was recommitted. This year there is before us only the single Hawaiian bill; let us pray that it will meet with a deservedly kinder fate.

Let us turn now from the representatives of the people in both Hawaii and the United States to the respective peoples themselves. In a 1940 plebiscite, the Hawaiian people voted 2 to 1 for statehood. A decade later they approved the proposed State constitution by more than a 3-to-1 majority. As for the views of mainland Americans (incidentally, the Hawaiians, of course, are just as much American as you and I), Dr. George Gallup has found that a decisive majority has supported statehood ever since pre-World War II days. More recently, the ratio of approval has jumped from 3 to 1 in 1946 to 8 to 1 in August of 1958.

We know that Hawaiians and their compatriots in the States want statehood. But are we sure that the islanders are loyal enough and Americanized enough to deserve such status? I say that the question was answered affirmatively long ago, and particularly so during World War II and its aftermath.

Immediately after the infamous assault on Pearl Harbor, rumors were rife, especially in the States, that Americans of Japanese ancestry engaged in the most heinous sabotage, even designating targets for the attacking planes. Mr. Robert L. Shivers, former special agent in charge of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Honolulu from 1939 to 1943, gave the lie to such calumnies. He testified that all those rumors were false * * * and that sabotage and fifth-column activity was never engaged in at any time prior, during, or subsequent to the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Perhaps even more eloquently expressive of Japanese loyalty was the story of the 452d Combat Team and the 100th Battalion. The combined record of these units is probably the most remarkable one in all American military annals. Approximately 10,000 men, most of whom were Japanese from Hawaii, saw action in Europe with the famed outfits. Of these, 4,500 received Purple Hearts. The quantity, as well as quality, of other awards is equally impressive, particularly the 353 Silver Stars and 112 Army and division commendations. Crowning their glory was the fact that not a single one of these boys displayed the slightest cowardice. It's true that three of them went a.w.o.l.—from their hospital beds back to their foxholes.

The unmatched record of the Hawaiian soldier remained untarnished throughout the Korean conflict. Not a single case of cowardice or defection to the enemy was recorded. The battle-casualty rate for Hawaiians was three times as great as the rate per capita for stateside contingents.

One might well ask, in connection with statehood: So what? No one questions that the Hawaiians were brave, but does courage alone entitle a people to statehood? No, it doesn't; but it does prove that those "go for broke" Americans loved their county with an awesome passion. And certainly patriotism must constitute an integral part of any legitimate concept of Americanism.

Other manifestations of similarity with things American are widely prevalent. Despite the oriental heritage of large segments of its population, Hawaii's culture, for the most part, is American. And Hawaiians, regardless of ancestry, look to the west for guidance and emulation. Whether it be business, education, sports, politics, or mores, the pattern is always, and unmistakably, American.

Further evidence of the deep-seated Americanism of all Hawaiians—not merely the Japanese—lies in their chilly reception of the commonwealth idea. They refuse to trade what they consider their birthright for tax exemption. In other words, they insist on being recognized as first-class Americans, and demand the right to assume all the obligations that such a cherished condition would entail.

The Hawaiian people, I'm sure, are also aware that the imposition of commonwealth status would, in all probability, be unconstitutional. In *Downes* v. *Bidwell* the Supreme Court of the United States declared that "where the Constitution has been once formally extended [in all its parts, both fundamental and formal] by Congress to territories neither Congress nor the territorial legislature can enact laws inconsistent therewith." Mr. Justice Brown, in *Rassmussen* v. *United States*, another of the famous insular cases, asserted that "the exten[sion of] the provisions of the Constitution * * * once done, is irrevocable." It follows, then, that those who would remake Hawaii in the image of Puerto Rico are at least disingenuous when they extol the benefits Puerto Ricans derive from Federal tax exemptions. As an incorporated Territory, Hawaii is subject to section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution, which provides, in part, that "all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." It is doubtful, to say the least, that Congress has the power, under the Constitution, to exempt the citizens of Hawaii from the applicability of this uniformity clause.

It might well be, too, that the Hawaiian people are cognizant that the promise of statehood—at least by implication—was tendered them long ago. Of the 31 incorporated Territories in our history, all but Hawaii have graduated to statehood. From a legal, or constitutional, standpoint, Hawaii is no different from its more successful predecessors. The Federal courts repeatedly have said that incorporation leads to statehood. In 1883 an incorporated Territory was defined to *Ex parte Morgan* as an inchoate state. About 40 years later, in *Balsee* v. *People of Porto Rico*, among many similar cases, the Supreme Court asserted that "incorporation has always been a step, and an important one, leading to statehood." Admittedly, the Organic Act establishing the Territory of Hawaii did not explicitly promise statehood; yet it must at the same time be conceded that precedent and judicial opinion, whether dicta or not, alike have considered Territories as destined for statehood after a reasonable period of tutelage. It would seem that 59 years is long enough.

It behooves us to heed the Hawaiian argument that statehood for the other 30 incorporated Territories has never resulted in failure. Almost without exception, these Territories experienced an immediate and marked expansion in population and in agricultural or industrial development following their admission into the Union. Above all, the people of those new States demonstrated that when they were their own masters, progress recognized no shackles.

The third requirement for statehood—the ability to pay for statehood—poses no problem for Hawaii. The islands constitute, in terms of financial solvency, the richest Territory ever to knock on the statehood door. The gross Territorial product of Hawaii for 1957 was about $1¼ billion, a figure twice as large as that of any other State at the time of its admission. In 1956 the per capita income exceeded that of 26 States, while the per capita tax burden was higher than that of 33 States.

Hawaii's population, estimated in 1958 to total 569,504, is larger than that of any one of five States, and is more than twice that of Alaska. It is also larger than that of any State at the time of admission except Oklahoma.

Now that it has been established that Hawaii merits statehood, it is in order to examine the principal benefits that would accrue to the people of Hawaii under statehood. They may be listed as follows—and no rights were ever more precious: (1) the right to full voting representation in both Houses of the U.S. Congress; (2) the right to vote for the President and Vice President; (3) the right to choose their own Governor and to carry on functions of government by their own elected officials instead of by Federal administrators; (4) the right to determine the extent of the powers of their own legislature; (5) the right to have their judges locally selected rather than federally appointed; (6) the right to have Federal and local jurisdictions clearly defined and separate; (7) the right to a voice in any proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution; and (8) the right to help write the Federal taxes. Can any reasonable person deny that these rights are basic to the American way of life; or that so long as they are withheld, no citizenship can be first class?

Benefits to the Nation as a whole would also be substantial. Among these would be (1) enhancement of national security; (2) favorable psychological effect on the peoples of the Pacific basis; and (3) inspiration to racial harmony on the mainland.

The strategic importance of Hawaii is obvious, especially so now that our Pacific military commands have been enlarged and moved to Oahu. Headquarters for the commanding general, U.S. Army Forces Pacific, are at Fort Shafter, in Honolulu.

Statehood opponents concede that Hawaii is stategically vital, but they profess to see no relevancy between military considerations and the statehood issue: Statehood, they argue, would have no effect one way or the other on our defense posture in the Pacific. Apparently they are all materialists; things of the spirit escape them. I say to them that the greater stability afforded local government and the greater popular pride in full citizenship under statehood would enable the Armed Forces to be supported materially in time of war more effectively from the twin standpoints of local economic assistance and local civilian cooperation. And the will of the people themselves to fight, should total war ever become our lot, would be immeasurably strengthened were they called upon to defend their own State—and not a colony.

I reply to the isolationists and the racists who sneer at world opinion and deny any need to impress the East with such a meaningful demonstration of the dynamism of democracy as the elevation of Hawaii to statehood would present, with the observation that the American people have indicated that in these parlous days it's a pretty good idea to miss no bets in the pursuit of friends.

Hawaii justifiably has been called the melting pot that melts. Although its people comprise diverse blood strains, the Territory has a unique record for interracial harmony and cooperation. With the closer association between the islands and the mainland which would accrue from statehood, continental Americans would become more acutely aware of the degree to which democracy is practiced in Hawaii. The example assuredly would have a salutary effect on race relations throughout the States.

The reasons for statehood as outlined above surely dwarf the importance of the opposition's arguments. Chief among these are the alleged dominance of communism in Hawaii, and the disproportionately large representation that Hawaii would enjoy in the Senate of the United States.

The communism scare is strictly a phony. The constitution of Hawaii, which the people themselves drafted a decade ago, disqualifies Communists from holding any public office. And dock strikes, which formerly were both embarrassing and damaging, have been rendered impotent by the enactment of a law enabling the Territory to seize and work the docks.

As for disproportionate representation, that question was resolved, legally and constitutionally, in the Connecticut Compromise of the Federal Convention of 1787.

Hawaii has met all the arguments, and they are hers.

I strongly urge the committee to act favorably on legislation to admit Hawaii as a State of the Union. I shall program the bill after it is reported for as early consideration by the House as is possible.

Foreign Aid and Other Factors Make Balanced Budget Unlikely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the January 21 issue of the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, the Knowland newspaper. The editorial is as follows:

FOREIGN AID AND OTHER FACTORS MAKE BALANCED BUDGET UNLIKELY

"If we knew where we are and whither we are tending we could better judge what to do and how to do it," said Abraham Lincoln in his "House Divided" speech.

The challenge of the Federal budget shows that we have some tough decisions on "what to do and how to do it."

It is highly unlikely that the Federal budget will be brought into balance as long as over $3.8 billion is going into foreign aid.

Justified or not, the fact remains that this large sum triggers off demands for enlarged spending in all other Government activities.

It is time for the Federal Government to embark upon a program to terminate government to government loan and grant activities except perhaps for technical assistance to countries lacking certain "know how" in medicine, public health, agriculture and commercial problems.

These countries should seek to attract private capital not only from the United States but from other European, Asian or Western Hemisphere countries. The free enterprise system of the United States should not continue to carry heavy tax burdens to support public ownership and state socialism abroad.

To be sure this may be rugged for those countries that have come to look upon American foreign aid as an inexhaustible horn of plenty. But the issue has to be faced up to by them and by us.

Our Federal debt is approaching $285 billion. Interest alone amounts to over $8 billion a year, which is more than the total expenditures for all Government operations as late as the year 1938, and is greater than all receipts into the Treasury for governmental purposes as late as the year 1941.

In the opinion of this newspaper the administration has overestimated revenues and underestimated expenses. This is even more apparent when the reluctance of Congress to curtail appropriations or vote new taxes is taken into consideration.

The administration and the Congress together are the trustees of our future and should we become insolvent there is no country in the world that could or would "bail us out."

The time to put our house in order is now.

Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, Dan Lambert, county commander of the Penobscot County Council, American Legion, and Theodore A. Johns, public relations director of the same organization, have provided me with the following announcement of an event which I feel eminently deserves the attention of my colleagues:

FOUR CHAPLAINS MEMORIAL SUNDAY AND AMERICAN LEGION RELIGIOUS EMPHASIS WEEK, FEBRUARY 1–8

On Sunday, February 1, 1959, our Nation will pause to honor the memory of the four military chaplains who perished on the troopship *Dorchester* in the North Atlantic during World War II. The courage and faith of these four men of God, representing all major faiths, should be an inspiration to us all.

As in previous years, the Penobscot County Council, Department of Maine, the American Legion, is taking the leadership in the promotion of the Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday. We call upon all members of the clergy in Maine and all posts and units of the Legion and Auxiliary to assist in the proper observance of this day of remembrance.

We urge that prayers be offered in all the churches of Maine for the spirit of freedom in our land and for peace with honor in our time. If we as Americans, take the shining example of love of God and country, as exemplified by our four chaplains then we shall have the strength to carry on the struggle for justice, freedom and democracy.

Coupled with the Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday, the American Legion is holding a special religious emphasis week during February 1–8. Theme of the observance will be the moral leadership and the part played by military service in building character. As veterans, we in the American Legion should be greatly interested in this program.

The National Broadcasting Co. (NBC) will air the American Legion's annual "For God and Country" telecast 2:00 to 2:30 p.m., Sunday, February 1, 1959. It will all be carried by the radio networks during the period of observance. We urge all to consult with radio and TV outlets in Maine for time and station. Following the program, we suggest you drop a note of appreciation to your local stations.

Never before in history of America have we had greater need for religious emphasis. Everywhere we turn, the forces of communism and materialism have religion under attack. Members of the Legion and Auxiliary began their meetings with the words "For God and Country," let us resolve to this pledge by contacting your local priest, minister or rabbi and acquainting him with the Legion's Back to God movement.

The sacrifices of the four heroic chaplains should bring to our minds that here in America there is no room for bias or prejudice in regards to race, creed or color. Any organization which uses bias or prejudice in regards to membership or activity is unworthy of the real meaning of the Four Chaplains Sunday and a discredit to our God, Flag, and Country.

The Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday and Religious Emphasis Week should also serve to awaken within our Legion posts and units the use and purpose of the post chaplain. All meetings should be opened and closed with prayer by the Chaplain.

Let us remember that religion is not something that can be fitted on like a new suit. One's real religion comes deep from within. Religion may be learned on Sunday but is lived in the weekdays, work. The torch of religion may be lit in the church but it burns brightly in the home, shop, and on the street. Religion seeks its life in prayer but lives life in deeds. It is planted in the soul but does its growing out in the light of the world.

Role of Business in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, we are all aware of the increasingly active role being adopted by business and industry with respect to politics. There are hundreds of opinions on the relative merits of such participation. I recently read the opinion of one of our young industrial leaders which I believe will be of considerable interest to my colleagues and all who have the opportunity to read and evaluate it.

Henry J. Kaiser, Jr., vice president of Kaiser Industries Corp., stated recently in a speech before the annual conference of the United States Savings & Loan League in San Francisco:

Business must concentrate on political leadership, not political partisanship. Our job is one of education, not one of persuasion.

This young industrialist also called for more cooperation between labor and management. He stressed that it was "high time that management and labor realized they have a common responsibility, the American people." I submit that this is an enlightened and constructive approach to a problem that is causing business and industry considerable concern.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENSHIP RESPONSIBILITIES OF CORPORATE MANAGEMENT

Up until a short time ago—perhaps some of you out-of-staters may not know this—there were trains running back and forth across the Bay Bridge, between San Francisco and Oakland.

They were a part of the bay area—these trains—like the ferryboats used to be.

One day, about 6 months ago, they took the trains off the bridge, and put on buses instead. It was cheaper to do so. Well, we have a little boy, who's just turned six; and little Henry—this is a rather popular name in our family—had come to love those trains. He loved to ride on them, whenever he could. And he had set his heart on becoming an engineer, when he grew up, so he could gain permanent possession over them.

I explained why they had to take the trains away, and how they would have to charge the people a lot more money, for riding them.

A short time later, when he was riding across the bridge with his mother, he suddenly turned to her, and said:

"Mama, when I grow up, I'm going to be a bus driver."

Asked why he had decided on this career, he replied: "Because when I become a bus driver, I'm going to charge the people so much money that they'll have to take the buses off, and put the trains back on again. Then I'll be an engineer like I've always wanted to."

Well, when my wife came home and told me that story, I was floored. That's planning, I told myself. That's really looking ahead.

And I thought I'd like to tell that story here today, friends, because I think it illustrates, what we all like to do, when we have the opportunity. To plan. To think far ahead. To have a goal, and stick to it. Trouble is, when you're grown up, it's sort of difficult now and then, to look out over the breakers, and find out which way you're heading.

I think that's why we've gathered here today, to plan. That's why we have conventions, to find for ourselves a course of action.

I look at this gathering today—at all you men and women of experience, ability, judgment—and what do I see? I see a much larger convention, than the one assembled here. I see this as representative of the business community across the United States. You are asking the questions businessmen everywhere are asking. Where do we go? What is our relation to society, to labor, politics, government—the general public?

I don't think there's been a period in our history, when we've been asking so many probing questions of ourselves. And I say this is a good sign. Suddenly we are coming to life. Almost overnight as it were, we are catching up to our physical growth as a nation. We are becoming mature, perceptive, aware.

We turn to our educational system—we American people—and we say, "It is not strong enough." And we take immediate steps to improve the curriculum—deepen it.

We do the same with all other segments of our society. Not a single group escapes its share of analysis and criticism.

The business community is certainly no exception. On the contrary, I think we businessmen have been at the very center of this cry: "What's wrong with America?" The businessman is an easy target. He is a man who is concerned with material things: profits, capital gains, plant investments, production curves, tax carryovers. He borrows, and lends. He is powerful. He is also a stereotype.

The existence of this stereotype should concern all of us, deeply. For as long as this false picture of the businessman exists, just so long will we be looked upon as a special-interest group, whose interests run counter to those of the American people. And what is this picture, this stereotype? Unfortunately, it is almost always a negative one, and one which we ourselves, have helped to create. The businessman is pictured as someone who is antilabor, antigovernment, anti-free-trade, antiprogress, in any shape or form. He is a man who stiffens his back, the moment anything new comes along. And if he supports such things as the United Crusade, he does so only when he is given assurance that his gift is tax deductible. In short, he is a man who resists things.

Like it or not, this is the way we are pictured by a great many Americans. Is the picture a true one? Do we really resist change? Are we really against progress? Do we lend support to our communities only when we feel we can get something in return? No, of course not. The very opposite is true. Then why aren't we doing something to correct this picture?

I think we are. I think the business community today, is far more conscious of its social obligations, and community responsibilities than it has ever been before. We still have a long way to go, however. Too often, we are still substituting hopeful resolutions for quiet actions, ringing phrases, for simple deeds.

I have been asked to talk to you about the citizenship responsibilities of corporate management. Since there is always a danger in trying to say too much to a group of experts, I will merely examine this topic of ours quietly with you, if I may—and see what we can discover, together.

* * * * *

A "convention," says Webster, "is a meeting or assembly * * * for action on particular matters." I like this word "action." I think it is time for the business community throughout this Nation, to take action, not merely for its own benefit, but for the welfare of this country. And on what particular? On a very vital one, that of leadership.

A century ago, it may have been all right for a corporation to come along, and run its business with little or no regard for its neighbors. A century ago—less than that; only as far back as the twenties—many businesses were operating in just this way. Communications, transportation, machines, bigness, hadn't thrown us all together as yet. Our destinies as a people were still to be worked out. New land was yet to be discovered and developed. Mass production on the scale we now know it was something in the future.

Today, you can locate your plant on a hill, if you like, but you're really right down in the center of town, on First and Main Streets. And what you do—especially if you're a fairly large business or industry—affects the farmer, the realtor, the housewife, the banker, the school-board—everybody. Furthermore, because your marketing and sales area, may extend across this Nation, you've got to think of your "community" in exactly the same dimensions.

We've got aluminum plants in West Virginia, Louisiana, Washington, and in several other States as well. We've got a steel plant down at Fontana, Calif., a coal-mine in Utah, and more coal mines in New Mexico. We make Willys Jeeps in Toledo, and in several foreign countries as well. We produce cement up and down the Pacific Coast, and ship it to Hawaii and Alaska. And we produce parts for guided missiles here in California and back in Bristol, Pa. All told, we turn out 300 different products in 78 plants covering 17 States and Territories, and 5 foreign countries.

Eighteen years ago—in 1940—we had only five plants, all of them located right here in the State of California. Today, we've got 64,000 employees, 78,000 stockholders, and sales of more than one billion dollars per year. So we've known what it is to grow, and take on responsibilities. We've known what it is, to pioneer, too.

* * * * *

A short time ago, I ran across an article in a magazine which shocked me. The central figure in this article—a very successful businessman—was asked why he didn't engage in "community relations". His reply was something to this effect: "When the going gets rough, the community will only be thinking of itself. All this welfare stuff, and hoopla about 'improvement'—won't amount to a hill of beans."

This article disturbed me. For here was a seemingly intelligent man—with a highly successful business—whose attitude toward the community was: "What can I get out of it, by helping others? Where is the payoff? Show me how I can serve my own interest—and I'll do something about this community relations stuff."

To me, this attitude is not only thoughtless—but by being thoughtless—it is dangerous. For if all of our responsible leaders—our men of influence and standing—were to neglect their moral responsibilities in this fashion, we would not endure as a democracy. We would not deserve to endure. A community's strength is our strength. Who prospers in a strong community—if not the businessman? And who suffers when a community is allowed to fall apart, through negligence and indifference—if not the businessman?

For a concrete illustration of this community-business relationship, take a look at our urban renewal programs. No one will deny the enormous benefits to be derived from upgrading our cities—and eliminating unsightly slums.

Here's a real opportunity for our financing institutions. You savings and loan people, together with banking establishments, can play a major role in the rebirth of our communities. Together, you can provide the monetary means of transforming substandard dwellings, into liveable and valuable properties. You have done this already in Cleveland—and it's been a terrific program. Savings and loan firms in that city, have become corporate parts of their community. They have joined the family. More efforts such as these, will help us meet one of the major challenges, facing private enterprise. Namely, the challenge of initiative.

If we are to minimize the need for Federal support of such slum clearance, and urban renewal programs, we have to step in, and roll up our sleeves, and get the job done on a voluntary basis. Each of you would do well, on returning to your communities, to analyze your own needs for urban renewal. When you find that there is a job to be done you must accept such a challenge as a real opportunity.

* * * * *

We have a responsibility to our communities—farm and city alike. But particularly, we have a responsibility towards this private enterprise system. Nature helped build this system of ours. She gave us new land to work with, immensely rich resources, room to live in, and expand, and a chance to work out our individuality, in a frontier world. Now, all that is gone. From here on in, we alone are responsible for the continuance of democratic government. If we prove ourselves too self-interested in our goals and actions, we will lose every advantage we now possess. If, on the other hand, we recognize that these so-called responsibilities are really

blessings—wonderful blessings—we will prosper as never before. For to be responsible, is to be free. How responsible do you suppose you would be in Moscow?

You hear a great deal about how much corporations are doing in community affairs. And much of this is true. But there are also quite a few businesses—large and small—who are still trying to get by with the lipservice, of tax-deductible donations. Certainly, a businessman's first job is to run a successful business. Too often, however, he forgets that he is also a citizen, and a leader. If we, as businessmen, do not take the lead in community affairs—in education, industrial development, slum-clearance, welfare support—who will? Labor? Perhaps. Right now, it's doing a pretty good job along these lines. The Government? Very likely. And what do we mean when we say "the Government"? We mean "that organization which must step in, and do the job which we have failed to do."

Friends, the moment we all recognize, really understand in our hearts and minds, that "business" and "community" are merely two different ways of spelling the same word, our future will be more secure.

Business will advance according to the breadth of its viewpoint. This in turn will call for breadth of participation. And when do we assume responsibility? When it suits us? When we hope to gain something out of it? You can always gain something out of responsibility. To wait until a tit-for-tat situation develops isn't leadership; it is horse trading. Times have changed Times are tougher now. The laggard is not going to be tolerated. The freeloader will find himself unloaded, but fast. We will survive if we are fit to survive. And the test will be made in the area of intelligence. Horse trading is a thing of the past as far as survival is concerned. When you hold as many cards as we hold, you don't trade on them, you play them for the benefit of the entire house.

* * * * *

One of our firms—Kaiser Metal Products Co.—is located in Bristol, Pa. We have two plants there. One plant produces bathtubs, kitchen cabinets, sinks, and so forth, and the other turns out subassemblies for guided missiles like the Polaris and Minuteman. I went back there about a month ago to speak with our men and also with the men and women of the community.

In one of the talks I made I stated something which I would like to repeat here today. I said that I felt it was high time that management and labor put away their clubs and started working together at a round table instead of a long and narrow one, where labor sits glaring on one side and management glares back from the other.

I said I felt it was high time that labor and management recognize they have a common responsibility—the American people.

We've uncovered a few bad apples among labor unions. And we're getting ready to enact legislation which will help prevent such individuals from again seizing power and abusing that power. But this legislation, let us remind ourselves, is being introduced for what purpose? To curb, possibly to break, unions? No—to benefit and protect the working man. There's nothing wrong with unions. Unions are a strength in America. They insure against the abuse of power on the part of management. They are necessary to our industrial way of life. And some of our greatest patriots, our most sincere advocates of the free enterprise system, are to be found within the ranks of labor.

It was not so long ago, if you'll remember, that business had to undergo its own housecleaning. Legislation had to be passed to protect the American people from monopolistic practices, unfair trade usages—price fixing and the like. Was all business to blame? Not by a long shot. But loopholes had to be filled to prevent the unscrupulous few from engaging in practices which would wreck the economy.

So today, instead of joining in the popular hue and cry that all labor is suspect of racketeering, because of a guilty few, we should find a means of bringing about reform, quietly, sensibly, and in a spirit of cooperation.

In this election year, one hears a great deal about the need for businessmen to take a more active part in politics. You hear this each election year, and in many cases it's a good sign, and a necessary one. The business community can ill afford to remain aloof from politics. The legislation that is passed each week, and each month, on the local, State and Federal levels affects each one of us. And so we have to make sure our interests do not fall by the wayside, through default.

At the same time, however, I think business must beware of assuming a partisan role in politics. I do not think it is the proper function of business to march the streets with placards or to tour communities from one end to the other in support of such-and-such a candidate or proposition no matter how favorable the cause.

We cannot afford to place ourselves in the position of becoming a power bloc. This is just what the unions have been accused of doing—pressure politics. Indeed, union-supported campaigns are being looked upon with increased suspicion because they are politically obvious. Is the union really campaigning for the interests of the workingman? Or is it merely out to increase its own power? Reverse the picture. Put business in the campaigner's seat. And recall, if you will, the stereotype which we discussed earlier. Will the American people consider that such partisanship is truly in their interest—or will they feel that we are merely trying to augment our own power? Labor stands here—business stands there—they say. But what about the great huge public which stands in between?

My friends, we can't tell people how to vote. Our job is one of education, not one of persuasion. Let us become active politically, by communicating both sides of an issue to our employees—so that these men and women may more intelligently support that legislation which will mean good government for all people.

This is still a free country, friends. The American citizen still—thank heaven—enjoys the privilege of making up his own mind. It would be the height of impertinence for a corporation to gather its employees together in order to tell them how to vote.

No, where business must concentrate its powers and energies is in political leadership, not in political partisanship. Let us work to inform our employees, our own managers, of both sides of a proposition, reserving to them, the sacred right of deciding for themselves how they will vote. Business will do itself a grave injustice if it attempts to combat labor on its own terms. For this will only serve to prove to the general public that labor stands here, and business stands there, and that this position is an irrevocable one, nothing can change it.

Friends, I ask you, seriously, go outside now and stop the first 10 people you meet and ask them this one question, "Who do you believe truly represents the interest of the workingman, labor or business?"

You know what their answers would be as well as I. Labor has succeeded in identifying itself with the workingman's interests, and business has foolishly, thoughtlessly permitted this to happen.

So this is our challenge: To find a means of identifying the interests of business with the interests of the workingman—and by workingman I don't mean just the fellow with the lunch pail. I mean the people who are employed in business and industry, in any and all capacities, wage earners and salaried personnel alike.

And we accomplish this, not by words or slogans, but only through the sincerity of our actions. By supporting legislation which will benefit the majority of the people, whether it concerns our own affairs or not, we will conclusively prove that our true interest lies in the welfare of society in general. By taking the initiative in progressive measures which can benefit our employees, we, one and for all, will be taking a big step toward eradicating the stereotype which pictures the businessman as a self-interested profiteer. Actions, mind you, not words.

This should be the manner in which we business people answer this challenge to immerse ourselves in politics, not as partisan advocates, not as Republicans or Democrats, not as ax grinders for special interests, but as political leaders who intelligently communicate with our employees and the local, State, and Federal legislators who can use our support. We must prove that business is as close to the people, to the wage earner, emotionally and spiritually as the labor union.

Only in this way can we maintain the advantages of a free economy which, by its strength and purpose, can withstand the threats of socialism or supergovernment control.

What does the worker want which is so different really from the desire of the businessman? Security? That's what we are trying to build into everything we do. We want our plants, our businesses, to grow on firm foundations. Higher pay? We're not against higher pay, because higher pay means more security, more incentive for advancement, and higher production. Higher pay means higher living standards, greater purchasing power. What we are against are higher pay demands which are unrealistic and which will damage the security we are trying to build, especially the worker's security. Why? Because such demands will end by undermining our companies and the workers' own jobs. So why don't we tell our employees this? Why wait until the union tells them that here's that old stereotype at work again, the fellow who always resists things, the fellow who's antiprogress? We should be taking the initiative wherever possible. As long as we permit others to interpret our motives for us, we cannot hope to have the values we support made clear and reasonable.

We have a job of communications, then, and a job of education as well. And perhaps this is as far as our partisanship should go—to put forward, in clear light, the values which we know are essential to a prospering community. We should encourage our employees to thoroughly study the background of candidates and issues so that they may become better citizens. We should encourage them to make use of their own resources in order to arrive at their own political evaluations.

* * * * *

It does little good for the business community to buy full-page ads in a newspaper, bragging about how good our system is over another. The ads we buy must be our actions, and our ability and willingness to serve, as well as to make profits.

Speaking of profits, the best profit-sharing plan I know of is the one where all of us—business, labor, and general public, the community—work together to earn for ourselves, a share in freedom, prosperity, and continue high production.

So, to sum up, I would say that the citizenship responsibilities of corporate management should be these:

First, to actively work with, and support our community, locally, and on the State and Federal levels.

Second, to identify the interests, and objectives of business, with the interests and objectives, of the workingman, and workingwoman.

Third, to improve our communications, between management and employees, particularly in the political field. To acquaint our people with both sides of political questions, and to encourage them to exercise mental initiative as voters. I like to believe these people are intelligent—I know they are—and I think the most intelligent thing for us to do, is to operate on this principle.

Fourth, to seek the passage of legislation, which will benefit the community as a whole, regardless of selfish, or short-range interests. For through such action, we will help insure the continuance of free institutions, in this country.

Fifth, to take the initiative in finding a common ground, in which to work with labor and the community. To extend a hand to the working citizen, and the labor union, and to bring about a speedy resolution of our differences.

By doing all of these things now, I think we will find the means of withstanding not only the threat of foreign ideologies abroad, but the dangers of division and mistrust, here at home.

Thank you, friends, for this opportunity. Good luck, and God bless each and every one of you.

New Products Boost Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the January 8, 1959, edition of the Roseburg (Oreg.) News-Review. Reporter Brad Slack recently visited a plywood manufacturing plant in my district which today is manufacturing a new product and helping bring to Oregon diversified production. An account of this process follows:

PACIFIC PLYWOOD FLOORING PRODUCT ATTRACTING INTEREST AMONG BUILDERS—SALES BOOM AFTER YEAR ON MARKET

Pacific Plywood Manufacturing Co. at Dillard has introduced a new idea with a new product in this area that may lead the way to an increased and more diversified production of wood products.

Long recognized as the Northwest's timber capital, the Roseburg area is known for the excellent plywood boards turned out here. However, while serving scores of needs in American industry, many of the plywood products are completed or finished elsewhere such as California, the Midwest, and even eastern United States.

Pacific Ply, with its new Par-Tile product scarcely a year old, is providing a major breakthrough in one respect. The tough but beautifully grained building board is a finished product when it leaves the sheds of Pacqua division at the company mill.

And it is beginning to sell. Since September 1957, when the first Par-Tile squares were packed in cartons for shipment, architects and contractors as far distant as Chicago, Dallas, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Phoenix, and Seattle have begun to recognize the product for its strength, durability, low cost, warm good looks, and simplicity of installation.

PRODUCT WITHSTANDS WEAR

Diversified, it has a soft, sound-absorbing quality that makes Par-Tile adaptable for wall paneling and flooring. Tough enough to withstand long and rough wear, it can be used in schools or office buildings, homes, and playrooms. It will stand up readily under the pounding of a basketball court, and is simple to maintain.

The president and general manager at Pacific Ply, Bill Forrest, thinks the company has something really good.

"What makes me happy," he said, "is the fact that we've found another use for the fine lumber in this area. Up to now we've been able to develop uses for only about 50 percent of the logs brought in from the woods.

"Development of Par-Tile shows that the Roseburg area can turn out a finished building product rather than sell just the board for completion by some other plant far away. I think this area could do more of this kind of manufacturing." Forrest added, "and be less dependent upon outside companies."

FINISHED PRODUCTS NEEDED

He is convinced, he said, that development of finished products would be a definite shot in the arm for the local economy.

Bill Gray, assistant sales manager for particle board and Par-Tile at Pacific Ply, reports enthusiasm everywhere for the new product, once it is tried. "Our biggest job," he said this week, "is to acquaint builders and architects with the product so they can write it into specifications. We have no trouble selling the material once people become acquainted with it."

A little over a year ago the first 250 cartons of the 9¼-inch-square Par-Tile products were shipped from the Dillard plant, 80 pieces to the carton. The squares are three-eighths of an inch thick and ready for laying upon arrival.

To protect the unique and versatile wood product Pacqua Division engineers, headed by Bill Cooke, manager, have patented a method of scoring the unfinished bottom of the board pieces into small squares. This not only provides manufacturing rights, but is a major feature of the product, according to Cooke.

SQUARES EASY TO LAY

"The scored underside of the material fits easily and quickly onto mastics used in laying flooring," he explained. "It is very good to put down on cement or concrete."

Called "Flexo-Grid scoring," it is a most important feature in the manufacturing, and done on a special machine with rotating, hard steel saw blades.

The product itself is made from small chips or slivers of wood, treated under heat and pressure after being mixed with a special resin formula developed in Cooke's laboratory. The manager first began experimenting with the idea 5 years ago at the Oregon Forest Products Laboratory at Oregon State College where Cooke was lab head for the State Board of Forest Research.

Particle board was an earlier product to be developed at the Pacific Ply plant. Par-Tile is similar, though subject to special treatment and considerably more pressure. About 15½ tons of pressure is applied in the process of preparing the board which is produced in sheets 8 feet long and 4 feet wide under hydraulic pressure.

OTHER WOODS UNDER STUDY

The company now is experimenting with other native Oregon wood such as oak and cedar, although manufacturing to date has been exclusively with Douglas fir.

Two weeks ago a night shift was added at the plant as orders for the new Par-Tile product built up. Soon about 5,000 cartons daily will be packed and shipped at Dillard. Thirty persons have been hired to turn out the product and the night shift has required four to five more on a regular shift. Forrest expects about 50 or more persons will be needed when other machines are delivered to speed production.

Under tests the Par-Tile product has nine times the wearing power of cork, and six times that of many floor tiles. It is considerably more durable than regular oak flooring, laboratory tests show.

Cooke explains that by using chips or splinters the product, under pressure, has greater density and uniformity of strength than some of the hardest woods.

ADVERTISING PROGRAM STARTS

Gray now has begun an extensive program for acquainting the public with the new product through newspaper, radio, and TV advertising from Chicago to the west coast. Just last week the company got an order, its first locally, for flooring a considerable part of the Winchester School north of Roseburg which is to be remodeled.

This is the way the product has been selling, and one reason why the Pacqua division material has a long backlog of orders.

Rumanian Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from a speech made by me Thursday evening, January 22, 1959, on the occasion of the dinner given by the League of Free Romanians in Washington, D.C., commemorating a century since the reestablishment of Rumanian independence:

Mr. Farcasanu, ladies and gentlemen, the event we commemorate this evening is indeed a historical one. It commemorates the 100th anniversary of the firm intervention of the Western Powers in order to reestablish the independence of Rumania's lands and thus stem the Russian invasion in Europe, suggests a definite similarity as to the basic facts of today's situation.

A century ago, Moscow imperialism was making aggressive inroads toward the heart of Europe. It was at that moment, after a long and bitter experience, that the Western Powers realized that asquiescing in Russian encroachment in Eastern Europe was not the proper method to insure the balance of power in Europe. The security of nations in Europe depended on checking the Russian advance, or peace in Europe would be in permanent jeopardy.

At the Treaty of Paris in 1856 a successful attempt was made to substitute collective action on the part of the concert of Europe for aggression by Russia. Today a greater alliance of free people is confronted by the recurring and intensified danger from Moscow under communism. This danger has spread from the relatively small area of Eastern Europe to the greater part of Asia. The problem which now faces all those who stand for freedom is to stop the expansion of a ruthless Soviet tyranny aiming at world domination. The dimensions and implications of this issue are far greater today. The new feature of this Soviet drive for world dominion is its implacable and universal subversive organization.

As chairman of House committee investigating the Katyn Forest massacres, I had the sad opportunity to go deeply into the ruth-

lessness of Soviet Communist schemes. The coldblooded killing of thousands of pro-allied Polish officers and civilians was done with the same cynicism and purpose as the wholesale murder of the Hungarian freedom fighters; the purpose being, by physically liquidating the fighting elite of these nations, as they did also in Rumania and elsewhere, to destroy the backbone of independence in the respective countries.

But in spite of it all hate for Soviet-Communist domination is deeper than ever. That is one of the reasons why, in Rumania for instance, the Soviets have organized the largest concentration camp in Europe, the Danube-Black Sea Canal and recently, after the Hungarian uprising, the Danube Delta slave-labor camp. It is reported that this Danube Delta camp is an international pool of slaves, where besides Rumanians there are Hungarians, Poles, Koreans, Germans, and others.

These are a few features of a situation on which the Soviets would like us to make new agreements implying fresh concessions either in the West or in the East. Such concessions would consolidate and augment the menacing strength of the aggressive Red bloc.

I am sure the American people now sense the inherent danger latent in any new concessions. Our own security requires, on the contrary, that we uncompromisingly follow a policy of restoring freedom to Rumania and other Soviet satellite nations.

The following is a statement by Rev. Father Eugene Lazar, of 1133 Madison Street, Gary, Ind., made at a dinner given Sunday, January 25 observing the 100th anniversary in East Chicago, Ind.:

THE CENTENNIAL OF THE UNION OF THE PRINCIPALITIES OF MOLDAVIA AND MUNTENIA UNDER ALEXANDER ION CUZA

Saturday, January 24, marks the observance of the 100th anniversary of the Union of the Principalities of Moldavia and Muntenia under Alexander Ion Cuza. The event is one of the most important in the history of the Rumanian people.

The 19th century was a time of flourishing idealisms and of realizations for the national state. Some of the most recent writings claim that the beginnings of such attitudes are to be found in the 16th century writing of Machiavelli. It took much time before it came to the attention of the political and spiritual leaders of Europe, that the people aspired for a free and independent national life. The completion of this movement commenced with the unification of Germany and of Italy in 1870–71. The principles of self-determination of President Woodrow Wilson and of the peace treaty of Versailles, which had adopted this principle, further solidified this world change.

A hundred years ago when Rumania was not to be found on the maps of Europe as it was known in later years, brothers of the same nationality and blood of the two principalities of Moldavia and Muntenia were forced to fight each other for the ambitions of foreign sovereignty. Rumanians decided to end this situation with the election of the same sovereign in both Moldavia and Muntenia in the person of Col. Alexander Ion Cuza.

During that period of time the peasants were exploited without any compassion by the lords, who in the majority were foreigners.

Alexander Ion Cuza, who himself was the son of a lord, understood the peasants' situation better than anyone else, and gave heed to the cry and aspiration of the peasants, and began to give justice to the people, and gave to the people some of the land that they had worked for their masters.

This certainly could not have been of any liking to the lords and therefore began to maneuver through the liberal and conservative party to force Cuza to resign. The first try at dethroning Cuza, the "lord of the peasants" was in 1865, during the absence of Cuza from the country.

To a great extent the parallel can be made between Lincoln and Cuza, each in his manner—unifying a torn country and freeing those that had been oppressed. Another Cuza will arise, not only in Rumania, but in other Iron Curtain nations, and destroy the Communist tyrant and restore liberty and self-government. Freedom-loving people throughout the world hope that day is not far distant.

Huntington, W. Va.: All-America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal pride that I rise to announce that I have been informed that my hometown of Huntington, W. Va., has just won the coveted title of "All-America City," and will receive 1 of the 11 annual awards presented under the joint sponsorship of the National Municipal League and Look magazine.

For Huntington, this has been a dynamic decade of progress. The progress has been achieved through the unselfish cooperation, hard work, and good will of many dedicated Huntington citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the American city is now our frontier of progress. I am sure that municipalities throughout the country will draw inspiration from the example of Huntington, W. Va., and the other 10 all-America cities.

I ask to have printed at this point the main steps listed in Huntington's application for all-America honors, followed by an editorial in the January 22, 1959, issue of the Herald-Dispatch, of Huntington, W. Va., entitled "Go Ahead, Huntington."

The articles follow:

STAIRWAY TO HONOR—CITY'S ACHIEVEMENT LIST IS IMPRESSIVE

Here are the main steps in progress which were listed in Huntington's application for all-American honors:

Nineteen hundred and forty-eight: First of 4 successive 3-year school levies which provided improvements and the addition of 282 classrooms, 27 gymnasiums-auditoriums, 42 kitchens, 4 libraries, and 2 band rooms.

City-county health department formed.

Huntington Industrial Corp. raised $40,000 to purchase airport site.

Nineteen hundred and forty-nine: Tri-State Airport Authority organized under State legislation demanded by the citizens of Huntington.

Nineteen hundred and fifty: Excess levy voted for four municipal swimming pools.

Voting machines used first time following legislative action demanded by citizens of Huntington.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two: $3 million bond issue voted to build 237-bed Cabell-Huntington Hospital.

Opening of $600,000 Huntington Galleries.

Central Ohio Valley Industrial Council formed with Huntington leadership.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-four: Opening of four municipal swimming pools.

Public subscription of $325,000 to equip Cabell-Huntington Hospital.

Purchase of permanent theater by Community Players.

Organization of United Fund with 27 participating agencies.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-five: $650,000 bond issue and supporting 3-year excess levy voted for 33-mile street resurfacing program.

Formation of Huntington production pool by small industries.

Organization of All Huntington Association to obtain council-manager charter.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-six: Citizens voted 12,005 to 6,130 for drafting a new charter and elected 10 manager plan proponents to 11-member charter board.

Excess levy voted to retire $940,000 debt against Memorial Field House.

Cabell County bond issue of $1 million plus Wayne County bond issue of $225,000 voted to obtain matching Federal funds for Tri-State Airport.

Twenty percent increase in property assessments and property reappraisal demanded for school purposes.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-seven: Council-manager charter adopted by vote of 9,577 to 5,330.

Election of seven All Huntington Association-endorsed candidates to seven-member council.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-eight: Transfer of $170,000 levy by county court to board of education for recreation and library purposes.

Public subscription of $51,696 to purchase 226 acres of additional park land.

In addition, there are listed dozens of projects of various organizations which were not citywide in their impact.

GO AHEAD, HUNTINGTON

Go ahead, Huntington.

The Herald-Dispatch not only desires that Huntington go ahead but urges the city to adopt "go ahead" both as a prevailing attitude and slogan.

This newspaper this morning rejoices with the community that Huntington has been signally honored by being named an all-America city, 1 of 11 so chosen by the National Municipal League and Look magazine because civic groups continually pressed for civic improvements.

We join in congratulating those civic leaders who worked so valiantly for those improvements for which Huntington is honored and those persons who so ably stated the city's case before the all-America city awards jury last fall.

We all may take justifiable pride in the fact that the name "Huntington" today is being recognized nationally as a community where accomplishment is possible.

But elation, however pardonable, must be tempered with the fact that we cannot and must not rest upon the laurels of past achievement. That way lies stagnation.

We can be proud, yes. But we have not reached the millenium of municipal excellence—far from it. The criterion for the award was not civic perfection, it was accomplishment through continuing citizen participation.

There is only one direction for Huntington to go today—"go ahead."

Our problems are still multiple and complex. But we, situated as we are in the everexpanding Ohio Valley, have an unrealized potential for growth in all fields.

Continued growth means continued citizen participation.

It means continued citizen awareness, continued citizen desire to have even a better community in which to live. As in the past, it shall be the welcome task of the Herald-Dispatch to keep the citizenry aware and informed of those goals toward which it should be striving.

When one follows a city's progress day by day it is easy to lose sight of long-range gains. For that reason we review briefly the accomplishments gained over the past decade, the merits of which led to Huntington's being honored.

We have a new hospital, a new tristate airport and memorial fieldhouse. A street resurfacing project was undertaken and municipal swimming pools were built; 4 excess school levies were approved by the voters and 226 acres of land added to the park system.

We achieved a 20-percent increase in property assessments and property was reappraised. A council-manager charter was approved.

These accomplishments did not come about overnight, and they did not happen by themselves. They were accomplished because someone cared enough to assume the community leadership. They were accomplished because the programs were worthwhile and had a broad basis of community action and underlying community support.

None of them were accomplished easily. All change, all expediture for change brings with it opposition—sometimes bitter and temporarily victorious opposition.

There is only one way for Huntington to go—go ahead.

Huntington receives more than an honor today. It has learned a valuable lesson.

And that is that any community improvement must have as its base concerted citizen action. It has to be wanted badly enough for representatives from all walks of community life to band together to see that it gets done.

Cabell County is making preparations for the celebration of its centennial. This is an event not totally divorced from today's theme of municipal recognition. The centennial itself should serve not only for a fond look at the past but as a springboard for future growth.

The nearness of the centennial further serves to remind that Huntington's growth and accomplishments did not transpire only in the past decade. It has been a long, continuing process and we today are in no small measure reaping the benefits planted by unsung community leaders of a century ago.

The Herald-Dispatch has great faith in Huntington and the tristate area which Huntington serves. But we gain nothing by denying or ignoring existing problems.

Huntington and this area need new industries. We need new and adequate highways to attract those industries. We need a new bridge across the Ohio River. Much remains to be done to make our present airport adequate for the jet age. We have a downtown parking problem. More street resurfacing is needed. The community has a great stake in an expanded Marshall College. Local schools face a financial dilemma. We need a modernized city market. A municipal wharf and expanded river terminals are called for if the city is to continue to grow. Urban renewal and zoning lie just ahead.

Any list aiming at community betterment could be endless.

Huntington has been honored primarily because of continuing citizen action.

Such citizen action must not stop with the award. Too much remains to be done. It can be done.

We do not pretend for a moment that it will be easy. There probably won't even be any prize for it. Its only reward will be headache, heartache, disappointment, delay, brickbats instead of honors. It will be done because a handful of dedicated people love Huntington. It will be done because the citizens of Huntington have the will to do it, and the good commonsense to band together to see that it gets done.

Go ahead, Huntington.

Sioux Falls, a City With a Heart, Lifts Her Mentally Retarded Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, America's most precious resource is the minds of our children. Aside from the humanitarian considerations at stake, we cannot afford to ignore the mental development of a single one of these young minds. This is true of the gifted child, the so-called average child, and the youngster whose mentality is retarded.

It was a genuine satisfaction to me in the last Congress to sponsor legislation that was enacted into law which is designed to assist mentally retarded children. There are approximately 1 million of these children in the United States. Unfortunately, only about 15 percent of them are being given the opportunity to learn under the direction of specially prepared teachers. The legislation passed by the 85th Congress will help solve the critical shortage of qualified teachers by providing a modest Federal grant to encourage the training of teachers to meet the problems of mentally retarded youngsters.

I am very pleased that citizens in my own State—South Dakota—are moving ahead in providing special education for mentally retarded children. A recent article by Mr. John Wooley appearing in the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader of January 11, 1959, relates some of the remarkable progress being made in this field by the Sioux chapter of the Association for Retarded Children, whose president is Mr. Bill Green. Under unanimous consent I ask that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

IGNORANCE, APATHY SEEN—SIOUX FALLS RETARDED BEING REHABILITATED

(By John Wooley)

Day by day, week by week, one step at a time.

Gradually mentally retarded children in Sioux Falls learn the habits and activities shared by their brothers and sisters.

But some retarded are still hidden in darkness of ignorance and apathy. Others are taught to be useful and happy.

Today, 1,800 Sioux Falls men, women, and children are mentally retarded, with 120 of that number becoming rehabilitated in private and public schools. But 16 years ago the number of persons receiving special adjustment training was almost nil.

Not until the early 1940s did Sioux Falls have a school for persons with mental deficiency due to impaired brain development.

Doctors say mental retardation may be caused by any one of a wide variety of diseases, accidents, or genetic deviations. In many cases the mental deficiency originates before or during birth or in early childhood.

Retardation plays no favorites, a fact prompting the late Mrs. Dorothy Hollister to start the first of the present four homes for mentally handicapped in Sioux Falls. Her child was retarded.

Later came to South Dakota Home for Speech Handicapped Children, Inc., 3901 S. Hawthorne Avenue; Hope School, 1909 East Sixth Street, and Shirley White School for Exceptional Children, 426 South Willow Avenue. The Hollister School is located at 1020 East 26th Street. The schools operated without group affiliation until 1954, when the Sioux Chapter Association for Retarded Children was organized by parents.

Associated with the State and national organizations, the Sioux chapter has helped secure funds and support for the schools, promote public understanding and secure favorable State and county legislation.

Bill Green, chapter president, said the past 5 years of organizational work with members has seen a significant step forward in the retardation field.

Like most of the other 85 members in the chapter, Green has a retarded child. He believes most mentally handicapped persons can master the three R's, or at least become a nearly normal citizen.

Among problems facing the chapter are securing sufficient funds, hiring qualified instructors—and educating the parents of a retarded child.

"Many parents think a mentally retarded person should be hidden in a closet, for he can never fit into society," the chapter president said. "Parents are amazed to learn we want to help their retarded children."

Unfortunately, not every retarded person in Sioux Falls and area can be helped by the chapter because of limited school facilities and employees. Consequently, the organization must be particularly interested in children of school age.

But, still, some Sioux Falls schools must refuse applicants because of crowded conditions.

In addition to the Sioux Chapter, schools have faced many problems in an effort to exist.

Mrs. George Sweeney, director of Hope School, was prompted by a retarded daughter to start a school in her farm home. Later she used a church basement, garage, and a truck terminal building for classrooms.

All the centers except the Shirley White School receive United Fund and other organizational support. Schools are paid $35 a month for each child from the individual's school district. In addition, some schools have parental support.

The South Dakota Home for Speeched Handicapped, which also has a school, is typical in that it has 20 retarded persons from ages 4 to 21 in its rehabilitation program.

Although enrollment and teaching methods have increased since the first school was organized in Sioux Falls, an existing problem is persons past school age.

Classrooms prepare students to be active and somewhat independent. But the retarded person must know a trade to be economically independent.

"We're attempting to develop workshops so retarded persons are not a burden to society," Green said. "Training of these persons in Sioux Falls has come a long way—but we have a long road ahead."

Tribute to Representative J. Harry McGregor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues from Ohio, and

others, in paying a brief tribute to the memory of our late friend, Representative J. Harry McGregor, of Ohio, whose sudden and untimely passing during the recess of the Congress came as a great shock to his many friends in this Chamber and throughout the country. He was a friendly and most personable Member who represented the people of his district and State most ably.

May I extend my sincere sympathy to the members of his family.

Good Place To Start Economy Try Is Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an editorial which appeared in the January 20 issue of the Saginaw News. It is very encouraging to find a newspaper that supports the President's budget even though that budget does not include their own hometown Saginaw Valley flood control project. It would be far easier to us to practice economy if all newspapers who preach economy were willing to advocate curtailed Government spending even though it directly affected local projects:

GOOD PLACE TO START ECONOMY TRY IS HERE

The temptation to preach economy for others and to protest refusals to indulge our own wants is always with us. Hence there will be no critical comment here in the wake of the news from Washington announcing the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer's decision to exclude from its requests funds for two Saginaw watershed improvement projects.

In doing so, the Corps of Engineers is only pursuing a policy strongly urged by President Eisenhower in his economy budget message in which he ruled out appropriations for flood control and navigation which were not already under construction.

To have brought the $20 million Saginaw Valley flood control project to the construction stage would have called for $500,000 in planning funds. The Corps of Engineers has $300,000 on hand for a start on the Saginaw River navigation improvement project, but it would be pointless to undertake that much of a $5.5 million job at this time.

Aside from the fact that we believe as strongly as anyone that spending from Washington must be curbed if inflation is to be checked, there is reason also for citizens of this area to distinguish between the two projects which have been sought here.

The river improvement project is, when it can be afforded, a justifiable Federal undertaking. The Saginaw River is a navigable stream by every standard, including established usage on a commercial tonnage basis. It stands to become an increasingly important carrier of water traffic with the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway. As such, we need offer no apologies in seeking participation in what has long been accepted as a legitimate function and responsibility of the Federal Government.

We recognize, however, that legitimate requests must await priority of importance and urgency in keeping with the Government's limited annual commitments.

As for the flood-control project, we can hardly protest this watershed's right to consideration, simply because the 21-county plan has considerably more merit than did many others approved by previous Congresses and Presidents.

Nothing in the years of preliminary local studies and surveys demonstrated that the Saginaw Valley could not manage the financing from its own resources. Nor is there anything in this proposed project to suggest that it serves wide areas of regional scope far beyond the bounds of the project as defined. The farmlands, rivers, game sanctuary and communities along the way stand to benefit directly and exclusively.

We express this view, knowing that our Congressmen have been eager and alive in promoting something for the people back home, especially since precious little "pork-barrel" indulgence has been brought this way from Washington in many long years.

There are those who criticize pretty pointedly the Congressman who doesn't bring home the bacon. We do not count ourselves among them. Today, the best service a Congressman can render his constituents is, in our view, to stand as firmly as he knows how against the spenders who care not for deficits and inflation which has reduced the value of the dollar to a second-grade 42-cent coin in just 20 years.

In foregoing legitimate Federal spending here this year as well as the questionable variety we should, however, be entitled to demand that equally stringent rules of justification be applied everywhere else in the United States. If less than that is done, no administration or Congress can protest the disillusioned cynicism that leads the public to grab, before someone else gets there first.

A Petition for Continuation of the Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include extraneous material.

The Santa Barbara, Calif., unit of Pro America has forwarded to me a petition urging that the House Un-American Activities Committee be continued in recognition of the past achievements of the committee and as a recognition of the continuing threat of communistic and other un-American organizations. I fully concur with these splendid citizens and join them in calling for the carrying on of the committee and its vitally important work:

THE COMMITTEE FOR CONTINUATION OF THE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Whereas it is an established fact that our concept of government based on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States is under attack by an opposing ideology, despotic and godless in nature; and

Whereas the perpetrators of this ideology have ceaselessly proclaimed to the nations of the world their plans for subjugation of said nations; and

Whereas the U.S. Government has been designated as a major objective of aforementioned subjugation; and

Whereas one of the approved techniques of appropriation is the infiltration of the subversive element into policymaking levels of government and into strategic defense positions;

Therefore, the undersigned do petition the Congress of these United States for the continuation of the Un-American Activities Committee, the past achievements of which have been of inestimable value to our national security.

Barbara S. Whittaker, Ellen Hayward, Paula A. Chauvel, Florence C. Sounsen, Helen M. Wood, Pearl E. Harley, Mrs. Charles S. Stevens, Maude I. Long, Mary Elizabeth Thomas, Meriam E. Storey, Mrs. Flint H. Jones, Myrtle M. Crafts, Margaret Nixon, Marion B. Phillips, Roy A. Lippencott, Genevieve G. Lippencott, John K. Northrop, Chuck Northrop, Margaret C. Northrop, Santa Barbara, Calif.

I Want To Stand on My Own Two Feet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Alfred Wilken, of Owego, N.Y., expressing his opposition to the many Federal Government spending programs. The views expressed in this letter from one of my constituents clearly reflects agreement with our President's determined stand for fiscal responsibility at the Federal level as the very least elected representatives owe the long-suffering taxpayer.

OWEGO, N.Y., *January 17, 1959.*
Congressman HOWARD W. ROBISON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROBISON: I have received my W-2 form, and what I see is that—

I have helped to stuff the mailboxes of other people with Government checks.

I have bought farm products that I, and probably no one else will eat.

I have bought irrigation in the American desert so that I can pay for more farm products I, and probably no one else will eat.

I have bought power stations and power for people living a thousand miles from here.

I am buying superhighways in sparsely settled areas halfway across the continent when we can't get the lumps chopped down on the road between Flemingville and Newark Valley.

I am buying plushier offices and appointments for an ever-expanding military and civilian bureaucracy, not to mention expense accounts, etc.

I am only a man working for a salary, as my receipt of a W-2 form would imply, but now it is proposed that I also pay for—

Somebody else's hospital and medical bills.

Junk real estate in the big cities all over the United States in the name of slum clearance and urban renewal.

Some other kid's college education, while I try to figure out how I can educate my own. Of course, in my day, I and many others paid for an education entirely ourselves, even without help from parents and scholarships, etc.

Of course, all the time I am expected to put up more and more money to guarantee more and more shaky mortgages, when I figure I can't afford to build a house myself.

I never have received 1 penny of compensation, either directly or indirectly from any government, except for 4 years and 5 months pay while in the Army in World War II. If anyone wants to say I have indirectly benefited from Government spending I dare them to give me something more than hypotheses, theories, and semantics. I dare them to trace it right into my pocketbook.

It would be to the interest of teh entire country if the Congressmen of the northeastern quarter of the United States joined together and stopped the march of Federal dollars across the Mississippi River.

To balance the Federal budget the Government should send a bill assessing each income taxpayers his proportionate share of the deficit, payment to be made in one lump sum in 30 days. Such a sudden and heavy blow to the household budget would be more educational of the evils of inflation than all the newspaper and magazine articles.

Of course, if the trend of Federal spending persists, about all the spenders will soon be able to do with fellows like me is to chop us up and fertilize the grassroots with us.

Yours truly,

ALFRED WILKEN.

New Civil Service Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an enlightening editorial by James A. Campbell entitled "New Civil Service Era" as printed in the Washington Daily News of Saturday, January 17, 1959:

NEW CIVIL SERVICE ERA

(Once a year, during National Civil Service Week, James A. Campbell, president of the AFL–CIO American Federation of Government Employees, takes over this column to talk about whatever's on his mind. This is the week—and the day.—John Cramer.)

(By James A. Campbell, president, American Federation of Government Employees)

The civil service is a sleeping giant.

Potentially the 2 million Federal employees and their families represent a might force in American life. If they should ever speak in a single voice, the merest whisper would reverberate through the corridors of Capitol Hill.

But this potential has never been fully realized.

Throughout most of the 76 years of the civil service, a majority of employees have been content to let a comparative handful of their colleagues carry the ball for them in campaigns for improved working conditions. Some were too timid to join a union. Some considered themselves above the fray, and some naively believed that improvements in their benefits somehow just happened.

It may be wishful thinking, but I am encouraged by signs that the civil service—this slumbering Goliath—is beginning to stir.

The signs of life became apparent last year during the pay raise campaign. At first it seemed to be merely hunger pains. The rumblings which followed the veto of the 1957 pay bill appeared to be merely the growling of an empty stomach which would subside when the immediate objective had been won.

RESULT

Perhaps it was, but one result of the resentment against an inadequate pay structure was a greater degree of engagement by the ordinarily docile Government employee in the campaign which led to passage of the 10-percent pay raise.

We were amazed at the turnout when we asked our local-unions to send delegations to Washington to call on Congressmen and Senators from their home districts. We found out that many of these delegates were able to make the trip through contributions by nonmembers to help meet expenses.

Everyone who wrote a letter, contributed a dollar, or attended a rally felt a sense of personal participation and victory in the success of the pay campaign. The logical conclusion was: "If we did it once, we can do it again."

Thanks to John Cramer and his colleagues who cover the Government news beat, Federal workers are gradually getting disabused of the idea that these campaigns for improved conditions are the result of spontaneous combustion.

Through the newspapers, employees are in on the picture from the time a resolution is introduced at a union convention to the strategy sessions of the Government Employees Council, the introduction of bills, open hearings, and even the inevitable compromises which are hammered out behind closed doors.

There's another factor which is gradually penetrating the fitful slumber of the uncommitted majority of Federal employees.

Many of the most influential Members of Congress—including such leaders as Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and Representative JAMES MORRISON, ranking majority member of the House committee, have said in plain, forceful language that they favor organization of Government employees.

I have, perhaps, taken advantage of John Cramer's hospitality by devoting a "Civil Service Week" column to the problems of organization. But the Civil Service Act would never have been passed in the first place if it had not been for the organized protest of reform groups against the corruption of the spoils system.

Having been appointed to his job through open competitive examination and retained on the basis of merit, he was able to demand good wages and working conditions as a matter of right.

Considering how much has been accomplished by so few, the stirrings of the 2 million Government employees promise to make news for many years to come.

H. R. Gross Continues His Relentless Fight for Economy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, it is reassuring to know that my good friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is back at the old stand this year in his relentless battle for a return to fiscal sanity in the Federal bureaucracy. The gentleman is widely recognized as one of the stanchest advocates of economy in Government, and I have been proud to join him in many of his fights to cut extravagant and unnecessary spending proposals.

It is appropriate that he would be assigned the number "H.R. 144"—one gross—to his bill to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed revenues except in time of war or grave national emergency, and in this regard I desire to include as part of my remarks the following article from the Washington Post of January 18, 1959:

GROSS PROFIT

Iowa's Representative H. R. GROSS, Republican, whose charges up the hill against spending have become a part of Capitol Hill folklore, is back fighting the windmill again.

This year he's taken out a patent on a new bill "to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues except in time of war or grave national emergency declared by Congress."

How did he apply his trademark? By numbering the bill "H.R. 144."

This, in case you hadn't heard, is a mathematical pun.

GROSS's initials, of course, are H.R., the same as those on the bill. And it just so happens that the number coincides exactly with Webster's definition of "gross," which is: "The number of 12 dozen; 12 times 12."

Balancing the Budget Against Needs, We Are Hopeful, but Not Fearful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Denver Post, Denver, Colo., on Wednesday, January 21, 1959, which analyzes the so-called balanced budget submitted by President Eisenhower. I am hopeful that all Members will take time to read this excellent editorial:

BALANCING THE BUDGET AGAINST NEEDS, WE ARE HOPEFUL, BUT NOT FEARFUL

We hope the $77 billion Federal budget President Eisenhower sent to Congress this week can be balanced. But if it is balanced, it will be through what now appears to be an unlikely combination of circumstances.

At least three major conditions would have to be fulfilled, if the amount the Government takes in and the amount it spends are to remain about equal, as the President proposes.

First, Congress would have to approve the President's new tax proposals or develop alternative tax measures to raise about $1.3 billion in new revenue.

Mr. Eisenhower wants to (1) raise the gasoline tax by 1.5 cents a gallon; (2) raise postal rates again; (3) raise the tax on aviation gasoline and impose a tax on jet fuel; (4) increase the tax on life insurance companies; (5) close a "loophole" in the taxation of cooperatives, and (6) extend present rates of corporation and excise taxes.

If Congress balks at any of these proposals—and it has already shown signs of doing so—revenues will fall short of spending and the budget wil be unbalanced.

Second, Congress would have to agree to abandon a number of proposed new pro-

grams and to impose cutbacks in a number of existing programs.

Budget Director Maurice H. Stans has acknowledged that the new Eisenhower budget contains fewer proposals for new programs than any budget in recent memory.

The President has asked for no new public housing starts; for an end after this year to the college housing program; for a sharp reduction in rural electrification loans through higher interest rates; for no new starts on reclamation and other public works; for reduced grants to the States for hospital construction, and for reduced military aid abroad.

On existing programs, the budget proposes a number of small reductions in areas ranging from the school-lunch program to the lending program of the Farmers Home Administration. No renewal is suggested on a number of spending programs due to expire automatically.

Congress is almost certain to insist on some of the new spending and to oppose some of the reductions. Any appreciable spending increase will quickly unbalance the budget.

Third, the American economy would have to follow the predictions of the President's economic advisers for the next year with a certain amount of precision.

If business doesn't continue to improve quite as fast as the Eisenhower economists think it will, then taxes will not produce the revenue the President expects. Again that would mean an unbalanced budget.

Unless all the contingencies are resolved in exactly the way the President would like them to be, the likelihood is that the Government will spend more money in the next fiscal year than it will take in and another deficit year is ahead.

The deficit will probably not exceed a few billion dollars, no small amount, but far less than the $12.9 billion deficit in the current fiscal year.

The President has warned us, quite properly, that a deficit would increase the pressures of inflation.

At the same time, his economic report to Congress indicates that at least three counterinflationary forces have been at work and should be taken in consideration:

Business expenditures for new plant and equipment declined $7 billion in 1958, net exports went down several billion and consumer credit failed to expand for the first time since World War II.

In general, the economy is experiencing a healthy recovery from the recession, perhaps in some measure related to the $12.9 billion deficit.

Inflation, meanwhile, has not gotten out of hand, despite the big deficit.

Should we, then, let fear of inflationary pressure from a new, though much smaller deficit, distract us from making sound judgments on other equally important considerations of national policy?

Balancing the budget is a wise policy in prosperous times, but it is not an end in itself. It has to be weighed against the needs and perils of a free society in a tense and unstable world.

If balancing the budget means shortchanging our missile program or allowing weaknesses to develop in the alliances that protect the world from Soviet aggression, then balancing the budget will have to be postponed.

If balancing the budget means neglecting the needs of our country for better schools and roads, decent housing, slum-free cities, and reasonable progress in the development of our natural resources, then it might well be better to do without a balanced budget.

In any case, if Congress decides to beef up the President's defense requests to some extent and to spend more than the President has asked on carefully considered education, housing, and reclamation measures, we won't look upon it as a tragedy.

Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced H.R. 1221, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $1,800 a year the amount of outside income permitted without deductions from benefits, and to provide that all types of income shall be taken into account in determining whether an individual's benefits are subject to such deductions. I have now requested the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to ignore this bill and am today introducing another bill which would embody the first part only of H.R. 1221, that is, the increase of outside earnings or wages permitted without deducting from benefits.

As might be expected, Mr. Speaker, I have received a substantial volume of mail in protest against the second part of H.R. 1221 which would have included all forms of income, earned and unearned, for the purpose of determining outside income. Many of those who wrote me stated that I was in effect penalizing persons who by virtue of thrift have been able to invest in stocks, bonds, or various forms of rental income to supplement their social security benefits following retirement. I have replied to such persons that this was not at all my intent and that I did not actually seek to make this particular provision a part of title II of the Social Security Act. I rather intended to focus attention upon the entire question of limitations on outside income which, to me, completely destroy the insurance concept of the social security program. To my way of thinking, it is manifestly unfair to have the present low limitation of $1,200 per annum on earned income and no limit at all on unearned income and my introduction of H.R. 1221 was merely intended to point up this inequity. I am firmly convinced, Mr. Speaker, that an individual who has contributed to the social security program the required number of quarters should be permitted to draw his benefits without any regard to his earnings from other sources as is the case after he has passed age 72. What the present law does, however, is to force people to retire from gainful employment upon reaching their 65th birthday if they desire to avail themselves of social security benefits.

As a matter of fact, the entire concept of an arbitrary and fixed retirement age does not appear to me to be sound. I am sure every Member of the House knows many people who, both physically and mentally, are well qualified to continue gainful employment past the age of 65. I am equally certain that every Member of the House knows others who should be retired substantially in advance of that age. I must confess that at the moment I see no practical possibility of making the social security retirement age more flexible, but I do wish to voice my objection to it in principle.

What is the position of the administration on the question of raising the limit on outside income? I think this is best set forth by the following texts of two reports, one from the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare dated October 2, 1957, and one from the deputy to the Secretary of Treasury dated February 28, 1958, and both addressed to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. It will be noted that both Departments are opposed to the enactment of such legislation at this time:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, October 2, 1957.

Hon. JERE COOPER,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your requests of May 8 and March 25, 1957, for a report on H.R. 4636 and H.R. 4828, bills which would amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder.

H.R. 4636 would increase from $1,200 to $1,800 and H.R. 4828 would increase from $1,200 to $2,400 the amount a beneficiary under age 72 may earn in a year without losing any old-age and survivors insurance benefits for the year. H.R. 4828 would leave unchanged the unit ($80) by which the total yearly earnings in excess of the exempt amount are divided to determine the maximum number of monthly benefits which may be withheld by reason of earnings. H.R. 4636 would increase the unit to $120.

The limitation on the amount of earnings a beneficiary may have and still receive benefits is necessary if the benefits are to be restricted to persons who have substantially retired from gainful work and to dependents of retired or deceased workers who do not themselves have substantial earned income. (For practical reasons, the same earnings test is used to determine whether the worker has retired and whether a dependent has substantial earned income.) Under present law a person can work enough to earn $2,088 a year and still receive at least 1 month's benefit. If he does not earn more than $1,200 in a year, he can receive all of his benefits for the year.

While it is difficult to determine the exact amount of earnings that most satisfactorily discriminates between retirement and nonretirement, the Department believes that the present exemption of $1,200 is preferable to the higher exceptions proposed by H.R. 4636 and H.R. 4828.

Even with the present test, some people can continue to work full time at their usual level of earnings and still receive benefits. For example, workers who have been earning at the rate of $2,000 a year can, after reaching retirement age, receive 2 months' benefits in the year without in any way changing their work activity. In 1955, 21 percent of the workers under ald-age and survivors insurance with earnings credits in all calendar quarters had earnings of $2,000 or less; many of these no doubt were full-time workers. Any increase in the amount of earnings exempt under the earnings test would increase the number of persons who could continue in their regular jobs and still receive benefits. If the exempt amount were increased to $1,800 and the unit used to divide earnings in excess of the exempt amount were increased to $120 as proposed in H.R. 4636, persons earning as much as $3,120 a year could continue in their jobs and receive 1 month's benefit.

If H.R. 4636 or H.R. 4828 were enacted, the cost of the old-age and survivors insurance program would be increased. The estimated

level-premium cost of H.R. 4636, on an intermediate-cost basis, would be 0.53 percent of payroll. The cost of H.R. 4828 would be 0.90 percent. The additional cost resulting from an increase in the amount of earnings exempt from the earnings test would be incurred for the benefit of only a small percentage of the old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries and these would be persons who already had substantial income from work. The great majority of beneficiaries do not have substantial earnings.

We therefore recommend that H.R. 4636 and H.R. 4828 not be enacted by the Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

———, *Secretary.*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, February 28, 1958.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the Department's views on H.R. 4636 to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits, and to liberalize the provisions under which such earnings are charged for purposes of such deductions.

H.R. 4636 would increase from $1,200 to $1,800 a year the amount of income a beneficiary under age 72 may earn without losing any old-age and survivors insurance benefits for the year. In addition, it would increase from $80 to $120 the unit by which the total yearly earnings in excess of the exempt amount are divided to determine the maximum number of monthly benefits which may be withheld by reason of earnings.

Two aspects of this bill are of particular concern to this Department.

If enacted, H.R. 4636 would increase present and prospective benefit payments substantially without at the same time increasing social security contributions. Responsibility for the payment of social security benefits is vested in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and that Department has estimated that on an intermediate-cost basis the increase in the cost of the program would approximate a level-premium cost of one-half percent of payrolls. This would result in a corresponding weakening of the financial soundness of the insurance program. We concur in the opposition of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to such increases in benefits and costs of the old-age and survivors insurance program.

Moreover, a liberalization of the earnings test for social security benefit purposes would have important implications for the retirement income credit allowed under the individual income tax. As your committee is aware, discrepancies between the tax treatment of social security benefits and other forms of retirement income have been a concern for a number of years. In the Revenue Act of 1954, the tax credit for retirement income was adopted to equalize the treatment of individuals receiving taxable retirement incomes with those receiving exempt social security benefits. In that connection, a deliberate effort was made to parallel the provisions governing the tax credit, including the earnings test, in the income tax with provisions in the Social Security Act. The amount of income which retired individuals could earn without reducing their retired income credit was fixed at $900 to parallel the annual earnings test of $900 which insured workers could earn without reducing social security benefits. In 1956, the amount of income which could be earned without reducing the credit was raised from $900 to $1,200 to parallel a corresponding increase in the earnings test provided under the 1954 amendments to the Social Security Act.

Enactment of H.R. 4636 would again unbalance the social security and retirement income credit provisions and stimulate pressures for a corresponding adjustment in the provisions of the retirement income credit. Such adjustment would not only reduce income tax revenues but raise additional questions concerning the relative income tax treatment of retired workers and other groups in the population.

In view of these considerations, this Department recommends against enactment of H.R. 4636.

The Director, Bureau of the Budget, has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

DAN THROOP SMITH,
Deputy to the Secretary.

The thing that both departments appear to overlook is the fact that over a period of time the steadily increasing cost of living has made many social security benefits completely inadequate to maintain a respectable standard of living. There are obviously two ways to solve this problem. One is to further increase the benefits and thereby incur the necessity of either higher payroll taxes or an additional increase in the income base for social security purposes. Having carefully studied the recent report of the advisory council on social security financing and the contemplated schedule increases in payroll taxes between now and 1969, a I would hesitate to upset this balance. The other way seems to me to give a little more ability to those past 65 but not yet 72 to supplement their social security benefits with outside earnings of their own. This is what I am interested in accomplishing.

I can appreciate the objections on the part of both the Treasury and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Nevertheless, I regard this problem as an extremely serious one and it is my belief that the Ways and Means Committee should give it careful consideration. If hearings are held by that committee on amendments to the Social Security Act, I trust I will be given an opportunity to testify and further expound my views in this connection. But this time, however, Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor for the purpose of reassuring those people who protested to me against H.R. 1221 that my sole purpose in originally introducing this bill was to call attention to this present inequity regarding the whole question of outside income under the social security program and not with any idea of penalizing those people who, through thrift, have been able to supplement their retirement income from unearned sources.

There follows the text of my letter to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee requesting that H.R. 1221 not be acted upon by that committee:

JANUARY 26, 1959.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to request that my bill, H.R. 1221, which was introduced on January 7, 1959, be ignored and that no action be taken by your committee in connection therewith.

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Member of Congress.

Teddy Roosevelt Centennial a Huge 1958 Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has just concluded a year-long observance of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Teddy Roosevelt. Millions of Americans paid homage to a great American who will never be forgotten.

Thousands traveled to his home at Oyster Bay in my district to pay their respects.

The many persons who participated in the nationwide observance are to be congratulated for what is probably the most outstanding job done in this field.

I would like to insert in the RECORD two articles of interest along this line. The first is from the Albany Knickerbocker News of Wednesday, January 14. The second is from the Public Relations News of December 29 which selects the outstanding public relations campaigns of the year as case histories. The Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission was chosen this year for this high honor:

[From the Albany Knickerbocker News, Jan. 14, 1959]

TEDDY ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL A HUGE 1958 SUCCESS

WASHINGTON.—The centennial celebration of Theodore Roosevelt's birth in 1958 is considered a striking success by its sponsors.

The 49-year-old Theodore Roosevelt Association, headed by Leslie C. Stratton, who retired as national public relations director of the Boy Scouts of America, spearheaded the celebration.

It assisted the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission, created by Congress in 1955, to honor a great American and to revitalize the principles of responsible citizenship by which Mr. Roosevelt lived and which he exemplified.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON was chairman of a bipartisan committee. Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, was vice chairman.

Local State committees were formed to add strength to the centennial and many chairmen were State Governors. Literature was distributed, including two books.

Outside public relations counsel, including Standard Public Relations, Inc., of Washington and New York City, headed by L. Richard Guylay, were brought in.

Congress paid part of the bill and private citizens paid part.

On July 4, the Theodore Roosevelt Island in the Potomac River, was dedicated as a historical shrine.

A special family day was held at Teddy Roosevelt's former home on Long Island. There was a citizenship day in September. Sermons were preached on T.R.'s exemplary life. A commemorative stamp was issued by the Postmaster General. President Eisenhower issued a proclamation stressing Teddy Roosevelt's awareness that freedom also carries responsibilities.

The Department of Defense produced a 28-minute film depicting highlights of T.R.'s life. It was televised nationally.

Theodore Roosevelt Distinguished Service Medals were presented to Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther and Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover with ceremonies and publicity.

The 129 mutuals savings banks of New York State used coin banks, circulars, window and lobby displays, and essay contests to tell the T.R story.

The U.S. Information Agency told the T.R. story through overseas posts. The Treasury Department, National Archives, and libraries set up displays.

The Theodore Roosevelt centennial year paid homage to a great American who will never be forgotten.

[From the Public Relations News, Dec. 29, 1958]

CASE STUDY NO. 694

Few centennial celebrations have received such diverse, sustained, and widespread support as that of the year-long program, just ended, which commemorated the hundredth anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt's birth.

Due to the efforts of the 49-year-old Theodore Roosevelt Association (a voluntary organization headquartered in New York and supported by members and contributors), the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission was created in 1955 by an act of Congress. Stated objectives were to honor the great American and to revitalize the principles of responsible citizenship by which he had lived and which he dramatically exemplified.

Vice President NIXON accepted the chairmanship of a bipartisan committee and Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, was named vice chairman. The T.R. Association's Director (now director emeritus) Herman Hagedorn, became the committee's director and secretary and, with the aid of Assistant Director Sidney Wallach, energetically went to work.

One of the first steps was to organize a local subcommittee in each of the States; in many cases, the chairman of the committee was the Governor. To stimulate the efforts of these committee's, a variety of literature was distributed. This included two substantial books (the print order for each was over 50,000 copies): "The Free Citizen," a selection from the actual writings of T.R. (edited by Hagedorn), and "A Theodore Roosevelt Roundup," a compendium of excerpts from T.R.'s writings, comments about him by his contemporaries, and political cartoons of his era (selected by Wallach) with a biography (by Hagedorn).

The team was strengthened in 1957 by the addition of Leslie C. Stratton when he retired from his post of national public relations director of Boy Scouts of America. He became the T.R. Associations' director, deputy director of the T.R. Commission and general coordinator of the centennial activities. Outside counsel, Standard Public Relations, Inc., of Washington and New York City, headed by L. Richard Guylay, was retained. Its specific function, in addition to helping with general planning, was to stimulate the medium to bring dramatically before the public the record of T.R.'s contributions to the Nation. A series of fortnightly meetings was begun, with Hagedorn, Stratton, Wallach, and Guylay and three of his assistants attending.

Expenses for the first half of the program had been met by a congressional appropriation; but the association, due to an economy wave which hit the country, decided to provide the rest of the money from its treasury and pledges of additional contributions from members. To limit expenditures, meetings were restricted largely to Washington and New York. Other contacts were maintained by mail.

The state committees were kept informed by means of regular bulletins. Full background information on the centennial was distributed to industrialists, educators, labor leaders, clergy, and other opinion leaders and to service organizations and libraries.

There were several warm-up events. On July 4, the Theodore Roosevelt Island in the Potomac River, given by the T.R. Association to the Nation some 25 years ago, was dedicated as a historical shrine. A special Family Day was held at T.R.'s former home on Long Island, N.Y. There was a Citizenship Day in September.

On the 99th anniversary, a wide variety of kick-off activities was staged. Sermons were preached on the subject of T.R.'s exemplary life. A commemorative stamp was issued. President Eisenhower issued a proclamation stressing T.R.'s awareness that the privilege of freedom carries with it responsibilities which cannot safely be avoided.

The Department of Defense produced a 28-minute film depicting highlights in T.R.'s life. It was viewed widely on network and local TV and by the Armed Forces, schools, and other organizations. The Department of the Interior, in commemoration of T.R.'s pioneer efforts to conserve wildlife and natural resources, held a Hemispheric Conference of conservation authorities. Because T.R. had been Assistant Secretary of the Navy, that branch served a commemorative birthday cake to a group of Police Athletic League children visiting the U.S.S. *Valcour* and made special awards in his name. Theodore Roosevelt Distinguished Service Medals were presented to Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther and Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover with appropriate ceremonies and accompanying publicity.

The 129 mutual savings banks of New York State used coin banks, circulars, window and lobby displays, and essay contests to tell the T. R. story. Comic book publishers incorporated material on T.R. in their funnies. Teachers College of Columbia University prepared a 40-page handbook to help school teachers to develop centennial activities, and the presidents of more than 100 universities gave support to the program. (The T.R. Association has already awarded 1,000 certificates to schools for the excellence of essay programs and contests.)

Sinclair Oil Corp. included in its conservation series of ads (Public Relations News, March 11, 1957), a color photo of Theodore Roosevelt Memorial National Park (in North Dakota). There were special programs on the radio and TV networks pointing out that the principles laid down by T.R. are just as applicable to today's problems as they were to those of his time, and there were colorful interviews with surviving members of T. R.'s Rough Riders. The USIA told the T.R. story through its overseas posts. Displays were set up by the Treasury Department, the National Archives and Records Service of the General Services Administration, and in libraries (the latter activity being stimulated by a committee headed by L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress). The Financial Public Relations Association and other influential groups distributed centennial material to members.

Media coverage was superb throughout the 12 months of the campaign, highlights being a 10-page cover story in Time magazine, a full-page Life magazine editorial titled "A Man To Be Thankful For," a 26-page article in National Geographic magazine, and two editorials in the New York Daily News. (One, under the title "Americans To Remember," and accompanied by a cartoon, appeared in a Sunday edition reaching 3½ million readers.)

Stratton, who is continuing as director of the association, happily informs us that T.R. is now clearly recognized by the younger generation as well as oldsters as "America's fourth greatest President, overshadowed only by Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln." And he agrees with Guylay's recommendation that Public Relations executives should keep selling T.R.'s concept of responsible citizenship—a concept which can be extremely helpful in the area of economic education.

Anniston Star Says Washington Post Betrays Its Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 21, 1959, the Anniston (Ala.) Star, an outstanding daily newspaper in our State, ran an editorial which was highly critical of the Washington Post. The editorial referred to the action of the Washington Post in refusing to accept the Putnam letter, which has received considerable publicity and attention the past few weeks, as a paid advertisement. Previously the Washington Post had refused to run this excellent piece of writing as a news item and as a letter to the editor. This was their privilege, although their judgment is questioned and manifests a very appalling and disturbing lack of objectivity on their part. As you know, the Putnam letter, written by Mr. Carleton Putnam of Washington, D.C., stated in a very forthright manner the South's position on the segregation-integration controversy.

The refusal of the Washington Post to run the letter even as a paid advertisement has been the object of criticism by editors and other thinking people all over the country. In view of the importance of this matter and the threat which it presents to the constitutional guarantee of freedom of expression by the American people, I am happy to insert herewith a copy of the editorial from the Anniston Star. I urge that the Members give it their careful study and attention. There is far move involved in this instance than any citizen's particular views on segregation.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star has agreed to run the Putnam letter as a paid advertisement and the advertisement will appear in this evening's Star (January 26, 1959).

The editorial follows:

POST BETRAYS ITS CREED

Possibly never before in recent history have honest newspaper editors been so disappointed in a member of their profession as they have had occasion to be more than once in the last few years with the Washington Post, which had been looked upon as the exemplar of freedom of expression and the right of the people to know.

But for some strange and inexplicable reason, that great morning daily has seemed to lean overbackward in its efforts to keep its subscribers in other regions from knowing all the facts about the battle of civil rights, which has become one of the foremost issues before the American people in every State of the Union.

It is well known that there has been a considerable increase in crime since the great Negro migration to the Capital City began. But the Post, as do some other newspapers in the North, refuses to identify Negro criminals by race. Thus they deny criminologists, ethnologists, etc., the right of access to essential information.

But its most unpardonable deviation from honest journalism came to light just a few days ago when the Post refused to print even as a paid advertisement a letter that has been written to the President of the United States by an eminent author, scholar and airline executive of the city in which the Post is published, Carleton Putnam.

The letter in question was never answered, so far as we know, by Mr. Eisenhower, although it is written in even tenor and is by no means offensive. It was published voluntarily by the Christian Science Monitor and as an advertisement in the New York Times, which also censors its news columns against Negro crimes.

But possibly because it sets forth an argument against integration of the white and colored races so convincingly that its truth and logic cannot be refuted, it was rejected summarily by the Post, although its sponsors was one of the most eminent citizens of Alabama, a leading Birmingham corporation lawyer and fore State senator.

And what makes the strange conduct of the Washington Post so deplorable in newspaper circles is the fact that members of its editorial staff have led the fight against censorship in the National's Capital. J. R. Wiggins, executive editor of the post, has ably headed the committee on freedom of information of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

But we hope that the editorial staff of the Washintgon morning daily had no voice in the denial of the subscribers of that honored paper the right to know the other side of the so-called civil rights battle. But be that as it may, the Post has betrayed the ethics of its profession, and that is something to be deplored.

The Late Thomas S. Gordon: Truly a Fine Gentleman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, through no fault of my own, I was unable to be on the floor last Thursday when several Members of this body paid tribute to the late Hon. Thomas S. Gordon, my friend and former colleague from our home State of Illinois. I would be remiss to my own deep sentiments if I did not take this moment to express my condolences and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks accordingly at this point in the RECORD.

From each friendship we cultivate in our many associations as Members of this Congress, we take something that we value as part of our own personal lives.

My colleagues paid fitting tribute to the late Thomas S. Gordon following his death last Thursday. What was said by those who knew him best is a fine and deserved memorial. I shall add only that in my 2 years' association with him, I enjoyed the friendship of one who was a real gentleman by any definition of the word. Our society would benefit with many more men of his character and general mannerisms. Our world would be better for more of Tom Gordon's kind of understanding and attitude toward his fellow man.

He will be sorely missed, though his family should find rich solace in the human and material contributions which he made to so many during his lifetime.

A National Recreation Area on the Current and Eleven Point Rivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Resolution No. 19 adopted by the Missouri House of Representatives to establish a national recreational area on the Current and Eleven Point Rivers as proposed by the National Park Service and the U.S. Forest Service and to declare the Current and Eleven Point Rivers national streams and to provide for the acquisition of the necessary land without exercising the power of eminent domain:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 19

Memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a national recreational area on the Current and Eleven Point Rivers as proposed by the National Park Service and the U.S. Forest Service and to declare the Current and Eleven Point Rivers national streams and to provide for the acquisition of the necessary land without exercising the power of eminent domain.

Whereas there exists, in the valleys of the Current and Eleven Point Rivers in Missouri, five springs of the first magnitude and many hundreds of smaller springs which provide a constant supply of clear, cold, sparkling water for these rivers; and

Whereas the phenomenon of such large volumes of clear, cold water issuing as springs amid rustic and picturesque surroundings, make places of wonder and rare natural beauty, which offer a lure and inspiration to those who come to view these extraordinary manifestations of nature, and to play, rest, and to refresh themselves in a peaceful and inspiring environment; and

Whereas these springs make a valuable contribution to fish-life in these streams by providing favorable sites for fish hatcheries, and by discharging large quantities of crystal clear water, they become the controlling factor favorable to the propagation and maintenance of game fish and other aquatic life natural to both streams; and

Whereas the State of Missouri and the U.S. Forest Service own vast acreage adjacent to these streams suitable for recreational development and other improvements for the public use; and

Whereas the Current and Eleven Point Rivers are nationally famous for their "John Boat" float fishing trips through this Ozark scenic wonderland; and

Whereas the Arkansas-White-Red Basins, interagency committee, recognizing the unique natural qualities of the Current and Eleven Point Rivers of Missouri, and their importance to present and future generations, recommended that appropriate State and Federal agencies prepare a plan to preserve and enhance the natural qualities of this region; and

Whereas a plan was prepared by the National Park Service in cooperation with Missouri State agencies, and was published by the Division of Resources and Development, to preserve and develop the Current and Eleven Point River country, without the exercise of the power of eminent domain; and

Whereas the U.S. Forest Service has indicated a similar interest in the preservation and development of lands adjacent to these streams by recommending the creation of a National Forest Recreation Area in a National Recreation Plan prepared and adopted in 1936: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Missouri House of Representatives, in its 70th General Assembly, request of the Congress of the United States, that it establish a National Recreation Area along the Current and Eleven Point Rivers of Missouri, and that it declare the Current and Eleven Point Rivers as national streams; and be it further

Resolved, That this assembly request that the Congress enact the necessary legislation providing for the purchase and development of the National Recreation Area as heretofore described, lest the great scenic and recreational values of the Current and Eleven Point Rivers in Missouri, be lost forever to public use by manmade encroachments; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to send copies of this memorial to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the Missouri Members of the House and Senate.

National YMCA Week, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention to the fact that the week just past was National YMCA Week.

During last week, millions of Americans affiliated with nearly 2,000 Young Men's Christian Associations across the country celebrated one more year of fine service to our youngsters, teen-agers, young men, and to our family groups also.

Since 1844, the YMCA has been a pioneer in the cause of brotherhood and development of our youth—the spirit and mind of youth as well as physical well-being. The Y has become also a unique and vital part of virtually every American community.

The YMCA has served our fighting men during every war since the Civil War. It has contributed mightily to health and physical fitness programs and has contributed much to American sports and athletics, creating such games as basketball and volleyball.

The Y has also sponsored organized camping, water-safety instruction, youth and government programs, and boys' work.

The YMCA has also pioneered in night-school education, short-term community finance campaigns, and many other advances.

I am certain that all of us will join in a sincere "well done" to this excellent and growing organization and, we might also add, "Please keep up the good work."

IMCO Cool to Panama and Liberia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, a U.N. organization, refused to recognize Liberia and Panama as major shipping nations. The American Merchant Marine feels particularly bitter about this due to the fact that our foreign-aid program subsidizes, to a great extent, many major projects in those nations which opposed us. The story is ably reported by William J. Humphreys in the New York Herald Tribune Bureau:

IMCO COOL TO PANAMA AND LIBERIA—NEITHER SEATED ON SECURITY UNIT

(By William J. Humphreys)

LONDON, January 15.—Overriding objections from the United States and Latin American countries, the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO), an affiliate of the United Nations, refused today to recognize Liberia and Panama as leading shipping powers.

But Liberia, again with United States support, wants to test the legality of the decision, in which Britain was a spearhead, by referring it to the International Court of Justice. An important ballot on whether an appeal should be made to the court in The Hague is expected to be taken tomorow.

Today's decision against Liberia and Panama in 28-nation IMCO was regarded as an important manifestation of growing resistance in Britain and elsewhere in Europe to the liberal ship registration laws of Liberia and Panama. These laws have attracted vast numbers of vessels to the Liberian and Panamanian flags.

On this account, the failure of Liberia and Panama to be elected to the IMCO's Maritime Safety Committee—today's issue—appeared to have implications ranging far beyond the scope and importance of the technical work that will be done by the committee.

IMCO turned its back on the flag-tonnage listings of the authoritative Lloyd's registry in denying that Liberia and Panama belonged among the world's eight largest ship-owing nations. To preserve Germany with a large number of its NATO allies on this matter, the United States had urged a decision be postponed until 1961.

The eight nations elected from a list prepared by the conference secretariat rather than chosen from Lloyd's Registry listing, were the United States, United Kingdom, Norway, Japan, Italy, the Netherlands, France, and West Germany.

Later six others were chosen from a list of nominees: Argentina, Canada, Greece, Pakistan, the Soviet Union, and the United Arab Republic.

Although nominated in this second group, Panama refused to be a candidate. Nationalist China and Israel, both nominated by the United States, received only 9 and 7 votes, respectively, when the minimum number required for election under the preferential system of voting was 15.

SHIPPING MEN HERE INDIGNANT

American shipping men indignantly described the defeat suffered by this Nation's delegation to IMCO as "another foreign attempt to scuttle the American merchant marine." They noted that Britain, Norway and other European nations that ganged up on the United States, Liberia and Panama are the same nations whose ship owners oppose the American subsidy program and the Cargo Preference Act which requires that at least 50 percent of all government financed relief cargoes be sent abroad in American flag ships.

"They would deny us subsidies, our share of aid cargoes and now our right to sail our ships under flags of necessity," one said. "Perhaps we should begin some denials of our own."

He suggested that one might properly take the forming of barring foreign aid cargoes to the ships of any nation which allows its merchant vessels to trade where American ships are not allowed to sail. This was obviously a reference to the fact that Britain and Norway permit their ships to trade with Red China.

Tom Kitayama—Union City Councilman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most rapidly growing areas in California is southern Alameda County. In the last 5 years three areas have been incorporated into new cities. The last came into being early this month when the people of the Alvarado-Decoto district decided to incorporate into Union City.

Under California State law this can only be done by referendum. The proposition to incorporate Union City carried better than 4 to 1.

At the same election 15 citizens of the area submitted their qualifications to the voters by seeking 5 nonpartisan city council seats. The man who topped the ticket was Tom Kitayama, a 35-year-old prominent nurseryman.

Councilman Kitayama is probably the first northern California Nisei to seek an elective post as city councilman. His election is indicative of the respect with which Californians hold their fellow countrymen of Japanese ancestry.

Kitayama's younger brother, Kee, is the newly elected president of Eden Township Japanese-American Citizens League. Another brother, Ray, is a past president of the Freemont JACL.

The Kitayama brothers operate one of the largest carnation nurseries in the country. Tom is president and coowner of the firm and also director on both the northern California Carnation Growers Association and the American Carnation Society.

Tom is married to the former Hideko Horikawa, both Seattle-born Nisei, and they have four children.

Foreign Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years the administration in Washington has been paying lip service to a liberal foreign trade policy.

Unfortunately, being all things to all men sooner or later comes home to haunt us. Last year I pointed out that many of the difficulties existing between our country and our nearest neighbors—Canada, Mexico, and the republics to the south of us—were the result of our vacillating trade policies.

The hostility generated against Vice President NIXON, in my opinion, could never have come about had it not been for many of our own stupid mistakes about trade matters with our friends in Latin America.

Now comes another episode involving a bid on a project in Arkansas. Despite the fact that the OCDM had ruled on several occasions that this type of machinery had no particular national defense implications, our Government has now decided to spend a quarter of a million dollars that it would not have to spend in order to give a contract to a bidder who was almost 20 percent higher than an English bidder.

This comes at a time when administration officials are pointing with alarm toward inflation and asserting the need for a balanced budget. It also comes at a time when responsible administration officials are saying each day that the free world must prepare itself for the continuing Soviet economic and trade offensive.

It is no wonder such such policies, or shall I say lack of policies, cause consternation among our friends.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on January 24, 1959, and also a reprint of a news story in the New York Times for January 25, 1959. I hope that Congress will soon have a full look at these developments.

The editorial and article follow:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 24, 1959]

DOUBLE STANDARD

A strong odor of fish emanates from the denial of a turbine contract to the English Electric Co. on national security grounds. English Electric's bid on machinery for the Greer's Ferry Dam in Arkansas was 19 percent below that of the Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp., which received the award. No matter how elaborately the rejection of the low bid is disguised, it still smells.

What smells the most is the prostitution of the country's trade policy for political reasons. On the eve of the election last fall, Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, announced that the White House had assured him that the contract would go to Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton, which has a plant in Eddystone just outside Philadelphia. This was confirmed the other day when the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Leo A. Hoegh, announced that nations' security interests outweighed other considerations.

Under the Buy American Act, a governmental contract must be awarded to a foreign firm when its bid is more than 6 percent below the lowest domestic bid, except when domestic producers are in a situation of serious unemployment. In that circumstance, a domestic bid up to 12 percent higher than a foreign bid may be accepted. Clearly the English Electric bid qualified under either criterion.

That is what makes particularly interesting the finding of Mr. Hoegh—that unless Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton received the contract certain domestic production capacity would be irretrievably lost. Inasmuch as the machine tools involved—"elephant" tools, they are called—cost in the neighborhood of $1 million each, it is hardly conceivable that they would be junked.

The incident arose at a time when the electrical manufacturing industry generally was pressing OCDM for a ban on turbine and generator imports for national security reasons. This request in itself was curious, for the market for heavy domestic electrical equipment has been extraordinarily stable, and the backlog of orders has expanded. The case of Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton was taken out of context, however, before an interdepartmental committee has passed upon the larger issue.

Now, unquestionably Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton has been hard hit by the recession. The company has received only a very limited amount of defense business. Senator SCOTT cannot be blamed for wanting to help his State. But if it was desirable to throw a crumb to this employer, as a practical matter this could have been done through a negotiated defense contract without disrupting the country's good relations with Britain.

Philosophically the worst part of the situation is that it makes a sham of American trade policy and belies the Administration's word. English Electric went through the same disappointing procedure several years ago over its bid on the Chief Joseph Dam. The same excuses have been found on bicycles and other goods. In this instance the company was put to the expense of justifying its case for several months after the political decision had been made.

The time has long since passed when it was realistic to expect this administration to stand up for principle in this area. But in deference to the country's reputation for fair play at least it might end the double standard. If the intention is to wriggle out of foreign trade commitments in the face of political pressures, it would be far less damaging and more honest to say so frankly in advance.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1959]

HOUSE MAY STUDY CURBS ON IMPORTS—TRADE PANEL PLANS INQUIRY AFTER LOW BRITISH BIDDER LOSES TURBINE CONTRACT

(By Richard E. Mooney)

WASHINGTON, January 24.—The House Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy may soon investigate the whole question of curbing imports on national grounds. The group will pay particular attention to this week's award of a turbine contract to a Philadelphia company despite a lower British bid.

Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana, and chairman of the subcommittee, will propose an inquiry when the group is formally established in the new Congress.

Congress asked the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization last year to report by February 1 on its experience which the national security clause of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

That clause—inserted in the law 5 years ago in place of a proposed protectionist amendment on oil imports—authorizes the President to apply restrictions whenever he finds that the importation of an item is a threat to national security.

NATIONAL SECURITY INVOKED

The national security issue was raised this week by the Army Corps of Engineers selection of the Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Co. of Philadelphia, to make two turbines for the Greer's Ferry Dam in Arkansas.

In competitive bidding last summer, Baldwin offered to do the job for $1,757,210. The English Electric Co., which has fought this issue before, bid $1,450,700 but failed to get the contract on national security grounds. The Mobilization Office found that if Baldwin did not get the contract it could mean the loss of heavy machine tools and labor skills needed in a war emergency.

The finding was made under the Buy American Act, but the national security issue here is closely related to the issue in the trade law. Under the Buy American Act, the low English electric bid had to be rejected for being less than a certain amount lower than Baldwin's or the mobilization office found national security threatened.

Because Baldwin was in an area of high unemployment, the English electric had to bid at least 12 percent less than Baldwin. It bid 17 percent less, thus ruling out the unemployment issue.

"It looks to me as if it's some political thing to bail out some industry that's in trouble," Mr. BOGGS said. Referring to Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, he said, "If Mr. SCOTT wants to testify we'll be glad to hear him."

On October 31, Senator SCOTT—then a Representative campaigning for the Senate—announced in Pittsburgh that he had information from the White House that Baldwin would get the contract. That was 6 weeks before the case was even referred to the mobilization office for a national security ruling, and almost 3 months before the ruling was made.

AGENCY DELAYED RULING

The agency tried to delay its Greer's Ferry ruling until it had decided a broader case it is pondering under the national security clause. In that case this country's electrical equipment industry is seeking restrictions on imports on a variety of items, including turbines.

After delays in the broader case dragged on—it was initiated last February—the agency felt forced to act on Greer's Ferry. The Agency insists that the Greer's Ferry opinion cannot be interpreted as an indication of how the broader case will turn out.

The essence of all national security cases, under either the reciprocal trade law or the Buy American Act, is whether a domestic industry that is deemed vital will wither or die if it does not get some business that is going to foreign suppliers.

The Eisenhower administration has consistently held that the non-Communist world's strength depend in part on liberalization of trade.

Thomas S. Gordon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentlemen from Illinois and my other colleagues who have paid tribute to our beloved former colleague, Thomas S. Gordon, of Illinois.

Our friend, Tom Gordon, was a man of great ability. He was sincere and forthright. His integrity was such that his word was his bond. We admired him for these sterling qualities, but more than that we loved Tom Gordon because of his great capacity and friendship.

Tom Gordon was a success. He was a success because he was a man of solid integrity. He was a success, because he was willing to give unselfishly of his fine talents to help make a better world.

His life was one of inspiration and encouragement, for it was in the fine American tradition. He was a poor boy who achieved much and gained honor for what he did, through hard work and a constant reaching out for more knowledge and a lifelong striving to find ways to serve those less favored than he was in abilities and personal assets.

During his recent illness my prayers for the restoration of his health and strength were with him, but God, in His infinite wisdom has ruled otherwise, and now I join with my colleagues in a fervent prayer for the restful repose of his beautiful soul.

Mrs. Kluczynski and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Gordon and the children in the loss of their loved one.

Resolution 9, Senate of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, under clause 4 of rule XXII of the House of Representatives I respectfully submit the attached resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Texas, expressing opposition to House Resolution 53, which would abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities and transfer jurisdiction to the House Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION 9

Whereas the Un-American Activities Committee of the United States House of Representatives was established some 20 years ago to expose and halt the infiltration of subversive elements in our country; and

Whereas, because of its great work in ferreting out the enemies of our American way of life, this great committee was given a permanent status by the U.S. Congress; and

Whereas the House Un-American Activities Committee has worked closely with J. Edgar Hoover and all National and State agencies in fighting communism and other un-American activities; and

Whereas the Honorable Martin Dies, of Texas, was the author of the legislation that set up this great committee, was its first chairman and worked untiringly and unceasingly for over 20 years to expose and stop each and any form of un-American activity; and

Whereas the House Un-American Activities Committee through Martin Dies, its members and staff, has rendered permanent and invaluable services to our Nation; and

Whereas there has been introduced in this session of Congress, House Resolution 53 to abolish this great House Committee on Un-American Activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas, That the senate voice its opposition to House Resolution 53, and urge each Member of the U.S. Congress from Texas to oppose its passage; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Speaker SAM RAYBURN and to each Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from Texas.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the senate on January 19, 1959.

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

Letter to Washington Publisher Criticizes Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's mail I received a carbon copy of a letter which Mr. William F. Monogan, Sr., of 15–C Council Street, Charleston, S.C., addressed to Mr. Philip L. Graham, publisher of the Washington Post, on January 23, 1959. Mr. Monogan, in his well-phrased letter, criticizes Mr. Graham and the editors of the Washington Post for their action in refusing to run the Putnam letter, which has received much publicity of late, as a paid advertisement in their newspaper. As you know, the letter, written by Mr. Carleton Putnam, of Washington, D.C., a prominent businessman of this city and presently a member of the board of directors of the Delta Air Lines, states the case for the South on segregation. The Washington Post, a few weeks ago, refused to run the letter as a news item or in the letters to the editor column.

This was their privilege, of course, but their action indicated an appalling and disturbing lack of objectivity on their part. However, a few days ago they refused to accept the letter as a paid advertisement and it was this development which caused Mr. Monogan to write Mr. Graham.

Because of the importance of this matter and the threat which the refusal of the Post to run the letter even as a paid advertisement presents to the constitutional guarantee of freedom of expression it is a privilege for me to insert Mr. Monogan's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD herewith. I urge that every Member of Congress give it his careful study.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star has stated that they will be pleased to run the Putnam letter as a paid advertisement and the letter is scheduled to appear in that paper this evening, January 26, 1959.

The letter follows:

JANUARY 23, 1959.

PHILIP L. GRAHAM,
Publisher, Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRAHAM: This letter is by way of an endorsement of the statements of the Honorable GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Jr., U.S. Representative from Alabama, regarding the failure of the Washington Post to print the Putnam letter as a paid advertisement.

Regardless of your personal views or that of your editors, you could and should have given this letter space on a paid basis. You had the right to state in an editorial that the views as expressed by Mr. Putnam were not those views held by the paper you publish, and you could even have ignored the letter in your news items as not being newsworthy, but as long as an advertisement is not immoral or indecent you should have accorded it full respect as a business item, fully and honestly paid for. It will be a pretty pass in this world when men such as you can ignore your readers and the business public.

Just to set the record straight so that you will not think I am a dyed-in-the-wool southern rebel, completely blind and prejudiced to all the rights of the Negro, may I say that I was born in Massachusetts, the seat of the abolitionist movement, and cut my eye teeth on many false tales about the southern brutality toward the Negro. Now being past 65 years of age and having lived in the South since I was 25 years of age, I have found that the Negro is treated much better here than he is in the North. Until your NAACP became so active we had very friendly relations with our local Negroes. I had many of them I could call friend. Can you say that? Also, do you personally have Negro neighbors or are you doing as you do merely to court business for your paper?

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM F. MONOGAN, Sr.

Shining On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD an article entitled "Shining On," written by Capt. P. A. Horton, a resident of the 24th Congressional District of California, which I represent.

I know Captain Horton to be a sincere patriot and a true American, and feel the article he has written will be of interest to the Congress.

The article follows:

SHINING ON

(By P. A. "Dick" Horton)

One of our national heroes who seemed to best represent the common man of America was Abraham Lincoln. His birth in a hand-hewn log house; his modest and frugal childhood; his guidance from a kind and understanding mother and his own determination to educate himself were character moulding factors that have always appealed to the American people. His life, more than any other American has given hope and inspiration to the youth of our land. That, regardless of social or economic station in life Americans all have equal opportunities to reach the highest position of trust in our land.

During Lincoln's day our people held a deep respect, loyalty, and gratitude for Washington and the knowledge that he was more responsible than any other person for the winning of our freedom, for the adoption of our Constitution and for the building of the first Nation on earth dedicated to the religious and political freedom of mankind.

Lincoln's reverence and respect for Washington are revealed in his statement, "To add brightness to the sun, or glory to the name of Washington, are alike impossible. Let none attempt it, and in its ageless, deathless splendor leave it, shinning on."

The Nation was at that time less than a century old. Many were still alive whose fathers had been companions of Washington. Our people were proud, very proud of the accomplishment of both of these two noble Americans. Loyalty, integrity, patriotism, and faith were the guiding words, spirit and conduct of Americans. The most odious word in the English language was treason.

OUR CHANGING WORLD

Following World War I, the world was aflame with the hatreds built up by centuries of turmoil, strife, plottings, trickery, and ambitions of European politicians. New tryants had arisen in Italy, Germany, and Russia. Each of these tryants were determined to conquer the world or destroy it. Propaganda or brain-washing became an advanced art.

The old Grecian method of appeasing the masses was used under the banner of socialism and the false promises of equality, position and goods. Hitler called his socialism, Nazism; Mussolini called his socialism, Fascism; Stalin called his socialism communism. While the approach differed slightly, the objective was the same in every instance, to enforce conformity under the iron rule of dictatorship under the penalty of death or even worse.

Serene in our belief it could not happen here, our people were aroused by diligent members of patriotic societies and particularly the American Legion. One piece of evidence after another was furnished by patriots who found plottings, schemings, and propaganda of the agents of these foreign groups. Most of this material was received with a shrug. Veterans, patriots, Americans were crucified for daring to suggest that there were those among us that worked for our downfall. Treason is an ugly word.

Patriotic members of the American Legion and other groups realized that unless we could soon obtain an official Government body with its cloak of authority to investigate and expose these traitors in our midst it would soon be too late to save our beloved America.

The national Americanism commissioner, Homer Challiaeux, and the united efforts of the members of the Legion in every State in the Union, and including the writer in the State of California, pleaded with our Congress individually and collectively until we had at last obtained the appointment of a committee in Congress, known as the Un-American Activities Committee. Enemies of this committee have attempted to destroy it ever since its organization. But year after year patriots have risen to its defense.

History will write of the noble work it has done and how it has exposed the traitors in our midst. How it exposed the machinations of the Remingtons, the Harry Dexter Whites, the Alger Hiss's, and those thousands of men and women of foreign ideals who have come to our shores determined to destroy all that those two noble men, Washington and Lincoln, had worked so diligently to obtain.

The need of this committee is greater now than any other time in our Nation's history. It is stated that the Civil Liberties Union and other organizations whose loyalty to our country has long been submerged by their sympathy for Communist causes intended to file a petition of 2 million names demanding a discontinuance of the Un-American Activities Committee.

We must all ask ourselves, are we less loyal than our fathers; is conformity and slavery a good substitute for liberty? Do we lack the energy to defend our country or protect it from the fanatics that would destroy it?

Our Congress is now in session; how deeply are you interested in your country's future? Write to your Congressmen. Write to your Senators and express your views on this matter.

When the shades of night have fallen and you are nestled in the bosom of your family secure in the rights guaranteed you under our Constitution, take time to pray to God that we may continue the America of Washington and Lincoln and that the light of liberty be kept shining on.

Fidel Castro and the New Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, whether Cuba's new climate of freedom lasts depends largely on Fidel Castro. Castro defends the necessity and fairness of the military trials of accused war criminals. Many important voices have been raised in the United States to protest the trials as drumhead court-martials and the executions as a blood bath. These procedures are far from ideal, but how significant are these shortcomings?

Many who loathed Batista are sickened by the thought that Fidel Castro, perhaps in spite of himself, may end up just another Latin American strong man ruling for an interval by terror and tribute. This is by no means impossible.

Because I had long admired Castro as a brave fighter against Batista and because I want to do whatever I can, however little, to help the new Cuba to be democratic, I accepted an invitation from Fidel Castro and the Cuban News Reporters Association last week to visit Havana. My distinguished colleague, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, was also visiting Cuba at this time and will make his own report to the House of Representatives. His deep interest in the Caribbean area is well known.

I was there Wednesday and Thursday. I attended the mammoth rally. I spoke with Fidel Castro, with President Urrutia, whom I had previously known and respected as a determined and democratic anti-Batista man, with cabinet ministers whose merits I had read about in a State Department dossier I read on my way down to Habana; with our top embassy officials; with 26th of July leaders, with seasoned Latin American newspaper reporters, and with ordinary Cubans both rich and poor.

Of course it is conceded that some people feel they can fly through the stratosphere over any country and immediately become qualified as experts in all aspects of the country's political, economic, and social affairs. I confess that my 2 days on Cuban soil, though very busy days, may not have qualified me fully to advise Castro, our State Department, and United States citizens generally on this delicate, crucial period in Cuban history.

Whatever my credentials, here is my report:

It has been my good fortune to visit Colombia, Venezuela, Honduras, and now Cuba within the past 2 years in each instance after the ousting of a dictator. My interest in hemispheric affairs no doubt exceeds my information. I am still learning and there still are several countries in this hemisphere for me to visit.

WARM ABRAZO OR FORMAL HANDSHAKE?

If Castro's Cuba is in fact an emerging democracy, then the newly adopted policy of our Goverment requires our rendering a warm abrazo. If this is not true, then a cool, formal handshake only should be proffered in our relationships. This follows Dr. Milton Eisenhower's recent proposals which the President has endorsed.

My good friend and respected mentor, the senior Senator from my State, is deeply respected in Cuba as elsewhere in the world for his unflinching and aggressive liberalism. Senator WAYNE MORSE has referred to the executions in Cuba as a "blood bath" and has stated that "the Castro regime shot many Batista people without a semblance of a fair trial," although he adds, "I haven't any doubt that a fair trial would have found them guilty."

Senator MORSE is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. He has always been an outspoken foe of dictators.

Another friend whose qualifications and motives are above question is John O'Rourke, distinguished editor of the Washington Daily News and immediate past president of the Inter-American Press Association. On January 23, 1959, he editorialized in his paper as follows:

> Few will deny that Bastista was an evil man—and good riddance. But Fidel Castro's determination to proceed with "rebel justice"—drumhead trials, mob juries, and arbitrary executions—cannot avoid stirring second thoughts among those who hoped the revolution signaled the end of tyranny.

Here also is a friendly voice which cannot be ignored.

Another hardworking and sincere friend of Latin America, Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, has urged his colleagues and the public to reserve judgment on the Cuban revolution until events more clearly show what has happened there. He believes it is too early to tell whether the revolution was a victory for freedom or simply a change in dictatorships.

WIDE EDITORIAL CRITICISM

Editorial comment in Oregon and throughout the Nation has been adversely critical for the most part. An article by S. L. A. Marshall, January 21, 1959, on the editorial page of the New York Herald-Tribune refers to "Cuba's new strong man harvesting vengeance in the name of the revolution" and to "swift, farcical trials and firing squads working as callously as if they were slaughtering beeves."

The Louisville Courier-Journal recently made an editorial comment that "the demand for vengeance is still short-circuiting the orderly processes of democratic justice."

My own hometown newspaper, the Eugene Register-Guard, approved Senator MORSE's words "blood bath" as accurate and states that the world wishes Castro well but that "he cannot keep the favor of decent people around the globe if he sanctions the same terrorist tactics that the world deplored in the deposed dictator, Batista."

What about these charges?

Are they true?

Are Fidel Castro and the new Cuba fast returning to the same old "strong man" situation?

No, I do not believe that there has been any blood bath in Cuba nor do I believe that Castro and his 26th of July movement are denying fair trial to accused war criminals, although I believe their procedures should be much improved.

My opinion is based on 2 years of observing the Cuban situation.

What is a blood bath?

I would say it was irresponsible, indiscriminate killing of persons. As for drumhead trials or lack of elementary due process, I suppose that means the accused not knowing exactly the charges against him, not being confronted with the witnesses against him, and not having a proper opportunity to defend himself.

Persons critical of the trials and executions are not, in my judgment, fully informed, often through no fault of their own. They do not realize the magnitude and high morality of the revolution.

Before Batista's frantic flight to Trujillo's haven for defeated dictators, I had met many Cuban revolutionaries in the United States and elsewhere in the hemisphere. Manuel Urrutia, the provisional President, Ernesto Betancourt, the Washington representative of the movement, Tony Varona, former president of the Cuban Senate, Dr. and Mrs. Santos Buch, and many others were well known to me.

NOT A RABBLE IN ARMS

These revolutionaries were devout, not fanatic; humble, not arrogant; angry, but not bloodthirsty. Last week I met many who served in the ranks. My impressions square with those of impartial observers who lived with them in the mountains. The Castro men are restrained, disciplined, and dedicated to their task. They are not a rabble in arms.

The rebels tortured no one. They shot no prisoners. Even after victory there is no report of looting or violence by them. Theirs is a crusade for an honest and terror-free Cuba, not a conquistadorial drive for wealth and power. Priests and protestant ministers were attached to the rebel forces. Batista's army had no chaplains at all.

In short, and I invite you to ask anyone who knows Castro and his men, the 26th of July movement is not made up of men who would indulge in or allow irresponsible, indiscriminate killing or, if you will, a blood bath.

Since Castro took over in Cuba there has been respect for civil liberties. The press has been entirely free. Many journalists have roamed all over the island with notebook, taperecorder, and movie camera. Whatever else the revolution may or may not be, it is newsworthy.

I have followed these reports closely and I have yet to see a specific allegation

that even one accused war criminal was denied elementary due process or that a particular one of them was unjustifiably executed. I asked veteran newspapermen in Habana if they knew of any such instance. They did not. They were convinced that the men executed deserved conviction and that they had had a fair opportunity to defend themselves at their trials.

During Batista's years of terror there was censorship. "Official" acts of cruelty and murder were kept out of print. Huge sums of money were spent by the Government to bribe both publishers and reporters. It is no wonder that many persons in the United States thought Castro's insistence on the continuance of these trials harsh and ominous.

"There is hardly a family which has not felt the brutality of the Batista police," a Life correspondent reported—Life, January 26, 1959. Time magazine for the same date reports:

Many of the Batista cops who faced the firing squads last week were proved killers whose twisted minds drew pleasure from pain. To extract secrets from captured rebels, they yanked out fingernails, carbonized hands and feet in red-hot vices. Castration was a major police weapon.

Bodies were left in sun-speckled streets as police warnings. One Santiago cop of the Batista regime, trying to break down a rebel woman, brought one of her brother's eyeballs on a platter to her cell. Other rebels were forced to watch their wives raped by cops. A U.S. resident of Santiago, who chanced upon Police Chief Rafael Salas Canizares shooting 4 young rebels dead in the street, reported:

"He was in a state of maniacal ecstasy—face flushed, eyes bright, breathing hard."

CASES CAREFULLY PREPARED

The cases against the accused war criminals were not hastily concocted on the say-so of some hysterical woman who might or might not be telling the truth. The movement had many spies. Almost every Cuban was against Batista.

Vehicle movements of Batista men were carefully checked. Pictures were taken. Batista's policy was to allow pictures of torture victims to become available widely. He wanted to terrorize the rebels and their friends.

Dossiers were prepared by the rebels. Many of Batista's murderers and torturers escaped when the Government fell. Those who did not are being tried by military courts under war criminal laws similar to those the Allies employed in Germany after World War II.

"If I allow just one man to be killed unjustly, I destroy my whole movement," Castro told me very seriously when I first talked with him. We were jammed together with his chiefs and with journalists from all over the hemisphere on the speakers' platform at the rally last Wednesday.

This was the rally where he asked those who supported the continuance of the trials to raise their hands. Of course I deplore such tactics and others he has used. Let me make it clear, however, that I believe in the good faith of Fidel Castro and the new Cuban Government. These men are not vengefully killing people, nor are they harvesting vengeance or giving swift, farcial trials, or allowing firing squads to work callously as if they were slaughtering beeves.

If wanton murder and inhuman torture are capital crimes, and they are in the rebel war criminal code, those executed deserved to die and were permitted to do so far less painfully than their victims.

We fought a war to make the world safe for democracy but the fact is that a Democrat in Latin America in the past several decades has lived a precarious life and often died a painful death. The recent overthrow of a number of dictators gives reason to hope that the hemisphere may become unsafe for tyrants and their menials.

CASTRO, NOT THE MOB, RULES

At his gigantic press conference last Wednesday, which included almost 400 newsmen and lasted 5 hours, Castro said that a public opinion poll showed that 93 percent of the Cubans wanted all the imprisoned accused war criminals executed. "But they will receive fair trials," he said. "I am not so radical as the people."

Senator MORSE's suggestion to Castro that he invite a United Nations observation team to Cuba to investigate the war crimes procedures is of course a good one. I strongly recommended its careful consideration when I spoke with the highest officials in the new government and with Castro. A committee from the Organization of American States or from the Inter-American Bar Association could serve the same purpose.

I personally do not need convincing as to the motives of Castro and the new government, but an outside group of ability and prestige could do much to reassure many Cubans and their apprehensive friends elsewhere. A minister of the new government assured me that these suggestions were being explored and considered.

When I sat next to Fidel Castro at dinner last Thursday evening I told him that I thought it was wrong to hold war crimes trials in the Sports Palace and to allow unrestrained press, radio, and TV coverage. A man's trial for his life, I said, should not be made a spectacle. The first—and I hope last—such trial was barely 2 hours old when I said this.

TOO LITTLE AND TOO MUCH

As I spoke I felt the irony of my words because a few days earlier I had been urging the new Cuban Government to invite newsmen and various opinion leaders to observe for themselves the war-crimes procedures. I cabled President Urrutia that the new Cuba had nothing to hide. Castro had a right to feel baffled about an outside world that apparently did not know its own mind.

I pointed out the middle way: A small courtroom, spectators and journalists limited in numbers; dignity yet no hint of star-chamber proceedings.

I predicted the outcry that did in fact ensue. The following day he radioed from Caracas to stop the trials in the Sports Palace and take away the TV and radio coverage.

I shall refrain from claiming credit for this move. Many others no doubt were saying the same thing to him. It does demonstrate, however, his ability to learn and his wish to do what is right.

Castro is not infallible. He is 32 years old and without broad experience. He makes mistakes. I think he is entitled to a few mistakes considering his accomplishments and his great responsibilities.

Operation Truth brought almost 400 newsmen from every country in the Hemisphere except the Dominican Republic. They came at the expense of the new Cuban Government and were in addition to the journalists already there. They rightly criticized the circus quality of the trial in the Sports Palace but they also agreed that the legal procedures used were fair.

"Better understanding abroad of the provisional government's aims was foreseen as a result of the public trials," said an Associated Press story, January 24, 1959, in the Washington Evening Star. Better understanding can come without boisterous public spectators, TV and radio coverage. Press coverage, on a pool basis if need be, is of course essential.

If Castro had been after power and money he could have much of both firmly in his grasp by now. Instead he set up the Provisional Government under President Manuel Urrutia. Neither Urrutia nor his Ministers are men who would act as puppets for Castro or anyone else. The State Department prepared a notebook with their biographies for me to read on my way down to Habana. I was impressed by the fine qualifications of these men.

AMATEURS IN POLITICS

Of course, like Castro himself, many of them are amateurs in politics. They will need help and forbearance until they learn how Cuba can be governed effectively in conditions of honesty and human freedom.

Castro now governs Cuba but the signs are that he will soon turn over his great powers to the new government. He drives himself relentlessly but manages to keep his sense of humor and humility. His remark about 200,000 gringos dying was a flippant sally in answer to a newsman's flippant query as to what would happen if the United States sent the Marines to Cuba. The U.S. press solemnly printed this as a bragging threat and called him a demagogue. He is wryly rueful about the incident, but I think certain reporters have more to answer for than Castro. I am certain that he is not anti-United States at all.

Fidel Castro can mean democracy at long last for Cuba or he can mean disillusionment and another strong man government. His present reign is characterized by confused disorganization but much good will and dedication in preparing for a democratic Cuba. One of his young bodyguards, a U.S. citizen from Brooklyn, told me, "Fidel uses C.S.T., Castro Standard Time—6 hours late."

He needs counsel from experienced Latin American democrats like Governor Muñoz-Marín of Puerto Rico, Costa Rican ex-President Jose (Pepe) Figueres, Colmbian President Alberto Lleras Camargo and Venezuelan President-elect Romulo Betancourt.

These men can tell him much he needs to know about relationships with Cuba's immediate neighbors, the United States, and Soviet Russia. Fidel Castro has it within his power to win a place in the history books as a great builder of Latin American democracy as well as a guerrilla leader of a highly popular revolution.

TIME TO SHAVE THE BEARDS

If this is to come about, he will have to seek solitude and to allow the provisional government to rule Cuba and to set the stage for free elections in 18 months. This will be hard to do, but it must be done.

I told him, with my usual tact and omniscience, that he and his followers should now shave or trim their beards and that they should discard their characteristic fatigue uniforms for the regular Cuban military uniforms. Nothing would mark more dramatically the passing of the combat phase to the civilian phase of the fight for a democratic Cuba.

Castro made a mistake in naming his brother Raul as his successor in case of death. Successor to what? This is the move of a strong man, not a man who wants an orderly lawful government to rule in Cuba. Upon reflection I think he will want to remove the mantle of succession from Raul's shoulders—and then destroy the mantle.

His demand that the United States return Cuban war criminals and the money they stole is another indication of his incomplete education in public affairs. It is up to Cuba to indict these men and to invoke reciprocal treaties providing for extradition.

The trials should be slowed down. Cuba is at peace, and civil judges, not military judges, should sit on the bench. More time should be allowed for the preparation of defense cases, although I have yet to hear or read of any protest on these grounds made by an accused war criminal or on his account. I urged these changes in policy in writing before I went to Cuba and personally when I was there to President Urrutia, Castro, and Secretary of Justice Angel Fernandez.

SENATOR MORSE'S FRIENDLY ATTITUDE

I agree entirely with Senator MORSE'S statement:

It is not too late. We want to be friends of the new leadership of Cuba. I believe the leaders are democratically motivated. When a wrong develops, steps should be taken to correct the wrong.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, speaking in the other body January 20, 1959, and commending Senator MORSE's stand for better judicial processes in the war criminal trials, said that Senator MORSE "has been principled in his comment and stand and, at the same time, considerate and tolerant."

Senator HUMPHREY continued:

I hope the people of Cuba realize that the remarks which have been made by Members of the Senate, and in particular by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs [Mr. MORSE], were made not in a spirit of hostility, bitterness, or antagonism, but rather in a spirit of understanding, friendship, advice, and kindly admonition. They were made in a sincere effort to maintain wholesome, respectful, and cordial relationships between the people of Cuba and the people of the United States.

Castro needs rest. He needs time to ruminate, time for contemplation and study, then consultation with others and travels in Cuba and elsewhere. If he does not withdraw, he will inevitably diminish, then destroy, the authority of the new government. This will make the transition period difficult and perhaps impossible.

Many Cubans will protest his withdrawal into the wings at this time. They will cry, with understandable concern, that Cuba needs him. More than Castro, Cuba needs a functioning government, honest and mindful of human freedoms. Castro has no desk, no organization for government, and no time or ability to decide the many and often complex issues brought to him. Most important of all, he has no business trying to do what the provisional government was established to do.

"NOT UNDER MAN"

As a thoughtful lawyer Castro can recall Coke's famous proposition, inscribed in Latin on the pediments of Langdell Hall at Harvard Law School, "Not under man, but under God and the law." This proposition, in addition to being right and just, is the only feasible way to run a government today and to maintain human freedoms.

As I said goodby to him Wednesday evening he said I had given him things to think about. My bet is that he will find time to think. Cuba's emerging democracy will be realized without still another bloody detour.

What about our Government's policies now?

In my opinion they are excellent, both in theory and practice. Last Wednesday morning in Habana I conferred with the Chargé d'Affaires, First Secretary Dan Braddock, and the top Embassy staff people for about an hour. Our various programs are all set to resume operations, awaiting only necessary organizational moves of the new Cuban Government. Our men there have the right attitude about extending the warm abrazo to this Government of honorable and democracy-minded men.

After two sorry experiences with amateurs, we are now sending a first-rate career Ambassador to Cuba, Philip Wilson Bonsal, a man who, according to the New York Times, January 22, 1959, "does not strive to conceal his strong preference for democratic governments."

In my opinion much credit must be accorded to William Wieland, the State Department's director for Cuba, Mexico, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic. He is highly competent and conscientious. Mr. Wieland was a United Press reporter at the time of the dictator Machado in Cuba. He was jailed for his activities against that tyrant. His sympathies are unchanged. However, he dealt honorably and correctly with all Cuban factions, winning the respect of all those who themselves were respectable.

ADDITIONAL AID IS AVAILABLE

We have further aid available for Cuba. All the new government has to do is ask. The request will receive careful and favorable consideration. This is also a bit ironic, for our official governmental policy is far more friendly to the new Cuba than are many vocal opinion leaders and many editorial writers.

Often the reverse has been true.

My explanation is that in this case the Government is better informed as to the character of the men who threw Batista out and as to the nature and extent of the crimes of the accused war criminals and as to the procedures by which these men are being tried.

Fidel Castro and his friends who seek to bring democracy to Cuba need and deserve our sympathy, our forbearance, and support. Our condonation for acts of cruelty is not solicited because, so far as I have read the record made by the free and active press, they are not guilty of any such acts.

Democracy is not won by vanquishing a tyrant. It is won by fostering human freedoms and basing the government on the results of free elections. Democracy is an equilibrium. Once attained, it has to be retained.

Expediency and indifference can destroy democracy. This is why the United States must concern itself with the development of democracies in other lands, and particularly with respect to a close neighbor like Cuba. To the extent we encourage democracy elsewhere we help maintain and strengthen our own standards of human freedom.

Faith without works will fade. The more faith in democracy we export, the more we have.

I hope that many of my colleagues and other fellow citizens will have occasion soon to visit Cuba and to see for themselves what a tremendously significant revolution has taken place.

This, then, is the report of a recent tourist about his 2-day trip to Cuba, a freed and freedom-loving Cuba, a pro-American Cuba, a peaceful and law-abiding Cuba, a Cuba that needs and deserves our help in its historic opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following items: A letter to the editor of the New York Times of January 25, 1959, from my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES]; an editorial from the Times for January 23; and a column by Drew Pearson as it appeared in the Miami Herald for January 23:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1959]

OUR CUBAN POLICY QUERIED—PRESENT ANTI-AMERICANISM DECLARED RESULT OF OUR SUPPORT OF BATISTA

(The writer of the following letter, formerly Governor of Connecticut, was U.S. Ambassador to India from 1951 to 1953. He is now a Member of Congress.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Millions of Americans have been shocked at the brutal manner in which the new Cuban Government has been disposing of many of its adversaries and the bitterness of its attacks on the United States.

Although our disappointment and resentment are understandable, it is important that we appreciate the extent to which our own policies have helped create the antagonism with which we must now contend.

According to the narrow view of many of our policymakers, any dictator who tells us he is against communism, regardless of how hated or corrupt he may be, deserves American support. This has led us time and again

to place American dollars and American prestige behind reactionary, rightwing governments which ruthlessly exploit their people and which sooner or later are doomed to fall.

SOURCE OF ARMS

For nearly 3 years the now victorious Cuban revolutionaries were hunted like animals through the mountains and jungles by Batista's armed forces. Many of the Government tanks, planes and small arms which brought death to their families were manufactured in American factories, paid for by American taxpayers and shipped to Cuba by the American Government.

Our Government cannot be held responsible for the brutal behavior of the fallen Cuban dictator. But it can and should be held responsible for the damaging effect which some of our policies and personnel have had in producing the anti-American resentments unleashed by the Cuban revolution.

Our last arms shipment was landed in Cuba scarcely 9 months ago. If the victorious leaders of the new government did not now resent the official support and comfort we gave the vanquished Batista, they would be less than human.

Although this experience has cost us heavily, not only in the respect of Cubans but in that of other non-Communist peoples in all parts of the world, there is scant evidence that we have taken it to heart. On the very day that Castro's revolutionary forces were entering Havana through cheering crowds we announced that a Marine Corps training mission would be sent to Haiti to bolster a government that since last summer has been forced by public opposition to rule by decree.

REVOLUTIONARY PRACTICES

All thoughtful observers regret General Castro's drumhead courts, mass shootings, and his demagogic raving about a "gringo" invasion. But our disappointment should not blind us to the implications of our own failure to live up to what the world expects of us.

The truths which our Declaration of Independence held to be self-evident are still providing the inspiration for non-Communist revolutionary leaders who are challenging dictators in Latin America, Africa and Asia.

Whether the Cuban revolution succeeds or fails in its effort to provide freedom and dignity for the Cuban people will depend largely on what Castro does with his victory in these first few weeks. But this and much more will also depend on our capacity to remember our own revolutionary origins and to bring our policies into focus in a world of revolutionary change.

CHESTER BOWLES.

WASHINGTON, *January 21, 1959.*

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1959]

HABANA AND WASHINGTON

A new and what must be a happier chapter in Cuban-American relations is about to begin. Our Ambassador, Philip W. Bonsal, is a splendid choice and Cuba's new Ambassador to Washington, Prof. Ernesto Dihigo, an educator and diplomat of the highest caliber, is certain to represent the revolutionary regime with distinction.

It is time to put aside arguments and recriminations on both sides. There is much constructive work to be done. Cuba has to get her sugar crop going, her roads and railways repaired, and her governmental structure reorganized all the way up from municipalities to the capital of Habana.

Cuba is being reborn. She has the greatest opportunity ever offered in her history to construct a new, free, honest, democratic government. The men now in control have fought, and many of their fellow Cubans suffered torture and death, just for that.

There is a major work of repair to be done in Cuban-American relations. The harsh fact has to be faced that the resentment and bitterness of Cubans against the State Department and American policies rose to a crescendo under the ambassadorships of Arthur Gardner and Earl E. T. Smith. Now a distinguished career diplomat with a splendid record is to take over. Philip Bonsal has every qualification that could be asked for the difficult and gratifying task he is taking on.

Dr. Dihigo, the Cuban Ambassador, is professor of Roman law at the University of Habana, the author of a number of books on international law, a jurist, a former Ambassador to the United Nations, and a former Minister of State. In addition he knows the United States and likes Americans. It is to be hoped that both Ambassadors will get to their posts as soon as possible.

[From the Miami Herald, Jan. 23, 1959]

EXECUTION OF TERRORISTS NECESSARY ACT BY CASTRO

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—Though not condoning kangaroo courts and quickie firing squads, Latin American diplomats returning from Cuba report that if Fidel Castro had not proceeded at once with the trial and execution of Batista's chief terrorists, he would not have been able to maintain order in the country.

Continuous censorship during the last year of Batista's reign kept newsmen living there from giving even an approximate picture of the slaughter that was taking place.

As a result, U.S. readers got no real idea how Batista's agents—military and police—operated against suspected civilian sympathizers of Castro's July 26th movement.

On one occasion, for instance, the bodies of 17 university students were thrown on the capital's streets from speeding police cars.

One of the first common graves located in Oriente Province on January 6 contained 183 half-burned corpses.

Impartial medical inspection showed that the majority had been pushed into the hole alive, gasoline poured over all, and the torch applied. There have been half a dozen other similar graves discovered.

As one observer put it: "Castro landed from Mexico on December 2, 1956, with 81 followers. Four months later, after the first skirmishes with Batista's forces, only 12 of that original group were still alive.

"If he hadn't had volunteers flocking to him from the farms and small towns all over Oriente, he would have been finished.

"Relatives of those volunteers—especially brothers and sisters—paid for that support by the thousands, with their lives, their sight, their fingers, or toes, or genital organs, their virginity.

"By the time Castro was ready to start his final big push, early in December, he had 8,000 men and women fighting for him, and one family in three all over Cuba was giving active aid to the rebels.

"There are only a little over 6 million people in Cuba. In every town and city, all the people—whether they were helping Castro or just keeping out of it—knew the names and faces of the Batistia men in their areas who were carrying out the torture, rape, and murder.

"In order to hold his army together and maintain its morale, Castro had to promise that every such agent who was positively identified would be tried by the revolutionary forces, as soon as they won, and shot if convicted.

"If he had reneged on that—failed to seize the terrorist, or held them indefinitely for civilian courts to be reorganized—there would have been a wave of mob lynchings all over Cuba, with at least 2,000 or 3,000 dead by now, instead of 200 or 300, without trial of any kind.

"It's a grim, bloody business, of course, but this was a real civil war, with practically every Cuban involved on one side or the other—not just another one of the palace guard coups that so often pass for revolutions in Latin America."

They're Stealing My Dollars, Robbing My Children, Grandchildren, and Great Grandchildren

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, my parents and my grandparents never had a dollar they did not earn through manual labor—except what the latter left to the former.

Whatever the grandparents, by practicing thrift, were able to save, they gave to my parents. My parents lived simply, frugally, and one of the principal objectives of their toil and their thrift was to give my sister and me a better start in life than they enjoyed.

The wife and I have been endeavoring, throughout our 59 years of married life, to follow along the same path. From time to time, out of my earnings as a lawyer and because of our frugal living, we were able to purchase a little life insurance, a few securities, put a little money in the bank, buy a home and a little additional real estate; but, for the last 20 years, the purchasing power of our investments—except those in real estate—has been shrinking. And the taxes on the real estate have become so high that it no longer pays its way, returns a profit. Nor has the actual purchasing value of real estate—except in development instances—increased.

The result is that, because—as the days roll by—the purchasing power of his resources is less than when he denied himself, attempted to securely invest any surplus, there is today little inducement for the average citizen to work, attempt to practice thrift, to accumulate property or a bank account.

The present situation is learnedly, factually set forth in an article printed in the January 1959 Reader's Digest, which was condensed from the Saturday Evening Post of November 22, 1958. It reads:

DO YOU WANT A 10-CENT DOLLAR?

The United States presents a curious spectacle today. Here is the richest country in the world either unwilling or unable to raise enough money in taxes to pay its current governmental costs. Our Federal deficit this year is expected to be about $12 billion—considerably more than the total expenditures of the Federal Government 20 years ago.

For the first time in our history, and just when we are trying to prove that our economy will outperform that of the Communist states, Congress has had to raise the total debt limit twice in the same year: first to $280 billion, then to $288 billion. Senator HARRY F. BYRD has estimated that in 5 years, at expected spending levels, the debt will reach $350 billion. This is a fantastic $6,250

for every American family—more than the average family's annual income. Are we headed downhill on the slippery road to disastrous inflation that so many countries have traveled before: the road that leads to a 25-cent, 10-cent, 1-cent dollar?

In 20 years the value of the dollar has been cut in half. Just since the end of World War II the dollar's purchasing power has been reduced by 23 cents. If fumbling governmental fiscal policy should encourage that deterioration to continue, in 25 or 30 years our present 48-cent dollar might be worth only a dime.

What can be done to get the Government back on an even fiscal keel?

1. Should we increase taxes?

Many citizens, convinced that they are overtaxed already, cry for tax reduction. The present tax burden, including all hidden and direct taxes, takes about one-third of the average person's income. He works 12½ hours of his 40-hour week just to pay for Government. On a daily basis, the tax burden is even more depressing. The Tax Foundation has shown that in an 8-hour day the average $4,500-a-year man must work for the Government 2 hours and 29 minutes. By contrast, to pay for food he works 1 hour and 39 minutes; for housing, 1 hour and 25 minutes; for clothing, 37 minutes.

A major difficulty is that our principal taxes cannot be raised to produce much more revenue without wrecking the economy. Our tax system is like an old rubber band, which has been stretched so long and so often that there is no stretch left in it. Since enactment of the income tax in 1913, our system has consisted fundamentally of: The income tax, which now produces 79 percent of total Federal revenue; a series of special excise taxes, producing 6 percent of total revenue; taxes at very high rates on sales of liquor and tobacco, producing 7 percent; and taxes on transfers of property by gift during life, or at death, producing 2 percent.

To raise an additional $12 billion (the amount of this year's deficit) from the present Federal income tax would require the confiscation of everyone's taxable income in excess of $4,000, or an increase in the corporate rate from the present 52 percent to 82 percent. The result of income taxes of that magnitude would be economic chaos. They would destroy all stimulus to risk-taking, new investment and business expansion—the most potent forces in the economic development of our country.

A few hundred million dollars could be raised by increasing gift and estate taxes. Since the taxes on liquor and tobacco already approximately equal the cost of the product, they cannot be used effectively to produce much more revenue. The rates of our existing special excises could be raised a little, but we have found that some excises, such as the taxes on freight and passenger transportation, so discourage activities we want to foster that Congress has had to repeal them. The latest revision of the excise tax laws resulted in an estimated loss, not a gain, in revenue.

So, raising taxes is not a very acceptable solution.

2. Can we solve the problems by reducing governmental expenditures? Just what expenditures can be cut?

In the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the Federal Government will spend almost $80 billion. Although defense spending, estimated at $46.8 billion, is obviously the largest part of the budget, it is by no means responsible for the recent big increases. In the last 5 years nondefense spending has jumped by a startling $12½ billion—from $20 billion to more than $32 billion. The biggest increase in this area has been in the farm programs, which have risen $3¾ billion and now amount to $6½ billion per year. Federal spending on housing and commerce has gone up $3 billion; labor and welfare expenditures, up nearly $2 billion; veterans' services and benefits, up $900 million.

Now these civil expenditures do not represent pure congressional wastefulness. When, for example, Congress increased the social security payments (and the taxes to pay for them), Congressmen had an eye on the forthcoming elections: they calculated that the number of citizens who wanted to see larger payments was greater than the number who would resent the increased taxes. We are a big Nation of enormous wealth; why shouldn't we live the good life? Let's have guns and rockets, but let's have butter, too—lots of it.

And let's have lots of roads. The cost of the Federal highway program, not now included in the budget, jumped from $586 million in fiscal 1954 to an estimated $2½ billion this year. Last year Congress suspended the pay-as-we-go feature of this program, ensuring even greater costs in the future. We all want good roads; but do we have to have them so quickly that we must pile up more debt to get them?

Furthermore, is it essential that we have some 2,250,000 civilians on the Federal payroll at a monthly cost of about $1 billion? Is it necessary to pay Federal employees an average of $90 a week while the average in private industry is $78? This kind of spending has increased the cost of Federal payrolls in the past 10 years from $162 per American family per year to $255 per family. Isn't it time for us to distinguish essential expenditures from desirable?

Under present world conditions, it is hard to justify a reduction in military spending. But we might be able to hold national security costs at the present level. This would require that money for new programs and weapons should come from cutbacks in expenditures for other military projects. A sizable sum was saved this way in the present budget.

It is primarily in the area of nondefense spending that Congress might make real cuts. There is nothing inevitable about the $6½ billion to be spent for agriculture this year, nor the nearly $4 billion for housing and commerce. The farm price-support program (changed for the better in 1958) has piled up unnecessary surpluses at the taxpayers' expense. There are now in storage, government-owned, for every American family, 24 bushels of corn, 19 bushels of wheat, 4¼ pounds of dried milk, 3½ pounds of cheese and 2¼ pounds of butter.

This is just not reasonable. Nor is it reasonable that more than half the patients in veterans' hospitals are being treated for nonservice-connected disabilities. Nor is it reasonable that the Federal Government should continue to add to the 100-odd Federal-aid programs to States that can better finance and administer their needs locally.

The President in his budget for the current year made a series of recommendations which held hope for lower expenditures. Mainly, his proposals were of three types: reduction in some of the Federal-aid programs, largely by the transfer of entire programs to the States; limitations on the extent of Federal loans and loan guarantees; curtailment of direct-spending programs.

In general, Congress ignored these proposals. In some instances it moved in the direction of greater Federal participation in local projects. Thus, instead of eliminating a program of Federal aid for local sewer systems—certainly a subject of local rather than national concern—Congress voted to enlarge it.

By accepting the President's proposals for cutbacks, and adding some of its own, an economically minded Congress could bring expenditures down to $70 billion. That is probably a spending minimum. It is not impossible to attain. In fact, presputnik, it was the administration's target.

3. Do we really want to continue as we have been doing: borrowing what is needed and passing along the cost of today's government to our children to pay tomorrow with, say, a 10-cent dollar?

The Federal Government has paid much of its way by borrowing ever since 1931. In 7 of the past 11 years we have had to pay for a budget deficit by borrowing. Have we found this to be a satisfactory way of life? We have not.

When the Government does not collect enough taxes to pay current expenses, it issues governmental promises-to-pay to cover the difference. Such promises may be called savings bonds or certificates of indebtedness or long-term bonds. Whatever the name, we accept them at their face value so long as we believe that the Government will live up to its promises.

Since the Treasury has issued so many, however, and since Congress is obviously reluctant to levy enough taxes to pay currently for the steadily increasing governmental costs, the value of these obligations has gradually declined. This is what is behind the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar over the past 25 years.

The resulting inflation has rightly been called the cruelest tax of all. Just because of taxes and inflation the person who earned $5,000 in 1946 would have to earn $7,343 today—nearly 50 percent more—simply to be as well off as he was before. It is plain to see what happens to the retired man, the widow on a fixed income, the insurance policy or annuity payable in a fixed number of dollars.

The best way to weaken America as a nation is to convince our citizens that our governmental promise to pay, our currency, has lost its integrity. There would not be much use in saving if we suspect that the dollars which we put aside with such difficulty won't be worth a dime in purchasing power at the time we need them—to raise a family, to send our children to school, to pay our own way when we retire.

Hence, it looks as if the Government had better take the other fork of the road, uphill and stony as it may be: reduce expenditures, and levy such taxes as are needed to pay for current costs.

An immediate objective might be a $75 billion budget for the next fiscal year. This $5 billion reduction of the present budget would require the utmost effort of both the President and Congress. It would also require strong support from the individual citizen, who might keep in mind that every reduction of $1 billion in Federal spending is the equivalent of a $20 bill in the pocket of the average family.

Since Federal, State, and local taxes are all so high, Congress will need to make an extraordinary endeavor, in levying any further taxes, to damage our economy as little as possible. It is vital to permit and if possible to encourage our economy to grow. If private enterprise flourishes in this country, if plants are steadily renewed and improved through investment, "plowing in," of profits, the U.S. Treasury, now more heavily interested in corporate profits than all private stockholders put together, will reap increasing revenues, even though tax rates remain constant.

Finally, Congress must face the tremendous task of looking deeply into the problems of tax structure and fiscal policy. The most promising solution might be the creation of a Commission on Federal Tax and Fiscal Policy, organized along the lines of the Hoover Commission, whose recommendations have led to savings of billions of dollars through improved efficiency and reorganization of the executive branch. Proposals to set up such a special nonpartisan group of the highest distinction have already been made in Congress. They deserve careful attention.

A nation such as ours cannot concede that its fiscal problems are insoluble. We must

apply our best brains to the project and stop trying to patch up an inadequate, archaic system. Surely American intelligence can be mustered to provide the Government with a sound fiscal system, to match a sound economy and a sound defense organization.

Willford I. King, long an active opponent of overspending, points out that at the end of 1957 there was $725.8 billion of public and private debt in the United States. Since then, the Federal debt has grown by some $8 billion. Probably, therefore, the total net debt at the end of 1958 was $734 billion, plus paper currency and demand deposits held by Americans amounting to $230 billion. If inflation reduces the value of the dollar by three-fourths, American creditors—as a rule the older and thriftier of our citizens—may be fleeced out of some $723 billion.

The real cause of our present trouble is not the inability of the people to pay any reasonable justifiable tax, but the insistent demand of pressure groups that the Government do for them the things they might well do for themselves, and that it adopt and follow a paternalistic policy under which the Federal Government attempts to treat the healthy, strong individual, able to care for himself, like a nursing baby.

The net result is that, as individuals and as a Nation, we are becoming soft, dependent, too shameless to take care of ourselves, bear our just burden.

We are becoming a bunch of softies, as far from the courageous, independent, industrious, thrifty individuals—as were our forefathers—yes; even our own parents—as it is possible for us to be.

About the only decoration we merit is one for shameless lack of willingness to carry our every day burdens. To our everlasting shame it can be said that those burdens we are passing on to our descendants.

Listening, one is forced to the conclusion that everyone desires that the Government live within its income. Watching, one realizes that the people back home, as well as the Members of Congress and of the State legislatures, are willing to drift along, continually spending more than is received.

If you are interested in the viewpoint of Roswell Magill ask for up to 10 free copies of this statement. Send one copy to each of your Senators and to your Congressmen expressing your viewpoint regarding the Roswell Magill article.

Every Peter, robbing some Paul, through appropriations and taxation, ignores the fact that his turn to be robbed is at hand.

Poison in Your Water—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of Friday, January 16, 1959, had an article "Waterway Woes: The Pollution Problem Grows, Bringing Public Clamor for Stiffer Laws." That article by Mr. Cal Brumley told about some of the problems created by pollution, characterized by these words from Mr. Gordon McCallum, Chief of the U.S. Water Pollution Control Division of the U.S. Public Health Service: "Pollution is costing us at least a billion dollars a year."

I hope this article and the others I intend to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will serve as a basis for understanding the need for Federal action and for full Federal water pollution control and construction grant appropriations in the amount of $50 million rather than $20 million, as included in the administration's budget:

WATERWAY WOES: THE POLLUTION PROBLEM GROWS, BRINGING PUBLIC CLAMOR FOR STIFFER LAWS—INDUSTRY LIFTS SPENDING ON WASTE CONTROL, BUT SOME TOWNS REJECT NEW PLANTS—TOP TROUBLE SPOT, THE SOUTH

(By Cal Brumley)

DEMOPOLIS, ALA.—When Gulf States Paper Corp. opened its big new $25 million pulp mill here on the banks of the Tombigbee River a little more than a year ago, the people of west central Alabama couldn't say enough nice things about the company.

Public officials exponded lengthily on the significance of the new plant: What it would mean to the community in added payrolls, growing bank deposits and new jobs.

Today, this warm regard has cooled. Not long ago, a valve stuck at the mill. Within 4 hours, 5 million gallons of blackish sodium lignite and other wastes poured unchecked into the Tombigbee. For 13 miles downriver, fish—bass, bream, buffalo, spoonbill, drum and catfish—died almost instantly. In all, more than 200,000 pounds of fish perished.

A COSTLY BLOW

Gulf States' president, youthful-looking, dark-haired Jack Warner, winces as he recalls the incident. "People get pretty emotional when fish are killed," he says. What ensued after the mishap not only was a mighty embarrassing public relations problem for the company but a financial blow as well. State water officials moved in immediately and closed down the plant for a week—costing $235,000 in lost production. Then the State wouldn't let the mill reopen until it promised to install new precautionary equipment—another $200,000 item. These extra expenses come on top of $250,000 the company spent originally on waste control equipment, which up to the accident had cut waste flow to 40 percent of normal for a mill of this size.

The Tombigbee incident points up growing pollution problems along the Nation's waterways—and the mounting public clamor for stiffer antipollution laws. Fearful communities, in some cases, are beginning to cold-shoulder prospective new factories because of the amount of wastes they discharge. Private companies, in turn, are installing millions of dollars of waste-control equipment in an effort to ward off public criticism.

"Our people want to clip the coupons of industrialization during the week, but when they go fishing or boating on Saturday or Sunday, they want their rivers clean," says William Weir of Georgia's Department of Public Health.

A BILLION-DOLLAR LOSS

These two desires aren't always compatible. Gordon McCallum, Chief of the Water Pollution Control Division of the U.S. Public Health Service, estimates: "Pollution is costing us at least a billion dollars a year." Untreated industrial wastes now pouring daily into streams are equal to the sewage produced by 110 million people, double the 1920 rate. And although many municipal sewage systems have installed elaborate waste-treatment equipment, such equipment has not kept pace with pollution growth. Those systems which still do not treat wastes now serve areas with a total population of 55 million, an increase of 37 percent over the 1920 total.

It's not just a question of fish welfare, either. "Along many miles of river frontage in Tennesse it is impossible for industries to locate because of the amount of pollution entering these streams from the headwaters in other States," says Harold V. Miller, executive director of the Tennesse State Planning Commission. He ticks off four textile firms, a paper plant and a chemical company which turned down eastern Tennessee sites because of a lack of the fresh, pure water needed in their operations.

Few areas of the country are completely free of the problem. Regional conferences in the last 2 years have been called concerning pollution in the Big Blue River in Nebraska and Kansas; the Potomac at Washington, D.C.; the Lower Columbia at Portland, Oreg., and the Bear River in Idaho and Utah. The Missouri is plagued with pollution at St. Joseph, Mo., at Omaha, Nebr., and Council Bluffs and Sioux City in Iowa.

These regional meetings were held under the rules of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act passed in 1956, which gives the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the authority to force waste-control action if voluntary efforts fail.

TROUBLE AT CORNEY CREEK

What might be termed "the trouble at Corney Creek" has given the Department its worst moments so far. The stream, running from Arkansas into Louisiana has served as a dump for oil-well wastes. Corney Creek, in turn, carries impurities into the much larger Ouachita River, which serves as a source of drinking water for fairly sizable Louisiana towns. It took the threat of Federal prosecution to get some of the oil-well operators to clean up their operations, and even today, mayors of some of the Ouachita River cities aren't entirely satisfied with its purity.

Concern about pollution has been growing faster in the South than in other parts of the United States. For one thing, the region's industrial growth in the past 10 years has outpaced the rest of the Nation. Also, one of its key industries—paper production—is subject to more than its share of waste-control problems.

"Most of the early paper mills in the South located near the seacoast so pollutants could be dumped into large bodies of water. Now, new mills have to go inland and their pollution problems are much greater," comments an official of St. Regis Paper Co. Moreover, southern paper output has nearly doubled in the last 5 years.

Other industries which have been accused of fouling the streams of the South are the phosphate mines and citrus-processing plants of Florida, the chicken-processing plants in northwestern Georgia, the coal mines of Alabama, and textile mills and chemical plants throughout Dixie.

According to the Izaac Walton League, a national conservation group, severe problems also exist in the North in New York and Wisconsin, where dairy processors have dumped wastes into streams, and in the West and Southwest, where sugar-beet factories have been offenders. The Government, itself, has not been completely blameless in the handling of radioactive wastes at atomic plants, according to the league. Even steel companies and other industries which add nothing to water but use it solely for cooling cause trouble.

"Every industry which uses water from a stream and returns any portion of that water changes the character of the stream. For example, water that is heated is altered, usually

becoming unfit for fish life," says Frank Gregg, executive director of the league.

THE BRUSHOFF

Fear of pollution has caused some communities to have second thoughts about greater industrialization. Frontier Refining Co., an oil firm with a yen to build a new refinery on Florida's east coast, has tried unsuccessfully for 5 years to find a welcome at a spot the company considers suitable. It got a not-so-polite "no thanks" from Fort Lauderdale, Fort Pierce, and West Palm Beach.

Currently, Frontier hopes to build on Merritt Island, near the town of Cocoa on Cape Canaveral where it has acquired a 160-acre tract. But even there, in the heart of missileland, the company is meeting opposition. Bird and fish lovers, property owners and conservationists have organized "the Committee Opposing an Oil Refinery on Merritt Island," with Gary Bennett, mayor of Cocoa, whose business is fish bait and fishing tackle, as chairman.

"The fishing industry on our marine estuaries (Banana River and Indian River) is worth $7 million a year to Brevard County," says Mr. Bennett. "I'm very jealous of what we have and I don't want to see an objectionable industry, such as a refinery, pollute, contaminate, and destroy it."

M. H. Robineau, Frontier's president, says the company is embarking on a campaign to convince Floridians that refinery wastes are not harmful. In fact, he says, Frontier dumped wastes into oyster beds as an experiment; not a single one of the sensitive bivalves suffered any ill effects.

More trouble for industry looms. Sportsmen in Florida, detecting what they consider an overlarge decline in fishermen's luck recently, are planning to ask the legislature for a full-scale investigation. "We want to find out how many spawing beds are disrupted, how many shell fish are poisoned, and how many fish are killed by pollution," says Dr. H. R. Wilber, president of the Florida Wildlife Federation, a highly vocal group with some 20,000 members.

Georgia passed new laws last year and Alabama has begun to enforce its existing antipollution laws for the first time. North Carolina is surveying pollution in all its river basins, and dozens of plants located in the eastern part of the State already have been ordered to clean up wastes which flow downriver into Tennessee.

DAM JUMPING GULLY CREEK

Private companies, of course, are going to enormous expense in an effort to solve the problem on their own. National Container Corp., a division of Owens-Illinois Glass Co., has spent $450,000 damming up Jumping Gully Creek into a series of ponds for its paper mill at Valdosta, Ga. These ponds, which cover nearly 450 acres, hold mill waste (or effluent, the more elegant name preferred by engineers) for up to 5 months before allowing it to trickle into the Withlacooche River.

Champion Paper & Fibre Co., too, is getting ready to spend several million dollars to wrestle with the waste now pouring out of its mill in Canton, N.C. The goal: To purge the Pigeon River of pollution. "We feel a moral obligation to do the job," says a Champion official.

The U.S. Public Health Service estimates that 5,700 new waste control systems are needed urgently to treat industrial plant outpourings throughout the country. The price tag: About $2 billion. Cities, the Government agency adds, need to spend about the same amount improving their sewerage systems.

Contributing to the pressure on many companies to clean up is the loud hollering of downriver communities. "We have to deal with fanatical fishermen, pompous politicians, water skiers, boatmen, health officials and nature lovers who don't want the smell or looks of their favorite stream changed," says the harassed manager of one southern pulp mill.

MISPLACED BLAME

Sometimes a company gets blamed publicly when it isn't at fault at all. In the uproar over a fish kill on the Altamaha River in Georgia, Rayonier, Inc., wound up with a consent injunction providing that Rayonier will shut down its mill at Doctortown if its waste kills any more fish. Later, it was established that the fish really were killed by an unknown source upstream from the mill's effluent discharge pipe.

Nevertheless, a Rayonier spokesman observes, "We have this injunction hanging over our heads."

(Pollutants seldom actually poison the water. Usually their decay uses up the stream's dissolved oxygen, causing fish and other aquatic life to suffocate.)

Rayonier has another public relations problem at its Doctortown mill. Two suits were brought against the company because of a grayish, slimey river growth—with the tongue-twisting name of "sphaerotilus"—which seems to thrive on Rayonier mill waste. The slime floats downriver, fouling the nets of shad fishermen and frightening away the prized roe fish.

Although both suits were dropped when the company showed good faith trying to control the slime, Rayonier isn't out of the woods yet. "We've spent $45,000, but so far we still don't have the answer," says a company spokesman.

INTERSTATE COMPACTS

Rivers that flow through several States pose difficult control problems. Currently seven States—Tennessee, North Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama, Virginia, Kentucky, and Georgia—are working to establish an interstate regulatory commission.

The model for such a body is the Ohio River Valley Sanitation Commission which was organized about 10 years ago with the backing of industry as well as public health and conservation officials. In this year's annual report, the commission claims that 8,095,000 people, or 79 percent of the population of the valley, are now served by sewage treatment plants either operating or under construction. Ten years ago less than 1 percent had such service. Also, 70 percent of the 1,459 industries discharging wastes directly into streams in the Ohio Valley are complying with minimum requirements established by the agency, compared with only 30 percent a decade ago.

However, the river that has made the most progress, according to conservationists, is the Schuylkill, which flows through the heart of downtown Philadelphia.

"It was nothing but a flowing sewer a few years ago, but today residents can swim in it or fish for bass," a leading conservationist says.

Inaugural Address of Hon. Ernest F. Hollings, Governor of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a high privilege and great honor to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the inaugural address of His Excellency Ernest F. Hollings, Governor of South Carolina, delivered at Columbia on January 20, 1959:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE ERNEST F. HOLLINGS AS GOVERNOR OF SOUTH CAROLINA, COLUMBIA, JANUARY 20, 1959

This, the most honored day of my life, I want to speak to you not of parties or politics, but of governments and men. I want to speak of the future.

I have just sworn before God and before you, my people, that I will preserve and defend the constitution of South Carolina and the Constitution of the United States. The constitution of the State has been amended so many times that it is difficult to recognize the original—but it has been amended legally. The Constitution of the United States has been amended illegally by the Supreme Court and today we struggle to recognize the original. This "noblest document ever penned" has been defiled by careless men of less nobility. Our United States Constitution, like all great things, finds its greatest strength in its permanency—and when that permanency is casually handled, its greatest strength suffers, and weakens, and perishes.

I feel particularly solemn this day as I take the highest office in our State, which is one of the few remaining citadels of belief in the traditions and principles upon which our Nation was founded. With clear conscience, and clear convictions, I reaffirm to the world that we are a government of laws and not of whim—that our deep sense of civic responsibility demands a respect for the law—that if the slightest law is to be respected, then the greatest law is to be hallowed. We recognize that the United States Constitution is an inspired document and a great gift and hope to mankind—but when the form and letter and spirit of that Constitution is ignored, a gestation period of chaos erupts into a miscarriage of conscience and propriety. We find a U.S. Attorney General pledging economic blackmail against our Southland. We see both political parties competing to hurl the greatest insult and defamation at our door. And worse, we find a confused and petulant Chief Executive assuming command of a marching army, this time not against Berlin, but against Little Rock. This same commander admonishes the southern governors that in taking the oath to support the United States Constitution, they swear allegiance to the Supreme Court and the Court's version of "the law of the land." Or to be specific, he and others insist that the governors are sworn to integrate the public schools.

The law of the land, my friends, is the same today as it was the day this Nation was founded in 1787—that is the Constitution of the United States. As Mr. Charles Warren, eminent historian of the Supreme Court, stated: "However the Court may interpret the provisions of the Constitution, it is still the Constitution which is the law and not the decision of the Court."

The men who assembled and drafted our Constitution and those who have subsequently lawfully amended it made it apparent and definite that the individual, the State, and the Nation, were all to have rights. As a matter of course the rights must be different in scope since the needs are different in scope. Note carefully, I have emphasized "in scope"—they are not different in degree, for the National Government can no more take away a man's life or property without due process of law than can that same individual refuse to serve in our Armed Forces. Equally true is this with regard to the powers of a sovereign State over the individual. While some States allow 18-year-olds to vote, other States forbid it, and the individual citizen of 18 in a forbidding State is not denied equal protection of the laws because he can't vote.

Paramount among these powers reserved to the States, therefore, is that of regulating elections, and equally paramount is the power of providing and regulating public

education. Both of these powers remained undisturbed by the 14th amendment. The right to vote without regard to race was not guaranteed until 2 years later by the 15th amendment. It is clear both by law and intent that the 14th amendment did not disturb the fixed boundary between the right of the individual and the power of the State in providing public education. Both the Congress that framed the amendment and the States that ratified it continued to operate segregated schools. When the doctrine of "separate but equal" was sanctioned by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1896, neither Congress nor any court or State protested. On the contrary, everyone understood this doctrine as the basis upon which the States could conduct public education. The correctness of this understanding was confirmed repeatedly by the highest State and Federal courts in an unbroken line of decisions. The boundary line remained fixed. There is today no law and no provision of the Constitution requiring racially integrated schools. Until the Constitution is lawfully amended and the boundary line changed, the South stands on this boundary and on this principle. Until the Constitution is lawfully amended, my refusal to integrate our people during the next 4 years will not conflict with the oath just taken.

In fact, the contrary is true. I cannot conscientiously take this oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States and not object to the Supreme Court usurping the amendatory power that constitutionally is vested in three-fourths of the States. To do so would give us a government of men and not of laws. This danger was foreseen by our forefather in the founding days of this republic, for it was George Washington who said in his Farewell Address:

"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates, but let there be no change by usurpation; for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

Nevertheless, the danger grows and members of the Court claim for it the function, and even the duty, of amending the Constitution at will. In his dissenting opinion in *Green* v. *United States* in March 1958, Justice Hugo Black, with the concurrence of Chief Justice Earl Warren and Justice William O. Douglas, said this:

"Indeed, the Court has a special responsibility where questions of constitutional law are involved to review its decisions from time to time and where compelling reasons present themselves to refuse to follow erroneous precedents; otherwise its mistakes in interpreting the Constitution are extremely difficult to alleviate and needlessly so."

In other words, when these Justices disagree with earlier and longstanding interpretations of the Constitution, such interpretations are mistakes and should be corrected by the Court, because the amending process is extremely difficult, and needlessly so when the Justices can so easily take the place of the constitutional three-fourths of the States.

The Supreme Court of our land was established to decide litigation in the light of past decisions and not in spite of past decisions. It is not the Court's function to lay down the law of the land by judicial fiat. It is the Congress under the American system that makes law. Flagrantly, baldly usurping the amendatory power of three-fourths of the States, the Justices of the Supreme Court apparently take their gospel from Richard III, whom Shakespeare caused to say:

"Strong arms shall be our conscience, swords our law.
March on, join together to pell mell,
If not to Heaven, then hand in hand to Hell."

It is distressing that the Justices are trying to force us, but it is even more distressing that they, like Richard, apparently don't care.

I shall not dwell on the subject of segregation as it affects race relations. We all have heard too much on this subject and there is too much to be done in the days ahead for us to waste our energies and arouse our tempers over a subject upon which we in South Carolina are in essential agreement. We are fortunate in having a well nigh boundless store of good will and understanding among all races and beliefs in South Carolina. In South Carolina, in our schools, peace patrols the school corridors; unlike New York, we do not need armed guards. The Negroes of our State feel as all of us feel, that schools are intended for education. They feel that their Governor and general assembly are doing everything possible to provide them the best educational program and the best opportunity to succeed on an individual basis. Let alone, we shall continue to do this. As a practical matter, this can only be done in the segregated pattern, and for those who would by integration destroy the education, culture, opportunity, and friendship of both races, I simply state that our position of determined resistance remains unchanged.

The segregation stand of the South is symbolic of the stand of our forefathers against the oppression of government when this great Republic was founded. This Nation was founded on a desire to avoid government. The unconditional surrender making possible the Constitution, the Supreme Court, and the Government in Washington, was obtained by an army of the Colonies or States, and are not of a national government. The difficulty of establishing and maintaining such an army gave the basis for the primary need and function of our Federal Government—that of national defense. While today this fiscally remains the primary function, all powers for all purposes have been preemptorily assumed so that rather than the Government defending the citizen, the citizen feels a need for being defended from the Government.

While everyone cites segregation as a point of argument with respect to race relations, I cite it as a challenge which faces South Carolina—and all of the other 48 States. South Carolina and the South stand in the critical role of fighting against a tide which would sweep us into national mediocrity, crush the States and their citizens into national molds, stifle the views and rights of minorities, and destroy the original constitutional balance of power among the individual States and the Federal Government.

This is a continuing threat, and it runs deeper than most persons realize. Americans who live in other parts of the country and who are not presently faced, as we are in the South with an obvious and alarming onslaught against our rights, have no understanding of the fundamental at stake. The federal system of checks and balances, America's unique contribution to the science of government, is at stake.

South Carolina and the South are standing firm against this national attempt to wipe out the boundaries which were designed to preserve this system. Because we do so, we are labeled reactionaries by those so-called liberals who seek to force their own idea of the centralized state upon all of the United States. It must be admitted that we do react against their scheme to subvert the basis of American government as we have known it through the years. We also admit that we are conservative, in the sense that we seek to conserve those principles of government, and of free enterprise, which have been tried and proved, and which have made this Nation what it is today. We in South Carolina see no conflict between such conservatism and progress; indeed, we think they go hand in hand toward bringing us a better life, and it is our mission to put forward a dynamic conservatism as an asset, not a liability.

When we speak of such conservatism and the free-enterprise system, we speak of the right to work and make a profit as compared to the power of the Government to interfere and to take the profit. The only reason free people on this earth work is to make a profit from their labor. If they work for other people, their reward is called a wage or salary. If they work for themselves, it is called a profit. If they work only for an oppressive central government, it is called communism. Without the hope of a wage or profit no person would ever work or no business would ever be established, except as slave or regimented labor. Without the realization of a profit no business could continue to live, and without an adequate profit no business would be able to grow. The opportunity to profit, to live, and to grow is fundamental to the American system of free enterprise. When the Federal Government through its taxing power and other policies kills this incentive to work and profit, to live and grow, then the boundary of the purpose for government as we know it is exceeded by the power of government and we are lost. History is well marked by civilizations which have collapsed following the loss of that basic strength inherent in the initiative of the individual citizen.

We make no apologies for this conservatism; indeed we proclaim it as evidence that we in South Carolina have resisted—and will continue to resist—the dictation of a power-happy Federal Government. Both our State and our people have maintained their self-respect and are pledged to continue fighting to retain their self-government. We are susceptible neither to threats of Federal pressure nor to promises of Federal aid.

A great South Carolinian, Robert Y. Hayne, whose plaque appears at the entrance to our State Capitol, once had this to say to a colleague in the United States Senate:

"Sir, let me tell that gentleman that the South repudiates the idea that a pecuniary dependence on a Federal Government is one of the legitimate means of holding the States together. A moneyed interest in the Government is essentially a base interest; and just so far as it operates to bind the feelings of those who are subject to it to the Government—just so far as it operates in creating sympathies and interests that would not otherwise exist—it is opposed to all the principles of free government and at war with virtue and patriotism."

South Carolina no longer stands simply as the geographic center of a defeated South. We occupy the larger and more compelling role as the stronghold of traditional thought in America. Let it not be believed for a moment that we, or our southern neighbors, stand alone in our resistance to Federal encroachment on those rights which, by every rule of common sense and by every rational constitutional interpretation, should be exercisable by the States alone. In this respect, millions all over the Nation stand with us, realizing as we do that the last of our prerogatives in local self-government is imperiled.

The businessman of our country realizes that our free enterprise system is not founded on the excesses of northern pressure groups. He appreciates his heritage and seeks a region where the people are willing to defend that heritage. With all the charges of preju-

dice and bigotry, with all the talk of illiteracy and backwardness, with all the fears of school interruption and disorders, the American businessman continues to flow south. He comes not just for markets and climate, but because of the character of our people and State government. Public office is still a public trust. We are a stable people and we have a stable government. We believe in living within our means. We refuse to increase taxes unless absolutely necessary. Our legislature will not enact an appropriation bill and I, as Governor, will not sign such legislation except within the expected revenue. The people themselves believe in individual rights and individual responsibility. We believe that the freedom to work is as fundamental as freedom of speech or freedom of worship. We believe in a day's work for a day's pay. We do not look for security but for opportunity. South Carolina is a good place to live and provide opportunity for our children. We recognize the indisputable fact that ours is the only way that we can give to our young people of every walk of life and of every section of our State the efficient public education without which our children will not be able to achieve the economic, social, and political future that their parents would want them to have. We are a law-abiding people and will not stand for violence against our churches and schools. There is tolerance and understanding and good will among all of our peoples. This is our South Carolina today.

We are a State of hope and dedication—a State touched by destiny. The battle for the Republic is truly at hand. On our shoulders ride the cape of leadership, the hope of free enterprise, and the dignity of truth. On my shoulders rests the burden of presenting the case for South Carolina, but it is you who have supplied the evidence, and it is you who are the witnesses. I will not desert your cause, nor will I fail you. I recognize the problems, but they only give me enthusiasm for the solutions. With a humble prayer for God's blessings and guidance I assume this task with a vigorous pride that while South Carolina and our Southland 25 years ago may have been the Nation's number one economic problem, today we are the Nation's number one hope for the survival of the free-enterprise system. Today we are the Nation's hope for the survival of constitutional government. Today we are the hope for the future.

Poison in Your Water—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a résumé of the effect of water pollution on fish and wildlife by Mr. William E. Towell, distinguished director of the Missouri State Conservation Commission:

A RÉSUMÉ OF THE EFFECT OF WATER POLLUTION ON FISH AND WILDLIFE[1] BY WILLIAM E. TOWELL, MISSOURI STATE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The objective of the conservation commission is to protect the fish and wildlife resources and under sound management to provide for the greatest use of these resources by the people of Missouri. In pursuing this objective, we feel that water pollution is a serious obstacle and we believe that in future years it could become increasingly more difficult to overcome. We are reminded often of an increasing population and the need for added waste treatment which this alone brings with it. Beyond this, added industrial development is being vigorously encouraged. These advancements, which will increase the need for waste treatment, should carry with them a stern responsibility to maintain clean water. We feel that this is essential in providing for anticipated demands upon the fish and wildlife resources.

We know from records of permit sales now that one out of five persons in Missouri is interested in fishing and hunting. This does not include the thousands who are interested in the out of doors purely for the aesthetic value. Regardless of the particular interest, clean water is always a center of attraction in out-of-door enjoyment. Whether we admire it for its beauty or regard it as a producer of bass and ducks, we are invariably attracted to clean water. Our love for water in its natural state seems universal.

With this in mind, we remember that only about 1 percent of the total surface area of Missouri is in water. This means that we are entertaining one-fifth of the people on 1 percent of its area, and this includes only hunters and fishermen. We have no accurate record of the thousands who seek outdoor recreation who do not wield a rod nor shoulder a gun. Together all of these must reach an enormous total. This, in our opinion, is significant in demonstrating the need for maintaining clean water. The importance of out-of-door recreation is confirmed further by the fact that in Missouri expenditures related to hunting and fishing alone amount to an estimated $69 million annually. We arrive at this estimate by the application of the Crosley formula for appraising the value of the hunting and fishing resources which was developed in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

We in wildlife conservation are grateful for the effort and interest of all who took part in creating this water pollution board. We feel that the function of this board is essential to us in fulfilling our commitment to the people of Missouri.

Water pollution (1) kills fish and other aquatic life, (2) lowers the fish supporting capacity of water for the more desirable fish species, and (3) renders water unfit for recreation. These effects and their severity depend upon the kind and extent of the pollution. All occur in Missouri every year.

The conservation commission conducted a statewide survey of pollution in 1949. This showed that over 900 miles of stream in 69 counties and the city of St. Louis were polluted, and by mid-1957 these values had increased to more than 1,200 miles of stream in 74, or, roughly, two-thirds, of Missouri's 114 counties and the city of St. Louis. This represents an increase of 300 miles of polluted stream in 8 years. We recognize the limitation in using stream mileage as a measure of pollution, but we feel that this is a graphic expression of its extent. We find that many sources of pollution are not always limited to a defined reach of stream in which they might be considered more or less chronic. One bad day can wipe out a fish population for miles, as it did in the James River following a freshet near Springfield in 1954. In that instance fish were killed for many miles down the James River, even though chronic or permanent contamination in Wilson Creek precluded a normal fish fauna for a relatively short distance. The same can be said of Cedar Creek in Boone and Callaway Counties. This stream is permanently contaminated and devoid of fish in its upper reach, but during heavy runoff the fish populaton is often destroyed in the entire 40-mile length of the stream between the source of contamination and the confluence of this stream and the Missouri River. This is possible because this stream, as do others, tends to become repopulated with fish between the flushes of contamination. The source of pollution, therefore, is a potential which under appropriate conditions can be extended over many miles and can destroy great quantities of fish and other forms of wildlife.

Pollution is caused by many substances which vary in their effect upon fish and other aquatic life. Some pollutants which are lethal to fish directly include industrial chemicals, acid-mine wastes, lead, zinc, iron, brine, insecticides, lime, plating liquor, and water-treatment compounds. Others remove dissolved oxygen from water. These include sewage, dairy, corn products, canning, and meatpacking wastes. Some of those listed have both of these properties and still others impart off-flavors to water and fish.

Other kinds of pollutants blanket the bottom of streams, ruining them as spawning and feeding grounds for fish. These include sediments resulting from washing barite, iron ores and gravel, oil, sawdust, glass fiber, coal washings, trash, wood fiber, and varnish.

The extent of some pollutants is more widespread than others, and the effect differs with the type and volume of the pollutant. Thirteen streams in 16 counties and the city of St. Louis are affected by industrial chemical wastes. These consist mainly of the complex wastes of industries which include acids, alkalies, oil, ammonia, phenols, and others. A serious effect of this type of pollution is the foreign flavor imparted to fish. Although fish are not always killed, this condition renders them unfit for use. The commercial fishery in the Mississippi River from St. Louis to Cape Girardeau has been practically ruined by industrial wastes which enter the river in the bi-State area surrounding St. Louis, and their effect has been reported downstream for at least 300 miles. Industrial wastes from Kansas City area have a similar effect on the commercial fishery in the Missouri River in the 56-mile reach from Kansas City to Lexington, and during low flow, off-flavored fish have been reported at Boonville, about 180 river miles below Kansas City.

During the 10-year period from 1947 through 1956, the number of licensed Missouri River commercial fishermen operating below Kansas City in Clay, Jackson, Ray, and Lafayette Counties declined 62 percent, and in the Mississippi River below St. Louis the number of these fishermen declined by 64 percent in the reach of the river bordering Jefferson, St. Genevieve, Perry, and Cape Girardeau Counties. The reported commercial fish harvest in the latter 4 counties declined 71 percent during the same period.

More investigations have been made on pollution by coal mine waste than on any other kind. Forty streams in nine counties are contaminated by this waste. Acid water formed in coal mines probably kills more fish and aquatic life than any other single pollutant. This water contains sulfuric acid and iron compounds formed by the action of air and water upon coal exposed during the mining operations. Usually, there is some lag in time between the exposure of pyrites and the formation of the acid. Consequently, abandoned strip mines are serious potential sources of pollution. If corrective measures have not been followed, these mines cause trouble indefinitely, depending upon the amount of pyrite-bearing coal exposed. Although some pits whose spoil banks contain little or no sulfur are supporting fish life, many others are highly acid in character. A creek in north-central Missouri which was seriously polluted by acid coal-mine wastes in 1940 still flows acid water. Fish mortality resulting from this is

[1] Presented to Missouri Water Pollution Board, June 3, 1958.

most serious after heavy rains in the mined area which cause abandoned pits of acid water to overflow, and strong wastes are carried far downstream.

The harmful effects of coal-mine wastes are many. Not only do they kil fish, fish food organisms and plants, they also render the stream unfit for stock watering and other purposes. Acids kill fish by coagulating the mucus of the gills resulting in the complete stoppage of the flow of blood. Fish mortality from this source of contamination has been frequent and extensive. We are pleased, indeed, to note that some mines have adopted corrective measures, but pollution by coal mines remains a serious problem in the north central, west central, and the southwest portions of the State.

Raw or poorly treated sewage pollutes streams in many parts of the State. Thirty-eight streams in 30 counties and the city of St. Louis are affected. It affects fish in several ways, most importantly by using up the dissolved oxygen in the water. None but the most tolerant fish can live in water whose oxygen levels are subject to the demands of organic decay, and these fish are not the kinds preferred by the angler. Sewage also contributes to fish disease, and sludge is ruinous to spawning grounds and to fish foods used by the kinds of fish which occur in clean water. Heavy rains have carried decomposing sludge far downstream where reduction in dissolved oxygen has killed fish for many miles.

Increased public interest and the consistent effort of the division of health and cities throughout Missouri have resulted in the construction of numerous sewage treatment plants since World War II. This has reduced the pollution load considerably but an increasing population and the lack of efficient operation in some sewage treatment plants continue to be a problem.

The washing of clay from barite ore has caused sedimentation in 10 streams in 3 east-central Missouri counties. Heavy sedimentation and high turbidity result from this operation and the accumulated sediment is carried downstream with increased discharge following rainfall. Generally tiff mill operators construct settling basins to impound the silt, but often the banks are too low or too unstable to withstand water pressure during heavy runoff. Often this has resulted in overflow of silt-laden water, or complete breakthrough in settling basin dams. As a result, streams have been blanketed with sediment for miles. In one place a heavy layer of red-colored tiff silt was found 5 miles below the nearest tiff mill.

This causes the destruction or deterioration of fish habitat by destroying spawning grounds and fish food organisms and by reducing the transparency of the water to the extent that sight feeding fish are not able to feed properly. In some instances fish have been killed by the clogging of their gills.

Oil pollution is quite widespread, affecting 19 streams in 16 counties of the State. The sources are refineries, leakage from barges and tank cars, waste from industrial users of oil, aircraft overhaul bases, service stations and others. Refinery wastes contain phenols and other substances which impart an off-flavor to fish. Often oil kills fish by clogging the gills or it destroys eggs and kills fish food organisms. An oil film on the surface prevents normal aeration of the water and oil sometimes blankets the bottom of a stream for miles. This is particularly true of the Mississippi River below St. Louis where oil deposits are found on the bottom for 83 miles downstream from the source.

Pollution in this reach of the Mississippi also has an important influence on waterfowl movement. The conservation commission's waterfowl counts between 1936 and 1955 show that for many years there has not been a measurable number of migratory birds in the reach of river between St. Louis and St. Genevieve. Repeated observations of oil slicks have been recorded, and waterfowl specialists have observed thick bubbly oil on the surface of the water. Contamination from oil has had a similar effect on waterfowl concentrations on the Missouri River. Pollution on this stream has been observed consistently in routine aerial censusing during the fall migration since 1937. After 1943 oil slicks became continuous in the Kansas City area and frequently were observed as far as 26 miles downstream. By 1954 oil was seen 50 miles downstream. Within the last 3 years it has been observed regularly as far as Napoleon which is 44 miles below Kansas City and occasionally as far as Waverly, 80 miles downstream. Over a 20-year span covered by the commission's observations, we believe that waterfowl habitat in the Missouri River has gradually deteriorated for a distance of 50 miles below Kansas City. Waterfowl specialists report few birds in this part of the river. Oil is particularly harmful to waterfowl because their feathers become saturated and the birds cannot fly. The effect of oil on migratory birds is highly significant because the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers lie within the midcontinent waterfowl flyway. In view of increased hunting pressure in recent years this is a matter of vital concern.

Salts of zinc, lead, and other heavy metals half caused fish kills in the east and southwest sections of the State. Six streams in four counties are affected. In southwest Missouri, this contamination resulted from pumping out inactive lead mines while in the eastern Lead Belt region it results from the escape of water used in processing ore. The salts of lead and zinc are directly toxic to fish and are lethal in low concentration.

Most organic wastes have an effect on fish similar to those described for raw or poorly treated sewage. These include dairy, meatpacking, canning, and corn products wastes. As they decompose, all have a high demand for oxygen which renders water unfit for all but the most tolerant species of fish. Dairy wastes alone contaminate 23 streams in 18 counties. These wastes have a particularly high demand for dissolved oxygen.

Wastes of the meatpacking industry affect seven streams in as many counties. This includes extensive contamination of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. Decay of the organic matter in these wastes rapidly depletes the dissolved oxygen. This is also true for the 12 miles of 3 streams in 2 counties affected by canning wastes. The operation of canning factories is seasonal. Consequently pollution from this source is not continuous. The waste of an out-state corn-products industry affects 25 miles of the Mississippi River in a 3 Missouri counties. This has a high demand for dissolved oxygen and commercial fishermen report that it clogs their tackle.

Sawdut, glass fiber, mine, gravel, coal and iron ore washings, varnish, and wood fiber wastes are others which cover the bottom of the stream, ruining it as a spawning and feeding ground for fish. Some of these create intense water turbidity. Sawdust affects about 18 miles of 7 streams in 7 counties, mostly in the Ozarks. It also has the property of giving off organic acids and lowering dissolved oxygen. The washing of ore at several recently developed iron mines has caused sedimentation and high turbidity in a number of streams in southern Missouri. More contamination from this source is anticipated if means to prevent the escape of wash water are not used.

In recent years, insecticides have killed fish in several streams throughout the State. Toxaphene, DDT, aldrin, benzine hexachloride, chlordane, and others are extremely toxic to fish. Several of them kill fish in concentrations as low as 1 part insecticide in 100 million parts of water. The mere runoff from vegetation sprayed with aldrin recently killed many fish in a nearby slough and some insecticides are believed to be toxic to warmblooded animals. The use of these preparations merits serious consideration by fishery and wildlife management authorities. Needless to say, great care should be used in handling and applying them.

This describes briefly the influence of water pollution on fish and wildlife and points out the value of recreation in the form of hunting and fishing. We often refer to pollution as the cancer of fresh water. I believe this is a reasonable analogy because pollution is the dark side in the future of fishing and other recreational uses in which the waters of Missouri are involved. If it were to continue to increase as it has in the past 10 years, pollution would soon make a serious inroad on fish and other forms of wildlife at a time when there is a greater demand for this resource than at any time in Missouri's history.

The Late Honorable Thomas S. Gordon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I learned about the untimely death of my dear friend and distinguished former colleague from Illinois, the late Honorable Thomas S. Gordon.

His sudden death, which came so swiftly upon his retirement from his body after the completion of the legislative work of the 85th Congress, brought a deep sense of loss to his family and to all of his friends in various walks of life.

I had the privilege of serving with Tom Gordon on the Committtee on Foreign Affairs since my first election to Congress in 1949. As a member, and later as chairman of that committee, he participated and presided over some of the most important deliberations that have come before us. His outstanding work in this and in other legislative fields has earned him a lasting place in the history of our Nation. He was a distinguished legislator, who always placed the interests of his District, and of our entire Nation, above all personal matters.

I respected Tom Gordon for his experience, his understanding of the issues, and for his integrity, and I had deep affection for him as a friend. His gentleness and consideration for his colleagues was one of his outstanding characteristics—and one that endeared him greatly to all of us who knew him, and who worked with him. He was patient and understanding in controversies, soft spoken in his counsel, and loyal to the principles which he held.

Certainly the district which he represented for so many years in this House had a faithful and devoted public servant. Even the failure of his health during his last years did not deter him from his unstinted service to his constituents. No request was too small; no interest was too obscure to escape his undivided attention.

Such a man was Tom Gordon. And in his death, his State and our Nation have lost a trusted and outstanding public servant.

My wife, Blanche, joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his widow, Cele, to his children and his grandchildren. May they derive some small measure of consolation from the knowledge that we share their grievous loss—and from the thought that our Lord has called Tom Gordon to be among his very own.

How Concerned Are You?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent approved by the House, I am including a sermon by Dr. Ewart G. Watts, pastor of the First Methodist Church, Topeka, Kans. It is entitled "How Concerned Are You?" It is a forthright statement dealing with one of the difficult problems of our day. I believe Members of the House will be interested in reading it.

The sermon follows:

HOW CONCERNED ARE YOU?

Today, we are to think together about one of the most delicate but desperate problems of our day. With 55 to 60 percent of the American people drinking beverage alcohol more or less regularly, it is obvious that anyone who questions the morality of this habit is in the minority. It is also clear that strong words of denunciation from the pulpit may create the impression that the minister is a fanatical bigot who has no real compassion for people who are struggling to control a habit which is wrecking their lives and their homes.

Another thing that makes a discussion of this subject difficult is the fact that there is no clear-cut and unequivocal stand for total abstinence in the Bible. Since the books of the Bible were written over a period of at least a thousand years and by many different authors, both the man who drinks and the one who does not can quote verses to support their positions. But when you consider basic issues, there is no doubt where the Bible stands. There should be no doubt where the Christian stands.

There are three basic axioms or standards of the Bible which should guide us on this question. First, the Bible proclaims the ultimate worth of the individual. It says that each person is of value in God's eyes. Anything which blocks or retards the physical, mental, or spiritual life of a person is wrong. From the primitive days when the prophet Elijah denounced King Ahab for killing Naboth in order to gain possession of his vineyard down to the time when Jesus drove the money changers out of the Temple for cheating the common people who came to worship, the books of the Bible magnify the importance and the worth of the individual. Jesus gave this principle a startling reality when he said: "Are not two sparrows sold for a penny? And not one of them will fall to the ground without your Father's will. But even the hairs of your head are all numbered" (Matthew 10: 29).

A second principle which is clear throughout the Bible is that God expects us to have a sense of compassion and concern for the weak and the afflicted. We are expected to be like the Good Samaritan. We are to love our neighbors as we do ourselves. We are to have the spirit of the Christ who said: "Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick. Go and learn what this means, 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice.' For I came not to call the righteous, but sinners" (Matthew 9: 12, 13).

The third ethical standard the Bible gives is the insistence that God expects men to make a firm commitment to the right, no matter how many support the wrong. From the days when the prophet Amos, opposed by all the religious and political leaders of his nation, declared, "The Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophesy?" to the time when the Apostles said to the Jewish authorities who forbade them to preach, "We must obey God rather than man," the Bible makes it clear that right is not to be determined by a Gallup poll. And it calls men to see that one man on God's side is a majority.

Now, let's take these three basic standards of the Bible and see what help they can be in facing this difficult problem created by beverage alcohol. First of all, if each person is of ultimate worth in God's eyes, what do we find? Well, we find that many people's lives are being destroyed by beverage alcohol. Here in our country alcoholism is rapidly becoming our major health problem. With over 5 million confirmed alcoholics, this disease is five times more prevalent than cancer, three times more prevalent than tuberculosis, and 100 times more prevalent than polio, even before the Salk vaccine. Dr. Karl Menninger says that the alcoholics in the United States constitute our largest single mental health problems.[1] In 10 years, the number of alcoholics has almost doubled and there are 17 times more women alcoholics than there were 10 years ago. Throughout the country, judges, marriage counsellors, and ministers report that 3 out of 4 broken families have drinking as a major trouble source. And what is more, the National Safety Council reports that drinking drivers are involved in at least 30 percent of all fatal highway accidents; while during holiday periods, this climbs to at least 50 percent. This means that during the recent Thanksgiving holiday 227 people were killed because drivers were under the influence of liquor.

But figures are cold and impersonal. To understand what beverage alcohol does to destroy persons, you need to look beyond the figures. Think about the people you know whose life or home has been wrecked by beverage alcohol. A few years ago, Upton Sinclair set out to compile a list of the drinking people he had known. He recalled 40 or more geniuses he had known who, as he said, "went to their doom" as a result of this habit. Their story is graphically told by Sinclair in his book "The Cup of Fury." He tells of John Barrymore, Jack London, Eugene O'Neill, Sinclair Lewis, Edna St. Vincent Millay, and others. I wish this book could be required reading for the young people in our schools. It might help to counteract the deceitful and distorted picture which they get from the $400 million advertising program of the liquor industry. And then, it would help if they—if all of you—could be with ministers, with psychiatrists, with judges as we struggle to help the victims of alcohol. Believe me, when week after week and month after month you see the terrible things that alcohol is doing to homes and to little children, it's hard to keep calm and objective.

But, this is the point where the second great standard of the Bible comes into the picture. There must be a genuine compassion and concern not only for the innocent victims, but also for the alcoholics and the problem drinkers who are enslaved by alcohol. Dr. Caradine Hooten, who heads our Methodist board of temperance, says, "Until churchmen learn to love alcoholics as much as they hate alcohol, they can never fulfill a redemptive mission in this area of human need.' 'Jesus said, "Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick. Go and learn what this means, 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice.'"

This word should call us to our knees. It should make us see that as churches and as churchmen, we have too often allowed our self-righteous disgust to keep us from being a redemptive fellowship for those who desperately need our help and our understanding love. They must not feel that Alcoholics Anonymous is the only place they can go for understanding help. Recently, our Methodist board of temperance put it this way:

"Only abstinence can be the real answer and preventive tot he problem of alcoholism. But we must try to understand the compulsive drinker and keep our communications open with him so that there will be no feeling on his part that he is rejected by the church."

The church is beginning to realize that it has much to learn from Alcoholics Anonymous and from psychiatrists about redemption. And if we can learn, there is so much we can do. Only 200,000 of the 5 million alcoholics belong to A.A. What a tremendous thing it would be if our churches could provide the strengthening fellowship and moral support which is so desperately needed by these alcoholics. This is one of the things that was done by the early Methodists through their class meetings. John Wesley's sermons may have converted many drunkards; but, in the long run, it was the prayer fellowship of the Methodist Class and the class leader meeting with them each week which really saved them. Wesley Memorial Church in Atlanta, Ga., is providing such a fellowship as it works with Municipal Judge James Webb and the Helping Hand Society which is provided for Alcoholics who are brought into his court. This group which meets 3 times every week there in the church has already helped to restore 50 of these men to their families and their jobs.

This does not mean that the church should try to compete with Alcoholics Anonymous. I agree with one counselor who says, "In all the dark history of the handling of the problem of alcoholism, the brightest ray of hope and help in Alcoholics Anonymous!"[2] But this group cannot do it all. There are about 142,000 new alcoholics each year and the total membership of A.A. is only 200,000. It is obvious that more help is needed. We can help because we represent the same principles that have proved so effective in the program of Alcoholics Anonymous. The 12 points of A.A. are so deeply spiritual that they might well be accepted as guides for new members of a Christian church.

Listen to some of them:

Believe that a power greater than ourselves can restore us to sanity.

Make a decision to turn our will and our lives over to the care of God as we understand Him.

Admit to God, to ourselves, and to another human being the exact nature of our wrongs.

Seek through prayer and meditation to improve our conscious contact with God.

Try to carry this message to alcoholics, and practice these principles in all our affairs.

You see, here is dependence upon God, confession of sins, giving oneself in service for others who need help. This is the very heart of Christian living. Now, if Alcoholics Anonymous can help men and women by bringing them to live by these principles, surely our churches should be able to do

[1] Clinebell, H. J., "Understanding and Counseling the Alcoholic," p. 35.

[2] Clinebell, op. cit., p. 110.

it, too. Let's be humble enough to admit that we have something to learn from this organization. Let's be concerned enough to become an ally and coworker in this great task of human redemption.

But the great principles of the Bible and of our faith call us to take one more step. We must not only be concerned to help and to redeem the alcoholic; we must also be committed to those individual habits and to those forces in society which stand against this evil thing that is wrecking so many lives. Trying to help and to redeem alcoholics without standing against the liquor traffic which does so much to create alcoholics would be like building a rescue station at the bottom of a cliff to help those who have fallen over, without working at the top of the cliff to keep others from falling.

Now, this is the point where it is up to each one of us to decide just how we are going to take our stand. As I have pointed out, the Bible makes it clear that God expects us to stand for the right, regardless of what others may think or say. Wendell Phillips, the great opponent of slavery, who stood out against this evil force when most of his contemporaries were simply closing their eyes and ignoring it, said: "We must each learn to feel, in determining a moral question, as if there was no one else in the universe but God and ourselves." This is the thing I would ask each of you to do this morning as you consider what stand you are going to take on this moral question of the drinking and distribution of beverage alcohol. Face it as if there was no one else in the universe but God and yourself.

As you know, I believe that total abstinence is the stand which God wants me to take. As I try to look at this question with the mind and the spirit of Christ, I cannot find a single good that can come from drinking beverage alcohol; but I can see innumerable dangers and evils. The one benefit which is usually argued is that moderate drinking relieves tensions and heightens sociability. But I am convinced that drinkers who are honest will admit that the ultimate tensions which are created are worse than the tensions which are relieved. One moderate drinker who decided to quit, wrote: "No doubt alcohol removed my tension. But it acted like a spot remover that takes the cloth with it. I came to see that I should do something more intelligent about the tension than to pour jiggers of rum over it."[3]

Briefly, then, let me tell you why I believe that total abstinence is the only way I can be true to the mind and the spirit of Christ.

First: even moderate drinking retards those parts of the brain which have to do with moral judgments and discrimination. In other words, it dulls the voice of conscience, and draws one just a little farther from God and a little closer to the animal. Dr. Robert Dovenmuehle, professor of psychiatry at Duke University Medical Center, writes: "The conscience is the latest and most highly complex of the developments in human personality, and it is the part of the organized personality that shows most markedly the effects of the depressive action of alcohol."[4] Now, I don't know about you, but I believe that the voice of conscience is something sacred. And I cannot believe God would approve my doing anything that would dull or distort that voice.

Second: I do not drink because by so doing I would be placing my stamp of approval upon an industry which breeds crime, wrecks homes, pollutes government, and causes thousands of unnecessary highway accidents and deaths. And on this last point, let me say that safety engineers report that moderate drinking causes more highway accidents than heavy drinking. Just this week, Mr. Claud McCamment, who heads the safety division of Kansas State Highway Department, told the Topeka Rotary Club that those who drink just enough to grow talkative and careless are the most dangerous drivers on our streets and highways.

Third: I do not drink because even my moderate drinking might bring me or someone influenced by me to become a problem drinker or an alcoholic. The doctors and scientists say there is no way to determine in advance whether a person might become an alcoholic or not. All we know is that of every hundred men who drink, nine and one-half become alcoholics; and of every hundred women who drink, two and one-half become alcoholics.[5] So, there is always the danger that any moderate drinker, under proper conditions of stress, may change from the casual drinker to the compulsive drinker. And I would hate to feel that my example had led one of my children or one of my friends to become an alcoholic. Paul wrote: "Take care lest this liberty of yours somehow become a stumbling block to the weak. If food is a cause of my brother's falling, I will never eat meat, lest I cause my brother to fall." Bishop Hazen Werner somewhere in one of his books suggests that the moderate drinker is the most dangerous carrier of the terrible disease of alcoholism. He is like the boy with a slight case of scarlet fever who is not very sick and so he goes to school. He is not sick but he infects others, some of them fatally. I have seen it happen and I am sure you have too where a father who drank moderately infected his son who, in turn, drank fatally.

This is a desperate problem which confronts our Nation and our society. It is one which leaves no place for neutrality. Jesus said, "He that is not with Me is against Me"; and I know He must be calling on each of us to stand where He would stand on this problem. It may not be right where I stand. I would not argue that with you. All I ask is that you ask yourself as seriously and as honestly as you know how: "What would Christ want me to do on this matter?"

With that question in your mind, will you join me in looking at the commitment check list which you received as you came into the service today. Please notice that this a secret ballot. There is no place for you to sign your name. No one but God will know how you vote.

[3] Brewster, Channing, "Why I Gave Up Liquor," reprinted from Reader's Digest by Methodist Board of Education.

[4] "Alcohol and Personality," a folder published by TEM Press, Washington, D.C.

[5] Clinebell, op. cit., p. 34.

A Letter From President Garcia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the text of a letter written by the President of the Philippines, Carlos P. Garcia, to my good friend Mr. Max Abelman, sometimes described as Brooklyns' ambassador of good will.

The text of President Garcia's letter to Mr. Abelman is as follows:

MALACAÑANG PALACE,
January 8, 1959.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR MR. ABELMAN: I am returning herewith the copy of our picture which you requested me to autograph. While writing my personal greetings on it, I had in mind our cordial exchange of correspondence even before I had the opportunity of visiting the United States and meeting you in person.

You informed me in your letter that you were for some time confined in bed. I sincerely hope that your health has improved by now. After a festive holiday season, I also take this opportunity to convey to you and your family my best wishes for a prosperous and happy new year.

With warm regards and prayers for your good health, I am,

Truly yours,

CARLOS P. GARCIA.

Poison in Your Water—No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the American Legion magazine for October 1958 by Robert and Leona Rienow telling how we are filling our waters with raw sewage, rotting vegetable matter, corrosive chemicals, industrial oil, dead fish and animal matter, acids, germs of a thousand kind, including viruses, dysentery, cholera, typhus—some authorities include polio—also deadly dyes, grits, canning filth, slaughterhouse leavings, the effluvia from hospitals and mortuaries and, of late, small amounts of radioactive wastes from atomic fission installations. This goes into the water that you and I and the citizens of this United States drink and bathe in. The article is as follows:

THEY CALL IT DRINKING WATER

(By Robert and Leona Rienow)

"The water that you drink today may once have quaffed Caesar's thirst." So reads the caption for a cast iron pipe ad picturing a Roman in war togs with a beaker to his lips. What a romantic thought. Yet a couple thousand years of nature's purifying water cycle—evaporation to rain to evaporation—take the curse off the secondhand drink. The pipe company has safely made its point that water is indestructible.

But when the Public Health Service points out that the "water you use may have been flushed down somebody else's bathroom"—perhaps yesterday or the day before—the romantic thought loses its glitter. Of course, in this newly crowded country of ours, we are going to have to accustom ourselves to using rehabilitated water for household as well as for industrial purposes. Crowded people can't be squeamish.

The issue in America now is not how to get enough pure, nature cycle water—it is how to get enough potable water for all of us and our industry. The steadily mounting deluge of pollutants which we are discharging into our once clean streams, ponds, and lakes is doing more than adding an increasing menace to the public health. In many places it has become so bad that it is curtailing industry.

Unless we clamp down drastically on our present pollution rate, we won't even have enough of this secondhand, rejuvenated water. Already Wheeling, W. Va. is throwing its dry sponge on Ohio River water; it just can't purify it.

When our tap water becomes so rank that it affects the flavor of our coffee and our beer, then we shall have a home demonstration of the social crime of pollution. Yes, 90 million

Americans depend on rivers and lakes to slake their thirst; so 90 million Americans can be wronged.

Ironically, this is the 10th anniversary of the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 which, presumably, was to be tried for 10 years before more drastic steps were taken.

How do we stack up after 10 years? Here are the facts: We have one-tenth more domestic sewage in our rivers than ever before. Why? We made a fair try, but it wasn't good enough to keep up with the increased population. Before the act, 82 percent of our municipal sewage poured untreated into our public waters; now only 58 percent spills into our streams raw. If we went in for Russian statistical methods, these percentages might satisfy us. But the truth is, we are falling behind.

Industry unloaded 81 percent of the wastes into streams untreated before the act; the figure has now come down to 40 percent. Again, that looks fine until you note that the smaller percentage represents twice the total industrial pollution of a quarter century ago.

Even good water is filled with life forms. We stopped in at the filtration plant for the city of Albany the other day to take a look at a drop of water under the miscroscope. With a roster of 64 kinds of algae and bacteria at our elbow we tried to take the roll of this teeming liquid. It was like trying to identify a friend at the Army-Navy game. But this was the finest water drawn from a woodland reservoir.

What are some of the less tasty items which are glutting our watercourses, poisoning our fish and waterfowl, befouling our sources of drinking water? There is raw sewage, rotting vegetable matter, corrosive chemicals, industrial oil, dead fish, and animal matter, acids, germs of a thousand kinds including viruses, dysentery, cholera, typhus (some authorities include polio); also deadly dyes, grits, canning filth, slaughterhouse leavings, the effluvia from hospitals and mortuaries and, of late, small amounts of radioactive wastes from atomic fission installations.

Altogether we have 22,000 sewage and industrial outlets into our once clear streams. Of these, 11,800 drain municipal sewage systems; they serve more than 92 million people. Now hold your hat (and perhaps your nose); the wastes from only 54,500,000 of these people have undergone any treatment at all.

When the Ohio River is low, 1 quart out of every gallon of water in the stream has been belched into it by a sewer. Go out to the South Platte River below Denver in the dry season and you will find four-fifths of its contents is effluent from the sewage treatment plant.

But in our highly industrial Nation 60 percent of the waste that burdens our creeks and rivers comes from industry's 10,400 outlets. The National Association of Manufacturers tells us that four out of five plants do nothing to their wastes.

Industry has increased by 700 percent since 1900. It will double again by 1975. Already the combined industrial and municipal discharge into the streams of America equals the raw sewage of 150 million people. It is going to be increasingly difficult for Tin Pan Alley to find a river to get romatic about.

Silt: American rivers were once deep, swift, and leaping with game fish. Today they are sluggish and much shallower, clogged not only with wastes but with huge cargoes of silt which eroded off the watersheds after the land was stripped of its thick tree and plant robe. Swift-flowing rivers decontaminate themselves by the purifying action of sun and air. These silt-choked water courses cannot begin to handle the overload of excreta, offal, bilge, and filth we pour into them.

Sewage: It is only in the last 200 years that municipal sewer systems have been constructed. Much of our sewage is concentrated at a few outlet points; more of it is inadequately treated. The need is for new sewage treatment plants at 6,600 places.

But these additional facilities are only the beginning of our needs. We must contend with the projected population figure of 200 million people by 1975, most of them urban. Nor should we overlook the little towns big enough to hang their houses on a sewer line but too small to buy a disposal plant.

Industrial wastes: If we had enough pride and wanted to spend the money, we could handle municipal sewage. We know how to treat it. But industrial wastes are increasing so fast disposal know-how can't keep up with them. A recent Merck index of chemicals lists 8,000; 2,900 of these did not appear in an edition only 12 years earlier. Since all chemical and most manufacturing plants have great quantities of wastes to get rid of, industry is alarmed. The Manufacturing Chemists Association is spending millions yearly on pollution research.

But paper mills, slaughterhouses, woolen mills, and all industrial and governmental installations have their pollution headaches. Our laughing waters are laughing no longer; they are in their death throes.

Oil dumping: Not only is our waterfowl poisoned by our evil inland waters, but many thousands of them succumb each year to the oil slick which oil-burning vessels continually pour out over the waters along our coasts. In spite of the law passed in 1924 which forbids jettisoning of oil in coastal areas, sea captains, barge captains, and even United States naval commanders defy the law with impunity. They rely on the snide provision in the statute which demands that the Coast Guard patrol must witness the actual dumping before making an arrest.

An observer for Audubon magazine (January-February 1957) counted, on Long Island, more than "400 oiled gannets, loons, grebes, Bonaparte's gulls, razor-billed auks, dovekies, and ducks on the beaches between Montauk Point and Coney Island. * * * The worst offenders are the great aircraft carriers. * * * I have seen dead ducks by the hundreds washed up in the seaweed at high water mark."

Moreover, oil sludge dumped into the River Rouge at Detroit has been known to destroy thousands of ducks and other waterfowl. It is a grimy story all round.

We are already paying a big price in water scarcity. We will pay more. Water reclamation is much costlier than waste treatment at the source. Our growing water scarcity problems are directly related to our growing recklessness in waste disposal.

Living in the midst of a network of open sewers is hazardous enough. But the scientifically guarded border we have set up between sewer water and drinking water is a precarious one. We live on the edge of a human or mechanical failure that might bring pestilence down upon us. This danger becomes more imminent every year.

At the same time, as crowds increase and leisure time lengthens, spots for recreation—breathers from the crush—become more precious. But who dares swim in our rivers any more? Turgid and oil-begrimed, our once scintillating rivers slink past the dump heaps and around the back doors of our towns. Gone are the canoes, launches, and rowboats. For the hardy who insist on river recreation, speedboats, and yachts (no dangling of hands) are the only recourse.

Yet what delights we forgo at our doorstep because of the misuse of our waterways. Rather than spend the money and effort to retrieve them for the joys of boating, fishing, swimming, and picnics, we doggedly pack into the car and buck the traffic for 50 miles or more as we join the hordes in feverish search of a clear lake. We fondly believe we are saving money; yet it is hardly economic to pollute the old swimming hole and then mortgage the community to build a chlorinated swimming pool for our children. Scarcely a community in the United States has not squandered its recreational heritage because of a penny-wise sanitation system.

Besides the loss of good water, of trout fishing, recreation, and fun—besides the constant menace to health—there are other disadvantages to our sewer-stream network. The shad and mackerel runs that once made our eastern rivers wriggle with life are now only a legend. Where once the salmon take in a western valley was $5 million a year, the sewage cut it down to less than $1 million.

But commercial fishing is only one industry that has paid the price. Today industrial water is at a premium. Once almost a free commodity, it has become an important item in production costs. Communities without supplies of acceptable water obviously cannot attract new industries. Their development is at a standstill.

Under the Pollution Control Act of 1948, the Federal Government: (a) Works out pollution programs, (b) underwrites research on industrial waste treatment, (c) gives technical aid to the States, industries and regions, (d) offers financial assistance to the States, to industries, and to the interstate bodies, (e) helps along the idea of interstate cooperation, and (f) disseminates information.

To date, the act may be called something of a failure. It was slow in getting off the ground. Congress, which had committed itself to a $135 million outlay over a 5-year period, had coughed up but $8.4 million in the first 4 years of the act, most of it for research. Only as the tenth disappointing anniversary approached, in 1956, did Congress unlatch its purse with a 10-year authorization of $500 million for municipal sewage systems and treatment facilities. At length a little hard cash started to spill on the counter—$38 million, in fact—and nearly 500 projects are underway. "A pittance," cried some. "Interference" snapped others.

But the truth is, the financial support offered by the Federal Government is little more than an incentive for local communities to pitch in themselves. The community itself must pick up the chit.

And the price is high. Roughly, the removal of 35 percent of the pollution effect of sewage costs about $35 a person a year. Raise the removal percentage to 75, and the price doubles—to $70 a person a year. Do the best possible job of 90 percent removal and the annual per capita cost zooms to $110.

Of course, what is paid out to reduce the pollutant content of sewage is saved by the next user in treating the water supply. It is just that people are less likely to change oil in the car they are about to trade in.

Before 1956 we were spending $230 million a year on abatement works. We spent in the vicinity of $340 million in 1957. Yet the official estimate calls for an outlay of $500 million a year for the next 10 years if we want to catch up with the backlog and meet the growing needs.

All this is only the story of municipal sewage. Add the industrial wastes to this municipal sewage and what is the price of cleaning up our streams? Say the experts with a sigh: "About $10 billion over 10 years."

We will never begin to restore our inland and coastal waters—to experience again the healthful activities and delights of sparkling streams and clean, spring-fed lakes—until we arouse public opinion. It is true that the water scarcity—which will worsen every year—will jar some smug thinking out of the rut. But unless our thinkers and leaders—service organizations, town and city officials,

editors, and educators—raise the white flag of clean streams and start the parade, we are doomed to spend the rest of our lives in the stench of our open sewer network.

Some communities have fought through to victory. When the citizens of Cumberland, Md., were shocked by the withdrawal of a large glass company's proposal to build in their city because of the pollution in the Potomac River at their site, they acted—and fast. A $1,500,000 appropriation for a new sewage treatment plant brought a lucrative new payroll to town.

The clogged and poisoned Schuylkill River of Pennsylvania has been redeemed. The Kansas River has been relieved of much of its sewage indigestion. Because of the fine teamwork among the cities of Athens, Lancaster, Logan, and Nelsonville, the Hocking River in Ohio again runs clean and sweet-smelling. With the facelifting of these rivers came a soul lifting of the people on the banks.

The cost of operating a treatment plant may run as high as $90 per million gallons in a small plant. But this charge can be cut to $15 per million gallons in a large installation, such as one of those built by Los Angeles. Unit construction costs are also reduced when many small communities band together on disposal. Most important advantage, of course, is that joint sewage disposal for a densely settled section imposes the same standards on all and gives the same protection to all in that area.

Seattle, Wash., offers an example of sectional cooperation. Greater Seattle had been spilling 20 million gallons of raw sewage and effluent into its beautiful Lake Washington every day. The lake is—or was—a major recreational attraction, not only for the natives but for tourists.

When, therefore, in 1957, the lake threatened to be a pestilence rather than a joy, the aroused citizens pushed an act through the State legislature, which, subject to approval by the citizenry at the polls, creates a general water council. This council, nicknamed "Metro," will not only build great sewage-treatment plants for the entire area of 200 local councils, but it will coordinate all area-wide problems of water supply, parkways, parks, and the like. The treated effluent will be piped far out into Puget Sound.

Sewage and treatment costs for the smaller areas will plummet, as will upkeep. And, best of all, a premium comes with the purchase—a clean and respectable Lake Washington.

What is more, pollution control by industry is bound to take its cue from aroused public opinion in a district, and fall in behind the band. Rochester, N.Y., recently witnessed the construction of a $1,500,000 industrial waste treatment plant. Industries near Houston, Tex., are working at the pollution problem with organized fervor, and the Niagara River industries are spending millions on pollution research. Industry is in desperate need of more and more water—clean water. Foul water is not industrial water.

We have learned a good many things in our first 10 years of playing around with water pollution control. We have sheaves of blueprints of our sick river basins—blueprints which the Public Health Service has painstakingly drafted for every area in the Nation. They are waiting for communities to pick them up to study. We have the know-how when it comes to processing sewage for greatest river protection. We have Uncle Sam's promise of active help.

All that we need now is more pride in ourselves and in our communities as Americans. Once that pride gets its back up, we will find the cash.

Fair Workload for Douglas Aircraft Needed—Airlift Issue Points a Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial carried on January 20 by the Santa Monica Evening Outlook points out a lack of workload situation that should be high in the consideration of Air Force contracting officials:

A COMMUNITY APPEAL FOR DOUGLAS

In the last week an extraordinary thing has happened in the Santa Monica Bay district, caused by an extraordinary situation. Labor organizations have joined with the Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce in urging the Defense Department, and particularly the U.S. Air Force, to give more consideration to the Douglas Aircraft Co. in big defense contracts. Repeatedly in the last 18 months this great company, with a record of plane and missile building second to none in the United States, has been passed over in the award of such contracts.

Apparently the chief reason has been the success of other areas in claiming a local unemployment situation. To distribute defense contracts with a view to relieving unemployment has been an admittedly paramount concern of the Eisenhower administration, and a most proper one. On this ground, and because of its economic importance to Seattle and the State of Washington, the Boeing Co. has secured more than one big defense contract, which should rightfully have gone to Douglas, had other factors been allowed to govern. As a result, Douglas now is threatened with a shortage of big defense orders which will work great hardship on its entire labor force, and on every community having a Douglas plant, unless it is soon remedied.

In the last week union members working at the Santa Monica and El Segundo plants have written nearly 3,000 letters to Congress, protesting the decline in work at the two facilities. And the Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce has addressed a strong appeal to the U.S. Air Force, that the Douglas Co. be given favorable consideration in the forthcoming award of a big defense contract for early warning and interceptor aircraft. Representatives of southern California in Washington, notably Congressman DONALD L. JACKSON and Senators KUCHEL and ENGLE, are lending their efforts to convince Defense Department and Air Force officials that the Douglas Co. must no longer be slighted.

We call this an extraordinary situation, when the company which has led all others in developing and building both military and civilian aircraft is denied its rightful share of defense orders. Relieving unemployment in the aircraft industry is a most desirable purpose, but it should not be carried to the extent of robbing Peter to pay Paul. Not only is the Douglas Co. preeminent in the aircraft industry, but its contribution is essential to the success of our U.S. missile program, and to the ability of our civilian airlines to compete with rapidly growing and largely subsidized foreign lines. The threat to the Douglas Co. is a most serious one, and it is a threat to the Nation as well.

Mr. Speaker, partly responsible for the situation outlined in the editorial is another factor which many feel should not have come into being. Some 18 months ago the Air Force canceled its contract with Douglas for development and production of the C–132 aircraft. This was to be a very large, fast, long-range airlift workhorse. It would provide massive mobility to our Armed Forces, particularly the Army, in limited war situations and the deterrence thereof.

Since this is a service-type operation performed by the Air Force for other branches of the military, some felt Air Force officials canceled the C–132 more in consideration of financing its own primary missions than in a regard for executing its service operations for other branches. This, of course, may not be the fact, and it is not my intention hereby to level criticism at the Air Force. I relate this only because it does illustrate that careful and intelligent thinking must be applied to determine what kind, how much and how fast and airlift cability is necessary for the proper protection of the Nation and to the problem of financing it and maintaining it in being.

The November 1958 issue of News Front magazine contained the following informative article and chart dealing with the airlift issue:

HOW MUCH AIRLIFT?

Three times in the past 6 months the U.S. Armed Forces have shown that they can "get there fustest."

In May, within 14 hours of President Eisenhower's decision to extend armed protection, if needed, to Vice President NIXON during the final stage of his South American tour, the Air Force had acted. It had flown 498 paratroopers with full equipment to Caribbean bases close to mob-threatened Caracas, Venezuela.

In July, on the very day the United States announced it was sending troops to Lebanon at the request of then President Camille Chamoun, a composite air strike force flew to Adana, Turkey, to back up marines landing south of Beirut.

In August when the Chinese Communist bombardment of Quemoy and its tiny neighbors seemed to presage an attempt to invade Formosa, another composite air strike force was flown across the Pacific to the Nationalist stronghold.

But inability to complete Confederate Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest's strategic formula, to get there by air not only "fustest" but "with the mostest" is perhaps the gravest of current United States military weaknesses.

The force flown to the Caribbean by the 314th and 63d Troop Carrier Wings at the time of the Nixon incident was intended—and strong enough—merely for police action.

The composite air strike force which flew to Adana was drawn from troops in Germany, not from Tactical Air Command units in the United States which had received special "brush-fire" training for just such eventualities.

The reason, it was reported at the time, was that enough airlift was not available in the United States—and thus the risk of temporarily weakening West Europe NATO forces had to be taken.

The Formosa flight was but the spearhead of a still continuing Formosa buildup and, like the Adana venture, was primarily important to show United States will and military capability.

Gen. O. P. Weyland, chief of the Tactical Air Command, recently stated that "we are

unable to transport and air support a force of much more than division size on a single lift."

The Army Information Digest said:

"The United States should be able to airlift a decisive limited war force to any place in the world in 4 or 5 days. * * *

"But there is an alarming lack of modernization in our troop-and-supply carrying air fleet."

The first full bitter cost of airlift inadequacy was paid by Great Britain and France, not the United States.

Had the island-hopping Mediterranean airlift which brought their forces to Suez in the fall of 1956 been completed even 1 day faster, most experts believe, the entire canal area would have been occupied and Egypt's President Nasser toppled before the U.N., prodded by the Soviet Union and the United States, could have intervened.

But, for lack of transport planes, the Allied troops were late, the two nations were forced to beat an ignominous retreat—and Soviet prestige in the Middle East soared at the expense of the West.

Suez emphasized what was first demonstrated in Korea, when the airlines and commercial charter companies were pressed into service with the Military Air Transport Service to do the airlift job with planes which, mostly, were neither designed nor suited for it. As Donald Douglas, Jr., president of the Douglas Aircraft Co., recently pointed out, "Korea was a lesson in the lack of proper airlift preparedness."

An airborne division contains 11,486 men; to move it, with supplies and equipment, means airlifting 7,000 tons. (A standard infantry division has 13,748 men, with more—and heavier—equipment.) By the 10-ton-per-plane estimate used as a working rule of thumb, 700 planes would be needed to airlift an airborne division.

To meet an airlift emergency, the Armed Forces can call immediately upon some 1,725 planes, more than 2½ times, on paper, the number needed for a division lift.

But many of these, including the 368 airliners of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, are primarily passenger planes, although the greater need is for cargo capacity. Besides, abruptly pulling airliners out of civilian service would cripple vital domestic schedules.

The 600 planes of the Air Force Reserve, manned by "weekend warrior" crews, are slow C–119 transports with only 3 tons' capacity.

Out of the 1,725 available planes, less than 200 are jet-prop powered, the rest have piston engines.

Ideal for transporting the streamlined pentomic division are the Lockheed Hercules C–130 and the Douglas Cargomaster C–133, both turbine-powered (jet-prop) aircraft.

The C–130 can carry 92 percent of the different items needed by an airborne division—and carry them 4,000 miles without refueling.

The Tactical Air Command estimates it can load 12½ tons into each C–130 for deployment to Europe or Africa, and 7½ for a Far East flight. (More space is needed for fuel.)

But the Air Force has only about 160 C–130's (96 in TAC), and to support for a month a Composite Air Strike Force Wing would require continuous use of 49. Sustaining a division would require some 150.

The Douglas Cargomaster C–133 has a capacity of almost 50 tons, but the Air Force has only a handful.

Why is U.S. airlift capacity low?

Primarily, because defense emphasis has been placed on nuclear deterrent rather than tactical potential, on a bigger bang for a buck.

Airlift, in comparison with such more glamorous and publicized military activities as the Strategic Air Command and missile development, has received very low budget priority.

But there is another problem; just how much airlift is enough? How many "brushfire" crises will erupt on the free world periphery, and how far will they be from the continental United States? Will two or more occur at the same time?

Should the United States develop, now, airlift capacity for a full-scale, multifront global war?

There is, industry and the military agree, no perfect solution.

But the most practicable approach the experts also agree lies in combining modernization with flexibility and capacity for rapid expansion.

Douglas engineers assert that a fleet of 107 turboprops (such as the C–133) could, with more efficiency and economy, replace the entire present MATS fleet.

Dr. Allen R. Ferguson, research director of Northwestern University Transportation Center, proposes that the Air Force lease, not buy, its turbine-powered transports.

He claims that this would greatly increase flexibility, and that "it should be possible to compute a rental less than the cost of operating the existing (MATS) piston fleet and still be enough to provide an adequate return for the lessors."

For actual combat conditions, the Stroukoff Aircraft Co. is developing an attack transport, the YC–134, which can land almost anywhere. But it is still experimental.

Not only is flying troops abroad to trouble spots, as needed, cheaper than permanent garrisons, but world developments are making it more desirable. A leading authority writes:

"It is only a matter of time before we will find it better diplomacy to bring our troops home from West Germany, Italy, and South Korea than to leave them there. The ideal arrangement would be to have only token forces abroad and the bulk ready to fly in at short notice."

But as Maj. Gen. Robert F. Sink, commander of the 18th Corps (Airborne), stated recently:

"If we don't have the means of getting transportation * * *why, hell, we stay at home.

U.S. military airlift planes

Company	Type	Pounds	Capacity (cubic feet)	Troops	Cruising speed	Range (nonrefuel)
Lockheed	Hercules turboprop C-130	36,900–40,000	4,300	92	370 miles per hour	4,000 miles (maximum range); 1,750 miles (maximum payload).
Do	Constellation C–121 or R–7V	40,000	5,500	58–94	334 miles per hour	4,447 miles (maximum range); 2,837 miles (maximum payload).
Douglas	Cargomaster turboprop C–133	41,700–95,000	13,500		315 miles per hour	4,000 miles (maximum range); 1,750 miles (maximum payload).
Do	Globemaster C–124	74,000		200	250 miles per hour	4,000 miles.
Do	Liftmaster C–118 or DC–6			54–89	315 miles per hour	5,000 miles.
Do	C–54, R–5D5 or DC–4	6,300–13,000		50	177 miles per hour	2,415 miles (maximum range); 1,150 miles (maximum payload).
Do	C–47, R–4D7 or DC–3	7,500		21–30	167 miles per hour	2,200 miles (maximum range); 1,440 miles (maximum payload).
Stroukoff Aircraft Co	Assault transport YC–134	30,000			250 miles per hour	4,750 miles (maximum range); 600 miles (maximum payload).
Boeing	KC–135		6,660		Over 600 miles per hour	4,000 miles.
Do	Stratocruiser C–97			130	Over 300 miles per hour	4,300 miles.
Convair Division, General Dynamics	C–131			48	200 miles per hour	2,150 miles.
Fairchild	Provider C–123B	16,000–18,000		60	186 miles per hour	3,450 miles (maximum range); 1,150 miles (maximum payload).
Do	C–119	6,850	3,150	62	175 miles per hour	3,480 miles.

Putting Our Surpluses to Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my great desire and hope that this Congress take affirmative action toward finding a workable solution to our farm problem, I submit as an extension of my remarks, the following editorial entitled "Putting Our Surpluses to Use," which appeared in the January 18, 1959, issue of the Des Moines Sunday Register. The editorial follows:

PUTTING OUR SURPLUSES TO USE

John H. Davis, former U.S. Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and now a professor at Harvard University, has recommended that the program for distributing American farm surpluses overseas be placed on a long-range basis.

Davis made a study for the Eisenhower administration of the operations of Public Law 480. This is the law which permits the sale of farm surpluses for foreign currency, as well as barter trades for strategic minerals.

Davis believes the program has been working fairly well, but he argues that both the United States and recipient countries could make it work better if it were set up on a 5-year plan.

Davis believes the sales for foreign currency could be gradually cut back if the program were on a 5-year schedule, instead of year-to-year operation. He thinks countries using the surplus farm products could prepare for a tapering off of these low-cost imports. At the same time, he believes United States could make needed adjustments in farm production.

It makes sense to establish the farm export programs on a long-range basis. But we doubt very much that it will be possible to taper off in 5 years. The lack of success in

adjusting farm production in this country in the past suggests that Mr. Davis is unduly optimistic about the future.

It is more probable that the United States will have still larger surpluses of farm products in the years ahead. At any rate, a long-range plan for use of these products in foreign economic development programs would be a good thing to have on hand.

The United States cannot operate in this field most effectively on its own. It should attempt to bring Canada, Australia, Argentina, and other surplus-producing countries into a joint program for using food surpluses to aid economic development in the poor countries. Controls need to be set up to prevent these donations or cutprice sales from interfering with normal commercial trade. International cooperation is needed to avoid charges of dumping or unfair usurpation of markets.

The Davis report deserves serious consideration by the administration and Congress. It would be a start toward a more sensible policy for utilization of farm surpluses.

Address by AFL–CIO President George Meany to a Joint United States-Canadian Labor Education Conference at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, in spite of herculean efforts in the past few years, the local school districts have not been able to cut into the backlog of our classroom shortage. We still need more than 130,000 classrooms to educate our children. Of equal importance is the shortage of trained teachers. The following address by Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, to the joint United States-Canadian Labor Education Conference held here in Washington on January 14, calls for immediate Federal assistance to the States to alleviate this crisis. He eloquently sets forth some of the reasons Congress should pass my bill, H.R. 22, which would provide for grants in aid for school construction and assistance in the payment of teachers' salaries.

Mr. Meany's speech follows:

Permit me to express my appreciation to the trade union representatives who are taking part in this conference on the urgent problems of education.

It seems you have come to the right place at the right time. The 86th Congress has just begun its sessions. Last Friday it listened to a message on the state of the Union which did not contain a single mention—not a single word—about the critical classroom deficit that exists throughout our country.

What we have to say at this conference about the shortcomings of our educational system may therefore serve to fill the gap. It may prove educational even to our highly educated Government officials and lawmakers. And let it not be considered presumptuous for labor to point the way, because it was our own trade union movement at its first national convention in 1881 that started the ball rolling for universal free education for the Nation's children.

Even if America's educational retrogression were to be considered in a vacuum, the picture would be disturbing. But looking at it, as we must, in comparison with the enormous strides taken by Soviet Russia, our retreat becomes alarming.

Last year an on-the-spot study of the amazing educational progress achieved by Soviet Russia was made by 10 leading American educators. In his report on that survey, one of our honored guests, Lawrence G. Derthick, U.S. Commissioner of Education, said:

"We are today in competition with a nation of vast resources, a people of seemingly unbounded enthusiasm for self-development and fired with conviction that future supremacy belongs to those with the best-trained minds, those who will work hard and sacrifice."

Commissioner Derthick called the turn. Recent occurrences in interplanetary space have made it painfully clear that Soviet Russia has outstripped us in certain scientific and technological fields, at least.

Just think of it—a nation whose people only two generations ago were almost wholly illiterate, today is turning out more scientists, engineers, and skilled technicians than we are.

We cannot consider this development with passive equanimity. It is not merely a blow to our national pride, but a distinct menace to our national safety. We are under no illusions as to the Kremlin's immediate policies or ultimate aims. The Communists are seeking and will never stop seeking world supremacy. America is the only major power which stands in the way of that goal. The cold war we are now enduring will inevitably become a hot war whenever the Kremlin is convinced it can win it. No other considerations count with Khrushchev and his associates.

Let me emphasize that I am no admirer of the Kremlin's educational concepts. The needs of humanity, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, can never be satisfied by chemical, electronic, or rocket exploits. Higher education will be truly high only when it enhances both the spiritual and material values of humanity—when it secures freedom, social justice, and enduring world peace. From our point of view, no education is complete or worthwhile unless people are encouraged to think for themselves, instead of being forced to follow the narrow channels ordained by a dictatorship.

But that doesn't take away the threat to our national security posed by Soviet Russia's educational advances. That threat is ominously symbolized today by the Lunik, the sputniks, and by Russia's acknowledged superiority in long-range missiles and rocket engines.

Since these are the products of the Kremlin's educational thrust, let us beware. The very fact that Soviet Russia's educational progress has become a potential weapon in her arsenal of international aggression compels us to give priority to improvement of our own educational system as a vital part of our national defense program.

It is not enough to attempt to make up lost ground by giving Federal scholarships for advanced study to scientific and technological students. Our school problems begin where the child begins—in the elementary school—and they exist all the way through high school and college. We must undertake a complete overhaul.

Toward that end, let us first consider the acute shortage of classrooms that afflicts even our more prosperous States. According to conservative estimates, we will need at least a quarter of a million new classrooms in the next 5 years to accommodate higher enrollment and to replace obsolete, rundown firetraps. How are we going to get this construction job done? There is no point in further talk of meeting this problem at the school district level, or even the community or State level. Their tax well has run dry.

The responsibility of rebuilding our school plant to regain the advantage we have lost to Soviet Russia is not a local problem. It is not a State problem. It is clearly a national challenge and we can meet it only at the national level.

Two years ago the administration proposed a Federal program of aid for school building involving the expenditure of over a billion dollars in 4 years. There was no follow-up and nothing happened. Last year no program of any description was advanced to meet the classroom shortage.

The second educational problem which is causing growing apprehension is the poor quality of teaching many American children now receive. Surveys all over the country have found that our elementary schools are sending to high school students who have not absorbed the basics of the three "R's"; that the high schools are sending to the colleges and universities young people who manifest not only obvious educational inadequacies but who do not even like to learn.

To meet this problem, President Eisenhower last week proposed a study by a representative citizens' committee. He told Congress: "We must have teachers of competence. To get them and hold them, we need standards."

If by this statement, the President means we need higher salaries and better working conditions for teachers we of labor agree with him fully. But why is another time-wasting study necessary to corroborate this simple fact? Can anyone doubt that most teachers in America today are grossly underpaid? According to the Government's own figures, they receive less pay per child than the average baby sitter.

Every study so far made shows that thousands of high-grade teachers have quit the profession to take over jobs in industry at which they can earn a better living. Likewise, not enough qualified young people are attracted to teaching because it offers a dead end instead of an economic future. As a result last year—and undoubtedly the same condition still prevails—more than 90,000 full-time teachers who held substandard certificates were employed on an emergency basis.

There is only one way of effectively ending that emergency—to establish higher salary standards for teachers, a move that is long overdue. Here again, our Federal Government must assume the responsibility for action because we can look to no other source to assume the financial burden.

Our third major educational problem involves enforcement of the Supreme Court's ruling against racial segregation in the public schools. While the Supreme Court directed that its decision be carried out with all deliberate speed, it has met with all deliberate obstruction. In two States, the Governors have even closed schools rather than comply with the law of the land.

This is unquestionably a difficult problem but it cannot be solved by nullification of the law. Nor can it be solved by abandoning responsibility to the States. Already college presidents are faced with the necessity of refusing admission to high-school seniors who were deprived of the opportunity to complete their courses last year. This waste of time and human resources cannot be tolerated by American parents any more than by their Government. The time has come for Federal authorities to bring about compliance with law and order and to accord Negro children throughout the country their right to equal educational opportunities.

There are two auxiliary educational programs of prime importance that I will mention only briefly because they have been discussed by other speakers at this conference. I refer to the need for improved vocational education and for Federal scholarships

to permit the great number of talented students who now have to quit school prematurely for economic reasons to continue with their educational development.

All these programs, of course, will cost a great deal. There is no getting away from it—somehow or other, now and in the years to come, we are going to have to raise much more money and spend much more money for education.

The decision can no longer safely be avoided. It must be faced courageously and effectively.

Unfortunately, the educational crisis has come to a head at a time when Washington has suddenly become preoccupied with budget balancing and fiscal economies.

The American people are looking for bolder and more forward-looking leadership.

We have had budgetary deficits before without disastrous results, but an educational deficit of the proportions that will soon pile up can never be overcome.

Congress should take the President at his word when he said, "We can afford everything we clearly need, but we cannot afford one cent of waste."

For the sake of survival, for the future well-being of humanity, we clearly need and we can easily afford the funds necessary to rebuild and revitalize our educational system. By the same token, we cannot afford, in the name of false economy, to waste the heritage and the opportunities of our children

Let us meet the educational challenge of our time as "one nation, under God, indivisible." That is the only honest, the only practical, the only available solution.

The Problem of Access to Public Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the January 15, 1959, issue of the Conservation News, a bimonthly publication of the National Wildlife Federation, contains some valuable information on our public lands.

The problem of access to public lands is a critical one. It is, however, an equally complicated problem. Yet as long as access to these lands is difficult or impossible, we fail to achieve the goal of multiple-use development. I am in complete agreement with the Conservation News in its statement that "perhaps the time has come for a reappraisal of public benefits to be derived from public lands and the administration of these properties." I am hopeful that such a reappraisal will shortly be forthcoming.

I think this article will be of great interest to all of my colleagues and ask that it be inserted in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

THE PROBLEM OF ACCESS TO PUBLIC LANDS

Something of a furor was raised in central Oregon this past fall over advertised plans of a group of ranchers to permit deer hunting on a fee basis over some 1 million acres of land. Many sportsmen's groups and the Oregon Game Commission went on record in opposition to the system, partly because it failed to recognize the right of all citizens to share equally in utilization of the State's wildlife resources and, in addition, because some public lands in Federal ownership were interspersed among the privately owned territory being advertised for fee hunting.

Reports indicate the fee-hunting plan was something less than a spectacular financial success, yet the incident does serve to point up a major problem, right of the public to enjoy access to, and use of, public lands for lawful recreational purposes.

The situation, largely concentrated in the 11 Western States but applicable to some degree all over the Nation, perhaps is best illustrated in Colorado. A survey just completed by the game and fish department and submitted to a State legislature interim committee reveals that 1½ million acres of public land in Colorado is controlled by private interests: farmers and ranchers, lumbering and mining companies, resorts and even municipalities. Members of the public can reach this land only by going across private property (sometimes for a fee, sometimes free, sometimes access is totally denied) or by detouring around at a considerable distance. Some Federal property is completely encircled by private holdings.

The final report covered 149 separate areas in 28 Colorado counties. The total public acreage controlled by private groups came to 1,462,738 acres, or 12.7 percent of the total public land area in the counties surveyed. From another angle, the study involved 10,788,402 acres, or 78.7 percent of Colorado's national forests. Of this total, 80 percent (8,695,357 acres) was considered to provide good hunting and/or fishing. There were 120 separate areas where the public was denied access to 1,038,190 national forest acres, or 12.1 percent of the total.

Public land access problems in Colorado are applicable, to a considerable extent, throughout the West.

In all, the Federal Government has some 406 million acres of land, exclusive of extensive holdings in Alaska. This huge area is broken down for administration into: National forests, 161 million acres; national parks and monuments, 17 million acres; national wildlife refuges, 10 million acres; military reservations, 25 million acres; and public domain, including grazing districts, 193 million acres. National forests, administered by the U.S. Forest Service Department of Agriculture, are dedicated to multiple use, including recreations such as hunting and fishing. National parks, administered by the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, are dedicated to recreational and educational use, except hunting. National refuges, administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior Department, are dedicated to the preservation of wildlife and some provide recreational possibilities, including hunting and fishing. Military reservations are administered by the Department of Defense and offer limited public recreational opportunities, including hunting and fishing, depending upon the type of basic activity and national security. Public domain, administered by the Bureau of Land Management, Interior Department, comprises the Federal properties which were left after the other lands were withdrawn for special uses.

The public access problem primarily concerns national forests and public domain lands. Each type of land has its own particular problems.

Speaking in generalities, many national forests are located in scenic but rugged mountain territory. Public domain lands constitute desert lands, plateaus, mountains, and odds and ends of Federal real estate, including huge tracts in Alaska.

Public domain property perhaps offer the most acute access problems. Whereas national forests were usually withdrawn or purchased in blocks, they are somewhat more easily administered than the public domain properties which often are widely scattered among more valuable land which was homesteaded, mined, or claimed for other purposes. Many public domain lands are rocky outcroppings, canyons, and gulches, or other unwatered areas of little or no value.

Access to public domain land and national forests is a thorny problem. The areas are so widely scattered and isolated that it is uneconomical to mark boundaries or to fence the properties. Even though State wildlife agencies are providing access to some areas, all cannot be opened in this manner. The Federal agencies understandably are reluctant to resort to condemnation procedures to insure public access to public property but this approach may, in the final determination, offer the only possibility. The Federal Range Code prohibits "interference with licensed hunters or fishermen to enter, and to hunt and fish on the Federal range covered by such license or permit" but many access roads are on private lands.

Admittedly, hunters and fishermen sometimes create damage and dismay for private landowners, but there also is another side to the coin. Denying entry prevents application of good wildlife management practices. It does not allow for proper harvest of such big game animals as deer and elk. When these animals come down to lowlands during the winter, they damage both public and private lands and, by their excessive numbers, create added problems.

Another problem resulting from denied access is one common to all posted property. Whenever hunting and fishing areas are withdrawn from use, greater and greater demands are made upon those still open. In some parts of the West the hunting and fishing pressures for certain forms of wildlife are not so great that, if scattered equally over larger areas, they would be harmful. The concentration problem, however, becomes more acute each time another area is blocked out from proper use.

As an expanding population gains more and more leisure time, increased demands will be made for recreational areas as well as for livestock. Problems of conflict over use of public lands are bound to result. Perhaps the time has come for a reappraisal of public benefits to be derived from public lands and the administration of these properties. Such a reappraisal may reveal the need for basic land-use law revisions.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many friends of freedom who are paying tribute to the brave Ukrainians on their 41st anniversary of their independence.

After years of oppression, they were able to throw off the yoke of Russian rule. Despite Russian attempts to wipe out Ukrainian nationalism, their love of freedom and high ideals prevailed, and when, in 1918, they regained their independence, they proclaimed the Ukrainian Republic. They adopted a democratic form of government, and, with vigor, courage, and hopeful hearts, they began to rebuild their war-torn country. Their liberty was short lived, for in 2 years the Russian Communists, by dint of their tremendous forces, again annexed the new Republic to the Soviet Union. Ever since 40 million Ukrainians have been bowed under Soviet rule in captive state; the freedom for which they sacrificed so much has been lost.

It is well that we commemorate the independence and freedom of the Ukrain-

ian National Republic; the people of the Ukraine are not allowed to recall the great day or celebrate by any outward sign. We who cherish liberty and democratic ideals can express our sympathy over their loss and also convey our good wishes that the day will come when their prayers will be answered and their and our hopes fulfilled—the day when a free and independent Ukrainian National Republic is again established.

We commend the Ukrainians now in our country for the splendid contributions they have made to our Nation in the fields of culture, science, and industry, as well as for their participation in our Government as splendid citizens.

Seventy-sixth Anniversary of the Civil Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and a tireless champion of Federal employees, the senior Senator from South Carolina, made the principal address at a banquet on January 17, 1959, celebrating the 76th anniversary of the Civil Service Act.

The American Federation of Government Employees sponsored the banquet under the sage and mature leadership of Mr. James Campbell, its national president. Toastmaster for the occasion was the genial and witty Thomas Walters, operations director of the Government Employees Council.

There were many dignitaries present including the Honorable Arthur Flemming, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the Honorable Barbara Gunderson, member of the Civil Service Commission. General Melvin Maas, a former member of this body and a distinguished member of the Marine Corps whose work among the handicapped is well-known, was present as Chairman of the President's Committee To Employ the Physically Handicapped.

Senator JOHNSTON delivered a stirring address in which he pointed that the vitality of the Nation depends in great measure on the strength of our Federal civil service.

I am honored and privileged to make his remarks a part of this RECORD:

SPEECH BY SENATOR OLIN D. JOHNSTON, DEMOCRAT, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, BEFORE THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AT THE 76TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT

President Campbell, Secretary-Treasurer Johnson, Secretary Fleming, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am delighted to join with you in observance of the 76th birthday of the Civil Service Act. I always look forward to and enjoy these meetings with you my fellow workers in the Federal service. Meetings of this kind are richly rewarding. They give us a chance to exchange ideas and to develop new ones.

New ideas and fresh thinking are needed today. We cannot afford to become sterile or stale in our thinking or in the way in which we act.

Our way of life depends on our national strength and vitality.

The vitality of the Federal civil service will remain strong in the future on a balanced diet of improved public opinion, purpose and progress.

I long have held to the belief that our civil service has been the victim of undeserved bad publicity. It has been the victim of an unfortunate lack of understanding by the public of what it is and of what it does. If the man-in-the-street knew it as we do, there would be no need to concern ourselves with the problem of public opinion.

Unfortunately, that is not the case today. Neither will it be tomorrow unless positive steps are taken to bring it about. As for my part, I propose to do all in my power to help mold a better and more realistic public opinion of the Federal service.

You, here tonight—the organization to which you belong—others like you—should consolidate your efforts on ways and means of acquainting the public with the virtues and accomplishments of our Federal service and our civil service system.

I doubt that the public gives proper credit to our civil service. It contributes so much to making this Nation strong and great.

How many know that much of our once fertile land is tillable today only because of farsighted and well-executed programs of conservation conducted on a national basis.

Is the public aware that our rivers have been harnessed bringing flood waters under control; that our forests have been created, extended, and improved; that game and fish have not been allowed to become extinct as the result of national planning and programs.

Does the public know that the foods we eat are clean and pure; that the medicines we take are safe and up to standard; that the cosmetics we use are free of harmful ingredients because of federally administered programs.

Does the public realize that our progress in providing a network of better roads; faster and safer transportation by land, air, and water; more effective prevention and cure of disease; maximum safety of bank savings; old age and disability benefits; greater protection to the honest and innocent against crime and fraud; and, improved communications result from Government interest in and attention to our national social problems.

Even if the public had such an awareness—and I think we can agree that it doesn't—there would still be the problem of getting across effectively that each of these varied and complex programs are only as good as the people who carry them out.

The mere recognition and identification of a national problem of itself does not provide a solution. That is only the first step.

Enactment of legislation—no matter how well concerned and designed—does not assure solution. That is merely a second step.

The most important ingredient is the human element. Let me make that point clear. Generally, the results are better with a bad piece of legislation in the hands of good people than a good piece of legislation in the hands of bad people.

Our Nation is and has been fortunate in many ways. We are blessed with abundant natural resources, rainfall, and sunshine, an industrious and honest citizenry and a government run for and by the people. This concept of government gave birth 76 years ago to the enactment of the legislation from which our civil service merit system is derived.

The Nation is fortunate that the legislators of that day had the wisdom and vision to look so well into the future. Without the benefit of that act, I fear we would not have attracted and could not have retained the high type of personnel needed to effectively carry out our many and varied Federal programs.

A good public opinion will not come our way easily or quickly nor will it remain with us long unless it is deserved. Unless we serve well and faithfully we do not deserve nor should we expect a good public opinion. To the end that we continue to warrant a good public opinion, we should reexamine our purpose in being where we are and in doing what we are doing.

We should each dedicate ourself to the task of giving the public better service by doing our job as efficiently, effectively and economically as humanly possible.

Whatever our field—whatever our assignment—the world of today is a challenge to each of us to do our best that tomorrow may be better.

I think every position in the Federal service should have a purpose. If it doesn't, its existence can't be justified. Every employee should know fully the purpose of his position and periodically renew his dedication to the fulfillment of that purpose.

You, Congress, and the leaders in the executive branch must be alert to the needs for maintaining the kind of civil service system in which you can be proud to serve.

I am sorry to say, this administration has not been alert to those needs during the past 6 years. Some of the appointments it has asked Congress to approve as leaders of this civil service system have left much to be desired.

I am happy to say, it looks as if Rip Van Winkle has finally awakened to needs of the service. The recent appointment sent to the Senate for Chairman of the Civil Service Commission leads me to believe they are at long last taking a proper look at this important post.

I sincerely hope they follow up this appointment with a good legislative program to make the service more attractive and to reward you for a job well done.

Maybe this is too much to hope for; maybe this new found respect for the civil service system is still in such infancy that they do not have a bold new program to submit.

As for me I took the Democratic majority leader's recent words very seriously—when he said to the administration—"Lead or be led." He was endorsing my actions for the past 6 years. I think you all are aware of the accomplishments I refer to.

As for the future, I will offer a bold new program. I hope the administration will join with me. If they do, the task will be made easier. If they don't, I will do it anyway.

I have already introduced legislation to:

1. Create a Federal employees health insurance program: As chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I am going to recommend to the committee that this be the first order of business. If we receive any kind of cooperation from the administration, this bill should become law before this session adjourns.

I am grateful to the subcommittee of the Government Employees Council for preparing this legislation. I know it represents many days of hard work.

2. Modify the Group Life Insurance Act to permit employees to purchase two times the amount of their salary; many employees have expressed the desire to be able to increase the amount of insurance they are allowed to purchase under present law.

3. Increase the per diem and travel allowance: I believe the present allowance is completely unrealistic. It was set in 1955. Revent surveys show the cost of travel has increased greatly since that time.

4. Allow persons convicted of an offense not involving the national security to draw the annuity they have earned, paid for, and are entitled to.

5. Preserve the rates of compensation of wage board employees whose positions are reduced in grade; and

6. Give employee organizations the right to represent their members and participate more fully in the formulation of personnel policies and practices.

During a recent trip to several European countries, I was impressed with the fact that the governments of most of these countries maintain a splendid working relationship with leaders of employee organizations.

These, then, are some of the things I hope to accomplish, to help insure for you a brighter and better tomorrow.

I say, thank you, for a job well done.

Good luck and God bless you all.

Success of Pan-American Games Vital to Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Leo Fischer which appeared in the Chicago American on January 19, 1959, entitled "Success of Pan-American Games Vital to Nation":

SUCCESS OF PAN-AMERICAN GAMES VITAL TO NATION—UNITED STATES PRESTIGE AT STAKE AS WHOLE WORLD WATCHES

(By Leo Fisher)

Whether we like it or not, prowess in sport in recent years has become tied up with national prestige. Maybe it's a byproduct of the cold war with Russia, but the fact remains that success on the athletic field is a mighty important matter these days when everything we attempt is looked upon with a critical eye to the rest of the world.

This summer, for the first time since the Olympics at Los Angeles in 1932, the United States will have an opportunity to act as host for a big segment of the world's athletes in the pan-American games.

Many of them will be making their first visit to this country—and a good portion of these firstcomers not only will be interested in winning laurels, but also in seeing how much of the anti-American propaganda they have heard is actually true.

The games, to be held in Chicago August 27 to September 7, will bring some 2,000 contestants from Canada, Central America, and South America. They will participate not only in track and swimming, but also in gymnastics, tennis, wrestling, water polo, yachting, weight lifting, baseball, basketball, riding, fencing, shooting, cycling, boxing and many other competitions.

Leaders of these athletes and teams are among the most important and influential citizens of their countries, especially in Latin America. Their treatment, their accommodations, the conditions under which they compete and every other phase will make an impression that goes for beyond the realm of sport.

Chicago, of course, will do its share. The city figuratively already has rolled up its sleeves and gone to work with zest and enthusiasm. Mayor Daley and his committees will go as far as they can to provide the finances and the background to make the pan-American games as successful as any meet ever held.

But this is a project that goes far beyond our city limits. It is a showcase not for Chicago but for the entire United States. It is an event of hemispheric and worldwide importance which must have the backing of every American citizen.

That is why the success of the bill introduced in the House by Representative SIDNEY YATES is so vital. It provides for an appropriation of $500,000 to be used toward the transportation, housing and feeding of the visiting athletes. It specifies that none of the money is to be used for permanent facilities, which is as it should be. Chicago can handle that phase of it as part of its continuing growth and its contribution toward the community's welfare.

A similar bill was passed by the House last year but was held up in the Senate committee until adjournment. With arrangements for the pan-American games now in high gear, speed is essential. The money is vitally needed to insure the finest of everything for our guests.

It is a nonpartisan project, just as was the appropriation of more than $3,000,000 passed last year and signed by the President to help the State of California provide facilities for the 1960 winter Olympics at Squaw Valley.

The Nation's civic, industrial and political leaders in every region should forget partisanship and get solidly behind the Yates bill to insure its quick passage. As appropriations go these days, $500,000 is hardly a ripple in the budget—but its importance is immeasurable in one phase of world affairs.

It should be looked upon not as a gift to Chicago, but as a small investment in the bettering of relations with our neighbors to the north and south of us. It will pay big dividends for many years to come.

Permanent Certificates for Helicopter Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House I include the following editorial published in the December 1958 issue of Flight magazine:

PERMANENT CERTIFICATES FOR HELICOPTER AIRLINES

Scheduled helicopter air services in Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York have proved beyond the shadow of any doubt that they should become permanent arms of our domestic air transport system. The only way to do this is to provide them with permanent certificates of convenience and necessity, following the precedent established 2 years ago when Congress passed legislation ordering the Civil Aeronautics Board to certificate the local service airlines on a permanent basis.

It won't be necessary for the Civil Aeronautics Board to certificate helicopter routes into every nook and cranny of present areas of operations. It would be sufficient simply to provide permanent certificates for their major routes such as interairport runs and leave the other routes and future expansion on an experimental basis. For example, Los Angeles Airways is presently certificated to serve any point in an area of a 50-mile radius, which leaves the carrier enough latitude to find out by trial and error what service can be justified.

The three helicopter carriers have a combined operating experience of some 30 years. Surely the documented statistics are available to determine on what basis to provide the hardy pioneers with permanent operating status. They have gone just about as far as they can go as experiments. Bob Cummings, president of New York Airways, recently pointed out we must move immediately into the era when helicopter transport is a conventional business instead of a laboratory. Permanent certification of the major routes of the three operations is certainly the first step to this desirable goal.

It's all well and good to get excited about the jet age and the coming supersonic age of air transport. But the low and slow business of helicopter airlift is just as necessary and exciting.

The coming of the jets means that the air traveler will spend a larger percentage of his origination-to-destination time on the ground than he does now with reciprocating craft and unless he can hop a helicopter or some other type of VTOL flying machine to and from the jet airport he wastes a lot of time he saves by the new long-range jet transports. So the helicopter either as a shuttle air taxi or a short-haul intercity bus must be developed simultaneously with the jet services if all the promises of the jet age are to be fulfilled.

It certainly is encouraging to know that the Civil Aeronautics Board as now constituted is perhaps the most progressive Board we've had in many years. The recent enunciations of several members in public addresses and the realistic approach to local service airline problems in mail rate cases and route extensions may be taken as an indication the Board will show the same brand of enlightenment toward the helicopter air transport companies. If and when permanent certificates are granted the Board should then begin to consider and adjudicate the many applications on file for similar services on a temporary certificate basis in other metropolitan centers.

The Supreme Court and the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a most learned and appropriate article written by Mr. W. A. Langley, Laurel, Miss., on the question of the Supreme Court and integration. The article was printed in the August 28 edition of the Laurel Leader-Call. I believe that thoughtful readers will agree that Mr. Langley has correctly analyzed the situation. This able statement is but another argument for the bridling of this runaway Supreme Court.

The article follows:

PUBLIC FORUM

Sir: Since I have some firsthand knowledge of the school situation as well as an intimate understanding of social customs and taboos in the South, and having been educated partially in the East, I can grasp to a very limited degree something of the problems facing our Chief Executive.

Most southern schools and all of most Southern States are not going to integrate to any noticeable degree, immediately. If this be "anarchy," then it has been made so by outside inteference and not by southern volition.

It is easy for anyone to conceive of any number of situations, which could make even our present executive rebel against a Supreme Court order. If by some coincidence the Supreme Court became controlled by the Communists and it ruled against the exercise of private enterprise, the present Executive would be first to lead a rebellion with all his might. The South would laud him for such action.

The North resisted, with all its might, the Dred Scott decision of 1857. President Buchanan tried very hard to enlist the sup-

port of all sections to the decisions; but the North would not listen to him any more than the South is listening to the present President. At that time the North quoted Thomas Jefferson as saying: "To consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions is a very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one that would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy."

Mr. Lincoln fought the decision. He said: "The candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the Government, upon vital questions affecting the whole people, is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made, in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of that imminent tribunal."

Was the North made up of anarchists when it resisted the Dred Scott decision?

Was Jefferson an anarchist when he said that the Court was not the ultimate arbiters?

Was Lincoln an anarchist when he said that when the people allowed the Court to become an oligarchy they had ceased to become their own rulers?

It just happens that the Court has become dominated by those who disregard States rights. To the South, integration is just as brazen a disregard of its customs as communism would be to the Chief. Legislation by no court will change the southern way of life, now. The future is unpredictable. Its changes will not be known until it becomes the past. However, one thing is certain, agitation by the courts will retard the future progress of good race relations rather than speed integration. If there is to be future tantalizing action by the courts, and other branches of the Government, future historians will write that the gravest error of the Eisenhower administration was race agitation.

Name calling cannot settle this or any other dispute: if so, the epithets hurled at certain branches of the Federal Government following the Army's occupation of Little Rock, would have amply achieved the desired ends. Southerners, sir, are not anarchists any more than the President would be an anarchist if he resisted a Communist-controlled court. Is it anarchy to disagree? It was in Hitler's Germany. It was in England in 1876.

The same Constitution which guards the rights of the individuals also guards the powers of the States and limits the power of the Federal Government. There is no provision made in the Constitution regarding education or social customs. If so, why does the court not so cite? "Powers not delegated to the Congress are reserved to the States." Integration is clearly then a State matter. Besides no Negro in America is denied education sufficient to meet the requirements of his ambitions.

The court has erred in projecting itself into the field of legislation. As authority for this statement see the report of the State chief justices now in session in California. The court's error leaves our chief some degree of latitude to correct the error partially. The phrase "with all deliberate speed" places the responsibility for the speed of enforcement directly on the Chief Executive. In the last analysis whatever errors are made in the speed of enforcement belong to him.

There is an unbiased and unprejudiced doctrine on American Government which touches directly this subject of legal and social coercion. To show that this opinion is unbiased, it was written decades before the race issue arose in our schools. The author was not from the South, nor from the North, nor from America. Lord Bryce in "The American Commonwealth" teaches that any American custom cannot become a successful American law unless it enjoys the overwhelming support of the population of a given area; that any present law that does not have the support of the great majority should be repealed; that local customs in one State might become successful laws there and be failures elsewhere. This unbiased document by a great British stateman is still held up to college students as perhaps the highest authorative treatise on the U.S. Government.

The great experiment of prohibition is here cited as an example that bears out the Bryce doctrine.

To show further that Bryce's law prevails here in Mississippi we have the most rigid prohibition laws of any State in the Nation. As a whole the State is technically totally dry; but in practice this is far from the truth. Certain counties and other government subdivisions do not subscribe to the State's liquor laws. Therefore, in these subdivisions liquor is sold openly across the counter.

Similar instances of local disregard for State or national laws can be cited in any of the States where the present Chief Executive has at times held his citizenship. Disregard for higher law then is not solely a characteristic of the South. It is characteristic of any American community where such a law does not enjoy the overwhelming support of the population. The supergovernment is not supposed to usurp the power of the supporting governments except under very limited circumstances as directed literally by the Constitution. If this usurpation does occur, then disregard of the courts legislation can be expected.

If the southern way of life had been let alone; and if as much progress in successful race relations had occurred during the next 50 years as has occurred during the last like period of time, the integration problem would have resolved itself through social development and change in the folkways. But the present turmoil has perhaps retarded solution for a hundred years. The South is simply not ready to integrate and integration cannot be successfully legislated without social acceptance by the affected locality.

The court and the Exeutive have made brave efforts; further forced attempts will be grave errors.

Any further attempts at integration should be done in conjunction with the local community. Wisely, a Commission has been set up to handle matters of integration. The only way the efforts of the Commission can succeed is with the cooperation of the community involved: Defiance of the wishes of a majority of any governmental unit by the Commission will mean ultimate failure in that unit. Cooperation with some units with no coercion, no threats, no force, no Army, no bayonets, no police action, no reprisals, no combination of these may achieve some degree of integration in some governmental units cooperation not coercion should be the motto of the Commission.

If demands for integration are made of any school board, then a petition to that effect should be signed by at least 10 percent of the bonda fide patrons of the schools of the area concerned. This petition should then be submitted to the Federal Commission. In turn the Commission should hold an election of all the school patrons of the area (both white and colored) to determine the wishes of the majority. After the election the Commission would know whether or not any further efforts would be advisable according to Bryce's law. This would also answer the Court's directive relating to "all deliberate speed."

The success of your Commission will depend upon its tolerant understanding, its thorough investigation, its deliberate action, its willingness to give a little here and there, its ability to see a community as one who has spent his life there, its willingness to seek the advice of those in the community who are wise and fair, its awareness of social structure, historical background, and some sympathy with local taboos.

If the commission approaches this problem in this manner and not in the manner of a police investigation, then on some distant day in a somewhat dim future, total integration will have a slim chance to succeed.

In the meantime the South goes along, unperturbed and fearless of the big bad wolf of integration, knowing that its bark is much more disturbing than its bite, believing that the administration should spend more of its energies in the solution of some of its foreign problems, rather than dissipating its energy and dividing our country—pitting one section against another—by dwelling upon a problem so impossible as the immediate integration of the races of the South.

W. A. LANGLEY.

Many Happy Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the January 15 issue of the Hillside (N.J.) Times, commenting on the 10th anniversary of one of the most unusual, constructive, and valuable civic associations I know of.

I have watched their activities over this period of time and I have no hesitation in recommending to our colleagues that the Hillside Industrial Association could be a most inspiring pattern for community-minded efforts throughout the country:

MANY HAPPY RETURNS

The 10th anniversary of the formation of the Hillside Industrial Association will be observed at a dinner next Thursday evening and Hillside residents could hardly be censured for pointing with considerable pride to this bouncing youngster.

For looking around us in all directions, we know of no other community, large or small, which can boast an organization quite like this one. Many municipalities have their chambers of commerce, but Hillside is the only community we know of where the industries have banded together to create better understanding not only by word but by deed.

Perhaps the most outstanding accomplishments of the association during the 10-year period was organization of the Hillside Industrial Foundation. In the short space of a few years it has contributed sizeable sums to a number of worthwhile civic projects, including a recreation fieldhouse, the building funds of two religious groups and several other endeavors.

All are familiar with the Ford Foundation and others on a national scale, but Hillside is probably unique in the entire Nation for having this foundation devoted exclusively to local projects.

During its 10-year life span the Hillside Industrial Association has initiated other projects which have been of benefit to the general public as well as its own members. These have included the second postoffice on Hillside Avenue, Youth-Industry and Teacher-Industry Days honoring Little League champions, and so forth.

The association's activities have won the commendation of two Governors, Alfred E. Driscoll and Robert B. Meyner.

On reaching its 10th anniversary, the entire community, we are sure, joins in wishing the Hillside Industrial Association many happy returns.

Appendix

Victory for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, last Saturday was a red letter day for the Democrats in New Mexico. They had a huge victory dinner at Albuquerque and were honored by having as their speaker the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Senator JOHNSON drew the largest crowd that has ever attended a political dinner in New Mexico. By actual count 1,105 people sat down in Albuquerque's huge civic auditorium to hear the majority leader. In addition, hundreds more were in the gallery to hear him.

They were not disappointed. The senior Senator from Texas was in rare form, not only in the formal address but in the friendly asides during the delivery of that address and in the stirring conclusion of his remarks.

I ask unanimous consent that his address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICTORY FOR AMERICA

(Address by Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON at Democratic victory dinner, Albuquerque, N. Mex., January 24, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, fellow Democrats, it is a special pleasure, as a Texan, to be here in one of the few States that outlie Texas.

As you know, of course, Texas suffered a little embarrassment recently. We used to be the largest State in the Union. Then we were knocked over by an iceberg.

DOWN, BUT NOT OUT

We are down—but not out. That is why we sent a Texan out here to take over as your Governor.

You know Colorado used to have a Texan as Governor. Oregon had a Texan as Senator. The Nation has a Texan as President.

Unlike John Burroughs, of course, these others are Republicans and that is one of our chief exports in Texas. We don't mind when they leave—in fact, we encourage it. We don't usually let the good Democrats like Burroughs get away.

CHERISHED FRIENDS

A special pleasure for me is the opportunity to be in the home State of two of my most cherished friends, DENNIS CHAVEZ and CLINT ANDERSON.

The Nation is fortunate that you have sent them both to serve in Washington.

DENNIS CHAVEZ holds a vital role in our national life as chairman of the Committee on Public Works and the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations. I congratulate you on his reelection and, personally, I thank you for it.

I thank you also for CLINT ANDERSON. Several years ago, I asked a senior Senator to stand aside so that he might serve as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. At this session, he again assumes the important chairmanship of that committee—and the job could not be in more responsible hands.

TWO GREAT SENATORS

You have two great Senators. You have, also, two of the most able young Congressmen in Washington—my friends, JOE MONTOYA and TOM MORRIS. Keep your eye on these two. They are on their way to positions of high responsibility.

These victories—and many more—we have come to celebrate.

THE GREAT CRUSADE

We are meeting tonight in the lingering twilight of the great crusade.

The noble slogans are muted and still. The polished brass has tarnished and scuffed. The flying banners hang listlessly and limp.

It was just 6 years ago that all the world was young and gay.

The ship of state was destined for a firm hand at the tiller. Fiscal solvency was the pole star toward which our course was set.

We were to have strength without exercise; health without care; an assured future without investment.

THE THREAT OF VETO

And now there is nothing left but a desire for quiet—and government by the threat of veto.

Our country is torn by a great internal controversy.

Communism has declared economic war against our way of life.

The United States—which led the world into the atomic age—now lags in the exploration of outer space.

A BALANCED BUDGET

And we are told that there is just one issue before us—passage of an artificially balanced budget with a dot over every "i" and a cross through every "t."

The people gave their answer to that kind of government 3 months ago. They repudiated the concept of administration by inaction, procrastination, and delay.

All over the country—from Maine to California, from Minnesota to New Mexico—they cast their ballots for men of vigor. They asked for—and they shall receive—leadership in keeping with their own desires for progress.

WASHINGTON RUMORS

But the ink had scarcely dried on the headlines of victory when the rumors began to seep out of Washington. The informed sources and the reliable informants all told us the same thing.

The President was determined to exercise his veto powers to the hilt to check a wild spending spree.

There is no American who objects to the exercise of the veto power. It is a proper, constitutional function and one of the most important checks in our system of checks and balances.

WILD SPENDING

There are very few Americans who favor a wild spending spree by their Government. We all know that the end of such a spree would be fiscal insolvency.

But I think it is about time that somebody blows the whistle on threats to veto bills that have not been drafted and to cancel steps that have not been taken.

Perhaps I studied the science of government in an old-fashioned school that is now out of date. But I had always believed that the veto power was something that the President exercised after he had examined a bill.

It was only in Alice's Wonderland, I was told, that the rule was "verdict first, trial second."

And when the verdict is "veto," not only before the bill is passed but even before it is printed, it becomes little more than an instrument to blackjack Congress.

It is rather strange at this date to have the administration standing at the dyke to hold back the tides of spending. It is just 6 years too late for the role to be natural.

ADMINISTRATION BUDGETS

The present administration has drawn up, and administered, the largest peacetime budgets in history. And the last Democratic Congress clipped $5,600 million off those budgets.

To set the present administration up as the guardian of the balanced budget is in the same class as hiring a coyote for a watchdog over the sheep.

The last Democratic Congress did not embark on any wild spending sprees. And there is certainly no reason for thinking that the present Congress will do so.

A CONGRESS OF ACTION

But there is every reason to believe that this Congress will be a Congress of action. And it is the concept of action that brings us to the heart of the matter.

There are two ways in which a nation—or a man—can remain fiscally solvent.

One is to pull in, cut down, retract, withdraw, scrimp, and shrink from activity.

The other is to expand, produce, work harder, be more efficient, welcome opportunities.

THE REAL ISSUE

The real issue before the United States today is which road we will follow.

Democrats believe the budget can be balanced if we take advantage of our opportunities to increase the wealth of the Nation.

Republicans believe the budget can be balanced if we turn our back on opportunities and resign ourselves to the status of a second-class nation—weak, but thrifty.

THE DEMOCRATIC TIDE

It is no accident that the Democratic tide, while rolling strong everywhere, reached high-water mark in the West. It is here in the West that men have the greatest vision of the meaning of opportunity.

We know, as westerners, that this whole vast region—from Texas to Montana and from the Mississippi to the Pacific—is one of the tomorrows of our Nation.

Your own State is a land of enchantment—not for the legends of its yesterdays but because of the lure of its tomorrows.

Here, all across the West, tomorrow is everything.

The same is true in all the regions of our young land.

We must make provision for the support of the population of the 1960's and 1970's. We must enlarge our productive capacity.

We must multiply our job opportunities. Add more schools. Erect more hospitals. Build more roads. Construct more homes. Increase the output of our farms. Solve the problems of our human relations.

THE MUSTS—THE NECESSITIES

These are musts, no choices; necessities, not options.

Today's leadership will be adjudged responsible or irresponsible in terms of how tomorrow is served by the course we set now.

As a Nation, we stand at the very edge of the most demanding era of our economy's history. Yet, as we see the needs ahead, we find our cities blighted, whole regions depressed, key industries sick, vital links of our transportation system mortally ill.

ACCUMULATED DEFICITS

Search the history of the Nation and you will find few periods of the past in which so many accumulated deficits have pressed upon us—at one time—for action and resolution.

Yet, in the face of this, we are confronted by a deepening division in the directions of our national leadership.

On the one hand, the representatives of the people—most recently elected to serve them—say that the time has come to put tomorrow back into the mind and heart of government.

On the other hand, those who serve in the executive branch of the Government are serving notice that there is no room for tomorrow in their planning. And, furthermore, they go one step farther: the partisans of those with Executive power are openly threatening to use that power to veto tomorrow.

WORLD LEADERSHIP

We cannot expect to lead the world if we turn our backs on tomorrow. Yet, that is now offered as the chosen course of those with executive responsibilities.

They have turned their backs on New England.

They are silent to the needs of the northern manufacturing States.

They are totally insensitive to the economic potential of the South.

DISREGARD OF THE WEST

Most tragically, this administration has elected to disregard the West.

Let us look for a moment at your own State of New Mexico.

In less than 15 years, New Mexico has grown enormously—both in population, in manufacturing, and in importance. Much of this has come directly from the stimulus of an industry which did not exist 20 years ago—and barely existed 10 years ago.

I refer, of course, to your atomic industry.

Out of this one new industry has come a whole new world of opportunity for you and for your children. Because of it, whole new cities stand in your State where none stood a generation ago. Great new wealth is coming from your soil. New capital is being invested here. A new future is opening before you.

What has happened to New Mexico because of the atomic age is only a beginning—for in the space age opening before us now, this story will be repeated many times.

STORY OF THE NATION

It is—or it can be—the story of the West and of the Nation.

For the real impact and import of the space age will not come in the skies above us but in the West about us. Our scientists tell us that in the next decade our space technology will produce a flow of knowledge and understanding of materials which will revolutionize our industrial system.

Entire new industries will be brought into being.

New uses for unused resources will be found.

New metals and new metals technology will develop.

Every region in the Nation will benefit from this, but the Nation will especially need—in this era—the full capacity of its West.

THE WATER PROBLEM

Furthermore, you know and I know that the full solution of the water needs of the West is not going to be achieved piecemeal, nor is it going to be met by conventional efforts alone.

In my State, we have drawn plans to take the surplus water from regions with an abundance and channel it across great distances to supply regions with a deficit.

The feasibility is established.

The sole question is not the way—but the will.

I remember 20 years ago that when the survival of the free world was at stake the United States marshalled its resources into the Manhattan project—to unlock the secrets of the atom. Through such concentrated effort, we solved—in less than a decade—a challenge which many doubters thought could not be solved. And because of our effort, we opened for all of humankind a new age of hope which we are only now beginning to realize.

MANHATTAN PROJECT ON WATER

I express to you my belief that the time has come when we must cease our dawdling over the water problems of the West. It is time for us to commit our resources to another Manhattan project on water.

The solution of the water problem is far nearer than was the task to which the scientists at Los Alamos first addressed themselves.

We know, already, for example, that it is feasible to transform salt water into usable water for municipal, industrial and agricultural use.

At modest expenditure, we should be able—within 5 to 10 years—to perfect our methods sufficiently to make such water available at an economically feasible cost to the West.

PROBLEM CAN BE SOLVED

The point is this: the water problem of the West can be solved, insofar as engineering is concerned. The solution depends not upon the engineers but upon the decisions and courage of our political leadership.

Thus, the question is a question of political integrity—not technical capabilities.

I, for one, would express the hope that we may during this Congress lay before the executive branch this clearcut choice: hand to them a program for undertaking to find the solution to the water problem—then let them, with the eyes of the Nation upon them, make their choice.

Will they meet or will they fail the responsibility to tomorrow?

RESPONSIVE SERVICE

We of the Democratic Party have—for the past 6 years—served constructively in the Congress. We have not sought and we have not exercised a veto over progress—or even over Republican proposals that are in the interest of America. We have served responsibly and the elections demonstrate that the people approve.

Our sense of continuing responsibility does not permit us to follow blindly along a blind course—and this we shall not do.

DYNAMICS OF THE NATION

It is my belief—as I am sure it is yours—that the future of this Nation lies not in turning back to the past but in forging ahead to unlock the dynamics of our regions.

We do not propose to leave any region or any area or any city to stagnate amid the promises of these times.

We do propose to devote ourselves to the expansion and the growth and the confidence characteristic of America.

This is the spirit and the image of the Democratic Party.

By this approach, we shall make our victory of last November what it ought to be—and what we want it to be—a victory for the people of America and free men everywhere.

South Carolina's New Governor, the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Wednesday, January 21, 1959, I had the pleasure of attending the inaugural ceremonies for South Carolina's new Governor, the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings, Jr. The Governor delivered a very able address which represents the thinking of the people of South Carolina. This address was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last week.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD edtiorials from several South Carolina newspapers which are very complimentary of the Governor's address, and which give further evidence of the fact that the people of South Carolina are standing firm for the principles of States rights and constitutional government.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Ridge (S. C.) Citizen, Jan. 22, 1959]

NEW GOVERNOR

Gov. E. F. Hollings, sworn in as Governor of South Carolina on Tuesday of this week, is at 37 one of the youngest men ever to occupy that position. And he is the 105th, we believe.

Mr. Hollings takes office in a critical time of the State's history. The coming 4 years of his term will find him confronted with a variety of problems, the like of which could not have been envisioned less than a generation ago.

The battle will continue and be intensified to preserve constitutional government because those who would destroy the Republic will intensify their efforts. The nature of his position as Governor of South Carolina will place him among the leaders of those fighting to preserve the American heritage of a government of laws rather than of men. The State's right to work law will come under intensive efforts to have it repealed. Preserving the system of public education in its accustomed peace and harmony will certainly be one of his main problems. The further industrialization of the State and preserving a climate favorable to industrial investment also will have a high priority.

These he has recognized and pledged to meet properly, as a reading of accounts of his inaugural address will show. There are these problems and more, including the $23-million deficit now facing the State, and it is to his credit that he accepted them in a spirit of challenge and proposes to meet them with confidence.

That he is a man of much ability is an impression we have had of him since we first knew him. That he also has ambition in ample supply we do not deny, nor do we find this a reason for criticism. Ambition that is made of Shakespeare's sterner stuff is a virtue, we think.

Our present impression is that his lack of years does not denote a lack of maturity. His inaugural address indicates a depth of understanding of the problems that will confront his administration. He is personable in appearance and popular with the people and with the legislature. In all, it's hardly possible to conceive of more auspicious circumstances under which to begin an administration.

We dare to hope that these good auspices will follow him throughout the next 4 years.

[From the Anderson (S.C.) Free Press, Jan. 22, 1959]

LOOKING AHEAD TO PROGRESS

Gov. Ernest F. Hollings, who was sworn in as South Carolina's new chief executive Tuesday, has sounded a call for progress in this State based upon conservatism and a rededication to constitutional government. We believe the new Governor has set a goal with which his fellow South Carolinians are completely in accord. It may well be that his 4 years in office will prove to be a period of unprecedented progress in the State.

The youthful Governor assumes his office with a wealth of good will on the part of responsible citizens. This is so not only because he is young, possesses a dynamic personality, and is temperate in his approach to political questions but also because the belief is widespread that he knows South Carolina and its business, that he will approach the State's economic problems realistically, and will effectively present South Carolina's case to the Nation.

Because he believes in his native State and possesses a great enthusiasm which will go far in helping him to convince others of its merits Governor Hollings may hold the key which will open a new era of industrial progress in South Carolina. He has promised to work unceasingly in this interest and citizens are confident that he has the ability to help the State take great strides forward.

During his inaugural address Hollings spoke on a general note rather than making any specific recommendations to meet the challenges before him. But in firm and ringing tones, he dedicated his term of office to the defense of States rights, continued resistance to racial integration, and preservation of the free enterprise system and those systems of government which have been tried and proved. He warned that South Carolina and the South stand in the critical role of fighting against a tide which would sweep us into national mediocrity, crush the States and their citizens into national molds, stifle the views and rights of minorities, and destroy the original constitutional balance of power among the individual States and the Federal Government.

He declared that because we stand firm against the national attempt to wipe out the boundaries designed to preserve the Federal system of checks and balances, we are labeled reactionaries by so-called liberals who seek to force their own idea of the centralized state upon all the United States. "It must be admitted," Hollings said, "that we do react against their scheme to subvert the basis of American Government as we have known it through the years. We also admit that we are conservative, in the sense that we seek to conserve those principles of government and of free enterprise which have been tried and proved, and which have made this Nation what it is today. We in South Carolina see no conflict between such conservatism and progress; indeed, we think they go hand in hand toward bringing us a better life, and it is our mission to put forward a dynamic conservatism as an asset, not a liability."

In spelling out a program of enlightened and progressive conservatism, Governor Hollings displayed a sureness of purpose and a calm determination that has inspired the confidence of his fellow citizens. Certainly he will need the support and prayers of us all as he turns now to the task of putting his beliefs into practice—that upon our shoulders may indeed, as he expressed it, "ride the cape of leadership, the hope of free enterprise, and the dignity of truth."

[From the Camden (S.C.) Chronicle, Jan. 23, 1959]

SOME WORTHY PLEDGES

Gov. Ernest F. Hollings' inaugural address yesterday was full of the common beliefs of a majority of the people he will govern: that the laws of the current Supreme Court are not constitutional laws; that both the white and the Negro races will be better served in segregated schools; that our battle for States' rights must be keenly pursued and intensified; that our beloved State has been touched by destiny to carry the hope of the South and the Nation in the continuing struggle for constitutional Government and States' rights.

Said the new governor of the Supreme Court's threatening attitude:

"The Supreme Court of our land was established to decide litigation in the light of past decisions and not in spite of past decisions. It is not the Court's function to lay down the law of the land by judicial fiat. It is the Congress under the American system that makes law. Flagrantly, baldly usurping the amendatory power of three-fourths of the States, the justices of the Supreme Court apparently take their gospel from Richard III, whom Shakespeare caused to say: 'Strong arms shall be our conscience, swords our law. March on, join together to pell mell, if not to heaven, then hand in hand to hell.' "

Governor Hollings, some believe, is a young man touched by destiny. He spoke potent words in his address—words which dittoed the feelings of a majority of Southerners. He pledged himself to fight for his convictions. He has the energy of youth and the mind of maturity to carry our standard tall in the saddle. And with the help of God we believe he will.

[From the Camden (S.C.) News, Jan. 22, 1959]

GOVERNOR HOLLINGS' INAUGURAL

The inaugural address of Gov. Ernest F. Hollings Tuesday gives patriotic South Carolinians assurance that this State will continue to resist any efforts of the U.S. Supreme Court to enact legislation affecting this State.

The new Governor took a bold and courageous stand. In taking the oath to preserve and defend the constitution of South Carolina and the Constitution of the United States, he made it plain that he planned to defend the Constitution of the United States as it was written and not as it has been amended illegally by the U.S. Supreme Court.

"I cannot conscientiously take this oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States and not object to the Supreme Court usurping the amendatory power that constitutionally is vested in three-fourths of the States," said the new Governor. "To do so would give us a government of men and not of laws."

Mr. Hollings said that "the segregation stand of the South is symbolic of the stand of our forefathers against the oppression of government when this great Republic was founded," and he gave assurance that our position of determined resistance will remain unchanged.

We liked the conclusion of his address when he said:

"With an humble prayer for God's blessings and guidance I assume this task with a vigorous pride that while South Carolina and our Southland 25 years ago may have been the Nation's No. 1 economic problem, today, we are the Nation's No. 1 hope for the survival of the free enterprise system. Today, we are the Nation's hope for the survival of constitutional government. Today, we are the hope for the future."

His message was a most heartening one.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Jan. 21, 1959]

GOVERNOR HOLLINGS' INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Governor Hollings has spoken in terms authentic, mature, and even majestic in giving his concept of the vulnerability of our Republic and the requirements for its protection.

South Carolinians can be proud that such a call for the defense of the Constitution arises within its own borders. And it can be reassured of the soundness and comprehension of a new Governor still in his late thirties.

While we, his fellow citizens, can take comfort in his words as the heralds of the basic policy he will pursue, there is no consolation in his address for those national disciples of centralism who seek one government and one design for this Nation.

There is encouragement in his exceedingly able exposition of the great American tradition which has been the exact opposite of those destructive trends of the times he so literately enumerated.

We recall no statement on constitutionalism more forceful, more logical, and so well supported legally. And we know of none more solidly based on the broad sustaining principles of the United States as contrasted with expositions grounded on outward manifestations of our difficulties rather than on the roots of the evil.

Mr. Hollings admirably submerged the manifestations and emphasized the organic lesions, and it is there that the whole country is sick. The problem which has been created for the South, by one of the departures from the Constitution, is just one of the multiplying misfortunes befalling the whole of the Nation.

We are living at a time when emphasis on manifestations, and neglect of basic causes, goes beyond the broad problems of the Republic. We believe we see it in many facets of our life today and even in the church. When Mr. Hollings, pitches his deploring on the higher and more fundamental plane of the sources of disrupture, he renders a service and demonstrates the deeper understanding which the times require.

There was a particular pause for us at the phrase, "oppression of government," in the governor's address, which was one of many striking phrases. There is oppression today as there was bound to be from the steady war of attrition on the American Constitution and tradition. There is not only direct oppression, but there is that oppression by indirection which pushes into subjugation those groups in the country so affected by governmental sponsorship and elevation of other groups. This is part of the general oppression deriving from what Mr. Hollings says is one to make the American into one mold.

The address of Mr. Hollings was that of the progressive conservative, not only as to his convictions on maintaining the original structure of our country as a union of sovereign States, but also as to the operation of his own State of South Carolina. He pledged that South Carolina would live within its means, that it would provide the freedom to work and the best opportunities within its means for its children. This is in the classic area of reasonable and advancing conservation.

And there was that singularly realistic and independent statement: "We do not look for security but for opportunity."

And if the oppression of centralism and nationalization can be warded off, there will

be opportunity and that species of security, coming from success, for the upcoming Commonwealth of South Carolina. It was to this sort of progress that Mr. Hollings pledged himself, as well as to the essential struggle to protect the rights of the States.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Jan. 21, 1959]

OUR NEW GOVERNOR SETS A GOAL

Ernest F. Hollings in his inaugural address struck a note of dynamic conservatism that will ring true in the ears of a vast majority of South Carolinians.

It was a philosophical speech, with little in the way of specific recommendations to meet the challenges which now face the State. Those suggestions will be made to the general assembly in other addresses, beginning today. On yesterday, he expressed the firm conviction that the will and the ability to meet these problems exists and the calm determination to meet and overcome them.

Governor Hollings limited himself to two chief topics: racial amity and the economic prosperity and growth of the State. The two, he pointed out, are not unconnected. South Carolina, he said, will overcome the obstacles which now surround each of them by a rededication to constitutional government, firmly rooted in the wisdom of the past but with a vigorous confidence in the future.

The common source of the State's present difficulties, he declared, is the growth of the centralized state, dedicated to the extinction of the individual and the regimentation of the group. The South in general, and South Carolina in particular, are well suited by custom and inclination to resist that encroachment.

In the opening paragraphs of his address, the new Governor made clear his position on the question of State and Federal relationships. He noted that the oath which he had just taken pledged him to the preservation and defense of the constitutions of South Carolina and of the United States.

But he firmly declared that he did not interpret this oath as binding him to observe blindly the unconstitutional decisions of a misguided U.S. Supreme Court.

"We recognize," he said, "that the United States Constitution is an inspired document and a great gift and hope to mankind, but when the form and letter and spirit of that Constitution are ignored, a gestation period of chaos erupts into a miscarriage of conscience and propriety.

"When the doctrine of 'separate but equal' was sanctioned by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1896, neither Congress nor any court or State protested. On the contrary, everyone understood this doctrine as the basis upon which the States could conduct public education. The correctness of this understanding was confirmed repeatedly by the highest State and Federal courts in an unbroken line of decisions. The boundary line remained fixed.

"There is today no law and no provision of the Constitution requiring racially integrated schools. Until the Constitution is lawfully amended and the boundary line changed, the South stands on this boundary and on this principle.

"Until the Constitution is lawfully amended, my refusal to integrate our people during the next 4 years will not conflict with the oath I have just taken."

The threat posed by the Court's ruling in the school segregation cases runs deeper than this, however, as the Governor pointed out. It involves a none-too-subtle attack on our entire system of government.

The Constitution establishes checks and balances between the powers of the States and the Federal Government. If these bulwarks are destroyed, nothing stands between the individual and the soulless oppression of centralized authority.

Governor Hollings quite properly emphasized the danger to free enterprise involved in this totalitarian trend. He said:

"The opportunity to profit, to live, and to grow is fundamental to the American system of free enterprise. When the Federal Government, through its taxing power and other policies, kills this incentive to work and profit, to live and grow, then the boundary of the purpose for Government as we know it is exceeded by the power of Government and we are lost."

The new Governor contrasted the spectacle of the Federal Government with its inflated budgets, its apparently uncontrollable deficits and its incessant interference in private affairs with the stable, thrifty and less tyrannical government of South Carolina.

The assaults made by outsiders against our customs, he declared, are part and parcel of the greater attack on our liberties. If we ever surrender to regimentation over our institutions, the last hope for our economic freedom will vanish. If we cannot operate our schools as our experience and traditions dictate, then we cannot hope to operate our businesses or, indeed, our very lives.

"We are a State of hope and dedication," he said, "a State touched by destiny. The Battle for the Republic is truly at hand. On our shoulders ride the cape of leadership, the hope of free enterprise, and the dignity of truth."

In his address, Governor Hollings has, with the enthusiasm and vigor of youth, spelled out a platform of enlightened and progressive conservatism sorely needed in a nation and world beset with constrictive radicalism. The success with which he may be able to apply his beliefs to practical matters will mean much, and not only to the State which he will lead for the next 4 years.

He will have the support and the prayers of all South Carolinians in his attempts to that end.

[From the News and Courier, Jan. 20, 1959]

STATE LOOKS FORWARD TO PROSPERITY UNDER LEADERSHIP OF GOVERNOR HOLLINGS

Ernest Frederick Hollings, of Charleston, today becomes the 105th Governor of South Carolina with the confident expectation of his fellow citizens that his 4 years in office will be a period of unprecedented progress in this State.

Few administrations in the history of this State have taken office with such a wealth of good will on the part of responsible and serious-minded citizens.

The reason for this good will lies not simply in the fact that Governor Hollings is young, personable and temperate in his approach to political questions. That is all to his credit and to the advantage of South Carolina. The chief reason for the enthusiasm felt in this State is the widespread belief that he knows this State and its business, that he will come to grip with economic realities, and effectively carry the South Carolina story to the Nation.

In recent years, much effort has gone into programs to bring new industry to this State. They are the principal way in which the living standards of South Carolinians may be raised. Many new industries have located in South Carolina, but the State needs more plants and payrolls. A substantial increase in the prosperity of this State requires a more energetic approach to selling the Nation on the advantages of South Carolina.

Governor Hollings has pledged to tell the South Carolina story to industrialists who are considering building new plants down South. Citizens of this State believe in Governor Hollings' command of the facts and the effectiveness of his words and ideas.

A State, of course, is not a product. Nor is a governor simply a salesman who travels around the country promoting a brand name. The South Carolina story that Governor Hollings has to tell people in other States is not a mere listing of physical assets. South Carolina is not the only State that has vacant land, people who are eager to work in industrial plants, pleasant temperatures, and adequate supplies of water and electric power.

The telling points in the South Carolina story concern the climate of freedom in the State.

South Carolina is a State where business can do business without the dictation of thugs or leftwing union bosses and without continual raiding by thoughtless and greedy legislatures.

South Carolina is a conservative State from top to bottom. Only last week Rep. Solomon Blatt, speaker of the State house of representatives, called for continued conservatism in State policies. He pointed out that private enterprise is running away from radical States and localities.

South Carolina has a right-to-work law that protects individuals and helps promote labor peace.

South Carolina has a population with deep roots and loyalty to a free way of life. Agitators meet with no success in duping the people into radicalism.

In short, South Carolina is a State that intends to progress through the sound, traditional methods of hard work and careful management of resources. A dollar's worth of service is demanded for each tax dollar spent. State business is conducted with honesty and decency.

The quality of the people of South Carolina and of their government can be described with pride by Governor Hollings.

As he takes the oath of office today as South Carolina's chief executive, Governor Hollings should be heartened by the fact that his fellow citizens are fully confident that he has the ability to help this State take a great stride forward.

Governor Brown Presents Vigorous and Constructive Water Development Program for California

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Governor of California, has delivered a special message to the State legislature on the subject of water, which everybody interested in water conservation and development should read.

Governor Brown makes the imperative point that the State and Federal Governments must team together to accomplish the important work that has to be done on California's rivers. We have reached the place where the State government must assume positive responsibility in the financing and construction of water projects, along with its long-established responsibilities in water rights and water contracts. The time for the State to act on this is now. As Governor Brown says, "It is time to start moving dirt and stop throwing mud."

Furthermore, State participation in the program, says Governor Brown, is

to be in full cooperation and coordination with the Federal programs of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. The era of State-Federal competition in water development in California is past. I am mighty happy to endorse the new cooperative approach.

Governor Brown, incidentally, supports the San Luis, Auburn, Buchanan, and Hidden Reservoir bills which I have introduced, along with the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], in this Congress. He also supports the Federal power program on the Trinity project.

But the Governor's message speaks well for itself. I ask unanimous consent to have the message printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER MESSAGE TO LEGISLATURE OF CALIFORNIA BY GOV. EDMUND G. BROWN

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, members of the legislature, may I first of all thank you for your courtesy in arranging this joint session of the legislature. I have asked to come here today, under these extraordinary circumstances, so that we can meet together as the single voice of all the people of California. I have come to present a water program which I believe is rational, realistic, and responsive to the needs of all the people of California.

Our State is magnificently varied in its resources, its scenery, its industry, and its people. Providence, as I said in my inaugural message, seems intent on making us a great people in a great State.

Yet, in spite of our great endowment, it has become the fashion in recent years to dwell on our water problems as being awesome and impossibly complicated. We have brooded over the expense and become lost in a forest of fear. In prior sessions of the legislature, the result has been delay and frustration.

This stalemate must come to an end. If we take courage and put our fears behind us, we can replace narrow, sectional differences with confident, pioneering leadership. This the people of California demand and deserve.

It is not the lack of water which creates the problem we meet to discuss. Indeed, the average runoff exceeds our requirements by a safe margin.

The core of our problem is distribution. We do not have enough water when and where we need it. We have too much water when and where we do not need it. Thus, it is obvious that we must build dams to capture water which would otherwise escape, and we must build canals and aqueducts to transport the water we have saved to the communities where it is needed.

To accomplish these vital tasks, our State has a great natural advantage. The physical setting of the delta of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers is a gift from nature that we have never fully appreciated.

Above the delta, we have both a supply of water and the sites to store it. Within the delta, we have the natural point of convergence. When we wish to export water to an area of need lying to the south, the delta can serve as the pool, or, if you please, as the tap from which the water can flow.

Every year there are 3 million acre-feet of water in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta which are not being used. At present, the water goes wasting out to sea through the Golden Gate. We must build the facilities for offstream storage and move this water to areas where it is urgently needed. Unless we save this surplus water, we waste a precious natural resource and fail the people of our State.

We should remember that we store water, not alone for future use, but also to avoid flood damage. To protect human life and valuable property, we must arrest our rivers in their headlong rush to the sea. Because the Federal Government contributes funds for flood control, we must impress the Congress with our urgent needs. We will also have to provide State funds to insure that flood control projects will be available for multipurpose use—not simply for flood control.

From our water development program, we should also create new sources of electrical energy. An ample supply of low-cost power is absolutely essential to our industrial future and to the needs of all our people. The State, too, will need an enormous amount of power to operate the pumps which are required to carry the water from areas of surplus to areas of need.

Fortunately, the extra cost of adding power facilities to our water projects is small in relation to the cost of the projects and small in relation to the resulting benefits. In addition, revenues from the sale of power enable us to furnish water and other benefits to deserving areas of our economy which cannot pay the total cost of water. As an example, I cite the Central Valley project, where the production of power has benefited our whole economy.

In planning our water projects we must give a high priority to recreation and to the development of our fish and wildlife resources. As our population grows and our leisure time increases, recreation requires added recognition as a beneficial use of water. Projects developed for recreational purposes provide our people with wholesome diversion and a happier and fuller life. At the same time, they stimulate the growth of portions of our State where recreation is the primary industry.

Against the background of these general observations, I propose the following program for water development:

First. I propose that this session of the legislature appropriate $38 million from the investment fund to start on a construction program. It is time to start moving dirt and stop throwing mud. This is the beginning of a positive program for water development. In considering this $38-million appropriation and subsequent expenses, I want to emphasize that the major cost of water development is eventually repaid from project revenues.

Second. I propose that we commit the entire investment fund to water development. This fund is unique in that it was built up through the depletion of a great natural resource, our offshore oil. I am determined that it shall be dedicated to the development of another precious resource, our water.

Third. I propose that in 1960 we authorize a general obligation bond issue in the neighborhood of $500 million to complete the program outlined in this message. To all of you, I pledge that I will fight to obtain adequate financing to complete the great aqueduct, south. And to all of you, I pledge that I will fight to obtain adequate financing to provide the other facilities throughout the State necessary to meet the needs of our people.

Fourth. We must encourage the Federal Government to finance water projects designed for navigation, flood control, and irrigation. Considering the condition of our budget, it is plain nonsense to resist Federal aid. I am glad to see that the old hostility to Federal funds is now mellowing. We should use Federal aid wherever we can, but we must also remember that we have our own responsibilities in the development of our water resources.

Fifth. We should undertake the development of our water resources on a comprehensive statewide basis. Local agencies, of course, must be encouraged to move ahead with those projects which have a primarily local impact. Yet, I am convinced that there must be an integrated statewide development of the massive works which affect many communities. Only thus can we prevent duplication and waste. Only thus can we avoid Balkanizing our State into competing water provinces.

Sixth. Many of the principles now applicable to the operation of utilities should guide us in the development of our State water resources. Thus, we should recognize our obligation to insure that water will be available to meet the proper demands of every part of the State. As in the case of a utility, we should be able to enlarge our facilities to bring more water into the delta pool and recover the cost from the system as a whole. Just as the first man to get a telephone does not enjoy a lower rate, so those who are first served by State water projects should not have a privileged status.

As long as the legislature guides our water development, we can be certain that the system will be completed and administered in fairness and equity. Those who would doubt this are questioning, not the water program, but rather the fundamental basis of democratic government.

In explaining this program, I have made no attempt to answer every conceivable question or satisfy all extremists. In addition, I have put to one side the question of a constitutional amendment. After long thought, I have concluded that an amendment is not necessary to an affirmative water program. Beyond that, I have found that there is no general agreement on what the contents of such an amendment should be. I am not hostile to an amendment and I am not closing the door on one. But I am convinced that our positive program of water development should not be delayed by further frustrating debate over the terms of a constitutional amendment.

Now let us look at the main points of the $38 million construction program which I propose for this year.

The great aqueduct system from the delta to the south is a key to pressing problems of water supply. By carrying water to southern California the aqueduct will supply the area where the human need is the greatest. On the way southward, the aqueduct system will also serve areas of critical water shortage.

I urge you to appropriate $10.7 million to enable us to start at both ends of this great aqueduct system. Of this amount $1.3 million would be for aqueduct rights-of-way from the delta to the San Luis Reservoir site; $3.8 million would be for the rights-of-way from San Luis to southern Kern County; and $3.3 million would be for rights-of-way for the aqueduct system into southern California.

The remaining $2.3 million would be used to complete the acquisition of the San Luis Reservoir site. This will provide an important portion of the State's share of the joint San Luis project. I am determined that the dam at San Luis shall be constructed to its full height so that we can store 2.1 million acre-feet in the reservoir.

In the past few days bills have been introduced by Senators ENGLE and KUCHEL and Congressman SISK and JOHNSON to authorize Federal participation in the San Luis project. I will do everything in my power to insure the passage of these bills. I see in them a reasonable compromise of the intrastate conflicts which have been a roadblock to this vital project. We must not allow disputes within the California family to delay us further.

There is also a vital need for a South Bay aqueduct to bring water from the delta to Alameda and Contra Costa Counties and portions of northern Santa Clara County. I am asking you to appropriate $7.9 million for

rights-of-way and for initial construction of this facility.

The units proposed for immediate construction will serve the Livermore Valley and the Niles Cone area where fresh water is urgently needed to prevent sea water encroachment into the underground basin. When Santa Clara representatives have completed their studies, the South Bay aqueduct can be extended to northern Santa Clara County.

The department of water resources has recommended that water service to southern Santa Clara, San Benito, and Santa Cruz Counties should be provided by a Pacheco Pass route. I will urge the Bureau of Reclamation to accelerate their studies as to the feasibility of serving these areas as part of the Federal Central Valley project.

The use of the delta as a collecting pool will require the construction of works to guard against sea water encroachment in the westerly portion of the delta. We are well aware of the hydraulic problems of the delta and the complex questions regarding water rights in that area. The department of water resources has been studying this matter for a long time and, remarkably enough, there appears to be a relatively inexpensive physical solution. By April 1, when these studies will be completed, I expect to ask an appropriation to begin the initial work for bringing fresh water to the threatened delta areas and thus also to permit increased diversions from the delta.

Let us now turn to consider facilities above the delta.

There are, of course, also areas in need of water which cannot be served from the delta. For example, Sierra Valley in Plumas and Sierra Counties is critically short of water necessary to support its agricultural economy. To provide service for this area, I will ask for $2.4 million for rights-of-way and construction of upstream features of the Feather River unit. The principal one of these would be Frenchman Reservoir.

I will also ask for the appropriation of $11.9 million for construction of the combination railroad and highway bridge over the west branch of the Feather River. The bridge will enable us to use the new high speed highway which is being completed this year.

A board of consulting engineers is conducting a study to determine whether construction on the Feather River should be started at Bidwell Bar instead of Oroville. On this technical question, I intend to accept the judgment of the department of water resources after it has had the benefit of the study which will be completed on February 1. I will then ask for funds to carry forward this major work on the Feather River which is vitally necessary for flood control.

Let me now turn to consider additional flood-control works. I will ask for $7.3 million as the State's share of the Black Butte project presently under construction on Stony Creek in Tehama County. I will also ask for $6.4 million for the State's share of the New Hogan Reservoir on the Calaveras River. Since the 1958 legislature appropriated $10 million of this amount, only $3.7 million in new money is involved.

These are multipurpose projects, which are urgently need for flood control, but are not immediately required for water conservation in their local areas. The flood-control benefits will be paid for by the United States. If the State will assure repayment to the United States for the conservation features, we can move forward with these construction projects. Since the State's entire financial obligation will be eventually repaid from the sale of water made available by these projects, I urge their approval now.

We must also bend our efforts to develop an economical means of obtaining fresh water from the ocean. Therefore, I request an appropriation of $1.6 million for use in cooperation with the United States in the construction of a sea water conversion plant. This plant, which will probably be located in southern California, will include a nuclear reactor as a source of energy.

Turning to Federal matters, I intend to urge the Congress of the United States to take the following action:

Authorize construction of the Auburn, Buchanan, and Hidden River Dams and the Folsom Canals;

Appropriate approximately $60 million for flood control construction and $70 million for reclamation in the State next year; and

Take the necessary steps to insure that water can be delivered in the Sacramento Valley canals area.

Further, I will urge the Federal Government to construct the power features of the Trinity Division and distribute the power in accordance with existing Federal law. The State itself will purchase a large volume of Trinity power to operate the pumps for its water projects. I am firmly opposed to the suggested partnership arrangement. Such an arrangement would deny to the State the preference that public agencies are now granted by Federal law.

I also intend to press for the enactment by Congress of the Engle-Kuchel bill which would permit low cost Federal loans for irrigation features of projects which are primarily municipal and industrial in character.

In this broad statement I have emphasized the first and immediate steps that we must take. But in our long-range plans for water development, we must and we will give thought to the future facilities that will undoubtedly be needed as our State grows. These will include additional local projects, expansion of the aqueduct systems, new works in the delta, master drains for the Central Valley, and, at the proper time, importation of water from the Eel River system and other streams of the north coastal area.

By all these recommendations, I have sought to bring the forward force of responsible liberalism to the specific problem of water. As I conclude, I would emphasize that our problem lies, not so much in the control and use of our rivers, as in ourselves. Let us resolve to prove that we are one State, one people, and that we can produce one good water program. Let us grow with the strength of unity, as we begin to fulfill our destiny of greatness.

The Recent Visit of Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the script of a radio broadcast made by the distinguished commentator, Sam M. Jones, on Sunday, January 25.

Mr. Jones enjoys a national reputation as an experienced and well-informed observer on the Washington scene. His comments on the recent visit of Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan are revealing and penetrating. In my judgment, they merit careful reading not only by Members of Congress, but by all other Americans.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening. This is Sam Jones reporting from Washington.

Our Government and our opinion-molders have been terribly concerned for lo these many years about what other peoples and other nations think of America and its citizens. In an effort to make other peoples and other nations think kind thoughts about America and its citizens, our Government has spent billions of dollars in giveaway programs. These programs were also supposed to insure military help from the nations we have befriended, in case of an enemy attack on the United States.

How many friends have we bought? And how many of them would come to our aid if we—the United States—were bankrupt, or under attack by Soviet Russia? Probably none, unless their own survival was dependent on ours. Should we, therefore, accuse our beneficiary nations of gross ingratitude? I do not think so. Good will is not for hire and a fool throwing money to the winds—whether it be an individual or a nation—sooner or later pays the price of folly—and there are no mourners at the funeral.

Wouldn't it be nice if our Government and opinion molders would become concerned with what we think of ourselves, and let other nations and other peoples think as they please about us? A self-respecting person, aware that he is far from perfect but doing his best, doesn't worry about what the neighbors think. And if he is blessed with commonsense, he knows that he can't buy friends, nor buy off enemies. And in these circumstances a nation is no different than an individual.

Some years ago I was talking to George Sokolsky in New York. He posed this question: "Have the American people lost their capacity for moral indignation." I had just driven in from Arizona—I had been refreshed by my own, my native land—west of the Hudson and south of the Potomac.

So I replied to Mr. Sokolsky. "Get out of New York, stay clear of Washington; listen to the average person everywhere. For in them our salvation lies. The people who never make headlines, who are slow to anger and sometimes easy to lead. But they are not sheep to be herded nor cattle to be driven." Mr. Sokolsky said; "I hope you are right."

I hope so, too.

Despite a generation where fools have walked with careless ease and traitors have overtly or covertly contributed to the destruction of this Republic—I still believe in America. I believe in miracles. I believe we can pull ourselves up by our bootstraps. But time is running out.

Our time.

Undoubtedly you are familiar with some of the highlights of the visitation of Comrade Mikoyan, the Armenian butcher, Comrade Khrushchev's right-hand man. He looked America over as a prospective buyer might, quite sure that he could buy, or that Russia could buy, come the day, on the buyer's terms. It would be silly to destroy the cities and the productive capacity of the United States with H-bombs or intercontinental missiles. Not when you can herd the sheep and round up the steers. A nation grown soft and fat and emasculated, a pushover.

Comrade Mikoyan is not to be blamed for his lack of depth perception. Superficially, his conclusions are right. The United States of America—our ship of state—is between the Scylla of bankruptcy and the Charybdis of conquest. And our skippers past and present—to say the best for them—knew little about navigation. Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, they meant well. But they couldn't tell port from starboard; nor read a compass; nor discern the difference between

black and white. If they are to be blamed, so are we, you and I. In this Republic—usually miscalled a democracy—we, the electorate, choose our leaders; ballots, not bullets, put them in office. But when a country reaches the point where the voters flip a coin to decide which candidate for president is the lesser evil, it's time for all good men to come to the aid of the country, while we still own it. Sometimes it seems that we have forgotten that we are the sovereign people and that our officeholders hold office by and with the consent of the governed.

Let us return to Comrade Mikoyan—the No. 2 man of the Kremlin. This super Al Capone who crawled across corpses to win favor in the Kremlin is in a way a success story, not exactly in the Horatio Alger vein, not bootblack to president, but bootlicker to super-salesman and panderer in chief of the murderous mob in Moscow.

I am going to tell you about Comrade Mikoyan's visit to the National Press Club, but first I would like to recall a historic incident which occured some 20 years ago.

An Englishwoman en route from London to New York—a woman of wealth and position and questionable morals—was disembarked from a Cunard liner and held at Ellis Island on the charge of moral turpitude. Now the worst that could be said about this woman was that she was free with her favors—she had no intent to overthrow the U.S. Government or even to corrupt Hollywood. If that's possible. So what did we do in our righteous moral indignation? We shipped her back to England. Very righteous. I think she had written a book, nothing as pornographic as any teen-ager can buy in any drug store today, but we just weren't going to be contaminated.

So times change. Comrade Mikoyan pays his disrespect to the United States of America. His contempt, in fact.

Is he held at Ellis Island? Oh, no.

Is he deported because of moral turpitude? Oh, no. Suppose he did kill some people and order the torturing of others? What of it? "That's a mere matter of policy," nothing personal, so saith the Armenian butcher. So what do we do. We rolled out the red rug. We gave him maximum security.

The metropolitan and the State Department security police and the CIA and all other Federal, State, and local protective agencies had an around-the-clock mission to see that Comrade Mikoyan was not endangered or annoyed by the American rabble or the relatives of the victims of the Communist tyranny.

My office is on the 13th floor of the National Press Building, the same floor as the National Press Club. I stepped out of the elevator on Monday, January 19, and started for my office. Two policemen in uniform asked me if I had a pass.

I said, I didn't need a pass to go to my own office and try and stop me. They could have, of course, quite easily. I'm no match for a couple of well-trained, young, athletic police officers. But it was quite obvious that they didn't like their assignment, and it was equally obvious that slugging or shooting me in potential defense of Comrade Mikoyan went against the grain. Theirs not to reason why. Nor was it my job to spend the afternoon in jail. So I showed the police my card signed by the head of the Secret Service, entitling me to admission to the White House. That made the cops feel pretty sure that I wouldn't shoot Comrade Mikoyan, so they let me go to my office.

Maybe you think this is fantasy, something I made up. It isn't. It happened to other people pursuing their lawful occasions. The 12th floor of the Press Building was also blockaded. Many other members of the Washington press corps also met a roadblock of cops and were compelled to produce credentials to gain access to their offices.

We treated Comrade Mikoyan real nice. A few people with Hungarian and Polish backgrounds, and other victims of the Red whip, made minor demonstrations, but all went well. Our best people—like Comrade Cyrus Eaton—whose tangible quid pro quo was four white horses (out of the Trojan stud) extended the utmost hospitality. Nor were the executives of major industries, the creme de la creme of capitalism, laggard in their tribute to Mikoyan. Will they tell their grandchildren, "This is the hand that shook the bloody hand of the Armenian butcher"?

The Washington Post—bugle of left-wing liberalism in the Nation's Capital—rebuked Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, in its editorial columns for raising his voice in protest against the luncheon given by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in honor of Comrade Mikoyan. Senator BRIDGES' refusal to break bread with and share the salt with a killer who has achieved second place in the godless Communist conspiracy, shocked the State Department and provoked the Washington Post. I am quite sure, however, that the Senator's constituents in New Hampshire who, to the distress of the State Department and the Washington Post, are patriotic Americans—are not displeased with their senior Senator. And it may be noted in passing that when Senator BRIDGES ran for reelection in 1954, he received the largest majority ever accorded a senatorial candidate in his State—without a single word from Ike, and despite the covert opposition of Sherman Adams and the all-out attacks by big labor.

On the floor of the Senate, Saturday, January 17, STYLES BRIDGES made a brief speech (which I quote in part): "I cannot condone the activities of those who indulge in socializing with Deputy Premier Mikoyan. A few of our industrialists and Wall Street bankers have given him the 'red carpet' treatment as a matter of obvious self-interest. I wonder if these bankers and industrialists are aware of Lenin's statement: 'When we Communists are ready to hang the capitalists, they'll try to outbid each other for the sale of hemp to us.'" And Senator BRIDGES asked: "Why do we pay tribute and social adulation to a man who does not bother to conceal the fact that he despises us and our way of life? Only a few months ago an unarmed American transport plane, enroute from Turkey to Iran, was shot down by Soviet fighter planes over Armenia, Comrade Mikoyan's home base. Mr. Mikoyan's government, the U.S.S.R., was kind enough to return the bodies of four American soldiers. There were 10 others on that plane. Where are they? We do not know."

Well, Comrade Mikoyan is now safe in the Kremlin. By and large his American journey, from the Communist viewpoint, was very successful. No one took a pot shot at him. No one even spat in his face. His own observations, his regal treatment, provided good reason for his outspoken contempt for America and Americans. He didn't need Adlai Stevenson's assurance that we are soft and weak. That was a gratuity from Adlai.

But there is something that the Armenian butcher didn't see; there are intangibles that Comrade Mikoyan did not feel; there is history that this entrepreneur of our catastrophe has forgotten. We have our share of traitors and fools in high places, and the latter are more deadly, but their warning to the bear that stalks like a man: It isn't as easy as it looks. Remember the Kaiser; remember Mussolini; remember Hitler; remember the Japanese Empire. They sold us short, too. Where are they now? Think well, Comrades of the Kremlin. We gave you in our folly what you are today—a Frankenstein monster. But what we made we can destroy. And to us, to Americans, I would like to recall Abraham Lincoln's words:

"Shall we expect a transatlantic military giant to step the ocean and crush us with a blow? Never. All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa, combined with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted), with a Bonaparte for commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio (River) or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of 1,000 years.

"At what point, then, is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer: If it ever reaches us, it must spring up amongst us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we ourselves must be its author and its finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through our times or die by suicide."

This is Sam Jones speaking.

Chicago Wants More Lake Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a perceptive and thoughtful editorial from the Green Bay Press Gazette entitled "Chicago Wants More Water." The Press Gazette has an excellent reputation for careful and responsible expression in its editorial policy. I commend to my colleagues this persuasive reply to the advocates of Chicago water diversion bills which will be before this Congress later in the session.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO WANTS MORE LAKE WATER

The first bill introduced in the House at the opening session of the 86th Congress was a measure to permit Chicago to divert more water from Lake Michigan. The bill which will be known as H.R. 1 would authorize Chicago to increase its diversion from 1,500 cubic feet per second to 2,500 cubic feet per second. The increased diversion is asked for 1 year only as a part of a 3-year testing program.

Bill H.R. 1 is said to be almost identical with bill H.R. 2 which was adopted by the House during the 85th Congress. That bill authorized the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Chicago, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, to withdraw an annual average of 2,500 cubic feet of water per second from Lake Michigan for the Illinois Waterway during a 3-year period with the maximum direct diversion never to exceed 5,000 cubic feet per second. The Secretary of the Army was to report the results of the test to Congress. Since the President had vetoed two similar bills in previous sessions largely on the ground that Canada had objected to it, there was much discussion about Canada's interest in the bill at the last session of Congress. A big point was made over whether Canada had actually agreed to the test. The bill finally died under a filibuster staged by Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin.

The diversion of water from Lake Michigan by Chicago has been opposed by all of the States bordering on the Great Lakes, by New York and in the past by Canada on the grounds that it would lower the level of the Great Lakes and reduce the flow of water over Niagara Falls. The Chicago advocates of diversion claim, however, that a diversion program within the limits of that asked by

Chicago could operate for 3 years without lowering the level of the lakes as much as 1 inch.

In spite of these assurances, people interested in shipping in the lake States have consistently and at great expense opposed all efforts of Chicago to divert water from Lake Michigan. The struggle began in 1900 when the city of Chicago and suburbs arranged to dispose of sewage in that area by reversing the flow of the Chicago River from Lake Michigan through the Chicago sanitary canal, the Des Plaines and Illinois Rivers, and eventually to the Mississippi. This began a heavy flow of water from Lake Michigan into the Mississippi basin and the fight was on. The fight has gone on for the 59 years since. Those opposing the diversion claim that the Chicago sanitary district has at times withdrawn as much as 14,000 cubic feet of water per second and that it had averaged 10,000 cubic feet of water per second in 1928.

The lake States finally brought an original action in the U.S. Supreme Court to enjoin Chicago and the State of Illinois from further diversion. After years of hearings and investigations the Supreme Court, in 1930, held that the Chicago water diversion had caused a lowering of 6 inches in the level of the Great Lakes. It declared that the lowering of the water had caused substantial damage in connection with fishing, hunting, beaches, summer resorts, and public parks. The Court then ordered a gradual reduction of the diversion of water from the amounts being taken for Chicago to provide means of disposing of the sewage in the sanitary district. Finally, the order fixed the amount of water that might be diverted permanently to 1,500 cubic feet per second plus domestic pumpage. Since that time the Chicago sanitary district has made great progress in sewage treatment but it has never given up its struggle to increase the amount of water taken from the Great Lakes.

In the beginning Chicago depended upon its claim that it needed the water to preserve the health of the millions of people in the Chicago area. In later cases, however, it rested its case upon the ground that navigation on the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers was impaired by low water due to drought conditions which had prevailed in the upper Mississippi Valley.

However, the opponents of diversion have never relaxed for a second in their continuing battle against what they call the Chicago water steal. At present they are opposing the diversion on the ground that it is illegal and improper to divert water from one watershed to another. It is pointed out, for example, that Wisconsin cities taking water from Lake Michigan in all cases use it and return it to the lake so that there is no change in the level of the water. On the other hand, Chicago would take water, use it for sanitary purposes, for navigation and for waterpower and then dump it across the watershed into the Mississippi where it is lost forever.

The reasons given for Chicago's wish to divert water are sufficient to explain the tremendous effort they make to gain their point. However the efforts by leaders in Wisconsin and the other Great Lakes States are purely in defense of the lake levels. It is unbelievable that they would carry on a campaign extending across half a century at tremendous expense if they were not convinced beyond all reasonable doubt that diversion would cause serious damage. There can be no doubt but that the people in the Great Lakes States are firmly convinced not only that they have a great asset in the Great Lakes waters for use in recreation and in commerce but that they also are certain, after years of study, of the conditions on the lakes, that shipping and shore property would be seriously injured if additional water should be diverted. They feel now that even the amount authorized for diversion is a concession to Chicago and not a thing that Chicago people are entitled to by any right. It must be clear to everyone that the waters in the Great Lakes basin belong there and the best public policy will be to have all such waters taken for use returned to that basin.

Congress Needs Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congress Needs Facts," published in the January 18, 1959, issue of the Columbia Missourian.

Because of my own interest in adequate freedom of government information, and also because of the interest of the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee in continuing studies of the subject, I believe this brief editorial is most timely. I agree that Congress must have access to opinions and facts from Government officials to carry out its own serious responsibilities to the American people.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS NEEDS FACTS

Congressional hearings on President Eisenhower's proposed budget are starting off with a storm of controversy over an administrative letter reminding Government officials that it is a violation of the 1921 Budget Act to ask increases in appropriations without clearing through proper channels.

A Budget Bureau spokesman denied that this was intended as a gag on prospective witnesses, but if it was not this, just what was it?

It is known that many of the officials are sure to be dissatisfied with the amounts allocated their departments and bureaus by the President's budget. Army and Navy spokesmen are certain to protest huge cuts in their requests, for example.

It is the duty of the Congress to make appropriations, and in carrying out this duty, it must investigate all possible sources of information. The most natural sources of information are Government officials. Congressmen must try to find out whether their requests are justified or not.

What causes much of the concern over the testimony of Government officials is that their motives for increased funds sometimes are questionable. One of these, of course, is the mere wish to rise in importance, influence, and power. More money would give them this.

Who is to judge these men? Congress has the responsibility for making appropriations. It must have information to do this. So, it must have access to opinions and facts from Government officials and make decisions based on committee findings.

Defeat—A Famous Figure Reflects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have just completed reading a very interesting article in the Wall Street Journal under date of January 20, 1959, concerning our friend and former colleague, a distinguished citizen of my State, William F. Knowland, of Oakland, Calif. The article discusses former Senator Knowland in his retirement from the Senate and in his capacity as a publisher of a great California newspaper.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFEAT—A FAMOUS FIGURE REFLECTS

(By Jonathan Spivak)

OAKLAND, CALIF.—The political tom-toms were still, the bitterness of the campaign long past.

He had come home as assistant publisher of the family-owned newspaper. In this industrial city, his name was admired and respected despite the final defeat.

As on those broiling autumn days of electioneering, he was shirt-sleeved and smiling. The cast of his bear-like shoulders, the deliberate power of his handclasp were unchanged. And yet there was a perceptible difference about the man.

Somewhere along the corridors of defeat Bill Knowland had shed his Senatorial robes. His simple and unpretentious desk was bare save for an open appointment book. There were no autographed portraits of famous figures along the walls. Only a wood plaque embossed with a few lines of poetry.

The office was an oasis. No phones rang, no eager secretaries bustled in with messages. Four flights down the presses roared, but in the room there was only the gentle hum of conversation.

Tanned and relaxed, he rocked back in his swivel chair, hands clasped behind his head. The stern belligerence of his features had mellowed. He no longer delivered speeches, but spoke as one newspaperman to another.

The causes of his defeat for the California governorship, and for the defeat of many other Republican candidates last fall, still perplexed him. "Some of the early columnists tried to oversimplify it," he said, "as a problem in one area or branch of the party. But on reflection that is not the case."

NO FIXED PATTERN

Pro-Benson and anti-Benson Congressmen were beaten. Republicans with good labor records and Republicans who were bitterly opposed by the AFL–CIO lost. "There was no fixed pattern or reason for it," he insisted.

As for his own campaign, one that probably cost him his political career, he had no misgivings. He spoke with the resignation of a man who had played for high stakes and lost. "I frankly have no regrets whatsoever in raising the issues I did and making the fight I did. I think that is what campaigns are for."

Then he added, with a touch of the crusader still, "I think it will help alert the people of California to some of the dangers ahead. History shows that the issue of slavery wasn't solved the first time Lincoln and Douglas debated it. Douglas won and Lincoln lost." He referred to the proposed right-to-work law which he vigorously supported as a union reform measure, but which was defeated along with him.

He had gained, however, a grudging respect for the political eeffctiveness of the unions. "Organized labor," he conceded, "certainly did give the Democrats a highly efficient, well organized in most cases, intelligently led and well-financed group able to do much more than the party could."

As a politician, the Senator rarely talked about himself in his speeches. As a private citizen he is much less reticent.

The single greatest change in leaving public life, he said, was that time was suddenly his own. At the Capitol his workday usually started with a 7:30 a.m. breakfast with perhaps members of the White House staff, or Cabinet officers, or other Congressmen. It rarely ended in less than 12 hours. In election years he campaigned through 12 to 14 meetings a day.

He plans to take a personal interest in the editorial department of his newspapers. "I've been associated with the paper for 30 years. I'll do some editorial writing from time to time as I feel the situation warrants it. I'll keep in constant touch with the editorial department, go over editorials, make suggestions," he said.

INDEPENDENT POLICY

Democrats and Republicans would fare alike. "There will be no carping criticism," he insisted. "I don't believe in it and never have." He said the Tribune will continue to do two things: first, cover the news and, second, comment on it constructively. "We'll be free to praise any Democratic official regardless of who he is. And if he happens to be a Republican who merits condemnation, we'll be critical," he declared.

The toughest question was saved for the last. "What of his future, did he plan to seek public office again?" "I have no present intentions," he replied firmly. "Right now I expect to be deeply involved in the newspaper business and my family. There is no appointment that I seek or would accept."

Then, for a fleeting moment, he gazed contemplatively out over the Oakland horizon. He mused: "Having been an active participant in history in the making for 13 crucial years, it will be very interesting to watch these events from 3,000 miles across the country."

And perhaps it will.

Brandeis on Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Louis D. Brandeis, regarded as one of the great American liberals, did not favor oppression of any kind in business and industry—neither by the ownership and management nor the unions. The able editors of the Charleston News and Courier have disclosed this in an editorial printed in their January 20 edition, entitled "Brandeis on Unions."

I ask unanimous consent that this fine editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRANDEIS ON UNIONS

Liberals and self-styled friends of the workingman are forever blasting monopolies. They are blind to monopoly by labor unions.

Citizens who favor right-to-work laws to protect the worker from union bosses are denounced as reactionaries. Yet Louis D. Brandeis, still one of the great names among American liberals, understood and approved of the principle of competition between union and nonunion members.

Brandeis, late Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, said:

"The ideal condition for a union is to be strong and stable, and yet to have in the trade, outside of its ranks, an appreciable number of men who are nonunionists. Such a nucleus of unorganized labor will check oppression by the unions as the unions check oppression by the employer."

If there is a right to organize, there should be a right to refuse to be organized by union bosses. That is the purpose of right-to-work laws. These laws are under constant fire.

Louis Brandeis may become reactionary in the eyes of those who talk of freedom but act like tyrants.

Way Down Yonder in Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Kansas City Star which deals with the U.S. cultural and scientific exhibition now planned for display in in Moscow next summer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAY DOWN YONDER IN MOSCOW

Those in charge of the U.S. cultural and scientific exhibition in Moscow next summer are big with plans. The Russians are to be exopsed to our kitchen conveniences, paintings, photograph collections, hamburgers, and perhaps the Chicago symphony orchestra and a rodeo.

However, a special adviser, Norman K. Winston, now tells the New York Times that the U.S. Information Agency wants to send along a jazz orchestra but that the Soviets frown on the idea. "They're worried it might put on some rock 'n' roll and have a bad influence on youth," says Winston.

This stand illustrates beautifully the ignorance of the benighted Russians in such matters and their need of deliverance. Rock 'n' roll is not jazz.

In fact the Russians have more reason to resist jazz because it gives a picture of America they would like to deny. The music is one of the happy results of the collision of European and African cultures on American soil. Its enjoyment knows no racial or national boundaries. Traditional or modern, Louis Armstrong or Dizzy Gillespie, we doubt that the Russians have heard anything like it. And from it, they could learn a little more about America. Perhaps that is the influence that really worries Soviet officials.

Relations With Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three articles on the subject of our Latin American relations, by Edward Tomlinson which appeared on October 27, 1958, December 29, 1958, and January 5, 1959, in the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AID TO LATINS HIGH DESPITE CRITICISM

(By Edward Tomlinson)

Our relations with the majority of Latin American nations have improved considerably in the past few months, especially since the Foreign Ministers of all the 20 republics met here in Washington.

Most of the ministers went away enthusiastic about the sympathetic understanding and spirit of cooperation they found among our officials.

But some of their political leaders still think we are not doing as much as should to help strengthen the economies of our neighbors.

CRITICAL

Brazilian representatives in the United Nations, who sat in on the foreign ministers' meetings, have been particularly critical of us in the last 10 days. Senhor Augusto Federico Schmidt, a close adviser of President Juscelino Kubitschek, has attacked the State Department because one of its spokesmen suggested there is a limit to what we can do.

The Foreign Minister of Panama returned to the isthmus and said that the Department of State is obstructing President Eisenhower's desires to see that terms of the 1955 treaty revisions are carried out immediately.

The Bolivians have bought full-page advertising space in newspapers to appeal for more financial aid, and remind us that we will be the losers if communism takes root in their country. Haiti and several others which have been hit hard by inflation and low income are desperately pleading for more financial assistance.

RECORD

However, our record of assistance, and the machinery for maintaining a steady stream of loans and aid to every one of the republics in the future is quite impressive.

The Export-Import Bank has made more loans for the construction of steel mills, hydroelectric and irrigation projects, road building and other public works in Latin America than in any other part of the world.

The International Bank, in which we are the largest stockholders, has advanced over a billion dollars to the different countries, while the International Monetary Fund has earmarked huge sums to bolster most of those confronted with inflation and other exchange difficulties.

We have set up the facilities of the International Development Corporation to which any country may apply for long term loans for productive enterprise. We have agreed to help set up an Inter-American Bank, which has been near to the hearts of Latin American leaders. We have joined in helping to stabilize the prices of several of their chief commodities, including sugar and coffee, and agreed to discuss the possibility of

establishing regional or common markets in this hemisphere.

Our citizens have invested more than $8 billion in the 20 republics, and we still buy the bulk of all their products, paying for them in dollars on the barrelhead. All of which may not be as much as we should, or could do, but it is far from niggardly.

REDS OPEN NEW PUSH IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Edward Tomlinson)

The Communists are going all out to forge new bridgeheads in Latin America in 1959.

Voters in most of 20 countries have dealt the Reds sharp rebuffs in the past year and a half. Communist-supported candidates for the presidency in practically all recent elections south of the border have lost.

Diplomatic reports from key capitals indicate that Moscow's chief weapons in the coming campaign will be trade and propaganda. It will concentrate on the big countries that are inflation ridden and short of foreign currency, particularly those in which dollars are scarce.

Conditions in such countries as Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, where inflation has already reached catastrophic proportions, are made to order for the Kremlin. Soviet agents, diplomats, and special trade missions already are making headway in these three countries.

Last summer U.S. economic experts were pointing out what some of them insisted was the big drop in trade between these three countries and the Russian bloc.

But by early December American business firms were warning of a sharp upward trend in Communist commercial activities.

Dollars, pounds sterling and other sound currencies are so limited that they are compelled to barter with Iron Curtain nations for increasing quantities of machinery and other needed products.

The Argentine Government has announced the signing of a new trade agreement with the Soviet Union. Russia will supply Argentina with a variety of heavy machinery and tools for the state oil monopoly and receive in return Argentine wool, hides, tanning materials, and other products.

To facilitate the deal, the Soviets extended Argentina a 10-year $100 million credit. Both Argentina and Uruguay have been bartering wool, corn, and other commodities for Russian oil since the first of the year.

Brazil has been selling Russia cotton, chocolate, and coffee in limited quantities for some time. Now she has entered into a barter agreement by which she is buying Russian crude oil in return for coffee, cacao (chocolate), castor oil and other surplus Brazilian products.

Some 500,000 barrels of oil are now on the way and 3 million more are expected to be imported during 1959. The Brazilians had already bought 12 cargo ships from Poland for her coastal trade.

In the last half of 1958, Chile sold large orders of copper wire to Russia, East Germany and other satellite countries. Meantime, Soviet and Communist Chinese trade missions have been pressing the Chileans for further commercial agreements.

The Czechoslovakians are even offering cargo and military transport planes to all these countries in exchange for mineral and agricultural commodities.

THINGS LOOK UP IN THE AMERICAS

(By Edward Tomlinson)

Latin America and its 175 million people have started a new year with more political freedom, but confronted with bigger economic and social problems than at any time since World War II.

Meantime, our relations with these 20 Republics next door have taken a turn for the better. At least the Eisenhower administration has finally come up with a definite and generous economic policy toward our neighbors.

TRUJILLO, STILL

In the political field, dictators have been walking the plank in almost rhythmic succession. Backward Paraguay and Haiti still are in the hands of minor strong men. But among the major despots only Generalissimo Rafael Trujillo of the Dominican Republic survives.

In the majority of the Republics from Mexico to Argentina general elections have taken place in the past 12 months. Mostly middle-of-the-road candidates, some avowedly conservative, have been elected. The extreme nationalists as well as the Communists have lost ground everywhere.

Three or four of the current regimes are shaky, including those of Honduras, Haiti, and Bolivia. Cuba's political future now hangs in the balance and the newly elected government of Venezuela will not take office for another several weeks. Some observers agree that but for the backing of the military, Presidents Juscelino Kubitschek, of Brazil, and Manuel Prado, of Peru, would have difficulty maintaining their positions.

In nearly all the countries the governments are grappling with runaway inflation, mounting living cost, huge debts, and falling prices of their chief products.

BLIND SPOT

Until recently top officials in Washington, and for that matter the American people, had been so preoccupied with crises in Europe, the Middle and Far East, that they were apparently unaware of the alarming and in some cases desperate state of affairs in many of our sister republics.

But when Vice President NIXON ran into such angry outbursts of opposition in a half dozen of the capitals of South America last summer, everybody from the President down got busy with fence mending.

The flowering of a series of economic gains came after the new government of President Arturo Frondizi of Argentina broke away from the past and instituted some of the most drastic and unprecedented national reforms in the history of Latin America. It scrapped its fanatically nationalistic laws against foreign oil companies. As a result, more than $500 million of United States and other private capital is flowing in to help expand the petroleum industry.

The Frondizi government also knocked the artificial props from under the peso, so that it could find its real value.

Washington also indicates there are millions for other countries that are willing to face up to the facts of economic life.

Actually, when it comes to financial aid, the United States had not neglected the Latins. More North American loans and credits have been flowing into the 20 countries in the last decade than to any other area of the world.

What we have neglected is the human factor. For the most part, we had acted like a doctor with poor bedside manners. We extended a lot of healing loans and credits, but failed to exude a sympathetic understanding of the plight of our ailing friends and neighbors.

Who's a Reactionary Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, present day parlance is replete with labels such as liberal and conservative and radical reactionary. It is refreshing to discover the correct usage of one of these terms by the press. An editorial in the Greenville News of January 26, 1959, entitled "Who's a Reactionary Now?" is illustrative of the correct way to apply the term "reactionary" as Webster defines it. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S A REACTIONARY NOW?

The union bosses like to call the right-to-work principle reactionary and say it is designed to break organized labor but they are woefully short on evidence to back up their claim.

In fact, many European nations, including some well down the road to outright socialism, have such laws on their books, with no noticeable diminution of union strength.

And the European counterparts of Reuther and Meany frankly say they like the open shop idea.

The February issue of Fortune magazine cites some examples of this somewhat surprising attitude. It notes that the British Trade Union Congress has a membership of over 8 million workers out of a total labor force of some 24 million. The closed shop exists only in parts of a few industries, mainly printing and mining, and the rest of the workers are completely free to join a union or not as they see fit.

The same general conditions exist in Germany, Italy, and France, all of whose governments are much nearer the welfare state form than our own.

The magazine quotes Charles Geddes, former president of the Trade Union Congress, as expressing satisfaction with the open shop. He said:

"I do not believe in a closed shop. * * * There is a fundamental issue here of the right of the individual to say whether or not he would become associated with other people. * * * I want the right to exclude people from my union, but that cannot be done on the basis that everyone must belong or starve."

For expressing sentiments such as these in this country, Mr. Geddes would be denounced as an out-and-out union-buster, We hate to think what he would be called by Mrs. Roosevelt who accused movie actress Irene Dunne of advocating slave labor in supporting right-to-work legislation.

So far the union bosses have been successful in arresting the trend toward open shops in the large industrial States. Why they should do so in the face of the position of their counterparts abroad with much more experience is quite another question.

It is probably just another manifestation of the fact that most of them are about 50 years behind the times. They are simply aping the actions of the robber barons of another era.

Juvenile Problem Types

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Cape Girardeau Southeast Missourian. It deals with juvenile delinquency and will furnish the Congress

with important statistics concerning the juvenile problem.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUVENILE PROBLEM TYPES

Not all schoolchildren are little monsters, according to the National Education Association, despite the impression that may have been created by the publicity given to juvenile delinquency. The NEA finds a higher percentage of those in school lead exemplary lives than do members of the older generations.

In a handbook for parents and teachers entitled "Juvenile Delinquency—Research, Theory, and Comment," the education association goes into some detail in analyzing the age groups of the most susceptible and the influence of schools on the problem. It even categorizes delinquency into two parts: Cultural and emotional delinquencies.

Less than 5 percent of school-age children were found to be other than normal, reasonably healthy and law-abiding citizens, and of this 5 percent a remarkably large number were found to be not in school. Of delinquents, 95 percent of those 17 years old, 85 percent of those 16 years old, and 50 percent of those aged 15 do not attend schools, according to the NEA's survey.

"The big stumbling block—for the general public as well as for teachers—is the scarcity of reliable information on the subject compared to the abundance of medicine-man prescriptions," complains the NEA. Despite the lack of material and proper guidance, the schools seem to have done a commendable job in promoting citizenship among their students.

In dividing juvenile delinquency into two parts, the educators have eliminated from the hard core of hoodlums the passively antisocial cultural delinquent. He is described as the otherwise normal child who shows antisocial tendencies only so far as is necessary to conform to the code of his gang.

The emotional delinquent is the bully, the sadist, or the violent hoodlum who is motivated by inner urges. He is the true delinquent, the menace to society, and the one responsible for the shadow of guilt cast wrongly on many of his youthful contemporaries. He is also the one in need of psychiatric or psychological help.

It is both gratifying and revealing to note the small percentage of youths who have earned themselves the label of juvenile delinquent. Even this small group, however, is responsible for some of the most heinous crimes and it is to the eradication of this element, and not the blackening of youthful reputations, that the fight against juvenile delinquency must be waged.

Deficit Financing and Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, economy measures by the Federal Government are often pictured as the hobgoblin which brings unemployment and hardship to the average citizen. Such illusions are dispelled by an editorial in the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., published on January 24, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFICIT FINANCING AND UNEMPLOYMENT

A typical Herblock cartoon published originally in the leftwing Washington Post and used in one or more South Carolina newspapers implies that, somehow, the President's proposal of a balanced budget and eventual tax cuts will increase unemployment and make worse the plight of those now unemployed.

Neither the balanced budget nor the promised tax cuts may come about. Defense urgencies may make them impossible, or so it may seem to Congress.

But the picture of a balanced budget bringing hardships on working people is a false one. It is the old delusion, long since dispelled in the minds of most reasonable men, left over from the heyday of the New-Fair Deal tax-spend philosophy.

Certain liberal economists still hold to the idea, of course. Their theory is that the way to offset depressions and provide full employment is for the Government to spend more, even if it has to go into needless make-work projects and finance these on a deficit basis.

The theory works, for a time, but experience has shown that eventually it defeats its own purpose. Deficit financing by the Government inevitably causes more inflation. The dollar is depreciated and wages and salaries buy less and less.

Actually, Government spending strikes the economy a double blow. The Government must tax the public to get the money it spends. The result is that the consumer has less money with which to buy things he wants and needs; business has less capital to put into improvements, expansions, new plants, and the development of new products. Thus, fewer jobs are created, and, worse still, many jobs are eliminated.

Along with this may come price increases. The net result is less consumer buying power and more unemployment.

We haven't tried it in a long time, but perhaps a different Government policy would produce the opposite—and more desirable—result.

A balanced budget, an end to deficit financing, and, perhaps, a reduction in the national debt would tend to peg the dollar at something like the purchasing power it still has left. The consumer could buy more goods, thus creating jobs. Tax reductions would give the consumer still more purchasing power.

Both factors would encourage business and industry to expand and create still more jobs. An expanding economy would enable the Government to maintain a healthy budget without reducing services, and the end result would be good for all.

Some, especially the tax-spending crowd, may call it fanciful reasoning, outmoded economics, or worse. But it might work. Who knows?

Senator Bridges and Mikoyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator Bridges and Mikoyan," which appeared in one of New Hampshire's leading daily newspapers, Foster's Daily Democrat, of Dover, N.H. on Saturday, January 24, 1959.

I believe this editorial comment, with regard to the wining and dining which Mikoyan received in this country, accurately reflects the attitude of the great majority of New Hampshire citizens.

This sound, well-written editorial merits the attention of all people in our country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BRIDGES AND MIKOYAN

Have we, in our great preoccupation with material wealth and immaterial entertainment, lost our priceless heritage, the capacity for moral indignation? This Nation, which refused tribute to Tripoli, pays casual toll to labor racketeers; which two generations ago threatened a sultan with death rather than ransom an America (who was forthwith released), has within this generation paid ransom to or left prisoners in half a dozen third-rate Communist countries; which for 150 years stood for principles recognized and honored throughout the world, has recently wined, dined, and feted the murderer from Moscow.

Granted that it may sometimes become necessary to meet with such a creature over the conference table, it was an example of extremely poor taste and judgment for some leaders in American business and political life to roll out the red carpet. We are gratified to learn that our Senator BRIDGES was one of several prominent persons who showed both the sense and the courage to refuse social invitations where Mikoyan would have been present.

Independent View of U.S. Prestige Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA,
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, recently I saw on the CBS Television Network a very fine program of news analysis entitled "Years of Crisis." Participating were Edward R. Murrow, Winston Burdett, Charles Collingwood, Richard C. Hottelet, Peter Kalischer, Ernest Leiser, Paul Niven, David Schoenbrun, and Eric Sevareid.

I was particularly impressed with the fact that these able and experienced news correspondents felt that the prestige of the United States is higher throughout the world today than it was a year ago. This is timely recognition that our foreign policy is operating to strengthen the United States in its relations with the rest of the world. Since I believe my colleagues would be interested in this impartial judgment on our foreign policy, I ask unanimous consent that this material be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the abstract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MURROW. Gentlemen, most of you have spent the last year looking at your own

country from the outside. How do we look? What is our posture? Leiser?

Mr. LEISER. Well, Ed, I think our position and our prestige in Europe are considerably higher than they were last year at this time. Our allies always hope that we'll stand firm without being belligerant and we satisfied those requirements in Berlin, at least so far. And then there's something else to remember. Last year at about this time the beep from sputnik was the only sound in outer space and our earth-bound voice was one of outrage and fear. Now we're up in space, too, and in a pretty impressive way. In Berlin, the very day that a Soviet general was making specially belligerent threats to us, we shot our talking satellite up into the air. And the Berliners paid a lot more attention to that satellite than they paid to the Russian general's threats.

Mr. MURROW. Burdett, how do we look from the Middle East?

Mr. BURDETT. Well, in the Arab part of the Middle East, the United States still faces the profound instinctive mistrust of the Arab nationalists and we're still very far from overcoming it. We're still regarded as the country that refused to invest in an Egypt that was taking arms from the Russians, as the country that decided not to help build the Aswan dam when we discovered that the Russians were not interested in building it. I think we'll have to do something radically new to persuade the Arabs that we are not interested in them merely because we're afraid of the Russians.

Mr. MURROW. Kalischer?

Mr. KALISCHER. Well, Ed, in Communist China we're Public Enemy No. 1. In South Korea and South Viet Nam, the anti-Communist bastions we've erected, we look pretty good, particularly after Quemoy. In the neutralist countries, India and Burma, we look much better than we did last year, possibly because Washington has ceased to regard neutralism as a dirty word. In Japan, our military bases are looked on as the accommodation you must make to your best customer.

Mr. MURROW. Hottelet?

Mr. HOTTELET. Well, I think we look a good bit better in the Western Hemisphere, too. We've done some concrete things. We're encouraging regional development and the common market in South America and that's noted and very much appreciated. But we still somehow missed that meeting of minds that engenders real cordiality. Friendship is a two-way street that seems to be a pretty rough road. The South Americans expect us to bail them out of all their troubles, and we smile at their dreams. Up in the north, Canada feels penetrated and dominated by American capital. I think somehow it's a problem of communications more than anything else and we miss in a field in which we normally excel.

Mr. MURROW. Collingwood, how do we look as viewed from London?

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Well, the British having accepted the fact of American dominance in the western coalition are not immune to the thought that perhaps they could manage these things better if they still had the leadership. Nevertheless, they think that we're doing pretty well lately, perhaps because we're doing a little more the sort of thing that they think that they would have done. An interesting development has been the way in which President Eisenhower has ceased to be the image of American leadership in Britain. When the British talk about American foreign policy, they tend to talk about it in terms of Dulles rather than of Eisenhower. When Vice President NIXON was there, the things he said, the things he did, made more impact than anything that's come from the White House. And the British tend to be a little skeptical about the tone and the style of the American image in the world. For instance, they were very impressed by the feat of getting the Atlas into orbit; but when the Atlas began to talk, the British thought it rather an odd thing to say from a military missile.

Mr. MURROW. Well, gentlemen, we began by talking briefly about the significant developments of the last decade. Let's go back to that. Schoenbrun, what would you regard as the most important development in Europe in the last 10 years?

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. Ed, the most important developments are not always the most spectacular. In my area the most spectacular development, of course, has been the rise and fall of the French Republic, but, although important, I don't think it was the most important. I think the most important has been the birth and the growth of European economic union, the hard core of which is the reconciliation of the French and German peoples—united for the first time in a millenium, economically, militarily. Now this unity of France and Germany has grown up behind the shield of NATO.

Mr. MURROW. David, are they united to stay, do you think, or is this just a personal relationship between Adenauer and De Gaulle?

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. Oh, no; I think they're united to stay. I don't think it has anything to do with De Gaulle and Adenauer at all. There are real factors involved in this, and I think the growth of Europe is a permanent thing. I think, also, just as important as the growth of Europe is the Atlantic alliance which has permitted Europe to grow. Ed, I would suggest that had there been a NATO alliance in 1913 or in 1938, the World Wars would never have broken out.

Mr. MURROW. I think we can all agree with that.

Parity Concept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Missouri Delta Farmer, published at Portageville, Mo. The editorial deals with the parity concept, and makes an interesting comparison between this concept and minimum wage laws. I commend the editorial to the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COULD THIS BE SO?

The Secretary of Agriculture and a few professional followers have commenced a ballyhoo barrage designed to convince the Members of the 86th Congress that the farmer would like to abandon the parity concept. Rejection of the corn marketing quota is being cited by the Secretary in suport of this contention. In short, farmers are solidly behind the Benson theory of no supports and unlimited production, with the devil to get the hindmost.

Now organized labor is strongly contending for minimum wage laws to apply to every workingman. Minimum wages are supposed to supply the cost of living; the things the worker has to buy in order to live and work. In a real sense, established minimum wages set a standard of parity compensation for the workingman. The Secretary of Labor and leaders of organized labor have, so far, at least, raised no cry for the abandonment of the minimum wage. Why should they?

To a greater extent than any other worker the farmer is forced to buy materials with which his product is produced. Far larger than the mere cost of living is the investment he makes in implements, fertilizer, seed, motor fuel, agricultural chemicals, services and repairs. The return on his investment, the profit on his crop, even his daily wage, depend on the relation between what it costs to produce a crop and what that crop will bring. We see little difference in either principle or effect between the minimum wage for labor and the parity concept for the farmer. Wonder if we could get the Secretary of Labor to step across the hall and explain some things to Elder Benson.

D. W. Watkins, of Clemson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is seldom that we recognize the contributions of servants of the public during their lifetime. An editorial published on January 23, 1959, by the Greenville News, a prominent newspaper in my State, illustrates that such is not the case with Dr. D. W. Watkins, the splendid leader of the Agriculture Extension Service in South Carolina. As the editorial points out, Dr. Watkins' contributions in the field of agriculture have been so outstanding they have merited the acclaim of his fellow citizens while he still lives. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I refer be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATKINS PORTRAIT SYMBOLIZES AN ERA

Across the history of the progress in agriculture in South Carolina during the last quarter of a century D. W. Watkins, of Clemson, casts a long shadow.

And because the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Extension Service is closely related to Clemson College's contribution to the State, Dr. Watkins stands tall in the annals of that institution.

Therefore, it was with pleasure that we learned that his portrait had been unveiled and appropriately displayed in Long Hall on the college campus.

Even more fitting was the fact that the portrait was painted by the beloved Dr. B. O. Williams, former professor of economics at Clemson who is now on the faculty of the University of Georgia. Dr. Williams, an accomplished amateur painter, left more than 15 years ago for a larger field of activity, but his heart has never left the Clemson campus, much less South Carolina.

For about a generation, the name of D. W. Watkins was synonymous with the development of agriculture in this State. He assumed leadership of the Extension Service, with its county agents and home demonstration agents in 1934, a time of crisis with the whole economy and an even more acute crisis with the farm economy.

It was the beginning of the period of mighty transition in the South. We shifted from the one-crop system to the dynamic idea of diversification and we began to bal-

ance agriculture with industry. It was the beginning of the era of experimentation with better crops, cattle, dairying and forestry. Soil conservation became a major objective of the whole operation.

Over much of this change, Dr. Watkins presided with a kindly but firm sort of leadership and he helped it along in many ways with a benign sort of missionary zeal.

It is well that this fine man has received homage while he is still able to enjoy it. By honoring him Clemson honors itself and its traditions.

It behooves the rest of us to think of him and the men and women who worked with him during his era and those who are following after them everytime we see a handsome rural home where once a tenant cabin stood, a green pasture with grazing cattle where once there were only weeds and rodents and fertile fields where once there were only gullied hillsides and silted bottomlands.

They didn't do it alone, but they provided the leadership.

We and the Russians; Let Us Not Be "Luniks"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, from the magazine Iron Age, entitled "We and the Russians; Let Us Not Be 'Luniks.'"

Mr. President, it is heartening to me, in the face of the socializing and triumphal ovation activities of some of our industrialists, to see this editorial in a magazine which is a spokesman for the steel industry. This cool-headed, practical appraisal of Mikoyan's visit is in encouraging contrast to those who are emotionally blind or have unwarranted hopes of quick profit through liberalized trade.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Iron Age, Jan. 22, 1959]

WE AND THE RUSSIANS; LET US NOT BE "LUNIKS"

(By Tom Campbell)

As usual, many Americans, high and low, are falling for the soft-soap spread about recently by Mr. Anastas I. Mikoyan. Maybe some will soon be calling him Mike, thus making everything right with the world.

The picture that unfolded as this astute old Bolshevik charmed our business people, our actors, and our publicity seekers smacks of the early thirties. Then there was a reawakening in Russian friendship followed by a diplomatic recognition. This was followed by a long list of reneging on agreements, by power grabs, and by imperialistic moves by the Reds.

We can't blame Mr. Mikoyan if a lot of people who ought to know better act like babes in the woods. There is nothing wrong with putting out the carpet for the Russian mouthpiece. He has done a good selling job but he had help from our naiveness.

There are a few simple things for us to remember in dealing with the Reds. Russia is ruled by an iron dictatorship. The people do as they are told by the State.

We are in the midst of a struggle between communism and our type democracy. This fight extends to trade, to minds, to expansion, to agreements, to allies, to science—and possibly (we hope not) to war.

Now that the United States is strong and capable of protecting herself and helping her allies protect themselves, we can afford to be less jittery. But we can't be relaxed to the point where we actually give the Reds what they are prepared to fight for.

The expansion pattern of the czars has been adopted under a new banner by the Reds. Everything is directed toward the goal of world rule. We and our allies have no such goal. Thus all the talk about coexistence, friendship, peace, et cetera, is propaganda. We must keep our eyes, ears—and minds—open.

It may help our people to see more of the Russians. But it won't cause them to adopt our way of doing things. It won't hurt to sell Russia nonstrategic items but the truth is that if we do, it will produce something the Russians want and need without benefit to us.

Let the "Luniks" fly out in space. Let us keep a cool head about us. Let's not mix our genuine good naturedness with Red deception.

Claude Miller—American, Friend, and Fighter for Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the late Claude Miller, of Wichita Falls, Tex., retired from business life several years ago, but he never retired as an active and patriotic citizen. Right up until his untimely death at 82 in December 1958, Claude Miller kept working for the America he believed in.

A native Texan, born at Jonesboro in Coryell County, February 21, 1876, he later moved to the Oklahoma Territory. He settled at the small town of Altus and immediately began working for civic improvements. He led the movement which brought the railroad to Altus and was instrumental in the subdividing of Greer County to form three counties—Greer, Harmon, and Jackson.

Claude Miller worked to have the Oklahoma Territory become one of the United States, and was a delegate from Greer County—later Jackson County—to the statehood convention. He was active in the election of Charles N. Haskell, the first governor of the new State, and worked untiringly for the nomination and election of Scott Ferris to the U.S. House of Representatives. Mr. Ferris was the first Congressman from his district.

Later, Mr. Miller, himself, ran for Congress from the new State of Oklahoma, but unfortunately was not elected. He was a delegate from Oklahoma to a national Democratic convention.

He married the former Miss Daisie Kimberlin at Altus in 1903. They had three children, Tom Mike, who died some years ago, Joe Betsy, and Claude, Jr., who is now a surgeon in Washington State.

Mr. Miller took his family to New Mexico for a short time while he opened some stores there, then they returned to Texas in 1919 and he entered business at Wichita Falls.

There Joe Betsy married a young attorney named James V. Allred, who later became district attorney of Wichita County, then attorney general, and later Governor of Texas. Mr. Allred was appointed a U.S. district judge in Houston in 1940, but resigned 2 years later to run for the U.S. Senate. Losing by a narrow margin, he entered private law practice in Houston until 1950, when he was reappointed to the Federal bench. He is now judge of the southern district of Texas and lives with his family at Corpus Christi. In spite of the fact that times were hard in business, Mr. Miller was extremely active in all of Allred's political campaigns, traveling about the State distributing literature and speaking to the people.

Mr. President, I was an Assistant Attorney General under James V. Allred, and first came to know Mr. Miller at that time.

I am proud to say that through my three races for governor of Texas, when all of us knew the difficulties of defeat, Claude Miller was one of the most active workers, and one who never lost heart in our fight for good government. He was also one of the instigators and statewide organizers and leaders of the "draft YARBOROUGH" movement which elected me to the United States Senate in April 1957, and has always been a loyal friend and true adviser to me.

Claude Miller was a loyal, active Democrat. He was a precinct chairman in Texas and a delegate to county, State and National conventions.

Mr. Miller's motto was "Don't do anything which would disappoint your friends." I believe he never did.

Mr. President, as an indication of the honor and esteem of the Nation for this civic-minded American, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of Mr. Miller's death which was published in the Wichita Falls Daily Times for December 13, 1958, and an article which was published in the same newspaper on December 15, 1958, under the heading, "Senator Pays Tribute to Claude Miller."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Daily Times, Dec. 13, 1958]

RETIRED BUSINESSMAN DIES AT HOME HERE

A Wichitan since 1919, Claude Miller, 82, father-in-law of Federal judge and former Texas Gov. James V. Allred, died at about 7 a.m. Friday in his home, 1009 City View Lane, after a sudden illness.

Funeral services will be held at 3:30 p.m. Monday in the First Methodist Church with Dr. Neal Cannon, pastor, and Dr. George R. Davis, pastor of the First Christian Church, officiating. Burial will be in Riverside Cemetery under the direction of Hampton-Vaughan-Merkle Funeral Home.

Miller, a native Texan, moved here in 1919 from Oklahoma City and went into business at Tenth and Indiana in the Miller-Ferguson ready-to-wear. He had been active in real estate, insurance, and other businesses before his retirement.

He had always maintained a keen interest in politics, making numerous talks in behalf of his son-in-law in his campaigns for State attorney general and later Governor, and in recent years had allied himself with campaigns of several Democrats seeking State offices, including Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH.

Miller was born February 21, 1876, at Jonesboro in Coryell County. He was a member of the First Methodist Church and also the author of a volume of poetry, "Texas Rhymes," published in 1940, which mentions many Wichita Falls people.

He was a business promoter during the boom years of Oklahoma's growth and worked closely with the pioneer builders of Oklahoma industries. Miller was active in numerous civic affairs of Oklahoma City while he lived there.

Previously, he and a brother had owned and operated Miller Bros. Dry Goods Co. at Altus, Okla., where he and his wife were married in the home of her parents, Mr. and Mrs. J. N. Kimberlin, November 8, 1903. Mrs. Miller survives.

Other survivors are a daughter, Mrs. James V. Allred, of Corpus Christi; a son, Dr. Claude K. Miller, of Wenatchee, Wash., two sisters, Mrs. E. R. McDaniel, 1903 Britain, widow of a Times Publishing Co. employee who served in the company's circulation department for many years, and Mrs. Patty Wisdom, Tyler; and seven grandchildren, Sam Houston Allred, Corpus Christi, James V. Allred, Jr., Austin, Dave Allred, a former Associated Press writer at Montgomery, Ala., now a member of the staff of U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, and Kim Miller, Pamela Miller, Rad Miller, and Claudia Miller, all of Wenatchee, Wash.; and one granddaughter of Austin.

The family requests no flowers but asks instead that donations be made to the Heart Fund.

[From the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Daily Times, Dec. 15, 1958]

SENATOR PAYS TRIBUTE TO CLAUDE MILLER

"Claude Miller was a believer who translated belief into action."

So spoke U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH Sunday in eulogy to the 82-year-old lifelong Democrat who died at his home in Wichita Falls Friday.

The junior Texas Senator flew into Wichita Falls Sunday afternoon to visit the family of Miller. He was scheduled to go back to Austin late Sunday night.

YARBOROUGH said he was in Denver, Colo., Friday when notified of the Wichitan's death and immediately began rearranging his schedule so he could come here and pay his respects to the family.

He expressed regret that an unbreakable Houston commitment would not allow him to attend Miller's funeral Monday afternoon.

Miller was active in Senator YARBOROUGH'S gubernatorial campaigns and was one of the chief figures in the move to draft YARBOROUGH to run for the Senate in 1957.

"While I have lost a close personal friend, I feel that Texas has suffered the greatest loss because Miller was a dynamic believer in democracy for the people," the Senator said.

YARBOROUGH recalled that he first met Miller more than 25 years ago while serving as assistant attorney general under James V. Allred.

Allred, now U.S. district judge, is a former Texas Governor and attorney general. Miller was his father-in-law.

With YARBOROUGH Sunday was Dave Allred, 25, of Corpus Christi, one of the Senator's research assistants and grandson of the deceased.

YARBOROUGH said that Miller traveled to 17 counties in the 1952 campaign when he was already 76 years old and personally nailed up placards.

"During five statewide campaigns in the past 6 years, he was one of my stanchest friends," YARBOROUGH said.

"Not long before his death, he wrote a little verse with a line that said, 'Democracy is my hobby.' It really was more than a hobby—it was a part of his life."

"I know of no one in Texas to fill his place," Senator YARBOROUGH concluded.

Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan's Recent Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorial comment which appeared in the Hampton Union and the Rockingham County Gazette of January 22, 1959. One is identified as "Soviet Spider Draws U.S. Flies." I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues who were concerned with the recent visit to this country by Deputy Premier Mikoyan.

The other comment, written by Mr. James W. Tucker, and published in his column "Our Town," also concerns the Mikoyan visit.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hampton Union and the Rockingham County Gazette, Jan. 22, 1959]

SOVIET SPIDER DRAWS U.S. FLIES

It looks as if we might have invited Khrushchev himself (the self-appointed grave-digger for the United States) to visit us than to have permitted his First Deputy, Anastas Mikoyan to land on our shores. As keen as he is cruel, as cunning and ruthless as is disarming, this number one henchman is bad medicine for the United States.

Except for minor annoyances created by Hungarians who resented his slaughter of their kinfolk in the double cross of Budapest, this arch enemy of the United States was given the conquering hero treatment, wined and dined and fawned upon, from coast to coast, by an eager press of politicians and tycoons who should have known better. By the time he had returned to New York, where the police commissioner deemed it wise to detail 500 men to his protection, Mikoyan had spent most of his synthetic sweetness and was talking tough. Next on his agenda were Secretary of State Dulles and President Eisenhower. He indicated in advance that he would find what Mr. Dulles meant by his recent statement that there were other ways of unifying Germany than through elections, would be interested in an alternative—if Mr. Dulles had one—but considered the arrogant Red plan to swallow Berlin the best yet. The President, whose weekends have generally been considered inviolate, stayed in Washington to receive Russia's star salesman Saturday.

We applaud the position taken by our own Senator STYLES BRIDGES who declared Saturday on the floor of the U.S. Senate:

"After a good deal of soul searching, I simply cannot condone the activities of those who indulge in socializing with Deputy Premier Mikoyan. Were he here on some specific business I could understand formal talks with him by our officials who would be concerned with his proposals. It should be obvious to all that Mikoyan is here for a propaganda good will tour; first, to try to weaken our hitherto firm stand in regard to the Berlin situation, and secondly, to attempt to soften us up for eventual proposals of increased trade with the Soviet Union which can only have the effect of weakening our comparative position.

"A few of our industrialists and Wall Street bankers have given him the 'red carpet' treatment as a matter of obvious self-interest if his mission is successful. I, for one, certainly do not intend to aid him in the accomplishment of his mission. I wonder if these same bankers and industrialists are aware of Lenin's statement that, 'When we Communists are ready to hang the capitalists, they'll try to outbid each other for the sale of the hemp to us.' When will we learn that men cannot be both greedy and free? Why do we now pay tribute and social adulation for a temporary smile from a man whose every past word and deed indicates that he despises us and our way of life. Has his many years of Communist indoctrinated thinking so suddenly changed?

"I am distressed that some of my congressional colleagues have also accorded him recognition in social activities. It is especially disturbing that this man, one of the top plotters of our destruction should have been given a luncheon under the very dome of the U.S. Capitol, which is the most important citadel of human freedom in the world today. Those of us in public life who have entrusted to us the safeguarding of the constitutional guarantees of human freedoms might better follow the course set by that astute and beloved leader of the Catholic church, Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, who recently said without equivocation. 'I shall not receive Mikoyan nor attend any functions in his honor.'

"That should, indeed, be the course of our people whose memories are not so dull that they have already forgotten an incident which occurred just a few brief months ago and which characterizes the calculated course of that ruthless regime which Mikoyan represents. An American unarmed transport plane on its way from Turkey to Iran was shot down by Soviet fighter planes over Armenia, which happens to be comrade Mikoyan's homeland. Eventually, Mr. Mikoyan's government was kind enough to return to us the bodies of four American soldiers. Where are the other 10? We don't know.

"Instead of traipsing around the country exuding affable charm, I would be much more impressed if Mikoyan would address himself to giving us some information concerning the whereabouts of those sons of American mothers.

"Cardinal Cushing's course is the one that I had already set for myself from the time Mikoyan arrived in this country. In that decision and in my whole course of action, I will continue to do my utmost to convey to the Soviet enslaved peoples of the world that the torch which they bear in their never-ending struggle for freedom still shines brightly in the eyes of the vast majority of the people of this Nation.

"It will be my purpose to demonstrate to those people of the world who look to us for leadership that the adultation and free-wheeling publicity accorded Mikoyan in some quarters is only an expression of the views of small fraction of the people of this country. A vast majority echo the words of Rudyard Kipling in that great anthem entitled 'The Recessional' which concludes with:

" 'Lord God of Hosts be with us yet—
Lest we forget, lest we forget.'

"I have full faith that the people of this country have not forgotten."

Would that more of our country's political leaders had the same foresight and clear thinking of STYLES BRIDGES and Cardinal

Cushing in respect to the Russian threat to America's heritage of freedom.

[From the Hampton Union and the Rockingham County Gazette, Jan. 22, 1959]

OUR TOWN

(By James W. Tucker)

BUTCHER OF HUNGARY

We had a sheaf of notes relative to some uncomplimentary facts we intended to write about Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan, top Kremlin agent in Budapest during the rape of Hungary and presently an uninvited visitor in our country. Then, in last Saturday morning's papers our Senator, STYLES BRIDGES, said what we had in mind much more politely, concisely, and diplomatically than we could ever have written it. He said: "That sight of American industrialists and Wall Street bankers fawning over Mikoyan makes me sick at my stomach. I regret that some of my own colleagues have seen fit to invite him here."

Technical and Legal Problems of Outer Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the technical and legal problems which surrounds the entry into outer space are receiving the active consideration of legal minds throughout the country. The section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association has held two seminars and discussions on this subject in the past year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two excerpts from a report on these seminars, quoting the views of Rear Adm. Chester C. Ward, U.S. Navy, Judge Advocate General of the U.S. Navy, and those of Loftus Becker, legal adviser to the Department of State.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEMS IN LAW FOR OUTER SPACE

(Excerpts from second seminar on the law of outer space)

Rear Adm. Chester C. Ward, U.S.N., Judge Advocate General of the U.S. Navy, under the title "National Sovereignty in Space," said:

"Basically, our position is that the law of space should be based upon the facts of space; and that there is much more that we have to learn before we shall be in a position to say what shall be the legal principles applicable to activities in space.

"The one point I hope to make with you is this: If before we know the facts, if before we know what we want, we commit ourselves to a code of laws to be applicable out of this world, we may well prejudice the survival of freedom in this world. We lawyers have our magnificent dreams of the world rule of law and of world peace through world law, but I am sure that we do not propose to use these fine dreams as escape solutions, and thereby weaken the defense of the United States.

"We want no premature system of space law which would bind us but be used by the Communists to assist in creating new Hungarys, Latvias, Estonias, Georgias, Czechoslovakias, Polands, or other satellites—literal or figurative—of the Communist imperialists. We must make certain that we create no system of national sovereignty or control of space which will advantage the military power of aggressive imperialism.

"I must close with a warning: the land mass dominated and enslaved by the Soviets here on earth is vastly greater than ours. Their 13,385,368 square miles would swallow our 3,082,809 square miles. It gives them tremendous advantages in dispersal of ballistic missile launching sites that we cannot match in our own small land mass. To help insure our survival, we must therefore take full advantage of that freedom of the seas we have long fought to defend; and deploy substantial segments of our retaliatory deterrent power on and under the sea. The subpolar voyage of the *Nautilus* has shown us new sources and positions of strength. Second, because of our disadvantage in land mass on earth, we must be doubly careful not to handicap ourselves in space."

Loftus Becker, Legal Adviser to the Department of State, dealt with another area of sovereignty, extending his theme to "The Control of Space," saying:

"Efforts to declare or establish detailed rules at this time can be at best only fumbling in the dark and at the worst prove actual impediments to the rational development of outer space. Before seeking adequate solutions we must know the nature of the technical problems we are facing, the human conflicts that are to be resolved, and the environment in which solutions will operate. As we come to know these things, we can then proceed step by step on the pragmatic basis of actual experience to build an enduring and effective structure of rules and principles which will adequately reflect real interests and sensible solutions.

"The basic pattern of our existing foreign policy with respect to space is no different from that which we have with respect to international relations here on the earth. In conformity with our undertakings under article I of the United Nations Charter, it is our purpose to insure that—in space as on the earth—international peace and security are maintained and that international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace are adjusted or settled in conformity with the principles of justice and international law.

"What of the question of sovereignty over celestial bodies, as contrasted with sovereignty over zones of outer space? Under existing rules of international law, may any one nation acquire exclusive sovereignty or "ownership" over parts or all of such bodies so as to have the right to exclude or prevent other nations from exploring, occupying, or exploiting them? What will be the legal effect of successful lunar or planetary probes or, perhaps eventually, manned landings?

"As a general matter, it seems clear that international law at the present time furnishes no clear rules or precedents as regards this problem. Neither treaties nor international practice apply to it for the obvious reason that there has been neither necessity nor occasion for either to develop. We have, indeed, analogies to draw upon in the international law pertaining to the law of the sea and in rules and precedents for the acquisition of sovereignty over terra nullius. But these rules are far from well-defined. Moreover, there are very great risks in attempting to transmute a body of law based upon a determined set of facts on the earth into a body of law with respect to celestial bodies as to which the facts have not been determined and which are in all probability vastly different from anything in our experience. We must recognize that the choice of rules in this area will represent a major policy decision for each of the various states—a decision outside the competence of any international body as the world is now constituted.

"Ultimately, to foster and guide the cooperative efforts that are possible, it would appear axiomatic that some appropriate international machinery be created. At this time, we in the State Department envisage no obstacles—political or technical—which would preclude the establishment of such an international system of cooperation or coordination."

Allegheny River Reservoir

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Press of January 23, 1959:

THE ALLEGHENY RIVER FLOOD—AND WHY IT WASN'T PREVENTED

The devastating flood that swept through the Allegheny Valley and came down into the Ohio was bound to happen. Every river expert knew it would happen, in time. The people who live along the banks of the river knew it, and feared it.

Why did it have to happen? For 21 years we've had a sound engineering plan to tame the river and prevent the worst effects of floods.

That plan calls for the Allegheny River Dam at Kinzua. It was proposed by the U.S. Army Engineers and authorized by Congress. The Federal Government wants to spend $100 million building it. The various studies and plans have been completed.

WHY WASN'T THE DAM BUILT?

We have no flood protection on the upper Allegheny because the sound and practical plan of the Army Engineers was blocked by a fantastic series of attacks by pressure groups, bleeding-heart sentimentalists, self-nominated engineering experts and notoriety seekers.

Spokesmen for some sportsmen's organizations and others who call themselves "conservationists" opposed the dam. They said it would destroy an area now used for recreation and adversely affect wildlife.

Amateur engineers flyspecked the U.S. plans and advocated impractical alternatives. Some wanted a series of smaller dams. Some wanted different locations. One highly publicized plan would divert flood waters to Lake Erie at greater cost for less protection.

The most effective lobby against the dam was in behalf of the Seneca Indians of New York State, part of whose reservation would be flooded if the dam were built.

That's where the bleeding hearts came in, and their work against the dam was all too effective. They said the Indians were a separate nation and that their lands were acquired by treaty, which the Federal Government should not break, even to protect the millions of people who lived downstream.

In vain, the U.S. engineers pointed out that Indians now are citizens, like all other Americans; that the Senecas would receive just compensation for their land; that courts repeatedly had held that the Federal Government can take land for public projects, whether owned by Indians or other citizens.

The Senecas, on their part, hired their own engineer to mastermind the U.S. engineers. They also hired a lawyer to take their appeal to the highest court.

We almost got a start on the dam a year ago when Congress—after a 20-year delay—voted the first $1 million to begin construction.

That's when the Indians and their sentimental allies got in their work. Congress was induced to put a proviso in the appropriation bill that construction couldn't start until the court appeal of the Senecas was completed.

Two lower courts now have upheld the Government's right to protect citizens against floods, even if the Senecas lose some of their land. The case now is awaiting a Supreme Court test, and we have lost another year by this maneuver.

The people of the Allegheny Valley and other flooded areas have paid a heavy cost because of the irresponsible actions of a small but highly vocal pressure group which succeeded in preventing protection of the millions in behalf of a selfish few.

It's time we viewed this thing in its proper perspective—in the light of what is happening today in the Allegheny and Ohio Valleys. It's time Congress ignored the special pleaders and acted in the public interest by taking the shackles off the plan for the Kinzua Dam.

Allegheny River Reservoir

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Press of January 25, 1959:

THE HIGH COST OF FLOODS

What is the cost of the recurrent floods in western Pennsylvania's river valleys?

You can get a variety of estimates and educated guesses. Perhaps the best guide is contained in a report given Representative L. H. GAVIN, Oil City Republican, by Col. H. E. Sprague, then district engineer for the U.S. Army at Pittsburgh. It cited a flood survey made by his office some years ago.

"At the time of that report the average annual direct flood damages for the four major damage districts involved (Wheeling, Pittsburgh, New Kensington and Kittanning) based on recurrence of natural flood stages of record and conditions and values as of June 1948, amounted to $10,034,000," Colonel Sprague said. "At present day price levels (1956) such direct damages would amount to approximately $15,600,000."

(The reader should note that this is an average every-year cost, and includes only direct damages, excluding such tangible values as loss of wages, business, and profits.)

The granddaddy of all floods, of course, was the devastating St. Patrick's Day flood of 1936. From Warren, Pa., on the Allegheny and from Braddock on the Monongahela to Moundsville, W. Va., this inundation did damages estimated by the Army Engineers at $728 million (1956 prices).

Which brings up the next question, which is: How much damage would have been prevented if the proposed Allegheny River (Kinzua) Dam had been in existence?

Colonel Sprague estimated 2 years ago that the total average annual benefits of that dam would be (January 1957, prices) $4,971,000, of which $4,093,000 would be in flood control, the balance in other stream control benefits.

He added that the dam would have prevented more than $4,500,000 in damages from the single flood of March 1956, in the Allegheny and Ohio Valleys. It may be assumed that the dam would have been at least equally effective in last week's flood.

The Kinzua Dam was first authorized by Congress back in 1938—21 years ago. It was deferred, delayed and postponed for various reasons, some financial, some because of priorities assigned to other flood control projects and some because of the vigorous opposition of certain groups who just didn't want the dam to be built.

Had the Kinzua Dam been built in 1938, the cost would have been well below the more than $100 million now estimated, and at $4 million a year in flood benefits, the project would have paid for itself by this time.

There are other real benefits to be derived from flood protection besides those dollars-and-cents figures of the engineers. The additional safeguard given lives and properties is worth an inestimable sum.

More, the completion of this key and largest unit of the plan for western Pennsylvania's flood protection would constitute a major improvement for the Allegheny Valley from Warren to Pittsburgh and the Ohio Valley to Moundsville, W. Va. It would open the way to the long-delayed industrial development of the Allegheny Valley—a development which is bound to come some time and which would be hastened by flood protection.

By any account, the Kinzua Dam is an investment that would pay big dividends, in lives, properties and prosperity. Congress should order construction started as soon as possible.

Allegheny River Reservoir

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of January 24, 1959:

FLOODS STRESS NEED OF KINZUA DAM

As angry, icy waters swept destructively through western Pennsylvania's river towns and on down the Ohio, the public was reminded again that the flood control program undertaken for this area 22 years ago is still incomplete.

In the aftermath of the historic flood of March 1936, the Federal Government planned a system of integrated dams and reservoirs extending into the headwaters of the Allegheny and the Monongahela Rivers.

Much of the work has been completed, with enormous benefits to the residents and industries along the rivers. Army engineers have constructed 10 dams and reservoirs in western Pennsylvania, 8 of them above Pittsburgh.

But one of the most important links in the chain of control remains to be forged. That is the Allegheny River Reservoir above Warren, more commonly designated as Kinzua Dam. Congress first authorized this project in 1938 and a year ago appropriated $1 million to begin construction.

Work has been obstructed, however, by a long and tenacious fight against the project by various interests, including the Seneca Indians, who argue that the reservoir would deprive them of land in violation of a treaty. Valuable time is being lost pending a Supreme Court review of lower court decisions sustaining the Government's right to take the land in the public interest. The Indians would, of course, be compensated like any other American citizens whose property is taken for public purposes.

We are not prepared to argue the extent to which the flood's crest at Pittsburgh—29.21 feet—or at any other point along the Allegheny or Ohio might have been diminished if Kinzua Dam were in operation. That can be left to the estimates of the experts.

It is safe to say, however, that Pittsburgh and other communities would have suffered much greater damage this week if the Government had not undertaken its program 22 years ago. It seems equally plain that danger will remain until the program is completed.

The most important project in the uncompleted part of the flood control system is Kinzua Dam. Anyone who doubts the urgency of the importance of completing the system needs only to look at the swollen rivers rolling ominously through the Allegheny and Ohio Valleys.

Many Clerics Oppose Ties With Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief story which appeared in the January 19, 1959, issue of the New York Times. The story reports on a very interesting survey made by the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations. The result is very significant, in view of a report, published at an earlier date, to the effect that the Protestant clergymen of America favored the admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANY CLERICS OPPOSE TIES WITH RED CHINA

More than 7,000 Protestant clergymen in the United States have signed a petition opposing United States recognition of Communist China or its admission to the United Nations, the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations said yesterday.

The committee said it polled a cross section of Protestant ministers, asking them to express their individual point of view on the question of United States relations with Communist China.

Representative WALTER H. JUDD, Republican, of Minnesota, an originator of the poll, said it was designed to counteract a reported resolution adopted by a World Order Study Conference, sponsored by the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. last November, proposing that Communist China be recognized by the United States and admitted to the United Nations.

Only 936 clergymen, he said, approved United States recognition of Communist China, in the poll.

The Social Ethic: A Social Evil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the age in which we are living seems to favor the group, the bare majority and organizations—all at the expense of the individual. The rugged individuals of yesteryear seem to be disappearing from the scene and with their disappearance go the material with which this Nation was built.

Anthony Harrigan of the Charleston News and Courier has written a thought-provoking analysis of this trend away from individualism in the December 19, 1958, edition of the magazine U.S.A.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "The Social Ethic: A Social Evil," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOCIAL ETHIC: A SOCIAL EVIL

(By Anthony Harrigan)

For a full generation, a large body of Americans have subscribed to the social ethic. They believe that group activity is more useful and important than individual activity; that group sanction is the source of the good life.

Adherence to groupism has resulted in theories of "adjustment to life," in hesitation or unwillingness to acknowledge inherent inequalities among individuals, and in a fantastic emphasis on team effort.

The social ethic has caused a devaluation of competition as a desired factor in school and in life. A pupil's report card isn't marked "F" if he fails. "Unsatisfactory" is the most severe penalty allowed by educationists subscribing to the social ethic. And in business organizations, decision making has become more and more a committee function, not an activity for the single, best-informed individual.

Because of the present climate in the world of ideas, it is very important to remember that the historic philosophy of the United States was not the social ethic. The men who founded this Republic and wrote its Constitution held to an individualistic creed. They did not believe that men were atoms useful only when joined together. Every great American to whom we look with retrospective respect—Washington, John Adams, Calhoun, Theodore Roosevelt—was a man who voiced an individualist philosophy, not the doctrine of "mass man."

MARXIST ILL WIND

The intellectual foundations of the social ethic were laid in the 1920's. The First World War had played havoc with civilized values. The seeds of western destruction, embodied in the totalitarian thinking of Karl Marx, were blown over the earth by the windy diatribes of our homegrown Marxists, who arrogantly rejected the unique thinking of their native land, and by European Marxists, who imported to America their resentments and prejudices.

A decade after the end of World War I came an economic crisis that touched off an explosion of disillusionment and left in many Americans the debris of spiritual fatigue. Rejecting the sound traditions of American life, a generation of writers and so-called intellectuals turned to group thinking and collective ideals. They hailed the social ethic. Only in collective enterprises, they said, could modern man control and organize his economic life, thus finding security and spiritual satisfaction.

THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

Suddenly, there was an epidemic of talk about the little man, the underprivileged, and the exploited. The greatest group experiments in the social ethic was the New Deal. Freedom to regulate many areas of life in these United States was taken away from individuals and turned over to bureaucrats alleged to be the mind and voice of the people.

By the late 1930's, the American people had shifted from self-reliance based on individualism to dependence based on revolutionary group experiments in collectivist rule. Millions of Americans, born in the freest country on earth, had accepted the idea of a leader and of mass social experimentation and regimentation. The revolutionaries thought not of individual citizens and their individual rights, but of special groups and group rights.

Undoubtedly, World War II fostered more groupism and a more extreme social ethic. A new measure of regimentation was introduced into the lives of Americans. Millions of young men learned to think of the group before the individual, and to value teamwork above all else. For Americans not in military uniforms, there were the new restrictions of rationing, civil defense, and war work.

The postwar years brought a vast change in the living habits of Americans. There was a continuing flight from the farms and, inevitably, a move away from the independence of rural life. Suburban life, with its emphasis on conformity, brought social regimentation into greater degree. Sudden desire for home ownership resulted not so much in respect for property rights as in fear of economic changes that might jeopardize security. Big business itself, while stressing self-reliance in institutional advertising, began to heed the counsel of the social scientists. They instructed personnel managers to recruit men with a strong sense of group loyalty and good team attitudes.

THE FEARLESS FORTIES

In the late 1940's, group thinking became the rage. Laboratories stressed group research instead of work by dedicated individuals. The tax-exempt foundations gave their grants to persons engaged in group projects. The churches began to speak of Christianity as perfect group living, terming belief in God-man directness as the tenet of an incomplete faith. Journalism, as exemplified by the Henry R. Luce publications, became increasingly a faceless group activity wherein the individual observer and creative writer is submerged into anonymity.

It is profoundly ironical that Americans who have turned away from their free society which put a high value on individualism and individual aspirations, are now pitted in a great struggle against the ruling oligarchy of an enslaved nation where the official political philosophy is the social ethic.

SOVIET AWAKENING

Another irony is that despite the ideological framework of the Soviet Union, the masters there have come to realize the value of individual competition, especially in education. As the Soviets move away from groupism and the social ethic in education, the United States moves nearer and nearer to complete fulfillment of the ideals of this weakening philosophy. More and more, our teachers, writers, and preachers urge that in any conflict between the individual and the group, the wise and moral thing is for the individual to submit to the group.

There are Americans who resist the popular way. The rising tide of juvenile crime, the lack of good manners among young people and adults, and the absence of stern moral standards and high cultural aims have caused many thinking citizens to believe that the individual is being debased in our modern society. The social ethic has provided the weaker and lazier individuals with a massive array of excuses for failures and deficiencies.

Life is, of course, fiercely competitive. While a nation may fool itself for a while, reveling in its folly, it cannot continue to live by subjective standards in an objective world.

It is important to remember that the group way over our approach to life's problems can be weakened. Men forged the hold; other men can break it. The evil of the social ethic can be overcome. It is possible to create resistance to groupism. Regardless of the apparent strength of group thinking in the institutions of American life, opposing forces also have strength. America has educationists who would sunder schooling from traditional learning and the accomplishment of hard tasks. America also has educators who insist on strict and high standards, who do not believe that all change is good and that groupist life adjustment is the aim of education.

Happily, our country still has leaders who are aware that lust for legislation is not a fit substitute for maintenance of principles and the slow development of sound customs.

REALISTIC REAPPRAISAL

As a people, we must rid ourselves of silly enthusiasms and belief in panaceas. Historically and traditionally, we have been cold-eyed seekers after reality and we have admired independent men able to see things as they really are. In recent decades, we have allowed ourselves to drift away from realistic thinking into the unrealistic concepts of a comfort culture and an adjustment group philosophy.

But now reality impinges on us in the form of a struggle for survival against a ruthless competitor. This struggle is forcing us to reject what is weak in our own society. Surely, we will right our wrongs, remedy our ills, restore that which needs to be restored, alter what is inept, compose what is disorderly, and abandon what is illusory.

An essentially realistic, individualistic approach to domestic and foreign problems is the one best hope of our Republic.

Let us reject the social ethic and renew the faith of our fathers.

Industrial Development in South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on January 15 the Anderson Daily Mail published its ninth annual edition of "The New South". This annual edition of this newspaper is devoted to industrial progress in South Carolina. South Carolina's recently inaugurated Governor, the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings, wrote for the Daily Mail a special article about the present and future prospects of industrial development in South Carolina. I

ask unanimous consent to have this splendid article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR OF SOUTH CAROLINA

(By Ernest F. Hollings)

Throughout my campaign for Governor and since that time I have tried to emphasize the importance of industrial development in the economic renaissance of South Carolina. The year 1958 provided a clear-cut demonstration of what new industry can mean to our people.

Despite a recession which in some parts of the Nation created unfortunate conditions, South Carolina moved forward at a steady pace in its almost revolutionary strides toward better standards of living. While the recession was, of course, felt in our State, the effect was not nearly so great had we not had the growing balance that industry is providing for the economy.

Records of the postwar years show that South Carolina, on a percentage basis, has been at or near the top in the Nation in industrial development. The story must not stop here, however. There is still a challenge to be met, for the State still has hundreds of industrial locations which are not only ideal for industry but which would provide needed jobs in communities whose potential has not been fully realized.

It shall be one of the primary purposes of my administration to assist in any way possible to promote this growth in a vigorous way.

Experience has shown us conclusively that a sound, businesslike State government is of the utmost importance in seeking new industry. Our general assembly last year demonstrated its belief in this principle by enacting several proposals to better the business climate. This included an important modernization of the corporate tax laws which had long been needed.

A review of the past year shows that South Carolina continued, in spite of a recession which shelved many plans, to move forward in securing new industry and in the substantial expansion of existing companies. This growth was marked by diversification, toward which we have been moving more rapidly every year.

During 1958 approximately $122,625,000 was expended or allocated for new plants and expansions. Of this total, about $109,625,000 was devoted to completely new industry, while $13 million went into existing company growth.

Both create new jobs, which is after all the aim of our development program. According to records of the State Development Board, approximately 5,300 new jobs are represented by the expenditures. Labor Department averages indicate that this will be about $15,425,000 in new wages, a substantial addition to the economy.

It is particularly interesting to note the growth of machine work during the year. Several new machine tool and dye shops have been established, including one or two of the better known names in the industry. This brings to South Carolina operations which have been greatly needed over the years, and which in themselves tend to bring in new industries.

Among other diversified industries are plants to manufacture such items as TV tubes, plastic products, wood specialties, house trailers, toys, and a number of others.

It was also heartening to note that the year brought several very substantial power developments. Beginning with the announced enlargement to the Virginia-Carolinas nuclear powerplant at Parr Shoals, the list included some of the largest power projects of recent years by several companies. Power must go hand in hand with industrial growth, and certainly our power sources have kept pace through the years and now offer further inducements to new industry.

Matching the growth of our industry is a vast ports improvement program at Charleston, Georgetown, and Beaufort. Substantial progress has already been made in this program under the State Ports Authority, and during the year Charleston enhanced its position as a leading Atlantic seaport.

To complement these developments, the State is experiencing a continued growth of diversification on the farm. With livestock steadily increasing and lands devoted to pasture growing rapidly, our farmers are building a better balanced agriculture with year-round rather than seasonal aspects. Accompanying these changes are higher and higher yields per acre as new and scientific farm methods are used.

As we seek a more stable economy and higher income for South Carolinians, we also realize the potentialities of the tourist business. No State has more to offer the visitor than South Carolina, and it behooves us to let the world know that fact. Already a substantial increase has been achieved in tourist revenue, with an income today of about $200 million annually.

All these things indicate that South Carolina has an excellent opportunity to improve our economy in the years ahead, if the challenges are met.

Proposed National Cultural Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the copy of a letter to the President from Adm. Neill Phillips, chairman of the Committee of One Hundred on the Federal City, containing six resolutions adopted by that group regarding the proposed National Cultural Center. I also ask unanimous consent that a copy of a telegram from Robert W. Dowling to Admiral Phillips, commenting on the importance of the National Cultural Center, be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. President, on January 13 I wrote the President a letter, calling to his attention the importance of early appointment of the trustees for the National Cultural Center; and on January 16 the assistant to the President kindly answered my letter, expressing the hope that the trustees could be appointed in the very near future.

Again, I wish to urge the President to proceed to appoint the trustees under the authority of Public Law 85–874. I deem it unfortunate, if not inexcusable, that the administration has delayed so long in the appointment of the trustees. Under the bill, the trustees have only 5 years to raise the necessary funds for construction of the center. Almost 5 months have elapsed since enactment of this act, and nothing has been done. The task of the trustees in raising funds for the center will be extremely difficult. They will need sufficient time to accomplish their job.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1959.

Subject: Public Law 85–874, 85th Congress, enacted September 2, 1958, to provide for a National Cultural Center.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Committee of 100 on the Federal City worked hard for the enactment of Public Law 85–874, and recently has made a study of its current status.

The committee of 100 has passed resolutions as follows:

"1. Public Law 85–874 shall lapse if, within 5 years after enactment date, sufficient funds have not been raised to establish the Cultural Center; therefore, time is of the essence. Already more than 4 precious months have gone by and the board of trustees has not been set up and made into a functioning unit.

"2. The President therefore is respectfully and urgently requested to activate the board of trustees and particularly to:

"(a) Appoint the 15 general trustees provided for under sections 2(a) and 2(b) of the act;

"(b) Appoint a Chairman and members of the Advisory Committee on the Arts provided for under section 2(c);

"(c) Obtain from the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House the appointments of Members of Congress to serve on the board of trustees as provided for under section 2(a).

"3. The act should be amended, or other steps taken, to provide immediate funds for office space and clerical help for the board of trustees and the Advisory Committee on the Arts; and for reimbursement of members for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in their duties, as permitted by the act. This is essential in order to permit the board and the Advisory Committee to set about raising funds and drawing up plans.

"4. Section 7(b) should be amended to provide, in case the act is terminated within 5 years due to insufficient funds being raised, that contributions may be returned to the donors instead of being transferred to the regents of the Smithsonian Institution. It is held to be an axiom of successful fund raising that donors be asked to give for a specific purpose, and not asked to contribute on a conditional basis as to employment of funds. If it is deemed impracticable to return a vast number of individual contributions, provision at least should be made to allow the donors an option as to how their gifts shall be disposed of in case the cultural center fails. The Committee of 100 believes that the necessary sum for the cultural center can be raised, but holds that the foregoing amendment is necessary for its psychological effect in the fund drive.

"5. The Committee of 100 pledges its continued enthusiastic support for the cultural center and its desire to work with other interested bodies and individuals, public and private, to that end. The Committee of 100 further urges that the overall project of the cultural center be given dynamic support by the executive and legislative branches, with strong guidance from the executive.

"6. The Committee of 100 enthusiastically endorses the views set forth by Mr. Robert W. Dowling in his telegram (copy enclosed) addressed to us at the American Planning and Civic Association. Mr. Dowling has been a successful leader in setting up the enormous project of the Lincoln Center in New York, and his support of the National Cul-

tural Center in Washington is of the greatest value."

Respectfully submitted.

NEILL PHILLIPS,
Chairman.

ADDRESS OF ROBERT W. DOWLING, PRESIDENT, CITY INVESTING CO. OF NEW YORK, RECEIVED BY TELEGRAM FROM NEW YORK CITY BY ADM. NEILL PHILLIPS AND READ BEFORE THE AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION, JANUARY 9, 1959

Dear Admiral Phillips and members of the American Planning and Civic Association, it had been my hope up to the last few hours to come to Washington today and to have the pleasure of meeting with you. But a combination of virus and laryngitis will, I am sure, make my absence a pleasure for all of you. I would deeply appreciate having another opportunity to join with you.

My enthusiasm for the Cultural Center in Washington is unbounded. It may very well be the symbol for which our country will longest be remembered. The might and power of the armies of many civilizations have long since faded, but the influence of their cultures lives on. Few remember the names of Spartan and Athenian leaders who waged the Pelopennesian Wars. But the beauty of the Acropolis and the thoughts and works of those who people it are with us still.

New York has a distinguished and well-organized civic group who have made great progress toward the creation of the Lincoln Center. This modern Acropolis will contain an opera house, concert hall, dance theater, theater for repertory drama, and library and museum for music and drama. Two-thirds of their money has been raised, and there is no doubt of its success.

Washington must and can enjoy a greater and more esthetically satisfying National Cultural Center. It is proper that through the encouragement of the Federal Government's gift of a magnificent piece of land that the entire population of the United States should feel a sense of participation in providing the means to create the buildings and the endowments as well. While it would be hard to refuse millions from certain foundations, nevertheless, an ideal of American pride would be for each citizens to provide $1. This would clearly demonstrate both at home and abroad the interest and affection with which our people hold American culture. I am confident through the newspapers, radio, TV, universities and schools, and the leaders of culture that more than enough money for halls, schools, and endowments will be provided. You have it in your power to achieve whatever you think is suitable and worthy.

Any manner in which I may be permitted to participate with you would remain for me the deepest privilege.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Young Democratic Club of the District of Columbia, at their monthly meeting on January 23, 1959, passed unanimously a resolution favoring the passage of legislation to grant statehood to Hawaii. The distinguished delegate from Hawaii, the Honorable JOHN BURNS, spoke at the meeting and enlightened the members with his first-hand knowledge of the islands.

The resolution illustrates the interest of the young men and women in further extending the rights and privileges of self-government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas our fellow citizens in the Territory of Hawaii have repeatedly manifested to their countrymen in the United States, to the Congress of the United States and to the world their earnest desire to be admitted into the Union;

Whereas their economy, their culture and their traditions meet all the historical requirements for statehood;

Whereas they bore the first burdens of American participation in the late world war and their sons and daughters fought and died in the battles of that war with patriotism as great as that of their mainland comrades in arms;

Whereas the admission of Alaska into the Union makes Hawaii's petition more significant: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Young Democratic Club of the District of Columbia, sympathetic because of the District of Columbia's voteless position, officially go on record in support of statehood for Hawaii; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States urging that Hawaii be admitted into the Union as the 50th State of the United States.

West Germany's Import Tax of $4.76 Per Ton on United States Coal Is Further Evidence That Foreign Nations Will Accept American Imports When It Is Principally to Their Advantage

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, last week, the West German Republic announced that effective February 16, 1959, a tax of $4.76 a ton will be levied on coal imported into that country. This tax will adversely affect the hard-hit coal industry of the United States and especially the normal export of 12 to 16 million tons of coal per year to Germany.

Frankly, the Nation's coal industry is about to receive another severe blow on the international trade front.

West Germany's arbitrary imposition of a prohibitive tariff on coal imports from the United States slams the door in the face of a salesman who has been able to deliver his product a distance of more than 3,000 miles and still charge less than producers within close proximity of this market.

This ability to put coal down in Europe at most attractive prices has been made possible through the dogged efforts of an industry that has refused to rest on its laurels as the world's most efficient coal producer. Although output per man day in the United States is at least four times greater than that of any other country, coal management—with the approval and encouragement of the United Mine Workers of America—continues to invest in new methods and machines that are largely responsible for coal's price stability in a period when most commodities have spiraled upward at an alarming rate.

Mr. Speaker, let us consider the impact of this proposed tax levy on the coal industry which has been beset by economic distress for almost every one of the past 10 years.

Many mines in Pennsylvania have long since gone out of business. Others are holding on with 1 or 2 or 3 days a week of production—not enough to allow for normal owner earnings and certainly not enough to provide a respectable standard of living for workmen and their families.

Despite coal's economic ills, the industry has gone forward with its mechanization program. In some cases the necessary capital has been made possible because of firm contracts which the industry has been able to negotiate. Contracts to sell coal to West Germany were among those which some American companies utilized as a basis for attracting investment capital or for making necessary loans. The action of the Bonn Government in placing a duty of $4.76 per ton on American coal entering West Germany amounts to a repudiation of such contracts, for obviously the tariff places an impenetrable cost barrier on U.S. coal.

The impact of West Germany's action will be felt not only among producers shipping overseas; much of the coal that would have been shipped across the Atlantic will, in seeking other outlets, bring further competition into domestic markets in a competitive struggle that the industry should not be expected to bear.

What has happened in Bonn is further evidence that foreign nations will accept American goods only when it is to their decided advantage to do so. In contrast, our State Department has insisted on continued decreases in our own tariff rates and has vehemently opposed quotas that would offer protection for the American coal miner against residual oil imports. The U.S. coal industry has thus been caught in the middle of an international tug of war. Our only recourse is for Congress to enact the legislation necessary to safeguard this vital industry and at the same time give our miners a chance to get back to work.

Incredibly Pleasant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the February 1959 issue of Holiday magazine

contains a fine article by Robert Carson entitled "West Coast Journey." It tells of the author's recent 3,000-mile trip through Oregon, Washington, and California in, as he notes, "a reexploration of the Pacific slope." It is beautifully illustrated by photographs taken by John Lewis Stage.

I hope each Member of this House and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have the opportunity to read this article. Today I want to quote a small portion of it which concerns the Oregon coast, the most beautiful in the world, and half of which is in the district which I have the honor to represent in this House:

We had been told beforehand that the Oregon coast is the most beautiful in the world, and were prepared to resist; but after 2 or 3 days we were entirely conquered. Nothing in our experience compared to it, even the shores of the Mediterranean, Brittany, the Caribbean, the British Isles and Ireland, and the Pacific side of Central America. To a generation steeped in the wonders of Cinerama, and more inclined to look at Lawrence Welk, the region is a constant delight to the eyes. The unending and almost bewildering succession of sandy beaches, bold cliffs, towering forests, and clean little towns dressed for holidays, is incredibly pleasant. If one grows tired of sparkling water and the swell of bold mountains, it is easy to turn to fields covered with azaleas, rhododendrons, Canterbury bells, tiny white daisies, and yellow and blue lupine. Around Tillamook, fat cows ruminate in landscapes Constable might have painted, and in the cheese factory they make tasty yellow slabs of the Tillamook Cheddar, which is favorably regarded by connoisseurs. All along the fisherman is paramount, either on the beach or in the rivers and streams, in search of salmon and steelhead. And clamming and crabbing rate high in popularity.

The Fight Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the weekly article of Sunday, January 25, by Mr. George Minot, distinguished managing editor of the Boston Herald, which contained a penetrating analysis of the fight against inflation:

IKE LAUNCHES ALL-OUT FIGHT

(By George Minot)

The big news of the new Congress was supposed to be the headlong clash between the economizers and the spenders. The pencil pushers told you wild-eyed Democrats would pour into Washington come the first of the year, hell bent to see how fast they could get to the job of spending more money on schools, airports, housing, rehabilitation of slum areas, and water resources, and bigger aid for the aged, the ailing, and the subsidy seekers.

It hasn't worked out that way at all, at least not in the first few weeks of the session. The very Democrats who yawned at the Eisenhower state of the Union and budget messages, still are terribly anxious that they themselves don't get in the position of having the big spending label pinned on them.

MIGHT BOOMERANG IN 1960

It's obvious they believe a runaway Congress, one that turns on the spigot of spending and piles up another big Federal deficit, might easily boomerang in 1960. The cost of living is bound to be one of the major issues 2 years hence and the Democrats don't want $2.50-a-pound steak, $1-a-dozen eggs, or 30-cent-a-loaf bread tied around their necks. Keep one eye on this. There's going to be many unfulfilled promises in this session of Congress.

The professors expect a lot from these liberals who replaced stick-in-the-mud Republicans. There's CLAIR ENGLE, from California, succeeding Knowland. VANCE HARTKE sitting where Indiana's Jenner used to sit. STEPHEN YOUNG, of Ohio, replacing Bricker. HUGH SCOTT replacing Ed Martin in Pennsylvania, and ED MUSKIE sitting in Payne's Maine seat. There are others, but these will do for an example.

Their lot is not a happy one. On one hand the professional pundits, the theorizers, and the star gazers harping at them that the population, the scientists, the Russians, and the economy all are running ahead of the administration and its plans for the future. They believe the pace of history is leaving General Eisenhower behind.

They are afraid the President will not gamble enough, explore enough, expand enough in his last 2 years in office, but instead will consolidate, solidify, and restrain. Thus, they tell the liberal newcomers and the country at large, we may fall behind in the race into space and allow the Russians to get ahead of us in some of the great undeveloped areas of the world.

ISN'T PRODUCTIVE AT ALL

They believe in a balanced budget, but they want it balanced at $90 billion instead of $77 billion. They believe that the way to combat inflation is to spend more, not less. They see the national production increasing by leaps and bounds, until by 1964 it is around $600 billion and still on the way up.

The way to get there, they will tell you, is for the Government to spend more and more—for public works, for rivers and harbors, for defense, for foreign aid, and for aid to the States for education, redevelopment, medicine, and the other arts and sciences. This, in theory, brings that mysterious thing known as the gross national product to huge levels.

The fact that big Government spending often, even usually, isn't productive at all, neither alarms nor interests those who advance this line of reasoning. Nor do they deign to look at France of today and learn a lesson from just one of many countries that pay the penalty for a binge into inflation.

All these were arguments advanced after last fall's election. Many Members of Congress were lulled by them. In Washington they found a different atmosphere. They found Mr. Eisenhower pounding home a theme of fiscal responsibility. They had been told the President planned to take it easy in 1959 and 1960. Instead, they ran into the battle of the century, on the result of which depends whether this country continues as a republic or degenerates into a socialist state.

FEARS OF FALSE PROPHETS

They found Eisenhower launching an Operation Budget as the biggest issue in the country. When false prophets twitted this man as one willing to risk the country's safety by paring $45 billion totals in the defense budget, they suddenly remembered that here was the Nation's Commander in Chief who led all the Allied armies in Europe only a few years ago. Thus their fears became laughable.

In his annual budget message and his report on the state of the economy this last week, he got down to business. Here it was put into sharp focus. Here was the start of what is promised to be a house-to-house, street-by-street explanation of how much depends on the purchasing power of the pay envelopes of millions of Americans. Here, obviously, is a man to whom the people will listen.

If Mr. Eisenhower can rally public support for a reliable currency, then the cries of special groups will fade. It won't be easy. Labor unions, a certain type of professor and political stooges deny that the unending cycle of wage increases is a main cause in the steady increase in the cost of living. Ask the landlord, the grocer, the electric light president, the clothing merchant the reasons for his markups. He will tell you, and prove to you, it is largely the cost of labor.

NOT ANXIOUS TO ASSUME BLAME

It won't be too hard for the President to show the householder how this inflation raises havoc with his daily budget, but stopping it will be difficult. It will mean a fight with labor and all those beholden to it and with Congressmen who know that when they vote to cut an appropriation or abolish an installation or a service they will hear complaints from many voters. Congressmen seldom hear complaints when they vote more money for anything.

The President's great asset will be that despite the vote of last fall and the loud cries of zealots, the mood in the country is one of moderation. He will not have as hard a time with Congress as you may suspect. He won't hypnotize anybody with his talk of a balanced budget. He won't get away with dictating legislation or trying to hamstring it, but don't be surprised if he works very well and successfully with JOHNSON in the Senate and RAYBURN in the House.

You probably noticed JOHNSON in his first skirmish. He didn't aline himself with the liberals of the North and West. He didn't care how spectacular were their victories. He and RAYBURN want no new inflationary spiral blamed on Congress. It simply wouldn't be good politics.

If the President goes through with this fight with the same vigor with which he started, it will be a corker.

A Trend in the Newspaper Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, a free expression of opinion has always been a vital part of the American tradition.

The more citizens who speak their piece, the stronger the base of the democracy. This also follows with the means of transmitting those opinions, the newspapers, magazines, radio, and television.

Today monopolies are surreptitiously creeping into all of these mediums, a trend that is cutting down alarmingly on the number of people who are expressing individual opinions.

Ben Kuroki, the editor and publisher of the Enterprise, a weekly newspaper

in Williamston, Mich., comments brilliantly on this subject as it relates to the newspapers of our country.

I submit herewith his editorial:

A TREND IN THE NEWSPAPER BUSINESS

The big news in the newspaper industry 2 weeks ago was the sale of the Chicago Daily News to Field Enterprises, Inc., owner of the Chicago Sun-Times.

The Chicago Daily News belonged to the Knight chain and has been one of the top newspapers in the Nation. But the real story behind the news is the growning trend of consolidation in the newspaper business and of fewer and fewer newspapers.

This trend is alarmingly pointed out in the January 16 issue of U.S. News & World Report. In 10 years, 217 daily newspapers have disappeared in the United States by suspension, merger, or shift to weekly or semiweekly basis.

Rapidly rising costs and labor relations were named as the two big problems of the newspaper business. For instance, U.S. News points out, "Over the last decade the average cost of getting out a newspaper has gone up more than 50 percent. Advertising rates have had to be increased. Subscription rates have moved up sharply. Yet more and more papers have found themselves unable to keep pace with rising costs."

The magazine adds: "Since 1948 the price of newsprint has risen from $88.50 a ton to $135."

Increasing competition from other forms of advertising—particularly television and radio—also has caused the disappearance of many dailies.

The trend toward consolidation and fewer newspapers also holds true in the weekly field. Rising newsprint and production costs have also been major problems in the profession.

The unfortunate thing is this trend is that there is less and less individuality in newspapering today. The whole concept of the freedom of the press is increasingly marred as ideals and views are subjected to greater control and monopoly.

The trend is not a healthy one in a democracy.

Legislation To Protect the Right of the Blind to Self-Expression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the National Federation of the Blind, I am introducing a bill intended for the protection of the rights and privileges of blind people, especially with regard to the right of self-expression. In order that blind people may be heard and given more opportunity to express their views with regard to matters that relate to them and to their Government, it becomes necessary they be assisted through representatives of organizations with which they are associated.

The bill is in two sections. Under the first section the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would consult with authorized representatives of recognized independent organizations of blind people in formulating administrative programs to provide aid and rehabilitation to the blind. This section is also intended to recommend that State agencies formulate programs that will coincide and work with those provided under the Federal program.

Blind people are asking, among other things, that they be given a chance to present their views and their programs to agencies of Government that deal in particular with blind people. They claim that about the only way they can make themselves heard is to do it through recognized organizations that represent the blind.

Blind people of America want to be recognized as a part of our Government. They are interested in the management of its affairs. It is not just a question of providing funds for these people, but more especially a recognition that they can be of service to our country and be a part of the community by becoming self-supporting when afforded opportunity to do so. Providing funds is important, but not enough. The desire for emancipation from economic and social bondage must come from the people themselves. This desire is strong in the blind citizens of our country.

In 1940 a group of 15 or 20 blind men and women from 7 States met for the purpose of starting an organization which today has a membership of many thousands in 45 States. In our State we have the Kansas Association for the Blind. This association has won the admiration of the people of our State.

The Kansas association, along with other State organizations, is joined with the National Federation of the Blind. I am informed it is the only countrywide organization to which blind people belong. Members of the national federation seek and work toward improvement of their position in society. They expend their strength toward the attainment of a better and freer life for people who are blind. By their initiative and courage and by refusing to accept helplessness as their lot, these people have proven their claim that they be consulted on matters which affect the blind. They insist on their right to join organizations of their own choosing and that such organizations represent them in matters of particular interest to blind people.

Members of Congress, as well as people in general, have always been concerned with regard to our blind Americans. The American people will continue to see that the needs of the blind are properly protected. This is a problem of assisting people who want to help themselves. Blind people do not ask for charity. They ask for opportunity to permit them insofar as possible to make their own way.

This bill is intended, especially, to protect these handicapped people in their rights as American citizens and to afford greater opportunity whereby they may help themselves. They feel that under the terms of this proposed legislation they will be better fitted to cope with problems that apply in particular to blind people.

The Small Business Committee Helped the Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is recalled that in the last Congress small and independent distributors and processors of dairy products complained that large distributors were using unfair methods of competition, including the making of sales at discriminatory prices and at levels below cost to destroy small competitors and gain a monopoly control over prices. The House Small Business Committee seriously studied and considered those complaints. A special investigating subcommittee was established to investigate the matter. It held hearings in Dallas, Tex., Kansas City, Mo., and Washington, D.C. Meetings were held with representatives of the dairy industry in Oklahoma City and other points for a discussion of the problem.

Our distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] served as chairman of the special investigating subcommittee and presided over the hearings relating to these problems in the dairy industry. Out of the records of those hearings, a very excellent report was developed—House Report 2713—entitled "Price Discrimination in the Distribution of Dairy Products." That report has been acclaimed by many who are engaged in various segments of the dairy industry. Our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], has been commended highly for his conduct of the hearings and for the report on the problem.

I have just received a letter dated January 23, 1959, from the National Independent Dairies Association explaining how the dairy industry was helped by the investigations and studies made by the House Small Business Committee. Under permission to extend and revise my remarks, I include a copy of that letter in the RECORD at this point. The letter is as follows:

NATIONAL INDEPENDENT DAIRIES ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., January 23, 1959.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We have read with great interest the excellent report entitled "Price Discrimination in the Distribution of Dairy Products," recently released by the House Select Committee on Small Business.

The investigation, upon which the report is based, was a most thorough and comprehensive one, and the report brings into clear focus many reasons for the chaotic conditions existent in the dairy industry today.

The evidence makes it crystal clear that the independent dairymen are suffering irreparable injuries resulting from such sales practices as sales below cost. Small and medium-sized independent dairymen simply cannot cope with financial giants who

can afford to engage in price wars, selling their products below cost in one area while realizing handsome profits in other areas of the Nation. As a consequence, many independent dairymen have been forced to sell out to a competitor or face bankruptcy. Consequently, there exists not a creeping concentration but a galloping concentration of the dairy industry into the hands of a few giant concerns.

We cannot too highly commend you, Representative TOM STEED, the acting chairman of the subcommittee, and its other members for the outstanding work done in this connection. We well recall that the need for the investigation was apparently deemed to be so urgent that you and Representative STEED held the first hearing on December 31, 1957.

Enclosed herewith is a reprint of an editorial from the 1957 American Milk Review, a national trade journal, entitled "Destructive Competition," which, no doubt, will be of interest to you.

Sincerely yours,

D. C. DANIEL.

The editorial which appeared in the June 1957 issue of the American Milk Review entitled "Destructive Competition," and which was referred to in the letter from the National Independent Dairies Association is as follows:

DESTRUCTIVE COMPETITION

The failure of a fair trade practices bill in Ohio is a blow to the dairy industry's efforts to extricate itself from the morass of destructive competition in which it is mired. The respect enjoyed by Ohio gives it an influence that extends far beyond its political boundaries. Other legislatures facing similar decisions will, to a degree, be affected by the debate and action taken at Columbus.

The unfavorable vote was probably the least of the misfortunes that befell the dairy industry. Far more serious in our estimation was the division of the industry that was exhibited. Despite the fact that the bill had the support of the Ohio Dairy Products Association the active opposition of certain powerful segments of the dairy industry contributed to its defeat.

We can view the result only with distaste and foreboding. It tends to give substance to the basic evil in the competitive situation. The evil, expressed in terms of unjustified discounts, free equipment and services, extensive loans, and outright gifts of cash, transform competition from a contest based on quality, service, and efficiency into a contest of financial strength. The victory goes to the biggest bank roll.

Such a condition is bad for the industry and bad for the country. It breeds a cynicism, a corrosion of the moral foundations upon which society rests.

We visited a magnificent plant a few weeks ago. It represented the best in milk processing equipment and design. Here was industrial management at its best. Here were the old virtues of thrift, of sound financial management, of service, of quality plus enlightened labor relations, progressive merchandising, and a high sense of industrial responsibility. By all the standards of the free enterprise philosophy this plant was a model. Yet it was struggling. It was struggling because it did not have a bank roll big enough to meet the deals that some of its competitors were offering. Of what avail are integrity, merit, and quality against a 12-percent discount with a new car thrown in?

This situation is not a mere matter of business relationships. This touches the very heart of the ethical and moral concepts that are the basic framework of civilization. A bribe is a bribe whether it is used to buy a vote or a stop. The demoralizing influence of such practices upon the industry is surpassed by the shameful deterioration of moral standards that they represent.

Perhaps the Members will be interested also in a feature article appearing in the American Milk Review, January 1959, entitled "Injunction May Be Answer to Destructive Competition." That article discusses the problem highlighted in the hearings over which our colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] presided. Under permission to extend and revise my remarks, I include a copy of that article at this point. The article is as follows:

INJUNCTION MAY BE ANSWER TO DESTRUCTIVE COMPETITION

The use of the injunctive process in meeting the thrusts of destructive competition should be developed in the dairy industry, Representative TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, told 297 members and guests of the National Independent Dairy Association at a luncheon in Chicago on December 11. Declaring that he had found in the dairy industry certain trade practices "peculiar to itself," the Oklahoma Congressman said that although milk distributors often had protection under the law where destructive competition was concerned, too often "they find themselves out of business before their case is heard." As a solution to this situation Mr. STEED urged the use of injunctions.

A member of the House Committee on Small Business, and chairman of a subcommittee investigating trade practices in the dairy industry, Representative STEED spoke with authority on the subject of competition in the dairy industry. He reported that his subcommittee, on the basis of evidence taken at its hearing, would recommend several pieces of corrective legislation to the 87th Congress.

GOOD-FAITH CLAUSE

Principal features of proposed corrective legislation dealt with tightening up existing regulations governing competitive practices. One of these was the so-called good-faith clause in the section 2b of the Clayton Act. Courts have held that a price reduction made in good faith in order to meet competition is a complete defense against the prohibitions in this section. The corrective legislation would make reduction in prices in order to meet competition a complete defense provided the action does not destroy competition or tend to create a monopoly. The need for correction arises out of an abuse where a large distributor of goods with a substantial portion of the market uses the low prices offered by an extremely small distributor with but a very tiny portion of the market as a justification for cutting the price on the grounds that the price cuts were made to meet competition. It is a case of arguing that a small tail is wagging a big dog.

Representative STEED also proposes that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act be made a part of the Clayton Act. The Clayton Act provides treble damages for firms that have been injured as a result of violations of the antitrust laws. Selling at low prices to destroy competition or create a monopoly is prohibited under the Robinson-Patman Act. However, the courts have held that the Robinson-Patman Act is not one of the antitrust laws and, therefore, persons or firms injured as a result of violations of the Robinson-Patman Act cannot collect treble damages for injuries sustained through such violations. By making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act a part of the Clayton Act, violators of this provision would become liable for treble damages.

VIGOROUS ENFORCEMENT

Two other recommendations from Mr. STEED's committee, while not exactly legislative, are offered as areas for action. The first of these is a more vigorous enforcement of existing laws. It is in order to get this more vigorous enforcement that the preceding legislative recommendations are made. The loophole of the good-faith clause and the redress of treble damages coupled with the use of the temporary injunction are tools to be used in making enforcement more feasible and more effective.

A second and rather startling recommendation is a review of Federal milk marketing orders. Mr. STEED said, "There are some areas where they have been working a hardship on both the consumer and the distributor and have had the incipient tendency to foment price wars.

"In other areas we found that price wars were backlashing and actually working a hardship on producers made possible through the way the milk industry works."

The essence of Mr. STEED's work with his committee was summed up in two very succinct paragraphs.

"We have discovered in these hearings that unless something is done to make the situation more stable than it has been, that no man in this room can go home knowing that he has any security if some big competitor with a big enough bank roll takes the notion to drive him out of business.

"Now that is not a good way for a businessman to have to live. I don't think it was the way it was intended. The only fear you ought to have is that if a man can make a better mousetrap and the customers want it, that is a competitive fact you must accept, but I don't think you should be the victim of a boobytrap. That is fundamentally what we are trying to bring about in the work of our committee."

MEMBERSHIP UP

Prior to Congressman STEED's talk, D. C. Daniel, executive vice president of the National Independent Dairies Association, described the growth of the organization and the work that it was doing. As of the time of the meeting, Mr. Daniel reported a membership of 307, an increase of approximately 100 over the figure reported at the first annual meeting in April.

Mr. Daniel listed four major functions of the organization. These were, first, representing the association before legislative committees and governmental agencies. Last year, for example, three out of five bills that the association supported were passed.

A second and very important area of activity is on-the-spot help for members hit by unfair trade practices, especially price wars. In these cases the association goes into an area where a violation of the law is taking place, enlightens people as to what the laws are and advises on the proper procedure. This has had a salubrious effect in most instances.

The association puts out a news letter or bulletin advising members of association activities and keeping them informed of significant legislative and judicial actions that affect their business.

The association also acts as a clearing house for evidences of violations of the laws on trade practices and is able to bring the matter to the attention of the proper authorities.

The Chicago luncheon, which was a sellout (in fact, some late comers had to be turned away), was further evidence of the deep interest that the matter of competitive relationships has evoked in the dairy industry. Some of the best independent operators in the milk business were present. The meeting gave the impression that some pretty solid citizens were trying, with considerable hope of success, to find a collective answer to a collective problem.

Why Latin America Distrusts Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a good account of the results of our mistaken policies in Latin America but it is further evidence of why both Houses of Congress ought now, through their respective committees, to conduct studies of Latin American policy in the hopes that it may be improved in the near future. Under a previous consent to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an article entitled "Why Latin America Distrusts Us," by Thayer Waldo, from the Harpers magazine of November 1958:

WHY LATIN AMERICA DISTRUSTS US

(By Thayer Waldo)

When Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina told the U.S. Government, a few months ago, what it could do with some $650,000 in proffered military aid, he was very angry—but not at all rash.

The one-time butcher's apprentice, who has run the Dominican Republic as his private hacienda for the past 28 years, could comfortably afford the gesture of spurning further arms shipments from this country. Since 1949, he had already received enough weapons—mostly obsolescent by Pentagon standards, but highly effective for Trujillo's purpose—to keep his 2,325,000 subjects in total subjection and to guard against any attempted invasion by Dominican exiles and their sympathizers.

The generalissimo's anger was, of course, occasioned by unkind congressional comment about the openhanded gallantries of his eldest son, Ramfis. That sportive yachtsman—who heads his father's air force although he does not fly—was forthwith appointed chairman of the Dominican joint chiefs of staff, apparently as a consolation for failing to get a diploma at the U.S. Army's Staff and Command School in Leavenworth, Kans.

The opera bouffe overtones of such goings-on tend to obscure a deeper and more disturbing fact. Trujillo is not the only Latin American dictator who has been able to keep the power he took by force, thanks almost exclusively to the military aid he has received from the United States. He is merely the first and most durable of a long line.

This point, painfully clear to the citizenry of other Western Hemisphere republics, seems to be lost on most Americans—including RICHARD NIXON. The charge that our policies in Latin America promote dictatorships was heard during and after the Vice President's hectic tour last spring; but the majority of us either discounted it as Communist propaganda or were simply nonplused by such a shocking accusation from our good neighbors.

The State Department helped to distract attention from the real issue by solemnly pointing out that any discrimination against dictators would be tantamount to intervention in the internal affairs of other countries. Yet many Latin Americans argue—with substantial evidence—that our recent practice of signing mutual defense pacts with, and supplying military aid to, any regime which takes the anti-Communist pledge is, in practice, the grossest kind of meddling.

When the Pan-American mutual security plan was launched by Secretary of State George C. Marshall at the Rio Conference of 1947, only three nations in the Western Hemisphere—Argentina, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic—were ruled by dictatorships. Even Perón had gone through the motions of a political campaign and general elections. The following year the U.S. Defense Department began furnishing arms, equipment, and training to the armed forces of the countries which joined the plan. By 1953, military men had ousted the legal governments and seized power for themselves in seven other Republics—all recipients of mutual defense aid.

They used American weapons to take over, then promptly demanded more to keep themselves in control. Such requests were nearly always granted. Cuba, which asked for and got less than $150,000 worth of military aid in 2 years under the presidency of Dr. Carlos Prío Socarrás, received nearly 12 times as much in a like period after Fulgencio Batista grabbed the government. Colonel Marcos Pérez Jiménez, overthrown last January after almost a decade as Venezuela's dictator, was given warships, planes, tanks, and artillery valued at more than $8 million. The 90,000-man Peruvian armed forces were completely re-equipped with quasi-modern armament between 1948 and 1955—the period when General Manuel Odría was ruling the country without benefit of civil mandate.

THE RED STRAWMAN

The pretext for the whole military-aid program is that it strengthens continental defenses against a potential Communist attack. Leaving aside the unanswerable questions raised by ICBMs with nuclear warheads, it is still astounding that such an argument could ever have been put forward with a straight face. Is it conceivable, for instance, that if the Soviet Union undertook to capture South America's Pacific Coast ports, from Buenaventura to Valparaíso, the invasion could be blocked, even momentarily, by the collection of antique gunboats, outmoded submarines, obsolete aircraft, and surplus howitzers we have shipped to that area?

As for native Reds, their number and influence have been vastly overstated. Mr. Nixon informs us that he learned that some South American labor unions are now being infiltrated by Communists. I have, as they say, news for the Vice President: many big unions throughout Latin America have been bossed by Communists for the past quarter of a century or longer.

Yet, generally speaking, the proportion of card-carrying Party members among the rank-and-file of those same unions is lower today than it was, say, fifteen years ago—except perhaps in Venezuela, Peru, and Columbia, where dictatorships, by suppressing the traditional liberal parties for long periods, have nudged some of the disenfranchised into the Red underground.

But even in those countries the totals are negligible and not likely to grow. Union members were conspicuously present in the huge crowds that demonstrated passionately in most Latin-American capitals in 1956 against the Russian rape of Hungary. Communism, as an ideology, has never won a solid foothold in Latin America—and in any case it can be fought effectively only with political propaganda and economic weapons, not with tanks.

What our blind insistence on carrying out the guns-for-generals program has actually done has been to create doubts about the United States in the minds of Latin American public figures who were once our stanch allies. The degree to which this has gone varies, naturally, with the man, his personal experiences, and what his country has had to endure. Thus Rómulo Betancourt of Venezuela is bitter on the subject, while Colombia's President Alberto Lleras Camargo merely views American policy with wary disapproval. Betancourt spent 10 years marking time in exile while Jiménez was dictator; Lleras went home from Washington and spearheaded the movement that finally unhorsed Dictator Gustavo Rojas Pinilla.

Lleras, who held his first cabinet post at 27, served as interim chief executive of his country in 1945–46 and then took over the direction of the Pan American Union. With tireless energy, he pushed through reforms which converted that fusty, ornamental agency into the modern, functional Organization of American States.

As Colombia's President-elect, he was present at Bogotá's Techo Airport to meet the Nixons on their arrival from Quito, Ecuador, one day last May. The bone-thin, 51-year-old Colombian sat beside them as their car, creeping through the capital's narrow streets toward the Tequendama Hotel, was the target of boos, jeers, and contemptuously flung U.S. coins.

Lleras understood quite well what lay behind the demonstration—exceeded in hostility on that South American tour only by the rougher tactics of students at Lima's San Marcos University, 3 days earlier, and the explosive violence still to come in Caracas. A newspaperman by profession and an internationalist by long training, he knew just how much of his countrymen's antagonism was directed at NIXON, the political representative, and how much at the flag and fabric of the United States.

"You must remember that Colombians have been through a great deal in the past few years," he remarked, somewhat cryptically. The observation was double-edged—referring at once to the savage strife between Liberals and Conservatives which took upward of 200,000 lives in a decade, and to the hard fact that General Rojas Pinilla could never have kept himself in power for 4 years without the arms supplied by the United States.

Until that practice is radically modified, we cannot hope to enjoy the full trust of even such men as Lleras Camargo, a thorough-going democrat whose basic sentiments toward us are eminently cordial. We may already have lost permanently the good will of Betancourt, Venezuela's former provisional president, who returned to Caracas from New York a few days after the ouster of Perez Jiménez.

TAKING FRIENDS FOR GRANTED

A clever, cultivated politician, Betancourt organized Venezuela's major party—the left-of-center Acción Democrática—and conducted the one free election in the nation's history. That was in 1946. The Acción Democrática slate, running on a markedly New Deal platform, received 68 percent of the ballots cast—and 9 out of every 10 eligible voters went to the polls. Betancourt handed the reins of government to an administration headed by Rómulo Gallegos, the country's best known novelist.

Two years later, the government was overthrown by Perez Jiménez and his military cohorts. A 3-man army junta, acting under martial law, began a wholesale roundup of the legal regime's top executive and congressional leaders. As this got underway, the U.S. Department of State blandly announced "no interruption of normal relations" with Venezuela. And while the mass imprisonment of elected officials was still going on, U.S. oil interests operating in the Republic signed a new contract with Perez Jiménez & Co., incorporating the 50–50 profit split they had refused to grant the Gallegos administration.

In the years that followed, Venezuela's dictatorship used its $2 million-a-day oil royalties to supplement arms shipments from the United States with the purchase of British military jet aircraft, and raised the pay scales and perquisites of the armed forces to seductive levels. Falangist experts were imported from Spain to organize and train a 15,000-man secret police force. Eventually the jails bulged with more than 18,000 polit-

ical prisoners, an estimated 20 percent of whom died behind bars.

Through all this, including the awarding of a medal by Dwight D. Eisenhower to Marcos Pérez Jiménez and public praise for his regime from other high U.S. officials—Betancourt held his peace. The greater part of his exile was spent in New York City, where he lectured at Columbia University and other colleges, wrote a variety of articles, essays, criticism, and poetry, and indefatigably directed resistance activities by the underground at home.

An intimate of Betancourt's during the final 3 years of his stay in this country credits him with originating the now familar assessment of our official postwar position toward Latin America: woo your enemies incessantly and take your friends for granted—a conclusion reached independently by other prominent Latin Americans, several of them through harsh personal experience.

Military aid is far from being the only sore point in those relations. Another crucial issue—better publicized superficially, but still little understood here—is economic assistance. Take the case of Galo Plaze, ex-President of Ecuador and, more recently, chairman of the United Nations factfinding commission in Lebanon.

Plaza, born in New York City 52 years ago, is perhaps the most knowledgeable, and surely one of the firmest, of this country's friends. Elected Ecuador's Chief Executive in 1948, largely on the strength of the popular belief that his close ties with the United States would bring the nation greater prestige and more help from Washington, Plaza found his solidly democratic, middle-of-the-road administration so benevolently regarded there that it was written off as safe to ignore.

Even the massive Ecuadoran earthquake of August 1949—one of the 20th century's major natural disasters in terms of human life and suffering—brought less financial aid from the U.S. Government than from those of Chile, Uruguay, or Venezuela. In the same year, the Export-Import Bank granted Perón's regime $125 million to repay forced deposits by American firms operating in Argentina, which had been misappropriated.

Bitterly disillusioned by such contrasts, Ecuador's voters turned the presidency over in 1952 to a sworn foe of Plaza—a nationalist demagogue who disavowed communism but shrilly echoed its vilification of el imperialismo yanqui.

Nixon spent more time talking to Galo Plaza than to any other South American he met on his junket. He found the strapping former soccer star, bullfighter, and Grace Line deckhand as warmly disposed as always toward the land of his birth. (Plaza's father was Ecuadorian minister to the United States in 1906.) In part, this is because of his unique appreciation of what motivates peoples in both segments of the Americas; in part, because he understands and sympathizes with the U.S. struggle to become a first-rank power in more than name.

But he also told the U.S. Vice President bluntly that the United States would have to take Latin America's aspirations for economic development into account—and help provide material support for their realization—if it looked for more than grudging lip service to Pan-American ideals.

GO TALK TO WALL STREET

What he was referring to is easily illustrated. I was present at an informal news conference held by Albert J. Powers, a Commerce Department trade consultant (Chief, Caribbean Section, American Republics Division, Office of Economic Affairs, Bureau of Foreign Commerce), who headed a U.S. delegation to the 1955 International Industrial Exposition in Bogotá, Colombia. A Colombian reporter asked if there was any hope of getting money from Washington for development projects.

"It is the policy of my Government," Powers replied, "not to intervene in the financing of activities which should properly be promoted by private enterprise. It is up to you people to create business and industrial opportunities which will attract investment capital from the United States. Remember, too, that you must offer the possibility of greater profits than can be obtained at home. This is a time of exceptional inducements in my country for domestic financial ventures."

NIXON came home saying his misadventures had shown, among other things, that we would have to reconsider many of our policies and practices in Latin America. Yet he gave an answer almost identical to Powers' when he was queried in Uruguay about prospects for economic assistance from this country.

This laissez-faire notion has crystallized during the past 5 years. In the same period, contributions to development programs sponsored by governments in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East have been stepped up—in large part because of eloquent recommendations by the Vice President, following visits to those regions. Anyone who misses the connection between such incongruities and the hostile reception accorded NIXON in South America is as totally misled about the whole affair as those who sought to dismiss it all as a Communist plot.

A popular misconception among Americans is that any talk by foreigners about financial aid means that they are looking for handouts. This is simply not true in the case of responsible Latin Americans. Galo Plaza stressed in his conversation with NIXON that a judiciously planned program of loans is needed, rather than outright grants. And events over the past decade and a half make his argument plausible.

During World War II, all Latin American republics, except Argentina, cooperated more or less willingly in the production of strategic materials. If they made money doing so, they also had to postpone many development projects and let other activities lie fallow for those years. When, after hostilities ceased, they sought to spend their accumulated reserves on U.S. machinery, tools, and equipment, they found domestic priorities here holding up shipments interminably, and inflated prices forcing a sharp cutback in their calculations.

Then came the Korean war and another near-total hiatus in U. S. export trade. By then, European economies had recovered; Britain, France, West Germany, and Scandinavia showed interest in Latin-American markets and the means to cultivate them. Government banks floated loans for the construction of hydroelectric plants, steel mills, bridges—all built with materials bought in the countries financing the jobs. Interest rates on long-term credits average half of those charged by the U.S. Export-Import Bank on shorter ones. The total bill often came to less than 50 percent of what comparable equipment and services from American firms would have cost. And where necessary or desired, the sponsoring nation generally furnished technician-instructors at very modest salaries.

Still, all this was only piecemeal assistance, and the Latins had other ideas. With the Eisenhower administration in office, the Korean conflict ended, and U.S. industrial output burgeoning, they advanced their long-cherished, carefully thought-out plan for an Inter-American Development Bank.

At the Caracas Conference in March 1954, John Foster Dulles would not so much as read a draft of their proposals. A few months later, then-Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey attended a meeting of finance ministers in Buenos Aires, listened to an outline of the plan, and advised its backers coldly to stop dreaming. The Eximbank, he said, would always consider, within the limits of its funding authority, loans for specific, conservative, self-amortizing projects; for the rest, look to private capital.

Following Secretary Dulles' recent consultations with President Kubitschek of Brazil, and Milton Eisenhower's return from his Central American trip, it was announced that the United States would, at last, go along with the development-bank scheme. This suggests that some valuable lessons were, indeed, learned from Nixon's troubled tour. (Incidentally, Milton Eisenhower urged, as long ago as 1953, after a quick look around South America, that we accept the bank proposal. However, that recommendation and several others—including a pointed reference to the need for improving the caliber of our diplomatic representation in Latin America—were quietly shelved. His whole report has now been dusted off for careful re-examination. The first results showed up at the September meetings of Latin-American foreign ministers in Washington, where a beginning step was taken toward setting up the bank.)

TWO SKEPTICS

If this apparent shift in U.S. outlook continues, it could lead to improved relations with at least two other influential South Americans who now view us with profound reserve.

Arturo Frondizi, the wily lawyer who took office as Argentina's president while NIXON struggled vainly through Buenos Aires traffic to reach the ceremony on time, was for years a participating witness of U.S. indecision and ineptitude.

After our 1946 interventionist fiasco in Argentina, master-minded by Spruille Braden, the State Department executed an artless U-turn and began courting the Perón dictatorship at every opportunity, apparent or invented. Frondizi, then a leader of the opposition Radical Civic Union Party, publicly attacked these maneuvers and their motivation. And despite his canny wooing of peronista support in his campaign, and a broad amnesty decree signed within 2 weeks of inauguration day, the new Argentine chief executive has not modified his enmity toward the exiled despot—or his cool distrust of Washington.

Argentines have never considered themselves full members of the Pan-American family, and their relations with the United States have traditionally been distant and formal. Above all, they want no part of any economic aid on a cooperative basis. Argentina was the only Latin-American republic to reject the point 4 program, just as she had previously declined assistance in the fields of health, education, and agriculture from the old Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

Loans and credits, with no strings attached, are a different matter. The Frondizi administration must get outside financial help before it can begin restoring the country's crippled economy. Indications now are that it might favor obtaining such funds through an inter-American agency, within which Argentina would seek to form an austral bloc—including Chile, Bolivia, Paraguay, Peru, and, perhaps, Uruguay—to counter U.S. influence on its policies.

However, Frondizi will probably prove easier to get along with than any Argentine president in the past 20 years. An extremely practical man, he is well aware that the present world situation offers choice opportunities for playing off the West against the Soviet sphere where aid and trade are concerned; but the same shrewd sense of values guards him against any illusions about which side is more apt to keep its commitments, once made.

Victor Raúl Haya de la Torre, Peru's dominant political figure and probable next president, presents a different problem. Now 57, Haya has always been a mystic—high priest of a movement which combines Marxist agrarian-reform theories with age-old In-

do-American aspirations in a somewhat amorphous ideology that has attracted several million devoted followers of Indian ancestry and mixed blood.

The APRA party, which he founded, delivered better than 60 percent of the vote in the 1945 elections. Three years later, when General Odría took over in a military coup, it was outlawed. Haya was branded a common criminal and hunted throughout the land by men with no specific orders to take him alive.

One dark night, the fugitive slipped through the gates of the Colombian Embassy in Lima and requested asylum. For almost 6 years thereafter, he never left the Embassy grounds—which Peruvian security police watched day and night—and had no contact with party colleagues. Yet his organization maintained such solid discipline and loyalty that it was back in business within hours after the proscription against it was lifted, during the 1955 campaign.

Septuagenarian Manuel Prado, elected president chiefly with aprista votes, voided the trumped-up charges hanging over Haya. And Haya, freed the year before from his diplomatic prison through bilateral agreement, came home from Europe to a triumphal welcome.

Although he is a fervent admirer of Franklin Roosevelt's policies, Haya harbors no such sentiments toward those of the present Washington administration. A number of the hostile students who met NIXON at the gates of San Marcos University were apristas; but they had not been encouraged by their mentor to attack the Vice President. In fact, Haya, who abhors violence, personally ordered expelled from the party 2 youths identified as rock throwers.

Later, he is reported to have told an associate sorrowfully: "Even Gandhi could not persuade all his people to forswear aggression, as witness his own end."

The comment is characteristic. Although Haya does not pretend to be a spiritual leader, much of his program resembles the Mahatma's. He wants to promote self-contained village enterprises, not unlike Gandhi's "cottage industries." He feels, as the Hindu ascetic did about India, that Peru must help itself gain economic maturity and independence primarily by diversifying its production.

TIME RUNNING OUT

Haya, however, also recognizes the need for foreign aid in developing his country's natural resources. And since he does not believe in capitalist management of such enterprises, he would welcome long-term loans to the government, with technical experts brought in under contract to supervise oil exploration, expansion of mining operations, and the buildup of light industry.

The next Peruvian elections are scheduled for 1960. If Haya runs and wins—as he seems fairly certain to do—his orientation to the United States is likely to depend on events between now and then. A changed Washington policy toward relations with dictatorships and a liberalized outlook on economic aid are both vital issues from his liberal point of view. Haya would be the most difficult Latin-American chief of state for us to deal with if he held the post today.

A very real danger exists that we are not going to do enough, soon enough, to bring about a firm improvement of our position in the Western Hemisphere. The flurry of anxiety and self-searching that immediately succeeded the Nixons' encounter with spittle, stones, and slurs has simmered down. Once more we are perilously involved and deeply committed in other areas of the world. There is a tendency for our latent, unconfessed feeling of contempt toward Latin America (cf. Stalin's cynical, "How many divisions has the Pope?") to reassert itself.

It may be worthwhile to ask how many of us believed, 4 or 5 years ago, in the possibility of a Middle Eastern crisis so grave as to prompt our military intervention. The parallel is not idly drawn. The very sort of aspiring, aggressive nationalism which we now recognize among Arab, Asian, and African peoples has also become the most surging force in Latin America. Merely because these nations gained political independence from colonial rule, 60 to 135 years ago, does not mean that they have attained true freedom, as we understand the term.

Coffee and tin; copper, silver, iron, oil; textiles and agricultural products: these are the prime exports of the other American Republics, sold on world markets where fluctuating prices are determined largely by the volume of U.S. purchases. One-crop countries, such as Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Bolivia, and Cuba, find themselves caught in a network of recurring crises, which spur inflation, accentuate poverty, bring unrest and instability, and frighten off domestic investment capital. Unable to obtain foreign loans or credits of sufficient size, at any one time, to make a real start on industrial diversification, they are limited to stitching a flimsy patch on the raggedest spot of the economy—and then waiting helplessly for the next seam to split.

These are not, to be sure, the only things wrong with Latin America. A good many of its woes arise from an ossified caste system, particularly evident in the Andean lands. The Indian, the mestizo, and the citizen of pure European extraction are as inexorably segregated, one from the other, in Peru, Bolivia, Colombia, and Ecuador as are the Negro and Caucasian residents of Jackson, Miss.—though perhaps less obviously, to the casual observer.

Mexico is, indeed, the one American Republic that has achieved almost total integration. The cause-and-effect pattern surrounding that circumstance is noteworthy: Mexico brought about social democracy, in large part, by successfully diversifying its production, and the economic independence thus gained permitted Mexico, alone of major Latin-American nations, the luxury of refusing to sign a mutual defense agreement with the United States.

This is not suggest that unwillingness to subscribe to such pacts should be an ideal. Precisely the contrary; it ought to be a fixed goal of the U.S. Government to cement trustworthy alliances with countries as healthy and courageous as Mexico.

That is not going to happen as long as we provide tyrants—present or prospective—with the means to defy the popular will. Nor can a truly working partnership within the Pan-American system be expected to develop until the strongest, richest member state in the group is ready to take its responsibilities to its nearest neighbors more seriously.

A Continuing Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, sometimes one of the newspapers in my State of Michigan editorially wraps up a national situation with such effectiveness that I feel it should be a matter of permanent record in the annals of the Congress.

On January 22, the State Journal of Lansing, in an editorial called, "A Continuing Purpose" summarizes how travel taxes labeled "temporary" when imposed, during wartime emergency, have become permanent. Thereby penalizing both the taxpayer, and all phases of the transportation business. I go on record to say that I agree heartily with this stand, and will continue to work toward the removal of these deadweights around a vital phase of the American economy.

I submit here, Mr. Speaker, the article referred to above:

A CONTINUING PURPOSE

The public is accustomed to hearing of cases in which the word "temporary" means "permanent" when used in connection with taxes.

A prime example is the Federal transportation tax which was imposed at the beginning of World War II in order to discourage nonessential travel by civilians using common carriers—the railroads, airlines, and buses.

The Air Transport Association points out that the principle of taxing passengers during wartime was put into practice during World War I when a tax was levied on civilians using the railroads and buses which were needed for transportation of military supplies and personnel. This tax was repealed 3 years after the end of World War I.

The association also pointed out that Canada put a 15-percent tax on travel during the Second World War for similar reasons but repealed the levy just 3½ years after the end of the war.

Although World War II ended more than 13 years ago the travel tax imposed at its beginning is still in effect although reduced from 15 to 10 percent in 1954.

The levy long ago had accomplished its purpose of discouraging civilian travel in wartime. Yet it continues to discourage travel at a time when common carriers are able and eager to handle all the traffic they can find.

The trouble is that after temporary taxes, including the excise tax on automobiles, accomplish their original and special purpose, they are retained to serve the continuing purpose of producing revenue for Government in spite of their adverse effect on vital segments of the Nation's economy.

Report on Higher Education in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr Speaker, recently the University of Pittsburgh prepared a very valuable and timely report on education in the Soviet Union.

Since this session of Congress will have a great many problems dealing with education, I feel that this report is essential reading for all Members of Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks I submit the following "Report on Higher Education in the Soviet Union."

REPORT ON HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE SOVIET UNION

I. INTRODUCTION

This is a report on higher education in the Soviet Union prepared by the heads of a number of American educational and research institutions. The group, lately returned from the Soviet Union, traveled as an official delegation from the United States under the recent United States-Soviet agree-

ment for the exchange of persons in scientific and cultural fields.

During its 15-day survey the group as a whole, or several of its individual members, visited 18 institutions of higher education including universities and research and technical institutes. The delegation conferred with educational officials at the Union, Republic, and local levels. It traveled 8,000 miles, visiting in European portions of the country the cities of Moscow, Leningrad, and Tbilisi as well as Tashkent, Samarkand, and Alma Ata in central Asia. Visits to teaching and research institutions were supplemented by visits to libraries, theaters, bookstores, museums, industrial and agricultural exhibitions, a technicum, youth camps, factories, collective farms, and a variety of other organizations representative of contemporary life in the Soviet Union.

This report is prepared primarily for those who are concerned with the problems of higher education in the United States. The limitations of the report should be clearly understood. In the first place, the delegation functioned under several severe handicaps. No group of this kind is in a position to verify the statistics with which it works. Language interpretation in any technical field makes for imperfect communication. The abstract terminology involved in the description of educational concepts is particularly liable to inadequate rendering in the relatively brief conversations that time permitted.

In the second place, we were unable to relate satisfactorily what we observed in higher education to the role of the governing elite in Soviet society, the Communist Party. Other brief observers of the Soviet scene, from time to time, have commented on the role of the Young Communist League in student life and occasionally in the classroom, the probable party role in the ideological content of textbooks and other instructional materials, the membership of university faculties in the party, and other similar considerations. These are but glimpses of the shadow. They tell us relatively little of the substance. Until an exhaustive study is made of the subject, our own experience would lead us to caution against drawing firm conclusions. However, it is our observation that all basic objectives and the nature of the pattern of higher education; as every other phase of Soviet life, are determined centrally for the nation by the party and do not necessarily reflect the thought and wishes of the faculties or administrations of the separate institutions. In such a society, there may be extraordinarily rapid changes in policies with a resulting flexibility necessary in the educational system as in other aspects of life. For instance, without an appreciation of this, it would be impossible to understand the rapidity with which an entire system of higher education could be significantly altered by an unexpected decision at central political levels that 80 percent of the students being admitted to the institutions of higher education should have 2 years of work in industry following the completion of their secondary education. Thus, we see the emergence of a new concept of learning in a manner which would be hard to understand in any nation other than one in which basic decisions are the exclusive prerogative of an isolated governing elite. Higher education, like all other parts of Soviet society, may be changed at any time, in almost any degree, and for any political reason which may appeal to the party. It is of primary importance to recognise that education in the Soviet Union is not a basic resource which undergirds the society, but a tool, fashioned, sharpened, and changed by the state in its own interests as those interests may be determined by the party.

It is perhaps pertinent to comment on the atmosphere in which our inquiries were made. In the first place, we had access to virtually all of the institutions, materials, and areas which we asked to see. The one exception was the schools of higher education maintained for the training of leaders in the Communist Party. Little is known about these educational programs and we are unable to add anything. Since the U.S.S.R. is a one-party totalitarian state, the role of these Party schools and military academies, especially the former is vital. Of the present number of the Party Central Committee, only a minority have college degrees. All have attended Party institutions. Otherwise, materials, institutions, and areas were quite freely opened to us. Our freedom of action extended to the taking of pictures under most circumstances, talking freely to people on the streets, in the halls of the universities, in the museums, and at work in plants and on farms. We were left alone to explore the cities in which we found ourselves and, as far as any of us could tell, we did so without surveillance, and certainly without hindrance.

In the second place, we undertook our study in an extraordinarily friendly atmosphere. Whether dealing with officials in the Ministry in Moscow, rectors of the universities, members of the faculties, students in the schools, or the most casual passers-by, we encountered an open friendliness which was too consistent, too spontaneous, and too widespread to have been simulated. Many in the group who are well acquainted with Europe, the Middle East, the Far East, and Latin American observed that they had never before been in a nation in which there were not occasional unfriendly glances or bitter comments about Americans.

A great many of the large number of people whom we saw evidenced great curiosity about the United States. Most of these questions had to do with material aspects of daily living, but more frequently than one might expect there would be questions about American authors and about American music. We found less basic curiosity among the university officials with whom we dealt. While some of them asked questions, many did not.

We must also comment on the residue of anti-American propaganda which is still part of the thinking of a number of the university people we met. While no one was deliberately critical, questions nevertheless reflected the indoctrination received. We were asked about the education of the American Indian, racial segregation in public schools, the serious depression, reasons for prohibitively high tuition rates, why so many able students were never permitted to continue their education, whether we taught anything about Soviet law and related aspects of Soviet culture, and why we permitted use of poor textbooks. There were similar questions reflecting either a quite mistaken or an exaggerated view of the problems of American higher education. During our stay in the Soviet Union, a typically Government-inspired criticism of American higher education appeared in the New Times. It contained precisely the kind of misinformation, quotation out of context, and half-truth which provided the basis for the questions we received. It was replete with such phrases as "the schools, too, feel the effect of the huckstering commercialism characteristic of capitalism." We must place what we found in proper perspective. In view of the barrage of critical comment which Government-inspired sources have made of American higher education, it is probably remarkable that we saw and heard as little residual criticism as we did. Furthermore, that which we did find did not seem to alter the basically friendly attitude of the faculties and officials we met.

Finally, we must caution the reader, as we have repeatedly reminded ourselves, to recall that while we have been unable to avoid making comparisons between Soviet and American educational practice, the fact is that there is an inherent difficulty in making such comparisons. Comparisons imply counterpart roles of similarly designated and motivated individuals and institutions. Whereas, in fact, the irreconcilable difference in the political foundations of the two societies means that no functional counterpart exists. Each comparison must therefore be examined in terms of the basic differences in the fundamental social structure of the two nations.

To summarize, this report is submitted to our colleagues in American higher education as a series of comments based upon what must necessarily be regarded as preliminary observations. They are not presented and should not be interpreted as definitive conclusions. Understanding of the Soviet Union will be furthered if they are accepted in this light.

II. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The delegation noted a number of general conditions which give depth and context to some of our observations specifically concerning higher education. Many of these are fundamental matters of far-reaching consequence in Soviet society. Indeed, they are of so much importance and our opportunity for observation was so limited that they are set forth with caution. Nonetheless, they are significant as statements of some of the general conditions in society which influenced our more specific reactions to higher education.

1. Cultural affairs

In the first place, one cannot visit the Soviet Union without concluding that there is a very widespread interest in what would generally be regarded as cultural affairs.

Good theater is cultivated and widely appreciated. Ballet, opera, drama are not only well supported by the State but enthusiastically received by large masses of the population. In Tashkent, in Central Asia, we found a city of 400,000 people with six or seven theaters, one of which gives 200 performances of ballet and opera each year to a consistently filled hall.

Museums are crowded with audiences apparently representative of the population. Among the museum throngs are a noticeable number of young people avidly taking notes which they claim to be for their own development. As this was a time when school was not in session we gave somewhat more credence to this reply than we might have under other circumstances.

Book stores are crowded and interest in newly published materials is so great that, at least in Moscow, there is a black market in new paperback editions of both contemporary and classic works. Furthermore, statistics as to claimed holdings of general libraries are very impressive, although there is some question as to the interpretation of certain of the data supplied.

The point that must be made here is that whatever evidence our readers may find later in this report of general support of higher education and a belief in its importance must be placed in the context of a far-reaching interest in cultural and intellectual affairs. It is not possible for us to conclude how much of this is spontaneous interest of the people and how much may result from encouragement by the Kremlin for whatever reasons may appeal to it in its total strategic political design.

2. Intellectual isolation

A second general matter came as no surprise to us, and certainly will not startle the reader, but still requires noting. There is clear evidence in many parts of the Soviet Union of the intellectual isolation in which the people have lived for so many years. This applies not only to subjects in which Government indoctrination has replaced the facts of world affairs, but also to areas of study and thought which are not necessarily inimical to the Party's own convictions. For example, we could find little evidence of any

familiarity with recent developments in such a politically neutral field as administrative science.

If there should be a period ahead in which there is relative freedom in the exchange of ideas, it may well be that some of these serious shortcomings will be corrected. There are some among us who feel that a much freer exchange of people and materials will be forthcoming in the period just ahead because of a widespread conviction among Soviet officials and scientists that they have more to gain by having access to our ideas and our progress in science and technology than they have to lose by the "corroding" influences of a capitalistic society.

3. Dynamics of atmosphere

A third condition which may be noted in most aspects of Soviet life is what might loosely be referred to as "the dynamics of the atmosphere." There is a noticeable conviction as to progress, an aparent feeling of success, a pride and a sense of destiny which is inescapable. Whether the individual is right or wrong in feeling as he does, the fact remains that the prevalence of this dynamic provides a general stimulation for the people which is of tremendous importance. Anyone who has assumed a role of leadership in creating change in either a single institution or in a major segment of society is aware of the fundamental significance of the development of such a dynamic. Anyone who finds himself in a competitive relationship with the Soviet Union would do well not to underestimate this, whether it is with reference to higher education, industrial productivity, military power, or any other aspect of modern life.

4. Competition for progress

Closely related is a fourth consideration. That is the extent to which competitiveness prevailed in everything we saw. It is not always competition of individual against individual; often it is that of the group against an established standard. Whether it is one or the other, it is nevertheless ever-present. None of us had witnessed before a situation in which there was as far-reaching an articulated system of rewards and punishments. The rewards may be lapel pins, they may be pictures and notices in the public square, they may be better summer camps for the best elementary and secondary school students, excursions for the best members of the Young Communist League, organized free trips on a tremendous scale to Moscow for those surpassing quotas on the farm or in industry, or they may be monetary payments to professors for articles published in professional journals or books published on professional subjects. Children are introduced to competition at an early age—in grade school and pioneer camp, and in organized sports and recreation. As others have noted, one frequently sees postered admonitions for Russians to equal and excel the United States.

Competition is measured not only against standards but against past performance. Every curve shown in charts in industrial and agricultural exhibits moves constantly upward.

In short, the use of competition of individuals and of groups against one another, against absolute norms, and against past performance is built into Soviet society as a way of stimulating ever-greater effort. Americans could not be more mistaken than to believe that competition is characteristic of our society and absent in the Soviet Union.

The relevance of this point to our specific study is that competition provides a motive for excellence in scholastic performance, for the investment of student effort, and for spurring faculty teaching and research. There is clear evidence of official Soviet interest in outdoing and outcompeting the United States in the money, the buildings, the salaries, and the research facilities which they provide for their universities.

5. Role of women

One cannot help but be impressed by another universal in the Soviet system. This is the recognition of an important role for women in society. Women are in every field and at virtually every level within each field. This is particularly true in education and in the medical profession. Very generous arrangements are made for working mothers during child-bearing periods and at other times when they are needed at home.

We must be cautious indeed in drawing conclusions in this area, but several of us have the impression that the price paid in family life for this kind of professional participation by women may not be materially greater than that paid by American and British families who send their children away to school and who have them in camps during the summer. There does appear to be a real difference in the use of released time by the women in our different societies.

As far as higher education is concerned, there is no evidence of grave teacher shortage in the Soviet Union, and the very widespread employment and service of women may be one of the reasons why this is true. In the United States, where we are apprehensively contemplating a tremendous increase in our student population in institutions of higher learning and the consequent faculty shortages, we might well pay attention to the values the Soviet Union attaches to its womanpower.

6. Program of plant improvement

We must also note that there is a tremendous program of plant improvement underway in the Soviet Union. The Moscow visitor sees this first in the vast array of new apartment buildings extending for several miles along the highway from the airport to the city. He sees it again in the extraordinary number of trucks hauling construction materials all through the city of Moscow. But he sees it, too, in Tashkent and Alma Ata. In the former city, we were told that 90 percent of the population now lives in modern dwellings and only 10 percent continues to live in the ancient adobe structures of the old Central Asian city. We, of course, had no way of verifying this statistic, but we did see blocks of new apartment buildings which could certainly house a vast number—if not actually 90 percent—of the city's former adobe dwellers. Curiously, plant improvement goes on even in elaborate and costly restorations of historic churches and mosques which an antireligionus state might be expected to ignore. New industrial plants of major importance are apparently developing in a variety of areas removed from the borders.

All of this is relevant to what we shall say later regarding plant expansion in higher education. It would be a mistake to think that the universities and the technical teaching and research institutes had been singled out for major plant improvement. Those improvements in educational plant are very great indeed, but on the other hand they must be weighed in terms of the commitment to plant improvement in industry, in domestic housing, in hospitals, and in a variety of other parts of the total society.

Furthermore, while this general improvement in plant is impressive in extent, we must most emphatically observe, first, that there is widespread evidence of shoddy construction which promises short life and high maintenance costs for many of these structures. Second, for all of their gains the Soviets are still far, far behind the United States in residential buildings and in selected other areas.

7. Planned society

Another general, yet crucial, observation is that most efforts that go forward in the Soviet Union have a clearly defined utility and a specific plan and they are not undertaken unless they are pragmatically important. Men and materials are assigned arbitrarily to realize the plan. Ultimately this affects the direction of research and the character of instruction. We would guess that this makes for a social system which is immediately productive and useful, but it probably makes for one which is less provocative and creative than we would hope for our own society. So, too, the system of higher education is intended to serve the identified utilitarian needs of the state, not the unpredictable values involved in the growth of the individual human being.

8. Absolutism in thinking and living

Again, while there is nothing new in the observation that the Soviet Union is a society of absolute rather than relative values, we were not entirely prepared for the extent to which that absolutism influences the patterns of thought and daily living. Every problem has one and only one right solution. Just as there is one correct way of interpreting history, so there is one best textbook in each field for use by all classes in all universities in all parts of the nation. There is one correct content for a university education, and hence there is one curriculum, and it is ordained for all institutions in all parts of the Soviet Union. If the unity and the absolute character of truth make it logical to have but a single press and a single political party to express it, so, with equal logic, there being but one correct interpretation of Othello, of Dreiser, of the Industrial Revolution, the content of all courses is necessarily the same; the prescription is prepared in Moscow and repeated in the classrooms throughout the land.

Our Soviet colleagues simply could not understand why we would permit several textbooks to be used in similar courses when obviously there could be only one correct one and, therefore, not only no need for several, but an actual loss involved in the use of any but the correct version. The uniformity of institutions and their centralized control are thus functions of the desire to preserve a dictated "absolute truth" rather than primary values in themselves.

Obviously, this has very far-reaching significance in education both in terms of academic freedom for the faculty and the development of creative and inquisitive minds on the part of the students. We have grave concern about an educational system which, at its presumably creative levels, postulates an overbearing major premise for every academic value and practice.

9. Strong nationalism

Like most newcomers to the Soviet Union, we were surprised by the amount of nationalism we found in the outlying republics such as Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Georgia. Nationalism is evidenced by the use of national languages both in newspapers and in daily speech, by the pride the people take in their national music and local costumes, and by a variety of other ways. In higher education it is reflected by the predominance of the national language in the classroom, in the written classroom materials, and by faculties primarily composed of people drawn from the republic involved. We were aware of the historical tension between the Russians and the individual national groups, but we had little opportunity to judge whether this tension is growing or abating or, if constant, whether it is a serious factor or not.

10. Many visitors welcomed

We must call attention to the fact that the Soviet Union is virtually flooded with officially sponsored delegations from over the world. In two days' time we counted 17 different national groups from Europe, Africa, South America, the Middle and Far East

which were traveling in the Soviet Union as guests of the Government.

The office coordinating these exchanges reports directly to the council of ministers, and the program has a high priority in Soviet affairs. As to our own experience, we found that the top officials together with their associates were available to meet with our group. The Government is well equipped with staff and funds to do everything necessary to impress the visitors effectively. Planes are placed at their disposal, and guides and interpreters are assigned in abundant number. Factories, farms, schools, camps, theaters, national shrines, public works projects are on constant display to this stream of visitors whom the Soviet Government would impress, and the visitors enjoy the best of the nation's hospitality.

We commend this observation to our own Congress, both with reference to the numbers of exchange persons involved and to the realistic financial provisions which are made for appropriate care of the national guests once they arrive in the country.

11. Personal living standards secondary to public needs

We also think it pertinent to comment on the disparity between personal and public standards of living. Individuals live in meager to very modest homes and apartments, have relatively few clothes and personal effects, and enjoy very few personal luxuries. There is no comparison between their standard of living and our own.

On the other hand, they have quite extraordinary public facilities. The theaters are elaborate and in some cases most attractive. The drama, choral, ballet, and opera groups which perform in the theaters are very good indeed. Schools, libraries, museums, parks, and similar public facilities are distinctly superior. They are very extensively used and appear to be deeply appreciated.

Our point is that there is a pattern of consumption which is deemed to be in the interest of the public rather than the individual. In the scheme of values the large public cultural and recreational purposes receive a much higher priority than purely personal and material considerations. Such a value makes it easier for a nation to make the commitment to education which we shall describe in greater detail in subsequent sections.

12. Summary of general observations

Finally, we cannot say too often that both these general conditions and the more specific aspects of higher education on which we shall also report arise in a very different way than they would in our own country. The unusual role for women, the interest in "things cultural," the conviction as to the importance of "competition" do not arise from the exercise of discretion by the Soviet people. They, like the "dynamic" of which we have spoken, are the exclusive product of the Communist Party's thought and decision.

Dr. Alexander G. Korol of the Center for International Studies of Massachusetts Institute of Technology has wisely cautioned us against suggesting that we are "comparing choices made by the peoples of the two countries" for we are "in fact comparing American popular consensus with the fiat of the Soviet government (the Communist Party)."

The specific observations about higher education which are made later must be interpreted in the light of the general reactions to the pervasive conditions and trends which have been noted here.

III. STRUCTURE OF SOVIET HIGHER EDUCATION

The detailed structure of Soviet higher education is set forth comprehensively in a variety of sources readily available to the reader. We will describe it briefly only to make our subsequent observations clearer.

1. Not parallel to U.S. education

Soviet higher education does not parallel that which we know in the United States. In general, the term "higher education" is used to describe a multitude of teaching and research organizations which offer programs beyond the 10-year (primary and secondary) school. For the most part, these are 5- or 6-year programs which, when added to the standard 10-year school, make a total of from 15 to 16 years of instruction. Since this includes professional work in medicine, law, and other areas at the post-baccalaureate levels in our system, the 15- to 16-year span is to be compared with our 16- to 20-year span. If one adds the 2-year work period now required before undertaking higher education, 17 to 18 elapsed years are involved, but the actual time in school remains less than ours.

2. Academic program limited

The Soviet universities have a much more limited academic program than American universities. They are normally divided into two groups, the faculties of the natural sciences and the faculties of the humanities. Humanities often includes faculties of law and journalism; and, in some of these faculties, heavy emphasis is placed on Oriental studies.

Most of the professional schools are separately organized in technical institutes. These include medicine, architecture, engineering, agriculture, mining, and metallurgy, and a variety of similar professional offerings which would normally be part of a total university organization in our country.

At the present time, there are 39 universities and 734 technical institutes. Two hundred of these higher educational organizations are part of the Ministry of Higher Education (not to be confused with the separate Ministry of Education which is principally concerned with the administration of the 10-year schools). The others are administratively tied to the ministry of most immediate interest. The medical schools, for instance, are in the Ministry of Health; the agricultural institutes in the Ministry of Agriculture. However, the admissions policy of such institutes, their curriculums, textbook materials, and a series of other policy matters are determined by the Ministry of Higher Education and not by the ministry having administrative responsibility for them. As we shall comment later, this results in a mass of isolated and highly specialized schools administered not by integrated educational institutions, but by a variety of different ministries.

The internal structure of the universities and the technical institutes is relatively uniform throughout the country. As with curriculum and textbooks, the structure is specified by the Ministry of Higher Education in Moscow. Course content, in large measure, is a matter of national prescription as well. Admissions policy and examinations are the same throughout the Soviet Union. Theoretically, each republic does have its own ministry of higher education and the rectors of the universities in those areas would report to their republic minister but, in fact, few of the republics have actually been given their own ministries and, in any event, all basic educational policy appears to originate in the Ministry in Moscow.

Graduate degrees are of two kinds. The candidate in science degree, which probably is a little less than the equivalent of our doctorate, represents approximately 3 years of work beyond the first diploma. It involves the defense of a thesis as does our doctor's degree. The doctor's degree in the Soviet Union represents a number of years of additional work, and satisfactory completion presumably involves a number of significant contributions to knowledge. The degree is not awarded by the individual institutions, but by a national commission charged with this responsibility. It may be earned by a person with the candidate's degree who is either a member of a university faculty or of the staff of a technical institute or one of the several academies of sciences.

3. Academies of sciences

Related to the institutions of higher education are the academies of sciences. The oldest of these, founded in 1725 in St. Petersberg, is really the parent of all the others, including an academy for each of 15 other republics. Each of the academies maintains a number of research institutes, not only in the natural sciences, but in the humanities as well. This is quite consistent with the almost universal practice of referring to all areas of scholarship as science. (Statistical reports must often be read with this in mind.) Several of the applied fields, such as medicine, have their own separate academies. While these are primarily research organizations, in several respects they overlap the institutions of higher education. Some of the academies' research is undertaken jointly with the technical institutes or the universities, and there are joint appointments between the faculties and the staffs of the academies. A considerable amount of research toward the candidate or doctoral degrees may be undertaken in the research programs of the several academies. The academy in Moscow reports directly to the Council of Ministers, and its budget is, in fact, approved by the Prime Minister after he has personally conducted budget hearings and the Council of Ministers has given him its recommendation. It would appear that a very considerable importance is attached to these research programs by the highest levels in the Soviet Union.

4. Division of educational systems

Again, we must repeat that there are two quite separate systems of higher education. We examined and will speak about the one with which the largest part of Soviet society is concerned. However, one must never lose sight of the very important higher schools for the party leaders. We are not able to comment upon these institutions for higher political education. The educational system is as sharply divided as the society is divided, between the governors and the governed.

IV. SIGNIFICANT ACHIEVEMENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

1. Prestige

By all means, the most significant aspect of higher education in the Soviet Union is the prestige it enjoys and the consequent support it can command. It is held in the highest regard by all portions of society. Its importance is unchallenged by industrialist or bureaucrat. Attendance at a university or technical institute is a prized opportunity. Faculties enjoy prestige second to no other professional group in the Soviet Union. Higher education is viewed by the State as the principal method of channeling the abilities of the nation. It is regarded by the individual as indispensable to significant achievement in society.

2. Support

The most important single thing that we can say to our colleagues, to legislators, to alumni, and to others who support higher education in our country is that in the Soviet Union higher education is prized and those who prize it are prepared to pay the costs thereof. Some of these are monetary costs and some are investments in human effort, but both are given willingly (albeit by the state apparatus and not entirely by the people) in the interest of a value which gives a higher and more urgent priority to university education than our people give it.

If one seeks to be competitive, here is a real challenge. If one is fearful of the predominance of the Soviet Union, here, indeed,

is cause for fear. To urge that this is utilitarian instruction—that it is more training than it is education—does not minimize the challenge; indeed, in the short run it may increase the reason for fear.

3. High faculty salaries

This overwhelming dedication to higher education is a stimulus for a whole series of circumstances which we can only regard as fortunate for the Soviet people. The first of these has been commented upon by other observers—the high monetary returns to faculty members. Basic salaries are among the highest in the nation. Perquisites in the form of larger housing allocations and payments for books and articles contribute to the effort to recognize scholarship and those who are responsible for it. The Soviets find it difficult to believe that we attach great importance to higher education when our faculties are among the lowest paid professional people in our Nation.

4. Excellent plant and equipment

The premium placed upon higher education also results in plant and equipment which, in terms of relative capacities to provide, is far in excess of anything done in the United States.

Let us cite a few examples. Construction of new buildings for the University of Moscow began in 1949. In the ensuing 9 years more than $200 million, at the most cautious appraisal of the ruble, have been invested, and large-scale construction is still underway. The University stands on a hill overlooking the city and rises symbolically to a height exceeded in Europe only by the Eiffel Tower. In location, height, and extent, it effectively illustrates the high value which the Soviet Government and its people place upon learning. In the University at Alma Ata, an already extensive plant for a resident student body of only 4,000 has now been allocated $27 million for additional facilities over the next 5 years.

The Minister of Higher Education claims total plant development in the next 5 years for a resident student population of constant size will exceed $1.5 billion. These are significant statistics under any circumstance, but they take on new meaning when we realize that this investment in education comes at a time when the allocation of housing space is still 9 square meters or approximately 80 square feet per person. One may not agree to the standard of values, but one cannot escape the conclusion that it is a formidable competitor who will force this much personal inconvenience uopn the individual in order to provide the best possible educational facilities for her future leaders in science, technology, government service, and industry.

5. High student regard

Students have a high regard for university education. Several times as many apply as are accepted. Those who are admitted have a minimum work week of sixty hours of classroom, laboratory, and study. In addition, they are expected to participate actively in student scientific societies and sports clubs.

We are not of one opinion as to the comparison between the actual amount of work done by students in the two countries. Some of us are inclined to regard it as significantly more in the Soviet Union in general, though this generalization would not be true of our students in science, engineering, and several graduate and professional areas. Others among us doubt that the Soviet student makes a substantially greater effort, and are inclined to minimize the value of some of the classroom work.

In any event, we have another illustration of a substantial investment—in this case a personal investment—which is made as a result of the high value placed upon university education. To make a comparison in terms characteristic of our respective systems: in the Soviet Union the hardworking and superior student is regarded and spoken of as a "hero."' Too often, on our campuses, and more particularly our secondary schools, he may be referred to as a "grind." As we commended the Soviet comparatively greater financial investment to those who have financial responsibilities for American higher education, so we commend this investment of student effort to student groups in our country for their thoughtful examination.

6. Extensive opportunities for women

We have noted with approval that higher education in the Soviet Union provides extensive opportunities for women. Thirty-five percent of the faculties of the universities and the technical institutes today are women. They are assistants, docents, professors, deans, and directors. Fifty-one percent of the students in institutions of higher education are women. In many fields, the percentage is higher. In medicine, for example, 69 percent of the students are women.

Even in such a traditionally masculine field as engineering, women comprise 39 percent of the student body. In Alma Ata, the capital of Kazakhstan, we found that women constituted 35 percent of the student enrollment in the faculty of physics and mathematics—probably a factor 10 percent greater than is common at an American university. We can only interpret this extensive use of women in the institutions as one more evidence of the deadly seriousness of Soviet intent to maximize its every human resource in its effort to achieve world leadership.

7. Significant relationship to industry

We have noted a very close relationship between the higher educational institutions and the work-a-day community. Many students work for a year or more after finishing the 10-year school and before entering the university. As a result of Mr. Khrushchev's recent announcement, this figure will apparently grow to roughly 80 percent of those who are admitted to universities and technical institutes.

After completion of the 5-year program, individuals who are going on to do graduate work are again urged, and indeed often required, to work in industry for another 2-year period. In industry graduate students are working in the areas of their specialization, whereas in the earlier period they were simply making their contribution to society, and presumably becoming more mature in the process.

In both cases, the educational theory of the Soviets rests on several considerations. In the first place, they believe that after work experience students are more mature and, therefore, more able to profit from the education they are given. In the second place, they believe that both a humility and a sense of reality result from work, and so the student emerges as a better balanced individual.

We pass no judgment on this thinking but would imagine that in the Soviet kind of society the practice has much to recommend it. The reader will make his own comparisons with the extensive summer and part-time year-round work experience which many of our own students have.

Further illustration of the closeness of relationship between the higher educational institutions and the community is the very large number of correspondence and part-time students who are working full time and who are taking work at the university level either by correspondence or in the evening. There are about 880,000 such students. Each is taking work toward a degree and following the prescribed patterns of study that are followed by the full-time students. The seriousness of their intention and of their industries' commitment to them is illustrated by the fact that each of them returns to the campus for 2 months of study and preparation for examinations every year. Published reports in some cases claim a 10-day leave for entrance examinations, 30 days for laboratory work and yearly examinations, and 4 months' leave for preparation and defense of diploma projects.

We have calculated the significance of this amount of released time, checked it carefully with members of the Ministry and individual institution heads, and find that apparently about 250 million man-hours are made available by industry to enable these 880,000 students to return (with compensation and with all expenses paid) each year for their study and examination periods. If one wanted a practical illustration of the importance with which the Soviets view higher education, this figure of one-quarter of a billion man-hours of released industrial time is surely an effective example.

These several points have a reciprocal relationship. If industry is required to give up student time for higher education on the one hand, it is equally true that all students are expected to give time to industry either before entering the university and/or before going on with graduate work. All of this suggests a conviction about the importance of maintaining the vitality of the relationship between the institutions of higher education, on the one hand, and the working world, on the other. It may well be that this helps to dissipate the artificiality of being in college today and at work tomorrow and, after graduation, of maintaining an exclusively work-a-day interest without regard to any further university work. The Soviet system would suggest that work and study are closely related and should be related over a long period of time. This has significance for our society, which too often regards the two as separate and distinct, pursued at different times in life, and related only as the layers in a cake.

8. Extensive libraries

Further evidence of the seriousness of Soviet commitment to higher education is found in the size and the extensiveness of library collections. While a definitive appraisal ought to be undertaken by specialists, it would nevertheless appear that, even after making allowance for variations in terminology, the Moscow University collection is one of the largest in the world. It claims 5.5 million volumes and a capacity for 12.5 million. The University of Leningrad claims 4.5 million volumes and the large Polytechnical Institute in the same city with 11,000 students is said to subscribe currently to 600 foreign periodicals. A relatively small university in Georgia with 4,300 full-time students boasts of having more than 1.5 million volumes. The University of Central Asia in Tashkent, established after the revolution, has but 4,000 full-time and 1,000 correspondence students, but already has accumulated better than a million volumes.

We were unable to determine the seriousness of the gaps in professional literature covering the periods in which free exchange of information was made difficult by the Soviet high command. Nor were we able to verify or disprove the frequent American assertions regarding inadequacy of cataloging and incredible delays in finding and delivering books for use. We did see enough to know there is a very comprehensive coverage today of foreign literature.

Furthermore, in the Academy of Sciences in Moscow we saw copies of abstracts of foreign literature which many of us have urged upon our own national organizations for a long period of time without success. We would judge from what we saw of these abstracts that Soviet scholars have better abstract materials of foreign articles and books than are available to American scholars.

However inaccurate any individual statistics may be, the overall pattern is none-

theless clear; the Soviets place a high premium on libraries, are providing them for their scholars, and are paying the very high costs involved. We cannot say how extensively these collections are being used. This would take a different kind of study from that which our group was able to make. However, with the seriousness of intent which we found everywhere, and with the materials apparently available, we think there is relatively little question but that usage is substantial.

9. Extensive student aid

Educators are concerned that people of ability have an opportunity to utilize their abilities to their own maximum profit and to society's ultimate advantage. In our country we know well that a significant number of our most able students never go on to higher education. While this is, in part, because of lack of motive, some of it also stems from inability or unwillingness to provide the financial support which the student requires.

Without in anyway commending the way in which the Soviets achieve it, we must acknowledge that they appear to be extraordinary successful in removing financial handicaps to persons seeking to continue their education. In the Soviet Union more than 80 percent of the students are assisted financially either in whole or in part, and the individual stipends are increased or decreased in accordance with demonstrated academic achievement. Many American families sacrifice personal convenience and pleasure in the interest of their children's education. On the other hand, many do not. Indeed, we are painfully aware of the unwillingness of the student and his parents to borrow from loan funds for educational purposes, although borrowing heavily for household appliances. The Soviets force on their people the sort of sacrifice made voluntarily by some of our families, in the interest of achieving the same objective for a total student population.

None of us would like to see a duplication of Soviet methods for bringing able people to universities but, on the other hand, we cannot help being envious of the consequence of their large stipends which provide the opportunity for virtually all the nation's most able people to have a higher education. At the same time we must recall that only 20 percent of those completing secondary schools are permitted to continue their education. This, indeed, is a parallel with the point we have made regarding the utilization of women. It is again an effort on the part of the Soviet Union to take maximum advantage of the human resources available to it, insofar as it may have need for them.

10. Size of classes planned

We raised questions as to the size of classes as this has bearing on the quality of instruction. We found a general conviction that large lecture courses were appropriate in the first 2 or 3 years of university instruction. On the other hand, in the seminars in the fourth and fifth years and in the discussion periods in the earlier years there appears to be systematic effort to restrict the size of the class to 25 or less. Their general ratio between faculty and students (1 to 10) is better than ours except in a few of our very wealthiest institutions.

11. Emphasis on language training

Others have commented sentiently on the importance which the Soviets attach to foreign language instructions. There is no question of the accuracy of earlier observations on this point. In addition to the foreign language work which the student is required to take in the 10-year school, every student at the university and technical institute level is required to take 3 to 4 years of a foreign language. There is every reason to expect that as a result of this the next generation of Soviet citizens will have a very large number of persons with fluency in English, French, German, or Chinese. In addition, it is extremely important to recognize that there will be a substantial number of people who will be able to speak a variety of Middle or Far Eastern languages which are regarded as so extremely specialized in our own country that only a handful of students are aware of them. In the Oriental Institutes found at several Soviet universities, language training is closely related to area studies which provide an intensive concentration on the foreign country's geography, culture, religion, government, institutions.

While the study of foreign languages is a matter of considerable preoccupation with Soviet educators and government officials, the intensity of their preoccupation and the extent of their pride should not be interpreted as having only academic concern. These are not people who are interested in culture for culture's sake and who think that fluency in a foreign language is of value because it suggests one's cultural attainments. We have already attempted to stress that this is essentially a utilitarian society, and its educational system is patterned after utilitarian values. We would suggest that the real significance of the emphasis upon foreign language competence is that the Soviets fully expect such a major role in world leadership in the years ahead that it will be incumbent upon their industrialists, their scientists, their government officials, their professional people generally to be fluent in the languages of the communities which they dominate or in which they exercise substantial influence.

In other words, foreign language instruction does not have the significance which we might accord it. Rather, it is, in their eyes, a measure of the extent to which their leaders will be able to discharge effectively their responsibilities in the days when they have even greater world hegemony. May we again suggest that if there is to be competition between our country and the Soviet Union, this is a very sobering consideration, even after allowance has been made for the fact that our need may be less since English is a second language in such a large portion of the world.

12. Speedup of professional study

Every educational system accumulates barnacles in the same fashion that other institutions do. We looked within politically neutral fields in the educational system to see whether the utilitarian interests of the new culture might have found ways of eliminating unnecessary time and motion. Evidence of Soviet ability to perform the same function in a more limited period of time was suggested by their experience in medical education. We are not prepared to draw a conclusion; but members of our group who had the best opportunity to observe the medical institutes and earlier visiting groups of medical educators suggest that the Soviets may educate their physicians as thoroughly in 6 years as we do in 8 years. Admittedly, this is at the expense of a liberal education, as we understand the term.

13. Physical education important

Whatever its commitment to the intellectual aspect of campus life, the Soviet system has not lost track of the continuing importance of personal physical vigor and health. None of the institutions represented in our delegation has as stringent a requirement in the field of physical education as is uniformly specified for the higher educational institutions in the Soviet Union. During the first 2 years every student is required to devote 136 hours to physical education. After that, he has options but is still required to do a certain amount of work to keep in the best possible physical condition.

Although we were unable to appraise the consequences of such a program, it is clear that the Soviets attach great importance to physical education and require substantially more of it than we normally do. This point has been treated here on the assumption that a well-considered physical education program is a significant addition to the intellectual work undertaken at the higher educational levels.

14. An example of accomplishment

We have attempted to outline some of the impressive characteristics of higher education in the Soviet Union. The question must remain as to the adequacy of the product. This is more than we could undertake to judge. However, as one measure of what can be accomplished by the kind of determination to which we have referred, the experience of the Republic of Kazakhstan will be of interest.

At the time of the revolution, Kazakhstan was a wide area inhabited by nomadic peoples. Illiteracy is alleged to have been at least 98 percent, but by any calculation was extraordinarily high. There were no institutions of higher learning, and there were only a handful of students from that area who traveled to other parts of Russia for education. Libraries were virtually nonexistent. Today, judged by almost any standard, a substantial amount has been accomplished. There are 27 institutions of higher education in that Republic. Of the 8 million people more than 55,000 are studying in institutions of higher learning today. Illiteracy, if not eliminated, has at least been reduced to the point of relative inconsequence in this 40-year period. We encountered professors in the medical school who had never been taught to read until age 16 and who have now made professional contributions which have been acknowledged in the outside world. The Republic's Academy of Sciences includes a large number of research institutes. One of them, situated high in the mountains, is the Astro-Physics Institute which, among other programs, is analyzing the orbits of earth satellites. As we have noted elsewhere, it supports seven or eight theaters, has an excellent Republic symphony, which we heard, maintains its own ballet troupe, and has built a park system in its capital which would be the envy of any American city of 400,000.

Judged by almost any standards, there has been a most successful effort in the cultural development of the people of the Republic. With a conviction about the importance of cultural developments generally and higher education specifically, these people have allocated their scarce resources to these fields. The consequences are impressive. At the same time we are fully aware of the fact that the same state determination which accomplished these improvements also dictated the drastic collectivization and forced resettlements in this Republic which had very serious human consequences for large masses of Kazakh population.

15. Summary

As we look at the preceding pages and review our appraisal of the positive aspects of the Soviet system, we come to several general conclusions.

1. The Soviets attach a greater value to higher education and have adopted a more pragmatic approach to it than we have in this country.

2. They do so because they regard higher education as a vehicle for the improvement of their own society on the one hand and for the assumption of world leadership on the other.

3. In the interests of the two considerations set out in point two above, they are prepared to pay the human and financial costs involved in making the most of higher education.

4. We should recognize their accomplishments in higher education, anticipate future achievements, and be aware of the significance of these developments for our society.

5. If we must live in competition with the Soviet Union, every educator, legislator, alumnus, taxpayer, student, and parent must develop a deeper appreciation of the values of higher education and be prepared to accept a greater commitment of his financial resources to higher education.

V. RESERVATIONS REGARDING SOVIET HIGHER EDUCATION

1. Basic philosophy unacceptable

Most readers of this report are well aware of the basically different premises from which Soviet and United States higher education proceed. The former regards education as an instrumentality for the training of persons who will serve the defined objectives of the State. If scientists and engineers are needed, individuals will be trained in those fields. Were public health suddenly to become a matter of major consequence, quotas for health education would be suddenly and perhaps drastically revised. On the other hand, if a surplus should develop in any field or the costs of the training made too costly, the quotas for admission and the facilities provided would be systematically curtailed. The objective is to train people to staff the State's programs.

In our own country, of course, we are concerned primarily with the development of the individual. The educational system is created in order to enable him to develop his capacities and interests to the maximum extent. Fundamental here is our assumption that a dynamic and free society will be able to utilize fully every new resource that is thus created in the individual.

In one culture higher education becomes a means for the achievement of defined objectives through planned efforts to realize them. In the other it is an instrumentality for individual growth which is assumed to create a total resource which will enable that society to grow more rapidly and more fully than it could if it proceeded on limited definitions of objective. This difference in premise as to the purpose of higher education and, in turn, the concept of social organization and change upon which it is based explain many of the specific differences found in the two systems and the reason we find many of the Soviet conclusions unacceptable.

2. Many students rejected

The most obvious difference between the two systems, stemming from the varying premises, is in admissions policy. Every year over 1.5 million students graduate from the 10-year schools but only 440,000 (220,000 full-time and 220,000 part-time) are admitted to institutions of higher education. The Minister of Higher Education predicts that in the future an even higher rejection rate may be expected.

These young men and women are not necessarily refused admission because of inability to profit considerably from higher education, but rather because the State has no specific and defined need for them in the fields which it has decided are important. The quota for chemical engineers in any given year is determined by an analysis of the new industrial needs in that field 5 years hence, plus the expected rate of attrition due to death and other causes within the present ranks of chemical engineers, and by other pertinent factors. Once this determination has been made, the institutions are assigned their quotas, and they will admit students on that basis. There may be thousands of others who are capable of being chemical engineers and who could make a contribution to society, but the goals have already been defined and the number of positions required to realize them has been determined; hence, only a specified number of students is required. This is repeated throughout the system.

The justification of this practice on the ground that a completely ordered society has no choice but to so regulate its educational program only transfers the grounds of our criticism from the immediate field of education to the more fundamental question of the limitations on creativity which such a highly regulated society implies. Or perhaps, it would be as well to say that in this denial of opportunity for growth of a large number of capable individuals in their areas of natural interest, and their deflection into channels deemed more important by the state in order to serve the purposes of a regulated society, we have another illustration of the limitations of such social organization. If we are apprehensive because of the thoroughness of the training of Soviets in certain areas, we can take satisfaction in the fact that we are not losing the benefits of the development of hundreds of thousands of students whom we would permit to follow their own chosen interests but who are denied that privilege in the Soviet Union.

3. Overspecialization

There is a further consequence of the use of higher education as a vehicle for the realization of state objectives rather than for the development of the individual person. Once he has been admitted to an institution of higher education the Soviet student becomes a specialist. If he enrolls with the faculty of biology, an overwhelming amount of his work is taken in that or in closely related fields. If he is enrolled in engineering, he has 5 years of strictly engineering work as well as applied, but relatively little theoretical, work in the natural sciences. The objective of every faculty is to train people who are thoroughly acquainted with the subject matter of that individual faculty. A well-trained specialist is the objective because specialists are what the state needs for the fulfillment of its defined objectives.

In terms of our premise, the Soviet student is seriously overspecialized. We are aware of the fact that in the 10-year school a significant effort is made to give the individual work in literature, history, language, music, and other aspects of the humanities to perhaps a greater extent than we succeed in doing in our elementary and secondary schools. However good training is at the lower-school levels, it is, in our judgment, no substitute for a liberal education of the mature mind either immediately prior to or in conjunction with professional education at the university level. Required courses in Communist Party history and philosophy and in foreign languages taught for purely utilitarian purposes are no substitute for an adequate grounding of the mature mind in the humanities and in the social sciences. Returning to the basic disparity in premises, we may say that, judged by our premise, Soviet students are seriously overspecialized, but judged by their premise they are being effectively developed as individual staff units in a highly organized society.

4. Prescribed curricula

Higher education which proceeds from the Soviet premise has in it something of the quality of prescription filling. Having determined what kinds of specializations it requires, the ministry first settles upon the curricula which will most fully achieve this specialized training, then forwards to the individual institution for implementation both that curricula, the individual course content, the textbook materials, and related readings. This has an important consequent impact on the individual professor. His role is that of faithfully inculcating prescribed materials. In a large sense, then, he is denied the opportunity for innovation, for the development of new interpretations, or for the search for new insights, all that we regard as essential ingredients of the inquisitive mind. Academic freedom in the affirmative sense (in which we too infrequently use it) is largely missing in Soviet institutions of higher education. It is not surprising, therefore, that we should encounter frequent comments about the mediocre and rote character of the classroom instruction.

An exception may be research in the natural sciences, though it is probable that this results largely from the absence of substantial conflict with party dogma. Where there has been conflict, as in genetics, dogma has replaced genuine academic freedom.

We postulate the importance of academic freedom as a guarantee to the individual faculty member that he may fully realize himself, and thus make his maximum contribution to his students, to the institution, and indeed to the world of scholarship as a whole. It parallels our concern that every able student have the opportunity to attend a college or university, to the end that he too may realize his full potential. To state it another way, in the Soviet system a large part of the faculty—and we must be careful not to overgeneralize this—would appear to be serving the prescribed ends of the state rather than fully realizing themselves as the interpreters and seekers of knowledge.

5. Serious gaps in subject matter

The same circumstances which militate against free inquiry by the individual faculty member and flexibility of curriculum development by individual institutions have resulted in serious gaps in the subject matter fields included in the university offering.

Because of a variety of aspects of Communist doctrine, and because of the pragmatic approach which demands a demonstrably utilitarian curricular content, one finds relatively little attention being paid to the social sciences as we know them. Economics is often buried under the heading "History of the Working Class." Social psychology is virtually unknown. Even the rudimentary psychology staffs are buried in faculties of law and philosophy. Sociology and anthropology as fields for objective inquiry are virtually nonexistent.

As we have noted elsewhere, there appears to be little awareness of the research undertaken in the behavioral sciences during the past generation in other parts of the world. Curiously enough, in a managed society we found relatively little interest in organization theory and related aspects of the field of administration. Although there is interest in cybernetics and operations research, in general we found little curiosity and no feeling of the inadequacy of their offerings in these fields. We did find one or two notable exceptions of individuals who were aware of what was developing in these areas in other parts of the world and who were at least intellectually curious about them. In one case we actually had a private admission that psychology, sociology, and anthropology would need very great strengthening in the Soviet Union in the years ahead. This, however, was a most exceptional point of view. In this connection we must note that we were seldom asked about new developments in thought in the outside world about fields other than the natural sciences.

6. Student development curtailed

Again we have reservations about the breadth of minds emerging from Soviet higher education. We are not speaking here of breadth of substantive material assimilated, but rather of the flexibility, the capacities for critical analysis, and the faculty for intellectual creativity.

The rigidity of the curriculum denies the student the opportunity to range widely in the development of his talents. Indeed, responsible Soviet administrators both in the ministry and in the institutions are themselves of the opinion that a rigidly prescribed curriculum and the desire that sub-

stantially all students obtain passing grades have discouraged the better minds from developing as much as they might. Here their complaints about their own higher education bear strong resemblance to the deep misgivings many of us have about secondary and elementary education in our own country.

But beyond the stereotyping effect of the curriculum itself there is the further point of the attitudes of instruction which appear to prevail in many faculties. Subject matter is passed to the students in what we judge to be a relatively doctrinaire way. Absolutist concepts which we have noted earlier as prevalent in the society as a whole discourage the student from critical analysis of materials placed before him. Most subjects appear to have an ordered frame of reference within which he is expected to do his thinking. We would judge that in a very substantial segment of higher education the student never has an opportunity to exercise his critical faculties with reference to first principles. As a consequence, we would suppose that the average Soviet student emerges from his university training with more knowledge, but with less of a critical faculty and with less analytical skill than the average student in our system.

Enough has been said to make it clear that what is called higher education is in fact training and not education. It is specific, pragmatic, concentrated indoctrination. It is not liberalizing, wide-ranging, thought-provoking intellectual development. Here is its short-run efficiency and its major threat to a competitor. But here, too, is its basic long-run built-in limitation.

7. Research limited

Research is not prescribed to the extent teaching is. There is a great deal of recognition of the need for the individual researcher to take the initiative in the development of his projects. However, once he has determined what he would like to do, his project is coordinated with work being done elsewhere in the nation through a series of regional and national reviewing bodies. He may in this way be assisted by information from other persons working in related fields. On the other hand, he may be denied funds with which to proceed and otherwise discouraged from working in this area in the event that the coordinating body is of the opinion that the research might be more effectively undertaken by some other person in some other institutional setting. To the extent that this represents coordination and communication, it is certainly helpful. To the extent that it represents centralized control, it again reflects the difficulty encountered by the individually creative mind which seeks to undertake research in its own directions by its own methods. It is consistent with the general pattern of utilitarian organization which may achieve monumental goals in prescribed fields but does so at the expense of what we assume to be the greater long-run good of unordered creativity.

8 Interdisciplinary and interprofessional communication lacking

We have grave reservations about the fundamental structure of higher education in the Soviet Union. Note has already been made of the fact that the concept of a total university is nonexistent. Professional schools are not organizationally related to the faculties of the natural science, humanities, and rudimentary social science disciplines. Medicine will be in one institution, engineering in another, law in a third, and the pedagogical institute still elsewhere. There does appear to be an occasional joint appointment which helps to mitigate the seriousness of this excessive separation.

Further fracturing of our concept of the university comes as a result of the establishment of a multitude of research institutions which undertake much of the basic research which in our country would be undertaken on the university campus. This is research sponsored by technical institutions within the several academies of sciences, medicine, et al. Indeed, there is general conviction in the academies of sciences that the more fundamental research is very largely the prerogative of academy-organized institutes and not of the universities or nonacademic technical institutes.

We thus have a double fracturing of the concept of a community of scholars. In the first instance, it is fractured by separating the faculties into isolated organizations and, secondly, it is further divided by the extensive inroads which the purely research institutes make upon the research function of the several faculties. This is not a chance development, but was deliberately undertaken to achieve a specified objective.

Some of the Soviet universities were at one time real communities of scholars. However, they were systematically divided in the interest of achieving two things. First, the Soviets believed that a greater specialization resulted from separation, and thus that they had prospect of realizing their immediate goals more quickly and efficiently than if less specialization were achieved. Second, it was thought that there was practical advantage in associating individual faculties with the fields of their application. In other words, the colleges of agriculture would do better if placed in the Ministry of Agriculture than if placed on a university campus, and the schools of medicine would be of greater immediate use if made part of the Ministry of Health. The immediacy of the relationship has a utilitarian value which in their view is compelling.

9. Dangers in separation of educational units

In our view, this compounded fracture of the university community has a number of serious implications. We think that it denies the faculties in similar areas the stimulation which comes with constant association. The Soviets would like the physicists in the engineering schools to be exclusively interested in the applied aspects of physics for the immediate and practical results that are achieved thereby. We are inclined to believe that, in the long run, better engineers will be trained if their physics faculties are geographically and professionally close enough to the theoretical physicists, not only to assure their continued stimulation, but also to keep both groups immediately abreast of developments in each of the areas with which the two are concerned. We would make the same point with reference to many of the disciplinary faculties and professional schools and would urge the same point as between faculties of professional schools themselves. A community of scholars is tremendously important in the Nation's total intellectual growth, and it is made immeasurably more difficult of attainment in the Soviet Union than it is in our own academic world.

In our judgment, students also suffer from this fracturing. Any tendency of the student in a professional school to broaden his preparation by taking work in the disciplinary faculties will be discouraged when it means transferring from institution to institution and perhaps even from city to city. It is a structure, in other words, which digs deeper an already well entrenched tendency to excessive specialization.

But we believe there is a further danger which results from this kind of institutional atomization of learning. We wonder whether it does not discourage the development of new fields of inquiry and instruction. In other parts of the world we have noted the retarding effect which rigidly structured faculty organization has upon the growth of new fields of scholarship. To mention but a few: law faculties in Europe have systematically frustrated the development of the field of political science; economics faculties in many parts of the world have discouraged the growth of independent instructional and research faculties in the field of business administration; the field of public health had difficulty in establishing its identity as long as it was dominated by faculties of medicine.

There is nothing unusual or reprehensible in this. Faculties, like all other social organizations, develop their internal cohesiveness in the protection of established views and values. They seek to protect the organism rather than to multiply it or to break off cells which will become new organisms with their own systems of knowledge. But it is part of the architectural role of academic leadership to assure a structure which is sufficiently flexible to permit the growth of new organisms when the need arises. We believe that this is a role which is best undertaken in the academic atmosphere of the total university community. We doubt that it may be properly assumed in the academically remote offices of a national ministry of higher education and in the substantial number of other ministries with technical institute responsibilities which are coordinated only through the Council of Ministers.

This fractured system of organization is also extravagant in its use of money and manpower. The separated institutions maintain their own faculties in the natural science and humanities disciplines rather than depend upon the services of the basic departments in a complex organization which can supply the needs of several specialties.

VI. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we must say that we would have preferred to digest and integrate our observations over a longer period of time; but we wanted to release this report within a reasonable period after our return. In many respects it has been a puzzling experience upon which we will enjoy rather extended reflection. Moreover, we certainly wish to be understood as being constantly aware of the reservations and disclaimers which were outlined in the early part of this report. On specific matters we do not pretend to bring back definitive answers. Rather, we return with tentative conclusions which we hope are based upon careful observation.

Whatever our caution may be about specific aspects of Soviet higher education, we are, nonetheless, reasonably confident of the overall pattern which appears to us to emerge. Affirmatively, we may say that the Soviets have achieved general recognition of the primary importance of higher education in any effective society, that they are prepared to support it with human effort and state resources to an extraordinary degree; that their overall approach is highly realistic and pragmatic; that their specialized curricula and institutional structure give promise of very impressive results in the specialized fields to which they have given attention, and that in the very large geographic areas which previously were underprivileged in education they have made astonishing progress in building the institutions, the facilities, the faculties, and the values of an effective system of higher education.

On the other hand, we return with an equally clear impression that the product of their educational system is overspecialized, less intellectually self-reliant, less competent in critical analysis, and probably on the average less intellectually creative than that which an institutionally dynamic and individually creative society requires in the long run. In other words, the Soviets profit from specificity of object and the specialization of their educational system but, by the same token, they may well suffer from the counterpart dangers of overdirection, lack of breadth, and lack of individual creativity.

Nuclear Testing and the Problem of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following text of an article by Henry A. Kissinger entitled "Nuclear Testing and the Problem of Peace," which appeared in the October 1958 issue of Foreign Affairs. I think it is very timely in view of the debate that has arisen regarding the controversial question of our abandonment of nuclear testing:

NUCLEAR TESTING AND THE PROBLEM OF PEACE
(By Henry A. Kissinger)

I

President Eisenhower's announcement of the suspension for 1 year of all nuclear weapons tests and his invitation to the Soviet Union to negotiate a permanent ban on tests has raised hopes all over the world that a beginning has been made in controlling nuclear weapons and that a big step forward has been taken in the quest for peace.

The hopes which have been focused on a nuclear test ban are intense and varied. Many thoughtful people concerned about the danger of radioactive fallout maintain that the quest for security must not be allowed to endanger the health of future generations. Others argue that the end of nuclear testing is essential to build confidence for more fundamental agreement, especially in the field of disarmament. It would prevent the diffusion of nuclear weapons to other powers. It would lessen the dangers of thermonuclear wars. And these arguments are reinforced by an insistent Soviet campaign to the effect that nuclear tests should be unconditionally prohibited and nuclear weapons outlawed.

The yearning for an end of the cold war reflects the deepest aspirations of the free world. So intense is it that we have been ready to stigmatize as more immoral than other weapons the weapon around which we have built our defense of that world. But the very intensity of our desire for peace may increase our peril. It may make us seek agreement for its own sake and thus set in motion a train of events which will divide the non-Communist world and undermine its resolution. The hopes which have been attached to a complete ban on nuclear tests are surely understandable. But they should not have been raised so high without a careful analysis of the political and psychological implications of such a step and its relationship to our defense policies and long-term goals. Instead we became preoccupied with technical problems of a test ban, which are by no means the most important. When we agreed to meet with Soviet scientists at Geneva, we clearly implied that if inspection was found to be technically feasible, we would be willing to discuss a complete ban. Therefore, when the scientists had made their report, we felt impelled to make a critical policy decision, although only its technical aspects had been fully explored.

This article questions whether a complete suspension of nuclear testing is desirable, whatever the possibilities of inspection. It argues that we should deal with the health hazard by ending tests which involve appreciable fallout but that we should agree to a complete ban only as part of a general disarmament agreement which includes conventional weapons. The desire to avoid a nuclear holocaust and to achieve a lasting peace should be taken for granted in any debate on this problem. At issue can only be the best means to achieve these ends.

II

Because of the emphasis laid on the technical aspects of ending nuclear tests, it may be useful at the start to discuss these and to point out some of the difficulties involved. It is generally agreed that surface nuclear explosions can be detected at considerable distances by equipment which measures radioactivity and shock waves.[1] The difficulty arises with underground testing, high altitude testing, and testing underneath the polar icecaps, and with the increasing civilian uses of nuclear energy.

With respect to underground testing it is argued that a system of inspection stations spaced 300 miles apart could detect all underground explosions of about 1 kiloton explosive power except in the seismic belt where earthquakes are more frequent, requiring inspection stations on a 100-mile grid. Nevertheless, serious problems remain. Methods of "buffering" explosions so that the seismic shock is weakened have barely been explored, but indications are that they can reduce the seismic wave by a very substantial percentage. Moreover, the seismic equipment can locate the shock only within an area several miles in diameter. Some, but not all, of the characteristics of an underground explosion can be distinguished from those of an earthquake. Conclusive proof can be obtained only by finding the precise location of the suspected evasion either by means of boring for radioactive samples or by discovering an entrance to the test site. This is a considerable task in an area which may cover more than 30 square miles. And the negotiators at Geneva agreed that the problem of high altitude testing was very little understood at this stage. The same difficulty may apply to testing underneath the polar icecaps.

Again, as the peaceful uses of nuclear energy become more widespread, other means of evasion may be developed. In fact, the United States explicitly and the Soviet Union by implication have both exempted peaceful applications of nuclear energy from their announced test bans.[2] One of the obvious applications of nuclear energy is in mining. It will not be easy to prevent a country from using devices for blasting which also have military applications, or from gaining militarily useful knowledge by checking the results with scientific instruments. To be sure, inspection teams could be invited to witness each peaceful use of nuclear explosives; but as the peaceful applications of nuclear energy grow more common, this will become increasingly difficult. A nation determined on evasion could overload the inspection mechanism by hiding test explosions among hundreds of ordinary ones.

In any event we must keep in mind that the best inspection system can guard only against presently known methods of evasion. In the nature of things it is difficult to protect against a contingency not yet imagined. And finally, evasion will be easier to attempt and to conceal in the Soviet Union than in the West. In the West a ban on nuclear testing will be largely self-policing, because public opinion will not countenance evasion and scientists will not lend themselves to it.[3] No such inhibitions will exist in the U.S.S.R.

Yet the most vexing problem of inspection is not that of obtaining information, difficult as it is, but the political consequences to be drawn from whatever information does become available. Obviously a violation of the nuclear test ban is not a casus belli. It may not even be a sufficient cause for the injured party to start testing again. Once nuclear tests have been banned, the free world will not abrogate its agreement easily, even in the face of strong provocation. Even if it reached a decision to do so, years might be consumed before tests could be resumed. For one thing, a nation like the United States which had observed the ban might by then have nothing to test. A ban extended over a period of years would almost certainly lead to the attrition of our weapons laboratories, whose ablest scientists would be increasingly tempted to concentrate on more promising fields. For another, the United States would have great difficulty reassembling its testing machinery. Present tests involve scores of installations and thousands of personnel. It would be impossible to keep these teams together once a test ban had been agreed upon. Even a strong indication of Soviet violation might therefore leave the United States at a serious disadvantage or at least without adequate recourse.

Moreover, there is a great difference between obtaining information which is technically reliable and establishing a similar degree of political and psychological clarity. It is often maintained that a violation of the test band would have a catastrophic impact on world opinion. But this assumes a degree of certainty about Soviet intentions which is belied by all past experience. The Soviet Union has always been skillful in presenting its challenges in an ambiguous manner, partly by masking its own actions, partly by charging its opponents with similar transgressions. According to its usual tactics, the Kremlin, within a short time of signing an agreement to end nuclear tests, would quite probably accuse us of violating it.[4] In the resulting atmosphere of recrimination it would be difficult to separate sincere charges from the customary exchanges of the cold war. The result might well be a further weakening of the will of the free world.

Finally, it is quite possible that a complete ban on testing would enable the Soviet Union to overtake us in the military applications of nuclear energy. Whereas a complete test ban would magnify our already great difficulty in inducing our ablest scientists to work on nuclear weapons, it would not prevent the Soviet Union from keeping its research teams together either by compulsion or by arranging appropriate incentives. Also, the Soviets may feel less dependent on testing in order to achieve scientific progress. The experimental method is instinctive to the West. Marxist dogmatism places much greater reliance on theory. For example, the Kremlin announced its first nuclear explosion several days before it took place. Thus even if the rate of scientific progress were the same, the Soviets may gain an advantage because of greater confidence in untested data. Or else they may use a temporary cessation to prepare tests of superior weapons.

Nevertheless, the deepest concern about a complete ban on testing does not arise from the danger that it may permit Soviet technical advances or from the political and practical difficulty of inspection. We must consider whether the basic motive behind Communist pressure for a complete ending of nuclear tests may not be the Soviet Union's conviction that it would gain a substantial advantage from a complete ban which it scrupulously observed. The wisdom of a complete end of nuclear tests so often advocated as a first step depends on the answer to the question "first step toward what?"

III

It may be argued that such a question is a symptom of the distrust which has produced the cold war. Unless both sides are willing to take some risks in the quest for

Footnotes at end of speech.

peace, it will be said, the world will be doomed to an indefinitely continued armaments race and eventual destruction. Since the death of Stalin, great changes have occurred in the Soviet Union, brought about by the appearance of a new bureaucracy, the increasing demand for consumer goods, and the creation of the entire apparatus of an industrialized society. According to this line of thought, the Russians' expressed desire for peaceful coexistence represents a concession to the pressures of these new forces. Given time and patience, the Soviet Union may evolve into a society not unlike ours.

Because these assertions derive from attitudes which have contributed so much to the stability and often the freedom of our society and that of many of our allies, it is difficult to contradict them. A status quo power always has difficulty in understanding a revolutionary state. All its instincts tempt it to accept peaceful professions and to refuse to believe in implacable hostility.

Were it not for this difficulty of understanding, no revolution would ever have succeeded. A revolutionary movement always starts from a position of inferior strength. It owes its survival to the reluctance of its declared victims to accept its professions at face value. It owes its success to the psychological advantage which single-minded purpose confers over an opponent who does not believe that some states may prefer victory to peace. The ambiguity which makes the Soviet challenge so deadly derives in part from the skill of the Soviet leadership; but the danger is magnified by the tendency of the free world to choose the interpretation of Soviet motivations which best accords with its own preconceptions. Neither Lenin's writings, nor Stalin's utterances, nor Mao's published works, nor Khrushchev's declarations, have availed against the conviction of the West that a basic change in Communist society and aims was imminent and that a problem deferred was a problem solved. It is only to posterity that revolutionary movements appear unambiguous. Thus a status quo power is never certain until too late that another state intends to overthrow the international system, especially as the revolutionary power will present each demand as a specific, limited objective, which often in itself seems quite reasonable. However weak at the beginning, it can substitute psychological strength for physical power; it can use the very enormity of its goals to defeat gradually an opponent who cannot come to grips with a policy of unlimited objectives.

This becomes a particular problem if the revolutionary power exploits this weakness systematically. In Soviet terminology, for example, the concepts war and peace are inherently confusing. Since, according to Communist theory, the social structure of capitalist states necessarily produces war, real peace can be achieved only by the world-wide triumph of communism. Therefore any act by the Soviet Union, however warlike on the surface, is pacific by definition and any measure by a capitalist state, however seemingly conciliatory, tends toward war. Thus the slogan peaceful coexistence has never had more than a tactical significance in Communist terminology. "Marxism-Leninism," wrote Mao, "does not allow concessions to be regarded as something purely negative. * * * Our concession, withdrawal, turning to the defensive or suspending action, whether in dealing with allies or enemies, should always be regarded as part of the entire revolutionary policy, as an indispensable link in the general revolutionary line. * * *"[5] To be sure, the protestations of peaceful coexistence have recently become more insistent; but the reason is not very flattering to the West, since it consists in the assertion that war has become unnecessary in order to encompass the downfall of the free world.

The argument outlined here may not prove persuasive to the increasing number of people in the free world who desire an end to the cold war so intensely that they ignore the lessons of the past and the fundamental professions of Communist doctrine. But even the most optimistic should ask themselves why Khrushchev can be expected to deal any more gently with the countries of the free world than with his erstwhile colleagues in the Soviet presidium. What was the doctrine of collective leadership but the principle of peaceful coexistence applied among the Soviet leaders? Yet it was used ruthlessly by Khrushchev first to paralyze opposition by branding it contrary to the principle of collective leadership and then to defeat his opponents one by one. Khrushchev could not have succeeded domestically had he not been able first to convince his colleagues of his sincerity. Is it not at least possible that the men who arrested the leaders of the Hungarian revolution while negotiating an armistice with them and who executed them despite a promise of safe conduct are now seeking to apply these same methods to weaken the cohesion of the free world and then to destroy its members piecemeal? A wise policy will at least consider this contingency and will not risk everything simply for the sake of agreement.

Certainly the free world has a duty to seek to spare mankind the horrors of another war. It must strive for any agreement that offers such prospects. But a real relaxation of tensions can come about only if the Soviet leaders become convinced that they cannot use negotiations to induce us to disarm unilaterally, that any agreement must be mutually advantageous. We must consider, then, whether insistent Soviet demands for a complete ban on nuclear testing are not designed to paralyze the free world rather than to bring about peace as we understand the word.

IV

Rightly or wrongly, the free world has based its defense on nuclear weapons. We need not here review the circumstances nor analyze the motives that led to this decision. It is enough to note that nowhere in the Western World are there sufficient conventional forces to resist the Soviet preponderance in conventional strength; and nowhere is there any immediate prospect of developing them. Nothing now stands in the way of Soviet domoniation of Eurasia save the Soviet reluctance to pay the price of a nuclear war.

That is why the Soviet Union has systematically sought to paralyze the West's will to use the weapons around which its entire defense effort has been built. It has done this both by creating a substantial nuclear stockpile of its own and by seeking to have nuclear weapons outlawed. Appealing to the most basic fears of humanity, the whole apparatus of Soviet policy, from diplomacy to peace congresses, has sought to undermine our reliance on the most effective—or at least the only available—means of resistance to Soviet domination.

The free world should therefore have no illusions about the implications of a complete ban on nuclear tests. For if a cessation of nuclear testing is a "first step" to anything it is to an increased campaign to outlaw nuclear weapons altogether. If these weapons are too dangerous to test, so the argument will go, they are surely too terrible to use. That this is the aim of Soviet policy was made explicit by Khrushchev: "After the termination of nuclear weapons tests, it would be possible to raise the question of the powers making a solemn undertaking not to use hydrogen and atomic weapons and henceforth to adopt a decision on the total prohibition of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons."[6] In the present state of Western defenses such a prohibition is tantamount to unilateral disarmament. The onesidedness of our military establishment has deprived our diplomacy of flexibility. If the free world possessed a conventional force sufficiently powerful and mobile to blunt Soviet aggression by similar forces, the complete cessation of nuclear testing would not be so dangerous. But none of the advocates of a nuclear test ban has been prepared to champion—and many have actively opposed—a build-up of conventional forces sufficient to offset the grave risks which their proposals invite.

Nor will the weakening of the free world be compensated for by a victory in the battle for the minds of men. In the current atmosphere where all attention has been focused on the most cataclysmic uses of nuclear weapons and we have failed to develop or to offer a plausible alternative, a complete cessation of tests will merely serve to shift pressures to the banning of nuclear weapons. We must be sensitive to world opinion. But we have also an obligation to contribute to shaping it. We must succeed in conveying the fact that unless the free world is prepared to accept a settlement on Soviet terms, we must have a military establishment which we are prepared to invoke for our defense. If we are not willing to run some risks for the preservation of our values and our interests, the collapse of the free world is inevitable and no amount of rhetoric can eliminate this fact.

V

The willingness to run risks depends in part on the options afforded by our military establishment. We require more conventional forces. We must have a wider spectrum of nuclear weapons. We must stop pretending that we can have security on the cheap.

One of the penalties of being on the defensive is that the choices which we must make are more difficult than the aggressor's, if only because the dangers against which we must protect ourselves are more varied. The aggressor can choose his point of attack; he can select the weapons system which seems most promising; he can concentrate on the area where his opponent is weakest either geographically or in weaponry. The defender must be able to defend all likely targets of aggression and against any weapons system that may be employed. Two consequences follow: (a) at equal levels of military effort the aggressor usually has an advantage; and (b) the defensive requires a more advanced weapons technology than its opponent. The side which concedes the first blow must have a more mobile and better protected retaliatory force, for it must be able to withstand the attrition of the initial attack. Its weapons must be lighter so that they can be rapidly moved to threatened areas. It must possess a range of capabilities which deters the aggressor from tilting the scales by expanding either the area or the intensity of the conflict. The side which concedes the first blow therefore runs major risks if it compounds the disadvantage of the defensive by having a frozen weapons technology. This is particularly true in the present stage of weapons development.

The nuclear weapons with which we are most familiar and which are most fully tested are also the most destructive. Any war would have to be conducted in their shadow. Under present circumstances they even inhibit recourse to conventional weapons, for the danger of a nuclear showdown will be thought to be inherent in any conflict. This view has already been articulated in Great Britain where Lord Russell has insisted that even surrender is preferable to running the risk of war.[7]

Footnotes at end of speech.

It is therefore essential that we develop nuclear weapons of finer discrimination, less destructive power and greatly reduced fallout. This need exists regardless of whether we intend to rely on a conventional or on a nuclear defense. As long as the defensive effort of the free world is polarized between inadequate conventional forces and nuclear weapons of enormous destructiveness, the Soviet bloc will be able to pose the dilemma of suicide or surrender in a variety of forms. By engaging in or encouraging aggression with conventional forces it can force our leaders to choose between yielding or invoking a strategy which will involve catastrophic casualties. Even if we build up conventional forces and resist initially without recourse to nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union may be tempted to utilize a few weapons of low yield unless deterred by the knowledge that we have ample weapons of similar discrimination and superior technology.[8] A conventional war can be kept conventional only if we are prepared with a wide variety of nuclear weapons.

This will be true whether or not the Soviet Union follows suit. The rhetorical question "Why develop clean weapons if they use dirty weapons against us?" is surely no more pertinent than the argument "Why rely on bullets if the opponent has nuclear weapons?" This reasoning would loosen all constraints and would lead to the continued elaboration of ever more destructive weapons. Moreover, the availability of clean weapons is of great importance for the protection of our own troops and also civilian populations, which may be endangered by fallout from our own weapons. But the essential purpose of having a wide range of clean and discriminating weapons is to give the free world an option which does not involve either immediate catastrophe or surrender. Possession of them will improve the plausibility of our deterrent and reduce the possibility of Soviet atomic blackmail which has been so central a feature of Soviet diplomacy in recent years. And they will provide a shield behind which to build up conventional forces if we are prepared to make the sacrifices. The difference in willpower between the Soviet bloc and the free world must not reach the point where we assume an unlimited willingness on the part of our opponent to run risks, while we recoil before the risks of even a limited defense.

In a revolutionary world rife with possibilities for upheavals, perhaps unsought by any major power, it is imperative to couple the quest for peace with efforts to mitigate the consequences of conflicts that may occur either by accident or design. If this effort is not made, the result must be an increasing pacifism which will produce appeasement if not surrender; or else, if a decision to resist is taken, it will lead to the most catastrophic kind of war. Is it not possible that Soviet leaders have been so insistent on a complete and unconditional end of nuclear tests precisely because they are aware of the paralysis produced by such prospects?

VI

Would not the end of nuclear testing avoid the diffusion of nuclear weapons among other powers? Of course, a nuclear test ban will serve only to inhibit the independent development of nuclear weapons by fourth powers; it will not necessarily prevent the distribution of nuclear weapons from the stockpiles of the major nuclear powers, nor will it stop them from turning over blueprints to an ally. Nevertheless a complete ban on nuclear testing will have psychological and political consequences which will make it difficult for other powers to acquire nuclear weapons, particularly in the free world. The issue of a ban on nuclear testing is therefore inseparable from that of nuclear sharing.

The situation with respect to nuclear sharing can be summarized as follows: The Communist bloc possesses a decisive military superiority in all contiguous areas. The Soviet Union can threaten with nuclear weapons all peripheral areas and much of Africa from its own territories; Communist China is overwhelmingly stronger than any neighboring state in conventional weapons. In these circumstances the Soviet Union may have decided that it has little to gain and a great deal to lose from the diffusion of nuclear weapons. Indeed, in view of the political unreliability of some of the satellite regimes, it probably has a positive interest in keeping nuclear weapons out of their hands.

The immediate Soviet objective is therefore to prevent the development of a nuclear capability under local control on the European Continent, for then Western Europe and other contiguous areas will eventually become neutralized. Without a nuclear capability of its own, Europe will find it impossible to resist the increasingly bold Soviet threats of nuclear warfare, which have been a cardinal aspect of Soviet diplomacy in every crisis since Suez. Europe, should it want to be defended, would then become entirely dependent on the American assessment of its danger. In such a situation the Soviet leaders may well calculate that the United States would be reluctant to invoke its own destruction for the defense of Europe, or than even in an all-out war they could not be prevented from seizing Europe. For after the initial exchange of blows the Soviet Union would remain supreme in Eurasia.[9] That the Soviet Union is concerned with making Europe impotent and not with the threat offered by a Europan nuclear establishment is demonstrated by the Soviet protest against the plan to equip the Swiss Army with nuclear weapons.[10] By no stretch of the imagination can Switzerland be suspected of aggressive intent against the U.S.S.R.

In negotiating about a nuclear test ban we must therefore take care not to contribute to a climate of opinion which will make our position on the Continent untenable and a local defense of Europe impossible. Already influential groups in Britain argue for a unilateral renunciation of nuclear weapons and considerable pressures exist in Germany against equipping German forces for nuclear war. In both countries the cessation of nuclear tests is considered as an initial move away from atomic weapons. The more the Soviet Union succeeds in building up a distinction between nuclear weapons and other weapons, while retaining full control of its own stockpile, the more it will undermine the will of the Western alliance to resist. Once the Soviet Union has succeeded in bringing about a divergence between our military establishment and that of our European allies, it may hope that our NATO partners will be paralyzed by their impotence and we by our unwillingness to risk all-out war.

If we permit a distinction to grow up between our military establishment and that of our NATO allies, our expulsion from Europe is almost inevitable. Further delay in the distribution of nuclear weapons to our European allies will give the Soviet Union more time to persuade Europeans that they will be able to escape involvement in any conflict by refusing to permit nuclear installations on their territory. Logically, this denuclearization of Europe will be followed by a demand that American troops withdraw, since their equipment is so obviously nuclear. At the very least it will expose us to great pressure to withdraw all our nuclear installations from the continent. Western Europe would then be impotent, at the mercy of Soviet Russia. NATO would cease to have meaning.

This is not to say that Europe must obtain nuclear weapons from its own production or that these weapons must be under national control. From many points of view it would be highly desirable if NATO's nuclear components were under NATO control, or if a European atomic force were formed on the model of E.D.C. Similarly it is not essential that nuclear weapons be locally produced, but only that there be European participation in their use and control. Before we go much further in the direction of a complete ban on testing, we should at the very least amend our Atomic Energy Act to permit wider nuclear sharing. And our approach to the question of nuclear testing should be based on premises which do not inhibit nuclear sharing and which will not give impetus to Soviet ban-the-bomb propaganda.

Will not the possession of nuclear weapons by our allies increase the danger of war? This would be true if our allies felt thereby encouraged to attack the Soviet Union, or if they were to use nuclear weapons in their own quarrels outside of Europe. But excessive adventurousness vis-à-vis the Soviet Union can hardly be considered a European failing. Even in the less preferred contingency that nuclear weapons were under national rather than NATO control, it is difficult to conceive the circumstances which would induce any European country to unleash a unilateral attack on the Soviet Union. The individual nuclear capability will remain so small, the disproportion in vulnerability is so great, that they could not, by any rational calculation, use these weapons for offensive ends. Their purpose would be to make the costs of aggression, particularly of local adventures, prohibitive, and to discourage Soviet atomic blackmail.[11]

As for the use of these weapons to settle private quarrels outside Europe, this could be effectively forestalled by placing them under NATO or an overall European control. But even should they be under national control, the likelihood of their use outside of NATO is slight. The difficulty which the French army has in Algeria is not inadequate firepower but that of finding targets against which this firepower can be used. Atomic weapons have little significance in guerrilla-type operations.

But what of the uncommitted nations? Is there to be no end to the diffusion of nuclear weapons? First, it must be recognized that from a technical standpoint the diffusion of nuclear weapons will grow increasingly difficult to prevent, regardless of what decision is reached with respect to nuclear testing. As the peaceful uses of nuclear energy become widespread, more and more nations will become familiar with nuclear technology. The end product of many atomic reactors is plutonium, which is also the basic component of nuclear weapons. As nuclear energy becomes more familiar, its military applications will be very difficult to control. Nothing short of the original Baruch-Lilienthal plan seems capable of arresting this trend.

It does not follow, moreover, that because the diffusion of nuclear weapons must be stopped at some point it must be stopped at this point, or that the most effective method is a ban on nuclear testing. To be sure, the more nuclear powers exist the more difficult it will be to arrest the spread of nuclear weapons. But we must weigh this risk against the danger of collaborating with the Soviet Union in the neutralization of Europe. This would leave us without powerful allies. It would place us ultimately in the position of having to defend the whole Soviet periphery alone against Soviet nuclear attack or Soviet atomic blackmail. Bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union to the exclusion of our European allies are fraught with danger. It would be much bet-

Footnotes at end of speech.

ter to deal with the problem of the diffusion of nuclear weapons directly rather than through the indirect method of a test ban, and to include our NATO allies as nuclear powers in any agreement, preferably through a European Atomic Community.

Of possible methods to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, a test ban is the most disadvantageous to the free world. In relevance to nuclear sharing is primarily that it will contribute to a psychological attitude in the West making it impossible for any of our allies to acquire nuclear weapons. Communist China will not be similarly inhibited from obtaining nuclear weapons from the Soviet Union. Even if reports that the U.S.S.R. has already agreed to give nuclear weapons to Communist China are premature [12] it does not seem likely that the Soviet Union would in the long run risk its most important alliance by refusing to share nuclear weapons in any form. It is idle to argue that in these circumstances the United States would be free to give nuclear weapons to its own allies. By that time, the public opinion of our NATO partners would not permit the possession of nuclear weapons, especially as the direct threat to these countries is not markedly increased if China possesses nuclear weapons.

The difficulty with a total ban on nuclear testing is that it stakes too much on a measure which in itself is of problematical significance. It will build up worldwide reluctance to resort to nuclear weapons, the only means of defense now existing against Soviet aggression or Soviet military pressure. It will impede if not prevent the articulation of a strategy for the defense of Europe. It will increase the danger that any war that does break out will take the most catastrophic form. By freezing weapons development after only the most fearful applications of nuclear power have been fully explored, it will increase the possibilities for Soviet atomic blackmail without reducing the free world's peril. As a first step it goes too far and in a too uncertain direction.

VII

One of the difficulties the free world has had in dealing with the Soviet bloc is that we have been clearer about the things we oppose than those we stand for. This has given much of our negotiations with the Soviet Union the quality of a stubborn rearguard action designed primarily to thwart Soviet overtures. It has enabled the Soviet leadership to define the issues in international debate, putting us in the position of respondent rather than initiator. Worldwide pressures are built up against us before we have a chance to demonstrate our own purposes and values.

So it has been with the issue of nuclear testing. Our diplomacy has concentrated on problems of inspection or on belittling the danger of fallout. Whatever the scientific basis of the fear of radiation,[13] there is no question that we should respect the depth of that fear among many peoples exposed to fallout from tests outside their control and against which they have no protection. Control over radioactive fallout is therefore a requirement of any U.S. policy on nuclear testing. But the United States should not be asked at the same time to initiate the control of armaments by paralyzing itself and its allies without at least the beginning of a reduction of Soviet conventional strength and of some protection against surprise attack. The fact that the Soviet Union has proved obdurate on a general disarmament scheme indicates only that it wants to use negotiations to disarm us unilaterally, not that such a scheme lacks merit. If we negotiate only on issues the Soviets declare soluble, we can be sure that diplomacy will become increasingly a device to undermine the free world.

Footnotes at end of speech.

In the negotiations on a nuclear test ban which are about to begin, the United States should therefore propose that we are willing to address ourselves immediately to the problem of fallout but that a complete ban would depend on a comprehensive disarmament agreement. Pending such an agreement, we should propose that, while nuclear weapons are essential to the defense of the free world, we are prepared to take immediate steps to mitigate the effects either of testing or of using them. We should invite the Soviet Union to join a U.N. committee which would immediately set a maximum dosage of permissible fallout from testing well below the level brought about by recent tests. The U.N. committee should then assign a quota to the United States and its allies and another to the Soviet bloc on a 50–50 basis. (Since most of the potential "fourth" powers are in the West, this would be a considerable concession to the U.S.S.R.) For 2 years all powers would agree to register with the U.N. all tests which involve fallout and both sides would agree not to exceed their quota. During those 2 years the quota would be progressively reduced, ultimately to zero. Afterward, unless there were by then a general disarmament agreement, nations would remain free to conduct surface tests of "clean" weapons, underground tests, and tests in outer space, so long as they did not cause fallout. Technical experts from both sides would agree on an adequate inspection mechanism, which could be relatively simple.

While such an agreement would impede the arms race, it would not stop weapons development altogether. It would permit the continued elaboration of defensive weapons and of weapons which can be applied with discrimination, both in terms of fallout and in terms of yield. Indeed, it will put a premium on such development because these weapons can be tested most easily underground or within established fallout quotas. It will avoid placing the United States in the position of not trusting its allies with the development of weapons which are essential to their defense and which their opponent already possesses in quantity. At the same time, it will impede the too rapid diffusion of nuclear technology and thereby afford time for a careful study of this problem. The easiest weapons to develop are those with major fallout effects. The least complicated method of testing is above ground. Thus a limited ban could channel future weapons development into the least destructive channels. It would reduce and ultimately eliminate whatever health hazard there may be in present testing.

Such a proposal would counteract the Soviet effort to elaborate a distinction between nuclear and nonnuclear powers or zones or warfare, a distinction which can only paralyze the free world. At the same time, it would call attention to a distinction between forms of warfare which are unnecessarily destructive and those which seek to confine devastation to the smallest possible proportions—a condition which is essential to make our deterrent posture plausible and to strengthen the will of the free world. If the Soviet Union rejected our proposal, we and our allies should impose a steeply decreasing quota on ourselves, thus forcing the Soviet Union into the position of being solely responsible for any health hazard in nuclear testing. In this manner, increasing pressure of world opinion could be built up against the most catastrophic use of nuclear weapons and in favor of a general disarmament agreement. This approach to the problem of nuclear testing would have the additional advantage that it would be much easier to inspect. Inspection could concentrate on one problem reasonably well understood: that of fallout. If no radioactivity were found, no violation was taking place.

A restriction of nuclear testing as outlined here would meet many of the fears of humanity without exposing the free world to incalculable peril. It would be a first step which avoids most of the dangers of a complete ban and yet achieves many of its goals. If the limitation of nuclear tests proved workable, the inspection system could be expanded, reduction of arms might follow, and efforts could be made to reduce the danger of surprise attack. None of these measures is possible, however, as long as the Soviet Union is encouraged to believe, by the irresolution and evasions of the free world, that through skillful and persistent diplomacy it can break up the cohesiveness of the Western alliance and undermine the will to resist aggression with the only effective weapon now at our disposal.

VIII

It is widely believed in the West that the issue of nuclear testing is a touchstone of our sincerity. Many argue that the Soviet Union scored a major gain by renouncing nuclear tests and that we exhibited lack of imagination and the absence of a moral dimension by not following suit immediately. The reluctance to end nuclear testing, so the argument goes, is a symptom of the sterility and overconcern with military problems which have been at the root of so many of our difficulties.

There is no doubt that the Western World is in deep trouble. It has not been able to articulate either a philosophy or a program adequate to the challenge of the times. It has failed to identify itself with the revolutionary period through which we are living and it has not had the vision or the willingness to carry through a sustained program of world economic development. Because we have not been clear about our purpose we have often found it easier to concentrate on defensive measures than on those which might give a sense of direction to a world in turmoil.

But even in the military field we are inadequately prepared to deal with most of the issues with which we are likely to be confronted. We have insufficient strength for limited war. We are falling behind in the overall strategic equation. The answer to our political dilemma is not to be found in reducing our defenses—for even here more effort and imagination are required—but in injecting a greater sense of purpose into our overall performance.

As a Nation of specialists we like to believe that a problem is either political or economic or military. The challenge we face, however, is that contemporary problems involve a combination of all these factors. Our choice is not between working for the things in which we believe or attending to our necessities. If we cannot do both, we will not be able to do either.

---

[1] For a very good account of methods of detecting nuclear weapons testing see "The Detection of Nuclear Weapons Testing," by Jay Orear, in "Inspection for Disarmament," edited by Seymour Melman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), p. 85 f.

[2] The New York Times, Aug. 23, 1958.

[3] For an interesting analysis of the degree to which public opinion in free world countries would support a test ban see "An International Public Opinion Poll on Disarmament and 'Inspection by the People': A Study of Attitudes Toward Supranationalism," by William M. Evan in Melman, op. cit., p. 231 f.

[4] This process may already have started. See the Soviet charge that the United States "hid" 18 test explosions in the Pacific. The New York Times, Aug. 24, 1958.

[5] Mao Tse-tung, "Selected Works," vol. 2, 1937–38 (New York: International Publishers, 1954), p. 263–4.

[6] The New York Times, June 29, 1958.

[7] Bertrand Russell, "Freedom to Survive," The New Leader, July 7–14, 1958, p. 23.

[8] The aggressor employing nuclear weapons against conventional forces will have a relatively concentrated target because massed firepower is difficult to achieve otherwise in a conventional war. He can therefore employ relatively crude nuclear weapons, having first dispersed his own forces.

[9] See Peregrine Worsthorne, "Our Bomb and Theirs: As the Russians See It," Encounter, July 1958. Also Raymond L. Garthoff, "Soviet Strategy in the Nuclear Age," New York: Praeger, 1958.

[10] The New York Times, August 9, 1958.

[11] For a fuller discussion of the problems of the defense of Europe see the author's "Missiles and the Western Alliance," Foreign Affairs, April 1958.

[12] The New York Times, August 18, 1958.

[13] See for example the recent U.N. report on radiation. The New York Times, August 11, 1958.

Bangor Celebrates 125th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it is easy to understand why Bangor, Maine, in the celebration of its 125 years of history, should seek to establish its claim to Paul Bunyan—both are grand.

I submit for insertion in the RECORD news articles from the Enterprise, which depict how the Queen City has laid claim to this kingly legendary personality:

BANGOR COMMITTEE WILL KEEP THE YEAR HUMMING—PROGRAM HAS BIG DOINGS OF ALL KINDS EACH MONTH

The 30-foot statue of Paul Bunyan has been erected in front of the auditorium in Bangor, and the Queen City is embarked on its year-long celebration of 125 years of history. From now until the end of the year, Bangor will be in festival, a program that started on New Year's Eve with a bonfire of Christmas trees.

SYMBOL

Paul Bunyan has definitely become the symbol of the frolic, although it seems this was not exactly the plan. Story comes that some citizens of Bangor think there is a ribald and indecorous tinge to the mighty Paul, and that as a symbol he is not precisely what the Bangor program ought to be, or will be. But Paul has always had a way of dominating anything he has to do with, and there probably is no point at this late date in fighting the thing.

Paul Bunyan is an American legend, the patron saint of lumbering, and the stories about him lie a mile high in all directions. He has long been associated with Minnesota and the Great Northwest, where his prodigious deeds are well known. Although the full legend makes him a native of Maine he has never been fully accredited as such until Bangor's 125th committee worked him in. Then the fun began. The Bangor News has been a clearinghouse for letters to the editor, including all sorts of incontrovertible proof that Paul belongs to Maine, and also dubious conclusions by experts that he was not indigenous. Nobody believes the latter, of course.

STOCKING CAP

Anyway, the 30-foot statue of fibre glass, the most magnificent of all those in existence, was ordered and set up, and the Paul Bunyan stocking cap became a Bangor commonplace. Paul Bunyan Days, from January 29 to February 1, are the winter carnival portion of the program, and high times and high jinks are in the offing.

If there's anything Bangor hasn't thought of to round out the year, the committee would like to know what it is. Some dates and events are still tentative, but other plans that will materialize haven't been mentioned yet. The committee has produced a printed program, and it may be had by dropping a note to the committee office, Bangor City Hall. Ask for the 125th program.

Calling it the big year to be here, Bangor lists the 1959 events with the following outstanding and ambitious dates:

PROGRAM

January 29 to February 1: Paul Bunyan Days, winter carnival, coronation of anniversary queen, contests, dances.

February 12: Lincoln-Hamlin Day.

February 23 to March 7: Regional and State basketball finals.

March 16 to 22: Ice Capades.

April: Circus, merchandising show, Oklahoma on stage.

May: High-school music festival, Armed Forces Day, antique car show.

June: Dairy Month do. Tourist tours start. Conventions.

July: Hurray for the Glorious Fourth. Big time.

August: 110th annual Bangor Fair. Pro football; first in Maine.

September: Softball playoffs. Labor Day stuff. Horseshoe. Big Shrine time.

October: Halloween fracas, banquets, business week, etc.

November: Historical pageant sine qua non.

December: Everybody pooped.

BANGOR FINDS BUNYAN BIRTH—CHANGES THINGS A WEE BIT

Bangor has played around a bit with Paul Bunyan's origins, and claims he was born there on February 12, 1834, the year the city was incorporated. The city clerk of Bangor deposed and stated a birth certificate is on file. They have further located a character designated as Lemuel, middle name Eliza, Chamberlain, now 125 years old and living at 37 Kaisar Boulevard, Bangor, who says he (she) remembers Paul as a boy.

Bangor also stipulates Paul was the son of "French-Canadian" parents, father's name was Jacques, mother's Sarah Marie.

Most of the stories say Paul was born at, or near, Machias. Having created the Fundy tides by rocking his floating cradle as a newborn babe, Paul obviously was cradled somewhere near the Fundy region. Bangor has changed that to "Penobscot tides." Does it matter?

A Tribute to Hon. Herman Eberharter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of our dear friend and colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable Herman Eberharter, was a real loss to our State and the Nation. It was also a great personal loss to those of us who had the privilege of knowing and working with him here in the House.

His tireless efforts in behalf of more equitable tax legislation, social security legislation to improve the economic status of our old folks, and other liberal measures earned for him the respect and admiration of his colleagues.

Herman Eberharter was a keen, active, and able legislator who possessed great courage and vision to see beyond the immediate aspects of a particular problem. He was faithful to his duties, sincere, and upright in dealings with his colleagues. We shall miss him greatly in the days ahead.

Alabama Press Association Denounces Washington Post for Refusing Putnam Ad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, last weekend the Alabama Press Association, the membership of which is composed of all publishers and editors of daily and weekly newspapers in the State of Alabama, met at its 88th annual convention. One of the highlights of the convention was the adoption by unanimous vote of a resolution criticizing the Washington Post and Times Herald for its refusal to run the Putnam letter, which has received much publicity of late, as a paid advertisement. It is my privilege to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under leave heretofore granted, a newspaper article which appeared in the Monday, January 26, 1959, issue of the Birmingham Post-Herald, concerning the meeting and adoption of the resolution:

STATE PRESS GROUP ATTACKS PAPER FOR REFUSAL OF AD

Alabama Press Association delegates, winding up their 3-day 88th annual convention, headed back to their editorial offices across the State over the weekend, but not before they'd fired a parting salvo at a Washington newspaper for betrayal of the press.

The association, representing 16 Alabama dailies and 116 weeklies, by resolution condemned and deplored the Washington Post and Times Herald for its refusal to publish the "Putnam Letter" as a paid advertisement.

The Alabama newsmen accused the Washington daily of obstructing the right of the people to know all sides of a public issue.

Before the resolution was read the newsmen elected William Stewart, of Monroeville, to succeed C. G. Thomason, of the Ensley Industrial Press, as it new president.

Post-Herald Editor James E. Mills was named first vice president. New second vice president is Harold May, of the Florence Herald.

Col. Harry Ayers, Anniston Star publisher, proposed the resolution flaying the Washington Post and Times Herald. That paper 2 weeks ago, with regret, had notified James Simpson, head of the Birmingham-based Putnam Letter Fund, it would not publish the letter, which expresses a general southern viewpoint, in a tract written by New Englander Carleton Putnam.

On the same topic of publicizing the "South's viewpoint," Lt. Gov. Albert Bout-

well, the convention's main speaker Friday, had informed the newsmen that an Alabama legislative committee would be formed to spearhead a States rights battle.

In another proposal, the conventioners had endorsed a resolution drawn by L. O. Brackeen, Auburn, to create a "Hall of Fame" for Alabama newspapers and outstanding journalists.

A five-member fame committee will report on the subject at the 1960 convention.

Jones Giles, Tuscaloosa, was reelected secretary treasurer and field manager.

New directors of the association are Tip Matthews, Mobile Press Register; Joel Smith, Eufaula Tribune; Porter Harvey, Guntersville Gleam; Jay Thornton, Haleyville Advertiser; Arthus Cook, Shades Valley Sun; and Arthur Slayton, Moulton Advertiser and Russellville Citizen Times.

Directors of the Alabama Newspaper Advertising Service also were elected. They are J. C. Henderson, Alexander City Outlook; Fred Elland, Cleburne County News; Tom Gardner, Brewton Standard; and Bob Bryan, Cullman Times and Democrat.

Labor and Industry Work Together To Save Hat Firm in Amesbury, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has a special interest in the news that the Merrimac Hat Corp., of Amesbury, Mass., will soon hum with activity. Threatened with liquidation, this 100-year-old firm faces a bright horizon as a result of a deep mutual understanding between labor and management.

For many years, it has been my pleasure to cooperate with the Merrimac Hat Corp., of Amesbury, in the consideration of its problems. During this period, I have observed a relationship between labor and management that was rare, enlightened and especially noteworthy because of a sincere spirit of cooperation and sharing of the difficulties that have faced the hat industry in recent years.

Discussions of the corporation's problems were frank and sincere and the viewpoint of the union's was strongly advanced by Mr. Frank Cynewski, the agent of the union. Yet, in the active and forceful presentation of views, there was a constant band of harmony uniting both groups.

It is a privilege, therefore, for me to congratulate the present and past presidents of the company, Mr. Hans Rie and Mr. Everett T. Brown, also Mr. Frank Cynewski, the representative of labor for their efforts which have been so much appreciated by the community.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Washington Post and which presents this interesting story in detail:

NEW YORK, January 19.—The union representing the Nation's hat workers has bought controlling interest in an ailing 100-year-old Massachusetts hat concern in a unique rescue operation that may foreshadow a radical shift in labor's traditional role.

The United Hatters, Cap & Millinery Workers (AFL–CIO) announced over the weekend it has taken over control of the Merrimac Hat Corp., Amesbury, Mass.

The move is designed to save the company from liquidation and reopen its plant which has been shut down since last November, idling 325 union members.

Alex Rose, president of the 35,000-member union, said he and 4 other union officials have been elected to the 9-man board of the company.

The union has bought the assets of Merrimac for $200,000, he said and plans to invest an additional $100,000, giving it a 60 percent stock ownership in the hat company.

The rest of the money to refinance the company will come from stock purchases by company workers, local merchants, and others in the community of 11,000. Rose said the plant would reopen February 2.

Rose emphasized that all present company officials will remain in their posts.

However, the union's action, apparently violates the AFL–CIO ethical practices code adopted 3 years ago which prohibits unions from investing money in or making loans to companies with which they have collective bargaining agreements. The ban was aimed at racketeers in the labor movement from enriching themselves through such deals.

Rose said he has written to George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, assuring him that no one in the hat union local will profit personally by the Merrimac venture.

Tribute to Management of Long Beach Veterans' Administration Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in May of this year, Dr. E. V. Edwards, manager of the Long Beach, Calif., Veterans' Administration Hospital, will retire from public service. Many letters of appreciation have been received by me from veterans who have been hospitalized under his supervision and care. His work has been outstanding during the 13 years that he has devoted his time to making the hospital a successful operation. The following letter I received from a veteran; recently a patient at the Long Beach Veterans' Hospital, is a real tribute to Dr. Edwards and his staff:

LONG BEACH, CALIF.

Mr. CRAIG HOSMER,
Representative for 18th District of California.

DEAR SIR: As a recent patient at the Long Beach Veterans' Hospital, I wish to thank you for your interest in the hospital and to assure you that interest is not misplaced.

I have had a serious illness for 5 years, and when I entered the hospital several doctors said I would have it the rest of my life. I don't know what the doctors did but my illness has gone. I used to cough so much I would disrupt the peace at the table, couldn't go to a theater, movie, or church; couldn't teach my class at Red Cross in first aid. When I got to thinking of the years ahead—of my trouble and embarrassment to others, I felt like going AWOL.

I can only say it was a semimiracle due to plenty of know-how that cured me. One other know-how—how to be pleasant and courteous—is used at the hospital. The sign "courtesy is contagious" has been well read and practiced as the hospital is one of the most efficiently run and the most pleasant places— with the most pleasant people—doctors, secretaries, nurses, orderlies, nurses aides, and cleaners. They are all imbued with the idea to make the patients feel as if they were a long-lost brother.

The so-called heaven could not be more pleasant and have more pleasant people. So the management of the Long Beach Veterans' Administration Hospital must be efficient, nice people.

Sincerely yours,

ARCHER C. BEACH.

Protecting Sources of Information Is Protection for the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Shreveport Times of January 9 entitled "Protecting Sources of Information Is Protection for the Public":

PROTECTING SOURCES OF INFORMATION IS PROTECTION FOR THE PUBLIC

Miss Marie Torre, a TV columnist for the New York Herald-Tribune, now is serving 10 days in a Federal prison for contempt of a New York Federal district court. She was not plaintiff or defendant in the case at issue. She merely had been called as a witness in a preliminary hearing to a damage suit filed against a TV network by a once world-famous movie actress who flopped on the air.

Miss Torre had written and the Herald-Tribune had published a column in which she quoted an unnamed TV network executive as giving reasons why the actress flopped on the air, among them being a supposed inferiority complex. While suing the network, the actress did not sue either Miss Torre or the Herald-Tribune for libel, slander, or anything else.

Called on at the preliminary hearing to identify the TV executive, Miss Torre naturally refused to do so. The judge sentenced her to 10 days, the U.S. circuit court of appeals upheld the sentence, and the Supreme Court refused to review the case, thus, in effect, upholding the lower courts.

In sentencing Miss Torre, the Federal judge also lectured her, even going to the extent of dragging in southern desegregation issues by saying that she should set a good example to people in certain parts of the country who were defying the Federal courts. Since contempt is a continuing offense, when Miss Torre finishes her 10 days she can be sentenced to another 10 days, and this procedure carried on for the rest of her life if the judge so wishes and she continues to refuse to divulge the source of her information. No one expects that to happen, but at times it seems that almost anything can happen in Federal courts these days, and, according to press association dispatches, the sentencing judge was quite irritated with Miss Torre.

It takes a long imagination, indeed, to picture Miss Torre as intentionally defying the Federal courts by refusing to give information which she obtained in confidence—refusing at a preliminary hearing to a damage suit between two other parties and to which neither she nor her newspaper were directly connected.

Miss Torre is not the first newspaper reporter to go to jail for refusing to reveal

sources of information. Others have done so on back through the decades, although rarely have courts imposed jail sentences in such cases and, when they did, usually it was merely a token sentence of a few hours and not a matter of 10 days.

Newspapers in this country always have asserted, as their right, the privilege of refusing to divulge sources of information. This right is not specified in the Federal Constitution, but the Constitution does specify in its first amendment that there shall be no law abridging freedom of the press. And a "right" can be ethical or moral as well as statutory and constitutional; in this case, certainly ethical and moral and having at least an inferential constitutional foundation, although the Federal district, circuit, and Supreme Courts denied the latter.

The importance of the Torre case is not merely that a newspaper reporter has been sent to jail or whether a newspaper has the right to withhold sources of information from courts or other official bodies, such as investigating committees of Congress or of State legislatures. Freedom of the press was intended by those who wrote the Constitution to protect the freedom of the people to know what is going on in or out of their governments. It is not some special privilege for publications.

Newspapers and other means of communication do not make news—they merely publish it, whether in printed form in a daily newspaper, on the air, in a book, a pamphlet, a circular, or by any other means. Freedom of the press is simply a part of the whole constitutional setup of freedom of speech and freedom of assembly and even freedom of religion.

The value to the American people of the self-asserted right of their newspapers to withhold sources of information in vital matters has been demonstrated over and over again. Many of the great scandals of city, State, and Federal Government which have come to light throughout the Nation's history—scandals of graft and corruption and stealing of public funds and public assets—were first brought before the public through investigations by newspapers and usually the revelations were possible because someone was willing to give newspaper reporters information under a pledge that identity of the giver would not be made public under any conditions.

The huge Teapot Dome oil scandals in the Harding administration came into full public revelation because the late Paul Y. Anderson, a Washington reporter for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, was able to obtain confidential information which he passed on to Senator Burt Wheeler, prosecutor for the investigating committee, but without revealing the source of this information. The inquiry had come to a dead end, but with Anderson's information, Senator Wheeler was able to phrase questions to the president of a big oil company which brought replies revealing oil corruption all over Washington. Later the oil company president himself went to prison. A Cabinet member went to prison for accepting a $50,000 bribe in connection with oil leases. Two other Cabinet members were forced to resign. Several persons committed suicide and numerous others went to prison in this and related Federal Government scandals of that time.

None of this could have happened but for the information Anderson obtained from official sources. Anderson could not have obtained the information but for realization on the part of persons giving it that he would protect their identity—protect his sources of information.

Millions of dollars in graft and corruption and stealing in an Illinois State administration in the 1920's running into tens of millions of dollars was exposed and brought to an end and public officials sent to prison because reporters for the Chicago Tribune were able to obtain private and confidential information under pledge not to reveal identity of those giving it. Only a few years ago, the State Auditor of Illinois was revealed as having stolen more than a million dollars from the public funds of the State—meaning from the people—and sent to prison as a result of investigations by a Chicago Daily News reporter who could not have gotten to first base but for confidential information obtained under pledge to protect the person giving it.

The huge scandals of graft and corruption and stealing in Pennsylvania during the days of the Vare Philadelphia machine were revealed by newspapers as a result of being able to obtain information confidentially. The terrible story of Tammany Hall in New York City and its thieving for decades came out in the same way, with the New York World (now out of existence) as the leader but with many newspapers taking part.

Here in Louisiana, the graft and corruption and stealing of State administrations in the middle and late 1930's became public when a New Orleans newspaper, acting on confidential information obtained through a pledge to protect the person giving it, printed pictures of State property being used for private construction of homes of State officials. This led to an almost endless trail of graft and corruption, bribery, kickbacks, and thievery.

The first revelations of the Dave Beck Teamsters Union graft and corruption and of the activities of Jimmy Hoffa came through publication by newspapers ranging from Pennsylvania to Oregon of data which stemmed from confidential information obtained under the pledge of protection of the person supplying it.

This could be carried on endlessly. The history of most of the great and independent newspapers of the Nation, large or small, is marked with fearless exposures of the type cited, made possible through exercise of the self-asserted right of newspapers, moral or ethical, to protect their sources of information.

Since the Supreme Court now has ruled that such protection is not constitutional, it is about time for Congress to make it so, through statutory action which Congress specifically is empowered by the Constitution to take—the enactment of laws specifying the appellate authority of the Federal courts. As things stand now, the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that a newspaper reporter must snitch on friends who supply information in confidence, but that an ex-Communist—in this particular case a nationally known playwright—need not name his fellow Communists of the days when he was a member of an organization pledged to seek overthrow of the U.S. Government, by force if necessary. In the latter case, the playwright was sentenced for contempt of Congress and the Supreme Court freed him, holding that he did not have to give such information.

Orderly Gains Noted in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two articles from the January 26, 1959, edition of the Christian Science Monitor. Writers Bertram B. Johansson and Thomas Probasco Wright bring encouraging words from the Cuban scene, words I am glad to bring to Members of the Congress:

CUBAN ORDERLY GAINS NOTED

(By Bertram B. Johansson)

WASHINGTON.—There is an increasing segment of responsible opinion here which holds that in spite of the aberrations of military trials in Cuba, the new Urrutia government is steadily consolidating its position and gradually, if slowly, bringing order out of chaos.

Certain news reports of the military executions, these sources hold, have tended to discolor and black out the new government's accomplishments.

Evidence from both United States and Latin-American sources confirms that a substantial start has been made in harvesting the sugar crop which supplies 40 percent of the white sweetener for U.S. tables.

ROADS, BRIDGES REPAIRED

The government and sugar firms are cooperating closely in repairing roads and bridges, so as to be able to transport cane from fields to the sugar grinding mills, and eventually from the mills to rail depots and ports.

In some respects, the Urrutia government has acted more circumspectly than the Batista regime in the matter of setting sugar quotas.

Under Dictator Fulgencia Batista, the Sugar Stabilization Institute, which sets the annual crop targets, had proposed a quota of 5,900,000 Spanish tons of sugar.

The Urrutia government, not wanting to handle matters in the same manner as the previous regime, set a quota of 5,800,000 Spanish tons.

AIMS TO AVERT GLUT

Several years ago, when a quota of 8 million tons was set and harvested, the glut of sugar this produced on the world market created a serious price depression in sugar.

It took several years before the effects of an overproduction of sugar were dissipated.

In the labor field a new awareness of the Communist infiltration threat has brought quick action.

Sources close to the Cuban labor movement state that Communist labor elements which attempted to make capital of the confusion attending the last months before General Batista's fall have been effectively shorn of their power.

A revolutionary labor front named FONU, or National United Labor Front, on which Communists had managed to gain several positions, has been summarily dissolved.

LABOR FRONT BUOYED

Responsible labor sources opine that a new council recently set up represents a definite defeat for the Communists who are charging betrayal and unilateral action by the 26th of July movement.

How vigorous the vigilance will be against Communist penetration into Cuba's labor unions remains to be seen, but labor sources here are cheered by first results.

The new Urrutia government is not without its many problems, as it strives to marshal up a program in the wake of the corruption of Batista dictatorship.

Financial problems are legion. The Batista administration, among other legacies, left a budget deficit of some $50 million, and a huge national debt of $1,500 million.

Not the least of the Urrutia-Castro government's problems is the fact that until now it has been a military organization.

Until it took power January 1, it had given no visible demonstration of a capability of establishing political unity. Military discipline and unity quickly established order among rival factions in the first

few days of the occupation of Havana, when it was feared wholesale slaughters such as took place with the fall of the Machado dictatorship in the 1930's might occur.

It has become apparent in recent weeks that the 26th of July movement, while effective as a military organization, still needs to learn the political skills of accommodation and compromise, and to establish a national economic program.

Latin-American statesmen, who know how deep the Castro revolution has cut into the corruption and cruelty that surrounded the Batista regime, are concerned lest it should falter now, for lack of political experience.

STATESMEN ANXIOUS

It can be stated authoritatively that these statesmen are so concerned about this that men like Gov. Muñoz Marín, of Puerto Rico; President-elect Betancourt, of Venezuela; President López Mateos, and ex-President José Figueres, of Costa Rica, are prepared to take Fidel Castro "under their arm" and teach him some of the political arts needed to preserve the reforms of the independence movement.

Currently, Major Castro is in Caracas, Venezuela, where he was invited to attend ceremonies celebrating the deposing of dictator Pérez Jiménez last January 27.

While there, Major Castro was highly critical of certain U.S. Congressmen and elements of the U.S. press which he felt had distorted the news from Cuba in recent weeks.

CUBA: OUT OF ITS CHAINS

(By Thomas Probasco Wright)

To one who has loved Cuba for many years, the news of its liberation from a brutal military dictatorship has brought a great relief and delight. But he knows that the words of Fidel Castro on entering Habana are emphatically true: "The revolution has only begun."

A glance backward at history to find how the ousted Frankenstein came into being will help to point the way to prevent such dark shadows from enveloping Cuba in the future, and aid in establishing the stable, democratic government under which that island's lovable people can realize their dream of happiness.

In all Spanish-oriented lands benevolent government is hard to find. Perhaps the reason is to be found in the Spaniard's innate view of life as pointed out by Thomas Madariaga in his definitive book "Spain" where he says that his countrymen are prone to look vertically up to God, disregarding their fellow men, while the Anglo-Saxon looks horizontally toward his fellow men, and is not so concerned with an unseen God. Outside his family group the Spaniard is not so socially minded, and this makes the self-sacrificing cooperation necessary for democratic government difficult to attain. No sooner does one strong man with his followers get to the top than another strong man with his backers is plotting to overthrow him—and incessantly unstable government is the result.

So it was with Cuba shortly before World War II, when a shaky President Machado was fighting off efforts to displace him, in a period punctuated by more than one political assassination and with the country in a turmoil. Cubans will tell you that at this point the Colossus of the North stepped in, in the person of Sumner Welles, who took up residence in the Hotel Nacional and, they say, worked with dissident elements for the removal of Machado. At any rate, the opposition mounted till Machado was sent packing to New York, and Fulgencio Batista, a professional army man, strode into power.

The writer was in Cuba during the early days of the war, when Batista had consolidated his rule and was running the country in no uncertain terms. Businessmen there said that under previous governments they had grown accustomed to 10 percent political graft, but that the "take" had increased to 50 percent. Batista grew enormously rich, and after a number of years chose to step out for a breathing spell and enjoy life at ease in Daytona Beach, Fla.

In 1952 the lure of power and its golden fruits brought him back again in a military coup that came natural to Batista with his long-time army connections. And then, in place of the former smiling and comparatively mild boss-man, a new Batista began to emerge. Hemisphere defense had become uppermost in Washington's relations with Latin American countries, and military aid poured in to buttress Batista's army backing to a point where no civil opposition could make a dent in it. It enabled him to build up a military establishment of 65,000 armed to the teeth, with bases all over the island, in addition to heavily swollen local police units at every country crossroads, all tightly organized for their own and their jefe's benefit—while the Cuban people more and more bowed their heads and paid the mounting bill of personal subjugation.

The officers' clubs were like Arabian Nights dreams; the corporals and sergeants rode in new American cars while other ordinary Cubans drove old jalopies or walked; and the foot soldiers exerted petty graft on the harassed populace. Two years ago I traveled the length and breadth of the island by bus and taxi, from Pinar del Rio in the west to the Oriente in the eastern end, from north-coast Caibarién to southcoast Cienfuegos, and everywhere the feeling was the same: it was Batista and his army against the Cuban people. Those who objected were murdered and tortured by the now-grim Batista shouting, "Communistas, Communistas," over the radio in an effort to distract attention from his own bloody rule.

While I was there, the president of the student body was shot dead, unarmed, on the University of Havana campus, and one of the most respected judges was dragged out of his home and murdered by the soldiers. And the killing and raping and torturing mounted and mounted and mounted as the freedom-loving Cubans struggled against their pampered oppressors.

Against this seemingly invincible machine, one youthful leader with 80-odd men landed from Mexico on the wild, rugged shore at the foot of the Sierra Maestra Mountains in southeast Cuba. Just a handful of small arms and limited ammunition was all they had. They were a comparatively unknown group not connected with other opposition elements, but in 2½ years under the flaming spirit of their Fidel Castro they overturned the "butcher of Havana" and rode triumphant down the heart of Cuba amid the grateful cheers and tears of the liberated population. And the first thing Fidel Castro did after his victory was to turn over the presidency of the country to a civil leader. The words in his first speech in the capital will long be remembered by the Cuban people: "We are determined to give you love."

In the face of the present challenging situation in Cuba, and remembering recent history, what can America do to help our warmhearted, gracious neighbor to the south in its struggle to attain stable, democratic government? We can view its efforts with patience and sympathy, keeping in mind the fact that, unlike ourselves who have inherited an established tradition of constitutional government from wise forebears, the Latin Americans have no such tradition and must gradually work it out in the fiery crucible of political experience.

We can resist the temptation to meddle in their internal affairs. Cubans know what is best for them, and they have a right to develop their own destinies just as we have ours. But if at times it seems impossible to refrain from interfering, let it never be on the side of dictators, which merely chains a Latin American country to the unhappy past and prevents it from going on to attain the democratic self-government we now enjoy.

It is impossible for one who has experienced the rich beauties of the Cuban landscape to end this article on a political note. Columbus is said to have described the island as "the fairest land ever beheld by mortal eye," and the modern adventurer through this "pearl of the Antilles" comes to agree with him.

But do not spend all your time in Habana. Visit the Valley of Vinales, which lies like a green sunken garden of the gods in the beautiful western mountains. Spend a few of the most restful days of your life at San Jose Del Lago in central Cuba, with its string of lakes and sprightly little Cuban horses to carry you up into luxuriant emerald hills from whose summit you can glimpse the hazy blue Caribbean far to the north. Wander through the unspoiled Spanish colonial town of Trinidad. It was from there that Cortez sailed to his conquest of Mexico.

Then head into the far eastern province of Oriente, the "wild west" of Cuba, and see sombreroed horsemen herding cattle on broad, rolling ranchos. This wide, open land has always been Cuba's Cradle of Liberty. You will see monuments all along the way to heroes of the War of Liberation from Spain. Then continue on to gloriously historic Santiago, and stand on the heights overlooking the bay where the Spanish Navy was trapped to usher in Cuba's independence. As you stand there raise your eyes to the towering, rugged Sierra Maestra range in the west where Castro launched his drive to free Cuba from an equally difficult foe.

Do all these things, my friend, and you will know what it means when you hear Cuban patriots singing their newly revived national anthem, and fairly raising the roof with a final "viva Cuba."

The 41st Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 41st anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Ukrainian National Republic. It is fitting that we join with Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, and with freedom-loving peoples everywhere, in commemorating this important date, and in expressing our deepest sympathy for the present plight of the Ukrainian people.

When the sovereignty and independence of the Ukrainian National Republic was crushed in 1920, the Ukrainian National Republic was one of the first victims of Communist expansion and aggression. Throughout the long years of enslavement, the people of Ukraine have kept alive a spirit of freedom and have preserved their strong national feelings.

Man and his sustained faith in eventual liberation are the most vital and potent weapons against communism. The human desire for freedom will survive all hardship, and will outlast the

effect of any technological or scientific weapons. We must not forget this basic truth.

The brave people of Ukraine must be encouraged to continue their undaunted determination to regain independent national status. We must again pledge ourselves to the goal that we shall build a better world in which all nations may live in peace, freedom, and justice. We will work toward this end, and trust that our determination to do this will bring added courage to the people of the Ukraine and the peoples of other Communist-dominated nations.

Davisville Boys 4–H Club News Report for Year 1957–58

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks and include extraneous material, I include the following to be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am extremely proud of the accomplishments of the members of the Davisville Boys 4–H Club and am pleased to submit the following report of the club's activities in order that others may become aware of the great work our 4–H clubs are performing.

DAVISVILLE BOYS 4–H CLUB NEWS REPORT FOR YEAR 1957–58

The Davisville Boys 4–H Club is now ending its first full year as a community 4–H club. We have had a full and interesting year and are proud of our record.

Our club placed first in the 1957 and 1958 Alabama-Florida fair held in Atmore, Ala. Our club also won first place in the 1957 and 1958 Interstate Fair held in Pensacola, Fla. Our club won first place in the district, however, because the boys are all under 14 years of age, they were not eligible to compete for first place in the State. They attended the State 4–H Camp at Lake Placid, Fla., for a week in August.

In 1957, Johnnie Godwin was a county winner in the 4–H boy of the month contest, and was also one of the top 10 corn producers in the county. This year Billy Franklin was a 4–H boy of the month, and was second in the top 10 corn producers making 102.9 bushels per acre yield. Both boys were guests at a luncheon given by the Kiwanis Club and Sears, Roebuck & Co. at the San Carlos Hotel in Pensacola.

Several of the boys won awards in the 1957 Sears corn show in Pensacola and Tallahassee. Our club members also won awards in dairy, meat, animal, and other shows—both county and State.

Four members won scholarships to Camp Timpoochee, and many others attended the camp, including the adult leader, Mr. Morris Miller.

The 1957 county achievement medal and the dairying medal were won by Billy Franklin. Johnnie Godwin captured the medal for meat animals, and Bill Pigg won second place in the county lamp-making contest.

The Davisville boys, in cooperation with the 4–H girls, entertained members of the PTA at one of the meetings.

The fifth-grade boys won first place in the county basketball tournament.

Members of our club participated in community clean-up drives, various health and safety programs, a campaign to establish a recreational center, charity drives, and rode horses in the Atmore, Ala., Christmas parade.

Members made many field trips, including a tour of the city fire department, the city hall, the potato grading sheds, the local sawmills, the pole plant, and outstanding farms and forestry sections.

In the 1958 Sears corn show, now in progress at the fair in Pensacola, the following boys won blue ribbons for their corn: Junior Albritton, Billy Franklin, Johnnie Godwin, Eddie Seales, and Ralph Darby.

Second-place ribbons were won by Jeff Montgomery, Robert Montgomery, Billy Franklin, and James Lee.

Third-place winners were George Peters and Marvin Hollingsworth.

Officers for the 1958–59 year are: David Wilson, president; Eddie Seales, vice president; Billy Franklin, secretary-treasurer; Johnnie Godwin, reporter; James Lee, delegate; Albert Paulson, alternate delegate; Mr. and Mrs. Morris B. Miller, adult leaders; Mrs. Martin Franklin and Mr. Jean Wilson, trustees; and Mr. Calvin Winters, assistant county agent.

This concludes the report for 1957–58 of the activities of the Davisville 4–H Boys Club.

No Need for Good-Will Trips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the recent visit of Anastas Mikoyan, First Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union, was reflected in varied emotions by the American people. All of us long for peace and in the minds of some, this occasion marked the advent of a new and hopeful gesture toward that end. But to those who have tired of this dangerous international game that the Soviet Union has played with mankind with its threat to civilization, the visit added further obstacles in the path of peace.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a highly interesting article by Col. Roland W. Estey, of the Salem Evening News in Salem, Mass., and with which I strongly concur:

ANGRY MR. MIKOYAN?
(By Col. Roland W. Estey)

We are not too sorry, Mr. Mikoyan, to learn that you are angry with us. Frankly, we anticipated that you would be, when it came time for you to return to your native land.

We tried to be good hosts to you on your trip to some of our more important industrial centers. While we didn't roll out our newest red carpet we did greet you with some degree of respect.

If you hadn't received our full approval of the things you felt you could jam down our throats then it is because you didn't have sufficient foresight to plan your trip properly.

You gave us too much advance notice of what you and your associate represent. We Americans are pretty well governed in our thinking and judge an individual by his previous acts and reputation.

It was your past record, Mr. Mikoyan, that probably had more to do with your failure and the defeat of your aims and objectives than any other contributing factors.

The American public is standing back of the President and the State Department in their refusal to lower the barriers to Soviet-United States trade.

There has not been much, in recent years, that would lead us to believe in the good faith of yourself and your associates. This is basically the reason you were turned down and why the American public support the President and the State Department in these particular decisions.

Strangely, you created some degree of good will in your trip across the country. You were openminded most of the time and in some of your activities you appeared almost human. We give you credit for these touches.

But, your last few hours and your announcements, particularly those relating to your stubborn insistence of maintaining Soviet policies and position, erased the favorable reactions you had gained since your arrival in this country.

Your childish attitude during the last few hours of criticizing our unwillingness to budge simply backslapped into your face for this is exactly what you were doing. You didn't suggest a single "budge" on your part or on the part of those you represent.

Your country is supposedly outstanding in the use of publicity and propaganda and its effect on the world. However, you failed miserably this time.

You apparently forgot one thing about radio, television and newspapers in this country. When a person talks in this country, particularly a VIP from another nation, there is no censoring of his remarks. The air channels are open and the printed word is made free to all who wish to read and listen.

This was your greatest error, Mr. Mikoyan. You forgot you were in the free world. This is not Moscow.

In a sense, it is unfortunate you have gone home angry. By doing so, your trip has proved a failure and Americans are more convinced than ever that our skepticism and doubts are fully justified.

Heading for a Dead End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, since a great deal of consideration is being given now to the matter of the possible increase in gasoline taxes, the attached editorial from the Butler (Ind.) Record-Herald is timely. It is important also, I think, in that it represents the thinking of a number of people with respect to this whole problem.

IN OUR OPINION—HEADING FOR A DEAD END

It is likely that Congress will be asked to increase the Federal gasoline tax from 3 to 5 cents a gallon, as a means of meeting anticipated deficits in the highway trust fund. And this probability is of very direct concern to consumers.

Motorists are already bearing an extremely heavy burden of special taxes. The State and Federal gasoline taxes combined now

average 9 cents per gallon—equivalent to 41 percent of the average retail price of the fuel. This burden is far out of line with that imposed on any comparable product in general use including luxuries.

Much of the revenue from special Federal taxes on motorists is being diverted. This revenue came to about $3.6 billion in the last fiscal year. But only $2.1 billion was allocated to the highway trust fund, while the remainder of $1.5 billion went into the general fund of the Treasury. If all the revenue expected to be collected from motorists in coming years was to be dedicated to road purposes, there would be no need for additional taxes on highway users.

Major new road construction is not the concern solely of those who use the highways. For example, one primary reason for the multi-billion dollar highway program authorized by Congress is the needs of national defense. It is grossly unfair to expect one group of citizens—motor vehicle operators—to pay the whole cost.

Finally, where the cost of the highway program was originally estimated at $27 billion, the current estimate is $40 billion. There's every possibility that it will go up by many more billions as the years wear on. Maybe it's time that Congress took a fresh and hard new look at the whole program, with a view to revising it in the light of the Nation's actual needs and capabilities. Excessive taxation can lead to a dead end road instead of a network of superhighways.

St. Agnes Congregation of Fond du Lac, Wis., Observes Its 100th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, back in 1858 the Reverend Casper Rehrl, pioneer missionary to Wisconsin, founded the Order of St. Agnes in Barton, Wis. This month the congregation observed its centennial. At this point I request permission to extend my sincere congratulations to the present Mother General M. Rosita, C.S.A., and the sisters of St. Agnes Convent, Fond du Lac, and include in my remarks for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief history of the order as it appeared in the January 20, 1959, edition of the Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter. The article follows:

ORDER'S FIRST MOTHER GENERAL JUST 16 WHEN CHOSEN IN 1858

History of the congregation of St. Agnes, currently observing its centennial, is one in which the pioneer nuns endured physical hardships and dealt with constant unforeseen difficulties and trials.

One of the highlights of the centennial observance will take place at the convent Wednesday when bishops, archbishops, clergymen, and representatives of various religious orders gather for a pontifical mass and a special banquet and program.

Order of St. Agnes was founded in Barton in 1858 by the Reverend Casper Rehrl, pioneer missionary to Wisconsin. First mother general of the congregation of Agnesian nuns was Mother M. Agnes Hazotte, who was appointed to that office by Father Rehrl when she was 16 years of age.

Mother Agnes was born in Detroit and died in Hays, Kans., at the age of 57. She had held office from 1864 to 1905, having been unanimously reelected three times.

In fact, when Mother Rosita, C.S.A., present mother general, visited Rome last summer and had audience with the late Pope Pius XII, it represented the first trip to the Vatican by an Agnesian mother general since Mother Hazotte visited Pope Leo XIII in 1884. Mother Rosita's visit and her meeting with the Pope constituted a major event of the centennial year.

At one time the little community of sisters at Barton was reduced to one blind nun before other candidates joined the order. Today there are 800 professed sisters in the order in this country and abroad.

It was on August 1, 1870, that the sisters decided to come to Fond du Lac. The mother house is on East Division Street at the original site of the convent.

The Congregation of St. Agnes is a papal institute. The three steps necessary for this distinction include a decree of praise, approval of the institute, and approval of the constitution or rules. Pope Pius IX issued the decree of praise on March 28, 1875, only 17 years after the beginning of the order.

Meanwhile, the Reverend Francis Haas, O.F.M., Cap., founder of the Capuchin order at Mount Calvary, wrote the rules according to which the sisters planned to live. The rules as well as the institute received the approbation of the then reigning pontiff, Pope Leo XIII, on July 11, 1880.

The sisters, while not a diocesan community, render complete submission to the bishops. Through the years the nuns have ministered under seven archbishops including the Most Reverend John Martin Henni, F. X. Katzer, Sebastian Messmer, Samuel Stritch, Moses E. Kilev, and Albert G. Meyer, now archbishop of Chicago.

Archbishop Meyer will be the celebrant of the pontifical mass at the convent Wednesday at 10 a.m. While here he will have opportunity to visit his sister, Sister Mary Theresa, C.S.A., registrar at Marian College.

Ormonde A. Kieb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to have this opportunity to pay tribute to a close personal friend who has recently resigned as Assistant Postmaster General, Ormonde A. Kieb.

Prior to assuming the very responsible office in the Post Office Department in February of 1953, he had been a very prominent realtor in Newark, N.J., had served as president of the New Jersey Association of Real Estate Boards, as national president of the Institute of Real Estate Management, and was one of the organizers and a charter member of the Society of Industrial Realtors. He had been active in the National Association of Real Estate Boards, having served as national director and as chairman of the public relations committee.

It was, therefore, with a fine background of business experience and real knowledge that he undertook the difficult task of the management of the Bureau of Facilities of the Post Office Department, which has jurisdiction over the real property management program of the Department, as well as the procurement and distribution of all supplies, equipment, and vehicles; the maintenance of the motor vehicle fleet, and the communications and physical properties of the Department's civil defense planning. The Bureau formulates policies and programs governing procurement, management, maintenance, and disposal of all real property, all equipment, all vehicles and supplies used in the postal service.

He rendered distinguished service and effected measures that led to the modernization of his department, reduced costs, reduced delivery schedule time, and streamlined procedures.

He received the Award of Achievement for the year 1955 in recognition of his outstanding success in introducing many methods of efficiency and economy. In 1956 the Postmaster General presented him the Distinguished Service Award of the Post Office Department in recognition of outstanding accomplishments.

As he returns to his profession of real estate it is a great pleasure for me, who has known him for many years, to testify to his high character, zeal, and his ability and, on behalf of his many friends, to wish him the greatest possible success in his future endeavors.

Consent of the Governed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, because all of us serve in this Chamber through the will of the people, I feel that we must occasionally remind ourselves of this fact if we are to serve in the best interest of those we represent. For that reason, I found a recent editorial in the Davenport (Iowa) Times-Democrat by a constituent of mine, Attorney Edmund Carroll, of Davenport, to be especially worthy of note. I ask consent that it be reprinted here so that its message can reach more public servants. The editorial follows:

THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED

Thankfully, we are living in a nation that has evolved, by heritage and through its history, a theory of government in which all authority and power of public officials is derived by delegation from the people—each governing by and with the consent of the governed.

Public officials have certain responsibilities to the people from whom they derive authority, for the people have delegated, not abdicated, authority.

Acting in his official capacity, the officer has the obligation of honesty, of competency, of efficiency, and to be forthright, entrusted with the affairs of the people to which they are entitled, favorable or unfavorable, except

such as would give aid to potential national enemies.

The citizen has the right to assume that every public official will transact his duties in such a manner. At times, this is not the case. We have seen dishonest officials, lazy and incompetent officials and the withholding from the public of information unfavorable to them.

What can we do, as members of the public, to insure that public officials will meet the required standards?

Initially we can rely upon the various news media that historically have scrutinized public offices and officers. But we can do more.

The political stability of this Nation can largely be attributed to our form of Government and the fact that it has operated through 2 major political parties. Each of these is comprised of various interested groups and each of them contests vigorously in presenting candidates and positions to the people for selection. It is this contest that enable the citizen to reach his decision.

But discussion at the barber shop, on the street corners and at lunch although interesting and perhaps stimulating is only that. To be effective and to make his views productive, the citizen must participate within the framework of the 2 political parties.

This does not mean that the writer suggests that every person can or should become a candidate for elective office. It does mean that the citizen can participate in the party of his choice for only by so doing can he share in the selection of the persons and ideas who will prevail as local, State and national leaders and national policies.

Party caucuses attended by a handful of people give disproportionate influence in the selection of delegates to county and State conventions, and from these and only these are selected delegates to national conventions which present national leaders and establish national policies.

Truly in the affairs of Government, by the consent of the governed, large oaks from very small acorns grow.

Soviet Psychopolitics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, articles III and IV of George Todt's current series on "Psychopolitics" further delineate the battle for the human mind that is being waged by the Soviet Union.

III. MURDER OF HUMAN MINDS

"You must carry forward the myth that only a European doctor is competent in the field of insanity and thus excuse among you the high incidence of foreign birth and training." Beria.—Address to American Quislings, 1936.

Yesterday, the question was posed: "What is a lobotomy?" How many people know the answer to that one? Perhaps not many.

And yet it is something the public ought to know about, dreadful and revolting as it may appear to be. Why should it be hidden from us?

Let's put the cards on the table for all to see. Possibly Joe and Mary Doakes will demand some answers for themselves. Why not?

Let me quote to you from the U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today. A bright young Congressman, GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, in whose congressional district I reside, sends it to me—and it often contains some real eye-openers. Imagine the shock, electric or otherwise, which I received when I read the following astonishing information which was given on the floor of Congress—with no reply or denial of any kind to follow it, incidentally—by Congressman Usher L. Burdick, of North Dakota, on Thursday, June 13, 1957. The extension of his remarks, entitled: "Beware of Psychiatrists" is given verbatim as follows:

"Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, one way to destroy any people is to destroy their health. The destruction of the mind is less obvious and not an open act of murder, but the millions who have had their minds destroyed by this sly Fascist and communistic scheme of controlling the people are as dead as they will ever be.

"Listen to what Dictator Georgi Malenkov said when he succeeded Stalin: 'There will be no more lobotomies while I am dictator of Russia.'

"Now, let us see what a lobotomy is. First, the patient is strapped to an operating table. The straps must be tight and very strong. Then electrodes are clamped to the temples of the person about to be lobotomized. Next, three jolts of electricity are shot through the patient's brains—enough to start violent convulsions, which give way to an anesthetic coma. Now the doctor takes his leucotomes—picklike instrument—and inserts them under the patient's eyelids. With a hammer he then drives them through the eyesockets of the skull and into the forepart of the brain. Finally, with a few deft sweeping motions back and forth, the doctor severs the prefrontal lobes of the brain from the rest of it.

"Hitler used this method on millions of his subjects and Stalin had over 10 million slaves or prisoners operated upon and turned into mere beasts of burden.

"It takes only 5 minutes to perform this operation and the subject does not know what has been done to him. He loses his animation as a living object and becomes a zombie. His productive organs wither up and he is incapable of resistance.

"This same practice is used here in the United States on persons said to be mentally ill, and it is estimated that 100,000 persons in the United States have been subjected to this operation upon the advice of some psychiatrist. This is murder, per se, although the patient may be hopelessly incurable. It is another way of putting the patients to death under the advice of skilled psychiatrists.

"In the United States today a large percentage of the psychiatrists are foreigners, most of them educated in Russia. The percentage runs as high as 80 percent.

"What does this mean? Does it mean that the Russian finesse of human destruction is introduced in America to further weaken our people so that there will be less resistance to communism? It means nothing short of that."

In view of this damning indictment by an American solon before the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C., over a year ago, it must appear curious that there has been no reply of any sort from the parties concerned or their friends? How come?

Is there really any answer besides what appears to be obvious and, if so, when will it be forthcoming to allay the fears and suspicions of an already aroused public? What's the score here?

IV. ANOTHER SAMPLE OF MIND ATROCITY

"By psychopolitics, create chaos. Leave a nation leaderless. Kill our enemies and bring to earth, through communism, the greatest peace man has ever known." Beria—To American Quislings, Lenin University, 1936.

Just as Rev. Kenneth Goff was about to say goodbye to me last week in Los Angeles, he suddenly turned and asked this question:

"Have you given your readers the contents of chapter 13 of the official Russian textbook on psychopolitics yet?"

"No, but I shall do so very soon," I promised him. "I think they are about ready to receive this hidden knowledge by this time; but I doubt that they will like it."

So here is chapter 13 of the Bolshevik travesty upon human decency called "The Recruiting of Psychological Dupes":

"The psychological dupe is a well-trained individual who serves in complete obedience the psychopolitician.

"In that nearly all persons in training are expected to undergo a certain amount of treatment in any field of the mind, it is not too difficult to persuade persons in the field of mental healing to subject themselves to mild or minor drugs or shock. If this can be done, a psychological dupe on the basis of pain-drug hypnosis can immediately result.

"Recruitment into the ranks of mental healing can best be done by carefully bringing to it only those healing students who are, to some slight degree, already depraved, or who have been treated by psychopolitical operatives. Recruitment is effected by making the field of mental healing very attractive, financially and sexually.

"The amount of promiscuity which can be induced in mental patients can work definitely to the advantage of the psychopolitical recruiting agent. The dupe can thus be induced into many lurid sexual contacts, and these, properly witnessed, can thereafter be used as blackmail material to assist any failure of pain-drug hypnosis in causing him to execute orders.

"The promise of unlimited sexual opportunities, the promise of complete dominion over the bodies and minds of helpless patients, the promise of complete lawlessness without detection, can thus attract to 'mental healing' many desirable recruits who will willingly fall in line with psychopolitical activities.

"In that the psychopolitician has under his control the insane of the Nation, most of them have criminal tendencies, and as he can, as his movement goes forward, recruit for his ranks, the criminals themselves, he has unlimited numbers of human beings to employ on whatever project he may see fit. In that the insane will execute destructive projects without question, if given the proper amount of punishment and implantation, the degradation of the country's youth, the defamation of its leaders, the suborning of its courts becomes childishly easy.

"The psychopolitician has the advantage of naming as a delusory symptom any attempt on the part of the patient to expose commands.

"The psychopolitician should carefully adhere to institutions and should eschew private practice wherever possible, since this gives him the greatest number of human beings to control to the use of communism.

"When he does act in private practice, it should be only in contact with the families of the wealthy and the officials of the country."

On such a note ends chapter 13 of the official Russian textbook on Psychopolitics. Reprints of this loathsome Red bilge may be obtained by my readers through writing to Rev. Goff in Englewood, Colo. Cost is $1 in check or money order from. It may cause us to retch before we have finished with its contents, but it is something every alert and vigilant American citizen ought to see for himself or herself.

Called Brain-Washing: A Synthesis of the Russian Text Book on Psychopolitics, this little eye-opener ought to be the subject of a study group by every patriotic society in the United States today. Why not?

Pepe Figueres on the Cuban Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Jose (Pepe) Figueres, ex-President of Costa Rica, and one of the foremost Democrats in the hemisphere, comments on the Cuban trials in a letter which was published January 18 in the San Jose, Costa Rica, newspaper La Republica. It contains a point of view which is highly persuasive and which should be given more consideration in this country:

(Translated from the Spanish)

Sr. EDMOND WOODBRIDGE, *San Jose.*

ESTEEMED FRIEND: Thank you for your expressive telegram of January 16, which says:

"You are the most qualified to interpret the humanitarian sentiments of the Costa Rican people by suggesting the cessation of the summary executions in Cuba. In this manner, as Cuba yesterday thanked you for your support in the revolution, tomorrow it will thank you even more for having tried to prevent violence from sullying the magnificient democratic triumph. All of the combatants who made the War of Liberations of 1948 with you are today harvesting the fruits of the clemency and justice which you stipulated for the losers. This memory is your best credential to take before Fidel Castro the matter which I respectfully suggest to you."

With such noble concepts, friend Edmond, you put me in a difficult situation with myself. How agreeable it would be for me to agree with your thesis! And how painful it is for me to disagree!

It is curious how the same event (the summary executions in Cuba) and a same desire (that of guaranteeing democracy in America) can stir up diametrically opposed reactions in different persons.

I am going to make public a letter I sent to Fidel Castro recently, before learning of the requests in various congresses of America asking suspension of the executions, and before knowing that the Legislative Assembly of Costa Rica, on the other hand, had turned down, by great majority, a motion aimed at sending the same request for clemency to Fidel Castro.

I have learned that the North American association, ADA, has addressed you asking clemency for the Cuban war criminals.

The ADA is a very estimable liberal group. Many of its members are friends of mind. They are the ideological allies of the Latin American democrats. And the petition which they make to you could not be better intentioned, nor more authorized.

This petition, in my judgment, complicates even more the rough matter of sanctions, in which it is so difficult to decide with certainty. It has its pros and its cons, of short and of long term.

I consider it a duty of other Americans to share with you this prodigious responsibility, at the risk of also committing an error. For this reason I dare to offer you this unsolicited opinion, in a matter that seems to be Cuban, but is American.

In my country capital punishment does not exist, nor has the necessity for it been felt in this century, fortunately. But each society and each historical moment has its own necessities of survival, which are wont to be the least of various bad possibilities. In Cuba's present circumstances, which I know well, severity can be a lesser evil and impunity.

Disgracefully in our America today, to be a democrat you have to risk life. This will not end until it is universally understood that you have to risk your life to be a hired assassin.

Yours respectfully,

JOSE FIGUERES.

Permit me to repeat the idea contained in the last paragraph of this letter to Fidel Castro, because it expresses my conviction, very sad, very lamentable, but one which I should not hide: so long as in several countries of our America it is necessary to risk one's life to fight for freedom, and so long as there is not the unquestionable certainty that to be an instrument of tyranny also means that you have to risk everything, there will be no end to the temptation on the part of bigtime adventurers to seize power and on the part of irresponsible citizens to back the seizure and to benefit from it by torturing their fellow countrymen.

There is an American minority, composed of politicians and military men and their henchmen who see in the governments of the countries a field in which to satisfy their appetites. Those people are always ready to take over a government by any means, and to hold it by blood and fire. They help each other, in a real alliance, and declare war against the democratic forces.

It is necessary that their soldiers know that they do not go to war simply to kill, but also to die. If it is not so, they will continue to hold all the advantages of aggressiveness and the lack of principles, and the good people all the inhibitions of decency and morality.

It is demonstrated that it is almost impossible, when a dictator is overthrown, "to catch the fat fish." Those always find the way to escape with their millions. Those who remain behind pay their debts. This injustice, superimposed on all the others, should serve as a warning: He who lets himself serve as a paid assassin of a tyrant should know that it is own life which is in danger, and not that of his master. The day when there are no instruments there will be no tyrants.

Society should protect itself by methods adequate to the circumstances. If the circumstances are extraordinary, the social defenses should also be extraordinary. No one who knows the barbaric extremes to which the recent torturers in Cuba, Venezuela, and other republics, arrived will be able to deny with his conscience that the corrective methods should be extreme, keeping relationship with the magnitude of the crimes and the propensity to commit them.

For the well-being of society, the law of vengeance cannot be recommended: eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth. The torturers should not be disrespected or tortured. But capital punishment, summary execution, turns out, in these extreme cases, by a cruel paradox, to be a civilized way to repress delinquency.

It is almost inconceivable the level of cruelty which the political delinquency in the 20th century has reached. Civilization needs to resort to the most painful methods to detain the tide. This spectacle of our times led a penalist of the stature of Jimenez de Asua to declare, a short time after World War II, that he would prefer the revolutionary justice in whose name the Italian people simply hung by the feet Mussolini and his lover, to the type of cold, slow, judicial process which was adopted in the Nuremburg trials.

Those who today favor that the Cuban war criminals be tried in common courts are not in touch with the present circumstances. There is no doubt, in every city and in every town, who were the principal murderers. Poor Cuba. It would be a tragic comedy to present proofs. The proofs are not even in the cemeteries. The corpses are in the wells, in the sewers, in the basements. And, just as happened in Venezuela, those who did not reach the relief of death from the tortures will be in insane asylums for the rest of their lives.

If the provisional Government does not rapidly execute the most notorious criminals, public passion, indignant at the impunity or the delay, will overflow, and then the number of deaths will be many, many thousands.

If there is not an exemplary punishment which leaves an impression in the memory of the country, the assassins will soon be organizing invasions, with the millions of dollars removed by the tyranny, in order to impose it again.

The Cuban people have suffered great disillusionments. I hope that today's revolution will not disillusion them again. For the time being, the severity of the punishment seems to me a salutary measure, however distressing. I believe it my duty to back it, in spite of the fact that I consider capital punishment repugnant, inadmissible, in other circumstances.

Inflation Is Everybody's Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the prevalent and persistent problem of inflation for which the Government and business are trying to find a satisfactory solution is everybody's business.

The average citizen can help stem the tide of inflation just as effectively as big business or big government if he realizes that every new service he asks the Government to perform comes from his tax dollar.

The following statement by Jesse W. Tapp, a prominent banker in Los Angeles, Calif., reveals the responsibility of the average citizen in curbing the inflation spiral about which we are all concerned.

INFLATION CONTROL NEEDS RESTRAINT ON GOVERNMENT DEBT

(By Jesse W. Tapp)

The Federal Government is faced with a deficit which may reach $12 billion by the

end of the current fiscal year. This prospect has greatly complicated the financing problems of the Treasury and has raised many questions about public debt management and the possibility of renewed inflationary pressures.

One question accompanying the numerous thorny problems of Government debts, however, should give us particular concern. It is a question which is not very amenable to productive study by economists, technical commissions, and national authorities.

UP TO THE PEOPLE

It is a question which can be solved only by the people themselves, by studies which each individual citizen makes within his own mind. It is a matter of private preference and, one might even say, of private morality—these are qualities which cannot be legislated; rather, they determine legislation.

I am referring to the following question: Has the public faced up to the consequences of demanding from their Government so many services for which they are unwilling to pay by current taxes?

Now I am not suggesting that the Government should never go into debt. For instance, local communities appropriately will continue to issue school bonds for the construction of classrooms to be used by the children of citizens not yet on the tax rolls.

Nevertheless, I wonder whether we, as a people, have become so accustomed to red-ink finance by governments as to forget that bills must be paid.

IT'S EASY TO BE LAX

Have we become too lax in our scrutiny of governmental expenditures on the local, State, and national levels—under the illusion that the funds for the less urgent activities are coming from somebody else's pocket, either by inflation or by taxation in some remote future?

Have we even urged our representatives to support projects that we would be unwilling to pay for if the terms were cash on the barrelhead?

One aspect of governmental debts, therefore, is the possibility that it weakens our resistance to governmental services that are pleasant but not feasible at the moment without adding to tax burdens or inflationary pressures.

Only a citizenry awakened to this problem can limit governmental functions to those for which they are willing to pay without inviting increases in governmental debts at a rate which will promote inflation.

Call in the Cookie-Pushers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting article appeared in the New Republic magazine of January 26, 1959. Written by Gerald W. Johnson, the article points out that the American public is kept as uninformed as this administration can possibly keep it. However, Mr. John Q. Citizen should not feel too bad about being kept in the dark. Members of Congress fare little better.

Mr. Johnson's article follows:

THE SUPERFICIAL ASPECT—CALL IN THE COOKIE-PUSHERS

The American with no inside information who must judge by the superficial aspect of things now has to choose one of two theories, both unpalatble. He must believe either (a) that the administration really had no inkling that lunik was going up and that Batista was coming down, or (b) that, possessing the information, it deemed it unimportant to give the American public the slightest warning of these impending events.

Since there is evidence to support either belief, it is admissible to confess a preference, and I prefer (a). If the Government really didn't know what was happening, that is evidence merely of an incompetent spy system. But if it considered it inadvisable to inform the people of highly significant events simply because the information might be somewhat alarming, that is evidence of incompent government; and it is obviously easier to reform the spy system than to reform the Government from top to bottom.

The principal evidence supporting the more dismal theory (b) is, in fact, merely the prevalence of the Madison Avenue mentality in Government circles. That mentality holds as an article of faith that what the customer does not know will not hurt the advertiser. This principle seems to be the only logical basis for Mr. Dulles' persistent refusal to permit American newspaper men to find out at their own risk what Red China is actually like and is actually doing.

On the other hand, the swift resignation of the American Ambassador to Cuba supports the other theory. It is clear enough that Washington is not filled with love and admiration of Mr. Smith; and it is easy to understand why if he let Washington get caught in an embarrassing position when the Batista Government fell. The event occurred between two editions of the Baltimore Sun. The morning paper carried dispatches from Habana asserting that the revolt was practically crushed; the Evening Sun, of the same day, announced Batista's flight. Editorially, the paper has remained grimly silent on the subject, but it can hardly be pleased at having been made to look foolish. No more can the Associated Press and other news services, when the merest hint from the State Department would have enabled them to cover themselves with a paragraph explaining that the earlier dispatches were only what the Batista Government said.

The prompt disappearance of the Ambassador suggests that remedial steps are being taken, but it is not proof that they are sufficient. If the gentleman is, as various commentators have been cruel enough to suggest, merely a fat cat who owed his appointment to heavy campaign contributions, still that doesn't account for the Embassy staff, the lads that used to me derisively called the cookie-pushers. In the old days, if a revolution had been boiling under his feet, even a second-rate cookie-pusher would have discovered it and would have tipped off Washington long before the bullets began to smash the Embassy windows.

One is bound to suspect that here is a delayed reaction to the disastrous pilgrimage of Cohn and Schine, those fantastic stooges of Senator McCarthy, who trailed through Europe half a dozen years ago, shattering the morale of the Foreign Service. It was discovered then that any cookie-pusher who reported to Washington an opinion, however well founded, that displeased a Senator was liable to be kicked out of his job and blasted as a Communist sympathizer; so, not being imbeciles, they quit reporting such opinions. But important news quite commonly comes in fist as a rumor without confirmation, and if the State Department isn't informed of those rumors it may be caught flat footed.

In any event, whatever the reason, it is evident that the American public is not being given early and accurate information of what is going on beyond the boundaries of the country. As regards the Russian satellite program there is some excuse, for gathering accurate information about that is extremely difficult. But when we are completely misled about the course of a civil war raging in an island 90 miles from Key West, our system of information is definitely breaking down badly.

Perhaps it is impossible for a man who served his time in newspaper work in the editorial, not the advertising, end to form a just appreciation of the Madison Avenue mentality; but I am persuaded that one of the chief failures of this administration is due to its inability to grasp the enormous difference between selling soap and gathering early and accurate information. Both, to be sure, are phases of public relations, but their methods are widely dissimilar. Roosevelt and Truman understood this, and F.D.R. was the great master of the art of making a hostile press serve his own ends. The cookie-pushers may have their comic aspect, but as a class they are intelligent and to a man they know that in ordinary affairs half a dozen first-rate American newspaper correspondents can get them more information than a platoon of hired spies and can get it sooner.

Is It Humiliating To Proclaim Loyalty?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave obtained, I wish to place in the RECORD a timely editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on January 26, 1959.

The editorial follows:

IS IT HUMILIATING TO PROCLAIM LOYALTY?

The American Association of University Professors is urging the repeal of the provision that recipients of Federal scholarships and student loans should be required to sign an oath pledging allegiance to the Government and Constitution of the United States and an affidavit declaring he did not believe in or support any subversive organization. The association says this provision is humiliating.

The presidents of Yale, Harvard, and Princeton Universities have protested this provision in the National Defense Education Act. Recently the Oberlin College student council took similar action.

President A. Whitney Griswold, of Yale, wrote to Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, that oaths and affidavits of this sort are at best odious, at worst a potential threat to our profession and that they are especially distasteful when they are required of young people who are just entering upon the most important phase of their educational experience.

If this reasoning is correct, we suppose then that the pledge of allegiance to the flag should be abolished. Even kindergarten children are taught to repeat it, and who can say what odious effect it will have upon them in later life? Likewise, the oaths required of public officials, from President on down, to uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States should be relegated to the ash heap. A man elected to the presidency who had spent his lifetime in public service might find it humiliating to swear on the Bible that he did not intend to violate the Constitution or disregard the laws.

What is so special about students, especially those who apply for a handout from

the Federal Government, that they should be exempted from taking an oath of loyalty to the Government that is about to provide them with the handout? If some students find such an oath distasteful, or if they fear they might incur the penalties for perjury by taking it, let them refrain from applying for Federal loans and scholarships, the money for which, after all, is being provided by the taxpayers, and that includes all of us.

Pills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter to me from Elizabeth Hall, president of the Iowa Directors of County Relief, together with an editorial from the Malvern Leader, Malvern Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, Congress best see to it that we go not one step farther toward socialized medicine. England, tried it, and failed miserably. The people soon learned that the government official in charge of socialized medicine considered them, and treated them, as we would treat, and think, of a sick pig—by number only.

The letter and editorial follow:

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: I note in the evening paper that the President has at last realized the fallacy of the Federal Government taking over local welfare programs.

It would have saved a lot of grief to Iowa, if this had been thought of before the last social security bill was passed, sending the State department of social welfare $6 million to be used were it is needed most. Rather than use the money to improve existing programs, this great State bureaucracy used the money to start a new State medical program, taking over a program that was already adequately provided by the counties.

(Please read enclosed excerpt from the Malvern Leader.) The old folks are really having a ball running to the doctor and buying pills. The local medical societies are furious.

Since 1951, the old-age assistance cases have decreased by 12,384 cases. Eventually all old-age assistance and most of the aid to dependent children cases will be taken over by social security. The counties could then pick up the few remaining cases and there would be no need for an expensive State agency. Yet this State agency is continually being built up with Federal subsidies, requiring matching State and county funds that, in the end, cost more than entire programs operated on a local level.

When the President appoints this advisory committee, if you were to send me their address, do you think they would be interested in information from as far down in the grassroots as Sidney, Iowa?

My best personal wishes to you.

Mrs. ELIZABETH HALL,
President, Iowa Directors of County Relief, affiliated with, Iowa County Officers' Association.

[From the Malvern (Iowa) Leader, Jan. 8, 1959]

BIG RUSH TO THE DRUG COUNTERS IN MILLS COUNTY PUTS HEAVY DRAIN ON PILL SUPPLIES

The new look in social welfare arrived in Mills County along with 1959—causing much concern as county officials and citizens associated with the new procedure.

In brief the State of Iowa has taken over and, as one member of the board of supervisors remarked: "It just sums up that the county welfare board doesn't have much to say about it."

Recently the State department of social welfare sent a notice with their checks to old-age pensioners. This read in effect that henceforth al bills would be taken care of by the State.

An immediate effect was a rush for medicines. Druggists in Mills County have been pushed almost to the limit in dispensing medications. Some have been so swamped that they were running out of certain kinds of pills.

But the fact that old folks are now taking more pills than they used to has aroused dander in many quarters.

It has brought charges from the county relief directors' group that many who now are not totally disabled and need only occasional help would under the State program with alleged lax eligibility requirements quickly become totally disabled and then would receive a monthly cash grant from which any income from work would be deducted. Since there is no supervision over spending of this money, the directors charge that incentive for rehabilitation is taken away.

"The county will be required to pay a share of this cost which will amount to more than they are now paying to take care of the entire program," they added.

It was pointed out that $6 million was given to Iowa under the new Social Security Act to be used where needed most. It was used, the directors continued, to start a new State medical program taking over cases that were being cared for adequately by the counties or relatives, and the counties will lose all control of them.

"It is a well-known fact that within the next few years the social security program of the Federal Government will absorb all of the old age assistance and most of the aid to dependent children cases.

"The county relief program is administered more efficiently and more economically on a local level, under the supervision of the board of supervisors."

Alabama Press Association Condemns Betrayal by Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, when the Washington Post and Times Herald refused to accept as a paid advertisement the Carleton Putnam letter to President Eisenhower, a wave of protest swept through the American reading public. For Americans, like no other citizens anywhere else in the world, demand and defend most vigorously their right to know all sides of a story and to decide for themselves how they will react.

Dean Walter Williams, of the Missouri School of Journalism last year wrote a "Journalists' Creed," and part of this creed stated:

I believe that the public journal is a public trust; that all connected with it are, to the full measure of their responsibility, trustees for the public; that acceptance of a lesser service than the public service is betrayal of this trust.

Certainly the Washington Post did not act in the public service when it decided to suppress an advertisement whose contents disagreed with the editorial policies of the newspaper. Of course, every newspaper has the right and the duty to take definitive positions in its editorial columns, but when a newspaper's obsessions bring it to spill these positions over into the advertising and news columns it cannot help but arouse the public's mistrust.

That this is an affront to the entire fourth estate is realized by the Alabama Press Association, which at its meeting in Birmingham last week adopted a resolution condemning the Washington Post and Times Herald for its untenable betrayal. The resolution was drawn up by Col. Harry M. Ayers, publisher of the Anniston (Ala.) Star, who also wrote an editorial on this subject in the Star of January 26, 1959.

There follows an Associated Press story on the Alabama Press Association resolution and the editorial to which I have just referred:

STATE PRESS GROUP HITS LETTER MOVE—CAPITAL PAPER IS CONDEMNED

BIRMINGHAM.—The Alabama Press Association Saturday condemned the Washington Post and Times Herald for refusing to carry the Putnam letter as a paid advertisement.

A private Alabama group is publishing the letter in northern and western newspapers as an expression of southern views on racial segregation.

A resolution adopted by the association at its annual convention said the APA "does deplore and condemn the betrayal of the press and of the right of the people to know all sides of a public issue."

COMMENT IS DECLINED

The Post and Times Herald declined comment in Washington on the association's resolution.

Carleton Putnam, a retired executive of Washington, wrote the letter to President Eisenhower in criticism of U.S. Supreme Court decisions requiring racial integration of public facilities. He was particularly critical of the ruling that racial segregation in public schools is unconstitutional.

A committee of prominent Alabamians launched a fund-raising campaign aimed at getting the letter published as a paid advertisement in northern and western newspapers.

TO APPEAR MONDAY

To date it has been printed in the New York Times and the committee says it will appear in the Washington Star Monday.

[From the Anniston Star, Jan. 26, 1959]

OUR RIGHT TO KNOW

It is pleasing to note that the Alabama Press Association, in session at Birmingham

last week, sought to rebuke the Washington Post and Times Herald management for its refusal to publish even as a paid advertisement the well-known Putnam letter, which sets forth in clear and measured language some great social truths.

The letter in question was originally addressed to President Eisenhower, but Ike never answers any personal letter that is not pleasing to his vanity. His latest offense in that direction was his snub of Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery, who had questioned Ike's generalship in the Monty book.

It could easily be understood, therefore, why the Putnam letter, which was written by a noted author and business executive, failed to get the attention that it deserved at the White House.

But it was a different question entirely so far as the Washington morning daily was concerned.

For the executive editor of that paper had served as chairman of the committee on free speech under appointment by the president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors and had fought valiantly to break up the growing evil of secrecy and censorship in the conduct of the people's public business.

In his fight with Charles I, one of the most tyrannical of the Stuart kings of England, old John Milton, in 1644, addressed a letter to the Parliament under the title, Areopagitica, in which he said: "Give me the liberty to know, to utter and to argue freely, according to conscience, above all other liberties."

King Charles lost his head largely because he denied that freedom, and any other government or agency that tries to hide the truth from the people will not long survive.

In fine, the Washington Post has done irreparable damage to the right of the people to know all the facts about a historic debate and has played into the hands of the censors throughout the country. This fact was ably set forth by Representative GEORGE HUDDLESTON, of Birmingham, in a speech on the floor of Congress a few days ago.

The organized press and other agencies of free expression, or the right of the people to know, were making great progress, even in Congress, before the noted Washington daily betrayed its fundamental creed. But now we shall have to apologize for Post's default in every fight for freedom we undertake.

Economic Grounds Said Key Factor in U.S. Welfare—Banker Urges Diligence, Honesty in Club's Toast to President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following text of an article which appeared in the Saginaw News of January 2 and which contains the text of a speech presented by Mr. R. Perry Shorts, one of Saginaw, Michigan's most respected citizens. Mr. Shorts' excellent address was given on the occasion of the Saginaw Club's 47th annual toast to the President of the United States.

ECONOMIC GROUNDS SAID KEY FACTOR IN U.S. WELFARE—BANKER URGES DILIGENCE, HONESTY IN CLUB'S TOAST TO PRESIDENT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Members of the Saginaw Club and their sons yesterday heard the counsel of one of Michigan's wisest business patriarchs when he gave the Saginaw Club's 47th annual toast to the President of the United States.)

It was given by R. Perry Shorts, chairman of the board of Second National Bank and one of the club's oldest and most respected members.

The New Year's Day toast ceremony at The Saginaw Club is one of Michigan's finest Yuletide holiday traditions. Mr. Shorts gave the toast once before, on January 1, 1921.

In his message, Mr. Shorts urged his attentive audience to consider the inherent greatness of the United States, oppose forces which would tarnish and dissipate the great heritage of American freedom and private enterprise.

He bade the young men, especially, to be diligent in their work and honest and thrifty in their habits.

He called out against improvident Government spending and warned against the menace of pressure groups dominating our standards of living.

Mr. Shorts labeled inflation as one of the foremost foes of the U.S. economy.

He praised President Eisenhower for his "untiring efforts even beyond his physical strength, to the promotion of peace on earth, the preservation of free enterprise for our people and efficiency, solvency and morality for our Government."

The Saginaw Club's invitation to give this year's toast was extended to Mr. Shorts several months ago. Some time after he had accepted it, he learned about plans, then underway, for the civic luncheon which was given in honor of his 79th birthday last Tuesday. He felt embarrassed about all the publicity the two events would bring to him in so short a space of time. But he could not stop the plans for his birthday party and was told it was too late to change plans for the New Year's toast.

The text of Mr. Shorts' address:

Having been a resident of this great country for 75 years, protected by its laws, educated by its schools, inspired by its institutions, and prospered by its industries—I eagerly grasp the opportunity this occasion affords to publicly thank God for the United States of America and to pay deserving tribute to its leadership. And it seems to me most fitting that on this patriotic occasion, we fathers should inform our sons on some of our national problems and urge them to take active part in their constructive solution.

AMERICA—A LAND OF OPPORTUNITY

Surely, we are living in the grandest Nation in the world. To our sons present and to every young man I would say—you don't have to be exceptionally brilliant to make a good living here. Our country is a land of opportunity where every man has a chance to rise and win his share of its manifold blessings to mankind. All you have to do is to use your God-given brains and follow the simple formula of thrift, hard work and old-fashioned honesty.

If you can't save money, boys, you haven't a chance of much success. Every fortune you see is proof positive that somebody worked and saved. What you earn is not so important—it's what you save that counts. Also, hard work is essential. Every outstanding man in every trade and profession is a hard worker—make no mistake about that. And you must be honest, in order to maintain a good reputation. Nobody will trust you far or long—unless you are honest.

FREE ENTERPRISE VERSUS SOCIALISM

And the grand thing about it all is that the great majority of our people have always been thrifty, hard working and honest—and their combined thrift and labor and integrity throughout the years, coupled with free enterprise, have built up the strongest Nation in the world. Critics may attack our free enterprise system, but no one can successfully attack the standards of living it provides—broadest ownership, highest wages, and greatest abundance of the good things of life. Back in ancient times, Horace, the wise old philosopher, said, "If a better system is thine, impart it; if not, make use of mine." This is America's challenge to the world today.

And don't let any politician tell you that our low income groups can't share in our prosperity. The top men in scores of our large corporations today were once poor boys who saved their money, bought their companies' stock and then worked like beavers to climb to the top. Any man who has saved $100 can now buy shares in almost any business corporation in America. Right now, we have an economic system that beats statism and socialism and communism a mile; where our workers themselves can even buy control of their own corporations—and do it without any bloody revolution. All they have to do is to save their money and invest it wisely. They will then be running their own lives—and not slaving for a dictator or a group of bureaucrats.

Every young man should quickly learn that the only allurement that socialism has to offer is a promise of greater abundance in exchange for freedom—but history shows that abundance and freedom for the people never go together. There just isn't enough abundance to go around. He should also soon discover that the Government hasn't any money to hand out to people, except what it collects in taxes from the people themselves, unless, of course, it manufactures it against Government debt, or simply prints it—and that kind of money spells trouble.

The true welfare of our people rests on economic grounds. When business prospers, we have prosperity—more wealth, more factories, more goods, more jobs—and every law that hurts business hurts everybody. There is more danger in big Government than in big business. It is free enterprise that promotes our industries, furnishes our jobs, and passes prosperity around. And so surely, it is our patriotic duty to preserve free enterprise in our Nation and not permit Socialistic philosophies to weaken its structure or divert its ideals.

PRESSURE GROUPS

After the Revolutionary War when the American colonies had finally won their independence, Benjamin Franklin said, "You have won your freedom—now keep it." And in 1857 (over 100 years ago), Macauley, the great English scholar, expressed the opinion that while our democratic form of Government was ideal in theory, "Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor." He then predicted that pressure groups would gradually pressure our Government to give up its seed corn for their special benefit and thereby bleed and weaken its structure and constitute a dangerous threat to its survival.

These predicted pressure groups are now growing by leaps and bounds. There are veterans' groups, farm groups, labor groups, pension groups, education groups, foreign-aid groups, and a host of others—and they are constantly demanding from the Government more and more costly benefits. They practice the slogan of the old horse-and-buggy days—"The wheel that squeaks the loudest gets the grease"—and few lawmakers have the courage to refuse to spend taxpayers' money when large groups of votes are at stake. In the last 5 years, Government spending on agriculture alone has more than doubled and now amounts to over $1,000 for every farm in the country.

And then there are cooperatives and mutual associations (hundreds of them of every nature and description) transacting billions of dollars of business per year and being allowed hundreds of millions of dollars of unfair tax advantages over our full taxpaying businessmen, against whom they compete. They are not concerned with the Govern-

ment's loss of revenue—but only with retaining their freedom from taxes. The pressure groups increase our outgo, and the co-ops decrease our income—and the ones who suffer are the full taxpaying citizens. Millions of members belong to these pressure groups and co-ops and they are working day and night to increase their representation in our legislative halls, both State and national. Isn't it about time we put an anchor in our laws to prevent discrimination and restrain the power of organized minorities?

Furthermore, these spenders on the one hand and tax-advantage-seeking co-ops on the other, are not Jeffersonian Democrats (for Jefferson advocated Government economy and pronounced "public debt as the greatest of dangers"), and they are not Lincoln Republicans (for Lincoln stood for equal rights for all)—and yet they are demoralizing both parties and threatening the stability of our Government. If democracy means anything surely it means tax equality and equal privileges for all. I have no fear of our ability to meet and defeat any foreign foe—it is group attacks from within that worry me.

SOUND MONEY

And in the financial field, I believe our greatest problem of the day is the defense of the dollar. Even the Communists work on the theory that the quickest way to ruin a country is to destroy its currency. Never before has our U.S. dollar been worth so little as it is today—and never before has our debt been so large (and socialistic ideas usually grow as a nation's debt grows). Monkey with the nation's currency and you jeopardize all values. Our Government started this inflation when it took us off the gold standard in 1933, and began its "pump priming" and spending sprees—and it can never stop it until it restores sound money again and quits spending more than it takes in. Only the Government can start widespread inflation—and only the Government can stop it.

Inflation is the politicians' cocktail to keep the people happy while it ruins them—and yet these spenders know that every time they vote another pension, another bonus, or another price support (without providing means to pay for it) your hard-earned dollar goes lower and lower. If our money today were depreciated since prior to World War I as much as France's money now is, $100 would buy about 2 pounds of hamburger. But, of course, the politicians don't like sound money because it restrains their spending. The tragic thing about it all is that this basic immorality which makes our Government's promises worth less and less is rarely ever considered by many of our politicians today. My earnest hope is that someday before it is too late our Government will declare and enforce as a national policy free and fair competition resting upon sound and stable money, and thus permit our country to sail proudly on to ever-enlarging strength and freedom and progress.

Here, then, are some of our national problems which you young men are facing. Study them carefully, protest against the wrong and fight for the right, always keeping in mind that famous warning: "To sin by silence when we should protest makes cowards out of men. The human race has climbed by protest." And also remember the words of Edmund Burke: "All that is necessary for the forces of evil to win in the world is for enough good men to do nothing."

NATION'S LEADERSHIP

And now let us consider the leadership under which our great Nation has developed. Thirty-three men have occupied the Presidency of the United States—and only three are still alive. Today we are toasting our present leader.

It is one of the tragedies of American history that the greatness of our greatest men has not been fully recognized until after death had closed their careers. So it was with Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln—and so it will be with President Eisenhower. It seems that greatness cannot be discerned except from a distance. In its presence our eyes are dimmed. You cannot see a mountain if you stand too close.

As in business, a man's net worth is measured by the surplus of his assets over his liabilities, so in history, a great man's net worth must be measured by the excess of his acccomplishments over his failures. War heroes are made by war, peace heroes by peace and world statesmen by world issues. Carlisle has said "Great men always come when they are needed." To my mind, President Eisenhower has been a great war hero, a great peace hero, and a great statesman in the cause of world peace—and I believe that a few years hence, when political prejudices have been forever washed away by the purifying waves of time, history will record him as one of the outstanding great men of our day—and one who came when he was needed.

His whole life has been one of unselfish service—first to his country, and then to the free world at large. In the early forties, when the chief business of the world was war, and the vast battles had thus far gone overwhelmingly in favor of the Axis Powers; when the Allies decided as a last resort to pool their European forces and launch one colossal attack against the enemy—it was Dwight D. Eisenhower whom they selected as the supreme commander of their combined armies and navies and air forces. The voluntary concentration of such stupendous faith and power into the hands of one man had never before been known. This battle was, no doubt, the greatest physical conflict in the history of mankind for on its outcome rested the continued life of 47 Allied nations throughout the world and the freedom of hundreds of millions of people (including you and me)—and the result was unconditional surrender of the enemy.

After World War II was over, Dwight Eisenhower came home. In 1952, he was elected President of the United States, and from that time on has devoted his untiring efforts even beyond his physical strength, to the promotion of peace on earth, and the preservation of free enterprise for our people, and efficiency, solvency, and morality for our Government.

And now, Mr. Chairman, just one more thought and I am through. At this crucial time, when our whole system of government is being challenged by a foreign power, let us not adjourn a large meeting like this without rededicating our lives to our country and its ideals of freedom—the noblest cause we know. Though our vision may now be obscured by the turmoil of the times and our spirits sorely tried by the apparent strength of evil, yet we have faith that the dawn is surely breaking on the day when the free nations of the world will stand together to establish and maintain enduring freedom for mankind.

"Ye who have faith to look with fearless eyes
Beyond the tragedy of a world at strife,
And know that out of death and night shall rise
The dawn of ampler life;
Rejoice, whatever anguish rend your heart,
That God has given to you the priceless dower
To live in these great times, and bear your part
In freedom's crowning hour;
That ye may tell your sons who see the light
High in the heavens, their heritage to take—
'I saw the powers of darkness put to flight;
I saw the morning break.'"

Gentlemen, I give you the President of the United States.

Speech of Hon. Arthur Winstead at the Mississippi Products Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit herewith a speech delivered by my distinguished colleague, the Honorable ARTHUR WINSTEAD, of Mississippi, on the occasion of the Mississippi products dinner on December 6 last at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

It will be recalled that the Dixie Darlings and the band from Mississippi Southern College, located in my own congressional district at Hattiesburg, Miss., were honored guests on this occasion. The next day they put on one of the best half-time football shows ever exhibited in these United States on the occasion of the pro football game between the Washington Redskins and the Pittsburgh Steelers. The menu at the dinner consisted of delicacies from Mississippi.

Mississippi Southern College, although a comparatively young institution, has achieved an outstanding record among the colleges of the Nation in the short period of its existence. It is famous not only for its outstanding prowess on the gridiron and its Dixie Darlings, but for the enviable record in the scholastic field that it has achieved.

The speaker on the occasion of the Mississippi products dinner given by the Mississippi Day Committee was my distinguished colleague, Congressman ARTHUR WINSTEAD.

His speech follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. George Marshall, ladies and gentlemen, this is a most happy occasion. Personally, I feel that we Mississippians in Washington are greatly honored by the visit of the Dixie Darlings, the pride of Mississippi, the marching band from Mississippi Southern College, officials of Mississippi Southern, and the many fine people who have come to the Capital from our State to be with us on this great occasion.

As an alumnus of Mississippi Southern, I feel also that our fine institution has been honored. Of course, our Dixie Darlings and band deserve the honor. They were chosen this year as the outstanding college drill team and band in the Nation and will perform tomorrow over a national radio and television network between the halves at the Washington Redskins-Pittsburgh Steelers football game. We are proud of the fine achievements of Mississippi Southern, which is the fastest growing institution of higher learning in the South.

We are proud that this great institution was honored when its band and Dixie Darlings were chosen as star performers at our first annual Mississippi products dinner in Washington.

Now, I know that Mississippians in Washington try to keep up with what is going on back home. However, I would like to call your attention to some of the outstanding achievements of Mississippi in agriculture and in agricultural industry, dramatized here tonight.

Up on Capitol Hill here in Washington we often find outstanding proof of the popu-

larity of gulf coast shrimp. Several times a year our friends on the gulf coast send up shrimp for seafood luncheons and dinners. And none of these congressional parties ever go begging when we let our colleagues know we are having a shrimp feed. Every first-class restaurant features gulf coast shrimp. To add to this tasty cocktail, Jimmy Love has supplied his delicious sauce. Jimmy has made this remoulade sauce, perfected by the Buena Vista Hotel, famous throughout the Nation.

You have not enjoyed real gumbo until you have tasted Pascagoula crab gumbo. Hermes Gautier, Pascagoula's ambassador of good will, is here tonight to enjoy with us this wonderful gulf coast delicacy.

We often hear that so-called western beef makes the finest steaks in America. But did you know that often top grade Mississippi beef sells on the Memphis market at prices higher than the same grade of western beef sells at the same time in Kansas City, Chicago, and Omaha? We are honored tonight by the presence of the world's No. 1 polled Hereford cattleman. I refer, of course, to my good friend, "Hot" Moore of Senatobia. Each year for the past 17 years, Mr. Moore's Circle M Ranch has staged the top cattle sale in America.

Last February, he sold a champion polled Hereford bull for $55,000, and that is the world's record price for any bull. We are proud of the fine achievements of Mississippi cattlemen and farmers in bringing our State to the forefront in livestock production.

Now, over in my district, in Scott County, we have the world's No. 1 poultry processing activity.

The chicken breasts that you will enjoy here tonight were supplied by my personal friend of Morton, Benny Rogers, who has one of the biggest chicken processing plants in existence. I stopped in to see Benny while I was in Mississippi this fall. As I parked in front of his plant a big truck, loaded with Mississippi chickens was pulling out for Los Angeles. Our Scott County chicken industry supplies poultry throughout the United States and many foreign countries.

The vegetables you are enjoying tonight were supplied by Wally Wright, one of the Nation's biggest wholesale grocers. He has wholesale stores throughout Mississippi and is interested in similar operations in other States. You will enjoy the lady peas, cooked southern style, and the delicious baked potatoes served you here tonight.

Mississippi has always been a leader in the production of dairy products. Mississippi Dairy Products Association shipped to our dinner pure creamery butter produced in our State. The Hattiesburg Creamery has surprised us with the addition of about 200 gallons of Hattiesburg ice cream to give you a choice of desserts.

But, before we come to the dessert, permit me to call to your attention to the wonderful deviled egg salad, made from the recipe of Mrs. L. E. Burnett, whose husband is the head of an organization known as "Better Eggs, Inc.," at Jackson. Mississippi grocers no longer find it necessary to import eggs to meet the table demands of our people.

Then, of course, we are enjoying wonderful Stafford Springs mineral water. Stafford Springs is also in my district. Stafford Springs water is most pleasant tasting, as you have already noted, and has very fine medicinal qualities.

Now, we come to the dessert. Many Mississippians contend that molasses pecan pie originated in our State.

The molasses in the pie here tonight is the very finest Marion County blue ribbon cane sirup. Lester Williams, nationally known weekly newspaper publisher who also owns the radio station at Columbia, was responsible for the sirup.

South Mississippi pecans were supplied by the Funsten Pecan Co. of Hattiesburg and the Natchez Pecan Shelling Co. of Natchez. The pecan industry also contributes substantially to our Mississippi economy. At this time of the year, they are in demand in all parts of the country, for pecans are essential in any good Christmas fruit cake.

We are most grateful to Mr. George Marshall, of the Washington Redskins, and to Philip Morris, sponsors of the National radio and television show for tomorrow, for helping us make possible this occasion.

Now, let's all have a good time and join in telling our friends in Washington about what a great State we have in Mississippi.

Oh, yes; before I sit down I want to ask a very pertinent question. My question is directed to Ole Miss and Mississippi State. Why don't you play Mississippi Southern?

Undue Banking Concentration Must Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by me before the Wisconsin Bankers Association at the Hotel Schroeder, Milwaukee, Wis., Monday, January 26, 1959.

The address follows:

I am very happy to be here with members of this distinguished group which has been in the forefront in seeking to maintain a sound, vigorously competitive unit banking system in this country and to arrest the trend which is slowly concentrating our financial resources into fewer and fewer hands. The members of this association are well aware that the healthy growth of independent banks is of vital importance for the preservation of our traditional, free enterprise system. That system is premised on a diffusion of economic power and depends upon economic activity being controlled by the market and not manipulated by a handful of men.

It is for these reasons, I think, that the American concept of banking traditionally has been based on community banking which provides the widest range of financial services to the people in the area. In my judgment, independent banks, locally organized, locally financed, and locally managed, not only act as a necessary balance wheel to offset the power of big business, they tend to provide a much healthier basis for effective community organization than does the absentee ownership of mammoth banking institutions. In fact, it is the independent bank—not the giant financial house—which in many cases provides the new ideas from which widespread innovations originate.

During the last 35 years, however, events have transpired in the field of banking which have severely transformed the entire structure of the Nation's banking system and have threatened to alter fundamental assumptions underlying the deposit and credit structure of the economy. In the last 35 years, the banking population of the country has been more than halved notwithstanding that the business transacted by the commercial banking system has multiplied many times. In 1921, there were over 30,000 commercial banks as compared to approximately 13,500 at the present time. True, a large share of the Nation's losses occurred prior to 1933 because of the depression when approximately 9,000 banks were forced to suspend operations during the 4-year period between 1930 and the end of 1933. However, since 1933, the merger movement has been the major factor in the gradual decline in the total number of banks. For example, in the period 1950 through 1958, some 1,330 of the Nation's commercial banks have disappeared by way of mergers and consolidations. Many of these consolidations, I would hasten to add, have been primarily the outgrowth of a deliberate effort on the part of certain banks to expand their banking facilities, add to their capital and depositors, and, in general, increase their overall financial strength in the economy.

This depletion of the ranks of the country's banks has lessened competition among banks in many communities. Over 76 counties in the United States have no commercial banking facilities whatsoever, while more than half the counties in the United States have only three or fewer banks serving the needs of the community. Hundreds of small, rural American communities have become bankless towns and many others are served by only one bank in place of the two or three which existed in the 1920's.

Other important trends have accompanied the demise of many of the Nation's banks. In the first place, banks have gradually been increasing in size. A bank that was considered large in size in the midthirties is now a relatively small institution. Smaller banks have become fewer in number, the big banks greater in proportion to the banking population.

In addition, the banking system has become characterized by a high degree of concentration of financial resources where a few large banks control a disproportionate share of total loans and deposits. Today the 100 largest banks control more than 48 percent of the Nation's bank deposits. In 10 of the Nation's 16 leading financial centers, 4 banks own more than 80 percent of all commercial assets. Furthermore, in nine of these financial centers, two banks own more than 60 percent of all commercial bank assets. Again, in each of the 16 leading financial centers, the first two banks own more than 40 percent of all the commercial assets, the first four banks, 60 percent.

Another aspect is concentration through bank holding companies which exercise a high degree of control over banking facilities in many areas. In Massachusetts, for example, holding companies control 48.5 percent of all commercial banking deposits; in Minnesota, two bank holding companies control 45 percent of commercial bank deposits; in Montana, the same two companies control over 44 percent of the commercial bank deposits; in Oregon, one company controls 42 percent of the State's bank deposits; in Nevada, the same company holds 78 percent of the commercial bank deposits. And here in Milwaukee, one bank, controlled by a holding company, has 48.8 percent of all deposits in the city.

The increase in banking concentration has been coupled with a comparative contraction in the credit extended to borrowers by the banking system. As banks have grown larger, they have tended to have fewer dealings with smaller businesses. A study conducted by the Federal Reserve Board several years ago shows that the very large banks with deposits of $500 million or more had the least number of loans with small business of all classes of banks, the next to lowest dollar volume of loans with small business, and the smallest percentage of dollar volume of all loans with small business. Considering the decrease in the proportion of small banks in the financial community, the overall drop in credit extended, and the frequent resort to Government agencies for funds, it seems likely that the increasing trend toward concentration has at times entailed credit shortages especially for smaller enterprises.

There is increasing awareness, I believe, that additional precautions are essential to

preserve the banking competition that still remains and to prevent banking credit from becoming dominated to an ever-increasing extent by a small tightly knit group. Successfully resisted in New York State last year, for example, were bills which would accomplish the following: First, permit bank holding company expansion throughout the State without regard to bank branch district lines, thus ending the freeze on bank holding company expansion except in accordance with branch geographic limitations; second, obliterate the branch district line between New York City and the suburban areas hence permitting bank expansion throughout the entire new district.

As I pointed out to Governor Harriman, adoption of such legislation not only would have the gravest consequences in respect of the State's future banking structure, but would bring banking monopoly closer into being. It would also have had the gravest repercussions throughout the Nation, since what happens in New York in the banking field frequently sets the stage for numerous other States.

Adoption of the first proposal, I indicated, would enable a bank, via the holding company device, to circumvent branch district lines and enable the same management, which is restricted in its operations under a bank charter, to acquire through a holding company a unit bank in the State of New York regardless of where situated and operate it in the same manner a branch would be operated. It was my position that this proposal would accomplish indirectly what is prohibited by the State in establishing branch district lines and would have effectively dissolved branch limitations. Beyond that, it seemed crystal clear to me that the proposal could have ignited what might have been the greatest chain reaction in recent banking history, the effects of which threatened to go to the very roots of the entire banking structure of New York State.

With respect to the proposal to obliterate the branch district line between New York City and the suburban counties, I emphasized that these district lines were drawn to protect independent banking from encroachment of the giant money-market-institutions in New York City, and that it was of even greater importance now to guard against such encroachment.

In my several communications to Governor Harriman, I also emphasized that to adopt either proposal would be to yield without justification to a few powerful financial institutions in New York City, which have, for years, sought to achieve dominance over the banking system of the entire State of New York.

The Independent Bankers Association, of which your group is a constituent part, played an important role in mustering effective opposition to this legislation. It is to be commended as is Governor Harriman who, recognizing the importance of unit banks, maintained unrelenting resistance to these measures.

I am sure the sponsors of this legislation will renew their efforts to secure passage of these proposals. I trust that the new Governor of New York, Mr. Rockefeller, will act with the same dedication to the public interest in opposing such measures as did his predecessor.

Also noteworthy this past year was rejection by the Federal Reserve Board of a plan by the First National City Bank of New York, the second largest in the city, to evade New York State statutory limitations preventing banks in New York City from establishing branches outside the boundaries of New York City. This it tried to do by applying to the Federal Reserve Board for permission to form a bank holding company with the initial objective of acquiring control of the County Trust Co. of White Plains, N.Y., the dominant commercial bank in Westchester County. In opposing this plan, I testified in detail before the Board that its consummation would be contrary to the competitive standards of the Bank Holding Company Act and in violation of the Celler-Kefauver act; that its effectuation could mean the end of branch district lines in the State; and could mean basic alteration of the State's banking structure completely without the approval of the State's legislature. My good friend Mr. Ben DuBois of the Independent Bankers Association, likewise testified in opposition to this proposal and, I might add, presented most persuasive arguments. It is gratifying that the majority of the Board recognized the serious competitive implications of this proposal and rejected it on that basis.

No less significant are the proposed mergers between the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York and J. P. Morgan & Co. and between the Manufacturers Trust Co. and the Bankers Trust Co. There is little doubt that consummation of either of these transactions would result in an undue concentration of banking facilities in the city; spur a further wave of bank mergers; and ignite a chain reaction that could have the most profound repercussions on our banking structure.

In view of the apparent impact these transactions would have on the competitive situation, I have communicated with the Superintendent of Banks of New York State whose aproval is required, together with the Federal Reserve Board which also must approve in the event either of the continuing banks establishes branches at locations of former offices of the absorbed institution. In addition, I have written to the Department of Justice which has jurisdiction under the Sherman Act which prohibits any combination in restraint of trade, attempt to monopolize, or monopolization.

With respect to these merger proposals, it is relevant that 3 years ago the New York Superintendent of Banks, Mr. George A. Mooney, testified before our Antitrust Subcommittee:

"It has been my policy as superintendent of banks of the State of New York to follow the spirit of the Celler Antimerger Act in determining whether or not to approve mergers of banks that come within my jurisdiction. That is to say, if after analysis of all facts, I find that the effect of a proposed bank merger may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to monopoly in any locality, I will unhesitatingly withhold approval."

Mr. Mooney's term expired a few weeks ago. In the circumstances, it is vitally important that his successor who will be appointed by Governor Rockefeller adhere scrupulously to the above policy in scrutinizing the Guaranty Trust-Morgan and Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust merger proposals. I would also note that before leaving office Mr. Mooney advised me that his Department was undertaking a thorough investigation of the Guaranty-Morgan proposal.

I hope that the new Superintendent not only continues that investigation but broadens it to include the Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust transaction. I trust that the Superintendent will, in addition, consult with the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the Federal Reserve Board as to the competitive aspects of these mergers. Furthermore, I believe it necessary that the Superintendent hold public hearings on the proposals so that all interested persons may be afforded an opportunity to present their views.

Let me make it clear that as chairman of the Antitrust subcommittee, I will keep a watchful eye on all developments.

On the positive side, additional Federal legislation dealing with bank mergers is imperative if we are to stop undue concentration and keep a unit banking system in this country. For there is little doubt that present Federal law on this subject is grossly inadequate.

Under the National Banking Act, approval of the Comptroller of the Currency is required for any merger between national banks, or between a national bank and a State bank, where the resultant institution is a national bank. In addition, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act requires that approval of certain mergers must be obtained from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency, or the Federal Reserve Board, as the case may be, but only where the capital stock or surplus of the resulting bank will be less than the aggregate stock of the two institutions combined. Also, approval of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is required for mergers between insured and noninsured banks. None of these Federal banking statutes applicable to mergers deals substantively with competition in the field of banking, and in no case is the competitive impact of the merger a necessary element to be considered by Federal banking officials in deciding whether or not to grant approval.

Bank mergers are also circumscribed by the provisions of the Sherman Act of 1890 which prohibit combinations in restraint of trade, attempts to monopolize, or monopolization of trade or commerce. Illegality is established by proof that the merger has actually resulted in an unreasonable lessening of competition; it is immaterial whether the merger was accomplished by stock or asset acquisitions.

Section 7 of the Clayton Act of 1914, on the other hand, deals specifically with corporate and bank mergers and bans those achieved by stock purchases where there is a reasonable probability of a substantial lessening of competition or a tendency to monopoly. Responsibility for enforcing the section insofar as banks are concerned is vested concurrently in the Attorney General and the Federal Reserve Board.

Section 7 was designed to stop mergers beyond the reach of the Sherman Act but its failure to include mergers accomplished by asset acquisitions resulted in a loophole which so far as nonbanking corporations are concerned was closed by passage of the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950. However, because of revisions made in subsequent versions of various antimerger bills, it became impracticable to include within the scope of the Celler-Kefauver Act corporations other than those subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission. This left asset acquisitions by banks unaffected by the new law since authority to enforce the provisions of section 7 dealing with banks is vested in the Federal Reserve Board and not in the Federal Trade Commission.

Beyond this, most bank mergers are accomplished by asset acquisitions. For this reason section 7 of the Clayton Act has limited value in coping with the mounting trend of bank merger activity.

Against this background I believe it necessary as a first step that Section 18(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act be amended in the following respects:

First, the provisions of existing law should be expanded so as to require prior approval by the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency for every merger or consolidation involving insured banks;

Second, the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency should be prohibited from approving any bank merger or consolidation where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly;

Third, the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency should be required to give notice to the Attorney General of a proposed merger and enable him to intervene or offer his views respecting the competitive phases of the transaction;

Fourth, the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency should be required to give notice with opportunity to be heard to the appropriate supervisory authority of the in-

terested State in the event the transaction involves State banks;

Fifth, an antitrust savings clause should be adopted for bank mergers similar to that governing bank holding companies which would make it clear that applicable provisions of the antitrust laws pertaining to banks are not to be superseded.

In addition, the loophole in Section 7 of the Clayton Act should be closed and Federal enforcement agencies should be provided with the same authority to move against bank mergers accomplished by asset acquisition as they have to move against bank mergers consummated by way of stock acquisitions.

It is important to note that amendment of the banking laws in this area is not inconsistent with amendment of the antitrust laws to cover bank mergers accomplished by asset acquisitions. Indeed, adoption of the approach that I have outlined would mean, in effect, that the antitrust statutory provisions pertaining to bank mergers would be essentially similar to provisions presently applicable to bank holding company acquisition of banking facilities.

The Federal banking agencies, while recommending amendment of existing laws so as to require prior approval of all bank mergers, feel that in granting or withholding consent, they should be required only "to take into consideration whether the effect (of the proposed transaction) may be to lessen competition unduly or to tend unduly to create a monopoly." They oppose the approach recommended above that would require them to disapprove a merger where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to monopoly.

Under the suggestion of the banking agencies competitive considerations would be only one of the various factors that would have to be taken into account by the appropriate Federal banking agency in scrutinizing a proposed bank merger. Moreover, they would have Congress adopt an entirely novel test, namely, whether the acquisition may lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly. Indisputably this proposed standard is far weaker than that of section 7 of the Clayton Act as amended by the Celler-Kefauver Act which applies to other businesses and prohibits any merger where the effect of the acquisition may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly. Nor are the characteristics of the banking industry so unique as to justify such departure.

The term "substantially lessen competition" has been imbedded in Federal jurisprudence for some 35 years in the course of which it has received judicial content through numerous court interpretations. If we discard this standard for the vague and novel standard of "unduly," we will find ourselves in a sea of trouble. It took years and years to determine through court interpretation what the term "substantially to lessen competition" means. Should the banking agencies' proposal be adopted, not only would the courts have to start all over again in interpreting a vague and untested term, there would be created—and without justification—a dual standard, one for banks, another for nonbanking corporations.

Also, it must be recognized that if the Congress should adopt the standard proposed by the banking agencies and proscribe only bank mergers which tend unduly to monopoly, then the Congress in effect would be placing its imprimatur of approval on mergers which tend to monopoly. Stated otherwise, adoption of the "unduly" standard would mean that it is the policy of Congress that a bank merger which tends to monopoly is in the public interest; that only if it tends unduly to monopoly should it be banned.

The short of the matter is that, as a former Assistant Attorney General in charge of the antitrust division testified, "the banking agencies' proposal does little if anything, to insure competitive enterprise in banking. Any pretense that it does seems to me hardly more than sham."

More than that, the proposal of the banking agencies would weaken the competitive standards which the Comptroller of the Currency now professes to follow with respect to bank mergers. It will be recalled that approval of the Comptroller of the Currency is required in all cases of mergers between national banks, or between a national bank and a State bank where the resultant institution is to be operated under a national charter. I point out that the Comptroller has stated on numerous occasions that before granting merger approval, he will determine whether its effect in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly; that he will determine, in sum, whether the transaction is violative of the policy of the Celler-Kefauver Act.

The conclusion is inescapable, however, as the Attorney General has testified, that the office of the Comptroller has tended to give little or no consideration to the question as to whether or not competition would be substantially lessened.

It is important that legislation in this area require the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency to give notice to the Attorney General. As the Department of Justice has observed, "failure to insure informed advice on competitive factors could have effects far beyond the banking field. Without (the Department's) right to intervene in bank mergers there might be as many different views of section 7 standards and scope as there were agencies charged with this enforcement. The result could well be disparities in view, which, in turn, spell real enforcement inequities. Enforcement effectiveness as well requires some procedure for (the) Department's intervention. Otherwise in its overall responsibility for section 7's enforcement * * * outside of the banking area, the Department would be bound by bank merger precedents (it) had no voice in picking or shaping."

In these circumstances, it would be little short of folly to require the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency to obtain the views of the other two banking agencies, as the agencies have recommended, but not impose the same requirement in respect to seeking the informed advice of the Department of Justice—the one agency possessing the necessary competency to make an informed recommendation respecting competitive implications of a proposed merger.

Furthermore, on the basis of past experience, unless a requirement of mandatory consultation with the Department is written into law, there is little, if any, likelihood that the Federal banking agencies will seek the informed advice of the Attorney General.

The foregoing considerations are equally applicable in respect to obtaining the views of the appropriate State banking supervisor when the continuing institution is to be a State bank. In such cases it is as necessary to obtain the views of the appropriate local official as it is the views of the other two Federal banking agencies since the State supervisor usually will have special knowledge of local banking and other matters, factors which are of the highest degree or relevance to a determination as to whether final approval should be granted or withheld.

Amendment of existing law is essential in another respect: to prohibit holding company acquisition of banks within a State except within the area within which branches of banks are permitted. Such provision, it will be recalled, was incorporated in section 5(c) of the Spence Bank Holding Company bill (H.R. 6627) which was adopted overwhelmingly by the House in the 84th Congress, though the section was later deleted in conference. Subsequent developments have only served to underscore need for its enactment. Absent such provision, State geographic limitations have been and can be avoided by the simple expedient of forming a holding company to acquire control of banks throughout a State without regard to district lines. To my mind the conclusion is inescapable that despite all that has been said about the distinction between bank holding company groups and branch banking systems, both accomplish the same thing—the operation of a number of banking units under one control and management. Through the corporate device, holding companies still can be used to evade branch banking laws and defeat the declared policies of the State regarding branch banking. This should not be tolerated.

Bear in mind that the overriding purpose of the Bank Holding Company Act and of State branching restrictions is similar: to safeguard against banking monopoly by minimizing the dangers inherent in concentration of economic power through centralized banking control. Yet, the Bank Holding Company Act, by permitting the piercing of branch district lines through the holding company device, is now serving as a convenient vehicle for fostering just that banking concentration which it is designed to prevent. I can think of no greater anomaly.

The legislation I have recommended above is the minimum necessary to preserve competition in the banking field. I shall do everything possible to see to its enactment during this Congress and I am confident that with the help of your association and other like-minded organizations, it will be approved by the present Congress.

TV Booster Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE BROCK

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution from the Legislature of Nebraska:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 6

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission on December 31, 1958, announced a decision prohibiting the operation of low power television broadcaster repeater stations on very high frequency channels and requiring existing stations to apply for conversion to licensed ultra high frequency translators by April 1; and

Whereas the cost of conversion to an operation of ultra high frequency translators would be prohibitive in the sparsely settled areas in Nebraska; and

Whereas because of the distances involved in the sparsely settled areas of Nebraska the use of repeater stations on very high frequency channels does not interfere with licensed operations using the same channel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 69th session assembled—

1. That this legislature respectfully requests the Federal Communications Commission to reconsider its decision of December 31 insofar as it applies to Nebraska and permit the continued operation of low power television repeater stations on very high frequency channels in this State.

2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Federal Communications Commission and to each of the Members from Nebraska in the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate.

Physicians in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article listing the physicians who have served in the American Congress from 1774 to 1959.

This interesting article was prepared by Mr. Jaroslave Nemec, the librarian of the Washington office of the American Medical Association.

I am sure that Members will find this information unusual. I congratulate Mr. Nemec on his scholarship and effort devoted to this work.

This is the story of the 361 physicians, who, over the years, have helped to shape the destiny of the country as Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate.

The story is interesting and in some ways revealing. For example, at least 13 also were State or Territorial governors, and 3 States selected men from this group as their first governors. If the report does nothing else it will document the point we have been making for years. There is nothing new, unusual, or improper in doctors taking an acting part in the National Government; they have been doing so from the very beginning of the Republic.

We are not offering this as a complete or definitive historical work on doctors in government. It deals only with those who served in the House or Senate. Obviously we can't touch on all of them, but we have said something about more than 50 whose careers seemed to us to be particularly outstanding or unusual.

The basis for this report is a complete listing, extracted by our librarian from historical documents, of all physicians who have served in the National legislature. It shows their name, party, dates of birth and death, years served in Congress, and occasionally other information about them.

DOCTORS WERE IN ON THE GROUND FLOOR; FIVE SIGNED DECLARATION

In 1776, Josiah Bartlett, physician, was 46 years old, a confirmed and vigorous patriot. So it was natural that as a New Hampshire delegate to the Continental Congress he signed the Declaration of Independence on July 4. Perhaps it was only an accident, but he was the second person to sign the engrossed document at the formal ceremony on August 2 of that year.

For Dr. Bartlett, that was only one incident in a long and brilliant public career that successively saw him as a signer of the Articles of Confederation, judge, member of the Constitutional Convention, Governor of New Hampshire.

Dr. Bartlett was not the only physician to sign the Declaration. There were four others: Drs. Lyman Hall, Benjamin Rush, Matthew Thornton, and Oliver Wolcott. All except Dr. Wolcott were in active practice at the time; while trained in medicine, he had given it up for law.

With all the others who signed the document—the lawyers, the statesmen, the soldiers, the businessmen—these five doctors were to achieve a degree of immortality. They are also symbolic of the strong interest the medical profession has taken in national legislation over the years.

DOCTORS IN CONGRESS THROUGH THE YEARS—BY STATES, BY PARTIES

Dr. Bartlett had been one of four physician members of the Second Continental Congress in 1775. The next year the Colonies sent eight doctors to the deliberations. In the critical years of 1783–84, 11 doctors were in the young Congresses that struggled to keep the States united. It is a tribute to the versatility of the profession that in the 181 years since 1775, doctors have sat in every Congress.

Research by this office carries down through nearly two centuries, Congress by Congress, the story of the medical profession's contribution to the development of the American Legislature. Here are some statistics on the doctors' participation:

Total representation

Six physicians now are Members of the House of Representatives of the 86th Congress. Counting them, a total of 361 physicians have served in American Congresses since 1775, including 35 Senators. Of the 361, 11 practiced another profession—generally law—as well as medicine, 33 were not active in practice when elected, and 18 had graduated in medicine but never practiced.

By parties

A total of 165 physicians were Democrats. Other party representation: Republicans 68, Whigs 30, Federalists 17, Jacksonian Democrats 6, American Party 5, National Republicans 2, Independents 2, and 1 each from 6 other minor parties. There is no record of party affiliation for 32 doctors in Congress, and party labels were not attached to the 27 who sat in the Continental Congress between 1775 and 1788.

By States

The large States that were members of the Original Thirteen Colonies naturally have supplied the most doctors to Congress. Leading the list is Pennsylvania with 52. Next are New York with 48 and New Jersey, 30. Ohio, although coming into the Union later, has sent 26 doctors to Congress. Other totals: Georgia 17, Kentucky 12, Maryland 16, Massachusetts 13, Missouri 10, New Hampshire 14, Virginia 18, North Carolina 11. Connecticut has elected 6 to Congress, Delaware 7, Illinois 5, Indiana 7, Louisiana 5, Michigan 5, South Carolina 5, Tennessee 8. The following have elected from one to four physicians as Representatives or Senators: Alabama, Arkansas, California, North Dakota, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. Puerto Rico's present Resident Commissioner also is a physician, Dr. A. Fernós-Isern. He is a nonvoting Member of the House.

SKETCHES OF A FEW FAMOUS AMERICAN PHYSICIAN-LEGISLATORS

During the troubled years from 1810 to 1849—the War of 1812, the struggle for expansion, the Mexican War, the early political skirmishes over slavery—there were at least eight and usually 12 to 18 doctors in Congress. In the following few sessions of Congress, the years leading up to the Civil War, the profession also was well represented, having from 7 to 15 of its Members in the House or Senate. During the Civil War, although a high percentage of the doctors were with the armies, between five and seven usually were seated in Washington.

These statistics may be important, but they show nothing at all about what these men were like as men, or what impelled them into the turmoil of national politics. In subsequent paragraphs some of them will be described in other connections—as State governors, as military line officers, as physician-legislators who also made unusual contributions. Below are brief sketches of a few not otherwise described in this report who are outstanding.

Matthew Thornton, a contemporary of Dr. Bartlett and the third signer of the Declaration of Independence, was a colonel in the New Hampshire troops almost 30 years before the Revolutionary War. Massive physically as well as mentally, he is said to have had black and penetrating eyes and an invincibly grave expression. After one session of the Continental Congress, he was appointed to his State's supreme court and thereafter did not practice medicine. One example of his mental capacity: when past 80 years of age he wrote a metaphysical treatise.

Lyman Hall, another signer of the Declaration, was born in Connecticut, graduated from Yale, then migrated to St. John's Parish on the Georgia coast, where he gathered around him a colony of intellectuals and independents. When he arrived at the Continental Congress in 1775, John Adams described him as "intelligent and spirited • • • made a powerful addition to our phalanx." Like Dr. Bartlett and most of the others, he suffered for his views. His home was burned by the British in 1778. Later, as Governor of Georgia, he helped to found the University of Georgia. Throughout his career he practiced medicine while also prospering as a rice planter.

Benjamin Rush of Pennsylvania, another practicing physician who signed the Declaration, was easily the most famous American physician and medical teacher of his generation. Dr. Rush was a rugged character, brash and bold in debate and in conduct. His correspondence was so indiscreet—he feuded violently with Washington, among others—that his family kept his private papers secret until recent years. He was a confidant of all the important men of his age in political life. It was to him that Jefferson wrote the famous line: "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hosility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

William Shippen of Pennsylvania was a member of the Continental Congress and a dedicated physician all his life, one of the founders of the College of Philadelphia (later University of Pennsylvania) and of the College of New Jersey (later Princeton).

Samuel Holten of Massachusetts, a friend of the Revolution from the beginning, held many State posts, and was a member of Provincial Congress, of the Committee of Safety and at one time president pro tempore of Continental Congress; later a judge.

David Ramsey of South Carolina, where he moved from Philadelphia, was an Army surgeon during the Revolution. Captured at the fall of Charleston, he was imprisoned by British for 11 months. Later, a member of Continental Congress and at one time its president pro tempore, he instituted the first election contest ever filed before Congress.

John Condit of New Jersey was twice appointed and twice elected to the U.S. Senate and several times elected to House. A founder and trustee of Orange Academy, he was an Army surgeon during the Revolution.

Samuel L. Mitchell of New York served as Representative or Senator from 1800 to 1813. He was medical editor and professor of natural history and botany and materia medica in the New York College of Physicians and Surgeons.

Westel Willoughby, Jr., of New York, was State judge, member of State assembly and president of Western New York College of Physicians and Surgeons. He was an Army surgeon (1812) before election to U.S. House. He founded the town of Willoughby, Ohio, and Willoughby College (now part of Syracuse University).

Royal S. Copeland of New York, perhaps best known of the modern physician-Sena-

tors, entered political life as mayor of Ann Arbor, Mich. (1901–03), and on moving to New York City, served as public health commissioner for 5 years. He was elected to the Senate in 1922 and served until his death in 1938.

FOURTEEN PHYSICIAN-CONGRESSMEN ALSO WERE GOVERNORS

Among the 359 doctors who have reached Congress, there are scores who, the records show, thrived on political combat. All their lives they were active in State and local politics and government, as well as national. They were sheriffs, judges, State legislators, State and national committeemen. Records we have studied are evidence that at least 14 of these men—doctors elected to Washington—also became State or Territorial Governors at one time or another.

One of the most colorful must have been Dr. James W. Throckmorton, of Texas, who served in the House of Representatives after the Civil War. He was elected Governor of Texas without much trouble, but was thrown out of office on orders of General Sheridan.

Three States; Alabama, Delaware, and Ohio, had doctors as their first Governors. William W. Bidd was Alabama's first Governor, before coming to Congress, where he served both in Senate and House. Likewise, Edward Tiffin was elected first Governor of Ohio in 1803, following which he came to Washington as a U.S. Senator. Joshua Clayton, who had one term in the U.S. Senate at the end of the 18th century, was Delaware's first Governor.

At least two physicians who served in Congress also have been Territorial Governors. Late in his career, William A. Newell was Territorial Governor of Washington, a job that could not have been a novelty to him as he had served as New Jersey's chief executive between 2 terms in the U.S. Senate in the midnineteenth century. Dr. Newell rounded off his career with an appointment as U.S. Indian Inspector, starting in 1884. During the Civil War, William Jayne was Dakota Territory Governor after sitting 2 years in the U.S. House as a nonvoting delegate. Other physican-Governors who spent some time in the U.S. House or Senate: John Osborne, Wyoming Governor 1893–95; William Harrison Bissel, Illinois, midnineteenth century; Alexander M. Dockery, Missouri's Governor at end of 19th century; William Eustis, who served as U.S. Minister to the Netherlands and Governor of Massachusetts after two terms in the House of Representatives; Joseph Kent, Maryland's Governor between terms in U.S. House and Senate; Henry Drury Hatfield, spectacular West Virginian, Governor 1913–17, U.S. Senator 1929–35; and Drs. Hall, of Georgia and Wolcott, of Connecticut, mentioned earlier as signers of the Declaration.

SCORES OF PHYSICIAN-CONGRESSMEN ALSO LED TROOPS IN BATTLE

When the country was young and bursting at its seams, doctors like others moved from one profession or business to another rather freely—medicine to law to agriculture then perhaps back to medicine. But among doctors in national politics, the most popular transition was from medicine to military duty as line officers, then back again to medicine. This tendency was pronounced during the Revolutionary War, continued through the War of 1812, and was not unusual in the Civil War, even though by that time there was a national awareness of the great value of military surgeons.

Henry M. Shaw, of North Carolina, served two terms in the U.S. House of Representatives before the Civil War. But when the fighting started he showed up as a line colonel in the Confederate Army and was killed in action near New Bern, N.C.

Similar to his career was that of a contemporary, Graham Fitch, of Indiana, who raised a regiment of volunteers for the North and led the men as colonel until wounds forced his retirement. A younger doctor in Virginia, Robert E. Withers, followed the same course; a major of infantry, then colonel, finally discharged in consequence of numerous disabling wounds. After the war he served in the Senate, founded the Lynchburg (Va.) News, was named consul at Hong Kong.

A generation earlier, Solon Borland, of Arkansas, had done the same thing—practiced medicine until the fighting started in Mexican and Civil Wars, then led troops in battle. His Senate service came between the wars. Similarly, John Bratton, of South Carolina, preferred fighting to doctoring; like Dr. Borland he had the rank of line brigadier general in the Confederate Army. He was a U.S. Senator after the reconstruction period.

In view of these cases, it is not unusual that two physicians who served in Congress also were selected as Secretary of War. One was Henry Dearborn, of Massachusetts, line officer in the Revolutionary War, Secretary of War for 8 years under Washington, Member of Congress, then senior major general in command of troops in the War of 1812. An earlier Secretary of War for Washington was James McHenry, of Maryland, whose Revolutionary War record shows him as surgeon, secretary to Washington, member of Lafayette's staff. He had sat in the Continental Congress.

THEY WERE LAWYERS, BOTANISTS, ASTRONOMERS, DIPLOMATS, PREACHERS

In addition to sitting in the U.S. Congress, doctors had the enthusiasm and capacity for many other activities, some unusual. They are not easy to catalog. Following are a few words about more of them. Unless otherwise indicated, their Congressional service was in the House of Representatives and during the years shown in parentheses:

John Archer of Maryland (1801–09) received the first medical degree issued on the American continent. Several combined preaching or theology with medicine; John Bull of Missouri (1833–35), Oliver Cromwell Comstock of New York (1813–19), Luther Jewett of Vermont (1815–17), Hugh Williamson of North Carolina (1789–93), and Manasseh Cutler of Massachusetts (1801–05). Dr. Cutler also had the time to be a lawyer, botanist, and astronomer; John S. Harrison of Ohio (1853–59), had as good a claim on the White House as a man could get without being elected to it; he was the son of one President and the father of another. The first President Harrison, incidentally, studied medicine but did not practice. * * * Two doctors who served in the Congress were later directors of the U.S. mint, Samuel Moore of Pennsylvania (1817–23) and Daniel Sturgeon of Pennsylvania (Senate 1840–51), and one was U.S. Treasurer, Thomas T. Tucker of South Carolina (1787–88) * * * Alexander Campbell (Senate 1809–13) was vice president of the first Ohio anti-slavery society * * * Thomas Dunn English of New Jersey (1891–95), trained as physician and lawyer, neglected both for writing. . . Samuel Fowler of New Jersey (1833–37) is recognized as the discoverer of two minerals, fowlerite and franklinite * * * John E. Hutton of Missouri (1885–89) practiced law and medicine at the same time. * * * After serving in the House, George B. Loring of Massachusetts (1877–81) was made U.S. Commissioner of Agriculture, then minister to Portugal * * * William S. Haymond (1875–77) organized the Central Medical College of Indianapolis, after Civil War service * * * Norton S. Townsend of Ohio (1851–53) became prominent in scientific agriculture * * * William Darlington of Pennsylvania (1815–23) was internationally recognized as a botanist * * * Robert B. Vance of North Carolina served one term (1823–25), was defeated three consecutive times when he tried again, the last time with a degree of finality: his successful opponent killed him in a duel.

PHYSICIAN MEMBERS OF 86TH CONGRESS

IVOR D. FENTON, of Pennsylvania, Member of the House since 1939, is the dean of five physicians in the 86th Congress in point of service. He is known in the House as the hard coal doctor because of his persistent battles in behalf of the Pennsylvania anthracite region, some of which have attracted national attention. As an Army medical officer FENTON was awarded the Silver Star and World War I Victory Medal with two Bronze Battle Clasps for "gallantry in action and meritorious services." WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, Member of House since 1943. Served in field artillery in World War I, medical missionary in China 1925–31 and 1934–38; just prior to World War II staged virtually one-man campaign to arouse people of the United States against Japanese military expansion. THOMAS E. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania, Member of House since 1945. Maintains practice at Fredericktown, Pa. Chairman of House Foreign Affairs Committee. DALE ALFORD, of Little Rock, Ark., who ran for public office for first time last fall; he is a board ophthalmologist. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, Puerto Rico's Resident Commissioner in Washington since 1946. Cardiologist, professor of public health in School of Tropical Medicine of Puerto Rico, commissioner of health and Acting Governor of the island several times prior to election to House.

Physicians who have service in the American Congress, 1774–1959

Name	State	Political party	Congress	House or Senate
1. Abbot, Joel (1776–1826). Prepared the first National Pharmacopoeia	Georgia	Democrat	15–18	House.
2. Acker, Ephraim Lester (1827–1903). Graduated in medicine, editor and publisher.	Pennsylvania	do	42	Do.
3. Ahl, John Alexander (1813–82)	do	do	35	Do.
4. Alexander, Nathaniel (1756–1808). Served in the Revolutionary War as a surgeon 1778–82. Governor of North Carolina.	North Carolina		8–9	Do.
5. Alford, Thomas Dale	Arkansas	Democrat	86	Do.
6. Allen, Henry Dixon (1854–1924). Later practiced law	Kentucky	do	56–57	Do.
7. Anderson, Samuel (1773–1850)	Pennsylvania		20	Do.
8. Archer, John (1741–1810). In 1767 received the 1st medical diploma issued on the American Continent.	Maryland	Democrat	7–9	Do.
9. Armstrong, James (1748–1828)	Pennsylvania	Federalist	3	Do.
10. Arnold, Jonathan (1741–93). Served in the Revolutionary Army as surgeon.	Rhode Island		Member of the Continental Congress, 1782–84	

Physicians who have service in the American Congress, 1774–1959—Continued

Name	State	Political party	Congress	House or Senate
11. Atkinson, Louis Ewans (1841–1910). Later practiced law	Pennsylvania	Republican	48–52	House.
12. Austin, Albert Elmer (1877–1942)	Connecticut	do	76	Do.
13. Averett, Thomas Hamlet (1800–1855)	Virginia	Democrat	31–32	Do.
14. Avery, John (1824–1914)	Michigan	Republican	53–54	Do.
15. Aycrigg, John Bancker (1798–1856)	New Jersey	Whig	25, 27	Do.
16. Babcock, Alfred (1805–71)	New York	do	27	Do.
17. Baker, Ezra (before 1765, died after 1818). Practiced medicine for a short time.	New Jersey		14	Do.
18. Ball, Lewis Heisler (1861–1932)	Delaware	Republican	57	Do.
			1903–5	Senate.
19. Barber, Isaac Ambrose (1852–1909). Practiced medicine for 15 years, then engaged in the milling business.	Maryland	do	55	House.
20. Brachfeld, Andrew Jackson (1863–1922). Delegate to the peace congress at Brussels in 1905.	Pennsylvania	do	59–64	Do.
21. Barnett, William (1761–1834)	Georgia	Democrat	12–13	Do.
22. Barstow, Gamaliel Henry (1784–1865)	New York	National Republican	22	Do.
23. Barstow, Gideon (1783–1852)	Massachusetts	Democrat	17	Do.
24. Bartlett, Josiah (1729–95). Signer of the Articles of Confederation and of the Declaration of Independence. Governor of New Hampshire.	New Hampshire		Member of the Continental Congress, 1775–76.	
25. Bartlett, Josiah, Jr. (1768–1838)	do		12	House.
26. Bateman, Ephriam (1780–1829)	New Jersey	Democrat	14–17	Do.
			1826–29	Senate.
27. Bates, James (1780–1882). Served as a surgeon during the War of 1812	Maine	do	22	House.
28. Beatty, John (1749–1826). Colonel of the Revolutionary Army	New Jersey		3	Do.
29. Bernhisel, John Milton (1799–1881)	Territory of Utah	Whig	32–35, 37	Delegate.
30. Bibb, William Wyatt (1780–1820). The 1st Governor of Alabama	Georgia	Democrat	9–13	House.
			1813–16	Senate.
31. Bissel, William Harrison (1811–60). Later practiced law. Governor of Illinois 1857–60.	Illinois	do	31–33	House.
32. Bland, Theodorick (1742–90)	Virginia		Member of the Continental Congress, 1780–83.	
			1	House.
33. Bohn, Frank Probasco (1866–1944)	Michigan	Republican	70–72	Do.
34. Booze, William Samuel (1862–1933)	Maryland	do	54	Do.
35. Borland, Solon (1808–64). Served throughout the Mexican War as major. Appointed a brigadier general in the Confederate Army.	Arkansas	Democrat	1848–53	Senate.
36. Bower, Gustavus Miller (1790–1864)	Missouri	do	28	House.
37. Bradford, William (1729–1808). Abandoned the profession, studied and practiced law.	Rhode Island		1793–96	Senate.
38. Bradshaw, Samuel Carey (1809–72)	Pennsylvania	Whig	34	House.
39. Bratton, John (1831–98). Brigadier general of the Confederate Army	South Carolina	Democrat	48	Do.
40. Brewer, Francis Beattie (1820–92)	New York	Republican	48	Do.
41. Brown, Benjamin (1756–1831)	Massachusetts		14	Do.
42. Browne, Charles (1875–1947)	New Jersey	Democrat	68	Do.
43. Brownson, Nathan (1742–96). Surgeon in the Revolutionary Army	Georgia		Member of the Continental Congress, 1776–78.	
44. Buffin(g)ton, James (1817–75). Studied medicine but never practiced	Massachusetts	Republican	34–37, 41–44	House.
45. Bull, John (1803–63). Later also a Methodist minister	Missouri	Whig	23	Do.
46. Burke, Thomas (about 1747–83). Abandoned the profession and practiced law.	North Carolina		Member of the Continental Congress, 1776–81.	
47. Burleigh, Walter Atwood (1820–96). Abandoned the profession and practiced law.	Territory of Dakota	Republican	39–40	Delegate.
48. Burnet, William (1730–91). In 1787 president of the State medical society	New Jersey		Member of the Continental Congress, 1780–81.	
49. Burns, Robert (1792–1866)	New Hampshire	Democrat	23–24	House.
50. Burton, Hiram Rodney (1841–1927)	Delaware	Republican	59–60	Do.
51. Butler, Thomas Belden (1806–73). Abandoned the profession and practiced law.	Connecticut	Whig	31	Do.
52. Butler, William (1790–1850)	South Carolina	do	27	Do.
53. Caldwell, Greene Washington (1806–64). Abandoned the profession and practiced law.	North Carolina	Democrat	27	Do.
54. Campbell, Alexander (1779–1857). Vice president of the first general antislavery society of Ohio in 1835.	Ohio	Democrat (?)	1809–13	Senate.
55. Carlton, Henry Hull (1835–1905)	Georgia	Democrat	50–51	House.
56. Carpenter, Davis (1799–1878)	New York	Whig	33	Do.
57. Castle, Curtis Harvey (1848–1928)	California	Populist and Democrat	55	Do.
58. Chaffee, Calvin Clifford (1811–96)	Massachusetts	American Party	34–35	Do.
59. Chambers, Henry (1790–1826). Served in the Indian wars as a surgeon	Alabama	Democrat	1825–26	Senate.
60. Chaves, Jose Francisco (1833–1904). Graduated in medicine but never practiced.	Territory of New Mexico	Republican	39–41	Delegate.
61. Chinn, Thomas Withers (1791–1852). Practiced medicine 1817–25	Louisiana	Whig	26	House.
62. Claiborne, John (1777–1808)	Virginia		9–10	Do.
63. Clardy, John Daniel (1828–1918). Abandoned the profession	Kentucky	Democrat	54–55	Do.
64. Clark, Robert (1777–1837)	New York	do	16	Do.
65. Clawson, Isaiah Dunn (1822–79)	New Jersey	Whig	34–35	Do.
66. Clayton, Joshua (1774–98). President and then the 1st Governor of Delaware.	Delaware		1798	Senate.
67. Clements, Andrew Jackson (1832–1913)	Tennessee	Unionist	37	House.
68. Clift, Joseph Wales (1837–1908)	Georgia	Republican	40	Do.
69. Cobb, David (1748–1830). Aide-de-camp on the staff of General Washington.	Massachusetts	Federalist	3	Do.
70. Cole, William Hinson (1837–86). Practiced medicine and law	Maryland	Democrat	49	Do.
71. Comstock, Oliver Cromwell (1780–1860). Abandoned the profession (Baptist minister).	New York	do	13–15	Do.
72. Condict, Lewis (1772–1862). President of the State medical society, 1816–19.	New Jersey	Anti-Federalist	12–14, 17–22	Do.
73. Condit, John (1755–1831). Served as surgeon in the Revolutionary War	do	Democrat	6–7, 16	Do.
			1803–17	Senate.
74. Conover, Simon Barclay (1840–1909)	Florida	Republican	1873–79	Do.
75. Cooper, Thomas Buchecker (1823–62)	Pennsylvania	Democrat	37	House.
76. Copeland, Royal Samuel (1868–1938)	New York	do	1923–38	Senate.
77. Cowan, Jacob Pitzer (1823–95)	Ohio	do	44	House.
78. Cowen, Benjamin Sprague (1793–1860). Abandoned the profession (lawyer).	do	Whig	27	Do.
79. Crawford, William (1760–1823)	Pennsylvania	Democrat	11–14	Do.
80. Crump, George William (1786–1848)	Virginia	Jackson Democrat	19	Do.
81. Cunningham, Francis Alanson (1804–64). Abandoned the profession (lawyer).	Ohio	Democrat	29	Do.
82. Cutler, Manasseh (1742–1823). Lawyer, theologian, physician, botanist, astronomer.	Massachusetts	Federalist	7–8	Do.
83. Darling, Mason Cook (1801–66)	Wisconsin	Democrat	30	Do.
84. Darlington, William (1782–1863). Noted as a botanist	Pennsylvania	do	14, 16–17	Do.
85. Darrall, Chester Bidwell (1842–1908)	Louisiana	Republican	41–44, 45	Do.
86. Davis, John Wesley (1799–1859). Governor of Oregon Territory, 1853–54	Indiana	Democrat	24, 26, 28–29	Do.
87. Davis, Reuben (1813–90). Abandoned the profession (lawyer)	Mississippi	do	35, 36	Do.
88. Davis, Robert Thompson (1823–1906)	Massachusetts	Republican	48–50	Do.
89. Davis, Roger (1762–1815)	Pennsylvania	Democrat	12–13	Do.
90. Dearborn, Henry (1751–1829). Secretary of War, 1801–09; Minister Plenipotentiary to Portugal, 1822–24.	Massachusetts (Maine district).	do	3–4	Do.

Physicians who have service in the American Congress, 1774–1959—Continued

Name	State	Political party	Congress	House or Senate
91. Deboe, William Joseph (1849–1927). Abandoned the profession (lawyer).	Kentucky	Republican	1897–1903	Senate.
92. Dennis, George Robertson (1822–82)	Maryland	Democrat	1873–79	Do.
93. Dick, Samuel (1740–1812). Colonel during the Revolutionary War	New Jersey		Member of the Continental Congress, 1783–84	
94. Dickson, David (?–1836). Lieutenant Governor of Mississippi in 1821	Mississippi	Democrat	24	House.
95. Dickson, Samuel (1807–58)	New York	Whig	34	Do.
96. Dickson, William (1770–1816)	Tennessee		7–9	Do.
97. Doan, William (1792–1847)	Ohio	Democrat	26–27	Do.
98. Dockery, Alexander Monroe (1845–1926). Abandoned medicine (business). Governor of Missouri 1901–5.	Missouri	do	48–55	Do.
99. Douglas, Fred James (1869–1949)	New York	Republican	75–78	Do.
100. Duncan, Alexander (1788–1853)	Ohio	Whig	25–26, 28	Do.
101. Eckert, George Nicholas (1802–65). One of the organizers of Berks County Medical Society in 1824.	Pennsylvania	do	30	Do.
102. Eddy, Norman (1810–72). Practiced medicine until 1847	Indiana	Democrat	33	Do.
103. Edwards, Thomas Owen (1810–76)	Ohio	Whig	30	Do.
104. Egbert, Albert Gallatin (1828–96). Practiced medicine until 1861	Pennsylvania	Democrat	44	Do.
105. Eldredge, Nathaniel Buel (1813–93). Engaged in the practice of medicine for a short time (lawyer).	Michigan	do	48–49	Do.
106. Elisberry, William Wallace (1833–94)	Ohio	do	49	Do.
107. Elmer, Ebenezer (1752–1843). Served in the Revolutionary Army	New Jersey	do	7–9	Do.
108. Elmer, Jonathan (1745–1817). President of the State medical society in 1787.	do	Federalist	1789–91	Senate.
109. Ely, John (1774–1849). One of the organizers of the New York State and Greene County Medical Societies in 1807.	New York	Democrat	26	House.
110. English, Thomas Dunn (1819–1902). Graduated in medicine and law but mainly pursued journalism.	New Jersey	do	52–53	Do.
111. Eustis, William (1753–1825). Served in the Revolutionary Army as surgeon. Minister Plenipotentiary to the Netherlands 1814–18. Governor of Massachusetts, 1823–25.	Massachusetts		16–17	Do.
112. Ewans, Isaac Newton (1827–1901)	Pennsylvania	Republican	45, 48–49	Do.
113. Faison, John Miller (1862–1915)	North Carolina	Democrat	62–63	Do.
114. Farrington, James (1791–1859)	New Hampshire	do	25	Do.
115. Felton, William Harrell (1823–1909). Physician, later also Methodist minister.	Georgia	do	44–46	Do.
116. Fenton, Ivor David (1889–?)	Pennsylvania	Republican	76–86	Do.
117. Fernós-Isern, Antonio (1895–?)	Puerto Rico		1946–59	Resident Commissioner.
118. Fitch, Asa (1765–1843). President of the Washington County Medical Society, 1806–26.	New York	Federalist	12	House.
119. Fitch, Graham Newel (1809–92). Colonel of the 46th Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry during the Civil War.	Indiana	Democrat	31–32	Do.
120. Fitzgerald, William Thomas (1858–1939)	Ohio	Republican	1857–61	Senate.
121. Flood, Thomas Schmeck (1844–1908). Studied medicine but did not practice (drug business).	New York	do	60–70	House.
122. Floyd, John (1783–1837). Surgeon in the War of 1812	Virginia	Democrat	50–51	Do.
123. Fort, Tomlinson (1787–1859)	Georgia	do	15–20	Do.
124. Foster, Martin David (1861–1919)	Illinois	do	20	Do.
125. Fowler, Samuel (1779–1844). Discoverer of minerals: Fowlerite and franklinite.	New Jersey	Jackson Democrat	60–65	Do.
126. France, Joseph Irvin (1873–1939)	Maryland	Republican	23–24	Do.
127. Fries, George (1799–1866)	Ohio	Democrat	1917–23	Senate.
128. Furlong, Robert Grant (1886)	Pennsylvania	do	29–30	House.
129. Gaines, John Wesley (1860–1926). Graduated in medicine but never practiced (lawyer).	Tennessee	do	1943–45, 1949–53	Senate.
130. Gaither, Nathan (1788–1862)	Kentucky	do	55–60	House.
131. Gallinger, Jacob Harold (1837–1918)	New Hampshire	Republican	21–22	Do.
132. Gerry, James (1796–1873)	Pennsylvania	Democrat	59–50	Do.
133. Griffith, John Keller (1882–1942)	Louisiana	do	1891–1918	Senate.
134. Gwin, William McKendree (1805–85)	Mississippi	do	26–27	House.
135. Hahn, John (1776–1823)	Pennsylvania	do	75–76	Do.
136. Hall, Lyman (1724–90). Signed the Declaration of Independence. Governor of Georgia in 1783.	Georgia		27	Do.
137. Hall, Thomas H. (1773–1853)	North Carolina	do	1850–55, 1857–61	Senate.
138. Halsey, Silas (1743–1832)	New York	do	14	House.
139. Hammond, Jabez Delno (1778–1855). Abandoned the profession (lawyer).	do	do	Member of the Continental Congress, 1775–80	
140. Hammons, Joseph (1787–1836). Member of the New Hampshire Medical Society.	New Hampshire	Jackson Democrat	15–18, 20–23	House.
141. Hand, Edward (1744–1802). Started as lieutenant colonel in the Revolutionary War; honorably discharged as major general of the U.S. Army in 1800.	Pennsylvania		9	Do.
142. Harper, Joseph Morrill (1787–1865)	New York	Democrat	14	Do.
143. Harrison, John Scott (1804–78). Son of President William Henry Harrison and father of President Benjamin Harrison. Studied medicine but abandoned the profession (engaged in agricultural pursuits).	Ohio	Whig	21–22	Do.
144. Hatch, Jetro Ayers (1837–1912)	Indiana	Republican	Member of the Continental Congress 1784–85	
145. Hatfield, Henry Drury (1875–), of West Virginia, 1914–17	Governor, West Virginia	do	22–23	House.
146. Haughey, Thomas (1826–69)	Alabama	do	33–34	Do.
147. Haven, Nathaniel Appleton (1762–1831). Ship's surgeon in the Revolutionary War.	New Hampshire	Federalist	54	Do.
148. Hawes, Aylett (1768–1833)	Virginia	Democrat	29–35	Senate.
149. Haymond, William Summerville (1823–85). Organized the Central Medical College in Indianapolis in 1877. Published history of Indiana in 1879.	Indiana	Candidate of Democrats and Liberals.	40	House.
150. Haynes, Charles Eaton (1784–1841)	Georgia	Democrat	11	Do.
151. Hedrick, Erland Harold (1804–?)	West Virginia	Democrat	12–14	Do.
152. Henderson, Joseph (1791–1863)	Pennsylvania		44	Do.
153. Henderson, Thomas (1743–1824)	New Jersey		19–21	Do.
154. Henkle, Eli Jones (1828–93)	Maryland	Democrat	24–25	Do.
155. Henney, Charles William Francis (1884–?). President of the Columbia County Medical Society, 1928–30.	Wisconsin	do	79–82	Do.
156. Henry, John Flournoy (1793–1873)	Kentucky		23–24	Do.
157. Higgins, Wm. Lincoln (1867–1951)	Connecticut	Republican	Elected as Delegate to the Continental Congress in 1779 but declined to serve.	
158. Hoffman, Miachael (1787–1848). Graduated in medicine and law but never practiced medicine.	New York	Democrat	4	House.
159. Hogg, Samuel (1783–1842). President of the State Medical Society of Tennessee in 1840.	Tennessee	do	44–46	Do.
160. Holcombe, George (1786–1828)	New Jersey	do	73	Do.
161. Holland, Cornelius (1783–1870)	Maine	do	19	Do.
			73–74	Do.
			19–23	Do.
			15	Do.
			17–20	Do.
			21–22	Do.

Physicians who have service in the American Congress, 1774–1959—Continued

Name	State	Political party	Congress	House or Senate
162. Holten, Samuel (1738–1816). Signed the Articles of Confederation in 1788.	Massachusetts		Member of the Continental Congress, 1778–80, 1782–87	
163. Hubbard, Joel Douglas (1860–1919). Practiced medicine and law.	Missouri	Republican	3	House.
164. Hunter, Whiteside Godfrey, (1841–1917). U.S. Minister to Guatemala and Honduras, 1897–1902.	Kentucky	do	54	Do.
165. Huntington, Abel (1777–1858)	New York	Democrat	50, 54, 58	Do.
166. Hutton, John Edward (1828–93). Practiced medicine, later law, and finally medicine and law.	Missouri	do	23–24	Do.
167. Ikirt, George Pierce (1852–1927)	Ohio	do	49–50	Do.
168. Irvine, William (1741–1804). Colonel and general of the Revolutionary Army.	Pennsylvania		53	Do.
			Member of the Continential Congress, 1786–88.	
169. Irwin, Edward Michael (1860–1933)	Illinois	Republican	3	House.
170. Jackson, David (about 1730–1801). Physician and apothecary.	Pennsylvania		69–71	Do.
			Member of the Continental Congress, 1785–86.	
171. Jackson, Edward Brake (1793–1826)	Virginia	Democrat	16–17	House.
172. James, Addison Davis (1850–1947)	Kentucky	Republican	60	Do.
173. Jayne, William (1826–1916). Governor of Dakota 1861–63.	Territory of Dakota		38	Delegate.
174. Jewett, Luther (1772–1860). Practiced medicine. Ordained as a minister.	Vermont	Federalist	14	House.
175. Johnson, James Augustus (1829–96). Graduated in medicine, but never practiced (lawyer). Lieutenant Governor of California, 1875–80.	California	Democrat	40–41	Do.
176. Johnson, Perley Brown (1798–1870)	Ohio	Whig	28	Do.
177. Jones, Daniel Terryll (1800–1861)	New York	Democrat	32–33	Do.
178. Jones, George (1766–1838). Served in the Revolutionary War and in the War of 1912.	Georgia	Federalist	1807	Senate.
179. Jones, James (1772–1848). Served in the War of 1812	Virginia	Democrat	16–17	House.
180. Jones, John William (1806–71). Professor in the Atlanta Medical College 1856–62, 1865–70.	Georgia	Whig	30	Do.
181. Jones, Noble Wymberley, (1723–1805)	do		Member of the Continental Congress 1775–76, 1781–83.	
182. Jones, Walter (1745–1815)	Virginia	Democrat	5, 8–11	House.
183. Jorgensen, Joseph (1844–88)	do	Republican	45–47	Do.
184. Judd, Walter Henry (1898–)	Minnesota	do	78–84–86	Do.
185. Kent, Joseph (1779–1837). Governor of Maryland, 1826–29.	Maryland	Federalist Democrat National Republican	12–13 16–19 1833–37	Do. Do. Senate.
186. Kidwell, Zedekiah (1814–72)	Virginia	Democrat	33–34	House.
187. Kindred, John Joseph (1864–1937)	New York	do	62, 67–70	Do.
188. King, Adam (1790–1835). Editor of the York Gazette, 1818–35.	Pennsylvania	do	20–22	Do.
189. Kinsley, Martin (1754–1835). Served in the Revolutionary Army.	Massachusetts		16	Do.
190. Kirkpatrick, William (1769–1832)	New York	Democrat	10	Do.
191. Kittredge, George Washington (1805–81)	New Hampshire	Anti-Nebraska Democrat	33	Do.
192. Lane, Harry (1855–1917)	Oregon	Democrat	1913–17	Senate.
193. Larrabee, Henry William (1870–)	Indiana	do	72–77	House.
194. Latimer, Henry (1752–1819). Served as a surgeon in the Revolutionary War.	Delaware		3 1795–1801	Do. Senate.
195. Lattimore, William (1774–1843)	Mississippi Territory		8–9, 13–14	Delegate.
196. Lawson, John William (1837–1905)	Virginia	Democrat	52	House.
197. Layton, Caleb Rodney (1851–1930)	Delaware	Republican	66–67	Do.
198. Lazaro, Ladislas (1872–1927)	Louisiana	Democrat	63–70	Do.
199. Lee, Arthur (1740–92). Graduated in medicine and law; practiced law only.	Virginia		Member of the Continental Congress, 1781–84.	
200. Lee, Joshua (1783–1842). Served as a surgeon in the War of 1812	New York	Democrat	24	House.
201. Lee, Moses Lindley (1805–76)	do	Republican	36	Do.
202. Leftwich, John William (1826–70). Graduated in medicine but never practiced. Mayor of Memphis 1869–70.	Tennessee	Democrat	39	Do.
203. Leib, Michael (1760–1822). Surgeon in the Revolutionary Army	Pennsylvania	do	6–9 1809–14	Do. Senate.
204. Leib, Owen D. (?–1848)	do	do	29	House.
205. Lilly, Samuel (1815–1880). Consul general of the United States to British India in 1861–62.	New Jersey	do	33	Do.
206. Linn, Lewis Fields (1796–1843). Surgeon in the War of 1812	Missouri		1833–43	Senate.
207. Logan, George (1753–1821). Graduated in medicine but devoted himself to scientific farming.	Pennsylvania	Democrat	1801–07	House.
208. Lord, Frederick William (1800–1860)	New York	Whig	30	Do.
209. Loring, George Bailey (1817–90). U.S. Commissioner of Agriculture 1881–85. U.S. Minister to Portugal 1889–90.	Massachusetts	Republican	45–46	Do.
210. Love, Peter Early (1818–66). Abandoned the profession (lawyer)	Georgia	Democrat	36	Do.
211. Mallory, Francis (1807–60). Practiced medicine for a short time.	Virginia	Whig	25, 26–27	Do.
212. Marable, John Hartwell (1786–1844)	Tennessee	National Republican	19–20	Do.
213. Marchand, David (1776–1832)	Pennsylvania		15–16	Do.
214. Marshall, Alexander Kieth (1808–84)	Kentucky	American Party	34	Do.
215. Mason, James Brown (1775–1819)	Rhode Island	Federalist	14–15	Do.
216. Mason, Moses, Jr. (1789–1866)	Maine	Democrat	23–24	Do.
217. Mason, William (1786–1860)	New York	do	24	Do.
218. Massey, Zachary David (1864–1923)	Tennessee	Republican	61	Do.
219. McCormick, James Robinson (1824–97)	Missouri	Democrat	40–42	Do.
220. McCulloch, John (1806–79)	Pennsylvania	Whig	33	Do.
221. McDill, Alexander Stuart (1822–75)	Wisconsin	Republican	43	Do.
222. McHenry, James (1753–1816). Secretary to General Washington, 1778–80. Secretary of War, 1796–1800.	Maryland		Member of the Continental Congress, 1783–86.	
223. McLean, James Henry (1829–86)	Missouri	Republican	47	House.
224. Miller, Arthur Lewis (1892–)	Nebraska	do	78–84–85	Do.
225. Miller, Homer Virgil Milton (1814–96)	Georgia	Democrat	1868 (?)–71	Do.
226. Miller, John (1774–1862). Organized and in 1808 was the first vice president of the Cortland County Medical Society.	New York		19	Do.
227. Mitchel, Charles Burton (1815–64)	Arkansas	Democrat	1861	Senate.
228. Mitchell, George Edward (1781–1832). In 1814 brevetted colonel for gallant conduct in repealing attack of British forces.	Maryland	do	18–19, 21–22	Do.
229. Mitchell, Henry (1784–1856)	New York	Jackson Democrat	23	Do.
230. Mitchell, Robert (1778–1848)	Ohio	Democrat	23	Do.
231. Mitchill, Samuel Latham (1764–1831). Editor of the New York Medical Repository (1797–1813). Founder and the president of the Lyceum of Natural History of New York City 1817–23. Professor in the New York College of Physicians and Surgeons 1808–26 (natural history, botany, materia medica).	New York	do	7–9, 11–12 1804–09	Do. Senate.
232. Moffet, John (1831–84). Practiced pharmacy and medicine	Pennsylvania	do	41	House.
233. Molony, Richard Sheppard (1811–91)	Illinois	do	32	Do.
234. Montgomery, William (1789–1844)	North Carolina	do	24–26	Do.
235. Moore, Ely (1798–1861). Studied medicine but did not engage in extensive practice (editor).	New York	do	24–25	Do.
236. Moore, Samuel (1774–1861). Practiced medicine for a short time. Director of the U.S. Mint, 1824–35.	Pennsylvania	do	15–17	Do.
237. Morgan, Thomas Ellsworth (1906–)	do	do	79–84–86	Do.

Physicians who have service in the American Congress, 1774–1959—Continued

Name	State	Political party	Congress	House or Senate
238. Morril, David Lawrence (1772–1849). Practiced medicine 1793–1800, 1807–30. Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in 1802–11.	New Hampshire	Adams Democrat	1817–23	Senate.
239. Morris, John Alexander (1814–1904)	Pennsylvania	Democrat	32	House.
240. Moseley, William Abbott (1798–1873). Abandoned profession	New York	Whig	28–29	Do.
241. Naudain, Arnold (1790–1872)	Delaware		1830–36	Senate.
242. Neal, Will E. (1875–)	West Virginia	Republican	83–85	House.
243. Nes, Henry (1799–1850)	Pennsylvania	Independent	28	Do.
244. Newell, William Augustus (1817–1901). Governor of New Jersey 1857–60. Territorial Governor of Washington 1880–84.	New Jersey	Whig	30–31	Do.
		Republican	39	Do.
245. Norton, James Albert (1843–1912). Practiced medicine 1867–79	Ohio	Democrat	55–57	Do.
246. Nourse, Amos (1794–1877). Professor of obstetrics at Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine 1846–54.	Maine		1857	Senate.
247. Olds, Edson Baldwin (1802–69)	Ohio	Democrat	31–33	House.
248. Oipp, Archibald Ernest (1882)	New Jersey	Republican	67	Do.
249. Osborne, John Eugene (1858–1943). Governor of Wyoming 1893–95. First Assistant Secretary of State 1913–17.	Wyoming	Democrat	55	Do.
250. Paine, Ephraim (1730–85)	New York		Member of the Continental Congress 1784–85.	
251. Palmer, John William (1866–). Practiced medicine 1895–1908	Missouri	Republican	71	House.
252. Parker, James (1768–1837)	Massachusetts	Democrat	13, 16	Do.
253. Patton, David Henry (1837–1914)	Indiana	do	52	Do.
254. Patton, John Mercer (1797–1858). Graduated in medicine but never practiced (lawyer).	Virginia	do	21–25	Do.
255. Peabody, Nathaniel (1741–1823). Served in the Revolutionary Army. Commanded a brigade in Rhode Island in 1779.	New Hampshire		Member of the Continental Congress in 1779–80.	
256. Peck, Erasmus Darwin (1808–76)	Ohio	Republican	41–42	House.
257. Petrikin, David (1788–1847). Surgeon in the War of 1812	Pennsylvania	Democrat	25–26	Do.
258. Peyton, Joseph Hopkins (1808–45)	Tennessee	Whig	28–29	Do.
259. Peyton, Samuel Oldham (1804–70)	Kentucky	Democrat	30, 35–36	Do.
260. Pfeifer, Joseph Lawrence (1892–)	New York	do	74–81	Do.
261. Phelps, Lancelot (1784–1866)	Connecticut	do	24–25	Do.
262. Pierce, Ray Vaughn (1840–1914). Publisher of the Medical Adviser	New York	Republican	46	Do.
263. Pierson, Isaac (1770–1833). President of the Medical Society of New Jersey in 1827.	New Jersey	Whig	20–21	Do.
264. Pinkney, William (1764–1822). Joint Minister to Great Britain 1806–7. Minister Plenipotentiary 1807–11. U.S. Attorney General 1811–14. Minister Plenipotentiary to Russia 1816–18. Studied medicine but never practiced (lawyer).	Maryland		2, 14	Do.
			1819–22	Senate.
265. Platt, James Henry, Jr. (1837–94)	Virginia	Republican	41–43	House.
266. Post, Jotham, Jr., 1771–1817). Graduated in medicine but did not practice (engaged in the drug import).	New York	Federalist	13	Do.
267. Preston, Jacob Alexander (1796–1868)	Maryland	Whig	28	Do.
268. Pugh, John Howard (1827–1905)	New Jersey	Republican	45	Do.
269. Ramsay, David (1749–1815). Served in the Revolutionary Army as surgeon. State historian and author of several historical works.	South Carolina		Member of the Continental Congress, 1782–86.	
270. Reading, John Roberts (1826–86)	Pennsylvania	Democrat	41	House.
271. Reed, Robert Rentoul (1807–64)	do	Whig	31	Do.
272. Reese, David Addison (1794–1871)	Georgia	do	33	Do.
273. Reily, Luther (1794–1854). Served in the War of 1812	Pennsylvania	Democrat	25	Do.
274. Reife, James Hugh (1791–1863)	Missouri	do	28–29	Do.
275. Rice, John Birchard (1832–93)	Ohio	Republican	47	Do.
276. Riggs, Jetur Rose (1809–69). One of the founders of the District Medical Society of Passaic County, N.J., in 1844.	New Jersey	Democrat	36	Do.
277. Riggs, Lewis (1789–1870). President of the Cortland County Medical Society in 1825–26.	New York	do	27	Do.
278. Robbins, George Robbins (1808–75)	New Jersey	Whig	34–35	Do.
279. Rush, Benjamin (1745–1813). Professor at the Philadelphia Medical College. Surgeon general in the Revolutionary Army. Signer of the Declaration of Independence. Treasurer of the U.S. Mint from 1797.	Pennsylvania		Member of the Continental Congress, 1776–77.	
280. Russell, John (1772–1842). Practiced medicine for a short time	New York		9–10	House.
281. Sage, Ebenezer (1755–1834)	do	Democrat	11–13	Do.
282. Samuel, Edmund William (1857–1930)	Pennsylvania	Republican	59	Do.
283. Say, Benjamin (1756–1813). Physician and apothecary. 1 of the founders of the College of Physicians of Philadelphia in 1787. President of the Pennsylvania Humane Society.	do		10–11	Do.
284. Schenck, Ferdinand Schureman (1790–1860)	New Jersey	Jackson Democrat	23–24	Do.
285. Scudder, John Anderson (1759–1836). Surgeon in the Revolutionary Army. Secretary of the New Jersey Medical Society in 1788–89.	do	Democrat	11	Do.
286. Scudder, Nathaniel (1733–81). Killed while resisting the invasion of the British Army.	do		Member of the Continental Congress, 1777–79.	
287. Semmes, Benedict Joseph (1789–1803)	Maryland	Democrat	21–22	House.
288. Seybert, Adam (1773–1825). Graduated in medicine but did not practice (chemist).	Pennsylvania	do	11–13, 15	Do.
289. Shaw, Frank Thomas (1841–1923)	Maryland	do	49–50	Do.
290. Shaw, Henry Marchmore (1819–64). Killed as a colonel of the Confederate Army.	North Carolina	do	33, 35	Do.
291. Shaw, Samuel (1768–1827)	Vermont	do	10–12	Do.
292. Sheffer, Daniel (1783–1880)	Pennsylvania	do	25	Do.
293. Sherman, Socrates Norton (1801–73)	New York	Republican	37	Do.
294. Shippen, William (1712–1801). 1 of founders of the College of Philadelphia and of the College of New Jersey (now Princeton University).	Pennsylvania		Member of the Continental Congress, 1778–80	
295. Showalter, Joseph Baltzell (1851–1932)	do	do	55–57	House.
296. Shower, Jacob (1803–79)	Maryland	Independent	33	Do.
297. Shull, Joseph Horace (1848–1944). Practiced law and medicine	Pennsylvania	Democrat	58	Do.
298. Simmons, Samuel (1792–1847)	Connecticut	do	28	Do.
299. Simonton, William (1788–1846). One of the original supporters of the free-school system, established in 1834.	Pennsylvania	Whig	26–27	Do.
300. Singleton, James Washington (1811–1892). Practiced medicine for a short time (lawyer).	Illinois	Democrat	46–47	Do.
301. Sirovich, William Irving (1882–1939)	New York	do	70–76	Do.
302. Skelton, Charles (1806–79)	New Jersey	do	32–33	Do.
303. Smith, Frederick Cleveland (1884–?)	Ohio	Republican	76–81	Do.
304. Smith, Isaac (1740–1807)	New Jersey	Federalist	4	Do.
305. Smith, James Strudwick (1790–1859)	North Carolina	Democrat	15–16	Do.
306. Spence, John Selby (1788–1840)	Maryland	do	18, 22	Do.
			1836–40	Senate.
307. Standiford, Elisha David (1831–87). Abandoned the practice of medicine.	Kentucky	do	43	House.
308. Stewart Jacob Henry (1829–84). Mayor of St. Paul in 1864, 1868, 1872–74.	Minnesota	Republican	45	Do.
309. Stone, Joseph Champlin (1829–1902)	Iowa	do	45	Do.
310. Storer, Clement (1760–1830)	New Hampshire		10	Do.
			1817–19	Senate.
311. Strait, Thomas Jefferson (1846–1924)	South Carolina	Alliance Democrat	53–55	House.
312. Strawbridge, James Dale (1824–90)	Pennsylvania	Republican	43	Do.
313. Sturgeon, Daniel (1789–1878). Treasurer of the U.S. Mint in Philadelphi 1853–58.	do	Democrat	1840–51	Senate.

Physicians who have service in the American Congress, 1774–1959—Continued

Name	State	Political party	Congress	House or Senate
314. Summers, John William (1870–1937)	Washington	Republican	66, 72	House.
315. Sutherland, Joel Barlow (1792–1861). Physician to Lafayette. Founder of Jefferson Medical College at Philadelphia. Abandoned the profession.	Pennsylvania	Jackson Democrat	20, 24	Do.
316. Swan, Samuel (1771–1844)	New Jersey		17, 21	Do.
317. Swick, Jesse Howard (1879–?)	Pennsylvania	Republican	70–73	Do.
318. Swinburne, John (1820–89). Mayor of Albany in 1882	New York	do	49	Do.
319. Swope, John Augustus (1827–1910). Discontinued the practice of medicine after a few years.	Pennsylvania	Democrat	48–49	Do.
320. Taylor, Miles (1805–73). Studied medicine, but never practiced. Lawyer.	Louisiana	do	34–36	Do.
321. Taylor, William (1791–1865)	New York	do	23–25	Do.
322. Tenerowicz, Rudolph Gabriel (1890–?)	Michigan	do	76–77	Do.
323. Tenney, Samuel (1748–1816). Surgeon in the Revolutionary War	New Hampshire		6–9	Do.
324. Terrell, William (1778–1855)	Georgia	Democrat	15–16	Do.
325. Thomas, Henry Franklin (1843–1912)	Michigan	Republican	53–54	Do.
326. Thompson, Hedge (1780–1828)	New Jersey		20	Do.
327. Thompson, John (1780–1852)	Ohio	Democrat	19, 21–24	Do.
328. Thorkelson, Jacob (1876–1945)	Montana	Republican	76	Do.
329. Thornton, Mathew (1714–1803). Signed the Declaration of Independence	New Hampshire		Member of the Continental Congress, 1776–78	
330. Throckmorton, James Webb (1825–94). Surgeon in the Mexican War. Abandoned the profession. Elected Governor of Texas but removed by order of General Sheridan.	Texas	Democrat	44–45, 48–49	House.
331. Tiffin, Edward (1766–1829). Physician and Methodist minister. Elected as the 1st Governor of Ohio in 1803.	Ohio	do	1807–09	Senate.
332. Tillotson, Thomas (1750–1832). Served in the Revolutionary Army	New York		Elected to the 7th Congress, but did not take his seat and resigned in 1801.	
333. Tilton, James (1745–1822). Surgeon in the Revolutionary Army	Delaware		Member of the Continental Congress, 1783–85	
334. Townshend, Norton Strange (1815–95). Delegate to the World's Anti-slavery Convention in London, England, in 1840.	Ohio	Democrat	32	House.
335. Trimble, Carey Allen (1813–87)	do	Republican	36–37	Do.
336. Tucker, Thomas Tudor (1745–1828). Surgeon in the Revolutionary War. U.S. Treasurer, 1801–28.	South Carolina		Member of the Continental Congress, 1787–88	
		Federalist	1–2	House.
337. Updegraff, Jonathan Taylor (1822–82)	Ohio	Republican	46–47	Do.
338. Valk, William Weightman (1806–79)	New York	American Party	34	Do.
339. Van Aernam, Henry (1819–94). Commissioner of Pensions, 1869–71	do	Republican	39–40, 46–47	Do.
340. Vance, Robert Brank (1793–1827). Mortally wounded in a duel	North Carolina	Democrat	18	Do.
341. Volk, Lester David (1884–?). Editor of the Medical Economist. Abandoned the profession (lawyer).	New York	Republican	66–67	Do.
342. Walker, Persy (1812–80)	Alabama	American Party	34	Do.
343. Wallace, John Winfield (1818–89)	Pennsylvania	Republican	37, 44	Do.
344. Walling, Ansel Tracy (1824–90). Practiced medicine a short time (lawyer).	Ohio	Democrat	44	Do.
345. Weatherford, Zadoc Lorenzo (1888–)	Alabama	do	76	Do.
346. Welch, William Wickham (1818–92)	Connecticut	American Party	34	Do.
347. Whipple, Thomas, Jr. (1787–1835)	New Hampshire		17–20	Do.
348. White, Bartow (1776–1862)	New York		19	Do.
349. Williams, John (1752–1806). Colonel of the Revolutionary Army	do		4–5	Do.
350. Williamson, Hugh (1735–1819). Theologian, mathematician, physician. Surgeon general of the North Carolina troops, 1779–82.	North Carolina		Member of the Continental Congress, 1782–85, 1787–88	
351. Willoughby, Westel, Jr. (1769–1844). President of the Herkimer County Medical Society, 1806–16 and 1818–36. President of the College of Physicians and Surgeons for the Western District of New York, 1812–44. Founded the town of Willoughby, Ohio, and also Willoughby College.	New York	Federalist	1–2	House.
		Democrat	14	Do.
352. Wilson, Frank Eugene (1857–1935)	do	do	56–58, 62–63	Do.
353. Wise, Richard Alsop (1843–1900)	Virginia	Republican	55–56	Do.
354. Witherell, James (1759–1838). Served in the Revolutionary Army	Vermont	Democrat	10	Do.
355. Withers, Robert Enoch (1821–1907). Lieutenant Governor in 1873. U.S. counsel at Hong Kong, China, 1885–89.	Virginia	Conservative	1875–81	Senate.
356. Wolcott, Oliver (1726–97). Studied medicine but did not practice. Signed the Declaration of Independence. Governor of Connecticut 1796–97.	Connecticut		Member of the Continental Congress, 1775–78 and 1780–84.	
357. Wood, John Travers (1878–). President of Kootenai County Medical Society for many years.	Idaho	Republican	82	House.
358. Yoder, Samuel S. (1841–1921). Abandoned the profession (lawyer)	Ohio	Democrat	50–51	Do.
359. York, Tyre (1836–1916)	North Carolina	Liberal Democrat	48	Do.
360. Young, Bryant Rust (1800–1882)	Kentucky	Democrat	29	Do.
361. Young, William Singleton (1790–1827)	do	do	19–20	Do.

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

As the sources do not contain a complete biography of each Member of the Congress (this is especially true for the Members of early Congresses), we are not able to get an exact total of persons who have completed their medical education.

Keeping this in mind, we can derive from the list of physician Members of the Congress statistical data as follows:

Practicing physicians	299
Physicians practicing medicine and also another profession	11
Physicians who abandoned their profession	33
Graduates in medicine who did not practice	18
Total	361

Political affiliation

Democrats	166
Republicans	69
Whigs	30
Federalists	15
Jackson Democrats	6

Political affiliation—Continued

American Party	5
National Republicans	2
Independents	2
Liberal Democrats	1
Adams Democrats	1
Conservatives	1
Unionists	1
Anti-Federalists	1
Alliance Democrats	1
Anti-Nebraska Democrats	1
Total	302
Political affiliation not known	32
Members of the Continental Congress	27
Total	361

Physician Members of Congress by State

State:	Number of physicians
Alabama	4
Arkansas	3
California	2
Connecticut	7
Dakota	2

Physician Members of Congress by State—Continued

State:	Number of physicians
Delaware	7
Florida	1
Georgia	17
Idaho	1
Illinois	5
Indiana	7
Iowa	1
Kentucky	12
Louisiana	5
Maine	4
Maryland	16
Massachusetts	13
Michigan	5
Minnesota	2
Mississippi	4
Missouri	10
Montana	1
Nebraska	1
New Hampshire	14
New Jersey	30
New Mexico	1

Physician Members of Congress by States—Continued

State:	Number of physicians
New York	48
North Carolina	11
Ohio	26
Oregon	1
Pennsylvania	52
Puerto Rico	1
Rhode Island	3
South Carolina	5
Tennessee	8
Texas	1
Utah	1
Vermont	3
Virginia	18
Washington	1
West Virginia	3
Wisconsin	3
Wyoming	1
Total	361

Physician Members of the Continental Congress

1774	—
1775	4
1776	8
1777	7
1778	8
1779	6
1780	8
1781	6
1782	8
1783	11
1784	11
1785	8
1786	5
1787	4
1788	3

Representatives (and Delegates) in the Congress

CONGRESS AND NUMBER OF PHYSICIANS	
1st (1789–91)	3
2d (1791–93)	3
3d (1793–95)	7
4th (1795–97)	4
5th (1797–99)	2
6th (1799–1801)	3
7th (1801–3)	8
8th (1803–5)	10
9th (1805–7)	13
10th (1837–9)	9
11th (1809–11)	10
12th (1811–13)	13
13th (1813–15)	13
14th (1815–17)	15
15th (1817–19)	12
16th (1819–21)	17
17th (1821–23)	15
18th (1823–25)	11
19th (1825–27)	16
20th (1827–29)	16
21st (1829–31)	15
22d (1831–33)	16
23d (1833–35)	16
24th (1835–37)	18
25th (1837–39)	13

Representatives (and Delegates) in the Congress—Continued

26th (1839–41)	10
27th (1841–43)	11
28th (1843–45)	10
29th (1845–47)	8
30th (1847–49)	8
31st (1849–51)	7
32d (1851–53)	10
33d (1853–55)	15
34th (1855–57)	14
35th (1857–59)	10
36th (1859–61)	8
37th (1861–63)	7
38th (1863–65)	1
39th (1865–67)	5
40th (1867–69)	7
41st (1869–71)	9
42d (1871–73)	6
43d (1873–75)	6
44th (1875–77)	10
45th (1877–79)	10
46th (1879–81)	8
47th (1881–83)	6
48th (1883–85)	10
49th (1885–87)	13
50th (1887–89)	10
51st (1889–91)	5
52d (1891–93)	5
53d (1893–95)	6
54th (1895–97)	9
55th (1897–99)	10
56th (1899–1901)	6
57th (1901–3)	6
58th (1903–5)	4
59th (1905–7)	4
60th (1907–9)	5
61st (1909–11)	3
62d (1911–13)	5
63d (1913–15)	5
64th (1915–17)	3
65th (1917–19)	2
66th (1919–21)	4
67th (1921–23)	6
68th (1923–25)	4
69th (1925–27)	5
70th (1927–29)	8
71st (1929–31)	5
72d (1931–33)	5
73d (1933–35)	5
74th (1935–37)	5
75th (1937–39)	5
76th (1939–41)	10
77th (1941–43)	6
78th (1943–45)	6
79th (1945–47)	7
80th (1947–49)	7
81st (1949–51)	7
82d (1951–53)	6
83d (1953–55)	5
84th (1955–57)	5
85th (1957–59)	6
86th (1959–)	5

Senators

NAME AND SERVICE IN THE SENATE	
1. Ball, Lewis Heisler	1903–05
2. Bateman, Ephraim	1826–29
3. Bibb, William Wyatt	1813–16
4. Borland, Solon	1848–53

Senators—Continued

5. Bradford, William	1793–96
6. Campbell, Alexander	1809–13
7. Chambers, Henry H	1825–26
8. Condit, John	1803–17
9. Conover, Simon Barclay	1873–79
10. Copeland, Royal Samuel	1923–38
11. Deboe, William Joseph	1897–1903
12. Dennis, George Robertson	1873–79
13. Elmer, Jonathan	1789–91
14. Fitch, Graham Newel	1857–61
15. France, Joseph Irvin	1917–23
16. Gallinger, Jacob Harold	1891–1918
17. Gwin, William McKendree	1850–55, 1857–61
18. Hatfield, Henry Drury	1914–17
19. Jones, George	1807
20. Lane, Harry	1913–17
21. Latimer, Henry	1795–1801
22. Leib, Michael	1808–09
23. Linn, Lewis Fields	1833–43
24. Logan, George	1801–07
25. Miller, Homer Virgil Milton	1868–71
26. Mitchel, Charles Burton	1861
27. Mitchill, Samuel Latham	1804–09
28. Morril, David Lawrence	1817–23
29. Naudain, Arnold	1830–36
30. Nourse, Amos	1857
31. Pinkney, William	1819–22
32. Spence, John Selby	1836–40
33. Storer, Clement	1817–19
34. Sturgeon, Daniel	1840–51
35. Tiffin, Edward	1807–09
36. Withers, Robert Enoch	1875–81

Bibliography

Browning, William, "Men of Medical Training in Congress (1789–1910)," Western Medical Times (Denver, Colo.), XXXIX (1919), 2.

Congressional Quarterly Almanac, Washington, Congressional Quarterly News Features, 1945–1958.

Haggard, H. W., "The Doctor in History," New Haven, Yale University Press, 1934.

Letters of Benjamin Rush. Edited by L. H. Butterfield. Philadelphia, The Philosophical Society, 1951.

Major, Ralph H., "A History of Medicine," Springfield, Ill., Ch. C. Thomas, (1954).

Ripley, Jacob James, "The Beginning of the U.S. Army, 1783–1812," Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1947.

Scheier, George Albert, "Chronological Table Showing Some Outstanding Events and Achievements of the Medical Department of the U.S. Army, 1755–1947." (Manuscript, Library of Congress).

Thoms, Herbert, "Lyman Hall, Physician, Patriot, Signer," Medical Journal and Record (New Haven, Conn.) June 15, 1927.

U.S. Congress, "Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774–1949," Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1950.

U.S. Congress, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1873–1958.

U.S. Congress, "Official Congressional Directory for the Use of the U.S. Congress," Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1944–1958.

Members of Congress who have attended medical school[1]

Name	State	Political party	Congress	House or Senate
1. Angel, William G. (1790–1858). Began the study of medicine in 1807. Lawyer.	New York	Adams, Democrat	19	House.
		Jackson, Democrat	21–22	Do.
2. Bates, Martin Waltham (1787–1869). Studied medicine. Lawyer.	Delaware	Democrat	1857–59	Senate.
3. Chapman, John (1740–1800). Studied probably medicine as he called himself "practitioner of physics".	Pennsylvania	Federalist	5	House.
4. Chilcott, Charles Miles (1828–91). Studied medicine. Lawyer.	Territory of Colorado	Republican	40	Delegate.
	Colorado		1882–83	Senate.
5. Conger, James Lockwood (1805–76). Studied medicine. No trace of practicing. Lawyer.	Michigan	Whig	32	House.
6. Cowan, Edgar (1815–85). Studied medicine. Lawyer.	Pennsylvania	Republican	1861–67	Senate.
7. Goodenow, Robert (1800–74). Studied medicine. Lawyer.	Maine	Whig	32	House.
8. Harrison, William Henry (1773–1841). President of the United States. Studied medicine.	Territory Northwest of the River Ohio.		6	Delegate.
	Ohio	Whig	14–15	House.
			1825–28	Senate.
9. Hickman, John (1810–75). Began the study of medicine but abandoned it for the study of law.	Pennsylvania	Democrat	34–35	House.
		Douglas Democrat	36	Do.
10. Lawrence, William (1819–99). Studied medicine, 1841–43.	Ohio	Republican	37	Do.
		Republican	39–41, 43–44	Do.

Footnote at end of table.

Members of Congress who have attended medical school[1]—Continued

Name	State	Political party	Congress	House or Senate
11. Manson, Mahlon Dickerson (1820–95). Studied medicine	Indiana	Democrat	42	House
12. McKissock, Thomas (1790–1866). Studied medicine and law. Practiced law.	New York	Whig	31	Do.
13. Niles, Nathaniel (1741–1828). Studied law, medicine, and theology	Vermont		2–3	Do.
14. Poinsett, Joel Robert (1779–1851). Studied medicine, attended the military school, and studied law.	South Carolina	Democrat	17–19	Do.
15. Read, Nathan (1759–1849). Studied medicine (?). Apothecary	Massachusetts	Federalist	6–7	Do.
16. Ritchie, John (1831–87). Commenced the study of medicine but abandoned it for law.	Maryland	Democrat	42	Do.
17. Sharpe, Peter (data unknown). Nothing is known about his studies and practice of medicine. In 1807 he was a member of Columbia County Medical Society.	New York		18	Do.
18. Sibley, Joseph (1850–1927). Taught school and studied medicine	Pennsylvania	Democrats and People's Party and Prohibitionists.	53	Do.
		Democrat	56	Do.
		Republican	57–59	Do.
19. Starin, John Henry (1825–1909). Began the study of medicine in 1842	New York	do	45–46	Do.
20. Stewart, Andrew (1836–1903). Studied medicine	Pennsylvania	do	52	Do.
21. Tracy, Albert Haller (1793–1859). Studied medicine but abandoned it	New York	Democrat	16–18	Do.
22. Venable, Abraham Watkins (1799–1876). Studied medicine 2 years. Lawyer.	North Carolina	do	30–32	Do.
23. Wade, Benjamin Franklin (1800–1878). Studied medicine, 1823–25. Lawyer.	Ohio	Whig Republican	1851–69	Senate.
24. Ware, Nicholas (1769–1824). Studied medicine for a time. Lawyer	Georgia		1821–24	Do.
25. Wick, William Watson (1796–1868). Moved to Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1816; taught school; studied medicine until 1818 and then law. Lawyer.	Indiana	Democrat	26, 29–30	House.

[1] Available information is not sufficient to indicate if those listed here completed their medical education and/or if they entered active practice.

Hallelujah! The Small Tobacco Farmer Has Been Saved for One More Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to report the arrival of good news which will hearten everyone who is interested in seeing that people get a fair break in their efforts to make a living.

I was informed yesterday that the Department of Agriculture had abandoned a previous plan to cut burley tobacco quotas by 16 percent, and will keep the 1959 quotas at the present level for another year.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great break for the small tobacco farmers in West Virginia, and throughout the burley belt. In fact, it will mean the difference between their survival and the danger of bankruptcy and possible starvation.

A few days ago I made a strong appeal for the small tobacco farmer in testimony before the Tobacco Division of the Department of Agriculture. I pointed out that the small tobacco farmer could scarcely be held responsible for creating any surplus—if indeed there were a surplus. Had this punitive measure been put into effect, it would have been roughly comparable to court-martialing a lowly private for the war crimes of his general.

Most recent policies of the Agriculture Department have tended to favor the big farmer, and conversely, to hamper the small farmer. Millions of small farmers have been driven off their farms. A cut in tobacco quotas not only would have hampered our small tobacco farmers—in some cases it would have driven him out of business altogether.

When I appeared before the tobacco hearing, I paraphrased a famous old tobacco advertising slogan, saying I did not want "L.S./M.F.T." to come to mean "Let's starve mountaineer farmers of tobacco."

If I may paraphrase another tobacco slogan of more recent vintage, may I say that "They said it couldn't be done." But somehow, the Department of Agriculture was persuaded to change its mind and rescind this punitive decrease in allotments.

All of us interested in fairness and justice applaud the action taken, and we are truly thankful.

A Whole $1,027 Per Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, a recent article by Roscoe Fleming in the Denver Post very graphically points out the misconceptions which are fostered by the present administration in regard to per capita farm income in our Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this article, titled "A Whole $1,027 Per Year," from the Denver Post of January 23, 1959:

THE GREEDY FARMER AGAIN—A WHOLE $1,027 PER YEAR

(By Roscoe Fleming)

It is said that figures do not lie. However, statisticians do obfuscate, as aided by publicity men.

One of the finest alltime jobs of this kind is done by the staff of Mr. Ezra Benson, Secretary of Agriculture.

For example, the Department of Agriculture recently got out a release implying that the farmers "never had it so good" as under Mr. Benson; and all at the expense of us city folk.

They reported that the average U.S. farmer is now enjoying a per capita yearly income of $1,027, or the "highest in history."

And they added that net income per farm operation is $2,735 yearly, characterized as the second-highest of all time.

The serious flaw in Mr. Benson's happy statistics is that they make no comparison whatever with the status of other Americans.

To take one example, the farmer's "highest in history" per capita income of $1,027 yearly is just about half of the 1957 national average income per person which was $2,027.

In other words, the farmer as a group got paid for his work and investment at hardly more than half the average return of all Americans.

Second, the $2,735 yearly net income per farm operation means that this was what the average farmer had left yearly to support his family on, buy shoes, schooling, and Cadillacs, after paying his business expenses.

How many city families get along on $2,735 a year? Too many, perhaps. But the average city wage earner, salaried man, or businessman would regard $52 a week as a starvation return, and that's what the farmer's net return averages.

Don't know about you, but I'm getting a little tired of having $5,000 to $50,000 city people encouraged to scold the $2,735-a-year farmer for allegedly charging them too much for food.

Finally, the makeup of the farmer's net: As reported by Mr. Benson's statisticians, it is made up, one-third from jobs off the farm; one-third from Government payments; and only one-third from actual market returns for the food and the fiber which he provides to keep the Nation going.

I do not know any other group of Americans whose net income is figured on the basis of what they must do outside their regular vocation to make a living.

By the lowest estimate a million farm families, or more, keep going only because either husband or wife has a full-time extra job of some sort, maybe driving 20 miles each way daily to and from it.

Of course, lots of city families are two-job families too; but they do end up with somewhat more than $2,735 yearly to show for it.

Second, that one-third of the farmer's net income form Government payments. Mostly these are designed to hold up prices at the farm and in the marketplace, which is exactly the wrong way to go about it.

But this statistic, more than any other, shows the grave illness of American agriculture. Yet, we are being continuously importuned to take away those supports, on the ground that the farmer is nothing more than a greedy oaf who is victimizing all the rest of us.

Specifically, that would reduce net income from farming to not more than $1,000 per farm, and net income per farm person from farming to not more than $400 a year.

A dandier way to promote poverty and to bring on depression, insecurity, and another 1929 can scarcely be imagined.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial from the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News, for January 19, 1959, relating to the subject of a judge's earnest efforts to find some way to stem the rising tide of juvenile delinquency.

It so happens, Mr. Speaker, that for some years I have known Common Pleas Judge Jay S. McDevitt, whose new plan for helping to assuage the problem of juvenile delinquency is discussed in this thoughtful editorial. As an attorney, I have argued cases in his court and I know him to be a prudent, kind, and extremely intelligent jurist. I know that he, like many another conscientious judge, has devoted a great deal of time and thought to the problem of juvenile delinquency.

We all understand that there is no one answer to the growing problem of crime with which our Nation is plagued, whether the crime be committed by young people or by old, hardened criminals. There is much to be learned about the subject, and how society will deal with this increasing problem. And there is much being left undone that could be done, under the laws now in existence, to stem the crime wave. I am happy and proud that Judge McDevitt is striving to find some answers, and I am just as happy to know that there are alert editors who will pay him the tribute he deserves, as this fine editorial does.

The editorial follows:

HOLDS PROMISE

Numerous attempts to solve the problem of teenage delinquency have been made. Few have been successful judging by reports on crime.

Some have failed because they were too drastic and some because they were too lenient.

A program, designed to deter young people from committing the numerous crimes that have been committed in the community recently was announced from the bench the other day by Common Pleas Judge Jay S. McDevitt when he was called upon to pass sentence on four young men, all under 20 years of age.

They had been indicted by the grand jury, 3 on 11 counts of breaking and entering, and 1 on a count of grand larceny. All had pleaded guilty.

Judge McDevitt announced that he had discarded the "plain probationary" method of handling such cases and had devised one of his own.

The four were placed on probation for 6 months under unusual conditions.

They were ordered to answer, without help, five questions which he submitted:

Did you know you were doing wrong when you committed this crime?

Why did you commit this crime?

Are you sorry you committed this crime or just sorry you got caught?

Will you obey the laws from now on and why?

What would you think of a person who would steal from you under like or similar circumstances wherein you were apprehended?

The questions must be answered and submitted to the court in writing within 30 days, must be accompanied by a statement, sworn to before a notary public, that they are their own.

Further provisions of the probation, include:

They must be at home by 9 p.m. every night of the six-month period.

They must not drink intoxicating liquor.

They must file monthly reports with Probation Officer Arthur L. Warman.

They must learn the ten commandments and recite them to the court within 30 days.

They must accompany the sheriff or his deputies to the Mansfield Reformatory or the Ohio Penitentiary to see what they still might face.

And the judge sternly warned them that the slightest violation of the provisions of their parole will mean sentences to the reformatory.

Judge McDevitt's program is neither too drastic nor too lenient.

He has imposed terms which are entirely reasonable, but which, at the same time, enable officials to keep tab on their habits, which should make them consider their illegal conduct and make them reflect on what is in store for them should they disobey the court's orders.

The four are at an age when they should be starting their careers and preparing to assume the responsibilities of citizenship.

They have been given the opportunity to make a start in that direction. It is not too late.

Judge McDevitt's program holds promise.

In Memoriam: October 23, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following text of a statement which appeared in the Michigan Daily, the official student newspaper of the University of Michigan, a few months ago. This statement, written by the Hungarian students at that university, appeals again to the American people not to forget the treachery of the Soviet Communists and the millions of enslaved peoples still living behind the Iron Curtain:

HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION—IN MEMORIAM: OCTOBER 23, 1956

Two years ago today the people of Hungary rose against their Communist rulers who had reduced the country to a mere colony of Soviet imperialism in servile obedience to their Kremlin masters.

With one blow the meticulously constructed legend of "people's democracies" marching toward the blissful goal of communism was shattered. Never will we forget that magnificent display of national unity, of millions of Hungarians fighting with one will for freedom, for independence.

From the old, retired lady teacher who overnight became an expert in fixing Molotov cocktails to the 14-year-old schoolboy who left a football game to play cowboys and Indians with Soviet tanks, from the docile elderly professor of philosophy who went sharpshooting on AVH henchmen and their Soviet pals to the frail, dark-haired girl confronting an armored car column with a single weapon, the Hungarian flag in her hand, holding it high until crushed to death; every one of us has contributed his or her modest share.

Incredible as it seems for our sophisticated century, the romantic pages of oldtime history books came alive. With banners and barricades, songs and pamphlets, rifles and machineguns, students and workers, peasants and poets challenged the massed military might of the Red Army—and a miracle took place, the people gained six unforgettable days of freedom. Apparently, these 6 days proved too short a time for the United Nations to officially acknowledge the country's regained independence and the declared neutrality of the revolutionary Hungarian Government (recognized, incidentally, as the legal government of the country by the Russians during the short period of armistice talks between the two countries). Left to themselves in a world preoccupied with the Suez crisis, and their supreme commander lured to a trap, under the pretense of negotiating the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungarian soil, the revolutionaries fought to the last bullet against the overwhelming strength of 25 Soviet armored divisions.

When the last hope of UN action faded, fearful of Communist revenge, unable to face their final loss of freedom, tens of thousands fled to the West leaving everything behind.

Those of us who were fortunate enough to be accepted by this country have experienced genuine good will, utmost willingness to help, and opportunity for all to found a new existence in the free world. For this, on this occasion, we would like to extend our gratitude.

As residents of the most powerful democracy, and as ambassadors by fate of our fellow Hungarians whose voice is so effectively silenced by the cruelest tyranny in the history of mankind, we feel obliged to draw the attention of our fellow students to some facts of major importance.

1. We wish to refute certain cleverly disguised insinuations, manifestations of clandestine Communist propaganda, according to which the October 1956 revolution had been a merely nationalistic uprising against foreign oppression. Our revolt was primarily aimed against the Hungarian Communist regime with the aim of securing the basic human rights of the individual citizen.

2. Millions are living today behind the Iron Curtain under a dictatorship whose callous brutality is unimaginable to those of you enjoying a democratic way of life. These millions have all but lost their faith in the Western democracies as well as in the United Nations because of their failure to come in any form to the aid of Hungary after her victory over the Soviet oppressors.

3. Anybody having to deal with Communist governments must realize that their word, like that of Hitler, is not worth the paper it is written on, and that in no way and under no circumstances can they be trusted to carry out their obligations if and when they find it more advantageous to do contrarywise.

4. While the West is painfully trying to maintain peaceful coexistence with com-

munism alias Soviet imperialism, for hundreds of millions this peaceful coexistence is tantamount to total economic, political, social and moral imprisonment with torture chambers and execution squads extinguishing human lives day by day. Who dares to assert that all this is not permitted to continue with the tacit acceptance of the free world?

HUNGARIAN STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY.

Israel Metes Justice in Kafr Kasim Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the young State of Israel has set an example in meting out punishment to its citizens who were responsible for the Kafr Kasim incident of 1956. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the October 27, 1958, issue of Congress Weekly:

JUSTICE IS DONE

The specter of Kafr Kasim, the scene of the shocking murder of 43 Israeli Arabs on October 29, 1956, the day the Sinai campaign was launched, has for the past 2 years haunted the national conscience of Israel and has occasioned widespread uneasiness among Jews everywhere. The atrocity was an inexcusable accompaniment to a military action ultimately recognized by the world as both moral and justified. If left unpunished, it could only expose the callousness of a people whose heritage and traditions enjoin against insensibility to wrongs.

An attitude of moral paralysis, however, has not prevailed nor was it ever countenanced. The outraged community of Israel, from the Prime Minister down, voiced its horror upon disclosure of the brutal facts and demanded that those responsible be brought to justice. Now, after months of testimony in a trial that lasted almost a year, a special military court sitting in Jerusalem has found eight border policemen guilty of murder for their part in the Kafr Kasim killings and sentenced them to long prison terms. Thus, in a dramatic application of the ancient Biblical injunction to "put away the evil from the midst of thee," Israel has again given evidence of her decision to abide by principles of law and honor.

The court's verdict cannot, of course, erase the memory of an act whose wantonness runs counter to every genuine Jewish instinct; the innocent blood of the murdered villagers will always be a stain on the nation's honor. Nevertheless, by the court's courageous action in assigning guilt, in addition to the generous compensation previously paid to the families of the victims, such amends as are possible have been made. Moreover, a nation's shame and horror have been publicly admitted, and this in itself is something remarkable.

Incidents such as the one at Kafr Kasim are not unknown throughout our troubled world, but rarely do they arouse the same degree of impassioned outrage as that vented by the Israeli public. Though officially regrettable, localized atrocities, minor massacres and the like have come to be regarded as inevitable consequences of the tensions of our time. That the innocent, caught helplessly in the path of the crossfire, must suffer an occasional, incidental injustice is accepted as a cruel but unavoidable fact. Governments rarely take the trouble to make full investigations, nor do they seek to punish the guilty. A justification—or at least a rationalization—is handily supplied and that is where the matter usually ends.

Israel, too, could have explained away the Kafr Kasim massacre in routine fashion. It had occurred at a time of national tension when a certain number of trigger-happy fingers could be expected, to be subsequently forgiven. Arab border villages had been placed under curfew and the villagers returning from the fields, though unaware of the curfew, were in technical violation of the law and the orders were to shoot anyone caught breaking curfew.

Nevertheless, despite these opportunities to be lenient in judgment and notwithstanding the excellent service records of the defendants, the court held fast and found the policemen guilty of having killed the 43 men, women and children deliberately and without any justification. As the presiding judge reminded the court, officers in other Arab villages had received the same orders as those given to the patrol at Kafr Kasim, but had interpreted them differently. What happened at Kafr Kasim must therefore be regarded as murder in cold blood.

In her insistence that justice be done, in avoiding an easy way out of a moral dilemma, Israel has set an example that other nations might well emulate.

A Salute to the 4–H Clubs and Their Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, on January 24 the Kentucky 4–H champions were named and it was with a great deal of pleasure that I learned that Joseph Wesley Sprague, 18, of Sturgis, Union County, Ky., had been selected as the champion in agriculture in the 1958 4–H Club achievement contest, while a young lady from another section of Kentucky took honors in home economics.

Joe W. Sprague is typical of the young men in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky, which I have the honor to represent, who have consistently taken prize after prize in agricultural contests throughout the State. During the 9 years Joe has been a member of the 4–H Club he has undertaken projects in the following categories: Baby beef, labor service, electric, tractor, leadership, appearance and grooming. His baby-beef project has won him numerous blue ribbons and cash awards; and a profit of $3,175 earned from this project has been set aside for his college education. In addition to his 4–H Club work, Joe, son of Mr. and Mrs. A. D. Sprague, takes a keen interest and an active part in various school and church affairs. He has a 12-year perfect attendance record at Sunday school.

While Joe Sprague is certainly to be commended for his outstanding achievements in agriculture, we must not forget or neglect the many dedicated people concerned with the development of our youth who make such achievements possible. We are indeed fortunate in having in the Second Congressional District a great many intelligent and energetic men and women who as 4–H Club leaders, argicultural teachers, county and home demonstration agents, and advisers to the Future Farmers of America and the Future Homemakers of America play such a vital part in inspiring, guiding, and instructing our youth in agricultural pursuits. When so many of our young people are leaving the land for the so-called glamour of the city, the selfless and untiring efforts of these persons in demonstrating the benefits to be gained from farming cannot be overestimated. It is to these leaders that we owe a deep sense of gratitude for having instilled in our young men and women an appreciation of the rewards and satisfaction to be achieved from a life devoted to farming, for as Thomas Jefferson said, "Those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God."

Fame of Fitzpatrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a well deserved tribute to Sheriff Howard Fitzpatrick, Middlesex County, Mass., which appeared in the Lynn, Mass., Telegram-News on January 22, 1959:

FAME OF FITZPATRICK

The appointment of Middlesex County Sheriff Howard Fitzpatrick as chairman of the Jefferson-Jackson committee by Democratic Party leaders serves notice that the party is not pausing in its forward march to hold, in 1960, the elective offices they won in the last election.

A close associate of the late former Gov. Paul A. Dever, Fitzpatrick succeeds Governor Dever as chairman of the Jefferson-Jackson fund-raising committee.

His unanimous choice by party leaders to succeed Governor Dever, virtually places him in the commanding post of director of important party functions on both the State and national level.

The fame of Fitzpatrick, energetic, hard working and brilliant battler for the Democratic cause that he is, extends beyond the political boundaries of the Bay State.

National Democratic policy-makers credit him for being responsible for the changing over of Middlesex County, which was once considered the greatest Republican stronghold in the State, to a solid Democratic section.

Governor Dever first brought Sheriff Fitzpatrick into public service by appointing him Middlesex County sheriff to fill a vacancy. He was elected sheriff in 1950, being the first Democratic sheriff ever elected in the country. In 1956 he was reelected with the largest vote ever given to a candidate in the county.

Through Fitzpatrick's political endeavors, every major elective office in the county is now held by a Democrat.

Noted as an outstanding benefactor to humanity, a business man of extraordinary talents and an astute politician, Fitzpatrick's appointment as chairman of the Jefferson-Jackson committee will redound to the great benefit of the Democratic Party as a whole, both State and nationwide.

He will bring to the party new faces, new ideas, and dynamic initiative. He exemplifies the qualities of leadership that are so much a part of the modern Democratic Party.

Blast at Arizona Meant for Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. RHODES or Arizona. Mr. Speaker, since Arizona became a State in 1912, it has always voted for the winning candidate for President of the United States. In fact, Arizona has been a more dependable political bellwether than has the great State of Maine, about which it has been said, "As Maine goes, so goes the Nation."

I represent one county in Arizona. This county has a population of over 550,000. In it is located the city of Phoenix, which has a population in excess of 350,000. It would hardly qualify then as a sparsely settled area of the country.

Therefore, when I heard a well-known commentator on television say that Arizona is sparsely populated, is an undeveloped State, and cast doubts upon Arizona's political erudition, I was somewhat taken aback. Apparently so was my friend Bert Fireman, whose column "Under the Sun" has appeared in the Phoenix Gazette for many years. I include herewith Mr. Fireman's column of Wednesday, January 21, 1959:

BLAST AT ARIZONA MEANT FOR SENATOR

(By Bert Fireman)

There probably are as many ways of falling in love with Arizona as there are persons possessed of the bright spark of individualism. Ordinarily affection for our sunshine and beauties comes through association. After a person has been here a while—whether he or she came for a vacation, as a health seeker, on business, or was sent here by Uncle Sam for training—he finds the joy of living here leads to the desire to remain. Those who go away soon want to return.

But there are also individuals who can so project their emotions that they can fall in love with a star in the sky, with a princess in a fairy tale, or with glamorous accounts of a sunny land as reported in the public prints. A lady, who lives in the East, has fallen in love with Arizona through reading the Phoenix Gazette. She hasn't explained how she happened to subscribe, and I would not look a gift horse in the mouth by asking.

It is almost enough that she has adopted Arizona although she has never been here and has no immediate plans to immigrate. Like the bullfight aficionado who lives in Brooklyn, or the resident of Montpelier, Vt., who knows the addresses of the Hollywood stars, she enjoys this escape from the realities of her own life.

Well, she doesn't always enjoy it. Some time ago she had her television set turned on. It being the Sunday after the general election, she heard and saw a program called "The Great Game of Politics." She sat there with great interest as Eric Sevareid and a panel of newspaper columnists reviewed the big upsets of the week.

She listened to their erudite comments without unusual response until one of the panelists started discussing Arizona. Say, said our fair listener to herself, that's my State. What she heard turned to gall. She just couldn't believe it. Lest she had misunderstood, she got in touch with the TV station and some time later was sent a copy of what had been said. She had heard correctly.

Miss Doris Fleeson, one of the best-known political columnists in the country, had made three statements (in commenting on the election) that my friend insists were unfair.

Miss Fleeson's first damaging statement was this: "Arizona is virtually meaningless in this land." One of the other panelists disagreed, saying Arizona residents wouldn't agree with that.

Undismayed, Miss Fleeson continued: "Arizona is sparsely populated, an undeveloped State relative to the trend that appeared * * * It seems to me that it's idle to say that Arizona represents anything significant * * *"

The lady who loves Arizona began to dislike Miss Fleeson. She wrote to me: "Can't you get the chamber of commerce to protest to Miss Fleeson and her syndicate? Why should she be allowed to slander Arizona? Who does she think she is, anyhow? I'd like to punch her."

Newspaper people are supposed to defend their colleagues. It just happens that I am acquainted with Miss Fleeson, but I don't know, in justice to either of us, that we are like peas in a pod. She can defend herself.

Doris is probably the most articulate and partisan defender of the Truman administration who still has an audience. She is married to Adm. Dan Kimball, former Secretary of Navy under Truman, now head of Aerojet, a California subsidiary of General Tire & Rubber Co., which produces rockets.

Miss Fleeson has visited Arizona at least twice that I know about in recent months. Both times she seemed to like our sunshine and warmth. But she is rabid, as Truman Fair Dealers can be, in her political opinions, and particularly zeroes-in on Senator BARRY GOLDWATER whenever she has the chance. Being an adept political columnist, she makes opportunities when none are readily available. He is one of her favorite whipping boys.

Actually, her comments about Arizona were not directed against Arizona, but was her way of venting displeasure over our State's choice of Senator GOLDWATER in the election. She meant that Arizona's decision to reelect BARRY was virtually meaningless against the national trend and jettisoned other Republicans. She doesn't like the way Arizona voted, so churlishly calls the results here "insignificant".

She is entitled to that opinion, of course, no matter how wrong it may be.

A Poem by Fred W. Cole of Upland, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, by request of Mr. Paul L. Hillsamer, of Marion, Ind., a poem written in 1938 by a young man 18 years of age, Fred W. Cole, of Upland, Ind., which is as follows:

Land of the dreamers where dreams come true.
These are my dreams and hopes for you;
Always thy government's form to be
An ever evolving democracy,
With thy people empowered to safeguard all
With initiative, referendum and recall.
May the spirit that prompts all law agree
With the Golden Rule and equality.
In the love of peace may our spirits pause
And weigh the merits of every cause.

And for sake of harmony let us seek
To avert strife, turning the cheek;
But never being too proud to fight,
If the need arise, in the cause of right;
For only through courage is progress made,
So, be ye peaceful but unafraid.
May thy economic creed aspire
To a living standard ever higher,
To the end that abundance be shared by all
Be the citizen rich, poor, great, or small.

May your modes of travel be good and cheap
That the lowliest citizen may keep
In touch with Nature's scenic thrills,
Waterfalls, geysers, springs and hills,
Oceans, mountains, and giant trees,
Canyons, glaciers, and sights like these,
That lift men's spirits and make them grow
Tuned with creation's wondrous show.
May the cities be free from ugly scars
Of crime and poverty, all that mars
The civic beauty, and destroys wealth,
Lowers manhood and injures health,
Like crowded tenements, filth, disease,
Graft, corruption, and things like these
That serve no purpose of worthy need
Racial hatred and narrow creed,
Of religious bigot whose dark-age rot
Blights and embitters, we need them not.
May men have courage to put in place
Facts of science and deeds of grace,
That America may ever stand
In peace and plenty—the promised land.

The Responsibility of Maintaining Permanent Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, early last September I had the privilege to attend the seventh conference of the World Parliamentarians Association in France. There were parliamentarians from 28 countries in attendance. The aims of our meeting were expressed through a charter which we adopted at Versailles on September 8. My remarks moving the adoption of the Charter of Versailles are, under a previous consent, included below along with the text of the charter:

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES O. PORTER, THE PALACE OF VERSAILLES, SEPTEMBER 8, 1958

Mr. President, distinguished Lord Attlee, and distinguished ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply honored to be permitted to move adoption of the Charter of Versailles.

Although I am the only Member of the United States Congress present here today,

you may be sure that there are many other Members who agree with our aims and who will help attain them.

My 460,000 constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon on the westernmost side of the United States join with the peoples of the world in demanding that the rule of law replaces the rule of force before it is too late.

While we must dream, must look ahead beyond seemingly impassable difficulties of history, languages, and culture, we must also be skeptics. Here we are in a beautiful historic palace, the scene of many crucial decisions in the fate of great nations. Is our Charter of Versailles a scrap of paper which will rate not even the sneer of a latter-day Caesar?

Paper and ink alone will not overcome greed and fear. The hour is too late for mere gestures, however pretty. This charter is a call to action, particular action, or it is worse than nothing.

In the 85th U.S. Congress, recently adjourned, I joined with my colleagues in voting to appropriate some $40 billion to keep my country strong. I am proud to be an officer in the Air Force Reserve. But, along with you I yearn for an end to the waste, the futility, the catastrophe of war.

What do we do to make our solemn act today meaningful?

Here are my recommendations, humbly presented for your consideration both as dreamers and as skeptics.

First, the call of this charter should be presented immediately to the chief executive and the legislative body of every nation. They must decide. The people of the world want their affirmation without delay. Specifically it is my hope that the decision will be to consider these vital matters at a United Nations Charter Revision Conference in 1959.

In my country we have a special problem. The Secretary of State holds that such matters are not within "the proper scope of the review conference." This means that the President or the Congress must overrule Mr. Dulles or Mr. Dulles has to change his mind or, regrettably in my opinion, the conference must be held outside the United Nations.

My intention is to present a copy of this charter to President Eisenhower directly upon my return home and to ask that he give his opinion about it and that he consider changing the policy laid down by his Secretary of State.

Both President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles are clearly on record endorsing world law as the only road to world peace. Less than 2 months ago in Washington the President declared that the attainment of peace required that nations make mutual concessions of sovereignty so that law could become the basis for settling their disputes.

To gain universal and enthusiastic acceptance of the aims set forth in the charter will require strong delegations of this association in every country. In the face of ignorance and prejudice this will not be easy. It may be that the first conference, because of the reluctance of some or even all of the big powers, will be a foothills conference of the other nations, a step which I believe would lead the peoples in the nonparticipating nations to demand favorable policies from their governments.

The second line of action has to do with devising and agreeing on safeguards so as to prevent one nation from getting the advantage over another or of interfering in the internal affairs of any nation in matters unrelated to world peace.

Of course the superb book by Grenville Clark and Louis Sohn immediately comes to mind. They have intelligently proposed the necessary amendments for strengthening the United Nations Charter and in a form most convenient for profitable discussions. The name of the book is "World Peace Through World Law."

Our lawyers and parliamentarians are up to this task. Already the American Bar Association and the International Bar Association have made great contributions and are determined to advance steadily.

The third and last line of action I suggest relates to what is known as public relations. The aims of this charter must be sold to people who thirst for peace but are themselves properly skeptical and somewhat disillusioned. The Clark-Sohn recommendations should be discussed widely, especially by women's organizations like the League of Women Voters in my country, by youth groups and by religious bodies everywhere.

Your signature on this charter, fellow parliamentarians, means that you will use your best efforts along these interrelated lines of action, political, legal and public relations. The winds that blow radioactive debris over all the earth will whisk away mere scraps of paper.

Finally, a word about the urgency of action. The massive force of the new weapons is a banal subject. The possibility of the total extinction of the human race bores many people. The human mind rebels at concentrating very long upon the prospect of collective death. Many are comforted by the so-called balance of terror and I, myself, believe that the instinct of self-preservation greatly diminishes the likelihood of intentional atomic war.

The danger, as I see it, is that given our present policies we will certainly stumble into the all-out atomic war. Three nations today have, each of them, enough nuclear power to end human life or at least human civilization. Almost all of these weapons are ready for instant dispatch and detonation. And who controls these myriad delivery systems and detonations? Who but error-prone human beings like you and me, imperfect entities who often make mistakes no matter what precautions are taken. We panic, we get drunk, our minds snap, we miscalculate, we misunderstand, we are misguidedly idealistic.

The real danger for mankind is that an accidental or unauthorized explosion will, perhaps later today even, trigger the all-out war. It not today, in my opinion, sometime soon. Errare est humanum now just as in the days of Rome. The difference is that they didn't have these awesome weapons.

Such an explosion will lend itself to misinterpretation as being the precursor of an attack. There will be no witnesses to interrogate, no twisted wreckage to examine. There will be many pictures on TV and in the papers, stories in the papers and on the radio, driving home the horror and, you may be sure, repeatedly and fearfully raising the question "Is this terrible explosion the first of many?"

An explosion of this sort means instant full alert for our Strategic Air Command for our other Armed Forces. Our intelligence agencies would report to the President forthwith that there was no evidence of it being part of an attack by the Soviet Union. But 20 minutes later or less the Soviet Union will go on maximum alert, just as would the United States were the circumstances reversed and the tensions as critical as they are today. Decision times grow shorter daily. Ballistic missiles, unlike manned bombers, cannot be recalled. There is no way to determine with reasonable certainty the difference between a military alert which is entirely defensive and one which precedes an offensive.

In these times of dread a small match in the form of an accidental or unauthorized nuclear explosion can light the short fuse of disastrous war. The question is this: Are we smart enough to survive? There is much reason for doubt but none for despair. What parent would not readily give up his place in the lifeboat of a sinking ship to save his child? The stakes are no less, but the choice is not yet clear to many parents.

The alternative to one world or peace through law is no world at all for anybody.

Mr. President, as dreamer, skeptic, and parent, I move the adoption of the Charter of Versailles.

CHARTER OF VERSAILLES

The point has been reached in human history when the peoples, parliaments, and governments of the world, must abolish the evil of war, fraught as that evil is with the possibility of the total extinction of the human race.

The peoples, parliaments, and governments of the world must decide to set up a world authority charged with the responsibility of maintaining permanent peace.

The world authority must be endowed with the necessary powers and means to carry out this task.

We, parliamentarians of many nations, met in the Galerie des Batailles in the Palace of Versailles, on this 8th day of September, 1958, dedicate ourselves to this end.

We solemnly promise that, through our parliaments and our governments, we shall seek urgently to realize our aim in order that the men, women, and children of the world may be saved from the destruction which threatens them.

We call upon the prime ministers, foreign secretaries, and governments who accept the principles underlying this policy, to convene a world conference of peoples, parliamentarians, and governments, to consider how there should be established: A world assembly to enact world law in order to secure and maintain permanent peace; an executive to administer these world laws; international courts of justice with compulsory jurisdiction in all matters of dispute concerning these world laws; a world police force to enforce world laws against all those who commit, or threaten to commit, a breach of these world laws, and thus make possible universal, simultaneous, and complete disarmament of all nations.

Demise of Government Contractors by Bureaucratic Fiat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the Commercial Law Journal of September 1958.

The article was written by my longtime friend, Solomon Dimond, a member of the District of Columbia and New York bars:

DEMISE OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS BY BUREAUCRATIC FIAT

Government contractors, financially sound in every respect, have been indirectly forced out of business without any legal basis by the actions taken by Government officials. The subsequent liquidations are the byproduct of these arbitrary and ill-advised actions. As soon as the contracting officer concludes that there is a sum of money due the Government, he is required by internal regulations to follow prescribed procedures. These

procedures are designed to withhold sufficient moneys due the contractor to protect the Government.

If a contractor has one or more Government contracts and, in the opinion of the contracting officer, it has defaulted on one of its contracts, the contracting officer is obligated to protect the Government for its possible damage claims. This is done by withholding funds due for materials delivered to and accepted by the Government, either on the defaulted contract or on any other Government contract. These alleged damage claims can be very substantial since in the event of default the Government reserves the right to reprocure by negotiation. It can claim that time is of the essence and instead of going into the open market, agree to pay any sum that it considers necessary to get the materials which it needs within the delivery requirements of the original contract. In one case, the original contract unit price was $6.75, after a default termination, the Government negotiated a reprocurement at a unit price of $16.11 and claimed damages of about $160,000. Apart from the fact that the contractor does not get paid for its work in process on the defaulted contract, any other moneys owed it by the Government, regardless of the source, are subject to withholding. Government contractors who allegedly owe money to the Government are placed on a consolidated hold up list which requires all other Government agencies and instrumentalities to withhold funds due the contractor to the extent of its indebtedness to the Government.

Government contracts have certain standard clauses which make them unique. The standard defaults clause gives the contracting officer the authority to make findings of fact that the contractor is in default and the standard disputes contract states that any findings of fact made by the contracting officer shall be final unless an appeal is taken within 30 days after the making of the findings. Despite the fact that an appeal is taken and the findings are not final, the Government nevertheless proceeds to collect the moneys allegedly due it.

Thus, as a practical matter, the Government prejudges the issue and withholds the moneys due the contractor without regard to the consequences of the withholdings. It is quite obvious that if the sums withheld by the Government are relatively substantial, companies could be forced out of business and into insolvency and liquidation. While the contractor has some remedies, it has no remedy as of right by which it can obtain the release of its funds before it is finally determined whether the decision of the contracting officer was fraudulent or capricious or arbitrary or so grossly erroneous as necessarily to imply bad faith, or is not supported by substantial evidence.

The time factors in the remedies available to the contractor are not within its control. Firstly, the contractor has 30 days' time in which to file its notice of appeal. The contractor can either file its complaint with its notice of appeal or within 30 days thereafter. After the appeal is filed with the contracting officer, there is no mandatory time requirement by which he must forward the appeal to the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals. In one situation, the contracting officer held the notice of appeal for 72 days, and this period was not considered unreasonable by the U.S. Court of Claims. If after the appeal is taken, the contracting officer feels that he wants to make revised findings, he merely does so, and again the contractor has the privilege of filing an appeal . Thereafter, the Government has 30 days time in which to file its answer, or, if that time is not sufficient, then, as a practical matter, it may obtain on a unilateral basis as much additional time as it may require from the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals.

Depending upon the complexities of the case, the appeal procedures can easily take from 1 year to 3 years.[1] If the decision of the Board is adverse, the contractor may institute suit in the U.S. district courts or the U.S. Court of Claims if the amount involved is less than $10,000, and if more than $10,000 is involved, suit must be brought in the U.S. Court of Claims.[2] While either the Board or a court might determine that the contracting officer was wrong, years can go by during which period the contractor's funds can be withheld.[3] If it is finally determined that the contracting officer was wrong, the contractor can obtain neither interest on the moneys withheld nor damages for the losses sustained by the contractor as a result of the withholding of its funds. There is little solace for a contractor who has been put out of business to be advised that the contracting officer's actions were wrong and that he has the privilege of proving his claim for damages as of the date the contract was improperly terminated.

While the heads of the Departments involved can grant relief, as a practical matter such relief is rarely given without the intervention of Members of Congress, particularly those Members who can act through one of the cognizant congressional committees. There are instances in which funds have been released under congressional pressure when a showing could be made that a contractor would be forced into bankruptcy.

It is unfortunate that Government officials are not more concerned with the irreparable harm caused by precipitate and ill-advised decisions. Unless Government procurement authorities are willing to write appropriate regulations protecting contractors from the arbitrary withholding of their funds, it is up to the Congress to enact suitable legislation to prohibit the withholding of a contractor's funds until it is finally determined that the Government is entitled to withhold.

---

[1] There are a few cases which have taken less than a year.

[2] It generally takes a minimum of 18 months in the U.S. Court of Claims to get a final decision.

[3] In one instance, the contract was defaulted on Feb. 24, 1951, and the contractor forced into bankruptcy. The issues have been in litigation since that time.

Unjustified Oil Price Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. No problem has been brought more forcefully or more repeatedly to the Members of the 86th Congress than has the problem of inflation and the need for holding the line in our price structure. The President of the United States has made this the major theme in two of the messages which he has submitted to this body, the state of the Union message and the economic report of the President.

In his state of the Union message Mr. Eisenhower said:

We must avoid any contribution to inflationary processes, which could disrupt sound growth in our economy. Prices have displayed a welcome stability in recent months and, if we are wise and resolute, we will not tolerate inflation in the years to come. * * * Inflation can be prevented. But this demands statesmanship on the part of business and labor leaders and of Government at all levels.

In his economic report the President touched on the same line:

Our objective must be to establish a firm foundation for extending economic growth with stable prices in the months and years ahead. This will not come about automatically. * * * Self-discipline and restraint are essential if reasonable stability of prices is to be reached within the framework of the free competitive institutions on which we rely heavily for the improvement of our material welfare.

Among the commodities which are essential to our modern civilization, in the rural areas no less than in the urban and industrial areas, is oil, especially oil for heating purposes. I have been deeply disturbed, Mr. Speaker, to learn that in sections of the 32d Congressional District of New York a wholesale oil price increase has gone into effect within recent days. In the village of Cooperstown, N.Y., the famous home of baseball, the major oil companies have just instituted an increase of one-half a cent per gallon in No. 2 oil, boosting the total price on this commodity to 16.4 cents a gallon, the highest in history. A similar increase of one-half a cent per gallon has gone into effect in Gloversville, and a similar increase has been authorized for Schenectady and Oneonta.

In Cooperstown alone it has been estimated that this increase will cost consumers about $7,000 during the next 2 winter months, when the necessity for oil is at its height.

I have been informed, Mr. Speaker, that at the same time this price increase has gone into effect for individual home consumers, that the oil companies have negotiated an arrangement with the Otsego County Courthouse to deliver oil at a price which is a cent a gallon less than Cooperstown dealers are themselves required to pay for the same product.

Let me make clear, Mr. Speaker, that this increase has not resulted from action by the local dealers, but has been dictated by the oil companies themselves, and without any justification. As a result the dealers are as hard pressed as the consumers, because their margin of profit has been forced down.

Irresponsible action of this kind is contrary to the call made by the President, and is the type of thing that could most directly contribute to the kind of runaway inflation we all abhor.

Because inflation, Mr. Speaker, is something that can come upon us gradually step by step, without our fully realizing it, I believe that this unjustified price increase ought to be fully explored immediately, and I have therefore referred the facts concerning it both to the congressional committee which is investigating all aspects of so-called administered prices and to the Justice Department for possible antitrust action on their part.

We in the Congress and in the Nation must act promptly and together to pre-

vent such unjustified increases and to hold the line against inflation.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include at this point an editorial from the Freeman's Journal, of Cooperstown, one of the oldest regular weekly newspapers in our Nation. The editorial appeared on January 21, 1959:

UNJUSTIFIED OIL PRICE INCREASE

Last week, the major companies which supply Cooperstown dealers with fuel oil announced a half-cent-a-gallon price increase, which local dealers of necessity have had to pass on to their customers because of the small margin of profit per gallon on which they operate. The dealers did not—and rarely do—add on anything extra for themselves. In fact their profit per gallon is just about the same now as it was 10 years ago. They've been able to maintain this per gallon profit, despite increasing costs, because of a higher business volume over the past 10 years.

Last week's price rise, initiated by the oil companies, ran the price of No. 2 oil to 16.4 cents a gallon, the highest in history here. There was no justification for this increase—it simply is a matter of price gouging on the part of the major producers who seem to operate on the theory that if you can come up with some excuse—no matter how flimsy—you've got a moral right to charge whatever the traffic will bear under a given set of conditions.

This time the oil companies have the flimsiest of excuses. They plead that this winter has been colder than usual so far, and that demand for oil has outstripped their refinery capacity. They've had to go into the open market, they say, and pay independent producers a premium for their product in order to get enough oil to meet this demand. That's a lot of bunk. They may have to do that to cover a small percentage of their requirements, but this percentage would be so small that a major producer would have to search and search for a legitimate excuse to boost the price by even a tenth of a cent a gallon, much less five times this amount.

Another thing that sticks in our craw about this oil company piracy, is this—how come a major producer can deliver oil to the Otsego County courthouse at a price which is about a cent a gallon under the price Cooperstown dealers have to pay for the same basic product? This means that the county pays about $60 a tank truck load less for its oil than local dealers pay for the same amount.

Why should it cost $60 more to deliver a truckload of oil from a terminal (Albany or Utica or Binghamton) to the storage plants of two local dealers only a few hundred feet from the courthouse, and to the third dealer who is less than a mile from the courthouse? The consumer could use this penny-a-gallon saving, and we're sure the local dealers would pass it on to him.

This latest half-cent increase by the oil companies is going to cost Cooperstown consumers about $7,000 during the next 2 winter months.

We would like to emphasize that this oil price increase has been none of the doing of your local dealers. They aren't going to make any more money out of it. In fact, their percentage of profit has dropped.

Don't get mad at him. But if this latest price increase makes you want to sound off, well, go ahead and sound off—but to the oil companies, who are the culprits. Your local dealer will forward your letter to the company if you can't find the latter's address.

Pioneering a New School Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Washington Star on January 25, 1959. It deals with that all-important subject of education and how the city of San Angelo, Tex., is attempting to improve its system. The article is as follows:

PIONEERING A NEW SCHOOL PLAN

(By G. K. Hodenfield)

SAN ANGELO, TEX.—This city of 60,000 on the west Texas plains thinks it has the best public school system in the United States.

That's a strong statement, even for Texas, and it begs for proof. San Angelo thinks it has proof aplenty.

For more than a year critics of education in the country have been demanding more academic achievement and less life adjustment. They want more of the solid and traditional subjects and fewer frills and vocational "escape courses," more challenges for the gifted student, more attention to the slow learner, better discipline, and more and better counseling.

In San Angelo they practice what the critics preach.

The philosophy here is to challenge each student to do his very best work in every subject, and then to provide the facilities and courses to meet and extend that challenge.

The payoff is in the curriculum—a three-rail program tailored to meet the needs and capabilities of all students, from the brightest to the dullest.

The San Angelo story is more than just the curriculum, however.

It's the story of a young, eager and informed schoolboard more concerned with learning than penny pinching, a citizenry willing to pay the taxes that built one of the outstanding high school plants in the country, a group of teachers and administrators willing to work 12 to 14 hours a day.

TOO PROGRESSIVE

It's the story, too, of Supt. Gerald S. Wadzeck, a man who cherished a dream for years and now has the tools and backing to make it a reality. When Mr. Wadzeck came to San Angelo 7 years ago the city had had an overdose of progressive, permissive, do-as-you-please education. It was ready for a change.

It took 2 years—until 1954—for Mr. Wadzeck to lay the groundwork and get his plans into action. And he's the first to admit there is still much to be done.

The San Angelo curriculum is based on the 3-rail plan. Rail I is for superior students, able to move much faster than their schoolmates. Rail II is for average students, eligible for college after high school graduation. Rail III is for the poor student, the slow learner for whom high school is the terminal point of education.

The rail plan isn't new. Versions of it can be found across the country. In San Angelo, however, it starts in the first grade.

During a pupil's first year in school he is constantly tested and evaluated to see whether he is really ready for school, really ready for the learning process.

"About 90 percent of a kid's trouble in grade school," says Mr. Wadzeck, "is that he is biologically immature when he starts. Some kids walk earlier than others, some talk earlier. It's the same with learning, some are ready before the others."

If a child isn't up to doing first grade work, he is held in that grade for another year.

FIRST MAJOR CHECK POINT

"We retain about 25 percent of our first graders," Mr. Wadzeck says, "probably the highest proportion in the country. We don't call it flunking or failing. We just hold them back till they're ready to learn, then we throw the book at 'em.

"After the first grade, there are very few we have to hold back through the next 5 grades."

At the end of the third grade there is a major check point.

"In the first 3 grades these children have been introduced to the tools of learning—numbers, the alphabet, reading, etc.," Mr. Wadzeck says. "From the fourth grade on, they will be using these tools more extensively. It's time to find out just where they stand."

Based on grades, intelligence tests, aptitude tests and teachers' reports, the pupils are assigned to rails I, II, or III during the first grade. Depending on their aptitudes, some students might be in rail I English and social studies, and rail II or III arithmetic. Depending on their achievement, they can climb to a higher rail, or drop to a lower one. All three rails are taught by the same teacher in the same classroom.

Some pupils spend 4 years getting past the third grade, some do it in two. There is no grade skipping, although Mr. Wadzeck says it may be necessary in the near future. Brighter pupils stay in their own age groups, but do more advanced work.

One major departure from normal grade school practice, even where the program is railed, is that only the student in rail I can get an A. If he is in rail II, the best he can get is a B, in rail III a C.

Some educators will tell you this might frustrate the children, that they should be graded on the basis of whether they are doing the best work of which they are capable.

Mr. Wadzeck disagrees: "Life is competitive, and if the children don't learn it in the classroom, they'll certainly find it out for themselves on the playground."

At the end of the sixth year there is another major check point. For many students, this may be a last chance to get on the academic ball.

From all of San Angelo's 17 elementary schools the pupils are brought to Washington School for the seventh grade. No other grades are taught in the building.

SIX SUBJECTS TAUGHT

Each student in rails I and II takes six academic subjects—English, reading, math, social science, natural science and foreign language—plus one fine arts elective and physical education.

Rail III students do no seventh grade work. They spend the year catching up on work in which they have fallen behind. In math, for instance, they would review fourth, fifth and sixth grade arithmetic.

And here is an exclusive San Angelo twist: If the rail III students get an A or B in his makeup work, he isn't promoted. He is held back so that the following year he can take rail II or college preparatory courses. If, however, he gets a C or less, he is promoted into the eighth grade in rail III.

"When a rail III student comes up with excellent grades in his remedial work," says Mr. Wadzeck, "we figure he deserves another chance. He may have had emotional problems stemming from troubles at home. Maybe he has been ill and out of school for long periods. Maybe he's just a 'late bloomer.' "

LOOK TO HONOR COURSES

"But if he comes up with poor grades in his remedial or makeup work, we just have to figure he isn't college material. So we push him ahead on a rail III program that will give him the best education he can absorb. If he spurts ahead later, of course, our testing and evaluating will catch him and there may still be time for him to advance to a higher rail."

Rail I students in the seventh grade take 2 years of a subject in 1 year and clear the way for honor courses and college-level work during the 11th and 12th grades. Rail II students take the "national curriculum" or normal college preparatory courses. Rail III students take modified work adapted to their capabilities, but including arithmetic every year through the 11th grade and English every year through the 12th.

"It may take a slower learner 10 to 12 years to master ninth-grade math," Mr. Wadzeck says, "but he'll know it by the time he graduates. And our kids with 4 years of rail III English are going to know more about the subject than the average student who takes 3 years of English in a traditional high school program."

In this, the fifth year of the program, San Angelo's only high school, Central High, has railed courses in math, foreign languages, science, and English.

Mr. Wadzeck figures only about 1 percent of the students are able to handle the top rail in all four subjects. About 10 percent take two courses in rail I and two in rail II and about 5 percent take only one rail I course.

The bulk of the students—about two-thirds—can handle all rail II courses. Even those who carry two rail II courses can be college material, Mr. Wadzeck says, if they have two rail II courses and keep their grades up.

CHECKING UP ON WORK

In high school the students are graded according to the work they do in the rail to which they have been assigned. The transcripts, however, identify the course by the rail number. Thus colleges and universities, as well as prospective employers, will know just what sort of work the student has done.

San Angelo's students are given every opportunity to enrich and broaden their education—and to pull themselves up to a higher rail while doing it.

For instance, the 710 seventh graders at Washington School have a 75-minute extra learning period at the end of the school day. If enough students ask for a particular course, Principal Dave Sands will try to find them a teacher.

Thus, 20 students who take Spanish during regular school hours are studying Latin in the extra-learning period—for no academic credit. Similar no-credit courses are also offered in math, science, orchestra, drama, rapid reading, poetry, speech, journalism—even football.

"Some of our students stay in the science labs until 5 or 5:30, when we have to chase them home," Mr. Sands says. "It proves our point that if you give the students an opportunity, they'll jump at it."

PAY TUITION IN SUMMER

Almost half the 1,400 students at Central High paid tuition to take summer courses last summer. Most of them wanted only to brush up in their weak subjects or qualify for a higher rail.

Mr. Wadzeck hopes that eventually all summer courses will be free and that the summer program can take over most or all of the nonacademic subjects.

"Typing is an excellent course for students who are going on to college," he says, "but why waste time on it during the regular school year? It would be a fine summer session course. The same goes for driver training—I'd like to see that as a strictly summer course, although it will take time to make the shift.

"We encourage the students to go to summer school and pull themselves up.

"That's the whole idea here—we want to challenge every student to extend himself to his limits, his full capacity. And when you get right down to it, that's all any school system can do."

Why Did O'Henry Become O'Henry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been observed before that great legal minds frequently take up hobbies of literary detective work, and the result is usually entertaining as well as instructive. I suppose this is because lawyers in general, and particularly those who have risen to the top of their profession, have cultivated a talent for observing significant details and solving the riddles of human motivation, all from the written word.

I believe the Members may be interested and amused by a highly original conclusion that Mr. Joseph Borkin has reached as a result of his literary detective work on the question why William Sidney Porter chose the pen name O'Henry. Accordingly, I am inserting a clipping from the Boston Daily Globe of January 1, 1959, which sets out Mr. Borkin's analysis.

Perhaps I should add that Mr. Borkin has engaged in literary detective work of a much more serious nature. In the early years of World War II Mr. Borkin was Chief of the Patent and Cartel Section of the Department of Justice, an experience which led to one of his more famous writings, "Germany's Master Plan," which he coauthored with Charles A. Welsh in 1943.

My own interest in Mr. Borkin was first aroused on reading his article on "Impeachment" in the Encyclopedia Britannica and on learning that he had, as a hobby, become the top authority on this subject.

The clipping from the Boston Daily Globe is as follows:

WHY DID PORTER CHOOSE O. HENRY?

(By Joseph Borkin)

WASHINGTON.—The origin of the pseudonym O. Henry and the motive for its choice have baffled students of literature for over half a century. Why did William Sidney Porter employ the alias? Was it more than a random choice? The solution presented here has the quality that follows the traditional formula for an O. Henry story.

To take his readers by surprise in constructing plausibility out of absurdity and contradiction was in the essence of his literary character. We should not be astonished, therefore, if the alias O. Henry betrays what it was designed to hide.

The explanation by Porter that the surname Henry was chosen at random, plucked from the society columns of a New Orleans newspaper, while the "O." was added as the easiest letter to write, has a tongue-in-cheek quality.

A theory accepted by many critics and biographers is that the name was that of a guard, Orrin Henry, who was employed years earlier at the Ohio Penitentiary. It is surmised that Porter, while a convict, saw the name on some prison records and adopted it.

In another version, Henry was the name of a bartender in a tavern frequented by Porter, who would indicate his thirst by calling, "Oh, Henry!"

Less plausible is the version that O. Henry was derived from an old ballad of the Kentucky hills and may have been a favorite song of Porter's.

These accounts are two-dimensional, and none is in the tradition or character of O. Henry. This is apparently what led Stephen Leacock to remark that the choice of pseudonym lacked aptness and must have been picked in a moment of whimsy.

Examine the portrait of William Sidney Porter.

He had the soul of a poet, the weaknesses of an alcoholic, and the job of a bank clerk. He was indicted in Austin, Tex., under the Federal Banking Act for embezzling funds from the bank in which he worked.

He stood mute at his trial, unwilling to help his attorneys or himself.

His bored and disinterested manner at the trial helped assure the verdict of guilty by the jury. An eyewitness who saw him off to prison recalled that he appeared to have welcomed his conviction. Many experts today are convinced of Porter's innocence, however.

Sentenced to 5 years' imprisonment in the Ohio penitentiary, which at that time had a subleasing arrangement with the Federal Government, he actually served 3 years, from 1896 to 1899.

In prison he utilized his talent as a writer and storyteller, sending his literary products to publishers via an intermediary, the relative of a fellow prisoner. It is to these stories, written in prison, that Porter first attached the pseudonym O. Henry, indicating no first name. With these devices, he was able to disguise his place of residence as well as his identity as the convicted embezzler William Sidney Porter.

Writers use pseudonyms to mask authorship while criminals use them to conceal their past records. Although O. Henry fits both categories, his pseudonym does not appear to have been designed to conceal the writer but rather to hide the identity of the convict. This distinction, I believe, is the answer to the riddle of O. Henry.

A police department could not function properly without an alias or monicker file. Although an alias is consciously designed to hide criminal identity, it so often is revealing that it has become standard operating procedure to examine it for clues. An alias lends distinction to the individual.

Sometimes the name will be taken from what the police call the "M.O.," or modus operandi, of the crime.

Among criminologists and psychologists, there is a growing awareness that many criminals may engage in a life of crime in order to be punished due to an irrational and overwhelming sense of guilt. They are constantly seeking punishment and perform in a manner designed to insure capture. It explains the masochistic components of most persons who find themselves incarcerated in prison.

Alcoholics seem to be subject to the same mechanism. It is possible that the compulsive drinker does so in order to be punished

by the inevitable hangover. O. Henry gave evidence of fitting both masochistic molds. He was not only a convicted embezzler but also an alcoholic, teetering on the border of skid row, and ultimately dying of cirrhosis of the liver at the age of 48 with his entire fortune of 23 cents in his pocket and nine empty whisky bottles under the bed.

Whether guilty or innocent, O. Henry's criminal record haunted him like a ghost, and its concealment was apparently one of his overwhelming needs. He covered up the time served in prison by falsifying his age to account for the missing years. In interviews he omitted any mention of his residence in Austin. He made his close friends feel that there were areas in which they were not permitted to pry.

Even after they all knew his secret, he acted as though it was still hidden from them. Will Irwin, the writer and friend of O. Henry, exclaimed, "Why didn't one of us go to him and say, 'Stop trying to hide yourself from strangers for fear of running across someone with knowledge of a secret that is no secret at all.'"

There is evidence that O. Henry himself was responsible for arranging the conditions whereby his secret was no secret at all, that in his methods of concealment he was preparing his self-betrayal.

To Al Jennings, a bank robber and close prison-mate, O. Henry resolved, "I will bury the name of Bill Porter in the depths of oblivion. No one shall know that the Ohio Penitentiary ever furnished me with board and bread."

Could it be that with the reverse irony that was O. Henry's trademark, he took an alias that was in truth a "pen" name?

Sheriff Howard W. Fitzpatrick To Be Chairman of Democratic Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an article which recently appeared in the Boston Herald and which was authored by my very good friend, Edward Devin, of that newspaper. It refers to our beloved Sheriff Fitzpatrick, who has accepted the post of chairman of the $100-a-plate Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner coming up in February. The Honorable Howard W. Fitzpatrick is the sheriff of Middlesex County in Massachusetts, the largest county in the United States.

I commend the article to my colleagues in the House, for it is a perfect illustration of how a successful and prominent businessman may also be successful in the political field; but let the following speak for itself:

FITZPATRICK, CHAIRMAN OF DEMOCRATIC DINNER

(By Edward Devin)

Leaders of the Democratic Party have chosen Sheriff Howard W. Fitzpatrick of Middlesex County as chairman of the $100-a-plate Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner, which will be held at the Statler Hilton in mid-February—the date hasn't been set officially yet.

It is fitting that the popular sheriff has been selected as chairman. The chairman of this year's dinner was the late Gov. Paul A. Dever. Fitzpatrick was one of the late governor's closest friends and supporters. He was also Dever's protege in politics, for it was Dever who appointed him sheriff of Middlesex to fill a vacancy.

Fitzpatrick is already making plans to make next February's Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner the most successful in history. And he's just the man who can do it, too.

The most cash the Democrats ever raised from this dinner was $119,000. Fitzpatrick is shooting for $175,000 and without pressuring anyone into buying tickets, either. He has more than a dozen close personal friends working with him on the arrangements.

LOYAL PARTY WORKERS

The Statler Hilton will be bulging with Democrats the night of the dinner. Of course, Republicans are invited, too, at $100 a head.

There is one thing anyone who knows him will tell you about Fitzpatrick. He is a loyal party worker. He works for the party at large and helps everyone in political contests. That's his favorite pastime, incidentally, helping people, even in his job as sheriff, or perhaps most of all as sheriff.

Fitzpatrick was the first Democrat to be elected to office in Middlesex County, formerly a Republican stronghold.

Afted his appointment by Governor Dever, he ran for election and swamped Dr. A. Warren Stearns, the noted penologist. It was the first time a Democrat had cracked Middlesex County. In 1956, Fitzpatrick was reelected sheriff by 70,000.

WORKERS CALMED

Now the Democrats hold all the offices in Middlesex County. The district attorney's office is held by James L. O'Dea, Jr. All the country court jobs went to Democrats and the three county commissioners are of the same political allegiance.

Wren Fitzpatrick first took office as sheriff of the State's largest county there was some trepidation among the employees, 99 percent of whom were Republicans.

"I never let anyone go because of his party affiliation," Fitzpatrick said. "They are all family men who have to earn a living. Besides I owe my success in politics to Democrats and Republicans alike."

He supported a bill passed by the legislature this year making deputy sheriffs court officers, thus protecting their jobs by giving them tenure. He also has a bill in now to make the guards permanent and to take the jails out of politics and run them as efficiently as a business.

Incidentally, Fitzpatrick doesn't take any salary. He accepts the $10,000, of course, but turns it over to a charity fund set up. Friends wanted to throw him a party but he declined. So they held a charity fund dinner in Lowell last year and raised $45,000.

LIKES TO HELP THE PUBLIC

In a year the fund spent $73,000 on good works. Howard and his brother, Robert, with whom he operates a big catering business, made up the difference.

"It makes you feel good to help people," the sheriff said. He must feel very good for he has found jobs for many of his former prisoners, many of them in his own plant. He has "straightened out" many prisoners and helped them and their families with money, clothes and good advice.

There is hardly ever any trouble with the prisoners at the Cambridge jail or the house of correction at Billerica. The sheriff treats the prisoners right and they have the greatest respect for him. He has charge of 320 prisoners at Billerica and 150 at Cambridge and both institutions have been given triple A ratings by the Federal government for their cleanliness and the way they are operated.

Fitzpatrick uses civilian chefs, bakers, butchers and mechanics instead of prisoners. In that way he gets trained help and there is not the turnover there would be if prisoners were used on those jobs.

He said that when he took over, he found the meals served the prisoners were "inadequate," that many men were losing weight and in some cases their health. As an experienced caterer he was able to remedy the food situation in short order, and not short order cooks either.

BLOOD DONATED

Now the men at Billerica donate 70 pints of blood every 2 months to the Red Cross and 40 pints at the East Cambridge jail.

Fitzpatrick has been in politics all his life but he admits he never had the desire to run for sheriff. He accepted the appointment from Dever after talking things over with another former close friend, the late Chief Justice John P. Higgins of Superior Court.

Sheriff Fitzpatrick has operated his jails so efficiently that if he doesn't watch out the State is going to be making a profit. The institutions have 200 acres of cultivated land, a canning factory, a piggery, slaughterhouse, smokehouse and deep freeze facilities. The herd at Billerica produces 250,000 quarts of milk a year. The dairy, piggery and canning factory provide half the costs of feeding the prisoners.

The prison brush and mat shops supply all of Middlesex County and had a $50,000 surplus in their account. They are going to turn back $25,000 to the State.

The late Judge Higgins advised Fitzpatrick to take the job of sheriff. He said he "could do a lot of good." He certainly has.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*——1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*——
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*——
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*——
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*——
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*——
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*——
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Engle, Clair, *Calif*——3840 Lorcom Lane, Alexandria, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*——
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*——
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*——
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*——
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*——1612 34th St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*——
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*——419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4545 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*——
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*——
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*——
Proxmire, William, *Wis*——
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John, *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*——
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*——

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of New Jersey, and Martin.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Lakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Green (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.*
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio.*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.* The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*	
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Lennon, Alton, *N. C.*	
Lesinski, John, *Mich.*	
Levering, Robert W., *Ohio*	
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.*	224 C St. NE.
Lindsay, John V., *N. Y.*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn.*	The Congressional
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*	The Washington
McCulloch, William M., *Ohio*	4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif.*	
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*	
McFall, John J., *Calif.*	507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGinley, Donald F., *Nebr.*	
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak.*	
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*	220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*	1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McSween, Harold B., *La.*	
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*	
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*	115 Dale Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*	
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*	
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*	
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*	
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*	Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*	
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*	
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.*	The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*	The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*	
May, Catherine, *Wash.*	
Meader, George, *Mich.*	3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*	
Meyer, William H., *Vt.*	
Michel, Robert H., *Ill.*	
Miller, Clement W., *Calif.*	
Miller, George P., *Calif.*	
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*	3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Milliken, William H., Jr., *Pa.*	
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*	2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*	8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga.*	
Moeller, Walter H., *Ohio*	
Monagan, John S., *Conn.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Moorhead, William S., *Pa.*	
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*	
Morris, Thomas G., *N. Mex.*	
Morris, Toby, *Okla.*	220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La.*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*	204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*	
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*	
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*	The Coronet
Murphy, William T., *Ill.*	
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*	
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*	
Nelsen, Ancher, *Minn.*	
Nix, Robert N. C., *Pa.*	
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*	
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*	2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*	
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*	The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*	The Congressional
O'Hara, James G., *Mich.*	
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass.*	
Oliver, James C., *Maine*	
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*	
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*	100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*	
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*	117 Carroll St. SE.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*	
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*	
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho*	
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*	
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*	
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*	
Pirnie, Alexander, *N. Y.*	
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*	228 2d St. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*	
Polk, James G., *Ohio*	
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg.*	
Powell, Adam C., *N. Y.*	
Preston, Prince H., *Ga.*	
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*	
Prokop, Stanley A., *Pa.*	
Pucinski, Roman C., *Ill.*	
Quie, Albert H., *Minn.*	The Coronet Apt., 200 C St. SE.
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*	
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*	
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*	
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*	
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*	
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*	
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*	The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*	1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*	6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*	5603 24th Ave. SE., Hillcrest Hgts., Wash. 21, D. C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*	
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*	3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*	
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*	
Rivers, Ralph J., *Alaska*	
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*	6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y.*	
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*	
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*	
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass.*	The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*	Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*	
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*	
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*	
Rostenkowski, Dan, *Ill.*	
Roush, J. Edward, *Ind.*	
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*	
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y.*	
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y.*	
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif.*	
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*	
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*	
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*	
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C.*	
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*	433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*	
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*	
Shipley, George E., *Ill.*	
Short, Don L., *N. Dak.*	
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*	
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*	
Simpson, Edna Oakes, *Ill.*	
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*	5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*	
Slack, John M., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*	
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif.*	
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*	204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Neal, *Iowa*	
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*	
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*	Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*	
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*	
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*	
Stratton, Samuel S., *N. Y.*	
Stubblefield, Frank A., *Ky.*	
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*	
Taber, John, *N. Y.*	
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*	
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*	
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*	6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y.*	Mayflower Hotel
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*	2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*	3301 Mass. Ave.
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*	
Thompson, T. A., *La.*	1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, Keith, *Wyo.*	
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*	
Toll, Herman, *Pa.*	
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*	
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*	
Tuck, William M., *Va.*	
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*	
Ullman, Al, *Oreg.*	
Utt, James B., *Calif.*	
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*	
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*	
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*	4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*	
Wallhauser, George M., *N. J.*	
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*	
Wampler, Fred, *Ind.*	
Watts, John C., *Ky.*	
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*	9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Weis, Jessica McC., *N. Y.*	
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*	
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*	
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C.*	
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*	5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*	
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*	
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*	1001 26th Rd. S., Arlington, Va.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*	
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*	
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*	
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*	
Wolf, Leonard G., *Iowa*	
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*	
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*	
Young, John, *Tex.*	
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*	4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*	
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*	

DELEGATES

Burns, John A., *Hawaii*	

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*	2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Series, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Place SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Appendix

Milton F. Brown, of Dallas, Tex., Outstanding American Banker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, my State of Texas offers many living proofs of the durability of the principles that form the foundation of our free-enterprise system.

The Horatio Alger legend is not dead. A man can still get ahead in Texas—in America—by hard work and thrift and honesty in his dealings with his fellow men.

A recent issue of Texas Parade magazine, published in Austin, tells the story of such a man—Milton F. Brown, one-time "butcher boy" on a train through Texas, who today is president of the Mercantile National Bank of Dallas, one of the Nation's hundred largest banks.

Milton Brown's story is truly inspiring. I ask unanimous consent that the article from Texas Parade be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROWN OF THE MERCANTILE NATIONAL—THE MAN WHO MAKES DOLLARS MAKES SENSE

(By Joe Cunningham)

In the year 1892, 400 years had come and gone since Columbus discovered America, but Texas had been a State of the Union for less than 50 years, and Dallas, as an incorporated city, had just turned 21.

The Civil War had been over for nearly three decades. There would be another decade before the Spanish-American War was to break in upon the country's complacency. It is true that, down in Texas, Jim Hogg and George Clark were getting warmed up for a no-holds-barred gubernatorial campaign. But, other than that, all was quiet on the southwestern front.

A placid conservatism was permitting the country to simmer down to a steady, plodding development—a sort of burrowing-in process that was to act, at least, as a partially effective shock absorber against whatever economic upheavals lay ahead.

In the atmosphere of this undramatic interlude the vital statistics were only mildly disturbed when, on July 16, 1892, Milton F. Brown was born. The event occurred at Ennis, in Ellis County, where his father was practicing law.

The county seat was at Waxahachie, some 15 miles away. This, in those days, with roads and means of transportation such as they were, was not an inconsiderable distance. Thus, even the mild milling of gathering citizenry on "court days" and the occasional forensics of the more impressive trials were in a world apart from the little fellow growing up at Ennis.

The most engaging activity of Milton Brown's hometown was the coming and going of the trains. Ennis was an important station on the Houston & Texas Central Railroad. This was the second rail line that had ever been built in Texas. It began in 1853 as the Galveston & Red River, but after 3 years the name had been changed with a change of ownership.

A high percentage of the rail payload in those days was people. The chugging, smoke-snorting engines with their train of plush coaches was the era's most luxurious form of travel. It was thrilling simply to board the cars, and then, in rolling along over the clicking rails, one soon settled down to a sense of satisfaction with the world.

The conductor was a romantic figure. A badge of officialdom adorned his cap, while an enormous, gold-plated chain festooned his midriff and led to a ponderous, snap-lid watch in the pocket of his blue serge suit. Withal, he was a towering functionary who occupied an enviable but, to a very young lad, a wholly unattainable status.

The butcher boy's job seemed more nearly within the range of youthful ambitions.

Milton Brown decided that he was going to be a butcher boy on the H. & T.C. The product of an unpretentious era and developing his personality and character in a quiet, orderly and unspectacular community, it seems that, already, what Milton Brown wanted he set about to accomplish with a sure and steady precision. He not only became the purveyor of fruit pies and other delicacies to the passengers, but was an exceptionally good one. He developed a merchandising technique that was not only pleasing to the customers but profitable to himself. On the special trains to Galveston he often netted as much as $20 a trip. Twenty dollars in those days was important money.

Some indication of Milton Brown's future as a vital factor in the upbuilding of business and community life manifested itself in the desire of the young railroading Merchant of Ennis to become a construction engineer and to have a part in building the roads. No sooner decided upon than done. He switched over to work—hard work—with the right-of-way crews.

His progress was next highlighted when he earned a diploma from Columbia Military Academy. That was in 1909. Then he was shaken out of the dream of an engineering career by learning the fact that college graduates with engineering degrees were paid less than $100 a month, with limited future prospects.

His thoughts turned back to business. Through a series of part-time jobs he got through a business college.

One day in 1911, he encountered a long-time friend who confided to him that he was going to quit his job as a messenger boy, or runner, for a Dallas bank. Young Brown decided that was for him.

Together the two youths went to Dallas, and, as the friend resigned the job, Milton Brown offered himself as a replacement. The beginning salary—$30 a month—was not the deciding factor. Intuitively, he glimpsed the opportunities that were ahead. He was more eager to learn than to earn when he became an employee of the important American Exchange National Bank. It then occupied quarters at Main and Poydras in Dallas. Since that day, more than 47 years ago, Milton F. Brown has been identified with the banking in this important financial center.

One just does not think of Dallas banks and bankers without obeisance to the colorful and dynamic R. L. "Bob" Thornton, chairman of the board of the Mercantile National Bank and longtime mayor of Dallas. Thornton is frequently quoted as having referred to his colleagues in the progressive development of Dallas and the Southwest, as "Dallas' dynamic men." Whether the quotation is accurate or not, invariably a lot of admiration goes along with it.

Ever the discerning man, Thornton had his eye on the young fellow who had not only gotten on the payroll of the American Exchange but had gone to work. An active, aggressive man himself, Thornton was attracted to this individual—a pleasant, determined and personable young man who took to banking "like a duck to water"—and enjoyed it.

In 1917 Brown had a call from Bob Thornton who, with two partners, had, only the year before, established a private banking concern in Dallas. Milton F. Brown was offered the job of assistant cashier in this little bank of modest beginnings. He accepted. The three partners, the new assistant cashier, and one other employee constituted the entire personnel.

The development of the original banking firm of Stiles, Thornton, and Lund, then the Dallas County State Bank, later the Mercantile Bank & Trust Co., and now the giant Mercantile National Bank is one of the epochal accomplishments of the Southwest's most epochal half century.

Today the Mercantile National, of which Milton F. Brown is president, is one of the Nation's 100 largest banks and is third in Dallas in deposits. A recent $5 million increase in its capital and surplus brings that figure to $30 million, with over $6½ million in undivided profits and reserves for contingencies.

The increase, as Brown has pointed out "is another step in keeping pace with the continuing growth of Dallas and the Southwest."

This country could not have built up, says Brown, "without its banks. You tell me what kind of banks and bankers are in any community and I would venture an opinion as to prosperity and progress of that community or the lack of it."

Milton F. Brown was in the banking business when automobiles were a rarity. It was then freely predicted that these contraptions would never replace the horse. He is the first Dallas banker, however, who ever made a loan on an automobile and is probably the first to have accepted an airplane as collateral. The Mercantile was the first bank in Dallas to have drive-in facilities. The imposing institution which Brown quite accurately calls "a financial department store" does not yet have a "Space Ship Loan Department," but one should not rule out the long-range possibility.

An interviewer can jump from automobile loans to the international situation without banker Brown showing the slightest evidence that, to him, the subject has been changed at all. This, of course, is of the greatest significance: we have a world growing smaller, there is no longer such a thing as isolation from any part of any people of this globe, and, perhaps, there may eventually be none from those of other planets. It is obvious that the thinking of the Mercantile is attuned to the most minute banking needs of the individual, yet related at all times to the overall, worldwide picture.

The so-called capitalistic economy of this country, so paradoxically supported, as it is, by the continued communistic threat of war, does not, in Brown's opinion, place continued growth and prosperity in the position of a disturbed situation for its support. "Why," he says, "if we did not have a money circulation occasioned by these defense efforts, America would be spending just as much money, or more, on entirely peacetime pursuits. For one thing, our highway programs would take a big jump ahead. We are a growing country, it is our nature, and this country will continue to grow. It is the responsibility of the banks to be soundly qualified at all times to finance progressive undertakings, large or small, as they develop.

"What is the relation of size to a bank's effectiveness in a community?" he was asked.

"Size is important, of course," he replied, "but every big business used to be a little business, and the all-important thing is to maintain, at all times and at all levels, the human relationship, the friendly attitude."

Milton F. Brown became a vice president of the Mercantile National in 1928, executive vice president in 1943, and president in 1947. He is also chairman of the board of First Federal Savings & Loan Association, a director of Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Southwestern Public Service Co., Mercantile Securities Insurance Co., Cabell's, Inc., Burrus Mills, Inc., and of the important agricultural research facility, the Texas Research Foundation at Renner, Tex. He is a director and past president of Circle 10, Council of Boy Scouts of America, and has been active in Scout work for more than a decade. He is past president of the Dallas Community Chest, vice president of Dallas Clearing House Association for 1958, as well as being a past president of that association, a 33° Mason, and 1956 general chairman of the Methodist Hospital building-fund campaign. He is a member of the Highland Park Methodist Church, Trinity Valley Lodge, Hella Temple, and Dallas Petroleum Club, the Dallas Country Club, the Dallas Athletic Club, Brook Hollow Country Club, the City Club, the Downtown Club, and the Reserve City Bankers' Association.

Asked if he has any hobbies, the busy man looked up in some surprise. "Why, sir," he said, "everything I do is a hobby. I like my work—and then I do a little gardening."

One would guess him to be a gardener when the day's work is through. Milton Brown likes to make things grow.

Soviet Challenge and Western Response

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in the New York Times of today entitled "Soviet Challenge and Western Response." I urge that my colleagues read the editorial for these reasons: First, they will see the stakes which are involved, and the position which is being taken by the United States in respect to Berlin and the reunification of Germany. They will recognize, as the New York Times editorial has recognized, that this is the point of decision, and that if we retire from Berlin on Soviet terms, we shall probably be yielding not only Europe but the "cold war"—the cause of freedom, itself.

The editorial analyzes that subject in the greatest detail. It is very important that Members of Congress, in all of their speeches, and in all of their answers to questions should not be confounded in their ability to answer on the facts. The fact is that the western position is thoroughly sound in terms of law, in terms of statutes, in terms of policy, in terms of the failure of the Soviet Union to keep its commitments, and in terms of our fidelity to our commitment the fact that we have kept them not only in letter, but in spirit.

We may be able to give ground in many ways—and the New York Times editorial suggests fundamental proposals we can make for security, for disengagement, for guarantees against any future German oppression and for nuclear arms limitation—but we cannot give way on the ground that the Soviet Union is attempting to foist on the world in the guise of peace—that we should quit Berlin and leave it as an isolated, sterile, neutralized area. If we yield on the Soviet terms, we shall not encourage peace; we shall have a prelude to war, just as yielding at Munich was a prelude to war. I assure Senators that the parallel is very apposite.

The editorial gives the background of the subject, legally and logically. By reading it every Member of the Congress of the United States will have the capability of answering any questions of any of his constiuents as to whether the policy of the U.S. Government is reasonable or unreasonable. I believe the editorial demonstrates the U.S. policy on Germany is eminently reasonable, and I think it is must reading for every Member of Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there obpection to the request of the Senator from New York?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET CHALLENGE AND WESTERN RESPONSE

I

Ever since, and even during, the catastrophe of the Second World War, the Western powers have sought to restore to the world a just and lasting peace. To that end they have made innumerable proposals, beginning with the Atlantic Charter, continuing through the war and postwar conferences of Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Moscow, London, Paris, New York, Geneva and elsewhere and culminating in the Charter of the United Nations.

These efforts have been frustrated by Soviet Russia, which broke up the wartime alliance, violated its war and postwar agreements, spurned all attempts to control the atomic bomb, and paralyzed the United Nations with its abuse of the veto. Even the peace treaties signed by the Soviets with East European countries were used by them merely to fasten their yoke on these areas.

Now Soviet Russia has offered a new challenge to the West. In what remains, in essence, an ultimatum with a time limit, it has in effect ordered the Western powers to get out of Berlin or risk an atomic war.

II

There should be no mistake about the seriousness of this challenge, whether Khrushchev blows hot or whether he blows cold. What is at stake here is not only the fate of free Berlin and its 2,200,00 free people, or even the fate of Germany, important as both are. What is at stake is the fate of Europe, of our own first line of defense, of peace.

The abandonment of Berlin would force Germany to seek a deal with the Soviets at the price of isolation and neutralization that would make that country a marshaling ground for further Soviet advances. It would undermine the North Atlantic alliance and in the end force a premature American withdrawal from Europe. It would torpedo the whole European unification movement and split the Continent again into isolated and indefensible individual states.

The consequences of such a development for the United States are self-evident.

III

Under the Potsdam agreement and related compacts both East and West agreed that Germany, "within her frontiers as they were on 31st December, 1937," and under the supreme and joint authority of the occupying powers, should be administered as a "single unit," except for territories east of the Oder-Neisse line, put under Polish and Soviet administration pending a peace pact. It was further agreed that the Big Four should prepare Germany for reconstruction of its political life on a democratic basis, with freedom for all democratic political parties, and that the Allied Council of Ministers should prepare a German peace settlement to be accepted by an all-German Government that was to be established as soon as conditions would permit.

The manner in which Soviet Russia destroyed this agreement is history. Unable to impose its will on all Germany under joint control, it detached its zone from the rest of the country and put East Germany under Communist control, suppressed the promised freedoms, sovietized its economy and rearmed it, annexing the eastern territories outright.

In consequence, the Western powers were compelled to organize a new regime for West Germany. And after the Soviet coup in Czechoslovakia they were forced to look to their own defenses. The Western European Union and the North Atlantic alliance were the result. These organizations include West Germany in their common defense and rearm it for that purpose, but also keep it under control. But as they also check further Soviet expansion they are denounced by Moscow as aggressive military groupings and Berlin is to be the apparent instrument of their destruction.

IV

It is against this background that Soviet purposes in the Berlin challenge must be viewed. In the existing situation the Western powers cannot and should not stand merely on their defensive strength. It is important for them to mobilize the moral forces of the world in support of a real peace. It is in this area that the West has failed thus far to take full advantage of its opportunities to state its case effectively.

One principal reason is that, in contrast to the deluge of elaborate and detailed Soviet proposals, the Western powers have produced nothing equally concrete and detailed. It would seem, therefore, to be the first duty of Western statesmanship to work out a comprehensive peace plan so fair, so practical and reassuring to all, that it would appeal to the decent opinion of mankind.

With the force of world opinion behind it, such a plan might persuade the Soviets that they have more to gain than to lose by accepting it.

V

It is beyond the scope of any newspaper editorial to define the terms of such a plan, which in any case cannot be presented on a take-it-or-leave-it basis and must first be negotiated with our allies and then with

Soviet Russia. But certain essential elements of such a plan have frequently been advanced by Western statesmen. Unfortunately, these Western proposals have too often seemed to be put forward in such a tentative, cursory, and piecemeal manner as to fall short of the impact they should have. It is therefore pertinent to attempt to summarize them, to tie loose ends together, and to look at the broad outlines that emerge.

Three of the essential elements of such a plan emerge at once. The first is that any move toward real peace cannot start with negotiations over Berlin alone, as the Soviets propose. The Berlin problem is merely part of the German problem, and the German problem is part of the problem of Europe. Any separate negotiations over Berlin would be really negotiations over the Western right to stay in the city. If that right is admitted by the West to be negotiable, it is immediately undermined, and once that is done a Western withdrawal from the city is in sight.

The second essential element is that Europe cannot afford a repetition of the folly of Versailles. As both President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles have said, any new attempt to isolate, segregate, neutralize, and demilitarize a people as numerous, vital, and vigorous as the Germans could only turn them again into a restless and dangerous force that could breed another Hitler. This is equally true of any attempt to partition Germany and divide its people by force.

The third element, deriving from the first two, is that a European peace settlement depends on a German peace settlement, and that a German peace settlement cannot be concluded in a vacuum. Militarily, politically, and economically, Germany is too large a factor in the European balance of power for such a solution. Any German settlement must therefore tie Germany into a European security system as West Germany is already tied into the Western security system.

VI

Such a system should first of all provide security for Germany's neighbors—and especially Russia—against a resurgence of German militarism and aggression and provide the basis for the kind of rapprochement that now unites Germany and France. Russia is entitled to have firm assurance in this matter.

The plan must also provide security for Germany itself, in order to prevent a recurrence of the nightmare of isolation that dominated the Germans in the past, prompted them to try to play off East against West and in the end produced the paranoia that led to disaster.

The logic of these considerations argues, therefore, that a European peace settlement should begin with the reunification of Germany and the creation of an all-German Government capable of accepting for all the German people the obligations of such a settlement. Such reunification, which would also automatically solve the Berlin problem, should rest on the will of the whole German people, and that will can be ascertained only by a free expression of opinion.

This means free elections, for which no one has found an acceptable substitute. Free elections may not necessarily be the first step toward reunification, but they should certainly be the last step. If the Communists are as certain of popular support as they claim, they should be willing to take their chances in such a test of popular opinion, together with all other parties.

The Soviets themselves agreed to such elections at Geneva, and they make a poor case when they propose that reunification be left to the German people but prevent these people from acting on that demand.

VII

A Germany reunited in freedom should be free to organize its own international relations and choose its own associations and alliances. The West makes no secret of its hopes that a reunited Germany would stay within the North Atlantic alliance. But the mutual security of both East and West also demands that the military balance of power should not be changed thereby to the detriment of either side. For that reason the Western Powers, including West Germany, have already offered various proposals which should be further explored, clarified and formalized.

These proposals include:

1. An undertaking by the North Atlantic alliance not to move its defenses eastward beyond their present positions, if a reunited Germany should choose to remain in the alliance, and to treat East Germany as a demilitarized buffer zone containing only ordinary police forces to maintain internal order.

2. No missile bases to be built on German soil, East or West. This is again an assurance to which Russia is entitled.

3. A thinning out of foreign forces in West Germany in return for a thinning out of Soviet forces in East Germany—a process which lessened tensions after the achievement of German reunification would make increasingly possible.

Over and above these measures in Germany itself, the Western Powers have suggested broader security measures. These include: (1) an overriding European security pact superimposed on both the North Atlantic alliance and the Warsaw Pact powers, which meets the Soviet proposal for an East-West nonaggression pact, and (2) a worldwide system to prevent surprise attack. Such pacts must be self-enforcing through an effective inspection and control system. But once such a system was put into operation, the way would be open to further measures of control that would lift from all nations the burden of present-day armaments and the dread of an atomic holocaust.

VIII

We believe that a comprehensive plan presented to the world, not in bits and pieces, but as a consistent and self-contained whole, would win the support of all men of goodwill, as Wilson's Fourteen Points once did. It would demonstrate the peaceful purposes of the Western Powers and should be allowed to penetrate the Iron Curtain to appeal to the Soviet masses, which also dread war.

It must be hoped that the discussions which are now beginning between the Western Allies will give consideration to such points as these and that from these discussions there will emerge a positive program to meet the crisis now threatened for the end of May.

Oilmen as Creators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a few weeks ago Oklahoma honored a group of its citizens by selecting them for the State's hall of fame. The three college presidents, two oilmen, and two distinguished women singled out in 1958 were Dr. John W. Raley, president of Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee; Dr. Oliver S. Willham, president of Oklahoma State University, Stillwater; Dr. W. Max Chambers, president of Central State College, Edmond; Mrs. Charles Page, Sand Springs, philanthropist; Miss Alice Marriott, Oklahoma City, author; Dean A. McGee, president Kerr-McGee Oil Industries, Oklahoma City; and K. S. (Boots) Adams, chairman of the board of Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville. Each of these individuals has made a very real contribution to Oklahoma, and we are proud of them. In paying tribute to these individuals for their accomplishments, Frank Porter, president of the American Petroleum Institute, made a speech in which he wove the history of our State into a dramatic story of pioneers and the creative force they provided. I share his conviction that "the force of creation is stronger than the force of destruction," and applaud his statement that "wisely led, soundly educated Americans can both gain and guard the good life that is due them."

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the speech entitled, "Oil Men as Creators," delivered at Oklahoma City, Okla., on November 17, 1958, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I make this request notwithstanding the fact that I have received from the Public Printer an estimate that the printing of the address in the RECORD will require 2¼ pages at a cost of $182.25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL MEN AS CREATORS

(Address of Frank M. Porter, president, American Petroleum Institute, before Oklahoma annual hall of fame banquet, Biltmore Hotel, Oklahoma City, Okla., November 17, 1958)

The idea of this annual hall of fame banquet has always appealed strongly to me. I believe a State that takes this means of paying tribute to its distinguished citizens testifies to its own merit as well as to theirs. By the very act of acknowledging the contributions of its outstanding people, Oklahoma proves it deserves their contributions.

Certainly in this age, when there is a marked tendency to submerge the man in the mass, it is heartening to participate in a ceremony that singles out individual achievement.

The occasion reminds us of a sometimes forgotten fact: No matter how favorably situated a State may be, no matter how abundantly supplied with natural resources, that State cannot hope to rise above the performance and capabilities of its individual citizens. Far more than any natural advantage of geography, the character of the people determines the character of the State, and decides to what extent it will be successful, prosperous and productive.

Oklahoma has been doubly blessed. It has been blessed with a lavish supply of natural resources, particularly oil and natural gas; it has been blessed again with the kind of citizens who have the intelligence, energy and initiative to make the most of nature's bounty. Without the right people, the richest resources would be but idle monuments to incompetence.

This, to my mind, is the theme of our gathering tonight: The theme of human achievement.

It seems particularly fitting that the men and women chosen for this year's tribute should include educators and oil men. Both occupations have done much for Oklahoma, both have an enormous potential for future service, and both are being drawn closer and closer together by the circumstances of their respective professions.

When I entered the oil business, 42 years ago, many an experienced wildcatter would have scoffed at the suggestion that there was any mutuality of interest between oil and education.

Yet, events have shown that even then the petroleum industry was in a transition stage, though few of us noticed the change. Science was replacing hunches in the search for and production of oil, the businessman was supplanting the speculator, and the industry was moving toward a maturity of outlook. Not that it was getting old and hidebound. I hope it never gets that way. But in my starting days the industry was outgrowing the restless impatience of its adolescence and beginning to make practical plans for a long future, as only adults do.

I had the advantage of taking part in some of the oil industry's most exciting years right in this State. I had the privilege of knowing and working with men whose careers are almost legends in the industry today. I had the thrill of being in many of the historic boom towns at the height of their booms. And I shall never forget the sights and the sounds of those towns that sprang up almost magically at the first show of oil. They were noisier than bedlam and as crowded as a New York subway at rush hour.

Not for anything in the world would I have missed the experience of those boom days. And yet, as I look toward the future of this State and of the oil business, I must confess a feeling of envy for the coming generation of oil men, too. Their experiences will be altogether different from mine. Their environment will be totally changed from the one I lived in during my early years in the business. They will never know the thrills I had, or the discomforts either, but they will encounter many thrills of their own, of a different kind, but equally exciting.

The first pioneers pushed back the wilderness and opened nature's storehouse. Their successors—a new kind of pioneer—will push back the wilderness of ignorance and pry from nature its most carefully hoarded and deeply hidden secrets.

And that's where education and educators come in.

The oil pioneers got their advanced training in the toughest and most expensive school of all—the school of experience. The qualities they needed to pass their examinations are not the kind you usually expect to acquire in classrooms—qualities like physical endurance, the ability to stand up under the hardest blows of fate, courage to the point of folly, daring to the limit of recklessness, and total inability to calculate the odds against any venture.

Sometimes these qualities were carried to extremes by the tough, hard-bitten pioneers; the early oil boom towns were hardly ideal communities by any standard of civic pride. But still courage, fortitude, stamina, and determination are not to be despised. They are virtues rated high in the American heritage. I hope that parents and educators will continue to instill respect for these qualities in the next generation of Americans, and especially in those young men and women who choose to make their careers in the oil business.

But from educators much more will be needed to prepare future oil men and women—all the learning they can get in school, plus the enthusiasm to continue their education throughout their lives; and, beyond that, an unswerving desire to create, to bring forth something new in the world.

For whatever else may be said of the oilmen of the past—the pioneers—they were first, and above all, creators. Oklahoma stands today as living proof of their creative force.

Repeated over and over again in human history is the tragic record of energy, intelligence, and talent misspent on unworthy and destructive endeavors. It is our sorrow and our loss that sheer destruction has so often proved the motive for vast undertakings, and that opportunities for discovery and creation have been neglected for the hot pursuit of predatory aims.

That is why I'm proud of my association with the oil industry; it is an intensely creative enterprise, wholly dedicated to bringing something more to people, instead of taking away from someone's stock of things that already exist on the earth's surface.

I think the contrast is well made by episodes from the history of this very State.

Just a bit more than four centuries ago Francisco Coronado wandered through a vast territory of the Southwest, including Oklahoma, in pursuit of a phantom. His quest had been inspired by reports of the Seven Cities of Cibola—seven cities reputed to be so rich that they glittered with gold and the buildings were ornamented with precious stones.

And so Coronado ventured forth with a large expedition—and larger hopes for gold and glory. Even after the Seven Cities proved to be a fraud, he plodded on, goaded by fresh rumors of another great metropolis laden with treasure for the taking.

It is ironic that in the course of his expedition he traversed some of the richest land in the whole world. He passed through areas where gold and silver abounded, where there were huge stocks of another treasure—then unknown—oil, waiting for the man who would free it from its prison in the earth. But he found nothing. He returned to Mexico with empty hands and a broken heart.

Coronado found nothing because he looked for his treasure in cities already built, and the treasure wasn't there, it was hidden in the ground; the cities he sought had not been built, they were waiting for the builders to come.

Centuries later they were built, when the right men arrived—the creators—who were willing to dig for their treasure and bring forth something new in the world. But because he came to loot and plunder what others had already found, and never thought to make discoveries of his own, Coronado failed.

The Seven Cities of Cibola were a myth, as Coronado learned to his lifelong sorrow, but today real cities thrive across the land he searched because creative men came to enrich that land and nourish its prosperity. Who were the real conquistadores? The oil men—for they did not contend with other men, but with nature itself, and they did not have to loot the treasure of others; they had the vision to find treasure of their own.

I shall not attempt to recite all the advantages oil men have brought to Oklahoma. It would take too long to tell with any degree of completeness, and it would only mean repeating what all of you know and have observed with your own eyes.

However, a few figures are worth recalling just to remind us of the size of Oklahoma's economic benefits from petroleum. It is estimated, for instance, that up to the first of this year the value at the wells of the crude oil produced in this State, from the start of commercial production here, totaled close to $13 billion. Last year alone the value at the wells of the crude oil produced in the State totaled nearly $652 million, with natural gas liquids accounting for another $50 million, and natural gas itself for nearly $54 million.

Up to January 1, more than 7½ billion barrels of crude oil had been produced in Oklahoma, and there's a lot left in the ground. Proved crude reserves run to nearly 2 billion barrels, with an additional 343 million barrels of natural gas liquids, and some 14 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

Oil or gas or both are produced in all but 8 of this State's 77 counties, and at the year's beginning there were 77,887 producing wells scattered across every part of Oklahoma. Close to 68,000 Oklahomans make their living directly in some part of the oil business.

Of course, there is no need to dwell on the ways Oklahomans, who are not even remotely connected with the petroleum industry, gain from its operations—the landowners, the merchants and business people, the royalty owners, the farmers, and many others into whose pockets flow, from one direction or another, money generated by petroleum activities.

This is truly a creative force, a purely constructive force, unleashed by the pioneer oil men who brought forth a boon from the earth that would endure long after they had spudded in their last wells. And the people we honor here tonight are men and women who have carried on this tradition by giving something new to the world—whether it is the world of machinery and chemicals, in the case of oil men; or the world of thought and learning, in the case of the educators.

I want to address myself especially to the educators when I express the hope that the schools of this State and of other States will continue to supply us with oil men and women capable of carrying forward the trail blazed by the pioneers. For the industry now and in future years has great need for such people, and the American public has a constant, growing need for the benefits they can confer.

Next year the oil industry will be 100 years old. We've climbed a long way in that first century, but only to a height that gives us a clearer view of the distances expanding before us—the limitless possibilities, the boundless opportunities, the seemingly infinite capabilities of the stuff known as petroleum.

As of now, there are more than 2,300 products made by the petroleum industry, but nobody believes the limit has been reached—or anything approaching the limit. Scientists of the future will find many hundreds, more likely thousands, of new uses for petroleum, some of them unprecedented and unparalleled by anything being done today. Here is a challenge for the creative mind, the mind aroused by education to break through the barriers surrounding our present knowledge of what petroleum can do.

Can we guess the services these new products will perform? Perhaps there'll be new fabrics to make life more comfortable for those who must work in difficult climates—the tropics or the polar regions. Perhaps they'll take the form of some simple, but prized, household improvements, a new kind of plastic or paint. Perhaps we can look for some medical discovery that will tame a terrible disease, relieve pain and suffering, or significantly prolong human life.

It may even be some present student's glory to contrive a petroleum fuel powerful enough to break with ease the grip of earth's gravity and transport the first men to see the dark side of the Moon, to pierce the clouds of Venus and solve the mystery of those canal-like markings on Mars.

Anyone who thinks petroleum has become a staid and routine wrapped business, with no chance for thrills and excitement, hasn't considered the exploits and adventures still to take place in laboratories, where a new breed of pioneer—with the old breed's imagination plus a modern education—ventures into regions that no human mind has yet explored.

That's only one of the broad avenues for the creative brain, the constructive brain, in oil. Let's look at some of the others.

Those of you who lived through the oil boom days in Oklahoma have memories of the waste that resulted from weakness in technology. The great Oklahoma City oil field, in its early stages, is a case in point. We've learned plenty since those days, but we've got much more still to learn.

Though the industry has made giant strides in the prevention of waste and the conservation of oil, it is far short of its goal. In the early days, the producer could usually expect to recover only 10 to 15 percent of the oil in a pool. Today, we're doing substantially better—recovering about 35 to 40 percent as a rule, and even more in some fields where conditions are especially favorable. But even a threefold gain in the recovery of oil from a typical reservoir leaves no room for complacency. Needed are new methods that will step up our recovery rate and bring us closer and closer to the only acceptable aim—full, one hundred percent recovery of all the available oil and gas in a pool.

There's another chance for a scientist to prove himself, and, at the same time, automatically multiply the Nation's oil reserves. And there's a chance for educators to discover and encourage students who give evidence of having the kind of skill and interests that could lead to such an important development. Just consider what it would mean to the country to have its petroleum reserves virtually tripled by improved recovery methods.

Consider also what it would mean if some scientist came up with a new and better way of drilling for oil and gas, so the wells could go deeper than they are going now, without a prohibitive increase in costs, and perhaps expose huge new oil reserves presently beyond our reach.

Here's another hint as to how today's science-minded student can prepare himself for a career ripe with opportunity: Last year over 80 percent of the 747 wildcat wells drilled in Oklahoma were dry holes. For the entire oil-producing country, the dry-hole figure was nearly 86 percent. We've greatly improved our exploration techniques, but, as these figures show, we're still playing a game that bears an uncomfortable resemblance to blindman's buff. The scientist who can do anything to reduce the odds oil producers now have to buck, who can give us more reliable ways of telling where oil is—and where it isn't—will earn the gratitude of the entire industry—and every consumer of its products. We've been waiting years for this man. I hope he comes along very soon.

I've mentioned only a few suggestions for future creative accomplishments by the highly educated and thoroughly trained oil men who will carry on with the work begun by the pioneers.

And I'm not thinking only of scientists either, though we'll need all we can get in the oil industry over the years to come. We need the right people for other occupations, too—executives for the future, mentally and morally capable of managing the industry's enterprises; highly skilled marketing people to keep the flow of products moving steadily from well to consumer; and certainly there's a very pronounced need for men and women who can do a better job of interpreting the oil industry to the public, so petroleum will stop being a national scapegoat and start receiving the understanding it deserves in the nonproducing States.

This is one of the oil industry's biggest problems today—lack of public understanding and deliberately fostered misunderstanding of our business. But we're not alone in our troubles. The whole private enterprise system is taking a beating from clever propagandists who know how to use words as weapons. No matter how brilliantly private enterprise performs, it will keep on taking punishment from these people unless it prepares itself to meet them on the battleground they have chosen, and refute their melodramatic propaganda with an equally appealing presentation of the facts. The private enterprise system is in mortal danger right now. It can't take many more propaganda blows without permanent hurt in public standing and misguided public laws. If this system is to be rescued in time, and preserved against future attacks, we must find more people with the talent and the training to wage a victorious fight for the ideas and ideals of American freedom.

You can increase the output of oilfields and the throughput of refineries to meet changing demand, but there isn't any way yet known to enlarge the supply of human talent to meet the tremendous demand now being felt in all walks of life. However, we can, and we should, look to this country's educators, and aid and support them, in developing and stimulating the best abilities in the young people given to their care. For, in large measure, what happens in our schools, our colleges and universities today will decide what happens in our country and the world tomorrow.

When we look into the future, it is with a feeling of awe at the possibilities that lie ahead. The average span of life has already been lengthened significantly and it can be lengthened more—giving people, as the saying goes, "more years in their life and more life in their years." The mobility of the present, when people think little of hopping oceans in a plane, may seem narrowly confined 10, 15, or 100 years from now. It is not at all impossible that our descendants may get away from it all by spending a vacation on the moon, as casually as one of us might take a trip to Santa Fe.

The plagues that tormented the middle ages have already been subdued in the Western World, and other diseases are yielding. Polio, once the bane of childhood, has already given way. We can hope that cancer, arthritis and the mental ills will soon be in full retreat.

Science, education, learning hold out all the prospects for a life so much better than anything we now know as to make our highest living standards seem lowly by contrast.

There is just one cloud—one threatening, ominous cloud—hanging over the future's landscape. That is the cloud of a total perversion of science in some form of destruction—either the physical destruction of war or the moral destruction of a totally regimented society. We could look happily toward the future, we could send our children and grandchildren into it cheerfully, if it were not for the specter of the kind of life described in "1984" or the end of all life in an atomic holocaust.

But I submit that the same powers of mind which are capable of inventing the advances a peaceful future can bring are equally capable of averting the catastrophes that we fear. I maintain that the force of creation is stronger than the force of destruction, and that wisely led, soundly educated Americans, can both gain and guard the good life that is due them.

We in the oil industry want them to have this good life. We have dedicated ourselves to creation—to drawing oil out of the earth and converting it into products that serve and advance human society. We want to build cities, not destroy them. We want to spread happiness and comfort, not tears and agony. These are our wishes, these are the aims we work for, these are the aspirations with which we enter the second century of our enterprise.

But we cannot realize these aims alone. We must have the help of educators, and of enlightened people everywhere, who can work with us to make this wish into a living faith, who can spread the light of learning until it overflows the boundaries of our own land into nations now groping in the darkness of ignorance and hate.

Once the people of the world understand what creative forces can do, fear and envy will be banished from human life. For when creative energies are let loose, there is no need to think of gain in terms of taking from another what rightly belongs to him, no need to struggle to grasp a small share of a dwindling stock of goods, no cause to believe that a man can get richer only by making some other man poorer.

Creation—as oil men have practiced it here in Oklahoma—as scientists are practicing it every day and will practice it even more in the future—means tapping unlimited abundance by bringing to people something they did not have before. And as this creative force advances, the evils of poverty, disease, and despair will be forced to withdraw. There will be no room for them in the world.

Let us, therefore, shun the narrow view of poor, misguided Coronado, who thought he could only increase the wealth of his own people by diminishing the possessions of another race. Let us look at life instead with the steady vision of the oil pioneers who knew that they could not enrich themselves except by enriching others, by bringing out of the earth a treasure that was denied to all until they found it.

As we approach the end of oil's first century, and look back at the obstacles surmounted, the difficulties overcome, as we consider what oil and oil men have done in this very State, and the courage and perseverance they needed to do it, we can draw upon the past for confidence in the future.

The qualities these men possessed are still being produced on American soil. They are not common today, they never were common, but neither are they scarce. The past gave us men and women with creative vision, and the future will keep up the supply. We look to our educators, and our clergy, and the other leaders of American thought to provide the inspiration and the moral incentive for the new kind of pioneers to come, so that oil's second century will shower the land with new advantages, and accelerate the progress of a State that counts its blessings and properly honors its benefactors.

The President's 1960 Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Advisory Council, under date of January 21, 1959, issued a statement on the President's 1960 budget. I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues this excellent statement which reads as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S 1960 BUDGET—A STATEMENT BY THE DEMOCRATIC ADVISORY COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 21, 1959

The brave and new words in the President's state of the Union message have now been followed by the weak and inadequate programs contained in the President's budget message. The President says that we need to do more, but his budget proposes to do less.

The President attempts to justify this inconsistency by the claim that he is presenting a balanced budget. That claim was spurious a year ago; it is spurious today. A budget that does not meet the economic

needs of the Nation and the people cannot meet the financial needs of the Treasury.

The new Republican budget comes close to being a fraud on the American people. President Eisenhower and his advisers, if they have read the lessons of the November election, have rejected them all. They have decided that the American people want not advance but retreat, not expansion but contraction, not an imaginative step toward the future but a selfish and sullen retreat into the past. The new budget shows, above all, that in the GOP administration there are no modern Republicans and no conservative Republicans but only men who put pocketbook before people. This the people of the United States will surely remember.

What is bad for people is also bad for pocketbooks, both private and public.

The new budget talks confidently of a great expansion in income and output. This underlies the forecast of a great increase in revenue without any important increases in taxes. But at the same time national programs, far from keeping pace with the normal increase in needs and capabilities, are cut back from the levels of past years. The effect of such cutbacks is not to expand but to repress the economy. In any case, public services must keep pace with private expansion. Neither the United States nor any other country can afford to base its policy on such false reasoning and foolish inconsistencies as are manifest in this budget.

The individual budget items and the related legislative program are an intricate combination of defeat, deception, and denial. National Defense outlays are reduced, and reduced even more when proper allowance is made for price changes. This means that the administration is disarming not by negotiation, a solution that it apparently rejects, but by unilateral action. It proposes to assist our friends and meet the challenge of the Soviet Union in the uncommitted world with a big reduction in economic aid. The new Development Loan Fund and the provision for technical cooperation are to remain at low or starvation levels. Indeed, nowhere in the field of foreign affairs does the budget show the slightest imagination, or indeed, even the most elementary realization of the nature of the world in which we live.

The mistreatment of our own people is callous. The budget shows no thought of the needs of an expanding population or of an improving level of popular well-being. Nothing is deemed so important by the administration as a reduction in appropriations. As a result, there is no program for school construction, no new aid to education, nothing to show that the anxieties and concerns of the post-sputnik and space era have made the slightest impression on President Eisenhower and his Republican budget makers. Increased needs for parks, conservation, forest protection and improvement, reclamation and assistance to low-income farmers are all met with budget levels below past years.

In recent years, as the Federal Government has lagged in meeting its responsibilities, States and localities have endeavored to the best of their abilities, to fill the gap. As a result, at a time when the Federal debt has changed only slightly, State and local debt has gone up severalfold. State and local spending has increased far more rapidly than that of the Federal Government. Nevertheless this Federal budget, either in ignorance or indifference to these rising burdens, proposes to transfer numerous responsibilities of the Federal Government to States and localities. This would include some or all of the present Federal responsibility for urban renewal programs, for assistance to impacted areas, for flood control, for waste treatment and pollution control, and for feed and seed loans in areas that have suffered disaster.

In the new budget the costly and ineffective farm program is made somewhat more ineffective by a cut in support prices. Due to the ineffectiveness of the program, costs will continue to be tremendous, and as a result of the Benson mismanagement of the corn program they will probably be even higher than the present budget estimates suggest. There is an unjustifiable reduction in funds for hospital construction and for medical research programs. Veterans are to be rewarded with increased interest costs as are Rural Electrification Administration borrowers.

Nothing better symbolizes Republican attitudes than the one big increase in the budget. That is for interest charges, which rise from $7.5 billion in the present fiscal year to $8.1 billion in the next. This is exclusively the result of the increase in interest rates. The only people who benefit in the big way from the new budget are those who have money and lend it to the Government. This shows, incidentally, that the tight money policy is to be renewed with its menace to expansion.

This is the budget of an administration which has lost respect for the American people, and which seems to have lost respect even for itself. The country is fortunate in having a Democratic Congress which is alive to our needs, both at home and abroad, and which will seek to provide for these needs in an honest and responsible way. We Democrats are not for spending for the sake of spending. But we do believe in doing what must be done for the preservation of the peace and for the protection and well-being of our people.

Is Inflation Inevitable?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address entitled "Is Inflation Inevitable?" delivered by Henry C. Wallich before the Federal Bar Association.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS INFLATION INEVITABLE?

(Excerpts from remarks by Henry C. Wallich, assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, at the monthly meeting of the District of Columbia chapter of the Federal Bar Association, Washington, D.C., Jan. 21, 1959)

President Eisenhower's balanced budget submitted to the Congress on January 19 will be a major factor in the battle against inflation. It promises to remove one of the chief sources of inflation—the Federal deficit. At a time when the Nation is moving toward new peaks of prosperity, a balanced budget is essential.

President Eisenhower's budget will have anti-inflationary effects that go beyond removal of the deficit. It is balanced at $77 billion, well below the $80.9 billion expenditures expected for fiscal year 1959. It thus avoids excessively high Government expenditures which can be inflationary in periods of booming business, even if fully covered by taxes.

In the Economic Report issued January 20, the President gives details concerning further action against inflation. He proposes an amendment to the Employment Act so as to make stable prices an explicit goal of Federal economic policy. A continuing Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth is to follow Government and private activities affecting costs, prices, and economic growth. Another committee is established to follow specific Government activities that affect prices and costs, including procurement, construction, stockpiling, and commodity price support. Fuller public information on matters relating to inflation was also proposed by the President.

These governmental efforts will be important to control inflation. But inflation does not spring from one single source, nor can the Government, in a free economy, control all possible sources of inflation. The consumer contributes to inflation if he goes overboard in his expenditures, if he is not conservative in the use of credit, and if he fails to shop carefully. The businessman contributes to inflation if he engages in sudden large variations in capital spending, if he makes injudicious use of credit, and if he does not practice restraint in the pricing of what he sells. Labor contributes to inflation if wage demands are not kept in line with the growth of productivity. All these activities must be avoided if we are to fight inflation successfully.

In a free economy, the actions of consumers, businessmen, and labor cannot be controlled, they must be voluntary. The responsibility which this imposes is all the greater.

It is futile to believe that as a nation we can protect ourselves against inflation by pressing for higher wages, by buying ahead, and by seeking out inflation-proof havens for our savings. Some may succeed and a few may even gain a temporary advantage. But in the long run inflation hurts the entire economy and we are all hurt with it. Against the damage done to our productive system, there is no way of hedging.

Inflation long continued will undermine also our posture in the cold war. It threatens us with a new economic isolationism. If inflation is allowed to proceed, we may price ourselves out of our export markets and be less able to compete at home with imports from abroad. Inevitably, there will come new demands for tariff protection and the like. Inevitably, our ability to strengthen the free world economically, through private investment and Government aid, will be reduced. We must not let that happen at this critical juncture.

Inflation certainly can be controlled. We know that it poses a threat to the very essence of our free economy. A mature nation will not let that threat materialize.

Discrimination in Military Pay Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Washington Sunday Star of January 25, 1959, commented editorially that it was encouraging that a large number of Senators and Representatives have sponsored proposed legislation to prevent discrimination in retired military pay and to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services.

I agree. Discrimination by statute among the combat veterans of American wars ought not to be, indeed, must not

be, tolerated. I hope legislation may be given early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the editorial comments in the Washington Star be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RANK DISCRIMINATION

There are gratifying indications in Congress that a highly discriminatory provision in the 1958 military pay law will be eliminated at this session. This provision, in effect, set up an inferior and a preferred retired list for pay purposes. Relegated to the inferior list were all officers who retired prior to June 1, 1958, the day the law became effective. They were limited to a retirement pay increase of 6 percent. All officers retiring after that date are on the preferred list. They are entitled to a much larger increase, based on the traditional relationship between active duty and retired list pay scales.

Among the penalized inferior group are many of the combat leaders of two World Wars and the Korean war. They have been cut off arbitrarily from the benefits which they justifiably had expected under a century-old formula. Yet officers retired since last June 1 and those hereafter to be retired are entitled to the full benefits of this formula (50 percent of present base pay of rank for officers with 20 years' service, 75 percent for those with 30 years' service). The unfairness of this so-called economy measure may be seen by the fact that a major general or rear admiral with 30 years of service who retired the day after the law became operative receives $1,884 more a year than an officer of like rank and service who had the misfortune to retire on the previous day.

The storm of protest which has arisen among active as well as retired officers of the three services is based not only on the inequity of the plan but on fear that departure from the established formula last year may set a precedent for future congressional economy. As the Cordiner report on armed service pay persuasively pointed out, the relationship between active duty and retired pay has been a vital force in stabilizing the military career service over many years. To abandon this relationship is to impair morale by holding over the services the threat of an unstable retirement-pay structure.

Hence, it is encouraging that nearly 30 Senators and numerous Representatives have sponsored identical bills at this session to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services. This legislation, involving amendment of the 1958 pay law, merits early passage—in the interest of a more stable and stronger Military Establishment.

Indiana Dunes on the Shore of Lake Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent article entitled "Will New Congress Save the Dunes?—Vast Tract To Be Either a Park or a Steel Plant," published in the Chicago American of January 24, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL NEW CONGRESS SAVE THE DUNES?—VAST TRACT TO BE EITHER A PARK OR A STEEL PLANT

(By Basil Talbott)

A strip of Indiana dunes on the Lake Michigan shore east of Gary promises to become a battlefield in the new session of Congress.

The issue is a simple one. Shall this shifting landscape, with its unusual flora and soft contours, be preserved as a natural resource or shall it be consigned to vast industrial development?

Leading the forces to keep the area as it is, is the Save the Dunes Council, of which Mrs. James Buell of Ogden Dunes, Ind., wife of an Ogden Dunes physician, is president.

Unable to find an Indiana member of Congress to carry its spear, the council appealed to Senator DOUGLAS, Illinois Democrat, and found him willing and eager. He introduced a bill in the 85th Congress to make the area a national park. It got nowhere, so he is to introduce it again this session.

The council is backing him up with an army of 300,000—people who have signed petitions for the preservation of the dunes.

There is a hitch. A year and a half ago, Bethlehem Steel Co. began buying up duneland. It now owns 4,000 acres—a reported investment of $7 million—and seeks more.

ONE AND ONE-HALF MILES OF SHORELINE

The purchase takes in one and a half miles of shoreline—including the area the council wants to save for a park. At the time the steel firm began making its purchases, Eugene Grace, the board chairman, was asked what Bethlehem intended to do with the property.

His answer, rated as the quote of the year, was:

"We certainly aren't planning to put up a bird sanctuary."

Grace has subsequently retired as board chairman.

Having bought the land, Bethlehem recently evicted 58 families of dunes dwellers. These were summer residents who had rented their plots—some as long ago as 20 years—for $125 a year and put up makeshift cabins. These structures lacked modern conveniences, such as electricity, gas and plumbing.

In effect they were told to leave and take their homes with them. The sites are inaccessible except by jeep or foot. One had to be a true dunes lover to live there. Most of these dwellers obeyed only the first part of the command, which was to leave.

WEST OF PRESENT PARK

The Bethlehem property is west of, but not adjoining, the Indiana Dunes State Park at Chesterton, which attracted more than 400,000 people last year.

Citizens who are fighting against the "dooming of the dunes" contend the building of a steel plant so near would damage if not destroy the recreational facilities of the park as well as other nearby areas.

The same group also contends that efforts to get the Federal Government to build a deep-water harbor would, if successful, be a gift to Bethlehem in the event the steel firm erected a mill.

Surveys have shown Chicago's Calumet Harbor would suffice to serve the needs of the Indiana steel industry, the group claims.

Besides the slice bought by Bethlehem, there is adjoining dunes property acquired by National Steel Co. 20 years ago. Whereas Bethlehem has indicated it wants to put up a plant there, National has disclosed no plans. The stretch of dunes owned by both firms includes 4 miles of shoreline.

TENANTS TOLD TO LEAVE

National also has dunes tenants and has ordered them to leave. This firm has its headquarters in Pittsburgh.

In a speech last year, Senator DOUGLAS said:

"The (Army) Corps of Engineers has blueprinted a harbor to slash through the middle of this park, eliminating the historic trails, uprooting the botanical and biological exhibit, closing down the way stations for migrating birds, driving out the wildlife, draining the bogs, eliminating for all time the moving, lifting, shifting landscape that has been the source of inspiration to artists, writers and just plain people for generations.

"What is worse, the construction of mills on this site will irrevocably damage the State park, polluting its waters and air, surrounding it with a symbol of industrialization, walling it up with noise, making it more like a neglected vacant lot in the city than a protected area."

ESSENTIAL TO ECONOMY

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART (Republican, Indiana), has been quoted as saying the steel mills are essential to Indiana's economy and that he had received no mail supporting the Douglas bill.

Gov. Harold W. Handley, of Indiana, reportedly remarked that Douglas should mind his own business and take care of Illinois.

DOUGLAS' answer:

"Handley ought to be ashamed of himself for taking this land from the people of Indiana. The attitude of many Indiana citizens and politicians is: 'Why should we spend money to provide recreation for Illinois?'

"This site is largely but not exclusively used by the people from Illinois and Chicago."

The dunes have attracted fishermen, campers, picnickers, bathers, photographers and other outdoors lovers since 1912 when it was brought to the public's attention by the Chicago Prairie Club, a hikers' group.

NEGOTIATE ON MERGER

A possible clue to Bethlehem's plans for use of the dunes property is supplied by the firm's recent merger negotiations with Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., whose plant is in Indiana Harbor.

Several months ago, a New York Federal judge ruled against such a merger, saying it would tend to create a monopoly.

Bethlehem spokesmen say the decision is being studied with the possibility of initiating an appeal.

Among the groups joining the campaign of the Save the Dunes Council are the National Parks Association, Indiana Federation of Women's Clubs, Garden Clubs of Indiana, Nature Conservancy, National Wildlife Federation, Wildlife Management Institute, Wilderness Society, American Nature Association, Council of Conservationists, American Planning and Civic Association, Conservation Council of Illinois, Trustees for Conservation, and the Sierra Club.

Thailand Invites Private Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there has been much notice of late in the United States of the importance of ac-

celerating the rate of U.S. private investment abroad from the present net of approximately $3¾ billion annually to a more realistic and needed $5 billion annually. However, this is not a one-way street, for not only must the private funds be made available from this country but there must be an atmosphere conducive to the encouragement of private investment in the countries receiving the funds.

In this regard, the changes recently enacted in the foreign investment law of Thailand are worthy of interest. The United States Department of Commerce, for example, is inviting the attention of American businessmen to the new law as an incentive to investment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an announcement by the Government of Thailand which invites private investments from the United States. Those, like myself, who are deeply interested in overseas investments have emphasized that there must be receptivity to such investments. Thailand is making an effort in that direction.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

Since the provisions of the industrial promotion act of B.E. 2497 are not deemed adequate and may constitute an obstacle to the establishment of industrial enterprises because of delays in completing the required formalities and, furthermore, because the facilities offered are not sufficiently attractive to induce both domestic and foreign private investment in industrial enterprises in Thailand, the revolutionary party, therefore, deems that the said act should be revised once the legislative assembly is constituted. In the meantime, and pending the constitution of that assembly, some measures must be taken with a view to promoting internal industrial development as promptly as possible, so that the country may receive benefits therefrom.

The revolutionary party, therefore, issues the following ordinance:

"ARTICLE 1. Such industrial activities which have already been the object of promotion by decree or by ordinance of the leader of the revolutionary party may be engaged in by private persons acting individually or jointly or by juristic persons, irrespective of whether they are corporations or limited companies and whether they are Thai or foreign. These physical or juristic persons enjoy similar rights and, once they receive necessary authorization from the committee empowered by the present ordinance, shall benefit from the following guarantees from the state:

"1. The state will not create new industrial establishments to compete with the authorized industries.

"2. The state will not transfer private industrial establishments to state ownership.

"ART. 2. The industries authorized by the committee in accordance with article 1 above shall enjoy the special rights as follows:

"1. Exemption from import duties on machinery, accessories, and equipments to be used by industrial establishments as they are first set up or for their major expansion. Such exemption shall not cover items which are produced or may be purchased in Thailand.

"2. In case the industrial undertakings are corporations or limited companies at the moment when they begin their industrial activities they shall be exempted from payment of taxes or their income derived from the sales of the products of their industries, for a period of time to be determine in each case by the committee. Such period shall not be less than 2 years and not more than 5 years.

"3. Normally the export of products of the authorized industries shall be permitted. In certain cases of necessity required by national economic interest, export may be prohibited.

"4. Remittance abroad in foreign currency is permitted for capitals and for profits derived from capitals brought into the country from abroad, after payment of taxes as required by law. Authorization must be obtained through official channel and favorable consideration shall be given to any request for remittance as far as the monetary situation will permit.

"5. Skilled workers and industrial experts shall be permitted to enter the country, even in excess of immigration quotas, if the committee empowered by this ordinance deems it appropriate.

"ART. 3. The industrial undertakings authorized by the committee empowered by the present ordinance may receive the following special rights and benefits which the committee may deem appropriate taking into account the requirements of a particular industry:

"1. Exemption from or reduction of import duties, for an appropriate period of time, on materials which are required for use in an industrial establishment and which are imported from abroad. Such materials shall include those which are consumed in the manufacturing process but will not include those which can be purchased in Thailand.

"2. Exemption or reduction, for an appropriate period of time, or export duties on manufactured products to be sent abroad.

"3. Protection through import prohibition for an appropriate period of time, of manufactured goods of the same category.

"4. Protection through increase of import duties, for an appropriate period of time, on manufactured goods of the same category.

"5. Protection through prohibition, for an appropriate period of time, of new industrial enterprises for the manufacturing of products of the same category.

"ART. 4. The committee empowered by this ordinance shall be the economic advisory committee set up by the head of the revolutionary party.

"After a government has been constituted, the committee empowered to carry out the above functions shall be the committee which the government shall designate.

"ART. 5. From the date of the effective application of this ordinance, it shall be noted that:

"1. The present ordinance shall not affect the rights or benefits which have been acquired under the industrial promotion act of B.E. 2497.

"2. Such provisions in this ordinance which may contravene those of the industrial promotion act of B.E. 2497 shall prevail over the latter.

"3. The rights and benefits accorded by the present ordinance shall accrue to those who are engaged in industries which have already been the object of promotion by the industrial promotion act of B.E. 2497. Nevertheless, these rights and benefits may not be claimed retroactively. In particular, those specified in article 2 (2) shall accrue only to the extent as will be determined by the committee.

"ART. 6. The industries which are the object of such promotion shall be listed and published subsequently."

Issued on December 5, B.E. 2501.

Field Marshal SARISDI DHANARAJATA,
Leader of the Revolutionary Party.

An Open Letter to Governor Almond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon entitled "An Open Letter to Governor Almond," delivered by Rev. Ross Allen Weston, minister of the Unitarian Church of Arlington, Va., on Sunday, January 25, 1959.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO GOVERNOR ALMOND

(Sermon delivered by Rev. ROSS Allen Weston, minister, Unitarian Church of Arlington, Va., Sunday, January 25, 1959)

JANUARY 25, 1959.

The Honorable J. LINDSAY ALMOND,
Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, Richmond, Va.

DEAR GOVERNOR ALMOND: My first task must necessarily be one of self-introduction, for you will want to know who it is that presumes to disturb with his tiny and insignificant voice your vast preoccupation with the complicated affairs of our Commonwealth. I am a relatively young man, the father of three children all of whom are in public schools, the minister of a Unitarian Church in Arlington, a community with which I am sure you are acquainted. I find it a fascinating and exciting place in which to live and work, and I hope that someday you will be able to spend some time here so that you can get to know us better.

I am sure that you need no introduction to Unitarianism, for being a good student of American history, you know that it was the faith of our Founding Fathers. Its history in Virginia goes right back to the days of Thomas Jefferson. The Unitarian movement is growing in Vriginia. We now have churches in Arlington, Fairfax, Mount Vernon, Charlottesville, Lynchburg, Norfolk, and Richmond. We have very active fellowships in Blacksburg, Danville, Fredericksburg, Hampton, Roanoke, and Waynesboro. So it is no longer true today, as Jefferson said of his day, that, "I must be content to be a Unitarian by myself." Incidentally, our churches in Arlington, Richmond, and Norfolk are integrated congregations—a fact which I find to be of considerable significance.

The main concern of my life is with the moral and spiritual welfare of the many families that comprise my congregation, and beyond that to the millions of people who are my brothers in the great adventure of life upon this earth. Each and every one of these, whether dwelling in the Piedmont mud of Virginia, or upon the wide, windswept plains of Siberia, I believe to be the creatures of that mysterious but wondrous creative power which some men call life, others nature, and others God. As such, then, I must think of all these people as brothers of one another, immutably bound together in a common destiny. And so I write to you, Governor Almond, as a brother in spirit, and as one who longs to see brotherhood and justice reign, not only in my own community, but over all the face of the earth.

For a long time I have wanted to write to you, but, like most citizens, I just didn't take the time. Since Tuesday evening, however, when I listened to your address on the

radio, I have felt a moral compulsion to say some of the things that have been bothering me. I suppose that you will call be a "pinko" or a "Communist sympathizer hiding behind the pulpit," but that won't bother me in the least. I can understand the psychological motivation which makes a man use such a defense as that, and I can forgive him.

But I find it difficult to forgive you for the disappointment, disillusionment, and outright disgust that you have caused many thoughtful Virginians to feel as a result of your talk last Tuesday. I have always been opposed to your doctrine of massive resistance; yet, like many other Virginians, I have continued to feel an active sympathy for the difficult position in which you found yourself. It has always been my hope that your intelligence and practical approach to problems would issue in the continuance of your early ideal of moderation. It was always my hope that when Virginia's own supreme court rendered its decision on the legality of massive resistance, your qualities and leadership would blossom into greatness, that then you would cease to be the politician and become the statesman and thus take your rank among the great men in the history of this State. The present loss of faith in the qualities of your leadership is now one of the great tragedies of our current social crisis. I hope that my letter may bring to you an inkling of some of the reactions of Americans to the abuse which you saw fit to hurl at us on Tuesday night. If it can convey some of the depth of our disappointment in you, and the genuine anguish of our anger at what you have said and done, then it will not be in vain.

I realize, of course, that there is a ridiculous element in this picture of me, an utterly insignificant citizen, writing to you, one of the most powerful individuals in the State today. My letter will probably never even reach you, and if it does, it will have little influence, for I am told that you are not easily swayed. And yet I have to write. I write to you now as I write to all of the statesmen and politicians whose policies and programs immediately or ultimately affect our Nation's welfare and destiny. I write to you now because I believe that in this present situation you are the one who is most responsible for what happens to the children of Virginia and to the concept of government by law in this Nation. Not only that, but I think you are also responsible for what happens to America's position of leadership in the world today. I make no apology, therefore, in taking my pen in hand and telling you exactly how I feel.

My main purpose in writing you this letter is to urge upon you a drastic change in your policy of open defiance of State and Federal law. To do this before it is too late. To do this, not only for the sake of Virginia, but for the benefit of America. Whether we like it or not, a tremendous responsibility has developed upon this Nation—upon us. We call ourselves the leaders of the free world. We say that ours is the task of preserving democracy, and freedom, and the high spiritual heritage achieved through the years. The United States has established itself as a Nation proclaiming individual freedom, equal opportunity, human dignity, and though all other nations fail in their basic responsibilities, it is incumbent upon us to continually strive to live up to the principles we proclaim so proudly. We must endeavor to maintain our integrity as the land of the free. We must live the words we speak, or we can never expect others in this world to believe our words; to believe that our high-sounding principles can be practiced in fact; that the way of life set forth in our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution is the better way of life; that is the only way mankind can truly come to the full glory of a fruitful, creative, peaceful, and just life. Our country today can tip the scales which decide the future course of mankind. It is within the power of our Nation to enable human beings to continue the centuries-old upward climb—or to end it all. Whether we like it or not, our actions and our decisions as individuals and as a State, will decide which of those alternatives will prevail. Whether we like it or not, there is this great weight of continuing responsibility resting upon each of us and upon the groups to which we belong. We must master the problems at home before we can master the problems abroad. And home, for us, is not Chicago or Washington or Atlanta. It is Arlington, it is Richmond, it is Norfolk, and Charlottesville, and Front Royal.

Yet, in spite of the well-known horrible reality of nuclear weapons, in spite of the obvious potential war situation that exists in the world today, in spite of our announced role as leaders, in spite of widespread education concerning the basic principles of our Nation—in spite of all these, there are those in our country—and I include you among them—who are loudly pursuing a suicidal course. As world communism engulfs more and more of the globe, you sap the vitality of our strength at home, thus weakening the ability of our Nation to combat this mortal evil abroad. Do you not realize that our Nation is under moral scrutiny today? That the rest of the world is watching and wondering whether we actually live up to our high-sounding principles and pronouncements? Whether we really are a people of integrity who practice what we preach about democracy and peace and equality under law? Regardless of how anxiously you wave the State flag and brag about Virginia's superior way of life, when you defy your own Supreme Court which upholds the law of the land, you are doing a grave disservice to your State, to your country, and to the future of mankind upon this earth.

To those of us who still hope that democracy may somehow win in the desperate struggle with communism, what is happening in Virginia, under your leadership, is profoundly disturbing. The Communists want civilization to recede. They want to limit personal freedom. They want to prevent us from living the good life. That is their declared doctrine. They are book burners, polluters of the intellect, degraders of the mind, betrayers of the soul. They are tyrants, and enslavers, tramplers. They proclaim the ancient tribalistic way of life. They want to take us back—back to the darkness from which we painfully emerged. They want defiance; they want disorder; they want bloodshed; they want revolution. They are in revolt against the higher levels of human life. They are in revolt against civilization. They loathe a world in which the individual can live the free life. They plan to reduce the whole world to a common level where that kind of freedom will be impossible.

They are against what all the prophets, all the moral pioneers, all the greatest of the human race have striven for. They are against the freedom that Socrates would rather drink the hemlock than lose. They are against the more abundant life that Jesus said He came to bring. They are against everything that would unburden and unfetter the human soul. Can you really be unaware, Governor Almond, of the tremendous aid you are giving to the very Communists whom you claim to be fighting? Can you really be unaware of the great harm you are doing to the people of Virginia and to the South and to the Nation you claim to be protecting?

Since your address of Tuesday night, I have received a letter which reminded me of King Darius I of ancient Persia. King Darius had feelings of dislike toward the Athenians, but apparently he did not trust the constant strength of those ill feelings, because he ordered a slave to call out to him before every meal: "Master, remember the Athenians." The letter which I received was from a local citizen. Following the example of King Darius, there was scribbled on a piece of paper with red pencil the words: "Remember Little Rock." I wonder if it is really necessary for anyone to remind us of Little Rock? Are we ever likely to forget it? Europeans remind us of it constantly. Asians remind us of it. Africans remind us of it. The South Americans remind us of it.

Can we here in Arlington forget Little Rock? Our Stratford Junior High School is due to be desegregated within a few days, and school integration will then become a reality in our community. I am sure that the vast majority of the people of Arlington will accept this with calmness, and that we shall be proud of the democratic behavior of our schoolchildren. There will be no disorder, no violence from the thinking citizens of Arlington. Our public officials know how important we feel it is for them to take a firm stand against violence. We support wholeheartedly our public officials in carrying out their duty to support la· and order.

I think it is important that you should know of this support before acts of violence occur, if they do occur, and not afterward. For if there is any act of violence it will be caused by the segregationists who have been whipped into fury by your vitriolic words of Tuesday night.

What I am saying is that the eyes of the world will be focused upon Arlington on February 2. What happens at Stratford will, in large measure, depend upon you. We can demonstrate to the world that democracy can really work, or we can prove to the world that what the Communists say about America is actually true—that we do not practice what we preach.

In a very real sense, the future of democracy will be determined by the behavior of the students and parents of Stratford. Democracy is destined to die in America unless its spirit of cooperation can join us together with all men to make a better world. The brotherhood of man must either extend or it must diminish. Selfishness will kill it everywhere, at home as well as abroad—if you and I allow it.

Do you ever wonder, Governor Almond, why it is that none of our pronouncements thus far on the purposes of the American dream have really been exciting? Why the concept of liberty somehow fails to cause enthusiasm throughout the world? Why we wage this bitter struggle with communism so grimly? The reason is not very difficult to understand. Just beneath the level of our ordinary thoughts—the thought that takes things for granted, that tries to be satisfied with what comes its way—below that level, there is a deeper level and it is very unsatisfied today. It wants more than pronouncements; it wants more than court decrees—more than any of these things. It wants a genuine, believable purpose—a sufficient purpose for life. Yes, and it wants that purpose backed up by deeds. Not just in the courtrooms, but everywhere.

Even people who do not realize it are haunted in their thought and conscience by the injustice of the world we try to live in. It depresses their nervous energies. It takes the joy out of life. It makes them uneasy and defensive. We know perfectly well that the brotherhood of man is right. We are beginning to know, too, that it is necessary. In the depths of our hearts—even when nowhere else—we realize that it is coming. In one way or another, it is sure to come. I write this without a shadow of doubt in my mind, in spite of a deepening feeling of distress about the human cost at which it may have to come.

Nothing that you do can keep brotherhood from coming. Nothing new that the general assembly enacts can keep it from coming.

Not even the complete abolishment of the public school system can keep brotherhood from coming. You are foolish indeed if you think the final issue can go your way. No one need think that prejudice can win. What we sow, we reap. Until we learn to sow the seeds of unselfishness, of brotherhood, we shall continue to reap a harvest of disaster. This was true when the prophets first declared it in pioneer loneliness—voices crying in the wilderness. It has been true throughout all history. It is true today. It is a truth which, when it can write itself in nothing else, writes itself in blood.

And of course, both sides of it are plainly written in American history. I need not remind you of that. The War Between the States was the dream of a better world battling for survival. So have been all the wars in which this Nation has fought. But some Americans still do not want to know it. For them, nothing is sacred, nothing full of promise, nothing dedicated to all mankind.

How long must it be, Governor Almond, before Virginians rediscover the meaning of America? How long before we know what that famous, founding declaration of human rights invoked? How long before we see that democracy is basically religious, spiritual, ethical, and that it must be the flaming passion for justice and freedom and brotherhood?

One who is only a Virginian is not yet an American. The Virginia creed must become the American deed. And this means brotherhood. Brotherhood in Arlington. Brotherhood in Richmond. Brotherhood in Virginia. Brotherhood in America. Brotherhood in the world. And brotherhood means religion—the religion that says "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

In conclusion, I am sure that you would be first to agree that Virginia has great pride in its past. And rightly so. Here was one of the birthplaces of our democracy. Here great, democratic pioneers like Washington, Madison, Monroe, and Thomas Jefferson were at home. Virginia gave birth to ideas of freedom—freedom of thought and expression, freedom of religion—and, through Jefferson, the idea of education for all. Virginia should take pride in its past, for here in the early days of our democracy men thought and acted on the basis of reason. What has happened to that tradition today? Where are the men who can think clearly and act reasonably? You, sir, could restore that tradition with one great act of statesmanlike leadership.

The world of freemen is waiting for the restoration of human dignity and equality. If they are not revived soon, they will slip from our grasp. If they do, they may well be extinguished forever in the dark abyss of space and time.

Very sincerely yours,

ROSS ALLEN WESTON.

Oregon's Centennial Rates Three Cheers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, Oregon will be 100 years old. It is no wonder that this great event arouses ecstatic expressions from its citizens, including the poetic form. Under a previous consent, I am including a poem, written in honor of Oregon's centennial celebration, by Mrs. William McKenna, of Coos Bay, Oreg.:

OREGON

It's California for her redwood trees
And lovely girls that Hollywood sees.
And New York's fame is her gay white way,
With shows and lights on old Broadway.

Ohio and Texas have rated a rhyme,
And Rhode Island, the smallest of forty-nine.
But I've traveled afar, and none can boast
Of more wondrous sights than Oregon's coast.
Her rivers, and mountains, and cities, too,
Have more to offer than the others do.

She has myrtlewood, and Crater Lake,
And plains and forests none can fake.
They can send out posters and try real hard,
But the grass is greener in our own backyard.

Now we invite the entire Nation
To come out west for our celebration.
Oregon's centennial rates three cheers
And a wish for a happy next hundred years.

Work of the Red Cross in Pennsylvania Flood Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the American National Red Cross is doing an excellent job in Pennsylvania flood areas. The Red Cross, under the fine leadership of Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, deserves the high commendation and sincere thanks from the representatives and people of the flood areas of the Nation.

The Red Cross is the quick and friendly hand that gives our people, caught in the current January 1959 flood disaster, the courage and will to rise and, through our own efforts, to clean up the damage, rebuild, and face the future with growing confidence.

WHAT THE RED CROSS DOES TO DISASTER SUFFERERS—WHAT THE RED CROSS WILL DO FOR YOU

The Red Cross is the official volunteer disaster relief agency of the Federal Government and the American people. It is the way in which people all over the country—your neighbors—are helping you to help yourselves.

Red Cross assistance is of two kinds:

First. Emergency assistance: The Red Cross will provide immediate temporary relief. If you need food, shelter, clothing, or medical attention now, report to the nearest Red Cross disaster office or emergency shelter. The Red Cross will give you a change of address order provided by the Post Office Department to speed up the delivery of your mail. On major disasters the Red Cross will provide you with safety notification cards so that you may notify your relatives and friends of your safety and whereabouts.

Second. Assistance after the emergency: The biggest job to be done is the reestablishment of homes. Those of you who need more than temporary aid to return to normal living may apply for Red Cross help at the Red Cross disaster office.

This help is an outright gift of the American people through the Red Cross. It may include:

First. Food, clothing, and maintenance.

Second. The repair or rebuilding of owner-occupied homes.

Third. Furniture and other household necessities.

Fourth. Medical and nursing care and hospitalization.

Fifth. Occupational supplies, fixtures, inventories, and equipment.

The Red Cross does not replace losses. It is not an insurance agency. Red Cross meets those needs that you cannot meet yourself without undue hardship. Your situation will receive individual consideration by a Red Cross worker. Enough time will be taken to plan wisely with you and to verify certain information, such as home ownership, income, and liabilities. The final plan will be reviewed in confidence with an advisory committee of responsible local citizens. Each case will be handled as quickly as possible with due consideration given such things as health or age, which might create unusual conditions.

WATCH OUT FOR MISLEADING RUMORS

The Red Cross never sells food or disaster supplies—no payment is ever expected for any assistance given. Any statements to the contrary are completely false and you can help by reporting them, with the name of the person you heard tell them, to the nearest Red Cross office.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1959.

The Honorable JAMES G. FULTON,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: Knowing of your great interest in the well-being of the people in Pennsylvania, I want to give you a report of Red Cross activity in connection with the flooding that began in Pennsylvania on January 21.

Incomplete surveys from Red Cross workers indicate that nearly 22,000 families have been affected by floodwaters in 63 counties in the 5-State flood area. At the peak of the flood emergency approximately 6,000 persons were housed and fed in 82 Red Cross shelters.

Chapter volunteers and national disaster workers of the Red Cross are on the job along with Federal, State, and community agencies to bring all possible relief to flood sufferers in your State and the four others affected. The full resources of our organization have been mobilized to aid these stricken families. The Red Cross will continue its emergency and rehabilitation work until the disaster-caused needs of all these families, lacking the necessary funds, have been met.

As perhaps you know, Red Cross help is based on the principle not of replacing all losses, but of assisting disaster victims in need who lack sufficient resources of their own, including insurance, to start back on the road to recovery.

All assistance from the Red Cross is an outright gift, coming chiefly from funds contributed annually by the American people. Unfortunately, our disaster reserve has been drastically reduced because of the extraordinarily heavy disaster losses in the past 4 years. For that reason special appeals for

funds have been inaugurated by the Red Cross in the affected areas. I am confident that the American people, as always, will contribute generously.

You may be assured that the Red Cross will remain on the job until all who need our assistance have been helped.

Sincerely,

ALFRED M. GRUENTHER.

JIM, this has really been a rugged flood in many of your areas.

AL.

Thank you, General Gruenther, we in the flood areas do indeed appreciate your warmhearted cooperation.

Forty-first Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the day the people of America forget the sacrifices and sufferings of people throughout the world who value freedom enough to die for it—that day we shall have forfeited our birthright of liberty.

Happily, that day is not near. And fortunately, we are plentifully supplied with opportunities to remind ourselves that freedom is worth fighting for—opportunities like the 41st anniversary of Ukrainian independence which we commemorate here on January 22.

The national independence of the Ukrainian people—a goal they passionately pursued for hundreds of years—was won on January 22, 1918, with the formation of the Ukrainian National Republic.

But independence for these brave people was destined to be brief. In 1920, invading Communist armies from Russia overran the proud and fertile land and absorbed the country as a part of the new Soviet state.

Thus, the Ukrainian people became the first in a long series of victims of Communist terror, oppression, and slavery. Virtually every form of persecution has been used to kill the instincts of freedom in the breasts of Ukrainian patriots: starvation, murder, imprisonment, religious, and ethic genocide, and slave labor.

The overwhelming force of the totalitarian state has succeeded in keeping the Ukrainian nation enslaved. But this brutality has not succeeded in killing the Ukrainian people's undying devotion to freedom. We have seen it happen so often—in Russia, Germany, Hungary—that whenever the struggle against Communist oppression breaks into the open we can be certain that Ukrainians are playing a prominent role.

This ceaseless fight for the freedom of their homeland is supported, at least in spirit, wherever Ukrainian people have settled throughout the world. To a large degree, it has been because the Ukrainian people, and others with firsthand experience, wherever they may be, have insisted on raising their voices and telling the world of Russian brutality that the free world has remained alert to the menace of Soviet communism.

Freedom-loving Americans owe a great debt of gratitude to those of our fellow citizens who have cared so strongly.

Because Union County, N.J., has a relatively large proportion of people of Ukrainian descent among its population, I know personally of their deep feeling for freedom. It has been a major element in their success as active, public-spirited American citizens, and a contribution we must always cherish.

Let us, therefore, rededicate ourselves at this time—especially those of us who carry the responsibilities of representatives of the people in Congress—to the ancient principles of personal freedom and national independence. Let us strengthen our resolve to fight oppression, to oppose brutality, to stand steadfastly against all the relentless pressures of Communist totalitarianism.

Let us, that is, absorb the spirit and courage of those Ukrainians who have loved freedom so truly that they have died for it.

Another Honor for Budge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Twin Falls, Idaho, Times-News, paying tribute to the very able gentleman from Idaho on the occasion of his membership on the Committee on Rules. The editorial quotes another distinguished statesman from Idaho, Hon. John Sanborn, who will be remembered with affection and respect by many of us here today.

The editorial follows:

ANOTHER HONOR FOR BUDGE

A few days ago, a news item from Washington told of the appointment of Idaho's Representative HAMER H. BUDGE to the powerful Rules Committee in the House of Representatives. Informative, certainly, but it didn't sound much out of the ordinary. It took a former Representative from Idaho's Second Congressional District, John Sanborn, of Hagerman, to grasp the full significance of the appointment.

"You can't appreciate this honor unless you're familiar with the workings of Congress and the House of Representatives," former Congressman Sanborn points out.

"Most people who are not familiar with the workings of Congress fail to realize the significance of this appointment. It's importance comes from the power of the Rules Committee. All important legislation is referred to the Rules Committee after other House committees have considered and approved such legislation. The Rules Committee can refuse to release any bill or legislation, thus preventing the House from acting on it.

"Or it can set the rules under which the legislation shall be considered by the House, whether the debate shall be short or long, setting specific time. It can permit or deny the privilege of amending a bill on the floor of the House," Mr. Sanborn points out.

The fact that only 12 Members of the House are appointed to the Rules Committee from the four hundred and thirty-some Members is an honor in itself. Hence, only 12 of the 49 States can possibly be represented on the Rules Committee, the most powerful in the House. As Mr. Sanborn points out, no Idaho Representative has ever been a member of the Rules Committee before.

"The people of Idaho and especially those of the second congressional district can feel a great pride and satisfaction from the appointment," Mr. Sanborn declares.

Membership of the Rules Committee is made up of eight Democrats, who have a large majority in Congress, and four Republicans. Besides Idaho's Representative BUDGE, the other Republicans are LEO ALLEN, of Illinois; CLARENCE BROWN of Ohio; and CARROLL REECE of Tennessee.

During his tenure in the House of Representatives HAMER BUDGE has built an enviable reputation. Last November, Idaho's voters in the second congressional district recognized and approved Mr. BUDGE's record. Not only did he survive the Democratic landslide, but he was returned to office by his usual wide margin.

Now Mr. BUDGE's associates in the House of Representatives have recognized his ability and constantly growing reputation by designating him as a member of the most powerful group in the House.

The Times-News is happy to join Mr. Sanborn in congratulating Mr. BUDGE on his appointment.

Views on Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement which I presented to the graduate club and ladies' auxiliary of the Phi Delta Epsilon medical fraternity, Washington, D.C., on January 27, 1959.

The statement follows:

Immigration has been a perennial subject of debate in the United States, ever since our Declaration of Independence ascribed a bad immigration policy as one of our reasons for wanting independence from England. This is not surprising, since immigration has been one of the most characteristic and distinctive marks of American history and has contributed enormously to our growth, our wealth, and our international preeminence.

However, I am not unaware that sometimes discussion of immigration palls. The subject has been drowned with a deluge of words. There is none of us who has been intimately concerned with the liberalization of our immigration policy who has not, at one time or another, felt that whatever observations we can make have long since become trite and platitudinous.

But the seriousness of today's struggle for freedom, for the right of people to live in decency and dignity, for liberty from oppression and dictatorship, make it all the more important for us to realize that immigration is a continuing challenge. We cannot afford to become weary of the fight for a decent immigration law. Russia's sputnik and lunik have caused us to lose face in the East-West struggle, and threaten to drive non-committed nations in today's divided world

into the Communist camp. We ignore only at our peril the question of how much face we have been losing for years among these same uncommitted nations because of our American immigration law which announces our belief that other groups of people are more desirable than the very noncommitted peoples whose loyalty to the free West is so sorely needed and so assiduously courted.

A decent and nondiscriminatory American immigration law could be a great secret weapon against the efforts of communism to subvert the uncommitted nations. If we could only see ourselves as others see us, we would not wait a moment to discard the present immigration law and substitute for it one more in keeping with the traditional image of America, the country that pronounced the radical doctrine that all men are born equal, the nation that was never afraid of immigrants and always welcomed them regardless of their national origin, creed, color, or race.

But I am a little ahead of myself. If immigration is important not only to our domestic economy, but also to our international relations—to the critical question of war and peace—what should our immigration policy be? As I see it, after a third of a century of intensive study of the subject, there are three major areas in which our present policy is sadly, nay desperately, in need of major overhaul. To accomplish these ends, I have reintroduced my bill of last year, now numbered H.R. 16. These three major areas are as follows:

I. WHO SHOULD BE ADMITTED INTO THE UNITED STATES?

Under the present law, we look to the national origin or race of the prospective immigrant as the over-all criterion of admission. If he comes from some areas of the world, he has carte blanche for admission (subject to some technical health, security and other requirements which I shall not discuss at this point). If the would-be immigrant was born in other areas of the world, he might just as well forget trying to come to this country, because the quotas are so small, and so heavily oversubscribed, that no one but Methuselah will ever be reached in his lifetime.

I believe that what we have to seek to establish at this time is the reassertion in our immigration law of the American principle of equality of opportunity for all, regardless of race, color, or creed. In our present discriminatory immigration law, we also have a time-tested example that such American principle of equality is in our own best interest. The present law applies the discriminatory quota system to Europe, Asia, and Africa, but not to the Western Hemisphere. So, for the past 5 years, an average of 45,828 Mexicans entered this country each year, as against approximately 223,716 from Europe, Asia, and Africa together. I have seen no injury to our Nation from this Mexican immigration, nor has it been a subject of complaint by those who urge immigration restrictions against the rest of the world. I point to this fact merely to show the fallacy of the restrictionists' thinking purportedly based on a pretended homogeneity of the American people.

My bill proposes elimination of the discriminatory features of the present law. Under my proposal, there will be no discrimination based on national origin or race. This will be achieved in my bill by wiping out the present discriminatory national origins quota system, and by substituting a new formula for the distribution of quota visas. In an atempt to make the new quota flexible in order to permit the United States to adjust its intake of immigrants in enlightened self-interest to the fast changing political, economic, and social situation of the world, under my new proposal our annual quota will be distributed among five classes of immigrants without regard to national origin, race, or any results of the U.S. census as follows: (1) Family unification, (2) occupational class, (3) refugee asylum class, (4) national interest class, and (5) resettlement class.

Within each of the five classes, no more than 15 percent of the annual allocation could be issued to inhabitants of any single country. Here is how the annual distribution of the overall immigration quota will be established: Each year the President of the United States, after consulting with the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Labor, and with the Attorney General, would submit to the Congress, prior to March 1, the proposed allocation for each of the five classes, and Congress will have 60 days following the submission of the President's proposal to disapprove it by passing a concurrent resolution. If the proposal is not disapproved by the Congress, it would take effect on the first day of the fiscal year immediately following. If the Congress disagrees with the President, the allocation effective in the preceding fiscal year would automatically become effective.

In order to get the joint executive-legislative responsibility for the annual distribution of the total immigration quota started, I propose that the first presidential allocation plan shall reach the Congress within 6 months immediately following the enactment of my bill and if agreement is not reached on this first presidential proposal, the total annual quota of 250,000 would be simply cut across the board so as to give each of the five classes 20 percent of the total. This interim allocation would, of course, be valid for the first fiscal year of operations, pending the submission of the next presidential proposal which, again, will be subject to congressional disapproval.

My main purpose in proposing this flexible distribution of a permanently fixed annual quota is to permit the President to decide—on a year-to-year basis—with congressional concurrence, whether it is desirable in any particular year to grant more immigrant visas to relatives of U.S. citizens or to, say, refugees, or to, perhaps, immigrants possessing special skills needed in the United States at that particular time, or to any of the other classes.

The 15 percent permanent limitation affecting the participation of any single country in the distribution of the fivefold allocation is, in my opinion, a sufficient guaranty that no unfair distribution of visas for the benefit of inhabitants of one particular country would be practicable.

The history of our immigration legislation since World War II is a clear example of the ineffectiveness of our present national origins law to meet our national and international needs. When the war ended, and displaced persons in camps had to be moved to new homes, our national origins law was a block to all action of substance. Congress had to amend the law to set aside the rigid and discriminatory national origins quota system. When the country wanted to show its gratitude to our GI's, by permitting them to bring in their alien brides, here again our national welfare was frustrated by the national origins law, so Congress had to enact another law to set it aside for this purpose. After the DP Act expired, there was still more to be done with the remaining refugees, and with new escapees from communism, again the national will was thwarted by the national origins requirement, and again Congress had to set that requirement aside for this purpose. The most recent example of how the national origins law prevents us from doing what is right and proper is the Hungarian situation, where an explosion of freedom fighters against communism enabled us to show our traditional humanitarian belief in the right of asylum only through disregard of the provisions of the law, a disregard which was later ratified, in effect, by a special act of Congress which was necessary since the some 30,000 Hungarian freedom fighters would have been barred under our quota laws. Something must clearly be wrong with a law that stands in the way of so many important and critical national objectives, and Congress itself has realized that the national origins system was wrong, but has repealed it only for the specific purposes under consideration.

And while I am on the subject of recent legislation, it is appropriate to say that there are many other eligibility provisions, apart from national origins, which are sorely in need of amendment. Some of these were tinkered with—and I am glad they were—in an act passed in 1957, but much more needs to be done here. Among the matters which need change are the now ancient definitions in the law of insanity and other medical conditions.

II. HOW MANY IMMIGRANTS SHOULD BE ADMITTED INTO THE UNITED STATES?

It is of utmost importance to separate the two questions, "How many immigrants?" and "How should they be selected?" I have already indicated that no matter how many or how few are to be admitted, there should be no numerus clausus. Admission should be in terms of the five criteria I have just outlined.

I believe that our present maximum admission of some 156,000 belittles our faith in the United States and shows distrust of our own stability and strength. I agree with the AFL–CIO that the United States should admit 250,000 quota immigrants each year, and that if we do so this will strengthen and reinvigorate our Nation in precisely the same manner which immigration has always done in our history. I have based this annual quota on the average number of immigrants actually admitted into the United States within the last decade.

Spokesmen against change will move away from its heaviest emphasis on possible subversives, and even away from the argument of inability of southern Europeans to assimilate easily into our culture. The argument is shifting to what will undoubtedly be termed "problems of overpopulation." It will be pointed out that we already have a population of some 170 million; that in about 20 years the population of the United States will increase by some 60 million; that the pattern of large families will continue; that our schools are overcrowded, to put it mildly; that our hospitals are already inadequate for our growing population; that automation is and will continue at accelerating pace to displace American workers; that increased population—either through natural increase or through immigration—will increase demands which, in turn, will increase inflation because productivity will not catch up with such demands.

It will be argued that immigrants almost invariably settle in cities already populated beyond the point of comfort, adding to congestion and, hence, contributing to delinquency. It will be argued that immigrants do not settle on farms where population is decreasing.

These, I believe, will be the main burden of the refrain. These arguments will have to be answered and I maintain that all these assertions can be rationally met. In general, these various arguments against change of the national origins formula come from the prophets of doom and express the view that this is the best possible world and that any change means catastrophe. This same sort of argument has been advanced against all forward-looking and liberal proposals and has invariably proved to be false and unwarranted. I am convinced the same will prove true here.

III. WHAT GOVERNMENT AGENCY SHALL EXERCISE JURISDICTION OVER IMMIGRATION?

Under the present law, we have a two-headed system where officials of the Depart-

ment of State issue visas to both immigrants and nonimmigrants abroad, while officials of the Department of Justice determine at ports of entry whether the holders of visas are admissible to the United States. This is an antiquated, cumbersome, and expensive system. It creates anxiety and uncertainty in the minds of the immigrants and nonimmigrants alike, and it causes friction between two governmental agencies operating independently in the same field and stepping on each other's toes.

Under my proposal, the entire administration of our immigration and nationality laws will be placed in the hands of a Director of Bureau of Immigration and Citizenship, who will be an Assistant Attorney General, subject to confirmation by the Senate. His officers, acting as immigration attachés, will be stationed at our consulates abroad and will issue immigrant and nonimmigrant visas after a finding is made that the recipient of a visa is found to be eligible actually to enter the United States.

In addition to simplification of procedures and elimination of dual standards, as well as uncertainty in the minds of immigrants or foreign visitors, my proposal will automatically open visa issuance to administrative review in the Department of Justice by the well-qualified and trusted Board of Immigration Appeals. The issuance of diplomatic visas will, of course, remain a function of diplomatic officers of the Department of State.

I believe that the administrative system which I propose will not only provide for a more efficient and more equitable issuance of visas abroad, but that it will also bring a great saving to the American taxpayer.

So much for what I believe to be the heart of our immigration policy; namely (1), our quota system, and (2) jurisdiction over immigration. There is much more in my bill that is new and desirable. Wives, husbands, and minor children of United States citizens will continue to be admitted as nonquota immigrants, but I have added to the nonquota class parents of United States citizens and professors of academic schools. In the naturalization portion of the law, my bill will not tolerate classification of United States citizens into two categories: native-born and naturalized. There will be no additional grounds for loss of U.S. citizenship by naturalized citizens except those that apply to native-born citizens.

My bill would eliminate all retroactive application of grounds for deportation and humanize all the unduly harsh provisions applicable in exclusion. We should humanize the provisions relating to suspension of deportation, through removing the present extremely harsh eligibility requirement, and enact the provisions of my bill designed to prevent the separation of families.

IV. WHAT WE SHOULD NOT DO

I would like to discuss with you one final problem which the Congress will face this year: a very bad and unwholesome bill which is being pressed for enactment. It flies in the face of a provision of my bill which provides for what is basic to our American concept of fairness and decency, a full and unlimited judicial review of administrative decision in all immigration proceedings, including rulings on deportation and exclusion. Contrary to this basic concept of American law, a bill (H.R. 13311) was rushed through the House of Representatives last year; designed and intended to curtail judicial review of deportation and exclusion orders. That bill has been reintroduced this year, and effort will be made to push it through. The bill would prevent aliens from seeking judicial review in the Federal district court, and compel them, generally speaking, to go to distant courts of appeal, which are fewer in number. Thus, review can now be had in 94 courts; under that bill, it would be limited to only 11 courts. The court of appeals is what its name indicates, a higher court which normally hears appeals from lower courts. Litigation in the appellate courts is normally more expensive, both in terms of legal fees and expenses. Furthermore, the bill specifically denies to aliens the rights to obtain declaratory judgments in certain cases, although the Supreme Court of the United States twice ruled that under current law aliens are entitled to this remedy. The bill also restricts the rights of persons who claim to be citizens to litigate their claim. And there are a wide variety of other ways, most of them technical, but highly important in terms of substantive rights, in which this bill would seriously handicap the presently available rights of aliens and citizens to obtain judicial protection against illegal, capricious, and arbitrary action of Government officials.

I testified against this bill; so did the American Bar Association, the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers, and the Immigration Committee of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia. In addition, the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc., through its Committee on Migration and Refugee Problems, which consists of 20 of the major religious and social agencies working in the immigration filed, deplored the bill's effect and urged against enactment. That distinguished body of representatives of the American people warned the Congress that instead of simplifying the process as is the alleged purpose of this bill, it might in fact increase the number of cases on the court calendars.

As a result of statistics provided me by the Commissioner of Immigration, at my request—figures which, by the way had not even been compiled previously—it is perfectly clear that the bill is not only dangerous but quite unnecessary. When I asked for a list of cases which justified so drastic a remedy as proposed in the bill, I was given 7 cases extending over the last 5 years. Imagine, just 7 cases out of a total of many, many tens of thousands which were under consideration during the 5-year period, and yet they would junk a time-honored protection for judicial review! The truth of the matter is that less and less cases are getting into court anyway, and there is no reasonable justification for the bill. It would be like putting all sick people in jail, simply because there may be one or two typhoid Marys around.

After all, judicial review of illegal administrative action is not a matter of grace conferred upon an alien; rather it is a mark of the highest civilization in according equality before the law. Deportation of an alien means banishment from all that may be dear to him. We must not forget that in immigration we deal with human beings, not inanimate or senseless things. An alien or a citizen deprived of the right of judicial review is cut off from protecting his way of life, his very existence. I sincerely hope that the Congress will reject any such unjustified, unwarranted, and unnecessary tampering with fundamental principles upon which our entire jurisprudence is founded.

Immigration is a large and controversial subject. But I would be less than candid if I were to leave you with the impression that a bill such as mine, which I believe to be moderate and reasonable and in our best national interest, will have easy sledding. I am not clairvoyant and do not presume to know what Congress will do. But I do know what is unfavorable and what is favorable in the climate which could or could not produce changes in the immigration law. I know that approximately two-thirds of the Congress are against change; particularly, they are opposed to any change in the national origins system.

Nevertheless, one of the hopeful signs of the times is the most recent Gallup poll on immigration which showed that although really very few Americans knew or understood this problem, where they did, they were largely opposed to the present law and in favor of major overhauling of it. This gives us the key to action. A democracy cannot thrive in the ignorance of its people. This subject is far too important to be relegated to senseless name calling, the heat of passion instead of the light of reason, and lethargy. The three major religious faiths of this country have demanded substantial liberalization. Organized labor has done likewise. If the proponents of liberalized immigration laws do their homework, carry their message to the people throughout the length and breadth of the land, and encourage the widest possible discussion and debate of this subject, I am morally certain that we will at least start the ball rolling toward an immigration law that will do honor to us and proclaim to the world at large that we have an effective and working democracy.

Hale's Mission of Faith to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Ruth Gruber which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of January 23, 1959:

HALE'S MISSION OF FAITH TO ISRAEL

(By Ruth Gruber)

Lincoln Hale died 1 year ago today. He had been in charge of America's point 4 program in Israel. On January 23, 1958, he was standing before the members of the Theodor Herzl Institute in New York, a Christian telling Jews about the land of Israel. He said what he felt about Israel, and then, just before he was finished speaking, in the middle of a sentence, he died.

It was symbolic, somehow. For Lincoln Hale never believed that anything was ever finished, that life was all a process of beginnings.

In 1954 the U.S. Government asked him to take a leave of absence from his post as president of Evansville College in Indiana to direct the U.S. Operations Mission in Israel. For Lincoln Hale, who had been a Congregational minister in Oxford, Conn., going to Israel was the great challenge of his life. His job was to direct American technical aid and economic assistance.

He became part of Israel. Israel's problems became his problems.

Dr. Hale did big things in Israel, but he did them quietly, with wisdom and simplicity. He was the second most important American in Israel, second only to the U.S. Ambassador. Yet his simplicity extended to everyone.

The people of Israel grew to know the mild-mannered, soft-voiced round little man with the bright blue eyes, and his round and happy and wonderfully enthusiastic wife, Sallie. Lincoln loved to meet the people and to talk to them. You could wake him at his home in Tel Aviv at midnight, after an exhausting day in the office or in the field, and tell him that a group of people wanted to hear him speak in Haifa. Lincoln would call his chauffeur, Amnon Gil-ad, and off they would go.

Speaking at the opening of a new road, a new school near the Dead Sea, he said, "We are dedicating a road built by the pioneers of today, and dedicating a school built

for pioneers of tomorrow. Thus too did we build in America."

Countless times at dawn he watched new immigrants who had been brought in by the United Jewish Appeal, come off the ships at Haifa. He traveled with them to their new settlements in the Negev to help them with technical aid and with point 4 money for houses and roads, for water piped in from the north, and for cotton and crops to seed their land.

He became a kind of practical missionary who understood Israel's mission. He saw the newcomers, broken, illiterate, hungry, riddled with disease—and he knew that no other land in the world would have taken them.

His mission grew broader constantly. He was no manager; no efficiency expert. But he knew that if Israel survived, she would have to compete in the world market.

His predecessor, Bruce McDaniel, had strengthened the Institute of Productivity inside Israel's Department of Labor. Lincoln Hale expanded it still further and helped develop a management training program. This was perhaps his greatest contribution—helping Israel keep its strides in agriculture but placing more emphasis on industry.

In November 1954, Lincoln Hale told a UJA study mission what the United States point 4 program was doing in economic and technical aid. He talked of Operation Cowboy to raise cattle, of bringing water to the Negev, of searching for oil and copper, of public health, of training managers, and of the meaning of Israel.

"My friends," he said, "this is a land of beginners. On every hand you see the young tree, the young vine, the new furrow in a long-neglected field. I have gone into factories where production is in its sixth, seventh, and eighth month, and have been amazed at the results, knowing that operation started with three or four trained personnel. Men and women have the confidence that comes from trying the new and novel. It is a land with a dynamic quality. It is a land of faith."

His name was Lincoln Hale. Two names that were the essence of America. And inside of 2 years Lincoln Hale became the essence of America in Israel. Not all Americans understood him, but the Israelis did. For them, he was the symbol of America's compassion, of our desire to help others live a better life by our willingness to teach them what we know.

The Alternative to Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Mr. E. W. Dykes, a distinguished architect, of Canton, Ohio, has revealed great insight into some of the problems that beset our free enterprise system in an article in the January issue of the Freeman. Under leave to extend, I include Mr. Dykes' article, as follows:

THE ALTERNATIVE TO COMPETITION

(By E. W. Dykes)

From time to time we are told that competition is an evil thing. Few among us will deny that it certainly produces its trying moments. There are, in fact, some persons who will argue that the harm from competition far exceeds any possible good which may result.

For example, they suggest that the student who does not get good grades suffers damage to his ego and may react in a most unsociable manner. I am sure there have been cases of persons who have failed in business and who have become bitter and despondent—perhaps even to the point of suicide. Some will say that these persons were victims of the urge to make a profit—a compulsion even worse than ordinary competition. Cooperation, they say—not competition—is what is needed for the good society. To equate competition with "the law of the jungle" is to leave little doubt in one's mind of its implied nature.

These ideas of the harmful effects of competition receive considerable support from various sources. Many school systems have eliminated grading on a competitive basis. Labor unions have undertaken to remove competition for jobs and to remove competition between individual workers on specific jobs by setting standard rates for a standard output which the least productive worker can meet. Some businessmen press for fair trade laws which will eliminate price competition on certain items. They may urge tariff barriers to protect them from the rigors of foreign competition. Farmers vote for subsidies and acreage controls to escape the vagaries of the free market. And so on and on, countless examples might be written, all of which show how we try to escape competition.

I suspect that most people believe competition to be neither generally good nor generally bad, but that a middle-of-the-road process will most likely produce a healthy society. They are all for competition in a horserace or in the American League or even among the suppliers of the things they have to buy, while going to no end of trouble to eliminate it, by law if necessary, in their own field as sellers.

Regarding competition, per se, they have no definite convictions. But persons with definite convictions about anything appear to be in rather short supply. Strong beliefs are developed by intimate knowledge of the true nature of the subject. If this be true, then it follows that we need to find the true nature of competition and then judge its merits.

A NONCOMPETING SOCIETY?

It is useful, at times, to examine the extreme point of view to show the probable effects of a particular policy or action and to indicate the direction most likely to produce desirable results. My study convinces me that there is but one alternative to competition. If I can show what the alternative actually is, that may help the part-time competitors in making a clear-cut choice.

Let us assume that we abandon competition in our society as of tomorrow. At once there would be a mad rush of people from their present jobs to more glamorous or more highly paid jobs. Thousands decide to be big league ballplayers. Hundreds of thousands decide to be movie stars. Those ready to become bank presidents are in oversupply. No one hauls garbage. No one waits on tables or digs coal. And since price competition is eliminated, no one knows how much to charge or how much to pay for a particular product. As a matter of fact, the dislocation would be so complete that the economy would come to a standstill. Clearly, competition cannot be eliminated overnight. A great deal of advance work would be needed if such a move were not to result in total confusion.

So let's go at it another way. Assume a society in which competition is to play no part from the very beginning. Our first problem is to decide who will do what. For instance, who will be the doctors? Who will write music? Sell shoes? Make shoes? What will determine prices and wages? Who decides all these things? Certainly not one person because he would be a dictator. A committee, perhaps, but who shall choose the committee? It's difficult, indeed.

It looks as though we'll have to have some competition—at least enough to select a committee. And so we have to select nominees, take a vote, and of course, accept a decision arrived at competitively. We will select those with the most votes. Now, perhaps, can't we do away with all competition?

WHO SHALL BE THE DOCTOR?

Then the committee is faced with the questions: Who shall be doctors and who shall write music and so on? Before they face up to that one, an infinitely more difficult problem faces them. How many shall be doctors? Will specialization be allowed or shall that become a subproblem after deciding how many doctors? And what about fees, prices, and wages? How will they be determined? Will any persons be appointed to act as inventors? Will anyone be set apart to occasionally don an asbestos suit and step into a flaming oil or gas well out of control? Who will become the lawmakers? This last may give a clue as to where the committee will locate itself.

It is not necessary to labor the point further to show that the committee has its hands full. But let us assume that a formula has been worked out by the committee. An extremely large catalog of possible occupations has been set up which takes account of the innumerable differences in jobs and which describes each in sufficient detail to render selection a little easier. Now we are ready to select the actual people to man these occupations.

"Everybody stand up and count off. The first 2,000 are doctors, the next 1 million go to the factory suboffice and get divided up there." And so on. Ridiculous, isn't it? Of course, that couldn't be the way. "We'll give tests—aptitude tests, of course." And so a long series of aptitude tests are evolved with thousands of subtests and gradations in order to match as easily as possible the many variations in a particular job category. Now, shall the best jobs be given to those with the highest grades? Or is that too competitive? Finally, we decide that we must introduce that much additional competition.

WHERE SHALL HE LIVE?

Where shall people live? Obviously, all the doctors can't be in one town or State and all the blacksmiths in another. The formula must be applied and all the jobs filled in the right proportion. The committee, of course, must decide who lives in what towns, too. Well drillers can be easily placed, you see, because it's well known where oil can be found—isn't it? And this brings up an interesting point. Who decides precisely where the bit shall bite? And how shall a test be devised to find that man? On the inventors' list, what shall we decide to have invented? And if something amazing comes out of it, what will that do to the formula? Dizzy? Then don't get elected to the committee.

And I shouldn't want to sit on the subcommittee which sets prices and wages either. That committee would have to bring wages and prices into balance so that everything produced could be bought. How to decide how much of even one single item should be produced almost defies comprehension. For instance, how many radios will be sold next month? How would we decide how much a doctor would be paid in contrast with a day laborer—or would they both get the same? The committee must decide. There is no other way—the law has been passed.

COMPETE OR SUBMIT

It should be clear from the foregoing that all matters which are not decided by com-

petition must be decided by decree. In other words, if wages, prices, production, jobs, and succesful inventions are not set or selected by competition, then an authority has to rule on them step by step.

In other words, the "alternative" to competition can only be the planned society. Every successful attempt to rule out competition in any area is but a step nearer the socialized state. We have taken far too many such steps already. The more we do without competition the more planned is the society. Admitting for one reason or another that some persons of high potential are occasionally and temporarily bypassed in the free, competitive society, it should appear clearly that the way to find the best of anything is to allow competition to decide. Just as the best ballplayers are competitively selected, so it is for surgeons, professionals, bank presidents, and playwrights.

The marketplace operates constantly with millions—no, billions—of decisions each day to elevate the best to the top, and each of us may aspire to reach the top. Consumers, in their market decisions, actually decide who or what shall succeed or fail. Good products are selected by each of us, voting in the marketplace with pennies and dollars as votes. High living standards are the direct result of competition. Competition, far from being the evil thing it is often represented to be, is the guarantee of the best for the least the most often.

OPPORTUNITY FOR COOPERATION

Now let us recall the brief reference, early in the discussion, to the suggested need for cooperation rather than for competition. To search for a clear insight to this problem, ask yourself, "With whom shall I cooperate?" The anticompetition adherents will say, "With everyone, of course." It is a pleasant idea, one which which few will argue. It just happens to be impossible. For example, if you purchase a Ford, the sellers of other makes would hardly decide that you have cooperated with them. When a maiden selects her spouse, her other suitors must necessarily have been rejected. Competition, you see, serves to select the persons with whom you would most like to cooperate—and it leaves you free to decide for yourself who they shall be. But this is a subject which, of itself, might be deserving of an essay. Suffice to say that cooperation and competition, diverse though they may seem to be, go hand in hand in the free society. The planned society, as it eliminates competition, eliminates the basis for voluntary cooperation and substitutes planned cooperation, whatever that is.

In planned societies the committee is always replaced by the strong man—the dictator. Competition and a planned society are incompatible. Freedom and a planned society are impossible. Free people and competition are inseparable.

The alternative to competition is to give up your freedom.

Newark Kiwanis Good Deeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Kiwanis Club of Newark, Calif., is an outstanding example of an American service club.

Newark is a typical small American industrial city. Her citizens are proud of their home community. Her city fathers are men dedicated to making their town a good one in which to live.

Newark counts no extremely wealthy people as citizens and conversely there is no great element of poor or underprivileged within her borders.

Newark is a better place in which to live because such institutions as her Kiwanis Club reflect the conscience of the community in its drive to improve the social and educational advantages of her people.

Here is the box score of the club's accomplishments as reported in the Newark News-Register of January 8, 1959:

NEWARK KIWANIS GOOD DEEDS

With the installation of new officers of Newark Kiwanis Club this Saturday night at a big event at Castlewood Country Club, Kenneth Foster is to succeed the present president, Herbert Lacey. We are proud of the year's record of Herbert Lacey and officers.

During year 1958 the Newark Kiwanis has sponsored the community projects which were made possible by the financial support of people of Newark.

More than 2,400 hours were devoted to civic and charitable activities, as follows:

BOYS AND GIRLS WORK

Took part in Scout work, sponsored local scout troop.
Purchased flags for scouts.
Gave financial aid toward a scout training program.
Encouraged local scouts to go on in scouting.
Helped recreation department with annual kite contest.
Purchased tickets for community concert series, for music students in local school.
Assisted recreation department in Easter egg hunt.
Put on a magic show for elementary school children.
Helped in annual pet parade.
Paid tuition fees of six outstanding music students for the summer school.
Sponsored boys for the local Little League by paying for uniforms for individuals.
Assisted recreation department summer program.
Held a watermelon feed for children of Newark.
Entertained children of Newark with free movies on Newark Charter Day.
Gave skating party for school children on traffic patrol.
Encouraged local 4-H group providing trophies in contests.
Sponsored Key Club at the Washington Hi and activities.
Provided Thanksgiving baskets for needy families.
Provided Christmas baskets for needy families.
Assisted in planning and financing Newark's toy bank.
Helped set relief program.
Purchased needed clothes and shoes for needy families.
Furnished blankets for families in need.
Sent local children to summer camps.
Maintained a dental loan fund for needy school children.
Assisted in sight conservation.
Worked closely with Salvation Army.

VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE

Sponsored tour of local industries for school children.
Rented vocation guidance films for interested boys.
Helped obtain employment at summer jobs for local high school boys.
Presented plaques to outstanding local school graduates.
Sponsored a science fair at local M. D. Silva School by providing Government bonds for winners.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Worked with local chamber of commerce on civic affairs.
Helped obtain employment for disabled veterans.
Participated in parade for City Charter Day.
Encouraged industries to locate in Newark.
Assisted United Crusade.

SUPPORTED CHURCHES

Published church directory which gave time of all church services. Was in both local newspapers.
Members worked for local church undertakings.

Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the statement made on January 26, 1959, by Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York, to the U.S. Conference of Mayors regarding new Federal housing legislation.

The statement follows:

Mr. HARRY R. BETTERS,
Executive Director,
U.S. Conference of Mayors,
Washington, D.C.:

As mayor of the city of New York and chairman of the New York Metropolitan Regional Council I vigorously support the views of the U.S. Conference of Mayors on new housing and urban renewal legislation and ask that the officials of the conference have this brief statement placed on the record when they testify before the Banking and Currency Committee of the U.S. Senate.

We are gratified that major housing and urban renewal legislation is being considered so early in this session of Congress. No other legislation is of more importance to the continuing health and sound development of cities and urban areas.

We take pride in the fact that New York has pioneered in programs which utilize the resources and assistance of city and State to produce low and moderate rental housing. But in common with all other cities, we must continue to look to the Federal Government for major support. Urban decay is a national as much as a local problem. Its cure far transcends the capabilities of limited local resources alone.

A program which measures up to the needs of this Nation's cities should include the following:

1. Federal contributions to title I redevelopment and urban renewal of $600 million a year for 10 years. The success of the title I program to date in New York City, as evidenced by 13 projects now underway and five more pending, the backlog of projects that are needed and could be advanced if sufficient funds are forthcoming, and the enthusiastic response of private redevelopers to the new west side urban renewal project where techniques are being developed that should be applicable to deteriorating

areas in cities throughout the country—all testify to the potential of the title I program for stimulating the private investment necessary for the renewal of our cities. So far this potential has been barely utilized. A program of the size indicated is needed to enable us to move ahead of the rate of deterioration, and will therefore result in the smallest ultimate expenditure of public funds.

2. The present two-thirds Federal contribution to write-down costs must be increased, rather than decreased. In view of the acute financing problems faced by all cities, any such decrease would be self-defeating and tantamount to reducing the scope of a program which sorely needs expansion.

3. Continuity adequate to permit and encourage sensible long-range planning and programing. In addition to the basic 10-year program, authorization for advance acquisition in blighted and deteriorated areas, and the provision of two-thirds grants for the preparation or completion of community renewal programs would be of great benefit. The community renewal program would enable cities to survey their older and declining communities and make comprehensive plans for orderly renewal programs.

4. An increase in the amount of funds that may be used for nonresidential redevelopment above the 10 percent now permitted, and elimination of the requirement that such nonresidential redevelopment sites must include a substantial number of slum or blighted dwellings. Whatever the form of blight, it undermines the foundations of a city. A successful renewal program must be broad and flexible enough to meet the particular needs of the community.

5. Liberalized relocation assistance for both the families and the businesses displaced by renewal programs. The amounts of payments should be increased and the ways in which they can be used broadened in order to give maximum assistance in relocation. Every effort should be made to provide equality in treatment to those displaced by the various types of public programs. Relocation assistance should be authorized for families displaced within a renewal project by voluntary rehabilitation or code enforcement on the same basis as for those displaced by clearance. This is of crucial importance to the success of a program such as our west side project, which combines conservation, rehabilitation, and redevelopment. The growing impact of renewal activity on small business and industry requires not only an increase in relocation payments, but assistance through a program of Federal long-term, low-interest loans.

6. The interest charge on funds advanced by a municipality to develop a renewal project should be allowed as a proper charge against the gross project cost. Otherwise a city like New York is penalized because it doesn't borrow Federal funds for this purpose.

7. Restoration of the low-rent public housing program established by the Housing Act of 1949. Even with this, the balance of annual subsidy contributions will provide less than half of the remaining number of units authorized at current costs. An adequate public housing program is essential to increase the supply of housing serving that sector of the market which no privately financed housing can reach. It is vital to the success of the urban renewal program since so many of the families now living in deteriorating areas which desperately need renewal fall within this sector. The regional administrators and the local authorities should be given greater autonomy to establish more liberal administrative practices, eligibility requirements, and rent and income limits. The acquisition and rehabilitation of existing structures where suitable for public housing purposes should be encouraged. Programs of housing for larger families and elderly persons should be fostered. Continued occupancy of over-income tenants on the basis of nonsubsidized rentals should be authorized in order to promote stability of projects and neighborhoods, and to broaden the cross section of families served by public housing for whom private housing is not available.

8. Strengthening of the FHA multifamily housing program, upon which New York City is singularly dependent, in the following ways:

An increase in the mortgage limits on sections 207, 213, 220, and 221 housing. Because of rises in construction costs the existing statutory ceiling on the amount of mortgage per room and per dwelling unit should be increased. Level payment mortgage plans for sections 220 and 207 housing should be made mandatory in order to reduce rents on new apartments. Increased FNMA special assistance for all multifamily programs is needed to support the apartment mortgage market. Section 221 should be revised to permit the purchase of existing small rental properties. FHA appraisal formulas should be changed to allow for more widespread use of sections 207 and 213 housing in the central portions of the city and to reduce the cash equity requirements now imposed on the private builder.

ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Mayor, City of New York.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*	
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*	
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*	
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*	The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*	The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*	
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*	
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*	4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*	2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*	
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Engle, Clair, *Calif*	3840 Lorcom Lane, Alexandria, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*	
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*	
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*	
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*	University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*	
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*	
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*	
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*	1612 34th St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*	4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*	
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Langer, William, *N. Dak*	2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*	4545 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*	The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*	
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*	Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*	
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*	
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*	
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Green (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS JUSTICES ASSIGNED TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

The Civil Rights Proposal of Senator Lyndon Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALAN BIBLE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, we who serve with him day to day know LYNDON JOHNSON as a driving, dynamic man-on-the-go. His boundless energy is matched only by his unfailing grasp of matters of great import to our Nation. What I am saying, Mr. President, is only a prelude to the distinguished Texan's latest proposal in the turbulent field of civil rights legislation.

Senator JOHNSON'S plan for sane and sensible approach to this extremely knotty problem has drawn accolades from all over the country. Bill Baggs, editor of the Miami News, is among the Nation's outstanding newspapermen who have commented favorably on the Johnson civil rights proposal. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Baggs' comments be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami News, Jan. 25, 1959]

LYNDON JOHNSON COMES UP WITH A GOOD PLAN

(By Bill Baggs)

The people who want integration in the morning and the people who want segregation forever got a chance to shake hands with one another last week.

It was a historic moment of sorts.

For the very first time, the hot integrationist and the defiant segregationist were standing there together on a common piece of ground.

At last they had agreed on something.

SOME SNICKERED

In essence they had agreed that the plan which LYNDON B. JOHNSON pulled out of his hip pocket and tossed on the table of Congress was no good.

Robert R. Nathan, chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, classified the plan as a typical Johnson compromise and dismissed it as unworthy.

Some southerners snickered. One prominent man of the South told the writer:

"What JOHNSON proposes is ridiculous."

The hard political truth is that nothing proposed by Senator JOHNSON is ridiculous.

Or unworthy.

STAMP OF APPROVAL

LYNDON JOHNSON has been described as at least the second most influential American today. He runs the Federal Senate as if it were a commissary. His partner from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, is the proprietor of the House of Representatives. For practical purposes, this gives Senator JOHNSON a congressional stamp of approval most anytime he wants it.

All of which makes anything proposed by LYNDON JOHNSON anything but ridiculous.

And what did the man propose?

He suggested a civil rights bill with an accent on conciliation instead of force.

The heart of his proposal is a Federal conciliation agency for civil rights. The agency would get white and Negro leaders of a community around a table, talking to each other, trying to work out their differences.

IT HAS MERIT

This smacks very much of the thought introduced to the Nation by Governor Collins.

As I recall, there were some snickers then.

But the idea does have merit • • • and especially when LYNDON JOHNSON in person tosses it up on that table in Congress.

Senator JOHNSON admitted that his plan was inspired by the tested concept of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. This is an agency which accomplished much in areas of labor-management trouble.

STEP AT A TIME

Of course, the Mediation Service is helped along the road by certain laws which are precise and are accepted by the American people. Senator JOHNSON did not get into these waters. He is taking this trip one step at a time. He's a practical man.

The Senator admitted his first step was no solution. It was, he said, a step in the right direction.

And what better first step has been offered the American people?

At the moment schools are padlocked in Little Rock and in several places of Virginia.

In Little Rock there are 3,600 young boys and girls outside the public schools. Of these, 1,000 have traveled out of Little Rock to other cities to seek an education.

FOR 600, NO SCHOOL

Of the children left, 830 are going to the "private" school which Governor Faubus and his friends got into business. Reports from Little Rock indicate this school is a poor substitute for Central High, the public school now closed.

Five hundred children in Little Rock are attending church schools of one kind or another.

Four hundred children are taking correspondence courses.

Six hundred children are not going to any school at all.

This is what happens when the public schools close. And there is every reason to believe that it could happen right here in south Florida.

ON A TREADMILL

Possibly most of the readers of this newspaper feel a closed school is better than an integrated one. Maybe you think so. But the young minds of the South go on a treadmill when the schools are closed, and these hasty alternatives to public education lead inevitably to situations where children cannot qualify, actually or technically, for higher education.

Senator JOHNSON has suggested a plan to keep the school door open and meanwhile to work toward a legal and voluntary arrangement for the public education of all children.

As one newspaper in this town, we cast our vote for the Johnson proposal.

Budget To Resist Communist Expansion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal of January 24, 1959.

The editorial expresses concern over the President's budget requests for the Department of Defense. As such, it is representative of considerable body of opinion in the country today, and I think it is important that it be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGET TO RESIST COMMUNIST EXPANSION?

In his budget message President Eisenhower says:

"It has become increasingly apparent that the Communist bloc is following a policy of deliberately and constantly probing free world positions to test our determination to resist the further forcible expansion of Communist influence. Under these circumstances, it is prudent not to plan for any significant changes during fiscal 1960 in our deployments overseas or in our ready military forces at home."

This is a sound and worthy objective. We hope it can be accomplished with the funds recommended in the budget. But on close examination of its provisions, misgivings arise as to whether the fighting forces and the weapons available in our deployments overseas or in our ready military forces at home would, in fact, be powerful enough to serve as an effective deterrent in 1960.

The administration's estimate foresees an expenditure for military purposes in 1960 only $145 million more than the current year. Yet the President reports that $800 million additional will be spent on missiles next year. It is evident, therefore, that all other weapons and forms of offense and defense will have to get along on about $650 million less than this year—a year in which personnel force levels in all of the military components are being reduced.

Even the $800 million increase in missiles cannot be considered as a remarkable gain when one considers that to reach this figure the President's budget advisers lumped in not only the procurement of missiles, but missile research, development, test, evaluation, construction costs for launching sites, and even the building of submarines designed to launch the Navy's fleet ballistic missile Polaris. We recall that in his state of the Union message the President stressed the high price of modern defense weapons by saying that each Atlas missile has cost $35 million. That figure, of course, included the research, development, and testing back to the very beginning but it does serve to show

that the currently recommended increase in this area could not go very far.

The comprehensive reports and analyses in this issue of the Journal show nothing that can be considered as augmenting our strength in areas other than missiles.

The Air Force loses, from 1958 to 1960, both in total manpower (5,000 less) and in total number of combat wings (15 less). The greatest loss in wings is in the tactical category, including the airlift upon which the Army depends for the mobility everyone says it needs, where the loss will be 11 wings. The total active aircraft inventory also drops.

The Army loses another division this year, bringing it down to 14, and that loss will be carried on into next year. The provision for Army procurement is only a small fraction of the extra $3 billion per year Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor has estimated the Army requires for 5 years in order to achieve the modernization it needs.

The Navy will have 869 active ships—27 less than in 1958. It will have one less carrier group than in 1958. The Marine Corps will keep its three divisions and three air wings. The total active aircraft inventory of the Navy and Marine Corps drops 1,333 below the 1958 level to wind up at 9,200.

These are not encouraging figures; certainly not what one would expect of a force designed to meet any Communist aggression, including "nibbling" and limited wars, in 1960.

When Congress makes its promised detailed inquiry into the sufficiency of these figures, it will run up against the Budget Director's warning to witnesses that they must not urge increased spending. But we are sure that the military representatives who will appear before the congressional committees are fully aware of their obligation to furnish Congress with all of the facts it requires.

Man of the South for 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the Anniston (Ala.) Star for December 19, 1958, Col. Harry M. Ayers, the distinguished publisher of that paper, had an editorial regarding the recent designation of Mr. Frank P. Samford of Birmingham as Man of the South for 1958.

The title of the editorial is "Magic City Triumvirate," referring to three distinguished citizens of Birmingham who have been honored in such a manner.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAGIC CITY TRIUMVIRATE

An excellent selection was made recently by Dixie Business magazine when it named Frank P. Samford, outstanding citizen of Birmingham, as its Man of the South for 1958.

Previously, this honor had been conferred on Thomas W. Martin and Donald Comer, so that the Magic City is alone at this time in boasting a Man of the South triumvirate.

A perusal of the record reveals, moreover, that, if anything, the distinction is even more impressive from a qualitative than from a quantitative standpoint.

Like Messrs. Martin and Comer, Mr. Samford has played a leading role in the upbuilding of this part of the country.

As a young insurance executive, he joined Liberty National Life Insurance Co. in 1921 in the capacity of its corporate secretary. He was elected to its vice presidency in 1932, and 2 years later became its president.

Under his leadership the firm has grown phenomenally—a fact that has meant much to Birmingham and all of Alabama since insurance dollars that otherwise would have gone out of the State have been put to work right here at home.

As an illustration, there is the impressive Liberty National Building on North Noble Street, in Anniston, which is headquarters for a large corps of workers assigned to east Alabama.

Nor is it only in terms of his able guidance of Liberty National that Mr. Samford has made important contributions to the advance of Alabama and the South.

At present he is serving on the boards of directors of a dozen of this region's leading utilities, financial institutions and manufacturing enterprises, including Southern Bell, Continental Gin, West Point Manufacturing, and the Birmininghan Trust National Bank.

Furthermore, Mr. Samford had headed at one time or another such highly useful organizations as the Birmingham and Alabama Chambers of Commerce, Associated Industries of Alabama and the Jefferson County Tuberculosis Sanitorium Society—not to mention the year he served as district governor of Rotary and long tenures on the boards of trustees of both Alabama Polytechnic Institute and Howard College.

A great deal more would have to be included in a detailed chronicling of Mr. Samford's accomplishments as businessman and public spirited citizen. But we believe the foregoing is ample to support the newest honor that has been bestowed upon him—that of being named "Man of the South for 1958."

People's Right To Know Is Vital to Democratic Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the importance of a free flow of information and a well-informed public is so well recognized that these basic elements of a free society are taken for granted, and thus are in constant danger. The Milwaukee Journal, in a January 27 editorial, explores this problem and points out how the threat to the people's right to know manifests itself at the Federal level of government. This is a matter which should be of utmost concern to all of us. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Battle for Right To Know," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATTLE FOR RIGHT TO KNOW

A democratic government must lean heavily on an informed public. Free government and free information are synonymous. These points, made in a recent telecast called the Press and the People, are too obvious to need enlarging upon.

Yet there is, in Washington as in other governmental areas, a constant effort on the part of officials to keep information from the people. In the last several years in particular, our Federal Government has used secrecy and even distortion and misinformation almost as a policy. Secrecy and misinformation, as Senator HENNINGS, Democrat, of Missouri, has pointed out, carry in them the seeds of dictatorship. At the very least, they help create an uninformed public, a dangerous state of affairs when the public is also the electorate.

One of the biggest efforts to get rid of unnecessary secrecy in Government has been made by a special House subcommittee on freedom of information headed by Representative Moss, Democrat, of California. The committee has spotlighted secrecy, jogged officials right up to the White House, and fought for the public's right to know. It still has a lot of work to do.

But it is not certain that the subcommittee will be allowed to do that work. Representative HOFFMAN, Republican, of Michigan, a member and an enemy of the subcommittee, says that it has not been renewed. Representative DAWSON, Democrat, of Illinois, chairman of the parent judiciary committee, says that it is possible that the subcommittee will not be reestablished. He hasn't made up his mind.

It would be most unfortunate if the subcommittee were not continued. Its fine job to date is widely recognized, even by DAWSON. It has a lot more to do. The fight against secrecy can't succeed if it is carried on in fits and spurts. It needs to be waged constantly. Let the subcommittee continue to battle for the people's right to know.

The Destiny of America in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I was brought up to believe that an individual should not meddle in the affair of others when he has plenty of problems of his own. David Lawrence, in a brilliant column entitled "Whither America," published in the November 28, 1959, edition of U.S. News & World Report, reminds us all of the real challenge facing the United States today and warns us to accept this challenge or else further weaken our world position. I ask unanimous consent to have this column printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITHER AMERICA?

(By David Lawrence)

What is the destiny of America in the world? How can we best serve mankind and at the same time keep from dissipating our energies and our resources?

These questions go to the heart of public policy today. They are not solely international. They also challenge the fundamentals of domestic policy.

For what doth it profit a nation to seek laurels abroad if it forsake its ideals at home?

We have in America today two basic philosophies at work inside our two political parties.

One philosophy is that the end justifies the means—that the attainment of a meritorious objective must be compelled even if this means disregard of a written Constitution.

The other philosophy holds true to the principles on which this Republic was founded—that we must have a government of laws and not yield to the concept of a government of men. Progress in government achieved at the expense of a violated contract inspires no faith or spirit of permanence. It fluctuates with the will of the mob. The intolerance of majorities has throughout history left in its wake a casualty list of human freedom destroyed.

Too many people in America today would indignantly disavow any thought of totalitarianism, but they are often ready to accept some of its ways. They cry out that the process of amending the Constitution is too cumbersome or time consuming. They do not advocate, as they could, a change in the method of amending the Constitution as already prescribed in that document itself. They prefer usurpation instead—even the seizure of a whole industry to curry favor with labor leaders or the use of Federal troops to enforce a sociological doctrine. It is defended as a quicker process. So is dictatorship.

Too many people believe that the writing of laws should not be confined to Congress but that the Supreme Court of the United States must legislate. Many of the professors in our law schools and many of their deans are resentful of any criticism of the Court and say frankly that it is up to the Court to reconcile the past with the present—to take care of evolution and adapt the Constitution to changing conditions.

This is reminiscent of the speech which Hitler made in the 1930's when, after accepting election under the legal process of the German Constitution, he proclaimed that the courts should take into account public sentiment in writing their decisions.

We have today many perplexing problems to solve in America. We have severe competition now with goods made abroad, where labor is cheaper and trade unions have no such economic power to raise prices as they have here in the United States.

We fought successfully for decades against monopoly by corporations, but today we have in our midst a far worse monopoly power in the labor unions. The unions win political elections by the expenditure of many millions of dollars. They influence a sufficient percentage of voters to swing elections. Labor unions have become a sort of supergovernment.

We have also a serious problem in combating the inflationary trend that has come upon us. We have taxes that are almost confiscatory and a $12 billion deficit this year.

How can we assume, as some crtics repeatedly suggest, that "bold and imaginative ideas"—which means American money for the underdeveloped nations—are all that's necessary to make American leadership supreme and thus counteract Soviet infiltration?

We must continue certainly to spend billions for armament so as to deter a potential enemy. This in itself is draining our resources and frustrating our normal progress. We cannot, however, take on the support of all the rest of the world, too.

There are some things we can do in world trade and through developmental loans, but these should be largely by private capital. The era of lavish expenditure in the form of grants and gifts is about over. It is time to take a good look at internal America and put our own house in order.

Unless we start now to readjust our domestic position, we shall have a depression in the next 5 years that will weaken our world position. This is not a time for starry-eyed sprees in "welfare" spending.

It is a time, moreover, to examine critically the functioning of our system of government.

It is a time for a crusade to restore the constitutional system our forefathers gave us and to use it as they prescribed. For if we give up government by law and yield to government by the caprice of individuals, we shall destroy the American Republic and find ourselves surrendering gradually to the totalitarian concepts of our chief adversaries.

The best way to advance American leadership abroad is by maintaining solvency and adhering to constitutional government at home. Then we will by example prove that the United States is succeeding and will continue to succeed as a great republic.

For a Better Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "For a Better Senate."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR A BETTER SENATE

The Senate committee assignments, Republican as well as Democratic, suggest that both parties have paid attention to the message of the November election.

On the Democratic side, it deserves to be said first in fairness to Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON that there is no evidence the voting on the filibuster was a factor in determining which posts went to the new Democratic Senators. Eight of the 15 new Democrats voted against the Johnson position either two or three times, and yet they fare very well on committee assignments.

HART of Michigan, who voted against JOHNSON four times, receives two choice committee assignments, Judiciary and Agriculture, committees for which veterans have striven in the past. ENGLE of California, goes to Armed Services and Commerce; MCCARTHY of Minnesota, Finance and Public Works; Moss of Utah, Interior and Public Works; MUSKIE of Maine, Banking, Government Operations and Public Works; WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Banking and Labor.

DODD of Connecticut and YOUNG of Ohio, who voted against JOHNSON on two of the three first rollcalls, also do well. Dodd is assigned to Appropriations, Judiciary, and Space Sciences. YOUNG, who turned the big surprise of the election by ousting John W. Bricker, is appointed to Agriculture, Public Works and Space Sciences.

The six new Democrats who supported JOHNSON on every rollcall do well also, but relatively no better. Alaska's BARTLETT, goes to Armed Services and Commerce and GRUENING to Government Operations, Interior and Public Works. The others in this group are: ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia, Appropriations and Banking; CANNON of Nevada, Armed Services, Rules and Space Sciences; HARTKE of Indiana, Finance, Commerce and District of Columbia; and MCGEE of Wyoming, Appropriations and Commerce. RANDOLPH of West Virginia, who backed JOHNSON on three of the four votes, goes to Labor and Public Works.

These assignments reflect generally the preference of the Senators in terms of experience and interests. MCCARTHY, for example, is a former professor of economics. Joining DOUGLAS, of Illinois, he will make the second professional economist on the committee which handles tax bills in the Senate. GRUENING and Moss have deep interest in the work of the Interior Committee and HARTKE, former mayor of Evansville, should be a major help on District of Columbia problems.

While no newly elected Democratic Senator goes to Foreign Relations, the Democratic additions to that committee are notable: GORE, of Tennessee; LAUSCHE, of Ohio; and CHURCH, of Idaho. LAUSCHE and CHURCH entered the Senate only 2 years ago.

The practice under LYNDON JOHNSON of giving at least one major committee assignment to every Democratic Senator has finally been adopted on the Republican side under pressure from the Aiken-Cooper-Case-Javits-Kuchel group. The three Republican newcomers, all of whom supported COOPER, of Kentucky, for minority leader in opposition to the Bridges-Dirksen-Saltonstall combine, receive good committee posts. KEATING, of New York, goes to Banking and Interior; SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, to Commerce and Public Works; and PROUTY, of Vermont, to Labor, Public Works, and District of Columbia.

In a harmony move, Minority Leader DIRKSEN even gives up his cherished seat on Appropriations. It goes significantly to KUCHEL, of California, who was elected Republican whip after being nomintated by the liberal group. The prize new assignment among the Republicans goes to CARLSON, of Kansas, the only Republican to get a new seat on the Foreign Relations Committee. Significantly CARLSON, too, backed the liberal group. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, and SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, gave up Space Science seats to make way for JAVITS, of New York, and CASE of New Jersey, two leading liberals.

With the Democrats outnumbering Republicans two to one in the Senate, the Republicans owe the Democratic leadership a vote of thanks for increasing the size of several of the major committees. Had this not been done many veteran Republicans would have been knocked from committee seats in which they were secure—until last November.

It is being said by some Washington commentators that the effect of the November revolt at the polls has already been swallowed up in the sea of professional politics that surrounds Capitol Hill. On the basis of what the election has done to the Senate committees on both sides of the aisle, we suspect that some of these words will have to be eaten—and perhaps before many months pass.

Our Relations With Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a very thoughtful editorial on our rela-

tions with Latin America appeared in the January 14 issue of the Middletown Daily Record of Middletown, N.Y. It emphasizes, quite rightly, the vital importance of our country training dedicated young Americans to supervise our aid programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EISENHOWER REPORT

Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president of Johns Hopkins University and brother of the President of the United States, submitted a report to the White House the other day on our relations with Latin America. "The whole region," he said, "is in ferment—political, social, economic, financial. It is growing rapidly, with an explosive population rate and inadequate capital."

U.S. policies toward Latin America, he feels, are confusing to the peoples south of our border, because we seem to be too cozy with too many local dictators. "At best," he says, "we should offer them a cool handshake rather than a warm embrace. This calls for a change of heart on our part."

Dr. Eisenhower's report is thoughtful, kindly, and generous. But we wonder whether a change of heart is enough.

Even the U.S. offer to subscribe $400 million to the capital of a new Inter-American Development Bank is only a small step.

To begin with, we probably need a real understanding of the opportunistic psychology of Latin dictators. Too many do not have any sense of responsibility; they may be despots but they are rarely benevolent. On the other hand, so long as the peoples themselves accept dictatorship, we should recognize that any such government will accept outside help from the United States if that help costs them nothing. But U.S. help should be provided only if we are able to send into each country trained, dedicated young Americans to supervise our aid programs.

The Latin American countries need government grants, private loans, and private capital investment; and it would be in our interest to see that they get these things. But it would surely not be in our interest if they are used merely to line the pockets of the Batistas—past, present, or future. They must be truly useful; they must be truly practical; and they must be supervised in such a way as to benefit the people themselves.

Unless we provide manpower and supervision, our financial, business, and technical assistance will be worthless.

The Missile Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in connection with the missile controversy which has been on the front page and in Senate discussion for some time, a very interesting article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on January 26, by Mr. Joseph Alsop, under the title "The Major's Friend."

Inasmuch as a record is being built to dispel the confusion and get at the hard core of fact on this whole problem, I believe this column should be made available to more readers through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAJOR'S FRIEND

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—The day they brought the major in, the forward airbase in east China staged a celebration. The Japs had shot Rex Barbour down north of the Yangtze River. He had been too badly injured to walk. He had been carried several hundred miles on the backs of Chinese guerrillas. He had had several hair's-breadth escapes from Jap patrols. Altogether, a celebration was in order.

Later in the evening, after a good many "kan peis" of the local white mule, someone said, "Rex, tell us about how you got the Japanese admiral." An odd look crossed the major's handsome young face. Perhaps he was tired of describing the last seconds on earth of Admiral Isoroku Yamamoto, commander of all the Japanese Emperor's ships in the Pacific. Yet he told it well, all the same.

One all but saw the brilliant interception—the two little American fighters coming in on the flank of the big Jap bombers and their six escorting Zeros, just at the planned interception point over a steamy, palm-fringed South Pacific island. One all but watched the grim fight against these fearful odds—the Americans' quick, deadly first attack, the two bombers flaming and falling, then fighters diving and twisting in the bright air, and the Zeros also bursting into quick, hot flame, and the two American planes turning for home at last, their mission miraculously accomplished. One held one's breath, indeed, until the major finished:

"But the man who got the admiral was Tom Lanphier. I was his wing man. He led the attack. We each got a bomber, but he took the first one, and the first one had Yamamoto on board." There is a current reason for digging this snapshot of the forgotten past out of memory's album. This same Tom Lanphier, whom the major talked about for much of the rest of that happy, long ago evening, is again being talked about here in Washington. But this time Lanphier is being discussed in very different language, by men on the highest level of the American Government.

Primarily, Lanphier is being discussed because he is a very worried man, and because he has attacked the thing that worries him with the same devil-may-care, go-for-the-lead-bomber determination that he showed when Yamamoto met his end. But the thing that worries Lanphier happens to be the Eisenhower administration's complacency about the missile gap. So this new fight against odds is unlikely to be rewarded with the Navy Cross, the Silver Star, and the Distinguished Flying Cross, as the last fight was.

When Senator STUART SYMINGTON was Secretary of the Air Force, Tom Lanphier was his Assistant Secretary. Lanphier is still SYMINGTON's close friend; and in the last month SYMINGTON and Lanphier, with Lanphier feverishly spurring SYMINGTON on, have desperately pressed for a cold, hard, new look at the changes in the military balance between the United States and the Soviet Union.

This was a wholly private effort. It was only the failure of the private effort that drove SYMINGTON to speak out in public, with bitter eloquence, in the Senate last Friday. Twice before the private effort failed, SYMINGTON saw President Eisenhower himself, to beg for bold action to meet the challenge of Soviet progress in ballistic missiles.

Twice SYMINGTON and Lanphier, also saw the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Allen W. Dulles, whom the President told off to soothe the anxious Senator. On the second occasion, which had been planned as a fairly grandiose briefing, Lanphier all but broke up the party by declaring that his own manufacturing experience proved the dangerous overoptimism of the official estimates of Soviet missile output.

Lanphier knows most of the secret facts that are withheld from the American public, precisely because he is a manufacturer of ballistic missiles. But as vice president of Convair, which makes the Atlas Intercontinental Missile, Lanphier has an obvious interest in bigger Atlas orders from the Air Force. Thus a good many men on the higher governmental level are smugly saying that Tom Lanphier has just been "selling a bill of goods with his furious, worried talk about the missile gap."

That is one way to look at it. The other way to look at it also involves a snapshot from the forgotten past—the tragic picture of Winston Churchill and Sir Austen Chamberlain going to plead with Stanley Baldwin for British rearmament to match Hitler's rearmament, and getting a smug, dusty answer to their anguished and farsighted pleas. The two ways of looking at it are diametrically opposed; and the choice between them deserves further investigation.

Pay for Retired Service Personnel Must Be Equalized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the United States is discriminating against a large number of servicemen who served it so well on so many occasions. Under the military pay bill passed by the 85th Congress in 1958, two persons who were in the same service and retired with the same rank can be paid on different scales.

I do not believe this is just, and I feel it makes our service personnel, who have stood ready to answer our Nation's call at any time, feel the Nation is ungrateful to them. Therefore, I have joined in sponsoring a bill to equalize the amounts paid to retired members of the armed services.

The military pay bill of 1958 provides that members of the Armed Forces who retire after May 31, 1958, receive pensions based upon a percentage of the current pay for persons on active duty, which is higher than the percentage granted those already retired.

A straight 6-percent increase was granted those who retired prior to that time.

This bill carries out the recommendation of The Cordiner Report that retirement pay scales be refigured each time

laws pertaining to them are changed.

I have just received a letter from Robert E. Joseph of San Antonio, Tex., a retired U.S. Army colonel, who is commander of the San Antonio Chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars, with some timely comments on this important subject:

The greatest single incentive to careers in the uniformed services—

Colonel Joseph writes—

is the time-honored principle that retired pay, once earned, will continue to be at the established percentages of active pay.

Colonel Joseph continues—

Young men of character and ability are now asking: "Shall I commit myself to a military career when the rules may be changed before the final whistle has blown?"

Are we to ignore the experience of mankind and established and maintain a policy which will inevitably result in mediocrity in our military leadership? I believe not.

Military men, whether they serve 50 years on active duty or 20 years, have been assured equality of treatment in the computation of their retired pay with those who are to follow them into retirement.

What am I to tell my son and son-in-law, both young regular officers and both graduates of the U.S. Military Academy, who are devoting their lives to military careers? I expect to say to them:

"Continue upon your careers in the profession of arms and the 86th Congress, in its wisdom, will reestablish equality in the computation of retired pay of personnel."

I hope that I shall not be proven a false prophet.

Mr. President, in further support of the necessity for the passage of this new bill on retirement pay for servicemen, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution passed by the Military Order of the World Wars in national convention at San Juan, P.R. on October 24, 1958.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS

"Whereas military retirement and its firm tie-in with active duty compensation is perhaps the most powerful long-term career incentive existing within the military compensation system; and

"Whereas the Cordiner committe said of this recommended feature now abandoned by Public Law 422 of the 85th Congress:

" 'The committee has therefore concluded that the incentive value of this existing military retirement program depends to a major degree upon its integral relationship with active duty compensation and the confidence which has been built up in the military body that no breach of faith or breach of retirement contract has ever been permitted by the Congress and the American people'; and

"Whereas this law should be amended to comply both with the recommendation and with the long-standing tradition which has been, and remains, the major incentive to retention of military personnel: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Military Order of the World Wars in convention assembled at San Juan, P.R., this 24th day of October 1958,* That we urge upon the Congress the enactment of amendatory legislation to Public Law 422 of the 85th Congress to restore the incentive feature embodied in this historical relationship between active duty pay and retired pay, in order to insure the highest caliber of personnel for our national defense."

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the Military Order of the World Wars to be affixed this 24th day of October 1958.

ROBERT G. KALES,
Commander, U.S.N.R. (Retired),
Commander in Chief.

By the commander in chief:

HARRY F. MCCULLAH,
Commander, U.S.N. (Retired),
Secretary General.

Help for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the January 22, 1959, issue of the Wall Street Journal headlined "Agency Works on New Plan To Spur School Building—Uncle Sam Would Help Local Units Pay Debt Interest, Not Construction Bills."

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix immediately following this news story, my press release of the same date, in which I point out that the administration's school-aid proposal, as leaked to the Wall Street Journal, is designed to help bankers rather than schoolchildren or schoolteachers, and that it shifts the cost to future years so the administration will not have to account for the expenditures during its remaining 2 years.

This administration proposal, I regret to say, bears no relationship to the realities of educational needs.

There being no objection, the article and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGENCY WORKS ON NEW PLAN TO SPUR SCHOOL BUILDING—UNCLE SAM WOULD HELP LOCAL UNITS PAY DEBT INTEREST, NOT CONSTRUCTION BILLS—FEDERAL SHARE STILL QUESTION

(By James A. Reynolds)

WASHINGTON.—Administration officials are trying to draft a new program to stimulate school construction that would not involve Federal sharing of building costs.

Instead, it would empower Uncle Sam to pay part of a local school district's debt service load—the interest on money the district borrowed to finance construction of new classrooms. Earlier administration aid-to-education proposals included outright Federal grants for school building.

Health, Education, and Welfare Department officials hope the new approach will appeal to White House budget balancers. They figure no Federal outlays would be required until mid-1960, at the earliest. School districts, they argue, would need a few months to float new building bonds, and a year would pass before the first interest on the new bonds would come due.

WOULD NOT AFFECT NEW BUDGET

Thus, the new plan would not unbalance the administration's $77 billion budget for the fiscal year which starts July 1. However, Federal payments might run high in later years.

To get an idea how big the Federal program might grow, consider the size of the present and future school district debt service burden. Federal officials estimate the local districts have obligated themselves to pay $6.5 billion in interest on the outstanding principal borrowed to finance classroom construction. Within the next decade, it's estimated, the districts must add another $6.5 billion to their debt service burden if they hope to keep pace with the demand for new classrooms.

But the Federal agency's planners are not proposing that Uncle Sam take over all of this load. The question of how big a share the United States should accept and for how long is, in fact, the toughest problem facing the bill drafters.

Some officials think Uncle Sam and the school districts should split the future debt service payments 50–50, while others believe the States should assume part of the burden. Only a few States at present help local school districts pay interest on their construction bonds, and in these cases the State share is small.

LENGTH OF PROGRAM

Officials doubt the administration will go so far as to propose that Uncle Sam help carry the debt service load for a bond issue's full term, which frequently runs for 20 to 40 years. It's more likely, they say, that the program would run for only the next 5 or 10 years—the period when they figure most building would have to be done, adding to the chore of carrying the present debt.

The new approach, Health, Education, Welfare officials believe, would stimulate school building in two ways. Districts theoretically would find it easier to borrow money—that is, sell bond issues—if they could show that the State and Federal Governments would be responsible for meeting part of the interest payments.

Moreover, they figure many districts that are already heavily in debt might be encouraged to take on still more in an effort to overcome classroom shortages if some of the worry over the cost of future borrowings were shared by the Federal and State Governments.

Currently, officials are studying the new scheme only for elementary and secondary school construction. But if it's tried and works, they add, it might later be used to stimulate construction of college classrooms. The Federal Government already offers low-rate loans for the construction of college housing, but is not seeking any new funds for this program for fiscal 1960.

NEW APPROACH FOR ADMINISTRATION

If it were adopted, the new approach would mark a major change in administration thinking on school construction. Twice before, President Eisenhower has asked Congress for up to $2 billion of Federal aid to States over a 4-year period to spur building of new classrooms. Both times the program failed to pass when it got snarled in a congressional fight over civil rights. Last year, the administration dropped its school construction efforts, and instead concentrated on winning legislation to step up science and engineering education.

This year, many Democrats are expected to line up behind an aid-to-education measure sponsored by two Montana Democrats, Senator MURRAY and Representative METCALF. They propose Federal grants to States, based on each State's school-age population, for school buildings or teachers' salaries. If the Federal payment was fixed at $25 per child, the program might cost $1.1 billion a year.

The National Education Association currently favors the Murray-Metcalf approach, but N.E.A. officials decline to say how they'd view the Health, Education officials' plan.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the Senate Education Subcommittee today made the following statement:

"The administration's school aid proposal, which was leaked to the Wall Street Journal today is designed to help bankers rather than schoolchildren or schoolteachers. It

shifts the cost to future years so the administration won't have to account for the expenditures during its remaining 2 years.

"The administration proposal bears no relationship to the realities of educational needs.

"The administration would have the Federal Government pay part of a local school district's debt service load. According to the Journal:

" 'Health, Education, and Welfare Department officials hope the new approach will appeal to White House budget-balancers. They figure no Federal outlays would be required until mid-1960, at the earliest. Thus the new plan would not unbalance the administration's $77 billion budget for the fiscal year which starts July 1. However, Federal payments might run high in later years.'

"In other words, the Eisenhower administration does not care if the Federal budget is unbalanced, provided it will be the budget of the succeeding Democratic administration. Furthermore, the bankers who have done so well under Eisenhower want this program so the succeeding Democratic administration will have to continue paying them high Republican interest rates. I imagine administration officials and their big business friends stayed late at the club several evenings cooking up this bit of mockery.

"It is also evident that the advice of people who know educational needs was disregarded. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has stated his view that teacher salaries should be doubled. To do this would require approximately $6 billion annually. According to the U.S. Office of Education it would require about $5.4 billion to construct the more than 135,000 classrooms needed just to meet present needs.

"S. 2 which 30 Senators joined me in introducing, would permit a start on meeting this great need, by authorizing grants to the States to be used for classroom construction or teacher salaries or a combination of these two purposes, as each State sees fit.

"I would suggest to the administration that in preparation for forthcoming hearings by the Education Subcommittee it begin to consider the needs of education rather than the desires of bankers, and the relative financial condition of States and local school districts as compared with the Federal Government. From 1948 to 1957 our national debt increased from $252 billion to $270 billion, but our national income increased from $223.5 billion to $364 billion. We as a Nation are like the man who 10 years ago bought a house with a $6,000 mortgage when he made $5,000 a year. He recently bought a bigger house which had a $7,000 mortgage; however, his salary is now more than $8,000 a year. He obviously is now in a much better position to pay for his new house.

"And he certainly is in a better position than the man who, like many local school districts, is in debt so far, according to his ability to pay, that the banker waves him out the door."

Insecure Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of January 27, 1959:

INSECURE PROTECTION

The multitude of things that can be covered by national security is shown once again in the rejection of a low British bid to supply hydraulic turbines for an Army project in Arkansas.

Under our Buy American Act, a foreign company interested in Federal contracts not only has to bid lower than the domestic competition; it has to bid substantially lower. And if there is heavy unemployment in the area of an American producer, the bid has to be 12½ lower. In this case, English Electric's bid was some 19 percent lower than that of Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton, which eventually got the contract.

The decision was made by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, which claimed that national security would be jeopardized by awarding the contract to the British firm. The rationalization was that domestic productive capacity for making these turbines would be reduced to a level inadequate for emergency requirements. In other words, if we got into a war we might not be able to produce these turbines fast enough.

This is a weak argument on the face of it; for one thing, Baldwin is not the only company making the machines. Also, as English Electric sensibly retorted, the way for Baldwin or any other American firm to keep busy is by effective competition. Nevertheless, the national security argument is made for protectionism for all kinds of domestic industry, some of whose connection with defense is tenuous to say the least.

In this case hardly anybody even believes the argument. The real reason for the decision appears to lie in Pennsylvania politics. So there is something less than candid about dragging in national security as an ostensible justification for the decision.

Naturally the decision is causing a hullabaloo in Britain, as did a similar celebrated case several years ago. It certainly doesn't make the United States look good when it preaches free trade and practices something different. Then, too, this sort of thing always stirs the temptation on the other side to retaliate; and it is in such widening mutual retaliations that international commerce sickens, to the detriment of everybody.

But it isn't the foreign aspect that most concerns us; we have never believed that the United States should conduct its trade or any other policies simply to please people abroad. What mainly concerns us is that behavior like this hurts ourselves. In this particular affair it is perfectly plain: Unless the decision is reversed, the American taxpayer will have to fork out more than $300,000 more than is necessary for the turbines.

That isn't much for a Government that spends billions as though they were dimes, but why should the taxpayer have any amount of his money wasted? Moreover, this is an illustration of the way protectionism in general works, whether the protectionism takes the form of tariffs, quotas, national security decisions, or whatever other gimmick.

Protectionist devices amount to a hidden tax on the consumer. He simply has to pay more than he would otherwise have to for the things he or his Government buys. That is the whole point—to shelter some firms from price and other competition.

We aren't trying to say that much freer trade would cure all the ills of the world. We do say it would be in the national interest and spur competition to the great benefit of the consumer-taxpayer and even of the firms that want protection. In the process it would improve our image in the world's eyes far more than all the billions we throw around as foreign aid.

In short, a policy of protectionism may protect a lot of firms—for a while, anyway. But the one thing it does not protect is national security.

Castro Is Betraying His Own Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Capital Times of Madison has won a reputation as a militant fighter against tyranny, dictatorship, and corruption everywhere. For this reason it enthusiastically supported the Castro revolution against the Batista tyranny in Cuba.

For this same reason it has protested against the newborn tyranny of Castro which seems to be developing now in Cuba. In commenting on the merciless violence of Castro toward the conquered Batista forces, the Capital Times writes:

Orderly justice and democratic procedures cannot grow out of such a grisly carnival. Terror spawns more terror.

Castro is betraying his own revolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTRO IS BETRAYING HIS OWN REVOLUTION BY A REIGN OF TERROR

A Capital Times reader has written to protest our critical attitude toward the terror loosed by Fidel Castro and his Cuban revolutionaries. Revolutions, he suggests, are not Sunday school picnics. Violence and bloodshed are the trademarks.

Our correspondent misses the point—a point well made in a recent column in the New York Post by Max Learner, the distinguished scholar and author who has been in sympathy with Castro's struggle to rid Cuba of Batista tyranny:

We had better face it: The things that are happening in Cuba today, as the execution toll mounts and the reign of terror moves into full swing, present an unlovely picture of the political animal as revolutionary.

It is one thing to spill blood—to kill and be killed—in the course of revolutionary or civil-war fighting itself. It is quite another thing to keep killing after a revolution is over, and victory has been achieved.

In the one case it is killing in the heat of battle, as part of a war, with victory and survival at stake. In the other case it is killing in cold blood, out of hatred and revenge, with no real justification except the conviction that you are God and can mete out death to those who deserve it.

Nor is it an answer to cry out against the crimes of Batista. Two wrongs have never made a right. The revolution was fought to rid the country of terror, not to substitute one brand for another.

It is argued that there were reprisals against the Tories in the American Revolution, but only a perversion of history could compare it with what is going on in Cuba. Insofar as it did exist it was wrong and should be condemned by all who understand what democracy and justice really mean.

What is going on in Cuba today is more like the terror that came with the French revolution when the guillotines bathed the

streets of Paris with blood to satisfy the lust of the mob. The trials before 17,000 shrieking spectators in the Havana sports area are tragically reminiscent of the days of Robespierre.

Fidel Castro might well reflect on the lesson of the French revolution in which the executioner of one day was the executed of the next. If the tide should turn against him the same mob whose blood lust he is satisfying today will call for his blood tomorrow.

Orderly justice and democratic procedures cannot grow out of such a grisly carnival. Terror spawns more terror.

Castro is betraying his own revolution.

A Loan Program for Nongovernmental Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, Dr. F. J. L. Blasengame, a distinguished physician of the State of Texas, has made the sacrifice of leaving private practice to serve his profession and his country as the executive vice president of the American Medical Association.

A recent letter by him to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, sets out the position of the American Medical Association as approving and supporting a Government-insured loan program of the FHA type for non-Governmental hospitals and nursing homes, whether the ownership is of a nonprofit and proprietary character.

For the information of the Members of Congress, I request that his letter be placed in the Appendix as follows:

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., January 26, 1959.

Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Housing,
Senate Banking and Currency Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: I am writing this letter to you to express the official views of the American Medical Association with respect to title II of S. 57, 86th Congress, which I understand, is now pending before your committee. Our position with respect to this proposal, which would make proprietary nursing homes eligible for mortgage insurance, is one of active support.

Our deep interest in the subject of the health care of the aged and the occurrence of some significant recent developments have prompted me to mention certain activities in this field before outlining the specific reasons for our support of title II of S. 57.

Since its beginning, more than a century ago, the American Medical Association has been deeply concerned with the medical aspects of caring for the aged. In recent years, however, our interest and activities in this connection have kept pace with the ever-increasing amount of national attention being given to the subject both within the Government and among groups and associations outside Government. This general trend is understandable, of course, since the proportion of our population over age 65 is increasing at an amazing rate. In 1900 there were only 3 million of these elderly citizens whereas now there are approximately 15 million.

For the past several years the American Medical Association has had a committee on aging, composed of some of the leading medical authorities in the United States in this field, which has devoted its full effort to this problem. In addition there are 45 committees on aging actively at work in the State medical societies. To facilitate and coordinate the work of these committees, a set of guides for their organization and operation has been developed and made available to them.

As a climax to a series of five regional meetings which were held last year, and in an effort to prepare a positive program for use by the State committees, an AMA National Planning Conference for Medical Society Action in the Field of Aging was held in Chicago on September 13–14, 1958. This conference was attended by over 175 people, including official State medical society representatives from 46 States and the District of Columbia, as well as 27 State health departments. A copy of the official proceedings of this conference, together with a related brochure entitled "Health Aspects of Aging," are enclosed for the information of the committee.

In our consideration of the health problems of the aged we have also given serious thought to effective methods of financing medical and hospital care. In considering this facet of the problem, it should be noted that enrollment of older people under voluntary health insurance has increased substantially in recent years. In the last several years alone the percentage of coverage has gone up approximately 100 percent. Presently, exclusive of the approximately 3 million older persons who receive public assistance, more than 50 percent of those over age 65 have some form of health insurance. Nevertheless, in our opinion, there is a need for further expansion of voluntary health insurance coverage among the aged.

During the last year the association has conducted or participated in numerous meetings and conferences with commercial insurance carriers and with State and national Blue Cross and Blue Shield commissions to encourage still greater efforts in the development of new insurance programs and in the expansion of lower-cost protection for persons over age 65. These companies, as well as Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans, are now engaged in intensive studies designed to develop new types of policies tailored to meet the needs of the aged ill; present retirement financing of health insurance policies with paid-up status at age 65; use of life insurance after 65 to pay for health care; and the application of deductible and coinsurance to permit coverage of costly illnesses at a low premium rate, among others.

In order to stimulate further the interest of State medical societies and individual physicians in this movement the house of delegates of the association approved the following resolution at its clinical meeting which was held in Minneapolis in December of 1958:

"For persons over 65 years of age with reduced incomes and very modest resources, it is necessary immediately to develop further the voluntary health insurance or prepayment plans in a way that would be acceptable both to the recipients and the medical profession. The medical profession must continue to assert its leadership and responsibility for assuring adequate medical care for this group of our citizens.

"Therefore, the Council on Medical Service recommends to the house of delegates the adoption of the following proposal:

"That the American Medical Association, the constituent and component medical societies, as well as physicians everywhere, expedite the development of an effective voluntary health insurance or prepayment program for the group over 65 with modest resources or low family income; that physicians agree to accept a level of compensation for medical services rendered to this group, which will permit the development of such insurance and prepayment plans at a reduced premium rate.

"This recommendation has been studied and restudied by the board of trustees and has received its wholehearted endorsement."

In addition to the numerous and varied medical, scientific, and socioeconomic activities being pursued in this field, physicians through their associations have, for some time, recognized the need for additional organizational weapons to attack these problems. For many years the American Medical Association was an active participant in the affairs of the Commission on Chronic Illness, in cooperation with representatives of the general public, industry, labor, agriculture, education, religion, social sciences, journalism, health and welfare. One of a number of studies which were conducted was entitled "Nursing Homes, Their Patients and Their Care." A copy of this study which was published by the U.S. Public Health Service is also attached for the information of your committee.

Last year the American Medical Association joined with the American Hospital Association, the American Dental Association, and the American Nursing Home Association in the formation of the Joint Council To Improve the Health Care of the Aged. In broad outline the program of the joint council will include a coordinated plan of research designed to:

(a) Determine the extent, utilization and availability of facilities and the economic status and resources of the aged.

(b) Spearhead the expansion and experimentation in all types of voluntary health insurance coverage for the aged.

(c) Encourage the expansion of health care facilities for the aged.

(d) Encourage the development of community health services for the aged.

(e) Urge State and local legislative bodies to provide realistic financial support for medical, hospital, and nursing home care of aged public assistance recipients and

(f) Appraise the problems of the aged who are mentally ill and provide an intensification of education, research, and action programs directed toward health problems of the aged at National, State and local levels.

In its work in connection with the overall medical care problems of the aged, the American Medical Association has long recognized the importance of proper nursing home facilities. For this reason the association has had a close relationship for some time with the American Nursing Home Association to work toward the development of higher standards for medical care in nursing homes. In February of 1958 the first National Conference on Nursing Homes and Homes for the Aged was held in Washington. Our association was an active participant at that meeting. On December 16, 1958, a conference on Nursing Homes and Related Facilities between representatives of our association, the American Hospital Association, the American Nursing Homes Association, Public Health Service, and public assistance agencies was held in Chicago to discuss current activities and projected programs concerning facilities for the chronically ill and the aged. The purpose of this meeting was to seek a coordinated effort on the part of interested national organizations.

In addition the AMA is currently making a survey of nursing homes throughout the United States. The American Nursing Home Association is also engaged in such a project and is surveying approximately 5,000 member homes to obtain data on the cost of care to the patient, the type of patient in the homes and the type of medical care provided.

As an outgrowth of all of these various related activities in connection with the health care of the aged, our Council on Medical Service has prepared a 6-point program, the details of which are outlined in the attached brochure entitled "Medicine's Blueprint for the New Era of Aging."

In conclusion I should like to comment more specifically with respect to the provisions of title II of S. 57, 86th Congress. As stated at the outset, the American Medical Association has approved and supports a Government-insured loan program of the FHA type for nongovernmental hospitals and nursing homes whether their ownership is of a nonprofit or proprietary character.

We have taken this position because we believe there is a critical need for new and improved facilities tailored to the specific health requirements of older citizens. It is our understanding that representatives of other organizations such as the American Nursing Home Association have or will appear before your committee. They have evidence accumulated over recent years showing that they cannot provide service of the desired quality or quantity because they are unable to obtain the credit they need on reasonable terms to permit them to increase the number and size of adequate nursing home facilities.

Under the Hill-Burton program the Federal Government has for years been assisting public and nonprofit institutions through money grants. It is also our understanding that the Federal Housing Administration is presently offering mortgage insurance for construction of large nonprofit institutional-type homes for the aged which may have a section for those needing nursing care. In our opinion the immediate need is for a similar program of loan guarantees for proprietary organizations, since, according to the latest statistics, over 70 percent of nursing home patients are cared for in such facilities.

In the administration of a grant program under the Hill-Burton system and a loan guarantee program under the Federal Housing Administration, we recognize the desirability of cooperation; however, we believe that the loan guarantee program proposed under title II of the pending bill should be administered by the Federal Housing Administration without mandatory supervision or coordination with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I would like to request that this letter and attachments, to the extent possible, be made a part of the record of the hearings of your committee. If you or any of the members of the committee desire additional copies of the attached material or any further information from our association, we shall be happy to provide you with anything we have.

Your willingness to permit the American Medical Association to present its views on the pending proposal is sincerely appreciated.

Very truly yours,

F. J. L. BLASINGAME, M.D.,
Executive Vice President.

People Can Help Check Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, inflation is the major enemy on our domestic front. It is an insidious economic smog that penetrates all levels of life in the United States. It is an enemy that cannot be fought by the President alone, or the Congress, or business, or the consumer. In order to lick this foe, we must all get on the front line and fight.

The press in the United States has a major role in reminding the American people that they are all in this up to their ears, and must get in there pitching if they don't want to see their dollar shrivel to the worth of green paper.

The editor of the Flint Journal in my State of Michigan, has given brilliant evidence of his realization of the responsibility of the press in this respect with the attached editorial, of January 25, which I submit herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

PEOPLE CAN HELP CHECK INFLATION

President Eisenhower has put defense of the value of the dollar in the "must" category of national policy. He declares that inflation, which means the decline in the value of the dollar, must be checked if America is to avoid economic decay.

The President says control of inflation and retention of the value of our money is the task of everyone—Congress, business, labor, consumers. He wants Congress to avoid deficit spending, business to hold down prices, labor to refrain from excessive wage demands, consumers to shop carefully.

Unless self-discipline and restraint in economic matters are provided, Mr. Eisenhower warns, it may be necessary for the administration to ask Congress for wage and price controls such as this Nation had during World War II.

Dangerous, destructive inflation will result unless some kind of restraint is imposed. Already we have experienced too much inflation. It has been the slow, creeping kind, but it could get out of even partial control and become a vicious spiral as it feeds upon itself.

We have been fortunate in America that the inflationary spiral has not been completely destructive. World history contains many instances of inflation ruining nations. Inflation in Germany after World War I wrecked the Germany economy and created conditions which contributed to the rise of Hitler. Right now Argentina is experiencing inflation so serious that an economic revolution is a possibility.

It is amazing that there is so little public concern about inflation. It is amazing that there has been no loud public demand that Government institute policies which will stop the spiral. Instead, results of the last election indicate voter endorsement of spending programs which, if adopted by Congress, will put more fuel on the inflationary fires.

Perhaps the absence of public agitation results from a lack of realization of the extent of inflation in the last 20 years. Some figures from a Saturday Evening Post article by Roswell Magill, chairman of Tax Foundation, Inc., may make the picture clearer. He writes:

"Inflation has been called the cruelest tax of all—and we are paying it, whether or not we realize it. In the last 20 years the value of our dollar has been cut in half; just since the end of World War II the purchasing power of our dollar has been reduced by 23 cents. Since the war, inflation and taxes together have taken such a toll that the man who earned $5,000 in 1946 would have to earn $7,343 today—nearly 50 percent more—just to hold his own in buying power."

Mr. Magill, who was Franklin D. Roosevelt's Under Secretary of the Treasury in 1937–38, has some other comparisons. The man with an income of $3,000 in 1946 would have to earn $4,445 in 1958 to stay even in purchasing power. The man earning $10,000 in 1946 now needs to earn $14,485.

Mr. Magill wonders if we are on the downhill road of inflation that ends in economic disaster. He wonders if we will come eventually to the dollar which is worth only 10 cents in purchasing power; perhaps to the 1-cent dollar.

Take just one of the inflationary factors—deficit spending by the Federal Government. The public can control that if we will accept the danger and become vocal enough so we will be heard in the House of Congress and in the bureaus of the executive branch.

We can insist that Federal spending in the coming fiscal years be tailored to fit income so that the highly inflationary process of borrowing will be avoided. We can insist that the new spending programs, which are being offered in Congress, be rejected until the money is on hand to pay for them.

We know defense spending will have to continue high because of the threats from Russia, but we can insist the military services stop competing for the defense dollar. We can insist that they stop duplication and give us a defense system that is worth every cent it costs.

We can demand the budget be limited to essentials. The desirable can be postponed until the Federal Government again shows a budget surplus. We can demand that Congress ignore the pressure groups that constantly seek more Federal handouts.

Inflation will continue to build up under deficit spending. The people, if they want their dollars to have some value, can be a pressure group for fiscal policies which will put brakes on the inflationary period.

Labor's Attack on Mikoyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Columnist John Herling, which appeared in the Washington Daily News of January 27, 1959:

LABOR'S ATTACK ON MIKOYAN
(By John Herling)

Back in Moscow, Anastas I. Mikoyan, the No. 2 man in the Soviet Union, this weekend filed one large-scale complaint about his U.S. visit. He charges the spokesmen of organized labor in the United States are unfair to the Soviet dictatorship.

He can't get over the way he was handled in the United States. He got the roughest handling, not from the capitalists, but from the union leaders. The rudest statements, he said, came from labor spokesmen.

What bothers Mr. Mikoyan is not the lack of etiquette on the part of any section of American society. What eats at him is his failure to hit the main Communist target in this or any country; the workers and their organizations. Here he fell flat on his face in his efforts to flatter, cajole, or mollify organized labor.

In the United States, five American trade-union presidents gave him lunch and then proceeded to spoil his appetite by telling him off with words that a top Soviet political boss never hears from the representatives of the state-controlled Soviet labor unions.

A couple of days later, AFL–CIO President George Meany, who sent his regrets to the luncheon, unloaded a personal and political attack on Mr. Mikoyan for his doublecross

of the Hungarian revolution, climaxed by the murder of Imre Nagy, Hungarian Prime Minister.

Even more all-out in its attack was a group headed by the officers of the United Hat Workers and Upholstery Workers who bought an ad that said: "Mikoyan, Go Home."

In Moscow, Mr. Mikoyan tried to do, verbally, what Communist tacticians have always tried to do with their opponents: drive a wedge in the opposition and so weaken it before moving in for the kill. In this instance, Mr. Mikoyan has tried to exaggerate the difference of opinion between Mr. Meany who wouldn't break bread with him and those who did: IUE President James B. Carey, Auto Workers President Walter P. Reuther, Letter Carriers President William C. Doherty, Karl Feller, president of the Brewery Workers, and Communications Workers President Joseph A. Beirne.

This obvious maneuver by Mr. Mikoyan had already been anticipated in American labor circles. One key labor observer said: "What is the difference between Mr. Meany's position and that of Messrs. Reuther and Carey toward Mr. Mikoyan? I'll tell you what it is: Mr. Meany believes Mr. Mikoyan isn't fit to live with pigs and Messrs. Carey and Reuther say he is." There is cold comfort for Mr. Mikoyan in this distinction.

Mr. Mikoyan's version of his conversation with the trade union leaders reveals that two of the main international subjects in their talk had to do with the Berlin crisis and the Hungarian revolution. Evaluating his own achievement, Mr. Mikoyan said he repulsed the attacks by the American labor leaders on those subjects.

Mr. Mikoyan said that despite the strong dispute, the meeting with the trade union spokesmen was friendly. Like many another salesman, Mr. Mikoyan likes to claim he made contact, especially when he has lost a sale.

What rankled Mr. Mikoyan especially is this exchange between him and the U.S. trade union leaders:

Mr. Mikoyan: "You fellows are more vicious than the capitalists. They don't talk to me the way you do."

Trade union leaders: "We know you better, Mr. Mikoyan."

Liberalization of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing in the House of Representatives legislation which will provide for some liberalization of the Social Security Act.

The bill is a package bill, and provides for three major changes in the act.

The first revision is the removal of the present limitation of $1,200 per annum on outside income that can be earned by those individuals who are receiving social security benefits. It is a well-known fact that the cost of living has continued to rise, and it is practically impossible for our older citizens to live comfortably and securely solely on the amounts they receive from social security. Over the years with such increased living costs whatever savings they might have been able to accumulate have been utilized for various reasons, and in many cases they find themselves dependent to some degree on relatives or friends, or on the various welfare agencies, for the additional help they need. To remove this restriction on the amount of income which can be earned would certainly make it much easier for them and their families.

At the present time the retirement age for men under the Social Security Act is 65; for women 62. Under the second provision of my bill this would be changed. Men would become eligible for full retirement benefits at the age of 60; and women would be entitled to full benefits at the age of 55. We hear much talk today of early retirement, and our older workers are encouraged to retire as soon as possible to make way for the younger employees. This could be an actual reality and not just a dream if the retirement age were lowered and the benefits liberalized. The life span of the individual is growing longer and it is estimated that within 20 years we will have over 20 million Americans over the age of 65. It is the responsibility of the Government to see that an adequate program for the care of these citizens is put into effect.

The final section of the bill deals with the elimination of the requirement that a person must have reached the age of 50 before he can become eligible for disability benefits under the Social Security Act. Many times an employee is injured and disabled through no fault of his own, and under the current provisions must wait many years before he can collect benefits. This proves to be a hardship for him and his family. My bill would permit such an employee to file immediately for benefits to which he is rightfully entitled, thus assisting him in some measure to contribute to the support of his dependents, and preventing his absolute dependency on others.

As Members of Congress we must look to the welfare of all our citizens whether they are young or old, able or disabled. If it is necessary to revise some of our programs to meet the challenge of the changing times then this we must do.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to give every possible consideration to the enactment of my bill.

The Last Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the Raleigh (N.C.) News and Observer, of January 26, 1959:

THE LAST REPUBLICAN

To the EDITOR:

Will Rogers used to say all he knew was just what he read in the News and Observer, or words to that effect.

According to your newspaper it is about time for Mr. Joe Nathan Daniels to write himself a new book, entitled "A Democrat Discovers a Democrat." A man named James Fennamint Cooper wrote a book one time called "The Last of the Mohicans."

It is also about time for John Frosty Dulles or Henry Cabbage Lodge to write a book called "The Last of the Republicans." It would compare favorably with Hoover's book called "Ragged Individualism."

The southern Democrats committed ambush on themselves when they let the two-thirds rule be abolished in the national convention. Now the two-thirds Democrats tell the southern Democrats to shut up, integrate, or get out. When Democrats begin casting out Democrats, where will the benighted southern Republican appear on the scene? He becomecs an innocuous desuetude. If he follows the national leadership, he must abandon all his ideals of racial integrity and come out wholehearted and barefooted for integration and this makes him about as popular as illegitimate twins at a family reunion.

The southern Democrat and the southern Republican have been treated by the national leadership like the preacher who got mad with the congregation and wouldn't preach, so he took up collection and left. Every election year involving the Presidency a group of Yankee Republicans drift South over the Potomac and appear on the scene in the Southern States. They beat on tomtoms and gather a multitude of Republicans together at some central point. Then they brag long and loud an Lincoln and Teddy Roosevelt. Then they cuss out the Democrats in general, Truman in particular, and communism and high taxes just to be cussin'. Then they get real mealymouthed about a two-party system down South, and how they are going to help out with it. Then they take up a big, fat, juicy collection and flee back across the Warren-Nixon line behind the nylon curtain and that is the last you hear of them.

This method of building up a two-party system in the South is like the man who used to always put vitamin pills in his liquor, so he could build himself up, while he was tearing himself down.

"CHUB" SEAWELL,
Ex-Republican.

The Family Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, we who compose the militant minority of economy-minded Members of Congress know that those at home appreciate and understand our efforts to eliminate wasteful, unnecessary Federal spending. As another budget battle approaches, I am gratified that such an outstanding newspaper as the Cleveland Plain Dealer continues to share my conviction that a sound fiscal policy is compatible with efficient government and a strong defense. Under unanimous consent of the House, I insert an editorial from the January 27 Plain Dealer which sounds a sharp warning to those who would jeopardize the economic integrity of the Federal Government:

THE FAMILY BUDGET

At one time or another the head of every prudent family tries to make out a budget. He or she first writes down the amount of income the family can reasonably expect during a given period. Against that there are certain expenses which must be met, such as rent or mortgage payments, taxes, utilities, food, clothing, transportation, and insurance.

Too often, alas, these amounts eat up all the anticipated income, but sometimes, after the necessities have been provided for, there is something left over for other things, such as entertainment, vacation trips, new furniture, and so on. The problem then is to decide which of these other things the family can afford. Obviously, the family can't have everything it wants because if it could there would be no budget problem to worry about.

But the leftwing Democrats who are complaining that President Eisenhower's $77 billion budget isn't big enough would go about things in a different way. First they would list everything that the family wants under the heading of necessities and, if there wasn't enough money coming in to pay for them, they would borrow the balance.

That's what has been done all too often in the past, so that the Federal debt is now above $280 billion, a staggering amount. But the people who have loaned this money to the Government expect to earn interest on it, and that includes the holders of $25 U.S. savings bonds, as well as the banks and insurance companies that buy larger amounts of Government bonds in long and short term issues. As a result, interest on the Government debt is one of the big, irreducible items in the Federal budget. It amounted to $7½ billion this year and will be over $8 billion next year.

That brings us to the spokesman of the Democratic leftwingers, the Democratic Advisory Council. It complains that the only people who benefit in a big way from the new budget are those who have money and lend it to the Government. That's because the Government has had to increase its interest rates in order to induce the owners of capital to lend it to the Government. If the people who have money to lend can get better interest rates elsewhere, or if they fear that inflation will erode the value of their money if they put it in Government bonds, they will invest in something else.

As Raymond Moley pointed out in a column on this page last week, the time might come when the Government couldn't borrow any more money to finance its deficits. Then it would have to resort to the printing press and runaway inflation would be upon us.

The Democratic Advisory Committee is completely oblivious to this potential disaster. It wants the Government to spend more, to borrow more, and to cut down on interest rates, thus leading to a situation when the Government could no longer borrow. It's the classic road to ruin, whether it happens to your family's budget or the Government's.

Private Versus Public Power: A Lesson in Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, by a slim margin of two votes, a public power at an estimated cost of $575 million was scuttled 18 months ago in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. There is little doubt that approval of this legislation in committee would have resulted in final passage in the House of Representatives. I refer, of course, to the controversial high Hells Canyon project.

Now, after a relatively brief lapse of time, we should take inventory of just what has happened, for certainly there is a lesson to be learned by those who are inclined toward Federal spending versus free enterprise.

I personally take pride in the vote that I cast against this proposed half billion dollar-plus project in the face of what has since transpired. The Idaho Power Co. as you know, took on the job as a private enterprise. Now let us look at the situation as it now stands.

The first of three dams has been completed. At Brownlee, just 2 weeks ago, the fourth generating unit in the power-producing facilities of this project was placed "on the line" and is now furnishing 360,000 kilowatts of electric energy to serve the Pacific Northwest. Not only does this constitute a major milestone of progress, but it stands as evidence that costly Government programs which can be handled by private enterprise should be discouraged at every opportunity.

Proponents of this legislation fought to put the Federal Government into the power business at a tremendous expense to the taxpayers of this Nation. Several efforts were made from 1949 until a year and a half ago. When it failed, and while the Idaho Power Co. was proceeding with the job, the taxpayers of my State of Illinois alone were saved exactly $38,023,620, their share of the estimated original cost.

Brownlee Dam is now the second highest rockfill dam in the world and takes its place among the major power-producing installations in the Northwest. Construction is now proceeding vigorously at Oxbow Dam, second unit of the development and preliminary work has already been started on the third unit.

The Idaho Power Co.'s total investment in its three-dam development was approximately $110 million as of the beginning of this year. Power production equipment on special order total several more millions of dollars. Total cost of the entire project will be about $164 million. In addition to generating tax revenues of $10 million annually for the local, State, and Federal governments, the development is providing substantial public benefits in the way of flood control, navigation, fish conservation, and recreation.

The first of two upstream-migrant fish facilities is in operation and the second will be completed by March 1. Concrete placement for the Oregon side spillway is nearing completion. The embankment's impervious clay core and downstream rockfill section are under construction. Excavation of two power tunnels starts next month. Nearly 230,000-volt transmission lines to carry the development's electricity into the Northwest power pool are either completed or under construction.

Just as the crocodile tears of public power pressure groups trickled into the waters of the Snake River and disappeared, so have the ill-conceived arguments for the Federal project been washed away by what has been achieved without astronomical Government spending in this instance.

Not only will the full capacity be made available several years sooner than if the Federal Government had done the job, but it will be completed at a cost far less than if Uncle Sam had taken on the responsibility. Public interests will be served better as the private operation flourishes. Instead of spending tax moneys it will bring in revenue. Yes, the high Hells Canyon story is a case in point.

And it brings to mind, too, the words of Abraham Lincoln, who 100 years ago said:

> The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. In all that people can do for themselves, government ought not interfere.

There are many good citizens who apparently have yet to learn that Federal spending for projects that can be accomplished by free enterprise is basically wrong. From this lesson, we learn, too, that the Federal Government invariably spends far more to do the same job than it costs private industry or local government. Will we ever learn that we cannot continue merrily along the road to coddling by the Federal Government in so many areas of our national life? The folks who think that they are getting something for nothing because Uncle Sam takes over the responsibility are either misinformed, too frequently, or they simply will not face the facts of life. In the first place, dollars spent at a Federal level shrink from 25 to 35 percent through administrative costs. And an additional loss occurs through the tremendous interest payments on the national debt.

From all this, we will do well to learn and practice prudence. Perhaps we need some other yardstick by which to measure our spending activities in Washington than the superficial benefit of transferring responsibilities to the Federal Government which do not belong with it. Instead, perhaps we can develop a demand for fiscal responsibility on the part of elected representatives by the electorate in this way.

Yes, it will be a great day for this Nation when political popularity contests are not won by pork barrelling, especially when it involves deficit spending.

The Story Ends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, at a time when racial problems are in the forefront of public attention, it is a

real satisfaction for me to be able to call the attention of this House to the successful and unnoticed culmination of a struggle which began during the early years of World War II and has just now become a matter of historic rather than immediate interest. The treatment of the Japanese American residents on the west coast was a shameful episode in our Nation's history. It was especially so as far as the States bordering on the Pacific, including my own State of Oregon, were concerned, because we could not even plead long-lived historic social patterns as an excuse for our behavior.

To the credit of the United States, the mistakes of this program were eventually recognized and restitution made. To the credit of the people of the West, the atmosphere of hysteria was eventually replaced by an atmosphere of sorrow and regret. But to the Americans thus discriminated against belongs the greatest credit of all. They have never demonstrated the bitterness which should have been expected. Within the very concentration camps in which they were herded, their young men volunteered in unequaled numbers for service in the Armed Forces, serving in, among other units, the famous 442d Infantry Combat Team, the most decorated unit in the war. Their families and these returning heroes themselves came back to their homes after the war and have demonstrated by their lives in these postwar years a pattern of devoted citizenship, which has been unequaled by few and surpassed by no ethnic group in the Nation. It is with deep satisfaction that, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial of November 19, 1958, from the Eugene (Oreg) Register-Guard, concerning the completion of restitution to America's proud Nisei citizens:

STORY ENDS

Too little noticed in the public prints was a quiet ceremony in Washington, D.C., last week. There in the Office of the Attorney General was completed restitution to the Nisei (Americans of Japanese origin) who were herded into concentration camps on our west coast a little less than 17 years ago. It cost the Government $36.9 million to make amends for the indignities heaped upon loyal Americans by their jittery fellow citizens.

We're still waiting for the book, the book that will set out in shameful detail the injustices wrought here on the west coast. We picked on these people because of the color of their skins, the slant of their eyes, and the national origin of their parents. Before we here in the Northwest feel too superior about Little Rock, we should reflect upon our own cultural lapse.

The story ends more happily, to be sure. As Mike M. Masaoka, the Nisei representative at the ceremonies, observed, this restitution program demonstrates that "democracy can take care of its mistakes." And that's something. But it does not eliminate from the memory of the white westerner that when he needed to be calm and strong, he responded to fear—and sometimes avarice—with a base Ku Kluxism that was made worse because it had the approval of his free Government.

The Highway Trust Fund and Automotive Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise my colleagues that I am today introducing legislation providing for the dual purpose of first, strengthening the solvency of the highway trust fund; and, second, reducing to 5 percent the Federal excise taxes applicable to automotive vehicles and parts and accessories. In order that all of you will be familiar with the objectives of my bill I am including in my remarks the following news release I have made on this very important subject:

Congressman VICTOR A. KNOX, Republican, of Michigan, today announced introduction of legislation providing for the dual purpose of (1) strengthening the solvency of the highway trust fund; and (2) reducing to 5 percent the Federal excise taxes applicable to automotive vehicles and parts and accessories. In addition, KNOX's bill would ultimately repeal these excises. The present rate of tax applicable to automotive vehicles is 10 percent and in the case of automotive parts and accessories it is 8 percent.

The bill would provide that the rate reduction to 5 percent would be retroactively effective to sales occurring on or after January 1, 1959. This retroactive date would assure that the benefits of the tax reduction would be available to consumers purchasing automotive vehicles or parts on or after the beginning of the year. Congressman KNOX stated that in addition to immediate tax reduction his proposal would also provide (1) that the funds collected from these reduced tax rates would be entirely earmarked for the highway trust fund beginning with calendar year 1959; and (2) that the reduced rates would be repealed outright on July 1, 1972, at the conclusion of the present Federal-aid highway program.

In summary form the excise tax reductions that would be effective beginning January 1, 1959, and the revenue additions to the highway trust fund from earmarking for fiscal years 1959 and 1960 that would result from the bill are as follows:

1. The present 10 percent tax on passenger automobiles would be reduced to 5 percent. The additional revenue to the highway trust fund from earmarking would be $265 million in fiscal year 1959 and $625 million in fiscal year 1960.

2. The present 10 percent tax on automotive trucks, buses, and trailers would be reduced to 5 percent. This would have no effect on trust fund receipts because one-half of the present 10 percent tax is already earmarked for this purpose.

3. The present 8 percent tax on parts and accessories would be reduced to 5 percent. The increased highway trust fund revenues resulting from the earmarking of the parts and accessories tax would be $50 million in fiscal year 1959 and $100 million in fiscal year 1960.

Total additions to the highway trust fund would be $315 million for fiscal year 1959 and $725 million for fiscal year 1960. Under the KNOX proposal the revenues resulting from the earmarking of these tax sources would continue to augment the trust fund receipts for the duration of the present highway program and the taxes would be repealed outright effective July 1, 1972.

Congressman KNOX stated that one of his objectives in sponsoring this legislation was to achieve the meritorious result of immediate reduction in automotive costs imposed on the American people. At the same time he would bolster the economic strength of the automobile industry which is such an important factor in determining the level of overall national prosperity.

Another important objective in the sponsorship of this legislation, according to Congressman KNOX, was his desire to provide a feasible alternative to the budget message proposal to increase highway trust fund revenues by imposing an additional 1½ cents per gallon tax on gasoline. Mr. KNOX stated that by providing an alternative solution to the possible need for added revenues in the highway trust fund he was giving the Congress and the American people opportunity to express a preference for the possible solution desired—either higher motoring taxes; or lower highway taxes better used.

The Michigan legislator stated that while the automobile industry had sustained a promising start toward a more favorable year in 1959, he favored the immediate reduction and ultimate repeal of the automotive excises so as to remove the depressing long-run effect that the onerous Federal excise taxes have had on the industry. He called attention to the fact that nearly 1 million workers look for their employment in industrial plants producing automotive vehicles, parts and tires and that 9 million more individuals look for their employment to other phases of highway transportation. Added reason for a strong automotive industry is found in the fact that one of every seven persons works in the manufacture, distribution, service, or use of motor vehicles.

In demonstrating the benefits that would be realized by industries serving as material suppliers to the automobile industry Mr. KNOX set forth the facts that the manufacturers of motor vehicles and parts buy 23 percent of all steel, 69 percent of all plate glass, 72 percent of all upholstery leather, 41 percent of all lead, 29 percent of all zinc, and 10 percent of all copper sold in the United States.

Congressman KNOX called attention to the fact that another reason supporting his proposed excise tax reduction on automobiles and equipment can be found in other reductions of Korean war excise taxes that have occurred since the termination of that conflict. Mr. KNOX stated that the excises applicable to automotive products are virtually the only rates on any major products that have not been substantially reduced in the intervening period.

Congressman KNOX pointed out that while the enactment of his legislative proposal would tend to reduce highway user taxes presently going into the general funds of the Treasury, the American public is already overburdened with taxes, taxes of every variety. He stated the need for additional highway funds should be met by greater utilization of taxes presently collected from highway use sources and not in higher discriminatory taxes. He also stated that, consistent with his past position in advocating Government economy, he expected to continue his support of Government economy in more than sufficient measure to offset any general fund revenue reduction resulting from his bill.

Draft Law Issues: Waste, Unfairness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the haste with which this administration has urged the extension of the draft is, I believe, not in keeping with the importance of this issue and with the tremendous impact of the peacetime draft upon America's domestic condition, our defense posture, and our foreign policy. It is my hope that sufficient time and attention be given to this legislation, both by the distinguished Armed Services Committee and by the entire House, to bring all the revelant facts into the clear light of day.

Opposition to draft extension, Mr. Speaker, is not limited to any one part of the spectrum of American thought. There are responsible business leaders, labor leaders, and men in religion and education, who have expressed doubts about extending the draft. Certainly, in view of these doubts, extended consideration is called for. As one example of the questions that have been raised, I ask unanimous consent that the following article, appearing in the November 1958 issue of the Nation's Business, published by the United States Chamber of Commerce, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DRAFT LAW ISSUES: WASTE, UNFAIRNESS

Rewriting the Nation's military manpower laws will be a priority task when the new Congress convenes in January.

Authority to draft men into the armed forces expires on July 1, 1959. A month later the basic reserve forces statute, enacted in 1955, expires.

Businessmen have a fourfold interest in what Congress does about these laws.

As citizens, they are concerned with providing armed forces that are adequate, both in quality and quantity, to the requirements of national security in an era of rapid advance in weapons technology.

As taxpayers, they are concerned with staffing the armed forces in an economical and efficient way.

As employers, they are concerned with minimizing the disruptive effects of military service on civilian careers, and with avoiding an excessive drain on manpower resources.

As parents, they want to be sure that the draft and reserve programs operate fairly, and that they do not exact unnecessary or unreasonable sacrifices from any young American.

Devising new legislation that meets all of these tests will be difficult. Congress may be tempted to take the easy way out by pushing through a simple extension of the present laws. This temptation must be resisted for two reasons:

1. Peacetime conscription is deeply repugnant to American traditions. It is tolerated by public opinion only when people are satisfied that the draft is necessary and that it is being carried out in a way that is scrupulously fair. Millions of Americans today are not satisfied on either of these points.

2. Radical changes in military strategy and manpower requirements have taken place since the present draft and reserve laws were enacted. In the words of Thomas R. Reid, Ford Motor Co. executive who heads the manpower subcommittee of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the the assumptions on which the 1955 laws were based are now "obsolete."

The basic assumption of the 1955 laws is that the Nation's need for trained military manpower can be met only by compelling every qualified youth to serve. It is clearly reflected in the official title of the draft law which is not the "Selective Service Act" but the "Universal Military Training and Service Act."

It places on all physically and mentally qualified men between the ages of 18½ and 26 a legal obligation to perform at least 6 years of military service. This may be fulfilled by various combinations of active and reserve duty—the Armed Forces currently offer 34 alternative enlistment programs. Theoretically, any qualified youth who fails to sign up for one of these programs will be drafted for 2 years of active duty.

The flaw in this universal service plan is that it cannot be applied fairly without yielding far more manpower than the armed services need or want.

A little arithmetic will show why this is true.

In 1955, the number of youths flowing into the draft-age manpower pool was 1.1 million a year. About 300,000 of those were physically or mentally disqualified for military service. That left 800,000.

The Armed Forces at that time had an active-duty strength of 2.8 million. To maintain this strength, they were taking in from civilian life about 600,000 men a year—through the draft, through draft-stimulated enlistments, and through call-up of reservists.

Congress saw a prospective surplus of 200,000 men a year. So it wrote into the law a program which a House Program Committee report frankly labeled a control factor over the manpower pool. This is the now-famous 6-months-training plan, under which a youth can avoid being drafted by signing up directly in a National Guard or Reserve unit for 6 months' active-duty training followed by several years in drilling Reserve status.

Several factors have rendered the plan obsolete. New weapons, including missiles, have sharply altered military strategy and have reduced the need for massed manpower. The services this year are paring down to an active-duty strength of 2.5 million men. This strength can be maintained with a total intake of 450,000 civilians a year, or 150,000 less than were needed in 1955.

The postwar baby boom is beginning to be reflected in the late teen-age groups. The number of youths reaching the threshold age of 18½ rose this year to 1.2 million; by 1960, it will be 1.3 million; by 1965, nearly 2 million.

Finally, the Armed Forces have displayed a marked lack of enthusiasm for 6 months' trainees as a source of manpower for the Ready Reserve. Instead of the 250,000 a year authorized by Congress, the services this year took in only 55,000. The largest number they have accepted in any year since the law was passed was 95,000.

The net result of all this has been to confront Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey and his 4,000 local draft boards with an embarrassment of riches. They are trying to enforce a law which envisions universal military service in a period when the Armed Forces are no longer interested in training every able-bodied youth, even for reserve duty. This dilemma has been solved—if such an expedient can be termed a solution—by rigging the manpower pool.

By Presidential order, all youths who become fathers before induction are automatically moved to the bottom of the call-up list. General Hershey can rightly say that they have not been exempted from the draft, because they are theoretically still classified 1–A. But with draft calls running at a level of 10,000 a month, there is no conceivable likelihood of their actually being called. About one youth out of six is beating the draft via this escape hatch.

Two young men out of every six are avoiding service on grounds of physical or mental unfitness. General Hershey suspects that some of them are deliberately flunking the mental examinations which are formulated and administered by the Army at induction stations. The flunk rate will almost certainly show a substantial rise in coming months as a result of a law, passed at the last session of Congress, which authorizes the Army to raise the present passing grade on mental tests. With an abundance of 1–A's awaiting call, local draft boards have been liberal in granting deferments to students and to vital workers in agriculture and industry. Anyone who gets such a deferment theoretically remains liable for induction until he is 35 years old. But by Executive order, men with this extended liability go to the bottom of the call-up list, along with the fathers, as soon as they turn 26. So the actual prospect of being inducted is virtually nil.

Other relatively small groups of youths are draft proof because they are clergymen, divinity students, aliens, public officials, conscientious objectors, or sole surviving sons of families bereaved by war. This brings us to an eye-opening fact:

Less than half of the young men in the draft age group are actually seeing military service under the present universal service laws.

The public is increasingly aware of this fact. That's why Congressmen, stumping the hustlings this fall, have heard so much grumbling about the unfair and discriminatory draft.

Meanwhile the draft is under heavy attack from another quarter. A growing body of Americans—including some business leaders—believe that the draft is an inefficient, and, in the long run, uneconomical way of filling military manpower needs.

These Americans have rallied around the professional forces concept outlined last year by a high-level Defense Department study committee. The committee was headed by Ralph J. Cordiner, then president and now chairman of General Electric Co., and included a number of other prominent business executives.

According to the committee, the real personnel problem in the Armed Forces today is quality rather than quantity.

"Strategy and tactics are undergoing radical change," the report said. "Yet strangely enough, the principles and practices which guide the recruitment, motivation, compensation and development of men have not changed substantially in the history of our country.

"It is foolish for the Armed Forces to obtain highly advanced weapons systems and not have men of sufficient competence to understand, operate, and to maintain such equipment.

"The solution is not to draft more men to stand back and look helplessly at the machinery. The solution is to give the men already in the Armed Forces the incentives to stay long enough and try hard enough to take on higher responsibilities."

Congress responded to the Cordiner report by enacting this year a military pay bill which granted raises of at least 6 percent to all men with more than 2 years' service, and which set up a brandnew proficiency pay system under which the services will henceforth offer incentive pay boosts, ranging up to $150 a month, for specialists and technicians.

Although this pay bill is expected to cut losses of highly skilled servicemen who have been trained at great expense, Pentagon leaders say emphatically that it will not eliminate the need for draft authority.

"The draft is still absolutely essential if we are to maintain the military strength levels that are necessary for national security," says Charles C. Finucane, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower.

Mr. Finucane says the Army has concluded, from extensive recent studies, that it could not maintain a strength of more than 535,000 men on the basis of voluntary enlistments alone. The Army's present authorized strength is 870,000 men.

While the Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps are now meeting all their requirements through voluntary enlistment, Mr. Finucane says these services admit that their success in recruiting has been at least partly due to the stimulus of the draft.

He adds that draft-inspired volunteers are also of crucial importance in keeping the National Guard and other Ready Reserve components up to strength.

Mr. Finucane agrees that professional armed forces, composed entirely of volunteers, would be vastly preferable to a partially conscripted military establishment.

Modern armed forces require increasingly larger proportions of technical and skilled manpower—jobs requiring extensive and expensive periods of training. We know that enlisting men voluntarily for 3, 4, or more years produces a more effective force at less cost than inducting them for 2 years. We have been trying for the past several years to make military service more attractive in order to increase our voluntary enlistment and reenlistment rates.

He ticked off some of the career incentive measures placed in effect during the past 4 years—improved survivor benefits, medical care for dependents, better housing, larger reenlistment bonuses, dislocation allowances on change of station, Government-guaranteed home loans, and better promotion opportunities.

As a result of these measures, Mr. Finucane says, reenlistment rates have improved appreciably. The average reenlistment rate for first-term regulars (the most critical retention group) rose from 15.7 percent in fiscal 1955 to 27 percent in fiscal 1958.

"We hope that all of these career incentive programs will eventually require less and less resort to compulsory military service," he says. "But it would be folly to abolish the draft next year in the mere hope that volunteer programs would do the job."

Outside the Pentagon, several proposals have been made for speeding the day when the services can rely entirely on professional volunteers.

One is to raise the starting pay of recruits, which the Cordiner pay bill left untouched at $78 a month.

Dr. J. K. Galbraith, Harvard economics professor, believes that the increases in basic pay required to attract much larger numbers of men to the Armed Forces would not be astronomic.

Another suggestion, from a study sponsored by the Fund for the Republic, is to make more widespread use of civilian personnel and civilian contractors in construction, procurement, warehousing, supply transportation, housekeeping and record-keeping operations, thereby reducing the need for men in uniform.

If one accepts the Pentagon position that some kind of draft law will continue to be necessary after mid-1959, the next question is what changes are needed to bring the law into reasonable conformity with actual military requirements and to make it more equitable in operation.

Here is where Defense Department manpower experts part company with General Hershey.

Defense officials are greatly concerned about the rising age level of inductees. In an effort to maintain the congressionally decreed concept of universality of service, draft boards are filling their quotas with the oldest eligibles on their lists. But as the pool of surplus 1–A's grows, the average age of the men being called creeps steadily higher. It is now about 22 years and 9 months. This is at least 3 years and 9 months past what the military regard as the prime age for recruits.

There is growing sentiment in the Pentagon for two fundamental changes in the law. They call for:

1. Reducing draft age limits so that a youth is liable to call-up for only about 2 years after his 18th birthday instead of remaining eligible until he is 26 (or until he is 35 if he gets a deferment).

2. Recognizing that the Armed Forces need only a fraction of the youths in the draft-age group, and selecting by lot those to serve.

These changes would achieve several results. They would insure the Army's getting the younger men it wants. They would ease public criticism that the present draft throws a pall of uncertainty over a youth's life for an intolerably long period. Finally, they would end the hypocrisy of the universal service slogan, and would put the selection of draftees on a basis that Americans have traditionally regarded as the fairest possible.

There is, however, one flaw. It is spotlighted by General Hershey's question to an interviewer:

"Are you going to have a real lottery • • • or a phony one?"

To General Hershey, a real lottery means actually inducting the man whose number comes up—unless he is found to be grossly unfit for any kind of service. It means wiping out the special categories—students, essential workers, fathers, etc.—and throwing all able-bodied men into the pool from which the choice would be made by lot.

General Hershey well knows that the Pentagon is likely to balk at such a lottery. What the Army manpower planners really want is to continue the present system of screening out all of the less desirable draft candidates—the fathers who would rate dependents' allowances, the men who may need a lot of dental care or arch-supporting shoes, the slow-learners who create problems for training instructors (just as they create problems for high-school teachers and shop foremen). The lottery would then be applied to those who are left.

In General Hershey's view, this would be just as discriminatory as the present system.

General Hershey acknowledges that the present draft setup is not ideal but he believes that many complaints voiced against it would disappear if the Defense Department would operate the 6-month-trainee program at the 250,000-men-a-year level authorized by Congress. This would soak up a lot of the surplus in the 1–A pool and slow the risk in the average age of inductees.

It would also, General Hershey says, provide the Nation with something that it needed badly at the time of the Korean war and may need again—a large reservoir of ready reservists who are trained but have not served.

Defense officials would prefer to move in the opposite direction if they could.

The 1955 law authorized a Ready Reserve of 2.9 million men, and provided elaborate arrangements for channeling into it, not only 6-months trainees, but draftees and enlistees at the conclusion of their active duty service. Provision was made for enforcing the obligation of ready reservists to participate in regular drill sessions, under penalty of being called to active duty or even being court-martialed.

This much-publicized paraphernalia for compelling service in the drilling Reserve has come to a rather farcical end. The plain fact is that the Armed Forces are unwilling to invest their limited defense dollars in a Ready Reserve force of the size Congress contemplated. Less than 1 million men are now on drill-pay status—which is the real criterion for determining who is in the quick call-up components of the Reserve. The Defense Department tried valiantly this year to reduce the total still further by making 10 percent cuts in National Guard and Army Reserve personnel drawing drill pay. But an uproar from State Governors and Congress blocked the move.

The situation at present is that the Ready Reserve components generally have more men who are eager to draw drill pay than they have vacancies. Once in a while they have to invoke the compulsory clause to avoid the ultimate scandal of a 6-month trainee abandoning the weekly drill periods which alone bring his service into rough balance with the draftee's 2 years of active duty. But there is little point in threatening to recall or court-martial a former draftee or enlistee who fails to keep up the 3 or 4 years of postgraduate drilling Reserve participation which ostensibly is required of him by the 1955 law.

Obviously, both the draft and Reserve laws have already been amended by history. The only question now is whether Congress will lend history a hand, and try to put our military manpower statutes on a fair and rational footing.

Merit and Public Service Long Unrecognized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the specialist, the politician, the successful businessman, the stage or picture celebrity, and many others, receive public acclaim through the press, radio, and TV.

Unfortunately for the youth of the land, we get comparatively little information about the activities or character of many individuals who render long, valuable, distinguished public service in a quiet manner.

Many an individual, trained in law, ignores the opportunity to become wealthy, attain fame by selling his talents in the open market. Many such a man accepts a judicial position, retires to judicial chambers, and there spends his life in the effort to bring equal justice under law to those who present issues to the court which he serves.

The law is said to be a jealous mistress. She demands the full attention and loyalty of those who serve her.

Those who benefit, because of the ability, the courage, and the determination of a judge, seldom recognize the service rendered.

Nor does the public often consider the loyalty, the patriotism; and the sacrifice of the judge who protects our freedom, insures opportunity to the average citizen.

The occasion for this comment is an editorial printed in the Dowagiac Daily News, Dowagiac, Mich., of January 27, 1959, and which reads:

The man on the cover of the Michigan State Bar Journal magazine this month is Raymond W. Starr, chief judge of the U.S. district court, western district of Michigan.

While Judge Starr and many of his counterparts are recognized for their value to American justice by those closely associated with courts outside of their own profession, their sacrifices, compassion and tremendous responsibilities are little known to the layman.

Judge Starr is one of the several Federal judges whose courts fell in our journalistic jurisdictions during our hectic and turbulent 25-year career, and the impressions he left are indelible.

A Federal judge is like a physician who works 18 hours a day. The only difference is that the judge can pick out what 18 hours he wants to work.

Judge Starr's ditsrict embraces 31 counties in western Michigan, including Cass County.

Even prior to World War II, the duties of a Federal judge were cumbersome. After that Federal judges were swamped with the addition of various new duties involving numerous Government agencies that sprang into existence such as the OPA, WPB, and others such as farm control programs.

It amazed us when Judge Starr was appointed to the bench in 1946 after serving 5 years as a member of the supreme court of Michigan. He rejected several lavish offers to go into private practice.

A mercenary-minded reporter asked him "Why?" He replied that he thought he could best serve his country on the Federal bench.

Judge Starr served on the board of control of Ferris Institute; was chairman of the Michigan Crime Commission, the Michigan Public Debt Commission; president of the Blodgett Home for Children, Michigan's Children's Aid Society and was a member of the so-called Little Hoover Commission prior to going on the bench.

One of his most important achievements was in 1911 when he established a legal aid service in connection with social welfare work. It was one of the first of its type in the United States.

Just to give you an idea how tough a job like that can be, Judge Starr studied chemistry nights for 6 months before he felt that he was ready to rule on an involved case.

About the only time we can remember when the soft-spoken, gray-haired, and dignified judge looked out of character was one day he was caught playing a pinball game in his chambers—black robes and all.

The reason—he had to rule on a patent case involving a pinball machine and wanted to study its operation.

It never was my privilege to appear in the Michigan State Supreme Court when Judge Starr was on the bench, though I did have the opportunity of appearing prior to that time before many a distinguished Michigan justice of the State supreme court.

I have read many of the decisions rendered by Judge Starr while a justice of that court and have noted some of the decisions he has made while serving as a Federal judge in the western district of Michigan.

He was a worthy successor to Judge Knappen, Judge Sessions—whom I served as office boy while he was with the firm of Smith, Nims, Hoyt & Erwin of Muskegon, and of Judge Raymond.

Not only the citizens of western Michigan but of a large section of the Midwest are indebted to Judge Starr for the exceptionally able, unselfish service which he has so quietly, so unobtrusively, rendered to them and to our people as a whole.

Can the Republican Elephant Be Whitewashed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, in the heart of the farm belt at Des Moines, Iowa, last week some very plain words were spoken by leading Republicans. The chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. Meade Alcorn, and other high officials in the Republican Party called for more leadership from the White House and also a statement of principles to define what the Republican Party stands for.

The Republican leaders cheered loudly when these suggestions were made.

At the Des Moines meeting, it was reported that Claude Robinson of the Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton, N.J., stated that surveys showed that the Republican Party is suffering from political anemia and can only be cured by strong medicine, that the Republican Party has come to be regarded as the party of the rich and privileged—the uppercrust—whereas the Democratic Party is regarded as the party of the common man, the masses.

It was further reported that Mr. Meade Alcorn agreed with Robinson's statements, and Mr. Alcorn added:

We must immediately undertake to change the false image of the Republican Party as the party of big business the party of the vested interest and so on. It's time we snatched off the big business false face that the Democrats placed on us years ago. It's time we erased the dollar signs painted on our vests.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party can try and try to put a coat of whitewash over its elephant, but the elephant will still look as though it were made of gold.

Many years ago P. T. Barnum advertised far and wide that he had imported a white elephant which he would present at the circus. Mr. Barnum got scores of newspapermen together and plied them with lots of liquor before he brought them out to view his white elephant. One of the journalists who never took a drink caught up with Mr. Barnum, however, and exposed the hoax when he scratched off some of the white paint with his fingernails. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the same thing will happen if the Republican Party tries to whitewash its elephant.

Mr. Speaker, it took great courage for Mr. Alcorn and the leaders of the Republican Party at Des Moines to speak out so forcefully, and to demand that the White House provide the country with some leadership. That is exactly what we Democrats have been saying for 6 years, but it takes courage for a Republican to speak up and confirm what we have been saying. Yesterday, one of our newspaper columnists wrote that there were rumors of a great revolutionary movement going on: now that Sherman Adams has left the White House, it is even rumored that President Eisenhower will seize power.

On November 4, 1958, an election was held. The voice of the people spoke. And it spoke in favor of action rather than drift, leadership instead of the Alphonse-and-Gaston approach, and an end to the part-time attention to full-time problems.

We Democrats in the 86th Congress intend to provide the leadership which the people of our country demand to carry out a program in the interest of all the people. And then in 1960 we will restore to our great country and the free world the leadership on the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue which we have not seen since Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.

G. Robert Dodson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, last December Brig. Gen. G. Robert Dodson, chief of staff of the Oregon Air National Guard, died, having been taken ill the previous summer while on field duty with the guard. This distinguished Oregonian and outstanding American has been memorialized by an article on his career which appeared in the magazine the National Guardsman for February 1959. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

IN MEMORIAM: G. ROBERT DODSON, BRIGADIER GENERAL, OREGON AIR NATIONAL GUARD, JULY 25, 1904–DECEMBER 18, 1958

Stricken while on duty at summer field training, the chief of staff of the Oregon Air National Guard, secretary of the National Guard Association of the United States, and chairman of the Air National Guard Section of the Air Staff Committee on Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Policy, died in Portland, Oreg.

Commissioned in the old Air Corps Reserve in 1938, General Dodson was appointed commander of the Oregon National Guard's 123d Observation Squadron in 1941. Entering active Federal service that same year, he commanded the 70th Observation Group and the 70th Tactical Reconnaissance Group, later commanding the 1st Liaison Group and the 3d Combat Cargo Group in the China-Burma-India Theater, and earning the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Air Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters.

As a colonel, he plunged into the postwar reorganization. His active participation in National Guard Association affairs stemmed from that time, also, with attendance at the first postwar general conference in 1946. He served on the Air Force's Air Section 5 Committee from 1951 until early 1954, and then again from 1956 until his death. Meantime, he also served on a number of National Guard Association committees—continuously on the former Air Advisory Committee and its successor, the Air Affairs Committee, from 1953 until late 1957, and on the executive council from 1955 until his election as the association's secretary in October 1957. Pilot of his private aircraft, General Dodson also held command pilot

rating, with nearly 4,000 hours of military flying time.

In civilian life, he was vice president of Jantzen Knitting Mills.

General Orders No. 111, December 19, 1958, issued by Maj. Gen. Thomas C. Rilea, The Adjutant General of Oregon, summed up General Dodson's life, and his death, in this manner:

"An officer and gentleman unexcelled, an irreplaceable leader, the loss of General Dodson in the prime of his life is a tragedy to the State and Nation. The standards he set and the course he followed will long serve as guideposts to the officers and men who have had the privilege of serving with him throughout his career."

Ike's Better Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is most heartening to note the favorable comment which has been expressed throughout the Nation in the form of editorials, articles, and general discussion concerning the President's labor reform bill. This is particularly impressive at this time because it points up the desire of the general public to obtain complete and effective labor-management legislation in the President's measure as compared with the noncontroversial and inadequate provisions of the Kennedy bill, which, as we all remember, failed to pass the House last session.

The two following editorials from today's Chicago Sun-Times and the Chicago Daily Tribune emphasize that it is imperative and mandatory for Congress to take the full step toward labor reform rather than half steps as proposed in the piecemeal Kennedy program.

The Sun-Times article, "Ike's Better Labor Bill," emphasizes the fact that responsible collective bargaining can be carried on with full protection to the rights and freedoms of workers and with adequate guarantees of the public interest, and can be secured by support of the administration's bill.

The Tribune story, "Diversionary Exercise," points up the attempt by the proponents of the Kennedy measure to divert the public spotlight from the shortcomings contained in that measure:

[From the Chicago-Sun-Times, Jan. 29, 1959]

IKE'S BETTER LABOR BILL

The big difference between President Eisenhower's antiracket labor bill, sent to Congress yesterday, and the bill of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, that was introduced last week is in their respective provisions concerning picketing.

Both bills contain provisions that would stop certain racket practices within some unions, especially the Teamsters Union. These provisions would undercut the power of James Hoffa and his hoodlum associates. They would, for example, make it illegal for such men to use union dues to build their own personal financial kingdoms. They would restore to union members control over their own affairs.

The Eisenhower bill goes further than the Kennedy bill regarding picketing. The Kennedy bill would ban only shakedown or extortion picketing, set up in the hope of getting a personal payoff. The AFL–CIO agrees that such picketing is clearly a crime but says it is punishable under State statutes.

The Eisenhower bill is written to outlaw other union activities that have been uncovered by the McClellan rackets committee—activities that have put some companies out of business because they refused to cave in to union demands. The Eisenhower bill would strengthen secondary boycott provisions of the Taft-Hartley law and would prohibit picketing to force an employer to recognize a union against the will of his employees.

KENNEDY concedes that these provisions deserve consideration by Congress but that they are so controversial they would bog down his bill in acrimonious debate and delay swift action against organized labor's Hoffas.

The Eisenhower picket and boycott provisions are controversial only because labor leaders oppose them. They fear that they could be used to hamper reasonable union activity.

The truth is, however, that the provisions have become necessary because some unions have been unreasonable and unfair in their dealings with employers—and with employees, too. They have brought about a need for the kind of legislation proposed by the President. Even Senator KENNEDY recognizes that there may be a justification for such legislation but he wants to delay an all-out argument about it until after he puts through his agreed-on, noncontroversial measure.

Certainly the legislation needed to curb the Hoffas should not be delayed or imperiled by arguments over legislation not directly concerned with racketeering unions. But, as we said last week, any bill designed to strike at the excesses of the Teamsters Union must contain prohibition against racket picketing, not just shakedown picketing.

If there is to be a battle in Congress over picketing law changes, then let us get on with it, the sooner the better. While the public wants union members protected from their racket leaders, the public wants businesses protected from them too. And this calls for protection against the kind of coercion, threats, and picket activity the Teamsters Union has used to force employers to do business with them or drive them out of business.

As the President said, his proposals will not impose arbitrary restrictions or punitive measures on the legitimate activities of honest labor and management officials. The McClellan committee files are filled with cases that cry out for legislative relief—cases honest labor union officials should not condone. They should support, not oppose, the Eisenhower bill.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 29, 1959]

DIVERSIONARY EXERCISE

Robert F. Kennedy, counsel for the Senate Rackets Committee, which has been digging into union abuses, announces that he has asked for a transcript of the Edward R. Murrow radio show, "The Business of Sex." This program, presenting testimony from disembodied voices, purported to show that prostitutes carried on company payrolls are used to influence clients to purchase goods from or sign contracts with the employing company.

The National Association of Manufacturers, anticipating a move of this sort, predicted that the principal beneficiary of the Murrow stunt would be the labor unions. It said that they desperately need something to divert the public spotlight from their own wrongdoings to the sins of business, even if, as in this case, the sins turn out in the end to be mostly a hoax."

Young Mr. Kennedy is, as is well known, the brother of Senator JOHN KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, who has been knocking himself out to get the Democratic nomination for President in 1960. He has been most scrupulous not to give offense to Walter Reuther and other union bosses and unquestionably would like to take the heat off this crowd, which wields great political clout. It certainly is handy to have brother Bob in a strategic spot, and, of course, sex is always good for attention.

Extension of Public Law 480

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

PROGRAM AUTHORITIES

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the President is recommending an extension of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, commonly described as Public Law 480, an authority we have used during the past 4½ years to make effective use of our agricultural abundance at home and abroad. All of us can take pride in the results achieved under this authority.

The four programs operating under Public Law 480 have moved, or will move shortly, agricultural commodities valued at about $7½ billion. Some of these programs supply commodities at the cost that the Commodity Credit Corporation has invested in them. Even so, the value of these commodities at world market prices exceeds $5½ billion.

The largest and most important program under Public Law 480 is the title I authority to sell commodities to friendly countries for foreign currencies. These sales are opening up markets in many countries, particularly those that are less developed, where the demand for American farm products is high, but where the dollars to make such purchases are extremely scarce.

Two donation programs are authorized. One permits the President to send CCC surpluses abroad to meet the needs of countries suffering from natural disasters such as drought or flood or other emergencies; the other donation program provides for the distribution of commodities from CCC stocks to needy persons in many countries of the world through United States voluntary relief agencies. And, of course, Public Law 480 is the law under which food is furnished to needy persons in the United States.

The fourth authority is the barter program by which we exchange CCC surpluses for strategic and other materials which may be stockpiled or used by U.S. Government agencies.

TITLE I FOREIGN CURRENCY SALES

More than 60 percent of total programing under Public Law 480 has come under title I, a unique approach to the use of U.S. farm production. This device has proved useful far beyond our original expectations. It has been largely responsible for expanding U.S. agricultural exports in recent years, thereby keeping large quantities of commodities from going into Government warehouses. It has increased farm income. And through the use of the foreign currency sales proceeds, it is contributing to the economic development of our friends and allies abroad.

Title I agreements already concluded provide for the sale of 800 million bushels of wheat, of which 600 million bushels have already been exported; 200 million bushels of feed grains, of which about 180 million bushels have been shipped; 3 billion pounds of fats and oils, such as soybean oil, of which 2.5 billion pounds have been shipped; 3.5 million bales of cotton, of which 3 million bales have been shipped; 29 million bags of rice, virtually all already shipped; 225 million pounds of tobacco, of which 190 million pounds have already been exported; 235 million pounds of dairy products, of which 185 million pounds have been shipped; and other commodities.

Program operations under the current authorization are moving along very well with signed agreements having committed about $800 million of the $2¼ billion authorization. These agreements were concluded since last September when the new authorization was made available to the Department of Agriculture. I understand from the Department that additional programs are being developed which will bring the total commitments to more than $1 billion very shortly.

These new agreements, plus unshipped quantities from previous authorizations, have enabled the Department to increase exports under the program during the first 6 months of this fiscal year substantially as compared with the same period of fiscal year 1958. During the first 6 months of this year, for example, title I has resulted in the exportation of about 100 million bushels of wheat, 40 million bushels of feed grains, 365 million pounds of soybean oil, and 45 million pounds of dairy products.

OTHER BENEFITS OF TITLE I

The commodity importance of title I is obvious. There are other important collateral benefits of the program. A substantial portion of the sales proceeds is loaned back to participating countries for projects which will develop the economies of these countries: electric powerplants, roads, distribution facilities, railroads, and similar basic improvements which are being made to raise standards of living, increase jobs, and in general accelerate economic development plans already started by many of the less fortunate countries in the world.

Under agreements concluded during the past 18 months up to 25 percent of the sales proceeds are loaned to private business firms, mostly U.S. firms, for business development or to establish facilities to increase the consumption of U.S. agricultural commodities. Loans to U.S. businessmen have been made, for example, in Mexico, Israel, and France and loan applications are now being reviewed for the use of currencies in many other countries.

The title I program also helps attain U.S. foreign policy and mutual security objectives. In certain countries currencies are made available for military assistance purposes and grants are being made to improve and expand health and education programs.

Not the least important is the use of currencies to develop markets for U.S. farm products. Millions of dollars in foreign currencies are being used in various ways to maintain and expand our markets throughout the world.

I know that the President can count on the support of the Congress for the extension and enlargement of Public Law 480.

The President's Farm Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give the strongest possible endorsement to the recommendations in this special message on agriculture. This is the fourth special message which the President has sent to the Congress during his tenure in office. It is a sound message. It is a constructive message.

These are critical times. The men in the Kremlin talk about their desire for a thaw in the cold war. But there is no evidence that the temperature of that conflict is rising by so much as one single degree.

We must keep our economy sound, strong, and vigorous. We must live within our income as a Nation. The recommendations of the President's farm message are a long step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned about the high cost of our farm programs. When the President tells us that the outlay for these stabilization programs this current fiscal year will be $5.4 billion, I am deeply concerned. And I think the American people should be, and are, also deeply concerned.

The net income of our farm operators last year was about $13 billion. In other words, these prices and income stabilization programs are currently equal to more than 40 percent of the net income earned by our farm operators. This is an alarming situation—a dangerous situation. It is a situation that the American people will find hard to understand.

If these costs were only temporary—if they were solving the problem—if they were leading to a better balance between supplies and markets—taxpayers would feel that such heavy costs were justified.

But we all know this is not the case. Under the old farm programs these costs are not only continuing year after year; they are continually rising.

Instead of solving the problem the programs under which these vast sums are being spent are creating additional problems. They are causing distortions throughout the agricultural economy. They are making agriculture more and more dependent on Government. More and more of our farm products are finding their way into Government warehouses—and a Government warehouse is not a market.

Instead of cutting down the surplus, the programs responsible for these heavy costs are leading to increased accumulations. The wheat surplus is now far larger than ever before and it is expected to go on increasing at least until the end of the 1960 fiscal year. The feed grain surplus is also at an all-time high.

By next July the Government will have an investment of over $9 billion in price supported farm commodities.

By the time the Government completes its takeover from last year's crops, it will have acquired—since January 1953—25 million bales of cotton and 2½ billion bushels of wheat.

This is a fantastic situation. Do the Members realize that 25 million bales of cotton is more than twice as much as our whole cotton crop last year? Do the Members realize that 2½ billion bushels of wheat is more than our 1957 and 1958 crops combined?

But even these figures do not tell the whole story.

Mr. Speaker, when the 1958 crops have come into Government ownership the cost for storage, interest, and other charges of managing the inventory of supported crops will exceed a billion dollars a year. Think of it. More than a billion dollars a year, not for price support loans to farmers, but simply for keeping these inventories. And we are told that unless fundamental changes are made, this annual cost of over a billion a year will rise.

We must move promptly toward sounder, more realistic, farm programs—toward farm programs that make sense. The President has wisely warned us against jumping from the frying pan into the fire by attempting programs that would be even more costly and dangerous.

We must not fall into the trap of direct payments. These would make our farm people dependent for much of their income on the Federal Treasury. Direct payments could cost from $7 billion to $10 billion a year.

Multiple price programs are also unsound. They would tax American consumers to permit the sale of farm commodities for feed and export at lower prices.

Let us be sound. Let us be realistic. We owe it to farmers and consumers alike. Let us adopt the President's recommendations.

Let's Save Our Historic Treasures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have this week introduced in the House a bill designed to save from destruction many historic buildings, landmarks, and works of art owned by the Government throughout the country. Such treasures continue to be threatened intermittently with demolition.

It is my privilege to sponsor this legislation jointly with my colleagues and friends, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT]. The bipartisan nature of this endeavor is particularly gratifying to me.

The bill has been referred for action to the House Committee on Public Works, on which I am privileged to serve, and I am confident of a sympathetic hearing in that committee. Similar legislation is being introduced in the other body by Senator CLARK.

The need for such legislation, Mr. Speaker, was first made evident by the protests of the Federal Commission on Fine Arts, the American Institute of Architects, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Studies by these groups and by others have made it obvious that literally thousands of the most priceless treasures of our national heritage have been plowed under and utterly destroyed by the bulldozers of a ruthless progress during the past few years. The tragedy is that in most such instances, the destruction was wholly unnecessary. The valuable historic objects could have been preserved without retarding progress.

We obviously should not permit this thoughtless and wanton destruction of these last relics of our past, because they provide, in many cases, the only visible links to connect us with periods of our own national history. They remind us of the greatness of our past, of the hardships endured by those who with such painstaking care laid the foundations of our history.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to cite just a few illustrations as examples of the thoughtless destruction of priceless edifices by various governmental agencies.

A number of historic buildings dating back to the Revolutionary period, including the ancestral homes of the Lee family of Virginia, are right now in danger of being obliterated to make way for the new Chantilly Airport. These homes should be preserved and if necessary relocated.

The old San Francisco Mint, one of the few buildings to survive the famous earthquake and fire of 1906, a classic building of great historic and architectural value, has been declared surplus by the General Services Administration. The site is wanted for a parking lot.

A historic Dutch mansion, built around 1790, was acquired by the Government along with the surrounding land on the Hudson River for a Veterans' Administration hospital. This building certainly could have been preserved on the site as a museum and used as a waiting cottage for visitors. Instead, it was sold to a wrecker for $32. The wrecker dismantled it, sold the facade for $3,200 and disposed of the remainder in piecemeal sales.

A number of extremely ancient Indian pueblos, probably dating to a prehistoric period, have been destroyed in the path of bulldozers on highway work throughout the Southwest, notably in New Mexico. One is reminded of the supposed American visitor to Pompeii. The dynamic fellow's only remark, upon viewing the ruins, was "just think how fast a few bulldozers and razing cranes could level this outfit and let them start all over."

Only a very few of the remaining log cabins in Texas have been preserved, and the rate at which they are going out of the picture may leave us without adequate links to our western frontier.

I certainly do not want to stay the hand of progress, Mr. Speaker, nor retard the necessary developments of our advancing civilization, but I do feel that progress can and should move forward with an eye to saving the truly valuable and inspirational remains of our proud past.

This bill would direct the Administrator of the GSA, the real estate arm of the Government, and the Secretary of the Interior to preserve such objects when they come into the Government's possession. I respectfully petition the support of my House colleagues in this worthy effort.

Federal-City Relations Vital to Whole National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, not long ago the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] made a most interesting and provocative speech at the Boston convention of the American Municipal Association. The story was carried as the opening article in the January issue of the Alabama Municipal Journal, one of the very best publications of its kind in America.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL-CITY RELATIONS VITAL TO WHOLE NATIONAL ECONOMY

(By Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK)

I propose to speak today about some aspects of what seems to be emerging more and more clearly as the central issue of our public life. That central issue is whether the United States is going to come to grips with the great problems of the nation and the world, and master them—or whether we are going to fumble the ball.

Every city official in this room knows what our problems are. They are recognized, identified, admitted. They are just not being mastered.

PROBLEMS ARE NOT MASTERED

What are some of them?

National security is the most important.

The Soviet Union has attained a faster momentum than we in the race for modern weapons. That fact is recognized, identified, admitted—but not dealt with.

The Communists are making tremendous gains in their campaign to drive Western influence out of Africa and Asia. That problem is recognized, identified, admitted, but not dealt with.

Education is the next critical problem. The deterioration of our public schools, the inadequacy of our higher educational facilities, the decline of the teaching profession, our primitive failure even to build enough classrooms, the fact that hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of boys and girls who would profit from a college education won't get it, all this is recognized, identified, admitted—but it is not being mastered.

ECONOMIC SECURITY A PROBLEM

Personal economic security is a pervasive problem. The poverty of our retired citizens; their total inability, for example, to pay for medical care; the collapse last year of our unemployment compensation system—these problems are known, recognized, and admitted—yet not dealt with.

City slums are a problem every mayor knows, one that is visible, tangible, measurable, yet they are getting worse, not better, every year.

The crisis in school desegregation, the twin problems of recession and inflation, the great problems arising from metropolitan growth, of declining central cities and suburbs without adequate public services, of water resources inadequately conserved, of traffic and transportation strangulation, all these are known, recognized, admitted, but not grappled with and mastered.

LOCKED IN A COMPETITION

And so it goes. We suffer from a paralysis in our public life. The scope of our action is determined not from a forthright analysis of the facts which all admit, but by preconceived limitations growing out of inertia, timidity, and outmoded thinking.

Perhaps time was when we could sit like Ferdinand the bull smelling flowers under a tree and still survive. But that time has gone forever. We are locked in a competition with the Soviet Union and Red China in which our very existence as well as the survival of the good society is at stake. Our adversaries can mobilize their resources in ways we can't and wouldn't if we could. We must find alternative ways of mobilizing our own resources, or the ways of freedom will be lost in a universal state ruled by international gangsters.

ALARMING SIGNS OF SOFTNESS

Let us start from the frank assumption that we may not win this fight. Twenty earlier civilizations have risen, flourished, grown soft, and been overrun by brutality and tyranny. Nor need we look far to see

alarming signs of softness in America. The self-indulgence, the emphasis on luxuries, the juvenile—and adult—delinquency, the lack of self-discipline, the tendency to sweep hard facts under the rug, the unwillingness to ask the people for any sort of sacrifice—all these are danger signs.

But against these danger signs there are indications of some hope. Please believe that I do not speak as a partisan politician when I say that one such sign was the result of the last election.

A PROFOUND PUBLIC DISCONTENT

That the election returns indicate a profound public discontent with the way things are going seems clear beyond doubt. The people voted for candidates of both parties who look to the future and not the past, who represent and promise action rather than more complacency and inertia. The men who won are not happy about present day America.

The election was not a mandate to stand still. It was a mandate to move forward. It was a mandate to political leaders to get on top of our problems, to master them, to take control of our destiny.

Now, what stands in the way?

The answer we always get—whether the issue is national defense, or mutual security, or education, or housing, or urban renewal, or social security, or the development of Asia and Africa is, "We can't afford it," or "We must cut costs and balance the budget."

OUR PROBLEMS COST MONEY

Now let me admit that most, although not all, of the problems that confront us do cost money. And let me also state my own strong belief that governmental budgets at all levels, local, State, and national, should be brought into balance.

So the issue of whether we master our problems becomes, in concrete form, the issue of taxation and public spending. And that, as Walter Lippmann has said, will be the great debate of 1959.

I want to enter that debate by chopping away some of the folklore that surrounds the subject of public spending. Perhaps no topic in our time, has been the victim of so much nonsense. If we can dispel the nonsense and the fallacies, then we can put the Federal budget, as well as your city budgets, not only in perspective, but in balance and we can get ahead with the job that needs to be done.

FIVE MAIN FALLACIES

There are five main fallacies.

Fallacy No. 1 is that private spending is inherently good and public spending inherently bad—and therefore public spending should always be minimized and private spending increased to the maximum the gross national product will permit.

This fallacy is assiduously cultivated by conservative molders of opinion. The word "government" is equated with other nouns having an evil connotation—such as "waste," "extravagance," "socialism," "bureaucracy." Taxes are never referred to except as a burden. Private spending is described with fair-sounding words, such as "enterprise," "free," "competitive." The semantics are all wrong.

This is a pernicious tendency. Taxation and public spending are the means by which we divide resources between the public and private sectors of the economy. Those activities which are in the public sector are there not because they are naughty and ought to be destroyed, but because they are essential and cannot be adequately performed by private enterprise.

EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT

Activities in the private sector are there not because they are necessarily good and useful, but merely because they are not illegal and can be conducted at a profit.

There is, unfortunately, often extravagance in Government services, but I suspect that objective appraisal would show more in private business. Just compare, for example, the luxurious motor cars of today with the inadequate highways on which they must move; compare the extravagance of our country clubs with the spartan character of State and national parks; compare the lavishly appointed corporation and national labor union headquarters with our disgracefully rundown public buildings; compare the compensation of TV entertainers with that of great schoolteachers. We can only conclude that the private sector is comparatively plush and the public sector relatively starved. Indeed, as Prof. J. K. Galbraith has recently pointed out, the private sector of our economy is so plush that to get the private product purchased requires the strenuous efforts of huge advertising firms to create synthetic wants and needs that people do not even know they have. There is no problem at all, on the other hand, in identifying huge backlogs of essential public services for which we appear unwilling to pay the price.

WE MUST DIVERT RESOURCES

If the distribution of our national resources is to reflect the true value judgment of the American people, we must divert resources not from Government to private spending but in exactly the opposite direction.

Fallacy No. 2 is that the Federal Government is crushing the people and endangering the economy with a growing burden of taxes, expenditures, and debt, and that this threatens the health of our free enterprise system.

What is overlooked, of course, is that the ability to carry taxes and debt is related to income. Other things being equal, a man making $10,000 can pay at least twice as high taxes and carry without hardship twice as large a debt as a man making $5,000. And the same is true of the country as a whole. And taxes, expenditures, and debt are actually less today—as a proportion of gross national product—than at the end of World War II.

RATIO OF DEBT TO PRODUCT

In 1945, our gross national product was $213.6 billion, while the public debt was $278.7 billion. The ratio of the debt to the gross national product was 130 percent. In 1957, gross national product had risen to $440.3 billion, and the national debt had declined to $275 billion. The ratio of the debt to the gross national product was 63 percent.

Our debt is accordingly less than half as burdensome to the country as it was 12 years ago. Total debt has been almost stable, since the war, while the gross national product has more than doubled. The fact is that we could, if necessary, more than double our national debt and not be in any more peril of national bankruptcy than we were with the debt we carried without alarm or danger in 1946. Fortunately it isn't necessary.

TAXES PROPORTIONATELY LOWER

Similarly, Federal taxes, as a proportion of national product, are less now than they were 10 years ago, or 5 years ago, or 3 years ago. If people were going to be crushed by our present tax load, they would have been crushed long since. Lower taxes are always desirable, of course, when national needs are being met, but let us not say that there is a compelling economic necessity for reducing them. There just isn't.

This is a growing country. Our population is rising. The public services required by urbanization and national security are growing. Our civilization is becoming constantly more complex. States and localities are increasingly incapable of meeting new and growing needs. Naturally, the Federal Government should grow too. The Federal budget should rise. Given normal growth in our economy, it can increase by $3 to $4 billion annually with no change in the tax rates and no increase in the real burden—which gives us considerable room for expanding public services. And, if our public services need more than that—which I suspect they do—we can get most of it without raising tax rates by closing the outrageous tax loopholes which have made our Federal Internal Revenue Code a veritable sieve.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING NOT INFLATIONARY

Fallacy No. 3 is the notion that Federal spending is inflationary. Government spending is no more inflationary than private spending—provided the Government balances its budget. Deficit spending can be inflationary, of course, but even this is the case only when demand for goods and services exceeds supply, a condition which does not exist today.

Industry is far below capacity and unemployment is far above what it should be.

Our recent inflation arose from causes other than Federal spending. The Federal budget is being made the scapegoat by those who seize on any argument to stop Government programs which they have always opposed.

WHOSE FOOT SHOE IS ON

Fallacy No. 4 is that all Federal expenditures are alike. If a private bank makes a loan that is called an investment; if the Small Business Administration makes a loan, that is called spending. If a private power company builds a dam that is called investment; if TVA builds a dam that is called spending. One would have thought that this businessman's administration might have introduced business concepts into Government bookkeeping, but they have not done so. It may be that for bookkeeping purposes, we must continue to lump all accounts of Government disbursements together. But there is no reason why intelligent people, for purposes of public discussion, should not distinguish between operating expenses, loans which create accounts receivable, and investments which are offset by created assets, just as corporations make this distinction and just as municipalities distinguish between current and capital budgets.

SHOVING FUNCTIONS BACK TO STATE

Fallacy No. 5 is the notion that if the Federal Government shoves its functions back to the States and cities this constitutes economy. It is not economy at all if the functions are performed. The question then becomes simply which taxing system is used, and which administrative structure is employed.

There are good reasons for decentralizing administration. But that does not mean the financial burden should be thrown back on the States and cities too. The Federal tax system is far superior in justice and efficiency to those of State and local governments, and there is great merit in using it for urban functions. Taxpayers cannot threaten to flee the Nation, as they can and do the city and State. The Federal tax burden falls evenly across the land, based in large part on ability to pay. There is every reason to use it in preference to State and local systems where the choice exists.

I shall oppose proposals to turn Federal functions back to the States and cities. This would result in crippling essential functions. Important services now being rendered would be abandoned. An unjust tax system would be substituted for a better one.

I will press for Federal help in new fields, especially education. I hope the mayors of America will join me in these stands as they have done so effectively in the past.

The Federal Government must give greater, not less, support to the urban areas of America, because the great domestic problems of the second half of the 20th century are urban problems. We are no longer an agricultural society.

NO DEPARTMENT FOR CITIES

This brings me to my final point. A visitor from outer space, looking at the structure of our Federal Government, would conclude that America is still a rural nation. We have a Department of Agriculture, which devotes itself to the problems of the farm. We have a Department of Interior which reflects the interests and needs of the more-sparsely settled States. But there is no department with responsibility for the problems of the tens of millions of people living in forced congestion in sprawling metropolitan areas—one of which stretches unbroken all the way from Portland, Maine to Alexandria, Va. City people, too, need an advocate in Washington.

To illustrate: The Senate became disturbed last year about the plight of the Nation's railroads. The Department of Commerce was concerned; so was the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Commerce Committee of the Senate has a standing subcommittee with jurisdiction over railroads. So it organized a study.

Those of us who have been worried about a related problem—namely, the plight of the commuter and the deterioration of mass transit in the cities—tried to make sure that urban mass transit problems would be covered in the general study that was organized. The answer was "No." States rights intervened.

MASS TRANSIT A REAL PROBLEM

No department of the Government has any interest in what should be done about commuter transportation services. No committee or subcommittee of the Congress has any jurisdiction.

Yet you know that mass transit is not merely a State and local problem. Much of the traffic crosses State lines. Some of the railroads involved serve many States. Let's face it, State and local governments are incapable of dealing successfully with this problem in most localities—just as urban renewal was generally beyond their competence until the Federal Government stepped in to help.

Maybe the ultimate answer is that mass transit should not be a Federal problem, even in part. Maybe the same applies to air and stream pollution, and water supply. But what concerns me most is that, at the present time, we have no mechanism even for examining such problems comprehensively and making intelligent national decisions.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

I believe the first step should be the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs at Cabinet level with the responsibility of keeping abreast of urban and metropolitan problems and developing recommendations for Federal, State, and local action. The Department would represent the urban viewpoint in the administration of nationwide programs which particularly affect cities and their suburbs, notably, highways and water conservation. It would be assigned initially, at least, only those operating programs which are peculiarly urban, and these are clustered already in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. But the Department, to my mind, would be something far beyond the present HHFA. The additional element would be a hunting license to study, research, and recommend, and a responsibility to listen to representatives of groups like this one, understand their problems, and reflect that understanding in the policy forming processes within the executive branch. Urban extension is a procedure and a program we could well adopt from our agricultural friends.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS EVOLVE

I have seen the criticism that a new department should not be formed until a philosophy of Federal-State-local relations is developed and agreed upon as the new department's basis. Personally, I think the logic points in just the opposite direction. Governmental philosophies do not spring full blown into being; they evolve. But they cannot evolve unless someone in government has responsibility for thinking creatively about them. We will get the philosophy far quicker if we establish the mechanism first.

Some of us in the Senate who are former mayors put in a bill 2 years ago to create a new Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. We will do so again in January, and I hope the mayors of America will make the enactment of this bill an important policy objective and give us their full support as we attempt to push this bill through the various stages on the long road toward enactment.

German Cartels Rebuilding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, on January 7 I introduced H.R. 1345 which would permit the sale of vested enemy assets by the Attorney General with the proceeds to be held pending final outcome of litigation as to ownership.

The largest single property in the alien property problem is the General Aniline & Film Corp. There are many strong arguments against the return of GAF to its onetime German ownership. One of these is mentioned in a recent letter to the editor of the New York Times by Mr. Arthur W. Rhodes of Darien, Conn. I invite the attention of my colleagues to this letter pointing out that there is ample evidence of a rebirth of industrial cartels centered in Germany. My bill would insure that GAF does not return to become a component of a German cartel, but it offers assurance that the claimants eventually determined as owners by the courts would receive adequate compensation.

The letter follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 21, 1959]

CARTEL REBIRTH FEARED—RECENT STEEL MERGER VIEWED AS SIGN OF RELAXING CURBS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Approval of the merger of two large steel companies in Germany by the high authority of the European Coal and Steel Community is cause for alarm.

According to the account of Sydney Gruson in the New York Times of January 7, "One of the allies' painfully achieved deconcentration orders against big German industry * * * has apparently been jettisoned."

These orders were issued in 1946, when memories of the disastrous effects of the international cartels were still vivid. The deadline for Herr Krupp, head of the industrial family, to dispose of large sections of his holdings was March 1959. To permit the purchase of additional industry is a complete reversal of the original order. Why scrap these painfully achieved curbs now?

Certainly we welcome a strong and free Germany as a NATO ally. But we do not welcome the rebirth of international cartels. The files of the Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice contain ample evidence of the dangers of permitting industrialists of any country to gain too great a control of the world economy. International cartels can control prices, production, and distribution of vital goods. The cartels can then manipulate the economy according to their own desires.

GERMAN OBJECTIVES

There are evidences that the German industrial empire is rebuilding. In November 1958, the 10-year-old case to sell General Aniline & Film Corp. was given a new legal complication. As an out-of-court settlement appeared likely, the German I. G. Farben interests came out in the open to claim that Interhandel, the former owner, was an instrumentality of Farben. This maneuver has striking similarities to the incidents reported by Joseph Borkin in the book, "Germany's Master Plan," by Joseph Borkin and Charles A. Welsh (1943). American business ethics, our democratic procedures, and the justice of our courts have been used whenever it is convenient to foster the primary objective—German control of the world economy.

There appears to be no lack of concern and effort on the part of our Government to restrict monopoly powers and mergers of U.S. companies. The many companies that have pending antimerger cases against them portend no letup in the trust-busting activity in this country. Cannot this same type of vigilance be applied by the allied control council to West German business?

We should have learned that German cartels are of vital concern to our national security and world security. Surely those people who formulate the policy and enforce the orders of the allied control council are aware of the facts of economic history. Can there be a reasonable explanation for this reversal of policy?

ARTHUR W. RHODES.

DARIEN, CONN., *January 17, 1959.*

Code of Ethics of the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, according to reports of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the Federal Government allocated to the States for schools, hospitals and civil defense last calendar year property which originally cost $334,109,167. This was made possible pursuant to Public Law 61 which I introduced in the 84th Congress. Under this law the various States are required to designate a responsible State agency to operate the program in the State to insure fair allocation to many institutions, etc. The State agency representatives have organized themselves into a national association known as the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property—NASASP. This organization has been most helpful to the Congress in presenting the problems and the needs of the States with respect to the donable program.

At the national meeting of the association in San Francisco in July, 1957 I suggested to the association that since

the donable program had now reached such large proportions that the group might consider the adoption of a code of ethics under which it would voluntarily operate. Since that time the group has given much thought to this matter and I am in receipt of an excellent code which they have recently adopted. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, place the wording of the code in the RECORD at this point:

CODE OF ETHICS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE AGENCIES FOR SURPLUS PROPERTY

We, the members of this National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property, do ordain and declare that this code of ethics is a true expression of the desires, attitudes, and objectives which govern the activities of all representatives of State agencies for surplus property. We, the members of this association, further proclaim that we will give first consideration to the expressed purposes of this association's constitution and the beliefs, purposes, and principles of this code of ethics.

BELIEFS

Excess Federal property, before being declared surplus, should be utilized to the fullest extent practicable in these United States of America by the Federal Government.

Once property has been declared surplus to the needs of the Federal Government, the highest and best secondary utilization is by public and private organizations of this Nation that are dedicated to the education, training, health, civil protection, and safety of our people.

Only after these requirements have been satisfied should surplus property be disposed of by other means.

PURPOSES

We dedicate ourselves to the purpose of accomplishing the will of Congress through fairr, honest, and unbiased execution of the duties and responsibilities entrusted to us. Fully recognizing the responsibility that is ours, we accept the call of duty with a sense of humility, and with the firm resolve to give our best efforts at all times to those tasks that are inherent in the surplus property utilization program.

PRINCIPLES

Individually as members and collectively as an association, we subscribe unreservedly to the following principles to motivate and guide us in the proper conduct of the affairs of the surplus property utilization program:

To be guided by honor, honesty, and integrity in order that we may merit the respect and confidence of our associates and the public whom we serve.

To hold as dishonest any personal gain or profit obtained through abuse of our public trust.

To decline personal gifts or gratuities which might influence strict impartiality that must prevail in all business relations.

To foster and promote fair, ethical, and legal business practices; to measure each transaction on its own merit; and to grant all eligible organizations equal consideration.

To conduct all public relations and business affairs without prejudice; and to disavow all political, religious, or racial bigotry, or bias.

To be willing to submit any major controversies to arbitration.

To respect the policies of our immediate superiors, and to advise them on problems and progress of the program.

To counsel and cooperate with our membership; to subscribe to the association's objectives; to respect State boundaries in the screening of property; and to promote a spirit of unity among member States.

To promote the maximum utilization of surplus property through an educational program for all eligible organizations.

To maintain minimum service charges by the elimination of all unnecessary practices and procedures that do not directly benefit those we serve.

To accord prompt and courteous treatment to those transacting legitimate business missions.

To recognize and appreciate the total problem of surplus property disposal; and for this purpose to cooperate with Federal holding, custodial and disposal agencies.

To maintain professional attitudes at all levels of State agency service.

Tour of Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, Philadelphia is a historic city, with many interesting places and monuments. So often, however, visitors to our city have only a limited time to sightsee and can cover only some of the highlights.

To them particularly I commend the tour recommended by the distinguished political columnist, John C. Calpin. His recent article appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin. He recommends a 2-hour tour by car of about 25 miles whereby one will see some of old and new Philadelphia.

The article follows:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Jan. 4, 1959]

SIGHTS OF OUR CITY—TWENTY-FIVE-MILE TOUR TAKES 2 HOURS AND IS WORTH EVERY MINUTE OF IT

(By John C. Calpin)

Many Philadelphians, it is said, have never seen Independence Hall. Also, many people do not know city hall, except as that tall building in the wide space where Broad and Market Streets meet.

Others, secure in their own neighborhoods, have not seen many other points of interest. There have been so many changes in recent years that most anyone who is interested could see things to their advantage—even those who come into town every day to work.

To someone with 2 hours to spare and an automobile to drive or to be driven, a tour of old and new Philadelphia could be covered by traveling only about 25 miles.

Start at city hall, where the tower is open the 5 week days during the winter. There is no other view like it in Philadelphia. Even a tour of the city hall offices would be worthwhile.

SKATING RINK, TOO

Across the street is Penn Center, stretching from 15th Street to 18th Street and containing new, modern office buildings, a transportation center, a hotel, a concourse shopping center, landscaped courts and a skating rink.

Going north on 20th Street to the parkway, one finds the north triangle area, which was cleared by the Redevelopment Authority, and on which 4 buildings with 971 apartments are just about completed. The cost is over $16 million. This adds further majesty to the view out the Benjamin Franklin Parkway and also from the west.

Cross over the Spring Garden Street Bridge and the next stop could be the Powelton area, which once contained many of the best homes in the city, but which now is seedy and rundown. The feature here is the effort to restore the homes rather than raze them and start all over again.

Site clearance is only one way to fight blight, and there will be more effort to save what is salvageable. The Powelton area will be one of the tests.

EDUCATIONAL CENTER

Next, turn down 34th Street to our educational center south of Chestnut Street. It combines the University of Pennsylvania and Drexel Institute of Technology. Part of it, for the time being, is a rubble heap, where hundreds of houses and buildings have been torn down to make way for more college buildings.

Football fans for generations have been going to Franklin Field, and in recent years the Palestra has been one of the Nation's basketball centers.

Hundreds of thousands of people have been in the Convention Hall, but not one-tenth of them took the time to go to Commercial Museum, next door, where the amazing Philadelphia panorama is on view. This display of city planning could well be the finest in the world. The University of Pennsylvania Museum also is worth anyone's visit. As a view of one of the greatest hospitals in the world, there is Philadelphia General.

From here go south on Vare Avenue to Passyunk Avenue, seeing along the way, some of the city's big industrial plants. Go out Passyunk Avenue to Essington Avenue and then south on Island Road.

EASTWICK PROJECT

This brings you to the Eastwick section, where one of the biggest efforts in the world will be made to reclaim an area for both residential and industrial use. On 2,500 acres there are 1,600 substandard homes. Private groups will develop it. The work is underway and the city has just let a contract for the pumping of 9 million cubic yards of fill for the lowlands.

At the southwestern tip of the city lies the new Tinicum Wildlife Preserve of 140 acres. So far, 230 species of birds have been sighted at the preserve. During the spring and fall migrations, it is an important feeding place for waterfowl who use the Atlantic flyway.

Coming back to the east, there is the International Airport, one of the busiest and best equipped along the Atlantic coast. The visitors gallery is always open.

OUR FOOD CENTER

Returning along Penrose Avenue through the area of the oil tank farms the trip switches to Pattison Avenue to the Food Center, which is being built to replace antiquated Dock Street and the produce market. It will bring better, cheaper, and more sanitary food to the people of the entire region.

To the south is League Island Navy Yard, and to the north, the $85 million Walt Whitman Bridge, which was called, when opened, the most beautiful bridge in the world. About 17,500,000 vehicles already have crossed it.

Heading north along Delaware Avenue one sees a small part of the city's waterfront, including piers 38 and 40, which have been rebuilt into a general cargo pier. Three ocean-going ships can be accommodated at one time.

Between Lombard Street and Market, and from the river to about Eighth Street, plans are underway for restoration of the "Old City"—nearly 300 years old. The restoration, by private individuals, was triggered by the work on Independence Mall.

Entire blocks of the Society Hill-Washington Square section will be restored to their historical character. The area could become one of the most desirable in the city.

The section around Independence Hall, Independence Square, and 18 additional acres has become the Independence National Historical Park. The State has improved the section as a mall, north to the Benjamin Franklin bridge plaza. The Federal Government has appropriated millions for the work, under the urging of a committee headed by former Judge Edwin O. Lewis.

By 1963, about $17 million will have been expended.

These are only a few of the things worthy of seeing and cover only the southern section.

On This Thy Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Frederick J. Forell, D.D., executive secretary of the Emergency Committee for German Protestantism has called to my attention a solemn and moving appeal by the Right Reverend Bishop D. Otto Dibelius, Lutheran Bishop of Berlin, in which the bishop called for the daily prayers of the people of Berlin to save the city from the catastrophe of Communist control and for freedom for all the people of Germany.

Bishop Dibelius' sermon was delivered in his cathedral, the Marien-Kirche, in East Berlin under the very noses of the Communist oppressors, on the second advent Sunday, December 7, 1958. Bishop Dibelius has long stood out as a symbol of Christian courage in the face of the Communist conspiracy to destroy religious values in the lives of the people of Germany and, indeed, in the entire world. Coming at this crucial time in the struggle for the control of men's minds and hearts, as symbolized by the current crisis threatening the freedom of West Berlin, I believe that it is highly important that the people of the free world be aware of and join in the crusade of prayer for which the heroic bishop pleads as with the voice of a prophet of old. I, therefore, ask that his sermon, with an accompanying foreword by Merwin K. Hart of the National Economic Council, be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today at the conclusion of these remarks. The honest, pious prayers of a truly religious people would have prevented the destruction of the city of Jerusalem which Jesus foresaw and over which He wept. Let us take our lesson from that terrible story and pour forth our prayers in a mighty torrent to the throne of the Almighty so that Berlin, Germany, and the entire free world may be saved from such a righteous judgment.

FOREWORD

Public affairs and Christianity are closely knit. Seldom has this been more apparent than in the critical situation in Berlin today.

Here in our Christian country in the days ahead, as in Berlin, Christianity and personal liberty are going to survive together or go down together.

In recent months the Soviet authorities in East Germany have put into effect a rule that no person who adheres to the Christian faith may enter high school or university, thus condemning any youth, no matter how great his talent, who refuses to conform to Soviet edict to become an artisan or fieldworker.

By agreement among the United States, Britain, France, and Russia, following World War II, the Berlin area was divided into four sectors, and control of a sector was assigned to each of those countries. The sectors assigned to the United States, Britain, and France, like all of West Germany, have made an amazing recovery. But, aside from the narrow strip containing the street called Stalin Allee, East Berlin has continued largely in ruins.

A few weeks ago Khrushchev suddenly demanded that the other three powers get their forces out of Berlin. There is much evidence that Soviet Russia will this time not relent. Meanwhile, the United States, Britain, and France have refused to yield an inch.

We are assured by close German contacts that the loss of Berlin to the West would be a catastrophe psychologically, and might lead to the loss of all Germany and perhaps all Europe. On the other hand, there is some reason to believe that there are such weaknesses in the Soviet setup that Khrushchev believes his only safety lies in striking a blow now, such as this proposed attempt to seize Berlin.

One of the greatest men of our time is 78-year-old Otto Dibelius, Protestant Bishop of Berlin and Brandenburg, and holder of honorary doctorates from Yale, St. Andrews, Toronto, and other universities. Till he was absolutely forbidden a few weeks ago, he continued to preach throughout East Germany, and brought courage and comfort to millions in that unhappy land.

On a recent visit to Berlin, as vice president of the Emergency Committee for German Protestantism, I spent an hour with the bishop in his Berlin home. Like everyone who has met him, I was greatly impressed with this great Christian. With Adenauer, he has been a pillar of strength, not only to Germany but to the whole Christian world.

On Sunday, December 7, Bishop Dibelius preached in his cathedral in the eastern sector of Berlin. In his sermon, given below, he calls for 10,000 Berliners to pray daily for the saving of the German people.

Washington prayed at Valley Forge. At Benjamin Franklin's suggestion, when the Constitutional Convention was deadlocked, the members turned to prayer. We have no greater weapon in this present German crisis.

We of the National Economic Council, believing deeply in the efficacy of prayer where offered in the name of Christ, urge all Americans to join the Berliners in their prayers.

We urge all priests and ministers, Catholic and Protestant, to lead their congregations in this plea to the Almighty for the people of Germany. We ask them to secure from their flocks pledges to pray daily; and to forward the pledges to Rev. Dr. Frederick J. Forell, executive secretary of the Emergency Committee for German Protestantism, at 325 Central Park West, New York 25, N.Y. That will enable Dr. Forell to let Bishop Dibelius know that Americans care.

(The following translation from the German is by his son, Rev. Dr. George W. Forell, of Chicago.)

MERWIN K. HART.

ON THIS THY DAY

"When Jesus was come near, He beheld the city, and wept over it, saying: If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace. But now they are hid from thine eyes." (Luke 19: 41–42.)

"Was this fellow Jesus also for peace?" This was the question which a cabdriver asked his passenger here in East Berlin in the course of a conversation; for he had noticed the passenger was a minister. This cabdriver had apparently only the vaguest notion about Jesus Christ, and he was only able to think in terms of the slogans with which political propaganda blankets our people day after day.

"Was this fellow Jesus also for peace?"

Yes, indeed, He was for peace. When He beheld His Jerusalem and realized that soon this city would be rubble and ashes as the result of a cruel war, His eyes were filled with tears. The Gospel reports only twice that Jesus wept. Once He wept at the tomb of Lazarus where He was overcome by the fearful power which death holds over the life of men. Here we read: "Jesus wept." (John 11: 35.) The other time was in this passage where He thought of the judgment over His Jerusalem. He was always for peace.

But, of course, this was not an outward peace where for a time atomic weapons are scrapped and guns put away only to await the next opportunity when one will use them again. And meanwhile one expresses hostility by means of the weapons of the cold war. Christ's concern was a peace which descends from God's forgiveness into the hearts of men. This peace changes their attitudes and finally makes the very thought impossible that human beings and brothers should shoot at each other, knowing that others are just as close to God's heart as they are themselves.

Indeed, He was for peace. This is what He lived for. To bring this peace into the hearts of men, He went to the cross.

But mankind was not interested in this kind of peace. In the prologue to the Gospel of St. John, we read the sad sentence: "He came unto His own and His own received Him not." (John 1: 11.) These words are a summary of the entire life and suffering of our Saviour from that day on until now. "He came unto His own and His own received Him not."

To be sure, nobody wanted war. Whenever war came mankind felt sorry for themselves and nobody would take the responsibility. But they did not want to be bothered with the things which belong to peace. They did not want to prepare for the change necessary in man as he is now in the event that the dark threat of war should ever disappear from this world. They wanted to eat and to drink, and were willing to accept a little anxiety in the intermissions. To change their lives was far too inconvenient. In fact, to this day, this is too inconvenient. Men still say: "Whatever will be, will be. Better not think of it. This is all that is left to us." This is what they still say in Berlin today.

But it seems to me that in the case of most people, the soul announces its presence from time to time. Perhaps only very quietly, but the soul, the very soul they wanted to suppress, speaks up. "Can we live like this? Can we be so shallow and irresponsible?"

Boris Pasternak's Dr. Zhivago says: "No man can do violence to his soul for very long without suffering the penalty."

And because this is a fact, man is ever and again confronted by the question: "Should you really do something?" Physical blindness is something that we have to accept as God's will, and bear it in faith. But blindness of the soul, the blindness which refuses to see and which is quite satisfied if the decisive fact is hidden from our eyes, this blindness is always guilt. And all guilt must be paid for in Heaven and on earth.

Dear friends, this brings us to the theme of the second Sunday in advent. According to the tradition of our church, we must speak of God's judgment over man's unbelief on this day.

These judgments of God are always present. They take place in man's outward life, but above all in his inner life. No one should deceive himself into thinking that he can throw away his faith and remain the

same person he was before. He will notice how, step by step, he will become more selfish, more uncharitable, more inconsiderate, more untruthful. And should he fail to notice it himself, others will surely realize it. And even if others fail to realize the change, the Holy God in Heaven will surely see it. What the consequences will be in all eternity we can only anticipate.

God's judgments are carried out every day. There are hours in every life when these judgments gain special meaning. Then Jesus' lamentations about us are heard: "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace. But now they are hid from thine eyes." These are the decisive hours in the life of men and nations.

It appears to me that our city of Berlin, and, indeed, our entire German nation, is now passing through such a decisive hour. We all know what is at stake.

The worship service is not the proper place for political discussions. But this is the place to talk about the concern of man's soul. This is the church's task. In the 33d chapter, verse 7, of the Prophet Ezekiel, we read:

"So thou, O son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore, thou shalt hear the word at my mouth, and warn them from me."

What was first assigned to the prophet as an individual has come to be entrusted to the whole church of Christ. And as a watchman the church must now say three things:

First. The attempt is now being made to change the way of life of the 2 million people who live in West Berlin and—this is also openly admitted—later include the 50 million people who live in West Germany. In deed, this is to be done without asking the people whether they want this new way of life or not. In short, the same is to be accomplished as happened immediately after the last war 13 years ago when millions of human beings were thrown around like pieces of baggage and no one was in position to defend himself.

But all this is contrary to the proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. This Gospel proclaims that God wants free men, not men who are treated like things. He wants free men, not slaves, since faith can unfold only in an atmosphere where man is not the victim of overwhelming powers, but rather is able to make free decisions about his life, for or against the glory of God.

Since this is a fact, since our faith cannot live, in the long run, unless it breathes in a world of freedom, the church of Jesus Christ must warn all those concerned against subjecting the earth to brute force.

If you ask what belongs to our peace, the answer is not more barbed wire, but rather more freedom for all.

Indeed, freedom for all. That is the second point I must make. This does not merely affect the men and women of the West; the men and women of the East are just as much involved. Should a new barbed wire fence at the Brandenburg Gate in the center of Berlin, in the future, mark the border between two countries—this seems to be the fashion nowadays—the last chance will have been lost for human beings from both sides of the border to come together, to greet each other, and to exchange ideas. Then the last chance will be lost for mothers to see their children, who might live on the other side of this barbed wire. New suffering, new bitterness, will engulf millions of people. Against this development rises the love which our Lord Jesus Christ has commanded us.

We are told that sources of tension are to be cleared away. Yes, indeed, clear away these sources of tension, of which every Christian will say that they are unhealthy and unnatural. But watch out that you do not clear them away by bringing new heartbreak over mankind. Rather, clear away the sources of tension by doing what the church of Jesus Christ has been asking for in our country all these 13 years. Give back to the German people their national unity, and with the unity, peace and freedom.

The third point can only be stated with some hesitation. Nobody should be able to accuse me that I am trying to overdramatize the situation and that I am unduly pessimistic. But 10 years ago we had the very same experience, and we all know where it led. Violence breeds nothing but more violence.

Again I remind you of the Prophet Ezekiel, who says in the 33d chapter, verse 6:

"If the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned; if the sword come and take any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at the watchman's hand."

The bishop of Berlin stands today under this word. For this reason, I can only raise my voice and entreat all those whom it may concern: Abandon violence, grant freedom, and grant peace.

There remains but one question: What can we do in this situation? What can each one of us do? Is there anything that can be done? When our Savior spoke the words of our text about Jerusalem, the case of Jerusalem had already been closed in God's council. Nothing else remained but sorrow and lamentation. I do not know whether in the same council of God the case of Berlin is by now also closed. There is none of us who knows. But because we do not know, these words "On this thy day," tell us not only to obey but also give us hope that in God's mercy there may be possibilities for salvation. And this hope demands that we redeem the time.

Therefore, let me ask again: What shall we do? On the day when the Russian note was released, I met a western statesman whose findings will influence greatly what will happen in the next 6 months. We had little time for long conversation, but he looked at me, shook my hand, and said three words: "We must pray."

What this layman told the pastor is ultimately what the pastor has to tell the congregation. Our duty now is to pray for our city of Berlin and for our entire German nation. The Prophet Jeremiah says expressly: "Pray to the Lord for your city." The whole New Testament is full of such sayings: "Pray without ceasing." Indeed, while you pray, all nervous strain will vanish from your hearts. Your soul will become calm through trust in God. This will belong to your peace, and to the peace of the whole city.

In such an hour of decision, no Christian can pray in any other way than his Savior and Lord prayed in Gethsemane, namely, with the conclusion: "Nevertheless not My will, but Thine be done."

Here we find the calm confidence which realizes that even if God should have decided not to answer a certain prayer or, to put it more accurately, to answer it differently than man had anticipated, God's grace is at work. To say it with the words of a German hymn:

"Nothing can happen to me
But what God has decreed
And what leads to my salvation."

Even through darkness, God can lead us to the goal which His mercy has destined for us.

But these other words of Jesus are no less sure, they belong to the great paradoxes of our Christian faith which no logical effort can dissolve but which are, nevertheless, most real. "Ask and ye shall receive." Whoever asketh receiveth. "Whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive." I stand on this promise and because of this promise I cast away all anguish and sorrow, and I trust that no faithful Christian in this, our city, will lose himself in his own anxieties. United in prayer, let us face the coming months in quiet confidence.

Abraham prayed to God: "If only 10 righteous men be found in the city of Sodom, wilt not thou, O Lord, save the city from destruction?" That means only 10 men who want to serve God and pray to Him. And God said: "I will."

Sodom was a small town; Berlin is a big city. Let us apply it to the larger scale of our city. If there are found in Berlin 10,000 people to pray in these months every day faithfully to their God, asking Him that nothing should happen that would bring new heartbreak to its people, then God will say: "Yes, for the sake of these ten thousand, I will."

Will you be one of these 10,000? Amen.

The President's State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Walter Lippmann that appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Tuesday, January 13, 1959:

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

(By Walter Lippmann)

Granted that the President's first message to Congress is bound to be rather general in character, what the President had to say on Friday throws very little light indeed on the state of the Union. He said in effect that we are ceaselessly challenged, and that in meeting this challenge all that we can afford to do, without raising taxes, is all that we need to do.

This is a remarkable coincidence—that we are able to meet so great a challenge without any additional effort and sacrifice during the coming fiscal year, and that in the following year we may be able to relax and to reduce taxes. We are confronted, said Mr. Eisenhower, with a question which is as old as history, whether a government based upon liberty can endure when it is ceaselessly challenged by a dictatorship with growing economic and military power. And what is the answer to this question which is as old as history? It is that we can indeed endure by doing no more than we are doing now.

But just what is the use of asking this tremendous question about whether we can endure if the answer is that we are already doing all that is necessary? The explanation, I am afraid, is that the President is trying to ride two horses at once—to be hard when he talks to Moscow and soft when he talks to our own people. We are to defy the challenge abroad and are to reduce taxes at home.

This does not sound as if the President expected the Nation to take the ceaseless challenge very seriously. For if it is true, as in fact it is, that the Soviet Union is challenging us with an economic and military power of great and growing strength,

how is it conceivable that we can look forward to a tax reduction just before the coming national presidential election? This is the kind of softness and self-indulgence which is as old as history, and again and again in history has meant the ruin of great states.

To be hard on the outside and soft on the inside is to invite trouble. For this is a changing world in which the power and the influence of the challenger are growing. We cannot long hope to succeed in meeting this challenge by a policy of standing pat in all things—on all of our positions abroad and on our efforts at home.

The right position is that of Churchill's when he said "we arm to parley." We should arm more strongly and we should negotiate more readily. We should be not inflexible but we should be tough, remembering that what is inflexible is usually brittle.

Wheat—And the Farm Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, wheat is in serious trouble. Surpluses of the bread grain have built up so fast and so high that they now represent the biggest single problem we face in agriculture. And present trends show that the situation would get worse if we continued along the way we have been going.

We are nearly smothered under excess wheat now. The surplus pile will reach really impossible levels in the near future if we fail to take necessary action. Let's take a quick look at the facts—the highlights of the wheat situation.

We made a little progress in whittling down the wheat surplus between 1956 and 1958. Through aggressive and expensive efforts, we managed to cut production temporarily through programs like the soil bank—and to expand exports through special programs under Public Law 480.

Last summer, however, the dam broke. Excellent weather, combined with price support incentives, brought both yields and total production to alltime records. The gains of 2 or 3 years were more than wiped out. Surpluses shot up to new peaks in a hurry.

Total wheat production in 1958 was about 1,450 million bushels. Added to a carryover of 880 million bushels of old wheat on hand last July 1, this gave us a total supply for this marketing year of more than 2,300 million bushels—a record, 14 percent above the previous high.

To see what this means in terms of surplus, let us check our outlets for wheat—the total annual disappearance. Domestic use has been running around 600 million bushels; exports, with the aid of special subsidy programs, around 400 million—or total annual disappearance at about the billion-bushel mark.

And so—unbelievable as it may be—we had enough wheat on hand after last summer's harvest to meet all our domestic and export needs for 2 full years, and more. Put another way, if we did not grow a bushel of wheat this year—1959—we would still have enough to fill all available outlets until the 1960 crop came in. And, in fact, we would have a 300 million bushel carryover to start off that 1960–61 marketing year.

In carrying out mandatory price-support programs, the Government has had to invest tremendous sums in wheat. One and one-quarter billion bushels are being held in inventory or under price-support loan. The investment in this hoard of wheat is $3 billion—well over a third of the total price-support investment.

When the Commodity Credit Corporation takes over 1958-crop loan wheat later this spring, it will be paying $700,000 a day for wheat storage alone.

I said the wheat surplus figures might be almost unbelievable. They are, but unfortunately they represent hard, realistic facts. Action to reverse this blind trend toward catastrophe is past due.

In his farm message, the President has faced up to the wheat crisis. He has done so clearly and constructively, recognizing the basic problems and giving us clear guidelines for alternate courses of action.

Rigid, too-high support prices have obviously been responsible for much of our current trouble. The President wisely calls for adjustments to correct this weakness. One course would be to relate price supports to the average market of recent years. The other would be to provide the same discretion in setting price levels, as a percentage of parity, which now holds for all crops except the half dozen so-called basics. Either course would be a long step toward a sound basis for the wheat program.

Production and marketing controls represent the other major part of the basic wheat program problems. Those we have been trying to use have not worked. The President outlines two possible changes. One would relax controls, giving wheat farmers the freedom to produce and compete for markets, and using the conservation reserve of the soil bank to help cushion the transition. The other would tighten controls and eliminate present loopholes in the operation of the program—at least during an emergency adjustment period.

As the President points out clearly, the tighter control route would mean a degree of regimentation more drastic than Congress has been willing to impose in the past. It would mean lower acreage for wheat producers, more positive production controls, and heavier marketing penalties.

Virtually everyone agrees that we must do something about wheat now. The President has courageously recognized the inevitable. He has outlined alternate choices of action, with the final decisions properly left to the Congress. The action we take can reverse adverse trends and lay the foundation for continuing sound growth of our great wheat industry, or it can permit the already crucial situation to build toward the impossible.

Tariff on Coal to West Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the unprecedent decision by West Germany to close its ports to American coal by the imposition of an unrealistic, unreasonable, and uncalled for embargo tariff is only a forerunner of what we can expect from our stupid approach to reciprocal trade agreements.

This comes from so-called gentlemen's agreements to take foreign affairs out of partisan review and criticism.

A person fears even the word of "partisanship" in talking of foreign trade and aid.

The time has come for a hardheaded Yankee businessman approach based upon the economies of the situation.

Compromise and confidence are two way streets. We cannot open our borders to unrestricted foreign imports while our funds restrict and close their borders.

The statement of the John S. Routh of tthe Coal Exporters and Tom Pickett of the National Coal Association tell but a part of the story.

When you get the full story on glass, toys, textiles, rubber goods, and so forth, you may find part of the answer to our chronic unemployment of 4 million American workers.

I attach the following statements from the coal industry.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The National Coal Association, whose members produce most of the Nation's commercial bituminous coal, urges the Department of State to protest most vigorously the announced intention of the German Federal Republic to impose a prohibitive tariff of $4.76 per ton on coal. Most of West Germany's coal imports come from the United States.

This arbitrary, unilateral action will effectively deprive the United States of about 60 percent of its largest overseas market for bituminous coal. So onerous is the tariff that its effect will be to hold German imports of U.S. coal to the 3,500,000 tons allowed to enter duty-free.

This is only the latest damage done the coal industry in the field of international relations. In the name of free trade and international friendship, we have seen coal's normal markets on the Atlantic coast submerged by an ever-increasing tide of imported residual fuel oil.

In spite of the heavy damage to the coal industry, our own Government has failed to stem this tide, and I am informed the State Department has had an important voice in this refusal to act. While facing unrestricted foreign competition in this country, the coal industry encounters prohibitive tariffs when it tries to sell its product in West Germany.

West Germany's action is all the more arbitrary because long-term contracts between U.S. exporters and German importers are still effective. No indication was given that such a prohibitive duty of any kind was to be assessed.

The Bonn government's move is disappointing because American taxpayers—the coal industry and its workers not the least of these—have furnished West Germany more than $13 billion in aid since 1948, exclusive of U.S. expenditures in West Germany for military purposes. Much of this money went to rebuild the German coal industry. The hand that fed West Germany has now been bitten.

The effect of this action is also severe on the U.S. railroad industry, which transports coal from mine to tidewater.

The bituminous coal industry is placed in an extremely serious situation. We sincerely hope the Department of State will do its utmost to impress on the Bonn government possible consequences of its action.

Very truly yours,

TOM PICKETT,
Executive Vice President.

NEW YORK, January 27.—John S. Routh, president of the Coal Exporters Association of the United States, Inc., today called the new West German tariff on U.S. coal shipments stupid and prohibitive.

Mr. Routh urged the State Department to oppose enforcement of the new tariff, which was approved Friday by the West German Cabinet and is expected to be debated by Parliament Wednesday.

West Germany set a quota of 3,500,000 tons of American coal which could be imported duty free, with the rest subject to a levy of $4.76 a ton. Since the quota is retroactive to January 1, Mr. Routh said the 3,500,000-ton mark would be reached by May, leaving the rest of the year's shipments subject to a duty of $4.76 per ton which practically equals the price of coal at the American mine.

"In my 40 years in coal exporting I have never heard as much furor as this contemplated action is entailing," Mr. Routh said in a telegram to W. T. M. Beale, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

The Administration's Labor-Management Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker I wish to say a few words in support of the administration's labor-managment proposals. I am particularly happy to see that provision is made in these proposals for the regulation of union trusteeships. In this respect, I think this bill is an improvement over the administration's legislative recommendations in this area last year.

The extensive hearings of the McClellan committee have shown that one of the principal means by which a few unscrupulous labor leaders have grasped and retained unfettered control over local unions is through imposing trusteeships. There are, of course, times when it is necessary for a national or international union to assume such powers, but there is never any excuse for continuing a trusteeship beyond the time necessary to put the local's affairs in order. The administration's bill makes adequate provision for imposing such control under proper circumstances, but it also provides machinery by which it may be terminated if improperly imposed or continued beyond the time actually needed.

I believe the provisions the President asks will go a long way toward eliminating and preventing abuses of power and corruption not only on the part of labor leaders but also by unscrupulous employers. I heartily endorse this bill and hope it will soon be enacted.

The Elkhart Truth Speaks: "Let's Get U.S. Aid to the Disabled"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial published this month in the Elkhart Truth, an editorial which criticizes the head-in-the-sand attitude of the leaders of the Republican Party in Indiana.

This responsible and thoughtful editorial points to the burden placed on local property taxpayers because "our State of Indiana refuses to participate in the Federal aid to permanently and totally disabled program.

I cannot understand why the Indiana GOP supports this reckless giveaway of nearly $3 million, much of it the money of Hoosier taxpayers, to the other 48 States.

I commend the Elkhart Truth for opposing this radical Republican spending of our citizens' resources.

We Hoosiers pay Federal taxes. We have a right to share in Federal grants-in-aid programs.

He who feeds the cow has a right to at least some of the milk.

The editorial follows:

[From the Elkhart Truth, Jan. 10, 1959]

LET'S GET U.S. AID TO DISABLED

A count November 1 showed 77 totally and permanently disabled persons receiving aid from the tritownship relief office in Elkhart, which serves Concord, Osolo, and Baugo Townships.

Local property taxpayers have this burden for one reason alone:

Our State of Indiana refuses to participate in the Federal aid to permanently and totally disabled program.

In fiscal 1957, the Federal Government parceled out $106,927,775 to the States for this assistance.

Indiana could have had close to $3 million of this sum, which could have been administered by our county welfare department.

Instead, we got not a thin dime. We paid for the aid in Federal taxes, but other States got all of it.

It seems to us that the State legislature should vote to take this Federal grant.

The legislature should look into the entire problem of grants-in-aid.

Indiana at last report has been participating in only 41 of 64 Federal grant-in-aid programs.

In 1957 Indiana received $59,385,210 under these Federal grants, which was 1.5 percent of the amount paid to all States.

But in the same year, we were paying in 2.36 percent of the Federal revenue.

We are being shortchanged, by our own choice.

Now we share some of the misgivings about Federal aid. We agree that some of these programs well could be turned back to the States.

In fact, a joint action committee appointed by President Eisenhower has already suggested turning back vocational education and waste treatment construction to the State levels.

This seems reasonable. No doubt the prospect of getting Federal grants has actually deterred construction of some sewage-treatment plants in Indiana. Elkhart built its own plant on its own.

We do not agree with the Indiana commission on State tax and financing policy (in its recent report) that pressures should be placed on Congress to return to the States all Federal-aid programs which are not absolutely essential to national security.

Some programs should have national administration, and highways are a prime example.

But in any case, we see no immediate prospect at all of a mass abolition of Federal-aid programs.

On the contrary—judging by the election results in November—there will be heavy pressures for more aid programs.

Therefore Indiana should carefully scan the existing programs and decide which have merit and which do not. If an aid program can be better handled at the local level, our Congressmen should fight for legislation to do this.

But so long as a Federal grant-in-aid program exists, Indiana should get its share. We should stop cutting off our own noses.

We should take what is coming to us—both as a matter of right and to take some of the burden from local taxation, as in the case of the permanently and totally disabled category.

Another Berlin at Panama?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, January 13, 1959, as well as a news story from the Washington Post of Thursday, January 15, 1959, regarding the announced intention of Panama to extend its territorial waters from 3 miles to a total of 12 miles:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Jan. 13, 1959]

A CLOSER BERLIN?

Is another Berlin about to be created in the Western Hemisphere?

That appears to be the prospect if the Republic of Panama goes through with its already enacted law for extending territorial limits 12 miles at sea on either side of the Isthmus.

This means the United States-owned Panama Canal would be boxed in at both ends over an area extending 12 miles at sea. Technically, it means Panama would have the right to control shipping crossing this stretch while approaching or leaving the canal.

In effect, this vital and strategic waterway would be completely surrounded by the Republic of Panama, just as West Berlin is cut off and landlocked, subject to the whims or mood of any changing government.

For some time there have been reports of Communist encouragement of a long-range plan to get control of the Panama Canal away from the United States. So-called internationalization of the canal has been persistently pressed, along with the growth of nationalism in Panama. It is a familiar pattern.

Was the United States caught by surprise when this Panama territorial-limit law went through the National Assembly last month and promptly was signed by the Panamanian President? It would appear so.

In any case, we are acting now—after the fact has been accomplished. The State Department has asked Panama to reconsider its action, pending a study of the whole question. And we have notified Panama we do not recognize the new law. The U.S.-Panama Treaty of 1903 specifically guarantees free and unlimited access to the canal. Few nations have declared a 12-mile territorial limit on their waters, as compared with the usually recognized 3 miles. Interestingly, the 12-mile nations include the Soviet Union, Red China, Communist Romania and Nasser's Egypt.

It's something we'd better watch closely from now on.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Jan. 15, 1959]

PANAMA STANDS FIRM ON NEW 12-MILE LIMITS

PANAMA, January 14.—The national assembly unanimously rejected last night a U.S. request for reconsideration of its laws extending Panama's territorial waters. The extension to 12 miles boxes in the Panama Canal entrances.

An assembly resolution asked friendly nations to support the extension from the previous 3-mile limit. The law passed last month promised free passage to innocent shipping.

During a debate on the U.S. request, former Foreign Minister Aquilino Boyd called for Panama to receive half of the gross revenue from the canal, which is operated by the United States under long-term treaty.

Boyd asserted that the United States makes $100 million from the canal while paying Panama only $1,900,000 a year. He said Panama was not seeking a voice in canal administration.

The Panama Canal Co. reported that in the year ended last July 1 it collected nearly $43 million in tolls and made a net profit of $2,656,000. The United States pays Panama $1,930,000 a year for use of the 10-mile-wide canal strip, which includes 3 miles of the water off each end.

Other assemblymen criticized U.S. Representative DANIEL FLOOD, Democrat of Pennsylvania, who touched off the debate by telling Congress the territorial waters extension created another Berlin.

Our Federal Timber Sales Program Needs a New Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, our Federal forest resources constitute a tremendous national asset. Our timber sale policies are of great importance in realizing the greatest return from this asset. Robert E. Wolf, forest consultant, at the request of Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, upon the suggestion of Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, made a personal study of these policies last fall. Under a previous consent I am including in the RECORD at this point the summary of his report and the conclusions and recommendations. The report is entitled "Review of National Forest Timber Sales in Three Western Regions," and includes a memorandum of the chairman to members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, together with the staff study by Mr. Wolf.

Mr. Wolf is highly competent. His findings and recommendations are worthy of close attention by Members of Congress.

SUMMARY

In order to view in perspective the Forest Service timber-sale program it is well at the outset to examine briefly the changes that have taken place over the years.

This table illustrates the growth of the national forest timber-sale business.

TIMBER SOLD

Fiscal year	Region 1		Region 5		Region 6		All regions	
	Volume (billion board feet)	Dollars (millions)	Volume (billion board feet)	Dollars (millions)	Volume (billion board feet)	Dollars (millions)	Volume (billion board feet)	Dollars (millions)
1920	0.15	0.4	0.35	0.9	0.24	0.4	1.26	2.9
1925	.10	.3	.16	.4	.68	1.4	1.32	3.3
1930	.08	.3	.16	.4	1.72	5.6	2.77	8.6
1935	.11	.4	.04	.7	.71	.1	.67	1.6
1940	.20	.7	.17	.3	.69	1.6	1.78	4.7
1945	.25	.7	.19	.7	.96	4.7	2.39	10.4
1950	.33	1.9	.34	3.9	1.38	14.0	3.43	33.0
1955	1.11	6.9	1.11	16.3	2.39	50.9	[1] 9.63	[1] 100.4
1956	.64	7.8	1.19	21.5	2.45	69.6	6.84	129.3
1957	.68	6.5	.81	14.1	3.00	65.9	6.53	111.1
1958	.90	5.8	1.03	11.9	3.92	62.8	[2] 13.29	[2] 112.6

TIMBER CUT

1920	0.13	0.3	0.15	0.3	0.25	0.4	0.81	1.8
1925	.13	.5	.21	.6	.30	.7	1.02	2.8
1930	.13	.5	.46	1.4	.51	1.3	1.65	4.8
1935	.07	.2	.12	.3	.23	.6	.75	1.9
1940	.14	.5	.30	.6	.67	1.8	1.74	4.8
1945	.30	.9	.46	1.3	1.28	5.0	3.14	13.0
1950	.30	1.7	.41	4.0	1.50	14.6	3.50	30.7
1955	.86	4.9	.84	10.0	2.63	37.3	6.33	70.8
1956	.94	7.1	1.06	18.0	2.63	49.4	6.91	97.6
1957	.91	8.4	.97	17.5	2.75	64.7	6.97	115.6
1958	.77	6.3	.95	11.8	2.62	54.4	6.42	94.2

[1] Includes a long-term sale in Alaska: Volume 3 billion board feet; value, $6.2 million.
[2] Includes a long-term sale in Alaska: Volume 5.25 billion board feet; value, $10.7 million.

Except for the depression years there has been a generally steady growth in the volume of timber sold and cut. Some of the unusual increases in timber sold in various years resulted from large long-term sales. Timber cut has shown a steadier growth better reflecting the real availability of timber sold. The phenomenal aspect is the tremendous increase in the value of timber cut which was $2.20 per thousand board feet in 1920 and stayed at about this level until 1940 when it rapidly climbed to $8.50 per thousand board feet by 1950 then to $14.50 per thousand board feet by 1958. Timber cut climbed from under 1 billion board feet in 1920 to 3.5 billion board feet by 1950. Then up to almost 7 billion board feet by 1958.

With such a great growth both in volume and value in recent years it is evident that national forest timber is increasing in importance. It is neither surprising that there have been problems nor that with the increase in business some of these problems have become more difficult while others have been solved.

This report does not deal with the problems that have been successfully solved nor does it dwell upon accomplishments. The record, and the generally high regard which the public have for the Forest Service make this unnecessary. Rather it reviews the one particular segment of the Forest Service program which has accounted for 86 percent of the $1 billion in cash income which the national forests have deposited in the Treasury since 1905. The review is an effort to identify the steps that may be helpful to making the record better in the years that lie ahead.

The review was made at this time because groups in the forest products industry alleged that the Forest Service was not adhering to published timber sale announcements furnished the industry and that there was a substantial gap between timber sales and allowable cuts. Additionally, groups indicated concern about other elements of the timber-sale program such as sale size, opportunities to salvage timber, access roads, and right-of-way needs.

The field review was conducted to assess both the validity and dimensions of complaints and to determine their cause.

The review showed the following record for the three regions studied in detail:

Financed program—Regional office quotas

[Million board feet]

	Timber to sell, fiscal years—					Timber to cut, fiscal years—				
	1955	1956	1957	1958	Total	1955	1956	1957	1958	Total
Region 1	-------	1,045.0	920.0	1,245.0	3,230.0	-------	920.0	1,000.0	950.0	2,870.0
Region 5	1,190.0	1,176.0	1,595.0	1,452.0	5,413.0	822.0	905.0	1,231.0	1,189.0	4,147.0
Region 6	2,471.1	2,869.5	3,188.5	[1] 4,150.0	12,379.1	2,590.7	2,855.1	3,231.3	[1] 2,995.0	11,672.1

[1] Based on revised quota for year. Exhibit 5, p. 124, gives revised quotas. The table on p. 34 and exhibit 10 are computed on the original quotas.

Timber cut and sold

[Million board feet]

	Timber sold, fiscal years					Timber cut, fiscal years				
	1955	1956	1957	1958	Total	1955	1956	1957	1958	Total
Region 1	1,109.0	636.8	679.4	901.0	2,216.9	865.0	944.4	910.3	773.0	2,627.7
Region 5	1,099.0	1,178.0	800.0	995.0	4,072.0	820.0	1,043.0	958.0	932.0	3,753.0
Region 6	2,392.0	2,446.0	2,979.0	3,919.0	11,753.0	2,633.0	2,633.0	2,775.0	2,616.0	10,656.3

Percentage of financed program accomplished

	Timber sold, fiscal year					Timber cut, fiscal year				
	1955	1956	1957	1958	Total	1955	1956	1957	1958	Total
Region 1	----	61	74	71	69	----	103	91	81	92
Region 5	92	100	80	69	78	100	115	78	78	90
Region 6	97	85	93	102	[1] 94	102	92	86	[1] 84	91

[1] These percentages are based on revised goals. Figures originally supplied by the region were on a different base. Revisions were made only in total figure.

The above tables show the volume of timber that the regional offices estimated would be sold or cut with funds provided and the actual record expressed as a percentage each year when the funds are allotted the Washington office first sets quotas. Regions 1 and 6 usually set forest quotas which in sum were for about the same total volume as the Washington quota. Region 5, however, set selling quotas which for the 4-year period show a performance record of 75 percent against one of 91 percent when measured against the Washington office quota. Region 5's optimism on accomplishments has not been matched by its sales record.

The record on timber sold is well below financed levels except for region 6. While regions 1 and 6 have shown improvement, region 5 has not. The industry cut about 90 percent of the financed cut in each region but the Forest Service did not offer as large a percentage of sales as they were financed to handle. On a quantity basis the volume sold has exceeded the industry's removal of timber except in region 1 where the reverse is true.

The record based on financed plans is reasonably good. It masks the fact that if the industry had cut the full amount of timber the Forest Service estimated it would cut there would have been a further drain on funds and less money would have been available for sale preparation. The recent fair sales record in regions 1 and 5 and the good record in region 6 would have fallen to a less satisfactory level.

In region 6 when funds were reapportioned sales goals were revised upward and cutting goals downward in fiscal year 1958. This had the effect of reducing sales performance percentages while raising cutting performance percentages. However, the region was also financed to prepare for sale an additional 800 million board feet for future years. Immediate sales goals were only 94 percent met and cutting was 91 percent of the revised goal.

Sales goals for fiscal year 1959 are 3,802.9 million board feet compared to 4,150 million for 1958, while cut goals have rise in 1959 to 3,534.5 million board feet compared to 2,995 million board feet in 1958.

Revised goals for 1958 were not met and the position of the 800 million board feet in additional sales preparation is not readily ascertainable. This backlog of patrially prepared sales should be helpful in meeting 1959 sales goals.

In addition, measured against available data on announced plan accomplishments, region 6 sold only 79 percent and region 1 49 percent. It was the failure to adhere to timber sales plans announced on the various national forests, plus an inability to offer sales at full allowable cut level, which are the focal points of industry complaints.

The Forest Service did announce annual sales plans for volume substantially above these subsequently made. Except in region 1 (Montana and north Idaho) the announced plans have been for volumes well above the level of sales activity financing. The closer to the forest, the more optimistic forest officers are about the timber sales volume that can be processed. To some extent this represents an effort to respond to local demands for timber and the hope of obtaining a larger share of each region's allotment to meet this demand. It also stems from a realization that not all scheduled sales will materialize due to technical problems.

Among the major obstacles found to marketing announced national-forest timber sales were cancellations which occurred because needed rights-of-way and cost-sharing agreements had not been obtained from intermingled landowners who generally are members of the forest products industry. Another obstacle is the cost of needed mainline roads required. When timber purchasers are required to build the needed road, particularly in timber stands with marginal value species salability is diminished. Financing for timber sales has not been adequate to build a backlog of prepared sale so that varying market conditions can be met. Currently when an obstacle to planned sale cannot be overcome a new sale must be layed out if program goals are to be met.

Forest Service timber-sales programs rest on decade revised timber-management plans which describe overall management goals on the forest, annually revised 5-year cutting budgets which attempt to define and locate general sale areas, and an annual timber business report which combines a budget request for the fiscal year 2 years off with a request for an allotment from the next year's budget.

There is no common anniversary date for timber-management plans thus they provide only a broad guide for management. The 5-year cutting budgets do not have a common anniversary date either but they can be coordinated, while the annual timber business reports afford a current device for fiscal coordination. Until recently these reports showed timber to be cut but did not show timber to be sold. This has been a basic weakness in operations planning and budget presentations.

The volume and rate of timber cutting is largely affected by the economic situation of the industry, the extent to which alternate log supplies are used, the size of contracts, roads needed to permit cutting and the operating pattern of customers. It is the element which the Forest Service has made the least effort to consciously direct but it has been the biggest element used to relate fund requirements to program goals.

The Forest Service timber-sale program really consists of three interdependent parts:

1. The presale activity which leads up to programing sales for detailed preparation work;

2. The actual layout of the timber for sale and its advertisement; and

3. The supervision of sales under contract.

In the timber-sale business, the future is governed by the present, but the present is governed by the past. An effective timber-sale program requires that the three elements move forward in harmony.

The volume under contract creates an inescapable workload which influences the amount of presale preparation and actual sale layout work can be accomplished. The sales activity determines the workload in the future and the size and conditions of sales made coupled with the desires of purchasers influences when the timber will be cut.

There is no publically set forth long-range program which the Congress or the public can examine to determine the goals that the Department of Agriculture has for national forest timber management. This review of current problems in the national forest timber-sale program must be considered against this background because the operational and budgetary difficulties that presently exist stem from the lack of a clear goal with quantitative accomplishments related to time.

Finally the Forest Service annual plans and accomplishments reports do not presently give a complete picture of the operational problems or a quantitative assessment of situations requiring policy consideration.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The problems found in this study are cumulative and growing because the basic tools for their solution have not been fully utilized. The study made leads to these conclusions and recommendations:

1. National plan needed

In the public mind the Forest Service timber-sale program has as its only announced goal reaching something called the "full allowable cut" at the earliest practical date. Because of the rapidly growing importance of the national forests, as a timber source, for recreation and other uses there is an urgent need for definite management goals, fixed to a point in time, explained as to objective, and relating operating and investment requirements to benefits. The Department of Agriculture has just completed publication of Timber Resources for America's Future, the most complete analysis of the Nation's timber resources that has been made. This review includes forecasts of timber supply and demand both for the years 1975 and 2000.

A national plan should be made setting forth forest-management goals for the future which adequately describes:

(a) Timber-harvesting goals;

(b) Reforestation and silvicultural work needed to attain optimum forest production;

(c) Recreation, watershed protection, grazing goals, and land-use adjustments needed to harmonize multiple uses;

(d) Estimates of the role the national forest will play in the Nation's economy;

(e) Road and servicing facilities needed for management and operation;

(f) Cost estimates to reach stated goals within the first 5-year period, as well as overall costs.

The overall program should be utilized to formulate short-term goals and as the background for budget requests. Special attention should be given to developing presentations which evaluate how program goals are being met.

2. Lack of access held up sales

The major factor holding up planned timber sales in the period studied was lack of rights-of-way. This includes obtaining bare-land rights-of-way in order to construct a Forest Service road, purchase of the right to use an existing road, and agreements for cooperative construction of new roads serving two or more ownerships. Information furnished in region 6 showed that over 1 billion board-feet in unmade or delayed planned sales was due to these problems. In region 1 over 500 million board-feet in sales delays stemmed from the same source. In addition, there are substantial volumes ready to put into sales that never enter plans because of unresolved right-of-way difficulties. While on the one hand, it is a fact that the Forest Service has not been financed to sell all the timber that theoretically could be sold, on the other, it is clear that the Service, under present policies, has expended considerable time in fruitless negotiations where it is unlikely that agreements will be forthcoming.

Policies have not been set forth and backed up with funds so as to enable the Service to utilize the full range of possibilities in negotiations. Thus, the United States is at a disadvantage in negotiating both with parties who proceed in good faith, as well as with those who do not.

Progress has been made under the present ground rules but the true measure is the relation of this cause of delay to other causes and its effect on the sale program. Timber management is not possible without permanent access arrangements.

The Department of Agriculture should set forth a right-of-way policy and an active adequately financed program geared to solving problems in an orderly, firm, and fair manner.

3. Inadequate records

Forest Service records on timber sales are not sufficient to reveal significant and important facts on a timely basis for its $100 million annual business. The Forest Service has emphasized "timber cut" as an expression of timber-sales accomplishments. This measure is incomplete and misleading because it fails to properly describe accomplishments. The Service should clearly show the entire program and the interrelationships that exist. The minimum elements of the sale program that should be included are:

(a) The volume of timber in the various stages of sale preparation.

(b) Sales planned for the coming year with appropriate information on sale-size components, the cost of accessory timber, purchaser roads, and the anticipated rate at which the sales will actually be loggable.

(c) The volume of timber under contract and the rate at which it will be logged in the forthcoming year.

These key records, adequately briefed and highlighted for use by the Chief, the Department, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Congress, should form the nucleus of the budget justification for timber sales, and would be the basic tool for timber-sale policy and program decisions.,

Adequate facts would then be available to aid in securing necessary funds to maintain a suitable backlog of work in the various stages of preparation, to maintain an even flow of sales from preparation into production, to gear sales to meeting the requirements of prospective customers, to assuring that sales preparation and administration work is of a high quality and that increases in timber cutting can be met without later jeopardizing other elements of the timber-sale job.

Red Berlin Threat May Revise U.S. Military Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Los Angeles Times of Tuesday, January 13, 1959:

RED BERLIN THREAT MAY REVISE U.S. MILITARY POLICY

(By Waldo Drake)

PARIS, January 12.—The Soviet threat to oust the West from Berlin comes at a critical moment, when the United States is at the threshold of momentous decisions which may revise the basic strategy of our national defense.

The Army and the Navy have consistently sought adoption of a policy which would at once safeguard the Nation against surprise nuclear devastation and prepare its Armed Forces for immediate action against limited warfare, or armed encroachment, anywhere in the world. The Air Force has, in effect, opposed this policy with a program that has progressively reserved a larger and larger share of military appropriations for that service. Under the Eisenhower level budget growing Air Force appropriations have simply meant less and less for other defense activities of all sorts.

A revised strategy following the historic recommendations of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps and a growing body of disinterested but informed opinion would result in the defense budget's being reapportioned so that all three services could be welded into an instrument of team policy, effective either for unlimited war or to resist Communist nibbling operations around the periphery of the Iron Curtain.

Advocates of revision contend that current American defense policy—based on spiraling number of intercontinental bombers and eventual ballistic missiles as a strategic deterrent—is wrong. Why? Because the Soviets' weapons achievements already have thrown the mutual destruction stalemate out of balance and have made SAC's air-breathing nuclear delivery systems obsolete; because the newly projected bombers-missiles warning net would be too fabulously expensive for the Nation to bear; and because fiscal neglect of other areas of defense effort leaves the Russians and the Communist satellites free to pursue nibbling operations (such as Korea, Indochina, and more subtle economic warfare) throughout the world.

In bare essentials, the new plan proposes that:

1. The Strategic Air Command's role, as the massive deterrent against Soviet nuclear attack, would be share with the Navy's new missile-firing atomic submarines, which will be armed with the solid-fueled Polaris intermediate range ballistic missile. The term "massive deterrent" which has been the Air Force's license to steal in the past would become a tailored deterrent with dimensions. Its objective would be to put enough of the Soviet population and governmental paraphernalia at risk to deter. Many studies from various sources agree that this could be done at a fraction of the expense and effort now programed.

A program of this sort would recognize that in the area of nuclear stalemate deterrence must have dimensions; that national political-military problems cannot be solved simply by spending more and more to achieve damage beyond significant dimensions or to provide for excessive losses of vulnerable delivery systems. A deterrent effort with dimensions demonstrates cognizance of national objectives, i.e., "to maintain U.S. institutions and ideals" and does not permit unbridled pursuit of an objective which looks more and more like bluff and bravado and less and less like a balanced, rational, and stable program.

2. With the resultant savings in defense funds and manpower the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps would be rebuilt in to a highly mobile integrated team, ever ready for all contingencies: First, the deterrence of the big war of fantastic mutual nuclear destruction; second, deterrence or capability to fight the so-called compatible or little war against Communist encroachments; and finally a capability for the "broken-backed war" of survival which would follow the nuclear devastation of Eurasia and North America, if deterrent forces perform their retaliatory role.

Studies indicate that less than 20 percent of the annual defense budget would provide the "tailored deterrent," convincing Moscow that nuclear attack on the United States, or her allies, could trigger unacceptable devastation in the Soviet Union and Communist China.

The remaining defense budget would be divided between the several armed services for development of a balanced team, ready to defend American interests anywhere and in a variety of suitable ways.

FIRE BRIGADES

The Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force, for example, would have specially equipped battle groups, ready to move into immediate action. The U.S. fleet would be ready to support and sustain these fire brigades and to bring the necessary sea-tail reinforcement of airborne movements.

The newly defined deterrent of the defense team would call for a sizable contribution from Polaris submarines. Four missile-firing submarines are now being built; five others have been authorized. A program realizing about 50 boats by 1966 is within construction capabilities and compatible with balanced funding. Polaris, which will be operational in 1960, will have a range of some 1,500 nautical miles. Although designed to permit launching from deeply submerged submarines, Polaris also could be employed by surface ships. More than half of the Polaris submarines could be kept constantly at sea around the Sino-Soviet perimeter, ready to attack from submerged positions unknown to the enemy.

FOURTEEN CARRIERS PROPOSED

The Navy also proposes a modern fleet of 14 large aircraft carriers in which 9 World War II ships are being replaced by the 6 new Saratoga-type carriers and eventually by atomic-powered carriers. The first atomic carrier will be commissioned in 1961. These big carriers, with a mobility ballistic missiles cannot solve, have long-range attack bombers which are equally effective for a variety of limited tactical operations or for delivering high-yield nuclear weapons. They afford, in short, ideal tools for limited war with an economical and significant bonus contribution to deterrence or the broken-back war.

We can anticipate that on March 1 the Congress will be asked to approve a defense budget of nearly $41 billion for the 1960 fiscal year. Of this total the Air Force hopes to get $18 billion, leaving less than $24 billion to be divided among the Army, Navy, and Marines.

GOAL OF SAC

These figures conceal, however, the ambitions of the Strategic Air Command to begin construction of an imaginative, world-encircling readiness net: of aircraft and missile bases, radar screens (land, air, and

seaborne), and early warning and aircraft control systems. SAC has not divulged cost of this scheme, but has proposed a massive increase in manpower, which could only be obtained by denying support of a balanced and versatile concept. This denial of support is not bad in itself if justified; but such justification does not exist. The division represents indecision and inertia, a perpetuation of a trend to delegate real solution of our military problems to an almost paranoiac belief in the efficacy of massive retaliation—a trend whose faint basis in logic collapsed completely when atomic stalemate was reached.

America's strategic plans up to now have been a hodgepodge of compromise. Issues have not been clearly resolved but rather submerged and censored. We engage in an atomic arms race that lacks the logic of earlier ones; the atomic forces do not engage each other and relate to each other only in their ability to do significant damage. We can program atomic capability beyond requirements whenever we resolve contending concepts by compromise and fail to define the dimensions of deterrence.

PERIOD OF STALEMATE

Compromise has enveigled the United States to pass from a period where we alone were a nuclear power into a period of nuclear stalemate without a corresponding revision of our concept of the utility of atomic weapons as an instrument of national policy. We have not faced issues and have, in essence, supported a will-of-the-wisp promising security if we unquestioningly put our dollar on massive retaliation.

This sustained confusion in the Pentagon is partly responsible for the unwillingness of our European partners in the Atlantic Alliance to provide their shares in the common defense.

Britain's resultant dilemma over her own defense is described by the London weekly Observer, which says:

"Should we give the (nuclear) deterrent top priority and spend what is left on conventional forces? Or should we do exactly the opposite, concentrate on the conventional and put the remainder into nuclear development?"

WHITE PAPER CITED

"Some still accept the views (to concentrate on nuclear weapons) put forward in the 1957 white paper. Others believe that the deterrent theory is a dangerous myth and that if we continue with it we shall become perilously enfeebled. We shall have neither conventional forces nor nuclear weapons mighty enough to frighten off an aggressor."

On the other side of the coin, the Soviet Union is far advanced with a fourfold military program, viz: a fleet of 500 submarines which are likely, soon to include atomic-powered boats which could devastate the United States without warning by concerted missile attack from submerged positions around our coasts; a nuclear-equipped, highly mobile team of armies and tactical air forces in Europe, which holds an overwhelming superiority against anything the West could assemble today to defend either Europe or the Middle East; a diversified ballistic missile system, from short-range weapons already poised along the Iron Curtain to attack Britain and the great cities of Western Europe to intercontinental missiles intended for the United States, and a multiple screen of ground-to-air missiles and interceptor aircraft designed to prevent high altitude bomber (B–52) attacks on Russia's strategic targets.

SOVIET SMOKESCREEN

The Russians have developed this whole complex for modern war behind a propaganda smokescreen that they were building a powerful fleet of long-range jet bombers for nuclear attack on America. Instead, they were developing ballistic missiles, giving their armies a devastating punch, and assembling the greatest submarine menace in history. In short, we face a Soviet bloc capable and preparing for warfare of all sorts while we see larger and larger portions of our defense budget assigned to forces for the massive retaliation of the broken-back war.

A main reason why the mounting costs of our national defense threaten to bankrupt the Nation is because the American people have been bamboozled into spending too much of their money for costly weapons which are useful only for the nuclear holocaust.

This broken-back war is more likely to happen if we continue to concentrate our resources on an obsolete massive retaliation strategy, whose weapons would be useless against the limited wars and armed encroachments which the Soviet bloc is more likely to attempt throughout the world.

COLD WAR DEFEAT

The United States, consequently, is being defeated in the cold war because we have not acted decisively in determining what is required to (1) deter big war; (2) to deter little war; or (3) to fight little war. We have, for too long, accepted a policy of massive retaliation as a panacea from a threat of higher taxes, more rigorous draft provisions and reality, itself. We are today, inadequately prepared for limited warfare or to counter the Soviet's economic and psychological campaigns, as in the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America.

A new brush fire war, therefore, might force the United States, largely in frustration, to use tactical atomic weapons to offset overwhelming strength of enemy forces. This could set off the holocaust.

Address by Alvin G. Waggoner, Executive Assistant to Director of Guided Missiles, During Commissioning Ceremonies of "Observation Island," Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Va., December 5, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, on December 5, a new ship, the U.S.S. *Observation Island*, was commissioned at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard at Portsmouth, which is in my district. This ship is designed as a test ship for the Polaris missile.

This new type ship represents a major milestone in the development of the Polaris weapon system which is so vital to our national deterrent posture. With this ship the Navy will be able to test its new Polaris missiles in a seaborne environment at an early date, thus advancing and accelerating the availability of this weapon system. The commissioning of this ship is of great significance because of the part it will play in the development of missiles, which may bring about a change in our concept of warfare. Mr. A. G. Waggoner, executive secretary of the Office of the Secretary of Defense Ballistic Missiles Committee, was the principal speaker on this occasion. I am inserting Mr. Waggoner's address in the RECORD and commend its reading to the Members of Congress.

The commissioning of this fine ship today is, indeed, a memorable occasion for it is a most important step in giving our U.S. Navy a new capability, an intermediate range ballistic missile capability.

The mission of the U.S.S. *Observation Island* is to serve as a mobile test ship in the Polaris fleet ballistic missile program. She will be, however, the first ship in history configured to fire a weapon that will have a range of 1,500 miles. She is the first ship to mount weapons that can travel at speeds of 10,000 miles per hour. These facts make this a truly historic occasion.

For centuries, control of the seas meant control of the surface of those seas. History has seen the fleets of Carthage, of Rome, of Britain's Admiral Nelson, and of our own John Paul Jones, David Farragut, and George Dewey destroy enemy seapower by surface action. World War I introduced us to the menace of underwater warfare, the Navy's second medium or dimension of attack. Then came World War II with its decisive battles of Midway and of the Coral Sea in which enemies never even saw each others' fleets, but destruction was rained from the clouds through the medium of Naval Air Forces. That was the third dimension of naval weaponry.

Today we hoist the flag over the latest, and possibly the most amazing combination, the first ship to mount intermediate range ballistic missiles.

In wishing this fine ship, the U.S.S. *Observation Island*, a successful and fruitful existence of service to the Navy and the Nation, we must wish, quite paradoxically, that the Polaris system which she will assist may never have to be fired in anger.

Let's take a look at what this ship stands for and why she is being commissioned today.

About 3 years ago it became evident that a new instrument of delivery was being fashioned in our country and on the other side of the Iron Curtain to carry destructive warheads faster, more certainly, and farther than could be envisioned a few years ago. This instrument, of course, was the ballistic missile which could span oceans in minutes and reach out to targets hundreds and even thousands of miles distant.

Now, a ballistic missile is unique in that it is steered electronically or guided for only a very short part of its flight. Its guidance mechanisms place the missile on the exact path that will take it to its target and then say, in effect, "Now, Old Fellow, you're on your own." The last rocket stage and the guidance sections then detach themselves and drop back to earth, their tasks accomplished. This happens beyond the influences of the earth's atmosphere after the various rocket stages have built up to required speed in the first minute or so of flight.

From this point on the ballistic missile is merely a projectile winging its way to a distant target, out of reach of any control of any kind of either friend or foe. The only way to intercept it would be to knock it literally to bits by hitting it with another missile, and since the speed of ballistic missiles reaches 10,000 and even 15,000 miles per hour, to do this successfully promises to be quite a task.

We are assembled on the deck of a ship configured to test-fire the Polaris ballistic missile, the Navy's part in the overall longer range ballistic missile program about which you have read and heard so much.

Let me tell you a bit about Polaris. It will be an intermediate range ballistic missile with a range of some 1,500 miles. In speed attained and distance traveled Polaris will be exceeded only by the so-called intercontinental ballistic missiles, such as Atlas

and Titan. However, Polaris will have much in common with these long-range giants. First, it can be fired from our own soil—for every ship flying our flag is American soil—and hit targets far inland. The launching platforms of Polaris will be American ships using the great international highways of the open sea.

Polaris is the first, and only, ballistic missile designed to be launched from a moving, seagoing platform. Not only will this platform be located on a ship at sea, it will be located on a ship operating deep beneath the surface of the sea—a submerged submarine. This brings together in a new partnership two of the most revolutionary developments in military hardware since the close of World War II—a ballistic missile and the nuclear-powered submarine.

Now, what promise does this combination offer? First, distance covered by the missile. A Polaris missile will travel as far as from here to Denver in a single leap. Then, speed. This flight will take about 15 minutes. It will reach a speed of 10,000 miles per hour. In actual operation the missile flight will begin in the silent black ocean depths, sweep briefly through the atmosphere in which we have our being, proceed into the equally black silence of space, passing through our atmosphere again just before reaching its target.

Now, the performance of the nuclear submarine which will carry the Polaris weapon. Here is a ship that not only breaks, but shatters all previous submarine records. It can travel many times around the earth without refueling. It can travel submerged for weeks or even months at a time. It can cross major oceans at full speed without ever surfacing. It can travel faster than all but the fastest surface vessels. It might interest you to know that the crews in these submarines strap themselves into their seats, as in an airplane, so swift are the sub's motions in changing course at full speed. It can navigate under water for days at a time, even under thick arctic ice. These are not theories or prophecies. All of these submarine accomplishments are realities.

So here we have, combined in a single weapons system, the speed and ranges possible of an intermediate range ballistic missile and the vast potential of concealment offered by the millions of cubic miles of open ocean, the great watery blanket that covers some three quarters of our globe. With Polaris-armed submarines, our Navy can patrol the seas well within range of enemy targets for months at a stretch, silently, unseen, constantly on the move and ready to unleash its full striking power.

The *Observation Island*, the fine ship on whose decks this ceremony is taking place, will play a most important and even vital role carrying this daring concept of weaponry from the drawing boards of the technicians to operational reality. It will permit the Navy to make essential tests of the weapons system in virtually all its phases while the Polaris submarines are being built. It will permit a sensible step-by-step testing program to iron out all the "bugs", as we engineers call them of a wholly new mechanism. Since Polaris will contain some two hundred thousand separate parts, some of extreme complexity and exactness, quite an insect colony of such "bugs" may have to be explored and conquered.

We have all followed the tests of various missile projects at Cape Canaveral, cheered the successes and groaned at the failures, almost like spectators at a ball game. We know that in rocketry, as in the development stages of any technology, full accomplishment does not come in one step.

Though strictly a "test ship", the *Observation Island* will perform several most important missions. It will put together for the first time all elements of the Polaris fleet ballistic missile system in a seagoing ship and then test them in the ocean environment. In so doing, it will perform a major service.

The second big job which this ship is designed to carry out is that of training crews for Polaris missile submarines. For, like flying an aircraft missile handling and launching is an art which cannot be learned overnight. It takes practice and patience. It means learning every step of the job, and doing it over and over again. That is where this ship will repay the investment of her conversion many times over.

Now, finally, where does Polaris fit into the overall scheme of the security of our country?

Fundamentally, we have two big military jobs. One is to take care of the crises, the brush fires, the threats to peace that seem to have become the milestones of the cold war age. Suez, Indochina, Lebanon, Quemoy, Berlin, wherever trouble spots develop, it is our job to see that they don't grow into major wars. Then there was Korea, that was the time the Communist leadership wanted to find out whether we would stand and defend ourselves. They found out.

The second job is to retain sufficient military power in being to swiftly render an aggressor impotent, no matter how completely he may try to wipe us out before we can strike back. That's where Polaris comes in as a major factor in impressing the Communist leadership that the terms "aggression" and "suicide" are synonymous.

The Polaris-armed submarine, lurking beneath the surface in a position unseen and unknown, can be assured of surviving an attack on this country and thus can be a deliberate instrument of policy rather than an automatic weapon of revenge. These submarines, strategically deployed, could destroy many major centers within minutes.

No one can "zero in" these submarines for destruction in advance.

Furthermore and importantly, this weapon will force a potential enemy to divide further his attention to our total retaliatory forces.

I sincerely and firmly believe that the Polaris program is a major force for peace. I believe that we can equally sincerely dedicate the fine ship on whose deck we are gathered to the mission of peace, not war. For in these times peace must be bolstered by the readiness and ability to apply force decisively. All of us wish it were otherwise, but merely wishing won't make it so.

The *Observation Island* begins its mission today. It is a mission of technological testing. It is a mission of training. It is a mission which will pave the way for achieving one of the most effective retaliatory instruments of destruction ever conceived. Finally, it is a mission of buying time until reason and statesmanship can become the dominent factor in keeping peace in the world.

Of one thing, however, we can be certain. If we are not ready, if we do not possess destructive weapons which can survive enemy attacks, we lay ourselves open to aggression, and to aggression just as soon as the opposing leadership can be sure that the price of such action is not their own national suicide.

The *Observation Island* has a job to do in bringing the fleet ballistic missile system to a stage of readiness that assists in deterring any potential aggressor, no matter how power crazed and reckless.

We wish the captain and his crew the best of luck in placing their ship in the service of peace. We wish the test crews, and later the crews in training, all success in their endeavors. Most of all, we wish that all Polaris missiles ever launched will be test missiles, and that never will one be sent on its way to destroy human life.

God bless the mission of the *Observation Island*. May it be a major factor in driving the specter of war from our civilization; may it prove to be a milestone in our path to world peace.

Taking a Look at Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the following editorial from the Glendale News-Press to the attention of the membership. It is entitled "Taking a Look at Spending—Lawmakers Should Study Topic." I think all will find it of interest:

[From the Glendale News-Press, Jan. 19, 1959]

TAKING A LOOK AT SPENDING—LAWMAKERS SHOULD STUDY TOPIC

The first duty of lawmakers in Sacramento and Washington is to take a hard look at the extent and direction of government spending.

The first two-edged question that should be asked and answered in both capitals is what do we really need, and what can we prudently afford.

The key to sound and responsible fiscal practices lies in striking a balance between the reasonable needs and expectations of the people, and the financial ability of the State and national treasuries to pay for them without dipping further into red ink.

Until such a realistic appraisal is made and acted upon, talk of balanced budgets and an end to inflationary deficits is pure rhetoric.

There is a heartening indication that this approach will have influential backing in Sacramento.

Senator James J. McBride, Democrat of Ventura, the State's senior senator and head of the senate finance committee, says that California's budgetary problem should be approached, not merely from the standpoint of increasing taxes, but by a thorough study of all the State's spending programs and its revenue laws.

"I am not convinced," McBride said in commenting on Governor Brown's promise of higher taxes, "that the premise of funding existing programs is justified since all deficit estimates ($195 million) are based on the same level and quality of service that is currently being provided by the State."

We recommend the same skepticism to our Washington lawmakers.

There is a point beyond which we cannot sanely go in providing bigger and bigger benefits to more and more people and projects without risking financial disaster.

Twenty-five years ago we had just one big Federal subsidy—$250 million for highways.

Today, there are about 40 million people getting checks from the U.S. Treasury.

The States are beneficiaries of 62 programs of Federal grants totaling nearly $5 billion yearly.

Individuals and businesses, including the housing industry, are indebted for Federal credit to the extent of $80 billion.

All governments—Federal, State, and local—are in hock to the tune of nearly $350 billion.

All private debts total $850 billion.

All governments—Federal, State, and local—now spend $145 billion a year.

All taxes now siphon off $130 billion a year.

Ours is a wonderfully big and growing, rich and productive country.

But it is prudent to ask ourselves, and our lawmakers, where's the end of spending more money we don't have for many things we can do without.

The day of the political promise, the outpromise, and the superoutpromise has brought us to the question:

"How ridiculous can you get?"

The Boston University Symposium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 8, 1959, Boston University's Sargent College, one of the oldest schools for physical education and physical therapy in the Nation, will hold opening exercises in its new building, gymnasium, and other facilities on the university's Charles River campus.

To commemorate this occasion, 11 members of the Sargent College faculty or staff, headed by Dean George K. Makechnie, have participated in a written symposium on the subject "Do Americans Have Sufficient Health and Energy in This Modern Era?"

Although it may be premature, I am enclosing one of the answers written by Elizabeth Wellman Gardner who has been on the faculty of the Sargent College since 1928. She was graduated from the Sargent School in 1926, received her B.S. in education and her Ed. M. from Boston University, and her M.A. and Ph. D. from Radcliffe College. She is a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the New York Academy of Science, the Society for the Sigma Xi, and Delta Delta Delta.

Her answer follows:

Publications, both lay and professional, can have left little doubt in the public mind that the answer to our query is negative. How can this be true in a country whose standard of living, sanitation, and medical care are the best in the world, where one after another the major infectious diseases are being conquered, and where the average life expectancy is well over 60 years? For the same reason that our No. 1 killer is cardiovascular disease. Not only does the average American citizen fall short of optimal status in regard to circulatory health today, but he is likely to depart still further from desirable standards as the next decade proceeds. Why? Because the main cause of his circulatory inadequacy is lack of exercise—just plain lack of muscular exercise. And with industry bending ever greater efforts to develop more and more labor-saving devices, the situation can only worsen unless we do something about it.

Man, as an animal, is anatomically and physiologically designed for a life of vigorous physical activity. Had he been intended to live the sedentary life of automation (instead of animation) which he is increasingly adopting, he would never have developed an internal skeleton of linearly arranged bones with muscles whose attachments favor speed and range of movement. Nor would he have been equipped with specialized systems for respiration, excretion, digestion, temperature regulation, and circulation to support the energy demands of activity. But these are a part of his biological inheritance. He is "stuck with them." They can only be maintained in optimal condition by constant use, by periodically and frequently being pushed beyond the meager limits of today's requirements. As their health fails, so does his. And of all these systems, the circulatory system is the most essential because the functions of the others rely upon it as their go-between. If it fails, all fail.

Man is, relatively speaking, one of the larger animals, but it is not his size which requires these specialized systems. The largest living things ever to exist on our planet are the giant redwood trees. Being incapable of movement, they need no digestive system to periodically process enough food to last till the next meal, nor respiratory system to make oxygen continually and quickly available to each cell in large amounts, nor excretory and temperature regulatory systems to eliminate the waste products of metabolism, nor a circulatory pump and muscular-walled vessels to maintain a pressure-flow circulation of blood. Yet, the same biochemical processes go on in the great tree as in man and animals, differing only in rate. It is muscle whose activity so increases the metabolic rate of animals; muscle whose imperative demands can suddenly multiply the energy needs of man's body by 20 to 40 times, or as suddenly drop it again to the resting level.

Man's circulatory system is marvelously designed to meet, from moment to moment, the large variations in metabolic requirements of the muscles. Delicately adjusted feedback mechanisms, the prototypes of modern engineering, maintain functional levels in such a dynamic equilibrium that they just meet the needs of the active muscles without wasteful overfunction. A marvelous interplay of acceleratory and inhibitory regulators, acting simultaneously, hold increases of heart rate, blood pressure and respiration down to a minimum appropriate to the needs of the moment.

Everyone knows that frequently repeated activity promotes strength and skill. The skeletal muscles and nervous system are not the only organs to profit from use, however. The heart muscle itself, the smooth muscles of the blood vessels, and the muscles of respiration are also strengthened so that they too can function with greater efficiency. In fact, it is only by daily vigorous use that these vital systems can be maintained in peak condition. Habits of inactivity result not only in atrophy of voluntary muscles, but in circulatory deterioration as well. The capacity of the heart to handle a sudden increase in blood volume diminishes insidiously until someday, under the stress of sudden exertion, the heart my fail, or a tiny blood vessel in the brain, its walls having lost their elasticity, may rupture and a man may lose his life or be condemned to a wheelchair.

Man must recognize his need for proper exercise as he has his need for proper nutrition. Exercise must be a part of each day's living. Specific provision must be deliberately made for it in the daily routine. It is hoped that doctors and educators will join physical educators in awakening the American public to an intelligent realization of the importance of daily exercise to our national health, and that governmental agencies will act to make adequate and easily accessible recreational facilities available to all. If, however, it should happen that physical activity, like vitamins, must be popularized by the propaganda of modern advertising, I hope that the manufacturers of sports equipment will outdo the producers of the lie-still-and-be-jiggled devices. In your exercise, I implore you, do it yourself.

Emancipation From Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post has pointed out that some insight into Cuba's present mood can be gained by glancing through the current issue of Bohemia, a respected Havana monthly, now on sale on some Washington newsstands.

Bohemia is printed in Spanish. It is regarded as a conservative magazine. I believe the following translation of Bohemia's lead editorial of January 11, 1959, does much to set the current Cuban situation in perspective.

The emerging democracy made possible by Fidel Castro and his followers has won the praise of the archbishop of Santiago. Archbishop Enrique Perez Serantes' comments were carried in the Catholic Standard of January 23, 1959. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include both in the RECORD:

[From Bohemia, Jan. 11, 1959]

Bohemia's first word cannot be other than a word for the martyrs. Let us still for a moment our cries of joy, such justifiable joy. Let us not deliver ourselves entirely to the frenzy of our victory over the most repulsive and barbarous tyranny in the history of the Americas. We have a solemn debt toward the dead, and we must begin to pay it with a salute born of the heart that feels and the conscience that reflects. This is but the beginning of our tribute to the fallen.

We are tempted to affirm that it is necessary to go back to the living memory of the great collective sacrifice for independence carried on for 30 years by the Cuban people during the 19th century in order to find a parallel to the sinister period that has just ended. But on second thought we must correct ourselves and say that, notwithstanding the countless major calamities of that unforgettable historical period, the events of recent years are characterized by a blacker and more condemnable seal of cruelty.

In those days we fought against colonial despotism, against a regime controlled from Spain and defended by outsiders; this time native-born citizens fought against each other. In those days we were afflicted by a war during which Cuba's enemy often showed nobility and generosity; this time the defenders of the satrapy, though born in the same land and related by blood to the other people of the island, treated their fellow citizens as ferociously as the Nazi Gestapo and Hitler's army dealt with defeated nations.

The police of the tyrant Batista acted as an imported gestapo; Batista's army behaved as an occupation force in its own country. These monsters did not recognize human rights or feelings of brotherhood, did not have scruples over sex or age, did not respect prisoners. Defenseless civilian populations were subjected time and again to the most merciless bombing, as a punishment for their obvious sympathy for the rebel cause. The acts of genocide and the concentration camps were everyday facts in the horrendous strategy of Batista's militarism.

Crime ruled. The victims were a whole nation. The political leader, the professional, the heroic child, the priest and the

mason, the student, the housewife, the professor and the workingman, the farmer and the urban dweller, contributed their bloody quota of martyrs to the holocaust. History was written in blood, justice was frighteningly subverted; Cain and Abel were multiplied to the infinite.

Now the 7 years of infamy and death unload their unspeakable burden on the new year—which auspiciously begins with emancipation from tyranny—Bohemia rises to remember our dead, our most sacred memory, and to pledge the best it can offer, the determination to carry out without yielding the mandate ensuing from their sacrifice.

[From Catholic Standard, Jan. 23, 1959]

CATHOLICS BACKING CASTRO SEE EXECUTIONS JUSTIFIED

SANTIAGO, CUBA.—The archbishop of Santiago has praised the revolutionary triumph of Fidel Castro and his followers and called upon the country's new government to improve the lives of the people.

Archbishop Enrique Perez Serantes made 9 reform proposals in a 2,650-word letter read in all of the churches of Oriente Province, the birthplace of Mr. Castro's 26th of July movement.

He called the overthrow of the former government a triumph gained by the valiant followers of Mr. Castro. The leader himself was praised as a man of exceptional qualities.

Archbishop Perez Serantes listed the achievement of his nine points—which are mainly concerned with social justice and clean government—as the second stage of the revolution. The first stage, the overthrow itself and the installation of a new government, was "glorious, but is now closed," he said.

The social encyclicals of two Popes, Leo XIII and Pius XI, were cited in the archbishop's list of principles to be achieved by the new Cuban President, Manuel Urrutia, and his government.

The prelate recommended that the Government follow Leo XIII's "Immortali Dei"—on the Christian constitution of states—and "Rerum Novarum"—on the condition of the working classes. He also suggested that it follow Pius XI's "Quadragesimo Anno"—on social reconstruction—in providing Cuba with a new order.

"If Dr. Fidel Castro and Dr. Manuel Urrutia and the rest of the cooperators * * * inspire themselves with these principles * * * they will have deserved well from God and country," the archbishop said, adding:

"Should they not do this and should we revert [to the former type of government] then little will have been accomplished in spite of everything done by these new men, in whom the large majority of Cuban people have deposited their trust."

In Havana a Catholic publication said executions of ousted dictator Fulgencio Batista's agents were conducted in line with a military code providing strict guarantees of justice.

It added that the shooting of "a few hundred guilty persons" was "mild punishment" in view of all the "horrible things" that took place under the fallen dictator's 6-year regime.

The influential weekly La Quincena denied that the executions ordered by the military courts of revolutionary leader Fidel Castro constituted acts of political retaliation. The denial came from the magazine's own director, Franciscan Father Ignacio Blain.

NO CIVILIANS EXECUTED

The Catholic publication, noted during the years of the uprising for its condemnations of rebel terrorism and government reprisals alike, stated that all persons sentenced to death were convicted of common law crimes.

It said that no civilians had been executed, but only members of dictator Batista's secret police and armed forces "who were clearly men stained with serious crimes."

Revolutionary leaders have been quoted as saying that under Batista's regime some 20,000 persons, including women and children, were tortured or killed by the fallen dictator's agents. Supporting this view, the magazine said:

"The chain of murders was so long and the men who commited them so well known that we can easily assert that the testimony of witnesses (at the trials) was backed by truth, devoid of a spirit of vengeance, and above all free of unjust accusations."

The magazine noted that the revolutionary courts established in Santiago and other cities were the same tribunals operated by the rebels during Castro's 2-year-long uprising.

It declared that "although summary" the trials of Batista agents were conducted in such a way as to insure that sentences were handed down "with strict justice." The magazine added:

"When the world will have become fully acquainted with all the horrible things that occurred in Cuba during the past 6 years the executions of a few hundred guilty persons will seem to be mild punishment."

Address by Hon. George H. Roderick, Assistant Secretary of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on the 13th of last September, at the Union League Club in Philadelphia, a very striking and interesting ceremonial was performed in the formal presentation of a Scottish claymore—the long-time and most effective fighting weapon of the Highlanders—to the 111th Infantry, Pennsylvania National Guard. This was upon the 210th anniversary of the organization of the Black Watch, the widely famed military unit of the British Army, with Scottish background. Also, the occasion particularly commemorated the association of the Black Watch with the 111th Infantry on a battlefield in North America; that is to say, 195 years before, during the French and Indian wars. The 3d Battalion, the Black Watch of Canada, is allied with the parent Black Watch organization, which has more than two centuries of gallant military history behind it, and its allied units.

The presentation was made for all ranks of the Black Watch; and on behalf of the 111th Infantry—itself of a brilliant fighting record—the acceptance was made by our very popular Assistant Secretary of the Army, Hon. George H. Roderick, in a concise, able, and most interesting and informative address.

Pennsylvanians have every reason to be proud of their colonial history, and Secretary Roderick's reference thereto is especially appreciated.

Believing that the address is well worthy of a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under leave granted, I now include it as a part of these remarks:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE GEORGE H. RODERICK, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, CEREMONIAL MESS, 111TH INFANTRY, UNION LEAGUE, PHILADELPHIA, PA., SEPTEMBER 13, 1958

I am honored to receive in behalf of the U.S. Army this Scottish claymore which is so beautifully inscribed, "Presented to the 111th Infantry on the occasion of its 210th anniversary by all ranks of the Black Watch."

I am happy that the presentation of this claymore, a weapon symbolic of the soldierly tradition of the Scots, can be made before members of the Black Watch of Canada. Indeed, it is to commemorate the association of your allied regiment in the British Army with the 111th Infantry on a North American battlefield 195 years ago that this presentation is made. We deeply appreciate this thoughtful gesture on the part of Her Majesty, the Queen Mother, Colonel in Chief of the Regiment, and all ranks of the Black Watch.

I should like to take this opportunity now to add my expression of welcome to the officers and wives of the Third Battalion, the Black Watch of Canada. I consider it a singular distinction that your battalion commander, Lt. Col. William Wood is one of only two men to occupy the chair which, for almost 200 years, has been reserved at this ceremonial mess for the regimental commander of the Black Watch or his designate. This honor accorded your commander is also a tribute to each of you in the organization.

The Black Watch of the British Army, whose commander you represent here tonight, Colonel Wood, is held in highest esteem by the many Americans who are familiar with its history. This is true because the regiment has participated with distinction in significant military campaigns in many parts of the world beginning in 1743 with the War of Austrian Succession. Units of the Black Watch have through the years perpetuated the great traditions of soldiering which characterized the ancient Scots. One has only to review the battle honors of the regiment to see how the valor of the brave men who have worn your traditional uniform have contributed to great victories that have often shaped the course of history. Waterloo, Sevastopol, the Marne, the Hindenburg Line, are some of the battles in which the Black Watch won honors. In World War II and Korea, the regiment continued its outstanding record of valor.

The Black Watch of Canada has carried on the fine traditions of its Allied regiment in Britain since its organization in 1862. Today, I understand, it is the oldest Highland regiment in any Dominion of the British Commonwealth of Nations. It too has won many battle honors, including such campaigns as South Africa (1899–1900), Ypres, Passchendaele, Hindenburg Line, France, and Flanders. The traditions of the Black Watch have been perpetuated by the splendid record of achievement of your regiment.

It is a significant fact—a fact which all of us here tonight should know—that one of the first campaigns fought by the Black Watch, and for which it won battle honors, was in North America during the French and Indian wars. In a series of actions at Fort Pitt and at Bushy Run in that year detachments of the Black Watch were joined by companies of rangers or provincials. Numbered among these provincials were the associators, an outgrowth of Franklin's Associators, organized by Benjamin Franklin in Philadelphia in 1747. It is to this organization founded by Benjamin Franklin in Philadelphia that the 111th Infantry Regiment traces its ancestry. It is also a significant fact that the action at Bushy Run in which the antecedents of the Black Watch and the 111th Infantry fought side by side resulted in a resounding victory.

I shall not attempt to review this evening the splendid chapter which the 111th Infantry has writen in American history. The battle honors which have already been extolled here tonight are sufficient evidence of a magnificent record of achievement. But there is one aspect of this fine record which I would like to note. The 111th Infantry has maintained well the great American tradition of the citizen-soldier. From the earliest days of our history this Nation has maintained a small Regular Army and has relied upon its reserve of citizen-soldiers to form the bulk of our fighting forces in time of war. The record of the 111th Infantry with its many battle honors has exemplified the highest order of performance of the citizen-soldier in the defense of his country. America has always been proud of its citizens whose patriotism and love of country prompt them to take the time from their civilian occupations to maintain their military readiness to defend their country in time of war. I commend each of you this evening for your contribution to the defense of your country by your service in this great National Guard unit of the State of Pennsylvania. And, General Biddle, it is particularly pleasant for me to say to you, the adjutant general of Pennsylvania, distinguished soldier and statesman and admired personal friend, that the Department of the Army holds this service in highest terms of regard and pride.

The tradition of the citizen-soldier is likewise maintained in Canada by you gentlemen of the 3d Battalion. I understand that one of the outstanding features of your regiment in Canada has been the tremendous family spirit which has been present since its founding in 1862. Successive generations of officers and men from the same families have served both at home and abroad, in the same tradition that prompted the building of the parent unit in Scotland in 1739. We in America are very cognizant of the efforts which you are making to prepare yourselves as citizen-soldiers and appreciative of the importance of those efforts to the defense of your country and of the free world.

Knowing, then, the history of the Black Watch, it is with great pride that I accept this claymore in behalf of the United States and the U.S. Army. I accept it not only as a token of friendship and respect but also as a symbol of the fighting spirit and rugged character of the ancient Scot who used it as his primary weapon. It is this fighting spirit of the ancient Scot typified by his fierce loyalty to those he loved, his intense pride, his indomitable will, his determination never to yield to his enemies, that forms the basis of the Scottish tradition. In the U.S. Army we have always prided ourselves that our soldiers have been imbued with many of the characteristics of the great Scottish warriors. I hope that this Scottish claymore will serve to remind us again of the value in war of the individual soldier. For I say again, as many of the military leaders of the U.S. Army have said, that even in this age of the thermonuclear weapon a most essential prerequisite for victory on the battlefield is the fighting spirit of the individual soldier.

In this Scottish claymore I see an analogy. In its construction as a two-edged sword, the claymore can be said to be symbolic of the fighting forces of our two countries, the United States and Canada. Each force, like an edge of the sword, is capable of inflicting separate damage upon our enemies, but like the claymore, these fighting forces are wielded together operationally by single direction. Thus we in the United States and Canada along with Great Britain and our other allies have joined forces in NATO and are, with unity of purpose, directing our efforts in a common cause, the defense of freedom.

With knowledge then of the great symbolism and tradition associated with the Scottish claymore and with awareness of the deep significance of the expression of friendship on behalf of all ranks of the Black Watch. I turn over this claymore to the commanding officer of the 111th Infantry. Colonel White, I charge you in behalf of the U.S. Army to maintain this symbol as a cherished possession. Let it continue through the years to remind you to preserve the great traditions for which it stands and which have been the guiding spirit of your great regiment for over 200 years. Let it also serve to remind all of us of the strength that comes when great nations such as ours are united in common purpose and motivated by a common tradition. With the strength which abounds from such friendship we can truly say in the words of the motto the Black Watch of Canada, "No one strikes me without fear."

Interest on the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an informative article written by Sylvia Porter, appearing in the Boston Herald of January 26, 1959, relating to the tremendous increase of interest and money paid on the national debt. Few persons seem to know of and appreciate that this large increase has taken place as a result of the policies of the present administration.

There is another aspect of this policy of high interest which could have been avoided and that is the effect upon the market value of Government bonds of prior issues with a smaller rate of interest, the sharp drop in the market value of such bonds.

TEN CENTS OF EVERY DOLLAR OF TAXES GOES FOR INTEREST

(By Sylvia Porter)

A full 10 cents of every dollar you and I and America's businessmen will pay in Federal taxes in the new year will go just to meet interest due during the 12 months to owners of U.S. Government securities.

This is a slice of the budget second only to that taken by the catchall "major national security." It dwarfs the 7 cents of every dollar going for all veterans' services and benefits, tops the 8 cents of every dollar going for all farm programs.

Of the billions we'll be pouring into the Federal Treasury in the year starting in mid-1959, more than $8 billion will be automatically set aside for public debt interest.

This is a total which defies comprehension. It represents a new peak in the cost of carrying the debt, compares with an annual interest load of $1 billion as recently as 1940.

When World War II ended and we toted up the cost of that global conflict in dollars, we found that war borrowing had pushed the national debt close to $280 billion.

CRIES FOR EXPLAINING

The yearly payment made by the U.S. Treasury to holders of that massive amount of I.O.U.'s, was only around $4.7 billion, though.

Today the national debt is around $282.7 billion, not much higher than at the close of World War II.

But the yearly payment by the U.S. Treasury to holders of today's massive amount of I.O.U.'s, is over $8 billion—an upsurge of more than 70 percent.

It's a tale that cries out for explaining, for while there will be countless headlines about the coming congressional debates on spending for farm supports, veterans' benefits, housing, foreign aid, etc., there will be little noise about this far bigger chunk of spending.

And the reason is that Congress cannot do a thing about this expense. Once the Treasury has pledged to pay a specified interest rate to a buyer of its obligations, it must pay that rate for the life of the obligation. It cannot cut the interest rate while the I O U is outstanding. Of course, it can default on a note. When the President, in his budget message, estimated $8.1 billion for debt interest alone in the 1959–60 fiscal year, he wasn't exaggerating one bit.

What has been happening? A key point about what has been happening is that it has not been an accidental swelling in spending. Rather, it has been the result of deliberate policies adopted at the highest policymaking levels in Washington.

First, the Federal Reserve System has been encouraging rising interest rates across the board through most of this decade. In simplest words, the theory has been: "Higher costs of borrowing money will restrict speculative activities by curbing marginal borrowing, and this will help restrain price rises. When business is swinging upward, the costs of borrowing money should properly go up too. Only when business is declining should we expect lower borrowing costs."

INCREASE IMPROVED

Second, under President Eisenhower, the heads of the Treasury have not fought the higher borrowing costs—as did the Treasury chiefs under President Roosevelt and President Truman. In simplest words, the position of the Treasury in this era has been: "The Treasury should not get special protection against a general rise in borrowing costs. The Treasury is just another borrower competing for available funds, and it should compete as others do—meaning the Treasury must pay the price (the interest rate) demanded by lenders for cash."

The result of these policies has been that as the Treasury has borrowed new cash in recent years and replaced maturing I O U's with new ones, it has paid higher and higher rates.

In World War II the going interest rate on long-term U.S. bonds was 2½ percent a year—and the Treasury borrowed billions from us at that level.

Today the going rate on long-term U.S. bonds is over 4 percent a year—and the Treasury can't get much cash even at that rate.

Sure, the United States can afford today's debt and interest load—but that doesn't make $8 billion a year in interest alone any less staggering. What's more, the top of the debt or the interest cost is not yet in sight.

The President's Message on the Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I have examined carefully the President's message on the agricultural program and the

supporting memorandum of Secretary Benson, both of which were submitted to Congress today. The message and the memorandum reflect careful and thorough study by able and well-informed specialists. In my judgment the recommendations so presented are wise and constructive and I hope they will all be enacted into law promptly.

An Amendment Clarifying the Intent of the Outdoor Advertising Control Section of the Federal-Aid Highway Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today an amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act to clarify the intent of Congress regarding the regulation of outdoor advertising along the Interstate System. My amendment proposes to make it clear beyond any doubt that Congress intended to regulate—not prohibit—advertising along this great new network of roads.

Furthermore, my amendment insures that any such regulation must be fair and reasonable, and must not be prohibition in disguise.

What has made the introduction and the adoption of this amendment absolutely essential is the fact that the regulations, as they exist today, do constitute prohibition.

This unfortunate situation—posing a substantial threat to a large portion of our economy—was created by the Department of Commerce when it wrote the regulations. That agency completely misinterpreted the intent of Congress. Instead of regulation, the Commerce Department interpreted the act passed by the 85th Congress last year to mean prohibition and wrote a set of rules accordingly.

These rules are known as national standards for the display of outdoor advertising. Unless the proposed amendment is adopted, there is nothing to prevent the national standards issued last November 10 by former Secretary of Commerce Weeks from continuing in full force and effect.

Such an eventuality would work a great injustice upon the outdoor advertising business, which is a thoroughly legitimate and necessary business that helps promote our economy. We should not permit an administrative agency to flout the intent of Congress and injure such a business. It is therefore essential that prompt action be taken by this House to right the wrong that has been done.

For the benefit of the Members who are not familiar with this legislation, I will briefly review it. It has been customary every 2 years for Congress to pass a Federal Aid Highway Act, the most important provisions of which authorize appropriations for road construction for the ensuing 2 years. The latest of such acts became the law on April 16, 1958—Public Law 85-381—and is known as the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1958. It included a section 122 entitled "Areas Adjacent to the Interstate System." Section 122 has been incorporated into the codification of the Federal Aid Highway Acts, title 23 of the Code, and is now known as section 131. I will refer to it as section 131.

This section declares it to be a national policy that the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs within 660 feet of the edge of the right-of-way of the Interstate System should be regulated. It further provides that the regulation must be consistent with national standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce. These standards are to include only four types of signs. After the adoption of the standards, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to enter into agreements with the State highway departments to carry out the national policy. Any State that enters into such an agreement is entitled under this section to have its share of the Federal aid, payable on account of any project on the Interstate System, to be increased by one-half of 1 percent of the total cost of the project. That, in brief, summarizes the pertinent provisions of section 131.

Section 131 uses the word "regulate." It does not use the word "prohibit." In fact, one of the earlier bills upon which section 131 was based did use the word "prohibit." This word was stricken from the compromise measure which formed the basis of section 131 as finally adopted.

Indeed, the sponsors of this legislation declared frequently during Senate debate last year that the purpose of the act was to regulate and not prohibit outdoor advertising.

For example, on last March 25, and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senator GORE said:

> The bill does not provide for prohibition, either by States or by the Federal Government.

Senator NEUBERGER said on March 24 that—and I quote again from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> If State law authorizes the kinds of signs mentioned in the third and fourth classes of subsection (a), the standards promulgated by the Secretary may only contain reasonable regulation of them, not total prohibition.

Mr. Speaker, what could be clearer as to legislative intent? But did the Secretary of Commerce need this mandate? No; he went several steps beyond.

Allow me to cite some specific examples from the national standards. Take section 20.10 titled "State Regulations." This section reads:

> A State may elect to prohibit signs permissible under the standards in this part without forfeiting its rights to any benefits provided for in the act.

I ask you, is this a standard of regulation? No. It is nothing more than a gratuitous invitation on the part of the Secretary of Commerce for the States to prohibit advertising completely. Quite plainly this section tells the States that they may prohibit a legitimate business and still get their bonus. They will be paid for complete prohibition.

Only the most technical of interpretations of the wording of the act could justify the Secretary in making a payment for prohibition, or for that matter, to even invite prohibition.

Let us look at it this way. If Congress had intended to make the bonus payable for straight prohibition, then why did not Congress say so right in the law? Since this was not the intent of Congress, why then should it be allowed to stand as part of the national standards?

There are other—more direct provisions in the national standards leading to prohibition. Section 20.6 of the standards authorizes what it calls informational sites. Where one of these sites was constructed, all commercial signs would be prohibited for 12 miles in either direction.

This, too, is a gratuitous addition to the law. If you read section 131 of the Highway Code you will find no mention whatsoever of informational sites. Furthermore, at the time the act was being debated in Congress last year there was no mention or suggestion that informational sites should be established along interstate highways.

As a matter of fact, the first reference in Congress concerning these sites did not come until May 13 of last year, nearly a month after the law was enacted. On that day Senator NEUBERGER put forth the idea. The Commerce Department promptly grabbed it as an easy way to make it appear as though outdoor advertising were being permitted, when in actual practice informational sites would prohibit it.

The Commerce Department envisions these sites as being pulloffs from the highway where a number of small commercial signs are displayed on big boards, like a directory. Motorists would even have to get out of their cars to read them.

Now the purpose of outdoor advertising is to convey a message to persons as they move about from one place to another—walking, driving a car, riding a train, et cetera. This is the historical, commonly understood, and generally accepted concept of the meaning and purpose of outdoor advertising.

If one took a classified telephone directory and hung it on a post out of doors, we would not have outdoor advertising. By the same token, informational sites are not outdoor advertising. Because they would no more fulfill the true function of outdoor advertising than a telephone directory hanging from a post along the highway.

I might point out that there is no such thing as an informational site in existence in this country today.

Certainly, if there were any utilitarian advantage to such a device, some State would have constructed one by now.

Another provision of the national standards which leads to the virtual prohibition of outdoor advertising is the one contained in subparagraph (b) of

section 20.7. This prohibits signs within 2 miles in advance of an interchange. The latest figure that I have been able to obtain from the Bureau of Roads indicates that interchanges on the Interstate System will be on the average about 3½ miles apart. While it can be said with accuracy, that this regulation does not absolutely prohibit all signs, it also can be said with equal accuracy that it prohibits so many signs that it will act as a practical prohibition.

Furthermore, there is practical prohibition in the size limitation set by the Secretary on the few signs which are permissible. He has decreed that the maximum size shall be 150 square feet, which would allow for a 10- by 15-foot sign.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this restriction would exclude one whole segment of the outdoor advertising business, the segment known as the standardized outdoor advertising industry.

This advertising medium, as it is called, many years ago standardized its signs at 300 square feet, a fact, I daresay, that is well known by the Secretary. Yet, he wrote the standards so that standardized outdoor advertising would be prohibited.

I ask you, Is this reasonable regulation to make a raw discrimination against an established industry which has earned its niche in the economy? No. It is prohibition by regulation, just as the other facts and figures show that I have presented.

Prohibition of alcohol was tried once in this country. It was a failure. Prohibition is not the way of a democracy. It is an exercise of tyranny. Let us live up to the spirit of democracy and not be tyrants. Once the door is open to prohibition of legitimate business for purely esthetic reasons, where will it be stopped? Perhaps other groups will criticize and then try to abolish other types of structures for esthetic reasons. Certainly there is room for great differences of opinion. What is a pleasing attractive structure to one, may be completely unattractive and unpleasing to others. Are we to turn over to an administrative agency the power to prohibit a legitimate business on such unstable grounds? Shall we permit a precedent that may leave the door wide open for the prohibition of other legitimate businesses in the future according to the whims of an articulate minority?

In conclusion, section 131 authorizes the appropriation of several hundreds of millions of dollars to be paid to the States for the regulation of outdoor advertising. The Secretary of Commerce, through his promulgation of the national standards, has authorized the pouring out of these millions for a very different purpose, that is, as a bonus to those States which completely prohibit outdoor advertising or which adopt the national standards which require a virtual prohibition of outdoor advertising. In my opinion, no bill that called for paying these millions for a complete prohibition could have passed Congress. The national standards go far beyond the intent of Congress. The only way to carry out the intent of Congress is to pass the proposed bill, which will make it clear beyond all shadow of doubt that it is a regulatory, not a prohibitory, bill, and which will require new national standards that are not confiscatory, but fair and reasonable, and permit the continuation of a legitimate business which benefits this economy.

The Education of Our Children Is of National Concern, and if They Are Not Educated Properly, It Is a National Calamity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower said at his White House press conference on July 31, 1957, that:

> The education of our children is of national concern and if they are not educated properly it is a national calamity.

Fred M. Hechinger, a past president of the Education Writers Association, wrote an article which he titled the "Five Basic Problems of Education" and which appeared as the lead article in the New York Times magazine of January 25, 1959. The New York Times is to be congratulated for its generosity in giving so much space to a discussion of this vital subject by a former education editor of the New York Herald Tribune.

It must be said of Mr. Hechinger's article, I think, that it almost entirely ignores the vital point that inadequate pay is the fundamental reason why better people do not become teachers and why so many competent people leave the profession. This view was expressed repeatedly by the many distinguished witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives during the 85th Congress.

Similarly, the Rockefeller report on education (p. 25) declares that:

> The root problem of the teaching profession remains financial * * * until we pay teachers at least as well as the middle echelon of executives we cannot expect the profession to attract its full share of the available range of talents. Salaries must be raised immediately and substantially.

Since Mr. Hechinger's article is in all other respects such a timely and incisive discussion of American education, I include it for the information of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced three major bills designed to assist in solving the basic problems of education. H.R. 284 would amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide for 20,000 national defense scholarships and for other purposes.

President Eisenhower called for 10,000 scholarships during the 85th Congress. The House provided these but they were dropped by the Senate.

A preference for science and mathematics written into the National Defense Education Act would be modified by H.R. 284 to give equal weight to the other disciplines including the humanities.

Repeal of the loyalty oath is provided in the H.R. 284, however the measure also calls for an affirmative oath of allegiance. Many educational leaders believe the present requirement of a loyalty oath, applying as it does to a large number of young people and teachers, is thoroughly harmful since it singles out people in education as objects of suspicion. Further, the present act tragically stifles the free exchange of ideas in the classroom and leads to complete stultification of the educational process.

My second bill, H.R. 965, provides financial assistance for the support of public schools by appropriating funds to the States to be used for constructing school facilities and for teachers' salaries.

Federal grants to the States would be on the basis of each State's school-age population and would amount to $25 per child during the first year, $50 the second, $75 the third, and $100 for the fourth and succeeding years. Written into the bill is the assurance that no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration of any school or school system. To make sure that the States and local school districts do not slacken their own efforts, the bill provides for a reduction of the grants if a State's educational program is below the national average. The effective date of this reduction provision would be delayed for 3 years to give State legislatures two sessions to work on their programs.

Federal officials have estimated that we are short 140,000 classrooms and 135,000 teachers. It is a shocking thing to realize that only one-half cent of every Federal tax dollar goes to support public schools. This must be compared with the 43 cents out of every local tax dollar and the 31 cents out of every State tax dollar which goes to public education. Our schoolchildren must have the support of the one level of government which to date has been resting on its oars where education is concerned—the Federal Government. It is time that we began putting first things first. A nation which does not put a top priority on education will not remain a first-class power very long. At the present time we have launched a multi-billion-dollar Federal roadbuilding program; we spend $40 billion plus on defense, and several million dollars apiece for our missiles. Our citizens spend hundreds of millions of dollars each year on liquor, tobacco, advertising, automobiles, and other luxuries. Our materialistic culture can and it must find funds for education which is essential to our survival as a free nation.

My third bill, H.R. 2440, amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide funds for educational purposes by providing increased incentives for private

giving through the allowance of a tax credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education.

The following letter explains the purposes of H.R. 2440 in detail:

JANUARY 23, 1959.

Mr. EDMUND J. GLEAZER,
Executive Director, American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GLEAZER: I have your letter expressing interest in my bill, H.R. 2440, to provide increased incentives for private giving to colleges and universities, and asking for a statement regarding it.

This measure follows the recommendations of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the resolution adopted by the Association of American Colleges at its convention in Miami, Fla., last year. Many other organizations have called for increased private giving including the Council for Financial Aid to Education, the National Planning Association, and the recently established Independent College Funds of America consisting of 40 State and regional organizations representing 467 colleges and universities. Most corporations and individuals conspicuously fail to contribute the sums permitted under the present tax laws. In fact, it is the failure of the present tax laws to realize the sums necessary which has led to H.R. 2440 and the other bills in the Congress to increase private and public funds for educational purposes.

H.R. 2440 would allow a taxpayer a credit against income tax for charitable contributions made to institutions of higher education. In the case of an individual taxpayer, the limit on this credit would be the same as the present limit on the deduction for charitable contributions. H.R. 2440 would not give him a tax benefit with respect to more contributions than he may now include for deduction purposes alone; he may elect to treat a charitable contribution (if it is to an educational institution) as a credit rather than as a deduction, but the total of credit plus deduction is no greater than the present allowable total of deductions.

In the case of a corporate taxpayer, the limit on this credit would be increased from 5 percent to 10 percent of taxable income (where the percentage-of-taxable-income method of computing the limit is used), and this credit would be in addition to the deduction presently allowed for charitable contributions generally; a corporation may elect to treat charitable contributions to educational institutions as credits rather than as deductions (up to 10 percent) without cutting into the amount of such contributions (along with other types of charitable contributions) which may be allowed as deductions. Of course, the same contribution cannot be counted as a credit and a deduction.

Under H.R. 2440 the taxpayer would be allowed a 2-year carryover on the credit just as he is presently allowed a 2-year carryover for deduction purposes. The Secretary of the Treasury would be directed to prescribe regulations governing the time and manner of making the election to treat a contribution as a credit rather than a deduction and imposing conditions to ensure the effective correlation of the new credit section with the existing deduction provisions.

I am sending along two copies of H.R. 2440 for your use.

Cordially yours,

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

FIVE BASIC PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

Ever since the cold war moved into outer space, the American people have been concerned about education. No longer is the sky the limit; even the moon is only a whistlestop. And in the futuristic contest, the classrooms are the launching platform.

Hardly a week passes without several television programs peeking behind the scenes of education. Not long ago, a broadcaster cornered a few high school students, and their deplorable ignorance set off a national storm of criticism. The Rockefeller report on education got top billing on the front pages of even small-town dailies. Rear Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, father of the atomic submarine, received a sympathetic public ear when he proclaimed that, if the money for education could not be found in the Federal budget, the defense appropriation should be cut.

President Eisenhower appointed a special Committee on Education Beyond High School. The Ford Foundation made the largest gift in the history of private philanthropy for the increase of professors' salaries. James Bryant Conant, Harvard's former president, has devoted the past 2 years to an attempt to find out what is wrong with American high school education. In fact, the Conant report, which is set for publication next Wednesday, has already stirred up more excitement than many Government white papers.

Everybody is concerned about education; but education is an elusive, amorphous thing. Before it can be understood and improved, some of the crucial problems must be singled out and defined. As an observer of the educational scene, I have visited classrooms, talked with teachers, listened to parents, sat through speeches and conventions, scanned the statistics and studied the reports.

Let me set down what seem the five most immediate problems; then let us see what the experts recommend.

THE PROBLEM

1. How can American standards of education be raised, and what, especially, can be done to meet the challenge of the exceptionally gifted child?

American democracy promises every child a full elementary and secondary education, but the unanswered question has always been how to do this without surrendering to the lowest common denominator. Our educational laissez-faire, which permits even able students to pick elective snap courses, has allowed standards to slip.

The raising of educational standards for the great mass of students would mean a spectacular improvement in the country's total reservoir of skills. But what about the small number of exceptionally gifted children—the top 2 percent? The talents of these, if lost, are irreplaceable. In terms of the country's progress and of competitive coexistence in a cold war period, they may well hold the key.

THE PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

There is almost unanimous agreement that the search for quality in a system of quantity rates first attention. To cope with the problem of a curriculum which has been loaded down with an almost unlimited variety of subjects from driver education to citizenship training, the Rockefeller report, entitled "The Pursuit of Excellence," demands that "we reach some agreement on priorities in subject matter." Educators are asked to make up their minds which of the many elective courses are most important.

The Conant report will go a step further. It will clearly demand that all high school students complete 4 years of English, 3 to 4 years of history and related social studies, 1 year of mathematics and 1 year of science. Students in the top 20 percent would take 3 additional years of science, 3 more years of mathematics and at least 3 years of 1 foreign language.

For all students there must be improved guidance. Dr. Conant asks for 1 guidance counselor for every 250 to 300 high school students. And, in order to assure adequate programs and facilities, he asks for elimination, through consolidation, of all high schools with graduating classes of fewer than 100 students.

All proposals for the improvement of education demand a greater sense of continuity of subjects and a greater scope of understanding. Study of a foreign language for less than 3 years, says Dr. Conant, is like drilling for oil and then stopping before striking it. In the study of history, too, efforts are largely wasted unless there is a sense of the natural sequence of events.

For the 2 percent of gifted pupils, even more of a concession to the difference in human talent must be made. "A school system that insists on the same instruction for the talented, average and below average child," said Rear Admiral Rickover, "may prevent as many children from growing intellectually as would a system that excludes children because of the social, political or economic status of their parents. Neither system is democratic."

The experts agree. "Any educational system is, among other things, a great sorting-out process," says the Rockefeller report. But while the European sorting out is achieved almost entirely by impersonal examinations, the American experts call for a variety of tests, some scoring native talent, others the actual achievement of the student, with personal observation and guidance. Once the gifted students are recognized, the experts want them to be given advanced work, without separating them from their classmates.

Toward the end of high school the extra work would be increased. Thus, juniors and seniors would be offered college-level instruction in some subjects, as they now are under the advanced placement program sponsored by the college-entrance examination board. Another program for early admission to college, initiated by the Fund for the Advancement of Education and hailed by all the experts, has sent more than 1,000 gifted students to college during the past 5 years without completion of the last year or two of high school.

THE PROBLEM

2. How can we get better teachers?

There is no way to improve the quality of American education without an adequate supply of good teachers. Already a serious shortage of highly educated manpower exists. This shortage will become increasingly critical unless we find enough of what the Ford Foundation calls the seed corn—teachers who, through their superior efforts, help to raise new generations of educated brains.

Perhaps even worse, the standards set for the teachers are often pitifully low. For example, at a convention in Bowling Green, Ohio, recently, an education spokesman demanded that chemistry teachers be given at least 32 hours of college study in that subject. A Russian student in a college-preparatory high school, by comparison, gets more than 340 hours of chemistry before graduation.

THE PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

"No educational system can be better than its teachers," warns the Rockefeller report. It estimates that the number of new teachers needed in the next decade is somewhere between one-third and one-half of all college graduates in that period. The present ratio of college graduates entering the teaching profession is only one out of every four or five. And yet, even today, the report warns, the problem of quality is critical. As of 1956, 33 percent of all elementary teachers did not hold an A.B. degree, while more than 21 percent of all public school teachers had less than 4 years of college.

Since the training of all teachers depends on the quality of the training of

college teachers, there is special significance in a report by the National Education Association that "since 1953–54, holders of the doctor's degree among newly employed, full-time [college] teachers have decreased 25.2 percent." And the manpower pressures of the immediate future may make this situation even worse.

The Rockefeller report calls for an improvement in the courses and training procedures given teachers. "If the programs for the preparation of teachers are rigid, formalistic and shallow, they will drive away minds as fast as they are recruited," it warns. "Unhappily, preparation for precollege teaching has come all too close to that condition."

The report warns against the practice of handling teachers as "interchangeable units in an educational assembly line." At present, "the best teacher and the poorest in a school may teach the same grade and subject, use the same textbook, handle the same number of students, get paid the same salaries, and rise in salary at the same speed to the same ceiling." The ironic result is that school administration—and the end of active teaching—often becomes the only refuge for able teachers who want to advance their careers.

The problem of getting a sufficient number of teachers is primarily one of recruiting and of offering an attractive career. "But even with aggressive recruitment there appears to be little or no likelihood that we can bring into teaching at any level anything approaching the number of qualified and gifted teachers we need," says the Rockefeller report. "We must therefore utilize our superior teachers more effectively."

All the experts agree that, in the words of the Rockefeller report, "one way to make better use of the ablest teachers is to eliminate many of the petty tasks which occupy a teacher's time. Less highly trained classroom assistants may accomplish much in the lightening of this burden." The Fund for the Advancement of Education, putting this theory to the test in Bay City, Mich., found it successful, and it has spread from there to many communities across the country. A bonus, it was found, came when many of the aides, seeing teaching at its best, became so interested that they went back to college to get their teacher training.

Other experiments have been sparked by the success of the first one. The use of teams of teachers, made up of 1 master teacher, 1 regular teacher, and 1 untrained assistant has made it possible to increase the class size for some subjects to 3 times a normal classroom quota, while, at other times, permitting 1 teacher to work with only 8 to 12 pupils. The use of television has also made it possible to get more of the best teachers into contact with more students.

THE PROBLEM

3. Should we emphasize science as against the liberal arts?

However we respond to the challenge of sputnik or speculate about the importance of moon shoots, one fact is inescapable—science and technology are intimately linked with modern man's destiny.

Traditionally, there used to be a clear dividing line between the liberal arts and the sciences. The high school student who thought he had no interest in a career of science frequently was allowed to get by with a minimum of mathematics and science instruction. Reports about the Russian schools, which go to the opposite extreme of requiring a stiff dose of science and mathematics for all high school students, have intensified the problem of just how much science training should be required of every high school graduate.

THE PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

The experts agree on two fundamental points: (1) that, despite the panic headlines, science must not crowd out the humanities; (2) that it is vital for all students, not just the scientifically inclined, to have a thorough measure of basic mathematics and science.

On the first point, the President's Committee on Education Beyond High School says that the country "would be inexcusably blind if it failed to see that the challenge of the next 20 years will require leaders not only in science and engineering and in business and industry, but in government and politics, in foreign affairs and diplomacy, in education and civic affairs."

On the second point, Dr. I. I. Rabi, Nobel Prize physicist and chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee, says: "We must teach science as an intellectual pursuit rather than as a body of tricks." And he adds: "As yet, if a man has no feeling for art he is considered narrow-minded, but if he has no feeling for science, he is considered quite normal. This is a fundamental weakness."

Probably the greatest waste of scientific talent stems from social clichés which discourage girls from studying science and mathematics as "unladylike." Dr. Conant found that, even in the best high schools, fewer than half of the gifted girls elect 4 years of mathematics.

The experts agree that it is not a question of "either-or" between science and the liberal arts. The Rockefeller report warns as much against the narrowly trained scientist as against the educated man who is illiterate in science.

THE PROBLEM

4. Who should go to college?

Already more than 3 million young Americans are enrolled in college—a total of one-third of the eligible age group. Is universal college the next step, following the universal high school? Some State universities have, in practice, accepted this principle; they consider a high school diploma an automatic admission ticket. Other college spokesmen warn against the danger of indiscriminate admission policies as an invitation to lowered standards. They are, however, more concerned that rising costs will price the colleges out of the market for many able students.

One fact is clear: Even if the present policy of selection is continued, most colleges would have to double or triple in size by 1975 in order to accommodate the same percentage of students who go to college today.

No expert wants to restrict college admission, but all would like to see standards raised so that the restrictions could be built into the procedure of selection. They applaud current trends in that direction. They cite the announcement by the University of Illinois that by September 1960 its freshmen will no longer be nursed along in remedial English courses. They point with approval to more than a dozen colleges which have revived foreign-language requirements for admission.

The problem is not so much whom to keep out of college, but rather how to make sure that those who should go to college do so.

The two roadblocks, the experts agree, are motivation and finances. To remove the first, they say that young people with talent will have to be shown more effectively that there is real value and excitement in higher education. To remove the second, they suggest more scholarships.

The President's committee called for 10 times the present total amount of scholarship money, estimated at about $60 million. It wants about 200,000 of the ablest and neediest high school graduates annually to be assured of a college education by having the financial burden removed from them.

In addition, it calls for between 25,000 and 50,000 subsidized campus jobs so that another large group will be able to support itself with work-study programs. In order to build higher education firmly into the American way of life, the President's committee also suggests that the tax laws be revised so that students and their parents would be assured of credits or deductions.

THE PROPOSED SOLUTION

All the experts agree that there should be a greater number of 2-year colleges for those who are unwilling or unable to commit themselves to 4 years of higher education.

Finally, the Conant report will urgently demand another reform plan which would eliminate those students who feel that they are inadequately prepared to make a living when they leave high school, and who go to college for vocational training rather than for education. The Conant plan would expect the high schools to offer vocational training of highest caliber to these students.

Considering the importance of the problem of who should go to college, it is disappointing to find the experts vague and hedging in their replies. The reason is simple: they are torn between rational planning and the commitment to an ideal. The first calls for toughness in setting up restrictions so that the colleges and universities can be made into institutions of excellence; the second dreams about the removal of all limitations from a child's educational horizon. At present, the American genius for compromise is in search of a formula that will be democratic without destroying the standards of scholarship and education.

THE PROBLEM

5. How do you pay for all this?

If mass and class in education are to be combined, perhaps for the first time in history, then the cost will be high. What compounds the difficulty is the almost pathological fear of Government control through Government financing. Yet, from the problem of the loss of potentially able teachers to higher paying jobs to the fact that local spending is not even beginning to catch up with school construction needs, every sign points to an inescapable truth: the present sources of money are insufficient to pay for a first-class mass education system.

Many schools are overcrowded, understaffed and ill-equipped. There is an estimated shortage of 142,000 classrooms and an excess of almost 2 million pupils. And within 10 years the high schools will have arrived at a point where they will face 50 to 70 percent more pupils than they can now accommodate.

THE PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

None of the experts has tackled the money problem with complete candor. The fear of an allout fight over the principle of Federal aid has led to a flood of cautious statements and even more cautious legislation. Yet between the lines the implication is clear: Federal aid will have to be a permanent part of the picture.

What are the real needs? Our total expenditure for education, from elementary school through the universities, today is approximately $14 billion annually. This is 3.6 percent of the gross national product. The experts estimate that, in order to attain the goals of quality in a system of quantity, the Nation will have to spend $30 billion annually 10 years from now, with those $30 billion measured in terms of today's purchasing power. This would mean, according to the best economists' predictions, about 5 percent of the gross national product.

The Rockefeller report points out that local and State tax systems are in some respects archiac. School expenditures are charged almost entirely to the revenue raised through

property tax—and this is also the tax which meets with the most solidly organized and most vocal opposition. It is no coincidence that the rejection of school bond issues in New York State reached an all-time high last year—despite sputnik.

"It is this weakness in the State and local taxing systems more than anything else that gives rise to current proposals for increased Federal support of education," says the Rockefeller report. "For those who wish to resist or postpone the resort to Federal funds and at the same time not constrict educational services, there seems to be only one alternative: a thorough, painful, politically courageous overhaul of State and local tax systems."

Almost certainly this is not going to happen, and definitely not in time to bolster a weakened edifice of education.

The only public acknowledgment of these unpleasant facts was made by the White House Conference on Education, late in 1955, which voted better than 2 to 1 in favor of Federal aid to education, to be devoted specifically to school construction.

Congress omitted all Federal aid to school construction, however, after the administration's Federal aid proposals in 1958 completely dropped the demand for money for buildings.

Congress and the public had their eyes on scholarships, which they considered the chief ingredient of a crash program to compete with the Soviet Union. When it came to a vote and a series of compromises, the less than $1 billion aid bill offered mainly student loans (not scholarships); some graduate fellowships, plus special financial lures in the form of partly written-off loans to draw students into the teaching profession; and special funds for the improvement of guidance, language, and science teaching, vocational education, and research. The largest single amount—$300 million—was earmarked to buy science equipment for school systems in the various States. The most critically needed items, funds for buildings and for teachers' salaries, were overlooked.

Thus, the real Federal aid problem as a key to the financing of the schools remains an issue, with the fear of Federal control still the major roadblock to more sweeping appropriations. The Rockefeller report points out some safeguards that could be built into Federal aid to prevent it from leading to Federal control:

1. Federal funds would be one source of support among many.

2. State, local, and private sources of funds should continue to be the major factor in the support of education.

3. Federal funds should be used only to balance the serious gaps in the total educational system, and should be given in such a manner as to encourage State and local governments to use their own resources.

Whatever the sources may be, the experts have no doubt whatsoever that, financially, we have already face a real emergency. "It will not be enough to meet the problem grudgingly or with a little more money," says the Rockefeller report. "The Nation's need for good education is immediate; and good education is expensive. That is the fact which the American people have never been quite prepared to face. At stake is nothing less than our national greatness and our aspirations for the dignity of the individual. If the public is not prepared for this, then responsible educators, business leaders, political leaders, unions, and civic organizations must join in a national campaign to prepare them."

Blind Lawyer Accepts Post in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues that one of my constituents and a good friend, Attorney John F. Nagle, of Springfield, Mass., has joined the National Federation of the Blind here in Washington as its national legal representative. Mr. Nagle is blind himself, having lost his sight at age 12 when a seventh grade student in school. Despite this handicap, he demonstrated courage and initiative and completed his education at the famous Perkins School for the Blind in Watertown, Mass., the American International College in Springfield, and Northeastern University Law School, also in Springfield.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed in the RECORD a news story from the Springfield Union of November 24, 1958, concerning Attorney Nagle.

BLIND LAWYER ACCEPTS POST IN WASHINGTON—J. F. NAGLE TO REPRESENT NATIONAL ORGANIZTION FOR SIGHTLESS

John F. Nagle, blind lawyer, Sunday announced acceptance of an executive position with the National Federation of the Blind in Washington, D.C. He is leaving Springfield immediately and will begin his new duties December 15.

As national legal representative of the blind association, Nagle will promote the interests of the blind before Congress and various Government agencies, will help with drafting legislation, will appear as counsel for blind persons in social-security and civil-service cases, and will travel widely in the eastern part of the United States to help State blind associations with problems of organization and legislation.

The National Federation of the Blind has a membership of 40,000 blind members. It promotes and initiates legislation at Federal and State levels, conducts surveys of blind services in various States at the request of the State authorities and wages a ceaseless battle against discrimination against blind people in terms of job opportunities.

Nagle, who currently makes his home at 34 Myrtle Street has a law office at 782 State Street. He travels unaided, with a cane, between these two points twice daily. Until recently he had a seeing-eye dog, a Labrador retriever named "Cap."

Work with the organized blind is not a new thing for Nagle. He has long been active in this work. He is currently president of the Associated Blind of Massachusetts and chairman of its executive committee, and was general chairman of the national organization's last convention, held in Boston last July. He is also a member of the advisory board of the Massachusetts Division of the Blind, to which he was appointed in February 1958 by Gov. Foster Furcolo.

His other community activities are numerous. He is a member of the Springfield Lions Club and chairman of its sight conservation and blind committee. He is active in the United World Federalists, holding posts as member of the board of directors, chairman of the speakers' bureau, chairman of the study group committee, and legal counsel for the New England branch of the organizations, as well as being much in demand as a speaker on world federalism.

In the local Unitarian Church he is a member of the standing committee charged with running local church affairs and a teacher in the church school, as well as being active in other committees. For 6 years he was legal adviser for the Junior Chamber of Commerce.

MEMBER OF BAR

He is also a member of the Blind Profession Association of America, the Civil Liberties Union, the Adult Educational Council, the Hampden County Bar Association, and the American Bar Association.

Nagle lost his sight at age 12, when he was in the seventh grade in a local school. Thereafter he attended the Perkins School for the Blind, Boston University, American International College, and Northeastern University Law School, Springfield division. He holds two college degrees, one in law, and has been admitted to practice at the Massachusetts bar, the Federal bar, and the Department of Justice, Bureau of Naturalization and Immigration. While at Boston University he was a member of the varsity debating team.

During World War II he took special training in assembling and machine operation at Springfield Trade School. He was employed on the night shift at the U.S. armory and practiced law in the daytime.

In May of this year he married Miss Virginia Clarke of Worcester, also totally blind, and at that time president of the Associated Blind of Worcester.

A Bill To Expand the Veterans' Administration Direct Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED WAMPLER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 27, 1959, I introduced the bill, H.R. 3513, which would expand the veterans' direct loan program by $150 million thereby permitting the Veterans' Administration possibly to make in the neighborhood of an additional 15,000 loans. I understand that this increment in direct loan authority would make it possible for veterans' home loan applications to be processed on a current basis.

My bill is similar to other measures currently before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I feel that finding a solution to the veterans' home loan financing problem, particularly in the rural areas where private money

is not readily available, is of signal importance.

Had it not been for the Veterans' Administration's direct loan program, the Nation's veterans, and those veterans in the Sixth District of Indiana, which I have the honor to represent, would have received fewer loans than they have. And, although I find that in the State of Indiana the Veterans' Administration has made approximately 400 direct home loans in a period of less than 9 months, there are, at present, 1,312 Indiana veterans waiting for such a loan; and, unless they get a direct loan, they will be unable to buy a home.

The fact that these 1,000-plus veterans in the State of Indiana have not been able to find private financing has prompted me to introduce the measure, Mr. Speaker, and to urge that it be favorably considered by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. I am genuinely interested in doing everything possible to allow these Indiana veterans, living predominantly in rural areas, small cities and towns, to take advantage of their veterans' benefits, bestowed upon them by law for their service to our Nation.

For example, I am informed that in Warren County, Ind., where there is a veteran population of 790, no guaranteed loans have been made and absolutely no direct loans. I might add that the entire county is eligible for Veterans' Administration direct loan financing.

Surely, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and the House of Representatives will want to act to ease, if not totally correct, the home-purchase inequity placed upon the veterans of this country's rural areas.

God and Mr. Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a letter to the editor which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

I wish to say at the outset that I am in complete agreement with the views expressed by Rev. John P. Gorsuch. This Nation's policy toward Red China is wholly unrealistic, and I said so publicly last fall in a press conference. I advised the people of my congressional district that the question of recognition and of admission to the United Nations was a foregone conclusion. The only question to be determined is, when. The vote in the United Nations last fall on the question of admitting Red China to the U.N. was a clear signal to Mr. Dulles and his advisers that it should not be delayed much longer. If we are to entertain any serious hope for peace, it is not by denying the very existence of a nation of over 600 million souls.

In closing I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that the writer of this communication is the son of one of my closest personal friends. This young man's father and I were classmates at the University of Denver Law School. It gives me a great personal pleasure to insert this letter in the RECORD:

GOD AND MR. DULLES

In a recent story in the Washington Post reference was made to the fact that a high percentage of Protestant clergy were opposed to either the recognition of Red China or to its admission to the United Nations. Apparently the Committee of One Million which made this estimate felt this refuted the Cleveland resolution adopted by the National Council of Churches in November which proposed that diplomatic recognition should be given.

I for one wasn't polled. Nor, I suspect, were a number of other clergy. I simply want to bear witness to the fact that there are a good many of us, as there are a good many Americans in other professions, who feel the Cleveland resolution makes some real sense. It represents a flexible and open-minded approach that is sorely needed.

Our State Department has too frequently been pietistic and doctrinaire. And, tragically, one sometimes gets the impression that the churches feel that God and Mr. Dulles are on intimate terms.

What the churches need to make clear, and this is what the Cleveland report seeks to spell out in reference to a concrete issue, is that it is not so-called abstract moral principles which ought to guide us nearly as much as it should be response to the concrete workings of God in the complicated web of events we call history.

The present administration is always talking about operating from the basis of moral principles. But principles and God aren't the same thing. God's will can only be understood in specific situations, not by starting with abstractions and trying to paste them to real life.

The question of whether to recognize Red China is a good case in point. To be sure, it is hardly a moral nation in many respects. But the real point is, do we truly want world peace or don't we? And if we do, recognition seems to be a step in the right direction because it ought to mean new friends in the rest of Asia and a chance to drive a wedge between Red China and the U.S.S.R. so that we could deal more easily with each.

In other words, there are many of us who feel that if God's will is now to be realized and the goal of peace is to be furthered, self-righteous moralism, and hysterical anti-communism ought to be put aside in favor of a policy that is definitely realistic.

JOHN P. GORSUCH,
Assistant Rector, St. Alban's Episcopal Church.
WASHINGTON.

"That's America to Me"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD the following poem by Mrs. Bettie A. LaVeck of Dearborn, Mich.:

THAT'S AMERICA TO ME

My country is a symbol of each living thing I see,
The blooming of a rosebud, the rustle of a bee.
The sun rising in the morning, the people that I see,
Just living here on God's rich soil that's America to me.

Friends in the factories work side by side each day,
Makes our lives enriched more than words could say.
Friendships in all walks of life, the price of this is free;
Just living here on God's rich soil that's America to me.

Our home whether a mansion or old and broken down,
If filled with love can be the happiest in your hometown.
A friend who offers assistance to a needy one I see
Just living here on God's rich soil that's America to me.

The joys we give each other make our lives complete,
It gives us courage for the burdens we all have to meet.
A kiss, a hug, a baby, a thief, a king I see,
Just living here on God's rich soil that's America to me.

The church in which we worship is crowded to the door
With a hundred shining faces I've never seen before.
A problem leaves the face of an unknown man today, even I feel relieved as I pray my God to thee,
Just living here on God's rich soil that's America to me.

Albert Gallatin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, January 29 of each year marks the anniversary of the birth of Albert Gallatin, brilliant U.S. Secretary of the Treasury under Thomas Jefferson. Gallatin was born on January 29, 1761, in Geneva, Switzerland, the descendant of a family of watchmakers. Already then, as today, Switzerland was the center of a great watch industry which in our own day plays such an important part in United States-Swiss trade relations.

Gallatin came to America in 1780 and threw in his lot with the American patriots. After the establishment of the new U.S. Republic he embarked on a political career in which he served successively as a member of the Pennsylvania State Legislature, Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, U.S. Senator, Secretary of the Treasury and finally as U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain and later to France.

He devoted his life and work to many worthwhile enterprises, the most important of which were his advocacy of a system of free universal education, reform of Federal tax and budgetary policies, and the promotion of sound trade

relations with other nations. He also advocated liberalization of the immigration and naturalization laws.

As we offer our tribute today to Albert Gallatin, we pay our respects to the memory of a great American who laid the basic framework for policies which have helped to bring the United States to a position of preeminence in the marketplaces of the world. The ruling principle of his life was friendly commerce with other nations as an enduring promise of America's peaceful growth, and that principle is still a powerful factor in our continued growth and our leadership of the free world. The expansion of trade and commerce among the free nations is as vital today as it was in Gallatin's day.

Unfortunately, the present administration has shown a strong tendency to yield to the protectionists and those who seek to erect new barriers in our trade relations with the world. Such policy is against the liberal trade traditions of Gallatin. I trust that we shall return to the sound policies advocated by Albert Gallatin.

C. O. Wanvig, Milwaukee Civic Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, one of the best known and most widely respected leaders in Milwaukee and Wisconsin is Chester Odin Wanvig, chairman of the board of Globe-Union, Inc.

Mr. Wanvig is not only an industrialist, but a civic and community leader, farmer, and philanthropist. Throughout his life he has placed great emphasis on the spiritual values which have traditionally been a vital part of America's resources—a source of inner strength for us as individuals and as a nation.

Under Mr. Wanvig's leadership, Globe-Union has contributed to the reaffirmation of our spiritual values by broadcasting, over radio stations in the 17 communities where its 22 plants are located, inspiring prayers delivered by Chaplains of the House and Senate. One is the Pearl Harbor anniversary prayer given in the House on December 7, 1943, by Chaplain James Shera Montgomery:

Almighty God, on the anniversary of the grimmest hour in American history, give ear to Thy words and consider our mediation; grant that our fellow countrymen may harken unto Thy voice: "Fret not thyself because of evildoers, neither be thou envious against the workers of iniquity." Through the dreary desert of suffering and sin, we pray for a highway for the march of all emancipated peoples. "Commit thy way unto the Lord and He shall bring it to pass."

Heavenly Father, universal is the hand of justice that holds the eternal scale. As we meet the challenge of today, grant that we may keep enthroned within, the spirit of humanity which is the merciful endowment of our Master. Allow us not to relax the divinity of our immortal souls nor treasure up wrath against any nation which forgets God. O let us labor for the advancement and the release of man from the chains of tyranny, and the promise of future days will assume for us fresh meaning and power in all the vicissitudes of this world. Inspire all to bring to this Chamber tithes of time, of energy, and of understanding. O come and reign above all treaties that the Christian precepts may be augmented in all lands and thus they will be brought into closer relationship with Thee and become the garden of our Lord. In the name of Him who is the Prince of Peace and the Son of Man. Amen.

Two others are Christmas prayers given by the late Senate Chaplain Peter Marshall, and by Senate Chaplain Frederick Brown Harris:

We thank Thee, O God, for the return of the wondrous spell of this Christmas season that brings its own sweet joy into our jaded and troubled hearts.

Forbid it, Lord, that we should celebrate without understanding what we celebrate, or, like our counterparts so long ago, fail to see the star or to hear the song of glorious promise.

As our hearts yield to the spirit of Christmas, may we discover that it is Thy holy spirit who comes—not a sentiment, but a power—to remind us of the only way by which there may be peace on the earth and good will among men.

May we not spend Christmas, but keep it, that we may be kept in its hope, through Him who emptied Himself in coming to us that we might be filled with peace and joy in returning to God. Amen.

Our Father God, amid all the bitterness and ill will of these days, we thank Thee for the gentle, balmy climate of the Christmastide. May the cynicism which has tarnished our faith be dissolved by the confident assurance that these clouds are lies and that the blue sky is the truth.

We would bow anew at the shrine of that One who didst come to a violent world and who is now remembered and adored, while the ruthless dictators are forgotten. In a world that is a neighborhood and must be made a brotherhood or we perish, join us to that saving minority that across the boundaries of prejudice, intolerance, and hatred extends the dominion of understanding and good will. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

The presentation of these prayers serves to emphasize Mr. Wanvig's firm belief that the greatness of America is based on individualism which comes from religious faith—faith in the free man under God.

To give further insight into the philosophy of Mr. Wanvig, let me quote his own words:

Our economy thrives on competition. We continually strive to make better products—we continually strive to reduce costs. That in turn creates the typically American respect for the other fellow's work and ideas.

The quality * * * of all the products we manufacture walks into our plant every morning on two legs. Machinery and modern testing devices are necessary to insure quality, but the human element—in worker, engineer, and management—is still the controlling factor.

Attitude—how we think and how we feel about our work—determines the quality of our product. Quality can't be inspected into products. It can't be put on the surface. It must be built in. We make products by the millions—but they are used one by one.

We believe in the dignity of man, and the well-being of our employees has always been one of our major considerations. Years ago, long before we paid dividends to stockholders, we recognized our employees' contributions to our progress and shared with them the profits of successful years.

We believe in the Golden Rule and have unceasingly tried to practice it.

Despite the many demands on his time in the business world, Mr. Wanvig has given much effort in the service of his State and community. He has been a member of the University of Wisconsin board of regents, a trustee of Milwaukee-Downer College, and president of Milwaukee Country Day School. He is a member of the board of governors of Marquette University and the President's Advisory Committee at Marquette. He was one of the organizers of the Greater Milwaukee Committee, and is generally recognized as the founder of Junior Achievement in the Milwaukee area.

Mr. Speaker, the contributions made by C. O. Wanvig to his community, State, and Nation—and to his fellow men everywhere—are numberless. We need more men like him.

In Memory of Representative George H. Christopher

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, GEORGE CHRISTOPHER came from a town that is close to the center of our Nation. It is not far from the spot where the trails fanned out, over which the pioneers ventured to open up the West.

He loved the land and he cared for it tenderly, and he was proud of the fulfillment that came at harvest time. And the rhythm of the seasons brought the harmony of nature's art and poetry and music to his heart.

GEORGE was a Missouri farmer, and a good one.

He was blessed with the native wisdom, and wit, and independent spirit that is so true to the American character.

Quiet, but plain spoken, he had the faculty of stripping away all sham and artifice to get at the root of an issue.

As I am a city Democrat, representing an industrial district, I liked to talk with GEORGE and learn the viewpoint of the agricultural Midwest, which is the "seedbed" of so much that is individual and self-reliant in our country's personality.

He was conscientious in representing his constituents, and in going beyond that to serve the Nation's interests. Since coming to Washington as a Member of the 81st Congress, he had served on the House Administration Committee, the Committee on Agriculture, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

When Congress adjourned, he went back home to the farm of 975 acres where he and the late Mrs. Christopher lived so many happy and work-filled years building the homestead that made

its wholesome contributions to the progress of the Nation.

There he replenished himself in the company of friends and neighbors who, beholden only to themselves and to God, looked themselves straight in the eye, and then made up their minds as freemen.

When GEORGE returned to Washington he spoke for them, and we, his colleagues were the beneficiaries of his practical knowledge and his homespun counsel.

Missouri has lost a distinguished son who served his people and his Nation well.

We, his fellow legislators in the U.S. House of Representatives, mourn his passing.

To his sons and daughters we send our sincere sympathy.

We pray that the memories of his kindness to them, and his devotion to our Nation, will comfort them in their bereavement, and inspire them throughout the years ahead.

Treatment Plant Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, a recent poll of the Nation's 52 State and territorial health officers shows that by an overwhelming majority—82 percent—they believe the current Federal sewage treatment plant construction grant program has resulted in stimulation of sewage plant construction. Their views are backed up by the facts which show that construction of sewage treatment works—the Nation's worst public works problem—has risen steadily during the course of the construction grants program.

Contract awards in 1957 rose to $351 million and are expected to reach at least $390 million in 1958. The 1952–56 average was $222 million. Total construction of treatment plants reached an all-time national high in 1958 with over one-third of the projects constructed in that year receiving Federal grants. Moreover, at least 35 States experienced their highest treatment plant construction levels in 1957 or 1958.

The results of this poll of the Nation's health officials shows that three-fourths of them favor doubling the authorization of construction grant allocations. These same officials, it must be remembered, opposed the adoption of this grant program when it was first proposed in 1956. But in overwhelming numbers they now favor the program and what is more recommend additional Federal participation. On this, too, they are well supported by the facts.

A recent survey of State and Territorial sanitary engineers indicates the estimated sewage treatment construction program of 40 States for the next 3 years could utilize approximately twice the Federal grant money authorized for the next 3 years under Public Law 660. According to this survey, the estimated cost of sewage treatment plant construction requirements for the next 3 years is approximately $540 million per year. The average annual Federal contribution to maintain this level of construction is estimated in the survey to be approximately $100 million per year, or twice the current authorized Federal level of participation.

Despite the success of the treatment plant construction program and its endorsement by State health officials the President has recommended that it be repealed. According to the President's budget message his administration supports programs necessary to stimulate greater State and local effort in areas of critical national concern but has consistently endeavored to strengthen our system of government by encouraging State and local governments to assume responsibility for many public needs which they can provide well without relying on Federal aid at all. To further this worthy objective the President would discontinue Federal grants for waste treatment works construction and adjust Federal revenue laws as recommended by the Joint Federal-State Action Committee so the States can assume full responsibility for these programs starting in fiscal year 1961.

What the President has done is pick what has been termed "the Nation's worst public works problem" by Fortune magazine and single it out for the budget ax on the pretext of strengthening Federal-State relations. He has picked a program that was enacted in the first place because it was needed to stimulate greater State and local effort in an area of critical national concern, namely, pollution control, and which has proved to be such a successful stimulant that over 80 percent of the Nation's health officers who 2½ years ago opposed it today agree that it has resulted in stimulation of sewage plant construction within their jurisdiction. The President's own adviser for public works,, Gen. J. S. Bragdon, has stated that:

> To meet our needs for water, conservation is the order of the day. We cannot manufacture this necessity of life. We must store it and use it more efficiently, learn to convert saline waters and find ways to improve the distribution of it. Most important of all, our rivers will have to be cleaned, and adequate treatment facilities installed to prevent upstream pollution. To accomplish this job, we need almost 8,000 municipal plants alone, and in all, some 17,000 facilities, public and private, to insure that all of the potential sources of pollution are adequately controlled.

Obviously, here is an area of critical national concern where State and local efforts have lagged the past 20 years making necessary the program now in operation to stimulate greater State and local effort. No wonder 48 out of 50 State health officers have come out in opposition to the President's recommendation to repeal the existing program. No wonder the President's own Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, in an almost unheard-of action, unanimously refused to endorse his recommendations.

Who agrees with the President on this issue? The Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the National Association of Manufacturers were his sole supporters when hearings were held on the subject last year by the Public Works Committee. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I have never been able to fully understand the position taken by the chamber and the NAM on this issue. Water is essential to industry. By 1975 industry will be using 215 billion gallons a day, 62 percent of the Nation's water used will be in industry. To make a ton of steel alone requires 65,000 gallons of water. Industry has more at stake here than any other element of our economy and yet their national organizations oppose measures designed to assure that the quality of our water supply will be adequate for industrial as well as other uses. To encourage industry to join with others in combating pollution, I have introduced legislation today providing fast tax writeoffs for industrial waste treatment facilities which may be constructed in the future.

At the same time I have introduced a bill to increase the Federal grant program under Public Law 660 in order to further stimulate local effort to increase the level of treatment plant construction so that it more closely meets the proven needs of the country.

My bill would amend section 6 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act by authorizing:

First. Grants for projects in the amount of 30 percent of the estimated reasonable cost thereof or $500,000, whichever is the smaller. Under existing law the maximum grant is 30 percent of the cost or $250,000, whichever is the smaller. Experience has shown that there has been less stimulation of construction in the larger communities subject to the $250,000 limitation than in those eligible for the full 30 percent grant. Because of this limitation, there is insufficient incentive to larger communities which are at the same time often major contributors to pollution. Increasing the maximum grant limit to $500,000 should tend to stimulate more projects from the larger communities, thus giving State pollution control authorities an opportunity to bring their programs into better balance by accelerating construction in the larger as well as in the smaller communities.

Second. Municipalities to join together to build joint treatment facilities with the amount of grant allocable to each community as if it were a separate project. Under existing law each project is limited to the maximum grant of $250,000 or 30 percent of the cost, whichever is the smaller. Experience indicates that if communities which join together could receive a larger grant the program would have a greater stimulatory effect on such communities. Often the construction of such joint facilities is the most economical and efficient method of providing adequate sewage treatment and is generally encouraged by consulting engineers and the States. This amendment would give the States greater latitude in determining the use of funds within their States and author-

izes an allocation to each municipality involved in a joint project its share of the estimated reasonable cost rather than limiting the project, as under present law, to a single maximum grant.

Third. Reallocation of grant funds from States not using funds because of lack of projects to States having projects approved for which grants have not been made because of lack of funds. Experience under the present act indicates that a number of jurisdictions have not been able to use their funds because of lack of eligible projects. On the other hand, many States have backlogs of projects considerably in excess of their Federal allotments. This amendment would permit a reallocation of funds from jurisdictions which cannot use them to jurisdictions having projects for which grants are not made because of lack of funds. This will stimulate additional construction in the States having the greatest demonstrated need.

Fourth. One hundred million dollars for construction grants each year for 10 years. Present law provides for $50 million a year for 10 years for Federal construction grants. Even this amount has resulted in tremendous plant construction stimulation, but it is not enough. The level of construction is reaching the $400 million mark, but our yearly needs are nearer $600 million. In order to stimulate construction up to this level it is necessary to restore the Federal construction program to amount I originally proposed in 1956 and which was cut in half. I said then that we were creating a program with one leg amputated before it had even learned to walk. On one leg the program is walking well but we need to restore the other leg so it can run the pollution problem right into the ground.

My bill also provides for the establishment of an Office of Water Pollution Control within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At the present time the Federal water pollution control program is administered by the Water Supply and Water Pollution Control Program Section of the Division of Sanitary Engineering Services of the Bureau of the State Services of the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These men are doing a superb, dedicated job but the morass of the administrative framework within which they work cannot help but stifle and restrict their activities. The Committee on Public Works has stated explicitly that:

> It intends to watch carefully the progress and development of the national water-pollution control program and particularly the supporting role of the Federal Government.

In a committee report in 1956 it was stated:

> The committee believes that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should place a high priority on the objectives of the program authorized by the bill (Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956) and will diligently carry out its role in this Federal-State cooperative activity by providing a constructive program within an appropriate administrative framework.

Mr. Speaker, that appropriate administrative framework has not as yet been established by administrative action. Legislation is therefore needed. Control of pollution is part and parcel of the overall water resources problem. Waste carrying is an essential use of water. Pollution simply means that waste has built up beyond the water's capacity to carry it. Therefore, one of water's essential uses is curtailed and what is more its availability for other uses reduced at the same time. This affects industry, agriculture, fish and wildlife, and our health as well. The control of pollution is no longer concerned merely with the correction of sanitary nuisances but rather with the conservation of a great and precious resource—water.

The existing administrative framework within which the pollution control program operates must, therefore, be broadened and expanded so that the proper emphasis can be placed on all aspects of the problem—engineering, legal, research, construction, economic, and health. At the urging and by request of the Nation's great conservation organizations, women's clubs, and many others, and in the interests of good government, I recommend the establishment of an Office of Water Pollution Control within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare so that an all-out attack, at all levels of government can begin against the pollution problem which threatens our health, reduces available water supplies and restricts economic growth and expansion.

The Plight of the Small Businessman in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the small businessman is well expressed in the following letter which I have received this day from a constituent of mine.

The first day of this session I introduced House Resolution 30 to investigate the cost of living. This letter points out the need for such an investigation. It can be surmised that when small businesses are gone, big business will price with little regard to supply or to cost.

The letter follows:

> I am a veteran of World War II, with a wife and two children. Nine months ago, I took out a second mortgage on my home and borrowed over my head to buy a little supermarket. Today, I'm on the verge of bankruptcy. I'd place the major portion of the blame on the A. & P. Tea Co. In the early part of November, they opened a store not too far from me. The other major chains; namely, Food Fair, Kroger, and Wrigley in order to keep their share of the business started a price war which makes it impossible for me and any small businessman to compete. As an example, A. & P. is advertising 50 pounds potatoes for $1.29. I paid $1.65 for the same package this week at the Produce Terminal. They're selling Land O' Lakes butter for 67 cents when it costs me 69 cents per pound. Large grade A eggs are advertised at 45 cents per dozen and they've been costing me 47 cents all week. Their meat prices are beyond comprehension for any type business operation to make a reasonable profit. I'm not asking for any special considerations for myself; but is there any way through legislation or investigation where this "monster" big business can be controlled? I'm writing this letter as a last resort. I've done everything possible attempting to make my business show a semblance of profit. If you as a representative of the small businessman cannot help me, I foresee in the not too distant future a society of big business and a working class. Recent mergers in every field of business and industry offer justification of my statement. Thank you for your attention.

National Science Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on December 31, 1958, the Washington Post and Times Herald published on its front page a story bearing this headline: "Ike Warned on Lack of Trained Men." The story began thus:

> President Eisenhower was told yesterday the United States is in danger of running low on trained manpower while the Soviet Union is driving for technical supremacy. The President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers said it is convinced the Nation faces a "grave problem in highly trained manpower during the coming decade."
>
> It expressed doubt that "present public agitation reflected a real understanding of our long-term need for scientists, engineers, and technicians."

Thus, nearly 16 months after Soviet Russia launched its sputnik and despite our own scientific achievements of the past year, we are still being warned by the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers that we are facing a "grave problem in highly trained manpower" and that the American public still lacks "a real understanding of our long-term need" for scientists.

A year ago this month, on the opening day of the 1958 session of Congress, I introduced a bill for the establishment of a U.S. science academy. Its purpose was to help remedy the very shortage of trained scientists, engineers, and technicians about which we now hear and will continue to hear in the future, unless we take the necessary action now. What was true a year ago is even more true today, except that we have lost a whole year of time. This matter is therefore not only timely, but most urgent. I fear the problem may grow greater and graver by the month.

I have now revised my bill and brought it up-to-date. Today, I am reintroducing it and I am happy to report that our colleague from New York, the Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, has informed me that she will be pleased to be a cosponsor of the measure.

The bill provides for the establishment of a National Science Academy under the jurisdiction of the National Science Foundation, rather than under the Defense Department. The Academy is visualized as an educational institution emphasizing scientific knowledge and research, rather than as a military academy along the lines of West Point or Annapolis.

The purpose of the National Science Academy, as defined in the bill, shall be "to train selected men and women, to be known as science trainees, in the field of science or engineering for service as officers or employees of the United States." Specifically, this institution is to prepare young men and young women for scientific careers devoted primarily to the security of our Nation.

Highlights of the bill may be stated as follows:

Young men and young women, between the ages of 17 and 25, may be nominated as candidates for appointment to the National Science Academy by the President or by Members of Congress. Final admission to the Academy will be determined on the basis of qualifying examinations as prescribed and supervised by the National Science Foundation. Those who are admitted will receive a 4-year course of study, at Government expense, in which they will be trained in science, engineering, mathematics, and related fields.

Upon completion of the course of studies, the science trainees will be required to serve at least 5 years as science officers or employees of the U.S. Government, either with the Armed Forces or as civilian scientists and technicians in Government agencies. A limited number of foreign students from friendly countries may be admitted to the Academy, provided they pass a proper security check. The foreign students, however, will not be required to serve the United States as in the case of our own graduates. All those enrolled at the National Science Academy, including foreign science trainees, will receive a free education, housing, medical care, and other emoluments, and will be subject to established regulations of discipline, attendance, and so forth.

As far as location of the National Science Academy is concerned, no specific site is prescribed in the bill. It is merely recommended that the Director of the National Science Foundation shall establish a commission of five members to advise on the selection of a site. In the event there is no unanimity on the part of the commission, it shall submit to the director three sites, from which he is to choose one as a permanent location. Until this is done, however, the bill advocates the use of temporary facilities for the academy so that it may begin its operations as soon as possible.

In connection with a permanent location, I merely wish to express this view: I would prefer to see a site selected in an area which provides ample space for buildings, laboratories, and other needed grounds and facilities for an institution of this kind. Perhaps the most logical choice would be in an area which is not too close to any large urban center, an area which has not yet been built up and around which could be established in time a science city with major research facilities, equipment, and housing accommodations for the students, faculty, scholars, research people, and those serving their needs. In other words, to do what we have already done at our atomic research centers.

There is no way to estimate at this time the cost of establishing a National Science Academy, but Congress can appropriate certain sums for the acquisition of land, construction of buildings and laboratories, and other needs until the institution is ready to begin functioning, and thereafter a set sum can be designated each year on the basis of needs. Unquestionably this will require many millions of dollars, but it will be a worthwhile investment for the benefit of our country and it should not be any more expensive than providing funds for existing colleges to expand their present facilities.

As for the admission of students from friendly countries, this proposal is designed to help cement stronger ties with our allies, encourage them to develop the best scientific brains, and provide them with the opportunity of giving some of their students a thorough scientific background which should prove of mutual benefit.

Obviously, an institution of this sort must be established only under Government auspices for reasons of security, national needs, financing, attracting the best qualified students, and achieving the desired results. It must be provided with the finest scientific laboratories, and the top scientists in the country should be invited to teach at the National Science Academy. An educational institution of this kind would undoubtedly arouse considerable interest among high school students throughout the country and would serve to inspire many among them to pursue a career in science or engineering.

As to the question how a National Science Academy could be more helpful than existing colleges and universities, I should like to point out the following:

First. It would assure our Armed Forces and the U.S. Government with a constant and dependable flow of highly trained manpower, with scientists, engineers, and technicians, to undertake specific tasks and duties in any emergency. These people would be required to remain in Government service, in a military or civilian capacity, for at least 5 years. In this way the Nation would benefit from their services for having provided them with a free education and a career. Graduates from existing schools and colleges are under no compulsion to render such service to the Nation.

Second. It would create a great advantage for the United States by the fact that the scientists, engineers, and technicians trained at the National Science Academy would be geared toward problems of national security, scientific research for defense, and related problems.

Third. It would provide a great incentive for American youth to strive for a career in science or engineering and the development of scientific talent. This should serve as an excellent stimulus for the growth of scientific education. Many young people, who otherwise could not afford a higher education, would now have such opportunity on the basis of merit and scientific ability.

Fourth. It would strengthen the field of scientific education by training more people skilled in the art of communicating interest in science and increasing the prestige of science teachers.

Fifth. It would prepare scientifically trained and competent people with a broad knowledge of the humanities for participation in governmental functions of a civilian nature.

Mr. Speaker, over the past year we have been constantly reminded that Russia is outstripping us in the training of scientists and engineers and that she may be gradually attaining technical supremacy. Now this fact has been verified by the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers. There is no need to stress the importance of accelerating and expanding our science education. By now this fact is clear to all.

The establishment of a National Science Academy, such as advocated in my bill, would help relieve the existing shortage of trained manpower in this vital field, it would encourage more profound respect for science and science teachers, it would stimulate young people to pursue a career in science to a greater degree than ever before, and it would have a beneficial impact on the welfare and the security of our country.

There is a great need for such an educational institution in the country today. The urgency of the times in which we live requires it. I urge all my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert at this point the article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of December 31, 1958, as referred to above:

IKE WARNED ON LACK OF TRAINED MEN—COMMITTEE FEARS NATION IS FACING A GRAVE PROBLEM

(By Fred S. Hoffman)

President Eisenhower was told yesterday the United States is in danger of running low on trained manpower while the Soviet Union is driving for technical supremacy.

The President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers said it is convinced the Nation faces a grave problem in highly trained manpower during the coming decade.

Among other things, it mentioned a drop in 1958 enrollments at engineering schools. It also spoke of the prospect of a smaller group of men in the most productive age bracket in 1965, attributing this to a dip in the birth rate during the depression of the 1930's and World War II.

In its final report to Mr. Eisenhower, the committee of educators, scientists, labor union, business and Government representatives urged the White House to take responsibility for coordinating and stimulating efforts by public and private groups to meet the problem.

This was the kind of work—in the non-Federal field—assigned to the committee when it was set up in 1956, about 19 months before Russia sent aloft its first sputnik.

The Committee said the sputnik launching had sparked greater public awareness of the American scientific manpower problem. But it expressed doubt that "present public agitation reflected a real understanding of our long-term need for scientists, engineers and technicians."

"A sudden swing of the pendulum of public opinion, such as has occurred during the past year, invites a counterswing when the initial momentum is spent," the report said.

Termed disturbing was a 13 percent decrease in freshman enrollment in engineering courses this year and a 4-percent decline in total undergraduate engineering enrollment.

"At the same time," the report added, "the Soviet Union is reaffirming its intention to surpass the United States in the fields of science and technology within the next decade."

Another factor bothering the Committee, it said, was that in 1965 the "lean generation" resulting from lower birth rates in the depression and war periods will provide the country's labor force with fewer men in the 25–34 age group.

This smaller group, the report went on, will have to help support (1) an over-all population growing at the rate of almost 3 million persons a year, (2) a standard of living depending ever more on technological advances, and (3) a cold war "which does not appear to be abating."

Committee Chairman Howard L. Bevis, president emeritus of Ohio State University, said in a letter transmitting the report that certain Federal actions are "welcome evidence of the Government's practical concern and its readiness to act."

In this connection, Bevis mentioned the new National Defense Education Act, aimed at spurring scientific-technical education, and expanding programs of the U.S. Office of Education and the National Science Foundation.

"The watchword now is 'follow through'," Bevis said.

Last weekend Mr. Eisenhower announced he is creating a new Federal Council for Science and Technology. This group is intended to achieve better planning of scientific programs supported by various Government Departments, and to reduce duplication in such programs.

In doing so, Mr. Eisenhower followed a recommendation by another advisory committee made up of scientists.

Heading the list of proposals by the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers was the recommendation for White House coordination of efforts to develop and utilize trained manpower.

The report also called for continuation of programs launched by the Committee during its 33-month existence. They are:

Sponsorship of manpower utilization clinics with participation by industry, universities, and professional societies of scientists and engineers.

Organization of State and local groups to work toward the long-range improvement of elementary and secondary school education, with main stress on science and mathematics.

Development of adequate statistical data on the supply of scientists and engineers.

Development of guidance and counseling materials concerning science and engineering careers for high school students.

Fostering wider public understanding of the need for highly qualified scientists, engineers and supporting technicians.

Pay TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, good television is one of the rare and occasional free gifts of our free enterprise system. Last evening on the Columbia Network "Show of the Month" the television production "What Every Woman Knows," sponsored by Du Pont and starring Siobhan McKenna, was a superb 90-minute show with temperate advertising inserts. This was followed by a splendid bit of TV journalism in a production entitled "Castro's Revolution."

Shows of this type would dispel any interest in pay TV.

Priority for Starving Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the development of our national affairs through the activities of the Congress occasionally produces such a great contrast between the issues under discussion and the immediate requirements of some sections of our population that it becomes necessary to pause and take notice of a paradox of our own creation. In recent days the United States has greeted two important visitors—Mr. Mikoyan, the Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union and Mr. Arturo Frondizi, President of Argentina. I recognize the need for our country to treat important foreign visitors with courtesy and good manners and to assist our friends in foreign lands to the maximum of our capabilities. The contrast between the discussions in these chambers at the time our famous visitors were at hand, and the things I have seen with my own eyes, in my own district, within the past few days, is so great, however, that is is necessary in defense of the principles of democracy and fair play on which this Nation was founded for me to bring certain matters to the attention of this House.

During the visit of Mr. Mikoyan we were advised through press reports that he was greeted with mixed emotions in several of our major cities and in five of them his party was showered with eggs. When Mr. Frondizi spoke before this House he paid us many compliments as a nation and told us a great deal about the misery of his native land, and about our share in the responsibility for the correction of that misery.

He said:

We cannot ignore the fact that millions of human beings in Latin America suffer from misery and backwardness. A stagnant and impoverished country cannot uphold democratic institutions. On the contrary, it is a fertile soil for anarchy and dictatorship.

Following the visits of these two men I took a trip myself, back to my own congressional district. The trip was planned as a result of numerous communications which I had received from businessmen, labor leaders and public officials describing in detail the economic disasters which had fallen upon the people who I was elected to represent. I visited the coal fields of the southern Appalachian area, much of which lies within my congressional district.

In the coal fields of my district there are over 30,000 unemployed receiving unemployment compensation and 40,000 who have long exhausted their unemployment benefits, and who have not been employed in a productive manner for 2 years or more. They and their families are subject to the degradation of living on the combination of charity and surplus agricultural commodities.

They have seen the number of employed miners in West Virginia decline from 125,000 in 1948, to 47,000 today, and they have no illusions about the future.

Their children exist on a skid-row diet of corn meal, rice and whatever else the surplus commodities warehouse has available. These children never have any meat, and have seldom seen a fresh egg during the past 2 years. They envy the children who are so amply blessed with good food that they can afford to throw eggs at foreign visitors. The parents told me that even today they only receive enough food for 3 weeks out of the month under all of the existing aid programs—that their diet contains only one-third of the calories and proteins needed to sustain life. So the children weaken a little, and their parents are condemned to watch these future citizens shrink in vitality and hope, day by day.

They cannot afford to worry over the race to control outer space, the competition for the minds and loyalties of men, or the role of American leadership in the free world.

As for their children; can you develop a nuclear physicist out of a child who had no shoes and was forced to quit school in the fourth grade? Will you draw tomorrow's space pilots from among these who have had no orange juice or milk or eggs for over a year?

These are not the people of India or the masses of Chinese I am talking about; these are Americans—strong and self-reliant and skillful in their trade. They are disciplined to work in teams, and are renowned for their courage in a realm of industrial activity which is very dangerous under the best conditions. When they have work to do, they arise in the morning and enter the mouth of a coal pit to spend the day underground, beset by the dangers of gas and cave-ins more hazardous than fire and flood—dangers which few people, including myself, would care to face as a daily ration.

Their situation is not new, it has been growing cumulatively for several years. What have we done about it? We have done nothing of any practical benefit. These miners are the victims of several circumstances—for one, a trade policy that whittles away their livelihood in exchange for doubtful gains in foreign popularity. For another, they are the victims of technological advances which replace the miner with the machine. There is no disposition here to argue against automation or mechanization in the coal fields. We cannot stop progress, and those of us with business experience know that mechanization is necessary for competitive reasons.

But the miners have been displaced through the operations of American industrial ingenuity to create a more competitive end product and a more attractive price for the consumer. In other words, mechanization has been in the general public interest, but the miner and his family are being destroyed. So, they have given up everything, either for theoretical advances in international good will on the one hand, or a public benefit through lower cost to the consumer on the other.

In return they have received nothing but the right to starve and to see their children die before their eyes. This is a situation which cannot be permitted to continue, and I say it is the responsibility of this Congress to return to them an opportunity to live like American citizents, to lend a hand in their economic reconstruction, to see that this Nation does not take away everything and return nothing from any body of its citizens. If we do not take care of our own in circumstances as dire as these, how can we expect to earn respect in foreign lands? If these conditions are permitted to continue in this area of industrial operation, what confidence will our own people in other areas have in us and our way of life? Automation and mechanization will sooner or later enter all types of industrial activity. The coal miner has been struck first and struck hardest, but he will not be the last to be driven to his knees by the random progress of science. Industrial progress has created among the miners a permanent disaster. This is not a natural disaster of storm or flood, but it is a disaster nonetheless, and cries out for disaster relief.

I realize that this is not the first time this matter has been brought to the attention of the House, but the situation grows worse every day, and there is no sign of strong interest or concerted activity on behalf of those affected. What is necessary to stir us to action? Is it necessary to fill the gallery with half-starved men and women? Is it necessary to have a repetition of some dreadful enterprise like the depression bonus march on Washington? Will we not take forthright action until the pot boils over and the starving thousands descend upon us to parade the coldheartedness of their Government before the leaders of the world? There have been bills introduced before this House—thousands of bills—covering a great variety of subjects, but no pending measure merits consideration ahead of the lives and hopes of those who have given up everything in the advancement of the public interest.

We have before us for consideration measures to aid distressed areas, to increase the flow of surplus agricultural commodities, to institute a program of coal research, and other proposals which will give both immediate and lasting relief to the people of the coalfields. They must get priority. A distressed-areas bill was passed by the last Congress and vetoed by the President. This time it must be passed with an overwhelming majority, sufficient to defy the veto threat implied in the President's message. If I could assemble the membership of this House in a single vehicle, and take you with me through the coalfields of my district, and allow you to spend a day looking at the sum total of human misery which has resulted from prevailing conditions, I doubt that there would be a single opposing vote for any measure which would better the situation.

The subject is not one for debate. There is nothing to debate. The last and best hope for these people rests in the power and authority of this Congress. They have seen Development Loan Funds established to assist the backward people of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, with authority to spend $625 million for that purpose during the current fiscal year. At the same time they remember that a measure costing half as much, which would have given them hope and sustenance, failed of passage over a veto, and they were left with nothing.

The gaunt figure of the starving miner who stands idle is a mockery of the image of America as the land of abundance. If there is to be a showdown then, let it come quickly. Every day of delay means another day on which a 100,000 children face the morning on a breakfast of cornmeal and water, or with no breakfast at all.

I urge a quick consideration of the measures that will afford relief. I appeal to your generosity and sympathy. I challenge your native pride in the country we are all sworn to protect and defend.

The conditions that exist, left unattended, will brew the devil's broth of disloyalty and furnish fertile grounds for the disease of disbelief in our way of life.

It may be said that these are hard words, but this is a condition which defies words. Its solution rests solely in the source of all laws—the Congress of the United States. I appeal to you to make it your primary concern, even as it is mine.

Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. HEALEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the anniversary of Ukrainian independence. Forty-one years ago the Ukrainian people proclaimed their independence for the first time after centuries of oppression and foreign domination. Unfortunately, their freedom was short lived, and for that reason we commemorate this date with sadness and sympathy for the plight of these courageous people, today the victims of Communist expansion and aggression.

This anniversary should serve as a reminder of the fateful enslavement of 40 million Ukrainians by Soviet communism, and we should pledge anew our efforts and hopes for the day when once again there will be a free and independent Ukrainian National Republic.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley, at the Luncheon Meeting of the Adcraft Club of Detroit, Statler Hilton Hotel, January 9, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address given by the Honorable James A. Farley at the luncheon meeting of the Adcraft Club of Detroit on January 9, 1959. Mr. Farley's remarks will be of particular interest to members of the advertising profession:

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES A. FARLEY AT THE LUNCHEON MEETING OF THE ADCRAFT CLUB OF DETROIT, STATLER HILTON HOTEL, JANUARY 9, 1959

I am speaking to you today as a businessman, and I am speaking to you as fellow businessmen. There are no sharp divisions among our businesses. Advertising depends upon production. Production depends upon advertising. One without the other would shrivel away. Living standards would drop to those of a century ago. And, unemployment would spread over the land.

As businessmen we deal with something called economics. And, the people who deal with economics are called economists; that is, some of them do. So, a businessman is an economist, too, although he may not have a Harvard degree.

Now I want to be understood to say that I have the greatest respect for professional economists. They can, and most of them do, help us who are on the practical end of things with the many problems which we must meet. Every sizable company employs them and profits by their advice.

But, there are a few economists who are not content to advise business and Government and then let the responsible managers make the decisions. They want to make the decisions themselves. Above all they want to tell the President and Congress what to do with and to business.

I have met a good many of these economists, not only in business but in Government, for I was, for nearly 8 years, doing my bit in Government myself. And, in the Post Office Department I had a pretty big business to direct. I met a good many of the economists who were in Washington in those years. Most of them I respected. I liked almost all of them. But, the thing that struck me was not only their lack of practical knowledge of the problems of business but the fact that they never were able to agree with each other. Some of us had to make the practical decisions and when we got to that we had to brush away all of the technical language and the four-, five-, and six-syllable words and apply that commonsense that experience had provided for us in our years in business before we ever went into Government.

Of course I was also in politics. And, in a way politics is a business, too. The only thing about politics as a business that is distinctive is that if you are honest there is not monetary profit in it. But, in business

honesty is not just the best policy but the only real policy. In politics the profit is not in material things but in the satisfaction of serving your country and your fellow man so that he will have a better way of life.

We hear a good deal of talk these days about the need for advertising censorship and regulation. I know of no field that needs regulation less or that has disciplined itself more. There is no governmental body whose wisdom could be as great or whose discipline could be as harsh as that of the open competitive market. If we stop to think about it, competition functions in much the same way as his majesty's loyal opposition or as a minority party. State an untruth, be it ever so small, and your competitor is quick to point it out and to force you to correct it. Here and there a fly-by-night may publish an exaggeration and before competition and the public have time to catch up with him he will be gone. But the permanent manufacturer who represents 98 percent of the products we live by has long since learned that truth and honesty in advertising are the only policy that enable him permanently to live with his public.

Politics and advertising have this in common, that they thrive best in a free society where both are subjected to the continual harsh light of publicity, claim and counterclaim, criticism and opposition. About the only difference I see between the two is that a politician is a little bit like a banker. A banker draws up a statement at the end of his fiscal year—a politician subjects himself to the approval of the public every 2 or 4 years, as the case may be. But with a piece of merchandise and with advertising every day is election day, and every product and every advertisement is continually and completely subject to the verdict of public opinion. In both cases it is truth and character that stand out.

If we look over the field of famous trade names, the ones that are permanent are the ones that have been truthful and honest, that year in and year out have given full value for the dollar. If you stop to think of the amount of faith the average buyer puts in the merchandise he buys in the American market today it is the finest possible tribute to the veracity of the American printed advertising word. If you look at the politicians the world remembers, from Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, and Cleveland down to our own day, it is not the clever and expedient whom we remember but those who were known in their day for their stubborn addiction to the truth.

I do not know what your concept of a politician is. Perhaps it is as erroneous as my own idea of an advertising man used to be. I used to think that advertising men were long-haired artists who dreamed up ideas. Perhaps you think a politician is an adroit character who spends his time glad handing in a smoke-filled room. But just as in advertising the harsh reality of sales results weeds out the opportunist in favor of the statesman who renders a public service.

Let me give you a definition of politics that I have carried with me for a quarter of a century, written by Andrew Oliver in Boston more than 150 years ago. It goes like this: "Politics is the most hazardous of all professions. There is no other in which a man can hope to do so much good to his fellow creatures—and neither is there any in which, by a mere loss of nerve, he may do as widespread harm. There is not another in which he may so easily lose his own soul, nor is there another in which a positive and strict veracity is so difficult. But danger is the inseparable companion of honor. With all its temptations and degredations that beset it, politics is still the noblest career any man can choose."

With the change of a few words that would be an equally good definition of advertising.

To carry the parallel still further, let me give you a list of 10 rules for the making of a successful politician, which I have set down for my own guidance. A politician must have a good personality. He must have what we call character. He must be a substantial human being. He must work hard. He must be able to get other people to work for him and with him. He must have native ability and must be able to see and use ability in others. He must be aggressive but not to the point of being offensive. He must have a feeling for what people want. He must be able to make decisions. He must understand the meaning of the practical compromise without loss of principle. Above all, he must be truthful. The man or the advertisement that does not tell the truth is distrusted and shunned, and rightfully so. The dog of untrammeled ambition is usually pursued by the rabbit of conscience.

In short, I find little difference in the rules for success—whether in advertising or politics or any other field.

To return to the economists who have been in government in past years, some of whom are still around, they are still writing books and articles. And, they still cannot agree among themselves. I am thinking now of several examples.

One of these has written a book which has had a lot of attention. In it he concludes that the American people are much too well off. They have not only all that they need but all that they want. And, also that they have a lot of things that they not only don't need but that they should not really want at all. They are just too darned prosperous.

Of course this is a long, long cry from the days when they were saying that one third of the people were ill clothed, ill fed and ill housed. But a lot of water has gone over the dam since then. And a lot of economists have gone over the dam too. But some of them still survive. One of them goes on to say, and this is not without importance here in Detroit, that the people are buying too many nice big automobiles while the Government is not building enough roadways and highways to accommodate them.

Well, we do have our traffic problems, we must admit. But, it is also true that we are spending, through Government, billions of dollars a year to solve these problems. And, that volume of construction, along with the big Federal program passed by Congress a few years ago, is going about as fast as it is humanly possible to go. But, you cannot build highways with money alone. It takes engineering and planning and the mobilization of workers and machinery. And, above all, it takes time.

But this economist is in a hurry, and so he would slow down the building of cars in two ways. He would take the money away from consumers by heavier taxes. The economists' term for taking the other fellow's money is "drain it off."

Then, he would have workers and producers work fewer days in the year and fewer hours in the week, and also have them work with less energy while they are working.

He is not talking about fewer cars alone. He would have fewer refrigerators, and cosmetics, and baby food, and television sets and telephones.

He doesn't mention Coca-Cola but I imagine he thinks we consume too much of that, too. Probably he believes that the refreshment people get from Coca-Cola makes them work harder. And, in his book that is bad, very bad indeed.

For most of this overconsumption and overproduction he blames advertising. He sees in advertising a sinister plot to make people want more than they need. And, in his catechism it is a sin to want more than you need.

We have heard a lot from people who call advertising waste. There are some who would have government tell every businessman how much he should spend and not spend on advertising. These people would have a government bureau determine in every individual case what percentage of its gross receipts should be spent for advertising. Thus they would have an army of bureaucrats going over your books and making your business judgments. Of course, this would take more Government money—and employ many people who would otherwise be making things people could use.

But, I have seen enough of government to know that there is waste in government, too. I have served with two Hoover Commissions and I have participated in many reports of those Commissions—reports which point out specifically where those wastes are and how they can be eliminated.

We are not stingy with Government services. As a nation we are spending very considerably more than $100 billion a year at the Federal, State, and local levels. This is a very big part of our national production. It is, I believe, big enough. What we need is to get our money's worth for what we are giving in taxes.

But, I am at a loss to know a simple fact. How does this economist expect to get the taxes to pay for more and more public spending if at the same time we are producing less and spending less and working fewer days and hours? Sometimes the expert misses the simple point of commonsense. In his theories he forgets his arithmetic.

But, to come back to advertising what are we getting for our money spent in the newspapers, magazines, television, and radio?

To begin with, are advertising budgets too large in proportion with our receipts from what we produce? I do not think so and I speak with some authority. To achieve their advertising objectives, the bottlers of Coca-Cola and the Coca-Cola Co. together have probably invested more money in advertising Coca-Cola than is invested in advertising any other product in commercial history.

The determination of the proportion of receipts which should go into advertising is a matter of business judgment. For there are stockholders to be considered and wages and other matters with which such a decision must be measured. No successful business has as its mission in life to make the advertising profession happy. It uses advertising just as it uses engineers and research and new designs and faster and more efficient methods of production. It uses advertising because it helps toward the ever-expanding service which it gives to the public.

From the standpoint of advertising, the employment in that business of brains, manpower, and creative effort means more money spent, more consumption of goods and more taxes for public services.

There is also the maintenance of real services under private auspices such as the dissemination of information, news, entertainment, by the newspapers, magazines, radio, and television. This means the enrichment of life for all.

We have just completed a 19-day newspaper strike in New York City. This should have been a great satisfaction for the economist I have been talking about. For, without any direction from the daily press Christmas customers had to wander blindly among the stores for what they wanted to buy. This meant extra expense, wasted time, and general demoralization. It also meant from $50 to $100 million in loss to the people affected by the strike. If this is the sort of thing that some of our reformers want they are lacking not only in commonsense but they are lacking in the ordinary decent consideration that one human being owes to another.

But, behind all this sort of talk of economic reform is another and more serious consideration. If we are to cut the pie between what is spent by private individuals and what is spent by government, who is to do the cutting? Who is to decide what the individual shall have and spend and what government is to have and spend? That, these reformers answer very simply. They are to have national planning. I may say that there were plenty of these around when I first entered government service in 1933. They are the "papa knows best" boys.

The millions of decisions made in a free economy by the citizens would no longer be the main factor in the movements of the economy. That decisionmaking would be in a small aristocracy in the government. And, in general, those people would have never met a payroll—not met the practical facts of life in business, or the professions, or as manual workers.

That sort of planning was tried in England and it failed. And, if it could not succeed in a small country like that how could it succeed in a vast country like ours.

For myself, and I am confident for you, the old rule of freedom of choice is best. Freedom for businesses to make their own business judgments with, of course, reasonable regulation to see that competition is kept wide open. And, freedom for the individual to make his own choice. That is economic liberty practically applied.

That has made us what we are as a nation. We are not perfect. We never should be. But, this system of ours has produced more for all, more of what makes for happiness, and culture, and peace, and order than any nation has seen in all history.

This is liberty, the last best value given to men on earth.

Anniversary of Birth of Albert Gallatin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 198th anniversary of a great American of Swiss birth, Albert Gallatin.

Albert Gallatin, brilliant U.S. Secretary of the Treasury under Jefferson, was born on January 29, 1761. He was descended from a family of watchmakers, and born in Geneva, ancient capital of the modern watch industry which today contributes so importantly to United States-Swiss trade. Sensing that a greater future would be found in the new Nation struggling for its independence, he landed in America in 1780 and threw in his lot with the American patriots. After the Revolution he entered a political career in which he was successfully Pennsylvania State Legislator, Congressman, Senator, Secretary of the Treasury, and Ambassador to Great Britain and France.

I wish particularly to remind my colleagues that Albert Gallatin, while a Member of the U.S House of Representatives was the founder of the great Committee on Ways and Means, of which I am proud to be a member.

His life was devoted to many enterprises, most important of which were the system of free universal education, reform of Federal tax and budgetary policies, and the promotion of sound commercial relations with foreign nations throughout the world. He said:

It is commerce which unites the nations of the civilized world. It is principally to commerce that we are indebted for modern civilization.

We all recognize that America's ties with the entire free world are now challenged by the powerful, divisive force of Soviet collectivism. To cope with this challenge we must revive Gallatin's principles on trade as a guide to our future action. We must renew and strengthen our commercial ties to what Gallatin called the nations of the civilized world. We can accomplish this vital task, only if Members of the House can approach their job in the spirit of the founder of the House Ways and Means Committee—the great Albert Gallatin.

Soviet Psychopolitics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the final two articles by George Todt on the practice of psychopolitics by the Communist conspiracy. These articles were originally published by the North Hollywood, Calif., Valley Times. I wish to thank Mr. Todt and the Valley Times for permission to reprint this series:

AS BERIA PUT IT TO AMERICANS, V—AN ADDRESS BY BERIA TO AMERICAN QUISLINGS AT LENIN UNIVERSITY, 1936

"American students at the Lenin University, I welcome your attendance at these classes on psychopolitics.

"Psychopolitics is an important if less known division of Geopolitics. It is less known because it must necessarily deal with highly educated personnel, the very top strata of 'mental healing'.

"By psychopolitics our chief goals are effectively carried forward. To produce a maximum of chaos in the culture of the enemy is our first, most important step. Our fruits are grown in chaos, distrust, economic depression and scientific turmoil. At last, a weary populace can seek peace only in our proffered Communist state. At last, only Communism can resolve the problems of the masses.

"A psychopolitician must work hard to produce the maximum chaos in the fields of mental healing. He must labor to increase the personnel and facilities of 'mental healing' until at last the entire field of mental science is entirely dominated by Communist principles and desires.

"To achieve these goals, the psychopolitician must crush every homegrown variety of mental healing in America. Actual teachings of Freud, James, Eddy, and others among your misguided peoples must be swept away. They must be discredited, defamed, arrested, stamped upon even by their own Government until there is no credit in them and only Communist-oriented healing remains. You must work until every teacher of psychology unknowingly or knowingly teaches only Communist doctrine under the guise of psychology. You must labor until every doctor and psychiatrist is either a psychopolitician or an unwitting assistant to our aims.

"You must labor until we have dominion over the minds and bodies of every important person in your Nation. You must achieve such disrepute for the state of insanity and such authority over its pronouncement that not one statesman so labeled could again be given credence by the people. You must work until suicide arising from mental imbalance is common and calls forth no general investigation or remark.

"With the institutions for the insane you have in your country prisons which can hold a million persons, and can hold them without civil rights or any hope of freedom. And upon these people can be practiced shock and surgery so that never again will they draw a sane breath. You must make these treatments common and accepted. And you must sweep aside any treatment or any group of persons seeking to treat by effective means.

"You must dominate as respected men the fields of psychiatry and psychology. You must dominate the hospitals and universities. You must carry forward the myth that only a European doctor is competent in the field of insanity and thus excuse amongst you the high incidence of foreign birth and training. If and when we seize Vienna, you shall then have a common ground of meeting and can come and take your instructions as worshippers of Freud along with other psychiatrists.

"Psychopolitics is a solemn charge. With it you can erase our enemies as insects. You can cripple the efficiency of leaders by striking insanity into their families through the use of drugs. You can wipe out the outcries away with testimony as to their insanity. By our technologies you can even bring about insanity itself when they seem too resistive.

"You can change their loyalties by psychopolitics. Given a short time with a psychopolitician, you can alter forever the loyalty of a soldier in our hands, or a statesman, or a leader in his own country, or you can destroy his mind.

"However, you labor under certain dangers. It may happen that remedies for our treatments may be discovered. It may occur that a public hue and cry may arise against mental healing. It may thus occur that all mental healing might be placed in the hands of ministers and be taken out of the hands of our psychologists and psychiatrists.

"But the capitalistic thirst for control, capitalistic inhumanity and a general public terror of insanity can be brought to guard against these things. But should they occur, should independent researchers actually discover means to undo psychopolitical procedures, you must not rest, you must not eat or sleep, you must not stint one tiniest bit of available money to campaign against it, discredit it, strike it down and render it void. For by an effective means all our actions and researches could be undone.

"In a capitalistic state, you are aided on all sides by the corruption of the philosophy of Man and the times. You will discover that everything will aid you in your campaign to seize, control, and use all mental healing to spread our doctrine and rid us of our enemies within their own borders.

"Use the courts, use the judges, use the constitution of the country, use its medical societies and its laws to further our ends. Do not stint in your labor in this direction. And when you have succeeded you will discover that you can now effect your own legislation at will. And you can, by careful organization of healing societies, by constant campaign about the terrors of society, by pretense as to your effectiveness make your Capitalist himself, by his own appro-

priations, finance a large portion of the quiet conquest of the nation.

"By psychopolitics, create chaos. Kill our enemies and bring to earth, through communism, the greatest peace man has ever known."

Some fun, eh keed?

ONE ASPECT OF MENTAL HEALTH WORK, VI

Have members of the Communist conspiracy infiltrated themselves into the vast mental health program going on in the United States today?

That is a question which millions of Americans have been asking themselves over a long period of time.

One California State legislator, Senator Hugh P. Donnelly, Democrat of Turlock, made the forthright accusation in Los Angeles last July that mental health programs in our country are part and parcel of a long-range Marxist scheme to seize control—through cunning, treachery, and stealth—of the minds of our people. This in order to aid and abet the Soviet Union in its drive to a Red world government.

In saying this, I am sure we can all be certain that Senator Donnelly did not mean to impugn the motives or cast unpatriotic reflections upon the large number of dedicated American citizens who are helping to carry the water in their commendable struggle to alleviate the dread ravages of mental disease. I count myself in this category. I have nothing except admiration and respect for the 95 percent, or better, of those volunteers and professionals in mental health work who are motivated by pure humanitarianism and are Good Samaritans.

These are not the kind of persons to whom Senator Donnelly was referring in his blast at a conspiratorial few—hidden masterminds who may pull the strings unseen as they work behind the scenes—at Los Angeles last August. In fact, no responsible person wishes to do less than help the bona fide Good Samaritans achieve their worthy goals.

But nothing is more detrimental to their efforts than the considerable body of fear which has been built up in the United States by this time concerning the Kremlin's potential Trojan Horse technique in this field now and in the future. Is there anything to it?

Frankly, I do not know—at least, I am not sure. Let's put it that way. But I do know that there is a great amount of doubt about this engaging and controversial matter from one end of the country to the other.

Now, I submit that this subject of mental health is too important to remain obscured and hidden from the public's gaze for long. It may be time to put it on the table for public inspection.

In past columns, I have quoted at length from the official Russian textbook on psychopolitics and the infamous address of Beria, former head of the Russian secret police, to American quislings at Lenin University in 1936.

The odious implications are pretty obvious on the face of it all. And if they are true—then we have been laying back too long in our attempts to go to the bottom of the mystery. For Beria, although liquidated by his erstwhile pals in the Kremlin as of now, certainly spoke with the voice of Russian officialdom 20 years ago.

It is no question of a Hollywood film "whodunnit" to imagine that we have become the number one target of international spies and saboteurs on a grand scale by this time in our history. Such has been the fate of every nation which wore the imperial purple of world leadership in the past. And this will continue to be the case in the future.

Our very wealth and power attract the vermin who come here to undermine our Nation—at the behest of our most deadly opponent on the world stage. This isn't looking under the bed. Happens to be the facts of life. What should we do about it?

Back in August I suggested that the time is ripe in the forthcoming Congress to ask for this matter of mental health programs to come under the closest scrutiny—a first-class investigation.

In addition to this, I also think the Federal Bureau of Investigation ought to be brought into the case. The FBI's astute director, J. Edgar Hoover, has enough stature that he could perhaps do more than any other man, outside of the President and the Vice President, to keep this kind of ship on an even keel.

It would go a long way to restoring public confidence in the mental health programs if the President might request a bipartisan committee to shed light on this problem. And let the chips fall where they may.

As a former chapter president of the Sons of the American Revolution, I think all patriotic societies and citizens everywhere should join with one voice to make such requests of the White House and the Congress in the forthcoming year.

The aim shouldn't be that of looking for trouble—but to get the record straight for all concerned. Not the least of whom are the good Samaritans who are working their hearts out to bring assistance to those who have fallen. And to assist the latter by combing out the deadwood in the present programs.

The honest in heart would have nothing to fear from such an investigation. For the honest have nothing to hide.

Actually, none would suffer except the guilty—if such were to be found. Why not take a look and see for ourselves?

And while we are at it, why not ask this question, too: How is it that, in such a spiritual matter as mental illness may very well be, the church has indeed been so shut out of ministering to these sick and needy ones? Why have the men of God been kept at arm's length here? In any affliction of the spirit who may be more sorely needed by the patient than they?

State Senate Honors Korkosz Brothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Massachusetts State Senate has adopted a resolution congratulating John J. and Frank D. Korkosz, of Chicopee, Mass., who designed and built the projector apparatus for the new Hayden Planetarium of the Museum of Science in Boston. Recently, I included with my remarks on the Korkosz brothers some newspaper articles commending them for their achievement. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Springfield Daily News of January 19, 1959, concerning the State senate resolution:

STATE SENATE HONORS KORKOSZ BROTHERS

BOSTON.—The State senate this afternoon is expected to adopt resolutions congratulating John J. and Frank D. Korkosz, of Chicopee, for their outstanding scientific achievements.

The resolutions were sponsored by Senator Maurice A. Donahue, Democrat, of Holyoke. The text follows:

"Whereas John J. and Frank D. Korkosz, brothers, of Chicopee, have designed and built the new projectors for the New Hayden Planetarium at the Museum of Science in Boston, and for the planetarium at the Springfield Museum of Natural History; and

"Whereas our solar system and its complexities have been made dramatically visible by the ingenuity of the Korkosz brothers for the benefit of all people who wish to view their creations; and

"Whereas the scientific research and contributions of these brothers have been hailed by scientists and astronomers the world over; and

"Whereas the Korkosz brothers projects have been utilized by the U.S. Air Force as a training aid in celestial navigation, and invaluable contribution to the safety and perpetuation of our great Nation; and

"Whereas Korkosz Day in Chicopee was officially proclaimed recently by the Honorable Walter M. Grocki, mayor of Chicopee, commemorating their services to science and their country: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts Senate extends its congratulations to the Korkosz brothers for their outstanding accomplishments in the astronomical field; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the clerk of the senate to Frank D. and John J. Korkosz, of Chicopee."

Inaugural Address by the Honorable J. Millard Tawes, Governor of Maryland, January 14, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to commend to the attention of my colleagues the inaugural address of the Honorable J. Millard Tawes, the 59th elected Governor of Maryland.

Governor Tawes as Comptroller of the State of Maryland for the past 16 years has acquired a thorough and intimate knowledge of our State's financial structure. The people of Maryland are, indeed, fortunate to have as their pilot our most experienced State administrator who can be depended upon to chart the correct course for our State in the complex times that lie ahead.

His address follows:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF J. MILLARD TAWES, GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND, AT ANNAPOLIS, MD., JANUARY 14, 1959

I have just taken the oath of office as Governor of the State of Maryland.

This solemn ceremony has left me with a feeling of both pride and humility—pride in the consciousness that I now am a part of that succession of men who have been chosen to govern this State, and humble as men are likely to be when faced with a grave task and heavy responsibilities.

In taking office today, I have become the 59th elected Governor. And thus I take my place in a long line of Governors that goes back more than 180 years—to Thomas Johnson, who was sworn in as the first elected chief executive in 1777.

The responsibilities which now rest upon me I feel most deeply, and in all humility, I implore the support and the prayers of the citizens of Maryland who have given me the opportunity to serve them in this high office.

It is my own fervent wish that I may be able to discharge these obligations with courage, dignity and wisdom.

Each Governor, during his administration, confronts the peculiar problems of his day and era. Glancing back over the recent history of the State, we recall that Governor O'Conor's responsibility was to make certain that Maryland rendered the maximum contribution toward winning a global war. Governor Lane's big task was to restore State services and rebuild State facilities, which, through necessity, had been deferred during the war years. My immediate predecessor, Governor McKeldin, had the burden of guiding our State through a period of intensified growth in population and economic activity.

Now, with this inauguration, we are moving into a new era—an era which will produce new problems and new challenges and a period in which the people of Maryland will be called upon to make decisions of great consequence.

Firm courage in the face of these challenges must become the touchstone for the conduct of the Governor, the legislature, and all public servants.

The task of the legislature is not made any easier because of the overwhelming dominance of one political party. On the contrary the legislature must exercise unusual diligence to see that all shades of opinion are obtained and all points of view explored.

As I begin my task, I find comfort in the fact that Maryland is blessed with a devoted group of career public servants. Quietly and efficiently, they perform their duties. Many of them have served the State for long periods of time, and their intimate knowledge and experience will be utilized by my administration to the advantage of the public. These conscientious and loyal State employees deserve our appreciation; without their devotion to duty, no State policy can succeed.

I possess no special gifts of prophecy, but I predict, nevertheles ,that during the next 4 years we will witness an expansion of industrial and business activity such as never before has been seen in this State. Every report indicates that our population will continue to grow, and at an even faster rate. At the same time, we may expect the demand for services provided by the State to attain new peaks. Pressures will pile up for more highways, for more schools, for better hospitals and better prisons, for an improved welfare program.

I have no misgivings at all about our capacity to meet the demands as they arise. It is sobering, nonetheless ,to realize that within the last year our State approached a revenue crisis—a crisis in which we observed the demands for services overtake our ability to pay for them with established revenues.

In common with many other States, Maryland has reached a stage of development where great strides forward must be taken if we are to keep up with the times.

I conceive it to be the principal task of my administration to achieve these new standards and at the same time to preserve the financial integrity of the State.

I say quite frankly that there may be times when we find it impossible to reconcile requests for services with our ability to pay. In such an instance, clearly our alternative is to forego the service or to provide the additional revenues. As for my part, I am resolved to face the difficult choice with forthrightness and determination.

As I see it, this is neither the time nor place to discuss in detail the means of approaching our fiscal problems. That I intend to do later this month in my message to the general assembly.

I will confine myself today, therefore, to what I consider fundamental concepts—the basic philosophy from which I shall seek guidance during the next 4 years.

I offer you four fundamental principles which I believe to be essential to the conduct of a vigorous, progressive, and intelligent administration. I think of them as the four cornerstones of the structure I shall try to build.

The first is to look ahead. Matters of State no longer can be handled in a day-to-day manner, without plan or program. Gone, indeed, are the days when it was possible to think on a year-to-year basis. We must project our designs many years in advance to achieve the best results.

I think it is regrettable that in the past State planning to often has been no more than a pious hope, an expression of good intentions, ignored in practice after being paid dutiful lipservice.

The State of Maryland cannot afford the luxury of casual planning. I shall offer no program during my administration the end of which cannot be foreseen. It is my intention never to propose a course of action without a cautious exploration of all its aspects and all its possible consequences.

We must remain constantly aware that every move we make will have its impact upon our tax structure, upon the relationship of departments, upon the daily lives of the men, women, and children of Maryland.

The effects of our action fan out and expand as the years pass by. I conceive it to be the responsibility of this administration to weigh these effects and project them into the future as far as possible.

Likewise, it is our duty to determine the needs of the State 2, 3 or 4 years from now. This is a continuing responsibility and one that cannot be fulfilled by sporadic, independent surveys.

For all these reasons, I am placing "looking ahead"—that is to say, intelligent foresight—at the top of my list of fundamental principles.

A second precept I will call: "keep the public informed." In a democratic State, no program can be successful unless it is supported by the people, and the people cannot participate in a program effectively unless they understand it.

One of the great virtues of planning is that it gives the public the opportunity to examine measures well in advance of their initiation.

The State is confronted at every turn with demands for services which result inevitably in greater costs to the public. I consider it my duty, and the duty of every public official of the State, to do everything possible to remove any area of doubt or misunderstanding that may exist as to the effect of a proposed policy or program.

This administration and the people of Maryland will be called upon to make many difficult choices during the next 4 years. There is no magic formula to give us the things we want without cost or obligation.

When difficult decisions are being made, it becomes imperative that the Government keep the public fully and frankly informed.

I believe that the ultimate success of my administration will depend to a great extent upon the degree to which it takes the public into its confidence.

For this reason, it is my purpose and my aim during the next 4 years to heighten the public awareness of all the functions of State government, and by so doing, to create an atmosphere in which the Government assumes the role of a partner and coworker with its citizens.

The greater the interest and understanding of the people in the administration of their government, the better that administration will be.

A third principle upon which my administration will stand I like to call the principle of open mindedness. The era we are approaching will be one of rapid change. We see signs of this everywhere. Seventy percent of our citizens now live in urban communities, and this ratio will increase. New metropolitan areas will be created and existing ones will expand. New systems of mass transportation are being devised.

Traditional approaches to such things as education, public welfare, prison management, and many other State activities are being reexamined. Moreover, many State functions—because of our growing population—have outgrown old methods and techniques of organization and administration. New forms and new formulas must be devised.

It is my belief that in the interest of efficiency and economy—in the interest of good government in general—the State has a duty to make a continuous reappraisal of its traditional administrative processes and to remain constantly on the alert for new, better, and faster ways of getting the job done.

The quality of being alert to these new approaches and developments is what I mean by the term "openmindedness." An administration which is openminded will not hesitate to change or to do things differently from the way they were done last year or the year before.

As Governor, I will encourage—indeed, I will require—a reexamination by department heads of all their activities. I am going to count heavily upon this spirit of openmindedness to provide the formula for the solution of many of the problems ahead.

The final principle upon which I shall base this administration is confidence and faith. The day after election I made a statement in which I named as the three greatest assets of Maryland its bountiful land, its alert and vigorous population, and its unequaled heritage of freedom and tolerance.

We Marylanders are fortunate in the rich endowments of our State. As Governor, this knowledge will strengthen me in facing the tasks ahead. The opportunities for growth and development which lie before us are unlimited.

With faith and confidence in our State and its people, and with the help of Almighty God, we can look forward to an ever more bountiful and prosperous life for all our people.

Thank you.

The High Cost of Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the recent floods in Pennsylvania again point up the seriousness of the situation in many parts of our great State.

Particularly at this time, the grave concern of all of us is the unreasonable amount of delay in the construction of the Kinzua Dam. The loss of personal property to the residents of this area is far greater than any benefits real or otherwise that might be derived from nonconstruction of this needed public work.

The attached editorial from the Pittsburgh Press gives damaging evidence of the need for this improvement. It is time Congress demands the immediate construction of the dam which was authorized 21 years ago.

The present Governor of Pennsylvania, David L. Lawrence, has worked for years for the construction of this project. As the longtime mayor of Pittsburgh, he pointed out time after time the seriousness of the situation. It is a sad commentary to have to spell out how right he was in the millions of dollars of damages caused by a negligent an inexcusable delay in carrying out the mandates of Congress.

Congressman KEARNS, who represents this district, informed me that he has again introduced legislation for the needed appropriations.

The editorial follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Jan. 25, 1959]

THE HIGH COST OF FLOODS

What is the cost of the recurrent floods in western Pennsylvania's river valleys?

You can get a variety of estimates and educated guesses. Perhaps the best guide is contained in a report given Representative L. H. GAVIN, Oil City Republican, by Col. H. E. Sprague, then district engineer for the U.S. Army at Pittsburgh. It cited a flood survey made by his office some years ago.

"At the time of that report the average annual direct flood damages for the four major damage districts involved (Wheeling, Pittsburgh, New Kensington, and Kittanning) based on recurrence of natural flood stages of record and conditions and values as of June 1948, amounted to $10,034,000," Colonel Sprague said. "At present day price levels (1956) such direct damages would amount to approximately $15,600,000."

(The reader should note that this is an average every-year cost, and includes only direct damages, excluding such tangible values as loss of wages, business, and profits.)

The granddaddy of all floods, of course, was the devastating St. Patrick's Day flood of 1936. From Warren, Pa., on the Allegheny and from Braddock on the Monongahela to Moundsville, W. Va., this inundation did damages estimated by the Army engineers at $728 million (1956 prices).

Which brings up the next question, which is: How much damage would have been prevented if the proposed Allegheny River (Kinzua) dam had been in existence?

Colonel Sprague estimated 2 years ago that the total average annual benefits of that dam would be (January 1957, prices) $4,971,000, of which $4,093,000 would be in flood control, the balance in other stream control benefits.

He added that the dam would have prevented more than $4,500,000 in damages from the single flood of March 1956 in the Allegheny and Ohio Valleys. It may be assumed that the dam would have been at least equally effective in last week's flood.

The Kinzua Dam was first authorized by Congress back in 1938—21 years ago. It was deferred, delayed, and postponed for various reasons, some financial, some because of priorities assigned to other flood-control projects, and some because of the vigorous opposition of certain groups who just didn't want the dam to be built.

Had the Kinzua Dam been built in 1938, the cost would have been well below the more than $100 million now estimated, and at $4 million a year in flood benefits, the project would have paid for itself by this time.

There are other real benefits to be derived from flood protection besides those dollars-and-cents figures of the engineers. The additional safeguard given lives and properties is worth an inestimable sum.

More, the completion of this key and largest unit of the plan for western Pennsylvania's flood protection would constitute a major improvement for the Allegheny Valley from Warren to Pittsburgh and the Ohio Valley to Moundsville, W. Va. It would open the way to the long-delayed industrial development of the Allegheny Valley—a development which is bound to come some time and which would be hastened by flood protection.

By any account, the Kinzua Dam is an investment that would pay big dividends, in lives, properties, and prosperity. Congress should order construction started as soon as possible.

When Congress Looked Away, How the Speculators Did Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following articles written by Joseph R. Slevin, national economics editor of the New York Herald Tribune. Although Mr. Slevin's articles bear datelines of September 1958, they are most timely.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 1, 1958]

FOUR HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS LOST BY U.S. BOND SPECULATORS SINCE JUNE—EFFECTS TO BE FELT FOR MONTHS YET

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, September 1.—The Treasury Department sold $7,388 million of new bonds last June and the dust hasn't settled yet. It was the worst debacle in the history of U.S. Government borrowing. The bonds have been declining in value since the day the subscription books closed and they still were edging lower last week.

Individuals bought the bonds. So did banks, corporations, brokers, dealers, and insurance companies. Some bought the bonds as permanent investments. But an astonishingly large number bought the bonds for speculation. The real and paper losses of the buyers totaled almost $400 million when the Labor Day weekend began.

The loss is the largest that ever has been suffered by the buyers of a new issue of securities in so short a time. Every fresh decline in the bond market adds to its size.

SOME LOSE MILLIONS

The real dollars-and-cents losses are being borne by the speculators who bought the bonds to make a quick profit and, instead, have been selling them out at strapping losses. There are some individuals and syndicates who now count their losses in the millions.

The paper losses are on the books of the investors who bought the bonds for the 2⅝ percent interest that they pay, still have them, and plan to redeem them for 100 cents on the dollar when they mature on February 15, 1965. They will be hurt only if they are forced to sell at depressed prices before the bonds come due.

No one is wise enough to say how much of the drop was caused by the speculators overbuying the 2⅝s and then hastily dumping them when the market broke. The bond market was ready to turn down, and the skid in the new bonds has been accompanied by a steep slide in the prices of other Government securities. But there is general agreement among financial experts that the entire United States Government securities market has plummeted far more swiftly than it would have if the speculators had not moved in.

The magnitude of the speculative activity was staggering. The best guess now is that speculators bought more than $3 billion of Government bonds during the June refunding. That represents the difference between the $7,388 million total issue and an advance Treasury estimate that the true investor demand for the new 2⅝s would total between $3 billion and $4 billion.

"These guys must have thought they were playing with marbles," a leading investment banker said recently. Guys who had never found that they had signed up to take millions of dollars of Government bonds."

WILL BE FELT FOR MONTHS

The impact of the June fiasco will be felt for many months to come. It is a matter of profound national concern.

The market for United States Government securities has been disrupted and it has become measurably more difficult for the Treasury to finance the Government debt in a sound and orderly fashion.

The Federal Reserve System, which is charged with regulating the national money and credit supply, found its activities limited this summer by a need to be solicitous of the weakened Government securities market.

The persistent decline in bond prices has scared off the big Government bond houses that are supposed to make a market by buying, selling, and owning Government securities. They are reluctant buyers for they fear that further price declines—and further losses—are ahead. The new bonds plunged from a peak price of just over 100 13/32 on June 5 to a low of 93 28/32 last Friday—a drop of $6.54 in the value of every $100 bond.

Separate investigations of the June break are being made by the Federal Reserve and the New York Stock Exchange. Whether they can or will find solutions that will make it more difficult for the speculators to come into the Government bond market in the future remains to be seen.

There is a widespread conviction that it must not be allowed to happen again.

The damage to the market, to credit policy, to investors, and to the financial integrity of the country has been too great.

The full story of what happened has not been told and perhaps it never will be. But the major pieces now can be fitted together.

It is easier to single out those who played a part in the events leading to the collapse than it is to parcel out responsibility. Many people were involved. Many forces were at work. Some of the biggest corporations and banks in the country did things they intend never to go again.

But there is no one scapegoat.

The responsibility must be shared among:

Individual, corporate, bank, and broker-dealer speculators who unsuccessfully tried to make a killing in the Government bond market;

More than 100 leading corporations that supplied hundreds of millions of dollars to the speculators to finance their bond purchases;

Dozens of substantial banks that financed security purchases at little or no cost to the speculators;

A money broker who financed more than $500 million of the bond purchases by acting as go-between for the corporations and the banks on the one side, and brokerage houses and individual speculators on the other;

Brokerage houses, including stock exchange firms, that speculated in Government bonds for their own account and encouraged their customers to do the same;

Government bond houses and banks that sold securities to stock exchange firms on terms that permitted the buyer to delay payment until a date in the future;

The Federal Reserve System, which made money so cheap in pursuit of its antirecession policy that the speculative deals became tempting to corporations and banks that were in search of income;

The Treasury Department, which shared the general blindness about the events that were taking place and thus arranged the refunding on terms that tempted the speculators to make their play.

A minority caused the trouble—a minority of the corporations, a minority of the stock exchange houses, a minority of the investors.

The speculative fever burned its hottest in Wall Street, but it fanned out across the country and blinded the speculators and the lenders to the risks that they were taking.

It was a classic speculative surge. Hardened professionals and naive clerks all reached the same happy conclusion: the Government bond market could go only one way—"up"—and there was money to be made for the asking.

But they were wrong.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 2, 1958]

BIG PROFITS MADE IN FEBRUARY PURCHASES LURED PLUNGERS INTO JUNE DEBACLE

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, September 2.—Wall Street now holds the "Gay Nineties" partly responsible for last June's big speculative purchases of the Government's new 2⅝ percent bonds.

The financial center is not talking about the colorful decade that ended the 19th century. Instead, it is pointing directly at a $1,727,000,000 issue of 3½ percent bonds—due in 1990—that the Treasury sold in mid-February.

These were the "Gay Nineties." They soared to a peak price of 107 10/32s during the weeks after they were issued. Speculators had been heavy buyers at the offering price of 100 and the big paper profits whetted their appetites for more when they looked ahead to the $9,550,000,000 refunding that the Treasury would have to carry out in June.

BUT ONE EPISODE

The "Gay Nineties" were but one glittering episode in a story of huge speculative profits that began when the Federal Reserve System abandoned its tight money policy in mid-November of last year. The shift to an antirecession, easy-money policy and the impact of the business downturn on market expectations led to the sharpest drop in interest rates—and the steepest rise in bond prices—in history.

That was when the professionals began to make big money.

They reaped enormous profits by buying outstanding Government bonds and holding them while prices rose. They made millions more by buying 3⅞ percent, 17-year bonds that the Treasury sold in December and 3 percent, 6-year bonds that it sold with the 32-year "Gay 90's" in February.

It was against this background of a pell-mell price rise and confident expectations of further increases to come that the speculators began to build their positions for the June refunding. It seemed certain that the recession would continue for many more months and that bond prices would continue to climb as interest rates fell. It didn't look like a gamble. The word went out: There's no risk. It's a sure thing. It's a free ride. Get on board.

Bond prices customarily are pushed to higher levels when business activity declines. The supply of money grows while the demand for funds weakens. People bid against one another to buy the available supply of bonds.

The biggest plungers—and the heaviest losers—are believed to have been a Miami, Fla., family group. They are known to have had close to $90 million of new bonds and there are some indications that their purchases were substantially larger. They held on to their bonds after the market broke in June, kept hoping that a fresh rise would get underway, and didn't begin unloading in earnest until August.

They sold many millions out at 96 cents on the dollar and sold millions more at 95. Their losses have been estimated at almost $5 million—and just last Thursday a dealer found evidence that they still were selling.

The Miami crowd, as they now are known in Wall Street, and other giant speculators could operate on a magnificent scale because a money broker arranged to give the speculators access to the idle cash of some of the country's biggest corporations. The speculators paid no interest, usually did not put up any money of their own, and gave the corporations temporary title to the bonds to protect the loans.

They called the deals repurchased agreements. Sometimes they did them with banks and called them buybacks.

A Boston broker arranged $73 million of loans for his customers through the money broker. A prominent oil industry official came to the money broker. So did the head of a Midwest brewery, the lawyer for a big mutual fund, a top officer of a big defense company, and many, many others.

Bank officers got caught up in the rush and in at least two instances they approached Government bond dealers for special credit arrangements. The big foreign agency banks in Wall Street helped to finance the speculators, and substantial foreign interests, including Greek shipowner money, joined the profit-hungry throng.

The speculative excitement spread during May from the big Government bond operators to brokerage houses and through them to thousands of little people who had never bought a marketable Government bond in their lives. The stock market showed signs of weakening and brokers talked up the rising Government bond market as a smart hedge against the threat of a stock market break.

Where $100,000 deals always have been looked on as small potatoes in the Government bond market, some brokerage houses pushed the bonds in $5,000 and $10,000 blocs.

Some asked margin. Others didn't. One novice speculator bought $1 million of the new bonds by putting up only $1,500—a margin payment of exactly three-twentieths of 1 percent. He sold out at a profit of $180 before the market broke. If he had waited just a little longer he would have lost $7,000.

The public had missed out on the gay 90's and the big profits of the winter and early spring. The public came in during the last days of May and the first days of June—in time for the crash landing.

Toward the end of June, about 10 days after the market broke, a preoccupied trader for one of the leading Government bond houses stopped at a cigar stand and absent-mindedly asked for "a pack of 2⅝s."

"How are they doing?" the clerk asked. "I've got a hundred of them myself."

Another major dealer received a call at about the same time from a man who asked the price of the 2⅝s. When the dealer said they were selling at 99½, the caller said he would like to sell some.

The big bond houses trade with other dealers, banks, and brokerage houses but don't usually trade with individuals.

"What's your name and how many do you have?" the dealer asked. "Five million," replied the caller and gave a name that the dealer didn't recognize.

"Who are you?" the puzzled dealer inquired.

"A used car dealer in Jersey City," the man replied.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 3, 1958]

PLUNGERS WAITED IN VAIN FOR RALLY

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, September 3.—Professional speculators, commercial banks, big corporations, bond dealers and stockbrokers got caught with the dress manufacturers, real estate salesmen, storekeepers, stenographers, and ribbon clerks when the Government's new 2⅝-percent bonds broke par June 19.

Some people got out in time, but most didn't. A few Government bond dealers had sensed that a change was coming and had been quietly reducing their inventories for some days before the market broke. But many spectators wouldn't believe that the turn had come and hung on to their bonds—hoping that the slump would be brief, hoping that a rally would carry the bonds back above par and at least let them get even.

The rally never appeared.

The 2⅝s were in weak hands. Too many 6-year 8-month bonds were owned by individuals and corporations who didn't want to own marketable governmental bonds, had no business owning them—and couldn't wait to get rid of them.

They were speculators. They were not investors. They had bought the bonds in the hope of a quick profit. Now that the bonds were going down instead of up, they wanted out.

Price changes in the Government bond market customarily are small and the speculators signed up for huge quantities of the 2⅝s in their attempt to make a profit. They had to buy in on little or no margin to get the leverage they needed.

A composite case in point would be a speculator of modest means who bought $1,000,000 of bonds on credit, made no down payment, and was startled to realize that he had, in effect, signed a pay-on-demand note for $1 million.

A speculator who dealt with one of the New York Stock Exchange firms that lived up to the N.Y.S.E. rules by charging the full 5 percent margin that the exchange requires would have had to put up $5,000 on a $100,000 deal.

He still had powerful leverage. A 1-point rise would have returned a $1,000 profit. That figures out to a 20-percent return on a $5,000 investment within a few short weeks.

It was a different story when the market broke. Every point decline meant a $1,000 loss to the small speculator who had $100,000 of bonds. It meant a $10,000 loss to the speculator who had $1 million of bonds.

SPECULATORS SELL

The speculators had no stomach for that kind of pounding. They didn't plan to keep the bonds for 6 years 8 months and couldn't have paid for them if they had wanted to. One after another, the speculators began to sell out.

Some of the largest corporations of the country contributed to the debacle by speculating heavily in the 2⅝s. Corporations normally invest their funds in short-term securities that mature in a year or less. They know they will need the money within a short time for taxes, dividend payments or equipment purchases and choose temporary investments that can be liquidated quickly.

But the 6-year-8-month bonds were too tempting. The corporate treasurers knew about the big profits that had been made in the Government's February issue of "Gay 90's" and they thought that bond prices still were rising.

Treasurer after treasurer threw caution to the winds and decided that he would buy the 2⅝s, hold them until they rose to a premium of 101, 102, or perhaps even 103, then kick them out at a profit and switch to the 1-year-and-under securities that he should have bought in the first place.

The 2⅝s didn't go up. Some corporations sold out at a loss and added to the pressures that depressed the bond market. Others still are carrying the 2⅝s on their books in red ink. It's a safe guess that many red-faced corporate treasurers have spent uncomfortable hours explaining their June gambling enthusiasm to company presidents and boards of directors.

The startling fact is that corporations directly and indirectly financed more than $1 billion of the speculative purchases of the 2⅝s. A Treasury survey shows that corporations—which had been expected to buy only a handful of the bonds—actually took $1,045 million worth.

The corporations didn't buy the entire $1,045 million of bonds for their own speculative operations. A sizable share—certainly many hundreds of millions—represents bonds that the corporations took for the individual speculators that they were financing through the repurchase agreements.

Corporations were tempted to speculate in the 2⅝s partly because they were unenthusiastic about a 1¼ percent interest rate that the Treasury attached to a 1-year certificate that it issued at the same time as the 2⅝s. The corporations normally would have gravitated toward the 1-year security to meet their short-term investment needs, but the Treasury survey reveals that they bought a relatively meager $570 million of the certificates while taking the incredible $1,045 million of intermediate bonds.

Commercial banks speculated heavily, too. They were expected to be substantial buyers of the 2⅝s since a 6-year 8-month bond is an attractive investment for many commercial banks. But the banks bought many more than they needed for their own portfolios.

The Treasury breakdown shows that commercial banks took $4,031 million of the 2⅝s. The bank takings alone thus exceeded an advance Treasury estimate that total subscriptions to the 2⅝s by all comers would total somewhere between $3 billion and $4 billion, and played a significant role in boosting the total bond issue to $7,388 million. Where the Treasury had expected to sell $5 billion to $6 billion of the 1-year certificates, it received orders for only $1,817 million.

The bank figures undoubtedly exaggerated the volume of direct bank speculation just as the corporate figures exaggerate the amount of direct corporate speculation. The bank total includes the 2⅝s that the banks bought for speculators who had arranged direct loans and for speculators who had arranged "buybacks."

Ironically, commercial banks from one end of the country to the other were steadily—and injudiciously—buying the 2⅝s during the delicately balanced mid-June weeks when the Government bond dealers were cautiously liquidating their own holdings.

The bank purchases helped give the Government bond market a deceptive appearance of stability in mid-June just as heavy speculative buying in May had made the market look stronger than it really was.

The commercial bank speculation didn't and directly to the downward pressures after the market broke because the banks kept their 2⅝s in preference to selling them out at a loss. Normally, though, the banks would have bought up some of the 2⅝s as they were released by the speculators. But the banks were overstuffed and wanted none of them. An important cushion was missing when the speculators began to unload.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 4, 1958]

Money Brokers Tap Idle Reserves of Firms, Banks To Play Market

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, September 4.—One day in late February a New York investment banking house called a prominent money broker and asked him to arrange a $30 million loan for an unidentified individual. The money broker quickly complied. It was the first of many such loans that ultimately led the money broker to set up the financing for more than $500 million of speculation in the Treasury's June issue of of 2⅝-percent bonds.

The initial deal was arranged for tax rather than for speculative purposes. So were a number of the other transactions that the money broker negotiated during the following months. But the method that he used was peculiarly well adapted to financing speculation in Government bonds.

The word spread rapidly and the demand for the loans mounted. The money broker arranged some deals for big individual speculators including the Miami crowd that bought about $90 million of bonds. Most of his deals were negotiated for members of the New York Stock Exchange and for other brokers who wanted financing for themselves or for their customers.

He wasn't the only money broker who participated in financing the June speculation, but he was the most active. He showed speculators how they could tap the huge reserves of idle corporate and bank money to play the Government securities market.

The money broker called his deals repurchase agreements when he made them with corporations and buybacks when he made them with banks.

Speculators liked the deals because they obtained millions of dollars of Government bonds without paying any interest and without putting up any money of their own.

Corporations and banks liked the deals because they held Government obligations as security and collected more interest than they could have obtained through conventional financing techniques.

The first $30 million deal set the broad pattern that the others followed. Here is how a typical repurchase agreement worked:

Acting on the instructions of the money broker, a big corporation with idle cash bought $30 million of 2⅜-percent Government bonds that were scheduled to mature June 15. The money broker agreed to buy the bonds from the corporation by the maturity date and contracted in turn to sell them to an individual or a brokerage house that had placed the original order.

POCKETS INTEREST

The corporation pocketed all or most of the 2⅜ percent interest that the bonds paid. Frequently it agreed in advance to accept only 2 or 2⅛ or 2¼ percent and the money broker kept the rest.

It was an attractive deal because the corporation received about twice the income it would have obtained by the traditional device of investing its funds in short-term Treasury bills. The bills yielded about 1 percent during most of the spring.

The money broker collected one thirty-second of 1 percent commission on the bond transaction.

The speculator was assured delivery of the bonds on the date that he wanted, at the price the corporation had paid, and at a cost of only the one third-second commission that he would in any event have had to pay a broker for buying the bonds.

Banks found the buy-backs even more lucrative than the corporations did. The interest they received from the 2⅜s contrasted sharply with the one-eighth to one-fourth of 1 percent that they could have obtained by lending their surplus "Federal funds" to other banks during the period in late May when the speculative fever was at its peak.

The wide spread in the interest rate structure was responsible for the strong appeal that the speculative loans had for both the corporations and the banks. The spread had developed in large part because of the aggressive manner in which the Federal Reserve System had been pursuing its anti-recession easy-money policy.

BIGGEST IS $84 MILLION

The biggest repurchase agreement that the money broker arranged totaled $84 million. It was negotiated with a mutual fund.

One corporation made $70 million available. Another provided $60 million. More than 100 other corporations and some 2 dozen banks provided substantial but lesser amounts.

The speculators used the money to have the corporations and banks buy "rights" to the new securities that the Treasury would issue in its $9,550 million June refunding. "Rights" are maturing obligations that the Treasury encourages investors to exchange for new Government securities. Some speculators chose the 2⅜ percent bonds that matured June 15 while others bought the 2⅞ percent notes that came due the same day.

Most of the wealthy individuals who originally came to the money broker for tax reasons stayed to gamble. They got caught up in the speculative excitement of late spring and failed to sell out in time to achieve their tax objectives.

One affluent citizen bought $22,825,000 worth of rights for tax purposes through a repurchase agreement. He acted on the advice of a prominent New York accountant who told him that $22,825,000 was the exact amount that he needed. He bought the rights at a premium and gave orders that they were to be exchanged for the 2⅝s, which then were to be sold out immediately.

But he heard that the 2⅝s were going up canceled the sell order, and finally sold at a heavy loss after the 2⅝s broke par.

DIDN'T SELL IN TIME

Another individual bought $25 million of the rights, then became more interested in speculation than in taxes and bought and additional $36 million—a total repurchase deal of $61 million. He didn't sell in time, suffered a substantial loss, and is mad as a wet hen at the money broker that he dealt with.

The tax plan was only for people in the upper brackets and only for people who had substantial losses on other investments.

Take the hypothetical case of a man in the 70 percent income-tax bracket who bought about $30 million of rights and paid 100$^{8}/_{32}$s for each bond. The premium payments of $^{8}/_{32}$s totaled $75,000. A taxpayer is permitted to deduct premium payments from ordinary income. This means the taxpayer could subtract the $75,000 from his taxable income. The saving for a man in the 70 percent bracket amounted to $52,000.

He still had to take two more steps. He had to convert the rights into the new Treasury securities and had to sell out the new securities immediately to get his money back.

The market was rising. The taxpayer assumed that he would be able to get back his $75,000 of premium money by collecting at least as big a premium on the new June security as he had paid on the rights.

But he would lose his tax saving if he had to pay a 70 percent tax on the premium that he collected. The scheme therefore provided for writing off the premium income against carryover losses that the taxpayer had suffered from unfavorable investments in previous years.

The market remained strong for a brief period after the tax operators converted their rights into the 2⅝s. But most waited too long to sell.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 6, 1958]

Money Broker Traded on Name To Back Half-Billion in Deals

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, September 6.—The Wall Street money broker who arranged the

financing for more than $500 million of speculation in the Treasury's June refunding didn't invent the techniques that he used but he polished them up and put them to work on a scale that had never been seen before.

Individual speculators and brokerage houses, who could not have swung the deals on their own, obtained interest-free, no-downpayment access to huge qualities of corporate and bank credit for speculating in the U.S. Government securities market.

BROKER'S GOOD NAME

The money broker got them the money by putting his own name instead of theirs on the repurchase agreements and buybacks that he negotiated with corporations and banks. He traded on his high reputation and solid credit standing to make deals that corporate treasurers and bank lending officers would not have made with his clients.

At the peak of his operations, he had commitments to buy more than $500 million of Government bonds from corporations and banks. Individuals and brokerage houses in turn had promised to buy the bonds from the money broker.

But people up and down Wall Street shudder today to think of what might have happened if the Government bond market break had been sharper than it was—and if a number of the speculators had reneged on their contracts with the money broker.

He lost a large sum of money but he met all of his commitments and disappointed some Wall Street bankers who had been confidently predicting that he would go under.

The New York Stock Exchange has been auditing the money broker's books and is conducting a wide-ranging investigation of his operations in an attempt to find out whether any of its rules have been violated. It began looking into the situation after the 2⅝s came on the market June 15. In early July it ordered him to liquidate $376 million of repurchase agreements and buybacks that he still had in force.

WALL STREET PLAN

The methods that the money broker used had been developed in the last few years by the big Government bond houses to finance their portfolios of Government securities at lower interest rates that they would have had to pay the Wall Street banks.

The bond dealers tapped corporations and banks all around the country, and one result was that corporate treasurers and bank lending officers felt at home in negotiating "repurchase agreements" with the money broker. They were working with a type of transaction they had come to know well.

The money broker, for his part, had been using the same devices on a smaller scale to finance tax-savings deals and elaborate arbitrage transactions for his clients. He had established a special place for himself as a clearing house for banks that wanted to buy and sell "Federal funds." On his biggest day his transactions fell just $30 million short of an even $1 billion.

Bank lending officers in large- and medium-sized communities all around the country knew him. Borrowers came to him, for he could obtain money much more cheaply than they could get it for themselves. Because of his dealings in "Federal funds," he always knew which banks had extra money they were anxious to lend.

It only gradually dawned upon the banks and the corporations that the deals they had made with the money broker were riskier than their customary transactions with the Government bond houses. Some lenders were less knowledgeable than they might have been. Others had been lulled by eager talk of a rising bond market and riskless transactions.

Those who came in at the beginning started out with one type of commitment and ended with another. But even so, they probably would not have become nervous if the bond market had not weakened.

JUNE REDEMPTIONS

The original "repurchase agreements" and "buy backs" covered the 2⅜-percent "rights" that matured June 15. Banks didn't fret about entering into deals secured by a Government bond that could be redeemed at par in mid-June. Neither did the corporations.

But when the speculators told the lenders to exchange the "rights" for the new 2⅝s, the character of the deal changed profoundly. Instead of holding riskless securities, the banks and corporations now had title to Government bonds that would not mature until February 15, 1965, and that would fluctuate in price.

The lenders had not thought to obtain a promise of collateral from the money broker to protect them against a decline in price. He in turn had not obtained margin from his clients for he did not consider them brokerage customers who would be subject to the stock exchange requirement of a five-point margin payment.

Bank examination officials maintain they are not disturbed by the buybacks since they know of no bank that suffered a substantial loss. Many bankers vigorously disagree. They consider it unsound banking to lend money on a 6-year, 8-month bond without at least 5 percent margin.

As the 2⅝s rapidly lost their premium value before breaking par on June 19, the lending officers of the big New York banks received call after call from the worried treasurers of big corporate depositors. Some had loans they could call on short notice. Others were committed for fixed periods such as 30 days. One corporation had agreed to hold $5 million of bonds until August 15 and $5 million more until September 15.

NEEDED COLLATERAL

The bank lending officers shook their heads and advised the corporations to demand collateral to cover the decline in the price of the bonds. The margin calls mounted. The money broker had to get collateral to cover his contracts. Banks and brokerage houses demanded more margin from their customers. Each day brought additional liquidation of the 2⅝s. Each day saw more speculators shaken out.

The heavy volume of corporate financing and the insistent margin calls were ominously reminiscent of the 1929 stock market crash. Billions of dollars of speculation had been financed by corporate call loans in 1929. When the market broke, the corporations demanded their money and touched off a torrent of distressed liquidation.

The dimensions of this summer's break were not comparable to the 1929 crash.

But the country has had a blunt reminder that it is dangerous to finance speculation through bank and corporate call loans that are protected by little or no margin.

[From the New York Herald-Tribune, Sept. 7, 1958]

"NO DOWNPAYMENT" SAID WALL STREET IN FINANCING OF TREASURY OFFERING

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, September 7.—Some of the big Wall Street banks and large Government bond dealers helped finance speculation in the Treasury's $9,550 million June refunding by carrying securities for their customers without a downpayment and without an interest charge. The chief beneficiaries were leading New York Stock Exchange firms. But other brokerage houses and some individuals obtained the 100 percent "loans" too.

The "free carries" were a departure from the normal operating practices of the few dealers and banks who made the generous credits available. They acted under pressure from good customers and because they had a chance to earn a comfortable return on a riskless transaction.

"It wasn't something we went after," a bank official said recently. "We only did it for the substantial houses. We were careful which stock exchange firms we did it with. They came to us."

What the banks and the dealers did was to grant their customers "delayed delivery" in selling them the 2⅜ percent and 2⅞ percent "rights" that matured June 15. A stock exchange house that bought, say, $5 million of the 2⅜s on May 15, didn't have to put any money up until it took delivery of its securities in June. Normal government bond market practice would have called for payment either the next day or on the second day following the sale.

Most of the delayed delivery contracts were made as the speculative excitement mounted from mid-May on. They called for delivery in early June for that was when the Treasury was expected to open its refunding books. A speculator who planned to exchange his "rights" for new Government obligations would have to act at that time.

$2 MILLION TO $5 MILLION BLOCKS

A substantial number of the delayed delivery sales of rights to the stock exchange firms were in blocks of $2 million to $5 million. A few were larger. One well-known member firm took more than $50 million of the rights from a bank under a delayed delivery contract.

The stock exchange houses eagerly sought the delayed delivery contracts for the same reason that they embraced the "repurchase agreements" and "buy-backs" that they arranged for themselves or through a money broker. Delayed delivery was one more way in which they could obtain "rights" without an interest charge and without a downpayment.

The banks and the dealers found the delayed deliveries tempting because they were able to sell the 2⅜s at the premium prices of mid-May while they continued to collect the 2⅜ percent interest until their customers took delivery in June. It was a shade less profitable for the dealers than for the banks since the dealers had to borrow money at about 1 percent to carry the rights.

Many dealers refused to make delayed deliveries. The refusal often meant a lost sale because the stock exchange firm then shopped around until it found a dealer or a bank that would give it the free credit it wanted.

"We said: 'No thanks,'" a prominent Government bond dealer recalled. We're not in the moneylending business.

The loan officer of one of the big financial district commercial banks said flatly: "We're clean. We didn't finance any of the rights. We had the answer from the beginning: 'No.'"

The delayed deliveries like the buy-backs seemed sound from a banking standpoint. The collateral was the best. The 2⅜s came due on June 15. If the buyer reneged, the bank could exercise the rights itself or turn in the maturing securities for cash. It could lose no more than the premium it would have collected if the deal had not fallen through.

NOT GOOD FOR UNITED STATES

But the easy credit deals contributed to the excessive speculation in the government bond market. What may have been good for the banks was not good for the country.

The Treasury closed its subscription books on June 6 and the people who had bought the 2⅜s on delayed delivery contracts elected overwhelmingly to exchange their securities for the new 2⅝ percent, 6-year, 8-month bonds. The dealers demanded payment but the banks extended the free carries for 10 days until June 16—the day when the rights were to be replaced by the

new bonds. June 16 was the exchange date because June 15 fell on a Sunday.

The additional 10-day delay pushed further into the future the moment when the speculators would have to arrange loans and put up margin to finance their bonds. At least one bank carried the new bonds for insistent customers to July 1—without interest and without a margin payment.

Brokers pressed banks for liberal credit terms and many banks and brokers carried the speculators with little or no margin partly because they were convinced that the market was rising and there was no risk—and partly because they were in competition with one another.

A broker who meticulously observed the stock exchange's 5 percent margin requirement was aware that he might lose a customer to another broker or to a bank that charged no margin. Money was easy. The borrowers held the whip hand.

Many banks financed the speculators through standard security loans but granted more liberal terms than they normally would have provided. Where one Wall Street bank, for example, held fast to its regular 3½ percent interest charge for street accounts, another planned to ask 2¾ percent but trimmed its fee to 2⅝ percent because that was the rate a big competitor charged.

ZERO TO 5 PERCENT MARGINS

Margin requirements in New York ranged from zero to 3 percent on the rights and from 2½ percent to 5 percent on the 2⅝s.

The Wall Street division of one major bank had a larger volume of loans on its books after the 2⅝s were issued than at any other time in its history. Significantly, the bulk of the loans were to stock exchange firms that had never been active in the Government securities market before. Like many others, the stock houses found themselves doing something new—and took a licking.

A large number of banks outside of New York financed speculators on as little as 1 or 2 percent margin. They usually made the loans through money brokers directly to individual speculators.

They loaned hundreds of millions of dollars to people they didn't know and they had some frantic moments trying to get hold of speculators in New York and other cities to raise additional margin as the market went down.

One worried out-of-town banker came to New York in late June carrying a three-page, single-spaced list of unknown New Yorkers to whom he had casually loaned an average of about $200,000 each on the new 2⅝s. Along with other bankers throughout the country he had thought the bond market would remain strong and his loans would rest quietly until they were paid off. To their dismay, the bankers discovered that they had acquired thinly protected, highly active Wall Street accounts.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 8, 1958]

TREASURY AND WALL STREET DIDN'T KNOW THAT BREAK IN MARKET WAS AT HAND

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, September 8.—The mid-June break in the Government bond market and the steepness of the decline took Wall Street and Washington by surprise. They had known that trouble was brewing but they hadn't suspected that the situation was as grave as it proved to be. Top Government financial officials and some of the keenest bond dealers in New York only gradually abandoned hope that the drop could be held within narrow limits.

The ironical fact is that Government bond prices had hit their peak in April but the speculators didn't know it. They streamed into the market during May and early June to bet on a further rise in a market that had already started to drift lower.

The Treasury Department didn't know the turn was at hand. Neither did its expert advisory committees of top commercial and investment bankers. They came to Washington in the last week of May to advise the Treasury on the terms of its $9,550,000,000 June refunding and all of the discussions began and ended with an assumption that the market would remain strong.

KNEW OF SPECULATION

The bankers and bond dealers knew that people were speculating in the "rights" that matured June 15. But they had no notion that the speculation was as widespread as it was. Neither did the Treasury or the Federal Reserve System.

The advisory committees warned the Treasury that speculative demands would make it dangerous to include a long-term bond with the securities that it would offer in exchange for the "rights." But they stopped there. The Treasury accepted the committees' general recommendations and announced on May 29 that it would sell about $1 billion of 3¼ percent, 27-year bonds for cash and would give the holders of the "rights" a choice between 2⅝ percent, 6-year, 8-month bonds and 1¼ percent, 11-month certificates.

Speculators never had gambled by buying 6-year, 8-month bonds before. No one thought that they would now.

But the danger signs multiplied in the days that followed. The premium on the "rights" went up after the Treasury announcement. It had been expected to decline for it had been thought that the speculators would dump their "rights" once they found that the refunding package would not include a potentially lucrative long-term bond. Instead, they held tight. The rise in the price of the "rights" was a tipoff that the ranks of the plungers were growing.

THE ALARM RINGS

The subscription books closed on June 6 and on Tuesday, June 10, an alarm bell clanged loudly. The Treasury made public a preliminary finding that investors had taken about $7,250,000,000 of the new 2⅝s instead of the $3,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000 it had anticipated.

But commercial banks were buying in the market and the price of the 2⅝s edged up 1/32 the next day. The dealers and the Treasury agreed that it would take several months but the market could absorb the extra $3,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000 of bonds. The consensus was that the job was manageable.

Disquieting rumors circulated during the rest of that week. The speculators had to take delivery of the 2⅝s on Monday, June 16 and the market heard that a money broker had some commitments that he was finding it difficult to finance. On Friday, June 13 there were reports that he had asked that some deliveries be postponed beyond the Monday deadline.

The market became jittery. The 2⅝s slipped from a peak of 100$\frac{11}{32}$s on June 5 to 100$\frac{7}{32}$s on Friday, June 13. They dipped to 100$\frac{3}{32}$s on Monday.

People who had had "free carries" had to obtain bank loans and had to put up margin when they took delivery of the 2⅝s. Some sold out instead.

The money broker delivered $126,000,000 of the new bonds to his clients Many corporations had taken repurchase agreements on the understanding that they would get their money on June 16 in time to pay their quarterly tax installments. A number of speculators had mistakenly believed their interest-free, no-downpayment corporate credit arrangements would continue. Some reluctantly placed their bonds in bank loans. Others wouldn't or couldn't put up the margin that the banks were asking and they, too, sold out.

The 2⅝s slipped to 100$\frac{2}{32}$s on Tuesday and to par on Wednesday. The next morning the New York Herald Tribune reported from Washington that the Federal Reserve System has reached a major turning point in its antirecession drive and is slowing the pace at which it has been pressing toward easy money. The speculators leaped to the twin conclusions that the central bank soon would be shifting toward tight money and that a decline in bond prices was imminent.

The 2⅝s broke par. The general decline in the Government bond market was underway.

The Herald Tribune story triggered the decline. It had the impact that it did because it hit a nervous, speculative market at a time when business activity was beginning to improve and market expectations were shifting.

The recession was ending sooner than the plungers had anticipated. Speculative buying had helped bring about a record-breaking rise in bond prices after the Federal Reserve shifted to easy money last fall. Now the speculators started to dump their holdings and bond prices plummeted during the following weeks.

The market broke because business activity unexpectedly began to rise. It broke as dramatically as it did because it was shot through with speculation.

Each fresh report of an improvement in business activity made it seem more certain that higher interest rates and lower bond prices were ahead. Each new sell order from an individual or a corporate plunger aggravated the downward pressures.

When the New York Stock Exchange in early July ordered the money broker to liquidate $376 million of repurchase agreements and buy-backs that still were in force, it added to depressing influences that led the Treasury to buy up $589,500,000 of the 2⅝s from June 18 to July 9 in a vain attempt to stem the decline in bond prices.

Hindsight makes it plain that the Treasury should not have made an unlimited offering of 6-year, 8-month bonds to holders of $9,550,000,000 of maturing Government securities. It feared speculation in the 27-year bonds that it simultaneously sold for cash and it imposed stiff downpayment and allotment limits that kept most of the speculators out of the long bonds.

The $9,550,000,000 refunding would have been far harder to control since every holder of a maturing security had a right to one of the new Government obligations. But there were steps that the Treasury could have taken if it had known that the speculators were lying in wait. It could have offered only short-term securities for example, or it could have restricted the offering of 2⅝s to an amount that it was sure the market could digest.

But its suspicions were not aroused and it walked in with its guard down and its chin out. Even so, there is widespread agreement among market experts that the Treasury still would have come through unscathed if the speculators had not chosen to make their big play just at the time when people were becoming aware that the recession had ended.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 9, 1958]

PLUNGERS CAN BE A PROBLEM AGAIN IF ACCESS TO EASY CREDIT IS LEFT OPEN

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, September 9.—Speculators raised hob with the bond market this year and they can do it again unless corrective steps are taken.

The plungers turned the Treasury's $9,550 million June refunding into the worst fiasco in Government financial history. The bond

market is wide open for another foray any time they care to get it started.

Speculative activity has become a major problem because the character of the Government bond market has changed profoundly in the past 10 months. It has become a market where prices swing widely and dramatically enough to attract mass speculation. It no longer is a market where all price changes are small.

Government bond prices rose at a record pace after the Federal Reserve System abandoned its tight money policy in mid-November of last year. They dropped almost as violently this summer when it became apparent that the recession was coming to an end. Professional operators aggravated the upswing by buying bonds and professionals and amateurs alike aggravated the downturn by dumping them.

PSYCHOLOGY CHANGED

Market phychology has changed. Investors now expect drastic price movements. When the market broke in June, investors stopped buying and withdrew to the sidelines to wait for prices to stabilize at new and sharply lower levels.

The odds are against another speculative binge in the near future. The speculators were badly burned when the market broke and all except the toughest professionals will be nursing their wounds for a long time to come.

Market conditions at the moment are unfavorable for mass speculation. Business activity is rising and the dominant pressures on bond prices during the coming months are expected to be in a downward direction—not in the upward direction that attracts the speculators.

A shakeout as violent as the one that took place this summer temporarily provides its own correctives. Corporate treasurers who have large amounts of cash locked up in 2⅝ percent bonds that are below par won't soon again gamble with short-term money by using it to buy bonds. Corporations and banks that financed the speculators through "repurchase agreements" and "buy-backs" will be more careful about the people they do business with—for a while anyway.

But even the most painful memories eventually fade. The plungers will become a problem again the next time a recession develops and a sharp rise in bond prices seems to be a prospect. Now that the speculators have found the way, they will come back.

Easy credit made their operations possible. If they are to be stopped, it will have to be made more difficult for them to obtain funds to finance their purchases of Government bonds.

SAME PRESSURE LIKELY

The opportunity for big profits would not have arisen if the Federal Reserve System had not made money so easy that corporations and banks were hungirily looking for loans. And the opportunity would not have arisen if easy money had not driven short-term interest rates down so far that the lenders were searching for a more attractive return than they could obtain from normal short-term investments such as 91-day Treasury bills.

The Federal Reserve made money cheap in aggressively pursuing an antirecession, easy-money policy. It was trying to restore liquidity to the country's financial structure and thus to prepare the way for a business recovery. It will be under pressure to follow the same course in another recession. Even if it decides to move more cautiously, money may still become cheap enough to support a heavy volume of speculation.

A more direct approach to the problem of controlling speculation would seem to be in order.

The most commonly heard proposal is that Federal margin requirements be imposed on purchases of Government bonds. Along with State and local government obligations, Government bonds now are exempt by statute from the downpayment and other credit regulations that the Federal Reserve Board maintains on stocks.

Margin requirements would not have deterred the corporate and bank speculators who used their own money last spring and paid for their bonds in full. But the need to post a downpayment doubtless would have deterred many of the individual speculators and brokerage houses that put up little or no margin to carry huge quantities of the "rights" that matured on June 15 and of the 2⅝ percent bonds that were issued in exchange.

LESS EAGER TO GAMBLE

An individual who had a "free carry" on $1 million of "rights" might have been less eager to gamble if he had been faced with a 10 percent margin requirement and had had to put up $100,000—or with a 25 percent margin requirement and had had to put up $250,000.

The downpayment requirements on stock were set at 50 percent in June and now are pegged at 70 percent.

Banks could not have made "buy-backs" without margin if Government bonds had been subject to the existing regulations. Corporate money perhaps could have flooded in through repurchase agreements under the present rules but the margin laws would give the board power to control the "repurchase agreements" if the exemption were repealed.

An across-the-board imposition of margin regulations on Government bond transactions would create difficult problems for the big Government bond houses. They have to carry large inventories of securities and would be severely hampered by a regulation that required brokers and dealers to put up margin when they borrow against Government bonds.

New York Stock Exchange specialists and odd-lot dealers are exempt from the present stock margin requirements. It has been suggested that the Government dealers could be treated similarly.

An exemption could be granted only if standards were adopted to distinguish the 10 to 16 houses that make a market in Government bonds from the dozens of other brokers who call themselves Government dealers but actually do no more than execute buy-and-sell orders for customers.

It has been proposed that the Federal Reserve Board be authorized to establish the criteria. Alternately, it has been suggested that the dealers be given authority to set up a self-regulating association that would lay down rules as the stock exchange defines and supervises its specialists and odd-lot dealers.

Other margin recommendations have been made that stop short of new legislation. One is that the stock exchange increase its present 5 percent rule to a higher figure—and see to it that it is enforced. One objection that brokers voice to this, as to many proposals for stiffening the exchange rules, is that it might drive customers into the arms of more lenient banks and nonmember brokers.

It has been urged, too, that the exchange make Government bonds subject to its net capital requirements and there are some indications that it may take this step. Two Government bonds houses are members of the exchange and presumably would insist upon special treatment that would enable them to continue to finance their inventories of Government securities.

The exchange has steadily broadened its net capital rules as abuses have developed. It made commodity futures subject to net capital requirements in 1946 and it brought in tax-exempt State and local government obligations in 1953.

Brokers could not have made some of the deals that they made in June if governments had been subject to the net capital rules.

The exchange says that a firm must have a net capital equal to 20 percent of its aggregate indebtedness and must have a minimum of $50,000. A broker who buys stock must deduct 30 percent of its value from his net capital. If he buys a municipal bond, he must deduct 2½ to 10 percent depending upon the bond's rating.

Enforcement of a comparable deduction for Government bonds would have limited the capacity of the brokers to take on bond commitments last spring.

NO COMPLETE ANSWER

The Securities and Exchange Commission has a similar rule that covers all brokers and dealers but the regulation does not apply either to Government bonds or to municipal securities. Both sets of obligations enjoy a statutory exemption from SEC rules. Repeal of the exemption would enable the SEC to subject Government bonds to its net capital requirements.

There is no complete answer to the problem of preventing excessive speculation in the U.S. Government securities market. But measures can be taken that will help to keep the speculators within bounds.

Last spring's speculative activity disrupted the market so badly that the Federal Reserve had to buy $1,090,000,000 of Government securities to support an essential Treasury cash borrowing during the mid-East crisis in late July. The Government can't afford to give the speculators another field day. The risks are too great.

Americans Traveling Abroad Can Be Better Ambassadors of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the task of giving the people of foreign nations a better understanding of the United States is a difficult and continuing one. Recently Mr. Elmer L. Winter, Milwaukee attorney and businessman, made a 7-week trip to Europe. On his return, he made a number of excellent and down-to-earth suggestions for using the abilities of Americans traveling abroad more fully in the role of good will ambassadors.

I submit for the RECORD an article from the Milwaukee Journal summarizing Mr. Winter's recommendations, and excerpts from a letter written by Mr. Winter to George V. Allen, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, on this important subject:

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

LET TRAVELERS TELL OF U.S. WAY, PLEA

Intensified effort to better present our American way of life abroad should be undertaken by the United States, Elmer L. Winter is convinced. Recently returned from a 7-week tour of Europe, Winter has proposed to the U.S. Information Agency that more of the 600,000 Americans who travel abroad each year, especially businessmen, be enlisted in spreading understanding of the American way of life.

Winter, an attorney and businessman, is president of Manpower, Inc., an international temporary help service with headquarters in Milwaukee. In an address last week before the Milwaukee Rotary Club, he described Europeans' interest in American business and how he believed American businessmen could help in creating better understanding of this country among foreign nations.

EUROPE ON MARCH

"Europe, through the Common European Market (a federation for economic reasons and trade, including France, West Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and Italy) and through the vast strides made by the Germans since World War II, is literally on the march again," Winter declared.

"We in America had better do some hard and constructive thinking to determine how we can keep apace with Europe, as well as how we can match and stay ahead of Russia in the cold economic war that is going on today. * * *

"I say, that since we were able to utilize the skills, techniques, and manpower of business during World War II on such an effective basis, we should call upon business in this cold economic war to offer its services in assisting the Government in explaining more fully our way of life to peoples abroad."

Winter described the U.S. Information Agency as "one of our most effective fighting arms in this cold war." He said that he has suggested 21 areas where businessmen, service organizations, teachers, students, corporate foundations and other groups could be called in by the agency to develop programs for their members to better present the American way of life abroad.

CALLS TO ARMS

When a businessman applies for a passport, he suggested, he should be asked whether he would be willing to assist the Department of Commerce at foreign trade fairs, whether he would be willing to address students, business associations or trade groups while overseas, whether he would include visits to foreign industrial concerns on his itinerary.

These questions would assist in enlisting aid of American businessmen in presenting more fully our way of life, he explained. "This is a call to arms—not the arms of missiles, atomic submarines and rockets, but the arms of truth and integrity—to bring about better understanding between America and Western Europe," he declared.

The Common European Market will present challenge to the United States, including tariff barriers, and to meet the latter "we must expand our business operations abroad, open new plants in Europe and modernize our present plants," Winter said. His firm, he reported, has opened 10 additional Manpower offices in Europe.

"We must continue to expand our exports, but we must also increase the imports into this country," he added. "International business is always a two-way street. We must buy if we want to sell."

AUGUST 29, 1958.

Mr. GEORGE V. ALLEN,
Director, U.S. Information Agency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: I am deeply convinced that a far-reaching program should be developed whereby the American traveler in Europe will serve as a good will ambassador with specific duties and responsibilities.

In our struggle with Russia to beat them on the economic front, we, in my opinion, should utilize more fully the skills of the American businessman traveling abroad.

The program I would recommend to you for consideration is as follows:

1. Plan of close cooperation with Secretary of State, Passport Division, and Department of Commerce: I recommend that a joint program be developed, so that when an American businessman applies for a passport he would receive a questionnaire to be answered by him before going abroad. This questionnaire would contain the following types of questions:

(a) Would you be willing on your forthcoming trip to assist the Department of Commerce at trade fairs?

(b) Would you be willing to address trade groups in your field while you are abroad?

(c) Would you be willing to talk to students, businessmen's associations, graduates of business schools?

(d) Do you wish to visit foreign industrial concerns in Europe?

(e) Would you like to receive materials on how to present effectively the American way of life to people abroad?

(f) Would you like to have reports on political and economic conditions abroad?

(g) Do you wish to have materials on export and import, reports on doing business abroad, the European Common Market, etc.?

2. Program for foreign businessmen coming to America: I recommend that a plan be established whereby foreign businessmen will be asked by our foreign consuls the following questions before they come to America:

(a) Do you wish to visit American factories, schools, etc.?

(b) Do you wish to attend trade meetings, business seminars, chamber of commerce meetings, etc.?

(c) Do you want research material on American business, customs, the American way of life, etc.?

(d) Do you have family and friends in the United States? If you do not, would you like to meet Americans in their homes and visit with them?

3. Service clubs: I feel that the service clubs should be asked by your organization to tackle the problem of creating a closer relationship between the members of service clubs abroad and those in the United States. With proper advance planning, service clubs could do a more thorough and important job in giving visitors, whether they go to Europe or the European comes to America, a more complete understanding of the community being visited.

4. Chambers of commerce: Most chambers of commerce have a world trade committee. The chambers of commerce should be called upon by your agency to develop a program which will assist us in fighting the economic cold war.

5. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, National Association of Manufacturers, and American Management Association: These organizations print a great deal of material for circulation among people in this country. It would be well, in my opinion, for these materials to be sent abroad and particularly to European businessmen who have a great desire to obtain research reports, management materials, etc.

6. Distribution of trade magazines: These magazines, after they are read by the subscriber, are, for the most part, thrown away. Most businessmen would welcome an opportunity to send on these magazines to businessmen abroad and to business colleges, students, etc. A program of exchange should be developed.

7. Committee for Economic Development: This organization has among its board of directors the leaders of American business. I urge you to call upon CED to work with your organization in developing a program for a better and more complete understanding between the peoples of Europe and the United States.

8. Foundations: There are many foundations, particularly the Ford Foundation, that I believe would be interested in a program of broader understanding between America and countries abroad. These foundations should be invited by your organization to bring together their collective thinking as to how this program could be implemented.

9. Cooperation with American firms having branch offices abroad: I would recommend that your organization call in the major American firms that have offices abroad. These major companies should be asked for their recommendations as to how a more complete program can be developed in indoctrination of representatives going abroad, transfer of information, interchange of publications, setting up of libraries abroad, etc.

10. Problems of doing business abroad: With the advent of the Common European Market many American businessmen recognize the need for them to open branches abroad.

Let's develop a program through your organization and the Department of Commerce of providing clear cut information which will encourage businessmen to go into the markets abroad.

11. Business colleges and business school associations: While we recognize that language barriers present serious problems, obstacles of this type can be overcome through proper training. Representatives of business schools should be invited by your organization to suggest ways and means for developing an interchange of ideas, technical teaching materials, teaching techniques, etc., with our friends abroad.

12. Foreign trade fairs: The Department of Commerce, in my opinion, has done an excellent job in presenting American business life to those visiting the exhibits at the trade fairs. However, this is a limited program and could well be expanded.

13. American Chamber of Commerce in Europe: I do not think sufficient information has been given to American businessmen traveling abroad as to the work of the American Chamber of Commerce in Europe. This organization should be requested by your office to develop a program, so that American businessmen traveling to Europe will use the facilities of these offices. Likewise, the American Chamber of Commerce in Europe can do a great deal to initially advise the people of Europe before they travel to America.

14. United States consul offices abroad: A similar program should be discussed with the State Department as outlined for the American Chamber of Commerce in Europe. I do not feel full utilization is made of our consular offices abroad, and greater emphasis should be placed on their work.

15. Film libraries: As a visitor to Europe, I found that the American movies very often poorly portray our American way of life. I would suggest that film library associations should be consulted for a program as to how we can expand the distribution of our American industrial films abroad.

16. Students going abroad: After seeing many of these young people abroad, I question whether they are always presenting in the best light the American way of life. A good solid training program should take place before these students go abroad. This could be developed through the schools, travel agencies, etc., that arrange for these trips.

17. Teachers traveling abroad: Arrangements should be made for them to meet teachers abroad, visit schools abroad, talk to student groups, etc. They should have an opportunity to study the European educational system and visit in European homes, so they, too, will learn we are living in a shrunken world and can pass this information on to their students.

18. Professional organizations in America: There are many professional societies that should be called upon for a suggested program as to how the members of their organizations can be helpful in developing a better understanding between the countries

of the world, particularly where these organizations operate on an international basis.

CONCLUSION

If we were in a shooting war, you would call upon every available resource to assist our Government. I maintain that the urgency is as great in the cold war we are presently engaged in and that organizations throughout America would rise to the challenge of developing programs for their respective groups which would aid in winning out, particularly on the economic front.

I know you agree we need desperately to accomplish two purposes. One, prepare our businessmen, teachers, students, etc., to do a better job of creating good will, imparting information, knowledge, etc., to the peoples abroad. Two, we must provide the forum and the material for Americans returning to tell their friends in America in group and association meetings, as well as across the back fence, the story of the peoples abroad—their hopes, their quests for peace, and their reliance upon America.

Most of us appreciate that the Russian system directs all of its efforts toward influencing people to the Russian way of life. I submit that we must be constantly alert to this struggle and direct our fullest attention and effort to the development of programs which will bring about a better understanding between America and the peoples of the world who are not committed to the Russian way of life. Action is required. There is no longer time for sweet sounding phrases and platitudes. I suggest that a call to action be sent out from your office to every organization that has the resources for meeting the serious problems facing us.

I have a deep conviction that time is running out and that action is required. Let us call upon the best minds and talents in the country to aid your agency in the furtherance of greatly needed improvement in our relationships with the peoples of the world at large.

Sincerely,

ELMER L. WINTER,
President, Manpower, Inc., Milwaukee, Wis.

Prayer for Legislators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Pius X section of the Young Christian Workers in Milwaukee devoted much time last fall to studying and discussing the responsibilities and duties of public office. In the course of these studies, the Young Christian Workers came upon a "Prayer for Legislators" by the late Pope Pius XII.

I am indebted to Donna Saladino, secretary of the Pius X section, for sending me this prayer, and include it in the RECORD hoping that it may be a source of inspiration to this Congress and to legislators everywhere.

PRAYER FOR LEGISLATORS

Great and eternal God, Creator and Lord of all things, Supreme Legislator and Supreme Ruler, all power proceeds from You and depends upon You, and it is only in Your name and as a reflection of Your divine wisdom that those who must make laws determine what is just and unjust.

Therefore, we, the Christian members of this legislature, statesmen upon whom rests the weight of a responsibility which places us at the center of the entire Nation, implore Your help in a task that we intend to accept and fulfill for the greatest spiritual and temporal welfare of our people.

Grant that we may not omit any preparation or effort in the fulfillment of this high purpose. Grant us as well that objectivity and that healthy realism which will help us constantly to see clearly the course which seems best.

Grant that we may never stray from that sound impartiality through which we must be mindful of the welfare of all without unjust preference. Grant that we may never lack loyalty to our own people, faith in the principles we openly profess, or such greatness of spirit as is needed to keep ourselves above every possible kind of corruption and petty interest.

May our deliberations be calm, marked by no other passion than that which is inspired by a holy thirst for truth. May our resolutions be consistent with Your principles, even if the service of Your will should impose sufferings and renunciations upon us. May we strive, even in our lowliness, to imitate that rectitude and holiness with which You yourself govern and rule, for Your greater glory and the true welfare of human society and all Your creatures.

Hear our prayer, O Lord, in order that Your light may never fail our minds, that Your strength may never be lacking to our wills, and that the warmth of Your charity will always fill our hearts, these hearts which must love our people with such tenderness.

Withdraw from us every human ambition and every illicit craving for wealth. Instill in us a lively, deep, and ever present attachment to all that pertains to a sound social order and is in accord with the rules of right and equity.

And thus may it one day come to pass that, as a supreme reward, we may enjoy Your blessed presence for all eternity, along with all those who are entrusted to our care. Amen.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*	Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*	Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*	
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*	
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*	
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*	
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*	The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*	
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*	The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*	Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*	
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*	
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*	4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*	2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*	
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*	
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*	
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*	3840 Lorcom Lane, Alexandria, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*	
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*	
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*	
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*	
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*	University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*	
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*	
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*	
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*	
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C.*	
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*	1612 34th St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*	4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*	
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*	
Langer, William, *N. Dak.*	2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Russell B., *La.*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*	
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*	4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*	The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*	
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*	Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*	
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*	
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala.*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*	
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del.*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex.*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Green (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla.*	5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*	
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*	
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*	
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.*	University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.*	911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.*	3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.*	113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*	
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*	
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*	
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*	
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*	
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.*	Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*	
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*	
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*	
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*	
Bates, William H., *Mass.*	
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*	
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*	
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.*	1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.*	3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*	
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*	
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*	
Boggs, Hale, *La.*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.*	3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.*	Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*	
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*	
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.*	The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*	
Brademas, John, *Ind.*	
Bray, William G., *Ind.*	
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*	
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*	
Brooks, Overton, *La.*	4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.*	3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*	Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.*	Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*	
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*	
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*	
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*	
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*	
Burke, James A., *Mass.*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.*	2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.*	1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*	
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*	
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*	
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*	
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*	
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*	
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.*	1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.*	3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*	
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.*	2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*	
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*	
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.*	2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla.*	6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.*	4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*	
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.*	3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*	
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*	
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.*	4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*	
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*	
Dent, John H., *Pa.*	
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*	
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*	
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*	1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*	
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*	
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*	
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*	
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*	
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.*	3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*	
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.*	The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*	
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.*	3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.*	The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*	
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*	
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.*	1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*	
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.*	4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*	
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.*	The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.*	Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*	
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.*	6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*	
George, Newell A., *Kans.*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*	
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*	
Grant, George M., *Ala.*	4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*	
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*	
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*	
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*	
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*	
Haley, James A., *Fla.*	
Hall, David M., *N. C.*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*	
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*	
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*	
Harris, Oren, *Ark.*	1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*	
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*	
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*	
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*	
Hess, William E., *Ohio*	
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*	
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*	100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.*	3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*	
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*	
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*	
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*	
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*	
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*	
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.*	The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*	
Jarman, John, *Okla.*	
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*	
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*	2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*	
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*	
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*	
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.*	1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*	
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.*	3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*	
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.*	Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*	
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*	
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*	
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.*	The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*	The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.*	3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.*	4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*	
King, David S., *Utah*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*	
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*	
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*	
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*	

Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio.*
Lennon, Alton, *N. C.*
Lesinski, John, *Mich.*
Levering, Robert W., *Ohio.*
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.* — 224 C St. NE.
Lindsay, John V., *N. Y.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn.* — The Congressional
McCormack, John W., *Mass.* — The Washington
McCulloch, William M., *Ohio* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McFall, John J., *Calif.* — 507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGinley, Donald F., *Nebr.*
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak.*
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine* — 220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.* — 1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McSween, Harold B., *La.*
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.* — 115 Dale Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.* — Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.* — The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.* — The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
May, Catherine, *Wash.*
Meader, George, *Mich.* — 3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Meyer, William H., *Vt.*
Michel, Robert H., *Ill.*
Miller, Clement W., *Calif.*
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.* — 3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Milliken, William H., Jr., *Pa.*
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.* — 2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio* — 8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga.*
Moeller, Walter H., *Ohio.*
Monagan, John S., *Conn.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va.*
Moorhead, William S., *Pa.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morris, Thomas G., *N. Mex.*
Morris, Toby, *Okla.* — 220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La.* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.* — 204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.* — The Coronet
Murphy, William T., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*
Nelsen, Ancher, *Minn.*
Nix, Robert N. C., *Pa.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.* — 2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.* — The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.* — The Congressional
O'Hara, James G., *Mich.*
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass.*
Oliver, James C., *Maine.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.* — 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.* — 117 Carroll St. SE.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Pirnie, Alexander, *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.* — 228 2d St. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg.*
Powell, Adam C., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Prokop, Stanley A., *Pa.*
Pucinski, Roman C., *Ill.*
Quie, Albert H., *Minn.* — The Coronet Apt., 200 C St. SE.
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.* — The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.* — 1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.* — 6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.* — 5603 24th Ave. SE., Hillcrest Hgts., Wash. 21, D. C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.* — 3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Rivers, Ralph J., *Alaska.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.* — 6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y.*
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass.* — The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.* — Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rostenkowski, Dan, *Ill.*
Roush, J. Edward, *Ind.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y.*
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio.*
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.* — 433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Shipley, George E., *Ill.*
Short, Don L., *N. Dak.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Edna Oakes, *Ill.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.* — 5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Slack, John M., Jr., *W. Va.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.* — 204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Neal, *Iowa.*
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.* — Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Stratton, Samuel S., *N. Y.*
Stubblefield, Frank A., *Ky.*
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.* — 6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y.* — Mayflower Hotel
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.* — 2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.* — 3301 Mass. Ave.
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.* — 1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Toll, Herman, *Pa.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Ullman, Al, *Oreg.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.* — Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.* — 4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Wallhauser, George M., *N. J.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Wampler, Fred, *Ind.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.* — 9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Weis, Jessica McC., *N. Y.*
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.* — 5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.* — 1001 26th Rd. S., Arlington, Va.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolf, Leonard G., *Iowa.*
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, John, *Tex.*
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.* — 4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Burns, John A., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.* — 2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Series, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Place SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Appendix

Federal Insurance on Bank Deposits Did Not Lead to Federal Control of Banking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, those who would timorously prevent the Government from marching into the future close their eyes to the fact that the doom criers of a quarter of a century ago lived to see the downfall of their dismal prophecies that the United States was plunging headlong into socialism.

Many of us remember the outcry that accompanied the proposal that the Federal Government guarantee the safety of bank deposits. But the threatened taking over of the banks by the Government never materialized, as was pointed out recently in a forthright editorial in the Rome (N.Y.) Daily Sentinel. "They were wrong on bank insurance," says the Sentinel, and proves it.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY WERE WRONG ON BANK INSURANCE

They said—25 years ago—that if the Federal Government undertook to guarantee deposits in the Nation's banks, the inevitable result would be complete Government control of banking.

They said that to insure deposits the Government would have to assume an unconscionable degree of control over banking loans and investments, having the effectual result of underwriting those banking functions too.

These fears and alarms are only faint echoes of the past as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation celebrates its 25th anniversary this month. In retrospect its creation now appears a major banking reform. In the 2 years prior to its authorization by the 1933 Banking Act 3,643 banks in the United States had failed. Estimates of losses to depositers—some eventually to be recouped—ranged from three-quarters of a billion dollars to as much as a billion and a quarter.

The original plan provided insurance for the first $2,500 for each depositor. The limit was raised to $5,000 in 1934; on September 21, 1950, it was increased to $10,000 per depositor. Inasmuch as about 98 percent of all deposit accounts have balances of less than $10,000, substantially all of such deposits are now insured. Of the Nation's 14,095 commercial and mutual savings banks, 13,383 now qualify for the Federal insurance.

The original amount of FDIC paid-in capital was $289 million. Federal Reserve Banks provided $139 million; the U.S. Treasury, $150 million. Congress has never made an appropriation to the Corporation.

The original capital has been repaid with interest from surplus accumulated from FDIC's assessments on insured banks at the annual rate of one-twelfth of 1 percent of their total deposits, less authorized deductions, and income from investments. Since 1950, FDIC has been returning to insured banks 60 percent of their annual payments.

Some 1½ million depositors in 438 sick banks have received payments from FDIC insurance in the Corporation's 25-year lifetime. More than $343 million has been paid out. The rate of bank failures now has dwindled almost to a standstill. In 1957 the FDIC had to shell out to depositors of only one bank.

Meantime, over the years, the banking business has prospered, though consolidations have reduced the total number of banks. But this trend is being offset by the mushrooming of branches. And the fear that Federal insurance for deposits would encourage recklessness on the part of bankers was replaced long ago by a feeling of confidence in the banking system almost inconceivable in those shaky days of the great depression.

A new play based on the Lincoln-Douglas debates will be welcome emphasis of the fact that not all differences in that era were settled with six-shooters.

Address of Hon. Herman E. Talmadge, of Georgia, Before Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address which I delivered on Thursday, January 29, 1959, at the annual dinner of the Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York held at Hotel Plaza in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chairman Leslie, President Bell, distinguished guests and members of the Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York, thank you for affording me the privilege of sharing with you this significant occasion in your association's history. It is an honor for which I am deeply and humbly grateful.

This is a group with which I feel at home not only because of our common interest in the textile industry and its future but also because of the close ties which many of you and your firms have with my State of Georgia.

We in Georgia know how to appreciate the great industry which you represent.

Our State is the Nation's fifth largest producer of cotton textiles.

One out of every three Georgians employed in industry realizes his livelihood from a textile plant.

More than 85,000 Georgia cotton farmers look to the cotton textile industry as the principal market for the fiber they produce.

And, considering the wide dispersal of the industry and the hundreds of allied industries and businesses which it sustains, it is no exaggeration to say there is hardly a Georgia family whose welfare is not to some degree influenced by the cotton textile industry.

Therefore, I am particularly pleased to have this opportunity to express to you and your industry the heartfelt gratitude of all Georgians for the many contributions which the textile industry has made and is making toward the continuing economic progress of our State.

Georgians are looking with confidence toward a future of growth and prosperity limited only by the extent of our energy and imagination and it is a source of pride and inspiration to us to know that the textile industry shares our faith in a greater tomorrow and has cast its lot with us in laboring toward its realization.

The economic and social bonds between your industry and my State make it inevitable that what affects one affects the other.

When the textile industry prospers, Georgia prospers; when the textile economy is threatened, Georgia's economy is endangered, too.

That is why Georgians are sorely disturbed about what is happening to the cotton textile industry as the result of the asinine and unrealistic government policies and programs which have placed the industry and jobs of its employees in grave jeopardy.

Of all the Nation's major industries none is more deserving of favorable consideration in the formulation of governmental policy than the textile industry.

That is true not only because the Armed Forces rank textiles immediately behind steel in the order of priority of materials needed for national defense but, even more important, because no other industry so nearly epitomizes the American concept of free enterprise and competitive economy.

Since Samuel Slater built this country's first textile mill at Pawtucket, R.I., in 1790 and thus set in motion the American industrial revolution which transformed the United States from a frontier nation into a world power, the term "monopoly" has never been associated with the textile industry.

While the heavy industries were concentrating themselves in vast industrial complexes, the textile industry dispersed itself throughout the country in community-type enterprises of which no single company controls as much as 5 percent.

While the monopolies were seeking to control their wealth by channeling it through interlocking subsidiaries, the textile industry went into the open market to buy its needs and thus contributed to the establishment and expansion of independent allied industries in the best American tradition.

The result has been the development of a responsible and highly competitive industry which turns out superior products at minimum prices through efficiency, imagination and mass production—an industry so closely attuned to the general business cycle that it is a recognized bellwether of economic

trends—an industry which, so long as it was protected from unfair competition, prospered and contributed to the prosperity of all associated with it.

What has happened to the textile industry through no fault of its own is a shameful chapter in the industrial history of the United States. It is a sad commentary upon our national values and a ringing indictment of the poor judgment and callous indifference of our national policymakers.

The situation in which our Federal Government has placed the American textile industry is incredible to the point of disbelief to one not familiar with the facts.

But the record is as incontrovertible as it is shocking.

The United States has spent American tax dollars to help rebuild and equip the war-ravaged textile industries of our allies and former enemies and to establish new textile industries in undeveloped countries where wage scales are minute fractions of those in this country.

The United States has furnished the operators of those plants with complete information about even the most advanced management and production techniques developed by the American industry.

The United States has sold surplus American cotton to those countries at prices as much as 20 percent under those which the American industry must pay on the domestic market and, in many instances, has loaned the money with which the purchases were made and then bought the finished products for foreign aid distribution in other countries.

The United States has offered to finance the relocation of American textile plants to other countries and to insure them against loss or expropriation.

The United States has lowered American tariffs to the point and set import quotas so low that foreign textiles turned out with cheap labor and cheap cotton in new, modern plants built with American capital are glutting and destroying the markets for American textiles right here at home.

Those are the things which have been done to the American textile industry in the name of global goodness and under the guise of protecting the free world against communism.

In other words, it is the actual, if not officially expressed, policy of the Government of the United States that the American textile industry is expendable and should be forced to help finance its own liquidation.

What other conclusion can be drawn from policies and programs which require an industry and its employees to pay taxes to build, equip, and supply the plants of the competitors which are threatening to put it out of business?

It is a situation which prompts the question: Just how stupid can we get?

To my knowledge no other industry in the history of the world ever has been forced to compete for its existence under handicaps like those unilaterally imposed by American trade and foreign aid policies on the textile industry of the United States.

Because this country has taken the position of favoring foreign textile industries over its own, the list of advantages enjoyed by textile manufacturers in other countries over their American counterparts is staggering.

They can get their capital from the U.S. Treasury.

They can buy American cotton 20 percent cheaper and use borrowed American dollars to pay for it.

They can sell their finished products back to the American Government through so-called three-way deals under the foreign aid program.

They can pay wage scales which are one-tenth or less of the American legal minimum.

They can impose working conditions which would be illegal in the United States.

They can learn American trade secrets and production know-how merely by asking.

They can undersell comparable American products on the American market.

It is small wonder in the light of those facts that the American textile industry has lost markets equivalent to 10 percent of the national production and that, since 1947, 717 textile mills have closed their doors and 345,000 textile jobs have been discontinued.

It is a great tribute to the vitality and resiliency of the industry that it has been able to contain its losses within those bounds and that, even in the face of the almost insurmountable odds against which it must compete, it is now in the midst of a strong comeback.

Your distinguished president, Mr. Bell, very ably and graphically summarized the situation and position of the textile industry last month in his report on "Ten Years of Cotton Textiles—1948 to 1958" in which he stated:

"Unlike other sections of the American economy which have been favored with direct Government subsidies, financial and tax benefits or which have enjoyed large scale Government buying of their products, textiles have been made the ugly ducklings of the national barnyard. In consequence, textile people have become leading critics of a foreign trade policy which fundamentally discriminates unfairly against the American producer of textiles and apparel while at the same time it grants special privileges here to his foreign competitors and bounties abroad."

It is to your everlastihg credit that you have refused to be either discouraged by your plight or daunted by your high-placed adversaries.

Your persistent and consistent stand in defense of your rights has served to open the eyes of many heretofore complacent individuals. And I am encouraged to believe that the pressures being generated by your articulate and irrefutable criticism of the untenable policies of our Federal Government will assure their eventual modification to afford the textile industry the legislative relief and protection to which it is entitled and which it must have if it is to survive.

Without in any way minimizing the gravity of the problem or the effort necessary to bring about its solution, I am confident that—just as surely as was the case in the fable to which Mr. Bell referred in his well-phrased analogy—your days as the "ugly ducklings" of the American economy are numbered.

Although you have been rebuffed time and again when you have sought to present the merits of your case before the executive and legislative branches, you have the satisfaction of knowing that you have forced both to recognize the justice of your cause—the executive in negotiating the import agreement with Japan and the legislative in the action of the Senate in ordering a full-dress study of the problems of the industry.

As a temporary expedient, the executive agreement with Japan gave the industry some relief, but a limited unilateral arrangement which leaves the American textile industry at the mercy of a foreign government is no solution. Furthermore, the problem of low-cost foreign goods is not limited to Japan as is evidenced by snowballing apparel imports from the sweatshops of Hong Kong where the world's lowest wage scales prevail.

It is my resolute conviction that all American industry has a right not only to expect but also to demand that its national government by policy and statute give it unequivocal protection from indiscriminate foreign imports. That can be accomplished only through an effective system of tariffs and quotas sufficiently high to protect the investment of our industry and the jobs and living standards of its workers and to assure that all products of equivalent quality regardless of origin go into the American market place on a basis of competitive parity.

Let no one confuse the issue with the specious contention that America's position of world leadership in the struggle against international communism requires this country to divide up its domestic markets among the uncommitted nations of the world. The point at issue is not a question of foreign policy but rather a question of maintaining the vitality of our domestic economy. Trade is a matter of business and cannot be made a matter of international politics without disastrous results to business.

To any individual willing to take the time to think it through it obviously is far more important to the future of the free world that the United States sustain its solvency than it is to hand the remainder of the world readymade markets in this country at the expense of American industry. In dealing with the issue we must never lose sight of the fundamental fact that the only hope for the survival of all the free world is an economically invincible America and that the only sure course to American economic invincibility is through maintaining and strengthening—not betraying and destroying—our free enterprise, industrial economy here at home.

If the American textile industry were seeking special favors or preferential treatment, this might be a different story. But, as was so aptly stated by President Halbert M. Jones of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute in testimony before the special Senate subcommittee studying textile problems last July, all the industry is seeking is "a recognition of the vital and important place which this industry and its employees occupy in our national economy and, as a result of this recognition, an assurance of fair and just consideration of our industry and our textile jobs in all of our relations with the Government and its policies."

I interpret that to mean that the textile industry wants nothing more—and nothing less—than to be treated like any other corporate taxpayer. Surely no fairminded and realistic individual could object to that and I am hopeful that the Senate study of your industry's problems will prove to be the beginning of action which will culminate in remedial legislation during the 86th Congress.

While I would not presumt to predict what form any such enactments might take, I do have some definite ideas about the points I think they ought to include if the textile industry and its employees are to receive the protection to which they are entitled. They are:

1. Amendment of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to make it beyond doubt that its restrictions on imports apply to finished, as well as raw, agricultural products.

2. Strengthening of patent laws to prevent foreign pirating of American processes and techniques and to prohibit the State Department and the International Cooperation Administration from disclosing details about them under the foreign aid program.

3. Amendment of Public Law 480 to prohibit the importation into the United States of goods manufactured with commodities sold abroad under its subsidization.

4. Amendment of the Mutual Security Act to require that the International Cooperation Administration purchase in this country all textile products distributed under its terms.

5. Enactment of a new national farm program under which the farmer would be guaranteed his proportionate share of the

national income through compensatory payments and the textile and other agricultural-processing industries would be permitted to buy agricultural commodities at free market prices.

While I shall give my wholehearted support to all of those measures, as well as to any other reasonable and practical proposals which may be made for dealing with textile problems, I expect to concentrate my efforts in this area during the 86th Congress on seeking a new farm bill. My interest in so doing is not only to put the farmer back on his feet on a free-enterprise basis but also to help the textile industry and all other industries utilizing agricultural commodities regain their competitive position at home and abroad.

The present farm program has been a miserable failure by any yardstick. From the farmer's standpoint, it has reduced his income below the subsistence level and all but put him out of business. From the taxpayer's standpoint, it has increased his tax burden and the prices he has to pay for agricultural products. From the textile industry's standpoint, it has forced it to buy cotton at artificially high prices and thus priced its goods out of the world market and many areas of the domestic market.

My study of the problem has brought me to the conclusion that the only effective and permanent solution lies in freeing the farmer to plant and sell as he pleases and allowing commodity prices to seek their own levels under the law of supply and demand. It is my view that the most efficient and economical way under such an arrangement to make up the difference between the farmer's income and the minimum wage and collective bargaining advantages enjoyed by labor would be to pay him a compensatory payment on basic commodities consumed in this country equal to the difference between the market price and 100 percent of parity.

The beauty of such an arrangement is that it would cost the taxpayers $2 to $3 billion a year less and would put perhaps as much as $1 billion a year more in the pockets of the farmers. As paradoxical as that may seem, it would be the case because the high costs of administering the present bureaucratic program and of handling, transporting, storing and disposing of surplus commodities—the latter figure now running to more than $1 million a day—would be eliminated and every farm program dollar would go directly to the farmer.

I have embodied my ideas in a bill which I introduced in the Senate earlier this month. The overwhelmingly favorable response which I have received from farmers and consumers alike since I first set forth my plan last year encourages me to believe that it has widespread appeal and has the best chance of any proposal yet put forth of becoming a basis for agreement among the various farm groups in writing a new national farm law.

It is my hope that it will have the approval and support of the textile industry. I honestly think it could do more to help the industry than any other measure yet proposed because it would let you buy your cotton at the prevailing world price and would put an end to the utterly ridiculous present situation under which your foreign competitors are buying American cotton at subsidized prices of $35 to $40 a bale below its cost of production.

It is the only way of which I know by which our domestic farm economy can be restored and American textiles put back on the world market at competitive prices at the same time.

Certainly it is worth a try because, as I think you will agree, anything would be an improvement over the present patchwork of discredited and abortive farm laws.

The plights in which the textile industry and the farmer find themselves are perfect examples of what happens in nations which, to use the words of Thomas Jefferson, "have more machinery of government than is necessary."

With the exception of the external menace of communism, all of the ills and problems of the United States can be summarized in the one phrase—too much government.

The American economy is suffering from too much government.

We have 48-cent dollars and face the prospect of 10-cent dollars as the result of ever-broadening governmental policies and programs which are bankrupting our Nation and mortgaging our future.

American prestige abroad is suffering from too much government.

We have undertaken through various bureaucratic and paternalistic programs of spending and instruction to try to make the world over in our own image and as a result find ourselves despised and distrusted throughout most of the world and with less friends and dependable allies than before we started.

The American people are suffering from too much government.

The ever-encroaching arm of Federal governmental authority is embracing more and more affairs traditionally and constitutionally regarded as local matters and as a result the individual citizen finds himself with less and less voice in the conduct of his local government and its institutions.

I cannot bring myself to believe that the majority of American people approve of the philosophy that central governments must be all things to all men and do all things for all men.

To the contrary the mail which I receive from all sections of the Nation indicates to me that the rank and file of the populace are gravely concerned about the present course of our Nation and the consequences of pursuing it to its ultimate conclusion.

I believe the people of this country want to see the Federal budget balanced and the Nation's economy stabilized.

I believe the people of this country want the United States to cease doing for people in other countries what it either is unable or unwilling to do for our own citizens here at home.

I believe the people of this country want the Federal Government to confine its activities to those areas reserved to it by the Constitution and leave the management of all other affairs to local people on the local level.

I believe with Thomas Jefferson that: "The people may be misled or deceived for a time, but where the avenues of truth are open there men will learn to reject what is false and harmful. Where the people are well-informed, they can be trusted with their own government; whenever things get so far wrong as to attract public notice they may be relied upon to set them to rights."

Throughout the Nation there is a growing awakening to the dangers inherent in our country's present policies and a swelling voice for a recognition of the lessons of the past through a return to the fundamentals of constitutional, republican government.

I feel with all my being that the American people already would have expressed themselves in favor of such a return to fundamentals had they had a clear-cut choice at the polls.

I have faith in the desire and willingness of the American people to demand that their house be set in order and I believe that that desire and willingness is not far from making itself felt.

In a constitutional republic such as ours, the masses may not be immediately articulate; but once given leaders and leadership they are swift in making their wishes felt and known.

It is out of that abiding faith in the reason, good judgment, and commonsense of the great American public that I, in concluding, wish to address myself through you and this occasion to it about a matter which should be a source of grave concern to all persons who are interested in the education of all the children of this Nation regardless of their color or place of residence.

I speak of the chain of events which has resulted in the closing of public schools in various localities of the South and which, if allowed to run their full course, surely will result in the destruction of public education in the South.

Such an eventuality would be a tragic catastrophe which this Nation cannot afford under any circumstances to permit to happen at this critical juncture in our national life. Engaged as we are in a life-or-death struggle with the forces of world communism, this is no time to permit a constitutional controversy to rob the Nation of the minds and talents of a great segment of its youth by locking the doors of the public schools in their faces.

My friends, unless it is the wish of this Nation that we tear our country apart and destroy the schools of the South, action must be taken soon in the Congress of the United States to resolve the issue on a realistic, constitutional basis.

And I cannot believe there is any reasonably intelligent person who would contend that the use of Federal bayonets or the rearing of a generation in ignorance are either realistic or constitutional—and certainly not humane—solutions to the problem.

I have given long and serious study to this question and, recognizing that there are feelings as strong on the other side of the subject as mine are on my side, I have come to the conclusion that there is only one solution compatible with constitutional concepts to which all persons of all shades of opinion can subscribe.

That is the solution which I stood before the Senate on last Monday and outlined with all the sincerity of my being—that is, to amend the Constitution of the United States to give the people on the State and local level the right to determine for themselves the manner in which the issue will be solved in their localities.

This proposed amendment reads as follows:

"Administrative control of any public school, public educational institution, or public educational system operated by any State or by any political or other subdivision thereof, shall be vested exclusively in such State and subdivision and nothing contained in this Constitution shall be construed to deny to the residents thereof the right to determine for themselves the manner in which any such school, institution or system is administered by such State and subdivision."

Let me emphasize the language "the right to determine for themselves."

Such a provision in our Constitution would leave the citizens of each State and locality free to make their own decisions in accordance with local conditions and prevailing attitudes as to how and when their schools would comply with the Supreme Court's school decision.

Such a provision in our Constitution would prevent destruction of the public schools of the South and would end for all time any threat from any quarter of Federal control of education.

Such a provision in our Constitution would assure uninterrupted instruction for all the children of this country regardless of their color or place of residence.

Such a provision in our Constitution would permit either retention of the status quo or orderly change as dictated by the requirements of public opinion and make certain that whatever change might take place would be by the constructive process of evolution rather than the destructive process of revolution.

Such a provision in our Constitution would create a basis for unity throughout the Nation at a time when it is vitally important that we present a united front before our enemies.

I do not believe there is any parent in this country who could sincerely say that he or she does not believe in the fundamental fact that public schools are local institutions and, if they are to fulfill their role, must be operated on the local level by the parents of the children who attend them.

Neither do I believe that there is any parent in this country who is genuinely concerned about the future of our Nation and the education of our children who could not support such an amendment as I have proposed with a clear conscience and in complete consistency with his principles.

I presented my amendment in good faith. As a stanch adherent of the principle of local self-government and local self-determination, I have no qualms about submitting that or any other issue to the people of the United States or their elected representatives to be resolved by the democratic process.

The very basis of our form of government is, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, that it derives its "just powers from the consent of the governed." And it is to invoke that heritage to resolve the question of control of our public schools that I have proposed my amendment.

I appeal to all the citizens of America—particularly to the parents of school-age children—to let their views about what I have proposed be known to their Senators and Congressmen.

I am convinced that, if they will, the 86th Congress will vote to give the people of America the opportunity to amend our Constitution to assure for all time to come that they retain the fundamental right to run their schools on the local level in accordance with the wishes of the local citizenry.

The future of the United States rests in the hands and hearts of the American people.

Although we sometimes may be justified in feeling frustrated about the course and policies of our Government, we must never sell our people short nor discount their loyalty, courage, honesty, ability and sincerity of purpose.

They have demonstrated time and again their intense determination to meet and overcome whatever obstacles may confront them.

And, like Thomas Jefferson, I put my unswerving faith in them to continue to do so.

I thank you.

Dilemma of the College Student: Draft Dodger or Patriot?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, among the many reasons advanced in opposition to the proposed extension of the present draft act is the increasing arbitrary impact of the draft upon the young men liable to service. The honored concept of a universal obligation, which served the Nation well during World War I and World World War II, has been replaced, in fact if not in terms, by a system under which the incidence of the draft falls only on a small group. Some of the problems arising from this are well described in an article by John C. Esty, Jr., which appeared in the Nation for January 10, 1959. Under unanimous consent, I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

DILEMMA OF THE COLLEGE STUDENT: DRAFT DODGER OR PATRIOT?

(By John C. Esty, Jr.)

For the next few months, college seniors will be focusing their thoughts on how to find a proper place in a society which needs their talents desperately. The most frustrating barrier to this important process is the military manpower situation. Although the draft procedures are complex, it is not complexity that creates the problem for the students. The simple fact is that seniors are required to cope with Defense Department policies that are unimaginative, extemporary, unrealistic, and inadequate, even for military purposes. A few examples, drawn from my experience as military service adviser at Amherst, will illustrate the point.

I recognize him as one of our more alert seniors as he walks in and sits down in the chair by my desk. He has made a good record in college and holds great promise for a meaningful life. He comes right to the point: "I want to go to law school, but I think I should work for a year or two to get some perspective on law as a career. What are my chances of getting drafted during that time?"

This same question, this same slight frown, I have heard and seen hundreds of times. The reply is also the same. You'll probably get called within about a year after graduation. Wouldn't this be a good way to get some perspective and at the same time serve your military obligation?"

"Perhaps, but I'd hope to work in a law office, and, anyway, I want to get married in June. I don't want to drag my wife all over the country, especially when the housing is supposedly so bad around Army camps. What do you thing I should do? Go to law school right away and hope for deferment?

Shall I tell him he shouldn't get married? That married life for a buck private isn't so bad? That he should go right to law school to dodge the draft, even though he's not sure it's the right field for him? This would work, of course, but maybe it would be as much of a time waste as the Army. I'd better just pull out the stock answer: "Why don't you wait and see what Congress does, or perhaps there will be another Executive order changing the ground rules again. Better not make plans now."

The next boy is also a senior—and married already. He has a good job in the executive-training program of a large industrial firm. Now he finds his farsightedness and assiduity rewarded by the prospect of military service, which will upset hs plans completely. He wants to know if it's true that fathers are virtually draft free. When I confirm this, he shrugs his shoulders: "Well, we don't have any money and we thought we should wait on a family. But if fathers get out of military service, then I'll become a father."

Once during course registration—a time when our students typically make some attempt at relating their curricular choices to a future goal—a boy came to me with a neat scheme. Out of a generally versatile academic background, he was emerging with a clear talent in classical studies, perhaps headed for teaching or writing. This was the type of person a society must enlist to look backward and soak up the past, to carry along accumulations of wisdom, cultural tradition, and ethics; the kind who may not help to build missiles, but might help decide whether it's right to use them. He wanted to see the list of critical occupations for which draft exemption and reduction of reserve requirements are offered. He didn't find classical studies. He did find physics—and that's what he's majoring in.

Shall we call it lack of patriotism? Are these spineless or cynical young men of the silent, cautious generation, who don't care about their country? I think not. Listen to the Amherst Student editorializing on the campus visit of Marine officers recruiting for the platoon leaders course:

"We read daily how the intermediate range ballistic missile is now obsolete, how manpower is being slashed and draft calls are dwindling. Why then sacrifice 3 years and two summers to the USMC when, with a little effort and information, it is possible to fulfill a military obligation in less than a year, with a reserve commitment which can be waived for men that are entering critical-skills occupations in fields of chemistry, physics, geology, and foreign languages? It is possible to enroll in the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 6-month program in a rural area where there is no filled quota of reservists, go on active duty after graduation, and go to work with no reserve commitment except in case of war, when all reservists are called by act of Congress. The military obligation can be fulfilled more easily than by a 3-year hitch with the Marine Corps. A contribution to the security of our country can better be made in a research lab than by participation in obsolete field maneuvers at some obscure military outpost."

What particular lecture on American democracy and patriotism do you give to the boy who, having been dressed down for asking directly how to avoid the draft, wonders, "I see so many getting out of it, why should I be the one to go?" You point out that there have always been inequities in manpower conscription; that the burden of Korea fell at first on the reservists of World War II, and that this is why Congress changed from "selective service" (service by just those selected) to "universal service" (where everyone serves, at least in theory); that war has always consumed those most valuable to society in any sense. But he smiles and asks, "Is the senior who goes to graduate school just to get out of military service universal? Is the father universal? Is it universal to be the one sucker in four who gets hooked?"

And it's not just getting hooked that hurts; it's also staying hooked. Consider the story of the boy who applied for admission to us 5 years after graduation from high school. He had wanted to go to a challenging eastern men's college, but had no money at all. So he went to work as a patternmaker, which carried an essential skills draft deferment. For 5 years he put money aside for his education, spending some of it along the way on night-school courses, mainly to prepare himself even better for college. When he came to be interviewed, we found he was a boy of high ability and one highly motivated to work hard. We accepted him on the spot and offered him a partial scholarship to augment his own savings. It was the kind of case that makes an admission officer, in the midst of his harassment, feel the whole business is worthwhile.

The boy went home elated, quit his job, and enrolled in some summer-school courses we thought would help him in preparation for entrance in September. A week later he was on the phone—with his induction notice in hand. He was not eligible for student deferment, since he was actually not in college, so I counseled him to try the 6-month program. We would let him enter in February and there was a local Reserve unit where he could continue his 5½-year Reserve obligation. He followed this advice and came to us at midyear. His academic record has borne out our expectation; he has attended his Reserve meetings faithfully. Hear his dilemma:

"We have training meetings two evenings a week, since the unit is geared to the aca-

demic year; and we are then free during school vacations. The trouble is that I have to study hard—you know I'm on scholarship—and two evenings shot each week is a lot. I would apply for a waiver of the 48 meetings required per year in return for an extra 2 weeks of summer camp (2 weeks is required anyway), but then I don't get my summer job. A lot of men don't show up half the time and nothing seems to happen; I just don't dare. Do you know what we do at these meetings? We sit. We listen to a halting personal account of supply operations in the Panama Canal Zone, a lecture on military administration, or a talk on Pentagon organization. Sometimes we stand up and do a few column lefts and dress rights. I don't know what all this has to do with missiles, strategic warfare or even landings in Lebanon. And I've got 4 more years of it."

These are the kinds of stories and problems a collegiate military-service adviser hears day after day. The advice we must give adds up to something like this: don't plan—wait; become a father sooner than you had planned; go to graduate school even though you're not ready; pick your college major after consulting the draft-exempt list. Any dean or counselor who gives that kind of counsel would ordinarily be fired for incompetency, yet this is what the present military-manpower policies are forcing us to do. We had always tried to proceed from one cardinal principle of advice: do your planning now, as though there were no threat of military service; then see how the service best fits into your plans, and act accordingly.

This idea seemed to be useful during Korea and up to about 2 years ago. Then the effects of three major changes in atmosphere went to work on the side of confusion.

First, our students read regularly about the great shifts to technological-defense weapons, which are manned by engineers instead of by armies. The brush-fire argument for many divisions of standing infantry was undermined by the small number of men involved in Lebanon. They can't help but wonder why so many men, especially unskilled draftees, are needed. (Nor can I; my bias must be showing by now.)

Second, unlike 6 years ago, education seemed to have gained respectability so that, as the student editorial quoted earlier suggests, it should be as patriotic to develop one's mind and intellectual talents as to serve as clerk-typist in company headquarters. If Congress is willing to appropriate enough money for a National Defense Education Act (inadequate though it is, especially in strengthening public school teaching), doesn't it make sense to let intelligent people serve with their brains instead of their feet—and at no cost to taxpayers?

Finally, the most demoralizing shift in climate has been the manifest breakdown of the Selective Service System in maintaining any semblance of universality; that is, a sense of fairness as to who is drafted and who isn't. It is this aspect of military service which has led the Fund for the Republic, in a paper by John Graham entitled "The Universal Military Obligation," to question seriously the constitutionality of current manpower practices. Excerpted in numerous college newspapers, this paper clearly articulates the inequities which students feel as they try to plan their futures. The only course open to one charged with providing advice on military service is to point to the few fixed rules which may indicate some guide to planning. One simply answers four main questions in the minds of college students: What are the current obligations? What is the present status of the draft? What are the alternatives? What are the chances that all this will change?

The first obligation is that every male must register with the Selective Service System on his 18th birthday. Most colleges have some official designated as a local draft registrar for the convenience of students. Some time after registration, the registrant is required to fill out a questionnaire on the basis of which he is usually classified 1A by his local board. This classification means he is available for service until such time as he receives a deferment for academic, physical or other reasons. It is customary for students to hold the 1A classification throughout their college careers unless granted a student deferment by their local board (some boards grant deferments automatically). At the present time, students are rarely drafted much below the age of 23. A registrant is additionally obliged to inform his board of any address change (including college attended), any change of status, any plans to leave the country, and to carry his draft card at all times.

The law from which these obligations arise is the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, extended in 1955 by Congress until June 1959. It requires all physically qualified males between the ages of 18½ and 26 to serve 2 years of active duty and 4 years' of Reserve duy—or some administrative equivalent such as 6 months' active duty and 5½ years' Active Reserve duty. Those who have received a deferment have their liability age extended from 26 to 35.

Currently any male who is physically qualified—apparently about 40 percent of any age group fails to qualify—and who is not eligible for deferment (as a student, as a father, as a person with dependents, as a ministerial or medical candidate) may expect to be drafted between the ages of 22 and 23. Doctors and dentists may be deferred because of their professional training, but they then become eligible for a special draft—or the alternative of accepting a commission for 2 years of active duty—until age 45. In most cases, it is possible for a student to complete 4 years of college untouched by the draft, but graduate school almost certainly requires deferment. The student deferment is still based on a student's score on the college qualification test and on his academic rank.

Even though receipt of a deferment technically makes a student eligible for the draft until he is 35, the Armed Forces are not interested in inductees over the age of 26. By Executive order, local boards are required to exhaust all of the men in each category in the following sequence:

1. Delinquents (i.e., legal draft dodgers).
2. Volunteers (in the order in which they volunteered).
3. Nonvolunteers, nonfathers between 18½ and 26 (oldest first).
4. Nonvolunteer fathers between 18½ and 26 (oldest first).
5. Men over 26.

Many draft boards are filling their quotas entirely from category 2, and the typical board is operating in category 3 at the 23-year-old level. The fact that these categories have been established to begin with, the fact that the age of probable drafting in category 3 is rising, the fact that the number of men in categories 4 and 5 is increasing dramatically, the fact that draft quotas are dwindling—all point to a huge and growing manpower pool with which the system cannot cope. The result is that more and more legally eligible men are escaping the draft, and the bankruptcy of the universal concept becomes clear.

Being drafted—or volunteering, to precipitate the issue—currently involves 2 years of active service in the Army, which for a college graduate holds fair hope of useful activity (in spite of the "round-hole-square-peg" stories). This is followed by a 2-year stint in the Ready Reserve, where active participation is supposedly enforced by the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, and a final 2 years in the Standby Reserve, which carries no special obligations except in case of general mobilization.

The first alternative to the draft which seems to occur to most college students is complete escape. The attraction of this avenue is directly proportional to the odds involved, which means it's looking better and better all the time. Aside from this unfortunate consequence of current policy, the most popular alternative seems to be the 6-month program. The main advantage is clearly the shortened active-duty time; the disadvantages are the long active-reserve period of 5½ years and the fairly useless nature of the total 6 years' activity. It is likely that before long this program will reach its saturation point; already seniors find that their local Reserve units have reached the allotted strength and can accept no more applications.

The second most attractive alternative, especially for those who want to be officers and are willing to give up an extra year or so for the privilege, would be one of the officer-candidate schools of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard. After graduation, the candidate completes 16 weeks of training, 3 years of active duty, and some combination of Ready and Standby Reserve time for a total of 6 years. A similar program, the marine platoon leaders' course, substitutes two 6-week summer encampments during college for the post-college 16 weeks' training course, and commissions are awarded at graduation from college. Those seniors who might be interested in becoming aviation cadets are scared off by a 5-year active-duty commitment.

For some reason, there is great reluctance on the part of the Armed Forces to appoint officers directly on the basis of education, background, or civilian skills. When I went through officer-training school, the students came from three sources: direct appointment (my own category), ROTC, and appointment from the enlisted ranks. At the end of the course, the overall evaluation of each man—including military bearing, drill, leadership—was averaged for each source. The direct appointees, with no prior military experience, ranked significantly higher than the ROTC people and enlisted appointees, who followed in that order.

Various special programs for enlisted men create some interest for the college senior. Opportunities for specialized training—as at the Army Language School—are occasionally considered worth while enough to warrant spending an extra year of active duty. There is also the possibility of securing an officer-candidate school appointment directly from the ranks, although this is a real gamble. From time to time one hears of a special "quick opening" program of particular advantage for the college graduate, but these are announced softly and usually last only a short while, so capitalizing on them is a matter of luck.

The alternatives mentioned above are considered mainly by students whose college does not have a Reserve officers' training course (ROTC). Where such a program is available, the military obligations of those students not anxious to take a chance on the draft are comfortably attended to. But here again the dean, or military counselor, is placed in the position of advising boys to give up a fourth or a fifth of their college work just for the short-range assurance of knowing how and when they will discharge their military obligations. Typically, an ROTC student sacrifices the impractical or nonvocational courses, such as music appreciation and literature, which might have opened the way for years of leisure time richly and meaningfully spent; or political science, which might have engendered a greater sensitivity to the demands placed on an enlightened citizenry.

What are the chances that all this will change? The current draft law expires in June 1959, and Congress will have to act on new legislation this spring. It is apparent that the present situation will no longer be tenable after a few more months. Every executive action in the past 4 years has been directed at relieving the pressure of the manpower pool on the draft apparatus by creating more attractive alternatives. (Two years ago the Defense Department published a booklet, "It's Your Choice," listing more than 40 kinds of opportunities for military service.) Yet the monster grows each day. With the failure of these relief valves, the drafting age within category 3 will probably continue to rise until perhaps no one will be drafted except those who volunteer for service to avoid being drafted. The only way out of this paradox, under present law, would be to defer and exempt greater numbers, which would serve only to increase the present uncertainty and inequity. A particularly unfortunate aspect of the situation is the apparent unwillingness or inability of manpower officials to face these manifest breakdowns in the justification and operation of "universal" military service. Having talked with a number of these officials, directly and indirectly, I would guess that the Defense Department will simply recommend continuation of the present draft law.

I am aware that our military manpower policy has been criticized on the bases of unconstitutionality, inadequacy, waste, and expense. It should be. But about these grounds I am not especially informed, and can only grumble. I do know, however, of the draft law's effect on college students, and if they are considered to be an important segment of the society, then someone had better pay attention to their perspective. From that perspective, the status quo is absolutely unviable, the corruption of "universal" service is corrupting their sense of duty, uncertainty is making cynics of them, and their talents and training are deliberately turned from the service of their country.

It is not yet stylish to be unpatriotic, but the college student can't hold out forever.

Permanent Extension of Special School Milk Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced a bill to permanently extend a program which has great significance to the health of our schoolchildren—the special school milk program. I might add that this program also has a great bearing on the economic health of the dairy industry.

Congress has been appropriating the sum of $75 million a year for the maintenance of this program. Under the present utilization system in our schools, this appropriation is sufficient through fiscal 1959.

Beginning on July 1, 1959, however, there is need of an increased appropriation or the program will need to be curtailed.

The value of healthful milk to the diet of our schoolchildren can hardly be overestimated. This program insures that every American child, regardless of the financial status of his parents or guardians, will not need to be deprived of nature's most nearly perfect food.

I believe I speak for millions of schoolchildren and their parents when I say that this is one program of which Congress can be proud. Scarcely a year goes by when research does not uncover more evidence to bolster the contention of modern science that milk is a vital food for children and adults.

Milk furnishes the human body with 100 different nutrients—including a tremendous assortment of vitamins, minerals, fats, sugars, and high-quality proteins. It is a fact that milk is essential for three nutrients that many nutritionists advise in quantities larger than many people consume.

But it is for three inherent nutrients that milk is justly famous.

Milk provides mineral calcium which is needed throughout life for healthy bones.

Milk provides B-vitamin riboflavin which is essential for healthy skin and nerves which enables the body cells to use other nutrients carried to them by the blood.

And milk dispenses protein which is the main building-and-repair material of all tissues in the body.

Many people receive all too little of these three nutrients. It is of major importance that our children receive them, and the best way to insure this is to see that they drink plenty of milk.

This is why the special school milk program has a great stake in our country's future—because it deals with the bodily welfare of our Nation's youth. Every investment we make in the health of our schoolchildren will certainly result in a stronger America for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable consideration of this legislation.

The Economics of Progress—Reform of Tax Rates and Methods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my friend and distinguished colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [HOWARD H. BAKER], and myself, I would like to call to the attention of the House companion bills, H.R. 3000 and H.R. 3001, which we introduced on Wednesday, January 21, 1959. These bills would reform Federal tax rates and methods to accord with the economics of progress. It is our conviction that this legislation should have priority over competing claims of all other Government policies and programs. We, therefore, urge its prompt consideration and enactment, and to this end solicit the interest and cooperation of our colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, of all Members of the Congress, and of the executive branch.

The present Federal tax structure stunts economic growth since it both prohibits adequate capital accumulation and destroys capital once accumulated. We can no longer afford a Federal fiscal policy based only on short-term considerations, from fighting inflation in one year to fighting recession in another, while neglecting the root source of fiscal crises.

By removing tax blocks to progress, our bills would contribute more than any other possible Government action to our economic well-being and national security. In enabling the economy to grow much more rapidly and consistently than in recent years, these bills would:

Counter the challenge of Russian communism for world economic leadership;

Encourage other nations outside the Communist orbit to reorganize their tax systems to permit more rapid economic development out of their own capital;

Increase the supply and mobility of venture capital, thus insuring a rebirth of the American genius for the starting and development of businesses;

Provide new and better job opportunities;

Insure adequate revenues for military preparedness and all other necessary Federal expenditures;

Smother inflation with growth.

In introducing this legislative program, we call special attention to two matters. The first is that the revenue effect of comprehensive reform in tax rates and methods is so great that major goals can only be achieved by spreading out reductions over a number of years. The second is that any lesser program would still leave us far short of a sound tax system insofar as capital accumulation and economic progress are concerned.

We cannot correct the fundamental tax problem of our times by nibbles and bites.

Legislative proposals for thorough reform of the income tax rate structure over a period of years are not new. Such proposals were introduced in the 85th Congress—H.R. 6452, 9119, 9415, and 11461—and received overwhelming support from the witnesses who testified for broad tax reduction during the hearings held by the Ways and Means Committee just 1 year ago. These earlier bills were designed to deal only with the tax impact on accumulation of new capital out of current income. The new bills also would reduce the tax destruction and increase the mobility of capital accumulations, by deferring tax on gains of individuals from sales of long-term capital investments the proceeds of which are reinvested within the taxable year, and by reduction in the rates of tax on estates and gifts. The bills also would establish more realistic depreciation rules. Because of the revenue effect of these new provisions, especially those applying to depreciation, it has been necessary to set ultimate income tax rates under the legislation at 47 precent instead of 42 percent, as in the earlier bills.

CAPITAL AND PROGRESS

Mr. Speaker, the boldness of the challenge to free capitalism by the govern-

ment capitalism of Communist Russia was the story behind the news which launched us into the space era. Of all the steps to counter that challenge which may be taken in America, and in other free nations, none could approach in importance the reorganizing of tax structures in recognition of the inherent goodness of capital and its indispensable role in the preservation of freedom in the world.

Combined with man's energy, vision, and technological skill, capital is the source of all economic progress. Its beneficial effect starts with employment. The production of capital goods itself provides jobs. Then, these goods are used to increase the productivity of existing jobs and to create new production and new jobs.

Any tax method or rate which impedes the accumulation, use, or preservation of capital is a tax on human betterment and national strength. Our Federal tax structure must stand convicted of this fault.

By use of capital-destroying tax rates and methods we have prevented our economy from achieving anything like its potential for progress. This means we have fewer and less productive jobs than should be available. Our total production is far short of our national capability for progress and the standard of living of our people is correspondingly less than it should be. It also means that failure to effect fundamental reform of our tax structure quickly would put in jeopardy the industrial supremacy on which our national security depends.

The critical impact of destructive tax rates on the economic health and vitality of our economy has often been overlooked because of the persistent illusion that our economy has been continuously in the midst of a capital goods boom since the end of World War II. This illusion comes from looking at totals expressed in inflationary instead of constant dollars.

For a span of 60 years preceding the depression of the 1930's, our economy grew in the range of 4 percent a year. We achieved no net growth in the decade ending with 1939, and the using up of productive plant and equipment was much greater than replacement during the war years. Thus, at the end of World War II, we were faced with a deficiency in capital formation which had been building up for 15 years.

Despite this deficiency, total economic growth—measured in constant dollars of gross national product—averaged only 3.8 percent annually in the decade ending with 1957.

Moreover, there was a nearly 40-percent reduction in the rate of growth in the second 5 years of that period as compared with the first. Specifically, in the first 5 years ending with 1952, the growth rate averaged 4.6 percent, but in the second 5 years ending with 1957, the average slipped down to 2.9 percent. In 1958, we lost ground in the production of goods and services and much more in capital formation. While we are now in a period of recovery in production, there is a continued lag in capital formation out of which must come substantial future increases in production. In fact, even at present inadequate production levels, the evidence indicates that we are using up capital plant and facilities at a rate 20 percent or more higher than we are replacing them.

In contrast with our postwar experience, Soviet Russia has made spectacular strides in capital formation and total production in recent years. Published estimates indicate that total Russian production which, only a few years ago was less than 25 percent of ours, is now upwards of 35 percent and expanding at a rate in the order of 8 percent a year.

These growth rates were achieved before the recent announcement of Communist leader Khrushchev of a program of capital investment in the Soviet Union between now and 1965, which would equal their total investment in the 41 preceding years of the Communist revolution. One does not have to accept at face value Khrushchev's boast of burying us under an avalanche of production to recognize that the goal of Russian communism is fixed and unchanging. It is political domination of the world. Even if we had not been told so plainly, we would know that their aim is to accomplish such domination by using industrial strength to sabotage governments, to enter and destroy free markets, and eventually to control whole economies throughout the world.

Khrushchev stated that they would equal our production in 1970. Actually, the Russians would not have to increase their growth rate of 8 percent a year in order to equal our total production by 1980, if we grow on at an average rate of 3 percent. If our growth rate should further decline to an average of no more than 2 percent, with Russia's continuing at 8 percent, their total production would approximate ours by 1975.

There could be no excuse for our Nation settling for growth rates in the future of no more than 2 or 3 percent. The core of the problem is in capital creation. In the Soviet Union, capital creation has absolute priority over all other matters, in sharp contrast to the situation in America. It is past time that we gave top priority to removing the tax blocks to capital creation. Under a tax system which did not penalize the accumulation and ownership of capital, and which allowed full play to the natural incentives for capital use, there could be no doubt of our capabilities for much more rapid progress than in recent years. We should not be satisfied through the indefinite future with an average growth rate under 5 percent. Even at that rate, if the Russian economy should continue to grow at 8 percent annually, they would reach our total production before the end of the century. Actually, there is no reason why we should not set our sights on a growth goal of 6 percent or more. Despite the arbitrary methods by which capital is created in the Soviet Union, we need not fear the challenge of government capitalism if our free capitalism is released from punitive tax rates.

SPECIFICS OF REFORM OF TAX RATES AND METHODS AND UNDERLYING REASONS

Mr. Speaker, in regard to a tax system which grossly penalizes capital accumulation and restricts economic progress the words "tax reform" could reasonably and logically have only one meaning, namely, to relax its penalizing and restrictive effects. In preparing our bills we have necessarily limited the proposed reforms to one type of action, regarding five major tax areas, which we believe would be most beneficial to economic progress, job creation and betterment, and national security. There are many other proposals for tax revision which merit the description of "reform" because their effect would be to reduce tax restraints on economic growth. Those involving substantial revenue effect have not been included in our bills since this would be possible only by the exclusion of some or all of one or more of the reforms provided therein. We believe that proposals, essentially technical in nature, involving little revenue effect, should be handled in separate legislation.

In the following discussion we describe the reforms in tax rates and methods included in our bills, with explanation of underlying facts and reasons.

THE INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

Starting with January 1, 1959, there would be five annual coordinated reductions in all the graduated rates of individual tax, with the first bracket rate being reduced from 20 to 15 percent. With compression of the scale of graduation being the key to fundamental tax reform over the 5 years, the top individual rate would be brought down to 47 percent, from its present 91 percent. Specific examples of reductions in other statutory rates follow: $4,000 to $6,000 taxable income bracket, from 26 to 17 percent; $8,000 to $10,000 bracket, from 34 to 19 percent; $12,000 to $14,000 bracket, from 43 to 21 percent; $16,000 to $18,000 bracket, from 50 to 23 percent; and $20,000 to $22,000 bracket, from 56 to 25 percent. Appendix A shows the new rates for each year. Appendix B provides a means by which individual taxpayers can compute their tax liability at the end of the reduction period, as compared to present law.

The revenue effect of these reductions would be somewhat more than $2 billion annually, or upwards of $11 billion over the 5-year period, out of a total revenue effect for the legislation as a whole of about $17 billion. Nearly 60 percent of this $11 billion revenue effect—tax saving to the individual—would fall in the taxable income brackets up to $6,000, as shown in Appendix C; and 79 percent in the taxable brackets up to $18,000. Only 6 percent of the total would fall in the brackets above $50,000. Of course, the data for the lower brackets include tax savings on all income falling in such brackets, including that of taxpayers whose total income also places them in higher brackets. The table demonstrates the point, however, that there could be no further significant reductions in the lower brackets by foregoing part of the reductions in the middle and higher brackets.

The emphasis we place on compression of the graduated scale of individual tax rates reflects the fact that graduation is the worst saboteur of the economics of progress. While the most senseless and uneconomic rates are in the highest brackets, the steepest climb in graduation is through the middle and not the higher brackets. In fact, half of the total range of graduation—the 71 percentage points between the first rate of 20 percent and the top rate of 91 percent—is reached at the taxable income bracket beginning with $22,000, where the rate is 56 percent—basic rate of 20 percent, and graduated element of 36 percent.

The steeply graduated rates dull the incentives to earn higher income and to engage or invest in venturesome enterprises.

These rates drastically limit the accumulation of new capital in two ways. As income increases only a declining margin is available for saving. And, because of the impact on incentives, much less income is sought and realized in the middle through higher brackets than would be the case under moderate rates.

The high rates limit the investment potential even more than indicated by the immediate effect on capital accumulation. Savings of persons in the middle and higher income brackets are more likely to be invested in the risky or venturesome types of enterprise than are the savings of those with lower incomes. This likelihood would be greatly increased under moderate rates. Risk-taking investments always forerun opportunity for safer use of investment funds. Under sustained, higher level growth, which must be sparked and initially fueled by venture capital, there would be much greater accumulation and use of investment funds from all sources.

The limitation on total investment potential has its most severe effect as regards the starting of new businesses, and the expansion of small businesses once begun. Aside from the incentives to engage in business, or to make a business grow, the punitive tax rates make it impossible for the small business to secure venture capital from outside sources. The once prolific source of such capital, the successful person who was willing and able to invest in new enterprises, has been choked off by the punitive tax rates. When, under moderate tax rates, the successful are again able to accumulate substantial savings out of current income, we will find that they again will be interested in investing in such enterprises.

Moreover, even well-established businesses in the middle and larger size categories are often faced with an impossible problem of finding adequate new funds for expansion. All across the board, the steeply graduated rates of individual tax serve directly and indirectly to limit the accumulation of new capital funds so desperately needed to realize our Nation's potential for progress and security.

THE CORPORATION INCOME TAX, AND DEPRECIATION

Starting January 1, 1959, there would be 5 annual reductions of 1 percentage point each in the rates of corporate tax, and 5 annual reductions of 5 percent each in the maximum required length of property lives for depreciation on new plant and equipment as measured from an average of present experience.

The first 3 reductions in tax rates would apply to the normal corporate tax, bringing it down from 30 to 27 percent, and the last 2 reductions would apply to the surtax, bringing it down from 22 to 20 percent. The combined top rate would thus be reduced from 52 to 47 percent.

The revenue effect of the corporate rate reductions is estimated at $400 million annually, or a total of $2 billion over the 5 years.

The depreciation provisions, applied to new acquisitions of business plant and equipment, would supplant Treasury determination of property lives under Bulletin F by substituting six broad statutory classifications of depreciable property. In actual experience many taxpayers have used, with Revenue Service approval, shorter property lives than provided in Bulletin F, and the aim in the legislation is to measure the reduction in lives from average actual experience.

In practical effect, the new lives available for use in regard to property acquisitions in the fifth and succeeding years would permit an average increase of one-third in the rates of depreciation allowances. These increases would come on top of the liberal allowances in early years under the sum-of-the-year's digits and double declining balance methods, made available to taxpayers through the 1954 Revenue Code, and the extra first-year allowance granted to small business taxpayers in the legislation of 1958.

While the long-range effect of depreciation speed-ups is to defer and not eliminate tax liability, the short-to-medium-range effects are the same as that coming from any type of tax reform.

On the basis of rough data we have estimated the revenue effect of these depreciation changes at up to $600 million annually, or up to $3 billion over the 5-year period. It is estimated that approximately 75 percent of the tax savings would go to corporate taxpayers, and 25 percent to unincorporated business taxpayers.

Potentially, corporate profits are a major source of new venture capital. The potential derives from two factors: First, profits retained within a corporation increase the stockholder's equity and hence are venture capital; and, second, people who own stocks could normally be expected to invest a large part of dividend income in new equities.

In recent years the first factor has been negated in large part because of the overstatement of corporate profits due to inflation. This results because depreciation charges are stated in dollars of original investment, instead of in dollars reflecting replacement cost. The difference, which is subject to the tax on profits, has to be made up out of retained profits in order to maintain intact the present value of investment. Only the remaining profits are available for net new investment in plant and facilities. This problem is aggravated by the required spread-out of depreciation allowances over unrealistically long periods of time.

Under these conditions, it is understandable there would be advocacy of legislative action to compensate for the inflationary impact on profits by increasing depreciaton allowances to reflect replacement instead of orignal cost. Such a procedure, however, would run counter to the purpose of our legislation, which is to stop inflation, not compensate for it. There are other reasons why it would not be feasible to incorporate a replacement cost formula, namely: the revenue effect would be so large as to prevent any contemporary reduction in corporate rates, as well as some of the reduction in individual rates contemplated in our bills; the tax reduction dollars involved would go entirely to establish enterprises without improving the depreciation situation of enterprises still in the development and initial expansion phases; and it would leave unresolved and even aggravate the problem of excessive property lives.

On the other hand, reduction of property lives as provided in our legislation would contribute to forces for stopping inflation; can be accommodated by foregoing a reduction of only 5 percentage points in the corporate tax; would benefit enterprises in accordance with the rate of new investment regardless of preceding development; and would constitute a major step towards a permanent solution to the problem of excessive property lives which otherwise could become intolerable under the rapid advance of technology. Moreover, as additional tax reduction opportunities open up, this procedure may be readily expanded to accomplish a total reduction of say 50 percent in property lives which would mean a doubling of depreciation allowance rates. As a final point, when this procedure brings property lives down to realistic levels, there would be eliminated one of the areas of persistent conflict between taxpayers and the Revenue Service involving tremendous time and cost on the part of both.

As regards the second factor mentioned above, stockholder reinvestment of dividend income is now largely prevented by the steeply climbing rates of individual tax. This situation would be greatly improved under the moderate individual rate scale provided in our bills.

THE CAPITAL GAINS TAX

In accordance with the precedent already established on the sale and repurchase of homes, our bills make statutory provision for tax free transfer of capital by individuals, but not by corporations, from one investment to another when the transactions are completed within the taxable year, and the investments sold have been held by the taxpayer for at least 6 months. The result would be a deferral of tax on long-term gains until such time as the taxpayer disinvests. We have included this application of the roll-over principle in the legislation since the only possible justification for taxing at any time the proceeds from sale of a long-term investment is that the seller is disinvesting

with the intention of using capital gains as income for consumption purposes.

Recognizing that consideration of this kind of procedure for prospective effectuation could result in an inflationary buyer's market for securities and other producing properties, as present owners held back from selling in the expectation of tax deferral on later sales, we have set the effective date for this provision as of January 1, 1959. Data are not available from which the revenue effect of this provision can be systematically calculated, but it could not be too large because of the exclusion of corporate transactions and also some other types of transactions, such as sale of timber-cutting rights as distinguished from the property itself, now classed as capital gains. The total revenue effect might go as high as $1 billion, but conceivably could be as low as half a billion dollars.

Whatever the revenue effect, there would be a complete offsetting increase in the availability of new capital. A tax on a capital gain from investment is a tax on capital, and the existing supply of capital is diminished by the amount of the tax. Capital so destroyed must be replaced by new capital accumulated out of current income, before there is a net addition to capital supply for new investment.

In addition to decreasing the existing supply of capital, the fact of a tax on capital gains serves to reduce the mobility of capital, since it defeats the investor's judgment where the reasons for transferring capital from one investment to another do not outweigh the tax consideration. Capital immobilized in this way is described as locked-in. The result is particularly serious as regards new and small business since, other things being equal, it restricts movement of funds from ownership in well-established businesses to more venturesome enterprises involving the prospect of greater return. Thus, the capital gains tax serves to compound the prohibitive barrier of the graduated individual tax to the starting and development of business.

ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES

Instead of establishing a new formula for setting tax rates on estates and gifts, our bills would simply bring the top rate of estate tax down to 47 percent to coincide with the top rates of individual and corporate tax after 5 years, and consistent with the present relationship, reduce the top rate of gift tax to three-fourths of this figure, or 35.25 percent. All lower rates would be reduced in proportion. Thus, as set forth in appendix D, the estate tax rates would range by taxable brackets from 1.75 to 47 percent, compared with the present 3 to 77 percent, and the gift tax rates from 1.25 to 35.25 percent, compared with the present 2.25 to 57.75 percent.

These new rates would become effective on the day following enactment of the legislation. Because of the normal delay between the occurrence of death and payment of estate tax, the revenue effect of the legislation would not be significant in the first year. Thereafter, it is estimated the effect would be no more than $400 to $500 million annually.

Since a death or gift tax is a tax on capital these are but modest reductions in destructive rates. As with the capital gains tax, the net reduction of capital through estate and gift taxes can only be restored by withdrawals from new savings out of current income.

The high rates have been championed as a means for breaking up and redistributing the wealth represented in large estates. To the extent of the tax, however, capital is destroyed and not redistributed. Actually, the high rates have resulted in transfer of the bulk of many large estates to tax-exempt trusts and foundations. Instead of dispersing ownership, such transfers have created a new kind of concentration which, unlike individual ownership, is self-perpetuating.

In its competitive-free economy, operating under the protection of the antitrust laws, America does not face the social dangers of concentration of wealth which have plagued other less dynamic societies. The higher the rate of economic growth, the greater will be the diffusion of income and new wealth throughout the population.

Actually, exorbitant rates of estate and gift taxes are a major tax cause of the merger of family and other closely held businesses with larger concerns. They complete the blow initially dealt the formation and development of new businesses by the graduated income tax.

FISCAL ASPECTS OF LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, it is our opinion that reform of the tax rate structure is of such urgent, overriding necessity in the national interest that it must not be further delayed for any reason. We further believe there could be no question but that, with enactment of this legislation, economic growth over the next 5 years would be adequate to offset the revenue effect of the legislation with a comfortable margin left over. It is roughly calculated that each 1 percent annual increase in the rate of economic growth, as measured by gross national product, will produce a billion dollars in additional Federal revenues. It is also estimated that the revenue effect of our bills would average out at less than $3.5 billion annually, or the equivalent of revenue increase which would come from roughly a 3.5-percent rate of economic growth. Thus, if with enactment of this legislation economic growth should average 5 percent annually over the next 5 years, there would be an average annual surplus of revenue increase of at least $1.5 billion over the requirements for effectuating the reforms provided.

Nevertheless, we recognize that the case for enactment must stand up against two natural questions.

The first would involve the danger that Government spending would increase so as to encumber the revenue gain from economic growth, whether or not induced by tax rate reform. The second question would involve the matter of timing, namely, whether any legislation should be enacted effectuating tax rate reductions in advance of our achievement of budget balance with a surplus in sight.

SPENDING VERSUS TAX RATE REFORM

In regard to the first question, the fundamental purpose of forward scheduling of income tax rate reductions, and depreciation rate changes, is to permit business planning, including the starting and development of business, in the knowledge of a more favorable tax climate in succeeding years.

In addition, forward scheduling would set up competition against encumbering revenue increase with new spending commitments, thus greatly increasing the likelihood that specific tax rate reductions will be possible within the framework of budget balance. Moreover, as with the earlier bills, we have provided a safeguard in the form of postponement procedures to guard against a renewal wave of deficit spending.

Taking the President's 1960 budget estimate as the benchmark, the legislation provides that income tax rate reductions may be postponed after those to be effecuated as of January 1, 1959. Postponement would be made in the event of determination as of November 15 in any year that spending for the fiscal year is running in excess of $77 billion, and a state of budget unbalance is threatened.

In view of the clear case in the national interest for giving absolute priority to tax rate reform, we offer these postponement procedures with somereluctance but in the hope that they will continuously induce, on behalf of the executive branch and the Congress, the utmost discipline and prudence in regard to spending.

The legislation places the responsibility for initiating postponement in the hands of the President. Balance has been struck as between the Congress and the executive in the final exercise of postponement authority.

While the postponement procedures may be applied separately as between corporate and individual tax rate reductions, every postponement of an individual tax rate cut must be accompanied by a postponement of a corporate tax cut. The only limitation on this linkage is where the result would be to postpone a corporate reduction for more than 1 year.

The bill further provides that each scheduled reduction in either the individual or corporate tax may be postponed for only 1 year with the schedule of subsequent reductions also being moved ahead 1 year. Thus, if spending should not be kept under control, it would be possible to space out the income-tax cuts over a maximum period of 9 years without new enabling legislation.

INFLATION VERSUS TAX RATE REFORM

The second question, that of enacting tax rate reductions in advance of budget balance, stems from the belief that such action would be inflationary.

Putting the first income tax rate reductions, and depreciation changes, into effect on January 1, 1959, would have minimal revenue effect in fiscal year 1959, but perhaps $4 billion revenue effect in fiscal year 1960. In addition, expansion of the rollover principle in the capital-gains tax would have an effect on revenues in fiscal year 1960 of perhaps some-

where between $500 million and a billion dollars. It would appear superficially that these tax actions would unbalance the 1960 budget, on the basis of the President's estimates, by an amount over $4 billion, but such a result is problematical.

In the first place, the President's revenue estimates for fiscal 1960 have been made on the basis of recovery trends which have not extended to business investment in plant and equipment and which leave with us a nagging problem of unemployment. It is possible that expansion in the use of current production facilities will carry overall economic activity to a point of producing up to $77 billion in revenue, but such a level of production would not be long sustained in the absence of sharp revival in capital formation.

In the second place, even with the lag in rate of investment in plant and equipment, our economy under present tax rates is pressed to find savings out of current income adequate to meet current demand. It seems probable that any sharp set-up in the rate of business investment would be short-lived because of the inadequate rate of new capital accumulations.

Since we cannot continue to tolerate an inadequate rate of new investment, as this would in reasonable time prove self-defeating even insofar as Federal revunes and deficits are concerned, we come to the conclusion that a good beginning on tax rate reform is the first step to insure a positive closing of the deficit gap and then keeping it closed.

We cannot fight inflation by keeping the tax brakes on economic growth.

This conclusion may be further buttressed by two different propositions. The first starts with the fact that we would not now be running a deficit except for the lag in economic growth. Specifically, if in spite of existing tax rates we had been able to achieve economic growth at the historic average of 4 percent, instead of the actual average of 3 percent, in the 5 years ending with fiscal 1957, the revenue total in that year would have been some $5 billion higher or $76 billion instead of $71 billion. If such a trend had continued through 1958, revenues would have reached $80 billion, which would have meant a budget surplus of $8 billion in that year. If continued through fiscal 1959, the revenue total would be some $84 billion or $3 billion more than enough to balance the budget. Of course, if growth had been achieved and maintained through the present at a 4 percent rate, the budget would not now include expenditures which have been recession inspired, and the surplus would be greater than $3 billion.

The second proposition requires understanding of the forces for continuous or repetitive inflation. The deficit spending of World War II greatly boosted the money supply and was the principal force for inflation for several years thereafter. Contrary to general impression, however, total budget operations in fiscal years after World War II ended have not been a net contributor to inflation. Combining all Federal accounts, the Government actually collected from the people approximately $19 billion more than it paid out to them, in fiscal years 1947 through 1958. Even when the estimated cash deficit of over $13 billion for fiscal year 1959 is added in, a cumulative cash surplus from 1947 on of nearly $6 billion is shown.

This analysis is not intended to divert attention from the seriousness of budget deficits, nor of the obligation of the executive branch and the Congress to exercise the utmost restraint in budgetmaking and spending. It does, however, make us look elsewhere to identify the instigating forces for inflation in recent years.

Inflation in recent years has reflected the constant tendency of wages as a whole to increase faster than national productivity, thus forcing a constant increase in labor costs per unit of output. The current recession, and hance the current deficit, came when the inflation produced by increasing unit-labor costs overran money supply.

However, the increases in unit labor costs would have been less if increases in national productivity had been greater. It may be that the contemporary trend in wage increases would be too great under any circumstances, but we know that the American appetite for an increasing standard of living creates pressures for a steady increase in wage and salary rates.

Thus, while there is and will remain need for the utmost restraint by unions and management in determining general wage increases, to concentrate on this point without attention to the cause of inadequate growth in production and productivity would not solve the problem of inflation, or the recurring problem of recession, deficits, and then more inflation.

A great underlying force for inflation in our time is the continuing capital shortage, resulting in inadequate growth in production and productivity, and caused by punitive tax rates and methods.

For many years past, Federal fiscal policy has been based on short-term considerations from fighting inflation in one year to fighting recession in another, thus causing neglect of the problem of a revenue system dependent upon economically destructive tax rates. In retrospect we know this has been a self-defeating approach, resulting in repeated recurrence of fiscal crises stemming from retarded economic growth. Looking ahead, we can be certain that continuation of emphasis on short-range aspects of fiscal policy would be the most short-sighted of national policies.

If we will move now to enact comprehensive tax-rate reform, there is good reason to believe that the short-term revenue effect would be largely compensated for by a sharp upward trend in capital formation, and hence additional revenues, before the end of fiscal 1960. There could hardly be reasonable doubt that in succeeding years there would be full compensation, and in the long run we would be rid of the plague of recurring fiscal crises.

We must smother the forces for inflation with growth.

APPENDIX A.—*Individual tax rates*

Taxable income bracket [1] (thousands)	Present rates	Jan. 1, 1959	Jan. 1, 1960	Jan. 1, 1961	Jan. 1, 1962	Jan. 1, 1963
0 to $2	20	19	18	17	16	15
$2 to $4	22	20.5	19.5	18.5	17.5	16
$4 to $6	26	24.5	23	21.5	20	17
$6 to $8	30	28	26	24	21	18
$8 to $10	34	31	28	25	22	19
$10 to $12	38	35	32	28	24	20
$12 to $14	43	39	35	31	26	21
$14 to $16	47	42	37	32	27	22
$16 to $18	50	45	40	35	29	23
$18 to $20	53	48	42	36	30	24
$20 to $22	56	50	44	38	32	25
$22 to $26	59	53	47	40	33	26
$26 to $32	62	55	48	41	34	27
$32 to $38	65	58	51	43	36	28
$38 to $44	69	61	53	45	37	29
$44 to $50	72	64	56	47	38	30
$50 to $60	75	66	57	48	39	31
$60 to $70	78	69	60	51	40	32
$70 to $80	81	71	62	52	41	34
$80 to $90	84	74	64	54	44	36
$90 to $100	87	76	66	56	46	38
$100 to $150	89	78	68	58	48	41
$150 to $200	90	80	70	60	50	44
$200 and over	91	82	72	62	52	47

[1] After deductions and exemptions. Applies to single persons, married persons filing separate returns, and split incomes of husbands and wives filing joint returns.

APPENDIX B.—*Tax computation tables—Individuals*

If the taxable income[1] is—	The tax— Is: Present law	Will be: Year 1963
Not over $2,000	20 percent of the taxable income	15 percent of the taxable income.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	$400, plus 22 percent of excess over $2,000	$300, plus 16 percent of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	$880, plus 26 percent of excess over $4,000	$620, plus 17 percent of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	$1,360, plus 30 percent of excess over $6,000	$960, plus 18 percent of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	$1,960, plus 34 percent of excess over $8,000	$1,320, plus 19 percent of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	$2,640, plus 38 percent of excess over $10,000	$1,700, plus 20 percent of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	$3,400, plus 43 percent of excess over $12,000	$2,100, plus 21 percent of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	$4,260, plus 47 percent of excess over $14,000	$2,520, plus 22 percent of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	$5,200, plus 50 percent of excess over $16,000	$2,960, plus 23 percent of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	$6,200, plus 53 percent of excess over $18,000	$3,420, plus 24 percent of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	$7,260, plus 56 percent of excess over $20,000	$3,900, plus 25 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000	$8,380, plus 59 percent of excess over $22,000	$4,400, plus 26 percent of excess over $22,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000	$10,740, plus 62 percent of excess over $26,000	$5,440, plus 27 percent of excess over $26,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000	$14,460, plus 65 percent of excess over $32,000	$7,060, plus 28 percent of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000	$18,360, plus 69 percent of excess over $38,000	$8,740, plus 29 percent of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	$22,500, plus 72 percent of excess over $44,000	$10,480, plus 30 percent of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000	$26,820, plus 75 percent of excess over $50,000	$12,280, plus 31 percent of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000	$34,320, plus 78 percent of excess over $60,000	$15,380, plus 32 percent of excess over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000	$42,120, plus 81 percent of excess over $70,000	$18,580, plus 34 percent of excess over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000	$50,220, plus 84 percent of excess over $80,000	$21,980, plus 36 percent of excess over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000	$58,620, plus 87 percent of excess over $90,000	$25,580, plus 38 percent of excess over $90,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000	$67,320, plus 89 percent of excess over $100,000	$29,380, plus 41 percent of excess over $100,000.
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000	$111,820, plus 90 percent of excess over $150,000	$49,880, plus 44 percent of excess over $150,000.
Over $200,000	$156,820, plus 91 percent of excess over $200,000	$71,880, plus 47 percent of excess over $200,000.

[1] After deductions and exemptions.

APPENDIX C

Tax savings by taxable income[1] brackets, based on current income levels

Taxable income[1] bracket (thousands)	Taxable income (millions)	Present rates	New rates, end of 5 years	Tax savings (millions)
$0 to $2	$95,121	20	15	$4,756
$2 to $4	15,967	22	16	957
$4 to $6	6,590	26	17	593
$6 to $8	4,090	30	18	491
$8 to $10	2,826	34	19	424
$10 to $12	1,984	38	20	357
$12 to $14	1,563	43	21	345
$14 to $16	1,074	47	22	269
$16 to $18	842	50	23	227
$18 to $20	720	53	24	209
$20 to $22	571	56	25	177
$22 to $26	924	59	26	306
$26 to $32	910	62	27	318
$32 to $38	584	65	28	215
$38 to $44	421	69	29	168
$44 to $50	312	72	30	130
$50 to $60	299	75	31	131
$60 to $70	203	78	32	94
$70 to $80	149	81	34	70
$80 to $90	109	84	36	53
$90 to $100	82	87	38	39
$100 to $150	217	89	41	105
$150 to $200	95	90	44	44
$200 and over	231	91	47	102
Total	135,887			10,580

[1] After deductions and exemptions.

Tax savings by taxable income bracket groups

Brackets	Tax savings (millions)	Percent of total
$0 to $6,000	$6,306	59.6
$0 to $18,000	8,419	79.5
$50,000 and over	636	6.0

APPENDIX D

Rates of estate and gift taxes

Taxable estate or gift (thousands)	Estate tax rates: Present	Estate tax rates: Upon enactment	Gift tax rates: Present	Gift tax rates: Upon enactment
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
0 to $5	3	1.75	2.25	1.25
$5 to $10	7	4.25	5.25	3.25
$10 to $20	11	6.75	8.25	5
$20 to $30	14	8.5	10.5	6.25
$30 to $40	18	11	13.5	8.25
$40 to $50	22	13.5	16.5	10.25
$50 to $60	25	15.25	18.75	11.5

Rates of estate and gift taxes—Continued

Taxable estate or gift (thousands)	Estate tax rates: Present	Estate tax rates: Upon enactment	Gift tax rates: Present	Gift tax rates: Upon enactment
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$60 to $100	28	17	21	12.75
$100 to $250	30	18.25	22.5	13.75
$250 to $500	32	19.5	24	14.5
$500 to $750	35	21.25	26.25	16
$750 to $1,000	37	22.5	27.75	16.75
$1,000 to $1,250	39	23.75	29.25	17.75
$1,250 to $1,500	42	25.5	31.5	19
$1,500 to $2,000	45	27.5	33.75	20.5
$2,000 to $2,500	49	30	36.75	23.5
$2,500 to $3,000	53	32.25	39.75	24.25
$3,000 to $3,500	56	34.25	42	25.75
$3,500 to $4,000	59	36	44.25	27
$4,000 to $5,000	63	38.5	47.25	28.75
$5,000 to $6,000	67	41	50.25	30.75
$6,000 to $7,000	70	42.75	52.5	32
$7,000 to $8,000	73	44.5	54.75	33.5
$8,000 to $10,000	76	46.25	57	34.5
Over $10,000	77	47	57.75	35.25

The Talmadge Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials entitled "TALMADGE Offers a Farm Plan," from the January 22, 1959, issue of the Waycross (Ga.) Journal-Herald; "Talmadge Bill Planned To End Farm Problem," from the January 21, 1959, issue of the Pasadena (Calif.) Independent; and "Our Perspective of Talmadge Bill Was Wrong," from the January 28, 1959, issue of the Kinston (N.C.) Daily Free Press.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALMADGE OFFERS A FARM PLAN

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE has introduced a bill which he believes will help to put the Nation's hard-pressed farmers on the right road.

His plan is simple. It would abolish all present production controls and price supports and give each farmer a domestic marketing quota for major crops.

Farmers would get direct Government payments for sales within these quotas. The payments would be enough to cover the difference between market prices and 100 percent of parity.

As we understand it, the payments would not cover everything farmers sell—just the volume of crops included in the domestic consumption quota. His bill further provides that no individual farmer could get payments of more than $25,000 a year.

TALMADGE has estimated that the program he proposes would cost between $1½ and $2½ billion a year which is far less than present price support programs.

The Georgia Senator, one of the best informed men in Washington on farm problems, concedes that his bill is not the complete solution to the Nation's vexatious farm problems.

But he points out that the present farm program has failed and that a fresh start is needed and that perhaps his plan can be used as the basis for drafting a brand new national farm program.

Certainly his bill deserves serious consideration. Both the farmers and the taxpayers are due a better deal.

TALMADGE BILL PLANNED TO END FARM PROBLEM

The price support program was written to protect the farmer when the price of his crop dropped so low that he couldn't maintain a reasonable standard of living. It was meant to keep small farms alive, to avoid the wholesale exodus of the depression years by farmers to the Far West and the big cities.

The program has not only failed to halt the abandoning of small farms, but has cost the American taxpayers sums undreamed of when the original support program was written. This fiscal year the tab will be nearly $7 billion.

Instances where big wheat farmers receive upward of $100,000 a year apiece for crops the government can't use are a national disgrace. Various schemes to limit crops have proved an irritating, expensive failure.

Clearly, a new concept in Government farm welfare is necessary. The farm program must be brought back to its original

purposes if the Nation hopes to keep the national budget in line and to halt the fantastic buildup of food stockpiles, much of which is rotting in the bins.

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, has suggested a bold new law which will give the farmers the protection they have been denied for the past 6 years without placing an intolerable burden upon the taxpayers.

The bill TALMADGE introduced would abolish present Federal farm programs and substitute direct Government payments for part of a farmer's output. All Government planting controls and price supports would be thrown out.

In their place, farmers would get quotas covering Government payments, but they would be allowed to grow as much as they wanted. Payments would be based on the difference between 100-percent parity and open market price. The system is similar to wool payments, which have been in effect for years.

For instance, a wheat farmer might be given a quota of 1,000 bushels. He plants 1,500 bushels and sells them for $2 a bushel on the open market. Established parity price is $3 a bushel. The Government pays the farmer $1,000, which is $1 a bushel (the difference between parity and market prices) times his quota of 1,000 bushels.

No farmer would be allowed to collect more than $25,000 a year.

TALMADGE estimates the cost of his plan at between $1.5 and $2.5 billion a year, considerably less than the present $7 billion.

The program may have serious flaws in it. We won't support it until we hear further argument about it. It may be less sensible than other direct-payment plans such as limited Government purchase of each crop.

However, the Talmadge bill is bold and it is designed both to save taxpayers money and to keep the little farmer in business without too much redtape, fuss, or feathers. We couldn't ask much more of any measure.

OUR PERSPECTIVE OF TALMADGE BILL WAS WRONG

In our issue of January 17 an editorial appeared under the title: "Who Pays Such Bills?" It referred to proposed legislation of Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, to abolish the present Federal farm programs and substitute direct Government payments to farmers for part of their output.

Since the article appeared Senator TALMADGE has been kind enough to send us a full copy of his speech on presentation of his bill, Senate bill S. 3963 which he introduced first in June 1958 and later the early part of this month. We find the bill is actually very much more practical and reasonable than we concluded with insufficient information of its actual contents and provisions.

In his address to the Senate when he introduced the bill Senator TALMADGE called attention to the fact that despite substantially increased Government payments the net farm income had shown a decrease in the 5 years between 1952 and 1957 of $3.6 billion.

Senator TALMADGE also points out that "farm production expenses increased from $22.6 to $23.5 billion yearly and it is estimated that the final total for 1958 will reach an alltime high of $24.5 billion or more. The spread between farm and retail prices has widened by $75 for each $1,000 spent for farm produce and the farmer's share of the market-basket dollar has dropped from 47 to 39 cents."

The Senator points out that "it is not strange that the Department of Commerce reported between 1950 and 1957 that 2,349,000 persons migrated from the farms of the Nation to compete for increasingly scarce jobs in urban areas."

The Senator suggests, and wisely, we believe, that the situation has "reached the point where it is essential for the future welfare of not only the farmer but also the taxpaying consumer that an entirely new approach to the solution of the Nation's farm problems be found." He emphasizes a number of pertinent points, including the desire of the farmer to return to a free-enterprise economy and a desire for a stabilized farm program. Experience of the past, he points out, is conclusive proof that those ends cannot be achieved through existing concepts.

The Senator says the only way to remedy the situation is to discard completely the present patchwork of discredited farm laws and start all over again.

He thinks that such a renewed program must have three fundamental objectives:

"1. To let the farmer farm;

"2. To guarantee the farmer his proportionate share of the national purchasing power; and

"3. To place American agricultural commodities back on the world market at competitive prices."

Senator TALMADGE goes further and says that he is convinced that desirable ends cannot be achieved "until the Federal Government is removed from the business of buying, storing, and selling agricultural commodities; until the responsibility for marketing the produce of our farms is returned to the farmer and private enterprise, where it belongs; until the farmer is free to plant and sell where he pleases; until the role of the Federal Government in agriculture is limited to paying the farmer the difference between the prices he receives for commodities sold for domestic consumption and 100 percent of parity."

The Free Press is glad to clarify its former comment.

This paper endorses 100 percent the contention that the farmer has been handicapped by the rules and regulations denying him the privilege of individual initiative in pursuit of his calling.

An Adequate Military Shield for U.S. Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the National Planning Association is a private research organization which has made a number of valuable studies of both domestic and international policy issues. Among current projects are those on security through arms control, the economics of competitive coexistence, and case studies of U.S. business performance abroad. Studies on the technical assistance program in Latin America have recently been completed.

The distinguished members of the National Planning Association committee on international policy represent agriculture, business, labor, and the professions. The recent statement by the committee on "An Adequate Military Shield for U.S. Foreign Policy" has received widespread attention.

I am pleased to invite the attention of my colleagues to the statement, which I feel is a thorough, objective, cogent analysis of one of the most critical problems facing the Congress and the Nation today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NPA INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON AN ADEQUATE MILITARY SHIELD FOR U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Last spring, the committee on international policy of the National Planning Association issued a statement on "A Positive Foreign Policy for the United States" which outlined the diplomatic, economic, and psychological measures required to reassert American leadership toward a better and more secure system of world order. While progress has been disheartenigly slow in improving the positive content of U.S. foreign policy, a more alarming deficiency now appears to threaten the military shield without which, under existing conditions, all of America's international efforts will be placed in dire jeopardy.

There is the very real possibility that, if present trends continue, the Soviet bloc will within a few years have a decisive military advantage over the United States and its allies. This frightening possibility arises not only from the intensified military development efforts of the Soviet Union but also from serious limitations and lags in U.S. defense concepts and programs. Past Communist behavior demonstrates that, in the absence of adequate military strength, it would be even more difficult—if not impossible—successfully to pursue the positive and constructive goals of U.S. foreign policy. Hence, this statement of the NRA international committee is focused on the necessity to achieve and maintain adequate military strength as one essential precondition for making U.S. foreign policy more effective.

Unless we are vastly mistaken, there is a profound and widespread uneasiness throughout the country about the way America's international affairs have been drifting in the global struggle in which the United States is engaged. In spite of many reassuring statements, the feeling persists that the position of the non-Soviet world, and notably of the United States, has been materially weakened by the inadequacy of its response to the ever-growing challenge of the Communist bloc. The longer this process is allowed to continue, the greater will be the national peril. The launching of the first sputnik came as a distinct shock both to the Government and to the public, and resulted in an intensification of U.S. military defense efforts. Unfortunately, this intensification seems to have petered out, and a new complacency appears to have settled on Washington. Once again, the defense of the budget seems to be mistaken for the defense of the Nation.

Before the Soviet Union's latest challenge to the freedom of West Berlin, it had been announced that the Armed Forces were to be cut again and that new appropriations for military defense were to be rigidly held within the limits set last year, although owing to rising costs this expenditure would provide even less in manpower and material. True, the latest Berlin crisis has produced some upward revisions of these figures. But, nothing yet suggests that there is any serious intention to make the major revisions required if the military strength of the United States is not to be dangerously deficient by the early 1960's.

There seems still to be little recognition of the fact that, desirable as a balanced or approximately balanced budget is in normal times, to seek it above all else in the circumstances of today may prove the prelude to disaster. For this is no peacetime budget with which the American people are presently concerned. It is a budget to insure the successful conduct of U.S. foreign policy

under the conditions of the cold war. And, although this would be far less burdensome than the budgetary exactions of a shooting war, it is a profound mistake to think that expenditures can prudently be held in the straitjacket which peacetime fiscal measures soundly conceived would properly impose.

The argument is often heard that the United States cannot afford even the present inadequate level of defense expenditures and that, if it is long continued, the American economy will collapse, thereby enabling the Soviets to triumph without war. Hence, it is concluded, the best defense against the Communist threat of world domination is a reduced and balanced U.S. budget. It is high time that the American people realized the dangerous fallacies inherent in this argument. As studies of the National Planning Association and other institutions have repeatedly shown, the United States could afford substantially higher budgetary expenditures if national economic policies were adopted which would enable the American economy to achieve more of its truly enormous growth potential. With an adequate rate of economic growth, the U.S. economy could afford a larger budget not only for increased military defense expenditures but also for the greater social capital investments necessary to sustain economic growth. With little less than national survival at stake, it would be a critical mistake to make a fetish of arbitrary budgetary limitations.

But the argument against adequate military expenditures contains another fallacy, even more dangerous. For, it must by now be obvious to every open-minded American that the successful conduct of U.S. foreign policy at a time when all the cherished values of western civilization are challenged as never before depends upon the adequacy of American military preparedness. If, through lack of foresight, the United States permits a further unfavorable shift in the balance of world power, it would inevitably encourage the intransigence of the Communist adversary; it would play into Soviet hands throughout the vast uncommitted areas of the world; and it would leave the closest friends and allies of the United States wondering whether this country had taken the full measure of the mortal danger to which the free nations are exposed—whether Americans are going to assume in time the burdens of sacrifice necessary to fend that peril off.

Mindful of all this, we feel that U.S. diplomacy and constructive economic measures will in a divided world be greater handicapped unless they have the full support of the will to prevail which only determined leadership backed by military strength can arouse. With considerable daring and at great risk, the Secretary of State has countered in recent years more than one move of the Sino-Soviet bloc. If, as we believe, appropriations contemplated for the military are inadequate, we can see the time approaching when a shift in power relationships will make the taking of such risks little more than a desperate gamble. This is a position which the United States must strive at all costs to avoid.

A formidable, resourceful, and unscrupulous antagonist has for the time being gained the advantage of the initiative. Probing ceaselessly for soft spots, the Sino-Soviet bloc keeps the United States constantly on the defensive. While it is true that neither the Soviet Union nor its Red Chinese ally has in the past year and a half gained the avowed allegiance of any nation previously outside the Sino-Soviet bloc, their influence in many areas seems in the ascendant, and the pressure they continue to exert is unrelenting.

The members of this committee are inclined to the belief that the Sino-Soviet bloc has at present as little desire as the United States to precipitate a general war. But quite apart from the fact that the Soviets recognize as does the West the utter devastation that such a conflict would involve, they are motivated by the belief that the world balance of power is moving inexorably against the United States and its allies. On this account, they look forward to a prolonged period of what they euphemistically call peaceful coexistence, during which they propose to consolidate their control over the vast areas now under their dominion, enormously increase their industrial and agricultural productivity, and gradually from an ever more secure base make further advances throughout the non-Soviet world by means of adroit diplomacy, by the skillful use of their growing economic potential, and by ideological penetration and subversion.

This presents for them an alluring prospect. The long-term objectives of the Soviet Union have in no sense changed nor has their view on the international outlook. Only recently in the "World Marxist Review: Problems of Peace and Socialism," published in 15 languages, the following occurs:

"No matter how bourgeois ideologists and their revisionist henchmen may try to embellish imperialism, the economic and political instability of the capitalst system grows more and more obvious. State monopoly capitalism, which evokes such raptures among the apologists of imperialism, only intensifies the anarchy of production, the hardships of the working people, the oppression and arbitrary rule of capitalism—as recent events in the economic and political life of the capitalist countries are once more showing. The inevitable result of the growing sharpening of the contradictions of imperialism will be to hasten its downfall. The present balance of forces on the world arena is more and more changing in favor of the peoples who are building socialism and fighting against the colonialists, in favor of the peoples who are defending the cause of peace, democracy, and national independence."

The strategy of the Soviet Union and its Red Chinese partner remains unaltered. The grand design is to draw into their orbit gradually ever more of the world's population. To this end, there will be a continuing effort to capitalize on that anticolonialism which is so easily kindled into resentment toward the West not only in the lands which still maintain a colonial status, but even in those nations which have recently emerged from it. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union and its Red Chinese partner will confront the free world with a succession of crises, hoping in this manner to undermine the smooth function of our system and eventually to bring about its inevitable collapse. When and if this program has met with its anticipated success, and the shift in world power in favor of the Soviet Union has become so pronounced that in their view the only alternatives open to the free nations will be surrender or annihilation, then the moment will have arrived when the Soviet Union will be prepared to implement the threat of thermonuclear war.

If in broad lines this proves to be the policy which the Soviet Union will continue to follow, it would at least have the advantage of affording the United States time to marshall more effectively than it has in the past all of those great elements of strength, spiritual and material, residing in nations and peoples deeply opposed to the realization of Soviet ambitions. We reject the view of world communism that its victory is inevitable. It is well to remember that the Soviet Union faces immense difficulties of its own. The Hungarian revolt evidenced dramatically the enormous vitality of the desire for national independence and for personal liberty. Ten years of the most intensive propaganda did not convince the Hungarian people that they were living under anything but a foreign despotism. And it is far too early to assume that in China the historic traditions of an ancient people will finally be extinguished by the latest moves of its Communist rulers. We continue to believe that, given time, the human spirit will emerge victorious over the forces bent on its enslavement.

But it would be folly not to recognize that the United States may be afforded far less time than is now optimistically anticipated. The unstable balance of terror which characterizes a bipolar world dooms the free peoples to a prolonged period of anxious uncertainty. Until more rational conduct can be brought to prevail once again in human affairs, the world will be constantly exposed to the danger that the holocaust of thermonuclear war may be set off either by accident or by design. For this danger, the United States is at present insufficiently prepared. The notion of a devastating surprise attack on a potential enemy is repugnant to the deepest instincts of the free nations. On this account, while realizing that the Soviet Union shares no such inhibition, the United States has placed its main reliance on deterrence. There was a time, not so long ago, when this reliance was justified by then eixsting military strength. The capability of the Strategic Air Command to inflict untold punishment upon an aggressor was so great that it was likely to remain unchallenged. The assumption was that no matter what the nature of an attack, the strategic air arm would still be able to perform its allotted task.

But the dismal fact is that unless the United States takes many measures not contemplated in its present military program, the moment is approaching when this assumption will have lost its validity. According to much expert testimony, if steps are not promptly taken vastly to strengthen American retaliatory capability, the Soviet Union in the not distant future will be in a position, by the use of intercontinental and intermediate-range ballistic missiles armed with thermonuclear warheads, to inflict so strong a blow on SAC bases in the United States and in Europe that retaliation by the United States would be held within limits acceptable to the Soviet Union. Just because such an eventuality as this is not inevitable, it is worth underscoring the fact that it remains within the realm of the possible.

It is in no sense ordained that the United States has to accept the possibility of such a development. The recent successful flight of an Atlas missile over its full range gives earnest of what U.S. military capabilities could be if adequate resources and efforts were devoted to their early realization. But, neither the present state of preparedness nor that contemplated for a few years hence under present programming will suffice. There are measures, at least in the planning stage, which, if promptly implemented, would materially increase the U.S. retaliatory capabilities likely to survive a surprise attack. Undertaken with courage and determination, they would greatly reduce the danger, although it would be idle to pretend that they can any longer remove it.

The measures proposed cover a wide spectrum and in their totality would undoubtedly be costly. On this account, they should be subjected to the most critical screening. But, certainly no doctrinaire attachment to fiscal orthodoxy should be permitted to stand in the way of the more promising choices. As the Committee on International Policy of the National Planning Association has stated on other occasions, where little less than national survival is at stake, budgetary considerations should yield to military necessities.

Until this view, with the sacrifices it may involve, has been accepted, the U.S. Government will remain hopelessly handicapped

in the conduct of its foreign policy. Once this view is accepted, however, new avenues will be opened for the development of a positive and constructive foreign policy. For far too long, the United States has allowed the impression to gain currency that in spite of its avowed dedication to the cause of peace with freedom and justice, it has not been willing to assume the burdens that the nature of world problems and of the Soviet challenge demanded. As a result, in spite of vaunted American strength, the United States has come to be looked upon more and more as an erratic and undependable associate.

This has done immense harm not only among our Western allies, but among the countless millions who would like to be friends of the United States. The damage is real, but it is not irreparable. Notice to the world that the United States was in the process of adopting policies and programs based upon a more realistic appraisal both of the peril to which Western civilization is exposed and of the problems of developing a better world order would have a heartening effect throughout the non-Soviet world. There has been little doubt about the broad purposes and objectives of American policy. The question that has created such concern is whether the United States has the wisdom and the determination actually to do whatever may be required to achieve those purposes and objectives.

It is the plea of the Committee on International Policy of the National Planning Association that this question now be answered by word and deed with a categoric affirmative. In the even, we would foresee an immediate and perceptible turn in the tide of world opinion. Confidence in the will and in the capacity of the United States successfully to meet the challenge of the times would be reawakened. It would be clear for all to see that while circumstances had obliged the United States to increase its efforts in the field of the military, it was embarking on this course as the surest way to avoid for all mankind the ultimate catastrophe of atomic warfare. Adequate military strength would provide the necessary shield behind which it would be possible to recapture the initiative in the cause of peace with freedom and justice. Then, by skillful diplomacy, the propaganda of truth, and constructive economic measure, the United States could again appeal effectively to the longing of men and women everywhere to escape from the vicious circle of competitive thermonuclear insanity, and to join in the great adventure of building that better world order which modern technology and science have brought within our grasp.

It would be too much to expect an early and favorable response from the Soviet Union. Yet the hope seems warranted that in the not too distant future the time would be ripe for a new approach designed to resolve many differences. For, in the light of the new American orientation, it will become increasingly clear that Soviet ambitions could not be realized at an acceptable cost. Deprived of the bright prospect which the leaders in the Kremlin see stretching before them today, it is just possible that they might be brought to cooperate with the free nations in the establishment of a tranquil world order from which the horror of thermonuclear war, if not of war itself, had been removed.

This statement has been formulated and is published in the continuing belief that the whole country and much of the free world as well are still prepared to follow imaginative, courageous, and great-hearted leadership from Washington.

Washington and Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the current "Washington and Small Business" column sponsored by the National Federation of Independent Business.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON AND SMALL BUSINESS

(By C. Wilson Harder)

A warning has been issued to small businessmen by the Federal Trade Commission against a loan racket.

The operation of this new hoax came some time ago to the attention of the field offices of the Small Business Administration and were reported in detail to George Burger, Washington vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, when he recently made a field trip to visit all the SBA offices.

In operation, the scheme is somewhat as follows: Sharp operators ascertain in a given community which small businessmen are seeking a loan for operating capital, for expansion, or for some other purpose. For the hoax player's purposes, it is better if the businessman has so far been unsuccessful in securing a loan.

The gyp artist then makes it a point to inspect the business premises in such a way he is asked the purpose of his visit.

He then reveals that he is an inspector for a group of philanthropic organizations with ample money to loan and whose philosophy is that small business must be helped, and he is sure that a loan could be arranged for the business, usually naming a figure of about twice what the businessman is seeking.

Of course, there is a long and plausible explanation that a contract must be signed, and that this calls for a modest fee in advance in order to compete the formalities of getting the loan.

Usually, too late, and after nothing has happened on securing a loan, the victimized businessman finds that the contract he signed, states in very fine print, that the "con" man, in exchange for the advance fee in cash, has only agreed to recommend to legitimate lending agencies that the businessman is a fine fellow, has a nice business, and should get a loan.

Obviously nothing but a racket.

Small businessmen are advised to shy away from any stranger who wants any advance fees for securing a loan.

As a matter of fact, it is recommended that small businessmen seeking a loan first try their bank. If they cannot secure the aid needed from this course, they are advised to contact the nearest field office of the Small Business Administration.

This agency of the Federal Government will try to work out any possible solution for the individual problem, either by making a direct loan with Government funds, or sharing a loan with a private lending agency.

As a matter of fact, the SBA welcomes inquiries from small business firms on financing problems and is prepared to exhaustively study each case in an attempt to work out a solution.

In fact, in many cases, these studies have been so complete, that they have revealed valid reasons for a loan that had previously been overlooked by a bank loan officer with the result the private bank has gone ahead and made the loan.

But the official warning is, "Don't pay anybody an advance fee to get a business loan."

Review by Senator Fulbright of Walter Lippmann's Book "The Communist World and Ours"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a review by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Walter Lippmann's book, "The Communist World and Ours."

The review, which appeared in the Washington Post of February 1, 1959, provides an excellent introduction to Mr. Lippmann's able and suggestive analysis.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS MR. K. SAID TO LIPPMANN

("The Communist World and Ours," by Walter Lippmann; reviewed by J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee)

No man has contributed more to the thoughtful considerations of the American scene than has Walter Lippmann during his long and distinguished career. He has a genius for extracting the essential threads of meaning from complex and confusing circumstances. In domestic affairs, his analysis often clarifies the abstruse and puzzling questions which arise from our complicated system of government.

This latest book in the field of foreign affairs from Mr. Lippmann's pen does not offer a cure for all the ills which afflict our relations with the U.S.S.R., but it does make some sensible suggestions regarding those relations. International affairs may not yield quite so readily as do domestic affairs to logical analysis, but understanding of statecraft and a feeling for the traditions of organized societies have produced in this instance, an interesting, a useful, and a provocative volume.

This work is divided into two parts, the first being the interview with Khrushchev and the second the author's own views and policy suggestions.

Mr. Lippmann's report of the interview is objective and matter of fact, but he conveys an interesting and lively impression of a powerful and ominous man. Khrushchev, he says, was quite relaxed and had none of the symptoms of a busy and preoccupied man.

In the anteroom to his office there were no guards, no people waiting, no secretaries carrying papers, no newspapermen, and there was none of the hustle and bustle which usually prevails in the outer rooms of busy and important officials. Under such conditions a man can think, and a man who directs a powerful nation with the ability and the opportunity to think can be a formidable and troublesome antagonist.

Khrushchev believes, says, Mr. Lippmann, that American policy rests on an obsolete estimate of the existing balance of military power, because our forward bases in Germany and Turkey cannot be defended against Russia's rockets. However, communism, according to Khrushchev, is not a danger as a military policy, but as an ideology * * *. We—the Communists—will cause you, the Americans, more trouble each year.

Under the new 7-year plan, the Communists expect to surpass the United States in per capita production. The United States, says the master of the Kremlin, is living the last years of its greatness.

One of Khrushchev's principal complaints against the United States was that we are contributing to the remilitarization of Germany. He warned that such a policy could well result in Germany being destroyed or more probably joining the U.S.S.R. in order to avoid destruction by nuclear missiles.

Perhaps the most significant revelations of the interview were Khrushchev's concern about German affairs and his confidence in the power and effectiveness of his missiles of intermediate range.

The cause of our bad relations with Russia, Mr. Lippmann says, is the suspicion each side holds that the other side intends to commit aggression. This suspicion arises from the belief that in the long run neither side can tolerate the other.

In spite of all the propaganda to the contrary, we do not inhabit one world, says Mr. Lippmann. But looking at the history of the globe, the truth, as I see it, is that there has never been one world, that there has never been a universal state or a universal religion.

So, he concludes, we should not approach this conflict as if it were a religious war in which the contending positions are absolute. Such a policy leaves no room for maneuver, for diplomacy, for statesmanship, or in short no hope for any solution except total war.

Mr. Lippmann is not without hope, that is, if we keep our powder dry and keep plenty of it, as he advises us to do. But we must find a way to provide adequate armaments without working ourselves up into a frenzy of threats and fear and without insisting that all the smaller nations of the world line up on one side or the other.

The main threat of the Communist states lies not in their clandestine activity but in the force of their example. Their example of material achievements has especial appeal to the underdeveloped peoples of Asia and Africa, an appeal not easy for us to meet. He suggests that the only convincing answer to this challenge is for the West to help India match the achievements of China without sacrificing her free society.

In Europe, the critical area of the movement, we should strive to bring about the withdrawal of the Red Army gradually and with prudent safeguards. I think, says Mr. Lippmann, that we are missing the bus as long as we fail to identify ourselves with the idea of bringing to an end, however gradually, the military occupation of the European Continent.

Such sentiments only a short time ago aroused a storm of protest. They may again, but the less we plunge ourselves into hysterics, the more likely we are to take good care of our affairs, wisely concludes the author of this succinct and penetrating book.

Frank Park Samford: Man of the South for 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of remarks of Hon. Thomas W. Martin, chairman of the Alabama Power Co., upon the presentation of the Man of the South for 1958 award to Hon. Frank P. Samford of Birmingham, Ala., at a dinner given by friends of Mr. Samford at the Mountain Brook Country Club of Birmingham on January 20, 1959. The Man of the South awards are presented annually by Dixie Business magazine of Decatur, Ga., and its publisher, Col. Hubert F. Lee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANK PARK SAMFORD: MAN OF THE SOUTH FOR 1958

(Remarks of Thomas W. Martin, Man of the South for 1946, at the dinner given by friends of Mr. Samford, Mountain Brook Country Club, Birmingham, Ala., January 20, 1959)

Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. Lee, Mr. Samford, members of his family, gentlemen, it is with a feeling of pride that I come before this important group to say something about the Man of the South for 1958.

At the outset, I want to express my cordial thanks to the toastmaster, Mr. Frank E. Spain, and to Col. Hubert F. Lee of Atlanta, editor of Dixie Business, for the honor and privilege of making this presentation.

The initiative for originating the plan by which flowers for the living are handed to them while they are still able to enjoy them came entirely from Colonel Lee. It has been carried forward by him for many years.

Obviously, time, effort, and dollars are involved in gathering the nominations, arranging the balloting, and supervising the awards. With Colonel Lee, it has been a labor of love. He has had no reward other than the consciousness that he has done something that makes life more stimulating and more interesting for those who live in the South.

When he began, he indicated that he would carry on his interesting work principally as a hobby, rather than as moneymaking enterprise. We owe much to him as a citizen of the South for giving of his time and means. Of course we like the name of his magazine, Dixie Business, which he founded in 1929 and of which he is the editor and owner. He thus shows himself to be a true southern gentleman with a feeling for tradition and a sense of the past.

It has been my fortune to be familiar with Hubert's work for a good many years. With one notable exception, men have been selected who in the opinion of others were worthy of the distinction of being the Man of the South. In looking over the records of these men, it is obvious that it was not the day-to-day business of the individual that brought him to public acclaim, but rather the things he did in religious, cultural, or other activities wholly outside his enterprise.

And, with respect to one of those selected, Colonel Lee said of him that he had a goodly heritage; but that that heritage did not consist of silver and gold, but rather in character and devotion to ideals. Thus we have an interpretation of the principles that have guided Colonel Lee.

Mr. Samford attended State Normal School in Troy, Ala.; high school in Montgomery. He received his bachelor-of-science degree from Alabama Polytechnic Institute in Auburn. He is a member of Alpha Tau Omega fraternity and Omicron Delta Kappa honorary fraternity. He was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree by Howard College of Birmingham. Mr. Samford has been a member of the Southside Baptist Church in Birmingham for many years, is a deacon of the church, and has served as the chairman of the board of deacons from time to time.

Soon after graduation he entered the life insurance business with the Manhattan Life Insurance Co. of New York. When the Insurance Department of Alabama was created, he was the first deputy insurance commissioner, serving for 4 years. He was elected secretary-treasurer of the present Liberty National Life Insurance Co. in 1921, vice president in 1932, and president in 1934.

Mr. Samford is a director of a number of important enterprises, including Southern Bell T. & T. Co.; West Point Manufacturing Co.; Brown-Service Manufacturing Co. (Birmingham); Service Insurance Co. of Alabama (Birmingham); Malone Freight Lines (Birmingham); Birmingham Trust National Bank; Continental Gin Co.; Dixie Mills, Inc. (Ga.); Columbus Manufacturing Co. (Ga.); Equinox Mill (S.C.); Wellington Sears Co. (N.Y.); Cabin Crafts, Inc. (Ga.).

Outstanding is his work for education. He is a trustee of Alabama Polytechnic Institute, is president of the board of trustees of Howard College (Birmingham), and is a trustee of Southern Research Institute (Birmingham). I speak with some feeling and personal satisfaction for his support of the activities of the Southern Research Institute.

It was said over a hundred years ago by a great writer that:

"Kings, warriors, and statesmen have hitherto monopolized not only the pages of history, but also those of biography. I do not begrudge destructive heroes their fame, but the constructive ones ought not to be forgotten."

The growth of Liberty National Life Insurance into the 45th largest in the Nation constitutes a tribute, not only to Frank Samford and his associates, but to the enduring principles of every private enterprise, without which no progress is possible. Indeed, he and his company are truly constructive forces in our society of today.

Mr. Samford's counsel and support have been sought in innumerable worthy causes. His response has always been generous, wholehearted, and effective. His words, his deeds, and his attitude have marked him as a man of vision, wisdom, tolerance, and humanity. The social consciousness of American businessmen is one of the distinguishing marks of the American form of capitalism, a quality too little honored. Possessed of these qualities, we acclaim him as one of the most useful citizens of our time.

The reality cannot be escaped that Frank Samford has found that the good life is good for him who lives it, as it is good for those whom it serves. Such realities provide an illustration of what counts most in the mysterious adventure of human existence. It is clear anew that the major satisfactions come from concern and labor for others. They who give themselves to such concern find that they have come upon the source of the most precious values men know in living.

For example, Frank Samford recently caused to be erected on his office building in Birmingham a replica one-fifth the size of the Statue of Liberty at New York Harbor. That statue, as you know, was presented in 1886 by the French people to the people of the United States; and we who live in Birmingham look with pride upon this patriotic act of Mr. Samford's. The replica of this great statue will not only adorn his office building, but it will symbolize the spirit of a city—Birmingham.

In every field, art, science, industry, or religion—we have a legacy reaching back many centuries—to the man who first drew a picture on a cave wall; made the first wheel; fashioned the first instrument of metal; or raised his eyes in worship to the stars. The progress of civilization has been uneven, but every generation can add something, be it little or much, to this heritage of the past.

Let us remember that these great human advances have not been brought about by mediocre men and women. They were brought about by distinctly uncommon people, with vital sparks of leadership, such as Frank Samford.

And so with great pleasure I present to you, Frank Park Samford, the plaque which tells you of your selection as the Man of the South for 1958.

The Establishment of National Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, reliable newspaper reports indicate that within the administration itself, that is, on the President's staff, there is fear that President Eisenhower may be moving too far in the direction of giving this country leadership. Sound fantastic?

Recently the New York Herald Tribune reported that the President's recent passing reference in his state of the Union speech to the establishment of national goals for this Nation shook up some members of his staff. They expressed fear that the recognition of where this country ought to be going, like in building schoolrooms, paying teachers, building homes, might lead to a public demand that the Government ought to do something to help us get there.

Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal carried an excellent editorial recently that nailed this negative nervous Nellie fear for what it is. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OF COURSE, WE NEED GOALS

President Eisenhower's plan to create a study group to establish national goals got a lot of favorable support. But not, according to the New York Herald Tribune, from his own White House staff.

The staff didn't like the word "goals." And, the newspaper says, if the staff gets its way, the committee will confine its work to studying such areas as education, housing, natural resources, technology. And it will then suggest ways of advancing in each of these fields. But it won't set goals. Why not? Well, the Herald Tribune quotes a White House staff member to this effect:

"Suppose the committee said there ought to be 100,000 new schoolrooms or 1 million new homes a year and then they weren't built. Why everybody in the land would be demanding that the Federal Government step in and see to it that they get built."

This is something like asking your garage repairman to find out what's wrong with your car—but not to tell you in precise terms lest you decide to get it fixed. We don't need a study to tell us that the country can use more and better houses or that education could be improved. We know those things. What we need to know is the extent of the need and how to meet it.

Expect Best, Maybe Castro Will Deliver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, having read in the Indianapolis Star an excellent editorial by Holmes Alexander entitled "Expect Best, Maybe Castro Will Deliver," and noting that a reference is made therein to my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis Star, Jan. 24, 1959]

EXPECT BEST, MAYBE CASTRO WILL DELIVER

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—They still have a one-party system in Cuba—dictators. Batista made himself president. Fidel Castro appointed a stooge who in turn named Castro his military chief. Neither way is any way to run a republic.

If Cuba were as far away as Laos, the choice of dictators would be an academic, harmless game in the United States. But with Cuba only 90 miles off our coast and an economic dependent of American business, we had better stop playing games and start looking up remedies for offshore revolutions.

In the game of choose-your-dictator, some members of our press have regrettably followed their party line instead of the facts. One metropolitan paper around New Year's reached back to pre-Christian classical days to find an analogy of the bearded young hero riding to the liberation of his worshipful people. But let us draw the curtain of charity across these embarrassing extravagances. With Castro in and Batista out, the joint interest of both Cuba and the United States is to rescue Castro from the revolving door through which so many Latin dictators have come and gone. We should use him as a safe conduct to a constitutional government in Cuba.

STATESMANSHIP SPOTTY

American statesmanship has been spotty but with patches of excellence. We owe a lot to Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon. He was the first of the liberal fraternity to point out that blood was flowing in Cuba and that this was more than a matter of whose ox was gored. MORSE deserves credit for arousing both public opinion and the State Department against the slaughter which temporarily has abated. All in all, the forbearance of the American Government has been worthy of our position as a major power and a mature country. True, Latin ways are not our ways, but until we have a perfect system at home we had better favor self-improvement over self-righteouness.

It's also a good idea, and fairly widely observed in the press and in Congress, to resist the temptation to shout Communist at every foreign event which goes against our interest. But it would be naive to forget Russia's fondness for fishing in troubled waters. Under the Batista regime, Russia agreed to buy some Cuban sugar. As a result Soviet merchant ships, chock-a-block with electronic reconnaissance equipment, have been cruising off our shores. We could be more indignant about this if American traders had not recently been so cordial to Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan.

But neither will it do to write off Fidel Castro and his ubiquitous brothers as agrarian reformers and innocent progressives. For instance, Time Magazine, July 8, 1957, carried a digest of a Fidel Castro speech, published at his own expense, in which he promised the following program should he become dictator of Cuba:

1. Nationalization of U.S.-owned power and telephone companies.
2. Confiscation of all wealth gained by corruption.
3. A drastic land reform.
4. Profit-sharing for labor.
5. Expansion of industrialization, public housing, rural electrification.

Our Foreign Cultural and Information Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from La Gazetta Del Massachusetts of January 16, 1959. I think that this editorial identifies one of the ways in which our foreign cultural and information programs could have greater impact. The editor of La Gazetta Del Massachusetts, Mr. Caesar Donnaruma, has been one of the most effective editors in foreign language journalism in America, and his newspaper has always been one of the most constructive voices in Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THIS SOUND THINKING?

One of the most effective ways of offsetting the propaganda employed by Communists in their false diatribes about capitalistic America is through the use of American newspapers which are circulated in European countries where communism is a problem.

This is particularly true in the case of newspapers printed in foreign languages. People in countries where Communists abound are able to read. They are also

liable to believe what they read. Their opinions of the democratic way of life in America are more susceptible to the knowledge they absorb from American newspapers than to the claims of Communists that are disproved in these newspapers.

Many thousands of American newspapers are mailed every week to European countries. The Gazzetta is proud of a very large group of subscribers in almost every province in Italy. They spend money to subscribe to this newspaper. They are so dedicated to reading articles that appeal to them that when their papers are not delivered they are quick to protest.

To make it more difficult for these subscribers to American foreign language newspapers, the Post Office Department with the approval of President Eisenhower and the Congress has increased the postal rates on newspapers sent to Italy and other countries by 1 cent.

A cent is of no importance but to be forced to pay such an additional charge every week in the year is of far reaching importance. The money involved would not halt the wheels of the Post Office Department if it should be lost.

Money is not the issue. The real issue is that perhaps unwittingly, Senators and Congressmen and even Mr. Eisenhower himself, have never considered the importance of the American foreign language press in contributing to the defeat of communism in countries into which the United States is continuing to pour billions of dollars of the American taxpayers. It seems that there is too little thought given to one of the best sources of propaganda that the United States possesses. Perhaps the men in Washington are too concerned about big problems to even think of the far more productive little problems. They should wake up.

William T. Evjue Wins High Honor From Government of Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in his lifetime of dedicated public service as a crusading liberal newspaper editor, Mr. William T. Evjue, editor and publisher of the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis., has been widely honored. Last week, he was awarded another high honor of which I am sure he is especially proud.

King Olav V of Norway has conferred on Mr. Evjue the Knight's Cross, First Class, of the Royal Order of St. Olav. This is the highest honor which the Norwegian Government awards to civilians of this country. It is a rare and coveted honor.

Mr. Evjue has always been proud of his Norwegian descent, and those who know him agree that his nationality may, indeed, be given a share of credit for the qualities of tenacious courage and dedication to public interest which have won him recognition as one of the Nation's leading liberal crusading editors.

Mr. President, in recognition of the high honor Mr. Evjue has earned, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Capital Times of Tuesday, January 27, 1959, and an editorial from the Wisconsin State Journal of Madison, Wis., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, Jan. 27, 1959]

KING CONFERS HIGH HONOR—NORSE MAKE EVJUE KNIGHT OF ST. OLAV

William T. Evjue, editor and publisher of the Capital Times, was informed today that King Olav V of Norway has conferred upon him the Knight's Cross, First Class, of the Royal Order of St. Olav, the highest Norwegian honor awarded to civilians in the United States.

In a letter to Mr. Evjue, Helge Akre, consul general of Norway in Chicago, invited Mr. Evjue to come to Chicago to receive the decoration and to lunch with the consul general.

The honor includes the St. Olav medal and a certificate signed by King Olav V.

Consul Akre pointed out today that the Knight's Cross, First Class, of the Royal Order of St. Olav, is very seldom given to citizens of the United States. He said that he recalled only four or five similar presentations during the time he has been consul in this country.

Upon the death of a recipient, the medal must be returned to the King of Norway, who retains ownership, Consul Akre explained.

He stated that this highly merited award is made to those civilians for services on behalf of Norway in this country, and services furthering the ideals, heritage, and culture of that land.

Consul Akre compared the Knight's Cross, First Class, of the Royal Order of St. Olav, to the Legion of Honor of France.

The Order of St. Olav was founded in 1847 by King Oskar I as a general order of merit, both military and civilian. It is given in reward for services rendered to king and country or to art and science.

The order is named after Olav Haraldsson, King Olav II of Norway, national hero and patron saint, who was canonized as St. Olav in 1164.

Olav, who was born about 955, fought with the Danes in England and was a member of the Jomsborg Vikings. After years of sea roving led him to Normandy, Spain, and the Holy Land, he returned to Norway in 1016 and defeated Earl Sweyn, the virtual ruler of Norway. Olav established peaceable relations with Sweden and Denmark and soon achieved a greater measure of power than any of his predecessors. He spread Christianity throughout the kingdom and reorganized the Government of Norway.

HONOR TO WILLIAM T. EVJUE

[From the Wisconsin State Journal]

The Wisconsin State Journal takes pleasure in adding its congratulations to the many directed to William T. Evjue today.

King Olav, of Norway, has conferred the Knight's Cross First Class, of the Royal Order of St. Olav, highest Norwegian honor awarded civilians in the United States, upon the editor and publisher of the Capital Times.

Mr. Evjue richly merits the distinction for his services on behalf of Norway in this country, which the award recognizes.

The ideals, heritage, and culture of Norway always have found a place of endearment in his newspaper, and his personal columns of reminiscences of early-day Norwegians and their communities in Wisconsin, and his accounts of his travels and visits among them have brought delight to many of his readers.

And his faithful reporting of church dinners in the lutefisk season has made him practically the official guide to good feasting and fellowship for all nationality groups who have him to thank for an introduction to the old country delicacy.

The St. Olav Knighthood is rarely given to citizens of this country. It is all the more significant, then, that Mr. Evjue is the third distinguished citizen of Madison to win it in recent times.

The late Albert G. Schmedeman, four times mayor of Madison and later Governor of Wisconsin, was similarly decorated by the late King Haakon while he was U.S. Minister to Norway from 1913 to 1921.

And the same King bestowed the honor on Prof. Einar I. Haugen, chairman of the department of Scandinavian languages at the University of Wisconsin.

Another pleasant point is that the man who has honored Mr. Evjue himself was honored here when, in 1939, the then crown prince received an honorary degree from the University of Wisconsin and a commission as honorary colonel in the 105th Cavalry, Wisconsin National Guard, from Gov. Julius Heil.

Labor Reform Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from the Washington Post and Times Herald dealing with the subject of labor reform legislation, one of January 25, 1959, and a second one of January 29, 1959. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the New York Times of January 30, 1959, as well as a column by Arthur Krock published in the Times that day on the subject of labor reform.

It seems to me that the pressing need in the field of labor legislation is for internal reform and democratization of unions. While I recognize that some amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act are necessary and useful, it appears possible that the Congress may again concentrate its energies on arguing the merits of Taft-Hartley amendments and delay essential labor reform legislation.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Jan. 25, 1959]

QUESTION OF PACKAGING

Senator KENNEDY has shown good judgment in introducing his revised labor reform bill early in the session and in moving promptly for committee action. In general it is a good bill. Whether or not it would "virtually put Mr. Hoffa and his associates out of business," as Senator KENNEDY claims it would certainly put more squeeze on the racketeers in the ranks of organized labor than they feel today. The chief question about Mr. KENNEDY's bill is not whether it looks in the right direction but whether it goes far enough—or, to look at the matter from a different angle, too far.

In general, the bill would strike at corruption within unions by requiring detailed disclosure of their financial operations and of any transactions by their officers which might involve a conflict of interest. It seeks

to give workers control over their unions by requiring secret-ballot election of officers or of delegates to the conventions, at which officers are chosen. Numerous specific safeguards to prevent undemocratic procedures would be written into the law, and the Secretary of Labor would be authorized to institute court action to upset improper elections and to substitute therefor honest elections supervised by his Department. Various safeguards would also be set up to prevent the use of trusteeships for exploitation of local unions and concentration of power.

Mr. KENNEDY has tried to draw a distinction between his reform bill and the larger task of overhauling the Taft-Hartley Act—a task which he promises to undertake later in the session, with the aid of a committee of experts. There is much to be said for this two-package approach. All the efforts of the last decade to achieve a comprehensive overhaul of Taft-Hartley have gone down to failure, carrying urgent reforms with them, although it must be remembered that the relatively mild Kennedy-Ives bill died in the House last year but this was partly because it was regarded as not strong enough.

In any event, Mr. KENNEDY has blurred the logic of his argument by including in his bill several Taft-Hartley changes that would normally go into the second bill. These are provisions to eliminate the no-man's land in the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board; to ease the bargaining problems in the construction industry; and to give replaced strikers the right to vote in representation elections. If these amendments are to remain in the bill, Secretary Mitchell will have a strong case for including also his proposed reforms dealing with blackmail picketing and abuse of the secondary boycott. The indications are that Senator MCCLELLAN will also introduce a bill including some of the stiffer reforms that Senator KENNEDY wishes to avoid.

Undoubtedly the two-package approach is more likely to result in prompt action. But when all the sweetening is added to the first package the incentive to load it also with the stiffer reforms becomes irresistible. We think Senator CASE of New Jersey is right in suggesting that the Taft-Hartley amendment be shifted to a second bill.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Jan. 29, 1959]

ONE TO ONE ON LABOR REFORM

President Eisenhower sought to contrast his complete and effective labor reform proposals with a piecemeal program (doubtless the Kennedy bill), but actually there is a striking similarity between the two. Eleven of the twenty points in the President's message to Congress yesterday are very similar to provisions of the Kennedy bill. Several other provisions of the rival programs are in partial agreement. It should not be difficult for the labor committees to write satisfactory legislation on the basis of these recommendations.

The areas of greatest agreement are on the reporting of labor union finances and procedures, the regulation of trusteeships, the requirement of secret-ballot elections, and the correction of several defects in the Taft-Hartley Act. Both programs would also eliminate the no-man's land in the regulation of collective bargaining. But the President would authorize the States to intervene in cases where the effect on interstate commerce is slight and the NLRB does not function. Senator KENNEDY would direct the NLRB to assert its full jurisdiction, except that it might relinquish local cases to State agencies operating under laws similar to the NLRB.

The major differences between the two proposals lie in their treatment of picketing and secondary boycotts. The Kennedy bill would outlaw shakedown picketing—the use of pickets to extort payoffs from employers. The President would strike at all varieties of blackmail picketing with the general objective of preventing unions from coercing employers beyond the scope of legal and legitimate collective bargaining. This is a favorite weapon of the Teamsters Union. It has been widely used in support of racketeering, and we think the President is right in saying that provisions against it belong in the antiracketeering bill.

It is also clear that the Taft-Hartley Act provisions on secondary boycotts need to be overhauled. The existing experimental provisions leave unions free to coerce and destroy employers who are not engaged in any labor dispute. There is danger, however, that if Congress brings this controversial item into the antiracketeering bill the whole measure may again go into the discard instead of onto the legislative books. The first consideration should be the enactment of an effective reform bill, and this means it must be acceptable to a majority in both Houses as well as to the President.

The next step might well be an attempt to agree on what should go into the initial reform bill and what should be left for later discussion. The administration could give up its demand for a single bill in return for assurance by the congressional leaders that a second labor bill devoted chiefly to changes in the Taft-Hartley Act would be brought to a vote on the floors of both the Senate and House.

Certainly both sides will have to yield in some measure if the national demand for reform legislation in this sphere is to be met. One item that the administration ought to abandon in any event is the meaningless and mischevious gesture of extending the non-Communist oath required of union leaders to employers as well. On his part Senator KENNEDY could greatly enhance the attractiveness of his two-package approach by confining the first "package" to the most urgent anti-racketeering reforms and leaving to the second "package" the sweetening (Taft-Hartley changes sought by organized labor) which properly belongs with a more detailed overhaul of the existing law.

LABOR UNION REFORM BILLS

[From the New York Times, Jan. 30, 1959]

The overwhelming demand of the public, supported by the AFL–CIO that dictation and corruption by union officials be outlawed in this country may now be thwarted again by partisan politics and irrelevant issues. Two competing measures are now before Congress, where there should be only one—and a bipartisan one at that. They are the Kennedy bill, cosponsored by 11 other Democratic Senators, and the bill introduced by Republican Senator GOLDWATER, based on the President's labor message to Congress.

But a striking feature of these bills is their wide agreement on ways to democratize and purify unions. Both require full reporting and disclosure, policed by the Secretary of Labor, on such matters as organization and governing procedures, financial operations and transactions that involve a conflict of interest. Both require the administration of union funds soley in the interests of the members, backed by punitive sanctions. Both call for a secret ballot, free of coercion, in periodic elections of officers; freedom to run for office, with a ban on the use of union funds to support any candidate, and minimum standards for trusteeships of local bodies. Incidentally, why not require a majority vote of all members involved to validate a strike?

Bipartisan support for a measure along these lines should not be too difficult to mobilize. The main trouble is that the two bills differ widely—both as to what is in them and what is left out—in such matters as picketing, secondary boycotts and the jurisdiction and operation of the National Labor Relations Board, which call for amendments to the Taft-Hartley law. And not only are the differences between the bills extremely hard to reconcile, but the problems they deal with are controversial in themselves—which intensifies the differences.

But, after all, these are matters that primarily involve the power and external relations of labor unions, not how they manage their own affairs. Doesn't this mean that amendments to the Taft-Hartley law should be made through a separate and carefully considered, overall measure? They seem like excess baggage which might well be temporarily jettisoned now for the sake of reaching the main and immediate objective: greater democracy, honesty and efficiency within American labor unions.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 30, 1959]

IN THE NATION—PROSPECT OF COMPREHENSIVE LABOR BILL

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 29.—Democratic Senators KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and ERVIN, of North Carolina, have offered to Members of Congress an easier solution than the administration's of a political problem very common at the Capitol. This problem is, how to respond to the public need and the promptings of conscience for some legislative curbs on union labor at this session without incurring the resentment of labor leaders who can express it effectively at the polls.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill strikes at many, though not all, of the roots of union corruption, with legislative correctives which cannot be either safely or soundly opposed by labor leaders. The administration measure does this also, perhaps a little deeper. But it includes curbs on flagrant misuses of organized labor's special political power, such as the secondary boycott, that have been widely employed to nullify the Bill of Rights.

THE OPPOSING CONCEPTS

These are omitted in the Kennedy-Ervin bill on this representation: (1) The paramount necessity of American society is to penalize the appalling union corruption which has been revealed by the McClellan committee of the Senate; (2) amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, which the administration measure proposes with respect to secondary boycotts, should, as a matter of parliamentary strategy, be dealt with in a separate bill because they are controversial; (3) if these are combined with the anti-corruption curbs, opposition will be invoked that may result in no labor legislation at all at this session.

The opposing concept of the administration bill is this: (1) Corrective labor legislation is very difficult to attain anyhow, particularly in a Congress composed of many members who attribute their elections to union support; (2) if two separate legislative packages are submitted, No. 2, because it wil ideal with industrial controversies, including the secondary boycott, will have far less chance of passage than if combined with No. 1, which is generally endorsed by labor, management, and the public.

WEAKNESSES IN KENNEDY BILL

Senator KENNEDY's position has several weaknesses. Although he would separately legislate Taft-Hartley amendments, his bill includes a few. These are all favored by organized labor, and may fairly be classified as "sweetening" of the anticorruption dose on the evidence of a statement by a labor witness before the subcommittee yesterday. He said that, if these amendments are stripped from the Kennedy-Ervin bill, his group would certainly reconsider its support of the remainder. The third weakness is implicit in the much milder correctives

of blackmail picketing in his measure as contrasted with those proposed by the administration. Finally, the long stalemate in Congress on basic labor correctives makes an unpromising prospect for a separate and deferred measure on which powerful union leaders could and would concentrate their attack.

If this opposition prevailed at the current session, only the most naive could expect it to be overcome at the next, which will occur in the presidential election year.

SHORTCOMINGS NOT EXCLUSIVE

The weaknesses in the administration's draft are also patent. The fundamental source of the excessive power of union labor in the economy is its special group immunity from the antitrust laws. A basic source of its political power are the devices with which unions circumvent the Federal law that forbids them to use their funds as political contributions. The administration bill ventures no correction of either.

There is, of course, a practical consideration which supports the Kennedy-Ervin approach. This is that any progress toward curbs of the excessive power of the unions is worth making; that the Kennedy-Ervin measure provides this, will surely be approved, but may fail if amending it as the administration proposes leaves organized labor with the choice between all or none.

This consideration appeals to many Members of Congress who cannot be fairly accused of timidity or tagged as pawns of the unions. And naturally it appeals to others: Those for whom it is politically safe to vote for the Kennedy-Ervin bill but not for the administration supplements; and those who, welcoming progress in the field of industrial relations, sincerely oppose the curbs in the administration's draft.

Need for Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent column by Mr. Victor Riesel. This column gives a convincing demonstration of the need for action this year by the Congress on a bill such as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and I have introduced.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON.—Miami's sunny real estate has not seen its last tycoon. A fellow by the name of Jim Hoffa has just put $4 million into the refurbishing of the Everglades, a residential hotel on the mainland. It is some distance from the Gold Coast's motel row where the Teamsters already have put $1,250,000 into a sandlot drive-in palace called the Castaways. All this is atop some $4 million in a west coast housing project and some $12 million in million dollar deposits in as many Midwest banks.

So when Senator JOHN KENNEDY says he has a law to put Hoffa out of business—it's a pretty big business, for there are other millions I've not listed here and tens of millions more in welfare funds still available. Some experts put these funds at a billion dollars for Hoffa's dollar diplomacy.

But Senator KENNEDY's proposals are big enough to contain even Hoffa.

This antiracketeering bill will get more kicking around than an English soccer ball. But if it survives as the minimum law we, the people, get this year, this is how KENNEDY believes the public can win this final conflict:

There are nine main assaults on racketeering. KENNEDY's most dramatic proposal calls for the summary dismissal of all exconvicts from their union posts. This means that any union leader anywhere with a long police sheet which has a conviction for arson, larceny, extortion, narcotics pushing, mayhem, or any other major crime must be dropped from his post the moment the Kennedy bill becomes law. If the ex-convict stays in office, the Justice Department can automatically move in, demand his ejection and bring criminal proceedings against the union leaders. The union itself can also be fined heavily.

No union official ever will be able to draw dues money for yachts, homes or major items like convention hotel bills without everybody getting a real X-ray look at his personal accounts. Kennedy's bill calls for full public disclosure of all salaries, expenses and other disbursements of every single official and employee who receives more than $7,000 annually from a union. This will include virtually every paid national and local labor leader.

In the past, the looting crowd has been able to cover up by passing bylaws enabling leaders to hide or destroy union books each year. If the Kennedy bill passes, it will be a Federal offense, punishable by a 5-year jail term and heavy fine, to steal, deface or destroy union records.

Believe it or not, embezzlement of union funds is not a Federal offense. Under this bill, it will be illegal to steal union funds. That's progress. Imagine having to fight to pass such a law in the Congress of the United States.

Under the bill, the rank and file can go into a State or Federal court and sue the till thieves for recovery of union money even if the union itself does not act to recover the stolen funds. This means that a rank-and-file committee can ask the court to turn boats, cars, country homes, furniture, and even clothing back to the union if officials simply paid for the comforts out of "expense" accounts or just lifted union dues.

There are other powers for the rank and file. If they believe there's been a crooked election, the bill gives them the right to ask the Secretary of Labor of the United States to investigate. He would have subpena powers. He could seize all records affecting the election (any records for that matter). He would then have the right to set the election aside—whether a local or an international union was involved.

The proposed law would give him the power to call new elections. He could see to it that no intricate union statute kept any member from voting or running for office so long as his dues were paid on any day of the month, not just on the first of each month as is called for in the Teamster bylaws.

There are six specific rules against any union official, who earns more than $5,000 a year, buying into companies which deal with his labor outfit, thus causing a conflict of interest. There are proposals against union loans to officials of more than $1,500; proposals against employer loans to union men, and proposals against the use of picket lines for extortion.

If we, the people, get all this written into law this year, some of our heartaches will have been worthwhile.

The West Puts Its Brand on Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as all of us know, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] is one of this Nation's most capable writers, as well as one of the most able and conscientious Members of the Senate.

Further proof of the Senator's perceptiveness as a writer appeared yesterday in the New York Times magazine, which published Senator NEUBERGER's article entitled, "The West Puts Its Brand on Congress."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Senator NEUBERGER's article, from the February 1 issue of the New York Times magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WEST PUTS ITS BRAND ON CONGRESS—SOMETHING NEW HAS BEEN ADDED TO POLITICS: THE PRESTIGE AND POWER OF THE FAST-GROWING WEST.

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

After he had sent Lewis and Clark on that first westward trek across our land, Thomas Jefferson visioned a vast commercial empire in the realm the great explorers had discovered. Their reports to him told of virtually limitless riches in pelts, timber, fisheries, deep harbors, minerals, and valleys ripe for homesteading. And so Jefferson foresaw for the American West a mighty role in the burgeoning nation. Yet it is doubtful that even our buoyant third President, with his dreams of Western expansion and success, could have imagined the influence and prestige that the West holds in the nascent 86th Congress—and will hold perhaps in the sessions of Congress for many years to come.

Two factors have combined to make the West far more prominent and influential on Capitol Hill than ever before. One is a national migration that has moved steadily and inexorably toward the sunset rim of the continent during the past 2 decades. The other is a renewal, after a hiatus of almost half a century, of the historic process of adding States to the Union.

But what is the West? After all, a place as rooted in the East as the University of Michigan has an alma-mater song that refers to its athletes as the champions of the West. By comparison, Capt. Meriwether Lewis, on his journey of high destiny, felt he had reached the real West when he glimpsed peaks nearly 3 miles high notching the distant horizon. The West has been defined more explicitly by one of its foremost chroniclers, the late Bernard DeVoto, as "the huge and fateful area extending from the eastern ramparts of the Rocky Mountains to the shores of the Pacific Ocean."

Today this area consists of twelve immense States—Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Idaho, Nevada, California, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska—covering nearly half the land mass of the Nation. It includes teeming metropolis and lonely upland in its span from ocean strand to glacial summit.

Alaska, of course, is the latest addition—the first new State since Arizona was admitted in 1912. Inevitably the next new

State, and probably soon, will be Hawaii. Its admission to the Union will change the geographic definition of the West, but it will assuredly be considered part of the West, especially since its shares many of the social dilemmas and climatic and crop conditions of its principal contact on the mainland, California.

The political growth of the new West can be seen at its sharpest in the House of Representatives. Between 1940 and 1950, the West gained eight seats in the House because of population increases. People are traveling westward to operate aircraft plants, to staff military bases, and to produce and test the original atomic weapons. According to the latest estimates from the Bureau of Census, the West will qualify for an additional nine Representatives when the next congressional reapportionment occurs in 1960. Most of these will accrue to California, which in recent years has passed Illinois, Ohio, and even Pennsylvania in population, and by 1965 is expected to challenge New York's supremacy as the most populous State in the Union.

As for the Senate, the West now occupies 24 out of the 98 seats. When Hawaii becomes a State, western membership will increase to 26 out of 100. This will mean, for example, that western Senators will outnumber those of the Solid South by eight.

What will the new West do with its aggregate of political power? Will it act as a bloc? Is there, for example, a western stereotype in the Senate, as we have come to think of one for the Senators from the South and even the East?

Mention of southern politicians often conjures up pictures of men hostile to civil rights legislation, proud of the TVA, fervently in favor of price supports on cotton and tobacco, and proficient at dramatic and flowery oratory. The typical Member of Congress from one of the great cities of the East is regarded as an ardent sponsor of civil rights, an opponent of restrictive immigration laws, and frequently friendly to such broad causes as urban renewal and public housing.

Western Senators, however, cannot be so easily characterized. They share no uniformity of experience or antecedents or political views. The two new Members from the fledgling State of Alaska, to cite a case in point, are E. L. BARTLETT, a former prospector for gold in Alaska's foaming creeks, and ERNEST GRUENING, a former editor of newspapers and magazines in New York City. Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, known as the silent Senator, rarely speaks from the floor, while Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, is famous for his feats of oratorical endurance.

The very name Montana creates visions of cowpokes and six-shooting frontier sheriffs, but Montana's popular junior Senator, MIKE MANSFIELD, is a former professor of oriental history who specializes in scholarly studies of foreign policy. The West claims the Senator of longest tenure, HAYDEN, now in his sixth successive term, and the Senator of youngest age, FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, 34.

Western Senators include Protestants, Catholics, Mormons, and Jews. They range from Arizona's BARRY GOLDWATER, critic of labor unions, to JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, their defender; from WALLACE F. BENNETT, of Utah, foe of public power, to Washington's HENRY M. JACKSON, its advocate; from WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington, proponent of 90-percent price supports on basic crops, to CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, an adherent of the flexible scale for farm commodities. While Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, warns against business monopolies, Senator GORDON ALLOTT, of neighboring Colorado, calls for Federal action to suppress monopolies in organized labor.

There is no clear western position on civil rights, one of the most heatedly discussed issues of our era. This was evident during the bitter Senate debate in the summer of 1957 when southerners succeeded in having a crippling jury-trial amendment added to legislation which sought to assure southern Negroes access to the ballot box. Twelve of the twenty-two Senators then from the West answered to their names in favor of the amendment, while 10 western Senators opposed it.

Not even on such a regional issue as the great water-power site at Hells Canyon, along the Oregon-Idaho border, is a so-called Western viewpoint discernible. Every Democratic Senator from the West voted for Federal development of the mile-deep chasm; all the West's Republican Senators favored a private utility company. This was almost exactly the same partisan division that prevailed on the issue among Senators from other parts of the country.

The West's sheer immensity and geographic and economic diversity prevent a monolithic point of view. A Senator from Los Angeles or Portland has totally different pressures upon him from those affecting a Senator from Pocatello or Carson City. As a member of Oregon's Legislature, I had sponsored one of the early State fair employment practices acts in the Nation. But in the Senate I soon discovered that some of my colleagues from other Western States—particularly those from the States that lie behind the battlements of lofty mountain ranges—had had little or no local experience with this issue.

A Senator from California, where thrive such specialty crops as lettuce and asparagus and citrus fruits, thinks differently on agricultural matters from a Senator whose home is Montana, where upland wheat and other grains are the all-important farm commodities. In the Southwest the fundamental problem is lack of water for drinking and irrigation, but in the Northwest flood-control projects are needed to hold back the Columbia's rampant freshets.

In the vital realm of foreign policy, the West is riven by many points of view. Geographical diversity is a factor here, too. Some of the world's finest harbors dot the Pacific seaboard—Puget Sound, the mouth of the Columbia River, San Francisco Bay, San Pedro Bay. Congressmen from these areas are receptive to reciprocal trade. They know that accelerated overseas commerce means jobs for their stevedores, sailors, and warehousemen. They support foreign aid and other instruments of internationalism.

On the other side of the trade issue, representatives of the mountain States are often conscious of the economic impact of imports on the ores, sugar beets, and finished minerals produced by their constituents. During the last session of Congress, the administration proposed generous subsidies for certain ores such as lead and zinc in an effort to win the support of some western Senators for continuation of the reciprocal trade program.

It has been regarded as inevitable that the West's increasing strength in Congress will bring about a dilution of the great political power long wielded there by the South. The only challenge to southern domination of Senate committees, through the holding of key chairmanships, comes from western Senators of lengthy service such as HAYDEN, of Arizona, and MURRAY, of Montana. Nor can it be overlooked that the President pro tempore of the Senate is not a southerner but Mr. HAYDEN, who first came to Capitol Hill as a House Member almost 47 years ago. No southerner would think of challenging him for this honor.

Yet westerners and southerners are not necessarily arch rivals, as some seem to assume. If there is a prevailing western viewpoint on economics, it is that too much of the country's manufacturing is concentrated in a few Eastern States. The South shares this attitude. Despite the financial vigor of the California colossus, the West in general needs new industrial payrolls; so does the South. Too many of the West's natural resources are hauled out as raw materials, rather than processed by native industries. The South murmurs against the same inequity.

Oregon's timber industry complains that the structure of national freight rates tends to make prohibitive the local manufacture of lumber into finished products. Southern sawmill owners voice an identical protest. A Western Democratic Senator, looking at the swift reaches of the Columbia and Colorado Rivers, has many of the same thoughts as his Democratic colleague from the realm of the Tennessee and its surging tributaries; each hopes that cheap kilowatts in abundance will lure new manufacturing payrolls to his State.

Thus, the expanding strength of the West in Congress may not be so distressing to the long-dominant South as has been predicted, particularly in the field of economic legislation.

Despite the lack of a Western stereotype, are there some policies which Congressmen from the West may be expected to promote with special diligence? I would say such issues fall into a few categories:

1. Water. During the past quarter of a century, the Federal Government has spent more than $10 billion to develop Western water resource projects. This pace will probably be accelerated in view of the West's new numerical strength—although Western Republicans and Democrats may continue to split over the question of Federal powerplants versus private-utility dams.

2. Recreation. The West is the scene of many of the country's outdoor marvels—Yosemite, the Grand Canyon, Crater Lake, Yellowstone, Mount Rainier, and Mount Hood—and tourist trade is a key part of the economy of most Western States. Westerners in Congress are certain to unite behind requests for additional appropriations to be spent in the national parks and national forests.

3. Transportation. The West needs better roads, especially in its sparsely settled farming and timber areas. Western Members of Congress will favor acceleration of the Federal aid program on interstate and secondary highways.

4. Hemisphere relations. The West is highly conscious of its neighbors on the North American continent. Mexico shares tourists, rivers, and wetback migratory laborers with such border states as California, New Mexico, and Arizona. Off to the north, Oregon and Washington and Montana seek a mutual agreement with Canada for joint use of the still untapped Columbia River water power. Alaska's Senators desire a similar pact on the Yukon.

5. Credit and monetary policy. Tight money has not been popular in the West. Traditionally, the West has sought low interest rates in order to encourage expansion. Residential housing, crucial to the logging and lumber industries of the Pacific Northwest and northern California, relies on abundant and cheap credit. Higher rates of interest contribute to more expensive public works projects. All of these things may make the West a factor in opposing tighter Federal controls over interest and credit.

Despite these common causes, western Senators and Representatives enjoy a far wider latitude on major issues than do their counterparts from other regions, who are often blocked by local prejudices and conclusions. Elections in the South and East can turn for or against a candidate on a single issue. I do not know of any one political question that alone could determine the fate of a major candidate in a Western State.

The West is, in effect, a genuine third force in the Congress, capable of entering new alliances and adopting untried positions. Its

bargaining power is enormous if only because its allegiance cannot be forecast. In the elections of 1958 westerners triumphed who advocated a firm stand on Quemoy and Matsu, but so did those who called for recognition of Red China.

As the newest American region (I have talked with pioneers who remember the Indian wars), it perhaps is fitting that the West is the least strapped by political straitjackets. When the West is older, its ideas will jell and harden; strong voting blocs may materialize; spokesmen in Senate and House may be handcuffed by phobias. But now the West is young.

Statement by Chief Justice of the New Jersey Sup.eme Court, on Recent Resolution of the Chief Justices Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a recent resolution of the Chief Justices Association condemning the Supreme Court, which was passed in Pasadena, Calif., August 23, 1958, has caused considerable comment. I believe the views stated by Chief Justice Weintraub, of the New Jersey Supreme Court, will be of interest to the entire Senate. I ask unanimous consent that these views be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chief Justice DETHMERS. The Chair recognizes Chief Justice Weintraub, of New Jersey.

Chief Justice WEINTRAUB. Mr. Chairman and members of the conference, I am confident that every member of this conference has carefully considered this important resolution and has reached, as I have, a firm view with respect to it. I sense that the resolution will attract a spanking majority. I doubt that extended debate will add very much. I speak simply because, in the light of the importance of the matter, I should state the reasons why I cannot join in the resolution. May I say to members of the committee who prepared the report that my difference of view certainly does not suggest any personal criticism. I am just one lawyer differing with another.

I place no institution, office, or public official beyond full and frank public criticism. Nor do I question the right of any member of this conference, at least in his capacity of private citizen, to express his disagreement with the work of the Supreme Court. But I do question the wisdom, and indeed the propriety, of a joint pronouncement by this conference of Chief Justices, assembled as it is in an official or quasi-official capacity. I doubt that it is within the proper function of this conference to issue what in essence is a blast, devoid of any specific recommendation as to any specific matter. More importantly, in my judgment, the criticism and characterizations in the report are unwarranted.

As I read the report it laments the readjustment of power and authority between the National Government and the States and then belabors the Supreme Court for its role in the process.

I agree that John Marshall would be astounded by the present scene. This, I believe, is most fortunate, because if the present scene were such as to appear at all familiar to him, our Nation would be a third- or fourth-rate power, if indeed it would exist at all. The report itself acknowledges the inexorable sweep of scientific and economic events which have dictated the readjustment of responsibility and power, events which have led the States themselves to look to Federal authority for the solution of problems beyond their abilities.

I am sure that if the Federal Government would abandon its many programs of local assistance and release to the States the sources of revenue gathered for those purposes, my little State—small in acreage but large in population, industry, and tax remittance to Washington—would profit greatly. Yet I would not urge so provincial a view, because the welfare of the several States and Territories is single and indivisible. For the same reason, in all matters involving the relationship between the Nation and State, the rights of a single State must yield to Federal needs. And for the same reason, in international matters it is today unthinkable that any State may possess the power to pursue a course of action or inaction which may embarrass or jeopardize the well-being of the entire Nation.

Such is the background against which the Supreme Court must resolve the issues before it. Its horizon is different from ours. We may lament the course of history and even weep in its wake, but let us not suppose that we can, by resolution, stay the current of events.

The report assails decisions of the Supreme Court in two areas: interpretation of acts of Congress and interpretation of Constitution, especially the 14th amendment.

The report cites a number of decisions as to many of which it is adversely critical.

I assume it is not intended to obtain a vote in this conference upon each of those decisions. I should be surprised if some 50 justices could, upon careful consideration, be unanimous as to any of those decisions and I would be amazed if unanimity were achieved as to the basketful. And although each of us might venture a curbstone view with respect to the cases cited, I doubt that we would assume responsibility for a public pronouncement without consideration of the record, briefs and arguments presented in each case. We would want the benefit of the same material with which the Supreme Court was favored in those matters.

Hence we can only deal with the generalized conclusions and criticisms which appear in the closing portion of the report.

With respect to the interpretation of acts of Congress, the Supreme Court is contending with a well-known phenomenon, legislative ambiguity. I think it enough to say that if the Court has incorrectly divined the legislative intent, correction is within the easy reach of the authors of the ambiguity.

As to its work in the interpretation of the Constitution, we may of course readily disagree. But our disagreement should be tempered by our understanding of the inherent difficulties of the constitutional interpretive process. It would hardly be a justifiable criticism to say the Supreme Court engages in a process of evaluation and judgment. The Constitution does not offer a literal, definitive answer to the awesome problems which confront the Court. One may read the commerce clause, the due process clause, the equal protection clause, a thousand times and still not detect the slightest clue to the proper decision. The answer must be found elsewhere. The constitutional framework, as we all know, is a mere skeleton expression of governmental power and individual rights. The actual contours of those powers and rights must be determined in the context of changing conditions, by a process which is more than a mere mechanical application of a constitutional phrase to a set of facts.

We may of course disagree with the nine gentlemen at Washington. Lawyers have always disagreed with each other and always will. But while we may register disagreement, we cannot justly impute to members of the Supreme Court anything less than conscientious devotion to duty as they see it.

And hence I disapprove strongly of what to me is the essense of the report—the charge that the Justices of the Supreme Court have violated the duty of judicial self-restraint in constitutional areas, the suggestion that their behavior has been such as to raise considerable doubt that we remain a government of laws and not of men. I have no doubt whatever that the Justices are men of conscience and honor, that they respect the rule of law, that none would set himself above the law or seek to arrogate power or responsibility which he believes is not his.

It is one thing for a judge to say that he disagrees with another; it is something else to impute to that other a violation of the basic standards of judicial behavior. I find no bill of particulars within the report which in my view supports the charge and I know of no facts that would sustain it.

I think it unfortunate that the prestige of the conference of Chief Justices should be placed behind so serious an indictment. I think it unfortunate that there should emanate from this conference a document which will surely be misunderstood and so readily lends itself to misuse by anyone who tilts with the Federal Government. Any man or group of men who choose to place themselves above constituted authority or to flout basic rights as the Supreme Court authoritatively finds them to be, will surely claim comfort and support in the sweeping reflection upon the Supreme Court in the report.

Reduction of Ferry Fare Increases Granted to Erie-Lackawanna-New Jersey & New York Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the township committee of West Milford, N.J., concerning reduction of ferry fares granted to the Erie-Lackawanna-New Jersey & New York lines.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is at present pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission, under dockets Nos. 32840 and 32532, applications for the reduction of ferry fare increases granted the Erie-Lackawanna-New Jersey & New York lines; and

Whereas it is to the best interest of citizens of the township of West Milford in the county of Passaic that said ferry fare increase be reduced: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the township committee go on record as petitioning the Interstate Com-

merce Commission by this resolution to grant the reductions requested.

Introduced January 2, 1959.

Approved January 2, 1959.

CHESTER A. PULIA,
Mayor.

Attest:

GEORGE F. ECKHARDT, JR.,
Township Clerk.

No Double Standard in Code of Ethics—Philadelphia Inquirer Commends Senator Keating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Philadelphia Inquirer has published a thoughtful editorial about a measure introduced by the junior Senator from New York. It was a personal pleasure for me to read these comments about my longtime colleague. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO DOUBLE STANDARD IN CODE OF ETHICS

Most Congressmen are strong for a code of ethics—for others. They favor regulatory measures to curb influence peddling—so long as they are not included.

That's why we think the move to enact legislation on ethical practices in Government, though badly needed, won't get far in the 86th Congress.

It isn't that the majority of Members of the House and Senate are involved in backstairs deals in favoritism. They just don't like having this sort of law aimed at them.

The newest effort to set up a real Government code of ethics is about to come up for hearings before the House Antitrust Committee. It would apply to all officials and employees in the executive branch and to persons doing business with the Government.

The proposed code would provide for dismissal of Federal employees and cancellation of Government contracts, loans, grants, or permits for violation of its provisions. It is plain that the Bernard Goldfine-Sherman Adams-vicuna coat theme has figured in some of the Committee's deliberations.

But Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, New York Republican, says this isn't enough and we agree with him. He urges legislation barring Congressmen from using their official position to obtain unwarranted privileges or exemptions.

It is right and proper to prohibit influence peddling with the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission and all myriad agencies of the Government. Why, then, should not Members of Congress, some of whom have been revealed as parties to influence deals, be included?

As KEATING says, "We cannot afford to take a holier than thou attitude. There should be no double standard in Government morality."

Senator KEATING is exactly right and we hope he sticks to this line. Let us have a code of ethics that covers all the Government agencies and those who do business with them—and, in addition, all Members of House and Senate.

A Commendation of the Texas Board of Education by the Houston Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Texas Board of Education has approved that State's participation in the new National Defense Education Act program.

The board acted on the recommendation of the Hale-Aikin School Study Committee, which last October reversed an earlier decision, and recommended that Texas participate in the new program. I praised the committee's decision at that time and I now highly praise the action of the board.

I had the privilege of being a coauthor of this National Defense Education Act, which provides for loan scholarships, teacher institutes, college fellowships, stepped-up vocational education program and other aids aimed at overcoming America's lag in some educational fields.

From students came sputniks, from education came Explorers. Today's pupils will plan tomorrow's peace.

Mr. President, as a further extension of my remarks, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in one of Texas' finest daily papers, the Houston Post, for Monday, January 12, 1959, under the heading "Defense Education Plan Approved." The Houston Post has served the cause of education well. It has crusaded to improve Houston's public schools; it has supported school lunch and vocational educational programs, and has now endorsed Texas participation under the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE EDUCATION PLAN APPROVED

The State board of education has acted wisely in approving participation by Texas in the new National Defense Educational Act program despite personal dislike for Federal aid to education by some members of the board.

The board's action is permissive. The final decision on participation is left to the individual school districts. Those that wish to receive Federal Government aid may do so and those that prefer to do without it are not required to take the proffered money. Congress has authorized the allotment of $8,893,152 to this State for various phases of the national defense education program.

Jack Binion, Houston attorney, who headed a board committee on Texas' participation, said he thought the Government is trying to do something good for the country through the aid to education program. He commented that he had not noticed the people of the State breaking their necks to raise teachers' salaries or to spend money for educational improvements, although educational improvement is generally favored.

The major fear of those who oppose Federal aid to education is that it may lead to Federal control of education. Binion pointed out that Texas already is getting Federal aid by the millions and their is no Federal control.

The board's action was in line with its policy of allowing local districts to operate their schools with the least possible State control. For those districts which want the Federal aid, the board will act only as intermediary in obtaining and disbursing it. The money should be of great help to school districts which cannot now afford adequate science courses.

The World Is Adopting America's System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the observation that Russia and other Socialist-type countries have been adopting the American system has been made by many writers in recent years. The ably edited Columbia (S.C.) Record reiterates this in one of its January 30 editorials, entitled "World Is Adopting America's System."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD IS ADOPTING AMERICA'S SYSTEM

Enterprise all over the world is increasing and improving. And most of it is in the pattern of the world's most successful enterprising Nation, the United States of America.

It is virtuous to welcome and commend such progress outside of the United States, but it would be naive and shortsighted to overlook the certainty that this worldwide enterprise will have a strong impact upon our own.

The United States is already finding itself in an international competitive situation which is markedly different from that in which we, for so long, were so much ahead in productive and distributive enterprise. Our competitors were limited to only a few nations, even the best of which rated below us.

Now Arthur Larson, a former White House aid, has written a book on the subject entitled "What We Are For," portions of which appear in the current issue of Fortune magazine.

Mr. Larson has given this world economic awakening a name—enterprise democracy. He says it is being applied even in Soviet Russia, and that in recent years people everywhere "have been moving in the direction of what we are for." Mr. Larson reports an inevitable development of such enterprise in Russia. The Soviet leaders were compelled to adopt private enterprise methods and incentives to increase their lagging production. And he also reports that in the sciences the Russian leadership has found that freedom of thought, ordinarily poison to Communists, is essential.

"Not only freedom of thought," Mr. Larson writes, "but also independent economic power will continue to grow in the Soviet Union. Eventually we may see the crucial combination—substantial economic power joining political power—in the hands of large numbers of individuals with independent ideas, and the ingredients of evolutionary

change toward a freer regime will be at hand."

There is good and bad news in this forecast by Mr. Larson. A joining of the sort of political power which exists in Russia today with increased production could create a force perilous to the whole world. But if Mr. Larson should be right in his prediction that it would mean a beginning for a freer regime, that could conceivably be good news.

In any event, the United States may be facing such competition from the spread of its own process, enterprise democracy, as to have formidable effect in this country.

The race is on, and the most encouraging factor on our side is that our team is deeper and more experienced in the know-how of enterprise democracy.

Even more critical would be some basic change in our system, such as too much nationalization, as to set us back in our own successful formula for enterprise and success. That could possibly mean others would proceed, with our own idea, while we would be denied its full force. Nationalization is the opposite of free enterprise.

The Missile Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial and an article by Joseph Alsop which appeared in the Washington Post on Monday, February 2, relating to the current missile controversy. Both pieces contain some sharp observations regarding the administration's unrealisic attitude on the missile gap. I ask unanimous consent to have these items printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSILES BY THE NUMBERS

The testimony of Secretary McElroy and other defense officials about the country's missile preparedness would be more impressive if there were not unhappy memories of very similar arguments nearly a decade ago. For budgetary reasons the administration is proposing a missile program that in future numbers will fall far behind the Soviet capability, with the explanation that a balance of delivery methods will assure American superiority. Much of the same sort of case was made for the $12.5 billion defense budget on the eve of the Korean war.

Now, to be sure, there is a vast difference between a $12.5 billion budget and the $41 billion proposed for the next fiscal year. A number of able and sincere men have devoted their energies to weighing the various demands in the budget. They would not consciously sell the country short. Moreover, there is good evidence that American missile development, as contrasted with quantity production, is coming along well, even ahead of schedule. It is reassuring to learn that funds have been released to permit maximum work on the Air Force solid fuel Minuteman—though why this fact could not have been disclosed earlier is an unanswered question.

But fundamentally the defense program remains a big gamble. The validity of the decision to accept a possible 3–1 numerical lag behind the Soviet Union in intercontinental missiles depends upon the assumption that other means of delivery—intermediate missiles and strategic bombers—would not be neutralized and would be adequate to break through enemy defenses in the event of war. There seems to be a concerted effort to play down intelligence estimates of Soviet capabilities, particularly in intermediate missiles; and there seems to be an accompanying tendency to discount possible improvement of Soviet defenses. Recent history is unfortunately replete with instances in which this country has underestimated the Soviet Union.

Obviously, it would be presumptuous to say that one fixed sum would assure an adequate defense program and that anything short of it would be insufficient. The military power of the United States will be formidable by any analysis. Nevertheless, there is serious question whether a decision not to keep pace with the Soviet Union in certain basic elements of strength—plus the lack of any conspicuous effort to build up limited war forces—might not diminish the effectiveness of the deterrent and invite enemy risk taking in the future.

Some of this apprehension is detectable in the statements of members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Whereas the Chiefs agree that funds are sufficient for the next year, each member seems to have a reservation about the future. The cumulative effect of the failure now to provide for replacement of ships and planes and for modernization of the Army could sap future effectiveness. It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that security is being shaped to budgetary edicts instead of the budget being shaped to security requirements.

If the administration were investing heavily in other items related to the overall struggle there might be some justification for added risks in defense. A strong case can be made that, provided that the basic deterrent is maintained, the most pressing challenge is in economic development for the emergent countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. But here too budgetary myopia afflicts the program.

The new mutual security report for the first time breaks down economic aid country by country. It emphasizes how pathetically inadequate have been American efforts in areas of the greatest challenge. Yet the administration has been unwilling to ask for long-term capitalization of the Development Loan Fund and has cut back its own recommendations. There is no attempt to ask for even 1 percent of the American gross national product for economic help, although this is a bare minimum. To do less than enough to make possible an economic breakthrough in countries like India is to engage, really, in waste.

It would be wrong to accuse the administration of lack of faith. It has altogether too much faith of the wrong kind—a sort of Micawberish hope that something will turn up and things will come out all right. What is lacking is another kind of faith, faith in the maturity of the American people to accept the hard facts of the challenge and willingness to respond to leadership in approving the measures, including more taxes if necessary, to assure that the country will do what it is capable of doing.

THE MCELROY GOSPEL

(By Joseph Alsop)

By studying last week's testimony by the Defense Department leaders as scholars study the Bible, you can now discover the strange mainsprings of the Eisenhower administration's decision to accept inferiority to the Soviets in ballistic missiles.

The clue to the mystery lies in budget pressures, plus the great difference between the liquid-fueled missiles the first generation and the solid-fueled missiles of the next generation.

In brief, liquid-fueled ballistic missiles cannot be kept fully ready to fire. Their minimum reaction time is a quarter of an hour or rather more. Even by maintaining a costly fuel alert, in other words, these missiles cannot be fired within less than 15 minutes of the first warning of the enemy's attack. Because of the same fueling problem, bases for these missiles are also very costly. The expense is further increased by a wide margin, if the bases are "hardened" in order to protect the missiles on their pads against anything but a direct hit.

These characteristics make liquid-fueled IRBM's and ICBM's much more suitable for a nation that can attack first and by surprise, like the Soviet Union, than for a nation like the United States, that has vowed not to attack first. If the necessary money is spent to disperse and "harden" the launching sites, liquid-fueled Atlases and Titans in sufficient quantity can certainly even up the ICBM balance between this country and the Soviet Union. But Atlas and Titan are interim weapons, which will certainly have to be replaced as soon as possible.

The planned replacement is the solid-fueled Minuteman missile. Minuteman will hardly be able to carry as heavy a warhead as the more powerful liquid-fueled Atlas and Titan. But the solid-fueled Minuteman missiles will be cheap to produce in quantity. Having built-in fuel, they will have zero reaction time and their launching sites can even be made mobile, for greater protection.

For the United States, therefore, the second generation of ICBM's is immensely preferable to the first generation, except for one tiny fact. Atlas missiles can be obtained now, and Titan missiles can be obtained soon. Minuteman missiles, in contrast, will hardly be available in operational quantities until 5 years from now, and the delay may be considerably greater than this.

All these facts are so important because the Eisenhower Defense Department has never been able to get used to the idea of disposable weapons. This is certainly odd, in a country that invented the disposable facial tissue, and in a Defense Department reshaped and still dominated by that great man, Charles E. Wilson, who is such a strong advocate of the disposable automobile. Nonetheless, Wilson also rebelled, and his successor, Neil McElroy, still rebels against the basic need to maintain force-in-being by purchasing weapons now that have to be replaced later.

This being the psychology, the Defense Department is buying very few liquid-fueled missiles now, and waiting to buy a lot of solid-fueled missiles later. The result, inevitably, is acceptance of heavy inferiority in missile striking power, at least until the distant date when the Minuteman missile will become available in quantity.

This lighthearted treatment of the missile gap has in turn been justified by two devices which would cost the greatest executive his job, if he used them while still in private business. In the first place, the missile gap has been made to seem very much less dangerous by comfortably downgrading the opposition. To be sure, the comfort of General Motors would not be long-lasting if General Motors' production and pricing policies were based on the belief that the people over at Ford were a bunch of slack-twisted incompetents. But this is the best parallel for the Defense Department method of judging Soviet missile capabilities.

In the second place, the dangers of the missile gap have been further obscured by the simple act of cooking the defense balance sheet. The comparatively useless IRBM's being sent to our NATO allies are counted on the balance sheet as major assets, the far more numerous and immeasurably more useful Soviet IRBM's are not

counted at all; or, if reluctantly mentioned under senatorial pressure, the Soviet IRBM's are not put down on the debit side of the balance sheet. Other examples of this interesting practice might also be cited.

If American newspapers would print something comparable to the grimmest Biblical commentary, chapter and verse could also be cited to prove all the foregoing that may seem incredible. But for present purposes, this is commentary enough on the McElroy gospel. It remains to examine the risk, the allegedly calculated risk to which the McElroy gospel exposes the United States and the free world.

The Mikoyan Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Facts Spotlight Mikoyan Hoax," written by George E. Sokolsky and published in the New York Journal-American of January 21, 1959.

I have placed this article in the RECORD as a further means of alerting the American people to be aware of the true aims and purposes of the Soviet propaganda campaigns of which the Mikoyan visit is an open move. The people of the United States need to be made constantly aware of the new Soviet offensive, which the Kremlin boldly states will bring about their control of the world without the need of a hot war or a cold war. I for one do not intend to stand idly by and witness any such eventuality.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS SPOTLIGHT MIKOYAN HOAX
(By George E. Sokolsky)

The Mikoyan hoax is bound to disclose itself because too many persons have willy-nilly become involved in it and therefore it is no longer secret that as far back as last November, the State Department was busily at work softening up small groups on a local level to be nice to Russians. There is also some evidence that Dag Hammarskjold was interested in the project and one wonders why he would interfere in the internal affairs of the United States or any State or city thereof. Hammarskjold is an alien here whose job is to run the United Nations which is an institution for speech cultivation situated on the East River in New York City. Beyond that he ought to mind his own business and when it is suggested that he approve or disapprove something in or about the United States, he is not minding his own business and his intervention is not appreciated.

Slowly the evidence is coming to me of the activities to have Americans meet Russians as a softening-up process, undoubtedly part of the people-to-people movement, except that involved were not people but a Russian official and soft-minded businessmen who for an eighth of a buck forget dignity, honor, and the glory of their flag. The Russians must be roaring with laughter at how they can take these people in, particularly those who arrange the special affairs and those who during November and December held private dinners in quiet places to be let into the secrets of grand diplomacy.

If Joe McCarthy were alive and heading a Senate committee, some of the arrangers of these parties would be summoned to explain their activities, but today, the Russians can play their games and nobody looks askance at improprieties, except perhaps John Foster Dulles who will have to transfer some personalities in the State Department from a soft desk in Washington to Mongolia or Tibet or some other uncomfortable place.

In a word, although we have been led to believe that Anastas Mikoyan came here as a tourist and walked about the streets for a day of two until he was recognized, it is now incontestable that as early as the first fortnight of November, arrangements were already being made to soften up Americans to welcome Russians with whom ordinarily these people do not associate.

WELL-PREPARED FUNCTIONS

The result in New York was seen in well-prepared dinners and luncheons and receptions for Anastas Mikoyan, none of which could have been arranged spontaneously on the scale and magnitude which the city witnessed.

The Economic Club of New York dinner, for instance, was held in the Grand Ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria. The seating list shows about 1,000 diners and gives the tables itemized all except tables 89 and 114 which are for "see information desk," probably for some who do not care for a permanent record of their attendance. The seating list shows who sat at each table, but does not diagram the dais, although that is usual custom. Their names do appear in the alphabetical list.

As I look through this list, I see no names of important public officials but the banks are numerous. For instance, the Bank of America had table 52; Bankers Trust Co., table 6; Hanover Bank, tables 22 and 23; Irving Trust Co., table 43; and so it went. General Dynamics Corp., which sells submarines and airplanes, had a table. There was a table for a Standard Oil Co., but it does not say which one. It could be that these banks and others who were present attend all Economic Club dinners. It could also be that some came out of curiosity to see what an Armenian bank robber become statesman looks like. But it cannot be, in the circumstances prevailing in New York, that this dinner appeared spontaneously without long and painstaking preparations.

It is not the dinner that is important; it is the attempted hoax on the American people that Mikoyan came as a tourist and had no other purpose than to look at his old friend known as Smiling Mike, the Russian Ambassador. That is untrue, and the proof that it is untrue is beginning to take form.

The Welfare Lullaby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there are many able editors of smalltown newspapers in South Carolina. One of these, Tom O'Connor, of the Allendale County Citizen, reprinted in his January 30, 1959, edition an editorial written by him 10 years ago, entitled "The Welfare Lullaby." This editorial is even more appropriate today than it was a decade ago, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WELFARE LULLABY
(By Tom O'Connor)

There has been a lot of talk lately of security, the protection of the people from want and care all through the days of their living. Plans are extant for systems of governments that promise to do just that. All, say the planners, shall be adequately fed, clothed, and housed, no matter what the circumstance. The fat shall get the same ration as the lean and the rich shall have no more than the poor.

Such systems sound fine on paper, but in practice, where they have been tried, they have led the people down unhappy roads to more want and more care than had been the lot of the sturdy individual pitting his wit and his strength against chance and destiny.

Many persons in this country today give promise of being advocates of such systems. The word security is on many lips, the dream of a life of freedom from the struggle for bread finds many adherents. Most overlook that it is a dream. A thing that fades with the dawn of reality. Most overlook these facts, the longing for security is immature, it is based on impossible premises, actually born in the childish game, "Suppose." With an equal share of everything no one has anything. Most business is founded on personal ambition and initiative, doomed under socialistic and welfare states of being.

With an incentive only to stand quietly in line to get the monthly welfare check, men soon deteriorate and the check is far from enough to supply the simplest wants of most men. What then is, and has been the outcome of these planned states? The answer is aggression. Unable to supply their people with needs for daily existence, the planners have had to reach out to take from others what they cannot provide with the best of plans.

Actually, there is no security. Perhaps Nature intended there should be none. Men are tired of the dog eat dog aspect of life. But until man becomes a creature far different from what he is today, the game of "Suppose" can best be left to the nursery, where the dreamers, with a certain sharp sense of reality, content themselves with what is at hand.

Until the day when man's material wants can be met without the aid of the plowshare, the lathe and the loom, and the saw, it should be the aim of man to better himself against the future betterment of his lot.

The social planners sing a lullaby, such as the wee ones sing when the day grows old and the comforting bottle is at hand. It sufficies for a while but even the children will be up and doing on the morrow. So, pray, shall we all.

Education and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, Admiral Rickover, who has already played an outstanding part in strengthening our

national defense, is now making a provocative contribution to the debate over the adequacy of our Nation's educational effort.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a review of Adm. H. G. Rickover's book, "Education and Freedom," by Arthur Bestor. This review appeared on page 1 of the New York Times Book Review of February 1, 1959.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW SHOULD WE RETOOL OUR SCHOOLS?—A HISTORIAN AGREES WITH ADMIRAL RICKOVER'S PROPOSALS

(By Arthur Bestor)

The problems of the world—today, our problems—will tomorrow be our children's problems. Are we equipping the younger generation to deal effectively with them? This is the central question in education—a perennial question, which every adult generation must, in a sense, answer anew, taking into account the changes that may have occurred in the nature of the world's problems.

In the great debate now going on over the adequacy of American education, both sides take off from this same starting point. Defenders and critics unite in believing that the public schools should prepare young men and women for the world in which they are going to live. The debate is over the kind of education that will do the job. Parents and citizens should keep the central issue in mind, for efforts are frequently made to obscure it.

Professional educationists in the United States often claim to be the only group interested in preparing young people for contemporary life, and they accuse their scientific and academic critics of wishing to turn back the clock. This completely misrepresents the position of those who are anxious to reemphasize intellectual discipline in the public schools. One of the most distinguished spokesmen for the latter point of view, Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, states the matter with complete clarity in his latest book, "Education and Freedom." Through "bitter disappointment," he writes, we have come "to the realization that America's predominant educational philosophy is as hopelessly outdated today as the horse and buggy."

The educational philosophy that Admiral Rickover considers outdated is the one that takes life adjustment for its central aim. The result, he charges, is substitution of know-how subjects for solid learning and the widespread tendency of schools to instruct pupils in the minutiae of daily life. His own alternative is concisely stated: "English, foreign languages, mathematics, sciences, history, geography—these are the subjects which must be mastered. They are the intellectual tools that enable us * * * to understand the complexities of today's tense and uncertain world. Those who do not have the mentality to master all these subjects need the same kind of intellectual fare, only less of it."

The issue is squarely joined. How completely opposite the two positions are can be neatly shown by a single sentence that Admiral Rickover quotes from an educationist source. The sentence describes a situation that Admiral Rickover would obviously consider sound. In actual fact, the sentence appears in a pamphlet published by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development of the National Education Association as a description of the situation which that association prides itself on having helped to destroy: "Physicists wrote the text on physics; literature was selected and interpreted for high school pupils by college professors; mathematicians decided on the order and content of arithmetic texts; and so the experts dominated the content of the curriculum."

The question, be it remembered, is which kind of education will best prepare young men and women for the task of the immediate, foreseeable future. Professional educationists argue that they alone are competent to answer the question. They insist that no one but an expert in pedagogy possesses the kind of information and experience necessary to reach a sound judgment. The arrogance of this argument is bad enough, but what destroys it utterly is its manifest illogicality.

Who, after all, is an expert on the nature of the intellectual problems that are posed by the technological world of today and tomorrow? Is it the professor of education, employed to teach teachers how to teach, and perhaps engaged in research on the ways of adolescents? Or is it the scientist constantly engaged in solving the problems that arise along the advancing frontiers of knowledge or the professional man, actively applying new ideas to practical affairs? Merely to ask the question is to wipe out the educationist's claim to expertness on the question before us.

No one is better qualified than Admiral Rickover to assess the intellectual demands that the future is certain to make, for his pioneer work on nuclear powerplants for the Navy has brought part of the future into actual being. Generalizing from his experience in these development projects (including that which produced the *Nautilus*), he writes: "Whatever the world of tomorrow may turn out to be, one thing is certain. Greater mental effort will be required of all mankind." Military considerations are not necessarily uppermost in the author's mind. Some of his most telling passages picture the need for a prompt and intensive technological effort to stave off the collapse of civilization through exhaustion of fuels, metals, and other natural resources.

Given the intellectual needs of contemporary society, Admiral Rickover reaches the conclusion (inescapable to this reviewer's way of thinking) that the first duty of American schools is to develop in all children—talented, average, and below average—the highest level of intellectual competence of which they are capable. The author intends every word to be taken literally. He believes that even below-average students are capable of far greater intellectual effort than American schools usually call upon them to make, and he proves the point by citing the achievements of pupils of like ability in Russia and other countries.

Though defenders of the educational status quo will no doubt call this a book of negative criticism, it is, in fact, crowded with positive suggestions, attesting Admiral Rickover's sincere and intelligent concern with the improvement of American schools. Almost the first of his specific suggestions, one should note, is phrased as follows: "An immediate step in solving our educational problem is to increase [teachers'] salaries drastically."

Of most concern to him is the education of the talented, because the waste of their abilities exposes the Nation to the most direct and immediate danger. A rigorous program in the basic intellectual disciplines, with a minimum of electives and a maximum of continuity, is his prescription for the top 15 or 20 percent of the population in intellectual ability. Special accelerated tracks for these students in the high schools he considers indispensable. And in his most publicized proposal he urges the setting up of 25 demonstration high schools throughout the country to show the acceleration possible for talented students under subject-trained teachers in a strictly academic environment with a lengthened school year.

Such an experiment might well be a *Nautilus* for American education.

The Best Is Yet To Be

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a broadcast made by Joyce Roberts, the public relations director of the pineapple companies of Hawaii, over the Aloha Broadcasting System in Hawaii. I do so, Mr. President, for the reason that the script contains some very excellent excerpts from an article entitled "The Best Is Yet To Be" prepared as a guest editorial in the Hartford (Conn.) Times by Mr. Sam Pryor, the distinguished vice president and assistant to the president of Pan American Airways. Many of my colleagues know Mr. Pryor because of his distinguished achievements in aviation and also as a former Republican national committeeman from the State of Connecticut.

I hope that Senators will take the time to read Mr. Pryor's comments about the constructive approach rather than what I have constantly decried as the derogatory approach to the potential of America in its progress under this administration.

There being no objection, the commentary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BEST IS YET TO BE

(By Joyce Roberts)

Good evening ladies and gentlemen. This is Joyce Roberts speaking.

Do you sometimes find yourself wondering a bit about this land of ours—these United States of America—and her future, and our future, in this troubled world?

Do you sometimes wonder if maybe this dream of freedom come true—if maybe this dream of freedom come true is going to disappear as a dream, after all—and not continue as the new and real revolutionary way of life that it has been for nearly 200 years?

It would not be surprising if you did sometimes wonder, for if we would listen only to all the attacks made on us, on our country and its leaders and institutions and on our many groups of people, we might get to thinking that nothing is right, and everything is wrong.

From without, there are those who attack our system of government, our prosperity, our good intentions toward other peoples.

From within, there are those who also attack our system of government, who would destroy confidence in our courts and system of justice, and would undermine our own confidence in our own Government.

And even within the great and overwhelming majority of Americans who have unquestioned allegiance to this idea we call America, even within this group we hear charges and countercharges that might lead one to ask, Where is the unity of purpose and ideals that any people must have for growth and progress?

Is labor a reckless force whose growing power is to be feared, and whose leaders are not to be trusted?

Is management, are business leaders, as shortsighted and selfish and opposed to social progress as some labor leaders charge?

Are all public officials and would-be public officials either so poorly equipped or so morally weak that we can neither expect any-

thing from them nor place any hope in our future?

During these times when we as a people are faced with a challenge of world leadership unknown in history, and our shortcomings at home and abroad are so magnified by election-year oratory that it may seem there is nothing good, it might be a good idea to stop a moment to look at the other side of things.

And this is what a recent visitor to Honolulu did in one of the finest brief articles we have read for some time—a short article entitled "The Best Is Yet To Be"—written by Samuel F. Pryor, Jr., a national and international leader in aviation. Mr. Pryor is vice president, assistant to the President and a director of Pan American World Airways, as well as a director of several other large American corporations—and incidentally he is also a director of the Boys Club of America.

A former Republican national committeeman from Connecticut, Mr. Pryor was in charge of Wendell Willkie's eastern headquarters during the 1940 presidential campaign.

On his return from a business trip for Pan American to Australia, Tahiti and Fiji last month, Mr. Pryor stopped in Honolulu at which time this article, The Best Is Yet To Be was reprinted by the Honolulu Advertiser following its original appearance as a guest editorial in the Hartford (Conn.) Times.

And here is why Mr. Pryor says, the best is yet to be.

And now we are quoting Mr. Pryor.

"When I was a student at Yale, William Lyon (Billy) Phelps, the great professor of English literature, was of world prominence.

"Billy's cardinal philosophy was best expressed in the words of his favorite poet, Robert Browning—'The Best Is Yet To Be,' which very words happen to be on the sundial in my garden," says Mr. Pryor.

"If Billy were here today," he writes, "I am confident he would again look optimistically into the future and repeat those words.

"Never at any time in our history was there a greater truth. Never before has any civilization enjoyed the blessings and the standard of living which are now so synonymous with America.

"My business, continues Mr. Pryor, taking me into 67 countries of the world, allows me to see this at first hand with my open eyes.

"The future holds so much more for all of us, if only all of us can realize that we have in our power to create—if only all of us will recognize that the cries of a defeatist's economy—the preachings of the gospel that America is finished—are the voices of false prophets.

"Recently a group of economists—noted Mr. Pryor—gathered together and took a conservative look at what America can be like 10 years from today.

"Here are some of the things they say can happen:

"America will have a population of 175 million people—14 percent higher than in 1951.

"There will be over 67 million people in our labor force—an increase of more than 3 million people over 1951.

"America will produce goods and services worth $380 millions—16 percent higher than in 1951.

"Consumers will spend around $255 billions, up $50 billions over 1951.

"Business will spend about $27 billion to improve its plants, its products, and its services, $4 billions more than in 1951.

"And—continued these economists—the average man will work about 40 hours a week, as compared with 44 hours in 1951—depending on how much money is invested in new tools for him, how well he uses them, and how much incentive he is given to use them well.

"The output per man-hour can be worth $2.70, in contrast to $2.24 in 1951.

"Concluded these economists, Americans may have disposable personal income, after providing for the necessities of life, of $260 billions, as against $233 billions in 1951.

"Then," continued Mr. Pryor, "from my own knowledge of international air travel, I predict that with the reduced fares the number of Americans going abroad will double shortly. They now number 2 million. By 1962 international air travel time will be cut in half. For example, London will be but 6 hours from New York. With more world travel will come more world understanding.

"On every side," continued Mr. Pryor, "pessimists are being disproven, as the industrial and labor teams of America works new miracles. We are told that there is almost no lid to the growth of the fabulous chemical industry, that new fibers will completely revolutionize the textile industry, that the use of byproducts of oils has barely scratched the surface, and that equally staggering growths can be expected in the fields of medicine, electricity, metals, transportation, and food, to mention only a few.

"What all of this can mean to human happiness is staggering to contemplate," says Mr. Pryor.

"But a big element in realizing this vision still remains. It is not material. It is spiritual.

"It is not whether America has the sense and the courage and the foresight to do this job.

"The question is, Do we have charity toward and understanding of our fellow man?

"Let's realize that we are not members of separate teams, but one team.

"Let's realize that you and I can't do it alone—that America has enough for all of us.

"If we increase our productivity, keep ourselves informed, maintain our Defense Establishment, and exercise our franchise to vote, we will preserve our two-party system, our American form of government, the finest Government on earth, and can look with confidence to the future.

"Instead of saying, 'Down with labor. Down with management. Down with the farmer. Down with everyone who doesn't see it my way,' let's try:

"Up with labor.

"Up with management.

"Up with the farmer.

"Up with everybody who wants to help build a happier country.

"Up America.

"The best is yet to be."

So concluded Samuel Pryor.

Yes, never before has any civilization enjoyed the blessings and standards of living which are now so synonymous with America and so much a part of us.

And yet, as Mr. Pryor says, if we will but realize this, and realize, too, that we are not members of separate teams, but of one team, and say, "Up with everybody who wants to help build a happier country," then the best is yet to be.

This is Joyce Roberts speaking. Goodnight.

The Need for Moral Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, columnist Constantine Brown, in the January 30 edition of the Evening Star, and our own Senate Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, in the February 1 edition of the Sunday Star, discuss the need for moral strength at this time. These two columns are worthy of the consideration of all leaders in Government, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Brown's column, entitled "When Moral Strength Counts" and Dr. Harris' article "The Moral Thermometer" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN MORAL STRENGTH COUNTS—BELIEF IN RIGHT CAUSE AND WILL TO RESIST HELD CRUCIAL WEAPONS AGAINST ENEMY

(By Constantine Brown)

Politicians and technicians who gauge the capabilities of this country against a Soviet onslaught are talking in terms of how many of this and that America has as compared to Russian and how many of that this the Bolsheviks have in contrast to the United States.

Facts and figures are produced for news-eager people, indicating that in some phases of armament we are far ahead of our enemies, while in others we are well behind. But nobody—despite the existence of a great bureaucracy in the psychological warfare divisions—is willing to point out that moral stamina, the conviction of a whole people that they are fighting a worthy cause, has anything to do with final victory, either in a conventional or nuclear war.

The governments which initiated the last two world wars suffered crushing ultimate defeat despite their enormous military and technical superiority. The German military machine in World War I was far better than that of the allies. So were most of the German military leaders. Yet ultimately the German armies were crushed because the Western allies, backed by American intervention in 1917, had enough moral stamina to continue the fight until the aggressor was defeated.

The Nazi forces in World War II were so much better trained, equipped and inspired to establish the millennium that it appeared to superficial observers after the fall of France that a quick victory was inevitable. The collapse of France was not due, however, to the Nazi tanks and Stukas, but principally to the education the French people had received in the three years before the outbreak of hostilities that the Nazi armies were unbeatable.

France's fall was due also to the Communist subversive elements in the French forces (before the fall of France, Stalin was Hitler's ally) which created confusion and panic in the ranks. Another contributory factor was that a number of officials in sensitive positions were either Communists or fringe Communists. One of these was Pierre Cot, Minister of Air, who managed to give France only five planes a month when the Germans were producing several hundred. And lastly, the weak governments which had succeeded each other since 1934 had become soft on nazism and actually believed it was possible to coexist with Hitler.

France, too, enjoyed a Mikoyan visit from Nazi Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop, who was wined and dined by the French Government and French industrialists who were anxious to enter into partnership with the big German industries. No wonder that France collapsed from lack of stamina rather than the blows of Hermann Goering's air armadas.

The air attacks against the British Isles were far more disastrous and costly than those against France. They continued without interruption day and night for many months. But the British were morally better prepared to withstand Hitler's attacks. Brit-

ish politicians, too, had made the fatal error of believing in coexistence with dictators. And Britain had been caught napping and was not prepared to defend herself. But the Communist infiltration before the war was negligible. The people believed in national honor (regarded as jingoistic trash by the increasing number of crytoliberals all over the world) and put up a desperate resistance when everybody believed they would have to surrender.

In 1950 the South Korean armies showed what stamina means in resisting aggression. They were practically annihilated in the early stages of the Communist attack. They were reorganized, and after we equipped them the Korean fighters became as good as our own veterans of the last war, while the people themselves stood unflinchingly the brunt of hardships.

The American people have been served large doses of figures about how far advanced the Russians are in rocketry. They are told daily about devastations which a Soviet onslaught would inflict on this country. And they are told by Khrushchev and Mikoyan as well as Americans awed by these two characters that coexistence on Moscow's terms is preferable to resistance. But few remember that it takes more than the latest destructive weapons to destroy peoples whose fiber has not been weakened.

THE MORAL THERMOMETER

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

George Washington warned that morality cannot be maintained without a genuine religion.

Morality is the fair flower of religious convictions and experiences. But there is a great gulf between what has been called "churchianity" and Christianity. Long ago Mark Rutherford had that difference in mind when he referred thus to a certain man, "Oh he is a miserable cur; for 40 years he has attended church regularly until he thinks that church going is everything and meanness is nothing." By "meanness" he meant practices in the realm of common decency which violated accepted moral standards.

A great deal of so-called discussion about religion these days has to do with churchianity rather than Christianity. There is, of course, much in present-day church statistics at which we rejoice, but the vital question growing out of the reported church prosperity is what is it doing to raise the moral temperature outside the church. The fact is, that while the church thermometer is on the rise, the moral thermometer is dropping. Certainly it takes no alarmist to point to the gang wars on the steets of our great cities, lighting up the awful problem of juvenile delinquency which only accentuates parental delinquency and the tragic breakup of the American home; the really appalling increase in consumption of beverage alcohol with the frightening personal catastrophes to which any preacher or social worker can testify, to say nothing of the colossal cost in loss of life and crime. All this seems to be more and more accepted as a part of American life, poisoning every aspect of it, and this at the very time that Russia, seeing the danger, is using its regimented authority to discourage such excessive drinking.

Then, there is the unbelievable condition revealed by gangster control of certain crucial labor organizations, as unscrupulous leaders feather their own nests from the dues of the toiling millions and threaten to control the Nation's transportation arteries by underworld methods.

A national radio program holds up in lurid light the alleged growing practice of utilizing sex, and the degradation of womanhood, as an allurement to clinch business deals. And now an actress, having publicly torn to shreds her marriage vows, is given a star role in a picture with "happiness" in its title. Thus is this woman featured as a movie queen, glorified for teen-agers as fit to entertain the American public. So low sinks the moral thermometer in these times when the survival of our way of life is at stake. The list of degradations could go on and on.

But not only in these flagrant examples of the breakdown and the breakthrough of moral bulwarks, but in the ordinary practice of many, in the day-to-day transactions with their neighbors, there are unmistakable evidences of moral sag. Said a prominent lawyer recently in a luncheon conversation: "I find that things have come to such a pass that nowadays when you remind people that what they are doing is not exactly ethical by the old standards, they simply shrug their shoulders and reply, 'Well, by those old rules perhaps what I am doing may not be morally correct, but it's legally right, so what.'"

And so a lack of personal honor has seeped into public life, commercial life, even sports life, to a degree that is ominously disturbing. The primary consideration is, can I get away with this? Rather than, is it right?

A recent article in a nationally read magazine had for its caption, "Are We Becoming a Nation of Chiselers?" The chiseler is one who studies the rules, not to follow them but to dodge them. The chiseler's guide is not conscience—it is anything he can get away with.

In the colleges today are those who will soon be at the wheel of American business life. By what standards are they running their lives now? A recent survey at the University of Pennsylvania showed that 40 percent of the undergraduates freely admit to frequent cheating. The surveyors noted that these chiselers often admitted it with no apology or sense of wrongdoing. In a western university a 21-year-old coed argued that the sort of cheating which is dubbed "cribbing" is simply "collaborating."

The annual cost of shop-lifting in America is pretty close to a billion dollars. Eighty percent of these thieving operators are not professionals, just light-fingered mothers and sisters out of decent homes.

America with its sagging morals needs to listen most to a wise prophet of old who formulated a timeless principle. He enunciated a law which is as valid for our towering-skyscraper age as it was for that ancient nomadic tent-drawing day. That law of the tent is, when you lengthen the cords you must strengthen the stakes. If you neglect this procedure you are heading for calamity, catastrophe and collapse. It is impossible to go on majoring in length if you forget the correspondingly vital matter of strength.

With the supporting stakes of our glittering civilization bending and breaking, the chief danger to America grows out of a pathetic and tragic trust in length without strength, in goods without good, in commercial maneuvers rather than in ethical sanctities. That is the danger to which Edna St. Vincent Millay points with alarm as she saw the tremendous energy of this dynamic day constantly pulling the straining ropes out to wider expanses as the moral thermometer was going down. Here are her warning lines:

"Above the world is stretched the sky,
No higher than the soul is high.
* * * * *
And he, whose soul is flat—the sky
Will cave in on him by and by."

Mikoyan's Espionage Into Our Industries During World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "How Mikoyan Got U.S. Secrets," written by George Todt, and published in the Valley Times, San Fernando Valley, Calif., of Saturday, January 24, 1959.

Mr. Todt discloses many revealing facts about Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan's days during World II as chief of Soviet espionage into our war industries. I found this well-written commentary to be so informative that I have asked that it be printed in the RECORD as an additional means of bringing it to the attention of the American people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MIKOYAN GOT U.S. SECRETS

(By George Todt)

"The advanced state of Soviet technology today is due more to Soviet success in espionage than it is due to their apparatus, good as it is." (Lt. Gen. Arthur Trudeau, Chief, Army Research and Development, 1958.)

Actually, one of Comrade Anastas I. Mikoyan's chief duties during World War II was to serve as chief of Soviet espionage into our war industries.

His main spy headquarters was located in Washington. It was called the Soviet Purchasing Commission.

Some years after the war had ended, a former member of SPC—Victor Kravchenko—gave some pertinent testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee. Here is what he said, in part:

"The Soviet Purchasing Commission during the war had more than 1,000 employees. Some of them came to the United States as simple engineers, but in reality they were in top positions in industry or in scientific research. Some came as civilians, but really they were officers of the navy or artillery or tank troops or the air force. * * * On the seventh floor of the SPC, behind the iron door at 3355 16th Street * * * there was a special department of the NKVD. * * *"

Kravchenko told of one order from Mikoyan in 1943 which stated, "that we had to find out all secret information about industrial development in the United States, and especially the military industry."

These boys, under the present Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union, did right well at their job, too. For Mikoyan was the Russian counterpart of our own (?) Harry Hopkins, and apparently these gentlemen had a thriving partnership arrangement that really flourished—at least for Moscow.

This might have never come out except for the fact that an American major named George Racey Jordan got nosy one day and pried into supposedly immune Red diplomatic pouches inside some airplanes which our pilots were ferrying to Alaska, there to be picked up by Russian pilots and continued on their Eurasian journey.

What Jordan discovered when he sneaked a look at the Red loot made him start talking to himself. Included was a letter in

longhand from Hopkins to Mikoyan, formulas for the atom bomb, and materials for its manufacture. His subsequent protests to Washington went unheeded.

One well-known atomic authority, Dr. Medford Evans, said:

"It is possible that U^{235} and plutonium, the nuclear components of the atomic bomb, have been systematically diverted from Oak Ridge, Hanford, and Los Alamos in sufficient quantities to charge perhaps 20 atomic bombs."

All of which gives us some small idea of just how effective Comrade Mikoyan was when he was here in our country before.

In fact, he was so outrageously successful in obtaining any and all of our secrets he wanted, including the atom bomb, that a new light has been thrown upon nuclear scientist Robert J. Oppenheimer's reluctance to help in the creation of the even more deadlier hydrogen bomb.

What Dr. Oppenheimer told the Atomic Energy Commission's Personnel Security Board in 1954 was essentially this: If we built a hydrogen bomb, Russia would build one—but if we did not build the thermonuclear device, the Russians would not construct it, either.

Essentially, Dr. Oppenheimer may have been implying that the Reds couldn't steal from us what we did not make; and that if we didn't make a hydrogen bomb, the Reds wouldn't have a model to steal away from us for later mass production purposes.

If this was the way that Dr. Oppenheimer figured it, he may very well have been right.

There is more and more evidence being uncovered which amply demonstrates that the Russian scientists have been wizards at copying the work of others—but with very few scientific firsts of their own.

Their best agent in the securing of our most priceless industrial and military secrets has been—Anastas I. Mikoyan, who is only one notch removed on the Red totem pole from "Mr. Big," himself. He is a very competent and efficient Bolshevik workman.

Some day he might even become the Soviet Union's headman. Who knows?

The Greatness of Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a sermon entitled "The Greatness of Lincoln," delivered by Rev. Richard S. Emrich, Bishop of Michigan, in the Washington Cathedral on January 11, 1959, in connection with the Lincoln sesquicentennial celebration.

The sermon—learned, eloquent, and moving—was preached at a special service in Washington Cathedral inaugurating the Lincoln sesquicentennial celebration. The service, in which the Bishop of Washington participated, was attended by the Vice President of the United States, Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON, members of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, and a large congregation.

Hon. Ralph Bunch and the senior Senator from Kentucky, members of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, read the Scripture lesson for the service.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREATNESS OF LINCOLN: A SERMON BY RICHARD S. EMRICH, BISHOP OF MICHIGAN, PREACHED IN THE WASHINGTON CATHEDRAL, JANUARY 11, 1959, IN CONNECTION WITH THE LINCOLN SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

My friends, I count it one of the privileges of my life to speak to you on this occasion. I do not know any more about Abraham Lincoln than most of you here, and I know far less than some of you; but I will affirm that I love the man, and that wisdom and the grace of God have come to me through him.

Our text is the well-known statement of our Lord, "By their fruits shall ye know them."

It is common knowledge that when one stands too close to a mountain range, one cannot see which mountain is the highest and towers above the rest. It is only at a distance that a true perspective is gained, and the great peak can be distinguished from the foothills. So it was that some who lived close to Lincoln could not see his greatness, and failed to see which speech was great at Gettysburg. So it is that we, 150 years after his birth, are able to see that no American is greater; that he was the grandest figure on the crowded canvas of the 19th century; that he represents the America we love as does no other man; that he abides and grows greater with the years; that there was in his simple figure an olympian quality, a nobility and a grandeur; that he was of God; that it is fitting and proper his kneeling statue should be in this cathedral; and that all of this greatness is revealed in the mood approaching religious awe which we feel when we visit his memorial. One hundred and fifty years since his birth, and the outline of his figure, towering above his contemporaries, becomes clearer with the distance.

As preparation for this occasion I read with care his letters and addresses, trying to enter his mind and spirit that I might see his greatness from within and in some small manner understand it. The purpose of this address, and I hope of the whole sesquicentennial celebration, is that we may so understand him that something of his greatness will rub off onto our poorer natures.

There are, of course, some aspects of his figure which we will never understand, and at which we can only wonder. Trying to understand his strange combination of sorrow and jest, of loneliness and wit, is like gazing into a great forest: you can see so far, and then there is hidden mystery. Or how was it, to take another example, that in the midst of an age in which histrionic and florid oratory was the style, a man arose—with 1 year of formal schooling, poor, self-taught—who used language as clean, chaste, and a simple expression of his thought? From what mysterious spring did he drink that he would not, could not, fit into the oratorical pattern of his day? And how was it that he who did not strive for beauty yet achieved it? We can never comprehend him, grasp him, wrap him up in a neat package; but we can from his writings see the broad outline of his greatness.

But, it is not enough to say that he was wise, moderate, merciful, forgiving, humane, a thinker of the first rank, and because of all these virtues the saviour of the Union. We must try to go deeper than that, into the fabric of his mind and spirit, to see why he was these things. He looked at the world in a certain way; he reasoned in a certain manner; and then from the basic unity of his person the specific virtues arose. Great character is not a series of disconnected virtues—like a picket fence—but the great trunk of a tree that organically spreads out its strong branches.

Why was he so great? Why does the poet say that his deep spirit broods over this Nation? Why, a few short years, after the most bitter of partisan struggles, was he accepted as a nonpartisan and unifying figure? Let me share with you my poor analysis, in which I have been helped by other men, and ask that you continue it in your own thoughts.

I

First, we live in a world where men tend to have their thoughts determined by their immediate interests and surroundings. They are white and think white, rich and think rich, easterners and think eastern. The tragedy of history is not simply that men are prone to obvious evil, but that they put their virtues and nobility at the service of their party or little group. Their virtues serve a limited perspective and a parochial imagination. How few Russians there are, for example, who are able to see the aspirations, interests, and fears of America—and vice versa? The result of this is enormous group egos that clash self-righteously with each other.

But occasionally, very occasionally, there appears a man like Lincoln, who mysteriously rises above background, self-interest, and even his age to think and speak for all men. He viewed the world in the deepest perspective, and had constantly about him the Olympian outlook. (See Richard Weaver, "The Ethics of Rhetoric.") The Lincoln Memorial catches this; but you can see it also in his photographs with their homely grandeur and the faraway look in the eyes.

But most of all we can see this grand perspective in what Lord Charnwood calls the "arresting and simple beauty" of his language. "Fourscore and 7 years ago our fathers"—the faraway look back across the long years to the founding of the Nation. He deals with the Founding Fathers systematically and at length in the Cooper Union address that, knowing where they came from, his listeners may know where they are. Some men were violently from Massachusetts or South Carolina, but Lincoln had to say "brought forth on this continent" with a great sweep of thought. And then in the same address there is the faraway look into the future, "The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here." Or again with the great perspective, "I shall do nothing in malice. What I deal with is too vast for malicious dealing." Or again, with the Olympian outlook above section or partisanship, "In the present Civil War it is quite possible that God's purpose is something different from the purpose of either party." Or, again, the great inclusive view, "As I have not felt, so I have not expressed any harsh sentiment toward our southern brethren. I have constantly declared, as I really believed, the only difference between them and us is the difference of circumstances." Or, again, going beyond America he states the meaning of America for all history and time, "* * * that sentiment in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world, for all future time."

It was from this perspective that the other virtues came. This is the trunk, and the other virtues are the branches; for, if you have a true and great perspective, you know that you are only one actor in a vast drama—and humility is born. And, knowing the greatness of the cause and feeling the travail of a whole continent, you are willing to bear suffering and apologize if only the great cause may go forward. On October 24, 1862, he wrote to General McClellan with very human irritation, "I have just read your dispatch about sore-tongued and fatigued horses. Will you pardon me for asking what the horses of your army have done since the Battle of Antietam that fatigues

anything?" That is a temper like yours and mine. But 3 days later the great perspective rises again. Yours of yesterday received," he writes to McClellan. "Most certainly I intend no injustice to any; and, if I have done any, I deeply regret it."

II

Second, there was something truly remarkable about his method of reasoning. We all know that this self-educated man went deeper than most men, and that after a century much of what he said is still strangely fresh. Why is it, as Richard Weaver says, that he is more quoted than the more intellectual Jefferson or the academic Wilson? What can we learn about his method of reasoning?

Well, he was not corrupted by the modern advertising assumption that the average mental age is 12 years, or by a trust in promotional tricks that make all things trivial. He respected the people, and, as Herndon said, would not think of cheating a man out of his vote any more than he would cheat him out of his money. For his own sake and for his hearers he liked to boil a matter down to a terse statement. "I could not sleep, although I tried to, when I got on such a hunt for an idea until I had caught it; and when I thought I had got it, I was not satisfied until I had repeated it over and over again until I had put it in plain language enough, as I thought, for any boy I knew to comprehend. This was a kind of passion with me." Herndon says that his opponents were afraid of his condensation. This means that Lincoln never threw a battery of arguments at people, like a scattering shotgun. He went to the essence of the matter; or, as he said, he liked to come at a question like a surveyor, from the north, south, east, and west until he had focused it. And then this essence was passed on to the people. "We won't break up the Union, and you shan't." "* * * of the people, by the people, and for the people." "* * * to do the right as God gives us to see the right." "Slavery is a violation of eternal right. We have temporized with it from the necessities of our condition; but as sure as God reigns and schoolchildren read, that black foul lie can never be consecrated into God's hallowed truth." These essences of a clear mind soaked down into the public consciousness until he was able to carry the people with him. He was, says Lord Charnwood, "free from ambiguity of thought or faltering of will."

But Herndon says another thing that brings us still closer to the secret of his power, and reveals the effect of his speaking. "All opponents dreaded his originality of idea, his condensation, definition, and force of expression; and woe to the man who hugged to his bosom a secret error if Lincoln got on the chase of it." Or again, "He was the strongest man I ever saw, looking at him from the standpoint of reason and logic. He came down from that height with irresistible and crashing force." Why? Well, partly the condensation we have already mentioned, but more profoundly the fact that he based his arguments on a definition of the nature of man, the nature of government, the nature of a nation, the nature of the war. This is why we quote him.

If you argue from expediency, your words will disappear in the sand; for the circumstances, upon which your expediency is based, will change. You will be clever, but not necessarily wise. But if you argue from the nature of man, from definition, your words will remain; because human nature does not change. Definition implies a general view which goes beyond the immediate circumstances. Definition requires courage, for you have committed yourself. Definition, based upon the nature of man, is reverent reasoning; for you are asserting the given fact, the final fact, the grain of the universe. So, slavery is attacked at dead center as contrary to the grain of the universe, corrupting the nature of the slave and the slaveholder. The facts of human nature, he believed, could be observed. It is God's decree which can never be reversed.

Is free government strong enough to survive, or must it always be smashed by a minority?—That was the basic question about the nature of free government which was being tested by the war. Or how, with the Father of Waters flowing through the middle of this Nation, do you divide it north and south? The nature of a continent, the nature of man, the nature of government, the defined nature of the war. And because he went in his reasoning to the one essential fact as distinguished from the peripheral and secondary, because he went to the argument behind which there is no other argument, his words endure. And some of them came out with thunder and finality. As Lord Charnwood said, he learned to reason with Euclid and to feel and speak with the authors of the Bible.

III

Finally, we consider the mystery of his religious stature which includes, of course, all we have said so far. This mystery is simply that of his total person. Formal education is good and necessary, but he was wise and profound without a formal education. Church membership with its means and Grace and nurturing fellowship is good and necessary, but he was a saint in politics and a man of God without Church membership. Just as in a lonely way he educated himself, so in a lonely way by reading the Scriptures and by profound meditation he nurtured his soul. "By their fruits shall ye know them"; and his good fruits reveal he was a good tree. If any man, freed from self, seeks the common good, he is a converted man, said William Temple—by that test he was a converted man. As a young man he was a sceptic, but the trials of his life drove him to God. He became a prophet bearing God's righteous and reconciling word to his people. While the church is as necessary for mankind as is the school, we must always recognize that "The wind bloweth where it listeth," and not try to domesticate the Almighty. We must, at the same time, recognize that in church attendance and Bible reading he did receive the water of life.

I first sensed his tremendous religious stature when his life helped to open up for me the meaning of the Beatitudes, which Senator COOPER read in the second lesson this afternoon. "Blessed are the merciful:" kindness and mercy were in the fabric of his being. "Blessed are they who do hunger and thirst after righteousness"—"Beyond and above all skill, says the editor of a great newspaper who heard him at Peoria, "was the overwhelming conviction imposed upon the audience that the speaker was charged with an irresistible and inspiring duty to his fellowmen.

"Blessed are the pure in heart": purity of heart is, apart from selfishness, to will one thing, that God's will be done and the good of all the people be served. "Blessed are the peacemakers". "Blessed are ye when men shall revile and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake". "Blessed are the poor in spirit," for, knowing their own need, and not arrogant in spirit, they turn to God in their need. "Blessed are they that mourn"; if you truly love men, you must mourn when they die in battle. Sorrow is the other side of the coin of love.

"Blessed are the meek"; meekness is the opposite of self-centered pushiness. It is to be so centered in God's great purposes that one's own little ego is out of the picture. Lincoln refused to be angry when McClellan snubbed him, even insulted him. He wrote to General Grant," . . . When you got below and took Port Gibson, Grand Gulf, and vicinity, I thought you should go down the river and join General Banks, and when you turned northward, east of the Big Black, I feared it was a mistake. I now wish to make the personal acknowledgment that you were right and I was wrong. Sincerely, Abraham Lincoln." "Blessed are the meek."

Before closing with three passages in which we will listen to Lincoln's own words, consider this description of how it appeared to those who heard him. "As soon as he lost thought of himself in his subject his voice and manner changed; deeper notes, of which friends record the beauty, rang out, the sad eyes kindled, and the tall, gaunt figure with the strange gesture of the long, uplifted arms, acquired even a certain majesty."

1. He said about a Negro slave, "In some things she is certainly not my equal, but in her natural right to eat the bread that she has earned with the sweat of her brow, she is my equal, and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of any man."

2. He said, "I know there is a God, and that he hates injustice and slavery. I see the storm coming, and I know that His hand is in it. If He has a place and work for me—and I think He has—I believe I am ready. I am nothing, but truth is everything. I know I am right because I know that liberty is right, for Christ teaches it, and Christ is God. I have told them that a house divided against itself cannot stand, and Christ and reason say the same; and they will find it so. Douglas don't care whether slavery is voted up or voted down, but God cares, and humanity cares, and I care; and with God's help I shall not fail. I may not see the end; but it will come, and I shall be vindicated; and these men will find that they have not read their Bible aright."

3. He said, "When * * * you have succeeded in dehumanizing the Negro; when you have put him down and made it impossible for him to be but as the beasts of the field; when you have extinguished his soul in this world and placed him where the ray of hope is blown out as in the darkness of the damned, are you quite sure that the demon you have roused will not turn and rend you? What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling sea coasts, our Army and Navy. These are not our reliance against tyranny. All of those may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors. Familiarize yourselves with the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them. Accustomed to trample on the rights of others, you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subject of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you."

Praise be to Thee, O God, for thy servant and prophet, Abraham Lincoln.

Ten Points Deserving Consideration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in South Carolina editorials frequently are published in many of the newspapers around the State under the byline "The Spectator." In the most recent column

by the Spectator he lists 10 points well worth considering. There was a time when no one would question any of these points. I should like to think that such will soon be the case again. These 10 points were sent to the Spectator by Mr. G. R. Battle of West Columbia, S.C. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the 10 points were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEN POINTS

1. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.
2. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.
3. You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.
4. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.
5. You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.
6. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income.
7. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.
8. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.
9. You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence.
10. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

The Flying Wheels Visit Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, last evening one of the most exciting basketball games of the year was played at Bethesda Naval Hospital gymnasium. Yet not one of the players is able to walk, let alone run. This was a game of wheelchair basketball, played by brave young veterans who carry on almost normal lives despite the loss of the use of their limbs.

Their story has been well told by John B. Old as follows:

BEST YEARS OF THEIR LIVES
(By John B. Old)

Paralyzed veterans by definition are fine young Americans who will never walk again. They're paralyzed from the waist down. Most of 'em are victims of an enemy bullet in the spine. Others are victims of polio or tragic accidents. All served their country gallantly.

Many are continuously bedridden. Others find themselves chained to wheelchairs for the rest of their life, compelled to return periodically to VA hospitals for checkups and medical attention.

Their incentive to live isn't the same as most people—or so you might reasonably assume. Not so with the courageous members of the Flying Wheels, all-star wheelchair basketball squad of the Long Beach, Calif., Paralyzed Veterans Association.

They're out to prove to themselves, to their less fortunate bedridden PVA brethren, polio victims everywhere and the world at large that the years to come should not be wasted in self pity or vain regrets sitting on the sidelines of life. They're going to be participants.

The agonies of the souls which all hopelessly crippled young veterans must have suffered can only be imagined. What gutty guys like the Flying Wheels are doing today takes more courage, in a way, than they were called on to display against the enemy.

Although their mode of living is limited, they have but one code: "Ability, not disability, counts." Wheelchair basketball is doing much to keep that spirit alive and contagious.

It all started early in World War II at the now discarded Birmingham VA hospital, Van Nuys, Calif. Hunting a way to inspire bedridden patients, Bob Rynearson of the recreation department hit upon the idea of wheelchair basketball—played just like able-bodied teams do with only slight variations—such as two pushes on the wheels, while the ball rests on a player's lap, is the equivalent of a dribble.

Occasionally a veteran would wheel down to the gym. On the court self-confidence was bolstered. Returning to his ward, he'd brag of his shooting—a direct challenge to ward mates to get out of bed. As the competitive spirit lurks in the heart of every American youth, many accepted. Later more and more. For most of the paraplegics it was their first real inspiration to get out of bed, back into the American competitive way of life, if only to beat a bunk mate.

Once on the court they gained physical benefits far and beyond the reach of calisthenics. A new and hopeful mental outlook was born. They bit heavily into the challenge to excel, found they were no longer cognizant of their handicap. Now all wheelchair basketball players love crowds—especially when backward fellows with similar handicaps are watching. Their brilliant court play is inspiring proof positive: "Ability, not disability, counts."

Because of its proven value, wheelchair basketball is now played wherever PVA groups assemble. Unfortunately for the southern California group, there is no other VA paraplegic center west of Kansas City. Hence these annual coast-to-coast, nonprofit, noncommercial tours. The Flying Wheels want to meet and beat the best wheelchair teams in the country.

Hail to the gallant crusading Flying Wheels.

An excerpt from Veterans' Administration Technical Bulletin TB 10–503, page 36, paragraph 5, reveals:

The importance of competitive games for physical and psychological rehabilitation of paraplegics must not be forgotten. These games maintain the musculature in good condition, improve coordination, and put to severe test the paraplegic's ability to balance as in a fast basketball game conducted from wheelchairs.

The mental goal achieved by such competition is a loss of self-consciousness and a gain of self-reliance.

It is medically desirable that tournaments be regularly arranged between the several paraplegic centers in the Veterans' Administration.

Dr. Ernest Bors, medical chief, paraplegic section, Long Beach Veterans Hospital, observes:

Having witnessed the very beginning of the athletic rehabilitation of paraplegic patients, I am impressed with the beneficial effect wheelchair basketball has on the morale and on the physical well being of the paralyzed veterans.

Successful rehabilitation of the severely disabled person is contingent upon the mental approach. It is evident that the self-consciousness of patients, who are bound to use a wheelchair, has been greatly relieved by competitive performances before spectators. Good muscle function, so vital to the patient with a spinal cord injury, is obtained through participation in wheelchair basketball.

The patient's desire to play wheelchair basketball makes his mental and physical rehabilitation a voluntary pleasure.

In 11 coast-to-coast wheelchair basketball tours and 3 national championship trips, the Flying Wheels have amassed the amazing record of 86 victories, 29 defeats in 115 intersectional games. They have averaged 35 points per game, a remarkably high percentage.

Their best years were in 1948, 1950, 1953, 1955, and 1958.

The Long Beach, Calif., PVA All-Stars have accounted for three national championships—in 1948, 1955, and 1958. In 1948 they were named U.S. champions by the Helms Athletic Foundation of California.

In 1958, the Flying Wheels, after capturing the Pacific Coast Wheelchair Basketball Association title, registered nine straight triumphs without a loss on their 11th annual transcontinental tour. Then they traveled to Rantoul, Ill., where they eliminated the St. Louis Rams, 50 to 28; the Brooklyn Whirlaways, 58 to 40, and the defending champion Pan-Am Jets, 51 to 42, to win the national championship.

The record: 1948,[1] won 12, lost 1, national champions; 1949, won 7, lost 4; 1950, won 10, lost 1; 1951, won 3, lost 6; 1952, won 3, lost 3; 1953, won 9, lost 1; 1953,[1] won 1, lost 2; 1954, won 5, lost 4; 1955, won 9, lost 0; 1955,[1] won 3 lost 0, national champions; 1956, won 6, lost 3; 1957, won 5, lost 3; 1958, won 9, lost 0; 1958,[1] won 3, lost 0, national champions. Totals, won 86, lost 29.

The 1959 Flying Wheels team members are the following:

No.	Position	Name
10	Guard...	Roger Latham: Korean war veteran (Air Force), staff sergeant, gunner. Born in Mount Vernon, Ohio, Apr. 30, 1930. Graduated from military academy in Woodstock, Va. Attended VMI, SVC, and Long Beach State College. BA degree in psychology. Letterman in college wrestling and also won letters for football and baseball in highschool.
11	Forward.	Esker Hester: Korean war veteran (Air Force). Born in La Mesa, Tex., Aug. 16, 1930. Moved to Hollywood, Calif., at age of 16 and graduated from Hollywood High. Studied accounting at UCLA. Spent 4 years in Air Force, a navigator. Hobbies include chess and bridge.
12	...do.....	Chauncy Durand: World War II veteran, (Army). Born in Rochester, Minn., Dec. 6, 1926. Graduated from Rochester High after playing football and ice hockey. Attended Rochester Junior College and studied business administration. Also attended a trade school for instruction on radio and television repair. Choe Chee is his nickname.
14	Guard...	Gil Ortiz: World War II veteran (Army). Born in Anaheim, Calif., Sept. 30, 1924. Lived in Chandler, Ariz., greater part of his life. He was a high school letterman in basketball, football, and baseball. Studied journalism at Long Beach State. Hobbies run from hunting to fishing. He was voted all-America third-string guard at national tourney, 1958. Spider (long arms) is his nickname.

[1] National championship tournaments.

No.	Position	Name
15	Guard	Dean Traxinger: Korean war veteran (U.S. Marine Corps), corporal. Born in Memphis, Minn., Feb. 18, 1933. Graduated from St. Louis Park High School. Attended Minnesota Business College and studied accounting. During high school days was active in basketball, football, and baseball. Dean has been married 5 years.
16	Forward.	Frank Behunin: Korean war veteran (Army). Born in Fillmore, Utah, Mar. 16, 1931. Graduated from Provo High School, Provo, Utah, and won his letter in basketball. His hobbies are archery and wood carving. He also has done some outstanding work with the Artesia, Calif., Boy Scouts. He is married and has a daughter.
20	Center..	Gene Atkinson: Korean war veteran (U.S. Marine Corps). Born in San Francisco, Sept. 16, 1928. Graduated from Balboa High School. Letterman in high school football and also played sports in service. Gene is single.
21	...do.....	Ray Mitchell: World War II veteran (1st lieutenant, Army). Born in Kansas City, Mo., Aug. 24, 1921. Attended Kansas City High School. Holds bachelor of science degree at UCLA in personnel management. Also master of business administration. Hobbies and sports include swimming, water and wheelchair basketball, football and "rooting for the Dodgers." He is married, the father of 2 boys. A veteran of wheelchair basketball world.
22	Guard..	Ronald Rynders: Korean war veteran (Navy). Born in Van Nuys, Calif., Oct. 4, 1931. Attended Van Nuys High School where he won letters in track and basketball. Contracted polio in 1956. During war won battle ribbon and 3 battle stars. Also awarded Korean Presidential unit citation. He is now in private business in the appliance and furniture field. Is married, father of a girl.
——	.....	Tom Culp (coach): Korean war veteran (staff sergeant, U.S. Marine Corps). Born Aug. 5, 1932, in Akron, Ohio. Graduated from Akron West High School. Was a letterman in basketball, football, and golf. Attended Long Beach City College where he studied prelaw. He is now a director for the Lakewood, Calif., Recreation Department. Tom is single and this is his 1st Flying Wheels' coaching assignment.
——	.....	Russ Churchman (assistant coach, trainer): Korean war veteran. (Navy). Born in Hardin, Ill., Mar. 17, 1933. Graduated from Hardin High and was letterman in baseball and basketball. Served 4 years in Navy—a yeoman 2d class in the Pacific and Korea areas. Attended Long Beach City College. He works for the Lakewood, Calif., Recreational Department as a director. Is married and has a little girl.
——	.....	James E. Smith (manager): World War II veteran (Army). Born in Brockton, Mass., Mar. 12, 1927. Graduated from Brockton High School. This is Jim's 2d year with the Flying Wheels. He is president of the Pacific Coast Wheel Chair Basketball Association.

Able-bodied personnel accompanying the Flying Wheels are the following:

Coach, Tom Culp, Long Beach, Calif., Recreation Department.

Physicians, Dr. Martin Hansen and Dr. Peter J. Rocovich, both of Queen of Angels Hospital, Los Angeles.

Trainer, Russ Churchman, Long Beach, Calif., Recreation Department.

Publicity director, Sam Schnitzer, Los Angeles Examiner.

Tour director, John B. Old, Los Angeles Herald Express.

All traveling expenses for this tour—and last 5 years—paid by the Los Angeles Evening Herald and Express through the courtesy of Mr. David Hearst, publisher; and Mr. George Hearst, business manager.

Expenses for the first seven coast-to-coast tours were raised by John B. Old through personal solicitation of his friends.

Korean-American Proxy Adoption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release issued by the Presbyterian News Bureau entitled "Korean, American Church and Welfare Leaders Endorse Proxy Adoption."

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREAN, AMERICAN CHURCH AND WELFARE LEADERS ENDORSE PROXY ADOPTION

SEOUL, KOREA.—Proxy adoption as currently provided for under American congressional legislation is an essential element for any real solution of the Korean-American orphan problem, according to strong statements made here by Korean and American representatives from a dozen interested agencies now at work in that phase of Christian and secular relief and welfare operations in Korea.

Meeting in a seminar held under the auspices of Korea Church World Service, the participants took strong exception to representations by visiting International Social Service Director William Kirk, who insisted that proxy adoption should be eliminated as a valid procedure under future orphan legislation. Kirk, currently touring ISS branches in Asia, proposed that only orphan placements arranged by professional graduate social workers in long-established welfare agency programs be accepted as acceptable, sound practice.

Dr. G. H. Rue, M.D., well-known Seventh-day Adventist director of the Seoul Sanitarium and Hospital, was the first of those present to confirm the fact that present independent programs are moving the overwhelming majority of mixed-blood orphans, and have piled up a record of impressive success—including a replacement figure comparable to that found in more time-consuming professional programs.

"We do our own work," Dr. Rue said. "We find that it works very satisfactorily, and we've had no trouble at all."

To answer why the Seventh-day Adventist orphan-placement program does not make use of the services of the professional welfare agencies at work in their area, Dr. Rue stated that the main reason was because "it takes forever and a day."

Mrs. Oak-soon Hong, director of the Child-Placement Service of the Korean Government, added that her own organization had found it necessary to use proxy adoption to move orphans because of the large number of professional welfare agencies in the United States which refuse to release home studies to any other agency except International Social Service. There was general agreement that commonsense home studies based on the judgment and opinion of pastors and a broad base of mature individuals already thoroughly acquainted with the prospective adopting home weer essential in order to cope with Korean conditions under which professional agency delays often lead to serious illness or death for the mixed-blood orphan.

Two representatives—Mrs. Wilbur Bacon, Korea director for Pearl Buck's Welcome House program, and Miss Marion A. Shaw, Methodist leader in orphan welfare work for Korea—backed up the professional welfare concern for home studies conducted along traditional time-consuming lines, but spoke out strongly for proxy adoption as the sensible way to expedite the process once child and home have been matched.

Only fireworks of the seminar developed when the visiting International Social Service director charged that already hundreds of Korean-American orphans have been so badly placed by the five non-ISS agencies that they have undergone abuse and described their detailed followup programs which have protected each child and resulted in happy second placements for the approximately 1 percent of Korean-American orphans who failed to become satisfactorily integrated into their new homes.

Independent observers from missions not directly engaged in adoption programs joined in emphatically to say that they felt they could not credit Kirk's allegation because they had personally followed large numbers of children through the independent programs to their new homes and had found nothing but happy adjustments. Miss Olivette Swallen, longtime worker in home visitation for the United Presbyterian Mission, stated, "I positively know that very, very few have been changed. It's been a very, very small number, and altogether there are hundreds and hundreds—thousands—of children sent from this country to happy homes."

Major statistics as brought out in the seminar included:

Agency (in alphabetical order):	*Orphans moved from Korea*
American Soul Clinic	13
Child Placement Service, Ministry of Health and Welfare, Republic of Korea	[1] 508
Holt adoption program	1,070
International Social Service (no statistics)	([2])
National Catholic Welfare Service	[3] 23
Seventh-day Adventist	[3] 23
Welcome House	21
Total reported	1,800

[1] Through June 1958 only.
[2] ISS estimate, around 200; Korean Government estimate based on issuance of orphan passports, ISS, around 50.
[3] In 1958 only.

GTA Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the GTA Daily Radio Roundup broadcast by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association on January 15, 23, and 30, 1959.

There being no objection, the text of the radio broadcasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF JANUARY 15, 1959

Do you remember those $10 hogs back in the fall of 1955? That was a disastrous price. But farmers had to sell. You don't just turn off the machine, stack hogs in a warehouse, and wait for a better price.

So farmers sold, took their beating, and readjusted production programs. Hundreds of thousands gave up hog raising in disgust or cut way down on their herds. No businessman can sell at a loss for long and stay in business.

As soon as the hog glut was flushed out of the market, prices started climbing. In the meantime, the administration in Washington had been busily trimming price supports on grain and, of course, cash prices weakened, too. Again, farmers couldn't turn off the growing crops, so the country became flooded with cheap feed grain. What to do with it? Well, hog and cattle prices were perking up, "so let's throw this cheap feed into more and more cattle and hogs and take another price gamble."

Now, all this isn't done in a day. It takes 5 to 6 months to feed up a hog to market weight and around 2 years for a beef cow. With the wild fluctuations on the wide open livestock markets—who can guess the price that far ahead?

It's a multibillion-dollar gambling game and farmers have no choice but to keep rolling the dice.

Now it looks like we have again arrived at the jumping-off place for hog prices. At least that's the opinion of economist Francis A. Kutish of Iowa State College. He warned the other day that the hog market could get rough in the late February-March-April peak marketing period. It seems that fall production of pigs in 1958 was up 17 percent over 1957. In South Dakota alone the jump was 49 percent, as we see by the South Dakota Farmers Union paper.

And on top of that, another pile-up of 16 percent is expected when spring pigs are farrowed, beginning in a short time.

So the Iowa economists tell farmers to market fall pigs in the next 30 days, as fast as they reach 210 to 220 pounds. It sounds to us that he is telling farmers to unload before the price bust. That's the advice of Francis A. Kutish, Iowa State College economist. We're just passing it on for what it is worth to you as individual farmers.

Well, we don't pretend to be livestock marketing experts but we do note that Glenn Long, manager of Farmers Union Marketing Association, is warning of a general slump in livestock prices, too.

The tragedy is that farmers can't do much about it now except maybe to plow under little pigs and cows—and that goes against just about everything farmers have always believed in. They believe in abundance and fair prices to consumers. They don't believe that food production should teeter on the verge of scarcity just to hold up prices. Farmers have said so time and again through their organizations like Farmers Union, and through their cooperatives like GTA. All they ask in return for this abundance is fair prices and a fair return on their labor, investment and management. Legislation to smooth out the free-wheeling—roller-coaster prices that are so ruinous to farm business management. And that's why more and more farmers are organizing and cooperating—GTA—the co-op way.

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF JANUARY 23, 1959

For many years now certain groups have been attacking the cooperatives that you farmers built. They say your co-ops don't pay taxes.

The truth is just the opposite. Every year the co-ops in the United States, from your hometown to the big cities like St. Paul, pay out many thousands of dollars in taxes. The same property—and real estate—and special taxes that any other business pays.

The only tax that the co-ops do not pay is the income tax that corporations pay on their profits. And why not? Because the earnings of a co-op belong to the people who do business with it and they are returned to these people in cash or securities.

Now, nearly all farmers know that. But many city people do not. It always comes as a surprise to them when they find out that co-ops are big taxpayers. In many communities, GTA or the local co-op is the biggest single taxpayer.

So on January 19, when President Eisenhower said in his budget message that corrective amendments to the laws on taxation of cooperatives will be transmited to the Congress shortly, farmers were not concerned because they are willing to pay their fair share of taxes and they believe that their privately owned, taxpaying co-ops are paying their fair share.

There was some talk in Washington that the Government could get $50 million a year more from co-ops. But Alfred D. Stedman of the St. Paul Pioneer Press says in a newspaper article that co-op leaders he has talked to agree that the Treasury's proposition is plainly not a revenue measure but a move to block future cooperative growth. Some doubted that it would yield any substantial revenue at all.

Roy F. Hendrickson, executive secretary of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, headquartered in Washington, says that co-op friends and even some of their enemies consider the Treasury proposal to be extreme, unfair, and punitive. It would force co-ops to pay a specific minimum interest rate and dictate the terms of their obligation to members. It would also reduce the ability of co-ops to expand services and activities that have been voted by members.

What is the treasury co-op tax proposal? It says that co-ops can keep their earnings for only three years despite the wishes of members. And they would have to pay 4 percent interest. At the end of 3 years it would all have to be paid out in cash no matter whether the co-op needs the money to grow and expand, or to carry on operations that have been ordered by the farmers.

And this, of course, is a drastic change from the historical treatment of cooperatives. The former Senator Robert A. Taft, a conservative and a Republican leader, said in 1951: "It is true that cooperatives may be able to accumulate reserves and build facilities from those reserves. But again, if the farmer is to have his fair bargaining power in the marketplace he requires physical facilities and there is no place where he can get the necessary capital except from the operation of the cooperative itself." That was Senator Taft's statement.

Unless there is strong co-op protest to the President's co-op tax plans, they could be railroaded through Congress. So it is up to co-ops and their farmer members to make themselves heard in Washington.

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF JANUARY 30, 1959

The most amazing thing about President Eisenhower's farm ideas is the fact that they are absolutely inflexible. They are rigid as a steel pole, and they haven't changed even a little bit since he named Mr. Benson as his Secretary of Agriculture back in 1953. The President, way back then, began demanding lower flexible farm price supports, and he did it with inflexible singlemindedness.

Almost every farmer in America, however, remembers the Eisenhower "Golden Promise" of full parity income for farmers. It was made in the 1952 campaign at Kasson, Minn., and repeated at Brookings, S. Dak. But by 1953, the golden promise was broken.

So the farm ideas that the President laid before Congress Thursday came as no surprise to farmers. They are Secretary Benson's ideas. The President apparently endorses them 100 percent. The very program that the President calls excessively expensive (and it is, both to farmers and taxpayers) is the handiwork of his Secretary of Agriculture.

Now even the big newspapers, and many important Republicans, are admitting that the President is wrong. The newspapers are full of criticism of the farm message—coming from both sides of the political fence. Just about any criticism you want to make already has been voiced by some top-ranking Republican or Democrat or farm leader.

One says the farm message is "conceived out of a desire to punish farmers for the sins of the Agriculture Department." Another says: "A plan to reduce farm prices 25 percent, and that's 100 percent wrong." You'll be hearing plenty more, too.

It has been obvious for some time now that Secretary Benson has been trying to put his hex sign on wheat. St. Paul newspaper writer Al Stedman says that "A terrific farm fight looms in Congress to head off a cut of 10 to 39 cents or more a bushel in Federal wheat price supports next year—and further cuts later." And he's right. The President called for wheat prices "competitive with corn and other feed grains." That would mean about $1.30 a bushel for wheat in 1960.

It's either that, the President indicated, or ironclad production cuts, along with lower price supports, down to about $1.43 a bushel. And either way, the wheat farmer would find that he must get along on less money. That's no choice.

Is there an alternative? Well, one suggestion that sounds reasonable is this: Farmers who are asked to cut way down on production should be given decent prices, on a parity yardstick. Be paid a living wage. How do you think that would work? Right for the moment, on the sunny side of the barn, there is the fact stated by GTA General Manager M. W. Thatcher. He said that Congress will decide this year's farm legislation, not Secretary Benson. And we note that Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON backs that up with a promise of new and better legislation.

But while you are waiting, don't forget that your cooperatives are on your side, both at home and in Washington. Patronize them, because they work for you, GTA—the co-op way.

Social Welfare Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on a recent tour of the Far East, Dr. Frederick M. Lange, executive vice president of the Dallas County Community Chest Fund, Dallas, Tex., delivered to audiences in Delhi, India, an outstanding address on social welfare work.

Dr. Lange, for many years an outstanding national leader in the American Community Chest movement, addressed the Delhi School of Social Work and the Indian Conference of Social Work.

I am informed that this address will cover slightly more than two pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a total cost of $216, but so well does it examine

the operations and ideals of community social welfare work that I believe it should be brought to the attention of the Congress and the people of America.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL WELFARE WORK

(Address delivered by Dr. Frederick M. Lange, executive vice president, Dallas Community Chest Trust Fund)

Under our Government we have a broad system of social insurance called social security participated in by all employed persons. Also almost all citizens carry life, accident, and hazard insurance with commercial firms. Further we have programs of financial assistance, some of which are under the joint auspices of our National and State Governments and some given by our local city and county governments. In general, our governmental social services are related to the need for financial assistance and medical care caused by misfortune, handicapping accidents, unemployment or old age. Many of our specialized social services, particularly in relation to personal and family counseling, child care, health education, research on various diseases, and preventive services are financed privately. In the latter our churches play a very significant part.

As you can see, in the United States of America most of our leaders as far as possible, try to get things done through private rather than governmental means. There is a conviction that we should not ask government to take on programs which can be carried effectively by private individuals or private organizations. Our community leaders resist the tendency to unnecessarily centralize authority in the National Government. If governmental help is necessary they do not ask the State to do what the local government could do, and they do not ask the National Government to do something which the State government could do.

Although our leaders made every effort to provide constructive and essential social services for individuals and families, they have a strong belief that these services should be given in such a way that they will encourage people to help themselves as much as possible. They have a conviction the social services should be given in such a way that they will restore and preserve the personal independence, responsibility, and initiative of the individual and his family.

In your kind invitation you suggested that I tell you about the work of the community chest. This is a complicated story and I will try to do it in general terms. You may wish to ask questions about specific matters later on and I will be glad to elaborate on any phase that interests you. Many of our voluntary agencies are older than the governmental services, many of which came into being during the widespread economic depression in the 1930's. Many of the national governmental agencies were created at that time because large numbers of persons were out of work and the need mounted so rapidly that it was not possible for private organizations to finance all the necessary help.

Every large American city has a very large number of private welfare organizations, each devoted to a specific area of service. In my community there are at least 75 such private organizations. To understand this complex situation some explanation is necessary. The main reason we have so many organizations in the field is because so many private groups are interested in and doing such a great variety of things. Their services touch the lives of everyone regardless of economic or social position. Welfare services in the United States of America are not confined to services for the indigent. A good example of this is the tremendous amount of money spent on research, public education, and case finding in regard to almost every known disease. We have many services classified as welfare services in which all economic groups participate. For instance, the Community Chest raises funds to support our Boy Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, Girl Scouts, Young Men's Christian Association, and Young Women's Christian Association. Boys and girls from the very high income families participate in these activities in exactly the same way as do children from homes where for various reasons the income may be modest. In certain programs some of the participants pay and some do not. The knowledge of who pays and who does not is kept confidential and is known only to the administrative office. As far as participation in the program is concerned, everyone is on an equal footing and treated alike.

In addition to the fact that our social services are for everyone, we have many agencies in the field because social work in the United States of America is specialized. Through constant studies our professional workers have learned a great deal and have developed skills which enable them to give more effective help. When a worker specializes, he gets to know more about his field and has greater competence, but they also must have a knowledge of the entire field.

Because of the number of these organizations, it is essential that there be some place where they all can come together, so that they can plan their many activities cooperatively and coordinate their programs. As you can readily understand, unless this is done there would be chaos and waste. Every large American city, therefore, has an organization called a council of social agencies or a welfare council. Representatives from all these organizations, both governmental and private, together with interested citizens, come together to plan their part in the total effort. The result is that these organizations are made aware of what social services are needed most in their county, and they are encouraged to give those services with as little duplication as possible. Although this coordinating and planning council works with all organizations, it is financed by voluntary gifts through the community chest.

I am telling you about the work of the council of social agencies before I tell you about the community chest because in this way I believe that my later remarks will be clearer. In addition to working and planning with representatives of all the agencies in our county, the council is constantly making studies concerning changes which need to be made as a result of changing social and economic conditions. The council also keeps the general public informed about what is being done, and also about what needs to be done in the future. The council on the basis of experience knows that an effective overall social welfare plan in any city must include a variety of basic social services. If more money than necessary is spent on one problem, this can mean that another problem, perhaps equally important, may be neglected. Too much of one service or too little of another upsets the balance and can make for inefficiency. Although this planning and coordination through the council is voluntary and not prescribed by government, it is remarkably effective. When the council recommends that a new service be created or a service changed or discontinued, the recommendation is usually followed because it is generally accepted that the recommendations are based on study and experience and in the best interests of the total community.

In an effort to generalize the many complex problems and services in a large city, some communities, including Dallas, classify the numerous social services into four large categories:

First. Those problems and services directed toward what we call economic needs. In other words, directed toward those individuals and families who cannot provide minimum living essentials for themselves because of some misfortune. This usually means food, shelter, and clothing.

Second. Problems and services related to health and health education. These services are directed toward everyone. Those who cannot afford to pay for essential medical care receive it free. Others pay in accordance with their ability depending upon their income, based on a scale developed by the council of social agencies called the standard family budget which is developed by expert homemakers. Much service and treatment is available from social agencies which is not available anywhere else.

Third is the area which we call counseling services. This area concerns casework, counseling, psychological testing, guidance and psychiatric services for individuals, including children, who have emotional or personality problems which are causing difficulties. Here again these services are for everyone.

The fourth area of service is the recreation, group work, informal education field. This includes community centers, clubs, scouting, and group activities for all ages but especially for young people. We have learned that providing opportunities for creative play and enjoyment is a necessity, not a luxury. Experience of such national groups as our National Recreation Association has indicated that constructive group activity is essential not only to good physical but also to good mental health.

I want to say a word of caution about the four areas of service which I have mentioned. I have greatly oversimplified a complex picture for the sake of brevity.

July 1956, I appeared before a group of social welfare leaders in Stockholm, Sweden under the auspices of the control committee representing 16 private business associations in Sweden. The members of these associations contribute to separate appeals by voluntary philanthropies approved by the committee. Last year they gave 47 million kroner for the support of Swedish voluntary agencies. I was pleased when my remarks at that meeting were printed and made a permanent record of our National Government in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the United States of America. The Swedish leaders were most interested in one particular aspect of my remarks, the fact that so much of the private social work activity in my country is carried on by nonpaid volunteers. This fact seemed to impress them most of all. In our total private welfare effort there is a low proportion of paid professional workers to nonpaid volunteers. We have several organizations where just one or two professional workers have several hundred volunteers to call upon to help get the agencies' work done. We have a very large number of volunteers who contribute their time working in hospitals, thus freeing the professional and technical staffs from doing many of the nontechnical chores. Another typical example is our group programs where a few well qualified professional workers recruit and train large numbers of volunteers to carry on the bulk of the program.

This same thing is true of activities directed toward financing private social services. Thousands of interested citizens volunteer their time in soliciting funds during the intensive campaigns. This participation on the part of nonpaid volunteers not only helps to lower costs but also builds up a strong interest in the social services on the part of the citizens. For these reasons you can see that social services in my country are truly for everyone and supported by everyone.

I cannot overemphasize this fact since it is so important. Because everyone benefits from these services and helps support them, it removes the old fashioned idea that social

services are an act of condescending charity on the part of those who have financial means toward those in the lower economic group. In our city social service is, "Many in one, for all." This is consistent with our democratic way of life.

Because so many citizens are involved in supporting these activities, it is impossible for anyone to tell exactly how many there are. I can only give you these examples and estimates. For instance, in one campaign for funds on the part of a health agency 20,000 citizens in my city actively participated. I believe it would be conservative to estimate that at least 75,000 citizens in Dallas are engaged in some form of nonpaid volunteer activity in our social service organizations. This does not include doctors, lawyers, and other professional groups who give millions of dollars of service free, contributing thousands of hours both day and night.

One of the most notable developments in this field in the United States of America is the community chest. This is the part of the total picture which I know best since I have been engaged in work related to social service for the past 25 years and have been a director of the Dallas Community Chest for the past 13 years. However, I come here realizing that what will operate successfully in my country may not necessarily work successfully in another country. I can only tell you what we do and leave the judgment of its values to you.

Of course, I have not come here as a missionary trying to convince you that our plan is the only one. I am certain that as leaders in this field in India, you have given considerable thought to these matters and that you have evolved an approach to your problem which is related to your particular needs and conditions. My only reason for going into detail about the plan which we use in the United States of America is to give you an opportunity to compare your methods with ours. This meeting will also give me the same opportunity and enable me to go back with new knowledge.

Because we have a great many voluntary welfare organizations their financing through private contributions is a large task. Many years ago each of these organizations collected its own funds by making separate appeals to the population. It was realized many years ago that this pattern of each one asking funds separately was inefficient. Gradually more and more of these private organizations came together and had one large appeal during the year for the benefit of all. The first American attempt at such a cooperative appeal for charitable purposes took place in the city of Denver in 1887. However, this venture was not permanent. The first cooperative appeal which is generally regarded as the first community chest was organized in the city of Cleveland in 1913. This method of raising funds for private welfare organizations has been very successful and has spread rapidly. According to United Community Funds and Councils of America, last year about 2,000 American cities used this method and the movement has spread to Canada, Hawaii, Australia, Cuba, the Philippines, and South Africa. Funds raised this way in 1956 for use in 1957 totaled more than $379 million, and represented contributions from over 26 million individuals and companies. This total effort was carried on by over 3 million volunteer citizen workers and supported the programs of over 21,000 private welfare organizations.

It is easy to understand why this method of fund raising is increasing in popularity. It allows the volunteer solicitors to concentrate on a single campaign instead of separate campaigns for each agency. It relieves the director and workers of the agency of the responsibility for raising their own funds and so enables them to concentrate on performing needed service. It helps the contributor because he knows that each organization which will receive money has been thoroughly studied by the citizen leaders in the community chest. Because the cooperative campaign is larger and more inclusive, it has an appeal to all people at all levels.

These cooperative fund-raising efforts in the United States of America have various names, many are called community chests and generally include only local agencies. An increasing number of local community chests are taking in more nationwide organizations and are becoming known as united funds. The prime purpose is the combining of many appeals on the part of private organizations into a single campaign. The success of this movement is not accidental. We believe that its success is due not only because it conserves funds and effort but because it builds public confidence in the work of the organizations. It helps the people to understand better not only the need for these organizations but to understand how their many activities are interrelated.

These large cooperative appeals can be made dramatic enough to gain the interest and support of the very top leaders in the community. Because of the inclusiveness and size of the appeal, more citizens can be enlisted as volunteer workers. This inclusiveness enables people and organizations of different faiths and backgrounds to work together. Through these efforts in the annual appeal an ever-increasing number of citizens have a more informed outlook about welfare matters and become the leaders of our total welfare effort. This is possible because they learn about the relationship of the voluntary agencies to the governmental agencies and therefore have a better understanding of both.

I would like to tell you how this plan works in my home county of Dallas. The Dallas Community Chest, which includes 35 local welfare agencies and 2 nationwide voluntary agencies that give services locally, has made significant strides in recent years. For instance, in 1948 we raised $1,470,000. In 1957 we raised $2,619,448. This is an increase of 78 percent. In 1948, 105,000 persons contributed. In 1957, of the 336,000 employed in Dallas County, 205,000 persons contributed. This is an increase of 94 percent. Remember we are talking of voluntary giving.

The Dallas Community Chest has an overall board of directors composed of 105 men and women. These people come from all walks of life. The board of directors, elected by those who give at least $1 to the fund, sets the general policies of the community chest, while many of the important day-by-day decisions are made by a 16-member executive committee. The small year-round paid staff of 15 members carries out the policies and decisions of the board and executive committee. As representatives of the overall community, these people vouch for the efficiency and integrity of the community chest operation. I cannot overemphasize the fact that all significant community groups are represented.

This citizen participation is further strengthened by the fact that each of the 37 member agencies of our community chest, operating a total of 105 centers of operation, has a board of directors of its own. There is a total of 670 board members serving with the member agencies. Agency board members help operate their agencies and also are expected to work in the chest campaign. This broad citizen interest is further strengthened by an additional 6,000 citizens who volunteer to work in the central fund-raising efforts. Each of these volunteer workers learns much about the work of the agencies and becomes an informed spokesman for them. It is their community chest and the agencies are their agencies. This whole project is carried on with the philosophy of "Many in one for all." Put in another way, when we help people who need us, we are helping everyone, and what hurts the general welfare hurts everyone.

To some degree our success depends upon our year-round public relations program. All publicity media are used. Television is being used more and more. Agencies are encouraged to use constructive human interest stories for publicity purposes. Each agency always states in its publicity that it is a member of the community chest. Periodically, we have public relations clinics, when agencies are given ideas of how better to interpret their services to the general public. In all of this the chest receives invaluable help from a publicity committee made up of outstanding public relations and advertising people in Dallas who give their time free. People who help in these ways become active partners in this enterprise.

In the actual solicitation of contributions every encouragement is given to make the giving convenient and fair. The total campaign organization is divided into divisions according to the major grouping of contributors, based on their type of business and ability to give. In this we have the cooperation of many business and labor union union leaders; for instance, the worker can pledge an annual amount of money and have this amount deducted from his regular pay check in monthly installments. At the employee's request the firm he works for will handle the deduction and send it to the community chest office. In our community, most salaried workers are encouraged to give 1 day's pay as a fair share while people with higher incomes are encouraged to give on a more generous basis. Their giving or not is a matter of conscience and election on their part.

A speakers bureau composed of informed volunteers gives talks before civic, professional, and employee groups explaining these matters. In all of this we have the encouragement of our National Government since under our income tax regulations a corporation may make tax-free gifts for charitable purposes up to 5 percent of profits. Individuals can make tax-free gifts of 20 to 30 percent. There are so many aspects of our operation that I can only pick a few to describe in detail.

One more factor which requires attention relates to the activities of our appeals review board. All fund-raising efforts for charitable purposes in Dallas must be licensed by the city government. In this way time of the campaign is designated also, so that several campaigns are not carried on at the same time. In addition, the leading business and industrial people in Dallas have a committee called the campaign screening committee. This group works closely with our Council of Social Agencies, and studies the need for the proposed campaigns before they contribute to them. As you can see, this helps the essential welfare efforts by discouraging the unessential ones.

Another of the many important aspects of our work is the way in which we determine the annual overall amount which is needed for the operation of the combined agencies of the chest for the coming year. This is the amount which we call our annual campaign goal. The community chest receives monthly financial reports and monthly activities reports from each member agency. This makes possible year round study and budget control and trends are noted quickly.

Each spring outstanding local citizens are appointed to serve on what we call the citizens budget committee. It would be impossible for 1 committee to review the budgets of all 37 chest agencies. Therefore, the committee is divided into four groups and each agency is assigned to one of the four budget groups, depending on its field of service.

The board of directors of each chest agency every year studies its own program in view

of future financial needs. Then each board of directors draws up a proposed budget which it believes its agency will need during the coming fiscal year beginning November 1. In June, a committee from each agency personally appears before the community chest budget committee to explain and justify the request for future funds.

During these conferences staff of the community chest and also of the Council of Social Agencies are present. The chest staff has at its finger tips data concerning previous expenditures of each agency, for each of the many individual items which comprise the total budget. Staff members of the Council of Social Agencies whose overall job is to know the work of all the many welfare groups in Dallas, are available during the discussions for consultation.

This procedure is used with all chest agencies, regardless of how much or how little of the agency's total income comes from the chest, and how much is derived from charging fees for its services, or from other sources. Several chest agencies in Dallas receive only a small proportion of their total income from the chest. On the other hand some agencies receive all of their funds from the community chest. This is so because, depending on the nature of service, some agencies can charge fees while others cannot. Some agencies have been able to supplement their chest income by receiving grants from foundations and trusts; still other agencies receive part of their funds from the community chest and part from the local government. The scrutiny of each budget item is the same regardless of the sources of the funds.

A good example of an agency which receives funds from a variety of sources is the Dallas Child Guidance Clinic which provides psychological testing and psychiatric services for emotionally troubled children. That agency is currently receiving support from six sources: the community chest, fees from clients, the Texas State Department of Health, the Dallas public schools, a local private foundation, and a private statewide foundation. The budget of this agency is handled in the same way as the budget of the Neighborhood Recreation Association, a small community center which receives all of its operating funds from the community chest.

The campaign goal for the year is based upon information provided by the budget committee. An additional amount must be added and earmarked as a reserve for necessary unforeseen expansions during the coming year. Also, an amount must be added as a reserve for emergencies and an amount for uncollectible pledges and shrinkage. I can go into more detail about this in the question period if you wish.

Each agency is immediately notified of the action taken on its particular budget request. Should the agency feel that its request was not given proper consideration, that agency can return to the budget committee for a rehearing. Although in Dallas the chest raises over $2½ million, the total expenditures of the chest agencies are close to $6 million. This means that for an investment from voluntary contributions of $2½ million the chest agencies are providing $6 million worth of service to the community.

The budgeting process is an important part of not only financing, but planning for welfare services. The chest budget committee made up of outstanding local citizens represents the persons who use the agencies' services and who contribute to the cost of the services. It includes people of all races and religious backgrounds, housewives, salaried workers, union labor officials, professional men, career Government men, and leaders of business and industry. It is important to clarify that although these people are identified with these various groups, they do not come as official delegates. They come as citizens and are free to act as individuals. For instance, the man or woman from industry or labor does not speak officially for their organization nor do they commit their group but because they are leaders in their field their opinion is highly regarded. This is consistent with our democratic way of life. However, the benefits of this budgeting system are greater than giving representation to people who use and pay for the services. Through this close review of each agency's budget, citizen leaders get to know a great deal about their community.

The budgeting process pledges to the community that the funds which the community chest collects for the agencies is vitally needed and is being spent wisely. Also, the budget committees learn very quickly that the various agencies could provide more good services than current funds can support. This means that the budget committees must choose and approve only those expenditures which they feel are important. Because of this they can tell the general public the necessity for, not only attaining the current goal, but the need to raise more money in future years, so that additional services can be given. It is democracy at work through public education and voluntary commitment.

I believe you will agree with me that the process which I tried to outline contributes much to our community life. It is far more than merely a check on the validity of the agencies' request. It not only keeps fund raising costs low, it not only makes for greater efficiency, it not only helps to keep balance among the many various types of social services; but it has educational, social, and spiritual values.

Many of our people say that the byproducts of the community chest fund raising efforts are just as important as the direct results in terms of money; for instance, our business firms tell us that working in the chest campaign is excellent leadership training for their young executives.

Working together for a common unselfish goal is basically a spiritual experience which cuts across all religious and denominational lines. We never lose sight of this fact. Participation by clergy of all faiths is emphasized. Many of the campaign meetings are led by outstanding spiritual leaders and the efforts of the volunteers and the significance of the money raised is constantly translated into spiritual values.

We are convinced that the democratic way of life is best. We are convinced that the quality of our democracy depends upon our standard of values, which in turn depends upon the quality of our religious life. We know that our community chest efforts gives our people an opportunity to put their religion to work. Through this work they dedicate themselves to the finest in life. There is no question in our minds but that this program, hand in hand with the church, strengthens the foundations of our lives. This truly is our concept of many in one for all.

Thank you very much for your interest and attention. I shall be happy to try to answer your questions.

The Farmer, the Public, and the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I note with increasing frequency the publication of statements and reports and speeches on the situation of farmers that put this situation into the clear light of objective examination. Apparently, more and more people are able to see through the smokescreen of propaganda put out by the Secretary of Agriculture and other officials of the administration and by those who expect a huge volume-low price farm economy to increase their profits.

At the 57th Annual Farm and Home Week Convocation on the St. Paul campus of the University of Minnesota recently, Lauren K. Soth, editorialist for the Des Moines (Iowa) Register and Tribune, spoke out some home truths on the relationships of the farmer, the public, and the Government.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Soth's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMER, THE PUBLIC, AND THE GOVERNMENT, AN ADDRESS BY MR. LAUREN K. SOTH, EDITOR OF EDITORIAL PAGES, DES MOINES REGISTER AND TRIBUNE, TO THE 57TH ANNUAL FARM AND HOME WEEK CONVOCATION, ST. PAUL CAMPUS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, JANUARY 15, 1959

It's human nature that your difficulties seem less burdensome when you observe your neighbor facing greater hardships than your own. When you're in the hospital you feel much better if you see someone across the hall in worse shape.

In the interest of this kind of therapy, it might be a good idea for Americans to compare their farm problem with that of the Soviet Union. In these cold war days, we are making comparisons with the Russians all the time—on progress in atomic energy, space satellites, intercontinental missiles, and so on. Some of these comparisons don't make us very happy. But just take a look at the farm problems of the two countries and you'll get a real lift.

The Soviet Union needs a great deal more farm production; it needs more meat, eggs, milk, and other high-quality protein foods; and it needs higher output per man in farming to release more people for work in Russian factories and offices. Dictator Khrushchev knows very well that industrial expansion will be limited by the productivity of agriculture. Since Stalin's death, the new Khrushchev regime has been promoting agricultural research and education, offering incentives to farm people to produce more, granting more freedom of initiative to farm managers, and in other ways driving for a more productive agriculture. A large number of Russian farm delegations have been sent to the United States, Canada, and other countries to pick up ideas on better methods.

In the United States, our farm problem is having too much rather than too little. In spite of efforts by the Government to hold farm production in check, farmers are continuing to turn out more than we can possibly use. Nearly everybody in the United States is well fed, and Secretary Benson is trying hard to ship more of our grain, livestock products, cotton, and other farm products overseas. Still, the stuff keeps piling up. We have more than a year's supply of wheat ahead. We could stop producing wheat for a full year and not run any serious risk of shortage, either for ourselves or our normal foreign outlets. Feed-grain supplies have been building up, and farmers now are beginning to convert more and more of these feed supplies into pork, beef, chicken, and other livestock products. In the next few years, livestock farmers will face a serious crisis of low prices and low

net incomes. Overabundance of American agriculture is proving to be a chronic, and certainly an unsolved, problem.

Since Ezra Benson seems unable to prevent farm surpluses and Vladimir Matskevich, the Russian minister of agriculture, seems unable to prevent farm shortages, it has been suggested that the happiest solution all around would be for us to trade secretaries of agriculture with the Soviet Union. I suspect that this idea would have some support both in the United States and in the Soviet Union.

Joking aside, Americans ought to consider their farm problem in the light of the Russian farm people, which is a much more common one in the world than our own.

Our kind of farm problem, overproduction, is a serious one for farmers, to be sure. But from the general public point of view, it is not a problem at all, it is a mark of magnificent achievement. The American people have no worries about being short of food. Agriculture is not a limiting factor on economic growth in this country.

Yet many Americans seem to have the idea that farming is a horribly inefficient industry, heavily subsidized and mismanaged by the Government. One even hears talk like this from the highest echelon of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It is not surprising, therefore, that many ordinary city dwellers think they are victims of a greedy farm pressure group, with rich farmers getting large handouts from the Government.

What are the facts? Is it true that the American people are being gouged by farmers? Is the public paying too much for the food abundance, the food security, it receives from farmers?

First, let's look at the cost to the public in the form of taxes. The U.S. Department of Agriculture budget is one of the largest nondefense items in the Federal budget. In recent years it has amounted to from $5 billion to $7 billion a year. This huge sum often is labeled as a farm subsidy, and despite attempts by some farm leaders to put the facts straight, the myth still lives on.

The greater part of the Department of agriculture budget goes for general services which are of benefit to the entire population, not just to farm people. These services include scientific research, education, grading of farm and food products, market reporting, the U.S. Forest Service, soil conservation work, and a great many other activities. The budget also includes such things as the Rural Electric Co-operative loans, which are being repaid on schedule and can hardly be lumped off as a subsidy.

The benefits of agricultural research and educational activity go to consumers very promptly. The purpose of these public programs is to improve agricultural efficiency; and their effect is to increase total farm output, thus bringing down prices of farm products and the cost of food. I want to say more about the whole Federal-State program of farm research and education later. But let me move on now to the subsidy question.

In the last 25 years the Federal Government has been trying to protect agriculture against the effects of its own abundance—by price supports, direct payments for making acreage adjustments, putting land into soil conserving uses and so on. How much have these subsidies amounted to? According to the Department of Agriculture's calculation, the cost of programs for stabilization of farm prices and income never amounted to as much as 1 billion dollars a year until 1955. In 1955, it amounted to $1.4 billion, in 1956 $1.9 billion, and in 1957, $3.3 billion. The 1958 figure may be still higher, but it will be a long way from the $7 billion often labeled as farm subsidy. But even these Department of Agriculture figures on cost of farm income supports are somewhat misleading.

The $3.3 billion for 1957 include more than $600 million loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation from sales of farm commodities to foreign countries. There is a question whether this loss should be called farm subsidy or foreign aid. The CCC also lost $171 million in 1957 from the sale or donation of farm products in this country, including distribution in the school lunch program. Is this general welfare program all to be charged as subsidy to farmers? In our public accounting, we should make allowances for some of these dual-purpose programs.

The cost of farm price and income support programs has gone up sharply in recent years, though price support levels have been lowered. Why is this? Part of the reason is that the CCC has been taking its losses on commodities accumulated in earlier years. Also, crop production has been unusually large and market prices of major crops have dropped. So CCC has had to put out more cash to provide price support even though the guaranteed levels are lower.

The reason why price supoprts cost the Government so much money is that farm production controls have not worked. The drive to improve farm technology, spurred by Federal and State research and educational programs, has been a far more powerful force in American agriculture than the acreage allotments and other efforts to limit output.

Or, to say this the other way around: If farm production controls were effective, market prices of farm products would be above the support levels. So the cost of farm income supports would not appear in the Federal budget. Instead it would appear in the price of food, and the public would pay all of it in the food bill instead of partly in the tax bill. That's the way tariff subsidies are paid, of course; they don't loom up in the Federal budget.

One more point should be mentioned. A sizable proportion of the cost of farm programs consists of payments to private warehousemen, exporters, and other handlers of grain, dairy products, and cotton. In recent years, these charges have been from $⅓ to $½ billion annually—out of a total cost of $2 to $3 billion.

No one should assume that all the money for farm programs goes to farmers.

The price supporters and storage operations are ever-normal granary or stabilizing operations with wide variations in costs from year to year. So, to get a more accurate picture of what the programs have cost the taxpayer, CCC losses should be averaged over a period of years. For the 10 years through 1957, they averaged just under a billion dollars a year. If you take the entire 25 years of such programs, the cost averaged about $600 million a year. In the war years, CCC actually showed a profit on grain and cotton acquired during the late 1930's.

So much for the cost of farm income support programs to the taxpayer.

The public also has had to pay somewhat higher prices for food in certain years than it would have paid without the programs. Undoubtedly, food prices would be lower today if the Government had not removed a portion of the supply of some farm products from regular commercial markets.

Whatever this cost has been during periods of accumulation of surpluses, it should be balanced against the effects of the stabilization programs to reduce food costs in periods of short crops and in wartime. Over the last 25 years, the cost to the consumer certainly has been small.

When these programs began back in the early thirties there was great fear that the consumer would be injured. A consumer's counsel was established in the Department of Agriculture to guard the public interest. This fear that a giant farm monopoly, established through Government, would gouge the consumer proved to be unwarranted.

In fact, the American consumer has done very well under the farm programs. The proportion of his income spent for food has declined steadily. It's true that people buy more packaging, more precooking and other services with their food. But they spend relatively less for the food itself than they did before the farm programs began.

Another way to assess the effect of the farm programs is to look at income per person on farms, compared with the average income of nonfarm people. The average income of farm people, including money value of house rent and food and fuel consumed on the farm, was about half the average income of city people in the midthirties. Farm income per person today still is about half of nonfarm income per person. Farm income rose during the war relative to nonfarm income, but it has declined in the last few years. So farm people are no better off compared with the rest of the population than they were in the mid-thirties. This surely indicates that the farm programs have not resulted in great transfers of income from the general public to farmers.

When the farm programs began in the thirties, it was also feared that progress in farming efficiency would be stopped. Controls, it was said, would stifle farmers' initiative. Farm income would be so high, moreover, that too many people would stay in farming—and necessary population adjustments would not be made. This criticism of farm programs is still being made. It's nonsense. Farm production and marketing controls have not stifled initiative, and they haven't prevented change.

Farm production efficiency has continued to rise very rapidly—more rapidly in recent years than productivity in nonfarm industry. Moreover, people have been leaving farming in droves. Since 1940, about one-third of the entire farm labor force has left agriculture. This is a terrific adjustment, and it is still going on.

A good case could be made, I think, that the net effect of acreage changes under the allotments, plus incentives for better land use through conservation programs, plus the reduction of uncertainty through price supports, have advanced the overall efficiency of U.S. agriculture, increased total output, and lowered food costs to consumers.

Far be it from me to defend all the farm acreage allotments, price support, and other programs. Many of them have been ill-conceived. The price supports on a few basic crops have been a clumsy way of trying to protect farm income in a period of overabundance. Acreage controls haven't worked well and have led to some distortions in production. We need to be looking for better ways of stabilizing farm income.

But the present programs have been better than nothing. Without them, farm people would be much worse off than they are today. It is only with these programs that farmers have been able to hold their own in the great advance in national income of the last 20 years.

In examining the farm income support programs of the last 25 years, we ought to put them in perspective. These programs of price support, acreage allotment, and direct payments are comparatively minor in the whole picture of Government intervention in agriculture.

The really big Government programs are in research and education. And they have been going on for almost 100 years. The Land Grant College system of experiment stations and extension services has had far more impact on agriculture than any of the so-called subsidy programs of recent years.

For nearly a century the American people have been pumping new technology into agriculture. They have been urging farmers, in effect, to produce more and to produce more efficiently. And farmers have responded. This has been an extremely important factor in the general economic progress of the United States. Why is it that it takes only about 10 percent of our working population to produce food and fiber when it takes about 25 percent for Europe and about 40 percent for the Soviet Union?

It isn't just that we have good land and a free enterprise system. It is in large measure the result of a deliberate public policy of promoting farm efficiency, Government intervention in agriculture on a massive scale. The land grant colleges, the Department of Agriculture, the county agent system, the high school vocational agricultural teachers, all these are a part of it. In recent years the Soil Conservation Service also has helped push farm technology forward.

This vast program of farm research and education has been good for America. Farm leaders, Government farm officials, and farm educators have been remiss in not explaining to the public who it is that benefits from this effort to make farming more efficient. In recent times farmers as a group actually have suffered because of the advances in technology which have stimulated total farm output. The reason is that prices of farm products decline more than enough to offset the lower costs. The highly inelastic demand for food makes a big farm output sell at a far lower price than a small output.

If agriculture were using the methods of 1940 today, the country as a whole would be much poorer. But farmers would be much richer. Prices of food would be far higher, and Mr. Benson would have no surpluses to worry about.

Let me reemphasize the issue here. We have had a consistent public program, socialistic program if you like, to increase farm output. When the results of this policy show up in surpluses and low prices, it seems hardly fair to tell farmers they must make the necessary adjustments on their own in a free market.

What are the policy choices then?

One choice is to adopt a free market policy all the way. This would mean greatly reducing the public investment in research, education, soil conservation, reclamation, and so on, as well as ending price supports.

This policy would impose a drastic adjustment on agriculture, with low prices and and incomes for some years ahead. But eventually a balance would be reached and farm prices and incomes would rise. The cost to the present farm population and to future generations of consumers from such a policy would be a high one indeed. No one would seriously consider the reckless course of dismantling all the public facilities for encouraging more efficient farming.

Another choice is a real production control program for agriculture with quotas in bushels and pounds. This would give farmers some bargaining power and would raise income. But it would also require tight discipline and limited entry into farming. It would be difficult to enforce. It might slow down the advance in farm technology. From the public viewpoint, this also would be a costly and undesirable choice.

A third choice would be to continue and improve present government programs to support farm income. Even if these programs cost the taxpayer a considerable amount of money, and even if they create difficulties in handling surpluses, this choice is preferable to an elaborate control system. The total cost to the public, considering the price of food and the technical progress of the farm industry, would be much lower.

As is so often the case in difficult public policy problems, the middle way turns out to be the most desirable way.

One Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Victor Herbert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this year all America is celebrating the 100th anniversary of the birth of that great Irish-born, German-bred, and American-adopted musician, Victor Herbert. Creator of numerous operettas and two grand operas, symphony conductor and virtuoso, Herbert is especially remembered today for such perennial melodies as "Ah, Sweet Mystery of Life," "Kiss Me Again," "Sweethearts," and "Indian Summer." A generous friend to his fellow composers, Herbert was one of the founders in 1914 of the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers—ASCAP—which is dedicated to the proposition that no composer of music which has ever found its way into the hearts of Americans shall ever want for the necessities of life—nor that composer's widow and children.

Hugh Mulligan, talented writer for the Associated Press, has condensed Herbert's colorful career in a short article which I commend to the attention of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an excellent summary of Herbert's character and accomplishments. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 1, 1959]

VICTOR HERBERT'S ANNIVERSARY RECALLS HIS LOVE OF QUIET

(By Hugh A. Mulligan)

Victor Herbert, born 100 years ago today, never lived into the age of television. He was lucky.

Although he would have enjoyed writing for it, he would have abhorred listening to it, especially if the neighbors had a set and insisted on playing it into the wee hours.

A musician all his life, the composer of 43 operettas, 22 grand operas, and innumerable concertos, suites, ballets, and other pieces, Herbert asked only one thing of the world: quiet.

But the world was reluctant to comply. Sometimes it seemed that all the forces of man and nature conspired to torment the artist in his atelier. Rag pickers blew bugles in the streets below his window. Ferry boats and switch engines intruded on his musical musings with unscored horn solos. Children shouted, trolleys clanged, cattle mooed and bleated on their way to the big stockyard on the corner. And invariably the little girl next door decided to take up the piano right in the middle of one of his most intricate stage compositions.

In desperation, the volatile Irishman once had double doors installed in his upper Manhattan studio and hired the U.S. Gypsum Co. to do a thorough soundproofing job—this in a day when even opera houses lacked such acoustical refinements. Two weeks later a music professor moved into the adjoining apartment with five grand pianos, two violins and an octet of young lady students who came for sorely needed voice lessons.

"His caterwauling all day long is driving me crazy," cried the exasperated composer. "We hear it before breakfast and it doesn't stop until quite late at night, but if the music were any good we wouldn't mind."

Herbert informed the soundproofing firm it could go whistle for its money outside his double door. He would hear them all right, he fumed, but he wouldn't come out to pay. He successfully defended his stand in a celebrated court battle, then tried unsuccessfully to have the board of health dispossess his musical neighbors as a public nuisance.

This predilection for peace and quiet may seem strange for a man who once directed America's biggest brass band, conducted the great Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra and spent most of his life creating noise—thrilling, melodious noise that still echoes down the years whenever an orchestra plays "Kiss Me Again," "Indian Summer," "Kiss in the Dark," "Sweethearts," or any of the dozens of other great tunes that flowed from his fertile imagination.

But that's the way the "Prince of Operettas" was. He could build a summer home at Lake Placid in the Adirondacks, buy up the houses on each side to make sure the tenants had no pianos and then spend his afternoons playing the cello with a little band down in the village square that had the butcher playing flute, the blacksmith on cornet and other tradesmen sitting in as their time allowed.

To him music was a happy, gregarious way of life, filled with good friends, good wine, good food, good cigars. But it was a way that brooked no interference.

Herbert is best remembered for operettas like "The Red Mill," "Babes in Toyland," "Naughty Marietta," "Eileen," "Mlle. Modiste," and "The Fortune Teller." People forget that in his day he was considered the world's greatest cello virtuoso, an accomplished musician who did all his own orchestration, was an intimate friend of Tschaikovsky, Dvorak, Liszt, Richard Strauss, and played a major part in the development of American music.

The American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers (ASCAP) was founded at his famous gourmet's table in Luchow's restaurant on 14th Street in Manhattan. He remained a member of its board of directors until his death in 1924. In a historic test suit involving his music, he battled all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court to win royalty payments for composers.

Fritzi Scheff, Vernon and Irene Castle, Helen Hays, Peggy Wood, Elsie Janis, Gus Van, Fay Bainter, Marilyn Miller and a host of others won critical acclaim in his productions. A second generation of Herbert fans arrived in the thirties with the Nelson Eddy and Jeanette MacDonald movie versions of his works. And now a third generation is being mustered by television spectaculars and hi-fi recordings.

United States Is Now Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following text of an article which appeared in the November 14, 1958, issue of U.S. News & World Report. This article presents a very thorough and encouraging picture of just where the United States stands in comparison with

Russia in all areas of rivalry. It would appear from this article that the United States is today, despite all of Russia's boastful claims, still the No. 1 world power and is expected even to widen her lead in the future.

UNITED STATES NOW AHEAD—WILL IT GAIN MORE IN WEAPONS? ATOMIC POWER? SCHOOLS? SCIENCE? INDUSTRY?

Is Russia threatening the U.S. position as No. 1 world power? Hardly. Despite gains, Soviet Russia still lags far behind in practically everything. It's a primitive nation by U.S. standards. But are the Communists gaining, closing the gap? Take a look at the record.

Signs grow that the United States today is ahead of Soviet Russia in all fields of rivalry and still is gaining.

The lead—lost sight of when sputnik I went into orbit—is in diplomacy, in science, in schooling, in weapons, in industry, in well-being of people, in freedom of the individual.

Recent events signal the American lead over the Soviet Union.

In the Far East, around Quemoy, Communists pulled back from war when challenged.

In the Arab world, Egypt's Nasser, Soviet ally, is being checked in his drive for an empire in the Middle East.

In Europe, France is taking a sharp turn to the right. Communist parties in all of the countries of Western Europe are steadily losing strength.

In space, United States has three satellites in orbit; Soviet Russia, one. United States has probed 80,000 miles toward the moon; Soviet Russia, only hundreds of miles. United States, with its X-15 rocket plane, possesses the only manned vehicle capable of flight into space.

WHO'S REALLY SECOND-RATE?

Those are a few outward signs of inner trends that shape the course of affairs in the world of today. In that world, United States-Soviet rivalry is basic.

A claim is being made at this time that the United States today is a second-class power, reduced to a status below that of Communist Russia.

All evidence points to the contrary conclusion: United States today is the world's No. 1 power; Soviet Russia the world's No. 2 power—its only real strength resting upon arms.

FORCE ON ONE SIDE, FREEDOM ON THE OTHER

A simple measure underlines that conclusion. The measure being applied is this:

Soviet Russia, at home and within its empire, is dependent upon armed force to keep its people in line. Force alone holds the Communist empire together. Remove force, and the whole structure topples.

The United States, on the contrary, lives free from fear. People are not afraid of the Government. Government does not live in fear of the people. Allies of United States remain allies by choice, not allies held by armed force.

Fear is found to represent the basic weakness of the Soviet Union—fear of people on the part of Government; fear of Government on the part of the people.

It is against that background that other measures of strength and weakness are being applied now to United States and Soviet Russia.

IN ARMED MIGHT, A DECISIVE LEAD

To the world, the arms race is a measure of who is ahead. Let Soviet Russia gain the lead, and she'll chance World War III, aim for her goal of world rule. Keep a U.S. lead, and Soviets will stop short of a showdown.

The United States lead in weapons, in thermonuclear explosives, and ability to deliver them, is regarded by military officials as decisive at this time. Thel ead, as the military sees it, lies in these fields:

Bases

The United States and its allies have more than 400 U.S. air and missile bases ringing the Soviet Union. At sea are a score or more of mobile air bases and missile bases. One false move by Russia, and her destruction could follow.

Bombers

Russia is far behind United States in jet bombers. The major Soviet effort in long-range striking power is concentrated on ballistic missiles. United States today, in bombers, possesses the means to destroy Soviet Russia.

Aircraft carriers

The Communists never entered this race. In these ships is another powerful U.S. striking force.

Long-range missiles

Neither United States nor the Russians possess at this time operational missiles of ballistic type with 5,000-mile range. Russia may be slightly ahead in development work. She has a rocket motor more powerful than the United States has. But United States today possesses operational long-range air-breathing missiles, and Russia possesses none.

Other missiles

In medium-range missiles, United States and Russia are described as nearly neck and neck, but with United States ahead. With overseas bases, medium-range missiles suit United States best. In antiaircraft missiles, United States is ahead. In air-to-air missiles, United States is much ahead. In battlefield missiles, United States is ahead. In ship-borne missiles, United States is far ahead.

Submarines

The Soviet Union is ahead in numbers of submarines. However, United States possesses, and Russia lacks, nuclear-powered submarines capable of operating indefinitely under water. Atomic submarines soon will provide capability of launching medium-range missiles to strike most of Soviet Russia.

Atomic weapons

United States, with a long head start, is well out front with specially tailored atomic and thermonuclear weapons of all types. Russia, to date, is testing cruder-type bombs of great power, described as "dirty" because of heavy fallout of radioactive material.

Ground armies

Here the Soviet edge in terms of divisions of troops is great. Reliability of Soviet and satellite armies in event of trouble is described as "uncertain." Satellite armies proved highly unreliable during Hungary's anti-Communist revolt of 2 years ago.

As of now, American military officials describe the U.S. lead in the arms race as "impressive."

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE RACE TO SPACE

But what of space? Isn't the Soviet Union far ahead in the race to conquer space? Will the one who wins that race control the world?

The answer informed officials give is this: Sputniks are not weapons. They are objects tossed into space and placed in orbit. The time when space will become a major battlefield is so remote that nobody need now become excited about it.

Even so, who is ahead in space exploration? The answer:

Earth satellites

United States has successfully launched four; Soviet Russia, three. The Communists have launched the largest satellite; United States, those capable of producing the greatest variety of scientific information. Russia showed that she possesses rocket motors with a thrust greater than present American motors. Today it's a toss-up in the satellite race but with United States moving ahead fast.

Moon shots

In October, when a U.S. space vehicle first went 8,000 miles toward the moon. Soviet scientists conceded that the Americans were far ahead in that type of space probe.

Space ships

In the X–15, United States possesses the nearest thing to a man-piloted space ship, capable of traveling under its own rocket power. Capt. Iven Kincheloe, before he was killed in a jet accident, piloted an earlier test plane to the very edge of space and, briefly, experienced the sensation of weightlessness. No other nation is even close to the United States in this race.

Balloon exploration

Again United States is ahead.

Space exploration is in its early stages. United States is at least equal to the Soviet Union in this experimental field. Every indication is that it is pushing ahead, now that a race has started.

KHRUSHCHEV CHOOSES BRAWN OVER BRAINS

Now about education. One year ago, when Sputnik I orbited the earth, a furor arose over the quality of U.S. education.

All the youth of Soviet Russia was pictured as feverishly busy studying mathematics and physics. Engineers were pouring out of colleges, scientists being developed on a mass-production basis.

A big backdown

Today, what do you find? The goal of 10 years of schooling for all in Russia is being abandoned by Nikita Khrushchev, Soviet dictator. An eighth-grade education is to be considered good enough for the average Soviet youth. Manual labor is set as the highest goal.

But let Khrushchev explain the reforms that he is making in education.

Under the new Khrushchev school system: The great majority of Soviet youths will leave school and start work at age 14 or 15. By American standards, Soviet Russia will exploit child labor.

Said Khrushchev in Pravda, Soviet newspaper, to Russia's youngsters: "You will get what amounts to a high school education not through present-day schools, which are divorced from life, but through a network of evening or correspondence courses."

Work all day and go to school at night, that's the new offer. There is a further promise of on-the-job training for youths who show special skills.

Why not a high school education for all? Said Khrushchev: "Everything indicates that it would not be advisable, at the present time, to make high school education—in its present form—universal and compulsory.

"The majority, having completed high school and received their diploma, turn out to be unprepared for life. They don't know where to go from there."

Said Khrushchev, too: "A number of high school graduates are reluctant to go to work in factories, on collective farms and on state farms, and some of them even regard such work as degrading. Our society raises people who do not respect physical labor and are out of touch with life. We cannot put up any longer with such a bad situation."

A paradox

The Soviet dictator is not impressed by Soviet schools, as some American educators profess to be.

Khrushchev told parents of Russia: "If a child studies badly, some parents will tell him: 'If you don't do well in your studies, you won't get into college; you'll go to the factory as an ordinary laborer.' Some people use physical labor as a kind of scarecrow with which to frighten the children. This

is insulting to working people in a socialist society.

"Although college entrance examinations do exist," Khrushchev said, "it must be admitted that to get into college it is often not enough to pass the examinations successfully. The influence of parents also plays a large role. Young people who are trying for college often say that, after they are through competing among themselves, there begins a competition among their parents, and it is this competition that often decides everything.

"We cannot close our eyes to the fact that there are few children of workers and peasants in our colleges and universities," Khrushchev added. "In Moscow colleges and universities, for example, only 30 to 40 percent of students are children of workers and peasants.

"Some of our agricultural colleges have their own farms, but at these farms the animals which the students are supposed to study are cared for by laborers. What kind of aristocratic setup is that? Under this kind of system a student who comes to the farm is scared out of his wits when a cow shakes her head."

That is higher Soviet education as Khrushchev describes it.

A democratic shift

Now there is to be change. In most colleges and universities, students will hold down full-time jobs during the first 2 or 3 years. They will go to school and study outside working hours. In the concluding period there will be full time for study—"except for the necessary practical training."

Khrushchev said in Pravda: "This system will be democratic since more nearly equal conditions will be created for all citizens: Neither the position of parents, nor the exertions of these parents will free anyone from productive labor. Secondly, this system will constitute a wonderful school for the raising of all youngsters in the spirit of the heroic traditions of the working class and of the collective-farm peasantry."

Better than the American system? Most educators say: Definitely not.

Behind the switch

Why the sudden change in Russia? Reasons being given are two:

1. A labor shortage plagues Soviet Russia. School changes will free 2.5 million to 3 million for work each year.

2. Educated youths are found to be politically unreliable. Soviet periodicals are sprinkled with references to incorrect attitudes and activities of students. Khrushchev's idea: Break up campus life, and nests of unrest are removed.

FORMULA FOR PROGRESS: STEALING OF SECRETS

Where, then, does this leave the Soviet Union in the field of science? The answer, it seems, is this: Far behind United States except in a few fields related to war.

In rocket-motor development, the Russians are equal to United States, if not ahead. In nuclear physics, the Soviet Union is far advanced, but United States is still out front, as many Russian scientists themselves admit. The main Soviet textbooks in advanced nuclear physics are American books translated into Russian.

In the whole vast field of chemistry, Soviet Russia is not even in the race. The Soviet government is seeking to buy equipment and know-how from United States in order to break into the chemical industry.

Medical backwardness

In another major field, that of disease-combating drugs, the Soviets are far behind. Soviet medical research is still wrestling with the problems of overcoming epidemics of diphtheria, scarlet fever, and other diseases which were virtually licked in the West decades ago.

Of science in Russia, Lieut. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, the U.S. Army's Chief of Research and Development, said this:

"The advanced state of Soviet technology is due more to Soviet success in espionage and subversion than it is to their scientific apparatus, good as it is."

And what do Russia's scientists themselves think about the relative standing of United States and Russian science? For an answer, listen to academician A. I. Berg, one of the Soviet Union's leading scientists. At a meeting called to celebrate the launching of the first sputnik, Berg stated:

"Hardly any of us thinks that American scientists and engineers are lagging behind us from the point of view of science and technology."

Atomic Power: The Standing

It is somewhat the same story in the development of atomic power.

Soviet Russia has the world's largest single reactor for development of electric power. The United States, however, has over 80 atomic-power test reactors in operation or in various stages of development—a program whose scope has been officially described as "not approached by any other country."

Other countries, in fact, are now beginning to turn to the United States for the purchase of such reactors.

An even more impressive lead has been established by the United States in the use of atoms in industry. More than 1,300 U.S. firms are now using atomic tools for such processes as gaging the thickness and density of products, testing metal castings and weldings, etc. The use of radioactive isotopes for improved production techniques is saving U.S. industry $500 million a year.

United States is making important advances, too, in putting the atom to work in medicine. Radioactive isotopes are used to diagnose or treat the ailments of about 1,000 Americans each year.

In spite of all the talk, U.S. science still seems well ahead of Soviet science.

LAND OF MUD HUTS AND VILLAGE PUMPS

Or measure strength with other yardsticks. Success of a nation or a system may be judged by the well-being of its people.

Apply that measurement, and what do you find? Russia a first-class power?

Diet

In Soviet Russia, basically the diet is cabbage soup, coarse bread, potatoes. Meat is scarce.

Shelter

One room to a family is standard in major Soviet cities. Mud huts or log cabins are home for rural families.

Clothing

Quality is poor, price high, style standardized, colors are dark and drab, a subject of comment by visitors from the West.

Plumbing

Fewer than half of Soviet cities have public water supplies; fewer than one-fifth, a sewage system. Apartments offer usually courtyard water pumps and outdoor toilets.

Privacy

Largely nonexistent. A kerosene stove usually is shared with other families. Bathrooms, where provided, are shared with several families.

Refrigeration

Largely nonexistent. Modern kitchens are unheard of. Electric power is little used in homes except for limited lighting.

Travel

Highly restricted. Police permits are required. Private cars are a rarity. No really modern highways exist in the whole of Soviet Russia. Air travel is unavailable to the general public.

Family life

Difficult. Half of Soviet Russia's working force is made up of women. In United States it is one-third. Women do much of the heaviest manual labor in Russia; almost none in United States.

Use any standard for measuring the well-being of people, and United States is far ahead.

WAR ECONOMY VERSUS ABUNDANCE OF PEACE

Why is Russia so far behind United States in good things enjoyed by the people? The economy of Soviet Russia is strictly a war economy. A bare subsistence is offered the civilian. The economy of United States is overwhelmingly a peace economy. The military is required to get along on a small fraction of the Nation's total effort.

Apply the measure of national effort going to military and nonmilitary purposes, and you get a further answer to who's ahead.

With United States operating at about 80 percent of capacity, the military is getting what $40 billion will buy. The civilian economy is enjoying the product of $400 billion in national effort.

For each $1 going to the military, $10 is spent to satisfy the needs of civilians.

Straining at every seam, the Soviet Union, officials estimate, is able to provide the equivalent of $40 billion of goods and services for the military. This leaves some $130 billion for the civilian economy.

For each $1 going to the military, a little over $3 is spent to satisfy the needs of civilians.

For U.S. citizen, $1,700

In United States, the $400 billion being spent on civilian needs is divided, approximately, as follows: $110 billion for capital investment and $290 billion for goods and services. These goods and services are shared among 170 million civilians. The average American citizen enjoys the equivalent of over $1,700 each year in goods and services.

For Red citizen, $350

In the Soviet Union, the $130 billion being spent on civilian needs in divided, roughly in this fashion: $60 billion for capital investment and $70 billion for goods and services. These goods and services are shared among some 200 million civilians. The average Soviet citizen enjoys the equivalent of $350 each year in goods and services.

If a system's success is measured in well-being of peoples, the United States today is far ahead of Soviet Russia.

WHY RUSSIA NEEDS 52 MILLION FARMERS

Or apply another measure—the efficiency of agriculture, which is basic.

It requires the labor of 52 million workers on farms in Russia to provide food for the population. That leaves 58 million individual workers for all other occupations, including the military. In Russia, nearly one-half of a labor force of 110 million persons is engaged in agriculture.

Even so, the diet in Soviet Russia is wholly inadequate by American standards. Farms in Russia produce nothing like the abundance and variety of crops produced by U.S. farms.

There are 6 million persons working on American farms. That leaves 63 million workers available for all other occupations, including the military.

In the United States, less than one-tenth of the Nation's labor force is engaged in agriculture.

With fewer than 1 worker in 10 employed on a farm in the United States, the American diet is greatly superior to that of Soviet Russia. At the same time, an immense surplus of foodstuffs exists in the United States after large amounts are exported.

Facts reveal in drastic fashion the superior efficiency of American farms and factories when compared with those of the Soviet Union.

FOR RUSSIA'S CITIZENS: SHACKLES OF FEAR

In terms of rights of the individual, there is no real basis for comparison between the United States and Soviet Russia.

Freedom of speech

In the United States short of libel or obscenity, the individual is free to write or to say what he pleases. In Soviet Russia the right of simple criticism is denied the citizen if that criticism is directed at the Government. Boris Pasternak, Soviet poet and novelist, is vilified for moderate criticism of the Soviet system in a novel, "Dr. Zhivago," which was awarded a Nobel prize. Mr. Pasternak finally refused the award.

The vote

An iron dictatorship rules the Soviet Union. In the United States voters choose those who rule them and those who make policies.

Freedom of person

Secret police are an ever-present threat in Soviet Russia. The individual who is accused of a crime against the state can be imprisoned indefinitely. There is no right of habeas corpus. There is no guarantee of free trial.

Right to strike

Strikes are illegal in the Soviet Union. In the United States, there is no real limit upon the right of workers to strike if dissatisfied.

Travel

The American citizen can travel without restriction within the United States and with no real restriction outside the United States. The Soviet citizen can travel within the Soviet Union only after receiving official permission. Only the most carefully screened Soviet citizens are allowed to voyage outside Russia. Wives and children are seldom permitted to make trips abroad with husbands. The families stay home as hostages.

Work books

In the United States every worker is free. In Soviet Russia, every worker must carry a work book. On the job, this book is held by his manager. The boss can tie the worker to his job by adverse reports in his work book.

The meaning of all this? Simply that it is a basic measure of the strength of two systems. In the United States, the individual is trusted and enjoys rights that are firmly protected. In Soviet Russia, the individual is feared and enjoys no rights that cannot be taken from him at the slightest whim of a boss or a Government official.

ON WORLD FRONT, CLOSING OF RANKS

Against that background, who is ahead today and gaining in the field of diplomacy and world influence?

Once more there is a thumbnail method of measurement that helps to provide a clue. In recent years there has been a contest between the United States and Soviet Russia in providing aid for nations that are regarded as friendly.

Apply that measurement, and here is what you find:

U.S. aid

In the years since World War II, U.S. taxpayers have given nearly $70 billion in aid to other nations. Most of that aid has been in the form of gifts.

Soviet aid

In the years since Soviet Russia began to challenge the United States in the field of foreign aid, loans in the amount of $1.9 billion have been promised. Of that amount, $1.5 billion is economic aid through loans, and $400 million is in military aid through loans. Less than one-half of these loans has been drawn against by those to whom they were made. Practically all Soviet aid must be repaid. Moscow doesn't go in for gifts.

In every year since the end of the war, the United States has dispensed, on the average, about $5 billion in foreign aid—or more than twice the amount of the entire Soviet foreign aid program.

If size of aid is a measure of strength in alliances, the United States is found to be far ahead of Soviet Russia.

Glance around the world today, and signs of gain on the part of the United States are becoming impressive.

France

A strong government under Gen. Charles de Gaulle is prepared to limit the power of Communists in that nation. Communist influence is on the decline.

Great Britain

The Conservative Party government, under Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, is strengthening British ties with this country. The British Labor Party, inclined to try to play off Russia against United States is reported to be losing popular strength.

West Germany

An ally of increasing importance to United States. Strongly anti-Communist.

North Mediterranean

Spain becoming stronger. Italy's Communist Party divided. Greece and Turkey are firm allies of the United States.

In the Pacific

South Korea, Japan, Formosa and the Philippines all are firm allies. Communist strength is not great in any of them.

South Pacific; Indian Ocean

South Vietnam, Thailand, Burma, and Pakistan are all in strong hands, firmly anti-Communist. Indonesia, flirting actively with communism not many months ago, has cooled off. Nehru's India is increasingly concerned about the aims of Communist China.

In recent months, United States has made gains in the world.

Now glance at the Soviet side, in this contest in the world.

Eastern Europe

Armed forces of the Soviet Union continue to be needed to hold down the people and support Communist regimes. The flight of people from East Germany continues on a broad scale. Revolt simmers everywhere.

Red China

There are signs that the Soviet dictatorship is not happy about the new drive by Chinese officials to speed industrialization by putting a large share of the population into communes—a form of slavery. Mao Tse-tung, Chinese dictator, is reported to feel that dictator Khrushchev is an upstart who has no real claim as a revolutionary.

Middle East

Soviet Russia has managed to get a foothold in the Middle East. But Moscow's friendship for Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser, for example, has not solved all Nasser's problems. Aid from the Soviet Union, while continuing to flow in the form of loans, has been insufficient to do the things Nasser wants to do at home and abroad. The Egyptian dictator is not getting the financial support that he had expected from oil-rich areas of the Middle East.

When Khrushchev looks around, as American appraisers see it, he has little reason either to be confident or to be happy. At this time, things are not going his way, in the opinion of these appraisers.

OUTLOOK IS FOR UNITED STATES TO WIDEN ITS LEAD

How does it all add up?

The answer, at bottom, as the facts disclose, is the one that follows:

The Soviet Empire rests upon force and restless peoples. Within that empire are vast amounts of territory and, in spots, an extremely high density of population. At the same time, resources are not what they might be either from the point of view of quantity or of proper location for efficiency. The Soviet system, based upon decisions reached by a few planners, is an inefficient system.

The United States is an immensely powerful Nation, possessed of a highly efficient industrial and agricultural system and with ready access to the richest markets of the world. Available resources appear limitless.

Today, based upon all the evidence, United States is far ahead in the world and still gaining. That lead and the gains can continue, officials say, barring colossal mistakes of judgment. Big war does not enter into the picture as it is developing for the future.

Need for Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press on Thursday, January 22, 1959.

Once again we are reminded of the ravages of the uncontrolled rivers and the ensuing floods. If the flood-control projects already approved by the U.S. Army engineers had received the necessary appropriations by the Congress and the administration, thousands of persons living in the Allegheny River Valley would not have had the horrifying experience of the recent floods, as well as the millions of dollars in losses to property and the lives of our people.

The article follows:

FLOOD STRESSES NEED FOR KINZUA DAM—MISSING LINK WOULD HAVE HELD WATERS AT BAY IN WARREN, OTHER TOWNS

Thousands of persons living in the Allegheny River Valley were suffering again today because of the missing link in Pittsburgh's flood-control system.

Forecasters were predicting a record-breaking flood in the upper reaches of the river which is expected to crest above 18 feet at Warren, where the water touched 18.4 feet in March 1956.

River experts pointed out that if the Kinzua Dam above Warren had been built as planned back in 1937, flooding along the banks of the stream would have been negligible.

They recalled estimates made following last year's flood by Col. Howard E. Sprague, district Army engineer at Pittsburgh.

"Construction of Kinzua Dam could have cut that 18.4-foot crest at Warren to 8.9 feet, well below the 13-foot flood stage," Colonel Sprague said. "Any damage to the town would have been averted."

During hearings on the dam, the engineers estimated that 2 to 6 feet would be cut from flood stages at Oil City, Franklin, Pittsburgh, and Wheeling, depending on where the floodwaters originated.

The rapidly rising waters of the Allegheny today were lending new force to the colonel's arguments.

He noted that the 10 flood-control dams in the Pittsburgh area already have prevented $250 million in damages since they were built.

"This is twice their original cost of $114 million and their economic benefits are just beginning to be felt," Colonel Sprague said.

Construction of the proposed 180-foot-high Kinzua Dam, the engineers estimated would control about 22 percent of the runoff from the entire Allegheny River Basin and eliminate the last major flood danger in the western Pennsylvania area.

The Army experts said 10 feet could be cut from Allegheny flood stages in the Pittsburgh district by the dam.

Construction of Kinzua has been held up by the opposition of the Seneca Indians, whose Allegany Reservation north of Warren would be partially flooded. The case currently is being appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

So far Congress has appropriated $2 million for preliminary work in connection with the $101-million dam but the President's budget submitted last week asked for no new appropriation.

The previous appropriations carried the specification that no money should be spent for construction until the Senecas' suit was settled. Consequently only a small fraction of the original money has been spent so far on surveys and planning.

For Better Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared recently in the Rockford, Ill., Morning Star, entitled "For Better Courts":

In an address before the Chicago Bar Association, Illinois Supreme Court Justice Charles H. Davis, of Rockford, offered a meritorious blueprint for improvement of the Illinois court system and the administration of justice by legislative action and amendment of rules of the State supreme court.

Justice Davis called for immediate court revision through legislation providing for creation of adequate supervisory powers in the judicial branch of government to be administered through an administrative officer of the supreme court, with power of assignment over judges of any court of record; elimination of courts of record in cities, villages, and incorporated towns and absorption of their personnel into the circuit courts; increase the number of judges of the circuit and superior courts if necessary; revision of the probate act to require that all appeals from probate court rulings be taken to the appellate or supreme court, thereby abolishing an intermediate review by the circuit court; transformation of the offices of justice of the peace and police magistrate from a fee basis to a salary basis; use of impartial medical testimony in resolving medical issues in civil litigation; amendment of the civil practice act to permit the use of a jury handbook, rather than to require the court to give all instructions to the jury at the conclusion of a trial.

The provision for elimination of city and village courts of record would not apply to the municipal court of Chicago.

Justice Davis would amend supreme court rules to permit either party to a lawsuit to require the trial court to grant a pretrial hearing and to require the bar to expand its list of trial lawyers.

All of the recommendations made by Justice Davis are designed to expedite litigation, streamline the judicial process, and generally improve the workings of justice.

These recommendations merit the earnest consideration of the legislature, the judiciary, and the bar. Illinois State Bar Association is preparing legislation providing for some of these improvements. It is recognized that necessary revision of the court system can be accomplished by legislative action.

Who's Overseeing the Oversighters?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the Honorable J. Sinclair Armstrong, entitled "Who's Overseeing the Oversighters?" Mr. Armstrong is leaving the Government service, and his address is predicated on considerable testimony before the Oversight Committee of the House. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for its inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I am informed by the Public Printer that the estimated cost of printing the manuscript is $263.25. I believe the address has a bearing on certain pending questions. Otherwise, I would not ask that it be printed notwithstanding the cost.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S OVERSEEING THE OVERSIGHTERS, AN ADDRESS BY J. SINCLAIR ARMSTRONG, BEFORE THE SECTION ON ADMINISTRATIVE LAW OF THE BAR ASSOCIATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AT THE MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., NOVEMBER 6, 1958

In early January 1957 the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Representative OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, dropped in the hopper the resolution by which the House of Representatives authorized that committee to make investigations and studies into matters under the jurisdiction of certain of the so-called independent regulatory agencies. This was the now well-known House Resolution 99, and it included authority to investigate and study the adequacy of the protection to investors afforded by the disclosure and regulatory provisions of the various securities acts.

In discussing the resolution on the floor, the Speaker, Representative SAM RAYBURN of Texas, with obvious pride, mentioned that during the time he had been a Member of Congress every board and commission except the Interstate Commerce Commission had been set up, many of them from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. He particularly mentioned the Securities and Exchange Commission and certain of the Federal securities laws. He said, referring to the chairman of the committee, Representative HARRIS, "I trust that the gentleman will set up a subcommittee, and I think under the broad authority of this resolution he has that authority to go into the administration of each and every one of these laws to see whether or not the law as we intended it is being carried out, or whether a great many of these laws are being repealed or revamped by those who administer them."

Replying, Representative HARRIS mentioned that it was his intention to set up a special committee to investigate the administration of the laws as intended by Congress which come under the jurisdiction of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. "As the resolution indicates," he said, "many of these agencies come under our jurisdiction. They are established as arms of the Congress and appropriately report to the Congress."

Representative WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, of Illinois, a member of the committee, stated: "I think the committee ought to go back through the years from the time that the law was first put into effect to determine what the trend has been over that period of time. That is perfectly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I think the House would like to know, because the agencies which are under the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce cover almost every facet of business in America today. If that is done and done properly, you could have a study and it would have a good effect, not only so far as this particular committee is concerned but upon business generally."

Thus was set in motion, at the beginning of the 1st session of the 85th Congress, the now famous Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight.

We might pause for a moment to consider just what "legislative oversight" means. In 1946, by the Legislative Reorganization Act, Congress established various standing committees and assigned to them the duty to exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies of the laws.

Responsibility to exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution of the Federal securities laws by the Securities and Exchange Commission was assigned to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House. Pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Securities and Exchange Commission had made regular biennial presentations at the opening of each Congress to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or to its standing Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, of its programs in administering the Federal securities laws.

Also, throughout 1955, a whole year before the establishment of the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee, the Commission had presented to the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the programs and problems of the Commission in the light of the drastically changed conditions of the securities markets which confronted the Commission as a result of the tremendous increases in the marketing of new issues of corporate securities, in trading on the exchanges, and in trading in the over-the-counter market, and the consequent development of abuses and enforcement problems. Particular emphasis was placed on the penny uranium stock boom, and our efforts to improve the administration of the exemptive regulation for issues of small size.

During the spring of 1956, the Commission developed its proposals for legislative changes that would be needed to assist the Commission in better coping with these problems. They were submitted to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the late Representative J. Percy Priest, of Tennessee, in May. There was not time for the committee to take them up before adjournment, but early in August, right after adjournment, the chairman assured me that these legislative proposals would have the prompt and early consideration of the committee at the beginning of the 2d session. Unfortunately, in October Representative Priest passed away, and the great support which he gave to the work of the Securities and Exchange Commission, during his tenure as a senior member and finally chairman of

the committee, was thus unfortunately withdrawn.

Another most unfortunate change in personnel of the committee was the retirement from Congress of Representative Arthur W. Klein, chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, to become a Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York. Justice Klein had been a member of the commission staff earlier in his career, and understood and supported the work of the Commission superbly.

In February 1957, at the opening of the 1st session of the 85th Congress, I met with the new chairman of the committee, Representative HARRIS, in his office, to explain to him the importance to the work of the Commission in protecting the investing public of an early hearing on the Commission's legislative proposals. Unfortunately, no such hearing was accorded either by the committee itself, by the standing Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, or by the newly formed Legislative Oversight Committee.

After House Resolution 99 was passed, it occurred to me that the assistance of the Speaker, whose great interest in the securities laws was well known, could be enlisted. So I obtained an interview with him a few days later, in his office, and urged him to consider promptly action by the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee of the Commission's enforcement problems, particularly in light of the uranium penny-stock boom and the boiler-room fraudulent, high-pressure sales boom, with all the staffing and budgetary implications of these. I also requested consideration of other aspects of the Commission's legislative program. The Speaker indicated to me great interest in the problems of the Commission which I described to him in this meeting. Unfortunately, no progress in the way of a hearing with the committee or either of the subcommittees resulted from my meeting with the Speaker.

Thereafter, in March 1957, Representative PETER F. MACK, JR., of Illinois, who was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, invited a discussion with me of a case with which the Commission was then dealing. Some of you may remember that Representative MACK took considerable exception to my testimony last June before the subcommittee on this subject, as he seemed to feel that I regarded his inquiry about this case as improper in some way because I compared it with inquiries from White House staff members about cases. I think the record should be perfectly clear that I do not regard inquiries by Members of Congress about matters pending before the Commission as improper, any more than I regard the White House staff as barred from inquiring into the status and progress of cases pending in the agency.

At any event, in this meeting with Representative MACK I again pressed the urgency of consideration by the committee, or any of its subcommittees, of the Commission's legislative program. Unfortunately, no continuous interest or watchfulness was shown by Representative MACK for the Commission's programs and problems.

Neither the committee nor any of its subcommittees considered the Commission's legislative proposals during 1957 in the 1st session of the 85th Congress. Nor did the committee nor any of its subcommittees take these matters up in the 2d session in 1958. I think this constitutes a very clear failure by the committee of Congress, which has a statutory duty to exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution of the Federal securities laws, to discharge its obligation and duty to Congress and the public. The committee did not exercise continuous watchfulness at all after 1956. It was solely for the purpose of calling as wide public attention to this as one individual could that I brought this sorry record of lack of attention to serious problems in the securities markets to the attention of the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee in my testimony before the subcommittee in June of this year.

I do not propose to spend any time this noon on the record up to now of the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee itself, other than to say that it is only just beginning to deal with fundamental problems confronting the Commission in the Commission's effort to carry out the basic purposes of investor protection embodied in the Federal securities laws.

The subcommittee circularized the Commission on the question of whether members were being unduly traveled or entertained by the regulated industry. That was a good thing for the subcommittee to do, because it is always well for Congress to keep a close watch on standards of behavior of officials in the executive branch. But it was hardly a major effort in carrying out the purpose, which I read a moment ago, expressed in House Resolution 99, or of the duty of oversight expressed in the Legislative Reorganization Act.

Also, the subcommittee concerned itself at great length, and in my opinion unfairly and unduly, about alleged pressure brought to bear by the White House staff in particular cases. The record made before the subcommittee has conclusively demonstrated that there was no pressure brought to bear by the White House staff in any case before the Securities and Exchange Commission. The record also shows diligent efforts by the Commission to enforce the law, under staffing handicaps and in hard-fought litigation. I think it is perfectly obvious from the record that had there been pressure brought to bear it would have been resisted by the Commission just as we resisted congressional pressure.

In passing, I might say that the number of congressional inquiries during the 4 years I was a member of the Commission exceeded by many hundredfold the number of White House inquiries. I think the subcommittee has done a grave disservice to the confidence of the public in the administration of the law by independent agencies by creating the impression in the public mind that members of independent agencies are automatically susceptible to pressure from the White House, any more than they are susceptible to pressures from Congress. The Securities and Exchange Commission during the 4 years I served on it was entirely free of any susceptibility to pressure from the White House, Congress, or anyone else, including the securities industry. I also think that the subcommittee has done a grave disservice to the public by attempting to create the impression that because agencies, such as the Securities and Exchange Commission, are independent they are under the administrative control of Congress. This they are not. The laws by which these agencies were created, as well as other basic laws enacted by Congress, such as the Budget and Accounting Act and the Administrative Procedure Act, make it perfectly clear that these agencies possess executive and quasi-judicial powers, as well as quasi-legislative powers. Under our Constitution, it is the function of Congress to write the laws, not to administer them. The designation of these independent agencies as arms of Congress is a convenient colloquial description. However, it is completely at variance with the concept under which the Securities and Exchange Commission and the other so-called independent agencies operated during their early years, when their close collaboration with President Franklin D. Roosevelt was well known. After all, the famous Humphrey case on the tenure of Commissioners arose from the unwillingness of one Commissioner to truckle to the White House, as a result of which President Roosevelt attempted to fire him without cause. To call the Commission an arm of Congress does not validly carry the legal conclusion which the subcommittee has attempted to create, that these agencies are or should be independent of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

So much for the record of the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee to date. I recognize that the subcommittee, and particularly its new chairman, Representative HARRIS, have had unusual problems, to say the least, both among its members and its staff, with which to contend. Every encouragement should be given to the subcommittee and to its new chairman, Representative HARRIS, to get on to the important work that lies ahead in carrying out the purpose of House Resolution 99 and the duty of continuous watchfulness imposed by the Legislative Reorganization Act. I am personally hopeful, as I have been in times past, that this is going to go ahead in the next Congress. I am hopeful that the chairman of the subcommittee and the Commission will soon address themselves to the Commission's problems and its legislative programs. I pledge to Representative HARRIS my personal support and cooperation if there is any help and assistance which I can give the subcommittee in its consideration of these important legislative proposals and problems of administration of the Federal securities laws.

Let us look for just a moment at what some of these legislative proposals are and why they are needed.

First, I would like to speak of the Commission's study pertaining to the desirability of the registration of unlisted securities of certain companies having large public investor interest. In the winter and spring of 1955, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee conducted a so-called friendly study of the stock market. The only legislation which came out of this study was the reintroduction of legislation which the Commission had earlier recommended back in 1947 and 1950 of a bill which would extend the financial reporting, proxy and insider trading provisions of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to companies which, by reason of the broad distribution of their securities and their failure to have registered them under the Exchange Act and listed them for trading on a stock exchange, were exempt from these provisions of the Exchange Act.

During 1955, our Commission made the first full, complete and factual study to determine the companies which might be affected by this bill, the extent of their compliance with the applicable financial reporting requirements of the Commission, and their practices in soliciting proxies. About 1,200 corporations were affected, having estimated assets in excess of $35 billion. Serious deficiencies were found, particularly in the proxy soliciting material, and in 1956 the Commission endorsed the enactment, with some minor changes, of this legislation. Unfortunately, the Senate Banking Committee under the chairmanship of the bill's sponsor, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, more or less lost interest in the proposal, and my personal efforts to have it considered by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce also failed.

In 1957, the Commission made a similar study in regard to the practices of insurance companies which were exempted from the original bill. Toward the end of the last session, the Banking Committee amended the bill so as to reduce its coverage and reported it to the Senate, but no legislative action was taken.

The Commission expressed the opinion that this bill would provide additional protection to investors in securities in which there is a broad public investor interest, and which are sold and are traded in the interstate securities markets, by requiring disclosure of the business and financial facts pertaining to the corporations issuing them,

and that it would strengthen the protections against fraud afforded to investors. In my opinion, there was a sorry lack of legislative attention to one of the most important financial studies ever made by the Commission.

Next, let me refer to the so-called technical amendments proposed by the Commission. These resulted from the most exhaustive legal study of the statutes which the Commission administers that has been made since 1940. The proposals were designed to strengthen the jurisdictional provisions of the statutes, correct certain inadequacies, and, most important, to facilitate criminal prosecutions and other enforcement actions. As I mentioned, they were first submitted in 1956 and again in 1957. During 1957, in order to facilitate the work of any committee of Congress which might take up these problems, the Commission obtained approval of the respective Senate and House committee chairmen to circulate the proposals to the public and hold hearings on them. Thus, in a sense, the Commission did some of the committee's work for it in advance.

After the Commission had held hearings and conferences in the winter of 1957, and had considered the testimony and written comments received, the proposals were redrafted and revised and, as I mentioned, again submitted to Congress. No hearings were held nor was any action taken.

I was delighted to read in a talk which the present Chairman of the Commission, Edward N. Gadsby, delivered just a few weeks ago that the Commission presently intends to reexamine these legislative proposals in the light of comments which have been made since their introduction. He said: "It is reasonable to predict that the proposals will be reintroduced in substantially the same form in the 1st session of the 86th Congress which is scheduled to convene on January 7, 1959."

I would just like to mention briefly several things which these legislative proposals, if enacted, would do to aid the Commission in its enforcement work. The proposals to amend the Securities Act of 1933 would provide more workable administrative procedures and more time within which to conduct investigations in connection with registration statements for new issues, would clarify the jurisdictional basis of the civil liability provisions of the statute, would make clear that showings of past violations were sufficient basis for injunctive relief, and that aiders and abettors may be responsible in administrative proceedings, and would extend civil and criminal liability to documents filed with the Commission under the exemptive regulations as they now are when filed under registration provisions.

The proposals to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 would make it a violation of Federal law to embezzle money and securities entrusted to the care of an exchange member or a registered broker-dealer, would make the status of an exchange member or a broker-dealer doing business through a member or a registered broker-dealer basis for Federal jurisdiction, would clarify and strengthen the provisions relating to manipulation and the financial responsibility of brokers and dealers, would authorize the Commission to regulate the borrowing, lending, or holding of customers' securities by a broker-dealer, would make it clear that attempts to purchase or sell securities are covered by the antifraud provisions of the statute, and would make various other improvements.

These are just a few of many important and necessary changes which Congress should consider making in these laws if the Commission is to continue to serve the investing public in today's active securities markets.

In 1953, and again in 1957, the Commission amended and strengthened the rules relating to the disclosure provisions of its exemptive regulation relating to the sale of small issues of securities, that is, issues not in excess of $300,000. These are exempt from the full registration provisions. In the light of these protective improvements in the exemptive regulation, the Commission recommended to Congress that the Securities Act of 1933 be amended to provide for an increase in the exemptive amount from $300,000 to $500,000. We believe that this would be beneficial in facilitating the attraction of new capital, particularly new equity capital, to small business enterprises. The difficulty of small business today to attract new equity capital is one of the serious problems of our economy and one to which a number of committees of Congress have from time to time addressed themselves.

The proposed increase in the exemption was unanimously passed by the Senate in 1954 but blocked in the House by the opposition of Speaker RAYBURN himself. Similar bills again passed the Senate in 1958. I believe it is high time that the committee considered favorably this effort on the part of the Commission to facilitate the freer flow of vitally needed new capital to small business.

In addition to the Commission's legislative program, there are a number of rulemaking problems with which the Commission is attempting to deal. I was delighted to read in Mr. Gadsby's address, to which I referred a moment ago, his statement that, "The Commission may legislate by adoption of rules only within the framework of the powers entrusted to it by the Congress. It may not add to the statutes by rule, but it has the statutuory duty to implement them. The remedy for an inadequate statutory delegation of powers is by amendment of the statute and not through the adoption of rules."

The Commission has adopted a number of rules which, in my opinion, are very much in need of legislative scrutiny. I do not intend to dwell on this at length, but one of the most important of these is the so-called no-sale rule under the Securities Act of 1933. The rule in effect provides that the registration and prospectus requirements are inapplicable to securities issued in connection with mergers, consolidations, reclassifications and transfers of assets between corporations. The rule does not purport to provide an exemption from the antifraud provisions of the act.

The statutory construction embodied in this rule was developed in the early days of the Commission, and in 1956 we concluded that the rule should be reconsidered. Various revisions have since been proposed. I have spoken on this subject at length, particularly in a talk which I gave before the Illinois Society of Certified Public Accountants in June 1957.

Suffice it to say that, as an interpretive rule, I consider it to be an incorrect interpretation of the statute. The terms "offer" and "sale" are specifically defined in the statute to include every contract of sale or disposition of a security for value, and every attempt to dispose of a security for value. That definition in my opinion applies to the solicitation of stockholders' votes for a plan of merger or like transaction which will involve the issuance or exchange of securities for value, and the solicitation of such votes in my opinion is an attempt to dispose of a security or interest in a security for value.

Moreover, elsewhere in the statute certain other exchanges are expressly exempted from the registration provisions. Furthermore, the exemptions from the registration provisions of the statute for certain types of securities and certain transactions are broader than the exemptions from the antifraud provisions of the act. Thus it is clear that Congress was perfectly capable of stating what exemptions it intended and what it did not intend.

The no sale rule has the practical effect of adding a substantial category of transactions to those expressly exempted from registration. I believe this is unsound as a matter of statutory construction. Congress did not give any power to the Commission to add to the classes of securities exempted by the act, except in one instance not here relevant. This problem is urgently in need of legislative correction. No matter what rule the Commission may now adopt modifying the present no sale rule, careful lawyers will inevitably be reluctant to advise clients to rely on it.

Unfortunately, the existence of the rule provided a loophole through which securities involving millions of dollars were issued and sold in promotions freed of all Commission interference during the boilerroom resurgance of 1955 and 1956.

Another most important phase of the Commission's enforcement program, which I believe urgently needs staffing and follow through, is the program of inspection of registered investment companies. Investment companies have shown striking growth since the act was passed in 1940. From assets with market value of $2.5 billion that year, their assets increased to $15 billion in 1957. This enormous pool of public investors' funds is subject to virtually no State or other Federal regulation, and, because of staff inadequacies, not until 1956 did the Commission ever consider any program of regular inspections. That year, because of the rapid expansion of the industry, we projected an inspection program for 1957. However, because of staff lack only six inspections could be completed. This is obviously totally inadequate in view of the size of the industry and the possibilities for abuse.

The mutual fund business is probably the most important single segment of the capital market through which the savings of millions of individual American citizens are invested. The financial integrity of this segment of the market is vitally important to these millions of small investors. The danger of this large industry suffering abuses by the inability of the Commission to perform even the most elementary of supervisory functions called for by its present statutes could result in tragic consequences.

The Legislative Oversight Subcommittee should carefully review the Commission's legislative authority over investment companies to determine whether it is adequate in the light of present day circumstances and market conditions to protect the investments of the multitude of citizens in whose interest this Commission was established.

Such a program should be supported by responsible segments of the investment company industry, because the whole industry could suffer loss of public confidence by abuses which might occur in a few mutual funds which in themselves were of no great importance.

Finally, I invite the consideration of the subcommittee to the Commission's enforcement problems in the light of the entirely new conditions which prevail in the securities markets today. Conditions at present require a most vigorous and accelerated program, including new measures of enforcement, for at no time in the history of the Commission has activity and public participation in the securities markets been so great. For example, the dollar volume of securities registered increased 94 percent from $7.5 billion in 1953, to $14.6 billion in 1957. The market value of all stock on all stock exchanges increased from $111 billion in 1950, to over $262 billion in 1957. The dollar volume of securities traded on stock exchanges rose from $17 billion in 1953 to $34 billion in 1957. The number of holders of shares in publicly owned corporations is estimated to have increased from 6½ million persons in 1952, to over 8½ million by 1956.

Unfortunately, a substantial segment of the public again appears to believe, as it did in the roaring twenties, that it is possible for the unskilled to reap large and quick profits in the securities markets. An increase in the number of uninformed and unsophisticated investors, and an increase in their willingness to purchase unknown and speculative securities, has increased the opportunities for illicit profit in illegal or fraudulent sales of securities. The problem of boiler rooms, the problem of sale of unregistered securities based on claimed exemptions, the evasion of registration requirements through the no sale theory, which I mentioned above, and problems in connection with promotional stock, particularly in new insurance and financial ventures in some parts of the country, have all drastically increased the work of the Commission in enforcement. Also, for reasons which I have recently discussed in the Virginia Law Review, State blue sky law administration is almost completely ineffective in protecting the public in today's predominantly interstate securities markets.

The Commission's efforts to cope with this problem by increased broker-dealer inspections and civil and criminal action in the courts have met with considerable success, but they are limited by staff and budget. Fortunately, the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, under the able leadership of Representative ALBERT THOMAS of Texas, has taken a genuine interest in these problems and, indeed, has provided the only effective forum for the Commission in the House during the past few years.

As a matter of fact, back in 1955 at the request of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, the staff of the Library of Congress made a study of the work of independent agencies with a view to determining whether they were properly carrying out their functions, which in my opinion made a real contribution to the work both of the subcommittee and of the Commission.

With the backing of the Director of the Budget and the Independent Offices Subcommittee, the Commission's staff has been increased from about 650, the 20-year low which occurred in the spring of 1955, when I became chairman, to about 1,000. A great deal more needs to be done, and support from the committee of the House which has substantive jurisdiction, namely the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, for the Commission's enforcement program and staffing and budgetary problems, is urgently needed.

In conclusion, I would like to make a few observations as to the purpose of Federal regulation of the interstate corporate securities markets. As lawyers, we sometimes tend to become so deeply immersed in the complexities and niceties of law and legal procedures that we lose sight of the basic social and economic objectives which the law serves. In a free society, with modern scientific and industrial techniques, the only way in which the production of the many things needed to provide a high standard of living and national security is through large aggregations of capital provided by millions of small investors. Today we have in the United States just such a system of free private enterprise. The means of production in our country are owned by the people, not through the state as would be the case under socialism or communism, but, rather, directly through ownership of corporate securities. If corporations are to attract the funds needed for capital purposes in an expanding economy, with a burgeoning population, and under conditions of enormous national security responsibilities at home and in the free world, they must have access to the savings of millions of individual investors. If these savings are to be made available voluntarily, these millions of investors must have confidence in the integrity of the capital markets. Because of abuses and other conditions which prevailed in the late twenties, the confidence of the American people in our capital markets was destroyed. Reestablishment of this confidence by Federal regulation became a basic policy of the Government, commencing with the enactment of the Securities Act of 1933. This act, incidentally, was based upon studies made by the Federal Trade Commission, commencing in 1928. A series of laws were placed on the books up to 1940. They have remained substantially unchanged since. As they have been administered over the intervening years by the Securities and Exchange Commission, with maximum and effective cooperation from a reorganized and highly responsible securities industry, the confidence of the investing public in the integrity of the capital markets has been restored. This is vitally important to the continued success of our free enterprise system. Hence, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House and its Legislative Oversight Subcommittee have a great responsibility to the American people to support and aid the Commission in its efforts to improve the administration of the Federal securities laws. Thus, in the last analysis, the answer to, "Who's overseeing the oversighters?" is the American people.

It will be obvious to all of you that I feel strongly about these problems. I spent most of my time as a practicing lawyer for 12 years assisting business and industry in raising capital under these laws. Then for 4 years I was privileged to participate in administering them. I believe in them. They must be made to serve the public, and they must be improved. I have spoken my piece on this subject, in Washington and around the country.

For the past year and a half I have had nothing to do with the Commission. The views I express here are my own. I hope I haven't ruffled any feelings by what I have said or done. During my tenure on the Commission, I experienced most heartwarming support from responsible members of the bar, the securities industry, and Congress, not to mention fellow Commisisoners and staff, for whom my personal admiration and to whom my debt for their hard work, intelligence, and loyalty is truly enormous. I hope I have helped to stimulate responsible consideration of vital problems affecting our Nation's securities markets and the success of our free-enterprise system.

A Tribute to Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, since we are nearing the birthday anniversary of our former President, Abraham Lincoln, it seems fitting and proper to include a statement delivered in the House by a distinguished and former Member of Congress, the Honorable Homer Hoch, who represented the Fourth District of Kansas during the period March 1919 to March 1933. It is a classical tribute to a great American, to a great President, Abraham Lincoln.

There is no new thing to be said of Lincoln. Nor is there a new thing to be said of the mountains or the sea or the stars. The mountains ever tower in solemn majesty above the drifting clouds, the mysterious sea ever sobs upon the shore, and the silent stars ever keep holy vigil above a tired world—but to mountain and sea and stars, men turn forever in unwearied homage. And thus was Lincoln. For he was a mountain in grandeur of soul, he was sea in deep undervoice of sadness and mystery, he was star in steadfast purity of purpose and of service. And he abides. With the name of Lincoln tears are called from old men's eyes, and with the name of Lincoln childhood learns to lisp a patriot's devotion. And there is no new thing to be said of him—what need, for such as he. But while the republic stands on whose altar he laid his great mind and heart, while liberty is cherished, while civic virtue and service and sacrifice are honored in the earth, the name of Lincoln will be spoken in undying love by the sons of men.

President John L. Lewis, United Mine Workers of America, Vehemently Protests the Ill-Advised Action by the German Government in Levying a Customs Tax of $4.76 on Coal Imports While the Flood of Foreign Oil to Germany Is Exempt From Such Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to my protest to Congress on January 27, 1959, regarding the action of the German Government in levying a customs tax of $4.76 per ton on coal imports, I wish to call attention to the letter dated January 26, 1959, written by President John L. Lewis, United Mine Workers of America, to Hon. Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary for Economic Affairs of the Department of State, in protest over the arbitrary and discriminatory action by the German Government.

Mr. Lewis minces no words in evaluating the disturbing factors apparent in the shortsighted action taken by the German Government and which is certain to prove of aid and comfort to Soviet Russia in development of its export and barter programs.

Mr. Lewis' letter follows:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1959.

Hon. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Your department is familiar with the protests of all elements of the coal industry against the proposed plans of the German Government, in its policy of discrimination against imports of American coal. Despite these protests and the sympathetic cooperation of your department, the German Government now officially announces a customs duty of $4.76 a ton, chiefly effective against American coal.

I point out:

(a) That the tax is not applicable to foreign oil, vast quantities of which are now entering Germany.

(b) That the tax will not affect coal imported from Poland, nor lignite from East

Germany, now and in the future delivered under barter arrangements.

(c) The arbitrary imposition of this tax will nullify term contracts with U.S. coal producers in the approximate amount of 10 million tons per annum. It will lay idle $100 million of investments made by American coal, railroad, and shipping interests, to provide facilities and highly efficient quality, requisite to deliver the tonnage obligated under existing term contracts. These investments were made upon the invitation of German coal, steel, and governmental interests, who gave assurances that continuity of purchase on the part of Germany would last over an indefinite number of years, and make possible the amortization of the aforesaid investments.

(d) Motivation on the part of the German Government is political in nature and not, in itself, economic. Germany is planning to increase its trade with Russia, Poland and East Germany on a barter basis, and has now pending requests from Russia for additional barter deals. The Russian development of the East Caspian and other coal fields now being planned will release vast quantities of Black Sea coal, now being mined by Russia for export and barter purposes.

(e) The employment of 20,000 Americans now employed in the coal, rail and shipping industries, will be destroyed by this contemplated action on the part of Germany, and the internal revenue of the United States will be diminished accordingly.

The contemplated arrangement smacks of bad faith on the part of the German Government, and will create bitterness and resentment on the part of those who will be the victims of such contemptible treatment. It is astonishing that this action should come at a time when the integrity of Germany, guaranteed by the United States, is being threatened by the nation which Germany now hopes to placate at the expense of her benefactor.

The arbitrary action of the German Government should be effectively protested by the Government of the United States, and economic reprisals resorted to if necessary, to protect our American economy against such ill-conceived and hostile action. Without hesitation, Mr. Secretary, I assure you that the overwhelming majority of all Americans adversely affected by the proposed act of the German Government support the sentiments I herein enunciate.

Yours truly,

JOHN L. LEWIS.

The Import Difficulties of the Automobile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of Congress, I included in my remarks the text of an address made by Mr. Roger M. Blough, the board chairman of the United States Steel Corp. Mr. Blough called attention in his speech to the increasing flood of imports of steel and steel products and their resulting adverse effect on the American steel industry and our domestic economy.

Mr. Blough did not believe that reasonable tariffs to equalize foreign and domestic costs were the solution to the steel industry's problem. Rather, he felt that restraint with respect to wages could offer a solution. I pointed out at the time that, while I agreed with his statement of the problem, I did not agree with his solution.

Now another leading industrialist, Mr. Ernest R. Breech, chairman of the board of the Ford Motor Co., has cited the problems facing the American automobile industry as a result of the economic resurgence of Europe.

Mr. Breech and the other automobile manufacturers have good reason to be disturbed about the flood of imports and the failure of other nations to reciprocate our Government's generosity with respect to admitting imports. Yet, in part, policies which he espouses have caused this situation.

For the year ending October 31, 1958, the United States imported 398,791 automobiles. Over the same period we exported 130,723. From the viewpoint of the shareholders and workers in the automotive industry, such a 3-to-1 adverse ratio can scarcely be interpreted to mean that the foreign trade policies of the United States were written and are being administered with their welfare in mind.

And the situation would appear to be deteriorating rather than improving, in view of the fact that our automobile exports for the first 10 months of 1958 were down 10 percent from the same period of 1957; and our imports were up almost 100 percent.

While I am not an expert in the affairs of the automobile industry, one has only to do some simple arithmetic to compute the effect of this situation upon our workers. Some 600,000 people on the average were employed in the industry in 1958; production was 5,119,720 units. Thus, it might be said that roughly each worker produced about 8.5 automobiles during the year. Employment figures for the automotive industry show substantial month-by-month variations. The 600,000 figure is believed to be a relatively conservative one, rendering the results discussed elsewhere also on the low side.

Hence, we see that the 398,791 automobiles imported displaced some 44,300 jobs in the automobile industry.

On the other hand, and for the latest available 12 months' period, the exports of 130,723 vehicles provided jobs to some 15,400 workers.

The next time the free-trade advocates from Detroit express concern over unemployment in that area, they might well give some thought to the fact that the difference between the jobs displaced and the jobs created showed a net deficit of 28,900 jobs. That conservative estimate is no insubstantial number of unemployed American citizens, the vast majority of them in Michigan.

Now, in its monumental study, "The United States in World Trade," the American Tariff League makes the following statement:

> It can be estimated that for every 100 jobs permanently lost, a community is deprived of $360,000 in annual retail sales; $270,000 in bank deposits; 107 automobile registrations; 112 households; 74 jobs in other enterprises; 4 retail establishments.
>
> In addition to this approximate equation, other significant cutbacks must be computed, such as reduced Federal, State and local tax revenues; greater outlays for unemployment compensation; declining school budgets; less income for charitable purposes.

If these 28,900 jobs are permanently lost in the automotive industry, we can then apply the league's ratio of 74 additional jobs lost to each 100 manufacturing jobs lost, and we have 21,200 more unemployed, or a grand total of 50,100 jobs lost—again mostly in Michigan.

Let us assume that the annual wages of each of the 50,100 workers would have been $4,000 a year, a conservative figure. Again by simple arithmetic, we find that the imports were costing American workers $200,400,000 in wages lost over the 12 months named—again mostly in Michigan.

I would now like to call my colleagues' attention to the conclusions of Mr. Breech. While I would agree with him that the problem is serious and that American automobile manufacturing suffers from a serious cost disadvantage, I differ markedly from some of his conclusions. As one of his conclusions, he states:

> If America's cost disadvantage continues to increase, however, it seems to me that we must anticipate an increasing flight of American capital and much more sourcing of parts and products abroad. A trend in this direction is already evident. American manufacturers of tractors and farm implements, as well as typewriters, office machines, cameras, and optical instruments—particularly goods having a high labor content—are increasingly sourcing and manufacturing in Europe, Latin America, and Japan for sale in the American market. I suggest that what is now a trickle may grow to a flood which could disrupt both production and employment patterns here in the United States.

I disagree with him that this transplantation abroad of American capital and, more importantly, American jobs is now only a trickle. It already is disrupting both production and employment patterns here in the United States. Already substantial, it will inevitably continue to grow under the foreign trade policies our Government has practiced for the past 25 years. I agree with him that any such deteriorative situation is unfortunate.

His next conclusion deals with the same point:

> Now it seems to me that, if we want to sell in expanding world markets, and more importantly if we do not want to see American production and jobs disrupted by the flight of capital and industry abroad, we are going to have to remain competitive in design, quality, costs, and prices with foreign industry.

By all means we must remain competitive in design and quality. However, with the labor differential so substantial between our workers and those abroad, we cannot now compete with respect to costs and prices; nor will we be able to do so in the foreseeable future. This problem is not unique to the automobile industry; it is true of hundreds of other American industries.

Mr. Breech rejects the use of reasonable tariffs to make our prices and costs

competitive with those of foreign industry.

I do not agree.

Reasonable tariffs offer us at least a partial method of insulating our American standard of living against the ravages of cut-rate, foreign competition. And yet, as every Member of this House must know, I have never advocated the use of the tariff simply as a mechanism to exclude foreign goods from our markets. Rather, I have long advocated the principle of fair and open competition between American manufacturers and their counterparts overseas; and one way to insure this kind of competition is to use reasonable tariffs as an equalizing device.

If our automotive industry is to reduce its costs and prices as he suggests, all I can suggest is that they had better hurry up.

Mr. Breech also considers the lack of reciprocity abroad to be a major problem and I agree with much of what he says on this:

Here I want to point out that, whatever our own problems of cost reduction, we must be granted full and free competitive access to foreign markets.

The theory that trade is a two-way street applies just as much to our foreign competitors as it does to us. If we are to give free access to the American market to foreign producers with size and efficiency comparable to ours and with substantially lower wage costs, we must ask an equally fair crack at their markets.

Here I would point out that in 1957, Great Britain allowed only 265 American automobiles to be imported, and a scant 576 found their way to West Germany. This does not seem to me to be reciprocal trade. In 1957, the United States exported 142,000 cars, while West German auto exports exceeded 500,000 and Great Britain shipped 426,000. Both countries, of course, did much better in 1958.

For 25 years, the State Department has been, in effect, telling us that, if we provided a good example by lowering our tariffs, other countries would reciprocate. I believe that Mr. Breech's own remarks show how unsuccessful that policy has been:

Today, some European countries have tariff and quota barriers so effective, or penalties so high, as virtually to exclude all imports of various U.S. manufactured goods. Take the case of automobiles.

As you may know, our tariff on imported cars was recently lowered from 10 percent to 8½ percent. We have no quotas or other restrictive devices such as currency controls.

Now consider a 1959 Ford Fairlane 500 Fordor Hardtop, with full optional equipment, delivered in Pittsburgh. The suggested list price is about $3,600, including State and Federal taxes, although, as in the case of many other products, it is common knowledge that the actual cost to the customer may be somewhat lower than the manufacturer's suggested retail price. If you wanted to buy the same car in France, England, or Italy, you would have to hurdle barriers of severe quota restrictions and heavy cost penalties.

In France, the delivered price of that car is about $8,200. It includes no less than $3,200 of duties, a 40 percent premium for dollars called an equalization fee, and special purchase taxes. You would also pay an annual use tax of about $240. In Italy, it would cost $5,800, with a penalty of $1,400, plus an annual use tax as high as $302.50. In England, the price would be about $8,000, with the penalty composed of a 30 percent duty and a 60 percent purchase tax—which is applied without discrimination, however, to all passenger vehicles.

As if these formidable barriers were not enough, imports are further limited by severe quotas and related devices. France admits only 12,000 vehicles a year from all sources, the United Kingdom presently restricts imports from the United States and Canada to 650 automobiles per year—even that quota has not been filled every year—and Italy admits only a few hundred American cars.

I have many times commented on this lack of reciprocity which Mr. Breech so clearly documents in his address. For 25 years I have been listening to the State Department promise that the condition would be corrected.

Imports are not the only problem which has faced or now faces American industry. Obviously there are others, such as styling changes, consumer tastes, management-union controversy, and a host of like problems. But I would state, as anybody who goes out to a nearby traffic light can see for himself, that imported automobiles are one of them—and an extremely serious one at that.

I am concerned about the small shareholder who has invested his hard-earned savings in the automobile industry. I am concerned with the men and women who have lost their jobs. I am concerned with the young people who are unemployed because of diminishing job opportunities.

The major segments of the automobile industry have for some years preached the doctrine of ever-freer trade. Leaders of the United Auto Workers have also preached this doctrine. I should think that their shareholders and union members would today be wondering about the wisdom of such policies.

I might, therefore, respectfully urge that those business and union statesmen, who have been preaching freer trade, might wish to reevaluate their own policies.

I deeply regret I can foresee no immediate improvement in the situation.

Poison in Your Water—No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the Missouri Conservationist of September 19, 1958, setting forth compelling reasons for a vigorous program of Federal action to combat pollution in our waters. That article is entitled "Freshwater Cancer," by Mr. Bill Towell, director of the Missouri Conservation Commission.

That article outlines the terrible problem of sewage and other pollution as it affects the people of Missouri. This, of course, is a single example of the great problem besetting all of America—pollution.

I hope all will read this article and understand why it is necessary that we have vigorous enforcement and a continuation of the Federal grant program inaugurated by Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress making grants to municipalities for construction of sewage abatement works.

The article follows:

FRESHWATER CANCER

(By Bill Towell, Director)

We know from records of permit sales that one out of five persons in Missouri is interested in fishing and hunting. This does not include the thousands who are interested in the out-of-doors purely for the aesthetic value. Regardless of the particular interest, clean water is always a center of attraction.

With this in mind, we remember that only about one percent of the total surface of Missouri is water. This means that we are entertaining one-fifth of the people on one percent of its area, and this includes only hunters and fishermen. We have no accurate record of the thousands who seek outdoor recreation but do not wield a rod nor shoulder a gun. Together all of these must reach an enormous total. This, in our opinion, is significant in demonstrating the need for maintaining clean water. The importance of outdoor recreation is confirmed further by the fact that in Missouri expenditures related to hunting and fishing alone amount to an estimated $69 million annually.

Water pollution kills fish and other aquatic life, it lowers the fish supporting capacity of water for more desirable fish species and renders water unfit for recreation. These effects and their severity depend upon the kind and extent of the pollution. All occur in Missouri every year.

The conservation commission conducted a statewide survey of pollution in 1949. It showed that over 900 miles of streams in 69 counties and the city of St. Louis were polluted, and by mid-1957 these values had increased to more than 1,200 miles of stream in 74, or roughly two-thirds, of Missouri's 114 counties and the city of St. Louis. This represents an increase of 300 miles of polluted streams in 8 years.

Pollution is caused by many substances which vary in their effect upon fish and other aquatic life. Some pollutants which are lethal to fish directly include industrial chemicals, acid mine wastes, lead, zinc, iron, brine, insecticides, lime, plating liquor, and water treatment compounds. Others remove dissolved oxygen from water. These include sewage, dairy, corn products, canning, and meat packing wastes. Some of those listed have both of these properties and still others impart off-flavors to water and fish.

Other kinds of pollutants blanket the bottom of streams, ruining them as spawning and feeding grounds for fish. These include sediments resulting from washing barite, iron ores and gravel, oil, sawdust, glass fiber, coal washings, wood fiber and varnish.

The extent of some pollutants is more widespread than others, and the effect differs with the type and volume of the pollutant. Thirteen streams in 16 counties and the city of St. Louis are affected by industrial chemical wastes. A serious effect of this type of pollution is the foreign flavor imparted to fish. Although fish are not always killed, this condition renders them unfit for use. The commercial fishery in the Mississippi River from St. Louis to Cape Girardeau has been practically ruined by industrial wastes which enter the river in the Bi-State area surrounding St. Louis, and their effect has been reported downstream for at least 300 miles. Industrial wastes from the Kansas City area have a similar effect on the commercial fishery in the Missouri River in the

56-mile reach from Kansas City to Lexington, and during low flow, off-flavored fish have been reported at Boonville, about 180 river-miles below Kansas City.

During the 10-year period from 1947 through 1956, the number of licensed Missouri River commercial fishermen operating below Kansas City in Clay, Jackson, Ray, and Lafayette Counties declined 62 percent, and in the Mississippi River below St. Louis the number of these fishermen declined by 64 percent in the reach of river bordering Jefferson, Ste. Genevieve, Perry, and Cape Girardeau Counties. The reported commercial fish harvest in the latter 4 counties declined 71 percent.

Forty streams in nine counties are contaminated by coal mine waste. Acid water formed in coal mines probably kills more fish and aquatic life than any other single pollutant. This water contains sulfuric acid and iron compounds formed by the action of air and water upon coal exposed during the mining operations. Usually, there is some lag in time between the exposure of pyrites and the formation of the acid. Consequently, abandoned strip mines are serious potential sources of pollution. If corrective measures have not been followed, these mines cause trouble indefinitely.

The harmful effects of coal mine wastes are many. Not only do they kill fish, fish food organisms, and plants, they also render the stream unfit for stock watering and other purposes. Acids kill fish by coagulating the mucus of the gills resulting in the complete stoppage of the flow of blood. We are pleased, indeed, to note that some mines have adopted corrective measures, but pollution by coal mines remains a serious problem in the north-central, west-central, and the southwest portions of the State.

Thirty-eight streams in 30 counties and the city of St. Louis are affected by raw or poorly treated sewage. It affects fish in several ways most importantly by using up the dissolved oxygen in the water. None but the most tolerant fish can live in such water and these fish are not the kinds preferred by the angler. Sewage also contributes to fish disease, and sludge is ruinous to spawning grounds and to fish foods used by the kinds of fish which occur in clean water.

The washing of clay from barite ore has caused sedimentation in 10 streams in 3 east-central Missouri counties. Heavy sedimentation and high turbidity result from this operation and the accumulated sediment is carried downstream with increased discharge following rainfall. This causes the destruction or deterioration of fish habitat by destroying spawning grounds and fish food organisms and by reducing the transparency of the water to the extent that sight-feeding fish are not able to feed properly. In some instances fish have been killed by the clogging of their gills.

Oil pollution is quite widespread, affecting 19 streams in 16 counties of the State. The sources are refineries, leakage from barges and tank cars, waste from industrial users of oil, aircraft overhaul bases, service stations, and others. Refinery wastes contain phenols and other substances which impart an off-flavor to fish. Often oil kills fish by clogging the gills or it destroys eggs and kills fish food organisms. An oil film on the surface prevents normal aeration of the water and oil sometimes blankets the bottom of a stream for miles. This is particularly true of the Mississippi River below St. Louis, where oil deposits are found on the bottom for 83 miles downstream from the source.

Oil pollution in this reach of the Mississippi also has an important influence on waterfowl movement. The Conservation Commission's waterfowl counts between 1936 and 1955 show that for many years there has not been a measurable number of migratory birds in the reach of river between St. Louis and Ste. Genevieve. Contamination from oil has had a similar effect on waterfowl concentrations on the Missouri River. Pollution on this stream has been observed consistently in routine aerial censusing during the fall migration since 1937. After 1943 oil slicks became continuous in the Kansas City area and frequently were observed as far as Waverly, 80 miles downstream. Over a 20-year span covered by the Commission's observations, we believe that waterfowl habitat in the Missouri River has gradually deteriorated for a distance of 50 miles below Kansas City. Waterfowl specialists report few birds in this part of the river. Oil is particularly harmful to waterfowl because their feathers become saturated and the birds cannot fly.

Salts of zinc, lead and other heavy metals have caused fish kills in the east and southwest sections of the State. Six streams in four counties are affected. In southwest Missouri, this contamination resulted from pumping out inactive lead mines while in the eastern lead belt region it results from the escape of water in processing ore. The salts of lead and zinc are directly toxic and are lethal in low concentration.

Most organic wastes have an effect on fish similar to those described for raw or poorly treated sewage. These include dairy, meatpacking, canning, and corn products wastes. As they decompose, all have a high demand for oxygen which renders water unfit for all but the most tolerant species of fish. Dairy wastes alone contaminate 23 streams in 18 counties.

Wastes of the meatpacking industry affect seven streams in as many counties. This includes extensive contamination of the Missouri and Mississippi rivers. Decay of the organic matter in these wastes rapidly depletes the dissolved oxygen. This is also true for the 12 miles of three streams in two counties affected by canning wastes. The waste of an out-state corn products industry affects 25 miles of the Mississippi River in three Missouri counties. This has a high demand for dissolved oxygen and commercial fishermen report that it clogs their tackle.

Sawdust, glass fiber, mine, gravel, coal and iron ore washings, varnish and wood fiber wastes are others which cover the bottom of the stream, ruining it as a spawning and feeding ground for fish. Some of these create intense water turbidity. Sawdust affects about 18 miles of seven streams in seven counties, mostly in the Ozarks. It also has the property of giving off organic acids and lowering dissolved oxygen.

In recent years, insecticides have killed fish in several streams throughout the State. Toxaphene, DDT, aldrin, benzine hexachloride, chlordane, and others are extremely toxic to fish. Several of them kill fish in concentrations as low as one part insecticide in 100 million parts of water. The mere runoff from vegetation sprayed with aldrin recently killed many fish in a nearby slough and some insecticides are believed to be toxic to warmblooded animals.

This describes briefly the influence of water pollution on fish and wildlife and points out the value of recreation in the form of hunting and fishing. We often refer to pollution as the cancer of fresh water. I believe this is a reasonable analogy because pollution is the dark side in the future of fishing and other recreational uses in which the waters of Missouri are involved. If it continues to increase as it has in the past 10 years, pollution will soon make a serious inroad on fish and other forms of wildlife at a time when there is a greater demand for this resource than ever before in Missouri's history.

To Revive Europe: More Competition and Fewer Cartels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker I wish to take this opportunity to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by Robert M. Burr which appeared in the September 13, 1958, issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "To Revive Europe: More Competition and Fewer Cartels." I believe it merits the attention of the Members of the Congress:

TO REVIVE EUROPE: MORE COMPETITION AND FEWER CARTELS

(By Robert M. Burr)

As a nation we have been spending much time and money to increase living standards throughout the world. Our ability to defend democratic institutions against the spread of communism and other types of authoritarianism depends in large measure upon the success of this effort.

But what has made it possible for the United States in the last 50 years to outstrip all other nations in productivity and living standards? A number of authorities say: "Competition." The British Specialist Team on Industrial Engineering of the British Productivity Council, after an extended tour of the United States in 1958, stated that "more than any other factor, competition provides the drive for more frequent analysis of costs and application of industrial-engineering techniques in the United States."

For more than 50 years we in the United States have been developing and perfecting a very uncomfortable form of capitalism for producers and sellers, but a very satisfactory one for consumers.

We have had our ups and downs, as has every other economy. But no other economic system thus far created has developed as potent and effective motivations for the achievement of maximum distribution of wealth as have been nurtured under our system of competitive capitalism. It is these strong motivating forces that need to be exported and sold throughout the world.

Restrictive trade practices are rampant abroad. For example, at the end of last year, an official count showed more than 1,900 restrictive agreements in existence in Great Britain. More than 650 cartels exist in Switzerland, and virtually every industry operates under such agreements. In a few countries, tentative, cautious, creeping steps have been taken toward overseeing or limiting such practices. A West German anti-cartel law, passed in July 1957, is the boldest act so far. Great Britain requires the registration of various types of agreements. But Great Britain exempts agreements affecting export and international trade, and Germany is seeking authority to reestablish its cartels in international trade. The Swiss rejected by a substantial margin (191,934 for and 549,842 against) a constitutional amendment which would have made illegal all agreements intended to limit competition. Four years ago, Japan announced that it was going to reestablish its cartels. Nowhere in the world is there even a resemblance to competitive capitalism as practiced here.

The margin between living standards abroad and in the United States has shifted

very little in the last 10 years. It is going to take much more than foreign aid, foreign investments, technical assistance and tariff reductions to change this situation. What is needed is the establishment of a dynamic society throughout the world comparable to our own.

We must rework our foreign economic policy so that the advancement of competitive capitalism throughout the world becomes one of its major planks. We should adjust our administration of foreign aid, the trade-agreements program and the Tariff Act to encourage the spread of competitive capitalism abroad and safeguard its practice here.

The Military Draft Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1959, the Universal Military Training and Service Act will expire unless the Congress act to extend its life. In view of the growing number of both military and civilian critics who feel that our present method for recruiting members of the Armed Forces is filled with flaws and inadequacies, I call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article by Mr. Fletcher Knebel appearing in Look magazine, May 27, 1958, entitled "The Fight To Kill the Draft." It raises questions fundamental to the security of our country, the morale and effectiveness of our military forces and our quality of leadership.

Under unanimous consent I include the article in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIGHT TO KILL THE DRAFT

(By Fletcher Knebel)

"We must abolish the draft—bury it in the military museums alongside the muzzle-loading rifle and the cavalry saber. We must create a new military manpower system; one that will give the services the kind of men they, and the Nation, desperately need."

This is the battle cry of a small but growing group of manpower experts who are directing a withering fire at the Selective Service System. They see the draft as a poison that infects our Armed Forces and gives us delusions about our military strength. They point out that modern war is a business for razor-sharp, highly skilled specialists ever ready to handle the newest weapons. They argue that compulsory service isn't doing the job—that it's a museum piece. It worked fine in its days, but it fails miserably to meet the standards set by the cataclysmic threat of the nuclear-space age.

Ralph J. Cordiner, president of the General Electric Co., and chairman of a committee that spent 18 months devising ways to make a military career attractive, says, "The explosive speed of advances in modern war technology makes it almost impossible to train a specialist in 2 years." (That is how long draftees serve.)

"I talked to hundreds of enlisted men," adds Cordiner. "I found antagonism and bitterness over the draft. They were checking off the days until they got out. We must devote 25 percent of our military effort to training men who don't stay. The trainers are discouraged. They resemble the poor teacher whose every class flunks."

Air Force Maj. Gen. Harold R. Maddux, a West Pointer who directs the Defense Department's division of manpower requirements, says, "The next war might come with only a few minutes' warning. It is impossible to provide the required state of instant readiness with men who don't want to be there. We need a professional service, manned by men who are proud of their uniform and trained for the job."

"We need dramatic changes in pay and attitudes to upgrade a military career in the eyes of the Nation. We can't get that change with huge numbers of men compelled to serve against their will."

Dr. Eli Ginzberg, director of staff studies for the National Manpower Council, sees the conscription system coming under more and more scrutiny and criticism from experts and the public. "More and more people are questioning the status of the draft," he declares. "A compulsory system that is supposed to be universal—and isn't—creates political hazards. The trouble with the system is that there is a tendency for the defense management to seek the remedy for its errors by the simple method of calling up more manpower."

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, Democratic whip of the Senate, looks at the men the draft serves up and finds serious weaknesses. One third of the 179,000 draftees in 1957, he reports, were rated "dull" or below normal in intelligence. Like other responsible men who are beginning to doubt the draft, MANSFIELD wouldn't wipe out the conscription law without a substitute that would keep 2,500,000 men, about our present strength. But once this substitute is found—and MANSFIELD backs the Cordiner report, which would upgrade service salaries to attract better men—he says, "The draft should be abolished."

It was 18 years ago, with the shadow of World War II reaching toward America, that the first $21-a-month draftees were called up. On July 1, 1959, the present draft law runs out, and the Eisenhower administration will ask Congress for an extension, probably for 4 years. Here are some charges against the draft that already are being leveled, and that will resound when the Congressmen must decide:

INEQUITY

"The Universal Military Training and Service Act"—the draft law's official name—is one of the least universal of our laws. This year, some 1,170,000 boys turn 18 and must register. But draft calls have been running under 200,000 a year.

Outright exemptions, for ministers and conscientious objectors, are few. But no fewer than 4,115,000 out of the 10,144,000 men currently liable for military service have deferments, according to the Selective Service System's latest report. For many other men, service is postponed until they escape the draft in practice if not in theory. Childless men between 19 and 26 are supposed to go first. But if a potential draftee becomes a father before he's caught in a quota, he drops a notch on the available list. If he passes 26 and still hasn't been called, he goes down still further. Meanwhile, thousands of younger boys keep coming along each year.

COMPLACENCE

The draft guarantees an endless flow of young bodies, as many as needed. Only the Army has been taking draftees, but the Air Force and Navy use the draft indirectly. Both say the threat of conscription is what gives them enough enlistees.

As a result, the Armed Forces can—and do—shrug off their shortcomings. They seem to be as strongly manned as the budget will allow. There is no pressure on them to provide the kind of leadership and morale that long have been a spine-tingling tradition of the all-volunteer Marine Corps.

The administration is also draft-deluded. It is under no pressure to sponsor and cherish the type of military service that would make young men proud to join and stay. As evidence is the way servicemen's fringe benefits have been raided and curtailed. Military housing has been a recurrent scandal. Military pay reforms languished until the Cordiner Committee put steam into reform proposals.

The heat is off Congress to pass the legislation needed to attract competent men to a profession of arms. With the Armed Forces always filled to the limit, the public also gets complacent. Actually, the 2-year draftee is a babe in the woods in an era of airlifted armies, missiles, and nuclear bombs. He just begins to learn about the arsenal of modern military science when he's sent back home.

LEADERSHIP

"The draft has poisoned our military system," says a ranking officer. "The rot of draft motivation extends from the newest group of inductees up through thousands of officers."

These officers took their commissions merely to escape conscription. One Pentagon official estimated that "80 percent of our officers below the rank of general are draft-motivated." He says the poison has spread to the service academies with terrible results. He asks, "What kind of leaders will we have when hundreds of boys at the academies are there, not because they want to be officers, but because they don't want to be enlisted men?"

The Reserve officers' program on the college campuses is filled with men who intend to serve their 3 years and then return promptly to civilian life. Seventy-three percent of them quit the minute their compulsory tour of duty is up.

WASTE

Ninety-seven out of every one hundred draftees return to civilian life as soon as their hitch ends. This is just the point in their training when they would begin to be of some value to the Army. A private company would go broke quickly with such a wasteful turnover of apprentice personnel. And the Defense Department, costing $76,000 a minute to run, is the free world's largest enterprise.

The Army, the Cordiner report showed, has only half the career enlisted men it needs to maintain electronic gear; the Air Force, less than half, and the Navy, only one-third. Assistant Defense Secretary William H. Francis, Jr., says that 6½ wings of Strategic Air Command bombers on the average have been made idle recently for lack of trained ground and air crews. So a favorite argument of Air Force and Navy officers—that they don't want draftees, but do want the draft as a persuader for voluntary enlistments—fades away. Conscription provides raw manpower—but not men to do the vital jobs. For draft pressures are of scant benefit in making the trained men stay at their posts.

MORALE

Americans look down their noses at institutions rooted in compulsion. The Armed Forces are no exception: Military service must be bad, it is said, if men have to be forced into it against their will. A private poll conducted for the Pentagon showed that the public rates a military career far down the prestige scale of occupations.

If the civilian snoots the uniform, say foes of the draft, how can the man who wears it be expected to respect it? Not until every man in the services is there of his own choice will the uniform be vested with the dignity it deserves at a time when our Armed Forces are defending not only this country, but the whole free world.

Those who favor continuation of the draft are disinclined to meet this battery of arguments head on. Rather, they shift their fire. They argue, first, that the draft is a symbol of American preparedness. The draft's number one champion, Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Selective Service Director, believes that shedding this symbol would be

catastrophic abroad. "We would say to the world," says Hershey, "that we don't have the stamina and will power for leadership. The results would be terrible—disintegration for the NATO aliance, neutrals fleeing to the strong arms of communism and Russia emboldened to new aggression."

The importance of the draft symbol was demonstrated during the 1956 campaign when Adlai E. Stevenson aired his qualms about the effectiveness of draftee forces. It appeared to many voters that he wanted to weaken our defenses. His attempts to explain were lost in the heat of the campaign. This explains why some congressmen who privately question the value of the draft hesitate to do so publicly.

The second chief argument against abolition of the draft takes the form of a question asked over and over in Congress and at the Pentagon: "Suppose we do abandon the draft in favor of a substitute program—are you willing to risk decimation of the Armed Forces on a gamble?" Defense Secretary Neil McElroy, President Eisenhower, the Joint Chiefs of Staff—all answer, "No." As Assistant Defense Secretary Francis puts it: "Because a shoe doesn't fit, we'd be foolish to cut off the foot." The Army believes it must have a draft or fall below manpower requirements. Without conscription, the Pentagon chiefs fear that enlistments for the other services, now running at 300,000 a year, would wither. It is a common saying at the Pentagon that volunteers might man a service of 1,500,000 men, but anything above that has to be draft-induced.

This doesn't mean that the Pentagon admires conscription. Rather, it is viewed as a necessary evil. Brig. Gen. James P. Berkeley, chief of manpower for the Marine Corps, states the prevailing attitude succinctly: "We don't want any part of the draft in the Marines. We want every man a volunteer and proud of it. But we've got to have the draft law to provide the pressure that propels boys into our recruiting offices. After that, it's up to us to make marines of them."

A curious fact about the draft is that Americans have accepted it so placidly in recent years. Once we hated the draft with a passion. Millions of us are descended from immigrants who fled Europe to escape conscription by the old armies of empire. Only 95 years ago, more than 1,000 persons were killed in New York City's Civil War draft riots. In 1941, a proposal to lengthen the draftees' term of service passed the House with only one vote to spare—and that at a time when World War II was under way in Europe.

For years, the peacetime draft has been accepted without question at the Pentagon. Now, doubts about it have arisen in the wake of dire shortages of skilled manpower. And the challenge to compulsory service will grow in volume. For one basic fact is too stubborn to yield. Our military manpower system is not supplying the skills our defenses demand in an age when the issue is nothing less than survival.

Consideration of Immigration Matters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to transfer consideration of immigration matters in the House of Representatives from the Judiciary Committee to the Committee on Internal Security runs exactly contrary to the best American traditions.

It implies that the immigrant is a potential security risk or suspect, instead of a potential good American.

It tends to stop consideration of the immigrant as a man seeking freedom and justice—for these are factors that a judicial function considers—and instead makes of the immigrant a man possibly guilty of subverting our institutions, and therefore the business of a security committee.

The transfer of passport controls to such a committee is equally bad. Instead of keeping the emphasis on the right of every American citizen to travel, as a free man, the emphasis would now be placed upon the danger of any American citizen being allowed to move at will about the world.

The implications of such transfers of function thus run far beyond the administrative questions involved. They go to the very essence of the picture of freedom which we present to the world abroad, and to our people at home.

Even on the administrative level, however, immigration questions bear much closer relationship to the courts and the Department of Justice—and therefore to the Judiciary Committee—than they do to police or security functions. If any other interest were to be consulted, it would logically be that of the departments and committees charged with labor and economic questions.

The same is true respecting passport affairs, which fall basically within the area of the State Department and the Senate and House committees charged with the supervision of foreign relations.

Any departure from this logical distribution of authority could only be justified on the theory that a special police or security function is involved in these matters.

Clear Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared recently in the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star, entitled "Clear Choice":

Congress now has a clear choice between intelligent labor reform offered by President Eisenhower and ineffective legislation proposed by congressional liberals and backed by the labor bosses themselves. The President's program gets at serious abuses which are sidestepped in the milder legislation embodied in the Kennedy-Ervin bill, which is a reproduction of the measure Senators KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and IVES, of New York, sponsored unsuccessfully last year.

In his labor recommendations, President Eisenhower challenged Congress to do the kind of a job that needs to be done in the way of labor reform. He made clear that he will give determined leadership to the fight for effective legislation. The President can count on strong support from northern and southern conservatives in Congress and from the public, which has been made aware of the seriousness of the problem by the McClellan Rackets Investigating Committee.

President Eisenhower has asked Congress for changes in the basic Taft-Hartley labor law to ban racket picketing and tighten curbs on secondary boycotts. The President's program would require union leaders to make detailed annual reports on financial operations and election procedures. It also calls for public disclosure of union finances, secret ballot election of union officers, and other safeguards which would protect rank-and-file members.

The President said he was offering a complete and effective approach, rather than piecemeal legislation. The fact that Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, presented the President's program gives further assurance of its effectiveness. Senator GOLDWATER fought hard last year for effective labor reform.

The President's program stops short of what many feel must be the ultimate objective of applying the antitrust laws to organized labor. Exemption from the Sherman Act, which restrains business from endangering the public interest, has made the labor monopoly possible.

Senator KENNEDY's liberal labor bill would set up rules for union finances and require democratic procedures within unions, but it is silent on the matters of racket picketing and secondary boycotts. That silence makes it acceptable to the union leaders who have a strong influence in the Democratic-controlled Congress.

President Eisenhower is making the fight that must be made in the interest of the public and labor itself.

Wool Act Should Protect Sheep Growers and Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I have become acquainted with a serious problem of cut earnings and unemployment among sheepshearers in some Western States. This decrease in earnings and work is not due to economic conditions in the industry. Instead, it is the result of importing workers who labor under semipeonage conditions and undercut the wages of sheepshearers who have long lived and long worked in the areas.

The crews who are being imported into the woolgrowing areas from Texas are paid as little as one-fourth of the wages of the sheepshearers who live in the Rocky Mountain and west coast States. They are tied to the contractor who brings them into the wool areas because they owe him the money he has advanced them in the winter or nonshearing months.

The conditions of these crews who come into the woolgrowing areas to shear sheep is short of fantastic. They are crowded into trucks like cattle. They must sleep around the trucks. They are provided only the lowest quality foods.

This exploitation of substandard living and working conditions has resulted in serious harm to the sheepshearers who live in the woolgrowing areas. Their jobs are being taken away. Their wage rates are being seriously undercut. They are finding it increasingly difficult to get work.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that these conditions exist while the Federal Government supports the earning of wool growers. The wool act was enacted to put a floor under the earnings of the growers. It is aimed at allowing American growers to compete with foreign ones.

It is obvious that the growers have a protection which workers do no have. It is obvious that workers need the same sort of protection against imported labor, which undercuts their wages, as the growers have protection against imported wool whose price undercuts their income.

I sincerely hope that legislation to protect sheep shearers will be enacted by Congress. If we are to protect one part of the wool industry, we must protect the other also.

In the past, I, as well as many other Representatives from urban areas, have voted for the Wool Act and other measures which aided the wool industry. I am certain that these city Congressmen believed, as I did, that our votes would help not only the woolgrowers, but also the workers who shear the sheep.

Workers should certainly have the same protection which the growers have. This is simple justice. If the growers opposed legislation to provide fair labor standards for the workers, I would certainly reconsider my position toward the Wool Act. I would see little justice in renewing the act, as we do every 3 years.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, such a situation will not come about. I hope legislation to protect the earnings of sheepshearing workers will be enacted, just as legislation now exists to protect the earnings of woolgrowers.

Strong Labor Law Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star of January 30, 1959:

STRONG LABOR LAW NEEDED

Senator JOHN KENNEDY's new labor-management bill, as everyone knows, is considerably less than is needed to protect workers and the public from union racketeers and monopolists. But the old half a loaf is better than none argument has been trotted out to justify it.

Sometimes the half a loaf argument is logical. But this is not one of those times.

The sordid record of lawlessness in some unions so far produced by the McClellan committee has been brought to the people by every communications medium—newspapers, radio, television, magazines, and newsreels. It has alarmed labor union members as well as the general public. Never has the need for comprehensive reform in any area been so clear and so well understood.

To say that it would be useless to expect Congress to pass a sweeping reform bill, because it is a Democratic Congress heavily indebted to labor union politicians, is to say that the party owes a greater debt to labor bosses than to the rank and file of labor and to the people of the United States.

If the Democrats in Congress feel that way about it, let them bear the blame for failing to vote a reform that is widely demanded. And instead of accepting half a loaf, which would theoretically appease the public, let us continue to demand real reform and set about electing a Congress in 1960 with enough courage to give it to us.

Senator KENNEDY's bill is aimed at characters such as Jimmy Hoffa and his associates. It would drive hoodlums out of labor unions. But it would do nothing about the monopoly power of unions, such abuses as the secondary boycott, blackmail picketing or the dangers that have grown up with the uncontrolled power of some unions.

Labor unions once needed the protection of the law against big business. Now they themselves have become big business and their power, in some instances, is greater than that of the robber barons of business who brought on antitrust and other restrictive legislation. Public protection against this unrestricted power is as necessary as worker protection against racketeers in unions.

The need for comprehensive reform is proven. The public demand is unmistakable.

This is no time to talk of settling for half a loaf.

Constitutional Government Imperiled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the fact has become more and more evident that the U.S. Supreme Court is following a studied pattern of attempting to amend our Constitution and change our laws through usurpation of authority which the Court does not possess. Judges, lawyers, and citizens in every section of the country are concerned and alarmed at these destructive blows which are being struck at our constitutional form of government.

The American people as a whole believe in law and order, and respect constituted authority. However, when one branch of the Government deliberately oversteps its authority and usurps functions belonging to another branch of the Government, such reprehensible conduct is good reason for vigorous and emphatic protests on the part of good citizens and right-thinking people throughout the entire country.

A very able address on this subject was delivered by the Honorable Marlin T. Phelps, now Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court in Phoenix, Ariz., on November 13, last year. I have just recently had the privilege of reading Chief Justice Phelps' address. I was so impressed by it that I have obtained permission to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and pursuant to unanimous consent of the House I attach the address herewith as a part of these remarks:

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT IS IMPERILED

(Text of speech delivered before the Arizonans for America Organization, Phoenix, Ariz., on November 13, 1958, by Hon. Marlin T. Phelps, justice, Arizona Supreme Court)

GOVERNMENT OF MEN REPLACES GOVERNMENT OF LAWS

Ladies and gentlemen, in order to get a better perspective of what has taken place and what is taking place in our Nation today I believe it would be well to go back to the inception of our Government and briefly refer to the considerations which brought it forth even at the expense of repeating much that is trite.

Original concept

In the first place this Government is the result of a concept never before adopted by any people as their governmental philosophy. It rests upon the postulate that all the powers of sovereignty should forever reside in the people and that the government they were about to establish should be a limited government subject always to the will of the people.

Pursuant to this concept resulting from their broad knowledge of the history of governments that had risen and fallen in the past and their knowledge of the frailties of man, our forefathers sought to create a government limited both in the duties assigned to it and limited in its power to discharge those duties with such checks and balances incorporated therein as would insure that all public officials should forever remain subservient to the will of the people. They had experienced the oppressive hand of British rule as a result of unbridled power, and they had witnessed the adoption of oppressive legislation by some of the American Colonies after they had gained their freedom from Britain.

They, therefore, determined that, insofar as they could prevent it, they would establish a government that would secure to its citizens, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, declared in the Declaration of Independence to be inalienable rights of all men. Lincoln afterward defined the government thus created on this basis to be a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. It was designed to be a government of laws and not a government of men. The framers of the Constitution were of the view that the checks and balances provided for therein between the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government would result in a wholesome restraining influence as between these two branches. Nevertheless, they provided that the judicial branch of such government should have the power of review over the official actions of both the executive and legislative branches in order that they may be securely kept within the constitutional limitations delegated to them. The final arbiter in such matters was vested in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Judiciary unrestricted

Unfortunately, however, they provided no checks against the exercise of excessive powers by the Supreme Court although most of them agreed that this constituted a great weakness in the framework of the proposed new government and expressed fears of the potential dangers that lurked therein. The only restraint that exists today against the exercise of excessive power by the Supreme Court is that restraint which the conscience dictates to the individual members of the Court. Congress has the constitutional power to limit its appellate jurisdiction under such regulations as the Congress shall make

but it refused to exercise such power at its last session. Experience has confirmed the historical fact that the conscience of the men who are vested with great power in government is inadequate to protect the governed from oppression. Jefferson recognized that when he said: "* * * free government is founded in jealousy, and not in confidence, which prescribes limited constitutions to bind down those whom we are obliged to trust with power; that our Constitution has accordingly fixed limits to which, and no further our confidence may go. * * *

"In question of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

And with respect to the Supreme Court he said:

"* * * there is no danger I apprehend so much as the consolidation of our Government by the noiseless and therefore unalarming instrumentality of the Supreme Court."

Fear prompts amendments

It was the fear of the inadequacy of the limitation provided for in the original document that prompted the immediate adoption of the first 10 amendments. The 10th amendment to the Constitution reserved to the States respectively, or to the people, all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution. This was done to serve as a check against all the branches of the Federal Government and it served its purpose splendidly for 150 years; but if the present Court is aware of its existence, it has shown no evidence of it in recent years. If there were ever any cases in which this amendment should have been considered it was in the Court's decisions in the sedition and segregation cases.

The segregation decisions concerned the public school system of the sovereign States of the South, a matter which had always been considered to be of purely local concern and therefore subject to the exclusive control of the States under the powers reserved to them under the 10th amendment. The identical question decided in these cases was adversely decided by the same Court in 1896 and reaffirmed in 1927 in a school case where both the equal-protection of the law, and the separate-but-equal-right questions under the 14th amendment were directly raised. The Supreme Court then headed by Chief Justice Taft unanimously decided both questions in favor of segregated schools provided for by the constitution of the State of Mississippi. The Court then said the same question had been many times declared to be within the constitutional power of the States without intervention of the Federal courts under the Federal Constitution.

Fourteenth amendment overworked

Please remember I am not discussing segregation, I am discussing the proposition that the present Supreme Court does not feel itself bound by either precedent involving the same constitutional question, or by the Constitution itself. Without any qualms or apologies they set aside the previous decisions of the Court which had been recognized by the Court itself as binding upon it for nearly 60 years. These decisions were handed down in 1954 based upon the provisions of the 14th amendment providing equal protection of the law to all citizens as well as due process of the law. The 14th nendment is a limitation only upon the States. The Court said in *Brown* v. *Board of Education* in discussing these questions that "we hold that plaintiffs and others similarly situated, for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment. This makes unnecessary any discussion, whether such section also violates the due-process clause of the 14th amendment."

But, in the Bolling case involving the District of Columbia decided on the same day the Court invoked the provisions of the fifth amendment which applies to the Federal Government only. It does not have in it the equal-protection clause but only contains the due-process clause and with its usual disregard of constitutional provisions in reaching its decisions it held that the "due-process clause" in the fifth amendment should be construed also as an equal-protection clause as respects the Federal Government, although on that very same day in the Brown case, it distinguished between the two clauses and after it decided the equal-protection clause had been violated it said it was unnecessary to also discuss the due-process clause of the 14th amendment whether such segregation also violates the due-process clause of that amendment.

Unstable decisions

Ladies and gentlemen, its decisions are as unstable as the shifting sands of the desert and are as unsound as they are unstable. A decent respect for the provisions of the Federal Constitution would have demanded the consideration of the 10th amendment in these cases. Many of the greatest judges and lawyers in the United States condemn these decisions as being purely legislative in character and wholly beyond the power and jurisdiction of the Court to pronounce.

A cursory examination recently made by some of the law clerks in cur court indicates that approximately two-thirds of all the cases which the Supreme Court has accepted for consideration since Warren's ascension to the bench have been cases involving Communists and undesirables whom the Government has attempted to deport, and out of the first 39 such cases considered by the Court, 30 of them were acquitted which resulted in a wholesale release of Communists throughout the Nation charged with similar offenses—Chief Justice Warren voted for the acquittal in 36 of the 39 cases. In the October 28 issue of the Arizona Republic I noticed that the Court has decided to review the case of William L. Green who lost his job as an $18,000 a year vice president of a Maryland engineering research firm in 1953 when the Defense Department withdrew his security clearance. This involves the right of the Federal Government to impose loyalty and security standards in defense plants. It's dollars to doughnuts that the right to impose such standards will be denied.

Decisions not supreme law

The Attorney General of the United States and the President and others who are following their lead are telling the people of the Nation that the decisions of the Supreme Court on these constitutional questions are the supreme law of the land and that it is the duty of every citizen both public and private to obey them. The Supreme Court itself in a supplemental opinion a few weeks ago in the segregation cases stated that the decisions in those cases are the supreme law of the land. The fact is that no individual has to obey these opinions except the parties who were litigants in court any more than you have to obey a decision of the supreme court of this State unless you are a party to the cause of action in which the opinion is rendered. This is just simple commonsense. And it has been the declared law of all courts for 150 years and until Mr. Warren established his arbitrary rule of being bound neither by precedent nor the Constitution. The most that can be said concerning their effect is that they furnish a standard by which all cases of a like nature must be determined until the Court reverses its position again. The Constitution states in clear and simple language that "this Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made and to be made under authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land."

The Constitution, acts of Congress and treaties with foreign nations alone constitute the supreme law of the land by which the sovereign States of the Union and the people of the United States are bound. There was nothing farther from the minds of the framers of the Constitution than that the decision of the Supreme Court should ever become the supreme law of the land. This was clearly evidenced by the pronouncement of Jefferson quoted above.

Not until the Supreme Court reverses its philosophy of government and takes the position that it is bound by a previous decision of that Court on the same constitutional question (interpreted according to cardinal rules of construction, i.e., upon the intent of the farmers, the purpose of its adoption, and its historical background) and that such decision is integrated into the Constitution and becomes a part of it as much so as if originally written therein, can anyone justifiably and truthfully say that the decisions of the Supreme Court are the supreme law of the land binding upon all persons public and private. It will then become the supreme law of the land not because it is a decision of the Supreme Court but because it has been integrated into and become a part of the Constitution.

Unwarranted emphasis

The unwarranted broadening of the scope of the 14th amendment by the Court has been the basis of all of the decisions of the Court liberating hundreds of dangerous Communists in this country by restricting the congressional and executive branches of the Government in the exercise of their constitutional powers. It has been the too frequent use of this amendment and the broadening of its scope that makes it so dangerous to the liberties of the citizens of this Nation. It has been one of the Court's springboards which it has employed in its practical destruction of States rights. Both Justices Holmes and Hughes recognized this danger. Justice Holmes stated in an opinion (in *Baldwin* v. *Missouri*, 281 U.S. 586) that he had not adequately expressed the more than anxiety he felt at the ever-increasing scope given to the 14th amendment in cutting down what he believed to be the constitutional rights of the States, and Justice Hughes said, in substance, in a speech in 1937 before a joint session of Congress, that it was just as essential to preserve the rights of the States under the 10th amendment as a check against the encroachment of the Federal Government upon the liberties of their citizens as it was to preserve inviolate the checks and balances of the three coordinate branches of the Federal Government against each other.

The Supreme Court is not alone to blame for constitutional violations and the continued centralization of power in the Federal Government. Congress enacted a law in 1935 providing that anything which affects interstate commerce is a part of an interstate transaction which has been interpreted by the Court to cover window washers and elevator operators in a building where there is located a business engaged in interstate commerce subjecting them to the provisions of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, and therefore under the control of the Federal Government. By the enactment of this law Congress opened the door for these opinions. The Constitution only gave Congress the right to regulate interstate commerce. By the use of the term "affect interstate commerce" it broadened its own powers, which has been construed by the Court to empower Congress to regulate transactions wholly within a State upon the theory that it affects interstate commerce. There is not a business in Arizona today that the Court cannot say is engaged in inter-

state commerce. This gives the National Labor Relations Board exclusive jurisdiction over all disputes between building contractors, plumbing contractors, or any other kind of contracting business and labor unions in Arizona, or any other State. Even if the National Labor Relations Board declines to accept jurisdiction of such a case the courts of a sovereign State of the Union cannot determine their own jurisdiction in the matter but must first obtain the consent of the National Labor Relations Board to exercise such jurisdiction before it can do so. Think of it. The courts of sovereign States in whose citizens all powers of sovereignty reside, must petition a Federal administrative agency for permission to exercise the powers of sovereignty. Until this new and strange philosophy sprang up it was always considered by the courts of the States that such courts had the inherent power implicit in the sovereignty of the State of which it was an arm, to determine its own jurisdiction in all cases wholly independent of any interference from Federal restrictions and especially from a Federal administrative body.

Congress abdicates powers

Both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government are deliberately violating the Federal Constitution. The President violated the Constitution when he sent Federal troops into Little Rock to picket a high school there and to order citizens off of their own front lawns and that of their neighbors. There wasn't a semblance of legal authority for this action.

In 1934 at the request of President Roosevelt, Congress passed a law commonly known as the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, in which Congress delegated to the President the power to enter into a reciprocal trade agreements with foreign nations. This grant of power to the President was upon the understanding that it was a legislative expediency to aid the President in pulling the Nation out of a great depression and that it would not be extended beyond the term granted. Notwithstanding these assurances at the end of each period to which the authority had been extended, at the insistent demand of Mr. Roosevelt and each of the succeeding Presidents, this power delegated to the President has been extended again and again and is still in full force and effect except that it has been now, by executive agreement, removed beyond even the power of the President to fix a tariff on any imported commodity by agreement with other nations. President Truman, in 1947, without authority from Congress entered into a series of multilateral agreements with 36 other nations including at least one Communist country (Czechoslovakia) by which the United States has lost its control over our tariffs. Under the present arrangement with these nations known as GATT, tariffs on commodities imported into the United States are fixed by these 37 nations and we have only 1 vote in 37 in fixing our tariffs on imports. The result has been disastrous to American industries. President Eisenhower in urging its renewal stated that it was vital even to our safety as a nation. It is reputed that the reason for this statement is that the State Department (Mr. Dulles) is using it as a bargaining instrumentality in establishing our foreign policy. A government whose actions are based upon expediency such as this rests upon a foundation of sand and can withstand neither wind nor wave.

President violates Constitution

The power to lay taxes, imposts, duties, and excises and to regulate commerce with foreign nations is vested in the Congress of the United States by the Constitution, and Congress unlawfully abdicated its constitutional powers and its Members violated their oaths of office and the provisions of the Constitution when Congress gave the Executive the power either to lay a duty on imports or to regulate trade with foreign nations, and the President is violating his oath to support the Constitution when he urges its violation by Congress and in exercising that power. It is elemental as a fundamental principle of law that both the executive and legislative as well as the judicial branch of Government must function within their constitutional limitations if we, the people, are to remain free. Failure to recognize and to function within such limitations destroys the very concept upon which the Federal Government was founded. It makes this Government a government of men and not of laws. It destroys the sovereignty of the people and empowers those whom we have entrusted to administer our Government to enslave its citizens.

Trade Agreement Act disastrous

Since the power to fix duties on imports has been exercised by the President, over 700 textile plants have been forced to close their doors resulting in the unemployment of over 350,000 textile employees. Repeated protests have been made by textile operators concerning this situation but to no avail. Textile plant owners are having to pay 20 percent more for cotton today than foreign textile plants have to pay and they cannot compete with these foreign cotton goods manufacturers with their cheap labor under such condition. They are told they may procure money from the Government to build a textile plant in a foreign country and ship their products into the United States but the Government refuses to raise the tariff on imports of these commodities from other countries, primarily I presume, because it cannot do so until it gets the consent of 36 other nations. But Congress has never ratified the Truman agreement and it could have refused the extension of such grant of power. However, it again supinely yielded to the President's demand at the last session of Congress.

Since 1934 tariffs on imports have been reduced to one-third of what they then were. Dean Manion reports that in 1938 there were 70 sewing machines shipped into this country but as a result of this reciprocal trade agreement in 1956, there were 55,156 sewing machines shipped in. Ten years ago five American companies were manufacturing sewing machines in the United States. Today there is only one.

In 1938 less than 1,200 dozen cotton shirts were imported. In 1956 the number exceeded 1¼ million dozen. One big American camera company has quit manufacturing parts and accessories and is now shipping them in from Germany.

In 1938 there was less than 3 million square feet of plywood shipped into the United States. In 1956 there was more than 708 million square feet shipped in.

In 1956, 173,851 autos were shipped into the United States. In 1957, 259,343 autos were shipped in.

A long list of other imports could be given that have suffered the same fate.

General Motors, he says, is manufacturing cars in Europe and shipping them into the United States. Studebaker now distributes for German-made Mercedes. A Los Angeles manufacturer of ceramic dinnerware has become the U.S. distributor for its Japanese competitor. He says many of the modern foreign factories to which American jobs are now being exported have been built and equipped with American foreign-aid money. In other words, he says: What is being done by these 37 nations known as GATT, who meet in Geneva, Switzerland, is that they are administering a worldwide job-sharing distributing system of international trade regulations at the expense of American industry, American workmen, and American taxpayers. The results of the operation of the reciprocal trade agreements are alone sufficient to bring on a depression in this country in both loss of employment and loss in production of wealth. The Democrats and Republicans think we can spend ourselves back into prosperity when a recession occurs and they are putting the Government in business at the expense of private business.

Perhaps one of the most outrageous of all the wrongs heaped upon the people of the United States in further centralization of power in Washington has been the creation of dozens and dozens of Federal administrative agencies, giving to them the power to adopt rules and regulations of said agencies which have the same force and effect of laws so long as they are pertinent to the purposes for which the agency was created and within the powers vested in them.

Despotic bureaucratic rule

A splendid example of such a situation is the Agricultural Adjustment Act under the administration of the Secretary of Agriculture. This legislation gives to the Secretary of Agriculture practically the power of life and death over the farmers of this Nation. (Read the editorial on this subject in the November 8 issue of the Saturday Evening Post.)

Dan Smoot in his report of August 11, 1958, detailed the method of operation in the administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act in a case in Michigan, one in Texas, another in Indiana, and another in Ohio. The pattern is the same. Investigators go onto the farm, measure the acreage planted to wheat, cotton, or whatever the crop may be, determine the quota he is entitled to under the act, if one has not been already established, determine the excess acreage and fix the penalty or fine, and the committee known as the Agricultural Stabilization Committee notifies him of the amount of the fine imposed and demands payment. There is no escape from the penalty imposed. Mr. Smoot says the regulation that provides that a farmer who has less than 15 acres in cultivation, has no voice in whether the program shall be kept in force or abandoned, has disfranchised 90 percent of the farmers of the United States in the referendum vote and leaves its determination in the hands of the big farmers. They make money by not growing crops. There are 20 million farmers in the United States and only 200,000 can vote under the restrictions imposed. The act since 1954 is compulsory on all farmers whther they want it or not. The declared purpose of the act was to reduce the surplus of the crop grown.

Specifically as it applies to wheat, the Government claims that the excessive production of wheat was depressing prices. The purported object was to grow less wheat and receive better prices. The fact is that there is and was no wheat surplus and has never been. He said while American farmers are paying fines for growing too much wheat we are importing wheat to relieve the wheat shortage; that America was once the world's largest wheat exporting Nation, and that governmental meddling has priced our wheat out of the world market. In Ohio, a large wheat- and corn-growing State, the head of a large milling company of Mansfield, Ohio, told a farm association in June 1956 he had already exhausted the supply of wheat from all the counties in its normal trade area in Ohio; that never before in 40 years had there been such a shortage of wheat in Ohio, when during that very year over 200 Ohio farmers had been fined for growing wheat on their own farms. This applies to cotton and other crops as well.

Exorbitant taxes

We are now exacting of our citizens income and other taxes to meet exorbitant budgets, billions of which are willfully wasted. Nothing is being done to correct it although the Hoover Committee has twice pointed the way.

Other billions are being given away even to Russian satellites. This too is without constitutional authority. Neither of the branches of the Federal Government makes any attempt to function within constitutional limitations. The Supreme Court is by judicial fiat gradually repealing the 10th amendment in violation of its plain provision. Congress has by legislation invited the courts to enlarge its constitutional power to regulate interstate commerce. The effect of all the things I have mentioned is to centralize all power in the Federal Government. The next step is dictatorship.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have never believed anything more sincerely in my life than that the collapse of constitutional government is inevitable in this country if present trends continue. The officials in the higher echelons of government have repudiated the principal concept upon which our Government was founded and the creature has become master of the creator. Already bureaucratic despotic rule is in evidence in the administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act as above stated and in the income tax administration agency. Whatever states rights are left are being rapidly lost. We are aiding in this process by calling on the Federal Government for aid for everything we seek to do. It is historically true that the centralization of all power in a government is the last step preceding national decay. A dictatorship then becomes inevitable. When that happens the Russian coal fields of Siberia will be thrown wide open to American citizens, "from whose bourne no traveler returns."

Please let us through the conservative thinkers of both national parties try to preserve America. This can only be done by demanding an adherence to the principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence and in the Federal Constitution, and an abiding faith in God.

The Activity of Unions in Politics Is Going To Compel Business To Do Same for Self-Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared recently in the Rockford, Ill., Morning Star, entitled "The Activity of Unions in Politics Is Going To Compel Business To Do Same for Self-Protection":

Unless corporations make politics an essential part of their business, they are going to find it increasingly difficult to do business at all, Thomas R. Reid, director of Ford Motor Co.'s civic affairs office, said Monday in an address at Los Angeles, Calif.

Addressing the general management conference of the American Management Association, Mr. Reid said that the competition to influence the legislative climate is the most critical of all problems facing American businessmen in the next few years.

"This fact of life goes beyond business and affects every citizen," he said. "Right now completely representative government is in danger."

The Ford official urged that businessmen take immediate steps to establish positive political action programs. He said that employers and managers have shunned politics and consequently have allowed other elements to have more than a proportionate share in forming all legislation.

Mr. Reid emphasized that when he spoke of a "program for business," he was not advocating that business "line up the whole support of the corporations behind one political party as labor's support has been given to the other."

He said he was strongly opposed to the practice of partisan-power politics by either unions or corporations. Any attempts to tie one party exclusively to one group of interests, he continued, can only lead to the breakup of representative government.

Mr. Reid told members of the conference that some persons feel that political action on the part of business "will simply consist of the corporations using their money and influence to strengthen one party."

"I do not think that corporations have any right to use their stockholders' money in this way," he explained, "any more than I believe that unions have a moral right to use their members' money.

"This kind of division would ruin our two-party system, and none of us can afford that disaster."

He said he believed that the most effective political action that corporations or individuals could take was to strengthen the whole system of representative government, not to try to capture a party.

"The corporation should express its opinion—pro or con—publicly and clearly on those public issues at all levels of government in which it has an interest," he declared. "It should take positions on legislation having impact on its operations and state them. The corporation has every right to be active in governmental relations. Anything that affects its business becomes its business.

"However, the corporation has no business in politics as a corporation. Its responsibility as a corporate citizen is to encourage its members of management and its employees to participate voluntarily as individual citizens in the political party of their choice.

"It is time to admit that public affairs are a business problem," Mr. Reid said. "Ford Motor Co. has pioneered among large companies in recognizing this and is doing something about it," he said.

He urged other businessmen to begin planning now for the November 1960 elections and outlined a month-by-month timetable of political activity.

Mr. Reid said any business could adapt the following major points of his timetable to their own organization:

1. Study the impact of government and politics on business and what can be done about it.

2. Organize within corporations for effective action on governmental, legislative, and political matters.

3. Speak out on public issues.

4. Compile and issue to members of management and employees a digest of votes of Congressmen and State legislators on key business issues.

5. Get acquainted with Senators, Congressmen, and State legislators.

6. Recruit employees to work with the party of their choice.

7. Train members of management in practical politics.

8. Get people to register to vote.

9. Declare company policy encouraging political participation in the party of the employee's choice.

10. Conduct year-round activity instead of last-minute campaign efforts.

"Such a program," Mr. Reid said, "will result in a net gain in business action to improve the governmental and political climate in the United States."

Voluntary Retirement Savings Plans for Self-Employed Individuals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have today again introduced legislation to encourage the establishment of voluntary retirement savings plans for self-employed individuals. This legislation, which is similar to the measure which I introduced last session and identical with the bill that was passed by the House of Representatives on July 29, 1958, would permit self-employed individuals to take a current deduction for a limited amount of income invested in certain types of retirement annuity or trust. The investments would be treated as ordinary income when actually received in later years. This legislation is intended to achieve a greater equality of tax treatment between self-employed persons and employees.

Under present law, a corporation can deduct from taxes money put into a qualified employee pension plan and the employee is not taxed on this money until he actually receives the retirement income in later years.

When this provision was made in our tax law in 1942, the millions of self-employed persons were apparently overlooked. These self-employed citizens are denied this opportunity to defer taxes on retirement savings.

This legislation would generally apply to persons who are subject to the tax on self-employment income—for social-security purposes. This would include doctors, barbers, druggists, farmers, undertakers, lawyers, accountants, and other self-employed persons.

The bill would permit self-employed persons to take a deduction for a limited amount of income which they voluntarily place into a restricted retirement plan. This deduction is in general limited to 10 percent of net income from self-employment, but not to exceed $2,500 in any one taxable year and it may not exceed $50,000, during the lifetime of the self-employed person.

If an individual is over 50 years of age on the effective date of the proposed act, the limitation on the annual deduction is increased by one-tenth for each year that his age exceeds 50. For example, if he is age 60, the annual limit on his deduction would be 20 percent of income, but not over $5,000. No deduction is allowed for any year beginning after the taxpayer attains age 70.

That the present tax law discriminates against the self-employed is not denied. Can this discrimination be morally perpetuated indefinitely when a just and economical revision of the law is available?

If tax deferment is economically sound for the employed, then why is it not equally sound and just for the self-employed?

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House gave their answer to these questions on July 29, 1958, by overwhelmingly passing legislation similar to that which I introduce. I sincerely hope that this Congress will pass such legislation early in this session.

Need to Supplement Surplus Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, during last week I joined with Senators RANDOLPH and BYRD of West Virginia in introducing legislation to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to use $200 million to purchase foods to supplement the surplus commodities now being distributed to needy citizens.

This legislation is of particular interest to West Virginia, Mr. Speaker. Our State is in the unfortunate position of having 306,000 people dependent upon these surplus commodities for their food supply. At present, only butter, flour, meal, rice and dried milk are available for distribution.

The unfortunate families of West Virginia and the rest of the Nation who must, because of no fault of their own, rely upon this food supply, are not getting anywhere near an adequate diet. The West Virginia Department of Health has stated that the diet, as now constituted, provides only 26 percent of the needed calories, 36 percent of the necessary protein and 46 percent of the required calcium.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture should be in a position to purchase other foods as they become available to supplement this diet. At present, he does not have such authority. The legislation I introduced will give it to him.

The plight of these 306,000 West Virginians, dependent upon surplus Government-owned farm commodities for their food supply, emphasizes the need for a program to assist distressed economic areas such as West Virginia.

The providing of food, as essential as it is in the present emergency, is at best only a stopgap measure. What is needed is a program to attract industries which will provide jobs for these people. We are all familiar with the story of how employment in coal mines and on railroads has declined steadily in recent years. These men must be given new opportunities.

Congress is going to pass legislation in this field. The legislation would provide loans and grants for the economic rehabilitation of distressed areas. The jobs such a program would create will make surplus food programs unnecessary in the long run.

But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we should at least provide a subsistence diet for people who are forced to depend upon surplus commodities for food for their families.

The Amateur Athletic Union of the United States Is Proud of Its Accomplishments in the Field of Amateur Sports as a Member of the Sports Committee of the People-to-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, a lot of credit is due the officials of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States, and especially its foreign relations committee, for its many activities in the field of amateur sports as its contribution to the people-to-people program designed to encourage international relations and promote peace and good will among the nations of the world.

The Amateur Athletic Union of the United States, which is the national governing body of 19 sports in the United States, has been carrying out the people-to-people idea for more than 40 years. During that time this organization has sent many thousands of track athletes, swimmers, boxers, wrestlers, weight lifters, basketball, and other teams to all parts of the world and have brought many hundreds of foreign athletes to this country. In the year of 1958 the AAU sent more than 300 athletes to over 30 different countries, including visits to several countries behind the Iron Curtain.

To get some idea as to the extent of the AAU's activities as a member of the sports committee of the people-to-people program, I am inserting herewith a copy of the annual report of the organization's foreign relations committee, which is self-explanatory:

FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

To the Amateur Athletic Union:

Starting with the British Empire—U.S.A. track and field match on December 5 in Sydney, Australia, following the Olympic games in Melbourne in which the United States was victorious, American athletes competed on five continents during the following 10 months, bringing fame to themselves and honor to the AAU and the United States.

Six different sports were represented by nearly 300 athletes on their jaunts around the globe. Track and field led in the number of athletes and trips. As a result of their outstanding performances in the Olympic games, our track and field athletes have been very much in demand.

The match between the athletes of the London athletic clubs and those of the New York clubs at the White City Stadium, London, July 19–20 and another meet in Manchester on July 24, resulted in our sending more track and field athletes abroad this year than ever before, except possibly in an Olympic year. With the approval of the sponsors, we selected the so-called New York team from among the best athletes of eastern Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Connecticut, New York, and Massachusetts and the London clubs drew their talent from a 100-mile radius from London. The match was won by the New York team with a 94-point score to London's 61 points.

In addition to the team which competed in this match, five other American teams showed their talents in Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Germany, France, Switzerland, Italy, and Rumania.

Our girls basketball team won the world's championship in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, early in November defeating the Soviet Union in the finals by a score of 51–48. They went through the tournament with but one defeat and that was at the hands of Czechoslovakia early in the tournament. Twelve countries had teams in the tournament. Because of lack of funds, we had about given up hope of being represented in this important championship, but at the last minute the father of one of the girls chipped in $2,000 which made the trip possible.

A five-man wrestling team competed successfully in Japan.

We were represented in the World's Bobsled Championships in St. Moritz, Switzerland, by two teams in the two and four man events, one team making the trip from the United States and another the military team made up of representatives of the Armed Forces in Europe.

A seven girl synchronized swimming team plus two male divers toured Japan and exhibited at many of the United States military bases for the entertainment of U.S. troops stationed in the Orient.

Betty Becker Finkston, manageu and chaperoned two divers—Jeanne Stunyo and Don Harper to Buenos Aires, Argentina, for a series of exhibitions there in March.

Arthur O'Connor, track coach at Fordham University, was selected by the AAU to accompany his former star, 800-meter Olympic champion, Tom Courtney on a 18-day tour of South Africa.

The Denver Chicago Truckers basketball team played a series of games in Argentina between August 17 and September 15, winning eight matches and losing just one.

The last U.S. team to compete abroad was the U.S. weightlifters who competed in the World's Weightlifting Championships at Teheran, Iran, November 5–14. Like our women's basketball team, we experienced considerable difficulty in raising the necessary funds to defray this team's expenses. It could not have left the United States except for the willingness of Clarence Johnson, chairman of the National AAU weightlifting committee, to pay the $2,500 balance on the transportation costs to enable the team to make the trip.

Bobby Clotworthy, the Olympic diver accepted Australia's invitation to appear in a number of swimming meets following the Olympic games. He also accepted an invitation to engage in a number of diving exhibitions in Chile as a representative of the State Department.

Rafer Johnson of the University of California at Los Angeles, was selected for a tour under the sponsorship of the State Department and he visited Italy, Yugoslavia, Belgian Congo, Israel, and Pakistan between July 14 and August 13. The tours of both Clotworthy and Johnson were highly successful. Both athletes were very popular wherever they visited and proved excellent good will ambassadors for the United States.

Some 50 American athletes traveled to Israel to participate in the Maccabiah games from September 15 to 24, competing in track and field, swimming, and basketball.

The traffic in athletes was not all away from the United States. A wrestling team from Japan visited the United States early this year and competed in a series of wrestling matches all across the United States, including the national AAU wrestling championship at Waynesburg, Pa.

Dawn Fraser and Lorraine Crapp, Australia's famous swimmers and Olympic champions, with Mrs. Dorothy Quinton as their manager and chaperone, accepted our invitation to compete in Honolulu, Oklahoma

City, Houston, Tex., and San Francisco. At Houston they competed in our national AAU swimming championships for women. Miss Fraser won the 110-yard freestyle event and Miss Crapp won the 440-yard freestyle event. These girls were very popular and won the hearts of the Americans with whom they came in contact. They were not only great champions but were leaders in sportsmanship and made many friends for Australia during their visit in the United States.

The international boxing tournament held in Seattle, Wash., August 1, 2, and 3, attracted entries from Japan, China, Mexico, Canada, Cuba, and Hawaii.

A team of seven Greek-American track athletes toured Greece from July 31 to August 24. The team received a tumultuous welcome by the Greek people. They participated in exhibtiions in Athens, northern Greece, the Balkans, and had a dual meet with Austria.

Merger of Manufacturers Trust Co. and Bankers Trust Co. Would Have Most Serious Competitive Implications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, last week I wrote to the Superintendent of Banks of the State of New York, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, calling their attention to the grave competitive implications of the proposed merger of Manufacturers Trust Co. and the Bankers Trust Co., both of New York City.

In these letters I pointed out that this consilidation, following on the heels of the Guaranty Trust-Morgan merger proposal, would result in an undue concentration of banking facilities in New York City; spur further bank mergers in the city; and ignite a chain reaction that could have the most profound repercussions on the entire banking structure of the city and State.

The banking system of New York City, is already highly concentrated to the point where the four largest banks in the city control over 60 percent of the city's banking assets. Manufacturers Trust is now the third largest in the city with over $3 billion of total assets, while Bankers Trust is the city's sixth largest bank having total assets in excess of $2.8 billion. Merger of these two institutions would mean that almost 70 percent of the tctal assets of New York City's banks would be concentrated in the hands of four financial houses.

I pointed out that although there are now approximately 54 banks serving the city area, the new entity resulting from the consolidation would have assets almost double the combined total assets of 44 of the city's banks.

It is no less significant that Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust are in substantial competition with each other in the so-called retail banking field. Manufacturers Trust, with 114 branches in New York City, already has the most extensive retail banking system in the city. Adding the 45 branches of Bankers Trust would only serve to increase the dominance of the new institution in this phase of the city's banking business and further restrict the freedom of choice of depositors and borrowers alike.

In addition to these considerations, I indicated that the present size of Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust has been acocmplished in large part through absorption of other banking houses. Manufacturers Trust Co., for example, since its organization in 1905, has absorbed no less than 81 banks together with their branches, all in the greater New York area. The Bankers Trust Co. also has been taking over other banks at a rapid rate, especially in the last several years. Since 1950 the Bankers Trust Co. has absorbed such substantial banks as the Public National Bank & Trust Co. of New York, the Title Guarantee & Trust Co., Lawyers Trust Co., Flushing National Bank, the Commercial National Bank & Trust Co., and the Bayside National Bank.

In the context of the merger history of these two institutions the present merger proposal appears as but another step toward larger size and greater dominance in the New York City market area.

In my letter to Assistant Attorney General Hansen in charge of the Antitrust Division, I said in part:

Bank mergers, whether accomplished by stock or asset acquisitions, are * * * circumscribed by the provisions of the Sherman Act of 1890 which prohibits combinations in restraint of trade, attempts to monopolize, or monopolization of trade or commerce. * * * Establishing a Sherman act violation hardly presents insuperable problems.

In this connection, I think it is highly significant that since 1950 there has been a total of 1,232 bank mergers, of which 1,059 took place in the period from 1953 to 1958. Despite this great number of bank consolidations which is concentrating control of the Nation's banks into fewer and fewer hands, the Antitrust Division has never once invoked the provisions of the Sherman act against a bank merger. I am at a complete loss to understand this extraordinary record of inaction.

In respect to the Guaranty Trust-Morgan and Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust merger proposals, I trust that the situation will change and that the Department will finally execute the provisions of the Sherman Act promptly, vigorously and effectively. This is particularly important since each of these mergers on its face would apparently result in a substantial lessening of competition as between the acquiring and acquired institutions. Thus, Guaranty Trust and J. P. Morgan are seemingly in vigorous and substantial competition with each other in the wholesale banking business, while Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust compete with each other substantially in the retail banking field. In both cases, this competition would be entirely lost should the merger plan be accomplished.

The chairman of the board of J. P. Morgan last week has been quoted as saying that the Department of Justice inquiries about the merger with Guaranty were apparently routine. If this accurately reflects the nature of the Department's inquiries, that would be a most serious reflection on the Department's willingness to enforce the provisions of the Sherman Act impartially and vigorously. A token investigation conducted for appearances' sake would be worse than no investigation at all. Moreover, I hope that in dealing with these two merger proposals the Department will carefully avoid pursuing the course it followed in 1955 in connection with Chase-Bank of Manhattan merger.

In my letter to Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board, I stated, among other things:

The statutory structure requires that State member banks be placed on an equality with national banks in respect to branches and that since national banks must obtain approval of the Comptroller of the Currency of branches acquired through merger, State member banks of the Federal Reserve System are necessarily subject to the same condition. Thus the Board has made it plain that in determining whether or not it will approve the establishment by a bank of branches acquired through merger, it is bound by the same terms and conditions and the same limitations and restrictions as are applicable to branches of national banks. For that reason, the Board has stated that it is required, like the Comptroller of the Currency, to consider the effect of the merger on competition.

It follows, in these circumstances, that it is incumbent on the Board to use the same competitive test as that which the Comptroller of the Currency has stated he follows. In this connection I would point out that the Comptroller of the Currency has made it clear that before granting merger approval, he will determine whether the effect of the transaction in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly; that he will determine, in short, whether the transaction is violative of the policy of the Celler-Kefauver Act.

* * * * *

In view of the competitive test set forth above, it is difficult to ascertain how the Board could grant approval of the branch applications which will be here involved.

* * * * *

More than that, the consequences of the contemplated transaction are so far-reaching as to make it imperative that the Board conduct public hearings on the record so that all the facts be brought out and all interested parties be given an opportuinty to be heard. I think it fundamental that matters of this importance not be left to informal private determination. The public interest involved here is too great for that.

My letter to the New York State superintendent of banks pointed out the necessity of careful investigation of this transaction in order to determine whether its effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. It also emphasized the importance of public hearings on the record.

I further indicated that it was essential for each of the three agencies involved to have close consultation with each other particularly with respect to the competitive phases of the merger proposal.

Finally, each agency was requested to furnish to the Antitrust Subcommittee answers to a series of questions dealing with the competitive factors that are involved.

Attached are copies of my letters to the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and the New York State superintendent of banks.

JANUARY 23, 1959.

SUPERINTENDENT OF BANKS,
State of New York Banking Department,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: My attention has been directed to a proposed merger of the Manufacturers Trust Co. and the Bankers Trust Co., both of New York City. This transaction, which would require your approval, presents on its face grave competitive implications. Following on the heels of the Guaranty Trust merger proposal, there is little doubt that its consummation would result in an undue concentration of banking facilities in New York City; spur further bank mergers in the city; and ignite a chain reaction that could have the most profound repercussions on the entire banking structure of the city and State. I think it entirely probable that approval of a Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust consolidation would bring banking monopoly in our State much closer into being.

As you know, the banking system of New York City is already highly concentrated to the point where the four largest banks in the city control over 60 percent of the city's banking assets. In this connection it will be noted that Manufacturers Trust is now the third largest in the city with over $3 billion of total assets, while Bankers Trust is the city's sixth largest bank having total assets in excess of $2.8 billion. Merger of these two institutions would mean that almost 70 percent of the total assets of New York City's banks would be concentrated in the hands of four financial houses. This, I think you will agree, would be a matter of the most serious concern.

Furthermore, although there are now approximately 54 banks serving the city area, I would emphasize that the new entity resulting from the consolidation would have assets almost double the combined total assets of 44 of the city's banks.

No less significant, Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust are in substantial competition with each other in the so-called retail banking field. Indeed, Manufacturers, with 114 branches in New York City, already has the most extensive retail banking system in the city. Adding the 45 branches of Bankers Trust, would only serve to increase the dominance of the new institution in this phase of the city's banking business and further restrict the freedom of choice of depositors and borrowers alike.

It must be borne in mind that the present proposal, like that of Guaranty Trust and Morgan, does not involve a situation where a small, inadequately financed or managed bank, suffering or falling behind in the competitive race, seeks by merging to form a big, integrated institution able to compete on equal terms. On the contrary, each of the banks involved here is a gigantic, efficient, and vigorously competing institution well able independently to serve the banking needs of its respective clients. In fact, it is evident that the proposed consolidation is primarily the outgrowth of a deliberate effort on the part of the parties to expand their banking facilities, add to their capital and depositors, and, in general, increase their overall financial strength in the economy. Nor can it be overlooked that the present size of Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust has been accomplished in large part through absorption of other banking houses. Manufacturers Trust Co., for example, since its organization in 1905, has absorbed no less than 81 banks together with their branches, all in the Greater New York area.

The Bankers Trust Co. also has been taking over other banks at a rapid rate, especially in the last several years. In fact, since 1950, the Bankers Trust Co. has absorbed such substantial banks as the Public National Bank & Trust Co. of New York, the Title Guarantee & Trust Co., Lawyers Trust Co., Flushing National Bank, the Commercial National Bank & Trust Co., and the Bayside National Bank.

In the context of the merger history of these two institutions, the present merger proposal appears as but another step toward larger size and greater dominance in the New York City market area.

You will recall that on December 19, 1958, I wrote to your office with respect to the proposed merger involving the Guaranty Trust Co. and J. P. Morgan & Co. In that communication I pointed out that your predecessor had testified before our Antitrust Subcommittee in 1955:

"It has been my policy as superintendent of banks of the State of New York to follow the spirit of the Celler Antimerger Act in determining whether or not to approve mergers of banks that come within my jurisdiction. That is to say, if after analysis of all facts, I find that the effect of a proposed bank merger may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to monopoly in any locality, I will unhestitatingly withhold approval."

The Comproller of the Currency of the United States has likewise made it clear that his policy is the same—that before granting merger approval, he will determine whether the effect of the transaction in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly; that he will determine, in short, whether the transaction is violative of the policy of the Celler-Kefauver Act. Thus, in a letter to me dated March 14, 1955, the Comptroller of the Currency stated in part:

"In determining whether the approval of this office will be given to any merger or consolidation, the Comptroller considers, among other things, how the proposed merger will affect the particular banks involved, the soundness of the national banking system, and the convenience and needs of the community concerned. There may be a technical question as to the specific application of section 7 of the Clayton Act to these mergers. However, it has been the practice of the Comptroller before giving his approval to determine whether the effect of the merger, 'in any section of the country * * * may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly.'"

Again in March 1957, the Comptroller testified before the Antitrust Subcommittee as follows:

"COUNSEL. Is it your practice * * * not to approve any bank merger where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly?

"Mr. GIDNEY. I say, that has been our practice. We have not approved any where it could be.

"COUNSEL. That is your practice?

"Mr. GIDNEY. We have not approved where it could be shown."

If competition in the banking field in New York City is to be preserved, it is, of course, vitally important that your office adhere to this policy in scrutinizing both the Guaranty Trust-Morgan and Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust merger proposals. Furthermore, in applying that policy, it is equally important that the purpose of the Congress in passing the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act be kept carefully in mind. In this respect, as I indicated in my previous letter of December 19, 1958, the decision of Judge Weinfeld in the Bethlehem-Youngstown merger case is extremely relevant. Also in my previous letter, I observed that Judge Weinfeld in that decision had pointed out that the precise purpose of the Celler-Kefauver Act was to limit future increases in the level of economic concentration resulting from corporate mergers in order to block resulting monopolistic tendencies in their incipiency. The report of our House Judiciary Committee on this legislation emphasizes that a merger would come under the statutory ban when its effect "may be a significant reduction in the vigor of competition, even though this effect may not be so far reaching as to amount to a combination in restraint of trade, create a monopoly, or constitute an attempt to monopolize. Such an effect may arise in various ways such as elimination in whole or in material part of the competitive activity of an enterprise which has been a substantial factor in competition, increase in the relative size of the enterprise making the acquisition to such a point that its advantage over its competitors threatens to be decisive, undue reduction in the number of competing enterprises, or establishment of relationships between buyers and sellers which deprive their rivals of a fair opportunity to compete."

In connection with the present transaction you will note that in the Bethlehem-Youngstown case the court rejected a contention, which undoubtedly will be made here, that the merger of the two companies would result in increased competition with the largest concern in the field. Apposite is the court's statement that to allow the merger would set in motion "a chain of reaction of further mergers by the other but less powerful companies in the * * * industry * * * [reaching] a point of more intense concentration in an industry already highly concentrated."

The considerations in the Bethlehem-Youngstown situation apply with even greater force to the Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust merger proposal. More than that, the consequences of this contemplated transaction are so far-reaching as to make it imperative that your office conduct public hearings on the record so that all the facts be brought out and all interested parties be given an opportunity to be heard. I think it fundamental that matters of this importance not be left to informal, private determination. The public interest involved here is too great for that.

I point out also that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice is the executive agency possessing the greatest expertise with respect to application of the standards of the Celler-Kefauver Act. Consequently, it would seem essential that your office seek the advice of the Antitrust Division, if there is to be an informed judgment concerning the competitive phases of the transactions.

In all the circumstances, I would greatly appreciate your adavising our Antitrust Subcommittee as soon as possible as to whether or not your office contemplates following the spirit of the Celler-Kefauver Act in determining whether or not to approve the proposed Guarantee Trust-Morgan merger and the Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust merger.

With respect to the Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust merger proposal, I should also appreciate your advising our Antitrust Subcommittee:

1. Whether or not your office is undertaking an investigation of this transaction;
2. The nature of such investigation;
3. Whether or not your office is consulting with the Antitrust Division with respect to the competitive phases of this transaction;
4. The nature of such consultation;
5. Whether or not your office proposes to hold hearings with respect to this transaction;
6. In the event hearings are not held, the reasons therefor.

Finally, you will recall that included in my letter of December 19 was a series of questions relating to the Guaranty Trust-Morgan merger proposal. Would you undertake to provide answers to these questions at your earliest convenience?

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER, *Chairman.*

JANUARY 26, 1959.

Hon. WILLIAM MCCHESNEY MARTIN, Jr.,
Chairman of the Board of Governors,
Federal Reserve System,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: My attention has been directed to a proposed merger of the Manufacturers Trust Co. and the Bankers Trust Co., both of New York City. This transaction presents on its face grave competitive implications. Following on the heels of the Guaranty Trust-Morgan merger proposal, there is little doubt that its consummation would result in an undue concentration of banking facilities in New York City; spur a further wave of bank mergers in the city; and ignite a chain reaction that could have the most profound repercussions on the entire banking structure of the city and State.

As you know, the banking system of New York City is already highly concentrated to the point where the four largest banks in the city control over 60 percent of the city's banking assets. In this connection, it will be noted that Manufacturers Trust is now the third largest in the city with over $3 billion of total assets, while Bankers Trust is the city's sixth largest bank having total assets in excess of $2.8 billion. Merger of these two institutions would mean that almost 70 percent of the total assets of New York City's banks would be concentrated in the hands of four financial houses.

Furthermore, although there are now approximately 54 banks serving the city area, I would emphasize that the new entity resulting from the consolidation would have assets almost double the combined total assets of 44 of the city's banks.

It is clear that this transaction cannot be completed except with approval of the Federal Reserve Board which, as you have previously advised me, has jurisdiction over the establishment by the continuing bank of branches at locations of former offices of the absorbed institution. Indeed, the Board, as you recall, has recently pointed out in *Old Kent Bank and Trust Company* v. *The Federal Reserve System* (D. Col., C. A. No. 1993–58) that the necessity for Board approval of branches acquired through merger is required by the Federal statutes dealing with supervision and regulation of the banking industry. The Board's position, as indicated in that case, is that the statutory structure requires that State member banks be placed on an equality with national banks in respect to branches and that since national banks must obtain approval of the Comptroller of the Currency of branches acquired through merger, State member banks of the Federal Reserve System are necessarily subject to the same condition. Thus the Board has made it plain that in determining whether or not it will approve the establishment by a bank of branches acquired through merger, it is bound by the same terms and conditions and the same limitations and restrictions as are applicable to branches of national banks. For that reason, the Board has stated that it is required, like the Comptroller of the Currency, to consider the effect of the merger on competition.

It follows, in these circumstances, that it is incumbent on the Board to use the same competitive test as that which the Comptroller of the Currency has stated he follows. In this connection I would point out that the Comptroller of the Currency has made it clear that before granting merger approval, he will determine whether the effect of the transaction in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly; that he will determine, in short, whether the transaction is violative of the policy of the Celler-Kefauver Act. For example, in a letter to me dated March 14, 1955, the Comptroller of the Currency stated in part:

"In determining whether the approval of this office will be given to any merger or consolidation, the Comptroller considers, among other things, how the proposed merger will affect the particular banks involved, the soundness of the national banking system, and the convenience and needs of the community concerned. There may be a technical question as to the specific application of section 7 of the Clayton Act to these mergers. However, it has been the practice of the Comptroller before giving his approval to determine whether the effect of the merger, 'in any section of the country * * * may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly.'"

Again, in March 1957, the Comptroller testified before the Antitrust Subcommittee as follows:

"COUNSEL. Is it your practice * * * not to approve any bank merger where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly?

"Mr. GIDNEY. I say, that has been our practice. We have not approved any where it could be.

"COUNSEL. That is your practice?

"Mr. GIDNEY. We have not approved where it could be shown."

Against this background I note that Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust are in substantial competition with each other in the so-called retail branch banking field. Indeed, Manufacturers, with 114 branches in New York City, already has the most extensive retail banking system in the city. Adding the 45 branches of Bankers Trust, would only serve to increase the dominance of the new institution in this phase of the city's banking business and further restrict the freedom of choice of depositors and borrowers alike.

In view of the competitive test set forth above, it is difficult to ascertain how the board could grant approval of the branch applications which will be here involved.

Beyond that, it is clear that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice is the executive agency possessing the greatest expertise with respect to application of the above competitive standards in view of its prosecution of cases under the Celler-Kefauver Act. Consequently, it would seem essential that the board seek the advice of the Antitrust Division, if there is to be an informed judgment concerning the competitive phase of the transaction.

Also, since the transaction is subject to approval by the New York State Superintendent of Banks, and since the avowed policy of the superintendent is to follow the competitive test specified above, it would seem essential for the board to maintain close and continuous liaison with the bank superintendent particularly in respect to competitive aspects.

More than that, the consequences of the contemplated transaction are so far reaching as to make it imperative that the Board conduct public hearings on the record so that all the facts be brought out and all interested parties be given an opportunity to be heard. I think it fundamental that matters of this importance not be left to informal private determination. The public interest involved here is too great for that.

In view of the foregoing considerations, I would greatly appreciate your advising our Antitrust Subcommittee as soon as possible as to the competitive test the Board will follow and whether or not the Board will disapprove this transaction if it finds that its effect in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. I should also appreciate your advising our subcommittee:

First. Whether or not the Board is undertaking an investigation of this transaction;

Second. The nature of such investigation;

Third. Whether or not the Board will consult with the Antitrust Division and the New York State Superintendent of Banks with respect to the competitive phases of this transaction;

Fourth. Whether or not the Board proposes to hold hearings with respect to this transaction.

Finally, many of the above factors are equally applicable with respect to the proposed Guaranty Trust-Morgan merger proposal. Therefore, it would be appreciated if the Board answer each of the above questions as they relate to that proposed transaction.

I am enclosing for the Board's information copies of letters I have sent to the Superintendent of Banks of the State of New York and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice concerning this matter.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 26, 1959.

Hon. VICTOR R. HANSEN,
Assistant Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JUDGE HANSEN: My attention has been directed to a proposed merger of the Manufacturers Trust Co. and the Bankers Trust Co., both of New York City. This transaction presents on its face grave competitive implications. Following on the heels of the Guaranty Trust-Morgan merger proposal, there is little doubt that its consummation would result in an undue concentration of banking facilities in New York City; spur further bank mergers in the city; and ignite a chain reaction that could have the most profound repercussions on the entire banking structure of the city and State. I think it entirely probable that a Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust consolidation would bring banking monopoly in New York State much closer into being.

The banking system of New York City is already highly concentrated to the point where the four largest banks in the city control over 60 percent of the city's banking assets. In this connection, it will be noted that Manufacturers Trust is now the third largest in the city with over $3 billion of total assets, while Bankers Trust is the city's sixth largest bank having total assets in excess of $2.8 billion. Merger of these two institutions would mean that almost 70 percent of the total assets of New York City's banks would be concentrated in the hands of four financial houses. This, I think you will agree, would be a matter of the most serious concern.

Furthermore, although there are now approximately 54 banks serving the city area, I would emphasize that the new entity resulting from the consolidation would have assets almost double the combined total assets of 44 of the city's banks.

No less significant, Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust are in substantial competition with each other in the so-called retail banking field. Indeed, Manufacturers, with 114 branches in New York City, already has the most extensive retail banking system in the city. Adding the 45 branches of Bankers Trust would only serve to increase the dominance of the new institution in this phase of the city's banking business and further restrict the freedom of choice of depositors and borrowers alike.

It must be borne in mind that the present proposal, like that of Guaranty Trust and Morgan, does not involve a situation where a small, inadequately financed or managed bank, suffering or falling behind in the competitive race, seeks by merging to form a big, integrated institution able to compete on equal terms. On the contrary, each of the banks involved here is a gigantic, efficient, and vigorously competing institution well able independently to serve the banking needs of its respective clients. In fact, it is evident that the proposed consolidation is primarily the outgrowth of a deliber-

ate effort on part of the parties to expand their banking facilities, add to their capital and depositors, and, in general, increase their overall financial strength in the economy. Nor can it be overlooked that the present size of Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust has been accomplished in large part through absorption of other banking houses. Manufacturers Trust Co., for example, since its organization in 1905, has absorbed no less than 81 banks together with their branches, all in the Greater New York area.

The Bankers Trust Co. also has been taking over other banks at a rapid rate, especially in the last several years. In fact, since 1950, the Bankers Trust Co. has absorbed such substantial banks as the Public National Bank & Trust Co. of New York, the Title Guarantee & Trust Co., Lawyers Trust Co., Flushing National Bank, the Commercial National Bank & Trust Co., and the Bayside National Bank.

In the context of the merger history of these two institutions, the present merger proposal appears as but another step toward larger size and greater dominance in the New York City market area.

Further demonstrating the effect this and the Guaranty Trust-Morgan proposal will have on the banking structure, the president of the Manufacturers Trust Co. was quoted last week as saying: "The merger discussions were spurred by news of the Morgan-Guaranty combine. * * * I know of no bank in New York that hasn't had conversations formal or informal with other banks over the possibility of a merger." Business Week of January 10, 1959, had this to say: "New York bankers predict that if and when [this] merger goes through, a series of competitive realinements will result that won't end until a new balance of power is established among New York banks."

I am quite aware that these two merger proposals may involve an acquisition of assets and that, should this be the case, section 7 of the Clayton Act would not be applicable. However, I am equally aware—as I am sure the Department of Justice is—that bank mergers, whether accomplished by stock or asset acquisitions, are also circumscribed by the provisions of the Sherman Act of 1890 which prohibits combinations in restraint of trade, attempts to monopolize, or monopolization of trade or commerce. Illegality under the Sherman Act is established by proof that the merger has actually resulted in an unreasonable lessening of competition. It is true that such proof is more difficult than the Clayton Act test which requires only a reasonable probability of a substantial lessening of competition. Nevertheless, establishing a Sherman Act violation hardly presents insuperable problems.

In this connection, I think it is highly significant that since 1950 there has been a total of 1,232 bank mergers, of which 1,059 took place in the period from 1953 to 1958. Despite this great number of bank consolidations which is concentrating control of the Nation's banks into fewer and fewer hands, the Antitrust Division has never once invoked the provisions of the Sherman Act against a bank merger. I am at a complete loss to understand this extraordinary record of inaction.

In respect to the Guaranty Trust-Morgan and Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust merger proposals, I trust that the situation will change and that the Department will finally execute the provisions of the Sherman Act promptly, vigorously, and effectively. This is particularly important since each of these mergers on its face would apparently result in a substantial lessening of competition as between the acquiring and acquired institutions. Thus, Guaranty Trust and J. P. Morgan are seemingly in vigorous and substantial competition with each other in the wholesale banking business, while Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust compete with each other substantially in the retail banking field. In both cases, this competition would be entirely lost should the merger plan be accomplished.

The chairman of the board of J. P. Morgan last week has been quoted as saying that the Department of Justice inquiries about the merger with Guaranty were apparently routine. If this accurately reflects the nature of the Department's inquiries, that would be a most serious reflection on the Department's willingness to enforce the provisions of the Sherman Act impartially and vigorously. A token investigation conducted for appearance's sake would be worse than no investigation at all. Moreover, I hope that in dealing with these two merger proposals the Department will carefully avoid pursuing the course it followed in 1955 in connection with the Chase-Bank of Manhattan merger.

There is a further consideration. As you know, both of the merger proposals will require the approval of the New York State Superintendent of Banks and the Federal Reserve Board. In considering these transactions these agencies should, for reasons which I have set forth in the letters which are enclosed, consider whether the merger's effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. This competitive test is the same as the standards set forth in section 7 of the Clayton Act as amended by the Celler-Kefauver Act. For that reason, it would appear imperative that the Antitrust Division present its views on the competitive phases of these transactions to the Superintendent of Banks and to the Federal Reserve Board. As you know, it would not be a novel departure for the Division to present its views on the competitive aspects of a bank merger to a bank supervisory agency. This is evidenced by your letter to me dated March 20, 1957. It is also evidenced by the Department's intervention before the Federal Reserve Board on the application by the First National City Bank of New York to form a holding company to acquire the County Trust Company of Westchester. In view of the competitive implication of each of the two current bank merger proposals, I think you will agree that it is of even greater importance here for the Department to present its views to the bank supervisory agencies. On the other hand, should the Department fail to act, "in its overall responsibility for section 7's enforcement—outside of the banking area—(the) Department would be bound by bank merger precedents (it) had no voice in picking or shaping."

In light of the foregoing considerations, I will appreciate your furnishing the following information to our Antitrust Subcommittee as soon as possible with respect to the Guaranty Trust-Morgan and the Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust merger proposals:

1. Whether the Department of Justice is presently undertaking a Sherman Act investigation of each of these proposals;

2. Whether or not each of these investigations is or is not routine;

3. Whether or not the Department of Justice is consulting with the New York State Superintendent of Banks and the Federal Reserve Board with respect to the competitive phases of these transactions;

4. The nature of such consultations.

Finally, I am enclosing for your information copies of letters I have sent to the New York State Superintendent of Banks and to the Federal Reserve Board concerning the Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust merger proposal.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER, *Chairman.*

Flood Control Thoughts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, the people of my congressional district, as everyone knows who has read the newspapers in the past several weeks, have been hit by a devastating flood. Rather than bemoaning their fate, they have pitched in as individuals to clean up after the flood, to rebuild and restore the buildings and land laid waste.

Knowing them as I do, I knew that they would respond in this way—by doing everything, individually, they could do to restore life to normal and to make the countryside as beautiful and well kept as it was before.

Yet, the people are not forgetting the tragic flood. They are discussing it, and its causes. This, too, could be expected. It is, I think, a tribute to them, as thoughtful men and women in the United States and as good citizens, to strive to find out what happened, what was not done that should have been done, and what ought to be done to prevent future damage in future potentially dangerous flood periods.

As a public official, I have striven to develop and to hold the idea and the attitude that I do not know everything. I have stated before, and I meant it sincerely, as I state now, namely, that I covet the thinking of the people in my district about every problem which affects them and impinges upon public questions.

I respect their advice and counsel. I strive in every way to get the viewpoints of many, diverse individuals, for I realize that everyone, if he will contribute what he can to our problems, can help to solve or assuage our public problems.

Robert Burton said: "A dwarf, standing on the shoulders of a giant, may see farther than the giant himself."

I feel, in a way, that the combined intelligence of the people of my district constitutes a lot of wisdom. Figuratively speaking, I want to stand on their shoulders and, using their combined knowledge, strive to see a little farther into the distance, in order to help them. But I can help them only to the extent they express themselves freely and that I learn of the thoughts they are thinking.

Relative to our flood, Mr. Speaker, a number of fine citizens have expressed their thoughts and observations in various ways. Because I feel that each of the following news clippings, either letters to the editor or news columns are pertinent to the problems my district faces in making sure we are not the victims again of a disastrous flood, I am inserting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A letter to the editor of the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News, written by D. F. Ridenour, and published on January 29, 1959.

Two columns by George McConnell, farm planner and Wayne Burkhart, County Agent, published in the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News on January 29, and January 30, 1959, respectively:

[From the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News, Jan. 29, 1959]

PEOPLE'S FORUM

EDITOR, THE NEWS:

The first time I realized we were having a flood I drove up to the east side of Knox Lake to see if the water was high there. I thought some of you people would be interested in what I found.

The two creeks that come into the lake there were all over the lowland and pouring over the new road about four feet deep for at least one-eighth of a mile. Ice a foot thick was lodged on the trees turned up edgewise and holding the water back . That country looked like the Atlantic Ocean.

I became alarmed about the dam so drove down the west end of the lake and the ice was not broken at all and the water was about normal.

If this lake had not been there Mount Vernon would have had at least 2 feet more of water. This was at noon Wednesday. Knox Lake was not built for flood control but it really saved Mount Vernon this time.

D. F. RIDENOUR.

[From the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News, Jan. 29, 1959]

DRY DAMS SUGGESTED AS SOLUTION OF FLOOD PROBLEM HERE

(By George McConnell)

There has been much written and said about what could and should be done to prevent a recurrence of the flood of January 21, in Knox County. Certainly no one wants it to happen again. Many people have offered ideas that are worth considering.

It seems obvious that channel clearing is needed. The dikes need repairing and perhaps relocated. Apparently the Corps of Engineers has a plan to take care of this need, although it has not yet been made public. This may offer the lowest sections of Mount Vernon a measure of protection. Cooperation with the Corps of Engineers would seem to be the quickest way to protect the most people and property at the lowest cost to local government.

First, Congress must appropriate the necessary funds and the Public Works Agency must approve the proposals made by the Corps of Engineers.

The official Soil Conservation Service notes of water level at the B. & O. bridge at Mount Vernon are most interesting. The record of the floodwater rise went like this: 8:15–9:15, 1.5 feet; 9:15–10:25, 1.7 feet; 10:25–noon, 1.5 feet; noon–1, 1.4 feet; 1–2:45, 1.9 feet; 2:45–3:15, 2 feet; 3:15–3:35, 2.4 feet; 3:35–4:20, 2.4 feet; 4:20–4:35, same flood crest; 4:35–4:50, 0.1 down; 4:50–5:15, 0.1 down.

The rise was about 1.5 feet per hour till noon, then about 0.4 foot per hour till 2:45. It was during this period that the water spread out in the west end of town and rose more slowly because it was covering more and more land.

Then between 2:45 and 3:15 the floodwater level rose exactly 2 feet in just one-half hour, in spite of the fact that the water was still spreading out. The rise (of 0.8 foot) and spread continued for about another hour cresting between 4:15 and 4:35 p.m. The local Soil Conservation Service personnel searched for 5 days for an answer to this behavior. We saw the abrupt rise. Many people reported a wall of water from 3 to 6 feet high coming down the river.

The SCS figures prove that there was a sharp rise. The only explanation that seems worth considering is the big pool of floodwater that gathered in the north end of Fredericktown. It finally broke over the railroads opposite the Edwards sheet-metal plant about 11:30 a.m. The big blocks of ice may have dammed the 9-foot culvert under the railroad there also. Plenty of them are big enough. Certainly it must have cut loose abruptly. At any rate it temporarily detained the water. The heaviest rain shower at Mount Vernon came after 3:30. Rain may have been heaviest at Fredericktown earlier in the afternoon.

The North Fork of the Kokosing River falls about 80 feet in the 8 miles by river to the viaduct in Mount Vernon. It seems logical that the water from the temporary dentention structure at the upper end of Fredericktown could have reached Mount Vernon at about 3 p.m. as the figures indicate. The next question is just how much water was stored, temporarily, in the upper end of Fredericktown. A quick look at the area early this week indicates that it may have been about 1,000 acre-feet. That is an average of 4 feet, over 250 acres of land or the equivalent of less than a 2-foot rise in Knox Lake. In a dry dam, that would be regarded as a good sized body of water.

If the above assumptions are correct, and we feel that they are, then this demonstrates how valuable upstream dry dams could be. With several thousand acre-feet of flood storage the damage could have been nearly, if not entirely, eliminated in Mount Vernon and Fredericktown.

[From the Mt. Vernon (Ohio) News, Jan. 29, 1959]

FLOOD PREVENTION IS EXPENSIVE, FLOODS ARE EVEN MORE SO

(By George McConnell)

Flood prevention is expensive, but floods are much more expensive. Provisions have been made under Federal and State law for part of the cost to be paid by the Federal Government.

It will still cost local government a considerable amount for the protection needed. We understand that the local government will have to provide easements, rights-of-way and in some cases buy land and pay to get utilities moved. All this will be needed so it can't happen here again.

Channel improvements along the Kokosing and pumping stations in Mount Vernon will help give some protection, but they will not do the whole job. Dry Creek has repeatedly gone on a rampage.

County Engineer Warren Veatch had done excellent work on the Dry Creek channel, but it continues to roar out of its banks from time to time. It is apparent that upstream protection is also needed to substantially slow down the fast flowing runoff from the watershed of Dry Creek.

Future damage in the north end of Fredericktown cannot be averted by channel work alone. The water will have to be controlled before it reaches Fredericktown.

Knox County losses have not been limited to the densely settled urban areas and to roads and bridges, although they suffered the most. Many farmers in the bottom lands also sustained heavy losses. Our preliminary estimate of fence damage is 100 miles washed out. The cost of rebuilding these fences will average about $1,000 per mile. There is probably another 100 miles of fence that is badly damaged but can be put back for an average of about $400 per mile.

There have been few reports of flood damage in any of the towns downstream from the Muskingum Conservancy District dams. They have not had serious damage. The topography of the land above Mount Vernon on the Kokosing does not lend itself to big flood control dams such as the Mohawk dry dam. Maybe we are lucky at that The river bottoms that would be flooded are the most productive land we have.

There are, we are sure, scores of sites where small dry dams could be built on many of the branch streams and their tributaries. In many instances these small dams would flood only woodland and pasture land. This would do little, if any, damage. This time of year and in early spring when most floods occur it would do no damage even to crops that might be temporarily flooded by such a dam since the water would be retarded for only a day or two. Retarding or slowing the water runoff for only a few hours before it reaches the main tributaries will sharply reduce the flooding in most instances of the larger streams below.

The worst flood hazard areas are in Oklahoma, Texas, and Nebraska. They have worked there under rainfall conditions much more severe than ours. They have had rains up to 9 inches in a single day and no damage. Dry dams have furnished flood protection there on watersheds similar to the Kokosing and they can do the same thing here.

We know of several locations where a properly located dam would benefit individual farmers on whose land they were built protecting his lower lying land as well as providing downstream protection. This protection would be in two ways. It would keep the lower land from being flooded and reduce the stream bank erosion. This would surely be true on many farms.

Small dams and other on-the-farm flood-control measures could be installed entirely with Federal flood-control funds, under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. If a farmer wanted water for livestock or irrigation in addition to providing flood storage he would have to pay a proportionate part of the cost. In almost all instances the farmer would still have full use of the land in addition to the flood control and other benefits that might accrue to him. He would also be benefiting all who lived downstream from him.

Adequate conservation practices would have to be applied upstream from any dry dam in order to avoid reducing its effectiveness by siltation. These conservation practices must be applied by the time the dam is built. The reasons are obvious. There are about 1,200 farms upstream from Mount Vernon. About 360 of these farms are upstreaem from Fredericktown. It is on these farms that our floods begin. That seems to be the most sensible place to start stopping our floods. It will require an understanding of the total values on the part of the farmers who live on these farms. The planning and building of structures will take a lot of time and study. There are many agencies of the county, State, and Federal Government that are able and willing to cooperate in getting the job done. They can and will work closely together to help us solve our problems here if we ask them for that help. More than 887 small watersheds like ours all over the United States have asked for and are getting planning help under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. We can too. Floods are much too expensive, when they can be prevented.

Chance for Labor Cleanup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star of January 29, 1959:

CHANCE FOR LABOR CLEANUP

Congress, with its large majority of Democratic Members friendly to the cause of organized labor, has an opportunity this year to clear away some of the abuses which have given certain sections of the labor organization a bad name.

It has before it now two proposals. One is the spineless bill sponsored by Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, which is similar to the legislation passed by the Senate last year and which really will do little toward routing the racketeering bosses from some of the labor unions.

The other is the program presented by President Eisenhower, which also won't accomplish everything which needs to be done but which would go a long way toward providing protection against racket picketing in cases where no labor dispute is involved.

There are rumors to the effect that a third and stronger bill will be presented by Senator MCCLELLAN, who, as chairman of the Senate Labor Racketeering Committee, knows as much as anyone just what is needed to clean up labor.

Certainly the Kennedy bill will not do the job. It obviously was drafted with a primary objective of doing nothing which might offend the labor bosses. It has all the earmarks of the work of a man who is trying to line up strong support for an effort to win a presidential nomination.

The Eisenhower program, whatever its shortcomings, tries to bring racket picketing under control. That section of the bill is desperately needed. Secondary boycotts and racket picketing inflict severe damage on people who are not directly involved in labor disputes and they must be curtailed.

Congress now has its choice. It either can go along with the hollow pretense of adopting the Kennedy bill or it can draft the more workable legislation which bitter experience has shown is the country's need.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter of January 31, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

JANUARY 31, 1959.

The President's labor message to Congress contained various commendable provisions to remedy labor leaders' abuses and excesses, suggesting: (1) Unions to file annual public reports concerning financial transactions with the Secretary of Labor; (2) filing of union constitutions and bylaws; (3) keeping of proper records, open to the government and union members; (4) proper administration of union funds; (5) the right of secret ballot by union members; (6) imposition of criminal penalties for violations of the law (bribery, embezzlement, records destruction, false entries, etc.); (7) prevention of secondary boycotts; (8) recognition of coercion or blackmail picketing as illegal.

These legislative requirements are tougher than the Democrat bill of last year and the newly introduced Democrat bill of this year, but at best they comprise a minimum labor law. What we need, in addition, is a law to put labor unions under the antitrust law and subject to all the laws which govern our citizens (not above and beyond the law as labor unions are at present). Such a law is urgently needed to protect union members themselves from their own leaders.

A comprehensive tax reform bill is another urgent Federal legislative need. The progressive confiscatory tax, never intended by the originators of our Nation's income tax, is killing incentive and drying up risk capital. When incentive goes, free enterprise will die. When risk capital becomes scarce, Government loans enter the scene. In both cases, socialism blooms while the heavy-laden taxpayer gives up property and loses freedom. To a degree this is the United States' situation today. To whatever degree we are encouraging socialism by tax burdens, at the expense of personal freedom and free enterprise, we must alter the income tax law. Yet such alteration in the closely-knit Government-business relationship must necessarily be accomplished gradually, with maximum foresight and planning. The changes effected must not disrupt business nor inflate or weaken our currency through deficit spending, as a result of precipitously reduced income to Government.

So I joined others in sponsoring the bipartisan tax reform and reduction bill known as the Herlong-Baker bill. The bill provides: (1) A gradually reduced individual and corporate income tax rate over a 5-year period (individual—lowest bracket down from 20 to 15 percent; highest—91 to 47 percent; corporate, 1 percent per year); (2) a more realistic depreciation rate; (3) decreased estate and gift taxes; (4) deferral of capital gains tax until taxpayer disinvests. At the end of the 5- year period further tax changes could be made to remove the tax burden and stimulate economic growth. The loss of Government income, which always must be considered in tax cuts, would be more than offset by business growth which in turn provides more tax revenues. This seemingly contradictory anomaly has been established by earlier tax cuts providing the wisdom and incentive of such action. So it is that by preserving incentive and building risk capital, we can surpass any Russian effort (no matter how great) that is based on government tyranny. If we try to emulate Russia by government regulation, control, and confiscatory progressive taxation, which is Russia's blueprint for destroying free enterprise societies, we just commit suicide. Unfortunately, many citizens and some Congressmen, as I see it, do not even recognize the danger, much less the solution to the problem. This tax bill provides a solution, it seems to me.

Controversial subjects now being discussed here for legislative attention, in addition to tax and labor reform, include agriculture, housing, airports, depressed areas and school construction—all requiring more Federal money, more stipulated Federal terms, more Federal control—at the expense of local and State jurisdiction and the balanced budget.

As we embark legislatively in a new Congress, I think the time has come for both political parties to state their principles. Surely, Members of Congress should know and adhere to a basic concept of the role that Federal Government should play in our lives—rather than competitively bidding for votes, or entering name-calling contests, solely on the strength of a name—Republican or Democrat—without a basic definition of principles. It is my hope that in the days ahead, members of both parties will stay with basic American concepts in defining the Constitution, and will decide legislative issues with an eye to the strictly limited role assigned the Federal Government by the Constitution, thus preserving States rights and the importance of the individual citizen.

"A wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government" (Thomas Jefferson, inaugural address, March 4, 1801).

Carol Wise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH
OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an article by Paul Robinson, which appeared in the Waycross Journal-Herald, of Waycross, Ga., on December 31, 1958, concerning Carol Wise, a native Ware County girl, who has just recorded her first gospel hymns. I am very proud of this outstanding artist who resides in my congressional district in Georgia and would like others to know of her achievements and her courage, despite her physical handicap. Her dedication to God's work and her faith in Him is an inspiration to all who know her.

The article follows:

CAROL WISE, NATIVE WARE COUNTY GIRL, RECORDS HYMNS

(By Paul Robinson)

Endowed with what is called one of the finest singing voices in Georgia, a native Ware County girl has just recorded her first gospel hymns.

Carol Wise, daughter of Mrs. Lois Wise and granddaughter of Mr. and Mrs. J. E. Hancock, now has the first copies of her recording, entitled "He's Everywhere," and "How Great Thou Art."

The recordings were cut under Miss Wise's own label. Accompanists for the vocal solos were R. G. "Gene" Hancock, an uncle of the singer, playing the electric organ, and Miss Wanda Hill at the piano. A Springfield, Mo., firm cut the records.

Miss Wise is a graduate of Wacona High School and studied voice 1 year under Clayton Logan at Valdosta State College. Her ambition is to continue voice training. Meanwhile, she is biding her time.

AN UNUSUAL GIRL

A chat with friends of Miss Wise reveals that Waycross' newest recording star is an unusual young lady.

Carol Wise has what friends describe as an unexcelled faith. Her faith is exemplified in her daily life and the type of songs which she recorded, one observer stated.

It is said by acquaintances that her charming manner endears her to all with whom she comes in contact. To know her is to love her, is what many friends say of this petite brunette.

One close friend said, "Carol simply glows with love for family and friends. Her devoted family rejoices in her amazing attitude and accomplishments."

Another said, "She is unusual in that a physical handicap has not embittered her nor hindered the development of talent and personality. She has no qualms about being dealt a cruel blow by fate."

SINGS WITH MEANING

All who have heard Carol sing proclaim the clarity and tone of her voice as being just great. When she sings, her listeners say they feel immediately she means every word of the gospel hymns.

"To hear her crystal-clear voice ring out when she sings 'He's Everywhere,' would tug at the heartstrings of even the stanchest unbeliever," was the way one admirer described her singing.

"I see Him in a baby's smile." Quoting these words from one of the hymns, the friend of Miss Wise said though the young lady might never see the glory of a sunrise or the beauty of a sunset, when she sings the lyrics to "He's Everywhere," you know by the earnestness of her voice and the peaceful expression that she knows her God is everywhere.

Her admirers say Carol's song is made more touching by the knowledge that, though she says she sees Him everywhere, it is only through faith that she knows He's there.

For Carol has retinitis pigmentosis, an eye disease that doctors say is incurable. The disease causes progressive blindness and Carol's handicap is in the advanced stages.

But the courageous youngster wants no pity. She aspires to a singing career, hoping to prevent being a burden to her family. All her hosts of admirers feel that her charm and talent should assure the plucky lass of this.

Readers who would like further information on the records mentioned here may contact Carol Wise in care of J. E. Hancock, Route 4, Waycross.

What They Don't Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Joseph Alsop which appeared in a recent edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald:

WHAT THEY DON'T SAY

(By Joseph Alsop)

In public and in private, the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are now pouring the usual floods of soothing sirup about America's defense posture.

This year's soothing sirup differs in several respects from the sirup of earlier years, however. For instance, it has a higher content of outright untruth. Even the President indulged in flat misstatement of facts, though no doubt unwittingly, when he told his press conference that "our missile program is going forward as rapidly as possible."

But what makes the 1959 vintage of soothing sirup really memorable is not so much the untruth that is included, but all the harsh, disagreeable, indigestible facts that are left out. As a really superb illustration of how to compound soothing sirup by the method of omission, consider the diversified means of delivery argument used before the Senate Armed Services Committee by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Gen. Nathan Twining, and also used elsewhere by Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy.

Even by making the most transparently overoptimistic estimates of Soviet progress, the Secretary and the General could not absolutely wish away the Soviet lead in intercontinental ballistic missiles. Secretary McElroy has actually admitted that we are conceding the Soviets a 3-to-1 lead in ICBM's by 1962, and in reality we are almost certainly doing far worse than Secretary McElroy admits. But Twining and McElroy argue that the Soviet ICBM lead will be counterbalanced by our diversified means of delivery.

On the debit side of the balance sheet, in other words, Twining and McElroy write down just Soviet ICBM's, and on the credit side they write down our much smaller number of American ICBM's, plus our Strategic Air Command, plus the intermediate range missile squadrons we are sending to our allies, and so on and on. According to Twining and McElroy, the results ought to satisfy everyone.

In the Senate hearings, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat of Missouri, therefore asked General Twining how many IRBM's the Soviets would have among their own diversified means of delivery. Fantastically enough, Twining replied that he really did not know and would have to look into the matter. But the answer to the Senator's question is plain. The Soviets must be assumed to have, already in operational squadrons or soon going into operation squadrons, between 600 and 1,000 IRBM's to cover the Strategic Air Command's bases in Europe and the Mediterranean, plus enough more to cover SAC's Pacific bases.

The facts that demand this assumption are of all sorts. One is the regular Soviet IRBM testing rate—15 a month, fired off as though by clockwork—which clearly implies test firings to train operational IRBM squadrons. Another related fact is the identification of whole Soviet IRBM trains, including specially designed cars to serve as launching pads. Still another fact is the enormous number of Soviet IRBM tests that were identified in the earlier period, before we had even tested one IRBM at full range.

The plain truth is that the Soviet IRBM lead is vastly greater than the Soviet ICBM lead. Secretary of Defense McElroy has not been allowed to count the Soviet IRBM's on a special guided tour, so he can say he is not positive the Soviets have any that are operational. But it is worse than playing Russian roulette with the intelligence estimates, if American policy is not squarely on the assumption that the Soviets now have or will soon have the kind of IRBM capability outlined above. And this powerful Soviet IRBM capability is simply omitted from the balance sheet!

Meanwhile, the mere 8 squadrons of 120 IRBM's that this country will eventually send to Britain and elsewhere are put down on the balance sheet's credit side. And the fact is omitted that our allies wil absolutely control the use of these American IRBM's. The whole striking power of SAC is also put down on the credit side. And the further fact is omitted that SAC's striking power can be reduced by at least 50 and perhaps 60 percent by a surprise attack by the Soviet IRBM's on SAC's overseas bases. Thus the balance sheet is cooked in the most flagrant manner.

The question remains why such men as Twining and McElroy are first willing to delude themselves and then willing to delude the public by cooking the balance sheet. The answer lies in the administration's conviction that it is better not to look hard facts in the face, because the richest country in the world really cannot afford to defend itself. As General Twining has gloomily remarked, "irresponsible spending for military hardware" (for which read "spending to meet the Soviet challenge") could result in our losing, without ever firing a shot, the very things we now fight for.

Professional Gossips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a sermon given by His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, at the sixth annual journalists' mass, celebrated at Our Lady of the Railways Chapel, Boston, Mass., on January 25, 1959.

In his remarks about and warning of "professional gossips," Cardinal Cushing well said:

Newspapers are made for men by men and unless they help to make all men better, then they are truly without significant purpose.

The above-mentioned follows:

PRESS WARNED OF PROFESSIONAL GOSSIPS—CARDINAL CUSHING PRESIDES AT MASS FOR JOURNALISTS

(Following is the address of Richard Cardinal Cushing at the sixth annual journalists' mass, Our Lady of the Railways chapel, South Station, Boston. The mass for the press was offered on Sunday, January 25, 1959, at 4 p.m., in anticipation of the feast of St. Francis de Sales, patron of journalists, January 29.)

This is the sixth annual mass for the press and each year I have been happy to preside at the ceremonies and to offer some observations on the work of the journalistic profession.

My first duty is to say a word of thanks, even in informal fashion, to the working press of Boston for their services during these last few months, when I found myself, like the rockets of the scientists, launched into the unknown world of fame and glory by becoming a Cardinal. No one knows better than you how little my disposition is in accord with such special dignities and how little inclined am I to elevated decorum of any kind. Many of you have followed me into the hospitals and prisons, you have seen me happy with the aged and the poor, you know my affection for the little ones, afflicted and undeveloped—in short, you know me, and I like to think that more than most others you understand me.

Because of this particular relationship that I have seen formed between the working press and a bishop going about trying to do good, I am especially happy to be here this afternoon. Since that October day on which good Pope John announced my name as a member of the College of Cardinals you have hardly been able to give your typewriters a rest. So many kind words came my way that I blushed to pick up the papers, so many pictures that I hurried over the pages. There were many pious exaggerations too in the midst of the excitement, but they were the product of an excess of goodwill in my regard. At this time it is enough to say that I understand the good motives that inspired your many efforts and that I am grateful for it all, even when your generous phrases ran on ahead of the reality.

The press of Boston, as I see it, has a unique flavor like the city itself. I have often described Boston as a big city and a small town. This is at once its character and its charm. It is true also of its press. Rolling off the big city editions of the newspapers, now with two of America's newest and most modern plants, the papers of Bos-

ton stand on a level with the great papers of the other large cities of the country. At the same time they have a quality of their own, the subtle, small-town quality of being interested in people. This is more significant than we may realize at first for it expresses a kind of philosophy of journalism, even if only in an unconscious fashion.

Newspaper very often concern themselves almost exclusively with events and in our times events are happening so quickly as to be easily the preoccupation of editors. From Quemoy to Berlin, from Little Rock to Anchorage, from Cape Canaveral to the moon, and in these last weeks almost to the sun—in every part of the world and beyond it the day's news brings us new events and new accomplishments. Sometimes it is possible for us to forget that the center of the world is still man, that history is the story of man, and civilization the product of his genius. News is significant principally as it affects man, and any record of the day which leaves out the human element or merely touches it lightly distorts the true values of our existence.

In this connection I have been thinking recently of the young lady reporter who took herself to prison rather than reveal certain sources of information used in her column. I suppose it is natural to feel a certain sense of chivalry in her regard—she suffered, according to her claims, in order to protect the position of another. From this point of view, even if her action was ill-advised, she has demonstrated a certain strength of character. There are added circumstances, of course, which color the incident and all of them are important for those who wish to make a judgment in her regard.

For my part, I will leave it to those more learned in the law than myself to pass a definitive decision on the celebrated case; in a conflict of rights such as this one, there are many aspects of the case to be studied and the claims of justice move in many directions. For myself, I would prefer to comment on a matter which stands at the source of the incident itself and has been little discussed, but deserves some consideration from us all.

The original item of news which began the controversy and raised so many questions was, in a simple everyday phrase, a bit of gossip. Normally, we do not take seriously the problem of gossip; we think of it generally as something associated with elderly ladies gathered about a tea table and with men having nothing else to do. For the most part it is fair to say that gossip is harmless. It is clear, however, that it can become dangerous, and indeed immoral, when it touches the good name and reputation of others. This does not mean merely that we should be careful not to tell lies about our neighbors, but that in certain cases we cannot even tell the truth, if such a revelation will destroy a reputation and serve no just purpose. These principles we have learned in our youth and so we know the moral evil of detraction which reveals a damaging truth about another, as well as calumny, which reports a lie about another.

Now for several decades we have had growing up in the newspaper world a whole batch of writers who must be termed professional gossips. Things were bad enough when the only gossips we had around were the backfence variety and other amateur forms; it has become intolerable now that the whole business has gone professional with newspaper writers making a living out of it, and in some cases, I dare say, a fortune out of it. Of course, I know that much of these columns is made up of items of a pleasant and happy nature, and I know that there are some columnists who show good taste and restraint in discussing the lives of celebrities.

But I also know that there are some who handle the lives of their neighbors with no sense of values at all and with no respect for reputations. In little staccato lines they feed the hungry public the evil food of malicious gossip; they quietly destroy their subjects and just as quietly poison their readers.

Fortunately, this is something quite rare in our city; when we encounter it, it is likely to be something introduced from some other area. At the same time we must take every precaution against its increase either locally or nationally. Gossip of the kind I refer to is essentially unkind, and it caters only to the instinct of curiosity in man, the busybody tendency which lurks beneath the surface of the best of us and looks for opportunities to be satisfied. Moreover, gossip is also unjust, for it nearly always damages the reputation of others and takes away from them their good name or the remnants of their proper esteem in the community. It might also be noted that gossip has a very debilitating effect on the character of those who make a practice of indulging in it. It is the product of small minds and it encourages small-mindedness.

All of us can remember reading in the masthead of the New York Times the famous legend, "All the News That's Fit To Print." This is a very old text but some reflection on it might put a good deal of sense into our thinking on situations like the one we have been referring to. A newspaper is a free enterprise; it sets out to find the news and to give it to the public. At the same time, every editor and, indeed, every reporter knows that he cannot print all the news; he must select and reject, and he must have a formula for preferring the one and setting the other aside. There is, in plain terms, some news fit to print and there is some news that is not fit to print. A good publisher and a good editor know how to make the distinction between the one and the other.

Some people speak a great deal about the so-called right to know. This is a very precious idea and it lies at the heart of the democratic society as we know it. The public has a right to know many things about the conduct of government, the state of society, as well as any and all, the public events which make up a passing day. At the same time there are many things that are not public property; we just do not have the right to know everything about everybody.

It has never been a rule of good journalism that we have a right to print everything we can find out about everyone in the world. Alongside the concept of right to know we must set the principle of fit to print. Beside the ingenuity of the reporter who finds out hidden facts we must be sure to encourage the restraint of the editor who knows which ones will serve legitimate interests and which will unjustly bring damage to others.

The newspaper is not an irrational machine into which we can carelessly throw the news, and let the results fall where they may. Newspapers are run by newsmen and that is why they must be answerable, as man is answerable, to laws higher than themselves.

Perhaps the reason why papers in Boston do not often fail in this regard can be found in the quality I mentioned earlier, the fact that they are human enough to be interested in people. We know that newspapers are a kind of daily textbook in the education of the readers, that minds are informed and personalities affected by their reading. This places a high community responsibility on the newsmen of a city, for they can be said to set the human climate of the areas they serve.

If papers are edited in a manner that recognizes human dignity, that encourages what is best in man instead of exploiting what is worst in man, this will be reflected in the community. Your work certainly helps to make Boston a happy place in which to live.

In this sense, then, that it will always be a place where people are important, Boston will always be a small town; I sincerely hope so. In other ways, of course, we must all work together to make it a more prosperous big city, although we must never proceed at the expense of those human factors which give it its special quality. Boston can be bigger, its facilities can expand and new ones be developed; Boston can be richer, its business life can grow and its investments mount; Boston can be newer, its old buildings can be torn down and new ones replace them—all of this can happen and in some measure must happen. But the authentic spirit of Boston can remain unchanged even while the city moves on to new greatness.

I know that you appreciate your role in the life of the city and I know too that, with remarkable consistency, you are faithful to it. My purpose this afternoon is to encourage you to continue this fidelity in the days ahead. Keep before you the thought of man himself as the center of your work; do not permit situations and events to smother the true value of things so that the human factor becomes merely one more among many.

There are matters far more important than putting out big papers or vast numbers of papers; you must be certain to put out good papers which do not wither the spirit of those who write them or those who read them. Newspapers are made for men by men and unless they help to make all men better, then they are truly without significant purpose. The focus you take in every day's work can make the difference, and it is the difference between success and failure.

Need of Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I took office on January 7. Today is January 30. That is 23 days I have held office, representing a great constituency in the 17th District of Ohio.

In that brief period, the people of my district—and many other parts of Ohio and other adjacent States—have suffered a devastating flood.

On January 22 I made a personal tour of the devastated area to see for myself the extent of the damage and to alleviate in every possible way, personally or officially, the suffering of my people. Knox County has been the home of my family for generations. I have thousands of friends there. I had an opportunity to talk to the mayors and other elected officials of towns and cities in my district. I am happy to say that, in spite of the emergency situation, the two persons in the district I had chosen to be on my staff were available and ready to go to work at once. They were Mrs. Nona Darling of Lucas, Ohio and Emmett Guthrie of Coshocton. Mrs. Darling is my district secretary and Mr. Guthrie is my district liaison officer.

Although there was no chance for them to be paid for some of the work they might be called upon to do, at least during January, I am happy to report

that both of them offered to pitch in and to work without thought of themselves.

My district, Mr. Speaker, has many problems. They were not all born on the day I took office on January 7—22 days ago. In my campaign, I pointed to many of our problems, as a district and as a nation.

I would like for my people to realize that I am here striving to represent them—all of them—all of the time, except during those rare occasions, and I hope they will be very rare, when a crisis in my district calls me home to be with them, to render such aid as I can and to learn more about it in order to serve them better.

I would also like for them to know that I welcome their viewpoints on all issues. It is not necessary that these viewpoints parallel my own. All of us are in varying degrees of knowledge and understanding about problems of all kinds—local problems, State problems, national problems, international problems. There are many fine citizens who have different economic interests. What is pleasant and profitable to one group may seem most unpleasant and definitely costly to another group. I feel it is my duty, indeed, it is my pleasure to learn of all the viewpoints possible represented among the many diverse individuals in my district. We are proud of our people in the 17th District and of their determination and ability to think for themselves. This is their right and I want to make it clear on my 23d day here that I want the views of all the people in my district who want to express their views to me. I also am happy to read in the newspapers the views of our finest citizens, about pressing, immediate problems, as well as their view about long-range problems.

Among the many fine citizens of my district, Mr. Speaker, is F. B. Herendeen, of Fredericktown. I know Mr. Herendeen and I respect his views and admire his unusual style of writing. I am asking that a copy of his letter to the editor which he recently sent to the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point. When a gentleman of his caliber takes the time to write a thoughtful letter to the editor, it behooves us all to read it and to ponder the thoughts he has written:

FREDERICKTOWN, OHIO,
January 25, 1959.

EDITOR, THE NEWS:

Now that most of us have the top mud washed off, the furnace back in working order and our nerves tranquilized, we are wondering just what happened and what we can do about it.

How could the engineers in one State make so many blunders in just one small community as have been made in this, the Fredericktown section. We must be the focal point for engineering incompetency. Surely they couldn't make as many in each community. There just ain't that many engineers in Ohio.

First, there is the poorly designed and constructed Smith curve, where many lives have been sacrificed. Recently the State has spent a few dollars to erect sufficient signs and in a measure correct the construction.

Then, there are the double curves at the south side of Fredericktown. Fortunately the property damage has been the major destruction.

The design and construction of Leaky Dam at Knox Lake cost the taxpayers thousands of dollars and for 2 years placed an awful threat to lives of residents and property downstream. This was breached, as were several others, and a dam was built that we hope is safe.

The muddling and blundering of the cave-in on North Main St. here is another. Right now, water has to run uphill to get to the culvert and the sidewalk is useless after a rain unless you risk the splash from passing vehicles.

But the daddy of them all, the prize of engineering stupidity is the concrete bridge on Route 13 just north of Fredericktown. This should concern Mount Vernon and all points down the Kokosing. This bridge dam (or dam bridge) caught the floodwaters in April 1948 and caused the north end of Fredericktown to be inundated. The damage was not so extensive and fewer people were harmed, so it did not attract much attention. Actually it was an advantage to Mount Vernon as it held back the crest.

This barrier to the natural watercourse has done it again and this time the disastrous results are not localized. In my humble opinion, that is the real cause of the flooded dikes and the breakthrough in Mount Vernon.

Here is the situation: Sixty years ago the B. & O. built a bridge across the Kokosing. Evidently, the railroad engineers studied the rainfall, area drained, rate of flow, topography, etc., and put in a bridge about 200 feet wide with one pier and sufficient clearance. That took care of the big flood of 1913. A little 5-foot driveway dike kept the water out of Fredericktown.

When Route 13 was relocated west of the railroad, some 30 years ago, the present concrete bridge was built. This bridge is 150 feet (not 200) long, there are two piers (one additional) and the clearance was lowered by about 2½ feet. The State engineers apparently ignored the precedent set by the railroad engineers with their bridge about 100 feet downstream. Either for the sake of economy or lack of ability and knowledge they narrowed the width and dropped the bridge, thus reducing the opening by a wide and critical margin. The water is no respecter of State engineering procedure so it just keeps rolling along—right down Route 13 to spread over the north end of Fredericktown. When that section was overflowed, the next lower ground was over the railroad back to the channel. The break through the railroad came at 11:30 a.m., Wednesday, causing a wall or crest of water estimated at 3 to 6 feet, to start down the Kokosing for Mount Vernon. Of course, the once adequate dike could not stand that. It just overflowed and caused all the misery and damage. The engineering of the High Street bridge is another matter and certainly deserves some deep study by others than State engineers.

Since the crisis has passed, what are we going to do? Be pacified by the visits of the governor and Congressman or unite in an effort to get a correction. Let's see whether the visits were for vote-getting window dressing or a sincere effort to correct the situation. Time will tell.

A suggested remedy should follow a criticism. In 1948, the writer reported the flood situation and the highway department surveyors verified the figures given above, but like most complaints, the buck was passed and nothing was done to correct it. So few votes were affected that they could do better spending elsewhere.

This last catastrophe affects 300 people, directly, in Fredericktown, 3,000 directly and 15,000 indirectly in Mount Vernon. How much more will we have to tolerate before the lethargic officials act? Let's strike while the iron is hot.

Let's demand that they raise the bridge by at least three feet, add another span, build a dike to protect Fredericktown, and then clean out the channel under and below the bridge. Stubs of the construction piling are still under the bridge to catch and hold debris. The gravel people have ruthlessly dug and piled the dirt with no concern for the rights, safety, or welfare of our community or for the general appearance of the neighborhood. This has not helped the situation.

Here is a chance for action. The chamber of commerce, business and professional men, manufacturers, unions, lodges, service clubs, and other interested organizations (and aren't we all interested?). Our alert mayors now have the attention of the politicians; the way is open for action—let's push it.

Nero fiddle while Rome burned.

F. B. HERENDEEN.

Tortoise and Hare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Edwin L. Dale, Jr., which appeared in the New York Times on January 29, 1959:

TORTOISE AND HARE—SLOW PACE OF U.S. ECONOMIC GROWTH SUGGESTS THAT SOVIET MAY WIN RACE

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, January 28.—Nikita S. Khrushchev predicted yesterday that economic growth in the Soviet Union over the next 7 years would come to about 8.6 percent a year. Judging from recent performance, he may not be far wrong. Mr. Khrushchev said this compared with an annual rate of growth in the United States of 2 percent. He was being unnecessarily kind. Since the end of the Korean war, the annual economic growth of this country—after correcting for higher prices—has averaged less than 1.5 percent.

The experts are deeply divided on the two most obvious questions:

Why has the slowdown in growth occurred?

What ought to be done about it?

Economic growth is usually measured by the increase in the real gross national product, or total output of goods and services, after allowing for price changes. Growth comes about because the labor force grows each year and because, with the aid of machinery, each worker's productivity—his output for each hour worked—also increases each year.

NORMAL RATE AT LEAST 3 PERCENT

The rate of growth has varied widely during United States history, but by almost any test the recent experience has been disappointing. There have been periods—1947–53 was one—when growth in real terms came to 5 percent a year or more. Almost no expert puts normal, achievable growth at less than 3 percent a year, and many think it should be more.

Practically everybody favors a high rate of economic growth. It improves living standards. It supplies more and more revenue to governments at all levels, without raising

tax rates, to do the many things that governments now must do and in the future will have to do even more. But how do we get it?

"We" in this case clearly means mainly the Federal Government.

CAUSE AND CURE DEBATED

The arguments range over the cause of the recent slowdown and what should be done now.

All sides concede that the main reason for the decline in the average rate of growth over the last 6 years has been that this period saw two recessions, during which the economy went down rather than up. All sides also agree that the rate of growth in the long run will depend on the rate of increase in plant and equipment (national capital), plus the rate of increase in our technical skills and inventiveness.

But after that, the disagreements begin.

Some say far greater Federal spending is essential to speed up the rate of growth. Others say the exact opposite: that the best prescription for growth is lower spending and hence lower taxes, which would supply more investment capital.

Some think the present situation calls for budget deficits; others believe large surpluses are the right medicine.

Some say high interest rates and tight money greatly deter growth and are mainly to blame for our recent slowdown. Others say high interest rates increase savings and thus help growth, and also help growth by checking inflation.

ROLE OF INFLATION ARGUED

Some say a little inflation is probably the price that must be paid for more rapid growth. Others say that toleration of even a creeping inflation will result in uneven growth, and less growth in the long run, with more frequent "busts" or recessions following inflationary booms.

Some say that growth can best be stimulated by tax relief aimed at encouraging more investment in plant and equipment. Others say the reverse: that the best stimulus would be to cut taxes for low-income groups, thus increasing demand and inducing businessmen to expand.

Some say higher wages are essential to spur the rate of growth. Others, with equal conviction, say that greater profits are the key.

All of these differences are fundamental. The differing viewpoints are held by nonextremists on both side. And meanwhile growth has practically ground to a halt.

This year, to be sure, will see a pickup in the rate. That always happens after a slump ends. But the period that has greatly disturbed experts of practically all viewpoints is the prosperous period of 1956–57.

Following the typically rapid growth of the post-recession year of 1955, growth in 1956 was only 2.4 percent and in 1957 it was 1.1 percent. Why? Until the experts—let alone the politicians—come to some agreement on the answer, Mr. Khrushchev may make good his boast about catching up to the United States by 1970.

More About Airlift's Importance to Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, considerable interest has been evidenced in the remarks I made a few days ago about evaluation of the need for an adequate, fast airlift as part of our defense system. By way of further information I have asked that the article by Donald W. Douglas, Jr., president of the Douglas Aircraft Co., which appeared in the May-June, 1958, issue of National Defense Transportation Journal be reproduced here. Mr. Douglas' article describing what airlift is and how it fits in the defense picture reads as follows:

LET'S LOOK AT AIRLIFT

(By Donald W. Douglas, Jr., president, Douglas Aircraft Co.)

It is often said that the sputniks were a boon to the United States because they awakened us to a dangerous situation and forced us to take a hard look at ourselves. In recent months this critical reexamination has focused on missiles, basic research, the country's educational system, and the conquest of outer space. This is all to the good and should continue. But preparedness is compounded of many things, and we must be careful that our concern is not confined to more spectacular items at the expense of equally vital factors in national security.

We accept as axiomatic that this country's world position depends in large measure on the military capability we possess in support of our diplomatic actions. It is no less true that military strength must be supported by an effective and swiftly responsive logistics system.

Today this means airlift. Failure to understand this, and act accordingly, could be an Achilles heel.

Airlift is a component of preparedness that is equally effective in cold and hot warfare. During World War II air transport helped link the farflung forces of the United Nations. The most dramatic example, perhaps, is the famous "Over the Hump" airlift in southeast Asia which, for a long time, was virtually the only link between China and her allies. Since V–J Day, airlift has demonstrated its indispensability in the Korean war, in cold-war situations like the Berlin airlift, the evacuation of Hungarian refugees, and the rapid transfer of United Nations troops to the Suez area in late 1956.

Airlift also made possible the construction of the DEW Line radar network along the shores of the Arctic Ocean. It speeded completion of Thule, the vital Strategic Air Command base in northern Greenland. Without it U.S. scientists could not have wintered at the South Pole for scientific work in connection with the International Geophysical Year.

There are other aspects of a complete logistics system that we tend to overlook. In support of its commitments to NATO, and its Mutual Defense Assistance Pacts with 43 nations, the United States maintains deterrent forces in many distant locales. This requires the continuous movement overseas of an enormous quantity of supplies—something on the order of 16 million tons annually—a small but critical portion of which moves by air. The stationing of intermediate range ballistic missiles at foreign bases will soon increase the problem of keeping these forces at a high level of combat readiness. No taxpayer needs to be told of the burden this imposes on the national economy.

Airlift can ease that burden. Shipping by air reduces almost to the vanishing point the quantities of an item that must be bought just to "fill the pipeline," and permits drastic reduction of inventories as well. For example, when the U.S. Air Force began shipping J–57 replacement engines by air, it found that its requirement was reduced by about 2,000, a saving of $337 million. Similarly, use of air shipment enabled the Air Force's European command to save $500 million in its service operations and achieve a 14-percent increase in effectiveness while doing it.

Air shipment saves in other ways, too. Packaging is simplified and in some cases eliminated; warehousing is reduced because inventories can be lower; and finally, items are usually handled less, so that the possibility of damage in transit is lessened. It is a startling but proved fact that airlift can pay for itself in savings.

Even more important than economy, however, is the military importance of airlift. We have seen how quickly airlift can react to cold war emergencies. This same rapid reaction time will be essential in meeting the outbreak of hostilities anywhere in the world. Many competent observers believe that limited, so-called brush-fire conflicts, rather than an all-out nuclear holocaust, are likely to confront us in the years ahead. It is obviously impractical to keep adequate forces at all points of possible trouble. With airlift we can quickly move forces to places where they are needed, and perhaps insure that the conflagration does not spread.

The Soviets, because they operate on internal lines of communications, enjoy a built-in logistical advantage. Despite the vastness of their country, supply routes are much shorter than those we must maintain in support of forces all around the Soviet Union's periphery. There is only one way to match and possibly surpass the Communists' capacity—the use of airlift.

Like any transportation system, airlift requires terminal facilities, fuel supplies and a good route system. All are available in adequate measure today. For more than a decade the U.S. Military Air Transport Service has been giving logistical support to U.S. deterrent forces around the globe, as well as standing ready to evacuate Americans from sensitive areas or engage in mercy missions. MATS, like the civil airlines that fly allied flags, is a living symbol of free world unity.

What, then, is lacking? What is there to be concerned about?

The answer can be given in one word: aircraft. The need for airlift is clear, and the system to support it already exists. But the aircraft fleet—in being and potential—is not adequate. Shortsightedness, parading in the guise of economy, has hobbled our airlift system by condemning it to operate with aircraft which lack the range, speed, and payload capability demanded by modern cargoes, both military and commercial.

In some cases, reciprocating engine aircraft are employed beyond their economic service life, so that even our present limited airlift is not functioning with the efficiency we should expect.

The question is not one of numbers alone. Ten years ago we mustered a large fleet of military and commercial planes and met, with outstanding success, the challenge of the Berlin blockade. The need then was to move many relatively small packages less than 300 miles. Two years later the Korean conflict created an entirely different kind of problem: moving men and material long distances over water. The same aircraft could be used, and perforce were, but at the cost of a severe restriction in payload. They made a valiant showing, but the fact is that Korea was a lesson in the lack of proper airlift preparedness. And today, a decade after the Berlin Airlift, many of the aircraft that did yeoman service then are still used by the Air Force and civil airlines.

Aircraft types as well as numbers must figure in any assessment of airlift potential. Thus, while some 350 of the more than 2,000 aircraft in the U.S. airline inventory are part of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, approximately half are passenger planes. The primary military need is for cargo lift.

Full mobilization of this Reserve, likely only in the event of total war, would require about 60 days and cut our civil airlift by

half. Moreover, since these are mostly medium-range aircraft, their effectiveness for overseas operation would be very limited. As things now stand, therefore, mobilizing our Civil Reserve Air Fleet would provide only an inadequate supplement to the military cargo lift, and at the expense of crippling civil aviation service when it might be needed most.

Emphasis on airlift is justified, and indeed essential at this time, because of the ever-accelerating advance in weapon technology, accompanied always by rising costs. The most conspicuous example, of course, is that of missiles. These are simply too expensive to buy and stock in quantity as we once did with guns and tanks and even aircraft. Large missile inventories would be prohibitively expensive and create attractive targets for enemy attack or sabotage. In a techno-military sense they would be unwise, since new developments continuously make most of our weapons obsolete almost as soon as they reach mass production.

With airlift, however, missile preparedness can be militarily sound and economically sensible. High speed mobility, by air, can keep a reasonable number of weapons available for use wherever and whenever needed.

There is another immediate factor that is sometimes overlooked. The intermediate range ballistic missile will precede its intercontinental sisters into service by many months, and even when ICBM's are available the IRBM will continue to play an important role for us and for our allies. The significant thing about the IRBM is that it is not intended to be fired from this continent. Under a united defense system, bases must, and it now seems certain will be developed. Airlift is the only effective means to support such bases.

The Soviets have recognized the importance of airlift and are moving ahead of us rapidly in this field. Russia has developed at least six new turbine-powered transport types, and her aircraft fleet appears to cover the spectrum of airlift requirements. Included are high-speed jet personnel carriers, long-range heavy cargo transports, and short-range cargo aircraft that can operate from rough terrain. While some of these aircraft are employed for commercial service, all are unmistakably intended for speedy conversion to military use. Many of these Soviet craft are already familiar in European skies and one, the 70-passenger TU–104, has been flown to the United States.

Our own effort is in marked contrast to that of the Communists. Against their four turbine-powered cargo transports we can muster only two, the Lockheed C–130 and Douglas C–133, and the work capability of their aircraft is superior to ours. In the personnel carrier field the Soviets have two turbine-powered types; we have none. U.S. airlines have ordered large numbers of jet transports, some of which will be assigned to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet. But today there is not a single modern jet personnel transport in the Air Force inventory. The KC–135 jet is a tanker plane, and is restricted to Strategic Air Command missions.

This adds up to a substantial Soviet lead in the development of airlift. There is no technological barrier to our overcoming this advantage; we need only accord airlift the priority consideration it requires. Normally; years of design, development and testing precede the introduction of a new transport plane into service. We should, right now, be working actively on new types that would go into service in the mid-1960's. For the more immediate future, we are fortunate in having several modern commercial designs that could easily be modified to meet current military needs.

Developing large, new transport aircraft is an expensive business involving hundreds of millions of dollars. For the military services, as well as for civil airlines, this presents a serious problem. Several means to finance the airlift we need have been proposed: leasing portions of our military fleet for commercial use, fast tax writeoffs for airlines that buy new transports and assign them to the reserve fleet; granting of military airlift contracts to civil airlines as a stimulus to their purchase of new equipment.

The blunt truth is, however, that the costs of developing prototype aircraft and tooling up for production must be borne by Government. The financial magnitude of the task is now beyond the capability of private industry. This is a hard fact that the Congress, the administration, and all of us had better face if we want the United States to hold its own along the world's skyways.

There is a well-established precedent for this kind of support. In the last two decades for compelling reasons of national security, the Government has supported the American merchant marine with both ship construction and operating subsidies. For equally valid reasons, this same principle can now be applied to cargo airlift. In the case of cargo airlift, however, the savings to Government made possible by air transport will more than compensate for the initial investment. Airlift, as I have said, pays for itself.

If Government provides this initial financial boost, freight or cargo aircraft can then be priced within reach of commercial operators.

Developing a full-bodied sky cargo system, as well as providing the military with adequate transport aircraft, would be a tonic for the national economy. To visualize an economy in which air cargo plays a major role is to perceive the future. We need desperately men of such vision and imagination—in Government, business, and the military—who will act now to insure American leadership in the years ahead. The Soviets, it is clear, are moving in the direction of large-scale air cargo transport. We can do no less, and indeed must strive to surpass them.

Every plane and every dollar invested in the development of a peacetime air cargo system is paid-up insurance against a wartime emergency. Another war is likely to come too suddenly and its decisive phases be too brief to permit our placing much reliance on Reserves that take time to mobilize. Forces in being, both combat and logistical, will be the blue chips for both sides.

One need not peer into the future to see how a true air cargo system could weigh heavily in a sudden war situation. Think what air cargo might have done for General MacArthur's embattled forces in the Philippines after Pearl Harbor. Or how, in the Korean situation, an effective airlift could have saved lives by minimizing the effects of a serious ammunition shortage—a shortage, incidentally, made all the worse because filling the pipeline of a slow, earthbound logistics system was in itself a gigantic task.

There are no insuperable obstacles to creating an adequate airlift for this country, and there are many compelling reasons, both military and commercial, for getting on with the job as quickly as possible. This is the inescapable conclusion for anyone who troubles to take a hard look at the problem.

U.S. Coal Is Dealt an Unfair Blow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "U.S. Coal Is Dealt an Unfair Blow," which appeared in the January 30, 1959, issue of the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

U.S. COAL IS DEALT AN UNFAIR BLOW

A stiff new West German tariff of $4.76 a ton on imports of U.S. coal is being vigorously protested, and the National Coal Association, which fends for the industry in Washington and elsewhere, this week urged the State Department to protest the German levy most vigorously.

No Hopkins County coal is exported to Germany, but for the industry as a whole the German action is a sharp blow. Involved, jobwise, are work for several thousand miners, for unnumbered railroad people, and for others whose jobs are related to the getting out of coal for the German market, transporting it to ports, loading it aboard ship, and transporting it across the Atlantic.

All in all, the effect is much larger than a casual observer might think.

Tom Pickett NCA executive vice president, described the damage in a letter to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in which he said:

"This arbitrary, unilateral action will effectively deprive the United States of about 60 percent of its largest oversea market for bituminous coal."

Further, Mr. Pickett pointed out that this is only the latest damage done the coal industry in the field of international relations. Pickett asserted that in the name of free trade and international friendship we have seen coal's normal markets on the Atlantic coast submerged by an ever-increasing tide of imported residual fuel oil.

Pickett asserted that in spite of the heavy damage to the coal industry, our own Government has failed to stem this tide of oil, and said the State Department has had an important voice in this refusal to act.

The West German Cabinet last week approved the new tariff on all but the first 3,500,000 tons of U.S. coal to be imported this year. Last year West Germany imported 9,500,000 tons of bituminous coal from our country.

Since the quota is retroactive to January 1, the 3,500,000-ton mark will be reached by May, leaving the rest of the year's shipments from America subject to a duty of $4.76 per ton, which practically equals the price of coal at American mines.

Pickett said another thing which irks American taxpayers, including the coal industry and its thousands of workers, is the fact that the United States has furnished West Germany more than $13 billion in foreign aid since 1948, much of which went to rebuild the German coal industry.

"The hand that fed West Germany has now been bitten," he said.

Fishbait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a bright and vivid article by Mary Van Rensselaer Thayer concerning the House's able major-domo, William M. Miller. Without minimizing the emphasis the article places on Fishbait's service to new Mem-

bers, it is fair to say that he is equally invaluable to those of us who have served here for a number of years.

Why do we continue to confer the ignominious title of "Doorkeeper" upon an important official under whom serve some hundreds of employees and who has responsibility for the housekeeping operations of the House of Representatives? This seems an especially appropriate question, in view of the efficiency with which the duties are performed by the present incumbent.

Ever hear of a fishbait special? Sandwich? Seafood cocktail? Some curious adjunct to piscatorial sport? Not at all!

It's an initiation ritual set up for newly elected Democratic Representatives by "Fishbait" Miller.

But who's Fishbait?

Why, he's the House of Representatives majority Doorkeeper, who likewise functions as House crier, housekeeper, and Emily Post.

Fishbait, who toiled under the Capitol Dome 27 years, has been majority or minority Doorkeeper since 1947, and during that time has demonstrated the niceties of congressmanship to thousands of fledglings. This autumn, thanks to the Democratic landslide, he's shepherding a record 63—there are 19 new Republicans chaperoned by House minority Doorkeeper Tom Kennamer—and, as usual, he has shown them the ropes in nine easy stages.

How does a "fishbait special" operate?

Preliminarywise, "Fishbait" gets to know his future charges before they're elected. On even (election) years when Congress adjourns, "Fishbait," 50-year-old Chief Page Turner Robertson and Charles Hackney, Assistant Director of the House Telephone, scoot over to the National Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee.

Ohio's Representative MIKE KIRWAN was last year's chairman and the "savvy" trio functioned as his glorified office boys throughout the campaign. By election night, "Fishbait" knows the Democratic candidates from A to Z.

A week or so after battle, victors trickle into the Doorkeeper's office, ripe for the "Fishbait Special."

"Fishbait" welcomes them with courtly Mississippi charm in his green-carpeted, gilt-mirrored suite. Then, he personally conducts them on a leisurely tour.

Here are the "fishbait special" ports-of-call:

First, the stationery room where the Congressman-elect pens a facsimile signature as pattern for his mailing frank. Second stop is ches Emmanuel Ridgell, the House Office Building Superintendent. Mr. Ridgell explains the office situation, asks the newcomer to draw a metal disk from a box. The disk number determines priority on the office space list. Then, the Superintendent "shoos" them off to inspect a sample suite.

Afterward, the Doorman takes his new Congressman visiting.

They drop into the Speaker's office to meet Mr. Sam's administrative assistant, John Holton, then call on assistants to the House Parliamentarian.

Next, the freshman legislator is introduced to Joe Metzger, the Parliamentarian's secretary, an important "guy" to know, because he stopwatches the minutes allowed for House oratory.

Last on the list is Lewis Deschler, the Parliamentarian who's been interpreting the rules for 30 years. Deschler sets the newcomer in the right groove by giving a 5- to 10-minute briefing on House procedure.

Next, the Congressman gets down to practical business.

Ralph Roberts, the House Clerk, reminds him to file a campaign expenditures accounting and keep his certificate of election handy.

Harry Livingston, Disbursing Office Chief, follows along, explaining that a Congressman may hire up to eight clerks, secretaries, stenographers (most settle for five or six) on a $17,500 allowance, though none can be paid more than $7,000 annually.

And now comes the big moment when the happy Congressman is put on the payroll. He's in. It's Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., the House Sergeant at Arms, who turns the trick.

As a "Fishbait" special finale, the new legislator is told the Capitol facts of life.

This is no birds, bees, and flowers stuff but a shrewd warning by Ken Harding, executive secretary of the National Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee.

Harding hands his visitor a list of experienced office workers employed by former Congressmen. He emphasizes that a knowledgeable staff keeps a Congressman in office, while an inexperienced office force may ruin reelection chances.

The tour done, "Fishbait" and his now sophisticated charge return to base.

But what of "Fishbait" himself? How come a doorkeeper is so important that he's constantly consulted by congressional VIPs and draws a cosy $18,150 annually?

It's because his job is important. It was set up during the first session of our First Congress. It's an elective office; Congressmen do the voting and the election of Doorkeeper and other House factotums is legalized in the first resolution of each new Congress.

The job's purpose, according to the incumbent, is to take care of all the chores. The chores are something and under "Fishbait's" direction 250 to 300 employees handle them. They include House pages, working doormen and 40 custodians who keep the vast House spotless.

"Fishbait" also supervises three barbershops; the document and folding rooms, and a snack bar in both Democratic and Republican cloakrooms.

The part of his job "Fishbait" enjoys most is announcing each group of VIP guests at joint congressional sessions.

He belts out "The President of the United States," with such resonance that radio men leap back from their microphones.

Practically no one knows "Fishbait's" real name (it's William M. Miller) and he even campaigns under his nickname. He acquired his compelling moniker in a curious way. As a 15-year-old, he weighed a trifling 75 pounds and, hailing from a small Mississippi town on the Gulf of Mexico, he spent much time on the waterfront. Because of his smallishness he was called an assortment of names—"Alligatorbait," "Garbait," "Crabbait," "Shrimpbait"—but "Fishbait" finally stuck.

Now he's a sizable chunk of man.

How did he get that way? "I've been feeding at the public trough a long time," he says with a grin, "and besides I married a registered nurse."

Airmen of the Greenville Air Force Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, our soldiers, sailors, and airmen have a first responsibility of performing their mission as servicemen. I think as a whole that they have a good record as citizens of the communities in which their bases are located. This is especially true at the Greenville Air Force Base at Greenville, Miss.

I am sure a major part of the credit for the fine record of good relations between the airmen at the Greenville Air Force Base and the citizens of the surrounding territory is due to the fine leadership of Col. Jasper N. Bell and the preceding base commanders as well as the local civic leaders who helped to establish liaison with the base.

There are many instances of the contributions which the airmen at the Greenville Air Force Base have made as good citizens of the city of Greenville, but I would like to mention at least four with which I am familiar. This story can best be told by clippings from the Clarksdale Press Register and the Greenville Delta Democrat Times, which follow:

BASE FOLK AMONG FINEST CITIZENS OF GREENVILLE

To the EDITOR:

This concerns relationships between the airbase and civilian personnel of the city of Greenville. In the past too many of us have regarded the Air Force as transients instead of citizens of our community. In my opinion, this is not true.

I would like to use, for an illustration, S. Sgt. Richard F. Gray, of Headquarters Squadron Section Wing. Sergeant Gray overheard a conversation between Mrs. Azar and myself regarding two destitute families in our city. Sergent Gray went back to the airbase, took the matter up with his associates, and brought in a quantity of groceries and clothing. This was to some families that he had never seen. I don't know who all contributed to this, but I do know that it cost them a considerable sum of money and effort.

Colonel Bell says that we should be proud of our Champion Air Base. I would like to say that I am not only proud of our Champion Air Base, but I am also very proud to live in a community with people like Sergeant Gray and his associates.

H. A. IRVINE,

Veterans Service Officer, Beppo-Arnold Knowles Post, American Legion.

BRAVERY AND HUMANITY

It's good to live in a world where a sergeant will rush into the children's ward of a burning hospital time and again, disregarding the personal danger, to help evacuate helpless youngsters.

And it's good to live in a world where a captain will streak across the State in a jet and back in less than an hour and a half, with officials at each end bending their efforts to speed a life-saving serum to a child who might otherwise die.

Both these rewarding stories were told this week. The first incident brought a much-deserved Soldiers' Medal for heroism beyond the call of duty to a Lelander, S. Sgt. William V. Carpenter.

The second one brought life to young Stanton Horne, 13, of Inverness, who lay critically ill in the King's Daughters Hospital, thanks to Capt. John C. Carson, III, and a multitude of others.

That the immediate plight of one small 13-year-old could throw the hospital medical staff, the Red Cross, the county sheriff's office, and two Air Force bases into high-geared action to save his life is something to make one proud to be an American.

BOLIVAR COUNTY HOUSEWIFE FINDS THERE ARE MANY WHO ARE WILLING TO HELP HER IN CRUCIAL FIGHT

SHELBY.—Mrs. Carl Savage, a farm housewife who lives between Shelby and Perthshire, has been given 61 pints of blood by

transfusion and continues to require it at the rate of a pint a week.

Yet she is fairly active, supervising the cooking and housework at her home. She doesn't look too strong, as might be imagined of a woman of 137 pounds who now weighs 92, but she is putting up a gallant fight against cancer.

She has even shown recent improvement, gaining 7 pounds in the last few weeks.

The encouragement Mrs. Savage has received from friends and relatives of Shelby, Perthshire, Gunnison, Cleveland, and other towns in north delta counties is illustrated by the many contributions of blood made on her behalf.

* * * * *

Mrs. Savage received her first blood transfusion September 19, 1957.

She underwent her first operation for cancer in January 1951. Another operation was required in July 1956.

* * * * *

An estimated 100 people have contributed blood for Mrs. Savage, including several friends of a brother, Maurice Powell, coach and junior high principal at Belzoni.

However after nearly all donors near her home had given blood, the Reverend J. Bradley Pope, pastor of the First Baptist Church at Shelby, wrote Congressman FRANK E. SMITH requesting help in locating servicemen in the area.

Representative SMITH wired Col. Jasper N. Bell, commanding officer of the Greenville Air Force Base, and the senior chaplain at the naval air station at Millington, for assistance.

Within 4 days of Pope's appeal to SMITH, the assistance of servicemen at both stations had been offered. Greenville responded first as Colonel Bell wired back that arrangements had been completed to furnish blood for Mrs. Savage as needed.

"Blood will be drawn by base hospital personnel from volunteer donors and shipped as required," the colonel said. "Thirteen have already volunteered and more anticipated as the need arises."

* * * * *

Two pints of blood are given Mrs. Savage every 2 weeks, with her last transfusion coming Friday.

Her gratitude liberally covers all the many donors who have helped her. While there is no end in sight of the blood she will need, there appears the same infinity of people ready to keep her in ample supply.

Wilkes-Barre Kiwanis Club Honors Former Mayor Charles N. Loveland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader-Evening News of January 8, 1959:

KIWANIS CITE CHARLES N. LOVELAND

In awarding a citation for outstanding community service to Charles Noyes Loveland at a dinner in Hotel Sterling tonight, Wilkes-Barre Kiwanis Club is taking cognizance of a career spanning six memorable decades he helped to shape. Today at 86, he is cast in the role of elder statesman, a local version of Herbert Hoover, whom he resembles in so many respects.

An attorney by profession and member of a colonial family with its roots deep in the soil of Connecticut, this native son followed the advice of Dr. Russell Conwell and found his Acres of Diamonds amid familiar scenes. As he heads for the century mark, he is able to look back, with satisfaction, on a life of service, studded with achievement and garnished with modesty.

It was back in 1894 that Wilkes-Barre first heard of Charles Loveland as a public benefactor. Fresh out of Yale University and only 22 years of age, he was studying law in the office of the late Henry Fuller when he organized the Boys' Club in the 14th ward. It was an auspicious start and a happy omen, for young men usually have their minds on other subjects when they are in the early twenties. But Charles Loveland was a stimulating exception to the rule.

Admitted to the bar of Luzerne County where he was to distinguish himself subsequently in civil practice, he answered the call of his country 2 years later when the Spanish-American War was declared. Back in civilian life, he plunged into a round of activities, lending a hand to such institutions and worthy causes as Georgetown Settlement, the children's guidance movement, Playground and Recreation Association, Wilkes-Barre General Hospital, Sutton Home for Men, Community Chest, and First Presbyterian Church.

It was inevitable that a man of his background and idealism should be induced to enter politics. It was as a member of city council and mayor of Wilkes-Barre that he was to make one of his most impressive contributions to the public welfare. He also served as solicitor to the board of education in Wilkes-Barre and to Laurel Run where he maintained a summer home.

This recital does not pretend to encompass the entire record of his activities, but to touch only on a few of the highlights. But it is enough to furnish an insight into the character of the man Kiwanis will acclaim tonight.

To be singled out for service by an organization, dedicated to service, is a rare distinction indeed and a fitting tribute to one who has given consistently of his time and talents to the betterment of Greater Wilkes-Barre over so long a period.

Charles N. Loveland, public servant and good citizen, is a worthy recipient of this honor, conferred only once before and, on that occasion, on William Sword, whose name in this decade has become a household word by virtue of his contribution to the rehabilitation of the city and its environs.

In saluting Mr. Loveland, the Times-Leader Evening News also would like to commend Wilkes-Barre Kiwanis Club for maintaining so high a standard in its 1959 selection for this civic recognition.

Reimbursement of the State of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD, under leave to extend my remarks, a memorandum dated June 5, 1958, in regard to H.R. 10443, 85th Congress, introduced by me. This memorandum was prepared for the Honorable JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, at his request, for use at the hearings on that bill. I have reintroduced the same bill, H.R. 827, of the present 86th Congress:

In order to provide for reimbursement of the expenditures of the various States in responding to requisitions for troops, Congress passed an act approved July 27, 1861, 12 Stat. 276, as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to pay to the governor of any State, or to his duly authorized agents, the costs, charges, and expenses properly incurred by such State for enrolling, subsisting, clothing, supplying, arming, equipping, paying, and transporting its troops employed in aiding to supress the present insurrection against the United States, to be settled upon proper vouchers, to be filed and passed upon by the proper accounting officers of the Treasury."

By resolution approved March 8, 1862, 12 Stat. 615, to assure prospective as well as retroactive application of this statute, Congress provided: "That the said act shall be construed to apply to expenses incurred as well after as before the date of the approval thereof."

Congress also provided by joint resolution approved March 19, 1862, 12 Stat. 616, as follows:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That if any State during the present rebellion shall make any appropriation to pay the volunteers of that State, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to accept the same, and cause it to be applied by the paymaster general to the payments designated by the legislative act making the appropriation, in the same manner as if appropriated by act of Congress; and also to make any regulations that may be necessary for the disbursement and proper application of such funds to the specific purpose for which they may be appropriated by the several States."

The following regulations pertaining to reimbursement of the expenditures of the States were promulgated by Secretary of the Treasury Chase:

"8. Bounties or donations to men, or their families, to induce men to volunteer, will not be recognized. Such bounties as may be authorized by law will be paid by the United States directly to the men authorized to receive them. Voluntary contributions, either by States or local corporations or by individuals, in aid of families of volunteers, etc., constitute no charge against the United States, and will not be refunded."

Congress viewed this legislation as sufficient authority to reimburse California for bounties and extra pay (see House report, pp. 46, 48, 49):

"It is not apparent how the requirements shown in section 8 of these rules necessarily flow from and are in accord with the intent of the act of Congress.

"If it is to be inferred from the interpretation put upon this act by the Secretary of the Treasury that the expenditures were not proper if they constituted bounties * * * such a conclusion cannot really follow from anything in the act itself * * *.

"The expenditure made by the State of California * * * was not a bounty in any proper sense.

"Had it not been for this particular paragraph 8 of the so-called Chase regulations, so narrowly interpreted, the legislation enacted by Congress on July 27, 1861, would have been sufficient long ago to have enabled the Secretary of the Treasury to have settled the requests for reimbursement on behalf of the State of California.

"It is only upon such a technicality presented under the so-called Chase regulations, narrowing and limiting the plain intent of

the act of 1861, that up to the present the State of California remains unreimbursed.

"Congress * * * swept aside this technical construction of the act of 1861 under the Chase regulations, which the Army officers themselves stated were unjust and inequitable to apply thereto."

The California Soldiers' Relief Fund was insufficient to cover all claims filed by its enlisted volunteers, and the California Legislature by an act approved March 31, 1866, Statutes of California, 1865–66, at 640, appropriated the additional sum of $550,000 for the payment of the claims of California volunteers accrued or to accrue under the provisions of the act of April 27, 1863, and the State treasurer was authorized and required to transfer that amount from the general fund to the solders' relief fund.

By an act approved March 31, 1866, Statutes of California, 1865–66, at 604, the California Legislature provided that the remainder of extra pay claims after the exhaustion of the additional appropriation of $550,000 should be paid out of the soldiers' bounty fund which was created by the legislation hereinafter referred to in finding No. 32.

EXTRA PAY TO VOLUNTEERS

Pursuant to said acts, the State of California expended the principal amount of $1,459,270.21 as extra pay to the California volunteers for their services in the United States Army. In addition, California expended $3,000 to print the relief or extra pay bonds.

By April 1864, the time was approaching when the enlistments of many volunteers raised in California in the early part of the war would expire. The California volunteers in the United States Army were occupying important stations throughout the Far West, and it was obvious that it was a matter of necessity to retain them in the service by reenlistment or to replace them with new recruits. Despite the provision for extra pay, it was difficult to obtain sufficient enlistments to meet the additional calls made on California by the Federal authorities.

The probability existed that unless volunteer enlistments increased, the national draft would have to be applied in California as it had been in the East. The threat of the draft failed to stimulate enlistments.

By an act approved April 4, 1864, Statutes of California, 1863–64, at 486, the California Legislature granted every soldier who should thereafter enlist as a California volunteer in the United States Army for 3 years, or during the war, a bounty of $160 in addition to any other pay or bounties to which the soldier might otherwise be entitled. To encourage reenlistments, it was further provided that a bounty of $140 be paid to every veteran soldier who had served more than 6 months in the United States Army, either honorably discharged therefrom or then serving therein, who reenlisted in any unit organized as a part of any quota of California.

To pay the bounties, the California Legislature created the soldiers' bounty fund by appropriating $2 million to be raised by issuance of bonds bearing interest at the rate of 7 percent per annum, redeemable July 1, 1884.

BOUNTY PAYMENTS TO VOLUNTEERS

The bounty payments made by the State of California pursuant to said act, amounted to the principal sum of $900,839.50.

INTEREST PAID ON EXTRA PAY AND BOUNTY INDEBTEDNESS

The interest paid by the State of California acts of April 27, 1863, and April 4, 1889, on the original relief (extra pay) and bounty bonds, issued pursuant to the California Acts of April 27, 1863, and April 4, 1864, to the date of their redemption or conversion at times prior to July 1, 1889, amounted to $302,364.60 on the relief bonds, and $366,206.26 on the bounty bonds, or a total of $668,570.86.

By an act approved April 2, 1870, Statutes of California, 1869–70, at 646, the California Legislature authorized the issuance of bonds known as the State funded debt bonds of 1873, to bear interest at the reduced rate of 6 percent per annum, for the purpose of liquidating and refinancing the funded indebtedness of the State. Pursuant to said act, and on January 2, 1873, various new bonds were exchanged for relief bonds to the extent of $239,500, and for bounty bonds to the extent of $605,000. Thereafter and until July 1, 1889, the State of California paid interest on such new bonds in the sum of $233,025 on the converted relief indebtedness and in the amount of $598,950 on the converted bounty indebtedness or a total of $831,975.

The total interest payments to July 1, 1889, on the relief and bounty indebtedness amounted to the sum of $1,500,545.86.

After July 1, 1899, and until July 2, 1945, when all of the State funded debt bonds of 1873 were redeemed, the State of California paid interest on the new bonds issued in exchange for the original relief and bounty bonds, to the extent of $789,693.34 on the relief indebtedness, and in the sum of $2,032,900.85 on the bounty indebtedness, or a total of $2,822,594.19.

The total interest paid by the State of California on all bonds covering the indebtedness incurred to finance the extra pay and bounty payments amount to $4,323,140.05.

By an act approved May 27, 1902 (32 Stat. 207, 235), Congress provided that the claim of the State of Nevada be reopened and reexamined by the Secretary of the Treasury. As authorized thereby, the Secretary transmitted the claim to the Court of Claims for determination of disputed questions of law. In its opinion of March 14, 1910 (45 C. Cts. 254, at 271–86), the court upheld the Chase regulations and decided that Nevada could not recover bounties paid to officers for securing enlistments, extra pay provided to the Nevada volunteers, or interest paid on moneys borrowed for those purposes.

Thereafter, by an act approved March 4, 1929 (45 Stat. 2378), Congress authorized by direct appropriation the payment of such claims of the State of Nevada.

CERTIFICATION BY THE TREASURER OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Exhibit A

Amount expended in recruiting California volunteers	$24,260.00
Amount expended in payment of adjutant general, etc	38,083.17
Amount expended in organizing volunteers	5,639.34
Amount expended in pay of volunteer officers	23,277.34
Amount expended in extra pay to enlisted men of California volunteers	1,459,270.21
Amount expended in bounty to enlisted men	900,839.50
Total expenses of volunteers	2,451,369.56
Amount expended in payment of interest on moneys borrowed to carry out the provisions of laws of the State of California enacted Apr. 27, 1863, and Apr. 4, 1864	1,500,545.86
Aggregate expenses incurred on account of volunteers, principal, and interest	3,951,915.42
Amount expended on account of militia	468,976.54
Grand total of expenses on account of volunteers and militia	4,420,891.96

Exhibit B

Interest paid on moneys borrowed through the sale of State bonds issued under acts of Legislature of California approved Apr. 27, 1863 and April 2, 1870; (period of interest payments, July 1, 1889–Sept. 25, 1950),[1] aggregate	$789,693.34
Interest paid on moneys borrowed through the sale of State bonds issued under acts of Legislature of California approved Apr. 4, 1864 and Apr. 2, 1870 (period of interest payments, July 1, 1889–Sept. 25, 1950),[1] aggregate	2,032,900.85
Discount on sale of State bonds issued under acts of Legislature of California approved Apr. 27, 1863, Mar. 18, 1864, Mar. 31, 1866, appropriating $1,459,270.21 for pay of troops; loss	100,512.00
Discount on sale of State bonds issued under acts of Legislature of California approved Apr. 4, 1864, appropriating $900,839.50 for pay of troops (recruits and reenlistment); loss	217,510.00
Total loss on account of discounts at which original bonds were sold and on account of the discount at which new bonds were given in exchange for original bonds	318,022.00

Recapitulation

Volunteers and militia, expenditures and advances	$4,420,891.96
Discounts on sales and exchanges of State bonds	318,022.00
Interest paid on moneys borrowed through sale of State bonds, July 1, 1889–Sept. 25, 1950[1]	2,822,594.19
Amount repaid by the United States since July 1, 1889	None
Final balance due State of California	7,561,508.15

[1] All actual interest payments ceased on July 2, 1945, being the date of redemption of all bonds affecting this matter, therefore above calculations reflect actual interest payments to July 2, 1945.

The Honorable and Logical Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, last week, as we know, there was introduced in both bodies of the Congress a joint resolution for an amendment of the Constitution to reaffirm the rights of the States and local governments to administer their school systems. This resolution has been received with great interest not only in the Congress but throughout the Nation. Among the significant comments on this resolution have been editorials in the Nashville Banner, the Nashville Tennesseean, and the Wash-

ington Post. Under unanimous consent, I include these editorials in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorials follow:

[From the Nashville Banner, Jan. 28, 1959]

RIGHT, SENATOR TALMADGE: AS CONSTITUTION PROVIDES, LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE

In his proposed constitutional amendment to fix, beyond any question, the area of public school authority, Senator HERMAN TALMADGE goes to the heart of the school issue.

The stipulation sought is neither segregation nor integration; it provides simply that administrative controls shall be vested in the hands of the individual States and their subdivisions—which means that the decision would be made there and not in any blanket decree handed down by Washington or a five-man majority of the Supreme Court.

Further, he proposes that this decision of where the controls belong be submitted to the people of the United States and rendered by them. Congress should need no reminder that Government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed; and no consent has been given to divest the States of the authority and rights in question.

The seven Southern Senators joining Senator TALMADGE in this step to codify by formal action a principle that was honored until the judicial trespass of 1954 occurred, do not stand alone in challenging that departure from the constitutional concept, or in insisting that an issue of such magnitude is for the people to decide. Not only other Southern Congressmen, but Constitution-minded lawmakers of other regions, must see the merit of it.

It is, as the author of this amendment declares, a way to avert the unparalleled catastrophe of widespread sehool closings.

It is not the first suggestion to settle by the constitutional method the question of where these controls shall remain.

Eighteen months ago, on July 30, 1957, the Banner proposed the following amendment: "The public school system of these United States is the property of the States individually, and subject in all particulars exclusively to State and local jurisdiction."

The accompanying editorial declared the belief that that stipulation belongs as the 23d amendment to the United States Constitution, and that a resolution to that effect calling for such amendment should be drawn by Congress for immediate submission to the people.

It would, the Banner said, "Define beyond doubt and arbitrary evasion, an area of authority historically reserved until—wholly without precedent, constitutional warrant, or legislative assent—the Supreme Court divested State and local governments of that jurisdiction."

It was further emphasized that the amendment would in no sense bar integration of schools where that is the wish of the States. They would have that right, exactly as they have had it all along.

The Talmadge resolution goes no less to the heart of the matter, providing equally the right of the people to decide for themselves, State by State.

Actually it would incorporate in the Constitution—as an unarguable safeguard—the point of law already validated 10 times in the legislation extending statehood, the latest case being Alaska.

The Banner repeats, the American people are confronted by a question demanding answer now. Congress is aware, surely, of a responsibility to the electorate in a matter thus far evading the sanction of legislative enactment.

For the sake of principle and security in a primary realm of concern to every right-thinking citizen, the amendment proposed is needed. It would provide effective and adequate guarantee of school stewardship where it belongs, where historically it has resided, but where right now it is increasingly endangered.

Senator TALMADGE and his cosponsors have furnished a mean sof redress. It should be swiftly adopted by Congress, and submitted to the people of 49 States to deside for themselves.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Jan. 28, 1959]

COURT'S CRITICS OPEN EYES TO HIGHER POWER AT LAST

Southern Senators who propose a constitutional amendment which would assure States and their subdivisions full control of education—and thus override the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court—are now getting down to fundamentals.

The amendment as introduced by Senator TALMADGE of Georgia would declare that "nothing contained in this Constitution shall be construed to deny the residents thereof (meaning the States) the right to determine for themselves" the manner of administering the schools.

As far as the sponsors are concerned, this is a segregation amendment which comes close on the heels of new court blows to the theory of massive resistance to the present law.

Whether the Talmadge plan, cosponsored by Senator HARRY F. BYRD and six others, will ever get approval of two-thirds of both Houses and ratification by three-fourths of the States is a matter of speculation. The odds would seem to be against it.

But in advancing the plan with such vigor, the backers have gone far towards undermining their claim that the Nation is at the mercy of nine capricious men on the Supreme Court or, as Mr. TALMADGE puts it, "the whims of whatever five men happen to constitute a majority of the Court."

Reference is made to the disruptive laws applying to every school in the Nation. But the fact remains that rulings of the Court with which the American citizenship is not in sympathy are always subject to change by ordered processes.

New members have been added to the high Court since 1954, but they too have shown their concurrence in the historic ruling of that year.

Coupling the new development with the recent State and Federal court decisions in Virginia which have left that State floundering for a way out, those who are pledged to fight integration to the last now show awareness of the fact that the Supreme Court is always answerable to the people and their representatives.

Espousal of a constitutional change, in the opinion of this newspaper, has always been the logical course for those opposed to the integration ruling.

By inference, Mr. TALMADGE and his associates are saying that they are willing to leave the issue up to the Nation as a whole, which is certainly an entirely new approach. Perhaps they believe that sentiment against the Court has been built up to a point where there is a real chance of success.

Changing the Constitution as it applies to public schools would inevitably bring about the abrogation of other clauses of that document which have had traditional acceptance. Such a change can cause controversy and debate, and the guess is that it will.

In any case, however, a step has been taken to apply the yardstick of public opinion to the integration rulings of the courts—and especially the Supreme Court—with full assurance that decisions of lawmakers and citizens will prevail, as they should in this democracy. That is the reasoned way.

Earlier acceptance of this course would have prevented the futile fight over interposition and the succession of other court rebuffs which culminated last week in a double rejection of Virginia's segregation laws.

The Federal court said that Virginia cannot by State action close schools in some communities and keep them open in others; that it cannot by local action close some schools in a community and keep others open in that same community.

And the State supreme court decreed that Virginia cannot close public schools—except temporarily—without amending the State constitution, which requires a State system of public education. In addition, it cannot withhold State funds from a school, even though it becomes racially mixed; it cannot establish State control over school funds raised by local taxes, take control of schools from local boards and vest the control in the Governor, or use funds withheld from local schools to finance payment of tuition grants to pupils for use in attending segregated schools.

Considering these developments in Virginia, which was supposed to be showing the rest of the South how to evade the 1954 ruling, it is not surprising that a broader and more direct approach to the whole question at last has won favor.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 30, 1959]

THE HONORABLE WAY

Senator TALMADGE and seven southern colleagues have chosen an altogether proper and dignified means of registering their disagreement with the Supreme Court school desegregation decision. In a commendably moderate speech Mr. TALMADGE has proposed a constitutional amendment to establish the exclusive right of the States to determine the manner of administration of schools. In his preamble the Georgia Senator speaks of the terrible tragedy of the closing of a public school system, and adds that "the American concept of universal education, more than any other factor, is responsible for the greatness which this Nation has achieved."

Especially notable is Mr. TALMADGE'S recognition that the Supreme Court decision "is an accomplished fact which will remain so until it either is reversed by the Court itself or is nullified or modified by Congress or the people." Of course, Congress has no power to nullify or modify a Supreme Court decision on a basic constitutional question. Mr. TALMADGE speaks, however, of his dedication to seeking reversal of the decision "by every lawful means." This comes close to an acknowledgment that the decision is the supreme law of the land.

We hope that Mr. TALMADGE is wrong when he says that the overwhelming majority of people in the South will neither accept nor submit to the forced implementation of that decision—for the Court has indicated many means of gradual adjustment. And we have no thought that if the amendment is put to a vote either in Congress or among the State legislatures requisite majorities will elect to overrule the Supreme Court in its interpretation of the 14th amendment.

Nevertheless, this is the honorable way for those who disagree with the Court decision to make their case—to seek to amend the Constitution through the established process. If they should win two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and three-fourths of the State legislatures to their cause, no one could reasonably object. The obverse of this situation, of course, is that if they should fail, their obligation to respect the decision would become even clearer. At any rate, Mr. TALMADGE has sought to raise consideration of the problem to a legal plane from the muck of defiance and closed schools.

Dr. Adolph Stone Describes Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of States is proceeding to Europe this week to discuss the problem and much more will be heard in months to come about the controversial city of Berlin. The Journal of Geography for November 1958, carried an interesting article about the city by Dr. Adolf Stone which provides considerable data helpful in understanding the situation there. Dr. Stone's article follows:

BERLIN [1]

(By Adolf Stone)

"Berlin is the most interesting city in Europe." This statement refers to a paradox unequalled any place else in the world. The capital of defeated Germany under the 1945 Potsdam Agreement became a joint trust of the then four Allied Powers, the United States of America, France, Great Britain, and the U.S.S.R., whereas all other German lands were divided into four occupation zones. Since the Red army took over all German territories east of the Elbe River, Berlin became a political island surrounded on all sides by what the West calls the Soviet Zone and what the East has designated as the German Democratic Republic.

The events following this partition are well known. The cooperation between the three western allies a the U.S.S.R. came to an end in 1948. A Soviet attempt to swallow Berlin by cutting all roads and all communications was met by the historic airlift, or better airbridge, as the Germans called it. For 11 months, from June 1948 to May 1949, more than 2 million Berliners were kept alive by air missions of peace. When the blockade ended on May 12, 1949, two worlds began to consolidate in a space of only 338.3 square miles, one patterned after American democracy and the other after Russian communism. Berlin today is the most interesting city in Europe because it is an outpost of the West in a Red sea.

LOCATION

Two factors account for the rise of Berlin: (1) Its geographical location; and (2) the history of the Hohenzollern dynasty. The city lies about half way between the Elbe and the Oder, the two important waterways which open Central Europe to North Sea and Baltic Sea traffic (fig. 2).

The original town was at a crossing point of a large west-east glacial depression. Swamps, lakes, and small rivers, such as the Havel and the Spree, still marks the path of the retreating ice and stretch all the way to the 700-mile long Elbe and the 500-mile long Oder. Thus, a combination of central location and of navigation facilities to the open sea are natural growth factors in this city of several harbor basins and of famous water sport facilities.

Bodies of water are so frequent, even in the metropolitan area, that a surprising 20 percent of Berlin is still in parks, each spreading around one, or several, waterfilled depressions. Best known as the Grunewald (Green Forest) and the Tiergarten (Game Garden). The few driftpiles, none exceeding 350 feet, in this flatland of sands and marshes became so prominent that they are reflected in district names, such as Kreuzberg and Schoeneberg (berg meaning mountain).

Climatic charts, too, show that Berlin is a meeting place, namely of continental influences from the East and of maritime influences from the West. There is much irregularity in the length of summer and winter. Temperatures climb as high as 85° F. in July and fall to 15° F. in January. Annual precipitation is around 30 inches with considerable snowfall in winter. Berliners consider their climate the invigorating variety. It might be pointed out that even in the densely populated center rift, air pollution is only slight due to ample winds.

GROWTH

Berlin was named in 1307 after its feudal lord Albrecht, the Bear. The city's symbol ever since is the Bear displayed on city seal and flag, also on all products made in this city of the bear.

Growth, thereafter, came step by step. The bridle trail of the Hohenzollern Kurfuerst (Prince elector) to his hunting lodge, for instance, is now the fashionable boulevard Kurfuerstendamn. What was the property of a princess developed into one of Berlin's largest districts, Charlottenburg. A Friedrich (Frederic), like in Friedrich Strasse, became king and thereafter turned the place into his royal capital. Finally, Chancellor Bismarck proclaimed his King Wilhelm (William) in 1871 the new German emperor. With this act, Berlin took a seat among the great centers of the world and words from the Wilhelm-Strasse were as much listened to as those of Downing Street or Pennsylvania Avenue. Unfortunately, the imperial government of this second Reich paid less heed to city planning than to the building of the two pillars of a unified Germany, the civil service and the army.

To take care of the ever-swelling population, a conglomerate of unsightly apartment houses and streets grew up. Historic homes in the old center gave way to new office and business structures and Berlin's core area became known officially as "the city." The Nazis with their coordination of party and government brought new armies of functionaries and with them more "city" construction. Berlin's population in 1943 had reached 4,489,000 and Hitler's chief of construction and armament, Albert Speer, prepared it for a ten million hub of central Europe's highways, railroads and airlines.

THE PIECES

Then came the catastrophe. The unfortunate, but under the circumstances unavoidable, allied air bombardments of 1943–45 were followed by the fury of Hitler's last ditch fight in the streets of Berlin. German officials claim that the Red army, after achieving victory, in the months of uncontested rule from May to July 1945, continued the destruction and also dismantled 70 percent of the city's industrial installations.

In July 1945, the already mentioned four-power military government took charge of a city of ruins. The 2,807,000 remaining Berliners, after evacuees and casualties, literally dug out from the rubble. Clearing and salvage teams, among them many women, were the first signs of new life and the most needed tools and machines were put together in a manner in which American boys build engines out of junked parts.

With the Allied Kommandantura as the highest echelon, each ally was, and still is, repsonsible for one sector of the city. Southwestern Berlin, an area of 81 square miles, is under U.S. guardianship. In 1949, the three Western allies began to consolidate their total area of 184.5 square miles into a free Berlin, while the 153.8 square miles of Soviet sector under the catching name, "Democratic Berlin," was being integrated into communistic East Germany. West and East now are in such proximity that in some instances a street is policed by communists while the houses facing this street are under Western control with Western policemen walking their beat from basement to basement.

The unfortunate city has more governments than any other place in the world and everything exists in duplicate from public utilities to fire departments, and from mail to street cleaning. No telephone connects East and West Berlin and the only joint operation is the sewage system. Yet, commuting within the total area of Berlin is still possible except for customs and currency control at the sector boundaries.

In spite of confusion and treaty restrictions the three Western allies managed to guide free Berlin to self-government. The combined West sector is now governed by a freely elected senate. A proportional number of senate seats are still open for delegates of the East sector if, and whenever, the Soviets allow free balloting. West Berlin has also been proclaimed a land (state) since West Germany is a Federation of Laender. However, Berlin's delegates to the Federal parliament (Bundestag) have only a voice and no vote. All Federal legislation requires separate legislative processing in Berlin. Thus, free Berlin is federated with West Germany, but full integration must wait until the "Limitations of Allied Authorities" are removed. This is the often referred to difference between Berlin's de facto and de jure status. This respect of the West for treaties coupled with Berlin's present geography makes the restoration of its political functions at least temporarily impossible. That Berlin some day will again be the capital (Hauptstadt) of 67 million Germans is vouched in the new West Berlin constitution. But, while the West can offer only a promise, the East simply moved the communistic government of East Germany into its Berlin sector. In order to avoid misunderstanding, the West does not identify this government with Berlin but only with the suburb in which it resides, Pankow.

ECONOMIC STRUGGLE

Berlin's economic recovery is impressive but somewhat slower than that of West Germany. The obvious reasons are (1) a long lasting blockade; (2) the island location; and (3) the split of a prewar economic unit. Fortunately, the west as well as the east considers the area a "show window" for their respective economic strength. Therefore, Government aid in the form of loans, outright grants, priorities, and preference rates lubricates progress in both camps. Posters on construction projects in West Berlin display the United States and the German colors announcing that the work is financed by GARIOA (Government Aid and Relief in Occupied Areas).

The problem of rubble disposal was solved in an ingenious manner. Manmade mountains of junk were smiply landscaped, thus giving Berlin additional recreation areas. The new apartment houses and commercial structures are of the modern skyscraper variety which, at least, is not worse than Wilhelminian or Goering architecture. Up to 1957, 120,000 dwellings had been reconstructed in West Berlin against a total loss of 300,000.

Prewar Berlin was not only the German captial but also the country's leading trade center and largest industrial producer. Thus a large pool of skilled labor and management was available to be put to work. Already in 1945 most of these talents gave a clear vote of confidence in the west by gathering in the west sectors. This made up for the disadvantage that most prewar industrial sites were east of the new boundaries. As in the field of politics, duplication was frequently

[1] The author wishes to express his grateful appreciation for the contribution of much unpublished information by the (1) Free University of Berlin, Institute of Geography, (2) U.S. mission, Berlin-Dahlem.

necessary. For instance, West Berlin was plunged into darkness when the Soviets staged their walkout in 1948. Machines for power production had to be airlifted. Today, a new steampower plant produces sufficient electricity, but a lack of switching facilities occasionally brings hours of paralysis to entire districts. As of 1957, close to 1 million West Berliners were again gainfully employed and about 100,000 listed as unemployed. The constant flow of refugees from the East makes reduction of the latter figure very difficult. Imports into West Berlin, also proportionally declining, still exceed exports, with meats and dairy products leading the list. The precarious food situation is underlined by the fact that the people maintain victory gardens throughout the metropolitan area. Other essential imports are industrial raw materials and coal, the city's major source of energy.

Since almost all the needed goods come from West Germany, a long haul through communistic territory represents the lifeline of this outpost of the West. Transportation is two-thirds by truck with rail and water carriers sharing the remainder.

Four industries account for the bulk of exported goods: (1) Electrical products come from the world-famous plants of A.E.G., Siemens, Telefunken, Osram; (2) machines are shipped from the assembly lines of Borsig and Schwartzkopff, and machine tools from Adrema and Rotaprint; (3) optical instruments from Zeiss-Ikon and from Oskania are known everywhere; (4) chemical industries achieved world repute with the pharmaceutical products of Schering and with Europe's answer to nylon, called perlon. Others are clothing, beer (Berliner Kindel), chocolate (Sarotti), and pianos (Bechstein). It seems reasonable that the same carriers, which bring imports to the city, take the readymade goods out on the same politically precarious roads. While West Germany is West Berlin's most important customer, a U.S. instigated Berlin marketing council and an annual industrial fair boost the city's exports to other Europeans as well as to Latin America and to the United States.

Berlin's biggest problem that seemingly cannot be solved pending a summit conference is transportation. Logically, but also unfortunately, railroads, including Berlin's interurban trains are communistically operated. This rail hub of prewar Central Europe has now only one major terminal, which of course is the Ost (East) bahnof. Within the city, streetcars and buses stop at the sector boundary, while the subways go through under special agreements. Traffic to and from Berlin is restricted to only a few gaps in the Iron Curtain which the Soviets agreed to keep open, some canals, four highways and a 20-mile-wide air corridor. Since ground transportation is constantly harassed, Berliners like Americans take to the air. Tempelhof airport, the island's gateway to the world, is getting too small for the ever-increasing two-way flow of Berliners and their friends.

Possibly counteracting anxiety over a shoestring lifeline as the basis of everybody's livelihood is a renaissance in culture. West Berlin has again many theaters, an opera house and a central library which is an American contribution and, therefore, named the American Memorial Library. There are two schools of university rank, the Technical Institute in Charlottenburg and the Free University in the former village of Dahlem and grouped around the new Henry Ford Hall. Dahlem, also an end station in the urban transportation system, seems to be developing into the new culture center. Latest display of the Dahlem Museum is the world famous head of Nefertite.

EAST BERLIN

Little dependable material is available on East Berlin's economic recovery. Several unpleasant lawsuits show that East Berlin products are sold in neutral countries under the same prewar tradenames which the West tries to revive. The basic issue seems to be whether the name goes with the original factory site or with the producing company. The state-owned East Berlin industries produce the same type of goods in which West Berlin excels, namely, electrical equipment, machines, and optical instruments. Leading customers are the countries of the communistic bloc, and also neutral nations. The quality of East Berlin's technical products is good. Textiles, especially clothing, on the other hand are definitely inferior. In addition, many items such as fuel, are still rationed. Of course there is no unemployment recorded in a socialized economy. But, actual purchasing power is reduced by rationing, complete lack of many items, and mainly by the poor quality of the articles used in daily living. Most amazing, but also revealing, is the continued food rationing and the complete disappearance of foods, such as potatoes, from the market from time to time. This, in spite of the fact that East Berlin geographically is part of East Germany and that East Germany always has been the traditional farm area of prewar Germany.

Constructionwise, the much proclaimed showpiece of the Communists is the mile-long Stalin allee, a Moscow style district with 2,200 flats, all in eight to nine story apartment houses with shops, movies, and restaurants on the ground floors. The retail center, with all stores completely nationalized in the H. O. Handels (trade) Organization, is the Alexanderplatz. Nearby is the restored old city hall, now headquarters of the communistic city administration. Other communistic additions are a palatial Soviet embassy, some gymnasiums and similar mass assembly facilities.

Much disputed is the Marx-Engels Platz, a huge parade ground like Moscow's Red Square, for which the former imperial palace had to give way. A stupendous Russian War Memorial in Berlin-Treptow and the Red Army monument at the edge of the boundary line, but on Western territory, complete the picture of mostly ruins interspersed with some life. The guards at this monument and at the prison for top war criminals, located in West Berlin-Spandau, are the only armed Russian soldiers, anywhere in the world, permitted to stand on Western soil.

EAST MEETS WEST

East and West now face each other in the center of the city which, as the location of Hitler's last resistance, became one huge field of dead rubble. Most of it is now under Russian control with the remainder in the British sector. To every Berliner this area around the symbolic Brandenburg Gate is synonymous with the much desired political functions. Both sides talk much about reconstruction of this historic central district, but so far very little has been done. East of the Brandenburg Gate, Berlin's avenue of parades, Unter den Linden, has been replanted with several hundred Linden trees and work is proceeding on the Gate itself. West of it, and in free Berlin, the restoration of the Reichstag is still in the blueprint stage. Further west, the Tiergarten Park is filled again with 1 million young trees. Part of it, the English Garden, is a gift of the British people. The West's most ambitious undertaking halfway close to the center is the reconstruction of the Hansa district. Here, grasping a unique opportunity, architects of many countries have each designed his own version of modern living quarters, shops, and churches. The entire 8,000 flat project is handled as an International Architectural Exhibit.

Standing on the main east-west thoroughfare, famous Potsdamer Square, even the casual observer can see why so many have defected from the east via the Berlin escape hatch. Whereas the east side of the square is dead rubble, the west side is covered with wooden stalls and a veritable carnival of all imaginable merchandise. Anybody can buy anything in West Berlin and, in spite of an unfavorable currency exchange, East Berliners have become ingenious at smuggling.

At the root of this western superiority lies an American inspired reform of the West Germany currency, which included West Berlin. Now the international exchange rate is one west mark (DM) for four east marks. To avoid hardships, special provisions have been made for West Berliners who work in the east sector and vice versa. Official Exchange Bureaus in West Berlin permit unrestricted spending of east marks in free Berlin. The east sector, on the other hand, accepts west marks only at the unrealistic rate of one to one and prohibits the import of east marks to all but the holders of communistic identification cards.

THE PEOPLE

A large share of the credit for the city's rise from the ashes goes to the people of Berlin. With 3,400,000 inhabitants in 1957—2,200,000 in the west and 1,200,000 in the east—the city is still 1 million short of the 1943 population figure. But almost the entire increase of 600,000 people since 1945 has been in West Berlin, whereas in the east sector, the influx of administrative personnel is equaled by the exodus of mostly young people. The free Berliner's confidence in his city's present, as well as in its future, is shown everywhere in the crowded sidewalk cafes, in stores, factories and at the ballot box.

American aid for this Mecca of freedom totals about 1 billion dollars. Since the money comes from sales of surplus foods in Germany, it is no direct burden on the U.S. taxpayer. These mutual security funds are strictly loans with the provision that payments are to be reinvested. So far $150 million have been repaid. From the economic, and from every other point of view, the American citizen could have made no sounder investment anywhere in the world.

Address by Hon. Richard M. Simpson at 73d Annual Meeting of the American Tariff League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able and conscientious Members of this body was the recent recipient of an annual award by one of America's oldest business organizations. On October 29, 1958, the American Tariff League awarded its annual scroll of honor to Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania.

We are all aware, I am sure, of Congressman SIMPSON'S consistent devotion to the maintenance of a strong and prosperous America and his almost prophetic concern with the problems that occur in the economic area. He has been an active proponent of all measures directed toward a stable industrial base for our country. He has for years devoted his energies to the creation of a sound, equitable taxation

system and has just as vigorously opposed the perpetuation of unsound fiscal policies.

On the occasion of the Tariff League award, Mr. SIMPSON delivered an address, since reprinted in Vital Speeches of the Day, calling attention to the new crises ahead in world trade. I heartily recommend this speech to all Members as a portion of what we can expect in the days and years ahead.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the league's award as well as the text of his address. They follow:

THE AMERICAN TARIFF LEAGUE ANNUAL SCROLL OF HONOR, 1958

The American Tariff League, Inc., at its 73d annual meeting salutes the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, U.S. Representative from the 18th Congressional District of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, who has served continuously, beginning with the 75th Congress in 1937, in the interest of a sound, strong, and prosperous United States of America.

Representative SIMPSON has devoted his legislative energies to the perfecting of his country's foreign trade and tax laws in ways that would assure the growth of a dynamic economy and would prevent the corrosive effect of unsound fiscal policies. His high position on the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and the friendly respect in which he is held by his fellow House Members of all parties have combined to make his voice important in Government councils. In addition, his own party in the House has demonstrated its regard and confidence in Representative SIMPSON by entrusting to him for several years the leadership in their political campaign efforts.

Representative SIMPSON in the last four Congresses has courageously lent his name and prestige, and gave unstintingly of his efforts, to legislation designed to afford adequate safeguards to American industry faced with injury due to the workings of our foreign trade policy. As a result, these safeguards now have an assured place in our laws.

In respect and appreciation for his great services to the American economy, and with its best wishes for his future, expanding role in legislative and Government affairs, The American Tariff League, Inc., on October 29, 1958, unanimously resolves that this scroll of honor be presented to Representative SIMPSON.

WORLD TRADE: NEW CRISES AHEAD

(Talk by Hon. RICHARD M. SIMPSON at 73d annual meeting of American Tariff League)

I thank you sincerely for this splendid award—and for the singular honor of your friendship.

Your sincere good will is reassuring, particularly to one so fresh from the heat of congressional controversy.

It is always reassuring to see again that Americans really care, that they are truly interested in wise government, and in the people they send to Washington to serve their highest and most honorable interests.

As you well know, many of us differ as to just what these honorable interests are.

Are they, for example, best served by yielding a large measure of sovereign economic authority to a multinational body, in which our voice is only one of many?

Are they best served by inviting American manufacturers to take their capital and machines and jobs to other shores, as the most effective way to meet and beat the competition for the home market here?

And are they best served by inviting others to invade the world's most productive economy on terms that are clearly harmful to many of our industries and workers, terms lacking minimum wage guarantees, child labor prohibitions, and beyond the purview of our antitrust laws?

I don't think so. I know you don't think so. I know many other Americans don't think so.

I know something else, and that is that in the years just ahead a great many more Americans are going to find that they don't think so, either.

Far from being resolved in 1958, as some would have you believe, the great issues of international trade will intensify. Many critical decisions remain to be made in capitals around the world.

Foreign trade, moreover, is quite likely to occupy a prominent position on the agenda of the 86th Congress. Let me recount a few of the reasons why.

Issue No. 1 concerns a legal interpretation of Executive authority under the Trade Agreements Act. The Customs Court of New York has seriously challenged the supposed discretion of the Executive to modify recommendations of the Tariff Commission as he sees fit.

If this ruling is upheld, the Executive will be required either to accept or reject Tariff Commission findings as they stand, and he will be required to act within the time limit specified for these cases by Congress.

This issue may have to be resolved by legislation. If the Customs Court decision is sustained by higher tribunals, legislation is the likely recourse for those who seek to maintain Executive freewheeling in trade policy.

But no matter how the litigation ends, the case already has crystallized doubts in the minds of many, doubts which may be thoroughly explored and discussed in the next Congress.

Issue No. 2 calls up again the question of OTC, the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation. Has the idea really been discarded by its advocates? Have they really found a way to reach the same goal by detouring around Congress, as the press has suggested?

This speculation grows out of what was said—and not said—by a leading United States delegate to the latest meeting of GATT. He said the United States was amenable to creating "stronger permanent delegations" to GATT in Geneva, presumably so that these delegations might assume duties previously foreseen for OTC. But he did not mention OTC.

This is still a subject of raw speculation. Those in a position to know the answers have remained silent. Meanwhile, the trial balloon is aloft, waiting to be pushed one way or the other by public opinion.

I need not remind you that two Congresses have rejected the principles of OTC. My conviction is that Congress will continue to reject OTC, camouflaged or otherwise.

Now, issue No. 3. And that is GATT itself, to which I have been a delegate. In my opinion, it is showing signs of wear and tear. Today it is challenged by a trading concept, the European Common Market, which is a contradiction of its basic principles.

There is talk of a watchdog committee to protect the interests of GATT's non-European members doing business in the Common Market. At the same time there is talk of new Common Market agreements elsewhere in the world.

The question is, where does the American manufacturer fit in? Equally important, where does the American workingman fit in?

A few weeks ago, at a meeting here in New York, the president of a large corporation told a group of chemical producers that only one course is open to American industry, and that is to establish plants in Western Europe.

He said this was the only way that American companies could compete in the Common Market and its system of "monopolistic free enterprise," to quote his own words.

Then, just last week, a spokesman for the State Department said the same thing. And that is particularly ironic, since it was by the same source that we were assured only recently that the Trade Agreements Act would strengthen our bargaining hand and prevent just such a situation.

There are other ironies attached to GATT. You probably noticed that the British delegate accused us of "bad behavior" in our trading policies. He was particularly incensed by the Administration's lead-zinc quota, and, as usual, he rebuked us for continuing a system of agricultural quotas which serve to stabilize our domestic farm market and safeguard the standard of living of our farm population.

He said the United States should take the lead in chopping down trade barriers and fostering the flow of goods between nations.

On the other hand, when it was believed that large profits were waiting behind the Iron Curtain for those who would come and get them, American leadership and considerations of Free World defense were shunted aside by these same allies.

Over our objections, the controls on strategic shipments to the Communists were peeled back at the insistence of merchants in Britain and other Western countries.

It boils down to this:

When it comes to sacrifice, the United States is exhorted by Sir David Eccles, Chief of the British Board of Trade, to furnish the momentum.

When it come to opportunity even the dubious opportunity of doing business with international warloards, the United States is asked not to stand in the way of progress.

We are used to this, of course. As acknowledged leader of the Free World, and as the pillar of Free World security, perhaps it is no more than right that we should give more than we expect to receive.

The fact is, we have accepted this burden of self-sacrifice, at tremendous cost to our citizens and our economy, even while attempting to disguise it as "reciprocity."

These are simply a few of the issues, the unsettled questions, facing us in the field of foreign commerce. There are others—the Soviet economic offensive, for example.

That the Soviets can severly disrupt world markets at their pleasure has been proven to us all. By dumping tin and aluminum on a large scale, the Communist provoked market upheavals that brought hardship to large and small nations alike.

In fact, these tactics proved so successful that they have been adopted by the Chinese Communists who are flooding the Far East with slave-labor goods, to the distress of Japan and other countries.

Both Houses of Congress, through their respective Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committees, will, I expect, investigate this problem in the next session.

Policies bearing on United States private investment abroad will be studied by a subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee.

Furthermore, the new Congress will be watching for signs that changes in the Trade Agreements Act of 1958 are accomplishing what they set out to do; namely, to provide a greater measure of stability and equality for domestic industries and workers vulnerable to excessive imports.

I realize you were not satisfied when Congress enacted this law. I was not satisfied, either, because several improvements that we worked for were rebuffed.

But in perspective we must recognize that important gains were made.

For the first time in a quarter of a century Congress holds statutory powers to review Executive decisions in escape clause

cases. These powers are not easily invoked—yet they are a long step in the right direction.

In addition, peril point procedures were tightened up. The range of relief available under the escape clause was broadened. The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization was given greater authority to curb trade practices harmful to national security.

Obviously, these are not cure-all measures. Important gains, yes, as far as they go. And certainly they reflect credit not only on the 85th Congress, but on the American Tariff League and other responsible groups and individuals whose support was essential and decisive.

Yet you know and I know the struggle is far from over. In view of the long list of imponderables confronting our policy-makers, and the long list of unresolved issues, you might say the struggle has hardly begun.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of continued vigilance—on the part of America's industries, American labor, American consumers; and on the part of those they select to encourage a healthy, expanding economy by intelligent governmental action.

The need for responsible participation in a vital public issue is still strong. Already we are witnessing new currents of alarm among industries once unconcerned by this issue.

This underscores my belief that more and more industries, more and more workers, more and more Americans in all walks of life will be sharing our concern in the years just ahead.

Again, I thank you for this generous award, for your warm hospitality, and for inviting this expression of a firm and mutual faith.

Legislation Clarifying and Overcoming Certain Supreme Court Decisions Is Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the fourth in a series of bills to clarify or overcome Supreme Court decisions in some of the more aggravating cases, specifically including bills dealing with the Mallory, Sullivan, Yates, and Nelson cases.

I have previously introduced H.R. 491 dealing with the redefinition of the term "organize" which was necessitated by the Yates decision which ruled, in effect, that it is legal to organize Communist cells with the avowed purpose of teaching and preaching the overthrow of the Government of the United States. This bill passed the House unanimously on final passage but failed in the Senate during the last session.

I also introduced H.R. 488 dealing with the Mallory case which had the effect of permitting a confessed Negro rapist to go free in Washington, D.C., by ruling his confession as inadmissible solely because the accused was held for 7½ hours between his arrest and arraignment—with no elements of coercion whatsoever present. My bill would make such admissions admissible in evidence.

In addition, I introduced H.R. 492 dealing with the Nelson case which invalidated the Pennsylvania State antisedition statute simply because the Federal Smith act, the antisedition statute, was enacted on a national basis, and despite the fact that nowhere did it state that it was the intention of Congress that the Federal act should supersede or preempt the State statute on the same subject matter. My bill would prevent such implied preemption by the Supreme Court in the future and is similar to H.R. 3 introduced by Mr. SMITH of Virginia.

Today, I introduced the fourth bill, dealing with the Sullivan case in which the Court ruled that gamblers could deduct from their income tax expenses incurred in carrying out their illegal operations, which, together with the Mallory case, gives the criminal licenses to commit crimes by stymying law enforcement efforts. My bill would eliminate this deduction.

It is my fervent hope that this Congress will more readily accept its responsibility in these fields of fighting communism and strengthening our criminal law enforcement than did the 85th Congress which failed to enact any of the first three bills, the fourth resulting from a subsequent ruling of the Court. As the ranking minority Member in the 86th Congress of the Special Subcommittee on Supreme Court Decisions, of the Judiciary Committee, a subcommittee that did much fine and constructive work in this field, it is my hope that our efforts will bear fruit this session.

American Public Opinion and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, with so much evidence these days of superficial thinking and action relative to international communism, it is refreshing and heartening to receive an unsolicited and sensible appraisal of the Communist threat from a rank and file citizen.

Recently, I received such a communication from a constituent of mine in the Third District of Michigan, Mr. William Sweeney, of Hillsdale, Mich.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this letter from Mr. Sweeney:

HILLSDALE, MICH., *January 23, 1959.*

DEAR MR. JOHANSEN: One may wonder what the strange relationship developing between Red communism and American public opinion portends.

The wise poet, Alexander Pope, may have given the most revealing insight into that relationship:

"Vice is a monster of so frightful a mien
As to be hated, needs to be seen;
Yet seen too often, familiar with her face
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

Accepting the assumption that communism is a great vice, many puzzling things become more clear. To name but a few: The willingness of communism to make use of the lesser vices when expedient, the similarly of Red slavery and white slavery, the spirit of clandestine conspiracy, the arrogance and impudence of its leaders, and its fever of hatred when rebuked by religious opposition.

Americans seem to be now in danger of entering into that second stage—that of pity in which our quasi-intellectuals entered long ago.

This "pity" would seem to be an emotional experience, perhaps a psychological mystery having to do with an affinity or merging of spirit.

This assumption would also serve to explain why realistic men whose work brings them into contact with organized vice or unlawful rackets have a better understanding of communism than do many bemused university professors.

It also provides or suggests the logical reasoning back of the present strategy of Russian communism toward America.

This strategy would appear to be a program of familiarity, of togetherness. They are saying, in effect, "have pity on us poor Russians; we need so much from you; we are trying so hard to be prosperous and unafraid like you; we need your understanding—have pity."

What is our answer? Our answer is unbelievable, but a matter of record. Our prospective presidential aspirants journey to Moscow for an understanding, which they must feel is necessary before they can announce their intentions.

Congress, by compelling a break in diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia, could counter this strategy and prevent the possibility of America taking that last and final step cited by Pope, that of embracement of communism.

But Congress may no longer have the will and courage to do this.

There are three facts concerning communism that seldom, if ever, are brought to the attention of the average American:

First, there is no warrantee from past world history that America could not fall victim to communism.

Second, triumphant world communism would look with favor upon the resettlement of two or more hundred million land-hungry people from Asia into North America.

Third, militant communism has acquired a near perfect psychological understanding of the American mass mind by patient investigation over a period of 40 years.

The amazing success of their massive controlled experiment upon 7,000 American prisoners of war in Korea alone gives the Communists a blueprint for action against the younger generation of Americans, if, indeed, it would not be effective against all Americans.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SWEENEY.

Public Housing for the Aged: A First for Toledo, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, with congressional hearings underway on the far-reaching housing bills which have been introduced in both the House and the Senate, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues a recent de-

velopment in Toledo, Ohio, which is especially timely and significant.

The Toledo Metropolitan Housing Authority, having long ago recognized the need for low-cost public houisng for our senior citizens, recently opened the first public housing development completed with Federal assistance, designed exclusively for elderly persons.

The immediate and great success of this project, known as A. Gideon Spieker Terrace, has led me to the conclusion that this type of housing should be included as part of the total public housing program for the country.

I should like to briefly describe the Spieker Terrace project.

The project consists of 50 dwelling units in 10 buildings—44 one-bedroom apartments for families and 6 efficiency apartments for single persons.

Persons living in the project are 65 years of age or older and are living on small incomes derived mainly from pensions.

The buildings are single story, brick veneer, ranch-style. They are especially designed to make life easier for the elderly, all walks being ramped to eliminate the hazards of steps to accommodate wheelchair users. The walks are all surfaced with rough concrete to prevent slipperiness.

The project is located on 2.64 acres of land adjacent to another public housing project of 384 units, occupied mostly by younger families with children. It is within two blocks of a regularly scheduled busline and near stores and shopping facilities. It is also near churches of various faiths and public recreation facilities.

A community building of 1,000 square feet is located in the center of the project and includes facilities for movies, game and hobby rooms, meeting rooms, and a general lounge.

There are two laundry rooms in the project with free washing and drying facilities.

During the designing and construction of the project every consideration was given not only to convenience for the elderly residents but for their safety.

Each fireproof unit is equipped with an electric range, an electric refrigerator, individual gas-fired space and water heaters, a bathtube with a built-in seat and wall-mounted handrail, as well as an emergency buzzer system for summoning help. There are electrical outlets on every wall to eliminate the need for hazardous electrical extension cords. The doors are extra wide to allow wheelchairs easy passage and, to protect pension checks from vandals, each unit has a special wall slot for mail delivery.

The estimated overall cost of this project is $606,830—a per unit cost of $12,136. Of the total cost, planning costs amounted to $39,871.

Annual interest on borrowed funds for the project amounts to $17,816.

Actual site acquisition, survey, construction, and installation of equipment amounted to $535,573, or a per unit cost of $10,711.

In view of the fact that the families who reside in this project are recipients of meager incomes—old-age pensions, social security, and other types of retirement benefits—the management operation of the project has been combined with the larger project adjacent to it to allow costs to be prorated on a unit count basis for both projects.

Although the management experience of this project is, as yet, limited, the financial balance is estimated at $35 per month average rental and $26 per month operating cost, leaving an anticipated net of $9 per month per unit.

The housing authority has estimated the operating cost probably will be much lower than the figures quoted since the project is much better constructed than other projects on which the estimate is based.

The tenant selection office for the dwelling units in the Spieker Terrace project has reported a waiting list of more than 100 eligible applicants.

The need continues to grow for such units as this because of the accelerated rate of retirement of persons who are able to care for their physical needs but whose incomes are restricted.

At this point I should like to include the following article from the Toledo Blade of Sunday, December 21, 1958, dealing with the reaction of the elderly residents of Spieker Terrace to the project:

GOLDEN AGERS PUT PERSONAL STAMP ON NEW HOMES—EXPERIENCE TOTALS NEARLY 4,000 YEARS

(By Elsie McKay Cram)

Spieker Terrace is less than 3 months old. But already this haven for senior citizens is as invitingly friendly as that mythical grandmother's house "over the river and through the woods."

And that's to be expected. For in it live 60 men and women whose combined homemaking experience totals nearly 4,000 years.

They are, in a sense, the elite of the city's retirees. From among hundreds of applicants, they were selected to become the pioneer residents of Toledo's first public housing for the aged.

"They're a wonderful group," said McClinton Nunn, Toledo Metropolitan Housing Authority director.

"And this is a wonderful place" appears to be the unanimous appraisal of the residents about their new domain.

LITTLE THINGS ADDED

Helping make this homelike atmosphere are not only the scientifically planned details built in by TMHA, but the little things added by the occupants.

The Christmas tree and lighted wreathes in the windows at Apartment 400, for example. They help make it home for Mr. and Mrs. William Pechikos.

So do the religious pictures on the walls, brought along to Spieker Terrace when the couple moved in last October.

Mrs. Pechikos sometimes is crippled with sickness, and climbing stairs is hard for her. Hence, she likes the one-floor plan of their apartment. The kitchen, too, is compact, requiring no wasted steps.

The master of the household, still a husky, active fellow at 75, is more enthusiastic than his wife about the apartment. He has only one complaint. He misses puttering around. Everything is so new, there's nothing to keep a Mr. Fix-It busy.

SUGGESTS GARDENS

Mr. Pechikos hopes that in any future senior citizens housing projects, TMHA plans will find room on the site for some small gardens.

"Not a big garden," he explained, "just a place where a fellow could keep busy putting in a few flowers and vegetables."

Down the road a bit, Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Black have found their apartment a godsend, as Mrs. Black expressed it.

They came from a seven-room, two-story house in West Toledo, and possibly could afford more than the $52 a month rent they are now paying for their present one-bedroom quarters.

But Mr. Black is confined to a wheelchair as a result of a stroke. Before moving to Spieker Terrace, the couple were separated 8 months—he living in a rest home and she with a son. Both are in their seventies.

In some respects, the new apartment is just about perfect for the Blacks. It has no stairways, and the doors are wide, making it easy for Mr. Black to negotiate his wheelchair.

RAMPS FROM DOORS

Mrs. Black can push him outside for a stroll with ease, for the front and back doors have ramps leading to sidewalks.

In some respects, said Mrs. Black, the apartment could be improved. She suggested sliding instead of swinging doors on cupboards and utility rooms. There is little space in the pullman-like kitchens, and the doors, when open, tend to interfere with one another.

"But don't think I'm complaining," she hastened to add.

Mr. and Mrs. Leo Lassond are another couple tickled, as they said, to be chosen for Spieker Terrace. They lived in a second-story apartment before, where access to out-of-doors was down a long hallway and a flight of stairs.

Mrs. Lassond has a serious heart condition. As a result, she seldom got outside. Now, the curb is only a few steps away, and she gets out for a drive now and then.

The bathroom in her new home is extra special, Mrs. Lassond said, because it has a tub with a wall grip bar that makes it easy for her to take a bath.

Mr. Lassond is a retired factory worker who has discovered, due to his wife's health, that he can turn out as sparkling a family wash as any of the girls who use the community laundry room.

AUTOMATIC LAUNDRY

The automatic washers and driers, he explained, are just around the corner from his apartment, and can be used free of charge.

In the midst of the 50-unit project are six efficiency apartments, all occupied by persons living alone. Frances Smith moved into one of them 10 days ago. She pays $27 a month and says she couldn't beat it anywhere in the city.

For the $27, she has a large combination living-bedroom, kitchen with stove, refrigerator and plenty of cupboards, a linen closet and large clothes closet, and a buzzer arrangement in case she needs to summon help from neighbors. The rent includes all utilities, and the tenant has control over the thermostat.

Miss Smith was one of the founders of the Women's Advertising Club of Toledo, and formerly ran the public stenographic service in the Secor Hotel. With that busy background, she finds her new surroundings a bit quiet.

But, she said, she's about to take a new lease on life and start developing some hobbies in the new community recreation building just across the court from her apartment.

The Truth About the British Ambassador's Complaint Involving Contracts and the National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have drawn to the attention of Mr. Leo A. Hoegh, Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, the unreasonableness of the complaint by the British Ambassador insisting that since they are able to undersell the manufacturers of electrical goods due to their low income to the workers, that we should grant them the contracts anyway—even at the cost of unemployment to between 500 and 1,000 electrical workers.

I am hoping Mr. Hoegh will consult with our own Government instead of taking the dictates of a foreign government when he asks for advice in the placing of orders:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 30, 1959.

The Honorable LEO A. HOEGH,
Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is my hope that the petitions submitted to you by the national security committee and the transformer section of the National Electrical Manufacturers Association and by the General Electric Company regarding the threatened impairment of national security as a result of imports of large hydraulic turbine generators, large transformers and large electrical circuit breakers will be considered and decided entirely within the letter and spirit of the criteria expressed by Congress in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958. I have noted the recent news stories and press comments which were published following your decision recommending that the hydraulic turbines for the Greers Ferry Dam in Arkansas be purchased from the Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp., on national security grounds, instead from the English Electric Company which submitted the low bid. I have also noted that the British Ambassador promptly protested to the State Department that it is "a strange form of trade liberalization" to invite foreigners to bid and then tell them that the low foreign bid will not be accepted because of the national security interests of the United States.

In my opinion it is strange that the British Ambassador has so little regard for a decision of our Government regarding the national security interests of the United States. Last year when Congress was considering the Trade Agreements Act several representatives of foreign trade interests argued that the United States should not adopt a policy of restricting imports which threaten our national security. The foreigners, who naturally want unrestricted access to American markets, argued that such restrictions would be contrary to "liberal trade" policies. Congress rejected these arguments, and wrote into law specific criteria for protecting our national security interests when threatened by imports. I suppose it is the British Ambassador's duty to make a special plea for a British manufacturer who wants to sell his good to a United States Government agency. On the other hand, I hope you will regard it as your duty to carry out the policies of the United States, as prescribed by Congress and approved by the President last year.

As Secretary of State Dulles observed a few days ago, the United States is not the only country making certain exceptions and qualifications to the general principle of liberal trade. In fact, I believe the foreign trade policies of the United States are far more liberal than those of Great Britain.

I urge that the pending petitions dealing with the threats to our national security interests from imports of heavy electrical equipment be resolved not according to the desires of foreign suppliers and foreign governments, but in keeping with criteria set forth in the provisions of section 8 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958.

Furthermore, I want to urge that your decision on these petitions be made as promptly as possible. The petitions deal with problems of national security, but inevitably the economic welfare of the employees in the heavy electrical industry is also involved. We need a realistic Government policy to guide our Government procurement and we need it soon.

Sincerely yours,
ELMER J. HOLLAND,
Member of Congress.

The Biggest Carnival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press of January 31, 1959:

THE BIGGEST CARNIVAL

The biggest and best frolic of them all is here, as the people of the city and surrounding territory, outstate Minnesota and visitors from over the Nation gather for the opening of the St. Paul winter carnival of 1959. This occasion makes St. Paul the winter entertainment capital of the Nation, proves that winter sports and contests are as popular as those of any traditional vacation season.

The old theme of the carnival, the warfare between Boreas, king of the north wind, and Vulcan, the fire king, will be unfolded once more as new generations of visitors, along with the older ones, thrill to the colorful drama of this festival of lights, this realistic drama based on legend and mythology. The audacity of Vulcan and his fellow conspirators is not limited to Boreas and his followers, however, for the fire king cares nothing of what people think of him, knowing well that he will eventually overcome the good-natured winter king, put his court to flight and seize his throne. But spectacular events attend the struggle between these titans before the warfare is over.

The parade of Saturday, led by Capt. Richard B. Laning, commanding officer of the atomic submarine *Seawolf*, during its 60-day submerged run last fall, is an early highlight of the festival, when gorgeous floats representing the area's industry, trade, culture, and history, pass through the streets. The torchlight parade, the earlier version of the first pageant, will perhaps draw even a greater attendance. The two parades' attractions vary from the antics of the clowns and other entertainers to the solemn reminders of the past and the bravery of the pioneers who founded the present State and city.

The coronations of both King Boreas XXIII and the carnival princess are occasions of lights, music and gaiety. Outstanding entertainment is presented in the auditorium. Talent, professional and local, will be on hand during the entire course of the carnival. St. Paul Musicians Association, Local 30, will again donate the services of its members for performances during the festival. Verne Rooney's orchestra will play for Boreas' coronation, and Ray Komischke's group for a high school dance in Hotel St. Paul Saturday after the parade.

The great outdoors, however, is the chief arena for those who have come primarily to participate in the winter sports or to constitute the galleries for these events. Skating, fishing for prizes, skiing contests, dog races are on the agenda at this yearly assembly. Outdoor square dancing is offered in a blocked off area of a downtown street. Tobogganing sliding at the State Capitol grounds is provided as in other years. And for those who are interested in prizes, there is the treasure chest hunt sponsored by the St. Paul Dispatch and Pioneer Press.

The time is here for the major national sports and entertainment feature of the winter season. The success of the gathering may partially depend on the weather—on whether Boreas can summon sufficient snow to give the setting its usual luster and magic. But the spirit is what counts. It has always been merry at carnival time, a bubbling over of good nature in the games and amusements of our invigorating climate.

"Repaying the Federal Government Through Taxes on Their Increased Incomes"—Missouri Veterans' Education Director Urges GI Educational Benefits for Younger Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the tremendous good accomplished for the entire country, as well as for the young men and women who received the benefits directly, as a result of the educational opportunities provided under the World War II GI bill of rights and the Korean war GI bill.

Educational benefits have not been provided for veterans who entered the service after February 1, 1955, although many bills have been introduced since then to revive this very successful program of educational and vocational training.

Paul S. Smelser, director of veterans' education for the Missouri Department of Education, recently wrote me a very interesting letter on this subject, pointing out, among other things, that the veterans who participated in the previous programs have "attained professional, educational, and vocational objectives that have increased their ability to contribute to the economy, the general welfare, and the defense of our Nation. They have acquired greater earning power, and they are now repaying the Federal Government through taxes on their increased incomes. There is every reason to believe that the cost of an

extension of these programs would be repaid in the same manner."

Mr. Speaker, the letter from which I have quoted is worth reading, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
DIVISION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Jefferson City, Mo., January 26, 1959.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: An increasing number of Missouri veterans are inquiring about the possibility of legislation that would provide education and training assistance for them. As you know, these men and women who entered the military service since February 1, 1955, have been denied the assistance granted to veterans by Public Law 550, 82d Congress. We believe that legislation to extend similar educational benefits to these veterans is worthy of careful consideration.

The interruption of the education of these men and women because of their service in the Armed Forces has resulted in a great loss to them individually. It has also resulted in a great loss to this State and to this Nation. These losses can be partially or fully restored by the enactment of an adequate educational and vocational assistance act.

The education and training assistance programs that have been granted to veterans since World War II have paid generous dividends. The veterans who participated in these programs have attained professional, educational, and vocational objectives that have increased their ability to contribute to the economy, the general welfare, and the defense of our Nation. They have acquired greater earning power, and they are now repaying the Federal Government through taxes on their increased incomes. There is every reason to believe that the cost of an extension of these programs would be repaid in the same manner.

We have been informed that several bills are being introduced that would grant educational and vocational assistance to veterans for so long as compulsory military service is required. We respectfully request your careful consideration of these bills.

Please let us know if we can be of help to you at any time in furnishing you with information regarding education and veterans in Missouri.

Sincerely,

PAUL S. SMELSER,
Director, Veterans Education.

Luzerne County (Pa.) Medical Society Honors Five Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader Evening-News of January 13, 1959:

In honoring Dr. Charles Shafer of Kingston, Dr. Peter Mayock of Wilkes-Barre, Dr. M. C. Rumbaugh of Kingston and Dr. George Baskett of Montana, formerly of Retreat, for more than 50 years of service each to the public, and Dr. A. W. Grover of Kingston as the General Practitioner of the Year, the Luzerne County Medical Society voices the sentiments of the community. Greater Wilkes-Barre shares medicine's high regard for these men as citizens and neighbors as well as in their professional capacity.

So many honors have come to Dr. Shafer in the course of his long career that it is like gilding the lily to add to the list. A native of Williamsport, a World War veteran and a fellow of the American College of Surgeons, Dr. Shafer has held such offices as president of the Federation of State Medical Boards of the United States, chairman of the Pennsylvania Board of Medical Education and Licensure, president of the Luzerne County Medical Society, president of the Kingston Board of Health, director, staff president and chief surgeon of Nesbitt Memorial Hospital and chairman of the Wyoming Valley Chapter of the American Red Cross. He has served as president of Wilkes-Barre Kiwanis and commander of Black Diamond Post of the American Legion and has been a prominent figure in the Masons and other fraternal bodies. It is an amazing record for an individual to compile.

Dr. Mayock, a native of Miners Mills and a resident of Wilkes-Barre, by coincidence, launched his career in Kingston in 1909. A nationally known urologist, he holds fellowships in the American College of Surgeons and the American Urological Society. He also is a diplomate of the American Board of Urology. Apart from his specialty that has brought him such renown in the profession and outside it, Dr. Mayock is known widely for his contributions to the field of social hygiene where he is credited with a great deal of pioneering. As first chief of the State Genito-Urinary Clinic, he led the successful fight locally against syphilis and other social diseases, giving Wilkes-Barre the lowest incidence of any city in Pennsylvania. He also served as chief of the urological department at Mercy Hospital and consultant at other institutions. It would be difficult to estimate the indebtedness of the community to him for service beyond the call of duty.

Dr. Rumbaugh, a native of Thompsontown and a veteran of the First World War, came to Kingston in 1911 after preparing for teaching and business careers and actually entering the employ of the Lackawanna Steel Co. at Buffalo. The steel industry's loss was medicine's gain, for he has been an outstanding member of the profession which has conferred on him its highest honors. He not only is a member of the International College of Surgeons, but its board of examiners in general surgery, and the board of qualifications of specialists in surgery have designated him a certified fellow. He also is a fellow of the American College of Surgeons. Dr. Rumbaugh has been chief of surgery at Wilkes-Barre General Hospital and founder of the clinic that bears his name. Friends know and respect him also as a trustee of the Methodist church and teacher of a men's Bible class, an extracurricular activity that provides an index to his character.

The inclusion of Dr. Baskett on the list of members of the profession to be honored recalls his service at Retreat State Hospital where he was superintendent for 22 years and where his wife, Dr. Olive Baskett, was a member of the staff. The bridge, crossing the river at Retreat, is one of the many monuments to his zeal and foresight. Dr. Baskett devoted his entire career to institutional work, being identified with the State Mental Hospital Service of Minnesota before coming to Pennsylvania. Dr. Baskett's professional skill was matched by his enthusiasm and his candor. Dr. Baskett through the years gave unstintingly of himself to the phase of medicine to which he dedicated his life.

Dr. Grover, who will be honored as the practitioner of the year, also qualifies for recognition as a veteran physician and surgeon. A native of Hobbie, he came to the West Side 60 years ago and is a fellow of the American College of Surgeons. He is a past president of the Luzerne County Medical Society and is a director of Nesbitt Memorial Hospital as well as a member of the staff since it was organized in 1912. He also has served on the staff of Wilkes-Barre General Hospital and as director of postgraduate work offered by the Pennsylvania Medical Society. He is widely known for his extracurricular activities, particularly for his long service on the board of education in Kingston both as a member and president. He also was identified with the draft boards in both world wars.

In brief, these are the records of the men to be honored at the annual dinner of the medical society at Hotel Sterling on January 21. They are impressive, to say the least.

Sound and Specific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, since January 12, 1959, when the Honorable Michael V. DiSalle took office as Governor of the State of Ohio, it has become apparent that a new era of vigorous leadership has commenced in Ohio's affairs. Governor DiSalle has pledged to increase Ohio's economic expansion and at the same time take care of the genuine needs of its citizens. He proposes to undertake this program with no new tax burdens. In his vigorous program, Governor DiSalle has the solid support of the citizens of the State.

The following editorials indicate the widespread appreciation of the Governor's program:

[From the Cleveland Press, Jan. 28, 1959]

SOUND AND SPECIFIC

In his first major policy statement since he took over as Governor, Mike DiSalle made it clear that (1) he's not soft on labor racketeering and (2) he's not a wild spender.

DiSalle punched up these points in his message to the legislature with special emphasis and for a special reason.

His opponents spread plenty of scare stories during the campaign about how DiSalle would take his orders from the labor bosses, and spend the State into ruin.

This is a standard line, including the drawing of a gloomy parallel with Michigan, where some of these frightful things have actually happened under a Democratic administration.

So DiSalle naturally was anxious to dispel any lingering doubts about where he stands, and how he intends to run the State.

But his comments went reassuringly beyond vague statements of principle.

On labor racketeering, he urged State laws to trap the crooks and hoodlums who've wormed their way into the labor movement.

This is a refreshingly direct approach to a responsibility which less courageous State politicians have been happy to push off on the Federal Government.

On money, the governor realistically concluded that the State is in a pinch. He'll deal with financial problems more thoroughly next week.

But meanwhile, he specificially (and wisely) ruled out a State income tax.

One of Ohio's best selling points in attracting new industry is that it doesn't have an income tax.

And cities like Cleveland which have resisted the temptation to adopt this deceptively easy way to gather in more money can make full and persuasive use of the argument.

DiSalle's comments on these two subjects not only answer his critics, but give further promise of an administration that will offer fresh vigor and fresh ideas, liberally sprinkled with courage and commonsense.

[From the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star]

DiSALLE AND THE CITIES

Governor DiSalle talked sense about city-State relationships and problems in his message to the legislature.

The Governor noted the current interest in adoption of a State income tax, then put his foot down squarely on the idea. If the State did turn to this tax, which it has a right to impose under the constitution, the levy would be too disruptive, in the Governor's view, of the balance in the tax field.

The Governor, whose home city of Toledo was the first in the State to use the payroll (income) levy, is aware of the chaos that would result if the major municipalities were suddenly forced to abandon this tax. Even though the State is under constitutional edict to return half of income tax revenues to local governments, the consequences would be serious to all municipal budget-makers.

The Governor's second point is a corollary to the first. Local governments have complained justly from way back that the legislature had the unhappy habit of loading them with new duties, then letting the local officials worry about finding the money.

"We must either give the (local governments) the right and authority to finance their own governments, or to spell out the services rendered by local governments on behalf of the State as a whole," the executive said.

The meaning of this language is plain. It should not be misunderstood even by some of the veteran legislators who look upon State-collected taxes as private State money to be doled out frugally to hat-in-hand mayors.

[From the Columbus Citizen, Jan. 28, 1959]

DiSALLE'S PROGRAM

Governor DiSalle pledges:

"We will demonstrate beyond a scintilla of doubt that efforts have been and will be made to eliminate duplication, waste and extravagance, and that the sums of the financial program are those required to take care of the genuine needs of Ohio. * * *

"It is our intention to proceed with a minimum of imposition on our citizens and the continuance of the conditions which have made Ohio's industrial climate the envy of many of its sister States."

With these prefacing statements, the new Governor spelled out to the legislature his program for the next 4 years—a commonsense, practical program that if accomplished will bring reforms sorely needed by the taxpaying public for many, many years.

In his program, that could become a monument to him if carried out, the 'round-the-clock working Governor recognizes the State's perilous financial condition.

And he promises that the program "will be minimal in the need for funds and these funds can be considered in the nature of investments which will produce returns that will help spread and meet these costs as far as the future is concerned."

DiSalle sets out concrete proposals that can be accomplished only by his department heads and the Ohio legislature working as a team.

Among them are:

Increase Ohio's economic expansion.

An aggressive policy to combat the long-neglected water and air pollution.

Encouragement of labor and management to settle their differences without resorting to strikes.

Break up labor racketeering.

Provide for payment of supplemental unemployment benefits.

Reorganize workmen's compensation procedure for better benefits to people hurt on the job.

Put the highway program on a pay-as-you-go basis instead of spending millions for needless interest payments.

Reform the utility laws to give the consumer a better break.

Create a civil rights commission for the protection of all persons. Overhaul the stumbling mental hygiene system.

Establish old-age pensions on a basis of practicality instead of rigid, artificial ceilings.

Reestablish the relationship between local governments and the State.

Strengthen the criminal code with the intent of bringing the big shots to bay instead of the small fry.

Abolish capital punishment.

Fewer and better-paid State employees, more efficiency.

Some of these proposals will be bitterly fought. Some of them will be lost.

Whether the earnest, sincere Governor can accomplish his goal in the main is a matter for time to tell.

The taxpayers wish him well on the huge task he has outlined.

Editorial Freedom for the Broadcasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois Broadcasters Association recently adopted unanimously a statement dealing with the very important subject of editorial freedom for the broadcaster. Since this is a subject which interests all of us, I include it here under leave to extend my remarks:

Whereas an editorial or editorializing as defined by dictionary is as follows:

Editorial: An article as in a newspaper presenting the opinion or comment of the periodical; an article in a newspaper, explicitly stating opinions of the editor or publisher.

Editorializing: To set forth one's position or opinion on some subject in, or as if in, an editorial; to express editorial opinions into (a newspaper article, etc.); and

Whereas from a practical standpoint in a definition of an editorial the broadcaster assumes the role of a newspaper publisher; and

Whereas actually since only ownership of the firm or corporation holding the license is responsible to the FCC in case of failure to live up to the responsibility of a broadcaster under the terms of its license, therefore, the owner of the firm or corporation must be the one responsible for editorial policy through its agents or otherwise; and

Whereas by certain utterances of FCC commissioners and important persons in the broadcast industry, station operators are continually urged to editorialize; to establish and maintain regular editorial broadcasts and policies; and

Whereas by the very nature of an editorial, the great preponderance of editorials should be advocating or setting forth the station's position for or against a certain subject matter; and

Whereas by certain utterances of the FCC in the past, it has been said in substance that " * * * the licensee must follow a reasonable standard of fairness in the presentation of the issues in the controversy" (and to this we agree) but—

Whereas the Commission has also said "* * * that he has an affirmative duty to seek out, aid and encourage the broadcast of opposing views by responsible persons" (and to this we disagree).

This dictum, while sounding good in substance, is unsound and impractical. If carried to the strict letter and interpretation, this makes practically impossible an editorial policy of force and effect; and

Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of the Illinois Broadcasters Association that the burden of seeking out and encouraging the broadcast of opposing views by responsible persons puts an undue hardship on the broadcaster for the reason that (1) in many instances there is no organized opposition of responsible person in the area in which the broadcaster operates willing to oppose the broadcaster's editorial point of view; and (2) the burden on the broadcaster of determining that the person applying for time to present the opposite point of view is a responsible person is an unnecessary and unrealistic position in which to put the broadcaster; and (3) that should the broadcaster determine that the applicant is not a responsible person, such person requesting the time could go into court claiming damages, requiring the broadcaster to prove irresponsibility, all of which complicates the matter of editorializing to such a degree that it makes it impractical and unrealistic for a broadcaster to entertain and pursue a serious editorial policy in conformance to present Commission rules, lest his license and livelihood be placed in jeopardy; and

Whereas practically any person who has the funds to do so can buy time from the broadcaster to say most anything he desires subject to legal limits and FCC rules, yet it is illogical that the broadcaster himself is not presently under responsibility to go seek out and sell an ad to someone else to present another point of view, nor can he present such view himself; and

Whereas from a practical standpoint, anybody but the broadcaster can have his opinion published under the strict legal interpretation of the present rules; and

Whereas the broadcaster is in danger of violating a rule of the Commission unless, when he expresses an opinion he must affirmatively seek out a "responsible" someone to express an opposite point of view; and

Whereas in Illinois today, there are several important issues before the voters involving the subjects of education, hospitalization, welfare, and judicial reform, all of which the broadcaster should be free to explain and take a position without fear of the FCC or the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the NAB, representing the broadcast industry, be hereby urged and requested by unanimous vote of the Illinois Broadcasters Association to appoint a representative industry committee to confer with the FCC, as well as with Members of Congress and other Federal Government officials in an endeavor to get established a commonsense editorial policy for broadcasters in substance as follows:

"That so long as the broadcaster follows a reasonable standard of fairness in the presentation of an editorial or an issue that

the broadcaster may approve or oppose by editorial; and

"So long as the editorial is designated an editorial or opinion of the broadcaster, both before and after the editorial; and

"That when such editorial is so defined, it shall not be necessary for the broadcaster to affirmatively seek out a responsible person to present the other point of view, but when opposition desires to be heard either in writing, properly identified, or by personal appearance, it shall be the duty and obligation of the broadcaster to provide equal time and facilities for such opposing views."

The Andrija Artukovic Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 29, 1955, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech of mine entitled "The Persecution of Andrija Artukovic." This was followed by an article written by Rev. M. D. Forrest, M.S.C., in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17, 1958, volume 104, page 99, involving the same subject. Again, on August 25, 1958, page A7763, there appeared an additional article by Reverend Forrest. On the same date, at page A7843, I inserted a letter which I had written to the Honorable J. M. Swing, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which resulted in the correction of misinformation given to the public by that Department. Now I am asking unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of the decision of the Federal District Court in Los Angeles disposing of the extradition proceedings brought by the Government of Yugoslavia against Andrija Artukovic which completely exonerates him of the charges made by that Government, beginning with rule of probable cause:

The Supreme Court of the United States in *Collins* v. *Loisel*, 259 U.S. 956, laid down the rule to be followed in extradition cases. That Court said:

"It is not the function of the committing magistrate in foreign extradition proceedings to determine whether or not the accused is guilty, but merely to decide whether or not there is competent evidence which, according to the law of the surrendering State, would justify his apprehension and commitment for trial if the crime had been committed in that State."

The law to be applied is therefore the laws of California. See for example, *Cleugh* v. *Strakosch*, 9 Cir. 1940, 109 F. 2d 330, 333; *Charlton* v. *Kelly*, 1913, 229 U.S. 447, 457, 33 Sup. Ct. 945, 57 L. Ed. 1274; *Curreri* v. *Vice*, 9 Cir. 1935, 77 F. 2d 130.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Cleough* v. *Strakosch*, supra, said:

"The phrase 'sufficient cause' in sections 871 and 872 of the Penal Code, means reasonable or probable cause. This appears in section 1487 of the same code, which provides that where 'a party has been committed on a criminal charge without reasonable or probable cause, he shall be released on habeas corpus. * * *' Evidence showing reasonable or probable cause to believe the accused guilty is sufficient" (citing cases).

The district court of appeals of California in *Ex Parte Martinez*, 98 P. 2d 528, held:

"The term 'sufficient cause' within the statute providing that a defendant can only be held to answer when it appears from the evidence that there is sufficient cause to believe that defendant committed offenses charged, means the same as 'reasonable and probable cause,' and hence a commitment based entirely on hearsay or incompetent evidence is unauthorized" (citing 7 Cal. Jr., sec. 120, p. 984).

Therefore, it becomes a question of fact in this case whether the evidence presented is sufficient to show reasonable and probable cause to believe that the defendant is guilty of at least one count of the amended complaint in extradition. Inasmuch as it is a question of fact in each case no useful purpose would be served by citing and quoting from cases determining that fact under other evidence. It is so elemental that where evidence is taken in any proceeding the weight to be given the evidence is for the finder of fact that citation of authorities is unnecessary.

Murder is a crime in both Yugoslavia and the United States. The definition of murder is substantially the same in both sovereigns. Section 187 of the California Penal Code defines murder as "the unlawful killing of a human being, with malice aforethought." Both Yugoslavia and California makes one a principal if he commits the offense directly or aids, abets, advises, or encourages the commission of the crime. Murder is a crime coming within the provisions of the treaty as a basis for extradition.

Absolutely no evidence was presented that the defendant himself committed murder. The complainant relies entirely upon their evidence that members of the Ustasha committed murders upon orders from the defendant. There is no necessity to review all of the evidence in this opinion. Only portions will be referred to for illustrative purposes.

The Ustasha at one time was a political party in Croatia. They ardently supported an ideology of a separate state for the Croatians. When political parties were abolished in Yugoslavia the Ustasha continued to function secretly and when the Germans and Italians commenced invasion of Yugoslavia during World War II came out into the open and proclaimed an independent State of Croatia.

On April 15, 1941, one Eugen Kvaternik was appointed by Dr. Ante Pavelic, the "Poglavnik" or "head man" of the independent State of Croatia, as Ustasha Commissioner for Public Order and Security in Zagreb with directions that all organs of police, gendarmerie, etc., must execute his commands and orders and act in compliance with his instructions.

On April 16, 1941, there was published in the Narodne Novine, the official paper in the independent State of Croatia, an order of the Poglavnik appointing the defendant commissioner of the entire public security and internal administration. The following day on April 17, 1941, the order appointing defendant Minister of Internal Affairs was published.

A number of changes were made in the ordinances and decrees as to the internal functions of the Ustasha. At one time the Ustasha was accountable only to the Poglavnik. At other times it was placed under the Minister of Internal Affairs. At all times Eugen Kvaternik remained at the head of the Ustasha. Mr. Kvaternik was a very ambitious man.

The Poglavnik by ordinance at one time required compulsory sojourn in collective and working camps of any persons dangerous to the public order and security or who might menace the peace and tranquility of the Croatian nation. The Ustasha was authorized to establish the camps and to determine who was to be interned with no appeal or complaint to any court. These ordinances provided for the internment of the entire family of anyone coming within the ordinance. Even before the issuance of such ordinance people were being interned by the Ustasha in Crotia.

The evidence is conflicting as to the orders made with reference to the Serbs, Jews, and gypsies. Some of the orders were for internment and deportation. Some of the evidence shows alleged verbal orders for the killing of the enemies of the Independent State of Croatia.

It was common practice during World War II to intern anyone who was even suspected to be an enemy or possible enemy of the government in power. Our own Government saw fit to intern all Japanese on the west coast, men, women, and children of all ages, immediately following Pearl Harbor.

The evidence is convincing that the ones named in the complaint with committing the murders called on the head of the Ustasha, Mr. Kvaternik, in Zagreb, on many occasions. The evidence is light that the defendant met with these men.

All of the evidence presented by the complainant is in narrative form. The affidavits were signed by the affiants but very evidently are not in their words. They are someone's conclusion as to what the testimony covered. A layman is often prone to sign anything presented if prepared by a court, an attorney or notary public without proper regard to its accuracy.

The same language appears time after time in the affidavits. The words "so-called Independent State of Croatia" appears in affidavit after affidavit. I doubt very much that this could be a coincidence.

There was no opportunity for this court to observe the demeanor or possible motives of these witnesses. I do not have even the words of the witnesses to judge their meaning or whether the answers were induced by the questions asked. I am presented with someone else's conclusion of what the testimony was. This is very unreliable evidence which can be given little weight.

Much of the evidence presented by the complainant is hearsay. Hearsay evidence, under decisions of the higher courts, may be admissible in extradition cases but the weight to be given the evidence is for the committing magistrate. For example many of the affiants stated they knew a certain individual was dead because it was well known in the village; or because so-and-so told him or because "he was taken away and I never saw him again."

It is also apparent that the affidavits were drawn to incite passion and prejudice. They constantly refer to children of tender years, newborn babes, aged persons, cruel and inhuman treatment, and so forth. If a murder is committed the age or sex of the victim should make no difference in the action taken. This evidence may have been offered to show it was not a political offense which is one of the defendant's affirmative defenses. This subject will be covered later.

The complainant attempts to lend credence to the affidavits by showing that they were taken in a court with a judge presiding. An examiner or investigating officer was present to conduct the examination with a registrar or recorder to report the proceedings. But the testimony of the witness is not furnished. In only a couple of instances is a question and answer given. The evidence on behalf of the complainant resolves itself into ex parte affidavits.

The defendant presented live witnesses who were subjected to vigorous cross-examination. In certain instances the live witnesses testified that the affiants were not telling the truth. No attempt was made to rebut this evidence. The complainant presented no rebuttal witnesses nor asked for time to secure rebuttal evidence. The live

witnesses were in the United States and under no fear, inducement, or compulsion to testify falsely. History indicates this might not have been true in Yugoslavia at the time the evidence was taken.

One must also keep in mind that the events to which the witnesses testified took place at least 10 years before the testimony was taken. The passage of time tends to reduce the weight which may be given to evidence. Some of the affidavits must be eliminated from consideration because the affiants testified to matters of which they could not possibly have personal knowledge. Many of these affiants testified that certain people were loaded on trucks or railway cars, taken to such and such a camp and there killed. They could not know where they were taken or what happened to them. Such testimony stretches the credulity to the breaking point.

Most of the affidavits state that the ones committing the atrocities were Ustasha. Sometimes they were well-known members of the Ustasha. Sometimes they were in Ustasha uniform. Sometimes they were Ustasha in Moslem attire. Sometimes they were Ustasha wearing a fez. Sometimes they were Ustasha in ordinary attire. But always they were Ustasha.

No evidence was given as to how the Ustasha could be identified. They apparently wore no brands or means of identification. They were of no special color or distinguishing characteristics. One might try to identify a Democrat or a Republican by their appearance, but it certainly would not be reliable enough to act upon in any important matter.

Some of the complainant's witneases testified they called on the defendant with reference to the treatment of the Serbs, Jews, and Gypsies. Some of defendants' witnesses testified they also called upon the defendant. Again the evidence is in irreconcilable conflict. The complainant's witnesses testified the defendant told them his orders were being obeyed. The defendant's witnesses testified that the defendant told them to see the man upstairs, Mr. Kvaternik, that there was nothing he could do. Where does the truth lie? I believe the live witnesses when they said the defendant told them there was nothing he could do. Mr. Kvaternik was theoretically under the Minister of Internal Affairs during part of the period involved. I am convinced that in fact Mr. Kvaternik was taking orders from no one.

The pro forma use of the name of a minister in such orders and decrees does not meet the quantum of proof necessary to show reasonable and probable cause to believe the minister is guilty of participating in crimes committed by others in his department. To so hold would probably result in failure to find any candidate who would accept the responsibilities of such a position if he was going to be held to answer for crimes committed by his underlings without more definite proof that they were acting under his orders. Such proof is lacking in this case.

I am cognizant of the proof necessary to hold a defendant for extradition. In *Glucksman* v. *Henkel* (221 U.S. 508, 522, 55 L. Ed. 830, 31 S. Ct. 704), the Supreme Court said:

"It is common in extradition cases to attempt to bring to bear all of the factitious niceties of a criminal trial at common law. But it is a waste of time. For while, of course, a man is not to be sent from the country merely upon demand or surmise, yet if there is presented in somewhat untechnical form according to our ideas, such reasonable ground to suppose him guilty as to make it proper that he should be tried, good faith to the demanding government requires his surrender. * * *"

And in *Fernandez* v. *Phillips* (268 U.S. 311, 312, 69 L. Ed. 970, 972, 45 S. Ct. 542), Mr. Justice Holmes, speaking for the Supreme court, said:

"Competent evidence to establish reasonable grounds is not necessarily evidence competent to convict. * * *"

I am convinced that Mr. Kvaternik usurped all powers over the Ustasha and that the defendant had little or none. Mr. Kvaternik even aspired to be Poglavnik and did anything he thought necessary to assert his power and gain his ambitions.

Upon consideration of all the evidence presented and the authorities cited by both parties I can reach but one conclusion. The complainant has not shown by sufficient competent evidence that there is reasonable or probable cause to believe the defendant guilty of any of the crimes charged. I hope I do not live to see the day when a person will be held to answer for a crime in either the California or U.S. courts upon such evidence as was presented in this case on behalf of the complainant. It would be mere speculation or surmise to find the acts charged were done upon orders from the defendant.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES—POLITICAL OFFENSE

It is probably unnecessary for me to determine any affirmative defenses in view of my findings on probable cause. However, the issue was presented and the parties are entitled to my findings.

One of defendant's affirmative defenses is that the crimes, if any, are political in nature and not extraditable under the treaty. I do not deem it necessary in this case to go into the question of extradition for so-called war crimes.

Article VI of the treaty involved provides:

"A fugitive criminal shall not be surrendered if the offense in respect of which his surrender is demanded be of a political character, or if he proves that the requisition for his surrender has, in fact, been made with a view to try or punish him for an offense of a political character."

"Political character" or political offense has not been too satisfactorily defined. Generally speaking it is an offense against the Government itself or incident to political uprisings. It is not a political offense because the crime was committed by a politician. The crime must be incidental to and form a part of political disturbances. It must be in furtherance of one side or another of a bona fide struggle for political power.

The evidence presented, as well as historical facts of which I can take judicial notice, proves that for years the peoples of the Balkans were in disagreement. Without any elections or choice of the Croations following World War I Croatia was made part of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. This government was controlled by the Serbs which imposed tremendous burdens upon the Croats. The Croats wanted an independent government or at least representation in the Sabor or Parliament. In 1928 Croatia held an election and elected delegates to the House of Parliament in Belgrade. Upon their arrival the Serbian leader of the House proceeded to shoot the delegates. Civil war nearly ensued and in 1929 King Alexander dissolved all political parties. The Croatians never forgot their ideal of an independent state and when the Germans and Italians invaded Yugoslavia during World War II they had their first opportunity to set up their own government.

On April 10, 1941, the Croatian leaders declared their independence and started to establish their own government. This was opposed by the Serbians and others and civil strife was rampant.

The leaders of the Independent State of Croatia called upon the Croats to support the new government and took what steps it considered necessary to further its struggle for political power. The evidence disclosed that some villages, where the new government was unable to furnish protection, established their own militia for self-protection. Bands from the new government would come in and take control only to be ousted by bands from their opponents. Some villages changed hands several times a day. These bands were not organized armed forces but in many instances ordinary civilians. Many lives were taken. Fractions of the Chetniks and Partisans were doing everything they could to defeat the aims of the new government.

Conditions were such that even the complainant's own witnesses referred to the occupation by Italian troops as a "liberation." It was better to be under the control of the organized troops of Italy than continue the internal strife.

Complainant contends I must ignore completely the findings of Judge Hall and the opinion of the U.S. Court of Appeals on the question of whether the crimes charged are of a political nature. The Supreme Court of the United States vacated the judgment of the Court of Appeals and remanded the case for a hearing under section 3184. Undoubtedly these decisions are not binding upon me as they have been vacated. However, they certainly are entitled to my consideration and are persuasive as far as the question of law is concerned.

In my opinion the order of the Supreme Court means nothing more than that the question of whether the crimes charged are of a political character cannot be determined upon habeas corpus but must be determined at a hearing under section 3184.

The Supreme Court in *Ornelas* v. *Ruiz* (161 U.S. 502, 509), stated that whether the crime charged is of a political character is "* * * a question of mixed law and fact, but chiefly of fact."

I hereby adopt the opinion of the U.S. court of appeals in *Karadzole et al* v. *Artukovic*, supra, and the findings of Judge Hall in the habeas corpus action as my opinion and findings insofar as the question of law is concerned.

From the evidence presented I find as a fact that the crimes charged in all counts of the amended complaint are political in character.

JURISDICTION

No question has been raised as to my jurisdiction to hear and determine this extradition matter. I hereby take judicial notice of the order of the district court appointing me as U.S. commissioner for this district which includes the power to conduct hearings where persons are sought to be extradited by foreign governments, and to do all acts and things which may be necessary in connection therewith, and as more particularly described in section 3184, title 18, United States Code.

IDENTITY OF DEFENDANT

No contention has been made that the defendant before me is not the Andrija Artukovic named in the amended complaint on extradition. The evidence presented conclusively proves that the defendant before me is the person named in the amended complaint.

FINDINGS OF FACT

I

That I have jurisdiction to hear and determine this case.

II

That the defendant before me is the person named in the amended complaint on extradition.

III

That the complainant has not proven by sufficient competent evidence that there is reasonable and probable cause to believe the defendant guilty of any of the crimes charged in the amended complaint on extradition.

IV

That the crimes charged in the amended complaint on extradition are of a political character and under article VI of the treaty are not extraditable.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I

That the demand of the complainant for the surrender of the defendant should be denied for failure to prove by sufficient competent evidence that there is reasonable and probable cause to believe the defendant guilty of any of the charges in the amended complaint on extradition.

II

That the crime charged in the amended complaint on extradition are of a political character and the surrender of the defendant should be denied.

ORDER

It is hereby ordered, adjudged, and declared that the demand of the complainant for the surrender of the defendant is denied and the bail bond of the defendant in the habeas corpus action should be exonerated.

Dated at Los Angeles, Calif., this 15th day of January A.D. 1959.

THEODORE HOCKE,
U.S. Commisisoner.

More Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, at a time when several million of workers and their families are in distress and great need, the Eisenhower Administration continues to push curtailment policies and bitterly opposes legislation to alleviate this suffering or to reverse the backward economic trend.

Under the guise of economy, the President and White House advisers continue to push policies that result in the tragic waste of real wealth that comes with idle men, idle factories, and in lost educational opportunities and public health and welfare services.

This may create the better business climate envisioned by White House and NAM visionaries, but in addition to bringing widespread human suffering it is leading the Nation toward disaster.

Mr. Speaker, the question of jobs and the narrow, blind, and selfish policies of White House advisers and the NAM is vivdly portrayed in an editorial in the current issue of "The Machinist."

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include herewith this editorial on "More Jobs."

MORE JOBS

Respectfully, of course, we'd like to suggest that President Eisenhower crate up the economic theorists now working at the White House and ship them to the National Association of Manufacturers—collect.

The current crew of White House theorists is as woolly as they come. In our opinion, they don't know the first thing about the American system or what makes it prosperous.

Obviously, their learning comes from books written at least a half century ago and not from events. They may have read the words, but they don't get the message. The NAM News may be their bible, but they lack the simple instinct for economic survival that saves most businessmen and union members.

The White House theorists have discovered that business must make a profit to survive. But they haven't the foggiest idea of what it takes to keep our shops and factories busy.

They have read that our population is expanding, that the labor force is growing, that we need more and more jobs. But they don't know what creates jobs.

The theorists say the basic factor is high profits, profits that can be used to build new factories and buy new machine tools. That was true a half century ago when the big problem was production. Today profits are only part of the picture. Today business cannot or will not expand its plants or create new jobs unless and until the demand for its products increase. Today the big problem is selling what we produce.

Last year's recession wasn't caused by any lack of production. Men weren't laid off because we didn't have enough factories or enough machine tools. We had a recession last year because the customers didn't have the money to buy all the goods we were producing. The customers ran short of purchasing power.

Anybody who knows anything about the American system knows that unless the American people have the money in their pockets to buy the goods, the factories lay off and the farmers take a licking.

Yet, on the advice of economic theorists and a few financiers who lack that instinct for self-preservation, the President is saying we should go easy on wage increases; he is talking about tax loopholes to raise profits.

Union members had better negotiate more purchasing power or we'll soon have another recession that'll make last year's look like prosperity.

Caution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the February 2, 1959, issue of Newsweek:

CAUTION

Although most U.S. papers splashed the trial story on page 1, many editors who watched did so with misgivings. The Chicago Sun-Times executive editor, Larry Fanning, who had turned down a Castro invitation to his paper, explained: "No one is saying that the guys who went down there can be bought, but somehow the context is all wrong for a newspaperman. The implication is that you are being bought whether or not that is true." Like many other editors, Fanning felt that coverage of Castro had been inadequate long before the trials started. "The night before Batista fled," Fanning recalled, "both UPI and AP put out word that the Castro forces had been crushed. We were completely misled. We're hoping the copy we're getting now is a fair representation."

Some on-the-spot observers sincerely believed that stories of Castro's executions had been overstressed at the expense of news about the gains he has made for his country. "The executions," said Look magazine's foreign editor William Attwood, "are what prevented riots; nothing else could have done that. When the Hungarian Freedom Fighters began killing policemen in 1956, they were praised by everybody. When Castro does the same thing, he's cursed."

Back in New York, Herbert L. Matthews, the New York Times man who had secured an exclusive three-part interview with Castro in 1957, remarked:

"In all my 36 years of newspaper work, I have never seen a worse job of journalism than the coverage of the Cuban revolution during the last 3 weeks. All you saw in most papers was how many people Castro shot. The real picture of a country under Batista's brutal dictatorship was not made clear."

At the weekend, despite criticism of the Sports Arena trials, Castro announced that they would begin again this week after he returned from a 3-day trip to Caracas, where he helped celebrate the first anniversary of the overthrow of Venezuelan dictator Marcos Pérez Jiménez.

Castro's toll in his first 24 days in power: 253 executions, 100 acquittals.

One for the Road—Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, a group of outstanding citizens of the city of San Diego, Calif., have joined in the past several months in a move which is typical of the very fine and dedicated public spirit of our community. What these good friends of mine have done is very well set forth in a feature article published in the December, 1958, issue of the National Business Woman, the magazine of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc. I have had the good fortune to assist these ladies in clearing some of the hurdles they faced in forming the Crossroads Home. Crossroads is performing an invaluable service to the southwestern corner of the United States. I am proud to pass on this information to my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

With your kind permission, Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

ONE FOR THE ROAD—BACK

(By Peggy L. Penney)

Last December 24, a desperately ill young woman sat disconsolately in a bus depot in San Diego, Calif., facing the unpleasant prospect of Christmas in jail. This young woman's illness was alcoholism; her only relief alcoholic oblivion. In her battered purse was 50 cents—enough to buy one drink at the nearest bar. Surely bar friends would supply the rest. Then, inevitably, jail. She didn't really want that drink, or the others, but her body cried out in helpless torment. What else was there? She had no home, no hope, no one to help.

Idly she glanced at a discarded newspaper on the bench beside her. A headline caught her attention. Eagerly she read the story of a new home for homeless women alcoholics. It changed her life. Someone did care. She spent a dime of that last half dollar to call Crossroads Home. A month later she was able to leave Crossroads with renewed spirit, friends, a job, clothes, and help in her continuing battle against her disease—alcoholism.

This young woman, ill and at the crossroads of her life, found hope and help on the road back because a San Diego research attorney named Bernice Morris was deeply concerned over the fate of the homeless alcoholic women who roamed the city.

Bernice Morris, past president of the National of San Diego's BPW Club is founder of Crossroads Home. The home is a monument to her leadership, for wholeheartedly into its cause went not only her own BPW club but a list of other organizations reading like a bluebook of clubdom contributed time, money, materials and furnishings: Zonta, Pilot, Soroptomist, American Association of University Women, California Association of Cosmetologists, American Association of Women Accountants, American Pen Women, Medical Secretaries' Association, Visiting Nurse Association, Opti-Mrs., Kiwani-Annes, Federated Women's Clubs and the Women's Christian Temperance Union.

Alcoholics are not all skid row failures or social riffraff. Alcoholism is a disease. It is not selective in its targets. It is no respecter of persons. Professional women, housewives, mothers, society matrons—any woman whose body chemistry cannot assimilate alcohol normally is a potential victim of our greatest national killer—alcoholism. The ratio of women alcoholics is more than 1 out of 3.

Armed with these grim facts, Miss Morris called together a group of friends in April 1957, in a community endeavor to cope with a community problem. In the group of 10 were 6 recovered alcoholics—men and women—respected members of the community with years of sobriety behind them. Within a month these business and professional men and women had formed Crossroads Foundation; within 9 months they opened the pleasant two-storied residence on San Diego's Fifth Avenue known as Crossroads Home.

In leading Crossroads Foundation into action Miss Morris said, "I felt that it was the duty of the community to care for persons suffering with the disease of alcoholism just as much as it is to care for those afflicted with tuberculosis or who are homeless."

The foundation's first discovery was that there was no place for a woman alcoholic to stay during the time it took her to recover. A few charitable organizations gave help for a few days at a time and there were organizations to give help to their recovery, but no home or haven; no provision for clothing and food. These necessities were given top priority on the foundation's program.

Two founder's committees—finance and housing—were appointed. Within a few months a pencil-slim budget of $3,200 was obtained from businesses, organizations, and individuals, of this, $400 was paid for rent and $500 for necessary carpenter work. Pressed by the need for economy, the house committee gratefully accepted the helping hands of the business, professional, and club women of San Diego.

Some women donned blue jeans to help with the painting; others took up needles to make slipcovers, curtains, and draperies. Artists and decorators lent their talents freely to color-coordinate the rooms. The result in a pleasant, homelike atmosphere—a far cry from the barren jails, State institutions, and cheap rooming houses so many of Crossroad's guests have known.

Crossroads Home, newly decorated and freshly painted in a labor of love, opened its doors to its first two homeless women on Christmas Eve 1957. In its short period of operation, it has offered 33 women an opportunity to take their first steps on the road back—all but 4 of them are still sober.

The work so nobly begun by the business, professional, and club women of San Diego didn't stop with Crossroad's opening. More join forces each month to see that these women have the best possible chance to succeed.

For example, a clothing committee collects, sorts, and cleans donated clothing to give each Crossroads' guest a recent wardrobe. A girl or woman just out of jail isn't likely to have much more than the clothes on her back. In soliciting clothing the committee urges, "Give us something you would be caught dead in. In other words, we want our residents to go out into the world when they begin their new life, looking like businesswomen."

A welfare committee of businesswomen consults with the girl and her sponsor regarding her job possibilities. If training is indicated, they endeavor to secure it for her. One BPW club has earmarked its contribution to be used in furtherance of its project "Employment of the Mature Woman," with the money expended for carfare, brush-up courses, and in the case of one "over 40" woman, such a useful adjunct to job hunting as a set of false teeth.

An advisory board of 12 women—all of whom are recovered alcoholics—works with the residents counseling and advising them.

Each girl has a sponsor, a recovered alcoholic, who understands her problems. The sponsor calls her girl at least once a day, invites her to meetings of recovered alcoholics, and is consulted by the trustees and welfare committees on all matters involving her.

As a further contribution to each girl's peace of mine, Attorney Morris tries to straighten out some of the problems. It is here that her legal training is of special value. Are creditors hounding the girl? Attorney Morris talks with the creditor. If the debt is an unjust one, the creditor is advised to "lay off;" the girl to "forget it." If the claim is bona fide, the creditor (with the girl's permission) is advised that she is seriously ill with alcoholism. If she recovers, the debt will be paid; if she continues drinking, he probably won't get his money anyway. Attorney Morris asks bluntly, "Why not give her a chance?" Most creditors cooperate.

Residents come from all walks of life. Some are college graduates, nurses, technicians, office workers, waitresses, factory workers. Most have seen jail from the inside. All have one common bond—a sincere desire to stop drinking. In their new, if temporary, home they quickly find friends, understanding, and help. No woman is ever turned out to find her troubled way alone. She is helped to a job, a pleasant place to live, and her new friends never slacken their interest in her welfare.

One woman, nearing 60, had been in and out of jail so often in 28 years of residence in the city that her only friends were among the jail matrons. This woman, after finding the road back at Crossroads, is now living in a boardinghouse run by a new-found friend and sponsor, a recovered alcoholic.

Perhaps the true meaning of Crossroads can best be expressed by the guests. Here in halting, heartwarming words is what Crossroads means to one newcomer whose poignant history of arrest and confinement is typical: "* * * I have been in Alcoholics Anonymous and at Crossroads for 5 days and I know evrything is going to be all right now because it's a wonderful place and a gift from God. God still loves me and everyone here loves me like a sister and I love them the same. I finally found what I have been searching for. I didn't know alcohol was a disease, I thought I was no good and had almost given up hope. I won't say that I'll never take another drink. I just hope and pray that I don't."

The road back can be a long one, and while it is paved with good intentions, they are not enough; it needs sympathetic, helping hands. Through Crossroads Foundation and Crossroads Home, the business, professional, and club women of San Diego are extending that helping hand to offer the homeless alcoholic women of San Diego one for the road * * * back.

Holly Product Saved Sub's Polar Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, all of us are very proud and elated at the remarkable accomplishments of our Navy's atomic submarine, the U.S.S. *Nautilus*. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a $135 purchase by the Navy from a small manufacturing plant in my own home district of Oakland County, Mich., which made this possible. The owner of this firm, Mr. Fred D. Barton, of Holly, Mich., has made an indirect, but nevertheless valuable, contribution to our Nation's defense and prestige.

The following account appeared in the January 23, 1959, issue of the Flint Journal:

HOLLY PRODUCT SAVED SUB'S POLAR TRIP

(By Harold R. Gerace)

If it hadn't been for $135 worth of stop-leak concoction—made in Flint area for auto radiators—the atomic submarine *Nautilus* wouldn't have made its epic voyage under the North Pole last August.

A leak in the condenser threatened to halt the voyage under the icecap by the $100 million vessel.

The stuff that succeeded, when all other efforts to stop the leak failed, is prepared and bottled in Holly at Bar's Products Supply, Inc., 720 Rose Street. Bar's is a contraction of Barton's.

Owner of the firm is Fred D. Barton, who got into the stopleak business by mixing water, soluble oil and a little household ginger.

He never dreamed that years later his modernized, patented product would make him the atomic age counterpart of the legendary Dutch boy who saved the town by using his finger to plug the leak in the dike.

Barton's radiator stop-leak is known the world over and is sold under a variety of brand names. It is used on six to seven million cars annually.

Comdr. William R. Anderson, skipper of the *Nautilus*, tells about the stop-leak treatment of the nuclear submarine in his book, "*Nautilus* 90 North." It is the story of the first voyage under the North Pole.

The *Nautilus* was in the Pacific en route to the Pole when the condenser developed a tiny leak. Salt water was seeping into the steam of the propulsion plan. This condition would corrode if it allowed to continue. The leak could not be found when the *Nautilus* was placed in drydock in Seattle.

In desperation, lest the polar trip be canceled, Commander Anderson ordered the crew to try the automobile stop-leak. At first the crewmen didn't know whether he was fooling. He finally convinced them he was dead earnest.

Barton treasures a Government purchase order for 75 quarts of radiator stop-leak to be consigned to the *Nautilus*. It cost $1.80 a quart, or $135.

"Incredible as it may see," Commander Anderson writes, "the stop-leak treatment worked. Wherever it was, the leak was plugged. Neither in Seattle, nor later would this problem arise again."

Barton has been the guest of the skipper of the *Nautilus* and was toured the submarine. He donated $1,000 to the recreation fund of the *Nautilus*.

The 51-year-old Barton once conducted a school to train salesmen. Its success caused him to go out of business.

His F&I Training School was in San Francisco. The letters meant "Focus & Impulse."

"All my graduates seemed to get high-salaried jobs," Barton recalled. "I guess I wasn't charging enough for the course. So I closed up the school to try for a high-paying job."

A ruddy-faced heavy-set individual whose 206 pounds are distributed on a 5-foot 10½-inch frame, Barton, in his gravel-throated voice, likes to expound his philosophy of the rights of individuals and small business.

He practices what he preaches, too. He has just taken on a giant chemical company in a suit to collect $33 million in a case involving his product. He also recently organized the RIS Foundation and endowed it with $50,000 to assist students studying for business careers. The initials "RIS" stand for the "right of the individual to sell."

Nearing completion is Barton's dream house. It is near his factory in an area he has named Holly Wood Acres. The house has five baths and will have a swimming pool.

Barton is a native of Saginaw and was graduated from Saginaw High School.

He spent many years in California. After he closed up his salesmen's school, he sought a job with an oil company. It was then that he became interested in automobiles.

In the backyard of his home, he mixed water-soluble oil with water and bottled and sold it as a rust-preventive for automobile radiators. As Barton tells it, he began wondering about adding something to his product that would also stop radiator leaks. He began experimenting with household items his wife had on hand. He isn't sure just why he tried ginger, but he did and it worked.

In trying to mix a better stop-leak, he finally came up with the roots of certain plants. His formula now is protected by patents. Virtually all new cars are treated with his product before they leave the factory. Buick is one of his big customers.

Plugging the leak in the Nautilus was probably the most spectacular feat of Barton's product, but it was by no means the first.

In 1950 his stop-leak saved a huge irrigation project from closing down. A ditch-digging shovel that scoops up 20 yards of dirt at a time and has the weird name of Walking Monagahan sprung a leak in its engine. The shovel, which "walks" as it progresses in digging, was the key machine for the entire project and hundreds of jobs were threatened.

In the 1956 Olympic games at Melbourne, Australia, the swimming events nearly came to a halt when the pool developed a leak. Again Barton's concoction fixed the trouble.

While he enjoys dwelling on the success of his product, Barton can remember the uncertainties encountered when he was starting out. Someone wanted to know if his stop-leak would be effective under compression—around the water jacket of an engine valve, for instance.

"You got rocks in your head?" he asked. "How could something like that withstand compression?"

After thinking about it, Barton quietly gave it a try and, to his amazement, found it did stop leaks under compression.

Since then he has never made the mistake of underestimating his product.

He got into the stop-leak business in 1947 and moved to Holly in 1954. He wanted to get back to Michigan. He now operates another plant, Fret, Inc., in Shortsville, N.Y.

The name Fret again shows Barton's fascination for abbreviations. The word is an acronym—a combination of the first two letters in his name, Fred, and his wife's, Ethel.

The Bartons have two daughters, Mrs. William Fies, Redwood City, Calif., and Barbara Beth, a student nurse at the University of Michigan.

"No son," he mournfully comments. "That's the tragedy."

Warren County, Ind., Farm Program Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED WAMPLER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, recently I received an exceptionally interesting report setting out in some detail the results of a farm program survey conducted by an energetic, nonpartisan group of approximately 30 Warren County, Ind., farmers.

I was particularly impressed with the survey report, which was brought to my attention by Mr. Warren C. Wright of Williamsport, Ind., because of the specifically-mentioned unbiased composition of the survey group itself. The group's roster included individuals of both major political affiliations, as well as large and small farmers.

As I told Secretary of Agriculture Benson, in a letter covering the survey's transmittal to him for his analysis, there is considerable merit to the contention of the Warren County group that the farmer be given an opportunity to vote on the type of farm program with which he must comply.

I am, and I feel sure anyone even relatively close to this country's agricultural economy is, entirely sympathetic with the farmer's efforts to increase his income to full parity thus attaining an equality of purchasing power, while decreasing the production of surplus farm commodities, with the ultimate goal of eliminating Government subsidies.

Although the administrative costs of such a program as proposed by the Warren County, Ind., survey group might slightly exceed current costs, this small increase in operational expenditures would be more than offset, in the long run, by the reduction, if not the removal, of tremendous quantities of grain now in storage, thereby saving the taxpayer astronomically high annual storage costs and contributing to the eventual elimination of subsidies.

The Warren County, Ind., farm program proposals follows:

WARREN COUNTY FARM PROGRAM

The following tentative farm program was discussed, developed, and written by a group of approximately 25 to 30 Warren County, Ind., farmers with no political affiliation, organized backing, or outside influence for the purpose of conducting a survey to determine what type of a farm program, we as Warren County farmers most desire of the three general types (high price supports with rigid controls, flexible supports, or present program, or no program at all).

In order to conduct the survey, the following program was formulated:

TENTATIVE FARM PROGRAM

The purpose of this program is to increase our income to full parity in order that we might as farmers have equality of purchasing power, while decreasing production of commodities now in surplus, and to eliminate government subsidies and handouts.

(a) Full parity support price on all feed grains and certain crops such as corn, soybeans, wheat, grain sorghums, barley, oats, rye, etc. This could apply to any crop or crops in any area.

Full parity being approximately $1.75 for corn, $3 for beans, $2.40 for wheat, $2.60 per hundredweight for grain sorghum, 87 cents per bushel for oats, $1.33 per bushel for barley, $1.57 per bushel for rye, etc.

Compulsory acreage allotments shall be established on all farms in the United States that produce any crop that has a price support. These allotments shall be given only to those farms having grown such crops in one or more of the past 3 years. These allotments shall be established for each crop on any farm by the following method:

A percentage of total tillable crop acre base shall be established for each crop in any area by using a 10-year land use history of that crop in its area.

The national need for each crop would be determined and a certain percentage would be deducted from, or added to, the land use history base of all areas. Each farm within its land use area would then have the same percentage of its tillable crop acres in any given crop, as every other farm in that area. This eliminates the unfairness that has always been present and helps, rather than hinders, the farmer that has been using good farming practices.

This system for allotting acres could be applied to any crop grown in the United States and would eliminate the shifting of overproduction of crops from one area to another.

The total allotted acres for any crop in the United States should be set low enough (without any floor on acres) to just produce our national and foreign needs, or even cut into the surplus, if it exists, for the next 2 or 3 years.

A 2 months' supply, or whatever deemed necessary, of these supported crops, should be established as a national reserve commodity to be used in case of emergency, such as war, drought, floods, etc.

The penalty for exceeding the acres shall be set at: Overage acres X average area yield X support price, with the option of destroying the overage acres of crop before harvest.

(b) Twenty percent, or whatever percentage deemed necessary, of the tillable crop acres of each farm having a crop allotment shall be put in a soil building program free of Government payment.

The penalty for not complying with the soil building part of this program shall be: The number of acres not in compliance X average area yield X support price of highest priced crop of that area.

(c) A levy of five cents per alloted acres to be used for new uses and better markets of all allotted farm crops.

(d) The last and probably the most important part of this program is to give the farmer a chance to vote on the type of program he most desires among the three general types (high price supports with compulsory allotments, flexible price supports with little or no allotments, or no farm program at all).

This program along with a ballot and a self-addressed stamped envelope was sent out to fourteen hundred farmers in Warren

County (tenants, landlords and farm managers who farmed, owned or managed fifteen acres or more), with the following results:

Four hundred sixty nine were voted and returned and counted at a public meeting; 48 percent voted for the high support compulsory acreage allotment or above program; 33 percent voted for the no program; 19 percent voted for the present program. This survey was taken in February 1958.

It was our hope that by developing a program and taking a survey that, we could determine what the farmers of Warren County really wanted in the way of a farm program. We felt that we were successful in that 35 percent of the ballots were voted and returned. The fact that 48 percent of the votes were for a program that has some teeth in it was also very significant because, this survey was taken in a county that has a very strong Farm Bureau organization (all but 2 of the 25 to 30 farmers who developed the program are Farm Bureau members) which is opposed to a high support, compulsory program.

A survey was also taken in Pike-Steuben Township Farm Bureau of Warren County. One hundred and sixty ballots were sent out, 64 or 40 percent were voted and returned with the following results: 13.9 percent voted for Farm Bureau program (support at 90 percent of average market price for last 3 years with no allotments); 67.4 percent for full parity with compulsory allotments; none for flexible price supports; 18.6 percent for no program at all.

It is our feeling that if this new program was adopted this would still be a big administrative job, but the total cost would be far less than storing huge quantities of grain year after year. The only way to solve the farm problem is to control production the same as every other business does that manufactures a product to sell.

The big thing that is bothering most farmers is the fact that they don't have the opportunity to vote to determine the type of farm programs they most desire. That, if nothing else, is something that certainly could be rectified.

The recent corn referendum was an example of sidestepping of the issues and was an insult to the intelligence of the average farmer. There was nothing on the ballot but a choice between an unworkable program and one that will make the situation even worse. I sat on the election board (corn referendum) and, of the few farmers that did vote, practically every one expressed his dissatisfaction in no uncertain terms.

WARREN COUNTY SURVEY GROUP.

George Christopher: He Served the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following fine editorial on our late colleague, the Honorable George H. Christopher, of Missouri, appeared in the January 30, 1959, edition of the Kansas City Daily News-Press:

GEORGE CHRISTOPHER: HE SERVED THE PEOPLE

It's hard to believe that Congressman George H. Christopher is gone. The leathery visaged Shakespeare quoting man of the soil served well the people he knew best—the farmer and the working man who comprised the majority of his constituents.

Because farming is often a complicated business in this day and age, Congressman Christopher could also grasp the problems arising for the businessman, especially the small businessman.

As a Democrat he always found the time to lend his services and presence to any party group or gathering, no matter how large or how small. It was this common touch, this willingness to serve all the people and the party he represented, that endeared him to so many, and paved the way to victory for him when the chips were down.

Always a fighter, he overcame the handicap of an amputated leg to make a strong and successful bid for reelection.

In a way it was fitting that his life should end after passing the biblical mark of three score and ten, for he was a God-fearing man and knew the Good Book and lived by its principles.

For George Christopher the end came in the Capital City of the Nation he loved.

His body is now interred where his heart forever was—in Bates County, among the people he loved.

An Honor to a Great Wisconsin Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished editor, well-known throughout the country for his continued and outspoken efforts in the interest of the economic, political, and social welfare of the people, has now been honored for his dedicated service to, and perpetuation of, the ideals, heritage, and culture of Norway.

King Olav V of Norway has bestowed the Knight's Cross, First Class, of the Royal Order of St. Olav upon William T. Evjue, editor and publisher of the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times.

Mr. Evjue, in the progressive traditions which he saw grow under the personal guidance of the late Senator Robert M. LaFollette, Sr., and his sons, and which he has nurtured through his persistent editorial leadership, is held in high regard by the people of the State of Wisconsin and the Nation for his dedicated opposition to the forces of concentrated wealth. Now he has received a highly deserved recognition for his fidelity to the heritage and culture of Norway, passed on to him by his parents who immigrated to Wisconsin from Norway. It is for this loyalty that King Olav V has conferred the rare honor upon this leading citizen of Wisconsin.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article describing in detail the honor conferred upon Mr. Evjue, which appeared in the Wisconsin State Journal, Madison, Wis.:

WILLIAM T. EVJUE AWARDED TOP HONOR BY NORWAY KING

William T. Evjue, 920 Castle place, editor and publisher of the Capital Times, has been awarded the Knight's Cross, First Class, of the Royal Order of St. Olav by King Olav V of Norway.

Evjue was notified of the award, given for furthering Norwegian ideals, heritage, and culture in this country, Tuesday in a letter from the Norwegian consul in Chicago, Ill., Helge Akre.

Evjue said Tuesday that he had been invited to receive the award and accompanying citation at the Norwegian consulate in Chicago at his convenience but had not decided when he would do so.

The award is the highest Norwegian honor which can be awarded to an American civilian. It includes the St. Olav Medal and a citation signed by the King.

No specific reasons for the award were cited in the letter of notification and Evjue said Tuesday that it came as a complete surprise to him. His intense interest in his Norwegian heritage and Norwegian-American activities in this country are well known, however.

The award will be the second time that Evjue has been honored by the Norwegian Government. During the early years of World War II, he was cited for his work as State chairman of the Norwegian Relief Committee which raised money to be sent to Norway for the relief of citizens of the war-stricken country.

Evjue becomes the third State resident to be given the St. Olav Medal. In 1940, Einar Haugen, chairman of the department of Scandinavian studies at the University of Wisconsin, was presented with the award after serving as a visiting professor at the Univerisity of Norway in 1938.

The late Gov. Albert G. Schmedeman also received the award during World War I for his service as U.S. Minister to Norway.

King Olav V, who conferred the honor upon Evjue, is no stranger to Madison. He visited here in 1939, while still Crown Prince, was awarded an honorary doctor of law degree by the university, addressed the legislature, and was entertained at the Madison club in a gala event by the late Gov. Julius Heil.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include the following letter which I recently received from Tullius Brady of Brookhaven, Miss.:

DEAR MR. JENSEN: Sir, I wish to thank you for your remarks of January 9, published on page A33 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is such a tragedy that there are so few of you, too few, I fear, to save us from destruction.

Sincerely,

TULLIUS BRADY.

P.S.—This, too, should be put in the RECORD, just to keep it straight that someone knew a long time ago this would happen.

Words of Webster in eulogy of George Washington, who said: "If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvests.

"It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.

"But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty?

"Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity?

"No, if these columns fall, they will be raised not again! Like the Coliseum and Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful and a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty."—"Daniel Webster's Eulogy of Washington."

A Budget, "Political" and How

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members and the country at large will digest this editorial which appeared in the February 2 issue of Life magazine. The writer did a great service for our country in presenting this and I hope everyone reads it and understands it:

A BUDGET, "POLITICAL" AND HOW

The budget for fiscal 1960 which the President submitted last week is already the hottest issue between him and Congress. Democratic Senate Leader LYNDON JOHNSON immediately termed it a "propaganda budget" which was designed to "create a political issue for 1960." JOHNSON was grossly unfair to the President. Nevertheless the wily Texan said a mouthful.

If the Republicans stand with the President, and the Democrats behave in their normal spendthrift manner, the voting issue before the American people in 1960 will be clear and sharp. That issue will be the value of the dollar. The purpose of the President's budget is to protect the dollar. LYNDON JOHNSON and SAM RAYBURN will have to watch their step if they do not want to subvert the dollar, which is the first step to subverting the country. Any Congressman who does not actually favor inflation (or higher taxes) must either support this budget or try to cut in. Instead of which, leading Democrats are attacking it as too small, with epithets like "skinflint."

A "skinflint" budget? It is the largest peacetime budget in U.S. history. It is barely balanced (at $77 billion) in a year which, in Ike's own words, is "expected to be the most prosperous of our history." It is as full of economic waste as the Nation can afford.

The men who made this budget assume an increase of more than $30 billion in this year's gross national product, from which they figure to get $9 billion more in Federal revenues at present tax rates. The men who made the budget achieve balance by cuts of $3.8 billion below the current rate of spending. But so far from slashing any major Federal programs, they have merely taken advantage of the expiration of certain nonrecurring expenses of fiscal fifty-nine, such as the soil bank, Federal unemployment payments, and the antirecession Housing Act. Our greatest economic scandal, farm subsidies, remains virtually untouched.

The Eisenhower budget meets all the basic civilian needs of a prosperous U.S. economy, with a big bet on continued expension. It is a typically Republican bet, that a free economy will do its own expanding if Federal policy gives it half a chance. Democrats argue that this rich country can afford the many extra public services, from dams and public housing to subsidized consumption and easy money, for which any imaginative politician can pretend to hear a public demand. Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve, answers that argument with this question: "Since Americans clearly can afford these expenditures, why don't they pay for them?" The only way we can pay for more Government services than we are getting is through higher taxes. Either that—or inflation and ruination.

The Republicans think taxes are high enough now, if not too high. In his state of the Union message, Eisenhower declared his next objective after securing a balanced budget: a thorough revision of the tax structure, to remove inequities and to enhance incentives for all Americans. In short, a downward revision. In these fly-now-pay-later days, it may seem an old-fashioned order of business to deny ourselves public services now so as to have more real income later. But it is also the honest order. The tax revision Eisenhower promises depends on a stable dollar. A nation incapable of balancing its budget in the most prosperous years in its history would be a nation incapable of self-government.

Such are the issues raised by this Eisenhower budget. It makes fiscal integrity a political issue. Congressmen who support this budget will be doing the minimum necessary for a sound dollar. Congressmen who vote additions without voting equal cuts or new taxes must be deemed irresponsible. If Republicans and Democrats divide along that line, the Republican chances in 1960 will look very much better than in 1958.

The Most Brazen Attempt at Propaganda Ever Devised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times and other newspapers last week carried news accounts of an exhibit of Russian-made scientific equipment set up at meetings of the American Physical Society and the American Association of Physics Teachers at the Hotel New Yorker in New York City. The purpose of this exhibit was to promote the sale to American schools of such Soviet-made equipment as microscopes, electronic equipment, projectors, and other apparatus for use in our classrooms.

Mr. Speaker, in passing the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Congress declared:

The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women. The present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available. The defense of the Nation depends upon the mastery of modern techniques, development from complex scientific principles. It depends as well on the discovery and development of new principles, new techniques, and new knowledge.

This act was designed to make appropriations of some $70 million annually over a 4-year period to State education agencies for the acquisition of equipment to teach sciences, mathematics, and modern foreign languages.

It is a sobering challenge.

It must be met head on. We cannot afford to be second best in this educational race with Russia.

To meet it, we will need the best talents of American educators, the best talents of American manufacturers, and the enthusiastic cooperation of our schoolchildren and college students.

This is a project for the whole United States.

Its seriousness is shown by the fact that no sooner had the ink dried on this new law than the Russians began figuring ways to take advantage of it—for Russia.

And—in typical Red fashion—they've really moved right in on us. They want to show us how to teach our youngsters. They want to show us with made in Russia scientific equipment which they are anxious to sell to American school boards, State educational agencies, and colleges at a much lower cost than American-produced equipment.

This is the most brazen attempt at propaganda ever devised. The Russians hope to reach our youth during their most impressionable years. They hope to convince them—by setting up made in Russia equipment in our classrooms—that Russia is the world's No. 1 scientific power.

How can we convince our youngsters that America is the greatest of all nations—that our scientists are the world's best—that our manufacturers produce products that are the envy of the world—if we place Russian microscopes, electronic equipment, and other devices in their physics lab classes?

Sure, the Russian-made equipment is cheaper. Even with the heavy duty the Russians must pay their equipment can be sold at lower prices than American-made goods. Do I have to tell you why? The Russian equipment is made by slave labor or other workers in Government-run factories. In fact, I am sure that the Reds would be glad to provide these wonderful propaganda gimmicks for free if we would let them. They realize, of course, that to give it to us for free would make it a truly propaganda vehicle but by selling it to us they are bringing in this propaganda weapon under the guise of commercial business.

There is no question among the educators and scientists with whom I have talked that our equipment is far superior to the Russian equipment. But that is not the point. This is just another Russian move—another Russian big step—to propagandize us. We hope that American educators will have more sense than to fall for this obvious device.

A Bill To Impose a Tax Upon Savings and Loan Associations and Mutual Savings Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced a bill to equalize a taxpaying situation in our economy and at the same time provide revenue to the Federal Treasury, which is similar to the bill I introduced in the last Congress with the exception that I have deleted the portion that limited the amount savings and loan institutions could pay out in dividends and receive a tax credit.

The following is the same explanation I made of the bill at the time I originally introduced it. However, before setting it out I want to make it clear that my purpose in introducing a specific bill was and still is to have something specific for the Ways and Means Committee to consider. In suggesting that the 12 percent tax reserve fund be changed to 5 percent I am wedded to no figure. If hearings developed the fact that more than 5 percent is required I would be interested in using that figure. Certainly savings and loan and mutual banks are entitled to some differential which reflects their actual needs for reserve accounts to insure the safety of their investors. On the other hand, that figure should be realistic as should all differentials placed in our tax code. All differentials need periodic review lest through changed circumstances or merely through added experience we find that what we thought was a differential actually is a preferential.

I do not share the concern of certain people in the mutual bank and savings and loan field that equalizing the tax burden between savings institutions places a tax on thrift. Quite the contrary, it should encourage thrift by making the institutions which appeal to the people to save on a more equally competitive basis. The entire issue should be what will made the Federal tax laws neutral as between competitive thrift institutions. Differences between types of institutions should be reflected in the tax laws where the differences make a competitive difference. If the differential is too large it becomes a preference; if too small it becomes a burden. I want the amount of tax free credit funds to be neither a preference nor a burden. Two way of equalizing.

This bill would impose a tax upon savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks. It is motivated by no lack of appreciation for the economic service being performed by these institutions. Quite the contrary. As a member of the board of directors for 17 years of the oldest savings and loan institution in Missouri, I am deeply concerned about their economic welfare and want them to continue performing the service they do perform for our society. I am satisfied that placing them on a basis of nearer equality as opposed to preference, with other savings institutions will actually redound to their economic health. Wherever possible we should remove subsidies in our economy whether they are in the nature of direct subsidies or indirect subsidies through tax benefits or other devices.

Savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks were specifically exempt from the payment of Federal income taxes until 1951. In that year the Congress revoked their tax-exempt status and put them on a taxpaying basis. While this amendment was in the Senate, however, a provision was added which permits a savings and loan association or mutual savings bank to retain, as a deductible reserve for bad debts, any and all earnings as long as the reserves of the association do not exceed 12 percent of all withdrawable accounts. As a result of this provision, which was enacted into law, practically all savings and loan associations and most mutual savings banks are able to retain all their earned income without paying and Federal income tax thereon.

It was obviously the intent of the Congress, in removing the tax-exempt status of these organizations, to put them on a taxpaying basis. That intent was not fulfilled as a result of the tax formula which was adopted. The ineffectiveness of this formula is quite evident by comparing their reserves when the tax law was passed with those of a recent date. At the end of 1951 the capital structure of the members of the Home Loan Bank System—representing 95 percent of the assets of all associations—was 8.2 percent of their outstanding shares, which then totaled $15,025,505,000. Earnings in 1951 were $540,260,000. On December 31, 1955, with earnings of $1,190,865,000, and outstanding shares of $30,813 million—an increase of $15,800 million—their capital structure was approximately 7.5 percent of outstanding shares. Thus, it is evident that after years of tremendous prosperity, they are getting no closer to being required to pay any Federal income tax.

Section 593(2) of the Internal Revenue Code should be amended so that it will no longer permit practically all savings and loan associations and most mutual savings banks to escape the payment of all income taxes. Since most State laws relating to State chartered building and loan associations provide for a reserve equal to from 3 to 5 percent of withdrawable accounts, it seems that a reserve of that amount would be adequate. At the present time the reserve of most commercial banks is less than 1 percent. In order, then, to put savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks on a taxpaying basis, the suggested bill provides that the amount of tax-free reserve funds that can be accumulated be limited to 5 percent instead of 12 percent of withdrawable accounts.

Russian Chrome Ore to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as most of my colleagues are undoubtedly aware, a major U.S. producer of ferroalloys recently acquired 80,000 tons of Russian chrome ore. Commenting on this transaction, the E&MJ Metal and Mineral Markets, in their October 30, 1958, issue, stated that the United States has "no significant amount of chrome ore—it is clearly a have-not nation in this respect."

Mr. Speaker, it is true that chrome deposits in this country are not as large as those existing in several other countries. However, it is quite untrue to contend that the United States is a have-not nation with respect to chrome ore. Our present have-not position has nothing to do with a lack of deposits—it only results from the lack of a sound domestic mining program. It is for this reason that I have diligently worked for the enactment of such a program and am hopeful that one will be enacted promptly during the 86th Congress.

Commenting on the E&MJ Metal and Mineral Markets article, the November 1958 issue of the Ore.-Bin, published by the Oregon State Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, made some interesting statements which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues. Consequently, I ask permission to include this article in the RECORD:

RUSSIAN CHROME ORE TO UNITED STATES

The E & MJ Metal and Mineral Markets, issue of October 30, 1958, states:

"Russian chrome ore, 80,000 tons of it, is being acquired by a major U.S. producer of ferroalloys. The same firm bought perhaps a third as much last year. On both occasions a Canadian broker arranged the business.

"The transaction is probably better described as a barter arrangement. An amount of steel equal in value to the chrome ore is being taken by the Canadian broker for shipment to the U.S.S.R. A major U.S. steel manufacturer may have had more interests in arranging the transaction than the ore consumer. The steel company has probably assured the ferrochrome manufacturer it will take any of the ferro the latter cannot sell.

"Though the ore is scheduled to go to Canada, shipping arrangements for some of it may provide for alternative U.S. destinations. The ore is standard Russian ore—good grade but with considerable amount of fines.

"Doubtless chrome ore suppliers and their governments will express displeasure at acceptance by U.S. firms of Russian ore. Some Americans take the position that since the U.S. has no significant amount of chrome ore—it is clearly a have-not country in this respect, and chrome ore is an important product to the steel industry here, it is to the advantage of the United States to take all it can get from the U.S.S.R. It might appear that it conserves the limited Western supply. Turkish chrome ore representatives have been saying Turkish good grade ore is becoming scarcer and that what was

a few years ago considered only passable ore is now considered high grade; they suggest this will continue. They have claimed prices must rise because of this growing scarcity of good ore. In the past year Turkish asking prices have dropped very little in spite of the drastic drop in sales.

"The claim probably will be made the Russian sales are really calculated to destroy the western chrome ore industry. Some chrome ore suppliers point out that the U.S.S.R. was once a major supplier of chrome and manganese ore to the U.S. and some years ago stopped selling here—a part of the U.S.S.R.'s economic warfare. No one doubts the U.S.S.R. will engage in economic or any other form of warfare that suits its purpose. But there is no doubt it also has the more usual motive—to export in order to import.

"Since the U.S.S.R. is taking an equal value of steel, and since the steelmaker here appears to be as interested in the steel market as the ferromaker is in getting the ore, any claim of economic warfare may be hard to prove. Doubtless when negotiations were going on the sale of perhaps $3.5 million of steel looked to be most beneficial to the U.S. economy and steel industry. Certainly U.S. firms can be expected to compete with the rest of the Western World in getting foreign business, including with Russia. They have been put to considerable disadvantage by the slowness with which the U.S. Government has implemented the COCOM agreements, announced August 15, to drop the Western embargo on the export of hundreds of products to the U.S.S.R.

"It is most impractical to export products to the Iron Curtain areas without importing from them; if U.S. firms are going to get a significant amount of that business they will have to import from them also."

How familiar these arguments sound to the West's mining industry. Following World War II we were characterized as a "have not" nation in various materials, including tungsten, petroleum, cobalt, columbium-tantalum, uranium, and quicksilver—to name a few. Now we have many of these commodities "running out of our ears." That "have not" is a matter of price has been demonstrated time and again.

Another slant on the subject is furnished by the Wall Street Journal in its commodity letter of November 18, 1958. Here pitfalls of trading with Russia are touched upon. Sales of aluminum and platinum have been carefully timed by Russia to disrupt the markets, according to U.S. producers. Russia trades arms for cotton and then dumps the cotton on world markets. Now it is rumored that Russia plans to dump Chinese tea.

Perhaps the barter of American steel for Russian chrome, as described above, benefits the steel producer in this instance, but such a deal puts another nail in the coffin of the domestic chrome industry and therefore is difficult to reconcile with the common good.

The Institute of International Education Presents an Award for Distinguished Service to the People of Burns, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday evening, January 30, at a dinner at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C., the Institute of International Education celebrated its 40th birthday anniversary. The highlight of the event was the granting of awards to organizations, institutions, and individuals that have made unusual contributions to the understanding among nations.

Among the recipients chosen by the institute is the town of Burns, Kans. This award is granted because of the unusual service of the town of Burns, Kans., in developing international understanding. The award was made by Vice President NIXON. Mr. and Mrs. E. D. Grimwood, of Burns, accepted the award. It is an honor to include in the RECORD the citation as well as the reply of Mrs. Grimwood. The town of Burns is in the Fourth District of Kansas. Mr. and Mrs. Grimwood are among its leading citizens:

CITATION FOR A U.S. COMMUNITY

To the people of Burns, Kans., who have created a home away from home for foreign students from all parts of the world, the Institute of International Education presents its award for distinguished service.

In the midst of farmlands and oilfields, isolated from the stream of world traffic, this town of 310 people has proved that international exchange is not the sole privilege of metropolitan cities. Since 1954, young men and women of very race, creed and color have been welcomed into the homes of the Burns farmer, the cabinetmaker, the minister, the businessman and the teacher. A foreign student aptly characterized the distinctive character of the town when he said, "Burns is on the way to and from everywhere."

The Burns program, organized by the Women's Society of the Methodist Church, began on Thanksgiving, 1954. The first foreign visitors were 10 students from the University of Kansas, 140 miles away. Not only did they return, but they brought with them friends from campuses across the country. They came on Christmas, New Year's, Mother's Day, Easter, the Fourth of July, and during the summer—just as American students come home for college vacations.

In 5 years 77 students from 37 countries—Hindus, Moslems, Christians and Buddhists—have come to Burns, not once but many times. If the city of Washington, with a population of 800,000, had opened its homes on a comparable scale, we would have had 192,000 guests from abroad here during that time. As one overseas guest said, "Burns is the smallest U.S. community with the biggest foreign diplomatic service in the world."

The students came back to Burns because they did not feel like visitors. They had gained the feeling of belonging to a family—a rare gift to any man or woman thousands of miles from his own country. These students have become a part of the life of Burns. They drive combines and tractors in the wheat fields, milk cows in local dairies, help to cook meals and dress the children, and some even teach Sunday-school classes. They have shared the joys and sorrows of this small town, taking part in its weddings, baptisms, and funerals.

One foreign student on her return home described the impact of her Burns experience: "When I close my eyes a little bit I see the Grimwood house with the chain of Christmas lights in front, and my look wanders around: I see Burns Plaza, the Methodist and Catholic churches, the Nelson's, the Lohrentz', the Funke's and Notz's, the Brenzikofer's, the Warkentine's, and all the other houses and farms. And it is good to know that you are all there instead of in a big city, where life and people are changing so terribly fast. I see you picking up your mail at the post office—there must be a lot of foreign mail—and going to the grocery and filling station. Really, I haven't lost a bit of all this, because they are my most and best cherished memories. It is a great accomplishment, what you have done. We never can pay back all of you. It never can be compared with the organized dinners and club and church meetings where in the long run a foreign student felt a little bit like a peacock in a zoo. You gave us part of you, by sharing your everyday life with us."

To the citizens of Burns, the descendants of pioneers, who have understood so well that friendship is not a gesture but a real sharing of everyday life, the Institute of International Education presents its distinguished service award.

The award will be accepted by Mr. and Mrs. E. D. Grimwood of Burns, Kans.

RESPONSE OF MRS. E. D. GRIMWOOD

This evening you have presented to our community of Burns the highest honor which can be received by a group of citizens active in extending hospitality to students from other lands.

As we accept this citation we would like to share it with other Kansas communities which have taken an active part in the student exchange program.

We feel that the award is not limited to Kansans, but it is being shared by the many students who have been in our homes, students who are now living in many areas throughout the world. Above all, we would mention the first 10 foreign students who came to Burns. Not only were they at home with us, but they made us feel at home with them. They encouraged the participating families with the warmth of their response to our hospitality and with many letters of appreciation which followed their first visit to Burns.

One of the first letters which we received was from an Italian school teacher who said, "When I come back to Italy and I will speak about America, I always think Burns, and I am sure all my friends will like Burns. I can never forget the lesson, wonderful lesson, that you gave me: You invited in your home the Catholic priest and the Methodist minister, and they looked very well together. This one, for us intolerant European and Asiatic people, was the best lesson of tolerance."

One of the six students who spent Christmas Eve 1954 in Burns said it was impossible to be homesick when she went to church and recognized the postmaster and his assistant, a rancher in whose home she had been a guest, her host's baby sitter and she even knew the priest.

It is not unusual for a Burmese to see his first snowfall in Burns; a German lawyer to assist his host in cutting fireplace wood; a doctor in economics from Pakistan and a Venezuelan engineer to freeze ice cream for a party; a Methodist host to be welcomed as a visitor in the Mennonite church with his guest—a Quaker from Kenya; or for a Swiss student to take her fellow Europeans to town to meet her friend, Mr. Hammann, the harness maker.

Families who have been hosts to students, other than those named in the citation, are the Don Parrishs, Mark Millers, Fred Olberdings, James Benjamins, and Rev. Robert Peters.

Tuesday, just before our departure for Washington, a Burns hostess shared with me a letter which she had just received. It was written by a Japanese teacher who, together with her husband, had visited our community for the only time less than 2 months ago. She wrote: "Thank you so much for your letter which made me homesick for

Burns. How I wish to visit your home again (before I leave for Japan) but since things are so rushing it looks very doubtful. I hope you will write me and tell me all about your lovely home and about life in Burns so that I can remember Burns as if I visited there often."

We, in Burns, have made no new discovery * * * but we have experienced an age-old reality: When people can live together in the atmosphere of a home there are no barriers of race, creed or nationality. One of our students wrote from Switzerland this Christmas: "This sharing of your everyday life with us is certainly one of the finest accomplishments in a foreign students program. I wish some Russians could come some day and experience the same. And many more of them* * * then we would not need to be afraid of a war."

Our hands are small * * * because they are few, But, when linked with God's hand they have become big and we have been thrilled to share in a bit of His plan for world peace.

If we could be granted one prayer this evening it would be that many additional communities the size of Burns, Kans., would also share in this plan which could eventually bring peace to our world.

Mr. Vice President, to you and to the Institute of International Education, we say, "Thank you, from the depths of our hearts."

St. Louis Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men Opposes Recognition of Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles J. Malloy, social action chairman of the St. Louis Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men, has forwarded to me a resolution adopted by the council, and also by the National Council of Catholic Men, dealing with the question of recognition of Red China. I think this merits the attention of the House and I am submitting it for printing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Most Rev. Joseph E. Ritter, S.T.D., is episcopal chairman of the St. Louis Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men. J. Stuart MacLellan is president. The Rev. Clarence D. White is spiritual moderator, and the Rev. John P. Cradick is assistant spiritual moderator.

The resolution referred to, as adopted by the executive committee of the National Council of Catholic Men and also by the St. Louis Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men, is as follows:

OPPOSING RECOGNITION OF RED CHINA

We have noted in recent days that certain groups and individuals have expressed favorable policies and opinions in regard to the recognition of Red China by the United States and the admission of Red China to the UN.

The National Council of Catholic Men wishes to record once again its strong opposition to such recognition and admission of Red China. It also opposes any steps which might lead in this direction.

The passing of time has only served to underscore again and again that Red China by its policies and action is opposed to the principles of the United Nations and the United States.

Sophisticated technicalities and secular philosophies cannot be used to rationalize the facts of international life as related to Red China.

These facts are known to the people of the United States.

War, religious, and secular persecution, the violation of human rights are not credentials acceptable for recognition by either the UN or the United States.

We respectfully call upon the Congress of the United States to reaffirm the joint resolution of the 84th Congress on this matter.

We Bitterly Oppose Raise in Federal Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, since the new budget recommendations were made 2 weeks ago, there has been considerable publicity in the press concerning the proposal to raise the Federal tax on gasoline in order to meet the mounting costs of the Federal highway program.

When this program was before the Congress several years ago, I opposed it because I felt at that time, and still feel, that this would be just another example of Federal assumption of power in the States and that it would ultimately cost the American people far more than its supporters led us to believe. I believe that roadbuilding, like so many other things, can best be handled by the States and I am opposed to raising gasoline taxes further.

Typical of the objections I have had brought to my attention is that contained in a fine editorial in the Hopewell News of Hopewell, Va., edited by Mr. A. Robbins, Jr.

Mr. Robbins is a sound believer in States rights and in the necessity of maintaining a strong fiscal economy. He advocates a commonsense approach to the problems of our people and is a firm believer in self-reliance rather than the present-day tendency to run to the Federal Government to meet our needs. I wholeheartedly concur in his feelings.

Given the situation we now face, I feel the suggestions he makes are worthy of attention and I would like to include the editorial herein with my remarks:

WE BITTERLY OPPOSE RAISE IN FEDERAL GASOLINE TAX

There was one item in the President's budget message with which we violently disagree. That was his proposal to increase the Federal tax on gasoline by 1½ cents.

This has no bearing on balancing the budget, because the money would go into the separate fund being used to construct the huge new System of Interstate Highways.

Due in considerable measure to the hard work of our own Senator HARRY F. BYRD this new highway system was set up separately, outside the Federal budget, supposedly on a pay-as-you-go basis. It had the Federal taxes on gasoline, oils, tires, etc., assigned to it and this was supposed to pay the Federal Government's share of the system.

But, due to rising costs, the special highway fund is going into the red during the next fiscal year, if construction continues at the present rate. So the President calls upon the Congress to raise the Federal gasoline tax from 3 to 4½ cents per gallon.

ANOTHER SIDE

There is another side to the coin, of which we here in Virginia are very conscious. In spite of the fact that the Federal Bureau of Public Roads is supposed to pay 90 percent of the cost of these interstate superhighways, the extra costs to the various State highway departments, above the actual 10 percent of the construction costs, have put such a burden on many of them that they are going into the red, if they meet all the Federal matching terms and still keep up their own primary and secondary highways.

The Virginia Highway Department estimates that it will need an additional $25 million in the next tax years if it is to continue to match the Federal interstate highway money and meet all of its other obligations on our primary and secondary highways.

Governor Almond has hinted that it might be necessary to ask the next general assembly to increase the Virginia gasoline tax 1 or 1½ cents per gallon to meet this situation.

If the Federal tax went to 4½ cents and the State tax to 7½ cents, that would make a total tax load of 12 cents on every gallon of gasoline that we burn. That is too much. It is not fair to the average motorists to force them to pay such a high tax on gasoline.

As we have stated before, we would rather see the Virginia tax hiked one penny, if that is necessary to take care of the pressing needs of our State highway department, than to see the Federal tax increased at all. As a matter of fact we have always felt that the Federal Government should have left the taxing of gasoline entirely to the States.

ONE SOLUTION

In any event, there is apparently only one solution to this situation, without raising taxes and that is to spread out the Federal Interstate highway program over a longer period of years.

Even then, it might be necessary to increase the State tax on gasoline 1 cent per gallon. We would oppose any greater increase and we bitterly oppose any increase in the Federal tax.

If you think as we do, that speeding up this huge Federal program is not worth paying more Federal gasoline tax for, then we urge you to write to our Representative and our Senators:

Representative WATKINS M. ABBITT, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.; Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.; Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

And if you feel strongly about it also write to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, The White House, Washington, D.C. He won't see the letter, but if enough protests descend on The White House it will make an impression.

We feel that the automobile has been made the goat for taxes long enough. When you buy a new car there are a minimum of some $600 in Federal taxes in the purchase price. And the Federal Government goes right ahead taxing tires, oil, gasoline, etc. Then we have the State gasoline taxes, license plates, drivers license, property tax, etc.

It is time that automobile owners put a stop to it. We don't think that a few years delay in completing the huge new Federal Interstate Highways is going to hurt anything. It won't affect most of us one way or the other. But if they put another increase on the gas tax you know very well we'll never get rid of it.

The Balanced Budget—Administration's Answer to Soviet ICBM

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent article appeared in the Friday, January 9, 1959, issue of the Kansas City-St. Joseph Register:

THE BALANCED BUDGET—ADMINISTRATION'S ANSWER TO SOVIET ICBM

(By Norma Krause Herzfeld)

In spite of sputniks and congressional pressures and various reports and cries of mortal danger, President Eisenhower continues to be more interested in achieving a balanced budget than in providing adequate military defenses against Russian armed might. The public has long since been shut out of the great debate on U.S. military security, and secrecy and deliberate misrepresentation have made it increasingly difficult for the press to dig up the facts.

Nevertheless, it is quite possible, according to all available indications, that the United States has already lost the cold war. And if it hasn't already lost it, and no drastic changes are made in the present go-slow, little-bit-of-everything, business-as-usual defense policies, the United States seems bent on losing it in the next few years.

Those who take this grim view are contemptuously tagged "Cassandras" and hooted down as prophets of gloom and doom. There is little they can do to prove their case because, although the cold war can be lost today, the unthinkably tragic results will not show up for 5 or 10 years. In the meantime, life goes comfortably on.

The first and most obvious indication of inadequacy, of course, comes in the amount of money spent on defenses. The U.S. defense budget was cut from $43.7 billion in 1953 to $38.5 billion by 1957. The same week Russia's sputnik hit the skies, Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson held his farewell press conference and expressed satisfaction that all the economies he had effected would achieve his aim of a $38-billion defense budget. Congress, too, indulged in a budget-cutting orgy in 1957.

But although the administration was able to sit on information on Soviet H-bomb developments and air capabilities, and attemped to quash reports of successful Soviet ICBM tests, it was not able to hide sputniks from the American people. The sputniks, which they could see quite plainly at stated intervals, alarmed them.

The administration set out to reassure them, with the President planning a series of speeches, characteristically of the "chins up" rather than the "chips down' variety. After only two of these vague speeches, the President had a stroke and the whole project was quietly dropped. But a couple of tiny Explorer satellities and even a Vanguard satellite aloft seem to have convinced most Americans that things were all right after all. The only indications that they are still beset with some deep fears and suspicions have been the elections, when to be a Republican has been the kiss of death.

The top-secret Gaither report, which was turned in to the administration in November 1957, gave a more-than-grim picture of U.S. defenses vis-a-vis Rusisa, according to all reliable stories concerning it. It recommended that defense spending be increased from the then current $38.5 billion by $8 billion annually, to a total of $46.5 billion a year. It also recommended that another $5 billion be spent annually on civil-defense shelters, up to a total of $22 billion. The subsequent Rockefeller report recommended substantial increases in defense spending, running to at least $3 billion more annually until 1965.

Almost all the non-Pentagon witnesses at the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee hearings which ended last January declared that the U.S. defense effort was too little, too slow, and certainly needed a bigger budget. At a follow-up hearing of the Senate subcommittee in July, Pentagon officials admitted that the United States has no defense or even any prospect of defense against Soviet ICBMs; that the United States can't even move one fully equipped combat division overseas by airlift; that there has been no increase in aircraft deliveries.

In the meantime Gen. James Gavin, Army Chief of Research and Development, who had told the subcommittee that he had "watched the deterioration of our military forces with increased concern," was hounded out of his job for talking too frankly. Trevor Gardner, a similarly frustrated victim of administration defense policy, had resigned in 1956 as Assistant Air Force Secretary to protest the slow pace of U.S. missile development.

These voices were joined with those of other "Cassandras," including Senators SYMINGTON and KENNEDY, former Air Force Secretary Thomas Finletter, the journalistic team of Joseph and Stewart Alsop, and a handful of newspapers and magazines.

The administration has ballyhooed such diversions as non-stop jet tanker flights and atomic sub journeys under the Polar icecap, and has even gone so far as to vastly exaggerate the significance of the recent Atlas satellite success in relation to Russian achievements. But the fact remains that the current defense budget is only $40.8 billion, and the administration would like to cut that.

If one makes allowances for inflation and the phenomenon of dollar depreciation in procurement and research, which could increase all costs by possibly 3 percent annually, the defense budget needs an increase of approximately $1 billion annually just to keep it where it was in 1957 when it had been pared to the bone.

Senator SYMINGTON pointed out to Defense Secretary McElroy last July that "the total amount of money that has been asked for since the first sputnik on October 4, for acceleration over previous programs is a great deal less than the depreciation in the value of the dollar in the same period."

With regard to U.S. limited-war power, the administration is currently slashing military manpower by 75,000, bringing the Armed Forces down to their pre-Korean war level. The Army needs a $15-billion modernization program, mostly outside its present budget.

The token landings in Lebanon last summer strained the whole U.S. airlift system and took too long to accomplish. Arabs, at first shocked, were later amused by some of the obsolete equipment U.S. troops carried.

As to major war capabilities, the deterrent power of the Strategic Air Command is growing weaker rather than stronger. The administration has refused to speed up vital Polaris and Minuteman missile programs and has frozen funds voted by Congress for this. Many experts now predict a "gap" in U.S. defenses from 1960 until 1963 or later, when Soviet capabilities for nuclear attack will far outstrip U.S. defenses and retaliatory power, leaving the U.S. completely vulnerable not only to political and economic blackmail but military disaster.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON queried Gen. Nathan Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, last July about this gap. "Are you satisfied," he asked, "that we will have adequate countermeasures by the time the Soviet missile capability reaches its height?" Twining replied, "Well, we hope so. , I wouldn't want to say 'Yes' to that one."

Nevertheless, the Budget Bureau remains the top-priority U.S. weapon and it gave orders for 1960 budget makers in defense, as well as in every other Government program, to cut spending. President Eisenhower continues to remain the captive of the balanced-budget-above-all-else philosophy of his former Treasury Secretary George Humphrey.

When the sputniks made their appearance, Humphrey, in contrast to most other administration officials admitted that they were a "real danger." What he meant by "danger," however, was that the American public might get excited about them and demand more action to keep up with Russia, regardless of the cost.

Above all the administration ballyhoo, two things stand out:

1. Most experienced and savvy observers here, expert in their particular fields in the Government, say privately that the United States is not doing enough in these respective fields to overtake or to keep ahead of the Russians.

2. The American people are being told on the highest authority that the United States cannot afford to spend more money in all these fields without going bankrupt.

If both of these things are true, we have already lost the cold war.

Federal Excise Tax on Gasoline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE BROCK
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 11

Whereas since the enactment in 1919 of the first State gasoline tax, this levy has been historically and rightfully a State tax, and

Whereas the gasoline tax has traditionally provided the major portion of the funds needed by the States to construct and maintain their highway systems, and

Whereas in 1932, the Federal Government also imposed an excise tax on gasoline, as a temporary, emergency, revenue-producing measure, and

Whereas the expressed, and reaffirmed, intent of Congress to vacate this tax field has not been carried out, and

Whereas instead, the original Federal excise on gasoline has been continued and increased by 200 percent, and

Whereas the mounting Federal tax on this product threatens to preempt this legitimate tax source belonging by priority and equity to the States, and

Whereas further increase in the Federal gasoline tax rate would lead to serious restriction upon the ability of the States to

secure funds for needed highway improvements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 69th session assembled:

1. That the 69th session of the Nebraska Legislature does respectfully record its opposition to any further increase in the present Federal excise tax on gasoline.

2. That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the office of the President of the United States and to the Members of the House of Representatives and of the U.S. Senate from Nebraska, and to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and to the chairman of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate.

DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
President of the Legislature.
HUGO F. SRB,
Clerk of the Legislature.

Poison in Your Water—No. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the RECORD an article from the Twin Falls, Idaho, Times-News describing the situation in the Columbia, Snake, and Yakima River Basins to show that poison, pollution, and filth in our waters is not limited to any one part of the country. This is just one more reason for a vigorous Federal program to clean up the lakes and streams and waters of our beloved county:

WASHINGTON AREA TOLD COLUMBIA RIVER CONTAMINATED, BUT SNAKE RIVER WORSE

PASCO, WASH., July 16.—The water wonderland of the Tri-City area is "buggy."

Benton-Franklin district health officers don't want to cause people to shun the rivers but they can't declare them safe for swimming.

The Columbia is contaminated; the Snake is worse; and the Yakima is worse still. The degree of contamination fluctuates daily and according to seasons, the condition of the sewage treatment plants, and other factors.

A 6 weeks' survey to check bacteria count in the Columbia is under way by the health department. The check will show the population of potential disease-causing organisms in the water.

Dr. Vernon Michael, district health officer, stated a great deal of sewage flows into the river despite sewage disposal plants, plus industrial pollution and bacteria from other sources.

For instance, the sewage disposal plants of Richland, Kennewick and Pasco all meet requirements but they have different degrees to proficiency. Kennewick and Pasco plants give primary treatment and Richland a more complete treatment of the effluence. But in all plants a certain amount of bacteria is carried into the river despite chlorination. The amount varies.

Columbia River water always contains this bacteria. The extent of diffusion depends on the amount of it, riverflow and certain other factors such as lagoons, etc.

Dudley Beall, sanitarian, said today the Yakima River is polluted with animal refuse, sewage and perhaps conditions outside the health district jurisdiction.

The Snake River contains more bacteria than the Columbia. This is believed due to animal refuse.

Dr. Michael said the 6 weeks test will determine bacteria count and try to find its sources. He added that many known germs come from runoff and sewage. Sometimes raw sewage flows into the river when a treatment plant breaks down, he stated.

"Because of these facts it is difficult to judge the pollution of the river from day to day," Dr. Michael said.

More and more people are using the rivers. Beaches and parks are being formed. The health department doesn't want to be a killjoy but the fact is that the river just isn't safe for swimming.

Some may swim for years and not be affected because of immunity, health, amount of water ingested. Others may get sick right away. Principal diseases would be intestinal such as dysentery.

The health department says: "They're swimming at their own risk. We feel the river is more contaminated today than ever."

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I recently had an opportunity, along with a number of my colleagues, to discuss the problem of management of the public debt with Secretary of the Treasury, Robert Anderson.

Naturally, the subject of inflationary pressures played a prominent part in our discussion. At that time, I expressed the opinion that the United States, wealthiest country in the world today, should not place itself in an economic straitjacket because of fear of inflation.

For this reason, I include two amusing, but penetrating columns, the first of which appeared in the Boston Daily Globe on January 26, 1959.

The second column was included in the January 29 edition of the Washington Evening Star.

[From the Boston Daily Globe, Jan. 26, 1959]

THE QUEEN TELLS ALICE ABOUT INFLATION

(By John Harriman)

Bugbear: A kind of imaginary goblin or specter, used to excite needless fear, as in children.

"Well," said Alice, "I've never been able to understand all this talk about inflation we've been hearing lately. What is it anyway?"

The Queen of Hearts smiled tolerantly. "Inflation, my dear child, is too much money chasing too few goods, and this makes prices go up."

"Oh," said Alice, as the Mad Hatter laughed in a kind of growling way in his throat. He, you see, being a sort of an economist, knew better.

WHY THE MAD HATTER LAUGHED

From where the Mad Hatter was standing he could see all the great factories of Wonderland—not going full blast as the Mad Hatter would have liked to see them, but rumbling along with plenty of idle capacity to spare. Really, the Queen of Hearts is quite an idiot, he thought.

But the Queen of Hearts was not quite as stupid as she seemed and after a quick glance at the Mad Hatter's sneering countenance she went on: "Of course, child, there is another kind of inflation, or really two other kinds," she added lightly. "The push kind, which occurs when naughty labor leaders push up wages faster than productivity and then the kind that comes when the big companies of Wonderland raise prices because they are in a position to administer them."

"Is that second kind naughty too?" asked Alice.

"Certainly not," cried the Queen. "Big companies are never, never naughty. You ought to know that, child."

"Oh," said Alice meekly. She was very confused (and the Mad Hatter could see this, and he felt deeply for her). "But tell me, dear Queen. All the stocks you have bought for me; they have gone up a lot, haven't they?"

"They have. And they will go up further child and make you rich."

"Why?" asked Alice.

"Because we are having inflation; an inflation caused at the moment by the wage demands of wicked labor leaders."

"What I don't see," said Alice, screwing up her nose and frowning, "is why labor leaders are wicked or naughty if they are making me rich."

At this the Mad Hatter gave a great shout and threw himself on the ground, grasping his sides and rolling about with laughter. (Remember that he wasn't a regular economist and all the regular economists mistrusted him for his irreverence in never agreeing with them.)

THE QUEEN FINALLY MAKES HER POINT

"Child, pay attention to me—not that idiot," exclaimed the Queen. "You've missed the point. You own stocks because we're in an inflationary age, and nobody owns bonds and everybody owns stocks in an inflationary age. And besides, stocks can make you rich. Don't you want to be rich?"

"Of course," said Alice, simply, still staring at the Mad Hatter and wondering what on earth had got into him. "But, well just suppose that we aren't in an inflation——"

"Really, child," the Queen burst out. "If we weren't in an inflationary age, there would be no point in owning stocks, so we've got to be in an inflationary age. Can't you get that through your head?"

"Yes; I think I understand now," Alice replied thoughtfully.

"Well, it's about time," said the Queen. "You don't want to be ruined by inflation, do you?"

"Oh, no," said Alice.

The Mad Hatter was crying.

The Government of Wonderland announced on Friday that the cost-of-living index last month declined slightly to the level of last June—lower prices on food, automobiles, and clothing.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 29, 1959]

MILTON BERLE EXPLAINS INFLATION

(By Sylvia Porter)

Milton Berle was having a lot of fun with President Eisenhower's $77 billion budget on his TV show recently. Suddenly, during his monologue came this:

"Inflation? That means your money today won't buy as much as it would have during the depression when you didn't have any."

My family howled—and I ran for pencil and paper to write it down. For he had put into focus a basic aspect of our country.

Why hasn't there been a great outcry against rising prices, swelling public support for measures that really would stop the wage-price spiral? Why don't average Americans feel as strongly as, say, former President Herbert Hoover that inflation is the most monstrous economic evil there is?

Why has grumbling about price rises not been translated into a crusade for price stability or at least, buyers' resistance?

Why is it that most union members are utterly unmoved when the experts try to explain that a $10 pay rise doesn't mean anything if the cost of living goes up $10 at the same time?

ANSWERS ARE OFFERED

The answer to the "why" lies behind Berle's wisecrack. Listen to what I heard as I checked the response to the remark.

From the head of a big Wall Street financial house—a millionaire thoroughly aware of what dollar fluctuation means:

"Oh, that's a beauty, I wish I'd heard him say it. Yes, in the thirties, I could have bought four suits for what one costs today, and I could have had a mansion in the suburbs for the asking. But I didn't buy the four suits and I didn't take over the mansion because I didn't have the courage to splurge. I won't say it in public, but I'll say it to you if you don't identify me. While I think what has been happening to the dollar is terrible, I personally am better off than I ever dreamed I'd be, and so is my family. I wouldn't turn the clock back for anything."

From a middle-aged housewife who lives with her husband, a junior executive in a New York commercial firm, in a small apartment near my home:

"I've always lived in this neighborhood, and I remember passing by the grocery once—it must have been in 1938 or 1939—and seeing the whole window filled with eggs. On impulse, I wanted to go in and buy up the whole display, but Jim's pay had just been cut 10 percent, we were trying to live on $32.50 a week, and both kids were in high school and, well, I just stood and stared into the window. Now I buy in that grocery every day and I buy whatever I want. I don't like rising prices, but I'd rather pay more and have the money to buy than see prices cheaper and be worried again."

WIDOW NOT BADLY OFF

From an active member of the newspaper union in my office:

"Ha, I heard that show and I laughed, too. What does it mean to me? Well, during the depression I didn't have any money, so it didn't matter to me what things cost, because I couldn't buy them. Now my money buys less, but I have the money. Better off? Sure, I am. Did the union help? Of course it did, and I'm all for it."

From a widow, a friend of my mother's, who's living on insurance, social security, and income from a small investment portfolio:

"That's cute, and I know what he means. When Steve worked it out so I'd get $250 a month from insurance I thought I'd live comfortably forever after. That dream is busted. But you know what's making up for it? My social security. And I've been making money on my stocks. I'm complaining, but I'm really not so badly off. Honestly."

Not until the majority of Americans feel they're being more hurt than helped by rising levels of wages and prices will the cry come, "Halt!"

Persistent Unemployment Needs Congress Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the serious problem of permanent unemployment for millions of American workers is receiving considerable attention from well-informed writers and experts on social and economic questions.

In my own State and in my own district the plight of these unemployed and their families conflicts sharply with the President and White House theorists who continue to say that all is well and 1959 will be more prosperous than ever before.

I cannot agree with those who see a float of unemployment as necessary for their so-called better business climate. Nor can I understand the callous disregard of administration leaders for the intense human suffering that this condition breeds.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial writer of the Reading Times illustrates how increased productivity and automation permits record-breaking output with fewer and fewer workers.

He points to the responsibility of Congress to face this problem with positive action in calling for the inactment of the area redevelopment bill.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include herewith this editorial from last Saturday's issue of the Reading (Pa.) Times:

PERSISTENT UNEMPLOYMENT NEEDS CONGRESS' ACTION

Writing in the New York Times last Sunday, A. H. Raskin, the Times' expert on labor and related subjects, had a most depressing story to tell.

In an article that was obviously well documented and written only after a tremendous volume of research, Mr. Raskin said in his leading paragraph: "Some of the country's major mass production centers are haunted by the prospect of permanent pools of jobless workers as a carryover from the recession."

The article, which was based on a survey by Times correspondents in 16 big industrial cities, stated that Detroit, the capital of the huge automobile industry has one-eighth of its work force idle at a time when the output of 1959 cars is climbing toward its peak. The steel and coal center, Pittsburgh, has twice as many unemployed as it had in the recession month of January 1958. In New York, 1 worker in every 13 is still jobless.

The article then presents a paradox: "Few of the areas surveyed appeared to be returning to normal in job opportunities with anything like the same speed they had exhibited in moving back toward full production."

Mr. Raskin and the men who gathered his material for him find several reasons for this. One is automation, in which machines take the place of men. Another is the decentralization of production. (More and more work is being shifted to assembly plants away from Detroit; more and more steel is being poured in mills away from Pittsburgh. The transfer in military emphasis from tanks to electronic devices, from aircraft to guided missiles, has caused a substantial reduction in requirements for industrial employment on defense programs.)

This is happening, the article states, in 16 big industrial cities. Can anyone believe it is not also happening in scores of smaller cities throughout the country? No one can so believe if he knows anything at all about what has happened to the basic textile industry—the manufacture of cotton, woolen, and synthetic cloth—in New England, for the aforesaid and for other reasons. Look at New Bedford. Look at Fall River. Look at Providence. Look at Biddeford-Sacco. Look at many another basic textile town. They are not ghost towns but they are the industrial and economic skeletons of what they were a dozen years or so ago.

Look at what is happening just to the north of us, in Schuylkill, Luzerne, and Lackawanna Counties, the anthracite heart of America. There are also industrial ills, leading to great unemployment, in certain bituminous areas. Accordingly, we may be permitted to believe that many small and medium-sized cities are hit in proportion to the big 16 the Times writes about.

What to do? Well, President Eisenhower, just a few days before the election last November 4, vetoed an area redevelopment bill which would have placed millions of dollars at the disposal of areas which need to attract new plants in order to approach full employment. We said at the time that we believed that the veto was economically and socially unjustified.

On Tuesday Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, introduced another such bill, calling for a fund of nearly $400 million in loans and grants from the Federal Government, for redevelopment purposes. We believe, in view of the Times' abundant documentation of the need for redevelopment, the need for many more jobs than now appear in the offing, that Senator DOUGLAS' bill should be passed without delay, as the previous bill was passed and that if Mr. Eisenhower once more vetoes it, it should be passed over his veto.

The States Are Something, Still

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, some months ago a constituent stopped me on the street back home and asked, "Don't the States have any rights any more?"

The question, and its implied protest, is, in my judgment, becoming increasingly pertinent and crucial. Moreover, it has a significant and most revealing historical precedent.

Back in 1867, as an aftermath of the tragic Civil War and as a part of the equally tragic Reconstruction era controversy, U.S. Senator Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, was advocating consolidation of virtually all governmental powers in the National—that is, Federal—Government.

It is worth noting that his motive was to establish through the whole country absolute equality of civil and political rights.

Regarding Sumner's views, his biographer, Edward L. Pierce, writing in 1893, said:

Thoughtful students of the American system recognized, even at that period when national power was being pressed to its utmost verge in the interest of freedom, that Sumner's conception was one-sided. He admitted indeed the place of States in our system, as supplying opportunities for education and meeting local wants; but he treated them as conveniences rather than essential organs of national life, and his conception reduced them almost to the level of counties and towns—as if States, with equal representation in the Senate and with jurisdictions guarded by the Constitution against national interference, bore any real analogy to the municipal divisions of a State, which are useful for local administration but absolutely

subject, as to their sphere and even as to their existence, to legislative power.

Commenting on Sumner's views his own colleague from Massachusetts, Senator Henry Wilson, remarked critically after Sumner had lectured in Boston, "The States are something, still."

Today I wonder just how much longer Senator Wilson's statement can be made truthfully and accurately.

Item: Increasingly the Federal Government is establishing itself as the agency for "supplying opportunities for education and meeting local wants."

Item: Continually, and in more and more fields, States are finding their authority to legislate either sharply curtailed or specifically banned by decree of the U.S. Supreme Court. While the integration decision is the most spectacular and presently the most disturbing example, it is only one.

Item: Openly even Members of Congress are urging that there is every reason to use—the Federal tax system—in preference to State and local systems where the choice exists—which means progressive centralization and federalization of the tax-leving and revenue-dispensing function of Government.

Item: Recently a distinguished Federal judge—not from Michigan—confessed to me that the practical meaning of the 10th amendment—supposedly reserving broad and vital powers to the States—is becoming increasingly obscure and uncertain, a situation which he deplored.

Item: More and more it seems to me—as I stated this week on the floor of the House—we face the possible supreme irony and tragedy that, under the guise of creating alleged social rights, we will so centralize Government, so nullify the 10th amendment, and so weaken the responsibility, rights and powers of the States that the security of all rights and liberties of our citizens will be jeopardized by an all-powerful Government in Washington.

Are we really willing to reduce the sovereign States to the status of counties in a single, Federal superstate? I think not.

Social Security Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a group of bills which are intended to close up some significant holes in social security protection provided for our old people, our widows and children, and those of our workers who become disabled. In brief my proposals would:

First. Provide hospitalization benefits for individuals who (a) are eligible, or potentially eligible, for old-age benefits, (b) are the survivors or dependents of insured workers, or (c) are disabled;

Second. Reduce the retirement age from 62 to 55 for women and from 65 to 60 for men;

Third. Provide a more liberal definition of disability for both the cash payment program and the disability freeze;

Fourth. Eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained age 50 in order to qualify for cash disability benefits;

Fifth. Raise the limit on outside earnings, without loss of benefit, from $1,200 to $1,800 a year;

Sixth. Clarify the law so that it is clear that social security benefits shall be exempt from all taxation;

Seventh. Increase the earnings base for tax and benefit purposes from $4,800 to $6,000 a year.

The most important area in which action is needed is in the provision of hospital care insurance for our older citizens. It is one of the unpleasant facts of our times that the age group which probably needs this type of insurance the most—elderly people over 65—finds itself in the position of being the least protected. Just over one-third of the people over 65 and one-sixth of the people over 75 have hospitalization of any sort.

Many private plans refuse to accept older people after they pass a specified age and drop members or raise rates as age increases. These practices seem to be the accepted method of avoiding adverse risks and holding down the premium rates. Moreover the plans which do not discriminate against the older subscriber—Blue Cross and others—are finding competition increasingly severe from those that do.

The bill which I have introduced provides a simple and straightforward remedy—a hospitalization benefit—to the present social security system. Under the bill anyone who would be entitled to receive old age, survivors, or disability insurance benefits, would also be eligible for up to 60 days of hospitalization in a semiprivate room in any calendar year. The cost would be paid directly to participating hospitals from the appropriate social security trust fund. A total of some 13 million persons—including the dependents and survivors of eligible workers—would be given this protection at the outset. The bill provides for utilization of qualified State agencies and private nonprofit organizations, and it preserves the right of each patient, upon referral by a licensed physician, to make his own choice of a hospital.

The insurance in the bill would include the usual services, drugs, and appliances furnished by a hospital—that is, bed and board and the nursing, laboratory, and ambulance services, use of operating room, staff services, and those other services, drugs, and appliances which are customarily furnished by the hospital to its bed patients. The insurance would not cover any medical or surgical care, except such as is generally furnished by hospitals as an essential part of hospital care. It would not cover hospitalization in any tuberculosis or mental hospital or an institution which furnishes primarily domiciliary or nursing care.

I also have reintroduced a bill to reduce the retirement age to 55 for women and 60 for men. Age 65 for retirement is an arbitrary figure which was established without any convincing social or economic reason. The healthy and vigorous, who are permitted to work, almost uniformly continue beyond the present age of 65. This is evidenced by the fact that the average age of retirement for men under the social security system is 68. On the other hand, many persons because of health, company compulsory retirement, automation, and other events beyond their control are forced off their lifetime jobs. Once the older worker is thus removed from the labor market, the difficulties in finding new employment are often insuperable. He is, then, in a very real sense, retired, yet must struggle through the interim years until he reaches the age specified in the Social Security Act.

The two amendments I propose to the disability provisions are a necessity if we are to have a meaningful program. The requirement of age 50 for disability benefits has no defense in reason. The worker who becomes disabled at age 45 is just as much in need of benefits as the worker aged 55.

Fully realizing that disability benefits will mean nothing to the man who cannot qualify for the strictly worded and strictly administered definition of disability in existing law—inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity—I urge the Congress to act speedily in adopting a more equitable provision. The definition I propose would be closer to those in the Civil Service and Railroad Retirement Acts and would allow the worker to qualify if he was unable to engage in a substantial gainful activity which is the same as or similar to the occupation or employment last performed by him on a regular basis before the onset of such impairment. As the law is now administered it is a flat on your back proposition, and the social security definition is much more severe than in other Federal disability programs.

A liberalization of the so-called retirement test is another much-needed development. At a time when living costs are cutting deeply into the protection furnished by benefits—averaging around $70 per month per retiree—the $1,200 per year earnings limit makes a marginal existence mandatory and discourages attempts to better oneself. My proposal, to raise the annual earnings limitation to $1,800, is a reasonable start in the solution of this perplexing problem.

As a means of protecting beneficiaries from possible State and local taxation of their meager benefits, I have introduced a bill which would make it clear that social security benefits are exempt from all taxation. At present the Federal Government does not tax such benefits, but this is the result of Treasury ruling rather than specific provision of law. Such an enactment would clarify this muddy situation at all levels of government.

Finally, I have introduced a bill which will raise the wage base for benefit and tax purposes from $4,800 to $6,000 a year. Last year Congress, in raising the wage base from $4,200 to $4,800 a year, took a step in the direction of bringing the earnings that are creditable for social security more nearly into line with the great increase in wages which has occurred in the past decade. But we did not go far enough. The original law in 1935, which used a $3,000 wage base, covered all the wages of 97 percent of covered workers thereby implying that the program should cover all the wages of almost every American worker. If the full earnings of the same proportion of workers today were to be covered the wage base would have to be set at more than $8,000. My proposal, to increase it to $6,000 a year, is needed to help regain this lost ground and, incidentally, would provide a saving which would help to finance a part of the cost of the other improvements I am advocating.

I believe we have every reason to be proud of the evolution of our social security system. We should always remember, however, that the history of this legislation has been one of action, and the frontier of social security is not closed.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*	Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*	Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*	
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*	
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*	
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*	
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*	The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*	
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*	The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*	Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*	
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*	
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*	4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*	2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*	
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*	
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*	
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*	3810 Lorcom Lane, Alexandria, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*	
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*	
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*	
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*	
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*	University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*	
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*	
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*	
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*	
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C.*	
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*	1612 34th St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*	4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*	
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*	
Langer, William, *N. Dak.*	2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Russell B., *La.*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*	
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*	4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*	The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*	
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*	Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*	
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*	
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala.*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*	
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del.*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex.*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla.*	5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*	
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*	
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*	
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.*	University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.*	911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.*	3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.*	113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*	
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*	
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*	
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*	
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*	
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.*	Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*	
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*	
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*	
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*	
Bates, William H., *Mass.*	
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*	
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*	
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.*	1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.*	3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*	
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*	
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*	
Boggs, Hale, *La.*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.*	3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.*	Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*	
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*	
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.*	The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*	
Brademas, John, *Ind.*	
Bray, William G., *Ind.*	
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*	
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*	
Brooks, Overton, *La.*	4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.*	3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*	Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.*	Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*	
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*	
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*	
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*	
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*	
Burke, James A., *Mass.*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.*	2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.*	1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*	
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*	
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*	
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*	
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*	
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*	
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.*	1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.*	3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*	
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.*	2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*	
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*	
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.*	2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla.*	6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.*	4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*	
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.*	3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*	
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*	
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.*	4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*	
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*	
Dent, John H., *Pa.*	
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*	
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*	
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*	1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*	
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*	
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*	
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*	
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*	
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.*	3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Duiski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*	
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.*	The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*	
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.*	3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.*	The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*	
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*	
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.*	1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*	
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.*	4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*	
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.*	The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.*	Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*	
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.*	6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*	
George, Newell A., *Kans.*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*	
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*	
Grant, George M., *Ala.*	4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*	
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*	
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*	
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*	
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*	
Haley, James A., *Fla.*	
Hall, David M., *N. C.*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*	
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*	
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*	
Harris, Oren, *Ark.*	1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*	
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*	
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*	
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*	
Hess, William E., *Ohio*	
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*	
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*	100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.*	3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*	
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*	
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*	
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*	
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*	
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*	
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.*	The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*	
Jarman, John, *Okla.*	
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*	
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*	2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*	
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*	
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*	
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.*	1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*	
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.*	3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*	
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.*	Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*	
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*	
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*	
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.*	The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*	
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.*	3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.*	4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*	
King, David S., *Utah*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*	
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*	
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*	
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*	

Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*	
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Lennon, Alton, *N. C.*	
Lesinski, John, *Mich.*	
Levering, Robert W., *Ohio*	
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.*	224 C St. NE.
Lindsay, John V., *N. Y.*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn.*	The Congressional
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*	The Washington
McCulloch, William M., *Ohio*	4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif.*	
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*	
McFall, John J., *Calif.*	507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGinley, Donald F., *Nebr.*	
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak.*	
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*	220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*	1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McSween, Harold B., *La.*	
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*	
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*	115 Dale Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*	
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*	
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*	
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*	
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*	Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*	
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*	
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.*	The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*	The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*	
May, Catherine, *Wash.*	
Meader, George, *Mich.*	3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*	
Meyer, William H., *Vt.*	
Michel, Robert H., *Ill.*	
Miller, Clement W., *Calif.*	
Miller, George P., *Calif.*	
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*	3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Milliken, William H., Jr., *Pa.*	
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*	2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*	8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga.*	
Moeller, Walter H., *Ohio*	
Monagan, John S., *Conn.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Moorhead, William S., *Pa.*	
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*	
Morris, Thomas G., *N. Mex.*	
Morris, Toby, *Okla.*	220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La.*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*	204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*	
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*	
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*	The Coronet
Murphy, William T., *Ill.*	
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*	
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*	
Nelsen, Ancher, *Minn.*	
Nix, Robert N. C., *Pa.*	
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*	
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*	2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*	
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*	The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*	The Congressional
O'Hara, James G., *Mich.*	
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass.*	
Oliver, James C., *Maine*	
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*	
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*	100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*	
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*	117 Carroll St. SE.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*	
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*	
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho*	
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*	
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*	
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*	
Pirnie, Alexander, *N. Y.*	
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*	228 2d St. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*	
Polk, James G., *Ohio*	
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg.*	
Powell, Adam C., *N. Y.*	
Preston, Prince H., *Ga.*	
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*	
Prokop, Stanley A., *Pa.*	
Pucinski, Roman C., *Ill.*	
Quie, Albert H., *Minn.*	The Coronet Apt., 200 C St. SE.
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*	
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*	
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*	
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*	
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*	
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*	
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*	The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*	1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*	6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*	5603 24th Ave. SE., Hillcrest Hgts., Wash. 21, D. C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*	
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*	3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*	
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*	
Rivers, Ralph J., *Alaska*	
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*	6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y.*	
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*	
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*	
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass.*	The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*	Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*	
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*	
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*	
Rostenkowski, Dan, *Ill.*	
Roush, J. Edward, *Ind.*	
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*	
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y.*	
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y.*	
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif.*	
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*	
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*	
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*	
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C.*	
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*	433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*	
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*	
Shipley, George E., *Ill.*	
Short, Don L., *N. Dak.*	
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*	
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*	
Simpson, Edna Oakes, *Ill.*	
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*	5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*	
Slack, John M., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*	
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif.*	
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*	204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Neal, *Iowa*	
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*	
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*	Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*	
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*	
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*	
Stratton, Samuel S., *N. Y.*	107 Martha's Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Stubblefield, Frank A., *Ky.*	
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*	
Taber, John, *N. Y.*	
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*	
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*	
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*	6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y.*	Mayflower Hotel
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*	2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*	3301 Mass. Ave.
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*	
Thompson, T. A., *La.*	1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, Keith, *Wyo.*	
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*	
Toll, Herman, *Pa.*	
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*	
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*	
Tuck, William M., *Va.*	
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*	
Ullman, Al, *Oreg.*	
Utt, James B., *Calif.*	
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*	
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*	
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*	4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*	
Wallhauser, George M., *N. J.*	
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*	
Wampler, Fred, *Ind.*	
Watts, John C., *Ky.*	
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*	9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Weis, Jessica McC., *N. Y.*	
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*	
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*	
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C.*	
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*	5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*	
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*	
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*	1001 26th Rd. S., Arlington, Va.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*	
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*	
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*	
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*	
Wolf, Leonard G., *Iowa*	
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*	
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*	
Young, John, *Tex.*	
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*	4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*	
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*	

DELEGATES

Burns, John A., *Hawaii*	

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*	2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Series, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Place SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Appendix

Mrs. Abraham Lincoln's Visit to New England in 1863

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entiled "Mrs. Abraham Lincoln's Visit to New England in 1863," written by James Duane Squires, Ph. D., chairman of the department of social studies at Colby Junior College, in New London, N.H.

Mr. President, Dr. Squires is a distinguished historian and an authority on the life of Abraham Lincoln. His article was recently given at a meeting of the Lincoln Society in Boston, which is composed of men and women from the six New England States who have a deep interest in the life and activities of our 16th President.

Mr. President, in this year in which we honor the 150th anniversary of the birth of President Lincoln, I am happy to bring to the attention of the general public Dr. Squires' contribution to the ever-growing body of material covering Lincoln's life. This article by Dr. Squires is indeed a valuable addition.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the article is estimated to make approximately 2¼ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $182.25.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MRS. ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S VISIT TO NEW ENGLAND IN 1863

(By James Duane Squires, Ph. D.)

From the viewpoint of the historian the problems involved in this study have been numerous, interesting, and to some extent unsolvable. Although materials were examined in more than a dozen libraries and archival collections, including the Congressional Library, it was not possible to locate any written record of the trip by one of the participants. All that can be done, therefore, is to piece together a number of facts from a wide variety of sources, and to explore with diligence certain New England newspapers for the months of August and September 1863.

Despite these difficulties, however, the narrative of this journey by Mrs. Abraham Lincoln and her two sons to New England in 1863 is a most interesting one. It is well worth an effort at reconstruction in our day almost a century later. Let me suggest five reasons why. In the first place, it was the longest trip that Mrs. Lincoln ever took during her years in Washington. Secondly, it was one of those rare occasions when she traveled with her two sons. Thirdly, the communications exchanged between President Lincoln and his wife while she was away testify convincingly to the warm affection and devotion which existed between them. Fourth, Mrs. Lincoln, while in New England, was in a rare and relaxed mood, perhaps the last time during the war that she exhibited her natural charm and happiness. She had emerged from the shroud of gloom which had covered her since Willie's death in 1862, and was not yet plunged into the new sorrows caused by the deaths of her favorite half-brother and her brother-in-law later in 1863. Finally, it was from this trip that Robert T. Lincoln developed his interest in Manchester, Vt., which led to his retirement there many years later.

The origins of the journey, I think, are clear enough. As we all are aware, Abraham Lincoln and his family during the war years spent most of the summer months in the Anderson Building at the Solider's Home in the environs of the capital city. They had moved there on July 1, 1863. The next morning, as Mrs. Lincoln was driving into the city, she was thrown from her carriage. In addition to bruises, she suffered head injuries which, as it turned out, healed slowly. On July 3, the President telegraphed Robert, who was having his final examinations at Harvard, that his mother's accident was not serious. But 8 days later he was disturbed about her, for on July 11 he telegraphed his eldest son, "Come to Washington." Three days later he wired again, "Why do I hear no more of you?" Robert was already nearing Washington, and later on the 14th he saw his parents.

This factor of Mrs. Lincoln's injury and slow recovery was the first reason for the trip that summer. Again, July and August in 1863 were excessively warm all along the Atlantic seaboard, and Mrs. Lincoln never thrived in the hot and humid weather of the capital city. In his recent book, Stanley Kimmell comments on the sickening heat and dirt of Washington in the summer of 1863. No wonder the kindly and thoughtful President wished to speed his wife's convalescence by getting her away to a more agreeable climate in northern New England.

A third factor involved Robert T. Lincoln. As a freshman at Harvard, in October 1860, Robert had visited the White Mountains and had deeply enjoyed the experience. He had been urging his mother to visit them ever since his own journey there. As Mrs. Elizabeth Grimsley's letters indicate, Mrs. Lincoln had been hoping to do this very thing ever since the spring of 1861. Moreover, Robert had just completed successfully his third year at Harvard College and would be 20 on August 1. What could be more natural for an affectionate mother like Mary Lincoln than to observe these two anniversaries with a trip with her sons?

One other aspect of Robert's relation to the trip was suggested by the astute John Hay in a memorandum to J. G. Nicolay, dated August 7, 1863:

"Bob and his mother have gone to the White Mountains. Bob was so shattered by the wedding of the idol of us all, the bright particular Teutonne, that he rushed madly off to sympathize with nature in her sternest aspects. They will be gone some time. The newspapers say the tycoon will join them after awhile. If so, he does not know it."

It is a little surprising that the metitculous Hay failed to mention the fact that Tad Lincoln accompanied his mother and elder brother on this search for nature in her sternest aspects.

Mrs. Lincoln and Tad were in New York by Tuesday, July 28, for the President telegraphed them there that Robert would join them the next day. Presumably the family group went to Boston on Thursday, July 30. This was Mrs. Lincoln's third trip to the capital city of Massachusetts since she had become the First Lady. She had been there on a 2-day visit in May 1861 with Mrs. Grimsley, and again for a longer stay in November 1862. She invariably stayed at the Revere House, a hotel not now in existence, but which then stood in Bowdoin Square on a site now occupied by a municipal fire station.

The Boston Daily Journal on the very day that Mrs. Lincoln and her sons arrived in that city, i.e., on July 30, put this headline on a news dispatch: "President Lincoln To Visit New England." The source for this incorrect statement was an unnamed Washington correspondent. The next day the Journal amplified its original report to read as follows:

"Mr. Lincoln contemplates making a short visit to the New England States during August, if his official duties will permit. He is sadly in need of a little relaxation. He will avoid all the fashionable places, and proceed quietly to the White Mountains, where he will meet Mrs. Lincoln and his eldest son."

Again, it is to be noted that there is no mention of Tad's presence in the party.

By Saturday, August 1, 1863, the Manchester Daily Mirror in New Hampshire had the story with some further embellishments:

"Mr. Lincoln contemplates making a short visit to the New England States during August, if his official duties will permit. He is sadly in need of a little relaxation. He will avoid all the fashionable places and proceed quietly to the White Mountains, and meet Mrs. Lincoln and his eldest son. The President will decline all receptions and ovations, but will go as a quiet citizen on a health-seeking tour."

Supplementing this, the New Hampshire Patriot, a newspaper not in sympathy with the national administration, at Concord rather sourly observed on Wednesday, August 5:

"'Father Abraham Coming.' It is stated that the President is coming to the White Mountains to cool off and rest. The Boston Post says he couldn't do better, and that the country can get along even if he is perched on the top of Mount Washington."

Gov. Joseph Gilmore, of New Hampshire, was a man well acquainted with what today we would call public relations, and he read his papers carefully. On Tuesday, August 4, he wrote the President:

"I see from the public prints that you are intending to spend a few weeks among the mountains of New Hampshire. May we not have the privilege of welcoming you to our State capital? I have no desire to subject you to speeches or parading you over our dusty streets in the boiling sun. But if you were to let me know a day or two before your arrival that you would spend a night at least in my house, the people would give you a spontaneous and informal ovation which would do your soul good."

To this friendly letter the President replied on Friday, August 7, as follows:

"MY DEAR GOVERNOR GILMORE: I thank you very heartily for your kind invitation to visit Concord and especially for the exceedingly cordial terms in which you have conveyed it. I very much regret that I cannot at present accept it. I am by no means certain that I

can leave Washington at all this summer. The exacting nature of my official duties renders it exceedingly improbable. I assure you, however, that I am nonetheless sincerely grateful for your kind intentions and for the expressions of personal good will contained in your letter. I am,

"Very truly yours,

"A. LINCOLN."

While this high-level correspondence was going forward, Mrs. Lincoln and her two sons left Boston on Saturday, August 1, and journeyed by rail to Alton Bay, N.H. From that point they took a steamer across Lake Winnipesaukee to Center Harbor on the northwest shore. This was the regular tourist entryway to the White Mountains in those years, traveled by thousands each season. Mrs. Lincoln and her sons, according to the Manchester Daily Mirror, spent Sunday, August 2, in Center Harbor. From that point on Monday the 3d they "staged it to Conway, where gentlemen from Boston put their private carriages at her disposal."

In a special dispatch to the Boston Daily Journal, published on August 8, but dated Tuesday, August 4 at the Kearsarge House in North Conway, that paper's New Hampshire correspondent wrote:

"Mrs. Abraham Lincoln and her two sons arrived here last evening from Center Harbor. Their party will leave here tomorrow morning for the Glen House and Tip Top House, Mount Washington, in a handsome turnout which has been especially detailed for their accommodation with an old and popular driver in charge. They will visit all points of interest on route. While at North Conway Mrs. Lincoln and family have been very courteously entertained at the Kearsarge House; gentlemen from Boston having their carriages with them have put them at the disposal of the Presidential party.

"Mrs. Lincoln has expressed herself more than delighted with the elegant and unobtrusive attention which the guests at North Conway have given her.

"The weather is beautiful and the company unusually large all through the mountains."

The Mount Washington carriage road, at that time the only method of riding up New Hampshire's loftiest peak, began at a point close to the Glen House, and ran upward along the east face of the mountain. It had been authorized by the State legislature of 1853, but had not been finished and opened for traffic until August 1861. It had proved to be a great tourist attraction and, now in its third season, was heavily patronized. On Thursday, August 6, Mrs. Lincoln and Robert joined the throng of tourists and drove to the Tip Top House. The Boston Daily Journal correspondent in his dispatch dated August 7, which he headed "Thanksgiving Day on Mt. Washington," wrote as follows:

"Yesterday—130 visitors came to Tip Top and in the crowd came Mrs. A. Lincoln and her son Robert. Mrs. Lincoln is a lady of medium size rather round favored and quite fleshy. She was dressed in a dark riding habit, dark bonnet and veil. She has a very fair, cheerful, smiling face, which does one good to look upon. She is quite light complexioned, has blue eyes and dark auburn hair, and on the whole, as might be expected of a President's wife, has a very agreeable way. Her son, Robert, is a dark complexioned lad of some 16 years.

"Today Mrs. Lincoln came up again from the Glen."

On this second visit Mrs. Lincoln delighted the Boston journalist by asking him to take down the mountain for immediate mailing to Washington a letter from herself to the President. What a pity that this letter has not survived.

The dispatch to the Boston Daily Journal which has just been quoted is worthy of note for at least three reasons. First, it is one of the few complimentary descriptions of Mrs. Lincoln penned by a newspaper man after her crushing grief in her son, Willie's, death. No doubt its kind words about the First Lady reflected her true felings that summer day on the top of Mount Washington; certainly at that moment the horror of war and the tensions of the Capital City seemed far away indeed. Second, this dispatch correctly notes that the President's Thanksgiving Day proclamation, dated July 15, 1863, but set for Thursday, August 6, was generally observed throughout the North. Third, the journalist gave a succinct description of Robert T. Lincoln, although he grossly underestimated the young man's age. Actually, Robert was not 16, but had just passed 20.

Although this particular correspondent failed to mention Tad Lincoln, the writer for the Manchester (N.H.) Daily Mirror was more explicit. In the issue of that paper for August 8, the following comment appears:

"Mrs. Abraham Lincoln and her two sons, Robert and Thomas, the latter about 10 years old, are creating quite a sensation in the mountain region."

Knowing the high spirits of the younger boy, we may surmise that it was he rather than his more dignified older brother who was creating the sensation.

It was while his family was in the White Mountains that the President on Saturday, August 8, wrote his charming and oftenquoted letter to his wife, summing up the weekly grist of news from Washington, and containing the famous line: "Tell dear Tad that poor 'Nanny Goat' is lost, and Mrs. Cuthbert and I are in distress about it." This delightful letter is reproduced in full in Stefan Lorant's new book, "Lincoln: A Picture Story of His Life."

Just how and when the Presidential family left the White Mountains I have not been able to ascertain. They were still there as late as Tuesday, August 11. But on Thursday they were en route to Boston. The Manchester Daily Mirror in its issue for Friday, the 14th, stated that:

"Mrs. Lincoln and her two sons passed through here yesterday afternoon on their way home from the mountains, and stopped at the Revere House in Boston last night."

On the same day, Friday the 14th, the Boston Daily Journal reported that "Mrs. Lincoln and her two sons are at the Revere House on their return from the White Mountains."

A similar item appeared in the Boston Evening Transcript for the 14th, and on the 15th the Boston Evening Traveller noted that the President's wife and her two sons had spent the morning on a steamboat excursion in Boston Harbor.

Mrs. Lincoln never forget her pleasure in seeing the White Mountains in August 1863. Sixteen years later, in 1879, when she was far removed from her days as First Lady and in much anguish of spirit, she yet found the time and energy to write a long letter to her grandnephew, Lewis Baker. In this missive she urged him to take a vacation in New England, and especially to visit the Tip Top House on Mount Washington. So strongly did she wish him to do this that she offered to pay his vacation expenses for 4 weeks. It is proof of her happy memories of her own trip there in 1863 that Mrs. Lincoln recalled the exact name of the hotel on the mountain summit.

There is a little uncertainty about the return of the family group to Washington. The Washington Star, an evening newspaper, reported on Monday, August 17, that Robert Lincoln had reached the Capital City this morning. The dispatch stated that Mrs. Lincoln was staying on in New York. Tad is not mentioned in this story. It seems probable to me that the younger boy returned to Washington with his brother, while Mrs. Lincoln remained in New York. The New York Tribune on Saturday, August 22, gave this news item:

"Mrs. Lincoln, who has been in the city a few days, paid a visit on Thursday to the French frigate, *La Guerriere*, where she was received with the honor due to her position, and with that courtesy characteristic of the French gentleman."

Whether she remained in New York after this appointment on the 20th, or went down to Washington, I am not positive, but the latter alternative seems to me unlikely.

At any rate, Mrs. Lincoln and Robert, accompanied by Mrs. Abner Doubleday, wife of the well-known Union general and a close friend of the First Lady, soon went back to New England once more. This time, probably at the suggestion of her hostess, the President's wife and son journeyed to Manchester, Vt. Arriving there on Monday, August 24, they registered in the Equinox House of that town, and remained there for a fortnight. The President's telegram to his wife, found in the "Collected Works," volumne VI, under date of August 29, has been printed with an erroneous address, i.e., Manchester, N.H. The mistake must have been made in the secretariat of the Executive Mansion, for we may assume that the President knew where his wife was. His two subsequent telegrams to Mrs. Lincoln, assuring her that all was well in Washington, dated September 3 and September 6, respectively, are also in the "Collected Works," and are correctly addressed to Manchester, Vt.

Maj. General Doubleday joined his wife and her guests on Thursday, August 28. The Manchester (Vt.) Journal in its issue for Tuesday, September 8, observed:

"Mrs. Lincoln and her son, and General Doubleday and lady left town yesterday, after a stay of 2 weeks."

They went back to New York, from which point, no doubt, Robert left to begin his fourth year at Harvard. His mother, who was taying at the Fifth Avenue Hotel in New York, received in quick sequence three tlegrams from the President, dated respectively September 20, September 21, and September 22, urging her to return. On September 24, the President wrote Mrs. Lincoln telling her of the terrible battle of Chickamauga and the death there of her Confederate brother-in-law, Ben Hardin Helm. It is my understanding that she went home at once after receiving this communication. She had been away almost 2 months.

There is existing manuscript evidence, however, to indicate how thoroughly Mrs. Lincoln had enjoyed her trip. In the Stone collection of Lincolnia at Boston University, one may read a personal letter from the First Lady to Franklin Orvis at Manchester, Vt. Mr. Orvis was the proprietor of the inn at which Mrs. Lincoln's party had stayed. Dated April 14, 1864, this hitherto uncited letter reads as follows:

"MR. FRANKLIN ORVIS.

"MY DEAR SIR: Illness alone has prevented my writing to you, to express my thanks and obligations to you, for the geological books and delightful maple sugar and molasses you so kindly sent. Since my charming visit to Manchester last summer, how frequently and gratefully your kindness has been remembered, and how often I have wished you would visit Washington, so that in a measure I could repay it. The only drawback to my pleasure was that my poor husband was not breathing the same delicious air we were. Our son Robert graduates about the 20th of June, and if his father can leave, consistent with his duties here, he will be present. If so, I shall feel quite tempted, if he can, to make a little flying visit to your Green Mountains. I am sure the pure air would be more refreshing even than it was to me. Please present my kindest regards to Mrs. Orvis, your good mother, and sisters, whilst I remain sincerely and gratefully your friend.

Mrs. LINCOLN."

So ended Mary Todd Lincoln's two-phase trip to New England in 1863. It was not her last visit to this area, for the next summer she and Tad again came to Boston and Cambridge, this time to attend Robert's class-day exercises at Harvard on June 24. Later that summer she and her sons were in Vermont once more, first at Rutland, then at Manchester. But this visit of 1864 is a story in itself, and another one.

The trip in 1863 which I have to describe in this paper, for the reasons given in the introduction, will always remain of deep interest to students of the Lincoln family. Aside from the wives of our Presidents who came from New England, Mrs. Lincoln, I believe, was the first First Lady to make an extended visit to this region. For that reason alone, if for no other, we are happy in the memory that hotels in three New England States 95 years ago last August carried on their guest registers the names Mary Todd Lincoln, Robert Todd Lincoln, Thomas Lincoln.

The Plight of New Jersey Commuters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Plight of Jersey Commuters," written by Tom Barrett, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of February 2, 1959. The article outlines the very real problems which New Jersey and surrounding States face in the efforts to maintain essential passenger service.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLIGHT OF JERSEY COMMUTERS—FOR 70,000 WHO RIDE TRAINS, END OF LINE IS IN SIGHT

(By Tom Barrett)

The end of the line is in sight for nearly half of the 160,000 daily New Jersey commuters to New York City.

This is the nearly half—70,000 a day at latest count—who make the daily trek to Manhattan via the rail-tunnel or rail-ferry service of six major New Jersey railroads.

It includes the broker of Wall Street, the ad man of Madison Avenue, the secretary at Rockefeller Center, and the saleslady of Fifth Avenue, who call the Garden State home.

For 50 years, at least, it's been the railroads who have been on the defensive; the rates have been too high, the service erratic, the cars dirty. These are the perennial and standard complaints of commuters.

Now it's the railroads' turn to complain; the fares are too low; the public doesn't use the services available; the railroads are only quitting on customers who have been quitting on them.

The quitting customers are those who show an increasing preference to travel to and from New York by bus and private car. These are the people who represent the one-third drop in rail commuters in the past 10 years.

While the warning signs of the railroads have been flashing in deeper shades of red since the passage last summer of the National Transportation Act of 1958, the final red-over-red that will bring rail commuter service in New Jersey to a halt will still prove a shocker, railroad officials admit, unless some authority—and it won't be the railroads themselves—comes up with a substitute system of transportation.

ROCKEFELLER URGING IMMEDIATE ACTION

The impending severance of the major transportation lifeline for New Jersey residents working in New York, is, in the words of Governor Rockefeller "an intolerable prospect for commuters."

The Governor warned:

"We all know what the problem is—dwindling commuter services which are threatened with extinction. We have passed the time for study. We have reached the time for action. We have passed the time for calling on Washington or someone else to solve the problem.

"Let's face it realistically ourselves and take the steps that have to be taken now to insure adequate, efficient, convenient commuter services for the residents of our great metropolitan areas."

The Governor hopes to take the first realistic step jointly with Governor Meyner of New Jersey and Governor Ribicoff of Connecticut following a meeting of the three next Tuesday with a transit solution high on the agenda.

PSC WANTS LINES RESTRAINED BY ICC

The critical element of time in the commuter crisis has been emphasized by the New York Public Service Commission in an appeal to the Interstate Commerce Commission to use restraint in permitting railroads to pull out of commuter services pending an overall solution.

The National Transportation Act, favored by the Interstate Commerce Commission, has paved the way for railroads to give up services which seriously hamper their ability to operate in the black.

And to the New Jersey railroads, passenger service is in this category.

Take the cases of the Jersey Central Lines, which serves commuters in parts of Hudson, Union, Somerset, and Hunterdon Counties on one branch and those from Monmouth County (North Jersey Shore), Union (Elizabeth), and Hudson on another, and that of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad, which does commuter business in Essex, Morris, Somerset, Bergen, and Passaic Counties.

In 1948, the Jersey Central carried 14,000 commuters and 4,000 other passengers a day to and from New York. The other passengers were those who rode during off-commuter hours between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m. and after 7 p.m.

Today, the same line lists 10,000 commuters and 2,000 other passengers.

On the Lackawanna, the 28,000 daily commuters of 1948 have dwindled to less than 20,000 and the noncommuter from 11,300 to 6,900.

Despite sizable fare increases, 100 percent or more in many cases, and a cutback in operations, the Jersey Central today lists losses of $3,253,000 a year in passenger operations; the Lackawanna $3,629,000.

The financial troubles of these two roads are matched by other railroads in New Jersey—the Pennsylvania, Erie, West Shore Division of the New York Central, the Susquehanna, and the Hudson and Manhattan (Hudson Tubes).

When will the railroads finally call it quits on commuters?

The Lehigh Valley Railroad, down to a few hundred commuters, has already asked the ICC for permission to drop this service.

Earl T. Moore, president of the Jersey Central Lines, says in his case the request for the elimination of commuter service could be sudden.

"It may come in the form of 10-day notice that the railroad just can't carry on," he said in an interview.

Perry M. Shoemaker, president of the Lackawanna, said complete abandonment of commuter service, in his case, probably will be preceded by a sharp cutback in existing service.

"We have already notified Governor Meyner we are making an abandonment study on our run from Summit to Gladstone, affecting about 2,000 daily riders. That's in an area of influential development but the passenger rail business just does not support the costs of the line," Mr. Shoemaker said.

RAILROADS BLAME TAXES AS EXCESSIVE

"We are also, by necessity, trimming operations on our Morristown line and if things keep going the way they are, we may find a way to cease all passenger runs at Newark and not continue into Hudson County," Mr. Shoemaker warned.

Governor Meyner was sought by the railroads last year as an intermediary with Hudson County municipalities which the railroads claim have levied an excessive tax burden.

The railroads, which asked a year's deferment in paying an $18 million tax bill, were told by the Governor that no deferment was forthcoming.

As the Governor expressed the attitude of the municipalities:

"If the individual homeowner is assessed penalties when he doesn't pay on time, why shouldn't railroads get the same treatment?"

LINES SEE NO NEED TO RUN AT A LOSS

The threat to move out of Hudson County in a fight over high taxes imposed there would affect the Hoboken terminal of the Lackawanna which it shares jointly with the Erie Railroad. Passengers going to New York would then have to ride the last 10 miles or so by bus, Hudson Tubes or Pennsylvania Railroad.

As to whether the New Jersey railroads can go through with their abandonment threat in view of the long established sympathy of the New Jersey Public Utility Commission on behalf of the commuter, Mr. Shoemaker countered:

"While the State public utility commission, in practice and prior to the Transportation Act of 1958, has adopted a different attitude from ours, there is certainly no moral obligation and probably no legal one to furnish passenger and commuter service at a loss. Since the incurring of great losses is the only way of furnishing passenger and commuter service as demanded by the State in the past, the responsibility should be taken from our hands."

The position of the railroads was stated even more bluntly by Jersey Central's Mr. Moore, who said the railroads were no longer in a position to carry on the responsibility of commuter and other passenger services.

"Just to meet our costs, we would have to increase the present commuter fares by 90 percent," he said. "Should we lose any riders through attrition over the near doubling of fares, then we would be forced to raise the fares all over again.

"This would go on until we had no riders at all. Rail passenger service just can't pay for itself, especially if it is done by a taxpaying private enterprise."

Definition of a Liberal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, one of the least understood situations today involves the proper interpretation of the term "conservative" and the term "liberal."

Mr. President, there was published in the Wall Street Journal of Monday, January 19, 1959, a very good editorial entitled, "Quote Liberal End Quote," and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUOTE LIBERAL END QUOTE

One of our readers asks today why this newspaper puts quotation marks around the word "liberal" when it is used in a modern political sense.

Politically, the word "liberal" comes down to us from the British and the dictionary says that in this connotation the word means having tendency toward democratic or republican, as distinguished from monarchial or aristocratic forms—as liberal thinkers, liberal ideas in politics.

Today, however, a great many of the people who have appropriated this word for their political purposes don't fit this meaning. These liberals are not liberals at all; most of them believe not so much in the growth of individual freedom as in the growth of the state.

In fact the term "liberal" in politics today usually describes the most ancient type of reactionary, for people who believe in an all-powerful state are people who believe in the forms of government that resulted in enslaving men, not in freeing men. That's been true all along, whether the all-powerful state was that of the Caesars or the kings, or their more powerful presentday counterparts, the dictators.

Maybe it's also that we dislike having violence done to a fine, old honest word.

Now we haven't any right to tell people they can't use any word they want to describe—or to disguise—their activities or their intentions. But when something isn't what it seems to be, we think perhaps we ought to distinguish it from the real McCoy.

So we put quotes around it. Just as many newspapers do when they write about "Prince" Mike Romanoff.

Hawaii, With a Tradition of Freedom and Good Government, Deserves Statehood Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the mental picture which the mention of Hawaii often calls up is one of pineapples, palm trees, carefree islanders, and surfboarding at Waikiki. I feel we fail ot see the real Hawaii—the Hawaii which I feel deserves statehood this year. I have coauthorized a bill to grant statehood now.

The items mentioned in our mental picture figure prominently in Hawaii, of course, and are definite assets and good reasons to offer in support of my argument for statehood. Along with the fact that 6,423 square miles of land and 575,771 people would be added to our Union of States, I believe the intangible assets of Hawaii should also be considered.

The Hawaiian Islands have a stability of government and a record of protection of life and property in keeping with the highest traditions of American freedom and justice. They have had a stable government for more than 100 years, first a monarchy, then a republic, then a Territory. In the recent elections, 87 percent of the electorate cast their ballots. This is far above the national average.

The per capita income in Hawaii is ahead of 23 of our present States and Hawaiians pay more in taxes than the national average.

Mr. President, in further support of my arguments for Hawaiian statehood, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in my hometown paper, the Austin (Tex.) Statesman for Friday, January 30, 1959, under the heading "Statehood Owed Hawaii."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEHOOD OWED HAWAII

This country and both its political parties are obligated by sentiment and repeated promises to give statehood to Hawaii. There have been objections to this, usually on the claim that Hawaii has such a polyglot population that the national security might be jeopardized. Yet a Hawaiian battalion, made up of Japanese citizens, was the most decorated in World War II.

Another claim is that the Harry Bridges outfit would tie up the economy of Hawaii. This may be true. Bridges has done that in the past.

But unions have tied up the economy in this country too on various occasions. Strikes have shut down great industrial plants, airlines, newspapers, manufacturing concerns, and organizers right here in Texas in the Port Arthur case tied up a business district by morally illegal picketing of a large number of small firms whose workers they aspired to organize and control in a catchall New York union.

So that argument doesn't hold very well in the case of Hawaii. What does count is that if Alaska, a noncontiguous land area with a smaller population and larger land mass is found to be desirable as the 49th State, then Hawaii, with a smaller land mass and a large population, and by virtue of its strategic economic and political importance should not be left out in the cold. Simple justice demands it.

Bill To Let Gas Producers Gouge the Public Is up Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a new natural gas bill is in the House hopper, and, despite the fact that this measure, like its predecessors, is clearly against the interests of most sections of the country it will have the powerful support of House and Senate leaders.

The Milwaukee Journal of Sunday, February 1, contains an editorial which analyzes the new bill and assesses its chances. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILL TO LET GAS PRODUCERS GOUGE THE PUBLIC IS UP AGAIN

The natural gas and oil interests are back as congressional suppliants again, seeking to remove Federal controls from the price of natural gas produced by so-called independent operators.

Again it is Representative HARRIS, Democrat of Arkansas, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who lends his powerful position to author the natural gas bill. The bill, H.R. 366, is in the House hopper and HARRIS means to get action.

This time the bill has some new twists—including changes meant to satisfy the coal lobby that surplus natural gas won't be dumped at low prices to large industrial users. The gas interests, as Representative DINGELL, Democrat of Michigan, points out, hope to pick up some 15-odd votes from coal areas with this provision.

Twice the natural gas bill has passed Congress and met Presidential vetoes—once by former President Truman and most recently by President Eisenhower, who was shocked by what he called arrogant lobbying. Last year the bill looked like a cinch until a letter turned up announcing a $100 a plate dinner to be given by Representative MARTIN, Republican of Massachusetts, by the oil and gas interests. The letter contained an implication—unknown to MARTIN—that the affair was aimed at influencing votes. The revelation killed chances of passage.

It's too much to hope that the oil and gas interests will continue to be so arrogantly stupid right out in public. They can't keep making mistakes—or can they? The big hope is now that there are enough new men in Congress who would oppose the bill to prevent its passage. But don't let hopes get too high. The Senate and House leaders—Texans LYNDON JOHNSON and SAM RAYBURN—favor the bill.

And what they want they usually get.

Voting Rights for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Hawaii and the District," published in the Washington Evening Star of January 21, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed on the RECORD, as follows:

HAWAII AND THE DISTRICT

As if there were some connection between the two, the President couples statehood for Hawaii and home rule for the District of Columbia in the same short breath. Recommending both in his budget message, he says that further delay in either would be unconscionable.

Hawaii was made a Territory in 1900. The Territorial form of government is the normal step preliminary to statehood, and Hawaii meets all reasonable standards for admit-

tance now as a full-fledged State. There is no good reason for further delay.

The same thing is not true concerning further delay in so-called home rule for the District of Columbia. Far from being unconscionable, further delay in home rule for the District would be highly desirable, especially if it led to abandonment of the idea that home rule means worthwhile voting rights. A semi-Territorial form of government for the District has previously been recommended by this administration as the form of home rule most likely to work in this Federal city. Something of the same sort was tried here briefly and abandoned 25 years before Hawaii even became a part of the United States. There is not much sense in trying it again.

What should be done is to give the people of this city voting representation in Congress and in the choice of President and Vice President of the United States. With such rights established, Congress and the President should work toward development of this city as the Capital of the United States and forget the play-acting diversion of some futile form of home rule, which would delay rather than hasten that desirable and readily attainable development.

Strange Bureaucratic Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it has always been disturbing to read statements attributed to official State Department sources which undermine the policy of the Government in international affairs. Columnist Constantine Brown, in the Tuesday, January 27, 1959, edition of the Evening Star, comments on this unfortunate situation. He observes that South Korean President Syngman Rhee was depicted in a November story as being so weak physically that he could serve no real useful purpose as head of the Korean Government. Yet, in truth, Mr. Rhee, a gentleman whom I have known personally, and in whom I have the utmost respect, is in excellent condition—both physically and mentally. This reminds Mr. Brown of the treatment Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek received at the hands of some high officials in the State Department in the 1940's.

I ask unanimous consent that this column, entitled "Strange Bureaucratic Practices," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRANGE BUREAUCRATIC PRACTICES—ARTICLE ON HEALTH OF RHEE, ATTRIBUTED TO TOP U.S. PLANNERS, STIRS PROTEST

(By Constantine Brown)

There is something strange in the activities of our evergrowing bureaucracy which is supposed to follow the policies of the administration in office.

The taxpayers have been compelled to fork over since the end of the war close to $100 billion for foreign aid in various forms. The principal reason why the American taxpayers' representatives (the Members of Congress) have voted large sums year after year for this project was our effort to stem or roll back international communism which we recognized as the main danger to survival of the free world whose leader we have become.

When our Legislators approve substantial economic and military aid to countries like Yugoslavia and Poland, it is in the hope that somehow, some time, we may be able to detach them from the Moscow-Peiping conspiracy aimed principally at the United States.

It is because of the fear of another international Communist aggression that we are building up, at the taxpayers' expense, in the Middle and Far East close allies such as the Turks, Iranians, Pakistanis, Filipinos, free Chinese, and South Koreans. Since the American taxpayers are digging into their pockets without much grumbling to "buy insurance for the American people," as Secretary Dulles has frequently stated, one would assume the high officials of the State Department would not purposely try to undermine the public's confidence in those Asian leaders who are most determined to fight international communism to the bitter end.

Last November a weekly magazine with a nationwide circulation printed a story to the effect that South Korean President Syngman Rhee's health had so deteriorated that he could serve no real useful purpose as head of the government. An official personality who had just returned from Seoul and had marveled at President Rhee's vigor (both physical and mental), wrote the editors a letter pointing out pleasantly the fallacy of the item printed in a highly reputable magazine and, to back his contention, inclosed a recent picture of Mr. Rhee. An official of the magazine answered very politely, explaining that "—our sources for the items published from Washington were top State Department planners and we were publishing their views. Our report was based on personal interviews and not rumors."

This is highly revealing. The State Department officials, like those of the Defense Department, are very secretive toward newspapers and newspapermen in an unprecedented manner. An unauthorized official—that is one who has not been cleared by the department head—will not give a reporter even the time of day. What is not secret or confidential is at least restricted. Rumors about the health, habits and other personal things of heads of state, be they allied, neutral or hostile to us, are not easily pried from our top State Department planners unless there is a strong political-diplomatic reason for the leak.

For instance, during the war there were numerous leaks (mostly completely unfounded) about Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and the Gissima. The grapevine informed correspondents about their venality and that of the Kuomintang government; about the manner in which the Kuomintang was pocketing American financial assistance, and so on. On the other hand, the grapevine was extolling the high qualities and statesmanship of Mao Tze-tung, who was described as a great agrarian reformer.

But in those days there was a group of policymaking officials in the State Department in Washington and in Chungking (the wartime capital of China) who believed firmly that Chiang and his followers were millstones around our political neck. There were many in this country who were still very much confused over the actual objectives of our then Russian ally. This is no longer so. In the last 14 years the American people who wanted to open their eyes even slightly have seen the true face of international communism.

We know that the Communists across the 38th parallel are not agrarian reformers. The policies of the succeeding administrations in this country since 1948 have clearly shown that the Communists are our only enemies. Hence, it appears unbelievable that high State Department officials should continue a policy of leaks about popularly elected heads of government in the Far East such as Mr. Rhee and Philippines President Garcia.

The Right To Work Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the right to work issue was fought out in several States last year. Around the country it is the general consensus that the issue is dead.

Mr. President, I disagree with that belief. I feel that in the very near future in one of our campaigns the major issue will be wrapped around the unbridled power of the union boss. Whether it will be called right to work, voluntary unionism, or whatever other form it may take, it will be represented by the philosophy behind the right to work movement.

Mr. President, there was published in the Deseret News of Salt Lake City on January 17, 1959, an editorial entitled "The Right To Work," and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RIGHT TO WORK

Rather than accept the challenge to make membership in a union so desirable and worth while that employees want to join, some Utah union officials prefer to take the easy way—and men's freedom with it.

Through a bill introduced in the Utah House of Representatives Friday in their behalf to repeal Utah's right-to-work law, union leaders prefer to force employees to belong whether they want to or not. LaMar D. Gulbransen, president of the AFL–CIO, spokesman for the sponsoring labor groups, told reporters that the right-to-work bill has hindered union membership growth in the State.

This, if true—and no proof has yet been established—is admission that in and of itself union membership is not now attractive enough to appeal to all workers. The argument for voluntary membership—or nonmembership—is too obvious to need elaboration; it should be the right of free men to choose their own course of action.

Mr. Gulbransen's further argument that Utah's right-to-work law "has resulted in Utah's per capita income dropping in relation to other States" also bears some questioning. Utah's law became effective in May 1955. At that time, Utah manufacturing production workers were earning an average of $76.63 per week (according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics). Three years later, May 1958, the same workers were earning an average of $89.15, or $12.52 more each week.

Manufacturing workers in the three Mountain States that have outlawed compulsory union membership have enjoyed a more rapid increase in their average weekly earnings than have workers in the five Mountain

States where union leaders were still permitted to force membership upon the workers during the same period.

The U.S. average increase in wages for the 3-year period was 7.5 percent. In States without right-to-work laws (Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Wyoming), the increase was 10.2 percent. In the States with right-to-work laws (Utah, Arizona, Nevada) the rate of increase was 14.4 percent. In Utah alone it was 16.3 percent, more than twice the national average rate of increase.

Labor's argument for compulsory membership rests on the assumption that the desirability of union membership is so unquestionable that those who refuse to accept it voluntarily must be required to do so. If this desirability is so unquestionable, why then do the union leaders need a compulsory bill?

Those whose faith in the infallibility of union leadership is less than complete certainly have the right as free American citizens to determine for themselves whether or not they want to belong. The deep question is: Do the unions exist for the members, or the members for the union?

Isn't the right to work one of the basic human rights which Government is bound to protect? Or is it restricted to union members? Or do nonmembers fall outside the human category?

Rather than work toward the repeal of Utah's right-to-work law, union officers ought to concentrate their efforts on trying to make membership so worthwhile that every employee can easily see the advantages and by his own free will join without being coerced into it by an arbitrary law.

James P. Preston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Like many of my colleagues, Mr. President, I was deeply saddened last week to learn of the death of Mr. James P. Preston, superintendent of the Senate Press Gallery for 35 years before his retirement in 1955.

Many of the outstanding acomplishments of this devoted Senate employee are recounted in an article appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 31, 1959.

In addition, he was known to many Senators for his many special courtesies. For example, one of my prized mementos is a miniature rocking chair fashioned by Mr. Preston, who was skilled in woodworking. For this piece Mr. Preston used pine wood from the stand erected on the east front of the Capitol for the inauguration of President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON in 1953.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article reviewing the life of Mr. Preston be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS GALLERY'S JIM PRESTON

(By Everard Munsey)

When Jim Preston retired from his post at the Senate in 1955, veteran Capitol Hill reporters and lawmakers could scarcely accept the reality. It seemed James D. Preston had always been in the center of activities at the Senate and, indeed, he had been there for 58 busy years.

Mr. Preston, who died of pneumonia Thursday, was born on August 2, 1876, on C Street, within sight of the Capitol dome. Inheriting a taste for journalism from his father, Herbert A. Preston, longtime Washington correspondent of the New York Herald, he became associated with the Washington bureau of the Boston Journal and the Chicago Inter Ocean at the age of 14.

Covering the 1896 conventions for his papers, he reported the bolt of Republican delegates opposed to the adoption of the gold standard and William Jennings Bryan's famous "Cross of Gold" speech. When "General" Jacob Coxey's army marched on Washington the same year, Jim Preston was on the scene for a first hand story.

HEADED PRESS GALLERY

Then in 1897, Mr. Preston, not yet 21 years old, was elected superintendent of the Senate Press Gallery. Those were the days when Senators, elected by their legislatures, were hardly inclined to publicize their activities, except through their favorite reporter. Mr. Preston always remembered that the Senate resolution declaring war on Spain in 1898 was passed in an executive session, with press and public barred.

In the 35 years he spent as superintendent of the gallery, he became indispensable to reporters. He was in the center of all press information, telling from notes or memory what committees were meeting, the status of bills, and the situation in almost every matter involving the Senate. A physical change, as great as the change in attitude accompanying the institution of direct election of Senators, occurred during his tenure. The one old crank telephone was replaced by modern equipment while typewriters were introduced with rules and regulations for the gallery.

AIDED CONVENTION WRITERS

Jim Preston was also in virtual charge of the press section at the great national conventions during these years and earned the gratitude of correspondents for his diplomatic handling for seating and his arrangement of telegraph and hotel accommodations.

On his 20th anniversary as superintendent, members of the press gallery gave Mr. Preston an automobile in appreciation of his work.

In 1931, he left the press gallery, moving to the office of the Librarian of the Senate. There his poking around in old papers turned up some priceless historical documents, including several communications written by George Washington and the original Second Inaugural Address.

His interest in documents aroused, he paid his way to England, where he spent several months at the British Museum studying British methods of document preservation. In 1935 he became assistant administrative secretary at the National Archives and for 6 years directed work to centralize valuable Government-owned documents at the Archives. He also arranged exhibitions of the collection.

RETURNS TO SENATE

Longing for the Senate grew too strong, however. "The excitement of the place was in my blood and I couldn't get it out," he said, as he celebrated acquisition of the job of indexer of the Senate Journal. He returned to many of his old ways, to the delight of Capitol Hill reporters. Shortly, after his return, he took charge of registration of Senate lobbyists.

Throughout his career at the Senate, Mr. Preston kept a running diary. Recorded there are the rules of the Senate by the Republican triumvirate, Aldrich, of Rhode Island, Hale, of Maine, and Allison, of Iowa, the arrival of LaFollett in 1906 and the Republican defection in the West and the consequent Democratic majority in 1912. He took that diary with him when he went to Hollywood in 1939 as technical adviser and bit actor in "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington."

As befitted his English ancestry, Mr. Preston was often mistaken for British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain—until he spoke. He once delighted President Roosevelt with an impersonation of Chamberlain at a Gridiron Club show. The President was also pleased by another work of Mr. Preston's a huge sphinx with a long cirgarette holder which Mr. Preston made from dampened paper when the question of a third term was the biggest political riddle. Mr. Roosevelt took the sphinx to Hyde Park.

PROMOTED GOLF COURSE

Besides woodworking, which he did very skillfully, he lover golf and was a promoter of the Rock Creek Public Gold Course. He sponsored national public links tournaments and, during recess of Congress, assisted in the conduct of four national tournaments of the U.S. Golf Association.

He lived at 4724 15th street NW., for about 36 years, until entering the hospital several months ago.

He married Mary E. Sanford, daughter of a Baltimore ship captain, in 1902. Mrs. Preston now lives with her son, Edward H. Preston, in Lynbrook, N.Y., Mr. Preston also leaves a sister, Theodora C. Preston, of Washington.

University of California Receives International Education Citation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in these days of international tensions it is very gratifying to read of the work of organizations and individuals who are working constructively to improve understanding among nations. On January 30 the Institute of International Education cited the University of California for doing a distinguished job in developing a sound program of international educational exchange. Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, president emeritus, accepted the award for his university, and I am proud to ask unanimous consent to have the text of the citation printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION FOR A U.S. UNIVERSITY

To the University of California, a great cosmopolitan center of education on the shores of the Pacific, the Institute of International Education presents its award for distinguished service.

At the university a teaching staff of 5,300, both native sons and men from the great academic centers of the world, combines the excellence of scholarly tradition with the vigor of new inquiry, unrestricted by national boundaries. Here is a faculty which includes 6 winners of Nobel prizes, 59 members of the National Academy of Sciences, and in the aggregate the largest collection of Guggenheim fellows in the world.

Cal, a relatively young State university, demonstrates that in the United States a great institution is judged neither by its age nor by the fact that it is not located in the green hills of New England—but only by the standards of excellence it has achieved. Scholars from centuries-old academic centers of Europe and the Orient recognize that Cal in less than a hundred years has proved itself to be a strong, healthy, and prolific member of the international academic family.

Here, international education has flowered for half a century and more. Here, uncounted thousands of persons have come from abroad to earn degrees and to serve their countries on return. Their names include three former presidents of our sister republics—Mexico, Colombia, and Ecuador; Ministers of Agriculture in Egypt and Iraq; a Minister of Commerce in Pakistan; leading educators, doctors, administrators, in nearly every country and on every continent. Here are cultivated the habits of mind and spirit that helped to produce an educational system in the Philippines; a health service in Indonesia; an improved civil service in Italy; a Chief Justice of the United State Supreme Court, and a host of statesmen, governors, and advisors in the council of nations.

From the University of California hundreds of American students have gone to other countries as winners of Rhodes, Fulbright, and other international scholarships.

At Berkeley, generations of foreign and American students have been drawn together by the strength and presence of a great international house in which men and women of every nation live constructively and creatively.

To dramatize the imaginative and creative contributions which the colleges and universities of the United States are making to the improvement of international understanding, the Institute of International Education presents its distinguished service award to the University of California.

Britain's Verdict on Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the alert Anderson (S.C.) Free Press of January 22, 1959, ably comments on the trend in Great Britain away from socialism, while pointing out that we in the United States are moving in the direction of the welfare state. Those among us who would continue in the direction of socialism should consider the results of the experiment in Great Britain before it is too late in this country to reverse the current trend.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Britain's Verdict on Socialism," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN'S VERDICT ON SOCIALISM

With the United States already well on the way toward a socialistic form of government, it would seem that recent developments in Great Britain should—even at this late date—make American citizens sit up and take notice of where we are heading and what we can expect if we continue our present course.

According to a special report in a recent issue of U.S. News & World Report, Britain's 13-year-old experiment in socialism is being written off as a failure, with private enterprise emerging stronger than ever. The report states that searching inquiries just completed by a parliamentary committee, by industrial and management organizations, and by individual experts show that the British public has soured on Government operation of basic industries. Even the Labor Party, which brought socialism to Britain, is reversing its stand.

Important facts which have emerged are as follows:

Efficiency in nationalized industries is shown to be considerably lower, over all, than in comparable private industries.

Costs are higher because managers of nationalized industries are not under pressure, as are private owners, to show a profit or even to make ends meet. Deficits are covered by huge Government subsidies.

Prices in most nationalized industries are kept artificially low by political pressure, bear no relationship to costs. The consumer gets stuck for higher taxes and inflationary financing that is required for subsidies.

Labor relations in nationalized industries turn out to be no better—and sometimes considerably worse— than in private industries, contrary to Labor Party expectations. The record of strikes and noncooperation between workers and management in the nationalized coal mines and transport industries is among the blackest in Britain.

Between 1946 and 1951, the Labor Party's program to make Britain a socialistic state took over, as public enterprise, coal, electricity, gas, rail and highway transport, steel, cable communications, the Bank of England, and civil aviation. Using coal as a case in point, the report reveals that $1 billion has been poured into the mines since 1946 to modernize and maintain them; yet, despite this investment program and the recruitment of 11,000 additional miners, the British mines produced slightly less coal in 1957 than in 1951. The investment program for the mines has been termed a failure by a parliamentary committee that investigated the coal industry last year, and it warned that a second program now under way is also in jeopardy.

With a few rare exceptions, the nationalized coal industry has gone into the red in its current accounts year after year. During a 10-year period of scarcity and a sellers' market, the mines accumulated a $75 million loss which had to be covered by Government subsidies in addition to the $1 billion provided for a capital investment.

In fact, the promise made by the Labor Party that notionalized industries would, in time, stand on their own feet without Government subsidies—is proving unrealistic. Steel, an expanding industry, was nationalized for a brief period and then returned to private ownership. It provides a striking contrast to the declining coal industry. Steel production has increased from $12.7 million tons in 1946 to 21.7 million in 1957. The steel industry has not only earned a profit but has financed a substantial part of its $1.5 billion program of expansion from its own resources, while still managing to cut prices and pay its workers wages that are among the highest in British industry.

Of late, Britons who have been asking what's really wrong with nationalized industries have come up with some of the answers. The men who run Britain's nationalized industries are influenced more by political pressure than by commercial realities. Since the Government in power, whether Labor or Conservative, finds it expedient to keep both consumers and workers happy, it resists price increases to appease the consumer and raises wages according to union demands to please the workers. By holding down prices while allowing wages to rise, the result has invariably been a loss at the end of the year.

Overstaffing, inefficiency, and waste are other reasons given for the failure of nationalized industries. In some instances, union pressure keeps two men on a job where only one is neded. The unions have resisted any efforts by management to drop unneeded workers and cut costs and, until recently, political considerations have prevented management from forcing a showdown.

To sum it up, after 13 years of living with it, Britain is ditching socialism as "old-fashioned" and impractical and turning back to private enterprise. But here in the United States, socialism, centralized government, or the welfare state—whichever we prefer to call it—is on the way up. The voices of our courageous and conservative leaders are raised in protest, but are lost in the increasing clamor for more government in business, more Federal subsidies.

If the citizens of the United States are not to heed the advice of their own countrymen who warn of the dangers ahead, are they also determined to ignore the facts as revealed by the experiences of other nations? Britain has written off its experiment in socialism as a failure. What further proof is needed?

Union Power Versus Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on the subject of the illegitimate power vested in union bosses an excellent editorial entitled, "Union Power Versus Public Interest," was published in the Wall Street Journal of January 29, 1959, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION POWER VERSUS PUBLIC INTEREST

The measure of any union reform proposal is how well it grapples with two issues: The protection of union members against unscrupulous union bosses, and the protection of the public against excessive union power.

The recommendations that President Eisenhower sent to Congress yesterday would deal effectively with the first issue, or at least would promise great improvement. By requiring public reports, proper records, secret ballots, criminal penalties for willful violations—in these and other ways the legislative proposals would go far to insure democratic and responsible union organization and to prevent the methods by which unions have been able to abuse their own membership.

But the second issue—the issue of union power—is the more basic, because it is untrammeled union power which threatens the entire public, including union members. The threat is not only the paralysis of whole industries, which has happened often enough, but potentially the paralysis of the whole economy and hence the whole Nation.

It has long been evident that one prime source of such dangerous power is the unions' specific exemption from the antitrust laws, which make such economic power im-

possible for any other group in our society. On this the President's message is silent; it makes no suggestion for removing the exemption.

That is not to say, however, that it does not try to come to grips with union power at all. In at least two important respects it would curb the application of the power.

One of these reforms would outlaw blackmail picketing, a practice whereby a union coerces an employer to recognize it, even though the employer has already recognized another union or the majority of employees don't want the coercing union. Plainly enough, this practice is not only gangsterism but also a bludgeon for a union to use to expand its power. Making it illegal would be, to say the least, a belated victory for elementary justice.

The other proposed reform in this connection would tighten the existing restrictions on secondary boycotts. As it is now, a union, the teamsters, for example—since this is one of their specialties—can put tremendous pressures on a concern with which it is having labor troubles; it can persuade individual truck drivers and members of other unions to boycott any firm doing business with the first concern. The union can also threaten another employer with labor trouble if he persists in doing business with the first firm—and that is often a very effective threat.

Such pressures are so effective, in fact, that they enable unions to extort hot cargo clauses from employers. These are provisions under which an employer agrees not to require his employees to handle goods from a firm having union difficulties. This, too, is a device much admired and used by the teamsters.

All these secondary boycott practices—which, incidentally, can be especially tough on smaller businesses—are a gross and obvious violation of individual rights; just as clearly they are blunt instruments for entrenching and widening a union's power.

Now it's being said in Washington that these remedies for blackmail, picketing, and secondary boycotts are too severe to win the approval of the present Congress, and that Congress will more likely take to the revived Kennedy bill. The latter, along with other glaring deficiencies, omits these two reforms.

That prospect may be true; certainly the problem of union power versus the public interest is a complex one, both politically and and intrinsically. At least, however, the administration is indicating some routes to a solution; it is trying to show the public how vital is the public's interest.

Perhaps that will help Congress, too, to see the problem whole. We hope it will not wait until it is jolted by an event such as Teamster Boss Hoffa's achieving his dream of becoming king of all transport workers in the country. But, late or soon, Congress is going to have to face squarely and entirely the problem of overriding union power.

Unions and the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the New York Times of January 30, 1959, and the New York World Telegram and Sun of January 29, 1959, relating to the competing bills now before the Congress designed to correct certain labor abuses and undemocratic practices followed by some unions. Both bills are designed to promote and protect the rights of individual union members within the union organization. However, reasonable men will differ when it comes to changes or additions to the National Labor Relations Act—Taft-Hartley Act—rather than proposals that have as their immediate objective greater democracy, honesty, and efficiency within the union structure. These editorials suggest the importance of considering these two areas separately from each other:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 30, 1959]

LABOR UNION REFORM BILLS

The overwhelming demand of the public, supported by the AFL–CIO, that dictation and corruption by union officials be outlawed in this country may now be thwarted again by partisan politics and irrelevant issues. Two competing measures are now before Congress, where there should be only one—and a bipartisan one at that. They are the Kennedy bill, cosponsored by 11 other Democratic Senators, and the bill introduced by Republican Senator GOLDWATER, based on the President's labor message to Congress.

But a striking feature of these bills is their wide agreement on ways to democratize and purify unions. Both require full reporting and disclosure, policed by the Secretary of Labor, on such matters as organization and governing procedures, financial operations and transactions that involve a conflict of interest. Both require the administration of union funds solely in the interests of the members, backed by punitive sanctions. Both call for a secret ballot, free of coercion, in periodic elections of officers; freedom to run for office, with a ban on the use of union funds to support any candidate, and minimum standards for trusteeships of local bodies. Incidentally, why not require a majority vote of all members involved to validate a strike?

Bipartisan support for a measure along these lines should not be too difficult to mobilize. The main trouble is that the two bills differ widely—both as to what is in them and what is left out—in such matters as picketing, secondary boycotts and the jurisdiction and operation of the National Labor Relations Board, which call for amendments to the Taft-Hartley law. And not only are the differences between the bill extremely hard to reconcile, but the problems they deal with are controversial in themselves—which intensifies the differences.

But, after all, these are matters that primarily involve the power and external relations of labor unions, not how they manage their own affairs. Doesn't this mean that amendments to the Taft-Hartley law should be made through a separate, and carefully considered, overall measure? They seem like excess baggage which might well be temporarily jettisoned now for the sake of reaching the main and immediate objective: Greater democracy, honesty and efficiency within American labor unions.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Jan. 29, 1959]

UNIONS AND THE LAW

Two of the big labor union reform bills now have been introduced in Congress—by the Eisenhower administration and Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY. Another, being drafted by Senator MCCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Rackets Committee, is yet to come.

The logical hope would be that Congress take the best of all three and thus produce a law which will clean up the abuses, the corruption and arrogance exposed by the McClellan investigations. Both the Kennedy and the administration bills are aimed in this direction—the latter more so.

In one important respect, the Kennedy bill is remiss. It does not deal with secondary boycotts. While the Taft-Hartley law on the books since 1947 forbids secondary boycotts, the administration bill attempts to tighten this ban, which has been widely evaded. It deals specifically with threats, coercion and forcible restraint—the usual methods in secondary boycotts.

The two bills differ on what constitutes illegal picketing.

The administration measure would outlaw picketing in jurisdictional disputes, where the issues already have been settled legally or where the union cannot prove sufficient interest on the part of employees. The Kennedy bill would also outlaw blackmail picketing where a money payoff was the purpose.

Both types of picketing are immoral and ought to be outlawed.

There are other complex differences between these bills which must be studied in detail in the effort to give a fair shake to union members (as contrasted to union bosses) and to the public.

Any law which reaches in this direction is an improvement—and if Congress will stick to those two objectives, it not only will reduce the abuses revealed by the McClellan investigation, but will be doing the union movement a wholesome favor.

Health Insurance for Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the welfare of our senior citizens has been, as it should be, a matter of growing concern in recent years, as their numbers have continued to mount in proportion to the population.

The maintenance of an adequate standard of living for senior people and of adequate housing and improved health and medical care facilities for this segment of our population, have been a matter of great concern to government, labor, and industry. Over the past 25 years each has done much to help in these worthwhile objectives.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee and of the House, I have long taken an interest in social security and other legislative proposals to provide more and deserved comfort and security for people in the later years of their lives. Industry and labor have worked together in the development of improved pension and retirement plans. For some years I have sponsored a bill to extend to the self-employed the same tax-deferrable privileges enjoyed by approved and qualified employee pension plans. I have hopes that that bill, which last year passed the House by an overwhelming voice vote, will be enacted this session or, at the latest, during this Congress.

Unfortunately, progress assuring the 65-plus group adequate means with which to meet the burden of higher costs for medical care has not kept stride with other social welfare advances. Those

over 65, generally, have been unable to obtain health insurance coverage.

There are now about 15 million people of age 65, or more, in the United States—about 8.6 percent of the total population—and only about 6 million of these have hospital-surgical coverage. This coverage for the most part is under plans which they paid for prior to age 65 and which plans have advanced to permit retention of coverage after age 65.

It is, therefore, very encouraging to many to note the intensified efforts on the part of the insurance industry and the medical profession to solve this problem and to give to those over age 65 the opportunity of providing for their own medical care costs through private initiative.

The Continental Casualty Co., one of the Nation's largest insurance companies, has pioneered in this field and other insurers are following suit.

The Continental 65-plus policy, after being tested in several States, has recently been introduced in my home State of New York and in seven other Eastern States.

By successfully applying the principle of group insurance to individuals, Continental has found that it is possible to make available, without restriction, basic hospitalization and surgical insurance coverage to those age 65 plus.

This new plan admittedly is not a panacea. For this critical problem, it most certainly does represent a great and feasible stride forward in the expansion of voluntary health prepayment plans for those generally more in need of such protection, and, as such, merits the public recognition by those in government, industry, and labor who long have urged the encouragement of such worthwhile experiments. We shall see.

The Legacy of Dr. Wise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last Dr. Jonah B. Wise, the spiritual head of the Central Synagogue of New York, passed away. Rabbi Wise was known as an elder statesman of religion. He has been described as one of the most contributive and distinguished leaders of American Judaism of this generation. He was a leading exponent of interfaith cooperation.

Rabbi Wise was one of the founders of the United Jewish Appeal and served continuously as a national chairman of that organization from its founding until last year, when he was named honorary national chairman. It was under his leadership that the UJA was able to raise sufficient funds to help the oppressed and needy Jews throughout the world.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial which appeared in the New York Times of February 3:

THE LEGACY OF DR. WISE

There must be at least a million persons in the world whose unhappy lot has been ameliorated by the efforts of Dr. Jonah B. Wise, who was for so long the chairman of the United Jewish Appeal. There are other millions who have been inspired by his leadership in the effort to help refugees of all faiths. There are millions of his own coreligionists who looked to him for a special type of interpretation of religious thought. They, also, are his heirs.

We like to think, however, that his greatest contribution to our time was his understanding of the need to bring together persons of differing backgrounds of religious faith in a common cause of religious feeling and purpose. In this sense he was much more than an outstanding leader in his own faith. He was also a leader in the cause of better understanding among men.

Unions in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I do not wish to burden the RECORD with insertions all of the same character, but I realize the subject is of great interest to the American people. In the hope that editors around the country who read the RECORD may be encouraged by remarks of some of their brethren in the larger cities, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Wall Street Journal touching on the subject of the illegitimate, unbridled power of union bosses, which is entitled "The Only Political Party."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ONLY POLITICAL PARTY

When George Meany recently said organized labor might some day have to set up its own political party, his remark was not taken very seriously even by other unionists.

That's natural, since labor already has its own party. In fact, some say that COPE—the AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education—is the only political party in the United States today.

To be sure, this "party" works through the Democratic Party. But its effectiveness is no less for that. As a report from Washington in this newspaper today notes, 77 percent of the Senate candidates backed by COPE in the November voting were elected; in the much larger House, COPE's score was 62 percent.

And now, not surprisingly, the political bills are beginning to come due. Labor has a small army of lobbyists in Washington ready to oversee the enactment of the unions' legislative goals of lots more Federal spending for all kinds of socialistic purposes. They may not push everything at once, realizing that they can overdo their zeal and also that after 1960 they may have won the White House as well as much of Congress.

A revealing tactic in this connection is to press promptly for a weak union "reform" bill to forestall the possibility of a tough one; then, after 1960, they could hope to accomplish one of their important aims: The dismantling of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Well, we know of no legal objection to the unions having their own party or to lobbying for what they consider their legislative interests. All the same, we think the strategic and perhaps dominant position now occupied by the unions in Congress raises questions to which all the people ought to give some serious thought.

Is it right, from any point of view, for union members to have to pay for the support of their leaders' political candidates? That is what happens now, even though many members do not share their leaders' views. It is also the members' dues which finance the lobbyists working for legislation which not all of the members want.

Is it right for a large number of Senators and Representatives to be in the pockets of the unions? It may sound naive to say it, but, after all, these men are supposed to represent their whole constituencies, which they cannot conceivably do when their political life depends on organized labor. It would be an unhealthy development no matter what the group; it is especially so in the case of unions, with their heavy burden of collectivism and corruption.

Is it right for any group to enjoy political power vastly out of the proportion to its numbers? There are well over 170 million Americans, of whom some 15 million belong to unions. And very few of those are in a position to determine union policy or political strategy. It is perfectly plain that a tiny group of union leaders are well on the way to being able to dictate the policies of the U.S. Government.

The core of the labor problem in this country is too much power. It is power expressly granted by the law, and it is already the power to paralyze the national economy. From the excessive power comes the flagrant corruption, for if men are put above the law they are all too likely to act accordingly. On the economic power is based the tremendous political power. It is far too much power for any group to wield, far too much for the safety of the Nation.

These are not theories or formless fears. They are facts parading before our eyes today. We had better not delay deciding whether we really do want to have just this one political party.

Closing of Caven Point Army Terminal, Leonardo Ammunition Depot, and Curtailment of Activities at Bayonne Naval Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to exend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter received from Mr. Frank Murray, president of Local No. 1247 of International Longshoremen's Association Independent who states that the matter of closing the Caven Point Army Terminal in Jersey City, the Leonardo Ammunition Depot, and the curtailment of activities at the Bayonne Naval Base by the Department of Defense has created a desperate economic situation to longshoremen and allied craft industry of New Jersey and New York and requests a probe of the Defense Department. Since I am interested in the matter of employment in the port of New Jersey, especially as it

effects my constituency in the 14th Congressional District, I commend this letter to your attention:

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION INDEPENDENT,
Jersey City, N.J., January 27, 1959.

Hon. DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The longshore and allied craft industry of New Jersey and New York has felt a desperate economic pinch during the past several months. This has resulted from the closing of Cavan Point Army Terminal in Jersey City, the Leonardo Ammo Depot, and the curtailment of activity at the Bayonne Naval Base by the Department of Defense.

During the closing days of the last session of Congress, we, together with public officials of Jersey City and Hudson County and representatives of commerce and industry, contacted Members of the House, appealing to them for support in our fight to save the ports of New York and New Jersey from being sacked by the Defense Department.

Meetings were held in the Pentagon, telegrams were sent to the White House, the local press backed up our pleas but to no avail.

The Defense Department through the voices of Messrs. Frank Higgins and Courtney Johnson insisted that Cavan Point was closing for reasons of economy. That no cargo would be diverted from the port of New York. That it was a dunnage storage area.

We labeled these charges false. We now hereby request you as our Representative from New Jersey to launch a full-scale investigation of the Department of Defense.

We shall also invite your fellow Members from Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Richmond Counties to join with you in this request, inasmuch as many of their constituents have been affected when Staten Island was closed for economy.

On an enclosed sheet we submit a list of charges which we feel in justice should be answered to the hundreds of families of unemployed longshoremen. Many of these men have exhausted their unemployment benefits and are faced with the plight of being forced on relief roles.

We are requesting Messrs. GALLAGHER and DANIELS from the 13th and 14th Districts of New Jersey to serve as our chairmen and that they insert our charges into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

U.S. Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, Jr., has arranged a meeting to be held at the Pentagon, February 6 at 2 p.m., and has assured us that the matter will be brought up on the Senate floor.

We have full confidence that you will aid us in this fight and return to the ports of New Jersey and New York their just deserts.

Copies of this letter together with the statement of charges have been sent to all newspapers in the metropolitan area.

Very truly yours,

FRANK MURRAY.

[Enclosure: Statement of charges.]

CHARGES

We accuse the Department of Defense with a systematic sacking of ports of New Jersey and New York under the guise of economy. We accuse that military cargo has been channeled from New York in general, and into Philadelphia in particular.

We cite as examples the closing of piers in Staten Island, Leonardo Ammo Depot, Caven Point, and curtailment of activity at the Bayonne naval base. We ask is the Brooklyn Army base to follow?

We state that the Defense Department has created a monopoly for the handling of thousands of tons of military cargo and turned these shipments over to one firm, the Northern Metals Co. in Philadelphia.

We ask why 200 stevedoring firms in the New York harbor were not given an opportunity to bid on these military cargo contracts. But Northern Metals was awarded the contract without bidding.

We ask is it in the best interest of the Government to pay for storage, warehousing and rentals for 70 acres of land in Philadelphia when 365 acres of tax free, rent free property owned by the Army exists in Jersey City known as Cavan Point.

We ask is it wise economy for ships to have to sail 10 extra hours to reach ports in Europe from Philadelphia. Or to have to wait for proper tides before vessels can berth in the Northern Metals Docks, via the Delaware River.

We ask why a former commanding general of the New York Port of Embarkation resigned a high position from Northern Metals Co. We ask are there at present any high ranking former military officers on this company's payroll.

We ask why the same reason to close Staten Island was given to the public officials of the counties of Manhattan, Kings, and Richmond in 1954 and then to New Jersey officials in 1958.

We ask Presidential Assistant Wilfred S. Persons where have the millions of tons of military cargo which were handled at the closed piers shipped from during the years 1954 to 1958, inclusive, when he stated, "I have been advised that no cargo has been nor will be diverted from New York."

Finally we ask why Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy feels that any further meetings with New Jersey officials will serve no useful purpose.

A Mountain of Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial that appeared in the Boston Daily Globe, February 2, 1959, which is worthy of the consideration of the Members of the Congress:

A MOUNTAIN OF WHEAT

The farm problem in the United States today is best approached if one realizes that it is an instance of the machine throttling man, a social problem more than an agricultural one. Scientific farming has so increased the yield from the ever-diminishing amount of land give over to crops that we are slowly being suffocated under a mountain of wheat. In 1958, America harvested the greatest general crop ever from the smallest amount of land planted in any year since 1918.

In 1959, it has been estimated, the job of storing, managing and partially disbursing our food surpluses will cost us $1 billion alone. Our budget item for price supports and stabilization of farm incomes will be $5.4 billion. This is about 40 percent of the national farm income.

Meanwhile, the poor in Haiti riot for want of food, and well-to-do Brazil is tormented by a touch of famine. Even at home, anomaly rides the scene. About 1.5 million farm families in the United States have cash incomes of less than $1,000 a year. Of the many farms producing wheat, only a little more than half collect 90 percent of the Government subsides.

The big corporation farm prospers. Some large farms produce crops for which there is no market, calculating their enterprise deliberately to make money through the parity payment system, worsening the Government's storage headache. Better the crop should be plowed under. Meanwhile, the family farm is being forced to the wall. The number of men on farms declines; and homes decay.

This is the situation that President Eisenhower's latest message on farm policy seeks to correct. Unfortunately many of its recommendations will be unacceptable to a majority of the Congress.

The farm situation has worsened under the Eisenhower Administration. The flexible prices supports, so praised by Secretary Benson, have not proved themselves to the point that the Democratic Members of Congress will be inclined to vote him the broad powers that the President has asked. Others will simply be unwilling to abandon the parity program based on the 1910–14 formula.

Yet it seems almost certain that some other formula must be found. The principal point to be seized in regard to the matter is that the parity program, rigidly linked to farm income levels of 1910–14, was devised to ensure production and now must be twisted to serve the opposite purpose of somehow combining with acreage control to fight overproduction. And this at a time when scientific agriculture has made a mockery of acreage control.

Perhaps the farm problem is insoluble. Whatever system is devised, absurdities creep in, which only means that times change, economies alter, and man progresses. What is needed is an approach which strives to set a balance and permits quick decision by Congress or speedy action by the Department of Agriculture to restore the balance when it starts to totter.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON says curtly that Congress will come up with a workable farm program that will not be conceived out of a desire to punish the farmer for the sins of the Agriculture Department. At least both sides see that the point of no return has been reached under the present system, and that something drastic must be done to restore and maintain a stable reciprocation of price and production in a broadening farm economy.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

British Turbines, Keep Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which was broadcast over WDSU–TV and WDSU Radio on January 27, 1959:

BRITISH TURBINES, KEEP OUT

Representative HALE BOGGS has criticized—with good reason—the way this country has just slammed the door on a British electrical company. The story is not one of fair play.

The United States, which has repeatedly urged its allies to emphasize trade, not aid, invited the British to bid on work for large hydroelectric projects in this country.

In this case, the British put in a bid on furnishing two turbines for a dam to be built in Arkansas. They went to all the expense and effort of surveys, blueprints, and estimates to put in their bid, even though they knew the odds were against them. The odds were unfavorable because, under our law, a foreign bidder has to bid 6 percent lower than an American company to win the contract. And if the American company happens to be in an area of substantial unemployment, the foreign company has to bid 12 percent lower.

Bidding on the turbines for the Arkansas dam, a British company managed to beat those odds. It bid 19 percent lower than the lowest American company—a difference of some $300,000.

Then, some days after the bids were opened and the British bid turned out to be much the lowest, a Government agency in Washington ruled that the contract would go to an American company after all. The agency said that national security was involved, although, as Boggs points out, the same office had said that this kind of machinery has no defense significance.

The original announcement, incidentally, that the contract would go to a Philadelphia firm, instead of to the British company, came from Republican Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.

So, on our invitation, the British invested considerable time, effort, and money, to bid on this project. Then, after they put in the best bid, the contract went to an American company on a technicality—a sort of change of rules announced after the ball game was over.

The British are now hollering "We wuz robbed." Or, maybe being British, they're hollering "We were robbed."

However they're saying it, we can hardly deny it. This is no way for the United States to do business with an ally.

The Sixth Year Begins for the Monitor, Official Catholic Newspaper of the Diocese of Trenton, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Monitor, the official Catholic newspaper of the diocese of Trenton, N.J., is embarking on its sixth year of publication.

The fifth anniversary edition of this worthy newspaper was replete with reports of the widespread support the Monitor has received from the Roman Catholic community throughout Mercer and Burlington Counties. Indeed, the appreciation for the fine service the newspaper has performed has not been confined to members of Catholic congregations alone. Leaders of labor, business, and government have recognized that the invaluable information obtainable only in the Monitor of many of the varied affairs as well the attitudes in the Catholic community has been of tremendous service not only to the members of the Catholic faith but to themselves as well.

No one can doubt that the official newspaper of the diocese has been supremely successful during its first 5 years, and the future of the Monitor is particularly promising now. Although its lay audience has been large, a drive is now underway for total support by the families of the diocese.

The Most Reverend George W. Ahr, the Bishop of Trenton, under whose auspices the Monitor was initiated, has sent an open letter on this circulation drive to everyone in the diocese. In his letter the bishop emphasized the value of the Monitor to the clergy and the laity alike through its dissemination of information to the people of the diocese.

Bishop Ahr declared that—

In the Monitor the diocese has a newspaper of which we can all be proud. But more than that it is an efficient aid to the bishop and priests in their difficult task of bringing to you a wider knowledge of things Catholic, a deeper understanding of your holy faith, a more vigorous development of your life of grace.

The sixth anniversary edition of the Monitor once again reminds the people of the Fourth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, of the great loss we all sustained with the tragic death of Msgr. Richard T. Crean in the fire which destroyed St. Mary's cathedral. The good monsignor somehow found a place in his incredibly crowded schedule to foster the development of the Monitor and its further service to our people, along with many other fine things for the benefit of the people of our diocese and our State of New Jersey. Once more, an otherwise glorious milestone in our history is saddened by the fact that Monsignor Crean cannot be with us to observe the growth of the Monitor as a spiritual and moral force throughout our religious and lay community.

Chief Robert V. Murray, Metropolitan Police Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week a colleague of mine, who has just been assigned to the District of Columbia Committee, was quoted in the newspaper as stating that the Police Department of the District of Columbia is one of the worst in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the District of Columbia Committee for 12 years. I have observed the Police Department and believe that they have one of the most difficult police jobs of any city in the world and that they do one of the best jobs of any police force of any city.

Washington is certainly the crossroads of the world. The Capital of our Government is located here, as well as many foreign diplomats, and each of these groups cause a special police problem.

It is true that there is a high crime rate in Washington, but for sure the police do not cause the crimes.

I want to compliment the Washington Metropolitan Police Department and their chief, Robert V. Murray, and to include at this point a copy of a resolution adopted by the House District of Columbia Committee commending Chief Murray:

Whereas Chief of Police Robert V. Murray, of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, has rendered outstanding services to the Nation's Capital in the field of law enforcement: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives hereby commends Chief of Police Robert V. Murray, of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, for the distinguished service he has rendered as the chief law-enforcement officer of the Nation's Capital, and the committee also commends and approves his administration of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia.

Resolved, That, the chairman of the committee is authorized to have prepared and to present to Chief of Police Robert V. Murray an appropriate replica of this resolution and to extend to him the sincere best wishes of the committee for continued success in his administration of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia.

JOHN L. MCMILLAN, Chairman; JOHN DOWDY, HENRY O. TALLE, JOS. P. O'HARA, HOWARD W. SMITH, BILLY MATTHEWS, JAMES C. DAVIS, OREN HARRIS, JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., DEWITT HYDE, JOEL T. BROYHILL, A. L. MILLER, SID SIMPSON, JOE HOLT, ROY W. WIER, THOS. G. ABERNATHY, JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, CARROLL KEARNS, KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, ABRAHAM MULTER, OLIN E. TEAGUE, JIM PATTERSON, JIMMY MORRISON.

2d Lt. George W. P. Walker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I inform my colleagues of the death of 2d Lt. George W. P. Walker, son of Mr. and Mrs. George Walker of 1103 East 34th Street, Brooklyn, N.Y. Lieutenant Walker was in an aircraft accident in North Carolina while he was en route to Oakland, Calif., for overseas assignment.

Lieutenant Walker was my appointee to the U.S. Military Academy and when he was graduated from that institution in June of 1958, he stood No. 1 in his class. For the entire time he attended the Military Academy, he was carried on the dean's list.

Upon graduation, he was presented with the following awards:

For having the highest rating in mechanics of fluids, a portable typewriter, presented by the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

For excellence in intercollegiate debating, a wristwatch presented by the Consul General of Switzerland.

As the No. 1 man in military topography, a wristwatch presented by the Daughters of the Union Veterans of the Civil War.

The Francis Vinton Greene Memorial, caliber .45 pistol, presented in the name of Mrs. Greene, for standing No. 1 in general order of merit for 4 years; a set of books presented by the American Bar Association for having the highest rating in law; a silver tray—called the Eisenhower award—presented by Mr. Charles P. McCormick of Baltimore, Md., for excellence in military psychology and leadership.

In addition to maintaining his very high military and academic standing while at the Academy, Cadet Walker was active in extracurricular activities, and during his last year held the rank of lieutenant in the Corps of Cadets.

The Nation has lost a potential outstanding military leader and the loss is indeed a great one. I was proud to have been his sponsor, and I join in grieving with his parents.

Balancing the $40 Billion Defense Budget by Firing 17 Custodial Employees Under the Contracting-Out Subterfuge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, after months of effort—telephone calls, correspondence, further correspondence, and more telephone calls—I have finally obtained from the Department of Defense its explanation for the proposed dismissal of 17 longtime career employees in St. Louis and their replacement through the device of contracting-out the work they do.

These 17 men are in the custodial force at the Army Support Center in St. Louis. They have worked for the Government for from 7½ to 20 years. Many are veterans—this is the kind of work which is normally supposed to be reserved for veterans who qualify—and some are disabled veterans with 10-point preference under civil service.

I am now informed that by contracting-out their work to private enterprise, we are going to be well on our way to solving "the general funding situation within the Department of the Army" which has "required that stringent economy measures be imposed."

WHERE ARE THE ELUSIVE FIGURES ON ECONOMY?

Mr. Speaker, we all expect and demand that the Defense Department exercise strict economy. We all know that the greatest part—the overwhelming part—of the huge budget Congress has been asked to enact for the coming fiscal year represents expenditures of the Department of Defense. If we could save substantial sums in Defense Department expenditures, we could almost certainly enjoy the luxury of cutting taxes, and certainly we could eliminate the nuisance excise taxes. So cutting Defense Department expenditures—if that is safe to do, in light of our defense needs—would be most acceptable to all of us.

But I have not been convinced that firing 17 longtime employees of the Army Support Center in St. Louis and turning over the work of these custodial employees to private enterprise on a contract basis, will put any significant crimp in a $40 billion defense budget. Further than that, I cannot obtain—I have not been able as yet to obtain—any figures actually showing there would be any saving at all. The figures are elusive.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, my information is that the substitution of a private contract for the custodial work now done by these modestly paid civil service employees would actually cost the Government more rather than less for cleaning the installation in St. Louis.

CAREER GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SUMMARILY FIRED

In the meantime, these 17 employees, many of them up in years, face a bleak prospect in looking for other work. I have received very moving letters from some of the employees outlining their problem in finding other employment after, in some cases, a lifetime of working for the Federal Government in an unskilled or semiskilled capacity.

It was this situation, plus the difficulty in finding any clearcut evidence of savings to the Federal Government as a result of these dismissals, which led me to intervene in the case as soon as I learned in December that these men had been notified of their scheduled dismissal as of February 15, 1959.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I tried immediately to find out how the Government would accomplish any savings through the dismissal of these men, since the work they perform is going to be performed in any event—and by a private contractor who must not only pay prevailing wages but must make a profit in order to stay in business.

I said that the figures on possible savings are quite elusive. I am convinced, further, that if any such figures exist, they are, in fact, illusive.

The chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations has sought the same figures. I am beginning to doubt that any such figures exist.

It appears to me that someone in the Department of the Army dreamed up a bright idea as to a way to get around personnel ceilings and make it appear through a subterfuge that the Army was cutting down on civilian employees. By firing employees and contracting out the work they do, the Army apparently can show a reduction in employment even though there is no corresponding reduction in expenses, and even though costs may actually be much higher.

If this is what has been happening, then I certainly think the responsible officials in the Department of Defense should crack down—and the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget should also intervene. And Congress, also, must look into this problem—not because of 17 employees in St. Louis but because their situation seems to be part of a nationwide pattern.

MONTHLY REPORTS ON GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures issued its monthly report on Government employment for the month of December. It showed a slight cut of 2,943 in the number of Federal employees from the previous month's total of 2,351,824.

The Joint Committee added, Mr. Speaker—and to me this is most significant in view of the situation I have discovered in the Army Support Center in St. Louis—the Joint Committee added that the decrease in overall Government employment of 2,943 represented a cut of 3,930 civilian workers in the military departments against an increase of 987 in employees of the civilian agencies.

How many of the 3,930 civilian employees let go by the military were taken off the rolls only to have their work turned over to private contractors at a cost at least equal to, and probably higher, to the Government? That is the figure I would like to know about, Mr. Speaker.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE INVESTIGATING

In several instances in the past, Mr. Speaker, the military services—and particularly the Army—have been disclosed to have contracted for services through private enterprise in order to maintain a fictitious employee ceiling on total personnel. I am aware of the fact that the General Accounting Office has looked into several such instances, and has found the ceiling on employees cannot legally and properly be circumvented by farming out, on contract, work normally done by Government employees.

The General Accounting Office is currently conducting an inquiry into the proposed dismissals in St. Louis, and I sincerely hope it can establish the true facts. I have not been able to get those facts on specific costs or savings from the Army. In fairness, I might say that the Army informs me there are substantial reductions in direct costs obtainable through contracting out custodial work of this nature—and I will place that letter in the RECORD later in my remarks—but I have seen no figures to bear this out. And the information does not coincide with information I received elsewhere from sources I deem to be reliable.

EXCHANGES OF CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Speaker, I submit, in chronological order, some of the correspondence I have sent or received on this matter.

First, the letter I wrote to Secretary of Defense McElroy shortly after this matter was brought to my attention, and after I had made a series of preliminary inquiries by telephone:

[LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Third District, Missouri]

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 12, 1958.

Hon. NEIL H. MCELROY,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have recently learned of a Department of Defense action

in St. Louis involving a group of faithful career Government employees, many of them with 10-point preference as disabled veterans. The whole situation smacks of shabby treatment and fiscal dishonesty. I am writing to you in the hope that you will not only correct this particular situation but see to it that any similar episodes occurring elsewhere are stopped.

In an apparent desire to reduce the number of civilian employees of the Department of Defense, someone in the Department dreamed up the idea of eliminating certain custodial positions and then placing out the work on a contract basis. As a result, a majority of the men now employed as laborers in the custodial department of the St. Louis Area Support Center have been notified their jobs will be eliminated February 15 and the work put out on contract. When I inquired about this I was informed that the orders had come from the 5th Army Headquarters, who got their orders from Washington, based on a determination to reduce the number of employees. So far as I can determine there will be absolutely no saving in costs and, in fact, operating costs may increase.

The men involved have been employed by the Federal Government for periods ranging from 7½ to 20 years. There are only a few of them involved and I can appreciate the fact that with all the worries that you have you may not have the opportunity to look into a matter involving perhaps 17 employees in an installation in St. Louis. Yet I think the principle involved here is important enough to justify the concern of everyone in the Department of Defense interested in preventing injustice to faithful, long-time employees and interested also in avoiding the presentation of a dishonest picture of "economies" in the Department.

May I have a report on this matter at your earliest convenience?

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Third Ditsrict, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, since the monthly reports on Government employment issued by Senator BYRD's joint committee may well have been a factor in the Army's desire to contract out various types of work to private enterprise, and since I know the Senator from Virginia would want to make sure that the figures his committee issues reflect the true conditions of Government employment, I addressed the following letter to Senator BYRD in his capacity as chairman of the joint committee:

DECEMBER 12, 1958.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Each month the joint committee of which you are chairman issues reports on the number of Government employees and the increase or decraese in Government payrolls. This is useful information for the Congress to have and I am sure stimulates the executive department in seeking to hold employment in line.

May I respectfully point out, however, that in an attempt, apparently, to make its employment picture look better that it really is, the Department of Defense seems to have adopted a policy of discharging long-time, faithful, career Government employees and awarding this work on a contract basis to outside firms.

A situation of this kind has just been called to my attention at the Army's St. Louis Area Support Center, where a majority of the custodial staff—men with from 7½ to 20 years of service, including a number with 10-point preference as disabled veterans—are to be discharged as of February 15th. I have checked and I have been informed that the Federal Government will not save any money by such a step but may, actually, pay out more than it presently does for this work.

Of course, by eliminating these jobs and others like them the Department of Defense presumably shows a better employment picture while hiding or disguising the cost of custodial work in other accounts or items of its budget.

I wonder if there is any way your committee can investigate this type of practice and see to it that the departments do not provide a misleading and totally dishonest picture of their employment costs by resorting to subterfuges of this kind, particularly when career Government employees are cast adrift after a lifetime of service.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Third District, Missouri.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, if the contracting out of custodial work was in fact a subterfuge to get around ceilings on personal services employment, and could cost the Government far more in the long run than retaining faithful employees in the work, it occurred to me that the President's chief budget officer, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, would want to look into the situation. Consequently, I addressed the following letter to Mr. Stans:

DECEMBER 12, 1958.

Hon. MAURICE H. STANS,
Director, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STANS: May I call your attention to a situation in St. Louis which I think is reprehensible?

After a lifetime of service, a group of Federal employees on the custodial staff of the Army's St. Louis Support Center—all of them with from 7½ to 20 years service, some of them with 10-point veterans' preference—have received notice of discharge as of February 15. The work they have been performing is to be put out on contract to private firms. I am informed that there will be absolutely no saving to the Federal Government as a result of this step, although there will be great hardship on the individuals involved.

Could you give me the thoughts of the Bureau of the Budget on measures of this kind taken by individual agencies to carry out the orders of the President to cut down on employment, when the measures taken are subterfuges of this kind, saving no money whatsoever and perhaps costing more than the present system?

Does the Bureau of the Budget exercise any supervision or control over agencies putting out more and more of their work on a contract basis to private firms when there is absolutely no saving involved and when it actually costs the Government more in the long run?

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Third District, Missouri.

Following, Mr. Speaker, is a reply I received from Senator BYRD, dated December 15:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES,
December 15, 1958.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: I have your letter of December 12. I am very glad that you have called this matter to my attention.

I share your concern over such a practice and I shall look into the matter thoroughly.

With high regards and very best wishes.

Faithfully yours,

HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense acknowledged my letter to the Secretary in a reply dated December 16, and indicated the Department of the Army would seriously study the allegations. That letter follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., December 16, 1958.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This is to acknowledge your letter to the Secretary of Defense dated December 12, 1958, in which you requested a report pertaining to certain personnel practices by the Army in the St. Louis Area Support Center. Secretary McElroy is out of the country on official business.

Your letter complained of elimination by the Army of certain custodial positions in order to reduce the number of civilian employees, and then allegedly having the same work effected by contractors. This is a matter within the purview and knowledge of the Department of the Army, and I have therefore taken the liberty of referring your letter to the Secretary of the Army for direct reply to you.

Please be assured that the allegations contained in your letter will be seriously studied, and investigated if necessary.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

CARLTON R. ADAMS,
Captain, USN, Deputy Assistant to the Secretary (Legislative Affairs).

On the last day of the year, Mr. Speaker, the Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Elmer B. Staats, responded to my letter of December 12 as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., December 31, 1958.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This is in response to your letter of December 12, 1958.

Administration policy, as expressed in Bureau of the Budget Bulletins 55-4 and 57-7, reads as follows:

"It is the general policy of the administration that the Federal Government will not start or carry on any commercial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels. Exceptions to this policy shall be made by the head of an agency only where it is clearly demonstrated in each case that it is not in the public interest to procure such product or service from private enterprise."

Savings to the Government are not always apparent in action taken under this policy because comparisons of cost may not include all relevant costs of the agency production unit, Government and private accounting systems differ which makes comparison difficult, and because taxes paid by the private entrepreneur to Government may offset apparently higher costs.

Agencies are required to carry out actions under this policy in an orderly way. They have been directed to give adequate notice to the community and employees in advance of discontinuance or curtailment, and where necessary to assist employees in finding other employment.

Through such measures it is hoped that the inevitable dislocations which occur can be minimized to the end that a viable econ-

omy might be maintained and responsible Government promoted.

Please get in touch with us if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Assistant Director.

BUDGET BUREAU SEES VIABLE ECONOMY IN FARMING OUT 17 CUSTODIAL JOBS TO PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Mr. Speaker, I read the letter from Mr. Staats with great interest—and a somewhat sinking feeling in the pit of my stomach. If I gather its drift correctly, we are to turn over to private enterprise all jobs now performed by Government employees except where it is clearly demonstrated in each case that it is not in the public interest to procure such product or service from private enterprise.

Under that approach, I am sure we could conceivably justify firing nearly everybody in Government except the Cabinet members and a few assistants. We could hire taxis instead of chauffeurs for the entire executive level of the executive department; we could farm out the Council of Economic Advisers to the Brookings Institution and the Budget Bureau to one of the big industrial management firms. We could assign Westinghouse or General Electric the task of administering the Atomic Energy Act; and we could fire a whole slew of generals, admirals, and Assistant Secretaries of Defense and farm out their work to corporations expressly formed for that kind of servicing operation.

This may be taking the thing far afield, Mr. Speaker, but the principle is the same. We are firing 17 janitors in St. Louis in order to shore up private enterprise, assure a viable economy and perhaps—we do not know for sure, but perhaps—save some money, perhaps only by the fact that we will collect taxes on the private contractor doing the work these 17 men have performed.

Mr. Speaker, on January 20 the Army directed another interim letter to me on this matter, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington D.C., January 20, 1959.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This is in further reply to your inquiry pertaining to certain personnel practices by the Army in the St. Louis Area Support Center.

Please be advised that the investigation of this matter is continuing. Upon receipt of the necessary information you will be informed immediately.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. B. WALTERS,
Lieutenant Colonel, GS, Office, Chief of Legislative Liaison.

After nearly 2 more weeks of waiting, while the February 15 deadline for the dismissal of the custodial employees at St. Louis rapidly approached, and after a number of calls to find out what, if anything was happening on this, I have finally received the Army's reply to my letter of December 12.

This letter, dated today and hand-carried to me, is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1959.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This is in reply to your recent inquiry regarding the proposed release of custodial laborers at the U.S. Army Support Center, St. Louis, Mo., and assignment of the custodial work on a contractual basis.

The general funding situation within the Department of the Army has required that stringent economy measures be imposed. Since, in many instances, the application of such measures has brought about a reduction in available manpower without a corresponding reduction in the amount of work to be performed, local commanders have been forced to explore every possible means for continuing their operations.

The St. Louis Support Center was faced with this problem when, approximately 7 months ago, it became necessary to assume the maintenance of additional office space in the Mart Building. At that time, due to budgetary limitations, space authorizations would not permit the employment of any additional personnel for the performance of this additional work and it was decided to contract for its performance.

Experience with this contract indicated that there were a number of advantages to the installation. First, a substantial reduction in direct cost has occurred, even though the contractor is paying prevailing union wages for such work. Second, the contractor furnishes all equipment and supplies, thus relieving the installation of the work involved in procuring, accounting for, and repairing numerous items of property not required for the conduct of its mission. Third, there has been a substantial reduction in the overhead required for supervision of the custodial work.

Further budgetary limitations have now required that the St. Louis Support Center seek additional means of carrying out its mission without jeopardizing essential operations. Such limitations were partially met by not filling 13 vacancies arising from personnel actions such as retirements, transfers, and resignations. In the light of earlier favorable experience with contract operations, and in order to conduct operations fully within fund limitations, it was decided to reduce the maintenance staff by 17 employees and to enter into an additional contract for the performance of this work.

Any action which causes the loss of loyal and experienced personnel is always regretted by the Department. You may be assured, however, that every effort is being extended by the center to find other employment for the employees involved. To date this action has resulted in the probable placement of three employees.

Thank you for your interest in this matter, and I hope that the information furnished will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

C. G. DODGE,
Brigadier General, GS, Deputy Chief of Legislative Liaison.

MORE INVOLVED THAN 17 CUSTODIAL JOBS

Mr. Speaker, it is not very encouraging that in the period since early December until now—a period of 2 months since these 17 men were notified they were going to be let go—the Army's "every effort" in helping the men find other employment has resulted in "the probable placement of three employees."

That, more than anything else the Army and the other agencies involved have said, or omitted from saying, sums up the cruelty of this whole high-handed episode.

It may seem a bit far-fetched for me to go into so much detail here today over the jobs of 17 custodial employees in an Army installation in St. Louis. But these are not 17 fence posts, or 17 desks, or 17 cases of floor wax. They are 17 long-time, career Government employees, in jobs normally reserved for and assigned to veterans, and some are disabled veterans. There are 17 families involved here. One of the men who wrote to me has 8 children—he is a 10-point disabled veteran with 22 months of overseas service to his credit and 16 months of service in the States in World War II.

Both the Disabled American Veterans and the American Legion have intervened in these dismissals because of the pattern and trend they reflect in disguising Government personnel costs by turning out career employees—frequently veterans—and replacing them through the private contract subterfuge.

I appreciate the interest other Members of the House have showed in this problem when I discussed it with them, and I appreciate the follow-up inquiries which several have made. I hope we can save these 17 jobs. But the principle involved here goes far beyond the 17 men involved. It goes to the heart of decency in personnel and fiscal policies in Government.

The Big Jump

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article entitled "The Big Jump," which appeared in the supplement with the first issue of Looking Ahead for 1959, a publication issued periodically by the Second Bank-State Street Trust Co. of Boston, Mass.

Since this subject is most timely, it may be of interest to my colleagues:

THE BIG JUMP

Probably your great-grandchildren will be told in school that the space age began in 1959—the year when earthlings made their first real contact with the moon.

But men have been going to the moon, in their imaginations, for 5,000 years—ever since Etana, the shepherd, went there on an eagle to complain to God about oppressive taxation in Babylon.

Science-fiction was written way back in the second century and parodied by Lucian, the Greek, in his "True History." Lucian's hero got to the moon by accident when his ship was carried aloft by a waterspout while sailing beyond the Pillars of Hercules, where almost anything could happen in those days. He found there a race of creatures who drank air and ate the smoke of roasting frogs.

During the Middle Ages life was too grim for fantasy, but in the 1600's speculation about space travel was renewed. Francis Godwin, Bishop of Hereford, in his "The

Man in the Moone, or a Discourse of a Voyage Thither," published in 1638, imagined a flock of geese as the prime mover. The birds were trained to follow a white sheet which, when manipulated as a yachtsman might handle a spinnaker, enabled the pilot to navigate. He reported that the inhabitants of the moon were a peace-loving people whose language could be written only in musical notes. In the same year another bishop, John Wilkins, wrote "The Discovery of a World in the Moon," a quasi-scientific discussion of the possibility of earth men living on the moon. In 1649 Cyrano de Bergerac, in his "Histoires Comiques," dreamed of rocket propulsion with the sun as a source of power.

Galileo could have told them that their tales were tall because he had a good look at the moon with his telescope in 1609, but the Inquisition soon silenced his heretical talk about a new conception of cosmography.

Probably the best-known yarn that has been spun about travel to the moon is Jules Verne's "From the Earth to the Moon," written in 1865. His crew was shot from a giant gun and circled the moon without landing. Verne was followed 5 years later by Boston's Edward Everett Hale, who wrote a serial story called "The Brick Moon," for the Atlantic Monthly. Dr. Hale seems to have been the first to imagine an artificial earth satellite.

John Jacob Astor made his contribution in 1894 with his "Journey to Other Worlds" and H. G. Wells, in 1901, in "The First Men in the Moon" imagined a material called cavorite that canceled the earth's gravity.

For the last 50 years we have been getting closer and closer to our nearest neighbor in the galaxy, but we are still earth bound. We are, as one scientist put it, like a potato bug in a sack of potatoes in the hold of a ship wondering what makes the ship go. But we will soon know more and you may be sure that such news as reaches us will be reported in Looking Ahead.

Why do we want to reach the moon? "Because," as a famous mountain climber once said, "it's there."

My True Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include in the RECORD today, an excellent speech which was made by Miss Pattie Ritter, of Jacksonville, Fla., on the subject of true security. It seems to me that the message of this young lady is one which all good Americans should profit by reading.

The speech follows:

MY TRUE SECURITY

Exactly what is security? A feeling? An emotional state? It is these, but, also, it is an everyday feeling. Security is something that everyone must have to be a natural human being, not just in the United States, but all over the world. I must possess it in everything I attempt to do. Security exists everywhere, but in order for it to progress, everyone must believe in it.

We, the citizens of the United States of America, have known security from our first few moments on earth. We have found it in our homes, and in the love of our parents. Security starts in the home and is an influence on all of its surroundings. "The strength of a nation, especially that of a republican nation, is in the intelligent, well-ordered homes of the people." This quotation, taken from the "New Dictionary of Thoughts" could not be more true, but how few of us realize it. Most homes and parents are taken for granted. If they were suddenly taken away from us, only then would we realize how very fortunate we are.

There must be security in our homes. If it does not exist we are without the strength, the supporter of our Nation. There must be security in our Government. Ever since 1787 citizens have enjoyed a fair and secure Government. Without our Government, we are without the United States we all love. Security lies in all our privileges we enjoy as citizens of the United States of America. Our freedom of speech and of the press—being able to voice our views, our problems, our anticipations. Our freedom of education. Our country offers to us an education worth much more than a bike, a car, or pretty clothes, and it is up to us to take hold on this opportunity and make the most of it. Our freedom of religion—being able to attend the church of our choice, worshipping God in our own way. When I think of the many people all over the world who are not free to worship God in their churches on Sunday or any other day of the week, who have to hide their respect for our Almighty Creator, I feel so ashamed of myself for being too lazy to get out of bed and give 1 hour of my time to the Supreme Being, God, that has made me possible.

Yes; there is security in many things. I can live as I please and where I please. I can choose my own friends, elect the people I want to represent me in my Government. I can worship God in the church of my own choice and in my own way. I can attend a school provided for me and millions like me without obligation. I do not have to be afraid to voice my opinions or thoughts. I can go to sleep at night, knowing that my family and I are protected from harm.

What is my true security? It is the United of America, and all of its opportunities, lying before me like an open book. I am so lucky and proud to be able to say, this is my country, I belong to this country, and I will, until my death, cherish this unfailing gift that has been given to me.

The Late Judge Lloyd Herzka

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1958 Judge Lloyd Herzka was called to his eternal home. The entire Brooklyn citizenry was deeply grieved. He was one of Kings County's most promising citizens, dearly beloved, a loyal friend and true American.

When the Honorable John Cashmore, president of the Borough of Brooklyn, was honored at the Beth El annual dinner, he paid a special tribute to Judge Herzka in his speech, which I quote here:

Rabbi Halpern, Mrs. Herzka, Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, how can I possibly put into words all the thoughts that are in my heart at this moment.

Just let me say I am grateful. I am grateful to your chairman, Mr. Stark, and to Mr. Benne Katz for their kind and generous words of friendship.

I am grateful to the mayor of the city of New York who has given up an evening of much needed rest and relaxation so that he could be with me at one of the most important events in my life. And I feel honored indeed that Joe Sharkey and Judge Moss, two of my oldest friends, could be here to take part in these ceremonies.

Let me say that I am thrilled, and I am deeply moved by this beautiful expression of your sentiments.

Mixed with the pleasure of being here tonight, there is a considerable note of sadness. For anything that I have been able to do for Beth-El Hospital has only been a continuation of the great work started by the late Judge Lloyd I. Herzka.

For many years he was my assistant. He was a loyal and devoted friend, whose friendship I sadly miss.

If praise has been earned for any good works, then it is his praise, and I shall accept it for him and in his memory.

I will accept and I will treasure this gift only with the understanding that I serve as a symbol for Judge Herzka and for every one of you here who has worked so tirelessly for Beth-El Hospital.

If I have been privileged to give even a small part of myself to help in this great humanitarian work I feel well rewarded, for it has brought to me a kind of spiritual satisfaction which each one of us grows to cherish more and more as our age and wisdom increase.

You, the friends of Beth-El, have never sought and never will seek earthly reward for your charity, but if every the temptation comes to complain about the endless demands that works of charity make upon you, stop for a moment and ponder upon the message that is contained in a little poem which Lloyd Herzka used to like to quote:

"Go break to the hungry, sweet charity's bread,
For giving is living the angel said,
'Must I be giving again and again?'
The weary wondering question came,
'No!' said the angel piercing me through,
Just stop when the Lord stops giving to you."

And now let me thank you once again for this beautiful gift which Mrs. Cashmore and I will treasure.

Let me thank you, too, for the beautiful tribute that you have paid me here tonight. It will provide me with a memory to cherish the longest day that I live.

Responsibility Passes to Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., under date of January 21, 1959.

The editorial follows:

RESPONSIBILITY PASSES TO DEMOCRATS

President Eisenhower's official presentation of his $77 billion budget to Congress initiates a measure that carries in it the

destiny of the value of the dollar. Indeed, it might be said that it carries in it a test of the moral character of the American people. As the wealthiest people the world has ever known, will they have the character to tax themselves to pay for what they can afford to have, or are they going to evade payment by borrowing for current expenses?

This new budget, which is the largest in the peacetime history of the country, might well be criticized as being too large. Yet it represents a compromise between two extremes of those who call themselves "liberals" and the others who call themselves "conservatives." Three-fifths of the total sum goes for national defense and security, which should convince doubters that more money than ever is being spent for such purposes.

Now that the President has done his duty, it is up to Congress to do its duty. Since Congress is controlled by the Democrats, the responsibility falls squarely on the shoulders of the Democrats. If they scorn the budget as too small, then they should provide new taxes to pay the bills. If they insist on spending more and more and borrowing to pay for current expenses, they will have initiated a precedent which will forecast a progressive depreciation of the purchasing power of the dollar.

The eyes of the world are upon the United States to see what happens. For years, and as a part of our foreign-aid program, we have insisted that other nations balance their budgets. If the Democrats fail to do this with our own budget, it should not be hard to realize that the prestige and the sincerity of the United States will sink to a new low.

What a spectacle it would be to see the wealthiest and most powerful Nation the world has ever known evade paying for what it can afford from current revenue.

Are the Democrats of Congress going to fail to meet this historic test?

Bloomington, Ind., an All-American City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that a city in my district, Bloomington, Ind., has been selected as one of the all-American cities by Look magazine and the National Municipal League. This is an honor extended to only 11 medium-sized cities throughout the Nation.

Bloomington is a city with which I have had a long and special association, and its achievements are always filled with meaning for me. It has truly been a second home to me since I first went there as a freshman at Indiana University in 1921, and worked at Wells' Cafe. Throughout the years I have had continued close contact with Bloomington. My wife is a professor at Indiana University and my son is a senior in the law school there.

I have lived in Morgan County, which is adjacent to Monroe County, of which Bloomington is the seat, all of my life, as has my family since 1822. The people of Bloomington are and always have been representative of a friendly, kind, but rugged independence so typical of those living among the rolling hills of southern Indiana. I have known that Bloomington is an all-America city but I am glad to see it receive official recognition.

From long association I know the kind of teamwork which binds the citizens of Bloomington together in one successful civic enterprise after another. I have seen it exemplified in many instances, and I saw it again last fall when they made their presentation before the panel that selected this year's honor cities. I joined the delegation sent out to Colorado Sprngs, and after seeing first-hand their presentation I felt their selection was assured.

While I was happy to see Bloomington grow and become an increasingly important industrial center, I was fearful that this growth might destroy that friendly, helpful village atmosphere that has made Bloomington such a fine place in which to live and raise a family. But the true greatness of Bloomington is its ability, despite its growth and increasing importance, to remain the kind, friendly community that I knew years ago.

The same judgment applies to Indiana University. One cannot adequately discuss Bloomington without discussing the university, nor discuss the university without discussing Bloomington. Both have lived and grown together for about 140 years. Indiana University has steadily grown from a small but outstanding midwestern school to one of the largest universities in the country and, like Bloomington, it has retained its personal and friendly atmosphere, reflected in its interest in each student.

Perhaps the greatest thing that can be said of any city is that it is a fine place to live. You can certainly say that of Bloomington. It is most outstanding in livability.

Two Amendments To Be Offered to H.R. 2256

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the following are two amendments which I propose to offer to the bill H.R. 2256, which I understand will come up for action on the floor tomorrow afternoon. I believe it will be difficult for the veterans to pay the high interest rates proposed in H.R. 2256:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2256, 86TH CONGRESS, AS REPORTED WITH A COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Section 2(a) of H.R. 2256, 86th Congress, as reported with a committee amendment, is amended by (1) striking the word "and" before "(2)" and inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and (2) by adding before the period at the end thereof the following: "and (3) by adding at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows: 'In every case in which a loan is guaranteed under section 1810 and the interest rate is more than 4¾ per centum per annum, the Administrator is authorized to pay out of appropriations directly to the veteran, during the period the property is owned and occupied by the veteran as his home, and at such intervals as he may prescribe by regulations, an amount representing the difference between the interest paid by the veteran on the loan at the rate actually charged, not exceeding the maximum rate chargeable hereunder at the time the loan was made, and the amount of interest that would have been paid had the rate been set at 4¾ per centum per annum.'"

ADDITIONAL AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2256, 86TH CONGRESS, AS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE

Amend section 2 of H.R. 2256 by adding a new subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 1811 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'In every case in which the interest rate on the direct loan is more than 4¾ percent per annum, the Administrator is authorized to pay out of appropriations directly to the veteran, during the period the property is owned and occupied by the veteran as his home, and at such intervals as the Administrator may prescribe by regulations, an amount representing the difference between the interest paid by the veteran on the loan at the rate actually charged and the amount of interest that would have been paid had the rate been set at 4¾ percent per annum.'"

Mr. Speaker, it is important to legislate additional money for GI loans. I feel the veterans fare better if they can secure loans under VA auspices.

COMPARISON OF GI LOANS AND FHA LOANS

There are certain definite advantages to GI loan financing over FHA financing from the viewpoint of the veteran borrower and these advantages are present even if the two loans bear an identical interest rate.

The obvious advantage to the GI loan is that it may be obtained for home, farm, or business purposes whereas the FHA has no comparable farm and business loan program.

Other advantages of GI loan financing are as follows:

First. The GI loan guarantee or insurance is furnished without charge to the borrower whereas FHA loan insurance is paid for by the borrower through a mortgage insurance premium payment of one-half percent per annum on the monthly declining balance of the loan.

Second. The VA valuation of the property fixes the maximum price which the veteran may pay for the property. The FHA valuation is used in determining only the maximum loan amount and the purchaser may pay in excess of the FHA appraisal if he chooses to do so.

Third. The GI loan may be made for 100 percent of the approved purchase price. The FHA loan may be no more than 97 percent of the FHA valuation of the property in cases where the property is valued at no more than $13,500 and for a lesser percentage as the value of the property increases. Consequently, a downpayment requirement exists in FHA insurance authority which is not present in VA authority.

Fourth. The GI loan may be prepaid by the borrower at any time without premium or fee. A prepayment fee of 1 percent of the outstanding principal balance may be required if the borrower wants to pay off an FHA loan before maturity.

Fifth. The VA has authority to purchase defaulted GI loans where the holder refuses to extend indulgence in deserving cases, thereby affording the borrower a further opportunity to keep his home. The FHA has no comparable authority.

Sixth. The VA has more limitations on foreclosure action by lenders which are designed to protect the veteran's interest and prohibit precipitous action.

Seventh. The VA has a statutory directive to release an original veteran borrower from liability under certain conditions where the property is sold and a new purchaser assumes the mortgage indebtedness. The FHA has no such requirement.

Deep in the Heart of Dixie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to submit an editorial under date of January 29, 1959, from the Wayne County News, a weekly newspaper published in Wayne County, Miss., by Mr. Harvey Hurt.

I think that even a casual reading of this editorial will prove enlightening to even the most biased critics of the Negroes' educational facilities in the South.

The editorial follows:

DEEP IN THE HEART OF DIXIE

Gene Wirth, in his column, Magnolia Mirror, in the Jackson Daily News and Clarion-Ledger, compiles some very interesting figures on taxation in Mississippi, as follows:

During the 1956–57 school session the State paid $109.99 per Negro child in public schools at a total cost of $22,505,475, while during the 1957–58 school session the State paid $118 per Negro child at a total cost of $23,922,209. Of these millions spent for Negro education, this figured that the white taxpayers picked up 90 percent of the check.

Since Mississippi's program started in 1954 to provide equal school facilities, the education finance commission has approved 186 construction projects for Negroes at a cost of $39,576,910.37, while during the same period it approved only 39 construction projects for white children at a cost of $12,100,544.47. The white children received 23.42 percent while the Negro children received 76.58 percent, and the white taxpayers footed 90 percent of the bill.

By the time this equalization program is completed, Mississippi's taxpayers will have coughed up more than $200 million on schoolbuildings. Based on the present percentage of racial distribution of school construction funds, Negroes will receive over $150 million while the white children will receive less than $50 million.

During the current 2-year period, the State will extract from the taxpayers' earnings and then give away in all forms of welfare some $88,327,400. Of this amount, only 38.97 percent or $34,421,187.78 will go to the State's white people, while 60.79 percent or $53,694,286.46 will be given to the State's needy Negroes.

For old-age assistance, the State will take from the taxpayers' earnings and then give away $59,400,000. Of this amount, only 40.70 percent or $24,175,800 will go to the State's needy white people, while 59.11 percent or $35,111,340 will be given to the State's needy Negroes.

For aid to the blind, the State will give away $5,807,400. Of this amount, 42.11 percent or $2,445,496.14 will go to the State's needy white blind people, while 57.56 percent or $3,342,739.44 will be given to the State's needy blind Negroes.

For aid to dependent children, the State will take from the taxpayers' pockets and then give away $17 million. Of this amount, only 27.32 percent or $4,644,400 will go to the State's white children, while 72.22 percent or $12,277,400 will be given to the State's needy Negro children.

For aid to the permanently and totally disabled needy persons, the State will give away $6,120,000. Of this amount, 39.34 percent or $2,407,608 will go to the State's needy disabled white people, while 60.31 percent or $3,690,972 will be given to the State's disabled Negroes.

These figures would seem to be convincing enough that the white taxpayers of Mississippi are paying heavily to assist and advance the Negro.

The Court Blandly Disregards Its Own Established Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present two timely editorials of broad interest which appeared in the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., on January 26, 1959:

THE COURT AGAIN BLANDLY DISREGARDS ITS OWN ESTABLISHED PRINCIPLES

A few days ago the U.S. Supreme Court handed down another of its blandly inconsistent decisions, one which gained little public attention, because it affected only a single individual, but which is important as indicating the manner in which individual Justices hop back and forth across the judicial fence at will.

The case involved a single and very limited question under section 92 of the Articles of War, whether the United States legally was in time of peace in June 1949. A soldier in California had been convicted of conspiracy to commit murder, conviction coming through military court-martial on the ground that the United States was not legally in time of peace. If the Nation was in time of peace the case should have been tried by civil courts. The Supreme Court ruled, 6 to 2, that the country was legally in time of peace and ordered the conviction reversed.

Justices John Marshall Harlan and Tom Clark wrote the dissenting opinion, stating quite abruptly that the Supreme Court in 1921 had ruled on this point, holding at that time that "in time of peace" signified "peace in the complete sense, officially declared," and that this was not the condition in 1949 any more than it had been in 1921. In the current California case, all litigants agreed that peace had not been officially declared in the complete sense.

Speaking for himself and for Justice Clark, Justice Harlan said:

"I think that Congress, and the military authorities charged with the implementation of the Articles of War, should be able to rely on a construction given one of those articles by an unanimous decision of this Court."

The two dissenters pointed out that Congress had never objected to the Supreme Court's 1921 decision—on the contrary, Congress reenacted the military statute concerned without amendment.

Justices Harlan and Clark said that they failed to understand how their colleagues could hold that between 1921 and 1949 the meaning of the statute had changed so that "the authority under the statute then confirmed must now be denied."

That is sound and solid law. It is the principle of the long-accepted—and now often rejected by the Supreme Court—stare decisis. This simply means settled law; that points of constitutionality of Federal statutes passed by Congress, or points of issue in the Constitution itself, when once determined by the U.S. Supreme Court remain so determined until and unless Congress passes new law or the Constitution is amended by the people.

But it is necessary to point out that the sound principles of jurisprudence which Justices Clark and Harlan pointed out in this decision apparently did not occur to them in some of their own previous decisions, noticeably as recently as last September when they again voted to void the power of States to maintain racially separate schools.

Justice Harlan obviously is impressed by the fact that the 1921 decision as to court-martial or civil trial was a unanimous decision. Obviously he believes that Congress and the military, once this unanimous decision was rendered and since there had been no new law on its subject, should have been able to rely in 1949 on the ruling that had stood for 28 years. In 1899, Justice Marshall Harlan's grandfather, the first John Marshall Harlan on the Supreme Court, wrote a decision in which the Supreme Court held unanimously that "the education of the people in schools maintained by State taxation is a matter belonging to the respective States, and any interference on the part of the Federal authority with the management of such schools cannot be justified except in the case of a clear and unmistakable disregard of rights secured by the supreme law of the land." And that decision became the supreme law of the land just as much as the present desegregation decision of the Supreme Court.

Were not the southern States—or segregation States outside the South—entitled to rely upon that ruling? (That case was *Cumming* v. *Board of Education*). In 1927, in *Gong Lum* v. *Rice*, the Supreme Court again considered the allegation that segregation is in itself a denial of equal protection of the laws. Again, the Supreme Court refused to tamper with established construction of the Constitution—with "settled law," with stare decisis, since there had been no change in law or in the Constitution on the issue at stake.

In 1954 when the Supreme Court wrote its original opinion on the current school cases, the Cumming case had stood for 55 years and the Gong Lum case for 27 years.

The principles of "settled law" which Justices Clark and Harlan criticized for violating in the case of the California soldier are the same principles which Justice Clark violated in the original 1954 Supreme Court desegregation decision, and which both have violated in desegregation decisions since 1955 when Justice Harlan became a member of the Court.

It has been clear for some time that nothing is safe these days from the Supreme Court through having been established and

accepted by time, previous Supreme Court rulings, or action or inaction of Congress. Apparently, Justices Clark and Harlan are not safe even from their own expressed judicial principles, on the basis of their votes in the California soldier's case and in the desegregation decisions.

BOMBINGS SHOULD BE HANDLED BY STATES

J. Edgar Hoover's reluctance to have the FBI pushed further than it already is into the campaign against church and school bombings should receive the support of Congress when House and Senate consider the various proposals before them to make such bombings punishable by Federal law.

As the Sun of Baltimore points out in a recent editorial, "We may be sure that Mr. Hoover is as much against the bombings as the best of us. The idea that bigots can write their bigotry with dynamite into the desolation of houses of worship is repellent. But repellent, too, is the prospect of slow Federal drift into every government responsibility across this continental Nation. Especially repellent is the prospect of an FBI swollen into a universal police force and bound as its first effect to wither local policing. This, obviously, is the main danger Mr. Hoover foresees."

Among the proposals to make school and church bombings a Federal offense—which would authorize FBI entry into any such case—is a seven bill package introduced by the two Republican Senators from New York, JACOB K. JAVITS, and KENNETH B. KEATING. This package, in addition to making such bombings a Federal offense, would ban hate literature from the mails.

A similar bill, broader in some respects but confined to bombings, is offered by two Democrats, Senators JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and SAM J. ERVIN JR., of North Carolina. This measure is said to have the backing of 30 to 40 Senators. In the House, Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, of the House Judiciary Committee, is sponsoring similar bills, as he did at the 1958 session.

Shipping explosives across State lines for terroristic purposes would have been made a Federal crime by a key provision of a bill advanced last year by CELLER and Representative KEATING, then the ranking minority member of CELLER's committee. The specific ban was against such interstate transportation "with the knowledge or intent that it will be used to damage or destroy any building for the purpose of interfering with its use for educational, religious, charitable, or civic objectives, or of intimidating any person pursuing such objectives."

The bill would have justified immediate entry by the FBI in bombing cases by setting up a presumption that explosives used in bombings had been brought across State lines. It, and other similar measures, are in conflict with the position of the Department of Justice that ordinarily crimes of violence, including bombings of religious buildings, are subject to exclusive State jurisdiction, "even if they are a conspiracy and even if the conspiracy is operative in several States."

In this case the position of the Department of Justice and the expressed opinion of Mr. Hoover should prevail. Further extension of FBI authority into State police spheres should be avoided, both as detrimental to local police and as generally undesirable.

It is also worthwhile, in considering this legislation, to raise once again the question of why the same liberal Congressmen who are so eager to push through this antibombing legislation, turning over State and local police powers to the FBI, are not sponsoring similar legislation with regard to bombings and other terrorist activities by labor unions.

It is a safe bet that if provisions making labor terrorism a Federal offense were tacked onto the bills making church and school bombings a Federal offense, a good part of the support now given the latter measures would suddenly and mysteriously evaporate. And this despite the fact that local enforcement has been far more effective and energetic where school and church bombings have been concerned than in the case of labor violence.

Address by Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy Before the Women's Forum on National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks and include extraneous material, I request that the attached address by Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CHANGING DIMENSIONS IN NATIONAL SECURITY

"Changing Dimensions in National Security"—I wonder if you realize how very apt such a theme is for your forum discussion. In these days of exploding technology, change is the one constant dimension in national security.

Sometimes your Secretary of Defense feels that the component elements of our national security have all the stability of ladies' fashions—a subject with which each of you is concerned and quite obviously well informed. You know, for instance, better than I, that strange things happen from season to season to such items as necklines, waistlines, and hemlines. Once in a very great while you ladies can rise up and exercise some control over the changing dimensions of fashion—as witness your boycott and the consequent sack of the sack and the demise of the trapeze.

Changes in weapons come upon us even more unexpectedly than changes in fashions. They are also apt to be more radical and fantastically expensive. In fact new elements in defense frequently arrive on the scene just after we've made a huge investment in yesterday's weapons' style. This upsets the defense budget keepers just as a sudden change in fashion raises havoc with your clothes budget. But you have options. If you don't like a new fashion you can rise up en masse and reject it collectively. In my experience as a husband and the father of two girls who are now young women, this seldom happens but it is theoretically possible. Or, you can choose, to ignore the new fashion for economic reasons and wear last year's model. This also seldom happens. Again—I'm speaking as a husband.

In the serious business of defense, unlike the world of fashion, we do not have the option of freezing styles in weapons nor can we reject new weapons for either aesthetic or economic reasons. In fact, we must carry on unceasing research deliberately to outmode what was invented and built just yesterday—however uneconomic such a practice may be. We must, in short, seek to change dimensions and catapult into new and untried areas. In the business of defense the cow has already jumped over the moon. Almost anything can happen in the future. Ask Dr. Wernher von Braun when he speaks to you tomorrow.

He can testify also to the impact of a vast dimensional change on a brand new, freshly caught Secretary of Defense to be. On the night of October 4, 1957, I was attending a dinner at the Army's Redstone Arsenal at Huntsville, Ala. It was one of the last stops on a month-long orientation trip I had made to military installations across the country. A group of us were discussing the changing dimensions in warfare. While we were talking about changes which would be brought about by guided missiles Dr. von Braun was called to the telephone. He returned, visibly excited, to inform us that the Russians had just announced the successful launching of an earth satellite. To the three standard dimensions of warfare—land, sea, and air—a fourth had been added, space. And this, just five days before I was to assume office as Secretary of Defense.

Yes, in the 16 months I have been in office there has been a steady and rapid evolution in our defense posture. But, while the dimensions of national security have changed, the overall superiority of U.S. military power in relation to any potential aggressor has not and must not change. While we cannot always be first with every link that makes the chain of our defense—we must always be first in the sum total strength of all the links. That is where we are tonight and that is where the Department of Defense is determined to remain.

Last September I expressed to the American Legion Convention in Chicago:

"Fullest confidence that the United States is ahead of the Soviet Union in overall strength in being * * * now."

I wish to bring that statement up to date by repeating it to you tonight. And, I wish to add that the Department of Defense, fully supported by the President, has no intention of allowing this condition to change. We believe that our planned military programs are adequate to achieve this result for the foreseeable future. You and the country may be assured that our programs will keep pace with what our official intelligence warns us any enemy of the United States may have in the future. Our budgets support military programs tailored to produce what that intelligence tells us we must have.

Americans have always shown themselves capable of both great effort and great sacrifice in times of national danger. Our whole history as a Nation testifies that our people need only to be informed and aroused to take any action necessary for national survival. I am told by Mrs. Gunn that the very purpose of this forum is to inform and arouse this representative group about the threat to our security. I'm glad that Mrs. Gunn used the word "aroused" and not I. As the loving husband of Mrs. McElroy and speaking as a veteran of 30 years of marriage I hold with Charles Dickens that—

"There is something about a roused woman * * * which few men like to provoke."

I agree, however, that the total resources of America can never begin to be marshaled unless the women of this country are kept informed of the problems facing us as a Nation. You need only be convinced that everything you hold dear—your home, your security, your children—calls to you for help. Victory in war, hot or cold is not possible without your support, it's as simple as that.

Now let me tell you something about the changing dimensions of the world I live in these days—the Department of Defense. I entered the Pentagon with the Space Age. For those engaged in the business of defense, entering space is vastly different from the use of new and unproved weapons in the known elements of land, sea, and air. True, such weapons as the airplane and the submarine changed the dimensions of warfare over the years but the changes came about by a process of evolution. Weapons of the space age—and I refer specifically to long

range missiles—have caused and will continue to cause a revolution in the art of warfare, with all its violent side effects.

We must devise whole new categories of weapons both offensive and defensive. Thus, you can see not only have the dimensions of new weapons changed but the very bench marks—the very points of reference from which measurements may be made—have shifted.

Let me, at this point, give you just one example to illustrate what I mean. Up until a very few decades ago it took weeks for a weapon to be launched against America because it had to come by sea—then with the advent of the long range airplane the time for possible warning was reduced to hours. Then, suddenly, as the guided missile burst upon us we found ourselves up against one of the most fantastic defensive requirements ever placed upon military technology.

Instead of weeks or hours the missile will allow us something on the order of 30 minutes for defensive action. The actual number of minutes will depend on the effectiveness of our warning systems—systems which must be redesigned to meet the threat of a missile traveling 25 times as fast as the speed of sound. To devise a weapons system which will in the time required, detect, track, fire at, and destroy, such a small fast moving target, is a challenge military technology must meet.

Our scientists and engineers have dedicated themselves to this task. They are spurred on by the knowledge that technology has given to the offensive missile a striking and destructive power of well over one hundred thousand times the bomb which we knew in World War II as the "blockbuster." You can now understand why I say the bench marks from which dimensions are measured have shifted.

In any commercial enterprise there are six basic elements known in management studies as the Classic M's. They are machines, men, materials, methods, money, and markets. Markets we don't have to worry about in the defense business. But the other five we must deal with to accomplish our objectives and their dimensions are constantly changing. Let's look at machines first.

Last year we were told by General Betts from the Office of the Director of Guided Missiles that technology in this day and age does not stand still—and that was the understatement of 1958. Later in this year's forum you will see and hear a dramatic story by Mr. Joe Powell of the Department of Defense on the "Collapse of Time" and the effect of the stampede of technology on our machines of war.

I've already told you about our defensive problems with missiles. They stagger the imagination of even a scientist. Let me just mention some of our more serious management problems with other weapons, submarines, for example. This is a weapons delivery system where we now enjoy a qualitative and technological superiority. We know that in less than 2 years our atomic submarines will be able to hurl powerful ballistic missiles many hundreds of miles. They will create grave problems in detection and defense for any potential enemy of the United States. But Russian submarines likewise pose serious defensive problems for us. While we believe they do not now have atomic submarines we must assume that whatever we have the enemy is capable of producing—sometimes much faster than we thought possible.

So, the increasing complexity and destructiveness of modern machines of war create new and grave management problems. You have to know just when and how long to go along with an old weapons system and just when to put your money and faith in a successor system. And, of course, they must overlap for a while. This is not unlike buying the newest style before you know whether it will take. However, in the case of weapons, you bet your very life. The security of the country may hang in the balance on right decisions. Machines are indeed a changing dimension of national security.

The second M—materials—are likewise a defense management headache. No longer can we depend alone on the common materials of other wars. Excursions into outer space and deep under the sea call for exotic metals and plastics, for new and better fuels and for more powerful explosives in smaller packages. One of the major projects of the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defense, for instance, is the development of a more powerful solid fuel needed for our third generation intercontinental ballistic missiles. Defense management is solving this problem and adding another new dimension to national security. In doing so we have devised new methods—the third classic M of management.

ARPA, the Advanced Research Projects Agency I mentioned a moment ago is in itself a new organizational method established by management for the purpose of advancing our knowledge in—to name just a few of its projects—the field of missiles, anti-missile missiles and military space vehicles. Set up to handle advanced research and development programs, ARPA utilizes the best brains of the university and industry. It focuses particular skills on special problems whose solution is vital to America. Old methods of research are too slow to cope with the pace of technology. Your defense management must and is finding new ones.

The fourth M is manpower. The research and development, production and operation of new weapons systems puts space age strains on our manpower resources. We must utilize the best scientific and engineering brains the country now possesses in research, development and production. At the same time we must take steps as a Nation to educate and train the scientists, the engineers, and the skilled workers of the future. Democracy's future demands and depends on an unending supply of well-educated citizens—educated, that is, to cope with all changing dimensions of the space age.

Mere numbers of men used to be a measurement of this Management M. Today skillpower and brainpower have had to make radical improvement in efficient use of manpower. A guided-missile ship, for instance, with a crew of 1,000 men but no skilled electronic technicians, wouldn't have any fighting power. The same is true for other modern weapons systems of our Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines.

Therefore defense management needs better educated and better trained soldiers, sailors and airmen to operate the complex machines of war devised by our scientists and engineers. Technology has multiplied the penalty for stupid or careless error 10,000 fold. The error of yesterday's gunsmith could cost us only a musket or two. The error of today's technician could cost us a bomber worth, literally, its weight in gold.

Improving our educational system to cope with the new demands of technology is an all-hands, all-American task. The average citizen can't invent fuels, build missiles or fly an airplane but he can and should find out what's needed in the field of education and take steps to insure that his community fills the needs.

Now, we come to the fifth and last great M of management, money, a problem that affects all of us. I imagine if I were able to listen to the conversation of any one of you ladies for a few days I would be bound to hear you say, "Everything costs more these days." That's true of clothes, food, automobiles, houses and luxuries. It's also true of the materials and machines of defense. We buy everything you buy, we feed, cloth and house millions of people. Our costs have gone up, too. That's tough enough on our budget. But the cost of military hardware, unlike the ordinary commodities we buy, didn't go up just a little—it blasted off into space.

If an automobile cost 50 times as much today as it did in 1945 you'd be shocked and probably decide to keep your old one. Yet as the President pointed out in his State of the Union message today's fighter aircraft are 50 times more expensive than the fighters of World War II and we can't use the old ones. Our Polaris firing submarines will cost 15 to 20 times more than the conventional subs of the last war.

Of course, the weapons we buy at these increased prices are much more powerful. Indeed, their effectiveness oftentimes goes up in much greater ratio than their cost. We must have these weapons, regardless of cost. But in buying them defense management strives to spend your money in the most efficient manner possible.

Let me emphasize that money is important to defense but it's no panacea. You can't purchase prepackaged defense. It's the job of defense management to translate the amount of money needed into a winning combination of men, methods, materials, and machines. I think we have that combination.

In addition to the changing dimensions in national security brought about by the five great M's of management, we are always conscious of another M looking over our shoulder. This M stands for moments—we know you can't spend deficit time and you can't borrow minutes. Our potential enemies have exactly the same amount of time we have. He who uses his moments most wisely will be the winner in the cold or hot war of the future.

The framework I have set for your forum discussions bears principally on the problems of military defense. I would not want you for one moment to think that changing military dimensions are the only ones that are important to national security. The last few years have seen tremendous changes in the dimensions of the economic competition between the nations of the free world and the Communist bloc. These years have not lessened either, the changing political and psychological pressures. To these changes we must be responsive. We must, in fact, continue to develop political, psychological, and economic programs of our own—programs which are as appealing as our military might is unassailable.

America's military might is for defense not aggression. The dimensions of your Military Establishment keep changing only to make it clear to any aggressor than an attack on us would be foolhardy.

America's defense will remain geared to reality—we will keep pace with technology. We will keep America's military strength superior to that of any nation which threatens us.

We will—that is, if we—and I mean all of us—take care to insure that the dimensions of our minds keep pace with the dimensions of our problems. Our mental dimensions represent our ability to understand the problems ahead and our determination, with God's grace, to conquer those problems.

Ladies, your forum represents citizenship at its best—informed citizens are the priceless ingredients of a democracy—our democracy in particular. I salute you and join you in your efforts to keep America strong.

An Appraisal From a Citizen of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received in my office from Carlos Cabrera, a citizen of Cuba. In its simplicity it speaks more eloquently than could anyone who has not suffered under the tyranny of a dictator. Without further comment, then, it follows, introduced by a shore note to me written on the margin of the letter:

THE CUBAN SITUATION

HAVANA, CUBA, *January 22, 1959.*

To the EDITOR.

DEAR SIR: I would like to have your permission to write you, not only this letter but others, from time to time, to keep you informed on how the man on the street feels and thinks about the present revolution and the Provisional Government of Cuba.

First of all, permit me to say a word in favor of the Provisional Government. It has been formed by young men (I am old), with great honesty and intelligence, as we have not seen it before in Cuba. But besides that, they have a surprising capacity for work. To find a man, the head of a government department, who did not have an hour's sleep in the last 72 hours is nothing exceptional these days. And these men will greet you with a smile and answer as many questions as you care to ask, as if they would have lots of time and nothing else to do.

We were very much surprised when the rebel army entered Havana. The men were so modest and polite that it was difficult to believe that these were the same men who fought with so much tenacity against an enemy 10 times their number, with much better armament, tanks, planes, navy, etc. But the previous army had no morale or reason why to fight.

Men at Havana were forgetting such courtesies as letting the seat to a lady in the bus, ask for permission, giving thanks, etc., and these rebels, in that respect, have gone back to the XIX century. While in the mountains, they were given instructions, not only on military matters but on other subjects, among them civics.

Now a word about Fidel Castro. Some papers, outside of Cuba, have referred to Dr. Castro as the "new strong man of Cuba." The strong man in Cuba, as you know, was Batista and it seems they are greatly confused when they compare our leader with the head of the previous Government.

Dr. Castro could have anything he would wanted in Cuba, after what he has done for us. But he wants nothing. We think so much of him, that he is often compared to our Apostol José Martí. There was a meeting yesterday, to back the provisional government and I believe that about a million persons attended it. We were parading from 2 o'clock in the afternoon to about 8:30 p. m. There were many foreign correspondents who would attest on the enthusiasm of the people for Fidel Castro. Hundreds of thousands came from the interior of the island.

With reference to the executions it is estimated that, during the Batista regime (about 7 years) there were more than 10,000 persons taken from their homes at night, tortured to get information from them, killed and buried anywhere, in large groups. In a town, near Havana, there were 90 persons killed in one night.

A few days ago, eight policemen and soldiers were executed. But that was done, as in every case, after a fair trial was conducted, at which the tribunal listen to all evidence, no matter how many hours it would take. A military tribunal might carry on for 14 or more hours, without interruption, to have the facts clear and listen to everyone who has something important to say.

The referred to policemen and soldiers executed, were responsible for the death of 53 persons, robberies, etc. Since these persons had relatives, father, mother, brothers, etc., who were present when the men were taken from their homes and went the following day to the police or soldiers quarters, they furnish much more evidence than it was required to sentence the men to death. But the men had their lawyers and could appeal to a higher tribunal.

The code used in these trials was the one approved by the rebel army while in the mountains which, in its turn is a part of the much larger one used by the Cuban army in our wars of independence.

On the other hand, 59 army officers, from colonel to lieutenant, were released the same day. It is believed that they were guilty of something, but it could not be proved to the satisfaction of the tribunal, and the motto is: better let free an assassin than to kill an innocent man.

A week after the shooting was over, there were no policemen on the streets and traffic was directed by our Boy Scouts with no trouble at all.

We are enjoying peace and liberty as we have not known in Cuba in the last 25 years.

Cordially yours,

CARLOS CABRERA.

MY DEAR MR. PORTER: This letter was sent to several periodicals in the United States of America. I am taking pleasure to send it to you in case you have not seen it. Thanking you for your attention to this letter.

Very truly yours,

CARLOS CABRERA.

Prayer Offered by Hon. Harold T. Garvin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, 1959, at a breakfast honoring Oklahoma's newly elected Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and other elected officials, an inspiring prayer was offered by the president pro tempore of Oklahome State Senate, the Honorable Harold T. Garvin.

Because Senator Garvin's prayer is sure to have meaning and significance for all Americans in these days of stress and trial, it is here reproduced for the RECORD. Senator Garvin's prayer:

Since it is through the mercy of Almighty God that another day is added to our lives, we here dedicate both our souls and our bodies to Him and to His service in sober, righteous, and Godly lives; to the glory of His Kingdom and the everlasting benefit of this great State; and in such dedication, we ask that He confirm and strengthen us.

Knowing the weakness of our nature and the many temptations which we meet daily, we ask that He have compassion upon our infirmities that we may be restrained from sin and ever mindful of our duty.

We pray that He will imprint upon our hearts such a dread of His judgments and such a grateful sense of His goodness as to make us both afraid and ashamed to offend Him.

In particular, we implore His grace and protection in the days, the weeks, and the months to come—that He will keep us temperate in all things, and diligent in our several callings.

We ask that He grant us patience under our afflictions; grace to be direct and upright in all our undertakings; quiet and peaceable; full of compassion; and ready to do good to all men according to our abilities and opportunities.

We pray that He will direct us in all our ways; defend us from all dangers and adversities; and take us and all who are dear to us under His fatherly protection.

These things we humbly beg in the name of the Governor of all men.

Future Status of Military Installations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to the following resolution adopted by the Beauregard Post of the American Legion, DeRidder, La., on January 12, 1959. This resolution follows the announcement of the closing of Fort Polk, a permanent military installation in Louisiana:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY BEAUREGARD POST NO. 27, JANUARY 12, 1959

Whereas the deactivation and closing of Fort Polk will greatly affect the citizens of the State of Louisiana and particularly those residing in Beauregard and Vernon Parishes; and

Whereas the periodic opening and closing of Fort Polk during recent years has lessened the confidence of these citizens in the long range planning program and objectives of the Department of Defense; and

Whereas it is felt that proper planning by the Department of Defense would enable it to make effective use of existing military installations, thereby eliminating the practice of scrapping costly established installations and building others to replace them; and

Whereas the present method of operation not only disrupts and dislodges many thousands of citizens each year, but it also has a disastrous effect on the economy of the local areas involved and it also affects the economy of the United States as a whole: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, from the local to national level, institute a program to determine if existing military installations can be continued in their present capacity or be utilized in a more economical manner in the future; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be introduced at the Mid-Winter Conference of the Louisiana Department of the American Legion on January 24, for the purpose of having it brought before the national convention of the American Legion at its next meet-

ing. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of the Louisiana congressional delegation with a request for their support and cooperation.

O. W. WEST,
Commander, Post No. 27.

Attest Correct:

E. B. MURRELL,
Adjutant, Post No. 27.

Joe Pearson, a Dedicated Humanitarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, there is a very unique charitable institution in my congressional district which caters directly to the poor, the aged, the destitute. This institution is known as the Free Kosher Kitchen of Williamsburg; and it provides not only free food to needy individuals but also relief for entire families, help to youths who are in trouble with the law, reinstatement of families on welfare rolls, and other forms of direct aid to the poor.

The founder and president of this institution, which is today recognized by the welfare department of New York, is Joe Pearson. He is a dedicated man and a devoted humanitarian. He is loved and respected by the people of the district for his charitable work for the Free Kosher Kitchen and many other noble causes.

In this week's issue of the Williamsburg News, published in my district, there appears an article about Joe Pearson and the Free Kosher Kitchen. It is written by Harvey Rosenfeld, a very able columnist and reporter, and reads as follows:

ABOUT IMPORTANT PEOPLE
(By Harvey Rosenfeld)

The 28th annual banquet of the Free Kosher Kitchen of Williamsburg is ready for its unveiling this Sunday night, February 1, at the Grand Paradise. All the intense preparation and dedicated efforts will reveal that night what the institution has accomplished.

The last few days before the events has, in the past, resulted in a column heralding the affair, spotlighting the celebrities in attendance, and profiling the guests of honor. Joe Pearson, devoted president and founder of the kitchen, wanted to make sure this year would be no exception. He provided us with a long roll of personalities to be expected, and an alert signal for the guests of honor. As regards himself, hardly a word was mentioned. He just requested that he be shown the article when printed.

But we refuse to listen to you Mr. Pearson. This column is yours. Though many personages will be there that night, you take top billing. Though the dais will be heavily populated with names from diverse fields of human activity, your work in charity has preeminence over all the rest.

This is not meant to disparage, among others, the two guests of honor, who were accorded the same rank last year. In their work, they do not have to account for any defect in their performances.

"Big Joe" Rosenfeld, Jr., author and philanthropist, has allayed the distress of many, using such soothing powers when the cries of the unfortunate reached him. Formerly associated with radio station WMGM, he now is the messenger of charity at WABC. But his deeds remain the same. In combination with Jim Gordon, a sports announcer once associated with WMGM, they speak over the microphones from midnight to 6 a.m. They work while most men sleep, so that many will have something to wake up for.

And Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO's record in Washington is a source of pride to his many constituents whom he represents. Many organizations, to which he has attached constant service, recognize his worth by the honors they accord him. As for his future, it can only be indictive of more success.

These men, however, are well known. Newspaper readers have seen their names in the familiar black and white. But to most Joe Pearson is at best a name which we may have vaguely heard of. Yet, those who have been aided by his generosity can fill in the details.

Joe Pearson likes poetry. The lines he writes are put into practice, though. When he formed the free kitchen about three decades ago, he penned such a poem. It was in the midst of the depression, and his verse was the expression of a man who wanted to help. It read:

"A feeling heart—a helping hand
Does its part, that hope and sunshine again ascend.
A generous soul, a noble mind
Will hear a brother's cry and peace will find
When wounds are healed and hunger stilled,
When hopeless life with faith and love once more filled."

Joe Pearson became the minstrel of charity. He will tell you that for some people the depression still exists. The poor do not know any economics. For the emotionally depressed, there can be no prosperity. Working for the poor at 228 South First Street, he purveys food for 70 families weekly. These people, mostly aged, have the benefit of both cooked and uncooked food.

His wife, Tillie, has been a faithful aid in the running of the kitchen. And undoubtedly there are many others who share in the prizes of charity. Yet, the institution is run by one. The pile of papers and bills which fill Joe Pearson's living room is ample evidence.

The free kitchen is not only food. Its menu is complete with relief and rescue. Recognized by the welfare department, it has saved families whose cases were rejected by the department. Each year Joe Pearson pleads for 25 youths in trouble with the law; he reinstates 50 families on the welfare's register; numerous people are released through his efforts from mental institutions.

In Williamsburg, Joe Pearson helps in other ways. He is an unknown but important wheel in the Democratic machine of the 14th assembly district and has many a time been selected as an alternate delegate to presidential conventions.

This is the work of Russian born Joe Pearson, a father of four and grandfather of five. This is not the type of a column he wanted for the banquet, but it is one he deserves.

Farm Surpluses Can Be an Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1959, Gilbert Rohde, president of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, sent a telegram to Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, detailing the need for a responsible farm program that would utilize the abundant production of our farms to raise living standards at home and win friends abroad. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a copy of Mr. Rohde's telegram in the RECORD:

President's Eisenhower's farm message shows pathetically weak imagination and no long-range vision in attempting to solve administration-created price-depressing farm surpluses. U.S. farmers, world's most efficient agricultural producers, could be a Godsend to low-income and hungry Americans and to overseas nations desperately in need of economic development to withstand the inroads of international communism—and these farmers could see incomes rise as surpluses are put to wise use. Our farmers should not be penalized through lower income for the administration's dismal failure to grasp the urgent need of putting farm surpluses to effective implementation domestically, and as major foreign policy weapon. Wisconsin Farmers Union urges congressional leadership, under vigorous guidance, to reject administration request to produce still lower farm prices, more farm surpluses and fewer farm families. In its place, we need responsible farm and food policy that, in benefiting all Americans and providing aid to free world nations, will be America's answer to the recent 21st Communist Party Congress plan of Soviet Premier Khrushchev.

The High Cost of Asylum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column from the Washington Post and Times Herald for Wednesday, January 28, 1959:

BATISTA UNHAPPY IN REFUGE, AT COST OF A MILLION
(By George Dixon)

A well-known Latin-American diplomat underwent an odd metamorphosis the other night. He is ordinarily one of the most cautious gents in diplomacy but something came up, or went down, which turned him from a listener to a talker.

He had no difficulty attracting an audience because everyone knew he had been thick as thieves with Batista, although he represents a South American country far removed from Cuba. But the thing that served most to win him attention was his disclosure that he has been in contact with the deposed Cuban President since the latter took exile in the Dominican Republic.

The diplomat threw out the provocative line that his dear old amigo was not wildly happy over his asylum. Satisfied that he had us properly on tenterhooks, he repeated that Batista was not a happy man at all.

Playing along with him, one of our number murmured sympathetically that it must be hard on a dictator to be torn from his despotism, but that Batista had the consolation of being with his great friend and fellow dictator, Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo, adding:

"It must have touched Batista to be welcomed with open arms to the Dominican Republic."

One of the first things a properly trained diplomat is taught not to do is snort, but this careerist forgot his training. He snorted that Batista was not teary-eyed with gratitude toward Trujillo.

He proceeded to tell us the inside story of how one despot gave sanctuary to another. The revealing recital left me disconsolate.

The distinguished diplomat gave us a vivid word picture of the meeting, as he had gotten it direct from Batista. The fleeing Cuban was literally welcomed to Trujillo City with open arms. Trujillo folded him in brotherly embrace, but after all the Latino embrazos were over, and the formalities of asylum dispensed with, the Dominican took the Cuban exile aside.

"You are, of course, welcome," beamed Trujillo. "Everything that is ours, is yours. But there are things we must think about."

By this time, Batista's smile of gratitude was beginning to change to one of uncertainty. He asked the benefactor if he would mind being a little more explicit.

"Well," said Trujillo, "we spent millions on public relations. When Peron came here, we had to augment our public relations budget; when Perez Jiminez came we had to increase it even more. Now that you are here we will have to increase it again.

"It is going to be very costly to combat this bad publicity and it seems only fair that you contribute a share."

"What is a few dollars between friends?" shrugged the benefactor beneficently. "We think you should contribute $1 million."

Batista did.

Address by Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, Before 35th Annual Session of Institute of World Affairs

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to me to note a growing awareness within the State and Defense Departments that an all-out nuclear-type general war is less likely to occur than all other types of war from the extremely limited to the type fought in Korea.

Following this unavoidable logic, well substantiated by recent history and the international situation, our attention must be inescapably focused on the Army and its ability to meet the contingencies involved in less than a general nuclear war.

The modernization of appropriate Army equipment is, I am convinced, absolutely necessary to improve the capability of the Army in conjunction with sister services to meet the possible challenges which lie ahead.

At the present time the Army has on hand an equipment inventory of approximately $14 billion, of which $5 billion consists of World War II models or older. Experience has shown that the average wearout cycle for Army equipment is approximately 10 years. Thus, $1.4 billion of new procurement is required to offset annual wearout and obsolescence of the current inventory, without considering additional inventory needs. The Army's fiscal year 1960 procurement funds available to offset wearout and obsolescence amount to $1.19 billion. This means that at this rate the inventory is being depleted at the rate of over $200 million per year.

It is bad enough that the Army has reached a point with its current equipment where it is no longer economical to maintain it or at best it is incapable of meeting the stepped-up requirements of today's or tomorrow's possible war. To not provide sufficient funds to maintain the current level of inventory is, in my opinion, completely inexcusable. That this inventory is only about two-thirds of what the Army should have further compounds the felony.

Modernization of Army forces will tend to improve the Army's strategic mobility as well as its ability to fight. An effort is being made to develop lighter, more effective weapons and equipment.

It naturally follows that modernization of the Army should be accompanied by modernization of the sea and airlift upon which the Army, along with the other services, is so dependent.

I have read with a great deal of interest the speech which the Army Chief of Staff delivered before the 35th annual session of the Institute of World Affairs in Pasadena, Calif., in December. This speech, dealing primarily with limited war, contains four conclusions of paramount importance if we are to be properly prepared for limited war. Two of these conclusions pertain to the need for modernization and mobility which I have already discussed. The remainder of the speech, however, is of such significance that I desire to insert it into the RECORD in its entirety.

The address follows:

IMPROVING OUR CAPABILITIES FOR LIMITED WAR

(Address by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, 35th annual session, Institute of World Affairs, Pasadena, Calif., Dec. 8, 1958)

I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before this distinguished gathering and to talk about a few of the significant aspects of national security which confront us. It is a pleasure for a soldier to be able to share this platform with the eminent speakers who have preceded or will follow me in dealing with your theme of "Agenda for American Action."

In choosing a topic for my discussion this evening, I have decided to talk about limited war, what it is, why it is important to understand, and what are some of the requirements to cope with it. This choice is made because of the recurrent debates over our readiness for this kind of threat which appear in current press and radio. In view of the complexity of our national strategy it is not surprising that there are some misunderstandings about the nature of the problems which deserve a few words of clarification. At the outset, let me define general war and limited war as they are generally understood today. General war would be a direct armed conflict involving the United States and the Communist bloc in which our national survival would be at stake. In a conflict of such magnitude it is probable that weapons of all magnitudes would be used with little or no limitations. It is depicted as an atomic fight to the finish by the two great power blocs.

The definition of limited war then becomes relatively simple—it is any military conflict short of a general war, one in which our national existence is not at stake. Thus, limited war covers a wide range of military action, from a patrol action to an operation on the magnitude of the Korean war or greater. While this definition is very broad, further to refine it leads to complications which add nothing to the clarity of the concept.

If I were asked why the growing interest in the limited war question, I would say that it is because we have all noted the fact that they have occurred—and in impressive numbers. In fact, a total of 17 limited war situations have arisen since 1945. They include a wide variety of military actions such as the Chinese civil war, guerilla operations in Greece and Malaya, the North Korean aggression, the Hungarian revolt, and the recent renewal of hostilities in the Taiwan Straits by the Chinese Communists.

Further, these have not necessarily been small or short wars. By striking a statistical time-manpower balance of all 17 limited wars, one finds that they have averaged about 2½ years in length and 570,000 men engaged. In most cases, a very significant military effort was required to bring these limited wars to an end.

Thus, in the past 13 years, there has been a notable incidence of active military operations short of general war. It is possible to pass from this fact to the inference that they will continue to occur and that the rate of occurrence may increase. This possibility arises from the fact that the Soviet leaders have always shown a willingness to take chances, even when they had no counterpoise to our preponderant atomic power. With the rise in their capability in the atomic and missile fields we may expect increasing intransigence on their part. We may well be required to respond to increased levels of provocation in an atmosphere of increased international tension. We have seen evidence of increased Soviet belligerence at the time of the Syrian crisis last year, in the situations in Lebanon and during the recent Taiwan Straits incident—all of which have occasioned Soviet threats of nuclear devastation directed at our allies and ourselves. The renewed pressure on Berlin is the most recent case in point.

The sober thought that both sides have the capability of destroying each other should nuclear weapons be used without restraint is a hard fact of life with which we are going to have to live for the indeterminate future. Meanwhile, the Communists are well aware of the very material gains they have made in the past through the more limited forms of aggression. Therefore, under the cloak of fear imposed by mutual atomic capabilities it would appear quite likely that they may henceforth undertake to kick us harder and higher on the shins than they have done during the period of our atomic monopoly.

At such a time it is well to take inventory of our resources and ask ourselves if we have the wherewithal to cope with the threat of limited aggression. I will speak now only of our military assets, recognizing that our national assets are truly wider than the military; that our national strength is an aggregate of political, ideological, and economic strengths as well as military resources. However, for the purpose of our discussion I am going to talk primarily about military matters.

Approaching the problem from the negative side, I should like to point out the military assets that we have which do not contribute primarily to coping with limited war. For example, the power of our atomic retaliatory bomber and missile forces is so destructive that it is difficult to conceive of a limited situation in which they would be

applicable. I make this observation while recognizing that forces of this kind are absolutely indispensable to deterring that general atomic war which it is our primary purpose to avoid.

By the same token, our expenditures for continental air defense—the interceptor planes of the Air Force and the surface-to-air missiles of the Army—do not contribute to our limited war effectiveness, notwithstanding their necessity for deterring or fighting a general war. The early warning systems, while justified by the requirements of general war, will have no use in lesser situations.

The Navy has very warranted concern over the submarine threat arising from the build-up of the Soviet submarine capability. On the other hand it does not appear probable that antisubmarine warfare would play a significant part in any limited war. Thus, our assets in that particular field would not contribute primarily to a limited war capability.

Likewise, I would say that those activities which we group under civil defense, although highly important and representing the expenditure of considerable money and effort at both Federal and State levels, do not contribute to limited war.

Indeed, most of our present atomic weapons systems may be of doubtful use in limited war, the doubt increasing in proportion to their destructiveness. In such wars, our normal role has been and probably will continue to be the provision of assistance to a friendly nation resisting some form of aggression. Under such conditions it will be important to rescue our friends with minimum damage to their homelands.

From what has been said thus far, it is apparent that we have a very impressive list of military assets which do not accord to any great degree with the requirements peculiar to limited war.

On the other hand, we do have important assets which are directly applicable to limited war. I would not say that the entire Army can be counted as a primary limited war asset, for in addition to our participation in continental air defense I mentioned earlier, a significant portion of our combat forces are deployed overseas, particularly in Europe. There they are involved in a defensive mission to deter or resist Soviet-bloc aggression in that area. While we can detach forces from Europe, as we did in the case of the airborne battle group which was sent into Lebanon last July, we would be reluctant to reduce our overseas deployments for use in limited wars outside their present location. The Army force specifically oriented toward readiness for limited war is the Strategic Army Corps, or STRAC, which is based in the United States, together with the back-up forces supporting its employment.

The marines are also a definite limited war asset in their amphibious role. This fact was illustrated by their use in Lebanon, where marine forces afloat moved in rapidly to seize the Beirut Airfield and the port, preparing the way for Army elements coming in by air and water to expand the beachhead and settle down for the long pull.

A great deal of the Tactical Air Command may be counted as a limited war asset, ready for rapid deployment overseas in similar manner as our Strategic Army Corps. So may be the Navy carrier forces, which can provide air support in peripheral areas where airfields do not exist ashore. Likewise, the long-range air and sealift furnished by the Air Force and Navy by which Army forces can be strategically deployed are a very important part of our limited war resources.

To summarize, I would say that a good part of the Army, the Marines, the Tactical Air Command, some of the Navy's carrier forces, and the strategic airlift and sealift represent a tabulation of our principal limited war assets.

Having identified what we have to work with, a logical question is, "Do we have enough?" I will try to answer this in two ways: first by discussing some specific situations short of general war, which are now history, and then by reference to some studies that have been made of hypothetical cases. In combination, such an examination should give us some insight into the adequacy of our means. Although I am going to speak primarily about Army forces, from what I have said thus far, it should be clear that there is no suggestion that limited war is an Army monopoly in any sense of the word, but a problem which confronts all of the services.

Korea is the most conspicuous case of U.S. experience in limited war. It is interesting to reflect that the Communists could not have picked another spot on their periphery where the United States could have reacted so successfully to sudden aggression as in Korea. It was most fortunate that they chose an area in close proximity to our Japanese base, where we had forces—unprepared though they were—but at sufficiently short range to permit a rapid reaction. As we study possible areas of future limited wars, one doubts that the Communists will be so obliging the next time. In any event, although we did respond in time in Korea, it was really touch and go. We literally had to assemble our Army on the field of battle under the bullets of the enemy, welding it into an effective combat force barely in time to avert defeat.

The most recent experience in operations of the small-war type was our expedition to Lebanon, mounted at the request of the lawful government of that country. This operation was, from a technical military point of view, entirely successful. By dint of careful advance planning permitted by due warning, all services responded rapidly and reached their destination in an acceptable lapse of time. However, in addition to the advantage of adequate warning, the operation was made simple by the absence of a shooting situation at destination, and the forces employed were limited. Thus, it is not possible to draw general conclusions from our experience in Lebanon.

Because of the limited experience derived from actual cases, the Army Staff has undertaken a number of hypothetical studies of possible limited war situations where the United States might be involved. From these studies coupled with practical experience, four major conclusions have been developed.

First, the reaction time of U.S. forces should be improved. Next, this improvement can be obtained in part by careful joint planning and training. Such training would include exercises involving elements of all services to rehearse the organization, dispatch, and movement of task forces to destination. Third, many logistical obstacles to strategic mobility exist, similar to those encountered in Beirut, where a single airfield and restricted port facilities limited the rate of buildup of our forces ashore. After these logistical bottlenecks have been viewed as insurmountable obstacles. My response is that if the leaders responsible for the development of naval power 200 years ago had accepted the conditions of the harbors, ports, and facilities around the world as they found them, we would not be able to project our naval power abroad as we can now. We have today the same problem for the projection of land power, in conjunction with its supporting air and sea components.

Finally, we determine from these studies that our limited war forces must have the most modern equipment. This equipment would include both conventional and low-yield atomic weapons and be characterized by lightness of weight and air transportability.

My conclusion then is that, although we new have a significant capability to cope with limited wars, we can and should take steps to improve it. So then the question becomes: "What should we do about it? What are these steps?"

My view is that we should embark on a five-point program to improve the capabilities of the Army and our sister services to meet the possible challenges posed by limited war. The salient points of this program are (1) the modernization of appropriate equipment; (2) the improved strategic mobility of limited war forces; (3) the preplanned use of air and sealift; (4) expanded joint planning and training; and (5) the publicizing of our limited war strength once it is reality.

In speaking before the national convention of the American Legion last September, the Secretary of Defense stated:

"Our Army has been undergoing a modernization program designed to prepare it for the stepped-up requirements of today's or tomorrow's possible war, not yesterday's. * * * This modernization program is by no means complete. We intend to push it vigorously."

In pursuance of Mr. McElroy's injunction, the Army intends to push its modernization along the following lines:

Dollarwise, our problem is not a simple one. Approximately 60 percent of the dollar value of the Army's inventory of equipment was procured during World War II or the Korean War; 10 percent of it is of pre-World War II vintage. As a result, many items have reached a point where they are no longer economical to maintain or are incapable of meeting "the stepped-up requirements of today's or tomorrow's possible war." As a result, we need to include second-generation missiles, light atomic weapons, improved conventional weapons, and many new types of air and ground vehicles to advance tactical mobility. To direct and control our units and weapons, we require improved lightweight signal communications based upon newly designed radio equipment.

The modernization of our forces will tend to support our second point; improved strategic mobility. As the Army lightens its loads, we hope that our sister services will modernize the sea and airlift upon which we depend for our startegic mobility.

As a part of our program to improve strategic mobility, we need to determine the logistical bottlenecks to mobility about the world which I earlier mentioned and endeavor to eliminate them. These can often be minimized by the forward stockage of supplies and equipment in critical strategic areas, to reduce the tonnages which must be transported in an emergency.

The third of our five points is the preplanning of the contingent use of a certain amount of air and sealift for possible limited war requirements. At present, the Army has no indications of the lift which would move its spearhead forces in an emergency. Some predesignation of air and sea elements for planning purposes would materially shorten the time required to get the initial forces on their way to a limited war situation. The actual lift would not be made available without the specific approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I do not suggest that such preplanning should cause a certain number of planes or ships to stand idle, marked "For Army Use Only." That makes no sense to me. However, it would make a great deal of sense if the Army knew in advance that in an emergency, a given amount of lift would be available at designated airfields and ports, on JCS approval. This knowledge would contribute materially to realistic planning for the rapid reaction of our spearhead units to limited war situations. I should add that the possibility of effective coordination of such preplanning will be facilitated by the new joint staff authorized by the recent re-

organization act of the Department of Defense.

In this latter regard I would like to say that, in my judgment, this legislation and its implementation now in progress, represent a major step forward in the achievement of an organization better able to deal with the military exigencies of today and the future. One important use of the new joint staff should be directed toward the accomplishment of the fourth point of the limited war program; namely, expanded joint planning and training for limited war. Such joint action might include the checking and testing of plans for overseas movement of forces, the verification of their readiness, and the actual movement of token forces as training for emergency situations. I should like to feel that we are as effective in meeting the complex requirements of limited war as SAC is in meeting the requirements of general atomic war. I think SAC is a most impressive military organization. Its complete dedication to readiness in its particular field is most impressive. I should like to find a similar intentness on the limited war problem.

The final point of the five-point program is to make clear to the world our readiness to react adequately anywhere to the challenge of aggression. To many observing America from a distance, we appear to be a country prepared to fight in case a general war should be forced upon us, but with unknown resources for a lesser response. It is highly important for psychological reasons to publicize our capabilities to react with weapons and means short of those associated with massive retaliation. This evidence of readiness could be attained through the exercising and testing of our limited war forces. Illustrative of what I have in mind was a small operation on a limited scale about 3 years ago in Thailand. We sent a joint airborne, seaborne task force into this area for the purposes I have described. The Army furnished an Honest John rocket unit from Japan, a Marine unit and Navy ships participated, as did planes of the Tactical Air Command. The task force was assembled in Bangkok in about 48 hours. This exercise made a very favorable impression in southeast Asia as a token demonstation of the reaction capability of American forces in that area.

In conclusion, I would stress again that I am not preaching a purely Army program. All services are involved in this five-pronged effort to improve our effectiveness in limited war. It is an essential extension of our national policy. We must overcome any impression that we are a country which can respond with a big bomb and little else. Although we have significant assets now to cope with limited wars, these can and must be improved so that it can be made crystal clear to both our friends and foes that we can respond promptly with proper weapons and proper forces to any challenge. It is the goal of the Army to develop its strength so that it may play its indispensable part as a member of our tri-dimensional team in presenting this flexible military capability to the world.

Who Won What in Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Karl Meyer, brilliant young editorial writer for the Washington Post, concludes his article in the current Reporter magazine with the question, How much longer will the United States seem to be running after the crowd shouting "Wait for me! I'm your leader."

Under a previous consent, I am including the text of this excellent analysis of the situation in Cuba, entitled "Who Won What in Cuba?":

WHO WON WHAT IN CUBA?

(By Karl E. Meyer)

How Fidel Castro became the best known Latin American in this country—surely only Juan Peron and the Trujillos père and fils could give him a contest—constitutes a minor epic in the history of the hemisphere. The Cuban revolution began inauspiciously. On December 2, 1956, Castro invaded the coast of eastern Cuba with a guerrilla force of 81 men crowded aboard a leaky Mexican yacht. His invasion was spotted from the air, and the Cuban Army met the insurgents when they landed on the jungle shore, eliminating, I was told by Castro, all but 12 of the rebels.

Yet this was the nucleus of an army that ultimately grew to about 8,500, seized control of half the island, humbled one of the best-equipped military forces in the hemisphere, and sent President Fulgencio Batista fleeing to Ciudad Trujillo. Castro's story is a narrative worthy of Sabatini, Dumas, or Hemingway, but, let us be frank, with also just a slight flavor of opera bouffe.

As with others who spring from Hispanic stock, it is the genius of the Cuban people that moments of epic heroism and national tragedy are leavened to some degre by the absurd. There was, for example, the time that the rebels impertinently kidnaped the world's leading auto racer, Juan Manuel Fangio, of Argentina, right under the nose of Batista's police. Senor Fangio emerged from his ordeal no worse for wear, with a good-humored smile on his face, and an immense pile of clippings for his scrapbook.

And who should stride before the footlights after the shooting was over to announce that he had spent the past months with the rebels? Who indeed but Errol Flynn, a little stouter perhaps than in his days of portraying Robin Hood, but with a thirst for melodrama still unquenched.

The Cuban revolution, in sum, violated many of the time-tested precepts of insurrection. It came during a period of unusual prosperity, and it was fought for the most part while tourism as usual prevailed. Last fall I spent 10 days in Santiago de Cuba, capital of the province that was the seat of the rebellion. The army ruled by truncheon; midnight killings and rebel reprisals were common. Castro's detachments made forays into the suburbs. Yet amidst this state of siege I was able to charge my stay at the leading hotel on an American credit card. One wonders how Richard Harding Davis would have reacted to this report-now, pay-later arrangement for covering a revolution.

Yet all this—the heroic and the seriocomic—is properly the province of the dramatist. I would like to focus on three broader themes: the dilemmas of a hero in an organization age, the waning of the caudillo, and the plight of U.S. diplomacy in which every gain for freedom seems a paradoxical setback to the State Department.

THE OBSOLESCENCE OF HEROISM

Our age has reason to assume all heroes guilty until proven innocent. In a century that has grown cynical about saviors armed with a sword, it is not surprising that Fidel Castro is regarded with equal parts of admiration and distrust. Cuba, to be sure, is only an island, but atrocities are as deplorable there as on a continent; Batista has given proof of that. Moreover, ours is an era of organization which has as its emblems the research team, the secretarial pool, and the group therapist. Our age dwells in bureaucratic halls, preaches the futility of revolt, and confines its taste for the epic to adult Westerns. Our dissenters tend to be either beat or glumly angry.

Castro has confounded the categories of his age, and for that he cannot easily be forgiven—or understood, for that matter. And yet surely one is still free to hope that this misguided heretic will become more than a captive lion on "Face the Nation," or just another tabloid-size dictator in our backyard.

In the United States, it would be regarded as a mild form of insanity for an ambitious young lawyer to jeopardize his career at its start by leading a quixotic revolt for republican ideals. And yet this is what Castro did shortly after he got his law degree at the University of Havana, a year after Batista had returned to power in a bloodless coup. Leading a band of a hundred youths, Castro attempted a commando-style capture of the military barracks in Santiago. The attack was bloodily repulsed; and Castro was caught, tried, and sentenced to 15 years in prison. The date of the attack—July 26, 1953—provided the slogan for Castro's movement.

Freed from jail by a congressional amnesty, Castro took flight to Mexico and with the help of money from his wealthy sugar-planter father organized an army for an invasion. When the report came that Castro's invaders had been cut down by army bullets (and that Castro himself had been killed), even his friends sorrowfully concluded that the last had been heard from him. But Castro and a handful of followers took shelter in the peaks of the Sierra Maestra in Oriente Province. The rugged terrain proved an impregnable fortress against an apathetic army, while Batista's air supremacy was nullified because his planes were unable to spot rebel installations. Thus, by hit-and-run raids, Castro was able to expand his realm and ultimately bottle up the island's key sugar ports, striking at the heart of the Cuban economy.

His success would have been inconceivable without one essential factor: the support, either active or passive, of the great mass of citizens in Oriente, Castro's birthplace and the island's largest and richest province. This support for a youngster who brought his province economic hardship, and even misery, cut through all strata of Oriente's society.

Anyone who spent time, as I did, traveling around Oriente during the fighting can testify to the passionate quality of his backing. One instance remains vividly in my mind. In Santiago, I asked one of the city's wealthiest sugar planters, a self-made man, whose holdings were largely in rebel-controlled areas, how he felt when Castro's forces set his fields afire and scorched his profits away, as they had done the year before. His reply in Spanish was succinct, immediate, and explosive: "I am enchanted."

Plainly one reason why Castro won such backing is that he was a symbol of resistance to an occupying army as brutal as it was venal. But it also was an eloquent tribute to the character of a leader whose guerrilla force was disciplined and relatively restrained.

I lived for 10 days with rebel forces in the Sierra Maestra, and spend 3 days with Castro himself. For a guerrilla army composed of unpaid volunteers, many of them unlettered guajiros native to the hills, I was impressed by the tough-minded intelligence I found. As to Castro, I was struck by his tremendous vitality, his articulateness and wit, and his thoughtfulness—in roughly that order.

In a land where most men are short and wiry, Castro is a 6-footer whose energy is awesome; like all Latin Americans, Castro loves to talk, but unlike some, he talks ex-

ceedingly well—even in English, which he speaks with vigor if without grammar.

Indeed, he is a virtuoso in the art of personal communication; the intense look through owlish, horn-rimmed glasses, the politician's amiable squeeze of the shoulder, the apt joke, and the studied concern with the listener's reaction. Combined with this is an indifference to physical surroundings: whether he is crouched in his shoebox-sized headquarter's cabin or marching at the head of a column in clothes as shaggy as his beard, the stream of words is incessant and sharply articulate.

For a man who has spent most of the past decade in the twilight world of revolutionary activities, his thinking shows a surprisingly thoughtful bent. Castro has fought like a zealot, but in private conversation he does not talk like one. Anything but an inflexible doctrinaire, he struck me as speculative and pragmatic.

In politics, he has insisted that his crusade had a single objective: the restoration of a freely elected government in Cuba. Yet on such details as the role of political parties he has been unsatisfyingly ambiguous. In economics, he asserts that he has changed his mind about the virtues of nationalization and favors a program of moderate reform and welfare legislation. I asked him if he wanted a New Deal for Cuba.

"Yes," he drawled, "but if you write that, be sure to say you asked me whether I favored a New Deal for Cuba and I said 'Yes.' Otherwise, people would think I want to be the Franklin Roosevelt of Cuba." (Castro has repeatedly said he does not want to run for the presidency, pointing that he is too young to qualify under the constitution. Nonetheless, Castro's voice prevails in the provisional government led by his choice for president, former Judge Manuel Urrutia Lleo. The caliber of the new regime's ministers has been generally high, representing Cuba's more moderate elements.)

On the debit side, however, have been the rash acts of Castro's subordinates—and some rash statements from Castro himself. Doubtless revolutions are not namby-pamby affairs, but the hijacking of airplanes and the seizing of United States citizens are a strange way of winning friends and influencing Washington. More worrisome has been the victorious movement's insistence on vengeance. Last November, Castro threatened reprisals against all traitors who participated in a Batista-sponsored election, and the recent sentences of the revolutionary tribunals have certainly lived up to that promise. Castro's angry threat that if the United States tried to interfere with the executions by landing marines—no one had suggested it—there would be "200,000 gringos dead in the streets" may have been just "blowing off steam." But the cynics and some sniggering Habaneros are already betting that Castro will prove a counterfeit idealist. Perhaps they are right. Those who hope that the age of individualism has not altogether vanished hope time will show that Cuba will be a better place because Castro failed to become an organization man.

THE ROTARIAN REVOLUTION

If nothing else, the collapse of Batista draws attention to an admirably perverse phenomenon that is taking place in our backyard. Elsewhere in the so-called underdeveloped areas of the world, democratic governments are yielding to dictators—but in Latin America precisely the opposite tendency is evident.

Four years ago, 9 of the 20 Latin American republics were ruled by caudillos; today, only 3 dictators survive—and of these, only Generalissimo Rafael Trujillo of the Dominican Republic is without visible challenge. (But all men are mortal, and it is delicious to contemplate what life will be like in the era of Trujillo, Jr., when El Benefactor's heir turns the Republic's postage stamps into a gallery of pinups.) The region's democratic tide began in Argentina in 1955, when Juan Perón fled into exile aboard a Paraguayan gunboat. In 1956, Manuel Odría of Peru voluntarily stepped down and Anastasio Somoza of Nicaragua was assassinated. A year later, the Colombians rid themselves of Gustavo Rojas Pinilla, and in 1958 neighboring Venezuela overthrew Marcos Pérez Jiménez. And now Batista is following a well-worn itinerary via Ciudad Trujillo.

All this, to be sure, is a negative achievement and offers no guarantees that new men on horseback will not soon prance into power. But accompanying this decline of the caudillo has been an extraordinary sequence of free elections in which the opposition party has not only won at the polls but has peacefully taken office. Within the past few years, this has been true in countries as diverse as Costa Rica, Venezuela, Argentina, Chile, Honduras, Guatemala, and Uruguay. Meanwhile, Mexico continues its two decades of stable and reasonably free government under President Adolfo López Mateos. And in Colombia, after a decade of fratricide, the Republic's two rival parties have joined forces behind President Alberto Lleras Camargo, one of the hemisphere's most esteemed liberal statesmen.

One interesting aspect of this steady democratic evolution in Latin America has been the aggressively antidictatorial position the Catholic Church has taken, notably in Argentina, Colombia, and Venezuela. Even in Cuba, where the church has traditionally been timid in politics, the hierarchy remained officially neutral in the civil war while the lower clergy and Catholic action groups actively sided with the rebels.

But more fundamental has been the changing structure of society in most Latin American countries. The region is in a ferment of economic growth, and one consequence has been the growing influence of Latin America's nascent middle classes. Another result has been the emergence of trade unions and a militant labor leadership pressing for swifter change.

In Cuba it is unthinkable that Castro could have waged his revolution without the support of the island's growing, if still small, professional and middle class. My contact with the rebel forces—I can record his name now—was Mariano Roca, a developer and appliance dealer who was an officer in both the Rotary and the Lions clubs. The man who undertook grave risks by smuggling me through the army lines to meet Castro was a General Motors dealer. Néstor Hernández, owner of the largest ice plant in Santiago, took equal risks in hiding me upon my return.

Everywhere I traveled in Cuba during the civil war, I found the most thoughtful and articulate supporters (and sympathetic critics) of Castro's movement precisely among groups that had the most to risk in a time of turmoil and anarchy. Although the labor movement remained lukewarm toward Castro until the closing battles, country clubs in Havana were frequently the rendezvous of rebel sympathizers.

Indeed, the medical profession was in the front ranks of the opposition to Batista. Some of Cuba's leading doctors joined Castro's forces in the hills; the four hospitals built under their supervision were the first established in the primitive back country of Oriente. Almost a year ago medical men took the lead in framing a manifesto condemning the Batista government that was signed by 42 of the island's religious, professional, and civic organizations. In December physicians openly refused to celebrate their traditional holiday as a protest against the barbarisms of the Batista regime.

Because of this strong middle-class complexion of the Castro movement, the charges that the insurgents were the harbingers of communism has seemed a wry joke to those who were familiar with the rebellion's unlikely recruits. But not only does his bourgeois support seem a barrier against communism; it also holds hope that whatever course Castro may take the pull of Cuba's democratic tide will be steady and strong.

WHAT ARE WE AFRAID OF?

Like their counterparts elsewhere in Latin America, the Cuban middle classes are in revolt against the whole tradition of government that has held the region in thrall. Graft, favoritism, police brutality, profligate waste of public funds, neglect of education, and rule by military and landed oligarchs—all these are the venerable afflictions which the emerging Latin middle class seeks to eliminate or at least moderate. Is there anything on this agenda that should cause panic in the long corridors of the State Department?

Yet there's the rub. In Cuba as elsewhere in the hemisphere, the United States has frequently been caught in a melancholy posture of embarrassment when its good neighbors to the south overthrow a dictator and enlarge liberty's realm. Why this should be so is a puzzle that fully deserves the investigation of a Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee that is now underway.

It must be noted, of course, that the predominant position of the United States during Cuba's revolution was cautious neutrality. Last March 14, the State Department clamped an embargo on the shipment of arms to either side, a step that pinched the Batista regime far more than the rebels, who were adept at smuggling. But few Cubans today believe that our policy was one of neutrality. One obvious reason is that Batista, who controlled what the press and radio could say, was careful to muffle the facts. Another reason, however, is that our official representatives allowed themselves to be used in a way that lamentably implied United States support for a government that was detested by its own people.

Until 1957, the Ambassador from Washington was Arthur Gardner, whose personal chumminess with the Batista clique was widely known. His successor was Earl E. T. Smith, who had previously distinguished himself as a broker, sportsman, and Republican fund raiser in Florida. Mr. Smith was a novice, and only 6 days after he had presented his credentials to Batista he enraged the government by expressing a perfectly human if undiplomatic feeling of shock at seeing Batista's police hose down a group of women demonstrators in Santiago. But after this incident, Mr. Smith developed more affable relations with the Batista set and made it known that he regarded Castro's rebels as an unsavory bunch of troublemakers. Mr. Smith has been recalled to Washington, but the sour aftertaste remains in Havana.

A more prickly controversy concerns the U.S. military mission in Havana. This group of 30-odd officers resides in Cuba under the terms of the Rio pact aimed at defending the hemisphere against communism. To the Cubans, however, it seemed worse than meddlesome for a group of U.S. military officers to be associated with the Cuban Army in the midst of a civil war, especially since the pact specified that in cases of civil strife the mission could be recalled. What particularly galled the Cubans was a much-publicized occasion last March when the mission, in a mood of convivial camaraderie, threw a congratulatory dinner for Gen. Francisco Tabernilla in honor of his promotion to chief of staff. Tabernilla has now left Cuba, and there are indications that the sociable mission, too, may be asked to depart.

These blunders, combined with the friendly association between the United States business community and the Batista regime, have contributed to the unpopularity of the United States in Cuba. But short of outright intervention, it might fairly be asked, what

can we do to disengage from a dictator's embrace?

Obviously, we can be scrupulously proper in our relation with dictators, both in public and private, without exhibiting excessive cordiality. This would rule out most of the gross errors committed in Cuba. It would also eliminate the embarrassment caused by the award of a medal to Venezuela's recent tyrant, Perez Jimenez.

An attitude of distant coolness to dictators is one side of the coin; the other is the obvious need to give warm and friendly support to the emerging democracies of Latin America. Here again, the United States record is ambiguous. The most grievous case of neglect came in Argentina after the overthrow of Juan Peron. An honorable and moderate-minded provisional government headed by Adm. Pedro Aramburu came to Washington, hat in hand, for help. The aid it got was both skimpy and belated, in large part (it is understood) because U.S. oilmen were unhappy about Argentina's policy of developing its own oil and because private power groups were annoyed about unsettled claims against a nationalized Buenos Aires electric concern.

Will we also risk offering too little too late to other democratic countries in Latin America? Economic distress in the hemisphere is widespread, mainly because the world prices of key commodities have declined sharply, and the one-crop economies of most Latin countries are extremely vulnerable to fluctuating prices. Some slight stirrings in Washington indicate that the seriousness of Latin America's plight and the scope of United States opportunity are at last registering on official consciousness. Dr. Milton Eisenhower has spoken out forcefully about the need for action. The Brazilians have come up with an arresting suggestion for "Operation Pan-America," a regional development plan which if given effective U.S. support might awaken new hope in the hemisphere.

And yet there was an uneasy symbolism in the way Dr. Eisenhower's latest report on Latin America was released to the press. This report, based on Dr. Eisenhower's recent tour through Central America, stressed the need for a cooler policy toward dictators. It was distributed to the press on December 30, but since Press Secretary Jim Haggerty dislikes giving a preference to either morning or afternoon newspapers, it was marked for release on Sunday, January 4—and hence Dr. Eisenhower's critical words about dictators came as a tardy echo of the explosion in Cuba. How much longer will the United States seem to be running after the crowd shouting "Wait for me. I'm your leader."

A Continuing Report From Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article concerning the new Cuban Government which appears in the February 8, 1959, issue of Our Sunday Visitor, the national Catholic action weekly:

WHY WERE THEY WRONG ABOUT CUBA?—U.S. COMMENTATORS HAVE TAKEN FOR GRANTED THAT THE PEOPLE BEING EXECUTED WERE MERELY POLITICAL OPPONENTS—THEY WERE NOT—THEY WERE CRIMINALS WHO MURDERED, TORTURED, RAPED

(By Dale Francis)

Denunciations of the executions by the new Cuban Government have followed no political lines. Fulton J. Lewis and Edward R. Murrow found themselves in surprised agreement. David Lawrence and Max Lerner wound up for the first time in years saying almost exactly the same thing. The anti-Communist editor of American Opinion and the decidedly left-leaning editors of the New York Post were in agreement.

All without exception denounced the executions and they were joined by the editorial writers of all the secular newspapers in the United States.

But even as they denounced the executions, the highly regarded Catholic Bishop of Mantanzas, a man known for his progressiveness, was declaring that not only were the executions just but that had the Government not carried them out it was quite possible that the people could have validly taken the law into their own hands.

What was the difference between these two widely separated viewpoints? Why was it that the Nation's opinion makers held such a vastly different viewpoint than this outstanding bishop?

The answer is simple. The bishop knows the situation, the opinion makers do not. Unfortunately radio commentators, columnists, editorial writers, opinion makers in general, believe it necessary that they comment on every issue that attains prominence whether or not they really know anything about the issue or not. This is exactly what happened in relation to what has been going on in Cuba.

U.S. commentators have taken for granted that the people being executed were merely political opponents. They are not. They are criminals who have murdered, tortured, raped.

Few men know this better than Bishop Alberto Martin y Villaverde, bishop of Matanzas, one of the most highly respected leaders of the church in Latin America.

Reinaldo Bermudez and Rene Fraga were two of the Catholic youth leaders in the city of Matanzas. Reinaldo works in the chancery office. Rene was an outstanding Catholic from the days when he was just a boy and he become a leader in Catholic Action. His home was near the bishop's home.

They were not members of the rebel forces but they were suspected of rebel sympathies and so the police of Matanzas arrested them. They were questioned and tortured.

Perhaps you saw the picture of Pepe Caliente, the notorious torturer of Matanzas, showing how prisoners were forced to kneel for their beatings. It was featured in some U.S. papers in a series of pictures that seemed almost designed to build sympathy for Pepe Caliente, who since has been executed.

They beat Reinaldo and Rene like that. They tortured them for 3 days. Reinaldo survived their tortures but his battered and beaten body took months to recover.

Rene was tortured even more brutally. Those who measure pain say that one of the most intense pains of all is that of a burning cigarette pressed against the skin. The police did this over and over to Rene Fraga until finally, crazed by pain, he broke loose and started to run away. They shot and killed him and tossed his body onto the roof of a little shack down along the bay.

The people of Matanzas, who knew and loved Rene Fraga, came out for his funeral and Bishop Martin, who was close to Rene and loved him, came to the cemetery, too. But the police didn't want the bishop there so they fired their guns over his head and forced him to turn away.

These were things Bishop Martin remembers. He is not a man seeking vengeance, he is a man seeking justice and he knows justice demands that murderers be punished.

The first public trial in Havana was the trial of the commander at Holguin and in one of the most astonishing bits of inanity in television history, the man on trial was compared by NBC's Frank McGee to the Christians in the coliseum.

Holguin is one of my favorite towns in Cuba. It reminds me somehow of a west Texas town, why, I'm not quite sure. Few towns suffered more. One day the people of Holguin awoke to discover 25 men hanging from the trees on the edge of town. They were murdered to teach a lesson to the people.

The man on trial was charged with 48 murders. It seems difficult to make many Americans understand but these were not combat deaths, these were murders of men suspected of rebel sympathies, suspected of aiding the rebels.

How many were murdered no one really knows. I see Raul Castro claims 10,000 were murdered in Oriente Province but that is twice the amount given to me. My figures came from Archbishop Enrique Perez-Serantes, archbishop of Santiago de Cuba; Carlos Chain, civilian administrator of Oriente Province; and Oscar Cossio, director of the Red Cross for Oriente. They considered carefully and when they gave me a figure they told me they considered it a minimum figure. They said at least 5,000 people were murdered in Oriente Province. Since that time new mass graves have been found, and the figure mounts upward.

But the tortures that always preceded murders were also inflicted upon people who were not murdered. There is one officer still being sought who had one of the most horrible tortures of all. When he is caught he will be thankful for police protection for he must fear what would happen to him if his victims seized him.

The story of his method of torture was told to me by Father Francisco Guzman, S.J., and his knowledge comes from those who suffered.

In the villages throughout Cuba there were those who sold war bonds to help the rebels and there were those who bought them. The Batista men wanted to end this and so they sought to terrorize the people and to find out who helped the rebels.

This man brought in a suspect—and Father Guzman said he did this not just once but many times—and tied him to a chair. Then he brought in the wife of the suspect and before the husband, had a soldier rape the wife.

This happened in Cuba, not once but many times. And when the officer and the soldier are found they will be given great mercy if they escape the revenge of their victims and are executed by the courts.

Father Guzman told me of another similar incident where the fiancee of a suspect was raped before his eyes, not once but many times. The experience was too much for her and she is hopelessly insane.

If Americans could find some understanding of the crimes that have been committed in Cuba in the last year and a half then they would understand that the executions of the murderers and torturers are justice and not "blood baths."

A priest said to me, a little helplessly, "But I can't understand Americans. In the United States, when a man murders one then you give him a trial and if he is found guilty you place him in an electric chair and execute him. But when a man here murders 30 or 40 and we try him and when he is found guilty, execute him, you accuse us of being barbarians."

There was no way for me to answer this priest except to say, "They just don't know, Father, they just don't understand."

But now you do understand and you must tell others. See that your Congressmen and Senators read this series of articles and if you want to help the people to Cuba to recover then send your help to the Most Reverend Enrique Perez Serantes, Archbishop of Santiago de Cuba, Santiago de Cuba, Oriente, Cuba.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*.....6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*.....1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*.....
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*.....
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*.....
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*.....
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*.....
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*.....
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Engle, Clair, *Calif*.....3840 Lorcom Lane, Alexandria, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*.....University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*.....
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*.....
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*.....
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*.....5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*.....
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*.....1612 34th St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*.....
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*.....419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*.....The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*.....
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*.....
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*.....Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*.....
Proxmire, William, *Wis*.....
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John, *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*.....
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*.....

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Green (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Addresses Delivered at Testimonial Dinner in Honor of Leslie L. Biffle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, I desire to make a brief statement and to propose a request.

On Tuesday evening, January 20, 1959, a testimonial dinner was given at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington in honor of the Honorable Leslie L. Biffle, former Secretary of the Senate, in commemoration of his 50th year in Washington.

We are advised by the Public Printer that the remarks made on that occasion exceed the 2-page limit, and that the estimate of the cost of printing is $351. Notwithstanding that fact, we ask unanimous consent that these remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Leslie Biffle is by all odds one of the most gracious and obliging personalities I have ever encountered in my lifetime. He has been completely unselfish, regardless of political identity, in being kind and helpful to everyone he might serve. The testimonial dinner in his honor was richly deserved, as were all the encomiums which were spread on the record.

So I am delighted in joining the majority leader in asking that these proceedings be made a matter of record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thank my delightful friend from Illinois for his eloquent tribute to this faithful public servant. I was privileged to attend the dinner, although I arrived there just before it concluded. I have never seen a dinner in Washington which was attended by more members of both parties who felt so sincerely that they wanted to honor a public servant. The distinguished minority leader has expressed better than I can how all of us feel about this former officer of the Senate.

There being no objection, the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

J. HOWARD MCGRATH. Ladies and gentlemen, the invocation will be offered by the Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate. Please stand.

Dr. HARRIS. Let us lift our hearts in prayer. Oh Thou God of the best we aspire to be in our highest hours, we are grateful for the sacrament of friendship, and for the contagion of a friendliness which is not mixed with the alloy of self-seeking.

In a world where so much is marred by unworthy covetousness, we thank Thee for the abiding beauty of a care for one's fellows, pictured in the Book of Ages, where Thy servant, Saint Paul, tells of a love that is patient and kind, that is not jealous nor boastful, that is not arrogant and rude, that does not insist on its own way, that is not irritable nor resentful; a love that does not rejoice in the wrong, but rejoices in the right.

We come this hour with glad and grateful hearts to honor a friend whose record fits this scriptural frame and who, across the years, has lived in his house by the side of the road, and been a friend of man, who has a place of affection in the hearts of a host who have felt the warmth of his selfless interest in public and private life, across fruitful years for a half century in this Capital City.

With deep appreciation for all he means to so many, we salute this radiant friend in whose heart there is malice toward none and charity for all, and who, in the school of the years, has learned—

"To think without confusion clearly,
To act from honest motives purely,
To love his fellow man sincerely,
To trust in God and heaven securely."

We come in the name of the Master of all good workmen. Amen.

(The National Anthem.)

J. HOWARD MCGRATH. I now present on behalf of every and all persons that are here tonight, in force and on our behalf, Mrs. Perle Mesta.

Mrs. PERLE MESTA. My father always taught me that a woman—a mother or sisters, or a wife—was behind any man's accomplishments, and tonight we have the charming wife of Mr. Biffle, and I am delighted to present these roses, on behalf of this committee, to Mrs. Biffle.

J. HOWARD MCGRATH. We will now proceed with the purpose which brought us here—that is, to have a dinner.

A panoramic picture of the guests tonight; the camera is in that direction, directly opposite me; if you could give your attention for 2 minutes, the picture would be concluded.

Will you please cooperate in the taking of these panoramic pictures. This is not a sound picture, so upstairs you can make as much noise as you like.

Gentlemen and ladies, you will find on your table a sheet entitled "Friends of Leslie Biffle." These are enclosed in a cellophane envelope. It is our hope that each of you will sign his name, carefully preserving these sheets so that they can be incorporated in a volume that will be presented to Mr. Biffle as a remembrance of those who are here tonight. So, if you have not already signed your sheet, please do so now, reenclose it in the cellophane envelopes, and the waiters or members of the committee will collect it. The sheets that you have signed, friends of Leslie Biffle, that are to be included in a volume to be presented to him which have not already been collected, please see that your waiter picks them up and brings them to the head table.

Ladies and gentlemen, we must be on with our business. I would like now to present those who are seated at what is commonly known as the head table. There is no significance about the personages of those who are here and are about to be presented; they are symbolic of the many beloved friends of our guest of honor. If you will bear with me I will ask each of them to stand for your approval.

To my left, Mr. Felton M. Johnston, the Secretary of the Senate; Mrs. J. Borden Harriman, the grandma of the Democratic Party; Mr. Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee; Mrs. Thomas C. Clark; Rev. Frederick Brown Harris; Mrs. Perle Mesta; Robert V. Fleming; Mrs. Samuel F. Pryor, Jr.; Senator Lister Hill; Mrs. Styles Bridges; Justice Wm. O. Douglas; Mrs. John L. McClellan.

On the other side of the table I would like to present Mr. James W. Carkner, chairman of the board of Pepsi-Cola of which our honored guest is a distinguished member; Mrs. Felton M. Johnston; John W. Holton, the Administrative Assistant to the Speaker of the House of Representatives; Mrs. Wm. O. Douglas; the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Wm. P. Rogers; Mrs. Frederick Brown Harris; the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr.; Mrs. J. Howard McGrath; Hon. Styles Bridges; Mrs. Lister Hill; Justice Tom C. Clark; Mrs. Leslie Biffle.

Now, it becomes my very pleasant duty and honor to present to you my cochairman of this magnificent tribute to our honored guest. There are happy privileges that come to one in a lifetime but none more rewarding than to have as a working companion, in a cause that is so wonderfully rewarding as this we are engaged in tonight, such as I have had. There have been no conspiracies betwixt nor among us save one—I agreed with my cochairman that he would seat the Democrats and I would seat the Republicans—so if any of you have a problem about where you are or why you are, blame each of us and find out where you are. I now want to introduce to this gathering which has been a real effort on behalf of those who are in attendance, and those who could not be here for many and varied reasons, the man who has contributed the most to making this affair the bipartisan, nonpartisan, triple partisan, whatever partisan you have—our cochairman, Sam Pryor.

SAMUEL F. PRYOR, JR. Thank you Mr. Chairman. Honored guests and distinguished guests and friends of our honored guest, Reverend Harris, that world you spoke of, Mrs. Pryor and I have had the privilege of seeing nearly every living corner of it and I can honestly say it's a beautiful world. In fact, I sometimes think we have Heaven on earth here, with the exception of one thing—people. People cause trouble, confusion, and unhappiness. But, tonight, tonight we have one of the great exceptions to the rule. Our guest of honor has brought happiness to nearly everybody in this room. He's brought kindness, regardless of party, regardless of whether you're big or small, he's been kind to us. And also we have another person of this category. We are very fortunate to have him. He is in the midst right now of making the United States a better place to live, not only for us, but, more important, for our children. And he comes from the same background; in fact since my party has been referred to, may I say he has a great many of the qualities of Abraham Lincoln. It is a great privilege the

committee has given me to introduce to you all our toastmaster, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN.

Senator MCCLELLAN. Thank you, Sam, Mr. Cochairman, Les and Mrs. Biffle, distinguished guests, my colleagues in Congress, ladies and gentlemen. I should like also to thank the entire committee on arrangements and to express my deep appreciation for the privilege of serving as your toastmaster this evening. To have the pleasure of participating in this program in that capacity is a very high honor, indeed, and one that I shall greatly cherish because I regard this testimonial dinner as one of the most outstanding functions of this kind ever held in the Capital of the United States.

I know this is a happy occasion for all of us. We are here to do honor to a very dear friend and to a truly great American, on this the 50th anniversary of his entering into public service with the National Congress here in Washington. This magnificent audience, your presence here now, is an eloquent tribute to him who has earned our eternal admiration and esteem by the unselfish and devoted service he has so faithfully and abundantly given to his country.

Naturally, I am doubly proud, because he is a fellow Arkansan. Truly he is a beloved son of the great wonder State and one in whom all of her citizens take justifiable pride and in whom they are well pleased.

Our guest of honor first came to Washington in 1908 as secretary to the Honorable Robert Bruce Macon, Congressman from the first district of Arkansas. In that capacity his talents and qualities soon appeared and were recognized. They quickly attracted the attention and interest of Members of the Congress, and he was repeatedly called to serve in important positions in the U.S. Senate and in fact to almost every important non-Member position in that body, finally culminating in his being elected Secretary of the Senate in 1945 by the unanimous support and vote of both the Democrats and Republicans alike and later elected again to that same position in 1949. It was my privilege to place him in nomination before the Democratic conference on that latter occasion. I think some of the things that I said then at that time when there was no occasion like this in my mind nor contemplated, I think some of the things I said would bear repeating here this evening. I refer to his many years of faithfulness and devotion and loyalty to the Democratic Party, to the unexcelled highly capable and efficient service he has rendered in the many places of trust and responsibility he held, to his affable and matchless personality, and to his many courtesies and accommodations that have throughout the years indelibly endeared him to the hearts of all of us.

But, there is still more to the story. In the drama of national life many personalities have from time to time played impressive roles on the Washington scene. Presidents, Members of Congress, Cabinet members, and other Government officials, come and go. While they are here they make their influence felt in politics and on the affairs of our Government and the Nation, some of them only to a small degree, and others with potent effects and results. During the time our honored guest served as secretary to the minority and as secretary to the majority, particularly when the Democrats were in power, as Secretary of the Senate, but few men, if any, have had equal or greater influence than he was able to bring to bear in the direction of forces of the Democratic Party or in the formulation of policies and the enactment of laws by the National Congress.

His counsel has eagerly been sought by legislators, by administrators, by diplomats, and by military leaders and even by Presidents of the United States. He has been a counselor and adviser, a confidant, whose opinions and judgment were respected and often followed by those in the highest positions of trust and responsibility. I truly feel inspired on this occasion, but I must not, of course, monopolize the time. It wasn't expected that I should make even these many remarks, but I couldn't refrain from doing so.

Now, before I introduce our other speakers, I may say that there have been literally thousands of messages received from friends all over the Nation, and it is impossible for the presiding official at this dinner to read all of them, or to even call the names of the large number of friends who join us here tonight in this way of paying tribute to our honored guest. But, I shall read some few that I think would be of interest to you and that I think you would like to hear. The first is:

"Regret I cannot be present this evening, to join your many friends, in tendering you this well deserved recognition. My kindest regards and best wishes always.

"J. MILLARD TAWES,
"Governor of Maryland."

"A new Governor does not have much time to travel. This becomes extremely regretful on the occasion such as this, when so many friends are joined in honoring Leslie Biffle on the 50th anniversary of his arrival in Washington. Very few individuals have made so many friends during a lifetime. Very few people have had such an influence on the destiny of our fellow citizens.

"I join all of you in expressing to Leslie many happy returns of this momentous day.

"MICHAEL DI SALLE,
"Governor of Ohio."

"Because of a mandatory commitment here I regret that I cannot attend the testimonial dinner to Leslie Biffle so I have requested Dick Patterson, my commissioner of commerce and public events, to represent me. Leslie Biffle has been a distinguished public servant for many years. Among his many fine attributes is his capacity for friendship. He has friends everywhere because he himself is a friend. The list of his friendships ranges from ditchdiggers to leaders in law, industry, and politics, to statesmen, ambassadors, and scientists. Loyalty is in Les Biffle's bloodstream. He never forgets a friend, he never fails to reward one. I salute him with admiration and affection.

"ROBERT F. WAGNER,
"Mayor of the City of New York."

"It is a most fitting and well deserved recognition of an outstanding career, and of a man who has followed a creed of placing the welfare of others ahead of his own. May I add my hearty congratulations and best wishes, may I further say that I am proud to be among your many warm friends and admirers.

"FRANK E. MCKINNEY."

"I hope you will tell Les Biffle how sorry I am not to be in Washington for his testimonial dinner. He is getting just what he deserves.

"Regards,

"ADLAI E. STEVENSON."

"Now I want to read you one from Arkansas:

"DEAR GENERAL MCGRATH: It is a real pleasure to enclose herewith a copy of a resolution which unanimously passed both houses of the Arkansas general assembly yesterday. I have signed the resolution and will transmit original copies, along with my signature, to the members of the general assembly to Mr. Biffle, as soon as the resolution is enrolled. I regret very much that I am unable to be present at the dinner tonight; however, it will be deeply appreciated if you will convey my personal congratulations and best wishes to Mr. Biffle, who is certainly one of Arkansas' most distinguished and favorite sons.

"Most sincerely,

"ORVAL E. FAUBUS,
"Governor."

May I read you the resolution?

"SIXTY-SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS JOINT HOUSE AND SENATE RESOLUTION, JANUARY 19, 1959

"Whereas there will be a testimonial dinner honoring Leslie L. Biffle at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C., on Tuesday evening, January 20, 1959; and

"Whereas the Honorable Leslie L. Biffle is a native of Piggott, Clay County, Ark., from where he went to Washington in 1908 to distinguish himself and bring honor to his native State with 50 years of public service in the Nation's Capital; and

"Whereas the Honorable Leslie L. Biffle has become enshrined in the hearts of his fellow men through his great acts of mercy, compassion, brotherly love, and a benevolent spirit that has given joy and sustenance to thousands of people; and

"Whereas during this period of 50 years in which he worked in the service of his Government, of his country, and his fellow men, this son of Arkansas has constructed a place of greatness as he has moved with charm and warmth, trust, and dignity in the political arena; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 62d General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the Senate concurring therein), That the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas does by unanimous action hereby commend their fellow citizen, the Honorable Leslie L. Biffle, for a half century of devotion in the service of democracy; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the testimonal committee dinner in Washington, D.C., to the Piggott Banner, in Piggott, Ark., to the Piggott Public Library, and to the Honorable Leslie L. Biffle of Washington, D. C."

Here is one that I know is from a dear, dear old friend:

"DEAR LES: Conditions have arisen which will prevent my making a trip east on the 20th as I had hoped. I congratulate you on the wonderful show of appreciation our friends are giving you. The Senate and the country never had a more faithful public servant than Leslie L. Biffle. I have never regretted anything more in my life than not being able to be with you on this occasion.

"Sincerely yours,

"HARRY S. TRUMAN."

And, now I am happy to read a message from the highest authority in the land:

"DEAR LESLIE: I am sorry that I cannot join the friends who are with you this evening to congratulate you in person on your first 50 years in Washington. You have long been known as one of Washington's foremost citizens, noted for your warm personality, your readiness to be helpful, your professional efficiency and your loyal service. You have carved out a position that is unique in this city. Only a man of deep understanding, fine character, and a warm personality could have formed the many and warm friendships that enrich your life. Truly, you have done much to make Washington a better and more pleasant place in which to work and live. May the Lord in his providence keep you healthy and happy in the years to come.

"With best wishes to you and Mrs. Biffle.

"Sincerely,

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

I certainly am not going to take further time. We have a brief program arranged. Some of our speakers that had been invited are unable to be present. Quite some time ago, when this meeting was first initiated, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, graciously accepted an invitation to be present and to speak to us on this occasion. Subsequently there was arranged a state dinner at the White House, and, of course, you know what takes precedence in such a situation. So, our Mr. SAM, our beloved Speaker, is at the White House this evening, but he has here as his

representative one who has already been introduced to you as his administrative assistant and whom I am proud to present again, Mr. John W. Holton.

JOHN W. HOLTON. Senator MCCLELLAN, distinguished guests and friends of Les Biffle: Les, I do not think we need to ring the bells tonight because the entire membership is already here.

I bring you the friendly and warm greetings of Speaker RAYBURN. If you have read the biography of the distinguished honor guest tonight and the biographies of many other illustrious statesmen of our time, the Speaker would have me remind you that if you really want to reach the pinnacle of success, you must have had some association with the House of Representatives.

Mr. Biffle, your charming lady: I extend to you my sincere congratulations on this happy occasion. My wish for you is that your life may be spared for long and useful service; that the path of life may lead you by still waters; that you will be healthy; that you will find a prosperous and strong America and the world in peace.

Senator MCCLELLAN. Thank you, Mr. Holden. The gentleman I shall now present to you is now serving, I believe, his 17th consecutive term in the Congress of the United States. He has twice been Speaker of the House of Representatives, and is one of the best known, the most influential, and one of the most loved Republicans in the United States: I give to you, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, the guest of honor and friends of Les Biffle, I am glad my good friend and neighbor Howard McGrath explained where he seated the Republicans. I was rather lost why a back seat Republican should be at the head table; but your explanation cleared that up most thoroughly. He did it from the kindness of his heart. You see we live only 12 miles apart. But what is the reason I am so happy to come? Because it gives me the privilege of paying a warm personal tribute to a man who through the years has won the affection, the regard, and the esteem of all who come in contact with him. He's a great American. He has given 50 years of service to our country. Think of the events that have happened in all those years, and realize that Les Biffle has played an important part in so many of them. My good friend JOHN MCCLELLAN has stated he has been the confidant of Presidents. He has been the confidant of Senators and I can remember him 35 years ago in the early days when we House Members ventured into the rarefied atmosphere of the Senate—he would extend to us a helping hand. Now, of course, we go over there with the brusqueness of the modern age; because we have so many former House Members over there now. Sometimes we think we run the Senate. Well, at the critical moments they show us that we don't. But I find it a great privilege to come here tonight. It's a wonderful tribute to see this magnificent gathering, fine telegrams and messages, that have come from all over the country. They are heartening, they are warming. And they indicate to us the building of America is due to lives like Leslie Biffle's doing the everyday work, thoroughly, conscientiously, and with but one thought—what is best for America. Oh, my friends, as we face these critical years that are ahead, we need dedicated Americans, we need men of undoubted loyalty to our country, for that is the only way we are going to come through. It doesn't make much difference after all, whether we are Republicans or Democrats, the one great thought must be, "Are we doing what we honestly believe is best for America?" Are we doing our best to build this great country of ours? And so wherever I sit, in the back seat or the front seat, that shall be my purpose, because I love this country. It has done so much for all of us. I know it can't be written in the stars, that in this hour this great country shall fail. No, we are going to go forward, we're going to go forward because we have men like Les Biffle, men of stalwartness, men of courage and men of discernment. * * * As I looked over that bicycle over there, automobile I guess it is, it says: "The Arkansas Pollster," and Les, I know the results of your polling. Sometimes as a Republican, I rather resented the reports you brought back from the country, but I know one thing always, that your reports were thorough and you were a keen observer. And, so I say to you tonight, I wish you well, Les. You see all these people who have come here tonight to pay tribute to you and your wife. It must make you feel proud; it must make you feel happy. Because after all, material possessions may vanish; the financial wealth that men accumulate may disappear; but the real friends a man earns are enduring. They are the real wealth. Les, you're a millionaire in the friends that you and your wife have accumulated in your long 50 years of service. May God bless you and take care of you in the years ahead.

Senator MCCLELLAN. Thank you, Congressman MARTIN. I certainly take back nothing I said about him, don't you agree with me?

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, our able and distinguished majority leader, in the Senate, was also to address the group this evening. He gladly accepted when the invitation was extended, and, unfortunately for us, he, too, is at a command performance at a state dinner down at the White House. But, he has a representative here, in the distinguished Senator from Alabama, one of the ablest men on the Hill. He is Chairman of the important Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He served some 15 years in the House of Representatives and is now serving in his fourth term in the United States Senate. I am pleased to present to you, my able distinguished colleague and friend, Hon. LISTER HILL.

Senator HILL. Mr. Toastmaster, Les Biffle, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, when I was called at the last moment, advised that our distinguished Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON could not be here tonight, and that our fine assistant leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, is ill with pneumonia and could not be here tonight, and therefore, I had been chosen to say a few words at this time, frankly I was frightened. And then I thought about Les Biffle, and I thought, "Well, there'll be no trouble about that speech, except that it will take all night to tell all the good things about Les Biffle. And, then I was reminded, my friends, that 2 years ago last fall, Les Biffle sent me out to Iowa to make some speeches in the campaign there and I was with this good gentleman and his good wife; we were going to a city about 100 miles north from Des Moines, the capital, the good lady was driving the car and I was sitting on the front seat with her and the good husband was sitting behind, when we got about 15 miles out of our appointed destination we ran into one of the hardest rains I have ever seen in my life. The rain really came down in sheets. Just at that time the automobile stopped. It had given out of gas. Fortunately, it stopped right at a farmer's driveway and the good husband and I got out, went into the farmer's house, and of course he gave us enough gas to go on into the city. But you can imagine that on our way in, we really gave that lady a good time about giving out of gas. That night after I had spoken and the meeting was over she came up to me, shook my hand and said, "Senator, I want to congratulate you. I gave out of gas but you certainly didn't."

Who is there here who knows where Piggott, Ark., is? Well, there are a few, but I tell you my friends, it's the place whence came Leslie Biffle to Washington and that was 50 years ago. Think of it, that was before most of us here this evening were even born. But, I want to say this about Les Biffle: all the ladies tell me that he's still young, charming, and captivating. He had his start, just as many of us did in the House of Representatives and then got demoted and came on over to the Senate. He fell under the eagle eye of that great statesman from Arkansas, Joe Robinson. Joe brought him to the Senate folding room; and ever since then Leslie Biffle has been a-busy folding good things for his friends, for the Democratic Party, and for our country.

During World War I, the War Department sent Leslie to France; there he made a record to be proud of, one of honor and distinction. And when he came back he was made the factotum of the Senate, the doer of all things. Wherever a good man was needed, wherever a wise man was needed, Leslie Biffle was put into the breech. For we know that this fellow Leslie Biffle never puts off anything until tomorrow. He always gives everything his best attention, he attends to every detail, to every little requirement, and the job he does is always the paragon of perfection. And then as JOHN MCCLELLAN has told us, in 1933 Les became secretary to the majority in the Senate, and there ripened that friendship that made Leslie Biffle the intimate friend, the closest confidant and counsellor to the one and only, the immortal Mr. "Veep" our own beloved Alben Barkley. In those early days, Leslie Biffle contributed so much to the passage of legislation that took our Nation out of the depression of the thirties, that he was named a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission by the gallant leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt. And, may I say that he is honored tonight and we are all honored by the presence of one of his fellow members on the American Battle Monuments Commission, Mrs. Wendell Willkie.

In 1945 Les became the Secretary of the Senate and when our good friends the Republicans came into power with the 80th Congress of course they took the job; so Leslie came with the Democratic policy committee. I remember, as a member of that committee, we had a lot of discussion on some of the problems and we had to sit around the table trying to solve those problems, and finally some member would say, "Les, what do you think about it?" and then Les would seem to know everything. It was like turning the light on in a dark room and we gazed and the wonder grew how this little small head could carry all that Les knew. But, you see, Les not only thinks himself but he knows what everyone else thinks. Why, if he were in the Senate today, he would know exactly what BOB BARTLETT and ERNEST GRUENING were thinking. He made so many contributions to the work of the Senate and did so much for the Senate that we nominated him Mr. Biffle the Senator at Large from the United States. Our good friend, that great and fine American JOE MARTIN, referred to this poster up here; you see it. Well, you know for a long, long time we heard about the Arkansas traveler and we wondered who was the Arkansas traveler. In 1948, as you recall, all the experts, and all those who thought they were experts, declared that there was no question about it; the election was in the bag for the Republicans. Governor Dewey was certain to be the next President of the United States. Well, Leslie Biffle went back to Piggott, Ark. He went into the old trunk, got out the old blue denim overalls that he had down there on the farm, put on a pair of old brogan shoes, got him a tin lizzy and he went out across the country to visit the people, the farmer, the filling station operator, the corner grocery store operator, right down to the grassroots of American democracy, and then he began to send back the reports that the Democrats could win, that the Democrats would win, and I often wonder how much those words of encouragement and assurance from Leslie

Biffle inspired that two-fisted fighting campaigner, give-'em-hell Harry. Our Republican friends know that Les is their friend; they also know his love for the Democratic Party that he is the dedicated Democrat. It is as a friend above all else that tonight we pay our tribute to him. He is the friend that asks no questions, needs no assurances, makes no demands. All that he asks is to extend a helping hand, to do something for his friend and, as his friends we rejoice to pay our tribute to him. In Leslie Biffle and the example of his life we see the nobility of friendship, the strength of character, the fellowship of humility, the gospel of humanity, and the love of God. To know Leslie Biffle is to love him, to name him is to praise him.

Senator McCLELLAN. Thank you, LISTER; thank you very much. I am indeed pleased to present to you another of my colleagues in the Senate, the former Governor of the great State of New Hampshire, now serving, I believe, his 22d year in the Senate. He was minority leader in the 82d Congress, the President pro tempore in the 83d Congress; he was also chairman of the Appropriations Committee during that Congress, and I may say to you that he is the ranking or the senior Republican in the United States Senate and the ablest statesman in the Republican Party. I present to you the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES. Mr. Chairman, Les, Mrs. Biffle and friends of Les Biffle. Probably few men in America have more genuine friends over the length and breadth of this country than Les Biffle. He is known for many of his accomplishments. One of those accomplishments referred to here this evening was the time in 1948 he went out as a pollster. He, at that time, attained a reputation as being a sort of "barnyard Gallup." He conducted a barnyard Gallup poll. It has been recalled here how he dressed up in old clothes, took a Ford pickup truck and started out to learn the political sentiment in this country. You know what happened and how he told the then President Truman that the pollsters had underestimated his strength. Les urged the President to hustle during the last few weeks of the campaign. This advice was followed, unfortunately, and the result was that on election day the Republicans were singing that song, "Hang down your head, Tom Dewey." There is one thing that most of you don't know, however, and that is that we Republicans were on the job at that time. We sent a man out to follow up Les Biffle. The only thing different was that we had him buying turkeys instead of chickens and we found that there were more chickens in this country than turkeys, much to our disappointment. Now, Les didn't make a poll in 1954 or 1956. He rested on his laurels but this last year he made a poll and he predicted that the Democrats would gain 14 seats in the Senate and 25 in the House. The rest is a sad story and I won't go into it. It reminds me of the anecdote about our President from the little State of New Hampshire, Franklin Pierce, who, incidentally, was a Democrat. We also at that period produced another great citizen who was the publisher of the New York Tribune—Horace Greeley. They didn't care for each other. After Franklin Pierce had been elected President—and this is a true story—Greeley sent one of his reporters back to the little town of Hillsboro, N. H., to make inquiry as to what kind of a President the local people thought Franklin Pierce would make. He finally went to a storekeeper by the name of Smith and said to Smith, "What kind of a President do you think Franklin Pierce will make?" The storekeeper in his typical Yankee tone said, "Well, I'll tell you. He has done pretty well here in the State in all the State offices he has held, but when you spread him over the whole country he will wear kind of thin in places." That was our only trouble last fall. We were a little thin in places. Now, when Les was Secretary of the Senate and when he was secretary of the majority here, he was known to us on the Republican side as a sort of "walking encyclopedia" and he lived up to that because he was the author of more proposals than I can describe on various bills which were sponsored by other people. He was uncanny in his ability to predict how the votes were going to come out and how each Senator was going to vote. As a matter of fact on several occasions I saw polls prepared by Biffle in which he predicted how I would vote before I had decided myself. It was a great source of wonder to me and admiration too to see Les Biffle move around the Senate floor and whisper to the various Senators. He is the only man I know who can whisper to you and not move his lips. I have always thought he would make a great, great ventriloquist. The only thing that bothered me was what Democratic Senator would he use as the dummy. Seriously speaking, there are a great many things about Les Biffle in which he and his family and all his friends can take great pride. He has done well for a country boy from Arkansas. He has attained a pinnacle in the Nation's Capital that few men reach. And I don't believe there is anyone in this room who would deny that there is no one individual on the American political scene today who has made more friends, real friends, in both political parties than Les Biffle. And as long as the American political scene continues to attract men of Les Biffle's character we don't have too many worries about the future of our Nation. He has my affection, my respect, and my esteem. You know, in closing, that I have not always agreed with the former President of the United States, Harry Truman, but he said at one time, and I quote, "They don't make them any better than Les Biffle." As we say on the floor of the U.S. Senate, I wish to associate myself with those remarks.

Senator McCLELLAN. I have a pleasant surprise for you. We are very happy that the distinguished majority leader of the Senate has been able to break away from the White House long enough to join us. LYNDON, you have the mike—they are waiting for you.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Biffle, my fellow Americans. Somebody once said that there are two ways for every boy in Arkansas to go. He can either go up in the world or he can go to Texas. A loss to Texas can be a gain to the Nation. Les Biffle is one Arkansas boy who went up in the world but none of us are here tonight to honor him for that alone. For Les Biffle did more than to go up in the world for himself. The important thing is that he helped a great many others go up in the world themselves and once there he helped all of them serve the Nation better. When Les Biffle left his native Arkansas and came to Washington he brought with him far more than what he packed in that little suitcase. He brought good sense, warmth, and human understanding, and a lot of real backbone. As long as he was here his supply never ran low. He made men stronger, he made the Senate stronger, he made his party stronger, and he made a great contribution to strengthening his Nation by his counsel and his leadership. This is a great thing for any man to have said of himself. I hope, Les, that you will admit it to yourself. We honor you tonight as a man because you deserve it. In a larger sense, though, we honor you for the standard of selfless service which you have set because this Nation deserves such a standard of service. You, as all your friends know, spent your time here seeding your party with responsibility. I know it must be a great satisfaction to you and your gracious lady to see the harvest now being reaped by your party in these fields of responsibility. If I were writing you a postcard instead of speaking as I am I think you would appreciate the new meaning of an old message if I would say only, "Having a wonderful time, wish you were here with us."

Senator McCLELLAN. Thank you, LYNDON, we are so happy that you could get away from the White House dinner in time to join us and your remarks, I think, are a very fitting close and climax to the speeches we have had here this evening. My part on this program is coming to a close. Before I turn the gavel over to the cochairman, however, I should like to recognize and have her stand and take a bow—the estimable and charming lady, Mrs. Alben W. Barkley. Mrs. Barkley.

Now may I say, and I know everyone of you will join me in these sentiments, I want to say to Mrs. Biffle that every tribute paid here this evening to your illustrious husband and every sentiment we have expressed for him, you share in our thoughts equally. You have been to him a wonderful companion. You have made it possible for him to achieve his great success and to be endeared to all of us as we have expressed here tonight. I now turn the gavel back to your distinguished cochairman, J. Howard McGrath.

J. HOWARD McGRATH. I assure you that I have made every effort to have my cochairman, Sam Pryor, take this place but he has declined. Leslie, you know that we would not have a testimonial in your honor unless we brought gifts so we have them and, briefly, I will present them to you and to Glade without remarks. First of all, let's open this up because these are very valuable gifts. On behalf of each and all who are gathered here, Les, we give you your 100th watch. And to you, Glade, we give you your 1,000th diamond. But above and, oh, yes, there is a little throw in here, Les, this is a book. You are from Arkansas, you know what a book is. It is something with a proud name on the back and a cover on each side but inside this book will be the most precious names you will ever know, at least for the next 50 years. So, once in a while when you are not at a Cafritz party or a Mesta party look through this book, read these names and remember us. Now, for all who are here and who are not here who have contributed to this dinner, I just want to announce that when the Biffles go home tonight, in their apartment there will be set up the finest yet produced color television set. This is a delicate instrument and it was thought unwise to display it here but this is the picture for all to see. As a matter of fact it is so delicate that Pryor and myself decided that we had better insure it for a year, so Les, if anything goes wrong with this machine for the next year, it is on us. After that you are on your own. These are our gifts. Don't you want to thank us for them?

LESLIE L. BIFFLE. My wonderful, wonderful friends. I am deeply, deeply touched at what you have done tonight. What an anticlimax this is going to be in the way of a speech. I am going to suggest to you something that you know already. I am as nervous as a June bride—it's true, too. I did pencil a few lines this morning. Thought I would be able to read them, but you turned out the lights on me. My good friends, I am deeply indebted to you all for this party, including the presents. I don't know how to thank you. So many have put in hours and hours—working day and night. I am very grateful. It says here, I am the happiest man in the world. I have already said the next paragraph. My 50 years in Washington. It's a long, long time in anybody's life. I arrived in the Capital City the last of November 1908. I was one of the greenest young fellows that ever arrived in the Capital; however, I know a certain fellow who was a little green when he came to Washington.

I am calling no names but many of you know him. He got a job in the Senate in 1935, he studied and worked hard for 10 years, and then he was given another place. Shortly after that he was given still another place, which he held until January 1953. I think he has a job in a library out in the Middle West some place. May I tell you folks how I happened to come to Washington? In the month of May 1908, Congressman Macon came to my hometown, Piggott. He was running for reelection. I went with my father down to the train to meet him. He walked up the street and the Congressman asked my father's permission for me to take him around and introduce him to the different people in our community. Well, I took him to the courthouse, to the different stores around the square, to the cotton gin, and to the sawmill. About 3 weeks after that my father had a letter from the Congressman saying he would like to appoint me his secretary. My father accepted before he could change his mind. He was so happy about it. I borrowed some money, I think it was $60. I went to a school in Little Rock to study shorthand. I think they called it "cross-electric." I never heard of it since. In the fall my father took me to St. Louis, bought for me a new suit, cost $11, and a new hat, cost $2. He put me on the train, day coach to Cincinnati, in an upper in a sleeper from Cincinnati to Washington. Our train had to wait about 3 hours for connections from Cincinnati to Louisville. I asked the conductor if it would be all right for me to walk down the street a little piece. It was just getting dark, the street lights were on. He said, "Yes, but don't go too far." While I was out walking it started to rain. My suit got wet; my hat got wet. The next morning when I got up I had a lot of trouble getting my trousers on—(it was an upper berth) you ought to try getting your clothes on in an upper berth in the mountains—when the train is throwing you from one side to the other. I may tell you I had a little trouble getting into that upper berth. I didn't know anything about a ladder. Had never seen a pullman before. The colored man wasn't in the car at the time, so I put my foot on the arm of the lower berth and tried to get up. Couldn't make it. A fellow sitting across the aisle from me said, "Buddy, if you will wait awhile the porter will bring you a ladder," which he did and I finally made it. I must say that the Congressman was certainly nice to me. He would dictate the mail to me in the morning, would go over to the House, and come back in the afternoon to sign it. It would take him about 3 hours to correct my letters and I would have to stay until about 11 or 12 at night rewriting them. It is a wonder he didn't send me home after the first month. I remained with the Congressman until he left public life and I then went over to the Senate side where I held various positions. Finally, I became Secretary of the Senate. Let me tell you of one of the most interesting experiences I ever had. It was in January 1947. The question before the Senate was the seating of Senator Bilbo. We at that time did not have a Vice President, President Truman having gone to the White House. The man who was to be President pro tempore was a Senator-elect. His name was way down on the list to be sworn in. I had to preside, being Secretary of the Senate at that time. The galleries were crowded, the floor packed and jammed. The debate started on Bilbo. I was not permitted to call a Senator to come and relieve me when I wanted to go to lunch or do anything else, all day long, all day long. It was a long, long afternoon. If you folks could see some of the notes that I have on file that different Senators would write and send up to me. "Les, would you like me to go out and eat a little lunch for you or would you like me to do this or that?" I must say this about my dear sweet wife, Glade. She has been a tower of strength to me. She has been a little peeved at me since Christmas. I gave her a Hagerstown Almanac. There is also something about Glade. Many of you know I am cross and irritable and hard to get along with. I sometimes go home cross and say something critical to her. She doesn't say a word back. She just shuts up like a clam. If she would fight back a little I think I would feel better, but she goes right along washing dishes or sweeping the carpet or something. She has been, as I said, a tower of strength to me. I had the most efficient help when I was Secretary of the Senate—Mrs. Darling, Mrs. Kraus, Mrs. Roche, and Mrs. Tucker. They were all very able girls and they were all loyal to the cause. Guess that's a blank piece of paper. Again, I must tell you how very grateful I am to you for the wonderful things that have been said about me tonight. You have touched me beyond expression. You have made me very happy and you have made my family very happy. My two sisters are sitting here. They came up from Miami for this occasion. Thank you ever, ever so much.

J. HOWARD MCGRATH. Now the first part of our program is over. We have a beautiful entertainment program. I hope that all of you can stay to listen to it. I turn you over now to Director of Music.

(Eddie Pierce presented entertainment here.)

J. HOWARD MCGRATH. I think now we have had quite a wonderful evening. The program has run a little longer than planned, but on behalf of Leslie and Glade and all of us who have had the privilege of being on this wonderful committee, I want to thank you a thousand percent. A thousand percent is the interest that we hope to make next year on the prosperity of America.

"If America Forgets Where She Came From, if the People Lose Sight of What Brought Them Along, Then Will Begin the Dissolution," Carl Sandburg, Biographer of Abraham Lincoln, Declares

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Lincoln scholar, Carl Sandburg, poet and philosopher, wrote in his book "Remembrance Rock" that:

> If America forgets where she came from, if the people lose sight of what brought them along, if she listens to the deniers and mockers, then will begin the rot and dissolution.

Surely, the inspiration to be derived from the great lessons of the past which are set forth in our rich heritage of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities is of the utmost significance and importance in guiding the present as well as future generations toward similar high standards and worthy attainments.

With this thought in mind, legislation to save this cultural heritage has been sponsored by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN], the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], myself, and no doubt others.

The need for such legislation, Mr. Speaker, was first made evident by the protests of the Federal Commission of Fine Arts, the American Institute of Architects, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Society of Architectural Historians, the National Park Service, the New York Times and many other newspapers, as well as a large number of groups interested in conservation of our resources.

In introducing his companion bill the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] declared that:

> Studies by these groups and by others have made it obvious that literally thousands of the most priceless treasures of our national heritage have been plowed under and utterly destroyed by the bulldozers of a ruthless progress during the past few years. The tragedy is that in most such instances, the destruction was wholly unnecessary. The valuable historic objects could have been preserved without retarding progress.
>
> We obviously should not permit this thoughtless and wanton destruction of these last relics of our past, because they provide, in many cases, the only visible links to connect us with periods of our own national history. They remind us of the greatness of our past, of the hardships endured by those who with such painstaking care laid the foundations of our history.

Congress has, in the past, enacted legislation to preserve historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities. I would cite, in this connection, the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906—16 U.S.C., sections 431, 432, 433; the act entitled "An act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities, and for other purposes," approved August 21, 1935—16 U.S.C. 461 and the following; and section 7 of the act of August 27, 1935, as added July 18, 1940—40 U.S.C., section 304a–2.

Certainly, the intent of the Congress is clear enough in this matter. It clearly intended to preserve our heritage, but the present administration has chosen repeatedly to ignore the intent of the Congress.

It recommended to Congress that the historic Civil Service building, in Washington, D.C., designed by Robert Mills, architect of the U.S. Treasury Department building and Washington Monument, be destroyed in order that the site could be used as a parking lot.

It recommended that the historic State, War, Navy building in the Nation's Capital be replaced with what it described as a more efficient modern building.

Morristown, N.J., National Historical Park has been threatened with a federally assisted highway, 90 percent of the cost of which is furnished by the Federal Government.

It proposed to survey some 30 historic buildings across the country preparatory to replacing them with more efficient office space, too. Obviously, these recommendations were part of a plan to reward builders who were faithful to the Republican Party with fat contracts.

But this this not the end of this sorry tale, Mr. Speaker.

A number of historic buildings dating back to the Revolutionary period, including the ancestral homes of the Lee family of Virginia, are right now in danger of being obliterated to make way for the new Chantilly Airport. These homes should be preserved and, if necessary, relocated.

The old San Francisco Mint, one of the few buildings to survive the earthquake and fire of 1906, a classic building of great historic and architectural value, has been declared surplus by the General Services Administration. The site is wanted for a parking lot.

A historic Dutch mansion, built around 1790, was acquired by the Government along with the surrounding land on the Hudson River for a Veterans' Administration hospital. This building certainly could have been preserved on the site as a museum and used as a waiting cottage for visitors. Instead, it was sold to a wrecker for $32. The wrecker dismantled it, sold the facade for $3,000 and disposed of the remainder in piecemeal sales.

It is to be hoped that the Committee on Public Works, and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will move rapidly to consider the legislation dealing with the preservation of our great heritage which has been referred to them and that they will favorably report this legislation to the Congress early in this session. There is no time to lose, particularly in view of the fact that the administration obviously considers that the legislation previously enacted by the Congress does not apply to it.

I include here two items which gives some idea of the scope of the problem which I have been discussing.

WANTON DISREGARD OF OUR HERITAGE

An architect visiting West Point a few years ago was admiring the superintendent's residence, beautifully situated to command a sweeping view of the West Point plain. The oldest building still being used at the Academy, this one has housed almost every Superintendent, and so has historic as well as architectural value.

"We're tearing it down for more barracks room," an officer told him matter-of-factly.

The architect was horrified. Couldn't it possibly be saved? No, the plans were made.

The visitor hastened to Washington and buttonholed Congressmen and Senators, but could interest none. Then he had an inspiration: he called on Senator HARRY F. BYRD of Virginia. "Senator," he said, "did you know that Gen. Robert E. Lee's famous home while he was superintendent of West Point is about to be destroyed?"

The Senator was incredulous. "Get me West Point," he said to his secretary. No one will give a verbatim report of the ensuing conversation, but the destruction plans were canceled and today this architectural landmark still stands, used and admired.

The patriotic architect is but one of many Americans who are alarmed at the wanton razing of places precious to our heritage. All over the country structures that help recreate our past are being sacrificed to make way for shopping centers, superhighways, skyscrapers and subtopias. Studies indicate that at least 25 percent of the finest historic and architectural monuments that existed in the United States in 1941 have been destroyed.

Much of this destruction is the result of callous disregard of cultural values. Residents of Charleston, S.C., used to point with pride to their Orphan House Chapel, designed in 1802 by Gabriel Manigault, one of the finest of early American architects. Culturally it was of national importance and when a mail-order house acquired it along with other property for a retail store, Charlestonians begged the company to spare the charming chapel. But it was destroyed to enlarge the parking lot.

Boscobel, a classical mansion dating from 1804, was considered one of the most distinguished examples of Hudson River architecture. Located in Westchester County, N.Y., off the grounds of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Veterans Hospital, it was in rapidly deteriorating condition in 1950. Despite local efforts to save it, Government officials declared it surplus property and sold it for $35 to a wrecker, who tore it down.

Even in ruin it was beautiful. Admirers of the old house raised enough money to purchase the dismantled structure and move it, piece by piece, to a 30-acre park site at Garrison, N.Y. There it lies today, while devoted sponsors go about the heartbreaking job of collecting funds to reconstruct the mansion as a community center and museum of Hudson Valley history and art.

Why save old places? What can they contribute to living in the world today?

A nation with no regard for its past will have little future worth remembering. We need authentic, tangible reminders of our national virtues and heroes to make us feel a part of the best in our heritage. Properly presented, they breathe life into past experience. The most cleverly illustrated children's book cannot compare with the Farmers' Museum at Coopertown, N.Y., for example, as a means of giving boys and girls the feel of rural living before the Civil War. The housewife churning and cooking, weavers fashioning fabric from wool or flax, the brawny blacksmith working red-hot iron, the country storekeeper cutting into a generous head of cheese—all create a vivid picture of the industrious men and women of the time. City youngsters are enchanted by Cooperstown's farm animals, the team of sleek brown oxen pulling a cart, the parade of gray geese and goslings. A morning there is not merely a history lesson, but an unforgettable taste of early America.

Historic preservation speaks to the spirit. In 1942 an Army private wrote to John D. Rockefeller, Jr., about his visit to colonial Williamsburg: "Of all the sights I have seen and the books I have read, none ever made me sense the greatness of this country with more force and clarity than when I saw Williamsburg slumbering peacefully on its old foundations."

Williamsburg and Cooperstown are famous. But many a lesser known locality, taking a fresh perspective of its past, is finding an old courthouse or residence, even a covered bridge or a tavern, that is rich in historical associations. How can such sites be preserved?

Deciding just which structure to select, how to raise the money to save it and present it to the public is a baffling job for amateurs. Fortunately they can get advice from the National Trust for Historic Preservation, a private, nonprofit organization supported entirely by patriotic individuals and organizations. Anyone can join. Chartered by act of Congress in 1949, it owns a number of historical properties, but its chief task is encouraging and guiding other groups over the country. Its president, Richard Hubbard Howland, is an architectural historian, and he and his staff of five experts are continually at work advising townspeople how to make the most of their best. More than 250 preservation organizations are affiliated with the National Trust and support its programs in their own areas. Trust services are rendered by mail or by on-the-spot consultation.

A number of cities have put entire areas under architectural control. Charleston, S.C., started it in 1924 by passing an ordinance creating the Old and Historic Charleston District. Since then, New Orleans has preserved the Vieux Carré, Boston has set aside Beacon Hill, Washington has protected Old Georgetown, and Natchez has made her finest architectural area inviolate. The National Trust has stimulated this activity in dozens of cities by distributing copies of model ordinances, and publishing regular reports of new legislation.

The National Trust helped bring to life the Mississippi River town of Galena, Ill., once a busy lead-mining center. A century ago as many as 18 steamers loaded and unloaded at its levees at one time; Joseph Jefferson performed and Jenny Lind sang there. Galena gave the Union its most distinguished general, Ulysses S. Grant.

But as the years passed, traffic left the river for the highways. The lead mines failed. The town sank into oblivion, and its young people drifted away. Today it has one-third the population it boasted in 1858.

Four years ago, when the National Trust held its annual meeting in Chicago, members were invited to visit Galena. They were enchanted to find an almost untouched antebellum town on steep hills with a wonderful river view. But the General Grant home was shabby and dominated by a souvenir stand peddling tawdry tourist trinkets.

A careful restoration of the home was started; the famous Market House was saved from becoming a parking lot, and Galena's last remaining old firehouse, built in 1836, was restored. By last November 200,000 people had visited the once sleepy town, and Galena had opened a productive mine of tourist gold.

Historic homes can retain their charm and still be put to good everyday use. In Washington, D.C., when three handsome buildings of the Federal style were about to be torn down for a parking lot, a group of neighbors formed Historic Georgetown, Inc., an organization designed to prove that preservation will pay. They sold stock at a dollar a share, bought the buildings and leased them to a restaurateur, a florist, and an interior decorator.

D'Estrehan Plantation House in Louisiana, built in 1787 and remodeled in 1840 in the style of the Greek revival, was one of the finest homes overlooking the Mississippi River. An oil company took it over. But instead of destroying this beautiful reminder of our 18th century agricultural economy, the 20th century technologists restored it. They now use it for administrative offices.

As the experience of Galena and many other towns testifies, preservation can be good business. A recent Government survey shows that an average of only 28 tourists a day visiting a town with historic attractions will bring in as much money during a year as a new business with a $100,000 annual payroll.

The true preservationist, however, is not motivated by money. His is the spirit of Ann Pamela Cunningham, the South Carolina woman who almost singlehandedly saved the proudest prize of all our past—Mount Vernon. Washington's home was in sad disrepair and in danger of falling into ruin when she formed the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association. In 1858 the association bought the historic place for $200,000 and restored it as a national shrine.

Now is the time for every town to take stock and determine what is most worth

preserving. As Lewis Mumford has said, "The concrete cloverleaf is becoming our national flower." In the next few years 41,000 miles of new highways will charge through some of our last surviving wilderness areas, through major cities, along historic old roadways. Many communities may not attempt to save their historic places until it is too late.

How can you tell what to save? Here are a few touchstones which the National Trust suggests be applied to any building or site.

1. Is it of substantial historical or cultural importance to your community, State, or Nation? It could be a mansion, a pioneer's squared-log cabin, a sod house or even an Indian mound.

2. Is it suitable, that is, is it accessible to the public and in presentable condition? Generally speaking, say the experts, it is better to preserve than repair, better to repair than restore, better to restore than reconstruct.

3. Can you maintain it, once you've bought it? Few places can sustain themselves from admission fees. If yours cannot, and is not fully endowed or otherwise self-sustaining, perhaps it can be adapted to use by an organization or business firm without losing its significance.

If we can save enough of the homes, churches, courthouses and other places where Americans who went before us lived and worked, we can sense their way of life, their ideals and character. We want our children to sense them, too. Unless we act now, few of these firsthand lessons from the past will remain.

NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION,
Washington, D.C., February 1959.

To: Members and friends of the National Trust for Historic Preservation.
From: Richard H. Howland, president.
Subject: United States Mint in San Francisco.

On February 18, at 2 p.m., on the third floor of the Public Health Building, in the Civic Center in San Francisco, a public hearing has been arranged to permit interested organizations and individuals to express their views on the preservation of the old mint. This hearing is of utmost concern, not alone to those who wish to see this nationally significant architectural monument preserved, but to all who realize the threat it poses to the legal basis of preservation as defined in certain Federal laws.

By a wise provision of the act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 885), as amended July 18, 1940 (54 Stat. 764); 40 U.S.C., 1952 edition, section 304a–2, the Administrator of General Services is authorized to demolish any building declared surplus to the needs of the Government. Before proceeding with demolition he is to inform the Secretary of the Interior in writing of his intention to demolish it, and shall not proceed to do so until he has received written notice from the Secretary of the Interior that the building is not of national significance.

Between April 23, 1956, and August 23, 1957, eight buildings were referred for opinion to the Secretary of the Interior, and only one, the San Francisco Mint, was given the nationally significant designation, in a report dated December 6, 1956. It was then agreed that the building would be turned over to the National Park Service as a national historic site for their administration. An item in the 1959 budget provides for its renovation as headquarters for the Western Division of the National Park Service, which includes five Western States, Alaska, and Hawaii. The offices now occupy expensive rented space in the city. It would also provide for museum exhibits telling the story of the San Francisco Mint, its importance in the financial history of the country, of the process of coinage, and of the valor and courage of the citizens of San Francisco as exemplified by the heroic efforts of those who saved it in 1906.

City officials have asked their Representatives in Congress to disregard the evaluation of the Secretary of the Interior, and the provision of the law for Federal responsibility for preserving its nationally significant structures, and demolish the building (at an estimated cost of at least $250,000) to return the site to the city for private development as a parking lot or building site.

The American Institute of Architects, the Society of Architectural Historians, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation have also rated the Old Mint as one of the few notable historic buildings and architectural monuments in the city of San Francisco. Its demolition at this time would be a short-sighted waste of our national heritage, and one that the future could only regard with deep regret. Rehabilitated, it could become one of the city's major tourist attractions, and an incentive for redevelopment of the area surrounding it.

In other great cities, Philadelphia, Boston, St. Louis, and Providence, major efforts are being made to preserve many buildings of less distinction. It has been repeatedly demonstrated by careful study that such historic attractions bring to the areas that save them a larger share of the $20 billion annual tourist business.

Culturally, the old mint built in 1873, is accepted as one of only three or four important buildings in San Francisco to survive the fire and earthquake of 1906, and one of the finest examples of 19th century Federal architecture in the West. It was designed by the great A. B. Mullett, leading architect of Government buildings of the post Civil War era. Writing of its value to the city, State, and Nation, Stephen W. Jacobs, president of the Pacific section of the Society of Architectural Historians stated: "The San Francisco Mint, of Columbia blue stone with a classical portico of Rocklin granite, has retained its characteristic setting with cast iron fence and fountains, and beds of greenery. The integration of the tall chimneys at the rear, which served as flues for the metal retorts, gives the whole complex an unusual and striking character. On the interior, the high ceilings and the vaults of brick on iron beams retain the early type of Federal construction which represented a pioneering attempt at structural engineering and fireproofing. Its massive construction enabled the mint employees to save the building and the $200 million it contained during the 1906 fire, when a 7-hour battle was fought by mint employees and soldiers with a single, 1-inch fire hose to keep at bay the flames gnawing at its barred and iron-shuttered windows. One of the best surviving examples of Government architecture sponsored by Jefferson and Jackson in the early days of the Republic, the old mint is probably the only building in San Francisco famous throughout the country for its design character."

"San Francisco is unusually fortunate that the Federal Government has retained this building and is willing to restore it and maintain it in an eminently suitable way at no expense to the city," Mr. Jacobs stated in another report. "It seems almost incredible that the city does not realize how lucky it is to have what is perhaps its most important architectural monument maintained at no expense to it. * * * There is every reason why the Old Mint should remain one of our principal monuments and a memorial of San Francisco's unique history."

David E. Finley, chairman of the board of trustees of the National Trust, in a letter to the Administrator of General Services Administration stated the Federal responsibility for observing the spirit as well as the letter of the law governing demolition of nationally significant structures in January 1957, "The preservation of this building is important not only because of its intrinsic merits but also in order that the Government may set an example for the preservation of important historic monuments."

On January 23, 1959, at a meeting of the full board of trustees of the National Trust held in Washington, a resolution was passed again sustaining the cogent reasons for preservation of the Old Mint, and instructing us to communicate to our concerned members and member organizations an appeal for their support. We are accordingly asking our member organizations to send representatives to the meeting of February 18, and for individuals to attend the hearings if possible, also. May we urge that you write your Congressman sending copies to City Planning Commission, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif.

Tribute to Hon. Richard B. Russell, of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of remarks on January 30, 1959, by the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress from the 20th District of Pennsylvania, in presenting to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] the annual Minute Man of the Year award of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, JANUARY 30, 1959, IN PRESENTING U.S. SENATOR RICHARD B. RUSSELL, OF GEORGIA, THE ANNUAL CITATION BY THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION AS MAN OF THE YEAR FOR 1959

It is a signal honor to have been selected to present the Reserve Officers' Association annual citation to the citizen who has contributed most to national security in these times.

The recipient of this year's award is a distinguished Member of the U.S. Senate, and since it is the habit in Congress to rely upon the Congressional Directory for background information, it is interesting to observe that the recipient of the award is recorded in the pages of the directory listing Senators as follows:

"RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL, Democrat, of Winder, Ga."

This is the sole reference from a biographical standpoint to one of the most able and popular Members of the U.S. Senate.

Even though his biographical sketch is the personification of brevity, Senator RUSSELL'S official activities embrace chairman of the Senate Committee on the Armed Services, and membership on the powerful Senate Committee on Appropriations.

He is also a member of the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and, in addition, is serving as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy, the Board of Visitors to the Naval

Academy, and the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

The resolution selecting Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL for this annual citation describes him in a manner in keeping with his worthwhile contributions to our national defense.

The resolution that accompanies the citation reads as follows:

"Reserve Officers Association of the United States annual citation to the citizen who has contributed most to national security in these times: 1959, RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL.

"An association resolution: To the Honorable RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL, because throughout your career you have been—

"(a) Profoundly aware of the obligation of every citizen to service to his nation, and by continuing precept and example aided in keeping alive this vital tradition;

"(b) Broadly knowledgeable in history and motivations of peoples and nations of the world, you have exercised a genius for leadership critically contributing to this Nation's victories in wars;

"(c) Nobly motivated in your public service, you have shunned narow considerations, including partisanship, but rather have fixed your course and your influence toward highest standards of national interest;

"(d) Deeply dedicated to honor and duty, you have given of your strength and genius far beyond and above the call of both honor and duty.

"In the name of this Nation's first Minutemen, who gave our forefathers the inspiration and instinct to contest to the death for their liberty, this association proudly recognizes your service as a patriot, and its meaningful contribution to the national security shared by every citizen of the United States in these times.

"For the association—by the National Executive Committee, Washington, D.C., January 30, 1959.

"(Signed) Rear Adm. Leon J. Jacobi, USNR, national president, Detroit; and Col. John T. Carlton, USAR, executive director, Washington."

Senator RUSSELL—or DICK as you are known to your thousands of friends—it gives me great pleasure to present you with the Reserve Officers Association award of Man of the Year for 1959, and with it I extend my sincere congratulations.

The Business Users of the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, it has been my privilege to preside over committee hearings when business users of the postal service have testified. These sessions have emphasized just how important our Postal Establi hment is to a healthy American economy. Too often we forget the role which the post office plays in helping to keep the machinery of business going. Countless thousands of businessmen use the facilities of the post office to advertise and sell their products.

The present administration has been too prone to attack business users of the mail, charging them with causing all the ills of the postal service. In the balance sheets which executive departments transmit to the Hill, no notice is ever taken of the wealth created, the employment opportunities afforded, the taxes paid by customers of the Postal Establishment.

It was encouraging, therefore, to observe in an article published in the New York Times of January 28, 1959, some kind words regarding the Nation's businessmen who depend on the post office to transmit their sales messages to the American people.

I know that the ranking Republican on the committee, the able Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], feels as I do about postal patrons and will recommend the Times article to the attention of the Senate. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPICS

RESULT OF THE BLACKOUT

An interesting result of the recent newspaper blackout, when any bit of informative reading matter took on the aspect of a brandy-laden St. Bernard to a lost mountain climber, was the care with which all members of the family read the morning mail. Bills weren't let go until each item was scrutinized. Small print was read with as much solicitude as the large print. And business mail, of the kind that often winds up, unread, in the waste basket, enjoyed far more attention than ever before was lavished on it. Many of us joined—perhaps to remain as members even after the newspaper returned—the army of adventurers whose mailboxes are an ever-changing vehicle for all kinds of wonderful flights of imagination. Helping us on these flights, of course, are business concerns that realize that the postal system represents a direct link to prospects for their products and services. The post office is delighted; last year it received $272 million of welcome revenue from business mail. And the postmen are at their happiest when the mail flow is at its heaviest for, in the words of Gilbert and Sullivan, they are then employed at their employment.

THE FULL MAILBOX

Who doesn't remember the days when, as children, we would clip every coupon in the back of the magazines, fill them all out, and mail them in? And for no other purpose than to receive mail specifically addressed to us, a definite sign of growing up. Nor has the excitement really diminished. A full mailbox can be as good for the morale as a full stomach. Content often has little to do with it. While there is little so heartwarming as a letter from a friend, written in familiar hand, an interesting piece of business mail often is quite attractive, too. The fact that it is printed rather than written in hand does not remove completely the personal touch. It means that we are on various lists, as persons interested in specific things, specific ideas, specific publications. Not everybody in the world is on the same lists, because, with the wisdom peculiar to this trade, it is realized that not everybody in the world shares the same interests.

A UNIQUE INDUSTRY

Behind the business mail borne daily to mailboxes near and far is a unique industry. According to the Business Mail Foundation, more than a billion and a half dollar are invested each year to bring things to our attention by way of the mailbox. Many organizations deal wtih the public only by mail, while others use the mail to supplement efforts in other channels. Business mail is also a favorite technique of that American hero, the small businessman. Many a company, long in business and respected for integrity, consists solely of an individual, a product or a service, and a happy union with the post office. As a result of this combined effort, 16 billion pieces of printed matter find their way each year into our mailboxes, with commercial mail resulting each year in sales of merchandise worth more than $20 billion.

SELLING BY MAIL

The use of the public mails for other than personal messages and business-to-business communication is by no means new. It was, in fact, a tool in the forging of our country. Stoking the fires of liberty before the American Revolution was the Committee of Correspondence, through which such patriots as John Hancock and Samuel Adams dispersed as they were throughout colonial America, kept one another informed. The method was not unlike methods used today. A circular letter was printed and mailed to members of the committee in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and wherever else patriotic groups existed. Since that time entire cultures in America have been built around the catalog from the mail-order house. Many a shopping problem has been solved in the comfort and quiet of the living room. Of all the forms of selling that American ingenuity has devised, none is closer to us than business mail—as close as our mailbox.

Institute of International Education Award to Leonard Bernstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last Friday evening, January 30, at a dinner in Washington, D.C., the Institute of International Education marked its 40th anniversary. This commemoration was a part of the Third National Conference on Exchange of Persons which the institute sponsored in cooperation with some 139 national private and public agencies interested in exchange programs. As a feature of the anniversary celebration, awards were tendered to organizations, institutions and individuals who have made unusual contributions to the improvement of understanding among nations. Among the five awards presented was one to the American born and educated composer and musician, Leonard Bernstein. It is my pleasure to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the citation of Mr. Bernstein by the institute for his outstanding contributions in behalf of his native land as a cultural ambassador in what has been termed the international language, music.

We are very proud of Leonard Bernstein, and I am delighted to see him so honored.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION FOR AN INDIVIDUAL

To Leonard Bernstein, American-born and American-educated conductor, composer, and cultural ambassador of the United

States, the Institute of International Education presents its award for distinguished service.

All great art, and music in particular, transcends the barriers of language. Music is itself a universal language. Mr. Bernstein speaks it fluently.

Performances by Leonard Bernstein and other American artists have demolished the cliche that the people of the United States are completely materialistic and concerned only with technical gadgets.

The Cultural Presentations Program of the Department of State, ably administered by the American National Theatre and Academy, has given the world a chance to see and hear the best of our performing artists. In the first 6 months of 1958, American symphony orchestras, ballet companies, drama groups and individual artists performed in more than 500 cities in 94 countries. The jazz of Dave Brubeck, the spirituals of Marian Anderson, the modern dance of Martha Graham, have been offered to audiences who had never before seen or heard an American artist.

The impact of cultural diplomacy is clear. Mr. Bernstein and the New York Philharmonic, in their recent tour of Latin America, were acclaimed everywhere.

For example, the Caracas Daily Journal said, "The visit here of the New York Philharmonic under the baton of the great conductor, Leonard Bernstein, enables the United States of America to speak to Venezuela in a field where the bonds between people are strongest." Le Prensa in Lima said, "Critics have classified unanimously the presentations of the Philharmonic as an event without precedent in the musical history of Peru." El Mundo Argentina in Buenos Aires said, "Without any doubt, the New York Philharmonic is one of the most perfect orchestras which it is possible for the human ear to hear." Even El Siglo, the Communist daily of Santiago, said, "The men who make up the orchestra are very great artists and they carry the message of beauty and emotion in a language which crosses frontiers and is common to all human beings, and can for a moment calm the passions and hatreds which daily life awaken in man. The performance of the New York Philharmonic was magnificent."

In 1949 Leonard Bernstein composed his second symphony, "The Age of Anxiety." A decade later, we still live in anxious times—but so did Bach, Beethoven, and Brahms, whose affirmation of the triumph of good over evil is so superbly interpreted by Mr. Bernstein.

In recognition of the significant role which the American artist plays today in cultural exchange, the Institute of International Education bestows its distinguished service award upon Leonard Bernstein, whose music unites us in the belief that harmony will one day prevail among all men.

Seapower Is Not Just Men-of-War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, at this late date, after the experiences of two World Wars and the Korean conflict, no justification of the American merchant marine should be needed. Yet, year after year, our merchant navy is a target for elimination by those who fail to appreciate its true significance. These uninformed critics might well reflect carefully upon a recent definition of seapower made by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEAPOWER IS NOT JUST MEN-OF-WAR

(By Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, USN, Chief of Naval Operations)

Seapower is not just men-of-war. It includes freighters, tramp steamers, passenger liners, tankers, and the many other ships which make up the merchant marine.

But seapower is even more than this. It is the sum total of weapons, ships, shipbuilding capacity, and geography which enable a nation to use the sea advantageously during peace and war.

These are the physical things, the tools of seapower. They can be made effective only by a nation whose people are aware of the advantages offered by the sea, and whose government understands the employment of its maritime assets.

With the great progress the world has made in communications and transport between land masses, seapower has become progressively more important as free nations have become more interdependent economically and militarily.

As populations have grown, as world resources have developed, maritime commerce has also increased. In the past 10 years world commerce has increased 50 percent.

Ten years ago United States water-borne foreign commerce was 188 million short tons. By 1956 this had risen to 327 million short tons—and it is still going up.

This indicates not only a continuing, but an increasing need for shipping.

Yet while our water-borne foreign commerce has nearly doubled in 10 years, the percentage of this traffic in ships flying the American flag has gone down rapidly.

In 1947 American-flag ships carried 54 percent of our foreign oceangoing commerce. This percentage has been decreasing steadily since then until it is now just 20 percent.

The implications of this trend are too serious to be ignored. The United States is the greatest trading nation in the world today. We exported last year one-fifth of the world's total export trade of $100 billion.

We are heavily dependent upon the sea, and this demands not only that we control the sea but also that we have the means to use the sea. This means ships under effective American control.

Both in peace and in war, a strong American merchant marine is essential to the strength and well-being of our country.

Commendation of Federal Bureau of Investigation by National Commander of American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Hon. Preston J. Moore, national commander of the American Legion, commending the FBI and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY PRESTON J. MOORE, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION

At its 40th national convention in Chicago last September, the American Legion went on record commending both the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, for their vigilance and effectiveness in protecting our Nation and its people from Communist subversion, while at the same time, respecting the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

Since that time I have been asked on many occasions, "Why was it necessary to reiterate a confidence in the FBI and Mr. Hoover shared by every loyal American?"

The answer is that there are some individuals in this country and certain publications determined to discredit the FBI and its Director. It is difficult to attribute any purpose to these attacks other than a desire to destroy this Federal law enforcement agency and its leader as an effective deterrent to undetected, unopposed Communist subversion in this country.

That a deliberate smear Hoover and the FBI campaign, similar to the Communist Party's unsuccessful efforts of 1940, has been launched is no mere supposition.

The entire October issue of Rights magazine, the official publication of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, branded by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee as a Communist front organization, is devoted to an article, "The FBI and Your Freedoms." It is, of course, a biased, one-sided attack on the FBI, distinguished only by its omission of any reference to communism's denial of human dignity or humanitarianism.

Coincidentally, or so the timing suggests, a recent issue of The Nation magazine featured an article by Fred J. Cook, attempting to discredit the FBI. Some reviewers have evaluated this piece as 60 pages of distortion, half-truths and innuendoes.

Finally, and most significantly, former FBI agents have been approached recently by reporters of the New York Post seeking derogatory material on J. Edgar Hoover. These reporters have extended their beat to Paris, France, in what is obviously a far-flung and must be a discouraging attempt to do a character-assassination job on Mr. Hoover.

Evidently the initial failure of this mission resulted in the New York Post stepping up its major effort in Operation Gumshoe back in the States. Apparently forgetting, at least momentarily, that they were supposed to obtain information, not reveal it, reporters for the paper disclosed to unquestionably reliable New York sources that the Post plans to assign reporters to Washington, D.C., and other cities to skulk around restaurants and other public places in the hope of digging up information that could be used against Hoover and the FBI.

The American Legion believes that the American people will not permit their justified confidence in Mr. Hoover and the FBI to be compromised by scurrilous distortions and half-truths. Nor will they allow irresponsible journalism to blind them to the need for continued FBI investigation of the dangerous Communist conspiracy in this country.

Mr. Hoover and the FBI have earned the gratitude and trust of every American. They ask only that they be permitted to continue their essential and effective efforts to protect our country and all of our people from Communist subversion.

The American Legion believes they should be given this right. We believe that our people should reaffirm their faith in Hoover and the FBI by insisting that they push more vigorously than ever their investigation and exposure of the Communist traitors in our midst. We hope that the American press which, with a few tragic exceptions, is commendably patriotic, will continue to give J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI their necessary and persuasive editorial vote of confidence.

Labor Reform and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial published on January 29, 1959, in the Chattanooga Times. This thoughtful editorial makes a convincing demonstration of the need for action on the Kennedy-Ervin bill and the desirability of separating labor reform and labor relations legislation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR REFORM AND POLITICS

The differences between the labor reform bill introduced last week by Senator KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and the measure called for in President Eisenhower's special message yesterday are more a matter of extent than intent. This is of significance, lest the needed changes advocated by both be obscured, then lost in a welter of political charges and countercharges.

Senator KENNEDY was explicit in his purpose. "This is primarily a labor-management reform bill," he said, "dealing with the problems of dishonest racketeering; it is not a bill on industrial relations, dealing with the problems of collective bargaining and economic power. The two areas of legislation should not be confused or combined."

With that in mind, Senator KENNEDY did not include proposals to amend the Taft-Hartley Act, which is the basic law in the area of labor-management relations. Instead, he said, he would seek the advice of a panel of experts in the field and introduce needed amendments to Taft-Hartley later to be considered on their merits.

Several of the Kennedy and Eisenhower proposals are parallel in purpose, including provisions to insure fair elections of union officials, regular inspection of financial records with penalties for misuse of union funds or destruction of certain records and closer supervision of union affairs by the Secretary of Labor with additional authority to move decisively to eliminate corruption in union ranks.

If anything the Kennedy bill goes further by specifically prohibiting persons convicted of serious crimes from serving as union officers and spelling out additional safeguards against improper management of local unions by the parent organizations through so-called trusteeships.

Mr. Eisenhower went on to call for changes in the Taft-Hartley Act clauses covering certain types of picketing and secondary boycotts, among other things. It was precisely this field that Senator KENNEDY said should be covered separately in order that the anti-racketeering measure not become bogged down in consideration of the broader aspects of labor-management relations.

In this respect then, Mr. Eisenhower's characterization of the Kennedy bill as a halfway measure seems unfair and may be a political maneuver designed to offset the Senator's advantage in having introduced the first bill.

There is need for sensible revision of labor-relations laws, based on experience as well as revelation of union corruption, and there is room for recommendations from both sides of the aisle. But, as exhibited last year, the need cannot survive the play of pure politics.

The Case of Povl Bang-Jensen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column, These Days, by George E. Sokolsky, which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald, Wednesday, February 4, 1959.

In his penetrating analysis entitled, "Bang-Jensen and the U.N.," Mr. Sokolsky reveals many important facts about the particular case of Povl Bang-Jensen. I place such importance on the information contained in this column that I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a further means of alerting the American people to this situation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS—BANG-JENSEN AND THE U.N.
(By George E. Sokolsky)

What does membership in the United Nations mean? Is this a body in which a member state, particularly one that pays a large part of the expenses of running the institution, has nothing to say?

An American citizen addressed a letter to the American Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, concerning the dismissal of Povl Bang-Jensen, a United Nations official, a citizen of Denmark, who was entrusted with taking testimony from Hungarian refugees. Bang-Jensen was authorized to guarantee the witnesses that their names would be disclosed to no one and he gave the guarantee. Ultimately, he was dismissed from the United Nations for refusing to give up the names of these witnesses whose relatives would have been murdered, to say the least.

A reply was sent to my correspondent by Stephen Lancaster, who signs himself Public Affairs Officer:

"The status of Mr. Bang-Jensen in relation to the United Nations is strictly a matter between the Secretary General of the United Nations and Mr. Bang-Jensen, who is a citizen of a foreign country, Denmark. It does not call for any comment by the United States representative to the United Nations. In fact, it would be improper for him to appear to trespass on a matter involving Denmark. Similarly it would be regarded as unwelcome interference if a foreign power took an active interest in a case involving a U.S. employee of the United Nations. You may recall Mr. Lodge's effort to eliminate disloyal Americans from employment by the United Nations in 1953. This was regarded as a matter between the United States and the Secretary General, one in which intercession by a foreign government would have been improper."

This is a case which does not particularly involve Denmark, and the fact that Bang-Jensen is a Danish citizen is incidental. The case involves the dignity and honor of the United Nations and all the members thereof. The United States as a member and the largest dues payer to the United Nations cannot avoid responsibility for the administrative conduct of that body. If Bang-Jensen were a citizen of Patagonia or Ghana or any place, the principles at issue would be the same; namely, that when an official of the United Nations takes testimony from individuals on the guarantee that the names of the witnesses would be kept from the persecutor of his country, that promise must be inviolate. Bang-Jensen was not acting in this capacity as a Dane; he acted as an official of the United Nations.

What is the role of the Secretary General of the United Nations? He represents no country. He is a hired administrative official who is assigned to the housekeeping functions of a growing organization which can only exist as long as there is no war. The first Secretary General was Trygve Lie, a Norwegian, who tried to establish the position of Secretary General as a kind of head of the universe. He was tactful and avoided projecting himself beyond the terms of the Charter.

The second Secretary General is Dag Hammarskjold, a Swede, who seeks to build his position into something more than mere administration. He has in some measure succeeded because the exigencies of the times, the cold war, require a neutral to perform tasks, regarding which there can be considerable distrust. Many do not regard Hammarskjold as a neutral, but rather as one who would pay any price to keep the United Nations afloat. And of course, the biggest price that must be paid, if Russia is to remain in that body, is to favor Russia over the United States.

Bang-Jensen is a victim of that attitude. The Russians demanded his scalp because he would not disclose the names of his witnesses. The whole matter became administratively difficult. To give the list of Hungarians even to Dag Hammarskjold would mean that it would become available to all Iron Curtain personnel on the administrative staff of the United Nations; to refuse to obey Hammarskjold is insubordination. Therefore Bang-Jensen was fired.

Lancaster's explanation, which is probably a form letter, does not hold water. It is an alibi and therefore meaningless. An honest answer would have been: "The Russians have our hands tied. We don't want to start anything."

The Talmadge Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Sane Program in Store?" from the January 30, 1959, issue of the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SANE PROGRAM IN STORE?

The administration's limp proposals for farm aid legislation make the bill offered by Senator HERMAN TALMADGE look all the better.

President Eisenhower Thursday sent to Congress a message calling for some changes in existing programs but offering nothing really new or far reaching.

The President's message had about it the same tired look that has adorned other administration congressional efforts this season.

Senator TALMADGE has introduced a measure which would provide for a major overhaul of present farm policies. His proposal would put free enterprise back down on the farm and yet give the farmer reasonable governmental assistance.

The dynamic nature of the Talmadge bill already has gained it the approval and support of major Democratic powers. The peaked nature of the Eisenhower proposals undoubtedly will deliver up even more support for the Senator's program.

It's too early to predict anything but prospects appear to be growing bright for sane farm legislation at last.

Legality of Adoption of 14th Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on February 3, there appeared in the Washington Evening Star an illuminating article by the able and widely read columnist, David Lawrence, on the subject of the legality of the adoption of the 14th amendment and other related questions. This article carries a serious challenge that should be met with forthrightness. It should have wide circulation, and I therefore ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEGRATION AND THE CONSTITUTION—LEGALITY OF THE 14TH AMENDMENT AS BASIS OF DESEGREGATION QUESTIONED

(By David Lawrence)

The people of Virginia are not happy over the enforced integration of their public schools. They feel they are being coerced into doing something against their will. They have been told the Constitution is "what the people of the United States say it is." But is it always? In no State of the Union have the people ever voted to approve any change in the Constitution that requires integration or desegregation in the public schools.

Nine men sitting in the Supreme Court of the United States have, however, said they interpret the 14th amendment to require desegregation in the public schools.

But did the people ever ratify the 14th amendment by the method prescribed by the Constitution—namely, by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and three-fourths of the States, either through their legislatures or constitutional conventions?

The historians tell us this wasn't done. The Secretary of State who proclaimed the 14th amendment in 1868 frankly expressed his doubts as to whether it had been legally ratified.

Upon what were these doubts based? Abraham Lincoln had said the Union was indissoluble and that no State could secede. When the War Between the States was over, President Johnson, in May 1865, formally proclaimed amnesty to former rebels and established provisional governments in the Southern States. During that summer, new State legislatures and Members of Congress were elected. All these governments in the South—except one—ratified the 13th amendment, abolishing slavery. Their ratification was accepted as legal. So they were unquestionably in the Union.

When, however, Congress met in December 1865, all the Senators and Representatives from the Southern States, except Tennessee, were excluded from both Houses of Congress. Nevertheless, the 14th amendment was voted on by Congress and was formally submitted to the States in June 1866. Ten Southern States rejected it.

Congress thereupon passed a law putting the South under military rule and specifically ordering the States to ratify the amendment or remain excluded from the Union. The President vetoed the bill and called it plainly unconstitutional, but it was passed over his veto. Federal troops took command of the State legislatures in the South.

Under military rule, the Southern States—with their legislatures composed largely of Negroes, because most of the white voters had been disenfranchised—ratified the 14th amendment. W. E. Woodward in his "American History," one of the best known of the standard school textbooks—published in 1936, long before the present acute controversy arose—says the "ratifications were obtained at the point of the bayonet." Historians are unanimous about the facts.

Up to 1896 not a single court of importance held that the separate but equal idea for public schools was a violation of the Federal Constitution. In fact, the highest courts of several States, including Massachusetts, Ohio, and New York, repeatedly upheld the "separate but equal" doctrine as conforming to the Federal Constitution. Even the same Congress which had ordered the 14th amendment ratified by the South under military coercion passed a law providing for segregated public schools in the District of Columbia. Yet the present Supreme Court of the United States, before its 1954 decision, asked for testimony on the intent of the framers of the 14th amendment, and then called the facts as submitted "inconclusive."

The truth is the present Court followed precedent in declining to examine the legality of the process by which the 14th amendment was allegedly ratified. Every time anyone has tried to get the previous Justices to examine the issue—and this has happened several times—the matter has been turned aside as political. No decision has ever been rendered by the Supreme Court on the merits of the case. This was doubtless due to the feeling that, if ever passed upon, the amendment would have to be declared illegal.

But why turn the clock back to 1868? This question is often asked, and it is answered by asking another question: Why in 1954 turn the clock back to 1896 to invalidate the doctrine of separate but equal which was for 58 years the law of the land?

This correspondent attended an integrated public school, both in the elementary grades and in high school, and would gladly attend one again if he were a student. If a constitutional amendment were proposed that would permit the States to deal with this subject, this writer would vote for such an amendment. If the 14th amendment were adopted today by the States, and it specifically forbade segregation, this writer would welcome it as an expression of the free will of the people uncoerced by bayonets and representing the desires of the American electorate.

In the absence of any Supreme Court decision to the contrary, the 14th amendment is assumed to be valid. This means Federal court orders based on its provisions must be obeyed. But no State is denied the right to try by legal means any form of circumvention to achieve its objectives. This is lawful until the court in each case specifically rules otherwise.

Meanwhile, can America afford to let the record of fraud and coercion stand as it is before the world—or will a troubled conscience some day make the people of the United States square that record by a lawfully adopted amendment to the Constitution?

Antarctica's Value to Nation Increasing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the old saying "It's a small world" is being graphically proved now in Antarctica. Mention of this frozen land still conjures pictures of snowy wastes inhabited only by penguins and a few hardy explorers.

From 1954 to now, approximately 10,000 Americans have been in the Antarctic, thanks to Operation Deep Freeze and other activities. And we are there to stay; not as mere visitors, but as keeping permanent bases there. The value of this region for scientific, business, and defensive purposes is becoming more and more recognized throughout the world. The Russians also have bases in Antarctica.

In recognition of the importance of this vital region, I have cosponsored a bill to create the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission.

Due to atmospheric conditions, scientists say the Antarctic is the best place in the world from which to launch devices bound for outer space. In addition, the area is of supreme significance in assuring our national security, particularly when we are under threat of guided missile attack. And thirdly, uranium and copper have been found and there is a great deal of marine life in the water surrounding the Antarctic Continent. I am confident further exploration will uncover other facets of economic value. There may be other scientific advantages locked in this 5½ million square mile area.

I feel our Nation should take immediate action to capitalize on the considerable investments we have made and will continue to make in Antarctica. It would be a practical move from the scientific, economic, and defensive standpoints.

Mr. President, in support of this, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Jim G. Lucas which was published in the Washington Daily News for Tuesday, January 20, 1959, under

the heading: "Eight Nations To Stay in Antarctica."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EIGHT NATIONS TO STAY IN ANTARCTICA—TYREE WILL COMMAND U.S. FORCE

(By Jim G. Lucas)

At least 8 of the 12 nations which established Antarctic bases during the International Geophysical Year—including the United States and Russia—intend to remain there indefinitely, Rear Adm. David Tyree said today.

Admiral Tyree will take over as commander of Operation Deep Freeze, the American Antarctic force, in April. He will succeed Rear Adm. George Dufek, who is retiring.

The permanent Antarctic community will include parties from the United States, Russia, New Zealand, Australia, Argentina, Great Britain, France, and Sweden.

ENIWETOK

Admiral Tyree until recently was deputy of U.S. forces at the Eniwetok nuclear testing grounds and commander of Joint Task Force Seven, the naval supply force in those tropical waters. He flew to Washington last weekend after his first visit to the Antarctic.

Admiral Dufek will remain in command until the last ships are out of the ice, probably in March. After the changeover, Tyree will remain here working on future programs. He plans to fly to the Antarctic in August or September.

Admiral Tyree said we will leave approximately 150 scientists and military personnel in the Antarctic to winter in at four stations. These are at the South Pole, McMurdo Sound, Byrd, and Hallet. The United States is turning its base at Ellsworth over to Argentina and its Wilkes base to Australia.

REDS EXPANDING

The Russians will maintain four, perhaps five, bases. Admiral Tyree said the Russians not only intend to stay, but are expanding the operation. But he said our force of 150 men will be, by far, the largest in the Antarctic this winter.

The 18-month International Geophysical Year ended December 31 and its scientific functions temporarily have been transferred to the National Science Foundation. Admiral Tyree said there is some thought of setting up a permanent American Antarctic Foundation.

He said our interest in the frozen continent is primarily scientific. Studies will be made this winter into meteorology, minerals, glaciology, the ionosphere, and cosmic rays.

To date, he said, approximately 10,000 Americans have been in the Antarctic, beginning with the first trip of the icebreaker *Atka* in 1954. Deep Freeze has cost between $75 million and $85 million.

The Navy is making surveys looking to the construction of a permanent airfield near McMurdo Sound, and some estimates of its cost run as high as $300 million.

Address by Hon. Herman E. Talmadge, of Georgia, Before the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address which I delivered on Tuesday, February 3, 1959, at the 29th annual convention luncheon of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, held at the Mayflower Hotel, in Washington, D.C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSTITUTION AND RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT

(Text of remarks of Hon. HERMAN E. TALMADGE, of Georgia, in addressing the 29th annual convention luncheon of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies held in Washington, D.C.)

President Lory, distinguished guests and members of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, to have the privilege of sharing this significant occasion with you is a twofold pleasure for me.

Not only is it a great honor for which I am deeply and humbly grateful but, even more important, it affords me the desired opportunity to express to you and the societies you represent my profound gratitude for the assistance and support which you gave me, as a freshman Senator, in obtaining an unmistakable expression of public sentiment on the question of freedom of debate in the Senate.

The 364-page printed transcript of testimony, statements, and letters compiled by the special subcommittee of which I was chairman during the 85th Congress was the most comprehensive presentation of public sentiment on limitation of debate ever assembled. It was an impressive and convincing document which confirmed my long-held belief that the rank and file of the American public consider free debate in the Senate a vital safeguard of individual liberty in this country.

While I personally was opposed to any change in the Senate's rule governing cloture, I am pleased to report to you that the revisions made will not affect materially the right of any Senator to speak out in defense of the viewpoint of his State and people. Furthermore, I am convinced that the addition of a new provision recognizing for the first time in the rules of the Senate the body's constitutional continuity more than offsets the changes which were made.

Considered in balance, I believe those of us who adhere to the concept that the Senate is a continuing repository of State sovereignty on the national level won an impressive victory for constitutional government—a victory in which you of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies can take particular pride for the invaluable role which you played in making it possible.

I want to thank each of you here today as representatives of your individual organizations for the magnificent way in which you acted to bolster our defense of constitutional fundamentals. And I especially want to express my gratitude to your alert and able executive secretary, Mrs. Leetch, for her indefatigable efforts in seeing that you and, through you, your organizations and citizens at the grassroots level throughout the Nation were fully informed about the ramifications of the issue. She is doing an outstanding job for you and the Nation.

It is most gratifying and encouraging to those of us in Congress who subscribe to the philosophy that responsible government is the product of strict adherence to the Constitution of the United States word for word as it is written to know that we are backed in our position by dedicated organizations with truly national memberships like the American Coalition. I wish this country had 100 more groups like yours to espouse the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States and I am confident that if we had them the affairs of our Nation, both foreign and domestic, would not be in their present sad state.

The Declaration of Independence was written to give expression to the principles which our forefathers learned from bitter experience were essential to the maintenance of liberty and the Constitution was drafted and ratified to perpetuate those principles for posterity.

Under them the United States was founded as a nation in which government at all levels would be the least government necessary to do for the people what the people could not do for themselves.

Under them the United States was founded as a nation which respected the rights and integrity of other nations and demanded that it be accorded the same respect.

Under them the United States was founded as a nation dedicated to faith in God and the right of the individual to achieve his highest destiny under God consistent with the right of every other individual to do the same.

So long as the United States adhered to those founding principles, it grew, prospered, and was respected throughout the world.

But in recent years the United States has departed from those founding principles and, as a result, its economy is deteriorating, the rights of its people are being circumscribed and it is losing the respect of the other nations of the world.

In foreign affairs we have taken the position that we are always right and everyone else is always wrong. We have undertaken to try to make the world over in our own image and in so doing have sought to substitute words for wisdom, dollars for deeds, and bluster for good faith.

In domestic affairs we have countenanced the development of the philosophy that an all-powerful Central Government is better qualified to manage the affairs of the people than are the people themselves. In so doing we have sanctioned an ever-encroaching Federal bureaucracy which is steering the Nation on the road to bankruptcy and totalitarianism.

In personal affairs we have built unto ourselves false gods of creature comforts and have become so preoccupied with an all-consuming quest for security that we have forgotten the words of the Psalmist that "blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."

Is it any wonder then that our enemies depict us throughout the world as a nation of neurotic, meddling busybodies who attempt to buy what we are unable to earn and to preach what we ourselves are unwilling to practice?

Is it any wonder then that we are burdened with a taxload which borders on confiscation and a national debt which has mortgaged future generations and that government by laws enacted by the elected representatives of the people has given way to government by executive decree, judicial edict, and Federal bayonet?

Is it any wonder then that we have become a Nation plagued by stomach ulcers and heart attacks in which personal debt and national crime have reached all-time records and the Golden Rule is something which is used only to print on advertising rulers?

The sum total of the experience of mankind is that the inevitable result of the failure to profit by the mistakes of the past is to repeat them in the future.

Distressing as it is to admit, we in the United States seem bent upon proving that we have learned nothing from the past of either our own or any other nation.

What other conclusion can be drawn from the plain facts that the policies which we are following at home and abroad are diametrically opposed to the principles upon which our country was founded and are parallel to the courses which have brought

about the downfall of every other major world power in history?

The apologists for our present course of personal and political expediency seek to promote their ends through the coercion of conformity and the intimidation of labels. Their reply to criticism is to call the critic a reactionary or worse and to plead in the name of their brand of pseudo-progress that changing times and changing conditions have made our founding fundamentals obsolete.

They would have the American people believe that the Constitution of the United States is an accordion which can be contracted or expanded to play any tune which might be popular at any time rather than the music by which the instrument is supposed to be played.

The lessons of the past give the lie to those constitutional improvisers.

They choose either to forget or deliberately to ignore that the collapse of Roman law under the weight of a decadent bureaucracy heralded the conquest of Rome by the barbarians.

They choose either to forget or deliberately to ignore that the attempt of the British Empire to extend its control over the world reduced Britain to national bankruptcy, state socialism, and military impotence.

They choose either to forget or deliberately to ignore that every nation in the history of the world which has sought to control the destiny of the world at the expense of its own citizens has fallen from within or without.

It could happen to the United States unless we change our course.

It will happen to Soviet Russia unless that country changes its course.

The advocates of our present course maintain there is no alternative.

I emphatically reject that philosophy of fatalism.

There is an alternative to a foreign policy based upon the inevitability of world conflict.

There is an alternative to a domestic policy based upon the regimentation of people and resources.

There is an alternative to a personal philosophy based upon physical existence as an end unto itself.

That alternative is simply expressed in the development of an America so strong militarily, economically, and spiritually that any nation choosing to attack us invites not retaliation but annihilation.

And it is an alternative which can be realized only in a return to the principles of individual freedom, free-enterprise economy, and government on all levels which is the servant, not the master, of the people.

The cause of our present national dilemma is what Thomas Jefferson characterized as "more machinery of government than is necessary."

With the exception of the external menace of communism, all of the ills and problems of the United States can be summarized in the one phrase—too much government.

The American economy is suffering from too much government.

We have 48-cent dollars and face the prospect of 10-cent dollars as the result of ever-broadening governmental policies and programs which are bankrupting our Nation and mortgaging our future.

American prestige abroad is suffering from too much government.

We find ourselves despised and distrusted throughout most of the world as the result of our continued interference in the affairs of other nations through our various bureaucratic and paternalistic programs of spending and instruction.

The American people themselves are suffering from too much government.

The mushrooming Federal establishment, like quicksand claiming its victim, is steadily embracing more and more affairs traditionally and constitutionally regarded as local matters and as a result the individual citizen finds himself with less and less voice in the conduct of his local government and its institutions.

I cannot bring myself to believe that the majority of American people approve of the current philosophy that central governments must be all things to all men and do all things for all men.

To the contrary, the mail which I receive from all sections of the Nation indicates to me that the average citizen is gravely concerned about the present course of our Nation and the consequences of pursuing it to its ultimate conclusion.

It is my belief that the American people want to see the Federal budget balanced and the Nation's economy stabilized.

It is my belief that the American people want the United States to cease doing for people in other countries what it either is unable or unwilling to do for our own citizens here at home.

It is my belief that the American people want the Federal Government to confine its activities to those areas reserved to it by the Constitution and leave the management of all other affairs to local people on the local level.

It is my belief that the American people want above all else for the United States to be made militarily and economically secure and for themselves to be left alone to run their own affairs and enjoy the fruits of their own labors.

Our present course offers only one of three ultimate conclusions: conquest from without, collapse from within or development here in the United States of a totalitarian government as reprehensible as that which exists in the Soviet Union.

It is incomprehensible to me that free men and women living in a free society will choose to wait supinely for either of the first two consequences or to countenance passively the implementation of the latter.

I choose rather to believe with Thomas Jefferson that:

"The people may be misled or deceived for a time, but where the avenues of truth are open there men will learn to reject what is false and harmful. Where the people are well informed, they can be trusted with their own government; whenever things get so far wrong as to attract public notice they may be relied upon to set them to rights."

Throughout the Nation there is a growing awakening to the dangers inherent in our country's present policies and a swelling voice for a recognition of the lessons of the past through a return to the fundamentals of constitutional, republican government.

I feel with all my being that the American people already would have expressed themselves in favor of such a return to fundamentals had they had a clear-cut choice at the polls.

They certainly did not have it last November and frankness compels the observation that the overwhelming sweep of the Democratic Party was less an endorsement of its program than it was a repudiation of the Republican Party for its failure to act decisively to solve the Nation's problems.

Perhaps the saddest aspect of our present situation is that at this critical juncture in our national life, we of the United States have no one in a position of top executive responsibility to whom we can look for dynamic and imaginative leadership to thwart the spread of inflation and regimentation at home and to deal with the threat of communism abroad.

But I have unlimited faith in the desire and willingness of the American people to demand that their national house be set in order and I believe that that desire and willingness is not far from making itself felt.

In a constitutional republic such as ours, the masses may not be immediately articulate, but once given leaders and leadership they are swift in making their wishes felt and known.

A fact which must never be discounted is that the essence of our concept of constitutional government is, from the words of the Declaration of Independence, that our National Government derives its "just powers from the consent of the governed."

It is true that policies and programs can be initiated and sometimes even carried out without the "consent of the governed" but ultimately, as always has been the case in our national life, the will of the people has overwhelmed the efforts of those who sought to frustrate or circumvent it.

The most serious constitutional problem to confront our Nation since the War Between the States is the direct result of the failure of those in responsible positions of leadership in all three branches of the Federal Government to take into account the fact that governmental programs and policies to be implemented successfully must square with the "consent of the governed."

I refer to the present effort to force a new social order upon an entire region of our Nation by judicial constitutional amendment.

It is my firm conviction that the historians of the future in looking back upon the present time will record as one of the gravest and most costly mistakes of our national life the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States to usurp unto itself authority to make judicial questions out of matters of human relations which should be left to the orderly processes of evolution.

I say that, my friends, because, unless Congress acts soon and decisively to resolve that issue on a realistic, constitutional basis, the inevitable result will be the destruction of public education throughout the South. And, engaged as we are in a life-or-death struggle with the forces of world communism, the United States cannot under any circumstances afford to permit such a tragic consequence to rob it of the minds and talents of a great segment of its youth.

The answer is not to be found in the use of Federal bayonets, Federal control of education, or rearing a generation in ignorance.

My long and serious study of the question has convinced me that—feelings on the subject being as strong and as inflamed as they are on both sides—there is only one solution compatible with constitutional concepts to which all persons of all shades of opinion can subscribe.

That solution is to invoke our heritage of "consent of the governed" by amending the Constitution of the United States to give the people on the State and local level the right to determine for themselves the manner in which the issue will be solved in their localities.

It was with that in mind that I last week stood before the Senate and, with all the sincerity of my being, proposed a constitutional amendment which would read as follows:

"Administrative control of any public school, public educational institution, or public educational system operated by any State or by any political or other subdivision thereof, shall be vested exclusively in such State and subdivision and nothing contained in this Constitution shall be construed to deny to the residents thereof the right to determine for themselves the manner in which any such school, institution, or system is administered by such State and subdivision."

The adoption of such an amendment would settle the question for all times and rid the Nation of a divisive issue which threatens to tear it asunder.

That is true because such a provision in our Constitution would leave the citizens of each State and locality free to make their own decisions in accordance with local conditions and prevailing attitudes as to how

and when their schools would comply with the Supreme Court's school decision.

That is true because such a provision in our Constitution would prevent destruction of the public schools of the South and would end for all time any threat from any quarter of Federal control of education.

That is true because such a provision in our Constitution would assure uninterrupted instruction for all the children of this country regardless of their color or place of residence.

That is true because such a provision in our Constitution would permit either retention of the status quo or orderly change as dictated by the requirements of public opinion and make certain that whatever change might take place would be by the constructive process of evolution rather than the destructive process of revolution.

That is true because such a provision in our Constitution would create a basis for unity throughout the Nation at a time when it is vitally important that we present a united front before our enemies.

The public schools of the United States are local institutions which have been established and are operated and financed by local people on the local level and all persons willing to view the question dispassionately will admit that to fulfill their role they must be administered on the local level in accordance with the wishes of the parents of the children attending them.

I do not believe there is any person who is genuinely concerned about the future of our Nation and the education of all its children who cannot and will not subscribe to the proposition of local control of schools.

And it is on that basis that I have appealed to all Americans—particularly to the parents of school-age children—to let their wishes on this subject be known to their Senators and Congressmen. It is an appeal which I reiterate here today and urge that you take it back with you to the citizens and organizations of your respective communities throughout the Nation.

I am convinced that if the public will express itself on this question the result will be to give the 86th Congress a mandate to afford the people of America an opportunity to amend the Constitution to assure for all time to come that control of the public schools shall forever remain in the hands of local people on the local level.

Our heritage as free Americans is that our Government's foundations rest upon the will of the people.

It is a heritage of which we are proud and which the entire world respects.

It is a heritage to which we must adhere if we are to succeed in passing it uncompromised to our children and their children after them.

It is a heritage which is to be put to an acid test in the issues now confronting our country.

Those of us who believe in responsible, constitutional government have our work cut out for us if we are to preserve that heritage.

With our faith in Almighty God and our feet firmly planted on the rock of the Constitution, I am supremely confident that we shall not fail.

I thank you.

Arthur E. (Gus) Cook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast by Joseph McCaffrey reporting on "Today in Congress" for the Independent Airlines Association, Friday night, January 16:

A lot of people lost a wonderful friend today.

"Gus" Cook, who spend 60 years on Capitol Hill, died early today. He was 85.

"Gus" was Assistant Architect of the Capitol.

He came to the Capitol as a $1.50 a day laborer—that was back in 1898.

He knew them all in that time. When he came to the Hill, William McKinley was President.

For the last 30 years or more it was "Gus" Cook who served as the official greeter for the Presidents when they arrived to deliver their state-of-the-Union messages.

During World War II, it was Cook who was responsible for security at the Capitol. And he was the key man in the security arrangements for all the Presidents on their visits to the Hill.

Time and time again reporters, this one included, have tried to persuade "Gus" to let them write about his experiences and about the people he knew, as he knew them. But he always turned down the requests.

Only about 6 months ago I talked to "Gus" about this and after he turned me down he said, "Don't worry, Joe. When I get ready to let some one write about me, I'll tell you and I'll answer all your questions."

But this is the only chance I ever had to write about him—and my questions are still unanswered.

Britain's Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Sunday, February 1, 1959. The author of the letter Mr. O. R. Strackbein, is acknowledged to be one of the foremost proponents in this country for the protection of the jobs of American workmen from the effects of unlimited importation of foreign-produced goods.

BRITAIN'S POLICY

I have been much impressed by the great to-do that has been made over the failure of our Government to award an electrical equipment contract to British manufacturers who were low bidders. Even the British Ambassador to this country has expressed dismay over such inconsistency in our policy.

British newspapers have flayed us for similar reasons and have mentioned the close alliance between our two countries as a backdrop, the better to highlight our faithlessness.

It has also been said that we were motivated by crass poltical considerations. Senator HUGH SCOTT, while campaigning for election, apparently gave assurances to business-hungry voters that the contract would be awarded to a Pennsylvania firm, Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp., as it later turned out to be.

What a shame, indeed, that candidates for office should come bearing gifts to voters in the form of promises and assurances. What further shame that the money voted by American taxpayers should be spent in the United States to give employment to Americans out of work.

These complaints only show how far we have gone in fanning the expectations of those who look to us for favors from abroad. The British Ambassador, indeed, said quite clearly that if we had no intention of awarding public contracts to foreign bidders we should not invite bids from them.

He has a point there, and a good one.

Let us turn to page 477 of the printed hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee on Renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, February 17 to March 7, 1958. The following testimony is found there: "For example, since its creation in 1947, the Central Electrical Authority of Great Britain has limited its procurement of power and transmission equipment to domestic suppliers because, as its official report to a parliamentary committee of inquiry states: 'It would be unwise for the electricity supply industry (of England and Wales) to be dependent upon foreign manufacturers for spares and maintenance.'"

Now, that is straight to the point, forthright, and admirable. It shows clearly that we could learn from the English; and we would not be in the present hassle.

In your editorial of January 24 you say that "a strong odor of fish emanates from the denial of a turbine contract to the English Electric Co. on national security grounds." That company's bid, you say, was 19 percent below that of Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton.

Should there be any wonder that the English company could underbid by 19 percent when its wages are about a half to two-thirds below those paid by electrical and other companies in this country? Do you want our wages cut to the European level, or what have you in mind?

O. R. STRACKBEIN,
Chairman, Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy.

Tribute to Hon. Norris Cotton, of New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Concord Daily Monitor relative to my colleague [NORRIS COTTON] entitled "COTTON'S Big Job."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COTTON'S BIG JOB

Senator COTTON has won appointment to the powerful Senate Finance Committee which deals, primarily, with Government financing. And what it does also involves taxation.

It is pleasant to think that there is a possibility of Federal tax reductions. There is hope this can be accomplished by the obviously painful and difficult process of budget balancing, but it would be welcomed by any other method the Government can devise.

Just about everyone, from the troubled business managers to the man or woman of moderate income feels the strong pinch, year by year, of Federal tax requirements. Everyone wants taxes reduced, but the best guess is that it will not be brought about in the immediate future.

In Congress there are pronounced Democratic and liberal Republican tendencies to pile on perhaps billions above Eisenhower's suggested budget. There are powerful pressures spurred on by results of the recent congressional elections.

There are demands for more rocket and missile production and research, for higher unemployment relief, for aid to seriously depressed areas. There is talk of vastly expanded Federal aid to education and of providing free hospital and medical care for millions of social security beneficiaries.

Eisenhower's $77 billion spending means $1 out of every $5 the American people earn. And these Americans already know that inflation means rising costs for all housewives and a falling value in pay envelopes.

When he was informed of his appointment to the Finance Committee, COTTON said he believed taxation is one of the most serious problems the country faces. There will be widespread endorsement of this observation.

Taxes must come largely from privately generated income. The burden is a heavy one. The taxpayer cannot be blamed for wondering where it will all end of for reacting with a black rage against taxes of any description.

COTTON and other members of his committee face difficulties. They will be urged to spend more, not less. They will be told the public demand for Government services has priority over a spending pattern based on thrift.

Broad scale tax reductions may not be just around the corner. But easing, as far as possible, of the tax load could produce valuable results for the entire Nation.

Dan Flood Justifies Confidence With Work at Mine Catastrophe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent, February 1, 1959:

DAN FLOOD JUSTIFIES CONFIDENCE WITH WORK AT MINE CATASTROPHE

When the people of Luzerne County, in their wisdom, last year once again reelected DAN FLOOD they got more than a Congressman.

They got a man who, when the emergency arose, proved the one real leader available in these parts to serve them.

And if he does nothing more than what he did for the awful mine catastrophe at Port Griffith, when the river breakthrough threatened all the mines of the region, his would be a greater accomplishment than that of most of the other Congressmen who have been elected in recent times—in all of their combined terms.

It was a splendid service and proved that not only is the know-how of experience so valuable in the right hands but that you also need someone who has the force of character to make full use of it.

Actually, Congressman FLOOD was in charge of nothing at the scene of the accident.

In complete command was State Mine Inspector Daniel Connolly, who was assisted by other State men, Federal men, Army engineers, and Seabees.

But it was FLOOD who first and so quickly determined what could be done to help, where to get those who could help, how they could be combined into an effective team and then, serving as liaison man between Federal and State forces, brought them together.

And it was at the Friday night meeting in his office that the work was planned on a scale sufficiently massive to accomplish something.

Before that happened, the struggle that had been made was heroic but also an unequal one.

The resources, the power, and the equipment were just not of sufficient size and strength to make an impression against the almost limitless power of the raging waters.

However, the individuals did their best and the little towns gave their all as they struggled until the State and Federal powers were on the scene.

But in all that time, from beginning to end, most conspicuous by its complete absence was any effort or even sign of interest from the government of Luzerne County—the only local branch of government big enough and with sufficient resources really to try.

Yet not one county leader was in any small way even slightly concerned.

For All Who Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I wish to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial from the Baldwin (N.Y.) Citizen under date of January 29, 1959, commenting on a timely reminder by the American Legion of the wisdom of recognizing our responsibilities.

The editorial follows:

FOR ALL WHO CARE

The annual "For God and Country" telecast of the American Legion reminds all Americans—with especial force, this year—of the most vital issue of 20 centuries.

As we stand at the crossroads of history, and in the gathering storm that must revolve whether this world is to be God fearing or anti-God, the world's largest body of veteran fighting men asks us to stand up and be counted. It commands us to recall that from its faltering beginnings on the precarious edge of a wild man's wilderness, the strength of this Nation has flowed from God and been manifest in freedom of worship and respect for faith.

Against the shocking background of the recent visit of Anastas Mikoyan—the arch spy who directed the theft of U.S. atomic secrets, and the assassin of the victorious Hungarian freedom fighters—and the hospitality extended by Americans of prominence, we quote from the supplication of the Right Reverend Monsignor John J. Twiss, national chaplain of the Legion:

"Remind us, Lord God, of the pressing need today of reemphasizing, rather than shying away from, the word 'loyalty.'

"Warn us that the recent decline of this concept of loyalty can undermine the foundation of a free America—the family and the home—unless we return to those values and virtues that claimed the uncompromising allegiance of those who founded this Nation and made the struggle for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness irresistible and undeniable.

"Above all, help us to be passionately loyal to America and our way of life. Make us nonpartisan in our choice of programs and policies for the service of the Nation. Lord, may we always ask: 'What will best serve America as God wills that America be served?' "

Spiritually, the Nation endures again the discouragement of Valley Forge. And Americans may seek today, as General Washington sought then, the strength of divine guidance, or they may flee to the temporary warmth of indifference and expediency.

This is the critically timely message of the American Legion.

Kansas Observes 98th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 29, 1959, Kansas observed her 98th anniversary of her achievement of statehood. Since 1903 this day of January 29 has held special significance to all Kansans. It has been regularly observed on most of these years by schools, organizations and particularly by the Kansas Day Club. Although the Kansas Day Club does have a political connotation, its membership is open to all and the annual meetings are generally atended by Kansans from all parts of the State. The arrangements for the annual meeting in 1959 were largely taken care of by Mr. Richard D. Rogers, of Manhattan, the president. Among the distinguished guests attending this annual meeting was Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Fred A. Seaton.

One of the outstanding features of the program for the annual banquet of the Kansas Day Club was a testimonial to Kansas delivered by Ned Cushing from Downs, Kans. Little could I say that would describe this testimonial in addition to the persuasive phrases that it contains. Not only is it a testimonial to Kansas, but it also depicts the great trials that faced the pioneers of Kansas as well as the historical events that have left their mark in the history of our State.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert following my remarks this testimonial to Kansas by Mr. Cushing:

Mr. President, distinguished guests, fellow Republicans and Kansans, on this night, the 98th birthday of our great State, I ask that you pause briefly with me to review our "search for the stars."

Ad astra per aspera—to the stars through difficulties since the 1500's the way has been rough and hard for those who have made our great State what it is today, but the motto on our State seal tells us that if we ever expect to reach the stars we must overcome difficulties.

It thrills us to recall the great deeds of those who lived before us, and isn't it natural to wish we could have been present for those historic experiences? If it were possible to make a wish and have it come true, what would you choose?

To ride with Coronado's Spaniards and discover the Indians in the 1500's?

To sing with the French boatmen as they traded up and down the Kansas Rivers in the 1700's?

To explore with Lewis and Clark in the early 1800's, or maybe travel the Santa Fe, Oregon, and California Trails?

To take part in the chaotic, turbulent days of pro and anti slavery when Kansas was only a territory?

To see President Buchanan, on January 29, 1861, sign the Kansas Bill which admitted us to the Union under the Wyandotte Constitution as a child of the Republican Party?

To join those who came to Kansas by covered wagon, on horse, on foot, from the East, North and South, all "searching for the stars"?

Whatever your wish or whatever road to the stars you choose, none can deny that Kansas has had a splendid past as the child of free statehood, a land of variety and extremes, a land of promise and disappointment; all put together into one glorious heritage by the energy and intelligence of determined Kansans before us. A heritage that is ours today.

Yes; we have a legacy reaching back even to the very beginning; to the man who built the first dugout canoe; made the first wheel; fashioned the first instrument of metal; or raised his eyes in worship to the stars. The progress of Kansas as well as civilization has been uneven, but every generation can add something, be it little or much, to this heritage of the past. And today we face the greatest challenge history has ever known. Each one of us, as a trustee of the past, has the task of living up to our heritage and adding something to it.

Our search for the stars must not stop with our early history. How about our present and future Kansas? It is even more vital that we point with pride to what she is and will be than what she was.

In this century the skies are as blue, the clouds as white, the grass as green, the people as courageous, and the rainbows as full of promise as in the days of the pioneers. Kansas is not yet complete, and every time is a good time to live in if we know what to do with it. We should all be concerned about the future because that is where we will spend the remainder of our lives. The past is gone and static. Nothing we do can change it. The future is before us and dynamic. Everything we do will affect it. Each day brings with it new frontiers if we will only recognize them. Existence is a strange bargain. Life owes us little. We owe it everything. The only true happiness comes from dedicating ourselves to a purpose.

What better than to have as our purpose, now and for the future, to build a better and even more glorious Kansas? "Ad Astra per aspera." To search even harder for the stars through difficulties, toward the highest ideas of political, social, and moral excellence. There is politics written in almost every line of Kansas history and if we will make this motto not only the motto of Kansas but of the party which gave her birth and being, the Republican Party, we shall continue onward and upward through all difficulties to ultimate success.

To continue our search for the stars will mean untiring effort—it will require the utmost harmony—it will demand strict adherence to moral right—it will call for the strongest and ablest of leaders. The task will not be easy, but it can be done. We are saying with our presence here tonight that we will reach those stars.

And so, tonight I would propose,

Yes, of difficulties we've had our share
But Kansas is none the worse for the wear,
What's been done should not concern us most,
Rather look to the future as we end this toast.

Federal Government Largely to Blame for Housing Bias

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Rights Commission, on February 2, 1959 in New York City, began a study of racial discrimination in federally aided housing as well as in the private and public housing fields.

Walter L. Kirschenbaum, public relations director of the Jewish Labor Committee told a Workmen's Circle audience on February 1 at the Workmen's Circle Center, 615 Rittenhouse Street, Washington, D.C., that it was imperative for President Eisenhower to issue an immediate Executive order establishing a committee to aid in the abolishment of discrimination in federally aided housing. He said that such an order would become a beacon for State and municipal governments to follow in the private and public housing arena.

Mr. Kirschenbaum said that sordid housing conditions, created by neglect and apathy on the part of some landlords, had a direct bearing on the attitudes of these landlords toward minority groups.

Depressed areas—

He said—

are depressed because those who own the property have a contempt for those who tenant the buildings. Out of such conditions is spawned juvenile delinquency, racial tensions, moral decay.

There are Little Rock conditions—

Mr. Kirschenbaum said—

because real estate interests have been coddled. They have been permitted by law and by the apathy of public officialdom to destroy the basic tenets of human dignity: the right of human beings to live in peace together without regard to race, religion, or national origin. From segregated housing has also been spawned segregated schools.

Mr. Kirschenbaum said that—

It will become shockingly clear at the Monday and Tuesday hearings in New York, that minority groups are forced to live in ghettoized slums, their children forced to attended segregated and often inferior educational institutions, because decent housing is closed to them, and public housing is consistently under attack from real estate quarters and professional bigots and therefore scarce.

Conditions exist in New York State that cry out for legislative remedy. Existing laws, such as the Sharkey-Brown-Isaacs Law in New York City banning discrimination in private housing was passed in spite of vicious pressure from a combination of bigoted real estate interests and equally bigoted politicians who sought to curry favor for financial returns to political coffers. Right now, in Albany, highly placed officials in the Rockefeller administration are advising against the passage of the Metcalf-Baker Bill which would do on a State level what the New York City ordinance is designed to accomplish locally.

There is sufficient evidence—

Mr. Kirschenbaum said—

to indicate a conspiracy against minorities in the housing field. Such evil practices as coded listings of available apartments, hiking the rental of an apartment after a price had been agreed to, discouraging non-whites from residing in a community after a Negro family had moved in, or spreading vile and ugly rumors about Jews, Negroes, Puerto Ricans in order to create the ghetto atmosphere, are some of the devices employed.

Harry Belafonte's agent had been quoted one rental and Mr. Belafonte a higher one after the landlord learned of the singer's interest in becoming a tenant. In another case, the New York City Commission on Intergroup Relations successfully mediated a complaint brought by a Jewish family against a self-styled cooperative. Cooperatives under the United Housing Foundation which includes the major labor and fraternal organizations have pioneered in breaking the barrier of discrimination in their occupancy practices.

Ghettoes are monuments of shame, built on foundations of bigotry—

Mr. Kirschenbaum told his audience.

He cited examples in the District of Columbia, Chicago, New York State which, he said, "indicates that segregation is a national problem and not relegated to any geographical center."

The labor movement, especially through the AFL–CIO civil rights committee, is determined to crack not only the employment barriers of discrimination but the housing barriers as well. Long before a local law was passed in New York City, the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the Amalgamated Butcher Workmen, and the Hat, Cap, and Millinery Workers and the Workmen's Circle were sponsoring cooperative housing on a nonsegregated basis—

He said.

Mr. Kirschenbaum announced that the JLC position will be presented by the New York State Committee Against Discrimination in Housing at the Federal Commission hearing. The JLC is actively supporting the antibias housing committee.

In my opinion, Mr. Kirschenbaum's remarks are timely and his statements very informative. I fully agree with him.

Morris Cunningham's Articles on Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include three very ably written articles which appeared in the Commercial Appeal, published in Memphis, Tenn.

I had the great pleasure of serving with the author of the articles, Mr. Morris Cunningham, on the U.S. delegation to the ninth meeting of the council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration in Geneva, Switzerland. Mr. Cunningham's articles read as follows:

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Jan. 14, 1959]

REFUGEES: PERPETUAL RESULT OF CONSTANT WORLD TURMOIL

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, January 13.—Wars, revolutions and political coups and persecutions loose a continuing stream of refugees upon the rest of the world.

The size of the stream rises and falls in reasonable proportion to the political stability of the combined nations of the world.

For more than 20 years now it has stayed at a high level, falling in one area as peace is restored but rising elsewhere as a new conflict bursts forth.

Nazi persecutions in Germany, the Spanish civil war, Nazi conquests, World War II, Russia's seizure of the satellite countries, Russian persecutions, the Israeli-Arab conflicts, Communist conquest of China, the India-Pakistan division, Indochina, Indonesia, Korea, the revolt in Hungary, Algeria—these and other less-publicized conflicts have fed the stream of refugees, have put people in alien lands, looking for asylum and homes—old people, young people, sick people, healthy people; some good, some bad; some, no doubt, Communist agents.

The United States once was a generous host and a haven for the world's persecuted. Between 1820 and 1914, the United States accepted more than 32 million immigrants. This was in the days when populations and wars were smaller and when conflicts affected lesser numbers of people. In these years the United States served as a primary "escape hatch" for those refugees who had the means and the inclination to migrate.

The wholesale dislocations of World War I brought refugee problems of such magnitude that a continuation of this relatively "open door" policy became impossible. The people of the United States no longer could accept all of the people from abroad who wanted to come here without risking serious dislocations within their own country. As it is, 2,925,000 aliens are registered in this country.

BACKS NOT TURNED

While realizing that they could not continue to carry such a high proportion of the load, the people of the United States have not turned their backs on the problem. Far from it.

Today the U.S. Government is the leader in recognizing the refugee problem and in trying to cope with it on many fronts and through various organizations.

There are various components of the problem since refugees fall into many different categories and situations.

For instance, there are the Germans in Soviet-held East Germany, who are escaping into free West Germany at the rate of 10,000 a month. They are easily assimilated into the prosperous, growing West German economy, particularly since they are of the same nationality and speak the same language.

This is also true with other refugees of ethnic origin or culture similar to that of the country of asylum.

Since the outbreak of the Korean war in June 1950, an estimated 750,000 residents of Communist-held North Korea have sought and found refuge in South Korea. A small number, mostly defecting North Korean soldiers, are still finding their way through the lines.

Between 1950 and 1952, about 175,000 Turks who were living in Communist-held Bulgaria were expelled. They found asylum in Turkey.

Since the cessation of hostilities in Indochina in 1954, about 900,000 persons have moved from the Communist Viet Minh area into free Vietnam. About 150,000 were French and Vietnamese military personnel. The French mostly have returned to France. The others have become a part of Vietnam. In addition, the Chinese community in Vietnam has absorbed about 400,000 refugees from Red China.

FIVE MILLION MOVED

One of the largest movements of people in recent history resulted from the division in 1947 of British India into two nations, India and Pakistan. Shortly thereafter about 5 million Hindus and Sikhs moved from west Pakistan into India and about the same number of Moslems left India for west Pakistan. Since then an additional 3 million Hindus have moved to India from east Pakistan and another million and a half Moslems have moved to east Pakistan from India. While these vast exchanges have not been without difficulties, the immigrants have been accorded equal political rights and their economic problems generally are no worse than those of the people they have joined.

There also are instances of the successful integration or refugees of ethnic origin or culture alien to that of their country of asylum.

For example, France still has about 110,500 of the 400,000 Spanish republicans who fled to France during the Spanish civil war in 1937–39, about 20,000 Armenians who arrived between 1919 and 1926, and about 3,600 Austrians from the Nazi era, all now integrated into French life.

England has about 110,000 former members of the Polish Army and their dependents, and Sweden about 200,000 other Europeans of non-Swedish origin, but including about 50,000 from other Scandinavian countries. All of these also are permanently established in their adopted country.

These are examples of situations where refugees have found new homes with relatively little difficulty.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Jan. 15, 1959]

REFUGEE CHINESE AND ARABS BIG PROBLEM FOR FREE WORLD

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, January 14.—State Department statistics indicate there are more than 2,600,000 refugee in the world today who have not yet been integrated into the life of an asylum country.

By far the greatest number fall into two groups. First there is the estimated 1 million Chinese who have fled Red China and crowded into teeming Hongkong, the British colony. Next there are the 947,000 Arabs who fled Palestine during the Arab-Israel hostilities in 1948, and since then have been living in camps in nearby Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Egypt.

In addition, there are now about 100,000 refugees of the fighting in Algeria. About half are in Tunisia and the remainder in Morocco.

An estimated 50,000 Dutch refugees from the civil disturbances and unrest in Indonesia have been forced to return to Holland.

Austria has about 100,000 unintegrated refugees, mostly from Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania.

Most other European countries also have varying numbers of refugees of alien ethnic origin or culture who have not yet been integrated into a new life. State Department figures show France with about 75,000, Germany 126,000, Belgium 56,000, Italy 28,000, and other countries with lesser numbers.

IRON COUNTRY ESCAPEES

Many of the latter have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain and therefore are of special interest to the United States.

Escapees, in the American view, are living evidence of the malfunctioning of political-economic systems. So are the elaborate border guards maintained by Soviet Russia and her satellites.

After an escapee has evaded these guards, the aid accorded him is symbolic of Western concern for the satellite populations of Eastern Surope. Word of this aid filters back behind the Iron Curtain and rekindles hopes and disaffection.

Thus, the remarkably successful job that was done in finding homes for the Hungarian freedom fighters was an expression of this realistic though humanitarian policy.

The basic interest of the United States in unresolved refugee problems stems from three factors:

1. The desire of the United States to uphold and support the principle of asylum to refugees and its corollary principle of a refugee's right to choose or reject repatriation. From these principles stems the humanitarian desire of the people of the United States to alleviate suffering among refugee groups.

DESIRE TO STABILIZE

2. The desire of the United States to assure the stability of free world governments. An unresolved refugee problem is a factor in internal stability.

3. The desire of the United States to avoid the creation of factors within free world countries which would be exploited by Communist agents and propaganda either to utilize disaffected refugee groups as a part of the Communist espionage-sabotage-propaganda apparatus or to produce unfavorable comment on free world interest and effort in behalf of refugees.

These, then, are the American objectives in attempting to cope with the never-ending refugee problem.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Jan. 16, 1959]

UNITED STATES AIDING REFUGEE WOES BY INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, January 15.—The United States is tackling the world refugee problem on its own and through various international organizations.

Chief among the international organizations is the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, a 27-nation group which since its creation in 1951 has found new homes for more than 800,000 migrants and refugees.

Essentially a processing and transport organization, ICEM had received little publicity before the Hungarian revolt, October 23, 1956.

ICEM maintains a secretariat at Geneva, Switzerland, and delegations from the member nations meet there in the spring and the fall.

UNITED STATES MAKES PROPOSAL

Member nations currently are considering a U.S. proposal for a special program aimed at closing the remaining refugee camps in Europe. The camps now house about 38,000 persons, which is less than the average number of European refugees resettled each year.

The U.S. delegation suggested at the November ICEM meeting at Geneva that the program be coordinated with World Refugee Year, which the United Nations General Assembly has designated to begin June 1.

The proposal is to be discussed at the April meeting.

With Western Europe now recovered economically, the U.S. delegation also proposed that ICEM give thought to broadening its program.

WORK WITH EASTLAND

The American delegation's nerve center is the State Department's Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs, headed by Robert S. McCollum, a 42-year-old former Denver, Colo., businessman. His assistants include Richard R. Brown and George L. Warren.

This State Department agency works closely with Representative FRANCIS WALTER,

Democrat, of Pennsylvania and Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairmen of the House and Senate Subcommittees on Immigration and Naturalization.

In addition to participating in ICEM, the United States operates the U.S. Escapee Program and the Far East Refugee Program. These programs aid selected individuals and groups, providing them with food, clothing and other essentials, and working with ICEM to find permanent new homes for them.

CARE FOR ARABS

The United States also participates in the programs of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. This includes the $16 million United Nations Refugee Fund, which is dedicated to the resettlement of difficult cases—those refugees who require permanent institutional care.

And, finally, the United States is the largest contributor to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. This is the agency that cares for the 947,000 Arabs who were forced out of Israel during the 1948 hostilities between the Israelis and the Arabs and who since have been living in camps in neighboring Arab countries.

UNRWA, which cares for them, draws its financial support mainly from the United States, which contributes about 70 percent of the budget. This country has averaged donating about $22 million a year for each of the last 2 years.

American cannot accept all of these people into the country. But we're compensating for this on many fronts and through many organizations, with work, money and planning.

Poison in Your Water—No. 6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article appearing in the Cleveland, Ohio, press on July 2, 1958, set forth some more reasons why the Federal Government must vigorously pursue its efforts to clean up pollution in lakes and streams.

This story entitled "A Terrible Price To Pay" describes the health menace along the shores of Lake Erie resulting from raw sewage being dumped into that lake by the communities of Euclid, Wickliffe, and Willowick. The situation is so bad that the article says, "If a man took a bucket of that polluted water and set it down in Public Square he would be arrested for creating a health menace."

This is the drinking water and the water for recreation that Americans depend upon:

A TERRIBLE PRICE TO PAY

A health menace almost beyond description exists on the county's East Side, along the lake.

It stems from the city of Euclid's sewage outlets, which are pouring thousands of gallons of completely untreated sewage into the already polluted lake hour after hour, day after day, week after week.

A sickening stench pervades the entire area, constant reminder of the terrible price in health risk the suburb is paying for all the years of delay in meeting the need for a new sewage plant.

A need that was recognized almost 20 years ago.

This is not to blame Euclid officials entirely. Many factors, including the prolonged Hilltop sewer line controversy, played a part.

But the point is that the years slipped by, each year the problem growing worse and worse.

Now, to Euclid's credit, it is doing something to eliminate the problem. A $5 million plant is underway, but at what a terrible price beyond dollars.

While the work is going on, while pipes are being installed, the old sewage plant has to be shut down 60 percent of the time at a very lenient estimate.

The result is that raw waste from Euclid, Wickliffe, and Willowick homes, thousands upon thousands of homes, is pouring directly into the lake, is carried up and down the easterly lake front.

And this situation will go on until late next year—almost 18 months.

Swimming? Out of the question. Boating? Who can stand to sail or dock boats in a mess like that?

The Euclid lakefront is so polluted, some residents say, that if a man took a bucket of that polluted water and set it down in Public Square he'd be arrested for creating a health menace.

Euclid's Mayor Sims knows of the menace and pledges to see what can be done to minimize this health hazard.

If there is any single thing that can be done to alleviate this mess, to safeguard the health of many people, it is worth every effort.

Address by Charles H. Silver, President of Beth Israel Hospital, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Charles H. Silver, president of Beth Israel Hospital in New York City, at the cornerstone laying ceremonies for its new residence for nurses last September 28, 1958:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT, BETH ISRAEL HOSPITAL, AT CORNERSTONE LAYING CEREMONIES FOR ITS NEW RESIDENCE FOR NURSES, SEPTEMBER 28, 1958

On the wall of one of the buildings that comprise Beth Israel Hospital there are some words that constitute our credo. This is how our credo begins:

"I know of no phase of human endeavor which is nobler in purpose than the healing of the sick and the alleviation of suffering.

"I know of no institution that serves a community with such utter unselfishness and such great effectiveness as a modern hospital."

When the cornerstone of the structure in which those phrases appear was laid in June of 1952, and I knew that it would be named for me, I felt a surge of pride, and gratification that I thought could never come again to any man in his lifetime. Now, a little more than 6 years later, I know that I was wrong. Today, I feel that this hospital is at the threshold of a great fulfillment, the realization of its founders' dreams and a monument to the vision, determination, and courage of every man and woman on our board of trustees. This is their triumph * * * and I salute our trustees as this new building starts to rise. It will stand as a tribute, in stone and steel, to their dedication in developing Beth Israel into the great, new medical center of the East Side, second to none in our metropolis.

The announcements tell us that we have gathered to lay the cornerstone of a residence for nurses. Actually, it is much more than that. This will be part of our splendid school of nursing, and the living accommodations it will offer to our students will be on a par with the finest available in any college or university in the country.

Its exciting architecture, its comforts and dramatic design, are an invitation to attract more young women to choose a career in nursing. The nationwide shortage of nurses is critical. Here is a profession whose mission to humanity approaches the divine * * * whose rewards cannot be measured in material compensation alone.

The building to be erected here will enable us to take a long step forward in meeting the personal needs of our student nurses.

Many of us, as we saw this edifice take shape on the drawing boards, have called our new project a multipurpose building. In a very practical sense, that is just what it is * * * for the lower three floors will house complete operating suites, an integrated X-ray department, recovery rooms and auxiliary services. These facilities will increase the capacity of our main hospital by about a hundred patients' beds.

So you see, it is, indeed, a building of many purposes. And yet, it has, basically, just one purpose—the same one for which Beth Israel was founded and has grown from strength to strength for almost three-quarters of a century.

Above all—and to all—Beth Israel is an island of compassion in the midst of a teaming melting pot of more than eight million souls. It stands as a symbol of man's concern for the welfare of his fellow men. It is an arsenal of unending research and ceaseless care in which the advances of science and the heritage of tradition meet to ease the tensions of a troubled society. For these are times of momentous decision when justice and mercy seem to be forgotten virtues in many places.

Well, here is a place where these things still matter. Here is a hospital where our aim is not the betterment of our balance sheet, but the betterment of humanity. An endless procession of ailing men, women, and children from all walks of life, from all races, colors, and creeds, come to us for help—and they do not come in vain.

For this is our dedicated purpose: To grow with a growing New York—to serve the needs of today and plan for the needs of tomorrow. And as we lay the cornerstone for which we have gathered this afternoon, we lay the cornerstone of other afternoons in the future when we will build, and build again to fulfill our mission to relieve pain, to prevent suffering, to prolong life.

The importance of our talk is attested by the vast throng who have come to join in these ceremonies. These are our friends and neighbors, our workers, our volunteers, our doctors, our nurses, our technicians, our administrative personnel * * * all members of the Beth Israel family, all devoted to the ideal of service which is the true cornerstone of our hospital.

I speak of them as the Beth Israel family, and I speak of such notables, whose presence honors us on this occasion, as my dear and cherished friend, that revered humanitarian and great American, Bernard Baruch.

I speak of that outstanding champion of human rights, statesman and inspired leader of his people, Carlos P. Romulo; that beloved Governor of our sovereign State of New York, Averell Harriman; our distinguished, crusading Senator, Jack Javits; the best friend of Beth Israel, and every institution of public welfare in the city he serves so faithfully, our Mayor, Bob Wagner;

that devoted servant of his country and his State, Nelson D. Rockefeller; the public-spirited president of the Borough of Manhattan, Hulan Jack.

These men and women, and many more that time will not permit me to name, have filled this platform with the foremost figures in the civic and professional life of our city, State, and Nation. They, and the many foundations and benefactors—including our Federal Government—have made this great moment possible.

Finally, let me acknowledge our heartfelt gratitude to the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York of which Beth Israel is proud to be a charter member. Without the constant and generous assistance of the federation, the work of this hospital could not continue.

When I realize that federation is responsible for the support of 116 welfare agencies in our city, I am deeply aware of how much we all owe to the tireless efforts of its president, trustees, and hard-working personnel.

The doctors and nurses, in whose name we will dedicate this building when its doors open next year, fulfill the final words of that credo from which I quoted at the beginning of my talk:

"I know of no personal relationship that is more genuine and tender than that which exists between the patients in a hospital and the men and women in white who function within its walls. This, our credo for more than half a century will endure long after those who now serve Beth Israel have passed on."

Let me close by saying, on this memorable day, that I rejoice in having been able to give more than 30 years of my life in constant service to this hospital. If I tell you that they were the best years of my life, it is only true that they were the best because I gave them, with love and devotion, to Beth Israel.

Hon. Louis B. Heller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made at the induction ceremonies of our former colleague, Hon. Louis B. Heller, who was inducted as a justice of the city court of New York at the Central Courts Building, Brooklyn, on January 6, 1959. Hon. Nathan R. Sobel of the county court of Kings County presided at the ceremonies:

Judge SOBEL. May I invite the newly elected justice of the city court, the Honorable Louis B. Heller, to enter the courtroom.

(Judge Heller enters. Applause.)

Judge SOBEL. May I introduce Rabbi Baumol, Judge Heller's rabbi, who will deliver the invocation.

(Rabbi Baumol delivers invocation.)

Judge SOBEL. Judge Heller has requested that these proceedings be kept as informal as possible. We have had requests from many of his dear friends and associates in the courts, as well as the legislature and Congress, to speak. We have explained to them that we shall curtail the speechmaking and make their presence known so that they may briefly congratulate the newly elected justice.

Before calling on the speakers, I should like to introduce to you Mrs. Ruth Heller, the judge's charming wife, who has so understandingly cooperated with him in his work over the years.

(Presentation of flowers by the officers of the court.)

Judge SOBEL. I should like also to introduce his very lovely daughter, Marcia.

His son Bobby, who was present at the formal swearing-in last week, returned yesterday to Bucknell University, and the judge has just whispered in my ear that he is cramming, as we all used to do, for his final exams.

I should like to introduce for a bow his lifelong partner and associate in the practice of law, his devoted brother Harry, who has been by his side during many trying years.

There are so many of Louis Heller's old friends here, even his childhood and boyhood friends, that I must, without selecting any particular one or group, mention that included in the group, sitting in the audience, are 22 members of the class of June 1922, of Boys High School. This is a class which has great historical significance to Boys High because it was the only class in the history of this country, I think, which captured all of the State scholarships, all of the Cornell scholarships, and all of the Harvard scholarships, and, indeed, all of the other scholarships offered throughout the country, all in one class, in one school, and in one particular year.

We had a great many geniuses among them, geniuses in the medical profession who have proved themselves, in business, in the other professions, and, of course, least of all are the geniuses who ascended the Bench. I see present one of them, Judge Keogh of the Supreme Court, and Judge DiGiovanna of the Supreme Court, also a member of the class, and, of course, Judge Starke and Judge Schor are present here, and a great many members of the legislature, and least of all, myself.

My friendship with Louis goes back even much before the time we attended high school. We knew each other when we attended elementary school.

The following addressed the meeting:

Francis Verilli, Esq., the president of the Brooklyn Bar Association.

Albert Gondelman, Esq., chairman of the city court committee of the Brooklyn Bar Association.

Judge Joseph A. Solovei, who presented a scroll on behalf of the Kings County Criminal Bar Association, which reads as follows:

"The Kings County Criminal Bar Association presents this plaque to Hon. Louis B. Heller, justice of the city court of the city of New York, for his distinguished services as a lawyer and judge, his warm-hearted concern for his fellow man and counsel to the bench and bar."

Gilbert S. Rosenthal, Esq., president of the Association of Lawyers of the Criminal Courts of Manhattan, also presented a scroll, which reads as follows:

"The Association of Lawyers of the Criminal Courts of Manhattan extend to Judge Louis B. Heller the heartiest congratulations and best wishes on his appointment to a higher court. For many years Judge Heller served the city and State of New York with pride and distinction. His untiring efforts, wise counsel and vast experience have done much to further the cause of justice. We, who practice in the criminal courts, indeed regret to see him go but are happy that his new appointment reflects a job well done. May he continue his dedicated work for many years in the best of health."

Morris Himmelfarb, Esq., representing the Queens County Criminal Bar Association.

Judge Heller, as you know, has held many public offices. I know you recall that he served for more than 10 years on the executive committee of the Democratic Party of Kings County.

I should like to introduce for a bow at this time the Honorable Joseph T. Sharkey, majority leader of the city council and chairman of the executive committee of the Democratic Party of Kings County.

I should also like to note the presence of Judge Heller's former associates of this committee; the Honorable James V. Mangano, general clerk of the supreme court of Kings County, who had the distinction of opening the ceremonies on yesterday commemorating the dedication of the new supreme court building; Hon. John Cashmore, borough president of Brooklyn and former chairman of the Kings County Democratic organization; Hon. Jack Weinberg; Hon. Harry M. Mortimer; Hon. Ross J. DiLorenzo; Dr. Joshua H. Friedman; Hon. Frank A. Nolan, commissioner or borough works; Hon. Joseph B. Whitty, county clerk; Hon. Frank A. Cunningham, Jr., chief clerk of the appellate term; Hon. Harry Morr, deputy fire commissioner; Hon. James M. Power, commissioner of the board of elections; Hon. Albert M. Leavitt, chief clerk of the surrogates court, Kings County; Hon. Vincent P. Carney, former motor vehicle commissioner; Councilman Edward Vogel; Assemblyman Stanley Steingut; Hon. John A. Valente, deputy markets commissioner; and Hon. Alexander G. Hesterberg, tax commissioner—all State committeemen associated with Judge Heller in many of his activities.

I can see many coleaders present, but I must be pardoned if I do not call out their names, and in lieu thereof I shall read the following telegram by Victoria Rapps, chairman of the coleaders executive committee.

"On behalf of the Democratic Coleaders of Kings County, I congratulate you and I wish for you and your family good health, and many happy years in judicial life."

I shall also read an excerpt from a message from a former associate of Judge Heller in the legislature, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, Mayor of the city of New York. He says:

"Regret exceedingly that official business makes it impossible for me to be with you on the occasion of your induction as a justice of the city court. I am pleased to join with all of your friends in congratulating you for you have done so much to help make our city a better place in which to live."

Present in spirit is the lifelong friend of Judge Heller, the president of the city council, Hon. Abe Stark. I shall read only part of his message.

"Your constructive record in Congress and on the bench naturally endow you for this new responsibility. I am confident that the city court will be enriched by your demonstrated talent in the realm of judicial affairs."

As you are all aware, the legislature has convened this morning for its first session of the year 1959. Present, however, are a great many members of the legislature who are taking early trains to Albany. They insisted on staying for these ceremonies. I regret that I am unable to call on all of them, but I should like to have the senior delegate from Brooklyn, the Honorable Bernard Austin, speak for the members of the assembly.

(Assemblyman Austin spoke briefly.)

Judge SOBEL. I should also like to have Senator William Rosenblatt speak for the members of the senate.

(Senator Rosenblatt spoke briefly.)

Judge SOBEL. The attorney general of the State of New York, the Honorable Louis Lefkowitz, is detained in Albany, and has sent the following message:

"It has been my privilige to be a friend of Louis Heller for many, many years. Blessed with innate wisdom and unexcelled integrity, Louis not only has gained an enviable record in public service but by his sincerity and consideration of others, he has earned the regard and love of all with

whom he has come into contact. I am confident that Louis Heller will add immeasurably to the city court's proud record of achievement."

As all of you know, Louis has served for several terms with great distinction in the House of Representatives. As you have no doubt read in the newspapers, the House is organizing this morning and since there is a controversial matter before it concerning the increase in the membership of the powerful House Rules Committee, many of his former colleagues who had planned to be here have been unable to attend.

I have too many messages to read, hence permit me to read excerpts from only a few and then mention the names of his colleagues, whose messages I hold in my hand.

From the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House:

"I want to congratulate you as you begin a splendid career as city court justice and extend to you my kindest wishes for a long life of useful service to your people."

From Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Massachusetts, the majority leader:

"Dear Louis, I regret very much official business in Washington prevents my being with you and your many friends when you are sworn in. While I have missed you here I extend to you my hearty congratulations and very best wishes for every happiness and success in your new position and field of great responsibility."

From Hon. CARL ALBERT, Oklahoma, Democratic whip:

"It is really marvelous to know that such a good friend is getting along so well. We certainly miss you in Washington. Come to see us."

Now, from the Senate side, may I read the following excerpts:

From the Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS, senior Senator from New York:

"My warmest congratulations on this auspicious occasion. Your new appointment reflects the great pride and confidence of your colleagues and associates in your ability and the integrity of your actions. Please accept my every good wish for success."

From the Honorable KENNETH KEATING, newly elected and now junior Senator from New York:

"Warmest greetings as you begin your new duties as city court justice. I know you will bring dignity and judgment to your new post and I wish you every success and happiness in the years ahead."

From a very warm and dear friend of Lou's, the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY, Senator from Massachusetts:

"Warmest congratulations on the occasion of your taking over your new position as court justice. I am delighted that you have received this important judicial recognition and that you'll continue to serve the New York community with eminence. With every good wish."

From the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana, majority whip of the Senate, and a member of the powerful Foreign Affairs Committee:

"Dear Louis, congratulations. I know that New York will be well repaid on the basis of your ability, integrity and understanding in the position you are assuming. On behalf of your many friends in both Houses, as well as my own, I wish to extend to you good luck and success in the years ahead. You have been a great public servant and your contributions to the public good will be your monument in life. With best personal wishes, I am, sincerely yours."

And this telegram is a must. It is from the Honorable STEPHEN M. YOUNG, who formerly served in the House with Louis, and last November upset all predictions by becoming the junior Senator from the great State of Ohio:

"Lou Heller is a truly great public servant and a real friend to any of us. As a former colleague of his in the Congress of the United States, I congratulate the people of New York on his induction as justice of your courts. I extend to him my sincere personal greetings and regards with the full knowledge that this is but a continuation of a great career in public service."

Other Members of the House of Representatives who served with Judge Heller and who sent messages are: Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, Hon. ABE MULTER, Hon. ISIDORE DOLLINGER, Hon. JOHN B. BENNETT, Hon. HEBERT ZELENKO, Hon. OREN HARRIS, Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr., Hon. PAUL A. FINO, Hon. LESTER HOLTZMAN, and Hon. EUGENE KEOGH.

Only yesterday I received a telephone call from the dean of the Kings County delegation in the House. He is, of course, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. Congressman CELLER is a close and dear personal friend of Judge Heller and, indeed, of all of us. We, in Brooklyn, are particularly proud of our Congressman, because we feel he has made the greatest contribution to the welfare of the people of the United States in the many years he has served as chairman of that powerful committee. We particularly emphasize his magnificent achievement in the field of antitrust and antimonopoly legislation.

Congressman CELLER phoned in a warm message. He asked me to state that he has been made very happy, Judge Heller, because your ambitions are being realized. He is certain that you will bring to bear upon your work in the city court the fine qualities you exemplified in the Congress of the United States.

Seated at the bench next to Louis is the chief justice of the city court, the Honorable Peter A. Quinn, who has had a distinguished career in the legislature and in Congress, and who now graces one of the finest courts of our city. Both have been colleagues but now Peter is going to be Lou's chief, and a finer chief Lou knows he could never have. He will soon address you.

Present are almost all of the justices of the court of special sessions. They all desire to say a few words. However, the limitations of time make it impossible for us to complete these proceedings and yet hear from all of them.

Seated with us on the bench is the president-justice of the court of special sessions, the Honorable Irving Ben Cooper, a very dear friend of Lou's. And also our very dear friend, the Honorable Vincent Impellitteri, a member of the court and the former mayor of the city of New York. We want to express our appreciation to Justices Cannella, Galloway, Cawse, Gassman, Rossbach, Acquavella, Silver, Loscalzo, Byrne, Dunaif, Ringel, and Thompson, who traveled from the outlying boroughs to visit with Judge Heller this morning.

I should also like to note the presence of former Justice Louis I. Kaplan, now the commissioner of investigation of the city of New York.

Also present are his new colleagues of the city court of Kings County, Justices Sabbatino, Feidem, Wecht, and Low, as well as many of Judge Heller's new associates of this court from the other counties.

I also note the presence of many judges of the domestic relations court, including Judges Lorence, Marchisio, Kaplan, Ruisi, Ramsgate, and Pagnucco.

And from the municipal court, all friends of Lou's, Judges Alter, Williams, Berry, Rinaldi, Simon, Andreozzi, Johnson, Pearlman, and Damiani.

And from the magistrates court, I must salute Judges Chapman, Solomon, Potter, Maglio, Rader, Tolleris, Gray, Schanzer, Fagan, Serper, Ohringer, Malbin, Livoti, Wallach, Glowa, and Cullen.

I am acting as chairman on this occasion only by sufferance. We had expected that Chief Judge Conway's duties would permit him to attend and preside over these ceremonies. Unfortunately, this was not to be, but I have here a very warm telegram from the chief judge to the new justice. It reads:

"I send you every good wish for health and happiness in your further service to the people of our city as city court justice."

The District Attorney's Association is holding its annual convention in California, a much more pleasant, and I am sure, warmer place than Brooklyn is today. District Attorney Silver has sent his chief assistant, the Honorable Kenneth McCabe, who will address you later.

The Honorable Frank Hogan, who is also on vacation, has deputized one of his chief assistants, the Honorable Anthony Leibler, who will also address you.

Frank O'Connor, the district attorney of Queens County, phoned in a warm message just a few minutes ago.

Most of the justices of the supreme court from Kings County are with us. Mr. Justice Anthony DiGiovanni, the chairman of the board of justices, will speak on their behalf.

But I cannot permit this occasion to pass without asking Mr. Justice J. Vincent Keogh, a life-long friend and classmate of both Judge Heller and myself, to stand up and take a bow.

I should like to have Mr. Justice Arthur Klein, of New York County, a colleague of Judge Heller in Congress, to stand up and take a bow.

It is also my privilege to introduce the Honorable Ferdinand Pecora, former justice of the supreme court of New York County. [Applause.] I know your applause would be even more resounding, if that were possible, if you knew that Judge Pecora is celebrating today his 77th birthday. You will soon hear from him.

I should also like to note the presence of the surrogate of Kings County, the Honorable Maxmillian Moss, who will speak, and also the Honorable Samuel DiFalco, surrogate of New York County, who asks leave to return to a motion calendar which was scheduled for early this morning. [Applause.]

Present also with us on this occasion is the Honorable Henry Ughetta, justice of the appellate division of the second department, who brings with him the greetings and good wishes of all of his associates in this department, and who, I am sure, will want to say a few words.

Similar messages have been sent by the Honorable George J. Beldock, a lifelong friend of Lou's, and now a justice of the appellate division of the supreme court. Also from the Honorable Leo F. Rayfiel, judge of the United States District Court, Eastern District of New York, who served in the legislature with our distinguished guest. And another from the Honorable David N. Edelstein, a judge of the United States District Court of the Southern District of New York. And I hold in my hand a very warm message from the lovable John MacCrate, a former justice of the appellate division.

This completes the list of public officials present here with us today within my immediate view. I am sure I have been unable to spot them all in this crowded courtroom, but I hope that those whom I haven't mentioned will forgive me.

Present also are many of Louis' very old friends from his childhood, boyhood, and schooldays. It is obviously impossible for me to mention all of them. I must, however, note the presence in the courtroom of one of his dearest friends and his guiding mentor through all the years of his public life. I should like the commissioner of jur-

ors from the eastern division of New York, the Honorable "Moish" Solomon, to take a bow.

Lou wishes me to state that he has received a very warm message from one whom he holds in very high esteem, but for the fact that he is out of the State he would have been here with us. I refer to Mr. Morris Forgash, president of the United States Freight Co.

And from some other friends, Jerry Wurf, regional director, State, County & Municipal Employees; the Honorable Charles R. Howell, commissioner of the department of banking and insurance of the State of New Jersey; and Arnold E. Feldman, attorney-adviser at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.

I should like to introduce also for a bow, some very, very dear friends of the new justice: First, the Honorable Meier Steinbrink, former justice of the supreme court; also Al Kevelson, Eddie Zeltner, of the Mirror; Harold Harris of the Journal; Geane Toomey of the Telegram-Sun; and Al Turk of the Journal-American.

I have hundred telegrams, letters, and messages in my hand that I cannot possibly wade through now, hence I will order that they may be made part of the official record and turned over to the judge.

As you know, we have used Judge Barshay's courtroom, which is the largest in this building, and Lou and I wish to thank him for his generosity. Unfortunately, he is home ill, otherwise he would have been present.

And, of course, I cannot forget my own colleagues who are present, Judges Marasco and Starkey.

And also from the court of general sessions, Lou's former colleague, Judge Culkin. Also Judges Geller and Schweitzer.

My next duty is to convey a message from Mrs. Heller. She has asked me to invite each and every one of you to participate in a collation in the courtroom of the new justice of the city court on the 10th floor at the conclusion of these proceedings. I hope eoch and every one of you will accept that most cordial invitation.

(The ceremonies were brought to an abrupt end by the sudden illness and death of Assemblyman Bernard Austin.)

Public Backs Ike on Hold-the-Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the Gallup Poll of last weekend clearly sets forth how interested the vast majority of our citizens are in having Uncle Sam live within his income.

People want a balanced budget. They want cutbacks in spending and not more taxes. They want a real fight waged against inflation. Let us give the people what they want and are entitled to.

The Gallup Poll as it appeared last weekend follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Jan. 31, 1959]

PUBLIC BACKS IKE ON HOLD-THE-LINE

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J., January 30.—In the clash between President Eisenhower and congressional Democrats over the budget, the President holds a great initial advantage in public support for his philosophy of holding the line.

Just what may happen to this advantage, however, will depend on how well and how hard the Democrats sell their philosophy that an expanding economy requires more Federal aid even if it means deficit spending to accomplish this.

The important political significance is that the public still thinks in strictly orthodox terms regarding the budget, or like a family, the Government shouldn't spend more than it takes in.

Behind this overwhelming vote is a feeling on the part of many voters that operating in the red during the next year or two will result in serious inflation and have a generally harmful effect on the Nation's economy.

Some political observers have felt that if prices continue up between now and 1960, the Republicans will have a readymade issue in blaming the Democrats and their policy of deficit spending for rising prices.

Democrats challenging the President, therefore, have yet to convince voters of their economic philosophy; namely, that increased spending is needed to make certain of national growth and progress to keep pace with Russia.

Some key questions and results in the Gallup poll's nationwide study of the public's attitude toward the budget:

Do you see any connection between an unbalanced budget and the prices of things you buy?

	Percent
Prices will rise	56
Prices will drop	1
See no connection	43

Do you see any connection between an unbalanced budget and the value of the dollar?

Inflation:	Percent
Value of dollar decreases	58
Value of dollar increases	1
Sees no connection	41

If the time should come when Government income cannot pay for all the things in the budget, which would you favor—cutting back on certain things or increasing taxes?

	Percent
Favor cutting back	72
Favor increasing taxes	15
No opinion	13

When voters who favored cutting back under these circumstances were asked what they would like to see pared, two areas of the budget were mentioned most often.

The No. 1 item which voters would like to cut back on is Government operations—salaries, personnel, and other expenses incurred in the day-to-day operation of the Federal Government.

The next most frequently mentioned was foreign aid.

A Look at Psychiatry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honor for me, both as a Roman Catholic and as a native of the Boston area, to be able to insert into the RECORD at this time the lecture delivered last night at the Catholic University of America by his eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, our beloved archbishop of Boston. I am sure that my colleagues in the House will be interested in his topic, and I commend to their attention the following words which Cardinal Cushing has to offer:

A LOOK AT PSYCHIATRY

(By Richard Cardinal Cushing, Guild of Catholic Psychiatrists at the Catholic University of America)

Anyone who attempts to discuss the field of psychiatry within the space of a half hour must do so with many misgivings. Psychiatry is a broad and complex field of study with roots that are historically deep. It is also a comparatively new branch of medicine and is still in its infancy. The ever-increasing amount of literature, the development of different systematic approaches, and the current advance in therapeutic procedures give testimony to the vigorous growth and development of this science which deals with the causes and treatment of mental disorders.

When, however, one untrained in this field attempts within a limited space of time, to take a look at and, in a sense, appraise the field of psychiatry, misgivings arise not only in his own mind, but also, I suspect, in the minds of his audience. I believe, therefore, that my approach to this subject may well precipitate in your minds such questions as: "Are we in for another attack on psychiatry? Will there be a reinforcement of the position, taken by some, that there actually exists a fundamental opposition and a necessary hostility between the church and psychiatry?"

Let it be said from the start that in discussing the topic, "A Look at Psychiatry," I profess that I look on psychiatry and psychiatrists with interest, respect, and admiration for their work, even though these sentiments are at times tempered with a legitimate concern.

I might add that I not only look at but I also look to psychiatry as an important collaborator with the church in its concern for men's minds and souls.

The church's interest in and respect for psychiatry dates back to the early history of medical psychology. This history has been one of ideas, originally incomplete and often naive; of dedicated men and women; of movements born of man's love and concern for his less fortunate brethren. To be sure, there has been much bias evident in the retelling of this history as ideas and events were viewed out of their context. Yet one who reads this history cannot overlook the interest of the church in psychiatry or fail to see the tradition, early established by the church, of founding hosiptals and infirmaries for the care of the insane, crude though some of these may have originally been. One thinks in this connection of the infirmary at Monte Cassino which played a great role as a source of medical knowledge in the sixth century. One recalls the Hotel Dieu at Lyons, France, in the same century and at Paris in the seventh century, the monastery of the Alexian Brothers at Cologne also in the sixth century which cared for mentally sick men, and the colony at Gheel, in Belgium, which was founded as a religious work, and whose tradition of care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill is still carried on, influencing therapeutic and rehabilitation methods down to our own day. This is the place where St. Dymphna, the patron saint of the insane, was martyred.

But we need not go back to historic times to validate the interest and respect of the church for psychiatry. We find abundant testimony today in the establishment of psychiatric wards in many of our hospitals, the use of psychiatric services in our hospitals,

the use of psychiatric services in our child-caring institutions and youth-guidance centers. Psychiatrists are found on the staffs of our clinics, in our schools and institutions for exceptional children.

Our diocesan charity offices throughout the United States regularly make use of the services of psychiatrists and refer cases to them. Under church-related auspices, institutes and workships on pastoral care and psychiatry are conducted yearly at several Catholic universities where the clergy and psychiatrists come together to learn from each other while working on a mental health problem that calls for mutual understanding and cooperation. Orientation courses in psychiatry and abnormal psychology are becoming common in our theological seminaries and are implemented by practical field work done by seminarians in mental institutions.

Full-time Catholic chaplains are regularly assigned to mental hospitals and, currently, in the archdiocese of Boston, we are building chapels for the Catholic patients in the mental hospitals owned and staffed by the State of Massachusetts.

These facts are overlooked by many who have been swayed by ill-considered statements of uninformed people, not excluding some members of both the clergy and the psychiatric profession that the church takes a negative and somewhat unfriendly view of psychiatry. It is true that there have been few formal statements of either approval or disapproval of psychiatry by the church, but there exists ample evidence in such activities as these to which I have referred that she respects the science and is anxious to cooperate with it.

Surely it should not be difficult to understand why the church, as the healer of sick souls, should have high regard for psychiatry, the healer of sick minds. Is it not in accord with true religious principles and the charity of Christ to do everything we can to heal the sick mind while we care for the troubled soul? In the fulfillment of this apostolate, religion and psychiatry must frequently complement each other.

This recognition and the complete and wholehearted respect for the field of psychiatry which it should entail is, however, tempered by a legitimate concern regarding the ideas on the nature of man, ideas, which of course, are basic to the practice of psychiatry.

Psychiatry is concerned with human nature and human behavior; the church is concerned with human nature and human behavior. When, therefore, she meet those psychiatrists who deny the existence of the spiritual, whose concepts on the nature of man, on his purpose and destiny in life, on what morality means and what in the concrete is morally good and what morally bad behavior, are diametrically opposed to her own, it is not to be expected that she will agree with their proposals and methods.

It is not the science of psychiatry but the concepts and such psychotherapeutic techniques of individual psychiatrists as rest upon a materialistic interpretation of life that have called forth a warning on psychiatric procedures and make necessary a careful examination before accepting or rejecting them.

Our late holy father, Pope Pius XII, sounded this warning with great clarity, scientific objectivity and Christian charity when he addressed the Fifth International Congress of Psychotherapy and Clinical Psychology held in Rome on April 13, 1953, and again on April 10, 1958, when he spoke to the 13th Congress of the International Association of Applied Psychology.

You have read, I am sure, these two pronouncements and recognize the moral principles upon which the warning of the late holy father is based. Predicated upon principles of sound philosophy and morality, as they are, the precautions which his holiness warned were necessary, will not only contribute significantly to the general acceptance and prestige of the field of psychiatry but will also insure the mental, moral, and religious well-being of patients.

The theme of both addresses by Pope Pius is the compelling necessity of accepting the teaching of the church on the nature of man—teaching as old as the church herself—that man is a unity of body and soul, made in the image of God and destined through his own free choice to eternal union with Him. To quote his holiness, "What constitutes man is principally his soul, the substantial form of his nature."

It is clear, then, that the spirit of materialism, atheism, and determinism which colored certain psychoanalytic theories in their origin and whose influence can still be found in the present psychotherapeutic procedures of some psychiatrists cannot fail to be a matter of concern to not only the Catholic religion but all religions. Add to this pervading spirit a pansexual emphasis and an orientation toward man which in rejecting his spiritual aspects and reducing him to the level of the brute characterizes his natural tendency toward God and religion as a compulsive neurosis and an illusion. Can we, then, wonder at suspicions that have been aroused in God-fearing men?

Nevertheless, even while warning against these false premises held by many psychiatrists, the holy father spoke in a spirit of great friendliness toward the profession of psychiatry itself, as is clear from his concluding words:

"Be assured that the church follows your research and your medical practice with warm interest and best wishes. You work on a terrain that is very difficult. Your activity, however, is capable of achieving precious results for medicine, for the knowledge of the soul in general, for the religious dispositions of man and for their development. May Providence and divine grace light your path. In pledge thereof we impart to you with fatherly good will our apostolic blessing."

With the words of the holy father in mind, let us consider to what extent psychiatry can be an aid in the pastoral work of the clergy. Let me look, too, not at psychiatry. Mutual understanding between psychiatrists and the priests, while important, is not enough. Mutual cooperation and a sharing of knowledge is needed, for in these days mental illness ranks as our major national health problem. Religion and psychiatry can and must join forces in helping mankind in what is so frequently called our current age of anxiety. In fact, it may well be that on this common ground of human anxiety that we can find a focal point for the best cooperation between the psychiatrist and the priest. For anxiety in my experience is at the heart of most mental disturbances and appears to be the basic core of neuroses. Both the clergy and psychiatrists encounter people who are burdened with anxieties in varying degrees and concerning many things. We must help these people not only in the negative sense of controlling their anxieties, but in the positive sense of preventing abnormal anxiety reactions. We must help the individual attain vigorous sound intelligent cheerful mental health. For this we need not only a psychiatric and a psychological approach to the problem; we need, above all, a religious approach.

Anxiety is likely to develop when there is a threat to some value or values which the individual considers essential to his existence as a personality. The understanding of anxiety, therefore, cannot be separated from the problem of values, for in the values which the individual lives by is the key for the treatment of his anxiety. What particular events or stresses will constitute a threat to a person depends on what particular values he considers important to his existence, status, or prestige as an individual personality. For any given individual these may hinge upon health, wealth, economic and social prestige, or whatever else he believes is worthwhile in life.

What of the values which many people today are overlooking or have allowed to grow dim, and which, nevertheless, are essential to their existence as personalities? What of the many values which must not be threatened or lost in the contemporary crises of modern life? We know that these values transcend all other values and can be realized when all other values fail. They are the eternal values which flow from the fact of Almighty God's love for us and our eternal salvation. It is toward the attainment of these values that we must direct men in order that they may be better persons not only religiously, but psychologically as well. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of Heaven."

Much of the anxiety of our time is due to the circumstance that people, by being solicitous about the wrong things, in an immaturity which is at once psychological and religious, have identified their happiness with the wrong values. "Do not lay up for yourselves treasures on earth, where rust and moth consume and where thieves break in and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither rust nor moth consumes, nor thieves break in and steal. For where thy treasure is there also thy heart will be."

It is through a reorientation on the lasting and eternal values that mankind can obtain insight and find wisdom to met the anxieties that must come into our everyday lives. Such an orientation enables a man to meet anxiety, not in a negative, neurotic nervous manner, but with courage and confidence. It is through courage and striving rather than through evasions and withdrawals in meeting the day-to-day anxieties as they arise that we can prevent normal anxiety from becoming pathological.

Yet problems and anxieties cannot be met in a positive and constructive way unless courage and fortitude be coupled with faith in the protecting providence of God. The person who achieves acceptance of real values and attacks his problems in the light of this acceptance has, generally speaking, banished mental anguish and is returning to health. He discovers his place in life and realizes that he has a work to do. The shilly-shally of anxiety gives way to the expansion of the creative force of a stable personality. The meaning of life itself becomes clarified, and the science of psychiatry, under God, has achieved a victory. For, whatever may have been alleged in the past to be the chief psychological factor in the development of mental problems, there is a growing consensus of opinion today that it is an anxiety concerning the meaning of life. In short, we must recognize the relationship between mental illness and one's philosophy of life, and all psychiatric treatment must take into account as a basic consideration the philosophy of life in the light of truth.

Contingent upon acceptance of the true meaning of life is the setting of goals, in order to avoid mental conflicts. I speak now not of the great goal of life, union with our Heavenly Father, for recognition of this is inseparable from knowledge of the true meaning of life. I am thinking of the minor goals of everyday living, goals which should be in accord with the great goal of life, but whose importance can be lost sight of just because so often they seem to be so insignificant. But the are never insignificant. Happiness and peace of mind and soul are found in the possession of definite purpose. Wholesome interests develop realistic goals and in reaching for them the personality matures and finds true happiness in cooperating with his neighbor in daily work, in service to

others, in charity, and love. Psychiatrists and psychologists remind us constantly of the importance of goals. The church knows that no goal is ultimately realistic unless in it there is a place for Almighty God.

Psychiatrists speak of what they call an internal goal of actualization in the personality, the ideal toward which the personality tends and they call this the ego-ideal or the self-ideal. This ideal is the goal or pattern of realization which every person sets for himself, they tell us, the concrete image of what one proposes to make of himself. It is the goal of every person's striving and, whether distorted or not, whether articulated or not, some degree of knowledge exists in every person showing him the relationship of what he truly is to what he wants to be. We are told that this ideal of self, may well be the core of integration in any personality.

Here, as perhaps at no other point, religion and psychiatry join hands. "Be ye perfect, as your Heavenly Father is perfect." While it is true that a person's ideal of self is influenced by many factors—biological, psychological, social, or cultural—yet a complete understanding of any ideal requires a recognition of its religious and spiritual components. For this tendency toward the realization of a self-ideal, which is found in some manner in all men, exists in a type of life—a psychic life—which can know and aspire to realities which transcend the limits of the material world. Man can incorporate his aspirations toward a better self into desires to be more like his Creator. In religion alone have all men received in the mystery of the incarnation a concrete model of what his ideal of personality should be: The imitation of Christ, as Christ lived our kind of life on the shores of Galilee. The most perfect man was St. Francis of Assisi.

Religion and psychiatry have, indeed, many points of contact within the totality of the human personality. They can be for each other—they must be for each other—important auxiliaries in the understanding and care of men's minds and souls. This does not mean that the priest should try to play the role of the psychiatrist; nor that the psychiatrist should attempt to take over the work of the priest. It does mean that each can find common ground for mutual understanding and cooperation in the work of alleviating human sufferings and in the salvation of souls.

There is much evidence today that religion and psychiatry are drawing together to face these problems. The establishment in 1955 of the National Academy of Religion and Mental Health with the explicit purpose of bringing together psychiatrists and clergymen to work on problems of mental hygiene is a more recent instance of the trend toward closer and better relationships. It is natural that this should occur. For mental hygiene is but a new name for some very old ways of dealing with life's problems. There is a close parallel between a philosophy of life and what we call mental hygiene; therefore, religion, which plays so important a role in the former, cannot be overlooked in the latter.

As psychiatrist, you can do much good for the souls of men if, mindful of your own moral and religious responsibilities, you are aware of the part that religion can and should play in the lives of your patients.

May God bless you in your important work.

May He help you to see the divine in all persons for whom you labor.

May He foster your scientific insights as you strive to develop your theories and perfect your techniques.

May He give wisdom and prudence to your counsels, so that as trustees of human values, you may be ever concerned with those that are divine.

May He assist you in your therapies so that they may be the means by which each person whom you treat may come to find, through you, the ultimate source of his health, happiness, and security, Almighty God, Himself.

Wisconsin's Capital Has a Two-Party Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it was 10 years ago that the two newspapers in Madison, Wis.—the Capital Times and the Wisconsin State Journal—formed Madison Newspapers, Inc. This action enabled the newspapers to have efficient, combined business operations, while continuing to have separate editorial and news departments.

Thus Wisconsin's capital city remains one of the all-too-few cities in the United States having two newspapers and, even more rare, having a vigorous two-party press.

The following article, setting forth the story of Madison Newspapers, Inc., and its importance to the people of Wisconsin, is from the Capital Times of Monday, February 2, 1959:

TEN YEARS OLD—TWO-NEWSPAPER PLAN IS SUCCESS; IS BIG ASSET TO MADISON

Madison Newspapers, Inc., a corporate device which has given to this community two militant daily newspapers in the best tradition of a two-party press under a representative form of government, has reached the 10th anniversary of its birth.

Thus, Madison today is still the only city in Wisconsin, outside of Milwaukee, which has two daily newspapers expounding and fighting for the political, civic, and business philosophies that should prevail under a two-party government.

The newspaper situation which now prevails in Madison is succinctly described in the 1958 Year Book of Editor & Publisher, the newspaper fraternity's publication. This statement follows:

"Madison Newspapers, Inc., is publisher and owner of the Capital Times and Wisconsin State Journal. The editorial and news contents of the respective newspapers are provided under contract by the Capital Times Co. and Wisconsin State Journal Co., and are editorially independent and competitive. Madison Newspapers, Inc., operates the business, circulation, mechanical, distribution, and all other departments. Officers and personnel of Madison Newspapers, Inc., are Don Anderson, chairman of the board; William T. Evjue, president; E. G. Lockwood, treasurer and general manager; Martin Wolman, business manager and secretary; W. H. Scrivner, advertising manager; John M. Canny, circulation manager; and Howard McCaffery, assistant circulation manager."

When the Second World War ended in 1947, newspapers all over the United States found themselves in precarious positions. Printing equipment—presses, linotypes, stereotyping machinery—was badly worn. Buildings were too small and expansion was needed. Print paper skyrocketed from $50 a ton in 1940 to $135 in 1956. Union labor scales were soaring skyward.

What to do? This was the question facing the two Madison newspapers. Not less than $1,500,000 would be needed to buy new presses for both papers and to pay for expansion additions to the buildings of the two papers. This expenditure was prohibitive.

The came negotiations and the suggestion that the local publishers should bring the two papers under one roof—one paper should remain in the evening field and one should publish in the morning field. Under this plan one new press and pressroom would be required for both papers. This meant a saving of $1 million over a two-paper operation. Other big savings were made by having the business office staffs under one roof as outlined in Editor & Publisher above.

This is a sketchy outline of what was done to insure that Madison would be a two-newspaper city—an asset that every city 25,000 or more should have to guarantee a two-party press under a two-party government. It is idle to talk about a two-party government where there is a one-party press.

In 1952 and 1956, 90 percent of the total daily newspaper circulation in the United States supported Eisenhower. It was during one of these campaigns that Adlai Stevenson, Democratic candidate for President, made his famous statement that we are living under the American system of two-party government, but we live under a one-party press.

The Capital Times has frequently pointed out that the following metropolitan cities in the United States did not have a single newspaper that supported Stevenson for President:

Boston, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, Indianapolis, Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Des Moines, Kansas City, Denver, Salt Lake City, Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Tucson, Tulsa, and other cities.

Here is something for the American citizen to think about. The city of Chicago now has only two ownerships of newspapers—the multimillionaire Tribune and American owned by the McCormick estate and the Chicago Sun-Times and Daily News owned by the Marshall Field interests. In New Orleans, every newspaper being published in that city is under one ownership. This has been the trend all over the United States.

Two newspapers under one roof is the type of operation adopted in scores of cities over the United States to guarantee that there will be a two-party press. Here are some of the cities in the United States now operating under the same type of ownership and operation carried on in Madison:

Springfield, Ill.; Fort Wayne, Ind.; Shreveport, La.; Evansville, Ind.; Tulsa, Okla. (Richard Lloyd Jones, formerly owner of the State Journal is the owner of the Tulsa Tribune); Birmingham, Ala.; Cheyenne, Wyo.; El Paso, Tex.; Nashville, Tenn.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Amarillo, Tex.; Charleston, W. Va.; Bristol, Tenn.; Tucson, Ariz.; Davenport, Iowa; Lincoln, Nebr., and many other cities.

Here in Wisconsin, however, Madison is the only city in Wisconsin, outside Milwaukee, that has two newspapers. The hyphenated names of Wisconsin newspapers shows how the dominant newspaper in each of the following cities gobbled up the weekly newspaper and came up with the following hyphenated names:

The Appleton Post-Crescent, the Baraboo News-Republic, Green Bay Press-Gazette, Marinette Eagle-Star, Marshfield News-Herald, Racine Journal-Times, Wausau Record-Herald, LaCrosse Leader-Press, Chippewa Falls Herald-Telegram, Fond du Lac Commonwealth-Reporter.

All of these newspapers have been in the pocket of the Republican Party for years. Today we see what it means to reduce every outstanding city in Wisconsin to a one-newspaper level. Eventually these newspapers all gravitate toward alinement with the forces

of special privilege and private interest in government.

The biggest asset to point out on the 10th anniversary of Madison Newspapers, Inc., is that a corporate device was used here to bring about a situation under which Madison would have the benefit of two newspapers fighting for different issues and principles so vital in a representative form of government.

Madison is fortunate in being the one city in Wisconsin, outside Milwaukee, which has two newspapers representing both sides of all questions under our representative form of government.

In the first decade of its existence, Madison has demonstrated that it is possible for American citizens to have newspaper setups under which all matters vital to the welfare of the American people can be presented to the people. This can only be done by newspapers operating under a setup such as Madison Newspapers, Inc., here.

The Capital Times is glad to be a partner in this guarantee of a two-newspaper operation here in the city of Madison.

German Embargo of American Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, suddenly, on January 23, 1959, Germany unilaterally and in violation of her coal and steel treaty with other European nations, placed a tariff of $4.76 a ton on foreign coal. This practically was an embargo and was aimed at the United States, which normally ships over 16 million tons of coal per year to Germany. Not only was this action in violation of Germany's Coal and Steel Community treaty, but I suggest that it was in violation of another treaty, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—of which the United States is a member, forbidding bilateral or group agreements by members of GATT without the unanimous consent of all nations concerned. So sudden was Germany's unilateral action that even our State Department, which had been negotiating with the Bonn government since last September, was taken by surprise. The other day when our Government made a last minute request for a 60-day delay in the German action, it was brushed aside and the rash decision of the German Government was rushed through the Bundestag for formal approval.

Where does this leave American mining and shipping interests? Many American miners will be forced out of work because this huge hike in German coal duties will make prohibitive the importation of American coal to Germany. The $4.76 per ton will raise the price of American coal far above Ruhr coal. This hike, as I noted, came like a bolt from the blue. No warning, no advance notice, and no way of cushioning the blow. American coal miners in Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Tennessee, and other States will be faced with continued idleness. Already West Virginia, which supplies more than 50 percent of the Nation's annual output of coal, has the highest percent of its labor force unemployed. Starvation and want stalk its hills and that situation will be exacerbated by the rigors of the cold winter. Based on 1957 figures, Germany's action involves a loss of 500,000 days' work to coal miners.

American shippers have contracts to purchase this coal as mined, and have in turn chartered ships for transportation and are under obligation to deliver coal to German importers. Germany's action will make these contracts virtually impossible of performance. These people are well on their way to suffering immeasurable damages. Charter fees run into the millions. Damages in other respects are inordinate. More than 30 million tons of U.S. coal still are on order. With a $4.76-a-ton tariff staring them in the face—a tariff which, by action of the Bonn government was made retroactive to January 1 of this year—many American exporters face bankruptcy. Thus coal in transit is affected.

The Bonn government seeks to justify this drastic action on the grounds that it is an economic move designed to rescue the Ruhr coal industry from its year-old doldrums. This is somewhat hard to believe when it is remembered that Germany was in real need of American coal in 1957 in order to maintain at that time its strong domestic economy. The facts indicate that her move is not based on economic need; rather it is political. Having fully recovered from World War II, Germany is once again becoming industrially aggressive and is seeking to change the whole distribution of coal in Europe. And being the dominant power of the nations which comprise the European Coal and Steel Community, she can force her arbitrary action upon her weaker neighbors. I seriously question the right of Germany to impose these drastic tariff duties. It is morally indefensible.

Be that as it may, in the absence of diplomatic negotiations, which appear at this time to be inadequate, what remedies do American producers and shippers have? Germany's action, though arbitrary, is not a case in law which could be classified as a "force majeure" or confiscation, so that businessmen who suffer, may recoup damages from the government. It may be that they could sue the individual German importers of coal; but this would take much time and involve insurmountable difficulties.

Meanwhile, what?

It seems anomalous at a time when the United States is responding to the requests to rescue West Germany, particularly as to the status of Berlin, that the Bonn government would so heedlessly injure American shippers and producers. It certainly does not make for pleasant or cordial relations between the United States and the West German Government. On the contrary, it shows a country willing to accept advantages and display no gratitude. Nay, more, it is symbolic of utter apathy on the part of West German rulers as to the interest of American citizens who are or will have to continue to ship coal to Germany.

I have been a friend to Germany, but this latest maneuver has tinctured that friendship.

It is incumbent on West Germany forthwith to come forward with some remedy, otherwise there will be agitation in and out of Congress to retaliate. Raising duties without rhyme or reason will bring in its trail ever increasing American duties against German manufactured goods. The thrust will be given where it hurts Germany the most.

Tour Reveals Coal Camp Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague [Mr. SLACK], the gentleman who represents the Sixth West Virginia District, has dramatically emphasized the distressed economic plight of West Virginia through the medium of a tour of coal mining areas in his district.

He was accompanied on his trip by a reporter for the Charleston Gazette and a series of articles has ensued. With accompanying pictures, the newspaper accounts underline the depression in our coal counties.

He has found in his district, as I have found in my own First District coal mining communities, a dreary story of lengthy unemployment, of mines that have been worked out, and of unemployment benefit credits long since exhausted.

The story, too, includes the thread of tables bare except for Government handouts of surplus commodities. There are hungry children and men and women in my State of West Virginia. Something must be worked out immediately in the way of a works program or something of similar nature to alleviate the want and depressed economic condition which presently exists.

Statistics show that West Virginia has been one of the States hardest hit by the business recession and while other areas of the Nation are now showing recovery, very, very little of the same has been noted in West Virginia.

With consent of the House, I would like to insert an article from the Gazette, a newspaper for which I have great respect, which was printed in its edition of February 2, with further assurances that I will submit for all to see future articles written on this most pressing problem in West Virginia:

TOUR REVEALS COAL CAMP POVERTY

(By John G. Morgan)

HIGHCOAL.—"All of them have been cut off, their unemployment checks are running out, and they're up against it."

That's what Representative JOHN M. SLACK, Jr. heard on his way up the creek to this ghostly mining camp in Boone County.

The report was quickly confirmed. Here in little old mining shacks, the heads of large families told the new Congressman from the Sixth District:

"I don't know how I'm going to make it. I've been everywhere and I haven't been able to find nothing."

"This is the first time I've ever been in a place like this. I've looked this country over for a job, everywhere."

"We get molligrub (surplus food), but we run out of some things before the end of the month."

"We usually have gravy and oats for breakfast."

"An egg? When was the last time I eat an egg? I just don't know."

"We look across at the hills for entertainment."

As if all of that wasn't trouble enough, SLACK also heard:

"No colored fellows are working in the mines. We don't get the same treatment as the white man, not since 1952."

"They won't hire no colored fellows."

Highcoal, about 45 miles from Charleston, was the first stop on SLACK'S 1-day tour of the coal fields in Boone and Kanawha Counties. He decided to make the trip because he is:

1. Irked by the Eisenhower tendency to spread the impression that the Nation has fully recovered from the recession.

2. Further irked by the fact that the budget bill presented to Congress makes no provision for relief of economically distressed areas.

3. Fearful that Congress may take no action on the dozen distressed-area bills now before it.

By his visit to the coal fields, SLACK hopes to accomplish at least three things:

1. Find dramatic proof of economic conditions in the distressed areas.

2. Present that proof to Congress for action.

3. Join with other Congressmen representing similar areas in an effort to expedite the action.

"It is my intention to make improvement of the economic situation in my district the first order of business," SLACK declared.

"A first-hand look is necessary to get the facts."

The dramatic approach is SLACK'S last resort. He adopted it after discovering that few people in Washington are mindful of West Virginia's unemployment statistics.

Among such statistics is the glaring fact that nearly 80,000 coal miners lost their jobs in West Virginia during the last 11 years, including 20,000 within the past year. That leaves approximately 46,000 still working in the mines.

In district 17 of the United Mine Workers it is estimated that about 60 or 70 of 200 mining communities are deserted or partially deserted as a result of mine shutdowns and layoffs. The district includes parts of four counties represented by SLACK—Kanawha, Boone, Logan and Raleigh. It covers other areas in southern West Virginia and two counties in Kentucky.

While the economic recession obviously has had its effect on coal mining, leaders of the industry point out that mechanization has had more to do with the decline in employment.

Production declined sharply last year, but the estimated total of 113 million tons was about the same as in 1954 when 18,000 more men were employed in the industry.

SLACK wants to tell the Nation that West Virginia's unemployment problem is peculiar and pressing.

It's peculiar because unemployment in West Virginia's leading industry is persisting in the face of general economic recovery. It's pressing because the miners and their families are beginning to get hungry and desperate.

On the trip to the coal fields, SLACK took with him R. R. (Big Chew) Humphreys, secretary-treasurer of district 17; a photographer and a reporter.

The Congressman drove the car through the town of Marmet and then followed U.S. 119 across Lens Creek Mountain.

As the hills rolled by in their cloak of wintry brown, the gloomy aspects of the mission were brightened somewhat by Big Chew's vivid stories of earlier, more dangerous days in the mines. A fondness for tobacco while working underground earned him his nickname, he said.

At Racine, SLACK took West Virginia 3 through the towns of Comfort and Seth. At Sylvester he picked up Johnny Protan, who is the constable for Sherman District in Boone County, an amateur fight promoter and coal miner.

Protan has an unusual understanding of the problems of miners in the local area. Some of the younger ones fight for him.

As SLACK drove up Seng Creek toward this mining camp, it was Protan who said:

"All of them have been cut off, their unemployment checks are running out, and they're up against it."

Dr. Shaeffer Continues Efforts for Improved Wildlife Habitat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's most effective and persistent champions of proper wildlife preservation and management is Dr. J. H. Shaeffer of Parker, S. Dak. He has attracted nationwide acclaim for his efforts to preserve wetland areas necessary for the production of waterfowl in the prairie pothole areas of the Dakotas and Minnesota. Dr. Shaeffer recently appeared before a combined meeting of the Senate and House Committees on Game, Fish, and Parks of the South Dakota Legislature with additional recommendations. I include at this point in the RECORD a summary of the doctor's remarks as reported in the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, February 1, 1959:

STATE NEEDS MORE WETLANDS—DR. SHAEFFER OUTLINES PROGRAM FOR PRODUCTION OF DUCKS

PARKER, S. Dak.—Ducks are not getting a decent break in South Dakota.

That's the opinion of Dr. J. H. Shaeffer, Parker, regional director of the National Wildlife Federation and chairman of the North and South Dakota Emergency Conservation Committee.

He is asking the South Dakota Legislature to assist in a program that will restore the State's waterfowl production to its former levels and to restore the State's waterfowl hunting.

Here is his review of conditions which led to 1958 being the worst duck-hunting season in the memory of man and his solution to the problem:

The 1939 legislature passed legislation providing for the acquisition of duck habitat and public-shooting grounds.

Then in 1941, the legislature set aside $5 of each nonresident pheasant hunting license fee to finance land acquisition.

"That measure," he explained, "has produced $2,184,455 for the acquisition of duck habitat and public-shooting lands."

To date, approximately 150,000 acres of land are owned or controlled by the department.

Fifty-two thousand of these acres form Custer State Park.

Nine other State parks, 58 State recreation areas and 43 roadside parks account for another 17,000 acres.

Another 25,000 acres comprise the multiple-use lands along Federal reservoirs.

"But only 13,991 acres are classified by the department as potholes and marshes," a point which Shaeffer emphasizes as showing that ducks are not getting a decent break in South Dakota.

While the game, fish, and parks department has acquired approximately 137,000 acres of other lands, subsidized drainage has destroyed 121,285 actual surface waters acres of duck habitat since 1954.

This destruction represents the loss of the Nation's finest duck-producing areas and the loss of the best duck-shooting areas in South Dakota.

How has this influenced South Dakota duck production and duck hunting?

South Dakota formerly produced 1,500,000 ducks a year. The production in 1958 is estimated at less than 300,000.

In 1952, when we lost 14,591 actual acres of potholes and marshes by subsidized drainage, we still had a breeding population of 1,002,000 ducks.

With subsidized drainage continuing, by 1954 the estimated breeding population had declined to 826,000.

"And by 1955, the estimated breeding population was down to 360,000.

"This represents an 80 percent decline in South Dakota duck production since 1944," Shaeffer explained.

Then he compared the loss of duck habitat to hunting conditions.

"The State has shown a population increase during a 10-year period.

"At the same time, improved highways and faster transportation has made available duck areas more accessible to all hunters.

"But during the 10-year period, 1946–56, South Dakota has 40 percent fewer duck hunters going afield according to the sale of Federal duck stamps.

The drought, he said, has further aggravated the waterfowl situation when it is realized that in 1958 the Sioux Falls area received 9.39 inches below normal rainfall; Watertown area 8.84 below normal, and Aberdeen 6.69 inches below normal.

Many areas not drained are now dry because of drought.

"The South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks Department has been very negligent in acquiring potholes and marshes.

"Minnesota in 1958 alone acquired 17,417 acres of wildlife lands of which 90 percent is potholes and marshes.

"Since 1951, Minnesota has acquired 57,456 acres of duck habitat in 62 counties.

"Minnesota in 1 year acquired more potholes and marshes than the South Dakota department has acquired in its entire history."

The solution is a definite program for acquisition of wetlands and marshes in South Dakota.

"This can be accomplished by increasing the nonresident pheasant license fee from $20 to $25 and earmarking the $5 raise for wetland acquisition and development.

"Approximately 40,000 nonresident pheasant hunters would provide $200,000 annually and this sum would total $1 million within 5 years.

"These funds should definitely be earmarked for acquisition and development of potholes and marshes.

"And it would be wise to further earmark these funds providing 90 percent for acquisition and 10 percent for development.

"It is very possible that South Dakota could again produce a million ducks annually at the end of a 10-year period if members of the present legislature would recognize these facts of the current waterfowl situation.

"They in this session can provide funds for acquisition and development of wetlands by raising the nonresident pheasant license $5 and provide a definite program of restoring the dwindling supply of ducks and at the same time restore the State's waterfowl hunting," Shaeffer concluded.

Hon. Charles H. Silver Dedicates Alfred E. Smith Elementary School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUDWIG TELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, the address by the Honorable Charles H. Silver, president of New York City's Board of Education and a prominent New Yorker, which Mr. Silver made on the occasion of the dedication of Alfred E. Smith Elementary School, deserves our attention. The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, AT DEDICATION OF ALFRED E. SMITH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, DECEMBER 2, 1958

It is a high point in one's life to do what I am doing now: To dedicate a school building to the memory of an old and dear friend. Alfred E. Smith was my friend. Vivid in my mind are the many occasions when we walked together on Fifth Avenue chatting like old comrades and discussing the state of the world. In my mind's ear, I can still hear his warm, vital voice full of commonsense and homely wit. He had an uncommon talent for getting at the nub of any matter he discussed quickly and without fuss.

Al Smith's life is in a classic American mold. His is the celebrated story of the self-made man, up from the streets of New York to the seat of power and prestige. It is the heartening saga of the open society, in which people of humble background can aspire to, and often attain, lofty positions. The Al Smith story is the Lincoln legend of our times. Instead of the log cabin, there is the humble tenement; for the crossroad general store, there is the street corner; for the remote schoolhouse, there is the neighborhood school. The Al Smith story is in essence the American dream—a society in which the poor can become rich, the downtrodden can attain the highest level of dignity, a society in which no one is in any final way handicapped by class, color, or place of origin.

But if Al Smith is a reminder of what is profoundly good and true in our democracy, he also stirs some troubled chords in the American consciousness. He symbolizes the unfinished business of American democracy. Though Al Smith's life is a thrilling success story, it reached its noblest height in a moment of apparent failure. But the failure was not that of the Happy Warrior. It was instead the moral infirmity of American society. We all know the grim story of 1928—the far-sighted statesman, the talented administrator defeated as presidential candidate because he was a member of a minority religious faith. We all know the bitterness that this naturally caused and his rise above this to an even greater stature in his last years.

Al Smith poses a challenge to us today: How far have we progressed from the bigotry which stained the America of Al Smith? Are we ready now to fulfill the promise of America in all particulars, for all its citizens? These are questions which must occupy us from now on.

But let us turn to happier thoughts. Al Smith himself would approve of that for he was a man of robust humor and zest for life. As I look upon this handsome building, I know that the gallant spirit of Al Smith is pleased by it. Though a self-educated man, he was a steadfast friend of free public education. He knew its value, he knew its enduring contribution to American democracy. He recognized, in all modesty, that few could educate themselves as he did. He above all people knew the complexity of the job which confronted the ordinary citizen who had to thread his way through a maze of issues and make bewildering choices of political parties and candidates.

Al Smith, I dare say, would take a view of the current controversy about school buildings which would be both amused and indignant. A man who learned the value of the dollar the hard way, he was also unafraid to spend money in the public interest. He knew well that there are no shortcuts to good education. As Governor of the State of New York, he pioneered in public housing, in creating belts of greenery in the large cities, in public works of all kinds. He was also a man of sensitive artistic appreciations. He understood that education should take place in the most attractive setting possible and that a mural on the wall is as much an educational device as a textbook, a gym where the body is trained as important as a classroom. Inexpensive education comes dear, for it can exist only at the expense of our children. Al Smith would say: "Let us save if we must, but not on our most precious resource, our children."

The open society which Al Smith exemplified is never an accomplished fact; it is, instead, a continuous process, a recurring challenge.

People believe in Al Smith because he believed in them and he never feared their actions as long as they knew the facts. We in the board of education follow this principle. We have built, here, a school for your children, and our faith in you and the splendid faculty and administrators gives us our belief in this school's future—it is your children's future. We have provided a setting for the parent-teacher-community team that spells success for the adult of tomorrow. We in the board of education welcome your participation with us on that team. This is so appropriate here because that is the way Al Smith would have seen it. The question we must ask ourselves searchingly today and always is: Do the Al Smiths of our time, regardless of color or creed, have the opportunity to rise in the social and economic escalator of our society? What part does education play in making that rise possible?

Since education is the only way to open up opportunity for our children, there can be no school too good for our children. Our goal is clear: The best education for all the children of our city. In doing this we are being loyal to the memory of that great American, Al Smith, and to the highest ideals of democracy.

Tribute to American Indian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the poem entitled "Tribute to American Indian," which was written by the late Riley Thompson, of Cloquet, Minn., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN INDIAN

(Dedicated to Minnesota State Centennial, 1858–1958)

Once a proud and noble Indian race,
Endowed with nature's freedom reigned:
Tradition of our past century since has flown
Thus to our forefathers; they well known,
Told how they greeted him who found us:
The great discoverer of America, Columbus.
Reigning this glorious land of painted scene,
A proud and noble race roamed serene.
Resisted tide of emigration, in conquest sought,
Avenging cruel and bitter wrongs they fought.
From his savage bosom, the medicine-man's song:
He sang nature's own lyrics, the day long.
Weird chants through his reed of cane he reign,
Blowing into potherb, cedar twigs, and herbs in vain.
Driving evils from medicine, pestilence, fever, cast
Sickness from his people, to future vast.
In his savage heart, he worshiped in token,
Not idols, his handicraft made of stones broken.
Nor images made of glittering gold,
Like ancient Romans and Egyptians behold.
The "Great Spirit" was his guide and master
From skies above, the land of here-after.
A race passing slowly to happy hunting grounds,
Going there forgotten in hallowed mounds.
Like unto green leaves, of summer to decay,
For swift autumn wind to blow away.
From branches leaving but bare twigs to endure,
Gathered into melancholy clusters in obscure.
Dying un-resenting, obedient to wind begin,
Toward their winter's snowy grave within.
Beside gleaming campfires, aged Chieftains told.
The listening youthful, our Indian history unfold.
They told of treaties vowed, and broken to defy,
Our noble race, with sacred promise and pacify.
How bitter hatred sprang and flourished; war began
In strife and blood-shed resisted time and again.
To beating of tom-toms and rattling of shell,
The noisy chorus began with whoops and yell.
By warriors, at twilight circling camp-fire flame
With tomahawks, gesture in anger war-dance fame.
Shouting loudly echoed, war-cry in bitter wrath,
Faced terroring shot and powder on the war-path.

Dying with camp-fires, never begging mercy or plea,
Ever fighting, never fear death's warning on knee.
To weapons of White Father's armor the foe,
Chieftains told of bitter fate, poor conquered Lo.
The strife ended with battle fray at peace,
Hear no-longer Indian war-whoops now cease.
Hearts filled with bitter hatred exist not anymore;
Wounds that bled many ages are healed as before.
Thus the noble Red-man, now immersed in woes,
Vanquished in bitterness: "Today the world knows"
Now the Indian-sun, sinking with drooped head in sorrow,
Without silvered rays are not bright with tomorrow.
Sinking slowly with grief-stained face to grave
Soon be forgotten; his history never forgave.
To his memory, erect a monument inscribed his acclaim,
Write a sonnet, with pathetic rhyme of exclaim.
With soft music as tuneful lay of brooklets onward,
Rippling in moon-light rays, and sun ever seaward.
Erect an image of a warrior, to his likeness an antique,
War-bonnet on head, decked with eagle feathers meek.
With war-paint his face, tints of many colors by plan,
From nature's rude designs, his ancestral clan.
Lean beside him his bow un-strung, in token the past,
His savage ways and customs; our Chieftains cast
The mighty tomahawk, place in hand useless aside,
Strap across his shoulders, quiver filled arrows his pride,
In token of reluctance his history, write big letters bold,
Let not time blot, tribute to American Indian, behold.

—By RILEY THOMPSON.

Urban Renewal Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I received from Honorable John B. Hynes, mayor of the city of Boston, Mass., relating to urban renewal legislation, together with copy of my reply to him:

CITY OF BOSTON,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
January 30, 1959.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Urban renewal legislation is pending before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. Both of the mayors organizations, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the American Municipal Association, are heartily in favor of a bill which would provide for a 10-year urban renewal program with the Federal Government appropriating $600 million each year and the local communities providing the usual one-third or even a 20 percent share.

As you know, the administration bill is for $250 million a year for 3 years and $200 million for the following 3 years. This simply will not do the job that must be done. In addition, the requirement in the administration bill that cities share on a matching 50–50 basis will be the death knell to the urban renewal program, for cities simply cannot contribute that much to this most necessary program.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors, and through its president, Hon. Norris Poulson, mayor of Los Angeles, has placed its case before the committee on January 26. I am in accord with everything that Mayor Poulson said at that time because it reflects the unanimous opinion of the mayors throughout the country.

I will appreciate if you will keep your eye on this legislation and help wherever you can. I know that you are interested in the continuation of urban renewal on a sensible scale and in a sensible manner and I know also that you hardly need to be asked to help.

With best wishes, I am
Respectfully

JOHN HYNES, *Mayor.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1959.

Hon. JOHN B. HYNES,
City Hall, Boston, Mass.

DEAR JOHN: I am in receipt of your letter of January 30 and in reply will say that the President's recommendation in relation to urban renewal legislation is completely inadequate.

I am having your letter inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Excise Tax Cut Could Save Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is cheering when the newsmen of the country understand clearly that specific legislation is important to the whole country, and transmit that information to the readers in their editorials.

I submit herewith for inclusion in the RECORD an article which appeared in the January 28 edition of the Flint (Mich.) Journal. This piece gives an excellent summary of why the bill to repeal the 10 percent excise tax on automobiles is important to the economy of the whole Nation.

I welcome this opportunity to again put before my colleagues the vital importance of removing the excise tax as a measure helpful in spurring sales and restoring jobs to many Americans.

The article follows:

EXCISE TAX CUT COULD SAVE JOBS

The announcement that 2,250 Buick and Fisher 1 workers are being laid off is the kind of news that none of us like to hear.

Expressions of sympathy don't pay the grocery bills of those workers and their families. What we need is the kind of economic climate which will spur the sales of automobiles and restore those unfortunates to the factory payrolls.

One measure which could stimulate sales is now before Congress. Representative CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, Sixth District Republican, has introduced a bill to repeal the 10 percent excise tax on cars.

A similar attempt to cancel the automotive excise tax was defeated last year because of the opposition of the Eisenhower administration, which argued that the Federal Government could not afford the loss of revenue.

The Treasury Department probably will oppose Representative CHAMBERLAIN's new bill because the need for revenue is great, particularly in view of the probability that Congress will vote more spending than the administration considers sound.

However, there is a definite possibility repeal of the excise tax would result in more tax revenue, not less.

Individuals who are laid off from their jobs are not earning and therefore are not paying income taxes. They become an expense to local, State and Federal governments through unemployment compensation or direct relief.

In addition, lower sales reduce the profits of automotive manufacturers. The corporations profits tax, as a result, will not bring in as much revenue as it would if car manufacturers could maintain high production.

It is impossible to prove that abandonment of the excise tax on cars would mean an increase in tax revenue. It is impossible to prove that it wouldn't. At least it is worthy of consideration.

If manufacturers did not have to pay a Federal excise tax, which averages about $180 per vehicle, the price of cars could be reduced. Lower price tags probably would mean more buyers for new automobiles, and possible return to work of those who are being laid off.

Elimination, or substantial reduction, of the excise tax could be most helpful in spurring sales and, of most importance, restoring those laid off to their jobs.

The administration and Congress should give it a try.

Alaska: Wildlife Reservoir

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the vast new State of Alaska has tremendous wildlife and waterfowl resources which must not be allowed to disappear. Both the Federal Government and the State of Alaska have a heavy responsibility to preserve and protect these resources.

R. G. Lynch, conservation writer for the Milwaukee Journal, made an extended visit to Alaska last year. In the following article from the Journal, Mr. Lynch discusses Alaska's resources and the nature of the conservation task ahead:

ALASKA: WILDLIFE RESERVOIR—UNITED STATES HAS CHANCE TO AVOID MISTAKES OF PAST IN TEEMING AREAS OF ITS VAST NEW STATE

(By R. G. Lynch)

Many a man, and perhaps a few nations, would like to turn back the clock and do something over again, without mistakes now

realized. In a sense, the United States has this chance in Alaska.

A century ago, Congress turned over 65 million acres of wetlands to the States. Now the Nation is trying to buy back some marshes for ducks and geese.

Settlers in the Great Plains plowed up 14 million acres of prairie sod that the Nation is trying to get back into grass to keep the soil from blowing away.

Farming and overgrazing have left but few remnants of virgin prairie, and in the east and the Lake States only islands of primeval forest have survived logging operations.

PRESERVE KEY AREAS

Scientists, conservationists, and sportsmen are determined that these things shall not happen in Alaska. They are supporting efforts of the Fish and Wildlife Service to preserve key areas for public ownership and management.

These proposed wildlife areas are expected to become an issue in the present Congress, when Alaska tries to gain control of its fish and wildlife, which was withheld in the Statehood Act because commercial fisheries interests dominated the Territorial administration.

Alaska is big game country probably surpassed only by Africa. The Alaska brown bear, largest land carnivore, is found nowhere else. The new State has several varieties of grizzly bear, an animal dangerously near extinction elsewhere. It has mountain sheep and goats, moose, caribou, deer, and polar bear, as well as small herds of musk oxen and bison, established by game managers.

BIG ARCTIC RANGE

Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton, late in 1957, temporarily withdrew 14,000 square miles from the public domain for an arctic game range, abutting Canada. It has grizzly and polar bears, Dall sheep, caribou, and many small animals, including the wolverine, another creature near extinction. It is an important nesting ground for waterfowl.

Severe winters and summer insects make this arctic shelf unattractive to man, but the area adjoins oil and gas fields, so Seaton wants it kept open for leases for petroleum and mining operations.

Development would proceed as in the Kenai moose range, where oil companies drill under regulations which protect wildlife. The land would remain public.

BIG WATERFOWL SITE

The delta of the Yukon and Kuskokwim Rivers is one of the world's greatest waterfowl breeding places—20,000 square miles of marshy tundra with thousands of small ponds. The Pacific flyway gets 20 percent of its flocks from here.

Since 1947, the Fish and Wildlife Service has been trying to get this waterfowl factory protected and meanwhile has cut its request to 2,900 square miles. A few Eskimos use the area. Other settlement is unlikely. Because of petroleum possibilities, a game management area is proposed, rather than a refuge, so that leasing may be permitted.

Southward, across Bristol Bay, there is a waterfowl crossroads at the tip of the Alaskan Peninsula. Millions of geese, brant, and ducks concentrate here to fatten up before continuing flights. The Wildlife Service wants 500 square miles of land and 183 of water around Izembek Bay, where berries on the upland and eel grass in the tidal flats provide food for the tremendous flocks.

PROTECT WALRUS, BEAR

Alaska has other urgent problems for the attention of Congress. A marine mammals act will be introduced to provide some protection for walrus and polar bear.

With the demand for carved ivory, hunters kill walruses just for their tusks and leave the carcasses to rot. The animal is a source of meat and skins for boatmaking. Its depletion would work a hardship on the natives.

Glenn Orton, a Federal game agent, with whom the writer made some flights out of Fairbanks last summer, had just made a walrus survey. Along the coast from Unalakleet on the Bering Sea to Point Barrow on the Arctic Ocean, 69 carcasses were counted. Heads or tusks had been removed from all but six, which probably got away from hunters before dying.

The polar bear was safe from too much hunting until the airplane enabled man to seek it on the ice pack at sea.

Now it is feared that the kill of both walrus and polar bear exceeds their reproduction. Since both range beyond the 3-mile limit, a treaty may be necessary to provide international protection.

National Defense Student Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment upon a program which has significance for the young people of this Nation and for the strength of the Nation itself. I refer to the national defense student loan program authorized by Public Law 864, enacted by the 85th Congress in its closing days and signed into law by the President on September 2.

The national defense student loan program provides for the establishment, at institutions of higher education throughout the Nation, of loan funds from which needy students may borrow funds for the completion of their education at low interest rates and on generous repayment terms. Its objective is to encourage needy students to continue their educational pursuits, an objective contemplated in several features of this act. The Congress is authorized to appropriate $295 million for this purpose during the next 4 years. The assistance and encouragement that this program can and will offer to needy young people throughout the country is immense. It should do much to reduce the waste of talent which has resulted from the failure of able but needy students to continue with their educational plans.

President Eisenhower signed the National Defense Education Act into law on September 2, 1958. I have followed the progress that has been made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in implementing this program. I believe that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Arthur S. Fleming, and the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick, are to be complimented upon the prompt and sound manner in which they have undertaken the implementation of all programs authorized by the National Defense Education Act. This is a new era of departmental responsibility and they have measured up to the challenge. They are to be complimented upon the appointment of Dr. Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., to head the administration of those programs affecting American higher education. It has been my pleasure to work with Dr. Babbidge in various capacities over the years, and I am confident that he will lend able and imaginative leadership to the administration of these programs.

It is a particular source of pride to me that officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have selected to administer the national defense student loan program a resident of the State of New York, and a prominent official of the State university of New York, Mr. Peter P. Muirhead. Mr. Muirhead has for many years served as director of the New York State regents scholarship and examination program. He served as executive secretary of the New York Higher Education Assistant Corporation, which was responsible for the establishment of New York State's successful student loan program. Mr. Muirhead is a man of experience and wisdom, and in entrusting to him the responsibility for the administration of this program, the Department has ensured that the program will be administered soundly and well. Mr. Muirhead's appointment to this post was made possible only through the cooperation of Dr. James S. Allen, Jr., Commissioner of Education for the State of New York. Dr. Allen's willingness to lend to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a key member of his own staff is a splendid example of effective Federal-State Cooperation. It is an example of the constructive concept of partnership which has been stressed so much by the President and other administration leaders, as the key to effective progress in the field of education.

Mr. Speaker, the national defense student loan program authorized by the 85th Congress is a well conceived program. It is secure in the hands of able educators and administrators. I am confident that it will do much for the young people of our Nation, and therefore for the Nation as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I have one concern regarding the effective implementation of this program; and this has to do with the amounts of money available for this purpose. As I indicated earlier, the act authorizes the appropriation of sums up to $295 million during the next 4 years. For this, the first year of the loan program, a total of $47½ million is authorized. The respective Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate, under pressure to act on an appropriations request during the closing hours of the 85th Congress, effected an interim, or stop-gap, appropriation for this purpose of only $6 million. This was done with the clear understanding that the Appropriations Committees would reconsider at the earliest opportunity a supplemental request for this and other purposes. I trust and hope that this body will see to it that the additional funds in substantial quantity are made available at the earliest possible opportunity.

Let me suggest the importance of prompt action on a supplemental request for the purposes of the National Defense Education Act. Taking the student loan program by itself, let me indicate how inadequate a figure of $6 million is.

The most recent figures show that 92 institutions in the State of New York have applied for funds under the loan program, and these institutions represent more than 167,000 full-time students. The total amount requested by New York State schools is approximately $7 million. In my home city of New York alone, 28 institutions, representing more than 71,000 full-time students, have applied for Federal funds under this program. Under the State allotment formula embodied in this act, the State of New York would be entitled to only $623,442. If the initial stopgap appropriation of $6 million were not increased this sum would not begin to meet the needs of New York City institutions alone. This sum would not meet one-tenth of the current student loan needs of institutions of higher education in the State of New York. Failure to provide additional funds under this program, therefore, would work a hardship upon the young people of the State of New York and upon the institutions which they are attending. I urge, Mr. Speaker, that the leadership of this body give prompt and positive attention to this critical need.

I am confident that President Eisenhower will forward to the Congress a request for supplementary funds with which to implement the national defense student loan program. I know that Secretary Flemming and Commissioner Derthick are well aware of the urgent need for additional funds for this purpose. Certainly the colleges and universities of the Nation know how pitifully inadequate $6 million is for this purpose. The young people of the Nation and their parents have made perfectly clear how urgently they need this assistance. It now rests squarely upon this Congress to respond promptly and positively to a need identified and endorsed by the entire Nation.

School Money Without Strings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years Federal grants-in-aid have developed rapidly until now, in a substantial degree, they help to support many major State government services. In Federal aid programs, the Congress has intended as much as possible to remove from such grants Federal direction, control, and interference, but it is obvious that through establishment of Federal standards it is not possible to eliminate Federal Bureaucratic dictation and intervention.

What has happened is that to meet enormous and ever-increasing expenditures the Federal Government has tapped the most lucrative sources of tax revenue, leaving State and municipal governments little other than real property taxes and sales excises from which to meet their needs unless these State and municipal governments duplicate Federal taxation including individual and corporation income taxes, admission taxes, beverage taxes, as well as tobacco, gift, luxury, transportation, and communication taxes, to name a few.

The Federal Government developed the grants-in-aid type of appropriations to provide incentives to State and local governments to meet local needs. In all fairness, Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out that the purposes of these aid programs are certainly for the most part meritorious. Of course, it is neither economical nor efficient to withdraw huge sums from the taxpayers of each State and then have a portion of such funds trickle piecemeal back to the States. However, the real argument against Federal grants is of course the Federal strings and the compulsory requirements imposed by law and regulation of Federal administering bureaus.

In my State of Washington, like in many other States, the State legislature is presently struggling with the problem of obtaining funds to meet adequately the responsibilities of State government under our constitution, including the needs of education. The government has requested $135 million in new taxes for public services as well as for a deficiency appropriation of $25.5 million to cover overspending in public welfare and to help lower the current State deficit estimated at about $80 million.

The Governor in his budget chopped off about $12 million from the current State school fund estimate recommended to the legislature by our State superintendent of public instruction. The State school directors association had recommended $40 million above the Governor's figure.

For educational construction funds our State is planning to issue $30 million in bonds, but all the while we are told the State is running out of borrowing power.

The harrowed Governor in a dilemma has expressed an opinion that Federal aid to education is the answer.

I have opposed Federal aid to education, Mr. Speaker, but nevertheless I deemed it my responsibility to confer with our Washington State superintendent of public instruction, Lloyd Andrews, who is widely recognized as courageous politically and at the same time dedicated to the cause of public education and conversant with its financial needs.

Thus, I sent Mr. Andrews a copy of the Murray-Metcalf bill because it seemed to represent the type of legislation which will get the nod from the congressional committees having jurisdiction over education.

As I expected, Mr. Andrews wrote me opposing the bill and, may I add, I strongly share his criticism in that as presently written this bill sets forth limitations and definitions of the States' education programs, and places authority for administration in the Office of the U.S. Commissioner of Education. For example, section 4, subsection (b), spells out specifically that this money shall be used for school construction and teachers' salaries.

I agree with Washington State's superintendent of public instruction in his position as stated to me that the general operation and maintenance of our public schools must be treated as a whole, and not in this manner, or to quote Mr. Andrews' own words, "We would have to abdicate our local and State jurisdiction over educational process."

In the Murray-Metcalf bill, furthermore, as Mr. Andrews pointed out, section 5 by inference sets forth priorities for school buildings, removing from the State the latitude of determining its own needs. Also in section 6, the U.S. Commissioner determines the purposes for teachers' salaries.

Mr. Speaker, I share my State superintendent's concern of such encroachment on State and local responsibility by control of the Central Government But I likewise have a deep interest in education and recognize adequate money must be provided to our local school authorities to enable them to provide classrooms and decently paid teachers for our expanding school population.

Therefore, I am introducing a no-strings-attached alternative bill to pay back some of their own money to the respective States and Hawaii for educational purposes free from any Federal controls. My bill would authorize an appropriation equal to 2 percent of all Federal income taxes collected in each State and Hawaii for education in the common or public schools. That is all. No standards or specifications of any sort are stipulated. The purposes for which these funds would be spent would be entirely up to each State and its legislature providing it was for education.

In other words, if some of our local school districts' financial affairs are critical, and I am convinced such is the case, let us give the local and State authorities help but refrain from dictating how they must solve their problems.

Under my bill, the handling of funds will not be in any way, shape, or form through the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The only Federal responsibility will be the calculation of amounts to be returned to each State and then the transfer of funds by check from the Secretary of the Treasury. The amount would be automatically geared to the national income for each year. There would be no bureaucratic power or expense involved.

The accompanying table of the approximate Federal income tax collections by State or Territory for fiscal 1957 shows the estimated amount of income taxes. Also shown is 2 percent of each amount, which gives an idea of how much each State could expect to receive.

Estimated Federal income tax collections, by State or Territory, fiscal year 1957

[In millions]

State or Territory	Estimated Federal income tax collections	Estimated yearly payment to each State or Territory
Alabama	$394	$7.9
Arizona	170	3.4
Arkansas	143	2.9
California	5,134	102.7
Colorado	697	13.9
Connecticut	1,079	21.6
Delaware	702	14
Florida	820	16.4
Georgia	602	12
Idaho	105	2.1
Illinois	5,081	101.6
Indiana	1,275	25.5
Iowa	465	9.3
Kansas	404	8
Kentucky	456	9.1
Louisiana	510	10.2
Maine	156	3.1
Maryland (plus District of Columbia)	1,368	27.3
Massachusetts	1,710	34.2
Michigan	4,104	82
Minnesota	939	18.8
Mississippi	129	2.6
Missouri	1,385	27.7
Montana	109	2.1
Nebraska	298	6.0
Nevada	77	1.5
New Hampshire	119	2.4
New Jersey	1,798	36
New Mexico	113	2.3
New York	11,985	239.7
North Carolina	671	13.4
North Dakota	62	1.2
Ohio	4,547	90.9
Oklahoma	514	10.3
Oregon	419	8.4
Pennsylvania	4,271	85.4
Rhode Island	259	5.2
South Carolina	219	4.4
South Dakota	59	1.2
Tennessee	476	9.5
Texas	2,016	40.3
Utah	150	3
Vermont	60	1.2
Virginia	695	13.9
Washington	728	14.6
West Virginia	274	5.5
Wisconsin	1,124	22.5
Wyoming	49	1
Alaska	29	.6
Hawaii	128	2.6
Puerto Rico	1	.02
Total	[1] 59,078	1,181.6

[1] The difference between this total of $59,078,000,000 and the total figure of $60,560,000,000 as reported by the Internal Revenue Service is due to: (1) A difference in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance contributions' data estimated by the IRS for the entire United States, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates thereof, which had to be used in compiling this report; and (2) other adjustments made by the IRS to its State data in deriving its total figures—1 such adjustment is a $797,000,000 adjustment for undistributed depositary receipts.

Sources: 1957 Annual Report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and Social Security Bulletin, March 1958.

As a matter of interest I am also showing the figures from the budget of the United States Government for fiscal 1960 to indicate other amounts allocated to education in the form of grants.

Selected Federal grants for education

Program	Appropriations	
	Fiscal 1958	Fiscal 1959
1. Vocational education	$33,750,000	$33,750,000
Permanent authorization	7,138,000	7,138,000
2. Land-grant colleges	2,502,000	2,502,000
Permanent authorization	2,550,000	2,550,000
3. Grants for library services	5,000,000	6,000,000
4. Federal-impacted areas assistance for—		
School construction	98,650,000	50,800,000
Maintenance and operation	127,000,000	130,000,000

Selected Federal grants for education—Con.

Program	Appropriations	
	Fiscal 1958	Fiscal 1959
5. Program and financing, Office of Education	$7,186,000	$8,786,000
6. President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School	50,000	(1)
7. National Defense Education Act of 1958		40,000,000
8. National school lunch program	99,872,340	[2]145,000,000
Total	383,698,340	426,526,000

[1] No longer operating.
[2] Estimated.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me urge consideration of a no-strings-attached type of bill instead of opening the door to a program that will only end with a Federal bureaucrat, so to speak, sitting on and dictating to, so to speak, every school board in America. Let us not take away the management of our schools from the parents and local communities and school boards.

Report of Recent Attacks Against the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the November 1, 1958, issue of Firing Line, published by the American Legion, containing a statement by Commander Moore of the American Legion, and referring to the FBI and its Director, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON RECENT ATTACKS AGAINST THE FBI

Recently, a series of apparently unrelated attacks, with the obvious intent to smear J. Edgar Hoover and discredit the Federal Bureau of Investigation were initiated. Instigator of the initial attack was Cyrus Stephen Eaton, aged, multimillionaire industrialist, on May 4, 1958 American Broadcasting Company television program financed by the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic. That episode was exposed in the July 1, 1958 issue of the Firing Line. In a statement released on October 27, 1958, National Commander Preston J. Moore stated that the national convention in September 1958 commended both the FBI and Director J. Edgar Hoover. He found it difficult to attribute any purpose to these attacks other than a desire to destroy this Federal law enforcement agency and its leader as an effective deterrent to undetected, unopposed Communist subversion in this country."

Commander Moore declared "that a deliberate 'smear Hoover and the FBI' campaign, similar to the Communist Party's unsuccessful efforts of 1940, has been launched is no mere supposition. The entire October issue of Rights magazine, the official publication of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, branded by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the United States Senate Judiciary Committee as a Communist-front organization, is devoted to an article (postponed by exposure) 'The FBI and Your Freedom.' It is, of course, a biased one-sided attack on the FBI, distinguished only by its omission of any reference to communism's denial of human dignity or humanitarianism. Coincidentally, or so the timing suggests, a recent issue of the Nation magazine featured an article by Fred J. Cook, attempting to discredit the FBI. Some reviewers have evaluated this piece as 60 pages of distortion, half-truths and innuendoes."

"Finally, and most significantly, former FBI agents have been approached recently by reporters of the New York Post seeking derogatory material on J. Edgar Hoover. These reporters have extended their 'beat' to Paris, France, in what is obviously a far-flung and must be a discouraging attempt to do a character-assassination job on Mr. Hoover. Evidently, the initial failure of this mission resulted in the New York Post stepping up its major effort in 'Operation Gumshoe' back in the States. Apparently forgetting, at least momentarily, that they were supposed to obtain information, not reveal it, reporters for the paper disclosed to unquestionably reliable New York sources that the Post plans to assign reporters to Washington, D.C., and other cities to skulk around restaurants and other public places in the hope of digging up information that could be used against Hoover and the FBI." Commander Moore believes "that our people should reaffirm their faith in Hoover and the FBI" and hopes "that the American press which, with a few tragic exceptions, is commendably patriotic, will continue to give J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI their necessary and persuasive editorial vote of confidence."

Hero of the Cook article in the Nation is none other than the aforementioned Cyrus S. Eaton, recently returned from a visit to the Soviet Union and Austria. Based on an article published in Pravda, Soviet Communist Party organ, the New York World Telegram of September 8, 1958, quoted Eaton as stating that Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's "directness, sense of humor and sincere aspiration for peace throughout the world would find a response" in the United States. The New York Herald Tribune, European edition of September 25, 1958, reflected that Khrushchev interrupted his vacation and returned to Moscow "for a session with the American industrialist Cyrus Eaton" and to conduct a Communist Party meeting. According to Eaton, the fundamental reason for world tension and distrust of Russia is "based on the misconception of the people of the United States about the Soviet Union, its people, resources and present government." He further stated, "I am confident that in Khrushchev we have a man with whom we could deal." (See Cleveland Plain Dealer, October 8, 1958, p. 1.)

Eaton believed Communist China should be recognized and admitted to the United Nations and "we should start doing business with them." The credulity and abysmal ignorance of Eaton in damning Hoover and praising Khrushchev appears difficult to understand. Eaton obviously never read the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee report on "The Soviet Empire: Prison House of Nations and Races." Senator EASTLAND in his release of July 7, 1958, summarized the modus operandi whereby the Soviet, through trained agitators, exploiting national and racial feelings and duping nations into severing protective ties, renders them defenseless. Like a ripe plum they fall into the waiting arms of the Soviet, either as a subordinate republic or as a satellite state.

Many of the questions raised by reporters of the New York Post parallel the smears of the Nation. James A. Wechsler, editor of the Post, testifying before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations on April 24, 1953, stated he joined the Young Communist League in the spring of 1934 and left the subversive organization at the end of 1937. In the fall of 1937, after returning from an European trip which included Russia, he wrote articles for the Nation and became its full-time editor early in 1938. He resigned from the Nation in May 1940, to become assistant labor editor of PM. The reason for Wechsler's antipathy to Mr. Hoover and the FBI is not known, but an article in the New York Journal American of August 9, 1952, stated:

"It is true that Wechsler now howls he is a stanch anti-Communist, but like his Americans for Democratic Action (ADA), he protests much but seldom acts. Both Wechsler and the ADA—which houses a selection of leftwingers—spend more time time lambasting the Smith Act, the McCarran committee (Senate Internal Security Subcommittee), Senator McCarthy and Louis Budenz then they do in direct frontal thrusts at Stalin's local boys. Wechsler also has a peeve at the FBI and he has tried to rack up this Federal Bureau time and again. Fortunately, J. Edgar Hoover's lads are sturdy souls and they continue their pursuit of Remington and other riders of the subversive circuit who gallop as heroes across the pages of the New York Post.

The California Senate Factfinding Committee on Un-American Activities made the following statements on pages 621 and 622 of its 1949 report: "The Nation and the New Republic have long records as liberal publications. They cannot be described as Communist, but they are so infiltrated with the Communist Party policy that they serve the interest of the Communists and confuse liberals on many issues, much more than do some of the Communist publications." Concerning the attack by the aforementioned subversive Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, Carey McWilliams, an executive committeeman of its national council is editor of the Nation. His record of affiliation with subversive organizations is extensive. (See Firing Line, Oct. 15, 1958 and House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC), "Operation Abolition," 1957, pp. 8 and 9.)

NEW VOICES OF SOVIET IMPERIALISM

During the last several months, the international Communist movement has made noticeable strides in attempting to further indoctrinate its own members and propagandize the non-Communist world through the circulation of new Marxist periodicals. The most important of these was the publication in September 1958 of World Marxist Review: Problems of Peace and Socialism, the theoretical and information journal of Communist Workers' Parties. Prior to the appearance of World Marxist Review, the worldwide Communist revolutionary conspiracy has been without a published directive since the expedient dissolution of For A Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy in April 1956. The latter periodical was the official weekly organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties (Cominform), successor of the Soviet dominated Communist International (Comintern).

World Marxist Review is published monthly in 14 foreign languages and distributed by the Press Circulation Agency, Sadova 6, Prague, Czechoslovakia. English language editions are published in both Canada and in Great Britain. The Canadian edition is issued by a dummy setup called Progress Books of 924 King Street West, Toronto 3, Ontario. According to a recent catalog, Progress Books also operates under the name of Progress Subscription Service which specializes in the distribution of numerous periodicals from the Soviet Union and Communist China. It also advertises subscriptions for three subversive periodicals published in the United States; namely, Mainstream, National Guardian and Political Affairs. (See HUAC, "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," 1957, pp. 104–106; and "National Republic," October 1958, p. 33.)

On page 96 of the October 1958 issue of World Marxist Review, the Communist journal claims it is a magazine dealing with a wide range of questions of Marxist-Leninist theory, problems of Socialist and Communist construction, the struggles of the working class and the national-liberation movements. It provides a tribune for the exchange of experiences and opinions in the international labor movement. Its contributors include leading figures of the Communist and workers' movement, as well as scholars, writers, representatives of democratic opinion. In translating this deceptive Communist jargon to understandable English, the above means that the Soviet Union is utilizing World Marxist Review as another tool for dictation and control over its subservient Communist Party apparatuses throughout the world. The masthead of World Marxist Review carries the Soviet revolutionary slogan, "Workers of all countries, unite."

The October issue also contained an article on pages 80 and 81 entitled "Consolidating the Ranks of the Communist Party of the United States" (CPUSA) reflecting the party has become a stronger and more militant conspiratorial organization. World Marxist Review stated: "Recent developments in the CPUSA indicate an important move in the direction of consolidating its ranks and improving its work among the masses. During the past few years the Communist Party was forced to conduct a serious struggle against the revisionists and splitters who sought to disrupt and destroy it. The undermining activities of the (John) Gates revisionist group gravely injured the party. However, the hopes of the enemies of the working class were not fated to be realized. The sound elements in the party leadership, supported by the organizations chiefly in the industrial areas, fought hard to preserve and consolidate the party. The first gains are now evident. Facts show that the CPUSA is surmounting the numerous obstacles and exposing the opportunities of all hues. It is making better headway along the road mapped out by the 16th national convention." For a complete report on this convention held in New York City from February 9 to 12, 1957, readers may wish to consult the March 15, 1957, Firing Line. According to both the October 5 and 12, 1958, editions of the Worker, the CPUSA solicited its membership to subscribe to World Marxist Review.

The September 1958 issue of Party Affairs, the official publication of the national committee of the CPUSA, disclosed startling revelations pertaining to the growth of local party periodicals. Party Affairs stated: "Within the past year, a number of party organizations have begun to publish community or party bulletins. The New York State committee has resumed publication of Party Voice, which had not appeared for some time. The Queens (New York) County committee issues a four-page monthly bulletin, the Comet, of which 1,500 copies are mailed each month to party and nonparty readers, including a number of prominent figures in the community.

"An unusually lively and well-written paper is the two-page Searchlight issued by the Erie County (Buffalo) Communist Party. This paper, of which some 3,000 are distributed monthly, covers a wide variety of subjects. A different type of publication is Moving Forward, a mimeographed monthly bulletin issued by the Communist Party of Missouri. Now in its second year, it is addressed primarily to party members, though it is distributed more widely as well. Moving Forward is not a one-man job, but is put out by a party group assigned to this task, which involves as many as a dozen people in the writing and technical work."

"The Southern California District (CPUSA) issues a four-page tabloid, the Southern California Party Forum, which is addressed to the party membership. The Illinois district (CPUSA) is planning to issue a State party bulletin soon." In summarizing the article, Party Affairs declared that "these bulletins are an important means of reaching the party membership or the community. Their appearance is a welcome sign of growing party activity." Generally, the subject content of the aforementioned local party periodicals included the following: "ending H-bomb tests," "school segregation," "CPUSA ideological questions," "labor struggles," "news and announcements of party activities," and "statements by leading bodies and correspondence from (CPUSA) clubs and sections."

Our November 1, 1957 Firing Line reported that Party Affairs is an internal bulletin of the CPUSA which commenced publication in August 1957. Restricted to members of the CPUSA, Party Affairs is now printed by the subversive Prompt Press and is distributed from the party's national office located on the third floor of 23 West 26th Street, New York City.

An item of interest: Dr. Victor A. Kovda, of the Soviet Union has been named to head the Department of Natural Sciences of UNESCO. (See the New York Times, October 17, 1958, p. C–3.)

New Price Tags for Government Managers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article, written by Carl W. Robinson, which appeared in the September-October 1958 issue of the Harvard Business Review.

As the article points out, lower-level Government positions are usually paid competitively; but top-management jobs are frequently underpaid. Yet, in Government as well as industry, the caliber of management personnel determines the effectiveness of the total operation. We need good managers in Government positions if we are to get maximum return from our tax dollars.

NEW PRICE TAGS FOR GOVERNMENT MANAGERS

(By Carl W. Robinson)

An acute shortage of qualified top Government personnel has developed in this country. It affects every area of governmental jurisdiction, from the municipal level to the Federal. And it affects taxpayers—both corporate and private—for it is beginning to cut seriously into governmental efficiency.

No thinking citizen will deny that the effectiveness of an organization depends upon the skill and ability of a small number of key managers and professional personnel in strategic positions. In business the

stockholders have usually accepted this principle, but in government the voters and elected officials have been slower to respond to it. Only in a few enlightened communities have conscientious citizens joined with public officials in efforts to put the principle into practice.

All this has created a problem, as a study by the Harvard Business School Club of Washington demonstrates. In a 3-year survey of 8,500 businessmen who have held government jobs at the Federal level, the club found that the main reason for dissatisfaction with Washington jobs was loss of pay due to the lower salaries in Government service. The report states in summary that the business community has a "frightening lack of interest" in offering its best brains for Federal jobs.[1] (Working for Government at the State and local levels also has this drawback, besides lacking the glamour which is frequently attached to the life and limelight of Washington.)

TOP-LEVEL SHORTAGE

The conditions which are precipitating this growing shortage of capable executives and professional personnel in Government seem to be clear. In the race to win and hold professional and managerial talent since World War II, business has outbid Government by maintaining a more realistic balance between salaries in the upper and lower brackets. As long as management is able to show improved profits, stock holders raise few complaints about higher salaries and special forms of supplemental compensation for key executives.

In Government, however, it has been more difficult to face a mass electorate with demands for salaries of $20,000 or more, despite the fact that the responsibilities of many of the officials are comparable in both magnitude and complexity to those of business. It has been especially difficult to overcome this obstacle because no accepted basis has existed for comparing top level jobs in Government positions of comparable responsibility in business.

DEMANDS FOR ACTION

Three developments have started a more realistic appraisal of the shortage of top personnel in Government.

The first is the mounting demand from citizens' groups for a higher level of efficiency in Government operations. It comes from such organizations as local community clubs and the League of Women Voters, and from growing numbers of businessmen and professional people who are taking a more active interest in Government problems at all levels. This demand is forcing some realization on the elected official, who is dependent upon the vote of the public, that it is increasingly necessary to have specially trained and widely experienced managers for the vast and complicated departments of Government if he is to produce the record of outstanding performance needed to wage a successful campaign for reelection.

The second development stems from the fact that some well-known top business leaders have undertaken key responsibilities in Government. When respected and highly paid men such as Charles E. Wilson, George M. Humphrey, W. Randolph Burgess, Sinclair Weeks, and Robert Cutler accepted positions of key responsibility in Washington, they highlighted the recent trend for business executives to accept a new degree of responsibility for service to the community. Even more important, they focused attention on the fact that Government is the country's biggest business, and that it calls for the best of managerial skill if it is to operate efficiently and economically. As a result, a growing and highly influential segment of the electorate is beginning to know and respect the magnitude and complexity of Government operations.

But the development which is most likely to precipitate action in supporting reasonable Government executive salaries is the creation and use, in the last few years, of a practical method for evaluating and comparing the scope and responsibility of top-level jobs in Government and industry. Its continued use over a period of years by a growing number of Government units should help to keep Government salaries in a more realistic relation to business salaries. If this is achieved, one of the serious roadblocks in attracting and retaining high-caliber professional and management in Government service will be removed.

GROWING RESPONSIBILITIES

If there is any question about the need for putting Government executives and professional leaders on a salary scale more comparable to those in industry, look at what has been happening to management responsibilities in Government in recent years.

Population explosion

In the last 20 to 30 years sheer increase in size has made the managerial requirements more difficult in many Government jurisdictions. Between 1940 and 1957, the population of the United States increased by 40 million; and this rate of increase is expected to continue for the next few decades and possibly to accelerate. Individual States have experienced particularly spectacular gains. California's population, for example, increased by more than 3,675,000 between 1940 and 1950. But the most dramatic changes have come in cities and towns of the country, with population in many cases spilling across village, township, and county lines and thereby creating a maze of problems for public utility, transportation, school, and public health authorities.

Increased complexity

Another vital factor is the new range of governmental services which the public demands, bringing with it an alarming increase in the tax burden and in the magnitude and complexity of Government administration. The problem is especially acute at the State level:

Income, sales, and other taxes are now a major administrative problem of many of the States and larger cities.

Pension systems have developed within local governing units, and must be administered.

States now have their own labor laws, local programs for the aged, laws regulating public utilities, and, recently, a growing number of State planning and development commissions.

Large programs of urban renewal are often planned by the States in cooperation with city government.

Total State budgets have tripled since 1942. State borrowing amounted to only $170 million in 1942. Today it exceeds $2.2 billion.

Squeeze on executive manpower

The overall problem is further complicated by the executive manpower squeeze which every businessman has run into for the last 5 years and which will continue into the 1960's. This squeeze was precipitated by the rapid expansion of our economy. It will continue and be aggravated by the shortage of young men entering the country's labor force (the result of the low birth rate of the 1930's). It has intensified the bidding for competent young executive talent, and has increased the bargaining power of older executives who are needed to carry on until the shortage has passed.

The inevitable result is that government, with its low salaries for managerial jobs and its reluctance until now to stand up for adequate salary boosts at the top, is being bypassed by ambitious young talent and is losing some of its key people to business.

BELATED RECOGNITION

Many observers, when viewing government's growth in size and complexity, might feel that it is getting too large too rapidly. They would agree, however, that this growth is controlled best by competent executives—men of proven ability who usually can be attracted and retained in government only by salaries that are in reasonable relation to those found in business.

Executives who have analyzed the managerial problems of both business and government are increasingly convinced that the executive requirements for effective public administrators are as exacting as those for executives in private business. Sound management of a public works or highway construction program for a large State, county, or city, for instance, calls for engineering and executive skills comparable to those of the management of a large private construction firm. Likewise, directing a statewide public or mental health program in this age of stress, mass emergencies, and the peculiar needs of an aging population calls for an unusual combination of professional management and public relations talents.

The main difference up to now is that industry has recognized the size and importance of the management job and has paid as much as was necessary to get and hold an executive or professional expert capable of handling the job efficiently. So, in fact, have the labor unions, the country's leading trade associations, and the big private foundations.

Thoughtful citizens are belatedly realizing that government, the biggest service organization of all, has not adequately recognized the need for high-level management skill and ability in top positions, and has not provided a level of compensation which will attract sufficient numbers of executives of this caliber to government positions.

EXHIBIT I.—*Levels of Government employees*

	Percent of total employees	Percent of total payroll
Lower level (clerical, manual, and lower technical positions)	75-90	65-85
Middle level (supervisory, technical, professional, and middle-management positions)	7-22	11-33
Upper level (top-management positions)	0.5-2	1.5-5

COST OF IMPROVEMENT

The potential cost of inadequate managerial talent in the executive jobs of government is appalling. By contrast, the cost of adjusting the salaries in upper-echelon positions of government to a level that will attract and hold managerial talent in government is small.

Varying needs

For the purpose of illustration and comparison, government workers can be divided into three broadly defined levels, as exhibit 1 shows. Among lower-level workers there is generally little or no salary differential between those in government and those in industry. Since the lower echelons usually account for 75 percent to 90 percent of the total number of employees, it is easy to understand the concern for their interests on the part of elected officials. As a result of that and also of the ease with which their jobs can be compared with similar jobs in private industry, the salaries of lower-level government workers have stayed generally in line with, and sometimes ahead of, the com-

[1] Businessmen in Government (Washington, May 1958); available from Division of Research, Harvard Business School, Boston 63, Massachusetts.

pensation of their private industry counterparts.

As exhibit 1 also indicates, the middle salary area usually accounts for no more than 7 percent to 22 percent of the total employed personnel, and 11 percent to 33 percent of the total payroll dollars. But these averages, while they reflect the personnel and payroll distribution of a wide range of governmental organizations, can present an exaggerated picture to the taxpayer of the cost of a major salary adjustment for the key technical, supervisory, professional, and middle management positions of a city, county, or State. What is overlooked is that the lower positions of the middle level are generally in reasonable adjustment. It is the upper-middle jobs that are usually underpaid.

Because only a partial salary revision is necessary, the cost of making middle management compensation in government comparable to that in industry is lower than many people would expect. For example:

In one of the large counties of eastern New York the total cost to the community of increases which brought the salaries of all key positions in the middle level into a much improved relation with those of private business was only 1 percent of the total payroll. This was true even though several large individual salary increases were called for.

In one of the metropolitan counties in the Great Lakes area a similar adjustment of combined middle-level and upper-level administrative salaries raised the overall payroll budget a bare 1 percent.

These low percentages should not lead us to overlook the importance of the positions involved. The performance of the jobholders affects the efficiency not only of middle management but also of top personnel. We are dealing here with a wide variety of key men—specialists ranging from engineers connected with highway programs to medical and psychiatric specialists connected with public and mental health services, and from lawyers connected with the attorney general's office to accountants attached to the revenue, tax, or budget departments.

It is in the upper categroy that Government salaries most often fall notably below the levels which prevail in industry. The number of positions involved is small, and usually accounts for fewer than 1 percent of the total employees. Their salaries often account for no more than 2 percent of the total payroll. Yet it is this group, with its requirements for top-management skills, that should provide the catalytic force necessary to ensure a sound return on the taxpayer's dollar. The benefits from possible improvement of management are almost without limit, and the total cost is negligible because of the size of the group. For example:

In a county adjacent to a metropolitan area on the eastern seaboard, total annual payrolls amount to $15,300,000. The 15 people who fall into top echelon positions receive $238,290, or only 1.6 percent of the total. A 10 percent upward adjustment of salaries for this small group would add less than $25,000, or 0.00163 percent of the total payroll. A more substantial adjustment would still add only an inconsequential cost to the taxpayer.

REVISING SALARY LEVELS

Even if we agree on the importance of raising upper-level salaries, we still have a problem: How can a satisfactory compensation scale for Government posts be determined?

Difficulties to overcome

Experts in the field of compensation have explored the feasibility of measuring the relative value of Government positions with a point-factor evaluation system similar to most all governmental salary and classification studies to date.

one used successfully for many years in industry. Such a system has been developed and, after application in a variety of governmental organizations throughout the country, has proved consistently reliable and effective.

Nevertheless, a serious shortcoming has characterized most Government salary and classification studies. In virtually every project of this sort, a sincere effort has been made to conduct the survey of prevailing salaries on a basis that would insure accurate comparison of as nearly identical jobs as possible. To this end, the surveys have generally included business as well as Government jurisdictions. But while adequate amounts of comparable salary data have been available from business in the lower-level classifications, little or no direct salary comparisons have been possible in the upper levels.

[Exhibit 2 omitted in RECORD.]

Exhibit 2 helps to illustrate both the problem and a new technique that has been developed to cope with it. It shows statistical trend lines of the relation of salaries to job values; this relation is used to analyze and compare salary levels from data gathered in comparative salary surveys. For jobs of about 90 evaluation points or less the chart is very useful, but for jobs above 90 evaluation points it is not possible to make comparison with positions in business. Examining the curves in more detail:

Line A was developed from data gathered in Government jurisdiction only. It rises steadily as job value increases, but the rate of increase falls off at the upper end of the line (reflecting the inadequate salaries of top-level men).

Line B was developed from data gathered in private business concerns. Its rate of increase does not fall off as it rises, but it covers only the lower three-quarters of the range of jobs. Data were not available for the top quarter because of lack of directly comparable business positions.

Line C, developed from both Government and business data gathered in a survey, tapers off, then coincides with the Government line in the upper section, since no private business data were used at this level.

A salary structure developed from this data would, therefore, fail to consider private business salaries in the higher levels. This is precisely what has occurred in al-

The reason for this condition is easily understood. In the gatherings of comparable salary data on a straight job-to-job basis there is adequate comparative business information at the lower levels, but little at the middle levels and almost none at the upper levels. A typist does similar work whether it is for a bank, for the office of the sheriff, or for the department of highways. It is therefore easy to establish a basis for comparison. The same is true for a photostat operator, who performs similar functions whether he is employed in a job print shop or in the county courthouse. And a janitor cleans the same way whether he is working in a city hall or in the State capitol.

But when the salary analyst is dealing with senior psychologists on an agency staff, or the warden of the penitentiary, or the sheriff, or the director of the division of sanitation for a State or county, it is difficult to find directly comparable positions in private industry. And the problem is even more difficult in the top echelons where the director of a State mental hospital, or a county attorney, or a county health commissioner must be compared with positions in private industry.

New approach

To meet the problem of the lack of comparable top-level private business salary data, we need a new approach. A suitable one has, I believe, now been developed. By careful factor rating and point evaluation of the jobs of business executives on the same point-evaluation scale used for Government positions, business jobs can be compared with governmental executive positions in terms of relative value, scope, responsibilities, and requirements, even though they differ in specific duties.

To illustrate, exhibit 3 presents four actual cases of evaluation of relatively comparable jobs in industry and Government, showing the close similarity in job values. The relative values of these jobs were calculated by using the factors employed in a typical evaluation plan. The jobs compared are similar though not identical. The evaluations, developed in terms of factors common to all of the jobs studied, are quite accurate and make possible the inclusion of business salary data in trend line computations.

EXHIBIT III.—*Evaluation of comparable jobs in industry and government*

	Special knowledge	Experience	Scope and complexity	Initiative and creativity	Contact	Working conditions	Judgment	Supervision	Total points	Salary range
EXAMPLE 1										
Industry: Market research executive	14	20	17	16	9	2	12	8	98	$8,900-$12,800
Government: Head of planning department	14	18	17	13	10	4	12	6	94	8,560- 11,000
EXAMPLE 2										
Industry: Plant maintenance engineer	14	20	17	10	10	5	16	14	106	10,600- 15,800
Government: Director of facilities and services	14	24	17	10	10	3	12	14	104	9,660- 12,420
EXAMPLE 3										
Industry: General attorney	20	24	17	10	12	1	16	6	106	10,500- 15,800
Government: Deputy county attorney	20	20	17	10	12	1	16	9	105	9,660- 12,420
EXAMPLE 4										
Industry: Corporate construction executive	14	22	17	13	15	6	16	12	112	10,900- 18,900
Government: Deputy commissioner of public works	14	22	17	13	12	6	16	14	114	10,800- 13,880

Extending information

The new approach to salary comparison in Government salary surveys now makes it possible to utilize a long-neglected wealth of business executive salary information in setting professional and managerial salaries within Government. The American Management Association, the Dartnell Corp., and the National Industrial Conference Board, for example, all publish, more or less regularly, good basic surveys of a cross section of management salaries according to reasonably detailed job descriptions.

Of course, precise or perfect comparisons between top-level business and Government positions will not be possible, even with the new approach and the added data. But it will be possible to make fair, reasonable, and statistically supportable projections; it will be possible to develop equitable differences between the salaries for top men in Government and their subordinates. When selected business jobs are carefully analyzed against the Government jobs under study, a number can usually be found which correspond closely enough to permit useful comparison with factor-rating and point-evaluation methods.

Thus, we can extend the all business trend line in exhibit 2 through the level of the upper executive positions; similarly, we can develop the composite of business and Government data line to include the data for top-level business jobs. This eliminates the tapering off of the composite trend line and provides a sound and statistically supportable basis for explaining to legislators and the public the end for raising top executive and professional salaries to their proper levels.

CONCLUSION

A drive for better organization and for a higher degree of efficiency in Government operations is under way in this country. It had its impetus from the original Hoover Commission in the late 1940's. By 1953 more than 30 States had undertaken, with varying degrees of enthusiasm, to review and reorganize their administrative structures.

If this job is to be carried out promptly and efficiently, however, executives and professional leaders with a high caliber of skill and devotion to their jobs are required. In today's competitive market for this kind of key personnel in the upper brackets, most governmental units are at a salary disadvantage. Yet, without excellent personnel, the demands of the electorate for more and better services cannot be met.

Elected officials, until recently, have shied away from the problem of the higher-level salary groups. In the first place, a relatively small number of potential voters is involved. Further, until recently, few political leaders have had any encouragement from any segment of the public to go after salary increases for top officials, no matter how much more exacting their duties have become, or how much more necessary it is for them to invest in specialized education, or how critically their decisions may influence the economical use of the taxpayer's money.

Fortunately, studies like that of the Harvard Business School Club of Washington are throwing a new light on the problem, and are making it more acceptable politically for elective officials to campaign for a level of salaries which will attract to Government the kind of management talent that can do the job the public is beginning to demand.

With the development of a sound technique for comparing executive salaries with those in industry, one very important obstacle to a realistic handling of top-level Government salaries has been removed. Our elected officials can now face the issues with greater assurance of public understanding and acceptance.

Congressman Daniel B. Brewster Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, signal honor has just come to one of the members of the Maryland congressional delegation, Congressman DANIEL B. BREWSTER, in the award to him of the annual distinguished service award of the Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce.

This coveted award is made only after the most careful consideration of the activities and accomplishments of the young men of our city and of its environs. The JAC is so constituted that only those who manifest exceptional abilities and who bid fair to continued greater success can be the recipient of the award. Screening committees and executive action of its officers make certain that the ultimate choice is one who richly deserves the acclaim and the stamp of approval of this organization.

Congressman BREWSTER is the unanimous choice as the metropolitan area's outstanding young man of 1958. In the relatively short period in which he has held public office and been active in private pursuits, he has displayed unusual capabilities, unquestioned integrity, and an attractive personality. He has won the favor of those both in Baltimore County, where he resides, and in Baltimore City, where he is also active, through intelligent effort, zeal for the public good, and courageous action in emergency situations. In order that his colleagues in the House of Representatives and the public generally will have knowledge of the facts supporting this award to him, I ask unanimous consent to have the account of the award published in the Baltimore Sun printed at this point of my remarks.

BREWSTER GETS J.A.C. AWARD

Representative BREWSTER, Democrat, of Maryland, yesterday was given the annual Distinguished Service Award of the Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce.

Alan H. Stocksdale, president of the organization, gave the freshman Congressman a plaque, citing him as the metropolitan area's outstanding young man of 1958.

The presentation was made at a luncheon meeting at the Park Plaza Hotel.

COMMENDED FOR ACHIEVEMENTS

A succession of speakers commended Mr. BREWSTER for his achievements, which they said "have transcended the city-county boundary."

Former State Senator John Grason Turnbull, Democrat, Baltimore County, Mr. BREWSTER's partner in a law firm, declared his feeling on the occasion was that of "a very, very proud older brother."

"As Dan's career goes on and upward," he told the J.A.C. members, "you can look back with pride at having given one of the earliest recognitions of his contributions and abilities."

EXAMPLE CITED

Mr. Turnbull said Mr. BREWSTER "has never been one of provincial or parochial interests." To illustrate, he cited the young lawmaker's work on the Maryland Port Authority bill and his support of a municipal court bill for Baltimore City when he was a member of the State legislature.

He said Mr. BREWSTER also has been active on behalf of local charities, including the Cancer Fund and a campaign to raise money to support the Timonium State Fair.

"He's not the kind of fellow who says I'll take the job, but you get somebody else to do the work," Mr. Turnbull stated.

COMPARED WITH PRESIDENTS

The Reverend Vincent J. Beatty, S.J., president of Loyola College, compared Mr. BREWSTER's accomplishments with those of Presidents Jefferson and Madison, who, he said, also achieved fame at an early age.

The college president stated he was sorry not to be able to report that Mr. BREWSTER was a Loyola graduate, but he added the school is a training ground for future J.A.C. award winners.

D'ALESANDRO SPEAKS

Mayor D'Alesandro, a third speaker on the program, declared, "Maryland needs more men like DAN BREWSTER. He has the qualifications to be a great statesman."

Other guests at the luncheon included the members of the committee which selected Mr. BREWSTER for the award: Martin B. Kohn, president of the Association of Commerce, chairman; the Reverend Monsignor David I. Dorsch, director of the Associated Catholic Charities; C. T. Crossfield, vice president of the Commercial Credit Co., and Judge John T. Tucker, of the Baltimore supreme bench.

Textile Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial from the Camden Chronicle of January 29, 1959, commenting on a statement by one of our leading textile industrialists. We think this is significant and worthy of the attention of the American public and of the Congress:

TEXTILE TARIFFS

For those who keep telling us that prosperity is just around the corner for the ailing textile industry, Textile Industrialist Leon Lowenstein had a disturbing warning this week.

Speaking before a congressional delegation from both Carolinas, the manufacturer warned that American mills cannot compete with foreign labor paid slave wages.

His words ought to carry much weight with our elected officials, our industrialists, and our workers. If his statements are correct, and we assume that they are, then some revision in the reciprocal trade agreements should be made.

Mr. Lowenstein said the State Department had been sold on a point of view which could ruin the textile industry: (1) That the whole picture of foreign aid and trade was more important than the textile industry, and (2) that the industry has enough ingenuity to take care of itself.

He called these two ideas fallacies and predicted that unless some changes were made in the law to help solve the import

problem, many plants would drop down to 5- and 6-day weeks, some would curtail activities to 3 days, and some marginal plants might have to shut down entirely.

Cheraw is greatly affected by the fortunes of the textile industry. Our dependence upon it for employment and retail trade has increased in direct proportion to the decline of agriculture.

Once a primarily free trade area, the Carolinas now must, in enlightened self-interest, move more into the protectionist field. While we favor foreign trade agreements, we do want to see our local industries and their workers protected, too.

Summary of Poll for Meeting of Federal Water Pollution Control Advisory Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a summary of a poll taken by Mr. Milton P. Adams, executive secretary of the Michigan Water Resources Commission, as a part of his duties both in the Michigan Water Resources Commission and as a member of the Federal Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, to which he is appointed by the President.

The Federal Water Pollution Act, Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress, provides for grants from the Federal Government to the States and municipalities for control of pollution in streams and waters of this country.

Mr. Adams polled all of the States including Alaska, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission, the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission and the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River.

The results are significant. Agencies concerned with control of pollution overwhelmingly favored retention of Federal construction grants by some 48½ to 2½, a half vote representing a statement showing that there are good points and some bad points.

Even more significant was the vote of 48 to 2 against future sewage disposal construction grants to become an exclusive State function financed out of proceeds of the State excise tax on local telephone services as recommended by the Joint Federal State Action Committee.

Equally significant was the vote of 49½ to 3½ in favor of continuance of the Federal program for grants to States and interstate agencies as provided in Section 5 of Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress.

In order that all may understand the views of State agencies and interstate agencies controlled with water pollution I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD at this point the results of the poll with the hope that it will help to make available the full $45 million in grants to States as authorized in Public Law 660:

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF POLL FOR DECEMBER 1958 MEETING OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD

MUNICIPAL SEWAGE DISPOSAL CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

1. Are current Federal allocations resulting in stimulation of sewage plant construction within your jurisdiction? Yes, 43; no, 9.

2. Do you favor doubling the authorization of construction grant allocations through reintroduction and enactment of the Blatnik bill (H.R. 11714—85th Cong.) or its equivalent? Yes, 38; no, 13.

3. Do you favor elimination of further Federal construction grants by repeal of section 6, Public Law 660? Yes, 2½; no, 48½.

4. Do you favor repeal of section 6 with future sewage disposal construction grants to become an exclusive State function financed out of proceeds of a State excise tax on local phone services as per Joint Federal-State Action Committee recommendations? Yes, 2; no, 48.

5. If your answer to (4) is "Yes," do you think your legislature would enact such a tax in 1959? Yes, 1; no, 12.

6. If your answer to (5) is "Yes," do you think your legislature would appropriate from the proceeds of such a tax, funds in an amount equal to or greater than you are now receiving for sewage disposal construction grants? Yes, 1; no, 10.

OTHER MATTERS

7. Do you favor creation of a new position of Assistant Secretary of Water Pollution Control within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as per H.R. 13839 Blatnik—85th Congress, or its equivalent? Yes, 16; no, 28.

8. Do you favor continuance of Federal program grants to States and interstate agencies (sec. 5, Public Law 660)? Yes, 49½; no, 3½.

9. Are you satisfied with progress to date toward solution of interstate water pollution control problems in which the Public Health Service has participated? Yes, 44; no, 1.

10. Since industry cannot qualify for grants but its taxes assist in providing grants to cities, States and PHS, would you favor amendment of the internal revenue laws to permit industry an accelerated amortization rate for such capital investment as is necessary to meet State or interstate water pollution control objectives? Yes, 51; no, 3.

REPORTING STATES, TERRITORIES AND INTERSTATE AGENCIES

Region I: Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island.

Region II: New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware.

Region III: Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, North Carolina, District of Columbia.

Region IV: Tennessee, South Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida.

Region V: Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio.

Region VI: North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri.

Region VII: New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana.

Region VIII: Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado.

Region IX: Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Interstate agencies: Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission, Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission, Interstate Commission on the Delaware River.

Possible Solutions for VHF–TV Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, a native of my State, Mr. Frederick W. Ford, who is now Federal Communications Commissioner, appeared before the Radio and Television Executives Association of Houston, Tex., and delivered what I believe to be a timely and interesting analysis of problems involved in very high frequencies on television. It is essentially a rather technical paper, but it will be of interest to others, including those who operate and manage our television industry.

Commissioner Ford's address follows:

The communications industry is constantly faced with a set of problems that no one individual could possibly foresee or solve. The Federal Communications Commission seems to inherit a sizable share of these problems in one form or another. Tonight, I would like to review with you the problem which I consider the most pressing and perhaps the cause of many other difficult problems for you in the industry and for the Commission. I refer to the VHF–UHF TV problem. After I briefly discuss the history of the allocations of spectrum space to television, I will consider the possible courses of action which may be open to the Commission and some of the consequences of each.

There are four significant phases in the growth and development of television in the United States. I have divided these phases into the time period before July 1, 1941; July 1, 1941, to December 7, 1941; December 7, 1941, to May 25, 1945; and May 25, 1945, to the present.

For many years prior to July 1, 1941, scientists and engineers were devotedly engaged in the basic research and development, experimentation and, of lasting importance, the establishment of the technical characteristics of the TV system to be employed in the United States. These characteristics (525 lines, etc.) were promulgated as standards by the FCC on May 3, 1941, to be effective on July 1, 1941, and commercial TV in the United States was thereby established. It is difficult to see, by hindsight, any basic errors which emerged from this period. Indeed many of the benefits of television which we enjoy today stem from the pioneering done during this period.

The growth of commercial TV was restricted by the start of the war on December 7, 1941. The contribution which this brief second phase of development made to our present-day problems is nevertheless significant. The 18 channels then allocated were all VHF channels between 50 and 294 megacycles. The fact that TV began on VHF later became a controlling factor in deciding whether postwar TV was to be in the VHF or UHF spectrum.

The wartime restrictions on the availability of equipment and materials prevented the establishment of new TV stations and the war ended with six licensed commercial TV stations, all on frequencies below 84 megacycles, some 70 applications for additional stations in the pending filed, and an estimated 7,000 receivers in the hands of the public, most of which could tune only the frequencies below 90 megacycles.

Because it was apparent that the postwar uses of radio in the United States would

be substantially different and greater than the prewar uses, the Commission held its most comprehensive frequency allocation hearing in 1944, preliminary to determining the amount of spectrum space and the position in the spectrum for all services including television. Industry presented divergent views on the question of how much space should be provided for TV and its position in the radio spectrum. One group felt that the best place in the spectrum for TV as a service to the public was in the UHF spectrum, where much more space would be available than in the VHF spectrum. The principal advocates of UHF TV at that time were the Columbia Broadcasting System, Zenith Radio Corp., and the Cowles Broadcasting Co. whose arguments were summarized by the Commission in its report (January 15, 1945) in docket No. 6651 as follows:

"The demands of other services for frequency space below 3000 megacycles are so great that only a limited number of 6-megacycle channels can be assigned for television broadcasting (Craven Tr. 3494–95, 3500–03); that the advancement applicable to television made in the electronic art during the war cannot be fully utilized in 6-megacycle channels (Ream, Tr. 1761–2, 1773–4; Goldmark, Tr. 1871–5, 1939); and that the art has reached a point where a superior television broadcast system adapted for the use of ultra-high frequencies could be proven and made available to the public within possibly 1 or 2 years (Ream Tr. 1764–73, 1801–09, 1813–14, Craven, Tr. 3498–3500; 3509–11; Goldmark, Tr. 1911; Brown Tr. 3483)."

The opposing industry group relied upon prewar progress that had been made in TV as a broadcast service (all of which was on VHF and mostly below 84 megacycles) and contended, among other things, that the use of UHF TV would involve operating difficulties, the solution of which would require extensive research and experimentation and that many years might elapse before a UHF TV system could be established.

Faced with these conflicting views, the Commission decided in May 1945, to allocate 13 VHF TV channels (later reduced to 12) each 6 megacycles in width—and, in addition, a UHF TV band the limits of which presently are 470 and 890 megacycles, i.e., a total of seventy 6-megacycle UHF channels or 420 megacycles of UHF spectrum space. In taking this action, the Commission commented that it was "still of the opinion that there is insufficient spectrum space available below 300 megacycles to make possible a truly nationwide and competitive television system. Such a system, if it is to be developed, must find its lodging higher up in the spectrum where more space exists and where color pictures and superior monochrome pictures can be developed through the use of wider channels. In order to make possible this development of television, the Commission has made available the space between 480 and 920 megacycles for experimental television. The time which may elapse before a system can be developed to operate on wider channels on these ultra-high frequencies is primarily dependent upon the resourcefulness of the industry in solving the technical problems that will be encountered."

Thus on May 25, 1945, the third period ended and the fourth or present period began. The studies, conclusions and decisions of this third period—right or wrong—essentially delineated the allocations of spectrum space for TV which we have today.

Since May 1945, we have witnessed the phenomenal growth of VHF TV, most of which took place after 1952, and the relative failure to attain a nationwide competitive system of TV with sufficient channels and equitable service for all. The Sixth Report and Order (April 14, 1952) did not yield this result. Neither has the most recent decision of the Commission on June 25, 1956 to "undertake a thorough, searching analysis of the possibilities for improving and expanding the nationwide television system through the exclusive use of the UHF band throughout or in a major portion of the United States," resulted in any substantial amelioration of the problem to date.

Section 307(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, enjoins the Commission to make such distribution of frequencies and power among the several States and communities as to provide a fair, efficient, and equitable distribution of radio service to each of the same.

Over half of the UHF–TV stations which went on the air have ceased operation for financial reasons. The financial report of television stations to the Commission indicates that the UHF stations which are still operating are either barely breaking even or are losing money regularly when in competion in the same market with VHF stations. At the same time VHF stations are generally quite profitable. This disparity cannot long continue.

Great dissatisfaction has been expressed in the past few years with this second-class television system we have in which only about one-fourth of more than 2,000 possible commercial television stations are on the air. Consider for example the interest of the Congress in the several hearings which they have held trying to find out what, if anything, can be done to convert the vast amount of spectrum space reserved for television into a truly first-class nation-wide competitive television service, limited only by available spectrum space and competitive forces.

Since the adoption of the Sixth Report and Order there have been 401 VHF stations and 165 UHF authorized to go on the air. Of this number, 5 VHF and 89 UHF stations have ceased operation. Although about 90 percent of American homes can receive a signal, much less is known about what percentage of this number receive an acceptable signal, and what percentage of the homes in the United States have a choice of acceptable signals. These questions are answered in different ways by different people. I doubt that anyone has the correct answer. Too frequently, I fear, we tend to base our judgments on the fact that 50 percent of our population live in the top 25 TV markets of the United States and rough television justice for the rest is all we can hope for, but the Congress was not so callous when it wrote the Communications Act.

The plain hard truth is that UHF and VHF are not competitive in the same market, and, therefore, the spirit of equal treatment for all areas of the country has not yet been achieved.

I am frank to say that shortly after assuming my duties as a member of the Commission, I sought to understand this problem and devoted as much of my time as possible in trying to determine how to attack it. My interest has been in trying to find a solution which would cause the least dislocation to existing service and yet discharge our statutory responsibility. I have tried to approach this task with no preconceived idea of the ultimate solution. The only thing that has been clear to me is that the efforts made in the past to find an acceptable solution have not been productive. I am not able to propose one now. If we continue the present policies, however (which I assume are embodied in the sixth report and order, as amended from time to time) I believe the following results will be inevitable:

1. All or part of the allocation to UHF will be reallocated for nonbroadcasting services.

2. There will be a minimum of competition between local television outlets in many areas of the country.

3. Efforts to relieve monopoly situations and lack of a choice of stations will lead to shorter mileage separations between cochannel and adjacent channel stations, thus tending to degrade or eliminate service which the public now enjoys, particularly in rural areas.

4. Many communities will be denied local television outlets entirely.

Before considering the possible alternative courses of action open to the Commission it would be well to set up an ideal standard to which any of the alternatives may be compared.

1. The allocation of spectrum space should be in a continuous band, or as near to it as possible.

2. The ratio of the highest to the lowest order of frequency should be as low as possible. I am told that a ratio of not more than 3 to 1 would be desirable. (The lower the ratio the lower the cost and complexity of design of the television receivers.)

3. The allocated frequencies should exhibit as nearly similar propagation characteristics as possible.

4. The total number of channels should be adequate to provide a nationwide competitive television service with fair, efficient, and equitable distribution of service to all the States and communities.

With this ideal standard in mind, let us consider what I believe to be the six major alternative courses of action open to the Commission and consider some of the consequences of each.

The first course of action would be to make no change in the present allocations to television. This, in itself, is one solution, the consequences of which would be to compound the present difficulties already described and in my opinion ultimately lead to the demise of UHF.

The second course of action would be taken by a decision, as a matter of basic policy, to employ for the long-range future only the presently allocated 12 VHF–TV channels between 54 and 216 megacycles and revise the rules to accommodate as many stations as possible on these channels. It would follow that the spectrum space between 470 and 890 megacycles would eventually be allocated to services other than broadcasting. This would at least clarify the status of UHF–TV and clear up any questions about the economics, from a broadcaster's point of view, of trying to serve the public in the UHF–TV band. Whatever UHF–TV service we have now probably would be either discontinued or transefrred to VHF under such a policy, since the ever-increasing requirements for frequencies for all users of radio must in some way be satisfied.

While this course of action might increase the total number of stations, it is also possible that it would lead to less service to the public. This could occur through increased interference between stations which are closer together.

If we elect a third alternative and decide to employ the present VHF and UHF–TV channels on any type of deintermixture basis we can find any number of versions of how this might be done. The fact remains, however, that deintermixture has been the interim policy since 1956 and it has not had the result that was anticipated by the Commission at the time it was decided to deintermix. This is perhaps due to the fact that this alternative meets only the fourth criterion in our ideal standard. Admittedly, novel schemes for deintermixture have been put forth but not tried out. But it seems clear that any deintermixture scheme would leave us with two different TV services in this country. The choice of which system serves a particular community would be de-

termined by the geographical location of communities rather than by the normal standards of public interest, convenience, and necessity.

In July 1956, the United States Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce stated that it "specifically approved the Commission's interim program of selective deintermixture, urging that this essential preliminary step be pursed as broadly and rapidly as possible." At that same time the committee characterized the Commission's deintermixture proposals as an interim measure pending the shift of all or a major part of TV to the UHF band and urged that the Commission move as rapidly as possible to the accomplishment of its stated objectives. The same report indicates that the "key to the Commission's long-range proposals for allocations is contained in its request for comments as to the feasibility of ultimately shifting all or a major portion of the TV broadcasting to the UHF band."

If the presently allocated VHF and UHF channels are effectively exploited by TV, the risks of losing spectrum space for TV will be avoided. The longer it takes to effectuate deintermixture, however, the greater the risk of losing all or part of the UHF-TV band. Any inroads into this band could operate to prevent using deintermixture as the formula for putting TV broadcasting on a nationwide competitive basis with a choice of service to the public.

A fourth alternative would be to augment the present 12 VHF channels with as many more channels as possible and abandon the allocation of 470 to 890 megacycles to TV. The impacts of such a scheme are quite significant. Since the frequencies below 54 megacycles are generally considered not too suitable for TV broadcasting and since the upper limit of channel 13 is 216 megacycles, we can roughly analyze the cost and time factors by examining the present non-TV uses of radio between 54 and 300 megacycles. The only frequency bands in this portion of the spectrum which are not now allocated to TV are: 72–76 megacycles; 88–174 megacycles; and 216–300 megacycles.

A method of getting one additional VHF channel would be to find a way to allocate the frequencies between 72 and 76 megacycles now allocated to the operationally fixed service to TV. If we could find a way to increase this band by 2 megacycles we could acquire one more TV channel. It has often been suggested that this could be done by moving channels 2, 3 and 4 downward by 2 megacycles, or by shifting channels 5 and 6 upward by 2 megacycles. If we elect the first alternative, the impact on non-TV uses of radio would be primarily on the amateur service which is allocated 50–54 megacycles. The amateur service would lose half of its existing band. Whether it would be practical for the amateur service to make use of the remaining amateur band 50–52 megacycles is conjectural. It is already difficult, in certain areas where TV channel 2 (54–60 megacycles) is employed, for some amateurs to use the frequencies immediately below 54 megacycles. Moreover, all existing TV receivers in the hands of the public would have to be adjusted to receive channels 2, 3 and 4 on their new frequencies because the video and audio carriers for each of these three channels would be shifted 2 megacycles downward. This adjustment would take time and money and on some widely-used types of receivers is not considered to be practical.

Moreover, provisions would have to be made in existing sets to receive the new channel. We would also have to relocate the point-to-point uses of radio now licensed by the FCC in the band 72–76 megacycles in areas remote from TV broadcasting stations on channels 4 and 5. Not only would replacement frequencies have to be found for these point-to-point users of radio but time would have to be allowed for their shift, at their own expense, to any new frequency band provided for them. If these replacement frequencies, for example, were between 470 and 890 megacycles (the present UHF band) then, in many cases, new equipment would have to be purchased and installed by these users at their own expense. Many of these licensees are local governments whose budgets for this purpose are not adequate.

Another difficulty to overcome in establishing a new TV channel between 70 and 76 megacycles is that on the frequency 75 megacycles a great many marker beacons serve aircraft. We could not actually put TV broadcast stations on the air on this new channel, 70–76 megacycles, in any particular area until the marker beacons on 75 megacycles in that area were removed.

In order to move the marker beacon frequency we must first have international agreement for transferring these markers to some other frequency, or of providing the function now obtained from the present markers by some other means in some other frequency band available to aviation. Studies of ways and means of accomplishing this have made it clear that it would take not only national actions by the United States but also coordination within the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), an organization of governments to which the United States belongs. If international agreement to remove the markers from 75 megacycles could be reached, the negotiations would take a significant amount of time—months certainly, and more likely years. Thereafter, the actual transition itself would take several additional years.

It would be most difficult to estimate with any accuracy either the cost or the time factors involved in overcoming this one problem. The investment in ground transmitting equipment and airborne receiving equipment involves not only aviation within the United States but in many other countries as well. The cost to aviation to shift could not be estimated until it was known in exactly which frequency band and by what electronic technique this function would be performed as a result of the international agreements which would have to be reached.

Another way of using the frequencies between 72 and 76 megacycles for TV would be to move TV channels 5 and 6 upward by 2 megacycles. This would deprive FM broadcasting of 2 megacycles of space between 88 and 90 megacycles. FM broadcasting is presently allocated the frequencies between 88 and 108 megacycles and the FM band would thereby become 90–108 megacycles. Besides the cost and time factors involved in this 10-percent reduction of the spectrum space presently allocated to FM broadcasting, there would be a time and cost problem involved in adjusting those receivers susceptible of adjustment to receive TV channels 5 and 6 on audio and video frequencies 2 megacycles higher in the spectrum. Moreover, the removal of the 75 megacycles aviation marker would have to precede, any such implementation of the frequencies between 72 and 78 megacycles for TV broadcasting as previously explained.

Regardless of whether either of the two alternatives for employing the frequencies between 72 and 76 megacycles for TV broadcasting were adopted, the existing FM broadcasting band between 88 and 108 megacycles were adopted, the existing FM broadcasting could be allocated to TV provided some solution were found to provide for FM broadcasting a suitable band of frequencies and the time required to implement it. One, two, or three TV channels can be formed from the present FM broadcasting band between 88 and 108 megacycles. If, however, we are to take 6, 12, or 18 megacycles of space from FM for TV then we would surely have to consider the adequacy of the remaining spectrum space from the point of view of FM broadcasting.

When we examine this problem we find that FM has already undergone a major postwar removal from around 40 megacycles to its present position in the spectrum (88–108 megacycles). Delays in implementation and slow progress in the rendering of service to the public resulted from the 1945 shift in the FM allocation. A further move of FM broadcasting to some other portion of the spectrum (presumably between 470 and 890 megacycles) might very well cripple it, obscure its importance and cause years of delay in the reestablishment of this very fine aural broadcast service to the public.

The cost and time factors involved in such an FM transition would be tremendous. The cost factors could not be estimated with any accuracy until we knew the specific details of the frequency band to which FM were to be moved. The time factors would be geared intimately to the public's desire to junk or scrap existing equipment in favor of purchasing new and possibly initially more expensive receiving equipment for a new FM broadcasting band. All of this movement of FM to some other frequency band would have to precede any implementation of the frequencies between 88 and 108 megacycles by TV broadcasting. Furthermore, there would be some cost and time delays for the viewing public, because the existing TV receivers in the hands of the public would require adjustment to receive any new TV channels on any new frequencies that were allocated for TV.

Whether or not we added a new TV channel between channels 4 and 5, or obtained 1, 2, or 3 new TV channels between 88 and 108 megacycles, we would, in evaluating this plan, have to examine the remaining non-TV frequencies between 108 and 174 megacycles.

When we examine the frequencies between 108 and 132 megacycles, we find that these are intensively used by civil aviation throughout the world and that the band has been channeled by international agreement and is being employed in accordance with internationally agreed practices. Any move on the part of the United States to abandon the use of all or portions of this band by aviation in favor of TV would require agreement within the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), and probably the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) as to a replacement band and an internationally agreed timetable to implement such a replacement band. It does not appear to be any incentive from the point of view of any other country to undertake such a move, or any basis for such countries to expend the tremendous sums of money necessary to implement such a scheme. Even assuming that international agreement could be reached on such a program, it would take some years to negotiate and still more years to implement.

The frequencies between 132 and 150.8 megacycles are now allocated to the U.S. Government services. Civil aviation is trying hard right now to obtain a part of this band between 132 and 136 megacycles as an extension to the present aviation band 108–132 megacycles. Our Government agencies have a significant interest in aviation communications, and it would appear that there must be some rather impressive reasons why the present Government uses have not so far been altered so as to provide for this requested expansion of aviation spectrum space.

If this proposed aviation expansion takes place, it would result in about a 25-percent reduction of the present Government allocations in the bands 132–144 and 148–150.8 megacycles (the band 144–148 megacycles is

allocated to the amateur service), thus increasing the difficulties inherent 'n the release of additional space to provide more TV channels.

On the other hand, if the proposed aviation expansion into the band 132–136 megacycles does not take place, the question would then be whether TV could make a superior claim to that now being pressed by aviation. If it could, there would be some imposing practical difficulties to overcome. For one thing, 4 megacycles would not suffice for a TV channel. If it were an "island" in the spectrum (that is not contiguous to other TV channels) then 10 or 12 megacycles might be required, as a practical matter, to avoid interference from narrow-band services in adjacent bands.

In studying this possibility of obtaining additional VHF TV channels between 132 and 150.8 megacycles we would have to develop new information not brought out in the 1956 conclusion of a special interdepartmental Government study. That conclusion announced in April 1956 was that "National security requirements and the needs of air navigation and air communications preclude the release for non-Government use of any of the very high frequencies now utilized by the Federal Government."

The non-TV frequencies between 150.8 and 162 megacycles are allocated for non-Government land mobile service, that is, police, fire, business radio, taxis, and a host of other vehicular uses. It is perhaps the most effectively exploited frequency band in the spectrum. If all or part of it were to be released to TV, the relocation impact would be tremendous. Most of the users of this band would find it most difficult to raise or to justify the money involved in moving to any new replacement band which might be provided. Again, if an isolated TV channel or "island" were established in this band, the actual spectrum space required for one TV channel would consume more like 10 megacycles of space and not merely the nominal 6 megacycles that is normally assumed for each TV channel.

The frequencies allocated for Government use between 162 and 174 megacycles also were the subject of study in the 1956 investigation, and any speculation about their availability for TV must likewise assume some change over the 1956 facts.

In summary, we see, on the one hand, that there is a possibility of 15 new additional TV channels in the present VHF band 54–216 megacycles. If all 15 of these potential channels could be allocated for TV, then we would have 27 channels in 1 block which would meet the first 3 criteria in our ideal standard with extensive studies required to determine whether the 27 channels would be sufficient for an adequate nationwide competitive television service.

In considering this alternative, we could, of course, study variations of it that would not require all of the spectrum space between 54 and 216 megacycles for TV. For example, we could decide to add only one channel, or perhaps five, which would still leave the same question as to the adequacy of the number of channels.

The fifth alternative course of action is the establishment of a single band of frequencies for TV which is large enough to provide a nationwide competitive service as low in the spectrum as feasible (for example, between 174 and 474 megacycles). Such a plan would meet the criteria of our ideal standard.

There are two important advantages that this alternative has over the 27-channel allocation of all frequencies between 54 and 216 megacycles to TV.

First, it is more feasible, that is, it has much less impact on other uses of radio. Second, the potential number of channels surely would be adequate to provide a nationwide competitive TV service.

These two advantages over the 27-channel allocation (54–216 megacycles) are sufficiently important to require careful consideration of all features of this possibility.

If we take 50 channels as the minimum for a nationwide competitive service, then we must find 300 megacycles of spectrum space (in one block if possible) somewhere in the spectrum where this is feasible.

If, because of the difficulties in converting all or part of the space between 88 and 174 megacycles to TV, we were to decide to make an allocation for TV entirely above 174 megacycles, it seems logical to consider that the existing TV allocation between 174 and 216 megacycles (channels 7–13) would form the lower portion of this new TV allocation. Adding 300 megacycles (the spectrum space required for 50 TV channels) to the frequency 174 megacycles makes the upper limit of the TV allocation 474 megacycles. If such an allocation could be established (174–474 megacycles exclusively for TV) it would reasonably well meet the criteria in our ideal standard.

The feasibility requirement in this plan assumes it would be easier, or more in the national interest, or both, to seek new TV frequencies above 216 megacycles rather than between 88 and 174 megacycles. In any event the feasibility would depend on the impact on other affected radio services. This impact would include cost and time factors. The same April 1956 report mentioned above bore on the possible release of frequencies between 216 and 300 megacycles for TV. Unless the facts which then were relevant have changed, we would find, for these frequencies, that the worldwide buildup of our international defense facilities in collaboration with friendly countries has intensified the reliance which must be placed for defense purposes on these frequencies.

So, to the extent the April 1956 study was valid, one of the first questions would be whether the international defense considerations today would make it more feasible, or less feasible, to release space between 216 and 300 megacycles for TV.

The 1956 study did not consider frequencies above 300 megacycles. Therefore, in thoroughly examining the possibility of allocating the band 174–474 megacycles for TV, a new, careful, and competent study would have to be made of the possibility of releasing frequencies up to 474 megacycles for TV.

We would need such a new study before we could decide whether this plan was feasible or desirable in the national interest. We would not need any study to know that appreciable time and cost factors would apply to the non-TV services in implementing such a plan. If it could be agreed, it would take time to negotiate with a considerable number of other countries, and much time and many dollars to implement.

Assuming it could be successfully negotiated with the other countries involved and that all of these countries would bear the costs incident to its implementation, we would have to justify these impacts in terms of superiority of the end result in comparison with each of the other available alternatives.

As to the sixth alternative—all TV in one UHF band 470–890 megacycles—there would be no adverse impact on other existing radio services and it would reasonably meet all the criteria in our ideal standard. The 12 channels of VHF spectrum space now allocated for TV could be effectively utilized by a number of radio services.

Most of the impacts on TV licensees and the general public of this plan have been carefully analyzed before. The report of the Television Allocations Study Organization will, I hope, furnish new light on the engineering capabilities of UHF.

There is one aspect of this plan that may not have received full attention, and that is the ability and willingness of the public to obtain the necessary receiving equipment for whatever frequencies are employed for TV.

We know that the 1945 decision on spectrum allocations for TV took into account some 7,000 receivers then in the hands of the public, the fact that these receivers generally were designed for reception of stations on frequencies below 90 megacycles, and the fact that the on-the-air TV stations at that time used frequencies below 84 megacycles.

The extent to which these factors were controlling in the 1945 decision is unimportant. The important fact is that the 1945 decision retained only 6 of the 18 prewar VHF TV channels intact. Nevertheless, the public and the industry rapidly adjusted to this situation in implementing the postwar VHF allocations of spectrum space for TV.

In deciding between the available alternatives, it may be worthwhile to note that there is relatively little difference, from the point of view of the public, between the 50 channel VHF plan (174–474 megacycles) and all UHF (470–890 megacycles), since the receiver conversion problem would be approximately the same for both. The 50-channel VHF plan would be costly and time consuming for the nonbroadcast users in this and friendly countries. The UHF (470–890 megacycles) would not.

All but alternatives 1 and 2 would entail serious disruptions because of necessary TV receiver conversion or replacement. In this respect, the alternatives which would extend the VHF range immediately beyond channel 13 are at a disadvantage in that there are no TV receivers which cover these frequency bands in existence or production. For an all-UHF system using the 70 channels now allocated there are now in the hands of owners some 8 or 9 million receivers which tune to some or all of the UHF channels, and in addition, there are all-channel sets in commercial production. It is of course obvious that use by TV of any part or all of the spectrum now allocated to TV would avoid the tremendous dislocation of other Government and non-Government services vital to safety or the national defense.

I would like to make it clear that in the event of changes in the present structure, if any changes are possible at this late date, the conversion period should be sufficiently long to permit appropriate amortization of sets in the hands of the public and investments in television broadcasting plants by broadcasters.

In an industry as dynamic and ever changing as radio this analysis may be outdated tomorrow, but in preparing this material, I have gained a new understanding of this problem, and I hope contributed something to your understanding of it.

I cannot predict what course of action the Commission will follow. I can tell you that we are all vitally concerned with this problem, and for the past several months have had a number of technical studies underway. We all hope these studies will contribute to the sum total of knowledge, and materially assist us in arriving at an appropriate solution. In this way, perhaps, we can chart a course which will eventually result in a truly first-class nationwide competitive television service with a fair and equitable distribution of television service to all our people.

A Look at the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post of today's

date, there appears an editorial concerning what I feel to be the most momentous legislation presently before the Congress. This editorial urges careful consideration of the proposal set forth by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF], as an alternative to a simple 4-year extension of the draft. The Post's editorial position is especially appealing, Mr. Speaker, because it does not attempt to prejudge the merit or lack of merit of the draft system on the basis of the inadequate evidence presently available. Rather than an unqualified 4-year extension, or an unqualified termination of the draft, this editorial supports Mr. WOLF's proposal for a limited extension, coupled with a searching examination of the Nation's military manpower needs. I believe this position is well calculated to avoid both the alleged perils of an abrupt cessation of draft authority, and a repetition of our previous uncritical acceptance of the draft as a permanent part of our Nation's peacetime defense policy.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial as follows:

A LOOK AT THE DRAFT

Before Congress automatically adopts a long-term extension of the military conscription law, it ought to take a careful and critical look at the way in which the draft has been operating. When draft calls take only a small fraction of the total number of eligible young men and the great majority avoid military service, a very serious question of fairness arises. John Graham notes in a study for the Fund for the Republic that "because of either disability or fatherhood, more than 60 percent of all non-prior servicemen" were being deferred in early 1957 and "there is no reason to believe the picture has changed since then, or will change in the future."

Actually, the Army is the only one of the military services using the draft. It calls approximately 8,000 a month, of whom fewer than 7,000 are inducted for the 2-year period. Some 90,000 young men each year take advantage of the plan for 6 months of active training and 5½ years of Reserve or National Guard service; and of course there are many thousands of others who volunteer for service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines. All in all, however, the burdens and obligations are distributed very unequally among the 1.2 million young men who come of military age each year. Some have their education, career or family plans disrupted while many others make no national sacrifice at all.

The House Armed Services Committee has reported a simple 4-year extension of the draft beyond June 30. There is something to be said for using such means to avoid harangue over new plans for additional deferments and special-interest concessions. But there is a great deal more to be said, in our opinion, for the approach of Representative WOLF of Iowa. Mr. WOLF's bill would provide for a 2-year draft extension, but a concurrent resolution would require an intensive study by a joint congressional committee of military manpower procedures and alternative methods of meeting the needs.

This newspaper has long supported both the draft and the concept of national service. It does not share the views of those who feel that the country's youth is being stereotyped or "prussianized"; indeed, it believes that most young men benefit in one way or another from their military service. But it recognizes also that there is now no chance of fulfillment of the universal military training plan which Congress approved 8 years ago. With the changing character of war, UMT probably has been outmoded; moreover, it would be extremely costly.

Now, the Army makes somes compelling arguments, in which it is supported by the other services, that a draft law is necessary on the books whether or not it is fully utilized. A recent study shows that the Air Force and Navy benefit notably in the caliber of their volunteer enlistees because of the draft; and the Army obtains higher-quality men than might otherwise be the case.

Furthermore, the contention that there will be no more Koreas is highly dubious. It is impossible to predict the exact needs of limited war. If the Reserves and National Guard are worth anything, their requirements cannot be overlooked. The assertion that higher rates of pay for the lower ranks would attract an all-volunteer force rather begs the question of national obligation. Does the United States really want to abandon the concept that each young man owes some service to his countrymen? What would be the effect of higher pay scales in the countries where American forces are stationed abroad? And what would be the result in NATO, which is having trouble maintaining its strength, of an American decision to end the draft?

Plainly such questions demand thoughtful consideration, and we think there is strong reason for Congress to extend the draft temporarily. But the country also needs to determine whether the draft is the best way of meeting the problem—and whether, alternatively, if there is value in the concept of national service, it ought to be expanded beyond military conscription to include an overseas technical service corps, a scientific corps, a civil defense corps, a conservation corps, and the like. It is a delusion to think that there is an easy or even a wholly satisfactory answer. Surely, however, while Congress is attending to the immediate need, it ought to provide for conscientious, unemotional examination of the possibility of some less wasteful and more equitable method than mere indefinite reliance upon the draft.

Bishop-Elect, the Reverend John W. Comber, From Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, American missionaries of all faiths have inspired us with their courage and their devotion to God. And we in turn can learn much from the wisdom they acquired during their service in far-off lands.

A man who was born and raised in my home city has become superior general of the Catholic Foreign Mission Society, more familiarly known as the Maryknoll Fathers.

An additional honor came to him on January 28, 1959, when he was named titular bishop of Foratiana by Pope John XXIII.

Bishop-elect John W. Comber is the beloved leader of 1,200 missionaries, including the society's second superior general, the Most Reverend James E. Walsh, who has been imprisoned on false charges by the Chinese Reds.

As a mark of our respect for the honor conferred on Bishop-elect Comber, and under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following account that appeared in the February 2, 1959, issue of the New York Herald Tribune.

MARYKNOLL BISHOP-ELECT WAS JAILED BY JAPANESE

(By Jo-Ann Price)

MARYKNOLL, N.Y., January 31.—The New York area's newest Roman Catholic bishop-elect, the Rev. John W. Comber, superior general of the Catholic Foreign Mission Society (Maryknoll Fathers), is a short white-haired priest who, like a number of his clergymen, has served a term of imprisonment.

On the day after Pearl Harbor, Father Comber and about 25 Maryknollers were clapped into internment in Fushun, Manchuria, by the Japanese, with a large group of Protestant and Catholic missionaries.

They were treated well, Father Comber said today in an interview. But the experience, which ended when he was repatriated aboard the Swedish liner Gripsholm 2 years later, provided him with many valuable lessons on the subject of prison.

The new bishop-elect was named titular bishop of Foratiana last Wednesday by Pope John XXIII. He will be consecrated on April 9. He has been superior of the Maryknoll Fathers since 1956. He is the fourth superior general of the society, which was organized in 1911.

HEADS RELIGIOUS SOCIETY

Father Comber is 52. He heads a religious society of 1,200 American missioners in Korea, Japan, Hong Kong, Formosa, Philippines, Hawaii, Mexico, Guatemala, Chile, Peru, Bolivia and Tanganyika. Since it was established in this country in 1911, it has built up a large honor roll of men who have died for their faith, he noted.

They include men like Bishop Patrick J. Byrne of Washington, who perished in 1950 after the death march and ill treatment by the Communists in North Korea, and Bishop Francis X. Ford, of Brooklyn who died in a Communist prison in Canton in 1952.

Between 1946 and 1951, a total of 180 Maryknollers were expelled from Red China. Between 25 and 30 of these were subject to arrest and imprisonment. Even now, the society's second superior general, the Most Reverend James E. Walsh, is believed to be a prisoner in Shanghai, Father Comber said.

Father Comber spoke with considerable caution on the subject of reported consecrations of Chinese bishops in the Communist-sponsored and schismatic national Catholic Church of China. He observed that "there can be no true bishops with jurisdiction, since jurisdiction comes from unity with the Holy See."

PRELATES RESIST REDS

A recent report reaching Maryknoll headquarters here said that Communist efforts to promote an independent church had met with opposition from most Chinese prelates. Many Chinese clergy have been jailed for defiance of their Communist rulers, it said.

On the credit side of the missionary ledger, Father Comber said that during 1958, more than 82,000 converts were baptized among the 10 million persons within the areas served by the Maryknoll Fathers. Everywhere, he said, "our missions are working under peaceful conditions."

While members of the society regard the present mission situation with optimism, he said, "we also have to look to the time when the church in mission lands must stand on its own." Every missioner "must think of the development of a native clergy" so the church may flourish after the last

foreign clergyman has departed from a country.

For his personal motto as a bishop, Father Comber, a native of Lawrence, Mass., has selected the classic missionary motto, "Going, teach ye all nations." It has inspired him through his years of service in Manchuria, from 1931 to 1943, and subsequently in Peru and Chile.

Purchase of Foreign-Made Turbine Generators by the REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I was not surprised, although I must confess I was, like the rest of my hometown, puzzled at the action of the REA in the purchase of foreign-made turbine generators.

This in the face of a chronic unemployment of about 4 million American workers.

This, too, in the face of the cry for more aid from this country from practically every nation on the face of the earth.

I have said before, and I now repeat it is time to review our position in world trade and aid.

It is time we look after our own interest with a little more pride and zeal. I repeat again the wise admonition of President Theodore Roosevelt when he said:

> There is room for only one soul loyalty and that loyalty is to the American people.

I submit for the RECORD the wire of protest from Mayor A. B. Elias of the city of Jeannette and my protest to the REA:

JEANNETTE, PA., *February 3, 1959.*
Congressman JOHN H. DENT,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We in Jeanette are very much puzzled by last Friday's action of the REA in Washington. Contract for two large turbine generators for the Medina Electric Cooperative in Hondo, Tex., was awarded to Brown Boveri of Switzerland after the user had indicated our local Elliott Co. as the supplier. Loss of this business will seriously affect employment at the local plant which is already low, and our relief rolls, as you know, are already high.

A. B. ELIAS,
Mayor, City of Jeannette.

FEBRUARY 4, 1959.

Mr. DAVID HILL,
Administrator, REA, Washington, D.C.:

Pursuant to my telephone conversation, I herewith officially and vigorously protest the awarding turbine generator contract the Medina Electric Corp. to Switzerland. The Elliott Co. in Jeannette, Pa., seriously affected by this decision. Entire community considered serious labor surplus area and every man-hour payroll denied means that much more in local taxes, local loss of business, and local relief rolls. This matter goes deeper than a mere acquiring of machinery and seriously affects the economic and moral fiber of our way of life. Governments by their taxing powers are rapidly destroying the competitive quality of American manufacturers and the unrestrictive right grants competition for country to bid on American requirements, especially in nontaxpaying corporations and Government purchasing sets an example that can be and is in some quarters, destructive and devastating to our economic well-being. I request a delay in the granting of this contract and that the work be given to American working men and American plants.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

Extension of the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have today received in my office several telegrams from prominent citizens in my State of Oregon, protesting the passage, under the terms of the committee's report, of the draft extension bill, H.R. 2260. Two of these telegrams are simply the expressions of individual citizens, many of whom are known as thoughtful students of the problems posed by the international scene. The third telegram quotes in full the resolution on draft extension adopted by the Oregon Methodist Church in its annual conference on June 20, 1958. These telegrams present what I consider to be very persuasive arguments for supporting a much more severely limited extension of the draft than that proposed in H.R. 2260. I ask unanimous consent that these telegrams be printed in full.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1959.*
Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Alarmed with hasty maneuvers to steamroller draft extension through House. After 19 years, 4 more years of draft must not be fastened on us from high pressure tactics and public apathy. Urge you speak out against H.R. 2260 when it reaches House floor.

Fern Gage, Roy Gage, Albert Querin, Mildred Querin, Hideo Hashimoto, Howard Richards, Esther Richards, Rev. Mack Caldwell, Pauline Doran, Rev. Raymond Walker, Eldon Helm, Fred Breckon, Lillian Breckon, Robert Hungerford, Mary Hungerford, John Wallen, Manvel Schauffler, Howard Willits, Christine Willits, Helen Juergens, Wilton Hartzler, Bernhard Fedde.

Resolution adopted by annual conference of Oregon Methodist church, June 20, 1958, in regard to draft extension is as follows: "Peacetime conscription; we affirm the oft-stated position of the general conference that compulsory peacetime military training is contrary to the best American traditions and disregards the Christian hope for security through positive policies. We urge the abolition of peacetime conscription."

Official Board of Parkrose Heights Methodist Church meeting February 3, 1959, voted unanimously to adopt this resolution also.

Rev. DAVID POINDEXTER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1959.*
Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

We, voters of Clackamas County, Oreg., are disturbed over rushing draft extension through House. Are they trying to pass it before public can know and protest it? We oppose H.R. 2260.

Essie Hildreth, Mable West, Erna Kingsley, Katharine Talbott, Helen Millham, Mercy Holland, Edith Glassen, A. J. Prideaux, Mabel Downs, Herbert Hildreth, Nora Rumbaugh, Elvira Raven, Martha Wedemeyer, Elsie Greile, Alta Edgar, Edith Bork.

End Rocket-Missile Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 4, 1959:

END ROCKET-MISSILE CONFUSION

America's aerospace position and programs in recent days have taken on a startling tinge of uncertainty and confusion. This is a condition that should be cleared up.

These programs relate, particularly from the standpoint of national defense, to intercontinental ballistic missiles. Our military and civilian authorities admit that Soviet Russia has made such gains in developing these vital weapons that we would need many months, perhaps years, to catch up.

A similar situation prevails regarding rocket vehicles for space exploration. There, again, Russia is said to be 3 years, maybe 5 or more, ahead of us.

Why? And what are our leaders, our scientists, doing about it? Indefinite answers we are getting on this score are not reassuring.

Gen. Thomas D. White, Air Force Chief of Staff, told the House Space Committee yesterday that the nation which maintains mastery of aerospace will hold the means for survival—that "The decisive weapons of the future will be aerospace weapons."

This we can well believe. It points up the necessity for more determined and more effective rocket and missile research and development than current information indicates is in prospect.

But Dr. T. Keith Glennan, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, fends off the idea, given more or less political emphasis by some Democratic critics, that greatly increased amounts of money are needed to make real progress. Yet he told a House committee that "urgently sustained * * * time, money and effort * * * for years to come" are required. And, even so, he said, it will be 18 months to 2 years before the United States could send forth as big a space payload as the Russians have already launched into space.

A few days ago Dr. Wernher von Braun, of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency, testified the United States is 12 to 20 months behind Soviet rocket and space technology. At the same time he and other witnesses declared Russia could now pinpoint a city in the United States with a ballistic missile fired more than 5,000 miles away.

If the Soviet Union continued at its present pace, Dr. von Braun said, it would require 5 years for us to catch up, and then only if the United States went ahead faster than present plans permit.

At the same time Defense Secretary McElroy, defending the administration's defense budget provision—$41 billion—insists the United States is prepared to meet the threat it faces today and that the United States will be practically even with Russia in war-ready ICBM's by the end of this year.

The paramount question—as to rockets or ballistic missiles—Is the progress fast enough?

In Russia Marshal Malinowsky boasts that the West's—he means our—nuclear weapons are outdated by Soviet long-range missiles of great accuracy. That touches on our once-powerful bombers, capable of delivering nuclear bombs against Russian targets—if they can get to them.

There have been official decisions not to try to match Soviet output missile for missile. That may be wise, or it may not be. Aside from such questions the preponderant one is the plain lag in rocket and missile development, including such powerful propellants as the Russians, it is admitted, have produced and we have not.

The problem of America's new defenses, in outer space and here on earth, is the tremendously important one. In these projects uncertainty and confusion have no place. They should be eliminated, without further loss of time.

Cuban Woman Writes About Terror of Batista—Defends War Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a story from the Cheraw Chronicle, of January 29, 1959, about the Cuban situation. Since we have been so concerned, I thought it best to bring to the attention of the Congress this grassroots report which appeared in a letter to a member of the staff of one of the newspapers in my district.

CUBAN WOMAN WRITES ABOUT TERROR OF BATISTA; DEFENDS WAR TRIALS

A young Cuban woman who was a frequent visitor to Chesterfield County a couple of years ago has written a letter in defense of the Cuban war trials to Mrs. S. Gordon Brown, associate editor of the Cheraw Chronicle.

Miss Gilsa Aguero, a foreign student at Wingate College, told of the persecution under Batista's dictatorial regime. She said her letter, parts of which are reprinted below, was the first in nearly 6 years that she could send out of Cuba free of censorship.

Miss Aguero became a friend of Mrs. Ruth Horton, foreign student advisor, at Wingate and through Mrs. Horton, met Mrs. Brown. The student and the editor cultivated their friendship through correspondence, but this is the first account of the historic events in Cuba that Miss Aguero has been able to give:

"DEAR MRS. BROWN: What a nice surprise I had last month when I received your letter and a few days later the Christmas gift which you sent.

"It is so nice for you to remember me. I am sorry that both times before, when you wrote me, the letters were returned. I am writing down my correct home address and perhaps now you will be able to come visit me in Havana.

"We didn't have too much of a Christmas, but I, as well as all the Cuban people, had the most marvelous New Year, for we received the wonderful gift of 'Freedom,' about which we have been dreaming for so long. After almost 7 years of dictatorship, murders and finally civil war, we have reached a new period of peace, justice, and liberty. At last we should realize the well-being and progress that Cuba deserves.

"We know that normalcy will return right away under the leadership of the new revolutionary government and that we shall attain and safeguard those revolutionary ideals so well defended by Fidel Castro, his men, and so many of our people who have suffered the horrors of tyranny. The chief sufferers have been the university students who died defending a cause and their idealism which they valued above all else.

"Cuba is proud to know the tremendous effort made at the beginning by a handful of simple men facing incredible hardships, suffering, and danger. Thanks to their efforts Cuba has returned to the fold of democratic, sovereign nations.

"I recall when all this began at Havana University 5 years ago with the student boycotts and strikes. Our 200-year-old university was closed as the students began to plot against the dictatorship of Batista.

"We are filled with gratitude and appreciation for the discipline, discretion, sacrifice, and honor shown by the men of the revolutionary army. They have given the finest example of Cuban courage, citizenship, and patriotism. It is amazing that a group, beginning with 12 men and 1 determined leader, could win for a nation its freedom fighting against an organized army.

"Back in March 1952, Batista and his group of army officers threw out the constitutional government 2 months before general elections and started his dictatorship, which signaled the start of tyranny, killing, terror, censorship, and destruction of all our constitutional guarantees and civil liberties.

"Batista and his henchmen filled the jails and cemeteries with innocent people, murdered children and hit and abused women. For 82 months our country went through the worst kind of torture, crimes, and violation of human rights that compared with the German and Japanese tortures of World War II.

"It was even a crime to be young, for the young opposed the dictator, and for this reason, more than 20,000 young people, usually between the ages of 15 and 26, were killed. In the last 2 months Batista directed that our towns and cities be machinegunned and bombed with 500-pound bombs, including the use of napalm bombs, furnished him by the United States, and planes, tanks, and all kinds of arms sent to him by England and the Dominican Republic.

"Thanks to God that is all over now. What the entire Cuban people want is justice for all the crimes committed against them and their country. I have read that for this (executions), we are being criticized in the United States, but I for one, same as all the population, believe that the revolutionary government has as much right to exterminate the war criminals here as did the Allies in World War II to condemn the Nazi leaders at the Nuremberg trials. The trials are according to codes based on the Nuremberg trials, during which time your country sentenced to death or prison German war criminals.

"Anybody who did not see what was really happening in Cuba from 1952 until last month might not understand this, but we who suffered know. Batista and his military clique did not hesitate to imprison, detain, torture or murder our relatives, friends, acquaintances, or anyone and everyone who they thought opposed them or who they feared might help the rebels.

"This is the first time in years that we can express in letters our real opinions without the fear that regime would open the mail.

"Sincerely,

"GILSO AGUERO."

Poison in Your Water—No. 7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago News of January 13, 1958, had an interesting article on sewage and pollution in the State of Illinois.

In an article under the byline of Mr. Jack Mabley the lead sentence is, "It looks to me as though the rivers and streams of suburban Cook County are destined to become open sewers." This is a situation that plagues not only Cook County but hundreds and thousands of communities throughout the United States. The article is as follows:

SEWAGE GOES STREAMING BY—STRATTON HIT FOR POLLUTION

(By Jack Mabley)

"It looks to me as though the rivers and streams of suburban Cook County are destined to become open sewers."

Burton Atwood, chairman of the Cook County Clean Streams Committee, and national secretary of the Izaak Walton League, makes this prediction in his annual report to the comittee.

The committee is fighting to keep the rivers and streams in Cook County unpolluted. Right now it seems to be a standoff. They've kept things from getting worse, but they aren't any better, either.

The lovely streams that meander through the forest preserves, the rivers that course through suburban towns and open country, and eventually pour into the Chicago River, are loaded with oil, garbage, sewage, and industrial waste.

The Clean Streams Committee tries to chase down the source of the pollution, but when they catch one, another may spring up.

They're getting little help from the State.

ATWOOD BLUNTLY BLAMES STRATTON

Mr. Atwood, like most conservationists a blunt man, says, "The record in Illinois should make Governor Stratton hang his head in shame.

"The Izaak Walton League has often cited the Illinois program of water pollution control as outstandingly successful.

"But the deterioration of the Illinois Sanitary Water Board during Governor Stratton's administration is today the outstanding example of the failure of State control.

"This deterioration is due to the loss of the experienced engineers who built the reputation of the Illinois Sanitary Water Board, due to an unrealistic salary scale."

Mayor Daley has, or had, visions of gondolas paddling up and down the Chicago River.

It is difficult to picture the gondoliers picking their way through the filth.

Factories dump oil and waste into the rivers. Restaurants dump their garbage and empty their toilets into the streams. Trailer camps operating without licenses have been fouling streams.

AND THE MESS IS GETTING WORSE

The mess is getting worse because of actions such as that of a large subdivision next to Des Plaines which is planning to dump its combined storm and sanitary sewage into Weller Creek, which goes into the Des Plaines River, which flows mostly through forest preserves.

Atwood thinks 1958 will determine whether the fight to control stream pollution will be won or lost.

The law entitles citizens to reasonably clean water in streams that enter their communities. Protection of public health is a major factor. Atwood believes in the rights to clean streams for fishing, swimming, picnicking, camping, hiking, and plain enjoyment of nature.

I'm a little sensitive because my dog likes to swim in the west fork of the North Branch of the Chicago River, while the kids run along the bank trying to keep him from drowning.

It was only recently I learned that two trailer camps and a restaurant a mile upstream have been illegally dumping their sewage into the water.

GI Joe and Honest John

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times magazine of February 1, 1959, written by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, noted military editor of the New York Times:

GI JOE AND HONEST JOHN—MISSILES AND PLASTIC FOXHOLES ARE TRANSFORMING THE FACE OF WAR, BUT AS ALWAYS, DESPITE CHANGES, THE FOOT SOLDIER IS NECESSARY TO HOLD THE GROUND

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The slim, long shape of Nike rises above the sagebrush and mesquite of west Texas and missiles soar over the vast arid ranges where the drumming hoofbeats of the horse cavalry once stirred the desert dust. At Fort Bliss, where the lean, tough "yellow-legs" tamed the West's wild frontier, the Army of today is reaching into the frontier of the sky to develop the tactics of tomorrow.* * *

In the highlands of Arizona, at Fort Huachuca, the thin notes of the bugle wail their sweet lament as in the days when Geronimo, the Apache, was the enemy. But today Huachuca is an electronic proving ground where the Signal Corps tests the instruments for tomorrow's secret, silent war, radar sentries, television spies, infrared detectors, electronic jamming devices to make enemy shell fuses detonate prematurely, new communications systems and mobile computers that will lighten the command burdens of some future Patton.

At Fort Rucker in Alabama, the cavalry of the past has sprouted wings. This is the Army Aviation Center, home of the flier who hedgehops across rivers or swamps or mountains to reconnoiter and to move men and supplies—to "git thar," as in the days of Forrest, "fustest with the mostest."

And at Fort Benning, Ga., long the home of infantry, "Queen of Battle," the foot-slogger of yesterday—with new arms and new equipment—is still the pediment of tomorrow's Army. He may ride to war in an armored personnel carrier, skim the battlefield in an aerial jeep, receive his commands from a helmet radio and protect himself with plastic foxhole covers, but he is still the service that holds or dominates the good earth.

The Army's posts and forts today present to one who has long known the heritage of their history a strange and exciting mixture of past, present and future—yesterday's traditions and some of yesterday's ancient architecture; today's cramped Wherry housing built in wholesale lots and today's military generation groping into tomorrow's unknown dawn, and the fantastic battlefield dreams and tactical aspirations, the futuristic weapons and equipment of the Army of 1965–70, shaped and tailored for the atomic age.

What will this Army be like, so far as men can envision it now? What will be its purpose? What of its tactics and its equipment and its men?

The strategic purpose of the Army of tomorrow is still the same as that of the armies of Alexander the Great, of Hannibal, of Grant and Lee. To dominate and occupy the earth upon which man lives is, and will remain, the fundamental mission of the ground forces.

But in the age of missiles and atoms, victory—of a sort—could conceivably be won through the air by long-range nuclear bombardment. In such a general, unlimited war ground forces would have a secondary role. How secondary is a subject of debate.

Some strategists believe that even in an unlimited nuclear interchange ground forces would be essential—for martial rule in what remained of the warring countries, to fight a broken-backed conflict once the main atomic punches had been exchanged, or to pick up the pieces at the finale in a world gutted and in chaos. Such a war might end, as they foresee it, as wars began, with battles between small groups of men, lightly armed with rifles, bayonets, clubs, and stones.

But the army of tomorrow—though it claims an essential role even in the apocalyptic vision of all-out conflict—believes that its primary mission will be in limited conflicts. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, has pointed out that there has been a total of 17 limited war situations in the 13 years since 1945 (other counts make the total 20), and that by striking a statistical time-manpower balance, one finds that they have averaged about 2½ years in duration and nearly 600,000 men [have been] engaged.

If future history follows past experience, there will be more limited wars. Indeed, the rate of occurrence may increase, since Soviet leaders have always shown a willingness to take chances * * *.

From this conviction that wars are still likely even in the atomic age, and that they probably will be less than all-out conflicts, has stemmed the Army's creation of STRAC, the Strategic Army Corps of three divisions, its objective instant readiness for transportation by air or sea to any part of the world. STRAC is envisioned as a mobile fire brigade, always ready for combat, prepared to put out small conflagrations before they become big ones.

But this is easier stated than accomplished. A nonaggressive nation never knows where it must fight. The defense never chooses the time or place of attack. Nor can the Army know how limited a war may be, whether or not it will develop into an unlimited one, whether atomic weapons will be used, what kind of terrain it may have to dominate, the climate its soldiers will have to endure.

In short, the future role of STRAC—indeed, the primary mission of the Army of tomorrow—is to be prepared to fight any kind of war anywhere, with or without nuclear weapons; to confirm ultimate victory by the physical presence of "GI Joe" on the disputed soil. But the mere statement of this mission, comprehensive though it is, slights the tremendous problems—greater than in all the past—that face the Army of tomorrow.

Though the Army's strategic mission has not changed, the technological revolution in warfare has altered the weapons and eqiupment with which it fights so fundamentally as to shake its whole structure, tactics, and organization.

The revolution, first of all, is in fire power and range. One moderate-sized tactical nuclear weapon will yield as much explosive force as 21,600 105-millimeter shells; one weapon might wipe out a whole battalion—or even a division. Yet all kinds of tactical nuclear weapons are now available for land forces' use—nuclear shells fired by 280-millimeter cannon and 8-inch howitzers; large warheads for Redstone (200-mile) missiles; medium-sized warheads for the Corporal (90-mile) missile; small warheads for the Honest John field-artillery rocket (range: 20,000 yards) and for the Nike-Hercules antiaircraft missiles.

The Army already is developing its second-generation missiles; the solid-fueled Sergeant missile will replace the Corporal; the Pershing, the Redstone. And nuclear weapons are becoming even smaller and more portable; soon there may be 5-inch nuclear shells, and portable Davy Crockett "nukes" for the infantryman.

Nuclear weapons have tremendously extended the killing radius of a ground force; they incorporate in one weapon the destructive blast of a gigantic artillery shell, and the denial effects of mustard gas. For radioactivity is now a factor every commander must reckon with: his own weapons, as well as the enemy's, may create, with each burst, downwind elliptical patterns 70 to 80 miles long where the silent killer will prohibit—or at least limit—battlefield movement.

The revolution in firepower is not confined to nuclear arms. Tomorrow's rifles and small arms, though far lighter and simpler than those they supersede, will be capable of spewing out far more lead—and rounds that count—than the M–1 of World War II. The new M–14 rifle, now going into production, can be fired fully automatic—40 rounds in 45 seconds—with less kick, or recoil, than its predecessors. Its companion, the M–60 machinegun, is far lighter than its predecessors and its barrel, when heated from rapid fire of 100 rounds a minute for 10 minutes, can be changed in 4 seconds—just a twist of the wrist. Yet the end is not yet.

Luminous sights for night firing, light little rifles with plastic stocks and simple parts, high-velocity .22-caliber rifles that will lighten by one-third the infantryman's ammunition load, and a rifle that fires two bullets in tandem—thus increasing materially the chances of a hit for each shot fired—are under study. There are even liquid-propellent small arms in the offing.

Missiles are supplementing, and in some cases replacing, artillery. There is an anti-tank missile, controlled by trailing wire unreeled in flight, with a shaped charge powerful enough to penetrate the armor of any tank. There is LaCrosse, a robot that attacks field fortifications. There is even a napalm missile and the Lobber, a supply missile.

There are new recoilless 120-millimeter rifles, and improved bazookas. But the old

reliable gun tubes which made artillery the king of World War II still provide the principal punch for limited war, and new ones—a 175-millimeter piece, and a so-called moritzer (marrying the characteristics of mortar and howitzer) are under development. New antitank and antipersonnel mines now have directional capabilities and wide dispersion. One, detonated at the proper time, can wipe out a well-dispersed patrol.

Chemicals—gases that are tasteless, odorless, colorless but toxic, persistent and lethal—could add to the hazard of tomorrow's battlefield. Against some of them, and against biological agents—the unknown, undiscussed weapon—the safest protection would be a completely enclosing rubberized suit with its own self-contained air supply.

To the revolution in firepower and the revolution in range must be added the revolution in speed, and in mobility. Just as the internal combustion engine and the machinegun doomed the horse in war, so the armored personnel carrier, weird cross-country vehicles, transport aircraft, helicopters, vertical takeoff aircaft, flying jeeps, and platfoms are superseding the jeep of World War II.

The long-distance airlift (as in the Lebanon crisis) has reduced appreciably the Army reflex time; ground forces can react to an enemy's aggression—even half a world away—far faster than in the past. Tomorrow, tactical mobility on the battlefield itself will be keyed to a light, aluminum personnel carrier which can ford or swim rivers and move overland on tracks; to the Mechanical Mule, a tiny, four-wheeled vehicle which can carry loads heavier than its own weight, and to gadgets that can skim over the battlefield and land on a dime.

Flying cranes—powerful jet-driven helicopters—will be the load carriers and the aerial scouts. Armed with machineguns and rockets, they will lay down suppression fire and, as "Skycav," move small bodies of troops to the enemy's rear or flanks. For the infantryman himself, it now seems possible that terrain-skimming jeeps or individual flying platforms, perhaps utilizing ducted fans, may transform the mile-an-hour mudslogger into a man with seven-league boots.

For heavy load and supply missions behind the front, vehicles with huge wheels will drag supply pallets or rolling rubber containers of gasoline across the earth—waddling cross-country over uneven ground like prehistoric monsters. For the Arctic, the Sno-Train—with 6-foot rubber-tired wheels 48 inches wide—will supplant the sleds and wannigans of today.

These—and other vehicles—may be run by atomic power or by universal engines capable of burning gasoline, diesel oil, or nearly anything but wood.

To link this hard-hitting, long-ranging, fast-moving Army together and to supply its commanders information about the enemy, there are new miracles in electronics: radar to spot enemy mortars, invisible eyes that can report walking men 4,000 yards away, television and infrared detectors to gather and transmit information about the battlefield and calculating machines and digital computers—their data presented on fluorescent screens.

Automation is coming to the Army—and with it, jibes GI Joe, will come the Army's greatest blessing: the machines will do the thinking and supersede the generals.

The revision of military organization has always followed the development of new weapons. The development of battlefield nuclear weapons forced the abandonment of big triangular (three-regiment) division with which the Army fought World War II. But the new pentomic (five-sided) division, which is the basis of today's army, has been created before most of the weapons with which it is to be equipped have been produced.

Many of the weapons and equipment described above are still merely gleams in the designers' eyes, or exist only in prototype forms. At the same time, the multiplication of weapons and weapons systems—the old ones must be retained to fight nonnuclear wars, the new ones are essential for any atomic battlefield—presents a problem of amoebalike growth.

How do you keep a division—the tactical unit of any army—small (and it must be small if it is to be mobile, and it must be mobile if it is to live on any future battlefield) when it needs so many different weapons to meet an incalculable number of situations?

Today's answer—the pentomic division—is no more than a compromise. The fighting heart of the division is its five battle groups, with both conventional and nuclear support, but the structure already has been radically changed since its inception 3½ years ago. Its capability to fight nonnuclear battles has just been sharply increased by strengthening its conventional artillery support.

But the pentomic division still faces a number of what the Army calls "incompatibles"—the geatest of them the incompatibility of nuclear and conventional war. It cannot retain its tactical, or battlefield, mobility (which requires such bulky items as tanks, armored personnel carriers, light planes and helicopters) and at the same time attain strategic mobility (portability by air across oceans and continents). Its communications and electronics equipment—there is now one radio transmitter for every 10.3 men in the division—already is so plentiful that electronic interference from its own equipment is an ever-present problem. It calculating machines and its weapons are so increasingly complex that the problem of maintaining them under field conditions sometimes seems insurmountable.

The tactical organization of the Army of tomorrow is therefore still a matter of trial and error. The trend is toward small mobile units (considerably smaller than present battle groups), quickly responsive to command, armed with light but very powerful weapons.

The tactics of tomorrow's Army will be dictated by necessity—necessity bred from the technological revolution in war. Battlefield nuclear weapons—whether used or not—enforce their own rules. A ground army can hope to survive only by widespread dispersion, operation in small groups, the use of cover and constant movement.

Tomorrow's ground battlefield—if there is one—will be a far cry in its dimensions from those limited areas overseen by Napoleon, astride his horse, where the destinies of nations were decided. In the age of the plane and rocket, airborne troops and guerrilla armies, the concept of the line is gone forever. A front may extend the depth of a whole nation. Under such conditions, victory would go to that force which—as in the days of Jackson's foot cavalry—was able to marry most closely the principles of mobility, firepower, and flexibility. The principles are the same, but the difficulty of applying them has increased by quantum jumps.

What about the men? Clearly, if tomorrow's soldier is to be master of the machine and not a creature of chaos he will require higher intelligence, better training, greater toughness and more initiative by far than all past GI Joes. More—much, much more—will depend upon the few.

The Army recognizes the importance of man as the hub of the battle, even though there are weaknesses and omissions in its preparations for the unknown battlefields of speculation. The criticism so often voiced between past wars that "the generals are preparing for the last war" is certainly not valid today; indeed, the criticism should be reversed. The futuristic weapons, the revolutionary organization and tactics of tomorrow's army, as envisaged today, are geared perhaps too much to some future battlefield, not enough to yesterday's.

Today's Army, for instance stresses but slightly guerrilla tactics, or defense against the terrorist underground and irregular forces that have cost so much British and French blood and treasure in the postwar years. Today's Army views the skies as tomorrow's strategic and tactical answer to its mobility needs, yet the enormous supply problems of aerial movement are unresolved.

The Army of tomorrow is not backward looking; it has leaped into a whole new era of warfare since World War II. But one suspects that in some future time, if the chips are down, the fantastic dreams of electronic, automated armies may—sooner or later under the stress of battle—bend and break beneath the sheer weight of complexity and incompatibles. Then GI Joe with the will to win as his oldest-newest weapon—GI Joe, bearded, bloody but unbowed—will still slog through the mud to victory.

U.S. Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, once again the administration is preparing to ask Congress for a vast foreign aid appropriation and once more we will be bombarded with propaganda in support of continued spending abroad.

In line with this there has recently been prepared in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress a very enlightening report, showing, among other things, that this country has extended aid to foreign countries in the last 18 years totaling more than $120 billion.

This is significant, it seems to me, in view of the fact that this represents nearly one-half of the total national debt of some $282 billion. Of course, there is a good deal more involved, but at the time of the first large expenditure for foreign assistance, in 1940, our national debt was approximately $40 billion. Today the interest on the debt amounts to more than $8 billion annually, and a large part of this interest is paid on money which has been sent to foreign shores for military and economic assistance.

While a good part of this total—$49,223,859,000—was for lend-lease during World War II, the fact remains that the overwhelming part of it was for aid since the war. The report shows that from July 1, 1945, through June 30, 1958, a total of $71,551,940,000 has been spent in foreign aid, including $55,017,837,000 in direct grants—which we will never get back—and $16,534,103,000 was in utilized credits and loans.

Mr. Herman L. Ficker, of the International Finance and Trade Unit of the Economics Division of the Library of

Congress, has gone into considerable detail in explaining the various aspects of the foreign assistance program, and I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD his entire report—feeling that it should be of interest to every American:

U.S. FOREIGN AID

RECAPITULATION AND EXPLANATORY NOTES

Summary totals

During the period July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1958, the United States extended gross utilized aid totaling $120,775,799,000 to foreign governments and international organizations as follows:

War period, July 1, 1940–June 30, 1945

Gross grants—Lend-lease (table I)	$46,728,287,000
Gross grants—all other (table II)	1,400,010,000
Utilized credits and loans (table III)	1,095,562,000
Total	49,223,859,000

Postwar period, July 1, 1945–June 30, 1958

Gross grants (table V)	$55,017,837,000
Utilized credits and loans (table VI)	16,534,103,000
Total	71,551,940,000

(Gross grants were reduced by $2,256,854,000 consisting of prior grants converted to credits. This total was added to utilized credits in table VI.)

Not included in the overall total of aid are U.S. capital investments of $3,420,000,000—in the International Bank, $635,000,000; International Monetary Fund, $2,750,000,000; International Finance Corporation, $35 million.

Although these investments constitute an additional measure taken by the U.S. Government to promote foreign economic development, they do not result in immediate equivalent aid to foreign countries.

Availabilities of aid on July 1, 1958

Foreign grant and credit authorizations available during fiscal year 1957 approximated $14.8 billions. Total utilizations during the year amounted to $5.4 billions in grants and credits. The Office of Business Economics of the U.S. Department of Commerce estimated that, as of July 1, 1958, foreign grants and credits available and still to be furnished from prior authorizations amount to approximately $9.5 billions. This did not mean that these carryover funds consisted of cash available for disbursement. These funds were substantially committed in long-range contracts under which goods and services had not yet been delivered. The availabilities by category comprised:

	Billions
Grants of military supplies and services	$3.4
Other economic grants	2.1
Credits and loans	3.9

In addition to these carryover funds, the 85th Congress, 2d session, provided $6.1 billions in new appropriations for foreign aid:

	Billions
Export-Import Bank Act amendment, Public Law 85–424	$2.0
Mutual Security, Public Laws 85–477 and 85–583	3.3
Estimated available proceeds of additional sales under amendment to Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, Public Law 85–931	.8

Thus the carryover funds of $9.5 billions plus new funds of $6.1 billions provided an estimated availability of $15.6 billions for foreign aid during fiscal year 1959.

This approximate total may be disbursed under the following three main categories:

	Billions
Grants of military supplies and services	$4.9
Other economic grants	3.5
Credits and loans	7.1

Postwar military aid

The breakdown of military aid by country is not given as such information is classified for security reasons. A partial country list is given at the end of table V comprising postwar grants. Regional totals of military aid are given at the end of table V as military supplies and services by the U.S. Defense Department and other agencies as well as multilateral construction program contributions. Cumulative military disbursements during the postwar period are stated for the following regions:

Asia and Pacific	$4,590,297,000
Europe	12,889,192,000
Near East, Africa, and south Asia	2,740,317,000
Other areas and overlapping programs	225,440,000
Total	20,445,246,000

It should be clearly understood that any total for postwar aid by the United States to any foreign country compiled from these tables will consist of economic grants and loans only. Military totals will not be included so that final aid totals are only a partial representation of disbursements.

Definitions

Grants are transfers for which no repayment is generally expected, but might involve an obligation on the part of the receiver to extend aid to the United States or other countries to achieve a common objective.

Credits are loan disbursements or transfers under agreements for specific repayments over a period of years, usually with interest. In some instances aid has been given under grants with the understanding that a decision as to repayment would be made at a later date. When such a decision for repayment is made a credit is established. As a rule such credits are not deducted from the grants recorded in previous periods. Only after the agreement for repayment is signed, an adjustment is made from grants to credits.

Credits to individual countries may include loans to private entities; e.g., loans to Canada represent credits extended solely to private interests.

The measure of foreign grants and credits generally is in terms of goods delivered or shipped by the U.S. Government, services rendered by the U.S. Government, or cash disbursed by the U.S. Government to or for the account of a foreign government or entity.

Reverse grants and returns on grants comprise: (1) Reverse lend-lease received in the immediate postwar years; (2) the return of military equipment loans, usually aircraft and watercraft; (3) the return of civilian supplies; (4) the return of military naval ships as well as lend-lease merchant ships; (5) the cash war-account settlements for lend-lease and other grants; (6) and finally, the foreign currency funds resulting from military aid collections, usually for administrative expenses, as well as the counterpart funds resulting from economic and technical assistance.

At the end of the war period such reverse grants, reciprocal lend-lease, and returns on grants amounted to $7,872,637,000.

During the postwar period ending June 30, 1958, such returns totaled $1,805,343,000.

Utilizations of credits and loans are given for the total war and postwar periods in table VIII. During this time the United States authorized net credits and loans including conversions from prior grants for an aggregate of $20,481,987,000. On June 30, 1958 the unutilized total amounted to $2,692,682,000. This would be available as lines of credit to be drawn down during fiscal year 1959 or until such time as the authorizations expired.

Direct utilizations since 1940 amounted to $17,302,055,000 and an additional $487,250,000 were lent through agent banks by the Export-Import Bank.

Since 1945 such utilizations including reconversions have amounted to $16,534,103,000.

Repayments of loans or principal collected by the respective U.S. Government agencies on the credits extended, the loans, sales, commodity programs and prior grants converted into credits have amounted to $5,595,364,000 since 1940. The major portion, or $5,153,859,000, has been collected during the postwar period since 1945.

During fiscal year 1957 utilizations of credits amounted to $440,282,000 and collections were $639,574,000. This trend was reversed during fiscal year 1958 when utilizations totaled $1,226,736,000 and collections $614,769,000.

Outstanding on June 30, 1958, or utilizations unrepaid, amounted to $12,179,482,000. Repayment prospects are excellent if forecasts are made according to the past history of collections. During the past 18 years principal charged off as uncollectible has amounted to less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the total lent or credit utilized.

Welfare data included under postwar grant aid comprise government grants of agricultural food surpluses distributed overseas by private American welfare agencies, churches or international agencies such as CARE. These agencies undertook the free distribution of such surpluses as part of their oversea missionary commitments.

Sources: (1) Material published periodically as Foreign Grants and Credits by the Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce. Latest issue is for fiscal 1958, November 1958. (2) Various articles in the Survey of Current Business, U.S. Department of Commerce during year 1958. (3) Foreign Aid, 1940–1951, by the Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1952.

TABLE I.—*Foreign grants, lend-lease, by country*

WAR PERIOD, JULY 1, 1940–JUNE 30, 1945

[In thousands of dollars]

Total	46,728,287
Bolivia	5,026
Brazil	347,945
Chile	22,038
Colombia	8,278
Costa Rica	156
Cuba	6,154
Dominican Republic	1,458
Ecuador	7,208
El Salvador	877
Guatemala	1,736
Haiti	1,362
Honduras	368
Mexico	38,621
Nicaragua	885
Paraguay	1,952
Peru	18,001
Uruguay	6,942
Venezuela	4,480
Unspecified Latin America	108,539
Belgium	68,774

TABLE I.—*Foreign grants, lend-lease, by country*—Continued

WAR PERIOD, JULY 1, 1940–JUNE 30, 1945

[In thousands of dollars]

United Kingdom	28,600,797
Australia	896,641
India	610,172
New Zealand	249,432
Union of South Africa	93,370
China	845,743
Czechoslovakia	2,760
Ethiopia	1,238
France	2,613,543
Greece	75,365
Iran	7,791
Liberia	236
Netherlands	114,690
Norway	37,039
Poland	12,119
Saudi Arabia	5,489
Turkey	90,041
U.S.S.R.	10,760,975
Yugoslavia	32,050
Unclassified	1,245,077

Source: Foreign Aid: 1940–51, Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1952, pp. 85–90.

TABLE II.—*Foreign grants, other, by country*

WAR PERIOD—JULY 1, 1940–JUNE 30, 1945

[In thousands of dollars]

Total	1,400,010
Argentina	1,239
Bolivia	1,926
Brazil	12,693
Chile	2,864
Colombia	2,230
Costa Rica	1,722
Cuba	503
Dominican Republic	400
Ecuador	4,132
El Salvador	1,026
Guatemala	1,484
Haiti	1,131
Honduras	2,720
Mexico	8,130
Nicaragua	2,267

TABLE II.—*Foreign grants, other, by country*—Continued

WAR PERIOD, JULY 1, 1940–JUNE 30, 1945

[In thousands of dollars]

Panama	989
Paraguay	2,406
Peru	3,485
Uruguay	814
Venezuela	2,557
Unclassified Latin America	4,373
Austria	1,022
United Kingdom	16,158
Australia	108
Bermuda	1
British East Africa	301
Hong Kong	368
India	77
Trinidad and Tobago	3
China-Formosa	385,116
Czechoslovakia	5,717
Egypt	1,700
Finland	1,489
France	7,449
Algeria	15,945
French Equatorial Africa	118
French Morocco	68
Greece	3,627
Iceland	99
Iran	353
Ireland	308
Italy	310,166
Eritrea	15
Ryukyu Islands (Japan)	4,122
Liberia	236
Indonesia	3,625
Norway	70
Philippines	52,515
Poland	84
Portugal	1
Spain	1,759
Sweden	766
U.S.S.R.	15,205
Yugoslavia	1,028
Trust Territories in Pacific	1,826
International organizations	53,238
Unclassified areas	447,379

Source: Foreign Aid: 1940–51, Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1952, pp. 85–90.

TABLE III.—*Foreign credits utilized, by country*

WAR PERIOD—JULY 1, 1940–JUNE 30, 1945

[In thousands of dollars]

Total	1,095,562
American Republics	318,563
Argentina	390
Bolivia	4,510
Brazil	67,031
Chile	21,366
Colombia	22,254
Costa Rica	7,124
Cuba	18,200
Dominican Republic	3,284
Ecuador	5,567
El Salvador	900
Haiti	7,755
Honduras	895
Mexico	14,717
Nicaragua	4,065
Panama	2,338
Uruguay	7,086
Venezuela	5,111
Unclassified	121,276
Bahrein	17,048
British Commonwealth	607,447
United Kingdom	434,281
Australia	8,372
British Honduras	468
Canada	32,770
India	131,555
China	80,245
Ethiopia	4,358
Finland	15,074
Iceland	200
Liberia	3,334
Netherlands	36,137
Portugal	327
Saudi Arabia	12,714
Spain	116

Source: Foreign Aid: 1940–51, Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1952, pp. 96–100.

TABLE IV.—*Foreign grants: By program—Postwar period: July 1, 1945–June 30, 1958—Fiscal years 1957, 1958*

[In thousands of dollars]

Programs	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Total	57,274,691	4,109,498	4,130,476
Mutual security	42,524,196	3,859,019	3,889,749
Military aid:			
Military supplies and services:			
Defense Department	20,334,455	2,207,823	2,432,841
Other departments and agencies	71,122	8,740	8,289
Multilateral construction	492,425	63,367	67,442
Other aid:			
From economic and technical aid appropriations	20,038,457	1,426,810	1,173,332
Atoms for peace	410		410
From Public Law 480 currencies	91,732	8,328	71,257
Famine and other relief:			
Wheat for Pakistan	67,403		
Under Famine Relief Act	9,375		
Under Public Law 480	346,588	80,469	86,787
Through Chinese-Korean student aid	7,429		
Through international agencies:			
Movement of migrants and refugees	78,464	21,044	17,074
Multilateral technical aid	107,738	15,939	16,317
Palestine relief	185,722	26,500	16,000
U.N. Korean Reconstruction Agency	92,876		
Civilian supplies:			
Civilian relief in Korea	444,255	2,675	1,814
Government and relief in liberated and occupied areas:			
By Defense Department	5,107,394	805	827
By International Cooperation Administration	172,533		
From lend-lease appropriations	134,444		
International agencies:			
UNRRA	2,588,659		
For refugees	240,766		
For children	137,120	11,514	9,664
Post-UNRRA	298,748		
Interim aid	555,684		
Lend-lease:			
Military (China)	679,073		
Postwar pipelines	1,227,061		
Greek-Turkish aid:			
Military	530,203		
Other	122,484		
Philippine rehabilitation:			
Private claims	397,540		
Surplus property	100,000		
Reconstruction and rehabilitation	137,035		
Donations of surplus agricultural commodities through welfare agencies	777,419	165,221	173,234
Military equipment loans	390,605	45,597	24,192
Chinese naval aid	141,394		
Chinese military aid	119,732		
Chinese stabilization	119,594		
Foot-and-mouth disease eradication	93,891		
Technical aid (other than mutual security)	51,378		
Inter-American and related highways	67,014	15,977	20,961
Trust Territory development and support	38,564	4,690	6,035
Yugoslav aid	37,560		
Berlin investment fund	12,857		
Through American Red Cross	10,435		
Libyan special-purpose funds	17,000	4,000	4,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	53		

TABLE V.—*Foreign grants, by country and program—Postwar period, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1958; fiscal years 1957, 1958*

[Military breakdown not available by country; aid by area at end of table]

[In thousands of dollars]

Country and program	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Grand total	57,274,691	4,109,498	4,130,476
American Republics	1,041,404	167,428	192,199
Argentina	320	84	38
Mutual security aid	122	84	38
Technical aid	193		
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5		
Bolivia	104,972	23,155	32,046
Mutual security aid	73,318	19,855	32,046
Urgent relief	25,305	2,590	
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	3,599	710	
Technical aid	2,645		
Inter-American highways	80		
RFC	25		
Brazil	50,301	17,039	6,228
Mutual security aid	21,511	4,614	4,674
Urgent relief	474		
Atoms for peace	350		350
Lend-lease	3,616		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	7,821	2,288	1,204
Military equipment loans	10,137	10,137	
Technical aid	6,050		
Inter-American highways	13		
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	329		
Chile	26,214	2,776	11,773
Mutual security aid	12,441	2,131	3,790
Urgent relief	194		
Agricultural commodites (welfare)	8,882	645	7,983
Technical aid	4,697		
Colombia	19,027	3,345	6,203
Mutual security aid	7,502	1,189	1,923
Urgent relief	68		
Lend-lease	11		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	9,549	2,156	4,280
Technical aid	1,879		
Inter-American highways	18		
Costa Rica	27,586	4,604	7,985
Mutual security aid	6,789	884	1,157
Urgent relief	267		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	495	128	332
Technical aid	2,190		
Inter-American highways	17,845	3,592	6,496
Cuba	2,808	521	571
Mutual security aid	2,352	521	561
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	10		10
Technical aid	446		
Dominican Republic	2,595	210	163
Mutual security aid	2,089	210	163
Lend-lease	3		
Technical aid	496		
Inter-American highways	7		
Ecuador	14,591	1,894	2,419
Mutual security aid	10,245	1,715	2,189
Urgent relief	96		
Lend-lease	545		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	637	179	230
Technical aid	2,924		
Inter-American highways	144		
El Salvador	8,193	1,392	1,117
Mutual security aid	5,418	947	1,060
Urgent relief	41		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	567	379	57
Technical aid	1,242		
Inter-American highways	925	66	
Guatemala	67,950	19,040	17,136
Mutual security aid	35,586	10,454	9,792
Urgent relief	3,344		
Lend-lease	1,347		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	458	333	55
Technical aid	2,734		
Inter-American highways	24,481	8,353	7,289
Haiti	22,627	4,503	2,663
Mutual security aid	14,715	3,565	2,474
Urgent relief	3,571	749	
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	1,162	189	189
Technical aid	3,145		
Inter-American highways	33		
American Republics—Continued			
Honduras	11,071	2,255	2,065
Mutual security aid	6,538	1,295	1,094
Urgent relief	533		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	1,145	472	266
Technical aid	722		
Inter-American highways	2,133	488	705
Mexico	108,664	1,701	1,257
Mutual security aid	5,773	1,167	821
Urgent relief	216	216	
Lend-lease	553		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	953	318	436
Foot-and-mouth disease eradication	93,891		
Technical aid	7,277		
Inter-American highways	1		
Nicaragua	18,012	2,410	3,896
Mutual security aid	4,787	709	756
Urgent relief	41		
Technical aid	395		
Inter-American highways	12,789	1,701	3,140
Panama	20,372	4,179	5,256
Mutual security aid	8,550	1,440	1,335
Urgent relief	68		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	2,708	962	590
Technical aid	559		
Inter-American highways	8,487	1,777	3,331
Paraguay	13,150	2,028	2,013
Mutual security aid	10,093	1,887	1,901
Urgent relief	30		
Lend-lease	2		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	452	141	112
Technical aid	2,571		
Inter-American highways	2		
Peru	38,748	10,156	8,897
Mutual security aid	17,497	3,470	3,612
Urgent relief	12,816	6,082	3,756
Lend-lease	237		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	3,537	604	1,529
Technical aid	4,605		
Inter-American highways	56		
Uruguay	2,707	259	260
Mutual security aid	1,793	259	260
Urgent relief	1		
Technical aid	903		
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	10		
Venezuela	2,484	133	144
Mutual security aid	991	133	144
Technical aid	1,493		
International Organizations:			
Inter-American Institute for Agricultural Sciences	20		20
Organization of American States	7,534	1,365	1,173
Pan-American Sanitary Organization	3,500	1,500	2,000
Unspecified	467,955	62,879	76,876
Military supplies and services	452,756	61,710	75,027
Other mutual security aid	11,679	1,169	1,849
Technical aid	3,836		
RFC	[1] 316		
Afghanistan	19,651	3,376	11,999
Mutual security aid	14,212	3,339	6,642
Urgent relief	5,317		5,317
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	104	37	40
Technical aid	18		
Albania: UNRRA	20,444		
Australia	12,539		
UNRRA	239		
Lend-lease	12,300		
Austria	1,086,815	3,084	21,653
Mutual security aid	734,779	1,088	3,848
Urgent relief	18,255		15,235
GARIOA [2] (Defense)	89,318		
UNRRA	72,696		
Post-UNRRA	86,055		
Interim aid	68,291		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	17,421	1,996	2,570
Belgium-Luxembourg	582,937	80	82
Mutual security aid	522,139	38	76
Urgent relief	10		

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE V.—*Foreign grants, by country and program—Postwar period, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1958; fiscal years 1957, 1958*—Continued

[Military breakdown not available by country; aid by area at end of table]

[In thousands of dollars]

Country and program	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Belgium-Luxembourg—Con.			
UNRRA	1,137		
Lend-lease	59,480		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	154	42	6
American Red Cross	17		
Belgian Congo	32	14	
Mutual security aid	30	14	
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	2		
Burma	21,799	306	537
Mutual security aid	21,073	74	299
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	722	232	238
Technical aid	4		
Cambodia	122,219	40,868	39,193
Mutual security aid	119,844	40,846	39,183
Urgent relief	2,343		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	32	22	10
Canada	3,964		
Military equipment loans (repaid)	3,964		
Ceylon	20,101	5,385	14,478
Mutual security aid	7,168	2,251	4,804
Urgent relief	6,903		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	6,025	3,134	2,771
Technical aid	5		
China-Taiwan	2,373,339	99,243	73,596
Mutual security aid	768,880	86,917	55,707
Public Law 480 currencies	322		322
Urgent relief	504		
Chinese-Korean student aid	7,363		
UNRRA	362,897		
Post-UNRRA	43,919		
Lend-lease military	679,073		
Lend-lease postwar pipelines	50,345		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	23,244	7,702	5,067
Military equipment loans	54,183	4,625	12,500
Chinese naval aid	141,394		
Chinese military aid	119,732		
Chinese stabilization	119,594		
American Red Cross	1,889		
Czechoslovakia	185,827		
Mutual security aid	379		
Urgent relief	1,995		
UNRRA	183,374		
Lend-lease	2		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	2		
American Red Cross	75		
Denmark	247,635	1	
Mutual security aid	247,631	1	
UNRRA	4		
Ethiopia	18,950	3,762	5,305
Mutual security aid	18,458	3,756	5,284
UNRRA	439		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	53	6	21
Finland	3,522		
Mutual security aid	27		
Urgent relief	36		
UNRRA	1,840		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	1,456		
American Red Cross	163		
French Union	4,396,030	62,714	629
France	4,390,774	61,551	372
Mutual security aid	3,669,542	61,151	141
Urgent relief	538		
UNRRA	3,061		
Post-UNRRA	60		
Interim aid	311,388		
Lend-lease	372,441		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	6,253	400	231
Military equipment loans	25,345		
American Red Cross	2,146		
Algeria	1,128	808	213
Mutual security aid	186	159	27
UNRRA	97		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	835	649	186
American Red Cross	9		
French Equatorial Africa: Mutual security aid	2,200		
French Union—Con.			
French Guiana: Agricultural commodities (welfare)	56	56	
French West Africa: Agricultural commodities (welfare)	197	184	
French West Indies: Agricultural commodities (welfare)	140	79	44
Madagascar: Mutual security aid	1,198	12	
Unspecified French Africa: Mutual security aid	337	38	
Germany, East	17,342	21	3
Mutual security aid	16,585	21	3
Urgent relief	757		
Germany, Federal Republic	3,858,657	26,617	34,725
Mutual security aid	1,534,771	13,856	16,806
Urgent relief	5,080	1,284	306
GARIOA:			
Defense Department	2,033,248		
ICA	172,533		
UNRRA	3,616		
Post-UNRRA	2,086		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	86,814	11,477	9,961
Military equipment loans	7,652		7,652
Berlin investment fund	12,857		
Ghana	477	65	238
Mutual security aid	238	11	227
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	239	54	11
Greece	1,739,931	39,620	20,400
Mutual security aid	865,186	29,230	4,775
Urgent relief	997		
Currencies from Public Law 480	7,443		1,295
UNRRA	279,755		
Post-UNRRA	37,255		
Lend lease	5,956		
Greek-Turkish aid:			
Military	371,146		
Economic	122,484		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	45,634	10,390	10,290
Military equipment loans	4,040		4,040
American Red Cross	35		
Hungary	16,430	8,873	1,702
Mutual security aid	1,422	780	104
Urgent relief	12,649	8,093	1,598
UNRRA	2,359		
Iceland: Mutual security aid	29,893	79	55
India	310,254	47,283	54,193
Mutual security aid	237,629	36,140	39,819
Urgent relief	4,665	1,165	
Lend-lease	3,000		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	64,940	9,978	14,374
Technical aid	20		
Indochina	110,811	49	
Mutual security aid	110,183	49	
Urgent relief	446		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	182		
Indonesia	139,832	9,606	11,605
Mutual security aid	133,502	8,690	10,975
GARIOA (defense)	4,106		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	2,204	916	630
Technical aid	20		
Iran	251,948	49,163	14,496
Mutual security aid	241,608	43,551	12,033
Urgent relief	2,748	2,748	
Currencies under Public Law 480	4,472	2,235	2,237
Lend-lease	750		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	2,330	629	226
Technical aid	40		
Iraq	15,267	2,592	3,756
Mutual security aid	14,304	2,540	3,287
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	963	52	469
Ireland	18,346		
Mutual security aid	18,324		
American Red Cross	22		
Israel	285,838	16,101	20,842
Mutual security aid	245,894	14,935	19,004
Urgent relief	32		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	39,912	1,166	1,838

TABLE V.—*Foreign grants, by country and program—Postwar period, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1958; fiscal years 1957, 1958*—Continued

[Military breakdown not available by country; aid by area at end of table]

[In thousands of dollars]

Country and program	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Italy (including Trieste)	2,734,023	51,002	55,817
Mutual security aid	1,576,338	4,338	11,584
Urgent relief	68,478	30,099	17,364
Civilian supplies (GARIOA)	112,955		
Civilian supplies (lend-lease)	134,444		
UNRRA	409,754		
Post-UNRRA	128,461		
Interim aid	176,006		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	113,701	16,565	26,869
Military equipment loans	14,695		
American Red Cross	191		
Italian Somaliland Trust Territory	1,736	395	998
Mutual security aid	1,696	395	958
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	40		40
Japan and possessions	2,628,706	23,246	23,680
Japan	2,397,554	18,466	18,486
Mutual security aid	14,745	1,696	2,267
Urgent relief	28,438	13,699	14,092
GARIOA (Defense Department)	2,184,569		
Post-UNRRA	178		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	10,050	3,071	2,127
Military equipment loans	159,574		
Ryukyu Islands	231,139	4,780	5,194
Mutual security aid	748	403	345
Urgent relief	3,529	1,887	1,642
Currencies under Public Law 480	3,265	1,093	2,172
GARIOA (Defense Department)	222,078	805	827
Post-UNRRA	12		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	1,494	592	208
American Red Cross	13		
Miscellaneous islands	13		
GARIOA (Defense Department)	13		
Jordan	72,921	8,843	34,888
Mutual security aid	68,198	8,335	34,236
Urgent relief	1,089		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	3,634	508	652
Korea	2,160,731	316,257	314,018
Mutual security aid	1,179,596	289,820	247,476
Currencies from Public Law 480	58,800	5,000	47,800
Urgent relief	869	78	
Chinese-Korean student aid	67		
UNRRA	92,876		
Civilian supplies (Defense)	444,255	2,675	1,814
GARIOA (Defense)	292,090		
UNKRA	546		
Post-UNRRA	72		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	51,348	15,972	16,928
Military equipment loans	40,212	2,712	
Laos	152,724	49,004	38,015
Mutual security aid	151,861	48,148	38,008
Urgent relief	839	839	
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	24	17	7
Lebanon	27,727	4,754	5,717
Mutual security aid	25,456	4,618	5,594
Urgent relief	311		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	1,959	136	123
Technical aid	1		
Liberia	10,636	1,567	2,062
Mutual security aid	10,439	1,561	2,057
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	64	6	5
Technical aid	133		
Libya	61,723	21,917	11,807
Mutual security aid	33,236	14,084	6,940
Urgent relief	9,584	3,044	
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	1,903	789	867
Special purpose funds	17,000	4,000	4,000
Malaya	954	219	43
Mutual security aid	83	2	
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	862	217	43
Technical aid	9		
Morocco	14,492	2,217	11,445
Mutual security aid	2,229	378	1,795
Urgent relief	6,781		6,767
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	5,482	1,839	2,883
Nepal	10,619	1,940	4,978
Mutual security aid	8,443	1,940	3,011
Urgent relief	2,176		1,967
Netherlands Union	916,737	3,766	1,183
Netherlands	915,329	3,229	791
Mutual security aid	827,632	3,299	791
UNRRA	1,899		
Lend-lease	64,334		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	2		
Military equipment loans	21,340		
American Red Cross	122		
Netherlands New Guinea	39		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	39		
Surinam	1,369	467	376
Mutual security aid	1,211	309	376
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	158	158	
New Zealand, lend-lease	2,300		
Norway	238,566	509	501
Mutual security aid	237,570	509	501
Urgent relief	24		
UNRRA	771		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	30		
American Red Cross	171		
Pakistan	343,436	55,715	71,473
Mutual security aid	190,540	49,834	44,467
Urgent relief	115,119		7,069
Currencies under Public Law 480	17,430		17,430
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	20,336	5,881	2,507
Technical aid	11		
Palestine	175		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	175		
Philippines	822,868	26,874	31,883
Mutual security aid	145,076	25,223	28,197
Urgent relief	484		
GARIOA	28,345		
UNRRA	7,700		
Philippine rehabilitation	634,575		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	6,622	1,651	3,686
Technical aid	55		
American Red Cross	11		
Poland	365,339		361
Mutual security aid	66		66
UNRRA	364,031		
Lend-lease	92		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	295		295
American Red Cross	855		
Portugal and possessions	33,435	12,052	2,756
Portugal	32,609	11,935	2,517
Mutual security aid	15,937	63	117
Urgent relief	68		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	8,849	4,057	2,400
Military equipment loans	7,815	7,815	
Macao	207	44	163
Mutual security aid	97	44	53
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	110		110
Portuguese India	415	53	13
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	415	53	13
Unspecified Portuguese Africa	144	20	63
Mutual security aid	144	20	63
Rhodesia and Nyasaland	11	6	4
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	10	6	4
Technical aid	1		
Saudi Arabia	4,252	13	
Mutual security aid	2,639	13	
Lend-lease	1,591		
Technical aid	22		

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE V.—*Foreign grants, by country and program—Postwar period, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1958; fiscal years 1957, 1958*—Continued

[Military breakdown not available by country; aid by area at end of table]

[In thousands of dollars]

Country and program	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Spain and possessions	343,086	124,837	101,623
Spain	343,029	124,837	101,573
Mutual security aid	255,473	87,603	81,553
Urgent relief	2,005	257	953
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	65,234	16,669	19,067
Military equipment loans	20,308	20,308	
Canary Islands	16		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	16		
Spanish Africa	50		50
Mutual security aid	50		50
Sudan	260		254
Mutual security aid	254		254
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	6		
Sweden	87,143		
Mutual security aid	86,539		
Urgent relief	6		
UNRRA	549		
American Red Cross	49		
Switzerland, UNRRA	1,803		
Thailand	108,482	33,133	23,477
Mutual security aid	108,293	33,078	23,402
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	165	55	75
Technical aid	24		
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Carolina, Mariana, and Marshall Islands)	43,008	4,690	6,035
GARIOA	4,444		
Development and support	38,564	4,690	6,035
Tunisia	17,713	6,641	9,123
Mutual security aid	7,624	840	5,152
Urgent relief	9,326	5,507	3,818
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	764	294	153
Turkey	630,024	80,723	39,045
Mutual security aid	436,836	79,297	38,876
Urgent relief	12,187	884	
Greek-Turkish military aid	158,575		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	1,086	542	169
Military equipment loans	21,340		
U.S.S.R.	465,434		
UNRRA	186,380		
Lend-lease	277,254		
American Red Cross	1,800		
United Kingdom and dependencies	3,821,725	42,034	8,275
United Kingdom	3,797,753	33,981	614
Mutual security aid	3,447,491	33,967	614
Urgent relief	203		
UNRRA	8,369		
Lend-lease	341,462		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	179	14	
American Red Cross	49		
Aden, agricultural commodities (welfare)	11	6	5
Bahamas, agricultural commodities (welfare)	188	59	61
British Borneo, agricultural commodities (welfare)	567	150	201
British East Africa	3,423	727	2,431
Mutual security aid	3,114	660	2,279
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	309	67	152
British Guiana	420	132	77
Mutual security aid	270	67	55
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	150	65	22
British Honduras	683	125	121
Mutual security aid	88	35	50
Urgent relief	274	16	
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	321	74	71
British Isles East of Africa	4		4
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	4		4
British Somaliland	88	88	
Mutual security aid	88	88	
United Kingdom and Dependencies—Con.			
British Virgin Islands	31	15	5
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	31	15	5
Gambia	130	50	46
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	130	50	46
Hong Kong	12,119	4,789	2,735
Mutual security aid	2,436	933	607
Urgent relief	1,031		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	8,652	3,856	2,128
Malta	2,334	343	688
Mutual security aid	2		
Urgent relief	26		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	2,306	343	688
Nigeria	204	72	82
Mutual security aid	88	34	54
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	115	38	28
Technical aid	1		
St. Helena	18	18	
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	18	18	
Sierra Leone	115	89	19
Mutual security aid	102	83	19
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	13	6	
Singapore	87		32
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	87		32
West Indies Federation	2,963	1,290	714
Mutual security aid	258	136	64
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	2,702	1,154	650
American Red Cross	3		
Unspecified British Africa	423	130	276
Mutual security aid	423	130	276
Unspecified British America	164		164
Mutual security aid	164		164
Vietnam	795,335	245,349	222,510
Mutual security aid	769,162	233,455	219,102
Urgent relief	1,109		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	25,064	11,894	3,408
Yugoslavia	804,273	46,930	22,130
Mutual security aid	350,821	26,362	3,086
Urgent relief	47,763	1,232	
UNRRA	298,054		
Lend-lease	76		
Agricultural commodities (welfare)	69,280	19,336	19,044
Yugoslav aid	37,560		
American Red Cross	719		
Other international organizations:			
European Payments Union, mutual security aid	238,084		
Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, mutual security aid	66,814	14,144	13,524
Intergovernmental Committee for Refugees	3,650		
International Atomic Energy Agency	60		60
International Refugee Organization	237,116		
OEEC, mutual security aid	5,100	2,000	1,350
United Nations	302,586	52,974	34,674
Mutual security aid	5,000	5,000	
Refugees	11,650	6,900	3,550
Multilateral technical aid	100,184	14,574	15,124
Palestine relief	185,722	26,500	16,000
United Nation's Children's Fund	137,120	11,514	9,664
World Health Organization, mutual security aid	5,000		5,000
UNRRA	273,505		
Unspecified countries (see note 2, end of table):			
Asia and Pacific (excluding south Asia)	4,610,065	623,190	884,939
Military supplies and services (defense)	4,590,297	622,455	883,437
Mutual security aid	19,768	735	1,502
Europe	13,336,971	1,191,375	901,790
Military supplies and services (defense)	12,391,847	1,113,209	831,579
Military supplies and services (other departments)	4,920	1,079	557

TABLE V.—*Foreign grants, by country and program—Postwar period, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1958; fiscal years 1957, 1958*—Continued

[Military breakdown not available by country; aid by area at end of table]

[In thousands of dollars]

Country and program	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Unspecified countries—Con.			
Europe—Cont.			
Multilateral construction programs	492,425	63,367	67,442
Mutual security aid	311,549	3,720	2,212
GARIOA (Defense)	136,290		
Near East, Africa, and south Asia	2,769,686	395,356	627,171
Military supplies and services (Defense)	2,739,747	393,219	624,104
Military supplies and services (other departments)	570	76	108
Mutual security aid	28,888	2,061	2,959
Greek-Turkish military aid	481		
Unspecified countries—Con.			
Other areas	541,288	70,924	78,110
Military supplies and services (Defense)	159,808	17,230	18,694
Military supplies and services (other departments)	65,632	7,585	7,624
Mutual security aid	180,650	46,109	51,792
Urgent relief	80		
UNRRA	102,997		
Post-UNRRA	651		
Lend-lease	29,364		
Technical aid	11		
American Red Cross	2,095		

NOTES

1. In this table mutual security aid does not include military supplies and services, either through the Defense Department or other agencies. It comprises only assistance rendered under economic and technical programs from the mutual security appropriations.

2. Military assistance data are generally not available by country and are stated at the end of this table under military supplies and services in "Unspecified countries." A Defense Department release of Oct. 7, 1958, gave some totals (in millions of dollars) as follows for the period: Belgium, 1,069; Luxembourg, 7; Denmark, 385; France, 3,708; Greece, 678; Italy, 1,592; Netherlands, 968; Norway, 547; Portugal, 238; Spain, 239; Turkey, 1,222; United Kingdom, 693.

3. The military equipment loan to Canada is noted as "Repaid." The transfer represented the loan and return of aircraft under the program announced by the U.S. Department of Defense, Aug. 15, 1952.

[1] Credit.

[2] GARIOA—Government relief in occupied and liberated areas.

TABLE VI.—*Reverse grants and returns on grants, by country—Postwar period July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1958; fiscal year July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957, and fiscal year July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1958*

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Total	1,805,343	76,881	81,188
American Republics	53,992	85	212
Brazil	52,880		
Bolivia	200	23	172
Chile	78		
Colombia	154		
Cuba	48		
Dominican Republic	245	62	40
Ecuador	29		
Haiti	7		
Honduras	30		
Mexico	73		
Nicaragua	34		
Paraguay	7		
Peru	117		
Uruguay	66		
Venezuela	24		
Australia	20,000		
Austria	53,944	Cr. 1	2
Belgium-Luxembourg	7,948	488	468
Burma	625		
Canada	3,964		
Cambodia	706	201	384
China-Taiwan	72,966	Cr. 346	304
Czechoslovakia	173		
Denmark	16,518	324	200
Ethiopia	726	175	293
France	243,472	1,229	1,189
Germany	85,672	1,058	5,128
Greece	79,326	197	60
Iceland	1,777		
India	28,611		
Indochina (1945-54)	6,375		
Indonesia	5,183	89	49
Iran	7,878		
Iraq	483	62	124
Ireland	910		
Israel	458		
Italy and Trieste	88,692	1,329	1,503
Japan	5,864	1,062	1,917
Jordan	63		
Korea	17,926		
Laos	29		
Netherlands	54,786	379	362
Norway	24,639	545	369
Pakistan	14,482	3,211	4,830
Philippines	5,619	821	677
Poland	110	110	
Portugal	4,211	296	420
Spain	155,227	54,900	52,818
Thailand	5,735	963	745
Turkey	40,648	6,556	7,262
Union of South Africa	92,500		
U.S.S.R.	30,204		
United Arab Republic	58	58	
United Kingdom	531,152	599	560
Vietnam	4,262	2,037	
Yugoslavia	27,179	454	74
United Nations	1,247		1,247

TABLE VII. *Foreign credits utilized: By country—Postwar period: July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1958; fiscal year 1957, July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957, and fiscal year 1958, July 1, 1957, June 30, 1958*

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Total	16,534,103	440,282	1,226,736
New credits	14,277,249	439,695	1,226,736
Prior grants converted into credits	2,256,854	587	
American Republics	1,837,405	152,809	348,939
Argentina	130,835		29,160
Bolivia	42,532	1,041	26
Brazil	743,767	76,550	53,302
Chile	171,434	4,703	44,985
Colombia	142,065	1,106	79,626
Costa Rica	10,825	2,220	3,943
Cuba	38,734	8,851	3,393
Ecuador	36,413	4,360	2,361
El Salvador	642	58	9
Guatemala	2,547	1,606	369
Haiti	25,517	1,410	1,012
Honduras	1,693	14	1,456
Mexico	305,701	13,695	55,177
Nicaragua	874	14	209
American Republics—Con.			
Panama	4,919		916
Paraguay	9,938	3,383	5,602
Peru	116,450	32,986	51,678
Uruguay	12,253		
Venezuela	19,422	166	1,678
Unspecified Latin America	20,784	646	14,044
Afghanistan	44,425	9,307	5,285
Australia	14,188		
Austria	52,599	3,143	17,821
Belgium-Luxembourg and possessions	239,522		
Belgium	234,972		
Luxembourg	3,000		
Belgian Congo	1,550		
Burma	5,324		282
Canada	163,285	66	
Ceylon	1,423	1	1,421
China-Taiwan	281,548	16,943	17,407

TABLE VII. *Foreign credits utilized: By country—Postwar period: July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1958; fiscal year 1957, July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957, and fiscal year 1958, July 1, 1957, June 30, 1958*—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Czechoslovakia	20,583		
Denmark	56,709	23	29
Ethiopia-Eritrea	9,499	2,400	3,700
Ethiopia	9,449	2,400	3,700
Eritrea	50		
Finland	140,102		14,000
French Union	2,480,869	1,211	9,703
France	2,474,231	1,211	9,614
Algeria	680		
French Equatorial Africa	4,457		88
New Caledonia	1,501		
Germany	1,348,382	918	1,796
Greece	167,012	2,633	26,727
Hungary	15,917		
Iceland	12,594	866	6,069
India	306,537	17,495	21,998
Indonesia	174,512	4,300	16,410
Iran	114,009	13,225	24,044
Iraq	1,222	155	177
Ireland	128,200		
Israel	226,861	18,642	38,827
Italy	506,404	12,550	51,736
Japan	916,426	101,654	199,320
Korea	24,928		
Lebanon	1,550		
Liberia	30,438	2,250	4,300
Libya	157		157
Morocco	37,028		18,659
Netherlands	436,035		
New Zealand	17,459	40	24
Norway	140,608	4	
Pakistan	80,171	5,762	44,437
Philippines	164,852	8,932	17,826
Poland	97,551		19,830
Portugal and Angola	57,158	53	3,459
Portugal	57,046		3,400
Angola	112	53	59
Rhodesia and Nyasaland	60,686	6,978	
Saudi Arabia	19,112		
Spain	128,902	10,039	7,404
Sweden	24,200		
Thailand	21,298	10,429	3,110
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	517	8	115
Tunisia	1,894		1,894
Turkey	203,960	15,606	34,956
Union of South Africa	150,316	16,029	3,250
U.S.S.R.	222,495		
United Arab Republic	25,566	5,811	1,429
United Kingdom and dependencies	5,056,567		250,000
United Kingdom	5,032,428		250,000
British East Africa	2,394		
British Guiana	128		
British Honduras	13		
Nigeria	674		
West Indies Federation	20,930		
Vietnam	35,196		10,196
Yugoslavia	55,900		
United Nations	65,000		
European Coal and Steel Community	100,000		

TABLE VIII.—*Net foreign loans and other credits, by country, period July 1, 1940–June 30, 1958—Utilizations, repayments and totals outstanding on June 30, 1958*

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Net authorizations	Utilizations	Repayments	Outstanding on June 30, 1958
Total	20,481,987	17,789,305	5,595,364	12,179,482
New credits	18,225,132	15,532,450	5,442,945	10,075,264
Prior grants converted into credits	2,256,854	2,256,854	152,419	2,104,218
American Republics*	3,103,080	2,228,701	1,072,827	1,151,353
Argentina	264,365	131,225	47,756	83,469
Bolivia*	47,042	47,042	10,947	34,173
Brazil*	1,174,787	839,460	394,661	444,769
Chile	262,213	193,901	94,774	99,127
Colombia*	250,858	164,500	69,076	95,395
Costa Rica	23,799	18,000	3,801	14,199
Cuba	98,600	84,412	60,657	23,754
Dominican Republic	3,284	3,284	3,284	
Ecuador*	50,285	41,980	13,438	28,538
El Salvador	1,542	1,542	1,517	26
Guatemala	2,599	2,547	858	1,689
Haiti	37,891	35,837	7,985	27,853
Honduras	12,321	2,588	1,146	1,442
Mexico*	435,451	321,528	171,813	147,157
Nicaragua	7,333	5,525	5,079	446
Panama	21,357	7,407	5,786	1,621
Paraguay	18,570	15,343	6,189	9,153
Peru	178,087	116,450	10,384	105,065
Uruguay*	19,338	19,338	12,122	6,508
Venezuela*	28,662	24,565	20,725	3,568
Unspecified	164,696	152,228	129,829	22,400
Afghanistan	51,684	44,425		44,425
Australia	22,559	22,559	16,335	6,225
Austria	107,419	52,598	33,174	19,424
Bahrein	17,048	17,048	17,048	
Belgium-Luxembourg and Congo	239,522	239,522	108,917	130,606
Belgium	234,972	234,972	107,230	127,742
Luxembourg	3,000	3,000	136	2,864
Belgium Congo	1,550	1,550	1,550	
Burma	57,343	5,324	3,457	1,867
Canada	196,070	196,070	196,036	34
Ceylon	4,100	1,423		1,423
China-Taiwan	407,858	400,051	196,218	203,831
Czechoslovakia	430,377	30,377	25,507	4,870
Denmark	56,748	56,709	11,114	45,595
Ethiopia-Eritrea	32,457	13,857	4,682	9,174
Ethiopia	32,407	13,807	4,682	9,124
Eritrea	50	50		50
Finland	166,313	166,314	67,054	99,259
French Union*	2,530,043	2,480,868	863,241	1,613,088
France*	2,523,405	2,474,231	861,873	1,610,922
Algeria*	680	680	204	396
French Equatorial Africa*	4,457	4,457	1,010	2,369
New Caledonia*	1,501	1,501	154	
Germany	1,355,706	1,348,387	241,499	1,106,888
Greece*	187,799	167,012	55,354	110,149
Hungary	15,917	15,917	4,655	11,262
Iceland	22,592	13,184	1,142	12,042
India*	974,906	438,093	134,008	263,341
Indonesia	199,551	174,512	29,461	145,051
Iran	153,835	114,471	10,838	103,634
Iraq	1,380	1,222	1,008	213
Ireland	128,200	128,200	1,643	126,557
Israel	274,488	226,861	33,537	193,324
Italy	587,325	519,780	255,712	264,068
Japan	1,012,724	916,426	710,556	205,870
Korea	24,928	24,928	3,978	20,950
Latvia	11	11	11	
Lebanon	1,550	1,550	1,550	
Liberia	44,773	33,773	5,965	28,506
Libya	3,500	157		157
Morocco*	38,369	37,028	16,755	19,759
Netherlands	472,172	472,172	227,761	244,410
New Zealand	17,566	17,459	5,139	12,320
Norway*	140,835	140,835	70,218	70,529
Pakistan	166,320	80,171	25,101	93,084
Philippines	182,654	164,852	75,574	89,278
Poland	136,268	101,098	27,288	73,810
Portugal and possession*	58,512	58,494	6,988	51,475
Portugal	58,317	58,317	6,925	51,393
Angola*	195	177	64	82
Rhodesia and Nyasaland	60,686	60,686	15,363	45,323
Saudi Arabia	31,826	31,826	13,491	18,334
Spain	305,148	142,583	43,960	98,624
Sweden	28,311	28,311	9,736	18,575
Thailand	36,505	21,298	6,812	14,486
First Territory of Pacific Islands	517	517	230	287
Tunisia	3,500	1,894		1,894
Turkey*	205,300	203,960	41,865	162,051
Union of South Africa*	150,316	150,316	37,234	112,949
U.S.S.R.	222,495	222,495		222,495
United Arab Republic	25,566	25,566	18,040	7,526

TABLE VIII.—*Net foreign loans and other credits, by country, period July 1, 1940–June 30, 1958—Utilizations, repayments and totals outstanding on June 30, 1958*—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Net authorizations	Utilizations	Repayments	Outstanding on June 30, 1958
United Kingdom and dependencies*	5,741,316	5,491,316	822,491	4,668,394
United Kingdom	5,716,709	5,466,709	809,688	4,657,021
British East Africa	2,394	2,394	426	1,968
British Guiana	128	128		128
British Honduras*	482	482	51	
Nigeria	674	674	674	
West Indies Federation	20,930	20,930	11,652	9,278
Vietnam	53,300	35,196		35,193
Yugoslavia*	227,700	55,900	11,889	43,796
International organizations:				
European Coal and Steel Community	100,000	100,000	2,900	97,100
United Nations headquarters loan	65,000	65,000	11,000	54,000

NOTES

1. Apparent discrepancies are due to rounding of totals.
2. Asterisks denote those countries where some principal has been charged off as uncollectible. For period July 1, 1940 to June 30, 1958, this total amounted to $14,458,000 out of total utilizations of $17,302,055,000 or less than 1/10 of 1 percent.
3. On June 30, 1958 the total unutilized from the net authorizations amounted to $2,692,682,000 or the difference between net authorizations and utilizations. This total represents lines of credit still available till such time as the time limit expires or the authorizations are terminated.

Kennedy Realistic; Ike's Courageous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following column "An Editor's Notebook," by John S. Knight, from the Salt Lake Tribune of February 1, published in Salt Lake City, Utah. It is a forthright presentation of the differences between the administration labor reform bill and the labor reform bill cosponsored in the other body by Senators KENNEDY and ERVIN. It is a challenge to us in the Congress to act honestly and fearlessly in the correction of established union abuses:

AN EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK—KENNEDY REALISTIC, IKE'S COURAGEOUS

(By John S. Knight)

Views on the news:

President Dwight D. Eisenhower's proposed labor reform legislation seeks to correct the worst of the union abuses exposed by the Senate Rackets Committee.

It is a better bill than the one introduced by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, because it comes to grips with the evils of "blackmail" picketing and secondary boycotts.

Senator KENNEDY thinks the President has gone "too far."

The Eisenhower recommendations would require amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act and Senator KENNEDY doubts that the Congress will approve of these changes.

The young gentleman from Massachusetts hangs his reasoning on the premise that "for 12 or 13 years, we have tried to do too much and accomplished nothing."

He believes that a more moderate bill, similar to the Kennedy-Ives legislation which passed the Senate with only one dissenting vote in the last session and then "got lost" in the House, can be enacted this year.

The Senator wants to settle for the attainable, rather than lose with the impossible.

Kennedy's position is understandable because he is a candidate for the presidency and the AFL–CIO prefers his bill.

I am not implying, as do his critics, a lack of courage on the Senator's part.

But he is a practical man and a skilled politician.

If KENNEDY, with the help of responsible labor leaders, can achieve a measure of reform, his reputation for statesmanship will have been enhanced without inviting labor's opposition.

And, as everyone knows, a thumbs-down verdict by labor in a Democratic convention means that an aspiring candidate has had it.

The Eisenhower recommendations appeal to me because they go to the heart of the problem.

Secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing are tools of unscrupulous strong boys in labor.

Although existing law forbids union pressures on an employer by persuading or coercing other businessmen not to deal with him, the law is consistently and flagrantly flouted.

Unions either advise their members to act as individuals or threaten employers with labor trouble if they don't boycott the company in disfavor with the union.

The President's bill is designed to stop these strongarm tactics.

It also would prevent, by court injunction if necessary, picketing by a union which does not represent a majority of the employees in a picketed company.

This crude and undemocratic method of organizing a shop or small business is contrary to our concept of freedom and makes a mockery of individual rights.

The administration bill would put an end to this tyranny.

The new Kennedy-Ervin legislation ignores its existence.

While it seems unlikely that a prolabor Congress dominated by the opposition party will give much heed to the President's recommendations, the administration's position is both right and courageous.

If more of our Senators and Representatives in Congress would stop fawning on labor and assert a greater degree of independence, they might be agreeably surprised to find a grateful public giving them enthusiastic support.

It is inconceivable to me how any Federal lawmaker who can distinguish between right and wrong is able to condone the rotten conditions that exist in certain segments of the labor movement.

Here is your opportunity, gentlemen, to crack down on the rough stuff and perform a real service for your country.

But I am not holding my breath until you do.

Honored by Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at noon today I was highly honored with the presentation of a badge from the Boy Scouts of America for the celebration of the 49th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America during Boy Scout Week, February 7 through 13. It is with genuine pride and honor that I shall wear this badge of the Boy Scouts of America which carries with it so much meaning and significance in the finest character-building organization for boys in the entire world.

The Boy Scouts of America have made monumental contributions in the building of sound, dependable character in the future young men of our country. In this fine work of moulding honorable character, the Boy Scouts are responsible for tomorrow's national leadership. Among the Boy Scouts in the Halls of the Capitol today and who will be here during Boy Scout Week, surely may be a future President of the United States and certainly those who will hold great positions of responsibility in the direction and affairs of our country in the years to come.

I was presented with this honorable badge of the Boy Scouts of America by a Boy Scout who not only excellently represented the Boy Scouts of America but also made an excellent presentation. Although young in years, Paul Murphy, Jr., who presented me with this honorable badge, is one who might inspire all of America to courage and fineness. Possessing an attractive personality, being very courteous and thoughtful, Paul is also extremely able. A student of the Russian language, already he is able to speak some of this very difficult language. In addition, he has many other accomplishments, but above all he has

the courage to overcome all difficulties and burdens with which he may be faced. This is indeed a real test of character.

Following is the quoted text of the presentation speech of Paul Murphy, Jr.:

I am Cub Scout Paul Murphy, Jr. During Boy Scout Week, February 7 through 13, the Boy Scouts of America celebrate their 49th anniversary. I have the honor to represent the Boy Scouts of America in making this presentation to you, Mrs. ROGERS. We would like you to join in the 49th celebration of Boy Scout Week by wearing this badge during Boy Scout Week.

At this point, Paul Murphy pinned the Boy Scout badge on my jacket lapel.

In conclusion, I extend my thanks and sincere and genuine appreciation to Paul Murphy, Jr., and through him to the Boy Scouts of America. I assure them I shall be honored to wear this badge during Boy Scout Week in America, February 7 through 13.

Reds Now Have Power Balance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Drew Pearson which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on February 4, 1959:

REDS NOW HAVE POWER BALANCE

(By Drew Pearson)

If you analyze carefully Secretary of Defense McElroy's statement that the United States will not attempt to match the production of Russia's dread, long-range intercontinental ballistic missile, it amounts to the most depressing, defeatist admission made by a public official since the United States became a world power. In effect it's an official admission that the United States is willing to accept the status of second-class power.

This is especially so when coupled with Nikita Khrushchev's confident harangue before the Communist Party Congress, comparing Russia's 8.6 percent annual increase in industrial production with the American increase of 2 percent.

These facts may have been new to the American people, but they are not new to the men inside the National Defense Advisory Council, nor to some of the newspapermen who have been accused of being Cassandras.

For weeks experts in the State Department and Pentagon, whose job it is to study what makes Moscow tick, have been warning that the balance of power was shifting. The emergence of Russia as the world's No. 1 missile power now puts a final period after that shift.

WHAT IT MEANS TO UNITED STATES

Here, in simple language, is what that shift means to the American people and the peace of the world:

1. Balance of power yesterday was with the United States. For the past 15 years, Russia knew that any aggressive action by it meant the risk of heavy and effective retaliatory action by the United States. It knew we had the power to retaliate and it did not want to risk that retaliation.

Time after time the Kremlin took exploratory steps to test the United States, then backed down. In 1946, the Red army was on the northern border of Iran ready to march in, when the United States threatened action.

In 1949–50 it tested American readiness to retaliate in the Berlin airlift. We had the balance of power. Again Moscow retreated.

During the Korean war—another probing operation—Russia supplied planes, men, and materiel, but was careful not to risk any headon showdown with the United States.

During the Suez crisis the Kremlin sent blunt warnings to the West, but kept out. Again, when the United States landed troops in Lebanon last summer, Moscow wrote notes and made speeches but scrupulously avoided any military test.

The balance of power up until then was with the United States.

2. The balance of power today is on the side of Russia. It began to swing last year. The swing became evident with Khrushchev's statement to Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY regarding his latest long-range ballistic missile, which went unchallenged by Eisenhower. And with Secretary McElroy's recent admission that we would not try to match Russian ICBM's, the shift of power became categoric and definite.

This brings out from the diplomatic shadows the unpleasant reason why Russia is so tough regarding Berlin, why Mikoyan offered no compromises in the Russian position. Moscow knows that it has the balance of power.

It knows that a new Berlin airlift would not be effective. The American Air Force is now smaller than the Russian. Three Russian radio jamming stations could prevent American navigation into Berlin in bad weather. It knows that if American tanks attempt to open up the highways into Berlin, the strength of the American Army's 17 divisions is no match for the Red army's 175 divisions. The balance of power has shifted.

EFFECT ON ASIA

The balance of power affects not merely Berlin. It is likely to affect the entire neutral or pro-West perimeter of Russia.

In the Asian countries surrounding the Soviet-bloc countries, one thing and one thing only has kept Moscow and Peiping from moving in—fear of American striking power.

Pakistan, Burma, Thailand, Indonesia, the Malays have been relatively free of Soviet threats. They are relatively defenseless. Their chief protection is the force of public opinion backed up by the power of the United States.

The Kremlin's hope was gradually to put its own pro-Communist governments in power. In many of these countries, however, strongly anti-Communist governments have recently taken over, in some cases dictatorships. This anti-Communist trend may well tempt the Kremlin to use strong-arm tactics.

It now has the balance of power.

Progress in High Fidelity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, like other Members of the House, I have been gratified of late to observe the marked progress which our Nation is making in the field of electronics. Components of the electronic industry are located in my own district, and I have had a special opportunity to observe the rapid changes and advances which are taking place in this great industry which so well serves the American people and our armed services. There are many facets to the marvels of electronic development which are currently transforming and vastly improving our communication systems, our sound reproduction media and automatic quidance and control systems and truly revolutionizing our industrial methods, weapon systems, and in fact, the reproduction instrumentalities that we use so frequently in our homes and in our daily lives.

I was very much impressed recently with the progress in the electronic field evidenced by demonstrations and exhibits presented as a prelude to the High Fidelity Festival being held in Washington this weak. The initial event of the program last Saturday night in which the Washington National Symphony Orchestra participated before a large audience was a most convincing testimony of the great advances made in recent years in the electronic reproduction of sound.

Some 2,500 music lovers thought they were hearing trumpeter Lloyd Geisler during the solo portion of Purcell's "Trumpet Voluntary." Actually, he was simply going through the motions of playing while the audience was listening to a recording he had made on tape earlier in the day. Reproducing this recording for the audience were high-fidelity amplifiers and speakers such as are found in many homes today for the faithful reproduction of recorded sound.

To complete the illusion, a second rendition of the Purcell composition was given. This time the orchestra on stage remained silent while trumpeter Geisler played to the accompaniment of a recording made by the National Symphony earlier.

This demonstration of the new great advances made in sound reproduction, which is called stereophonic sound, was the opening event of the 4-day International High Fidelity Music Festival, which begins this Thursday, February 5, at the Hotel Shoreham.

An exhibition area, comprising some 50 rooms, has been set aside at the Shoreham where more than 250 different items of high-fidelity equipment for the home will be shown, including phonograph records, amplifiers, speakers, radio tuners, tape recorders, turntables, and other music reproduction products.

This is not Washington's first high-fidelity music show. Last year's showing attracted some 16,000 visitors to the Shoreham. This year's music festival, however, marks the first time that a nationally known symphonic group participates actively in an exhibit of this kind.

Other cities such as Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York have very successful high fidelity shows, which attract thousands of visitors. This week's music festival in Washington, however, brings together our great National Symphony and the newest in sound reproducing equipment in an association which may be the start of a musical trend for other parts of the country.

I hope that some of my colleagues in the House will have the chance to visit the International High Fidelity Music Festival during this weekend at the Shoreham. An exciting experience is in store for them as it is for everyone who hears stereophonic sound for the first

time. At the same time, they may gain firsthand knowledge of woofers, tweeters, crossover networks and other equipment dear to the heart of the high fidelity devotee.

I would be remiss if I do not bring to the attention of my colleagues three exhibitors from Massachusetts: the H. H. Scott Co. of Maynard, which is in my district; High Fidelity magazine of Great Barrington; and Acoustic Research of Cambridge.

The H. H. Scott exhibit should be of particular interest because the products of this company are well and favorably known throughout the electronics industry. Acoustic Research has developed a new speaker system, which has attracted wide interest and much favorable comment in music circles. High Fidelity magazine pioneered in its field and has grown in influence and scope in the world of high fidelity.

Permit me to close with one word of warning: Music will never sound the same, especially from a small radio or old record player, once a convincing demonstration of stereophonic sound is experienced firsthand. We are in truth living in a fabulous world and I am very proud that my district and State through the growing electronics industry are contributing so much toward this impressive progress.

Conservation: A Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the St. Marys (Kans.) Star. Mr. R. E. Robinson, Jr., is publisher and editor of the newspaper.

I cannot improve or add to the comments contained in this excellent editorial. I strongly recommend that every Member of Congress take the time to read this very fine editorial:

CONSERVATION: A WAY OF LIFE

A few short years ago this country was a virgin land over which Indians roamed, supported by a bounteous Nature. The population was too scant to make a dent in the resources which abounded here.

Then came the white man with his gun and his plow and the other appurtenances of civilization. Game was slaughtered—the buffalo, which had been counted in the millions, became almost extinct. Prairie land, which had supported life for countless years, was broken with the plow and delivered to the wind and rain. In the honeymoon years, conservation was unheard of. The early settlers couldn't imagine a time when the natural resources of these fruitful hills and prairies could so erode away that life could not exist upon them.

Fortunately, man awoke before the ruin became complete. Not too many years ago, too few in fact, some men realized that unless our resources were conserved, they soon would disappear forever. They saw that a human being could no longer act like a child in a candy shop, taking indiscriminately, without eventually having to face the consequences. And the consequences would be death.

Then, too, developed the idea that we, today, owe something to the generations which follow us. It isn't Christian or moral to dissipate the wealth of our country and turn over to our children a barren and denuded land.

The bounties of Nature are great but they are not without limit. Nature is like a woman. Treat her well, pamper her a little, and she will smile and produce. Mistreat her and she turns cold, ugly, and unproductive.

All of us have an interest in the conservation of the soil. Whether we are farmers or town dwellers, the food we eat and the clothes we wear depend largely on the productivity of the soil. It is with this in mind that we dedicate this issue of the Star to the interest of conservation. We hope that it will, in a small way, increase the interest in and enthusiasm for, the conservation of our natural resources.

Hood River Electric Cooperative Can See No Reason To Increase Electric Power Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently read with a great deal of interest a letter from Willard I. Johnson, manager of the Hood River Electric Cooperative, which was addressed to all electric consumers in the Hood River Valley in Oregon.

The letter is self-explanatory and provides a rather telling commentary on power development in the Pacific Northwest. I am hopeful that my colleagues will closely examine this correspondence and bear it in mind when next the House considers the authorization of a public power project.

The letter follows:

HOOD RIVER ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
Hood River, Oreg., January 20, 1959.

Subject: Request for rate increase filed by Pacific Power & Light Co. in selected areas of Oregon and Washington.

To All Electric Consumers in Hood River Valley:

Since the newspaper announcement regarding proposed rate increases of 15 percent in Oregon and 10 percent in Washington, we have been repeatedly asked if our rates would go up too. We see no reason to increase our rates; 1958 has been the best year in our history, in spite of the fact that labor, materials, and everything else we buy, except wholesale power, has gone up.

The reason is increased sales per customer. Our members are finding that electricity will do the job better, safer, and cheaper and are buying more and more. We have learned that low prices bring more sales and more sales bring lower prices. The two go hand in hand.

We get our labor from the same union, at the same price as does any other utility. The same is true of transformers, meters, poles and wire; but volume increases offset these items for us and should do likewise for any other utility.

This rate increase request is for a system-wide increase of 15 percent in Oregon with the exception of Hood River rural area. The Dalles, Springfield, part of Umatilla County, and Tillamook. In each area excepted, there is an active cooperative, PUD or municipal system in direct competition. It could be that Portland, Astoria, Albany, Hood River City, and others will bear the cost of this competition. It seems to us that the signers of the petition last June, which kept HREC lines out of Hood River City should reevaluate the wisdom of that signing. Their loyalty is now to be rewarded by a rate increase of 15 percent while their country neighbors will have no increase at all. HREC rates are now approximately 17 percent below Hood River City rates. Add 15 percent to this and you get 32 percent, nearly one-third more that the city customer will pay than does his country neighbor.

Outgoing PUC Commissioner Howard Morgan saw these and other discrepancies in the rate filing and ordered it suspended for not to exceed 6 months until the entire matter could be thoroughly studied. His successor will take final action on the matter and no one knows what the outcome will be.

Meanwhile, we take pride in pointing out to the people of Hood River Valley the direct and indirect benefits to them from the existing local cooperative. It is truly the yardstick in electric rates.

Very truly yours,
HOOD RIVER ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
WILLARD I. JOHNSON, *Manager.*

Berwick (Pa.) Plant of ACF Industries To Build Cars for Subway in U.S. Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story from the Wilkes-Barre Record of January 31, 1959:

BERWICK TO BUILD CARS FOR SUBWAY IN SENATE

After 45 years of shuttling U.S. Senators the 760 feet between their offices and the Capitol, the monorail cars of the Senate subway are being retired in favor of new two-rail trolley cars.

A spokesman for the Office of the Architect of the Capitol said four cars have been ordered from the American Car and Foundry Division of ACF Industries, Inc. They will be installed this summer after completion of the new Senate subway system between the Capitol and the Old and New Senate Buildings.

The new system, according to the spokesman, comprises two separate subways. The new line to the Old Senate Office Building is 650 feet long, with the line to the New Senate Office Building measuring 1,200 feet. Two new cars will be installed in each subway. The old monorail subway, a point of interest to tourists through the years, will continue in use as a utility tunnel.

Charles Venrick, vice president of railroad sales for the ACF Division, said the $363,180 Government contract covers four cars, an overhead conductor system and a power supply substation.

Mr. Venrick described the cars as four wheeled, with open tops and partly enclosed sides. Each car will seat 18 lawmakers or tourists 3 abreast in 6 seats. He said the cars will be made at the Berwick plant of ACF.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*	Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*	Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*	
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*	
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*	
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*	
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*	The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*	
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*	The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*	Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*	
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*	
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*	4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*	2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*	
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*	
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*	
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*	3840 Lorcom Lane, Alexandria, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*	
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*	
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*	
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*	
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*	University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*	
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*	
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*	
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*	
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C.*	
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*	1612 34th St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*	4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*	
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*	
Langer, William, *N. Dak.*	2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Russell B., *La.*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*	
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*	4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*	The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*	
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*	Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*	
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*	
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala.*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*	
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del.*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex.*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Green (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*.
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss*. 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*. 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*.
Albert, Carl, *Okla*. 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*.
Alford, Dale, *Ark*.
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*.
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*. University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*. 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont*. 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*. 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*.
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*. 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*.
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*.
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*. Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*. 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*.
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*.
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*.
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*.
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*. 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*.
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind*. Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*.
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y*.
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*.
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*.
Bates, William H., *Mass*.
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*.
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*.
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*. 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*. 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*. 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*.
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*.
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga*.
Boggs, Hale, *La*.
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*.
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*. 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio*. 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*. Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*. 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn*.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*. The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*.
Brademas, John, *Ind*.
Bray, William G., *Ind*.
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans*.
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*.
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr*.
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*.
Brooks, Overton, *La*. 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich*.
Brown, Charles H., *Mo*. 3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*. Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*. Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*.
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*.
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*.
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak*.
Burke, Frank W., *Ky*.
Burke, James A., *Mass*.
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*. 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*.
Byrne, James A., *Pa*.
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*. 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J*.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*.
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*.
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*.
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*.
Casey, Bob, *Tex*.
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*.
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*. The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich*.
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*.
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*.
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*. 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*. 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*.
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*.
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*. 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*.
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*.
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*.
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*. 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*.
Cramer, William C., *Fla*. 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*. 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*.
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*. 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*.
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*.
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*.
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J*.
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*. 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga*.
Dawson, William L., *Ill*.
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*.
Dent, John H., *Pa*.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*.
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*.
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*.
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*.
Dingell, John D., *Mich*.
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*. 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*.
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y*.
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*.
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*.
Dowdy, John, *Tex*.
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*.
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*. 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y*.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*. The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J*.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*.
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*.
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*. 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*.
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y*.
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*.
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*.
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*. 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*.
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*. Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*. The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis*.
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*.
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*. 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md*.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*. 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*. 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*.
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*. The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn*. Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*. 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*.
Fulton, James G., *Pa*.
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J*.
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*.
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*.
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*. 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*.
George, Newell A., *Kans*.
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*.
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J*. Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa*.
Grant, George M., *Ala*. 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*.
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*.
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*.
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich*.
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*.
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*.
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*.
Haley, James A., *Fla*.
Hall, David M., *N. C*.
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*. 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y*.
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*.
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans*.
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind*.
Harris, Oren, *Ark*. 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*. 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y*.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*. 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*.
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C*.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*.
Hess, William E., *Ohio*.
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*.
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*. 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*. 3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill*.
Hogan, Earl, *Ind*.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*.
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*.
Holt, Joe, *Calif*.
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*.
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*.
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*.
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*.
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*. The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*.
Jarman, John, *Okla*.
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*.
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*. 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*.
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo*.
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*.
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md*.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*.
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*. 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*.
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*. 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*.
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*.
Kasem, George A., *Calif*.
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis*.
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*. Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va*.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y*.
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*. The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*.
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*. 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*. 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif*.
King, David S., *Utah*.
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*.
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C*.
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*.
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*.
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn*.
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa*.
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*.
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*.

Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*	
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Lennon, Alton, *N. C.*	
Lesinski, John, *Mich.*	
Levering, Robert W., *Ohio*	
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.*	224 C St. NE.
Lindsay, John V., *N. Y.*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn.*	The Congressional
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*	The Washington
McCulloch, William M., *Ohio*	4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif.*	
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*	
McFall, John J., *Calif.*	507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGinley, Donald F., *Nebr.*	
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak.*	
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*	220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*	1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McSween, Harold B., *La.*	
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*	
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*	115 Dale Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*	
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*	
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*	
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*	
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*	Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*	
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*	
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.*	The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*	The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*	
May, Catherine, *Wash.*	
Meader, George, *Mich.*	3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*	
Meyer, William H., *Vt.*	
Michel, Robert H., *Ill.*	
Miller, Clement W., *Calif.*	
Miller, George P., *Calif.*	
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*	3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Milliken, William H., Jr., *Pa.*	
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*	2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*	8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga.*	
Moeller, Walter H., *Ohio*	
Monagan, John S., *Conn.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Moorhead, William S., *Pa.*	
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*	
Morris, Thomas G., *N. Mex.*	
Morris, Toby, *Okla.*	220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La.*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*	204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*	
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*	
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*	The Coronet
Murphy, William T., *Ill.*	
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*	
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*	
Nelsen, Ancher, *Minn.*	
Nix, Robert N. C., *Pa.*	
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*	
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*	2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*	
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*	The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*	The Congressional
O'Hara, James G., *Mich.*	
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass.*	
Oliver, James C., *Maine*	
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*	
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*	100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*	
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*	117 Carroll St. SE.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*	
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*	
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho*	
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*	
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*	
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*	
Pirnie, Alexander, *N. Y.*	
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*	228 2d St. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*	
Polk, James G., *Ohio*	
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg.*	
Powell, Adam C., *N. Y.*	
Preston, Prince H., *Ga.*	
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*	
Prokop, Stanley A., *Pa.*	
Pucinski, Roman C., *Ill.*	
Quie, Albert H., *Minn.*	The Coronet Apt., 200 C St. SE.
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*	
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*	
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*	
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*	
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*	
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*	
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*	The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*	1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*	6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*	5603 24th Ave. SE., Hillcrest Hgts., Wash. 21, D. C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*	
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*	3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*	
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*	
Rivers, Ralph J., *Alaska*	
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*	6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y.*	
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*	
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*	
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass.*	The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*	Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*	
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*	
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*	
Rostenkowski, Dan, *Ill.*	
Roush, J. Edward, *Ind.*	
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*	
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y.*	
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y.*	
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif.*	
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*	
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*	
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*	
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C.*	
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*	433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*	
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*	
Shipley, George E., *Ill.*	
Short, Don L., *N. Dak.*	
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*	
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*	
Simpson, Edna Oakes, *Ill.*	
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*	5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*	
Slack, John M., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*	
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif.*	
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*	204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Neal, *Iowa*	
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*	
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*	Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*	
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*	
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*	
Stratton, Samuel S., *N. Y.*	107 Martha's Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Stubblefield, Frank A., *Ky.*	
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*	
Taber, John, *N. Y.*	
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*	
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*	
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*	6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y.*	Mayflower Hotel
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*	2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*	3301 Mass. Ave.
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*	
Thompson, T. A., *La.*	1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, Keith, *Wyo.*	
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*	
Toll, Herman, *Pa.*	
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*	
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*	
Tuck, William M., *Va.*	
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*	
Ullman, Al, *Oreg.*	
Utt, James B., *Calif.*	
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*	
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*	
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*	4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*	
Wallhauser, George M., *N. J.*	
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*	
Wampler, Fred, *Ind.*	
Watts, John C., *Ky.*	
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*	9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Weis, Jessica McC., *N. Y.*	
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*	
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*	
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C.*	
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*	5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*	
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*	
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*	1001 26th Rd. S., Arlington, Va.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*	
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*	
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*	
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*	
Wolf, Leonard G., *Iowa*	
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*	
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*	
Young, John, *Tex.*	
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*	4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*	
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*	

DELEGATES

Burns, John A., *Hawaii*	

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*	2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Serles, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Place SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Appendix

Sam P. Harben, the Grand Old Man of the Texas Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the grand old man of the Texas press, Mr. Sam P. Harben, has recently retired as editor-publisher of the Richardson Echo, an outstanding weekly newspaper in north Texas. His illustrous 58-year career is notable for his many contributions to his community, his State and Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, from the Chronicle-Journal, on the retirement of Mr. Harben.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Floresville (Tex.) Chronicle-Journal, Jan. 30, 1959]

SAM P. HARBEN SETS SOME RECORDS; RETIRES AFTER 58 YEARS AS PUBLISHER

RICHARDSON.—Things are not the same here in the Richardson Echo office. Not for anybody. And especially for Sam P. Harben, the grand old man of the Texas press, who just retired after an illustrious career of contribution to his community during 58 years as a weekly newspaper editor-publisher.

All week long, Mr. Harben has been coming to his office as usual. Just sitting and reflecting. For him, there's no gaiety in being a guest of the world, even in restful retirement. But he sold out last week to his partner, O. A. Spotts, an associate with the printing-newspaper firm since 1929. And when you scan some of his achievements during his 80 years, it's easy to see why—out of harness—he feels like a country printer without a linegage.

Take this for instance:

In 1900 he founded the Echo in the back end of his drugstore.

He built the first telephone system in Richardson.

He was one of the founders of the Citizens State Bank.

He was one of the founders of the Texas Press Association.

He was secretary of that organization 32 years.

When I started out as a printer's devil back in Teague, I was beginning school, too. That's when I first heard of Mr. Harben. Even then, he was a power in the country press, always preaching the might of the grassroots minds. And its good influence in a free world.

Few men in Texas—perhaps none—have ever equaled the 58-year record of this man who loves to be called a country editor. He has been in business longer than any other Richardson merchant, helped found the Rotary Club here, and has an almost perfect attendance record. Since 1895, when he first picked up his "stick" and started handspiking type for patent medicine ads in the Rockdale Messenger, this pioneering printer has been a builder.

When he sold his first 150 subscriptions to the Echo back in 1900, Richardson had 6 businesses and 113 residents. But he stayed and stayed, and has never missed an issue of his paper.

Said Maurine Cook, one of his reporters: "He deserves time now to just take it easy and feel his time has not been spent in vain, but has been of service to his home and country. He has fought (with all the tools he had) for the preserving of the freedom of the press as a part of the American way of life, an invaluable contribution to the people of a free country." (The Dallas Times Herald).

News of Sam Harben's retirement naturally will bring sorrow and joy alike to the countless hundreds of friends of this beloved country newspaperman, who spent over half a century in the profession. Some sorrow, because those of us who have known and loved him through the years, well know what it meant for him "to drop the traces." It brings joy to us all, to know that if ever there was a member of the fourth estate who is entitled to retire and enjoy the evening of life without the humdrum of press days, busy workadays, and all that goes with the life of a country publisher and printer, that man is Sam P. Harben. He has made a great contribution to Texas journalism in general, and the Texas Press Association in particular, and in his long and active life as a Texan devoted to the upbuilding of his State. We shall always cherish the happy press conventions, hours in his home, and personal associations, with Sam Harben, our friend for nearly 50 years. All the joy and happiness to him in the days ahead and in this we know we are joined by scores of newspapermen throughout Texas and members of their families.

Rise in Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a member of a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee dealing with the problems of juvenile delinquency, I am increasingly concerned by the unfortunate rise in the number of delinquency cases.

In 1957, for example, these cases had reached an alltime high of 603,000; involving 520,000 of our youth. This is, indeed, a tragic situation.

We recognize, of course, that this epidemic of delinquency knows no boundaries. Large and small cities, as well as our rural communities, unhappily face an increasing problem in this field.

We also recognize that the problem of delinquency is not one that can be solved entirely at the Federal level. Rather, constructive efforts must be made by the State and local communities; and particularly the American home bears a basic responsibility in helping to assure that our young folks are trained and brought up to lead good, constructive lives.

We realize that, very often, the delinquency problem obscures the fact that the vast majority of our youth are participating in, and contributing to, worthwhile programs in their community. In this way, they are laying the groundwork for leadership in the Nation of tomorrow.

Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the startling and lamentable increase in the number of delinquency cases. Recently, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare furnished my office with a report of the latest figures concerning the continued rise in juvenile delinquency. To give my colleagues the benefit of this data, I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEW REPORT ON INCREASING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

According to reports from juvenile courts to the Children's Bureau for the calendar year 1957, juvenile delinquency cases have continued to rise for the ninth consecutive year (1948–57). In 1957, these cases reached an alltime high of 603,000 cases involving 520,000 children. The increase in the number of these cases coming before juvenile courts was almost five times greater than the increase in the child population of juvenile court age (10 to 17) during these 9 years.

The continuing rise in juvenile delinquency extends throughout the Nation. It is not confined to any one group of States. Nor is it confined to any one geographic area. Rural and urban areas alike are confronted with this problem.

Not only the number of cases, but the proportion of children involved, has steadily risen. In 1948, about 12.6 out of every 1,000 children (10 to 17) came to the attention of juvenile courts for alleged juvenile delinquency. By 1957 this rate had mounted to 23.5 out of every 1,000 children—almost double the 1948 rate.

Even if juvenile delinquency remains fixed at the 1957 rate, the number of juvenile delinquency cases may be expected to increase by 140,000 in 1962, and by 205,000 cases in 1965, simply because of the known increase in the number of children aged 10 to 17 that will occur by these years.

A much greater number than come to the attention of juvenile courts—perhaps as much as 1.7 million children—are dealt with by the police for misbehavior. About three-quarters of these are not referred to juvenile courts but rather are handled directly by the police. In such cases the police officers take whatever steps they think might alter the delinquent behavior of the children. This means referring some of these boys and girls to social agencies for help.

Police arrests of children as reported by the Federal Bureau of Investigation also show increases in recent years, following closely the pattern evidenced by the juvenile court delinquency cases. The following table shows the percentage change from one year to the next in both series:

	Percent change from preceding year	
	Police arrests of children [1]	Juvenile delinquency court cases
1949	+4	+7
1950	+5	+3
1951	+8	+6
1952	(1)	+11
1953	+8	+13
1954	+2	+6
1955	+11	+9
1956	+17	+21
1957	+10	+16

[1] Police arrests of children up through 1951 are based on fingerprint arrest records; for 1952 and thereafter they were based on reports of all persons arrested whether fingerprinted or not and therefore are not comparable to the earlier data. Percentage changes are based on a varying number of cities participating each year—not on a comparable group throughout as in delinquency court cases.

The increases are not limited to the large congested urban areas as is so often supposed. On the contrary, the increases seem to be greater in the smaller and rural areas. For example, the FBI reports that the increase between 1956 and 1957 in arrests of persons under 18 years of age was 16 percent in cities under 25,000 population while it was only 8 percent in cities of 25,000 or more. Juvenile court statistics also show greater increases in rural and semiurban areas than in large urban areas. Even though increases have been somewhat greater in the smaller areas, juvenile delinquency is still primarily an urban problem. For it is in the large cities that most delinquency is concentrated.

The Texas Water Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there appeared in the Denver Post of January 28, 1959, a very interesting article, by Mr. Roscoe Fleming, entitled "The Texas Water Challenge." Mr. Fleming discussed the efforts made by Texans to control and utilize Texas' water resources, and spoke of our reclamation and flood control projects as "defensible in terms of that wholly conserved America that I am coming to think should be the Nation's most sought interior goal."

I ask unanimous consent that this fine article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TEXAS WATER CHALLENGE
(By Roscoe Fleming)

Texas may have ceded first place to Alaska in size, but she is challenging for first place in water utilization. She is undertaking the Nation's most ambitious water-development program outside of California's. The Texans voted a $200 million bond issue for this purpose, part to match Federal contributions, part to build State water projects that dovetail.

Adjusting for differences in wealth and population, Colorado to match this would have to appropriate at least $40 million. But as we all know, Colorado spends almost nothing in State funds on water.

Such a program will surely pay Texas, as it pays her to have the two leaders of the two Houses of Congress.

But that isn't the whole story. Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, who takes great personal pride in the Texas program, has steadily urged Texans to do more for themselves in this regard, even while he works for more Federal aid.

The results are really something. Texas has recently gotten a complete Federal-State survey of its water-project possibilities; and by special enactment of the 85th Congress, it now has the Nation's only Federal-State Commission devoted permanently to solving the water problems of a single State.

Texas therefore has a very fine chance to see full implementation of its water-salvage program, to be built over many years at a cost of much more than a billion dollars. When it is complete, Texas will have about as full use of its immense water resources as is possible for a State.

A yearly average of about 40 million acre-feet of fresh water flows unused into the Gulf of Mexico from a dozen river systems, most of which are wholly, or almost wholly, inside Texas.

The grand scheme is to interconnect these basins by a huge canal running southwestward from humid east Texas to the drier regions, and to pass the water along and redistribute it, until fullest possible use is attained.

This requires a degree of interbasin cooperation which, of course, has not yet been fully realized. But Texas has organized a board of water engineering to work on nothing but better water utilization. And as we say, the Texans have the fullest cooperation of Federal agencies.

They've done all right by themselves so far.

Nearly 500 of the individual contracts for droughtproofing individual farms and ranches under the special Great Plains program of 1956, or almost half the present total, are in Texas. About one-third of all the money obligated so far—or more than $2 million—has been obligated for Texas.

Texas already has some 18 projects qualified under the special Flood Prevention and Water Control Act of 1954–56, with an estimated total expenditure of about $34 million, of which about $13 million is Federal.

Its Harlingen (small projects) Act program was the first in the Nation to qualify under the law by which the Federal Government makes interest-free loans up to $5 million to local agencies. Texas also has two of the largest single projects under the Flood Control Act of 1944, which alone cover more than 13 million acres.

All this is in addition to the large flood control and navigation programs of the Corps of Engineers, of which Texas has about $400 million worth underway with another $190 million authorized.

None of these should we resent. All are defensible in terms of that wholly conserved America that I am coming to think should be the Nation's most sought interior goal—to match peace on earth as its exterior one.

The Texas example of aggressive local and State participation and spending to match Uncle's dollars might well commend itself to other States with huge water problems such as Colorado.

Pastoral Letter of Archbishop of Montreal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the evil that is unemployment has been discussed many times in this body. Many of the measures which will come before us in the weeks ahead properly must be weighed in part in the light of their effect on the Nation's unemployment. The problem of unemployment remains among the most urgent of our time.

His Eminence, Paul Emile Cardinal Leger of Montreal, in a pastoral letter in January, takes up the same problem in the great nation to our north; describes the effects of unemployment in the powerful terms of a man of deep thought and deep feeling; and offers some fresh approaches to the question.

Highlights and background of his letter were contained in an article carried January 20 by the N.C.W.C. News Service. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARDINAL CALLS FOR UNITED EFFORTS TO CUT UNEMPLOYMENT; ANNOUNCES SPECIAL COLLECTIONS

MONTREAL, January 20.—His Eminence Paul Emile Cardinal Leger has called for management, labor, and the state to combine forces against the scourge of unemployment.

The archbishop of Montreal announced in a lengthy pastoral letter that a special collection would be taken up monthly in archdiocesan churches to finance construction projects aimed at relieving the surplus of workers.

The cardinal also urged the formation of commissions of labor and management representatives to propose solutions to unemployment, then to be aided by the state in carrying them out.

In Montreal there are about 80,000 persons unemployed. Canada's jobless were estimated to total about 440,000 on December 13, according to the most recent survey of the Canadian Bureau of Statistics and the Labor Department. This was a hike of about 79,000 over November.

The cardinal said his pastoral was prompted by the thousands suffering, materially and morally, and placed in social conditions which render difficult a life in conformity with Christian principles.

"How can we reconcile the paradoxical picture of thousands of citizens without work in a country which is immensely rich and in full development?" he asked.

"Who would dare to pretend, faced with such a situation, that unemployment is normal and constitutes at the most a necessary evil? Such a pretension would be as little in accord with morality as it is with present-day knowledge," he asserted.

"The Christian cannot remain indifferent before a situation which engenders such sorrowful consequences. Beyond the statistics and figures, he must recognize men, women, and children and aged reduced to poverty and exposed to the terrible temptations of despair.

"Deprived of all the moral advantages assured by work, the unemployed get the impression of being useless or being superfluous in society," the cardinal continued.

"This situation upsets the family and compromises its harmony. The father is humiliated by not being able to acquit himself of his responsibilities for his family; he feels himself impaired and sinking. Discouragement can take hold of him and idleness exposes him to all sorts of temptations. Crime which increases considerably during times of unemployment underlines further the gravity of this evil," the cardinal stated.

Lippmann Clears Up Some of the Confusion in the Missile Argument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, once again Mr. Walter Lippmann has made an objective and penetrating analysis of a confusing controversy. In his column in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "McElroy's Troubles," he puts his finger clearly on the basic issue in the present controversy over whether or not we are ahead or behind the Soviets in the missile program. He points out that this is an issue that cannot be settled definitively because neither side of the argument knows precisely what the Soviets have. Mr. Lippmann correctly states that the basic error of the administration is equating the national security to a balanced budget at the existing level of taxes. This casts suspicion on military estimates because the real measuring stick of the military estimates is not the national security but what we can afford in terms of the budget level the President has selected. I agree with him that Congress should make it clear in no uncertain terms that the national security has the first priority.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 5, 1959]

MCELROY'S TROUBLES

(By Walter Lippmann)

In the swirling controversy over the Eisenhower-McElroy budget the inquiring bystander must, I believe, accept the fact that the basic issue is not one which can be settled definitively. There is a race of armaments. But who is ahead now, and who will be ahead 2 years from now is not something that can be measured quantitatively, even if there existed perfect intelligence with exact and complete knowledge of the quantity and quality of all the weapons on both sides. What statesmen really have to estimate is what is likely to be the judgment of other statesmen about the existing balance of power. In making these judgments they have to listen to the calculations of the experts in various specialities. But they must be able to make the necessary discount in these expert calculations, remembering that they are essentially about war games and not about the whole reality.

For these calculations are invariably theoretical abstractions—what for example, would happen if there were a war in which one side had X number of missiles and the other had X plus Y missiles?

At bottom the argument between the administration and Senator SYMINGTON is whether the balance of power should be calculated in terms of intercontinental missiles or whether it shall be judged in terms of the whole complex of armaments and of the international political situation.

My point in all this is not to say that Mr. McElroy and the administration are right. I think they are very wrong. But I do not think they are deliberately misleading the country. What they have done is to argue their case so badly that they are losing the confidence of the public.

The fatal error lies in the decision of the President to make the paramount issue of the present time a Federal budget balanced at the existing level of taxes, along with a promise of a reduction of taxes before the next presidential election. We are approaching one of the great climaxes of the cold war and the President's decision about the paramountcy of the budget reflects a failure to understand the nature of the cold war.

It makes suspect all the military estimates in the budget. For it is no part of the law of the land, or of that moral law which the President frequently invokes, that the existing tax structure cannot be raised and should be lowered. To insist on such a dogma about taxes is to tell the people and the world that national defense is not the first but only the secondary consideration in this Government.

From this it follows inevitably that Secretary McElroy's assurances about our overall strength are quite unconvincing. For nobody is prepared to believe that by a wonderfully lucky coincidence the money needed for national defense is just the amount of money we can afford to spend if the budget is to be balanced without raising taxes.

This initial error about the budget has forced Mr. McElroy into making the disastrous announcement that the United States has withdrawn from the missiles race. He may well be right that with fewer missiles there will still be an overall balance of power. But it is not good for the Russians and it is bad for our allies to be allowed to think that the richest nation on earth is unwilling to pay what it costs to stay in that part of the race of armaments which has the most horrible prospects. Secretary McElroy's announcement is a most lamentable way to prepare for the impending negotiations which Secretary Dulles is now dealing with in Europe.

What should be done about it? It should be said in no uncertain terms that defense has the first priority. If the President will not say it, perhaps Congress itself should say it by resolution. There should then be a substantial increase in the military appropriations, an increase sufficient to put us back into the missiles race. Then an increase of taxes should be voted in order to balance this larger budget.

I am aware that the extra money invested in making more of the existing missiles may be "wasted"—wasted in the sense that these missiles will soon be obsolete and good only for the junk pile. But the race of armaments is in the same sense inherently wasteful since the objective is to make weapons which will never be used and will soon be obsolete.

Nevertheless we are in a race of armaments. It would be a great day for mankind if it could be ended. But if the race is to be ended, this will be done only if and when we are able to reach general political settlements with the Communist powers. The race of armaments cannot be ended or suspended merely because we wish to balance the budget without raising taxes or because it would be good politics to reduce taxes before the next election.

Committee Chairmanships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my remarks on the floor of the Senate Monday regarding the obvious weakness in adherence to strict seniority in committee chairmanships has prompted a considerable and encouraging response from many parts of our nation. I have also received an interesting and generally favorable reaction from some of my Senate colleagues.

Letters and wires, according to the present count, are running about 50 to 1 in favor of my position on Seniority Rules. I intend to go into this matter in some detail in the future. I am delighted with the favorable response.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two typical responses to the position I have taken. One is a letter from Maryland; the other, a wire from Cleveland.

There being on objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SILVER SPRING, MD., *February 4, 1959.*

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I have read with great interest and care your statement on the floor on February 2, 1959, relative to the designation of committee chairmen. Although I am not one of your constituents—indeed, I have not had the pleasure of meeting you—I should like to express my deep appreciation for your very accurate, courageous, and exceedingly timely statement.

May I recommend that you ask the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare and publish an historical analysis of the selection of committee members and committee chairmen in the Senate? I have the decided impression that the seniority system is of relatively recent origin. I recall from reading history that frequently outstanding Senators were selected as committee chairmen in their first term as late as the end of the 19th century. It seems to me that the information which the Legislative Reference Service might bring together would be of great value in the educational phase of what I hope you will undertake as a long-range attack on the unfortunate and almost completely indefensible seniority system to which you directed your remarks on Monday.

SOUTH BEND, IND., *February 4, 1959.*

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your effort to change Senate procedures resulting in Dixiecrats always heading important committees. In this effort you are ably representing all of us.

FRANK HENSON,
Cleveland, Ohio.

Wisconsin Conservation Expert—Age 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years, Wisconsin has developed an outstanding construetive conservation record. The program has included soil and water conservation projects, reforestation, development of watersheds, and a wide variety of other constructive activities for protecting and improving our natural resources.

Recently, the University of Wisconsin sponsored a Farm and Home Week. During the week, special programs were held at the university to cover such subjects as: Utilization of basic natural resources wisely; farm and home management; research and its impact on agriculture; special meetings on product marketing; social problems; homemaking; and a variety of other topics of interest.

During the activities, there were of course, a number of addresses delivered by authorities in various fields. Interestingly, a fine report on conservation was presented by an 11-year-old farm boy, George Gullickson. A prizewinner in a statewide speaking contest, George gave a report of soil conservation and preservation, including the planting of 1,000 pine trees, that won the warm applause, and the hearts, of the crowds attending Farm and Home Week.

A recent issue of the Milwaukee Journal carried an article about this young man's achievements—illustrative of the importance of instilling early in the youth respect for, and the necessity for, conservation of our natural resources.

I request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Jan. 30, 1959]

CONSERVATION EXPERT, ONLY 11, BEST OF ALL—CHEERS FOR FARM BOY FROM POLK COUNTY ARE THE LOUDEST AT UW PROGRAM

(By Lewis C. French)

MADISON, WIS.—A pint-sized Polk County farm boy, just 11 years old, Thursday made the best speech of the whole University of Wisconsin farm and home week program.

Reading his dime store notebook manuscript, little George Gullickson, who comes from crossroads Cushing in the sand-blown country near Bass Lake, told a simple but challenging story of soil, water, and timber conservation. An overflow crowd cheered so loudly that it almost lifted the rafters of Great Hall in the Memorial Union.

There had been a dozen speeches on the need for faster and more scientific work to protect natural resources. D. A. Williams, the administrator of the soil conservation service, and professors with a long list of degrees spoke on the problems of anchoring enough of the eroding topsoil so that this Nation could continue to be the land of abundance.

HE STRIDES BOLDLY

The soil conservation district supervisors and others endured all this and more. Then, near the end of the program, the youth from Polk County, a prizewinner in a statewide speaking contest, got his chance.

He told how the early colonists found rich soil and grew cotton and tobacco until the land ran out of fertility and eroded down to red clay. Then they moved West, raiding new country rich in pine and forests and clean water—always new land. Then the new land gave out and there was no more.

"Little by little there was less of that rich soil, there was less of the wildlife, less of the fish, less of the clean water. And then settlers began to wake up," said this sixth grade farm boy. "Erosion was a silent thief stealing our topsoil."

BISON DESTROYED

He gave an account of the ruthless destruction of the bison and other wildlife.

Then George Gullickson took his spellbound audience right up to Polk County, where storms of flinty sand cut down crops, where drought blistered crops that farmers needed to buy socks and shoes for their families.

"There was a continued loss of that rich and dark blanket of soil your dad and mine need to raise crops for the cows, the pigs, and chickens," said this lad.

Then he told how in 3 years he and his twin sisters, Marion and Marilyn, a year older than he, planted 1,000 pine trees on rough land near a quarry on their farm. And how even now the Norways are higher than his head.

TREES PLANTED

And he told how the county and the town of Sterling took 9,996 acres to plant 600,000 trees.

"Now the township has not had to make a tax assessment for township purposes for years," said George. "The forest paid the township costs."

He told of seeing muddy roads with topsoil slopped down from the slopes and the gullies. "Do not do this to our country. Leave a heritage of abundance, soil, clean water, and timber," he said.

The throng got up and cheered and after the Polk County champion got his $50 bond prize they broke out in a second round of applause.

Airport Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of recent date entitled "Airport Aid Is Needed."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIRPORT AID IS NEEDED

In mustering its forces to oppose the resubmitted bill calling for a billion-dollar airport construction program, the administration is putting economy ahead of the country's best economic interests and national defense. This measure, which was pocket-vetoed last September 2, would grant the States a total of $575 million in matching money for airports during the next 5 years.

Mr. Eisenhower believes that a transitional program, in which $200 million would be allocated during the next 4 years, is sufficient. With the jet and turbojet airliners just beginning to come in, and major airports all over the country needing to be extended and strengthened, is it wise to withdraw Federal aid at this moment?

Only a few airports are now equipped to handle the jet airliners safely and efficiently. The air lines, committed for more than $2 billion of jet planes and under severe restrictions that keep them from fare increases, have no ready cash surpluses. Some cities and States are also financially unable to make the swift improvements needed.

The military value alone of the new jet airliners more than compensates for the Federal aid that would be granted. Under emergency conditions the civil reserve air fleets could provide more than 9 billion tonmiles of airlift annually. It is estimated by the Air Transport Association that this reserve air fleet would represent a billion-dollar saving to the taxpayer in military planes that otherwise would be necessary.

Missouri and St. Louis share in this vital problem. Just last October the Federal Airport Use Panel, after long study, reported that the St. Louis metropolitan area should provide at least one additional all-weather civilian airport.

Under the new bill sponsored by Senator MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, and Representative HARRIS, of Arkansas, Missouri would be eligible to receive $1,736,412 in Federal airport aid. In rank according to the amount of money the States would be eligible to receive, Missouri stands ninth. Texas is first, California second and Illinois fifth.

The airport aid bill is desirable and necessary. We hope Congress adopts it by a wide enough margin to override a second veto.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Chicago Daily News of February 2, 1959. It deals with the subject of inflation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUT FEDERAL SPENDING—INFLATION CAN BE LICKED, EXPERTS AGREE, BUT CONGRESS AND THE EXECUTIVE MUST QUIT PLAYING POLITICS

President Eisenhower has declared a "relentless war" against inflation.

In his economic report to Congress January 20 he warned that U.S. economic health is jeopardized by spiraling wages and prices.

But can inflation be stopped?

And if it can, then how?

The joint congressional economic committee, under Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, has undertaken still another inquiry to get the answers.

But the fact is, inflation can be stopped. And the Senate finance committee, headed by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, already has all the necessary formulas for stopping it.

They came from 71 of the keenest brains in the country—industrialists and bankers, economists, and professors.

The 71 men gave their expert views on curbing inflation early last year in answers to a questionnaire sent out by the Byrd committee.

These formulas were printed in a 758-page report.

The economic experts quoted made clear that they believe no formula can whip inflation until Congress and the executive branch stop playing politics and do the job.

President Eisenhower has named a seven-man Cabinet committee headed by Vice President NIXON to plan a battle against inflation.

Its continuing job, according to the White House, will be to study how to maintain reasonable price stability.

HERE'S THE WAY TO DO IT

What is the single, most important step necessary to curb inflation? The 71 experts answer with 1 voice: "Cut Government spending."

The prescriptions are there in abundance for Congress to act on to rescue the dollar.

Stop the ballooning of Government spending by turning a deaf ear to pressure groups that demand more and more and more.

Strip labor of its monopoly control over wages.

Make corporations consider the Nation's good when they establish their price and production policies.

Revise the tax laws to put a premium on thrift rather than on waste.

Restrict consumer credit when it threatens to get out of hand.

Some of the recommendations, their sponsors admit, would be painful on segments of the economy—segments with votes—but they are urged nevertheless for the good of the whole Nation.

GOVERNMENT ADDS MOST TO INFLATION

On the need for economy, Gerhard Colm of the National Planning Association said:

"In 1957 the total expenditures of governments (Federal, State and local) in the United States amounted to $114.1 billion."

This mammoth sum, representing 26 percent of all the goods and services produced in the country, is said to be the biggest single source of inflation, even in years when the budget is balanced.

But wouldn't it be just as inflationary if the same money were left in the hands of taxpayers and spent by them?

No, said Arthur F. Burns, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. His reasons:

Government officials, not given to bargain hunting, are less efficient shoppers.

A high proportion of their buying is on a cost-plus basis, that is, the contractor gets his percentage profit regardless of how high he lets his costs soar.

Government contracts are required by law to include provisions on minimum wages and other labor standards (which, no matter how desirable, increase costs).

Frank E. Jerome, a Seattle bank president, added that if the same money were left in the hands of the taxpayers, part of it would be saved—and savings are deflationary.

Carl E. Allen, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, recommended this approach to Government belt tightening.

He said officials should ask themselves not "Is this something we would like to have?" but "Is this something we can do without?"

WANTS SERVICES ON LOCAL LEVEL

Pressing for action on a favorite proposal of President Eisenhower, Ralph J. Cordiner, president of General Electric Co., urged:

"Transfer as many Government services as possible from the Federal to the State and local levels.

"The construction of schools, highways, and public buildings by the Federal Government adds to the inflationary potential of the public debt."

The reasons for this are technical. Local governments finance their projects by long-term bonds, the sale of which takes money out of circulation and thus is deflationary.

(Much of the Federal debt is financed by short-term obligations which, sold to banks, become a reserve for expanding credit. This is inflationary.)

Recommended for immediate action by Frederick W. Ecker, president of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.:

1. Put into effect the economies called for by the Hoover Commissions, which would save many millions.

(Of the 1947 Hoover Commission recommendations, 72 percent have been adopted by the Government; of the 1953 ideas, only 53 percent are in effect.)

2. Enact the McClellan bill, which calls for a joint, expertly staffed, budgetary watchdog committee in Congress.

3. Give the President the power of "item veto" in appropriations bills, a power that 40 State Governors now have.

(When a pork-barrel bill now comes before the President, he must reject or accept it all—the good projects and the wasteful. Item veto would allow him to reject the worst features without killing the whole bill.)

Ecker added, "Unwarranted increases in social security benefits add to inflationary forces."

One expert after another shook a finger at farm price support policies, which are inflationary in a double way.

First, farm product prices are kept at an artificially high level, and secondly the Government spends billions annually to keep them there.

HOW TO MANAGE HUGE U.S. DEBT

In other Government fiscal recommendations, the economists and industrialists were in general agreement on how the gigantic Federal debt should be managed so as to cause the least inflationary harm.

The principle behind their ideas, though long known to economists, frequently has been violated by Treasury action.

Frederick L. Deming, president of the Federal Reserve bank of St. Louis, stated the principle:

"Sale of long-term securities and retirement of short-term issues during inflation would tend to reduce liquidity and hence inhibit bank loan expansion."

Other sources urged that Treasury securities "should be placed as far possible in the hands of investors other than banks."

The idea here is not too complex for general understanding.

When a private investor buys a bond, the money passes out of circulation. When a bank gets it, the bond is used as a base for new loans and the money is spent over and over again.

When more money circulates in the economy and the things available for purchase by the public remain static, prices of course go up. This is the basis of "classical" inflation.

The chief arm of the Government in regulating the supply of currency in circulation is the board of governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The Fed, as it is called, was widely—if not unanimously—praised in the reports to the Senate committee for wisdom in the way it has used these monetary controls.

But several economic specialists said that it can't do a fully effective job because its powers reach only into a fraction of the banking system—the banks that are Federal Reserve members.

Howard Ellis, professor of economics at the University of California, urged that all commercial banks, members or not, be brought under the credit-limiting powers of the Fed.

Others went further and recommended that the controls be extended to cover nonbank lending institutions—such as savings and loan associations and installment finance companies—which have grown phenomenally in recent years.

H.R. 1012, Liberalizing the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts, Should Be Approved Immediately

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I appeared before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in support of proposed amendments to the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts, including my own bills, H.R. 1370 and H.R. 1373.

My statement follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 3, 1959, IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT AND RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACTS

Mr Chairman, I deeply appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and the members of this committee in support of bills I have introduced to amend the Railroad Retirement and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts.

The legislation has been introduced by me in previous Congresses and has the support of many individuals and groups among the railroad population of my congressional district in Pennsylvania and of the Nation.

The bills are as follows: H.R. 970 provides retirement on full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years, and further provides that such annuity shall be not less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings, and so forth.

H.R. 971 provides that an annuitant be permitted to continue to perform compensated service for the outside employer by whom he was last employed before his annuity began to accrue. H.R. 971 covers the situation where an employee about to retire is required to resign a clerical position with a church, civic, fraternal, or social organization.

H.R. 972 repeals the prohibition against the payment of both earned social security benefits and spouse benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act. At the present time a spouse entitled to earned social security benefits is penalized by deductions from the amount payable as spouse benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act.

H.R. 1374 is a bill to provide a 20-percent increase in all widows' annuities. In this connection, the 1956 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act granting an increase of approximately 10 percent did not include all persons receiving retirement benefits, with the result many widows were denied the increase.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1370 and H.R. 1373 represent my version of the Harris bill, H.R. 1012, with H.R. 1370 providing for an across-the-board increase of 10 percent in railroad retirement benefits and H.R. 1373 amending the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act by providing an increase from 130 to 195 the maximum number of days of unemployment within a year for which unemployment benefits may be paid. The bill also liberalizes other provisions of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act and is identical to those provisions of the Harris

bill, H.R. 1012, that affect the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

I want to go on record at this point of expressing my support of H.R. 1012 because I think it is a step in the right direction in recognizing the urgent need for amending the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts. I should like to comment on H.R. 1012 and mention briefly some of its principal provisions.

In amending the Railroad Retirement Act, H.R. 1012 will provide:

1. A 10-percent increase of all monthly benefits effective January 1, 1958.

2. Female employees with less than 30 years of service or the spouse of a retired employee will be able to obtain retirement benefits at age 62 on a reduced annuity. This option is already in effect under the social security system.

3. Maximum creditable compensation for determining benefits and earnings subject to taxation would be increased from $350 to $400 a month for the purpose of broadening the tax base to secure the additional revenue needed to pay the cost of the proposed amendments and to liquidate almost entirely the present actuarial deficit in the railroad retirement fund of $213 million.

4. With the taxable base of earnings broadened to $400 a month or $4,800 annually, the tax rate on employers and employees will increase January 1, 1959, from 6¼ to 6¾ percent. On January 1, 1962, the tax will increase to 7¼ percent each.

In the field of railroad unemployment insurance benefits, H.R. 1012 would provide:

1. An increase in daily benefit rates of 50 cents to $1.70 a day higher than present rates.

2. A new schedule of rates ranging from a minimum daily benefit of $4.50 for annual compensation of $500 to $699.99 to a maximum benefit rate of $10.20 for annual compensation of $4,000 or more.

3. Unemployment benefit periods would be extended for employees with 10 or more years' service by 65 to 130 days, depending upon length of service beyond the 130-day maximum provided in the present law.

4. To finance the cost of additional benefits and to take care of the current deficiency, the tax base after 1958 would be increased from $350 to $400 and the tax rate would be increased so that it would range from a minimum of 1½ percent to a maximum of 3½ percent contingent upon the balance in the railroad unemployment insurance account. Minimum annual earnings needed to qualify for benefits would be increased from the present $400 to $500.

Mr. Chairman, as we all know, the 2d session of the 85th Congress increased social security benefits 7 percent effective January 1, 1959. In addition, for those unemployed whose insurance benefits terminated during 1958, an extension of 13 weeks was granted them.

Therefore, should H.R. 1012 become a law, the 10-percent increase in railroad retirement benefits provided for would become effective January 1, 1959, and for those unemployed railroaders whose unemployment insurance benefits terminated in June 1958, they would be eligible for benefits from 65 to 130 additional days, dependent upon length of service.

The bill actually gives to retired and unemployed railroaders the same treatment accorded persons retired under the Social Security Act or unemployed under the State unemployment compensation laws.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to dwell briefly on the situation facing retired and unemployed railroaders in my congressional district.

First, from a population standpoint I represent one of the largest railroad districts in the Nation. Therefore, I know the full impact of the cost of living on retired railroaders as well as the hardships of unemployment that exist in the railroad industry.

As an example of unemployment conditions in the railroad industry and the urgent need of extending the benefits period for railroad unemployment insurance benefits, I wish to call attention to the fact that in the 3 counties comprising my congressional district a total of 2,101 employees have already exhausted their eligibility for railroad unemployment insurance benefits.

At the present time 1,048 employees are receiving unemployment insurance benefits, and, of this number, 861 will exhaust their right before the new benefit year begins on July 1, 1959. At that time it is estimated by the Railroad Retirement Board that a total of 1,681 employees in my congressional district will be unable to qualify for railroad unemployment insurance benefits in the new benefit year because they did not earn sufficient wages during the calendar year 1958 to qualify for such benefits.

Mr. Chairman, in reviewing my efforts during my congressional career to give adequate service to constituents affected by the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, I have been greatly aided by the members and employees of the Railroad Retirement Board not only at the Chicago headquarters but also at district and regional offices in Altoona, Pa., and Cleveland, Ohio, as well as the liaison representative assigned to the Washington office of the Railroad Retirement Board.

In December of last year I visited the headquarters office of the Railroad Retirement Board in Chicago to discuss with the chief executive officer cases of my constituents that came under the provisions of the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts, and also to obtain an evaluation of the actuarial condition of the railroad retirement fund and the effect on the fund of legislation that has been suggested to me for introduction in this Congress.

While in Chicago, I also met with members of the Board and some of the staff. I was not only impressed by the way the information I requested was readily made available to me, but I was also impressed by the keen sense of interest and responsibility those Government employees had in administering the provisions of both acts and their consciousness of the existing inflationary trend.

The Board is also well aware of the economic changes that are going on in the railroad industry and of the possible effect of such changes on operations of the Railroad Retirement Board. With this in mind, they are continually reviewing operations to keep expenses at a productive minimum.

I learned that even before the request of the Bureau of the Budget was received requesting that a 2 percent reduction be made in personnel expenditures for 1959, steps had been taken to hold employment levels well below budget limitations so that there was no problem in adhering to the request.

It was pointed out to me that although the retirement load of the Board has increased greatly since the inception of that program in 1937 and will continue to increase for some years in the future, every effort is being made to find new ways of performing necessary services to prevent an increase in the present employment levels of the Board and if possible to reduce the level of employment.

This is already reflected by the fact that there were 87 fewer persons employed on January 1, 1959 as compared with January 1, 1958, even though the work volume was substantially increased.

It is a pleasuer to conclude my testimony by paying this well-deserved tribute to the members and employees of the Railroad Retirement Board for the efficient manner in which the administration of the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts is accomplished and at a minimum of expense .

Such economy of operation is appreciated as efforts are made to find means of wiping out the deficiencies in both the retirement and unemployment compensation funds and to finance the cost of the much-needed amendments to existing laws contained in H.R. 1012.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1012 is needed and needed badly. It is the fervent wish of my constituents who will benefit from its enactment that it will become a law at the earliest possible date.

As I stated previously, the Harris bill, H.R. 1012, contains in one package the provisions of my bills, H.R. 1370 and H.R. 1373, and I sincerely hope the legislation will be enacted as quickly as possible and that at a later date the committee will consider the other bills I have introduced to amend the Railroad Retirement Act.

Providing Additional Funds for Direct Loans to Veterans

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2256) to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional funds for direct loans, to remove certain requirements with respect to the rate of interest on guaranteed loans; and for other purposes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is very simple. At the present time the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs allocates each regional office four times a year sums of money to be used for the direct-loan program. From time to time some of those mortgages are sold. The money that is received from the sale of those mortgages then goes back to the Veterans' Administration and is redistributed from the central office proportionately to all the district offices, not in the area where the mortgages were originally placed, only a small portion of it goes back into that area.

The purpose of this amendment is to see to it that if in any area you have people in the Veterans' Administration who have enough energy to get out and sell their mortgages they will have the money realized from the sale of their mortgages to reinvest with veterans' mortgages in the same area. That is the purpose of the amendment. It was rather technical to have it drafted, and I can say to the members of this committee that had the staff had the amendment ready it would have been adopted by the committee at its regular meeting.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the distinguished lady from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand the Veterans' Administration would be very glad to have this amendment adopted.

Mr. SAYLOR. The Veterans' Administration would be very delighted to have this amendment adopted.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I have no objection to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Shorter Workweek Urged by General Electric and Westinghouse Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting letter received from Mr. Albert J. Fitzgerald, general president, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, in New York, urging Congress to adopt legislation establishing a shorter workweek, and to investigate the relationship between the rising rate of corporation profit and the increasing number of the unemployed:

UNITED ELECTRICAL, RADIO, AND MACHINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., February 3, 1959.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LANE: On January 31, 1959, a meeting of UE delegates, employees of the General Electric and Westinghouse companies, voted to ask Congress to adopt legislation establishing a shorter workweek, and to investigate the relationship between the rising rate of corporation profit and the increasing number of the unemployed.

We, like the huge majority of all Americans, must depend for jobs upon employment by a corporation. In recent years the General Electric and Westinghouse Electric companies have discarded by layoff 60 to 70,000 of their employees. Thousands of these employees have long years of service. These companies have embarked on a policy of systematic layoff of employees and abandonment of whole plants and communities as a means of pushing profits to record-breaking levels.

The corporations are wholly free to employ workers or to lay them off. They take the profit that they have made from the work of thousands of employees in one community to build a new, modern plant, employing hundreds in another, and completely abandon both workers and community which made the new plant possible. This enormous and unrestrained economic power over the lives of our citizens is exercised without consideration of humanity or social responsibilities. The corporations disclaim responsibility for the plight of their discarded employees and the blighted towns they abandon.

The General Electric Co. and Westinghouse Co. have abandoned or are about to close plants in Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Indiana, Massachusetts, and elsewhere. In other established plants in these same areas, where thousands of workers have been laid off in past months, the companies are continuing layoffs.

While this is going on both corporations are announcing higher profits on drastically reduced employment.

Vice President Jack S. Parker, of the General Electric Co. declared in September: "We see business picking up pretty generally, but through economies we have made, our employment level won't get back as high as it was at the peak."

Mr. Parker's economies are jobless GE workers and blighted communities. This Union, the UE, has addressed itself seriously to the problem of returning tens of thousands of General Electric and Westinghouse workers to their jobs. In collective bargaining negotiations, this past fall, with both corporations the union proposed a 2-year program to shorten the work week to 35 hours without reduction in weekly earnings. This would have returned some 50,000 General Electric and Westinghouse workers to gainful employment. The seriousness of the proposal by the union is marked by the fact that the General Electric and Westinghouse workers offered to apply two annual wage increases contractually due them toward the cost of instituting the shorter work week. This offer by General Electric and Westinghouse workers would have covered approximately half the cost of the program. No other program for returning the jobless to work was offered by either company.

To date neither company has given the slightest indication that either recognizes its responsibility to the workers and communities which its present policies are destroying. Two days after the proposal for saving jobs had been made, the General Electric Co. publicly announced its total rejection.

The problem placed before you largely in terms of the plight of General Electric and Westinghouse workers is one that affects every industrial worker in the Nation.

Today, with gross national production virtually back to its prerecession level, only 30 percent of the decline in non-farm employment has been recovered since the low point last April. Unemployment today consistently under-estimated by the Department of Commerce stands near 7 million if proper allowance is made for those on short time and short earnings and the million new workers who annually come into the labor market.

We believe that Congress should direct its most serious attention to the problem of grave continuing unemployment, a labor problem that far transcends in importance other labor matters that are currently receiving far more attention from Government.

Congress can and should give leadership to the American people in helping solve the problem of unemployment. We ask specifically for:

1. Legislation to reduce the length of the standard work week to not more than 35 hours a week. This should be done in a way that will not simply re-distribute the present inadequate share of the national income among the employed and unemployed workers of America.

2. Congress should conduct open hearings and an investigation into the matter of the rising rate of profit in relation to the constantly increasing number of the unemployed.

We submit that this is a minimum course necessary not only from the most profound humane and social considerations, but an absolute necessity for the economic health of the Nation.

We call to your attention a few reported facts drawn at random out of many hundreds which compel the same conclusion:

The U.S. Treasury Department currently estimates that 1959 corporation profits will set a new record of $47 to $48 billion. This is far higher than the 1956 peak of $45½ billion in a year of relatively full employment. Federal Reserve Board and private business analysts foresee 1959 corporation profits as high as $50 billion.

The magazine Business Week of January 3, 1959 declares: "The only question seems to be how much more abundant the gravy will be."

Fortune Magazine reports: "Man-hour productivity has resumed a dramatic climb. * * * The spurt in productivity also affects the outlook for employment * * * profits margins are widening as output advances faster than man-hours."

Business Week writes:

"Rising productivity is having a two-fold impact on the economy: it's reducing labor unit costs and, with companies doing a bigger volume of business, is already boosting profits.

"It's slowing the rehiring of laid off workers, creating fewer job openings for new entrants to the labor force and keeping unemployment at higher levels than during earlier post-war recoveries."

The Wall Street Journal says: "New plants pay off in soaring output with less manpower. Today's 11.9 million workers turn out 35 percent more than 12.7 million did in 1948."

The New York Herald Tribune says: "About six hundred thousand jobs disappeared during the 1953–54 recession and another 1 million are due to vanish during the current down-turn. That means that almost one out of every seven factory production workers will have been chopped from the country's industrial payrolls."

We believe that the fact of continuing unemployment with high levels of production and profit show that the shorter work week is overdue. As the corporate employers of America reject responsibility for the economic welfare of the American people, responsibility for immediate and constructive action clearly lies with Congress. We sincerely hope that Congress will rise to the occasion and act in this most serious crisis.

Respectfully yours,
ALBERT J. FITZGERALD,
General President.

Abraham Lincoln's Message to Congress Concerning Labor, December 3, 1861

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very timely article which appeared in Steel Labor, the voice of the United Steelworkers of America, published in Indianapolis, Ind., issue for February 1959:

Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed.

Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration. Capital has its rights, which are as worthy of protection as any rights, nor is it denied that there is, and probably always will be, a relation between labor and capital, producing mutual benefits.

The prudent, penniless beginner in the world labors for wages a while, saves a surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account another while, and at length hires another new beginner to help him.

This is the just, and generous, and prosperous system, which opens the way to all, gives hope to all, and consequent energy, and progress, and improvement of conditions to all.

No men living are more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty—none less inclined to take or touch aught which they have not honestly earned.

Let them beware of surrendering a political power which they already possess, and which, if surrendered, will be surely used to close the door of advancement against such as they, and to fix new disabilities and burdens upon them, till all of liberty shall be lost.

The struggle of today is not altogether for today; it is for a vast future also. With a reliance on Providence, all the more firm and earnest, let us proceed in the great task which events have devolved upon us. (Abraham Lincoln in his message to the Congress, Dec. 3, 1861.)

Shall We Repeat the Mistakes of the 1920's?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, many of us have constituents who, by their insight and capacity for creative thought, from time to time impel us toward solutions of major national problems. One of my constituents who has a well-earned position in this category is Louis W. Douglas, a former Member of this body, who is presently chairman of the board of Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York, and, not so long ago, was our Ambassador to the United Kingdom.

In a speech to the Life Managers Association of Greater New York last month, Mr. Douglas discussed the problem of preserving stability in the foreign exchange market. His thesis was that if we are to achieve orderliness and stability in our own financial markets over the long run we must in turn allow others to earn dollars which will enable them to discharge their obligations to the American Government and its business concerns. Drawing on the lessons of the 1920's, Mr. Douglas asserted that unless there is a free flow of international commerce—combined with stabilizing factors such as our foreign-aid program—other countries will not have the capacity to discharge their debts, and that the distortion of the world exchange structure will ultimately bring chaos and economic disaster everywhere.

I would suggest that Mr. Douglas' observations should be weighed carefully by those who formulate our international economic policies, and I commend his speech, which I include under unanimous consent, to our colleagues.

The speech follows:

I appreciate very much indeed the cordial invitation you have extended to me to be with you this evening. It is not at all clear that you will feel toward your officers the same sense of gratitude that I feel toward them.

If we review objectively the course of history over the last half century, I think we must conclude that the period is one of the most revolutionary in modern times. The changes in the structure of society, within the frontiers of each nation state, we can identify without exaggeration as being fantastic in both magnitude and character. Within the orbit of international affairs the environment has changed no less strikingly. Never in such a short span of time has the international order of things been so completely uprooted. Never in such a short span of time has there been such a migration to the East and to the West of the centers of power. Never in such a short span of time has there developed such a sharp philosophical chasm between two such large segments of the world. Never in such a short span of time, between the two, have the amenities of diplomatic conduct been so profoundly debased, if indeed there are any amenities left at all. And never in such a short span of time have the international monetary and financial system and the international movement of commerce in the channels of trade undergone such revolutionary modifications.

It is in connection with the effect, on our vital national interest, of these changes that I should like to speak tonight.

I am confident that, within the limited period of time at our disposal, what I say will be an oversimplification of the matter; but I am equally confident that it is a subject which touches the lives of each one of our countrymen—whether he be butcher, baker or candlestick maker; whether he be engaged in the business of insurance, the manufacture of automobiles, of mining nonferrous metals, of extending credit, of healing the infirmities of the ill, or indeed of any other useful occupation.

One of the greatest difficulties of relatively conservative-minded men and women—indeed, of all people—is to accommodate their intellectual processes and their judgments of policies and measures, both private and public, to the changes that have occurred in this, the most revolutionary period of history since the disintegration of the holy Roman Empire. Far too frequently, the person with the conservative bent of mind continues to think and act as though this own conception of things were a true reflection of his environment, and as though forces that have been created during this revolutionary period—so intensified and aggravated by two great wars and their aftermath—did not exist at all. The problem of the conservative is to identify these novel forces that are operating, try to direct them and to control them in order to preserve the best and, indeed, the fundamental principles upon which American society rests. Such, for example, as the right of the individual to save and to expend, to invest, to make a profit or sustain a loss, to enjoy the basic human privileges of speaking one's mind, of seeking redress, of worshiping the God of one's own choice, of owning property, of preserving the rights of minorities, indeed of all the basic concepts that are embedded in our Constitution.

An example of the sort of problem to which the conservative should attempt to adjust his mind finds its image in the general view held by many people that it is the function of government to intervene in economic affairs in order to attempt to arrest or modify the exaggerated movements of the business cycle. Whether over long periods of time government successfully can achieve this objective without creating problems far greater than the ones governments undertake to solve is a matter which only the years and experience will adequately test. But any government which asserts that it is not a public responsibility to try to prevent the appearance of wide-scale unemployment will shortly lose the enthusiasm and the confidence of its supporters. The problem is not, therefore, how to avoid doing what people expect governments to do, but rather by the enactment of what measures and the employment of what devices governments will attempt to reach the objective.

Dr. Arthur Burns has spoken pointedly and wisely about this question.

There are many other examples about which the conservative should adjust his intellectual processes which could be cited if he is to preserve some measure of influence in the development of public policies. It is within the context of a society much modified over the last 50 years by violent pressures of change and revolution that many matters could be discussed with you tonight. There is, for example, the question of taxation and the volume of public expenditure; the weight of the former upon the individual and the country's institutions; and the vast enlargement of the area of economic activity into which the latter has insinuated government authority. There is the long-term problem of inflation and the highly contradictory series of public policies which necessarily limit the power of the Federal Reserve System to control it. There are many questions of international affairs, especially with the apparent advent of another Berlin crisis, which should not have come upon us as a surprise. But it is of the international monetary system, the wide changes that have occurred in the commercial relationship of our own country with the rest of the world and the consequent extremely fragile stability of the international financial system that on balance it would seem to me more interesting and more of a novelty to speak about.

It is perhaps not obvious to the person in Keokuk, Iowa, in Elgin, Ariz., or Memphis, Tenn., or even to many in the heart of the financial district of New York that their economic welfare and the internal health of our country are profoundly influenced by variations in the value of foreign currencies, particularly of world currencies against the dollar.

I should, at this point, draw the distinction between a hard currency and a world currency. The Swiss franc, the Canadian dollar, and perhaps one or two other currencies can well be labeled as hard currencies, but the volume of world trade will not be substantially influenced and historically has not been much affected by a fluctuation in the value of these currencies against our own dollar, despite the large trading account we enjoy with Canada. Sterling, on the other hand, which enjoys at the moment a tenuous strength, and in which more than 50 percent of the total international commercial transactions are conducted, cannot be identified as a hard currency. Yet should there be a deterioration in the value of sterling expressed in terms of dollars, the volume of world trade would shrink, prices would be adversely affected, our internal structure of values would be undermined, and the vitality of our internal economic affairs would be subjected to enervating influences. The historical evidence on this particular point is unimpeachable. The strength and vigor of our internal economic system are affected favorably or unfavorably as the stability and orderliness of sterling in relation to the dollar are preserved or undermined. It is perhaps well to be reminded of the experience which commenced in 1929, and which lasted until the threat of war and wartime activities reduced to a manageable figure the permanent and massive body of our unemployed that was one of the unique phenomena of the thirties. The depression which started in 1929 with the stock market collapse, intense though it was, was manageable until in September of 1931, the British were forced to abandon gold payments, and sterling depreciated against the dollar. Within 6 months of this historic milestone, unemployment rose by over 5 million—it almost doubled—the price of commodities went tumbling down, the stock market plummeted downwardly a greater percentage than had been its fall during the entire preceding 2 years. All values began to wither. The volume of world trade shrunk; and the foundation was laid for the banking crisis and credit demoralization which we experienced in the early months of 1933 when unem-

ployment rose to the alarming figure of over 14 million.

I refer to this historical experience to punctuate the frequently demonstrated—but unhappily not widely understood—relationship between our own internal economic welfare, the vitality and the strength of our industrial activity and the maintenance of a sound world currency. Why, you may well ask, did this catastrophic financial debacle occur? The answer to this question is to be discovered in the far-reaching changes that occurred in the position of the United States vis-a-vis the rest of the world in commerce and finance as a result of World War I. Before this violent disturbance, in what had been the general tranquillity of human life throughout almost a century of experience, we had been a debtor nation. Since the close of the Civil War, with but two brief intervals, we had been adopting a progressively protectionist policy. Provided we owed sterling and French francs to investors from Britain and France and other European countries, the question of stability of international exchange rates was never critical, so long as the great creditor, Britain, pursued a policy of free trade. We could exclude imports. We could protect many of our industries—as indeed we did—because our problem was not how to permit others to earn dollars to service their debts to us or to produce a return on our equity investments abroad, but rather how to obtain foreign currencies in order that we might discharge our debts to others and that others might earn a return on their equity investment in our own country. We, for example, needed sterling and francs. The British and the French did not need dollars.

But World War I completely reversed the position. We emerged from this first great world conflict since the Napoleonic wars as a great creditor nation. Moreover, our industrial system had gathered weight and strength and vitality which were to make it one of the most impressive economic systems in modern history. Accordingly, we developed, throughout the period of the twenties, a surplus of the trade account which, combined with our position as a great creditor, made it imperative that we allow others to earn dollars in order to service their debts to us and to redress their adverse balance of trade and thus preserve stability in foreign exchange markets.

At the very time when, in our own interest, this became imperative for us to do, we followed precisely the opposite course. We reversed the tendency toward lower tariffs established under the provisions of the Underwood Tariff Act. We enacted the emergency tariff legislation of 1921, and supplemented it with the Fordney-McComber Tariff Act which provided for the highest protective barricade American industry had ever had before in our history.

The fundamental weakness in the exchange position, which was caused by the policies we pursued and by the inflexibilities that had developed in the internal economies of other countries, was for many years concealed by the large volume of capital invested by us on private account, principally in South America and central Europe, throughout the decade of the twenties. But despite this large export of capital by private investors in foreign countries, gold flowed almost continuously throughout the 10-year period in a westerly direction to the United States. It was only through this westward movement of gold that the imbalance in international accounts could be redressed. It was this westward current of gold which was to make sterling so vulnerable when at last the illusion of the 1920's vanished and the starke naked fragility of the situation became apparent. When the stock market broke in the fall of 1929, the exportation of dollars on private account as well as public account came to an abrupt halt. The fundamental weakness in the exchange position then began to become sharply silhouetted. But we stubbornly clung to the same policy. The Smoot-Hawley Act further restricted imports and further restricted the ability of others to earn the dollars necessary to service their debts to us. The migration of gold westward continued at an accelerated rate; the termination of the loans that had been made to central Europe created a crisis which forced the Credit Anstalt suddenly to withdraw its short-term balances from the Bank of England. The gold reserve of the sterling area evaporated, and by September 1931 Britain had no option but to discontinue gold payments. Sterling fell sharply against the dollar.

The international monetary machinery lay in ruins, international trade withered and shrunk as it had not shrunk since Waterloo. The depression was upon us with an intensity heretofore unexperienced throughout the course of more than a century.

Now our position—not necessarily for today but for long term—is even graver than it was in the twenties, and our surplus on trade account, after all the subtractions are made on account of foreign aid, is probably the largest of any country in modern history. Others must, therefore, earn more dollars than was ever necessary in the twenties if orderliness in the exchange markets is to be preserved, and if we are to avoid the consequences of a deterioration in the value of sterling against the dollar. And yet the paradox of the situation is that, despite what moderate downward adjustments have been made in our impediments to imports, our public policy prevents others from earning the dollars that, in our interest, it is so essential that they earn.

It would, I suggest, create internal difficulties of great intensity were we to reduce too suddenly our protectionist policy.

How then, if we will not, in the immediate future, allow others to earn dollars in order to maintain orderliness in the exchange markets, can there be achieved the orderliness and stability which are so important to the lives of our countrymen?

If we won't permit others to perform services for us, and to import enough to collect dollars from us and thereby to lay a solid foundation for confidence in exchange rates, then we must, on public account, export the dollars that we will not allow others to make. Instead of calling the program which, heretofore, since the close of the war has been called foreign aid, it should, in fact, be called a device to preserve stability in international exchange rates—for this is now the basic purpose of the exportation of dollars.

This problem of preserving stability in the foreign exchange markets would be with us if the Soviet and ourselves and the Communist world and ourselves were living in complete amity. This problem would still be with us if there were no chasms that divided the world into two parts. This problem of exchange stability would still be with us were there no international threat whatsoever to our security.

I recognize that there has been an outflow of gold during the course of the last 12 months, but this has been in large measure a product of the difference in interest rates and the more favorable terms of trade which the decline in the price of basic raw materials has established for the United Kingdom. It is in some measure, too, the product of perfectly normal, natural, temporary deviations from the long-term trend.

I recognize also that the volume of American exports has fallen more than has the volume of foreign imports. But even after making all the adjustments, the brute fact still remains that there is a very large and ominues deficit in the balance of payments. If this deficit continues and is not made up, either by an improbably large and permanent volume of imports, or by a corresponding export of dollars, we can expect a period of exchange disequilibrium and confusion at some time in the future. This deterioration of other currencies, and particularly of sterling against the dollar, is apt to produce here at home a serious economic convulsion not unlike the one that was produced in the early thirties when the same sort of deterioration occurred for much the same reasons.

It would be deceptive to deny that there have been some infirmities in the administration of the foreign aid program, or to deny that frequently it has failed to make friends. But even the validity of these criticisms—if they are valid—of foreign aid does not destroy the case, or lessen the need for the exportation of dollars necessary to preserve a stability of exchange rates. Our own national interests require it.

An alternative solution to the problem would be to become free trade and to eliminate foreign aid. This course is philosophically logical, and it is logically philosophical. But to expect that this will happen within any reasonably limited period of time is, to quote Adam Smith, to expect Utopia. Moreover, if it were done too suddenly it would cause serious dislocations here at home. It is perhaps cynical to argue that, because large segments of our private economy are being subsidized through tariff quotas and other restrictions on imports, they should receive a double subsidy by insinuating dollars on public account, and therefore from the taxpayers, into the channels of foreign trade which the tariff and other restrictions on imports and services prevent others from earning. But this, for a creditor nation, is the cost of protectionism. The alternative—a shakeout in exchange rates which could, during a period of deflation, rock us on our economic foundation—is far more alarming and distressing picture to contemplate.

There are, of course, other aspects of the problem of the exportation of dollars. We do live in a perilous world. We are under the potential threat of external attack with the most frightful lethal weapon. We do, therefore, need allies that are strong in an economic sense and that can muster some military might. It is not debatable that the Communist world is attempting to capture the more primitive and undeveloped parts of the world and to imbed them within their own Communist dominion. On these scores the American dollars are necessary. But I have deliberately divided the problem up into segments tonight and have tried to confine the major weight of the case to the economic situations that touch vitally our internal national economic welfare. I have so divided the whole problem and have dealt with the economic considerations, because others have dealt so adequately with other aspects of the problem. I have done so, also, because administrative officers and legislators, in their highly commendable efforts to save dollars, may strike at one of the very items in the budget which might, in a certain economic environment, cause this country the greatest pain and suffering, and which might upset our position in the world, diminish our prestige, and even cause a lamentable weakening of our North Atlantic Treaty Alliance, if indeed it might not shatter it to bits. This would be a frightful catastrophe, for the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance is the heart, the bone and the sinew of our national security and the foreign policy of most of our Western allies.

There are a number of factors such, for example, as the progress of others toward making their currencies convertible, the extent to which we, in fact, reduce our impediment to the flow of international trade and investment, and the effectiveness of measures taken here and elsewhere to restrain and check the powerful inflationary forces that

have been pressing prices upward. All these and several others might form a realistic basis for dtermining the amount of dollars that the Congress should authorize to achieve exchange equilibrium.

I can do no more than to plead for a reexamination by everyone of his own conception of reality and of the environment in which he lives. For, as a great historian has put it, "There are times when we can never meet the future with sufficient elasticity of mind, especially if we are locked in the contemporary systems of thought."

This is one of those times.

Legislation To Create a Coal Research and Development Commission Will Prove a Boon to the Nation's Coal Industry and Should Receive Favorable Consideration by the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 7 I introduced H.R. 1179 which would create a Coal Research and Development Commission as an independent agency. A number of other Members of this House on both sides of the aisle have introduced like proposals. It is our hope that this legislation can be acted upon expeditiously and that the coal research body can be put into operation soon.

This legislation is identical to bills which were introduced in the 85th Congress. In the Senate the bill was passed and sent to the House. In this body the legislation was approved by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, but was caught in the rush of legislation during the final days of the session.

The creation of the independent Coal Research and Development Commission is the only type of coal research legislation which has met with the approval of both management and labor in the coal industry. When a subcommittee of the House Interior Committee, of which the present chairman of the committee was a member, hearings were held on this type of research agency. In addition to witnesses representing the coal operators and the United Mine Workers of America, the committee heard advocates for the legislation from the railroads, the mine machinery suppliers, industrial consumers, Governors and other officials of coal-producing states, and representatives of coal communities. All were in agreement that the type of research agency as proposed in this legislation would be a boon to the coal industry.

As a member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, I have personal knowledge of the vast sums of money which have been and are now being spent on the experimentation of an atomic reactor designed to procduce commercial power. Certainly if we can afford to spend such astronomical sums on a source of energy which is now in the experimental stage, we can well devote a small percentage of that amount to further research developments of a fuel that has been the principal source of our economic power in every emergency that this country has faced.

I sincerely hope that for the benefit of the thousands of unemployed mine workers and railroad workers in my district that we can have early committee action on the various legislative proposals to establish the much-needed and essential Coal Research and Development Commission.

Army Cheeseparing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent news article which was published in the Baltimore Sun of January 25, 1959. It is entitled "Army Cheeseparing," and was written by Mr. Mark S. Watson.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY CHEESEPARING

(By Mark S. Watson)

ENLISTMENT OF 30-CENT-A-MONTH KOREANS RESORTED TO FOR THRIFT

WASHINGTON, January 24.—Newer members of the Senate Armed Services Committee have learned with surprise that in order to keep combat divisions in the Far East at required strength, the Army has filled them, to a very considerable degree, with Korean personnel.

The exact percentage is not considered properly publishable, but it is more than is generally suspected.

This is one of the means by which the Army is forced to adjust itself to the administration's economy program of the past 2 years, still underway in the limited authorizations of funds both to buy needed new equipment and to keep major combat forces at or near true combat strength.

TWO KOREAN DIVISIONS

Without the Katusas (Koreans attached to U.S. Army) the two divisions in Korea would be very far below requirements.

The Koreans are well regarded by Americans who have served as Katusa officers, they are thoroughly integrated with the American soldiers in their units, and are given identical responsibilities.

There is one important difference, which is the reason for their being in the United States divisions; they are a financial bargain if there ever was one.

An American soldier gets $78 a month for his first four months, thereafter $83, and then $85.80. His Korean companion gets from 15 cents to 30 cents a month—and even if some day he should get to be Korea's Chief of Staff or Defense Minister he would get but $40 a month. The Korean private's main benefit is not in cash but in receipt of full Army subsistence.

ONLY ONE REVELATION

If this is the most dramatic revelation to date in the testimony of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, before the new Senate committee that has been holding its first hearings this week, it still is but one item. Other economies in which the Army is engaged, in order to stay within the administration's allowance of men and dollars include the following:

1. New weapons: General Taylor lately stated that any genuine modernization of the Army (both the President and the Defense Secretary have stressed modernization, in principle) would require annual appropriations of $3 billion a year for 5 years. This would be made up of $1,400 million a year purely to cope with the processes of mere wearing out and absolute obsolescence of equipment (10 percent a year for the $14 billion inventory) and $1,600 million a year for actually new-model equipment, comparable to that with which Russia is renovating its own Army resources.

TO DEVELOP TANK

The new defense budget allows Army procurement totaling $1,190 million for mere replacement, plus $180 million for admitted modernization.

This permits, among other things, a small start on the new light rifle and machinegun; development of the very important new M–60 tank, marking our belated embarkation on diesel power with its great increase in range, reliability, noninflammability; a new antitank ammunition with much greater power; field adaption kits permitting swifter and more efficient interchange of nuclear and conventional warheads for three types of weapons; and a start on the "Davey Crockett," a revolutionary bazooka type, permitting use of tactical atomic projectiles by two very mobile soldiers.

The essential fact is that the prescribed total for both mere replacement and actual modernization in these important items is actually less than Taylor's recommendation for replacement alone.

NEW MONEY NEEDED

2. Ammunition: Taylor pointed out that normal training activities call for about $200 million a year in ammunition of all types. Up to now this has been met largely by drawing down stocks accumulated during the Korea war but we must now put new money into ammunition to forestall depletion of certain critical categories, and also to procure certain new types.

It is standard and proper practice to use for field training the older stocks of ammunition from the shelf—but also to replace it, as called for, by newer stocks. The latter step has not been taken. Accordingly, in such critical areas as shells for medium artillery, it appears, the economy-bedeviled Army now is approaching the very condition of which an extremely rigideous congressional committee complained fiercely only a few years ago when the post-1945 economies had left the Nation short of shells gravely needed in Korea.

What the present congressional committees will do about the present between-wars situation will be worth watching.

TWO DIVISIONS WEAK

3. Personnel: General Taylor explained the necessary reduction of the much-admired Strategic Army Corps from four to three divisions, plus corps troops. STRAC is supposedly ready to go. But two of the four divisions are so far under strength that they are simply not ready. That is why one is dropped altogether, to help build up the other to a combat-ready state.

Now ordered because of personnel econmies to reduce from the present 15 to 14 divisions, the Army must keep its 8 oversea divisions at or near full strength (that in Hawaii is shy 1 combat group and the 2 in Korea, as noted, are at strength only because of Katusas).

DISCRETION ON CUTS

Subtracting 8 from 14 leaves 6 divisions, of which STRAC has 3. The remaining three, politely called STRAC reinforcement, are in plainer terms training organizations which are not remotely close to combat readiness.

4. Reserves: Upon this latter—the ordered reduction of both National Guard and Army Reserves by 10 percent, despite congressional refusal to permit it last year—General Taylor spoke most discreetly.

But on this issue is expected some of the fiercest of all congressional opposition to the President's economy package. Both guard and Reserves have made clear their indignation and both have ardent friends in Senate and House committees. The battle on this score therefore is expected to be noisier than on all other counts.

A hint came today when Maj. Gen. William H. Harrison, Jr., president of the National Guard Association, described the administration's new budget as pennywise and security foolish. He added that in 1957 the Defense Department spent more on publicity to build up the Army Reserve that it will save in the coming fiscal year by cutting it down.

Federal Tax, Spending Policy Biggest Danger Facing United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, from reports in the press, it is becoming obvious that once again the American people are beginning to express themselves as opposed to vast public spending, and despite the claims of some of the liberal forces I feel that the vast majority of the American people do not want their Government to continue a program of deficit spending nor are they willing to raise taxes in order to finance such public welfare measures.

Among those in my section who are most concerned about this is Mr. A. Robbins, Jr., editor of the Hopewell News, at Hopewell, Va. Mr. Robbins has been warning for years that deficit spending and nonessential expenditures would bring great danger to America and he is continuing his advocacy of sound fiscal practices.

I wish to include herein in my remarks a splendid editorial which appeared in his paper on Monday, February 2, 1959, in which he calls attention to the great dangers which face us unless the present trend is curbed.

I commend his editorial to the Members of the House:

FEDERAL TAX, SPENDING POLICY BIGGEST DANGER FACING UNITED STATES

Local persons attending the chamber of commerce banquet could feel they were almost getting a peek at this past week's headlines as Russian boss Nikita Khrushchev in a jovial mood Tuesday told a cheering Communist Party congress that it was Soviet economic power which would win the cold war and not a bomb.

The Hopewell audience on Friday heard T. Coleman Andrews, former Director of the Internal Revenue Bureau, say that while a hydrogen bomb might be the way to start the world all over again, that he personally was not afraid of the bomb, but of economic ruin brought on by our Federal Government tax and spend policies and our inflationary race of wages and prices.

This Federal spending and tax policy is not only being watched with glee by Russian leaders, but is being abetted in any way possible by Communists within our own borders.

We find ourselves in agreement with Mr. Andrews on many points, but particularly when he says we, the American people, have lost the capacity for indignation which stood our forefathers so well as they carved out this Nation.

We are afraid that too many people both in and out of Government no longer take the Communist menace from within seriously enough. But, as Mr. Andrews added his voice by saying that, in daily living, it is hard to tell who is a Communist, he assured his audience they were all around us and it was up to us to check the false ideologies they have brought into our American way of life.

We are afraid that voices of men who know, like Mr. Andrews, and even that strong voice of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, are not being listened to enough, either by Government in Washington or by the voters.

FIRST LINE

There is no overlooking the voice of Russia in the fact that economic battle is the first line of offense. Read his words and see what he thinks of our economic future.

In announcing a new 7-year plan, Khrushchev said, "The 7-year plan is a decisive stage in the economic competition of socialism and capitalism. This plan will greatly influence the entire international situation and prove a new triumph of Marxism-Leninism. Our successes in the fulfillment of the plan will attract to the side of socialism millions of adherents. They will lead the strengthening of the forces of peace and the weakening of the forces of war."

In plain, simple words the top Red leader is saying to the world that Russian economy will grow so strong and the capitalist world so weak there will no longer be a cold war, for Russia will dominate the world.

MUST BE CHECKED

Words will not make it so, but we cannot overlook the growth recorded in Russia nor the warning signs of inflation, overtaxation, overcentralization by our Federal Government; all are signs that many sound-thinking persons feel will bring economic ruin if not checked and checked soon.

Some of the examples cited by Mr. Andrews in his speech here more than bear repeating as examples of what the American people pay attention to and insist that their Congressmen do the same.

Among the examples cited by Mr. Andrews included the paying of $30 million to teach farmers how to get greater egg production and then spending $36 million to buy up the surplus egg production.

Or the TVA project in Tennessee. Mr. Andrews reminded his audience that this grab for public power to ruin private power had been sold on the basis of better navigation and flood control. But after it was completed there were 100 recorded trips up that river in 10 years and more good farm land was covered up than could ever be flooded by a natural disaster in 500 years. And the TVA boys aren't through yet, they are after additional steam plants to pave the way for the extinction of private power.

NOBLEST BATTLE

On the matter of the growing centralization of Federal power, Mr. Andrews told a story of what he calls the noblest battle ever carried on. It concerns the battle between a small farmer in Michigan, Stanley Yankus, who did not have an acreage allotment but raised enough to feed his chickens. He was arrested and fined more than $4,000, but he put up a long battle against the fine and for his rights as an American citizen. But finally he was forced to give up, "an awful indictment of you and me," according to Mr. Andrews. In giving up he said that he can't fight all of those who want something for nothing.

In putting security first, which is well on its way to being proved false, Mr. Andrews warned, the old America is dead and we are headed for security and slavery for everybody.

Inflation and Federal spending will lead us down the road to economic ruin before 1975, if they are not checked in the opinion of Mr. Andrews and he cited some figures that should have an eyeopening effect. These were the comparison of salaries in 1939 against 1957 and what will be needed in 1975, if inflation continues only at the present pace and there are no new taxes. Neither possibility which seems likely, as Mr. Andrews sees it. He pointed out that the value of the dollar has dropped to 50 cents and doubling wages is no answer because that throws him in a higher tax bracket. The figures shown below are the salaries needed to match that made in 1939.

1939	1957	1975
$2,000	$4,800	$10,538
5,000	13,000	33,240
10,000	30,097	92,141
20,000	83,000	383,748

To match a $50,000 income in 1957, by 1975 if things continue on their present road it will take nearly a million dollars.

But in a way those figures are worthless, according to Mr. Andrews' views for we will never reach that point in one piece but will have an economic collapse first.

Mr. Andrews is right, Congress could save the day, but first the American people must see the light and insist on less Government, more self-reliance and gain back their capacity for indignation over the wastefulness of the tax dollar and the lack of concern over the Communist subversion of many of the ideals on which America was founded.

If we don't wake up Mr. Khrushchev may have a point when he predicted this week that Russia would catch up with and outstrip the United States in 12 years and take over first place in the world.

We don't happen to think Mr. Khrushchev can live up to all his big words in the time alloted, but there is much to think about in the fact that the Reds feel their big weapon is economics.

It is time for us to take our medicine in the matter of forcing prices up and then trying to catch up with wage increases. Even if this is possible, it can't be done with the current tax policy of the Federal Government. It is time for the American people to call upon a halt to the growth of this Government in the fields of private endeavor where it has no place being.

Or Mr. Andrews put it, "We have got to have the courage to take the medicine needed to stem this tide and give America back to us."

Hon. Michael V. DiSalle's State of the State Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

commend to my colleagues the following "State of the State" message delivered last week by the Honorable Michael V. DiSalle, Governor of the State of Ohio, before the 103d general assembly.

From all indications, in a few short weeks Governor DiSalle has demonstrated a capacity for imaginative and dynamic leadership which will be a welcome change to the people of Ohio. Ohioans everywhere wish Governor DiSalle every success in dealing with the knotty and weighty problems which face his administration in the months ahead.

I am confident that the citizens of Ohio will have reason to be proud of the record which Governor DiSalle will make during his term of office.

The message follows:

STATE OF THE STATE MESSAGE BY GOV. MICHAEL V. DISALLE BEFORE THE 103D GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF OHIO

The State of Ohio has been fortunate in the fact that enlightened citizen interest has produced over the years many capable public officials and I believe that it has had, over the period of time, a responsible type of leadership in its legislative halls.

Twenty-two years ago, as I stood before this rostrum being sworn in as a member of the legislature, I looked forward with great anticipation to the session and what might be its accomplishments as far as the well-being of the citizens of this State was concerned.

At that time the legislature was overwhelmingly Democratic. Frank Ubile was the speaker. Jacob Davis, of Pike County, was the majority floor leader, later to be replaced by Bishop Kilpatrick, still a member of this house. Bill McCulloch was the minority floor leader, and the late Harry McGregor was his whip. On the senate side, Paul Yoder was presiding as Lieutenant Governor, with Keith Lawrence acting as majority leader, and the late Vern Metcalf as the minority leader. Only two of these men have left this life. The rest are active, respected citizens in various walks of life, but with only two of them still active in public affairs.

There are not many people still around who would be able to name the leadership of that particular assembly, but yet, in their own way, they fashioned a program that served the needs of that particular day. The Republican minority was then so hopelessly outnumbered that many of us from time to time felt it necessary, in the interest of militancy and complete discussion, to join with them in giving voice to an essential of democracy—free and open debate of the issues.

Today, in this assembly, the lines are more closely drawn so there will be very little need of closing party lines for the purpose of opening up the debate. But as was the case in 1937, it remains vital today that the leadership of both the majority and minority parties employ ability and responsibility. I am certain that on those occasions which affect the welfare of the State and its future, that partisanship will be disregarded and that each of us, in his or her own way, will contribute constructively to building a better State, a better hope, and greater opportunities for our fellow Ohioans.

In the course of this message, it may be necessary from time to time to refer to the past. I do so only in the sense of making comparisons and drawing upon those experiences for the purpose of attempting to demonstrate improvements which will contribute to a better type of government for the times in which we live.

Each generation, each assembly, each administration, owes an obligation to fashion new and better methods and techniques which draw upon the experiences of the past.

We face many complex problems and were I to attempt to discuss each one of them in detail, we would be here for too long a period and I am sure that the importance of each would be lost in the length of the total discussion. Consequently, it is my purpose only to outline the problems we face as a people, as a State, and as individuals bound by a solemn contract to have courage and conviction in meeting squarely the responsibilities which are ours. I will send for your consideration in future days individual and more detailed discussions of items within the areas sketched here today as well as of other matters which, while of importance, cannot be covered in this address.

There is no doubt that we face a new era of governmental finance in the State of Ohio. For the first time in nearly 20 years, we cannot come before you pointing to the accumulation of balances in the State treasury. As the accumulation of funds in the State treasury was largely a result of the events and conditions of an abnormal period in our history, so was the dissipation of those funds largely a result of obligations which grew at a concurrent time.

In the late 1930's upon Gov. John Bricker's recommendation, the legislature adopted a program which removed the earmarking of the newly levied sales tax. This course of action as it turned out prevented the wartime flow of revenues from accumulating automatically at local levels of government.

With the advent of the Second World War—yes, even in the early days of possible entry into war, restrictions become so pronounced that the State was effectively precluded from meeting even minimum needs for capital improvements in the form of highways and institutional construction. This created the rather paradoxical situation of increased revenues and accumulating balances but an inability to keep pace with the obvious needs of our State.

It was anticipated that these increased balances would provide for Ohio's needs during the postwar period. This situation continued during the first Lausche administration and through a part of the subsequent administration of Governor Herbert. After Goverhor LAUSCHE had taken office for the first of his four subsequent terms, the Korean United Nations action intervened and again certain restrictions on the use of steel resulted in the further postponement of construction programs. In all of these days, the accumulated surplus was zealously guarded and inroads were made only for capital improvements.

In the meantime, the passage of the $500 million bond issue for highway construction and the subsequent Federal highway bill provided funds for a stepped up highway program and the $150 million bond issue provided funds for an institutional public building and school construction program.

However, the recession of 1957 and 1958, the end of which is not completely in sight, caused a dropoff in sales tax revenues, but at the same time, increased burdens were felt in the school program, in poor relief, and in certain other areas. New institutions have brought with them a necessary increase in operating costs. The result now is a virtually complete erasure of the balances which have been our cushion for many years. While there are many people who have indicated confusion as to the conflicting statements made with reference to the fiscal situation, those who will study the factual situation will find that the record demonstrates with clarity that the deterioration of the State's fiscal position is real and critical.

My definition of a surplus is that amount of money you have remaining after your commitments have been taken care of. If we were to accept without question the last administration's budget document, we would find that at the time of its submission, when no thought was given to a possible recession, this document showed on its face that recommended general fund expenditures were expected to exceed general fund revenues by some $40 million. Thus the fiscal problem is not of current origin nor did it find its source in the recent recession.

It is true that certain revenues, principally those of the sales tax, declined as a result of the recession and also certain costs increased as a product of the Nation's economic decline. But, it also must be noted that for the greatest part of the present biennium, the government of Ohio has operated below appropriation levels and, in many cases, below the minimum standards required by decency. Not only has the State been unable to provide those goods and services which are so obviously needed in terms of the future wellbeing of our people, we have not been able to meet present needs—we have not met basic requirements of medical criteria and accepted social standards.

This, at least in part, serves to bring into focus the major problem that we now face. For the present biennium, we are definitely underappropriated for poor relief, for aid to the aged, and for the school foundation program. The amount necessary to meet these deficiencies will approximate $20 million plus the costs resulting from the flood emergency.

Only with carefully applied restraints, can we end this biennium with any cash balance at all. Might I say in clarification of the conflicting balance statements, that the best illustration is the individual himself. The money he has fluctuates from day to day. The balance he has on payday is usually not the balance he has the day after payday. His financial picture only becomes clear at the end of the month when he collects all the money he has coming and pays all of the obligations he owes. The State of Ohio has been supplementing its current pay by withdrawals from a savings account previously built up and it is now without further savings upon which to draw.

Our future insofar as finances are concerned and my recommendations for that future will be clearly spelled out in the budget message now in preparation.

We know that the department of mental hygiene and correction, even with the addition of more funds, will still be below reasonably accepted standards, but this is not something we can continue to postpone, it is a need and obligation that must be met. We know further that some of the programs outlined herein, such as the removal of the $65 ceiling on aid for the aged payments, will cost more money, but this is also an obligation which must be met in the interest of decency. We know that the school program, the need for increased teachers' salaries and benefits will produce increased costs, but this, too, is a responsibility that must be met.

Actually, the new programs suggested herein, in addition to those for which we are now responsible, will be minimal in the need for funds and these funds can be considered in the nature of investments which will produce returns that will help spread and meet these costs as far as the future is concerned.

In our budget message, we will demonstrate beyond a scintilla of doubt that efforts have been and will be made to eliminate duplication, waste, and extravagance and the sums of the financial program are those required to take care of the genuine needs of Ohio. It is our intention to proceed with a minimum of imposition on our citizens and the continuance of the conditions which have made Ohio's industrial climate the envy of many of its sister States: But we will be frank with you, the people of Ohio, and with ourselves.

While it is my intention to set out a recommended fiscal program in the budget message, I would like now to make clear my position with respect to one area which is the subject of much discussion. I recognize

the possible design of an income tax structure which might serve as an equitable vehicle for the raising of needed moneys, it is now my settled position that to presently employ such a device would be too disruptive of State-local relationships in light of the present utilization of such sources at the local level. I will not, therefore, recommend that this body enter the State into the field of income taxation.

INDUSTRIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

As the State's population grows, and we know that it will, the problems of government can be met only with an increasing economic expansion. This expansion is not one that can be taken for granted.

Today, nearly every State in the Union is anticipating the need for growth. New techniques for subsidizing and attracting new industry and industrial growth are being developed.

Here in Ohio, we need such a program on a statewide level.

Presently, we find our communities pitted against whole States in their quest for new industry. We find our large communities vying with small communities, which are at great disadvantage because they do not have the financial resources to present the marketing and economic data necessary to support their bids.

In many cases, this local competition works to the disadvantage of the State as a whole.

These local community programs must be coordinated and bolstered.

With this in mind, I propose the establishment of a department of industrial and economic development.

Into this department, I propose to incorporate the existing economic development and publicity commission, now in the Department of Commerce. We also will propose to include the State atomic energy advisory board and the capital planning division, now in the department of finance. It is our hope that this department will serve as an arm of the State in the industrial development field. It should be staffed so that it can assist the State in a needed central planning function which will attempt to anticipate the needs of the State and provide the data necessary for us to meet those needs.

It is our hope that soon we will be able to bring together in Columbus representatives of the public, labor, and management, and those communities which now have industrial development committees in order that our specific program may take into full consideration their recommendations.

RESEARCH

In this modern age, we are constantly being amazed by new developments in the fields of science and medicine. We can envision more improvements in every area.

The State is spending, and has spent, millions of dollars in the treatment of disease. It will spend more.

It would be wise and provident to invest a small percentage of these dollars in the area of research. In this way, we might contribute to discoveries that will lift the burden of treatment from the shoulders of future generations.

We are spending millions in the treatment of the deaf and blind and a mere $50,000 for research into the causes of these illnesses. The same is true for the mentally retarded. Look at our expenditures for treatment of chronic illness of the aged.

It is my hope that we may be able to establish small funds, at the beginning, for research at our State universities in the various fields of human suffering.

While on this subject, might I say that Ohio is doing fine work in agricultural research.

This program, too, must be stimulated in order that we may be in a position to assist in maintaining Ohio as one of the Nation's great agricultural States.

POLLUTION

We must pursue an aggressive policy in order to prevent the pollution of our water supply and our air.

It was thought, at one time, that an inexhaustible supply of water permitted us to be careless and reckless. We have learned that water for human consumption as well as for industrial and farm use must be carefully nurtured and kept clean.

Air pollution presents a real danger to the health of our people. The State must begin—at least—to authorize the entry into compacts between community air pollution groups in Ohio and those of other States.

CONSERVATION

Although we do not deal in the intangibles of research, conservation, too, is a program that needs more vision and stimulation through education.

We must husband our resources. We know that they are not inexhaustible. We know by our population growth that the need for them will become greater with each succeeding generation.

Consequently, great care must be exercised in the preservation of our forests, our water supply and the recreational facilities that continue to disappear rapidly before the onrush of the human elements in civilization.

Hunting and fishing and boating have served as instruments to create a greater awareness of our fight for conservation.

I propose that we proceed as quickly as possible to acquire the 40,000 to 50,000 acres in Ohio practically abandoned as a result of being despoiled before the adoption of our strip mining law. This land serves as a depressing influence on the valuation of surrounding property.

Over a period of time, we can, after acquiring this land for little or nothing, reclaim forests and restore it for future generations.

We can envision great recreational uses for this land which is now lying idle, ugly, and wasted.

Not only do I recommend acquisition of this despoiled property, but I would invite the contribution to the state of any property which, in size, would lend itself to future development.

In order to prevent recurrence of the conditions that made this situation possible, I would advocate the review of the strip mining law and use of the fees collected for reclamation purposes only.

LABOR

The labor-management relationship in a State such as Ohio plays a leading role in determining whether that State will continue to grow. We must, whenever possible, encourage labor and management to resolve their day to day differences without resort to industrial warfare.

We must, whenever possible, contribute to the more mature relationship that exists when each realizes his responsibilities to the other party in the contractual relationship.

We must encourage labor and management to recognize that their paramount interest is to the public welfare.

In this necessary economic marriage, the more the parties help each other in the resolution of economic problems resulting from maladjustments, the less the burden will be on the public generally.

SUPPLEMENTAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

I feel that when labor and management, through collective bargaining, arrive at an agreement which is not contrary to the general welfare, these agreements should be interpreted liberally.

They should be encouraged and given incentive rather than being halted, interfered with, and made more difficult.

The law covering existing contracts under which labor and management have agreed to establish a fund to supplement unemployment benefits should be clarified as soon as possible.

There should be no question as to their legality.

The benefits of this progressive innovation should be made available to the people of Ohio at the earliest possible moment. Unemployment compensation on the State level must keep pace with increased cost of living. The status of the trust fund is such that if we are to fulfill the minimum requirements, as originally intended by law, we cannot indulge in extreme revisions of the benefit schedule.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

It is better to give some protection to all than to dissipate the fund quickly.

We must expand the benefits derived from workmen's compensation. The workman and his family must not be penalized as a result of injury over which he had no control and which results in the loss of his earning ability either permanently or temporarily.

Death benefits must be increased in order that dependent children might be protected in the legitimate aspirations that were those of the parents while the breadwinner was still alive.

The revision of the law in order to provide statistically for the possible influences of inflation in the future, insofar as awards for permanent disability, is also a necessity that must be anticipated at this time.

In this revision, provision must be made for the permanently totally injured worker of the preinflation days whose limited income now makes him a recipient of relief and a burden on society in general.

Thought must be given to including the total cost of administration of the program as part of the expense chargeable to the fund rather than to taxation generally.

ANTIRACKETEERING

The last point on this subject is the adoption of legislation designed to punish those individuals who violate a position of trust for selfish purposes.

There is no room in a decent labor movement for racketeers of any kind. The large number of respectable people who lead their fellow workers along legitimate organizational lines, seeking to protect their economic interest as well as the public, must have their reputation protected by the elimination of men whose only purpose is to serve themselves.

This cannot be left to the labor groups themselves, for their best weapon is suspension of an organization, leaving that organization free to continue its preying upon the public generally and the membership which, of necessity, remains a part of the suspended group.

Although most elements of organized labor, under its present leadership, is doing a commendable job in ridding its own ranks of these venal leaders, there is no guarantee that the present leaders will not be replaced or that the new leaders will have the same high motives.

This is a matter that must be handled by law and, regardless of what the Congress might do, there is no reason for the State of Ohio to wait.

We must act and act now.

HIGHWAYS

So-called crash programs are extravagant and wasteful. It is our purpose to continue a highway program which will meet the present and future needs of the State on a pay-as-you-go basis. Emphasis will be

placed on the safety of the traveling public, elimination of traffic bottlenecks and the maintenance of a balanced system which will not neglect a part of the system in favor of another.

The financial picture at the present time is clouded. We hope that by the time we send up the budget message, it will be clear enough to give the assembly a sound program.

PUBLIC UTILITY RATES

There has been a great deal of controversy over the existing formula for setting rates for public utility services. We will present a revision of this formula which will be designed to be fair to the consumer and, at the same time, provide a reasonable return for the investor.

Regardless of what formula is used, the essence in any system designed to protect the public must rest in a department staffed and able to present the public view whenever an increase of rates is before it.

It might be well, in this instance, to place greater reliance on the reorganization of the public utility division through improved administrative procedures than on a system of ratemaking which can prove ineffective if a utility's case is to be made by highly skilled and highly paid representatives in opposition to a poorly prepared statement on behalf of the public.

CIVIL RIGHTS

It is my hope that the 103d general assembly will be the one to bring to the people of Ohio a complete guarantee that the constitutional provisions for the civil rights of all individuals be implemented and given life by the creation of a commission which will have complete powers of mediation, conciliation and proper enforcement authority when education and other methods have failed. There is no valid reason to wait any longer. This is again an area in which we should have action now.

MENTAL HYGIENE

Much has been said on the subject of the treatment of our mentally ill. Setting aside the debate that goes on constantly, here, too, the difficulty rests in the improper emphasis on the program. We need people, trained people, skilled people—psychologists and psychiatrists and nurses. In order to obtain them, we need funds and we need training programs. Yet, I would not ask these funds to be provided until we have demonstrated that the administration of the department is improved, that reasonable standards have been established, that the elementary care of persons and property are being provided. This, too, will be treated more fully in a special message dealing with the legislative needs of this program.

PUBLIC HEALTH

In a State such as Ohio, there cannot be two types of programs for the protection of health. The health of our citizens is certainly as precious in our less populated districts as it is in those with higher densities of population.

Our health program must proceed from the basic, fundamental principle, that its purpose is to protect public health and to act against contagion and elements that may result in danger to health whenever it might exist. The legislative program of the Department of Health is a reasonable one and one that I believe will merit your support.

LIBRARIES

Nothing—no one single endeavor—contributes more to the cultural development of our citizens, young and old, than the public library system. We should, in every way possible, attempt to extend uniform library service throughout the State.

AID FOR THE AGED

The present $65-a-month ceiling imposed on old-age assistance is unrealistic. We must remove this artificial barrier which has no relation to reason or practicality and establish old-age assistance on a needs basis.

We will begin the administrative work necessary to establish the program. With your help, it is our hope that we can put the new system into effect with the beginning of the coming biennium or shortly thereafter.

EDUCATION

As our population continues to grow—creating the need for more classrooms and more teachers—we must begin an orderly reassessment of the part the State must share with local communities in the support of an educational program at all levels.

We can no longer continue to improvise from session to session.

We must become definite as to the State's responsibility. We will have some specific recommendations in the budget message.

STATE OF OHIO SCHOLARSHIP ENDOWMENT FUND

We do propose, at this time, the establishment of a State of Ohio Scholarship Endowment Fund, with trustees to be appointed from all segments of our economy.

The fund would be financed in part from public subscription and the balance would be contributed from public funds by the State of Ohio.

The ultimate objective of this fund would be 1,000 scholarships a year, to be awarded on a merit basis. The trustees will write the rules, changing the type of scholarship to be awarded at their discretion in anticipation of the needs of our society at a particular time.

These scholarships will be in the amounts determined by the trustees, but limited to the amount earned by the investment of the capital account. The objective will be to raise the capital account to $20 million in the space of 10 years with the State providing 25 percent of the total amount over this period of time.

This will provide a continuing source of the talents needed by the citizens of Ohio and make available to worthy individuals an education which they might otherwise not be able to obtain.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Here again is a subject that needs a new approach. No longer must we consider that we are subsidizing our local political subdivisions. We must either give them the right and authority to finance their own government or to spell out the services primarily rendered by local governments on behalf of the State as a whole.

Once having ascertained what these services are, then we must arrive at a formula for compensation for those services. We will offer specific suggestions and hope that, with your cooperation, we will find a final answer to this ever vexing problem.

LAW AND ORDER

In addition to the legislation proposed regarding certain labor-management practices, I propose the strengthening of our criminal code. I recommend enactment of a law making it a conspiracy, punishable as a felony, for two or more people to enter into agreements to conduct gambling ventures, prostitution, and the sale of narcotics.

Included as a party to such conspiracy will be those public officials who participate by becoming a part of such agreements.

No longer can we continue to take the petty gambler who fronts for a syndicate, punish him with a nominal fine or a few days in the workhouse, while permitting individuals who profit most from this enterprise to sit in the background and reap their unlawful harvest.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

The State of Ohio is achieving maturity. We have been a State since 1803. During this period, we have used capital punishment in an attempt to deter the murderer. Year after year, we electrocute, and in the past, we have taken to the gallows, individuals charged and convicted of the crime of murder.

But murder continues as a crime, along with robbery, burglary, and all the related ills of organized society.

I would recommend the repeal of the death penalty in Ohio and substitute life imprisonment—without hope, without parole, without pardon.

I believe that the State, by its refusal to take the life of a human being, would be setting an example of proper morality which would serve its citizens in good stead. I will present a special message on this subject completely covering the history of it and further reasons for this position.

In conclusion, I want to discuss the State employee. If we are to provide efficiency in our government, intelligence in its administration and courage in carrying out its responsibilities, we must have dedicated public servants and public employees.

If the State should be left in a position where only those that cannot obtain other employment find themselves in the category of career public servants, the purposes of democracy will be poorly served.

Consequently, I advocate the constant review of classification and proper compensation for public employees, the strengthening of the civil service and greater adherence to the concept that public employment and public service is a sacred and integral part of society.

We are awaiting anxiously the report on classification and suggested State employee policy now being prepared by a subcommittee of the legislative service commission. My preliminary information on this indicates that a sound and thorough study has been made and that the report will map out a pattern of procedure which will be beneficial for many years to come.

I hope that this may be the beginning of a development of morale and pride on the part of the State employee which will assure the State of their undivided loyalty and service.

In this achievement, I hope you will agree with me in the need for legislation that will spell out clearly the public employees' undivided obligation to his public trust and the writing in law what certainly ought to be our ethical and moral obligation in not engaging in an activity for profit or for friendship which conflicts with a person's obligation to his public employment.

We cannot permit a conflict of interest to exist with the public employees if we are to attain the highest degree of efficiency and responsibility.

Thank you for your kindness in giving me the opportunity to be with you today. There will be other messages, on other subjects, in the future.

In deliberating the recommendations made to you today, there will be differences of opinion. There will be differences as to the need or timing of these proposals. When those disagreements are present, let us conduct ourselves in the debate with an earnest desire to inform the public of the reason for our varying positions. Let us not permit the greater areas of agreement to be clouded by the violence of the smaller clouds of disagreement.

We shall continue to work together in that service to which we are committed; the building of a better state for all.

Sellers' Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting analysis and a suggestion for dealing with inflationary depression has come across my desk. It is the work of Prof. Abba P. Lerner of the Department of Political Economy, Johns Hopkins University. It will serve us well if it only stimulates our thinking about this important problem.

The analysis follows:

SELLERS' INFLATION: AN ANALYSIS AND A SUGGESTION FOR DEALING WITH INFLATIONARY DEPRESSION

(By Abba P. Lerner, Department of Political Economy, Johns Hopkins University)

The United Automobile Aircraft and Agricultural Workers of America (or the UAW) International Union, has invited the three big automobile corporations to take a first step in checking the inflationary process from which our economy is suffering. Not unnaturally, the corporations have in effect replied, "After you, my dear Alphonse." In its invitation the UAW has pointedly concentrated on the prices set by the corporations for motor cars and in their replies the corporations have pointedly concentrated on the price or wage demanded by the UAW for labor, and the level of politeness will no doubt deteriorate rapidly as the debate continues. Nevertheless, the proposals and counterproposals must be recognized as something more than sparrings for better future bargaining positions. They clearly demonstrate three phenomena of the first importance: (1) A genuine concern, on both sides, with the dangers of inflation; (2) a readiness, again on both sides, to cooperate in checking the inflation (provided that such cooperation is not exploited and diverted for the benefit of the other side); and (3), perhaps the most important, a recognition, once more by both sides, that the inflation we have upon us is based not on competition by buyers trying to buy more of everything than can be supplied, but on pressure by sellers asking for higher prices.

A NEW KIND OF INFLATION

Others also have recognized that our current inflation is not the more familiar and more thoroughly investigated kind that is caused by excess buyers' demand—by too much money chasing too few goods—by buyers bidding up prices in trying to get more goods than the economy is able to supply. President Eisenhower recognized this in making his appeal to labor and to business to help the fight against inflation by exercising restraint and refraining from demanding higher wages and prices.

If our inflation were indeed caused by excess buyers' demand, not only would the UAW proposals and the corporations' rejoinders be without interest, but President Eisenhower's appeal would be pointless. Free market prices would still be bid up by competing buyers, and sellers who exercised restraint would merely be making presents to the buyers (who would often even be able to resell at the higher free market prices). Such an inflation could be cured only by removing the excess buyers' demand via the well-known policies of tight money and restrictive fiscal measures, and the restraint called for by President Eisenhower would be unnecessary. If inflation in general could be caused only by excess demand for goods by buyers, restraint by sellers (of products or of labor) would always be irrelevant. In the presence of excess demand by buyers restraint by sellers would be ineffective, and in the absence of excess demand by buyers restraint by sellers would be unnecessary.

But excess demand by buyers is not the only possible cause of inflation, and our inflation is not the kind that is caused by excess demand by buyers. This is shown by the failure of our output to keep up with our growing productive capacity. It does not seem to be the case at all that we are unable to supply the current overall demand for goods and services. On the contrary, we are able to supply more than is being demanded of almost everything, and efforts by sellers to persuade the public to buy are as strenuous as ever (though they hardly ever take the form of lowering prices, or we would not be suffering from our inflation). Prices are rising not because of the pressure of buyers who are finding it difficult to buy. Prices are rising because of pressures by sellers who insist on increasing prices (even though they are finding it not so easy to sell). We may say that we have not a buyer-induced inflation but a seller-induced inflation—or more briefly, we have not a buyers' inflation but a sellers' inflation. That is why restraint, or the absence of restraint, by sellers in raising the prices they ask is of the essence, and President Eisenhower's appeal for restraint is far from pointless. (Whether the appeal is or can be effective in bringing about the restraint is quite another question).

INFLATION WITHOUT EXCESS DEMAND

It should be noted that in this suggested terminology the word "inflation" is used in its popular meaning of a state of affairs in which prices are rising. Some economists (including myself) have extended the word to cover all cases of excess demand (which is what causes the price increases of a demand inflation or buyers' inflation) even where prices do not rise, in spite of the excess demand, because price control of some kind prevents them from rising. This switch of the meaning of the word "inflation"' from a state of rising prices to a state of excess demand seemed perfectly legitimate, as well as very enlightening, as long as excess demand was believed to be the only force that could cause prices to rise. It helped economists to point out that the damage done by excess demand was not avoided by suppressing the rising prices. The rising prices are only the result, or the symptom, of the underlying cause—the excess demand which would have caused prices to rise if it were not for the price control.

INFLATION WITH DEPRESSION

But if sellers' inflation is possible as well as buyers' inflation, it is not such a good idea to use the word "inflation" to stand for excess demand. That use of language tends to suggest that if there is no inflation in the sense of excess demand, there can be no inflation in the sense of rising prices. It leaves us with no way of describing the kind of situation in which we find ourselves today. Prices are rising because of upward pressure by sellers, and the authorities, in endeavoring to stop the inflation, have taken steps which have been very effective in removing excess demand, but which have not removed the upward pressure on prices from the sellers' side. Indeed these measures of budgetary restraint and tight money have been so effective in removing excess demand that they have overdone this and removed some demand that was not in excess. They have brought about a condition of deficient demand, so that there has not been enough demand to enable us to make full use of our productive potential (and the visible appearance of symptoms of recession has even led to a slight loosening of the tight money policy). Nevertheless, prices keep on rising. The net result is that we are now suffering at the same time from both inflation and depression—prices are rising and at the same time we are not fully utilizing our available labor force and productive potential.

This appears paradoxical only because of our habit of using one word, "inflation," to represent two different things, rising prices and excess demand, that do not necessarily have to go together in the actual world. It is only our inadequate language, a bad speech habit, that makes us think of them as necessarily together so that we have a feeling of paradox when we observe them departing from each other. We are like my son when, as a baby, he first saw our kittens move away from their suckling mother. He cried out in consternation, "Look, Mummy, the cat broke." When he had added the word "kitten" to his vocabulary he was better able to deal with reality because he was then able to speak of the cat without assuming that the kittens were included and he was able to talk about kittens without talking of the cat. In just the same way we will be able to deal more effectively with reality if we stop saying inflation when we mean excess demand and stop saying excess demand when we meaning rising prices.

This will not prevent us from pointing out the evils of excess demand that remain, or are even aggravated, when price controls prevent present prices from rising—thus suppressing or repressing the inflation. We can do this quite simply and directly in terms of the bad effects of excess demand and price control, without calling this condition inflation, keeping that word to be used only to describe a condition of rising prices, whether the rising prices are caused by excess demand or by anything else.

INFLATION IS INFLATION

Many influential people still seem to argue as if the only kind of inflation possible is demand inflation (which I am here calling buyers' inflation). Although they cannot deny that they see excesses of potential supply much more often than they see excesses of buyers' demand, they insist that "There ain't no such animal" as sellers' inflation. They declare that "inflation is inflation" and they sternly dismiss all talk about a new kind of inflation that does not respond to the orthodox treatment of monetary and fiscal restrictions as diversionary tricks by naughty children who are trying to dodge their medicine.

CREEPING INFLATION CAN LEARN TO GALLOP

Unfortunately, such sternness is only too understandable. Some of the economists who were early to recognize the nature of sellers' inflation have been so impressed by the impossibility of dealing with it by the orthodox instruments of monetary and fiscal policy that they have capitulated to the temptation of dallying with mild or moderate inflation as part of an acceptable policy. The orthodox economists quite rightly point out that such a capitulation is indefensible either on moral or on practical grounds. Even a mild inflation accumulates, at compound interest and robs pensioners, fixed income receivers, and many other unfortunate victims, while it sabotages the proper calculations and accountings necessary for wise economic decisions. In time many of these faults could be corrected by institutional adjustments to a mild inflation, but to keep the inflation mild is more difficult than to prevent the inflation from starting in the first place, or to stop it before it gets less mild. The very same reasons for accepting a creeping inflation instead of maintaining price stability would apply with greater vigor for changing from a creeping to a walking inflation. Still stronger would be the pressures for changing from a walking to a running inflation and proportionately more powerful would be the forces turning a running inflation into a galloping one. Stability is a much more defensible position against inflation than is creeping against walking or

walking against running. This is a case where retreat only induces further retreat. Firmness is required and not appeasement.

RECOGNITION IS NOT APPEASEMENT

But the naughtiness of appears of inflation does not in the least diminish the importance of recognizing the existence of sellers' inflation, for it is not the recognition of the existence of the disease called sellers' inflation that opens the gates to the enemy. On the contrary, it is the denial of its existence, and the attempts to treat it with the inappropriate medicines that work only on buyers' inflation, that is so dangerous. The belief that the medicines appropriate for buyers' inflation are the only medicines available (because inflation is inflation just as fever is fever), when joined with the discovery that these do not work, gives rise to defeatism and appeasement. A clear recognition of the nature of sellers' inflation is the prerequisite for finding the medicine that can cure it, or better still the vaccine that would prevent it.

COST INFLATION AND PROFIT INFLATION—THE CHICKEN AND THE EGG

Another reason for reluctance to recognize sellers' inflation is that it has often been called cost inflation or cost-push inflation or wage-cost inflation and has given the impression that the whole of the blame for it falls on labor or on trade unions. When trade unions raise wages by more than can be absorbed by increasing productivity, costs rise. The employer then seems to be completely innocent of "profit inflation" in passing on the increase in costs as long as he does not increase his rate of markup, i.e. as long as he does not increase the prices he charges for the product in a greater proportion than his costs have increased.

There is, however, no essential asymmetry between the wage element and the profit element in the price asked for the product. A sellers' inflation could just as well be started by an increase not in the wage asked but in the percentage of markup of price above cost. Prices would rise and wages would then be raised by workers in attempts to maintain (or restore) their original buying power. Business would then "innocently" raise their prices again only in proportion to the increase in their costs, and we would have the inflation upon us as well as boring discussions about who started it first and the famous chicken and egg.

TRYING FOR MORE THAN 100 PERCENT

The "who started it first" debate is a complete waste of time because there is no original situation in which there was a "just" or "normal" distribution of the product between wages and profits. Any increase can be seen either as the disturbance which bears the full responsibility for the inflation, or as nothing but the correction of an inequity perpetrated in previous history—all depending on the point of view. The term "sellers' inflation", by treating wages and profits on exactly the same footing, avoids the fruitless game of mutual recrimination. Sellers' inflation takes place whenever wage earners and profit takers together attempt to get shares that amount to more than 100 percent of the selling price. When the sum of what they try to get comes to more than 100 percent of the selling price, it is futile to ask whether this is because the wages demanded are too high or whether it is because the profits insisted on are too great. No matter where justice may lie between the two claims, the only significant thing for our problem is that the sum of the claims is more than 100 percent. That is what causes the inflation.

It is of course impossible for the two parties to succeed in getting more than 100 percent of the proceeds between them, but it is precisely on an impossibility such as this that any continuing process depends. Buyers' inflation is similarly built on an attempt to reach the impossible. In that case it is the attempt of buyers to buy more than 100 percent of the goods that can be made available. There attempt bids up prices, but since that does not (and cannot) succeed in enabling them to obtain more than 100 percent of the goods that there are available to be got, they continue the attempt and we have the continuing process of buyers' inflation. In our case the impossibility that generates the process is the attempt of wage earners and profit takers between them to get more than 100 percent of the money proceeds from the sale of the product. Each increases the part he tries to take, by increasing wages or by increasing prices. Since they cannot succeed, they keep on raising wages and prices and so we have the continuing process of sellers' inflation.

OBJECTIONS TO SELLERS' INFLATION

1. There must have been excess demand

The resistance to recognizing the possibility of sellers' inflation sometimes takes the form of saying that there must have been some excess buyers' demand or prices could not have risen. This begs the whole question since it assumes, without apparently thinking it necessary to provide any support for the assumption, that the only possible cause of rising prices is excess buyers' demand, the argument assumes what it wants to prove.

2. There has been an increase in spending

A more sophisticated version of this argument points out that if output shrinks by less than the increase in prices, and this is usually the case during a sellers' inflation, there must have been an increase in the total amount spent in buying the output. The arithmetically irrefutable increase in expenditure is then triumphantly exhibited as the excess buyers' demand that is responsible for the inflation. Expenditure is the same thing as buyers' demand, but an increase in expenditure is not the same thing as excess buyers' demand. An increase is not the same thing as an excess. An excess of demand by buyers induces the price increases—it is the cause of the price increases. An increase in expenditure could be induced by—it could be the result of the increases in prices brought about by the pressure of sellers. If there is no increase in expenditure the number of units of goods bought must fall in the same proportion as the price per unit is raised by the sellers. A 10 percent increase in prices would thus result in a fall in output of about 10 percent. This involves depression and unemployment that the authorities naturally seek to remedy by monetary and fiscal measures. Such remedies all involve increases in money expenditure, so that even if only a part of the unemployment is corrected (and this is usually the case because of the authorities' reluctance to undertake inflationary measures when prices are rising), we would observe an increase in total expenditure. Buyers' demand, however, instead of being excessive, could still be deficient, i.e., it could still be insufficient to enable the potential output of the economy to be sold (at the prices demanded by the sellers). An observed increased in total expenditure is therefore no proof that the price rise is due to excess buyers' demand. The increase in expenditure could have been induced by attempts by the authorities to keep down unemployment induced by price increases imposed by the sellers. In a sellers' inflation an increase in expenditure is perfectly compatible with deficient buyers' demand.

3. Demand was not held down enough

A still more sophisticated argument along the same lines goes on to claim that even if prices are being raised by the insistence of sellers rather than by the pressure of buyers, the orthodox measures of reducing total demand would still check the inflation. By reducing total expenditure, or perhaps by merely refusing to permit the increase in total expenditure needed to accommodate the increased prices, the authorities would bring about depression and unemployment. This would stop the sellers from increasing prices. The question then resolves itself into how much unemployment would be necessary to stop the sellers' inflation, and whether it is morally desirable or politically possible for the authorities to induce or permit unemployment of the required volume and duration. This is a much more respectable argument, but before we can consider it more fully it would be desirable to get a perspective on the whole problem by a quick look at the general theory of inflation and deflation.

FOUR THEORETICAL MODELS

A. The classical model

A somewhat schematic formulation of the development of thought on this subject shows four theoretical models.

Model A assumes perfectly flexible prices and wages, so that any excess of buyers' demand makes prices and wages rise, and any deficiency of buyers' demand (through the unemployment that results) makes prices and wages fall, until price stability and full employment are restored. Monetary and fiscal policy is unimportant. As long as the volume of money is kept fairly stable by some automatic device such as the gold standard, the price level will automatically adjust itself so as to yield full employment with price stability and without inflation.

B. The Keynesian model

Model B embodies the recognition that we do not have the degree of price flexibility in the downward direction to make complete laissez faire a satisfactory monetary and fiscal policy. Unemployment does not reduce the wage and price level quickly to the level needed to restore full employment. The process is rather complex. To achieve the task unemployment must reduce the price level to the degree necessary to increase the value of the existing stock of money (as each dollar becomes more valuable) to the extent necessary to increase expenditure in real terms (as each dollar spent constitutes more real purchasing power) to the volume necessary to give a satisfactory level of employment. This process can last for years, during which time prices and wages are falling as different resistances to the reductions are gradually overcome. Meanwhile there continues an expectation of price and wage reductions still to come. This expectation induces investors as well as consumers to postpone their expenditures as long as prices are still falling, so that buyers' demand is reduced still further and the depression can get much worse before it gets better.

The recognition of the nature of such a process leads to the abandonment of laissez faire in monetary and fiscal policy. Instead of waiting for the price level to adjust itself to the volume of money expenditure, a policy is developed of adjusting the volume of money expenditure to the existing price level so as to reach and maintain a satisfactory level of employment.

This switch from laissez faire to an active monetary and fiscal policy is also applied in the opposite direction to deal with excess buyers' demand. Although there is not the same resistance to price and wage increases as there is to price and wage decreases, the necessary adjustment to excess buyers' demand by rising prices still takes time. It is no instantaneous adjustment (if only because of the existence of long-term contracts, and attempts to stop profiteering by preventing the necessary price increases) and so it causes disturbances that are unjust and reduce the efficiency of the economy. The policy is therefore applied in both directions, providing for increasing the volume of money expenditure whenever necessary to prevent an insufficiency of buyers' demand and for de-

creasing the volume of money expenditure whenever that is necessary to prevent the emergence of excess buyers' demand. The volume of expenditure may be adjusted either by working on the stock of money (by monetary policy) or by working on the velocity of circulation of money (by fiscal policy) or by some combination of the two.

Model B, which is, of course, the Keynesian general theory of employment policy, differs from model A primarily in incorporating a policy of increasing or decreasing demand if it should become too little or too great. (It has a "steering wheel" there being no rails to keep the car on the road). Because of this difference a secondary distinction arises. With policy coming into the picture it becomes important which of two instruments of policy is to be used, monetary policy or fiscal policy. Model B makes use of both instruments. (The car can use either kerosene or gasoline).

C. The anti-Keynesian models

Model C is not really a new model. It rather consists of a series of publicity releases of model B dolled up to emphasize one or another of its qualities as if this were a new invention that made model B obsolete. One very crude pamphlet of this series emphasizes the ability of Model C to cut down on demand if it becomes excessive or threatens to become excessive, seeming to imply that Model B was a depression model which could work only in the direction of increasing demand. (Model C has a steering wheel that can be turned to the right.)

A more refined variant of model C, let us call it model C*, is concerned with the relative effectiveness of monetary policy and of fiscal policy in different circumstances. An economy may be so saturated with money so that further increases in the stock of money would not be effective in increasing expenditure, and reductions in the stock would have no significant effect in reducing total expenditure. (This is sometimes expressed, though not explained, by saying that changes in the money supply would be offset by opposing changes in the velocity of circulation). Monetary policy is then useless and expenditure can be increased or decreased only by fiscal policy—by the government increasing or decreasing its own expenditure, e.g. on public works, or permitting others to spend more by reducing taxes or forcing them to spend less by increasing taxes.

It is then suggested that model B works only in this case which is called the Keynesian case. It should more properly be called Keynesian special case (of the Keynesian general theory) when it is appropriate to concentrate entirely on fiscal measures to increase or decrease expenditure on consumption and investment. (Only gasoline can be used.)

In this kind of situation even extreme price flexibility is unable to restore or maintain the desired level of real demand because it operates, after all, as nothing but a roundabout way of increasing or decreasing the real volume of money in terms of buying power. It is a kind of automatic monetary policy which is useless for the same reasons as other monetary policy is useless.

When the economy is at the other extreme from being saturated with money, and money is very tight, the situation is naturally reversed. Fiscal measures for increasing expenditure on consumption or investment are ineffective because an increase in expenditure anywhere in the economy, say in Government expenditure on public works, results in an increase in demand for money to hold in connection with the increased volume of transactions. In the very tight money situation this raises the rate of interest, or in some other way reduces expenditure somewhere else. Similarly, a decrease in expenditure anywhere releases holdings of money which permit an increase of expenditure somewhere else. Fiscal policy then is helpless, and what is called for is monetary policy to increase or decrease the money supply. (Only kerosene can be used.) This case is then called the classical case, as if it were one in which the Keynesian theory does not apply and where model B should be replaced by model C* (which uses kerosene instead of gasoline). This case should more properly be called the classical special case (of the Keynesian general theory). Since the Keynesian theory (model B) covers both situations in which fiscal policy is strategic (when model B uses gasoline) and situations in which monetary policy is strategic (when model B uses kerosene) as well as the more normal situations when both policies are effective (when model B can make use of both fuels, mixing the proportions to suit the terrain).

D. The sellers' inflation model

Model D is a genuinely different model in which unemployment not only fails to make prices and wages fall quickly enough but is even unable to prevent them from continuing to rise. When we have strong trade unions with the power to raise wages, strong corporations with the power to set prices administratively, and a general atmosphere in which it is considered normal, natural, and only fair for wages to be increased regularly, and by amounts greater than the average increase in productivity or in the share of the product that labor can obtain, prices increase, and the economy is subject to sellers' inflation. It is now no longer a question of whether fiscal policy or monetary policy is more effective in regulating the volume of buyers' demand or expenditure, since the inflation is caused not by excess buyers' demand but by the existence of powerful institutions and mores that enable sellers to insist on and obtain continually higher prices. The widespread and generous feeling that workers are entitled to the increases in wages that they get is made much easier by a recognition that any raise need not be taken out of profits, since it is possible, as well as proper, to pass it along to the ultimate purchaser in higher prices. Indeed, it is usually considered only right that profits, in dollars, should be increased so as to protect real profits from the declining value of the dollar.

DEPRESSION AS A CURE

We have already mentioned the argument that a really firm refusal on the part of the monetary authorities to prevent the volume of money from increasing, no matter what happened, would bring the sellers to their senses. Realizing, or discovering, that they will not be able to sell so much if they raise their prices, they will refrain from raising prices and they will not grant, or ask for, wage increases that raise costs by more than can be squeezed out of profits.

There are several reasons why this is not practical. In the first place, the policy of firmly or obstinately holding the money supply constant does not prevent excess buyers' demand from coming about. It does not even prevent an increase in total expenditure. This is because this policy is essentially a kind of monetary policy and we may be in the Keynesian special case where monetary policy is not effective. That we are at the present time in such a situation is suggested by the fact that while the supply of money has been held fairly stable in recent years, the volume of expenditure has continually increased. (Another way of expressing this, which is more common, perhaps, because it sounds like an explanation, is to say that the velocity of circulation has increased and that this has frustrated the restrictive monetary policy.)

HOW MUCH DEPRESSION WOULD BE NEEDED?

There is, of course, a limit to the degree to which expenditure can increase without an accompanying increase in the money stock, and if the inflation were a buyers' inflation it would come to an end when this limit was reached (i.e., when the velocity of circulation could not increase any more). But where the inflation is a sellers' inflation it does not stop at that point. After the increase in prices has absorbed all the increase in expenditure that is compatible with a constant money stock (i.e., that can be attributed to any increase in the velocity of circulation), it continues to increase. The increase in prices goes on further until it has reduced real expenditure and employment sufficiently to overcome the institutional forces that enable sellers to demand higher and higher prices. The question is how strong are these institutions? or, in other words, how severe a state of depression and unemployment would have to be maintained in order to destroy these institutions or to induce sellers not to use their power to raise prices; and how able and willing the authorities would be to bring about and maintain this degree of depression and unemployment?

An interesting indication of the strength of the most important element in the setup—the general feeling of the propriety and inevitability of continuing wage and cost increases (to be passed on in increased prices) is provided in the very debate about automobile prices and wages with which this article begins. The UAW had asked the automobile corporations to reduce the prices of their 1958 automobiles to $100 below the 1957 prices in return for the UAW promising to take this into consideration when presenting their 1958 demands for wage increases. In rejecting this suggestion the largest of the corporations put forward a countersuggestion which must clearly be considered as an extreme position, leaving some room for retreat (i.e., for conceding bigger increases in wages) in the forthcoming negotiations. This unrealistically extreme proposal, made, it must be remembered, in the course of a debate in which everyone is deeply concerned with the dangers of inflation, includes the continuation of the present contract which (apart from a cost of living adjustment) calls for a regular wage increase of 2½ percent per annum. This is more than the average increase in output per head in the American economy, so that there is a significant piece of sellers' inflation right at the lower end of the range subject to negotiation.

In such an atmosphere it would require, one would think, a quite severe depression to change people's notions of what is the proper development of wage rates and of the corresponding prices (since the right of wages to increase goes together with the right of profits at least not to fall). It would take perhaps an even more severe level of unemployment to destroy the power of labor to force the wage increases on more reluctant employers who grant wage increases only when they feel they are forced to—i.e., that they would lose more from the strikes and other weapons of the trade unions than they would lose by agreeing to the higher wages (and passing them on).

At the same time a policy of full employment seems to have won a firm place in the country's economic policy, not only because of the general acceptance of the desirability of prosperity, for human as well as for international political reasons, but because neither political party can afford the blame for even a mild depression. With such a setup there is no need to worry whether the cure is worse than the disease—whether the depression would be more harmful than the inflation that it would prevent. This cure is not one than any government would carry out or even seriously attempt to carry out.

This brings us to yet another objection to the sellers' inflation analysis.

A firm policy was not announced

It has been suggested that even if the authorities are not really prepared to bring

about the degree of depression necessary to negate the pressure of sellers' inflation, they could still do the trick by solemnly announcing a policy of refusing to provide the increase in expenditure called for by a continuing sellers' inflation. The threatened unemployment would then sober the sellers into calling off their inflationary wage and price increases.

It seems to me pretty certain first that such declarations would not be believed and that the bluff would quickly be called, and secondly, even if it were believed as regards the economy as a whole, that would not prevent any specific wages or prices from being raised while the local conditions still permitted this. It would perhaps even aggravate the wage and price increases as each tried to get his increase quickly while the local going was still good.

YOU CAN'T STOP SELLERS BY BULLYING BUYERS

All this brings us to the perhaps only too obvious conclusion that sellers' inflation cannot be cured or prevented by measures directed against excess demand by buyers. It can be successfully treated only by attacking the pressure on prices by sellers.

THE CURE MUST BE FAIR

The present debate in the automobile industry indicates where the solution may be found.

In an outstanding article which concentrates on showing the inadequacy and superficiality of proposals to prevent inflation by monetary and fiscal policies and declarations, Prof. Sumner H. Slichter seems to suggest that the distinction between buyers' inflation and sellers' inflation is a futile fantasy. Thus he says (using somewhat different terminology): "Much time has been wasted in recent years in discussing whether inflation is demand-inspired or cost-inspired. (Some 70 or 80 years ago the Austrian theory of value produced a similar debate as to whether demand or cost determines the value; the argument ended suddenly when it dawned on the economists that each blade in a pair of scissors cuts.)" ("On the Side of Inflation," Harvard Business Review, September–October 1957, p. 32.)

However, the inapplicability of this analogy jumps to the eye in his very next sentence which shows that it can make sense to distinguish between the blades, since he goes on to say "Thus changes in the price level may originate either with shifts in the demand schedules or with shifts in the supply schedules," and in another article, Professor Slichter definitely alines himself with the sellers' inflation blade in declaring that "There is no evidence that prices are rising ahead of costs and are pulling costs up. The evidence is all the other way: that prices are being sluggishly adjusted to slowly rising costs." ("Government Spending Can Reduce Taxes," Harvard Business Review, July–August 1957, p. 106.)

Workers feel that if they exercise restraint in their wage demands this would only increase the residual going to profits, while employers feel that if they should lower the price they charge for the product, wages would not be reduced proportionately, so that, instead of a general benefit from the avoidance of inflation with everybody gaining and nobody losing, there would be an unjustified or even an intolerable transference from profits to wages.

This was admirably brought out by the Ford Company which, in its reply to the UAW, turned the UAW proposal completely around and proposed, with more sarcasm than seriousness, that "if you will accept an immediate reduction in wages to the prevailing level at the introduction of our 1957 models, we will take this into consideration in determining how much we will increase prices in our 1958 models." In effect each says "you take the first step and trust me to play fair and do my part too." Such invitations are as futile as invitations for unilateral disarmament in another field—and for the same reason: neither party trusts the other not to exploit the opportunity offered to him. Agreement can be reached, if at all, only if there is a clear definition of what is to be done by both parties, and if neither party will lose, but both gain from a fair arrangement.

In the negotiations that take place between employers and labor, agreements are reached which are both clearly defined and mutually agreeable. But in the course of reaching such agreements the objective we are concerned with here—the avoidance of inflation—is lost. Both sides recognize that everybody would be better off if inflationary increases in all wages and in all profits were avoided. Real wages and real profits would be not lower but even higher to the degree that the efficiency of the economy was saved from inflationary damage. But each party tries to increase or to protect his share by asking for more money for himself and not by insisting on less money for others. Each party is, furthermore, represented by negotiators who have to show they are earning their keep by pressing as hard as possible to increase their party's share, so that there is a balance of upward pressure on the prices demanded. The result is sellers' inflation.

SELLERS' INFLATION RESTS ON ADMINISTERED PRICES

This does not happen on a perfectly competitive market because on a perfectly competitive market we cannot have the institutions and mores that give sellers the power to push prices up. On a perfectly competitive market all that is needed for stability of the price level is a monetary and fiscal policy to keep buyers' demand from becoming either excessive or deficient. No one holds back any product from the market—or can establish a price which results in some of the potential product or the available labor not being taken off the market, so that unless there is excess buyers' demand prices cannot rise, and if there is a deficient buyers' demand prices must fall. Unless there is full utilization of resources we cannot have inflation, and if there is a depression (or recession) we will have deflation (i.e. falling prices). In a perfectly competitive economy we cannot have inflation and depression at the same time.

But where prices are administered by decrees of large firms, and wages are administered by point decrees of powerful unions together with powerful employers or employer groups, the situation is different. Sellers' inflation is a byproduct of the process, and together with sellers' inflation we can also have depression—indeed we will have depression with our sellers' inflation if the authorities try to cure the inflation by reducing ("excess") demand.

These byproducts of administered wages and prices have important similarities to, and are no less socially harmful than, the monopolistic exploitation that would result from the administration of excessive prices by public utilities. We have gone a long way toward eliminating the latter evil by the regulation of prices that may be set by public utilities for the services they supply. The same kind of device can be used to eliminate the former evil. Just as the public utility prices can be and are being regulated so as to prevent monopolistic exploitation, so administered prices and wages can and should be regulated so as to prevent sellers' inflation and the depression it may bring with it.

ADMINISTERED PRICES MUST BE REGULATED

The regulation of administered prices and wages so as to prevent sellers' inflation would have to follow somewhat different lines. It would not be directly concerned as to whether there is more than or less than a fair rate of return on investments. That would be left to the strong competitive forces that still prevail in our economy. Nor would any other regulations whatsoever be involved other than price regulation. The function of the regulation here proposed would be only to prevent restrictive prices or wages from being administered. A restrictive price is one that results in the demand for a product falling below capacity output. A restrictive wage is one that results in less than full employment in the specific labor market to which it applies. With a monetary and fiscal policy concentrating on the maintenance of adequate buyers' demand for full employment at a constant price level, while preventing buyers' inflation, it would be possible for wages per hour to rise on the average at the same rate as productivity per hour, with aggregate profits rising too at the same pace as aggregate wages and aggregate output (except that increases in the degree of competition, which might be induced, could reduce the share going to profits and increase the share going to labor.)

PRINCIPLES OF REGULATION

The regulatory body would therefore have to follow a set of rules which would do the following things:

1. They would permit an administered price increase only when production and sales are at capacity. Such price increases should not be withheld on accout of profits being high.

2. They would enforce decreases in administered prices whenever production and sales are significantly below capacity. A price decrease should not be waived on account of profits being low, or even negative on this item in the firm's output, as long as the price more than covers current operating costs—more strictly short period marginal costs.

3. They would permit increases in administered wages in general at a rate equal to the average trend of increase in national productivity.

4. They would permit increases in administered wages greater than this wherever the labor market is tight—with, say, less than half the national average rate of unemployment.

5. They would permit only smaller increases in administered wages, or no increases at all, where the labor market is slack—with, say, more than twice the national average rate of unemployment. (The expected continuing increase in product per head makes it possible to avoid reductions in money wages, although it is unavoidable, for price stability, that some prices must fall if others rise.)

UNSOLVED PROBLEMS

This is, of course, not a fully worked out solution ready for immediate application. There remains much to be developed—such as generally acceptable criteria of capacity of different firms and industries and generally acceptable measures of slackness or tightness in particular labor markets, or measures for dealing with possible attempts by monopolistic industries to restrict the installation of capacity if they are prevented from restricting the utilization of existing capacity. (This would bring out the existence of a specific monopoly situation that calls for treatment quite apart from the problem of inflation.) The intensification of competition which the regulation would enforce would also, in some instances, lead to the elimination of high-cost competitors. While the public would benefit from the increased efficiency of the economy—in higher wages and lower prices—such elimination of competition would conflict with certain existing so-called antitrust policies that have become in effect anticompetition policies and need to be reconsidered.

There remain also important problems of organization and administration of the regulatory body as well as the need for wide-

spread and intensive public discussion to bring about the familiarity with, and the understanding of, the nature of the proposed regulation which is essential for its effective operation in a democracy. And in the course of such examination and debate important developments, changes and improvements are to be expected. Nevertheless the general lines indicated seem to be inevitable if sellers' inflation is to be attacked directly and if we are not to depend on irrelevant nostrums or pious exhortation because we do not dare to attack the problem at its roots.

In anticipation of the necessary discussion I would like to make only two points.

PRICE REGULATION IS NOT PRICE CONTROL

First, it is to be expected that one of the most effective debating points against the proposal will be the charge that it means price control against which there are a thousand cogent arguments, as well as a powerful popular appeal. I would like to go on record as an opponent of price control second to none. But price regulation is not price control. There is all the world of difference between them.

Price control consists of an attempt by authority to establish a price below that which clears the market, i.e., a price so low that the amount available is insufficient to satisfy fully the demand by all the would-be buyers. At the controlled price there is therefore excess demand. Buyers try to buy more than is available for them to buy. This results in disorganized supply, waiting in line, tyranny of sellers over housewives and other buyers, selling under the counter, gray markets and black markets, evasion of and disrespect for the law, corruption and gangsterism, and finally, as a lesser evil, the installation of rationing with all of its administrative burden, economic inefficiency and public inconvenience. The original sin from which all the evils stem and to which all the objections apply is the setting of a price below that which clears the market and the consequent creation of excess demand.

Price regulation does not attempt to set a price below that which clears the market. It only prevents the public utility, or whoever else determines an administered price or wage, from setting it above the level that would clear the market at the optimum output.

In the case of public utilities the price regulation results in greater output at lower prices and a more efficient use of the resources of the economy. The owners of the public utility are indeed deprived of their opportunity to make monopoly profits, but that is more than offset by the consideration that the monopoly profit could have been obtained (in the absence of the price regulation) only at the expense of a loss to the consumers much greater than the gain to the monopolists. Since there is no attempt to set the price below the level that would clear the market, everybody can buy as much as he wants to of the product—the railway travel, the electric current or whatnot—and none of the evils of price control come into the picture.

In fact price regulation is more properly seen as the opposite of price control. The function of a price is to clear the market. Price control is bad because it interferes with this function by attempting to establish a different and lower price which does not clear the market. Price regulation restores the function of price by adjusting the price so that it does clear the market at the optimum output. It interferes only with interferences, preventing the monopolists from fixing a price above that which would clear the market at the potential supply, which is the socially most desirable supply.

In the case of the proposed regulation of administered prices and wages, the suggested rules are specifically such as would always maintain prices and wages which would clear the market at full employment with price stability. Nowhere would it result in a price or wage below that which would clear the market so that the cry of price control would in no way be any more justifiable than if raised against the established policy of regulating the price of water supply or telephone service—perhaps even less justifiable, since the regulation of the prices charged by public utilities do prevent these from obtaining monopolistic gain, while the proposed regulation of administered wages and prices would only prevent the inflation from which practically nobody gains.

APPROPRIATE REGULATION INCREASES FREEDOM

The second objection I would like to anticipate is that the regulation of administered prices and wages so as to prevent sellers' inflation is in conflict with the traditions of free competitive capitalism. It is possible that the trade unions would easily see all the social benefits from keeping the prices of products down to the level needed for capacity production and full employment, but would denounce the regulation of wages as an intolerable interference with the fundamental right of collective bargaining. It is possible that employers would quickly appreciate the desirability of curbing excessive wage demands but would reject the regulation of prices as an alien and unthinkable interference with the free economy and an impious infringement of the sacred rights of management in setting prices.

Such responses would indicate that "after you, my dear Alphonse" really means "include me out of it," or "let George do it," and we will not have the bilateral cooperation that is necessary. But if the protestations against the general evil of inflation are genuine, and each side can be satisfied with an agreed fair share of the overall benefit, we may be spared all the rhetoric.

The true interests of labor are not damaged by the trade unions' relinquishing the right to institute inflation, or even by their giving up the right to use inflation as an instrument for attempting to increase real wages at the expense of profits. The true interests of capital are not betrayed by surrendering the parallel right to start (or keep feeding) a sellers' inflation by restricting output below capacity so as to raise prices (or by raising prices where this has the effect of restricting demand and output below capacity). The justification of the free economy and its institutions rests ultimately not on any ancient divine rights but on its efficiency in satisfying the needs and the desires of a free people. The price mechanism is the central instrument for approaching such optimum output, and it does this only to the extent that the prices (including wages) are those that clear the market while corresponding to the value of the alternative products that have to be sacrificed (at the margin) in order to produce the current output of any commodity or service.

Monopolistic restriction of output, causes resources to be shifted from the production of more useful to the production of less useful goods and services. The regulation of public utility prices is justifiable because it works in the desirable direction of correcting this distortion.

Inflation damages the economy as a whole. The restriction of output that results from attempts to curb sellers' inflation by reducing buyers' expenditures is more damaging than monopolistic restriction. The latter shifts resources from producing more useful products to producing less useful products, while the former shifts resources from the production of useful products to producing nothing at all—except the human frustrations and suffering from unemployment.

The full utilization of existing capacity may sometimes lead to inadequate profits, or even to losses, but that is the nature of the competitive profit and loss system. It shows that an error was made in the past in producing too much capacity in the industry, but that is no reason for compounding the error by refusing to make use of the capacity once it has been produced. The low profits or the losses are then performing their proper function of discouraging further investment in such industries.

In other cases the prices that clear the market at full capacity output will yield very large profits. These large profits are then performing their proper function of encouraging more investment in such industries (unless there is a monopolistic restriction on such investment, which would call for antimonopoly action or price regulation in the corresponding investment industries). Just as the low profits are no excuse for monopolistic restriction of output so the high profits are no excuse for enforcing price reductions below the level which clears the market. This would be price control and is to be equally condemned whether it is imposed by government or whether it is due to "restraint" on the part of producers who are powerful enough, and rich enough, to be able to do this. If the existence of excess capacity in steel and in automobiles means that current prices are set too high, the emergence of gray and black market prices during and after World War II meant that prices were then too low. The generosity of the corporations at that time in selling too cheap (in part to privileged suppliers of the black market) is no justification for selling too dear now. A genuine defense of the free market system is not appalled at the emergence either of profits or of losses. In this spirit the proposals here made will be seen not as infringing on the principles of the competitive profit and loss system, but as protecting this system from the power of sellers to raise prices and wages above the levels compatible with full employment and price stability. He is not a true friend of free society who defends the flaws in it that permit inflation and unemployment to persist.

It has been very fashionable for some time to deplore inflation and to quote Lenin's declaration that inflation is the Achilles' heel or the Trojan horse of capitalism. Recently it has become even more fashionable to preach restraint as a remedy for inflation to parties who are unable to respond, even if willing, because they have no assurance that the others will play their part. The most recent statements by labor and management in the automobile industry include public declarations of conversion to a readiness to exercise the restraint, provided the other parties cooperate. The time has come to wind up the deploring, the quoting, the preaching, and the declarations of conversion and instead, by regulating administered prices and wages, to provide the restraint needed to protect the free economy from sellers' inflation.

Boston Chamber of Commerce Protests Transfer of Customs Processing of Inbound Foreign Parcel Post Packages From Boston to New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

wish to include a statement released by the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce on January 22, 1959:

The Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce vigorously protests the announcement of Mr. Maynard Hutchinson, collector of customs in Boston, that customs processing of inbound foreign parcel post packages will be transferred from Boston to New York.

William J. Bird, executive vice president of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce said that in August 1958, this chamber was represented by its transportation manager, Paul K. Lambert, in a conference on this matter held in the offices of the Secretary of the Treasury, Robert B. Anderson.

At that time, Treasury officials assured all Boston representatives that there would be diversion from Boston until difficulties occasioned by previous diversions from Philadephia and Baltimore had been rectified to the complete satisfaction of those communities. "Under no circumstances," Treasury officials stated, "would there be diversions from Boston without substantial advance notification thereof to this chamber of commerce and other interested organizations."

"Such notification would have permitted independent and impartial investigation by this chamber but no such notification has ever been received by the Greater Boston Chamber," Mr. Bird said.

"In his announcement, Collector Hutchinson emphasized there would be no loss of jobs in Boston. This is good, to be sure, but where are the savings of this plan to come from? Meanwhile, the good service which our importers now receive may be in jeopardy," Mr. Bird stated.

The Grab Bag of Americana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to the leading Republican newspaper of my hometown of Huntington, W. Va., the Herald-Dispatch, and under unanimous consent ask to include an editorial from the February 3 issue of the Herald-Dispatch.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to the defense of the writer of this editorial, Raymond Brewster, the able editor of the Herald-Dispatch, who has given our community outstanding service down through the years. I know that my fellow Members will not be offended by Mr. Brewster's remarks about that great grab bag of Americana, the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In defense of Mr. Brewster, I wish to state that he is basically a constructive person with a wonderful sense of humor and I trust that his remarks will be taken in a constructive spirit.

Anyone who desires to be active in public life, Mr. Speaker, must, above all, have the ability to laugh at himself and not to take himself too seriously. Congress as an institution, likewise, has survived and become stronger because its Members have not only revered the institution but have been able to take criticism of it in the proper spirit.

On the morning after election day last November, Mr. Speaker, one of the officials of the Herald-Dispatch bemoaned the fact that very few voters had followed the editorial advice of Mr. Brewster on November 4. Nevertheless, Mr. Brewster and the Herald-Dispatch are great forces in our community and I hope they will always be read carefully, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, so far as the Democratic Party in my area is concerned, if Mr. Brewster did not exist we would have to create what would be a poor substitute, I am sure.

Keeping one's constituents informed is central to the function and mission of a Member of Congress. I could not afford to buy the splendid advertising which the Herald-Dispatch continues to give me. I desire publicly to thank the Herald-Dispatch for their continuing efforts to publicize my activities on behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia.

The editorial follows:

DR. HECHLER DISCOVERS THE RECORD

The Honorable KEN HECHLER, U.S. Congressman from the West Virginia Fourth District, and a man who does not spare the written word to let his constituents know of his multiple activities, has discovered the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a bulky, verbatim account of the thousands of words uttered daily in the U.S. Congress. The Appendix is devoted largely to an extension of remarks by its Members. The word "extension" is used advisedly.

The Appendix is composed of reprinted texts of previously published syndicated columns, tributes to local luminaries, special groups, home, mother, and just endless words.

Dr. HECHLER has found the Appendix.

Probably the most important fact about the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is that it is printed with your money, at a cost of $75 per page.

Since the current session began, Dr. HECHLER has taken leave to extend his remarks on at least three occasions.

The West Virginia Congressman used more than a third of a $75 page to laud the appointment of Roger W. Jones to membership on the Civil Service Commission. It took that much space to come to the fact that "a West Virginia Democrat rises to pay tribute to a Connecticut Republican."

Dr. HECHLER's constituents who may not see the RECORD will be pleased to know that he has fought valiantly for tobacco supports. Although the intelligence previously had been conveyed from the Congressman's office, the RECORD extension on the subject is folksy and full of puns based upon cigarette slogans—for another third of a page or more.

Last Saturday Dr. HECHLER extended his remarks to recognize the Des Moines Republican strategy meeting under the title "Can the Republican Elephant Be Whitewashed?"

At the Des Moines meeting Republican leaders took a searching look at a foregone conclusion—the overwhelming defeat last fall—and discussed plans for the 1960 campaign. The problem was viewed realistically with party leaders calling for stepped-up political activity on the part of the President, and Mr. Eisenhower himself urging unremitting effort. From the meeting came plans to scrutinize the party's objectives.

From this open soul-searching Dr. HECHLER deduces: "The Republicans are trying to put a coat of whitewash over their elephant, but the elephant will still look as if it were made of gold." There followed tributes to Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Truman, and the common man.

Thus far Congressman HECHLER has extended his remarks only about $200 worth, a minute sum considering his party is pledged to spending. But we have a sneaking suspicion that seeing one's utterances extended for posterity on the pages of the RECORD could grow into an almost unbreakable habit.

Problems Confronting the Hand-Blown Glassware Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that my district is vitally interested in the successful and prosperous continuance of the Flint glassworkers to maintain their employment, I deem it important that the following analysis of the escape clause provisions be inserted in the RECORD.

Most of this material appeared in a comprehensive statement delivered by O. R. Strackbein before the U.S. Tariff Commission for the American Flint Glass Workers' Union, January 27, 1959.

The American Flint Glass Workers' Union in whose behalf I appear before this Commission speaks for a majority of the employees engaged in the manufacture of hand-blown glassware in this country.

This union has not itself filed an application under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 as amended, but wishes to go on record in support of the application filed by the handmade table and decorative ware division (division H) of the American Glassware Association.

The welfare of the industry that employs the members of the American Flint Glass Workers Union is of vital concern to these members. Injury to the industry from imports means injury to our membership. In fact, the workers are usually in the first line of defense wherever imports strike the market in competition with the goods that are manufactured in this country.

One of the first steps that the manufacturer takes when imports seriously interfere with the sale of his products, reducing either the margin of profit or sales volume, or both, is to curtail employment. This he does in one of several ways, or a combination of them.

He may lay off a part of his work force; he may reduce the number of hours of work per day; or he may go on a short workweek. His purpose will be to avoid adding more output to his stock when the goods are slow moving and high priced, hoping thus to adjust his inventory to the downtrend of his sales. In order to do this he must reduce the flow of goods from the factory; and the only normal way of doing this is to curtail man-hours of production.

The worker thus becomes a buffer between the manufacturer and rising imports. Whether the manufacturer succeeds in stopping the import tide by the measures he takes toward retrenchment depends on the character of the import competition. Should the foreign manufacturers of sources of the imports be well equipped for long-term competition on an upward trend, the efforts to make an inventory adjustment would be of little avail.

In that event, any successive temporary expedients resorted to by the domestic manufacturers would be utterly inadequate. The failure of such efforts to adjust stocks to a lower level of demand by reduction of man-hours of work would then call for a permanent readjustment. Of course, imports might continue to rise in spite of more drastic new steps and it might be necessary to repeat them. In the end the situation would become chronic and some manufacturers would become desperate. Here and there a close-down would occur, possibly with the hope of reopening when the outlook might turn for the better.

The hand-blown glassware industry has experienced many difficulties of this character; and the outlook continues to be discouraging. Not only have imports continued to increase in the past 10 years but the trend of the domestic industry is downward in terms of the share of the market supplied by it.

A declining share of the market is important among the criteria of injury found in the escape clause. Indeed, a relative decline in a domestic producer's share of the market removes all doubt about the whereabouts of the competitive advantage. It means simply that the domestic industry is on the run.

Now, it is assumed altogether too often that inability to hold its own competitively with imports marks a domestic industry as inefficient. This assumption lacks even the virtue of fairness. It is like blaming a horse that carries a heavy handicap for not winning a race. American producers carry burdens far greater than foreign manufacturers. Most of this comes from the higher wages that set off our economy and standard of living from those of other countries. Should our wages be reduced to the level of those prevailing in other countries our producers, we may be sure, would have no difficulty competing. They need then be no more efficient than they are now in order to compete. Indeed, with still lower wages, they could come into a position to drive the imports from the market. But we would lose our high standard of living in the process.

Numerous economists, imbued with much beside practical experience, persist in saying that our higher wages are offset by our higher productivity. In repeating this fallacy, they exhibit a stubbornness that might be put to better uses in the land of make-believe. The very facts of daylight belie what these economists say. They refuse to credit the words of those who have daily experience in the marketplace. Imported goods are constantly underselling those of our own manufacture. The proof of the pudding is in the eating.

Why should this process of underselling be in any way surprising? Since the last war, billions of dollars worth of modern machinery and equipment has gone overseas from this country and has been installed in many hundreds of factories. Also more than 8,000 productivity teams from abroad have come to this country to study our production methods.

Beyond this it should be clear now, notwithstanding the peculiar notions of the academic economists, that the American industrial system has no corner on the technological arts nor on science, nor therefore on high productivity. Other countries are capable of developing and installing modern machinery on their own and are doing so.

From these considerations and others it follows that the indictment of inefficiency will not lie against American industry merely on evidence of inability to compete with imports, nor on the mere word of unseasoned economists.

In the case of hand-blown glassware the direct labor cost is high. Because there is little or no mechanization in this branch of the glass industry in this country, and lacking also in other countries, we witness virtual barehanded competition between labor here and abroad, with not much cushion between them. It would be expected that the domestic industry would find great difficulty in competing with imports, and the facts support the expectation.

It should have been obvious that no tariff reductions should have been made in the first instance; but they were made nevertheless.

The evidence of serious injury is to be found in the trend of imports compared with the trend in domestic production. Imports have come to equal and then to pass domestic production. This is shown by statistics that will be furnished to the Commission by the industry and may be verified by investigations of its own by the Tariff Commission.

The American Flint Glass Workers Union has ascertained from its records in 10 unionized companies manufacturing hand-blown glassware that employment of skilled workers was 979 in April 1949 compared with 667 in April 1958. Miscellaneous workers declined during the same period from 2,526 to 1,625. The respective totals are 3,505 in April 1949 and 2,292 in April 1958. This represents a decline of 35 percent in employment in 10 years in these plants. Imports, on the other hand, increased threefold or more.

To the union this has the appearance of serious injury. To the industry it spells desperation, and the industry will submit other compelling evidence of serious injury.

Since the sole function of the Tariff Commission in an escape-clause action is a finding on injury and recommendation of a remedy, it will be in order to inquire how far this carries us.

In 1943 an escape clause was indeed inserted into a trade agreement for the correction of any injury that might develop; and such a clause was placed in all subsequent agreements. In 1947 the clause was given greater recognition in the form of an Executive order. In 1951 a statutory escape clause came from congressional action. It says simply that—

> No reduction in any rate of duty * * * or other concession * * * shall be permitted to continue in effect when the product on which the concession has been granted is, as a result * * * of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products.

The President himself has said:

> The President has the responsibility of considering, not only the question of injury to a domestic industry * * * but also the other fundamental questions bearing on the security and well-being of 165 million Americans. The President's final judgment in each case must represent the best composite evaluation he can make of these questions.

This statement may be found in the Bicycle case decided August 18, 1955. He listed five issues that must be decided in an escape-clause case and limited the Tariff Commission's function to the question of "injury and relief to a domestic industry."

The four issues falling in the President's sole jurisdiction and free of any testimony that might be given in public hearings were asserted by the President to be, first, our national security interest in the economic strength of valued allies in the world; second, building export markets for products of our farms, factories, and mines; third, compensation to other countries for withdrawal of concessions; and, fourth, protection of the American consumer against unnecessary and unjustified price increases.

Mr. Speaker, the wide open prairies of the West could hardly offer wider avenues for circumvention of what should be due process of law than the practice thus followed by the President in the administration of the escape clause. This, let me emphasize, is no fault of the Tariff Commission itself.

How have the four factors other than injury intruded themselves upon the scene? By what justification? The escape clause is in the nature of a reservation that permits withdrawal or modification of a concession if a certain contingency develops in fact, namely actual or threatened serious injury. That is what Congress has provided in its wording of the escape clause, quoted above. The only remaining question should be one of fact; and the finding of such fact is the function of the Tariff Commission. The law contains not one word that calls upon the President to gather an unknown volume of additional evidence outside the hearing process and with it to swamp the Tariff Commission's recommendation at will and without compunction.

Unless the Tariff Commission's recommendations should call for a duty higher in its protective effect than that from which it was reduced in a trade agreement, or a proposal for a quota that would rob the country extending a reciprocal concession, as a quid pro quo, of its bargain, such recommendation should be proclaimed without question by the President. He should regard it as representing the invocation of a reser-

vation in keeping with the widely proclaimed policy of avoiding or preventing serious injury to industry. Only if judicial review disclosed improper procedures or insufficient evidence or similar failures of the Commission, should its findings be set aside. The President should stand by his own appointed Commission. The propriety of its findings and the adequacy of its procedures should be left to the judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, under the publicly avowed policies, many times repeated, as documented in the review offered for the record, stating in effect that the trade agreements program is not to injure our industries and that a sure remedy is at hand if injury nevertheless takes place, there is no place for supplemental evidence and trumped-up issues beyond the evidence taken at hearings before this Commission on the question of injury.

It would be difficult indeed to find any support in law or elsewhere for the practice of treating delegated power as authority to skirt not only the law itself but other elements of due process. Yet this is precisely what has been done by the executive branch of the Government in its disposal of Tariff Commission recommendations under the escape clause.

Mr. Speaker, that abominable practice should cease; and the findings of the Commission in the question of injury from imports should be the last word.

Outstanding Citizens From Holly Springs, Miss.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, there are few if any towns and cities in the United States which have produced the number of outstanding citizens that have come from Holly Springs, Miss., in my district.

With this great record in history, today it is carrying on in every modern way; they continue real progress. Truly the people of this fine city are carrying on in the fine tradition those of past left to them. I include herewith a pamphlet listing many of these outstanding citizens:

HISTORIC HOLLY SPRINGS AND MARSHALL COUNTY, MISS., PRODUCED THE FOLLOWING ILLUSTRIOUS PEOPLE

Generals: Samuel Benton, Winfield S. Featherston, Edward Carey Walthall, Absolem M West, James R. Chalmers, Claudius W. Sears, A. J. Vaughn, Daniel C. Govan, Christopher H. Mott, and Alexander B. Bradford.

Adjutant generals: Thomas Falconer, Kinloch Falconer, and Harvey W. Walter.

Nominated for Vice President: Absolem M. West, National Party 1880; Anti-Monopoly Party 1884.

Members of Confederate Congress: Alexander M. Clayton, Jeremiah W. Clapp, Samuel Benton, Harvey W. Walter, Orlando Davis, W. M. Lea, John W. C. Watson, Alexander B. Bradford, and James F. Trotter.

U.S. Senators: James F. Trotter, Joseph W. Chalmers, Hiram Revels, Edward C. Walthall, and Wall Doxey.

U.S. Congressmen: James R. Chalmers, Absolem M. West, Van Manning, G. Wiley Wells, Winfield S. Fetherston, Joseph W. Chalmers, and Wall Doxey.

U.S. Attorneys: G. Wiley Wells and Lester G. Fant.

U.S. marshals: George M. Buchanan and John S. Burton.

Governors of Mississippi: Joseph W. Matthews, Lt. Gov. Sam Lumpkin, and Lt. Gov. Kinlock Falconer.

Secretary of state: Kinloch Falconer, Henry Myers, James Hill, and George M. Govan.

Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit: Jno. D. Martin.

State supreme court judges: James F. Trotter, Mississippi; Wm. Yates Gholson, Ohio; Alexander M. Clayton, Mississippi; L. A. Smith, Mississippi; and Hamilton H. Chalmers, Mississippi.

Attorneys general: David Chambers Glenn and Roger Barton (attorney general of Tennessee).

Speakers of the house: James Lockhart Totten, James L. Autry, and Sam Lumpkin.

Executive secretary to the President (of Confederacy), Robert Josselyn.

Ambassador to Kentucky: W. S. Featherston (1860).

Chancellors: L. A. Smith, Sr. and Jr.; L. G. Fant, Sr. and Jr.; and Joseph W. Chalmers.

Circuit judges: Alexander M. Clayton, James F. Trotter, James Thorton Fant, John W. C. Watson, Winfield S. Featherston, and Hugh K. Mahon.

President of Louisiana State University: Francis L. Hawks.

Counsul to Havana: Alexander M. Clayton.

Hawaiian Islands: Judge Ed Watson.

Corporation counsel, city of New York: Arch R. Watson.

Mayors of Memphis: Jeremiah Clapp, Ed Crump, and Harry Litty.

President-elect Huguenot Society of America: Mrs. Miller Keith.

Nuclear scientist: Martha S. Parks.

National historian of the Colonial Dames of America, and vice president general of National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution: Mrs. Egbert R. Jones.

Artist: Kate Freeman Clark, who left her fortune, home and 300 pictures to Holly Springs and Marshall County.

Authors: Sherwood Bonner, Francis L. Hawks, Joseph Holt Ingraham, Prentis Ingraham, and Robert Josselyn.

Industrialists: Oscar Johnson, Jackson Johnson, Andrew Johnson, Lee Johnson, Oscar Johnson, Jr., Frank Rand (International Shoe Co., St. Louis), R. L. "Red" Taylor, Hope P. Sullivan, J. P. Norflett, Price Curd, and F. M. Crump.

Poets: Robert Josselyn, Samuel M. Patton, and Rev. F. N. Atkin.

Education: In 1860 Holly Springs spent more on education than the rest of the State combined except the University of Mississippi. General Sears and General Bradford taught here. William Yates Gholson and A. M. Clayton aided in organizing the University of Mississippi and were on its first board of trustees. We educated Hon. Hugh White and prepared him for the university and a great career. Mary and Jane Mills were the first two women in America to graduate from a college. This was in 1833 and the college was Mississippi College, Clinton, Miss.

For over a hundred years the Fant family have had lawyers in Holly Springs. One family, the Gholsons, had doctors serving this community continuously for 113 years.

We believe no small town in the Nation can surpass such a record.

Bank Merger Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills which would ban any bank merger or consolidation whose effect in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

The first of these bills would amend section 18(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act. It would:

First. Expand provisions of existing banking laws so as to require prior approval by the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve Board, or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation of every bank merger or consolidation involving insured banks.

Second. Prohibit the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency from approving any bank merger or consolidation where the effect in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

Third. Make it necessary for the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency to obtain the views of the Attorney General respecting the competitive phases of the transaction and require the Attorney General to submit his views within 30 days.

Fourth. Require the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency to give notice and opportunity to be heard to the appropriate supervisory authority of the interested State in the event the transaction involves State banks.

Fifth. Incorporate a so-called antitrust savings clause for bank mergers similar to that governing bank holding companies thus making it clear that applicable provisions of the antitrust laws pertaining to banks are not to be superseded.

The second bill would close a loophole in section 7 of the Clayton Act as amended by the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950, and prevent bank mergers achieved by acquisition of assets where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any section of the country.

Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended in 1950 by the Celler-Kefauver Act, covers bank mergers achieved by stock acquisitions, but fails to cover bank mergers accomplished by means of asset acquisitions. This gap in existing law has no logical basis in view of the fact that the purchase of assets has an even more enduring effect than a purchase of stocks and thus is even more inimical to competition. The bill would plug this gap in existing law and provide the Federal Reserve Board and the Attorney General with the same enforcement authority under the Celler-Kefauver Act to move against asset acquisitions by banks as against stock acquisitions.

All bank mergers whether accomplished by acquisition of stock or assets

are circumscribed by the provisions of the Sherman Act of 1890 which prohibits combinations in restraint of trade, attempts to monopolize or monopolization of trade or commerce. Illegality under section 1 of that act is established by proof that the merger has actually resulted in an unreasonable lessening of competition. Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Celler-Kefauver Act, requires, on the other hand, only a reasonable probability of a substantial lessening of competition. Hence the bill would enable the antitrust enforcement agencies to cope more effectively with the mounting trend of bank merger activity. The bill is similar to H.R. 5948 which was introduced by Mr. CELLER in 1955 and approved by the House of Representatives that year without dissent. The Senate did not, however, take final action on the measure.

Amendment of both the banking laws and the antitrust laws would assure that Federal officials apply the same competitive test to all bank mergers. In general, the bills would make applicable to the acquisition of a bank by another bank competitive principles which, under the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, now govern the acquisition of banks by holding companies.

These bills would establish a uniform competitive test for all bank mergers and forestall approval of any whose effect might be substantially detrimental to competition.

Legislation of this kind is vitally needed in view of the rash of mergers that has been taking place among banking houses in recent years. In the period from 1950 through 1958, for example, a total of 1,232 mergers have been completed, resulting in the disappearance of many strong, competitive, sizable financial institutions.

In large part because of bank-merger activity, concentration of the Nation's banking facilities has reached a point where a few large banks control a disproportionate share of total loans and deposits. Thus the 100 largest banks control more than 48 percent of the Nation's bank deposits. What is more, in 10 of the Nation's 16 leading financial centers, 4 banks own more than 80 percent of all commercial assets. Indeed, in each of the 16 leading financial centers, the first 2 banks own more than 40 percent of all the commercial assets; the first 4 banks, 60 percent.

The bank-merger trend has become, as the Federal Reserve Board stated, a matter of deep concern, particularly since competition is one of the strongest single factors which safeguards a sound banking system. The proposed merger of Guaranty Trust-J. P. Morgan exacerbates this situation. Permitted to be consummated, it would seriously affect the competitive banking structure of New York City. Our Antitrust Subcommittee will continue to keep a watchful eye on all developments in this matter. It is gratifying that another proposed merger in New York City between Manufacturers Trust and Bankers Trust has been called off. This transaction would have had equally grave consequences.

The President, recognizing the seriousness of the bank-merger problem, has in his recent Economic Report transmitted to the Congress in January 1959, repeated his recommendation that Congress act favorably on legislation to authorize Federal regulation of the merger of banking institutions accomplished through the acquisition of assets.

The measures I have introduced not only would carry out this recommendation, they would provide an effective accommodation as between the requirements of the banking and the antitrust laws.

Floods Again Plague Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I represent an area of the great State of Indiana which abounds in rich farmland, in great industrial potential, and people who are reasonable and proud. We do not make unreasonable demands upon our Government and whenever possible prefer handling our own problems. However, when we are in a position where the magnitude of our problem reaches beyond our own resources and abilities we do not hesitate to seek the help which only our Federal Government can give. We have such a problem now. Indiana has been plagued with floods for many years. Floods which have cost our people millions of dollars in flood damage. Floods which have swept away some of our richest farmland, floods which have destroyed property, floods which disturbed the economy and well-being of our people.

Last year our President signed into law a bill authorizing the construction of three reservoirs in the upper Wabash River Valley. This authorizing legislation was wise. It was not a hit-and-miss thing. It was an acceptance of the recommendations of agencies of authority who had spent years studying our problem. "At last," we thought, "we have made progress. We now have relief for our problem." Not so. Although recognition was readily given to the fact that we have a need in Indiana for flood control, this need was ignored when it came to supplying necessary funds for the final planning of these projects. The Presidents' budget ignored our request for $50,000 for the planning of the Salamonie River Reservoir and $150,000 for the Mississinewa River project.

Mr. Speaker, Indiana should not be denied the protection the construction of these projects will afford to the lives, property, and well-being of our people. At this very moment floods are sweeping away our topsoil, destroying our property, and endangering the lives of our citizens.

It is difficult for us Hoosiers to understand why we have been deprived of funds which would alleviate one of our most pressing problems.

Representative Wright Patman, of Texas, Given Award of Merit for His Key Role in Recognizing the Problems of Small Business and in Seeking To Aid in Their Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, occasionally one of our colleagues in the House of Representatives receives an award that is particularly appropriate, and one that meets with wide general approval not only in this body but among the citizens of our country.

Honors come easily and numerous in the U.S. Senate to its Members with endless newspaper columns, magazine articles, radio, television, and other motion picture film footage devoted to telling the story and chronicling the event.

The path is harder in the House and one has to be particularly outstanding to be acclaimed.

It is, then, with special pleasure that all of us welcome the bestowal of the much-coveted Award of Merit on the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] by the national coat and suit industry recovery board. This trade body is a national organization representing 1,200 manufacturers of women's and children's coats and suits and 70,000 garment workers. Member companies belong to 16 trade associations, dedicated to ethical business standards and fair labor standards, who work in conjunction with the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL–CIO.

I include a news story from the New York Times of February 3, 1959, giving the details of the bestowal of this highly merited Award of Merit to our beloved colleague, who is so richly deserving of it:

PATMAN SCORES ABUSES IN PRICING—SAYS SMALL BUSINESS MUST RESIST INEQUITABLE PRACTICES OF BUYING SYNDICATES—SEEKS TO BOLSTER LAW—GARMENT PRODUCERS WARNED POWER IS CONCENTRATED IN FEWER CORPORATIONS

(By Herbert Koshetz)

MIAMI BEACH, February 2.—Small business was warned today it would lose further ground in its fight against big business monopoly unless it stood firm against pricing abuses and the demands of large buying syndicates.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat of Texas, who isued the warning, also declared that the rising trend of mergers, coupled with monopolistic pricing, had placed control of the Nation's economy in the hands of a few large operators.

Representative PATMAN spoke at the opening of the annual meeting of the national

coat and suit industry recovery board. This trade body is a national organization representing 1,200 manufacturers of women's and children's coats and suits and 70,000 garment workers. Member companies belong to 16 trade associations, dedicated to ethical business standards and fair labor standards, who work in conjunction with the International Ladies Garment Workers, AFL–CIO.

The board presented its award of merit to Representative PATMAN for his "key role in recognizing the problems of small business and in seeking to aid in their solution."

He is coauthor of the Robinson-Patman Act, which requires sellers to offer equitable terms to all buyers. He also is chairman of the House Small Business Committee.

REVISIONS NEEDED

Mr. PATMAN said that certain sections of the law needed to be strengthened. He said that he would again seek to achieve passage of an amendment that would make it mandatory for sellers to make known and available to all customers the favorable terms given to anyone. After the meeting he expressed the opinion that this so-called disclosure amendment had an excellent chance being passed in the present session of Congress.

"There can be ominous meaning to you," he told the meeting, "in the fact that the disparity in size between your firms and the chains, syndicates, and buying combinations, purchasers of a large part of your product, is growing at a steady rate."

In 1952, he said, a few corporations, having more than $100 million of assets each, owned 51 percent of all the assets of manufacturing corporations in the United States. At the end of 1955 this percentage had grown to 57 percent. In 1956 their share had increased to 59 percent. It is now estimated that one-half of 1 percent of all manufacturing corporations had 57 percent of total sales, leaving 43 percent for the many thousands of other manufacturers.

ACT IS DEFENDED

The 10 largest companies purchasing goods produced by the garment industry, according to Mr. PATMAN, increased their annual volume by 60 percent in the last decade. These 10, he said, did about 10 times the total business of the 1,200 companies manufacturing women's coats and suits.

He defended the Robinson-Patman Act as an instrument to fortify the smaller producer and seller against "intolerable exactions as to terms and conditions."

Moreover, he said, the refusal of industry members to compromise their trade practice standards in such matters as advertising subsidies, discounts, transportation charges, consignment transactions, and other matters, was essential not only for preserving their own business but also that of all their fair-minded customers.

Max E. Weinstock, chairman of the board, told the meeting that more apparel could be sold this year if quality and value were stressed instead of price.

Isadore Nagler, manager of the New York joint cloak board and a vice president of the ILGWU, urged the manufacturers to continue to support New York's fashion institute of technology now operating in the Needle Trades High School, West 24th Street, between 7th and 8th Avenues.

Shirley Goodman, executive secretary of the school, gave a detailed report of the new building, which will be on West 27th Street. The institute was unique, she said, as the only junior college in the Nation offering production, merchandising, and management courses in the apparel trades. It is jointly sponsored by the University of the State of New York, the New York City Board of Education, and the Educational Foundation of the Apparel Industry.

More Thought Being Given to Repeal of the Income Tax Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, over the past few years, more and more thought is being given to the repeal of the income tax amendment. Bills have been introduced at the last two sessions of the Congress to repeal the 16th amendment.

Just a few years ago, to talk about repealing the 16th amendment, stamped anyone so doing as a "crackpot."

It is most gratifying to note the solid substantial organizations that endorse the repeal. Recently the American National Cattlemen's Association at Omaha, Nebr., adopted such a resolution. I append hereto this resolution and an editorial from a great newspaper, the Omaha World-Herald, in regard to this resolution:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION AT OMAHA, NEBR., CONVENTION JANUARY 17, 1959

Whereas the American National Cattlemen's Association has frequently and consistently taken a firm position in matters of principle; and

Whereas the need for support of an equitable system of taxation, consistent with our Constitution and Bill of Rights, is paramount in the performance of essential governmental functions; and

Whereas our Constitution provides methods for amendment, and precedent has been established, following a procedure of referendum: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we respectfully request the Congress of the United States to take such immediate action as is required which will permit the American people the opportunity made possible under the Constitution to vote upon the question of whether the 16th amendment to the Constitution is to be continued or repealed; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge and request elected representatives to support an equitable tax system restoring portions of the Bill of Rights.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald, Jan. 20, 1959]

HANDWRITING ON THE WALL

Just about every member of the American National Cattlemen's Association would be regarded as a responsible, substantial citizen of the United States. Two-thirds of them at their annual convention in Omaha last week stood up to be counted in favor of a resolution which asked that the American people be given an opportunity, by vote, to get rid of Federal income taxes.

This was not a hasty action; the cattlemen had been mulling it over for some time. But it was, to say the least, extreme. And it was something to which, we think, the political powers that be had better pay some attention.

What the cattlemen said, in effect, was this:

Uncle Sam is taking our money and spending it like a drunken sailor. He is throwing it away in every port of the seven seas, and here at home he is using it to impose upon us a big variety of welfare schemes which we don't want. And since he has refused to heed our advice to slow down, we may have to shut off his funds altogether.

We don't expect that the Government spenders will start shaking in their boots because of a resolution passed by a comparatively few cattlemen. But there are other signs, as well, that people are beginning to think seriously about their wasteful and too big Government. The handwriting on the wall looks mightly like an admonition to put on the brakes—or else.

Our Puzzling Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the New York Journal-American of January 22, 1959, illustrates the futility of our present program of farm support prices, and advances the theory that our agricultural policy is our enemy's best weapon.

With our agricultural problems now, as ever, in the forefront of political debate, the subject is most timely and may be of interest to my colleagues:

OUR PUZZLING FARM POLICY

(By Bob Considine)

Eugene P. Kane, farm authority from Summit, N.J., takes me to task for a recent piece here which might have been entitled, "How You Gonna Keep 'Em Down on the Farm After They've Seen Parity?"

He writes:

"Your article cannot go unchallenged. In the first place, the theory of Agri-Dynamics is not new. It started when artificially high price supports forced farmers to produce more per acre in order to circumvent acreage restrictions. For example, in 1932 farmers planted 36,494,000 acres of cotton. The crop amounted to 13,002,000 bales. The average yield was 173.5 pounds per acre. In 1958, the figures were 12,375,000—11,581,000—and 469, respectively. Agri-Dynamics is new?

"In the second place, the expanded production of the farmers must be paid for by the consumer twice. Once when the processors pass along the artificially high price which they must pay in order to compete with Commodity Credit Corporation. Again when, as a taxpayer, the consumer is gouged to make up the losses of CCC.

"In the third place, there is little or no free enterprise in American agriculture today. The Government decides how much each farmer may plant, and at which price CCC must buy from the farmer.

"Khrushchev warned the grain collectives of Russia that their costs were too high. He combined some 30 farms near Moscow into one unit to reduce costs. Thus, he paid homage to the rule that selling price determines cost.

"In the United States, this axiom is not applied to agriculture. Parity is the measure of the farmer's cost of living and operating. CCC must buy from the farmer at a stated percentage of parity. As parity goes up, the farmer's selling price to CCC goes up. Hence, cost determines selling price.

"Who is more capitalistic in regard to agriculture—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or the Republic of the United States of America?

"Our agricultural policy is our enemy's best weapon."

Mr. Kane encloses CCC reports in which the Government agency, which has piled up the most colossal surpluses in world history, announces that realized losses on all commodities from 1954 until this coming spring will amount to $5,294,449,872. Total losses since the plan was first introduced by Henry Wallace in the early days of the New Deal—$12,330,632,228. We are now paying $1 million a day rent for storage of our surpluses.

Poison in Your Water—No. 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News and Telegram which appeared on May 26, 1958, entitled "Clean Up—On Sickness."

That article, an editorial, discusses the relation of sewage to the disease known as infectious hepatitis, more commonly known as yellow jaundice. The article points out that clean up of sewage and construction of adequate sewage abatement works will do much in Utah to reduce the incidence of this disease which has risen in a period of 1 year from 26 to 96.

This is just another reason why the full $50 million authorized under Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress should be appropriated for grants to municipalities for construction of sewage abatement. Actually, it is a good reason why the amount of the grants should be at least doubled.

The article follows:

CLEAN UP—ON SICKNESS

For a long time now, experts in sewage and water treatment have been saying Utahns are living on borrowed time. This week the meaning of that warning becomes much more clear.

This week, the State is facing an alarming increase in the incidence of infectious hepatitis. This disease, commonly known as yellow jaundice, is a serious, debilitating one that takes months, sometimes years, to throw off. It is usually associated with polluted water or inadequate sewage disposal. Utah has seen 96 cases so far, compared with 26 at this time a year ago.

This is a disgrace for a State living in the 20th century when methods of prevention of this and other diseases associated with unclean water are thoroughly understood.

Methods of prevention were, in fact, being discussed by official groups even as the hepatitis report was released. One group of officials called for a new Federal study of water pollution in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons in relation to growing recreation pressures on the canyons. And another group released a report after extensive studies of four Utah rivers. Three of them are serious health hazards, carrying raw human sewage through populated areas.

The two problems are different, of course. No one knows just how much recreational development can be allowed in the canyons without endangering the Salt Lake Valley water supply. A fine treatment plant is finished at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon and construction will soon begin on a plant for Little Cottonwood. How much additional recreation these plants will make possible, if any, is not known. Of course pure water comes ahead of any other consideration, but we certainly should have a competent study to find out how much recreation we can have in the canyons and still be sure of pure water.

But there's no doubt at all about the other problem, that of the shocking pollution of the Jordan, Price, and Weber Rivers, and of other streams in the State. Any raw sewage dumped into a stream is too much.

To this problem, there's just one solution. Money is at the root of it. Utah's growing communities simply cannot continue letting their sewage go untreated.

A number of Utah County communities have shown the way. Sick and tired of the way the recreational possibilities of Utah Lake were being lost by its use as a cesspool, they took action, built sewage treatment plants and are on the way to rehabilitating the lake.

What they can do, others can do—and must do. And now is the time to do it. Building now can create much-needed jobs. The recession means that contractors are sharpening their bids. The bond market is good. Inflation shows no sign of ending. A time may never come when sewage treatment can be obtained as inexpensively as it can right now.

The growing threat of shameful pollution-caused disease should be a most effective warning to hurry up.

George H. Christopher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, all of us were saddened by the passing of that great patriot, George H. Christopher. Knowing him was one of the pleasant associations in the Congress. He was a great friend of the veterans, the farmers, and the American who earns his livelihood by honest toil.

Those of us on the Veterans Committee loved and admired George Christopher. We could count on him to do the right thing for our country and those who served our Nation in time of war. As a younger Member, I profited much by the experience, the advice and understanding of Mr. Christopher. He understood our agricultural problems as few other contemporary Americans. A successful farmer himself, he devoted a great deal of his time and energy to improving the lot of the farmers.

George Christopher raised a fine, upright family. Mrs. Dorn joins me in my deepest sympathy to them. George Christopher will be greatly missed by those of us who knew and loved him. His great service to our country will always be, to me, an admiring reminiscence.

Report of Committee on Industrial Water Use, Pollution Abatement, Wildlife, and Recreation to the 45th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the report which was made to the 45th annual national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress by the permanent committee on industrial water use, pollution abatement, wildlife, and recreation.

I have served for many years as vice president of the congress for the State of Minnesota and was honored to be asked by President Brooks to act again as chairman of this committee which it is agreed by all has rendered a distinct service to the people of the United States.

The committee met with a full attendance on May 14, 1958, and continued in session throughout the day, reaching complete agreement on its proposed report. On May 16, at the final session of the congress, I presented the committee's report which was unanimously agreed to by the convention.

I was again impressed by the keen interest shown by the committee members representing the many diverse geographic areas of our country and it was obvious that there is a growing awareness throughout the country of the increasing importance of this complex problem of sound water-use and pollution-abatement policies and programs.

The report of our committee is as follows:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL WATER USE, POLLUTION ABATEMENT, WILDLIFE, AND RECREATION

The committee reviewed its report adopted at the Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held May 16, 1957, and reaffirmed the broad and constructive principles for development of adequate water supplies set forth therein, emphasizing particularly the need for constructive policies relating to conservation, municipal and domestic use, pollution abatement, flood control, irrigation, recreation, industrial use, and other beneficial purposes.

The chairman reported outstanding progress made under the provisions of Public Law 660, providing for Federal assistance to communities for the construction of pollution abatement works. He called attention to the fact that the construction program under Public Law 660 has stimulated the greatest treatment plant construction in our history, noting that in the years prior to adoption of this statute, beginning in 1952, only 3 to 5 States had had record construction years in this area, but beginning in 1956, 13 States had had a record treatment plant construction year and the number had increased to 19 in 1957 as the program gained momentum. It is the sense of the committee that even the limited program permitted by Public Law 660 has been an outstanding success.

The chairman reported further that official communications had been received from the Bureau of the Budget and the President advising that in the future, budget estimates would include no funds for implementation of the program provided for by Public Law 660. Discussion of these matters indicated the increasing urgency of pollution abatement work and the growing need for larger Federal assistance to the States and communities affected. The committee deplored the attitude expressed by the Bureau of the Budget and the President in this regard and their failure to recognize the clear Federal responsibility for participation in solving a national problem.

Accordingly, upon motion of Mr. Marshall N. Dana, chairman, Commission of Public Docks, Portland, Oreg., the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Resolved:

"1. That this committee compile the record of accomplishment made under the administration of Public Law 660;

"2. That this committee recommends an appeal to the Congress from the decision of the Bureau of the Budget and the President for reconsideration of the decision heretofore announced to include no funds in future budget estimates for Federal assistance in the construction of pollution abatement works in accordance with the principles of Public Law 660;

"3. That Public Law 660 be modified and strengthened by increasing the total amount authorized for Federal assistance for the construction of pollution abatement works from $50 million to $100 million annually;

"4. That this committee requests each member of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress to enlist support from Members of Congress for the action proposed in the next preceding resolution."

Reports from representatives of all sections of the Nation contained dramatic evidence of growing water problems. It is clear that the population of the United States will continue to grow rapidly, that the needs of industry, agriculture, and the general public for adequate supplies of water will continue to mount; that with improved means of transportation and greater leisure time, demands for recreational facilities for hunting, fishing, boating and related forms of enjoyment will grow apace, and that the growth of industry and population will aggravate and intensify the already serious pollution abatement problem confronting the Nation. Accordingly, the committee reaffirms its conviction that all uses of water are interrelated and are of concern to the public generally, and that conservation, control and equitable disposition of our water resources are matters of profound interest to the development of the national economy and the welfare of all the people. It is evident that the water problem will become as vital to the national interest in 10 years as the missile program is today.

In view of the growing importance of water resource development, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Resolved:

"1. That the committee recommends recognition by the Congress in the evaluation of water resources projects of the full economic values derived therefrom including public water supply, low flow augmentation, industrial use, irrigation, pollution abatement, fish and wildlife and recreation, as well as flood control and navigation and that such values be established and taken into account in computing the benefit-cost ratios of such projects;

"2. That the committee strongly approves the principles embodied in section 205 of S. 497 authorizing the provision of storage in reservoir projects, (a) for present and anticipated future needs for munipical and industrial water supplies under the method of reimbursement when contract for use of such impounded water is made; and (b) to increase needed low flows downstream without reimbursement to the extent warranted at present or during the economic life of the project with such low flows determined on the basis of widespread general benefits;

"3. That the committee recommends improved coordination among the agencies at all levels of government for the more effective development and use of water resources; and

"4. That the committee recommends a more adequate program to ascertain, assemble, and disseminate in useful form basic data relative to surface and ground water resources."

Poison in Your Water—No. 8

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the San Francisco News of June 30, 1958, describing further the problems of pollution, this time in the lovely State of California and on our Pacific coast. The article is as follows:

ALL IS NOT LOST

The Downtown Association has protested to the State water pollution control board over the "big stink" at Candlestick Cove.

Anyone who has driven past that area along Bayshore knows what the association is talking about. The nostrils are assailed by the most obnoxious odors which contrive to invade passing automobiles even with the windows up.

The News is pleased to report that something is being done about it. The process will take months, scant comfort to those who daily traverse the reeking acres of "Candlestick Cove." But with patience and the possible use of a spray deodorant in their cars, we think these sufferers may be able to endure their olfactory misfortune.

The villains are two: Raw sewage and garbage.

Works Director Sherman Duckel reports that the city is negotiating with the Bayshore Sanitary District, to pump its sewage into the San Francisco sewage system for treatment—for a price. Final agreement awaits approval by Chester MacPhee, the new chief administrative officer. We are sure that Mr. MacPhee will act with dispatch.

The raw sewage from the Brisbane Sanitary District is another and more complicated matter, but the State water pollution control board is painfully aware of the problem and meets this week to seek a solution.

It has the authority to force one.

Another source of the scent is the 1,100 tons of San Francisco garbage which is dumped there daily. When garbage is dumped on sea water, it produces hydrogen sulfide gas. Whew.

The city and the pollution board have advanced several suggestions and the Sanitary Fill Co., which runs the operation, has a few ideas of its own. Unfortunately, some of the ideas cost money, which no one likes to spend, but we are sure the outcome will be happy.

We intend to follow the developments, because we know a story when we smell one.

Remarks of Hon. Carmine G. DeSapio, at the Editors and Publishers Luncheon, New York, N. Y., February 2, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include, with pleasure, a logical, powerful, courageous address, and a most appropriate one that should be of great interest to all and, in particular, to publishers and editors of our newspapers, made by Hon. Carmine G. DeSapio at the editors and publishers luncheon, at Hotel Plaza, in New York City, on February 2, 1959. The publishers and editors of the newspapers of our country should pay heed to the friendly but pointed remarks made by Mr. DeSapio.

The address follows:

Let me, at the outset, thank you for inviting me today and for fulfilling for me a dream which, in recent years, has almost bordered upon obsession. I am sure that you will understand my telling you that it becomes increasingly difficult for me to read your newspapers without wishing—indeed, without a wistful longing—for the opportunity to reply, to rebut, to tell you nice people where to get off.

But I don't own a newspaper, and I don't have hundreds of thousands of readers and, come to think of it, I don't even have a typewriter. And I must confess that this opportunity to deliver an editorial to you editorialists is one which I warmly cherish, at the same time that I am considerably awed and not a little apprehensive.

So, with your gracious permission, here is by editorial. It is entitled "The Responsibility of the Press."

Today's tragedy in Italy, where many political parties are unable to agree upon a coalition government, reminds us of similar repeated chaos in France and in other parts of the world, and emphasizes the great blessing which is America's two-party system.

Good or bad, America's political parties accept their responsibilities. They face the challenge of the voters on election day. And they provide for our municipalities, States, and Nation a system of government acknowledged by all honest minds to be the best in the history of civilization.

The two-party system of government in our country has survived wars, derpessions, crises, and the American press. With God's help—and with suitable vigorous editorial reform—it will continue to survive.

The men and women of the United States who own and produce our Nation's newspapers are universally acknowledged to be persons of high moral character, patriotic integrity, and extraordinary intelligence. This is indisputable. They are also men and women of firm principle, intense determination and, to a very large extent, unbridled partisanship. They have great power, and they know it. They wield enormous influence, and they know it. They enjoy unique positions of trust and responsibility, and they too often forget it.

The publishing business today—at least that segment of it which is chiefly concerned with reporting and interpreting current affairs—has lost the quality of independence which once was its most distinguishing and most valuable asset. Our Nation's press, to

a deplorably large degree, has rejected its historic role as a nonpolitical arbiter of public opinion. It has become, instead, an instrument for the expression of partisanship and for the selling, rather than the feeding, of ideas.

Now, it is one thing for the editor and the publisher of a newspaper to hold personal political views. Indeed, it would be catastrophic if they did not. Partisanship is the handmaiden of citizenship, and it is the obligation of every citizen to hold, to express, and to fight for a political opinion.

Yes, it is one thing to hold and to express political views; but it is quite another to color, to camouflage, to emphasize, to omit, and, yes, to distort news on the altar of partisanship.

How many newspaper publishers would tolerate a Republican electric company or telephone company, or a Democratic railroad? The analogy is clear. These organizations, like our newspapers, are public utilities. But, happily for our country, our newspapers are not regulated public utilities. Democracy would die and liberty would be destroyed if there were governmental control of our newspapers.

But, just as the people of the community must depend upon the other utilities for vital services, so must they also depend upon their newspapers as a reliable source of information about local, State, National, and international affairs.

And although the editorial pages and the opinion columns of our Nation's press traditionally and properly reserve the right to present partisan opinions on all subjects, too often—much too often—you can pick up the first page of a newspaper and from the mere presentation of news, determine at a glance the political philosophy of that paper's owner or editor.

Here in New York City, if a reader does not like his newspaper's views, you may argue, he can buy another paper. I could debate that with you, but it will have to wait for another occasion. Nevertheless, in community after community throughout our State and country, just as there is only one light and telephone company, there also is only one newspaper. And very frequently, where there is more than one newspaper, they are owned by the same person.

So here we have a vital utility, concerned with the well-being of every man, woman, and child in the United States, regulated—and, I emphasize—this is as it should be—only by the conscience of its owners.

Now let us see how this awesome responsibility is fulfilled by the distinguished men and women who own our great American press. As a politician, I know from my intimate first-hand experience over a period of many years of the great influence which the newspapers exercise upon the voter, upon public officials and upon politicians.

I must confess that much of the program of political reform which I have instituted as county leader in Manhattan was either inspired, agitated or needled into being by our newspapers. I am proud of what we have achieved and grateful to the press for encouraging me to achieve it.

But I am not proud of everything that the American press has achieved. I am not proud of the stigma which our newspapers have given to politicians—of the grotesque and untrue picture of politicians which they have painted and which has discouraged countless able decent men and women from entering politics.

Ask Mayor Wagner, ask Governor Rockefeller, ask President Eisenhower why it is so difficult to get outstanding people to accept important governmental posts. The reason is simple and terrible. It is because when a man enters politics or Government, a large section of the American press immediately brands him as a person who does not quite belong to the community of decent human beings.

Certainly, corrupt politicians and public officials should be exposed and ferreted out, just as the misdeeds of corrupt labor leaders, businessmen and even newspapermen should be exposed and punished.

Yet, there is a delicate problem of balance which must be met forthrightly. The sensational escapades of the corrupt cop, for example, are newsworthy and make for interesting reading. But it is so very necessary, in evaluating such a story, also to recognize that many thousand other policemen go about their jobs quietly, efficiently, courageously—without fanfare, glory, or publicity. And injudicious emphasis has seriously undermined popular respect for those charged with the enforcement of law and order, particularly among our highly impressionable young people.

Similarly, when you paint a complete picture around a handful of bad apples in the political barrel; when you add sinister hints of general political corruption to that picture; you create not only a distorted picture, but one which does incalculable disservice to our country, to our people, and to our system of government.

The nation's press, by and large, was up in arms over Franklin Roosevelt's quest for a third term. And when he sought a fourth term, the bitterness of much of the press was almost hysterical. And so there came forth an unprecedented campaign—unprecedented in vigor, in intensity and in determination—to limit the tenure of the presidency to two terms. That campaign—an anti-monarchy campaign it was called—was successful.

But was it?

For it has resulted in the pathetic spectacle of a President of the United States, not an overly strong leader to begin with, but now completely deprived even of bargaining strength; a lame duck who cannot even rally his own party behind his program because everybody—including himself—knows that at the end of this term, he is through.

The simple fact is that Khrushchev, McMillan, Mao-Tse-Tung, De Gaulle, and the heads of all other governments, know that President Eisenhower speaks only with temporary authority and that he doesn't even have his own partisans in Congress behind him; this, in a period in American history when the atom has balanced the world upon the precipice of disaster and when the whim of a single man can plunge us into holocaust.

Who is our leader? Who is our spokesman?

What have we done?

Yet, entirely apart from such situations, all Americans can take enduring pride in, and enjoy a sense of profound respect for, the press of our nation which daily produces the most remarkable facility of communication in recorded history—and which serves with zeal and distinction as a firm defender of our freedom, as an uncompromising guardian of our morality and as a dedicated custodian of our faith.

It has fought injustice. It has repressed bigotry. It has destroyed fear. It has given the American people a sense of security in the awareness that a vigilant press will protect their interests. But it has failed to fulfill its political responsibilities.

As a political leader, I have consulted frequently with the policymakers of our newspapers on the designation or nomination of people for positions of public trust. I have sought their guidance and, more often than not, I have respected and accepted their recommendations.

But see how difficult the press frequently makes the job of the political leader who wants best to reflect the thinking of the people and to assure the highest caliber of government. Can the Democratic Party in this State, for example—and I might say parenthetically that the Republican Party faces the same problem in other areas—can the Democratic Party in this State ever hope that whenever it nominates the best qualified person for State office the majority—or even a reasonable minority—of the press will support that candidate? Experience says no.

I tell you, my friends, if this situation continues to prevail, political parties throughout the country will be forced to select candidates solely on the results of screen tests and on the basis of personality, rather than by evaluation of ability and beliefs.

They will have to rely on the talents of the candidates for projecting themselves through the medium of television, rather than on their ability to project their views and philosophies through the medium of the press.

My good friends, just as we stand on the brink of despair, so too do we stand on the threshhold of new wonder, of new glory, of new achievement.

The barometer for success in 1960 is what we Democrats are able to do in the Congress, in statehouses, and in city governments between now and 1960.

At the Democratic National Convention next year my personal position will be the same as it was in the New York State Democratic Convention in Buffalo last year—I'll try to carry out the wishes of the majority of our delegation. They do the bossing. I just try to do what they want done.

However, I feel that when it comes to selecting a Democratic Presidential candidate the country's interest transcends that of the party. It isn't enough just to pick a man who can win—we should know that he will make a good President, that he will be a great and successful leader for America. If the Democrats don't face up to this high issue squarely, they're not keeping faith with our Nation. As a political candidate the present White House incumbent was quite a success. He did well at vote-getting. And nobody doubts his sincerity. But in meeting the rigid demands of these parlous times for truly great leadership, with force, courage, vision, and firmness, that's been quite another story.

I am sure our New York delegation will be ready to make a vigorous fight at next years' national convention, for the nomination of not just a good vote-getter, but a man who can be the great President and great leader America and the free world needs in these most dangerously critical times our country has ever faced.

For, just as the space age threatens to be an age of destruction—so, too, does it promise to be an age of new creation.

Which of these it shall be depends entirely upon the decisions which are to be made during the next few years. It is perfectly true—and it has been true through the ages—that the people need only to be armed with the facts to give expression to their inherent sense of goodness.

And this poses for you—you who are gathered here in this room today—as it poses for every political leader, for every labor leader, for every business leader, for every spiritual leader, for every teacher and scientist in America—but particularly for you—this poses a responsibility of great immensity.

The people read you. They are influenced by you. They accept you as authority. They look to you for objective guidance, for accurate portrayal and for honest leadership.

I submit that the responsible spokesmen for both parties want to work with you and to be guided by you. They want you to help them—through government—to fulfill

the wishes, the needs, the hopes, the aspirations, and the prayers of the people.

Do not damn us because we are of a different political faith. And do not praise us merely because we are of your political faith. But, rather, work with us toward the realization of a universal faith. Build with us and serve with us—and let us build and serve with you—in the cause of human justice and with the dream of a better world.

Thank you very much.

Poison in Your Water—No. 9

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the Providence (R.I.) Journal on June 27, 1958, telling of dumping of raw sewage and other waste into Narragansett Bay. I am satisfied that this article is another good reason why the full $50 million authorized in Public Law 660 for grants for sewage abatement works to States and municipalities should be continued and carried on.

The article follows:

WOONSOCKET CONTINUES TO POLLUTE NARRAGANSETT BAY

If the city of Woonsocket does not undertake soon to cooperate in the antipollution drive on Narragansett Bay, the State ought to use its authority to act in the city's name and charge the bill to the city's account.

In a recent report to Rhode Island on the progress of the clean-waters campaign, the Pollution Information Committee identified Woonsocket as the worst remaining source of pollution in the State. Providence, the greatest of the "Faltering Few," the committee said has just graduated to cleanliness.

But Woonsocket continues to offend today just as it has for the past 11 years, ever since the antipollution program was adopted. The northern city, the committee charges, is the only sizable community in the State that is dumping sewage, breaking the laws, and doing nothing about the grave situation.

The saddest thing about the committee's findings is that the size of the problem has been known for years in Woonsocket itself. A thoroughly inadequate sewage treatment plant cannot cope with the discharge from homes. Many industrial plants still discharge industrial wastes directly into the Blackstone River.

As recently as 1956 the question of sewage treatment improvements was discussed. But the city shelved the job of building a new sewage treatment plant on the grounds that other needs were more imperative and had to be met before it undertook to do its fair share toward cleaning up Narragansett Bay.

The city planning board proposes to give top priority to a new sewage treatment plant in the next series of capital improvement bond issues. There is no indication when the series will be submitted to voters, but about 2 years would pass between voter approval of a plant and operation of new treatment facilities.

As the information committee observes, there are no votes in sewage but a great deal of heavy spending. And really penurious taxpayers could argue that since the city wastes are sent along downstream from Woonsocket, the city has no pressing responsibility to build a new plant and extend its services.

The argument would be shortsighted. There always is danger to a community from untreated sewage dumped in waters that pass through it. But there is an area of wider responsibility which Woonsocket is ducking; cleaning up the bay is the job of every community which contributes to the fouling of the waters.

How long does Woonsocket expect to escape the wrath of downriver and bay communities which have been spending heavily on antipollution only to have their efforts almost negated by the millions of gallons of raw wastes dumped daily into the Blackstone River to dirty the whole bay?

The State would win few friends in Woonsocket if it ordered a sewage treatment plant built and then collected costs from the city. But communities which have spent willingly to keep up their end in the antipollution drive would waste little sympathy on Woonsocket taxpayers.

Woonsocket enjoys a large measure of home rule under its new charter. But with the privileges and rights of home rule go responsibilities to the State and sister communities. If Woonsocket won't meet them, the State must see that it does.

The Townsend Plan Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, for many years legislation embodying the principles of the Townsend plan "pay-as-you-go social security for all" has been before Congress. In the 85th Congress I joined with Representative BURDICK, of North Dakota in sponsoring the Townsend plan bill.

I have introduced H.R. 4000, which is identical with the Townsend plan bill I sponsored in the 85th Congress, and which differs from other bills embodying the Townsend plan, in former years, only in terms of legislative form and in respect to technical construction. It does not differ in respect to any basic principle, objective, or standard. The gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] has introduced a companion measure, H.R. 4001.

The 1959 Townsend plan bill is specially drafted as an amendment to the Social Security Act, repealing or suspending, as the applicable case may be, the various provisions of old-age and survivors and Federal disability insurance and instituting in place thereof the Townsend plan program under title II of the act.

Under this bill, a smooth transition from the present system of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance is provided for. No persons entitled to or receiving benefits under the present system will lose a penny of those benefits—because benefits under the 1959 Townsend plan bill will overlap those of the present system until all benefits under the present system are totally absorbed by the benefits under this bill. To the extent that some benefits paid under the present system exceed those initially provided for under my bill, the difference will be paid from the reserve funds of the old-age, survivors, and disability system.

Within 2 years, after the effective date of this Townsend plan program, it will have totally absorbed all benefit obligations of the present system.

This smooth, equitable transition is provided for by these provisions: Six months after its enactment the gross income—gross receipts—tax, upon which H.R. 4000 is based, will go into effect at the rate of 1 percent for a period of 6 months. Then, it will be advanced by one-fourth of 1 percent for each succeeding calendar quarter until it reaches the full tax rate of 2 percent. It will reach this rate of 2 percent as of the 16th month after its effective date.

The initial benefits financed under the 1 percent tax rate will be approximately equal to the average primary benefit paid under the present system—so that, right from the start, present benefits up to the amount of average primary benefits will be absorbed by the Townsend plan program. Then, as the tax rate advances quarter by quarter, benefits will proportionately advance to a level estimated at between $130 and $150 per month.

Thus, virtually every possible benefit-liability of the present system, under title II, will be smoothly absorbed by the Townsend plan program. If there prove to be some few beneficiaries entitled under the present system, who do not qualify for some unforeseeable technical reasons under the Townsend plan program—they are certainly provided for many times over by the approximately $23 billion reserve funds of the present system. Under my bill, nobody will lose any benefit—and in a short time all will receive better benefits than the present system will afford them. At the same time, once full benefits have been achieved under my bill, we will no longer have people trying to live on benefits capable of affording them nothing better than severe poverty. My bill will really solve the social security problem.

The problem of providing for equitable and smooth transition from the present program has been one of the foremost obstacles in Congress to adoption of the Townsend plan. This bill completely removes this obstacle.

The 1959 Townsend plan bill specifically defines its objectives. It provides that each year the Department of Commerce, under its Census Bureau work of annually surveying the distribution of money income in the U.S. population, will report to Congress each year, specifically, what rate of the gross income tax would have been necessary during the preceding year, under the program, in order for the overall income of the aged population to have compared favorably with that of the younger, adult population. This feature is designed to create a situation whereunder the Congress—and everybody else—will henceforth know, as a matter of clear record, exactly

what the relative position of the aged is economically.

This feature is designed to provide each year a defined basis on which everybody can henceforth deal with the primary problem of just how much pensions should justly be in the light of authentic facts. Up to now, this question of exactly how much pensions really ought to be has not been officially dealt with. The Townsend program is fundamentally predicated upon exactly that study and approach to the whole problem. My bill provides, in the Social Security Act, the legal requirement that this question be authentically reported on each year, to Congress by the Department of Commerce.

Now, there have always been a long list of arguments—in principle, academic arguments—about the workability of the gross income tax on which the Townsend plan is based. This bill provides, in its definition of gross income, the conclusive end to this whole field of confusion due to these purely theoretical and academic arguments, as well as an end to the waste of time and effort in dealing with such unrealistic claims and counterclaims, in a very simple way. Since 1933, a genuine gross income tax has been operating with unchallenged efficiency and practicality in the State of Indiana. Correcting jurisdictional references, the precise text of the definition of gross income contained in the Indiana State gross income tax act of 1933, as amended up to, and including, 1953, is incorporated in the 1959 Townsend plan bill.

It is specifically to be noted that this does not constitute any change in principle or departure in policy by the Townend organization. The tax proposed in the Townsend bill has traditionally been exactly what is now proposed. However, there have always been those, in and out of Congress, who insisted persistently that the Indiana tax really was not the same, was in reality quite different from the Townsend proposal. This specious argument stands abolished since the 1959 Townsend plan bill contains precisely the same definition of gross income as the Indiana law.

The 1959 Townsend bill provides for old-age retirement at the age of 60 years; for full benefits to persons disabled between ages 18 through 59; for full benefits for female heads of family groups with one or more dependent, minor children; and for proportionate benefits of one-third of the full benefit rate for such dependent children under 18. This last is new coverage.

H.R. 4000 does not require complete and outright, all-or-nothing retirement by beneficiaries, but encourages their participation in the Nation's productivity. At the same time, it provides a deterrent sufficient to prevent pensioners from selling their services so cheaply as to constitute unfair competition with other work-seekers. The provision is that above the amount of $75 per month, adult beneficiaries would lose $1 of their benefit for each full $2 earned in employment or self-employment. For the secondary beneficiaries, the children, they, too, would lose $1 for each full $2 per month earned in excess of $50 in employment or self-employment.

When accorded serious study, the above provisions will be seen—not only as providing reasonable inducement to beneficiaries to supplement their benefits by appropriate participation in the labor force without risking frustrating reductions in their benefits—but, also, as aiding greatly in enabling workers to "ease" into retirement over a period of time and in the rehabilitation of the disabled and "easing" them back into full occupation over a period of time.

The 1958 Townsend bill requires that any person over 18 years of age must have resided in the United States for a total of not less than 10 years in order to qualify for benefits. The reasons for this provision are manifold; but, suffice it to say that very rare would be the citizen of the United States who would not have satisfied this requirement before his childhood was over. At the same time, this requirement, imposed on our own citizens, will abridge the difficulties involved in treaties we have with various nations reciprocally agreeing that we treat each others' nationals exactly as we treat our own citizens; and it will conclusively bar persons from becoming simply retirement emigrees to the United States, since all will have to have been here long enough to support the system quite substantially before becoming eligible to draw its benefits.

The bill exempts persons under 18 from this residence requirement even if the adults upon whom they depend may be barred by this residence requirement.

THE NEED FOR TOWNSEND PLAN LEGISLATION

The need for this type of legislation is embodied, first, in the fact that we have a Social Security Act, in the first place. This means that in 1935 Congress recognized the social security problem to such a degree that the act was adopted. This realization extended to the level of the problem being recognized as, in principle at least, a national, not a local or regional problem—a problem requiring Federal legislative action. This legislative action, itself, certified the ruling conviction that privately the problem could not be handled. Legislating the entirely Federal program embodied in old age and survivors insurance recognized that the problem was beyond the capabilities of local and even of State governmental scope. The subsequent actions by Congress after 1935—up to and including 1958—certify unanswerably that this conviction as to the solid, national nature of the problem has continuously solidified and strengthened.

When it is all summed up, the truth is this: We have a social security problem simply because the great majority of the Americans reach old age only to find themselves lacking the financial ability to command income and living standards reasonably comparable to the general standards of living prevailing around them. The present system of old age, survivors, and disability insurance has done good as far as it has gone, or could go. However, in recent years it has become clearly evident that the present system is not altering the above stated reason for our having a social security program, in the first place. All we have done has been to prevent the originally deplorable economic position of our aged from becoming still worse. Since the end of World War II, we have not bettered the comparative economic position of our senior citizens. As a group, their income share has remained unchanged while their comparative numbers have increased over three times as rapidly as any other part of our adult population. In fact, in the overall, despite all our efforts under the present system, the comparative income position of our elderly people remains a continually declining one. I repeat, the present program is good—as far as it goes—but, far from solving the social security problem, it continues actually failing to prevent the problem from getting slowly worse.

The bill I have introduced today is squarely based on the belief that the Americans desire and should by all means enjoy economic sufficiency and independence as the final result of life. Obviously, if they are ever going to achieve this result, we have no alternative than an entirely new approach to the problem. That new approach is the substance of the bill I have introduced.

Let us look at the facts about the economic position of our elderly people. In February 1954, the Social Security Bulletin carried an article by Jacob Fisher of the Social Security Administration's Division of Research and Statistics, namely, "Postwar Changes in the Income Position of the Aged." This report shows the population aged 65 and over increased 17 percent from 1947 through 1952—while the total population aged 14 and over increased only 5 percent—but their share of total personal income increased from 7 percent in 1947 to only 8 percent in 1952.

Analysis of Census Bureau data shows the share of the elderly to have been 7.3 percent in 1953, 7.7 percent in 1954, 7.9 percent in 1955, 7.6 percent in 1956, and 7.4 percent in 1957. By 1957, the aged population increased 36.9 percent over the 1947 number, while the total population 14 and over, including the aged, increased only 11.5 percent. Thus, the comparative income position of the average aged person declined, seriously, from the admittedly unjust levels of 1947 to an even more inferior level in 1956.

The increase of the aged as a part of our total population continues unabated, while their total share of income remains unchanging. This has taken place despite congressional action in 1950 increasing OASI benefits by 70 percent and in spite of congressional actions each 2 years ever since. It has taken place despite the dramatic increase in private pension systems and the liberalization of just about every existing public and private retirement system, as well.

Since the end of World War II, OASI has not only failed to solve the social security problem; but, it has even failed to prevent it from getting worse.

Furthermore, a 1955 report from the Social Security Administration warns that to establish even so modest a minimum OASI benefit as $75 a month would

entail payroll tax rates so high as to endanger public support and acceptance of its contributory principle. This conclusion has repeatedly been urged by this same authority in the discussion of benefit increases ever since.

The facts clearly place before us the unavoidable conclusion that we do not yet have anything resembling a Federal social security program capable of affording the American people the kind of social security they richly deserve. It is in the light of these facts that I have introduced today H.R. 4000 which is designed specifically to provide such a completely desirable social security program under title II of the Social Security Act.

Our ever-increasing ability to produce goods and services dictates that we must keep buying power amongst our population abreast of our ability to produce or suffer again and again the losses in wealth and human welfare so recently experienced because of business recession. It has become more than clear to me that unless we stop destruction of the average American's buying power upon his reaching old age, we can never do this. It is what OASI has clearly failed to do. It is exactly what H.R. 4000, the Townsend plan, will do.

Added to what we authentically know the American people can do privately for their retirement, Townsend plan benefits will end poverty and dependence in old age, establish the aged, as a group, on reasonable income parity with the rest of our adult population—thus amplifying buying power, the only way prosperously to absorb surpluses.

Therefore, the Townsend plan should be adopted immediately, in place of the present system of old-age and survivors and disability insurance.

HOW THE 1949 TOWNSEND PLAN BILL WILL WORK

On the first day of the sixth month beginning after the enactment of this bill, the program will go into effect. For the purposes of simplicity, let us assume that the effective date is January 1.

Then, as of January 1, the tax proposed in this bill will go into effect and the present payroll tax supporting old-age and survivors insurance and Federal disability insurance would cease. For the 6-month period—January through June—the gross income tax will operate at the rate of 1 percent. For the 7th, 8th, and 9th months, the rate will be 1¼ percent; for the 10th, 11th, and 12th months 1½ percent; for the 13th, 14th, and 15th months 1¾ percent; and for the 16th and all succeeding months 2 percent.

Meanwhile, beginning with the seventh month—July—the revenue collected from the first month—January—less, specifically, administrative costs, will be distributed as benefits to the qualified beneficiaries. The amount of benefits will be determined simply by dividing the available revenue—after administrative costs—by the number of primary beneficiaries plus the number of primary beneficiaries represented by the secondary beneficiaries—with each primary beneficiary receiving the resulting sum and each secondary beneficiary receiving his appropriate fraction thereof.

As of the first of the eighth month the revenue from the second month would be so distributed; and, thereafter, as of the first of every month the revenue collected from the sixth preceding month would be so distributed as benefits.

Thus, as the tax rate matures and as beneficiaries qualify, the program will ease into full effect in between 1½ and 2 years of its effective date.

Statistical studies show that as of the 7th through the 12th month, the first benefits under this program would amount to between $60 and $70 per month. Then, based on the advancing tax rate described above, benefits would progressively increase to averages of twice that amount.

H.R. 4000 provides that benefits under old-age and survivors and disability insurance will continue to be paid to whatever extent they might be greater than benefits provided by the Townsend plan, and to whatever extent OASDI benefits so continue to be paid they shall be paid out of the OASDI reserve funds.

However, since the average benefit to retired workers under OASDI is less than $70 a month—and since dependents' and survivors' benefits are but fractions of the workers' primary benefits—it is obvious that the greater part of present beneficiaries will almost immediately be absorbed under the Townsend plan. As this new program matures, under the full 2-percent rate of the gross income tax, there can be no doubt whatsoever that all benefits under the present program would be absorbed.

Nobody can seriously doubt that the $23 billion reserves of the present system are far more than adequate to finance the benefit load incumbent upon them under this bill during this period of transition to this new program.

Let me repeat, at no time will any beneficiary of the present system ever lose 1 penny of any benefit because of the adoption of H.R. 4000; and all will end up incomparably better off than they will ever be under the present system.

The benefit-coverage provided by H.R. 4000 certainly takes account of all who can possibly qualify under the present programs under title II of the Social Security Act; and it takes under its coverage those few elements still excluded under the present programs. It is, indeed, very hard to imagine persons who will be able to qualify under present programs who will not qualify under the Townsend plan. Whatever possible cases there may be are obviously so few and infrequent that they will not constitute anything of such magnitude as to be classed as a problem.

The Townsend program, once operating under the full support of the 2-percent rate of the gross income tax—as indicated by statistics on the population, the distribution of income, and the volume of business in the United States—will provide primary benefits of $130 to $150 a month. This level of benefits, under the coverage provided for in the Townsend bill, will involve a revenue of at least $2.5 billion a month. The immediate question becomes this: How can so large a number of beneficiaries at these benefit-levels be justified? In other words, the immediate question to be settled is that raised by those who are forever denouncing anything that is going to cost money. Obviously, this is a program the financial features of which really raise their dander. However, the answer is not difficult to set forth.

The first fact is a simple one: As of 1956, the group aged 65 and over lacked by just about one-half an equal share of income as compared with younger adults—aged 25 through 64. They endured this lack—about 20 percent of them having no income whatsoever from any source—despite all the programs presently in force under the social security system as it is, despite all other public and private programs, despite the expanded rates of savings and investment that recent times of unprecedented prosperity have afforded.

The answer is that less than the Townsend plan will not fill the gap, will not eliminate the economic inferiority of the aged. Less will not secure the future of the younger people from the fate of economic deterioration when they reach old age and so forth.

So, it comes down simply to this: Is the solution of the social security problem a beneficial thing to our society or not? If it is a beneficial thing to do, then it is worth the price. The Townsend program is simply the only one ever designed and put forth actually to eliminate, fully solve this problem. If the problem is ever to be solved in any other way than through the Townsend plan, it will have to be by providing the same standard of benefits for the same number and classes of people as are provided for under the 1959 Townsend plan bill. That is all there is to it, in reality. Either the problem is a valid one and should be solved, or it should not.

To those who say the financial magnitude of the problem has been overestimated, I say that economic sufficiency and independence should be the final reward in life for the people of the United States; that this requires two things: First, that retired people, retired in this context of social security benefits, be not subjected to an income level that involves poverty, insufficiency in terms of the actual, general standards of the times; and, second, that as an overall group retired people should enjoy an up-to-date share in income and living standards as compared to those enjoyed by younger adult people. Less than this constitutes inferiority, lack of freedom and independence, curtailment of the ability to participate fully in the social, economic life of the day—injustice, in short. The Townsend plan is calculated on the basis of those convictions and standards.

Now, if somebody feels, in their own view, that less than this is really an answer, let them state how much they believe should be the share of the aged. On this basis the whole matter can be settled; but, the burden of proof is theirs. The Townsend bill alone is based upon

the square question: How much should an old-age pension be? The Townsend bill provides the ways and means of providing that pension—whatever it should be.

Since it is self-evident that whatever the final decision of Congress turns out to be as to what an old-age pension ought to provide for, there still remains the unassailable truth—"It will require just as much money to be raised for just as many people under any other plan as under the Townsend plan." Therefore, the whole question reverts back to the primary one: Is the genuine solution of the social security problem desirable or not?

To those who feel that it is desirable, we present the Townsend plan, embodying the defined ways and means of solving it. To those who do not wish its solution we say: "It is time you frankly said so." This is the essence of H.R. 4000 the Townsend bill.

Off the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Lancaster (S.C.) News of February 2, 1959:

OFF THE RECORD

Termites is what the Detroit automobile manufacturers now have. Seventy-eight varieties of foreign cars are now chewing away at the foundations of American prosperity because sales figures and customer surveys indicated these little imports were just a fad, a bad dream that would go away when the 1959 models hit the market.

Detroit was satisfied that the average American wanted the biggest, fastest, fanciest chariot that could be built and that he would willingly place himself in bondage for 24 to 36 months to possess the latest model. America brought the motorcar to perfection and it was nonsense to assume that Americans would forego the prestige, comfort, and service facilities of the domestic creation in favor of half-pint imports of doubtful ancestry and long-distance servicing.

This was not the picture at the annual convention of the National Automobile Dealers Association in Chicago. There was a definite feeling there that Detroit had missed the boat. Last year 340,000 small foreign cars were sold in this country and the figure is expected to reach 550,000 this year.

The dealers do not like it. Their profit margin on the imports is low and, Detroit theory to the contrary, they can't look forward to any fat fees for repairs and service. As one dealer put it:

"The service and parts required per 1,000 miles by foreign cars is negligible compared to domestic cars. The reason is, in my opinion, because the foreign cars are smaller, simpler, and better balanced."

Now this is nothing less than treason. So were other reports heard by the dealers. Detroit's idea that only kids and sportscar fans would be interested in the imports did not stand up. The average buyer was 37 years old, fairly well off financially and the head of a household. Furthermore, a majority of the 10,000 foreign-car owners questioned said they would have preferred buying an American car if Detroit would build something of similar size, price, and quality.

An Appropriation for the U.S. Coast Guard Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER W. BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced an appropriation bill of $6,565,000 to replace wornout and obsolescent facilities at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in New London, Conn.

The bill provides money necessary to carry out the recommendations of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, which were contained in a report to Congress on May 2, 1958.

In its report, the board expressed its concern over the "continued existence and use of World War II wooden buildings for various activities of the Coast Guard Academy."

The board reported that immediate replacement of the outmoded structures would result in long-range savings by removing excessive maintenance costs and would eliminate hazardous occupancy.

Mr. Speaker, I think none of us needs to be reminded of the valuable and courageous contribution of the Coast Guard in times of war. They were in the thick of battle as an integral part of the Navy, sailing the same seas and running the same risks.

Nor have they been any less active in times of peace. In addition to patroling our shores, they perform valuable rescue work, they keep open the sea lanes of the North Atlantic, and they are making water travel safe for surging motor and pleasure boat activities.

Yet if we do not provide sufficient funds, we will be striking at the very heart of the service—the Coast Guard Academy. This is where the new officers are trained; this is where the young service minds are shaped. We must not allow their welfare and training opportunities to deteriorate.

It is my sincere belief that as long as the United States recognizes the need for a Coast Guard, it has the obligation to maintain the service in a state of preparedness equal to the efforts made in behalf of the other armed services.

Mr. Speaker, the Coast Guard Academy is only 19 miles from my home and I know it well. It is under excellent management and it has close and most cordial relations with the New London community.

I might add that the New London Chamber of Commerce recently made a special study of conditions at the Academy and concurred in the recommendations made by the Board of Visitors.

Undoubtedly many Members of the House recall that last year a sum of $2 million was appropriated to replace the wooden cadet barracks. All friends of the Academy were gratified by this step forward. But, as the report indicates, much still remains to be done.

Therefore I have introduced a bill based on the report which would provide money for:

First. New barracks, new classroom and administration buildings for the officer indoctrination and candidate schools.

Second. Additional cadet classroom space to accommodate the increased enrollments.

Third. An auditorium for the Academy to replace the present wooden structure which the Board called a fire hazard and too small for corps purposes.

Fourth. Major repairs to the Academy docks and causeway that have badly deteriorated.

Fifth. The construction and improvement of other Academy structures that are presently inadequate, outmoded, and hazardous.

The cost of these improvements are based on estimates prepared by the Coast Guard Academy. I would like to point out here that the sum of $6,565,000 does not include an estimate for the construction of officer candidate school facilities. I have specifically stated in the bill that part of the money be used for that purpose because the operation of the school is an integral part of the Academy.

The money will have to come out of other projects, upon which the estimate was based. So even this sum of $6,565,000 may not be fully adequate to meet the entire need. Yet this is the very least we can do.

Mr. Speaker, since this sum was not included in the Treasury's budget for the fiscal year 1960, despite my pleas and those of others, I have introduced this bill in the earnest hope that the Appropriations Committee will take these pressing needs into consideration.

Although I realize that separate appropriation items are almost never reported to the floor of the House, I will be deeply grateful if this bill alerts the committee to what I believe to be a most urgent situation before it reports out the final Treasury appropriation bill now under consideration.

A Realistic Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address I delivered at the open forum of the New York Hotel Trades Council, AFL–CIO, Friday, January 30, 1959, in New York City. The address follows:

It is a pleasure and a privilege to discuss with you the problem of how we can provide decent housing for our people.

As with all big problems, it is not only degree which is important—that is, how much we can or should do about housing but also the approach—how we should go about it. In this respect I especially wish to congratulate you. Your approach here today has been most commendable. First, you have taken up the problem from the point of view of self-help. What can your own organization do about housing? Secondly, you have considered the question in terms of local government. And, finally, you have come to the question of what should the Federal Government do?

It seems to me that there is a great deal that the Federal Government can and must do in this field. This is through no fault of forward looking local agencies like the New York Housing Authority. Nor is it through lack of efforts by the unions to bring about better housing for their members. The plain fact is that the legitimate demands of our people for decent housing have exceeded the ability of commercial enterprise, labor organizations, and local government to satisfy those needs.

There is a variety of reasons for this. The biggest single factor is the growth of our population. It is expected that within the next decade, the population of the United States will increase by 25 million people. Within the next 20 years, approximately 56 million people will be added to our population. More than 1 million new families will be formed every year in the 1960's. Each of these families will seek and should have suitable housing. Fresh air, sunlight, adequate space for family living, modern appliances, recreational areas are fortunately no longer luxuries in 20th century America. They have come to be regarded as necessities, and rightly so.

In a country as large and as varied as the United States, it is obvious that the housing problem will take many different forms. Consequently, the programs upon which the Federal Government is embarked are equally varied. In much of the country—and especially in the large suburban areas—decent housing is best provided by encouraging home ownership. Through a series of acts passed in the 1930's Congress formulated programs of Government insurance and credit reserves designed to generate a flow of mortgage money at reasonable rates. The Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Home Owners Loan Corporation, the Federal Housing Authority, the Federal National Mortgage Association were all born of the great social and economic purposes of the New Deal. In one form or another those programs have been continued up to the present time. They have been expanded and additional programs like VA guaranteed loans have been created based on the same underlying principles.

What has this alphabet soup of housing accomplished? Let the figures speak for themselves. The FHA has insured mortgages on 4½ million homes. Of these, 2½ million were new construction. Twenty to thirty percent of the new homes built each year are facilitated by FHA insurance.

The VA has guaranteed home loans to almost 5 million veterans since 1944 alone.

The Federal National Mortgage Association, or Fannie May, has purchased mortgages amounting to almost $6 billion and has thus increased the availability of mortgage credit to the homebuilder.

It is a source of enduring satisfaction to me that I had the opportunity to vote for every one of these programs. As I travel around the United States, I can see in the living conditions of our people what we have accomplished through FHA, the VA, Fannie May, and others. I shudder to think of the situation we would be in today without them.

Not only have these programs brought decent housing to our people, but they have transformed homebuilding from a craft to an industry which, since World War II alone, has contributed about $140 billion to the national product.

And this has been done, amazingly enough, at little cost to the taxpayer. If we were today to liquidate all housing assets held by the Government we would find that except in public housing and urban renewal, these programs have not only paid for themselves but have shown a profit. Long-term, low downpayment home financing has been demonstrated to be realistic, sound, and effective.

Remember the cries of Socialist and Bolshevik which we heard when the New Deal fought for decent housing? Yet, today not a single responsible leader of the housing or banking businesses would have the temerity to advocate repeal of most of the Federal housing programs. On the contrary, I think they would actually insist that the continued operation of the Federal housing programs are essential to the health of banking and the housing industry.

The argument today is rather over how much we can afford. I say that in the area of home loan guarantees and secondary market operations there is no limit on what we can provide for the simple reason that these programs have cost us nothing and, soundly administered, will continue to cost us nothing.

Legislation has already been introduced in the 86th Congress to raise FHA mortgage ceilings on sales housing and to reduce down payment requirements. It would also reduce the equity required of builders in rental housing, thus stimulating construction of rental units. Authority to increase the total of FHA guaranteed mortgages by $8 billion for the next 2 fiscal years has also been proposed. This is sound legislation and I will wholeheartedly support its passage.

The enormous increase in home ownership under FHA and related programs has, however, been responsive to only part of the national housing problem. Special conditions which could not be handled under the National Housing Acts have necessitated special programs such as military housing, defense housing, cooperative housing, college housing, and public housing.

I should like to say a few words about the public housing program. Some of you will recall that the first public housing, consisting of about 22,000 dwelling units, was built by the old PWA back in 1934. Additional units were built under the United States Housing Authority which lapsed in 1940. The program was revised in 1949 and is now in effect but on a very modest scale.

The purpose of public housing is, of course, to provide decent low rental housing to those who could not otherwise afford it. Under the terms of the program, the Federal Government lends funds to locally established housing authorities for the construction of publicly owned projects. The Federal Government also pays the local authority an annual subsidy of the difference between the rent charged and the cost of carrying charges and operation.

I am aware that a number of serious problems have developed recently in the operation of public housing. Rundown projects and problem families have made public housing less attractive than it can be. I believe that it is up to local authorities to be more vigorous in maintaining the appearance and habitability of these projects.

The poor are still with us and their demands for decent housing must be met. In the budget which the President submitted he requested no new low-rent housing units but merely an extension of time for contracting for units already authorized. An expanding nation cannot afford a holding operation on public housing. I believe that authorization for fiscal year 1960 should be increased by 27,500 units. I also believe that the frequently unrealistic maximum income limits for occupancy should be raised.

Of all the Federal programs, however, the one that has completely captured by imagination is urban renewal. I know the cities and their problems best. I was born into the city; I grew up in the midst of its crowded tenements, and I have lived and worked in the city all my life. Slums, overcrowded tenements, blighted areas have taken a heavy toll in human misery and degradation. Fine men, good citizens, have come from the slums, but so have more crime and disease than we should have. The cost, however, is not only in human values, it is also in dollars and cents.

In a typical city the taxpayer pays an average of $7 each year for services rendered in a blighted area. The area pays back only $4.25 in taxes. In a good area the average cost per citizen is $3.60, and the area pays back $11.30.

Slums and blighted areas make the largest demands on the cities' services—hospital care, fire, police, welfare services. One city finds that 40 percent of its police calls, 40 percent of its relief funds, 30 percent of its city hospital expenses are used for 6 percent of its people—those living in blighted areas. With their financial structures already weakened by the movement of industry and taxpayers to the suburbs, and as a result of the increasing cost of services, the cities just can't afford the indefinitely continued existence of slums.

Under the urban renewal program which developed from the Housing Act of 1954, the local community is encouraged to formulate a workable program of urban redevelopment. This program must include sound local housing and health codes, a master plan for the community's development, and an analysis of neighborhoods and the treatment needed. It must include evidence of financial capacity to provide the necessary local contribution. It must also include plans for rehousing displaced families. Presented with a workable program the Federal Government will, on its part, make loans and grants to pay the bulk of the net cost for clearing slum areas or for replanning blighted areas for rehabilitation. In addition, special FHA mortgage insurance is made available to encourage private investment in rebuilding these areas.

The principles governing the urban renewal program are sound ones. Emphasis is placed upon the initiative of local government in bringing about a solution of its own community problems. Assistance given by the Federal Government is realistic and effective. But we must have more, not only of Federal aid but of local enthusiasm and initiative. Urban renewal presents what is perhaps the most difficult housing problem in America today. Costs are high. Rehousing displaced families often presents a real bottleneck to otherwise effective programs. However, the goal of clean, well-planned cities and decent homes for city dwellers is too exciting, too important to be frustrated by anything less than sheer impossibility.

I believe the program should be pushed as far and as fast as we possibly can.

The President has requested $225 million a year for the next 6 years. In a period of high national income, I believe that the United States can and must do more to clean up its cities, to alleviate the misery of the slums and to provide decent city housing for our increasing population. I believe the annual appropriation requested by the President is inadequate and should be in-

creased to anywhere from $350 million to $600 million a year.

In housing, as in public works, in medical research, in industrial development, and social security this country will either advance and create a better life for its people, or it will stagnate and die. A nation's course in history is very much like a skier going up a steep slope. He keeps going up of he slides to the bottom; there is no standing still.

In the 36 years I have spent in the Congress of the United States, this country has made great progress in insuring better sosial and economic conditions for our people. The Nation has moved considerably from the place near the bottom of the hill where we were 50 years ago. I am convinced that the new 86th Congress will, in the field of housing, as in other areas, make it possible for this country to climb still further up the slope of our national aspirations.

Peorian and 11 Texas Brothers Making Career in Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, 1958, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON inserted into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an extension of his remarks concerning the Ripowski family of Dayton, Tex. The Ripowski family is truly a remarkable group in that the 12 brothers of this lineage have seen active service in the Armed Forces. This is an outstanding example of sincere patriotism and of a family's supreme devotion to their country.

However, I have learned from Mr. George J. Marker of the Army Times that Senator JOHNSON may have overlooked another fine group of Texans who have a great deal to be proud of in that they are the 11 brothers of an exceptional Illinois boy whose enlistment enabled the family to equal the Ripowski record. Pfc. Jimmy L. Melton, whose wife continues to reside in my district while Jimmy serves in Korea, is one of 12 brothers currently serving in the Armed Forces, and, in addition, all intend to make a career of the service. Moreover, this family, which is originally from Missouri, will have accrued the amazing total of more than 250 years of service at the completion of the individual careers.

Mr. Marker is of the opinion that the Meltons offer a far superior record to the claim of being the Nation's First Family from the standpoint of service and in view of their multitudinous contributions to the Armed Forces. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following release from the Information Office of the 1st Cavalry Division dated January 22, 1959, which most certainly substantiates Mr. Marker's statement:

HEADQUARTERS, 1ST CAVALRY DIVISION, KOREA.—According to Pfc. Jimmy L. Melton, cook in Company A, 7th Cavalry, 1st Cavalry Division, when he and his brothers, all born in Quiln, Mo., complete their military careers, they will have donated more than 250 years of service to their country.

He said 5 of the 12 are soldiers, 3 are in the Air Force and Navy each, 1 is a Marine, and together they have served in practically every country in the world. Each has participated in either the Korean war or World War II.

Pfc. Melton stated that the brothers have a family meeting as often as possible, "but there is always someone who can't make it." The last get-together was held for Robert, at the Melton's farm in Houston, Tex., in 1943, and "more than 100 people were present," he added.

Other than Jimmy, the only one overseas is Maj. John Melton in Germany, the oldest of the 12, who, according to Jimmy, was the first one of them to enter the service, enlisting in 1939. James T., Michael, and Robert J., all NCO's, make the family's representation in the Army complete, he reported.

The three brothers in the Air Force, Robert F., Bill, and William E., are each assigned to Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex. Robert and Bill are master sergeants, and William holds the airman second class rank, said Jimmy.

Also assigned together are the three sailors, Marcus, Micus and Silus, who are stationed in San Diego, Calif. Marcus and Micus, twins, entered the Navy 8 years ago just a few days apart, said Jimmy, and since then have been assigned together several times.

The only marine of the 12 volunteers, according to Pfc. Melton, is Robert T., a corporal assigned to Camp Pendleton, Calif.

Jimmy, who was the last one to enlist, said that the brothers had no idea they would all enter the service until it was up to him and, "I hated to be the only civilian among us," he recalled.

At one time, reported Jimmy, when only 11 were in the service, each was assigned overseas. This was during the Korean war in 1952, and a few months later Jimmy enlisted in the Marines. He said he was then assigned with his brother in the 1st Marine Division near Pusan, Korea, where each was in the 7th Regiment but in different companies. Both were involved in heavy fighting and each received a Purple Heart, according to Melton.

Asked how the Meltons keep in touch, Jimmy replied, "Its pretty hard to keep up with each other, but we manage somehow. We try to write each other regularly, but usually there is at least one of them with whom I have lost contact because we move around so much."

Each of the brothers calls Texas his home State, with the exception of Jimmy, whose wife resides in Peoria, Ill. All of them grew up on the same farm in Quiln, Mo., and their mother, Mrs. Marybelle Melton, resides in St. Louis, Mo.

Abandoned Strip Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, during my 10 years in Washington scores of colleagues have commented on the beauty of the fertile farmlands, the rolling hills, and the inspiring mountains of western and central Pennsylvania. You have been most generous in your praise of our natural attractions. You have also been very frank in calling attention to a monunmental blight on Nature's handiwork that is inescapable to travelers—the abandoned strip mines so prominent in our part of the country.

We who live there are not insensitive to these pockmarks on a fetching native landscape. You do not accept such conditions, no matter how close you may be to a situation, any more than you would tolerate a fault in your front yard or chipped plaster in your living room. When you are a conservationist, the abandoned strip mines are even more appalling.

Each time I pass one of these hideous excavations I think of the economic and cultural losses involved. I conceive its transformation into a recreational site—where spiritual and physical comfort awaits those with troubled mind and tired body. I visualize playgrounds for children who may otherwise be deprived of facilities to play ball, to skate, or merely to indulge in family walks and picnics. I think of the rich fields of grain and vegetables, of fruit trees, and berries, of grazing cattle that would grace these areas if reclamation were brought about.

Our people are disturbed about this violation of our countryside. They did not protest when the huge shovels and draglines were assigned to the mission of pawing deep into the earth to lay bare the soil that covered veins of needed coal, for the time was during World War II when all available fuel was required in the interest of national defense. But as the years pass by our patience becomes exhausted. In many cases human lives are involved, for those mines which have filled with water are an extreme hazard to young children who live in the vicinity.

It is time for action. Today I am introducing a bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior and a report to the Congress concerning strip-mining operations in the United States. The survey may include but need not be limited to such matters as the nature and extent of strip mining in the United States, the ownership of the land involved, the use if any that is now being made of such land, the effect of such mining operations with respect to safety and health from such operations, the effect of strip-mining operations upon highway programs, scenic features, fish and wildlife and other resources of the United States and the several States, and the public interest in and public benefits that may be realized from appropriate use and development of areas that have been subjected to strip-mining activities.

At this time I should like to include in the RECORD a copy of a letter from Perry E. Walper, chairman, conservation committee, Allegheny County Sportsmen's League, Inc., and the preliminary data for proposed reclamation which he has submitted to me. The letter and enclosure follow:

ALLEGHENY COUNTY
SPORTSMEN'S LEAGUE, INC.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., December 22, 1958.

Congressman JOHN SAYLOR,

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAYLOR: This is to request your participation in bipartisan sponsorship of Federal legislation to recover abandoned strip mined areas in Pennsyl-

vania. The enclosed brief explains the anticipated advantages to the Commonwealth.

As I am writing to you, a letter and brief are also being sent to Congressman THOMAS E. MORGAN. Similarly, Senators JOSEPH CLARK and HUGH SCOTT are being requested to introduce identical legislation in the Senate.

This is not a random request, but rather the result of intensive investigation by the league. Our contacts have included Fred Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation; Ross Leffler, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife; and Mr. Young, Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service.

Information from these authorities clearly indicates that new legislation would be necessary to accomplish the restoration. There is no provision for such work under existing law.

During World War II, in the interest of national defense, the Federal Government requested coal at any price and in disregard of Pennsylvania law. We won the war, but the abandoned strip mines created as a result, stand as mute evidence of values lost. Certainly there is a definite Federal responsibility in this restoration.

Large appropriations have been spent by the Federal Government for reclamation of lands in Western and Midwestern States. Here in the east, comparable benefits have been trivial. With our booming population, it is high time that the welfare of our eastern lands was considered for the future of our country.

The league's only concern in this matter is the accomplishment of restoration of abandoned strip lands. The Allegheny County Sportsmen's League, its officers and members, invite your investigation of our sincerity of purpose at any time.

For the benefit of our State, your cooperation and leadership is requested. It is our thinking that you and Mr MORGAN can be of immeasurable service by collaboration, preparation, and presentation of an effective bill in the House of Representatives to accomplish this vital land restoration.

Of course, I am at your service at any time to further discuss this matter.

My best wishes for your success in the new Congress.

Very truly yours,

PERRY E. WALPER,
Chairman, Conservation Committee.

PRELIMINARY DATA FOR PROPOSED RECLAMATION OF STRIP MINED AREAS IN PENNSYLVANIA

Area: Best estimates obtainable from experienced strip mine operators indicate 70,000 to 100,000 acres of unreclaimed land resulting from operations since World War I and continuing to the Pennsylvania Act of 1945.

Exact nature, area, and ownership of lands could be determined only by survey. Lands subsequent to the act of 1945 are not considered in this proposal.

As the lands now are: They are minimal or nontax producing to the township and county concerned. This increases the taxation burden upon resident landowners, and deprives the Government of a taxable source of revenue. Many of the lands are held by the township for taxes, and hence produce nothing.

They are of no value or potential value in productivity of minerals or surface products. They are not now feasible for agriculture or reforestation. Pools of water, residual from past operations, are in the majority acid in character with some few exceptions. In their present state, such waters are detrimental if discharged into the streams of the Commonwealth. Present recreational values of the pools are nil. As a hazard to people, there is ample proof of drownings resulting from falling over high walls or swimming in dangerous areas.

If reclaimed, these lands would provide: Ample employment to the coal mining industry through use of available machinery and manpower. The coal industry is presently in an economic slump and reclamation would provide definite employment in this critical period. Increased tax values to the areas in which located. Land productivity for reforestation, pasturage or farming of several types.

Anticipated objections: If the reclaimed lands were returned to true or reasonable contour, this would set a pattern for land restoration which would be in excess of present legal requirements in Pennsylvania. Strip mine operators could view this as a pattern which would become a requirement for the industry as a whole. Objections could be voiced against restoration of stripped lands which are in private ownership; that assurance of such a program could bring about land speculation.

Summary: Regardless of concerns of the strip mining industry, present Pennsylvania law[1] is inadequate to assure land restoration for reuse and taxation purposes. Good land restoration will become mandatory as land values continue to rise with increasing populations.

Whether lands would be in private or public ownership upon restoration is of little consequence since these lands would once again be tax producing as well as productive in surface products. Further, in many instances, pure waters would return to many Pennsylvania streams, as restoration covers sites of mine acid drainage and hence pollution.

---

[1] The act of 1945, known as the Pennsylvania Bituminous Coal Open Pit Mining Conservation Act, calls for land restoration to this extent: That the operator shall place 3 feet of earth over the face of the exposed coal seam, round the tops of spoil piles, and plant grasses, trees or shrubs to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Mines. If these conditions are met, the bond is refunded to the operator following inspection and approval.

Address by Senator Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday evening, February 3, I was privileged to attend a dinner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at which the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, was presented with an award in recognition of his public service.

I think that the Veterans of Foreign Wars, ever mindful of the security of our country, could not have made a more appropriate and more deserving choice for this signal honor than Senator JOHNSON, who is also chairman of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

Senator JOHNSON's record in Congress is well known to all of us. He is a man of deep convictions, courage, and vision. He is without question the most outstanding personality in Congress today and has filled the void of leadership existing in Washington, which leadership our Nation so sorely needs in these trying days in order to withstand the onslaught of Communist aggression. Senator JOHNSON did not hesitate to sponsor civil rights legislation such as he introduced recently, despite the criticism he knew he would have to face in his home State.

Mr. Speaker, in accepting the award from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Senator JOHNSON delivered a most timely address dealing with the problems of national security as we face them today—an address which I believe every citizen will want to read. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert this address in order to bring it to the attention of all our colleagues and to the American people. It is as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATE DEMOCRATIC LEADER LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 3, 1959

FOR THE COMMON DEFENSE

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, for this award—and for the honor of this occasion—I am most grateful to you. While your recognition is to my public service, this moment is one of deep personal meaning to me.

I accept this award in the sense of a representative of the million of Americans who have joined in a partnership to provide for the common defense.

This includes those who faced the enemy in combat.

This includes those who have produced the tools of preparedness.

THE THOUGHT OF PREPAREDNESS

This includes those who, like the Veterans of Foreign Wars, have banded together to keep alive the thought of preparedness in the hearts of our citizens.

The VFW is not just an organization founded upon memories of events which become nostalgic as we get farther from them. It is a vital force upon the American scene today.

For 22 years now—as a Member of the House and as a Member of the Senate—I have served in the Congress. Throughout that period I have served continuously on those committees charged with the most direct responsibility for our national security.

DECISION AND RESPONSIBILITY

National security—in these times—is complex. National strength is costly.

The burdens of decision and responsibility are trials.

But when these matters are approached in terms of individual human lives, the complexities become simple, the cost becomes cheap, and the trials cease to matter.

The question today has not changed since 1942.

Can freemen ask their sons to defend freedom with less than the best of weapons or less than the maximum of willing support wherever the line of battle may fall?

For myself—and, I am sure, for you—I say that the answer is forthright and simple, "No."

NO AREA OF COMPROMISE

On this, there is no area of compromise. There is no alternative. There are choices. Either this is to be our standard and the purpose of our efforts, or it is not.

In terms of principle it is simple. It is not simple in terms of application. Twenty years ago—when we were beginning to mo-

bilize for World War II—we used what weapons were needed to protect our freedom. Where we did not have those weapons on hand, we could afford to make substitutions. We handed our sons broom handles with signs attached to identify them as guns. We posted signs on old trucks and called them tanks. We simulated artillery with water pipes.

SUBSTITUTES FOR THE REAL THING

Those weapons that mattered so much to us in 1940 are basically obsolete, and even the broom handles are obsolete.

The demands of national security—and the change of our national position—no longer permit us the leisure of outfitting ourselves with substitutes for the real thing.

This is the first—and the greatest—single change in our concept of national security.

Time is no longer our friend. Time is no longer on our side.

Security is no longer a point at which we may hope to arrive 1 year, 2 years, or 10 years hence. Security—in the modern world—is a condition we must maintain each hour of each day.

This underscores another matter of great importance.

CHANGES IN MILITARY CONCEPTS

Twenty years ago—in our period of mobilization against the threat afforded by the Axis Powers—you will recall the profound changes we were forced to undergo in our military concepts. At the beginning of mobilization, armored divisions and mechanized divisions were unheard of. Paratroops and dive-bombing and landing craft were unknown concepts. The most romantic branch of our services was the horse cavalry.

VICTORIES—THE PRODUCT OF CHANGE

Our victories in World War II were the product of changes we were forced to make in our thinking after the war in Europe had begun.

Today—and for so long as the Nation shall endure—we do not have and will not have that same margin of time.

THE EDGE OF CAPABILITY

For more than a decade, peace has been maintained because—as men such as Winston Churchill have pointed out—we of the United States have held a continuing edge in capabilities. What we often overlook is that American science gave us the lead in the nuclear age. This lead—won by the invention and creativeness of our minds—served the world as the greatest single deterrent to aggression. The fact that we had unquestioned leadership in this realm made it unnecessary to use atomic energy in any military form.

THE TIME OF DANGER

This demonstrates the point that needs making now. Our greatest time of danger in the world is at times of transition.

When we come to a phase in which old concepts are obsolete and new concepts are not yet perfected, there is where the danger lies.

SECURITY FOR THE FUTURE

If American science had not been the leader in bringing freemen to the atomic age, the cost of national security these past 15 years would have been prohibitive beyond our imagination. The parallel challenge of the opportunities of space is identical.

The weapons of the past are obsolete. The strategies of the past are obsolete. Along with this transition, we must fact another fact of change.

ONE GOAL FOR AMERICA

We are working now in the Senate on the job that is foremost for the members of the legislative branch—getting the facts. We must have those facts to discharge our duties. It is my hope, though, that out of this can come the search for a new way and a better way to bring together—rather than to keep apart—our joint pursuits of the same goal.

There is—and must be—only one goal for Americans: To provide our Nation with security and, through that strength, to be leaders for peace.

A TIME OF GREAT POTENTIAL

We have come to a time of great potential. Never has there been so great an opportunity for us as that opening now. If we move with vigor into the leadership of space, we shall turn those wild fields into the meadows of peace. The opportunity to achieve a creative peace is the opportunity before us now, and the challenge to our lives, our talents, our will. With this before us, let us so work that it shall never be said again that we did too little, too late.

Shelbyville Reservoir Will Serve Many Useful Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of Congress legislation authorizing the Shelbyville Reservoir was passed and an appropriation of $125,000 in planning moneys was approved by the Senate. But in the closing days of Congress the conference committee eliminated this project because the House conferees had not yet had an opportunity to consider this appropriation.

The construction of the Shelbyville Reservoir on the Kaskaskia River is needed to adequately carry out the plans of the Corps of Engineers. The Corps of Engineers has recommended that two reservoirs be built on the Kaskaskia River, one at Shelbyville and the other at Carlyle. They have indicated that one reservoir is as necessary as the other since to build just one would only halfway do the job. Therefore, I am hopeful that the Congress will appropriate planning money for this project.

A reservoir built in this area will serve many purposes. In addition to providing flood control and providing adequate water supplies, it would also have many recreational features.

I have today received a letter from the Illinois Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs expressing their interest in this phase of the benefits derived from such a reservoir. They have also indicated other programs in which they are interested, and I am very pleased to include this letter as part of my remarks. The letter is as follows:

ILLINOIS FEDERATION
OF SPORTSMEN'S CLUBS,
Champaign, Ill., January 30, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been instructed to solicit your support of the following major projects our Illinois Federation of Sportsman's Clubs is sponsoring for congressional action in 1959.

1. Des Plaines Wildlife Area: Senator PAUL DOUGLAS has introduced S. 747, a bill which directs the Administrator, General Services Administration, to convey to the State of Illinois, without consideration, the area requested by our department of conservation, known as Des Plaines Public Hunting and Refuge Area. We believe this bill deserves support as this public land should be permanently maintained for public use and not sold for private use. In this heavily populated area of Illinois there is an acute shortage of recreational lands.

2. Shelbyville Reservoir: This second reservoir on the Kaskaskia River should be started immediately as it is supplemental to the Army engineer Kaskaskia project. It will serve not only flood control and navigation but will provide much needed recreational water for central Illinois. We believe it will serve a real economic need by developing new recreation business.

3. Indiana Dunes: We hope that Congress will set aside the unique Indiana Dunes area for the future recreation of a rapidly growing population in the immediate vicinity of the Dunes.

4. Hennepin Canal appropriation: We urge that Congress appropriate at least $2 million for use by the Army engineers in making certain improvements on the Hennepin Canal so that this potential 100-mile recreational area can be turned over to the State of Illinois ready for public use.

Our 50,000 member sportsmen in Illinois will certainly appreciate any effort you extend to see these proposals forwarded.

Sincerely,

ROYAL B. MCCLELLAND,
Executive Secretary.

Can Rural Development Solve the Farm Problem?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the magazine Better Farming Methods serves thousands of agricultural leaders throughout the Nation. Its influential readership includes many of the dedicated men and women who are advising our farm people day in and day out as they strive to produce food and fiber for a growing Nation and to improve their rural homes and communities.

In the January issue of this valuable magazine there appeared an article, "Can Rural Development Solve the Farm Problem?" This article is the clearest, most objective statement I have seen on the rural development program, which is having a growing impact in wide areas of the Nation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit this interesting and informative article for the RECORD:

CAN RURAL DEVELOPMENT SOLVE THE FARM PROBLEM?

(By Joseph C. Doherty)

Forty or fifty years from now when historians review the record of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, the present controversy over farm price support programs and other well-known issues may take second place in his championing of the rural development program as a fundamental solution to much of the farm problem.

Although only about 2 years old as a working program, and still on a pilot or demonstration basis, the rural develop-

ment program (or "resource development in rural areas," as some States call it) has already had considerable impact on the work and planning of many farm and non-farm groups.

Agricultural leaders—extension workers, vo-ag teachers, FHA credit advisers, SCS technicians, and others—are in the forefront of the new program. In counties and areas taking part, these leaders are meeting tough problems of organization and project development with energy and imagination.

The rural development program started in 1955 with three main goals: To help families with ability and interest in farming gain the necessary tools, land, and skills; to widen the range of off-farm jobs; to provide better educational opportunities, especially for young folks.

Backing up the Secretary's decision to launch the new program were some hard statistics that had sometimes been lost in the debate over rigid versus flexible price supports, and other big issues.

In 1949, the year on which statistics in the Secretary's report were based, one and and one-half million farm families, about one-fourth, earned a thousand dollars or less in cash income. (This number is now down to about one million, somewhat less than one-fourth.)

Fifty-six percent of the Nation's farmers produce only about nine percent of marketed farm products; one-third of the income on all farms comes from non-farm sources—wages, pensions, etc.

As commercial family farmers improve their efficiency, the total number of farms continues to decline. According to U.S. Labor Department studies, there will be 15 percent fewer farmers and farm workers in the next decade. (However, professional and technical openings in agriculture and related industries will grow by leaps and bounds.)

THIRTY STATES PARTICIPATING

Thirty States are now utilizing the rural development approach in order to carry into action the three-point program. In each of these States, interagency committees have been formed to tie the work together.

A total of 102 pilot counties (including those in multicounty trade areas) were selected to get the program underway. They're located in almost all sections of the country.

Rural development is a complex program involving farm and nonfarm interests, Government agencies, and private groups. However, the core of the program is easily defined: Helping rural people, farmers, and townspeople, take a fresh look at where they stand, decide what they want to do about present conditions, and carry forward their plans.

Each county taking part in the work has formed a committee representing farm, business, civic and church leaders and other local citizens. Farm agency workers are either on the full rural development committee or have a separate group acting as advisors to the committee. In some places, health, education, welfare, and county government representatives are also on the agency advisory committee. Here you have the pilot county team: Local leaders plus agency workers.

To help land-grant colleges and universities and other agencies in the 30 States get the program under way, the U.S. Department of Agriculture makes special grants for the pilot work. Some 160 extension agents or specialists are at work on the program full time. FHA also strengthened its staff in a number of pilot counties. And SCS in 1957–58 contributed 58 extra man-years of professional time in 68 pilot counties.

This doesn't tell the whole story by any means. Other extension, SCS, and FHA personnel in these States work on the rural development program as part of their regular responsibilities. And many other agencies—ASC committees; research services; vocational agriculture departments; health, education, forestry departments; employment agencies, and others are putting time and skills into the program.

In the pilot counties, nongovernment leaders and workers representing the above agencies have joined together in a long-range campaign to build a better balance between agriculture and industry. Developing farms able to compete in modern agriculture is a big objective.

A PLAN OF ACTION

Projects in these counties are no different from projects everywhere in rural areas. But there are more of them, more people involved, and in some cases, faster progress.

Most important, in the rural development counties, leaders try to tie everything into a long-range plan adapted to the practical resources at hand.

A few examples:

Reinforced extension staffs in many program areas are helping rural development committees plan and carry forward surveys of farm family living, natural resources, health conditions, education needs. A survery just completed in Florida's two pilot counties has totaled up the most complete picture ever assembled of rural living, natural resources, and improvement opportunities.

Extension and land-grant college specialists are helping strengthen rural industries. In Watauga County, N.C., they did much of the spadework on development of a 200-employee clothing plant.

Vo-ag teachers are working right alongside other agencies in the program, setting up special classes, helping with crop and marketing projects. Kentucky's vocational education department assigned eight instructors to farm and T and I (trades and industry) projects in that State's rural development program.

A fruit and vegetable market, first one in the county, went up in Bertie County, N.C. Local people contributed the $40,000 it cost; rural development extension agents and committee members did the planning and organizing.

SCS has stepped up its work in program areas, mapping soils on farms; preparing conservation plans on small farms; advising in drainage, industrial zoning, and irrigation problems. In 1 South Carolina county 66 new farm conservation plans have resulted from the program.

In a Mississippi county, 350 families have improved their diets and general health through a joint health-extension RD project.

IMPACT OF THE PROGRAM

These few examples, from hundreds in the pilot counties, show the practical dollars-and-cents value of the rural development program.

More important, however, is its impact on the thinking of policymakers in and out of government, in short, how rural development will affect traditional ways of helping rural towns and small farms.

This is something intangible—hard to judge. But here are some of the probable effects, as seen by neutral observers in Washington and the States:

National and State leaders outside the field of agriculture now have a much better understanding of the important part played by nonfarm jobs in rural area prosperity.

Service and educational agencies in some States have begun to take a hard look at their own work, to see how they can help low-income rural people more effectively.

The trend in land-grant and other college programs toward technical assistance on area economic problems has been speeded up.

Work of citizen committees in the rural development program is stimulating more interest in developing improved cooperation between private individuals and agency workers to gain community goals.

Cooperative extension workers in all counties taking part in the program have had to step into many new fields. This is bound to have an effect on the long-term educational planning of this important agency.

Perhaps Secretary Benson summed it all up when he said recently, "Our educational and service programs, not only in agriculture but in other fields as well, must be adapted to help rural people take advantage of opportunities in an expanding economy which is rapidly changing the face of both rural and urban America."

A Better Understanding of Government Contract Requirements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, there are many small companies throughout the country that do not understand the methods of dealing with Government agencies, and consequently, automatically exclude themselves from potentialities available toward expanding business.

Conversely, there are many of these companies which enter into contracts with the Government and are penalized because they do not fully comprehend the requirements of such contracts.

One of the most simple, and yet comprehensive, explanations which would provide direction to such companies was written by F. Trowbridge Vom Baur, General Counsel for the Navy. The article to which I refer follows:

HOW TO DEAL WITH THE NAVY IN THE FIELD OF BUSINESS LAW

Today one may tend to visualize the Navy in terms of fast aircraft carriers ranging the seas of the world, jet planes and atomic submarines. Silhouettes of gray-hulled ships at sea with guided missiles pointing to the sky may readily spring to one's mind. And rightly so.

But there is something else in the Navy. Standing as a solid logistic base behind these dramatic items of military hardware is the Navy's enormous industrial or business organization. The Navy's buying of ships, planes, ordnance, electronics, petroleum, construction, etc., now runs to some $6 billion a year, requiring some 49,000 contracts above $1,000 in Washington and another 20,000 in the field. The Navy disposes of vast amounts of surplus property. It manages a real estate establishment valued, on the basis of cost, in excess of $12 billion, and which, for scope, activity, and variety of problems, might stir the imagination of any corporate executive. It runs a shipping organization (the Military Sea Transportation Service) some four times larger than any other shipping company in the previous history of the world. And it enters into a wide variety of other business transactions.

It is the purpose of this article to portray how a person outside the Government can deal with the legal aspects of this business side of the Navy.

THE GOVERNMENT IN ITS PROPRIETARY CAPACITY

Its proprietary capacity distinguished from its regulatory capacity

Members of a regulatory agency, such as the Securities and Exchange Commission, for

the most part sit in a quasi-judicial capacity as an arm of Congress, having as their major purpose the determination of facts, the decision of questions of law, and the application of statutory mandates to particular cases and parties. They hold such proceedings, usually adversary in character, to those ends as may be necessary. They also promulgate regulations which have a far-reaching effect of a regulatory character.

The Navy is a very different organization. It is wholly within the executive branch of the Government and it operates rather than regulates. Its main purposes are to administer the laws of Congress that implement the constitutional provision, "To provide and maintain a Navy," and to carry out the orders of the President as Commander in Chief under article II of the Constitution.

In turn, much like a corporation, the functions of the business side of the Navy are divided into what might be called a Requirements or Consumption Division, and a Production Division. The Secretary of the Navy presides over this entire complex, and personally manages the Requirements Division with the assistance of the other members of the Secretariat, the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps. They decide what and how many ships, planes, guns, missiles, electronics, etc., are needed to provide for a naval defense. In turn, the Production Division of the Navy is run mainly by the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries with assistance from the Chief of Naval Materiel and the bureau chiefs, and with legal advice from the General Counsel. Their job is to see that the various items of military hardware needed by the Requirements Division are produced effectively, expeditiously, and economically.

In its proprietary capacity, the Navy acts much like any businessman or corporation. It makes the best deals for itself that it can, subject to the limitations of applicable constitutional and statutory provisions and within the limit of reasonableness which necessarily inheres in the standard of conduct of every governmental administrator. It deal with corporations and other business concerns, not in any paternalistic capacity, but at arm's length. The legal relationship which our Government establishes with its contractors is substantially the same as those which private contractors establish among themselves. But the Government is, nevertheless, in a preferred or superior position with regard to such things as the inapplicability to the sovereign of statutes of limitation and laches, the irrevocability of bids or offers made to the Government and the inapplicability of the doctrine of apparent authority to Government officials. In addition, Government contracts have certain distinct peculiarities which will be pointed out hereinafter. All in all, however, Corbin and Williston on Contracts, Williston on Sales, etc., are just as much standard guides for Navy lawyers in the contract field as they are for private practitioners representing business clients.

Strangely enough, however, these facts are not generally understood. There appears to be a disproportionately large number of contractors who actually come into the Navy Department, usually after their contracts get into trouble, stating an expectation that the Navy is going to take care of them; or that they were under the impression that the Navy has guaranteed them against loss. See vom Baur, Government Contracts: Small Business and the Law, 43 A.B.A.J. 605 (1957). Recently one contractor unsuccessfully argued before the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals, though this was not a Navy case, that he should not be assessed excess costs of reprocurement of the hardware on his contract (which had been terminated for default) on the ground that the Government should have determined appellant's ability to perform before awarding the contracts. (Interstate Box Co., ASBCA Nos. 4180, 4181, 4182, CCH Government Contracts Rep., par. 75,019 (1957).) Instances of this kind reveal the serious misapprehensions and the lack of understanding which exist among contractors and even the bar generally as to the nature of the Government's dealings in its proprietary or business capacity.

Yet nothing should be more clearly established than that under the Constitution ours is a government of laws and that, under article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution, it is Congress—not officials in the executive branch of the Government—that has the power to dispose or authorize the disposition of Government property, including money. In general, the policy that Congress has expressed in authorizing the expenditure of Government moneys for the procurement of goods and services has been a policy, not of largesse, but of endeavoring to obtain value in exchange for money. Thus, in its proprietary capacity, under the applicable provisions of law, the Navy must protect itself; it must bargain at arm's length with business concerns; and contractors must protect themselves as if they were dealing with another business concern. A contractor cannot expect the Navy to hold its hand out like Santa Claus or a big brother with a large pocketbook, to possess an easy disposition or to have an unrestrained omnipotence for dispensing the taxpayers' moneys.

The crucial requirement of authorization

Ours being a government of laws and the requirement of congressional authority to dispose of Government property being absolute, the attitude which can be taken by the lawyer representing the Government in its proprietary capacity contrasts markedly with that of the private practitioner representing a business concern. The latter is apt to ask himself: What things can my client do without running afoul of some prohibition? The Government lawyer must approach his problems from the reverse position by asking himself: On what authority may I proceed? For, he represents an administrator or contracting officer who has only delegated powers and who lacks either the full powers of a natural person or the broad management authority of a corporate officer, the usual clients of the private practitioner. Thus, beginning with the Constitution itself, the requirement of authorization to act is always fundamental to the thinking and position of the Government lawyer.

The vital need for education in the field of Government contract law

It is no secret to us as lawyers that our system of law is undergoing constant growth and change. Perhaps its greatest initial period of growth was in the 13th century, in the time of Bracton, when there was, following the creation of the centralized courts in 1178 under Henry II and a great increase in litigation, a special development in the field of mercantile bonds, wills, and conveyances. Later there was the development of equity. In our own time—the last 75 years—we have witnessed in the field of administrative law what is perhaps one of the most spectacular developments that has ever taken place in the whole history of law. The legal profession should frankly face the facts that there is yet another field of law which is in the midst of boom, expansion, and change—the field of Government contract law—and that the legal profession, and indeed the Government itself, have been somewhat tardy and remiss in keeping up with it.

The principles of Government contract law go back to the last century at the time of the Civil War and an 1863 contract for the construction of the ETLAH, "an iron-clad steam battery." (See *McCord* v. *United States*, 9 Ct. Cl. 155, aff'd sub nom., *Chateau* v. *United States*, 95 U.S. 61 (1873).) However, the field got its real start in life and became an area of major importance only with the beginning of World War II. In the Navy, for instance, certain bills were enacted by Congress shortly after the fall of France in June 1940, in reaction to the wave of shock which then suddenly struck the world. They provided for the construction of a two-ocean Navy, and companion bills, designed to expedite such construction, radically altered the course of the Government contract field, probably forever. These new laws introduced into the procurement field the requirements of speed and action on a grand scale, including an expansion of the concept of procurement by negotiation. As a result, there occurred an unprecedented development in the field of Government contract law.

Today, some 15 years later, ignorance of the field in many quarters is still disturbing. This ignorance exists among contractors and, to be very frank, in many quarters of the bar itself.

For one thing, it should be generally known as an elementary principle of law that a bid must be responsive to the invitation for bids in order to be considered. Yet every day the Navy receives a substantial number of bids which are simply not responsive. Under existing provisions of law these bids cannot be considered for award of a contract. The results from this elementary type of mistake in terms of thousands of dollars wasted in preparation of a single bid are startling.

Other types of instances testify similarly. Once a contract has been entered into, many contractor representatives will take action based upon communications with persons in the Government other than the contracting officer, and then express surprise when the contracting officer advises that the action taken was not authorized. Many contractors appear to have no real familiarity with the changes, default, and disputes clauses. And many claims are inadequately presented, both to contracting officers and to the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals.

Many contractors do not believe that they have to read their contracts with care to understand with that bell-like clarity the legal machinery thereby set up, or, indeed, even to read the contract, with its mass of printed matter, at all. Some, indeed, feel vaguely that they can somehow muddle through by playing things by ear and hoping for the best. Yet the printed provisions of Government contracts are all there for a purpose, and every sentence, virtually every word, has some legal significance.

Indeed, government contract law has now become a distinct legal subject with its own principles, structure and pecularities, worthy of separate recognition by the legal profession, and worthy of day to day attention by practicing lawyers. Only through the bar, really, can such elementary principles as the need for responsive bids be made clear to clients, let alone the more complicated principles involved in the changes, default, disputes, and appeals clauses.

Finally, the mistakes which result from this ignorance of government contract law seriously interfere with and slow up Navy administration and cost the taxpayer money. They result in trouble, friction, claims, lawsuits with the Navy and in hurt feelings; and they disrupt that smooth performance of contracts and those good relations with contractors which are the earnest objectives of people in the Navy.

The need for a broad educational program in the field of government contract law is still fairly serious. The key to such an educational campaign appears to lie clearly in the area of better distribution of written materials in the field, plus a recognition of the need to read them. Just as contractors cannot become educated on the subject except through the bar, the bar in its turn can

only become educated through the availability of adequate written materials. And the Government must undoubtedly bear some burden of responsibility for making the written materials available.

The Navy has been trying to do something about this during the last decade. In 1949, "Navy Contract Law," written by lawyers in the Office of the General Counsel under the leadership of Hudson B. Cox, then General Counsel, was the first legal textbook to appear in the field. Although issued for internal Government use, a number of copies found their way into private hands, and the publication has been extensively cited in law reviews and other legal periodicals. Undoubtedly it has been of some help in making the principles of this new and fairly complex field more understandable to the private practitioner as well as to Government lawyers and administrators. The Office of the General Counsel is now revising "Navy Contract Law." At this writing, the manuscript of the revised version is virtually complete, and the publication should be available to the bar as well as to Government lawyers within 6 months through the Government Printing Office.

Most troublesome, perhaps, has been the lack of availability of the decisions of the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals, which are undoubtedly the best single source of Government contract law as its principles are applied in the Department of Defense. Until recently only excerpts from selected decisions were printed by a commercial service, the "Government Contracts Reporter," published by the Commerce Clearing House. The decisions themselves were issued by the Board in mimeographed form, some 300 copies being distributed to selected recipients. Thus, while Government lawyers kept their own private files of these decisions and regarded them as primary sources of the most valuable kind, and a few corporations were also on the mailing list, the decisions were not generally known by or available to the bar and contractors. This state of affairs, it so happens, had long troubled the writer, and in a speech to the Wyoming Bar Association made back in September 1954, the general publication of these decisions was strongly advocated. That portion of the speech was later reprinted in the February 1955 issue of the Harvard Law School Bulletin; and finally arrangements were made in 1956 for the issuance of a new publication, "Contracts Appeals Decisions" (BCA), by the Commerce Clearing House. This loose-leaf service is coupled with the issuance every 6 months of a bound volume containing all the decisions of the ASBCA for the period, plus a useful topical index. Another good publication is Lupton, "Government Contracts Review."

In addition, the law reviews, with increasing tempo, have been picking up gradually the orphan stepchild of government contract law. Many of the articles have been outstanding and have gone far to assist with the needed educational campaign. See for example, Pasley, "The Interpretation of Government Contracts: A Plea for Better Understanding," 25 Fordham L. Rev. 211 (1956).

The lawyer who has a problem with the Government will find it to his advantage to be familiar with these publications before aproaching officials of the Government.

DEALING WITH THE NAVY LAWYER

In order to deal with the Navy in the field of business law, the lawyer outside should know what the lawyer inside the Navy does, the scope of his responsibility, and how the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) is organized. In addition, the private practitioner should know that there are two law offices in the Navy, that of the General Counsel and that of the Judge Advocate General. The jurisdiction of OGC is that of business and commercial law, covering the great bulk of the field of civil law. OGC represents the Navy in its capacity as a large industrial organization. JAG's jurisdiction includes military justice, military law and tort claims.

Comparability in approach to the private practitioner

From time to time I have heard stories about the Government lawyer being standoffish, uncooperative and noncommittal, if not sometimes downright hostile and disagreeable. Lawyers of those dispositions no doubt may be found in the Government and in private practice. But I can say that in my own experience the average Government lawyer is not like that, and certainly not in the Navy. We strive to avoid it.

The Office of the General Counsel for the Navy, first known as the Procurement Legal Division, was founded in 1941 by H. Struve Hensel, head of the division, and later the first General Counsel for the Navy. He had been trained in a large metropolitan law firm. In those early years of wartime, the office was staffed by lawyers who had come from leading law firms throughout the country and whose basic approach was that of the private practitioner. They could not quite see why their role as counsel for various Government administrators should prompt them to act very differently from the way they had acted at a time when representing clients outside the Government.

As a result, the standards of private practice have been maintained in OGC ever since. First, OGC lawyers follow the private law firm principle of group effort. That is, different lawyers work closely with different clients and give them, to the fullest extent practical, final on-the-spot legal advice, rather than expecting every legal decision to funnel through the head of the office or go through a multiple review procedure from the Navy lawyer originally faced with the problem up to the General Counsel and back down again.

Second, we obtain uniformity through personal relations rather than through regulations. As in a private law firm, the initiative is usually left to the subordinate to come to the superior when there is something the superior should know, or when help is needed. Personal relations are close and informal; and there is a constant striving to maintain that atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence which is such a striking efficiency measure in any organization. The result is that large areas of responsibility are given to every lawyer, including the young lawyers, and, as in a private law firm, each lawyer is loaded up with about as much as he can take. In turn, this gives each lawyer a chance to participate in a project as a whole from beginning to end, and so tends to give him a greater feeling of responsibility and personal satisfaction.

In addition, a Government lawyer should be courteous and cooperative; and OGC lawyers strive to afford to persons outside the Government the courtesy and cooperative spirit which are inherent in the traditions of the legal profession. While no OGC lawyer proposes to give away rights of the Government, OGC lawyers do work cooperatively with lawyers in private practice, helping them to meet their deadlines, as private practitioners representing different clients ordinarily work with each other.

Organization of the Office of the General Counsel

Implementing these principles of private law firm management, OGC is highly decentralized in its operations; and it is also integrated so as to provide uniformity in thinking and centralized control.

First, there is the central office which is OGC's highest echelon, the supervisory unit and administrative core. It contains the general counsel, two deputy general counsel, and three assistants to the general counsel. There original legal work is done for the Secretary, the Under Secretary, the Assistant Secretaries of the Navy, and the Office of Naval Materiel.

At the next level are the bureau counsel who are counsel for the various bureaus and offices of the Navy who have business law problems. There is a counsel for each of the following bureaus: Aeronautics, Naval Personnel, Ordnance, Ships, Supplies and Accounts, and Yards and Docks. In addition, there is a counsel for the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and a counsel for each of the following: the Comptroller of the Navy, the Military Petroleum Supply Agency, the Military Sea Transportation Service, and the Office of Naval Research.

Each bureau counsel with his staff handles the great bulk of all commercial legal work for the bureau or office. Help and guidance to the bureau counsel are provided from the central office. Top-level legal problems move upward to the central office, and the closest personal relations are maintained with the bureau counsel by the General Counsel, his two deputies, three assistants, and others in the central office. A so-called bureau counsel meeting is held every Thursday morning for 2 hours, where problems of common interest are discussed much as in a weekly meeting of a private law firm. The central office issues a bimonthly publication, the OGC Newsletter, to keep all lawyers in OGC abreast of current legal developments. In addition, the counsel for the Bureau of Yards and Docks issues a monthly newsletter to its field counsel, and the counsel for the Military Sea Transportation Service issues a similar weekly publication to its field lawyers.

Field counsel are stationed at 34 field offices. These lawyers are there to give, so far as is possible, final on-the-spot legal advice to their clients of a particular naval activity; and uniformity within OGC is again attained through personal relations. The great bulk of each field lawyer's legal problems are solved finally by him. But if he has a problem which should be passed on to higher levels or on which he wishes help, advice, or guidance, he has a direct line of communication to the particular supervisory bureau counsel or to the central office and the General Counsel. There are two OGC branch offices, in New York and in London, which report directly to the General Counsel. All other field counsel are under the immediate supervision of counsel for one of the following bureaus: Aeronautics, Supplies and Accounts, Yards and Docks, the Military Sea Transportation Service, or the Office of Naval Research.

The legal profession is built around essentially informal relationships, and no particular magic or protocol is required to deal with any OGC lawyer, whether in the central office, the office of the bureau counsel, or a field counsel. The various lawyers are listed at the various naval activities under either "Office of the General Counsel" or as "Counsel" for a particular activity. They can accordingly be reached either by letter or on the telephone, and they correspond directly with lawyers in private practice.

Finally, the field lawyers in a particular geographical area, such as a naval district, are loosely banded together under the leadership of a regional counsel. While the regional counsel does not provide another echelon of review over the work of the other field lawyers in a particular area, he is expected to provide inspiration, leadership, and coordination, and to keep the lawyers in a particular area working together as if they constituted a small law firm handling all business and commercial law problems arising there. He also serves as a focal point for requests from naval activities which do not have lawyers regularly assigned. Upon receiving such a request, he will either perform the legal work himself, or parcel it out

to the lawyer in the area best able to perform it. Thus, the private practitioner with a legal problem to take up with the Navy in Washington should consult the counsel for the bureau or office concerned, or the General, Counsel, Deputy General Counsel or an assistant. With respect to activities in the field, he should consult the regional counsel or the nearest available field lawyer. A listing of all the field lawyers that includes their business addresses and telephone numbers can be obtained either from the nearest OGC lawyer or by writing to the Office of General Counsel, Department of the Navy.

What the Navy lawyer can do for the private practitioner

As has been said, the Navy lawyer is not out to give away the rights of the Government; not by any means. On the contrary, just as with the lawyer in private practice, he is out to represent the interests of his client in every reasonable and ethical way. He has a particular usefulness to the lawyer in private practice, however, for ordinarily he can tell the private practitioner in relatively few words what procedural steps are available to him in connection with any particular problem. However, the Government lawyer is subject to the statutory prohibition of the United States Code, title 18, section 283 that he must not assist in the prosecution of claims against the Government. The private practitioner should not except the Government lawyer to do for him what he can easily do for himself.

MAJOR AREAS OF INTEREST TO THE PRIVATE PRACTITIONER

Bidding on or negotiating contracts

If a private practitioner is to understand this field, he must always be aware of the legal authority on which the Government lawyer and administrator are proceedings. Specifically, he should be familiar with the basic authority of the Armed Services Procurement Act contained in United States Code, title 10 sections 2301–2314. He may also have occasion to be familiar with the "Armed Services Procurement Regulation" (the "ASPR"), which implements the act; and, when the matter concerns the Navy, with the "Navy Procurement Directives," commonly called the NPD. While the ASPR provides guidelines on problems common to the three military departments, the NPD's, in effect, fill in the gaps for particular Navy problems. The Army and the Air Force have similar departmental publications called the "Army Procurement Procedures" and the "Air Force Procurement Instructions." All of these publications are available through the Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

Private practitioners should also have some familiarity with the types of contracts which the Government enters into. "Navy Contract Laws" contains an extended discussion of types of contracts and the reasons for their use. In addition, certain contract clauses are required by law in a Government contract, and these clauses are described in some detail in a chapter of "Navy Contract Law."

Contract administration

The administration of a Government contract of any size or complexity has now grown into a subject of such distinct importance that the phrase "contract administration" has virtually acquired a secondary meaning that relates to Government contracts. A great variety of legal questions may arise in connection with the administration of Government contracts. Most large contractors who do a regular and substantial business with the Government have experienced, gimlet-eyed staffs of lawyers continually watching their Government contracts. All too often, unfortunately, we have found contracts getting unnecessarily into trouble because a contractor, usually a smaller concern, did not consult a lawyer or did not consult him early enough. Thus, the role of the private practitioner can be a very important one in the administration of a Government contract.

The first of the questions likely to arise in contract administration is that of the interpretation of the contract. Does the contract require the contractor to perform a particular item of work? Can he charge an additional sum for it under the changes and extras clause? Questions of the construction of a contract are legal questions. So here a private practitioner should consult, as Navy lawyers do, not only the books on contract interpretation and statutory construction, but also the decisions of the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals. Many of these decisions construe particular Government contract clauses. The chances are that by consulting these decisions you may find an authoritative interpretation of a clause that is also in your contract.

Next come questions on the important changes and extra clauses. As items procured have become more complex, it has become necessary for changes in design and specification to be made in the course of construction. Ever since the construction of the *Etlah* in 1863, certain Navy contracts have authorized the contracting officer to make changes within the scope of the contract during its performance. The changes which can be made are confined to changes within the scope of the contract. It would not be right for a contracting officer by use of a change order to try to convert a contract for a hundred radio sets into a contract for the construction of an aircraft carrier. But under the applicable clause in general use, the contractor is required to proceed with performance no matter how many or what changes are made within the scope of the contract. This may well lead to additional financial, personnel, and technical burders that will have to be carried by the contractor, and before he undertakes the contract at all, he should be prepared to carry those burdens. Also, if subsequently a dispute arises as to the amount of the equitable adjustment to be paid for as increased cost, the contractor may not be able to be fully paid for the cost of the change until he has processed his claim through the contracting officer and possibly also through the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals (ASBCA). And a lawyer should review the drafting of a contract amendment, if his client is to be protected.

Other questions which may come up in contract administration will arise under the inspection and guaranty clauses. All these questions are treated in some detail in "Navy Contract Law."

Contract termination

This is an area of crucial importance for the contractor, and an area where a lawyer with some knowledge of Government contract law is particularly needed. There are two kinds of termination under Government contracts: (1) termination for the convenience of the Government, in connection with which the Government agrees to pay costs reasonably incurred and profit for work done by the contractor; and (2) termination for default, with its requirement that the contractor must pay for any excess costs involved in reprocuring the article involved, with possible additional liability for liquidated damages and damages otherwise obtainable under common law principles. A contract may also be terminated with a no-cost settlement.

A termination for default may be an extremely serious thing for a contractor. However, a contractor who has failed to perform has one possible escape. Under the applicable contract provisions, a termination for default may be treated as a termination for convenience if a case of excusable delay can be made. Thus, if performance of the contract is getting into trouble and the contractor thinks that he has a case of excusable delay, he, and preferably with his lawyer, should be in close communication with the contracting officer and his counsel so as to acquaint them with the facts in advance of a possible termination. This is a communication problem. If the contractor and his lawyer do not remain in sufficiently close communication with the contracting officer and acquaint him with the relevant facts, they may find that the contracting officer will terminate the contract for default because he is unaware of a case of excusable delay. Even though the ASBCA may eventually treat the termination for default as one of convenience, that result will be obtained only after having gone through a lawsuit.

Disputes

The crucial disputes clause provides that any question of fact arising under the contract will be determined by the contracting officer and that this determination will be final, except upon appeal to the Secretary or his delegate, which, in practical terms, is the ASBCA. Thus, of the two kinds of claims possible under Government contracts, those arising under the contract must, by virtue of the disputes clause, be presented to the contracting officer, and on appeal to the ASBCA. Claims for breach of contract may not be determined by the contracting officer or the ASBCA and can be allowed only by the Court of Claims, or, if for less than $10,000, by an appropriate district court. The two kinds of claims are mutually exclusive: Claims arising under the contract can be determined only within the Department of Defense, and claims for breach of it can be determined only by tribunals outside the Department.

What of the presentation to the contracting officer of claims arising under the contract? If the claim is of any complexity, the assistance of a lawyer is essential. His presentation should be similar to the presentation of a comparable claim before any court or tribunal. All appropriate documents should be presented; affidavits are possible; and briefs may be useful.

Appeals

A contractor who is dissatisfied with a final decision of a contracting officer on a question of fact under the disputes clause may appeal within 30 days from receipt of the final decision to the ASBCA, the delegate of the Secretary of the Navy to hear the appeal. The ASBCA is an administrative tribunal. Its rules of practice are largely modeled on the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Present revision of the rules of practice was formulated with the aid of an American Bar Association committee.

The proceedings before the ASBCA compare to trials in the courts vested with judicial power and to hearings before the major administrative tribunals outside the Department of Defense. Cases are tried through the classic question and answer method and the proving of documents.

Unless a case is a very simple one, lawyers are just as essential as in the trial of any other adversary proceedings. In a case of any complexity, a contractor without counsel will be badly hampered in the presentation of his claim. From the Government's standpoint, I can frankly say that much Government (and the taxpayers') time and money has been wasted because the Board was compelled to try to sort out the facts, items, and details of a claim presented without the preparation, the sharpening, the separation of the wheat from the chaff, and the organization of material provided by legal representation.

The procedure before the Board provides for the filing of a complaint and an answer, and certain interlocutory mechanics such as interrogatories, discovery, and pretrial hear-

ings. The Navy panel makes extensive use of pretrial hearings in an effort to expedite, shorten, and clarify the trial. Trial briefs are often requested, and briefs after trial are frequently submitted. It presently takes a contractor who will proceed expeditiously about 6 to 10 months from the time of filing the notice of appeal to obtain a decision from the Navy panel. A motion to advance a case may be made for good cause shown. But it should be made only if the contractor is prepared to proceed immediately and, in the opinion of the writer, is represented by counsel.

If you have a case involving a dispute, do not seek to bring pressure on the Board through a Senator or Congressman, or by harassing the Secretary, Under Secretary, or an Assistant Secretary of the Navy. These claims are legal in nature; they have been assigned for decision by the Board; and they can only be resolved by going through a legal proceeding before the Board. The Board makes its own decisions. The Secretary of the Navy does not tell it how to decide cases. It is a quasi-judicial tribunal which acts impartially. The best course for the contractor is to see that his case is presented to that tribunal in true, lawyerlike fashion.

Real estate matters

Legal matters relating to the Navy's real estate establishment are handled primarily by OGC lawyers in the Office of the Counsel for the Bureau of Yards and Docks in Washington and by lawyers serving field activities of the Bureau. The latter are stationed in the various naval districts as counsel for the district public works officer.

SUMMARY

The Office of the General Counsel represents the Navy in its capacity as a large industrial organization much as a law firm or legal department handles the affairs of a large corporation. While the Navy is larger than any corporation, the Office of the General Counsel is organized and managed as much like a metropolitan law firm as possible, and, indeed, with a high degree of similarity. Outside persons can by and large deal with OGC lawyers as they do with lawyers in private practice.

Government contract law, a large area of OGC's work, is still inadequately understood by the bar and the public, although OGC has taken such steps as it can to make essential written materials generally available. However, lawyers can only deal effectively with the Navy in the field of business law if they sufficiently understand the subject. And the bar generally should assist in furthering the education of the legal profession in this important field. A complete educational program is still needed.

It's up to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president, American Farm Bureau Federation, is something that we as Members of Congress can take to heart and consider.

In this article Mr. Shuman points out our responsibility, and it is ours alone, to keep our country sound financially and to stem and halt the tide of inflation. We cannot pass the buck on this one. In Mr. Shuman's words, "It's up to Congress":

[From Nation's Agriculture, February 1959]

IT'S UP TO CONGRESS

(By Charles B. Shuman)

A new year, a new session of Congress, new faces in the Congress, new promises—but many old, unsolved problems. Continued inflation, excessive Government spending farm program failures, a ruthless labor monopoly and further concentration of power and authority in the national Government are a few problems that demand attention. Only Congress can initiate action to cope with these situations. Wise administrative decisions and recommendations as well as court decisions which recognize basic laws and the Constitution will be helpful. However, after all, it's up to Congress.

The Constitution of the United States wisely provides for the separation of the powers of the State—executive, legislative, and judicial. During recent administrations there has been a tendency to ignore these fundamental principles. The courts have tended to legislate and the President and his staff have often assumed legislative responsibilities.

Often the balance of power between the two parties has been such that it was easy for Congress to avoid the full responsibility for initiating legislation. This is no longer a valid excuse for Members of Congress to shift their responsibilities. The Democrats have a very substantial (two to one) majority—they control all committees in both the Senate and House—they can and should accept this opportunity to initiate legislative action to meet the serious problems that concern all citizens.

Farmers believe that inflation is our most serious economic problem. The dollar has lost more than one-half of its purchasing power during the last 18 years. We cannot check this inflation if the Federal Government continues to spend in excess of its income. The President is under constant pressure from the bureaucracy to maintain spending at high levels, and Members of Congress are tempted to turn to the Treasury for pet projects for their home districts. The reckless, inflationary spending of recent years must come to an end. This new Congress can and must take effective measures to regain control of Federal expenditures.

The voting delegates at the recent annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation took a good look at the farm program legislation that has brought so much trouble to agriculture during recent years. They reaffirmed our objective "* * * to create conditions which will make it possible for farmers to earn and get a high per family real income in a manner which will preserve freedom and eliminate Government regulation of individual farming operations."

We believe that Members of Congress should have the same objective. They should recognize that surplus production is our most serious problem and that it is aggravated by present legislation. Most of the panaceas now proposed—such as production payments and multiple price schemes—would encourage inefficient and unneeded production, add to production costs, and increase Government intervention in the farmer's business.

Many Members of Congress have been very critical of the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture. Actually, legislative policy should not be the responsibility of any Cabinet officer. It's up to Congress. Farmers have a right to look to the agricultural committees of the House and Senate for sound, constructive action.

The concentration of economic power in labor unions has progressed to the point where it is a very dangerous monopoly threat to our Nation. The continued exercise of such monopoly powers by any segment of our population—industry, labor, agriculture, or Government—weakens our competitive enterprise system and will finally destroy individual freedom. Congressional committees have thoroughly documented the need for legislative action.

It's up to Congress.

International Pancake Day Race at Liberal, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, in old England it was customary for the housewives to drop whatever they were doing and hurry to the church at the tolling of the bell to be shriven of their sins. In 1445 a wife in Olney, England, started baking her pancakes rather late. They were not quite finished when the church bell rang, but she hurried off to the shriving carrying her griddle and pancakes with her. Thus an annual sporting event was born.

In Liberal, Kans., we heard of this 500-year-old event of pancake racing over a 415-yard course from the town pump to the church, and in 1950 the challenge was accepted by Rev. R. C. Collins, vicar of Olney. In the running of the first international pancake day race over identical courses, times of the winners in both Liberal and Olney were compared by transatlantic telephone.

Mrs. Breeding and I and the citizens of Liberal, Kans., cordially invite the Members of the 86th Congress to attend this world-famous celebration in Liberal, Kans., on February 10, 1959:

LIBERAL, KANS.—One of the strangest events in the realm of athletics will take place in Liberal, February 10, when housewives will run 415 yards through the main streets at 11:55 a.m. flipping pancakes in skillets in a traditional race with the housewives of Olney, England. In the 10th annual race, Liberal housewives will be trying to even the score. Olney leads 5 to 4.

It all started more than 500 years ago in England when on Shrove Tuesday, the day before lent, housewives used up accumulated cooking fats before fasting by baking pancakes. Legend has it that one day a housewife baking pancakes lost track of time until suddenly she heard the church bell ring, calling everyone to the shriving service in the church. In her haste she ran to the church, clad in her apron and with her skillet in hand, and this was the first pancake racer.

Other women of Olney in following years, not to be outdone by their neighbors, got into the act. The one who beat the others to the church was kissed by the verger, and the kiss came to be called the kiss of peace and is still the traditional prize for the winner of the pancake race here and in England.

Liberal got into the competition in 1950 after a picture of the Olney racers appeared in a magazine. Liberal Jaycees decided that their housewives might be just as fast on their feet as the Englishwomen. They dispatched a letter to the Vicar of Olney, who ramrods the race over there, challenging the English to an international race. Vicar Col-

lins quickly accepted and the race was on.

Each year since then on Shrove Tuesday thousands of cheering spectators crowd the streets in each town to watch the apron-clad housewives flit and flip their way merrily down the village streets in this sporting gesture of international good will.

In spite of any temporary diplomatic differences betwee the United States and England, the race has always been carried out in a spirit of friendly competition and has remained a strong and permanent link of international friendship between the people of the two countries.

In Liberal the race course is over brick and asphalt streets. In Olney the setting is cobblestone streets, thatched-roofed cottages, and the old bull inn. Both races, according to age-old tradition, end at a church, where the kiss of peace is administered—in England by the church verger and in Kansas by the British Consul. The accompanying whirr of television cameras and the general hubbub of a major celebration are background additions to the traditional kiss, brought on by intense news coverage of the event.

Approximately a dozen housewives are in training now to recapture the trophy. Various methods of training are used, usually under husband's advice, most of the would-be contestants practice running in the later afternoons or evenings. And it is nothing to see a woman running round and round the block where she lives flipping her pancake in a skillet, cheered on by members of her family.

One more serious contestant in recent years would eat nothing for breakfast but a cereal guaranteed to give you the utmost in pep and energy, and would eat no fats for months before the race. Others give up chocolates and cigarettes or go for long daily walks to build up their wind.

The police were alerted one evening when rural residents saw a man in an automobile apparently trying to run down a woman on the road. As it turned out, she was practicing for the pancake race, in the lights of the car while her husband timed her efforts.

Athletic attire is prohibited in the race. Regular housewifely garb of housedresses, apron, headscarf, and oxfords or regular street shoes are required.

The best time ever turned in for the race was 1:05.1 by Mrs. Binnie Dick in 1955. She won the race here 3 consecutive years, and was international champion twice. After three local victories, a contestant is disqualified.

With a tradition of 500 years of racing behind them, Olney housewives jumped off to a quick lead, winning in 1950 and 1951. Liberal women soon caught on and won in 1952. Olney avenged their loss in 1953, but Liberal girls found the winning combination and swept the 1954, 1955, and 1956 races for a record string of consecutive victories, but lost again to Olney in 1957 and 1958.

Interest will run high in the February 10 event in both places. Liberal will be trying hard to even up the score. The whole town is pitching in with feverish excitement making ready for the day-long celebration which accompanies the event. Festivities here include a parade, beauty and amateur contests, dances, and parties honoring the visiting celebrities who crowd into the small town of 12,000 for the unique spectacle. Liberal, not normally well known for its athletics, will shine if pancake racing is ever added to the Olympics.

PANCAKE DAY SCHEDULE, LIBERAL, KANS., TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1959

6:45 a.m.: All Civic Club breakfast.
9:30 a.m.: Pancake Day parade.
11:15 a.m.: Kids Pancake Day race.
11:55 a.m.: International Pancake Day race.
12:55 p.m.: Telephone call to Olney, England.
1:00 p.m.: Kiddies free matinee, Plaza.
1:30 p.m.: Five-State beauty contest.
4:30 p.m.: Sixth annual all-American Pancake Day race.
7:00 p.m.: Finals of amateur contest coronation of international and all-American race winners.

President's Approach on Agricultural Legislation Is Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the President's recommendations for new farm legislation, which were transmitted to the Congress today, make sense. We all know that the present price support and production control program is not working. The program has been costly to taxpayers; it has not helped the farmers who need help the most, the little fellow; and it has stimulated production of tremendous surpluses that will be a millstone around the neck of agriculture for a long time to come. The President offers solutions to the most pressing farm problems. I sincerely hope that his suggestions can be enacted into law during this session of the Congress.

It would take too long to discuss all the difficulties now faced by agriculture. Therefore, I am going to zero in on just one facet of the overall agricultural situation, the burdensome surpluses of farm products under the control of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

At the end of November the Corporation's investment in commodity inventories amounted to about $8.3 billion, which is not far under the record $8.9 billion established in early 1956. The Department of Agriculture estimates that a new record investment of $9.1 billion will be set by this coming July 1. And by July 1, 1960, the Department says, about $10.5 billion could be tied up in commodity stocks.

At the end of this past November the Corporation's investment in price support—inventory stocks plus nonrecourse loans extended on price supported commodities—amounted to about $8.3 billion. The record was $8.9 billion, reached early in 1956. Now the Department of Agriculture estimates that a new record investment of $9.1 billion will be set by this coming July 1. And by July 1, 1960, the Department says, about $10.5 billion could be tied up in commodity surpluses.

Let us take a close look at the makeup of the November 1958 commodity stockpile.

In November the Commodity Credit Corporation had over $6 billion tied up in four grains—wheat, corn, grain sorghums, and barley. The total for upland cotton was $873 million. Tobacco accounted for another $616 million. The investment in only six commodities, therefore, was $7.5 billion—or 91 percent of the total outlay.

Do not these figures support the President's contention that most of the price-support dollars are now being channeled to producers of a few crops? Not only do the dollars go to producers of a few crops, but they also go to big producers of the few supported crops. For example, for producers having allotments of 100 acres or more, net budgetary expenditures per farm for the present fiscal year are, for wheat, $7,000 per farm; cotton, $10,000; and rice, $10,000. While all this was going on farmers producing unsupported commodities, such as cattle, hogs, poultry, fruits, vegetables, and many other essential farm products, have experienced growing markets rather than a buildup of stocks in warehouses.

There is enough wheat in this country right now to fill all available outlets at present price levels for 2 full years, with a carryover of about 300 million bushels left over as a start on the third year. The feed grain supply also is moving toward unmanageable levels. Crops of 1958 corn, grain sorghums, barley, and soybeans were all at record highs. Added to big carryovers, these 1958 crops meant record total supplies, both in volume and in supply per animal unit. The bulk of the surplus stocks are owned by the Government.

But, whether a surplus is in Government bins or in private hands, it puts pressure on market prices. And it costs money—large sums of money—to store farm products. At the present ime storage costs are well in excess of a million dollars a day. There is always the danger of loss through deterioration or spoilage. That is especially true of such perishable products as butter and cheese.

The President's suggestions encompass two basic steps aimed at solving the surplus problem. First, his program would cut down surpluses which already have accumulated; and, second, it charts sound policies which will avoid building up new surpluses. The President's program is a sound program. I endorse it. I am sure that the Congress will endorse it.

Here It Belongs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial "Here It Belongs" as it pertains to the National Air Museum in Colorado.

The editorial is as follows:

HERE IT BELONGS

The National Air Museum should be brought to Colorado, to be placed on Air Force Academy land or adjacent to it.

At the moment it is an orphan, housed in the Smithsonian Institution in Washing-

ton. What exhibits the Air Museum has on display must compete with all the other historical displays in the giant Smithsonian, a place where you could spend a couple of weeks without even glancing at everything.

But even worse, most of the Air Museum's exhibits are now in storage because the Smithsonian, where there is considerable competition for display space, hasn't room to show them.

The presence of an Air Museum at the Air Force Academy would do much more to inspire the cadets and teach them the traditions they are heirs to than some of the stunts tried at Colorado Springs to create tradition at the academy.

It would also give much more meaning to a visitor's tour of the academy.

Since the National Air Museum was created by Congress in 1946, many groups and individuals, including Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, and the American Legion, have attempted to win for the museum a home of its own, without success.

Creation of separate facilities at Colorado Springs would serve the purpose even better than in Washington. Here the museum would receive the undivided attention it deserves; while in Washington it would still have to compete with the Smithsonian, as well as with the hundred other historical sights the Nation's Capital has to offer.

West Side Jewish Community Center, of Los Angeles, Offers Lesson in Community Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, 5 years in the history of mankind is a brief span. But when 5 years span the lives of thousands of persons, each and every year becomes more important and valuable than the mere number of days they indicate.

I make this above observation because there is an organization in Los Angeles, Calif.—and I am more than pleased that the activities of this group take place in my district—which gives factual proof to this contention. The organization to which I refer is the West Side Jewish Community Center which, during its first 5 years of existence, has offered service and brought happiness to thousands of persons.

The record of the West Side Jewish Community Center is already an impressive one, and presages for the future the enriching of many more lives.

Mr. Speaker, I offer some facts and figures about the humanitarian undertakings of this organization, behind each of which is a human being, young or old.

Built at a cost of $2 million, the West Side Jewish Community Center opened its doors on March 1, 1954, and now celebrating its fifth anniversary, the center pridefully points out that it serves almost 7,000 members each year. The aggregate attendance has been approximately 2½ million, a figure equal to the estimated population of the city of Los Angeles.

The center serves as a threshhold to community life for many newscomers to Los Angeles, particularly young adults and is open to all members of the community. Inability to pay is no bar to membership, as budget plans are possible and several scholarship funds are available.

The significance of this undertaking is focused on the fact that persons of all ages are able to get together to learn from each other and to find a spirit of camaraderie in a highly populated, broadly-spread community.

Through the activities offered—in the fields of athletics, art, dancing, swimming, crafts, music, to mention a few—adults are afforded the opportunity to develop both professional and social skills. More than 700 children have learned to grow up in a new and ever-changing world through the guidance of a skilled nursery school; over 2,000 children have experienced the opportunity to go to camp sponsored by the center.

The community spirit of the West Side Jewish Community Center has been further demonstrated by its action of opening its facilities for meetings and events to other community groups including, among others, Community Chest, Girl Scouts, and Red Cross.

I am sure that there are many others who join me in congratulating the Center on its fifth anniversary and in wishing it all success in the years to come.

Next Question, Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I know from conversations with a number of my colleagues on our side of the aisle that they have had numerous questions in their minds regarding President Eisenhower's true position on the matter of public revenues and Federal programs. To inform their innocence, or rather, as I was saying, to straighten out certain things in their minds, I present the following excerpt from the President's press conference yesterday before he left to shoot quail in Georgia:

Question. Peter Lisagor, Chicago Daily News: Mr. President, you said that you did not think the American people wanted higher taxes. You also said that you thought localities ought to do some of the things.

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Question. Lisagor: Such as the airport. Governor Rockefeller, of New York, has found it necessary to move to get more taxes for what he regards as desirable programs.

Do you think the American people would be willing to accept tax increases from the State, rather than from the Federal Government? Do you think this is a better approach?

The PRESIDENT. Well, I do not know, because I don't know the rate of that taxation for these several States. This is what I was talking about.

The Federal rate of taxation and what I see as the American reluctance to accept higher rates, unless they can see that there is a clear emergency demanding now current action for which they can be persuaded to make the sacrifice, and I believe they will, if you have got an emergency thing. But now, let's remember we are planning for 20 years, 30 years, 40 years. We have got to live with this thing.

And as we know, as the population grows, we get more revenues, but we also get in some of these things very much higher costs. So let us not—when we remember that our taxes run from down to—we have got a $600 exemption, and we run up to 92 percent, I believe it is, in the very top ones—I think that income taxes, which are the things that the Federal Government mainly lives on, that they are getting about as high as you can keep them on the indefinite basis.

Now, I believe you can, for emergency, tough problems, I think you can do more than that.

Question. Sterling F. Green, Associated Press: Thank you, Mr. President.

(Whereupon, at 10:29 a.m., the press conference was concluded.)

History Repeats Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently, a group of Southern Senators proposed a constitutional amendment that would give States exclusive power to decide whether their school systems should be integrated. It specifices that nothing in the Constitution shall be construed to deny the States the right to determine for themselves the manner in which their public educational facilities shall be administered. The apparent purpose of this is to maintain segregated schools, to discriminate among students because of color. Such a plan is undemocratic and completely contrary to the recognized duty of our States and the Federal Government, to provide education for our youth on an equal basis, free from bias or discrimination.

The prevailing opinion is that the proposed amendment is given no chance of getting the two-thirds majorities needed for approval, but we must not lose sight of the fact that it is one more attempt to allow discrimination and undemocratic practices to flourish.

Let us recall another time of internal crisis in our history. In 1861 the following amendment relating to slavery was proposed:

Article 13: No amendment shall be made to the Constitution which will authorize or give to Congress the power to abolish or interfere, within any State, with the domestic institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or service by the laws of said State.

This proposed amendment to the Constitution failed of ratification by the States.

The amendments discussed are analogous in that both would place certain fundamental human rights in jeopardy; each would curtail the powers of Congress to uphold and preserve the national ideal; each would make it possible for the States wishing to do so, to inflict indignities upon certain of their citizens—which would be abhorrent to the United States considered as a whole; both would reflect unfavorably upon the Nation in that their motives are undemocratic and a violation of rights guaranteed under our Constitution.

States rights are important, of course, but our Founding Fathers and our wise leaders who have followed in their footsteps have recognized the necessity of curbing a State or several States when undemocratic action by a few would undermine or belittle our Nation. Congress must have the authority to create and to uphold the law of the land in order to protect the rights of all our citizens, when problems of national import are at stake.

The will of the people prevailed in 1861 when they refused to accept an undemocratic amendment to the Constitution, as it will today, in this latest attempt to deny certain inalienable rights.

Flying Farmers 1959 Aviation Clinic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Flying Farmers of Prairie Farmers Land, one of the country's foremost organizations of this kind, recently held their aviation clinic at Purdue University. In past years these clinics have been most fruitful and have made many constructive suggestions for Federal laws in the field of aviation.

On many occasions I have participated in these clinics and although I was not able to attend this year, I was very much impressed by the resolutions passed by the clinic. Since many of the resolutions concern Federal laws, I feel that they should be called to the attention of my colleagues. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am including them to be printed as part of my remarks.

The resolutions are as follows:

RESOLUTIONS FOR 1959 CLINIC FLYING FARMERS OF PRAIRIE FARMER LAND, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, JANUARY 24, 1959

I

Be it resolved, That we hereby express our appreciation to our hosts, Purdue University, Purdue University Airport, Purdue Union, Bill Graham, and the Purdue University Extension Service, the Home Economics Department, and Purdue Glee Club for the use of their splendid facilities and the wholehearted cooperation of their personnel in making our annual Flying Farmer Clinic so pleasant; be it further

Resolved, That we express our thanks to the fine people from the Federal Aviation Agency, Weir Cook Airport, State aeronautics commission, Piper Aircraft Corp., Warren Martin and Air Transport Association, and all others who gave so freely of their time and talents in making our programs interesting and instructive; be it further

Resolved, That we the membership take this opportunity of expressing our thanks to our hard-working State and Prairie Farmer Land officers for their work in carrying on the activities of your organization.

II

Be it resolved, That we, the Flying Farmers of Prairie Farmer Land, take this opportunity of expressing our affection and thanks to our former leader and executive secretary, Bill Renshaw, now convalescing in sunny Texas. Be it further expressed that we hereby convey to him and his good wife our most sincere wishes for a speedy and complete recovery.

III

Be it resolved, That we appreciate the fine cooperation of the Illinois State Park System in the establishment of landing facilities at the several of the Illinois State parks; be it further

Resolved, That we encourage the park commission to implement airstrips at all State parks; and be it still further

Resolved, That we encouraged istrict, State, and regional flying farmer meetings at such strips as well as individual use of such facilities.

IV

Be it resolved, That we support the Federal Aviation Agency and their representatives on their refusal to increase basic minimum VFR flight standards from the present 1,000 feet and 3 miles to the proposed 1,500 feet and 5 miles in U.S.A.; be it further

Resolved, That we heartily endorse this stand in the pending conference with ICAO (International Commission of Aviation Organizations).

V

Be it resolved, That we urge the creation of weather reporting substations, spaced to give a more adequate weather picture in the area currently reported by our weather reporting stations; be it further

Resolved, That we urge the implementation of the more recorded continuous weather broadcasts.

VI

Whereas we recognize and appreciate the excellent accomplishments of the Indiana and Illinois Aeronautics Commissions and directors. We hereby affirm our continued cooperation with these agencies and whereas we recognize: (1) That we are the heaviest class of property taxpayers in our respective States; (2) and that the continued development of aviation activities at the State level is necessary if air commerce and aircraft utility is to keep pace with the rapidly developing air age: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the Indiana Legislature to look with favor upon the submitted budget request of the Indiana Aeronautics Commission in order that this important commission's activities will not be hampered; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Governor, the president of senate and house, members of the budget and aviation committees.

VII

Be it resolved, That we urge the Federal Aviation Agency to restudy the already established high density zones and to give very careful consideration, in consultation with all segments of aviation, before any further high density zones are established.

VIII

In view of the fact that the development of the aviation industry is dependent upon the increased utility of the airplane as a means of transportation; and as of this date, 60 percent of the incorporated towns in the United States have no airports or landing facilities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge FAA to channel a much larger percentage of Federal airport aid toward development of the smaller airports; be it further

Resolved, That we urge the establishment of landing strips along all new and reconstructed Federal aid highways, to better serve the smaller towns, and at stated intervals in isolated areas.

IX

Be it resolved, That we wish to commend the Federal Aviation Agency for implementing the voluntary position reporting system of aircraft of VFR flights and that we strongly urge and encourage our members to cooperate in every way in giving and heeding these position reports; be it further

Resolved, That we feel a popular voluntary reporting system will produce much safer flying than an unpopular compulsory IFR system, as is being advocated by certain other segments of aviation.

X

Be it resolved, That we recommend to Congress that the hastily drawn, panic spawned, 1958 aviation law creating the Federal Aviation Agency be amended with the following changes in mind.

1. Define the powers of the administrator and confine his activities and control to air commerce and operation or navigation of aircraft thereof, within the limits of any Civil Airway as written in CAA Act of 1938.

2. Incorporate regulation and rulemaking in the hands of a board of three appointees with equal powers, and subject to approval by Congress, representing (a) military and defense, (b) air carriers and commerce, and general and private aviation.

3. Define the qualifications of the administrator safeguarding the interests of 90,000 general and private aircraft by specifying that the administrator must be a civilian and not actively identified with the military or defense organizations or their reserve components during the 5 years previous to his appointment.

4. Limit to 50 percent or less, the number of department heads which may be filled with retired or inactive military personnel.

5. Eliminate that part of the law which turns the FAA Agency over to the military in time of war. Civil administration has been adequate in previous wartime periods and there is no reason to believe it would be inadequate in the future.

XI

Be it resolved, That we commend the military and Air Defense Command for taking the lead in the use and research of high visability paints in avoiding midair collisions. We look with favor on Federal Aviation's interest in this safety device where all aircraft carry some high visibility paint design; be it further

Resolved, That we favor further research on increasing the lasting quality of such paints and also research on most optimum paint design before any regulation becomes mandatory.

XII

Whereas the continued construction of high television, radio towers, and high-tension lines has increased the hazards to low flying aircraft; and

Whereas the majority of past midair collisions have occurred between aircraft operating on IFR flight plans in VFR conditions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in the interest of safety to some 90,000 general aviation aircraft and 36,000 military and air-carrier aircraft, that the so-called positive-control system recognize the following:

1. Control area floor be raised to 3,500 feet.

2. All aircraft operating below 10,000 feet shall be operated on a see and be seen basis, and at moderate speeds with or without VFR flight plans.

3. Under no circumstances shall aircraft be operated below 10,000 feet on IFR flight plans, when VFR conditions prevail. (Take-offs and landings excepted.)

XIII

Be it resolved, That we commend the Federal Aviation Agency for its part in its direct and indirect support of moderate weight and priced DME (distance measuring equipment) suitable for private aircraft, and operational on present Vortac system.

XIV

Be it resolved, That we urge the National Flying Farmers Association to furnish to the State chapters, on a monthly basis, current aviation news of a national scope as a means of assisting the chapter secretaries with aviation news of interest which may be used to supplement local and State news items in chapter newsletters, thereby keeping our membership better informed on general aviation.

Respectfully submitted by resolutions committee:

L. KENYON WYCKOFF,
Chairman.
VIRGIL JOYCE.
CARL HAGERTY.
JOSEPH KUENZI.
DEAN SEARLS.

West Virginia Families Hang Onto Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, my comments of yesterday concerning the series of articles appearing in the Charleston Gazette concerning the condition of West Virginia's coal industry are equally applicable to the article I would like to insert today.

These newspaper accounts are built around a tour recently made by my colleague [Mr. SLACK], of West Virginia's Sixth District, to distressed mining areas in southern West Virginia.

Once again, this article stresses the starvation point to which a great many West Virginians have reached in many areas. The picture is bleak, the atmosphere is heavy with human dread and anguish.

I feel that there are no Members of this House who would not be distraught if such conditions prevailed among their constituents in their respective districts.

I can appreciate that such conditions are not general throughout the Nation; but, the following insertion is concrete proof that West Virginia is, at present, sorely afflicted and in need of all the Federal advice and assistance it can get:

FAMILIES HANG ONTO LIFE
(By John G. Morgan)

HIGHCOAL.—The mine here was closed a year ago. That meant unemployment for 82 men, the last of a gradually-reduced force of about 500.

Closure spelled economic collapse for this mining camp in Boone County. A large number of deserted or demolished houses testify to the truth of that today.

But here and there in the remaining rows of gray houses caked with coal dust are families hanging onto life. A real estate company rents them the houses at $16 a month.

Among those still here are Melvin Smoot, 37, father of eight; Ernest Taylor, father of six; and Carl Harris, 39, father of seven.

Representative JOHN M. SLACK, JR., West Virginia's new Congressman from the Sixth District, entered the house of each of the men and talked to them and their wives.

He sought information that might be helpful in backing a legislative program for relief of unemployed miners.

Smoot, a shuttle car operator until he lost his job December 31, 1957, said he hadn't paid his rent since last July nor his electric bill within the last four months.

His monthly ration of surplus commodities includes 30 pounds of flour, 5 pounds of cheese, 5 pounds of butter, 10 pounds of rice and a small quantity of meal.

"They charge 50 cents if we've got it," he said in reference to the surplus food. The money is used to help pay the cost of local distribution by authorized agents of the State.

By the third week in each month, some types of the allotted food supplies usually are exhausted, he said. If the supplies could be doubled the family would have enough, he added.

Three of the Smoot children are of school age. One attends Sherman High School and the other two go to a grade school in Whitesville. The grade school children get free hot lunches. All of the children are in need of clothes, especially shoes.

Smoot said he went to Cincinnati once to see about a job. A friend was successful in getting one there and is trying to look out for him.

He owns no automobile. His TV set broke down last Christmas.

Asked for his opinion on who should cure the unemployment situation, Smoot said:

"I hope that last bunch they put in there will do something."

He said "bunch" meant legislators in Washington and Charleston.

Taylor, who found work at a small punch mine operation in Greenbrier County from last August to December, is 3 months behind on his rent and only 1 month on his electric bill.

He owns a 1951 Buick, although it has been parked for the past 3 weeks. His TV set has been out of commission about a week, but he has a radio.

"We have about enough of everything to eat, except butter," said Mrs. Taylor, who recently recovered from an illness of a month.

Taylor said the six children are at home and indicated that others had married or found employment elsewhere. His 19-year-old son, Junior, is an amateur boxer.

The Harris home is a religious one. There are four pictures of Jesus on the living-room wall. Mrs. Harris said the family attends the local Baptist church.

She made it plain that the monthly dole of "molligrub" (surplus commodities) isn't enough for her family. Potatoes and beans in addition to the usual fare would be appreciated, she said.

Harris, a machineman, has been unemployed a full year. He recently has been "bootlegging copper"—gathering the metal around abandoned mines and selling it to a junk dealer.

Over the past month he said he sold about 120 pounds at 10 cents a pound, or $12—enough to pay the utility bill. He said the bill is "due right now," and he is 3 months behind in his house rent.

The family has no automobile, no TV set, no radio, and receives no newspaper.

The Harris children are from 4 to 16. The oldest, an attractive girl, is a senior at Sherman High School. While a Congressman was in her house she took the opportunity to interview him. With pad and pencil she approached SLACK and asked his name and reason for being there.

Harris and Smoot drew the maximum of 24 weeks, plus a special extension of 12 weeks, in unemployment payments last year. They have signed up for resumption of payments in reduced amounts this year. Taylor only recently started receiving the weekly $30 maximum.

Each of the three unemployed miners has no idea as to what he will do when his benefits are exhausted. Each said he has searched desperately and widely for a job.

In all of the gloom there is one bright light. A doctor visits the families when called and waits indefinitely for receipt of his fees. Credit is available at the nearby Whitesville Clinic.

SLACK attempted to reassure each of the families as he left their homes. His words were to this effect: "We're going to try to give you some help in Congress. We hope that something can be done. All we can do is try."

SLACK drove his car the full extent of the ghostly camp, and turned in front of the closed company store. The abandoned coal tipple could be seen on the mountain.

On the return trip down the creek a member of SLACK's party commented on the better appearance of the houses outside the mining camp.

R. R. (Big Chew) Humphreys, secretary-treasurer of UMW district 17, said the houses probably are owned by retired people who have a steady income, such as a pension or social security.

"They make a corn bread living," he said.

A Catholic Analysis of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dale Francis which appeared in Our Sunday Visitor, a Catholic weekly, on January 18, 1959, dealing with the questions surrounding the establishment of a new and free government in Cuba:

THE HAPPY CUBANS
(By Dale Francis)

There must have been great joy in Cuba when Fulgencio Batista left. As I've said several times in the last 3 years, the greatest contribution Batista could make to the island of Cuba would be to pack up and leave.

The trouble is, he and his friends are reputed to have packed up some $800 million to take with them. This would be in keeping with the past for other Cuban politicians have left the island with suitcases packed with U.S. dollars.

But in the midst of the joy there should be many prayers. The exit of Batista doesn't mean the problems of Cuba are solved.

This wonderful island with its wonderful people has never really had a good government. It has had some governments that were not as bad as others, but none of them could be called good governments.

Batista had a kind of popularity among some of the people a few years back, al-

though serious Cubans always resented the fact that he came to power unlawfully after an election defeat. But whatever popularity Batista had, it was largely dissipated in the last year and a half as his police ruthlessly killed and imprisoned those suspected of opposition.

The sins of Batista contributed to the popularity of his opposition, Fidel Castro. The people really don't know much about Castro. He has never held office; he has never been in a position where he could put into effect his political ideas. But the people needed an ideal to become the counter-image of Batista, and Fidel Castro was it. Today he is the most popular man in Cuba.

Is this popularity justified? Will Fidel Castro be the knight in shining armor that the Cubans expect him to be?

Well, first of all, he has the tremendous problem of organizing a government. Despite the fact that Manuel Urrutia is President, Castro still must be the man who forms the new government whether he wants it that way or not.

In forming the new government, he is going to have to show a tremendous ingratitude. Ex-President Carlos Prio and the Aleman family have helped the revolution from Florida with arms and men. Yet Carlos Prio and the Aleman family came to their wealth under circumstances that were, to say the very least, suspicious. It would be difficult for Fidel Castro to eliminate corruption from the Government if he permitted men who had profited from past corruption to have a say in his government.

Then what about the Communists? Those of you who have read this column the last 3 years know that I've expressed concern about some of the men around Castro.

One is Dr. Ernesto Guevara, the Argentine physician who commanded the rebel troops in Las Villas Province and who was the first of the rebel leaders into Havana.

Dr. Guevara has a long background of support for Communist causes. He was in Guatemala when the Reds controlled that country and he was one of those kicked out of the country when the anti-Communists took over. Is Guevara a Communist? Our State Department naively announced that a close friend of Guevara had said he was not. That may be proof enough for the State Department, but knowing something about Communists, I'd be inclined to keep a close eye on this man.

There were other known Communists in Mexico with Castro's group—among them Bayo Giroud, who had a long record of known communism. Even the Castro forces admit there has been Communist support for his cause—but this does not mean the movement is communistic.

Some have claimed Castro is a Communist and cite the fact that he was one of the young Latin Americans who protested a Pan American conference in Columbia a dozen years ago. It is true Castro was there, observers who believe this stamps him as a Communist show a misunderstanding of Latin America that is typical of North Americans. There has long been a revolutionary spirit in Latin America, a spirit justified by the fact that the governments of many Latin American countries have been brutal, corrupt dictatorships. The dictatorships have been on their way out for a long time and eventually the last three will fall to a protest that may be supported by Communists, who are always quick to capitalize on discontent, but which is not communistic.

Fidel Castro, assuming as I do that he is not Communist in his sympathies, will have a difficult time controlling the reds who gave him support. The Communists are certain to want to get into key positions.

The Catholic Church in Cuba did not enter openly into the struggle. But a year and a half ago Catholic leaders asked for a truce that both Batista and Castro refused. Castro and Batista later refused to arbitrate their differences through a committee formed largely by Catholic action.

Batista, who was baptized a Catholic, educated by Protestants and practices no religion, took the Catholic efforts as an affront to his government—the hierarchy after all did put the rebels on the same level as the government.

There followed serious reprisals against Catholic leaders. Catholic Action leaders were imprisoned and some were killed. A man we knew, the Grand Knight of the Knights of Columbus in Guantanamo, was murdered and, although the government denied any guilt, claiming he was killed by bandits, many of the people believed he was killed because of his opposition to Batista.

Such nationally well-known Catholic leaders as Jose Ignacio Lasaga sought asylum in other countries. The government brought great pressure on Catholics and the terrorism solidified Catholic opposition to Batista so that in the last year and a half many of the leaders of Catholic Action joined the Castro forces.

With Communist and Catholic influences in Castro's movement unalterably opposed to each other—there is certain to be a struggle for influence. The question is, which will be the stronger?

Well, first of all, Castro is a Catholic. He was educated in Catholic schools and he insisted on priests as chaplains for his army. This was an important thing, for there were no practicing Catholics among the officers of Batista's army and there was a well-founded rumor that no one who was not a Mason could expect to become an officer in that army.

But in contrast, when Castro's forces won out over Batista there were six priests assigned to the rebel forces.

What is even more important is that Castro called Father Amado Llorente to his rebel headquarters to seek his counsel. Father Llorente was not only Castro's teacher when the rebel chieftain was a youngster in a Jesuit school, he is the director of the most important Catholic action group in all of Cuba—Agrupacion Catolica Universitaria. This is an elite Catholic action movement of professional and intellectual leaders of Cuba, chosen while they were university students and under spiritual formation ever since.

All these are hopeful signs. Another hopeful sign came when the corrupt Batista labor movement was taken over largely by anti-Communists and Christian workers despite the fact that the Communists tried to take it over immediately after the end of the rebellion.

What Cuba needs now is the prayers of all of us. Never has there been such a chance for a good government, never has there been the prospect of a brighter future for that wonderful island.

But there are many hazards ahead; there are many ambitious men to be denied a chance to get in the Government for their own interests. There are struggles ahead in Cuba and your prayers are needed.

Say a prayer for Cuba today that Fidel Castro will be what the people of Cuba hope he will be—the man to finally bring freedom to a country that has been waiting centuries to become free.

Ike's Farm Bill and Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, analysis of the Federal budget for the fiscal year 1960, submitted by the President to Congress on January 19, reveals significant progress toward fiscal responsibility. A very excellent editorial of the Chicago Sun-Times of January 30, points out that the President's farm proposals which were presented to Congress on January 29 continues to emphasize the administration's determination to effect economies if Congress will give favorable consideration to the discontinuance of Federal programs for which emergencies have passed.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit this thought-provoking article for the RECORD:

IKE'S FARM BILL AND FOOD PRICES

Every housewife ought to call upon her Congressman to support President Eisenhower's farm program sent to Congress yesterday. We include farm housewives in this observation, too.

The President's new farm proposals would mean moderately lower food prices for consumers. His plan would lower food prices by reducing Federal support prices on farm crops.

Why should farm wives support a program that will reduce Federal subsidies on certain crops? There are several reasons.

The first reason is one that should draw support for Ike's program from all Americans: The farm program is stupendously expensive. It costs the taxpayers more than $5 billion this year. This is a big factor in putting the Government in the red. And, as we have repeatedly demonstrated on this page, when the Government spends more money than it takes in the result is more inflation. Inflation steals dollars from everyone's purse, including the farmer's.

In the past 6 years the Government has spent an average of $4.7 billion on farm subsidies. During that same period the annual Federal deficit has averaged $2.7. If Congress had taken Mr. Eisenhower's advice earlier and cut farm subsidies, the Government might have been able to keep in the black.

The enormous outlay of money might have been justified if it had done any good for the Nation. But it has not. The President flatly told Congress yesterday that the price-support and production-control program "has not worked." The money has gone down a gopher hole.

The expenditure has not brought supported farm products in line with demand. It has only succeeded in piling up huge surpluses, worth nearly $9 billion, in Government ownership. The cost of storage management alone is $1 billion a year. There is a year's supply of wheat in storage.

Farmers as well as the rest of us are helping to pay these costs. Yet, the billions being paid out in agricultural subsidies are not going to all farmers. The big producers—especially of wheat and cotton—are getting most of the money. Only 12 out of some 250 farm commodities are supported by law at prescribed minimum levels.

And how have these 12 fared in the general market? Not as well as those not supported, or those supported at levels that are discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture. Producers of cattle, hogs, poultry, fruits, and vegetables which are not supported have enjoyed growing markets. Their stocks are not piled up in Government warehouses.

Mr. Eisenhower and enlightened farmers do not advocate abandoning farmers to the vagaries of nature. They favor shielding basic crop producers against crop failures. They favor a floor for them just as industrial workers have minimum wages. But they believe that the farmer's best interests will be served if he relies on the market place rather than on Government handouts. Those handouts last year amounted to 40

percent of net farm income—few of them going to farmers in greatest difficulty.

Mr. Eisenhower asks Congress to give the Secretary of Agriculture greater discretion in setting the level of supports. He asks that standards for pricing be measured against market prices of recent years instead of the nearly half-century-old parity standard now in use. Corngrowers recently adopted the market-price standard in an election. There is no good reason why it shouldn't apply to other crops.

The President's farm program is a step toward agricultural sanity. It should be adopted.

The New Leaders In Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following biographies of some of the new leaders in Cuba: Fidel Castro, Provisional President Manuel Urrutia, Prime Minister Jose Miro Cardona, and Minister of State Roberto Daniel Agramonte Pichardo. This material wrs prepared for me for my information before I went to Cuba on January 20. I feel this information would be of interest to my colleagues who share my concern for the success of Cuba's new government:

FIDEL CASTRO RUZ

Fidel Castro, the victor in a 2-year armed struggle with the administration of President Fulgencio Batista, had been in open, armed rebellion against the Cuban Government since he led his "26th of Ju'y" forces to a landing in Cuba's Oriente Province on December 2, 1956.

Born on his father's farm in Oriente Province on August 13, 1926, Castro is the son of a self-made Spanish immigrant and the fifth of nine children. After receiving his secondary education at the Jesuit-run Colegio Belén in Havana, he entered the law school of the University of Havana. He soon became active in campus politics and was elected president of his law school class. He also became active in the Federación Estudiantil Universitaria (FEU), and joined the Ortodoxo Party. In the summer of 1947, while still a student, Castro joined in the abortive Cayo Confites invasion of the Dominican Republic. Upon his return to Havana, Castro was designated by the FEU to attend a student congress at Bogotá, Colombia, in April 1948. Castro was accused of having been involved in the bloody and violent riots which took place in Bogotá during the Ninth Panamerican Congress, but he has always maintained that he attended the congress in the role of an observer and did not take part in the riots.

Upon Castro's graduation from the University of Havana, he practiced law and took an active part in politics within the ranks of the Ortodoxo Party. In early 1952, he conducted a vigorous campaign for election to the House of Representatives on the Ortodoxo ticket. The March 10, 1952, Batista coup disrupted his plans.

He formed a revolutionary group, and on July 26, 1953 (the date providing his forces with a name) he launched the unsuccessful assault against the Moncada Barracks in Santiago de Cuba, in which a number of soldiers were killed and the insurrectionists were all but annihilated. Captured and sentenced to 15 years imprisonment, Castro was pardoned in a general amnesty declared by General Batista in May 1954. Castro remained in Cuba, continuing his oppositionist activities until July of that year when he went into voluntary exile in Mexico.

In October 1955 Castro came to the United States on an organizational and fund raising tour for his 26th of July movement. After speaking in New York, Tampa, and Key West, he returned to Mexico on December 10 after the Cuban Government had protested his frankly revoluntionary activities and U.S. Immigration authorities had cut short his stay. In Mexico Castro declared his intention to invade Cuba if Batista refused to step down. On December 2, 1956, following diversionary activities by his followers ashore, Castro led a band of 82 men in a landing in Cuba's Oriente Province. In the resulting skirmishes he lost most of his men but was able to recruit additional manpower from the countryside. He continued to grow stronger and his forces slowly opened new fronts in Oriente and Las Villas Province. He achieved his objective when it was announced on January 1, 1959, that President Batista and a large number of his followers had flown to exile in the Dominican Republic.

In the early 1940's Castro married Mirta Díaz Balarti. Some time after the birth of a son, Fidel Castro Díaz, the mother divorced Castro and married Emilio Nuñez Blanco, son of Emilio Nuñez Portuondo, Batista's chief of the Cuban delegation to the United Nations. Castro is said to have a fair command of English.

MANUEL EUGENIO URRUTIA LLEO

Manuel Urrutia was confirmed as Provisional President of Cuba by revolutionary leader Fidel Castro on January 1, 1959. A lawyer and judge by profession, Urrutia came into public prominence when he was presiding justice of the district court of the Province of Oriente in Santiago on May 10, 1957. The occasion was a trial of about 150 persons accused of insurrection and other serious offenses against the Batista government. Although 111 were acquitted by the panel of three judges and 40 were given various sentences, Judge Urrutia stated in pronouncing sentence that he personally had been in favor of acquitting nearly all of the prisoners, strongly attacked the Batista regime, and added that since Batista and his administration had usurped and were illegally retaining power, the defendants had been acting within their constitutional rights. As a result, the Cuban Minister of Justice brought impeachment proceedings against him, but they were later dropped.

Entering the judiciary as municipal judge of Jiguani on January 10, 1927, Urrutia subsequently served in the same capacity at Los Arabos, Limonar and Cienfuegos, Judge of the Cienfuegos Civil Court, Judge of the Matanzas Misdemeanors Court and the Colon Civil Court, and Justice of the Santiago Supreme Court, also serving as President of the Emergency Court. In December, 1957, he went with his family into voluntary exile in New York and Miami, following retirement as a justice after a career of nearly 31 years. He returned to Cuba late in 1958 as Castro's candidate for provisional president. In August of 1958 Urrutia was designated by the Movimiento de Resistencia Civica to be Provisional President of Cuba upon the fall of the Batista regime.

Born at Yaguajay, Las Villas Province on December 6, 1901, and married to Esperanza Gladys de Llaguno Aquirre, Urrutia has two sons, ages 20 and 14, and a daughter 8 months old born in the United States. Urrutia is reported to read, but not speak, English. He has been quite active as a fund raiser and speaker for Castro and the 26th of July movement in the United States and in other countries, and is believed to be at least potentially friendly to the United States.

JOSÉ MIRÓ CARDONA

José Miró Cardona, named Prime Minister of Cuba by Provisional President Urrutia on January 5, 1959, since May 1958 has been living in exile in the United States, and is one of the leading contemporary legal figures in Cuba with a reputation which is both national and international in character. Aside from his select legal practice, he has been prominent in both the National and Havana Bar Associations (having been dean of the latter since 1952), and also occupied a full professorship at the University of Havana in the field of penal law. In the international sphere he has been a delegate to the Inter-American Bar Association conferences of 1941 (Havana), 1946 (Santiago de Chile), 1947 (Lima), 1949 (Detroit), 1956 (Dallas), and 1957 (Buenos Aires). He also represented the National Bar Association at the Inter-American Congress of Odontology, Legal Medicine, and Criminology, held at Havana in 1946.

Miró Cardona entered the political arena late in 1955 via the Society of Friends of the Republic (SAR), formed by elder statesman Cósme de la Torriente for the purpose of bringing the Batista regime and its opposition together in working out a peaceful solution to Cuba's political problems. Following the unfruitful efforts of the SAR, Miró Cardona associated himself with an organization known as the Group of Civic Institutions in another attempt to bring about what the SAR had failed to achieve. The successive failure of both these efforts found him gradually moving away from an apolitical position to one of greater criticism of the Bastista Government.

Miró Cardona was born in Havana on August 2, 1902. His father, José Miró Argenter, came to Cuba from Cataluña, Spain, at the age of 17 and followed a journalistic career. He was active in preparations for the 1895 revolution, and during the ensuing war of independence rose to the rank of general in the revolutionary army and served as General Maceo's chief-of-staff until the latter's death. His three-volume "Crónicas de la Guerra" continues to be a standard reference work on Maceo's campaigns.

Educated both in Cuba and Italy, Miró received a liberal arts degree from the University of Havana in 1937 and the degree of doctor of civil law the following year. With a scholarship from the university he went to Italy where he studied at the Universidad Real de Roma during 1939. While in Rome he also served as cultural attaché of the Cuban Legation.

Miró is married to Ernestina Torra Obar. Their daughter, Yolanda de la Luz (who is married to the sculptor Sergio López Mesa and the mother of three children) has a doctorate in philosophy and letters and teaches at the high school of La Vibora in Havana. Miró's son, José Antonio (who is married to Silvia Santaella Ponce and the father of two children) is a lawyer, practicing in Havana.

Miró Cardona, who is the author of a number of works on juridical matters, holds the following decorations: Gran Cruz de la Orden de Honor y Mérito "Lanuza"; Commendador de la Orden Nacional de Mérito "Carlos Manuel de Déspedes"; Commendador de la Gran Orden Soberana y Continental de Mérito y Honor de la Unión Democrática Interamericana; Condecoración de la Sociedad Cubana de Derecho International; and Colegiado de Honor del Colegio Nacional de Abogados.

Miró Cardona has in the past displayed a basically friendly attitude toward the United States. He has some knowledge of English.

ROBERTO DANIEL AGRAMONTE PICHARDO

Appointed on January 4, 1959, as Cuban Minister of State, Agramonte is without question one of Cuba's intellectual leaders. An important public figure, he had a firm reputation in educational circles and as an author and lecturer before he became an unsuccessful candidate of the Cuban People's Party (Partido del Pueblo Cubano-Ortodoxo-PPC(o)) for vice president in 1948.

Agramonte had been professor of philosophy, psychology, and sociology at the University of Havana from 1926 until he left Cuba in 1957. He also served as its vice rector and dean of the faculty of philosophy and letters during part of that period. A member of the Ortodoxo Party from its early days, he was vice president of its national executive committee, prior to his nomination as the party's presidential candidate in 1952. Although the elections were not held because of Batista's coup in March 1952, it has been reported that Agramonte stood a good chance to be elected had they been held. In July 1957 he left Cuba for Mexico and remained there in voluntary exile until he returned to Cuba after the departure of Batista.

Quite widely traveled, Agramonte has visited the United States a number of times. A writer of texts in psychology and sociology, Agramonte is said to be an authority on Ecuadorean writers García Moreno and Montalvo. He has lectured widely on his major subjects and his broadcasts have been popular. He was Cuban Ambassador to Mexico during 1946–47 under ex-President Grau.

Born at Villaclara, Cuba, on May 3, 1904, Agramonte is married to Concepción del Río and they have an adult son and a daughter. Agramonte speaks English.

Coal by Wire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago a group of businessmen and union officials, all of them confident of the potential of electric heating, met in my office. Among those who took part were representatives of Appalachian Electric Power Co., National Coal Association, United Mine Workers of America, and electrical equipment manufacturers.

My interest in the expansion of electric utilities service is obvious enough. Mr. Speaker, West Virginia is the Nation's greatest coal-producing State, and from the Fifth Congressional District comes almost 30 percent of West Virginia's total coal output. The coal industry, directly or indirectly, is responsible for most of the subsistence of the residents of our district. When the miner receives a pay check, a widespread chain reaction takes place. The grocer gets a good portion of what the miner earns. The landlord from whom he rents or the bank with which he has his mortgage comes in for a regular percentage. The miscellany of other recipients includes the barber, the clothier, gasoline station, service utilities, and our churches. Needless to say, our Federal, State, and local governments come in for important shares of every dollar that the miner earns.

Our railroad industry receives much of its revenue from coal traffic. Without that traffic, both operational and maintenance employees are without work.

Supplying coal mines is a big business in southern West Virginia. Timber, steel products, electrical equipment, petroleum products, and many other items are used in heavy quantity by our mines.

Appalachian Electric Power Co. is itself an essential source of employment for many of our people, both in its offices and on its field staffs. What is more, the West Virginia generating stations of Appalachian Electric consume more than 3½ million tons of coal annually. As electric heating grows in popularity, this order will increase substantially. The Appalachian Co. has been in the vanguard of the coal-by-wire effort. Through its advertisements and other promotional activities, it has helped to make West Virginians more conscious of the economic value of the electric heating program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want anyone to lose sight of the fact that, although the market has declined seriously since the end of World War II, the use of coal in home furnaces is still very important to the industry. Nationwide, some 12 million residential units are kept warm by coal heat. The development of convenient stokers and ash-hauling equipment makes coal all the more attractive domestically, particularly because of its price stability in recent years. We are not suggesting conversions from coal furnaces. We do believe it to the benefit of builders and the public in general to call attention to the advantages of heating by electricity. For this reason, I am always happy when a publication devotes space to the growing popularity of electric heating.

Coal Age, a McGraw-Hill publication whose editor, Iven Given, is a native of Sutton, W. Va., and who is probably one of the best informed authorities on the mining industry, featured an article on electric heating in its January issue. Written by W. A. Raleigh, Jr., associate editor, this comprehensive review of the many facets of electric heat not only captures the imagination of investors, architects, and builders, but also offers an interesting study for anyone who is thinking of buying a new home now or in the future. I commend it to the attention of all who may read these remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to say that an excellent series of articles on "Coal by Wire" has appeared over the past few months in the United Mine Workers of America Journal. This effort has resulted in an availability of printed material that will enable any interested home purchaser or homebuilder to make his own choice of heating equipment based upon installation costs and present and future fuel crisis and supply.

From time to time Mr. Speaker, I hope to refer to these informative articles so that a digest of their contents may become an official part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Story of Whitesville Boom to Ghost Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I again today bring to the attention of this House the desperate plight of our people in West Virginia who are dependent upon the coal industry for their daily bread.

Herewith submitted for consideration of the House, another in a series of articles published by the Charleston (W.Va.) Gazette, after one of its staff writers, John G. Morgan, accompanied one of my colleagues, Mr. Slack, of West Virginia's Sixth District, on a tour of these distressed areas. The article is as follows:

STORY OF WHITESVILLE: BOOM TO GHOST TOWN

(By John G. Morgan)

WHITESVILLE.—About 6 years ago the mines were going full blast. Business flowed at high tide, and there was noise akin to tumult in the streets. This was a boomtown.

Fights occurred often when spirits soared too high, and City Police Chief R. W. Pittsonberger had his hands full.

Justice of the Peace Charles E. Casto had plenty of business too. In 1953, for example, he handled about 375 civil cases and a large number of criminal cases.

Today it's a different story.

The estimated total of miners in the Whitesville area has dropped from about 7,000 to 1,000. By rough count, 17 of 26 mines have closed. The remaining nine have reduced their work forces.

Merchants say business is off at least one fourth and that credit accounts are climbing. The stores and streets are never crowded, and there are times when they look deserted during business hours.

Pittsonberger admits that he has an easy job, and Casto has to depend on barbering for a living. Last year his civil cases dwindled to 31 and his criminal cases to 2.

"It's rough," said Nick Halkias, who operates a sandwich shop and two theaters. "I wash dishes, cook, sell popcorn and clean theaters—four jobs, and still I can't make a living."

He said he keeps one theater open nightly and the other only on weekends.

Zachari Karantonis, 69, who came to the United States from Greece in 1912 and who today operates a large supermarket in town, said: "We are making money, but there is no profit."

Nicholas Haddad, clothing store owner, said "Things aren't too critical now, but we can't hold up long."

Ralph Hottle said he had suspended publication of the weekly Whitesville State News, but declared that the reason wasn't necessarily economic.

He said he wanted to devote more time to teaching school, but added that the business decline did have a bearing on his decision.

Representative JOHN M. SLACK, JR., in Whitesville as part of his tour of areas hard hit by mine layoffs, heard comments of the businessmen here.

The new Congressman from the Sixth District explained that their remarks will serve as basic information in his efforts to formulate some kind of relief program for distressed areas.

The local men were enthusiastic about two possible road projects that would open up trade with surrounding areas on the other sides of mountains.

One would be the construction of a highway through an old railway tunnel to the community of Kayford. The other would be improvement of W. Va. 78 as a connection between W. Va. 79 and W. Va. 3, in the Twilight and Red Dragon vicinities, to make the towns of Van and Wharton more accessible.

Each project would chop off about 50 miles in circuitous driving and encourage an increased amount of through traffic.

Later as SLACK and his small party continued the tour, the Congressman thought out loud about the plight of displaced miners and the communities dependent upon them.

He seemed preoccupied with the thought that industries adaptable to the West Virginia terrain should be attracted to the stricken areas.

"The mountains here offer some natural protection against missiles," he said. "In the future it will be necessary for the Nation to manufacture highly dangerous fuels in larger quantities. Isolated areas surrounded by mountains would be ideal for that."

On another trend of thought, he said:

"It has been suggested to me that the Government should give seeds to these people. But in many places you can see there just isn't any spot for a garden."

R. R. (Big Chew) Humphreys, secretary-treasurer of UMW district 17, recalled that in earlier days when he was a miner and when people generally were more self-sufficient, he had a garden on top of a mountain and went to and from with great effort.

There was an interval of silence, and then Big Chew said softly and with deep conviction:

"The trouble with miners is, they just won't save."

As It Happened: The Big Havana Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Times of Havana of January 22, 1959, with byline "An Old Habanero." This is an accurate and detailed report of the big rally in Havana which I think would interest my colleagues:

THUNDEROUS APPROVAL OF EXECUTIONS ECHOES THROUGHOUT REPUBLIC

(By An Old Habanero)

Placing the blame for misrepresentations of Cuba's revolutionary government trials and executions squarely on foreign press agencies and discounting critical U.S. congressional statements as not representative of the feelings of the American people, Fidel Castro addressed nearly a million people yesterday afternoon from a hastily erected wooden rostrum in front of the Presidential Palace.

The crowd was immense, incredible, imposing. Never has such an enormous mass of humanity gathered in such numbers before the executive mansion to hear Castro, President Urrutia and other revolutionary leaders lambast foreign critics and present their case to the people of Cuba. By 2 o'clock in the afternoon, throngs were pouring down Malecón, gathering in huge masses on Carlos III Avenue and crowding all the approaches to the Palace on the Avenida de las Misiones.

The people carried signs, thousands of signs, banners and posters all demanding the trial and execution of war criminals of the Batista regime. Samples: "Toothpick Workers Support Fidel Castro." "No Foreign Interference." "Zero Clemency." "Shoot the Assassins of the People." "Fidel! Our Enemies Are Hiding Behind Uncle Sam's Whiskers!" "No U.S. Intervention in Cuban Affairs." One said in English: "Execution For Killers." There were large banners, small banners, white banners, red and black banners, yellow banners, some small posters carried by individuals, obviously lettered by loving hands at home.

It was an orderly demonstration. There were no fist fights, few sudden flurries in the crowd, no angry shouts, no haranguing. Complete order reigned throughout without the need of one cop or one radio car. It was not a hostile demonstration. People had turned out by the hundreds of thousands to see and hear their beloved Fidel.

It was a voluntary demonstration. No one was forced to come. As a spontaneous demonstration of the power of public opinion, it was breath-taking and imposing. As a demonstration of public order and discipline, it was well-nigh incredible. As a mandate of the people to the Revolutionary Government, it was incontestable.

It was not an anti-American demonstration. It was a demonstration for the people of the United States, to let them see how the people of this country stood behind their government and the decisions of that government. It was a demonstration of national solidarity never seen before in Cuba. It was a monster jury for Batista men accused of torture and murder and rape. It was a national condemnation of those men. It was the spectacle of a united people.

Again and again the theme ran through the words of every speaker preceding Fidel: "See, our country, our people have turned out in numbers never before seen to show you that we are not barbarians, that we are only interested in justice, that we want to see criminals punished as they are punished in every country in the world."

President Urrutia, in an unofficial interview before the beginning of the talks at the meeting said, "Cubans are demonstrating that they want their government to carry out justice. What is being done in Cuba is justice. We have said and I repeat, we have nothing to hide. I am happy to see so many U.S. correspondents here. I have a great deal of affection for the people of the United States and I don't want to see that great people fooled into believing anything but the truth."

Several speakers preceded Fidel Castro, like boxers before the main bout: David Salvador, secretary of the CTC (Cuban Confederation of Labor); Guido García Inclán, representing the Cuban press; Juan Ruiz, uniformed, bearded, one of the leaders of the Students Federation; Luis Orlando Radríguez, Minister of the Interior; Jorge Quintana, also of the Cuban press; and Major Rolando Cubelas, of the Directorio Revolucionario, the people that had a spat with Castro, and who was barely allowed to say a few words before Fidel took the microphones.

Fidel Castro's appearance created pandemonium. Thousands and thousands of throats yelled a greeting in a deafening uproar which immediately swelled to the cry "Justicia! Justicia!" chanted over and over again. With a characteristic gesture, Castro faced the crowd and put his right index finger to his lips. He rolled his eyes and held his left hand out for silence. The chant wavered and began to diminish. "Let's see if a million people can keep quiet," he said disarmingly. The noise died down, petered out, vanished. He had a million people spellbound.

I have never seen a public speaker who can so identify himself with his audience. In slow, measured, conversational tones, frequently pausing for his words to take effect, and swerving his body to command all his listeners, Castro spoke to them as he would have over coffee and cigars after dinner. Not once did he raise his voice; not once did he adopt the traditional heroic pose of the political speaker; not once did he rise above the lowest common denominator confronting him.

"This has been the biggest victory of the people of Cuba in the revolution. You are winning a victory without a shot, without arms, but a victory for justice and reason and morals. Those who thought we were simple guerrillas, those who thought we knew only how to shoot, have found out that the Cuban revolution can win the battle of information and the battle of reason," said he.

Castro looked very tired and perspired profusely in the warm afternoon sun. At one point he stopped and sighed. "Fellow countrymen, the next time I'm going to ask for only 10,000 instead of a million Cubans. It is too much. The press is too great. It is almost impossible to make a speech today. I shall have to compress my ideas. Every minute I stay up here can cost the lives of my compatriots. Women are fainting. I shall be brief."

Major Castro was brief. For about an hour and a half he spoke, bringing his case before the people of Cuba, asking the foreign press to truthfully report what they were witnessing yesterday. "Gentlemen of the foreign press, gentlemen of the diplomatic corps," he called, "imagine you have before you a jury of a million people of all classes and races and religions. I am going to ask that jury: Those in agreement with the justice being applied now; those in accord with the trial and execution of the myrimidons now being judged, raise your hands." A "million" hands shot up in the air and a huge shout rose from the packed hundreds of thousands in front of the palace. "Press of the whole continent," Castro continued, "a jury of a million Cubans of all ideas and classes and races has voted. Those who are democrats or who call themselves democrats, I say to you, this is democracy, this is respecting the will of the people."

Castro referred to the frequent concern he had met from people who are worried about his personal safety. He went on to say that the destiny of a people does not depend on one man, and he cannot seek safety by hiding in a bank vault. He declared that no one would stop the revolution, that there are other men behind him; adding as an afterthought, "And I will tell my enemies something, behind me there are others more radical than I."

He designated his brother Raul as his successor, should anything happen to him. "Not because he is my brother. I hate nepotism; but because I consider him fully capable of taking my place in case something should happen to me."

He jabbed at foreign news agencies for having killed him a few days after his landing in Oriente Province 2 years ago. "Not having killed me successfully then, they wish to do so now." He accused the wire services of cabling that merely adherents of Batista, and not murderers and torturers, were being executed.

He charged them with sending stories of mass executions without trials. "They (the news agencies) have not spoken about the conduct of the rebel army or the civilized behavior of our people. No one has been tortured; no one has been beaten. People have not taken vengeance in their own hands (as they did in Machado's time), but have placed the criminals in the hands of the revolutionary courts," he stated.

Castro reserved his heavy ammunition for the end of his talk when he said, "Real crimes have been committed in the name of

peace. I ask the U.S. Congressmen who attacked us: What did you do in Hiroshima and Nagasaki? In the name of peace, 300,000 human beings were killed. We have not shot women, children, and old men. At Hiroshima and Nagasaki 300,000 noncombatant civilians were killed. In the name of what? To find peace * * * to avoid the death of many fighting Americans * * * so I say to these Congressmen (who should keep out of Cuban problems), we are killing Batista's criminals to establish peace, that we might have peace not only today but in the future of this country."

Castro made it very clear that the United States Government had not attacked the Cuban Government directly. He said that some of the American press has defended him, citing Herbert L. Matthews, of the New York Times, as an example. "The American Government is not hostile to us," said he. "We are asking for the support of the American people," he continued. "We have not been aggressors. We have not attacked any people of the world. Yet the Cuban people have been the victim of a dastardly and cowardly campaign; but I assure you that this battle is won. This is everybody's battle."

He referred to the order reigning in Havana today, calling it a city patrolled by Boy Scouts, a city with no police on the street and yet a city where no looting is taking place. He challenged anyone to find a city like that in the whole world, and asked newsmen to tell that story to the people of their countries.

This afternoon at the Havana Riviera Hotel Castro will hold a press conference for 385 visiting newsmen, where, he said, he would be willing to answer any and all questions put up to him.

Fidel Castro's big winner yesterday was the enormous mass of people that attended the meeting. Their order, their discipline, their reason, and the absence of passion, all combined to teach the world a lesson in public behavior.

But did I notice a very slight trace of exasperation in the leader of the revolution. Exasperation at having to explain simplicities to the crowd; exasperation at having to obtain the approval of that crowd? Fidel Castro has said repeatedly that he aspires to no public office and that he subordinates himself to the government of President Urrutia. He yesterday appointed Raúl Castro as his successor. What is Raúl Castro successor to?

The Southern Moderates Are Still There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, events make it more apparent each day that men of moderation are the real hope of the South as it wrestles with the agonizing problems of desegregation. Over the years one of the most consistent and clear-headed southern voices has been that of Ralph McGill, the editor of the Atlanta Constitution.

Last September Mr. McGill wrote an article for the New York Times Sunday magazine in which he discussed the central issues that have emerged in this controversy.

The central truth of Mr. McGill's thesis was demonstrated once again this week in Virginia, I believe. And once again there is hope that honorable and practical men who, for want of a better term we call moderates, will yet lead the South out of the wilderness.

Mr. McGill's article follows:

THE SOUTHERN MODERATES ARE STILL THERE

(By Ralph McGill)

ATLANTA, GA.—After 4 years of being stormtossed on the seas of segregation, with unusual turblence and fog prevailing for the past 12 months, the southern moderate now will be able to function more effectively by reason of the United States Supreme Court decision of Friday, September 12, in the Little Rock case.

The Court upheld the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in its reversal of Federal Judge Harry J. Lemley's order of June staying integration at Central High school in the Arkansas capital for two and one-half years.

The Supreme Court decision had the immediate effect of restoring to the issue the sense of inevitability, which with that of law, is the ingredient essential to rational thought on the subject.

For almost 3 years now, but more especially since Governor Faubus began to dominate the southern segregation scene, there has been a heavy attack on the legal image of inevitability. For a time it was blurred and befogged. It was precisely in this period that the southern moderate seemed to some, at least, to have been submerged, or overwhelmed. And, in a sense, he was. But, being man, he endured.

The decision of September 12 provided a further dividend for the moderate. In addition to keeping alive the image of law and the supremacy of the high court in interpreting the Constitution of the United States, the southern moderate had been hard at work creating a new image. It is one of the Negro as a citizen. It is a fact perhaps not well comprehended outside the South that many southerners to this day have never considered the Negro as a citizen in the full meaning of the word. There is no image of such citizenship, for the good reason that it did not exist. It is only in very recent years that the white-primary laws and other barriers to citizenship have been declared unconstitutional.

The latest decision will greatly strengthen the picture of the Negro as a citizen, as well as renew the necessary sense of inevitability in the 1954 Supreme Court decision and its appeal to the moral and reasonable man. Because of this, the southern moderate's real job has been to keep this sense alive in the mind of the practical man of his region.

It is the practical man who is so necessary to an emotionally stirred, disturbed, and confused South. The southern moderate is not the quiet, assured, often scholarly, detached liberal of the East. In the deep South, ugly with reprisals, penalties, and abuses, where all the political controls are in the hands of men pledged to massive resistance, the moderate, like the liberal, learns that there is an immediacy of reaction, often violent, to anything he may say or write. From this he learns patience and acceptance of the fact that frustration is not defeat, though it can be almost as bitter.

It will be the moderate and the practical man who will see the South through this period which is to many one of agonizing readjustment far more acute than can be imagined by those whose liberal position is based entirely on principle without any corollary experience.

This practical man may be a leader on the vestry, a bishop, a clergyman, an executive of a great corporation, an editor, an attorney, or a person in some public position. With the sense of inevitability, this practical man can, and does, influence others in economic and professional positions to attain that image and to comprehend it and the ultimate meaning to his community.

It is this same image of inevitability that causes many a sincere Christian or Jew to say, "I don't like it, but I must either abandon my faith and its tenets or accept it, and so, with God's help, I will." And there are those who say, "I don't think the Court was right. I hate the decision. I wish it had never happened, but I love my country and I will accept decisions of its courts."

Governor Faubus especially, and numerous other southern political leaders—governors, United States Senators and White Citizens Council orators—had succeeded in greatly weakening this sense of the inevitable. They asserted over and over that the Supreme Court's decision was not legal or binding and was entirely unconstitutional.

It was a commonplace experience of newspapermen to talk with a southern political leader and hear him say, privately, he knew integration to be inevitable, and then, minutes later, hear the same man say to a whooping audience that the "left-wing Supreme Court" had acted unconstitutionally and that States' rights would emerge triumphant.

The citizens councils urged their members to write their Congressmen and Senators. "Just stand up and make yourself heard," they said, "and we'll win. We'll never surrender to those who would usurp our rights."

In addition, there were the fire-eaters who breathed defiance and slandered the court, the President of the United States and all who were not in agreement with them. Their text was "Never."

The effect of this, and the fact of it, were established before the Supreme Court by Richard C. Butler, the able attorney for the Little Rock school board. The people of Little Rock, he told the court, were confused about what was the law and did not accept the court's decision as final, particularly since Governor Faubus "was repeatedly" telling them it was "not the law of the land."

It was not a good argument in a court of law, but it was a factual description of a state of mind widespread in the deep south. There are even now literally thousands of good southern people who believe the court's action to be illegal and not applicable to them, because a governor, a Senator, a Congressman, an editor or some other person of position has so said or written.

The southern moderate, utterly destroyed insofar as any political influence in his State capital was concerned, was pushed out of the center of the picture by early 1955. He was chided and harassed. In some communities he was asked to resign from the vestry or board of deacons. Some teachers—a great many college teachers and some ministers—lost their jobs. There were businesses that warned employees not to "participate" in controversy. For a time various forms of coercions and reprisals flourished, mild and severe.

The Court decision shocked a great majority of the southern people, because their political leadership had failed utterly to prepare them for it. For some years the High Court had been handing down decisions which clearly indicated that full citizenship was the right of all Americans.

Political leaders began a belated, almost frantic, drive to build schools and thereby comply with the long-neglected separate-but-equal Court ruling of 1896. There were those few who spoke out, saying that segregation was on the way out and plans should be made to live with such a decision. But, as people do, they looked to their leaders. And a great majority of these told them not to worry, the Court would not and could not so find.

When it did come there was a great shock. The political leaders soon regrouped and came charging back, crying betrayal. A number of urban school boards that tentatively, and sensibly, had begun to make

plans to comply by gerrymandering school district lines and putting the fewest possible number of Negro children in school as a starter, abruptly were put in their place as legislatures hurried to write new laws and earn delay.

It was Virginia, with her pre-Civil War theory of interposition, that gave certain respectability and stature to these proceedings by throwing the great cloak of her history and tradition about total defiance.

In this period the national administration failed the cause of moderation. The Court had handed to the South, and some bordering States, a decision. But the executive department, which includes the Department of Justice, failed utterly to provide any leadership or to offer any plans for, or assistance in, enforcement.

It is true that all Governors and State officers, including judges, are sworn to support the Constitution of the United States. But in this period some imaginative national leadership and interposition between the moderate and the extremist might have made a different story. But it did not come.

However, the moderate was not as alone as he sometimes felt, or seemed to be.

There were two elections, in particular, that refuted the belief that the southern moderate had been driven from the scene.

In November 1957, Virginia went to the polls to elect a Governor. Nominee of the Democrats was J. Lindsay Almond, pledged to support a State program of "massive resistance" to the court decision. He had, of course, the full support of the Byrd organization. Senator HARRY F. BYRD himself led the Almond campaign. In public speeches he called on the voters to crush the opposition and let the Nation and the Court know how Virginia felt.

The opposition was Theodore R. Dalton, Republican. He had proposed a plan of limited integration. Thus, the sole, major issue was clearly drawn.

Almond won with, in round numbers, 300,000 votes to 188,000 for Dalton. Despite the heavy pressure by the Byrd organization, the emotionalism of the issue and the fact that President Eisenhower's popularity was down, the Republican candidate and limited integration received almost 200,000 votes.

An estimated 40,000 to 50,000 Negro votes were in this total. But of the white votes cast in a heated campaign pressed emotionally by one of the most efficient political organizations in the country, Dalton had a third.

More recent voting, that of the primary in which Governor Faubus won renomination, was one-sided. His two opponents were not well known. Neither had any following. Their efforts were not adequately financed. The Governor's organization went all out to round up the votes.

Governor Faubus received 264,346 votes. Yet, almost 120,000 moderates cast ballots in opposition. Of this vote perhaps 17 percent was Negro. But in a superheated, almost hysterical campaign, about a third of the white voters stood for moderation and due process of law.

Other elections, too, were revealing of moderate strength. In Tennessee a richly financed primary campaign based on defiance of the Supreme Court failed as a move to unseat Senator ALBERT GORE, who was charged with being in favor of abiding by his oath to support the Constitution and the courts. A gubernatorial candidate who favored allowing communities to desegregate if they chose was given no chance to win. He came within a few votes of upsetting the favorite. The moderates in the State were the balance of power in the Gore race and they almost nominated a relative unknown for Governor.

In Texas, liberal Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH was renominated in a primary otherwise dominated by extreme conservatives.

There is no political campaign, even in the Deep South, where race is the only factor. The extremists seek always to make this the only issue.

In Georgia's primary of September 10, the three candidates were all profoundly pledged to defend segregation. The most qualified, Ernest Vandiver, campaigned on a program of reforming the State government to eliminate corrupt practices that had been exposed. A Baptist minister, who was one of the candidates, promptly and preposterously charged Mr. Vandiver with being "weak on segregation" and carried on a campaign of political abuse that shocked all but the most extreme. The Baptist minister was all but obliterated by the heavy vote for Vandiver.

There is one generality that largely explains the many paradoxes of the South. It is that the climate, or mood, in which the moderate lives and seeks to function reflects the leadership of his State and the background that produces it.

Why, for example, could North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Texas, all former members of the Confederacy, proceed with deliberate speed in school integration this fall while their neighbors in Virginia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama were pledged to total, permanent defiance? They are all the same sort of people. Superficially their culture is the same. Why, then, the difference?

There is a very real explanation. Four States, Mississippi, South Carolina, Alabama, and Georgia, the heart of the Deep South, have had a continuty of political climate in which the race issue has been agitated in local and State campaigns. Some who have been most prominent in this form of campaigning have attained national reputations in that field. These same States have, on a percentage basis, the largest Negro populations. They also have remaining more of the old plantation type of economy. Industrialization came last to them.

It is neither fair, nor is it helpful in the attempt at solution, to charge the people of these States with being willfully rebellious, mean or perverse. Their political leaders are as pragmatic as those of other areas. They must first get elected. In a sense, they are captives of their past and of the leaders who before them set the pattern of violent racial agitation for political ends.

The Deep South has sent to Congress some of its ablest men. It has such men there today. Some of them have been, and are, fully qualified for the Presidency. One of the most melancholy spectacles is to see such able, intelligent men barred from greater national recognition or from the Presidency itself, not because they are southern but because their region or States advocate a policy that jars with that of the 42 other States. The frustration of such a situation leads some of them to bitterness of spirit and extremes of language and position that serve merely to add to their frustration.

In these States the political leader, or the moderate, practical, reasonable man who takes a stand and says, "Look, the only persons about to be hurt are our children; why can't we do what North Carolina or Tennessee has done—make a slow, token beginning?" is certain to be overwhelmed with abuse and charges of being a "nigger lover," or dangerous leftist, or worse.

If he is in one of the more rural areas of the Deep South he may well be in physical danger. The most preposterous charges are brought against him.

In the urban areas there are abusive telephone calls, threats, and slanderous mail, but there is less pressure for absolute conformity such as some rural areas demand. The moderate man, the reasonable, practical man, the Christian or Jew who stands on his religious tenets, the moral man of no religious affiliation, all these can, and do, take a stand.

In the elections previously referred to the substantial opposition to extremes came from the cities. But, in general, in such a climate of complete political control, the powerlessness of reasonable men is difficult for those looking on from a distance, and from an entirely different climate, to believe or comprehend.

In contrast to the Deep South, North Carolina and Tennessee, for example, have no past history of reckless political exploitation of race. The leadership there, led by the respective Governors, Luther H. Hodges and Frank G. Clement, weighed the elements involved most carefully and with all deliberate speed.

Once they had surveyed and discussed they assisted the school boards that wanted to go ahead and make a start at compliance. They assured them protection. They went on television and explained the plan to the people.

In North Carolina last year there was no trouble. In Tennessee there was. Prompt and effective police action ended it. This fall there were no incidents in a planned expansion of the program.

Neither this fact, nor the progress made in border States with a southern flavor such as Kentucky, Oklahoma, and Missouri, has made any impression whatever in the Deep South to save to produce harsh criticism of those States.

In candor, it must be said that in the Deep South the future will worsen. The region will continue to be an island of complete defiance while about it the deliberate sped of slow compliance continues. Arkansas, where five small cities have integrated schools, and Virginia, whose traditions and history make her a strange and unexpected companion of the old cotton States, are separate, if related stories.

The melancholy fact is that in the Deep South the future will see more and more schools closed. One's heart goes out to the people who have not been told by their political leadership the terrible price they and their children must pay in this deliberate sacrifice of their school system. Nor has their leadership told them the truth about the private school system that many propose.

Such a plan inevitably will be subject to injunctions and tests of its legality. If a State collects a school tax or provides money for tuition it can be said to be in the business of public education. The fact that such private schools would lack proper accreditation and that their high school graduates would find it very difficult to enter college was another truth not told.

But candor also requires one to say that many, if told the truth, would not change their minds.

Certainly, the moderates in this area, used to daily wrestling with reality, know that the outlook is gloomy and will become more so. But they also know that reaction is certain.

Within days after the Supreme Court's recent ruling there were a few who were beginning to say that, much as they hated the idea, they would rather allow a few Negroes in the schools than to have no school at all. The moderate is aware that none can set a time limit on how long the chaos of closed schools and attempted, hopelessly inadequate private schools will last. It could be a long span of tragic years.

There is one thing for sure. When the reaction begins, and the bitterness of it wells up into politics, the moderate will be needed more than ever to help put the pieces together again.

In those States where the climate of leadership is more sure of itself and, therefore,

more stable, the mood of the people is such that the practical man, the moral man, and the force of moderation will make continued progress. They will grow and prosper in comparison with their neighbors.

Not many new industries will come to a State where public education is in chaos. The young people of these States will go elsewhere seeking opportunity and schooling. That, too, is part of the price to be paid.

Meanwhile, more and more the clergy in all the South is making itself heard, if not heeded, in behalf of reasonableness and against destruction of the public school system. The Southern Regional Council continues a job of factual research and study. The Southern School News Reporting Service, a strictly objective monthly report of conditions State by State, is a continuing thorn in the flesh of extremist distortions of facts.

There are individuals, organizations, and newspapers that patiently, but firmly, point out that the question of whether one is for or against segregation is not relevant. The issue is the children, the country, and the integrity of the American dream—that here is a country which offers equal and full citizenship to all who live in it. The southerner has as much of a stake in that as anyone else.

This, then, has been, and is, the role of the southern moderate—to prevent the image of due process of law and that of the inevitability bound up in the Supreme Court's decision from being blurred. The waves have rolled over him. They will again. The clamor of the angry and defiant men now and then have drowned him out. It will again.

If he is no longer in the center of the picture in the Deep South he is still in it, if at the edge. Sometimes he gets cropped off by the picture editors.

And, in the end, of course, the moderates, the reasonable, practical men, the moral men and those whose convictions are based on religion, will be there to pick up the wreckage left by those who defy the law and the courts and forget their oath to support the Constitution of the United States. The moderates will make it unnecessary to start from scratch.

Proud Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the elevation of Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT to the chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is another great source of pride to the people of Arkansas. Our senior Senator, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, who is chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations and also chairman of the Select Committee To Investigate Racketeering in Labor and Industry, has brought great honor to our State.

On the House side, Arkansas has two top chairmanships, with our colleague WILBUR MILLS being chairman of the potent Committee on Ways and Means, and our colleague OREN HARRIS being chairman of the very important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

These four chairmanships make all Arkansas proud.

As an indication of this pride, I wish to insert the following articles as part of my remarks: An article in the New York Times of February 3, 1959, by Arthur Krock; and Walter Lippmann's column of February 3 from the Washington Post and Times Herald.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 3, 1959]

THE RISE OF A YOUNG MAN WITH IDEAS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 2.—Sixteen years after the following words made history they seem to express no startling national attitude:

"[We favor] the creation of appropriate international machinery, with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and [favor] the participation of the United States * * * through its constitutional processes."

But at the time they were embodied in the public record as a statement of the international aims of the United States they marked the dramatic end of one chapter and the beginning of another in American foreign policy. As the Fulbright resolution these words and their author became famous in all the chancelleries of the world. But not for 16 years did power in the form of the chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations come to match the fame of the young Representative from Arkansas who is now Senator FULBRIGHT.

Thirteen years ago the Senator gained fame of a different and unsought kind, with another idea. Unlike the proposition of the resolution, the expression of this idea was unpremeditated. He was musing aloud to oblige a reporter who asked for his thoughts on the election of a Republican Congress in 1946, only a year after President Truman had succeeded from the Vice Presidency. FULBRIGHT suggested that maybe, the times being so critical and the need for executive-legislative accord so vital, it might be a constructive act for President Truman to name a Republican as Secretary of State, the office (there being no Vice President) next in line of Presidential succession, and then resign to permit this Republican to become President.

The arrival of newspapers at the White House has often set off explosions, but none that shook the walls more powerfully than the afternoon edition in which Senator FULBRIGHT's mediation was published as a full-blown project. And, for a while the President more or less adhered to the estimate he then expressed that FULBRIGHT is an "overeducated, Oxford" expletive. But with growing experience of how chance comments of his own were turned into sensations, he reverted to his appreciation of the Senator's high qualities as a statesman.

Subsequent to House passage of the Fulbright resolution, September 1, 1943, it was approved by the Senate under the sponsorship of Tom Connally of Texas, current incumbent of the Foreign Relations chairmanship to which FULBRIGHT has just succeeded. Then Representative James W. Wadsworth of New York, Wendell L. Willkie and Thomas E. Dewey, who had aided the Arkansan in getting the support of the House, overrode the Republican isolationists at a conference at Mackinac Island, Mich., to put the party on record for a similar resolution. And the United States, which had refused to join Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations, was committed to the principle of the United Nations organization, but with "power * * * to maintain," etc., curbed by one veto in the Security Council.

Less than 3 years after these events in foreign policy, Senator FULBRIGHT, still concentrating on measures to bring about a durable world peace, proposed, and Congress passed, Public Law 584. This made his name perhaps more favorably known in more countries than any American legislator in many decades. Described by Secretary of State Dulles, in 1956, as " the most fabulously profitable investment ever authorized by the Congress of the United States," it is the legislation by which teachers and students are exchanged between this and many other nations. It is the cultural counterpart to our military and economic collective assistance program through the agency of young people known the world over as "Fulbright scholars."

But, despite this international fame, the Senator at 53 has just attained his first office of direct power in the formulation and conduct of United States foreign policy. The rise was slow because of the operation of the seniority system. But in this instance the Nation is the beneficiary of the system.

FULBRIGHT's immediate objective is to relax the "rigidity and inertia" of the administration's conduct of foreign policy which he sees personified by Secretary Dulles. This conduct, and the mood it reflects, not the basic policies themselves, have been the objects of his effective and intelligent criticisms.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 3, 1959]

FULBRIGHT AND DULLES

(By Walter Lippmann)

Senator GREEN has decided wisely both in resigning as chairman and in remaining as the senior member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Old men, the Greeks used to say, should not be leaders but counselors, and Senator GREEN with his long experience and his vigorous memory will be a good counselor.

Senator FULBRIGHT, who succeeds him, is a much younger man. But he is an old hand. In terms of his interest and active participation in foreign affairs, which date back to the early days of the Second World War, there are few if any Members of Congress who have such long and continuous inside knowledge. In thinking about his differences with Mr. Dulles, it is well to remember that insofar as he has been critical he has spoken as one the pioneers and early supporters of the global policies which have replaced the old isolationism.

And as a matter of fact, a study of his record will show, I believe, that the weight of his criticism has been directed not against the great purposes of foreign policy but against mistakes and distortions in their application.

His advent as chairman of the committee marks a turning point for the better in the conduct of our foreign policy. For the first time since the new era which began with World War II, the administration will have a responsible and articulate and loyal opposition. Until the conversion of Senator Vandenberg at the end of the war, the opposition was sullen and destructive. The Vandenberg arrangement was an emergency device for getting indispensable things done. But for the long run it was not a good method of governing. For instead of promoting debate, which educates the people and refines the policy of the Administration, the Vandenberg bipartisan system avoided and evaded debate. The same must be said for the so-called bipartisan arrangement with Senator Walter George, who suppressed debate when the country would have been much better served by a thorough debate.

The time has now come, as the last three congressional elections have made sharply clear, when—within the framework of our world responsibilities—we must move beyond the stereotypes and the slogans of the postwar years. We cannot stand pat forever on all the positions taken in the postwar era. For the postwar era is ending, and here and abroad among our allies a new generation is

on the threshold of power. With Senator FULBRIGHT as the chairman of the committee, the windows of the Senate will be open to the fresh air of a new time.

By coincidence, Mr. Dulles had just about decided to go to Western Europe when Senator GREEN stepped down. It is no secret that Mr. Dulles will be trying to work out with Dr. Adenauer and our other big European allies, a workable policy about Berlin and Germany. It must be a policy on which the allies are agreed and in which the Russians are interested enough to negotiate. This will not be easy to achieve, and it may well be that Mr. Dulles has now undertaken the most important mission of his whole career.

It will help him, not hurt him, if it is known in Europe that there is building up in the new Congress an insistence that we move off dead center, and do something more than declaim the reasons why we cannot do anything at all about anything. Nor are there so many as once there were in this country who are afraid that the allies will fall apart and that Congress will revert to isolationism if we stop consulting our fears and acting like paralyzed rabbits.

The George Washington Memorial Parkway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, next week the House Appropriations Committee will have before it once again a request from the President to appropriate the Federal Government's share of the funds necessary to acquire right-of-way for the last portion of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. In order to acquaint our colleagues with the historical significance of the area through which this 7½-mile stretch of the parkway will travel, I wish to insert in the RECORD a most interesting excerpt from a historical résumé prepared by Mr. Charles B. MacDonald. It is gratifying to know that historic Harmony Hall and Want Water are now to be included in the parkway. As an item of further interest, I wish to insert an excerpt from a letter received from Mr. Charles Wallace Collins, the present owner of Harmony Hall:

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY

(By Charles B. MacDonald)

Twenty-nine years ago the Congress of the United States took official notice that the Capital of the Nation had outgrown the boundaries of the District of Columbia.

Washington, D.C., had, in effect, spread to parts of Montgomery and Prince Georges counties in Maryland and Arlington and Fairfax counties in Virginia. If the Capital was to continue to be a showplace worthy of the nation it represents, some measure was required to assure that development in the adjacent counties did not grip the central city in a concrete and asphalt vise.

To fill this need, the 71st Congress passed into law the so-called Capper-Cramton Act. What the Capper-Cramton Act said was this:

Because of proximity to the Capital, the regions adjacent to Washington have responsibilities to the Nation not shared by other counties far removed from the Nation's Capital. They owe it to the Nation at large to keep the Capital area beautiful and to preserve the unique scenic, recreational, and historical features of the area.

If they are to meet these responsibilities—the act said, in effect—they will need help. The Nation as a whole therefore agrees to pay one-half the purchase price of lands needed for these purposes if the adjacent territories will pay the other half. The Nation then will develop these resources as required.

The one specific purchase and development program which the Capper-Cramton Act provided for was the creation of a memorial parkway along both shores of the Potomac River, from Mount Vernon to Great Falls on one side, from Fort Washington to Great Falls on the other.

This parkway was not to be just another super-highway. It was to be a scenic route specially designed to preserve as much as possible of the shoreline of the Potomac for the enjoyment of all Americans who come to their capital and to link in a readily accessible manner the sites and monuments along the Potomac of national historical interest.

When the act passed the Congress in 1930, the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway from Arlington to Mount Vernon along the west bank of the river already was under construction. Upon its completion in 1932, it was incorporated into the parkway system, which became known as the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

Today, 29 years later, some three-fourths of the parkway authorized by the Capper-Cramton Act either has been completed or is in process of construction. Only one segment, 7½ miles from Washington to Fort Washington in Prince Georges County, remains totally unrealized.

Next week, the House Appropriations Subcommittee is scheduled to act on a request from the President to appropriate the Federal Government's share of the funds necessary to acquire rights-of-way for this last portion of the parkway. If the House denies these funds, public officials in charge of the project believe this part never will be constructed. The $28 million already spent on the three other parts will have been spent on a project never to be fully realized. When visitors come to Washington, that part of Prince Georges County bordering on the Capital would have to be swept under the carpet.

The danger that funds will be denied is great. It has already happened once—just last year. Yet planning officials and interested citizens have refused to accept what, to them, seems an unrealistic and nonvisionary verdict. They will go back to the Hill for one last try.

Mr. Speaker, the request for funds for the Prince Georges County segment has not been delayed because this section is any less needed or desirable than the others. Indeed, the recent mass transportation survey for the National Capital region listed the parkway as an essential part of the area's road system. The delay comes from the fact that not until 2 years ago, in the face of indications that if the land soon was not purchased, private development would have pushed land costs to a prohibitive level, were Prince Georges County officials able to foresee their share of the costs.

The Maryland House of Delegates authorized the county to enter into an indebtedness of $1 million as the bulk of the county's share for land acquisition. At this point, in 1957, the National Capital Planning Commission asked Congress for the Federal share of the land costs and for an 8-year loan of $1 million to Prince Georges County in keeping with a proviso of the Capper-Cramton Act.

This request passed the House. But the Senate Appropriations Committee delayed it until the Interior and Insular Affairs Legislative Committee could study the proposal and determine if a project planned as long ago as 1930 still was advisable.

By the time the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee had studied the project and endorsed it, it was too late for the proposal to be acted upon by the 84th Congress. House approval thus went for nought. The request would have to run the entire legislative gantlet again in 1958.

Unfortunately, the request failed to meet with the approval of the House Appropriations Committee. Efforts to restore the item in the Senate also met with failure. Virtually all agree that this was a distressing mistake and was apparently brought about by reliance upon minority testimony. Little opportunity was given to Government officials and other interested proponents to present once again the convincing case that has been made on so many occasions for the parkway.

Mr. Collins' comments follow:

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY

(Comments taken from letter of Mr. Charles Wallace Collins, Harmony Hall, Oxon Hill, Md.)

This property is in the neighborhood closely associated with the life of George Washington. It is on the Maryland side of the Potomac. Directly across the river from Harmony Hall is Wellington, the home of Washington's secretary, Tobias Lear. It is situated on the original Mt. Vernon estate.

Washington ferried across the Potomac to the Maryland shore at Warburton Manor—now Fort Washington.

Ancient Want Water adjoins Harmony Hall on the north. It was built before 1700 and was the home of Col. William M. Lyles, a personal friend and neighbor of Washington. It is listed in the Historic American Buildings Survey—as is Harmony Hall. Nearby is St. John's Church which dates back to 1692. Washington frequently worshipped here. His pew is marked today with a silver plate along with that of Colonel Lyles.

No part of the Gorge Washington Memorial Parkway is more appropriate to the memory of Washington than the neighborhood of Broad Creek.

Letter by Birmingham Businessman States Case for South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the President of the United States from the Honorable Harry B. Lackey, assistant vice president of the Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co. in my home city of Birmingham.

Mr. Lackey is an outstanding citizen of our city and, indeed, of the South. One of his more notable civic contributions to our State was made when for 3 consecutive years, 1954, 1955, 1956, he served as Alabama State chairman for the USO, for that organization's fundraising drives. This is only one of the many ways that he has proved his civic pride and patriotism, and thus his right to be heard with attentiveness when he voices an opinion on a matter of grave concern to our Nation.

Mr. Lackey's letter contains the thought-provoking idea that, if the Federal Government, particularly through its executive and judicial branches, cannot control its insatiable appetite for creating confusion, strife and turmoil within the confines of our Nation and particularly in the southern section of our country—whether on constitutional questions, legal principles, or long-established social customs—that it set up Federal schools in the South where consideration of racial heritage and background would be totally ignored, to be attended by any children whose parents desired for them to have an integrated education. The proposal does not touch the ancient and, until recently, hallowed system of State schools, which system in the South realistically recognizes that racial segregation is of the utmost importance if order, concord, and cultural advancement of the respective races are to prevail.

In other words, there would be two systems of education: the State system, segregated because the State and a massive majority of its citizen-taxpayers want it segregated, and a Federal system, integrated because those currently in control of the executive and judicial branches of the Federal Government think, as they view the situation abstractly and pseudo-idealistically, that it should be integrated. Then the people being left that divine right to decide for themselves, should determine which system should properly and most effectively provide their children the desired goal—an education.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this proposal, worthy of the serious consideration of all those who so loudly cry for action, action—regardless of the dire consequences of that action, proves once again that on this crucial issue, the people of the South stand united and militant. It demonstrates, by its thorough reasoning and its calm tone that, in this cause, we are steadfast though not unapproachable, properly concerned though not blindly frantic, right though not arrogant.

The letter follows:

BIRMINGHAM, ALA. *October 9, 1958.*

HON. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT EISENHOWER: It is with some reluctance and certainly with great humility that I write you this letter. First, may I identify myself as the former Alabama State chairman for U.S.O. in the annual fund raising drives for 1954, 1955 and 1956. Through some degree of effort on my part, we were able to raise in this State over one quarter of a million dollars during this period. I attended the meeting in Washington when we visited with you on the steps of the White House in 1956, when the "Viking" Adm. J. L. Hall, Jr., was national chairman. I was in the picture taken on that occasion and later published in the U.S.O. Bulletin, a copy attached. Incidentally, I have framed and treasure a copy of that picture which was sent to me by U.S.O. in New York. Charlie Yates, of Atlanta, asked me to do this civic chore during those years and I feel good for having done so.

The purpose of this letter is far from USO activities and I relate the foregoing only for the purpose of seeking your attention because I know how sincerely you felt about that organization. Those of us who worked for the good of USO, both during and after the war, were only too glad to respond to the call for seeing to it that the objectives of this fine organization were attained. I hope I am not improperly taking advantage of a situation.

During my lifetime, I know of no man affiliated with the Republican Party that caught the imagination of our section of the country more than you when you first ran for the Presidency and were later reelected. I think people in our section, and I have occasion to talk with a number of leaders in our State, still have explicit confidence in you, but, at the same time, recent events, and I have reference to the integration issue, have created keen disappointment and irreparable damage to your political party. The question is: Who is responsible? Generally speaking, the belief is that the actions and events that have taken place were not so much your decision as it was action upon advice of others, which we all recognize is so necessary to the complete functioning of the Presidency.

I shall not attempt to picture for you the shock and disappointment of the turn of events on the part of your administration and the U.S. Supreme Court as it relates to the integration question. I believe that the people of this section are more determined and more united to resist what is now being done by the NAACP, which apparently has full approval of and is being fostered by our present Government and Court. Naturally, I do not know the feeling that existed prior to and during the War Between the States, but I have heard my grandparents relate it and it seems to me that the old sores have been opened and salt poured into the almost healed wounds. To say that the people of this section of the United States are just resistive is putting it mildly. I really believe that our people would bear arms over this issue rather than submit to integrated public schools which we believe would ultimately lead to mongrelization of America. The people of this section of our Nation, largely Anglo-Saxon, want no part of what we see now taking place in Washington, D.C. We believe the people of Virginia where my forefathers, I am told "came to this country about 1760 from Scotland along with the Scotts, Edmontons, Davises, and Campbells," are well within their moral, human, and religious rights in the position they have taken.

I have strayed from what I really want to write about, but I thought you would be interested in this reflection of opinion which I believe can be proved easily. I offer to you a sincere and, what I am told, is a practical suggestion. It is this: In the Friday, October 3, issue of the Birmingham News, an article by Robert S. Allen is headed, "As a Last Resort To Achieve Integration—United States Exploring Idea of Opening Schools in Dixie." Mr. Allen is quoted as saying, "The Justice Department head would have the Federal Government establish and operate integrated schools in these areas." The article goes on to say that you have indicated you may accept this plan "as a last resort."

I believe the people in this area would accept such a plan; that is, have the Federal Government own and operate such schools and, furthermore, that the people in the South would be willing to submit to a direct tax to support them. These schools would be known as Federal schools and would enable any parent of any child to send them to such schools if he so desired. By the same token, the States should be permitted to operate their schools in whatever manner they see fit, either publicly owned and operated or privately owned and operated. This is not unique, such schools now function without any friction on military reservations in the South. If Congress would recognize the problem and pass the necessary legislation it, no doubt, would receive congressional support in the South.

Those of us who have children in school are unwilling to see the entering wedge of integration in this area because we are fearful of the ultimate result and do not believe that the Supreme Court can change the order of things in our area by the reversal of a long standing decision to the contrary which was made many years ago and with which we have kept faith. No doubt the idea should be tested further and it is my proposal to discuss it with our Alabama congressional delegation, all of whom I know and have dealt with personally. If the possibilities of this idea are explored to the fullest, it should receive approval on the part of the people most affected, that is, in the South, and we could head a grave problem in a different and acceptable direction.

I write this letter as strictly a personal matter because I have three daughters in school and, like many thousands of others, would not agree to sending them to integrated schools. Fortunately, it would not be necessary unless private schools were overcrowded and there wouldn't be room available. Moreover, one is now at the University of Alabama and the twins will be in college next year.

My plea, therefore, is for a solution to the overall problem, rather than to a personal problem. Someday I, like you, may have grandchildren and to that extent I am personally interested.

I would be grateful to receive some expression from you. I am sending this letter with a personal note to General Persons, whose brother, the former governor of the State of Alabama, I know well and hold in high regard. I hope it reaches your desk.

Respectfully,

HARRY B. LACKEY.

Unarmed American Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Department of State today has released a statement detailing the discussions between the United States and the Soviet Union relative to the disappearance over Soviet Armenia of our unarmed C–130 transport on September 2, 1958. The Soviet Union returned 6 bodies from the crew of 17 aboard. On January 15, 1959, I introduced House Resolution 112 which asked that the President "take such steps as may be necessary to present to Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan, while that Soviet official is currently visiting the United States, a formal re-

quest for information concerning the whereabouts of the 11 American airmen who are still missing" from that incident.

Both Secretary Dulles and Vice President NIXON questioned Mr. Mikoyan, but no satisfaction was received. Today the State Department has released not only a chronology of its repeated efforts to discover the whereabout of these men whose status is uncertain, but also three revealing documents which confirm our darkest fears.

The first paper contains a 12-page "Translation of Transcript of Tape-Recorded Radio Conversation Among Soviet Fighter Pilots Who Participated in Attack on C–130, September 2, 1958." The second and third documents are translations—with photostats of the original Russian articles included—of two articles in Soviet Aviation, the newspaper of the Soviet Air Force, on September 19 and 20, 1958.

The first article, entitled "Great Skill: Part 1: The Target Is Detected," glowingly portrayed the role of the antiaircraft defense posts in detecting an aerial target. The following day, part 2, entitled "A Swift Attack," was published. This relates the guidance to the target of Soviet fighter planes. It is significant to note that in both these articles constant reference is made to Soviet intercepters Nos. 201 and 582 as they are guided to the so-called target, also referred to as the enemy.

Mr. Speaker, I now call your attention to page 3 of the official translation of the tape-recorded radio conversation which took place between the Soviet fighter pilots who shot down our C–130 unarmed transport.

582, I see the target, to the right.
I see the target, a large one.
Its altitude is 100, as you said.
I am 201, I see the target, attack.
I am 201. I am attacking the target.
You are understood.
I am attacking the target.
Stand by.
The target is a large one.
Roger.
Attack, attack, 218 attack.
Stand by.
582.
Roger.

I only wish space allowed me to include the full transcript of this murderous attack which was uncalled for by every standard of civilized nations. On page 4 of the transcript, one pilot states, "The target is a transport, four-engined." Further attacks. Then "The target is burning, 582." More attacks, followed by "The tail assembly is falling off the target." On page 5, we note the Soviet pilots saying:

Look at him, he will not get away, he is already falling. Yes, he is falling. I will finish him off, boys, I will finish him off on the run. The target has lost control, it is going down.

It is deplorable to note that the articles in Soviet Aviation conclude with the description of a general welcoming home the pilots: "He shook their hands warmly and thanked them for their successful execution of the mission."

The butchers of Hungary again have done their evil deeds. The repeated disdain registered by the Soviet Foreign Office to our inquiries in this case and their refusal to let American Embassy personnel in Moscow visit the scene of the crash, shows not a feeling of remorse and regret, but a feeling of overbearing arrogance.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the release by the Department of State concerning this sordid affair. I am sure that it will be of great interest to all Members of the House and the public generally.

The release follows:

U.S. REPRESENTATIONS TO SOVIET GOVERNMENT REGARDING UNARMED U.S. AIR FORCE C–130 TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT SHOT DOWN BY SOVIET FIGHTER AIRCRAFT OVER SOVIET ARMENIA ON SEPTEMBER 2, 1958

On September 2, 1958, an unarmed U.S. Air Force C–130 transport aircraft disappeared while on a flight in Turkey. Seventeen men were aboard the plane.

As the result of an investigation conducted by the U.S. Air Force in Europe (USAFE), it was determined that the plane had been intercepted and attacked by Soviet fighter aircraft in the region of the Turkish-Soviet frontier near Kars, Turkey, following which it had crashed in flames in Soviet Armenia.

On September 24, 1958, the remains of six men were turned over to U.S. authorities.

The U.S. Government has repeatedly pressed the Soviet Government for the return of the missing 11 members of the crew of this plane or for information regarding their condition and whereabouts. In its latest written communication on this subject, a note of October 16, 1958, the Soviet Government repeated its earlier denials that any further information was available regarding members of the crew of the plane.

REPRESENTATION BY DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY MURPHY

On November 13, 1958, Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy made a lengthy oral representation to Soviet Ambassador Mikhail A. Menshikov, presenting him with evidence that Soviet fighter planes had intercepted the C–130 and shot it down without regard to the rules of civilized international practice. Mr. Murphy said that the United States wished a settlement of this case. He emphasized that some of our men had been killed, that there were certain rules of conduct in the civilized world, and that the United States Government hoped the desired information regarding the 11 missing men would be promptly forthcoming. The Soviet Ambassador said that he would convey the details of this representation to his Government. (A full account of Mr. Murphy's representation is attached.)

The Soviet Government did not reply to this representation.

REPRESENTATION BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

On January 7, 1959, the Vice President of the United States received the First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., Mr. Anastas I. Mikoyan. During the course of their conversation, the Vice President raised the question of the eleven missing crew members of the C–130. Referring to the desirability of reducing tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union, the Vice President said it would be useful to make progress on matters like this one. He said it would be helpful if the Soviet Government gave the United States Government an indication or a statement about what had happened to the men involved. The Vice President said that the C–130 case has great emotional impact in the United States. Great concern is felt about this case by the American people.

Mr. Mikoyan replied that the Soviet Government had given all the information it had. He said that there was no sense in their trying to hide anything and wondered why the Americans were so suspicious about this.

REPRESENTATION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

The Secretary took up with Mr. Mikoyan on January 16, 1959, the destruction by Soviet planes of the unarmed C–130, and asked for information regarding the eleven missing crew members. He pointed out that response by the Soviet Government to our representations would help to satisfy serious anxieties felt by the American people, who want the missing men returned, and that a meaningful response would be a helpful step from the standpoint of United States-Soviet relations.

Mr. Mikoyan said that the Soviet Government had done all that it could, that all the bodies had been returned, and that the Soviet Government did not know about any other personnel. Mr. Mikoyan protested that there would be no point in the Soviet Government holding any bodies or living crewmen, and he expressed the Soviet Government's lack of understanding and irritation over the U.S. Government's insistence concerning this case. He denied that the plane had been shot down, asserting that it had crashed.

In view of the refusal of the Soviet Government to respond satisfactorily to this Government's representations on this case, the U.S. Government reserves its rights with reference to the human and material losses incurred as a result of the Soviet action of September 2, 1958.

The remains of six members of the crew of the C–130 were returned to United States authorities on September 24, 1958. Four of the crew members were subsequently identified and were buried in accordance with the wishes of next of kin. The two unidentified remains will be buried with full military honors at Arlington National Cemetery at 11 a.m. on February 6, 1959.

ATTACHMENT NO. 1

REPRESENTATION BY DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY MURPHY TO SOVIET AMBASSADOR MENSHIKOV, NOVEMBER 13, 1958

On November 13, 1958, Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy received Soviet Ambassador Mikhail A. Menshikov, who was accompanied by Maj. Gen. Mikhail N. Kostiouk, Air Attaché of the Soviet Embassy at Washington.

Mr. Murphy recalled Ambassador Menshikov's past statements regarding his desire to promote improved U.S.–U.S.S.R. relations and better understanding between the two countries. He then referred to the loss of the U.S. Air Force C–130 in Soviet Armenia on September 2, 1958, as a cause of grave misunderstanding. He expressed the hope that the Ambassador would cooperate in removing this misunderstanding.

Mr. Murphy told the Ambassador that it was difficult for the U.S. Government to understand why the Soviet Government had supplied no information regarding the crash until 10 days after the incident had occurred, and then had furnished only a fragmentary report. Mr. Murphy reviewed the facts in the case and informed the Ambassador that it appeared to the U.S. Government that the American pilot, as a result of the signals transmitted by radiobeacons in Soviet Georgia and Armenia, had probably made a navigational error which resulted in his unintentionally crossing the Soviet border. The plane, having thus flown into Soviet territory, had been shot down by Soviet fighter aircraft without regard to the rules of civilized international practice, as though it were an enemy aircraft. The tail assembly had been shot off and the plane had fallen out of control.

There had been 17 men in the plane, but the remains of only 6 men had been returned

to the American authorities. Accordingly, the U.S. Government was making this démarche to the Soviet Government through Ambassador Menshikov for information in the possession of the Soviet Government regarding the men who were still missing. Mr. Murphy said that he could not emphasize enough the gravity with which the U.S. Government viewed this case. The U.S. Government wanted the facts. It wanted to know what had happened to the men.

Since the Ambassador had questioned Mr. Murphy's statement that the U.S. plane had been shot down by Soviet fighter aircraft, Mr. Murphy offered to have played for the Ambassador a recording of the radio conversation between the Soviet pilots who had shot down the C–130. The Ambassador declined to listen to this recording, saying that he was not competent to assess it from a technical point of view. Mr. Murphy explained that it was for that reason that the Soviet Air Attaché, General Kostiouk, an aviation expert, had been invited to accompany the Ambassador on his call. Mr. Murphy explained that the Ambassador had been summoned in order that facts known to the U.S. Government might be communicated to him as Soviet Ambassador to the United States for conveyance to his Government. Mr. Murphy said that it was Ambassador Menshikov's responsibility, as Soviet Ambassador to the United States, to listen to the representations that were being made to him. The Soviet Ambassador nonetheless refused to listen to the tape recording. Mr. Murphy then gave the Ambassador a transcript in Russian of the recording.

Ambassador Menshikov stated that the Soviet Government had replied to the notes addressed to it by the U.S. Government on this matter and suggested that these replies represented all the information available to the Soviet Government. Mr. Murphy replied that evidence in the possession of the U.S. Government indicated that additional and very important information was available, and added that it was the intention of the U.S. Government to pursue this case further. Mr. Murphy said that the U.S. Government wished a settlement of this case. He emphasized that some of our men had been killed, that there were certain rules of conduct in the civilized world, and that the U.S. Government hoped the desired information regarding the missing men would be promptly forthcoming.

Mr. Murphy then briefly reviewed the case once more, pointing out that the operation of Soviet radio beacons in the area might easily have induced a navigational error on the part of the pilot. He said that the plane had entered Soviet airspace in error and not intentionally.

Mr. Murphy then read most of a translation of an article entiled "Great Skill: A Swift Attack," which had been published in Soviet Aviation, the newspaper of the Soviet Air Force, on September 20, 1958. When he had concluded, the Soviet Ambassader asked Mr. Murphy whether what had been read were fiction. Mr. Murphy then handed the Ambassador photostatic copies of the article and a preceding one on the same subject. Mr. Murphy once more told the Ambassador that the U.S. Government regarded this case with extreme gravity.

Ambassador Menshikov said that he would convey the details of this representation to his Government.

ATTACHMENT No. 2

CHRONOLOGY OF CASE OF USAF C–130 SHOT DOWN OVER SOVIET ARMENIA ON SEPTEMBER 2, 1958

September 2: An unarmed USAF C–130 transport aircraft, attached to the 7406th Support Squadron based at Rhine-Main Air Base, Frankfurt, Germany, disappears between Trabzon and Van, Turkey, while participating in a worldwide Air Force project to study the propagation of radio waves transmitted by United States radio stations. The plane was on a flight from Adana to Trabzon to Van and back to Adana, all within Turkey. Aboard the aircraft were Capt. Paul E. Duncan, Washington, D.C.; 1st Lt. John E. Simpson, Richland, Wash.; Capt. Rudy J. Swiestra, Compton, Calif.; 1st Lt. Ricardo M. Villarreal, Laredo, Tex.; Capt. Edward J. Jeruss, New Haven, Conn.; Sgt. Leroy Price, Hodgeville, Ky.; T. Sgt. Arthur L. Mello, Erie, Pa.; M. Sgt. George P. Petrochilos, Levittown, Pa.; A1c. Robert J. Oshinskie, Shamokin, Pa.; A2c. James E. Ferguson, Jr., La Porte, Ind.; ASC Joe L. Fields, Cynthia, Ky.; ASC Gerald C. Maggiacomo, Everett, Mass.; ASC Harold T. Camps, Coleman, Wis.; ASC Robert H. Moore, West Monroe, La.; ASC Archie T. Bourg, Baton Rouge, La.; ASC Clement O. Mankins, Fayette, Pa.; ASC Gerald H. Medeiros, New Bedford, Mass.

The Turkish Government and the Air Force begin an intensive search for the missing plane.

September 6: The American Embassy at Moscow delivers a note to the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the American Embassy in Teheran orally approaches the Iranian Foreign Ministry, asking for any available information regarding the plane and its crew of 17 (see press release No. 518, dated Sept. 6, 1958).

September 8: The Soviet Foreign Ministry orally informs the American Embassy at Moscow that the Soviet authorities conducting the investigation requested in the Embassy's note of September 6 desire to know in what region the plane might have approached the Soviet border. In response to the Embassy's question, the Ministry states that the Soviet authorities have no information about the plane.

September 12: The Soviet Foreign Ministry delivers a note to the American Embassy at Moscow in which it is stated that a USAF aircraft has been found 55 kilometers northwest of Yerevan in Soviet Armenia (see press release No. 534, dated September 12, 1958). The note further states that remains of bodies were found "from which it is possible to assume that six members of the plane crew perished." The note charges a deliberate violation of the Soviet frontier. In answer to oral questions put by the U.S. Chargé d'Affaires, Richard H. Davis, the Soviet Foreign Ministry states it has no further information to add to that given in the note. The Chargé Affaires requests that a further search for the missing men be made, that an officer of the Embassy or another U.S. official be permitted to visit the crash site of the plane and that arrangements be made for the transfer to American authority of the remains of the six crew members mentioned in the Soviet note.

September 13: The American Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow delivers a note to the Soviet Foreign Ministry requesting information as to the whereabouts and condition of the 11 missing men and stating that the United States expects full cooperation from the Soviet Government in granting access to the crewmen and in returning them. The note also requests that representatives of the Embassy accompanied by technical experts as may be required to investigate the circumstances of the crash be permitted to visit the scene of the crash and that facilities be extended to them for effecting identification of the victims and arranging for the transfer of their remains to appropriate U.S. authorities. The note goes on to reject the Soviet charge that the plane intentionally violated the Soviet frontier and states that the U.S. Government is unable to understand the delay of the Soviet authorities in furnishing it with the limited information contained in the Soviet note of September 12 or the oral denial of any information made by a Foreign Ministry official. It states further that the U.S. Air Force has information to the effect that the plane was intercepted by three Soviet fighter aircraft in the region of the Soviet-Turkish frontier, that following the interception the plane proceeded eastward under the control of the Soviet aircraft, and that shortly after this an explosion was heard and a large column of smoke was observed rising at a point within Soviet territory. Finally, the note demands complete information regarding the circumstances surrounding and following the interception. In answer to a question of the Chargé d'Affaires, the Ministry official to whom the note was delivered repeats that the Soviet authorities have no further information on the missing men.

September 15: The American Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow, Richard H. Davis, asks Acting Soviet Foreign Minister Kuznetsov when a reply to the note of September 13 will be forthcoming and if he has any further information on the missing men, pointing out the anguish suffered by the men's relatives. The Acting Foreign Minister replies that he has no further information, that a reply will be expedited, and that these unpleasant affairs would be avoided if American planes would stop penetrating Soviet airspace.

September 17: Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Firyubin repeats the answers given two days earlier by the Acting Foreign Minister to the same questions put by the American Chargé d'Affaires.

September 19: The Soviet Foreign Ministry replies to the American Embassy's note of September 13. The reply states that the Soviet Government has no information on the 11 missing crewmen and indicates the willingness of the Soviet Government to transfer to the American authorities the remains of 6 members of the crew found at the site of the crash. The note denies that Soviet fighter planes intercepted the USAF C–130 in the area of the Turkish-Soviet frontier. The American Chargé d'Affaires again presses the Acting Soviet Foreign Minister for information on the 11 missing men but is told that the Soviet Government has no information about them. The Chargé d'Affaires also reiterates the request that American officials be permitted to examine the wreckage at the scene of the crash, but is informed that this would not be possible. In response to a question, the Acting Soviet Foreign Minister tells the American Chargé d'Affaires that he has nothing to add to what is in the note concerning the circumstances surrounding the crash.

September 21: The American Embassy at Moscow delivers a note to the Soviet Foreign Ministry again requesting information on the missing 11 crewmen. The note also requests the transfer without delay of the remains and all materials which will facilitate identification of the six airmen who are known to have perished.

September 24: The remains of the six airmen are delivered by the Soviet authorities at Leninakan on the Soviet-Turkish frontier to the Air Attaché of the American Embassy in Ankara (see Press Release No. 555 of September 23, 1958).

October 3: The American Ambassador at Moscow hands to the Acting Soviet Foreign Minister a note requesting further information on the plane (see Press Release No. 587 of October 7, 1958). The note repeats the description of the interception of the USAF C–130 by Soviet fighter aircraft in the area of the Turkish-Soviet frontier and states that it must be assumed that the Soviet fighter pilots involved have knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the crash of this unarmed plane. The note states that in view of this, the United States Government cannot understand why the Soviet Government appears unable to furnish information on the circumstances of the crash or on the whereabouts and condition of the missing 11 airmen. After again rejecting the Soviet charge that the C–130 intention-

ally violated the Soviet frontier, the note requests information on the crash and on the missing men, requests that United States technical experts be permitted to examine the wreckage at the crash site, and states that the United States reserves the right to full compensation for the loss of the aircraft and its equipment.

October 6: In the course of a conversation on another matter raised by the Ambassador, Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert D. Murphy requests Soviet Ambassador Menshikov for information on the missing 11 airmen and for access by U.S. authorities to the crash site of the C–130. The Ambassador states that the Soviet Government has no further information on the matter and that, since the crash site was probably in a restricted frontier area, the United States was asking to visit a closed area in the Soviet Union. Mr. Murphy asks Ambassador Menshikov to inform the Soviet Government of his comments, adding that the United States has evidence that the C–130 was shot down.

October 16: American Ambassador Thompson is handed a note by Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister Kuznetsov in Moscow. The note reiterates the statements contained in earlier Soviet communications on this subject to the effect that no further information is available and that the United States bears the responsibility for the incident.

November 4: The Air Force announces the identification of four of the six-crew members who perished in the crash and whose remains were transferred to American officials on September 24. The Air Force announces that the two crew members whose remains were not identified will be buried at Arlington National Cemetery with full military honors. The crew members identified were:

1st Lt. John E. Simpson, Richland, Wash.; Capt. Rudy J. Swiestra, Compton, Calif.; 1st Lt. Ricardo M. Villarreal, Laredo, Tex.; Capt. Edward J. Jeruss, New Haven, Conn.

November 13: Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert D. Murphy receives Soviet Ambassador Menshikov, who is accompanied by Maj. Gen. Mikhail N. Kostiouk, Air Attaché of the Soviet Embassy at Washington. Mr. Murphy presents the Soviet Ambassador with evidence that Soviet fighter planes intercepted the C–130 and shot it down.

January 7, 1959: Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, during a conversation with Soviet First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan, asks that the Soviet Government give the United States Government an indication or a statement about what happened to the 11 missing crew members of the C–130. Mr. Mikoyan replies that the Soviet Government had given all the information it had.

January 16: The Secretary of State, during a conversation with Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan in the afternoon of January 16, asks about the fate of the crew of the C–130. Mr. Mikoyan says that the Soviet Government had done all that it could do. Mr. Mikoyan declares that the plane had not been shot down.

General Electric Receives Award for Its Work To Improve Understanding Among Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on January 30 of this year a distinguished firm with its headquarters in New York State, General Electric Co., received a special award for its efforts to improve world relations. At a dinner at the Mayflower Hotel, the Institute of International Education celebrated its 40th birthday, as part of the third national conference on exchange of persons, which the institute sponsored.

A highlight of the dinner was the award by Vice President NIXON to General Electric, as one of five organizations, institutions, or individuals which has made unusual contributions to the improvement of understanding among nations.

In bestowing this award, the institute recognized the outstanding programs General Electric has carried out through the years by means of which many young people from abroad have been introduced to this country and have returned to their homelands to better conditions there, as well as to serve as ambassadors of good will for the United States.

We in New York State are extremely proud of this record, and are happy to join with the entire Nation in saluting General Electric for its manifold contributions to cementing world friendship and cooperation. The citation accompanying the award to General Electric outlines well the company's many international activities. It was accepted by Mr. J. S. Parker, vice president of General Electric Co., in the absence of Mr. W. R. Herod, president of International General Electric Co.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the citation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION FOR A U.S. CORPORATION

To the General Electric Co., an American corporation known throughout the world for its dynamic leadership and dedication to progress, the Institute of International Education presents its award for distinguished service.

The history of General Electric Co.'s 70 years of growth reflects its confidence and willingness to invest in a peaceful future. Matching the vision of its men of research, production and distribution has been General Electric's imaginative acceptance of its responsibility for public service, not only in the United States but in the more than one hundred other countries in which it operates around the globe.

Within a year after its incorporation, General Electric Co., in 1893, brought its first foreign student to the United States for training. Since that pioneer step, over 1,800 young men and women from 62 countries have trained in this country under the company's sponsorship and guidance. Returning to their homes with new knowledge and skills, and better understanding of the economic, social, and political structure of the United States, these young people have taken positions with local industry, government, and educational institutions. Their contribution to the economic and social development of their own nations and to the betterment of international understanding has been profound.

In addition to this major program of educational exchange, General Electric has brought thousands of its own employees and those of affiliated concerns to the United States for specialized training and observation of American industrial and community life. It conducts in the countries where it operates dozens of training schools, not only for instruction in mechanical skills essential to industrial advancement but in the English language, public health, and other subjects of importance to local employees and communities. It has cooperated closely with the U.S. Government and other agencies in providing training and observation opportunities for great numbers of foreign specialists and advanced engineers. Its domestic plants each year receive more than 2,000 special observers from countries throughout the world.

Taking the best of its laboratories and plants to millions of people, the famed Science Show of General Electric has toured the world, revealing to men and women of other nations the wonders of the future and giving new hope for their own technical, economic, and social advancement. As a public service in the field of medicine, General Electric cooperated in introducing educational television to Latin America. Nearly a decade ago, in the infancy of closed-circuit broadcasting, the company's program "Video Medico" provided Latin-American doctors with training in advanced surgery techniques. This represented a revolutionary teaching concept both at home and abroad.

The Institute of International Education believes that the General Electric Co.'s record of service and leadership in meeting international responsibilities, and its faith in the future of foreign economic development, merit this award.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*	Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*	Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*	
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*	
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*	
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*	
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*	The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*	
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*	The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*	Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*	
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*	
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*	4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*	2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*	
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*	
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*	
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*	3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*	
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*	
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*	
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*	
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*	University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*	
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*	
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*	
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*	
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C.*	
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*	3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*	4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*	
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*	
Langer, William, *N. Dak.*	2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Russell B., *La.*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*	
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*	4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*	The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*	
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*	Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*	
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*	
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala.*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*	
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del.*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex.*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Green (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla.*	5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*	
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*	
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*	
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.*	University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.*	911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.*	3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.*	113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*	
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*	
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*	
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*	
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*	
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.*	Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*	
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*	
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*	
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*	
Bates, William H., *Mass.*	
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*	
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*	
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.*	1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.*	3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*	
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*	
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*	
Boggs, Hale, *La.*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.*	3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.*	Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*	
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*	
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.*	The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*	
Brademas, John, *Ind.*	
Bray, William G., *Ind.*	
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*	
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*	
Brooks, Overton, *La.*	4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.*	3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*	Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.*	Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*	
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*	
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*	
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*	
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*	
Burke, James A., *Mass.*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.*	2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.*	1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*	
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*	
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*	
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*	
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*	
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*	
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.*	1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.*	3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*	
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.*	2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*	
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*	
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.*	2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla.*	6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.*	4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*	
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.*	3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*	
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*	
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.*	4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*	
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*	
Dent, John H., *Pa.*	
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*	
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*	
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*	1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*	
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*	
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*	
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*	
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*	
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.*	3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*	
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.*	The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*	
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.*	3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.*	The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*	
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*	
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.*	1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*	
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.*	4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*	
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.*	The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.*	Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*	
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.*	6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*	
George, Newell A., *Kans.*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*	
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*	
Grant, George M., *Ala.*	4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*	
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*	
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*	
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*	
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*	
Haley, James A., *Fla.*	
Hall, David M., *N. C.*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*	
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*	
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*	
Harris, Oren, *Ark.*	1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*	
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*	
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*	
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*	
Hess, William E., *Ohio*	
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*	
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*	100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.*	3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*	
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*	
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*	
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*	
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*	
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*	
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.*	The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*	
Jarman, John, *Okla.*	
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*	
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*	2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*	
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*	
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*	
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.*	1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*	
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.*	3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*	
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.*	Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*	
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*	
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*	
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.*	The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*	
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.*	3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.*	4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*	
King, David S., *Utah*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*	
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*	
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*	
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*	

Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*	
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Lennon, Alton, *N. C.*	
Lesinski, John, *Mich.*	
Levering, Robert W., *Ohio*	
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.*	224 C St. NE.
Lindsay, John V., *N. Y.*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn.*	The Congressional
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*	The Washington
McCulloch, William M., *Ohio*	4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif.*	
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*	
McFall, John J., *Calif.*	507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGinley, Donald F., *Nebr.*	
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak.*	
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*	220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*	1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McSween, Harold B., *La.*	
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*	
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*	115 Dale Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*	
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*	
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*	
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*	
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*	Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*	
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*	
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.*	The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*	The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*	
May, Catherine, *Wash.*	
Meader, George, *Mich.*	3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*	
Meyer, William H., *Vt.*	
Michel, Robert H., *Ill.*	
Miller, Clement W., *Calif.*	
Miller, George P., *Calif.*	
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*	3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Milliken, William H., Jr., *Pa.*	
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*	2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*	8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga.*	
Moeller, Walter H., *Ohio*	
Monagan, John S., *Conn.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Moorhead, William S., *Pa.*	
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*	
Morris, Thomas G., *N. Mex.*	
Morris, Toby, *Okla.*	220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La.*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*	204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*	
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*	
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*	The Coronet
Murphy, William T., *Ill.*	
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*	
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*	
Nelsen, Ancher, *Minn.*	
Nix, Robert N. C., *Pa.*	
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*	
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*	2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*	
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*	The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*	The Congressional
O'Hara, James G., *Mich.*	
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass.*	
Oliver, James C., *Maine*	
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*	
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*	100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*	
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*	117 Carroll St. SE.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*	
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*	
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho*	
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*	
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*	
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*	
Pirnie, Alexander, *N. Y.*	
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*	228 2d St. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*	
Polk, James G., *Ohio*	
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg.*	
Powell, Adam C., *N. Y.*	
Preston, Prince H., *Ga.*	
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*	
Prokop, Stanley A., *Pa.*	
Pucinski, Roman C., *Ill.*	
Quie, Albert H., *Minn.*	The Coronet Apt., 200 C St. SE.
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*	
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*	
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*	
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*	
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*	
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*	
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*	The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*	1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*	6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*	5603 24th Ave. SE., Hillcrest Hgts., Wash. 21, D. C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*	
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*	3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*	
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*	
Rivers, Ralph J., *Alaska*	
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*	6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y.*	
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*	
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*	
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass.*	The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*	Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*	
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*	
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*	
Rostenkowski, Dan, *Ill.*	
Roush, J. Edward, *Ind.*	
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*	
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y.*	
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y.*	
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif.*	
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*	
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*	
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*	
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C.*	
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*	433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*	
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*	
Shipley, George E., *Ill.*	
Short, Don L., *N. Dak.*	
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*	
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*	
Simpson, Edna Oakes, *Ill.*	
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*	5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*	
Slack, John M., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*	
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif.*	
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*	204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Neal, *Iowa*	
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*	
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*	Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*	
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*	
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*	
Stratton, Samuel S., *N. Y.*	107 Martha's Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Stubblefield, Frank A., *Ky.*	
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*	
Taber, John, *N. Y.*	
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*	
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*	
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*	6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y.*	Mayflower Hotel
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*	2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*	3301 Mass. Ave.
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*	
Thompson, T. A., *La.*	1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, Keith, *Wyo.*	
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*	
Toll, Herman, *Pa.*	
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*	
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*	
Tuck, William M., *Va.*	
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*	
Ullman, Al, *Oreg.*	
Utt, James B., *Calif.*	
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*	
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*	
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*	4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*	
Wallhauser, George M., *N. J.*	
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*	
Wampler, Fred, *Ind.*	
Watts, John C., *Ky.*	
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*	9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Weis, Jessica McC., *N. Y.*	
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*	
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*	
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C.*	
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*	5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*	
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*	
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*	1001 26th Rd. S., Arlington, Va.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*	
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*	
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*	
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*	
Wolf, Leonard G., *Iowa*	
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*	
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*	
Young, John, *Tex.*	
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*	4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*	
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*	

DELEGATES

Burns, John A., *Hawaii*	

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*	2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 216 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Serles, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Place SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Appendix

Address by Paul M. Butler at Luncheon Honoring Gov. G. Mennen Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, at a New Year's Day luncheon honoring G. Mennen Williams on his inauguration as Governor of Michigan for a sixth term the guest speaker was Paul M. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Butler's luncheon address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF SPEECH OF PAUL M. BUTLER, CHAIRMAN OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, AT INAUGURAL LUNCHEON FOR GOV. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, LANSING, MICH., JANUARY 1, 1959

This is a most memorable occasion for all of us.

First of all, it is a great day for the people of the State of Michigan, for today marks the renewal of another 2-year period of progress and achievement for the citizens of this State, under one of the most notable administrations in the history of American State government—an administration noted not only for its longevity in office but for its breadth and caliber of accomplishment.

The transformation of the character and quality of the government of this State over the past decade has served to place Michigan in the front ranks of the best governed States in the Union. The people of Michigan know and appreciate this fact.

For this reason, they have adopted the pleasant habit of returning Governor Williams and the Democratic Party to the Executive Mansion in Lansing each 2 years—and, judging by the results, I would say that it is one of the most fortunate habits that the people of this State have ever acquired. It speaks well of their political judgment and of their desire to keep their State government attuned to the ever increasing needs of a constantly growing and rapidly changing society.

Thus, today should be a day of rejoicing for the citizens of Michigan, for the achievements of the past decade, under Governor Williams' leadership, have served to make Michigan a truly great State in which to live.

This is a great day particularly for Governor Williams and his family. I am sure that it is difficult for many of us to realize that today marks the beginning of Governor Williams' 11th year as Governor—a feat unprecedented in Michigan history—for Governor Williams is one of the younger men in American political life.

At an age that would be considered very early for many capable men to first achieve high public office, Governor Williams is already the senior Governor of the United States, and he has achieved what to my knowledge no other man in modern American history has attained—election as Governor of one of our greatest States for six consecutive terms.

I know that it must be a source of great pride to Governor Williams to know that the people of his State have bestowed upon him these repeated reaffirmations of confidence and expressions of approval for a job well done. But we know that they are tributes which have been hard won and are well deserved, indeed. Governor Williams knows that the best politics is a strong record of positive achievement and that the people always respect a man of courage and conviction, even if they disagree with him on occasions. That is why your Governor is beginning his sixth term in office today.

Finally, this is a great day for the Democratic Party, and to appreciate this fact freely, one has only to look to the situation of our party in this State a decade ago.

Ten years ago, the Democrats had no U.S. Senate seat, only 3 out of 17 Congressmen, 4 out of 32 State senators, 5 out of 100 State representatives, no members of the State administrative board, no members of any higher education boards, and only 2 Democratic-nominated justices on the State supreme court.

Today, for the first time in history, Democrats hold all top State offices and both U.S. Senate seats. In addition, we have elected 7 out of 18 Congressman, 12 State senators out of 34, 55 out of 110 members of the State house of representatives, all 8 members of the State Administrative Board, 4 out of 6 members of the board of agriculture, 4 out of 8 members of the University of Michigan Board of Regents, 1 out of 3 seats on the board of education, and 5 members out of 8 on the State supreme court.

Another interesting fact is that since 1954 there have been 40 statewide elective positions at stake in five elections. Democrats have won 37 out of the 40 positions, scoring "sweeps" in four out of the five elections.

The past few years have witnessed a remarkable expansion of support for our party throughout the Nation, especially in the West and Far West, and in those areas which had only recently been thought of as impregnable Republican strongholds—such as Maine, Vermont, Kansas, Nebraska, and South Dakota. But nowhere has the record of growth of our party been more widespread and more sustained than here in Michigan—a fact which should be a source of great pride to every Democrat in this State.

Of course, this record just did not happen. There are a number of very substantial reasons for it.

First of all is the fact that not only is Governor Williams an outstanding Governor, he is a great party leader and he takes seriously his responsibility to provide political leadership.

Governor Williams knows that it is impossible for one man alone to achieve all the things which a good Governor should do for the State, and that that government which is most responsible and most responsive to the needs of the people is able, dedicated party government, functioning within the framework of the two-party system. He knows also that the principles and program of our great party transcend any one individual, and that it is necessary to develop a large number of capable and dedicated men and women who can assume positions of responsibility, carry on the work of our party, assist with the implementation of the Governor's program and give effective expression to our party's aims and ideals at all levels.

The role of Governor can be decisive in the growth of his political party. Governor Williams has chosen to act vigorously as a party leader, to provide direction, to give of his time and effort to building the party. And the results show it.

Other very substantial reasons for this great record of party success are, of course, that grand gentleman, Neil Staebler, one of the finest men and one of the most able chairmen in our party; your outstanding and distinguished representatives on the national committee, Mrs. Margaret Price and Tom Quimby and, as an alternate, Mrs. Mildred Jeffrey; your wonderful vice chairman, Miss Adelaide Hart, and scores of other such dedicated men and women of this caliber who constitute the leadership of our party in this State.

Under this leadership, active political organizations have been developed throughout the State at the county level; the precincts have been organized; many people never before politically active have been persuaded to assume political responsibilities; effective representation and leadership have been provided from your State on the national level and the whole base of our party leadership has been broadened, as it should be, to give maximum expression to the largest possible number of party members.

To belong to the Democratic Party in Michigan, to participate in it and to work on its behalf has been made an enjoyable, meaningful, and most rewarding experience for the individual.

Consequently, you have developed one of the finest groups of precinct and county committee workers of any State in the Nation and they are the backbone of any party.

Another very important reason for the success of our party in this State has been the caliber of candidates you have chosen to carry our party's banner—men like Governor Williams; that able and fearless fighter for the people's interest, Senator PAT MCNAMARA; your outstanding, intelligent, and most promising Senator-elect, PHIL HART; your fine newly elected Lieutenant Governor, John Swainson; your unusually competent congressional delegation; the members of the State administrative board, and other elected State officials.

Today, more than ever before, voters are taking a closer look at the candidates themselves, and unless the man or woman is, in and of himself or herself, worthy of the job to which he or she aspires, the chances are that the party label will not be sufficient to pull them through. One of the most outstanding features of our party here in Michigan has been your ability to keep coming up with candidates of unusual ability, integrity and attractivenes to the voter. That is the acid test of any good party organization.

As important as are the factors which I have just outlined, I do not believe that our party could ever have achieved the record it has here in Michigan, had it not been for the fact that the Democratic Party of Michigan is first and foremost an "issue-oriented" organization—one held together primarily by belief in and devotion to some commonly held, clearly enunciated principles that provide motivation for political action.

This, it seems to me, is the keystone upon which politics in the modern era must be founded.

The extent and nature of the modern means of mass communication, the increased educational level of the population, the increasing importance of nationalizing trends as regards both section and nationality, the expanding participation of citizens in the processes of political parties and the growing importance of governmental programs in the Nation's economy and the everyday life of the citizen are all increasing the emphasis on the power of issues, principles and ideas as the forces which are most responsible for the attraction and lasting attachment of new people to the banners of political parties.

Party leaders are fast discovering, some the hard way, that political organizations based solely on patronage, personal favors and the power and prestige of public office no longer enjoy the tremendous effectiveness they once possessed.

While these factors continue to be important forces to be reckoned with in building a party organization, other factors are growing in importance.

The caliber and personality of individual candidates are of increasing importance, but while temporary winning combinations may be put together on the basis of a candidate's personality alone, it is his performance in office and his identification with meaningful issues and principles that counts the most in the building of a vigorous and lasting party organization which can survive the passage of the personality from the scene.

Thus it is that the "new politics" places a premium on principles and demands greater attention be given to issues and the kind of image that the party projects to the average citizen.

A party organization which is held together by the bonds of common convictions and dedication to principles and ideas may be a more difficult and delicate structure to create but it is fashioned of hardy material, designed to endure and function as a truly responsible party should. Such a party is not only a tribute to its leadership, but a positive contribution to the society in which it operates.

And it is the most winning kind of organization. Proof of this can readily be seen in the results of recent elections, for wherever our party is creating an issue-oriented organization and is emphasizing a hard-hitting approach based on issues designed to clarify the differences between our party and the opposition, we are making steady and often phenomenal progress and achieving some remarkable victories in areas where victories by Democrats had never been seriously considered before.

It is not surprising that this should be so. For the greatest strength of our party down through the years has always been the things in which we believed. Because of our attention to issues and principles we have become known as the party of ideas. This has been our secret of success both in winning elections, achieving and maintaining a position as the majority party of the Nation, and in attracting to our ranks men and women of unexcelled excellence and intellectual integrity.

The principal problems which today face the people of the State of Michigan and of our Nation stem primarily from the shrinkage of our national economy, the declining rate of our national economic growth, and the consequent reduction of income and revenue at the local, State, and national levels. These problems are related to our failure on the national level to provide for the growing backlog of accumulated need, thus thrusting an impossible additional burden on the States at the same time that we are failing to meet the extremely serious economic, political, and military challenge posed by the growth of the Soviet Union and the growing needs of the underdeveloped countries.

These problems can be met only at the national level and only by people who have both the will and the imagination to put America once again on the road to achievement of the sustained economic growth and military readiness of which we are capable.

The very same people who advocate a backward policy of retrenchment and shrinkage of governmental effort on the State level are generally the people who offer the head-in-the-sand policy of economic strangulation by reduced national effort on the Federal level.

These are the very same people who seek to avoid Federal action by protesting in the name of States' rights and then proceed to shirk State responsibilities by threatening the flight of industry and capital from the State should the State government act to meet the needs of the times.

Thus the buck is passed, responsibilities are avoided, duties are shirked. This philosophy, long pursued, can lead, in the treacherous world of today, to only one result—national suicide.

That is why the overwhelming victory achieved by our party on the congressional level this past November is so important to our Nation. For it is only to the extent that government accepts its full responsibilities at all levels that the full creative energies of our people may be released.

The voice of the people on November 4 said that America should move ahead, at all levels of government.

The voice of the people as expressed in the mandate of the ballot box said that America can, and must, afford the price of survival.

It is our task in the next biennium to give expression to this mandate for progressive action, and to justify once again the trust which has been reposed in us.

Address by George E. Stringfellow, Imperial Potentate of the Shrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on January 3, 1959, the El Katif Temple, AAONMS, in Spokane, Wash., was honored with a visit by George E. Stringfellow, imperial potentate of the Shrine of North America. At a banquet in his honor, Mr. Stringfellow offered a definition of a Mason and a Shriner that has lasting value as a reminder of the great principles on which this fraternal organization was founded and of the great work Shriners perform on behalf of crippled children. I ask unanimous consent that a digest of Noble Stringfellow's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the digest was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been my privilege to visit your city on a number of occasions in the capacity as president of the manufacturing division of the American Mining Congress, as vice president of Thomas A. Edison Industries, Division of McGraw-Edison Co., as a Shriner, as an imperial officer, and now as imperial potentate, and I want you to know that I feel that you have always made me feel at home, whenever I visit Spokane in any capacity.

I am particularly grateful, as is Mrs. Stringfellow to your illustrious chief rabban, Noble C. Grover Wilson, and his gracious lady Irene, for the special attention they have paid to us since our arrival here. I would also single out my good friend and one of mankind's benefactors, the Honorable A. Henry Pierce, 33d degree, past illustrious potentate of this temple, chairman of the board of governors of the Spokane unit of the Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children and a member of the board of trustees of that great philanthropic organization. He has added much to my life and he has been extremely helpful in making life more comfortable for crippled children. He is truly one of God's noblemen.

I am happy to recognize the presence of Illustrious Harold W. Walker, potentate of Algeria Temple, Helena, Mont., and members of his divan, Illustrious Sir Herman H. Dokken, potentate of Bagdad Temple, Butte, Mont., and members of his divan, Illustrious Sir Herbert L. Powell, potentate of Calam Temple from Lewiston, Idaho, and members of his divan, and finally my good friend of long standing, Barney Heffner, who for years was one of the moving spirits in Bunker Hill & Sullivan Mining & Concentration Co. and who now resides here in Spokane.

I also recognize the gracious and beautiful ladies who adorn this gathering with their presence. Some wise man once said, "Next to God we owe most to women for life itself and then for making life worth living." I am sure that applies to those in our audience.

Some months ago I was asked to give my definition of a Mason and a Shriner. Of course you Shriners know that all Shriners must first be Masons. Therefore, if you will bear with me for a few moments, I will give you that definition.

DEFINITION OF A MASON

A Mason is a man who believes in God and practices that belief. A Mason is a man who believes in brotherly love and practices his belief. A Mason is a man who uses the symbols of the builder to set for himself and his brethren a code of life which refines his thoughts, purifies his sympathy, and broadens his outlook, it amplifies his friendship, exalts his morality, and tames his passions.

DEFINITION OF A SHRINER

A Shriner is a Mason employing all of the virtues and characteristics I have just mentioned and perhaps more. A Shriner is a Mason who realizes the work of the craft, exemplifying the high code of morality, requires refreshment. In obtaining that refreshment, Shriners adopted the code, 59 years ago, of pleasure without intemperance, hospitality without rudeness, and jollity without coarseness.

The general public identifies Shriners by their red fez, gorgeous costumes, and parades. However, behind our fun and behind our frolic is a burning desire to be of help to crippled children, regardless of race, regardless of creed, and regardless of color.

The love of little children has turned Shriners into ministers of healing and ministers of happiness. The red fez thus takes its place with the Red Cross as an emblem of mercy and as an emblem of loving kindness.

Shriners' desire to help crippled children is implemented through 17 hospitals organized 36 years ago. Those hospitals are often referred to as temples of mercy. In the words of one of our leading citizens crippled children's work "gave the Shrine its soul."

May I, in all reverence, quote the words of the Holy Writ: "Suffer little children to come unto me," and paraphrase those words

as follows, "Bring into our hospitals little children that suffer, so that we may lead them from the valley of despair to the hills of help, of hope, and of happiness."

Masons and Shriners walk especially close to God when they aid crippled children, which has been one of our prime objectives for many years.

The Shrine is often referred to, of course in jest, as an old man's organization. However, I submit that youth is not a time of life; it is a state of mind. Men grow old by deserting ideals. Years wrinkle the skin but compromising principles wrinkle the brain and sour the soul. We Shriners strive to emulate St. Paul who, while crying the days were evil, labored to improve them. We Shriners radiate good will which is more precious than a gold nugget and harder to find. Good will is a measure of a man's success and to a large extent determines his usefulness to society. Good will is a priceless possession. Shriners cherish no jealousies and entertain no hatred for their fellow man.

A great Chinese philosopher more than 2,000 year ago, uttering these words, "With righteousness in the heart, there will be beauty in the character; with beauty in the character, there will be harmony in the home; with harmony in the home, there will be order in the nation; with order in the nation, there will be peace in the world," set forth a philosophy to which every Shriner can and does subscribe.

Shriners seek peace but always with honor, for we realize that our forefathers bequeathed to us a way of life that we should preserve, and if we are worthy of our heritage we will lift our voices in defense of it, to the end that every American may enjoy a high living standard and degree of liberty heretofore undreamed of.

Civil Rights and Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles which were published on February 1 and 2 in the Newark Sunday and Evening News be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. One, an editorial, is entitled "A Real Rights Bill." The other, a column by Marquis Childs, is entitled "Labor Reform Battle."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark Sunday News, Feb. 1, 1959]

A REAL RIGHTS BILL

The same progressive Senators who tried unsuccessfully to knock out the anti-civil rights filibuster have returned to the fight with legislation to reinforce the Supreme Court's school integration decree. As in the Senate rules battle, New Jersey's Senator CASE, Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, and Senator JAVITS, Republican of New York, again lead the bipartisan coalition.

What the group seeks is a declaration of congressional policy that will support with the power of the purse and stronger laws the Supreme Court ruling which, after nearly 5 years, finds Virginia integrating 21 Negro children in the State's schools. It may be said that Governor Almond has finally abandoned Virginia's massive resistance and yielded to the Federal and State courts. But among his brother Governors, notably in Arkansas, Alabama, and Georgia, defiance goes on.

Concededly the outlook for the Case-Douglas legislation is little better than when it was bypassed last year, a senatorial abdication that had its sequel in closed schools and the bombing of places of worship. LYNDON JOHNSON, the Senate's Democratic leader, didn't want integration action then, he doesn't want it now. Otherwise he would not have barred any reference to school integration from his compromise program for which his brother Democrat Senator DOUGLAS, has another name. He calls it surrender.

That is why the new legislation contemplates the expenditure of $200 million in Federal funds over a 5-year period to support schools deprived of State funds to thwart desegregation. What happens to it will provide the country with a far better guide to Democratic intentions than any kind words for civil rights out of the governors' conference in Detroit or the pious promises that may find their way into the national platform of 1960.

[From the Newark Evening News, Feb. 2, 1959]

LABOR REFORM BATTLE—CONGRESS WARNED PUBLIC TIRES OF POWER ABUSES

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—In the many-sided dispute over labor legislation, one thing should be clear even to the leaders of the big unions. The appalling abuses of labor power exposed over recent months have created a widespread demand for reform.

Those who are jockeying for position and power in the struggle now beginning in Congress will ignore this at their peril.

The fight will be waged from three—perhaps four—vantage points. Here in general is the alinement:

PROBERS' BILL DUE

1. Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY was first in the field with a bill to end abuses disclosed in the investigation of James Hoffa and his Teamsters Union. But the Kennedy bill, cosponsored by Senator SAM ERVIN, JR., of North Carolina, with wide Democratic support, also contains as a kind of sweetener minor amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act that labor wants. Without these amendments, the AFL-CIO might oppose the measure and perhaps succeed in killing it.

2. The administration has put in its own measure which contains the reform proposals aimed at union corruption. It goes farther in Taft-Hartley amendments, taking in new ground on secondary boycotts and certain forms of picketing strongly opposed by labor.

3. Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, whose committee exposed the abuses, is expected to come up with his own proposals going beyond both KENNEDY and the administration. In this same camp is Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, the foremost exponent of right-to-work and other union curbs. Because of his position on the Senate Labor Committee, GOLDWATER is sponsor of the administration bill, and that has produced considerable embarrassment to all concerned.

FEELING THEIR POWER

In between are those who hope that a reform bill shorn of the Taft-Hartley amendments can be quickly passed. Moderate Republicans, such as Senator CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey, are working toward this end. While he will not say so, it is possible that KENNEDY would accept this compromise to get a measure on the statute books effective against corrupt and racketeering unions and their corrupt leaders.

Labor leaders are feeling their power since the election of last November. But when it is used, as George Meany, head of the AFL-CIO, is said to have used it, to dictate the new members of the Senate Labor Committee, then even those long friendly to the objectives of organized labor grow resentful.

A moderate reform bill will neither end all abuses nor stop the controversy. But it will be a step in the right direction.

Racial Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the most thought-provoking letters ever written for the benefit of public consumption was Carlton Putnam's October 13 letter, to President Eisenhower, commenting on racial segregation. This letter has been published in newspapers throughout the Nation. In most instances, Mr. Putnam's letter was printed on the editorial pages presenting an intelligent viewpoint.

In order to have this viewpoint presented in newspapers which did not wish this viewpoint known, a special committee was organized for the purposes of collecting money to have the Putnam letter presented as a paid advertisement. To my knowledge, only one major newspaper in the United States has refused to give its readers the benefit of the Putnam viewpoint; that newspaper is the Post and Times Herald, here in Washington. It is indeed tragic that the people of this area are deprived by the Post and Times Herald of the opportunity to receive fair, impartial news coverage. But many of us have accepted this, and have read other newspapers, in order to receive both sides of major issues. For the Post and Times Herald, however, to refuse even paid advertising is incredible. This opinion not only is mine, but apparently is also that of many distinguished editors. I ask unanimous consent that the opinions of some of these editors be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S. C.) Evening Post, Jan. 29, 1959]

WHERE'S THE LINE, MR. WIGGINS?

The now famous Carleton Putnam letter, in which a prominent northerner severely criticized the Supreme Court's school integration decision, has been widely published in the South. Northern newspapers, for the most part, have not seen fit to give space for the letter.

Some weeks ago, in response to criticism of the northern press for its position, the Christian Science Monitor, published in Boston, reproduced the letter in its columns.

The New York Times agreed to publish the letter as a paid advertisement, the cost being borne by southern contributors.

The Washington Post and Times Herald, largest newspaper in the Nation's Capital, with a daily circulation of about 400,000, re-

fused to publish the letter—period. It would open up neither its news nor its advertising columns to Mr. Putnam's anti-integration points of view. The newspaper has offered no explanation for its refusal.

The irony in the position taken by the Post and Times Herald is that its executive editor, J. Russell Wiggins, has probably made more speeches defending the people's right to know and advocating unrestricted freedom of information than any other newspaper editor alive.

Unless something very unusual happens this spring, Mr. Wiggins will be elected president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. Perhaps when he accepts the gavel he will inform his fellow editors just where the line should be drawn in the people's right to know.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier, Jan. 21, 1959]

CAPITAL NEWSPAPER REFUSES TO PUBLISH PUTNAM LETTER

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.—The Putnam letter committee says the Washington Post and Times Herald has refused to publish the Putnam letter in a paid advertisement.

James E. Simpson, of Birmingham, chairman and treasurer of the committee that is circulating the letter, said the newspaper gave no reason for its refusal.

Philip Graham, publisher of the Post and Times Herald, declined comment at Washington.

The letter was written by Carleton Putnam, founder and president of Chicago & Southern Airlines, to President Eisenhower. Later it was published in the Birmingham Post Herald.

In the latter, Putnam, a native of New York and a graduate of Princeton, was critical of the U.S. Supreme Court's segregation decisions.

The Putnam letter committee was formed to circulate the letter. It already has published the letter in several newspapers with money collected through contributions.

Simpson said, "It is incredible that a newspaper published in our Nation's Capital should refuse to accept as a paid advertisement the fine statement of Mr. Putnam, which voices the views of the South on current problems facing our region."

Simpson made his remarks in a prepared statement.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Jan. 20, 1959]

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

The Washington Post and Times Herald, influential liberal morning newspaper in the Nation's Capital, recently refused to publish the Carleton Putnam letter either in its news columns or as a paid advertisement. The Post declined to say why it won't let its readers know about this powerful anti-integration statement by a distinguished northerner.

J. R. Wiggins, executive editor of the Post, is a member of the committee on freedom of information of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. He has said repeatedly that freedom of the press means the citizen's right to know.

Will Mr. Wiggins report his paper's conduct to the ASNE?

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Jan. 22, 1959]

PAPER CURTAIN POST

Several weeks ago the Christian Science Monitor published the Putnam letter. This widely circulated statement by Carleton Putnam, a prominent northerner, presents the viewpoint of those Americans who oppose compulsory racial integration.

The Monitor said that newspapers in the North are being criticized for not presenting the anti-integration viewpoint. It said the letter was being printed as part of a continuing effort to meet this news responsibility.

The New York Times refused to meet this responsibility in its news columns. The Times accepted the letter as a paid advertisement.

The Washington Post and Times Herald has refused to allow Mr. Putnam's comments to appear in any form, including a paid advertisement. The Post declined to explain its reasons.

Actually, no explanation is needed. The ultraliberal Post has no intention of meeting its news responsibility on the integration question. The Paper Curtain has been lowered. The editors of the Post have no intention of raising it.

The Splendid Record of REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in these days of complex problems, we recognize that we have very serious challenges in the field of agriculture.

Unfortunately, according to USDA predictions, there may well be a drop in farm income in 1959. As possible, I believe this Congress should take constructive action to prevent the further decline of farm income. Our farmers and farm organizations, themselves, too, should be given every encouragement to improve our agricultural programs and bolster income. In addition, we must strengthen—not weaken—significant programs which have contributed to an improved agricultural economy and a better farm life. Important among these has been the REA program. Over the years, the REA has literally brought new light to rural America.

In Wisconsin, for example, over 30 electric co-ops are bringing light and power to more than 93,000 consumers—brightening the outlook for present and future rural Wisconsin. In 1935, only about 19 percent of our farmers were receiving electric service. By contrast, about 97 percent were being served in 1958.

We recognize, too, that REA co-ops serve marginal areas that are not economically attractive to private power companies.

From time to time, efforts have been considered, or made, to cripple this program.

In view of the economic hazards ahead for the farmer, however, I believe this is no time to take any action that would reduce benefits, or cut income, of the Nation's farmer.

To give a detailed picture of the scope of the REA program in Wisconsin and the Nation, I request unanimous consent that the current Wisconsin statistics, and a special report from REA Administrator David A. Hamil, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statistics and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURRENT WISCONSIN STATISTICS

In the State of Wisconsin, at the time REA was created in 1935, only 39,206 farms, or 19.6 percent, were receiving central station electric service. REA estimated that 149,600 farms in the State, or 97.4 percent of all farms recorded in the 1954 census, were being served by June 30, 1958.

The first REA loan in this State was approved in May 1936, and the first REA-financed line placed in operation on May 8, 1937, by the Columbus Rural Electric Cooperative of Columbus, Wis.

Up to July 1, 1958, REA had approved $134,345,289 in electric loans in the State to 31 borrowers, 30 of them cooperatives. One of these (Bangor Municipal Utility, Bangor), has discharged its financial obligation to REA. The loans were made to enable the borrowers to build 31,752 miles of line and other rural electric facilities to serve 93,385 rural consumers. Most of these facilities already are in operation.

By July 1, 1958, REA had advanced $108,500,379 in electric loan funds in this State and the borrowers were operating about 30,389 miles of line serving 85,634 farms and other rural consumers.

The average monthly consumption on REA-financed lines in this State increased from 188 kilowatt-hours per farm in 1949 to 456 kilowatt-hours in 1957.

On July 1, 1958, the State's borrowers had paid $12,740,151 in interest and repaid $18,998,251 of principal on their Government loans. In addition, they had paid $3,330,793 ahead of schedule.

No payment was more than 30 days overdue on loans for rural electrification in the State.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1959.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Attached is a copy of my report on the activities of the Rural Electrification Administration during fiscal year 1958, a year in which important progress was achieved in helping rural people get more and better electric and telephone service.

In both our electric and telephone programs loan needs were met fully.

During 1958, REA's electric borrowers connected more than 115,000 unserved rural establishments, raising the total number of consumers served to more than 4.5 million. They installed more than 200,000 kilowatts of new generating capacity. On and off the farm, rural consumers used more electricity, increasing purchases 8.7 percent over fiscal year 1957.

To enable rural electric systems to meet this growing demand, my office approved during 1958 a total of $241,636,869 in electric loans, bringing total loans since inception of the program to more than $3.77 billion.

REA electric borrowers continued to grow in financial strength and responsibility. During 1958, their principal and interest payments pushed total payments made since the start of the program to over $1 billion. More than $128 million of this sum represented payments made in advance of due dates. Four borrowers—an alltime low—were delinquent in payments more than 30 days as of June 30, 1958. And at the end of calendar 1957, the net worth of electric borrowers amounted to 14.9 percent of their total assets.

In REA's rural telephone program, borrowers chalked up new construction records and had connected 693,831 subscribers by June 30, 1958. Nearly one-third of these subscribers had telephone service for the first time, and almost two-thirds had their first dial service.

Rural telephone systems received 216 loans totaling more than $89 million dur-

ing fiscal 1958—another record. Total loans from the start of the program came to more than $478 million. When construction is completed, these loans will provide modern telephone service to 1,020,454 subscribers.

During the year, telephone borrowers made payments to REA totaling more than $5.5 million. At yearend, 48 borrowers had a balance with REA of $709,920 in advance payments. The number of borrowers delinquent more than 30 days in their payments was reduced to 15 at the end of the fiscal year.

Sincerely,

DAVID A. HAMIL,
Administrator.

Recognition of Outstanding School System in San Angelo, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, explorers, scientists, and authors come from education. I mean explorers which are America's satellites in space, and explorers into new horizons in the various fields which will make tomorrow finer for all mankind.

Our young people need the finest training available to help this Nation retain its present position of world leadership and to improve the world of the future. A vital part of providing this training is to challenge and inspire the student. This gives the training program its extra meaning and enables the pupils to get the most from their instruction.

As a former schoolteacher myself, I have always watched the progress in American education with great interest. Recently my attention was attracted by an article written by G. K. Hodenfield, an Associated Press education writer. The article described the "Three-Rail Program" of the San Angelo, Tex., schools. It seems to me this "Three-Rail Program" deserves three cheers from all of us.

I feel that congratulations are particularly in order for the farsighted members of the San Angelo school board; for Supt. George B. Wadzeck, a man who can translate dreams into action; for the administrators and teachers who work under him so tirelessly to help our young people; and for the students themselves who, in many cases, have not only responded to the regular teaching but have requested and willingly attended extra classes as well.

Mr. President, this article presents a thrilling departure from the traditional picture of a school and its students. As a mark of recognition for all those concerned, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Hodenfield's article entitled "Three-Rail Program Fills Needs of Pupils, Superior or Dull," which was published in the Dallas Morning News of Sunday, January 25, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE-RAIL PROGRAM FILLS NEEDS OF PUPILS, SUPERIOR OR DULL

(By G. K. Hodenfield)

SAN ANGELO, Tex.—This city of 60,000 on the west Texas plains thinks it has the best public school system in the United States.

That's a strong statement, even for Texas, and it begs for proof. San Angelo thinks it has proof aplenty.

For more than a year critics of education in this country have been demanding more academic achievement and less life adjustment. They want more of the solid and traditional subjects and fewer frills and vocational "escape courses," more challenges for the gifted student, more attention to the slow learners, better discipline, and more and better counseling.

In San Angelo they practice what the critics preach.

CHALLENGE TO ALL

The philosophy here is to challenge each student to do his best work in every subject, and then to provide the facilities and courses to meet and extend the challenge.

The payoff is in the curriculum—a three-rail program tailored to meet the needs and capabilities of all students, from the brightest to the dullest.

The San Angelo story is more than just the curriculum, however.

It's the story of a young, eager, and informed school board more concerned with learning than pennypinching, a citizenry willing to pay the taxes that built one of the outstanding high school plants in the country, a group of teachers and administrators willing to work 12 to 14 hours a day.

It's the story, too, of Supt. George B. Wadzeck, a man who cherished a dream for years and now has the tools and backing to make it a reality. When Wadzeck came to San Angelo 7 years ago the city had had an overdose of progressive, permissive, do-as-you-please education. It was ready for a change.

It took 2 years—until 1954—for Wadzeck to lay the groundwork and get his plans into action. And he's the first to admit there is still much to be done.

The San Angelo curriculum is based on the three-rail plan. Rail I is for superior students, able to move much faster than their schoolmates. Rail II is for average students, eligible for college after high school graduation. Rail III is for the poor student, the slow learner for whom high school is the terminal point of education.

The rail plan isn't new. Versions of it can be found across the country. In San Angelo, however, it starts in the first grade.

During a pupil's first year in school he is constantly tested and evaluated to see whether he is really ready for school, really ready for the learning process.

IMMATURITY FACTOR

"About 90 percent of a kid's trouble in grade school," says Wadzeck, "is that he is biologically immature when he starts. Some kids walk earlier than others, some talk earlier. It's the same with learning, some are ready before the others."

If a child isn't up to doing first class grade work, he is held in that grade for another year. At the end of the third grade there is a major check point.

Based on grades, intelligence tests, aptitude tests, and teachers' reports, the pupils are assigned to rails I, II, or III during the first grade. Depending on their aptitudes, some students might be in rail I English and social studies, and rail II or III arithmetic. Depending on their achievement, they can climb to a higher rail, or drop to a lower one. All three rails are taught by the same teacher in the same classroom.

Some pupils spend 4 years getting past the third grade, some do it in two. But there usually is little grade-skipping. Brighter pupils stay in their own age groups, but do more advanced work.

MAJOR DEPARTURE

One major departure from normal grade school practice, even where the program is railed, is that only the student in rail I can get an A. If he is in rail II, the best he can get is a B, in rail III a C.

Some educators will tell you this might frustrate the children, that they should be graded on the basis of whether they are doing the best work of which they are capable.

Wadzeck disagrees. "Life is competitive, and if the children don't learn it in the classroom, they'll certainly find it out for themselves on the playground," he says.

At the end of the sixth year there is another major check point. For many students, this may be a last chance to get on the academic ball.

From all of San Angelo's 17 elementary schools the pupils are brought to Washington School for the seventh grade. No other grades are taught in the building.

SIX SUBJECTS TAUGHT

Each student in rails I and II takes six academic subjects—English, reading, math, social science, natural science, and foreign language—plus one fine arts elective and physical education.

Rail III students do no seventh grade work. They spend the year catching up on work in which they have fallen behind.

And here is an exclusive San Angelo twist: If the rail III students get an A or B in his makeup work he isn't promoted. He is held back so that the following year he can take rail II or college preparatory courses. If, however, he gets a C or less he is promoted into the eighth grade in rail III.

"When a rail III student comes up with excellent grades in his remedial work," says Wadzeck, "we figure he deserves another chance. He may have had emotional problems stemming from troubles at home. Maybe he has been ill and out of school for long periods. Maybe he's just a 'late bloomer.'

STILL NOT TOO LATE

"But if he comes up with poor grades in his remedial or makeup work, we just have to figure he isn't college material. So we push him ahead on a rail III program that will give him the best education he can absorb. If he spurts ahead later, of course, our testing and evaluating will catch him and there may still be time for him to advance to a higher rail."

Rail I students in the seventh grade take 2 years of a subject in 1 year and clear the way for honor courses and college level work during the 11th and 12th grades. Rail II students take the national curriculum or normal college preparatory courses. Rail III students take modified work adapted to their capabilities, but including arithmetic every year through the 11th grade and English every year through the 12th.

In this, the fifth year of the program, San Angelo's only high school, Central High, has railed courses in math, foreign languages, science and English.

FEW ALL IN TOP RAIL

Wadzeck figures only about 1 percent of the students are able to handle the top rail in all four subjects. About 10 percent take two courses in rail I and two in rail II, and about 5 percent take only one rail I course.

In high school the students are graded according to the work they do in the rail to which they have been assigned. The transcripts, however, identify the course by the rail number. Thus colleges and universities,

as well as prospective employers, will know just what sort of work the student has done.

San Angelo's students are given every opportunity to enrich and broaden their education—and to pull themselves up to a higher rail while doing it.

For instance, the 710 seventh graders at Washington school have a 75-minute extra learning period at the end of the school day. If enough students ask for a particular course, Principal Dave Sands will try to find them a teacher.

EXTRA WORK, NO CREDIT

Thus, 20 students who take Spanish during regular school hours are studying Latin in the extra-learning period—for no academic credit. Similar no-credit courses are also offered in math, science, orchestra, drama, rapid reading, poetry, speech journalism—even football.

Almost half the 1,400 students at Central High paid tuition to take summer courses last summer. Most of them wanted only to brush up in their weak subjects or qualify for a higher rail. Wadzeck hopes that eventually all summer courses will be free.

"We encourage the students to go to summer school and pull themselves up," he says.

"That's the whole idea here—we want to challenge every student to extend himself to his limits, his full capacity. And when you get right down to it, that's all any school system can do."

Tough Tax Collector

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, a New Jerseyan with an indirect connection with the U.S. Senate is probably the oldest tax collector in the United States. He is Walter C. Black, who at 92 is still tax collector of East Windsor Township. He has been on the job for 57 years. His grandson, Walter Black Stults, of Hightstown, N.J., has been on the job in the U.S. Senate for a shorter period. Mr. Stults serves as staff director of the Senate Small Business Committee. I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Newark Sunday News, of February 1, 1959, on Mr. Black's service as a tax collector, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX COLLECTOR TOUGH—BLACK, 92, HOLDS ONTO EAST WINDSOR TOWNSHIP JOB

HIGHTSTOWN.—Every time Tax Collector Walter C. Black, of nearby East Windsor Township, neatly pens an entry in his ledger he sets a record.

Not a record for the amount of money collected since there are only about 700 people in East Windsor, but a record for efficiency and longevity in office.

Black, at 92, is the oldest tax collector in the United States, and has been working at what he calls his avocation for the last 57 years in his office in York Road. His vocation during all this time has been the operation of a plant nursery at the York Road address.

He sold this business to his grandson 2 years ago but stayed on to help with some of the accounting work. Despite his advanced years, he still handles figures with an ease that would surprise some younger bookkeepers, and he has no thoughts of retiring.

SUCCESSFUL COLLECTING

During all the years he has handled the tax funds of the community, Black has compiled the record of never having collected less than 95 percent of the total tax levy in any year.

It was his ability to extract the needed money from reluctant residents that first won Black his job in 1902. Local officials wanted him because he was tough—not unfairly tough—but tough. When he took office, some residents owed as much as 4 years' back taxes. Within a short time all the money was in.

Black said he simply mimeographed a message to all the residents, telling them how displeased he was with the situation, and soon the accounts were up to date. He doesn't remember exactly what he wrote in th notice, but it was effective.

Last year the township built a new municipal building in Ward Road, and hung a shingle over one of the new offices which reads "Collector." The office is always empty.

Anyone looking for Black to pay a bill or chat must travel to the nursery about 2 miles away. A routine developed over more than a half century cannot easily be changed.

Black told the town fathers he wouldn't move when the building was being constructed, and they knew he meant it. The office is there in case he should change his mind.

Black graduated from Peddie School in 1886 and Rider Business College 6 months later. In 1907 he returned to Peddie as treasurer and a member of the school board, a post he held until 4 years ago.

JOBS SOUGHT HIM

Although he "never asked for an office in my life—they came to me," Black has had an active public career. In addition to his position at Peddie, he was a member of the township board of education for 54 years, including several years as president, and clerk of the board for 28 years.

He was also tax assessor for 2 years but gave it up when he found it interfered with the nursery business.

Last November the State senate took notice of his long career of public service and passed a resolution commending Black. He was also honored by the New Jersey Tax Collectors Association at the recent League of Municipalities convention in Atlantic City.

More Defense Contracts Should Go to Small Business Concerns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the rate of failures of small business climbed last year to the highest annual total since 1933. Nearly 15,000 business firms failed, and this was an increase of 8.9 percent over the previous year.

The liabilities of these failing firms in 1958 totaled $728,258,000. Even greater than the dollar loss was the job loss to many men and women who need work, particularly in the depressed areas of our Nation.

The Senate Select Committee on Small Business, under the chairmanship of the very able and distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], has repeatedly pointed out to the administration that America's small businesses are frequently neglected on defense orders. But latest statistics show that the 100 largest defense prime contractors increased their share of all contracts over $10,000 from 68.4 percent in 1957 to 74.2 percent in 1958. These statistics prove that the situation is becoming worse instead of improving, and it is a condition which demands correction.

Recently one of the better daily newspapers in my State, the Sherman Democrat, under the able editorial direction of the Honorable Frank Mayburn, published an editorial discussing this problem.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Friday, January 9, 1959, Sherman Democrat under the heading, "Defense and Business."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE AND BUSINESS

Stung by a charge of the Senate Small Business Committee that small concerns are neglected on defense orders, the Defense Department announces that small businesses averaged at least $7 billion a year in defense contracts in the last 2 fiscal years.

In 1958 small business was awarded less than the previous fiscal year, and $3,729,000,000 in prime contracts, slightly 243,000,000 in subcontracts, a drop of 2 percent. That is the basis of the committee's complaint. It compares with the total military procurement overage of $20 billion a year for the last 2 fiscal years.

A 35 percent average of all procurement for small business in military material would not seem to be equitable. Even in ships, planes, and missiles, literally thousands of items go into each, produced by some of the biggest purchases, such as small concerns. The procurement can and should be used to help small business in economically depressed areas weather the economic storm. The committee does well to press for at least half of it for small business.

Procedure To Be Followed in Case of Disability of the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, Congress has in past sessions and is currently concerned with the gap in our Constitution relative to the procedure to be followed if the President of the United States became unable to serve as President because of disability.

Prof. Noel T. Dowling, professor emeritus of constitutional law of Columbia University, and a summer resident of New Hampshire, has recently written an article on this problem based on the experience of several States whose Governors became disabled.

Professor Dowling's article has been printed in the January issue of the New Hampshire Bar Journal, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE DISABILITY

(By Noel T. Dowling, Harlan Fiske Stone professor emeritus of constitutional law, Columbia University)

One day, now perhaps 20 years ago, a telephone call came to me at my office at Columbia University from a man who introduced himself as a member of the bar of a certain foreign country and said he wanted to consult me on a point of constitutional law. I asked him what it was about and why he had called me. He answered that he had been referred to me by a New York lawyer (well known to me), but that he would rather not try to tell me his problem over the phone.

When he came to see me shortly thereafter he told a rather lurid story of political unrest in his homeland. That unrest was largely attributable, he thought, to the presence of an ailing chief executive unable to discharge his responsibilities and yet unwilling to surrender them to the person next in succession. In the course of his story he remarked—in an offhand sort of way as if it were nothing out of the ordinary—that his countrymen had occasionally been known to resort to unorthodox or even violent means in the settlement of their political disputes. For his part, however, and others likeminded with himself, he wanted to explore the possibilities of peaceful, particularly of judicial, ways to remove a disabled executive. His specific question, on which he wanted whatever advice he could get, was whether any legal process was available under his constitution by which matter of disability could be submitted for determination by the courts. He seemed to take it for granted that we had had occasion to deal with disabled executives in this country, if not in respect to the President at least of a governor, and that our experience might provide guidance to them in the interpretation of their own constitution.

As to the President, I could tell him at once that the problem of disability under our Constitution had never been submitted to the courts. More than that, the Constitution being silent on the determination thereof, there was no assurance that the Federal courts would assume jurisdiction of such a cause. As to the Governors of States, I had no information. The upshot of our conversation was that I agreed to make a spot study of a few States and give him a memorandum of any relevant information I could find.

Almost at the outset of the study I came upon a New Hampshire case. It was *Attorney General* v. *Taggart* (66 N.H. 362, 29 Atl. 1027), decided in 1890. The action arose in the Supreme Court on an original petition for mandamus against the president of the Senate to require him to take over the powers and duties of Governor. It was begun on the written request by Governor Goodell to Attorney General Barnard to "take such steps as you think necessary to cause the president of the senate to exercise the powers of the Governor during the vacancy caused by my illness."

The pleadings were singularly short and clear. This is the petition: "Daniel Barnard, attorney general of the State of New Hampshire, in behalf of said State, complains against David A. Taggart, and says the chair of the Governor of said State has been and is vacant by reason of the sickness of His Excellency David H. Goodell, and his consequent inability to perform any of the duties of his office, and the said Taggart is president of the senate of said State; yet said Taggart does not exercise any of the powers and authorities which by the constitution and the laws the Governor is vested with, but refuses so to do. Wherefore the plaintiff prays for a writ of mandamus, or other appropriate and adequate process, directed to the said Taggart, requiring him to exercise the powers and authorities of the Governor during the vacancy, according to his duty in the premises."

And this the answer: "The defendant says he does not exercise any of the powers and authorities of the Governor's office, because his duty to do so is not settled by any adjudication or conclusive evidence of record. He is ready to do his duty when he has authoritative evidence as to what it is, and thereof submits to the judgment of the court."

The case was submitted upon evidence introduced by the plaintiff and heard by the whole court. The evidence established (a) that the Governor was disabled and (b) that there was "executive business demanding immediate attention." On this showing the court directed the clerk to enter "judgment for the plaintiff."

The opinion of the court, in which all concurred, was delivered by Chief Justice Charles Doe. He first quoted article 49 of the State constitution: "Whenever the chair of the Governor shall become vacant, by reason of his death, absence from the State, or otherwise, the president of the senate shall, during such vacancy, have and exercise all the power and authorities" of the Governor. He noted that the "mischief designed to be prevented was the suspension of executive government by the Governor's death, absence from the State, or disability," and that the "prescribed remedy is the duty of a substitute to act in cases of necessity." He then referred to the proof established by the evidence and concluded that in such a situation the constitution directs the defendant "to exercise executive powers until the Governor resumes them." That was enough to dispose of the case in hand.

But the chief justice went further. He observed that while a judicial determination of the question of vacancy "is not legally requisite to call the president of the senate to the executive chair" it may prove to be "a convenient mode of avoiding embarrassment that might sometimes arise from doubt and controversy in regard to his authority and the validity of his acts." No question of jurisdiction has been raised, but the chief justice seemed to have something of that in mind in saying that the "existence of an executive vacancy is a question of law and fact within the judicial jurisdiction." Looking ahead he remarked that if the defendant exercised executive power without a previous judgment on the question of his authority, "the legality of his acts could be contested and determined in subsequent litigation." The judicial character of the question, he continued, "does not depend upon the time when it is brought into court. With adequate legal process, the consideration and decision of such a question may be prospective as well as retrospective."

The remainder of the opinion was given over to a consideration of mandamus as an appropriate remedy. On that point and after examining an array of cases, the court concluded that when, as in this petition, "a plaintiff asserts a legal right and an infringement of it, and asks appropriate relief, his case is decided on the facts proved, without a waste of time in the consideration of a form of action." As already noted, the question of jurisdiction was not raised by the parties; nor was it explicitly discussed by the court. An objection on that score would probably have been futile anyway, since the Court (aside from the fact that in some circumstances it could give advisory opinions) looked upon the case as presenting nothing other than an ordinary "question of law and fact." On its facts—however interesting the further reaches of Chief Justice Doe's opinion may be—the Taggart case was concerned only with the problem of a willing Governor and an uncontested jurisdiction.

A North Dakota case—to mention only one other decision discovered in the course of the study—tackled the tougher problem of an unwilling Governor and a challenge to the jurisdiction. This was *State ex rel. Olson* v. *Langer*, 65 N.D. 68, 256 N.W. 377, decided in 1934. It, too, was an original proceeding in the supreme court of the State, and it asked for a writ of quo warranto requiring the respondent to show by what right he continued to exercise the powers and duties of the office of Governor. The petition was based on the contention that respondent having been convicted of a felony, even though at liberty pending an appeal, was under a "disability," as specified in the State constitution, for exercising the powers of Governor. Jurisdiction was put in issue at once by a motion to quash. The basis of that motion was that these proceedings were inconsistent with the provison for impeachment as the exclusive method under the constitution for removal of the Governor.

The motion to quash availed nothing. "After a careful examination of all the authorities (said the court, with a reference to Taggart as an early case) we are of the opinion that this court has jurisdiction to pass upon the question as to whether, under the circumstances conceded to exist in this case, the powers of the office of Governor have devolved upon the Lieutenant Governor." On the merits, the court adjudged that the respondent had "suffered a disability within the meaning of that term" in the constitution and that the powers and duties of the office of Governor had "devolved upon the (Lieutenat Governor) for the residue of the term of office for which the respondent was elected or until such disability be removed."

Such were two high spots of the memorandum. I must say that my inquirer from abroad was less surprised than I at the number of times the question of disability had been before State courts. He seemed to find much satisfaction in the way the Supreme Court of North Dakota summarized the matter when it said that, though controversies had arisen in several States over the question of who should exercise the powers of Governor, "in each case the question had ultimately been solved by the courts." I was later informed that nothing ever came of the memorandum in the country on whose account it had been prepared. No judicial proceeding was attempted. On the contrary, the question of disability of the then incumbent executive was left for the settlement by the running of time and tenure.

The Taggart case seems to me to have a larger significance than merely revealing the Supreme Court of New Hampshire as the leading exponent of the judicial method for dealing with executive disability. An outstanding feature is its recognition of the practical aspects of State government in the situation with which the court was faced. The matter in issue, whether the president of the senate was entitled to exercise the powers of the Governor, was a question arising under the State constitution, and it had to be decided within the existing framework of government. As the chief justice pointed out, that very question, if not settled in advance, "could be contested and determined in subsequent litigation." So, if eventually, why not now—especially since the judicial machinery was amply geared for the task. The court thus became an

implement of government in the orderly and prompt transfer of executive power.

On a wider front the local experience of New Hampshire and other States may supply valuable suggestions on a present-day national problem. This is the matter of Presidential disability. On what happens in the event of the President's "inability to discharge the powers and duties" of the office the Constitution speaks in clear terms, namely, that those powers "devolve on the Vice President." But the Constitution is silent on the question who determines the existence of inability. There is a widespread belief that something needs to be done about it. Proposals in a variety of form and substance have been offered. Some call for congressional enactments; others for constitutional amendments; most would establish new governmental machinery. None has gained general approval.

It is just here that the experience of the States may prove helpful. For that experience has shown that the question of disability is by no means foreign to the judicial function and that, whenever invoked, the judicial method of dealing with the question has been adequate to the occasion. In the light of that experience, a possible proposal on the national scene would be that the matter of Presidential disability, both beginning and ending, be entrusted to the Supreme Court of the United States and placed within its original jurisdiction.

An amendment to the Constitution would be required. The basic content of such an amendment (it is no complicated affair) would be, first, extension of the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to cases arising under the inability clause, and, second, specification of the parties entitled to institute proceedings by petition to the Court—e.g., President, Vice President, Cabinet, possibly others. Perhaps the amendment should also include authorization to the Court to make rules governing the conduct of the proceedings.

Manifestly such a proposal would raise questions of large import and deep concern. I think I appreciate—and to some extent sympathize with—much that may be said against it. For myself, indeed, the most I would urge at the moment is that the underlying idea of the proposal is entitled to receive serious consideration. At the least and without detailed development here, several points can be made in its favor. It would utilize an ever-present and resourceful institution of government; it would put the matter to be decided on the highest possible plane of dignity and responsibility under the Constitution; it would—not wholly, to be sure, but I believe as far as possible in man-made institutions—free the problem of political considerations; it would settle in advance the legality of the Vice President's assumption of power and promptly stabilize his new position.

The United States Is a Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, many excellent observations are made in letters to the editor of the Boston Christian Science Monitor. In a recent edition, Mary Elaine Adams, of San Francisco, Calif., observes that the United States was set up as a republic and not a democracy.

I ask unanimous consent that her letter, entitled "Not a Democracy," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT A DEMOCRACY

To the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

In your article of December 30, "Majority Rule Keys Filibuster Fight," the question is asked: "Should a majority vote run a democracy?" It would seem that the answer to this can only be an unqualified "Yes," for majority rule in the essence of democracy.

However, we should remember that our Nation is not a democracy. Our wise founders gave us a republic. From their study of history and their own experiences, nearly all of them had as much abhorrence for the tyranny of the majority as for that of a king.

History had taught them that democracy was the political system that led to the loss of human freedom, and they were convinced that only a republican form of government was adapted to protect the liberties of the individual. Thus our republican system with its filtering of legislation through representatives chosen by the people—rather than voting by the people directly—was intended to protect the individual's rights. The demand for a two-thirds majority among the people's representatives when considering certain vital issues was intended not only to put the brakes on government and prevent hasty, unwise decisions, but also to prevent obliteration by a bare majority of the rights of individual States to work out their local problems individually.

At the first Constitutional Convention there was much objection to the provision in the Viriginia plan that only a bare or simple majority be necessary to settle any issue. While it is true that the Convention itself operated on the principle of a simple majority, it should be remembered that it was not a legislative body, but a purely advisory one, assembled for the sole purpose of making recommendations to the individual States. But in order to ratify the new Constitution, a two-thirds majority of all the States was necessary.

The idea of a two-thirds majority as a requirement in voting on certain important issues is thoroughly in harmony with the republican system. It is a wise check that should not be dispensed with for the sake of expediency—even if the end in view should be most desirable.

In sharpening our understanding of the terms "republic" and "democracy," contemporary lexicographers, unfortunately, are not of much help, since they make very little, if any, distinction between the two systems. Thus we must turn to the words of our founders in order to refocus our thinking on this vital question.

James Madison and Alexander Hamilton have given penetrating analyses of the nature—and consequences—of both a democracy and a republic, and the alert citizen today would do well to reacquaint himself with the political system the Founding Fathers had in mind and hewed out for us so laboriously.

Benjamin Franklin said, after the Convention, when asked what sort of government the delegates had agreed upon: "We have given you a republic, if you can keep it." Let us see to it that we do keep our priceless heritage. But in order to do so, we must thoroughly understand just what our system is and how it was meant to function.

MARY ELAINE ADAMS.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Special Recognition of the Outstanding Abilities of Hon. J. T. Rutherford, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the term "public servant" is sometimes overworked, but I rise today to pay special recognition to a man who has—by his wisdom and hard work—earned the right to this title in its finest sense.

I call attention to the outstanding abilities of the Honorable J. T. RUTHERFORD, Representative of the 16th Congressional District of Texas, who has humbly, conscientiously, and unselfishly worked for the best interests of his district, his State, and his Nation during his entire career.

A moment ago, I mentioned his outstanding abilities. Mr. RUTHERFORD'S talents are particularly evident in the field of public finance. His efforts in the public interest as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee have occasioned extremely high praise from his colleagues. He is an unusually able member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Mr. RUTHERFORD was capably serving his State prior to his election to the 84th Congress on November 2, 1954. From 1948 to 1952 he was in the Texas House of Representatives and then served a term in the Texas Senate from 1952 to 1954 when the voters around his home gave further praise to his work by electing him to the national Congress. The people recognized a man who would work for them and stand by his principles at all times. I knew Congressman RUTHERFORD during his years in the Texas Legislature, and have been gladdened by his progress.

Mr. President, in recognition of Mr. RUTHERFORD'S fine work in the national interest, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of his weekly "Report to the People" which I believe shows his interest in bettering the public financial picture.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE

(By Congressman J. T. RUTHERFORD)

Birthday greetings are usually reserved for individuals, but this week I would like to say "happy birthday" to a Government agency: The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

There are many people who may not be aware of the existence of FDIC, nor familiar with its functions. I confess that my attention to the agency is brought about by my service on the House Banking and Currency Committee, which has jurisdiction over it. Yet, if you have a bank account, chances are your money is insured by FDIC.

The greatest tribute that may be paid to the organization is that this month it reached its 25th birthday without fanfare. It may be that FDIC has moved so firmly

into history as one of the greatest financial reforms of the 20th century that no one feels the need to recall its basic beginnings. But 25 years ago, respected businessmen's and bankers' opposition to what they felt was Government banking was a bitter thing. Many well-meaning financiers and private citizens claimed the creation of FDIC would encourage recklessness among bankers, would discredit honesty and invite incredible abuses. Many of those former critics, still on the scene today, would probably like to forget their dire predictions but there are yellowed newspaper clippings around to remind them.

The purpose of the FDIC is simple: To insure us against bank disasters and to guarantee against the collapse of America's banking system as occurred inthe early thirties.

The system has worked well. Although perhaps a half-dozen banks will fail over the Nation this year (the current annual average), countless innocent families will not suffer and there will be no wild-eyed panic, because the accounts will almost surely be insured by Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

As of today, FDIC is insuring deposits of 13,383 of the Nation's 14,095 commercial and mutual savings banks. The insured banks hold 96 percent of all bank deposits in the Nation. (Of the 712 banks which aren't insured, about one-fifth fail to meet requirements, and the rest haven't joined because they resent the cost of the insurance or say they don't need it.)

The insurance maximum is $10,000 for each depositor, which means that if you have several accounts in different banks each will be insured up to that amount. Since approximately 98 percent of all accounts involve balances of less than $10,000 it is easy to see the vast majority of accounts are fully and completely insured.

In its 25 years, FDIC has built a nest egg of more than $1.8 billion. It raises funds by assessing member banks at the rate of one-twelfth of 1 percent of the insured bank's deposits, but has done so well it has been returning about 60 percent of the assessments. During its lifetime, the agency has paid out more than $343 million in insurance to about 1,500,000 depositors in 432 banks.

The spectacular success of FDIC has surpassed even the most enthusiastic predictions of its early supporters. And at the risk of using a poor pun, one might say its profits have made bad prophets of its detractors and former foes.

The Unlocked Back Door of the Federal Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the first budget-buster bill is on its way, and the boobytrap to catch those of us who are trying to hold the line on Federal taxes as well as spending has passed the House. I was 1 of the 89 to vote against this bill. I am referring to H.R. 2256, the bill which provided $300 million for direct Government loans to veterans.

Let me make it clear, as was pointed out when the House was debating this bill, there is presently available $192 million for these direct loans, but with the realistic interest rates in the new bill I doubt if there will be a demand for funds. Private capital will meet the need and that is the way it should be.

Furthermore, as my colleagues are well aware, this $300 million was not in the budget. That is why I, for one, did not deviate from my firm determination to support holding the line on spending.

Mr. Speaker, the debate on H.R. 2256 and this $300 million unbudgeted item brought out some other facts which needed airing. In the discussions from both sides of the aisle, there was strong criticism of what has been going on and what is one of the major causes of Federal deficits. In other words, all of a sudden out in the open comes the admission of a means of back-door approach to the Treasury, which has been used to open wide the spending floodgates and to bypass the constitutional requirement of congressional review and the prohibition that no money shall be withdrawn from the Treasury of the United States, except by appropriation pursuant to law.

It was pointed out that by authorization bills, which state the administrator of an agency in question may issue notes, it has been possible to get money direct from the Secretary of the Treasury who is required to cash these notes. Thus, the need as to the spending of such funds has not been studied or approved by the House or Senate.

Furthermore, the Constitution specifically provides that all revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives, yet, as was brought out in the debate on veterans housing, 16 bills calling for $9 billion of expenditures last year came to the floor of the House with that provision in them and 12 of these bills originated in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Rules Committee has introduced a resolution which, as I understand, would require conformity with the Constitution covering appropriations. I hope it will come to the floor and if so I will support it. It is the only way to hold the line on spending.

Meanwhile, I want to emphasize that the $300 million for direct loans to veterans, which I voted against, was an example of the back door Treasury type of legislation and in large measure is the way deficit spending has been flourishing.

I do not desire to inject politics today in this statement, but for myself I must ask to be counted in disagreement with those of the opposition leadership who seek to excuse this back door approach on the grounds that without it much progressive legislation, as it is called, would not be enacted. If legislation cannot stand up under constitutional legislative process and review within the framework of constitutional procedure and congressional approval, either the Constitution should be amended or the measures not enacted into law.

The salvation of our country to my way of thinking, as recognized by the Founding Fathers, lies in control by the representatives of the people of the right to appropriate money. If we abrogate the provision that no funds shall be withdrawn from the Treasury except by lawful appropriation by the Congress, there will be little hope of checking inflation and maintaining fiscal responsibility.

Finally, let me say, as I have said so many times in the past, let us redouble our efforts to curb unneeded spending and remember that the money we handle belongs to the taxpayers and the debt we incur is their obligation and liability; not ours alone.

Creating an ever-expanding national debt to be loaded upon our children I cannot view with equanimity. Especially so in a time of comparative prosperity and highest earnings and wages in history. I cannot join the spenders and charge off deficits to "balanced human budgets"—except in times of economic crisis.

My conscience cries out that presently, as we spend more, we should tax more, and I am against both of these. They are not necessary. So I urge locking the back door of the Federal Treasury and restoring control to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to Thomas Jefferson, if a choice is necessary, I will support economy and liberty as against profusion and servitude, especially, as it may be in the latter case, it would be visiting our sins upon the third and fourth generation.

Dick Neuberger Is Fully Recovered and Will Soon Be Back in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to report that our respected colleague and friend in the other body, the junior Senator from Oregon, RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, will return to Washington Thursday, February 12, 1959. He will be accompanied by his wife, Maurine.

It will be good to see them. His many friends have missed him. We were shocked and dismayed last fall when it was disclosed that he was the victim of a cancer the doctors identified as malignant. After a period of anxiety we were somewhat relieved to learn that this cancer was radioresponsive and that the outlook for recovery was excellent.

So it was DICK entered on a long period of cobalt treatments which only recently were completed. Now the official report is that he is wholly recovered. This is heartening news indeed for all his friends and admirers here and throughout the Nation.

Before he knew of his condition he had been in the forefront of the fight to obtain more funds for cancer and other medical research. He is resolved to continue this effort, and his very presence here should win him more allies equally determined.

The statement issued by Senator NEUBERGER's physicians on February 3, 1959, was as follows:

Senator NEUBERGER has completed an intensive course of radiation for the malignant tumor which was surgically removed last fall. He has tolerated the therapy well and has gained 14 pounds in weight. We are gratified with the manner in which he has responded to the treatment program, and we have every confidence in its success. He is returning to Washington next week prepared to resume a normal schedule of activity.

Congress Control of Debt, Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. W. W. McEachern, president of the South Carolina National Bank and president of the South Carolina Bankers Association, in the January 30, 1959, edition of the American Banker, urges Congress to do all in its power to control the national debt and inflation. One of the Nation's most able bankers and financiers, Mr. McEachern has made an excellent presentation of how the Federal budget affects even the smallest individual.

I ask unanimous consent that this presentation, entitled "Congress Control of Debt, Inflation, Called Major Task," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS CONTROL OF DEBT, INFLATION CALLED MAJOR TASK

(By W. W. McEachern, president, South Carolina National Bank, Greenville)

It is too bad that so many of us think of the budget as being something off in the distance when the real effect of what the Federal Government does is felt every day in nearly every transaction that takes place—in our grocery stores, in our department stores, on our farms, in our textile plants, in our banks, and in our homes. The sooner we come to realize that the only dollar the Government has to spend comes out of our pocket, the quicker we will try to protect against unnecessary or unwanted expenditures of the Government.

Too many Americans think of the Federal budget as some vast mystery beyond their understanding. That is just what the spenders in Washington want us to think. They want us to feel that budgetmaking is a task we don't understand and can't do anything about. That is bunk.

Perhaps the methods of accounting and the methods of arriving at a budget on the scale of the Federal budget are not easily understood, but the basic principles are the same as those we have to deal with in handling our personal income and expenditures.

When a family has a certain amount of income in a year, the most that family can spend is the total of its income, except under two conditions. If it has resources which have been saved from income in previous years, it can dip into them to supplement its income for the current year. Or it can borrow against anticipated future income.

Under certain circumstances, either of these ways of supplementing current income can be necessary and even wise. However, the one thing the family always has to face up to is that repayment must be made if it borrows. Or, if it dips into accumulated resources, the rebuilding of those resources is likely to require greater effort now and in the future than it did to build those resources in years past.

Therefore, the careful family first considers how badly it needs more funds than it is making. Then it considers the price it must pay to secure the funds. In cases of emergency, funds must be secured regardless of cost. But the prudent family is reluctant to obligate itself unless the need at a particular time outweighs the cost of the obligation it incurs to secure additional income. Or there may be other advantages to having access to additional funds immediately which outweigh the cost of borrowing.

The Federal Government is no different from the American family, except the Government can levy new or additional taxes while the family cannot call upon anybody for immediate income without having to repay.

A prudent Federal Government first tries to live within its income. When an emergency arises it borrows the needed funds and uses them wisely to end the crisis. And occasionally a situation arises that makes it desirable for the Government to borrow for a nonemergency purpose.

There is no justification for the Federal Government to spend beyond its income any more than for an average family to do so.

Deficit financing and the issuance of too many Government bonds can lead eventually to even greater Government bondage than at the present.

The Federal Government has spent more than its annual revenue 15 times out of the past 20 years. Since 1939, annual deficits have exceeded surpluses by a total of approximately $235 billion.

Our total public debt is now expected to be $285 billion at the end of 1960. This would be $2 billion over the permanent legal debt limit.

Another point we should remember is that during these 20 years while the public debt was growing to nearly 7 times its 1939 size, the Federal budget was growing too. It is now almost 10 times its size then. So the constant borrowing that increased the public debt did not help to keep the budget down. It actually added to it heavily because the interest on our deficit financing is estimated at $8.1 billion for 1960. In simpler terms, that means $1.50 out of every $10 spent by the Federal Government under appropriations for the current year.

The 2d session of the 85th Congress, which adjourned on August 24, 1958, appropriated $67,773,583,153 for 1959. However, it also approved $4,879,893,095 in supplemental appropriations for 1958, and permanent appropriations approved in prior years to be spent in 1959 are estimated at $8,334 million. The prospects are that the new 86th Congress will exceed the spending efforts of its predecessors.

Another little known element in the Federal budget is the fact that carryover appropriations for commitments made in previous years to complete unfinished projects are being spent each year. These are over and above the funds laid out for the current fiscal year.

TRUST FUNDS

The President estimated in his new budget message to Congress that the new and old obligational authority which will be available for expenditure in the fiscal year 1960 will be $128.3 billion including funds carried over into 1960 from fiscal 1959 and previous years.

In addition to the current and prior obligations included in appropriations and expenditures, the Federal Government also collects certain earmarked revenue which is set aside in so-called trust funds. These funds include such purposes as old-age and survivors insurance, Federal aid for highway construction, unemployment insurance, Federal employees' retirement, Federal disability insurance, railroad retirement, veterans' life insurance and other lesser funds among which is one for the secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Sound business principles seem to have been dispensed with in handling these trust funds, just as in the overall budget making activities of the Federal Government. It is estimated that in four of the eight funds I mentioned the expenditures in 1960 will exceed the receipts.

Such policies would never be tolerated by any board of directors charged with the responsibility of regulating a trust fund, outside the Government. It is true that provisions have been made to increase the tax on employees and employers for social security, but experts on the subject still question the soundness of the program after the adoption of increasingly liberal amendments.

SOCIAL SECURITY COST

Some experts predict that the social security trust fund will be exhausted and it will be necessary for Congress to supplement it by direct appropriations. This, of course, could mean additional reductions in the taxpayers take home pay. If Congress continues its present trend toward liberalizing social security—along with all other expenditures—additional revenue will have to be found to make up the annual deficits which are sure to result.

The thing we have to remember about expanding old programs, or establishing new ones, is that, once put into effect, there is a continuing obligation which usually increases instead of diminishing with time.

One good illustration of this is the highway program which has been hit by inflation and for which the President now asks an additional 1½ cents per gallon gasoline tax.

Social security is another example of what I mean.

Along with the increases in benefits under the original program, there have been a number of additional benefits added in recent years. Many of these new benefits were provided without any sound basis for including them in an already costly program. The only sound way to operate a retirement or insurance plan is to establish it so as to take into account the amount expected to be paid in and the anticipated payments out of the funds and always to provide for a substantial reserve against unexpected emergencies which sometimes occur, even when careful business practices are applied.

In his budget message, the President pointed out that trust fund receipts in the fiscal year 1960 are estimated to be $20.5 billion and trust fund expenditures $20.3 billion.

Even if all the trust funds were lumped together—which they are not—the margin of less than 1 percent of receipts over expenditures would be too thin. This is a good illustration of the Federal Government's unbusinesslike handling of financial affairs.

OTHER FACTORS

One of the prime dangers in the system of legislating and appropriating by the Congress grows out of the fact that Congress quite often fails to take into account the possibilities of increased requirements for funds out of a program which is inaugurated without a complete determination as to how much it can grow under the limits established.

Under the price support programs of the Department of Agriculture an unexpected yield in wheat and feed grain crops means that an additional $1.9 billion will be needed during fiscal year 1959, ending June 30. This is the largest nondefense item which helped to cause the 1959 deficit of $12.9 billion estimated at this time.

Also, Congress has to take into account—or should do so—that pay increases for military and civilian personnel of the Federal Government mean increased Federal contributions into retirement funds. This calls for higher taxes, more borrowing or reducing the budget somewhere else.

Congress has been willing to borrow funds to appropriate, but unwilling to cut back expenditures or to meet essential needs by tax adjustments which might stimulate business activity and in turn increase Federal revenue.

POPULAR WILL?

Some observers have expressed the opinion that Congress has reflected the views of the people by approving increased domestic expenditures. They believe the people generally have taken the attitude that if the United States can afford to spend billions for military and economic aid to foreign countries, then they, as taxpayers, want to get as many benefits as possible under domestic programs.

Whether this was a correct estimate of the opinion held by a majority of the people or not, it is apparently the basis on which the second session of the 85th Congress permitted:

1. A deficit of $12.9 billion;

2. The public debt limit to be raised from $275 billion to $288 billion temporarily and to $283 billion permanently, and

3. Nondefense spending for fiscal 1959 to be increased by $5.3 billion against an increase of only $2 billion for defense purposes.

If the Members of Congress thought they were acting in accord with the wishes of the people, it is time for the people to let Congress know they were mistaken.

In most instances, the Members of the South Carolina delegation voted conservatively in comparison with a majority of the Congress. We should give our strong support and express our approval of an even more conservative financial course in the future sessions of Congress.

NONDEFENSE SPENDING RISE

The fact is that total national defense spending planned for fiscal 1959 will be $4.3 billion under fiscal 1953's defense budget of $52.6 billion. On the other hand, nondefense expenditures in 1959 are estimated at $9.2 billion above the 1953 level of $21.7 billion.

In the face of the growing public debt, such extravagance has no place in the budget of a prudent government any more than it would fit into the budget of a prudent family.

Let's bring the Federal budget down to everyday terms.

A family budget, operated in the same manner as the Federal budget, would mean that the family started out fiscal 1959 with a debt of more than four times its annual income. Following the Federal trend, that family would face its financial situation by obligating itself to spend more than $1.08 for every $1 of income received during the year. No sound financial institution would accept a note signed by a member of a family in such a condition.

As a matter of fact, you and I know that no family and no business or industry could ever get in such a dire financial situation with private financing. They would be considered broke long before reaching such a status.

Of course, the Federal Government need not go broke because it holds the power through Congress to levy sufficient taxes to defray the costs of government. However, only this power to dip into the pocket of the taxpayer will prevent the Government from being declared insolvent.

One thing that has happened as a result of all this bad management is that Federal securities issued by the Treasury have been undergoing severe losses in value on the market. The people too have felt the effects of inflation in the decreased purchasing power of the dollar.

CONGRESSMAN CANNON'S VIEW

Congressman CANNON of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, advised his colleagues to tell the truth about the situation when they went home. This is what he said:

"When your people complain about the high cost of living tell them the facts. Tell them the national debt is higher because you voted to make it higher. Tell them the dollar has gone down and the cost of groceries has gone up because you voted to depreciate the dollar and voted to raise prices."

Congressman MILLS, of Arkansas, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, expressed fear that the 1959 budget "could let loose inflationary pressures that in turn will be emulated by business and labor. The result could be that during the course of the next several years we will see rises in prices such as we have not seen in peacetime."

It is my opinion that the contracts negotiated by the automobile workers union have shown that the continued inflationary trend in Government has indeed been followed by business and labor. We can look forward to other similar agreements all of which will pile additional costs on the American public for no additional service or value in a product.

DUTY OF CONGRESSMEN

On the other side of the picture, the President's veto last year of a $280 million program for aid to so-called depressed areas was encouraging in an era of socialistic endeavors. And his courageous anti-inflation messages to the new 86th Congress point in the right direction. The trouble is there are too few substantial attempts being made to find ways and means of reducing Federal spending.

The executive departments and agencies cannot spend a single dollar that is not approved by Congress, so it is the duty of Congress to seek out and cut out our unnecessary appropriations. Congress also must make a start toward reduction of the national debt. If this is not done during a time of peace, reasonably high employment, and high average income, then there will never be a time to reduce the Government's obligations which really are the debts of the people themselves.

A balanced budget would mean the surplus could be applied against the debt. Then in turn the budget could be reduced too, or at least held in line, because a part of the budget now applied to interest payments would not be needed if the debt were to be reduced or paid off. One dollar and a half out of every ten collected in taxes by the Federal Government would no longer be needed for interest payments if we paid off our Federal debt.

Perhaps that is too much to expect, but certainly substantial reductions could be made through sound financial practices. That is not too much for the American taxpayer to expect and to demand of Congress.

Since Congress passed the Interstate Commerce Act in 1887, and the Sherman Antitrust Act in 1890, we have seen a tremendous development of Federal regulation in many fields. When the United States entered World War I, Government controls had been enacted in the fields of banking, trade practices, farm and power credit, food processing, and labor.

During the boom of the 1920's the emergency controls were removed, but new acts of regulation soon were approved as the economy declined in the postwar era. After the stock market crash, the real era of Federal regulation began.

NEW AGENCIES, NEW SPENDING

Actually, from the passage of the Interstate Commerce Act, in 1887, through 1939, approximately 100 new agencies were created in the Federal Government. These included such agencies as the Rural Electrification Administration, the Federal Land Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, the Federal Housing Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the Social Security Board, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

By 1940, through the establishment of new agencies and the expansion of old ones, the Federal Government had firmly fixed its control or regulation over business and industry.

By 1944 the Federal Government was purchasing almost as great an output of goods as used by the entire Nation in 1929.

And consider this significant comparison: From 1900 through 1958 the Federal budget multiplied 140 times, while the population little more than doubled.

We have reached a point where the Federal Government is a vital and often controlling factor in the major economic decisions of agriculture, business, and industry—if not in labor. Many people in all situations have come to lean on Government and welcome Government support—if not Government control.

CHANGE IN POLICY NEEDED

We look to the Federal Government for security, for wage and hour regulation, for highways, for pork-barrel contributions to many projects. Perhaps some of the things we look to Washington for are desirable or necessary. However, many undesirable results have come about because of the Federal Government's expanded role in our daily lives.

We must be more consistent. We cannot write our Congressman to vote for a South Carolina appropriation and to vote against the same catchall bill because it contains similar funds for South Dakota. We cannot ask favors for our business which we would oppose for somebody else.

We must place principle above pocketbook.

There is no easy way to bring about a change in our situation. It will be difficult in the face of pressures and demands for new and continued Federal services and Federal aid for Congress to do an about face in spending.

However, the hard facts of dollars and cents should provide a powerful argument for a change in policy.

There are no tricks by which we can solve our financial problem. Just as the head of a family has to take drastic steps when things get out of hand with the family budget, so now must Congress take drastic steps to repair the damage done to our economy by the policy of spend and borrow beyond our capacity, and tax and tax beyond our means.

George Washington offered sound advice in his Farewell Address. These are his words:

"As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit."

He admonished the Nation to use credit "as sparingly as possible" and to avoid the accumulation of debt "not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear."

That is a simple formula. The following of it is what takes courage.

I hope the people and the Congress will find that courage. Otherwise, we will have to face a more destructive inflation than we have witnessed in the years since World War II. None can foresee what the ultimate results would be.

Views of Business and Industrial Leaders of New Jersey on the Economy Forecast for 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a symposium, prepared by several outstanding business and industrial leaders of New Jersey, on the economy forecast for 1959. The forecast was made through the cooperation of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America with the New Jersey Manufacturers Association and was published last month in the magazine, New Jersey Business.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORECASTS FOR 1959: A SYMPOSIUM—SEVERAL MEMBERS OF THE NEW JERSEY MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION BOARDS, LEADERS IN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY, MAKE THOUGHTFUL COMMENTS ON THE PRUDENTIAL ECONOMIC FORECAST FOR 1959 AND WHAT THE YEAR WILL BRING FOR NEW JERSEY

Paul L. Troast, home, Clifton; president, Mahoney-Troast Construction Co., Clifton; director, New Jersey Bank & Trust Co., Passaic; president, S. H. Kress & Co., New York; trustee, New Jersey Manufacturers Association; and director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Co.:

"Being generally of an optimistic nature, it is not difficult for me to wholeheartedly agree with Prudential's economic forecast for 1959. It is heartening, too, to note that my optimism is shared by those in the Prudential who are so able and whose outstanding record over the past 7 years lends much stature to their forecast.

"I am disturbed, on the other hand, to note that Government spending is continuing along an upward curve and feel that we as businessmen should more carefully examine this ever-expanding expense item which is such a large proportion of our costs of doing business.

"New Jersey can hope to benefit fully from the prosperous years which lie ahead only if we reestablish the healthy tax climate which formerly prevailed and which meant so much to our expanding economy.

"Again like most businessmen, I believe that there is a place in this optimistic future for more compensating profits for our stockholders. Competition is an important and necessary part of our economy but the past year has shown too many companies operating with expanding sales and curtailed profits."

Ward J. Herbert, home, South Orange; partner of McCarter & English, counselors at law, Newark; trustee, New Jersey Manufacturers Association; and director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Cos.:

"It is difficult for a lawyer, even though active in a practice devoted largely to legal aspects of business developments and business affairs, to get the personal experience needed to form an opinion about local application of a national economic forecast. Much attention is naturally given to problems and litigation arising out of transactions which have already been closed in a business sense; and some attention goes to matters which are part of long-range planning and may or may not lead to immediate construction of new plants or the like. I can venture two comments, however.

"Some out-of-State capital, when considering new plants or branches in New Jersey, shows signs of being reluctant to face our new corporate income tax. The current uncertainty about an increase in the rate of the tax does not help matters.

"As to new housing, the recent decline in transportation for commuters, with the threat of worse to come, is obviously going to hurt the sale of new homes in a large part of the State in 1959 and will discourage building to some extent.

"These are unfavorable factors here which may limit to some degree the application in New Jersey of the Prudential's optimistic forecast for the Nation."

Steele L. Winterer, home, Short Hills; president, A. & M. Karagheusian, Inc., New York City; director, A. & M. Karagheusian, Inc.; Summit Trust Co.; Strauss-Rose Carpet Corp., Chicago; Wilbur Newman & Co., Inc., Chamblee, Ga.; Seaboard Floor Coverings, Inc., Philadelphia; trustee, New Jersey Manufacturers Association; and director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Cos.:

"I think Prudential's appraisal of business conditions for the ensuing year will prove to be quite accurate. It is possible that in some industries again we may find ourselves unable to sell our productive capacity but, in general, the outlook certainly seems favorable.

"Overall, our Nation, with its population growth, will have vast numbers of new family formations and these are going to have a tremendous influence on business activity in the years ahead. However, it is evident that competition will be increased rather than lessened and those businesses that are able to improve their products and lower their costs will forge ahead, while those who fail in these two areas will lose out.

"Frankly, I am deeply concerned about New Jersey's future as a leading industrial State as New Jersey is facing a real challenge from many other States and if it is to retain its eminent position as an industrial State it must take a new look at its industrial climate. I don't think that business receives either encouragement or recognition for the part it plays in New Jersey and, in the long run, the States who are aggressively seeking new business are the ones that are going to go ahead and New Jersey's position will likely decline. Whether this decline begins to make its weight felt in 1959 remains to be seen, but it is one reservation on New Jersey business that I must add to the overall picture."

F. Raymond Peterson, home, Hackensack; chairman of the board and chief executive officer, First National Bank & Trust Co., of Paterson; director, First National Bank & Trust Co., of Paterson; director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Cos.:

"I do not consider the Prudential Insurance Co.'s economic forecast for this year unduly optimistic. I expect a continuation of the recovery this year even if auto production shows only a moderate increase. A good gain could be a major factor in a spirited recovery in the economy, and if this influence continues strong it could be a major factor in a materially higher level of personal income, sales, and employment in the early sixties. With most of its labor problems solved, the auto industry appears to be in a position to meet whatever demand may develop.

"We expect steel production will expand between 20 and 35 percent this year, depending, in an important degree, upon demand from auto manufacturers.

"In my opinion, another major factor in this year's recovery, and for the years immediately beyond, will be the contribution of the construction industry with emphasis on residential building. A further hardening of money rates could result in some curtailment of homebuilding, but I expect a minimum of 1 million new starts and would not be surprised to see this figure exceeded by one or two hundred thousand.

"It is reported that the University of Michigan's annual conference on economic outlook attended by 70 economists working for corporations, financial institutions, and universities, thinks prices will rise no more than 1 percent this year and that unemployment will shrink to an average of 3.7 million. The resultant increase in expendable income, coupled with a relatively stable price level, should result in the movement of a considerably higher volume of goods.

"We are inclined to keep a constant check on three factors—construction awards, inventory buildup, and Government spending. Favorable developments in these three fields should result in our expectations being met.

"The outlook for New Jersey seems to be at least as good as for the Nation as a whole, based upon a check of our leading industries.

"Chemical output should expand approximately 10 percent and iron and steel upward of 20 percent. Military requirements should increase the output of electronic equipment, and production of electrical appliances should be materially higher. For other electrical equipment and for nonferrous metals, the outlook is not clear.

"Food processing and textile production are expected to be moderately higher and drug production should increase approximately 10 percent.

"The influence of Federal funds in our area is large and growing. This is particularly true in Federal aid for highways. Construction of routes 80 and 287, together costing over half a billion dollars, should aid our local economy for several years to come."

Sydney E. Longmaid, home, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; president and chairman of the board, the Esterbrook Pen Co., Camden; director, First-Camden National Bank & Trust Co., trustee, New Jersey Manufacturers Association; and director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Cos.:

"We heartily concur with the Prudential Insurance Co. of America in its economic forecast for 1959 that consumer purchases within the State of New Jersey will show a substantial gain.

"New Jersey is especially favored in the great diversification of its business. The people of the State have an unusual stability of income which such diversification permits.

"We further believe that on balance, New Jersey business has demonstrated the type of leadership necessary if we are to take advantage of every opportunity for sound business expansion in this highly complex and competitive age.

"A further constructive element is the continued expansion of employment within the State and we agree with the Prudential survey that this trend will continue in the coming year."

Donald V. Lowe, home, Tenafly; president, Lowe Paper Co., Ridgefield; chairman, the Port of New York Authority; director, New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.; United States delegate to the Transport and Communications Commission of the United Nations; trustee, New Jersey Manufacturers Association, and director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Cos.:

"Based upon general reading and opinions polled, it would appear that we can anticipate a continuing recovery in the overall economic picture, but at a somewhat tapered rate through the first half of 1959 with a flattening indicated in the latter half of the year.

"It would appear that Prudential's forecast is a little rosier than current newsletters such as the most recent one from RIA. Perhaps Prudential is banking a little too heavily on inventory buildup. As in our own experience, many industries undoubtedly are watching their inventories more carefully than ever as a result of their recent recession burn.

"Generally, I would anticipate that New Jersey's economic picture would be somewhat more stable than the national average for States, in view of the fact that it has such a well diversified industry pattern. Again, therefore, I would anticipate that not having been hit as hard as States in the Middle West its recovery might be closer to 5 percent than the approximate 7.2 percent indicated in the Prudential forecast."

Alfred E. Busch, home, Short Hills; vice president and treasurer, Keuffel & Esser Co., Hoboken; director, Summit Trust Co., Summit; trustee, New Jersey Manufacturers Association; and director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Cos.:

"I feel that the forecast as outlined in the Prudential 'Economic Forecast for 1959' goes pretty much along with our own thinking.

It might be of interest to you to know that we have in the past been approached by Government departments involved in forecasting future trends for information regarding our sales of certain nondurable materials, such as tracing papers and tracing cloths and reproduction materials. The figures were wanted as it was felt that the use of these items for future planning might be some indication of future production activity.

"These lines during 1958 were depressed only slightly, so we do feel that the planning which has made use of these is indicative of the impovement in production and construction that is going to take place in 1959.

"Our durable goods, such as surveying equipment and drafting equipment, were seriously down during the first half of 1958, but there are indications of noticeable recovery here, and although capital expenditures for items of this kind might not reach the high figures of 1957, we do anticipate a material increase in their sale.

"Our manufacturing activities in our New Jersey plants are scheduled to be increased by 15 percent starting the first of the year. Some of this increase, however, was brought about by a more rapid inventory depletion than forecasted.

"Altogether, our feeling is that there will be an improvement of from 7 to 10 percent in the manufacture of our nondurable items, and possibly an even higher percentage of increase in that of the durable items over the present year."

Charles B. Gilbert, home, Trenton; president, Gilbert & Mott Chevrolet Co.; director, the First Trenton National Bank; Standard Fire Insurance Co.; trustee, New Jersey Manufacturers Association, and director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Cos.:

"I have read the 'Economic Forecast for 1959' by the Prudential Insurance Co. Needless to say, it is good reading and I agree generally with their conclusions.

"The summary points out that much of the lift in business is expected from consumer purchases, and I agree that an upward trend in retail sales seems assured in the year 1959. Although durable consumer goods are expected to share in this trend, there is no clear indication that sales of such goods will rebound sharply. For instance, strikes in the automotive business have delayed production schedules so that the real tests of the public's attitude toward the 1959 models will not come until late in February or perhaps in early spring.

"The other items in the 'Forecast' such as public purchases of capital goods, housing expenditures, and Government spending, all take time to show their effect and to reach the consumer's pocket, so we should not be too hasty in looking for an overnight surge in buying. I have every reason to believe 1959 will be one of our better years if the labor element will use restraint in its demands and resolve its differences quickly."

George W. Furness, home, Millville; vice president, the Millville Manufacturing Co.; director, the Millville Manufacturing Co.; Millville National Bank; Wawa Dairy Farms; trustee, New Jersey Manufacturers Association; and director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Cos.:

"Due to the press of business, I do not feel that I can go into the minute detail that would be required to give a formal version of my views of the Prudential 'Economic Forecast for 1959.'

"Suffice it to say, I feel the forecast to be over-optimistic and look forward to 1959 as in no way surpassing 1957. I rather expect business at best to run on a plateau rather than a new rise. The direction that will be taken after 1959 I feel is still indeterminate.

"In the textile industry a very bitter lesson was learned concerning inventory and I doubt if in the coming year it will be forgotten. There were little or no symptoms of it being forgotten in 1958. Sales and inventory have been kept in almost too close a relationship. I feel this might well apply to industry other than my own. From what I have heard from the automobile industry, while they are not disappointed in their sales, there is nothing startling in their improvement, which leads me to the above conclusion.

"I do agree that the man-hour output will improve in 1959 due to capital investment and modern machinery but I do not agree that the workweek will increase."

John S. Leslie, home, Ramsey; president, Leslie Co., Lyndhurst; trustee, New Jersey Manufacturers Association; and director, New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Cos.

"Certainly, Prudential's economic forecast appears to be the most optimistic of any I had read and from the businessman's viewpoint, that is encouraging, particularly in view of the statement that Prudential's average annual error in their economic forecast has only been 1.6 percent for the past 7 years.

"Since our business is essentially in capital equipment, we concur in the improvement in this field during the last quarter of 1958 and are optimistic about 1959 which we believe in our company, should be back up to the 1957 level.

"The comment regarding consumer purchases and the relatively insignificant reduction in consumer buying from the peak of 1957 to a low point of 1958, is very interesting and encouraging and would appear to confirm the viewpoint of some economists that population growth is and will continue to be an important stabilizing factor in our economy. Perhaps many of us in top management in industry are too far from the consumer level to fully appreciate the importance of this attitude and are therefore insensitive to this index and the effect which it should have on our thinking and planning.

"Another encouraging factor in this report is the emphasis on the little bearing which increased Government spending has had on the recovery to date. This again indicates that recovery is not a result of pump priming, but of a more basic nature and therefore can probably be properly interpreted as more durable."

Governor Nelson's Appointment Restores Wisconsin's International Reputation in Utility Regulation Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 6, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Governor Nelson, of Wisconsin, has made an appointment to our State's public service commission which has significance far beyond the boundaries of Wisconsin, in his choice of Prof. Martin Glaeser, of the University of Wisconsin.

Professor Glaeser is internationally recognized for his pioneering and creative work in the field of utility regulation. His research, his textbooks, and his students constitute the basic foundations for this field of economic study. Moreover, he played an important role in designing the rate structure of the Tennessee Valley Authority—a rate structure which made an indispensable contribution to the outstanding success of TVA. Incidentally, there are some very worthwhile lessons in the theory underlying Professor Glaeser's work in establishing TVA's rate structure which deserve more attention from economists today in their studies of our present problems of high and rising prices in the face of severe restrictions on output. Glaeser is an exponent of promotional rates—rates established at low levels for the purpose of promoting maximum demand and consumption, so that the resulting market for the full potential output of the productive resources will yield adequate profits even at the low unit prices. Economists might very well give increased attention to this theory, and its remarkable success where it has been given practical application in the TVA and in rural electrification, in their studies of industries which have continued to raise their prices steeply even while operating at only half of capacity.

The appointment of Professor Glaeser to the public service commission recalls the days a generation ago when Wisconsin was leading the Nation in the development of ideas for advancing the general welfare. It was his work on the Wisconsin Public Service Commission that brought David Lilienthal to national attention and led to his appointment as director of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I warmly commend Governor Nelson for this most excellent choice for the State public service commission. It is an outstanding example of Governor Nelson's determination to raise the standards of public service in our State government to the highest possible level.

Mr. President, Governor Nelson's appointment of Professor Glaeser has been highly commended by the Capital Times,

which for 40 years has been nationally recognized as the living spokesman for the progressive ideas and idealism of the La Follette era. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR MAKES FINE CHOICE FOR PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION: PROF. MARTIN GLAESER

Commenting on Governor Nelson's appointment of Prof. Martin Glaeser to the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, David E. Lilienthal said Tuesday:

"I am confident that his appointment will help restore the national prestige of the commission and greatly strengthen protection of consumers and at the same time bring to the commission's work a judgment and understanding that will mean fair and intelligent regulation beneficial to management and investors as well as to users of public services."

From the standpoint of reestablishing the prestige of the commission, nationally or in the State, Governor Nelson could not have chosen more wisely.

He has selected a man with an international reputation as an authority on public utility regulation—a man who has made a tremendous and unique contribution to the field in which he is now called to serve his home State.

As a distinguished researcher, teacher, and author, he has helped to bring society a better understanding of the complex field of utility regulation.

His mastery of the subject has been placed repeatedly at the disposal of the public. He has helped to draft regulatory laws for Wisconsin and was an indispensable aid in establishing the first rate schedules for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The appointment should reassure the people of Wisconsin who have watched for 20 years a dismal succession of appointments to the public service commission based only on political considerations. This is the first time since the appointment of Lilienthal to the commission that such an authoritative figure has been chosen.

Wisconsin is lucky to have him available. Wisconsin should be proud that so distinguished an authority is a native son and a teacher at the university.

Governor Nelson has shown a profound appreciation of good public service by his appointment.

Providing Additional Funds for Direct Loans to Veterans

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2256) to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional funds for direct loans, to remove certain requirements with respect to the rate of interest on guaranteed loans; and for other purposes.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for H.R. 2256. I did favor and support the amendment which would have eliminated direct loans. The record shows that this provision would have no practical application to Connecticut. In addition, I very strongly favor the provisions permitting an increase in interest rates because I feel that this increase will start bank funds growing out in the form of GI loans and that the direct loan provision will be rendered more or less academic. Finally, I know that in my section, existing lending institutions will adequately do the job of servicing these veterans applications and I see no need for governmental intervention in this field.

Inflationary Effect of Interest Increase in Veterans' Housing Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2256) to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional funds for direct loans, to remove certain requirements with respect to the rate of interest on guaranteed loans; and for other purposes.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Chairman, citizens of Wisconsin have for many months been deeply concerned with the ever-increasing spiral in the cost of living. Inflation is becoming a major threat to the American economy. Inflation is brought about through ever-increasing prices of commodities and the resulting need for increased wages to permit working men and women to keep pace with the increased cost of living. This ceaseless price and wage increase has been a major cause of the high cost of living in America today.

We here in Congress have witnessed this year another cause of the inflationary spiral and in the months ahead it will become increasingly apparent to the people of the country that there are other factors contributing to the high cost of living besides higher wages and increased costs.

The Veterans' Administration was originally established as a means of enabling veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict to secure housing for themselves and their families at somewhat less than the full rate of interest. FHA financing was inaugurated to give all citizens assurance that they could provide housing for themselves and their families at a moderate cost. From the beginning, it has been understood that interest rates under FHA financing would be higher than interest rates under VA financing. We have, however, witnessed, especially in rural and urban areas, a virtual refusal of capital to enter into the VA program of financing. Banks, building and loan companies, and other financial institutions have and are refusing to make VA loans at the current interest rate of 4¾ percent. This rate is only one-half of 1 percent lower than the FHA interest rate and this rate has already been raised several several times by previous Congresses.

Each time that the VA interest rate has been raised, the FHA has followed suit by increasing the interest rate on FHA loans. We have no reason to believe that the present VA interest rate increase will be met with any different response by officials of the Federal Housing Administration and I predict that the one-half of 1 percent increase in the VA interest rate will result in a similar increase in FHA loans. This will bring FHA interest rates to 5¾ percent. The criminal part of the situation, however, is that when the Federal agency interest rates are upped, this increase is accepted by private bankers as a license to increase private interest rates to private borrowers from our Nation's banks and I predict that the 5¾ percent interest on FHA loans will, during the summer and fall of 1959, result in private interest rates to private borrowers, across the board, of 6½ percent.

This interest rate is too high. It is inflationary. It is increasing the cost of living. The borrower has less money left when making the loan than he had before—just as the housewife has fewer groceries in her shopping basket for the money spent than she had before. There have been three increases in the past 3 years and undoubtedly 1960 will see further demands by the bankers to increase—first, the VA interest rate, then the FHA interest rate, then the private loan interest rate.

It is true the bankers made little or no appearance before Congress. They did not need to—for they had the American Legion and some other veterans' organizations, not including the VFW, and the National Association of Building Contractors to fight their battle for them.

I view this increase in the cost of using money with alarm. I view it as such because it has a direct effect upon inflation which besets our economy. I view it as such because the very people who are complaining loudest about the cost-wage inflationary spiral are the same people who championed for the fourth time the interest inflationary spiral.

I am for loans for the veterans at a moderate cost. I do not consider 5¼ percent interest a moderate cost to a veteran. This is especially true when the veteran is required to pay from 2 to 11 points for the privilege of getting the veteran's loan. We have failed in granting this increase to hold the line against inflation.

I, like many others who voted for this bill, did so because it represents the only way Congress provided of enabling veterans to get any loans at all, and because the bill carried a direct loan provision of $300 million. This provision will enable veterans in rural and urban areas to secure loans. The money market in these areas has dried up and without this direct loan provision, the Veterans' Housing Act is of no value to veterans who do not live in the large centers of population.

Airline Accidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, another accident in the vicinity of La Guardia Airport. How long must we wait to get corrective legislative action? This plane could just as well have fallen in the congested areas of Queens County, resulting in untold suffering and devastation, not only to those traveling in the plane but also to those on the ground.

Previous hearings indicate that about 90 percent of plane accidents are the result of bad-weather flying. The present regulations are too liberal—they need strengthening. It is our obligation to take this matter under advisement and to provide such action.

The crash of the American Airliner in the East River on February 3 is but one of many accidents which have occurred in the New York area in recent years during inclement weather. To cite a few, in April 1952 five persons were killed and four houses were destroyed when a plane crashed in Jamaica, Queens County, after it missed its landing at Idlewild Airport; in October 1953 two persons were killed and others injured when a plane crashed while taking off in fog at La Guardia Airport; on December 18, 1954, an Italian DC–6–B airliner roared low over homes and densely populated areas in the vicinity of Idlewild Airport, not once but three times, and finally, on a fourth approach ripped into a Jamaica Bay pier, burst into flames, and sank in the water, killing 26 persons.

To elaborate on this crash in December 1954, the airliner left Boston in bad weather for Idlewild where the weather was rapidly closing in; when the plane arrived at New York the ceiling was just about 200 feet—the minimum ceiling, under present regulations, for landing; the pilot had to drop below this minimum in order to establish visual contact with the ground—one point we must bear in mind is that before a pilot can effectively land upon any landing strip, whether guided by instruments or not, he must establish visual contact with the ground.

Now, this most recent crash in New York reveals that the ceiling was 400 feet at the time of the crash. In a report titled "Sensory Illusions of Pilots," published several years ago by the Flight Safety Foundation, Chief Pilot P. P. Cocquyt of Belgium's Sabena Airline, said that an overwater approach robs a pilot of landmarks by which to judge altitude visually. He often believes he is higher than he actually is and the illusion will cause him to descend toward the runway lights at a steeper angle than is warranted. I think it is safe to assume that the pilot of this plane, acknowledged by the company to be "one of the finest pilots American Airlines has ever had," lost his depth perception.

Mr. Speaker, I have cited these cases to point up the need for legislation to establish by law safety regulations to stop these bad weather accidents.

As my colleagues know, I have in the past two Congresses introduced legislation to raise, by law, the minimum visibility requirements for takeoffs and landings at the airports in the New York area. I have again introduced this legislation, which I feel would do much to avoid some of the catastrophes which have happened in the past and which I have outlined above. These bills are H.R. 4179 and H.R. 4180 which have been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In addition, I have introduced House Resolution 162 to create a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the powers and functions of agencies over the operation of aircraft which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, time for talking has passed; it is time for action. I urge my colleagues to join me in urging these committees to act speedily on my bills. It is my firm conviction that they merit enactment.

Questionnaire by Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include an analysis of an opinion questionnaire which was sent out to the farmer-owner-directors and managers of 335 member cooperative elevator companies in the State of Iowa.

This questionnaire poll was conducted by the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa among its membership to obtain guidance in drafting resolutions for the association which would reflect the majority opinion of the members. More than 600 questionnaires, representing 32 percent of the member cooperative elevator companies throughout the State were completed and returned. Of important significance in the analysis of these returns is the following breakdown for the section of the questionnaire concerning the formulation of resolutions directed to the support of legislation to provide for a farm program:

1. The Farmers Grain Dealers Association should support a rigid farm program. Yes, 75 percent; no, 25 percent.

2. The Farmers Grain Dealers Association should support in-kind payments on idle acres. Yes, 79 percent; no, 21 percent.

3. The Farmers Grain Dealers Association should support emergency reserve. Yes, 97 percent; no, 3 percent.

4. The Farmers Grain Dealers Association should support a national agricultural board. Yes, 92 percent; no, 8 percent.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Youth Conservation Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Youth Conservation Act of 1959," prepared by myself, together with an editorial entitled "A New CCC?" published in the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune of January 14, 1959.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH CONSERVATION ACT OF 1959

(Statement by Senator MORSE, of Oregon)

It was most gratifying to me to read another fine editorial appearing in the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune. On January 14 this truly great newspaper of the State of Oregon contained an item entitled "A New CCC?" In it the editor of the Mail Tribune struck a note which I think that the Senate will hear time and time again in the coming months as newspaper after newspaper, the Nation over, joins the chorus of praise for the legislation to create a Youth Conservation Corps, introduced by the very able and humanitarian senior Senator from Minnesota. As a cosponsor of this proposed legislation, S. 812, I am proud to work with the Senator from Minnesota and with the other cosponsors, toward speedy enactment of the bill.

In the last analysis, as I have often reiterated upon the floor of the Senate, the basic wealth of the United States rests not alone upon the raw materials we have at our command, abundant though they be; nor is it to be found solely in the broad rivers which convey our goods to ocean ports, in our forests which mantle the slopes of our snow-capped mountains, in our wheat-golden farms, nor in our blossoming fruit orchards. These all have but a derivative value. No, the truth wealth of our country lies in our basic human resource, the boys and girls who will tomorrow be succeeding us in the trusteeship of our natural resources.

This being so, have we not a plain duty to arrange matters in such a fashion as will conserve this human resource, so that when our children assume the trust of land, water, and minerals in their time they will wisely preserve their inheritance and pass it on, not only undiminished but enhanced? How better can this be done than through a program which gives at first hand a knowledge of and love for our forests, streams, and wildlife?

The boy salvaged from the slums of our blighted metropolitan areas through the Youth Conservation Corps would gain insight into the truths expressed by the great poet when he caused his character to say:

"And this our life exempt from public haunt
Finds tongues in trees, books in the running brooks,
Sermons in stones and good in everything.
I would not change it."

The Medford Mail Tribune editorial wisely points out that the cost is small in comparison with the benefits which would accrue to the boy, the community, and the Nation, through the enactment of this legislation.

The forest-access road program, so urgently needed, would benefit immeasurably from the enactment of the Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1959. Forest-access roads pay for themselves over and over again. Our timber is a crop to be harvested. It is a tragic waste if it falls to decay. It is a hazard when it becomes tinder dry and ripe for fire. Far better that it be harvested at prime and used for homes. The Youth Conservation Corps, under skillful leadership of Forest Service and Park Service rangers and foremen, who would build the access roads, clear the underbrush, and improve our Federal forests, would profit by their growth in skills. Their health would be enhanced. They could contribute to the family income to feed their younger brothers and sisters; but, most of all, Mr. President, they would grow in understanding of the riches offered by our open spaces, crystal lakes, and fragrant forests. This is the experience which would instill a true love of country, to be passed on and treasured by the generations beyond.

It is my hope that this legislation will pass the Senate without dissenting vote when it is reported from committee. Passage by unanimous action would constitute a symbol of the determination of the Senate to develop our country through the aid we extend to the young men of America in the recreation of a Youth Conservation Corps.

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune, Jan. 14, 1959]

A NEW CCC?

A couple of years ago, after a jaunt into the woods with a group of foresters and outdoorsmen, we reported here on a discussion we'd heard about the possibility of forming something like the Civilian Conservation Corps of pre-World War II days.

Several of the men in the party had had experience with the boys who came west to take over the barracks camps, build roads and trails, construct forest recreation facilities, do reforestation work, build firebreaks and fight fires, and generally effect a double rehabilitation—that of the forests and that of themselves.

Frequently these lads were the products of the slums of the East, and often were "tough cookies" themselves—boys who today would be called juvenile delinquents.

A rather amazing percentage of them, if we are rightly informed, went on from the CCC into contructive, useful lives.

How much credit the corps can take for this record is, of course, subject to debate. But many men who watched the tough boys from the streets of New York or Chicago change gradually into men who knew something of the outdoors, something of life, something of their fellow men, and something of responsibility, will swear that it was the turning point in more lives than a few.

The possibility of reviving the CCC or something like it has been broached every so often since the war.

The latest to do so is Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, who advocates a Youth Conservation Corps, to provide employment for boys of 16 or over.

After reading HUMPHREY'S proposal, Bud Forrester of the Pendleton East Oregonian talked to one of that newspapers' employees who came to Oregon with the CCC in 1937, who stayed, and who became a responsible citizen. He told Bud:

"There are 12 or 14 of us in and near Pendleton now and all of the fellows have made good. They came out of New York and New Jersey and if they hadn't had the opportunity to leave there I'm afraid it would have been a different story.

"Most of those guys were tough. We had gang fights in the CCC camp here in the beginning. Every guy wanted to show how tough he was. But it wasn't very long before it all got straightened out. Eveyrbody liked his job. We realized that there wasn't any point in trying to prove how tough we were—that it didn't make any difference in this new setup. It was just the right thing for some tough guys from the big city."

And he added that he thought Senator HUMPHREY should add one provision to his proposal, that the boys enlisted in a YCC should first of all come from the slum areas of big cities. He said:

"They are the fellows who need help. The situation that many of those boys face is almost hopeless. Get them into the YCC first. Broaden the program later."

The proposal, on a national scale, is similar if not virtually identical to suggestions for young men's work camps in Oregon, except that the latter would enlist youngsters who had gotten into trouble, or were headed that way.

Such an organization wouldn't end juvenile delinquency overnight, or in any length of time, for the causes are too deep-seated in our society. But it would solve a lot of problems, particularly in the area of the tough guys who really shouldn't be sent to prison, nor yet should be set loose again with a wrist slap.

The costs of such a program would not be negligible, but when compared to the Federal military budget, say, they would amount to probably a tiny fraction of that total.

And who could calculate the good that would come out of it?

It would include the construction of Federal forest access roads, which are so badly needed to get out overripe timber; it would speed up the rehabilitation and construction of forest service and national park recreational facilities now so badly behind the demand, and it would provide the resources for much other work which would benefit the Nation on its Federal lands—work now going begging for lack of budget and personnel.

But most of all it would provide a place for young men to get into a relatively wholesome atmosphere, to gain self-respect, to learn the merits of a hard day's work.

YCC has much to be said for it.

The Need for a Two-Party System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a speech by Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of the Indianapolis Star and News and the Phoenix Republic and Gazette, made before a meeting of the California-Nevada Associated Press on February 5, 1959.

Mr. Pulliam presents a very penetrating analysis of the need for a distinct two-party system of Government and spotlights some of our present-day trends. I was so impressed with the concise and straightforward approach presented by Mr. Pulliam that I am asking to have the text of his speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a means of calling it to the further attention of the American people.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALIFORNIA-NEVADA ASSOCIATED PRESS MEETING

(Address by Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher, Indianapolis Start and News, Phoenix Republican and Gazette)

Members of the Associated Press of California and Nevada, special guests, ladies, and gentlemen, frankly, I didn't come here to make a speech. I came to talk as one newspaperman with other newspapermen about the most important responsibility we have—the responsibility of preserving the Republic and saving individual freedom for America. Freedom is our business. It is our most important business.

I particularly want to call your attention to some things that have happened to this country during the last year, and give you at least my opinion as to why they happened.

Any sound political observer must admit that President Eisenhower was elected in 1952 by the protest votes of unhappy Democrats. There just weren't enough active Republicans in that year to elect a President. The unhappy ones hoped for a reversal of the New-Deal-Fair-Deal-Trumanism trend, and a return to conservative, economical, honest government. But within a couple of years or so they began to feel betrayed.

During the last 5 or 6 years this country has been drifting toward a one-party system run by Washington bureaucrats. Just recently I was talking to President Eisenhower about this matter, and he asked me about Congress. I ask him to define the Republican Party, and told him that if he would define the Republican Party I would prove he was talking about the Democratic Party, and if he would define the Democratic Party I would prove to him that he was talking about the Republican Party. There are the same elements in both parties. Neither party stands for anything definite and unequivocal, and this is one of the most serious aspects of our national life. Frankly, I believe it has happened because the newspapers haven't been articulate enough in warning the American people of the dangers of a one-party system run from Washington.

On its record for the past 6 years, the Republican Party has stood for deficit spending, bigger budgets, higher taxes, more foreign giveaways, more appeasements to the Soviets, Federal aid to and control of the schools—in short, everything against which it was fighting from the days of the two deals until the American people got sick of the two deals and threw Harry Truman out of the White House. No wonder the Republican Party got dumped in the ashcan last fall. It is no longer a national party with definite principles. It has abandoned the very people who gave it power and position in this country for the first time in 20 years. It has helped tremendously in establishing a one-party system in Washington and thus cut the ground out from under its supporters in State and local governments.

And yet the Republican Party does not need to die of suicide, as it seems just about to do. It can fight and win, as BARRY GOLDWATER—the most vigorous, the most unyielding, the most courageous Republican of them all—fought and won in Arizona.

Facing the combined assault of the rich and powerful AFL–CIO organization, COPE, facing the challenge of a popular and experienced former majority leader in the U.S. Senate, facing abandonment by his own party in Washington, and facing a population of voters registered overwhelmingly Democratic—as they always are in Arizona—GOLDWATER met every challenge. He did not retreat 1 inch from the principles in which he believed. He made not one particle of compromise with the liberal line. He fought for the very things his party once fought for in 1952, when he was elected, and he won a smashing victory, a victory so big that he carried a relatively unknown Republican Governor into office with him.

How did he do it? A month before the campaign BARRY GOLDWATER was beaten. Every poll taken in the State indicated this, but we kept hammering, hammering, hammering every day. We proved that the AFL–CIO organization called COPE was in the State with plenty of money, trying to take over both the State and local government and, above all, beat GOLDWATER. Not until we aroused the people of Arizona to the danger of having a labor-socialist government in the county and State did they begin to respond. By election time you know what the result was—the most disastrous defeat ever suffered by the Democratic Party in Arizona. And that was because they had allowed COPE to come in and manage their campaigns for them.

I tell you these things for only one reason. The American people will do the right thing when they are told the truth, but you have to tell it to them day after day, day after day, day after day.

The tragedy of these last few years is that during this period of deterioration of the Republican Party, America has been drifting day by day toward a welfare state. There has been practically no organized or concerted opposition to the welfare state throughout the United States. Some newspapers oppose it consistently, others spasmodically, others not at all. Very few papers have paid attention to the great danger that faces this country when we degenerate into a one-party government. That's practically what we have now, because there is no difference between the Republican and Democratic Party as far as their governmental objectives are concerned. They are both dedicated to some type of welfare state.

I hold no brief whatever for the Republican Party. I have supported the Republican Party and I have fought the Republican Party, but as long as the Socialist leaders of labor are hell-bent on controlling the Democratic Party, the only effective opposition must come from the Republican Party. In other words, I think it is our job as newspapermen in our effort to save this Republic to constantly, day by day, reiterate the importance of a two-party system and to stimulate the Republican Party to adopt a set of principles which are completely antiwelfare and anti-Socialist, in order that the people of this country may have a choice between a labor-Socialist government and a traditional American government. As I have said before, the people of this country will always do the right thing when they know the facts and are aroused to their own responsibility. Frankly, they take government for granted. They have been disgusted with the trend toward welfarism, but they really don't take time to do anything about it. It is our job to stir them up and make them understand that they must do something about it if they are to maintain individual freedom.

In the early 1900's, the New York bankers and the railroad presidents ran this country with an iron hand. The people finally rose up in rebellion and stamped out that dictatorship. Today our fight is with a group of highly intelligent but selfish bureaucrats in Washington and the Socialist-labor leaders of the country who are determined to turn our Government into a welfare state. As newspaper people we had to arouse the public to fight the railroad presidents and the bankers. Today it is our job to do the same thing—to arouse the people to the danger of a bureaucratic dictatorship in Washington, which leads to totalitarian government.

Another very grave danger has developed in this country, with some, but not too effective, opposition. And that is the definite objective of the Supreme Court to take over the legislative functions of the Government.

The Socialist-labor leaders are so exultant over their victory in the 1958 election that they are now determined to force a repeal of section 14–B of the Taft-Hartley law and thus nullify the right-to-work laws now in effect in 19 States.

This raises the question: Does the Congress have the power to prohibit such rights to the States?

When Senator Taft and Representative Hartley included section 14–B in their labor control law, they were simply acknowledging a State right which already existed. They granted no special sovereignty, because that sovereignty had already been established in the Federal Constitution. The Congress has no power to grant nor to prohibit the powers given to the States in the 10th amendment.

It is quite another matter, however, when we consider what politically inspired courts might have to say about the rights of the States. The American Bar Association and the Conference of Chief Justices of the States have been so alarmed that they felt impelled to rebuke the U.S. Supreme Court for decisions considered to be far more political than judicial. It is very obviously possible that the political courts, under the pressure of socialist-labor union bosses, might ignore the 10th amendment and render decisions which would emasculate the constitutional powers of the States.

The honorable Justices of the Supreme Court should remember that the laws and court decisions must stand the test of public approval and support. The 18th amendment, the prohibition amendment, was rendered ineffectual and finally repealed because it lacked the support of the American majority.

The people, after all, are the court of last resort and no judges, however they may be affected by delusions of power, can withstand the frowning disapproval of the people. It should be insisted then that the Congress has no power to nullify right-to-work laws in 19 States and that courts have no constitutional authority for upholding such an emasculator of States rights.

And this applies to all States rights—not only to the right to work. We have to maintain the integrity, the sovereignty, and the rights of the States if we are going to preserve the Republic.

So again I say to you that freedom is our business. It is our business to protest against this usurping power of the courts to make laws. The people must understand just what the Supreme Court is doing to the States and to the Constitution of the United States, and they won't understand it if we, as newspapermen, remain passively silent.

Thomas Jefferson, probably the wisest statesman America ever produced, recognized the great responsibility of newspapers and also what happens when people are not informed. He made this very dramatic statement, "Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government,

I would not hesitate to prefer the latter—newspapers without a government," because he knew newspapers, properly operated and dedicated to the public good, would keep the public informed and the Republic would be preserved.

The American press is the real backbone of liberty in this country. It represents the very depths and sinews of freedom in America. If we continue to maintain our fierce independence regardless of party affiliations, if we continue to resist the coddling and courting and flattery to which too many spineless eastern newspapers have capitulated, then freedom in America will be safe—safe in your hands. The preservation of a free America through a free press is more important than any other thing any of us can do. It is the finest, the ultimate service we can offer to our family, our State, our country, and our God.

Soviet communism certainly is a great threat to the American Republic. It is a great threat to the American people, but we can lick communism only if we keep America free and alert. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and that is something we've got to tell our people day after day after day after day.

Has it ever occurred to you that, while the United States is drifting into some type of Socialist welfare state Russia is backing away from the actual practices of Socialist philosophy?

The progress which Russia has made in economic and industrial development is in almost exact ratio to her withdrawal from Socialist concepts of government.

Collective farming is being supplanted by incentive farming. Scientists and industrial workers and professional people are being given individual rewards for outstanding service. This is all contrary to socialism, but as Russia abandons socialism she is moving forward economically and industrially, while we are drifting downward into a socialized abyss.

How long will it take the American people to learn that 5,000 years of history prove that socialism has failed miserably in every country where it has been adopted? The Russians have discovered this, but so far our Washington bureaucrats and world planners are blind to the truth.

Low morals and excessive taxation have destroyed every civilization since man organized himself into collective society. Study all of them—almost without exception they were destroyed from within rather than from without. They are destroyed by taxation upon taxation, until people lose their incentive, their initiative, and the whole morale of the nation disappears. This is a lesson we must learn. This is a lesson we must tell our readers. Federal bureaucracy is a far greater danger to the life and future of this Republic than is that of Communist domination—even though that at the moment is still very, very serious.

Today America stands alone, the only free country left in all the world. Blessed to have such a beachhead, as newspapermen we should be proud to do battle for our God and for our faith in freedom. If America remains free, the things we hold dear and all our bright hopes for the future are secure. If we preserve and protect our freedom, then sometime, someway, somehow, America, being free, will show the rest of the world the road to freedom. This is the mission, this is the crusade which I urge on you now as newspapermen, with all your initiative and all your courage, to assume as your own. This is the divine mission of America—freedom for ourselves and eventually freedom for all the world in which the spirit of the Lord will abide.

So I salute you, American newspapermen, on your opportunities as American ambassadors for freedom. Wherever you go, whatever you write, and with whomever you come in contact, remember that America is great only because America is free.

New Parole System in Texas Saves Money and, More Important, Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a new professional parole supervision system has recently gone into effect in Texas, and I believe it to be a progressive step in the field of rehabilitation of convicts.

It is estimated the new plan will save the State $1,250,000 in 2 years. However, I feel the new plan will save a commodity much more important—the lives of men.

Under the system set up by Texas' 55th Legislature, the requirements for the men who must administer the program were stiffly set. This will insure men of quality who will not only deal fairly with the parolees, but will conscientiously try to help them and their families. The good works which parole officers elsewhere have accomplished with patience and understanding are legion.

In addition, there is a supplementary system whereby local citizens volunteered to work with the parolees. As of the first of last year, there were 2,700 parolees out under the volunteer system. An additional 1,400 have been released under the professional system, for a total of 4,100. Of these, only 260 were returned to prison. This means more than 3,800 parolees have been returned to society. Certainly some will again run afoul of the law, but I feel these figures show most of them will abide by the law if given the chance. I am glad to say the Texas program is giving many convicts the chance to return to contributing lives outside.

Mr. President, I have a special interest in this program due to my 5 years experience as a district judge at Austin, Tex., and a member of the juvenile board of Travis County. Based on that experience, I led the way in advocating a State parole system in Texas staffed by professional officers and made more than 1,500 speeches in Texas between the years 1952 and 1957, advocating the system which has been set up.

And I feel special congratulations are due the State parole officers for their tireless, dedicated efforts to help their fellow men who have made mistakes, and to the legislature for establishing the program, and to the State board of pardon and paroles for its cooperation.

Mr. President, in recognition of the work being done by these men and women, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Milton Turner which was published in the Beaumont Enterprise for February 2, 1959, telling the story of Henry Kirby Pitts, one of the dedicated State parole officers, under the heading "Professional Parole Officers Serve Offenders at Less Expense to the State."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFESSIONAL PAROLE OFFICERS SERVE OFFENDERS AT LESS EXPENSE TO STATE

(By Milton Turner)

Jefferson County and the rest of Texas now has a professional parole supervision program designed for greater public protection and economy. Since Texas' crime problem has grown more rapidly than the population this program has become a vital State project.

Tall Henry Kirby Pitts, 27, of Kountze, may look more like an all-American basketball player than a State probation officer, but he opened the first State probation office in this area on April 21, 1958.

SIX-COUNTY AREA

Operating from his headquarters in the basement of Jefferson County Courthouse he has charge of six counties, including Jefferson, Hardin, Tyler, Newton, Jasper, and Orange. He makes personal contact with an average of 150 to 200 parolees each month and keeps tab on others by telephone and mail.

In his role as State probation officer he must, at times, be judge, officer, friend, chaplain, psychologist, and adviser to parolees and their families. Not only does he keep close tab on the location, conduct, and condition of his charges but, upon request, check on parolees from other States.

STATE BOARD ACTS

Before the State board of pardons and paroles will release a convict on parole he must show that he has a place to live and a job waiting him on his release. It falls on the shoulders of Officer Pitts to get this information and return it to the board in report form.

It is well to remember that a parole is not forgiveness for an offense, nor is it a pardon given an inmate. It is simply a means for a deserving inmate to serve the remaining portion of his sentence outside prison walls.

If he fails to live up to the conduct expected of him, he is returned to prison. The results of a parole officer's investigation is the deciding factor in an inmate's release or reincarceration.

When the 55th State legislature appropriated funds to set up the present professional system consisting of a director, 4 supervisors, and 40 parole officers, it took into consideration that the Texas prison system was filled to capacity.

Parole is cheaper, and the legislators reasoned, by using professional probation officers citizens would be better protected and parolees would have a better chance of making a success of their freedom.

VOLUNTEERS SUPPLEMENTED

The former volunteer system where local citizens contributed their time and effort to work with parolees has not been discontinued but supplements the present system.

Under the volunteer system only 750 parolees could be release in 1957. As of January 1, 1958, there were 2,700 parolees out under the volunteer system. The same year the professional system made is possible to release an additional 1,400 parolees making a total of 4,100 parolees in the State.

Of that figure 260 were returned to prison due to new felonies and other parole violations. It is estimated that at the end of 2 years the State will realize a net saving of

$1,250,000 after all parole costs have been deducted.

The division of parole supervision which operated under the State board of pardons and paroles is divided into three State areas including southeast, northeast, and southwest. There are 20 district offices.

Requirement for parole officers are necessarily stiff. For the job which pays a maximum salary of $400 a month, officers must be between the ages of 26 to 55. They must have completed 4 years in an accredited college, have had 2 years experience in correctional work, education, personnel or social work.

District State parole officer Pitt surpasses even these standards. A 1947 graduate of Kountze High School, he matriculated at Lamar Tech and in 1956 received his bachelor of arts degree from the University of Texas. A former State highway patrolman he is now working part time on his master's degree in educational counseling.

Rural Electrification Administration Doing a Good Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration has filed a very enlightening and comprehensive report covering the activities of that agency for the fiscal year 1958. In connection with the submission of said report, I enclose the following letter received by me from Mr. David A. Hamil, Administrator of REA, giving a concise breakdown of the subject matter of the report:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOEVEN: Attached is a copy of my report on the activities of the Rural Electrification Administration during fiscal year 1958, a year in which important progress was achieved in helping rural people get more and better electric and telephone service.

In both our electric and telephone programs loan needs were met fully.

During 1958 REA's electric borrowers connected more than 115,000 unserved rural establishments, raising the total number of consumers served to more than 4.5 million. They installed more than 200,000 kilowatts of new generating capacity. On and off the farm, rural consumers used more electricity, increasing purchases 8.7 percent over fiscal year 1957.

To enable rural electric systems to meet this growing demand, my office approved during 1958 a total of $241,636,869 in electric loans, bringing total loans since inception of the program to more than $3.77 billion.

REA electric borrowers continued to grow in financial strength and responsibility. During 1958 their principal and interest payments pushed total payments made since the start of the program to over $1 billion. More than $128 million of this sum represented payments made in advance of due dates. Four borrowers—an alltime low—were delinquent in payments more than 30 days as of June 30, 1958. And at the end of calendar 1957, the net worth of electric borrowers amounted to 14.9 percent of their total assets.

In REA's rural telephone program, borrowers chalked up new construction records and had connected 693,831 subscribers by June 30, 1958. Nearly one-third of these subscribers had telephone service for the first time, and almost two-thirds had their first dial service.

Rural telephone systems received 216 loans totaling more than $89 million during fiscal 1958—another record. Total loans from the start of the program came to more than $478 million. When construction is completed, these loans will provide modern telephone service to 1,020,454 subscribers.

During the year telephone borrowers made payments to REA totaling more than $5.5 million. At yearend, 48 borrowers had a balance with REA of $709,920 in advance payments. The number of borrowers delinquent more than 30 days in their payments was reduced to 15 at the end of the fiscal year.

Sincerely,

DAVID A. HAMIL,
Administrator.

Legislation Amending the Federal Airport Act So as To Extend the Time for Making Grants for Community Airports Should Be Approved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this morning I appeared before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in support of legislation amending the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants and so forth.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 9, 1959, IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO EXTEND THE FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

Mr. Chairman, as one who introduced a bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants and so forth, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before this committee in support of such legislation.

As many of you know, I represent the 20th District of Pennsylvania, comprising the counties of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield, and in this area the communities of Altoona, DuBois, Philipsburg, and State College are interested in the legislation now under consideration.

For your information, Altoona is served by the Altoona-Blair County Airport located at Martinsburg, Pa.

At this moment the airport is undergoing expansion, and it is estimated that at least another $315,000 of Federal assistance will be needed to complete the modernization program.

In the case of DuBois, Pa., the airport is under construction at this time with an estimated $300,000 in Federal funds being needed to complete the airport and make it operational.

At Philipsburg, Pa., the Black Moshannon Airport will need at least $100,000 in Federal funds to complete badly needed improvements including a terminal building, and so forth.

At State College, Pa., the site of the Pennsylvania State University, according to communications I have received, the sum of $100,000 in Federal funds will be needed to expand an existing and inadequate airport.

Mr. Chairman, in my three-county area the need of modern airports is acute.

The area is mountainous and what rail service we enjoyed the past many years is rapidly diminishing due to the curtailment of passenger service.

In the wintertime—and our winters are lengthy—travel by highway is precarious.

With the area being serviced by Allegheny Airlines, to obtain full enjoyment we need adequate airport facilities.

The communities which sponsor these airports through an airport authority organized for that purpose find it impossible even with State aid to finance the expansion and construction of airports.

Therefore, without Federal assistance the program of airport construction and expansion will come to a standstill.

It is for that reason I am appearing before this committee in support of legislation to extend the Federal Airport Act.

Engine of Overproduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Raymond F. Mikesell, a leading economist, is Miner professor of economics at the University of Oregon in my hometown, Eugene, Oreg. Professor Mikesell was quoted in the following editorial from the New York Times for January 6, 1959, and I include it here by unanimous consent, with respect to a problem which this Congress must squarely face as soon as possible:

ENGINE OF OVERPRODUCTION

In the period of 16 months between July 1, 1957, and October 31, 1958, the Commodity Credit Corporation disposed of surplus farm products whose cost to the Government had been $4,207 million. Proceeds of their sale, however, were only $2,956 million, a return of roughly 70 cents to the dollar. Stated another way, the loss to the Government in these transactions, which involve buying up farm commodities at the artifically supported domestic price and selling them for what they can bring in the world market, came to $1,251 million.

Now, if the effect of that expenditure had been to reduce by $4,207 million a Government-held surplus accumulated over a period of years, and if we could count upon similar progress in the years immediately ahead, then it might perhaps be economically and socially justified. But such was not the case. On the contrary, the figures just released by the U.S. Department of Agriculture reveal that over this same period of 16 months the CCC's price support inventory actually rose from $5,372 million to $5,576 million.

Prof. Raymond F. Mikesell, in a recent study, "Agricultural Surpluses and Export Policy," prepared for the American Enterprise Association, points out that rapid and unpredicted shifts in demand and supply conditions may create temporary surpluses

in which the Government may intervene to cushion their impact upon prices and ease the process of readjustment. So far as American agriculture is concerned the most important single element making for a shift of this kind is to be seen in the fact that between 1940 and 1955 output per man-hour alone increased by 88 percent. But when the Government's intervention results, as in this case, not in a temporary farm crop surplus but in the indefinite continuation of surpluses, notes Professor Mikesell, it can no longer be regarded as a readjustment program. "Thus," he observes, "the foreign disposal programs are a regular outlet for current overproduction. In fact, the disposal programs have become an engine for continuing overproduction."

Visit to Washington, D.C., by Students and Faculty Members of St. Martin's Episcopal High School, Metairie, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL B. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it was my pleasure several days ago to have as my guests in the Senate a group of students and faculty members from St. Martin's Episcopal High School in Metairie, La.; which is a suburb of the city of New Orleans.

St. Martin's Episcopal High School is fairly new to the New Orleans educational scene, having been founded in 1950. However, it is already the largest private school in metropolitan New Orleans. St. Martin's must be one of the few high schools in the United States to have all the members of the last three graduating classes enrolled in universities throughout the country. With this record, its standards are obviously of the highest order.

As part of its general educational program, the graduating class of 1959 made a trip to Washington between semesters for the primary purpose of giving the students an opportunity, before completing their secondary education, to visit some of the important centers of government activity in the country. During their visit to the Capitol, they were able to see the actual operation of our body and to observe at firsthand the procedures which are followed by the Nation's lawmakers in handling the many problems which confront us today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the names of the students of St. Martin's Episcopal High School and their chaperones who visited Washington.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chaperones: Mr. Ellsworth O. VanSlate, headmaster of St. Martin's, Mrs. Ellsworth O. VanSlate, Mrs. Robert Bowers, and Mrs. Carleton Schupp.

Students: Pete Smith, Jim Hitchcock, Mack Kennington, Chip Favrot, Bob Head, Stan Ligon, Randy Nockton, Bruce Cornay, Holland Collins, Larry Haas, Jimmy Williams, Jay Schupp, Eddie Ellzey, Ingersoll Jordan, Robert Bowers, Walter Drake, Philip Tiller, Susan Dean, Dana Suggs, Susan Vreeland, Carolyn Wirth, Lynne Hall, Sara Hogue, Paddy Livaudais, Leigh Moise, Cathy Brawner, Sally Heyerdale, Merle Morrow, Ellen Ryan, Eleanor Faulk, Wing Sinnott, Dixie DeLong, Sue Fulks, Kathleen Ross, Sue Kerlin, Gwynne Bowman, Jeannette Boykin, Carolee Andrews, Barbara Mayo, and Taffy Yeargain.

Senate Act Usurps Power of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. George Rothwell Brown appeared in last Sunday's New York Journal-American, February 8, 1959.

The powers of the House of Representatives on all moneys to be appropriated are very clearly spelled out in the Constitution that we have all sworn to uphold 1 short month ago.

At this time in our history we can ill afford to have the powers of either body of the Congress curtailed or infringed on in any way:

SENATE ACT USURPS POWER OF THE HOUSE
(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON.—By an extraordinary usurpation of power, the Senate last week passed a Federal housing bill that increased President Eisenhower's estimates by $1 billion, and knocked a $135 million hole in the current budget.

The bill enacted by a reckless "liberal" Republican and Democratic coalition, was both an appropriation bill and in some features a tax bill.

Under the Constitution's provisions regarding all money bills, this highly inflationary raid on a balanced budget, if presented at all, should have originated in the House of Representatives.

Instead it unconstitutionally originated in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and was then for purely political reasons hurriedly rushed through the Senate before the House had begun even considering its own bill.

If this bill properly could have originated at the Senate it should have been considered first, and reported, by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Instead the Appropriations Committee was bypassed. But this was not all. The Senate also by the same dubious procedure bypassed the House Ways and Means Committee, the House Appropriations Committee, and the House itself.

When the bill was passed by the Senate Thursday, and was sent over to the House, the Appropriations Committee of that body was bypassed again, and the bill which would commit the taxpayers to a cost of $2,675 million over a 6-year period, was referred for consideration to the Banking and Currency Committee.

This is a free-loading, free-spending, welfare-state committee. Thus the Appropriations Committee, which is supposedly the watchdog of the House, was ignored.

The housing bill shifted the appropriations function of Congress to a sidetrack and laid down a secret pipeline directly into the U.S. Treasury through technical loans.

The clever scheme of sneaking into the Treasury vaults, as it were, through the coal hole, when nobody was looking, began about 20 years ago. The matter has now become a very great abuse, crying loudly for reform.

The Democratic Party in the Senate cut $225 million from the original Sparkman housing bill, partly to evade the spendthrift tag that is being placed on it, and partly to escape a possible presidential veto.

It is now up to the Democratic leadership of the House, where there is a threat of an even greater raid through the Treasury's coal-hole pipeline, to keep the Housing Act of 1959 within the sane bounds laid down by the President, and avert the peril of runaway inflation to which it opens wide the door.

Hon. J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas, Brings International Reputation as Patron of Scholars to Chairmanship of Foreign Relations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the United States is fortunate indeed that it has a man of the competence, training, vigor, and good judgment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to take over the vital responsibilities that go with chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee at this critical time in our history. In addition to his committee experience, the Senator from Arkansas has another outstanding asset to contribute to the Nation in his important role in our foreign relations. This is the symbolism associated with his name throughout the world through the Fulbright scholarships program. This association is indeed a most fortunate one for the Nation. The Fulbright scholarships have been a tremendously effective and constructive force in developing and cementing good understanding and friendly relations in many areas of the world. Indeed, this program has been one of the most successful ventures of the Government of this country in the eyes of the men and women in other countries who share the major responsibility for leadership and government.

The merits of the Fulbright scholarship program are set forth in an unusually well informed and thoughtful article which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on Friday, February 6. This article, by Mr. Gerald Kloss, gives full

recognition to the fortunate contribution to our foreign relations which the chairman's association with the Fulbright scholarships makes at this time. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE'S MR. SCHOLARSHIP—J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, OF ARKANSAS, NEW FOREIGN RELATIONS HEAD, IS KNOWN INTERNATIONALLY THROUGH STUDENT EXCHANGE PROGRAM

(By Gerald Kloss)

Senator-J. (for JAMES) WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, new chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, enjoys one distinction that no other living American politician can match: His name has become part of the language.

The word "FULBRIGHT" is not yet spelled without a capital letter, but over most civilized parts of the globe it is practically a synonym for an American Government-sponsored college scholarship. Since 1946, when Senator FULBRIGHT pushed through a bill for a student-exchange program, about 16,000 American students, researchers, and teachers have gone abroad on "Fulbrights" and 15,000 foreign students from 31 countries have come to schools here. Not even the Marshall plan or Truman doctrine have achieved a closer identification with their authors.

A good many Fulbright scholars call on the Senator when they visit Washington, much as one would say thanks to a host upon leaving a party. FULBRIGHT regretfully has had to cut some of these visits short—"I haven't time for them all; I have to be a Senator, too."

He will have less time than ever from now on, for this week he started one of the most important and responsible jobs in the country, replacing the 91-year-old Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, as head of the Foreign Relations Committee. Under FULBRIGHT'S leadership, the committee is expected to take an even larger role in shaping American foreign policy.

For several years FULBRIGHT has been one of the Senate's sharpest critics of the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy, scourging the administration particularly for its lack of initiative. He has urged greater flexibility in handling the Berlin crisis and has attacked Dulles for refusing "to get off dead center" in dealing with Red China and Russia.

He has been outspoken in other fields, too. While still a freshman Senator, he calmly suggested that President Truman resign and let a Republican take over the White House in order to prevent a politically split Government following the Republican sweep in the 1946 congressional elections. Truman frostily ignored the advice, as did President Eisenhower when FULBRIGHT made the same suggestion after the Democratic victory in the 1954 congressional elections.

HE OPPOSED SENATOR M'CARTHY

Even more spectacular was his stand against Senator McCarthy of Wisconsin in the heyday of the latter's era. Convinced that McCarthy was doing the Nation a vast disservice, FULBRIGHT voted against a further appropriation for the McCarthy subcommittee on investigations early in 1954—the only Senator to do so. He also lined up votes and directed policy in the censure resolution that tumbled McCarthy from power.

For all his candor, however, the 53-year-old Arkansan also has been tagged the Senate's most reluctant gladiator. According to Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, FULBRIGHT is a child of the 18th century—a throwback to that age of enlightment, trust in reason, temperate argument and slightly aristocratic tendencies.

A handsome, blue-eyed man who keeps in trim by golf and frequent workouts in the Senate gymnasium, FULBRIGHT starred as an athlete and as a scholar in college.

At the University of Arkansas, which he entered at 16, he was captain of the tennis team, first president of the student government and a 60-minute halfback on the football team. In one game, against Southern Methodist in 1922, he gained 20 yards on a fake pass play, passed for a touchdown, ran 40 yards on a punt return and dropkicked a field goal, leading his team to a 9–0 victory.

Graduated from Arkansas at 19 with a straight A average and a Phi Beta Kappa key, FULBRIGHT then spent 3 years at Oxford as a Rhodes scholar, studying modern history, playing tennis and rugby and touring Europe. He continued his studies on this side of the Atlantic, getting a law degree at George Washington University in 1934.

After serving briefly as a Government attorney in the Justice Department and teaching at George Washington, he returned to the University of Arkansas in 1936 as a law professor. When the university president was killed in an accident in 1939, FULBRIGHT was named the new president. At 34 he was the youngest State university head in the United States.

His academic career ended in spectacular fashion 2 years later—he was fired. The new Governor of the State, Homer Adkins, had been opposed by the Fulbright family newspaper, the Northwest Arkansas Times of Fayetteville. Governor Adkins fired the college president after FULBRIGHT emphatically refused to resign.

A year later he made his first try for public office, running for the House of Representatives from the Arkansas Third District. He won easily, piling up the biggest margin of votes in three decades.

Flouting the tradition that freshmen in Congress should be seen and not heard, FULBRIGHT leaped into national prominence in 1943 by introducing a 55-word resolution favoring U.S. participation in a world organization for peace. The House adopted the Fulbright resolution that fall, and the Senate followed suit 2 months later, assuring the world that America would not retreat into isolation after World War II, as it had after World War I.

Running for the Senate in 1944, FULBRIGHT topped a 4-man field by 32,000 votes—1 of his opponents, by the way, was Governor Adkins. He was reelected in 1950 and 1956 without opposition. He professes to have no eye for office beyond the Senate—"the end, the total of my political ambitions."

Senate observers have a hard time fitting FULBRIGHT into a niche, either as a politician or as a man.

A liberal in international affairs, he generally takes the conservative side on domestic matters. On the touchy problem of school integration—especially touchy for a Senator from a State the capital of which is Little Rock—FULBRIGHT has lined up with the southern bloc. He calls himself a "constitutional traditionalist" in civil-rights questions, and feels that the Supreme Court was wrong in trying to change a whole social pattern through a single Court decision.

He favored the controversial Dixon-Yates power contract and sponsored a bill exempting natural gas producers from Federal rate control. In labor matters he has frequently voted wrong, according to the AFL–CIO, but the unions do not consider him a labor baiter.

Similarly, FULBRIGHT has broken with his party on certain occasions, such as his celebrated suggestion that President Truman—of all people—resign in 1946. FULBRIGHT'S investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1950–51, as chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee, gave the Republicans potent political ammunition, with the uncovering of the mink-coat and deep-freeze scandals in the Democratic administration.

SWINISH BLIGHT OF OUR TIME

Although FULBRIGHT disdains the backslapping approach to politics—some of his Senate colleagues refer to him as "the professor"—he has shown a good sense of timing and a high degree of skill in political maneuvering. One such occasion was when his student-exchange bill came up for a vote in the Senate in 1946.

His bill provided that funds for the scholarship program come from the sale of military surplus abroad—the money, of course, was in foreign currency and had to be spent abroad. This provision removed the curse of financing the program directly out of Treasury funds. Even so, FULBRIGHT learned that Senator McKellar, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, was against the bill, and his opposition might well kill it.

So FULBRIGHT quietly got the backing of both party leaders in the Senate and did not bring up the bill for passage until McKellar happened to be off the floor. Then he called it up as a routine measure, announcing that it had the approval of both party leaders. The bill passed with no trouble.

Education has been one of FULBRIGHT'S primary concerns in his Senate career—he told an interviewer last year that the student-exchange program "is the thing that reconciles me to all the difficulties of political life. He has carried the lance time after time against what calls the swinish blight so common in our time, the blight of anti-intellectualism.

Some critics, of course, have pointed out that FULBRIGHT'S stand on school integration hardly squares with his fervent appeals for higher educational standards in the United States. That aside, the honorable Member from Arkansas is considered one of the most brilliant men in the Senate. Senator McCarthy once angrily dubbed him Senato "Halfbright" because of his opposition to the McCarthy investigations. Nobody has used the pun since then.

National Spending and National Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on January 31, written by E. F. Hutton whose column is entitled "Think It Through." It represents a brief review of the attitude of the American Farm Bureau Federation toward national spending and national income. I strongly endorse their position and commend to the attention of Members of Congress the farmers' feeling as focused by Mr. Hutton.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THINK IT THROUGH

(By E. F. Hutton)

At Lexington in 1775 the embattled farmers stood and fired a shot heard around the world.

In 1958 at nearby Boston the embattled farmers fired another round. It was the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the largest farm organization, representing 1,600,000 farm families.

Those who think the old American spirit of Lexington and Concord has gone over the hill, would have been cheered by the speeches and resolutions of this notable convention of working farmers.

They were in rebellion against the whole trend of misgovernment for lo, these many years. They called for a balanced budget, reduced Federal spending, severe curbs on labor monopolies and the elimination of Federal controls on agricultural products at the earliest possible date.

The president of the federation, Charles Shuman, is convinced that without price fixing since the war ended, all agriculture would be better off.

A New Hampshire delegate said, "Every time you send $10 to Washington, you get 50 cents back, after passing through 21 different offices, in each of which there are 33 bureaucrats, all of them not doing anything."

The president of a State bureau brought down the house with, "There is a surplus of jackasses in this country and nine of them are on the Supreme Court."

Rough talk—but easily understood.

Something is cooking in the farm kitchens.

And, as Patrick Henry said, "If this be treason——" you know what.

Now or Never

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Star of February 8, under the interesting caption "Now or Never."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

NOW OR NEVER

Several days ago Budget Director Stans said that if the Federal budget is not balanced this year it will never be balanced. This, we believe, is a correct estimate of the Nation's fiscal outlook, and it is against this background that one should appraise the maneuvering in Congress over the bills to provide Federal funds for housing and airports.

There are those, of course, who don't believe in balanced Federal budgets. Others may be more interested in finding a political issue than in appropriate airport and housing aid. These are a minority, however. Most of the members of Congress, we assume, are genuinely interested in and concerned with drawing the line at the right point between necessary Federal aid and unnecessary Federal spending.

Thus, the Democratic housing bill was trimmed somewhat in the Senate and it has been cut back even harder by a House banking subcommittee. Even so, it calls for spending about $100 million more than recommended by the President.

The airport bill, as passed by the Senate, also reflects a modest retreat on the part of the leadership. But it still calls for substantially more spending than provided for in the budget, and it retains what we think are undesirable provisions for use of Federal money in building airport facilities which are not directly related to flying and flight safety.

This cannot be viewed as strictly a partisan matter, although the Democratic vote on final rollcall was 50 for and 5 against. For on this same vote 13 Republicans were recorded as for the bill and 17 against. In earlier votes on proposals to reduce the total outlay the Republicans were able to muster somewhat more strength.

The opposition arguments were summed up by Senator COTTON, Republican, of New Hampshire, when he said the total authorization "unbalances the budget, invites extravagance, and saps Federal money from the most vital of all programs—air safety."

The President, who vetoed a similar bill last year, will weigh the final versions of both the housing and the airport bills in the light of the uses which would be made of the money and their effect on the budget. In their present form these bills would produce a deficit in a budget which, at best, is precariously balanced. So Mr. Eisenhower will have to decide whether to approve these breakthroughs, and thereby pave the way for further and perhaps more serious breaches. If he approves, Mr. Stans' prophecy will be well on the way toward fulfillment.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, the Members of this body are all aware, I know, of the serious threat of inflation in our own United States.

The Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram of January 29, 1959, briefly outlines the course of inflation as it occurs in some countries other than our own. The warning is clear and obvious.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VICIOUS CIRCLE OF INFLATION

With some of our South American friends, it seems, inflation is a way of life. Few of them really like it, we understand, and many of them are quite militant in their opposition to it and those who perpetrate it, as shown by the violence that often results in changes in heads of states. But apparently governments, new or old, know no other course to follow.

One observer on the scene down there sends us this candid report on how the inflationary cycle works in some South American countries:

1. Printing is the first step, he says. In order to encourage productivity in the factory and on the farm, governments need money. So most of it is simply printed.

2. Spending is the second phase of the cycle. Fresh from the printing presses, the crisp, new money goes out from state banks to develop public and private enterprises.

3. Price rise is the third phase. The larger quantity of money in circulation serves to bid up the cost of goods and services. When labor finds prices rising, it strikes and riots, threatening political stability.

4. Wage rise comes next. In order to regain labor's support, politicians raise wages. Both prices and wages have then reached new levels.

5. Next comes devaluation of the currency. The rising cost of goods and labor serves to price exports out of foreign markets. Governments must then devalue their currencies in relation to the dollar in order to cheapen exports.

Then the cycle starts all over again at the printing presses.

Apparently the only ones who benefit from such a vicious circle as this are the politicans who manage to stay in office by hoodwinking the public, which has become demoralized and confused through successive inflationary cycles. Strange that they should be so foolish, and strange, too, that we up north who live in glass houses are still inclined to throw stones.

Spend and Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared under date of February 6, in the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star, entitled "Spend and Tax."

SPEND AND TAX

The public is not unmindful of the soundness of the position President Eisenhower has taken in challenging Democratic spenders in Congress to provide new taxes to pay for their reckless spending programs. That would be the straightforward way, the President said, to whether the country really wants these programs.

The President hurled the challenge as both Houses of Congress were rushing to put through housing legislation which would sweep aside the administration's balanced budget. The Democrats are making it clear that they prefer inflation to a hold-the-line policy on spending.

President Eisenhower declared that neither he nor the American people want higher taxes, the way to avoid higher taxes he pointed out, is for the Government to live within its income and avoid unnecessary expenditures.

For their own protection, Americans by the millions should answer the President's plea for public support in his fight for economy in Government and preservation of his balanced budget. The spending zeal of the Democratic-controlled Congress should arouse the ire of the taxpayers. They are the ones who have to pay the bills.

President Eisenhower and the out-numbered Republican forces in Congress can win the fight for economy if the public stands with them. The force of public opinion can provide the reinforcements necessary to beat back the spenders.

The President's challenge to Congress applies not only to housing but to all other reckless spending programs that are churning in the legislative hopper. The President is leading the fight that must be made for fiscal responsibility and economic stability. It should be everyone's fight.

Beardless Grant Eyes Vicksburg Fete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am sure most Members are aware that the Congress created a Civil War Centennial Commission 2 years ago. This Commission has been actively engaged in forming plans to commemorate the War Between the States.

Gen. U. S. Grant III, was wisely selected to be the head of this Commission.

As a member of this Commission I firmly believe we should commemorate many of the important events of this conflict.

I append hereto, an article written by a southern lady from Jackson, Miss., which contains much information in connection with the proposed commemorative activities of this Civil War Centennial Commission:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger-Daily News, Jan. 25, 1959]

BEARDLESS GRANT EYES VICKSBURG FETE

(By Florence Sillers Ogden)

Well, you can't have everything. I did not get to attend the President's White House Press Conference. He did not have it and I could not stay any longer in Washington. He did have a conference, as you know, at the National Press Club luncheon. But that was a segregated affair. Men only. I wonder what the Supreme Court thinks of that?

But I did see Gen. U. S. Grant, 3d. I did visit the White House on the VIP tour. I did see the Hope diamond. I did attend the concert of the Philadelphia Orchestra with Sir Thomas Beecham conducting. I did hear the great pianist Artur Rubinstein with the National Symphony Orchestra, Howard Mitchell, conducting. Both concerts were at the D.A.R. Constitution Hall.

My visit to General Grant was one of the highlights of my trip. The office of the Civil War Centennial Commission is on Jackson Place, diagonally across from the White House. My sister Mary and I called on the General and Mr. Karl S. Betts, executive director of the Commission.

And I tell you, friends, General Lee himself could not have been more courtly and hospitable than the grandson of the general who shelled my grandma's plantation nearly 100 years ago. They really rolled out the red carpet for us. It seems the whole staff had read my plantation-shelling letter to General Grant and they greeted us like old friends.

General Grant lives up to the description by George Kennedy in his column in the Washington Evening Star, entitled "The Rambler"—only more so. To quote Columnist Kennedy:

OLD SCHOOL GENTLEMAN

"General Grant * * * is a big, broad-shouldered, handsome, white-haired man with the military bearing one would expect of the West Point class of 1903."

I found him not only handsome, but very charming—a gentleman of the old school, with a sense of humor and a kindly twinkle in his eye. Indeed, he did not look old enough for the class of 1903. His face is smooth and unwrinkled, his hair still a white plume. I wanted to ask him where his beard was, for actually I felt as if I were in the presence of General Grant the first. Only he is far more handsome than his grandfather.

A large picture of his grandfather hung on the wall to the right of General Grant's desk, and directly across the room, by Mr. Bett's desk, was a lovely picture of Gen. Robert E. Lee, and others of several Confederate generals, among them Stonewall Jackson, and Pemberton, who commanded the Confederate troops at Vicksburg.

This is evidence that there will be no swords drawn during the Centennial. Mr. Betts, the executive director, is a most alert, enthusiastic person with plans and historical facts at his fingertips. They both went over plans with me and are anxious to see a centennial program at Vicksburg. Each State or city, or area, has to plan and finance its own commemorative program. I, for one, would like to see a colossal pageant in the National Park at Vicksburg.

Mr. Betts said that if this was done, they could probably set aside 1 year as Vicksburg Year for the one big event. The logical time would be the summer of 1963. Cooperative assistance would be given by the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and so on.

TO REENACT BATTLES

Virginia plans to reenact the battle of Manassas, and Maryland, the battle of Antietam. But General Grant says it is not their plan to reenact Civil War battles except in certain areas. My idea for Mississippi would be a pageant depicting the history of the State and the river and culminating in the siege of Vicksburg. Of course, I am only one person, but I can have my dreams.

General Grant says there are two things he would like to see us concentrate on, the raising of the Federal Gunboat Cairo, which has been located in the Yazoo Pass, and locating and marking the graves of Civil War soldiers.

Governor Almond, of Virginia, has invited the Centennial Commission to hold its first general assembly in Richmond. This meeting will take place at the Hotel Jefferson, April 16–17. Outstanding national figures will be present and a banquet will be held. All members of the State and Advisory Centennial Commissions, the Civil War Round Table, and representatives of civic and patriotic organizations are invited to attend. It will be an exciting and stimulating gathering.

WILL READ HISTORY

In discussing historical events, I mentioned the burning of Prentiss and the Bolivar County Courthouse. General Grant, Mr. Betts, and two other gentlemen of the commission were very much interested, and all of them want a copy of the "History of Bolivar County."

Of course, I am sending one to General Grant, but told him I must reread it first to be sure we did not write too much that was bad about the Yankees. He was equal to the occasion and, with a twinkle in his eye, said:

"You send me the book. I will read it and tell you whether it is true or not."

I am indebted to Senator JOHN STENNIS for these pleasant experiences and associations, for it was he who gave my name to the commission, and I received my appointment from General Grant, as have a number of other Mississipians, most of whom I know.

Who Is the Workingman's Real Friend?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Chicago Daily Sun-Times, Feb. 6, 1959]

WHO IS THE WORKINGMAN'S REAL FRIEND?

President Eisenhower laid it on the line with congressional spenders Wednesday. Discussing a Democratic proposal for expenditures on housing that alone would unbalance the budget he has submitted to Congress, the President asked:

"If we are going to ask for these new expenditures—and everybody admitting that deficit spending is certainly not a good thing—why doesn't each one of these bills include a measure for increasing taxes?

"That would be the straightforward, honest way to see whether the United States really wants this kind of thing."

Mr. Eisenhower was not seriously proposing that taxes be increased; he would like to see them cut. He was telling Congress and the people that if they want to spend more money than he has budgeted then they should be honest and schedule higher taxes to pay the bills. Otherwise, the Nation will go down deeper into debt and more inflation will rob all of us.

"I stand on this," the President went on. "You are going to hear me saying this often during the coming session and you will probably get weary of it * * *."

Readers of this page may get weary of our warnings about inflation, too. But, like the President, we are going to keep sounding them. Inflation is like a thief in the night who steals the savings of the industrious, pensions of the elderly, and insurance money of the widowed.

This week the Institute of Life Insurance warned that the United States can no longer temporize with inflationary forces in the economy. In the post-World War II period inflation has raised living costs 60 percent. Unless halted, inflation may undermine the people's desire to save, the institute pointed out. This would endanger the major source of thrift and investment funds upon which the country's future growth and progress are so vitally dependent, it explained.

We will put this another way, bluntly: Continued inflation could discourage family investment in insurance. Large funds invested by insurance companies would shrink. That would mean a shrinking of new construction and investment in business—and that would mean fewer jobs.

When the President speaks of inflation, therefore, he is not speaking of some theoretical and abstract economic theory. He is thinking about the effect of inflation on the average-American and his family. That is why he is so confident when he says the people will side with him if offered the alternatives of cheap money (inflation) or living within your income (a balanced budget).

Of course, the Congressmen who want to spend billions more than the President proposes, say that they are thinking of American families, too. They say that the expenditures that they propose are needed. They say that millions of dollars more than the President recommends are needed for urban renewal. They want millions for low-interest loans to house elderly people. They want more public housing.

Naturally every city dweller wants to get rid of slums and he wants to house low income and elderly people. But Americans should not confuse what they would like to have with what they can afford.

What would it profit elderly persons to have Government loans at the cost of further inflation that eats up their pensons and life insurance proceeds? Inflation hurts the slum dweller, too. If there had been no inflation—in recent years—no 60 percent increase in prices—the slum problem and the problem of the aged would not be as great as it is.

Putting the Government deeper into debt will create only greater inflation and bring still more problems of housing, slums, and the aged. A nation's needs should not be met at the cost of wrecking the nation's currency. Without sound money, no needs can

be adequately met—from military security to slum clearance.

Sound money requires that labor and business exercise restraint, too.

Many labor unions are preparing 1959 wage boost demands. They should ponder well that they, too, have a responsibility for inflation. They are powerful enough to exact wage increases that exceed the rise in productivity. What is the result? Here's a quote from the Guaranty Survey, a bank letter.

"The result is a wage-price spiral that impoverishes individuals and institutions with fixed incomes, while the increase in real wages is limited to the rise in productivity, precisely as it always has been."

In other words, most of the added real wages—purchasing power—workers have accrued over the years have come from the rise in productivity. That is why pay raises should be tied to productivity. The other dollars in the pay envelope are inflation dollars, worthless.

Congress will be putting more of these worthless paper dollars into pay envelopes if it votes to spend more than the Government takes in. This is hardly the role for the Democrats, who pride themselves on being the friend of the common man. It looks to us as though the common man's friend is Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Needed: A More Active Interest in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which William Scherwitz, chairman of the town of Oakland in Jefferson County, Wis., wrote recently for the Daily Jefferson County Union newspaper published in Fort Atkinson, Wis. Mr. Scherwitz' well-thought-out article should be read by all who are interested in good government:

NEEDED: A MORE ACTIVE INTEREST IN POLITICS
(By William Scherwitz)

The elections, for the time being, are over; budgets of the counties and local units of government are formulated; and the amount of money needed for the coming year has gone into the tax roll.

At this time, one who is actively engaged in politics begins to wonder about the worthwhileness of his efforts. From many sources come criticisms because taxes are high. Yet, those criticizing are often the same ones who wonder why services aren't better, why this road or that one isn't smoother, why the highways that pass their places aren't plowed or sanded at the minute it stops snowing, or why law enforcement officers aren't at the scene of the crime the moment it happens.

Naturally, our public officials are and should be eligible for constructive criticism. Such things as mink and vicuna coat scandals cannot be condoned, but more often than not this specific criticism becomes general criticism of all politicians and leads to open insult of capable and honest public officials—these officials being accused of being intellectual morons with no view in mind save the filling of their own pockets with illgotten gains from the Public Treasury.

Our young people go to grade school and high school to learn about the true greatness of America and its democratic form of government, and how that greatness could not have been attained without such men as Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Jackson, Lincoln, and many others. These men were statesmen—and also politicians. Yet, when the young people show any interest in politics, they are encouraged not to enter that dirty game.

The otherwise responsible citizen, when told he ought to run for public office, offers these excuses:

"It might hurt my business."
"I don't want to make enemies."
"I have troubles enough now."
"I wouldn't take that abuse for anything in the world."
"I can't afford to waste my time that way."
"I don't want to be classed as a politician."

Can anyone tell us, then, from where the responsible men are supposed to come?

Is it any wonder that there is increasing concern for the future of our country?

Doesn't it seem strangely inconsistent that we spend billions to send our young people to school and use a great part of this money to teach citizenship, political science, and history and then tell them how horrible all our officials are and urge them never to become a working part of that government they have been taught is so great?

Wouldn't it be better if we would occasionally search out those officials who earnestly try to do their duties—and there really are many of them—and commend them? We should do this whether or not we entirely agree with their views. Or maybe we should endeavor to put ourselves in their positions, and then ask what the dictates of our consciences would have been?

Would it not be wise to remember that all our statesmen have been politicians even though, unhappily, all our politicians have not been statesmen?

Surely, as mentioned before, politicians are not above criticism, but unless we begin to encourage those who are really trying to do right, and create more interest and respect for public office, our political structure will deteriorate to where we will be ripe for subversion.

Russian Propaganda in Sports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sports article entitled, "Barnstorming With Barnea," printed in the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader of February 4, 1959. In making this insertion, I desire to bring widespread attention to the fact that the United States is in direct competition with Russia in all aspects on all fronts. We all recall that in the last Olympic games the Soviet Union broke its agreement to keep separate the scores of the male and female teams. Although the U.S. male team had defeated the Russian male team, the Russians, by adding in the score of the Soviet female team could boast that they beat us in the aggregate. We can also recall what great propaganda use they made of this so-called victory.

Recently a touring hockey team of Russian professionals was passed off by the Soviet Union as amateurs, and great propaganda capital was made of the fact that they defeated some of our better college teams. Now comes the basketball fiasco in Chile, which the Soviet Union is using in the same propaganda way.

So important is the matter of prestige in the eyes of many impressionable people in the world, who are seeking to aline themselves with what they expect to be the dominant power, that we should not overlook any facet of the prestige contest. We must be completely realistic about the fact that Russian athletes are not amateurs but professionals nurtured, coached, and supported by the all-powerful state. Let us get hardheaded about this situation and enter these competitions on a realistic basis.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BARNSTORMING WITH BARNEA
(By Joe Barnea)

Can you imagine the fuss and furore that would result if the U.S. Government sent a group of college science students down to Cape Canaveral to take over the important job of beating the Russians in the race for space?

Every loyal American, of course, would be up in arms at the mere thought of sending a bunch of boys out on a man's mission.

But that, in a sense, is what happened in the recent world amateur basketball tournament in Chile, in which a United States amateur quintet was soundly trounced by both Russia and Brazil.

Representing this country in the world tourney was a team recruited from Air Force volunteers, presumably the only team available. But, at a time when the United States is fighting so desperately for prestige, why wasn't every effort made to send the best basketball talent in the country into the tournament?

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART of Indiana has strongly criticized the haphazard selection system which resulted in the disastrous defeat of the U.S. team at Santiago, Chile. The Republican lawmaker said that this country should make proper preparations in advance for such world events. The setback should be a lesson, he said.

He noted that the Yankee quintet not only was sadly trounced by the Russian representatives—who withdrew from the tourney after refusing to meet Nationalist China because they claimed it is not a country—but also was further humiliated when showered with debris from the stands in a game with Chile.

CAPEHART quoted a Santiago newspaper as stating, "When it comes to shooting at the moon or at a basket, the United States cannot keep up with Russia."

The Indiana solon said the team's showing was deplorable at a time "when our prestige could be much better in some parts of the continent to the south." He remarked, also, that basketball is an American sport introduced by the United States to other nations. "We should guard that heritage zealously, I might even say, jealously," he said.

Senator CAPEHART does not stand alone in his criticism of the selection method for such events. Alex Hannum, coach of the Wichita Vickers, a National Industrial Basketball League team, also blasted both the State Department and the National AAU for their selection of the United States team in the world tourney.

"Without consulting the National Industrial Basketball League, the strongest amateur basketball league in the world," Hannum declared, "they selected an Air Force all-star team that was soundly beaten by Russian and Brazil."

Continued Hannum: "I know for certain the Russians will make great propaganda use of the fact that they beat us in the sport which the United States invented."

And most certainly they will. The Russians will use any victory over the United States—whether in sports or in the field of missiles—in an attempt to mislead the rest of the world into believing that our system of government is decadent.

Whatever happened to that trusty, old axiom, about always putting your best foot forward? It would have been better to have stayed out of the world tournament rather than run the risk of playing into the hands of the Russians by fielding anything short of the best possible team.

What's going on in American sports today?

On the one hand, we use a Peruvian tennis star to help us recapture the Davis cup; on the other, we make no attempt to field our strongest quintet in a world competition.

It just doesn't make sense.

But, as usual, the Russian propagandists are having a field day.

The Spenders Can Be Stopped: Editorial Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, the Nation is looking to us, the national Congress, for the use of commonsense in the spending of its money.

The viewpoint of the average American is probably summed up in an editorial appearing in the Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram of December 24, 1958, entitled "The Spenders Can Be Stopped." The frank warning in this editorial should give us food for thought.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SPENDERS CAN BE STOPPED

President Eisenhower's promise to propose as close to a balanced budget as possible for fiscal 1960, stirs up a whisper of hope among a debt-burdened people that there is still a thread of sanity in Washington.

Additionally cheering was the observation by Representative ARENDS, of Illinois, that through the meeting at which the President made his statement there ran a dominant theme of fiscal responsibility. What a great thing it would be for the country for the future if Congress actually were to assume that obligation again—an obligation it has seemingly cast aside like an old cloak at the urging of the wild spenders.

We wish it were possible to be optimistic, as well as hopeful, over the talk of a balanced budget. Instead, we are fearful that this early talk is merely more whistling in the political rainbarrel, and that the beautiful theory will in time be assassinated by a gang of brutal facts resulting from the actions of a dollar-crazy Congress. The legislative halls are due to be packed again by a preponderance of men who believe a nation can be made stronger by pouring out its resources—in hand and as much more as can be borrowed—all over the Nation and the world. The result will be more huge deficit spending, more inflation, a dollar that's worth less.

This will happen unless people do not want it to happen—and are willing to do something about stopping it. What can they do? A suggestion was made the other day by Thurman Sensing, outspoken advocate of a sensible fiscal policy for the Nation, to this effect:

"Unreason on spending undoubtedly will flourish in the liberal and labor dominated 86th Congress. President Eisenhower, who has recently struck out at the spenders, has a great opportunity. Conservatives will pray that he takes advantage of this opportunity. He is constitutionally barred from running again for the Presidency. The need for appeasing the spenders has vanished. He can save America by using his powers to stop the spenders in their tracks. The President's great power to prevent unreasonable legislation is the Presidential veto. As a President without an ax to grind, he can use the veto in a constructive fashion. He can save the American economy from raids by the pirates of the left wing.

"The American dollar—its value—is at stake in the political struggles of the next 2 years. If this wonderful symbol of American strength and financial integrity is not to be shattered, it will be necessary for President Eisenhower to act with firmness. All thinking citizens ought to write and urge him to use his freedom of action for this high purpose. A ruined dollar would symbolize the destruction of the free American economy.

"American taxpayers should also write their Congressmen urging them to vote against the welfare-state spending that produces an unbalanced budget. Not all of them are under the spell of the spending cult by any means. Even those who are, might be brought to see the error of their ways—if they heard from enough voters."

Mr. Summerfield Has Improved the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Summerfield Delivers," published in the Youngstown, Ohio, Vindicator of January 31, 1959. The editorial relates to the improvements made in the Post Office Department during the tenure of Postmaster General Summerfield.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. SUMMERFIELD DELIVERS

The Postmaster General who is a good businessman and executive is rare. On the average, he is a political figurehead who is given the office as a reward for successfully running a presidential campaign.

Only infrequently are taxpayers given the services of such a Postmaster General as Arthur Summerfield who, since taking office 6 years ago, has made notable progress in modernizing and streamlining the Department's operations.

The job hasn't been easy. The postal deficit in fiscal 1958 hit an all-time high largely because of congressional and other obstructions, yet Mr. Summerfield pushed through the first general increase in rates in years, thereby stemming the flow of red ink. He has increased Post Office efficiency and speeded up its service. He has enlisted the aid of private industry in finding better ways of processing an ever-mounting volume of mail.

Despite postal pay raises and huge increases to railroads carrying the mails, the long-range outlook for the Post Office is improving. Retroactive boosts in costs are out of the way; the higher rates voted last year will swell revenues through 1959, and some of the rate hikes are progressive. At the same time, the Department is working hard to cut costs while improving service. In the last year, for example, it has expanded rural deliveries, extended window hours, and stepped up mail collection.

More significant, perhaps, is the beginning of drastic changes in mail handling within the Post Office itself. Mr. Summerfield has sought the help of many private concerns in designing, producing, and testing equipment.

In short, the Post Office under Mr. Summerfield has displayed extraordinary vision, initiative, and energy in solving its problems and improving service. He has well earned public commendation.

The Arizona Watershed Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HAYDEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, for a long time we in the arid Southwest have recognized that our number one problem is water. From the number of articles in the newspapers and national magazines on the subject, it is clear to me that the other sections of the country are waking up to the fact that they, too, are confronted with a water problem. This is indicated by the resolution introduced by the Senators from Montana, Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD—Senate Resolution 48 creating a committee to study our national water problems, which deserves prompt and favorable consideration.

There are a number of Federal and State agencies giving consideration to the full development of our water resources, as well as a sizable number of study groups, both public and private, involved in research programs dealing with water. In Arizona we are conducting a unique experiment. It is known as the Arizona watershed program and is a cooperative effort on the part of Federal, State, and private agencies.

The program is under the direction of the Arizona Water Resources Committee under the chairmanship of Lewis W. Douglas who is assisted by Mr. Kel M. Fox, the secretary-treasurer of the committee.

The specific purposes of the program is to determine, through study, research, and pilot operations, how best to manage the land areas of Arizona on a multiple-

use basis to assure the greatest possible water yield.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the December issue of the American Forests magazine by Mr. Kel M. Fox entitled "The Arizona Watershed Program."

To those members of the Senate, and others, who are concerned with adequate supplies of water I recommend this article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ARIZONA WATERSHED PROGRAM

(By Kel M. FOX, secretary-treasurer, Arizona Water Resources Committee)

Great ideas are sometimes hatched in the most unlikely places. Take the Arizona Watershed program for example. It was conceived under a pine tree, far from any conference room, let alone human dwelling place.

Two men attended this fateful meeting: Jake West, a hydrographer, and Dave Wingfield, a rancher with a penchant for practical conservation.

Both came well prepared. Born on a farm near Silver City, New Mex., West had spent 40 years climbing the ridges and exploring the canyons of the vast Salt and Verde River watersheds. His job, certainly one of the most unique in the world, is to see that this huge area delivers enough water to irrigate the thousands of farms, homes, and budding industries of the Salt River Valley. Lean and keen, West looks and acts like one of the fabled mountain men who once tramped these same canyons in search of beaver pelts, and he probably knows these watersheds better than any man alive.

Any man, that is, with the possible exception of Dave Wingfield. Now in his mid-seventies, Wingfield was born not many miles from where he and West were chatting. He had worked cattle in that very country before Theodore Roosevelt made his celebrated ride up San Juan Hill. He could remember the week-long drives to the railroad, the lonesome hours in the saddle scattering grass seed from a gunny sack tied to the horn, an occupation that has earned him the title of the "Johnny Grasseed" of Arizona. He could remember how this country looked 50 years ago, before there was a U.S. Forest Service.

The meeting between Wingfield and West began as an informal exchange of ideas on the same theme: Why were the lands of the Salt and Verde watersheds producing less water and less feed than they did 50 years before?

It ended with a conclusion, based on a century of combined experience: Something, probably the unregulated growth of brush and trees, was devouring the water and replacing the grass. If the brush could be controlled and the trees thinned, so they reasoned, springs that had vanished during their own lifetime could be made to run again, areas choked with trees and worthless brush could be restored to grass.

The theory found a responsive audience, and, before the year was out, the Salt River project, the Arizona Land Department, and the University of Arizona were embarked on a project to test its theoretical validity. Experts, a majority of whom were affiliated with the Forest Service, were called in to study the watersheds and express their opinions. These opinions were compiled by a staff headed by Dr. George W. Barr, at that time professor of agricultural economics at the university, and were printed in a report entitled "Recovering Rainfall," a report now almost universally known as the Barr report, after its chief author.

The Barr report took the raw theory of Wingfield and West and refined it into a broad program of recommendations for managing the various types of vegetation on the Salt and Verde watersheds. It predicted a considerable gain in runoff would result, along with such other benefits as fast growing, better-quality timber, more grass, and improvement in game and recreational sites.

Its release met with a mixed reception. It was hailed in some quarters, questioned in others—notably by spokesmen for wildlife groups fearful of possible changes in game habitat. The Arizona Legislature was sufficiently impressed, however, to create a new division of watershed management in the State's land department to promote the program, and elsewhere a group of citizens met and formed what is known as the Arizona Water Resources Committee.

This committee and the watershed management division, headed by Joseph F. Arnold, a former forester, have since become the principal champions of and spokesmen for the watershed program.

The committee is unusual in a number of respects, some of which are worth exploring. A private, nonprofit corporation, it operates on a very small budget, none of which comes from public funds. Aside from its president, Lewis W. Douglas, former ambassador to Great Britain, and its secretary (the author), each of its directors represents a group with an economic or other interest in the product of the watershed. Farmers are represented by Victor I. Corbell, president of the Salt River project; the logging industry by Pete Gaffney, a vice president of Southwest Lumber Mills, Inc.; ranchers by Ernest Chilson, former president of the Cattle Growers' Association; mining by Jack Pullen, of the Phelps Dodge Corp.; municipal users of water by Jack Williams, mayor of Phoenix; industrial users by George Christie; banks by C. C. Cooper, Jr.; game and recreation by Jay Price, former regional forester; publications by Richmond Johnson, former editor of the Arizona Farmer.

Each director has an advisory group of 4 to 12 representatives of his particular industry or activity.

The first task of the water resources committee was to make a fundamental decision: Would it promote the sweeping, sometimes controversial, recommendations of the Barr report, or would it choose a more cautious approach?

The answer was a combination of both. Six of the recommendations of the Barr report were adopted, in principal, with this important proviso: that each be evaluated in relatively small, field-test experiments before its adoption as a proven tool for management could be recommended.

Thus the Arizona watershed program, as it stands today, calls for experiments in the following:

1. Patch-cutting in the spruce-fir, mixed conifer type.
2. Thinning overstocked thickets of young ponderosa.
3. Conversion of noncommercial ponderosa to grass.
4. Removal of juniper and pinon where practical.
5. Chemical control of brush.
6. Thinning of stream channel vegetation in nonrecreational sites.

It is important to remember the proviso. The Water Resources Committee isn't recommending anything beyond the present research program until the experts, who should know, say it will work.

With this commonsense approach, the committee quickly established good working relationships with the Forest Service and Bureau of Indian Affairs, the two agencies managing some 90 percent of the Salt and Verde watersheds.

The Forest Service agreed to take the lead in conducting experiments to prove whether patch cutting could improve runoff in the spruce-fir and mixed conifer-type forests. About 100 acres of the Apache National Forest have been cut in this manner. Results are being closely watched. On an adjacent area, three small watersheds are being measured for rainfall and runoff before one is cut by patch method, one by the selective method, the third left uncut as a check.

The Forest Service is also taking the lead in experimental work in ponderosa pine type, which embraces most of Arizona's not inconsiderable timber resources. Thinning of overstocked stands of saplings is taking place on several thousand acres of the Coconino National Forest. In the same general area, the Forest Service has removed all the noncommercial ponderosa pine from a 200-acre experimental watershed.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Forest Service are both engaged in fairly large-scale juniper-pinon removal projects.

With the enthusiastic support of the Indians themselves, who are supplying a portion of the necessary funds, the BIA is removing 33,000 acres of juniper on the Fort Apache Indian Reservation in a project being carefully measured for effects on water yield. Elsewhere on the same reservation, some 100,000 acres have been cleared of juniper and pinon, primarily to increase forage.

Forest Service juniper removal is approaching the 10,000-acre mark on the Wet Beaver pilot watershed project on the Coconino Forest.

The same agency is in charge of experiments to convert brush to grass on selected areas of the Tonto and Prescott National Forests. Various control methods are being tried, the chemical tests on this particular project being handled by the Agricultural Research Service.

The fourth agency playing a major role in the Arizona watershed program in the U.S. Geological Survey. Survey technicians have installed and are readying stream gaging stations for both Forest Service and Indian Service projects. In addition, the USGS is undertaking an important project in cooperation with the Land Department and Salt River Valley Water Users to measure the effects of removing cottonwoods growing along the banks of a stream located in Mohave County.

Research in watershed management and in the control and conversion of vegetation takes money, and the Water Resources Committee feels it has an important responsibility to see that agencies cooperating in the porgram get the necessary financial support. To this end, it has strongly backed agency requests for funds, and with good results.

Congress appropriated $210,000 for watershed research projects in fiscal 1957, raised this to $324,000 the following year, and made $485,000 available this year. Some additional funds are appropriated by the State and by semigovernmental agencies such as the Salt River Valley Water Users Association. In addition, Indian tribes and ranchers are spending considerable sums each year in juniper removal work beyond the scope of these research projects.

Assuming positive results—and there will be a lot of long faces in Arizona if there are none—treatment of several million acres, at a cost of millions of dollars, will be the next step. How to raise the money, and the proportions to be borne by the several beneficiaries, are problems yet to be encountered.

The rapidly expanding Southwest desperately needs more water, and no one is more aware of it than the members of the Water Resources Committee. The committee feels it has taken a moderate, scientific approach to a problem that could easily become explosive in less cautious hands. It hopes the

ultraconservationist group on the one hand, and the more water at any price group on the other, will both be patient until the results are in.

Republican Support During Truman Administration for an Adequate Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter entitled "Symington's Failure," which was published in the Washington Evening Star of February 5, 1959, over the name of Maj. Gen. Julius Klein of Chicago, Ill.

I believe the letter goes a long way in setting forth the true facts regarding the positions of certain Republicans during the Truman administration with respect to support for an adequate Air Force.

Mr. President, the letter correctly asserts that my distinguished colleague, the late Senator Robert A. Taft, and I joined with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] in his plea for a strong air arm as a vital part of our Nation's defense program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SYMINGTON'S FAILURE

Your January 19 editorial entitled "SYMINGTON'S Failure" just came to my attention.

I have the greatest respect for your editorial policy and your fairness, and I am sure you would like to have the facts from someone who knows something about this matter.

I yield to no one in my admiration with respect to Senator STUART SYMINGTON. As a matter of fact, if I ever have to vote Democratic I hope it will be for him. He is a truly great public servant and a fine, courageous patriot. Senator SYMINGTON and I were both assistants to the late Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson. I find no fault in the praise you have for Senator SYMINGTON, and endorse it. But I do object to your statement that Senator SYMINGTON had no Republican support or help when he fought for an adequate Air Force while Mr. Truman was President and when Mr. Truman was opposed to the policy of his own Secretary of Air. The responsibility rests with the Democratic leadership and the administration of the Congress that did not support Mr. SYMINGTON.

I do not agree with the attack of the Republican National Committee on Senator SYMINGTON, and you are right in bringing out the facts, but I do disagree with you when you say you cannot recall the name of even one Republican politician who stood up and fought with him.

I can name two great Republican Senators who were right in Mr. SYMINGTON'S corner. One was my beloved and sainted friend, Robert A. Taft, and other one is Senator STYLES BRIDGES. And in my capacity as a Republican consultant Senator Taft directed me to rally all support for SYMINGTON. I personally arranged a meeting between Senator Taft and Senator SYMINGTON, and Senator Taft assured the then Secretary Symington of his solid 100 percent support for the Symington Air Force program. Senator Taft felt that America must have the most powerful air force in the world as a deterrent to any aggressor. And no one will remember this better than my good friend, Senator SYMINGTON, if he is asked by you for the real facts.

I always felt that it is criminal to make the defense issue a partisan issue. Neither Senator Symington nor Senators Taft and Bridges ever did that. And when you speak of the Symington report in 1949, before Korea, you will find that Senator Taft was the staunchest supporter when many Democrats and the administration were opopsed to it. No truer patriot ever lived than Senator Taft. He was a great statesman and a great politician, but also a partisan; but when it came to the security of America, Senator Taft championed the cause just as well as his and my Democratic friend Senator SYMINGTON. I owe it to the memory of Senator Taft not to let your editorial go unchallenged. If the Symington-Taft-Bridges program had been carried out the Korean war would have ended in complete victory or might never have taken place. Gen. Douglas MacArthur could have defeated the North Koreans and the Chinese Communists then and there—if he had not been hamstrung by the administration.

JULIUS KLEIN,
Major General (Retired), Chicago, Ill.

Out of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the February 1, 1959, issue of the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star, entitled "Out of Politics."

OUT OF POLITICS

President Eisenhower's farm program recognizes the urgent need for getting the politicians off the backs of the farmers and allowing agriculture to produce freely for the market and not for Government warehouses. After spending many years and many billions of dollars in trying to solve the farm problem, the politicians and the Government haven't solved anything. They created the problem by burdening agriculture with programs dedicated to the impossible task of trying to make time stand still.

In his farm message, the President called upon Congress to move agriculture toward independence and stability by overhauling the Government's farm-price-support system, which is based on long-outdated standards. He cited the huge accumulations of surpluses and outlays of Federal funds as demonstrating the need for reduction of incentives for excess production. By the end of the current fiscal year on June 30, the Government will hold more than $9 billion in farm surpluses. The supply of wheat, the President said, is enough to meet all domestic and export needs for an entire year, even if American farmers didn't harvest a single bushel of wheat this year. The Federal money goes to a relatively few producers of farm products and to warehousemen.

The President told Congress that the parity system which has been in effect since early in the New Deal should be scrapped in favor of a plan which would gear price supports to a percentage of market prices in recent years. The proposed change is designed to permit a gradual removal of the floor under farm prices. The President's call for support reductions applies to the six basic crops now covered—wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco. Production controls would be eased and eventually eliminated.

The course proposed by President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson is in line with the thinking of the farmers themselves. America's corn farmers last November voted nearly 3 to 1 in favor of Benson's plan to cut corn price supports sharply and eliminate acreage controls. Under the plan, which will go into effect with the 1959 corn crop, supports will be based on the average market price of the past 3 years. The American Farm Bureau Federation has urged a similar plan for wheat.

Adding weight to the President's arguments is the fact that producers of farm products, such as livestock, not covered by price supports, are doing well.

The politicians cannot continue indefinitely their stumbling efforts to try to guarantee the farmers a profit. Agriculture and the public will be better served when farmers are free to rely on their own ability rather than on Government paternalism.

Tribute to India League and J. J. Singh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following farewell message to the India League of America, which is suspending its activities on March 1, 1959:

INDIA LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
17 East 54th Street,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR FRIENDS: I cannot tell you how much I regret not being able to be with you at this farewell meeting of the India League of America. I feel as if I were saying goodby to old friends by proxy, and that I know is no way of revealing the depth of friendship and regard I have felt for the members of the India League. I wish I could be with you to tell you of the personal satisfaction I have gained from my association and participation in the work of the India League.

I want to single out from among the many friends in the India League the one with whom I have worked closest and who has given me so much of his time and thought when there was work I could do as a friend of India in the Halls of Congress. J. J. Singh has been a source of strength and inspiration to all of us; a man of dedication to his principles; a sturdy ambassador of good will for India. I remember the work we did together in accomplishing the passage of legislation that removed the obnoxious India Exclusion Act from our statute books and prepared the way for the naturalization of Indians resident in the United States.

Though he is leaving our midst, I know that our paths will cross again.

We who are the friends of India will not forget one moment that a crucial role in world history is now being played by the people of India. India must be given every opportunity to prove to the world that freedom and economic opportunity can exist

side by side and that it is not mandatory that freedom of a people must necessarily exclude its economic well-being, or that economic progress can only be made at the expense of freedom. This is the test mankind faces in these troubled times and one of the most significant of all testing foregrounds is the subcontinent. It is not a choice, it is a must that we, in the United States, give economic aid to India, help to increase her trade, and help to finance her new industries. That we have so far failed to recognize the importance of India to the development of a free society everywhere is borne out by the fact that of the $20 billion of trade that the United States carries on, only $5 million relates to India. Yet India gives us the mica, the jute, the manganese, the spices that we ourselves must have in the development of our own economic and scientific progress. To India we look for the attributes of charity and compassion, steeped as she is in spiritual strength. We in the United States cannot afford to take our eyes away from the Indian scene. I have witnessed for myself, in my visit to India, the heartbreaking problems that face her. I have seen, too, the tremendous work that is being done in the villages. The intelligence and sensitivity of her leadership, her men and women of dedication and sacrifice have left a deep impress on me. The world watches the struggles of a free people of India and the progress made under that freedom as against the brutal totalitarianism of Communist China. In a sense then I say—and I repeat—that herein lies the test tube of whence our civilization shall go.

I shall miss you all, but I must leave you with the assurance that my work and my friendship for India shall continue unabated.

Sincerely and hopefully,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Rising Retail Food Costs Are Not Caused by Farm Price-Support Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, payments to farmers for food products in 1957 were $19.5 billion, almost the same as the $19.2 billion paid in 1948, just 10 years earlier. This payment applies to food sold. It does not reflect the value of food produced on farms and used there by the farm family.

But the retail value of this same quantity of food in 1957 was $50.4 billion. This is what the consumer paid. It was only $39 billion in 1948. The increase in the marketing charge over the 10 years was $11.4 billion. This is the rising food cost to consumers.

These payments to farmers and retail values apply only to foods produced on farms in the United States and purchased at retail by consumers. The quantity was larger in 1957 than in 1948 because of the increase in population. The retail values are calculated in such a way that food eaten at restaurants is valued in terms of retail store prices.

The table below shows how these values and payments have changed during the 10 years under consideration.

Payments to farmers and marketing charges for farm food purchased by civilian consumers in the United States, 1948–57

[In billion dollars]

Year	Market value	Payment to farmers	Marketing charges from farm through retail store
1948	39.0	19.2	19.8
1949	37.9	17.1	20.8
1950	38.9	17.7	21.2
1951	43.0	20.2	22.8
1952	44.5	20.1	24.4
1953	44.6	19.0	25.6
1954	44.9	18.3	26.6
1955	46.2	18.3	27.9
1956	48.3	18.7	29.6
1957	50.4	19.5	30.9

During the years from 1948 through 1957, the population residing in the United States increased from 146 million persons to 170 million. This averages out at about 2.4 million more persons per year. But the farmers' take from feeding the smaller population in 1948 was $19.2 billion, whereas in 1957, 10 years later, it was $19.5 billion. This is no idle achievement. It shows that the farmers have been very efficient in providing the food supply. Less farmers providing more food each year have delivered enough for everyone with some added for export and at a lower gross cost in a period of serious inflation.

What caused the increase in food costs to consumers? Labor, transportation costs, and taxes seem to have been very important in the increased cost of distribution. Additional marketing services, particularly in packaging, and the preparation of these foods for retailing were also significant sources of increased distribution costs.

The justification of these increases in food costs to consumers is not questioned. If consumers want to purchase their food in more costly prepared forms, that fact alone is sufficient justification. But it is important that consumers should understand the reason for increased food costs. All too often the farmer is assumed to have received a comparable increase in income.

All too often the increase is attributed to price-support programs with respect to farm products. The data above, however, include farmers' total income from food products. His income attributable to price supports is included. The farmers' contribution to the consumers' food bill has not increased in the 10 years reviewed. Even when the increased quantities of food used by the growing population are added, the farmers' take did not increase, but since 1951 has generally declined.

Incomes to persons who are not farmers have increased steadily since the war. The cost of goods and services which farmers must buy has also increased. But farmers' cash incomes for the postwar period have been relatively static. These are facts which should be considered by those who would reduce price supports. Consumers of food have been getting a bargain, insofar as farmers are concerned.

The farmers as a group have a proud record in the past 10 years. Hunger in the United States has been greatly reduced. Important inroads have been made on hunger outside the United States. And all of this at prices which reflect the opposite of inflation in years when inflation has become our No. 1 national problem.

INFLATION HAS NOT AFFECTED BUTTER PRICES

Inflation, we are told, is one of the important problems of our time. Prices rise, and with them, the index of living costs also rises. In the case of butter, however, prices have declined. The average price of 92-score butter at wholesale in 1950 was 61.7 cents a pound. It rose to 72 cents in 1952, but since that time it declined until in 1958 the average price is 58.7 cents, 3 cents per pound less than in 1950. This shows that the farmers who produced milk for butter have not shared in any increase of income. Responsibility for inflation cannot be laid at the door of the dairy farmer. Consumers have been repaid for the tax cost of price support in their lower price for butter.

In 1950, the average retail price for butter was 72.9 cents a pound, and in 1958 it was 74.2 cents, an increase in cost of 1.3 cents per pound for this 8-year period. Retail prices also reached their peak in 1952, and since 1952 have declined, contrary to the general trend in prices. Whereas retail food prices increased by 30 percent between 1950 and 1957, butter prices increased less than 2 percent.

Butter: Retail and wholesale prices, 1950–58

Year	Wholesale price per pound 92°, Chicago	Retail price per pound United States
	Cents	*Cents*
1950	61.7	72.9
1951	69.2	81.9
1952	72.2	85.5
1953	65.9	79.0
1954	59.7	72.4
1955	57.4	70.9
1956	59.2	72.1
1957	59.6	74.3
1958	58.7	74.2

Hopes for Good Legislation on Capitol Hill Remain Slim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared February 6 in the Rockford, Ill., Register Republic, entitled "Hopes for Good Legislation on Capitol Hill Remain Slim":

HOPES FOR GOOD LEGISLATION ON CAPITOL HILL REMAIN SLIM

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—It's predictable that along around June, the Senate-House Democratic leaders will claim great accomplishments for the 86th Congress and will cite the large

numbers of legislative bills to prove the point. This is a regular annual occurrence, and it measures the amount of legislation rather than its quality. Nobody can tell by counting the sheaves of paper that have passed through printing presses whether a Congress has been good or bad. But here in February it is possible to make the calculated estimate that it will be among the least productive sessions that ever assembled and this is why:

Labor legislation, perhaps the most needed of all, gives every sign of being a dud—noise without force. There are three kinds of labor bills in competition. The AFL–CIO would like to have the Taft-Hartley Act repealed or, since that is impossible, emasculated. Andrew Biemiller, the AFL–CIO legislative director, let this cat out of the bag in his first day of testimony. Responding to a deft query by Senator GOLDWATER, Biemiller admitted that "at the present time we certainly would not support the Democratic (Kennedy-Ervin) bill without title 6," the latter being the Taft-Hartley revision section.

The Eisenhower administration has submitted a reasonably good bill, but the Democats and liberal Republicans won't back it. This means it simply doesn't have the votes. Senator GOLDWATER may submit a very strong measure, probably including an antitrust provision. It could not possibly get the votes to pass. What will pass, in all likelihood, is a very feeble law against crime and misfeasance, completely dodging the labor issue in our times.

Military legislation, not quite as urgent as labor because it is less neglected, will not advance much beyond its present status. The administration, despite being under constant criticism, is very pleased with itself about our military posture. Senator SYMINGTON, the chief Democratic critic, says this is false complacency that is based upon minimized estimates of Russian strength. But, as one of his armed services colleagues has told this reporter off-record, the only way SYMINGTON can be proved right is for the Russians to attack.

Defense Secretary McElroy has developed a pretty unanswerable retort to the observation that he is spending less money on national defense, even though the dollar is losing purchasing power and the Russians are increasing their ability to assault us. McElroy says he has learned how to spend more effectively and does not need so many dollars. The country is in a mood to believe him rather than pay more taxes. There is little reason to think that this session will produce any improved military legislation.

Civil rights has been the main conversation piece in the early session. Everybody in Congress seems to have a bill or two. But the signs are that the heat is going out of the civil-rights issue. The collapse of massive resistance to school segregation in Virginia is a shattering blow to all defenders of State sovereignty and a tranquilizing victory for the other side. If the courts can do this, why should Congress act by passing unpopular force acts? We will probably get an extension of the present Civil Rights Commission and possibly a new bureau of community conciliation, but neither will alter the current situation. The new laws may be showy but will hardly be substantial.

Inflation will remain, as it is now, a problem which labor and business will have to solve, or become engulfed. Nobody expects the President's budget to yield $77 billion in taxes so as to achieve a balance. But the President was right—and the rest of us wrong—last year at this time when he predicted a petering out by spring of the recession. He could be right again. Still, the two things that could be called dramatic—a tax cut, on the one hand, a return to economic controls on the other—seem very remote.

Welfare and public works, including school and hospital construction, as well as more dams and airfields, are much in demand, especially by the many new congressional Members who came in by promising everything. But except for airfields, which the jet age demands, the spending may well be discouraged by Presidential vetos and by serious-minded public opinion.

This leaves foreign affairs, a field in which Senator HUMPHREY is especially anxious to shine because of his 8-hour talkathon with Premier Khrushchev. HUMPHREY has been majoring in atomic disarmament, but he has no more chance than ever of finding a workable formula.

Sadly, it is world communism rather than the American Congress which can be expected to dominate events in 1959. In early February the signs are for a chatterbox session with humdrum results. All things considered, this could be the luckiest way to have it.

The Teaching of Foreign Languages in the Elementary Public Schools of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Hirris C. Long, superintendent of the public schools of Clay County, Fla., has recently made available to me the results of a survey of the teaching of foreign languages in the elementary public schools of Florida. This study was made in cooperation with Sidney L. Horne, director of instruction, and Mary Zeller, general supervisor. It speaks well for the initiative of these able school officials and of the effort of local school authorities to meet one of the important challenges of our time—understanding among people through improved communication. The report is as follows:

THE TEACHING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN THE ELEMENTARY PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF FLORIDA

BACKGROUND

One 10-teacher school in Clay County, the Middleburg Junior High School, this year became interested in offering instruction in a foreign language to some elementary schoolchildren. The fifth-grade teacher is well qualified in foreign language and was interested in teaching conversational Spanish to small children. The second grade was selected and, with the very active cooperation and support of the principal, arrangements were worked out under which, for one period per day, the second-grade teacher would exchange classes with the fifth-grade teacher. During this period, the fifth-grade teacher teaches Spanish to the second grade, while the regular second-grade teacher continues with routine instruction in the fifth grade.

The enthusiasm of the second graders in learning something of the use of the Spanish language is much greater than had been anticipated. Parents are interested and cooperate wherever needed. Other pupils have become so interested that the regular fifth-grade teacher is now finding it necessary to teach some Spanish in her regular class. These children felt that their teacher was letting them down by going elsewhere to teach something which they also wished to learn. Other teachers and other schools in the county are watching this experiment with interest.

Feeling that the county could profit by experiences of other counties in this field of effort, and also prompted by the possible implications of the Federal Defense Education Act on language teaching, Clay County instituted a study to determine to what extent Florida Public Schools have gone into the field of elementary foreign language teaching. In addition, some information was requested which would, to some extent, indicate the types of programs in operation in the State.

PLAN OF THE STUDY

Letters were sent to each of the 67 counties of Florida requesting that the following information be furnished:

1. Is foreign language taught in the schools of your county below the ninth grade?
2. What languages?
3. Is teaching traditional or conversational?
4. Number of schools in the county teaching foreign language(s) below the ninth grade?
5. Grades in which taught?
6. Is there an in-service teacher training program for this type teaching in your county? Please describe.
7. Helpful comments.

FINDINGS

The excellent response to the inquiry is perhaps indicative of the statewide interest in this subject. Sixty-four counties have replied to the request, and the other three may perhaps reply later. Of the responding counties, 24 are teaching foreign language in some classes below the ninth grade. Twenty-two are teaching Spanish; four are teaching French; and one is teaching German. Where this item was checked, the counties indicate that the language is taught as conversational rather than traditional, with the exception of the seventh and eighth grades in French and Spanish in Okaloosa County.

Dade, Hillsborough, and Pinellas Counties are conducting foreign language instruction by radio, and Palm Beach County plans to institute such instruction in January of 1959. Dade County also conducts a program of television instruction in foreign language. Gulf County indicates that phonograph records are used for foreign-language instruction.

There appears to be little or no consistency throughout the State as to programing and general practices. It is interesting to note that Brevard County reports that "we use parents in the community and are not concerned about the language." Orange County indicates that it has a policy of supplementing the salaries of some teachers who conduct instruction for classes of 20 pupils after regular school hours. Some counties consider the language instruction to be a part of the social studies program, others consider it to be a separate area of instruction.

The 24 counties reporting affirmatively on the teaching of foreign languages show such instruction being practiced in 177 schools, plus an indefinite number covered by such general terms as "optional with the schools," "several," "some," etc.

Only five counties report an in-service teacher training program for teachers of elementary foreign languages.

There seems to be little consistency with regard to the grades in which foreign language instruction is being conducted though the tendency seems to favor the upper elementary grades (grades 5 and 6). Three

counties teach foreign language in the first grade, 5 in the second, 8 in the third, 9 in the fourth, 11 in the fifth, 14 in the sixth, 4 in the seventh, and 3 in the eighth.

RELATED STUDY

Under the leadership of Mr. R. W. Sims, coordinator of research, State department of education, a study is being conducted designed to make an analysis of offerings and enrollments in foreign languages in all public high schools in Florida. A preliminary report has been published on this study, based on 1957–58 enrollments, and covers the following 20 counties: Alachua, Baker, Bay, Bradford, Brevard, Broward, Calhoun, Charlotte, Citrus, Clay, Collier, Columbia, Dade, DeSoto, Dixie, Duval, Escambia, Flagler, Franklin, and Gadsden. In this group it was found that 17 of the 20 counties were teaching some foreign language in at least one high school in the county, and 1,723 seventh and eighth graders were enrolled in language courses as follows: 1,615 in Spanish and 108 in French.

REPORTING OF FINDINGS

Copies of this study are being distributed to each county in the State and to other interested persons. Clay County appreciates the assistance of each of you in making information available.

A compilation of all data furnished is contained in the following:

1. A tabulation of the replies of the 64 counties from which replies were received.

2. Summary of comments offered by the reporting counties.

The teaching of foreign language(s) in the elementary public schools of Florida

County	Taught?		French	Spanish	German	Other	Conversational?	Traditional?	In how many schools?	Grades								In-service teacher tng?		No reply
	Yes	No								1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Yes	No	
1. Alachua																				X
2. Baker	X			X			X		1							X	X		X	
3. Bay	X			X			X		2				X	X	X				X	
4. Bradford		X																	X	
5. Brevard	X		X	X	X													X		
6. Broward		X																	X	
7. Calhoun		X																	X	
8. Charlotte		X																	X	
9. Citrus		X																	X	
10. Clay	X			X			X		1		X			X					X	
11. Collier		X																	X	
12. Columbia		X																	X	
13. Dade	X			X			X		126	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		
14. DeSoto		X																	X	
15. Dixie	X			X			X		1		X								X	
16. Duval	X		X	X			X		3					X	X					
17. Escambia	X			X			X		Several						X				X	
18. Flagler	X			X			X		1				X	X	X					
19. Franklin		X																	X	
20. Gadsden	X		X				X		1							X	X		X	
21. Gilchrist		X																	X	
22. Glades	X			X			X		1				X	X	X				X	
23. Gulf	X			X			X		1						X				X	
24. Hamilton		X																	X	
25. Hardee		X																	X	
26. Hendry		X																	X	
27. Hernando		X																	X	
28. Highlands		X																	X	
29. Hillsborough	X			X			X		Optional				X	X	X	X		X		
30. Holmes		X																	X	
31. Indian River		X																	X	
32. Jackson		X																	X	
33. Jefferson		X																	X	
34. Lafayette		X																	X	
35. Lake		X																	X	
36. Lee	X			X			X		6			X	X	X	X				X	
37. Leon		X																	X	
38. Levy		X																	X	
39. Liberty		X																	X	
40. Madison		X																	X	
41. Manatee	X			X			X		1						X				X	
42. Marion		X																	X	
43. Martin		X																	X	
44. Monroe		X																	X	
45. Nassau		X																	X	
46. Okaloosa	X		X	X			X					X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
47. Okeechobee		X																	X	
48. Orange		X																	X	
49. Osceola		X																	X	
50. Palm Beach	X			X			X		30			X						X		
51. Pasco	X			X			X		1			X							X	
52. Pinellas	X			X			X												X	
53. Polk	X			X			X		1	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	
54. Putnam		X																	X	
55. St. Johns	X																		X	
56. St. Lucie	X			X					Some			X							X	
57. Santa Rosa																				X
58. Sarasota																				X
59. Seminole	X			X			X		1						X				X	
60. Sumter		X																	X	
61. Suwannee		X																	X	
62. Taylor		X																	X	
63. Union		X																	X	
64. Volusia	X			X					1	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		
65. Wakulla		X																	X	
66. Walton		X																	X	
67. Washington		X																	X	
Total	24	40	4	22	1	0	20	0	177	3	5	8	9	11	14	4	3	5	59	3

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS OFFERED BY THE REPORTING COUNTIES

Baker: The foreign language program in junior high is exploratory type.

Bay: This is a beginning program so we have not gone far enough to be helpful.

Brevard: We use parents in the community and are not concerned about the language.

Broward: We are giving some consideration to the teaching of Spanish in the eighth grade.

Collier: We plan to initiate a conversational Spanish program in the intermediate grades (fourth, fifth, sixth) in one of our schools in the county in the school year 1959–60.

We have been in contact with the foreign language departments of both Florida State University and the University of Florida concerning such a program, and have received much helpful material as suggestions. Our elementary supervisor plans to take a course offered by the University of Florida during the summer of 1959 which is designed particularly for teachers of Spanish on the elementary level.

Dade: Weekly TV programs by superintendent of Spanish, evening. Also daily program by radio to every class in every school.

Dixie: We have a second grade teacher who is a good Spanish teacher and offers Spanish to the second grade of her own accord. We do offer Spanish in high school.

Duval: An exceptional child program teacher for gifted children has been teaching French in two schools to selected pupils. One school is experimenting on letting classroom teachers learn Spanish along with the children.

Escambia: Several elementary schools teach Spanish as an extra activity in sixth grade but no formal teaching is done in our schools below ninth grade.

Gadsden: This French is taught in a small school (grades 1 to 8). The principal of this four-teacher school teaches both seventh and eighth grades (12 children). This French class is enrichment.

Glades: The above program (Spanish fourth, fifth, sixth grades) is designed as an enrichment or challenge for the apparently superior and gifted students. It is not available to the total student body in those grades.

Gulf (Spanish, sixth grade): We use records (phonograph) and the guidebooks developed by Dade County.

Hillsborough, (Spanish): In the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh it is taught by radio and teachers are given a guide for the lessons. Teachers do not have to be able to speak the language itself. Radio teacher is available to help classroom teachers. A course in conversational Spanish is offered adults through our adult program.

Hamilton: How effective is the foreign language in the elementary and what is the true purpose for teaching it? We, too, are interested in this idea.

Lee: This was part of our enrichment program for gifted students.

Leon: There are a few teachers in the county who teach a little Spanish on their own. This is not a planned program, however.

Levy: We are a small rural county and do not have teachers qualified at the present time. We have had a 30-minute class in conversational Spanish 1 year in the elementary grades which was very well received by both pupils and teachers. We had to discontinue this when we lost this person.

Marion: We had a Spanish class in one of our third grades 2 years ago but due to the faculty we were not able to follow the program in the fourth grade. At this time, we are simply giving thought to the possibilities in the future.

Nassau: Our junior high day is overflowing now. I would like to see the daily schedule of a junior high class which has a foreign language.

Okeechobee: We plan to teach Spanish beginning with the second semester, in an advanced section of the fifth grade.

Orange: We are trying out an experiment of teaching four classes in foreign languages in four different elementary schools, after school hours. The teachers will get $300 a year and the hours will be from 3:30 to 4:30 p.m. Each class will be limited to 20 students. This is all the foreign-language teaching we have in the elementary schools at the present time, and this experiment has just been started.

Palm Beach: Through the adult education program, classes for teachers will be organized in conversational Spanish. Consultant from Miami will work with teachers who will be engaged in the program. We plan to initiate a program of Spanish radio lessons beginning at the third-grade level on January 27, 1959.

Pasco: (Spanish third grade). We have just started this and as yet would not be in a position to make an evaluation. It does seem thus far that the pupils enjoy it and tend to make a game of it. If it is successful we will probably expand it at a later date. We would be happy to have the results of your experiment.

Pinellas: We have a course in conversational Spanish taught by radio and on a voluntary basis.

Putnam: We are planning to begin a program (on a very small scale) in one of our elementary schools here in Palatka. We are at present attempting to secure suitable materials. At present we are looking over materials from Harr Wagner Publishing Co., San Francisco.

St. Lucie: In some third grades a limited amount of conversational Spanish is taught.

Seminole: Two sixth grade teachers in one school teach some Spanish in connection with social studies.

Volusia: (Spanish—grades 1 through 6) A junior college Spanish teacher is conducting a weekly class in Spanish with the entire faculty of 35 teachers in the one school where this is being done. This is the first year of the experiment and so far there is little which can be reported but the interest seems to be high. Every teacher participates in the program. In one other school a French war bride is conducting a small class in conversational French on a voluntary basis in the upper elementary classes.

Radical Surgery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Arthur Daley, entitled "Radical Surgery," and dealing with professional sports legislation, which appeared in the New York Times on February 6, 1959:

RADICAL SURGERY
(By Arthur Daley)

ESTES KEFAUVER, the resident surgeon at the legislative cure-all hospital in Washington, is operating on his sports patients with all the finesse of a physician who uses a meat ax instead of a scalpel. Even though the operations are successful, the patients surely will die. The surgery is far too radical and has been prescribed without any true understanding of the backgrounds of those about to be carved.

Senator KEFAUVER has just dropped into the hopper a sweeping sports antitrust bill that almost seems antisports as well. He proposes such an amputation job on the reserve clause that baseball hardly will be able to stand. He would cripple the draft, a move that baseball might survive but that would kill pro football.

The phenomenal rise of pro football is predicated almost entirely on the fact that evenly matched teams make competition so keen that these are the sharpest sports blades ever honed. It's the draft that supplies the razor's edge.

NEIGHBORLY LOOK

The Senator doesn't have to look far to find exhibit A. Just up the pike a bit from the Capital is Baltimore. Not many years ago the Colts were hopeless. But the draft kept giving them first whack at star players and the Colts now are the champions. The Detroit Lions won a title one season, dropped to last the next campaign and picked up just enough star performers to zoom back near the top again. The draft is the greatest equalizer ever invented.

If it should be eliminated, the rich clubs with the biggest seating capacities will dominate the National Football League. That would mean the Los Angeles Rams, the Cleveland Browns, and the New York Giants. They would corner the talent in an open market. That's what the Browns did in the All-American Conference and the lack of an adequate challenger to Coach Paul Brown's invincibles led to the league's dissolution.

The baseball draft is not quite so important as a feeder. Yet it has its place. When there was no draft some 30 years ago, the shrewd Jack Dunn of the old Baltimore Orioles of the International League built up one of the strongest of all minor league teams. While he was at it, Dunn delayed the big league debuts of a slew of stars.

DELAYED PROMOTION

The Oriole owner was the chap who sold a brilliant left-handed pitcher to the Boston Red Sox in 1914 for $2,900—a fellow named Babe Ruth. Eleven years later Dunn was an infinitely better salesman. He sold another brilliant southpaw, Lefty Grove, to the Philadelphia Athletics for $100,600. The reason for that odd price was because of the fact that Ruth's resale to the Yankees was for $100,000, then a record. Dunn merely wanted to top it with Grove.

But Lefty was then 25 years old, a late start for a fireballer of his superlative skills. Max Bishop was 25 when he was sold by Dunn to the A's for $50,000. Jack Bentley was 28 when he went to the New York Giants for $65,000. Other high-priced Orioles were George Earnshaw, aged 28, and Joe Boley, aged 29. If there had been a draft then, they'd have gone years earlier.

Dunn made a profitable operation out of minor league ball. But the minors never did recover from the blight of the depression. The number shrank to 14 leagues in 1933 and the alarmed majors began to subsidize their little brothers. In the lush postwar years the leagues zoomed to nearly 60, an obviously inflated number. Now they are down to 26, which is much too deflated.

But the majors are to blame for the most part because of their reckless flooding of minor league territories with television broadcasts. Commissioner Ford Frick would dearly love to control TV but is powerless to do so. If Senator KEFAUVER really wanted to help baseball, he would take the shackles off Frick and permit the Commissioner to order restraints.

SMART SYSTEM

Bert Bell, the fooball commissioner, operates a tighter league and he took the gamble of ordering blackouts of home games. When he won in court, his circuit's prosperity was assured because the play-for-pay gridiron performers were not required to give away what they were trying to sell.

However, Frick's sprawling baseball empire is so constituted that lawsuits with triple damages involved could lead to bankruptcy. If he could remove the risk of charges of conspiracy, the Senator from Tennessee would be doing a real favor. Instead of that, he seems inclined to fuzz up the situation even more by consigning baseball's television problems to the Federal Communications Commission.

The Kefauver bill, as reported in the press, appears unnecessarily harsh and unrealistic. It wouldn't cure the minors of their ills but would kill them because they would die of malnutrition as soon as the majors withdrew their subsidies. And there would be little spending for talent by the majors when they lacked assurance that they might some day profit on investments.

Maybe Senator KEFAUVER just got confused from listening to Casey Stengel's testimony in Washington last summer. The Yankees' manager can confuse anyone.

Jimmy Waits, but Page Job Hope Is Fading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by Mr. William McGaffen, of the Chicago Daily News, in my judgment, is one of the most factual reports on the troubles little Jimmy Johnson, Jr., has experienced.

I thought it would be of interest:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Feb. 6, 1959]

JIMMY WAITS, BUT PAGE JOB HOPE IS FADING—INTEREST IN CHICAGOAN'S CASE SLACKENING OFF IN CONGRESS

(By William McGaffin)

WASHINGTON.—Jimmy Johnson, Jr., flew in from Chicago on January 28, a 14-year-old Negro boy bursting with happiness.

Representative O'HARA, Democrat, of Chicago, had arranged for him to be a page in the House of Representatives.

This meant that Jimmy could attend the Capitol's page school and, perhaps, get a scholarship to go on from there to medical school.

After a week and a half of waiting, however, Jimmy still does not have the job. His nerves are so shot, his mother, Mrs. Avis Johnson, has had to take him to the doctor.

While Jimmy sits in the apartment of his aunt, Ethel Payne, nursing heartache and disillusion, the interest his case aroused at first seems to be dying down.

Who was to blame for the fact that the job was not open when Jimmy arrived?

O'HARA asserted that he had received a go-ahead from the Democratic patronage committee to send for the boy.

The committee later told him, O'HARA said, that it had made a mistake and confused his recommendation with one made by Representative O'BRIEN, another Chicago Democrat and leader of the Illinois Democratic delegation.

Representative WALTERS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the patronage committee, contends that O'HARA's version is incorrect.

After the initial shock wore off, however, it was not a question of who was to blame. Rather, could a job be made available for a boy who, through no fault of his own, was without one after being promised it?

O'HARA said he would fight for the boy. He would offer a resolution in the House to increase the number of pages from 50 to 51 so that Jimmy could be appointed to the vacancy.

WALTER countered that this would do no good as there were 14 Congressmen ahead of O'HARA with greater seniority waiting to appoint pages.

O'HARA might still have gone ahead with his promised fight except that the Democratic leadership in the House gave him the cold shoulder treatment. And the white-haired veteran of many a political battle was unable to rally enough support among his personal friends to fight "city hall."

Is there an unwritten rule or a gentleman's agreement, inspired by the powerful southern Democrats who control the House, that a Negro shall not serve as a page in Congress?

Some northern Members of Congress are beginning to suspect this.

They say perhaps that is why there has never been a Negro page in either House, although there are two now in the Supreme Court.

The patronage committee denies that race had anything to do with his. But the committee is not lifting a finger to cooperate with two Congressmen who are attempting to provide a solution to Jimmy's problem.

Representative ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, and Representative AYRES, Republican, of Ohio, have offered to share Jimmy as a clerk and messenger boy in their offices until a page job opens up for him, providing Jimmy is allowed to go to the page school.

"This has left a terrible impression around the country," said AYRES. "A little kid who was promised somehing and then Congress reneged."

AYRES said that although Jimmy now had a job offer, he still would have to get the approval of the Democratic patronage committee before he could enter the page school.

An official of the school confirmed this. Chairman WALTER, however, challenged both the school official and the Congressman. He said the committee's approval was not necessary.

Budget Out the Window

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Feb. 6, 1959]

BUDGET OUT THE WINDOW

It hasn't taken the Democratic majority in Congress long to dash all hopes that the United States will operate on a balanced budget, as proposed by President Eisenhower, in the next fiscal year.

With the House of Representatives authorizing a new $300 million fund for veterans housing, the Senate pushing through a $2.9 billion omnibus housing bill and Senate Majority Leader JOHNSON fronting for an airport improvement bill, it is obvious that the Democrats have launched on a spending spree that is likely to run up a deficit similar to the $12 billion one that we'll have during the present fiscal year ending in June.

The Democrats have shown definitely that they have no interest whatsoever in ending deficit spending or in making possible a reduction in Federal taxes any time in the foreseeable future. More than ever they are embarked on a high spend—high tax program with no thought whatever as to the consequences.

President Eisenhower in his press conference this week put the finger squarely upon their fiscal irresponsibility when he called upon those who vote for more spending also to vote to levy the taxes to pay for the expanded programs which they are espousing.

In their votes on housing and in the airport promotion program the Democrats have given no indication that they plan to provide additional taxes to pay for those programs. Apparently they have given no thought whatever as to how the money is to be provided.

Reckless spending of this sort can lead only to increased inflation and a further devaluation of the dollar.

There is only one thing good about the situation as it has developed. The responsibility for the wild spending spree is definitely placed at the door of the Democratic Party. There can be no doubt about that.

Life Magazine Prize Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in last week's Life magazine sets out facts regarding international problems. All Members should read the timely warning which reminds us of the downfall of nations in world history when the people followed the easy way of profits and pleasure.

THE COST OF EASY OPTIONS—WE MUST RECOVER OUR PUBLIC CONSCIENCE TO DEAL WITH RUSSIA'S IRON PURPOSE

Beneath the particular controversies over the missile lag, foreign policy, and the budget, a deeper and more fearful concern has been stirring some of the most responsible U.S. leaders. Their worry: are Americans—undereducated, overentertained, tossing easefully but restlessly in what Reinhold Neibuhr calls a state of sophisticated vulgarity, still capable of discharging their moral duty as citizens to their country and to the world they live in? When, they ask, will we realize that the very power and success of U.S. society demand more, not less, individual dedication from its citizenship.

The concern has lately been voiced by many men of widely separate outlooks—Vice President NIXON, Secretary of Labor Mitchell, Adm. Arthur Radford, Walter Lippmann, and Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, among others. And increasingly it is stated not in terms of security but of survival. In the long run, they agree, nothing but an intense national effort can halt the hugely purposeful Soviet assault on free civilization.

The best recent statement of this informed worry comes from Adlai Stevenson, in a speech about the condition of survival. It makes sharp and disturbing reading—especially against the background of the current proceedings at the Communist Party Congress in Moscow where Khrushchev's re-Stalinized leadership loudly boasts of the speed with which communism can overtake and defeat the United States.

Stevenson first cites his own recent observations of the Soviet Union: "An overwhelming impression of thrust and purpose in most aspects of Soviet life * * * no effort, no dedication, no sacrifice is too great that may help realize the Communist Party's goals in Soviet society * * * no corner of humanity can be a matter of indifference to the Communists, because the whole human race is destined to become one in Communist brotherhood."

This Soviet purpose he sets against the dilatoriness of the United States, which like the self-distracting hare seems content to watch Khrushchev's curious armored tortoise plod steadily toward the race's finish line. ("Why should they be so busy?" he asks. "Why do we never meet an isolationist Communist?") The reason for the discrepancy: "* * * the Soviet Russians believe in their truth, as the men of the Western World once believed in theirs. * * * The fact that their faith is in many ways an evil perversion of the great propositions that once made the blood course in our Western veins

does not alter the fact that their tempo is dynamic and ours sluggish—even, I think, to ourselves.

"All our talk—in diplomacy, in strategy, in aid and trade * * * has been to a depressing degree purely defensive. We have offered aid not to help others but to shield ourselves. We watch the skies for other people's sputniks and listen to the telegraph wires for other people's moves. Yet we are the freemen of this universe, the children of liberty, the beneficiaries of unequaled abundance, and heirs of the highest, proudest political tradition ever known to man."

This U.S. defensiveness comes from a paralysis of will, which has nothing to do with any deficiency of technology or resources. It is a matter of people forgetting that political freedom can be sustained only by continuing individual commitment. As Stevenson continues: "The great German poet Goethe, who also lived through a crisis of freedom, said to his generation, 'What you have inherited from your fathers, earn over again for yourselves or it will not be yours.' We inherited freedom. We seem unaware that it has to be remade and reearned in each generation of man.

"Do not let us make any mistake about this. The natural government of man is servitude. Tyranny is the normal pattern of government. * * * For freedom demands infinitely more care and devotion than any other political system. It puts consent and personal initiative in the place of command and obedience by relying on the devotion and initiative of ordinary citizens.

"If freedom means ease alone, if it means shirking the hard disciplines of learning, if it means evading the rigors and rewards of creative activity, if it means more expenditure on advertising than education, if it means bachelor cooking and life adjustment courses in the schools, and the steady cult of the trivial and the mediocre, if it means—worst of all—indifference or contempt for all but athletic excellence, we may keep for a time the forms of free society, but its spirit will be dead.

"I believe we have had enough of adjustment, conformity, easy options and the least common denominator in our system. * * * The dreary failure in history of all classes committed to pleasure and profit alone, the vacuity and misery accompanying the sole pursuit of ease—the collapse of the French aristocracy, the corruption of imperial Rome * * * all these facts of history do not lose their point because the pleasures of today are mass pleasures and no longer enjoyments of an elite. If we become a nation of Bourbons, numbers won't save us. We shall go their way. Vacuity and indifference are not redeemed by the fact that everyone can share in them.

"We do not slip into happiness. It is strenuously sought and earned. A nation glued to the television screen is not simply at a loss before the iron pioneers of the new collective society. It isn't even having a good time. No society has even spent as much as we do on drink and tranquilizers. Can we argue that this is evidence of universal fun?

"How are we to defend freedom if, for the tyranny of external control, we substitute the clattering, cluttering tyranny of internal aimlessness and fuss?

"I doubt if any society in history has faced so great a moral challenge as ours, or needed more desperately to draw on the deepest source of courage and responsibility. Ours is the first human community in which resources are so abundant that almost no policies lie beyond our capacity for purely physical reasons. What we decide to do, we can do * * *."

The ease of modern living makes our responsibility for wise decision greater, not less. "In a century in which so many of the mentors of the public mind—from the psychiatrists to the admen—speak to us in terms of what we owe to ourselves, may there not indeed have been a slackening of devotion compared with those days not so long distant, when what man owes to God and his neighbor was a common theme of public discourse?"

The implications of Stevenson's concern run too broad and deep to be confined to any set of rules or helpful nostrums. Some areas of U.S. life are more obviously targets of his criticism than others—in another speech last week Stevenson himself singled out the damage done to our schools by life adjustment educationists. But the prevailing climate of moral isolationism is found in every corner of our society, and almost everywhere it contrasts sadly with the immoral but energtic expansionism of the Soviet Union.

The United States grew into a great and free society precisely because the Nation could always count on a widespread instinct among its citizens for translating private moral conscience into public virtue, a virtue made operational by the citzens' action in the Nation's life. At the moment this instinct is dangerously weak. The resultant gulf betwen privae conscience and public virture cannot be bridged by easeful living, spectatoritis or a let-George-do-it indifference. The wider this gulf becomes, the narrower grows our margin of national survival.

Military Research and Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address "Military Research and Development," delivered by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army, at a luncheon of the American Management Association, held in Hotel Roosevelt, New York City, on January 14, 1959.

General Trudeau, a dedicated American is one of the best qualified men to discuss this subject matter of his address. His address should be as widely read as possible.

In making the remarks he did about Deputy Prime Minister Mikoyan of the Soviet Union, he is to be admired not only for his remarks, but for his courage in making them; remarks that at least 99 percent of our people agree with and approve. This is particularly so now in view of the release by the State Department of authenticated evidence of the inhuman and cold-blood killing of American airmen.

The Department of the Army is to be congratulated in having Lieutenant General Trudeau as one of its officers.

As the Department of the Army is a service branch of the Department of Defense, my observations above applies to this Department.

The address follows:

MILITARY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Marvin, distinguished guests, members of the American Management Association, ladies and gentlemen, it is always a pleasure for me to visit this great center of financial and industrial management and especially so when I can address such a notable group of Americans devoted to the ideals of better management.

Management—its concepts and practice—is the directing force of our national economy. It determines the effectiveness of our Government, our foreign relations, world trade, and our entire way of life. There is a growing recognition of the fact that it is one of the most vital factors in the tremendous challenge that lies in the future, particularly now, when we have a late but a growing awareness of the economic struggle ahead.

Today, I would like to discuss this challenge in the light of military research and development and how this program is related to industry and, to put it bluntly, to our national survival.

One hundred eighty-one years ago—just about this same time of year—Gen. George Washington was trying to rebuild his shattered army at Valley Forge to meet an enemy seemingly invincible at that time. The British were waiting for spring to close in on him and the American people were dismayed, at least those courageous Americans who believed in freedom. It appeared likely that the infant American Republic would not survive its birth struggle. There were many people in our country at that time who, I am sure, said either openly or covertly, "If that fool Washington would go home and leave things alone, we'd be much better off and business could go on as usual."

This group of people, who never have stood by the colors very well, I am sure said the same thing at Bunker Hill. They thought our fellow Americans were fools to stand and face the British and possible death by waiting until they saw the whites of their eyes, despite the fact that these patriots were fighting for principle and for honor and for freedom.

Unfortunately, there is still an element that feels that way today and advocates peaceful coexistence with the Soviet bloc without any appreciation of what the end result of such a policy would be.

Some of you have probably seen Bunker Hill. It is not a very impressive hill. In fact, it is not a very big hill at all. But the men who were there were very tall men because they stood for principle. When our country takes a firm position today with respect to Quemoy and Berlin as frontiers of the free world, it is taking the same attitude that those courageous men took at Bunker Hill and Valley Forge long years ago, even though the purpose be somewhat different. This has been done in spite of those weaklings who haven't the courage and of some who haven't the desire to support our national position in these difficult, delicate times; in fact, they constantly seek to dilute and destroy our national will to resist the ravages and inroads of world communism.

Now it was during this heartbreaking winter at Valley Forge that an American soldier sat down one night to write, and by the flickering light of his campfire, on a drumhead, he wrote as follows: "These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country."

This soldier was, as some of you may have guessed, Tom Paine. And the paper was the first of his many pamphlets titled "The American Crisis." While there are many points in the philosophy that Tom Paine expounded to which I do not agree, and I am sure some of you disagree also, we would have a hard time finding any fault with this particular thought.

A little later he said again: "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom,

must, like men, undergo the fatigues of supporting it."

I stand shoulder to shoulder with you members of the American Management Association and with real Americans everywhere who are willing to stand by their responsibilities for the privileges of reaping the blessings that have been bestowed on our country and retaining them for our children. We must do it with our whole strength and our whole mind and our whole spirit. I hope, and I know, that there are among us here no summer soldiers who are going to shrink in any crisis, and it is reassuring to me today to stand before such a group dedicated to the ways and means of keeping our Nation strong and uppermost in the struggle for freedom.

Our blessings of freedom today are being seriously challenged by an enemy who is powerful, fanatic, shrewd, ruthless, and completely unscrupulous. The Communists regard the struggle between themselves and ourselves as a matter of life and death. And it is truly that. Anyone who studied the tenets of Marx, Engels, Stalin, and Lenin cannot help but appreciate what these people, the proponents of this philosophy of life—as between ours which represents the dignity and freedom of man, and theirs which represents the slave world—are intending to do as far as we are concerned.

Khrushchev, the latest exponent of the Communist philosophy, states it in his own words. He made it very short, and only used four words, five syllables: "We will bury you." And he continues to repeat that day after day. The policies he follows indicate clearly his intentions, and we would be completely stupid to disregard them.

The Communist intention is very clearly stated in their own words—to destroy us. Yet there is that segment of our population who would try to tell you otherwise, through ignorance or intent, who would try to lull you to sleep, who would try to make you lie down as the lamb with the wolf and expect to wake up in the morning.

We must either be prepared to defend ourselves adequately or be willing to accept the consequences. That is the national challenge today, and the question is up to us—the American people—and our leaders to recognize these problems.

To meet the challenge of the Communist economic, political, and military threat that they have fashioned, our National Government and the military services must carry out an expanded research and development program that will result in better ways and better means to meet that threat. I am sure the great Soviet success with their lunar probe will give added impetus to our own programs.

At this moment in another part of this great city the No. 2 man in the Soviet Union is trying to convince some of our business leaders that the bosses of the Kremlin are really great and well-meaning fellows and that we ought to give them large credits to equip their industry so that it can outstrip ours more quickly. Since by their own definition they are our enemy this would clearly be giving aid and comfort to them in my opinion. Only last year Khrushchev said, and I quote:

"Of course we must recognize that we cannot coexist externally. One of us must go to the grave. We do not want to go to the grave. They (the West) don't want to go to their graves, either. So what must be done? We must push them to their graves."

But now our visitor's personal charm, ready wit, and pleasant smile are given the wishful interpretation of representing a new and really friendly Kremlin. It is easy to effect a grin that is a photographer's delight (this seems to be modern proof that one is a success and a great fellow) but we need a cold appraisal of the verbal vodka that flows from the Kremlin. It is alarming that this is so readily imbibed by many gullible people who accept the smiling face of Mr. Mikoyan as the proof and trademark of newborn sincerity, friendship, and integrity on the part of the Soviet despite the absence of any single action on their part to recede from or alter policies and programs that revulse the free world and foreshadow world chaos.

Our guest should be accorded courteous treatment by all means, whether he is here to borrow, bargain, bluff, or bludgeon—but if we have money to lend or invest and credit to give, let us turn our eyes to our friends in Latin America and elsewhere around the world who are trying to fend off the insidious and subversive pressures of communism by improving their stability and internal economy.

I would now like to turn to the military research and development programs, cover some of the more important aspects and point out where we need some bold steps forward. Following that, I would like to briefly examine research and development in industry and the combination of Government, military, and industrial research and development efforts as they affect our security for the future.

First, our Government research and development program.

As scientific and technological progress has accelerated in the past decade, so has the emphasis on research and development. I think it is a recognized fact that our ability to meet the military requirements in the next decade has largely been determined by research and development efforts which started several years ago. This is due to the present long leadtime cycle required under our system to produce operational weapons and equipment. We like to say that leadtime is the period from wanting to getting, or from "womb to boom." More specifically, it is the time from the initiation of a project until the finished hardware is delivered to the using troops.

At the present time, it takes an average of 8 to 10 years to complete this cycle. This is much too long. This time covers research, development, testing, engineering, and production. When compared to the Soviet leadtime of about 5 years, we can see that we have a serious problem between Government and industry to shorten this leadtime. And shorten it we must, if we are to match the wide and shifting range of Soviet capabilities. We can't compete in quantity with the manpower of the Soviet bloc, so it is necessary to be superior in weapons and material along with strategy and tactics if we are to assume a strong and adequate national posture and maintain it in the face of the Soviet threat. This means superior management, a dynamic research program and better utilization of our manpower.

I am not going to discuss the details and mechanics of the development cycle nor the corrective measures we are seeking to oil the gears of production. I do want to impress upon you the importance of shortening leadtime if we ever hope to establish a sustained advantage over the U.S.S.R. As an example, if a technological breakthrough were achieved today it would not be until 1966, or later, that a new family of developments could be operational. In contrast, the U.S.S.R. could acquire such new information 2 years later—or steal it from us meanwhile—and still beat us to the punch by 1 year with a similar weapon or a counterweapon. This is the real meaning of leadtime to us and the reason we are so conscious of the need for a drastic revision in our funding and management techniques to achieve a much shorter cycle of 4 years. This is a positive step to keep obsolescence from undermining our new developments.

You have undoubtedly noticed a definite tendency for centralized control of the national research and development effort. The President has a scientific adviser, Dr. Killian, a new Federal Council for Science and Technology, and other organizations such as the National Science Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The important point is here that research and development is becoming such a big business with the Government that centralized direction of such effort is necessary. However, there is always a danger of becoming overcontrolled. Of course, this is a problem that is common not only to Government and the military services but also to industry as well. In these days of superior communications and rapid transportation we often neglect the proper decentralization of authority to commanders and operators on the ground. Instead of letting a responsible manager make a decision, he can more easily be told to make a phone call or asked to come to his superior's office by plane to discuss the problem. This shifts the decision away from the place where it can best be made on many occasions and is costly in time, money, and effort.

It's an area that we all have to watch very carefully in the future. We all know the basic rule of good management that warns against overstaffing as it so often dissipates authority among those who share no real part of the responsibility for the results of their actions.

In general, the national research and development program has achieved widespread recognition in recent years as a basic requirement for the continuing scientific and technological progress of our Nation and the free world. Our Government has expanded the national budget to reflect this emphasis and has organized more facilities to pursue the fields of research. The services in turn have devoted more funds to research and development as requirements for more expensive and complex weapon systems increase with the growing Communist bloc threat.

Now for the military research and development program.

Because of the present environment of military uncertainty, all of the services face a difficult task in creating and maintaining effective weapon systems to carry out their missions. As you know, the Army has the mission of winning the land battle as well as providing elements for air defense. It is our objective in research and development to provide the most effective weapons and materiel for our future Army. The scope of this research and development mission covers an extremely wide spectrum of developments and we feel our responsibility very keenly whether we are predicting future needs in mobility, communications, firepower or logistical support.

I know that you representatives of management deal with organizations and objectives a great deal, but I would like to say a few words about the Army's research and development organization as an example of the military effort. We monitor over 2,000 tasks in the 2 general areas of basic research and applied research and development. By and large, these projects are actually executed by the Army's seven technical services and civilian contracting agencies.

We conduct a substantial amount of basic research through industry and some 123 colleges and universities. Ten major fields and 74 subfields are covered from mathematics and materials research to human factors and nuclear effects. We must continue to emphasize this type of work. Without it there would be little future development. As a matter of fact, our technological progress today determines the state of the weapon art in any future period. We can never afford to neglect basic research which contributes the seed from which applied research and development not only extracts the crop of weapons but also redounds in so

many ways to the betterment of our civilian economy and the welfare of our people.

Inseparably related to management, proper funding is one of the most critical factors in our program. An effective research and development program capable of producing weapons and equipment superior to that of any potential enemy in a timely manner requires hundreds of millions of dollars in any given fiscal year. There has to be appropriate adjustments to this amount annually to accommodate rising state-of-the-art and cost trends. Some of the factors inherent in the increased funding required are interesting to investigate because of their impact on our national economy and their general application to industry and Government, as well as to the military.

First, the acceleration of technological advances leads to earlier obsolescence of materiel, requiring more frequent replacement. This is part of the reason for the Army's $15 billion modernization program. As a result of rapid obsolescence, constant product improvement is required and it is seldom adequate. Bold steps forward are required in this area and these steps are often costly. While the horse and lance remained important weapons of warfare for more than 2,000 years, the manned airplane may last less than 100 years. Only man remains irreplaceable and we can hope that ultimately he will gain the wisdom to forgo the horrors of warfare.

Next, the decreasing value of the dollar serves to provide less and less return from each dollar expended. Based on comparative statistics, the Army can expect its current dollar to buy only 80 percent as much goods and services as dollars did 5 years ago. Projected to 1960 and translated in terms of the research and development program, this means that the money provided in our budget will procure 20 percent less than the dollar in the 1955 appropriation.

Third, the increasing cost of the more sophisticated weapon systems required in the modern Army further limits the return per dollar. The guided missile systems that became operational in 1953 such as the Nike and the Corporal are being replaced with newer systems today that cost several times more. Such is the cost of survival today in the face of the growing threat that confronts us but it is better to spend dollars than blood to preserve it.

The last factor is the increasing likelihood of hostilities without a thermonuclear exchange and with a possible restriction on the use of nuclear weapons. This requirement for dual approaches to satisfy conventional as well as atomic military needs—like the artillery piece that must be capable of firing either an atomic shell or an ordinary high explosive charge—further increases costs.

To secure the maximum advantage from available dollars, we must continue to eliminate projects that offer only marginal improvement. We don't have the funds to develop one-third of the projects that are favorably recommended to us. Consequently, we have to constantly review the developments already initiated or proposed and cut off those which appear to be only of marginal value.

Although I have not mentioned the role of management specifically, it is certainly up to military and Government management to terminate unprofitable projects of the type that I have just mentioned. This requires a definite degree of boldness, for you run head on into enthusiasts, backers, and manufacturers of these items who do not give in quietly. To keep our programs moving we must continually review and reject or cut off those at the bottom of the pile, while being aggressive but more selective in seeking newer developments for the future.

Another important action of management is to require a constant and studied boldness and alertness by scientists and technologists to seize upon new techniques and breakthroughs that continually change the research pattern. Such information must be quickly assimilated, disseminated, and exploited.

To take advantage of this rapid technological pace, concurrent research, development, production design and engineering is necessary in many cases. This is the "systems engineering concept where production engineers enter the picture early. These two areas of research and development are certainly fundamental in any analysis of the relationship of the technological goals of the military to the profit goals of industry. I have covered some of these technological goals in a rather general manner so far, so now I would like to be more specific in this respect.

The military services seek weapons and materiel that can be produced in the shortest possible time. This equipment must be as foolproof as possible, yet rugged enough to withstand the rigors of a dusty, grimy, dirty, muddy battlefield under all types of environmental conditions. The equipment must be lightweight to provide the utmost mobility. Above all, it must reliably perform its particular function, whether it is a complex guided missile system or whether it is merely a new item of clothing designed to keep a soldier warm in the most extreme arctic conditions. Integrated into this must be the human factors concept of engineering this equipment, so that maintenance, and particularly, training can be performed by a man with only limited military experience. Some of our recent electronic developments like module packaging and rapid "go, no-go" checks are examples of this type of design and engineering which give full consideration to man-machine compatability problems.

In addition to those characteristics of new materiel which reflect the latest state-of-the-art, the military also seeks a broad base of research and development experience that covers the various sciences and delves into the area of new materials, energy sources, radiation effects, and high frequency transmission systems. With a sufficient investigation of these areas, the requirements for future weapons and equipment can be more readily and better met.

Enough for the military side of research and development. Let's look at the industrial picture with which you are so familiar. I can only attempt a brief discussion in this area, but I would like to point out a few factors that I think are important.

As you well know, in our civilian economy, each corporation engages in research and development activities to increase its sales, either with new or improved products. The cost of such research and development must be borne completely by the corporation and will be reflected in the price of the product. Normally research and development by a corporation is done by laboratories and personnel within that organization or by contract. Generally speaking, the urgency of civilian research and development is dictated by economic factors and the rate of progress of such research activities is that which will give the most economical end result.

Research and development in industry is always a high risk business. The investment in research and development of products for the civilian market has to be considerable these days but industry must be able to please the customer with its newest products if its sources of profit are to continue. When a company is particularly successful in doing so, because of product innovations or improvements, the earnings are high enough to pay off many unsuccessful attempts. Therefore the same factors that govern military research and development—funding and management—achieve the same importance with industry albeit the motivations are different.

Now when civilian research and development is combined with the military programs we find that industry faces monumental new requirements. And all of these considerations have to meet the added requirement for mass production in minimum production time.

There is quite an impressive list of requirements that must be achieved if the technological goals of the military are to be met. When you also consider the time-consuming contractual and budget procedures, you can see why there is a need for bold innovation at every level of the research and devlopmnt process to include its management, funding, and administration.

On the national level again, it is mandatory that we increase our ability to better manage our resources, both material and human, if we are to cope with the Communist threat. If we feel that we can control our material resources by better research, engineering, development, and production methods, then perhaps we should look more closely at how we manage our human resources. I mean this: I believe we have failed seriously to advance our social sciences and their application at the same pace as we have advanced our physical sciences. This includes failures in the field of education and failure to indoctrinate our young people and our fellow workers with the ideals, morals, pride of accomplishment, initiative and acceptance of responsibility that made America great. Our philosophy of life needs a searching review.

Theodore Roosevelt expressed it this way: "The things that will destroy America are prosperity-at-any-price, peace-at-any-price, safety first instead of duty first, the love of soft living and the get-rich-quick theory of life."

Those are certainly words to think about and they rather indicate some of our present national attitudes toward life.

We cannot maintain the status quo of our economy and our way of life if we continue to look at ourselves and the world with the same old complacency that dictates holding the line and only advocates a higher standard of living for us with no willingness to make greater sacrifices or accept greater responsibilities on behalf of the free world. We need to regain the dynamism that energized us during the past century.

I believe that this directly bears on our national ability to project a more energetic research and development program in the military, industry or in government. Today, I have emphasized the military part of the research and development program and tried to indicate some of its objectives and technological goals as well as how it functions, at least within the Army. There are many ways to improve and broaden this vital program and I have stressed that the problem today is not so much one of shortages of material and human resources as it is the problem of better management and funding. Aggressive action in these two areas will result in better equipment and material for our future civilian as well as military needs and production by industry in a shorter lead time than we have now.

I opened my remarks with a bit of our rich American heritage which culminated in the establishment of our Nation years after that bitter winter at Valley Forge. Those men, those patriots, never ceased to take their eyes, their hearts, or their souls from the vision of independence. They came through the test by courageous action and not complacency for it was a most difficult task to even survive that environment in those times.

Liberty is a precious thing. It was bought with the blood of our fathers, and preserved by you and me and many of our sons within our lifetime. The signers who

pledgers their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor on July the Fourth, 1776, and the hundreds of thousands who gave their lives for America on this century's battlefields would look down on us with shame if they thought we would fail them now.

We must have a bold confident spirit in the fact of the Communist threat that endangers the free world today and a faith in our destiny as well as in our heritage. This is the kind of spirit that a fellow Vermonter of much earlier vintage had. His name was Ethan Allen.

After he had captured Ticonderoga and turned in the booty that he had captured, the Congress in its timidity considered turning the captured cannon back to the British, whereupon Ethan Allen wrote a letter to Congress and this is what he said among other things:

"I wish to God that America would, at this critical juncture, exert herself. She might rise on eagle's wings and mount up to glory, freedom and immortal honor if she but knew her strength."

Thank you very much. It has been a pleasure to be with you.

New Chairman of American Council on Education, Dr. O. Meredith Wilson, Distressed at Status of Education in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the new chairman of the American Council on Education is Dr. O. Meredith Wilson, president of the University of Oregon which is located in my hometown of Eugene. Dr. Wilson is the youngest chairman ever chosen for the council and is the first selected from west of the Mississippi. His honor is an honor for our State and the university. Dr. Wilson is concerned about the status of education in our country today. He urges wise investment in education to bring each of our children to his brightest potential. His remarks at a recent dinner in his honor are thought provoking. Portions of his address appeared in the January 30, 1959, edition of the Eugene Register-Guard. The story by Dan Sellard follows, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON'S WILSON WARNS COUNTING PENNIES HARMS EDUCATION

(By Dan Sellard)

SALEM.—America must not relax its attitude toward education, for tomorrow is looking in on us to se whether we are writing a prolog to tragedy or pages in an epic drama in which tomorrow can be a happy episode in a triumphant cavalcade, O. Meredith Wilson, University of Oregon president, said here Thursday evening.

Wilson spoke at a dinner gathering which honored him for his recent election as chairman of the American Council on Education. He is the youngest chairman ever chosen for the council and is the first west of the Mississippi.

About 150 guests were present at the dinner. Charles A. Sprague, Salem publisher and a former Governor of Oregon, was host.

Wilson expressed distress at America's status since the 19th century which has bred in us complacency, fed our national ego, quieted our pulse and stultified our efforts.

"There is merit in viewing the past as a prologue * * * but it is a fateful conceit for us or any nation to believe that we are the goal and that ours is the golden age."

To believe that "ours is the golden age," he said, "would mean that for western civilization this is the finale, and all since sputnik is but curtain call."

"Our history, read as prolog," he said, "should be searched for cause, in the hope that we may write a better script for what our children in their time may consider to be the final act."

The Nation has always invested generally in the minds of men, Wilson said, "but today we are faced with new difficulties, and if out of national conceit we spend our time in self-congratulation, we will be prologue to catastrophe."

THE HUMAN RESOURCES

"A sudden upsurge in the birthrate after World War II has presented us with the greatest crop of human resource in the history of our civilization," he continued "but at the moment when we should be congratulating ourselves and gladly making the appropriate investment to bring each of these children to his brightest potential, half the country is cautiously counting the educational pennies as though the perfection of our children were an extravagance rather than a prudent investment."

"Without support, education will fail and we will be prelude to tragedy," he said. "At the very moment that Russia, learning from our history, seems about to triumph through education, we threaten to make our education less general in its influence and more particular in its consequence."

QUOTED DE TOCQUEVILLE

Wilson quoted the French historian De-Tocqueville, who in 1835 said that "There are two great nations in the world * * * the Russians and the Americans * * * the Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends and gives free scope to the unguided strength and commonsense of the people; the Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm. * * *The principle instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter, servitude. * * * Their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

Wilson said that "what DeTocqueville expressed so clearly 125 years ago we were unwilling to recognize until sputnik rang the alarms and brought us bolt upright from the couch on which we have been taking our cultural siesta."

After tracing the history of American culture and education, Wilson launched into a case for spending more public money for better and more teachers.

DANGER TO EDUCATION

Obsolescence must be plowed under * * * without new adaptations or inventions, the quality of education must decline, for our supply of qualified teachers in college is soon to be in shorter supply than it has been in secondary education.

"In order to provide instruction for this increase (100 percent of college students by 1970) 440,000 new teachers will have to be appointed * * * but during the period, only 220,000 doctor of philosophy degrees may be awarded if we are able to double for the next decade the output of the last. * * * "But of the 220,000 doctors to be prepared, only 50 percent may be expected to enter teaching. * * *

"In other words, at a time when we are most concerned about the quality of the education we require for national security and economic prosperity, it appears certain that only one in four of our men teachers will be prepared as well as we would like to hope."

A possible innovation to alleviate the teaching load, Wilson said, is television, but he urged that this innovation be viewed with "a word of warning."

DO "WITH" NOT "TO" STUDENT

"The act of teaching should not suggest doing something 'to' but rather 'with' a student * * * it is, therefore, regrettable to contemplate an American society that is conditioned only to receiving—to being told. * * * If discussion falls victim to mechanical invention both education and democracy must suffer."

In conclusion, Wilson made an eloquent plea for more money to change higher education in Oregon from an average system to one of distinction.

It is always distressing, Wilson said, "that when the biennial (budget) decisions must be made, to be caught up in a campaign to keep Oregon's education average.

"As a State we are eager to grow. We have launched a great centennial celebration to attract attention. But we overlook the obvious, most simple step.

"The difference between the costs of average and distinguished higher education is primarily expressed in faculty salaries and library resources."

OTHER COSTS FIXED

"The other costs remain fairly fixed. For a small percentage addition to our asking budget we could catch attention where it really counts.

"Distinguished faculty draws distinguished students and funds for research often many times the State's investment. If there is any thing I can do for Oregon, this would be most useful: To persuade my people that investment in distinction would be prudent.

"Of course, it would have been prudent," he continued, "to have invested today's missile money in the last decade's education, for the success or failure of each countdown is but a sympton of our state of knowledge.

But we must remember that we are prologue, too, and that we must invest again, now. * * *

The wisdom and courage of today's investors in education will be measured in Oregon's growth and security tomorrow," he concluded.

Interview With Hon. Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island—An Elder Statesman at 91 Looks at the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interview with Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island, by the U.S. News & World Report, published in the issue of that magazine for February 13, 1959.

In my opinion, this interview with the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island is noteworthy, because it was participated in by a man who has seen much of the changing history of our country and the world. He has observed with wisdom and concern what has occurred and has, I believe, a good

deal of good advice for the rest of us.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR GREEN—AN ELDER STATESMAN AT 91 LOOKS AT THE WORLD TODAY

Question. Senator GREEN, what do you think is the most exciting period you've lived through?

Answer. Oh, I think this is.

Question. Why would you pick this period?

Answer. Well, I think possibly because more things are happening, faster and over a larger area. We are spreading out into other worlds now. And, partly because I am more susceptible to these changes, I find them more exciting.

Question. You are in the middle of them—

Answer. Yes, yes; I have a part in it and it is wonderful, I think—a wonderful time to be alive for any of us, but particularly those of us who possibly have something to do about it.

Sometimes it works the other way, of course, and it is depressing to think something ought to be done and it isn't, and you can't get it done, but I think it's better to try, even if you fail, than not to try.

Question. What is your general feeling, Senator, about the kind of world we are living in today, compared with earlier years?

Answer. Well, we are living so much faster today in every way—physically and every other way.

Question. Have you found that you can live more slowly than the general mass of the people?

Answer. No, I don't live any more slowly.

Question. Do you think things are moving in the right direction in Europe?

Answer. Well, we are moving so fast——

Question. Are they moving toward us, toward our ideas of what should be done?

Answer. Oh, I think so. I think the rest of the world is developing. They are going through some of the things we went through. The world has gotten so small now—we have to deal with the whole world. Even when I was a boy, our world was very much more limited than it is now.

Question. Are there many big men in the Senate today—and were there many big men years ago?

Answer. I don't think the big men in the Senate seemed as big at the time as they do now, when we look at it historically. Don't you think it makes a difference?

Question. Do you think the system of election by the legislatures gave us better men—more qualified men—than we get now through the primaries?

Answer. I don't think you had as great a variety. No, I think it's a better system—the elected system.

Question. In your quarter century on Capitol Hill, what changes in the service that Congress renders to the people have impressed you most? Hasn't it become more international minded?

Answer. Oh, yes, it has; but that isn't owing to Congress—that's owing to the world outside. I think the Congress has changed as the world has changed.

Question. We read in the papers all about the nuclear age. Are you fearful of our future? Do you think we're going to be destroyed?

Answer. What difference does it make?

Question. Does it make no difference?

Answer. No.

Question. Why? Are you a fatalist?

Answer. I'm going to do my duty as I see it as long as I'm here, and if I'm destroyed and everybody else is at the same time, what difference does it make—for me, for them, for any of us? Here where we are talking about all these worlds—suppose this earth is blown up by sputniks or some new inventions or discoveries.

Question. You don't have any fear about the future, then?

Answer. What is there to fear?

Question. Being blown up——

Answer. I fear a lot worse things might happen to us than being blown up.

Question. Should we stop worrying about it and get down to business?

Answer. That's right. It's our job to do the best we can with things as we find them—try to improve them—we can't make them perfect; we realize that.

Question. You don't think it's wise to look into the future too much?

Answer. Yes; I do. Look to the future. But I wouldn't worry about it. You can't change it probably very much—perhaps you can.

Question. Are you a fatalist? Do you believe what's going to happen is going to happen, anyway?

Answer. No. I think that men can do a great deal to affect their own careers and to affect the career of their country.

Question. Do you think there is much difference between the Republican and the Democratic Parties today?

Answer. I think it's much less than it has been.

Question. Have the Republicans come over toward the Democrats?

Answer. More of that than the other, yes. I think they have become more "liberal."

Question. Do you think the Democrats have become less "radical," and they have gone over to the middle of the road in both parties?

Answer. I haven't seen many signs of that.

Question. Do you think they are still as "radical" as they were in the thirties?

Answer. I think it sways back and forth a little bit. It's more the mood for the moment than it is the plan of the centuries. We're not planning for the good of the generation. Perhaps we ought to, but I don't think we do. How can you these days? A new invention comes along, and everything is changed in a week or a month or a year.

Question. Senator, you're a great traveler. Would you like to take a trip to the moon?

Answer. Yes, I would.

Question. You would volunteer to go on the first planet ship?

Answer. I never ask for invitations.

Question. You've been asked this a lot of times, but how do you account for the fact that you are looking so well at the age of 91?

Answer. Because I had a lot of warnings when I was young. I was an invalid. I had everything—all the usual children's diseases and a lot of extras—everything—pleurisy, pneumonia, typhoid fever—everything.

I was sick most of the time, so I couldn't go to school—not well enough when I was a little boy. I had tutors. Then I got better and better and, when I was old enough, my father sent me to a private school about a mile and a quarter north of where we lived. I remember the winter and I thought I would freeze to death. I withstood it and I got toughened up and I had all the other things I could have so I was pretty well after that and got better and better. I became interested in athletics.

Question. Do you still walk back and forth to the Capitol every day?

Answer. I frequently walk up in the morning—that's 2½ miles.

Question. Do you do any other exercising?

Answer. It all depends on whether I can find the time. Now it gets worse and worse. The longer I am here the worse it is—the less time there is.

Question. You played tennis until recently——

Answer. Yes, I played until about 2 years ago. It was a question of time more than anything. I like to play singles better than doubles.

Question. Do you exercise in the gym now, Senator?

Answer. I don't get time. I wish I did.

Question. You did that regularly for many years——

Answer. Yes, yes. I've had less and less time for myself.

DIET: "I EAT ANYTHING"

Question. Do you follow any particular diet?

Answer. No, no—luckily. I go out to so many dinner parties that I eat anything that is put before me.

Question. And you live through it?

Answer. Yes.

Question. You've spent a good deal of time abroad in recent years, haven't you?

Answer. Well, yes, I went abroad first in 1889. My grandfather thought that a young man—had the old idea about "finishing"—he ought to be "finished" by a trip abroad. I thought it was a very good idea, so he sent my two cousins who were just a little bit older and myself on a grand tour of Europe.

Question. And you have been going pretty regularly ever since?

Answer. Off and on.

Question. But in the last few years you've made official trips abroad, haven't you?

Answer. Yes.

Question. There has been a lot of criticism of our educational methods——

Answer. Oh, I don't think that boys and girls study here as hard as they do abroad.

Question. Should they study harder?

Answer. They should. But I don't think they do.

Question. You went to college both in Europe and here. How would you compare the two?

Answer. Well, it depends. They prepare you for a different life, perhaps. You usually decide there much earlier than you do here what you are going to do in life. In some ways one is ahead, and in some ways the other.

But I do think that, for instance, a German boy had to study a little harder than any American boy that I knew here. I know one of my friends, I remember in those days, could recite a whole book of poetry—I mean the whole thing right straight through—and things like that. They memorize a great deal.

Question. Does that train the mind very much?

Answer. That's one kind of training and the other is to develop your powers of thinking and reasoning. There are different parts of your human brain that you want to develop more.

Question. Do they narrow down the people they are going to educate?

Answer. The universities there had a different standard right along. They didn't care whether you studied or not. It was up to you. I don't think there was any more responsibility developed there than here. I regret to find the tendency seems to be the other way here.

They build these dormitories, for instance, at colleges, and they used to be standing free. Now they like to build them with moats around them, so the boys can't get in and out easily. They have to go through the gates—like they do it in English colleges. They keep tabs on them—when they go out, when they go in.

In Germany they go to the other extreme. They don't pay much attention to the boys. If they want to get a degree, they've got to pass an examination. In order to pass the examination, they've got to study hard to do it.

Question. They put the responsibility on the youth rather than on the teacher?

Answer. That's right.

Question. Do you think an individual's life is fuller now than it was when you were a small boy?

Answer. I think so. I think the average individual life is too crowded. That's the reason they do most things half well.

Question. Is that true on Capitol Hill?

Answer. Yes, certainly.

Question. Who was the first President of the United States you remember, Senator?

Answer. I've known every President—I've met personally every President—beginning with Hayes. Except Garfield—I never met Garfield.

Question. Of the Presidents you have known, which one has impressed you most?

Answer. I haven't known many of them intimately. I've known both Roosevelts—Theodore and Franklin—very well, indeed. I admired Woodrow Wilson very much indeed. He was a scholar, made great sacrifices—he'd go the limit. He practically died for his country. And he had a clean mind, clear. He was more scholarly than those I've known. He worked a great many reforms. He had a deep knowledge of government; he impressed me that way.

Question. Who do you think was the best politician of the Presidents?

Answer. I think Franklin Roosevelt.

Question. How about Teddy Roosevelt? He was pretty successful——

Answer. Not as good. He came to Providence, when he was first running, and he made a rather antiprotection speech. As the subject of tariffs was foremost in the minds of most conservative Rhode Islanders, that was the wrong speech to make there. I am told he never mentioned that subject again during his New England campaign.

I was very fond of him. I knew him very well, indeed. I stayed at his house. I had a standing invitation—a room at my disposal whenever I wanted to go and stay there.

Question. Even though you were a Democrat?

Answer. Yes; I knew all his family well.

I shocked him sometimes. I remember one Sunday morning he came downstairs in his togs—"Rough Rider" stuff—and I didn't have any. And he said, "Here, take an ax. Come out and help me chop down some trees."

And I said, "Well, I won't come down and help you chop down some of your trees because I've got on my 'Sunday-go-to-meeting' clothes, but I'll come around and boss the job." And I realize this was something terrible, and a sort of gasp went around the room because I had the nerve to say that to the President.

He asked me to be his campaign manager when he ran on the Bull Moose ticket. I had just come back from my first experience of a Democratic National Convention in Baltimore. When I got home, I found this request from Roosevelt to be his campaign manager for New England. Of course, I wasn't going to do it, couldn't do it, and had to write him to that effect.

But I ran for Governor that year and I never mentioned the fact—and there was a Bull Moose ticket in Rhode Island, too, but I didn't think it was decent to take advantage of a friendship and hurt him. And so I didn't and I got licked, but that wasn't the only cause.

Well, anyway, I never told anybody about it, except a few intimate friends who wouldn't tell. And I was staying, a couple years afterward—they were having a dinner party at Sagamore Hill, and somebody said, "Well, Mr. President, I guess nobody ever turned you down when you asked for anything."

"Oh, yes," he said, "they did, and he is right at this table now." Then he told the story.

Question. Senator, does government better serve the interest of the people today than when you were trying to bring about governmental reforms in Rhode Island back in the thirties?

Answer. Oh, I don't know. I can't compare those parts of the government. I think that Rhode Island and Pennsylvania were supposed to be the worst-governed States in the Union then. And by the time I got through with my State—I was elected Governor and I changed over the whole government—everything, including the whole supreme court and everything else.

Question. Senator, when you changed over the whole government, do you mean that you changed the people in it, or did you change the system—reorganize the government itself?

Answer. I reorganized it. I had the same constitution and the same laws. I changed those gradually, too.

Question. What changes did you bring? How were you able to get hold of the situation?

Answer. In the 1934 election I got a majority in both the senate and the house.

On January 2, 1935, the date of my second inauguration as Governor, the general assembly met at noon and I was sworn in for my second term about 11 p.m. that night.

Previous to my being sworn in, the house and senate met and several measures which had been carefully prepared as a result of several very secret meetings held at my home in Providence were introduced and passed immediately. I remember one bill vacated the five supreme court places held by the Republicans. The grand committee of the general assembly then elected five new judges—three Democrats and two Republicans.

At that time we had in Providence a Republican State board of public safety which really controlled the Democratic city of Providence.

The general assembly passed a bill repealing the State Board of Public Safety Act, and I named Ed Kelly superintendent of State police and temporary safety director for the city of Providence.

This bill passed the general assembly about 10:30 p.m. on the night of January 2, and I recall very well that I had my secretary, Eddie Higgins, take my car and chauffeur and deliver personally, at that time of night, letters from me to the board of public safety letting them know that they had been fired. The next morning I saw many broad smiles on the faces of the policemen and firemen in the city of Providence.

The assembly, at my suggestion, abolished the office of finance commissioner and created the office of budget director and comptroller—the appointee to be named by the Governor. We also had a bill passed declaring vacant the office of high sheriff of Providence County and reduced the term from 5 to 3 years.

We also passed bills that day restoring home rule to a number of cities and towns. The control of cities and towns had been taken away from these municipalities and placed in the hands of this Republican-controlled machine.

We passed a bill that day providing for the consolidation of about 80 overlapping bureaus and commissions. We set up this reorganization to take effect in 60 days and created under it 11 new departments in the State government.

I recall that at that time Colonel McCormick, of the Chicago Tribune, became very upset about what we did in Rhode Island, and the story is to the effect that he cut out one of the stars from the American flag which hung in the Chicago Tribune Building. From what I am told, someone tipped the colonel off that he was desecrating the flag, and he had it removed from the lobby. I did not know for years why the colonel was interested in Rhode Island politics, but I later found out that one of the stockholders of the Tribune lived in Rhode Island and was very active in Republican circles.

One incident I recall regarding the so-called bloodless revolution on the night of January 2, 1935, is regarding the Republican judges who were still in office. As I recall it, the judges were in a committee room waiting to be escorted to my second inauguration. Of course, there was considerable delay because the general assembly was busy passing these bills and I was busy signing them.

The judges sent some of their sheriffs out to find out what was going on and they soon learned that they might be out of office shortly. In order to save them some embarrassment, I went down to the committee room and saw the chief justice and the presiding justice of the superior court. I told them what was going to happen.

As a matter of fact, the legislature was at that moment passing the bills vacating their offices. I suggested that they might be somewhat disconcerted if they were to stay around, and I understand that they called their sheriffs and all went back to the courthouse.

The next day they were all out of office at 12 noon and the new supreme court, which had been elected in grand committee and sworn in by me, had taken over in the supreme court chambers.

LAWYER AND BUSINESSMAN

Question. Senator GREEN, it isn't often that someone serves in business and public life as many years as you have. Did you start as a lawyer?

Answer. Yes. I went to college—Brown, and Harvard Law School then to the universities of Bonn and Berlin. Then I came back and I practiced law—went in with my father.

The eldest son in every generation is a lawyer. My great-grandfather, the eldest son, was a lawyer. His eldest son, my grandfather, was a lawyer. My father, the eldest, was a lawyer. I was the eldest son, so I am a lawyer. I am not married. My eldest nephew of the name is a lawyer, and I take for granted his son is going to be a lawyer.

Question. How long did you practice law?

Answer. I still am, I suppose—theoretically, anyway. I have a law office in Providence.

Question. Then you went into business after that?

Answer. I never ceased being a lawyer—I am still a lawyer.

Question. You were head of a bank in Providence. Did you give full time to that?

Answer. I couldn't give full time to all these different things, although I did them all contemporaneously. I was chairman of the Providence Plantations Bank; I started it, and I am still chairman of the board, and I know they don't resent that I hang on because, on my 90th birthday, they gave me a large silver punchbowl and ladle.

And I was president of the J. P. Coates Co., the thread company.

Question. You were also a director of the National Exchange Bank in Providence?

Answer. Yes, for many years.

Question. You were officer and director of various railroad companies?

Answer. All of them in Rhode Island.

Question. You've also had an active participation in some of the public institutions there, too. You are a member of the board of fellows and a trustee in Brown University.

Answer. Oh, that's just like being loyal to the family. Ever since Brown University started—except for half a dozen years some member of my family has been on the board of trustees.

My great-great-grandfather's brother was the first—and for 2 months he was the only—student in the college. They had a president and only one student. So nobody can date further back than that, you see, or as far back. So I am a trustee, I am a

member of the board of fellows, I am the senior fellow. When the president is absent, then the senior member of the board of fellows takes his place. So I've been president of that, too.

Question. Before you were elected Governor of Rhode Island in 1932, you had already lived a pretty full life. When you became Governor you were 64—an age when most people are retiring. Was the governorship your first elective office?

Answer. No; 25 years before I was elected to the general assembly. That's the first taste I had of politics, the first active part I had in public office.

I was on some good government drive—they had a terribly rotten machine in Rhode Island—and I saw the rotten government we had. Rhode Island and Pennsylvania were the worst governed State in the Union. "Corrupted, contented," was the combination of adjectives there—it applied to both—and I said, "Well, I am going to change this if I can."

So I started out then and I ran for public office and got licked most times. For 25 years off and on I ran for something—the general assembly or Congress or something or other. I was elected Governor in 1912 but firmly believed as do many others, that I was counted out by the then Republican-controlled State board of elections. The Republican machine controlled everything, including the courts.

Question. How did you overcome that?

Answer. Well, I kept on running and I guess they got tired of voting against me.

NO PLANS TO RETIRE

Question. Do you plan to stay in the Senate?

Answer. In the last campaign they said I was too old to run. At first I thought the proper thing was to ignore it. Then I said it was going too far, I guess I would have to tackle it—so I did. And I said I intended to stay in the Senate until I was 100.

Question. How old was your last opponent?

Answer. Middle aged.

Question. Did you have much difficulty with that campaign?

Answer. No; I had more votes than I ever had before. Every time I have run I have gotten more than I have the time before.

Question. You have gottten practice each time. What's the secret of that success?

Answer. Honesty is the best policy. You'll find it so as you grow up.

Minnesota Provides a Model Report for State Studies of Radiation Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in this atomic age the problem of radiation control is at once one of the most serious problems and one of the most neglected problems. The State of Minnesota has faced up to the problem. Under a unanimous consent previously granted, I am including here a copy of the review prepared for the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists by Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, famed atomic publicist, of the Minnesota report.

BASIC DATA REGARDING ATOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS IN MINNESOTA

(Review by R. E. Lapp)

The State of Minnesota has issued a report on atomic energy which other States might well use as a model for their own studies. A Governor's committee consisting of more than a score of scientists (mostly from the University of Minnesota) and specialists compiled a very useful sourcebook on atomic energy which should be of value beyond the State's boundaries.

The report presents basic data on the science and technology of the atom, atomic power and radiation applications. No attempt to treat the military applications is made since this is obviously beyond the control of the State. There are some 20 pages devoted to summarizing measurements of radioactivity in Mississippi River samples and in air. These data amplify the summary reports published for the Nation by the Bureau of State Services, Public Health Service (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare). The availability of fallout data at a State level will be valuable in resolving local arguments about fallout.

A survey of radiation exposure was made within the State of Minnesota and it was found that X-ray shoe fitting machines ranged in dose from 0.4 to 23 roentgens per exposure (there was an estimated 100,000 exposures per year). It was found that there are 55 radioisotope licensees in Minnesota. Detailed data on the radiation dosage from diagnostic X-rays are presented.

It remains to be seen whether or not the States can handle the complex problems of radiation control; it is clear, however, that some States are fully aware of the problems and are looking for solutions.

Foreign Economic Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to an article that recently appeared in the Boeing News of Seattle, Wash.

I have been one of those who has constantly tried to point out that these foreign aid programs—which this country has been engaged—is nothing more nor less than buying foreign competition for the American worker and farmer.

The president of Boeing Aircraft, Mr. Allen, recently pointed out some most significant facts. Why anyone cannot see that by promoting these economic foreign aid theories all over the world for other countries—that eventually these countries would be bringing back to our country products which have been made with their cheap labor—which causes workmen in our country to lose employment.

It seems to me that this article points out very dramatically that we are now reaping what we have sown.

How anyone believes that we can compete in the world markets with our labor price of $1.87—with other countries' cheap labor of 25 cents an hour—is beyond my comprehension.

I commend this article most highly:

America is entering a new era of worldwide economic competition which will have a tremendous impact on business, labor, and our standard of living. So declared Boeing President William M. Allen, in an address this week to the West Coast General Management Conference. Because his discussion of the road ahead deals with matters of tremendous importance to all Americans, Boeing News carries here some of Allen's comments:

COMPETITION FROM ABROAD

"In the years since the Second World War * * * there was a domestic market hungry for goods. * * * We could offset lower wages in other countries through our mastery of mass production techniques. That era * * * has come to an end.

"The list of U.S. companies now having products made overseas for sale in U.S. markets is growing every week. In addition, foreign manufacturers of various important products are rapidly increasing their participation in our domestic market.

IMPACT NOT YET APPRECIATED BY AMERICAN PEOPLE

"Just as we ended our political isolation when the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, so today we are ending our economic isolation. The results of internationalization in military and political terms are all around us. * * * Changes of the same magnitude are now in the making as a result of the internationalization of markets. Such a change will have an impact on business, on labor, and on our standard of living to a degree not yet appreciated by the American people.

OTHER COUNTRIES USING MASS PRODUCTION, TOO

"We are now entering upon a competitive world economy. Ten years ago—even 5 years ago—most American producers could take solace in the confidence that they could produce better goods at a price competitive with foreign makers—by reason of the American's mastery of mass production techniques. In the meantime, other countries of the world are in the process of developing an industrial base which utilizes mass production and marketing techniques.

WE BEGIN WITH TWO HANDICAPS

"In endeavoring to compete with foreign producers, we begin with two basic handicaps. One is a wage scale that is dollars above those paid in competing nations. The other is lack of drive, in comparison with the will to work and the will to face up to economic reality which exists in certain other countries of the world.

PRICING OURSELVES OUT OF WORLD MARKETS

"Here at home, we have been and are in an inflationary spiral * * * So long as increases in wages do not reflect true increases in productivity, prices will increase—or profits (the use of which is one way of increasing productivity) will be squeezed further—or both. Thus, we face the prospect of pricing ourselves further out of world markets—and out of our own as well. We face also the possibility that capital, needed for greater mechanization of industry, will not be attracted to industry in this country. The rate of return on invested capital has declined steadily since 1948.

NOTHING SHORT OF A NATIONWIDE EFFORT

"It seems clear that the American people must exert their very best efforts to increase the productivity of labor and of invested capital in the years ahead, if we are not to be left will behind in the coming competition for world markets. Nothing short of a nationwide effort is likely to bring about percentage increases in the productivity of labor greater than the increases in the cost of labor which appear to lie ahead.

CAN WE MEET THIS CHALLENGE?

"Can we successfully meet this economic challenge? The answer, of course, rests in the attitude of the American people. There must be a general recognition that we have no God-given right to live at a higher standard of living than the rest of the world. We are entering an era in which we cannot maintain our economic position if we are unwilling to put the same amount of effort into a given product as do our competitors for an equivalent reward.

CRITICAL ROLE OF LABOR LEADERS AND BUSINESSMEN

"The President's economic report emphatically states that the future well-being of our country is dependent upon our ability to control the inflationary spiral with a resultant stability of prices. You have no doubt read that his statement regarding the responsibility of labor leaders in this effort have met with little enthusiasm in certain quarters. The President said 'Leaders of labor unions have a particularly critical role to play, in view of the great power lodged in their hands.'

"However, the President did not ignore the vital role of the businessman. He said: 'Businessmen must redouble their efforts. They must wage a ceaseless war against costs. Production must be on the most economic basis possible.'

SOMETHING WITHOUT WORKING FOR IT

"There is a need to get back to basic principles. We cannot expect to get something without working for it. We must stop the inflationary practice of paying more for less. The American people must understand that their welfare and their country's welfare are dependent upon a return to these basic principles."

Communist Penetration in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the challenge of communism today is primarily its threat to the peace of the world and the many, many directions in which its subversive tentacles reach throughout the world. Like every American, I am very concerned with the problem and, over the years, I have acted to expose communism and its dangers.

There was recently brought to my attention an address given by a friend of mine who is well known throughout the United States and all of Latin America. It carefully develops the penetration of the Red threat to this hemisphere. This gentleman, who devotes much of his time to this effort, is Mr. Pedro de Mesones, of Peru, who delivered an address to students of Latin America at Fordham University, December 9, 1958.

Mr. Mesones comes from a distinguished pioneer family of Peru who have contributed much to the development of that nation both in its economy and through many philanthropies. His travels and study in many countries qualify him for his post as permanent delegate in the United States for the Inter-American Federation for the Defense of the Continent, an organization of citizens of all Latin American nations, the United States and Canada, who carry on the fight against communism. It is their aim, through extension of friendship between these nations, to solve the mutual problems brought about by Communist assaults upon our shores. I commend the efforts of Mr. Mesones.

I believe this address would be beneficial to all the people and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include it in the RECORD at this time:

COMMUNIST PENETRATION IN LATIN AMERICA
(By Pedro de Mesones)

The great French political writer Charles Maurras once said that "contempt is not a political attitude." I should like to borrow that phrase and apply it to communism. To be contemptuous of communism would indeed be a grave mistake, for it is the most intelligent and systematic challenge our western Christian society has ever had to face.

Taking a leaf out of the book of another great Frenchman, Marshal Foch, let us apply the same system he used in the First World War whenever he was confronted with difficult situations created by the German Army. "De quoi s'agit il?" What is it all about? If we consistently tackled our problems from this angle, we should greatly facilitate their solution. What, then, is communism all about? First, we must understand what it is.. Secondly, the nature of the mechanism whereby it expands. Thirdly, how we can block its advance.

Communism may have been, in its beginnings, and above all in the minds of its first theorists, the social ideology of the working class. According to Marx, the progressive concentration of capital would inevitably produce a type of society in which all the means of production would be controlled by a tiny minority, which would hold the rest of the population in subjection. This polarization of forces would result in the seizure of power by that immense majority of the dispossessed, either through universal suffrage (social-democracy) or by means of revolution (communism).

According to this thesis, the countries best fitted for socialism or communism would be those which had achieved the highest degree of industrial concentration: Germany, Britain, Belgium, the United States, and so forth. Countries with an agrarian social structure, on the other hand, would be practically impervious to socialist ideas.

Events, however, have not borne out these Marxist predictions. Those four highly industrialized countries I have mentioned are ruled by Social-Christian parties, in Germany and Belgium, and by traditional conservatism in England and the United States. Yet, agrarian Russia, backward China, and Korea and Vietnam, which have hardly emerged from the Middle Ages, are dominated by the Communist Party. What has happened? What is it all about, as Foch would say? Simply this: Marxism has triumphed, thanks to a factor disdained by the Marxists—the decisive action of a human minority. It was the Bolshevik Party, a small group representative of the Russian working class—itself hardly 2 percent of the population—which seized power in Russia by means of two completely anti-Marxist platforms: Peace and the agrarian revolution, characterized by the bourgeois slogan of redistribution of the land. Lenin, a strategical genius, liquidated Kerensky and all the political and social philosophies in harmony with Russia's historical development in 1917 and seized power. From this position of power, with the aid of the slogan "Soviets plus electrification", with the iron discipline of the Communist Party, he diverted Russia's historical course and built on that immense, leaderless, agricultural country, without industrial tradition, technology, or capital, what is now the world's second industrial nation. We must not, therefore, underrate communism. Charles Maurras was right.

From the standpoint of Marxist theory, the countries best adapted to Communist penetration are still those of Western Europe and the United States, but, with the sole exceptions of Italy and France, where the local Communist parties have attained great numerical strength, communism is practically nonexistent in the rest of the industrial zone. On the other hand, it has triumphed throughout central and eastern Europe and has made serious inroads in the agricultural and backward continents of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

The way in which communism took power in central Europe is common knowledge. The Red army, which occupied the whole area, insisted upon the formation of popular-front governments. There sprang up in 1945 in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria, a group of popular governments composed of representatives of the Communist Party, the Socialist Party, and parties representing the poor peasants. Communist participation, at the beginning, varied between 20 and 25 percent of the members of the assemblies and cabinets. In the second phase, the Red army, using reasons of security as a pretext, asked—in reality, demanded—that the Ministers of Interior, War, and Propaganda should be members of the Communist Party. With these key government posts in their hands, they launched the third phase: the discovery of plots against the new regime, always organized by Socialists or peasants. Step by step, and always in defense of the state, the Communists gradually increased their participation in the government until they achieved a complete and absolute monopoly.

The tactics adopted in China were different. There, the Communists of Mao joined forces with Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalists in a struggle against a common enemy—Japanese imperialism. But while Chiang devoted all his efforts to this single purpose, the Communists were penetrating his organizations and gaining control of key positions in the country. Suddenly, once the common purpose of the struggle had disappeared with the collapse of Japan, Mao turned on Chiang Kai-shek and, in an amazingly rapid campaign, expelled him from the mainland, uniting the ancient land of China with the Communist world.

This brings us face to face with a paradox whose consequences may prove fatal for the course of civilization. While the highly industrialized areas of the world—western and northern Europe, Britain, the United States, Canada, and Australia—remain impervious to communism, the agricultural areas of central and eastern Europe, Russia, China, and parts of Korea and Vietnam are completely under the control of communism. It is from this vantage point that the Communists begin the struggle for the conquest of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. On the result of that struggle depends the future of our western, Christian culture.

In Asia, the struggle has favored communism from the outset. Outer Mongolia, Sinkian, and Tibet, occupying peripherical political and geographical positions, have been completely absorbed by the Communists. There is danger of absorption in Indonesia, Thailand, Burma, and Ceylon. There is already one state in the vast subcontinent of India—Kerala—with a Communist government, and several others in which the Communist Party, with a parliamentary representation only slightly inferior to that of the Congress Party, hopes to come to power with the next change of government. There is Communist penetration in Nepal and in a number of border states between India and China.

In the Near East, Russia has used the emergent nationalism of the Arab world and its opposition to the State of Israel to mask profound penetration. The Syrian and Egyptian armies are being supplied with Communist arms; yesterday's newspapers announced the shipment of Soviet arms to Iraq and everybody knows about the $100 million loan granted to Nasser for the construction of the Aswan Dam, on the Nile. The Communist Party is lying low in Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco, but it is

numerically powerful and only awaits a propitious occasion to assert itself. There is a strong Communist influence in the new African Negro state of Ghana and the political leader Sekou Tore', of Guinea, which recently won its independence from the French Empire, is a declared Marxist.

What is the situation as regards communism in Latin America? First of all, a brief outline of social and economic conditions will help us to judge to what extent our continent is suitable soil for Communist expansion.

In a recent statement addressed to the National Association of Manufacturers, Mr. Correa, the Ecuadorian Ambassador to the United States, declared that, if the Latin American population maintains its present rate of increase, which is 2.5 percent a year, by the end of the century it will reach the figure of 498 million inhabitants. During the same period the combined populations of the United States and Canada will only reach 300 million. A recent study published by the economist Woytinsky gives the annual per capita incomes of a number of Latin American countries. With few exceptions, the present standard of living in the great majority of the countries of Latin America is slightly superior to that of Africa and Asia, and the per capita income is hardly more than $100 a year. The social structure is also very similar, the rural population accounting for the vast majority of the inhabitants. In Haiti, Honduras, Guatemala, and Nicaragua, more than 70 percent of the population is made up of country people. That is to say, there exist simultaneously in Latin America three factors—population increase, poverty of the masses and the absolute predominance of agriculture—which, as we have seen and contrary to Marxist theory, are the elements most favorable to Communist penetration.

In 1945 the French Communists had the largest parliamentary representation and three of four Ministers in the Cabinet. The Minister of National Defense was a Communist. ' In Italy the situation was identical. It was at that time that the famous writer Kestler said that the Communist Party could have seized power in France over the telephone. Why did it not do so and how was it possible for its failure to do so to be transformed later into the recent rout of the French Communists in the latest elections? It was simply because it was not convenient to Moscow for the Communists to seize power in a western and industrial country like Italy or France in 1945. It was not expedient for international reasons, inasmuch as it might very well have provoked an armed attack by the United States at a time when Russia was still not prepared militarily; and it was not desirable from an internal point of view, either. Russia does not want any power to dispute her hegemony within the Communist world. The defiance of Yugoslavia—an only slightly industrialized country—has already caused her considerable difficulties. The rebellion in Hungary practically threatened her empire and she eyes with misgiving the industrial progress of China. The inclusion of an industrial western European country in the Communist sphere could conceivably cause a shift of its center of gravity from Moscow toward Paris, Berlin, or London, and undermine the whole historical plan, based on nationalism, of the Russian Communists. The Kremlin's plan is to expand into the agricultural and economically primitive regions of the world: First, Asia; then, the Near East; later, Africa; and finally, Latin America. The fact that our continent is last in the program of Communist expansion is due to two main reasons: Its geographical and spiritual isolation from Moscow and the presence of the United States. But everything seems to indicate that the time has now come for penetration to begin. For the time being and in order to avoid arousing the opposition of the United States, which has made the Monroe Doctrine the keystone of its international position, Communist activities in Latin America are limited strictly to the economic field.

We have three examples of this policy: Argentina, Brazil, and Bolivia. One of the causes of the chronic crisis in Argentina is its lack of petroleum. Importations of that fuel cost an estimated $300 million a year. The elimination of this deficit would stabilize the balance of payments, reinforce the national currency, and lay the foundations for the development of the country's economy. Blind nationalism and Communist opportunism have violently opposed any deal with foreign oil companies capable of helping the country exploit its oil. But recently the Frondizi government, with a display of rare courage, signed two contracts of different types. One was with Russia and the other with the United States and European powers, and both were aimed at the development of a domestic oil industry. What was the reaction to this move? The Communists, and the Peronists, following in their wake, declared a protest strike in the oil zones of Mendoza, against the national "abdication" implied by the contracts signed with the United States, but said not a single word against the signature of similar contracts with Russia. It is to overcome this strike in Mendoza that the Frondizi government has had to proclaim martial law, running the risk of civil war.

In Brazil there is a very similar situation. There also the Communists and the extreme nationalists of ex-President Vargas oppose any collaboration with the big American companies which might tend to increase the tiny domestic oil production. The imports of that precious fuel, also estimated at some $300 million a year, are a contributing factor in the grave economic crisis through which the country is passing. The Communists—who are partly to blame for it—take advantage of this situation to extend their political influence. Brazil is also faced with the prospect of a new civil war, and there is already very serious talk of the liquidation of Kubitschek and the formation of a military government.

In Bolivia, with the victory of the national revolutionary movement, a political revolution has triumphed which is most cordially hated by the Communist, since it is composed of a truly popular mass, socially progressive and politically anti-Communist. Russia wishes to discredit the Bolivian Government, in the same way as it has tried to discredit that of Yugoslavia, and to that end it has made use of a very dangerous economic weapon. Soviet agents in London recently launched on the market huge quantities of Chinese tin, to precipitate a vertical decline in the prices of that metal on the exportation of which Bolivia lives almost exclusively. The Bolivian Communists were thus enabled to make political capital out of the situation by asserting that the collapse of tin prices was due to the maneuvers of Patino, protected by Wall Street and the big American economic interests.

In other parts of Latin America Communist activities are carried out on a purely political plane. We refer principally to Guatemala, Venezuela, and Mexico. We have already seen the Communists at work in Guatemala; their penetration in that country was achieved by means of the popular front platform so successfully employed in Spain and France before the Second World War. Colonel Arbenz denied his Communist sympathies, but once ousted from power by Castillo Armas, he installed his family in a country behind the Iron Curtain. The Community minority in Venezuela is very important. There the Communist Party, whose cynical opportunism is proverbial, supported the candidature of Admiral Larrazabal against that of Romulo Betancourt, with whom it has broken and whom it considers, like Paz Estenssoro, Haya de la Torre and Tito of Yugoslavia, as its friendly enemy for the moment.

In Mexico, the Communist Party, weak and disorganized, is not a menace, either on the political or the economic plane. But, for a number of geographic reasons, the Mexican nation has long been used by the Communists as a springboard for activities throughout America. That excellent newspaperman, Roscoe Drummond, at present in Mexico, has just denounced this fact in one of his columns. "The families of more than 100 American Communists live in Mexico" he says, "since the persecution of the Communist Party began in the United States; moreover, during the period of dictatorship in Venezuela, Mexico was the meeting place for the leaders of Venezuelan communism. Between 100 and 150 of them lived in Mexico for 5 years, working under the orders of the officials of the Soviet Embassy. It was the same with the Guatemalan Communists. The secretary general of the Guatemalan Communist Party, Jose Manuel Fortuny, finally obtained a false Mexican passport to go to Moscow, but was discovered in time by the Mexican authorities. He was able, nonetheless, to make the trip to Russia, and on his return, via Rio de Janeiro, he was arrested by the Brazilian authorities for using a false passport." Drummond explains that, during the trial of the Soviet agent, Sobie, in the United States, the American authorities asked Mexico to permit the extradition of one of his accomplices, Martha Dodd Stern, and her husband. It was not possible to arrange it, and a few weeks later the two turned up in Prague. The Soviet Embassy in Mexico is one of the largest in the world, being composed of 125 adults and 48 children. Since the restoration of diplomatic relations between Mexico and Russia, the Soviet Embassy in that country has been considered the most important center of espionage against the United States and Communist expansion in Latin America. The mysterious murder of Ambassador Oussinsky, in Mexico, confirms this theory.

Russia, then, has penetrated by means of its economic maneuvers in Argentina, Bolivia, and Brazil. It exercises a powerful political influence in Chile and has considerable minorities at its beck and call in Venezuela and Guatemala. Mexico is the geographical center of its activities in Latin America.

We repeat that, for reasons of political opportunism, Moscow has not yet given orders to its agents in Latin America to mount a general offensive, but the historical perspectives for its development are so favorable that that order for mobilization may be given at any moment, opening up a new chapter of grave import in the history of the continent.

The countries of Western Europe have had at their disposal a defensive instrument whose effectiveness has surprised all the political observers: Christian Socialism. Without it, the traditional Democratic and Socialist Parties would have been unable to stem the Communist tide. At this moment, Christian socialism controls the governments of the following European countries: Italy, Germany, Belgium, Denmark, Holland, and Sweden; very similar organizations direct the destinies of Luxembourg and Norway. De Gaulle is a militant Catholic and the same may be said of Salazar and Franco. What would have happened if the defense of Europe had been left in the hands, for example, of that French radical-socialism that has just been overwhelmed in the recent elections in France? Pacciardi's Liberal Party has only 3 or 4 deputies in Italy. There is no Liberal representation in the Belgian Parliament, nor in Adenauer's Germany; it hardly exists in Sweden, Norway, Holland,

and Denmark. The Liberal Party, formed historically in England, has hardly half a dozen Members in the House of Commons.

The tragedy of Latin America is that, in the absence of powerful Christian-Social groups, it is these "liberal" parties that aspire to canalize the revolution. We have already seen how, in Europe, they merely become the Trojan horses for Communist penetration.

This historical lack in results, in Latin America, in the triumph of the so-called strong men or the establishment of military dictatorships. The army really stands behind Frondizi in Buenos Aires. The same is the case in Brazil. Strong men govern the destinies of Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, and Paraguay. The Venezuelan elections have most likely been won by an admiral, and the liberal experiment in Colombia is succumbing before the threat of a military government.

There have only been two timid manifestations of Christian-socialism in this continent: in Brazil, where it was symbolized by the figure of the Christian general, Juarez Tavora, and in Venezuela, through the presidential candidature of Mr. Caldera. Everything would seem to indicate, however, that, despite the catholicism of the Latin-American masses, Christian-socialism does not find fertile soil in those countries as a political ideology, and that the political panorama in those republics, in the face of the traditional incapacity of parliamentary liberalism tends to oscillate between the latent danger of communism and military dictatorship.

It is our duty, in the face of these tragic prospects, both as Catholics and as Americans, to encourage the development in our continent of these Christian-social ideologies, which, based as they are on the fundamental principles of humanity, have become in Europe an unbreakable barrier against which the atheistic despotism of international communism has hurled itself in vain.

A Great President Vindicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, a number of years ago the newspapers were filled with caustic and slanderous remarks on the administration of a great President. We have now learned that one of those who was the object of this malignant offensive has been vindicated, and I deem it only fitting and proper that the article which appeared recently should be made part of the permanent RECORD of this House, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article which appeared in the Washington Daily News on February 6, 1959:

GENERAL VAUGHAN WINS $10,000 LIBEL SUIT

Maj. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan (U.S. Army, retired), President Truman's military aide, was awarded $10,000 libel damages by a jury yesterday against the Curtis Publishing Co.

The verdict was based on a November 3, 1956, picture caption saying "charges" by Columnist Drew Pearson against General Vaughan had been "confirmed by testimony before a Senate committee."

General Vaughan told a District Court jury he had been "criticized" during 1959 Senate "5 percenter" hearings, but that there were no formal "charges" as, he said, the caption implied, and nothing was "confirmed."

TESTIMONY ONLY

General Vaughan was accused by witnesses of using his influence to help business friends deal with the Government. He denied giving any help that was improper.

There were Republican demands he be fired. But President Truman kept him on until the President left the White House. He now lives in Belle Haven, Fairfax County.

The trial sounded like the 1949 hearings repeated in miniature. General Vaughan was asked about John Maragon and others. He told the jury:

"I was instructed by the President to give aid to anyone who came in with a legitimate request for cutting redtape."

His lawyers were Byron N. Scott and Hyman Smollar.

"It was the principle," General Vaughan told a reporter afterward. "A verdict of $1 would have been enough."

It's Good To Be Free Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the following in an exact copy of a letter written in English to Rhoda Jenkins, 4 Garden Drive, Rye, N.Y., from her friend Elena Centurion in Havana, Cuba. Paragraphs concerning her family are omitted. It gives a first-hand account by a highly successful architect who studied at the University of Pennsylvania and is now practicing in Havana. Miss Centurion is a teacher at the University of Havana and has a conservative background, her family coming from the professional and land-owning class of Cuba. Mrs. Jenkins sent me the letter in the hope that it would help Members of Congress better understand the feelings of Cuba concerning Castro:

JANUARY 23, 1959.

Our emotions have been great since January 1 at 4:30 in the morning when someone called us and told us Batista was gone. What a wonderful beginning for 1959. How much father would have enjoyed knowing it. Fidel really did it. We all sympathized with his movement. Genaro's (her husband's) ex-partner was in exile over a year and a lot of people we knew personally or by reference. Every night for the last year we kept hearing at 11 p.m. the broadcast from Caracas, Venezuela, that retransmitted Fidel's speeches, ideas, and advances. We had complete censorship in our newspapers and in speech. They were paying $33.33 to people who gave away any information and it seemed there were quite a few. Many of those are the ones killed on that first days in the streets. Fidel's movement called the "26" didn't want those things to happen, but they were inevitable. One of father's property was burnt partially (brick and concrete didn't suffer) because one of the worst men of Batista, Masferrer, leader of a bunch of killers, had taken the house with his paper in the lower floor and two upper stories—he owed 2 year' (rent) but there was nothing we could do—it was full of machineguns and at night he even closed the street. That goes for democracy. I wish the Congress in your country could realize what countries like ours get from American democracy when they give their moral support to a man who takes the government by force like Batista did 2 months ahead of elections. It's too bad that so many had to die and suffer penalties, for I think I would rather die once than suffer what some people underwent. Now they've found the different implements of torture, for people had been found dead without nails, eyes out, burns and all kinds of things done to their different parts in their body. One can't imagine those things going on until it comes from people we know.

From your editorials it seems in the States they don't like us having people shot. I can tell that I wouldn't kill a mouse, but after going through all these years of terror I can well understand how people claim for it. It doesn't seem possible that you send someone to the electric chair for killing one person and yet have someone who has killed and tortured several, teaching others that one can do that and yet go on living as if nothing had happened. It was too bad that Batista and the worst men of his regime got away. I wonder if he was afraid of them for he let down practically all those who had given him moral and economic support. Tell your mother that Aguilera (was an architectural client of her's) was one of them. He didn't get notice on time like most of his political collaborators and they are all in the embassy's or hiding. I don't know where he is at all. He hasn't been caught as others who are in prison. It seems the revolutionary movement expects to make people give money back to the state and all they've done so far is freeze their bank accounts, taken their homes and business, and looked for documents and guns in their homes and offices. We don't know yet what or how they are going to do it and if good relations and influence will help or not.

As to the university, we don't know yet when it will open. I guess soon. A group of revolutionary (not the "26") was up against Fidel and took the university with tanks and guns but Fidel has crushed them apparently anyhow, by talking on the television. Never in your life you could imagine how people went out for him when he arrived to Havana. We saw him from a roof eight floors up. Today the university hasn't been handed back to the professors. Give Nora this letter and believe it, it's good to be free again.

ELENA.

Should Stop Selling Savings Bonds Until Inflation Halted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, here is an editorial from the Kansas Stockman, which has a new approach to the inflation problem.

Too few people realize just what inflation does to people on a fixed income. Too few people seem to be aware as to just what happens with bonds purchased 20 years ago with 100 percent dollars and cashed today on a 47-percent-dollar basis.

The article appended hereto would tie bond interest rates to the cost of living. Many wage contracts between unions and management have this provision. It

would seem that elderly citizens who have invested in Government bonds should be entitled to some protection from the evils of inflation.

The editorial follows:

SHOULD STOP SELLING SAVINGS BONDS UNTIL INFLATION HALTED

The thrifty and patriotic citizens who own the vast bulk of the $42 billion of U.S. savings bonds outstanding are entitled to protection of the value of the principal and interest of their investment in Government bonds.

So far the Government has failed to give them that protection, and those who have held these bonds since the early offering years have lost over 50 percent of their savings in terms of buying power. This record stands as a shocking indictment of the fiscal integrity of our Government.

If this confiscation of savings by inflation continues, these bond owners, who qualify as the most patriotic of our citizens and also as the segment of our citizenry who can least afford to lose will be financially wiped out to the degree they have trusted their Government.

Accordingly we propose that the Government face up to this problem now, and that it take immediate steps to give these frugal and trusting creditors a square deal.

To this end we propose either of the following alternatives:

1. That the sale of savings bonds be halted until the President has achieved at least a 2-year period of stability in the cost of living, or

2. That savings bonds issued from February 1 on carry an escalator clause on both principal and interest, giving the owner a guaranteed increase of both interest and principal proportionate to further increases in the cost of living.

As citizens deeply interested in the economic and political independence of the people of America, we contend that further temporizing with this grave injustice cannot be tolerated.

We urge that President Eisenhower, in his current stand against reckless and inflationary spending, recognize the significance of this evil, and that he make its correction a project for immediate action. We suggest that such prompt action on his part would do much to halt the flight from the dollar that is so apparent in the stock exchanges and trading markets of the Nation.

Statement of General Pate Before the Senate Armed Services Committee

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to insert in the RECORD the recent statement of the Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Pate, before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

It is a precise factual document. It lists in factual language the repeated instances during the past year when our ready Marine forces have had to move rapidly in response to emergency. Our need for this professional amphibious force in readiness in these tense times is starkly apparent from this mere recital of the record.

There follows an equally dispassionate account of the effect of the deep cuts in the Marine Corps which have been directed by the Pentagon. Without editorial comment, the effect of a cut of 25,000 Marines below the 200,000 the Congress considered minimum, and appropriated for, is factually set forth in terms of deactivated combat battalions and aircraft squadrons, and continued maintenance of remaining units at reduced strengths.

General Pate's statement is a simple, dignified statement of facts.

I consider it of such importance that I most urgently ask that all Members find time to study it with care.

For in it we see the actual results of the continued failure of the Pentagon to heed the most carefully considered and clearly expressed judgment of the Congress on a matter of vital importance to the Nation's military policy.

We have determined and provided by law that the Marine Corps shall be organized into three combat divisions and three air wings. We have determined that a strength of 200,000 is the minimum necessary to enable the Marine Corps to comply with the law. We have appropriated the funds necessary to maintain a Marine Corps of 200,000. We have stated our intent regarding this small, professional force in readiness in the most clear, simple and unmistakable words. The Senate Armed Services Committee, for example, used these words:

This decision to appropriate the funds necessary for a 200,000-man Marine Corps was made with full consideration of the fiscal and military implications. The committee desires that it be clearly understood by appropriate agencies in the executive branch of the Government that it is the clear-cut intent of the committee, and of the proposed appropriating legislation, that the Marine Corps be maintained at the strength of 200,000.

It is against this background that we must assess the Pentagon's order to cut the Marine Corps by 25,000 below what the Congress considered an absolute minimum. We are seeing a deliberate stripping from the Congress of constitutionally imposed responsibility.

This is the true impact of General Pate's plain statement of the facts.

Never has the need been greater for our Nation to possess this combat-ready Marine striking force to respond to any of the potential crises that confront us. Only with such a force as we possess in our fleet marine forces can we apply the proper amount of military pressure to protect American interests, carry out our national policies, and at the same time prevent a localized fire from spreading into a worldwide holocaust.

It just does not make sense to extend the draft and force into Army service unwilling—at least unenthusiastic—recruits while at the same time we arbitrarily direct the reduction of 25,000 hard, lean, highly professional, completely volunteer Marines. It does not make sense to say that we can maintain out strength for limited war by reducing each of our divisions by two battalion landing teams—for a total of six battalion landing teams out of the 27 we now have in our Marine Corps.

I am convinced that this arbitrary reduction of the Marine Corps to 175,000 is the deliberate, chosen method of the Pentagon for undermining and vitiating the provisions of Public Law 416 of the 82d Congress, very appropriately known as the Vinson bill after our distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, who was largely responsible for conceiving, sponsoring, and the ultimate passage of the law that requires three combat divisions and three air wings in the Marine Corps.

The continuing series of crises which have characterized the East-West conflict in the past few years have completely vindicated the position taken by the Honorable CARL VINSON in insisting that this bill be passed and thus provide the Nation with such a striking force of marines. In spite of this congressional foresight the Pentagon, unfortunately, has seen fit to disregard the provisions of the statute and the intent and desire of Congress when we appropriated the money to give meaningful effect to the provisions of the Vinson bill.

The argument that the Marine Corps is stronger by reducing its forces and disbanding a large portion of its combat units in the divisions cannot be understood except as a smoke screen behind which there is a deliberate effort on the part of the Pentagon—which stubbornly opposed the original passage of the Vinson bill—to erode and destroy its provisions. No other conclusion can be drawn from the action that is now taking place in refusing to apply the funds to provide the forces for which they were appropriated.

This is not only a matter of straight military policy. Even more strikingly it poses in crystal clear form the deep issue between the legislative and executive branches in the field of defense policy.

I am not one of those who feels that Congress should go into details of the direction of the Armed Forces. The use of the Armed Formes is the clear-cut prerogative of the President in his role of Commander in Chief. However, the Constitution places squarely upon Congress the inescapable responsibility of providing and maintaining those forces. This responsibility is not one that Congress can pass on to the executive, nor is it one which in good conscience Congress can let go by default.

The Attorney General of the United States speaking of the power of Congress to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a Navy has stated:

This power to raise and support armies and provide and maintain a Navy is plenary and without limitation or restriction, and Congress is the sole judge of how the Army or Navy shall be raised and of what it shall be composed (27 Op. Att'y. Gen. 259).

I know of nothing which has changed the correctness of that opinion. Indeed I am convinced that legally only a constitutional amendment could strip the Congress of the powers so precisely delineated by the Attorney General. I may also note that supine acquiescence

by a legislative branch which abdicates its responsibilities to a faceless, general staff type of executive omniscience will just as certainly accomplish the same perversion of the wise separation of power established by Founding Fathers.

We live in perilous times.

The Congress, after exhaustive, careful hearings rejected the proposal of an administration which insists on a Marine Corps of 175,000 as adequate to our needs.

Even as the Congress determined a ready force of 200,000 marines is vital to the Nation's security in these troubled times, the twin crises of Lebanon and Taiwan force an admission of Pentagon error when a Marine Corps of 190,000 is kept in hand to deal with these relatively mild examples of the Communist policy of constant pressure against the free world.

Then as the order is issued to execute the cut to 175,000 the Secretary of Defense tells the Nation that our military policy must be shaped with the lessons of Lebanon and Taiwan in mind.

Do these lessons justify a 12½-percent cut below appropriated strength in what is already the smallest of our active services?

How do they justify this cut—400 percent greater in relation to appropriated strength than that imposed on any other service—in the very forces which were able to respond most rapidly, most precisely, when Lebanon demanded action in a matter of hours?

No one has answered these questions.

No once can. For the true answer is that we are witnessing a return to the disastrous reasoning of the Louis Johnson school—the Alice in Wonderland theory that we gain strength through weakness.

Only strong, decisive, and immediate action by the Congress can reverse our course.

Never has the foresight of our distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] the sponsor of the Marine Corps bill, been more thoroughly vindicated than in the past year as well as the continuing crises which characterize the probings and incursions of Communist aggression.

Never has the Nation's need for a small professional force in readiness such as the Marine Corps been greater than it is today.

General Pate's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF GEN. R. McC. PATE, U.S. MARINE CORPS, COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS, BEFORE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, U.S. SENATE, JANUARY 26, 1959

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the Marine Corps deeply appreciates the interest you have always shown in our affairs. We welcome opportunities such as this to appear before you, and to report on our status. In general, I feel this committee is quite familiar with the Marine Corps. We are guided by the missions which Congress has assigned us. For the purposes of this meeting I will not make a lengthy statement, but will confine my remarks to two main points: (1) A summary of our activities during the past year; and (2) our plans, programs, and capabilities for the coming year.

During 1958, the basic deployment of our Fleet Marine Forces, which we have maintained for the past several years, was found responsive to the realities of global military pressures. One division and one aircraft wing were maintained on the east coast of the United States with the Atlantic Fleet. At least one battalion landing team of that force was normally on rotational deployment with the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean. Two divisions and two aircraft wings were assigned to the Pacific Fleet, one division and one aircraft wing operating on the west coast, and one division and one aircraft wing in the western Pacific. The latter division/wing team was under operational control of the 7th Fleet. This distribution of our forces provided for an amphibious capability in each of the great ocean areas.

To render these deployments meaningful, our Fleet Marine Forces were constantly prepared for combat action. The state of their readiness was several times demonstrated, when world events called for limited military action by the United States.

In May 1958, incident to the Vice President's visit to Caracas, Venezuela, elements of the east coast team deployed. Two rifle companies of a battalion landing team were airlifted to Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and embarked aboard the cruiser *Boston;* a third rifle company was lifted from the parade-ground at Camp Lejeune by helicopters which then accompanied them on board the carrier *Tarawa* to join U.S.S. *Boston.*

In the summer, world attention was focused on Lebanon, where the orderly processes of constitutional government were endangered. As tension mounted, the normal amphibious troop strength of the 6th Fleet was increased. An additional battalion landing team was provided in May; in late June a third departed its east coast base. On July 14, the Lebanese President sent an urgent request to our Government for assistance. As the Nation's initial response to that request, the 6th Fleet quickly landed the three battalions of Marines—the first one hit the beach on the 15th of July at the precise hour directed by President Eisenhower. The prompt arrival of those units had a stabilizing effect on a very explosive situation, and ultimately the Lebanese were given an opportunity to work out a Lebanese solution to a Lebanese problem.

In late August, there was need to reinforce the air defense of Taiwan.. Marine Air Group 11, stationed in Japan, was alerted for the purpose. The fighter squadrons flew off at once; but it is a mark of the mobility of the entire unit that within 12 days after its new base field was designated, the entire group—aircraft and ground support units alike—had moved their personnel and equipment 1,300 miles by sea and were effectively contributing operational support to units already at Taiwan.

Each of the incidents I have mentioned constituted a real emergency. In each one, the amphibious forces demonstrated professional competence in responding to the requirements of their role in our national defense. As a result of careful prior preparation they reacted immediately, using normal task groupings and communications, and without last minute, frantic planning. They moved at once to the trouble area, and they remained in the area until their presence was no longer required. The real mobility of naval forces was thus made apparent, and the true nature of the fleet's readiness demonstrated. No international political arrangements were necessary to permit the movement of these units. They were free to anticipate international events. They needed no rights of transit; and their own strength and self-sufficiency gave them ability to stay as long as their presence was needed.

So much for 1958. Now let me turn to our plans, programs and capabilities for this year.

The Reorganization Act of 1958 will necessitate no change in Marine Corps operations. Under its provisions we will continue to do what we have done in the past; that is, equip our troops, train them in the specialized techniques of amphibious warfare, then assign them to appropriate field commands. However, we do so in a somewhat different way than do the other services. The bulk of our Marine fighting forces are assigned directly to the principal fleets of the Navy. They become an organic part of the fleets to give them balance and complete the flexibility of their striking power. The fleets, in turn, are assigned directly to the several unified commands. Their commanders thus possess a ready amphibious arm which they may deploy in any locality bordering on the seven seas.

We started this year with a strength of approximately 187,500 officers and men. Right now, today, we have about 185,000. We will continue to decline as we implement the directive to reduce to a strength of 175,000 by June 30 of this year. Our supporting base, and the security forces which we must provide to other Government agencies, have already been reduced. Their strengths have reached the minimum consistent with efficient operation for the forces and missions presently assigned. For this reason, reductions have to be made in our combat units—the Fleet Marine Force. To effect this, we have two alternatives. We can either provide fewer and fewer men to the units than their tables of organization call for, or we can deactivate units.

In fiscal year 1958, with a ceiling of 188,000 personnel, we had a personnel availability in our Fleet Marine Forces equivalent to 8 battalion landing teams per division or a total of 24 within the Fleet Marine Forces. However, I chose to retain the full structure of 27 battalion landing teams in the 3 divisions and levy reductions across the board.

However, during the past year our experience in Lebanon and the Far East clearly demonstrated to us the fallacy of maintaining units at levels seriously below combat strength. I have therefore abandoned this philosophy, and returned to one of maintaining our battalion landing teams at full combat strength. This, linked with the further reduction to 175,000, has required me to deactivate 2 of the battalion landing teams in each of our 3 divisions. Thus our 3 Marine divisions will be reduced from a total of 27 to a total of 21 battalions. All remaining divisional units can then be maintained at not less than 90 percent of their table of organization strength. Also, by June 30, 6 aircraft squadrons and 100 additional aircraft will be deleted from our 3 aircraft wings. Some other reductions in our combat strength will be entailed, but I have mentioned the principal ones.

Elsewhere in the personnel field, in order to get every possible benefit from our Marines, we are making strenuous efforts to improve quality, to keep commitments for housekeeping and support functions to a minimum, and to reduce individual training requirements wherever possible.

These programs are meeting with considerable success. For example, the reenlistment rate for first enlistees has increased from approximately 17 percent in fiscal year 1957 to 25.4 percent in the first 5 months of fiscal year 1959. Added to this, the trend among first enlistees is to sign for 4 rather than 3 years. Last year only 21 percent chose the 4-year term. This has increased to a high last month of 89 percent of 4-year enlistees. The trend should continue. The combined effect of these programs will lead to a significant reduction in our training load, higher quality marines and increased readiness.

Throughout the past year, the Fleet Marine Forces carried out a number of exercises, battalion size and larger, aimed at the improvement of old and the perfection of new techniques of amphibious warfare. Each

exercise was in every sense a rehearsal for combat. Each exercise, regardless of size, involved the interplay of Marine air and ground units operating as a team with Navy amphibious forces. This mode of operations is a hallmark of our composition and doctrine, exemplifying, with the Navy, the essential qualities of modern war on the land, on the sea, and in the air. We have another full schedule of exercises planned for this year. Through them we will maintain our readiness for any eventuality.

In all of our exercises and in all of our training, we are stressing modern techniques of amphibious operations—the vertical envelopment concept. The helicopter assault landing capability, which we developed, is a reality now, and it is growing in potential from year to year.

The assault elements of our divisions are organized to take them transportable by helicopter. The structure of each Marine aircraft wing on the Atlantic coast, the Pacific coast, and in the western Pacific provides for a balanced helicopter group in each locality.

In order that helicopter capabilities can be employed in amphibious operations, carrier decks are required. In the Pacific, the Navy has one aircraft carrier specially converted for use as a helicopter platform. This is U.S.S. *Thetis Bay*, a former escort carrier which in 1955 underwent minor conversion and overhaul to give it a troop-carrying capability, and to facilitate the handling of helicopters. Marines have used it extensively. It has provided the naval amphibious forces with much valuable experience, both in perfecting modern amphibious techniques and for ideas of design to be incorporated in new construction vessels. However, *Thetis Bay* provides vertical assault capability for less than one battalion and only in one ocean. More is needed.

The Navy's approved shipbuilding program will provide two carriers specially designed for the purpose in 1962, but the problem cannot be put off until then. We feel there is urgent requirement that greatly increased helicopter lift capabilities be available to the fleets right now.

The chief of naval operations and I have, after much study, arrived at an interim solution. By providing additional marines to augment the Marine detachment to help fill out their crew, two—and possibly three—CVS-type carriers can be kept in service and devoted to helicopter operations. We have determined that a Marine detachment of 10 officers and 323 enlisted men will be required for each carrier designated, and I have agreed to furnish those marines. The Marine detachments, organized into two companies, will perform assigned air, guard, supply, communication and other support duties appropriate for marines. I might point out that this solution to our problem is only possible because of the close and intimate association of the Navy and Marine Corps over the years.

In the Atlantic area the amphibious forces inaugurated the use of the carrier *Boxer* early this month. In addition to U.S.S. *Princeton*, to be assigned to the amphibious forces in March, one more carrier is under consideration for assignment at a later date. These vessels are not ideal for efficient helicopter operations, nor for amphibious troops habitability, but they do provide a significant increase in our combat potential. They enable us to apply modern doctrine in our amphibious operations.

Any comment on our combat readiness would be most incompetent without mention of the Marine Corps Reserve. We place great reliance upon it. In the event of mobilization, our reserve will provide us immediately backup strength.

Our ready reserve comprises 208,000 men. Of these, some 43,000 are organized into drill-pay units. Drill-pay unit training programs maintain these units in a state of readiness that makes them immediately available for mobilization.

The balance of our reserves would be called to duty and placed in combat units as quickly as refresher training could bring them up to fleet marine force standards. Right now I am proud to say our reserve is in the highest state of readiness we have ever achieved short of full mobilization.

Gentlemen, I have summarized briefly our accomplishments during the past year, and indicated our posture for the year ahead. As it always has been, it is now—a posture of preparedness. Everything we have available to us today is in the highest state of readiness we know how to achieve. You have my assurance it will be kept that way.

Kentucky's Future—Soil and Water Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, for the second consecutive year a young man from the Second Congressional District of Kentucky was won first place in the soil conservation essay contest. This year's recipient of the award is Glenn C. Dockery, a 17-year-old Ohio county high school senior. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Owen Dockery and resides on rural Route 1, Beaver Dam, Ky. Glenn's essay entitled "Kentucky's Future—Soil and Water Conservation," was judged best from a record number of 31,426 written by grade and high school students in 118 Kentucky soil conservation districts. This honor which has been bestowed upon Glenn C. Dockery is to be coveted and is one of which he has every right to be proud. Not only in this particular instance, but by other means he has set an example which can well be emulated by young people throughout Kentucky. He has served as vice president of the Beaver Dam Chapter of the National Honor Society and as treasurer of his high school junior class. This year he is president of the honor society and vice president of the science club. Also he is a member of the student council and the junior conservation club.

Over the years the young men and women of the Second Congressional District of Kentucky have manifested a deep interest and concern in agricultural pursuits, and, by virtue thereof, have received recognition for their accomplishments. In addition to Glenn C. Dockery, winners in this year's soil conservation essay contest from our district are:

Jean Goodman, Scottsville, Allen County; Johnnie Hines, Hardinsburg, Breckinridge County; G. McCoy, Morgantown, Butler County; Mary Alice Wethington, Utica, Daviess County; Jackey Pearl, Big Clifty, Grayson County; Jacqueline Stephens, Pellville, Hancock County; Brenda Briscoe, Hebbardsville, Henderson County; Lena Villines, Nebo, Hopkins County; Sarah Miller, Sacramento, McLean County; Joyce DeBruler, Fordsville, Ohio County Lynn Caudill, Franklin, Simpson County; Shelby Woodring, Morganfield, Union County; Joe R. Cowles, Bowling Green, Warren County.

Mr. Speaker, soil and water conservation means a great deal to the State of Kentucky. Not only are the people of Kentucky, generally, aware of the necessity for a soil and water conservation program, but our young poeple have been well instructed along such lines, as evidenced by Glenn C. Dockery. The awards received by him and the other boys and girls are indicative of the outstanding work being done by our Soil Conservation Service under able and conscientious leaders. The young people who reside in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent belong to the different farm organizations such as the Future Farmers of America, Future Homemakers of America, and 4-H Clubs. I am justifiably proud of our future farmers and homemakers. I am thankful for the enormous potential that resides in the youth of our land. I feel that such potential for good is being fully realized. As our youth see, they understand, and as they hear, they are comprehending the truth so that they and all the citizens of our land may live more abundantly.

More Art Needed in Federal Architecture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, 1959, the Toledo Blade took occasion to applaud the recent admonition of the Fine Arts Commission against the stark functionalism of our Federal buildings throughout the Nation generally and in the Nation's Capital particularly. In an editorial entitled "One Percent for Art" the editor makes an eloquent plea for filling this aesthetic void through the judicious use of ornamentation to reflect something of the spirit and aspirations of the American people.

Surely the reservation of one percent of the funds appropriated for construction is little enough to devote to alleviating the barren utilitarian and uninspiring severity that has so characterized our public buildings.

Under unanimous consent, I include the full text of the editorial, and I commend its sentiment to the thoughtful attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

ONE PERCENT FOR ART

In many American cities and towns Federal buildings are among the most prominent architectural features. In Washington, of course, they dominate and convey both to foreign visitors and to our own citizens something of the spirit of the American people and their Government.

For this reason Congress ought to take note of the complaint of the Fine Arts Com-

mission against the plainness and severity in design which has made Government buildings constructed in the postwar period examples of barern monotony. Too often, the commission says, paintings, sculpture and other enlivening ornamental features have been struck from the plans of Federal and District of Columbia buildings.

The Government can afford to be a better patron of arts and American artists in this respect. Particularly do we believe that the humblest of Americans from the most remote crossroads would want the public buildings in the Nation's Capital to be of inspiring beauty and dignity. Elsewhere, too, the example of the Government in departing from barren monotony would have a leavening effect on other public, as well as private, buildings.

What the Commission would like is for Congress to set aside a special fund, equal to one percent of the appropriations for Federal and District of Columbia construction, that could be devoted to the judicious use of art" for buildings and their adjacent surroundings. The size of the sum which should be made available may be debateable but not we think, the need for the Government to move away from any sterile, purely utilitarian concept of building.

Thanks for the Sputniks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to hear my dear friend Dr. John S. Allen, president of the University of South Florida, when he recently made an excellent address before the Phi Delta Phi law fraternity breakfast at the University of Florida. I am happy to include here the challenging but, at the same time, encouraging thoughts which he presented on that occasion.

The address follows:

THANKS FOR THE SPUTNIKS

A century ago the colleges of this country taught liberal arts, theology, and a little science. Law was not in the college curriculum, it was read in a lawyer's office. The science that was taught was very simple and elementary compared to what is known and taught today. I have on my bookshelf an astronomy book that was used as a textbook by some of our colleges about a century and a quarter ago. It has in it the following definition: "Electricity is an all pervading fluid emanating from the sun." Today out information is more accurate and more elaborate.

A century ago colleges were small. President James Garfield described the ideal classroom as "a log hut with only a simple bench, Mark Hopkins on one end and I on the other, and you may have all the buildings, apparatus and libraries without him." Today we have so many attending college that it is physically impossible to provide President Garfield's ideal classroom, and in fact we seem to be going in the opposite direction when we point a television camera at a professor and carry his message by coaxial cable to literally thousands of students. If we will admit that some people can do good teaching by the lecture-demonstration method, then television is simply a device to carry the work of one excellent teacher to thousands rather than having most of the students subjected to less than excellent teaching. Many will feel that this is losing the personal touch, and education in the crowded classrooms of today is just not as good as it was in "our day."

On October 4, 1957, Sputnik I went into orbit and sent radio beeps to earth with coded messages. We Americans were embarrassed and annoyed by this, because we like to be first. A lot of people who had never been very much concerned about schools went into orbit and started beeping. They now want better schools. For this, I say, "Thanks for the sputniks."

I want better schools too. We all want better schools. Thanks to the sputniks, maybe we can get them. But I am not sure the general public knows what kind of schools they really want. I have known people: Who objected to their children having homework to do; who really desired social success more than academic success for their children; who thought time off from school for basketball practice was proper; who would provide car transportation for athletes after practice; or who would contribute personal labor to help build a football field. But would they do this for a library or for an honor student?

The practicing lawyers at this breakfast find themselves in the role of leading citizens of their respective communities. You who are still in law school will soon find yourselves in this role. People just expect a professional person, such as a lawyer, to be informed. They will expect you to know about the schools and how they may be improved.

Many of the practicing lawyers here are in my generation. We, of course, look on our days in school as a rigorous program of such high quality, that it made real men of all of us. Unfortunately, nostalgic memories are not very accurate. I propose to present some facts that will give us all a better understanding of where we are.

We should not be misled by nostalgic stories of the past when it is reported that men busied themselves with glorious fighting for church and country, or they amused themselves by dancing around the maypole. Actually, in the past most people were poor, sick, illiterate, short-lived, and worked from dawn to dusk to keep body and soul together. They were slaves to their jobs. They had no real freedom of choice or freedom of opportunity if they wanted to eat regularly. A boy learned his father's trade. A girl taught school or was a housewife, and that was about the only choice they had.

Freedom has come with our material abundance. A boy or girl can work at what they want to do. They can make a living by encouraging and exploiting any talent they enjoy. They can work in business, in industry, in science, journalism, music, art, or any other field.

In 1900 only 8 percent of our high-school-age population graduated from high school. The high-school program was strictly college preparatory in nature. Yet only about 4 percent of the high-school graduates went to college in 1900. This was a situation the American public would not tolerate. They insisted then, as we insist today, on the democratic principle that every child have the opportunity for as much education as his ability permits him to absorb.

This caused a diversification of offerings in the high school. Instead of attempting to prepare all comers for college, even though those who go to college are a small percentage of that age group, the secondary schools have developed offerings in secretarial studies, vocational agriculture, shop and industrial arts. The schools recognized that for many pupils this would be society's only chance to educate them, not only for a job, but for good citizenship and for their personal living responsibilities.

By 1950 two-thirds of the children of high-school age were enrolled in school. This gain was not made entirely in the nonacademic or skill courses. In 1900 only 7 percent of the boys and girls of high-school age were taking courses in mathematics and science. In 1950, 35 percent of them were doing so.

In other words, there are more boys and girls enrolled in mathematics and science today than there were in 1900, a greater percentage of children of high-school age enrolled in these subjects, and both enrollments and percentages are increasing rather than decreasing.

We must remember that we are created equal, before the law. We have equal privileges, responsibilities and opportunities. But let us not confuse equal with identical. Courses in science have always been offered in the better equipped modern schools, but they are not designed for all pupils. School counselors advise those who are not interested in academic things or ideas, but who are interested in doing things with their hands, to take skill subjects that will prepare them for trades and immediate employment. We must remember that we need the skilled artisan and that good workmanship at any level has dignity.

Unfortunately, some who have the ability for dealing with ideas rather than things have not been challenged or been shown the need for putting forth the effort necessary to succeed in academic subjects. School counseling is not able to accomplish this alone. School administrators have found that by working consistently and continually through the PTA, they can get parents to understand why certain pupils should be encouraged to take science courses. The pupils then get guidance at home around the dinner table, as well as in the classroom, and from the counselor. One school principal reported that whereas he had had only enough pupils for one half section of high school physics, the next year he had four sections. And where he had had only 3 sections of chemistry, the next year they had 13 sections of chemistry. Obviously pupils will take these courses if challenged and if properly guided by both the school and the home.

Further studies indicate that the schools are today doing a somewhat better job at teaching than they have in the past, as measured by student performance on standardized achievement tests. Let me give you an example from the elementary school. A midwestern university gave a reading test to the elementary pupils in the city of Indianapolis, and repeated the same test 30 years later. They found on the average that third-grade pupils read better today than did fifth-grade pupils at the earlier date. In the past the retarded reader dropped from school. Today we know how to help him. Scores made by third-grade pupils today should have been held down by the fact that the pupil who would have been retarded in the past and maybe dropped from school is in school today because of compulsory attendance laws if for no other reason.

I had a colleague who told me that he graduated from elementary school in west Florida nearly 50 years ago. The school term was 5 months a year. On graduation from the eighth grade he passed an examination given by the county which enabled him to start teaching immediately in the school from which he graduated. From his teaching he earned the money necessary to pay his way through high school which was on a 4 months' term. Since then he has not only completed college, but has gone on to earn a doctor of philosophy degree and is still devoting his energies to improving our schools. But I ask how many of you today would be willing to have your children attend elementary school only 5 months of the year, and be taught by a person with no other

preparation than graduation from the eighth grade? How many of you would be willing to have your children attend high school only 4 months of the year?

Similar statistics can be cited to show similar gains made at the collegiate level. Between 1900 and 1950, for example, the college age population of the United States about doubled, but the undergraduate enrollment in our colleges and universities jumped almost 1,000 percent and the graduate enrollment increased almost 4,000 percent.

At the same time the curriculum has been pushed downward through the colleges and schools. My father and I attended the same college, but 40 years apart. He majored in mathematics and got to calculus in his senior year. I majored in mathematics and got to calculus in my sophomore year. Not because I was smarter. More and better mathematics was taught to me in high school, and the college curriculum had been pushed downward by 2 years. Today many college freshmen take calculus.

Some people have been so impressed by the sputniks that they want us to install the Russian school system. Enough Americans have visited Russian schools and universities for us to know rather well what they are doing. For example, the programs in mathematics and in the physical sciences are very good. These were encouraged by the Czarist regimes and they are encouraged by the Communist regime today. Other programs are not given so much encouragement. To be admitted to a university the candidate must come from the family of a common man. The candidate must be politically reliable. A high quality program may be followed in science, but along with it each student is required to study Marxist-Leninist philosophy. And they are required to study a history that is so distorted it is hardly recognizable by our western historians.

Others say one of the western European school systems that has produced great scientists would serve our purposes better. Let me describe parts of the French system, since it is reasonably typical. To go beyond elementary and vocational schooling the child must come from the right family and must decide between ages 10 and 14 to take the school program that will lead to the university. Should he decide not to take that program and later with growth and maturity he discovers he would like to go on to the university and study academic subjects, he finds the way is blocked. There are no transfer points between the two routes.

Dr. Byron Hollingshead has reported on his 5½ years' of work assisting universities in western Europe that there are as many students elected to the three top American honor societies of Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi, and Phi Kappa Phi as there are students in the total enrollment of all of the colleges and universities of western Europe.

In America about 10 to 15 percent of our college-age population graduate from college, and about 1 percent complete college with superior records that cause them to be elected to the top honor societies. This means that in France, for example, only about 1 percent of the college-age population is enrolled in college or university. This is a high quality program in France. And the program completed by members of Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi, and Phi Kappa Phi in American colleges is equally high in quality. But we in America have a dual program. One in which educational opportunity is open to all who can profit by it, and a program within the first that is for superior students. In a democracy such as ours is, we have no alternative but to make some educational system, such as this, work and work well.

It is reported that in France there are not enough people educated to high enough levels to fill the positions in business, industry, and government that require college education. It is reported that a minister of finance in the French Government did not know even the rudiments of money, banking, finance, or even tax collection. If France has had a serious Communist Party, I believe it can be attributed in part to its educational system and its limited opportunities. If we in this country have not had a "serious" Communist Party, I believe this can be attributed in part to our educational system.

Remember that our educational crisis did not begin with Sputnik I, nor will it end when and if we are the first to send a rocket to the moon. Our educational crisis arises because to maintain our economic and political system, we in America must educate more people to higher levels than any society ever attempted before in all of history. Unfortunately during our growth in numbers we have not always had a similar development in intellectual standards. To this problem we must give immediate attention.

However, we do not do this by copying the Russians. They have built a system to serve the needs of their state. I do not believe the French educational system has served that state well. We in America have built a system to free the minds of 175 million people. And a democratic society with free and well-trained minds need not fear any challenge. We must be sure that our educational system really aids and stimulates its students to use their minds to full capacity.

To many of our people have gone under the illusion that you could get a good educational system for practically nothing. We thought that paying a few dollars school tax on our property and sending a $10 check to our college alumni fund every year was all we had to do. We seemed to think that the Government or some philanthropist would somehow do the rest. It is not so easy. Our less than adequate support of our schools to date causes me to question whether or not we really want better schools. It is typical to place a limit on the tax millage that can be assessed by local government for schools when there is no millage limit for other Government services. Have you been willing to authorize bond issues for new school buildings needed to avoid double sessions?

We are the ones who must pay the bill. And we can do it quite readily by increasing our total support of education, through taxes and gifts, from 2 percent to 3 percent of personal income. We are finding that local and State taxes have not been enough, and now it is proposed that the Federal Government use its taxing power to help out. But if you will hurry home to vote quickly for higher school taxes, and send twice as much to your alma mater, you can keep Uncle Sam from getting deeper into the educational business. If we do not, then the Government will do it for us, for Uncle Sam cannot afford for America not to have a first-class educational system.

Finally, our schools and colleges must demand the best from their students. We must never make the degrading assumption that young people unfitted for the highest levels of intellectual endeavor are incapable of meeting some sort of standards. Too many have assumed that those who are incapable of high level intellectual activity are incapable of any standards and can be exposed to shoddy and trashy educational fare. We recognize individual differences in aptitude or ability and at the same time we must expect every level of education to stretch the individual to the utmost of his particular potentialities.

"And," as John Gardner of the Carnegie Corp. has said, "we must expect that each student is striving for excellence in terms of the kind of excellence that is within his reach. Here again we must recognize that there may be excellence or shoddiness in every line of human endeavor. We must honor excellence in every socially accepted human activity, however humble the activity. There may be excellent plumbers and incompetent plumbers, excellent philosophers and incompetent philosophers. An excellent plumber is infinitely more admirable than an incompetent philosopher. The society which scorns excellent in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity, and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy. Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water."

The Enemy We Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article should be widely read, but especially it should be read by every Member of Congress.

We have got to recognize the fact that we face an enemy who is implacable and bent on our destruction. The time is growing short, and we are going to be destroyed not only by the men in the Kremlin but in our own lack of knowledge and our desire not to face up to anything unpleasant.

Mr. Wolfe is right when he says:

Our policy of containment has not contained; and our policy of liberation has not liberated; as our acceptance of the poison semantics of peaceful coexistence and the propaganda circus of summit conferences has given us neither genuine conferences for agreement on anything, nor peace, nor coexistence.

We must wake up, shatter our rosy, silly dreams and face reality.

[From the New Leader, Jan. 26, 1959]

THE ENEMY WE FACE

(By Bertram D. Wolfe)

The Soviet system of power, which is the enemy we face, can only be understood properly with the help of certain theoretical criteria of a sociohistorical nature. Very briefly, we may say that the Soviet system is a closed, single-centered, modern totalitarian society, as distinguished from an open, multicentered society. A closed society is one with built-in staying powers which enable it to endure for a very long period of time; it is a self-conserving society, in that any changes that occur are within-system changes that leave the basic structure of power untouched. A single-centered society is one in which there is only one focus of power, the state, which does not tolerate the diffusion of power among any other relatively independent social institutions or groups. Finally, a modern totalitarian society, as distinguished even from an old-fashioned despotism, is one in which the state seeks to be coextensive with the whole of society and the whole of life, a society that is perpetually at war with its own people and with the rest of the world, and which uses modern technology and widespread literacy as weapons in that war.

Now, the Soviet Union is truly a great power—great in population, great in resources, great in technology, and great in

military strength. Secondly, it has a great state machine which is in a condition of permanent semimobilization, and which attempts to keep its people mobilized. Finally, it is an enemy which is resourceful enough, wealthy enough, and determined enough to do what we have not had the determination to do (although we have had the resources in the West in much greater abundance): namely, to keep simultaneously an atomic striking power and a massive conventional striking power in being. It has a definite advantage over us at this moment because it is geared to both types of warfare. It believes that both types are necessary and that they must be integrated into a single plan.

At the beginning of the 19th century, one European in seven was a Russian, or under Moscow rule. At the beginning of the 20th century, one European in four was under Moscow rule. At the middle of the 20th century, approximately one European in two is under Russian rule. This in itself is enough to give us pause—especially if we remember that there are 125 divisions in being in Russia, while we have approximately 15 and are engaged in cutting our forces further.

It is a deadly enemy. It is a deadly enemy because never for a moment does it abandon its two basic aims: to remake man, and to conquer the world. It is particularly our enemy—not because we so choose, but because it has chosen. It regards the strength and the way of life of the United States as the chief obstacle to its plan to remake its own people and to remake the world in the image of its blueprint. We have been picked as enemy No. 1.

No matter what Eisenhower says or does, no matter whether Dulles conducts himself with tact or tactlessness, no matter how well the tourist behaves when he goes to the Soviet Union for his 3 weeks—we will still be enemy No. 1. Whether our working class is prosperous, or hungry and jobless, or jobless and not hungry, we will still be enemy No. 1. Whether we treat American Negroes decently, or indecently—or somewhere in between, as we are doing at present—we will still be enemy No. 1. Whether we pull out of Berlin or Quemoy or do not pull out of Berlin or Quemoy, we cannot disengage ourselves from this enemy.

Let us not listen to the siren song of those who tell us that we can get a release of tensions and a little peace in our time if we only disengage ourselves. If we disengage ourselves, we leave another strip to be occupied, a new place from which battle will begin.

They know, to be sure, that they cannot conquer us. They know something about our strength. They do not covet for a moment the risks of all-out war with us. There are two things that they are determined with all of their might to avoid: one is all-out war, the other is all-out peace. They will keep us in between as long as they have the power to do so. They do not wish all-out war because they believe that time and history are on their side. When they consider how their system has been expanding, I must say it seems to them that they have some empirical confirmation for their belief that time is on their side.

Of course, they do not want all-out peace, for their two fundamental aims do not permit them to be at peace either with their own people or with the rest of the world. If our statesmen and experts wish to make a test of any fresh proposal of theirs to see whether it really intends peace, there is a simple test. When they are ready to make peace with their own people, then we will know—and only then—that they are ready for real peace with their neighbors and with us. Otherwise, when they use the word "peace" it is just one of the gimmicks in their waging of war. It is well to remember that Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev is said to have two sets of teeth, one to smile with and one to bite with. And the more dangerous of the two is the set with which he smiles.

My next point is that "by the enemy we face," I do not mean the Russian people. The Russian people are not and have never been our enemies. They have not chosen and they do not choose their Government. They do not control its policies—except by their mute and silent pressure. And those who tell us that when the Russian people mature they will be able to control their Government and its policies, are deceiving themselves and us. No mere maturing of the Russian people will change their system, nor does their system allow them the organizational scope and independent activity, the genuine information and the right to judge which alone permit of maturing.

The Russian people are not unfriendly to us, only ill-informed, deeply curious, well-disposed toward us, and a little envious. If the gates were opened, they would vote with their feet by the millions in favor of our system. In fact, wherever they have had a chance to cross the line, they have crossed by the millions. Two-thirds of all the Chinese volunteers whom we took as prisoners during the Korean war refused to return to their native scenes, families, and lands, preferring the half-world of barbed-wire camps to returning to a country where their Government makes unending war upon them.

The real reason for the Kremlin's endless hostility toward the United States, regardless of what we do, is that they regard us, and rightly, as the main obstacle to their underlying plan. This will not be changed if Khrushchev should come to New York and see our skyscrapers, or if he should then go to Detroit and see how many automobiles our workingmen have. The Russian leaders are ruthlessly friendly. They talk of easing of tensions. In our society, tension is a bad word. We can thank the Freudians for that, I suppost, for they talk of the age of anxiety and the age of tension. To anybody who comes with a panacea for easing tensions, we open our arms and our hearts. However, if every time they speak of easing of tensions you would substitute for the word "tension" the word "concern" (which is a more neutrally or differently colored word), you would see that what they are asking us to do is to stop concerning ourselves with the freedom of the world and with our own freedom. Then you would realize that we must hug our tensions to our breasts as long as the dangers exist which have caused the concern.

When I say that nothing we can do will change this, I do not mean to say that it makes no difference whether our workingmen are prosperous and employed or not, or that it makes no difference how we treat our colored population, for it does make a difference. But the difference is in the winning of allies, not alienating them; in winning the secret support of the Russian people; in strengthening our prestige with neutrals. However, we will not disarm or change the philosophy or the goals of a mortal enemy. Nor do I believe with those who think that if we but disarmed everything would be easy (of course that sentence is not complete: it would be easy for the men in the Kremlin). I have never believed that the best way to get thieves to reform is to remove the locks from our doors.

The world is in serious and even mortal danger now, as it was in Hitler's day. Every country in the East is in mortal danger from China, with its huge population. Every country in Western Europe, the cradle of modern thought and liberty, is in mortal danger. Every country on the Mediterranean, which was the cradle of Western civilization and culture, is in mortal danger. The Near East, which was the cradle of our faiths, in in mortal danger at the present moment.

We have tried the gesture of "Let's be friends and see if that won't work"—we have tried it more often than our historical memories permit us to recall. I remember when Franklin Roosevelt said to Frances Perkins: "I really believe that I can get Uncle Joe to go along with me." Well, we tried it. So, at the end of the war, it turned out that there were three kinds of occupation zones. There were countries which Russia occupied ("liberated") exclusively—they lost their freedom and were sucked behind the Iron Curtain. There were the countries which were jointly occupied—all of those except one have been partitioned, and the Soviet-occupied half of each is behind the Iron Curtain (North Korea, East Germany, and so on). One country was occupied exclusively by us, Japan, and there the occupied country is free to criticize and disagree with its occupiers and liberators. If the experience of those three types of occupation does not teach us not to play this costly game of seeing if we cannot hypnotize the men in the Kremlin into abandoning their blueprint or into just being nice, then nothing will ever teach us. In the end we will perish, and deserve to perish, for being fools incapable of learning.

They are now proposing (and have been proposing for some time) a unification of Germany. Unification consists, as they have made abundantly clear, in having the two Germanys linked together and then in seeing how Communist Germany can gradually take possession of West Germany as well. We tried that before, too. We tried it with the two Chinas during World War II, and we see how it turned out. We tried it with the two Koreas, and we also see how that worked out. Some poor fellows tried earnestly to cooperate with them in Eastern Europe. But the Communists took the key posts in the cabinets and popular-front governments; they took the Ministry of War, the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Propaganda (Education); and, in the end, they took the country, by what former Hungarian Communist boss Mathias Rakosi called "salami tactics," in which you slice off one slice, then another slice, and then another slice, until you have the whole salami sliced up.

If we are still tempted by poisoned semantics (one of their deadliest weapons) to believe that the word "peaceful" means peace; and that coexistence means mutual tolerance and live and let live, I don't know at this late date what I can say, except perhaps that I might offer a homely metaphor: The farmer is perfectly willing for the turkey to coexist with him until Thanksgiving Day. If we keep that in mind, we will have a general notion of what they mean by peaceful coexistence.

The mistakes which our public figures have made, our statesmen, experts, journalists, diplomats—and our military men as well when we were in a joint military effort with Russia—have all sprung from the same thing: the virtual incapacity of a people brought up in an open society to understand the nature of the system we have been examining, and the aims and plans of its rulers. I could illustrate that with errors made throughout the last 41 years, since 1917. But let us start with World War II and the grand alliance. Not understanding that our ally of the moment had been, was then, and at the war's end would be also our enemy, we did not plan the peace during the war. We did not make it a self-enforcing peace, which we could only have done by planning our military conduct of the war to insure a decent peace by the position of our armies at the war's end. Therefore there has been no peace.

We have failed to understand that agreements with such an unrelenting and continuing foe are carried out only if there are deliberate provisions to make them self-enforcing. Such provisions involve the proper disposition of our military forces to insure enforcement.

Thus, when we say free elections for Germany, and they say free elections, it behooves us to remember that the elections they have in the Soivet Union are what they call free elections. We must spell out any agreement on free elections so as to include multiple parties, a press owned by individuals, associations and parties not controlled by the government, empty prisons and closed concentration camps, and the like, and joint occupying troops in quantity in all sectors, to enforce the rights and liberties we mean by the thus-defined free elections.

When they say peaceful unification arranged between the East and West German Governments, we must remember that that is what they said of Korea, of Vietnam, of wartime China. Agreements that are not spelled out and self-enforcing are merely semantic poison to prepare and justify conquest.

Above all, we are not giving our own people a clear vision of this opponent, and the nature of our struggle. How often have I sat down in taxicab or train and been asked: "What is your racket?" I answer, "Russia." Invariably the taxi driver or traveling companion follows up with: "Tell me, is Russia really as bad as our newspapers say it is?" Always I must answer, "Much worse, man. Our newspapers are not doing a good job." That depressing and forever recurring question shows how our leaders have failed to make our people understand—because they do not really understand themselves—the nature of our self-appointed opponent. Since both our political parties must appeal and do appeal recklessly and demagogically to a people to whom they have not given decent leadership and proper political education, each party poses as the party of peace while the enemy chooses to continue to make war on us. This is the most dangerous feature in our political life.

At the war's end, we demobilized our troops too soon, because we had not prepared our own minds or our people to remain mobilized until a decent peace was assured. We failed to make effective use of our then-monopoly of atomic weapons in ways which would have furthered a decent peace and effective and controlled disarmament, not because this could not have been done—it probably could—but because we were not sufficiently aware of the need to do so, and too frightened by our awful preponderance of power to make wise and restrained use of it for bringing about genuine peace and genuine liberation of the liberated countries.

We left Korea without adequate defenses because we were afraid that the Koreans might use our arms to unify their country, and we did not have the understanding to realize that the puppet government of North Korea would surely use Russian and Chinese Communist arms and forces for the peaceful unification of Korea, and the liberation of Korea from its independence. We even withdrew our troops and made the fatuous and inviting statement that Korea was not part of our essential defense perimeter. What could be expected from such a foe under such circumstances? When we finally had to fight to save Korea, we did an inspiring job. But under such self-imposed limitations that it was easy for Communist China to reconquer the northern half of the country, and restore the same impossible conditions that had brought us into war.

Our policy of containment has not contained; and our policy of liberation has not liberated; as our acceptance of the poison semantics of peaceful coexistence and the propaganda circus of summit conferences has given us neither genuine conferences for agreement on anything, nor peace, nor coexistence.

All these errors—and, alas, I could enumerate many more like them—come from a failure to understand the difficulties and intricacies of the problems, because of a failure to understand the nature of our enemy, his system, his power, his ruthlessness, and unscrupulousness in negotiation and action, his aims, his determination, and the role of his ideology in his efforts to conquer the world and remake man. This failure of vision or understanding is at the root of our failures in action and omission and negotiation.

I have used the word enemy and I should like to explain my choice of this word. I recognize that it is not a nice or a pleasant word. But we ought not be afraid of it. We did not pick the men in the Kremlin as enemies; they picked us. We have not tried to believe their statement of their aims. They said "world revolution," but we preferred not to believe they meant it. We have tried many times to show our good will and friendship. We offered to help them with arms in 1918 to reestablish a front against the invading Germans, but all that came of it were the misunderstandings of intervention. During the so-called intervention, we helped them to get back Siberia after they had lost it, and we forced the Japanese by our pressure to give up their occupation of Siberia. When war and civil war and the follies of their socialization of every grain of wheat and every inkpot brought on universal famine, we helped to save millions of Russians from starvation by our generous famine relief. In the period of their forced industrialization, we sent them technicians and engineers, whole factories and machinery, and helped them to build dams and powerhouses.

In World War II, after they had made their pact with Hitler to divide Europe, and Hitler turned on them, our help was generous and unstinting. Instantly, not after Pearl Harbor, but as early as June 1941, Harry Hopkins flew to Stalin to offer planes and tanks and trucks and guns, and wool and meat and fuel and bread. When Stalin asked Harry Hopkins quite naturally: "What do you want in return for all this?" Again came the failure of vision and understanding. Harry Hopkins boasted: "I told him we were not interested in conditions. All we were interested in was getting them the planes, the guns, the tanks, and the other things they needed."

They have picked us as the enemy of the things they are trying to do to their people and to their neighbors. If we forget that for a moment, in any one of their maneuvers, we fail in leadership. Yet always, with each maneuver, we are prone to forget afresh. We have failed to learn from a monotonous multitude of repetitions. We have failed in understanding. We have failed in leadership and enlightenment of our own people and other peoples. We have failed in political courage. Above all, we have failed in vision—and here, truly, where there is no vision, the people perish.

I would not have you understand that we have done nothing right in these 40 years, or recently. We have done many fine things. I do not count generosity among our errors, only the generosity which defeats and undoes itself.

A power which wishes to preserve peace and prevent an upsetting of the status quo by force is always at a disadvantage when dealing with a revolutionary power. I recognize that. Moreover, our life in this recent period has had its great moments: The first stage of the Korean war; the Berlin airlift; the Marshall plan—in which we even offered to include Russia if she would use it for genuine healing of the wounds of war. These have been noble moments, and there have been others like them.

But our vision is faltering, our understanding blurred; we are too easily deceived and too ready to deceive ourselves, to the world's detriment. My purpose in this analysis has been only a single one: To give such awareness of the nature of the Soviet system that the hand can be steadier, the vision clearer and more unflinching, so that each new maneuver of a tactical nature which the Soviet Government undertakes can be appraised in the light of a deeper, overall understanding of the nature of the system that torments its own people and is vowed to our destruction.

Moral Re-Armament in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter to me from my esteemed friend, Mr. Oliver W. Saul, together with two most interesting statements.

The Moral Re-Armament group is composed of citizens from over 40 nations, who have dedicated their lives—and without pay—to the task of bringing Christianity to the world in the most interesting and effective ways.

Moral Re-Armament is a great force for world peace. Their only purpose—prayers and every act—is to bring God and peace and good will to the people everywhere.

The letter and articles follow:

JOHANNESBURG, AFRICA,
January 19, 1959.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIEND: The enclosed report is by a leading British lawyer. It was in Washington that I first met him when he joined the statesman's mission.

At the assembly here the decision was made to start, at once, an all out offensive to do in Africa just what Sir Roy makes clear we must do.

In Lagos Nigeria performances of the play "He Was Not There" begin on February 6. A cast for the play "The Next Phase" assembling from all parts of Africa will be trained there, and will soon be in action. You may have seen both plays in Washington. The film "Freedom" will be shown throughout Africa. Commercial showings will begin here February 2. We are securing 16 mm. copies of this film in order to reach the masses in the heart of the African reserves.

Businessmen of South Africa are out to raise the funds that will be needed for the complete task. However, I am sure we will need considerable help from Europe and America.

Yesterday, over 200 gathered here to welcome the Colwell brothers who have arrived to join the 5 young men from America who have been with Moral Re-Armament in Africa for the past 2½ years. You will know if there is any way whereby Washington can give financial backing to these effective young ambassadors.

My son, Don, will be traveling right with the Colwells to introduce them. The other Americans will be scattered from here, through central and east, to west Africa. I can always be reached at the above address.

With very best wishes and kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

OLIVER W. SAUL.

[From MRA Information Service]

BRITISH M.P. ON MIKOYAN'S VISIT TO U.S.A.

"Deputy Premier Mikoyan of Soviet Russia has been sent to America to pull the wool over our eyes and to trick the free world with the greatest phoney peace offense that has even been seen," a leading member of the British Parliament said today in a speech which was reported in the Los Angeles Herald Express.

John McGovern, member of the British House of Commons for 28 years, told the Moral Re-Armament Assembly for America and the Pacific Nations that Mikoyan's job is to sell America on trading with the Communists so that their revolution can be financed by the free world.

To make his point Mr. McGovern quoted the greatest authority on world communism, Mihaillovich Lenin, and Dimitri Manilski, president of the United Nations Security Council in 1949.

Mr. McGovern said that Lenin told the Communist International in 1920: "On the day that capitalist countries purchase our products, they begin their own change to communism. And they provide us with the financial means to wage the internal struggle for world communism."

He quoted Manilski who said, "To win, we will need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep, so we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures, and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries will leap at another chance to be friends. But as soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with clenched fists."

Mr. McGovern continued, "That is the job of Mikoyan at this moment. It is part of the old idea of coexistence—you feel nice, cozy, and comfortable, but the real purpose is for mental and physical disarmament.

"I have been shattered at the American attitude to a man who 2 years ago proposed an agreement with the Hungarian revolutionaries and then broke it to allow Russian tanks and armies to sweep in and start that nightmare of a blood bath. That is the real Mikoyan. But now he comes to America and all that is forgotten. People wine and dine with him and say, 'He's not such a bad fellow as he's made out to be.'

"I am not surprised to see certain people in the film industry meeting Mikoyan, because we hear Russia has great difficulty in getting her films accepted in Poland and other Iron Curtain countries. Therefore they want something from America, but also to find a market for their own spurious films by unloading them in the West.

"My earlier Marxist training taught me that the extreme left and right would both sell their country to communism—one in the pursuit of world control and the other in the pursuit of profit."

Mr. McGovern is one of the most colorful figures in British politics. He has led hunger marches from Edinburgh to London. "Once I was a Marxist," he said, "but now I am fighting all out for the revolution of moral rearmament not solely because it is answering communism on a world scale but because it is the only answer I have seen.

"The Communists see in MRA the one force that can meet them on more than level terms. It is God-guided and deals with men and women on a moral and spiritual basis. Every day more and more people in authority are beginning to turn to MRA as an answer to the world's problems. They are going on steadily in every single field, in trade unions, labor organizations, among Conservatives and Socialists, and even bringing doubt to and winning numbers of Communists. They find in MRA an alternative to the brutal lies and system of deceit that this Communist philosophy has developed."

Mr. McGovern said the man in America who is "the clearest brain in the international field is John Foster Dulles. In spite of attacks that have been made on him right and left, he is still the one man that knows the Marxist aim. He knows how to take a stand to prevent its expansion. He could be the greatest figure in the entire world today if he could understand that moral rearmament is the positive answer to communism."

Mr. McGovern said, "Before I met MRA I was violently anti-Communist, but now I am in agreement with Chancellor Adenauer's adviser on East European affairs and communism, Dr. Hans Koch, who stated, 'We should go to the countries, the people behind the Iron Curtain and say to them, "We are not coming to you as anti-Communists, we are coming to you with moral rearmament, a superior idea to create a new world. We seek your liberty and ours, your freedom and ours." '"

WHICH WAY AFRICA?

(By Sir Roy Pinsent, Bart.)

Will Africa be another China? In recent weeks there have been held three conferences—in Ghana, Nigeria and South Africa—which raise the issues involved. The Pan-African Peoples' Conference was held at Accra in December last. A close friend of mine attended as a press represenative. As is well known, the conference was chaired by Mr. Tom Mboya, the ardent African nationalist from Kenya. The moving spirit behind the conference was Mr. George Padmore, who is Dr. Nkrumah's adviser on African affairs. One of the two joint secretaries was a Nigerian of great ability, Mr. Fred McEwen from Lagos, whom I have known well since 1956. The conference was attended by responsible leaders from all parts of Africa, and several governments made substantial contributions to the cost.

The theme of the conference was "Africa for the Africans," but as to the means by which this objective was to be reached, a compromise resolution was passed, laying emphasis on the use of nonviolence in territories where democratic means are available and giving its blessing to the use of violence only in retaliation. In a leading article in the Times of January 14, Dr. Nkrumah's visits to Delhi and Cairo are described as symbolical epilogs to this conference, and taken together amounting to a formal declaration of war in the all-out thrust against colonialism and white domination in Africa. Dr. Nkrumah, in Delhi, stated that in Ghana, while they were inspired by Gandhi's policy of nonviolence, they also believed in positive action.

It was noticeable at the Accra conference that large delegations came from Russia, China and the United Arab Republic, but little interest was shown by the West. Messages of support from Khrushchev and Chou-en-lai were announced at the opening and received prolonged applause. The delegations from Russia, China and the United Arab Republic went out of their way after the conference to assure the secretaries of their wholehearted support and help. The only message from the West was a brief message of good will which Mr. NIXON sent toward the end. The conference made it clear that the floodgates of African nationalism have been opened and cannot be closed. Its spirit was expressed in the chairman's closing remark: "The whistle has blown and we are on the march."

The second conference, in the preparations for which I was clearly concerned while I was in Lagos, was held over the New Year at Onitsha, Dr. Azikiwe's home town, on the banks of the Niger in the eastern region. There leaders from all sections of Nigeria and other West African countries met to prepare "a bold heave forward" in the moral rearmament of their nations.

Mr. McEwen, who is General Secretary of the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons, called for "men of destiny" to lead Nigeria into independence. "Such men of destiny," he said, "will be men who sacrifice everything for an idea big enough to heal the hurts, relieve the fears, answer the hates and meet the needs in human nature."

Describing the upsurge of nationalism and the need to rid Africa of imperialism, he said that nationalism "needs to be purged of bitterness, hate, jealousy, ambition and corruption. The reason why democracy has not worked in certain countries of Asia and Africa is because nationalism was not purged of these things," he said.

Mr. McEwen appealed to the leaders of the Western democracies to study and understand the force of African nationalism. "This force," he said, "may be sentimental or emotional, but men are ruled not by cold reason and logic, but by those very emotions and sentiments which the Western democracies tend to despise and which the Communist countries exploit."

Describing Nigeria's role in the development of Africa as a whole, Mr. McEwen referred to its population and resources, which will make it the largest independent country on the continent, and also to the links Nigeria has with the Arab countries to the north. "Nigeria can be the key to the whole of Africa," he said. In building unity out of the diverse peoples of the country, Mr. McEwen said, "The patience, tolerance and understanding developing in Nigeria stem out of our conviction for Moral Re-Armament, and we are beinning to find the way to unity."

Mr. McEwen called for a bold heave forward where people will be prepared to risk everything to get Moral Re-Armament into the hearts and minds of the masses, so that each man can take on the struggle with his own human nature and then affect his family and create change throughout the nation. "For me," he said, "the demand is total. It means the willingness to surrender pleasure, sex, ambition, alcohol and purposeless living, and let God rule my life.

"I am optimistic about the future," Mr. McEwen concluded, "because Frank Buchman, the initiator of Moral Re-Armament, his given us this message that produces the answer. It is for us to be bold to apply this answer to every situation as it arises, and we will turn the tide."

Professor Ita, who is an action group member of the eastern parliament, as chairman of the gathering, issued a new year cali to Nigeria to become "a listening nation, to realize God's purpose for Nigeria in 1959." In this way, he said, Nigeria would achieve "complete liberty and the fullest development of the best in us and of our nation's resources.

"Above the shouts of battle in politics, above the sordid squabbles at home, wranglings in the market and industry," Professor Ita said, "we must hear the voice of God. His wavelength is absolute honesty, absolute purity, absolute unselfishness, and absolute love. We must listen and obey."

His Highness Okosi II, Obi (King) of Onitsha, received the entire conference at his palace. After hearing from representatives of the different regions, the Obi spoke of his part in the making of the film "Freedom" here in 1956. "I and my red-capped chiefs have studied Frank Buchman's work and message," he said. "We are happy to follow the same steps."

A South African farmer, Mr. Roland Kingwill, speaking with his wife and daughter, said, "I am glad to be here to apologize and to find the way to restore for the way people like myself have lived in South Africa. People often come to South Africa and attack our political problems," he continued. "Dr. Buchman came and saw that our problems had to be tackled deeper down—they were the moral problems of men like me, bitterness, resentment, greed, and fear. The

issue is not between black and white but between those who decide to obey God's will and those who live for their own self-will."

The Nigerian leaders who convened and carried the Onitsha conference are men of action, and immediate plans on a national scale are in hand to give practical effect to their convictions.

The third conference, at most of which I was present, was held at the Moral Re-Armament center between Pretoria and Johannesburg from January 1st to 8th to plan South Africa's part in making Africa the answer continent." Over 300 people from all parts of South Africa, including leading people from law and education, businessmen, sheep farmers, revolutionary African political leaders, and students, were there. Also present were two chiefs from Basutoland, one of whom had just returned from the recent constitutional talks in London.

Dr. William Nkomo from Pretoria, first president of the revolutionary African National Congress Youth League, opening the conference said, "This conference will formulate a strategy for our continent. All of us are thinking on a Pan-African basis. There are people who are thinking on an ideological basis to change Africa and make it another China. People want to know—will Africa be another China? It depends on whether you and I by our living allow it.

"African nationalism moving side by side with white supremacy and domination will lead to clash and unprecedented bloodshed. Either there will be catastrophe tomorrow and our children will not know the new Africa that we want, or we hand our lives over to God and live as God directs. It rests on you and me being prepared to live by absolute moral standards. It isn't what the white man or the black man wants, or what both want, but only what God directs. In the words of Dr. Frank Buchman, Africa can be the answer continent."

Responding on behalf of the white South Africans, Mr. Roland Kingwell, who had just returned from 5 months with the Moral Rearmament force in Europe and West Africa, said, "If we don't think in terms of the whole of Africa we are living in an unreal world and we need to wake up and rise to our destiny." He continued: "I love this country. For many years I talked about loving it and just took out of it, and it was only after I had seen what I had been doing and where we were drifting that I began to understand what patriotism really meant. We are being called to the deepest patriotism today. God can give an answer to the people who listen. I am committed to bring that answer to Africa, because I believe that Africa can bring the answer to Russia and China. We haven't much time to grasp that opportunity, but if we do we have the greatest destiny as a nation."

Speaking in Afrikaans and standing with other Afrikaner leaders, Advocate John Trengove of Pretoria said, "We represent the first white settlement of the southern tip of Africa. We feel that we have come here with a special destiny, and we have discovered afresh through Moral Rearmament what that destiny is. We are grateful for the contribution which our forebears have made toward the development of South Africa, and where we have caused hurt to other races in this country, or where we have been indifferent to the real interests of other groups in South Africa, we want to accept responsibility for that and ask forgiveness from the other races.

"We believe that a new South Africa and a new Africa cannot be built on the superiority of any one group," continued Advocate Trengove, "whether that be in South Africa or Ghana or Egypt or anywhere else. As Christians we are called to serve our fellow human beings in South Africa and Africa. That is why we stand here today and commit our lives to this struggle, to fight with representatives of all races of Africa for what is right in our country and throughout the continent of Africa according to the plan of God. To that we wish to commit our lives and submit our wills to the will of God."

Two weeks after Basutoland had received its new constitution, two senior chiefs motored several hundred miles to this assembly because, said Chief Mopedi Jonathan Molapo, "We are in a state of transition and Basutoland needs this answer most." Chief Molapo, who had recently returned from the constitutional talks in London, continued: "The people I have seen here have shown us the way which God would like us to follow. I want to be a changed man in order that I should play my part with this big force that is going out to the world."

Mr. Benjamin Angoma, revolutionary African leader from Johannesburg, said, "We Africans, particularly in South Africa, live at the crossroads with offers of different ideologies. Being desperate, we will accept anything that will mean freedom for us in our own country. Now we as a black race are being offered communism. Society cannot live without an ideology. You refuse an offer because you have something better. Can we really repel that offer of communism because we have not seen it at work? We accepted the Western way of life but in it saw hatred, selfishness, and impurity at work.

"We can only refuse communism if a change of heart takes place. From both black and white in this country we need a change of heart through moral rearmament. So under the guidance of God I have decided to throw in my lot with this new ideology with its absolute moral standards."

I am convinced that Africa need not become another China and will not do so if the tide of nationalism can be guided into positive and creative channels, along lines which the new leadership so much in evidence at these New Year conferences is determined to pursue.

I am convinced that we in Britain can do much to help this new leadership to achieve its goal, if we approach the situation realistically but humbly with open heart and mind and a real caring for the African people.

I am convinced that what happens on this continent in the next few years will profoundly affect the course of history.

Tight Money Millstone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial from the current issue of the Reading (Pa.) New Era:

TIGHT MONEY MILLSTONE

Now that the reactionary press is aiding and abetting President Eisenhower's campaign against important social legislation by attacking spenders who advocate such measures, we'd like to call attention to one of the biggest budget items which proves who the real spenders are.

Syndicated Columnist Sylvia Porter points out that at the end of the Korean war our national debt was close to $280 billion. The interest we taxpayers kicked out to carry this debt was about $4.7 billion.

The President's latest budget, with the national debt standing at $282.7 billion—or just about the same as at the close of the Korean conflict—provides for interest payments of $8.1 billion, or nearly twice as much as during Truman's days.

Why are we paying so much more—almost $4 billion more—in interest on the national debt? Sylvia Porter says, "it has been the result of deliberate policies adopted at the highest policymaking levels in Washington."

This is the real spending waste in our national life, because this interest goes into powerful investment trusts. It is paid to the banks, the big businesses, the insurance companies that already control most of this country's wealth. Very little reaches ordinary consumers who spend what they get and keep the wheels of the economy moving.

This is the tight money policy we have been writing about ever since the Eisenhower administration arbitrarily began to encourage higher interest rates to discourage expansion.

Isn't it about time—especially in view of rising unemployment which has sent unemployment compensation claims beyond the 10,000 mark right here in Berks County—that this story of tight money and anti-expansion policies of the Republican regime in Washington is told forcefully to the people?

A stabilized dollar at high interest rates doesn't mean a hoot to people who can't even get a job.

Did Mr. Mikoyan Get the Message?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the recent holiday by Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan evoked interesting reactions in this country. Though I do not approve of egg throwing or other forms of hooliganism, such actions did, nevertheless, serve to show Mr. Mikoyan that we are not fooled by phony overtures of friendliness by the Soviet Union.

I must admit I was not impressed with the actions of some of our business leaders who seemed to think Mr. Mikoyan was a happy dispenser of good cheer and small jokes. Politeness is one thing, but when it can be misinterpreted for weakness and a desperate desire to concilate, then perhaps etiquette must be modified. One of my constituents, in a letter to the editor of the Binghamton (N.Y.) Sun, set out what I think should be our correct attitude toward Mr. Mikoyan.

If Mikoyan took back any impression that this Nation is going to lie down and let the Soviets fool us and milk us of technical know-how and strategic goods in the next few years, I hope he will now realize that the attitude expressed in the following letter is indicative of general public opinion throughout the United States.

Under unanimous consent I include the letter, as follows:

HE ASKED FOR IT

EDITOR, THE BINGHAMTON STAR:

I sincerely wish that reality were such that I could conscientiously commend your January 12 editorial, "Bad Behavior." Reality forbids it.

The only reason any United States citizen or refugee from Communist atrocities should feel humiliation in connection with the Mikoyan visit would be because our high Governnment officials allowed themselves to be sold this Communist propaganda visit to build up their prestige and because so many big businessmen and bankers, following the Eric Johnston line fall all over themselves to show they will do anything to make more dollars. Yes anything, even to sit down and break bread with this moral leper at dinner parties, "ih his honor," not realizing that you cannot honor an object which has no honor. I say object, because other than his physical shape, on his record no one can consider him to be a human being.

Naming the Communists with political parties and religious faiths is grossly misleading to many people because communism is neither a political party nor a religious faith, but an atheistic conspiracy—the most vicious the world has ever known.

Comparing the Mikoyan visit to the United States with Vice President and Mrs. NIXON'S visit to South America is absurd. The NIXON visit was definitely a good-will tour to countries where the United States has given millions of dollars in aid, both cash and credits, and has never mistreated a single citizen. On the other hand, Russia imprisons our citizens on the slightest trumped up pretext and still holds thousands of our civilians and servicemen in their slave labor camps. They collaborated with Red China in holding 944 of our servicemen illegally after the ill-advised Panmonjom armistice, besides the hundreds transferred to their Siberian salt mines during the war in Korea and some probably as far west as their slave labor camps in Solevetski islands in the White Sea, not far from Leningrad, which they started as far back as 1920. It was Russia's Communists and their dupes who did the atrocious things to the NIXONS on their South American trip and most assuredly on the orders from this same Mikoyan, who also gave the orders for the slaughter in Hungary. Now, to a small degree, it's backfiring and he and his dupes don't like it.

His mission here was not a "holiday," but a trip planned to spread more propaganda, to build up Communist prestige, to buy strategic machinery and other strategic materials that Russia needs, and that on credit which we United States taxpayers will pay for, as it is certain Russia never will.

How long do you think Teddy Roosevelt or Grover Cleveland would have put up with such asinine nonsense, from any country, especially while they were holding thousands of our citizens in their slave labor camps?

Please, fellow Americans, wake up, it's later than you realize.

FORD M. SPERRY.

The National Debt: Cheaper To Pay Than To Owe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, our national debt stands today at $283 billion.

In the new fiscal year we shall be paying $8.1 billion in interest.

The trend toward higher interest indicates clearly that the Government soon will be paying 3.5 percent on all its obligations, or a total annual interest of $9.8 billion, assuming the total debt remains unchanged.

This means that, of every dollar paid in Federal taxes, approximately 11 cents must go for carrying charges on the debt.

It means also that, if things go along exactly as they have been going, without any change in the total debt and with the Government having to pay 3.5 percent interest on its borrowings, in 28 years we will have paid the total amount of the debt, but we will still owe all of it.

This is a tremendous amount to pay in interest, for which our Government and our Nation get nothing in return. It is the price we are paying simply for the privilege of owing this huge debt.

Of course, so long as we have the debt, the carrying charges must be paid. There is no alternative, unless we were to mimic the Soviet Government and repudiate our obligation to those of our citizens who have loaned money to their Government. This would be so utterly unthinkable that it shames us even to mention it.

HOW MUCH IS $9.8 BILLION?

But the interest charges on our public debt have grown so large that they constitute today an immense burden upon the taxpayers of our Nation. They amount to almost $10 billion annually in dead weight.

As we struggle this year to strike a precarious budget balance in face of national needs, inflationary pressures and high taxes, anyone can think of a thousand beneficial uses for this $9.8 billion annually.

It could build some 15,000 miles of superhighways of the most modern design each year, and thus complete the entire 41,000-mile Interstate Highway program in less than 3 years.

Or, applied to development of the Nation's water resources, it could complete in 1 year three times as many flood control and navigational projects as have been authorized for the next 10 years.

Applied to soil conservation for the saving of our Nation's most indispensable wealth, it could perform more useful works in 1 year than we have devoted to this awesomely important task in the past 25 years inclusively or perhaps in the entire history of our Nation.

It could purchase some 700 B–58's, more than we would ever need of the world's best, most sophisticated and most costly weapons system; whereas we are struggling along today purchasing between 30 and 40 a year and wondering nervously if these are enough to serve their minimum purpose of deterring aggression.

Or, considered another way, this $9.8 billion if returned to the taxpayers on an equal prorata basis would mean that the average taxpaying family head could pay some $275 less in taxes every year.

LET'S MAKE A PLAN TO PAY IT OFF

In the interest of our own generation and of generations yet to come, I believe we should make a positive resolution and develop a definite plan of systematic debt retirement. I firmly believe the American public expects such leadership from the national Congress and will be disappointed if we fail to provide it.

I have today introduced a concurrent resolution which would set forth such a plan. It would express the sense of Congress that in each succeeding year we should pay on the principal an amount equal to not less than 1 percent of the present indebtedness.

In other words, the present Congress would be pledging ourselves—and insofar as it is within the power of this Congress we would be calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury and future Congresses—to pay an amount not less than $2.8 billion annually to the reduction and eventual retirement of this burdensome national obligation.

Such payments, of course, would be in addition to the interest payments which we are obliged to pay and over which we seem to have no control. But as the principal decreased, the interest would decrease. In 100 years, the debt would be completely paid and the slate wiped clean.

Under this plan, as I shall point out, we would actually pay many billions of dollars less over the next 100 years, in both principal and interest, than we shall be compelled to pay in interest alone if no such course is embarked upon.

In the beginning, to be sure, it would be an additional burden of expense. But it would be an honest burden, honestly assumed. It shall have to be undertaken someday, and the sooner we face up to it, the less costly it will be to our progeny.

CHEAPER TO PAY THAN TO OWE

If we can demonstrate the self-discipline, Mr. Speaker, to chart such a path and stick to it, we can reach a point in 29 years at which we shall have reduced the debt to a level where we will be paying no more in both principal and interest than we now are being called upon to pay in interest alone.

For the basic figures upon which I found this approach, I am indebted to a man named R. S. Shade who lives in Tulsa, Okla. He has worked out a table of payments based upon a $2.8 billion application to principal and allocation of interest at 3.5 percent on the unpaid balance.

In profound but simple terms, these figures reveal the amazing and yet inescapable fact that it is more than $485 billion cheaper to pay off the debt in 100 years than it would be simply to continue paying the interest for that period of time.

In 100 years we could completely retire the debt by paying $495 billion in interest and $283 billion of principal, or a total of $778 billion. But if we pay nothing on the debt itself, the interest alone for 100 years will be $980 billion, and we will still owe the debt of $283 billion, or a total of $1.263 trillion.

During the past 4 years we have three times extended the temporary debt ceiling and once increased the permanent ceiling. Since the end of World War II, there has only been one brief period—during the Truman administration—when our Government has made any reduction whatever in the national debt.

Yet these years have been years of comparative national prosperity. If it has not been possible for Congress during these years to reduce the indebtedness, we must wonder seriously if ever in the future we shall find it either expedient or even possible to do so without a definite commitment to some systematic plan.

We have had emergencies during this period, to be sure. But can anyone honestly contend that there exists any realistic prospect for the lessening of these tensions and critical demands in the foreseeable future?

Our Nation is engaged with Russia in a titanic competition which may not be resolved for a generation or more. And we fully intend and expect to be in business at a nation after this period of recurrent crises and ideological conflicts shall have ended.

CHALLENGE TO STATESMANSHIP

Why then, does it not make sense to gear ourselves to the long pull and begin facing in earnest the challenge of true fiscal responsibility which seems so clearly to demand such a course?

It would be a demonstration of our faith that this Nation expects to continue in operation for at least 100 years and are conducting our business with no other end in view.

It should provide a good example of resolution and sound economy to the families of our Nation who must of necessity make plans for the eventual retirement of their private debts. And 100 years in the life of a nation is not so long as it may seem.

Such a plan should have a salutary effect upon the inflationary spiral of cheap money and increasing indebtedness. It should revive confidence both in our own land and throughout the world in the stability of our dollar.

Perhaps more basic than any of this, however, it would constitute a simple act of good faith with those generations of Americans yet to come.

This is a challenge to our vision and to our statesmanship. It will require discipline and self-restraint of both the Congress and the American public. But I believe the American Nation is equal to it. Let it not be said that the Congress lacks the courage or the faith to put it to the test.

North Dakota Representatives Urge Removal of Excise Taxes on Telephone Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON. L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the excise taxes upon local and long-distance telephone service were imposed during World War II and the original justification for these taxes no longer exists.

In this connection the House of Representatives of North Dakota has passed a resolution which I commend to my colleagues. The resolution follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 4

Resolution memoralizing the Congress to remove the wartime excise taxes upon local and long-distance telephone service

Whereas a Federal excise tax of 10 percent upon the charges for local and long-distance telephone service was passed in 1941 as an emergency wartime measure to provide needed funds to support the war effort and to discourage the use of telephone service during the war period; and

Whereas telephone service is an essential part of our way of life and cannot under any circumstances be considered a luxury item to be taxed in the same manner as furs, jewelry, liquor and other luxury commodities; and

Whereas other household and business necessities, including electricity, water and gas are not taxed in such a manner; and

Whereas the placement of high excise taxes upon such a necessity of life as telephone service results in the taxation of those citizens who can least afford to pay in the same manner as those of unlimited financial means; and

Whereas the wartime emergency requiring the special additional revenue and restriction of the use of telephone service has long since passed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota; That the Congress is urgently requested to remove the unfair and unequitable tax upon telephone service during the current session of Congress; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded without delay by the chief clerk of the house of representatives to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

HJALMAR NYGAARD,
Speaker of the House.
GERALD L. STAIR,
Chief Clerk of the House.

National Science Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, some of the excellent mail that I receive from my constituents is worthy of far greater notice than the confines of my office. With the permission of the writer, I am inserting in the RECORD an excellent letter written by Dr. Serge A. Korff, professor of physics at New York University. Dr. Korff points out the importance of support of the National Science Foundation and the pure science aspects of our various science programs.

The letter follows:

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS,
New York, N.Y., January 5, 1959.

The Honorable JOHN V. LINDSAY,
Congressman from New York,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LINDSAY: There will presently come before the House various measures sponsored by the administration for the financial support of science in general and the National Science Foundation in particular. Such bills will presumably have Bureau of the Budget support and will, in my opinion, represent a minimum that should be done for science.

Further, it is often argued that other agencies, including the NASA, the AEC, and the research branches of the armed services, as well as other organizations, support research in basic science. It is, of course, true that they do, yet their budgets must principally cover applied science and development work. In this area the principal problem is one of semantics, for there are many pure scientists who would call much of the work those agencies support applied science, technology, or, indeed, development of military hardware. Now certainly applied science and technology and the development of military hardware are necessary, and should also be supported. It is not my view that these should be reduced. Actually, after pure science has uncovered new facts, it often takes a long and costly period of passing first through applied science and then through development before the new fact or idea is useable in a practical way. Therefore, the second and third steps must be supported also; but the main purpose of my argument is that sometimes the use of words is such that the considerable outlays for applied science and development are considered as being spent for pure science and that, therefore, science gets shortchanged.

In this complex technological world, the role of the pure scientist, and indeed often the lone investigator remains the principal spring from which flow the ideas which later make up our technology. The new ideas and facts of nature, which it is the job of the pure scientist to unearth, represent the capital upon which the system functions. These are the ideas which the applied scientist applies, and which later the technologists develop for industry. It is vital to the functioning of industry that this orderly progression in the flow of ideas continue uninterrupted. Among the newest of the ideas there must necessarily often be many that don't work, or that turn out to be impractical, or indeed wrong. And yet if we do not continue to stimulate the flow of ideas, our subsequent technology dries up.

It is often impossible for a pure scientist to say where a given study may lead, or indeed if it will lead anywhere. He may, of course, guess, but one should not be surprised if the actual direction of subsequent events is quite different. For example, if someone were seeking to find a better way to help surgeons set bones, who would think of studying the passage of electrical discharges through a rather bad vacuum? Yet this way X-rays were discovered. The great advances in technology spring often from quite unexpected facts found by pure science. No man has ever been wise enough to foresee all the ramifications. Science is, as Dr. V. Bush has so ably put it, our "endless frontier." This is so because science is knowledge, especially knowledge of nature, and many more facts remain to be discovered. Once discovered, how to apply them is sometimes obvious. But none can say what they will be before they are discovered.

The reason I am laboring the point is that the difference between pure and applied science is often not understood in this country. Our great genius here is in taking the second and third steps. We can take fission, discovered in Germany, and build the large plants needed for the next step in harnessing the process for useful ends. We can consider penicillin, discovered in England, and build the plants to produce it in quantity. But it seems poor public policy always to await the discovery of new facts by Europeans. In the long run we must learn to take the first step here also. This, in turn, means build-

ing up a vigorous and healthy basic science, and a climate in which this science can grow. To do this we must continue to build and back an increasing effort in pure science. Frankly, I do not think that this country has as yet done this on a scale required by our world leadership.

While I dislike to use the Russian argument to favor increasing our support of science, for I think that it should need no such prop and that it can be shown to deserve support in its own right, nevertheless the argument is cogent today. We are facing an increasing challenge, and whether we like it or not are in a race for the control of our environment. Science will give us the facts needed to control nature and to build an advancing technology. But if we cut down on science, then the flow of new ideas dwindles, and soon our applied scientists will be out of new ideas to apply. With new ideas shut off the technology too will cease to advance. The process is a slow one due to the time taken in the intermediate steps, but it is inevitable. It seems today hardly necessary to point out that the fruits of niggardly support of pure science in the past have been the striking relative advance of Russian technology.

I am well aware of the economic problems which are relevant and of the difficult task of the Bureau of the Budget. Nevertheless, we must not starve the goose that lays the golden egg, lest the supply dwindle below the levels we already know to be dangerous. For these reasons I urge support of the money bills for the National Science Foundation and for the pure research portions of the budgets of the other agencies.

Very sincerely yours,

SERGE A. KORFF,
Professor of Physics.

Mr. Hoover on Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mobile Register of January 19, 1959:

MR. HOOVER ON DELINQUENCY

Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, has appropriately called attention in Congress to a lengthy article written by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and published in This Week magazine.

This article by Mr. Hoover was entitled "Counterattack on Juvenile Delinquency."

In this article, which appeared in three parts, the Director of the FBI recommended that the counterattack against juvenile delinquency should include these points:

"1. Accenting the responsibilities of parents.

"2. Improving our juvenile courts and juvenile-aid facilities.

"3. Stopping the coddling of young criminals.

"4. Stopping the protection of juvenile hoodlums by secrecy.

"5. Cracking down on the corrupters of youth.

"6. Attacking delinquency at the local level."

Mr. Hoover pointed out that "fighting existing delinquency, however, is only half the problem. At the same time, we must also begin today to reestablish a firm moral structure to prevent future delinquency. We must stop sowing the seeds for more frightening delinquency in the years to come."

In emphasizing that the problem is not limited to dealing with current cases of juvenile delinquency but also involves a need for more effective action to prevent future delinquency among the young, Mr. Hoover is, of course, correct.

In commenting on the punishment of juvenile offenders, Mr. Hoover pleaded against undue leniency.

"In dealing with juveniles, it is essential that the punishment fit both the offense and the offender," he wrote.

"* * * Six boys in Virginia were convicted of savagely beating and mistreating a mule * * * The judge who heard the case ordered that the boys be given what many may regard as an appropriate punishment, a good, sound, old-fashioned whipping by their parents.

"In addition, each of the six was released to the custody of his parents on strict injunction of good behavior until he attains the age of 18.

"In another case, a 17-year-old boy who had committed extensive acts of vandalism in a high school was placed on probation under the provision that he find a part-time job after school and make restitution at the rate of $20 per month for the damage he had done.

"If, as a result of their sentences, the six Virginia youths learn to respect the feelings of animals and the teen-age vandal learns to value the property of others, the courts will have helped them to become better citizens."

Mr. Hoover has made extensive and intensive study of the juvenile delinquency problem in this country. What he says on the subject is worthy of thought.

Extending Universal Military Training Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, as we are called upon to vote upon H.R. 2260, which will extend the draft for 4 more years, I find myself in the position of being dissatisfied with the operation of the draft in some respects and at the same time reluctantly concluding that voting against the bill is not the way to correct the matters to which I object. I have read the testimony before the committee word for word and all of the reports. I have very seriously considered voting against this bill and for that reason spent about 14 hours carefully reading every piece of material and chart available. The statistical matter confirms conversations and communications which I have had from persons in the district I represent, to the effect that the military has been reducing the number of Ready Reserves and in some instances refusing to take men into the Ready Reserves when at the same time they are drafting new men into service who do not want to leave their civilian pursuits. It seems inexcusable to me that someone who wants to serve and be a minuteman, is refused the opportunity to do so; at the same time someone else is refused the opportunity to stay out of the service. Another thing that I dislike is not having a program for selectees where they can take about 3 months of intensive training and return under a Reserve obligation to become a part of the Ready Reserve. Many of these boys have an extreme hardship when taken away for a 2-year period, but almost all of them could be away for a 3-month period and then come home and remain in the Ready Reserve without nearly so much sacrifice. The other reason I feel so strongly about this is that many of these young men that were drafted for a 2-year period have told me that only the first 3 months of their tour of duty was spent learning how to be a soldier. Too many of these who are inducted spend most of their 2-year period either doing nothing, or cooking, chauffeuring, or doing something unrelated to the defense of our country. I object to inducting young men for these kinds of jobs. There are civilians who would like to have a job cooking in Army camps and my experience has been that no matter how much experience young men have at cooking with military recipes, the food still is no better.

I am very much impressed, however, with the figure shown in the report which indicates that of the men who reach 26 years of age and therefore have graduated from the 8-year period during which they were liable under the Selective Service Act for military obligation, over 70 percent received military training of some kind and that 286,000 were inductees, 467,000 were volunteers, and 17,000 had entered the Reserves or National Guard. It is very clear to me from these figures that even if the military would keep everyone who wants to stay in the Ready Reserves and even if it did not waste men, it still would be unable to maintain the forces that the experts conclude we need. I was also informed upon questioning the gentlemen from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], a long-time member of the Armed Services Committee and regarded as an expert on personnel matters on the committee, that I am not alone in feeling that the Military Establishment has not done the best job that it could in all of these matters, however, it has been brought to my attention that when the appropriations for the military are brought before the Congress there is some opportunity to review these matters and Congress can make some qualifications in expenditures in the fields which may help in the situation. It is a very bad situation when we try to administer as well as legislate, but it is also recognized as a fact by many of us that too many of the military are not as imbued with the necessity of avoiding waste in the military as most of us are and if the administration is unwilling to do

anything about it then there is no choice but for the Congress to do everything it can. I am voting for the 4-year extension of the draft but I am also going to go to work to do what I can to help reduce the number of selectees that are inducted to take the place of other young men who are refused the opportunity to be a member of the Ready Reserves. We must do this even if it requires placing qualifications on the appropriations for the military.

It seems to me that we must vote for an extension of the Military Training and Service Act today and then continue to do all that we can to alleviate the necessities for using it to the extent that it has been used in the past.

"Spain's Struggle for Freedom"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, we know too little of modern Spain. A book that deserves close attention from Members of Congress and others who wish to know more is "Spain's Struggle for Freedom," by Lawrence Fernsworth. His experience qualifies him to write a book on this struggle which is still in progress and to which our contribution has been entirely too negative.

By unanimous consent I am inserting two reviews of his book, one from the Christian Century, September 10, 1958, and one from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, September 16, 1958:

[From the Christian Century, Sept. 10, 1958]

FULL SWEEP: "SPAIN'S STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM," BY LAWRENCE FERNSWORTH

(Review by W. Stanley Rycroft)

The time has come when the complete story of Spain, and especially its glorious but tragic struggle for freedom, must be told. This book does just that in a moving and convincing way. Lawrence Fernsworth gives us the full sweep of the drama of a people struggling to be free; it is a drama of heroism, disillusionment and tragedy. The author has been a student of Spain for almost 30 years. As a reporter for the Times of London and a special reporter for the New York Times, he has been an eyewitness of many tragic events, for he has lived for long periods in Spain, particularly during the civil war.

It should be pointed out that the struggle for freedom in Spain did not begin with the birth of the Second Republic in the thirties; it is "the oldest thing of its kind in Europe." Prof. Trend of Cambridge University is quoted as saying, "It is seldom remembered that democratic government began, not in England, but in Spain," the principle being established in that country, before Magna Carta, that the king could not take action against the person or property of any of his subjects, "except by process of law."

The author's thesis is that Spaniards live in two Spanish worlds: one the world of individual freedom and human equality, an urge deeply implants in the hearts of the masses; the other an absolutist, privileged world, the kind of world that imposed the deadly Inquisition and brought on political and religious wars. The upholders of this absolutist world consider individual liberty and equality very un-Spanish. The watchword of the former world is "toward happiness from below" and of the latter "revolution from the top."

During the past hundred years the forces that have withstood the demands for human freedom are the thorne, the altar, and the army, or in other words, the monarchy, the political church, and the political generals. Sometimes there was a partnership between two of these, sometimes between all three.

Out of the turmoil and confusion of the Napoleonic wars, the political generals emerged; at times some stood with the throne and others with the people, but largely they have been motivated by personal power. "The word 'General' became synonymous with ambition, opportunism and treachery." One of the main purposes of the partnership of the Spanish throne and the Roman Catholic Church was the isolation of Spain from modern liberal culture. The dual nature of the Roman Catholic Church, that is, the spiritual church and the political church, is seen in Spain as in no other country, although often it has been impossible to draw a sharp distinction between the two.

At the end of a period of repression under the throne-and-altar partnership lasting over 200 years, came the Peninsular War against Napoleon which seemed to awaken the Spanish people and give rise to popular resistance movements. A new constitution approved in 1812 played an important role because it symbolized the democratic yearnings of the people. In 1873 the First Republic came into being as a result of 30 years of efforts by the Republican Party, but it lasted only 11 months.

A considerable part of this book is devoted to the rise and fall of the Second Republic, which the author considers the greatest moment in Spanish history. The Second Republic, which came into being in April 1931, is termed "the fifth phase in [Spain's] struggle for freedom. It was a gallant adventure." In this Republic the 1812 Constitution of Cadiz provided a basis for the new constitutional government. There were, however, two important changes: the king was no longer recognized and separation of church and state was proclaimed. Two criticisms that have been leveled against the Republic—that it was anticatholic and that it brought communism into Spain—are dealt with in detail. The author brings out the fact that Alcalá Zamora, the first president, was a stanch Roman Catholic and that the government never intended to be anticatholic. Rather it sought to hold the political church within reasonable bounds.

The story of how the Republic was destroyed within a few years from both within and without, is told graphically and forthrightly. Hand in hand the church and the political generals plotted and maneuvered. During a period of conspiracy some of the reactionary and treacherous generals were exiled. Says the author, "This was the Republic's worst and most fatal mistake." Francisco Franco was one of these. He and other exiled generals made contact with the agents of Hitler and Mussolini through General Sanjurjo who had been sentenced to death for treason but had later been pardoned and allowed to cross over to Portugal. The Republic was deserted in its hour of need by those who should have been its stanchest friends—Great Britain, France, and the United States.

The charge that the Republic was pro-Communist cannot be substantiated. As the author points out, until the rebellion broke out the Republic refused to establish diplomatic relations with Russia and it was not until 2 months after the outbreak of civil war that Russia decided to send badly needed arms. If Communists fought in the ranks of the international brigades, it is also true that Mussolini sent many thousands of Fascist soldiers to Spain. Fernsworth learned by questioning prisoners after 30,000 Italians were routed at Guadalajara that many of them had been duped into thinking they were going to Abyssinia to settle. The defeat of the Republic was brought about by the sheer weight of arms and men from Germany and Italy and massive bombing raids on defenseless towns. History will show that the civil war in Spain was the prelude to World War II.

However, the civil war is not the end of the story told in this book. The United States tripartite military pact, usually known as the bases agreement, is examined carefully. The author states that of all the European countries, Spain is the least communistic, but points out that the United States seems to have done about all it could to disillusion the liberal democratic people of Spain and "drive them toward communism, however they hated it."

By placing an embargo on arms to Spain in the thirties, the United States contributed to the downfall of the most democratic government Spain ever had. The bases agreement seemed to say to the rest of the world as well as to Spain that we put expediency before ideals and principles by giving aid to a regime which was once the close ally of Hitler and Mussolini. Says Lawrence Fernsworth: "All the evidence points to the conclusion that the move [the bases agreement] has earned for the United States suspicion and ill will in many places; that it has lessened its moral authority."

Fernsworth ends on an optimistic note. "The dictatorship will collapse," he says. "Every Spaniard knows that." There is hope in the fact that there are still liberal Spanish Catholics such as the Jesuit priest, Laburu, who told the Mexican newspaper Excelsior: "I prefer the authentic catholicism of the Republic to the formless catholicism of this present time. * * * The young priests do not hesitate to express their disconformity with the formula that 'state equals church.'"

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Dec. 16, 1958]

TERRORISM IN FRANCO'S SPAIN

Soviet Russia, unfortunately, is not the only country in the world where a Boris Pasternak is unwelcome. It is not the only land which does not allow its people to read such a book as "Doctor Zhivago," that is a book that is critical of the ruling power. Spain today is such a country.

The cartoon on this page shows Spain's dictator, Francisco Franco, twirling the keys to a cell door that locks away Spanish citizens who have committed the offense of thinking and speaking for themselves. They are representatives of the 80 or more young scientists, doctors, lawyers, factory leaders, and students who have been put behind bars for daring to criticize Franco's totalitarian regime.

Iberica, the monthly magazine published in New York by friends of Spanish freedom as a means of spreading facts about Franco's terrorist rule, shows that the new prisoners range all the way from sympathizers with the idea of an eventual democracy in Spain, to some who seek the return of the old monarchy of which the late Alfonso XIII was the last king. To a Franco it makes little difference what the dissent is or where it originates; there is only one allowable view, and that is the view of the controlling authority. Developments in the post-war world led the United States to work out defense arrangements with respect to an elaborate and costly system of air bases in Spain. This does not require anyone to admire or support Franco's iron-handed rule. Countless Americans who have agreed to sending defense funds that have propped up the Franco economy, hate his every terrorist act.

Meanwhile the United States has gained little in good will in Franco's Spain. As Lawrence Fernsworth, long a New York Times correspondent in Madrid, reminds us in his excellent book, "Spain's Struggle for Freedom," the dictator's regime has caused its tightly controlled press to denounce the United States for not pouring in still more money. When a Spanish newspaper speaks it is Franco speaking, for in Mr. Fernsworth's words, "the press gets its orders every day concerning what it must say and must not say." It is no wonder that many new political prisoners are in jail.

Playing With Economic Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following article by David Lawrence, "Playing With Economic Disaster," which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., February 6, 1959:

PLAYING WITH ECONOMIC DISASTER—VOTE TO INCREASE HOUSING FUNDS FEARED AS FIRST STEP TOWARD INFLATION DEBACLE

(By David Lawrence)

An economic debacle is in the making. Can it be avoided? Both Houses of Congress took on Wednesday a step that may hasten its coming. The American people may learn sooner than anybody has believed possible that a blunder was made in the election last November by giving the Democratic Party control of Congress.

For the threat now is that if the budget is unbalanced higher taxes for everybody will have to be enacted. And if the revenues to balance the higher spending begun by the Democrats are not to be collected by the Government, then the American people are in for an era of inflation that could send the cost of living upward and eventually bring the dollar down to a 10-cent purchasing power. This would mean international danger. For the weakness in the American dollar would have a far-reaching effect on the currencies of Western nations.

The vote in the House and Senate this week on the Federal housing program is significant. It was a bold defiance of budget balancing and an invitation to higher and higher taxes. President Eisenhower has said frankly that if the budget is unbalanced he will demand the passage of higher taxes.

The Democrats lined up almost solidly for budget busting and disregarded the inflationary dangers. Of the 282 Democrats in the House, 257 voted to authorize $300 million to provide direct loans to veterans for housing whenever they cannot borrow from private institutions. Only two Democrats voted with 121 Republicans against the measure. Just why any group of American citizens should be given such an advantage—especially in these days when there are outcries about second-class citizenship and discrimination—is not clear to anybody except the politicians. They think the relatively small number of veterans in the country who can't borrow from private loan institutions is a big enough vote to go after in disregard of the interests of all other voters. But that's selfish and misguided politics.

Democrats cast 51 of the 58 votes in the Senate against the administration's housing program, and in favor of more money than the budget provided. Only 7 Democrats voted with 25 Republicans to support the President's budget. This shows plainly that in both Houses of Congress, the Democratic Party has become the party of the spenders and looks with scorn on the savers.

There are several bills coming up for consideration in Congress involving the expenditure of more billions than the budget provides. If the Democrats think the country is back of them, they'll make a shambles of the President's budget. There is a feeling on Capitol Hill that the country doesn't care and that the sky is the limit on public spending if a "welfare" label can be pinned on it. Indeed, there are many so-called economists who say that the more spent, the more the country will prosper. No private individual has ever been able to get by on a doctrine that favors spending more than one earns or borrowing more than one can pay back.

The only reason the Government can borrow large sums of money while its tax receipts are down is because people have confidence in the ultimate capacity of the Treasury to pay back what it borrows. Once this confidence is shaken and Government bonds depreciate in value, the Government has to pay higher and higher interest rates. The price of everything else goes up correspondingly.

The biggest worry in America today is how long public confidence will stand up against the spending orgy that has now begun in Congress. Doubtless, the labor unions will begin a new series of demands for higher wages if prices of the articles the workers buy start going up. It's an inflationary cycle often called the wage-price spiral. Before it runs its course, nations generally do not realize the perils ahead. Only when the shock comes and it is almost too late to apply the brakes is there a popular revulsion.

Many countries in the world have had what is termed a "runaway inflation." Before it reaches that stage, the argument is made that a collapse can't happen. Today there are many economists who are arguing that inflation has been stopped. But what happened on Wednesday of this week is proof that, despite all the debate about how inflation is being held in check, an overwhelming majority of both Houses of Congress—particularly the Democratic Party—now votes to ignore the President's plea for a balanced budget and to plunge the country into more and more deficit spending.

Nothing would please the Kremlin so much as to see the economy of the United States weakened from within by unsound fiscal policies. For an inflationary trend would make necessary even bigger spending to pay higher prices for the same armament planned many months ago.

This week was a critical one in American history, and the die seems to have been cast by the Democratic Party in favor of inflation, which means a further devaluation of the purchasing power of the dollar.

One Hundred and Fortieth Anniversary Commemoration of Abraham Lincoln's Birth—One of History's Greatest Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to again present a few remarks, further and again, affirming the great inspiration the life and the sacrificial death of the great commoner has always been to me.

The last occasion, a couple of years ago, when Mrs. Doyle and I again stopped at the dirt-floored, one-windowed cabin at Hodgenville, Ky., where he was born, which is being so nicely and appropriately preserved, it was borne upon me again that his life had not only been one of extreme hardship and trial, but had in fact been one in which there had been a fair share of romance.

Then we continued to travel during the following few weeks the full length of the Lincoln Trail through Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois. I respectfully suggest it would not be amiss for many American parents to take the young folks of their family and spend some of their vacation time in taking this same trail. Increasingly I appraise as accurate and correct the statement of Secretary Stanton at the bedside of Lincoln about 94 years ago when he said, "Now he belongs to the ages."

So, Mr. Speaker, so much will be written and said of him by others more talented and gifted than I during these next few days that I will close these remarks by repeating the significant and historical, true and correct statement, which has been frequently stated before, which is to the effect that more books, both foreign and domestic, have already been written about Abraham Lincoln than any other civil ruler of government in all the world's history.

When I was a lad in the fifth grade of elementary school I used to draw the outlines of the birthplace cabin of Abraham Lincoln on my school slate when I should have been applying myself to my studies to be recited upon yet that day. I now realize I was doing in those very early years of my young life, in a very meager way, what the brilliant, informed brains of men and women of many lands have done in a truly magnificent manner in these subsequent years to the days when I drew the cabin on the slate and then tried to wash it out with the sponge before the teacher caught me violating her edict to study instead of wasting my time.

Resolution by State of Texas Opposing Increase in Federal Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, under clause 4 of rule XXII of the House of Representatives, I respectfully submit the attached resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Texas, expressing opposition to further Federal invasion of the gasoline tax:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9

Whereas the President has recommended that Congress increase the Federal tax on gasoline by 1½ cents per gallon; and

Whereas the Federal Government is annually diverting more than $1½ billion of Federal highway user taxes into nonhighway channels; and

Whereas it has been estimated that the addition of the 1½ cents to the present 3-cent Federal tax on gasoline would result in Texans sending $137 million more in highway user taxes per year to Washington than would be returned to the State for highway purposes under the present aid formula: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress be respectfully requested to oppose further Federal invasion of this gasoline tax which should be reserved for the use of the States, and that the use of such present highway user taxes be restricted to highway purposes only; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to each member of the Texas delegation in Congress.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.
WAGGONER CARR,
Speaker of the House.

Lincoln Penny Changes Garb First Time Since 1909

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I make these brief remarks about the brandnew Abraham Lincoln penny which penny makes its bow to the public commemorating the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

You will recall that President Dwight D. Eisenhower of the United States of America approved the new design of this historic penny on December 20, 1958, and that same cannot be changed except by law; if it is changed at all; and then only by congressional authority after 25 years. This, of course, will make it very, very difficult for so many counterfeiters to profit off of the theme and extensive daily use of the penny. My reading indicates that the Abraham Lincoln penny as we have known it, until the birth of this new penny in commemoration of the 150th birthday, was designed and created by Frank Gasparro, an employee of the Philadelphia, Pa., Mint.

This new penny is quite different, because it will have on its reverse side for the first time a very legible, discernible view of the magnificent Abraham Lincoln Memorial, situated right here in our Nation's Capital. On the several occasions, I have already spoken in commemoration of Abraham Lincoln, I have on each occasion, and I do now, urge every Member of this great legislative body to visit the Lincoln Memorial both in the daytime and during the nighttime as well. It is closed, by the way, at 9 o'clock sharp at night. The motto "E Pluribus Unum" also appears on the new penny below the designation of the penny as "One Cent." However, the original front of the penny with which we are all familiar, and which was designed by Mr. V. D. Brenner, remains as it has been.

In connection with the issuance of this historic penny, the National Geographic Society gives us some interesting facts about the history of the penny as we have known it. Here are those facts:

At least 25 billion cents have been produced since 1909, according to Geographic. Each day, mints produce about 15 tons of cents worth $43,500, but costing only about $10,396. Each coin contains 45.6 grains of copper, mixed with 2.4 grains of zinc and tin. Precise minting lightens the chore for those handling pennies by the thousands. They weigh them instead of counting, since there are exactly 145 cents to the pound.

Truth Must Prevail for Krebiozen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I have had hundreds of requests for copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Appendix, page A7780, presented on August 25, 1958, on the subject "Truth Must Prevail for Krebiozen." There have also been hundreds of requests for the material inserted, by me, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on the dates hereinafter listed in the aforesaid article.

In view of the great importance of the public interest in this issue and the fact that nothing has been done, to date, although conferences are presently being perfected between the U.S. Public Health Service and Dr. J. R. Heller, Director of the National Cancer Institute, and the Krebiozen Research Foundation, and Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, the Research Adviser of the Foundation, on the proposal of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois, giving Krebiozen a fair test, as set out on the floor of the U.S. Senate in August 1958, I hereby acquiesce to this request of hundreds of Americans who are acquainted with the same, by republishing the remarks made on August 25, 1958, touching upon this important subject.

TRUTH MUST PREVAIL FOR KREBIOZEN

(Extension of remarks of Hon. ROLAND V. LIBONATI, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives, Saturday, August 23, 1958)

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the story of Krebiozen is a sad one, and by their unfounded opposition, several past officials of the American Medical Association have been guilty of heinous actions against a great scientist in the medical profession, Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, who presently holds the high position of distinguished professor of physiology and head of the Department of Clinical Science of the University of Illinois College of Medicine. Because of the actions of these men, Dr. Ivy lost his position as vice president of the University of Illinois, as well as his membership in the Chicago Medical Society.

A true scientist is a man who seeks the truth, and Dr. Andrew C. Ivy exemplifies that type of man. In his experimentations with 250 other physicians, all members of the AMA, he has proved that there is biological activity in the use of this drug.

Dr. Stevan Durovic and his brother, Marko Durovic, have spent large sums of their own and their friends' money in Argentina in the development of the discovery of Krebiozen as well as thousands of dollars to the Krebiozen Foundation, to place the drug at the disposal of cancer victims, terminal cases, who were doomed to die.

Personally, I am well acquainted with the whole story in view of the fact that I acted as vice chairman of the committee and the commission, duly appointed by the Illinois Legislature, to conduct an inquiry to determine whether or not there was a conspiracy to prevent freedom of research at the University of Illinois, a tax-supported institution. A great deal of testimony given by many expert witnesses at those hearings proved beyond a doubt that false reports were released to the public by medical stooges of the AMA to destroy public confidence in the scientific findings conducted by Dr. Ivy and his fellow medics. This subject was in controversy for a period of 5 years, and still continues today in spite of the reports that have been released showing favorable results in certain phases of cancer study listed in the reports made by those individual doctors on their own cases.

Material has been inserted by me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 29, 1958, page A–4957; June 12, 1958, page A–5370; July 25, 1958, page A–6712; and August 5, 1958, page A–6986. The subject matter and testimony, together with conclusions thereon, were masterfully presented in the two books written by Mr. Herbert Bailey, K-Krebiozen, Key to Cancer? published in 1955, and A Matter of Life or Death recently published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, a concern that is very selective on printing any books, and especially those touching on scientific subjects, as to their value and veracity.

I am very pleased to note that the very distinguished Senator, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, being a person of substantial reliability in dealing with matters of public import, has advanced proposals for controlled tests for Krebiozen. He has every reason to be concerned in view of the fact that he has studied this question thoroughly. It is to his credit that he deals with the subject with a highly constructive sense of justice. He avers that mistakes were made by both the AMA and the scientists interested in the Krebiozen study, and yet he does not lose the mental grasp that there is a high sense of public obligation to be considered and, therefore feels that in view of the favorable reports of the doctors working with Krebiozen, the merits of the drug should be inquired into officially on a purely scientific basis, to determine its medicinal value for public approval.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS is a man of important stature in America. His background is one of high intellectual training as a professor in our colleges and universities. He shows no dispositon to dillydally with words, but gets at the meat of the problem and presents a complete picture of the controversy and its shortcomings.

His stand should be considered by the AMA as a warning that if they persist in their present attitude to belittle and devaluate the results and published findings in the experiments presently being conducted, that there is no question that the public health services and the National Institues of Health will be drawn into the picture through congressional enactment in the nature of a thorough investigation of this subject.

I stand firmly behind Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS in his position in this matter and, unless something is done to remedy the present unfortunate standoff situation preventing an authentic test of Krebiozen, I will proceed in the 86th Congress, God granting

my presence, to introduce a resolution to investigate those elements that are preventing the carrying out of such a test, on the grounds that the public interest demand such action. It is fundamental that a conspiracy to prevent scientific research is in itself within the congressional prerogative to protect the welfare of the people of the United States.

No organization can defy or deny the right of justice to be meted out to honest men and their works, especially in this case, directly affecting thousands of unfortunates, who die every year with great suffering and at great cost to their families, or the charitable institutions which are established throughout the land for this cause.

I am warning the American Medical Association at this time, as I did before in the Illinois State Assembly, to pay heed to Dr. Ivy's appeal for fair play and give Dr. Andrew C. Ivy a fair chance to prove what he contends is of benefit to mankind.

The Chicago Daily Tribune article touching on the Krebiozen proposal, by Senator DOUGLAS, appearing in that paper's issue of August 23, 1958, follows:

"SENATOR DOUGLAS PROPOSES TEST FOR KREBIOZEN

WASHINGTON, August 22.—A secret scientific test of the merits of Krebiozen as a cure for cancer was proposed in the Senate Friday by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois.

"DOUGLAS said in a Senate speech that the public is bewildered by the conflicting statements regarding the preparation. Dr. Andrew C. Ivy has reported Krebiozen to be helpful, DOUGLAS said, while the American Medical Association has denounced it and the National Research Council has found on the basis of the AMA report that there is no evidence of curative or palliative effects from use of the drug.

"DOUGLAS called for tests to be conducted by the United States Public Health Service and the National Institutes of Health. Under DOUGLAS' plan the Institutes would conduct a sample test upon 200 more or less terminal cancer cases of patients who had applied to the Institutes for help.

"ONE HUNDRED WOULD GET KREBIOZEN

"Of these, 100 cases would be treated with Krebiozen while the other 100 would be given mineral oil instead.

"The Institutes and Ivy would choose an outstanding biostatistician who would help design the tests and would be the only person knowing which patients had received Krebiozen treatment.

"The lists of those who had and had not received the treatment would be placed in a sealed envelope in a safe, to be opened later by the biostatistician and two advisers, Dr. Ivy and a representative of the medical profession chosen by the Public Health Service. The advisers would not know the identity of the patients.

"WOULD REVIEW HISTORIES

"At the conclusion of the test-treatment period, the case histories of all 200 in the test would be submitted to Ivy, and he would be asked to identify the 100 cases in which Krebiozen had been administered. DOUGLAS said Ivy would naturally select those showing the most improvement or pain alleviation.

"The sealed envelope would then be taken from the safe and the lists would be compared with Ivy's list. A comparative study would be made of the cases of the patients who did and did not receive Krebiozen.

"The degree of agreement or disagreement between Ivy's list and the other lists would then be announced.

"WOULD PUBLISH FINDINGS

"Finally, if Ivy requested it, the Public Health Service would examine records compiled by Ivy of other cases treated with Krebiozen, appraise the results, and publish the findings.

"DOUGLAS said the organized medical profession disparaged the discoveries of Pasteur, Lister, and others, and sought to defame the discoverers."

Library Services Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, one of the achievements of the 84th Congress was the enactment of the Rural Library Services Act of 1956. Members of the Congress have supported appropriations for the library services program beyond the timid and inadequate figures recommended each year by the administration. Each year, the appropriated funds have been put to good use by the participating States.

This year the President's budget looks generous, at first blush. It appears, before one gets to the fine print of which the Budget Bureau is so fond, that $6 million are programed. This is still 20 percent below the authorized amount, but it exceeds past requests, and seems a step in the right direction.

However, when one does get to the fine print, Mr. Speaker, one finds a different picture. The $6 million programed includes $850,000 of funds left over from last year. If this year's request is not increased, it will mean that in 4 years only 60 percent of the total amount of funds authorized will have been appropriated.

The library services program is a good one. It is one of which the Congress can be proud. It is my hope that the distinguished Appropriations Committee will recommend, and that the House will approve, an appropriation of sufficient magnitude to enable the librarians throughout the Nation to do the job which this act was designed to make possible.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the following editorial from the New York Times of February 7 be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

Ten years of effort for Federal aid to libraries culminated June 19, 1956, in the Library Services Act. The benefits derived are available only to libraries in rural areas of 10,000 population or less. This legislation was backed by the American Library Association, public librarians and library trustees throughout the United States. When President Eisenhower signed the bill he said, "It shows promise of leading to a significant enrichment of the lives of millions of Americans."

The act calls for annual grants of $7,500,000 for 5 years. The moneys appropriated have yet to equal the amount authorized. This year's budget recommendation is $6 million and, like last year's appropriation, still falls short of the allowable fund necessary to provide minimum service.

One of the important library services is that of continuing education where circumstances prohibit formal schooling. When the Health, Education, and Welfare Department appropriations are considered this year it is hoped that the grants will be raised to the full amount of $7,500,000.

Address by Commissioner Armand D'Angelo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by Commissioner Armand D'Angelo of the department of water supply, gas, and electricity of the city of New York at the installation dinner of the American Trade Union Council for Histadrut at the Astor Hotel in New York City on January 28.

Commissioner D'Angelo is recognized as an outstanding labor leader. His address relates to his recent visit to Israel as a guest of the Republic of Israel through the invitation extended to Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York.

ADDRESS BY COMMISSIONER ARMAND D'ANGELO AT THE INSTALLATION DINNER OF THE AMERICAN TRADE UNION COUNCIL FOR HISTADRUT AT THE ASTOR HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 28, 1959

I am very happy to be here this evening and to have this opportunity to share with the members of the American Trade Union Council for Histadrut on this very wonderful occasion.

For although my name is D'Angelo—and although my own family background reflects a heritage which stems from an area of the Mediterranean many hundreds of miles from the shores of Israel—I, too, rejoice, as you do in the birth, the early struggles, and the growing maturity of the great, young, vibrant land which has benefited so greatly from your dedication.

Indeed, it would be very strange if any American—regardless of religious creed, national background, or any of the social and cultural differences which distinguish one man from another—could remain unmoved by the saga of Israel by the breadth of the human concept which is Israel, by the courage of its people, or by the devotion of its friends in other lands.

It would be stranger still if I—as a lifelong trade unionist—could fail to take great inspiration from the magnificent work which my fellow trade unionists throughout our country have contributed to the development of a strong and vigorous labor movement in Israel.

For me, it is a very great privilege to participate in the activities of an organization such as the American Trade Union Council for Histadrut, and to contribute in some small personal measure to the material and moral support which are so vital to the democratic tradition which the people of Israel today are building for the spiritual nourishment of future generations.

As some of you may know, I had the opportunity last year, through our mayor, Robert F. Wagner, to visit Israel and to see at firsthand many of the astonishing economic, industrial, and agricultural develop-

ments which her people have fostered during the past decade.

I wish that everyone could be as fortunate as I; for the experience of witnessing at firsthand all of the modern miracles that the sons and daughters of Israel have wrought in their homeland, is something that will remain in my memory for the rest of my life, as proof of man's faith in his fellow man and of the reality of courage and vision in our troubled times.

A decade ago, the vision of Israel shone as a beacon of freedom which promised light and hope for Jews throughout the world—comparable only to the lantern uplifted toward heaven by our own Statue of Liberty to guide oppressed people of all nations to America's shores.

The vision of Israel today has been transformed into the achievements of courageous pioneers, of men and women—yes, and of children, too—who have labored, with love, with devotion, and with sublime faith, to recreate a nation that first rose to greatness thousands of years ago.

The story of Israel today is an inspiring account of the establishment of a democratic nation where men and women and children live without fear—secure in the knowledge that they may worship God, each according to his own conscience and heritage—and pledged to protect and to advance the welfare and well-being of his neighbors.

Many of the brightest chapters in that story have been penned by the men and women of the General Federation of Jewish Labor in Israel, by the Histadrut.

This community—for it is just that—of more than half a million workers in every phase of labor, in every part of Israel, so thoroughly permeates the life of the nation that it is literally impossible to think of Israel without immediately recalling the incredible achievements of Histadrut.

Throughout the land, the living, functioning monuments to the concept of Israel which have been lovingly created by Histadrut, bear witness to the strength and vitality of the organization. Modern hospitals, medical clinics, trade schools, cultural centers, youth centers, housing projects, consumers' societies, agricultural developments—all strength—and owe their very existence to the dynamism of Histadrut.

And in a very large measure, to a very great extent, the dynamic success of Histadrut stems from the financial, moral, and political support lavished upon it by the American labor movement through the American Trade Union Council for Histadrut.

The great fraternal relationship between labor in Israel and labor in America has been permanently recorded in the roll of institutions erected and maintained by Histadrut.

The William Green Cultural Center in Haifa, the Philip Murray Cultural Center in Eilat, the ILG Hospital in Beersheba, these are just a few of the monumental Histadrut edifices which bear the names of revered American labor leaders and prominent American labor organizations, in testimonial to the warm spirit of friendship which exists between the working people of these two great nations.

And it is you, my good friends—the officers and members of the American Trade Union Council for Histadrut—who have helped to build these monuments, who have breathed life into them, and who have helped to transform a great dream into a still greater reality.

Your unselfish, your openhearted—your immensely generous—gifts of time and effort and money to the cause of labor and social justice in Israel certainly have made possible the greatest national success story in modern history.

Tonight, as we accept the new and renewed pledges of faith in this great humanitarian enterprise of the new and reelected officers of the American Trade Union Council for Histadrut, let us pause, too, with gratitude and happiness in our hearts, with prayers on our lips, and with fervent hope that Almighty God will continue to bestow His benediction upon us, upon our brethren in Israel, and upon all workingmen and women, upon all of our fellow human beings who share our faith in His power and His love.

It is now my privilege to introduce the following newly elected officers: honorary chairman, Claude Jodoin; honorary vice chairmen, George M. Harrison, Donald MacDonald, and David J. McDonald; and cochairmen, Bernard Shane and Harold Hanover.

The following newly elected members of the national executive committee: Shelley Appleton, William Collins, Steve Federoff, Samuel H. Friedman, Samuel Herbst, Samuel Kraisman, Joel Menist, Jack Paley, Frederick H. Siems, and David Weisman.

And the following officers, all of whom have been reelected to their present posts: Chairman, Moe Falikman; cochairmen, Joseph Gold, David Siegal, and Norman Zukowsky; national executive committee chairman, David Gingold; administrative committee chairman, I. H. Goldberg; treasurer, Philip Lubliner; associate treasurer, Nathaniel M. Minkoff; financial secretary, Frank Brown; associate financial secretary, Murray M. Kolker; and recording secretary, Max Goodman.

My friends, it has been both a pleasure and a very great honor to join you here this evening and to pay tribute to the wonderful work that you are doing.

Thank you and God bless you all.

Community Development and Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely article by Prof. Paul S. Taylor, chairman of the University of California Institute of International Studies and a distinguished economist. Notwithstanding the fact that the Public Printer has advised the cost of including the article will be $486, I ask unanimous consent that this item be inserted in the RECORD:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

(By Paul S. Taylor, Community Development Consultant, ICA Office of Technical Cooperation, Community Development Division, and Chairman, Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.)

I

In the 13 years since World War II a succession of Asian nations have established their independence, one after another. Having thrown off the yoke of colonialism, following an American precedent dating from 1776, the governments of these young nations now carry the responsibilities of power that formerly rested on other shoulders. They have said to the world that they are capable of self-government, and are now engaged in demonstrating it. They have told their own people that independence is superior to colonialism, who now expect visible evidence of the validity of that claim. Korea is one among these new nations. Although handicapped by a cruel severance, by the ravages of a recent war, and by the uncertainties of an uneasy cease-fire, its political independence still stands after 10 years.

Most of the people of the Asian nations are farmers, living in villages. They live according to the customs of their ancestors handed down from time immemorial. However familiar and even cherished the customs themselves, the conditions of their daily lives are beginning to change. For the idea is reaching even the countryside that poverty, disease, and misery are not inevitable. Through advertising, movies, the sights in the cities, the vehicles that pass on the roads, political propaganda, and every other form of communications, they are subjected to a bombardment saying in myriad ways that old burdens can be lightened, that there are practical alternatives to acceptance and resignation.

These voices that penetrate into the villages are long familiar to the Western World. They represent the forces that create and are created by the city, the influences of a money economy that binds ever more remote areas of the world together, the spread of a technology that reduces distances and lightens labors and if experienced, even in the farm of a modern war machine, leads young men at the end of their soldiering to seek escape from the drudgery of their ancestral farming occupation. Korea now hears these voices, and feels these forces and influences.

Community development in the villages is among the most conspicuous and important of the domestic programs adopted by new Asian nations. It is founded on recognition of this urge toward a higher level of living, of the forces that portend the flight of farm youth to unprepared cities, of the subtle penetration of money economy into an economy based for ages upon ownership of land, of the impending urbanization of rural life itself through the spread of modern technology and widening of markets. Community development seeks to meet these forces in conscious ways guided by aspiration for the future and by reason, rather than in ways prescribed by tradition and the precepts of the past. Community development assumes a willingness to accept guided change as a political responsibility. It chooses democratic methods of stimulating change in preference to totalitarian methods.

India began a program of community development in 1952. There it carries the blessing of the followers of Mahatma Gandhi, the prestige given by gestures of presidential approval and the power accorded by the Prime Minister's personal assumption of chairmanship of the commission in charge of community development.

The Philippines followed in 1955 under the vigorous leadership of their President, who placed the program in the hands of a presidential assistant. The political leaders of both India and the Philippines felt a challenge to their leadership in the villages, coming from supporters of totalitarian programs of development. They found community development an effective answer. People generally choose progress by democratic methods with the aid of their own government.

When democracy was new in the modern world, it was regarded by monarchies as an untried experiment. In the 1830's a Frenchman, Alexis de Toqueville, went to the United States to examine the nature of the new phenomenon called "democracy." There he went from city to city, farm to farm, seacoast to wilderness frontier. His report, entitled "Democracy in America," has become classic. At one point he said:

"These Americans are the most peculiar people in the world. You'll not believe it when I tell you how they behave. In a local community in their country a citizen may conceive of some need which is not being met. What does he do? He goes across the street and discusses it with his neighbor. Then what happens? A committee comes into existence and then the committee

begins functioning on behalf of that need, and you won't believe this but it's true. All of this is done without reference to any bureaucrat. All of this is done by the private citizens on their own initiative."

Popular vigor, initiative, and participation are not only the strength of democracy; they are the antidote for authoritarianism whether in India, the Philippines, the United States or anywhere else, whether in the 1830's or in the 1950's. They are also instruments of progress.

II

Now the Government of the Republic of Korea, following India, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Indonesia among others, has decided to inaugurate its own program of community development. This program is to begin soon in rural areas selected for pilot demonstrations; it includes a training project and carries a prospect of expansion as availability of qualified personnel and other resources in the future may permit.

This decision rests not only on high policy, but also upon solid, earthy grounds. About 70 percent of the population, living on farms and in 20,000 villages, produces only about 40 percent of the gross national product. This maladjustment between human and material resources bears familiar symptoms of underemployment, unemployment, inefficiency, a low level of living, and a flooding of people from the villages into the cities faster than these can absorb them. An early 1958 document from the file on community development contains this passage:

"Korea has two acute rural problems. The first is a considerable degree of overpopulation in relation to the available land base, with the probability that increase will be more rapid than can be absorbed by industrial employment. The second is the potentially dangerous timelag in bringing to rural communities the technical knowledge and training needed for improved use of present resources and development of new sources of wealth. Population pressure makes the speedy and fullest utilization of present resources and the introduction of new ones a vital necessity. The alternative is a declining rural living standards, accelerated flight to the cities, and the aggravation of urban unemployment and overcrowding with its threat to internal order and security."

This is not to say that until now the Government has wholly ignored the existence of these problems. On the contrary, as Dr. Kyun Hi Tchah, economic planning officer in the Ministry of Reconstruction, told the Philippines-Korean Community Development Conference on May 26:

"The development of our industries, creation of an agricultural extension system, establishment of a special bank of agriculture, encouragement of farmers' cooperatives, a cottage industry program, reforestation program, and public works program are designated to solve these problems in these lines."

The Korean Government has been doing even more—by promoting improved agricultural practices, expanding irrigation, encouraging fisheries and better housing, assisting resettlement, and extending education and health, sanitation and other services of government into rural as well as urban areas. But the pace of these programs needs to be accelerated. Time presses, the resources of manpower technically trained in the specialties still are insufficient to meet the need, while unused resources are at hand in the villages themselves, and experience with community development elsewhere holds promise of its usefulness as a means of accelerating and amplifying the effectiveness of the substantive programs in rural areas.

The document of early 1958, quoted earlier, states this clearly:

"Community development does not provide the solutions to these problems but is a method, successfully tested in other countries with similar problems, whereby the timelag in providing means for the development of rural communities can be materially shortened, and the underemployed manpower of the villages can mobilize itself to improve the utilization of present resources and to discover new ones."

In preparation for this decision on program, and for undertaking operations, international experience has been shared directly through joint conferences in both Korea and the Philippines. These have been followed by preliminary domestic conferences bringing together officials from participating ministries, provinces, and guns (counties), and including staff members who will be responsible for the success of the community development program when it is launched.

The present, as a time of beginnings, is an appropriate occasion to restate soberly the concept of community development, to take stock of its tools and its relations with other programs that also seek to stimulate a development within the same communities, to weigh the conditions peculiar to Korea that affect the prospects for achievement in this country, and to relate rural community development to other processes directed at developing the greater community which is the Korean Republic.

III

Since community development became a self-conscious device for rural improvement in less-developed countries more than a decade ago, there have been innumerable attempts at definitions, with varying emphasis on this or that facet. The 1948 Cambridge Conference gave this as a definition:

"A movement designed to promote better living for the whole community, with the active participation and, if possible, on the initiative of the community, but if this initiative is not forthcoming spontaneously, by the use of techniques for arousing and stimulating it in order to secure its active and enthusiastic response to the movement." [1]

This definition developed from an effort by British administrators to prepare colonial people for impeding self-government, a status that some of these have now achieved.

In October 1955, a team of consultants to the International Cooperation Administration, after visiting India, Pakistan, and the Philippines, found that community development in each country expressed itself as "a concrete program of action" with "administrative structure," "budget," "personnel," "material resources," "plans," and "goals." [2]

The team described community development as "an operation whereby the technical government services * * * are channeled to and coordinated at the community level," and as "a method and an operation designed to complement the improvement of conditions from above, by the improvement of conditions through the initiative of the people themselves."

Later in the same year the United Nations defined community development as "a process designed to create conditions of economic and social progress for the whole community with its active participation and the fullest possible reliance upon the community's initiative." Community development "implies the integration of two sets of forces making for human welfare, neither of which can do the job alone: (i) the opportunity and capacity for cooperation, self-help, ability to assimilate and adopt new ways of living that is at least latent in every human group; and (ii) the fund of techniques and tools in every social and economic field, drawn from worldwide experience and now in use or available to national governments and agencies." [3]

More recently Prof. Irwin T. Sanders, of the University of Kentucky, has pointed out that community development may be viewed in any or all of four ways, viz.:

1. As a process of change from a condition in which, e.g., a few make decisions for all about matters of common concern, to a condition in which many participate in the decisions.

2. As a method, or way of working to achieve a goal.

3. As a program, or set of procedures for accomplishing a set of activities, e.g., improvement of health, welfare, agriculture, education, recreation, etc.

4. As a movement, or crusade, dedicated to progress as its supporters define progress.

Viewed as a process, the emphasis, or focus, is upon what happens to people, socially and psychologically. Viewed as a method, the emphasis is upon some end, or ends, to be achieved, i.e., as a process with an objective. Viewed as a program, emphasis is upon method and content, i.e., upon activities to accomplish results in respect to specific matters of health, welfare, agriculture, education, recreation, etc. Viewed as a movement, emphasis is upon a program and its emotional content, i.e., upon an idea, as interpreted by its adherents. Sanders remarks in reference to community development as a movement that it is "a special kind of program that holds unusual promise and one worthy of unabashed commitment by those * * * who want to see poverty and illness alleviated among the great masses of underprivileged humanity." [4]

Community development, then, is something to be perceived whole. Its full meaning can be understood only by viewing it in many ways, not like the elephant in Aesop's fable that was examined by blind men carefully in separate parts—trunk, tusk, ear, leg, side, and tail. The blind men, never having seen the animal whole, but each having touched only its nearest part, naturally were left quarreling among themselves after the elephant passed by. One maintained an elephant is like a snake, another that it is like a bone, a third that it is like a fan, and the others, respectively, that it is like a tree, wall, and rope. We could quarrel among ourselves endlessly and futilely over the nature of community development like the blind men unless, in addition to studying the parts, we can see the living whole of a creature that is more than the sum of the parts of its anatomy.

IV

The tools and procedures of community development are neither mysterious nor unique. They are familiar, many of them, to those who engage in the usual forms of group work, or seek to establish cooperative relations with communities in order to attain specific ends such as better practices in respect to agriculture, health and sanitation, education, etc. They are known also to administrators and others who work with groups of people in a variety of relationships, other than authoritative, to achieve practical purposes. The adequacy of the tools and procedures is the subject of inquiries by social scientists seeking to understand social attitudes and structures, or to refine methods in group dynamics, community activities, etc.[5] The methods most suitable in any specific country or situation will depend much upon the attitudes of the villagers in the particular society. They can be anticipated best by those who understand the purposes of community development and know the local situation. Tools and procedures should be reviewed carefully in the light of early experience, noting the circumstances under which failures and successes occur.

The community development program of India has made at least one significant contribution to the tools of community development that can be useful for administration everywhere.[6] This is the creation of a very small group, separated from any responsibil-

Footnotes at end of speech.

ity for decisions or operations of the program, with responsibility for observing continuously, for supplying a running account of program operations, and for making periodic evaluations of methods and results. A recent survey of the Indian program by Ernest Witte states:

"The evaluation reports are tremendously interesting and valuable and this seems to be a unique contribution to Government. No other major ongoing independent governmental agency seems to exist which devotes itself to measuring the effectiveness of an operating program in which it has no authority. Its findings (not its running reporting) are public." [7]

Even the evaluation itself needs recurrent reevaluation; Witte continues:

"Although this evaluation program is a positive contribution, it has some potentially dangerous aspects of concern to a program like community development."

"Naturally, it is easier to measure progress in things than the progress of people and the two do not necessarily go together. Thus in the early reports emphasis was placed upon such things as the number of acres reclaimed, the miles of roads built, and so forth. But these are only the byproducts of real community development. Its real objective is to change people so that they will think and act for their own and their communities' improvement. Fortunately, the evaluation staff is understanding more of the real objectives and is striving for more adequate measurements by which to judge results."

This hazard is faced not only by evaluation teams; it confronts all who bear any responsibility for program operations. Witte points to dangerous pressure for early visible results that is characteristic of every country with a community development program, and can be sensed already in Korea. He says:

"District or other officials want to make a good comparative showing and sometimes understand the physical evidences of progress better than the more intangible ones. Thus in a number of instances (and in the other countries as well) there was unmistakable evidence of what might be termed 'authoritative community development.'"

The distinguishing essence of community development, in my opinion, is that it assumes a responsibility for approaching a community whole, for eliciting popular participation in selecting goals and planning projects, as well as participating in their execution, and for developing the practices, attitudes, and initiative through experience that will continue indefinitely to generate guided change:

"The study of human wholes lies today on the borderline between science and art," says Robert Redfield of the University of Chicago in his "Little Community." Fractional analyses are useful but, as Lawrence K. Frank of Massachusetts Institute of Technology cautions, these cannot be "safely used for dealing with an organized whole, as we see in medicine which must integrate all the separate findings of the life and medical sciences when it approaches the single, identified organism—personality." [8]

The necessity for viewing a community whole, as well in its parts, is matched by the necessity for shaping a program so as to create impact on a community as a whole, not simply on its parts. There is no competition between parts and the whole, either as the subject of analysis or in the structure of program. The Korean Government, as noted earlier, already has initiated a number of programs aimed at improvement of one phase or another of rural community life; viz, health and sanitation, agriculture, education, etc. This is beneficial and there must be no slackening of these programs.

In examining community development in India, Pakistan, and the Philippines in 1955, a team of consultants of which I was a member reported:

"When we examined community development activities as programs of action we found elements not expressed in definitions of community development as concepts and processes. There is a substantive content in all such programs which lies beyond the resources of individual groups, without which 'better living for the whole community' remains an idle phrase. This substantive content consists of the traditional Government services in agriculture, medical care and public health, education, the building of roads, etc. In large measure the programs we examined are based upon the idea of strengthening these Government technical services, and of stimulating local community organizations to make the most efficient use possible of them.

"Community development programs are based upon the twin principles of (a) strengthening and coordinating Government technical services in agriculture, public health, education, etc., and (b) stimulating an awareness within the village of needs and group self-help potential in attacking these needs, in cooperation with Government." [9]

This is to say that a community development program and educational, health and sanitation, agricultural or other programs that touch rural communities are mutually interdependent. Separate substantive programs and community development programs in the same village are not competitive, but complementary.

Experience in other countries corroborates this; in recogniton of the importance of the whole, the practical trend is toward recognition of a mutuality between single-purpose and multi-purpose programs. The United Nations reported in 1955:

"A trend toward comprehensiveness or multiplicity of function in programs that originated for a single purpose in a specialized field characterizes recent programs of rural improvement in economically underdeveloped areas. A single purpose project may in many cases take root most quietly and easily, and can therefore serve as a spearhead of wider community development. However, the relationship of the various aspects of life especially in the rural community require that the concept of multipurpose development be introduced as soon as possible in the programs." [10]

V

Community development proceeds on the assumption that people who live in the same village constitute a community which will act together for common purposes. This may or may not be true. Caste, religion, faction, and class create serious cleavages within the same village in some countries, that resist the unified approach of community development and prevent villages from becoming a social unit.

In Korea, fortunately, villagers are a relatively homogeneous people. Castes are absent, religious differences are not seriously divisive, recent land reform has weakened class lines, and family overrides faction. Marcus Scherbacher says:

"With this very broad family system you have a natural feeling of family and community responsibility because you have whole villages with the same name, of the same family. And although you still find villages of only one family, the great majority (72 percent or even 80 percent) of a village will carry the same name." [11]

Anyone who has set foot in a Korean village can testify that the people are friendly and frank, ready to discuss their problems without waiting upon lengthy preliminaries to disarm suspicions, overcome barriers, or even conform to ceremonial codes prescribing how interviews or business relations shall be conducted.

Korean villages have strong traditions and much experience in sharing and in cooperation. Some of these are deeply rooted in the past as well as flourishing in the present. Group warehouses date from at least the 17th century. There are innumerable kaes, or groups, organized for savings, public works, farming, recreation, health, mutual help, meeting the occasion of marriage and funerals, and a host of other purposes. In 1937 some 480 different kinds of kaes were distinguished in Korea.[12] Bands of farmers weeding rice to the encouraging chant of a leader like a crouching football team responding to the urgings of a coach, dot the landscape in season.

These and other forms of traditional cooperation among villagers have not added up to community development in the past, for they have been directed mainly toward making life flow more smoothly in traditional channels, rather than toward the production of development and change. Yet they are favoring elements in a society seeking consciously to make its way in new directions.

The regeneration of rural society itself, with modest help from outside, is an idea not wholly new or foreign to Korea. The recent land reform had its precedents in past centuries. During the era of Japanese domination thoughtful studies were made and proposals advanced to guide action. From one of these, published in 1931, I note among "Proposals for Some New Institutions" the following items:

1. Institutes for headmen and their leaders of the villages.
2. Institutes for keywomen of the villages.
3. Culture centers in the villages.
4. A rural worker-training center, which included improved agriculture and home economics schools in its program to aid poor farmers, elevate their living level, and enrich the cultural life of the entire rural population.

A passage on village leaders is still worth quoting:

"We have seen what one man can do in the villages. These village headmen are usually the most respected men, with a high degree of culture and refinement, but usually they belong to the old schools of thought, admitted to be inadequate to meet the new day. With a little help for them in seeing and understanding the new day with all its complicated problems, they can become unparalleled leaders to regenerate rural Korea. Why not help them? They are the shortcuts in making over the rural communities. Their services are generally gratuitous. All the expenditure involved would probably be the financing of two or three leaders and their travel expenses until the institutes can be organized and managed by the village leaders themselves. It certainly is very little compared to the great good that can reasonably be expected to ensue. Present-day social, economic, and political high spots and their relations to their own villages are probably all that needs to be pointed out to them. Democratic ideals and a scientific attitude toward life will need emphasis. When once started, it is reasonable to expect that they themselves will make their own adjustments. All they need is a little help to make a turn * * * the point I want to stress is that all this does not require an expenditure of a big sum of money. It is within the reach of the people's ability." [13]

This, written more than a quarter century ago, has a very modern and timely ring.

Its thesis is confirmed by contemporary studies exploring foundations for the present program.[14]

VI

"First of all, the Korean culture needs to be emphasized to bring the Koreans to their own, as in the case of the discouraged Danes. Then there is the need to recognize the

Footnotes at end of speech.

equality, if not supremacy, of the Korean culture in the past and to let it develop as a part of the integrated whole of human culture; the emphasis is legitimate and right."[15]

The prospects of community development for Korea, like any other program, rest upon the potential resources, material and spiritual, of Korea. There is ample reason, as has been pointed out, to launch a program here with confidence. Great need, technical knowledge, local leadership and resources are present. These are substantial ingredients that justify an effort and hold promise of success. Community development can produce better living and more active citizenship.

It is useful to temper our optimism, nevertheless, with realism. Rural community development can stimulate agricultural, livestock, fishery, and forest production, cottage industries, health and sanitation, education, cultural activities, and recreation. It cannot be expected to set up great industrial enterprises, nor to substitute for great national public works like railroads, main highways, or large reservoirs.

Community development can contribute toward a more favorable balance between people and resources, but there are limits; a too rapid increase of population can be one.

The census of 1949 reported that 42 percent of the population of South Korea was under 15 years of age. This is extreme. In Norway and Switzerland the proportion was around 24 percent, or less than three-fifths that of Korea. The list of nations with any higher proportions of youth than Korea—and these only very slightly higher—included 15 Asian, African, and Latin American countries that, with scarcely an exception, face seriously unfavorable relations between resources and population. In all these nations, including Korea, steps are being planned and taken to lower the death rate. Meanwhile the birth rate in these nations, including Korea, remains high. As a matter of plain arithmetic this sets the stage for a population explosion.[16] Can community development, or indeed any other form of economic development, keep pace in Korea?

In India, family planning is at least nominally a point in the community development program. In Japan, where no community development program exists, a family planning program in the hands of welfare and home demonstration agents apparently is being pushed much more effectively than in India. For a variety of reasons, national population policy among them, the birth rate in Japan fell from the high rate of around 33 per thousand in 1949 to a low of around 18 in 1956, making the current birth rate of Japan comparable to that of France.[17] So great a decline within 7 years is history-making.

Two-thirds of Korean farmers in 1949 cultivated farms of less than 1 chungbo (1 hectare) in size.[18] To what extent increase in production (agricultural and otherwise) can outpace the growth in numbers in Korea is a grave question. The time to consider this problem is now, while the country engages in heroic endeavors to raise the level of living of the Korean people.

Korea, like many other nations, faces hard facts of geography. Among such countries are Finland, the Scandinavian countries, and Switzerland. Those countries have been obliged to balance population and resources, and to build their futures on the foundations of their heritages, geographic, economic, political, and cultural. They are doing so with a success that yields a high material level of living and a rich cultural life to their people. Their achievement and their stability command the respect of the world, and—not to be overlooked in a paper on ddevelopment—attracting an enlarging flow of foreign visitors that enriches private and public coffers while it promotes amity and enriches the cultural life of many people. Korea might wish to consider inclusion of such aims in her community development program, for she still possesses priceless resources in cultural treasures, landscapes of extraordinary charm and beauty, and an hospitable and responsive people.

Community development is at the center of one of the great problems of our day. The basic problem of people everywhere is how to maintain continuity or persistence of their cultural group and their community organization while changing.[19] Community development rejects the view that blind forces alone control our social life and govern the direction of change; it is founded on a belief in change guided by human choices and human strivings. Community development is designed to produce change without social disintegration by binding the people into the making of their own future.

History has thrust Korea into a political limelight, separated from an opposed system by a thousand yards—or by a river. Even within the Republic itself is a restored area north of the 38th parallel, many of whose present inhabitants lived for a time under the other system, affording them a basis in personal experience for balancing life under one system against life under the other.

This location presents Korea with great problems. It also presents Korea—and the United Nations—with great opportunity. There are factors favorable to grasping it. The size of the Republic holds the conception and operation of national programs within manageable scope. The Government and people are willing to make efforts and to advance in new directions, and to demonstrate here the fruits of freedom in a small nation.

In my opinion, although Korea is starting later than other Asian nations, it has a chance to make itself a leader and showplace before the world of what rural community development can do materially, politically, and culturally. Such a prospect is capable of evoking dedication to a national effort as to a moral crusade. By requiring participation of people in working out their own problems and destiny, it can cement people and government together through a common effort. It can generate stability while it generates progress.

Is it really possible to do this in Korea? I have been told here, as elsewhere in Asia, that I do not know Asians, including Koreans; they have to be told. They have been told for centuries, they say, and can learn no other way. Although I have had my feet on the ground in the villages of five Asian countries, I am not an expert on Asia. So I shall give not my own reply, but that of a Korean general in the military zone when I asked him recently if this description of Asians is true. His reply was simple; he said the Korean people want government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The U.S.S.R., by its statements to the United Nations, regards community development as unnecessary, not to say undesirable, where a strong central plan governs a nation's economy. It has no place in its economy for popular participation in making as well as executing the plans. It wants the labors of the people and their acquiescence. Community development, on the contrary, invites the participation and initiative of the people in both planning and execution. Therefore, it poses an issue that Koreans, with others, understand, an issue above and beyond the material products that community development is capable of creating.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Quoted from social development in the British colonial territories, report of the Ashbridge Conference on Social Development, 1954. Colonial Office miscellaneous publication No. 523 (n.d.), pp. 6, 7.

[2] Community development programs in India, Pakistan and the Philippines, team 1, International Cooperation Administration, p. 9.

[3] United Nations, Bureau of Social Affairs, Social Progress through Community Development, p. 6 (1955).

[4] Irwin T. Sanders, Theories of Community Development, Rural Sociology, March 1958; reprinted in Community Development Review, June 1958, p. 31.

[5] Rural Sociology, March 1958, entire issue.

[6] M. L. Wilson, community development program in India. Issued by Community Projects Administration, Government of India, 1956.

[7] Ernest E. Witte, Community development in selected countries, Community Development Review, March 1957, p. 43.

[8] Models for study of community organization. Community Development Review, June 1958, p. 1.

[9] Ibid., p. 40.

[10] Social progress through community development, op. cit., pp. 8, 9.

[11] Philippines-Korean Community Development Conference (1958), pp. 30, 31.

[12] Loc. cit.

[13] Helen K. Kim, Rural Education for the Regeneration of Korea (New York, 1931), pp. 110–112.

[14] John E. Mills, ed., Ethnosociological reports of three Korean villages (by Nam, Kyu Back; Park, Joon; Yoon, Eul Byong). UNC/OEC for Korea, A.P.O. 301, San Francisco, Kwangju Gun Survey (by Seok, Seh Kyun and Lee, Yun Sook). Publications in community development, No. 1, April 1958. UNC/OEC for Korea, A.P.O. 301, San Francisco.

[15] Kim, op. cit., p. 84.

[16] Frederic Osborn, Population: An international dilemma. A summary of the proceedings of the conference committee on population problems 1956–1957. The Population Council, 230 Park Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.

[17] Tachi Minoru, the population problem, Japan Quarterly, vol. V, No. 1 (1958).

[18] "Improving agricultural production alone will not be sufficient to eliminate all the economic difficulties of Korean farmers • • • The life of the average Korean farmer could be described as a continuous struggle against hunger, heavy taxes or imposts, and usurious interest rates; a yearly gamble against the weather in which the farmer often loses; a continuous repetition of patient, persistent efforts to produce good harvests from poor unfertile soils; and a hungry search for additional land to put under crops." FAO–UN Report for United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, Reconstruction and development of agriculture, forestry and fisheries in South Korea, 1954, pp. 75, 76.

[19] Lawrence K. Frank, Models for study of community organization, Community Development Review, June 1958, p. 23.

The Real Basis for the Foreign-Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the recent column by Walter Lippmann, "The Duty of Rich Nations," which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator CASE of New Jersey on Thursday,

January 29, 1959, contained an effective and reasoned argument for placing our foreign-aid program on a moral basis instead of on the basis of self-interest and power politics.

Mr. Lippmann's views, of course, are not new. I was present on the floor of the House on June 6, 1956, when THOMAS J. DODD, then a Representative from Connecticut's First Congressional District, made an unforgettable plea that we revive the effectiveness of foreign aid and rekindle public support of it by placing it on the right basis.

Senator DODD has continued over the years to advocate a foreign-aid program that adequately expresses the highest traditions and principles of this Nation. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have inserted in the Appendix excerpts from Mr. DODD's speech on the floor of the House, a speech which so eloquently defines the moral basis for foreign aid:

Our foreign-aid program should not be based solely on expediency, self-interest, Communist competition, or the cold war, but rather upon conviction and principle.

We have discovered in the last century one key to a shared sense of moral solidarity in the principle of the general welfare. This is the principle upon which our entire foreign-aid program should properly rest, for involved in it is the idea of universal brotherhood of men.

Over and over again we have heard it said that the problem of coping with communism is primarily an ideological or a spiritual one. And this is why we must found our foreign-aid program on a great moral principle.

If the basic cause of communism and its threat to our society is on a spiritual and ideological plane, the missing element in our policy of copying with it must be spiritual and ideological.

We can find this missing element in our foreign policy by rediscovering why we hold our democracy so dear and why we should endeavor to share its underlying principles and beliefs and blessings with our fellow men. Democracy is based on a Judaic-Christian ethic concerning the nature of man, his essential worth and dignity, and his inherent God-given rights and freedoms. Man is a valuable being.

Here is where we find the real reason for a foreign-aid program. Thus, we understand that we are engaged in this tremendous project not only because we must resist communism, not only because we must make ourselves secure, not only because we must have strong defenses, but more importantly, because it is the right thing to do.

This is what actually motivates us in the conduct of our affairs at home.

This is why we will not discriminate on the basis of race, creed, or national origin in our immigration laws.

We will oppose segregation in all its forms as a violation of the basic rudiments of Christian charity and another form of Hitler-like racism.

We will support measures to eradicate slums from our large urban centers which to our friends abroad are incomprehensible in the light of our high standards of living.

If God has blessed us with fertile land and a population with a high degree of technical skills and initiative, we shall recognize our responsibility to find ways and means of sharing our surpluses and skills with other peoples of the world who are less fortunate.

Thus, in our foreign aid programs, we should be prepared, when asked, to tell our foreign neighbors who need assistance why we want to help them—that one of our principal motives is to help them establish and maintain a free society. We should be able to tell them why we attach such importance to freedom, and why we are interested in sharing it with them; that it is the nature of man which is at issue.

We should discuss these matters in our churches and civic groups, in our schools and universities.

We should call for volunteers and, like the Communists, develop cadres of young people to dedicate their lives in whole or in part, to serve these ends, both here and abroad. We have never lacked for volunteers when wars, in the traditional sense, have broken out.

But this is a new kind of war—the cold war—but a war nonetheless. And it is a war to the finish between freedom and tyranny.

The American people should realize that these problems are not to be confined to Government action only; we all have a stake in the outcome and we all have a role to play.

Those who recognize these things, have a responsibility to act and to give leadership to others.

We need bold and imaginative leadership to infuse and permeate our foreign policy with this vitalizing element. The people of the United States are ready for it. For this is not a suggestion to introduce an element not already existing on the American scene. It is rather a suggestion to recognize it, and to draw more heavily from our spiritual ideals in the shaping of our foreign policies and our objectives, in the conduct of our foreign-aid programs, and in the content of our propaganda. Let us not be ashamed to explain our ideals publicly, and, above all, let us act as though we really believed in them.

If such a dynamic or positive element were infused into our national thinking on foreign policy it would tend to emphasize the quality rather than the quantity of our assistance programs.

The magnitude of aid would not be so much the measure which is often based on immediate threats of loss to the Communists.

The measure would rather be the economic and social needs of the country or area and our own ability to help on a long-term and consistent basis.

The people who receive our cooperation would not be made to feel that they are simply pawns in an international power struggle between the East and the West.

They should feel that we are doing these things because it is the right thing to do.

And I suggest that the American people and their representatives in Congress would be more willing to appropriate the necessary funds for these programs if they had sufficient confidence that those in charge of our foreign policy had clear objectives and knew what they were doing.

What these people need above and beyond all the technical skills we can give them is to find a way of life which will have some meaning and idealism in it.

They need to discover the essential worth and dignity of the human person, to develop a sense of self-respect as well as earn and receive the respect of others.

The personnel which we send abroad either under Government programs or through private organizations should be carefully selected on the basis of their suitability and capability to express and demonstrate these ideals to the people in the underdeveloped countries.

If we continue to flounder and drift in the conduct of our foreign affairs, we shall ultimately lose all the respect which our present position of leadership requires.

Should this happen, the cause of freedom and justice in the world will be lost.

I earnestly and devoutly believe that we of the United States have the greatest responsibility in this struggle. We are on the right road, and the legislation which is before the House will assist us in reaching our proper objective.

That objective is a world at peace under law. A world in which free men use and enjoy the blessings of creation and live in harmony with God and each other.

Plea for Conversation—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of our colleagues to two of the most significant statements I have read in some time.

In addition to the sincerity of purpose and the generosity of spirit they both manifest, they are unusual in that they each reach the same conclusion and make the same suggestion from positions which too often in the past have seemed irreconcilable.

The first is a brief address delivered by Mr. Lansing P. Shield, president of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, before that organization's annual congressional dinner here in Washington.

The second is an article prepared by Mr. Arthur J. Goldberg, special counsel of the AFL–CIO, which he adapted from an address delivered at the University of Wisconsin and which appeared in a recent issue of the Commonweal, a leading Catholic magazine.

Both Mr. Goldberg and Mr. Shield are deeply disturbed that American labor and industry have allowed themselves to harden into positions of hostility and have failed sufficiently to recognize their mutuality of interests and the need for unity in facing the economic and political challenge from Soviet Russia.

Both men see the urgent need to reestablish channels of communication between management and labor, to encourage them to listen to each other. And both men propose as a means of accomplishing this that a national conference or assembly be called of responsible leaders in business, labor, and government for the purpose of discussing—away from the tensions of the bargaining table—some of the issues of mutual interest and of great concern to all our people and to the safety of our country.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed substantial and pleasant relations with both groups. But this fact has enabled me to appreciate the truth of the analyses of Mr. Shield and Mr. Goldberg and the wisdom of their suggestion.

They are especially important, I believe, since neither gentleman—so far as I know—was aware of the other's proposal.

Both statements represent a high degree of statesmanship and of clear-sighted objectivity, and I recommend them to the thoughtful study of our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD the remarks of President Shield. The article by Mr. Goldberg will be included at a later point.

REMARKS BY LANSING P. SHIELD, PRESIDENT, NEW JERSEY STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, 22D ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL DINNER, HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 5, 1959

An unusual gathering of leaders of government, organized labor, and industry such as this provides an opportunity for all of us to achieve a better understanding. In these critical times, is there anything more urgent than the development of teamwork between these three important segments of our society? And this applies particularly to New Jersey—the most highly industrialized State in the Union.

Despite unparalleled prosperity and spectacular achievements in mass production and mass distribution, our economy in New Jersey and throughout the Nation is labeled as a high-cost one—and as each month rolls by, the break-even point of both industry and government rises. We are living in a plush economy. Because of high costs, world markets are slipping away from us.

Within the last 12 months, Khrushchev, Mikoyan and company have made trade agreements with 11 countries. During that same period we haven't signed a single agreement. The cold war with our adversary overseas has turned into a hot economic war and it's no wonder he already claims certain victory. As a Nation we are losing out to a competitor who has a built-in, low-cost austerity program. His economy, contrasted with ours, has a constantly lowering break-even point and the cost of living in Russia is being steadily reduced.

The colmplete answer to the dilemma in which we find ourselves does not lie solely in reducing Government spending, freezing prices and wages nor in further mechanization. We already lead the world in that area (I'm referring to mechanization—not spending) and it's ironical that the more we mechanize, the higher go our costs. The President has warned us that unless we reverse this trend which is weakening us both internally and externally, it may be necessary to put our economic body into a straightjacket in the form of wage and price controls. It is up to us to choose now between teamwork and dictation or the freedom of choice may be taken away.

As leaders in Government, business, and labor, we have been fighting small battles among ourselves instead of presenting a united front to our enemy.

As an example, industry and organized labor meet annually or biannually at the bargaining table and then withdraw until the next battle. Between political campaigns the liaison between government and industry also leaves much to be desired.

In our preoccupation with the problem of integration in race relationships probably unconsciously we have been practicing segregation in our economic relationships.

A form of class warfare is adding fuel to the flames that are licking at the foundations of our society. A columnist in the New York Times recently pointed out that "both political parties seem to be solidifying along the lines of class interests."

Can anyone say there is a conscious, common effort to promote integration and understanding between organized labor and management—and to a somewhat lesser degree, between government and industry?

Recently, recognizing my own shortcomings in this area, I invited to lunch a well-known labor leader in a neighboring State and a U.S. Senator. After 2 hours in which we exchanged views (no holds barred) all three of us came away with a better understanding of the problems of the others and we all wanted another meeting.

This week one of the top labor leaders in New Jersey told me the time was overdue for management and labor to bury the hatchet, particularly in view of the international situation. It is heartening to find that leaders in every field are becoming aware of the necessity for government, labor, and industry to close ranks.

May I respectfully suggest to the representatives of Federal and State Governments present here tonight that industry would be glad to join any effort to bring about a closer working relationship with government and labor. Perhaps a better relationship might be stimulated by a conference of leaders in Washington, followed by meetings at the State level. Such action would not only be good business and good politics, but would be a definite first step toward the objective of developing unity.

I am sure every member of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce is ready and eager to develop closer relationships and teamwork with all groups which are interested in strengthening our economy. We must have unity to be productive—we must be productive to be strong and we must be strong to remain free.

A Sane and Strong Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence's article of February 5 is an effective, sober reply to those Democrat presidential hopefuls who are perpetually endeavoring to undermine the faith of the American people in this Nation's military defenses.

It is interesting to note that these same critics of this administration's accomplishments in maintaining an effective defense were also here, on the Capitol scene, during the Korean fiasco, but had no comments then on the measure of the effectiveness of the Democrat administration's military preparedness at that time.

The article follows:

U.S. POWER SEEN SUFFICIENT TO DETER A RUSSIAN ATTACK

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 4.—Despite a concerted effort to scare the Congress into appropriating more money for intercontinental missiles, and the apparent attempt to play politics with national defense, the truth is that a world war is less likely today than it has been at any time since the close of World War II.

The outstanding fact is that the United States has sufficient military power today to deter the Soviet Union from making an attack. The price of such an attack is too big for the Kremlin to pay—for this would bring in retaliation the almost total destruction of all its major cities and the death of millions of people from one end of the Soviet Union to the other.

The average man is a bit confused by the persistent propaganda that tells him, "the Russians are ahead." But it is important to keep in mind these points:

1. The Soviets must go great distances across oceans with their missiles to hit at us.

2. The Soviets, in delivering their first blow, must simultaneously knock out every missile base and every air base in this country and in the territory of our allies in Europe and north Africa as well as in the Far East. It must be a 100-percent score.

BOAST HELD EMPTY

3. The Soviets must also knock out every U.S. submarine that is armed with missiles and every American or allied aircraft carrier at sea than can launch bombers carrying nuclear weapons. This, too, must be a 100-percent score.

4. The Soviets boast they can strike at targets with pinpoint accuracy, but one wonders how at a given moment a missile is going to find the exact spot that each submarine happens to be or the exact location in the air of each plane of America's fleet of heavy bombers. The unknown location of American warships is a deterrent, no matter how many missiles Russia has. The U.S. Air Force, moreover, here and overseas, keeps in the air in periods of crisis a certain number of nuclear bombers.

5. The Soviets not only must time their attack so it will knock out every allied base in Pakistan, Turkey, Italy, Spain, North Africa, as well as in Britain and France, but must make sure at the same time that all bases in this country are completely destroyed.

REPRISAL CONSIDERED

6. If the Soviets should miss any of these targets, they would promptly receive in reprisal a sweeping attack with H-bombs that would cause incredible devastation. It probably would take only 50 missiles or bombs to knock out 50 of their cities.

All these points, summed up, merely mean that the United States and her allies today still have the deterrent power they have been depending on for several years now. President Eisenhower at his press conference emphasized that the United States has a "balanced" defense. But the words "equivalent" or "balanced" do not convey the total significance of America's power to deter an enemy from attacking.

It is being said that the United States is failing to match each weapon now being produced by the Soviet Union. But the Soviets have need for more long-range weapons than America, because the Western allies have bases which are a short distance from the targets in Russia, whereas the Soviet air forces and missiles must travel across the Arctic or span the Atlantic or Pacific Ocean to reach America.

REDS' OBJECT: FRIGHT

There are, of course, many boasts being made nowadays by the leaders in Moscow. The purpose is to frighten America and her allies into submission to Soviet demands. But, as Mr. Eisenhower recalled at his news conference, the Soviets have bragged falsely in the past that they invented the flying machine, the automobile, and the telephone, and there's no reason why their claims about the performance of other inventions in the weapon field now should be accepted.

The United States Government has taken what is termed a "calculated risk." This means that it assumes the impracticability of any such simultaneous attack by the Soviet military machine as would destroy the American capacity to retaliate on a massive basis. The Kremlin would be taking a dangerous risk—the risk of terrible destruction—if they miscalculated in the use of their attack weapons.

HELD A STALEMATE

So the military situation is truly a stalemate in the sense that both sides have enough power to deter the other from initiating a war. Under the circumstances, there is little point in adding lethal weapons on a quantity basis merely to make sure that

the rubble and masses of dead people in cities in the Soviet Union are pounded to smaller pieces by more missiles.

America's position is secure primarily because the Soviet leaders are never expected to favor the suicide of their nation. Meanwhile, improvements in technology can add little to the security of either side—for the power to destroy another nation now is as efficient as it ever needs to be.

Plea for Conversation—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Plea for Conversation," by Arthur J. Goldberg, of the AFL–CIO, which should be read in conjunction with an address by Mr. Lansing P. Shield, president of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, which appears at an earlier point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

PLEA FOR CONVERSATION
(By Arthur J. Goldberg)

Sidney Hillman of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America made a profound contribution to the philosophy of labor-management relations by recognizing the inter-relationship of the workers' welfare and of the union's welfare to the well-being of the entire industry. In itself this recognition of mutuality of interest was not foreign to the philosophy of the American labor movement, which has fortunately been free of theoretical class-warfare ideology. But Hillman's contribution was to pay more than lip service to the idea: to set up institutional forms and to mold the thinking of his associates and others in the labor movement, and of his and other managements, to this concept of interdependence.

It is more than thirty years since the Hillman approach to mature labor-management relations became established and accepted in the clothing industry. How widespread has its acceptance been in the entire labor-management scene?

Superficially, the portents in this field are good. Labor unions are strong in membership and resources, and they have weathered the recession without fundamental organizational weaknesses. Despite widespread unemployment and underemployment, unions are negotiating new contracts which provide higher wages and improved benefits. Big strikes are few; major setbacks even fewer. Spokesmen for both major political parties, when they are overseas and therefore not campaigning, boast of our free democratic trade unions. Even at home—and even when campaigning—both parties extol free collective bargaining, and only the most neanderthal among them attack the concept of trade unionism. Each year the Bureau of Labor Statistics adds more collective-bargaining agreements to its already bulging files. Nonetheless, I suggest that if we probe beneath the surface we will find that we are a long way from universal achievement of the Sidney Hillman type of labor-management relations.

One large geographical area—the Deep South—has eluded organization by unions in many industries. The southern textile industry functions in large part on a nonunion basis, as it has for many decades. Great sectors of the clothing and garment industries in the South are also nonunion. So, too, are much of the construction industry and broad areas of the service trades in which various unions have jurisdiction. Even in organized industries the South has become increasingly a haven for runaway shops and factories. To say that the state of labor-management relations in the South is by and large unsatisfactory is an understatement.

Or take the problem of the white-collar workers. The technological revolution in America is producing a constantly smaller number of blue-collar workers in relation to an increasing proportion of technicians and subtechnicians, engineers, and subengineers, management and administrative people of various kinds. Yet, with few exceptions, unions have not found the technique with which to bring the increasingly large number of this type of industrial personnel into the labor movement. And, with few exceptions, managements have resisted the organization of these workers.

Even more serious than this resistance to the organization of white-collar workers is a hardening of attitudes in areas already organized. This intangible factor is, in my opinion, the most serious problem of all. After some 20 years of responsible collective bargaining in the major industries, we might reasonably expect a certain measure of understanding and goodwill, of ability to see the problem of the other side, of mutuality of efforts to reach solutions satisfactory to both. Indeed, 10 years ago we seemed to be on the road toward achievement of mutual respect and understanding in our major industries; the Wilson-Reuther agreements at General Motors, the Murray-Fairless agreements in steel, and others that could be mentioned, all pointed to an era of maturity in labor-management relations. But in the recent past I see a hardening of attitudes, and retrogression rather than progress in understanding. Management is tougher, unions are tougher, and the results are not good for either side.

Throughout American industry there is a widespread movement away from genuine acceptance of and cooperation with unions. In their place we see a philosophy of labor-management relations that aims at keeping unions at arm's length and seeks, wherever possible, to go around the union to its members. This philosophy treats unions as necessary evils; it does not see them as constructive partners in achieving harmonious and productive labor-management relations.

What reasons can be given for this polarization of viewpoint? I do not believe that it can fairly be attributed to an overreaching on the part of the American labor movement.

Of course, situations can exist where the comparative bargaining strengths of unions and employers are not in balance. There are situations in which a labor surplus exists, union loyalty is small, and the market is such that the employer can afford to forego production for a period of time; there are also situations where the opposite is true. Economic injury can occur when too great bargaining power exists on either side, although it is one of the essentials of our free economic system that we do not interfere to redress every individual instance of economic disequilibrium so long as there is no general pattern of imbalance.

The real question, however, is whether it can be said that on the whole labor exercises too great economic power vis-a-vis the employers. Here I would unhesitantly say that in the total picture greater strength is still on the side of the employers. The American industrial scene is certainly not one in which poor, downtrodden, profitless business enterprises have every last penny extracted from them by powerful labor unions. Wage and profit statistics do not paint such a picture, either for the economy as a whole or for those industries in which the large unions—usually denounced as "monopolies" by labor critics—exist.

If the hardening of attitudes which I see is not due to economics, then, what is its cause? I am not sure that I know, although I know that something has happened. Perhaps the change in climate is largely a by-product of our political scene. However successful collective bargaining may appear on the surface in organized industries—and I am, of course, questioning even this—politically, legislatively, and philosophically labor and management today stand apart, and the degree of polarization of viewpoints in these areas is far greater than in collective bargaining.

If we were to believe the political spokesmen of industry, for example, labor and its allies are determined to socialize America, a claim which everyone should know is plainly nonsense. And, to be entirely fair, I recently read a speech by an outstanding and respected labor leader charging a great American corporation with seeking a Fascist America—a charge which, in my opinion, is equally nonsensical.

In some measure the current hardening of attitudes is certainly due to the philosophy behind the Taft-Hartley Act, which speaks of encouraging both collective bargaining and individual bargaining—a complete contradiction in terms. Then, too, there is the fact that today we have a new generation of leadership in business, and, to a lesser extent, in labor. The generation passing from the scene developed mutual understanding and sometimes even friendship from their wartime experiences in governmental posts such as the War Production Board and the War Labor Board; on both sides those of the present generation are more inclined to be organization men, with all of the parochial characteristics of that breed.

Whatever the causes, the opportunities for conversation, for a sensible and realistic exchange of views between the leaders of labor and the business community, are becoming fewer and fewer. And the stereotype images, indeed the caricatures, are taking the place of reality. When the two sides meet, as they do now more and more infrequently, they meet almost solely at the bargaining table.

The bargaining table, of course, plays an indispensable and essential role in our labor-management scene, but it has never been known as a place where one could think out loud about basic problems: every word counts too much. Thus, in the period of growing estrangement between labor and management, one of our most conspicuous lacks is an area where men of divergent viewpoint can meet and exchange ideas, rather than make debating points, and where they can think realistically about our common future.

Take the question of old age as an example. The collective-bargaining table has obvious limitations as a forum for providing an adequate contribution, both by management and labor, to this complex problem. If a union in the course of collective bargaining raises the question of developing a program for retired employees, the discussion is likely to revolve around the narrow point whether, in law, the union has a right, and the company the obligation, to bargain for workers already retired. But, putting the legal question aside, can there be any doubt that both industry and unions have an obligation toward employees and members who have devoted long years of their lives to their respective interests? I have the deep feeling, unsupported by evidence, that if we could discuss this problem frankly and mutually, outside the collective-bargaining table, joint programs could be evolved which would have a beneficial impact both within and without the framework of collective bargaining.

Save for the collective-bargaining conferences, however, there is little joint exchange

of opinion. Where, then, do management and labor express their views? The answer is clear: Almost everywhere except together.

The Business Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce, composed of our leading businessmen, migrates to Hot Springs, locks itself behind closed doors and unanimously assures itself that labor is ruining the counrty. The National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce go respectively to New York and Washington for annual conventions, at which a host of the participants are already convinced that the labor movement and liberal politicians are the root of all evil.

The labor movement does essentially the same thing. We talk to ourselves in our conventions and in our executive council meetings, we adopt our maximum positions and we hurl these neatly mimeographed resolutions over the fence at the opposition, which picks apart the commas and semicolons and answers them.

There have been occasional efforts, of course, to bridge this gap. Back during the war some leaders in the CIO proposed an industrial council plan. Many people in management saw it as a blueprint rather than an idea, and promptly proceeded to tear it to bits. Perhaps to industry the phrase connoted a sort of codetermination. If so, I would say, let us forget the name.

American labor has not the slightest interest in codetermination. While it recognizes the right of our European colleagues to proceed by their own lights, American labor has considered the European experience and has concluded that it infinitely prefers to make its gains through collective bargaining rather than through any joint control of industry. No responsible American labor leader wants to take over management's prerogatives. American labor completely respects management's rights and regards it to be not only the right, but the responsibility, of industry to manage its plants. Only out of well-managed, profitable enterprise can American labor expect to make the gains in wages, hours, and working conditions which it desires.

Even where the term "industry council" was not used, however, and hence where there was no chance that the phrase itself produced misunderstanding, recent attempts to reach a rapprochement between labor and management have failed. In 1955, for example, the National Association of Manufacturers invited George Meany to address its convention. When he accepted in all good faith, he was subjected, as he sat on the platform, to a barrage of critical oratory that certainly did not contribute to mutual understanding. Is it surprising that he replied in kind?

The problem is that a philosophic chasm separates labor and management in America. Instead of narrowing, this chasm widens every year. It is essential therefore that we search for honorable methods of bridging this gap. As one step in this direction, I would propose a labor-management assembly, modeled after the United Nations Assembly, to serve as an instrument for bringing together the leading figures in American industry and the American trade union movement for periodic examination and discussion of the issues which affect us all and in which we find so little common ground.

I suggest that this labor-management assembly be convened under the auspices of the Government of the United States and that the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor act as cochairmen. But I immediately add that this need not and should not be a Government-dominated organization, any more than the ILO, on the international level, is a government-dominated institution, although government participates along with labor and management representatives in its functioning. I view the role of government as providing prestige, of supplying facts, and of bringing together a secretariat for the conduct of the meeting.

To achieve any beneficial results, the labor-management assembly I am suggesting would have to meet at regular intervals with top-level attendance and top-level thinking from both sides. It would have to be attended by the chairman of the board and the presidents of representative big and small corporations, and by the presidents of trade unions, both accompanied by adequate staffs. I would propose that the present membership of the Business Advisory Council, enlarged by representative small businessmen, constitute the industry representation. The general board of the AFL–CIO, on which sits at least one representative from each affiliated union, large and small, would constitute labor representation—with the proviso that respectable unaffiliated unions should of course be invited.

I would hope that the labor-management assembly issue no statements unless they were unanimously agreed upon and unless the common denominator achieved was higher than agreement that sin is bad and morality good. If the labor-management assembly is to be successful, it must be a place to discuss and think about important issues in the labor-management area on a broader basis than is possible in collective bargaining—not to fight and bicker over the words of a contract or a resolution. If the discussions are to be profitable, they should be off the record except for agreed upon statements, so that no one need be concerned that his remarks will be cited against him. Indeed, I visualize more and greater benefits from small discussion groups under the auspices of the labor-management assembly than from general plenary sessions.

Finally, I would hope that at the periodic meetings ample opportunities would be provided, as at international assemblies, for social intercourse between individuals in the respective groups—something that has been increasingly lacking since the wartime agencies functioned and the importance of which cannot be overestimated. I believe that our top level labor and management representatives must be brought together for a period of as long as 2 or 3 weeks, once or twice a year, under circumstances in which they have no alternative but to talk; and when they are through talking, they should talk some more.

Participants would have plenty to talk about. A good example of a problem we are all concerned about is inflation. If one reads the industrial press, inflation is caused solely by rising wages. If one reads the labor press, inflation is the end result of superprofits and administered price policies. Is either side right, or are they both wrong? If each is right, why is inflation a worldwide problem—in underdeveloped countries, in countries that are primarily agricultural, in countries that export, in countries that import more than they export, in countries with effective labor movements and in countries with quite passive, or nonexistent, labor movements? Whatever the answer, if there is an answer, the problem is rarely discussed by responsible leaders of labor and management sitting together.

And what about automation? How often do the top leaders of labor and management get together to discuss all of the implications of automation, except for the very limited treatment that can be given to this all-important subject by their representatives trying to hammer out a collective bargaining agreement before a strike deadline? Even the whole issue underlying the "right to work" laws has never been adequately discussed except in a political setting. It is ironical that in the recent political campaign, "right to work" laws were supported by many companies whose industrial relations would be fearful of the stability of their personnel relations if they did not have a union shop.

What about the problem of corruption in the labor-management field? It is no secret that many businessmen have gloated over Dave Beck and Jimmy Hoffa and consciously or unconsciously cast them in public speeches as symbols of all labor leaders. On the other side of the fence, many labor leaders are happy about the revelations concerning Nathan Sheffermann and the businesses represented by him, and they label them as characteristic of all businessmen. Yet businessmen and labor men both know better; they deal with each other, and they know that the vast majority of both groups are honest. Should not this be talked about frankly and candidly so that legislation in this most important area can be based upon facts rather than slogans?

The questions could be multiplied. What about our educational system, in which both labor and management have a vital stake? What about national defense? Is it too much to hope that a labor-management assembly, with the help of academicians and public figures, could discuss the implications of John Galbraith's thesis that we have reached the state of an affluent society and must seek goals other than steadily increasing production of consumer goods? The list of subjects which could be discussed and which are not now being discussed is endless.

I am, I believe, a realist. I know that creating a forum such as I propose will not solve, and could even aggravate, the problem of reaching mutual understanding. I am aware that at a meeting such as this men will read prepared speeches, setting forth their maximum positions and that the pressure from their own side against concessions may dim the chance of fruitful discussion. But I am similarly aware of what the General Assembly of the United Nations, with even greater problems, has accomplished, as well as what it has not accomplished, in relaxing international tensions.

Without expecting too much, and without even hoping for too much, I believe that a labor-management assembly would be good for labor and management and the American public. For if we make no effort, the alternative is a widening of the chasm, a hardening of attitudes, and eventually the development of a militant class consciousness—the absence of which has been one of the strengths of democratic America.

What is called for is a greater recognition of mutuality of interest. Mind you, mutual respect does not mean artificial unanimity of thought. Within the framework of mutual acceptance and mutual respect, there is wide room for diversity of opinion. But can we not work, labor and management alike, to solve common problems through the development of a program which will promote the Nation's economic health, and will advance the growth of both business enterprise and labor? It seems to me that in both management and labor there must be the vision and imagination needed to develop a program based on the premise that what is good for America is good for those who own and manage and for those who belong to our free trade unions.

Gen. William Donovan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, Gen. William Donovan, a lifelong friend of mine,

passed away yesterday at the Walter Reed Army Hospital where he had been a patient for a long period of time. Only a few days ago I sent my dear friend of football and first World War I days a message through a mutual friend. No man could know "Wild Bill" Donovan, as he was affectionately called, without respecting and loving him as a man. One of the great contributions which my friend made to his country was the fine example of patriotic citizenship that he set before the youth of our country. His was a life dedicated to the service of the United States. Few men have honored and ennobled his country in the field of patriotic service in the U.S. Army and in the diplomatic service to the extent that he has honored and ennobled it.

Bill Donovan, you have honored your country and your fellow citizens beyond any words of mine can adequately express. The heartfelt sympathy of Mrs. Reed and me are extended to Mrs. Donovan.

As a part of my remarks I insert the following excerpt from the Washington Evening Star of February 9, 1959:

HONORED AS ATHLETE

He was honored in quite another field in 1955 when Columbia University presented its athletic award to him to commemorate his days as one of the university's great quarterbacks and his 50 years of devoted service as an alumnus.

The general was one of the founders of the American Legion, although he differed with the Legion when it sought special benefits for able-bodied veterans.

Throughout the postwar years he often asserted that the United States was losing the cold war with the Soviet Union and called for stiff measures to combat it. He urged use of the best brains and most courageous spirits to wage an economic, political, and psychological counteroffensive to Soviet subversion throughout the world.

He also called for a just and reasonable security program in government and warned against "muddle headed" thinking on the subject.

C. R. "Pink" Gutermuth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday night the National Association of Soil Conversation Districts conferred another honor upon one of this Nation's great conservationists.

At the annual banquet in Houston, Tex., the association gave C. R. "Pink" Gutermuth its distinguished service award.

NASCD President Nolen J. Faqua cited Gutermuth for his long years of successful effort in promoting management of the Nation's soil, water, wildlife and related sources. The award is given in recognition to soil conservation districts and in dedication to their principles of "Conservation—development—self-government." The association represents the more than 2,700 farmer-supervised soil conservation districts throughout the United States and its Territories.

Former recipients of the award include Ervin L. Peterson, Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture; Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, first Chief of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service; and Donald A. Williams, present SCS head.

Gutermuth has been the vice president of the institute, an influential private organization with headquarters in Washington, D. C., since 1946. Prior to that he was secretary of the American Wildlife Institute. He currently is a trustee and the secretary of the North American Wildlife Foundation, vice chairman of the Natural Resources Council of America, and a trustee of both the Wildlife Society and Stronghold, Inc. (Sugar Loaf Mountain, Md.).

He is chairman of the steering committe for the annual National Watershed Congress that is sponsored by more than 20 leading industrial, agricultural, and conservation organizations. From 1934 to 1942 he was first director of education and then director of fish and game of the Indiana Department of Conservation.

In 1957 he received the Leopold Medal of the Wildlife Society, the highest award of that professional organization of wildlife scientists.

Hawaiian Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution of the State of New Mexico:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 5

Memorializing the Congress of these United States to extend the fullest rights, duties, and blessings of statehood upon Hawaii by admitting her to the Union of the United States of America

Whereas over 99 percent of the pupils in the in the public schools of Hawaii are citizens of the United States; and

Whereas the half million people of the islands include among their members large numbers of three great racial groups who speak five of the greatest languages heard around the world; and

Whereas members of nearly 50 language and racial groups and subgroups have long been associated together in amity and mutual esteem in the public schools of the Territory; and

Whereas as long ago as 1851 the islanders secretly petitioned these United States to be taken under our protection; and

Whereas the islands of Hawaii were annexed by joint resolution of Congress in 1898 and established as a Territory by law in 1900; and

Whereas the people of the Territory have amply demonstrated their capacity for self-government and self-reliance; and

Whereas the people of the United States must demonstrate to the world that our published ideals of liberty, fraternity, and equality are in truth a living creed to which we adhere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to admit Hawaii to statehood without delay; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the members of the New Mexico delegation to the U.S. Congress.

ED V. MEAD,
President of the Senate.
HAL THORNBERRY,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
MACK EASLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
ALBERT ROMERO,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Washington: A City in Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I have throughout my legislative career, been intensely interested in the problems presented by the rapid growth of our metropolitan centers. I have also keenly felt the need of having our Nation's Capital as the showplace of our great country. It is for this reason that I was extremely interested in a recent article appearing in Changing Times concerning the critical municipal problems facing the District of Columbia.

This article is all the more interesting in that it points up the fact that the voteless citizens of Washington are forced to look to Members of Congress from all areas of the Nation as their representatives. Because the District of Columbia has for many years been denied its right to local self-government, we are compelled to be members of their city council. I do not think that it is any reflection on our services to say that part-time attention by an overworked Congress is no substitute for a vigorous, locally elected municipal government. The serious problems the District now faces reflects this fact.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article "Washington: A City in Trouble."

WASHINGTON: A CITY IN TROUBLE

A pilgrim to our Nation's Capital comes to behold the Lincoln Memorial's brooding majesty and the classic grandeur of the Capitol. He sees these noble sights and is proud. But occasionally a visitor turns away from Washington the Capital to inspect Washington the City. What he discovers then may damage his patriotic pride. Washington is a city in trouble. Our "showplace of democracy" has some shocking shoddy exhibits on display.

Suppose, for example, that you pass up the tourist shrines for a look at the principal downtown shopping area in this capital of the free world. You expect something impressive of the core of a city of 2 million, our 11th largest metropolis. But what do you find?

"Downtown" is a characterless conglomeration of obsolete, narrow-fronted struc-

tures along a scant half-dozen blocks of F Street and G. Most of the buildings are three or four stories high, their upper floors blank and grimed from long disuse. There is nothing here that the citizen of Omaha, Kansas City or Duluth could not match or surpass right at home.

You think, perhaps, that you have missed the main stem? Then roam farther. You may happen upon Connecticut Avenue, known in the travel literature as "fashionable." Here there are a number of shops of modest distinction. Still, not even the most provincial visitor would mistake it for Fifth Avenue.

Wandering in the opposite direction from downtown is even more distressing. Quickly you encounter the welter of cut-rate retailing establishments that line Ninth Street and Seventh, many of them quite shabby and all of them cluttered.

The culture-minded might note in passing the absence of that standard ornament of great capitals, an opera house. Washington has a local operatic troupe of some merit—three productions a year—but no opera house. When New York's Met comes here on its annual tour of the provinces, it holds forth in a movie house. There is no adequate home, either, for ballet, orchestral concerts or chamber music. Congress recently authorized construction of a National Cultural Center in Foggy Bottom. Money to build it, however, will have to be raised by public contributions.

WHAT'S GOOD ENOUGH FOR HOGS

Painful as these observations may be to the out-of-towner, more and worse spectacles await. Just outside the business zone lies a morass of classic slums, acres and acres of them—starkly ugly, desperately overcrowded and dilapidated.

"The hog house on my farm," a western Senator recently declared on the Senate floor, "would be a much better place to house families than many of the places within sight of the Capitol."

His indignation caused no stir. Washington is inured to such protests, heard whenever legislation concerning housing in the city is considered. Inevitably, there is a picture in the paper showing the distinguished lawmaker gingerly eyeing a tottering privy in a trash-heaped backyard with the Capitol dome looming in the background. The periodic reappearance of this photographic cliché evokes little comment. There is silent disapproval but no sense of outrage.

Perhaps a tourist compound ought to be established, bounded by the White House, the Capitol, the Jefferson Memorial and Arlington Amphitheater. No special penalty would be necessary for border violations. What you would see would be punishment enough.

Yet, not even the most discerning tourist can begin to plumb the depth of Washington's troubles. He may observe that a great deal of the Northwest section bears the scars of creeping blight. But he could only guess that this area contains the city's "wickedest precinct," where many hard-working, struggling families live surrounded by disease, crime, and delinquency. Here more than a quarter of the homes are deficient in three or more respects, such as being overcrowded or lacking adequate plumbing or water supply. Incomes average less than $250 a month, although even modest family living here calls for about $400 a month. During the past year, schoolteachers were buying lunches out of their own pockets for hungry children, and 1,300 children were absent from school because they had no shoes.

This area has been staked out for a renewal program featuring demolition of hopeless buildings and rehabilitation of those worth salvaging. How successful this effort will be remains to be seen. Bad as conditions are, they are better than those that existed until recently in the Southwest quarter. There, behind the stately Government buildings on the Mall, housing was so far gone that it was leveled to the ground. It will be replaced with handsome town houses and luxury apartments that few of the area's former residents can afford to occupy.

Clearing Washington's slums is complicated by the fact that it is becoming a black city. Already 48 percent of the District of Columbia's residents are Negroes, and soon they will outnumber whites.

The colored Washingtonians are not shiftless Uncle Toms. A high proportion are well schooled and hold white-collar jobs. But the low-income slum dwellers also are predominantly Negro. And, unlike their white neighbors, they cannot escape the city by moving to the suburbs. By and large, the Maryland and Virginia suburbs do not welcome Negroes.

The inevitable, unanswered question is, How can the city's congestion be eased when so many of its people have no other place to go?

THE PENALTIES OF GROWTH

But Washington's woes are not just the worries of its colored residents. White Washingtonians are bedeviled by dilemmas, too.

Take traffic. Washington's big industry, government, is not on the rim of the business district but smack downtown. Over half a million people fight their way into the heart of the city every morning and back out again at night. Some 400,000 come by car, nearly 200,000 more by public transit, mainly buses that vie with private autos for street room. There are five private transit companies, regulated by four public agencies.

The ebb and flow of this mighty tide produces monumental, snail-paced traffic jams on the arteries leading north and east to the Maryland suburbs. Traffic to the Virginia suburbs is bottlenecked at the Potomac bridges, which bear the frightful burden of one of the world's heaviest traffic concentrations. Six solid lanes converge on one span that, alas, has room for only three and built for two.

Or take the water supply. The city proper quaffs the Potomac. So do some suburbs. Others are supplied by private wells, subdivision wells, and several systems tapping nearby streams. Some water systems are publicly owned, others are private utilities. Twenty-five different water rate schedules are in effect. What you pay depends on where you live. The cheapest rate applies in the District. In some suburbs, water costs nearly four times as much.

So far, there has been enough water to go around, despite occasional droughts in the suburbs. But the region's thirst has grown stupendously. The water table has dropped and already dependence on wells is risky. Competition for the Potomac's bounty has become so keen that someday the river could be drained dry before it reaches Washington.

The suburbs are clawing each other in their anxiety to preempt future water supplies. One Virginia suburb, Falls Church, makes a tidy profit peddling water to its neighbors.

Or take the Potomac itself. To the casual visitor, this watery expanse looks like an elegant recreational resource. But no Washingtonian would willingly dip a toe into it. The Potomac is scandalously polluted. Its waters are thick with debris and silt and fouled with raw sewage. Only 32 percent of the solids are removed from sewage before it is dumped, so to speak, in the front yard. If it rains too hard, however, untreated sewage overflows directly into the river. The situation is most noisome in midsummer. Then the Potomac's flow becomes so leisurely that a drop of water takes 40 days to pass the city. In the meantime, tides slowly swish the accumulated filth back and forth before the city.

Washington's problems, of course, are not novelties. Every big city worries about stagnation downtown, the traffic buildup and the drain of vitality to the suburbs. These are repercussions of explosive growth. Washington has earned its growing pains by doubling in size since 1940. A decade ago, it was solemnly foreseen that the population would reach 2 million by 1980. It has hit that mark already.

IS ANYBODY IN CHARGE?

The real puzzle is why this city, so much more fortunately situated than some, should be so helpless before its problems. Much of the time it appears to be apathetic to the point of criminal negligence. On other occasions, as when a proposal for a new Potomac crossing was stalled in a dispute over the comparative esthetic merits of a bridge versus a tunnel, it simply looks inept. Shouldn't a city whose one big industry is government do a better job of governing itself?

One basic trouble is that the power to govern is Balkanized. The city proper is no city at all, but a compact Federal enclave of 70 square miles known as the District of Columbia. The real Washington is a metropolitan area covering nearly 1,500 square miles. While the District of Columbia is under Federal jurisdiction, the actual city also embraces two Maryland counties, Montgomery and Prince Georges, two Virginia cities, Alexandria and Falls Church, and two Virginia counties, Arlington and Fairfax. In total, counting all units from the U.S. Government and two sovereign States down to the smallest trash-collection district, some 79 governments have a finger in running Washington.

Still, one can't put all the blame on the multiplicity of jurisdictions. Washington would be in trouble if it never had outgrown the District of Columbia. Its local governments is an anomalous freak unlike anything else in the land.

The District, remember, is neither city nor State. It isn't even a Territory. Its citizens have no governor, no council, no mayor. Like convicted felons and mental incompetents, they have no vote in either local or national affairs.

In the first half of the last century, Washingtonians did elect a city council and for a period chose their own mayor. As late as the 1870's they were choosing members of one house of a local bicameral assembly and a nonvoting delegate to Congress. Since 1878, however, the District has been run by a three-man Commission appointed by the President. Two are civilian residents of the District, the third an Army officer chosen from the Corps of Engineers.

Structurally, the local government is an administrative hodge-podge. An issue of land-use planning, for instance, is likely to be caught in a snarl involving the National Capital Planning Commission, a Federal body headed by a resident of St. Louis, Mo.; the Redevelopment Land Agency, an independent Federal body; the National Capital Housing Authority, still another independent agency; the highway department, a division of the District Government; the National Park Service, a Federal agency with duties all over the United States, its Territories and possessions, perhaps even the Commission of Fine Arts and the Bureau of the Budget, which has global worries.

There is a body known as the National Capital Regional Planning Council intended to provide a meeting ground for these diverse interests and their Maryland and Virginia counterparts. But it has neither money nor power.

FIVE HUNDRED MAYORS TOO MANY

For that matter, even the proconsular District Commissioners have little final author-

ity. The actual seat of power is on Capitol Hill, in Congress. Both Senate and House have standing committees to make law for the District of Columbia. In effect, the city has two separate but overlapping city councils. The current mayors are elected by voters of South Carolina and Nevada. Since few Congressmen or Senators are anxious to lavish their eminence on municipal matters of no consequence to their constituencies, assignments to the District committees are not eagerly sought.

A national legislature of 531 members makes a cumbersome town council. City ordinances have to run through the same legislative mill as multibillion-dollar measures affecting the security of the Nation and the peace of the world.

Under such conditions, Washingtonians themselves hardly can be blamed for not running a more efficient city. They are alert, intelligent and perhaps more solidly organized into vocal neighborhood associations than the people of any other city. But their disenfranchisement obliges them to focus on neighborhood concerns. They wind up obsessed by petty problems, often apathetic to big ones.

At the same time, a high proportion of Washingtonians are transplants from elsewhere in the Union. They tend to consider themselves citizens of Kalamazoo or Keokuk, or wherever they hail from, who are temporarily resident in the Capital. This is license for indifference to local issues, except when a local matter touches some sensitive nerve. Then they needle their Senators and Congressmen from back home into backing their individual views. Sometimes this bigtime lobbying on smalltime matters reaches ludicrous proportions, as when almost 100 separate bills were introduced in Congress to block the Government from obtaining a needed building site that happened to be owned by a farflung and politically hep organization.

Washington's lack of control over its civic destiny produces a curious lack of local leadership, too. There are no industrialists of the stripe whose zeal for civic betterment has meant so much to other cities. Washington's businessmen are limited primarily to real estate, retailing, and local banking. There have been some recent stirrings of civic consciousness, but so far few men of vigor and vision have emerged to tackle the city's problems.

Able men who live beyond the city limits find ample uses for their talents in their own bailiwicks. Washington's homegrown leaders meet one of two fates. Either they make a bid for national stature, trading on opportunities that naturally abound in a national capital, or they attain some innocuous local celebrity such as becoming chairman of the Cherry Blossom Festival. But their chances of becoming effective city leaders are slight.

So here bumbles your Nation's Capital, a city more populous than 17 different States, with nobody in charge and everybody hobbled. If George Washington could return today, he might be amazed to see how the city he and Major L'Enfant conceived had outgrown their vision. Yet, one wonders. Would Washington just sleep here?

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*.....6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*.....1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*.....
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*.....
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*.....
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*.....
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*.....
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*.....
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Engle, Clair, *Calif*.....3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*.....University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*.....
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*.....
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*.....
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*.....5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*.....
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*.....3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*.....
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*.....419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*.....The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*.....
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*.....
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*.....Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*.....
Proxmire, William, *Wis*.....
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John, *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*.....
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*.....

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla.*	5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*	
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*	
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*	
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.*	University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.*	911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.*	3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.*	113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*	
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*	
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*	
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*	
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*	
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.*	Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*	
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*	
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*	
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*	
Bates, William H., *Mass.*	
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*	
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*	
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.*	1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.*	3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*	
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*	
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*	
Boggs, Hale, *La.*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.*	3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.*	Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*	
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*	
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.*	The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*	
Brademas, John, *Ind.*	
Bray, William G., *Ind.*	
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*	
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*	
Brooks, Overton, *La.*	4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.*	3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*	Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.*	Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*	
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*	
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*	
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*	
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*	
Burke, James A., *Mass.*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.*	2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.*	1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*	
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*	
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*	
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*	
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*	
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*	
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.*	1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.*	3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*	
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.*	2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*	
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*	
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.*	2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla.*	6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.*	4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*	
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.*	3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*	
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*	
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.*	4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*	
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*	
Dent, John H., *Pa.*	
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*	
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*	
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*	1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*	
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*	
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*	
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*	
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*	
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.*	3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*	
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.*	The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*	
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.*	3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.*	The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*	
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*	
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.*	1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*	
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.*	4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*	
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.*	The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.*	Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*	
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.*	6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*	
George, Newell A., *Kans.*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*	
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*	
Grant, George M., *Ala.*	4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*	
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*	
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*	
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*	
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*	
Haley, James A., *Fla.*	
Hall, David M., *N. C.*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*	
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*	
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*	
Harris, Oren, *Ark.*	1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*	
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*	
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*	
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*	
Hess, William E., *Ohio*	
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*	
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*	100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.*	3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*	
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*	
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*	
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*	
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*	
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*	
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.*	The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*	
Jarman, John, *Okla.*	
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*	
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*	2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*	
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*	
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*	
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.*	1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*	
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.*	3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*	
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.*	Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*	
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*	
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*	
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.*	The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*	
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.*	3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.*	4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*	
King, David S., *Utah*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*	
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*	
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*	
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*	

Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio.*
Lennon, Alton, *N. C.*
Lesinski, John, *Mich.*
Levering, Robert W., *Ohio.*
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.*—224 C St. NE.
Lindsay, John V., *N. Y.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn.*—The Congressional
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, William M., *Ohio*—4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McFall, John J., *Calif.*—507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGinley, Donald F., *Nebr.*
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak.*
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*
McSween, Harold B., *La.*
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—115 Dale Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
May, Catherine, *Wash.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Meyer, William H., *Vt.*
Michel, Robert H., *Ill.*
Miller, Clement W., *Calif.*
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Milliken, William H., Jr., *Pa.*
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.*—8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga.*
Moeller, Walter H., *Ohio.*
Monagan, John S., *Conn.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va.*
Moorhead, William S., *Pa.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morris, Thomas G., *N. Mex.*
Morris, Toby, *Okla.*—220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*—204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murphy, William T., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*
Nelsen, Ancher, *Minn.*
Nix, Robert N. C., *Pa.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, James G., *Mich.*
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass.*
Oliver, James C., *Maine.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Pirnie, Alexander, *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—228 2d St. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg.*
Powell, Adam C., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Prokop, Stanley A., *Pa.*
Pucinski, Roman C., *Ill.*
Quie, Albert H., *Minn.*—The Coronet Apt., 200 C St. SE.
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—5603 24th Ave. SE., Hillcrest Hgts., Wash. 21, D. C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Rivers, Ralph J., *Alaska.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y.*
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rostenkowski, Dan, *Ill.*
Roush, J. Edward, *Ind.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y.*
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.*—2601 Woodley Pl.
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio.*
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Shipley, George E., *Ill.*
Short, Don L., *N. Dak.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Edna Oakes, *Ill.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Slack, John M., Jr., *W. Va.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Neal, *Iowa.*
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Stratton, Samuel S., *N. Y.*—107 Martha's Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Stubblefield, Frank A., *Ky.*
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y.*—Mayflower Hotel
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—3301 Mass. Ave.
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Toll, Herman, *Pa.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Ullman, Al, *Oreg.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Wallhauser, George M., *N. J.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Wampler, Fred, *Ind.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Weis, Jessica McC., *N. Y.*
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Rd. S., Arlington, Va.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolf, Leonard G., *Iowa.*
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, John, *Tex.*
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Burns, John A., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 216 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Serles, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1630 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Place SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Appendix

Four Hundred Million Dollars To Be Spent—But Where and for What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 286, at the request of the Department of State, which provides for the appointment of an assistant to the Secretary of State to assure joint policy and planning and equitable budgeting of exchange-of-persons program and administrative cooperation between staffs engaged in carrying out such programs.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate, has introduced the companion bill, S. 455, for himself and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, in the other House.

I include here the text of two letters I have received from the Department of State, together with information on progress made to date in the coordination of the international educational and cultural relations of the United States.

I include here the text of my bill, H.R. 286, which the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT] has cosponsored with me as H.R. 1987.

Finally, I include here the text of a splendid background article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch by Raymond P. Brandt, chief Washington correspondent of that great newspaper. This article shows conclusively, I think, that this legislation is long overdue and, further, why it must be enacted without further delay.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 8, 1958.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Last year the Department endeavored to obtain, through legislation which you sponsored, the establishment of the position of a Special Assistant to the Secretary for International Cultural Relations. As you know, the Department has for some time recognized the need for the creation of such a high level position, to be filled by Presidential appointment by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in order to achieve the important objective of having a coordinated, governmentwide effort in the field of our exchange-of-persons and other cultural programs with foreign countries.

In the last session of Congress S. 3112 (companion bill to H.R. 10031), providing for the establishment of such a position, passed the Senate but was not acted upon by the House. The urgent need for having a Special Assistant to the Secretary, however, remained.

In order to deal with the problem on an interim basis, and until legislation can be obtained which will give this position the status which the Department believes it should be accorded, there has been created within the Department by Executive order the position of Special Assistant to the Secretary for the Coordination of International Education and Cultural Relations at the GS–18 level. The Honorable Robert H. Thayer, former Minister to Rumania, who has more recently served as special assistant to the Director of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research in the Department, has been selected to fill this position.

It is our hope that legislation similar to S. 3112 can be obtained in the next Congress. Knowing of your deep interest in this matter, I hope that we may continue to look to you for assistance in this regard.

If you should wish to discuss this matter at further length, I shall be happy to meet with you at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE
SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, February 2, 1959.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I enjoyed very much listening to your speech at the panel on the performing arts during the IIE Conference last week and only regret that a meeting with the Under Secretary at 4 o'clock made it impossible for me to stay until the end of the meeting and take the opportunity of meeting you. I am taking the liberty of enclosing a copy of a progress report which I sent the Secretary recently and hope for an early chance to meet with you and discuss the increasing number of problems with which I am necessarily confronted in this job.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT H. THAYER.

To: The Secretary of State.
Through: S/S.
From S/IC—Robert H. Thayer, Special Assistant to Secretary of State for Coordination of International Cultural Affairs.
Subject: Progress Report on Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Relations.

Since I have assumed the position of Special Assistant for the Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Relations the following actions have been initiated:

1. A meeting has been held, called and chaired by Under Secretary Herter, of representatives at the Under Secretary level of 15 Government agencies engaged in the field of exchange of persons, technical assistance, etc., to explain the basis for the creation of the position of Special Assistant. The minutes of this meeting are attached (tab A) together with a copy of the charts used by Under Secretary Herter at the meeting (tab B).

2. At Under Secretary Herter's request, these agencies have designated individuals at the Assistant Secretary level upon whom I have personally called to discuss preparations for the issuance of questionnaires in the conduct of a survey of what those agencies are doing in this field. A list of these agencies with the name of the individuals designated is attached (tab C).

3. Questionnaires have already been forwarded to IES, ICA, USIA, and the Department of Defense with the request that this information be provided by the end of this month, if possible.

4. A task force has been organized at the working level to set up and staff a clearinghouse of information which will be kept current and maintained as a basis for planning the coordinated U.S. effort, country by country; a brief prospectus of this clearinghouse is attached (tab D).

5. I am making personal calls on the Presidents of the principal foundations to try to persuade them to conduct their own survey on what all non-Government agencies are doing in this field and to set up a celaringhouse for this information. I have had encouraging reactions from Dr. Heald of the Ford Foundation and particularly from Dr. Gardner of Carnegie Corp.

6. In cooperation with ICA, I hope to organize a 2-day seminar of seven or eight leading university presidents at some such place as Arden House for the purpose of discussing with appropriate representatives of State, ICA, USIA, and Defense the problem of whether the type of education being given to foreigners visiting the United States annually is appropriate to the objectives of our overall foreign policy.

7. In cooperation with ICA, I am discussing the assignment of a research officer to make a study of whether, in carrying out our programs of exchange of persons and technical assistance, we are making appropriate use of the available facilities of the universities of the United States.

8. I am preparing a cabinet presentation of plans for the coordination of the work of all U.S. Government agencies in this field, including a draft of an Executive order to be signed by the President directing that such coordination be the responsibility of the Secretary of State.

9. I am under continuous pressure from various parts of the Department to name a specific date on which I shall be prepared to take over the operating functions of the sections of the public affairs area now engaged in the exchange of persons and international, educational, and cultural field. These sections include the International Educational Exchange Service, East-West contacts staff, UNESCO relations staff, cultural presentation staff, arts and monuments adviser, cultural planning and coordination staff, and the Executive Secretariat of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange. However, until my functions as coordinator have been more fully developed, and the above described coordinating plans further advanced, I believe that I should devote all of my time to this larger and more important effort and postpone the transfer of operating functions. In any event, I would expect the actual operation of the various sections of the public affairs area to be carried out by a deputy under by general supervision, and I believe it most important that this deputy should be selected with particular care.

REPRESENTATIVES OF U.S. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES ENGAGED IN INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL RELATIONS PROGRAMS

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Robert A. Kevan, Assistant to the Secretary of HEW for International Affairs.

U.S. Information Agency: Saxton Bradford, Deputy Director, Policy and Planning.

Department of Labor: George Lodge, Assistant Secretary.

National Archives and Records Service: Dr. Robert H. Bahmer, Deputy Archivist.

Department of the Interior: Royce A. Hardy, Assistant Secretary for Mineral Resources.

National Science Foundation: James M. Mitchell, Associate Director (Management and Public Affairs).

Library of Congress: Rutherford D. Rogers, Chief Assistant Librarian.

Department of Agriculture: Clarence L. Miller, Assistant Secretary.

Department of Defense: Charles H. Shuff, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Military Assistance Programs (Office of Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs).

Smithsonian Institution: Mrs. John A. Pope, Chief, Traveling Exhibition Service.

Department of Commerce: Ralph Homan, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for International Affairs.

Department of the Treasury: T. Graydon Upton, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

U.S. Atomic Energy Commission: John A. Hall, Assistant General Manager for International Activities.

International Cooperation Administration: James H. Smith, Jr., Director, ICA.

PROPOSED CLEARINGHOUSE OF INFORMATION ON THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES OF AGENCIES OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT—A PROSPECTUS

THE OBJECTIVE

To make it possible for those planning a program of educational and/or cultural activity in any foreign country to be accurately informed concerning existing U.S. programs in that field in order that such planning can take its appropirate place in an effective, coordinated U.S. effort.

THE PROBLEM

To set up an organization with modern, mechanical facilities adapted to maintain information on activities of U.S. Government agencies in the international educational and cultural field; to keep such information current in the various categories appropriate for use in coordinated planning; and to maintain evaluated information on the tools necessary for the conduct of such programs.

DISCUSSION

This clearinghouse should be charged with maintaining current information on all U.S. activities, country by country, in a form usable at any time for general information purposes. The clearinghouse should be appropriately staffed, not only to catalog existing activities of Government agencies, but also to keep information on the tools useful to the conduct of these activities by the agencies concerned, such as an evaluated list of area specialists, teachers of English and individual foreign languages, up-to-date methods of language teaching, current educational and cultural needs of individual countries, etc.

The clearinghouse should be charged with the responsibility of disseminating to various Government agencies detailed information regarding related activities of other agencies and should be prepared to issue upon request special reports covering information in its files or from other sources. All interested agencies should be represented directly or indirectly in the clearinghouse to keep their agency currently and appropriately informed of its resources.

The clearing house should be charged with the responsibility of maintaining a public bureau of information which would answer requests for information from private, nongovernment individuals and institutions with legitimate interests.

It should be emphasized that this information clearinghouse is not intended to be a place which would contain only an inventory of activities, but is to be a center where readily available information can be collected, processed, and disseminated as an aid to the general coordinating problem. Its existence is based on the theory that complete knowledge of all programs in the educational and cultural field being conducted by U.S. agencies in any one country will enable agencies to fill existing gaps, prevent duplication, and generally facilitate effective, coordinated action in that country.

It is understood, of course, that the maintenance of such a clearinghouse will require a substantial staff and the annual expenditure of considerable sums of money for maintenance and servicing. This staff should consist of an adequate number of technicians to operate the most modern machinery for making the information contained therein available in its most usable form, as well as individuals qualified to process the information and do such evaluation as may be possible. Research and reports personnel should also be attached to the clearinghouse.

It is hoped that nongovernmental institutions can be induced either to set up a similar clearinghouse of activities in the educational and cultural field in which they are engaged, in which event a close liaison would be maintained between the two clearinghouses, or else to participate in the U.S. agency clearinghouse in whatever manner may be appropriate.

H.R. 286

A bill to provide for the appointment of an assistant to the Secretary of State to assure joint policy and planning and equitable budgeting of exchange of persons programs and administrative cooperation between staffs engaged in carrying out such programs

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there shall be in the Department of State an assistant to the Secretary of State to be known as the Assistant for International Cultural Relations (hereafter referred to in this Act as the "assistant"), who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) The annual rate of basic compensation for the position of assistant created by subsection (a) of this section shall be established by the Secretary of State in an amount not to exceed the annual rate of basic compensation established by section 106(a) of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 for Assistant Secretaries of State.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the assistant, under the general direction of the Secretary of State, (1) to coordinate the international exchange programs of the Department of State under section 32(b)(2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956, or other provisions of law relating to the exchange of persons, with a view to assuring joint policy and planning and equitable budgeting of such programs, and administrative cooperation between staffs engaged in carrying out such programs, and (2) to perform such other functions as may be assigned by the Secretary of State or prescribed by law.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 1, 1959]

FOUR HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS TO BE SPENT—BUT WHERE AND FOR WHAT?

(By Raymond P. Brandt)

WASHINGTON, January 31.—This year the American Government and American private institutions will spend more than $400 million on educational, cultural, and technical exchanges of persons with free and neutral nations, yet no one knows exactly where the money goes or can estimate the value of these programs to this and the other countries.

An attempt to correct this situation has been made in the appointment of Robert H. Thayer, former minister to Rumania, as Special Assistant to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles for Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Relations.

His selection last month followed Senate passage last session of a bill jointly sponsored by Democratic Senators J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, calling for the appointment of an Assistant Secretary of State to do this needed job. A similar bill died in the House but legislation to make Thayer an Assistant Secretary of State is expected to be approved this session.

The need for a high-level official to study, coordinate, and subsequently perhaps to supervise more than a score of major exchange projects, was emphasized in a recent report by the International Operations Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee. The report said in a forward:

"Government programs in international education are both extensive and varied. In view of their cost, their worth is a matter of concern to the U.S. Government and the American taxpayer.

"A major obstacle to appraising their value has been the fact that nowhere has it been possible to find an ordered body of information of how many programs and of what kind are currently in operation."

The 251-page report was the work of five experts on the subcommittee staff and in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. The report itself said in part:

"Although some informal and irregular intra-agency relationship exists, no single executive or legislative agency or committee has an overall responsibility for coordination of these programs. * * *

"An accurate calculation of total expenditures by the U.S. Government for international educational activities cannot be made from data presently available. Not even estimates of some of the costs are available."

The report, both a survey and a handbook, is the most definitive study yet made of these programs, yet it lacks timely information about the system the Soviet Union uses to get greater returns for the money it spends on similar exchanges.

Thayer doubts that his or any other Government agency can get adequate information about the Soviet system of educational, technical, and cultural exchanges. Both the Communist government and the Communist Party have had for 30 years a worldwide system of recruitment for young people and technicians to come to the Soviet Union, later to its satellites, for education and indoctrination. This enables the Kremlin to use the services of Russian-trained nationals in local revolutionary and subversive activities.

It is known that last year at least 654 young people from the free world went to Russian schools, whereas only 19 Russian students enrolled in free world educational institutions. It is not known how many students the Soviet bloc nations exchanged among themselves.

It is not known how much the Kremlin spends annually on its entire international educational, cultural, and technical exchange program. It may be more or less than the amount spent by Americans.

Thayer, who has been on his new job for about 6 weeks, estimates roughly that the Government and American private organizations will spend a total of $429 million this year on about 250 exchange programs. The general breakdown follows:

	Million
Nongovernmental—$215 million International Cooperation Administration	$129
State Department	20
Defense Department	35
U.S. Information Agency	10
U.S. share of multinations agencies	20

The nongovernmental institutions include such famous and respected names as the Carnegie, Rockefeller, Ford, and Guggenheim Foundations, which consider improvement of public-health conditions as part of the educational and technical programs. Their lesser operations extend down to the internal programs of American universities and religious organizations.

Far more information is available about nongovernmental projects, individually, by countries, and even continents, than about the Federal programs. There is considerable cooperation among the larger foundations to avoid duplication and competition.

The International Cooperation Administration's part in the Government's share is mostly for technical assistance. It was not until this week that the ICA made public its outlays by countries for its overall economic and military aid. For much of its technical and educational activities the ICA uses the equivalent of millions of dollars in local currencies it receives from the sale of surplus agricultural products abroad. The House report estimated these technical assistance programs provided training and teaching opportunities in the United States and abroad for about 11,800 persons in fiscal year 1958.

The State Department's operations are mostly for the Fulbright scholarships which the Arkansas Senator initiated in 1946. They are financed chiefly by local currencies and credits obtained from the sale of American wartime materials. Later laws provided additional funds in local currencies running into the equivalent of unestimated millions of dollars. The $20 million listed for the State Department is an annual appropriation in American money for supplemental payments to Americans abroad and, in exceptional cases, to foreigners studying in this country. There were more than 6,000 participants in these programs in 1957. About a third were Americans studying or teaching abroad.

The Defense Department expenditures, roughly estimated, range from the cost of American military advisory missions in allied and neutral countries down to the training of foreign noncommissioned officers in this country.

Similar but far smaller unlisted expenditures are made by the Atomic Energy Commission, the Public Health Service, and others.

The U.S. Information Agency's $10 million quota covers libraries abroad, its educational broadcasts and distribution of books, magazines, and motion pictures.

The multinational agencies' outlays go mostly to the United Nations educational, scientific and cultural organization and the Organization of American States, formerly the Pan-American Union.

The House committee report hit only the high spots of the problems faced by Thayer. Although the five experts had unusual access to all Government departments and agencies and worked for more than a year, they made no positive recommendations. Their criticisms were by implication.

Thayer told the Post-Dispatch he thought it would take more than a year for him and his small staff to assemble the basic information essential for policy recommendations to Federal agencies. He emphasized that the Federal Government could not dictate to the private groups, only suggest informally the benefits of cooperation and coordination.

"The first step," he said, "is to establish a clearinghouse of all pertinent information, governmental and private. * * * Once we have the basic information, the next step will be to keep it current and available. We shall start with about 15 agencies and 10 countries. We hope to have the latest IBM machines to keep track of every exchange activity, including the nongovernmental, in every country.

"Such complete information about the major programs in all countries would enable the American agencies to coordinate their programs and avoid duplication. It might be found that we were doing enough in one country and that new efforts could be more advantageously put in some other country."

Thayer said he thought such information should be available both in this country and the other participating countries. One unanswered question is whether lists should be kept of individuals benefiting from the exchanges. The theory advanced by opponents of lists is that if a participating country came under control of the Communists, the participants would be among the first to be liquidated.

Persons advocating the individualists idea argue that the local Communists would have such information anyway and that it is desirable to follow up the careers of the participants to determine whether the programs are worthwhile. The follow-up process is just getting started in some Government agencies.

Once the information clearinghouse is established. Thayer said, there could be a coordination of Government expenditures and policies and closer cooperation with the private agencies.

Eventually, it is believed, it would be more efficient if a single section of the State Department had overall policy control over the governmental exchange programs, comparable to the direction given American foreign aid by C. Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

Thayer's experience has been chiefly as a lawyer and foreign service officer. He is 57 years old, a son of the headmaster of St. Mark's preparatory school in Massachusetts. He attended Amherst College and Harvard University, where he was a member of the exclusive Porcellian Club. He was in the New York law firm of Cadwalader, Wickersham and Taft.

In 1926 he married Virginia Pratt, whose family fortune stemmed from the Rockefeller oil interests. He was an assistant district attorney for New York County from 1937 to 1941, when he entered the Navy as a lieutenant commander and emerged in 1945 as a commander. He was an assistant to John Foster Dulles at the San Francisco U.N. conference in 1945. He lost his contest for a seat in the House from Brooklyn in 1946.

From 1951 to 1954 he was assistant to the American Ambassador to France, in charge of SHAPE relations. In 1955, he was appointed American Minister to Romania. He returned to this country to serve in the intelligence and research division of the State Department.

Let's Hope the Flagmakers Get Another Job Real Soon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial from the Reading (Pa.) Times:

LET'S HOPE THE FLAGMAKERS GET ANOTHER JOB REAL SOON

We hope the flagmakers will take it a bit slowly in the production of the new 49-star flag dictated by the admission of Alaska into the Union. For we hope by the time the 1st session of the 86th Congress completes its chores, Hawaii will be the 50th State.

We are impelled to this thought by the news in the papers the other day that the first session of the Legislature of the State of Alaska got underway and we fell to wondering whether a similar conclave might not be getting into action in Honolulu about this time next year.

The State of Alaska has many problems before it. It will have to evolve its own way of life and legislate accordingly. And Alaska's way of statehood is bound to be quite different, up there close to the Arctic, close to Red Russia, and still fairly close to the main body of the States, from that of other States. We in the older 48 States must not expect miracles day after tomorrow. We must let Alaskans feel their way and if they occasionally do something which we do not see eye to eye with, as fellow Americans we must try to understand them.

In the meantime Hawaii has made its big pitch for statehood. Since Alaska has now been admitted, it is our view that not a single argument against Hawaiian statehood can hold water any more. What's sauce for Alaska should be sauce for Hawaii, too.

Address of O. R. Strackbein, Chairman, the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, Before the National Wool Growers Association, Portland, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following speech made by Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, before the National Wool Growers Association at its annual convention in Portland, Oreg., on January 28, 1959:

Woolgrowers in the United States have been interested in tariff protection for many years, going back several generations. It has been a continuing fact that the leading wool-producing countries of the world have been able to produce this fiber at costs well below our own; and wool production in this country could not have survived without tariff protection.

Of course there are those esteemed academic economists who say that any industry that cannot compete with imports should be rooted out. Inability to compete with imports without a tariff, they say, is convincing evidence of inefficiency. These economists, socalled, are wholly unrealistic, however, in their stubborn oversight of the factors that make for higher costs here, some of them the direct result of national legislation. They also do not say to what use the range lands of the West should be put if they were no longer to grow wool. But for wool growing millions of acres of land would go to waste and presumably should be left to the coyotes and jackrabbits.

Unfortunately, the free-trade philosophy as expounded by the economics professors not only took hold in Washington 25 years ago, but it has become deeply imbedded there. This intrenchment, of course, is not all to be attributed to the power of the professors. They gained some very powerful allies who had a financial stake in exports, and without whom the professors would have been helpless. We have only to mention the automobile, the electrical, the steel, international oil, rubber and farm implement industries in the industrial field; and cotton, wheat, tobacco, rice, soyabeans, and a few other farm crops in the agricultural field, in order to understand the strength of their allies. The industries that have become interested in exports in the past 25 to 40 years number among them the largest in the United States, and, of course, wheatgrowing is one of the leading farm operations in the country in terms of acreage. Cotton, tobacco, and rice, though planting lesser acreages than wheat, are also important in some sections of the country, particularly the Southern States.

Then, too, there are the industrial importers who seek a low tariff or a complete removal of the tariff so that they may obtain their raw materials at the lowest prices. The largest importers today are the international oil companies. Petroleum and petroleum products have taken the lead in our import trade, having recently surpassed coffee beans.

Together with those who believe that freer trade will lead to peace of the world, such as the League of Women Voters, various religious associations, etc., these various allies make a formidable combination and wield tremendous influence in Washington. It was they who supplied the State Department economists with the powerful support they needed.

Strangely enough, the wheatgrowers, flour millers, and cottongrowers, who have been so ardent in their support of the trade-agreements program and GATT (the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), are themselves thoroughly protected against import competition by restrictive import quotas. They seem to see nothing illogical in advocacy of freer trade for everyone else while insisting upon and getting extreme protection for themselves.

It is no exaggeration to say that these highly protected agricultural groups have wielded a great deal of influence toward the extension of the trade-agreements program from time to time since 1934. Under it, as you know, there has been carried out a relentless reduction of tariffs. Since its beginning in 1934, our protection in general has been reduced a full 75 percent, mostly through actual tariff cuts, but also by following a policy not to raise specific duty rates as a means of keeping in step with increasing prices. Today the United States is one of the low tariff countries of the world.

Well, what has all this come to?

It has brought us to an unfortunate situation indeed. It has brought us to the point where Congress has in effect lost its power to make the tariff and to regulate our foreign commerce.

You may well wonder how this could have happened here in the United States; and may rightly ask, are we not a free people? Do we not have constitutional government? Do not our elected representatives carry out the will of the people?

If so, and if the Constitution places the responsibility for our tariff and for the regulation of foreign trade on Congress, as indeed it does, very clearly and unmistakably, how could it come about that Congress has lost its control in this field?

This is a natural and a logical question.

Let me bring the situation home to you in a little more concrete form. During the past year there has been a great interest in the import of meat, both in the form of dressed lamb, live cattle, and beef. In both instances the mounting imports add up to a considerable threat to prices, e specially in some parts of the country. Therefore, it would seem logical to put on some restrictions, even if only temporary, as a means of regulating imports in such a way that they would not inflict serious injury on the growers and producers of lamb and beef in this country.

Very well, what steps should be taken?

To answer this question it now seems necessary to ask another: Who regulates our foreign commerce or who adjusts the tariff?

It should not be necessary to ask such a question, since everyone, or nearly everyone, whose affairs bring him into contact with such matters, knows that Congress is responsible for the regulation of foreign commerce and for making the tariff. It says so in the Constitution as plainly as anything can be said in English. No one disputes it; not even the free traders.

Yet, something has happened. Something has indeed operated to turn the power of Congress to regulate foreign commerce into a fairytale, something to tell little children.

Today the chance of obtaining legislation to put down the threat of dressed lamb imports or of live cattle and beef imports is about as good as siphoning dry the Pacific Ocean with a soda straw.

What, indeed, has happened? Several things have happened.

The combination of export industries, import interests, free-trade theorists, etc., already described, among others, has been in support of State Department trade policies. This support made possible heavy majorities in Congress for the trade agreements program.

This fact, in turn, made it possible for the State Department to take the power delegated by Congress to the President to enter into trade agreements and use it as a means of dealing Congress itself out of its own power, and setting that body aside, like a useless and helpless assemblage.

Not only was it possible for the State Department to do so but it accomplished the feat so thoroughly that even today Congress seems to be unaware that it is tied hand and foot; and is just as free to carry out its constitutional mandate as is any man at any time to dishonor himself, to break his word, and to run out on his commitments.

That is how free Congress is in the field of its original jurisdiction and direct responsibility, i.e., in the field of tariffs and trade.

This is so because the State Department, practicing a brand of statecraft of which Machiavelli himself might have been proud, put Congress neatly into a box and nailed down the lid.

You are entitled to ask how the State Department could accomplish such a feat. The answer is that it could do so only because Congress itself was willing or indifferent; but, whatever the blame upon Congress, the Department succeeded.

How?

It used international executive agreements as its instrument. Mind you, Congress authorized such agreements in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, which it subsequently extended each time it expired, until today; but it did not authorize some of the far-reaching provisions inserted in such agreements, especially in GATT, the master agreement made in Geneva in 1947.

Like the serpents or pythons seen in the Laocoon statue, the State Department threw its coils around Congress in the form of international commitments. Before Congress knew it, the coils had gained a deathly grip that bade fair to paralyze the whole body, so far as tariff legislation is concerned.

For example, the State Department agreed in GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) to the renunciation of import quotas; in fact, proposed this ban to the other countries. As a means of persuading them to accept this provision the Department agreed to three exceptions, designed to accommodate the other countries. Only one of these exceptions applied to the United States, namely the use of import quotas to protect agricultural products if a government program called for crop restriction. In this country this exception was recognized in section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and it was under this section that the import quotas on wheat, wheat flour, cotton, peanuts, and a few other crops were imposed. Thus was gained the support of these agricultural groups.

Other countries could use import quotas if they suffered from balance of payment difficulties, i.e., dollar shortage; and they have used this exception extensively to restrict imports from this country. It is not available to us. Underdeveloped countries also may use import quotas to protect their industries. We, of course, cannot.

Now, in agreeing to the renunciation of import quotas as a means of regulating trade, the State Department was committing the future Congresses of the United States not to use one of the important and effective means, and sometimes the only effective means, of regulating foreign commerce. What did this do to the constitutional power oc Congress to carry out such regulation? The State Department had deprived Congress of a very important instrument.

Beyond that the Department also bound a number of products on the free list and numerous tariff rates at existing levels. This was the same as a commitment that Congress would leave these items alone and in fact, retire from the field.

To say then as the State Department has often said, echoed by other executive officials, that Congress is still free to legislate in this field is, to repeat, the same as saying that Congress is free to repudiate the State Department and therewith the international commitments of this country.

A more pernicious and morally repugnant interpretation could hardly be contrived. If Congress is free to act only by violating the international commitments of this country then it has no freedom at all, unless we want to go to bed morally with the Russian dictatorship.

This is the point of degradation to which the State Department has brought our Congress, so far as its constitutional function of regulating foreign commerce and shaping the tariff is concerned. Thus has been destroyed the responsiveness of Congress to the electorate. It is no longer of avail to you to vote for a Congressman or Senator if you have in mind his doing anything for you by way of regulating imports. You may not know it but you have been disfranchised as effectively as if your vote had been taken away or the ballot boxes closed.

And let me tell you that it will stay this way unless a lot of people open their eyes and do it soon; and then do something about it.

This is not all.

You have perhaps heard of the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act. It has been sold to the public through all means of communication as a remedy against serious injury from incerased imports resulting from tariff reductions. From 1934 to date every President has said clearly and emphatically that the trade agreements program and the tariff reductions made under it will not be allowed to injure or jeopardize domestic industry. Every Secretary of State since 1934 has likewise gone to Congress and testified before the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Commit-

tee, not only confirming the Presidential statements but emphasizing and reinforcing them. Other public officials have done the same, not only once but numerous times.

I am sorry to have to say that either the level of official integrity in the highest reaches of our Government is shockingly and unacceptably low, or the right hand does not know what the left one is up to.

No decent citizen can read the record with respect to the escape clause, comparing the solemn Presidential assurances and those of Cabinet officials over the years, on the one hand, with the actual record of performance, on the other, without a blush of shame. It is as clear a case of roughriding over principles and noble professions, from what is no doubt regarded as a safe position of strength, as can be found anywhere.

The Presidents since 1951, when the escape clause was first made a part of the law, after having existed in the form of an Executive order, have refused upon one pretext or another to put into effect 7 unanimous decisions of the Tariff Commission; and out of some 28 total affirmative recommendations where serious injury or a threat thereof was found by the Commission, the President has proclaimed only 10, and these were largely small cases. The Tariff Commission itself has failed to find injury in over half the cases coming before it. Across the board, therefore, the number of cases that succeed in getting through the Tariff Commission and the President represents a low batting average, indeed; and the President has in nearly all the cases in which he has accepted the Tariff Commission's recommendations and proclaimed an increase in duty or imposed a quota on crop imports watered down the Tariff Commission's recommendation.

Altogether, the record comes close to nullification of the statute.

It is not as if the congressional intent were unknown. Congress has successively amended the escape clause to make its meaning clear and to tighten its provisions for more sure protection of American industry, agriculture, and labor. Yet the output at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue has remained the same. Congress might as well have saved its breath.

The only remedy to this incredible situation lies, and must lie, in Congress itself. Certainly the State Department will not surrender the power that it has become accustomed to exercising. Quite the contrary. It has sought to make its grip permanent by negotiating the articles of a new agreement for an international trade organization in which it proposes U.S. membership. It is known as the OTC, or Organization for Trade Cooperation, and would sit in Geneva. In time the OTC would perform the broad control over our trade, as was proposed for the ITO (International Trade Organization), which failed to gain congressional approval in 1950.

Should Congress approve our membership in this new organization (the OTC) it would represent a final bowing out by that body from its responsibilities to the people. In the field of tariffs and trade, not only in policy-making but in administration, our form of Government would be changed without a constitutional amendment and without recourse. Congress would have blessed its own burial.

This must not come to pass. I hope that you will take very seriously the situation as it has developed and that you will lend a vigorous hand in helping to set Congress in an upright position once more in this field.

The ultimate fact is that all these usurpations of power by the executive have been and are being justified in the name of international relations. The contest with Russia has in recent years been used as justification for almost anything. Yet the fact is that the ousting of Congress from its seat of constitutional power in the regulation of foreign commerce was well launched and solidly anchored before our cold war with Russia began. The cold war is therefore only a handy way of justifying what had already been done for other reasons.

The truth is that the Russian military challenge, if anything, makes it all the more necessary that we preserve our industries as a matter of public policy. Congress has, indeed, recognized this through the national security amendment of the Trade Agreements Act. This amendment, like the escape clause, however, has also become a virtual dead letter in operation. Not one order has been issued under the amendment by the President although about half a dozen cases have been heard by the Office of Defense Mobilization.

As for the Russian economic challenge, it should be clear that we cannot meet it through tariff reductions, GATT Conferences in Geneva or anywhere else. If we are really concerned over the Khrushchev trade challenge we must set up a government trading corporation that can import and export quite outside of the considerations that guide private international trade.

We must be able to meet prices in competition with Russia without regard to profits. We must be willing to practice dumping where this would become necessary. We must be willing to offer higher than the market price for imports in order to prevent Russia from forcing certain shortages of raw materials on our industries, by forestalling her preclusive buying. We must be able to do many things that do not go with private export and import trade carried on for profit.

GATT would certainly take exception to any such actions by us and might hobble and hinder us. We should therefore be looking after our freedom to act according to Russian moves; or to forearm ourselves by making ready our own governmental machinery to meet any developing Russian trade challenge, rather than going before GATT with hands extended for more snug-fitting manacles.

The notion that Russia's economic challenge is an argument for freer trade is a mark of upside-down thinking. The trend will be the exact opposite since all Russian trading is done by the state without regard to profits.

What the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy seeks is a remedy against serious injury from imports on the grounds that it was never the express policy of the Trade Agreements program to reduce tariffs to such a point. Quite the contrary. We fully agree with the reduction of unnecessary barriers to trade but vehemently deny that inability of an American industry to compete with imports is any indication of either inefficiency or uneconomic status. Our industries carry cost burdens that are the result of public policy, such as high wages, farm price supports, social security, etc. These cost burdens represent an outright interference with the free market and, further, represent the opposite of free trade. Yet they appear to be here to stay, or at least for an indefinite period, rightly or wrongly.

Foreign countries with which we have trade agreements know that we entered the agreements with the reservation that any duty reduction could be modified or withdrawn if imports seriously damaged a particular industry in this country. Therefore there is no proper ground for complaint by any country if we raise the duty on imports of a product or put on a quota that prevents or remedies the injury. It is understood all around that that is our right, just as other nations have the same right. There would be room for complaint only if we should make the changes in duties or quotas capriciously or without proper investigation of the facts.

To prevent such capricious action we have hearings and investigations by the Tariff Commission. Their findings should, therefore, be the end of it (1) unless someone could successfully impugn the fairness of the hearings process or upset the factual basis of their findings; or (2) unless the Commission recommended duty rates or quotas more restrictive than the level from which they had been reduced.

If we gain recognition in actual practice of this simple principle you will be able to go before the Tariff Commission and have your case resolved on the facts; and that, I am sure, is all that you are entitled to and that is all you ask. Until that day arrives you will have to fight for your rights, and I am sure you will do that too.

Hon. R. Walter Riehlman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, we learn with a great deal of regret that our distinguished colleague, the Honorable R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, of New York, has reluctantly decided to relinquish his membership on the House Select Committee on Small Business.

Mr. RIEHLMAN's recent appointment to the very important new Committee on Science and Astronautics and his continuing membership as the second ranking Republican member on the Committee on Government Operations and ranking Republican member of the Subcommitte on Military Operations of the Committee on Government Operations, makes it virtually impossible for him to give the required time and attention to the duties involved in the Small Business Committee.

As I have said, we as Members of the House on both sides of the aisle regret to learn of Mr. RIEHLMAN's decision, but we bow to the inevitable since we realize the vast amount of time which would be required in his new committee assignment on the Committee on Science and Astronautics. Our colleague's interest in national defense has long been well and favorably known and the kindred duties in connection with the national defense on the two committees which he retains are of the utmost importance.

Mr. RIEHLMAN has said that his interest in small business and small business problems will not be diminished and I know we will call on him for the advice and counsel which he is so capable of giving after 12 years of outstanding service on the House Select Committee on Small Business.

At this point I would like to include Mr. RIEHLMAN's announcement in which he sets forth the several reasons for giving up a committee service in which he has always shown selfless and dedicated service.

Mr. RIEHLMAN's statement follows:

RIEHLMAN ANNOUNCES TERMINATION OF SERVICE ON SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

WASHINGTON, February 11, 1959.—Congressman R. WALTER RIEHLMAN announced today

that he has reluctantly decided not to accept appointment to the House Select Committee on Small Business for the 86th Congress. RIEHLMAN has served on the committee for 12 years and, due to the retirement of Representative William Hill, of Colorado, would have been the ranking Republican member. RIEHLMAN stated, "It is with a great deal of personal regret that I turn down reappointment to the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives. During my 12 years' service on the committee many accomplishments have been achieved in the interest of small business.

"I have had a vital interest in the affairs of the small businessman for many years," RIEHLMAN continued, "and I do not intend to let that interest lie dormant as a result of this decision. I shall continue my efforts in behalf of small business and I shall continue to cooperate with every proper movement in the interest of our small business economy."

In emphasizing his recent appointment to the Committee on Science and Astronautics, RIEHLMAN said, "this committee will undoubtedly become one of the most important in the House of Representatives, not only because of the tremendous responsibility it will have in keeping America in the foreground of scientific research and astronautical development, but also because of its close relationship with the development and maintenance of our national defense. Committee activities will encompass relatively new fields and hearings will be quite extensive."

RIEHLMAN pointed out that the Science and Astronautics assignment, in addition to those as second-ranking Republican on the Government Operations Committee and ranking Republican on the Military Operations Subcommittee, would require a great deal of time and effort.

"I am convinced," he continued, "that there would not be enough hours in the day to do an efficient and effective job on all three committees. It was a question of time and I came to the conclusion that I had to give up something. In the final analysis, I decided to concentrate my efforts in the fields of space development and national defense.

"The small businessman in America is faced today with countless difficulties. A great responsibility lies with Small Business Committee members in this 86th Congress and I hope, for the sake of the small business community, that it will be fulfilled with sincerity and objectively.

"My membership on the committee has been both enjoyable and profitable over these past few years. I have been afforded a chance to see this important area of our economy in operation and have gained a much more extensive knowledge of its conditions and requirements as a result. I leave with reluctance and I want to emphasize the fact that I do so only as a result of my increased assignments in other areas."

Churches and Synagogues in the National Capital Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following summary prepared by the department of research and church planning, Council of Churches, National Capital Area, Washington, D.C.:

A STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF CHURCHES AND SYNAGOGUES IN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA

DEFINITION OF "NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA"

The National Capital area includes the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Md.; the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church, Va.; and Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Va.; Loudoun and Prince William Counties, Va., are being included in the classification as they are becoming more urbanized.

COUNCIL OF CHURCHES NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA

The Council of Churches, National Capital Area, is an interdenominational, ecumenical Protestant agency through which 300 churches representing 30 denominations express themselves in service to the community. Departments of the council are Christian education; institutional ministry; radio and television; research and church planning; social welfare; youth and young adults; and united church women.

In addition to the departments listed there are many active committees, a few of which are Boy Scout advisory; campus ministry; churchmen; civil defense; community life; ecumenical relations; evangelism; public meetings; and Government personnel.

Number of churches by religious groups in the National Capital area

Churches	District of Columbia	Prince Georges County	Montgomery County	Arlington County	Fairfax County	Alexandria	Total
Protestant	451	187	165	70	166	69	1,108
Roman Catholic	41	31	15	6	8	5	106
Jewish	16	2	5	1	0	2	26
Eastern Orthodox	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
Other	3	0	0	1	0	0	4
Total	518	220	185	78	174	76	1,251

COMPOSITION OF RELIGIOUS POPULATION

On the basis of surveys and censuses made by Jewish, Roman Catholic, and Protestant research organizations of the population in the National Capital area, it has been found that approximately 5 percent of the total population is Jewish and 13 percent Roman Catholic. The estimates of Protestant membership range from 40 to 50 percent.

According to a study of church membership in the States and the District of Columbia made 3 years ago by the National Council of Churches, the District of Columbia ranked third highest. The proportion of church members in the total population of the United States is 61 percent.

On the basis of the population of the National Capital area, which is now slightly in excess of 2 million, the Jewish membership estimate will range from 85,000 to 100,000; the Roman Catholic membership would be approximately 260,000, and the Protestant membership would be estimated from 800,000 to 1 million.

The largest Protestant denominations in the National Capital area are Baptists, Methodist, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Disciples of Christ, Seventh-day Adventist, and the United Church of Christ (formerly Congregational-Christian and Evangelical and Reformed).

Nine Baptist bodies have a total of 300 churches, 7 Methodist groups have 243 churches, the Protestant Episcopal Church has 109 churches, three Presbyterian denominations have 70 churches, 4 Lutheran bodies have 61 churches. The Disciples of Christ have 23 churches, the Seventh-day Adventists have 21 churches, the United Church of Christ have 14 churches. There are 15 Christian Science Churches, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints have 8 churches, the Unitarians have 8, the Church of the Brethren have 7, and the Evangelical United Brethren Church have 6 churches.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON RELIGIOUS BODIES

Questions concerning religious bodies and organizations can be directed to the Council of Churches, National Capital Area, 1751 N Street NW., Decatur 2-3132, for answer or referral.

The National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. maintains a Washington office at 122 Maryland Avenue NE., Lincoln 4-2350.

The international headquarters for the Seventh-day Adventists is located in Takoma Park, Md.

Other Protestant groups which maintain headquarters offices with regional or national functions are:

Baptist, 1626 16th Street NW., Columbia 5-1526.

Disciples of Christ, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Lincoln 6-9156.

Episcopal, 1702 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Executive 3-7878.

Lutheran, 2633 16th Street NW., DE 2-1910.

Methodist, 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Lincoln 3-5038.

Presbyterian, United States, 22d and P Streets NW., North 7-7747.

United Presbyterian, U.S.A., 1229 Connecticut Avenue NW., Executive 3-4526.

Marine Combat Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, together with so many of my distinguished colleagues I have been seriously disturbed over the actual effects of the cut in the Marine Corps strength to 175,000. As you know, this is 25,000 marines below the figure this Congress considered to be the minimum necessary to provide on an austere basis the three Marine divisions and three air wings required by law.

We are now beginning to be told by the Pentagon what we tried to impress upon them in the last session of Congress. The three full divisions and three air wings required by law cannot be maintained by a 175,000 man Marine Corps.

A recent article in the New York Times by the able military reporter of that newspaper, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, describes the effects of a cut to 175,000 Marines in terms of lost, deactivated combat units. Six of the twenty-seven infantry battalions of the corps and the equivalent of six air squadrons will be deactivated by July.

This latest cut then can only come from the combat strength of the divisions we tried so hard to establish as the

Nation's force in readiness. I commend this sobering fact to the Members as a matter for serious concern.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert this brief analysis of the Navy budget by Mr. Baldwin in the RECORD. It includes a concise statement of what is happening to the combat strength of the Marine Corps:

THE NAVY BUDGET: FLEET WILL REMAIN AT CURRENT SIZE BUT AIRCRAFT INVENTORY WILL BE CUT

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The Navy's share of the administration's defense budget for the fiscal year 1960 will maintain a fleet of approximately the present size.

Some 864 ships, the same number as are now in service, are scheduled to be in commission in the next fiscal year; 389 will be warships and 475 will be supporting vessels, amphibious craft, and so on. The Navy's active aircraft inventory will drop to 9,117 by June 30, 1960, compared with 10,533 on June 30, 1958. Only some 7,200 of these will be operational. Forty-seven percent will be jet-powered.

Fourteen attack aircraft carriers will be maintained instead of the 15 of last June, but new Forrestal-type carriers are replacing the old wartime Essex class.

SUBMARINE WAR STRESSED

The 1960 budget will maintain 16 carrier air groups—2 of them replacement groups—the same number as this year. More than 600 antisubmarine aircraft will be modified with new radar, and 2 new antisubmarine warfare task forces will be organized.

Patrol and warning squadrons will increase from 39 to 42 and the reorganization of the Naval Air Reserve, to orient it toward an antisubmarine mission, will continue.

The manning level for the active fleet will average about 81 percent of normal war strength per ship and squadron, about the same as this year.

With new procurement funds the Navy will buy 668 aircraft, which is less than one-half of the annual procurement needed to maintain an active operating naval air arm of 7,200 planes.

AIR ARM SHRINKING

Officials believe that given the present rate of procurement of piloted aircraft, the naval air arm will decrease to 4,000 to 5,000 aircraft by 1963–64.

There is also considerable concern about the growing obsolescence of the fleet. The 1960 shipbuilding program provides for 18 new ships, including a conventional-powered aircraft carrier of the Forrestal class, 6 guided-missile destroyers and frigates, 3 more nuclear-powered submarines and 8 other vessels.

Nine Polaris missile-firing submarines had been provided prior to the 1960 budget, but the administration has withheld funds for some of them and has adopted a building program of about three a year and one aircraft carrier every other year.

The 1960 budget contains funds for long leadtime items for three more Polaris submarines, in addition to the nine already provided, but does not authorize or provide funds for the full costs of the three additional submarines.

The building program also includes the conversion and modernization of 13 old ships, including a cruiser, 8 destroyers, and 4 other vessels.

The present naval construction program of about 20 new ships a year is less than half the number needed to replace overage ships if the operating fleet's present size of 864 vessels is to be maintained.

The Marine Corps is already undergoing a reduction from an authorized strength of 200,000 to 175,000 during the current fiscal year; its strength is to remain at the 175,000 level in the fiscal year that begins next July 1.

President Eisenhower's budget message declares that "the Marine Corps will continue to support three divisions and three air wings in their traditional state of high combat readiness."

MARINES DEPLORE CUTS

The Marine Corps flatly disputes this. Gen. Randolph McC. Pate, the commandant, has testified that the current reduction to 175,000 men will mean the elimination of 6 battalion landing teams out of the corps' current 27, and the elimination of 6 air squadrons.

The Marines will activate additional antiaircraft battalions to operate the Army-developed Hawk missile, designed for use against low-flying aircraft.

During the next 18 months an old aircraft carrier—the *Princeton*—is earmarked for use as a Marine helicopter landing ship. The use of this carrier, which will be operated with no material physical alterations, will give the Marines three ships from which to practice the technique of helicopter assault. Two have already been specially converted.

The administration's 1960 budget provides funds for maintaining a total of 1,030,000 Reserves, both Army and Air National Guard, in a paid status, as compared with 1,082,000 this year.

The President's budget envisages funds during the fiscal year 1960 for 330,000 Army reservists, 360,000 in the Army National Guard, 75,000 in the Air National Guard, 145,000 in the Navy Reserves, 48,000 in the Marine Corps Reserve, and 72,000 in the Air Force Reserve.

The Army National Guard will man an increased number of Nike antiaircraft battalions, and the Naval Reserve will provide at least cadre crews for 48 destroyers or destroyer escorts by the end of 1960.

The Air National Guard, its aircraft already 90 percent jet-powered, will be furnished more modern types in 1960.

The average cost of maintaining a Regular serviceman in uniform increases from $3,885 annually in 1958 to $4,150 in 1959 and to a figure estimated at $4,220 in 1960. This is chiefly due to pay increases and other added costs.

Address by Hon. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, Mississippi Valley Association Banquet, Chase Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., February 2, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1959, I had the privilege of listening to an address by Senator STUART SYMINGTON at the 40th annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association in St. Louis, Mo. This distinguished American is particularly qualified to discuss water resources and water utilization problems. While Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, Senator SYMINGTON suggested to President Truman the idea of creating the Materials Policy Commission, headed by Mr. William Paley. The Commission made an excellent projected survey of the general resources requirements of this country over the next few decades. It made a stern warning of the ever-increasing need for better water management in this country, necessitated by the great growth of our population and the tremendous and growing demand of industry for fresh water. In fact, to the great surprise of those who take water resources for granted, the Commission stated that by 1975, of all our resources, the No. 1 American shortage by that time will be fresh water. In his address before the Mississippi Valley Association, Senator SYMINGTON gave graphic examples of the ever-increasing need of fresh water and the insatiable thirst of such industries as the chemical and atomic and aluminum industries for phenomenal additional quantities.

Senator SYMINGTON made an earnest plea for a national water policy, and his seven-point program in that connection deserves national attention and consideration and for that reason I, under unanimous consent, insert in the RECORD a copy of his address for useful reference and research material in connection with water resources, water management and water utilization legislation:

Thank you very much for the honor of being with you at this 40th annual convention.

I have followed the activities of the Mississippi Valley Association for many years.

Your work in developing a consistent and intelligent policy for the use of water in the vast subcontinent of this valley area is of vital importance to the entire country.

As a Senator, my particular interest has been the State of Missouri and the development of its water resources. The work you have done for this State has been outstanding.

Many thanks for the advice and cooperation you have given to me and my State over the past years, and I look forward to many more years of our working together.

No river valley has played a more important role in the history and growth of this country than has the Mississippi Valley.

Exciting images of the past are evoked by the names: Lewis and Clark, DeSoto, Marquette and Joliet.

Picturesque days are recalled by the names Mark Twain, Mike Fink, memories of the sidewheelers, and Abe Lincoln's float trip to New Orleans.

Since the days when the wilderness was conquered and the great steamboats became queens of the river, the Mississippi Valley has been settled.

Thanks to the efforts of many of you here tonight to a large extent, the rivers themselves, either have been or are being tamed.

But these rivers are not only a part of our history. They are vital to our present. The Mississippi Valley is the heartland of America, and its rivers the great arteries of commerce.

Their great past and present is to be followed by an even greater future.

For they are the most vital resources of the decades ahead.

Too many people take water resources for granted. They believe we will always have an abundance.

This is dangerous thinking, for without an adequate supply of water, our civilization and our industry will not be able to expand to meet the needs of tomorrow.

Tonight I should like to discuss briefly two recent developments which show the ever-increasing need for better water management in this country.

Both have occurred since the end of the Second World War.

One is the great growth of our population.

The other is the tremendous and growing demand of industry for fresh water.

Many people have studied the population explosion now taking place in this country and the rest of the world.

But it has been studied primarily in terms of its effect on schools, on cities, and on industrial production.

Comparatively little attention has been paid to how this population increase will strain the water supply of our country.

In 1952, the President's Materials Policy Commission, headed by Mr. William Paley, issued an excellent survey of the resource requirements of this country over the next few decades.

This study was based on what we would be most short of 25 years from 1950—16 years from now.

To my great surprise, as well as that of many others, the No. 1 American shortage in 1975 will be fresh water.

The study pointed out that between 1900 and 1950, per capita water consumption in the United States has doubled.

Because our population has also doubled in that period, the demand for water had thus actually increased four times.

The Presidential Commission predicted a similar doubling of per capita consumption over the period from 1950 to 1975, as the Nation's standard of living rose; and with it the use of such luxury items as air conditioners, automatic washers, etc.

This famous report issued a stern warning that steps should be initiated now to assure an adequate water supply for the growing population.

The warning was based on a 1975 population projection of 193,400,000.

But this 1950 estimate has turned out to be far too modest. Our country is growing so fast that, under present projections, the 193 million point will be reached, not in 1975, but in 1965.

By 1975 we will have in America a population of more than 230 million, perhaps more than 240 million.

This would create an immense water supply problem even if the per capita consumption remained constant.

But it will rise with our standard of living, and therefore become even greater.

This country, and the Mississippi Valley in particular, is blessed with a large supply of fresh water. Properly utilized, it cannot only support this huge population but give the people an ever-increasing standard of living.

The Nation as a whole, however, has certain water problems, posed by nature.

Many areas have insufficient water supplies; and because of maldistribution of both rainfall, and access to water supplies, increasing control must be exerted over our water.

Such control will involve a conscious choice on our part. If we are willing to spend the effort and the money, however, the years ahead can see better living for all citizens.

If we do not heed the warnings of such studies as the one referred to above, the consequences are equally clear.

Now as to the increasing use of water by industry.

Since the war, such industries as the chemical and atomic and aluminum industries have grown tremendously.

And they have an insatiable thirst.

The amount of water consumed by an atomic energy plant is classified. But public figures do exist on some of the other industrial plants.

1. Water and oil may not mix, but 10 gallons of water are required to refine 1 gallon of gasoline.

2. Three hundred gallons of water are needed to turn out one barrel of beer.

3. With the growing interest in paper and steel mills in Missouri and the Mississippi Valley, it is significant to note that 64,000 gallons of water are needed to make 1 ton of sulfate paper; also 65,000 gallons to make 1 ton of steel.

4. A pulp mill requires more water each day than does a city of 50,000 people.

5. The Fairless works of the United States Steel Corp. on the Delaware River uses as much water daily as the cities of Buffalo and Boston combined.

In 1950, not counting the streamflow used mechanically to generate hydroelectric power, the water used by industry weighed almost 50 times the total of all other used materials combined.

Industrial consumption can only increase with our industrial growth; in fact, the President's Commission predicted that the total amount of water used would nearly triple in the 25 years from 1950 to 1975.

But even more important is the percentage share of all water used in the United States which goes for industrial use.

In 1950, it was estimated that industry withdrew 43 percent of all water used.

In 1975 estimates are that this percentage will be increased to 62 percent.

Is it not rather startling to realize that, during the Second World War, plans for building at least 300 industrial or military establishments had to be abandoned or modified because of inadequate water supply.

In the opening of the President's Materials Policy Commission report, it was stated that by 1975 access to good water might become the most important factor in deciding where to locate industries.

This is most significant for us here in the Mississippi Valley. It presents both a challenge and an opportunity, for we are blessed with an abundance of water.

If we shape our water management plans to provide an adequate industrial supply, the areas along the rivers of this valley will be able to attract more and more industry.

Associations such as yours will continue to play a key role in seeing that these Federal and State plans are best suited to developing the industrial potential of the areas served by our rivers.

If we plan wisely, we need never fear the ever growing thirst of industry.

If we do not, some of our brightest hopes for industrial development will be snuffed out before we know it.

Civilizations have always been dependent on water.

Early civilizations flourished on the banks of the Nile, the Tigris, and the Tiber.

Though our cities no longer need lie on the banks of our rivers and lakes, we are no less dependent on water.

In a sense, our dependence is even greater, for as these studies show, water is no longer as abundant as it was to the ancients.

The supply is not shrinking. But we use it more.

As our population and industry grow, we must think in terms of the very real possibility that, unless we plan wisely today, we will have a water shortage tomorrow—even in our now water-abundant areas.

To meet the demands of the future, therefore, it is imperative that we adopt a national water policy which will provide an adequate supply of this vital natural resource.

I present seven proposals.

Some are now being taken haltingly, some not at all.

All of them should be followed resolutely:

First. We must have a coordinated program of flood control, water storage, and power development through the construction of multiple-purpose reservoirs, wherever feasible, on the rivers of the Nation.

In this connection, I second the proposals General Itschner made earlier today in regard to the preservation of future project sites.

Second. I support the program of cooperation between Nation and States for organization and development of local watershed districts to control water runoff at its source.

This program has run into unnecessary delays. These must be overcome.

As the program is expanded, we will be better able to conserve and preserve a supply of fresh water on the land where it falls.

Third. Our stream-pollution-control programs should be accelerated.

We should place first priority on interstate cooperation in the control and prevention of pollution; second priority on Federal grants-in-aid to towns and cities for the construction of sewage-treatment plants, along with other water-purification facilities.

Fourth. There should be a cooperative national and State program for the reclamation of used water by the removal of waste, and through the use of purification processes.

Fifth. We should have a cooperative national and State program for the development of new ground water reservoirs, including the presently unavailable underground lakes and streams.

Sixth. We need a national research program designed to investigate the possibility of inducing rainfall through artificial means; and also to consider the development of a practical method of removing salt from sea water.

Seventh. Finally, a coordinated program is necessary to assure proper navigation of our water arteries wherever economically feasible, so as to provide the fullest utilization of these natural streams of commerce.

These programs cannot be carried out without the sympathetic aid of groups, such as yours, people with interest in, and devotion to, the cause of water resource development.

In establishing the details for this water management program, particular attention should be given to the problems of geographical distribution of our water resources.

As the Materials Commission stated: "If a single word were used to sum up the water problems of the United States, that word would be maldistribution—maldistribution in regard to time and geographic areas."

In the past, maldistribution was not a great problem because the center of our population was always near the Atlantic Ocean.

This center has been moving steadily westward, however; and indications are that it will continue to do so for the foreseeable future.

With reference to the point of navigation in this program, may I comment on the situation here in the Mississippi Valley.

In this connection, we know that the potential of our valley has not been fully utilized.

The upper Mississippi, Ohio, and Illinois have been dredged to a depth which allows full utilization of their navigation potential. Annual traffic on these rivers ranges from 20 million tons on the Illinois to some 80 million tons on the Ohio.

By contrast, with a record volume last year, the Missouri River carried only a little more than half a million tons.

The Missouri is the poor relation when it comes to navigation. It is the only major segment of the Mississippi River system lacking a 9-foot channel.

This association has been a strong proponent of a 9-foot channel for the Missouri.

I have consistently supported such a channel in the Congress, and I intend to continue to do so, because this channel would bring more industry and prosperity to our State.

Yes, the great volume of water in the Missouri can be used to attract the water consuming industries of the future, and if it is a fully navigable stream the attraction will be twofold.

In recent years it has been disturbing to see how our national policy toward rivers and harbors has been deteriorating.

As example, the President's budget for the fiscal year 1960 did not request a single dollar for either new construction or new planning.

This is false economy.

Such public dollars as are saved by eliminating dollars for water control and utilization can result over the years in heavy losses to private enterprise and our communities.

In addition, each year that we postpone the benefits of flood protection, we increase the danger from annual floods.

Recent disasters in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia underscore this fact.

None of us will ever forget the flood tragedy of the Kansas City area at the start of this decade.

Planning and construction to correct and improve our water position should be continual and orderly. It should not come in uneconomic spurts.

For it does not make much sense, when building a house, to put the roof on a bit at a time.

And so, my friends, this national problem involves the interests of all our States, and all our people.

In the future, as in the past, the Mississippi Valley Association can play a vital role in striving for a successful solution to this problem of fresh water.

Such a program will bring greater prosperity, not only to this rich valley, but also to the entire country.

The future of our society depends on our ability now, to plan wisely for coming generations.

What a tragedy if future growth is stunted by any failure on our part to plan against water shortage.

It is written in the second chapter of Genesis: "The Lord God took the man and put him into the garden * * * to dress it and to keep it."

Let us all band together to keep this garden in which God has placed us, and make it even richer for the generations to come.

Coast Laboratory Is Dedicated to Learning More About Universe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, all San Diegoans are very proud of the rapid advancements we have made in our scientific and industrial community. The varied and highly specialized talents required in the complex technology of the scientific and industrial world in nearly all fields are today found in San Diego. The companies and organizations situated in San Diego enjoy the reputation of being recognized leaders in their respective fields.

An important contributor to scientific advancement is the John Jay Hopkins Laboratory of Pure and Applied Science, which is located in La Jolla. This organization, also known as the General Atomics Division of the General Dynamics Corp., is researching all areas of science with a dedication to make our country a better place in which to live.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following article by Mr. William Hinds, science writer for the Washington Evening Star. I heartily recommend Mr. Hinds' article as interesting and informative reading.

COAST LABORATORY IS DEDICATED TO LEARNING MORE ABOUT UNIVERSE

(By William Hines)

LA JOLLA, CALIF.—In an industry so hectic that its leaders frequently complain that "practice has outrun theory," it is refreshing to find a place dedicated to helping theory catch up.

Such an establishment is the John Jay Hopkins Laboratory of Pure and Applied Science, also known as the General Atomic Division of the General Dynamics Corp. An out-of-this-world sort of place atop a sun-drenched mesa in one of the pleasantest parts of the globe, Hopkins Laboratory is dedicated to learning more about the universe man is already beginning to explore and exploit.

Supervised benignly by a roly-poly young genius named Frederic de Hoffmann, about 300 scientists and 250 helpers search for truth in every state of nature man can reproduce in the laboratory. They heat thin gases to a million degrees and accelerate shock waves up to 100 times the speed of sound. They chill materials down to within a few degrees of absolute zero and then bombard them wtih radiation.

Why? To see what will happen; to learn more about the nature of things.

RESEARCH EXPENSIVE

That this kind of scientific doodling costs money can hardly be doubted. General Atomic officials concede they haven't made any money yet and probably will operate in the red for another 5 or 6 years. But they point out that you can push basic researchers only so hard, and they are content to wait for something to turn up.

"Something" in the missile area already has turned up, in the form of a $1 million (first year) contract from the Pentagon's Advanced Research Projects Agency. The only public knowledge about this feasibility study contract is that it is related to the possible development of a new concept of propulsion of controlled nuclear explosions.

Beyond this, the Pentagon has muzzled GA so thoroughly that its officials decline even to discuss the scientific theory behind controlled explosions—despite the fact that theories are nonsecret.

This is not GA's first incursion into the missile field, though the company has no production contracts. It is, however, looking into the behavior of materials under the sort of radiation conditions that might be encountered in space.

FINDS LIMITATIONS

"It's getting to the point where electric circuits can't stand as much total radiation as a man can stand," Dr. Victor Van Lint observed. Dr. Van Lint, a lanky Indonesia-born, Netherlands-raised physicist who speaks with only the wisp of a Dutch accent, is a GA specialist in solid-state physics. One of his chief projects is investigating how transistors, diodes and other semiconductors behave in the presence of radiation at temperatures around 200° below zero Centigrade.

They don't behave well. "I've made it a rule that there are to be no transistorized components in our electronic measuring devices when we run these radiation tests," Dr. Van Lint said.

In his work, Dr. Van Lint—like the other scientists here—has access to some of the finest equipment available. One of the features of the laboratory is a powerful linear accelerator, a kind of a straight cyclotron, that kicks subatomic particles up to speeds near that of light.

The laboratory was a dream of the late John Jay Hopkins, who created General Dynamics out of a series of mergers of smaller companies. GD is now headed by Frank Pace, a former Secretary of the Army.

UNUSUAL PLANT

A striking thing about the Hopkins Laboratory is the physical layout. The chief feature is a circular building surrounded by two larger arc-shaped buildings rather as the orbits of electrons circle the nucleus of an atom in the classic atomic conceptions. The buildings are extreme in their architecture, apparently hanging from exposed steel girders.

The effect, while avant-garde, is pleasant, as are the carefully tended gardens, the building fountains, the splashing reflecting pools, and the trees. Next year there will be a swimming pool.

As might be expected, worker turnover is low, notably among the scientists.

"I'm here to stay," said Dr. Van Lint. "This is the finest compromise I can imagine between academic research and industrial compensations."

Which seems to mean they pay him well and leave him alone—and who could ask more of a boss?

Federal Education Plan Popular With Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial in the Clarksburg (W. Va.) Exponent of February 7, commenting on the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which was approved in the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

The editorial follows:

FEDERAL EDUCATION PLAN POPULAR WITH STUDENTS

The college student-loan plan written into the National Defense Education Act last year has turned up a major surprise in popularity.

It was substituted for a $75 million scholarship program after an intellectual wrestling match in the closing weeks of the last Congress. The lawmakers in their infinite wisdom killed the scholarship plan and put a $295 million, 4-year loan program in its place.

Few educators thought it would work. For, as Dr. Arthur Flemming, former president of Ohio Wesleyan and now Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare declares, up until recently, college-loan funds had gone begging.

The most optimistic prediction was that not more than 800 of the 1,950 U.S. institutions of higher learning would take part in the new Government student-loan program.

In the first 4 months, 1,230 colleges and universities have applied for participation, asking for $62 million in Government money for this year.

This figure is double the amount Office of Education now has in sight. Congress appropriated $6 million to get the program started this year. A supplemental $25 million is being asked to run the program until June 30. Unless the colleges are being overoptimistic in estimating student demand, it won't be enough.

Loans applied for now are expected to be small, to run students short of cash through this college year. For the next college year

beginning in September, it is believed that loan applications will be larger, to cover a full 9 months. But Office of Education has so far requested only another $31 million for the year beginning July 1.

Congress originally authorized, but has not appropriated for the student-loan program, $47½ million for the first year, $75 million the second, $82½ million the third, and $90 million the fourth. This $295 million total would take care of 590,000 1-year loans of $500 average.

No student will be permitted to borrow over $1,000 a year, or $5,000 over 5 or more years. Interest is 2 percent while the student is in college, and 1 year thereafter. Then the interest rate goes to 4 percent. The loan must be repaid in 10 years.

There is a 10 percent forgiveness every year for 5 years to students who go into grade- or high-school teaching. To this extent the loan program is a scholarship.

Also, the law offers fellowships to graduate students preparing for college teaching. They will provide grants of $2,000 for the first year, $2,200 the second, $2,400 the third, plus $400 a year for each dependent.

One thousand such fellowships were to be granted the first year. But in the first 4 months of the program 6,000 applications have been received. This response is likewise far heavier than was anticipated. Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick will make the first 160 grants early in February.

Last October DHEW Secretary Flemming declared that scholarships would still be needed, in addition to the loan and fellowship programs. The original plan was to give up to $1,000 a year for 4 years to exceptional students who could not pay for a higher education.

Unexpected popularity of the loan program, however, has shelved the scholarship idea. It is not mentioned in President Eisenhower's new budget. The administration's austerity program may have had something to do with killing it.

If the loan program turns out to be as good as it now looks, Secretary Flemming is of the opinion that corporations and private foundations which have granted most of the scholarships in the past may change their programs.

An Up-To-Date Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News on January 30 is a clear statement on the value of President Eisenhower's recommendations for a realistic agriculture program.

The President's program would protect the farmer from an abrupt drop in income as well as relate his parity to present day prices and cost, rather than those of a period long past. If parity for the 12 major commodities was set at 75 percent to 90 percent based on average market prices of the past few years it would cut the annual $5.4 billion price support expenditures approximately in half. In these times of excessive Government spending, such potential Government savings should be considered in legislation which will also free the farmer from his Federal chains:

JUST A START

President Eisenhower's farm message proposes to start the country, including the farmers and taxpayers, out of the unholy mess resulting from 25 years of Government giveaway to a minority of farmers—most big, factory farmers.

Consider the record, as revealed by the message:

Only 12 of the 250 farm commodities share the subsidies which this year will cost $5.4 billion, a sum equal to nearly a third of all the income taxes paid by all the corporations in the country.

Half the wheat farmers (the big ones) get 90 percent of the wheat subsidy. Twenty percent of the cotton farmers (the big ones) get 75 percent of the cotton subsidy.

The average subsidy to a rice farmer with 100 acres or more this year is $10,000. Same for cotton.

By July 1, the Government will have $9.1 billion tied up in surplus crops, most of which it cannot sell, some of which it can't even give away. All but 15 percent of this is in three crops—wheat, corn, and cotton.

It might not be so bad, as the President says, if this were a temporary helping hand to needy farmers, if it were helping to solve any problems. But it isn't. It's making them worse by continuing artificial incentives to create surplus crops.

The President had a word for it: "Intolerable." Instead of outmoded parity he would link price supports to recent average prices and thus protect the farmers from abrupt catastrophic price drops. Or, if Congress wants to stick to parity, he asks for a flexible system with a lower floor, encouraging crop planning to respond to the market.

His plan doesn't contemplate abandoning the subsidies but merely urges, in the name of commonsense, that they be cut down a little. But from the partisan outcries with which vote-conscious Congressmen have greeted the suggestion, you would think he was out to ruin agriculture.

Pentagon (AFL-CIO) Union Group Suggest Drastic Change in Civilian-Military Staffing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, recently the AFGE Council of Defense Lodges of the District of Columbia area made up of 18 AFGE locals representing civilian employees of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Office of Secretary of Defense, proposed changes in the civilian-military staffing in a special report prepared by its research committee. The report was approved by the delegates and sent to the national president, James P. Campbell, of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL–CIO. The council has outlined what it considers are key weaknesses in the Department of Defense personnel and manpower administration which are causing waste of both defense funds and manpower.

It is my belief that this study, coming from a combined group of career civilian employees, working at the Pentagon, contains substantial ideas and proposals for badly needed improvements in defense manpower and personnel policies. In the coming space age we need to develop more imaginative ideas and proposals for personnel administration which will at least keep pace with modern developments in missiles and airpower weaponry.

Although many committees of Congress and special commissions appointed by the President have studied this problem of dual staffing and employee utilization in the Department of Defense, there has been little progress by military and civilian leaders in facing up to needed changes in personnel administration. We, in Congress, the union leaders, the veteran organizations and others are besieged with countless individual cases involving often tragic personnel problems created in the first place by ineffective Department of Defense personnel management. Dual staffing and civilian-military conflicts have often been the primary cause. To solve such a problem, case by case, as we in Congress try to do, is costly and time consuming. It does not get at the root of the basic problems. It is for this reason that we should carefully study the proposals that this combined group of Department of Defense employees have so courageously offered. It should be clear to many of us that basic and far-reaching policy changes in Department of Defense personnel administration are long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD at this point the report of the Council of Defense Lodges. The officers of the council are: Mr. A. E. Casgrain, of the Department of the Army, president; Mr. Walter M. Siesko, Naval Research Center, vice president; and Mr. Richard Raymond, OQG, secretary-treasurer.

The report of the Council of Defense Lodges—AFGE—outlined:

1. Under present organizational structure, civilian control of Department of Defense activities is largely a myth. The transient nature of appointive officials at top DOD levels has created a situation where for practical purposes, operational control, particularly in manpower and personnel matters, has been defaulted to the military.

2. Promotion and career opportunities for career civilians in DOD and throughout the services, has largely been stagnated by continual placement of fulltime active duty, military personnel in civilian-type jobs in spite of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, and congressional and other committees.

3. Directors of civilian personnel at all echelons, and particularly in the support services at headquarters, are subordinated to, influenced, and coerced by numerous layers of unnecessary military supervision.

4. The assignment of retired military personnel is constituting a direct infringement upon the spirit and intent of the civil service system. If pending DOD legislation is endorsed, many retired military personnel will be collecting two incomes from the Government for doing jobs they should not have been assigned to in the first place.

5. Military personnel, in many instances, is being sent to colleges or universities, at taxpayers' expense, not to train for defense readiness, but to prepare for retirement and better civilian jobs in business and industry. By comparison, civil service employees in DOD receive little or no extended training or career development opportunities.

6. Domination of the civil service system by military officials and control, particularly in DOD, is creating a militarized executive branch. The defense council officers, the Members of Congress from the metropolitan area, and even private lawyers have received an endless flood of personal grievances as a result of dual, or military supervision, causing tragic personality conflicts. The councils' recommendations include:

(a) That in the future, all personnel exercising responsibilities for the selection, promotion, retention, and discipline of civilian employees within the support services be composed wholly of status civilian supervisory employees, and that the military have no voice whatever in such matters.

(b) It is believed that the influence and pressure exerted by highly placed military personnel, or by civilian cliques dominated through military pressures derives from the fact that the military is in almost 100 percent control of the position of higher supervisory management in all of the permanent supply and service type bureaus, even though the permanent personnel of such bureaus are composed entirely of civilians. This undemocratic and managerially unsound situation can be corrected only by the replacement of the military chiefs of all of the civilian bureaus under the Department of Defense with high caliber career civilians, and by restricting the military to positions of an advisory nature and to positions essential for the conduct of liaison with the offices of the several Chiefs of Staff.

(c) These and similar suggestions have been offered in the Hoover Commission report and in many, many other studies. The Government unions and many Members of Congress believe that it is time for action on this situation. It is our understanding that the British have already civilianized their support agencies. In this space age we should follow the lead of the best personnel management in our great American business enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, the results of this comprehensive survey of personnel conditions in the Department of Defense is strong confirmation of my contention, made in a recent letter to Chairman Murray of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, that the interests of the Nation would be best served by removing military jurisdiction from civilian employees in the Government service.

Do Drafts Work?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include two pieces of extraneous matter.

I am inserting two articles that appeared in the February 5, 1959, Denver Post. One article, by Norman Thomas, raises certain basic and provocative questions about military conscription in a democracy. His remarks should be seriously considered by Members of Congress. The other article is an editorial that also raises certain questions about the draft which, I do not think, were adequately answered in the debates last week. I hope that Members of Congress shall have a chance to reconsider these problems again as a result of a less hurried look by the Senate:

[From the Denver Post, Feb. 5, 1959]

DO DRAFTS WORK?—AN OPEN LETTER TO CARL VINSON, CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

(By Norman Thomas)

This morning I heard Gen. Lewis B. Hershey argue briefly for a 4-year extension of the Selective Service Act. His arguments, as I understood them, confirmed my opinion that the act should not be thus continued.

The weight of his argument was not the necessity of conscription to fill the diminishing size of the army in the age of nuclear warfare, but its value in giving a Government agency control over the lives of all our young men: who should be deferred and what they should do to keep a deferred status; what scientists may have to be called or recalled by peacetime conscription into military service which at present does not pay enough to attract them, etc.

I am a Socialist believing in social planning, but I am a democratic Socialist who considers this degree of control over all our youth far more consonant with communism or fascism that with any sort of democracy of free men. It is to be justified, if justified at all, only by the magnitude of a danger that can be met in no other way. And that has by no means been proved.

Gone from General Hershey's statements were the familiar arguments of advocates of compulsory military service. No longer is such service commended for the impartiality of the burdens it lays on all youth. As for the old argument of the character-building effects of compulsory military service, that is conspicuously refuted by the growth of crime, juvenile delinquency, and the general cult of violence.

Neither is there any evidence that Selective Service stimulates interest in a foreign policy which would give us a security that no armament in a nuclear age can provide.

On the contrary the fatalistic acceptance of an indefinite continuance of the military cold war is evident in the demand for a 4-year extension which automatically discourages an intelligent drive for universal disarmament.

What General Hershey asks is relief for taxpayers who don't want to pay for the kind of expert military forces nuclear warfare demands. I question, however, whether even here our present system does not add to total costs. Has your committee inquired?

To be sure the general also incidentally mentioned good guidance his system gave young men. (So did the Germans laud their system in the days of Kaiser Wilhelm and Hitler.) My own contacts with outstanding young men confirm Adlai Stevenson's statement: "Every young man who has served in our Armed Forces knows the incredible waste of our present system of forced but short-run service." There are better ways.

[From the Denver Post, Feb. 5, 1959]

IS THE DRAFT DOING THE JOB?

There seems to be little doubt at this time that Congress will vote to extend the draft law, known as the Universal Military Training and Service Act, beyond June 30, the date when it would expire if no extension were provided.

Secretary of Defense McElroy and Charles C. Finucane, assistant secretary in charge of manpower, are quite insistent that a continuation of the draft is necessary—although only 8,000 men a month are now being called and the armed services are in the process of trimming their strength by 250,000 men, to make a total of about 2¼ million by June.

Concern over national defense, stimulated by Russian success with space devices, is such that Congress will not take too critical a view of the request from the Pentagon. Chairman VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, has said the hearing on the draft extension bill will be brief.

The draft has now been a part of our national life since 1940, except for a brief recess of 17 months in 1947–48. It is the first peacetime draft the United States has ever had—a byproduct of the cold war.

Only the Army is now making use of the draft, but military leaders and most Congressmen are convinced that the importance of the draft is the incentive that it gives to young men to enlist "voluntarily" in the services of their choice.

But for the draft, the flow of "volunteers" would dry up quickly.

Any battles that may develop over the extension bill probably will relate to the length of the extension, whether for 2 years, as advocated by some Democrats, including Adlai Stevenson, or for 4 years, as advocated by military chiefs.

There may be some effort to alter the draft age limits (now 18½ to 26 years) to 19 to 25. The practice of deferring fathers, which has seemed to be a stimulus to early marriages, may be questioned.

Unfortunately, there is little inclination in Congress at this time to give the whole manpower problem the kind of thoughtful study which Mr. Stevenson and others would like to see it receive.

Is the draft wasteful of manpower, as some claim it is? Would a "professional" defense force of experts in scientific weapons provide better protection for less money than the draft system, under which men are "lost" to the services as soon as they have received 2 years of technical training? There are widely divergent views on these questions, as indicated in the adjoining column by Norman Thomas.

Is there any connection between juvenile delinquency and the outlook on life which youngsters subject to a draft law acquire, as some fear, or does military service give youth a greater sense of responsibility, as certain military leaders contend?

These are serious questions. The answers will not be easy to get, but a Congress which finds time to investigate so many subjects, profound and trivial, should try.

Federal Aid to Airports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the pending legislation on Federal aid to airports, the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on February 5, 1959, is most timely and pertinent:

SAFETY IS PARAMOUNT

The American Airlines crash in New York City, with its loss of 65 lives, underlines the importance of President Eisenhower's proposal that all future Federal aid to airports be used exclusively to improve flying safety. The plane might not have crashed had a safety beam guiding rate of descent been available on the runway approach which was being used. Such a beam is available on the opposite approach.

In the past some Federal airport money has gone for waiting rooms, baggage depots and other terminal facilities. There are bills before Congress to continue this diversion of funds into what the President described at

his press conference yesterday as "nice, lovely administration buildings." But safety should be the paramount consideration in allotting Federal money for airport construction.

Mr. Eisenhower's statement to reporters brought into the open a clash of philosophies between the budget-conscious administration and congressional sponsors of legislation to increase Federal spending for airports—including terminal buildings. Bills before the Senate and House Commerce Committees would not only extend Federal aid for up to 5 years but would authorize a jump in annual allotments to the States (on a 50–50 matching basis) from this year's $63 million to $100 million a year. And a portion of the money could be used for buildings to shelter and serve waiting passengers, provide ticket offices for the airlines and otherwise to afford comforts and conveniences to the public and business interests. Yet, as the President stressed, the Federal Government does not build depots for railroads or buslines.

Under the administration bill no Federal funds would be available for anything but such safety-promoting facilities as runways, control towers, taxiways and the like. And appropriations would taper off in the next 4 years from the present $63 million to $35 million a year. Administrator Quesada of the Federal Aviation Agency recently told a Senate Commerce subcommittee that facilities "beyond the gate" having nothing to do with public safety should be the responsibility of the State or local authorities. Surely, when there still is so much to be done to make flying safer, it is wrong to use Federal funds to provide for the comfort and convenience of passengers rather than for protecting their lives.

Birthday of the Mountaineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. This month my home State of West Virginia observes the 92d birthday of one of its proudest and noblest institutions, West Virginia University at Morgantown.

The university was chartered February 7, 1867, in the fourth year of our State's existence. It was born from a merger of Monongalia Academy and Woodburn Female Seminary, and was at first known as the Agricultural College of West Virginia. It assumed university status and its present name in 1868.

The university is one of the cultural and educational centers of our State. It has grown from humble beginnings to a giant institution which dominates the city of Morgantown. Its enrollment has climbed markedly to the neighborhood of 8,000 full-time students, and an additional 6,000 in its various extension services.

The university now has 17 separate divisions and is fully approved by accrediting institutions. It enjoys a reputation for academic excellence.

This month brings more than a birthday anniversary to the university. On the first day of February, the office of the president of West Virginia University was filled by Dr. Elvis Stahr. Dr. Stahr is uniquely qualified by way of education and experience to administer the affairs of our university. His arrival has been welcomed by alumni and other West Virginians as the opening of a new era in the steady growth of the university.

Dr. Stahr succeeds another admirably qualified and able man, Dr. Irvin Stewart, who is returning to the classroom at his own request. Dr. Stewart steered the university through its difficult and hectic period of explosive postwar growth, and the present quality of the University will stand as a monument to his skill, resourcefulness and determination.

The proudest new achievement of the university is a vast new medical school, now being completed. The center, which cost many millions of dollars, is one of the largest, most up-to-date and completely equipped centers in the United States. Its benefit to every West Virginian will be of lasting significance.

In a less-serious vein, it should be pointed out that the university's football and basketball squads have enjoyed great success in recent years, and have attracted much favorable publicity to our State. Both football and basketball squads have long records of being undefeated in play within the southern conference, of which the school is a member. The West Virginia gridiron forces have contributed many players to professional ranks in recent years, and the basketball teams have numbered no fewer than three men selected for All-American mention in the past decade. The 1958 basketball squad was chosen national champions by the Associated Press, and this year's squad is again given high ratings.

Every school and college within the university has produced graduates who have attained leadership and outstanding recognition in their chosen fields; this is a tribute to the high quality of instruction which the university maintains. As the university moves into another year, plans are already laid for new growth, for new advances. I believe the university merits fully the words expressed in one of the school's marching songs, "It's West Virginia, It's West Virginia, the Pride of Every Mountaineer."

Educators Support Amendment to National Defense Education Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on January 15 of this session I introduced H.R. 2437, the purpose of which is to amend section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Under title X of the act, section 1001(f) now reads:

(f) No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under authority of this act shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods, and (2) has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of American and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic." The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such affidavits.

My bill proposes to delete section 1001(f)(1), so that the negative disclaimer affidavit would be written out of the law; the section as thus amended would then concern itself only with the oath of allegiance as it now exists in section 1001(f)(2).

I am pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that my position in this matter has the support of a goodly number of educators and college administrators.

Under unanimous consent, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Donald M. Love, secretary of the faculty of Oberlin College in Ohio, wherein he expresses the views of the faculty in this matter:

LETTER FROM DONALD M. LOVE, OBERLIN COLLEGE, ON DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVIT IN NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: I am writing for the faculty of Oberlin College to express strong opposition to title X, section 1001(f)(1), of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which reads:

"No * * * funds * * * shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

Our opposition is not directed against the oath of allegiance (title X, sec. 1001(f)(2)) which the act includes, but only to the foregoing quoted provision, which is, in effect, a test oath. Such test oaths have aroused resistance many times before in the course of English and American history. An individual is compelled to make a statement disclaiming objectionable associations and beliefs in order to gain the benefits of the program. In our view, this is unnecessary and unreasonable.

The provision of the oath concerning belief is particularly repugnant. We object to the notion that an individual should be penalized because of a mental state where no overt act has occurred. We fail to see how justice can be done in any proceeding to enforce this provision concerning the content of a human mind. We agree heartily with the late Justice Jackson, who said:

"Our forefathers found the evil of free thinking more to be endured than the evils of inquest or suppression. They gave the status of almost absolute individual rights to the outward means of expressing belief. I cannot believe they left open a way for legislation to embarrass or impede the mere mental processes by which those expressions of belief are examined and formulated. This is not only because individual thinking presents no danger to society, but because thoughtful, bold, and independent minds are essential to wise and considered self-government."

Suspicion directed at the students and teachers in our colleges and universities is completely unwarranted. Their understanding of and devotion to freedom and the cause of democracy is not surpassed by any other group in our society. We concur in the statement of Mr. Bentley Glass, president of the American Association of University Professors, who commented on the test oath as follows:

"If an individual refuses to sign, he raises a suspicion that he is unworthy of public trust or benefit. If he signs, he endorses the pertinency of the general suspicion about him and his kind which is embodied in the requirement."

The stand now taken by the Oberlin faculty against the test oath in the 1958 act is fully in accord with its proudest traditions. In 1952 the faculty unanimously adopted a resolution which included these statements relevant to the present issues:

"Times of crisis present sharp challenges to the professed values of a democratic society. At such times it is tempting to measure all things by the rough standards of unity, loyalty, and orthodoxy. The inevitable tendency is to restrict such fundamentals of democracy as discussion and debate, and even to make divergence of opinion appear dangerous.

The Oberlin College faculty regards all forms of interference with intellectual freedom, discriminatory loyalty oaths, censorship, and other restrictions on free speech and thought as inimical to the democratic way of life."

In view of the objections and considerations stated above, we earnestly request that the test oath incorporated in title X, section 1001(f)(1) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 be immediately repealed.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD M. LOVE,
Secretary of the Faculty.

FEBRUARY 6, 1959.

As another example, Mr. Speaker, I bring to my colleagues' attention a communication from President Courtney Smith, of Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania, who, on February 5, wrote to me:

I was pleased to learn of the position you have taken, in H.R. 2437, in opposition to the disclaimer affidavit * * * and am hopeful that this requirement will be repealed by the Congress.

Accompanying this letter was a statement indicating Swarthmore College's position.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD the Swarthmore College statement:

FEBRUARY 4, 1959.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE STATEMENT TAKES COLLEGE OUT OF STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM UNDER PRESENT LAW

Swarthmore College, on the action of its board of managers and faculty, has voted not to participate in the student loan program of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 unless title X, section 1001(f)(1) of the act is repealed. The college does not find unacceptable the loyalty oath, or affirmation, of allegiance required of all students receiving loans under the program, but it does oppose the disclaimer affidavit of belief as being contrary to American principles and to the principles of sound educational procedure.

Swarthmore College is opposed to the requiring of any commitment from students as to belief or disbelief as a condition to their receiving loans made in aid of their education. The freedom, privacy, and integrity of individual beliefs is a crucial aspect of America's constitutional tradition, and these aspects of belief were precisely what the men who wrote the Constitution and the Bill of Rights intended to protect.

As an educational institution Swarthmore College believes that strong citizens in a democratic society are produced in an atmosphere of freedom where ideas do not need to be forbidden or protected. The college has confidence in its students and in the educational process itself, confidence in the efficacy of free inquiry and debate to reveal error.

In view of its action Swarthmore College will, as proves necessary, provide loans to students with established need at the same rate of interest contemplated in the Government's program.

COURTNEY SMITH,
President.

Remarks by Gen. T. D. White, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, Chamber of Commerce Dinner, Lubbock, Tex., January 23, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. MAHON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1959, the last of the B–25 aircraft were phased out of the Air Training Command inventory at Reese Air Force Base in Lubbock, Tex., Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, upon the invitation of the city of Lubbock, attended the celebration commemorating the occasion.

The people of the Lubbock area were highly honored by the presence of General White. General White is a distinguished American, an officer of real stature in the field of aviation and national defense. He has made, and is making, a tremendous contribution to the cause of peace and security. The people of the Lubbock area were deeply grateful for the recognition which was accorded to them and to Reese Air Force Base by the Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

The people of the Lubbock area were also honored and pleased to have in attendance at the ceremonies in Lubbock on January 23 the able commanding general of the Air Training Command, Lt. Gen. Frederic Smith. January 23 was a red letter day for aviation in the south plains area and a memorable day in the life of Reese Air Force Base.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point a speech delivered by General White at the chamber of commerce dinner in Lubbock upon the occasion of his visit to that area:

REMARKS BY GEN. T. D. WHITE, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. AIR FORCE, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE DINNER, LUBBOCK, TEX., JANUARY 23, 1959

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a distinct pleasure to be here this evening and I wish to thank the members of the Lubbock Chamber of Commerce for inviting me to join in the observance of this very significant event.

The keen interest and enthusiastic support which the citizens of Lubbock have consistently extended to the Air Force is a matter of record. I want you to know that all of us in Air Force blue deeply appreciate the fine relationship which exists. I am sure that those individual members of the Air Force stationed here at Reese Air Force Base particularly value the warm atmosphere of cooperation and understanding which prevails between the Air Force and your community.

The event which has brought us together today marks the end of an era here at Lubbock and in the Air Force. The graduation of the last class of pilots to be trained in conventional aircraft at Reese Air Force Base is another milestone in Air Force history, and another rung in the ladder of progress which has become an Air Force trademark over the years. Since the establishment of Lubbock Army Air Field during the early days of World War II, Lubbock has been constantly associated with the growth of this country's airpower. Thousands of pilots have received flying training here in bomber, fighter and transport aircraft—more than 7,000 of these pilots during the war years alone. With the exception of the 4 years between 1945 and 1949, when the base was on an inactive status, the sound of aircraft has been very much a part of your life here in Lubbock. You can be justly proud of the very significant part which the citizens of Lubbock have had in the rapid growth of this Nation's air strength.

Actually, I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to expand this thought to include the whole State of Texas, and to give well deserved recognition to its remarkable place in Air Force annals. I doubt very much if there are many pilots in the Air Force today who have not, at some time or other, served at a Texas base and enjoyed living in a Texas community. Military aircraft have been operating in the skies over Texas since 1910 when the Army's first machine—known as Aeroplane No. 1, Heavier-Than-Air Division, U.S. Aerial Fleet was flown by Lt. Benjamin Foulois from the drill field at Ft. Sam Houston. We have certainly come a long way since that time to the jet aircraft now operating out of Reese Air Force Base and other bases throughout the world.

The significant factor in the changeover here at Lubbock lies in the fact that the class which graduates tomorrow from the B–25 basic training course, is the last group of Air Force pilots to take their basic-flight training in conventional aircraft. All of our basic and advanced training bases, and half of our primary training bases have now converted to jets. This, I feel, is an excellent indication of the depth of the modernization of our training equipment, and of the extent of the progress which has been achieved. I do not want to give the impression that the Air Force has now achieved an all-jet status. This is not true. We still have several thousand conventional support aircraft in our inventory, and will continue to have them for some time to come. However, all of our combat aircraft in the Strategic Air Command, Tactical Air Command, and Air Defense Command are modern jet aircraft—B–52's, B–47's, F–100's, F–102's, F–104's, and F–105's—to name but a few of our primary operational aircraft. The record of the last 50 years in the development of airpower is one of tremendous advances; and one of which our country can indeed be proud.

Daily, we are reaching—and passing—milestones in the Air Force—some, as is the case here at Lubbock, with a momentary pause as we prepare to take the next step forward; others, as routine transitions from one phase of Air Force growth to the next. Actually, there is no single day that passes in which, somewhere in the farflung activities of the Air Force, some significant event is not taking place—the opening of new installations and incidentally the closing of bases—a necessary concomitant of change and progress, the conversion to new aircraft, the achievement of new aeronautical records,

or the demonstration of new heights of readiness. I think it is good, when time permits, to highlight these achievements, rather than let them slip by unnoticed. In this way, we in the Air Force, and you, the people of our Nation, are constantly reminded of the continuous effort—day and night, 365 days a year—which is being expended toward providing a modern, capable Air Force second to none.

I sometimes think that we, as a nation, have come to take such progress for granted because of the fantastic age in which we live. Very little surprises us any more; we have become almost inured to the unbelievable technical developments which have been occurring in recent years. Perhaps, if we were to pause here for just a moment and consider the speed with which we have been traveling along the road of scientific progress during the past 50 years, it would be easier to grasp the impact of the great changes which have taken place.

If one were to attempt to choose a field of activity most symbolic of the great industrial and scientific progress of our Nation over the past 50 years, I think you will agree with me that airpower would be a logical choice. The development in airpower reflects the magnificent scientific and industrial achievements which have contributed so much to our present national stature, and it is, I think, indeed symbolic of the remarkable growth of our Nation during this period of time. I would like to cite three specific examples of the amazing progress which has occurred in modern aviation, examples which, I think, are a measure of the scientific and industrial advances of our Nation during this period.

In 1903 the Wright brothers achieved man's first powered flight at Kitty Hawk, N.C.—a flight which lasted 12 seconds and covered a ground distance of 120 feet. Compare this to the flight made in 1956 by B–52's of the Strategic Air Command, which with the aid of air-to-air refueling techniques, circled the globe in 45 hours, flying 24,325 miles without landing.

In 1909 Glenn Curtis set the world's speed record for aircraft in his *Golden Flier*—a startling 46.8 miles per hour. In 1956 Capt. Milburn Apt flew the X–2 research aircraft to speeds up to 2,100 miles per hour, and last year Capt. Walter Irwin flew an operational fighter interceptor, the Lockheed F–104, at over 1,400 miles per hour.

In 1911 Gen. Hap Arnold set an altitude record of 3,260 feet. In 1956 Capt. Ivan Kincheloe flew the X–2 to an altitude of 126,000 feet—nearly 24 miles.

These are, of course, but a few of the many examples of rapid progress which could be cited in both military and commercial aviation, but they are indicative of the giant technological steps which have been taken during this relatively short period of time. They are admittedly taken from the spectacular, but are nonetheless typical of our direction and our rate of travel in that direction. They symbolize the rate and extent of progress achieved by this Nation.

It has not been an easy task to adjust to such rapid and continuous progress. The Air Force must not only be constantly looking into the possibilities of the future, but must also shoulder the equally grave responsibility of maintaining our day-to-day capability at peak performance. This is no simple job considering the rapid rate at which scientific barriers are being overcome. It is entirely conceivable that a breakthrough in certain critical development areas could render a modern force obsolete within a few years. The tried and true weapons of the past—the spear, the bow and arrow, and gunpowder—lasted for centuries as useful weapons. On the other hand, the conventional aircraft is now, for all intents and purposes, obsolete as a combat weapon—its service life, about 50 years. The operational life of each new development has been less enduring than the one before. Each new improvement has brought us closer to and made us more dependent upon science and industry. I might add here, that as each new weapon system is developed, the dollar cost of the high performance and complexity which must be engineered into that system is also progressing upward at an alarming rate.

The value of, as well as the necessity for, progress has become ingrained in our day-to-day thinking and actions—not progress for the sake of progress alone, but progress to maintain the best in airpower for our country's security. The rapid succession of scientific achievements by our own country—and we cannot overlook the recent remarkable scientific exploits of the Communist powers—has established time as one of our most valuable and critical resources. An environment of haste and urgency imposes grave responsibilities on those who chart the future of this Nation. It makes doubly important the requirement for clear undertsanding, correct decisions and decisive action, and it places a premium on obtaining maximum efficiency and effectiveness from every ounce of resource invested in the security of our country. No possibility should be overlooked which would contribute to our national security. At the same time, cool and steady judgment is required to stay on the straight path and to avoid the dangerous detours which overenthusiasm and premature optimism can bring.

In this respect—and this, I feel, is a very appropriate example of the need for cool heads and clear thinking as we rush toward new goals—there have been many predictions that unmanned, automatic super missiles will soon dominate the earth, while orbiting platforms dominate outer space; or perhaps, more modestly, that some new kind of conventional projectile, or some remodeled surface or subsurface vehicle, will soon make everything else out of date. I am not implying that fulfillment of any of these predictions is impossible—or even improbable. However, it should be noted that they all contain a time equation that is not solved by the free use of the word soon. Further, it has not escaped my attention—nor, I daresay, yours—that most of these predictions are heralded as promising to make one military vehicle obsolete. That vehicle is always the manned aircraft. Older vehicles and ways of war appear in these vague prophecies as somehow more useful than ever. Before I can be persuaded that the airplane is finished as an effective weapon system, other arguments must be used than those filled with phrases like in the near future, in the not too distant future, and just over the horizon.

The key to the Air Force approach to its job lies in mission performance. To do our job well, we must invariably select the best weapon systems—regardless of any emotional relationship to the traditional weapons of war. If missiles, for example, can do the job better, they will be used. If manned aircraft can do the job better, they will be employed. Thus far, critical examination of the various possibilities before us indicates that our weapon systems of the future will be mixed—that is, we will need a force of both manned and unmanned systems. This conclusion is based upon the simple fact that there are certain advantages and disadvantages to both systems. We intend to exploit the best features of each to obtain the best results. You can be assured, however, that if future developments indicate that man is no longer a required item in our weapon systems—we in the Air Force will be the first to admit this—loudly and enthusiastically supported, I am sure, by our combat aircrews who daily are faced with the grim possibility that the next takeoff may be all the way. There are no more ardent supporters of unmanned vehicles than those combat experienced airmen who have fought their way to and from targets.

Despite the great advances in unmanned systems, however, I feel that manned aircraft will be a vital contributing factor to national security for some time to come, and also that its logical successor, manned spacecraft, will assume equal importance in the future role of aerospace power. The judgment and reasoning ability of man have been required for many years to assure complete accomplishment of the Air Force mission, regardless of the sophistication of the equipment. I do not think that this will change in the future. Man and his powers of decision and his ability to reason will continue to be paramount—perhaps decisive—in space.

As the development of airpower has progressed through the years, each new step taken to improve our air capabilities has led to, and through new problems in technology and survival. The one common denominator which has existed throughout the whole history of this development is man—man in an airplane, man at altitude, man at high speed, man under extreme g. forces. Thus our energies and efforts have been oriented in a clear and direct line toward the ultimate goal of man in space. Unfortunately, man is the one facet of our program whose basic design is not readily subject to engineering changes. Therefore, it is necessary to design around him as the weakest structural link—albeit, the strongest intellecutally—in the overall chain.

In this connection, I am again reminded of the many and varied conrtibutions to the growth of airpower which have their roots here in Texas. In the summer of 1926, for example, the now famous School of Aviation Medicine was established at Randolph Air Force Base in San Antonio—by Texas standards of measurement, a neighboring community of Lubbock. The establishment and remarkable growth—both in size and stature—of this institution is another striking illustration of the Air Force's long-term interest in manned space operations.

Although the Air Force space medicine program can actually be traced back to the first Aviation Medical Center at Minneola, Long Island, in 1918, I feel certain that this center originally did not concern itself to any great degree with the problems of manned satellites and spacecraft. It was here, however, some 40 years ago, that the original seeds of the aeromedical program were sown. From that time on, aviation medicine has been geared to the problems encountered by aircrews as aircraft attained greater speeds and higher altitudes. The primary concern of this program was to engineer man into an environment which was not basically favorable to his well being. This was true in the early program and it is still true, culminating in our extensive efforts to place man in space—not man who, like some of our experimental animals, is thrown out into space momentarily and recovered alive, a passive passenger in a space vehicle, but thinking, reasoning, useful man—man who is fully operational in his new environment. This has been and continues to be the ultimate goal of our biomedical program.

The official space program began when the Air Force School of Aviation Medicine established its department of space medicine at Randolph Air Force Base in San Antonio in 1949. It was here that earnest research was initiated into the technical aspects of manned space flight. In conjunction with other more recently established Air Force human factors laboratories, problem areas related to the task of placing man in space have been constantly under investigation by Air Force research teams. Today, the School of Aviation Medicine is recognized as the unquestionable leader in its field. Its contributions to Air Force space programs and

to the national space effort are widely recognized and acclaimed, and its unique status as one of the few complete in-house research capabilities in the Air Force today is indicative of the imagination and foresight that has marked the work of the pioneers in this field. Although we fully recognize the fine contributions of other interested agencies in this field, there is no doubt in my mind that the Air Force has the finest space medicine program in existence. This is, I am sure, an extremely comforting thought to those airmen who will eventually be manning our spacecraft and whose lives will be dependent upon the results of the long years of research conducted by these aeromedical teams.

It has been a privilege to talk to you tonight. Although my discussion has dealt primarily with the progress and growth of the Air Force, let me reiterate that this is only one phase—albeit, a very typical and significant phase—of the advances in our national defense strength. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to measure in simple terms the contributions of each of the services—plus those of science, education, and industry—to the overall defense posture of our country. The Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the Air Force all hold complementary roles in preserving the security of our Nation and that of the free world. Daily these roles are becoming more and more interdependent, and the achievement of an integrated national defense team has become a reality. Never before has the word "teamwork" carried such a significant and vital meaning.

While I have taken the opportunity tonight to talk primarily about the Air Force, let me add before closing, that many of the factors which have been contributed to our progress have been the direct results of the teamwork between the services and the scientific and industrial talent this country is so fortunate to possess. I am confident that the integrated power of our military services—complemented by the knowledge, skill, and experience which science and industry constantly invest in the national defense effort and backed up by understanding and interested citizens such as yourselves—comprise a truly formidable force which will serve our country well in the accomplishment of its aims for lasting peace throughout the world.

New York Times Urges Equalization of Military Retirement Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times which calls attention to an oversight in the Military Pay Act of 1958. January 26 I introduced a bill, H.R. 3284, which is one of a number of bills designed to correct that oversight. This article explains why this legislation is necessary:

TO RIGHT A WRONG

The military pay bill enacted by Congress a year ago established two groups of retired personnel. Those members of the armed services who retired prior to the passage of the legislation received a 6-percent retired-pay increase; those who retired after the legislation was enacted are receiving a considerably higher pay—for the same rank and the same length of service.

In the case of the former group the historic principle of keying retired pay in proportion to active pay was violated; in the case of the latter group it is retained. In other words, last year's military pay bill created two classes of military citizens—first and second grade.

This discrimination was voted by the last Congress despite the recommendations of the Cordiner committee, which made a comprehensive study of means of increasing the attractiveness of a service career. The committee explicitly stated that "military retirement and its firm tie-in with active-duty compensation is perhaps the most powerful long-term career incentive existing within the military compensation system * * *. The incentive value of [the] military retirement program depends to a major degree upon its integral relationship with active-duty compensation and the confidence which has been built up in the military body that no breach of faith or breach of retirement contract has ever been permitted."

To many retired personnel, the 1958 Pay Act appears to have broken faith. Congress owes it to men who have served long and well to right a wrong.

The South Ward Boys' Club of Newark, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, today in this great city of Washington, we are honored to have visiting us a fine group of children from the great city of Newark, N.J.

Their visit magnifies for me the importance of the youth of America and the role many of our adults are taking to help prepare them for the future when from among their numbers will come those who will take our places as guardians of our Nation.

The children—numbering 50—here today are enjoying the sights of our Capital City because of the efforts of a civic minded and determined group of men. What these men have accomplished should be a shining beacon for all adult Americans. I would like to give a brief outline of their activities.

Led by Mr. David L. Warner, a successful Newark businessman, this group formed the South Ward Boys' Club of Newark, N.J., in January of 1956. Within a few months, the club, because of its outstanding accomplishments, gained affiliation with the Boys' Club of Newark, N.J., and the Boys' Club of America.

Joined with Mr. Warner in this very worthwhile endeavor, both in its inception and through its 4 years of activity, are many of the leading business and professional men and public officeholders of the area.

In 1957, two new and very important divisions of the South Ward Boys' Club were founded. They are the Mothers' Club and the Fathers' Club. More than 600 parents are enthusiastic and hard-working members of these divisions. They are interested in the welfare and future of their children.

The youth membership in the South Ward Boys' Club has grown steadily. From a handful in 1956 it now numbers close to 1,500. Significantly, I think it should be pointed out that membership is open to all children regardless of race, creed, or color and that the membership represents all walks of life in the highly populated south ward of Newark, N.J., which is a part of the 12th Congressional District which I have the honor to represent.

In helping prepare our youth for the future, the South Ward Boys' Club engages in many educational and recreational endeavors. Today's visit to Washington is the fourth annual trip to the Capital City sponsored by the club. Each year a different group of children make the visit. And as he did on the first three occasions, Mr. Warner again is chaperoning his flock.

Today's tour will cover visits to the White House, my office in the New House Office Building, the Capitol, the House of Representatives, the U.S. Senate, the Supreme Court, Lincoln Memorial, Arlington Memorial Cemetery, and Mount Vernon.

I know today's visitors will be awed by the things they observe, just as their predecessor visitors were awed. And, I know also, that they, like their predecessors, will leave Washington with a great respect and reverence for the Nation which is their own.

The Washington tour is only one of the major activities of the club. Since its inception, the club has provided a varied and extensive educational and recreational program for its youthful members.

This has included visits to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y.; historic shrines in the State of New Jersey, special children's theater shows in Newark and at the New Jersey seashore; sporting events in Newark and New York City, and in particular baseball games of the world champion New York Yankees; outings to the many fine amusement and recreational parks in the New Jersey-New York area.

There also has been a wide range of participation sports for the youngsters, such as swimming, golf, baseball, basketball, track, and field. Many of the youngsters have become very proficient in the sports of their choice. In 1957, the club's basketball team won a statewide tournament.

Presently, the club is conducting a drive to build a modern headquarters where there can be a further expansion of the activities of the youthful members. I know the drive will be successful, for the men and women have the determination to bring to success any undertaking in which they participate, particularly when it affects our youth.

Through all of its activities, the club has geared itself to one aim—building character in the youth of America and to prepare them for adulthood when they can take their places as dedicated and responsible Americans. Each one of these people who have made the South

Ward Boys' Club and its activities possible deserve the resounding applause of all Americans. As one who has had the opportunity of observing first hand their activities and the fruits of their efforts, I salute them.

Through my observations, I have become fully convinced that the boys' clubs have become the greatest organization for the building of character outside of the church, and in closing I would like to recite the boys' club code:

I believe in God and the right to worship according to my own faith and religion.

I believe in America and the American way of life * * * in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I believe in fair play, honesty, and sportsmanship.

I believe in my Boys' Club which stands for these things.

Certainly, it is a code that might well be recited time and again by all Americans.

A Definition of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 1959, Dr. Charles Malik, President of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, addressed the New York State Bar Association. I commend both speeches to all interested persons.

The following three paragraphs from Dr. Malik's remarks are particularly noteworthy. They state, simply and clearly, a definition of freedom:

The cause of freedom, my friends, is identically the cause of free institutions. Fundamentally these free institutions are seven: the family as the inviolate group unit of society; the free press, including freedom of expression in general; free political activity, including independent political parties; freedom of association, including inviolate clubs, societies, trade unions, circles of friends; free but fully responsible economic enterprise; the university as an independent citadel of truth; and the church in its absolute autonomy as the custodian of supernatural truth. It is these seven free institutions that make America.

The battle of freedom is more than the battle for national independence and self-determination; it is more than the battle for free international association in accordance with objective interests; it is more than the battle for freedom from want; it is more than the battle for freedom from the softness and degeneracy of materialism. The authentic battle of freedom is the battle for the freedom of the human person, and the human person is really free only where and when these seven institutions are free and vigorous.

It can be shown that it belongs to the nature of things that there be just these seven free institutions and none other.

I was pleased that the Secretary of State indicated that the administration is closely examining the question of this country's relationship to the International Court of Justice. Mr. Dulles stated:

There is a serious need for all of us to develop a respect for law as a basis for stability and confidence. Those nations which do have common standards should, by their conduct and example, advance the rule of law by submitting their disputes to the International Court of Justice, or to some other international tribunal upon which they can agree.

As I have recently indicated, we are closely examining the question of our own relationship to the International Court of Justice with the view of seeing whether ways and means can be found to assure a greater use of that Court by ourselves, and, through our example, by others.

Here is a major way by which the rule of law, about which we hear so much, can be advanced. I sincerely hope that the Department of State will speed its examination of this question.

If Only the Justices Had Been in Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., in its February 4, 1959, issue entitled, "If Only the Justices Had Been in Moscow." I believe that the subject of this editorial will be of interest to this body and should be called to your attention. The editorial follows:

IF ONLY THE JUSTICES HAD BEEN IN MOSCOW

It is wished that every Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court and the judges of the Federal Appeals Court in New York could have been in Moscow to hear James E. Jackson, Jr., the U.S. Communist Party's secretary for Negro and southern affairs, sing the praises of Premier Khrushchev. Perhaps that would have opened their dreamy eyes to the Communist menace in this country.

The courts have been duped into the false logic that American Communists do not plot to overthrow the Government by force, that they simply intend to exercise peaceably their right to vote and thereby influence the form of government. If they had been in Moscow this week, their unrealistic views would have exploded in their faces.

Jackson once was tried for advocating the forcible overthrow of the Government. He and other Communists were freed by the New York Appeals Court on the almost unbelievable logic that they taught revolution in theory only, not in practice. Similarly, the Supreme Court's decisions in subversion cases have taken a soft approach to the Communist threat.

Now Jackson praises the Soviet Union which, incidentally, is dedicated to destroying the United States. Now he publicly vows "to follow firmly the Marxist-Leninist line." Can there be any doubt that Jackson and his kind are guilty of the most infamous form of treachery? Can there be any doubt as to where his loyalties lie in the life-or-death struggle with communism?

Until the U.S. Supreme Court recovers its senses and awakens to the real threat of communism it shall remain this Nation's secondary enemy in its efforts to maintain freedom in the world. Oh, how it is wished that the Justices could have been in Moscow to hear Jackson's confession.

Strong Leadership for Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Democrat Party has asked for strong leadership from the President and here they have it. The following editorial by Gould Lincoln, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on February 5, 1959, is an excellent discourse on President Eisenhower's fight against further deficit spending by the Federal Government:

PRESIDENT CARRIES ECONOMY FIGHT
(By Gould Lincoln)

Democrats in Congress who are rushing bills for greatly increased housing funds and for airports—increasing the President's budget by hundreds of millions—have had the responsibility for big and irresponsible spending thrown directly in their faces by Mr. Eisenhower. Furthermore, this issue of big spending, with increased danger of inflation and a weakened dollar, will be hammered home by the President throughout this session of Congress and the session which will run next year at least until the national conventions are held for nomination of Democratic and Republican presidential candidates. If big Government appropriations and authorizations for future expenditures increase the cost of living and devalue the dollar in the next 18 months, the Democrats will have to bear a good part of the responsibility—if they persist in their present course.

PRESIDENT'S WARNING

President Eisenhower at his press conference yesterday pertinently commented that the Democrats—who are galloping toward a further unbalanced budget and big deficit spending—have made no suggestion for increased taxes to meet this situation. That, he said, would be the courageous thing to do. But, he continued, the American people do not want increased Federal taxes. He might have added that the Democrats are equally aware of the fact. The President did point out that the Federal Government relies on the income tax for the great mass of its receipts or collections from the taxpayers. These income taxes, ranging up to 92 percent of big incomes, soaring through many brackets, are a continuing and heavy burden, from which all relief will be effectually shut off by big spending and unbalanced budgets.

This economic issue, the President insists, will be fought relentlessly by him. He has warned that he will press it again and again. Whether it calls a halt to big Democratic increases in his $77 billion budget is still to develop. From the speed with which the Democrats have put forward the big spending housing and airport bills it could be predicted that the Eisenhower balanced budget will be swept aside.

The weapons of the President against the big spenders is his veto power. While he has repeatedly pointed out he does not say whether he will veto a measure until it is actually before him, the President has been so forceful in determination to hold the line there seems no doubt he will use the veto when the time comes. It takes a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress to override a Presidential veto. Despite the big Democratic majorities in Senate and House, a combination of Democratic conservatives and

Republicans may make it difficult to press the big spending bills to final victory.

ROCKEFELLER ASKS NEW TAXES

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, considered a probable contender for the Republican presidential nomination next year, is going ahead with big spending plans for the State. Unlike the Democrats in Congress, however, he is proposing increases in taxes to pay for the big new items of expenditure. This is the crux: he seeks a balanced budget by increasing taxes, while the Democrats in Congress do no such thing. Further Governor Rockefeller bars any compromise on his tax plan. In other words, if the citizens of New York are going to have increased facilities and a continuance of other facilities on the same scale they now have, they must pay for them—not in some dim, distant future, but now.

President Eisenhower, if you listen to the Democrats, is proposing nothing for housing in his budget, or for airports and safety of air passengers. The truth of the matter is that the Eisenhower housing program calls for Federal expenditure of $1.6 billion as compared to the Democratic program of $2.9 billion, a difference of $1.3 billion in expenditures over a period of years. For air travel safety, the President has included in his budget $375 million. The Democrats have increased this to $575 million, and they provide money for building administration buildings and facilities at airports—the same kind of thing the railroads built when they constructed depots. As the President pointed out, the Government did not build depots, either for the railroads or the buses.

The Eisenhower airport bill, on the other hand, directs itself to one factor and one factor only—improving the safety of flying, in the air, the takeoff, and the landing of airplanes and their passengers. In the President's opinion, the localities should look after the handsome airport buildings which so many desire—instead of having that cost put on the Federal Government. This, however, does not appeal to the big spenders.

The Democrats may bust the President's budget wide open. That may not be the only thing they bust open, if they succeed.

Soviet Subs Increase in Numbers and Require Early Completion of Intracoastal Waterway System in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, according to our best information, the Soviets have many more submarines than we do and have been rapidly increasing their numbers. According to a recent dispatch, Adm. Arleigh Burke, U.S. Chief of Naval Operations, the submarine has progressed faster than the antisubmarine warfare capability to combat it. This underlines for all of us the necessity of early completion of the Intracoastal Waterway system in the United States by the construction of the Cross Florida Barge Canal. This link between the eastern seaboard route and the gulf and Mississippi portions of our U.S. Intracoastal Waterway is necessary if we are to have a protected course for the transportation of oil from the western oil-producing areas in the United States to the industrial northeastern areas of our country. It has been estimated that the cheapest method of insuring the availability of this oil is to build this canal. Congress should not let this year expire before it starts the construction of this congressionally authorized project. I include here two articles which have valuable information on this subject:

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union, Dec. 15, 1958]

SOVIET FLEET SECOND ONLY TO U.S. NAVY—HAS 500 SUBS, ACCORDING TO JANE'S REPORT

LONDON, December 15.—Russia now is a first-class naval power, second only to the United States, with a submarine force of 500 "its most formidable defensive arm," according to Jane's Fighting Ships 1958–59, published today.

The world-famous naval reference work says there is evidence Russian shipbuilding and marine engineering resources are being concentrated on nuclear-powered vessels, which involves the conversion of existing plants.

"In recent months it has become clear that the overall technological lead which the United States held over Russia is diminishing."

The activities of the major naval powers "points to the certaintly of intensive submarine warfare in any future hostilities."

Naval administrators the world over had been shaken out of the orbit of conventional ships, conventional propulsion and conventional weapons.

REVOLUTION IN STRATEGY

"Naval architects and maritime experts are becoming increasingly aware of the revolution in naval strategy and thinking and in global sea warfare that the advent of the nuclear-powered submarine has caused.

"With their increase in size, propulsive power and destructive power, submarines are coming to be regarded by the principal naval powers as the capital ships of the future."

There have been notable advances in the technical development and operational capabilities of American submarines and the U.S. Navy's atomic submarine lineup now is very formidable.

"The concentration of undersea power has been reflected in the composition of fleets," Jane's says.

BATTLESHIPS OUTDATED

Battleships are rapidly becoming extinct, cruisers are following them into obsolescence (except in the United States and U.S.S.R.) and there has been a great resurgence of specialized warships of the destroyer or frigate size.

Among the nuclear powers there was little reason to expect the aircraft carrier to disappear yet, but the carriers of the future probaly would be limited to about half the size of the existing largest vessels.

Aircraft carriers will continue to be the core of the new streamlined British Royal Navy.

Britain has ordered four guided missile destroyers of about 5,500 tons displacement each fully loaded, but it will be some years before they will join the fleet.

One feature of U.S. policy is the readiness with which warship construction programs are financed. Another was the tenacity with which they are holding on to various obsolete warships.

"But it is in future naval programs that the U.S. Navy shows such strength of purpose and technical foresight."

There had been two significant developments in Russian naval policy in the past year.

"The deadwood in the shape of obsolescent warships has been cut out and the men and resources needed to maintain the old ships have been diverted to the development of new weapons.

"And there has been a considerable increase in Russian naval activity on the high seas."

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union, Jan. 27, 1959]

NAVY RATES U.S. SUBS BETTER THAN RUSSIA'S, BUT REDS HAVE MANY MORE

WASHINGTON, January 26.—The U.S. Navy is satisfied that Russia's submarine cannot match the performance of American subs, boat for boat.

But the great and growing number of submarines that Russia could throw into action worries the Navy considerably.

This two-sided picture was given to the Senate Armed Services Committee today by Secretary of the Navy Thomas S. Gates, Jr. and Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations. They testified in a closed briefing session.

Part of the testimony was made public. It included the appraisal of the submarine situation and a discussion of the Navy's growing nuclear power. Burke especially sounded alarmed about the Red subs.

Gates said the Navy will be able to hit harder than ever with a nuclear punch, both from submarines able to launch Polaris missiles from underwater and from carrier-based jet attack planes.

Burke emphasized the Navy needs more missiles, jet aircraft, carriers and fighting ships in general.

The admiral said the Navy will have 113 active submarines by next July 1, but Russia will have about four times as many.

"Of greatest concern to the Navy is their submarine force numbering about 450," Burke said.

"Since World War II the submarine has progressed faster than the antisubmarine warfare capability to combat it," he said.

Here's the way Gates put it:

"Russia's submarines cannot match ours, boat for boat * * * (The great numbers that the Soviets have) impose a grave threat not only to our control of the seas but to our ability to defend the country against missile attack."

Gates and Burke were before the committee to supply a briefing on the condition of the Navy. Gates made it clear he is supporting President Eisenhower's defense budget. Burke did not challenge these figures in his statement, but made it clear he is not satisfied with the current rate of replacement for ships, planes, and weapons.

The Curtis Bill: Additional Tax Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following letter from a valued constituent and friend, C. Herbert Cornell, president, Fidelity Bank & Trust Co., of Minneapolis, Minn. Mr. Cornell calls attention to

H.R. 3149, believing it to be one source for additional tax revenue:

FIDELITY BANK & TRUST CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 9, 1959.
The Honorable ROY WIER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ROY: You fellows in Congress are constantly looking around for additional tax revenue. Well, don't overlook the possibility of the Curtis bill, H.R. 3149.

Huge sums of tax free earnings are piling up in the big mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations. This money will never be distributed to the members in dividends. Do you know because of this tax advantage that the savings and loan associations have, that the Twin City Federal Savings & Loan Association has grown in a period of 4 years, from less than $100 million to over $300 million? My projection shows that within a period of sometime between 5 and 10 years, the savings and loan industry in the Twin City area will be bigger than the banking industry. This is possible only because of the tax advantage.

I do urge you to support the Curtis bill, H.R. 3149.

Very truly yours,
C. HERBERT CORNELL,
President.

William Mountjoy Garrard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, death came last year to an outstanding American who had made one of the greatest contributions to the American cotton industry of any individual in our time. William Mountjoy Garrard, Sr., of Greenwood, Miss., was one of the founders and a highly successful general manager for many years of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association. He made the Staple Cotton Association known throughout the cotton trade as the foremost organization of its kind.

Mr. Garrard's greatest contribution to cotton, however, was more than through his work with the Staple Cotton Association. His leadership in helping to formulate sound cotton policy throughout the cotton trade was vastly beneficial to the American cotton farmer and all segments of the cotton trade.

Under unanimous consent, I am including an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal and a resolution by the board of directors of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association in tribute to Mr. Garrard:

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal]

WILLIAM MOUNTJOY GARRARD

The Mississippi Delta and the cotton world mourn the loss of an outstanding leader, a man who devoted the major share of his life to the improvement of conditions in the area in which he lived.

William Mountjoy Garrard was an inspired man whose devotion to an idea resulted in the development of the greatest cooperative cotton marketing organization in the country.

Yet that was only the beginning of his work and his responsibilities. Innumerable civic projects succeeded because he directed them. He gave of himself without reserve, and the results of his devotion to the delta are felt in the economic, cultural, and spiritual life of the community.

The bounty that he gave was returned to him in the form of the love and esteem of his friends, neighbors, and community.

He will be missed, but the memory of the man and his accomplishments will remain forever in the consciousness of the delta.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. WILLIAM MOUNTJOY GARRARD—RESOLUTION

Be it resolved, That we the members of the board of directors of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association and the Staple Cotton Discount Corp., meeting jointly, wish to pay tribute to the memory, and to express our heartfelt grief at the passing, of our beloved Will Garrard, who joined his Maker September 8, 1958.

His hand more than any other guided this association through the rough road of its early existence.

His mind more than any other has directed this association through the narrow path of high standards and ethics for which it is known today.

His spirit, his determination, his drive, his enthusiasm, and his high optimism and confidence during times of adversity have been the leading factors in creating this association which stands today as a memorial to his lifetime endeavor.

For all of these the members and staff of this association will be forever grateful.

The longest shadow of his fine life, however, is cast upon our memory in a warmer and more personal way.

Any association member (and there were many) who through the years came to ask his advice will cherish the memory of a smile which bespoke of the joy of living—a sparkle of eye that indicated uprightness, honesty of purpose, confidence, and a lack of fear both physical and mental, a directness of nature and a warmth of personality which have endeared him and his memory to each and everyone of us.

We have lost wise counsel, it is true, but our greatest loss is that we have lost a friend.

May the lengthening shadow of his fine character and personality remain with our association through the years to come.

Be it further resolved, that this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this association and corporation and that a copy be sent to the family of William Mountjoy Garrard.

Martin Steps Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters and editorial:

HONOLULU, T.H., *January 8, 1959.*
The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Would you be so kind as to have enclosed Honolulu Advertiser editorial inserted in body of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

It is the very least we Hawaii DAV's can ask, as Joe, like yourself, has been our good friend these many years.

With kindest personal regards and all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH CAPSIN,
Chairman, Committee on Employment Security, Department of Hawaii, DAV.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Jan. 8, 1959]

MARTIN STEPS DOWN

His full name is JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., but he is known internationally as JOE.

JOE MARTIN has been in Congress since 1925. In all those years he served the Republican Party and the Nation ably and with integrity.

Now, ailing at 74, he has been deposed as Republican minority leader in the House of Representatives where he used to be Speaker. JOE MARTIN, who won admiration and respect even from opponents, is saddened today. In time, when he realizes that his countrymen are proud of his record and envious of his reputation, that sadness should pass.

It has been a long and fine career for JOE MARTIN, whose father was a blacksmith. The son, eldest in a family of eight children, because a newspaper reporter early in the century and still publishes a newspaper in North Attleboro, Mass. He entered Congress when Nicholas Longworth was Speaker, becoming minority leader during the New Deal.

It has been said that he would rather have been Speaker, which he was, than President of the United States, which he might have been. Had he been more personally ambitious he could have quelled the Wendell Willkie boom in the 1940 Republican convention at which MARTIN presided. Had MARTIN done so he probably would have been the Republican candidate that year.

JOE MARTIN now has been replaced by Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, a man still in his fifties, who was majority leader in the 80th and 83d Congresses. White House neutrality may have contributed to the downfall.

JOE MARTIN at 74 has nothing to be ashamed of, everything of which to be proud. He still retains his seat in the House of Representatives and probably can have it as long as he wishes. His work will be lonelier now, but he will be just as loyal, courageous, and wise as ever.

HONOLULU, T.H., *January 8, 1959.*
The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: We [majority of Hawaii's DAV's] regret that you stepped down as Republican minority leader. And I, personally, cannot find the right word to express my deep regret.

In the last 12 years I have read practically all of your comments and speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and you have shown utmost consideration for the war-disabled, the small businessman, the 1-acre-and-a-cow farmer, and, not lease, the laboring man.

Anent enclosure, I am forwarding the original of this Honolulu Advertiser editorial (January 8, 1959), "MARTIN Steps Down," to Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS requesting that she have same inserted in body of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Also, I am taking the liberty of forwarding copies of this letter—with true copy of editorial—to department commander, DAV, Massachusetts; department commander, DAV, Hawaii; and, of course, to the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

With warm personal regards and every good wish.

Sincerely,
JOE CAPSIN,
Chairman, Committee on Employment Security, Department of Hawaii, DAV.

Gen. William J. Donovan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Nation and the world lost a great soldier, a great diplomat, and a distinguished citizen in the passing of Maj. Gen. William J. (Wild Bill) Donovan.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial and article which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., February 9, 1959:

GEN. WILLIAM J. DONOVAN

William J. (Wild Bill) Donovan's life had most of the ingredients of a medieval legend in our time. He lived it to the full as soldier, adventurer, advocate and servant of his country.

One of Buffalo's most famous sons, he faithfully fitted the many roles in which he was cast in the past half century. Through World War I—in which he richly earned the sobriquet of "Wild Bill" as commander of "The Fighting 69th" of the Rainbow Division—he was a fearless fighting man; he practiced his profession before the courts of the land from the lowest to the highest tribunal; as chief of the shadowy Office of Strategic Services during the last war, he directed its almost incredible exploits of espionage and valor and gained his greatest fame.

Although he had all the appearance of the handsome, dashing hero of his lifelong adventure story, General Donovan shunned the reputation of swashbuckler. On the battlefield, he seemingly courted death but he was a clever tactician and strategist. He brought these same qualities to his practice of the law and put them to brilliant purpose in the hazardous works of the supersecret OSS. It was his skilled brain that masterminded sabotage and engineered the breathtaking escapes of thousands of allied soldiers from behind enemy lines.

General Donovan's career was studded with successes in every field except one—that of politics.. He was disappointed when he sought the governorship of his home State and even more so when he failed to be appointed Attorney General under Herbert Hoover. Perhaps it was as well that he didn't become bogged down in the jungles of the political life. It could very well have curtailed his services in other fields to which he devoted his unique skills. And besides he was not a practitioner of compromise, an art not wtihout its uses in politics. His country can be grateful to this man to whom the overworked description of dedicated must surely be applied. His is a monumental loss.

TYPICAL DONOVAN ACTION INSPIRED POEM BY KILMER

One of Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan's typical acts during World War I wasn't even mentioned in the day's dispatches. It was heralded, instead, in a poem by Joyce Kilmer, who had earlier written "Trees."

A lieutenant and his squad had been partially buried in a dugout by a shell explosion. General Donovan—then colonel of the "Fighting 69th" Regiment—helped dig them out.

Sergeant Kilmer witnessed the incident and it inspired him to write "Rouge Bouquet:" Several days later, Sergeant Kilmer was killed while serving as General Donovan's adjutant during the crossing of the River Ourcq under shellfire.

The poem was read publicly for the first time at Sergeant Kilmer's funeral. Republication rights have been purchased by the Buffalo Evening News. The poem follows:

"ROUGE BOUQUET

"(By Joyce Kilmer)

"In a wood they call the Rouge Bouquet
There is a new-made grave today,
Built by never a spade nor pick
Yet covered with earth 10 metres thick.
There lie many fighting men,
  Dead in their youthful prime,
Never to laugh nor love again
  Nor taste the summertime.
For Death came flying through the air
And stopped his flight at the dugout stair,
Touched his prey and left them there,
  Clay to clay.
He hid their bodies stealthily
In the soil of the land they fought to free
  And fled away.
Now over the grave abrupt and clear
  Three volleys ring;
And perhaps their brave young spirits hear
  The bugle sing:
'Go to sleep!
Go to sleep!
Slumber well where the shell screamed and
  fell.
Let your rifles rest on the muddy floor,
You will not need them any more.
Danger's past
Now at last,
Go to sleep!'
There is on earth no worthier grave
To hold the bodies of the brave
Than this place of pain and pride
Where they nobly fought and died.
Never fear but in the skies
  Saints and angels stand
Smiling with their holy eyes
  On this new-come band.
St. Michael's sword darts through the air
And touches the aureole on his hair
As he sees them stand saluting there,
  His stalwart sons;
And Patrick, Brigid, Columkill
Rejoice that in veins of warriors still
  The Gael's blood runs
And up to Heaven's doorway floats,
  From the wood called Rouge Bouquet,
A delicate cloud of bugle notes
  That softly say:
'Farewell!
Farewell!
Comrades true, born anew, peace to you!
Your souls shall be where the heroes are
And your memory shine like the morning-
  star.
Brave and dear,
Shield us here.
Farewell.' "

Whither Israel's Arabs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues a most illuminating article on the Arab peoples who still live in Israel. The article was written by Gideon Weigert and appeared in the American Zionist, January 1959 issue:

WHITHER ISRAEL'S ARABS?

(By Gideon Weigert)

JERUSALEM.—Minorities all over the world to this day undoubtedly represent a thorny problem. If this is true of such states as the United States and Russia, where after long periods the minority questions are far from being solved, it is all the more true about Israel.

People tend to forget how young Israel is, for 10 years in the life of a nation is as nothing. In Israel, in addition to the usual problems presented by minorities, religion, race, and culture, another one—a unique one, it must be admitted—must be added in order to present a true picture of the situation in the country.

Those Arabs who remained in Israel in 1948 after the rest of their compatriots fled across the borders, suffered a sudden and enormous psychological shock. From being a large majority, they suddenly found themselves reduced to a very small minority, bitterly disillusioned in their former leaders, and yet sharing with them the hatred and bitterness against the new, young State of Israel. This is the dilemma, then, which only now is being about to be solved from within.

It is only at the present time that some of the Arabs themselves, and the intellectuals mainly, are beginning to profess openly a more pro-Israel attitude (and without the fear of being branded by other Arabs as traitors) and to understand that man lives not by bread alone, and that in addition to economic and social progress in the first decade of their new life in Israel, the striking of cultural and intellectual roots must follow.

Who are these Israel Arabs? Mostly rural folk living in over a hundred villages in Galilee and the little triangle they comprise 175,000 Moslems with their own religious courts, judges (kadis), court of appeal (Sharia), and about 200 clergymen; over 45,000 Christians of the various communities with 160 churches and full freedom to observe their religious doctrines; some 27,000 Druse, part of a small tribe living mainly in the Lebanon and Syria and known for their toughness and secret religion; and hundreds of followers of the Baha'i sect, as well as the Circassian community.

Thirty-five thousand Moslems inhabit the little triangle, that stretch of land only a stone's throw from the Jordan border, running from Jenin, in the north, and southward to Petah Tikva. In 1949 these people, living in 22 villages, were given the choice of staying on their farms in Israel or leaving for Jordan to become refugees. They decided to throw in their lot with the young State of Israel and stick to their farms for better or for worse.

Even the most pessimistic ones, those who have numerous complaints about the military rule to which they are subjected and which still requires them to carry permits for traveling outside their zone, will admit today that very few regret their decision of 9 years ago.

In 1949 the entire area had some 15 wells producing 1.5 million cubic meters of water, enough to irrigate about 2,000 dunams (500 acres). Today, 6 Arab villages have drinking water on tap, while 45 wells produce 22 million cubic meters of water, which irrigate 30,000 dunams (7,500 acres) or 80 percent of all arable land in the district.

In 1 village, Tirah, 700 new rooms were built in 9 years. There are 3 secondary schools with 170 pupils. Another 25 attend agricultural schools, while 30 attend Hebrew University, including 15 from 1 village alone, Taiyba. While during the mandate there was no local council, there are now four. Hundreds of radio sets, and gas cookers, electricity, drinking water on tap, roads, banks, clubs, and modern communication facilities have made their appearance in this exclusively Arab region.

Or take the case of Nazareth, the largest Arab urban center in Israel. For decades

this town had lain dormant and listless, its inhabitants coming to regard unemployment almost as a profession. The town was off the beaten track of civilization, and apart from a handful of pilgrims, arriving for Christmas, and Easter, there was little activity, with the people seeking work in Haifa, Jaffa, and Acre. When Israel took over control the population numbered 23,000 and employment presented a major problem.

Since then, the Government administrative center for the entire northern district has been moved to the capital of Galilee, as the town is now known. Hundreds of housing units have been built and local workers have experienced an unprecedented boom. Two major industrial enterprises have opened, and instead of there being surplus manpower, new labor must be recruited from the agrarian hinterland to meet the mounting demand for workers.

There are Moslem, Christian, and Druse volunteers in the Israel armed forces, ranging from privates to officers. Altogether 417 members of various minority groups serve in the regular police and in the border police. An Israel £130,000 housing project has been completed for Druse ex-soldiers who had flocked in 1948 from the nearby Jebel Druse in Syria to fight alongside the Israel army to beat off the armed invasion of Galilee by Syrian and Lebanese troops.

Another thorny problem dating back to the war of liberation is now being tackled. It involves the economic well being of 20,000 persons (about 3,500 families), all of them Arab displaced persons who at the height of the fighting had left their villages and whose houses were destroyed.

The Government has allocated £20 million to be used over the next few years to solve the problem by means of providing compensation for land abandoned, and/or new agricultural units in exchange, the building of housing projects in areas where these persons are mainly concentrated (mostly in Galilee) and the provision of long-term loans enabling them to acquire new livestock and equipment, as well as technical and professional assistance.

Many of these persons are refugees who were allowed to reenter Israel under a reunion of families scheme, in addition to infiltrators who had returned illegally and were later allowed for humanitarian reasons to remain.

The government policy toward the Israel minorities has foundered on several crucial issues. First, there is an urgent need for a thorough streamlining of procedure: there are still cases of abuse and overstepping of authority by both civilian officials and junior army officers working among the Arabs. The authorities have been slow to inform the Arab population that such conduct is not the official policy of the state.

Then there is the serious problem of hundreds of secondary school graduates who can find no employment open to them. One solution might be the establishment of a liaison office in Nazareth to help and advise graduates. As it is, many of them sit around idly in cafes, becoming easy prey to Communist propaganda.

But little has been done to eliminate one sore point—the dissatisfaction of the intellectuals among the minorities, a group which has been sitting on the fence for the past decade, not knowing to which side to extend its loyalties. Only toward the end of last year was a serious effort made, for the first time, to engage this class of Arab in a free and open exchange of views with key Israel officials dealing with Arab affairs in order to encourage them to come out with their grievances.

But apart from teachers and officials, the Israel authorities must reach in a similar manner a great number of Arab local and municipal councilors, members of the free professions, students at the Hebrew University. If activities in this field proceed at the present slow pace, however, it will take years to reach an average of 2 to 3 persons of this group from each of the over 100 Arab villages. The same holds good in the absence of any drive in adult education, eradication of illiteracy in rural areas, opening of clubs, lectures and the provision of mobile cinema units.

As in the wider sphere of Arab relations, where the main reason for the difficulties is the inner weakness and absence of any political, social, and cultural ideas which mark Arab nationalism, and this in turn leads to the gradual acceptance of Communist ideology, so too, do anti-Israel and Communist principles spread among Israel's minority group.

What remains to be done? It is certain that Israel can do nothing to isloate her own Arab minority completely from the ideology of Arab nationalism sweping the region today.

There are two signs emerging recently which show a gradual thawing in the frozen posture of fence-sitting of the past. One is the gesture made by Fares Hamdan, the Knesset member from the little triangle. At the time of the declaration of the United Arab Republic and the Arab Union, he openly declared himself for the Jews of Israel by signing a contract investing capital in a joint Jewish-Arab industrial enterprise in his native village. "I believe," he said, "that this is the only correct way open to us Arabs in Israel—confidence in the Jews and a deep conviction that our fate is joined together forever. Let us hope that there will be other such projects."

A second development, minor though it may appear, is no less significant. It is the emergence of a feeling among Arab intellectuals that the time has come to care for the welfare of the village and that they are the ones to initiate such a move. In various villages, Arab school principals have for the first time begun organizing their village communities on their own initiative.

Availability of Funds for Doing International Business—Address by Hon. George A. Blowers

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in and impressed by a speech made before the World Trade Center Seminar in Boston, Mass., on January 29, 1959, by the Honorable George A. Blowers, Director of the Export-Import Bank, on the "Availability of Funds for Doing International Business." This is a subject of paramount interest to me and I am confident that my distinguished colleagues would benefit from the information in the address of Mr. Blowers and it is a pleasure for me to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The address follows:

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR DOING INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS—ADDRESS BEFORE THE WORLD TRADE CENTER SEMINAR, BOSTON, MASS., JANUARY 29, 1959, BY GEORGE A. BLOWERS, DIRECTOR, EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Because of the short time I have at my disposal, I shall without preliminaries jump right into my subject. I shall try to give you in broadest outline what the various national and international agencies are doing so as to have time to particularize on the activities of the Export-Import Bank in this field.

Right after the last World War it became obvious that if the economies of the various nations of the free world were to be rehabilitated and brought into production under a free enterprise system, by ways which would obviate the necessity of using autocratic means for forcing savings and capital growth, it would be necessary for the United States through public and private channels to create a huge outflow of investment capital. Such capital was needed not only to rebuild war damaged factories but to build whole new industries. In the developing economies the need was broader. Foreign loans were and still are required for the broad social overhead type of investment.

I need not recount for this sophisticated audience the steps which have been taken by our Government over the years to rebuild and rehabilitate war-torn economies on the one hand, and to speed the process of economic growth in the developing countries on the other. Recent events in Europe should be cause for great pride and satisfaction to our Nation. The Common Market and the general progress toward increased convertibility are evidence that through our efforts and the efforts of the people of Western Europe these economies have been restored to health and vigor.

In the underdeveloped economies progress and success are not so evident. Here the progress must be slower because it is a problem of developing human resources along with material resources. In spite of this, if we look at the statistics we find that the rate of growth has been rapid on every front. In most cases the increase in production has been at a more rapid rate than in the United States, while in Latin America it has been explosive.

International agencies and agencies of the United States Government have been making funds available for development purposes year after year and in the last few years at an accelerating rate. Last year alone the Export-Import Bank loaned and approved allocations under existing credits in the total amount of $1 billion. The International Cooperation Administration disbursed $1,219,000,000. The Development Loan Fund loaned $513 million. Public Law 480 surplus agricultural commodity sales were in the amount of $1.039 billion. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development loaned $770 million, and transactions of the International Monetary Fund totaled $1.2 billion. It is true that the funds made available by the International Monetary Fund are not considered to be for development purposes, but they keep the wheels of trade turning and help the development process.

Judging from announcements made during the last few months, it seems to be evident that our Government intends to maintain or to step up Government assistance to the developing countries and to do whatever possible to stimulate an increased flow of private funds for investment abroad. The administration, in fact, is committed by public pronouncements to request of Congress increased funds for existing agencies and funds for agencies to be brought into being. So far, we have heard of such assistance for the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in the amount of $2.6 billion, for the International Monetary Fund in the amount of $1.4 billion, a supplemental appropriation for the International Development Fund of $225 million, and a new appropriation of $700 million for fiscal 1960 with authority to increase their guarantee program to $1 billion. Funds will be required too, for the new Inter-American Development Bank and for a development bank in the

Middle East, if those countries should request such an institution.

Constant agitation from Washington for private enterprise or private lenders to become more active in this field and to take over a larger share of the burden does not mean that private enterprise has not been doing a magnificent job. Today, direct private investment abroad is estimated to amount to $25¼ billion. Total U.S. investments abroad are estimated at $54 billion. I think there is no doubt that private investors will invest abroad in increasing amounts as the host countries put out the welcome mat and convince American investors that the climate is healthy for such investment.

Having given you this very brief outline of what our Government, the international agencies and business have done in making money available, I should like, with your permission, to use the rest of my time to tell you about your bank—the Export-Import Bank, what it does and how it assists U.S. business while at the same time assisting our Government's foreign economic policy objectives. I say your bank because all of you as taxpayers are shareholders in the Export-Import Bank.

The $1 billion capital of the Export-Import Bank was subscribed by the U.S. Treasury. In addition to this, we are authorized by Congress to borrow from the Treasury up to an amount of $6 billion. This gives us a total lending capacity of $7 billion. The Bank was established in 1934 and its purpose from its inception has been to move U.S. goods into the export market without competing with private lenders and without making unsound loans. Those charged with its management soon discovered that the bank could best serve this purpose by assisting the borrowing countries to increase the productive capacities of their economies, thereby creating the means of repaying loans and at the same time increasing purchasing power for additional U.S. exports. This feature has given our loans a self-liquidating character as regards dollar costs. Since the emphasis is generally on projects which will either earn or save dollars for the borrowing country, it has had the additional effect of making our Bank a development bank from the point of view of the borrowing country. Even our balance of payments loans or so-called bail-out loans have served the purpose of keeping trade from stagnating and development from retrogressing. It is my firm conviction these loans have served a real developmental purpose in preventing financial and payment crises in developing countries from reaching the panic stage and the stifling proportions of our own growing pains crises of 1869, 1873, 1884, 1907, and 1929.

Over the years the Export-Import Bank as the principal lending agency of the U.S. Government has been able to bring sound financial judgment to bear on the problems of our trading partners. I believe this has been one of the Bank's greatest contributions and I am able to say this in all modesty because I am a relative newcomer to the board—actually the latest appointee.

Measured in dollar amounts, what has been the activity of the Bank? During its life, the Bank has authorized loans approximating $10 billion. The Bank has actually disbursed $6,586 million, of which $3,272 million have become due and have been repaid. During calendar year 1958 our Bank disbursed about $650 million. Let me, with a few figures, give you some idea of what the impact of our loans has been. During 1958 our board made every effort to stimulate exports—remember we were all fearful of what might happen to our economy that year. We estimate our loans helped move $1¼ billion of exports. Since total exports, excluding military hardware, amounted to about $16.5 billion, this means that the Export-Import Bank loans helped move about 7½ percent of our total exports for the year. Let me emphasize that the impact of our foreign loans is felt throughout the country. We have estimates which indicate that an order for one Lockheed plane creates business in 38 States. We have evidence that two credits totaling $16.5 million for power equipment generated orders of $24.9 million which were distributed among 40 companies in 15 States. Loans of $61.5 million for the development of a steel mill in Chile generated 7,807 orders with 780 suppliers, and a cement plant in Sumatra, 1,000 separate orders.

A fact about our operations which is not generally realized is that our loans offer a real stimulus to private investors to invest abroad. Estimates indicate that each $2 loaned abroad by the Export-Import Bank draws $1 of private investment. From 1952 to 1958 we authorized in round numbers $1½ billion in new credits, which were supplemented by commercial bank participations to the extent of $366 million. Let me point out that these participations were for the account and risk of the commercial banks and without recourse to the Export-Import Bank. In addition to these participations by commercial banks there were nonrecouse participations by suppliers and others to the extent of an additional $205 million, and there were equity investments in the enterprises financed to the extent of $265 million. These various participations add up to a total of $836 million of private capital, which accompanied our lending of $1½ billion. And I repeat, this private investment was without benefit of guaranties and entirely at the risk of the private investors.

I have not spoken of our so-called Cooley loans. At the risk of encroaching on Mr. Allison's subject, I would like to say just a word on this subject. This Cooley program was slow to get started, not because of problems within the Bank but because of the time necessarily required to agree on complicated details of sales agreements for agricultural commodities. After agreement is reached, considerable time is required to order and ship the grain before the money becomes available to the Export-Import Bank.

The result has been that in making loans we have kept pretty well abreast of the money at our disposal with the exceptions of India and Pakistan and we are willing to stand on our record. We have made to date 53 loans in 5 countries for a total equivalent of approximately US$24 million.

Time is getting short, so let me say just a few words as to what this means to you as a taxpayer. First, let me emphasize our activities have not cost you 1 cent! For the first half of this fiscal year net profits from our operations have amounted to $41.4 million. This, of course, is after paying all administrative expenses and $18.7 million to the U.S. Treasury as interest on monies borrowed from them. We estimate that for the full year our net profits will approximate $82 million. You might also be interested to know that during the 24-year life of the Bank we have paid to the U.S. Treasury $196 million in dividends on their equity investment in the Bank and we have paid to them a total of $238 million on money borrowed. I will not say that all the losses on our books are good, but to date the losses we have had to write off have been small, amounting to only one-twentieth of 1 percent of loans made. Against possible future defaults we have been able to accumulate out of earnings a reserve of $528.4 million, equal to just about 16 percent of outstanding loans. As a bureaucracy we have been a dismal failure. After 24 years of life in a climate conducive to expansion, we remain a small organization with only 224 employees.

I wish to apologize for the number of figures I have used but this is a broad field and in condensing it the fluff fell out and the figures remained. I shall be glad to answer any questions you may have.

National Security and Hydroelectric Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days we have witnessed the strange spectacle of a foreign government launching a campaign of recrimination in the American press against our Government's award of a contract for two hydraulic turbines to an American company in preference to a British firm.

Letters have been sent to American newspapers by the British Information Service, an agency of the British Government, quoting the British Ambassador to Washington and the president of Britain's Board of Trade as, in effect, impeaching the honesty and integrity of U.S. Government officials.

The president of the British Board of Trade, a government agency similar to our Department of Commerce, the British Ambassador and the British Information Services speak for Britain and British interests, not for the United States.

The direct approach of a British agency to American newspapers, with its implied slurs at American officials and policy, has met with a mixed response. One segment of our press has been quick to echo the British position.

In sharp contrast, the Oakland Tribune, of Oakland, Calif., speaks up for America.

The Oakland Tribune published the following editorial on January 28 under the heading "British Campaign":

Attention was called yesterday in these columns to the unhappy state of mind of much of the British press over the awarding of a contract for hydroelectric equipment by the U.S. Government to U.S. firms in preference to lower priced British equipment.

Now we learn that the comments of the British press were government inspired, and that a campaign has been launched in this country by the British Information Service, an agency of the British Government.

The San Francisco office of the British Information Service is sending out letters to financial editors and the city desks of newspapers in this area, and no doubt elsewhere, referring to the preference for American equipment over British as a slap in the face for Britain.

It refers to a statement by Sir David Eccles, president of the British Board of Trade, also a British Government agency, in which he said:

"Rejection of this tender is hardly consistent with the ideas of interdependence and freedom of trade upon which the two Governments have agreed. The rejection came as a shock and nothing that the U.S. Government has so far been able to tell us in any way reduces my disappointment."

Then the letter refers to vehement protests made by the British Ambassador in Washington, who among other things said of the U.S. Government's explanation: "Tell that to the marines—sailors won't believe you."

It was not necessary that the United States give any explanation, but it did. It was pointed out there is a Federal statute known as the Buy American Act, designed to give preference to American products by the U.S. Government. It was also pointed out the purchase was made in conformity with requirements that Government expenditures be made, wherever possible, in areas of unemployment.

It aso was made clear that security requirements had to be met, in this case the availability of parts when repairs might be needed and the availability of the machine tools needed to turn out replacements in the event of a major emergency.

I am happy to see the Oakland Tribune speak up for America and American employment, security and interests, and I am not surprised. The assistant publisher of the Oakland Tribune is William F. Knowland, who served his State of California and the Nation with distinction in the U.S. Senate for 14 years and retired voluntarily at the close of the recent session as Senate Republican leader.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the clamor which has been raised over the rejection of this English company's bid on two hydraulic turbines I would like to present this case in its proper perspective.

There has been an obvious effort in some quarters to represent this action as having shut out all foreign competition for such contracts.

The facts are that foreign overseas manufacturers during the past 7 years have received orders from American governmental agencies for 14 giant hydraulic turbines totaling 1,526,000 horsepower, 24 hydraulic turbine driven generators with a combined rating of 1,295,210 kilovolt-amperes, and 399 heavy power transformers.

Each year increasing millions of American tax dollars have gone into procurement from foreign suppliers of heavy equipment for our expanding federally owned or publicly owned power production and transmission facilities.

All of the 14 hydraulic turbines above mentioned have been supplied or are on order from the English Electric Export & Trading Co., Ltd., of Stafford, England, the foreign bidder on the two turbines for the Greers Ferry Dam in Arkansas over which the present British-inspired controversy has arisen.

Of the 24 generators of foreign construction, this company has built or has contracts to build the 12 largest, and also a 13th generator of lesser rating. It also has received the contracts for 39 of the 399 heavy power transformers being supplied from overseas.

With reference to two of these transformers, the English quarterly review British Affairs, stated in March 1957, as follows:

Two of the largest transformers ever built have been ordered by the Tennessee Valley Authority from the English Electric Co. of Stafford. The transformers are for the Authority's new power station at Gallatin, Tenn. When they are ready they will form one of the heaviest loads ever shipped from Britain.

Fifty British heavy transformers for other governmental power systems in the United States were ordered from another English company, bringing the British total for this type of heavy electrical equipment to 89.

Governmental procurement of the remaining foreign-built electrical equipment is divided between Swiss, Austrian, Italian, and British firms other than British Electric. It is evident that the latter has not done badly in this overseas competition for our hydroelectric power generation and transmission equipment market.

Industry data submitted to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization shows, with reference to heavy power transformers, that in 1951 the Federal Government purchased none from overseas. In 1952, 27 percent of the purchases were from overseas, in 1953 50 percent, in 1954 40 percent, in 1955 60 percent, and in 1956 they exceeded 80 percent. This data applies to transformers only.

In 1956 the Corps of Engineers bought 26 percent of all its power equipment, which includes turbines, generators, and circuit breakers, from foreign sources, the Bonneville Power Administration 39 percent and the Bureau of Reclamation 47 percent.

The U.S. Corps of Engineers has installed or purchased 37 heavy power transformers with a total rating of 2,692,000 kilovolt-amperes in the Chief Joseph Dam, The Dalles Dam and the McNary Dam—

An industry statement filed with Director Leo A. Hoegh, of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization states.

Also the Corps of Engineers has two foreign manufactured hydraulic turbine-driven generators, each with a 73,684-kilovolt-ampere rating, in the McNary Dam.

Also the Bureau of Reclamation has three large power transformers (kilovolt-ampere rating totaling 130,000) and six sizable hydraulic turbine-driven generators purchased from abroad and installed in this area.

Also, 32 heavy power transformers of foreign origin have been installed or ordered by the municipal power systems of Seattle and Tacoma or by the public utility districts in the area. They have a combined kilovolt-ampere rating of 2,372,000. In the same category are 10 hydraulic turbines totaling 1,140,000 horsepower, and 10 large hydraulic turbine-driven generators.

The same report states that the Tennessee Valley Authority has purchased 45 heavy power transformers with a total of approximately 4,098,000 kilovolt-amperes from foreign sources and has issued a letter of intent for the purchase of three 60,000 kilovolt-amperes hydraulic turbine-driven generators, while the power authority of the State of New York has purchased some 32 foreign-produced transformers with a total kilovolt-ampere rating of 4,098,000, identical to that of TVA.

Mr. Speaker, when we consider these facts, particularly those which apply to Federal projects for which Congress has appropriated the funds, the question must arise whether these wholesale foreign purchases are in the interest of our national economy, welfare, and security.

Yet, when the question arises there is an outburst from British officialdom and the British press which is reflected in several of our own newspapers, and the occasion seized upon is the rejection of one award to a company which has received previously many awards from American governmental agencies involving millions of dollars. They would have us subscribe to the view that it is un-American to be for America.

I do not know of any prior occasion when an award of an electrical equipment contract was denied when an English company was the low bidder, although I do recall such an instance when a Japanese firm entered the low bid.

Now what are the facts in this most recent case which has so aroused our British friends?

The Corps of Engineers last July advertised for bids on two turbines for the Greers Ferry Dam in Arkansas. English Electric was the only foreign bidder. Four of the five American companies manufacturing hydraulic turbines entered bids. The bids were opened September 4. The English company's bid was $1,450,700. The lowest American bid, that of the Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp., of Philadelphia and San Francisco, was, $1,757,210. The difference between the low foreign bid and the lowest American bid was $306,510 or approximately 19 percent.

May I say at this point that Federal Government specifications officially recognize that from 45 to 55 percent of the American contract price for the design and manufacture of hydraulic turbines represents the labor cost.

Baldwin-Lima Hamilton estimated that 207,250 man-hours of work were directly involved at its plant in construction of the two Greers Ferry turbines, and that an additional 81,000 man-hours would be provided by its immediate suppliers, a total of 288,250 man-hours.

I do not have an estimate of the total labor costs on this contract, but I do know that the construction of hydraulic turbines requires highly specialized techniques and skills, and that the average earnings for all labor in American manufacturing industries as of last October was $2.13 per hour.

On this basis, had the contract been given to the English company, which already has received many such contracts as I have pointed out, American wage earners would have lost $612,000, or double the difference between the English and the American bids.

Or, if we take the 45 percent minimum percentage recognized in Federal Government specifications as the proportion of labor costs to contract price in manufacturing hydraulic turbines the loss would have increased to $790,744 had the English company's bid been accepted.

The award of the contract, therefore, provided a net gain to the American economy of at least $300,000 and more than 7,200 weeks of productive employment to American citizens in an area where 6 to 8.9 percent of the total labor force is currently unemployed according to the January report of the U.S. Bureau of Employment Security.

The award of this particular contract to the lowest American bidder instead of to the foreign bidder was clearly justified, in my opinion, on economic and social grounds, in addition to that of national security expressed by Director Hoegh and upheld by Secretary Dulles.

American wage earners buy American goods in American shops and stores.

Foreign labor does not.

American wage earners pay Federal, State, and local taxes.

Foreign labor does not.

American employment and American households support our schools and colleges, our churches, and our civic and religious institutions.

Foreigners do not.

Americans man our military and industrial defenses.

Foreigners do not.

When Government tax money is paid out for Government projects and facilities American taxpayers are entitled, in my opinion, to have that money paid to fellow Americans with the realization that the benefits of these expenditures will accrue to all Americans in national security and an expanding economy, particularly where qualified American workers and taxpayers are unemployed.

Why should American jobs be sacrificed because British labor is content to work for one-half or one-third of our wage scales, thus permitting his employer to underbid American industry on public contracts?

I concede that this was not a factor taken into account by the Director of OCDM, but offer it as supplemental justification of his determination.

The decision was based solely on national security considerations.

Congress in 1933 passed the Buy American Act, designed to grant American producers a 25-percent differential over foreign suppliers on Government purchases on which both domestic and foreign bids were offered.

Written into that law was a provision that empowered authorities, regardless of any differential, "to reject any bid or offer for materials of foreign origin if such rejection is necessary to protect national security interests."

In 1954, the Buy American Act was superseded by Executive Order 10582 which, in effect, reduced the differential to 6 percent but retained the national security exception stated above.

It is, of course, the sovereign right and duty of any nation to protect its national security.

Director Hoegh's decision was consistent also with the national security provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958 which strengthened and expanded similar provisions in the 1954 Extension Act.

Section 8 of the 1958 act directs the Director of OCDM to investigate and determine the effects on national security of any article upon request of the head of any department or agency, upon application of an interested party, or upon the Director's own motion.

If, as a result of such investigation, the Director is of the opinion that the said article is being imported into the United States in such quantities or under such circumstances as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall promptly so advise the President.

Then, unless the President determines that the article is not being imported in such quantities or under such circumstances as to threaten to impair the national security he shall take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such article and its derivatives so that they will no longer threaten to impair the national security.

A definite standard and criteria were written into the law to guide the Director and the President in arriving at a determination.

Congress directed that the Director of the OCDM and the President consider:

First. Domestic production needed for projected defense requirements.

Second. The capacity of domestic industries to meet the projected defense requirements.

Third. Existing and anticipated availabilities of the human resources, raw materials, and other supplies and services essential to national defense.

Fourth. The requirements of growth of such industries and such supplies and services including the investment, exploration, and development necessary to assure such growth.

Fifth. The character, use, and quantity of the imported articles under investigation as they affect industry in the United States and the capacity of the United States to meet national security requirements.

These considerations are not optional with the Director of the OCDM or the President. They are statutory requirements and not subject to the whims of foreign trade expansionists or foreign press releases.

These provisions were written into the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958 by the House and retained by the Senate. The Senate added a further consideration to be recognized by the Director of the OCDM and the President in arriving at a determination of the impact or effect of imports of a given article on national security.

I quote:

In the administration of this section, the Director and the President shall further recognize the close relation of the economic welfare of individual domestic industries; and any substantial unemployment, decrease in revenues of government, loss of skills and investment, or other serious effects resulting from the displacement of any domestic products by excessive imports shall be considered without excluding other factors, in determining whether such weakening of our internal economy may impair the national security.

Thus the authority of the President to deal with imports which threaten to impair our national security is unequivocal.

Nor is the question of reciprocity involved where a nation's security is at stake.

Britain drastically restricts imports which compete with British industries which she considers essential or strategic.

She does this under the Safeguarding of Industries Act of 1921 as extended and amended.

She does this through a rigid system of import licenses and exchange permits.

She does this through her British token import plan, described by our own Department of Commerce as follows:

The British token import plan, established with the United States in 1946, enables eligible U.S. manufacturers or other eligible U.S. firms to export to the United Kingdom token shipments or specified commodities whose importation from other dollar sources is otherwise generally prohibited by the British Government.

Participants are permitted to make shipments under the plan in an amount not exceeding 30 percent of the individual certified firm's average annual exports of specified commodities to the United Kingdom in the base years 1936, 1937, and 1938.

The years 1936, 1937, and 1938 were depression years in which the total exports of the United States to all countries averaged less than $3 billion. The British token plan permits slightly over 500 American firms which were exporting to Britain in those depression years to export annually now 30 percent of what they exported to Britain then.

I am informed that there is no record of any heavy electrical equipment—generators, hydraulic turbines, transformers, or circuit breakers—having been supplied to British industry by any American manufacturer in recent years.

In fact, according to testimony presented before the Ways and Means Committee at the hearings held last year on renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, such export would be impossible even if American manufacturers were able to overcome the British low wage differential and enter competitive bids. I quote from the testimony cited:

Since its creation in 1947, the Central Electrical Authority of Great Britain has limited the procurement of power and transmission equipment to domestic (i.e. British) suppliers because, as its official report to a parliamentary committee of inquiry states: "It would be unwise for the electricity supply industry (of England) to be dependent upon foreign manufacturers for spares and maintenance."

Mr. Speaker, I submit that if it is unwise for England to be dependent on American or other foreign suppliers for spares and maintenance, it is unwise for the United States to be dependent on British suppliers for spares and maintenance of power and transmission equipment.

Britain's own policy and enactments demonstrate that when the President of Britain's Board of Trade speaks so glibly of interdependence and freedom of trade upon which the two governments have agreed, his statement, like many British products, was made exclusively for export.

I am not aware of our Government having ever formally acceded to the doctrine of interdependence with any nation, although I know that some lip service has been given to that concept in the executive branch.

In any event we are not dependent on Great Britain for hydraulic turbines, generators, or heavy transformers, although we might well be if we continue to rely largely on foreign sources for such equipment.

There are, as stated previously, five companies in the United States that manufacture hydraulic turbines, three of them located in areas that presently have a labor surplus, frequently referred to as distressed areas.

There are five companies manufacturing hydraulic turbine generators; synchronous condensers above 10,000 kilovolt-amperes, two of them located in labor surplus areas.

There are six companies manufacturing power transformers above 10,000 kilovolt-amperes, five of them in labor surplus areas, and only three companies manufacturing power circuit breakers of 1 million kilovolt-amperes interrupting capacity and above, two of them located in labor surplus areas. Governmental agencies have purchased 81 circuit breakers from foreign countries.

Should the foreign manufacturers elect to bid on all Federal Government jobs, they could, if present policies are continued, take over the bulk of production of all heavy power-producing equipment purchased by the agencies of the Federal Government—

The industry brief filed with the Director of the OCDM tersely states.

Since 1953, 70 percent of the hydraulic turbine generator business in the United States has been placed by governmental agencies, Federal and State, and the industry estimates that 60 percent of hydraulic turbine business is affected by policies of the Federal Government.

In brief, the Federal Government has become the principal buyer of heavy power-producing and transmission equipment, all highly vulnerable to disaster or sabotage.

It can buy foreign at the risk of many months delay in the event of breakdowns requiring repairs or replacement, or it can buy American with necessary parts and repair skills readily available.

It can buy foreign at the risk of increasing unemployment and the loss of specialists and technicians through shutdown of our own strategic industries, or it can buy American and assure our continued security in this highly important field.

Let us not be overwhelmed by the protestations of foreign agency leaders that we are breaching ideas of interdependence and freedom of trade when we endeavor to safeguard our own national security.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko and the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 12, marks the birthday of Tadeusz Kosciuszko.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko was one of many distinguished and gifted Poles who played a signally important part in our War of Independence. Today in observing the anniversary of his birth we once more pay our respects to his memory and express our gratitude for his great services.

Kosciuszko was born into a middle-class family on February 12, 1746, 213 years ago. In his early youth he showed unusual liking for books and study, and his relatives—his father died when he was 13 years old—did everything in their power to educate him. After he finished the Royal School in Warsaw, he earned a scholarship to study in France where he entered the famous Mezieres Military School, specializing in artillery and engineering. While in Paris stories about the American Revolution fired his imagination. He decided that this was a fight on behalf of a good cause. He borrowed money from friends, sailed for America, and arrived in Philadelphia in August of 1776. There he applied for military service; immediately he was admitted and charged with the drawing up of plans for fortifying the Delaware. His success in this first assignment earned him a colonel's commission. From then on, a high place in our Revolutionary War was assured him. Everything he did was done with distinction, and in October 1783, Congress made him a brigadier general.

With the end of the fight for our cause here, he sailed to Poland, to engage there in the fight for Polish freedom.

Unfortunately all his efforts to that end were unsuccessful. He ended his gallant career in exile in Switzerland, where he died on October 15, 1817.

Today Americans of all rank and creed solemnly observe the anniversary of his birth and do homage to his memory.

Forty Million Frenchmen Can Be Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, at yesterday's press conference President Eisenhower very ably summed up the disastrous consequences of profligate spending and urged the practice of frugality to avert the shrinkage in the value of the dollar.

Recent history has recorded many examples of these disasters in other nations, in addition to the 52-percent decrease in our own dollars' purchasing power. A recent example, but by no means the only one, is the tragic example of the great nation of France which is now struggling desperately to salvage what it can out of the wreckage of inflation. This story is ably set forth by Herbert Bratter in the current issue of Banking. Under unanimous consent, I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

In France, a wealthy land with socialized basic industries and banking, we have seen in recent years a Laocoön engaged in an endless struggle with the seemingly unconquerable serpent, inflation. In the early postwar years, inflation in France drew its strength from the concentration on investment and construction, rather than on production of consumer goods. In the early 1950's investment was again stimulated by the Korean war. Foreign aid in big amounts has been obtained from the World Bank and Fund, the Eximbank, and other sources. At home the successive governments have sought to check inflation with everything in the book: price rollbacks, materials allocations, price controls, forced loans, recall of 5,000-franc notes, a free gold market, indexed bonds, exhortation, new forms of taxation like the value-added tax, support prices, subsidies, general monetary controls, devaluation, and other measures.

Still we have seen French governments determining the prices of scores of manufactured products, apart from the products and services sold by the nationalized enterprises: railroad, subway, and bus fares; gas, electricity, coal, and gasoline. We have seen a three-man official committee with wide powers—the Action Committee for the Defense of Purchasing Power—created to police the national price structure. Yet, at least until DeGaulle, there has been no sign or hope that France can for long get out of inflation's grip. The nation seems only to have got mired ever deeper in the economic slough which makes its appearance when manmade regulations are substituted for the free play of the marketplace.

Too many groups in France, as pointed out by former Premier Mendes-France, think they can beat inflation by creating more of it. And, when not engaged in getting a group advantage at the expense of the total community, the Frenchman of today concentrates on group and personal hedges against inflation rather than exhibiting a determination to see the evil exterminated.

We could, if we would, learn something from others' experiences with inflation. History is replete with innumerable stories of nations brought to ruin by currency corruption. The trouble with history is only this: No one pays any attention to its lessons when the group to which he belongs—labor union, farm organization, veterans group, pension lobby, Government employees, construction industry, shipping, producer of foreign-aid goods, or whatnot—sees an immediate group gain to be got.

Nonetheless, it may be instructive and constructive here to turn the spotlight on some of the complications of life under intermittent and almost chronic inflation in our own times in France, using that country not at all as the worst exhibit that could be found in our time, but rather because of the great importance of France to Europe and the West.

One may see what has been happening to the franc over the years by comparing that unit with its former self. By 1954 in terms of purchasing power a franc was equal to only 1.163 part of a 1914 franc. An item which in 1914 could be bought with 100 francs, by 1938 cost 675 francs; by 1949 it cost 1,220 francs; and by 1954 it cost 1,630 francs. Since 1954 the process of shrinkage in buying power has continued.

Reflecting the economic, financial, and social problems generated by this dwindling of the franc's value are the following headlines taken at random from a file of 1957 newspaper clippings on France. They could be readily duplicated for other years:

"French Austerity Spurred"; "France Fires on Inflation—Blank Cartridges?" "Paris Price Curb Meets Hostility"; "French Miss Target in Price Fixing"; "France Freezes Prices in Fight on Inflation"; "French Labor Unrest"; "French Drive on Prices Jolted"; "Price-Wage Curb Baffles France"; "Rich France Economically Sick"; "French Exhorted to Tighten Belts"; "Inflation Wrings France"; "Sliding Wage-Scale Dilemma."

As every traveler knows, the ailing franc, with its foreign exchange value artificially pegged almost continuously until the last devaluation of December 1958, has fostered a widespread black market. Flouting the official exchange rates under the very eyes of the police in Paris and almost everywhere else have been those "furtive men in their

all-weather uniforms of shabby raincoats who lurk in the streets," importuning male tourists with their offers of spicy post cards and cheap francs.

For all that French central bankers and successive finance ministers could show in the way of accomplishment, the disease that was consuming the franc was beyond their power to cure. All sorts of official devices were resorted to with the aim of checking the decline and the loss of public confidence in the currency. Many of these devices, indeed nearly all of them, dealt with symptoms rather than fundamental causes of the inflation. Repeated periodic doses of inflation, brought about not only by war and its aftermath but as well by inadequate official economic and fiscal policies, wrought their effect not only on the economic and political life of the nation, but on social behavior and morals. Every Frenchman, almost, seems to have devoted a large part of his thought on how to save "his."

Should he hoard gold coins? Could he evade the tax collector? Was there some way to send capital to safety abroad? Were ordinary stocks and bonds any longer wise investment media?

ENDLESS INDEXES

Such have been the questions being asked daily in France. When no one knows what bread will cost tomorrow and when the price of a subway ride or a newspaper is subject to change by bureaucratic edict, the cost of living becomes a preoccupation for everyone. As Finance Minister Ramadier told the National Assembly in 1957, "It is no exaggeration to say that the value of the franc is tied to the cost-of-living index." And—he might have added—vice versa. In fact, the supposedly logical Frenchman has painted himself into a corner; for money, which the dictionary calls the measure of value, in France has its own value measured by the things it is supposed to measure. Here, indeed, is a pretty mess.

EFFECTS IN A NUTSHELL

"In inflation," remarked a former resident of France, "everyone in business makes money, even if he is not smart. The smart ones, of course, make a lot of money. But there is no competitive weeding-out of weaker businesses. Inflation leads to big profits, which are reinvested in the business—retained earnings, self-financing. This can have bad effects, the consumers' interests tending to be neglected. Also, the influence of the central bank is weakened. Thus, when in 1957 the Bank of France took steps to tighten credit, it took a considerable time before you could detect a slowdown in investment. That is, business investment was not heavily dependent on borrowing. So inflation, which is a bad thing from a monetary standpoint to start with, compounds the evil. Monetary controls tend to be undermined.

"An outstanding weakness in the French economy is the budget," this observer continued. "Why? Because so many activities which formerly raised their own revenues are now under the government's wing. For instance, housing used to be built for rental. Because of inflation, however, rent controls were instituted years ago and building for rental is no longer economic. So what happens? The government, of course, steps in and finances residential construction. It may do this by paying subsidies, or by guaranteeing mortgage credit, or in other ways. At any rate, the government has to garner the people's savings for this purpose, by taxation or borrowing. In the latter, the budget tends to become unbalanced and the deficit gives rise to more inflation. That is an example of an inflation spiral, the original inflation indirectly causing another round of inflation later.

"Whereas in years gone by savings banks lent on mortgages, now the savings they garner are collected in turn by the Caisse des Depots et Consignations, which lends them to the Treasury. The latter, in turn, uses the money to finance housing loans or to invest in nationalized enterprises. France's budget trouble is largely a matter of investment not being channeled normally."

In describing what four decades of creeping inflation had done to thrift habits in France, the U.S. News and World Report in 1957 (Aug. 23) quoted a French banker as saying: "I bought an annuity before the war that should pay me $2,000 yearly. It pays only $60 a year now. I don't even bother to collect it." The current income on $10,000 worth of war bonds bought at par in 1914 was only $1.80 a year. The cost of clipping coupons on bonds—which by law must be deposited with banks for this purpose—exceeded the value of the coupons in many cases of prewar bonds, because of inflation.

PENSIONS—11 CENTS

Similarly, the magazine further reported, the cost of maintaining files for paying pensions was greater than the pensions themselves. Some 160,000 World War I pensioners were collecting monthly pension payments worth but 11 cents; 500,000 collected 25 cents; and the rest, 75 cents a month. That was in 1957. Since then the real value of the pensions has further shrunk.

Where there is a prolonged and certain decline in the value of money, all that a businessman needs to do to keep in the black is to maintain his inventory. In France this fact helps explain the large increase in retail stores since 1945. Prices have kept creeping up despite all official price controls and subsidies. Periodically the official foreign exchange value of the franc has been adjusted, always downwards, and generally only after its value has already been lowered de facto.

Succoring groups victimized by inflation had posed grave problems of public finance. Taxes have had to be raised repeatedly and deficits have had to be financed by borrowing from the public on more and more onerous terms and from the central bank, with additional spurs to the inflation process. The Frenchman is notorious for his aversion to direct taxation, as witness the Poujadist movement of small shopkeepers a few years ago. In 1956, as one of the steps to find money for the new old-age pensions, the Government resorted to a 2 percent levy on the reserves of corporations—a capital levy.

INDEX-TIED BONDS

In its efforts to attract buyers for its bonds the Government has resorted to index-tied issues, notably in the cases of the two Pinay loans of 1952 and 1958, with their gold-price clauses. These issues have been very successful. Other governmental and private bond issues have employed the index device in a variety of forms. Moreover, commodity and service price controls have been widely employed in the Sisyphean task of stabilizing the cost of living, including rents and wages. What this tremendous task costs the Nation in terms of economic waste is anyone's guess.

In 1956 France was reported to be spending 70 billion francs a year to keep consumer prices under control. This sum did not include the payroll for officials, but rather the budgetary cost of tax exemptions, food subsidies, the sale of gas at low prices, the removal of import duties on meat, eggs, vegetables, potatoes, etc.

The variety of controls and the minutiae of official interferences in the economic process make French life today seem complicated, indeed, to an outsider, as some examples will make clear.

A decree published in the Journal Officiel last March tied rents for buildings used for commercial, industrial, or handicraft purposes to the index of 250 consumer articles instead of that of 213 such articles previously used. To link the 2 indexes a coefficient of 1.4793 was applied. Likewise, by this decree, all public and private contracts bearing an index clause are carried out on the basis of the 250-commodity index. For joining the old and new series different coefficients apply to the old and new index series for foodstuffs, light and heat, manufacturers, and services, respectively.

Determining which index number gives the best measure of the declining purchasing power of the franc gives rise to long arguments in France; and it is reported some juggling of the indexes has taken place. Thus, by substituting in the index the price of one kind of wine for that of another, it is claimed inflation has been concealed. An article in Le Monde in March 1958 challenged the validity of the index of 179 commodity prices at retail to which the guaranteed minimum wage was tied.

In France, as elsewhere, farmers have a powerful political voice and farming plays an important role in the economy and cost of living. Controls, therefore, are exercised over farm rents and agricultural prices. Indeed, control over prices of industrial products and over wages in industry to an important degree is motivated by the desire to placate the farmer.

Last May the French Government raised guaranteed minimum farm prices by 3 percent above the 1956–57 level, in view of the increase in minimum agricultural wages and the rise in the price index of products consumed by farmers.

Both the price of wheat and that of bread—vital elements in the French cost of living—are controlled by the government. While on the one hand wages are linked to the cost of living, the price of wheat, although itself a component of the cost of living, is in turn based on indexes of living costs, materials' prices, and wages. The price of wheat is a pilot price, directly and indirectly influencing the price pattern of farm products as a whole. And the average national wheat price, as published in the Journal Officiel, is an important element in the determination of farm rentals.

General DeGaulle's program of political and economic stabilization involves stricter government controls over the economy. Suggestive of the problems the General faced in suppressing inflation last July was the refusal of the farm organizations to accept the DeGaulle proposals for limiting food price increases. Instead the farmers insisted that, in accordance with previous governmental promises, the price of wheat be raised by 12 percent. The new government sought to limit the increase for wheat to 5 percent. In its effort to bring the general price level down, the government appealed to producers to cut prices voluntarily by from 2 percent to 5 percent.

In a compromise between wheat farmers and the government in July, the price of wheat was raised by 7 percent; and at the same time the prices of barley and corn were raised 11 percent and 10 percent, respectively. The price of sugar beets, also an important commodity in France, is based on the price of wheat. While, therefore, the price of sugar has gone up with that of wheat, the retail price of bread is independently regulated.

A country gripped by inflation finds it harder to sell goods abroad and easier to buy imports. Hence import controls of one sort or another, or of various sorts at once, are imposed. This has been the case in France.

An illustration of the nature of this form of dirigisme was the drafting last September of new regulations governing imports of capital goods costing more than 1 million francs per unit. Importers were required to supply evidence that the goods to be imported were essential and promised to improve the foreign trade balance. Moreover, importers were obliged to deliver such im-

ports immediately to productive enterprises and not to inventory.

Although France has a shortage of housing that, according to the French National Statistics Institute, will last a century—since the construction of new dwellings is not keeping pace with the population growth and there is a constant migration from country to city—new building is being held down by credit restrictions. These owe their origin to the need to combat inflation, as a result of which residential construction has had to be financed by the central bank itself, an inflationary process.

HOUSING AID

French state aid for housing—reported the Neue Zürcher Zeitung last year—takes the form of building premiums of 600 francs per square meter in the case of ordinary apartments and 1,000 francs in the case of those built under the social homebuilding plan. The premiums serve to lower the cost of building credits granted by the Credit Foncier for 5 years, after which they are converted into long-term loans. The Credit Foncier lacking the necessary funds, the latter are mobilized by means of bills discounted by the banks. Mobilization bills over and above the amounts allocated to the banks are taken up by the central bank. (On September 30, 1957, of 746 billion francs of mobilization bills created in respect of housing credits, 674 billion were in the portfolio of the Bank of France.)

We have already mentioned French resort to indexed bonds, such as the two Pinay loans, as devices to attract inflation-wary investors. In addition, other methods have been applied to the same end. While France is not the only country to have used such novel financial devices during the postwar years, it probably has relied upon them more extensievly than any other. It is not without parenthetical interest in this connection to read that a former New York bank officer, John E. Rovensky, has proposed that the Treasury issue "2 percent tax-free income consols," with interest to be adjusted annually to reflect changes in the BLS cost-of-living index.

How France has employed this idea in its security offerings during recent years may be seen in the following example. The return to the investor, including repayment of principal, being in part based on such criteria as the price of gold on the free market in Paris, prices of specific commodities or services, industrial turnover, industrial production, and the like.

Electricité de France, a government corporation, was the first French issuer of securities carrying a purchasing-power guaranty in terms of the product sold by the issuer. In October 1952 it offered bonds with a par value of 16,000 francs, the annual interest on which was fixed as the equivalent of the average selling price of 100 kilowatt-hours in the preceding year or 720 francs, whichever should be the greater. The bonds were made redeemable between 1958 and 1968 at the greater of either the average price of 2,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity or 16,000 francs. For this purpose the electricity price was determined by dividing the company's total revenue by the number of kilowatt-hours of electricity sold.

The electricité issue was very successful and was followed by similar ones for coal, railways, and gas, as well as other electricity issues. As a measure of their popularity, in April 1955 the yield on securities of public industrial enterprises with a purchasing power clause was 3.72 percent, while the yield on issues of the same enterprises not carrying such a clause was 5.95 percent.

How inflation affected the prices of securities may be seen from the following figures. It will be noted that, while bonds of the traditional kind with straight interest and redemption features declined in market value, those tied to an index of the price of gold coins or of commodities or services appreciated. The figures in the table are based on 1949=100.

	Dec. 31, 1955	Oct. 31, 1957
Rente perpetuelles (consols)	124.2	104.6
Loans of public enterprises	123.7	106.3
Private loans	121.1	105.7
Public index loans	206.7	251.1

Source: Neüe Zurcher Zeitung, Nov. 7, 1957.

Despite the inflation which has plagued France repeatedly and indeed almost constantly since the war, there are still French people who save: "Aunt Suzannes" who from lifetime habit regularly put part of their income in the savings bank or less secure places. The writer has heard of an American lady who was taken into a French home as an overnight guest in 1957. The mattress felt rather lumpy. On investigation, the visitor found that it had been stuffed with paper franc notes, thus exhibiting on the householder's part a surprising confidence in a sick currency.

According to the National Credit Council, 437 billion francs of new savings were made in 1957 in readily mobilizable form—savings accounts, treasury bonds, and time deposits. But the newspaper, Le Monde, called this partly illusory, stating that the increase in time deposits merely represented a transfer from sight deposits. Nonetheless, current savings by thrifty Frenchmen during an era of inflation must be sizable. In 1958, through August, savings deposits increased by 162 billion francs to 2,086 billion.

A Government-imposed ceiling limits the amount an individual in France may have in a savings deposit account to 1 million francs. This ceiling appears to have its origin in the traditional regard of savings banks as having been designed for the person of small or moderate means. It does not seem to make much sense from the standpoint of the authorities perpetually combating inflationary forces. But, on the other hand, savings banking in France seems to be destined in the long run to yield to the comparatively greater attraction of indexed bonds.

Under a 1948 law, owners of balances illegally held abroad were permitted to repatriate them subject to no other penalty than a special levy of 25 percent. The opportunity, however, was not seized by the capitalists in question. Therefore, in an effort to get some of those assets back to France, the Government suspended for an indefinite period the 25 percent penalty on the sole condition that the owners sell their foreign exchange on the official exchange market, or have their balances sent to France in the form of gold to be sold on the Paris gold market.

As another step in helping restore confidence in the franc, the government late in 1957 ordered all French banks to surrender 30 percent of their dollars held abroad as a forced loan on which they would receive 3 percent interest.

Whatever anti-inflation program is under taken in France, the difficulties it will encounter are described thus by ex-Premier and ex-Finance Minister Mendes-France: "All Frenchmen condemn inflation. But they have tolerated it so long that one may wonder whether, in their heart of hearts, they have really disapproved of it, and whether they are not under dangerous illusions as to its effects. Since 1914, the economists, the parties in power, indeed the whole country have been struck by the surprising convenience of inflation, considered as a method of financing. Does it not allow, at least for a time, considerable expenditures to be made, whether military or civilian, current expenditures as well as investments, and all this without incurring the inevitable reaction of the taxpayer? * * * Even if inflation has obvious disadvantages, a large part of the population believes it can escape them: the workers by a rise in wages, business leaders by an increase in their nominal margin of profit, capitalists by a de facto or de jure adjustment of their holdings on a sliding scale."

Harvey Seeds Post No. 29, American Legion, Department of Florida, Miami, Fla., Petitions Congress To Act Favorably on Pending Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1959, Harvey Seeds Post 29, the American Legion, Department of Florida, Miami, Fla., at a regular meeting, petitioned the Congress to act favorably on certain pending legislation for the benefit of veterans.

In doing so, Harvey Seeds Post 29 is continuing under its present able leadership a fine record of service for veterans. The accomplishments of the members of this outstanding post in community service are equally well known and regarded.

Their respectful petition should be accorded full consideration by the appropriate congressional committees. The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ACT FAVORABLY UPON PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR AND ON BEHALF OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT, THEIR WIDOWS AND CHILDREN

Whereas, Harvey Seeds Post 29, the American Legion, Department of Florida, Miami, Fla., is one of the largest posts of the American Legion in the Southern States and has a proud and unbroken record of service to the disabled veterans, widows, and children of veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas the National American Legion has mandated its officers to secure certain legislation for and on behalf of veterans, their widows, and children, by the 86th Congress, 1st session, such legislation being long overdue; and

Whereas such legislation is incorporated by the National American Legion in the 3-point American Legion pension program of 1959 for increase in certain classes of pensions and disability payments, and relief of restrictions that deny pensions to veterans, their widows, and children in certain classes; and

Whereas it is common knowledge that such legislation is long overdue, since prices, wages, salaries, retirement pay and benefits, have soared in recent years, and the 3-point program is based on the same reasoning that has won public and legislative support for increases in pay to teachers, Congressmen, Government workers, the military, and trade union members; and

Whereas Harvey Seeds Post 29, the American Legion, Department of Florida, has given careful and serious study to individual bills offered in Congress to implement the 3-point program of the American Legion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Harvey Seeds Post 29, the American Legion, Department of Florida, in regular meeting assembled, at Miami, Fla., this January 30, 1959, That the post hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon the following items of legislation heretofore introduced in the 86th Congress, 1st session, to wit:

1. A bill to provide that veterans age 65 shall be deemed to be totally and permanently disabled for pension purposes, similar to H.R. 2433.

2. A bill to provide that veterans suffering from active pulmonary tuberculosis shall be deemed permanently and totally disabled for pension purposes while hospitalized, similar to H.R. 258 and H.R. 2434.

3. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict, and their dependents, similar to H.R. 2436.

4. A bill to provide pensions for widows and children of deceased World War II and Korean conflict veterans on the same basis as is provided for widows and children of deceased World War I veterans, similar to H.R. 257 and H.R. 2435.

5. A bill to provide for increased rates of death compensation, and of disability and death pension, payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to widows and children of veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict.

6. A bill to amend section 301 of the World War Veterans Act of 1942, to provide that certain term insurance held by World War I veterans shall be considered as fully paid when the insured reaches the age of 65, similar to H.R. 170; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, duly certified by the officers of this post, be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Florida in the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the members and officers of the post in attendance at the meeting when this resolution be adopted, whose signatures are affixed hereinbelow, do emphasize their personal interest in the favorable action of such proposed legislation.

HENRY J. HALAM,
Commander.

Attest:

JOS. A. FRIEDMAN,
Adjutant.

Members of Harvey Seeds Post 29, American Legion, Miami, Fla., who signed the foregoing resolution on January 31, 1959: George Clark Smith, vice commander; William E. Cox, vice commander; C. J. Santucci, vice commander; Arthur W. Morrow, executive committee; Paul E. Hood, executive committee; John P. Ulirich, executive committee; Axel R. Carlson, executive committee; James T. Ross, trustee; Lewis J. Worrell, trustee; Cameron F. Craig, finance officer; Elmer Wesibrod, chaplain; James C. Akers, executive committee; William R. Simonds, trustee; James Kytle Williams; M. D. Herrington; Ferdinando Gabriele; Louis Galy; Freeman Cagle; George S. Flichman; Kay S. Thurston; Harry B. Peterson; Capt. Walter M. Frank; Chaplain Frank L. Titus; John J. Yazum; John C. Cuthbert; Arthur J. Smith; George C. Barth; Kalman M. Rocker; Bertha T. Cowan; George S. Seigman; V. L. Gilmer; I. F. Gilson; Etan W. Schaub; Joseph A. Bogkowski; Frank L. Smith; C. C. Mead; R. J. Waitte; Elsie M. Gooley; Mike Zorio; Capt. John Pahl; Joseph J. Kincaid; William T. McMorris; Ralph W. McMorris; Paul P. Forand; Edgar K. Tepper; Leo P. Herbert; Reginald A. McHugh; Murray McDonald; W. L. Zimpleman; John A. Peddard; A. J. Parks; E. L. deBroigne; William P. Dix; John Stapleton; Orlando Aschiero; Lamar W. Boye; Woodrow W. Matz; J. M. Kearney; Harry A. Dunham; James Harrington; Arthur G. Keene; Andrew F. Burnell; Joseph A. Tiesi; Joseph Allegra; Arthur D. April; Harry J. Plemonos; Rhotie R. Jackson; Ray Jewett; Stephen A. Russell; Roland A. Saye; John F. Anderson; Albert J. Schmacher; Theodore R. Wilder; Albert W. Kolstner; George Parkhurst; Max Froom; B. J. Deckorg; Garry J. Jansen; John H. Cerda; Harry N. Parker; Joseph F. Catanzaro, Jr.; Marshall E. Penton; C. E. Tiromar; M. R. Pellacani; James J. Harvey; James T. Megas; Egisto Cicci; C. E. Hazlett; Clarence G. Smallwood; Helen P. Purkey; Charles P. Eckhert; Alfred Manning; J. O. Tibbits; Adolph Scheer; Joseph W. Eden; Max Rozen; Wm. A. Scheer; John C. Cuthbert; Jacob Gerson; Frank C. Oher; Fred Karcher; John Broad; Clair De Coma; Albert F. Du Verger; Joseph A. Ryan.

Which Comes First, a Strong Enough Defense or a Balanced Budget?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the American people are disturbed by this administration's failure to understand and support the need for leadership in missile development and in space exploration.

They are disappointed in the strategy whereby the administration hopes to become popular in the elections of 1960 by appealing to the material interests of our people, at the expense of national security.

This is a shortsighted and risky policy that completely underestimates the character and the patriotism and the commonsense realism of Americans.

In the crucial debate now underway, the American people will not be satisfied by vague reassurances. Out of this debate they expect a rebirth of bold, imaginative and pioneering leadership, limited only by the cost of survival.

On this urgent need, the people must be heard, and speaking for them is the challenging editorial titled "Surrender on Missiles" that appeared in the February 6 issue of the Boston Herald.

Under unanimous consent, I insert it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SURRENDER ON MISSILES

Defense Secretary McElroy the other day announced this country's retirement from the long-range missile race. The United States will not attempt to catch up with the Soviet in this field; even may be consenting to a 3-to-1 superiority by the Soviet.

This announcement should have shaken the country to its foundations. We appear to have surrendered to our enemy clear priority in the decisive weapon of the future.

Now we can have an effective defense without matching the Russians in every other weapon. We could not possibly match them man for man. Our need for submarines is less than theirs. We ought in fact to tailor our whole defense system to our special requirements.

But there is no counter to Soviet missiles other than missiles of our own. Here is a whole new fourth dimension of warfare, which is not ships at sea or armies on land or planes in the air. But more than that, it is a dimension which is crucial. We could have in the years to come command of the air, command of the sea, and command of land areas within our defense positions, and still lose if we lacked adequate missile strength.

We are at present relying on B–47's for 90 percent of our potential for delivery of nuclear bombs. Yet these are obsolete, or soon will be obsolete, against Russian air defenses. Moreover, Secretary McElroy conceded the other day that our bases in Europe are vulnerable to medium-range Soviet missiles. And, finally, we must face the danger that any loss of confidence in this country's powers of deterrence will make our allies disinclined to permit us to remain in these bases.

Even the program for the B–58's to replace the B–47's has been cut down. And the Polaris missile for firing from submarines has had its range cut from 1,500 miles to 800 miles.

This is a dark picture, and it ought not to be made any darker than it is. The defense budget does provide for more B–52's capable of firing the Hound Dog air-to-surface missile to paralyze enemy air defenses. There are to be funds to keep a third of the aircraft of the Strategic Air Command on 15-minute alert at all times.

The administration is not asleep. Within the confines of a $41 billion defense budget it is working wonders.

But what Americans ought to be asking is whether this is enough. By what coincidence does the administration find that an adequate defense fits into a balanced budget?

There is abundant evidence that the American economy can meet considerably increased defense costs. Last year the Rockefeller Studies Group, warning that the balance of power would shift to the Soviets in 2 years, urged an immediate increase of $3 billion a year in the defense budget and similar increases each year for the following 6 years. The Committee for Economic Development has said that there is no factual basis for the notion that we are near some breaking point in defense spending. "We can afford what we have to afford," the CED stated.

We must face it: bigger defense would mean heavier taxes. Missiles are not cheap. But the price of preserving our place in modern weaponry—and with it the effectiveness of our foreign policy—is within our ability to pay.

Housing Bill Is Big, but Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Members will be interested in the views of the Denver Post in support of the housing bill, as expressed in an editorial on Thursday, February 5, 1959:

HOUSING BILL IS BIG, BUT SOUND

When the omnibus housing bill now being rushed through the Senate reaches the President's desk, he will face a difficult decision.

The Senate bill certainly calls for bigger spending on housing than the President wants.

Yet if he vetoes it, he will be turning down a sound bill that represents a compromise among Democrats and Republicans in the Senate.

This would be a severe blow for the moderates on both sides of the aisle, and would probably touch off allout fiscal war between the President and Congress.

The central difference, moneywise, between the President and Congress on housing is in urban renewal provisions.

The program began in 1949, but is only now beginning to gain real momentum (land for Denver's first project, Avondale, is now being acquired).

Now more than 400 cities have waked up to the opportunity urban renewal gives them to rejuvenate wornout urban areas and build up their tax bases. Requests for funds in 1958 totaled nearly $600 million.

But the bottom of the urban renewal pot has nearly been reached. As of December 31, only $23 million of the $1.3 billion allocated in urban renewal's first decade was left uncommitted.

The President's remedy for this was a quickie bill to put up another $100 million to last through June and then $200 million a year thereafter.

He also sought to cut the Federal share of urban renewal costs from two-thirds to one-half in order to make the Federal funds stretch further.

That would mean a 50-percent hike in the cities' share of urban renewal costs.

Liberal Democrats in Congress, such as urban-minded Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, former mayor of Philadelphia, countered with a $600-million-a-year proposal.

CLARK and his allies claimed, with some justification, that the low amount the President wants would only increase the urban renewal backlog (some cities now estimate they will have to wait 5 years for funds) and that the increase in local costs would discourage urban renewal just when enthusiasm was mounting.

The President's bill would certainly hit Denver hard.

Thus the $350 million a year provision in the Senate bill (over a 6-year period) is a fair compromise between the demand for urban renewal funds and the need to hold spending within reason.

The other main excess in the bill, from the President's point of view, is a new authorization of 35,000 public housing units. He recommended none for the coming fiscal year.

Yet some public housing is necessary if urban renewal itself is to go forward.

One of the requirements for an urban renewal project is that all families evicted from the project area must be rehoused in dwellings that are safe, sanitary, and which they can afford.

For many families, only low-cost public housing fits this prescription.

Denver again furnishes an example. Families now living in the Avondale renewal area can be absorbed in Denver's current public housing facilities.

But before another urban renewal project can be undertaken here, more public housing must be developed. Without it, urban renewal here is stymied.

If the omnibus housing bill reaches the President's desk in its present form, he should approve it. Its provisions are essential to the future health of American cities.

Impertinent Guest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, with the recent revelation that the U.S. C–130 transport was deliberately shot down over Soviet Armenia near the Turkish border, the visit of Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan will have to be reevaluated. Our own State Department, in releasing the transcript of the intercepted radio conversation among Soviet fighter pilots who attacked the unarmed American transport plane last September, indirectly accused Mikoyan of lying about the incident.

In light of these revelations, therefore, I am pleased to include in my remarks two editorials from the Western Michigan Catholic published at Grand Rapids.

Both editorials are by Msgr. Joseph C. Walen. The first, entitled "Why Salaams to Mikoyan?" appeared on January 15, 1959; and the second, "Impertinent Guest" was published on January 22:

[From the Western Michigan Catholic, Jan. 15, 1959]

WHY SALAAMS TO MIKOYAN?

(By Msgr. Joseph C. Walen)

It was refreshing indeed to hear the voice of Richard Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, raised in protest this week over the near-fawning welcome accorded to Anastas Mikoyan on his current tour of this country.

According to Cardinal Cushing, Mikoyan is a "bloody henchman in the murderous crimes committed by Lenin, Stalin and Khrushchev." The outspoken prelate further charged that these crimes include "the massacres of his own free Armenian republic, the Ukrainian massacres of 1932–33 and the Hungarian massacres of 1956."

RAPS PRAISE BY BUSINESS

The Cardinal went further. He castigated "American business leaders and certain American business circles now singing the praises of Soviet Russia, thereby drowning out the cries for help and sympathy of the Hungarian people, upon whom, in effect, the American Nation has turned its back. It has permitted them to be crushed by the Soviet dictatorship and Red army."

The amount of newspaper and radio-television coverage accorded the visit of the Soviet first deputy premier leaves no doubt about the propaganda success of his jaunt to swanky, exclusive clubs in our larger cities.

I believe that the extent to which the news media went to record details of this trip border on the ridiculous. Who cares that he spent $9.29 at a modern supermarket near Washington? Inasmuch as so many of the editors of the metropolitan dailies pride themselves about their ability to smell out press agents' stunts, it is all the more startling to have seen them fall for a phony interest shown by Mikoyan in some of our American institutions. His giving candy to a child in the supermarket mentioned above was hokum at its corniest.

Mikoyan even had the gall to question the historical fact alluded to by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message last Friday that the Communists regarded agreements as mere scraps of paper.

THOSE RED FEELINGS

In a Hollywood meeting attended by movie bigwigs Monday he is reported to have said that on the contrary there are some people who think that the imperialists keep international agreements only when it suits them. He is further quoted as claiming: "We also have the feeling that you have violated agreements."

I wonder why the Soviets have that feeling. Would it be because the Soviet press reports international events accurately?

SAINTS AND TRAITORS BOTH

At the same meeting he advised the Americans seriously to stop thinking of themselves as saints and the Russians as traitors. It would be better, he said, if we took the attitude that both at times are saintly and both at times perfidious. Who wants to bet that Pravda will carry that remark about the Reds being at time perfidious?

This lionizing of Russia's No. 2 representative by many representatives of big business here has more than one American citizen scratching his head. Yet it might be well to riffle through our newspapers of the thirties and recall that recognition of Russia was urged not so much by the braintrusters and eggheads in the Roosevelt administration (as is commonly believed now) but by big business groups. Their foremost spokesman was Publisher William Randolph Hearst.

In that perspective the action on display these last few days does not come as a huge surprise.

Victor Riesel, the articulate, competent columnist on labor-management problems in this country, wrote Sunday what he claims is an exclusive report on the meeting of Mikoyan and outstanding labor leaders in this country in Washington on January 6.

ROUGHED UP BY UNIONISTS

According to Riesel, the going-over he received from Walter Reuther, Jim Carey, Joseph Beirne, and others was the "roughest 2½ hours Russia's second in command has had since he shot down Hungarian children in Budapest streets."

Among the many questions directed at Mikoyan was one by Jim Carey who asked why there is no capitalist party in Russia after Mikoyan had brazenly asked why there is no labor party in the United States.

Riesel's Sunday column, if we accept its accuracy, was the most fascinating I've read on Mikoyan's trip. It provided a view of the leaders of America's organized labor roughing him up with down-to-earth questions, and unmasking the motives of a representative of a movement which claims to be interested in the welfare of human beings.

Mikoyan's trip, so favorably accepted by many influential Americans, is leading to a meeting for him with President Eisenhower next Saturday.

WHAT GOOD?

On the basis of past performance by the Russian leaders, what good can come of any agreements between Mikoyan and the President? I think the President was grimly accurate in his statements to Congress last Friday.

Egg-throwing Hungarian refugees might not typify an American welcome to representatives of foreign governments. But Mikoyan and his kind have never been concerned about good manners, nor have they ever rewarded good manners either by individuals or by nations. There is no reason to believe he has been changed by his current visit.

Cardinal Cushing's commentary on Mikoyan's good will tour might well be the one which will stand out above all the others when history sifts the facts from the phonyisms.

[From the Western Michigan Catholic, Jan. 22, 1959]

IMPERTINENT GUEST

(By Msgr. Joseph C. Walen)

If you have read only a little bit of history about Red Russia you have arrived at the conclusion that the Soviets recognize only one way—their way.

The trail of self-r'ghteous platitudes left behind by Anastas Mikoyan in his recent jaunt through this country emphasizes this conclusion.

Thanks to the wonders of our communications media Mikoyan's blatant propaganda statements have been transmitted to millions of Americans. He has perverted the freedom of our press to spread the treacherous Communist line which inevitably strangles freedom of every kind.

It should have been no surprise to Americans to find Mikoyan an impertinent guest. He showed no interest in two-way courtesy, though President Eisenhower had requested Americans to be polite to a high-ranking representative of a foreign government.

But Mikoyan in turn used our news channels to dodge pertinent questions about Russia's actions and policies by attributing only laudable motives of peace to the Reds and by simultaneously accusing the Western Powers of warmongering.

The climax of his performance of spouting anti-American blasts was reached by his statements on NBC's "Meet the Press" program Sunday. He flagrantly refused to answer valid questions. He backed down on previous statements that the Russians are not all saints. He hid lamely behind an excuse of "lack of space" when he was needled by the New York Times representative, Harry Schwartz, why Russian newspapers blithely omitted Mikoyan's references in his early speeches here to Russian mistakes.

Furthermore, he would not give on the program even the slightest assurance that Vice President NIXON would be given a chance to present American views to the Russian people through Soviet news media. But if you reflect about the validity of such assurances by Russians, on the basis of past performance, then it would be a waste of confidence to trust any commitments made by Mikoyan, publicly or privately. Thus again—there are only one-way streets for the Russians.

I think that the dreadful contrast between the credibility of Russian and the American news media must be carefully remembered by our citizens. One of the most reprehensible and snide quotes attributed to Mikoyan on his visit was reported from New York. In his appearance there before the big-money members of the Economic Club he boldly claimed that only lies and libel are kept out of Russian newspapers. He further is reported to have accused American newspapers of a lack of understanding of the free press concept. He then asserted: "When 1 millionaire has 10 newspapers and 10 million have none, that is not freedom of the press."

This last quotation is spit-in-the-face behavior by a guest who is given the chance by American newspaper, radio and television owners to present Russia's alleged policies. Mikoyan's gall to make the claim that Russia's present news media speak for all its people was hypocrisy at its rawest.

The owners of American newspapers, including the millionaires, have their faults, but all their defects combined are a speck compared to the ruthless censorship of the Russian Government over all news handling.

In criticizing our press for its coverage of Mikoyan's statements here, we Americans might deplore lack of some on-the-spot censorship by its reporters of the malarkey in some of his talks. Too many of his remarks were an insult to us. I suppose that our dedication to the cause of the freedom of the press leads both news media and their customers here to permit such malarkey to be so widely read and heard. Thus it's all the more difficult to swallow his slurs on the reliability of our news coverage and his totally untenable defense of government-controled news media.

Some representatives of Government and the press here might now plead for "equal time" for Vice President NIXON in Russia. I don't think it would be granted because I don't think that Khrushchev and Mikoyan would be interested in letting the Russians know about America's policies in the world today. Anyway, arrogant Anastas would probably like to remind us again that the Russian newspapers don't have the space to report fully the statements of American officials—as the American papers did to his journey and comments.

The deftful dodging by Mikoyan of facts of the day in his tour is evidence of a nimble intelligence and also of a contemptuous disregard of the amenities of friendship.

The cause of the freedom of discussion, interpretation, and news presentation requires us to print or broadcast accounts of the opinions and actions of officials of our own and of foreign governments. The consequences of service to this principle might lead us to wonder occasionally whether truth will win, particularly in the wake of an experience such as Mikoyan's visit. But history shows truth does prevail and the temptation to suppress even malicious attacks on this Nation's integrity and peaceful intentions must be overcome.

The problem now arises whether our President should ask Americans to be polite as well as dedicated to a free press when a boor comes to visit us.

Proposed Increase in the Federal Tax on Gasoline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include as an extension of my remarks, a statement by Mr. Robert G. Dunlop, president of the Sun Oil Co., in regard to the proposed increase in the Federal tax on gasoline. Mr. Dunlop's comments are as follows:

There is no justification for any increase in the Federal excise tax on automotive gasoline. The proposed 50 percent increase in this tax would be an unfair and unreasonable levy on American motorists, already staggering under exorbitant highway user taxes.

Federal, State, and local taxes on motor fuel now equal a national average of 9 cents a gallon, or 40 percent of the service station price of regular grade gasoline, exclusive of the tax. No other commodity essential to daily living is anywhere so highly taxed. Now it is proposed to boost the Federal tax another 1½ cents a gallon, making it 4½ cents.

The excuse given for such a shocking proposal is "to make highway related taxes support our vast highway expenditures." This is a misleading statement. Highway users now not only are paying all the Federal highway expenditures but are paying, in addition, hundreds of millions of dollars that are being diverted to nonhighway purposes.

In the 1958 fiscal year highway-related tax collections by the Federal Government totaled $3.6 billion. But only $2.1 billion were earmarked for highway purposes. The remaining $1.5 billion—or 42 percent of the total amount collected—were paid into the Treasury's general fund for other Federal activities that have no relation to highways.

If the Federal highway program requires more revenue than is produced by the earmarked taxes, then Congress should earmark for that purpose taxes already being paid by highway users and not place a greater load on the country's motorists.

The plea is made that if this is done, the new Federal budget cannot be balanced without the imposition of additional taxes in some other form. A balanced budget is imperative. But certainly it cannot be logically argued that motorists, as a group, solely are responsible for paying taxes to keep the Federal budget in balance. Surely, if the budget cannot be balanced by reducing contemplated expenditures, then the obligation of keeping it in balance should fall on all Americans.

I sincerely believe that the present situation urgently calls for a reappraisal immediately by Congress of the scope and of the method of financing of the Federal program set up in the 1956 Highway Act. This action should be taken before any further tax burdens are placed on highway users.

Farm Price Supports in the Existing Pattern of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, few, if any, areas in the United States are untouched by subsidies. Subsidies are as old as our Government and long have been used as an acceptable and serviceable adjunct to the free economy. Condemnation or praise of subsidies are academic and unrealistic unless the public purpose of the subsidy is taken into account. The above are general conclusions from an historical review of Government subsidies made by the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives of the United States.

What constitutes a subsidy? A definition is very difficult. Some would think of a Government subsidy as Federal moneys or their equivalent paid out to individuals. But this would exclude legislation under which certain groups in the economy are authorized to directly increase their "take" from the total economy. By such activities, the same purpose and result is achieved as that of a direct subsidy paid out to the same group. One of the first official acts of the Government of the United States was to enact a tariff to protect the growing industries of the infant Nation. Another gave preference in custom duties to goods imported on American ships. Both were designed to improve the competitive position of domestic businessmen and enhance the growth of American industry. In this respect, both were subsidies, although nothing was paid out directly by Government.

Early in the history of the United States, our Government recognized the need for improved transportation. Public lands, direct contributions, and loans were used to encourage construction of canals. Later, similar contributions were made to many railroads. Mail subsidies developed and supported other means of transportation and have been used extensively. The first mail subsidy was reported in 1845. More recently, millions of dollars have been paid out to subsidize the merchant marine. Hearings with reference to postal deficits also suggest considerable subsidy in the form of low postal rates, the benefits of which accrue to certain publishers.

For the reasons suggested above, it is perhaps desirable to avoid the notion of a subsidy in terms of cash paid out and think in terms of a welfare state. The evidence of the welfare state are actions by the Government designed to improve the economic position of specific groups or classes of the population. All actions of the Government, in fact, fall in this category. The promotion of public health, education, and the maintenance of order and tranquility are all costly activities of Government which directly benefit the public. We think of the welfare state as one which is interested in specific activities for specific groups of people, and, sometimes, as in the case of graduated taxation, to the economic detriment of other groups. The attempts of the Government to achieve a leveling off process both in individual incomes and in human welfare benefits some and penalizes others. The activity of the welfare state includes not only cash paid out to individuals, but also the levying of tariffs, the creation of stockpiles for surplus products either by the Defense Department or in the Department of Agriculture, marketing agreements, and the like. Perhaps it is desirable to list some of the specific activities which seem to fall in this category.

At the head of such a list certainly one finds the graduated income tax. Older, however, and more important in its time, was the protective tariff. Activities under the antitrust laws also fall in the welfare category. Of the more recent devices, the following come quickly to mind: Bank deposit insurance, the conservation of natural resources, transportation subsidies, school-lunch programs, Government assistance through charitable organizations, price-supports for farmers, defense stockpiles, allocation of defense contracts to job deficit areas, old-age and survivors pensions, minimum-wage laws, job insurance and separation pay, and labor legislation giving unusual privileges to unions.

It is not the purpose to evaluate these programs. It is only proposed to show their antiquity, on the one hand, and more recently the extent of the activities of the welfare state both in direct subsidies and in other programs with similar objectives.

Virtually every person in the population of the United States would seem to be a receiver of benefits from one or more of these activities. The entire nation, in one way or another, is affected by the various programs, whether for industry, for labor, for the young, for the aged, or for agriculture. It seems inappropriate, under a condition where activities of this nature have gained such wide acceptance as in the United States, that the public, through its legislators, should withdraw from support of any group unless that program had failed in its objective, or an improved program was conceived. Who in the United States has the right to say of another, "You get too much."

The program for support of farm prices was designed to improve individual incomes in agriculture. It was also designed to equalize farm and non-farm incomes and to create agricultural purchasing power, thereby improving the market for goods produced by others. There were no important failures. Until better programs have been proved, farm price supports have justified their position in the welfare state. They should be reexamined and amended to keep them abreast of the changing facts of the world, but they should not be abolished.

The programs for price supports for farm products have, in fact, contributed much more to public welfare than was planned in the original objectives. Through distribution programs, hunger has been largely eliminated in the United States and significant contribution has been made to reduction of hunger in other lands. Growing farm efficiency has made it possible for a declining number of farmers to produce food for an increasing domestic population for less total dollars. This is no idle achievement in a nation where inflation is the general rule. In terms of progress in the solution of basic human wants, it seems quite likely that the farmers of the United States who produce food have made a greater contribution than any other group in the world during the period beginning in the middle 1930's.

Daggers Against Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the Congress should read with interest the report about the Central Intelligence Agency by Charles Edmundson, formerly a reporter for the Fortune magazine, and with the Foreign Service.

This article appeared in the February 1959 issue of the Progressive magazine:

THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY: DAGGERS AGAINST DIPLOMACY

(By Charles Edmundson)

In his recent Saturday Evening Post article, "The Story Behind Quemoy: How We Drifted Close to War," Stewart Alsop tells of the part played by the Central Intelligence Agency in almost starting war with Communist China in 1954 and again in 1958. For the first time a mass-circulation publication revealed that beginning early in 1950 the CIA supported and masterminded "commando-type guerrilla raids on the [Chinese] mainland, which were sometimes mounted in battalion strength."

Alsop does not, of course, tell all of the CIA's activities in heightening tensions in the Far East. But he does describe in detail the role of "Western Enterprises, Inc." (a cover name for the CIA project) in raiding the mainland from Quemoy and the Tachens:

"The Western Enterprisers—ostensibly soldiers of fortune—were responsible for organizing and equipping the Nationalist guerrillas who raided the mainland from the offshore islands. * * * Until early 1954, the islands were pretty much their exclusive playground. By that time they had settled themselves pretty comfortably on the islands."

Although neither the White House nor Congress had yet made up its mind whether the offshore islands belonged to Mao Tse-tung or Chiang Kai-shek, the CIA decided the matter for itself and proceeded with systematic raids against the mainland. The results, direct and indirect, were enough to provoke the brink-of-war crisis of September 1954 and October 1958. The United States and the world were twice taken to the precipice by a secret bureau whose activities are unknown to Congress, the press, and the people until long after the event—if they are ever known.

The raids from Quemoy and the Tachens are not isolated instances of CIA activity. They are representative. As currently operated, the CIA is far more than an intelligence-gathering organization. It is an activist group which steps in boldly to dictate foreign policy in areas not covered by decisions of Congress, the State Department, or the White House. The CIA operates clandestinely in every country in the world, including several where the State Department and the press are forbidden. It executes its projects without concern over the reaction of the public. The incidents it provokes are never acknowledged, yet can be decisive in shaping—or misshaping—public opinion, and foreign policy.

All the machinery of government publicity is used to make CIA-induced incidents serve preconceived domestic ends. The public can thus be propagandized into believing whatever the CIA and its Old Guard allies in the State Department or the military want it to believe.

Not long ago I asked a distinguished career ambassador, "When CIA operatives are at work in the country to which you are accredited don't the incidents which they create shape policy in such a way as to take control largely out of your hands?"

"I couldn't agree with you more," the ambassador replied. He told of CIA activities in his country which had damaged American prestige and influence over a whole continent.

The CIA works under the direction of the National Security Council, the Nation's supreme body in deciding military policy. Chairman of the NSC is the President himself and there are four other members: the Vice President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. The Director of the CIA is not a member, but as its adviser on all intelligence matters he sits in on most important sessions and has a voice in Security Council discussions and decisions.

According to the basic statute, the CIA's functions are limited to gathering and interpreting intelligence. A final catchall clause, however, authorizes the CIA to perform such other functions and duties relating to security intelligence as the National Security Council may direct. This would not appear to authorize the organization of guerrilla raids * * * in battalion strength or the deployment of agents provocateurs in the territory of cold war adversaries. But the CIA has engaged in such activities on a broad scale.

Funds are not lacking for any schemes the CIA may see fit to adopt. In his book, "Central Intelligence and National Security," Harry Howe Ransom, a political scientist at Harvard, quotes estimates of national intelligence expenditures as high as $2 billion a year. "Several hundreds of millions of dollars annually," he writes, may be budgeted directly to the CIA, with the rest going to the Army, Air Force, Navy, State Department, and several other agencies which also gather intelligence. Nobody knows the exact amount the CIA gets. The Bureau of the Budget is forbidden by law to disclose the figure. Congress itself, carefully blindfolded,

passes CIA appropriations as disguised items in the budgets of other bureaus.

The CIA's total personnel, American and foreign, is estimated at about 16,000 persons. The "Little Pentagon" being built for the CIA across the river from Washington—at a total cost of $55 million—will have a capacity of at least 10,000 persons. Small wonder that more thoughtful Senators and Representatives are disturbed to see such a rich and far-flung empire operating in the vital fields of foreign affairs, hidden from the eyes of Congress and the press.

In reality, the press, with correspondents in most foreign capitals, knows much more about CIA operations than does Congress. Many foreign correspondents with whom I have talked would like nothing better than to report how the CIA often distorts international relations. But the editors at home long ago decided to regard the CIA as a sacred cow.

Perhaps the most glaring failure of the press, from the standpoint of public policy, has been its acquiescence in the State Department's repeated and sometimes incendiary statements that all the Americans held prisoner in Communist China are held illegally and in violation of international law. Every well-informed correspondent and editor in Washington knows that many of the prisoners have been U.S. intelligence agents, whom China has as much right to hold as the United States has to imprison Rudolph Ivanovich Abel, the Soviet master spy.

The reading and comparison of scattered items (always buried obscurely on inside pages) in the New York Times is sufficient to show that at least some of the prisoners are CIA agents. Confessions by some agents who have been released and others still held have been printed in the Times, the Washington Post, and other newspapers. At a press conference December 3, 1956, President Eisenhower pointedly refused, contrary to Secretary Dulles' practice, to say that all the Chinese prisoners are illegally held.

But such items go unnoticed, and when Secretary Dulles or Assistant Secretary Walter Robertson make speeches saying that the imprisonment of all the men is illegal, barbarous, and an affront to the dignity of the United States, doubtless 99 percent of the public believes them.

It is understandable that newspaper editors are reluctant to print the full story of U.S. intelligence agents captured in China. But to protect the integrity of public opinion they might at least warn Secretary Dulles that they will not forever remain silent while the State Department belligerently misrepresents facts. They could at least refuse to cooperate in the effort to propagandize and bamboozle the American public to the point where a rational China policy becomes a political impossibility.

President Eisenhower, according to his biographer, Robert J. Donovan, questions the wisdom of driving "the Chinese ever deeper into an unnatural alliance with Russia." But the Dulles brothers have been doing just that. Besides the raids from the offshore islands, Western Enterprises, Inc. for several years helped supply and direct a large remnant of Nationalist Chinese forces against the Communist Chinese from the northern border of Burma.

The Nationalist Chinese were never more than a nuisance to Communist China, but they were a real peril to Burma, which feared that Peiping might retaliate against the Burmese for harboring hostile forces. When Burma's own army was unable to deal with the Nationalist Chinese, Prime Minister U Nu protested to the U.S. Ambassador in Rangoon. After this proved useless he took his case to the United Nations. Feeling mounted so high among Asian and African delegates that something had to be done. Eventually a four-power conference—the United States, Burma, Nationalist China, and Thailand—was held and as a result 7,000 Nationalist Chinese and their dependents were evacuated to Formosa, although some 3,000 of Chiang's veterans still linger in Burma.

In this period the CIA and the Air Force cooperated in running an Air Resupply and Communications Wing. The wing's "mission in a global war," explained the New York Times, "would be to fly into enemy territory and drop supplies to United States or Allied agents operating there." Operations over China were extensive and occasionally a plane was shot down or accidentally crashed. Early in 1953 the plane of Col. John Knox Arnold, commander of the 581st Air Resupply and Communications Wing, was shot down over China, and Colonel Arnold and 13 other Americans were captured. After 2½ years the Chinese released all 14 of them. At a press conference arranged by the U.S. Air Force in Tokyo, Colonel Arnold said that under pressure he had "told the Chinese things they shouldn't know." By this time some members of Congress had become concerned over the trouble-making potential of the Air Resupply and Communications Wing and the operation was suspended.

In mid-August of 1953, the CIA brought off what it apparently regards as its most dramatic coup. This was the overthrow of Prime Minister Mohammed Mossadegh of Iran, accomplished with all the packed drama of a television scenario. The CIA was so proud of this masterpiece that it leaked the details to Richard and Gladys Harkness for a remarkable story published in the Saturday Evening Post November 6, 1954.

The coup was planned in a picturesque hostelry in the Swiss Alps. Allen Dulles flew there on August 10, 1953, to join his wife, ostensibly for a vacation. Soon they were joined by Loy Henderson, U.S. Ambassador to Iran, and by Princess Ashraf, the attractive and strong-minded brunette twin sister of the Shah. By a remarkable coincidence the late Brig. Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf, formerly U.S. adviser to the Iranian Gendarmerie, happened to be touring the Middle East, and was in Teheran, the capital of Iran, at the same time.

The Shah sent a military detachment to Prime Minister Mossadegh to inform him that he was dismissed. When Mossadegh refused to resign and took charge of the capital with armored jeeps and tanks, the Shah and his wife fled to Rome.

Others did not give up so easily. Some members of the Iranian Army had remained loyal and the support of others was won with black bags comfortably filled with rials (a total of $19 million was spent). A few days after the flight of the Shah, an innocent-looking troup of jugglers and trapeze artists began a parade toward the heart of Teheran. Their numbers swelled miraculously, and they began to chant "Down with Mossadegh," "Long live the Shah." The chant became an angry shout. The paraders were transformed into an aroused populace. As if by prearrangement, pro-Shah elements of the army joined the demonstration. After a half day of bitter fighting, Mossadegh was overthrown, and the Shah and his bride flew back to the capital.

In the background of all this were, of course, the oilfields on the north shore of the Persian Gulf. It is not irrelevant that Sullivan & Cromwell, the Dulles brothers' former law firm, is the longtime legal counsel of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., whose billion-dollar property interest on the Persian Gulf was saved by Mossadegh's overthrow. The international oil cartel, whose American members were then and still are under prosecution by the U.S. Department of Justice, found it easier to negotiate with the Shah than with Mossadegh, whose efforts to deal with American independent oil companies had been frowned upon by the State Department.

Congress seemed well enough pleased by what happened in Iran, but 3 months later it was jolted by reports out of East Germany. On November 17, 1953, the New York Times reported that the East German government had seized scores of persons whom it accused of being agents provocateurs. They had been caught, the East Germans claimed, with plans to blast railroad bridges and stations, burn factories and government buildings, and assassinate officials. In the prisoners' pockets were found, the East Germans said, faked food stamps and counterfeit bank drafts to upset food rationing and bank credit.

Something else piqued Congressional interest. Most of the captured agents were former Nazis, headed by Gustav Gehlen, who had been a major general in the Nazi army, and papers found on the captured agents included a list of West German anti-Nazis for slaying. Apparently the former Nazis were using their spy roles as cover for settling old scores.

An informal committee of Congress, with Senator Mansfield in the lead, demanded to know what was going on. Army intelligence, which was also operating in Germany, hastily gave the CIA full credit for the Gehlen affair, and this view was supported in the trials in East Germany. Four of the Gehlen group were executed, 11 were given life imprisonment, and those who escaped to West Germany were presumably culled from the American payroll. Thereafter intelligence operations in Germany were limited mostly to such ventures as digging a 2,000-foot tunnel into East Berlin to tap Communist telephone and telegraph trunklines—an enterprise discovered in 1956.

Using the CIA, the United States is able to react quickly when an alien power or ideology shows sign of gaining ground in the Western Hemisphere. In May 1954 the CIA found that a secret shipment of 1,900 tons of arms from Czechoslovakia was being unloaded at Puerto Barrios, Guatemala. Although there were no Communists in the cabinet of President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman, his government had been charged with Communist sympathies. Allen Dulles warned the National Security Council that action was urgent. Two Globemasters loaded with arms were flown to Honduras and Nicaragua. Within a week an exiled Guatemalan officer was leading an armed force across the border from Honduras and the Arbenz government was doomed. The coup deposing Arbenz was so easily executed that the State Department apparently forgot to do much subsequently about the conditions which helped give rise to pro-Communist sentiment in Guatemala.

It is not generally known that Radio Free Europe, which appeals for public contributions through the press, radio, and television, is an arm of the CIA and depends on the CIA for most of its funds. When a knowledgeable correspondent like Cyrus Sulzberger of the New York Times refers to Radio Free Europe as a private agency he puts the word "private" in quotation marks. Most of the Free Europe Committee directors are industrialists such as Irving S. Olds, former board chairman of U.S. Steel, and Eugene Holman, head of Standard Oil of New Jersey. One may reasonably question if the ideas of such men are suited to the development of propaganda appealing to repressed populations.

According to Dr. Frederick L. Schuman, Woodrow Wilson professor of government at Williams College, "Radio Free Europe is designed to conduct psychological warfare more vigorously than the Voice of America, with the object of instigating revolution and promoting what Life magazine called 'the necessary distintegration of the Soviet system.'" In 1956 Leslie Bain, Budapest correspondent for the Reporter, blamed Radio Free Europe

for helping raise the Hungarian revolution to a tempo which uselessly sacrificed thousands of Hungarian patriots after their cause had proved hopeless. The broadcasts, he wrote, kept repeating a refrain from Ambassador Lodge's speech in the U.N., "America will not fail you * * * America will not fail you," after it was clear that nobody was going to Hungary's aid.

In the spring of 1958 the Oxford University magazine Isis lifted a corner of the United States-British espionage curtain and revealed part of what was behind it. The authors were Paul Thompson, 22, and William Miller, 24, assistant editors of Isis and former members of a secret branch of the Royal Navy. When the authors were prosecuted for breaching the British Official Secrets Act, the public prosecutor stated in court that parts of their story were true. The Associated Press quoted the Thompson-Miller article:

"All along the frontier between East and West from Iraq to the Baltic and perhaps farther are monitoring stations avidly recording the least squeak from Russian transmitters, ships, tanks, airplanes, troops, and control stations.

"It is believed, perhaps rightly, that this flagrant breach of the Geneva Convention can provide accurate estimates of the size and type of Russian arms and troops and the nature of their tactical methods.

"In order to get this information, the West has been willing to go to extraordinary lengths of deception. British Embassies usually contain monitoring spies * * *.

"An airplane loses its way. Behind the frontier, tape recorders excitedly read the irritated exchanges of Russian pilots, and when the latter sometimes force the airplane to land, an international incident is created and reported in the usual fashion."

Accounts in the American press complement the story of the Oxford students. Hanson Baldwin, of the New York Times, and others have written of flights by the U.S. Air Force across the boundaries of Russia. In the January 1958 issue of Missiles and Rockets, Associate Editor Seabrook Hull gave some details:

"The Strategic Air Command still provides the United States with an overwhelming retaliatory power over the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, according to Pentagon experts. * * * Numerous and continuing SAC flights over the sovereign territory of the U.S.S.R demonstrate this. * * * Their [SAC] aircraft continue to fly over the Soviet Union with a relative degree of immunity. It is true that modern Russian fighters attack our bombers with major advantage of altitude, speed, and maneuverability. It is also true that they score some hits. But so far no attacks have been made by the Russians with missiles [possibly] because they don't want to tip their hands."

Time more than once has written of U.S. military planes making spy flights over Russia. In its November 3, 1958, issue Time quoted Soviet refugees as saying that high-altitude U.S. photo-reconnaissance planes flying in from the west made a nighttime penetration of Russian airspace in late 1956 or early 1957. Time said on its own authority that the Russians had seen such planes on their radar—proof that they are not asleep at their oscilloscope."

The most fundamental of all civil liberties is the right of the citizen to make up his mind on public issues without having the facts concealed or distorted by his government. The record shows that the CIA, in cooperation with the State Department, systematically contravenes this principle. A few examples of what is happening creep obscurely into some of the better newspapers, but nowhere, save in a few liberal publications, are Americans warned of the potential consequence of the far-flung operations of the secrecy-ridden CIA.

Public opinion can with effort make itself felt in the most public of Government bureaucracies. But bureaucracy operating in the dark, utterly insulated from public or congressional opinion in the delicate field of foreign affairs, is about as far removed from the democratic process as it is possible to conceive. Democracy is vitiated at home. Abroad, CIA activities are used by leaders like Mao Tse-tung to stir up hatred of the United States and generate more support for Communist dictatorship.

For 4 years men like Senators MANSFIELD, MORSE, and KEFAUVER have tried to get Congress to set up a committee to keep check on the CIA just as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy keeps Congress reassured in that vital field. Congressional participation in the supervision of the CIA has been recommended by the Hoover Committee on Government Reorganization, by a special Hoover Commission task force headed by Gen. Mark Clark, and by the Senate Rules Committee. But a bill to achieve this has not been passed by either House. Four such bills died in commitee in the past session.

Other bills are being prepared for the current session of Congress, and the temper of the new Congress is likely to prove more favorable. But the needed legislation will not be passed unless the public and the press demand action. Too many men high in Government gloat over the cops-and-robbers exploits of the younger of the Brothers Dulles.

Where and When Will It End?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a current article by C. Wilson Harder, writer of a weekly column of national distribution geared to the interests of small business. It is important reading for an understanding of the myriad problems confronting the small businessman:

For quite some time, the Nation's independent businessmen, voting through the National Federation of Independent Business, have urged unions be made subject to Nation's antitrust laws. So far, Congress has not seen fit to do this.

This stand by the Nation's small businessmen is not based on an antilabor, or labor-baiting attitude. Rather, the question goes much deeper. It is possible that unless some curb under law is placed on labor leadership that the welfare of the Republic will be impaired.

There is something corrosive about unlimited power to an individual. In olden times there was seldom a king who did not abuse his power. But the modern labor leader is not only unfettered in his use of power, he also has the problem of pushing for more and more to put on a good show for the membership. This abuse of so far uncontrolled power, plus the drive to seek justification by getting more and more for the membership, seemingly has no end.

Perhaps one of the best concrete examples of this fact is found out in California. In the food industry, this State is recognized as the birthplace of the supermarket, and thus, is also perhaps the place of origination of the grocery clerk's union. Over the years the union has pushed wages up to a point where any grocery clerk not making $125 per week is unusual. In addition, there are numerous paid holidays, and on some, if the store stays open to accommodate the public, double, and even triple time must be paid.

But now the clerk's union has dreamed up a new demand. It is now being sought to get the employer to finance a fund to pay for psychiatric treatment for clerks who "crack up" under the high pressure of their jobs.

Nothing is said about owners who might "go nuts" trying to keep up with this merry-go-round. It seems doubtful anyone ever contracted neuroses from stacking cans of peas on a shelf.

Thus, this demand by the union bosses would seem absurd on the fact of it, if it were not a part of a very sly strategy in applied psychology. If union leaders can get over to their members the idea that they are being driven into all kinds of neuroses for the enrichment of the boss, more ill feeling is created for the employer; greater dependence on the union is built up.

It is doubtful that any grocery clerk has ever considered that he has a psychosis brought on by weighing out the sugar, or stacking up the coffee cans. But it is a safe bet that in due time, the union will sell him on the idea that his job, and his employer, is "driving him nuts." After that is accomplished, who knows what will be the next objective of union leadership? Perhaps the next thing will be to seek a Mother's Day bonus for every clerk who had a mother, on the grounds that the employers owe a debt to the mothers who made it possible for the boss to hire them as clerks.

New Help for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of our Small Business Committee, I am particularly interested in the activities and progress of the Small Business Administration which, as you know, has been made a permanent agency by the Congress.

The 85th Congress legislated a Small Business Investment Act as a means of providing more adequate long-term financing for small businesses throughout the land. The job of getting the Investment Act into gear is the responsibility of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Wendell B. Barnes. He has tackled this work with alacrity and now has the Small Business Administration Investment Division about ready to prove its value to the national economy.

Paul Wooton, the veteran Washington and congressional correspondent, recently interviewed Administrator Barnes on this subject for the publication, Dun's Review and Modern Industry. His article is most enlightening and well done, and I believe Members of this body will be interested in reading it. I ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD. It reads as follows:

NEW HELP FOR SMALL BUSINESS—SBA CHIEF BARNES GIVES SOME POINTERS ON THE NEW LAW AIMED AT EASING THE LITTLE FELLOW'S FINANCING PROBLEMS

(By Paul Wooton)

The brandnew Small Business Investment Act will do more to stabilize and strengthen the overall economy than any peacetime legislation since the passage of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

So says Wendell B. Barnes, head of the Small Business Administration, which will administer the law passed by Congress last August to provide financing facilities for small businesses.

EVERYBODY BENEFITS

Barnes' optimism is based on the fact that this new concept of corporate financing can be applied to a large percentage of the country's 4.3 million business establishments. He feels that his enthusiasm is shared by most of the financial community.

Lack of capital which has retarded the growth of thousands of small businesses now can be overcome, Barnes believes, by the establishment of private investment companies which will lend needed funds for sound financing, expansion, and new product development. The loans can run from 5 to 20 years. State and local development companies also may obtain loans for site acquisition and plant construction for small concerns.

While a major long-term effect of the act will be the establishment of new companies, Barnes points out that the immediate benefits will come from providing going concerns with funds for modernization and expansion.

TAX RELIEF SPURS GROWTH

However, tax benefits provided for in the act already are resulting in the creation of new companies. Corporations with no more than 10 stockholders now have the option of being taxed as if they were partnerships. An original investor in a small business may deduct stock losses within certain limitations. A taxpayer also has the option of paying the estate tax over a period up to 10 years if the estate consists principally of small business holdings. A small business is allowed a 3-year carryback on new operating losses, and it may write off 20 percent of the cost of depreciable, tangible personal property in the year of acquisition. The writeoff, however, is limited to $10,000. The minimum accumulated earnings credit is increased from $60,000 to $100,000.

Administrator Barnes points out that licensed small business investment companies will be privately owned and privately operated. He sums up the main features of the Investment Act as follows:

HOW IT WORKS

Licensed companies will make loans and purchase debentures issued by small business concerns. The debentures are to be convertible into stock.

Small business investment companies will be licensed only after the need for small business financing in the area has been established.

Licensed companies must have a minimum of $300,000 paid-in capital and surplus, but the Small Business Administration can purchase a maximum of $150,000 of subordinated debentures. In addition, SBA can lend such companies up to 50 percent of their capital and surplus. For the purposes of the act, these subordinated debentures can be treated as capital.

Licensed companies are exempt from the Securities and Exchange Commission's requirements of 300-percent asset coverage against borrowings and are eligible for certain discretionary SEC exemptions.

SBA will charter investment companies if State officials cannot grant such companies powers to operate under the act.

Private funds must be employed in the program to the maximum possible extent. Federal funds to the extent of $250 million are authorized for loans to licensed companies and to State and local development companies. Of this sum, $50 million has been appropriated.

Funds also are available for use of schools and State agencies in research on the problems of small business.

An SBA division is in operation helping small concerns obtain Government contracts.

REGULATIONS AREN'T SO TOUGH

There have been some complaints that the regulations implementing the act are too technical and complex. Barnes admits the regulations are not simple, but they follow the requirements of the act.

Although they are set up to make loans to small concerns which have been unable to obtain long-term loans, the small business investment companies are not going to grant loans without reasonable assurance of repayment. They will look for concerns with prospects for growth.

Barnes points out that loans extended to implement promising product ideas can foster business growth and advance the economy as a whole.

MAJOR HEADACHE: INVESTIGATION

A problem that will be common to all the investment companies is the high cost of investigating small concerns. Some think 10 applicants will have to be examined for each 1 accepted. The investment companies will be looking for concerns whose net income can be brought up to the $150,000 or $200,000 level before they are turned over for public financing. However, the small business investment companies will have to compete with other concerns making venture capital investments. The SBIC loans are in no way subsidies.

Ten or more persons (fewer if permitted by State laws) may join in setting up a small business investment company. The SBA will purchase $150,000 of the company's subordinated debentures to help it get organized. They will be junior to other obligations of the company.

For the capital advanced to the small business, the investment company takes debentures which are convertible into the stock of the small business. It may also make secured loans of 5 years or more.

Banks and other investors may acquire the stock of the small business investment company. Bank holdings of such shares may not exceed 1 percent of the bank's capital and surplus. Efforts will be made by some companies to confine stock ownership to the community in which the enterprise will operate.

OTHER PROVISIONS

The percentage of borrowings of an investment company to its paid-in capital and surplus may not exceed a ratio of 4 to 1 without SBA approval. SBA will charge 5 percent interest on subordinated debentures purchased from the SBIC. The 5 percent rate also will apply on loans from SBA to SBIC. An SBIC may obtain stock of small business concerns only through the conversion of debentures.

SBA is precluded from buying more than $150,000 of subordinated debentures in any one small business investment company where several are owned by the same group. Financing extended to any one small business concern by an SBIC may not exceed 20 percent of the investment company's capital and surplus without special permission.

Existing State chartered investment and State development companies may convert to an SBIC with the approval of SBA.

SBA may make loans to State development companies, but the total loans outstanding may not exceed the total amount put up by other sponsors. Provision is made, in addition, for loans for specific small concerns.

What Can You Do About High Taxes?—One Answer Is: Demand Less

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared on February 5 in the Sidney Record-Enterprise in my district.

While the editorial deals with the problems of taxation and balanced budgets at our State level, nevertheless the same, and reasonable, approach applies equally to our own problems in the Federal Government.

It is time for more and more of our people to answer the question in the title of this fine article: "What Can You Do About High Taxes?—One Answer Is: Demand Less."

If these problems are ever solved, it will be by the people themselves:

WHAT CAN YOU DO ABOUT HIGH TAXES?—ONE ANSWER IS: DEMAND LESS

According to what we read in the daily newspapers the Republicans are divided in their reaction to Rockefeller realism. The Democrats, naturally, will make all the political capital they can out of the unpopular situation created when a hand reaches out for a larger portion of the pay envelope.

The average person is not particularly interested in the political implications of the situation; he knows that what we are being asked to do is pay for commitments already made. The specific figure is that 81 percent of the increase in our State budget is either mandated by law or obligatory. The commitments were made by a Republican legislature under a Democratic Governor.

New York State is a high-tax and a high-cost State; the result is that we have too many manufacturers and businesses ready to move out and too few ready to move in. Our government has not been conducted efficiently—that is a statement of business fact, not political innuendo.

Governor Rockefeller made the statement on Monday that "the interest that must be paid on bonds makes the cost of capital construction projects more than 50 percent higher to the taxpayer." He is trying to establish sound fiscal policies and that means raising the necessary added revenue to meet our expenditures.

Under the heading of economy Governor Rockefeller has refused to fill 9,000 requested jobs that he considers nonessential. He seems to be withstanding pressure extremely well, but there are forms of pressure that cost us too much money, and are beyond his control unless the public demands action.

To be specific there are the costs involved in building schools—the costs that come from pressure exerted from the time the architect draws up a new set of plans—no such things as standardized plans available. The architect, because of pressure from his professional group, will get a percentage fee that will net him around $50,000 to $60,000 on most schools being built in our State today.

The common laborer and the craftsman also have been able to bring pressure to bear so that their rate of pay on school buildings is inordinately high, and bolstered by such devices as traveling time and such gimmicks. When State money is included in a local project you must accept the formula under which State contracts are written.

Governor Rockefeller stated on Monday that "State aid to local communities exceeds a billion dollars, which is about half of the total budget." On January 29, a speaker addressing the municipal law section of the New York State Bar Association said that 61 cents of every State revenue dollar goes to localities in the form of State aid. That means that the true cost of local government in New York State is camouflaged by our beneficent State government.

When you hear that a village or town pays a certain percentage, the State contributes so much and the Federal Government pays the rest you are being asked to believe that the added money comes from somebody else. It comes from you—the only difference is that when your dollar goes to Albany or Washington and comes back as State or Federal aid it has somehow shrunk in the process.

Governor Rockefeller is asking us to pay for what we, on a local level, keep demanding; we will have to demand less if we want to cut down the high cost of living or doing business in New York State.

A Realistic Approach to Veterans' Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert an editorial from the Pasadena Independent of January 22 which is worthy of note:

A REALISTIC APPROACH TO VETERANS' PENSIONS

In his budget message President Eisenhower called for tightening requirements for veterans' pensions "according to effective tests of need, both as to income and as to net worth."

In other words, a veteran who doesn't need a pension shouldn't get one.

Mr. Eisenhower asked Veterans Administrator Sumner Whittier to propose legislation to do the job. If the bill is introduced it will run into a heavy flak of opposition from those veterans groups which seek greater, not less, benefits for men who donned uniform, whether or not they were wounded or even went overseas.

A new organization, the Veterans of World War I, seeks $100 a month pension at age 60 for all World War I veterans, no matter how short their war service or how high their current income.

If they should get their way, the Government would have to do as well by World War II veterans and Korean war veterans. It is estimated that by 1965, this across-the-board pension would go to 4.8 million men, more than a fifth of the Nation's 23 million veterans.

At present more than 1.3 million veterans and surviving relatives draw more than $1.1 billion in annual pensions. Much of it is justified. But many get help not for service disabilities but for injuries and illnesses incurred long after service. Many get pensions just for the disabilities resulting from old age, despite the fact that they have ample savings accounts and reasonable annual incomes from other sources.

To cite one example, a 78-year-old Californian who served for 7 months during World War I entirely within the United States has drawn $78.75 a month tax free for 90 months. He and his wife have other income of $4,701 a year plus total worth of $58,238.

The President wants to limit pension payments to the difference between the amount needed to live decently and a veteran's other income.

For instance, if $3,000 a year was set as the amount necessary for an elderly couple, then the veteran who now gets the maximum nonmedical pension of $945 a year and no other income would be given a sizable income boost.

But the veteran who also gets social security payments of $1,200 a year and has $1,000 a year outside income would take a cut. And the veteran who has outside income above $3,000 would get nothing at all.

One could argue that such a plan stifles initiative. To some extent it does, but most men reaching pension age have already established their incomes.

One could also argue, as Kipling did, that "Tommy" is forgotten except in wartime. But since 6.6 cents of every Federal tax dollar in the new budget goes to veterans' programs, this argument doesn't hold much water.

The 23 million living American veterans and their families are such a sizable portion of the total population that any across-the-board pension plan would just about mean that half the country was drawing forced largess for the other half.

A $100 a month flat pension is unreasonable and unrealistic at a time of growing national debt and a need for heavy defense expenditures. Old Soldier Eisenhower's plan is both realistic and fair.

Business in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the activities of organized labor and their participation in each election campaign underscores the importance of businessmen protecting their interests through similar activity.

The debacle now unfolding in the State of Michigan where under the policies advocated by certain leaders of organized labor we see a great State literally going broke must give us pause. The inflationary impact of each new round of wages and the demand for more and more hand-outs from Government sends the inflationary spiral and threatens the security of all of us, and especially the very recipients of these so-called benefits.

The leading daily newspaper in my home county, the Daily Local News of West Chester, Pa., has editorialized on the subject of greater activity on the part of businessmen in the field of politics and I am privileged to include the splendid article as a part of these remarks:

BUSINESS IN POLITICS

There's politics in business to be sure, but the ideal situation in these days finds business in politics, not only on a local basis but State and national.

Yesterday's edition of this newspaper carried a picture showing a delegation of West Chester citizens, many of them businessmen, boarding a bus for Philadelphia where they took part in the launching of the political participation program of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Purpose is to encourage and aid retailers and others to take a more active part in politics.

That is as it should be in a day when business finds itself very much a part of politics whether or not it wants it that way. Since it is on the paying end, it makes sense that it should also be active on the policy-making end.

Businessmen must make their voices heard or accept the consequences. That is the challenge that comes from the board chairman of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce who himself is a top executive of a large department store. He puts it this way: "Government decisions * * * have a tremendous impact on the retailer's right to manage. He must make his voice heard—or the decisions may be made without any consideration of his views." Moreover, the retailer is in a unique position to furnish leadership in national and community affairs because "no other person is closer to the people."

Advice of this nature, coming from business leaders and organizations, is being heard to an ever-increasing extent—as it should be. And, naturally, it isn't directed at retailers alone, important as their participation in political work is. The entire business community is at the mercy of political actions of one kind or another. The policies adopted and implemented into law in Washington, at the State capitals, and at all other centers of government will determine what kind of country we are going to have.

Any citizen who thinks himself above political affairs lives in a dream-world. Any citizen who shirks his political duty is asking for trouble. In the long run, the quality of government is more important to business than the quantity of its sales.

It is well that our local chamber of commerce is awake to the importance of active participation, and that its committee, headed by Robert L. Beling, saw fit to make a trip to Philadelphia to see what the situation is at present and what the future may be.

In this way our local chamber along with others will not be caught napping when legislation affecting businessmen is proposed.

Countering Labor Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the recent reports concerning increased unemployment, it might be well for all parties concerned to give careful consideration to the penetrating discussion in the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Star of February 10, 1959:

COUNTERING LABOR COSTS

The Federal Reserve Board has directed official attention toward one deeply disquieting aspect of the current economic recovery. It is that unemployment figures have not improved in concert with other indexes reflecting the business revival, or in the same degree that they improved during initial recovery from the recessions of 1948–50 and 1953–55. The FRB comment was contained in a staff study submitted to the Senate-House Economic Committee and came just prior to release of the Government's January jobless statistics—showing unemployment of

4.7 million, compared with 4.1 million in December.

There are some lessons to be learned from this relatively gloomy picture on employment. Continuing increases in labor costs through union-negotiated contracts for higher wage rates and steadily expanding fringe benefits prompted industry to do two things. One was to invest heavily, prior to the recession, in plant modernization and introduction of automation, with the result that productivity has increased in recent months without need for comparable rehiring of workers. The FRB points out, for example, that auto output last December was only 4 percent below December 1956, but that it was accomplished with 20 percent fewer production workers. Similarly, the Board suggests, such labor cost obligations as social security, vacation payments, tenure rights, and so on, have caused industry to be increasingly cautious about adding to its work force until long-term need is amply demonstrated.

If these are valid explanations for much of the slowness in reemployment organized labor itself should take a hard look at its pattern of ever-increasing demands and their impact on the overall job picture.

Anger, Sorrow, and Disgust Displayed in Hospital Morgue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IVOR D. FENTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, the terrible loss of life in the ever-increasing highway accidents is causing consternation among our citizens in all sections of the country. The heartaches which result from these accidents are in most instances beyond description.

A very fine article appeared in the January 26 issue of the Shamokin News-Dispatch following a head-on crash which resulted in the death of four persons. This article, written by Staff Writer Harry Deitz, gives a heart-rending account which inspired the headline, "Anger, Sorrow, and Disgust Displayed in Hospital Morgue." I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include this article which might in someway contribute to serious reflection in our efforts to eliminate this unwarrantable loss of human life on the Nation's highways.

ANGER, SORROW, AND DISGUST DISPLAYED IN HOSPITAL MORGUE

(By Harry Deitz)

A veteran police officer turned away in disgust; a young nurse, her white uniform stained with blood, grimaced and a doctor looked stoically at the three bodies lying in the small morgue.

No one had to say what each was thinking—that another accident involving a teenage driver had taken its toll; that a short time before there was life in each of the three young bodies.

The doctor turned to make notes. "It's a darn shame," he mumbled, "that the State can't do something to stop tragedies like this."

In the far corner of the room, a relative looked at the contorted face of a lifeless young girl. He shook his head affirmatively, identifying her as his niece. She was 18 years old.

Outside, a young husband walked down the hallway toward the closed door. His hand trembled as a police officer led him into the room. He took a long look at the bodies on two of the three stretchers. There was silence, followed by an outburst before the husband was led away for sedation.

Upstairs, a green light flashed on the switchboard and the operator plugged in one of the cords. "I'm afraid I have bad news for you" her voice trailed off to a choked whisper.

She turned back to three police officers standing near a desk. "You never get used to this," she said. "Every time it gets a little tougher." She fought back an outburst of emotion then turned to plug in another cord—"Sunbury Community Hospital."

The three victims in the morgue were identified. There were two young mothers and a teen-age girl. All three met death in the prime of life.

In an upstairs room, a team of white dressed nurses and doctors gathered around a bed in which a 15-year-old youth struggled to hold onto his life. A nurse entered the room carrying two pints of blood. The doctor quickly performed a tracheotomy. Two other nurses attempted to staunch the flow of blood from deep gashes. But the youth took a deep breath and then there was silence. The team of medical technicians watched for the next breath that never came.

On the first floor level, a mother and her daughter paced the hallway. The mother looked toward a screened off room. The daughter said a prayer in low but audible tones "please God don't let my brother die." Inside the room another team of medical staff members was doing all that was humanly possible to spare the life of a 19-year-old boy.

A police officer, who has seen many tragedies like this, talked to the county coroner. Other officers were busy assembling notes. A news reporter stood in the background analyzing the one moment of carelessness that was responsible.

Only 3 hours earlier, there were five people enjoying life at its best. Two young mothers enroute to a happy home. Three teenagers were enjoying a ride. But the moment of carelessness turned the scene into morbid sorrow.

On the crest of a hill, one car went over the dividing line. There was a scream as rubber tires skidded over the highway. A loud crash followed and fate had stepped into the picture. Another car came over the hill and its driver stared at the wrecked sedans. "Oh my God," he uttered. Soon the area was a beehive of activity, flashing red lights, screaming sirens of ambulances, and the voice of police directing traffic.

Seven teenagers were among the spectators. Their reaction was typical of those who rarely see tragedy or disaster. A young girl turned up the collar of her jacket and shuddered as she inspected the bloodstained seats, the twisted metal, and the remains of what once had been two modern cars. Her boy friend and two other companions observed the gruesome picture.

"Boy, that sure is an accident," the one youth said as the group passed a photographer enroute to their car. "It sort of scares you."

No sooner had the group entered the sedan when the starter turned the motor over. There was a loud roar as the car zoomed away at high speed and out of sight.

An older spectator shook his head and said: "Maybe I'm old-fashioned, but if I had anything to say about it, the age limit on licenses would be increased to 21. It's always the innocent ones that pay for the mistakes of these wild kids."

Peacetime Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. MEYER
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Enosburg Falls (Vt.) Standard, Dec. 11, 1958]

FIVE QUESTIONS ABOUT PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION

1. Is the present law fair and equitable?

As the present law now operates, "more than one-half of all young men will never see any military service," writes John Graham in "The Universal Military Obligation" (1958), published by the Fund for the Republic. Graham noted that in early 1957, 2.3 million or 46 percent of the draft pool of about 3 million men were classified as physically or mentally unfit by the artificial standards of the Armed Forces. (Sturdy athletes have been deferred for minor physical defects.) An additional 1.4 million men were deferred by Executive order because they are fathers. Other deferments are granted to students, certain workers, conscientious objectors, and others.

The deferment policy often discriminates against the economically disadvantaged. Those who can afford higher education can be deferred often until they pass the age when they are likely to be taken. John Graham notes, "Husbands who can afford to have children young see no military service while those who cannot are drafted."

Prof. John K. Galbraith, of Harvard, has asserted that the draft survives principally as a device by which we use compulsion to get young men to serve at less than the market rate of pay. We shift the cost of military service from the well-to-do taxpayer, who benefits by lower taxes, to the impecunious young draftee."

2. How does conscription affect young men?

When a draft board takes boys to serve at low pay for the convenience of other citizens, forces them to serve against their will for 2 years plus reserve duty, it is a serious matter for the persons involved. For most of them it means postponing or interrupting college or marriage plans or their first job. The very fact that they must be compelled to serve in a society in which others may work at jobs of their own choice makes it an interruption rather than a job.

August B. Hollingshead in a study entitled "Adjustment to Military Life" in the American Journal of Sociology, March 6, 1946, said:

"The perfectly trained soldier is one who has had his civilian initiative reduced to zero. In the process the self becomes identified with the institution and dependent upon it for direction and stimulation. The ideally adjusted soldier would be a military dependent who looked to the institution for all his personal, social, and emotional satisfaction. * * * For these reasons the recruit must be remade; as any old sergeant knows, 'a recruit is not worth a damn until he has been broken.' "

3. How does the draft affect the Nation?

Thirteen years ago Halford Hoskins wrote on "Universal Military Training and American Foreign Policy" in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Today his words have a prophetic ring, with military men in the highest councils of our Government, with the mili-

tary receiving by far the largest proportion of the Federal budget (over $47 billion this year) and often being given more than they request by a compliant Congress, and with many businesses and universities working on military contracts.

"The results of 1 year's training will not greatly affect the body politic and even after 5 or 10 years no striking change in public outlook may be apparent. Nevertheless, in the course of a generation the effects will have become cumulative even if they have grown imperceptibly, * * * and military considerations may be expected to enter more and more into party politics, governmental policy, and economic and social life."

Conscription encourages reliance on military men and methods. In a remarkable article on "The Generals and the Cold War" in the New York Times, November 8, 1958, C. L. Sulzberger notes a global trend toward placing military men in positions of national leadership. "War, of course, makes generals, and generals make war. But it is probably also true that cold war makes generals into politicians. Where does such philosophy lead? Ultimately toward dangerous adventure or into stagnation."

4. Does conscription help education?

John Graham has pointed out that "uncertainties about the draft make it impossible for young men to plan ahead, and, as a result, discourage them from getting the advance training in the sciences or professions that the country is needing increasingly."

Those who enter ROTC as an alternative to the draft in order to stay in college or postpone induction must later serve on active duty. "Like all other forms of military service, the Reserve officers' active duty period represents a burdensome interruption in his professional training, one so burdensome that the intended professional education may never be resumed," wrote Walter Millis in "Individual Freedom and the Common Defense."

Compulsory ROTC is a form of conscription within the college community, and thus represents time taken away from subjects that are of real educational value. "Many institutions devote 20 percent of their curriculum to the military sciences. On the average, it is somewhat above 16 percent," wrote Benjamin Fine in 1953, and there is little reason to believe the situation has improved since then.

One of the gravest dangers of ROTC and compulsory military training in general is the influence they have on the minds of those trained and hence on the Nation's foreign and domestic policies. In military training, as if to justify it in the first place, suspicion of enemies and the role of physical and military forces are magnified. Except among the rare few who react against such ideas there is a tendency to discount the role of political, economic and other processes of change unless they are backed by superior military might.

5. Do all political leaders and military men believe conscription is essential?

Those concerned with military strength, who are also opposed to conscription today argue that it is inefficient; it cannot accomplish the end for which it was adopted. They speak of a mobile, technically trained and highly professional force.

"Every young man who has served in our Armed Forces knows the incredible waste of our present system of forced but short-term service. He knows the money that could be saved, the new efficiency that could result from a volunteer system * * * we need more and more today a type of military personnel—experienced and professional—which our present draft system does not give us," said Adlai Stevenson on October 18, 1956.

The Defense Adivsory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation headed by Ralph J. Cordiner, president of General Electric, in its May 1957 report supported this conclusion. Cordiner said after talking to hundreds of enlisted men, "I found antagonism and bitterness over the draft. They were checking off the days until they got out. We must devote 25 percent of our military effort to training men who don't stay." The accident rate is so high as a result of inexperienced men manning intricate weapons or equipment that the Armed Forces estimate that close to $5 billion worth of equipment is not now operable.

In one attempt to remedy the problem Congress last year passed legislation increasing military pay. A general or admiral received an increase of $424 a month; a colonel, $148 a month; and a major, $58 a month. A private first class earning less than $100 a month previously, during his first 2 years of service would get only $3 a month increase. Congress and the Pentagon have thus far pursued a policy of granting large increases to officers who aren't drafted and keeping the pay of enlisted men so low it is necessary to draft them.

On November 19, Neil H. McElroy, Secretary of Defense, ordered a 70,000 cut in the Armed Forces by June 30, 1959. Even then the United States will have 2,525,000 men under arms. The draft call for January is 9,000, or 2,000 fewer than in recent months.

Great Britain has decided to discontinue conscription after 1960—but as a part of an increasing reliance upon nuclear weapons.

[From the Enosburg Falls (Vt.) Standard, Dec. 18, 1958]

PEACETIME DRAFT IN 1959

Congressman-elect WILLIAM MEYER will join the growing group in Congress who will work for a return to voluntary service and an end to peacetime conscription. In his campaign he told Vermonters that the draft today is uneconomic, undemocratic and poor military policy. With Congress coming up and in the light of MEYER'S election and a definite public change of attitude, a closer look at this question is in order.

TIME TO TAKE A NEW LOOK

The law presently in effect was extended 4 years in 1955 by a voice vote in the Senate and a vote of 394 to 4 in the House. Since this overwhelming vote was taken a number of changes have occurred. The use of military methods in an ideological struggle has been increasingly questioned. An era characterized by the rise of Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY has passed. More and more the catastrophic nature of nuclear war is recognized. Presidential candidate Adlai Stevenson in 1956 campaigned for an end to the draft "in the foreseeable future."

An article by Fletcher Knebel "The Fight To Kill the Draft" in Look magazine, May 27, 1958, presented the case for ending conscription and added, "A curious fact about the draft is that Americans have accepted it so placidly in recent years. Once we hated the draft with a passion."

Certainly the American people have been conditioned to accept it as a defense measure along with the terrible weapons to mass destruction. For years we have been told that the only language the Communists will understand is force. Thus, conscription and nuclear weapons symbolize our posture of strength and our unwillingness to meet world problems on a much different level of negotiation, reconciliation, worldwide disarmament, and the development of world law.

Today, however, as Knebel points out "doubts about it [the draft] have arisen" in the Pentagon and the challenge to compulsory service will grow in volume.

A majority of those present and voting at the Fifth World Order Conference, called by the National Council of Churches in Cleveland, Ohio, voted on November 21 against continuation of the draft.

[From the Enosburg Falls (Vt.) Standard, Jan. 8, 1959]

WHAT ARE THE ALTERNATIVES TO THE PEACETIME DRAFT

Proponents of a huge Military Establishment argue that weakness invites aggression, and that world peace can only be assured by emphasis on military strength. They also argue that the Nation must be prepared to fight a limited nuclear war, with the unlikely expectation that the war will remain "limited" in the heat of atomic battle.

As Americans we cherish liberty and freedom and want the rest of the world to share it and enjoy it. We have a positive duty to defend and to nourish the ideals that have made our people and Nation great. But our greatness does not rest on military regimentation or strength.

There is no simple or easy answer, nor any course that does not involve risk. But this much seems certain: communism in a revolutionary world can only be met by better ideas; by a sacrificial program of sharing our experience and resources and ideals and lives with the under-privileged two-thirds of the human race. People cannot be weaned away from communism in the Orient, the Middle East, Latin America and Africa by bayonets—only by brotherhood and better ideas, and the demonstration that democracy has a better answer for their needs than totalitarianism.

The fundamental problem of security must be met through the development of the United Nations, the use of its moral and political authority for the resolving of disputes, and by far-reaching steps toward universal disarmament. The eyes and prayers of many of the world's people are focused now on the diplomats meeting at Geneva who are attempting to work out an agreement to end nuclear weapons tests.

Instead of conscripting young men into involuntary military service, the Government should be encouraging young men and women to train for constructive service to mankind. We need a comprehensive Federal scholarship program whose recipients would form a trained manpower reserve. They would serve overseas or at home as teachers or technicians in lieu of military service. We need leadership and programs to stimulate and capture the imagination of young people and offer them a constructive alternative to sterile, tedious and disruptive military duty.

The United States has an opportunity to exert real world leadership with regard to conscription. Discontinuation of the draft here could be followed by American efforts for the international abolition of conscription. In the midst of a prolonged cold war, it is hard for either side to convince the other that it really wants peace without some clear-cut affirmative acts for peace. Ending the peacetime draft could ease international tensions, promote political settlements and disarmament agreements, and release men and resources to help concentrate on the real needs of the world's people.

The Soviet's Conduct—Vicious, Barbaric, and Warlike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 8, the editorial writer of the Long Beach Independent-Press-Tele-

gram performed a distinct public service in listing many of the acts of uncivilized conduct committed by the Soviets in recent years.

It well serves as a reminder to those amongst us who may be deluded by Communist "peace" propaganda and the daily doses of hypocrisy served up by Soviet delegates to such affairs in Geneva as the nuclear-test-ban talks and surprise-attack talks.

The editorial specifically makes the point of speciousness as regard to certain arguments that alleged "weakening of our defense posture" has anything to do with the murder of 17 U.S. airmen September 2, 1958, by the U.S.S.R.

The following is the text of the editorial written by Mr. Harry Karns:

THEY'VE DONE IT FOR YEARS

Why the sudden sense of shock and indignation?

The tape recording of the voices of Russian jet pilots who shot down an unarmed U.S. transport plane merely details something that has been going on for years.

The history of Soviet-American relations over the past decade contains a long, sad series of vicious, barbaric, and warlike actions against our airplanes, our civilians, and our soldiers.

These incidents, ranging from abduction to murder, strangely punctuate the stream of Soviet declarations of friendship and peace.

Senators SYMINGTON and JACKSON seem to think that the attack on the transport is the outgrowth of recent "weakening of our defense posture."

That view is illogical, since the defense posture has become steadily stronger through the years, and in view of the fact that such incidents have been happening over a long period of time.

The attack on the transport is the outgrowth of a longstanding policy of uncivilized conduct.

Space doesn't permit the listing of all the acts of Soviet barbarism. But here are a few of the highlights:

Soviet fighter planes shot down a U.S. Navy Privateer with 10 persons aboard in the Baltic on April 8, 1950.

Soviet planes shot down a U.S. weather plane over the sea of Japan, November 6, 1951.

A Soviet fighter forced a U.S. C–47 down, and the crewmembers were held in Hungary, tried, and ransomed for $123,605.

Soviet planes attacked and shot down a B–29 with a crew of eight over Hokkaido, Japan, October 7, 1952.

Soviet MIG's shot down an F–84 in Germany in March 1953.

Soviet planes attacked a B–50 over international waters off Kamchatka on March 15, 1953.

Soviet fighters downed an RB–50 with a crew of 17 over international waters of the Sea of Japan on July 29, 1953.

Soviet MIG's shot down a Navy P2V, killing 1 of 10 crewmembers.

Soviet MIG's shot down a U.S. B–29 November 7, 1954.

Soviet planes shot down a U.S. Navy patrol plane over the Bering Sea on June 23, 1955.

East German Communists imprisoned nine U.S. Army men whose helicopter had made a forced landing in satellite territory in June 1958.

Soviet fighter planes forced down a U.S. plane in June 1958.

Soviet jet fighters shot down a C–130 U.S. transport September 2, 1958.

The record shows that Soviet attacks on U.S. property and personnel are routine.

And now Mr. Khrushchev would like Mr. Eisenhower to come to Moscow for a friendly chat.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Association of American Colleges, the Council for Financial Aid to Education, and the National Planning Association Have Called for Increased Private Support of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, at various times in recent years many leading nationwide organizations have called for increased private giving to education. Among these highly respected and substantial groups are the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Association of American Colleges; the Council for Financial Aid to Education, and the National Planning Association.

Recently, I introduced a bill, H.R. 2440, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide funds for educational purposes by providing increased incentives for private giving through the allowance of a tax credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education.

Most corporations and individuals conspicuously fail to contribute to education the sums permitted under the Internal Revenue Code. In fact, it is the failure of the present tax laws to realize the large sums necessary for education which the Congress intended when it wrote these acts which led to the development of H.R. 2440 and other measures similar to it which are designed to correct the present situation.

Dr. Paul E. Klopsteg, distinguished president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, wrote me on January 28, 1959, that my bill, H.R. 2440, "could become one of the most important pieces of legislation in the interest of preserving the integrity and independence of our colleges and universities that has ever been passed." Clearly, if our colleges and universities are not adequately assisted in obtaining the funds without which their continued existence will be impossible, then the integrity and independence of these institutions will be ended. Both increased Federal aid and private giving is of absolute importance if our colleges and universities are to serve our growing needs as our country expands.

H.R. 2440 would allow a taxpayer a credit against income tax for charitable contributions made to institutions of higher education. In the case of an individual taxpayer, the limit on this credit would be the same as the present limit on the deduction for charitable contributions. H.R. 2440 would not give him a tax benefit with respect to more contributions than he may now include for deduction purposes alone; he may elect to treat a charitable contribution—if it is to an educational institution—as a credit rather than as a deduction, but the total of credit plus deduction is no greater than the present allowable total of deductions.

In the case of a corporate taxpayer, the limit on this credit would be increased from 5 percent to 10 percent of taxable income—where the percentage-of-taxable-income method of computing the limit is used—and this credit would be in addition to the deduction presently allowed for charitable contributions generally; a corporation may elect to treat charitable contributions to educational institutions as credits rather than as deductions—up to 10 percent—without cutting into the amount of such contributions—along with other types of charitable contributions—which may be allowed as deductions. Of course, the same contribution cannot be counted as a credit and a deduction.

Under H.R. 2440 the taxpayer would be allowed a 2-year carryover on the credit just as he is presently allowed a 2-year carryover for deduction purposes. The Secretary of the Treasury would be directed to prescribe regulations governing the time and manner of making the election to treat a contribution as a credit rather than a deduction and imposing conditions to insure the effective correlation of the new credit section with the existing deduction provisions.

I include here a letter I have received from Dr. Paul E. Klopsteg, president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the text of my bill, H.R. 2440:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE,
Glenview, Ill., February 3, 1959.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Thank you very much for your letter of January 30.

* * * * *

As you may know, I have been either directly active in or associated with higher education throughout my career. Having been on the staff of a large State university and a large private university, and on the board of trustees of a small liberal arts college, I am familiar with the problems, so many of which could be solved with more money that the institution can truly call its own.

I have literally lived with the question of how the flow of undesignated funds from many donors could be stimulated, over a period of more than 5 years. For more years than that, I had been aware of the inevitable pressure that would come upon the colleges and universities as a result of the rapid increase in the number of young people of college age, and that pressure is now upon them. To avoid operating deficits, they must either limit their enrollments, or obtain more operating funds.

Some private institutions are already limiting enrollments, which is bound to throw increasing loads on the State and municipally supported institutions, largely to their detriment. What is needed is clearly the additional "own" money to prevent deficits as enrollments increase. The source must be one of two possible ones: either Government, or private. As you know better than I, the pressure on Government for more and more subsidy for higher education is increasing each year, and understandably so. Private individuals have reached a ceiling in their charitable giving, as expressed in percent of adjusted gross income of taxpayers. As

shown in the study sponsored by AAAS, this percentage has remained close to 4.2 for a number of years, this being the average for those itemizing their gifts. The question is how to break through the ceiling. I believe it can be done, and I believe H.R. 2440 can be the instrument for doing so.

When I published the general plan for equalizing cost of giving in Science, I had requests for 1,800 reprints, out of an original circulation of about 45,000 copies. It indicated exceptional interest in the problem and possible solutions. Great interest was also expressed by many college and university presidents with whom I spoke about it, and the usual comment was, "This is exactly what is needed. You must keep on pushing it. Of course one individual isn't in position to push such a matter very far or very fast. It was not until AAAS, an organization without vested interest in the results, but of course interested in better education and research in colleges and universities, took enough interest to have the study made that things began to move off dead center. And H.R. 2440 expresses succinctly how the job needs to be done.

As I see it, either we have no concern for the future, since "Uncle Sugar" is always available to help, or we do something to make this help unnecessary. If we have strong convictions, from experience, that much of the strength of an institution comes from self-reliance, something must be done to spark and foster self-reliance in the administration of the institutions. Up to now I haven't seen a better method than that proposed in H.R. 2440, nor has anyone within my knowledge come up with anything better. When someone tells me that it isn't the answer to the problem, that it won't work, that the Congress won't pass it, I have one reply: "Then you have tossed yourself a challenge to improve on it, because a way must be found to channel more private funds into the institutions."

I believe that most of the pros and cons are covered in my article in Science for November 16, 1956. If you would like to use any part of it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a time you consider to be appropriate, I am sure that there will be every cooperation from AAAS to facilitate this.

During the next few months I shall be making a number of public addresses in which I shall discuss the subject broadly, and of course will refer to H.R. 2440 in the terms I used in my letter of January 28, quoted in yours of the 30th.

All other bills which I have seen, intended to aid higher education or research, seem to me to skate around the edges of the problem, and don't get at the heart of it. Yours does get to the root of the problem, and provides means for a solution which will automatically remain a solution with increasing enrollments; for it potentially breaks through the barrier (4.2 percent of adjusted gross income) and, provided taxpayers are properly informed, will substantially increase the percentage of increasing incomes.

You refer to the desirability of cosponsorship, which seems to me most important. Were I in Washington before March, I would be glad to help further in finding other Members who might also introduce the bill. I hope there are tried methods by which this can come about.

You may count on whatever help I can give, both personally and through organizations such as AAAS.

Sincerely yours.

PAUL E. KLOPSTEG,
President.

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide funds for educational purposes by providing increased incentives for private giving through the allowance of a tax credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 39. Credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—At the election of the taxpayer there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter the amount determined under this section.

"(b) INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, the amount allowable as a credit under this section shall be whichever of the following is the lesser:

"(1) the amount determined by multiplying—

"(A) the amount of charitable contributions to institutions of higher education, by

"(B) the maximum rate of tax imposed for the taxable year by section 1(a), or

"(2) (A) in the case of any individual who has elected to take the standard deduction provided by section 141 or to pay the optional tax imposed by section 3, 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, computed without regard to any net operating loss carryback to the taxable year under section 172, or

"(B) in the case of any other such taxpayer, 15 percent of his adjusted gross income, computed without regard to any net operating loss carryback to the taxable year under section 172.

"(c) CORPORATIONS.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of a corporation, the amount allowable as a credit under this section shall be whichever of the following is the lesser:

"(A) the amount determined by multiplying—

"(i) the amount of charitable contributions to institutions of higher education, by

"(ii) the percentage which equals the sum of the normal tax rate and the surtax rate prescribed by section 11 for the taxable year, or

"(B) 10 percent of the taxpayer's taxable income, computed without regard to—

"(i) section 170,

"(ii) part VIII of subchapter B (except section 248),

"(iii) any net operating loss carryback to the taxable year under section 172, and

"(iv) section 922 (special deduction for Western Hemisphere trade corporations).

"(2) CORPORATIONS ON ACCRUAL BASIS.—In the case of a corporation reporting its taxable income on the accrual basis, if—

"(A) the board of directors authorizes a charitable contribution to an institution of higher education during any taxable year, and

"(B) payment of such contribution is made after the close of such taxable year and on or before the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of such taxable year,

then the taxpayer may elect to treat such contribution as paid during such taxable year.

"(3) CARRYOVER OF CORPORATE CONTRIBUTIONS.—Any contribution made by a corporation in the taxable year which, but for the limitation of paragraph (1)(B), would be taken into account in computing the credit under this section, shall (at the election of the taxpayer made for the taxable year) be taken into account in computing the credit under this section in each of the two succeeding taxable years, but only to the extent of the lesser of the two following amounts:

"(A) the excess of the amount of charitable contributions to institutions of higher education which may be taken into account in computing the credit under this section under the limitation in paragraph (1)(B) over the amount of the charitable contributions to institutions of higher education made in such year; and

"(B) in the case of the first succeeding taxable year, the amount of such excess contribution, and in the case of the second succeeding taxable year, the portion of such excess contribution not taken into account in the first succeeding taxable year.

"(d) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given to such term by section 103 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

"(e) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) AMOUNTS TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—The determination of whether or not a charitable contribution to an institution of higher education may be taken into account under this section, and the amount thereof, shall be made under section 170; except that in the case of an individual any such determination shall be made without regard to any election to take the standard deduction provided by section 141, or to pay the optional tax provided by section 3.

"(2) CORRELATION WITH SECTION 170.—No amount taken into account under this section shall be allowable as a deduction under section 170. Any amount taken into account under this section shall be taken into account in computing the limitations provided in section 170(b)(1) (but not those provided in section 170(b)(2)). For purposes of provisions of law relating to amounts allowable as a deduction under section 170, any amount taken into account for purposes of this section shall be treated as an amount allowable under section 170; and any reference in any provision of law to a specific provision of section 170 shall, where appropriate, be treated as including a reference to the corresponding provision of section 39. An amount shall be treated as taken into account for purposes of this section only to the extent that, but for such amount, the amount allowable as a credit under this section for any taxable year would be decreased.

"(3) CREDIT NOT TO RESULT IN REFUNDS.—The credit allowed by this section shall not exceed the tax imposed by this chapter, reduced by the sum of the credits allowed by this part (other than this section and section 31).

"(4) ELECTIONS.—Any election provided by this section may be made only at such time, in such manner, and subject to such conditions designed to insure the effective correlation of this section with section 170, as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe."

(b) The table of sections for part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"SEC. 39. Credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education."

SEC. 2. (a) The second sentence of section 170(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to charitable, etc., contribu-

tions and gifts) is amended to read as follows: "A charitable contribution shall be allowable as a deduction (or taken into account in computing the credit under section 39) only if verified under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate."

(b) Section 170(c) of such Code is amended by striking out "For purposes of this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "For purposes of this section and section 39".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to charitable contributions made (within the meaning of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) during taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Moral Issue: Not Segregation Versus Integration, but the Constitution Versus Usurpers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include an article by Hamilton A. Long entitled "The Moral Issue: Not Segregation Versus Integration, But the Constitution Versus Usurpers," and a review of Mr. Long's book, "Usurpers—Foes of Free Man," which appeared in the American Bar Association Journal:

THE MORAL ISSUE: NOT SEGREGATION VERSUS INTEGRATION, BUT THE CONSTITUTION VERSUS USURPERS

My 1957 brochure "Usurpers—Foes of Free Man" deals with the basic constitutional crisis started in 1937 by the Supreme Court (supporting usurpation by President and Congress commencing in 1933) by flouting the Constitution's true meaning regarding Federal power limits. That is, what its framers and adopters intended to be the meaning, as initially defined by the Court in keeping with that controlling intent. This applies to amendments also. The brochure does not discuss post-1937 cases.

The Supreme Court's decision is not the law of the land, even though in a case the decision may soundly define the meaning of particular words of the Constitution. It is the Constitution which remains the supreme law of the land (article VI), while the Court's decision and orders control only the parties to the case. The Court has no power to make general rules binding upon the people and governments of the States, nor to amend the Constitution.

The Supreme Court's decisions and orders in conflict with the Constitution do not even exist in the eyes of the Constitution; they are null and void, and they must be treated accordingly by all who are loyal to the Constitution, to the Republic (which depends for existence on a stable Constitution) and to the people's unalienable rights. The same is true regarding anti-Constitution acts, orders, and pronouncements of other officials, notably Federal judges on lower courts and the President and his subordinates, as well as acts of Congress.

The great moral issue today, therefore, is not segregation versus integration in the schools; it is, instead, the issue of the sovereign people and their Constitution versus defaulting public trustees as oath-breaking usurpers. In other words, shall the people and their State governments defend their constitutional rights, or bow down before an anti-Constitution elite enforcing rule-by-man? Shall we have limited government and rule-by-law under the Constitution, or usurpers supreme with unlimited power? Shall the Republic endure, or shall we allow its destruction by the weapon customarily used to this end: usurpation. (Washington's Farewell Address.)

In the famous Dred Scott case in 1956, the Supreme Court declared that sympathy for the slaves could not justify the Court's saying the Constitution meant something different from what it was originally intended to mean by the framers and adopters. Likewise today, the prohibition against the Federal Government's having power to control education, schools (so as to be able to decree and enforce integration) under the Constitution, as amended, as defined initially by the Supreme Court in this respect, must be upheld. All morality requires this; the moral leaders (such as the clergy) and idealists in general, above all others, must support this conclusion. Otherwise they are guilty of debasing the morality and ideals they profess to uphold through subscribing in effect to the antimoral precept that the end justifies the means, which spells intellectual and moral bankruptcy. If change be needed, as the people see it, they can make it, by amendment.

As to Federal usurpation of power concerning the schools of a State, its government (particularly its legislature, with controlling power) must therefore take a firm stand as follows (correcting past errors accordingly): (1) Declare all decisions and orders, judicial and executive, in conflict with the original meaning of the Constitution, as initially defined by the Supreme Court, to be null and void and that they must and will be treated accordingly. (2) Stop all evasive actions and programs, designed to get around Federal court decisions, because unnecessary and such evasion implies the decisions have constitutional validity—not so. (3) Reject suggestions which would imply that the usurpers have been correct—for instance, to have a new amendment give the States what they already possess under the Constitution: Exclusive power over education, schools. (4) Proclaim, and pass binding laws accordingly, that the State and all subordinate governments and all citizens must and will respect the Constitutions of the United States and of the State—all officials being sworn to uphold them, not decisions of usurper judges in conflict with the constitutions; all in keeping with the foregoing considerations. (5) Require by law that all officials, from the Governor down, act accordingly: (a) To oppose any troops used by Federal usurpers, make full use of the State militia (over which only the Governor, not the President, has control in peacetime, lacking a national emergency duly declared in keeping with laws of Congress), as contemplated by the framers and adopters. (The Federalist, Nos. 28 by Hamilton and 46 by Madison, for instance); (b) to oppose usurpers' force by way of a number of deputy U.S. marshals, make use of the State police and, in each county, a sheriff's posse (posse comitatus) composed of specially deputized citizens in any needed quantity with suitable arms. All in defense of the Constitutions of both Nation and State, of the rights of the people and the State thereunder and, in effect, in defense of the rights of all of the American people and all of the States.

"USURPERS—FOES OF FREE MAN"—BY HAMILTON A. LONG—BOOK REVIEW

(By M. T. Phelps)

Washington said in his farewell address: "If in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use itself can at any time yield."

Jefferson wrote in 1823:

"There is no danger I apprehend so much as the consolidation of our Government by the noiseless, and therefore unalarming, instrumentality of the Supreme Court."

These classical texts may be said to form the takeoff points of this brochure by Mr. Hamilton Long, a member of the bar of the State of New York. This profound constitutional study is not only intriguing and thought provoking, but is supported by documented evidence which makes the conclusions of the author irrefutable. The brochure is extremely timely, in that it points out the evils of the day which are transforming the Federal Government into a government of men instead of a government of laws; into a centralized government of unlimited powers instead of a decentralized government with definite limited powers which the provisions of the Federal Constitution clearly indicated the framers intended it to be, and which the members of State conventions ratifying it and the people whom they represented understood it to be. Mr. Long has presented a challenge to every American citizen who believes in a republican form of government under the Constitution and who desires to preserve our American way of life: Man-over-State.

He shows beyond all reasonable doubt that the framers of the Federal Constitution intended the central government to be vested with limited powers—a concept never before adopted by any other people in the history of civilization as their governmental philosophy. His main thesis as to their intent is as follows: The fundamental principles upon which this philosophy was conceived was that man was endowed with "unalienable rights," God-given rights at birth and "that man creates government as his tools in order to secure these rights"; that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, the people; that to preserve these rights the powers of government must be circumscribed with definite limitations and that public officials must always be subservient to the will of the people; that the creature should never become the master of the creator. These convictions were deeply seated in the minds of the framers of the Federal Constitution as the result of their comprehensive knowledge of the history of governments in the past and of their own experiences with the tyranny of British rule under the colonial regime in America and oppressive measures adopted by legislatures in some of the States after 1776 during the existence of the confederation of States.

From this breadth of knowledge and wealth of experience they were thoroughly convinced, he says, that the safety and liberties of the people under the Government they were forming could only be preserved by providing in the organic law itself for adequate curbs and safeguards against the abuse of power by those entrusted with its administration; that jealousy rather than confidence must be the polar star in forming this new Government; that there must be both a limitation of its duties and a limitation of power to be exercised in performance of those duties.

These questions, the author asserts, were thoroughly explored at that time and it was the fear of the people that the Constitution as originally adopted did not fully protect them from an unwarranted restraint of their individual liberties by the Federal Government.

The coordinate branches of the Federal Government were designed to serve as checks and balances against each other and the rights reserved to the States and to the people were to serve as a safeguard against the encroachment of the central government upon individual liberties of the citizens of the various States. It was not enough, in the opinion of the people as expressed by their representatives thereafter, to create checks and balances between the coordinate branches of the Federal Government but if the goal uppermost in their minds, i.e., to keep the government, created by them, decentralized in the future it must be realized, if at all, by expressly reserving to the States and to the people all powers of sovereignty not expressly or by necessary implication granted to the central government under the provisions of the organic law. The first 10 amendments to the Constitution adopted soon after its ratification were designed to achieve that result.

The author declares, in substance, that so long as the Supreme Court of the United States adhered to the cardinal rules of interpretation of the Constitution and of statutory enactments a proper balance was maintained between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government and between the States and the central government, thus safeguarding the individual liberties of the citizens of the respective States of the Union. But when the Court no longer looks to the intent and purposes of the framers and adopters of the Constitution to determine its meaning, as it ceased to do in 1937, it aided usurpation of the powers reserved to the States as a check against centralization of power in the Federal Government which constituted the principal mechanism of the Constitution upon which the framers of that document relied to preserve to the people a definite limitation upon the powers of the Central Government.

One certainly does not have to be either a statesman, a lawyer, a judge, or an intellectual to observe and to realize that by the decisions of the Supreme Court since 1937 the powers of the Federal Government have been declared to be broadened to encompass fields of activity previously disclaimed and repudiated by the courts and by all the leading statesmen and students of government for 150 years and consequently have left only a skeleton of the rights reserved to the people and to the States. Mr. Long, in his brochure, has made this clear to the American people. This is positive evidence to all of us of the processes of national decay and the end of individual liberties in the United States.

The author in his review of the constitutional cases of the Court prior to 1937, upon which the majority of the Court relied as supporting the policy of what he terms "reverse interpretation," leads him to the opposite conclusion reached by the Court. In no instance, he declares, prior to 1937, did the Court expressly, deliberately, and voluntarily reverse a long line of consistent decisions involving the meaning of the Constitution as intended by the framers and adopters of that document. He states that in a few cases in which a prior decision was overruled, the Court was in effect choosing, of necessity, between what had come to be conflicting lines of decisions. In so doing it adopted one line of cases and overruled the other because of the need of clarification. This action of the Court, he asserts, gave no support to its 1937 "reverse interpretation" policy.

The author claims that the single proceeding entitled "The Legal Tender Cases" (*Knox* v. *Lee* and *Parker* v. *Davis*, 79 U.S. (12 Wallace) 457 (1871) decided together overruling *Hepburn* v. *Griswold*, 75 U.S. (8 Wallace) 603), decided in 1870, really constituted the only case which lends any support whatever to the reverse interpretation policy of the Court commenced in 1937. He points out that Mr. Justice Strong, who wrote the opinion for the majority of the Legal Tender cases, explained at length that the Hepburn case was decided by a less number of judges than the law provided; that it was a 5-to-3 decision (due to a vacancy) and that the Court had not been accustomed to hearing a constitutional question in the absence of the full Court if it could be avoided. Mr. Justice Strong further stated that almost immediately after the Hepburn decision was handed down, the question of reconsidering it was discussed.

A reading of the opinion in the Legal Tender cases should convince the reader that the Court felt reluctant to overrule the Hepburn case, as Mr. Long contends. It is also significant to note that in overruling the Hepburn case not a single member of the Court receded from his position in that case. The 5-to-4 opinion in the Legal Tender cases was made possible by the resignation of one of the justices who held with the majority in the Hepburn case while his replacement and the newly appointed ninth member of the Court joined with the minority in the Hepburn case, thus constituting the majority in the Legal Tender cases. Mr. Long reminds his readers that Charles Evans Hughes, in his book entitled "The Supreme Court of the United States," published in 1928 before his reappointment to that Court as Chief Justice, criticized the Legal Tender cases overruling the Hepburn case the previous year, saying that it was destructive of the confidence of the people in the Court.

Mr. Long says the Court's present policy of reinterpreting the Constitution according to the will or whim of its members, in defiance of the consistent decisions of the Court for a century and a half based upon the intent of those who framed and ratified it, has already made a hollow shell of that document, to be changed again and again at will by the momentary majority of the members of the Court; that this policy has not only sanctioned usurpation of the reserved powers of the people and the States by the other two branches of the Federal Government, but the Court itself has become the prime usurper of those powers which he says has resulted in unconstitutional centralization of massive power in Washington in violation of the rights of the States, and of the people, reserved to them under the 10th amendment, and has opened wide the gates to socialism-communism, which he asserts is impossible under a decentralized government.

The unforgiveable sin which Mr. Long ascribes to the Court is that by its policy of "reverse interpretation" it has assumed the function and is attempting to exercise the power to amend the Constitution of the United States, a function expressly reserved to the people under its provisions. It is Mr. Long's position that an opinion of the Supreme Court interpreting a provision of the Constitution is integrated into and becomes a part of the Constitution itself and that any different interpretation thereafter placed upon it must, to be valid, be by amendment in the manner provided in the Constitution. He contends its binding effect upon the Court is therefore based upon considerations more deeply rooted than upon the common law rule of stare decisis—which is not applicable in constitutional law. In other words, his position is, in effect, when the Court has once interpreted a provision of the Constitution, based upon full exploration of the intent of the framers, it has exhausted its jurisdiction and power, under our constitutional system, to consider it further except to enforce it as interpreted, leaving any change to the amendatory process of article V.

The Court prior to 1937 never expressly enunciated this as a principle of law but its history as gathered from its decisions according to Mr. Long's research might well be interpreted to harmonize with his views, in which the writer of this review concurs after examining the authorities cited by him.

Consultation in the Agency-Client Relationship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered at the Western Regional Conference of the American Public Welfare Association, on October 13, 1958, in Phoenix, Ariz., by Dr. Jacobus tenBroek, captioned "Consultation in the Agency-Client Relationship."

In addition to serving as head of the speech department of the University of California, located at Berkeley, Dr. tenBroek has for a number of years been the president of the National Federation of the Blind. I believe that his address is one of the most outstanding presentations I have ever read on the subject of agency-client relationship and the blind's right of consultation in the administration of programs which directly affect their welfare and their opportunities. This right of self-expression through organizations of the blind is enunciated in my bill, H.R. 14, which is now known throughout the country as the Kennedy-Baring bill. It would protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind. For convenient reference, I have taken the liberty of quoting it below. Thirty-eight Members have already introduced similar bills since January 7, 1959.

H.R. 14

A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the formulation, administration, and execution of programs for the aid and rehabilitation of the blind, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall to the fullest extent practicable consult and advise with authorized representatives of organizations of the blind; and shall, in developing and recommending policies and procedures to State agencies, take such steps as may be appropriate to encourage such agencies to consult with authorized representatives of organizations of the blind in the formulation, administration, and execution of my State program for the aid and rehabilitation of the blind to which Federal funds are contributed.

SEC. 2. No officer or employee of any Federal, State, or other agency concerned with the administration of any program for the aid or rehabilitation of the blind to which Federal funds have been contributed shall exert the influence of his office or position against the right of the blind to join organizations of the blind. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall adopt such regulations and shall condition Federal grants to State or other programs for the blind on such terms as will prevent the

exertion of any such influence against self-expression of the blind through organizations of the blind.

Consultation in the Agency—Client Relationship

(An address delivered at the Western Regional Conference of the American Public Welfare Association, October 13, 1958, Phoenix, Ariz., by Jacobus tenBroek)

Perhaps no single subject in the large and expanding province of social welfare has received more attention or stirred more controversy in recent years than the perpetually vexed question of the proper relationship between the agency worker and the recipient of services. This is, of course, a healthy and constructive concern; for no aspect of welfare is more fundamental or far reaching. The client-worker relationship is both procedural and substantive in character, both immediately practical and theoretically profound. It has to do alike with human rights and professional responsibilities, with psychological conceptions and legal formulations, with rigorous scientific method and elusive moral valuation.

The continuous ferment among social workers on this issue undoubtedly reflects parallel cleavages and conflicts in other fields of social science, pure or applied—fields such as psychology and psychotherapy, sociology and sociometry, group dynamics, general semantics, human relations, public administration, political theory, and educational philosophy. These inter- and intra-disciplinary disputes have, of course, a variety of contents and discontents; but if there is a common thread which runs through all of them it is the classic antinomy of liberty and authority—the ancient problem of reconciling the rights and needs of the individual with the demands of public order, social security, and the general welfare.

Everyone who works in the welfare field—or in any of the social sciences, for that matter—is careful to make the standard obeisance to the dignity and rights of the client, and generally to affirm the libertarian values of the democratic creed. But it will not be news to members of this audience that there have been, and there are, more than a few currents of thought and action in social casework which operate to exaggerate the weakness and dependency of clients while exalting the power and the glory of the professional practitioner of the social worker's art. To name just a few: There is a tendency, not only to take responsibility for the "whole" client, but to take whole responsibility for him. There is the tendency to become "aggressive"—and to brag about it—in tracking down potential clients and administering services, however, unwelcome they may be. There is a tendency to regard all those subject to depriving circumstances as innately inferior if not incompetent. There is the tendency to perpetuate custodial and protective practices for groups of clients demonstrably capable of rehabilitation and release.

This list of negative and authoritarian procedures might be extended a good deal farther; but it is perhaps sufficient to underline the obvious point that the homage paid to democracy by some workers and administrators may be little more than a formal ritual betrayed by contrary assumptions and practices of a distinctly antidemocratic nature.

It is not, however, my purpose to rehearse or rehash any of the familiar theoretical disputes which have a bearing upon the relationship between welfare agencies and their clients. The field of social work is, after all, preeminently one of action—and it is with the fruits of theory in practical execution that we are all primarily concerned.

Over recent years it has become increasingly evident—and our discussion here today is further positive testimony—that the numbers of groups and individuals in the welfare field have grown restive within the confines of traditional practice and have sought to strike new balances and find new common denominators in the agency-client relationship. I should like to call your attention to one such effort, which is currently the center of very warm controversy and which holds the promise of bringing about a wholly fresh and radically different approach to the relations of agency and client. This effort is embodied in a piece of pending national legislation known as the Kennedy-Baring bill—the provisions of which are incorporated in some 60 bills already introduced into Congress and likely to be the subject of committee hearings early next year. Although the measure deals explicitly with the rights of blind persons as citizens and welfare clients, the democratic principle which it expresses has, as I hope to demonstrate, much broader application. (Even if its significance were limited solely to this category of recipients, however, it would be important for social workers in all areas to recognize and ponder the political and professional issues which it poses).

The Kennedy-Baring bill has as its stated purpose "to protect the right of blind persons to self-expression through organizations of the blind." More specifically, the measure is designed (1) to provide for systematic consultation with organizations of the blind themselves by officials responsible for the administration of programs for the blind supported by Federal funds, and (2) to prevent such officials from interfering with the right of blind people to form or join associations of their own choosing.

In short, this legislation seeks to safeguard blind persons in their exercise of three elementary rights of citizenship: The right to organize, the right to speak for themselves, and the right to be heard.

It should be apparent even from this brief description that the Kennedy-Baring bill carries implications of the greatest significance for the agency-client relationship in the field of work for the blind, and indirectly for the broader field of welfare. The explicit extension to one specified clientele group of the "right to organize" presages modifications in the interaction of agency and client which may quite possibly be as far reaching in their own way as the changes in labor-management relations long since ushered in by the advent of trade unions and the principle of collective bargaining.

I would not wish to press the labor parallel too far. The blind are certainly not a single socioeconomic class, and their voluntary associations are not trade unions. Some of their most important problems, however, such as those which arise from the programs of vending stands and sheltered workshops, do bring together blind clients and social agencies in a direct confrontation of employer and employee. I shall have more to say about these economic relations later on; for the moment, the crucial point is that the Kennedy-Baring bill promises to introduce into the traditional agency-client relationship, at least with respect to the blind, something very like the principle of collective bargaining; or, to put it another way, it seeks to introduce a novel element of mutuality and equality by virtue of which advice and counsel would no longer flow all one way—from agency to client—but would become a genuinely reciprocal exchange: a transaction among equals to which both sides would contribute and from which each may derive instruction and advantage.

The right to organize, which this legislation seeks to safeguard in the case of the blind, is sufficiently well entrenched as a democratic principle to need little justification today. Freedom of association and assembly is enshrined alongside freedom of speech and expression among the guarantees of the 1st and 14th amendments; moreover, it has been reinforced, beyond danger of effective assault, by a long succession of historic events and judicial decisions. As recently as June 30 of this year, the United States Supreme Court declared that "Effective advocacy of both public and private points of view, particularly controversial ones, is undeniably enhanced by group association, as this Court has more than once recognized by remarking upon the close nexus between the freedoms of speech and assembly. It is beyond debate that freedom to engage in association for the advancement of beliefs and ideas is an inseparable aspect of the 'liberty' assured by the due-process clause of the 14th amendment, which embraces freedom of speech."

It may be, however, that what I have referred to as the "right to be heard"—which may be expressed in constitutional terms as the right of petition, in administrative terms as the right of consultation, and in quasi-judicial terms as the right of appeal in a fair-hearing process—is not quite so self-evident. At the level of the caseworker and of the fair-hearing appeal, this right is predominantly but not exclusively an individual right; at the constitutional, congressional and administrative levels, it is predominantly (but not exclusively) a right which in practice can only be exercised collectively. Because this "right to be heard" is less a part of our common language and accepted belief than the right to speak and the right to organize, let me take a moment to spell out what I take to be its indispensable function in the governmental process.

Despite its somewhat less than universal recognition, few principles of democratic government and public administration are in fact more firmly established or more widely practiced than this principle of the right to be heard—taken to mean the right of citizen groups sharing a common interest to be consulted in the formulation and execution of programs directly affecting them. The literature of public administration is replete with affirmations of the principle. A typical comment is that of Avery Leiserson: "There are always either formal or informal relationships between group organizations and official bureaucracies. Furthermore, it is perfectly clear that in the sense of the right to be heard, to be consulted, and to be informed in advance of the tentative basis of emerging policy determination, group participation is a fundamental feature of democratic legislation and administration." Another well-known authority, David B. Truman, has pointed out that the fundamental "rules of the game" which operate to preserve the public interest in the democratic process "prescribe that individuals and groups likely to be affected should be consulted before governmental action is taken." Indeed, he continues, "Not only is the requirement of consultation likely to be more or less automatically observed by administrative agencies in order to maximize support; the obligation is frequently explicitly written into particular authorizing statutes or into laws of general application, such as the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946."

The principle of group representation and consultation finds its most direct expression in the structure of government whenever an agency is created to serve a particular category of citizens or to promote the welfare of a group sharing common needs and interests. These are the so-called clientele agencies, of which probably the best known examples are the Veterans' Administration, and the Office of Indian Affairs. Moreover, even where public agencies are organized along functional rather than clientele lines, as Professor Leiserson has noted, "a function may be so defined that, in effect, it is restricted to a major industrial or economic group." (Examples of this would be the

Federal Reserve System, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission).

In a broader sense, at least three of the major departments of the Federal Government may be classified as clientele departments: namely, those of Agriculture, Labor, and Commerce. The main point concerning all such agencies and departments is that they have institutionalized the principle of direct consultation with those citizen groups primarily affected by their work. It should be emphasized that this principle of direct consultation is wholly distinct from other devices which may from time to time be adopted by the agency to obtain the opinion of the broader public or of interested nonclientele groups such as scholarly or professional societies. Thus the principle of client consultation within the Department of Agriculture, for example, means consulting regularly and systematically with organized groups of farmers—although the department may also seek the advice of academic specialists or other nonfarm experts. Similarly, the Departments of Labor and of Commerce have respectively developed both formal and informal methods of consultation with labor unions and trade associations, chambers of commerce and other business groups. In short, the principle of consultation—the right to be heard—means consultation first and foremost with the particular groups directly affected—not with external individuals or agencies, in or out of Government, however closely associated or professionally knowledgeable.

It is no longer a live issue whether administrative agencies should be delegated the power to make rules binding upon the groups affected by them; they have and should have the power. The issue today is rather that of rendering bureaucracy responsible and democratic. It is in this area of democratizing public administration that the role of consultation is most significant. For this function is not, and in the nature of things cannot be, adequately discharged by the formal processes of legislative oversight, executive supervision, and judicial review—which at best can only erect overall standards of regulation and make intermittent checks upon performance, or, in the case of the courts, review what has happened in the light of a negative power.

The direct responsiveness which is owed by administrative agencies to the client groups primarily affected by their policies has been convincingly shown in a widely cited article by Profs. Arthur A. Maass and Laurence I. Radway, of Harvard University. A major precept in their assessment of administrative responsibility is that "an administrative agency should be responsible to (private) groups so far as necessary to equalize opportunities for safeguarding interests, to acquire specialized knowledge, and to secure consent for its own program. This growing tendency for interest groups to participate in the formulation and execution of policy, irrespective of legislative provision, can be supported on at least three grounds: first, that such group representation is desirable to equalize opportunities for protecting and promoting respective interests; second, that the preparation of detailed regulations on complicated matters requires exact knowledge which even the best informed official may not possess and which interest groups can supply; third, that group participation in policy decisions makes possible the winning of consent for the agency's program."

In fine, the principle of consultation—the right of citizen groups to be heard—is no less serviceable to the democratic process than its companion rights of speech and association. After all, no degree of organization and no amount of speech are of any avail if no one is listening. The right to be heard is no more than the power of effective speech in matters of direct and vital concern—the right of access to the agencies of representative government.

To many in this audience the foregoing discussion of the right to be heard may seem to be only a superfluous demonstration of the obvious. But it is not, I can assure you, always so regarded; and the right itself is often deliberately disregarded in the formal relations between welfare agencies, both in and out of government, and their various client groups. There is not now, and there has never been any regularized or systematic consultation with representative organizations of the blind by those agencies of the Federal Government—notably the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Social Security Administration—charged with the provision of services to the blind. To be sure, these Federal agencies do indeed consult regularly and systematically with professional agencies and with State welfare officers, and usually take the position that client groups should do their consulting on the State level, since it is the State agencies which collect and disburse Federal funds. But aside from the fact that these funds are for the benefit of clients rather than administrators, it is obvious that policy for these programs is made in Washington and that it is in Washington no less than in the States and counties, that group consultation can have policy significance and fruitful results. Nor is the absence of consultative machinery noticeably improved with respect to other groups of the physically handicapped, or for that matter with respect to most categories of aid recipients (the organized veterans representing, of course, the most formidable and rule-proving exception). When we turn from public programs to the private agencies, the degree of recognition given to the right of clients to be consulted in the formulation of policy is still more conspicuous by its rarity. Here the rule would almost seem to be: Clients should be overseen but not heard.

That wisecrack may in fact contain more truth than humor. I have described the principle of consultation as a democratic right of citizens; but the working relationship of the welfare agency and the client of services is not often thought of as a democratic process in which rights exist on both sides of the table. The analogies most commonly used among social workers are those of the religious confessional, the psychiatric interview, or the medical consultation. More than a few professionals blandly accept without much struggle of conscience what they take to be the inherent and inescapable authoritarianism of the agency-client relationship. Witness, for example, this comment by the editor of a national journal for workers with the blind:

"Principally the concern about agency-client relationships has centered on the custodial-paternalistic tendency in service to blind people, which is to an extent an inherent natural concomitant of any program in which society provides a service for its minority of less favored members, be the minority based on blindness or any other cause or condition. • • • The problem of the custodialism and paternalism has been reduced, to the extent that its inherent nature permits, by those of society's agencies which are in the forefront of progress. • • • Still, to expect society to be completely free of all suggestion of difference between the beneficiary of service and the rest of society is probably visionary, given human nature as it is."

However remarkable that statement may seem to you, it is very far from exceptional in the field of work for the blind. It was the American Association of Workers for the Blind which issued a convention resolution opposing the Kennedy-Baring bill—with its protection of the right to organize and the right to be heard—as embodying a completely unsound and retrogressive concept of the responsibilities and privileges of blind persons as citizens. And it was the same association which declared, in the first sentence of its code of ethics: "The operations of all agencies for the blind entail a high degree of responsibility because of the element of public trusteeship and protection of the blind involved in services to the blind." It was the executive director of the largest national agency for the blind who proclaimed not long ago that a job, a home, and the right to be a citizen will come to the blind in that generation when each and every blind person is a living advertisement of his ability and capacity to accept the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship. And it was the head of another large private agency who wrote these candid words, only a few years ago: "The fact that so few workers or organizations are doing anything appreciable to (help in the adjustment of blind people) cannot be explained entirely on the ground that they are not in the vanguard of social thinking. It is rather because they are realistic enough to recognize that the rank and file of blind people have neither the exceptional urge for independence nor the personal qualifications necessary to satisfactory adjustment in the sighted world."

Such judgments as these could be, I assure you, almost indefinitely extended. What they reflect is an attitude of moral and intellectual superiority (if not of superciliousness) on the part of those administering services to a presumptively inferior (if not incompetent) clientele. The attitude clearly suggests, in the words of a shrewd observer, "that those who need the services of the State in any social matter are sick and can only be made well through the help of a class of trained, objective, neurosis-free officials. In this only the social worker or the psychiatrist is effective."

Let me say again that most, if not all, practitioners and theorists in the casework field are unquestionably devout in their liturgical affirmations of democratic values and sincere in their professional commitment to client self-determination. But it is difficult to escape the impression that in recent years more and more categories of welfare recipients have been proclaimed incompetent to lead their own lives. Those potential clients who resist the offer of services may be put down, ipso facto, as unstable defectives. Unwed mothers may be collectively dismissed as unable, if not incapable of making their own independent decisions without casework services. The parents of problem children may be considered too close to the problem to evaluate it rationally; while the children of public assistance clients come to be classified as wards of the community.

However indefinite or inconclusive these custodial attitudes may be held to be in the overall field of casework, there is no mistaking their prevalence, if not their predominance, in the special field of work for the blind. Here there are certain factors, not present to the same degree elsewhere, which function to reinforce the authoritarian bias among agency workers. The first of these is simply the physical fact of blindness which is regarded almost universally as qualitatively different and far more crippling in its consequences than the run of physical disabilities or social disadvantages. "All visible deformities," to quote the blunt words of an agency psychiatrist, "require special study. Blindness is a visible deformity and all blind persons follow a pattern of dependency." It would be hard to speak plainer, or crueler, than that. Naturally it follows, for those who accept this line of reasoning, that blind people must be closely supervised and protected, not only in the specific area of need in which they may seek aid but in

most aspects of their lives, and not merely for a limited period of training or assistance but virtually from cradle to grave. Thus this proclamation of an agency administrator: "After he is once trained and placed, the average disabled person can fend for himself. In the case of the blind, it has been found necessary to set up a special State service agency which will supply them not only rehabilitation training but other services for the rest of their lives. * * * (The agencies) keep in constant contact with them as long as they live."

There is yet an additional factor in public welfare provisions for the blind which operates to perpetuate this custodial philosophy. It arises from the peculiar set of institutions and services which has been established for their benefit, particularly the Federal-State vending-stand program and the hundreds or so sheltered workshops across the country operated especially for the blind. The issue of agency control versus client freedom, the antinomy of liberty and authority, is nowhere more clearly focused, as it seems to me, than in these two special provinces of social welfare.

The sheltered workshops constitute an arena of conflict in which the interests of blind persons as employees and the interests of the agencies as management confront each other over the workbench. (Nor is this conflict merely latent; for something over 2 months last summer, seven blind employees of a sheltered workshop in Texas carried on a strike against the shop management, maintaining a daily picket of the establishment and evoking the services of a special community committee to mediate the dispute). The interests of the workshop managers are intimately involved with such things as certificates of exemption from minimum-wage standards and from workmen's compensation laws, together with authority to retain in their shops (for reasons of efficiency) blind persons fully capable and deserving of release into competitive employment. It goes without saying that workshop administrators are opposed to independent organization by their blind employees, to collective bargaining, and to the whole set of established perquisites (seniority, pension plans, and the rest) elsewhere enjoyed as a matter of course by organized labor. Here is paternalism of a very familiar kind—albeit one that should by now have disappeared from the civilized world.

No less obvious, and no less anachronistic, is the manifestation of this custodial philosophy in the operation of the public vending-stand program under the Randolph-Sheppard Act. In all but a few States the program is administered under a strict system of agency control in which the blind vending-stand operators are in every sense employees of the enterprise—which functions, incidentally, very much like a commercial chain store in compelling all operators to contribute from their own earnings to support the operators of stands in unprofitable locations. The agency-control system is fervently opposed by organizations of the blind themselves, who have long sought (and in a few States have achieved) a system which permits operators to become independent owners of their businesses through the purchase of stands and equipment from the licensing agency. The rationale of the agency preference for tight and permanent control has been expressed by one prominent administrator in these straightforward terms: "The operation of the vending-stand program, we feel, necessitates maintaining a close control by the Federal Government through the licensing agency with respect to both equipment and stock, as well as the actual supervision of the operation of each individual stand. It is therefore our belief that the program would fail if the blind stand managers were permitted to operate without such control."

In such specialized areas of welfare as those of the sheltered workshops and vending stands for the blind, the existing conflict of interests between agency and client is plainly demonstrable and irrefutable. That definite vested interests in the maintenance of controls over the lives and livelihood of these client-employees have developed on the part of the agency managers is equally undeniable. But even in these extreme and agitated areas, the introduction of the principle of consultation—the right of the effected interests to be heard in the formulation of policy—can do much to reconcile the polarized interests and to make possible a more democratic perspective in which both client and administrator will participate as equal partners in a joint enterprise of mutual advantage and clear public service.

The principle of group consultation has primary applicability to the administrative process, in private welfare as in public policy—although it carries important implications as well for the individualized relationship of client and caseworker. Through systematic enforcement of this principle, welfare clients may be expected to perform increasingly a positive, rather than a merely negative and receptive, role in their dealings with the agency. The sharp dichotomy of interest and viewpoint which so often divides the two sides of the process; the invidious connotations which still persevere in the classic relationship of mendicant and almsgiver; the unilateral flow of counsel and advice over the administrator's desks—all these may be substantially reduced if not ultimately resolved by judicious and progressive application to the field of social welfare of that trinity of constitutional and human rights; the right to organize, the right to speak, and the right to be heard.

How Shall We Pay for Research and Education?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include here a brilliant article by Dr. Paul E. Klopsteg, president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, on the subject of how the education we so badly need can raise large sums from private sources.

The article follows:

[From Science, Nov. 16, 1956]

HOW SHALL WE PAY FOR RESEARCH AND EDUCATION?

(By Paul E. Klopsteg)

Population trends in the United States during the past two decades, along with the changing public attitude toward higher education and research, have posed a predicament for our colleges and universities. The approaching tidal wave of increasing college enrollments—a wave that has already engulfed our lower schools and is lapping the shores of higher education—is giving administrators and governning bodies apprehension and anxiety. The predicament is the inadequacy of operating funds to keep abreast of the rapidly growing needs of the institutions.[1]

The report of the Committee on Institutional Research[2] of the American Council on Education states as fundamental principles that "all accredited institutions of higher learning subscribe with varying emphases to three primary and essential aims: (a) the extension of the boundaries of knowledge; (b) the conservation of knowledge already acquired; and (c) the diffusion of knowledge through teaching, publication and other accepted methods of dissemination." It states further that "institutions of higher education are the principal instrumentality through which new knowledge is created by research scholars, existing knowledge is preserved and propagated through libraries and the minds of faculty members and students, and knowledge is disseminated through teaching and publications. In order that they may fulfill their primary and essential functions, institutions of higher learning require the utmost freedom in both their administrative and academic activities."

That these principles are truly fundamental in our society is beyond argument. The preservation of the essential freedom of research and education must be assured. Is it, in fact, assured in the future, or is freedom threatened? If we consider seriously the aforementioned predicament, there is no escape from the view that freedom of research and education, in both its administrative and intellectual aspects, is indeed threatened.

Government agencies are supplying, in growing amounts, funds for scholarly research but not to support the teaching function and other primary and essential activities in higher education. If the rapidly growing demands on institutions should bring about increasingly unbalanced budgets, substantial Federal support of all education would appear inevitable. Although present support by Government of research activities seems to have no concomitant control or intrusion, these are appearing in subtle, though not insidious ways. They develop almost spontaneously, without plan or intent, simply because the expenditure of Government funds calls for safeguards against improper disbursement and for checks to insure proper use. The exercise of such authority of guardianship of funds almost invariably becomes bureaucratic and can easily develop sinister aspects. If Federal aid to education, as well as to research, were to increase by large sums, we could not afford to remain complacent about the likelihood of increasing Government control.

Thus, although Federal subsidy appears to be a way out of one predicament, it immediately leads into another. Under the irresistible pressures that come with increasing demands on educational facilities, we are not only accepting but actively seeking more Government money, notwithstanding the probability that this carries with it increasing Government intrusion and eventual control.

The situation, though serious, is not yet hopeless. A remedy is possible which keeps complete authority of management and direction in the hands of the governing and administrative heads of our schools and colleges, where it belongs, and does not permit it to pass under the heavy hand of some Federal agency, where it might easily become lodged.

DILEMMA OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

From its very beginnings, our Nation attached great importance to the education of its citizenry. Public policy called for schools, locally founded, supported, and controlled. Colleges in growing numbers were

[1] The opinions expressed in this article are entirely my own; they reflect no official position of the National Science Foundation.

[2] Committee on Institutional Research, American Council on Education (Washington, D.C., 1954). Known as the Hancher Report.

established. Some were privately started and run by religious organizations, some by secular groups, others by municipalities and States. Attempts were made to establish a national university, but the idea of Federal support never took root. Indeed, strong sentiment prevails in the Congress, reflecting public sentiments, against Federal subsidies for education, especially at the higher levels. Unless some better way is found soon, however, Federal money for education may, by default, become the pattern for an attempted remedy for the present and impending difficulties.

Faced with the increasing pressure for more admissions, private institutions may and do take the position that they can accept only so many students, that they are under no obligation to take more, and that they will raise admission standards to limit enrollment. No one expects a college to carry a larger load than its resources allow. It may be suggested, however, that, as an institution organized to serve a public need, it may soon have to find means for expanding its capacity. As private institutions limit their admissions, the burdens are increased on those supported by taxes. •Of the latter, many are under pressure and some are under compulsion to accept all qualified comers, the qualification being a high-school diploma. How can the schools, public and private, under increasing heavy demands, solve the dilemma? All of them should be expanding their facilities now to take care of future student population, which is expected to double in the next 15 years, and probably sooner.

By minor artifices we may defer, but cannot avoid, facing the problem: How shall we finance research and education? These are the solid foundation of the Nation's future, and funds for their support must be adequate to provide superior opportunities for gifted students and able scientists. Greater knowledge and fuller understanding in all fields of learning must be the goal. No equal expenditure of money can bring greater returns for the public benefit. In no other way can we achieve the freedom that comes from knowing the truth. In no other way can we as a nation hold our own on this overpopulated planet. As we face the problem squarely, we find only one solution: Assurance that a sufficient part of our vast national income will flow normally and effectively into education, to meet its financial needs as they arise.

In trying to bring this about, should we take the easy way? During the past couple of decades, a father complex seems to have come upon many of our citizens, causing them to look to Washington as the ever-present help in time of trouble, especially when money appears to be the remedy. Many people seem to think that money from the Federal Government does not cost anybody anything. The easy way then would be to look to the Government to make annual grants to cover all operating deficits in education, under a formula by which funds would be doled out to all institutions, public and private.

To do this by statute would require a highly sophisticated law under which an attempt might be made to secure fair and just distribution, with effective safeguards against abuse. These are almost unattainable specifications. If they were attainable, and if easy money were meted out year after year, the institutions would lean more and more on Federal support and depend less and less on their own efforts and resources. The disbursing agency would have the annual task of accurately and objectively budgeting the needs, beginning 2 years in advance; of gaining approval by the Bureau of the Budget; of getting the budgeted amount through the congressional mill to an appropriation, with all the political implications of the process; and, finally, of disbursing the funds thus provided.

It is not a reassuring picture. A vast organization would be needed by the dispensing agency. It could easily become one of the greatest empire-building bureaucracies that the country has known. It would have to be vividly mindful of the fact that every college and university is in a congressional district. Could the institution in such circumstances escape governmental intrusion in its affairs, or avoid a measure of eventual control from Washington? If we treasure our heritage of freedom in thinking, in learning, in teaching, we cannot take the risk of traveling this way.

PRIVATE SUPPORT IS NEEDED

What, then, is the alternative? There is only one. The money needed to keep our colleges and universities solvent must be private, not public, money; and it must come from a great number and diversity of sources to assure complete independence from outside influence or control.

The efforts that are being made by friends of education to encourage and develop increased giving by corporations are commendable and should continue. Such gifts, though significant, cannot be more than a partial solution. Sentiment already exists against too large a fraction of the supporting funds being derived from business and industrial corporate sources. Even if it were feasible to get all needed support from them, strong antipathy against doing so would surely develop.

Desirable and helpful though they may be, gifts from business or industrial corporations are neither easy to come by nor easy to keep coming year after year. Boards of directors are trustees for the owners. They must be circumspect in either spending or giving away their stockholders' money. When the economic situation becomes unfavorable, prior actions are easily rescinded. Moreover, a large part of corporate aid is special-purpose money for specific projects or activities, to assure easy justification to stockholders. Although some special-purpose money can be well used, institutions would be hamstrung if the major part were of this kind. Keeping institutions in good balance in all fields of learning requires funds that, for the most part, are uncommitted.

In these considerations, then, there is left only one source for the kind and quantity of money needed. It is the individual whose income is enough to make him a potential donor. If he makes a Federal income tax return, he is in this class. Of his kind there are many millions. He is a major source of the Federal revenue. As a donor of gifts for the general welfare, especially education, he has not collectivley distinguished himself. There are, to be sure, outstanding exceptions among individuals in all income classes, and their generosity is most heartening. But at the very best, the total of their gifts cannot now come near to meeting all needs. However generous, they cannot fairly be expected to carry the whole burden.

Although it may seem that our individual generosity is not notable, we are in fact a nation of givers, and we are almost unique in this respect. Were we not collectively generous, our Government could not, year after year, maintain its program of foreign aid for nonmilitary purposes. But we could not be collectively generous unless we were individually so. If, then, the present total of gifts for public causes is relatively low, the reason is to be found not in the individual's unwillingness but rather in his inability to be generous.

TABLE 1.—*A table drawn to assist in explaining and illustrating how a simple revision of the income-tax laws would operate to make the cost of giving commensurate with the giver's income*

I Group No.	II Highest surtax rate (percent)	III Gift surtax (percent)	IV Present cost of gift dollar (cents)
1	No surtax	2	80.
2	20 to 31	3	80 to 69.
3	32 to 41	4	68 to 59.
4	42 to 51	5	58 to 49.
5	52 to 61	6	48 to 39.
6	62 to 71	7	38 to 29.
7	72 to 81	8	28 to 19.
8	82 to 91	9	18 to 9.

INCOME TAXES AND INDIVIDUAL GIVING

Notwithstanding the apparent unqualified approval by Government of the taxpayer's charitable inclinations, expressed by its permission to him to deduct up to 30 percent of his adjusted gross income for legal charities, he failed in 1954 by about $20 billion to take advantage of this exemption. Deductibility of charitable gifts must, therefore, be regarded as a gesture, not empty but unrealistic. Under this seemingly generous provision the Government exposes itself to possible loss of substantial revenue—namely, the taxes on the billions that the taxpayer might make as deductible gifts. Why has this provision failed so utterly to stir to vigorous action the generosity of individuals toward making gifts to worthy public causes?

Such gifts, approved by Government, are called a legal charity. They are the charitable contribution now deductible from adjusted gross income in the computation of Federal income tax. The term legal charity was superbly well defined in 1867 by Horace Gray, associate justice of the Massachusetts Supreme Court and later a justice of the U.S. Supreme Court: "A charity, in the legal sense, may be more fully defined as a gift, to be applied consistently with existing laws, for the benefit of an indefinite number of persons, either by bringing their minds or hearts under the influence of education or religion, by relieving their bodies from disease, suffering or constraint, by assisting them to establish themselves in life, or by erecting or maintaining public buildings or works, or by otherwise lessening the burdens of government." In view of the great number of Government-approved legal charities, why have individuals declined by so wide a margin to make deductible gifts?

The answer is found in the glaring inconsistency between the Government policy of approving gifts "to lessen the burdens of government" and its income tax laws. The curious if not startling fact is that the tax laws operate to increase greatly the ability to give of those whose income makes them most able to give and to diminish drastically the ability to give of those whose income already renders that ability low. The cost of giving for persons with a maximum surtax rate of 20 percent is almost 9 times that for those at the 91-percent maximum.

How does the disparity in the cost of the gift dollar arise? Consider one of the dollars given by the person whose highest surtax rate is 91 percent. It is tax-free. But if he had not given it, Government would have taken 91 cents, leaving him 9 cents. Thus the dollar he gave cost him 9 cents. By like process, we find that the cost of the dollar for one whose highest rate is 20 percent becomes 80 cents.

Such disparity in cost of giving between those of low and high incomes, respectively,

does not harmonize with governmental approval of giving as now expressed in the income tax laws. The zooming rise in cost of the gift dollar, with decreasing amounts of adjusted gross income, is a powerful deterrent, not an incentive, to liberality. This has undoubtedly been a major cause of the restraint by the individual upon his generous inclinations. To the person with income in the thousands or low tens of thousands, there is a double deterrent to giving. The first is that, after living expenses and other normal obligations have been met out of the year's income, the surplus remaining for savings and gifts is small; thus the intrinsic value of his surplus dollar is large—relatively much greater than it is for his counterpart with large income. The second deterrent is the amount that the gift dollar costs him. The effect is to put restraint on his generous impulses and to make him take the position that the Government had better use the taxes he pays to finance the public causes that seek his donations.

The inequity of the situation as it affects the individual who may wish to support worthy enterprises is clear, and its remedy is clear. The cost of the gift dollar to the person with low income should be no greater, and preferably less, than its cost to the wealthy donor. The cost of giving should be commensurate with income. Giving should be possible for all taxpayers. With a well-designed plan for establishing the obviously fair principle that has been stated, there is little question but that greatly increased and probably adequate funds for all worthy public causes would be forthcoming. They would come from a substantial fraction of the 40 million people who now pay income tax on the basis of form 1040, in accordance with their own choices and decisions. Such widely distributed giving is in the pattern of our tradition, an expression of the democratic process. It has been the mainstay of many of our necessary and valuable causes. With growing population, their increasing support becomes imperative. Education and research present the most immediate and most critical need.

RECOMMENDED REVISION IN TAX LAWS

To remedy the disparity in cost of gift dollars under the income tax laws involves relatively simple mechanics. Several methods can be devised by which a positive incentive to giving would replace the existing negative one, and which would end the incongruity between the tax laws and the Government's approval of giving.

* * * * *

The essence of the scheme is simple. At present the gift dollar costs the donor the amount shown in column IV of table 1. Under the proposed plan it would cost him, in cents, the amounts shown as percentages in column 3. This makes giving no less attractive than under present laws for the wealthy, but makes it much more feasible and hence more attractive for those with moderate or small incomes. The change in laws would give the many millions in, say, the lower four groups an opportunity that they are now virtually denied: to participate effectively in truly democratic support of education and other public enterprises.

That there will be strong objections to the plan may be surmised, and some of them are easy to anticipate. One comprehensive answer to any objection is that for eduaction there is no possible third choice; either the mounting deficits will be financed by Government, or they will be met privately. If the plan here proposed is not the answer, we face the challenge of devising a better answer. A decision must be made and action taken promptly, because the situation is critical and becoming worse.

There will be great reluctance in some quarters to do anything that might reduce gross public revenue. But we must look at the net decrease, and, whatever it may be, it will be a low price indeed for the benefits to be derived. Here is a plan that would avoid not only the cost but the adverse political aspects of the channeling of funds through Government. The gift dollar would reach its destination with its value intact. If it is forced through Government channels, its value is reduced by one-half or more. Since in either case the money comes from the taxpayer, the saving made in eliminating Government operations would leave his income after taxes higher, on the average.

One objection raised is that a plan of this kind would be putting the expenditure of public funds in the hands of private individuals. The reply is that the possibility exists now, in the permissive deduction up to 30 percent of gross income for gifts. In principle, there is no change; in operation there is. It would not only introduce realism into the expressed approval of giving but would assure a distribution of the gifts in accordance with popular decision. The many millions of donors would constitute a valid statistical sample of the entire population. Hence their collective good judgment could be implicitly trusted, as experience and history prove. At any rate, it is not inferior in wisdom to that of a central disbursing agency.

Should it appear that the more emotionally motivated giving to some causes provided funds disproportionate to the needs, the controls built into the plan could be operated selectively. Obviously any plan must be wisely administered. Amendments to the income tax laws will always embody safeguards against abuses; the Congress will see to that.

In its most important positive aspects, once the details of the plan were wisely developed and set in operation, it would solve the deeply rooted problems of education for the long term. As population and the need for more funds for education grow, the flow of support would similarly increase. It would help to solve the immediate problems of the school districts, the colleges, and the universities. There would be adequate funds for research on disease and public health and for the support of the basic research which is one of the primary responsibilities of the institution of higher education. Community funds would benefit immediately, as would the Red Cross. Religious charities would become better able to carry on their humanitarian efforts among the underprivileged, the ill, and the disabled.

Apart from the substantial quick and long-term relief that would be provided the elementary and secondary schools, and the easement that the plan would offer higher education and other qualified causes, there is an aspect of even greater significance. Where the gift dollar goes the giver's interest follows. His interest continues as he sees the dollar to its destination and observes the intended beneficial results. On the other hand, if the money thus to be used eventually is paid to the collector of public revenue, a curtain is dropped at that point against the taxpayer's further interest in his dollars, for their destination is now obscured. No better way has appeared to stimulate a citizen's interest, and to encourage him to become active in public causes, than to make possible his financial participation in them. He becomes a better citizen. We can, in the manner suggested, make millions of better citizens. It is the way our democracy has worked in the past. This great and valuable asset to the success of our democratic process can be recaptured by making it possible once again for many millions of citizens to participate in private giving, in accordance with their own decisions.

The Federal Credit Union Act Helps Millions of American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, for more than a century the credit union idea has given unfailing aid and inspiration to all who have turned to it in Europe. In the United States, too, this courageous outlook has been given all who have participated in the program since it was started in Massachusetts 50 years ago.

This past week in Washington, 175 Members of the Congress assembled at a dinner honoring those 28 original sponsors of the Federal Credit Union Act who still are Members. Accepting in behalf of 26 of his colleagues the plaque given by Credit Union National Association on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the act was Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, long a champion of the credit union movement. The 26 other Members who were original sponsors of the Federal Credit Union Act are Senators BYRD, CHAVEZ, HAYDEN, HILL, O'MAHONEY, RUSSELL, and DIRKSEN, and Representatives BROWN of Georgia, CANNON, CELLER, COLMER, MCCORMACK, O'BRIEN of Illinois, POLK, RAYBURN, SMITH of Virginia, SPENCE, VINSON, WALTER, ALLEN, MARTIN, REECE of Tennessee, REED, ROGERS of Massachusetts, TABER, and WITHROW.

Representative PATMAN's address was as follows:

Many things have happened in these 25 years since Congress passed the Federal Credit Union Act.

The Members of Congress whom you have so graciously complimented this evening have supported many good legislative proposals; and not a few of these proposals have aroused in us deep convictions and inspired us to hard and thoughtful work.

Yet we can never know in advance just how a new legislative measure will turn out in practice. Measures that seem to have the greatest promise sometimes turn out poorly. Others meet with only indifferent success. And, of course, a few succeed beyond even our greatest hopes.

I know of no legislation enacted within the last 25 years which has turned out better than the Federal Credit Union Act.

The credit union movement has succeeded mostly because it has been in the hands of good people. It attracts good people. And it makes better people of all who become members of a credit union. It fosters capitalism, because it brings democracy to capitalism. It teaches not just thrift—because thrift is no end in itself—but it teaches humanity, self-help, and community reliance.

Those of us who have been privileged to work for the Federal Credit Union Act, and to work for its improvement are indeed fortunate. It would be hard to find anywhere the kind of satisfaction which comes from feeling that we have had a share in the accomplishments you have made in the credit union movement. Every community in our country is a better community because of the credit unions. Our Nation is a better and stronger Nation because of them. And the other countries of the world to which this

progressive and human endeavor has spread are also better off and better neighbors in the community of nations.

With this meaning and record behind them, the beautiful plaques which you have so generously given to the 28 Members of Congress who had the good fortune of helping to pass the Federal Credit Union Act 25 years ago are treasures beyond comparison.

The great public service which credit unions perform, and their basic soundness, had been well demonstrated before the Federal Credit Union Act was passed. At that time there were some 2,200 credit unions in the country, operating under State law. Massachusetts had enacted the first credit union law in the United States in 1909. That law worked so well that President Taft, a few years later, called its great merit to the attention of the governors of the other States. By 1934, 38 States and the District of Columbia had similar laws.

But the 2,200 credit unions which had then been established had hardly begun to meet the great problems which faced people of ordinary means almost everywhere. These were the days when installment buying was still new but gaining great momentum. Ordinary working people were being victimized by the loan sharks on an unconscionable scale. Shocking incidents came to light such as that of the man who borrowed $30 from a loan shark, paid the loan shark $1,C80 in interest charges, and was then sued for the initial $30. Clearly there was a great need for legislation to encourage and strengthen the credit union movement. At least the need was made clear by the vigilant and able campaigning of the late Senator Sheppard of Texas who, I might add, had the able and inspiring help of our friend, the late Roy Bergengren.

Recently I reread one of Roy Bergengren's speeches pleading for this legislation—a speech he called "Credit for All the People." And I found that he said the credit union movement introduced three new banking theories, as follows:

1. Ordinary folks can develop capacity to manage their own money.

2. It puts money to work for the benefit of the people to whom it belongs.

3. The purpose of the loan is the important thing.

And to this he added, "the loan must promise a real benefit to the borrower."

Those ideas seemed somewhat radical at that time, but they were also persuasive.

Despite all the persuasive efforts, however, to obtain early enactment of Senator Sheppard's bill in the 73d Congress, the bill suffered the fate of almost all legislation to help the common man, even today: The bill was put over until almost the last moment before Congress adjourned. It passed the Senate on May 10, 1934, very late in the 2d session of the 73d Congress. Finally, the House took it up, amended it, and passed it on June 16, only 2 days before the Congress was to adjourn. Yet, when it was finally put to a vote, it passed almost unanimously. I called for a division vote, and the RECORD shows the House voted 180 to 2 in support of the bill.

But passage at this late date required some pretty fast footwork to get final clearance and get the bill to the White House before the Congress adjourned, as otherwise the legislation would have died with that Congress. The amended bill was, however, brought to the attention of the Senate on the same day; and the Senate passed it as amended. During the next 2 days we worked until the late hours of the night to make sure that the redtape was cleared away, that the Speaker of the House and the Vice President signed the bill, and that it was transmitted to the White House before Congress adjourned on the night of the 18th. There was never any doubt that President Roosevelt would approve it and sign it. In all this activity, I can assure you, Roy Bergengren performed some extremely fast footwork.

It is always pleasant to look back and describe victories that have been hard won, and to recount setbacks that have been narrowly averted. But there is considerable danger in too much looking backward, particularly when there are great new challenges to be met.

The question is, where are you going tomorrow and the day after?

If I might suggest my personal view, it would be this: The credit union movement has made only a beginning. The importance and the excitement in this movement lies ahead, not in the past. This is no time to rest on your past accomplishments. And the time has not come to dig trenches and merely try to hold onto your past gains. If 19,000 local credit unions are good for the country today, then twice that number should be good for the country 5 years hence. If 10 to 12 million people are better off today by reason of their membership in credit unions, then at least twice that number should enjoy this privilege 5 years hence. If the credit unions have proved a successful way of helping people meet their credit needs in their personal and family affairs, then it should also prove successful in meeting the credit needs of people who operate small businesses.

The Federal law authorizes loans for any provident or productive purpose. Provident purposes have been well served in the field of consumer finance, but much more needs to be done for productive purposes. One of the great challenges ahead, it seems to me, is to explore more fully the possibility of bringing small business into the credit unions.

Most small businesses have no place to go. And what a pity. We have in this country a great capitalistic system—a system which is based on credit. Even our money is based on credit. No debt, no money. Yet many of our most efficient and productive free enterprises are being squeezed out for lack of credit.

Here then is a new challenge and one worthy, I think of the credit unions' great heritage.

The question is whether to push on to new frontiers.

There is a tendency, we know, for great movements to become tired and conservative. There is a temptation to forego new advantures and new advances because of fears that what has been won may be lost. The time for new crusades seems unpropitious; the climate of opinion seems to turn threatening if not hostile; and the potential opposition seems to grow more powerful and more menacing. The voices of caution in all of us counsel against rising to new challenges; they advise that it is safer to let new growth proceed within the confines of the niche that has already been carved out.

Well, it has seemed to me that when the credit-union movement stops making new advances, it is as good as dead. No crusade can last bivouacked behind a fixed wall.

Of course there are powerful and selfish forces who see in the credit unions a potential threat to their self-interest. There are groups who would use the legislative halls to roll back, confine, and hamstring this movement. But these groups would outlaw all self-help on the part of the masses of the people.

There are groups who would try to find ways to tax the credit unions out of existence. But these gorups would tax the churches and the fraternal organizations.

And I think you will find that these selfish forces of reaction are with us at all times. They may seem more menacing today than in the past, but I doubt if they are. They only seem so because new conflicts and new tests of courage always seem more fearsome than those past.

If you push into new areas there will, of course, be opposition. If you carry on the crusade as you have in the past, there will be fights. But the fights will be no harder than in the past. And certainly the new advances to be made are no less important than those which have been made over the past 25 years.

New legislation is needed to improve and moderize the Federal law—that we all know. Present your legislative needs to Congress clearly and on their own merits, and you may be sure that Congress will give them careful and sympathetic consideration.

Certainly you can count on your stanch friends in the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The two legislative giants of that committee, Chairman BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky, and the Honorable PAUL BROWN, of Georgia, are still battling for the public interest, just as vigorously as when they gave their able support to the Federal Credit Union bill 25 years ago.

The Federal credit-union bill which was introduced last summer by Congressman LEROY ANDERSON, of Montana, will, I think, receive most sympathetic attention in Congress. And I know that if General ANDERSON continues to carry the leadership for this bill, many Members of the House will be willing to support it and to work to make its provisions and their merits understood. Under those circumstances, it would be my prediction that this Congress will pass such a bill.

You will always have many champions in Congress so long as your cause is good, and I can see little chance that your cause can ever be anything but good.

General MacArthur at 79

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Globe Democrat on January 26, 1959, the birthday of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. It is another fine and deserved tribute to our illustrious general.

The editorial follows:

GENERAL MACARTHUR AT 79

Today General of the Army Douglas MacArthur celebrates his 79th birthday.

As this noble patriot and greatest military genius of our age enters his 80th year, a grateful Nation might well pause to reflect not only on his incomparable service over half a century but the lessons which it holds for America.

General MacArthur's every word and deed has been dedicated to strength, both military and moral. He preached unceasingly that only the strong could remain free, and that only the prepared could be strong. He coupled military strength with the fully equal concommitant of the moral fiber of the people.

To its sorrow, America has not always listened to Douglas MacArthur. After World War I we created a vacuum of power when we decimated our Army and sank our fleet. Hitler and Mussolini and Tojo arose to take their place.

In World War II at an age when most soldiers are completing their military careers, General MacArthur assumed command of our scant military forces in the southwest Pacific and in a series of campaigns which will live forever in military history, he led his forces back from Australia, through New Guinea and the Philippines, to final triumph on the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay.

But again the forces of weakness and compromise and pacifism prevailed, with an inevitable Korea as a result, and a third time the United States paid the penalty of weakness by having a fight a long and costly and inconclusive war.

If Douglas MacArthur's advice had been heard and heeded, Korea might easily have been transformed into a victory which might have stemmed the tide of Communist aggression perhaps forever, in the Far East. The Nation at some future day may to its sorrow have to pay for the neglect of General MacArthur's repeated warnings.

In peace and in war, Douglas MacArthur has preached the need for strength. When his advice has been heeded, America has been victorious. When his warnings have been disregarded and we have listened to counsels of despair, our cost in men and wealth has been overwhelming, and is not yet fully reckoned.

Only when we learn the lessons of a lifetime of dedicated service—that only the strong are free—that only the strong can prevent future and even more disastrous wars—will Douglas MacArthur's enormous stature in world history be fully comprehended.

Showdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, editorials are appearing in numerous newspapers, big and small, throughout the country urging Congress to live within the President's $77 billion budget to the end that the budget will be balanced and the danger of runaway inflation overcome.

Many of the editors laud the President's indicated intention of vetoing bills that exceed his budget recommendations.

The following is an editorial from the Chicago Tribune on the need for a balanced budget:

SHOWDOWN

The Democrats who control both Houses of Congress have set out to wreck President Eisenhower's precariously balanced $77 billion budget. The outlook for preserving the value of the dollar thus is bleak, at least until the 1960 election when the voters will have another chance to say whether they want their pensions and savings destroyed by further inflation.

The Senate almost contemptuously passed a bill authorizing a $2.6 billion expansion of the slum clearance and public housing programs. The amount is approximately twice as large as the administration had requested. The Senate also lost no time in approving a $465 million airport improvement program, disregarding the administration's recommendation that only $200 million be appropriated for this purpose. The House voted overwhelmingly to set up a new $300 million loan fund for veterans' housing.

The President has indicated that he intends to veto all spending measures that go beyond his budget and he will explain his reasons in television and radio appeals to the people. He has challenged the Democrats in Congress to raise taxes to match all their reckless spending programs.

It's too bad Mr. Eisenhower didn't start earlier to fight for sanity in public expenditures. His failure to do so deprived his party of the inflation issue in the last congressional election and permitted the Democratic Party to pose as the champions of all the groups that want handouts from the Federal Government.

He would be in a better posture also for his fight against the squander maniacs if his current budget did not call for continued waste of tax funds on foreign aid and on a continuation of military conscription. The spending involved in both is as inflationary as any other spending. It is hard to answer arguments for housing and slum clearance programs under these circumstances.

Yet the President should hold to his determination to keep the Nation's spending within its income. Sometime there must be a showdown, and the sooner the better.

Disagreement on America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, St. Mary's College, nestled in the Moraga Hills in Contra Costa County, Calif., sometime ago initiated an annual Business and Industrial Executives Symposium where outstanding leaders in government, business, education, and science are brought together to discuss the current affairs of the country in the quiet atmosphere of the campus.

The keynote speaker in this year's seminar was Gen. Lucius D. Clay, board chairman, Continental Can Co., and one of America's outstanding soldiers.

This year's symposium was marked by a clash in the views of General Clay and Dr. Mortimer J. Adler, director of the Institute of Philosophical Research.

Herewith is a report of the symposium taken from the San Francisco Monitor, the official publication of the Catholic archdiocese for San Francisco, dated February 6:

AT ST. MARY'S—DISAGREEMENT ON AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By Jim Kelly)

St. Mary's College last Thursday sent 100 business and industrial leaders back to their desks and factories with:

An executive's cheerful prediction that an exciting atmosphere of change heralds continued economic growth for America.

A philosophers' gloomy warning that our system and Russia's are converging toward a meeting point on their side of the line.

Better understanding of, if not immediate solutions to, mutual problems.

Conferees left St. Mary's second annual business and industrial executives' symposium with handshakes all around after a stimulating 2-day tussle with the topic "What's in store for tomorrow's executive, and what can he do about it?"

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, board chairman, Continental Can Co., and Mortimer J. Adler, director of the Institute of Philosophical Research here, were the men on opposite sides of the oratorical fence in viewing this country's economic future.

REFUSE TO FEAR

Declared keynoter Clay: "I refuse to fear that inflation will get out of hand to limit our economic growth before the commonsense of the American people brings it to a stop.

"With new products and scientific developments stimulating consumer interest, with the consuming desire of the American people for an even better standard of living, with a better educated people contributing more to productivity, there appears ahead an economic climate favorable to continued and even more rapid growth in as far as conditions at home are concerned."

"If anything threatens this country's capacity for growth," Gen. Clay said: "it is the possibility of international turmoil so far staved off by NATO and our own defensive strength."

He told conferees their part in winning the cold war lies in assisting the have-not areas of the world where nationalism has become the raging passion.

"It cannot be done with large grants of money," he said. "It requires technical information, industrial know-how, and to the fullest extent possible the expansion of American business enterprise into these areas."

General Clay cautioned the businessmen to think less of sending export goods, more of sending capital and management to build and operate plants and factories which provide employment and contribute to the industrial development of the have not country.

Philosopher Adler, critiquing the Clay thesis, disagreed with the general that the cold war solution lies in peoples' choosing between communism's control by the state and the type of government of the people represented by the United States.

"So-called capitalist democracy and so-called Communist democracy are tending to be more and more alike," he said. "They are converging rather than diverging—and, worst of all, the meeting point does not seem to be in the middle, but well over on their side of the line."

The U.S. economy has been progressively socialized, Adler charged. He noted that less than 10 percent of American families own equities, that what they are getting, from government and giant unions and corportations, is the economic equivalent of property—a high living standard, good working conditions, access to the pleasures of sense (recreation) and the goods of the mind (education).

People in Communist countries are provided with the same economic equivalents through the state alone, Adler said.

He saw the United States heading for complete socialization unless it finds a way to diffuse private property in the means of production, instead of its economic equivalents.

Good speakers, good food, and a relaxing campus atmosphere stimulated the off-the-cuff seminar discussions that formed the heart of the 2-day meet. Sitting in as consultants, and guiding the conversation, were Christian brothers and lay professors of the St. Mary's staff, plus experts from other bay area college faculties.

One group burnished up these facets of America's troubles in overseas areas:

"It's a fine thing we're doing, helping the underdeveloped countries. But what happens when they reach the point of producing enough to export to us? Do we let them invade our markets? Can we keep our own level of technical achievements always in advance of theirs?

"That's where it becomes important to American business to have topflight men in our Foreign Service. That will be a problem for them to handle. And right now we aren't

luring that caliber of man into consular posts.

"What we need are young men to enter Government service abroad with the same sense of dedication that others enter West Point and Annapolis.

"How about offering tax and insurance benefits as an inducement? The problem now is, our Foreign Service career men spend a lifetime in a tough job and retire with very little to show for it financially. Let's make it lucrative enough to attract able, talented men who'd otherwise go into business."

On the 20-hour week:

"That will mean fewer hours on the job for the rank-and-file, but think what it'll mean for executives—more work than ever.

"In that case, it's going to set up one specific problem: Less time that executives can devote to civic and community affairs. Dealing with Government agencies, pressure groups, and labor already is eating into time that we used to be able to give to charity drives and the like."

"Why not delegate more of the civic-responsibility jobs to a wider number of men in our firms? Spread the load, give the junior execs a chance to function in public service, and I think that our communities will reap more service from business and industry than they get now."

On lack of manpower for industry's mechanical jobs:

"Youngsters these days seem to think it's a sin to get ink or paint or grease on their hands. They all want to go to college and become executives. We're getting too many would-be generals, not enough privates to keep the wheels turning.

"That's for sure. And after a lad has gone to college it's usually too late to train him for mechanical production work after he's found out his chances are small of reaching the executive level of business.

"By that time he has a car to keep up, maybe a family started, and can't afford to go back to the wages an apprentice makes.

"The crux of this thing is to interest more high school graduates in filling the gaps at the level where industry needs manpower. That means selling them on the idea that working with the hands is a respectable way to make a living, and quite often an extremely well-paying way.

"If we can do it, we might accomplish this, too. We'd take some of the pressure off the colleges. They'd be getting the kind of material they want—serious students who will go all the way."

May 22, 23, and 24 Selected as Dates for 1959 Congressional Tour of New York City for Members of Congress and Their Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, plans are being perfected for the 1959 annual congressional tour of New York City for Members of Congress and their families.

The weekend of May 22, 23, and 24 has been selected for the tour which provides for three fun-packed days in New York at a cost of $39.50 each for adults and $34.50 each for children between the ages of 5 and 12 years. This year's trip will include a reception at New York City Hall, a visit to the United Nations, a reception aboard a transatlantic liner, a boat trip of New York's harbor, a visit to the Empire State Building, together with receptions, and so forth, at various hotels and clubs. Opportunities for attending New York theaters are included in the schedule.

Since this is not a congressional election year, the weekend of May 22, 23, and 24 should now be reserved by all Members who desire to make this enjoyable visit to New York City. Those wishing to obtain further information may call Miss Patricia Bryan in my office, telephone extension 4576.

A Reporter Bares a Story About Fidel Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an interesting story concerning the Cuban revolutionary movement headed by Fidel Castro. The article was written by Mr. Tony Canty, a reporter on the Sunday Journal, published at East St. Louis, Ill. The article is from the February 8 issue.

Tony Canty, a personal acquaintance of mine, is an experienced and reliable newsman. He has been on the Evening & Sunday Journal staff 13 years, his career with the newspaper beginning after his separation from military service following World War II.

Canty followed two hobbies: the collection of guns and vacation trips to Mexico. The experience which prompted his story stems from these hobbies.

Mr. Canty's story follows:

REPORTER BARES A STORY ABOUT FIDEL CASTRO

(By Tony Canty)

With the overthrow of the Cuban dictator Fulgencio Batista by rebel leader Fidel Castro, some of the now it can be told stories of the bitter revolution are emerging.

One such story may be of interest to those who plan to visit East St. Louis Police Headquarters during open house next Tuesday. It concerns three pistols, one of which will be on display during "open house" and two companions to it which we hope helped just a little in assuring Batista's downfall.

We long have taken a deep interest in Latin American countries. For many years we have had strong ties in Mexico, which we have visited often. For some time we have had a personal interest in Cuba. Of great interest to us have been the ground swellings of revolution in some of the Latin Americas, directed against dictatorships as cruel, as undemocratic as that which very nearly enabled Hitler to conquer all of Europe. It has been of great concern to us that while our Nation preached and encouraged democracy for peoples far separated from the United States by oceans and continents, it did little to support and hearten those at our very doorsteps when at times they found the leadership and inspiration to attempt to bring their countries under more democratic processes.

After leading an initial but ineffective uprising in 1953 and serving a prison term, Castro was exiled to Mexico in 1955. Mainly because the young and honest intellectual brought them to believe in his cause, not only fellow exiles but Mexicans and others were drawn to him. He soon was training what was reported as an army. In reality it was merely a small group of deadly serious, fiercely determined men.

Although the people of the United States were told little of him, bit by bit, we learned more of this man, of his motives. We placed our bets on him and right up until his forces took over all of Cuba last month, no one could convince us that he would do other than win out in the end.

CLOSE TO HOME

In December of 1956, Castro with 80-odd freedom fighters returned to Cuba from Mexico and landed in Oriente Province, his home and the home of some of our in-laws. That first day all but a handful of them were killed. Batista reported Castro dead and did his best to publicize him to death.

We went to New Orleans that month on a short trip. New Orleans was a hotbed of Latin American exiles. Cuba was but a step away by plane. We learned, that as with Mark Twain, the reports of Castro's death were exaggerated. We also learned that his followers were ever increasing from the handful which had survived his landing in Cuba. These followers were willing to trade their lives for an end to the hated Batista. It was then and there that Castro, his followers and his motives became very live to us, not merely words in print.

Besides arms and ammunition, the rebels sought other supplies, and very wisely, sought the understanding of the people of this country. We were able to help in a minute way but not nearly as much as we would have liked.

During the next few months, Castro started slowly on the road to victory with his hit-and-run guerrilla tactics, coming out of the mountain to attack and wreak havoc, and backtrailing into the mountains to avoid destruction. It was a familiar picture to us. We were with guerrilla fighters in German-occupied Yugoslavia in 1944. In Cuba as there, the powers controlling the cities and the government could do little but hold on as time after time, the occupiers were slashed to pieces in night attack by fighters who held the mountains. In Cuba as well as Yugoslavia, old men, youngsters, and young women fought side by side. In both countries arms and ammunition was the chief problem.

Much has been said about the larger shipments of arms which were seized by the United States on their way to Castro. Little has been reported on the small individual contributions, at times a single gun or a handful of cartridges, which were donated by Castro supporters in this and other countries. It is estimated that at least 50 percent of the guns meant for the rebel forces slipped past United States and Cuban officials and reached the hands of the guerrillas.

One of the techniques of guerrilla fighting, when ammunition is at a premium, is to depend on guns which can handle the caliber of ammunition used by the enemy. Batista was using arms and ammunition furnished by the United States and a supply in such calibers was available if it could be captured or taken from a dead soldier.

Of great importance were pistols which rebels could tuck away on their person while infiltrating lines or mingling in towns. It was important that the hand guns take .45 caliber automatic ammunition such as used by Batista's army and police. This ammunition is for the .45 caliber automatic pistol.

Following one of our hobbies, that of collecting weapons, late in 1957 we came across a type of revolver converted to handle

the ammunition of the .45 automatic pistol, at a price even within our limited means. We thought a couple of them could be put to good use in Cuba.

The pistol is the English-made Webley Mark V service revolver with a break-top design which allows it to be emptied and loaded even while on the run. In its original form it handles the British .455 caliber cartridge. However, carloads of them were brought into the United States as surplus by dealers and in some instances were being converted to handle our .45 caliber automatic ammunition. Two three-shot, half-moon clips are used to load the six-shot cylinder of the gun.

TWO FIND THEIR WAY

We purchased one of the pistols for our collection, the pistol which can be seen Tuesday. We found it to be a rugged, dependable piece of workmanship and acquired two more in perfect, like-new condition.

The U.S. Government had pointed out that aid to Castro was a violation of the Neutrality Act. There is no law against making a gift to nonbelligerent friends. In December of 1957 we were in Mexico. A few weeks after we returned we heard that the two Webleys were being put to good use in Cuba but received no further details.

We hope some day to trace one of the guns. If we find it we gladly will trade the Webley we have or a better gun for it, yes and something to boot, if we find it has been put to proper use. Then we would like to retire it permanently to our collection.

We think that it will deserve that retirement.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities Has Done a Good Job and Should Be Continued

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, petitions bearing the signatures of more than 350 church member citizens of Clark County, Wash., lauding the House Committee on Un-American Activities for its investigation of subversion and expressing opposition to any efforts to discontinue that committee have been received by me.

The headings on the petitions read as follows:

Whereas it is an established fact that our concept of Government, based on the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States, is under attack by an opposing ideology, despotic and godless in nature; and

Whereas the perpetrators of this ideology have ceaselessly proclaimed to the nations of the world their plans for subjugation of said nations; and

Whereas the U.S. Government has been designated as a major objective of the aforementioned subjugation; and

Whereas one of the approved techniques of appropriation is the infiltration of the subversive element into policymaking levels of Government, and into strategic defense positions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the undersigned do petition the Congress of these United States for the continuation of the Un-American Activities Committee, the past achievements of which have been of inestimable value to our national security.

I am in complete agreement with these citizens. In my opinion the Un-American Activities Committee is one of the most valuable in the House. It should be continued and granted adequate funds for the thoroughgoing investigations it has been making.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter of February 7, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, February 7, 1959)

The veterans' direct housing loan bill provided $300 million more for direct Treasury loans and increased the maximum interest rate from the present 4¾ percent to 5¼ percent. Arguments for: (1) Additional veteran home purchases may result; (2) more private investment money may become available to veterans through the increased interest; (3) the President is not forced to spend this money, it is only made available. Arguments against: (1) There is $192 million still on hand for such loans; (2) Congress, control of expenditures is bypassed by this direct Treasury payout; (3) this is $300 million beyond the budget. The bill was passed 310 to 89 (35 not voting). I opposed the bill. As I see it, the merits of the bill were completely eclipsed by the unconscionable expenditure of $300 million we don't have, to that extent unbalancing the budget.

The "battle of the budget" is on, the opening gun being the vote on this loan bill. Not a single Democrat voted to keep the budget balanced (all 89 were Republican). Several Democrats spoke vehemently against the bill. Some, like myself, consider the bill clearly unconstitutional, since such appropriations bypass the expressed provisions of the Constitution for appropriating money. This backdoor to the Treasury, or House appropriation procedures bypass, accounted for $4½ billion of the 85th Congress' expenditures. Why this unconstitutional procedure? Why does not even one Democrat vote against it, including all alleged southern conservatives? Why? Could it be politics, pure and simple—the attempt to discredit and embarrass the President who is now trying to hold the line, trying to cut spending, trying to tailor spending to income—as all responsible fiscal practice demands—even household operation?

In the Senate Democrats are pushing a $2½ billion housing bill (creating the inflation which wrecks the income of the very people who politicians claim need housing); then there's the Armed Forces budget struggle with the "defense at any cost" cliche (our defense is based on a sound economy and can be wrecked by inflation); or how about agriculture with the Democrat plan now for direct subsidy payments to farmers. Well, where's the money coming from? The Federal Government hasn't any—it's broke and in debt. Do people want their taxes raised? The President reminded the spenders—"include the taxes in each of these programs to pay for them." Politicians vote for every appropriation and against every tax. If ever conservatives of both parties had the courage of their convictions, now is the time to support the President's balanced budget for the sake of our Nation. Surely, not even rabid partisans can oppose economy moves just because it's the President, a Republican, asking it. A prevalent distortion now presented by Democrat leadership is "the Democrat Congress clipped $5.6 billion off the budgets for 1958 and 1959." What a transparent distortion, even to the untutored, when it is remembered that the Democrat-led Congress piled up a deficit of $12.7 billion during this period. As Knebel, columnist, says of the budget battle: "Ike challenges Democrats to raise taxes to cover their spending. That's pay-as-you-go, but Democrats have their own slogan: 'Pie now—pay later.'" For myself, I dislike thinking the labor leaders, the ADA, and/or liberal Democrat leaders can so influence the traditionally conservative southern Democrats.

The draft bill extension passed handily 381 to 20 (32 not voting) extending for 4 years compulsory military service. Many Congressmen dislike a draft in our freedom and peace-loving country, but this cannot blind us to the reality of the dangers confronting us. We don't seem to be able to maintain the necessary manpower by voluntary methods.

The mountain of debt in this country now totals a staggering $788.8 billion, that's $4,650 for every man, woman, and child, a total debt more than that of all the rest of the world. The breakdown: Federal, $283 billion; State, $14.7 billion; farm, corporate, and family, $449.6 billion. Isn't it time we held the line on spending, taxing, and borrowing, and lived within our Federal income? The Alger thumbnail legislative program might be said in one sentence—cut Government spending, cut Federal taxes, make social security a sound pay-as-we-go system, free farmers from regulations and subsidies, evaluate all existing law, and stop the socialistic labor trend of government.

Voice in the Washington Wilderness Department: Last year, when a something-for-everybody boost in railroad workers unemployment compensation was being whistled through the Interstate Commerce Committee, only senior Republican Member JOE O'HARA and I protested in a separate report that under current conditions the unemployment insurance fund might well drop dangerously from $170 million to less than $100 million "within a year's time" O'HARA blocked the bill during the closing days of the session. Now this proposal is up again, backed by the committee chairman. Meanwhile in 8 months the compensation fund has plummeted to $80 million and the retirement board head requests authority to borrow around $100 million—coupled with a move to increase benefits.

Medal of Valor Awarded to Oakland Policeman Robert Ross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the East Bay Police and Fire Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, has awarded the Medal of Valor to Oakland policeman, Robert Ross, 32, 14317 Bradley Street, San Leandro, Calif., for the

performance of duties above and beyond the call of his official duty.

Last March Patrolman Ross went inside a tanker that was moored at the foot of Oakland's embarcadero to rescue three men who were inside the tanker, overcome by leaking gas fumes.

The citation given Ross reads in part:

A man's quick thinking and immediate action saved the lives of three workmen.

Ross and Charlie Kitchen, 30, a shipyard worker also from San Leandro, lowered themselves 40 feet into the tank of an oil barge where the three men were overcome by fumes. They secured lines about the men and a crane pulled them to safety as Ross and Kitchen guided the cables.

Ross is married and has two children, Karen, 9, and Robert, 6.

Judge Homer Buckley, Oakland Municipal Court, presented the medal and citation at a meeting held in the Veterans Memorial Building.

The Medal of Valor is given annually to an outstanding East Bay fireman and policeman. This year the medal was given only to Ross, since no firemen were nominated by the judging committee for the honor.

Can We Afford Not To Pay Off the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have been asking myself two questions which have a definite tie-in with the arguments over Federal spending policies and balanced budgets.

One question is this. Why do investors have a growing apathy toward the purchase of Government securities?

The second question is related to the first. It has to do with the obvious present difficulty of the Secretary of the Treasury. I would like to know whether or not the problem of debt management, the continual refinancing of U.S. note and bond issues, could develop into as serious a situation as it seems to me might easily occur?

There is certainly no lack of public savings. The total savings accounts in the banks and on deposit in financial institutions keep growing and growing. Yet, the regular public drives to encourage purchase of U.S. savings bonds do not seem to be very successful. Corporate investors lack enthusiasm too.

Some economists say we are in an expanding economy with no immediate threat of inflation or decline in the buying power of the dollar due to increasing Government spending.

Other economists do not agree and are fearful of more deficit Federal spending.

The investors seem to agree with the latter, or at least appear to lack confidence in long-term Government securities.

The national debt now stands at $283 billion. Interest on this is estimated during the next fiscal year at $8.1 billion. If the average rate increases to 3.5 percent as some people believe it will, the annual cost to the taxpayers will climb to $9.9 billion. In other words, assuming the debt remains constant, in less than 30 years at this rate we will pay as much as the debt is today but we will still owe all of it.

Meanwhile, it occurs to me, as I said at the start, that lack of enthusiasm for Government securities could be serious. Our increasing debt, it seems to me, could bring on a buyers' strike. I wonder what will be the consequences if Congress, year after year, creates deficits. I wonder as to the consequences of spending enormous and necessary sums for defense, and at the same time paying out ever-increasing subsidies for foreign aid and domestic programs of all kinds beyond the Government's income.

I wonder as to the advisability of the new Federal proposals which call for State matching funds. Many States at the moment face very serious budget dilemmas. Are we not causing them to overspend along with the Federal Government toward more debt and more taxes?

Socialists do not worry about a possible crisis in Government finances. Why should they? It means higher taxes and a possible capital levy. When a business pays a 52-percent income tax, it is more than half socialized. Let us not overlook that. Are we headed for more socialism?

Dictators can rise out of uncontrolled inflation, too. Adolf Hitler did.

As for the Communists, inflation is the means they plan to use to take over. Inflation gave communism its chance in Russia. That is how it started. And so it was with Red China.

Of course, Uncle Sam is not broke and there is no reason to panic, certainly not as long as the Government lives within its means. Not if we exercise self-discipline. Not if we plan and govern ourselves properly.

In this connection, a concurrent resolution was introduced in the Congress earlier this week which points the way. It called for a systematic program of national debt reduction. Its author showed how embarking on such a plan or retiring the $283 billion debt in 100 years, with payments of $2.8 billion annually, would actually save future taxpayers $485 billion as against continuing to pay the interest each year on the present debt.

Mr. Speaker, a policy of balanced budgets, together with regular yearly payments on the debt, could restore confidence in Government securities and the interest rates on Treasury borrowing would decline almost enough to offset the amount of yearly debt reduction.

If the volume of Treasury securities offered for sale declined each year, the demand would stiffen. Suppose as a result of this that the average interest rate declined 1 percent. That would save 1 percent of about $280 billion the first year or the amount of annual reduction under the resolution which I referred to previously. In other words, public confidence and more demand could be the solution of our Treasury problems, but only if we abandon the philosophy of spending ourselves rich. Only if we abandon that kind of quack fiscal remedy.

Mr. Speaker, let us adopt a policy of systematic retiring the Federal debt and set our financial house in order.

That is the road to victory in our economic competition with the Soviet Union.

Unless we hold the line on Government spending, I fear the consequences.

Massachusetts Loses, United States Gains, Guardian of Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the bulldozer is the great leveler of our times. It opens the way for highways, shopping centers, and spreading "suburbia."

But it must not be permitted to destroy all those natural resources which, apart from their beauty that recreates the spirit of man, serve him in ways that are necessary to his life on earth.

For many years a few wise men have sensed the danger implicit in this encroachment by the machine on the sanctuary of nature.

They have fought against it with imagination and skill and with protective programs that future generations will truly appreciate.

In Massachusetts we have a young man who has served with distinction as commissioner of the department of natural resources.

Almost singlehandedly he fought for and won the battle to save the natural features of our State from the onslaught of the bulldozer.

Francis W. Sargent has been recognized as one of our leading conservationists.

He has been summoned to serve as Executive Director of the new Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission in Washington.

Massachusetts is sorry to lose a man of his foresight and his inspiring devotion to the public interest. But we know that his talents deserve a larger field of opportunity for the Nation's good.

In his honor, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the February 6 issue of the Boston Herald:

WE LOSE A LANDGRABBER

The resignation of Francis W. Sargent as commissioner of the department of natural resources is sad news for Massachusetts; good news for the Nation. He is leaving us to serve as Executive Director of the Federal Government's new Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission in Washington.

As top staff man for this agency, Mr. Sargent will play a key part in its forthcoming

survey of the natural resources of the United States and its Territories, and in the formulation of a long-term plan for conserving these steadily diminishing resources. Mr. Sargent is admirably suited for this work. Indeed, his conservation accomplishments in Massachusetts may well have led to the Federal appointment, which was unsolicited.

Largely in response to Mr. Sargent's insistent and eloquent prodding, the legislature last year approved the first step in his 20-year, $100 million program for the acquisition and development of State parks and other outdoor recreation areas. It is a program that should some day be recognized as one of the wisest adopted in the Bay State in the 20th century. It is a public-spirit land grab initiated by a man who is delighted to be called a landgrabber.

The board of natural resources will not find it easy to obtain a topflight replacement for Mr. Sargent. The commissioner's post pays a paltry $10,000 a year. (There is a bill in the legislature increasing the salary to $15,000. It should be passed.) But the five distinguished men who comprise this board should not rest until they have found the best man available.

Massachusetts needs another indefatigable landgrabber to replace the one it is losing. Otherwise the ambitious conservation program launched by Mr. Sargent may falter. And if this happens, the Commonwealth in another generation will present an aspect of physical devastation and spiritual poverty.

Federal Assistance to Education

SPEECH
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to introduce one of two bills carrying out the administration program to strengthen American education. These bills properly recognize a national concern for our educational system by providing Federal assistance in meeting two of the most critical problems confronting our schools and colleges.

The first bill, introduced by Representative FRELINGHUYSEN, would remedy the plight of needy school districts which do not have the financial resources to overcome their classroom shortages on their own. It would enable such communities to construct up to $3 billion worth of new classrooms in the next 5 years.

Over the same period, my bill would help colleges and universities accelerate $2 billion worth of construction of additional academic and housing facilities which will be needed to accommodate the ever-increasing numbers of able boys and girls who will reach college age in the next few years.

Many colleges and universities, both public and private, are presently unable to finance the construction of additional classrooms, laboratories, and dormitories which must be built now to provide facilities for the tremendous enrollment increases expected in the decade ahead. It is a matter of national interest to assure that the opportunity for higher education will remain available to all able young men and women who seek it in the years to come.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a part of my remarks in observance of the Lithuanian Independence Day at the Lithuanian Citizens Club in Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, February 8, 1959.

The matter follows:

On Lithuanian Independence Day it is pleasant to note that Lithuania is as old as most of the other European nations, with a language, with a culture, and with political institutions that are definitely her own. In fact she was an independent state 900 years ago.

In spite of centuries of struggle to defend herself against envious neighbors, the Lithuanians have succeeded in preserving their language, which is proof of their national spirit and their pride.

It is a strange fact of history that when the savage Tartar tribes swept out of the Orient they easily conquered Russia but were defeated in battle by the Lithuanian princes.

Some of that cruel Tartar character has survived and still manifests itself in the rule by terror that is practiced by the Communists of today.

Even the famous author of Polish descent, Joseph Conrad, has said that in the second half of the 18th century there were two centers of progressive ideas on the Continent of Europe: one was France; the other, Poland and Lithuania. The educated classes of Poland and Lithuania were permeated with the humanitarian ideas of French and English literature. There was a Diet and an elective monarchy; the universities of Vilnius and Warsaw were important centers of culture. The liberal complexion of Polish and Lithuanian institutions was naturally distasteful to Russia, Prussia, and Austria, who decided to eliminate the outposts of liberal and democratic ideas by partitioning the Polish-Lithuanian commonwealth among themselves.

Lithuania's subjection to Russia lasted 120 years.

In all that long time, however, the spirit of the people never weakened. They never lost hope of regaining their freedom and independence.

The oppressive rule of the czars prevented economic and cultural development. The only way out for many was by emigration to the New World. Happily for us, there are now over a million Lithuanians in the United States.

The people in Lithuania know that you will speak for them in the free world, so that the free world will not forget its obligations toward those who live under the hated domination of the Communists.

Meanwhile, consoled and strengthened by their Catholic faith, Lithuanians in the homeland endure the Soviet tyranny. From their history they know that they can outlast Stalin and Khrushchev and others who, being mortal, must die. But faith is eternal.

Soviet troops and puppet officials seem to have the country under their control.

But there is a resistance movement that is doing its work in preparation for the day of liberation. The main purposes of this movement are: (1) To obstruct the attainment of all Bolshevik political aims; (2) to keep the local inhabitants informed of the true state of affairs; and (3) to document everything that has been done by the Soviets in Lithuania since 1944 and is still being done. And it can only be left to the free world to hope that the hour is not far distant when the authors of these outrages against humanity will be brought to account and made to pay the just penalty for their crimes.

And what about the Russian people who were the first slaves of communism? They are quiet because they know that the secret police are everywhere watching and listening. But the Russian people must be thinking of the day when they, too, can reach for freedom.

The Soviets would like everybody to forget Lithuanian Independence Day.

This is impossible.

Every year as February 16 approaches the Soviets squirm.

They hear of the proclamations issued by State Governors and mayors of the cities, giving official recognition to Republic of Lithuania Day."

United States Senators and Representatives pay tribute to Lithuania's splendid record of progress during her years of freedom, and to the admirable personal qualities of her sons and daughters in the New World.

This is not a tribute that is voiced on 1 day of each year and forgotten until the next anniversary rolls around.

It involves our own character and our own responsibilities as a democratic people.

For the principle at stake concerns the sanctity of human rights and of elementary justice and decency.

On Lithuanian Independence Day we serve notice on the Soviet Union that we shall never relax in our efforts until Lithuania becomes once again a free and equal member of the family of nations.

February 16: Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 Lithuanians and the citizens of Lithuanian descent throughout the Nation will commemorate the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Freedom loving Americans all admire the fight the Lithuanian people are making today to be released from the yoke of Communist tyranny.

Forty-one years ago, we all thought that Lithuania would be given the opportunity to build a free and independent government and establish a nation under the leadership of statesmen from their own ranks to again demonstrate to the people of the world their ability to build a nation in competition with the other great nations of the world. This dream was not to be realized because of the infiltration, duplicity, and aggression of its powerful Communist neighbor the Soviet Union. Lithuanians for over a century and a half had formerly received a dark experience of enslavement under the Russian czars.

The temporary rule of the Russian Communists will some day capitulate and collapse. The United States and all free nations should aid Lithuania in accomplishing this victory. It will require great sacrifice, and as long as Lithuania is enslaved and other neigh-

boring nations are captives of communism, liberty is threatened throughout the world including our own free country.

On February 16 commemoration programs will be held throughout the United States in honor of the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence. In Gary, Ind., Lithuanians from the Calumet district and their friends will assemble in a gathering and banquet commemorating this event and again reaffirm their determination to continue Lithuania's fight for independence.

I am hereby submitting a proclamation issued this week by Gov. Harold W. Handley, of Indiana, and Mayor George Chacharis, of Gary, Ind., setting aside this date, February 16, 1959, as Lithuanian Independence Day:

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR OF GARY, IND.

Whereas on February 16 of this year, the people of Lithuania and Lithuanians throughout the world, will commemorate the 41st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence for Lithuania, the city of Gary is fortunate to have as its citizens, a great number of people of Lithuanian descent who came to our shores to enjoy the liberties and freedoms of our great Republic; and

Whereas the great progress of our city, county, State, and Nation has been attained by stalwart immigrants and their descendents from nations across the water who have diligently worked and sacrificed to build a community and Nation wherein their children and their children's children will enjoy the life of freedom; and

Whereas the great majority of the people of Lithuania and citizens of Lithuanian descent living in our city and our State and our Nation, have consistently fought and opposed tyranny of all kinds back through the centuries and are continuing the fight for liberty until their mother nation is freed from the Soviet Communist tyranny; and

Whereas Americans of all nationalities and extractions join the people of Lithuania in this noble observance of their freedom anniversary:

Now, therefore, I, George Chacharis, mayor of the city of Gary, hereby proclaim February 16, 1959, as Republic of Lithuania Day throughout the city and hope that all of our citizens will join in this anniversary day. It is the hope of all of us that the day is not too far distant when self-government and freedom will again triumph in Lithuania and all satellite nations under Communist enslavement.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the city of Gary, State of Indiana, this 10th day of February 1959.

GEORGE CHACHARIS,
Mayor, City of Gary, Ind.

PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR OF INDIANA

Whereas the 16th day of February 1959, will marks the 41st anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of the Republic of Lithuania; and

Whereas on that day the citizens of the State of Indiana who are of Lithuanian origin or descent will convene in various communities throughout the State to commemorate that occasion and to join their countrymen in the grief of a liberty-loving nation caused by the aggression and the acts of injustice of the Soviet Union which took over Lithuania by force of arms, usurped the sovereign and inalienable rights of the Lithuanian people and proceeded with the extermination of them by mass deportation, imprisonment, and execution; and

Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to foreign occupation and oppression, and are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty which has been always recognized by the Government of the United States of America; and

Whereas because of their unmistakable attitude toward the Communists, struggling for world domination, the Lithuanian people together with a million Americans of Lithuanian descent represent an important force in the present fight of free nations against the Communist aggression; and

Whereas the residents of the State of Indiana feel deep sympathy for the gallant people of Lithuania and of other countries, presently enslaved by the Kremlin imperialism:

Now, therefore, I, Harold W. Handley, Governor of the State of Indiana, do hereby proclaim Monday, February 16, 1959, as Republic of Lithuania Day throughout the State of Indiana, and commend all interested groups, organizations, and individuals to appropriately observe the occasion, encouraging the Lithuanian people and wishing that they soon attain their goal of freedom and independence which they so ardently desire and cherish, and to which they have every right.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Indiana, at the Capitol, in the city of Indianapolis, this 15th day of January 1959.

[SEAL] HAROLD W. HANDLEY,
Governor of Indiana.

By the Governor:

JOHN R. WALSH,
Secretary of State.

Dogfish Bounty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service would do well to study the results of a Canadian program to reduce dogfish.

Last year proposed legislation to pay a bounty on dogfish to fishermen on the Pacific coast, including my own bill, were not reported out of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. Instead, a bill providing for research as to possible commercial uses of the dogfish was passed.

Frankly, I think stopgap legislation is needed. Scientific research may develop an answer to the problem of this predator that prays on valuable types of fish and sea life, but meanwhile we must reduce the menace which causes such economic loss to our fishermen. And our Canadian neighbors may prove that a bounty system is an effective means of doing this.

The following news article from the New York Times gives a graphic picture of what is happening in British Columbia waters:

DOGFISH YIELDS BONANZA—CANADIAN FISHERMEN GET 10 CENTS A POUND FOR THEIR LIVERS

VICTORIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA.—When hordes of dogfish were drawn toward Saanich Inlet by swarms of herring, the fishermen began reaping a bonanza through the subsidy of 10 cents a pound for dogfish livers.

"Ten trawlers are getting about 1,600 pounds of liver apiece, daily," said Will Egeland, a fisherman. "The average is about 200 pounds of liver to a ton of fish."

The fishermen are eagerly in favor of killing the destructive little sharks.

"Every dogfish caught has six or eight herring in its stomach," Mr. Egeland explained. "It is impossible to guess the number of tons of herring lost every day. When a dogfish school goes through, nothing is left—not even shrimps."

Likewise, this Marine Digest article describes the Canadian program:

BRITISH COLUMBIA FISHERMEN GIVEN SPECIAL DOGFISH BOUNTY

VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA.—Many British Columbia fishermen got underway recently on a clean-up of predatory dogfish, as a direct result of a special bounty of $130,000 provided by the Canadian government.

Dogfish have been increasing greatly in recent years, with heavy loss of food fish, and much damage done to fishermen's nets.

Fishermen will receive a bounty of 10 cents a pound for dogfish livers, delivered to processing plants at Vancouver or at Prince Rupert.

It is expected Vancouver fishermen will concentrate in the Gulf of Georgia and Vancouver Island, while Prince Rupert fishermen will work in Hecate Strait.

The fisheries department has chartered five trawlers to help combat the dogfish menace. In addition to the charter money, an incentive bonus of $6 a ton for the first 300 tons and $15 per ton for quantities in excess of 300 tons, was being paid for the first 4 weeks.

Italian Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following article by Mr. Vanni B. Montana, which appeared in the Giustizia, official organ of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

Mr. Montana is a great American. I have known him a long time. During World War II he held a very sensitive position with the United States and contributed greatly in the liberation of Italy and later in furthering the strong ties which presently exist between the United States and that country. Mr. Montana is a trade unionist and knows the labor movement in Italy almost as well as he does here. In addition thereto, he has studied the political parties of Italy and is au courant with all of them.

The association which he makes in this article between the Italian Socialist Party led by Pietro Nenni and that of the Communist Party led by Palmiro Togliatti is most interesting and I am sure my colleagues will find it so:

WHAT DOES NENNI REALLY WANT?

(By Vanni B. Montana)

Do the results of the Naples Congress of the Partito Socialista Italiano (PSI) mean a positive step by its leader Pietro Nenni toward

broadening the basis of Italian democracy?

As far as appearance goes, it could be yes. Were appearance to count more than substance, it might also be said that Communists are for democracy, since they often speak very loudly about constitutional rights and freedom and never fail to parade behind the names of such great democratic figures as Lincoln and Jefferson in America, Garibaldi in Italy, or Bolivar in South America.

But, if we look beneath the surface of the Naples Congress of the PSI, it will be seen that Nenni and his friends actually did not make a forward but a backward step. The autonomy proclaimed by the PSI in Naples from the Communist Party is not a new development. Its congress, held in Venice, a couple of years before, did practically the same thing.

Prior to the Venice Congress, Nenni and Giuseppe Saragat, leader of the Italian Social Democratic Party (PSDI) had met in a summer resort town, Prolognan, to arrangé for the merging of the two parties, on a democratic basis, free from all subordination to the Communists.

At the Naples Congress, Nenni disdainfully rejected any idea of dealing with the PSDI which—despite its numerical weakness, lack of strong organization and meager financial means—has contributed the decisive margin which Italian democracy needed to safeguard its newly gained free institutions against Communist and Fascist attacks, and to maintain Italy's bonds with the free nations organized in NATO.

Not only did Nenni reject at Naples any idea of merging with the PSDI, but he directed the main fire of his colorful oratory against the PSDI, the Christian Democrats and the other genuine democratic groups rather than against the Communists.

The important test is whether or not a party or any other organization helps Moscow's policies which are flexible in form to meet special local situations, but which are rigid and firm in their purpose—the weakening of the free world, the destruction of democracy and its replacement by worldwide Soviet despotism. It is not so much the kind of utterances one hears from the spokesmen of the PSI that counts as the practical work it does.

The fundamental points of Communist policy in Italy are:

1. Unity within the Confederazione Italiana Generale del Lavoro (C.G.I.L.) which is the central labor body completely dominated by the Communists.

2. Unity in the Cooperative Alliance, a central body controlling thousands of cooperatives, and tightly dominated by the Communist Party.

3. Unity and cooperation between Communists and the P.S.I. in the thousands of municipal and provincial governments, as well as strengthening the unprincipled united fronts in the regional government of Sicily between Communists, P.S.I. Fascists, Monarchists, and insurgent Christian Democrats.

4. United fronts in all other mass organizations—Women's League, sports, etc., etc.

5. One of the main aims of the Moscow-led Italian Communist Party is to dominate southern Italy and the great islands of Sicily and Sardinia, whose strategic importance in the Mediterranean, a sea connecting three continents—Europe, Africa, and Asia—is very clear. Those parts of Italy are largely depressed areas. The Communist Party has built a special united front organization "Comitato del Mezzogiorno," whose task is to win political domination of southern Italy and its islands. The Naples Congress of Nenni's P.S.I. strongly endorsed this committee.

Theoretically, Nenni again proclaimed the antonomy, the independence, of the P.S.I. from the Communist Party. But, in practice, he cemented once again the unity of action and common aims with the Communist Party in all these vitally important fields.

This is not all. In regard to foreign policy, Nenni's formula adopted at the Naples convention calls upon Italy to be outside the two blocs. It is said that this is neutralism of the Nasser kind. But the position of Italy is very different from that of Egypt. Italy is not in Africa. Italy is part of Western Europe and the shield of Western Europe including Italy, is the Atlantic Alliance. Deprived of this shield, Italy would become an easy prey to Communist maneuvers which are moving definitely in the direction of deals with the Fascists and some greedy industrialists who want to do business with Russia and its satellites.

In the new crisis created by the P.S.I. Naples congress, Giuseppe Saragat has been showing determination and courage in resisting the latest tricky and sinister Nenni maneuvers. Should disloyalty develop in his party, he would be fully justified in speedily taking the firmest measures to protect the democratic Socialist Party organization and future.

It is the opinion of this writer that the leaders of the Italian Liberal Party (P.L.I.) are also responsible for the dangerous situation now in the making. Their rigid opposition to the urgently needed reforms has led some sectors of the Christian Democratic Party, of the P.S.D.I., of the Republican Party, to look to the left. And it is in this so-called left where Palmiro Togliatti, head of the Italian Communist Party, has never stopped fishing with several rods and lines, with different hooks and baits, to lure the different fish he wants to catch.

What is greatly needed is not only a common denominator for liberty, but also a common denominator for social justice. To help the P.S.I., to serenade Nenni and his type of leaders, to approve, applaud or even excuse its policies can only result in destroying the free Italian trade unions, fatally weakening NATO, and ultimately preparing the crucifying and burial of Italian democracy without any further hope of resurrection. That is the ultimate goal and inevitable outcome of the new Nenni course. No critical Communist phrases and no hypocritical Nenni claims to the contrary can deter or defeat this logic of events.

TV Grows Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, television has become an effective medium for communication in politics and is a growing medium for educational purposes. The broadcasting companies recognize the growing importance of TV and are streamlining their programs to better educate the listening and viewing public and to make the citizenry more informed.

Donald H. McGannon, president of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., has announced a new concept in programing of forum programs which streamlines existing programs and brings the matters of public affairs to the local people as well as to a national audience.

A press release from Mr. McGannon sets forth the concept and the scope of the new plan and will be of interest to the televiewers and listening audiences:

WBC TO TELECAST "YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW" AND "AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR"

NEW YORK, February 5, 1959.—A new concept in programing of forum programs which will bring two of the Nation's outstanding public affairs programs to local television stations was announced by Donald H. McGannon, president of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. The programs which will be aired in February are the award-winning "Youth Wants To Know" and "The American Forum of the Air," produced by WBC in cooperation with the broadcasting industry's pioneer in forum programs, Theodore Granik.

WBC will schedule the two programs on its five television stations, each once a month as local specials in prime evening time. The TV programs will be syndicated to other television stations possessing tape equipment.

WBC will also produce with Mr. Granik "The American Forum of the Air" for WBC's six radio stations, a half-hour each week. These will be syndicated to radio stations from coast to coast. The radio and television programs have been made available for commercial sponsorship.

The WBC programs will originate in the studios of WTTG, Washington, D.C. and both WTTG and WNEW–TV, New York, owned by the Metropolitan Broadcasting Co., who will be broadcasting both shows. The WBC television stations which will carry these programs are: KDKA–TV, Pittsburgh; KYW–TV, Cleveland; KPIX, San Francisco; WJZ–TV, Baltimore; WBZ–TV, Boston.

The WBC radio stations carrying "American Forum of the Air" are: KDKA, Pittsburgh; KYW, Cleveland; WBZ, Boston; WOWO, Fort Wayne; KEX, Portland, Oreg.; WIND, Chicago.

"We are undertaking more than the production of a program and the investment of money in this effort," said Donald H. McGannon in making the announcement. He further stated, "We are testing a conviction that the appetite of the American public for information and background in the crucial issues that face the United States and the world today has grown dramatically and demandingly; there is a strong proof they are eager to be better informed in these areas and the opportunity to have our audience see and hear great men of our times face the hard realities and complexities of the nuclear world must be grasped by us as a broadcaster now and under conditions that will permit maximum family exposure. This experiment in the fields of public information and debate, like our prior efforts in the field of education, etc., carries with it our highest hopes. It is believed that the adoption of program vehicles such as 'Youth Wants to Know' and 'American Forum of the Air' which are bywords in the American household, will do a great deal to assure the ultimate success of our undertaking. We also anticipate the ability to fill a need on the part of other local radio and TV stations for service programing of national dimension on this basis that will achieve a service beyond the present extraordinary accomplishments of the networks and broadcasters to the moment."

In the more than quarter of a century of "The American Forum of the Air," Mr. Granik has brought to listeners virtually every major Washington name of those decades including such luminaries as ex-Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. "Youth Wants to Know" in its 9th year, has faced the controversial national and international issues and personalities who have been subjected to the sharp and incisive questions of bright and knowledgeable youngsters. As recently as last summer Mr. Granik went to Russia and filmed a "Youth

Wants to Know" interview with Mikoyan, the first such interview with the Deputy Prime Minister of the U.S.S.R., which achieved international acclaim.

"Both 'Youth Wants to Know' and 'American Forum of the Air' which have received worldwide acclaim and continual attention throughout their program careers, will be reshaped to add further excitement and new dimensions to stimulate audience appeal. WBC and Ted Granik intend to deliver to the public newsmaking guests and important and exciting subject matter," said Richard M. Pack, vice president, programing, Westinghouse Broadcasting Co.

Six Points To Watch in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Dale Francis, in an article in Our Sunday Visitor, a Catholic weekly, for February 15, 1959, has analyzed the possibility of a turn to the left in the new Government of Cuba. He comes up with six points to watch for in making judgments on which direction the new Cuba is taking. I think this is an interesting guideline for use as the months go on. Under unanimous consent, I include his article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

"Batista is America's best friend in Cuba and the strongest bulwark against the flood tide of communism." These are words published since the end of the Batista regime in an anti-Communist publication called American Opinion.

If the people of Latin America could really be convinced these words were true then the revulsion against the United States would be unanimous and the victory of communism in Latin America would be assured.

Yet a supposedly anti-Communist publication in the United States republished these words after the fall of Batista. They were words that had been spoken by Spruille Braden, a man who once served as assistant secretary of state for Latin America. His words demonstrate the myopic shallowness of men who lived and worked in Latin America for years and yet remained insensitive to the sufferings of the people.

American Opinion is also a publication that has called Fidel Castro a Communist. So let us examine the truth of this statement.

Fidel Castro is a graduate of Belen College, a Jesuit school in Havana. He has since that time been in contact almost continuously with priests of that school. They have talked with him often, going into the mountains to consult with him.

One of his closest friends is Father Amando Llorente, head of the Agrupacion Catolica Universitaria and a man who has appeared frequently in these stories on Cuba. Father Llorente knew Fidel Castro as a boy and knows him as a man. Castro in a letter to Father Llorente that Father showed me said, "I have kept unchanged the special feeling I always had for you because you were able to understand and encourage me."

Does Father Llorente understand Fidel Castro? He thinks he does. He has had every opportunity to know him well. Father Llorente says Fidel Castro is not a Communist, could never be a Communist.

Yet Robert Welch, editor of American Opinion, calls Castro a Communist. J. B. Matthews, writing in American Opinion, doesn't go so far as to call Castro a Communist, but suggests he cooperated and worked with Communists.

Who knows the most about Fidel Castro? Father Amando Llorente, who has known the man since he was a boy, talked with him many times in recent days, had a close contact with him, or the editor of an American magazine who probably has never met him, knows only by hearsay and does not give his sources for his statement?

I have talked with Castro, watched him in action. I found him a flamboyant man, a man of big gestures, extravagant language, a man who talks almost incessantly.

He struck me as a young man, more immature than his 32 years. Certainly he is not a prudent man when you consider that he is now a man of important stature in the world and yet a man who talks on and on. I told a close friend of his that he is certain to regret his talkativeness. A man who talks an hour may say something foolish; a man who talks 2 hours will probably say something foolish, but a man who talks for 3 hours is certain to say something foolish. Fidel Castro gives public addresses that last 3 and 4 hours.

He talks poetically. He seems incapable of expressing things simply. He dramatizes situations, and it is this flair for the dramatic that gives him much of his appeal.

But I know of no one who has heard him talk who thought him a demagog; I know of no one who knows the man who is not impressed by his apparent sincerity.

Yet his personality is not entirely pleasing. He seems a bit more enamoured of himself than even a man of such prestige should be.

But a Communist? Nothing he has said or done confirms that he is. And much he has said and done indicates he is not. There has been absolutely no indoctrination of the troops. Anyone who has talked with soldiers or heard them talk—and literally thousands were interviewed over television in Havana soon after the end of the war—could see there was no Communist indoctrination of these men. There wasn't even any anti-American indoctrination—one soldier ran after me down the street, when we finished talking, to tell me how much he liked Americans. This is not, of course, a certain indication, but it would seem that a Communist would have indoctrinated his troops at least a little.

The cabinet Fidel Castro formed is not a cabinet that leans to the left. It would have been difficult to have found a cabinet that stayed more to the middle. What is more, the men who were chosen were men well known to the public as genuine believers in democracy.

All the evidence seems to indicate Castro is not a Communist. But, of course, there are Communists in Cuba, and there are Communists who have served the rebellion.

While there is no proof he is a Communist, I have severe misgivings about Raul Castro, Fidel's younger brother. Like Fidel, he was Jesuit educated. Unlike Fidel—who still claims to be a Catholic although he does not seem to be a practical one—Raul takes pride in calling himself an atheist.

Several times in the past year I have called attention to the fact that the rebels received a part of their training from Alberto Bayo Giruoud. Bayo is a veteran of the Spanish Civil War, where he fought on the side of the so-called Loyalists. He is quite possibly a Communist, and he did help train the rebel units in Mexico. He stayed in Mexico during the rebellion—he is an old man—and while he came to Cuba to join in the celebration, there is no indication he will be invited to join in any way in the Government.

Another man of possible Red background is one I've mentioned several times before—Ernesto Guevarra. He is known to Cubans as "Che" and his handsome face is one of the most photographed. He was director of La Cabana, the military prison, when I went to see him.

A young man, he is nevertheless a medical doctor and a man who also participated in fighting in Guatemala on a side that was supported by Communists.

He is an Argentinian by birth and those who know his family there said his background was that of a boy from comfortable circumstances. A friend of mine, high in the Guatemalan Government and an anti-Communist, says he does not believe "Che" Guevarra is a Communist.

But Guevarra says that he is neutral in the disputes between the United States and Russia and that very neutralism tells a great deal about him. His early public statements indicated certainly a strong leftist leaning and this is a man I would judge bears close watching.

There is also a strong potential Communist influence in the labor movement. As this is written, this Communist influence has gained power in only a few places, but you can be certain it will keep trying and be ready to take over completely if the opportunity offers itself.

Because Communists are wise in the way of politics, because Communists recognize the importance of Cuba, it is certain that they will bear close watching.

Every action that creates more anti-Americanism paves the way for the Communists to move. The political illiterates who favor tyrants may think they are being anti-Communist, but they are the best friends the Communists have.

My own fear is not so much that Castro and his rebels might turn to communism as that in his own immaturity, Castro may destroy his own government by too much talking and too little responsibility and so create new chaos in Cuba.

I also have some fear about the welfare of Castro. He walks among the people and appears among them on speaking platforms absolutely without real protection. I think it inevitable that among the barbudos there would be some Batista plants. The murder of Castro, President Urrutia and a couple of more key figures would create chaos in Cuba.

The provisional President is essentially a middle-of-the-road man who heads an equally responsible Cabinet. When, in 1952, Batista took the Government by force, the party that seemed most likely to win the election was a new party called the Autenico. Many of the members of that party are represented in the new Cabinet, among them Roberto Agramonte, who would have been named President in a free election in 1952, and Raul Chibas, whose brother was the leader of the party.

Castro is not a member of this Cabinet. He says he does not want to be in the Government since his desire was only to free Cuba. But this ignores the political reality that he is the leading figure in Cuba. And it ignores the fact that he continues to speak on governmental matters, therefore usurping the Government without taking any responsibility for his actions.

There are a few key things that I think the average person can watch to know how the Government of Cuba is progressing.

1. The preservation of right of asylum: Castro seems to want to override the ancient provisions of asylum. Why he wants to do this is understandable—there are some real criminals who have taken asylum in embassies in Havana. But to override this would be to override a very necessary protection for freedom since not all those who seek asylum are criminals and overriding it now would set a precedent that could be used by tyrants in the future.

2. The fate of General Cantillo: The end of the war was precipitated by General Can-

tillo's negotiations with Castro. Batista learned of this and hurriedly left Cuba. Since Batista's police had planned a heavy drive early in January, his early leaving saved the lives of many persons. Castro, however, was angered because General Cantillo had promised to turn over Batista for justice. So General Cantillo is held for trial. It would be rank injustice to condemn General Cantillo to death, and if the Castro government does this you can mark down a most serious blot against it. I do not believe Castro will allow this mistake to be made, but this is one of the signs to look for to know what is happening in Cuba.

3. Castro in the cabinet or silent: If Castro wishes to continue to speak publicly on all matters of government then he should be in the government. If he does not choose to join the cabinet or take an active part, then he should become relatively silent. If he continues speaking but taking no responsibility, he may well make the work of the new government almost impossible and precipitate the resignations of mature men who are greatly needed.

4. The Communist Party in Cuba: After being banned for years—but still active—the Communists are allowed to come out into the open in Havana. You can observe their success by the positions they take in the labor movement. The name of the party in Cuba is the Popular Socialist Party, so if you see reports of government appointments of men of this party you'll know the Communists are gaining in power. As this is written, they have not yet attained power.

5. Recognition of Russia: If Roberto Agramonte and the Provisional President have their way there will be no recognition of Russia. You can know the solid men are being overridden if Cuba does give recognition to the Reds.

6. Continuation of executions: The justice of the executions of real criminals is something about which those who understand the Cuban situation have had no doubt. The manner of the trials and executions was bad. If the executions were to continue, if new arrests continue to be made, there will be real fear. There is an unfortunate failure on the part of some persons to distinguish between murder and death in battle. A news dispatch says three policemen have been arrested for the March 1957 murder of a Havana university student. If they are speaking of the death of Jose Antonio Echevarria, it really isn't proper to call it murder. He is a martyr for a noble cause, but he died in an attempt at revolt, armed and ready for death—his mother told a friend of ours that on the morning of the attack on the palace he told her he had gone to confession and holy communion and that if he died she should understand he was prepared. The soldiers who killed him may have been fighting against those who were right and for a tyrant, but it was surely not murder in a real sense.

The murder the next day of Pelayo Cuervo Navarro, a highly respected political leader who was taken from his home and shot, was murder in a real sense and these murderers could be punished. If executions continue in Cuba I fear a further lack of discrimination and eventual injustice.

These are six points to watch. If you keep up with them in your daily papers you will be as well informed as anyone in the country.

But don't be misled by some other things. The new government's insistence that all contracts with foreign companies be examined doesn't mean the government is going to go Communist. There was so much graft, kickbacks were so common, it is absolutely necessary to study all contracts made by Batista's government.

Summing up, Cuba has just rid herself of a corrupt and tyrannical government. This doesn't automatically mean the new government will be all we would wish it to be. Persons who know these leaders best are convinced, however, that they do believe in democratic freedom, and there is indication this is true.

We in the United States should offer understanding and support for the Cuban people, showing them a friendship on a fraternal and not paternal basis. We should aid the new government in the establishment of freedom, and regain whatever friendship we lost because of our support of the tyrant—Batista—who caused so much suffering in Cuba.

If we do not we are likely to drive the Cubans away from us into the waiting arms of the Communists.

In Mr. Dulles' Absence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very well written and timely editorial which appeared in the Washingotn Post today, February 11.

In my opinion this emphasizes the desire of all Americans, regardless of party or political affiliations, to support those in our governmental service, who are devoting their lives, energies, and abilities to work unceasingly to preserve the peace.

I am sure that we all join together, as suggested by the President, to pray for the good health and speedy recovery of this outstanding American and Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles:

IN MR. DULLES' ABSENCE

President Eisenhower spoke for the entire Nation yesterday in expressing profound regret about Secretary Dulles' new illness. Past disagreements are cast aside in recognition of how much the President and indeed the whole Western alliance have come to depend upon this one forceful man. His combination of firmness on Berlin and resilience on Germany has won the admiration of many here and abroad who have been critical of him on other occasions.

Mr. Dulles' absence is the more unfortunate because of the necessity for perseverance in establishing detailed Allied agreement on access to Berlin. Under Secretary Dillon, and Under Secretary Herter when he returns from vacation this weekend, may be counted on to do their utmost to maintain continuity. But these officials inevitably will be under some handicap because of Mr. Dulles' intensely personal approach to large diplomatic problems.

One could wish in other circumstances that the Secretary would place more reliance upon the initiative of subordinates and would permit more independent advance planning. As it is, there is no disguising the fact that his illness will leave a big hole not only in the State Department, but also in the Cabinet and the Government generally. Mr. Dulles indubitably is the strongman of this Administration, and his devotion merits an accolade.

Fortunately, the doctors report no recurrence of malignancy, although General Heaton and Walter Reed Hospital observe that Mr. Dulles is worn out and will need a considerable period of rest to recuperate from his prospective hernia operation. It would be altogether surprising if a man of nearly 71 did not show the strains of 6 years in office; the truly remarkable thing is that Mr. Dulles has stood up so well to the burdens he has had to bear for the administration and to the almost inhuman schedule he has set for himself.

It is important to have Mr. Dulles back, especially if there are to be negotiations with the Soviet Union. For that reason we hope that he really will rest and will encourage others to make necessary decisions while he is recuperating without attempting himself to carry the weight of policymaking. That will be the most effective way, incidentally, of showing the world that American policy is stronger than a single personality.

An Alternate Murdock Plan for Furnishing Water to the Western Portion of the Navajo Indian Reservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD the first of three articles by the Honorable John R. Murdock, of Arizona, a former Member of the House for 16 years and a former chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Murdock's articles set forth his proposal for the comprehensive development of the Little Colorado River so that its waters may be put to beneficial use on the western portion of the vast Navajo Indian Reservation and on the Hopi Reservation in Arizona. The Murdock plan also contemplates a supply of municipal water for Arizona's rapidly expanding city of Phoenix.

Mr. Murdock's plan to use Arizona's allotment of water under the upper Colorado River Basin compact of 1948 as a pump primer to develop additional water in the Little Colorado is based on his long years of service as a Member of the House, plus years of private study since he left the House in 1952.

The first installment of Mr. Murdock's plan follows:

AN ALTERNATE MURDOCK PLAN FOR FURNISHING WATER TO THE WESTERN PORTION OF THE NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION

A recent enactment by Congress contemplates as one of its details furnishing water to the eastern portion of the Navajo Reservation in New Mexico and Arizona. However, the most elaborate plans in the recent legislation referred to cannot possibly provide the necessary water for the western portion of that vast area. On the other hand, it is the opinion of those who know the situation well that thousands of Indians, Navajos and Hopis, will either have to be moved off the reservation or perish. It therefore becomes highly important that something more be done for these Indians.

Up until recent years when oil and gas and uranium were found on this arid and desolate plateau, the Navajo Indians have been regarded as the poorest as well as the largest Indian tribe in America. Friends of

the Indians and especially thousands of church people of every Christian denomination have long urged that better and proper treatment be given this group of American citizens. Many of the proposals already tried have cost large sums of money and some may not have been too successful, but after many years of study I can report that relatively small but important progress has been made.

CONGRESS HAS ACTED

In defense of Congress I must contend that the Government at Washington has not been as niggardly in furnishing appropriations for these Indians as many are led to believe. Whether the money appropriated has been used most effectively is another matter. I want to call attention to some Navajo Indian legislation 8 years ago which has had bipartisan congressional support and I shall name only a few Members on both sides of the aisle who have taken the lead in this matter. In the 80th Congress—a Republican Congress—the Honorable Richard J. Welsh, Republican of California, as chairman of the House committee dealing with Indian matters introduced legislation entitled "Rehabilitation of the Navajo Indians." I, being on the committee, asked the chairman to broaden the legislation and include the Hopi Indians, because the 5,000 Hopis are on a reservation within the Navajo Reservation and entirely surrounded by the 65,000 Navajos, and their circumstances are equally critical. This bill was amended and made to include the Hopi Indians.

Only a beginning was thus made at that time in the Republican Congress but in the 81st Congress—which was a Democratic Congress—Congressman TOBY MORRIS, of Oklahoma, took the lead in enacting the legislation which Chairman Welsh had introduced. I am happy to say the authorizing legislation was passed and became law. Therefore, I want to give due credit to Judge MORRIS, of Oklahoma, for his effctive work on the bill and also to Wesley D'Ewart, who was at that time Republican Congressman from Montana. Congresswoman Bosone, of Utah, gave it her very best support. Of course I as a Democratic Member of Congress representing the State of Arizona am giving myself some credit for this enactment. In recent months I have traveled over hundreds of miles of these reservations and have seen the physical construction made possible and resulting from this legislation.

GETTING MORE WATER ONE WEIGHTY PROBLEM

The chairman of the Navajo Tribal Council told me that the western end of his reservation is by all odds the driest portion, and in spite of the success in putting down deep wells—with which program I have also helped—they have been unable to get sufficient water for the vast portion of that reservation area lying next to the Colorado River and north of the Little Colorado River. There is a lot of water in the main Colorado River flowing by and some of it undoubtedly belongs to those Indians but, gloomily, it might seem as well to be on the planet Mars as to be so far below where they live.

An easy answer to this problem is to say, "Let's move the Navajo and Hopi Indians off that high and arid plateau." My question is, "where will we move them? The Hopi Indians living on the mountain tops like eagles on a rock do not want to remove from the sky cities which they have occupied centuries before Columbus came to America. My belief is that without too great an expenditure of money it would be quite possible to furnish sufficient water to enable them to continue and expand their life right where they have lived for more than 2,000 years. My studies show this should be done by utilizing the natural resources which are in the region. The following is perhaps the germ of a unique idea.

MURDOCK'S LITTLE COLORADO RIVER PLAN

My own view of the "law of the Colorado River" assigns to Arizona in perpetuity a firm block of 50,000 acre-feet of water annually out of the Colorado River system to be used where Arizona can get maximum benefit. This water need not all come out of the depth of the Colorado River if an "exchange of water" will improve the situation. By proper engineering it could be supplied in part by the Little Colorado tributary below any point at which white men or Indians might feasibly divert water from that stream except as herein proposed. Although the Little Colorado River at its junction with the main Colorado is in a very deep gorge—where the two great airliners collided June 30, 1956, with a loss of 128 lives—a large part of its waters come from the high plateau and could be captured before they reach the bed of the main stream. Many springs, like the famous Blue Spring in the Little Colorado, furnish much water which is not measured under the "law of the river" and is not used any place in the State of Arizona. My contention is that there is undoubtedly sufficient of such water to furnish those Navajo and Hopi Indians more than 50,000 acre-feet annually when and if the other and varying supply is stabilized or regulated by some such work as Murdock's Little Colorado River plan.

What expensive engineering would be required in this proposed Little Colorado River plan? Nothing like the expense which is contemplated by the recently enacted legislation for the Navajo Dam on the San Juan River. I do estimate that four sizable dams and one smaller dam would need to be built. The smallest of these, in the nature of a diversion dam, should be on the mainstream of the Colorado River just below the mouth of the Little Colorado. This would not be the most expensive dam and not nearly as expensive as the great project now provided for on the San Juan River by the recent enactment. This diversion dam on the main Colorado need not exceed 150 feet in height for purposes of my Little Colorado River development. I have studied four dam sites upstream on the Little Colorado where large dams could be built, but none of them exceeding 400 feet in height above the stream bed. These dams would each provide a catchment basin backing the water up to the foot of the dam above it and each have a unique powerplant for pumping water to the final level of Tuba City in the surrounding areas where Indians now are cultivating a little land with their limited supply of water.

TERMS EXPLAINED

Murdock's Little Colorado River plan: This is not a little plan, but a big plan on the Little Colorado River in northern Arizona, to develop its waters fully.

Diversion dam: In this water plan it means an obstruction across the main Colorado River, where the Little Colorado enters, high enough above stream bed to force a small part of the flow up the channel of the Little Colorado River a few miles to a point on the Navajo Indian Reservation and outside the Grand Canyon National Park.

Unique power plants on the high dams: With most reclamation dams we build hydroelectric power plants to produce electric power from falling water. My Little Colorado River plan is quite different. I want to catch all the water draining from its watershed (also sand, silt, etc.) behind these high dams so that none of the flow of the Little Colorado, water or rock, gets to the main Colorado. On each dam in the Little Colorado I want a Percy Thomas wind-driven power plant to lift the water from the foot of the dam to its top, thus reversing the river's flow. Also from the V-shaped lake at the junction of the two rivers I would count on the same, a wind-powered pumping plant, to lift about 140 acre-feet of water daily over the top of the highest dam near the main Colorado. The 140 acre-feet of water daily, more or less, would total the 50,000 acre-feet to be taken out of the main stream, to be mingled with waters coming down and to be used both on the Indian reservations and to be diverted southward for Greater Phoenix and central Arizona.

Exchange of water: Intermingling of the waters of the two rivers in this series of man-made lakes and dividing them according to a legal formula. A portion of the mingled waters is to be diverted to the Verde River for Greater Phoenix.

This, very briefly, too briefly, is my first alternate plan for a system of dams and unique power plants to furnish a constant and dependable water supply for the western Navajo area which would cost less than that contemplated for the eastern Navajo area in New Mexico. It would, in my opinion, be the sanest solution for this part of the Navajo problem. Since the foregoing is but a very brief outline of one phase of my proposed water development in northern Arizona, perhaps a further statement should follow and explain these suggestions.

Another reason calling for explanation and clarification is that terms and expressions have been used in this statement having different meanings, and capable of different interpretations. Further, some of the phases of this proposal are controversial and will need to be justified in the public mind because of the likely objections to be raised. Therefore, I want to follow this with a statement which will offer further explanation, elaboration, and justification.

In Honor of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, during the week of February 7 to February 13, the attention of the Nation is centered on the Boy Scouts of America.

The Scouts are proud of their organization; of its happy, wholesome program of activities; and its contributions to the making of a finer America.

As we, their elders, are proud of them.

Men and women devote their lives to their work, their homes, and their children.

But the greatest satisfaction they derive from all this effort is to see their youngsters become worthy of the advantages and the opportunities provided for them.

In our youth we knew little about the Boy Scouts. There were no troops available for us to join; and no one to direct us toward this organization that offers such fulfillment for the energy, the enthusiasm, and the natural idealism of youth.

If we had our lives to live over again, we would make certain to engage in those activities that we missed, and high among these would be membership in the Boy Scouts of America.

For there is no movement in this country that does more to make a boy self-sufficient, courteous, and inspired by the right thinking and the right doing that

develops a good man and a good citizen than the Boy Scouts.

I am humbly grateful for this emblem you have presented to me, and I shall be happy to wear it in celebration of the week that is set aside to honor your fine organization.

But do not ask me to go camping just yet. You will have to teach me the ropes before I can qualify for life in the great outdoors.

Even though boyhood days are far behind me. I admire your spirit, your healthy adventures, and your consideration for other people, that you are learning as members of your local troop.

Congratulations to the Boy Scouts of America.

Montana Eagle Scout Praises National Program of Youth Fitness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the President's Council on Youth Fitness is doing an admirable job of focusing the attention of the Nation on the conservation of its most important asset, its youth. The council, made up of the Secretaries and Administrators of Federal departments, with Secretary of Interior Fred A. Seaton, Chairman, is catalytic by nature and design. It achieves its ends by stimulating the multiplicity of youth-serving organizations and resources and the homes that support them. Prominent among these agencies is the Boy Scouts of America. At the recent 49th anniversary breakfast of the Boy Scouts of America, a gifted Montana youth, one of 12 carefully selected Explorer Scouts, made a statement on the relationship of scouting and fitness, which Shane MacCarthy, Executive Director of the President's Council, proclaimed a most enlightened and eloquent interpretation. I commend the exposition to my colleagues. It follows:

PRESENTATION BY EXPLORER DON A. LABAR, BILLINGS, MONT., OF REGION X, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The fitness of youth is an important subject which is getting much attention these days. My part on this program is to tell you about scouting and fitness. As everyone knows, the Scout program has been one that developed fitness ever since it started. All through the years the main emphasis has been on the outdoor activities of rugged camping and hiking, and on the Scout oath which says, "* * * physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight." It has been an all-round fitness program teaching boys to take care of themselves, be of service to others, and to develop functional and emotion, as well as physical, aspects of fitness.

President Eisenhower has called on all organizations and individuals to "take further action to improve the fitness of American youth." This will be a major emphasis in the Boy Scouts of America program during 1959 and 1960. Personal fitness will become a more important part of activities in units all across America. In other words, we're going to give more attention to something we've already been doing most of the time.

In this way we'll help youth become more fit. Through our adult leaders we hope to help parents understand their responsibility for fitness and how important it is for young people to be fit and stay fit.

It's going to take a great deal of planning and effort to do this job. Through our various committees and adult leaders, and with the help of experts in the various fields of all-round fitness, I know we'll do it and do it well for the personal fitness of the boys of our country.

Yorkville Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, New York has a glorious and eventful history. Unless the spirit of the passing times is captured and preserved by some one incorporating it into literature that spirit vanishes with the passing years. While I represent the 18th Congressional District and feel that I understand the people, the times, and the pulse, I feel that there are so many events which have escaped my attention. A few people have written about the glorious history of East Harlem and Yorkville. One of my constituents, Gertrude McManamon, of 325 East 69th Street, forwarded me a letter in which she portrayed a picture of Yorkville as it was in yesteryear and is today. This story depicts the area and describes the people who populated it, were supplanted by new groups, and moved on to other climes. It tells the story of the people of my district, the Italians, the Germans, the Irish, the Bohemians, and other ethnic groups who came, lived, and departed.

I find it a great pleasure to incorporate this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that a history of the segment of my district shall be preserved for posterity.

The letter follows:

YORKVILLE TODAY

As we walk along the streets how many of us ever think of the way these streets looked some 50 years ago or even 25 years ago.

The cliental and the appearance of Yorkville today would impress any visitor or even those who had moved some years past and made a visit therein.

Jones Woods, empty lots, and coalyards are now a thing of the past. Likewise the old families who for generations had made Yorkville what it was are all a memory.

Yorkville in the beginning of the century belonged to the Italian heritage. When one would pass through or experience an apartment hunt, the majority living therein were Italian families. After the 1908 depression many of these families lost their little apartments and had to double up because of lack of work and money.

After a year of complete poverty throughout the section there were many apartments available but no money to rent them. At that time Yorkville ceased to be Italian. There were many young Irish boys and girls who had migrated here from Ireland. With salaries at their lowest many of these boys and girls found their new home in America in the homes of others as domestics. Those who could afford servants as they were called lived on Fifth Avenue. Avenue A, First Avenue, Second and Third Avenues were a novelty to these employees when time permitted them to be free. Free time was very little. Lunch was served at 12 and they had to be sure to report by 4 to draw the blinds. They were permitted one evening a week free and every other Sunday. To them it was wonderful. They had a good home and enough to eat with a salary of $6 to $8 a month. With these few free hours they could find time to discover the other side of town or as they would say it—across the tracks.

As time passes boy meets girl and it was the Irish who took over the middle sixties of Yorkville. Then we eventually find the Bohemian people finding their way therein. The eighties found the German immigrants making Yorkville their land.

The year of 1914 saw difficulties which in most sections could have been bloodshed but in Yorkville the neighbors and inhabitants were one. Italian—German—Irish the problem was in their fatherland but they had found home in Yorkville where all worked and lived together.

The flu of 1918 did not spare anyone. The neighbor being struck down was as great a blow as one of the family, as Yorkville was all one big family.

The men who had loved Yorkville were corpses in their fatherland or the fatherland of their neighbors. Their sacrifice was to make Yorkville a home safe for their wives—and sons and daughters and in time for their grandsons and granddaughters.

The First World War was over; some did return to the home they loved more dearly than the home of their childhood. Many never did return, but they had left little boys and little girls to carry on their love.

The gayety of the twenties was felt to the utmost in Yorkville for they were fun-loving people. The dances and block parties more numerous in this section of the city than anywhere else. Most of the inhabitants were poor, some very poor but in love and kindness they were rich.

The first sorrow reached Yorkville when announcement was made of the abolition of Jones Woods now the site of Rockefeller Institute. Yes, a hospital was to arise to help not the poor of Yorkville but the unknown diseases of the whole world.

Then to the dismay of many, Burns Coal Co. must leave Yorkville. Many of the inhabitants had been employees since their immigration to America. To find new employment was not easy but to find new homes was harder. All the employees were forced to leave their homes, another new hospital was being sought out for this section of town. New York Hospital from West 16th Street was now to be among the beauties of Yorkville.

With new surroundings, furnished rooms would be a thing of the past. Sixty-eighth Street between First and Second Avenues was the first experiment sought out. Among the furnished-room houses was the home of the Dominican Sisters of Sparkill Community, 227 the number. A new home for the convent. This was not easy; it was not to be determined quickly. The Sisters returned to their motherhouse for the summer months and in September a house was secured at 228 East 69th Street.

With the advent of the winter months the buildings were slow arising. The boom of money which seemed to entwine the twenties was dwindling off into the past and by 1930 the new buildings completed but who had the wherewith to rent them. By 1931 work got scarcer the boys and girls of the boys and girls of the war years were now approaching their working years.

New York Hospital employed many from the neighborhood but many also from other neighborhoods therefore there were many unemployed in Yorkville. The Democratic Club was never lonely for visitors and the members therein in many instances took the opportunity to benefit themselves many jobs would be filled if a remuneration was given.

Through the years national churches had been added to the vicinity—now the church of St. Catherine which was the upper level of the school had outlived its usefulness. The parishioners who arrived in their teens now had grown to old age. The stairs was a hardship and many found that they could not attend the services because of the stairs.

Another edifice to be added to Yorkville, St. Catherine of Siena Church, on 69th Street. Now the depression in its highest the boys and the girls walked the streets day and night. Work was something everyone talked of but few had the joy of having a weekly pay envelope. Checks in those days were not thought of.

Soon the boys were again to disappear now not to their fatherland but to try to keep the homes for their parents, wives, or families. The CCC was founded. Many of the Yorkville boys were responsible for the roads and improvements which was attained by the CCC. Then to some the luck of the WPA saved them from leaving their homes. They were fortunate enough to stay at home and received the dole of the city to keep their little homes together. Few ever thought of the idea of leaving Yorkville.

Improvements were made in the suburbs and new edifices erected but the neighbors of Yorkville just married and waited for the God-given blessing of securing an apartment in Yorkville.

With the sorrow of the depression put aside and another decade added to time more and more looked for homes but this joy was not long to be experienced. New York Hospital continued to expand and the true natives of Yorkville had to take leave there were no homes left for them. Many homes because of lack of money had been neglected and were now beyond repair. These were just boarded up others were passed on to new owners and redecorated not for the Yorkville family of three or four but for the transient of one who would rent it out to two nurses on different shifts and get an exhorbitant fee for the rental. This was at first in the minority.

Pearl Harbor again brought back to many the sorrow of 1914. Once again the neighborhood was heavily robbed of its male youth yet too many of Yorkville females faced the safety of their country. The draft was heavy because of the many hospitals and city buildings and schools within the area. No one was safe. One with glasses from his baby years appeared in a uniform and some were among those who never returned to Yorkville but lay in the fatherland of their fathers or mothers.

Divorce or separation in Yorkville was seldom heard of. There was sickness and poverty but there was always a way. There was neighborly love and there was family devotion. To stay near to help the old folks to help the young ones with their little families was not a burden but a duty.

The war ended all looked to the return of the youth who in turn looked for a long happy life in Yorkville. This was soon to end their home and hopes. Now with homes at an impossibility of securing each month hundreds of families are forced out of the only home they have known or wanted to know Yorkville.

Lenox Hill settlement that withstood the depression and wars cannot withstand the inflation. It is not one house but blocks of houses turned into parking lots, office buildings, or apartment houses far beyond the reach of the working class.

As the hospital center moved in to help the people of Yorkville, it has helped the people of all over the world and left the lifelong inhabitants of Yorkville homeless.

Those who come to take the place of the immigrants that built and preserved and loved this spot in no way feel the home love it deserves. It is an address, or a place to work, but family life is not part of the dwelling. These tenants live for the day they will return to Pennsylvania, North Carolina, California, or any one of the other 49 States, but those who are being relocated are never to return to the home of their love and their childhood—Yorkville.

As history repeats itself, there is no room in the hearts of the political leaders to direct or preserve Yorkville from its fall. Home is not new beautiful buildings; home is where the family is raised and taught to be good citizens—good fathers and mothers—and in turn their children will do likewise. There will be no children to grow up in Yorkville to preserve its future or to pass on to their families the love they have inherited through the generations from their parents and grandparents.

Yorkville has helped make some of your dreams come true; surely it is in your reach to produce some possible assistance to save Yorkville.

Program of Inauguration of Hon. Pat Brown as Governor of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of the program occurring at Sacramento, the capital city of my native State of California, on January 15, when the distinguished California citizen, Pat Brown, was inaugurated as Governor of my State.

Heretofore, the distinguished U.S. Senator from California, Hon. CLAIR ENGLE, inserted in the Appendix of this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 14, 1959, beginning at page A140 thereof the text of the inaugural address by Gov. Pat Brown. It is now my pleasure to supplement for the information of all who read this the inaugural day program on that same historical occasion:

PROGRAM

Call to order of the joint session of the Legislature of the State of California. President pro tempore of the senate and speaker of the assembly presiding.

"Star-Spangled Banner": Organist, Assemblyman Frank Lanterman.

Invocation: Chaplain of the assembly.

Lieutenant Governor escorted into chamber and seated.

Governor escorted into chamber.

Introduction of Gov. Goodwin J. Knight by the speaker of the assembly.

Remarks.

Administration of oath of office to Hon. Edmund G. Brown, Governor, by Hon. Phil S. Gibson, chief justice of the supreme court.

"America."

Administration of oath of office to Hon. Glenn M. Anderson, Lieutenant Governor, by Hon. Phil S. Gibson, chief justice of the supreme court.

Introduction of Gov. Edmund G. Brown by the president pro tempore of the senate.

Inaugural address: Gov. Edmund G. Brown.

Introduction of Lt. Gov. Glenn M. Anderson by the speaker of the assembly.

Address: Lt. Gov. Glenn M. Anderson.

Benediction: Chaplain of the senate.

"I Love You California."

INAUGURAL DAY PROGRAM, STATE CAPITOL, WEST ENTRANCE, MONDAY, JANUARY 5, 1959, SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

1:30 P.M.

Band concert, San Francisco Boys' Club Band, Roland Terry, director.

2 P.M.

Proceedings from the assembly chambers.

3 P.M.

Call to order.

Presentation of colors.

Pledge of allegiance.

Invocation.

Administration of oath of office to Stanley Mosk, attorney general; Alan Cranston, controller; Bert A. Betts, State treasurer, by Hon. Phil S. Gibson, chief justice of the supreme court.

Presentation of Lt. Gov. Glenn M. Anderson and Gov. Edmund G. Brown.

Benediction.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*	
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*	
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*	
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*	The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*	The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*	
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*	
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*	4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*	2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*	
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Engle, Clair, *Calif*	3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*	
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*	
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*	
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*	University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*	
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*	
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*	
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*	3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*	4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*	
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Langer, William, *N. Dak*	2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*	4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*	The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*	
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*	Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*	
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*	
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*	
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*	
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Lennon, Alton, *N. C.*	
Lesinski, John, *Mich.*	
Levering, Robert W., *Ohio*	
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.*	224 C St. NE.
Lindsay, John V., *N. Y.*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn.*	The Congressional
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*	The Washington
McCulloch, William M., *Ohio*	4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif.*	
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*	
McFall, John J., *Calif.*	507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGinley, Donald F., *Nebr.*	
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak.*	
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*	220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*	
McSween, Harold B., *La.*	
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*	
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*	115 Dale Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*	
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*	
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*	
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*	
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*	Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*	
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*	
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.*	The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*	The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*	
May, Catherine, *Wash.*	
Meader, George, *Mich.*	3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*	
Meyer, William H., *Vt.*	
Michel, Robert H., *Ill.*	
Miller, Clement W., *Calif.*	
Miller, George P., *Calif.*	
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*	6601 Radnor Rd., Bethesda, Md.
Milliken, William H., Jr., *Pa.*	
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*	2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*	8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga.*	
Moeller, Walter H., *Ohio*	
Monagan, John S., *Conn.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Moorhead, William S., *Pa.*	
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*	
Morris, Thomas G., *N. Mex.*	
Morris, Toby, *Okla.*	220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La.*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*	204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*	
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*	
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*	The Coronet
Murphy, William T., *Ill.*	
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*	
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*	
Nelsen, Ancher, *Minn.*	
Nix, Robert N. C., *Pa.*	
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*	
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*	2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*	
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*	The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*	The Congressional
O'Hara, James G., *Mich.*	
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass.*	
Oliver, James C., *Maine*	
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*	
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*	100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*	
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*	117 Carroll St. SE.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*	
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*	
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho*	
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*	
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*	
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*	
Pirnie, Alexander, *N. Y.*	
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*	228 2d St. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*	
Polk, James G., *Ohio*	
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg.*	
Powell, Adam C., *N. Y.*	
Preston, Prince H., *Ga.*	
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*	
Prokop, Stanley A., *Pa.*	
Pucinski, Roman C., *Ill.*	
Quie, Albert H., *Minn.*	The Coronet Apt., 200 C St. SE.
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*	
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*	
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*	
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*	
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*	
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*	
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*	The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*	1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*	6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*	5603 24th Ave. SE., Hillcrest Hgts., Wash. 21, D. C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*	
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*	3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*	
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*	
Rivers, Ralph J., *Alaska*	
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*	6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y.*	
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*	
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*	
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass.*	The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*	Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*	
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*	
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*	
Rostenkowski, Dan, *Ill.*	
Roush, J. Edward, *Ind.*	
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*	
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y.*	
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y.*	
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif.*	
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*	
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*	
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*	
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C.*	
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*	433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*	
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*	
Shipley, George E., *Ill.*	
Short, Don L., *N. Dak.*	
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*	
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*	
Simpson, Edna Oakes, *Ill.*	
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*	5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*	
Slack, John M., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*	
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif.*	
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*	204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Neal, *Iowa*	
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*	
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*	Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*	
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*	
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*	
Stratton, Samuel S., *N. Y.*	107 Martha's Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Stubblefield, Frank A., *Ky.*	
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*	
Taber, John, *N. Y.*	
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*	
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*	
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*	6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y.*	Mayflower Hotel
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*	2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*	3301 Mass. Ave.
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*	
Thompson, T. A., *La.*	1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, Keith, *Wyo.*	
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*	
Toll, Herman, *Pa.*	
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*	
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*	
Tuck, William M., *Va.*	
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*	
Ullman, Al, *Oreg.*	
Utt, James B., *Calif.*	
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*	
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*	
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*	4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*	
Wallhauser, George M., *N. J.*	
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*	
Wampler, Fred, *Ind.*	
Watts, John C., *Ky.*	
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*	9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Weis, Jessica McC., *N. Y.*	
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*	
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*	
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C.*	
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*	5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*	
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*	
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*	1001 26th Rd. S., Arlington, Va.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*	
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*	
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*	
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*	
Wolf, Leonard G., *Iowa*	
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*	
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*	
Young, John, *Tex.*	
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*	4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*	
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*	

DELEGATES

Burns, John A., *Hawaii*	

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*	2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 216 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Series, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Place SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Appendix

The Businessman in Public Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST GRUENING
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the address I am about to ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD was made yesterday by a man who is peculiarly qualified to make it. It is on the subject "The Businessman in Public Affairs," and was made to the Weirton, W.Va., Chamber of Commerce. The speaker was the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. He began his activities as a working newspaperman. Then he became, successively, a newspaper editor, a magazine editor, a college professor, and a business executive.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH served with distinction for seven terms in the House of Representatives. In the course of that service, I was privileged to have him, with other Members of a House committee, visit us in Alaska, where his interest in its problems was reflected in subsequent legislation.

After his seven terms in the House, JENNINGS RANDOLPH became a business executive again in an industry which is greatly affected with the public interest, namely, the aviation industry. He is now, I am happy to say, our colleague in the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that his thoughtful and timely address, "The Businessman in Public Affairs," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUSINESSMAN IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the Weirton Chamber of Commerce, and guests, it is a pleasure to be with you and to discuss the role of the businessman in public affairs. This is a question which has long been of interest and personal concern to me—since I have considered myself a businessman as well as one professionally interested in public affairs—and I note that it is a subject which is becoming of increasing regard to your own organization.

During the campaign last fall an incident occurred which I think highlights one aspect of our discussion tonight. As I was walking along the street in my home community of Elkins, talking with the voters and discussing the issues, I was stopped by a citizen who drew me into a doorway to discuss the campaign. After finishing our conversation I asked him why he had drawn me off the street and into the privacy of a doorway. Whereupon he replied: "You know I am in business and I must be very careful of what I do and say."

Though this man may have dramatized his fears somewhat, ladies and gentlemen, he does not represent an isolated state of mind. For, the rule of prudence—the precautionary attitude against speaking one's mind on controversial issues—has taken seed among too many of us. It is a measure of the failure of the democratic process—a failure in the belief in the great dialogue of democracy—when anyone, business man, professional man, or teacher, fears to participate in the political process.

Therefore, I am much heartened by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce program of the Aircade and local political workshops to encourage the political activity and participation of businessmen.

However, I would offer a word of caution. For there is some indication that this action is stimulated by the concern within the thinking of some members of the chamber for what is seen as the growing power and political effectiveness of organized labor.

I hope that this view will not dominate the political actions of businessmen. I hope that they will see their role in larger terms—and not merely in opposition to labor. For any action which is cast in terms of protagonist and antagonist limits the freedom of the actors—by limiting the scope of their imagination and perception.

I would digress a moment to illustrate this principle in reference to our own national attitudes toward the Soviet Union. Russia has at one and the same time become our national demon and the gage by which we measure our own progress. We are too frequently confronted with such questions as "Are American schools as advanced as those of Russia?" "Do we offer enough support for basic research in science and technology compared with that of Russia?" "Are race relations in the United States strengthening the position of Russia in world opinion?"

Thus, in recent years, we have too frequently approached our problems not in terms of finding the best possible solutions, but in terms of the cold war with Russia. And to that extent we have fallen increasingly under the dominance of the Kremlin. For the solution to any problem is determined, in large measure, by the questions which one addresses to the problem.

I devoutly hope, therefore, that the political actions of businessmen will not be thus restricted—that they will ask questions not in terms of whether a particular policy will circumscribe the power of labor, but rather whether it is in the best national interests as well as their own legitimate self interests.

This is only instance, however, of the need to avoid the general tendency of interpreting public problems in terms of opposite solutions. Our political discourse, and hence the solution to political questions, is too often restricted by the use of polar or opposite terms—liberal and conservative, radical and reactionary, labor and management, farmer and consumer, socialist and capitalist, et cetera. The list could be extended. And we are all familiar with the old platitude, "There are two sides to every question."

Such a polarizing of public problems, however, falsifies the realities of political life. For there are, in fact, as many sides to every question as there are parties or interests involved. And the great genius of the democratic process is that it offers a wider variety of solutions than can be encompassed by mere opposites.

Politics in a democracy is the art of the possible—the art of compromise and conciliation. Webster defines "compromise" as "a settlement by arbitration or by consent reached by mutual concessions." This definition offers us a clue as to how the businessman can make one of his chief contributions in the arena of public affairs. For the life of business and commerce is in large measure a life of offering mutual concessions, of arriving at a compromise of interests whereby each party gains some satisfaction.

It was popular at one time in some quarters to state that America neded a sound business Government. Without commenting on the recent record of some businessmen in Government, I suggest that this statement offers an oversimplification of both business and Government. For it assumes that business can be defined solely in terms of dollars and cents and cost accounting. And that the justification of governmental policies should be decided in the same terms. I have called this an oversimplification, first, because it fails to acknowledge the complexity of government in a modern democratic society; and second, because it fails to perceive the cultural significance of business and commerce.

The modern businessman must be more than a mere cost accountant. Wise decisions in business require not only a knowledge of how to conduct a commercial transaction, but knowledge of personal relations, of community relations, and of the whole process of communication. From this point of view, therefore, the businessman, the modern businessman, is peculiarly well gifted to contribute to public affairs.

In this connection, it is appropriate to mention that one of the distinguished guests with us tonight, President Thomas E. Millsop, of National Steel Corp., is not only a man of management, but one who has associated himself with public affairs and has made real contributions to the advancement of community, State, and national interests.

The National Management Association, an organization of 73,000 members in 340 affiliated clubs representing 1,200 companies in 34 States, honored Mr. Millsop by awarding to him its 1958 Management Man of the Year distinction. I am sure that this award was not bestowed upon Tom Millsop simply because of his technical proficiency in the management field; rather, it was recognition, too, of his broad understanding of and contributions to public affairs in relationship to the free-enterprise system.

I say in passing, however, that we should not limit the term "public affairs" to the application of government alone. Public affairs, and the role of the businessman therein, imply the whole range of public life and all of our cultural institutions as well as those of the States. This means that the businessman should interest himself not only in politics in the more limited sense, but also in the advancement of our schools, our hospitals, and our institutions of the fine arts, as well as those matters which more immediately affect his own interests, such as tax revisions, fair-trade practices, and the reciprocal trade agreements.

Participation in such affairs can be justified in more than just humanitarian terms as well. It can be justified in terms acceptable to the most hardheaded businessman. For example, we are all well aware of the need to attract a more diversified industry to West Virginia. While we are fortunate in having such basic industries as coal and steel and chemicals, we also need light in-

dustries which involve a lower capitalization per man in order to revive our sagging economy and offer jobs to workers who have been displaced by technological developments. And it has been the experience of other States which have sought to attract new industry that modern enlightened management is becoming increasingly concerned with the general cultural conditions in the area in which they seek to locate. While such factors as the tax climate, transportation facilities, and natural resources are perhaps the dominant factors in attracting industry, present day management is aware that its industrial and personnel relations are strongly affected by the surrounding conditions in schools, hospitals, recreational facilities, et cetera. Thus, from a long range point of view, it is equally to the interest of the businessman to engage himself in the development of the general cultural facilities of his area.

This suggests another respect in which the business community can make a genuine contribution to public affairs. Ours is a civilization dominated in large measure by a business ethos—by the values and attitudes of the business world. This condition affords the businessman considerable influence in the molding of public opinion—in the conditioning of cultural attitudes. I would like to see him use this influence on public opinion in raising the cultural status of the expert—the person of achieved excellence.

The American businessman has the reputation of being tough-minded. He is from Missouri. He is hospitable to facts and to the person who is expert in dealing with them. I should like to see him use his influence and his arts of communication to extend this hospitality to the expert throughout the range of public affairs; I should like to see such efforts emerge in a revitalization of the American regard for the expert, for the person who has achieved excellence in whatever field—in the arts, in business, in science, in scholarship, in government administration, as well as in the individual conduct of life in our daily affairs.

We are today, and we have been for some years, faced with what might be called a growing lack of accountability. In an ever-more complex society in which individual responsibility becomes lost in the mesh of social relationships, it is too easy to avoid responsibility—too simple to avoid being held accountable for the quality of one's performance. This is what I mean by the lack of accountability.

Thus we have given rise to the glorification of mediocrity and the neglect of excellence. To dispel such a popular attitude and reawaken a public regard for quality performance may well be one of the greatest contributions the businessman could make to public affairs.

Now after this somewhat philosophical foray, let me turn, in closing, to more concrete matters, to matters which I am confident have occupied a considerable amount of your interest.

I refer to two items of legislation which will soon be presented to the 86th Congress. First, Senate bill 505, introduced by Senator KENNEDY with myself as one of the cosponsors. This is the labor-management reform bill—a revised version of the Kennedy-Ives proposal which passed the Senate in the last session by a vote of 88 to 1. During my campaign I stated that I would support such legislation as that offered by Senators KENNEDY and Ives. As a member of the Subcommittee on Labor of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I have offered myself as cosponsor of the present measure.

I am well aware of the criticism that has been leveled from some quarters. Without taking these criticisms up in detail, and without impugning the motives of any who have criticized the bill, I would like to state briefly its purpose and its provisions. But first I would like to quote from a letter which Senator KENNEDY recently received from former Senator Ives.

Senator IVES wrote, "This bill represents many months of careful study in committee, the collective judgment of the U.S. Senate as expressed in 5 days and nights of debating and voting, and many, many years of collective experience of labor-management legislation.

"Furthermore, it is designed to meet the objectives set forth in the report of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field. It is my firm conviction that this bill not only meets those objectives but does so in a fashion that makes it corrective rather than punitive legislation, a measure which will correct abuses without undermining the rights of working men and women."

First, as Senator KENNEDY has said, it is "a bipartisan measure on a nonpartisan subject." Second, it is stronger and clearer in its terms than was the original Kennedy-Ives bill. It has been revised to make it quite clear that the section on employer reporting does not interfere with normal personnel relations or communications, and that the section on bribes cannot possibly be interpreted to include wage or other normal payments.

And third, it is, as Senator KENNEDY stated, "primarily a labor-management reform bill, dealing with the problems of dishonest racketeering—it is not a bill on industrial relations, dealing with the problems of collective bargaining and economic power." The broad issues of labor-management relations are not involved in this legislation and were not so intended. For these are quite properly divorced from the issues of corruption and racketeering in labor.

I would, therefore, urge each of you to consult the bill yourself and in your own judgment determine if this is not for the best interests for labor and management alike, as well as in the larger national interests.

A question of equal importance to all of you is that of forthcoming legislation on small business. I am pleased that I am also a member of the Senate Committee on Small Business, and will be actively engaged in legislation in this field.

In preface to my remarks on this topic let me state that I am not one to whom big business per se is an evil; there is nothing inherent in the size of any economic structure, nor for that matter in any political or social structure, which makes it either good or evil. It is the uses to which such organizations are placed and the degree of responsibility exercised by those in management which determine their ultimate benefit to society. In recognizing this we must acknowledge also that bigness has become a permanent and fundamental characteristic of American economic and political institutions—big government, big labor, and big business are here to stay. The problems of capitalizing modern industry and exploring the new frontiers of technology require large units of production. But with this, we must develop and maintain the means and techniques to prevent the individual man and woman from being lost in the shuffle and to insure the continued vitality of small business.

The 85th Congress moved significantly in this direction in establishing the Small Business Administration as a permanent agency, in passing the Small Business Investment Act, and in broadening the lending authority of the Small Business Administration. But much remains to be done.

There are approximately 5 million small businessmen in the United States, roughly the same number as there are farm families. These two groups comprise much of the reservoir of talent and initiative that have brought our Nation to its present greatness. We must see that this reservoir is not drained off by neglect, by inequitable tax laws, and by administrative regulations.

Let me emphasize once again the potential power the businessman has for exerting his influence far beyond the range of the activities of buying and selling and of producing and distributing goods. For the men of commerce and industry are the ones who control the material resources of our society; morally speaking, these resources are held not in fee simple but in stewardship—a stewardship which carries with it the responsibility to see that these material resources are used to assure the widest possible benefit, both materially and spiritually, for a free society. It is within your power if you but will it.

These are times of extreme tension—sometimes of deep doubts about our tomorrows.

I close on this positive approach:

There is no room for gloom in the long-term future. Fact and faith must combine in the promise of a further unprecedented era of expansion, creation of new industry, and a more sustained prosperity.

The American people are resourceful. They will realistically meet the challenge of changing world and domestic conditions.

We must see to it that business continues its dynamic development and that our cooperative capitalism, which embraces both employee and employer, be cushioned by reasonable Government regulation and reputable practices within the framework of our private enterprise system.

Ours is a growth country. It is a fallacy to short-sell its future.

Deseret News Discusses Neuberger Bill on Alcohol and Tobacco Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the outstanding newspapers in America is the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City. In its weekly supplements for January 17, 1959, and January 24, 1959, the Deseret News has published two comprehensive interviews with me about my legislative proposal to have Federal matching funds used to encourage courses in our public schools in educating children with respect to the impact on their health of both tobacco and alcohol.

These interviews were written by Mr. George L. Scott, veteran newspaperman, who is correspondent in the Pacific Northwest for the Deseret News.

I ask unanimous consent that these interviews from the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interviews were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake City Deseret News, Jan. 17, 1959]

OREGON U.S. SENATOR OPPOSES TOBACCO, LIQUOR ADVERTISING

PORTLAND, OREG.—"Glamour advertising of cigarettes and liquor over TV and radio, in magazines and newspapers is aimed at the young—older people are already hooked."

So declared U.S. Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, as he prepared to reopen his senatorial effort to educate the youth of the Nation on their gamble with health if they use either product.

The Senator said he would reintroduce the bill he placed before the Senate on May 21, 1958. This bill, which did not reach the Senate floor before adjournment, provided Federal grants-in-aid for educational programs to teach schoolchildren about the dangers to health from cigarettes and liquor. He said there would be no substantial change in the measure.

Senator NEUBERGER emphasized that he was not advocating a prohibition in the use of either tobacco or liquor.

"My purpose is to give the States of this Nation a chance to advise their young people on important matters concerning their health," he said.

"Most of the advertising on tobacco and liquor is beamed at young people.

"They are entitled to know what the facts are. After that, if they want to smoke, it's up to them. Their own reasoning rather than the pressure of glamorized advertising should prompt them," he declared.

LAUDS HEALTH EDUCATION

Senator NEUBERGER, who does not smoke nor drink, said his determination to push for health education was intensified following his return from Washington after the last session of Congress.

He underwent surgery for a malignant growth and is still under treatment.

"My own experience," the Senator said, "has intensified my interest in anything dealing with health."

He pointed to the Nation's $6.8 billion expenditure for research, most of it dealing with nuclear science, while only $211 million, or 4 percent, was spent on medical research of all diseases.

"Cobalt radiation, now used in the treatment of cancer, is a result of research," Senator NEUBERGER said. "If my trouble had developed a few years ago my chances would have been much less.

"Look at the children in the past who died of polio, diphtheria and other diseases before medical research made recovery almost certain."

CHILDREN SHOULD BE INFORMED

"I feel every child is entitled to the right to be informed of dangers ahead. The best place to do this is in school—backed by research and not advertising glamor," he said.

"In contrast to the questionable advertising which prompts young people to take up smoking at an early age, when they frequently are told to associate this habit with the success of some great baseball star or motion-picture queen, is the warning by the Surgeon General of the United States, Dr. Leroy E. Burney, who said:

" 'Many independent studies thus have confirmed beyond reasonable doubt that there is a high degree of statistical association between lung cancer and prolonged cigarette smoking * * * while there are naturally differences of opinion in interpreting the data on lung cancer and cigarette smoking, the Public Health Service feels the weight of the evidence is increasingly pointing in one direction—that excessive smoking is one of the causative factors in lung cancer'," the Senator quoted.

[From the Salt Lake City Deseret News, Jan. 24, 1959]

PUBLIC INDIFFERENCE DELAYS HEALTH BILL

PORTLAND, OREG.—Public indifference, advertising power and sectional economy will be major hurdles to clear before the public can be educated on the health hazards surrounding the use of liquor and tobacco.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, encountered all of these obstacles after he first introduced his bill for Federal aid to States desiring to give their schoolchildren the facts of research concerning the use of cigarettes and alcohol.

He is hopeful there will be an upsurge of support from Senators and the public when he reintroduces his bill sometime in March.

"Any bill that has strong support from public bodies in the States will be brought out of committee for congressional action," the Senator said.

REACTION TO MEASURE

In dividing first reaction to his measure, Senator NEUBERGER listed the following:

Public: Indifferent, little immediate support in general.

Educators: Some support but far under expectations.

Churches: Good reaction from religious groups, particularly the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Seventh-day Adventists, and Methodists.

Advertising agencies: Hostile reaction from advertising magazines and publications. Much of their revenues come from tobacco and liquor.

"Only a few Senators gave promise of support," Senator NEUBERGER said.

"Southern Senators are swayed away from support by the importance of the tobacco crop to the South although they favored education on liquor.

"I realize that it takes time to build up a program but with the aid of such organizations as the American Cancer Society, other health groups, educators, and churches it can be done.

"If the public gives its support you have a chance to pass legislation.

"If indifferent, little chance because of the great amount of legislation facing Congress."

CHURCH MEMBERS LEND SUPPORT

Senator NEUBERGER said he received many letters from Mormon Church officials and members in Utah, Idaho, and California backing his program.

"The power of liquor and tobacco advertisers is the main hurdle facing the grant-in-aid education program," Senator NEUBERGER said.

"We leave the field entirely to the liquor and tobacco people who have unlimited capital to support their products."

The Senator insisted that education is the great hope for everything. He pointed out that the grant-in-aid plan he backs for giving the facts on cigarettes and alcohol respects State's rights. No State, he said, is required to give such education unless it so desires.

"I don't believe in prohibition," he declared, "but I do believe in giving relative facts. If advertisers misdirect the Nation's youth, the Government should at least give the fair facts.

U.S. AGENCIES INCONSISTENT

"If ever there was a situation where the left hand knoweth not what the right hand doeth, it is in the policy of the U.S. Government with respect to tobacco and cigarettes. While one agency of Government warns that cigarettes may be a factor in causing cancer, the most terrible disease afflicting the human race, another governmental agency subsidizes and encourages the growth of the product from which cigarettes are made."

Senator NEUBERGER inquired:

"What would be the reaction here in America if we learned that the government of Red China was subsidizing the production of poppies, from which opium is distilled? Would we not raise our voices in righteous scorn and indignation? Then what must the rest of the world think of the fact that in the United States eggs and meat and vegetables are not supported as basic farm crops, but tobacco is?"

The Senator conceded that "a bill is simply a piece of printed paper that can be indefinitely postponed."

"Other things," he said, "cannot be postponed so readily—cancer of the lung, for instance. The doctors and scientists will continue their studies. They will report, and some men in journalism and politics will disseminate the reports. People will smoke cigarettes, and human tissue and protoplasm will react accordingly. Such events as President Eisenhower's account of how he himself overcame the smoking habit are sure to have a mighty effect. Americans will learn the facts about cigarettes and various diseases, and then they will wonder why their Government considers tobacco a basic crop but not the Thanksgiving turkey or baby's milk or the morning baked apple or glass of orange juice.

"When enough Americans wonder about this, my bill will pass," Senator NEUBERGER concluded.

Who Will Control?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Edgefield Advertiser, in Edgefield, S.C., on February 4. The editor of this weekly paper points to the real danger of the continuing centralization of control by the Federal Government of the individual citizens of our country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO WILL CONTROL?

Among all the controversial issues or milder subjects that ferment in legislative bodies, in departments of state, in the press, and elsewhere, there is one—the most important among them all—that gets little or no attention.

It is: Who will control?

Each year, the individual has less control over what he earns.

Each year, he has less control over the who and the what and the how of the education of his children.

Each year, he has less control over his way of life.

Each year, he has less control over his Government.

It is a simple deduction, that, with less control over what he earns, and this control going to the state; with less control over education of his children, this control going to the state; with less control over his way of life, this control going to the state; and with less control over the state itself, the very meaning of freedom has been renounced.

It is not surprising that the ideals of American history are being subverted in many public school textbooks in the United States.

The words of Patrick Henry, for example, which were presented stirringly to schoolchildren for generations, "Give me liberty or give me death," are now in a position of ridicule, or are twisted to serve a new purpose.

The sordid substitute now is: "Gimme; I'm afraid of insecurity; and who wants to die for anything?"

To interpret the political trend in any other way is serving untruth. It is dishonest, and it is also a reason for more than impatience.

It is getting late to brand the enemies of freedom; for there are so many of them.

They parade with the mantle of welfarism, and speak with the sweetness of saints. From time immemorial it is the type which people of love and zeal have had to oppose with ceaseless vigilance and determination.

There is far too little hostility against these perpetrators of public evils and these abettors of communistic subversion in the United States.

No Communist missiles carrying hydrogen bombs will ever destroy freedom.

But freedom is on the way out because of these forces working from within.

Right-to-Work Legislation Held Harmful to U.S. Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. MOSS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on Tuesday, February 3, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], had printed in the RECORD an editorial from one of the leading papers in my great home State of Utah, the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City. The editorial dealt with the so-called right-to-work issue, and detailed the views of that newspaper on this important subject.

In the State of Utah, the Deseret News has a well-deserved reputation for precisely and forthrightly stating its point of view. It also has a reputation for fairness, and it regularly opens its columns to its readers whose views differ from those of the newspaper. This is, to my mind, a sound and fine example of true belief in freedom of the press and in freedom of speech.

The editorial which Senator GOLDWATER inserted into the RECORD on February 3, was published in the Deseret News on January 17. On January 30, however, that newspaper published a letter, from Mr. LaMar D. Gulbransen, chairman of the United Labor Committee of Utah, and president of the Utah State AFL–CIO, taking vigorous issue with points cited in the News editorial.

The Deseret News thus presented both sides of a controversial issue. I am sure that my distinguished colleague, Senator GOLDWATER, would want the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to present equally both sides of this issue; and, probably, when he offered the editorial he did not realize that the other side had already been presented in the same newspaper.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter to the editor of a great newspaper, the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake City Deseret News, Jan. 30, 1959]

RIGHT-TO-WORK LEGISLATION HELD HARMFUL TO U.S. ECONOMY

Our American democracy is based upon the collective bargaining process guaranteed under the present rule of the majority.

So-called right-to-work legislation is a fundamental attack on these basic principles; an attempt by a comparative few to make the expression "Union Busting" more realistic. It is a system devised to weaken and eventually destroy the fundamental and basic concepts of the collective bargaining process.

The right to work is not new; in the early 1900's it was formulated in an attempt to stop organization of working men and women into unions of their choice. This type of propaganda has been used by the National Association of Manufacturers and other employer groups in an effort to slow, weaken, and destroy labor throughout the entire first 60 years of the 20th century. Clarence Darrow stated in a legal brief drawn in 1900: "Right to work is a bit of bird lime to sway the unthinking mass."

It still is:

Proponents of right to work profess to be worried about the fate of the individual workers. They seek to give the right to a single employee to contact management for negotiation purposes—all by himself—for pay increases and/or better working conditions. In other words, right-to-work supporters seek to restore the ancient liberties of the working man and woman—the right to suffer, starve and work long hours under sweatshop conditions.

Responsible unionism is the result of secure unionism. The Taft-Hartley Act recognizes this. Under the Taft-Hartley Act a union may bargain for a union shop only if a majority of the workers so affected vote for a union shop. Originally, the Taft-Hartley Act provided for such employee votes to be supervised by the Federal Government. After 4 years, 92 percent of all such elections resulted in 95 percent of all affected workers voting for the union shop and Senator Taft, himself, asked that the provision of the Federal law calling for such elections be dropped as a waste of money.

Defenders of the right-to-work law use figures indiscriminately to try to prove that this type of legislation helps the economy. In reality, the right-to-work States rank at the bottom of the list of States in personal income according to the U.S. Department of Commerce. Utah's per capita income in 1957 was $333—16 percent—below the national average. Utah is 30th in the list of States in this category.

Right-to-work States with the low income are States where reactionary and selfish employers seek to manufacture goods on a 1920 pay scale and sell elsewhere on a 1959 scale. This is harmful to the economy of the United States. When our national economy is hurt; when the economy of States is harmed; it means that each of us is hurt as well.

To keep in step with progress—to regain her position in the march of States toward a better and more prosperous life, we need to restore the rule of sane and safe legislation and repeal the present unsound and harmful right-to-work law.

LAMAR D. GULBRANSEN,
Chairman, United Labor Committee of Utah, and President of the Utah State AFL–CIO.

Legality of Supreme Court Decision in Doubt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Legality in Doubt," which was published in the Greenville News in Greenville, S.C., on February 10, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGALITY IN DOUBT

It almost certainly is unintentional, but both the Republican administration and a group of Democratic and Republican liberals headed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, are betraying doubt that the antisegregation decision of the U.S. Supreme Court really is the law of the land.

They have been saying all along that it is, and have either used force or proposed the use of further force to compel segregated communities to admit Negroes to their white schools.

Now, however, in separate bills, the administration and the Douglas group are asking Congress to adopt a resolution declaring the decision of 1954 to be the supreme law of the land and demanding that the States must take immediate steps to end segregation.

We have never believed that the decision is truly constitutional and legal, but if the integrationists are right in their contention that it is, why do they feel the need of an act of Congress to declare it so?

Blows Against Protestant Christianity by the Peiping Communist Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, last November, the press of the Nation gave much attention to a proposal made by the Fifth World Order Study Conference of the National Council of Churches' Department of International Affairs, in Cleveland, Ohio. This proposal urged that Red China be granted diplomatic recognition by the United States and also be admitted to the United Nations. Opponents of the proposal quickly pointed out that the pronouncement did not constitute an official policy of the council.

A news story recently carried by the Religious News Service tells of a questionnaire sent to Protestant pastors and of the overwhelming disapproval of the study conference's proposal.

At the same time, the District of Columbia Baptist Convention weekly newspaper printed a compilation of reports from the National Council of Churches depicting the crippling blows which have been dealt to Protestant Christianity by the Peiping Communist Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD these two news stories, which indicate the views of many Protestant ministers and the terrible circumstances under which the Protestant churches in Red China exist.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURVEY DISCLOSES 7,437 PROTESTANT MINISTERS OPPOSE RECOGNIZING PEIPING

NEW YORK.—In a nationwide survey 7,437 Protestant ministers recently opposed United States recognition of Communist China and its admission to the United Nations.

Questionnaires were sent out to some 45,000 pastors of major Protestant denominations in this country. Of 8,572 replies, 963 approved China's recognition and United Nations entry, 172 expressed no opinion, and the remainder were opposed.

The clergy group, which originated the survey, said it was designed to counteract a proposal made by the Fifth World Order Study Conference last November in Cleveland that Red China be granted diplomatic recognition by the United States and admitted to the United Nations.

Sponsoring the conference was the National Council of Churches' Department of International Affairs but its pronouncements did not constitute an official policy of the council.

GOVERNMENT CRIPPLES CHURCH IN CHINA

(The following is a compilation of reports from the National Council of Churches. The sources are: Dr. Wallace C. Merwin, executive secretary of the China Committee, Division of Foreign Missions; Dr. Frank W. Price, director of the Missionary Research Library. Their sources included personal letters, the New China News Agency and China's only nationally distributed Protestant biweekly, Tien-Feng.)

A series of crippling blows has been dealt to Protestant Christianity in Communist China. Under pressure from the Peking Government, all denominations are being merged into a single church body, and a preponderance of local churches are being forced to close.

Involved are 16 principal denominations long established in the country, with a membership of nearly 1 million. Typical of local church closings was the recent shutdown of all but 12 of the 200 Protestant churches in Shanghai, while in Peking itself 61 out of 65 churches have been closed. These closed churches are being turned over to the Government as patriotic gifts, the reports indicate.

The measures are being carried out by the Three-Self Patriotic Movement Committee of Chinese church leaders, the only Protestant agency in the country officially recognized by the Peiping Government.

"By leaving the churches little choice except to join the Three-Self Patriotic Movement Committee," Dr. Merwin declared, "the Chinese authorities are succeeding in maintaining closer controls over the churches and their members. They have already acquired Protestant schools, hospitals and other institutions as 'patriotic gifts.' As a result, it is not so much a persecuted church as it is a captive church."

During the first 6 months of 1958, church workers underwent an intensive course in education for socialism as a part of a general thought-rectification campaign. Many rightists in the churches were exposed and a considerable number arrested. Among the many who refused to cooperate, Dr. Merwin cited a woman, the former president of a Christian college in South China, who is now scrubbing floors in that institution.

Congregations are constantly urged to carry out self-reform and to take an active part in China's giant leap forward. In inland towns, denominations have already merged into a single organization and church leaders everywhere are reportedly pledging wholehearted obedience to the Government and the Three-Self Committee. By holding joint services in a single building, the funds of the other churches are dedicated to socialist construction.

Under special attack now are freelance preachers, revivalists, and the steadily increasing religious gatherings in private homes, which are considered subversive.

In 1950, the year of the last count, Protestants numbered 903,805 active church members, perhaps 1,500,000 in the total community. The largest group was the Church of Christ in China, about 177,000. The Methodists reported 102,693, a few thousand less than the True Jesus Church, the second largest group. Lutherans and the China Baptist Convention numbered 65,000 each, the Seventh Day Adventists 21,117, and North China Congregationalists 18,235. Roman Catholic membership was estimated at between 2 and 3 million, including family members of all ages.

"Today," said Dr. Merwin, "Chinese Protestants are told that church divisions and denominational names are 'vestiges of western colonialism aimed to divide and rule'." To be truly independent and patriotic, they are advised, the churches must unify their forms of worship, methods of support and doctrinal creeds. This counsel is bringing such incompatible religious factions together that more and more church members are staying away from church. These latest actions are the first attempt to break denominational authority and bring all churches into a controlled ecclesiastical system. "It is also the first time," he concluded, "that Protestant congregations have had to surrender their properties and funds on such a large scale."

Two letters report the drastic changes taking place in Chinese Protestant churches.

"The first group of pastors and church workers have now finished their meetings after about 5 months," says the first writer. "There are many decisions, many restrictions. No one may teach or preach except those registered with the Three-Self Movement Committee and no services, prayers or Bible teaching may be carried out except in regular church buildings. Attendance has much fallen off, partly because so many work on Sunday—one of the latest resolutions is that services on Sunday must not be allowed to interfere with work.

"Many pastors and church workers are being taken into factories, the younger ones go out to farms. They are all having what they call the 'leap forward,' and everyone must work more, faster, better, and more economically. It is amazing what they have accomplished, working very hard often with only about 5 hours left for sleep."

A second letter:

"Mother does not always go to church on Sunday as the churches have now been joined together. The pastors who are not needed in the combined church are sent to work in factories or in the fields. And the church is not open much besides Sundays as the pastors have to attend political study meetings. The tension and fear of doing or saying something wrong is enough to wear you out."

A Star for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, sometimes a very few words depict the essence of a problem so clearly that comment upon the content is superfluous. Such is the very brief and to-the-point editorial urging Hawaiian statehood which appeared in the Idaho Falls (Idaho) Post-Register of February 5, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STAR FOR HAWAII

Alaska is over the hurdle and is one of us. Now it's Hawaii's turn. Statehood for the islands, a pretty sturdy perennial before Congress, is about to enter the bill-drafting stage for the umpteenth time.

This year the odds run more strongly for it, though opposition still exists. Alaska has broken the ice and changed the flag.

Hawaii seems to present a more stable picture than in former years. Communist influence in unions appears to have waned, and that argument has faded in consequence.

With Alaska we abandoned the notion that only territory directly attached to the continental United States could be brought within the fold of States. Once we did that, then what difference whether the spread is 1,500 miles or 2,600?

By all the fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood. The issue has reached the point where much further delay cannot be explained on reasonable grounds.

Recognition Is Given to Worldwide Travel Show at Bluefield, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, next Tuesday, February 17, the Bluefield, W. Va., Automobile Club will open its Worldwide Travel Show in the Bluefield Municipal Auditorium.

Mine has been a lively interest in the beneficial effects of travel, and I was privileged to issue a statement in connection with the forthcoming Bluefield Automobile Club travel show venture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my statement to the sponsoring club.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I extend my congratulations to the Bluefield Automobile Club and its director of travel, James H. Cowan, for initiating the first Worldwide Travel Show in West Virginia. I am confident of the success of this venture. The Bluefield Automobile Club deserves the gratitude of the citizens of the Mountaineer State for taking this step to attract the attention of American travelers to the charms and beauties of our fair State.

The tourist industry offers one of the chief sources of potential economic development in the State of West Virginia, and the automobile clubs are to be commended for the part they are playing in stimulating its development.

But it is worth noting that the Bluefield Automobile Club Show is not limited by merely State or sectional interests. This exhibition is an appropriate expression of the growing interest of Americans in world travel itself, and it offers another link between us and our neighbors in other lands.

We Americans are a mobile people, and the urge to be somewhere else will hold a continued fascination for innumerable millions of folk during this next record travel year.

The once-popular song words, "I was born to wander, I was born to roam," continue to be lived by vacationers and tourists who are lured "to the far-away places with the strange-sounding names."

We Americans who live and work at such a rapid pace can find in travel refreshment for the body and renewal of the lagging spirit. We may be mindful as well of the inspirational and spiritual values that flow from travel and the act of occasionally drawing away from our daily preoccupations. For it was the Master of all mankind, who, when the pressures from expectant people tapped too deeply His earthly resources, whispered to His disciples: "Come apart, and rest a while."

Travel, however, fulfills more than the needs of the individual alone. For the American traveler has become his country's main diplomat abroad. And as a nation we are in large measure judged by our neighbors in other lands on the basis of the behavior of the American tourist. Thus, the modern conveniences of travel—the jet airliner and the luxury ocean liner—will not alone bring about a world community of neighbors. There must be global-mined people traveling, men and women disposed to appreciate and understand the customs, cultures, and the philosophies of the countries they visit.

The late Irish poet, George Russell, predicted in the 1920's that the United States would have an historic role to play, because "Americans have been the first people to adopt a planetary viewpoint." Though Russell's statement was contested by those who worried about America's apparent drift to extreme isolation, he insisted that he could detect signs that we were preparing to assume planetary responsibilities. He said, "You Americans have a vision about this planet that no other nation has ever had."

We need to understand that our 177 million citizens, comprising only 10 percent of the non-Soviet world, control over half of the world's production of goods. Therefore, our policies and our actions affect not only our own national destiny, but that of the world at large. We are challenged to thinking in world terms. We have now reached the point where we must assume the same kind of responsibility in world affairs as we are accustomed to assume in our individual affairs. If we falter, the free world falters. If we are firm, the free world is firm.

A Children's Birthday Party With Emphasis on Giving Instead of Getting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, particularly for youngsters, receiving gifts is more than half the fun of a birthday party.

However, when the birthdays of two young ladies in Forth Worth, Tex., came this year, they gave a gift instead of taking for themselves.

There is some concern these days over the rise of juvenile delinquency and many have commented on the lack of civic spirit of today's young Americans. I have always maintained that the vast majority of young people in the United States not only stay out of major trouble and are therefore never mentioned in news reports, but they are actively working to be good citizens now and training to be better ones later. Seldom do we hear of the young people who do volunteer work with churches and hospitals, work with worthy charity solicitations and perform other unselfish acts that display good citizenship. I believe the spirit of giving in asking that, instead of birthday gifts for them, the money be given to a fund to buy milk for needy children, of Misses Sheryl and Brenda Palmer is a fine example of the spirit of today's young people.

Mr. President, in recognition of these two young ladies' unselfish action and as a salute to the other fine work being done quietly by today's young people, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Catherine Gunn which was published in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram for Sunday, February 8, 1959, under the heading "Party Given by Sisters Helps Fund."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTY GIVEN BY SISTERS HELPS FUND

(By Catherine Gunn)

Fort Worth children in need of milk were remembered when two sisters recently celebrated their birthdays.

Sheryl and Brenda Palmer, daughters of Mr. and Mrs. Max S. Palmer, of 2908 Cedar Park, asked their friends to help other children instead of bringing presents to their joint birthday party.

Contributing $6.55, which went to the Star-Telegram milk and ice fund, were Cathy Leggett, Janice Morgan, Paula Daniels, Debbie Thomas, Delane Mauldin, Linda Ard, Lavon Walker, Marilyn Walker, and Carol Rogers.

Sheryl's ninth birthday was January 31. Brenda was 7 on January 30.

Business Forecast by C. B. Stephenson, President, First National Bank of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on January 5, 1959, Mr. C. B. Stephenson, president of the First National Bank of Portland, in my home city, made his annual report to the Portland Chamber of Commerce on business conditions.

Mr. Stephenson is particularly afraid of mounting and continuing inflation, a fear which I share. Inflation is especially cruel to retired men and women on fixed incomes, such as social security and annuities.

While I do not agree with all the conclusions advocated by Mr. Stephenson, he has presented an important and significant point of view which merits inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that Members of the Senate and the House may be familiar with his recommendations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of my colleagues for that purpose, and I trust it will be granted.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW FAR CAN WE GO?

(Annual business forecast presented by Mr. C. B. Stephenson, president of the First National Bank of Oregon, to the Portland Chamber of Commerce, January 5, 1959)

The year 1958 turned out pretty much as predicted. If forecasts were wrong, they were wrong in the areas of timing and the depth of our recent recession. Only a few prognosticators saw the beginning of the upturn in the spring of the year. Most took the more cautious approach and predicted midyear as the turning point.

Once under way, the rebound was sharper than experienced in previous recession periods; and as we begin the new year it would appear that this momentum will continue. There is some historical pattern for this. The record shows that these upward swings carry on long enough to include a span of the 12 months that lie ahead.

Most everyone is aboard the good-business-outlook bandwagon although there are many economists who could not be classified as highly enthusiastic. Those less optimistic put normal-size question marks after housing and automobiles and smaller-size question marks after inventories and plant expansion.

Reasons for optimism are numerous. It is rather clear there will be a continuation of consumer spending. How much of the consumers' dollar will go into consumption items and how much into durables remains to be seen. Both areas of spending should be up. The same holds true of expenditures for services.

The automobile business should do better. It certainly has had a bad time. Just when it started to get off the ground it was plagued with strikes.

Government spending can be expected to keep up its steady march. A hundred speeches of this kind could be devoted to that subject.

Inventory liquidation continued in 1958 and chances are there will be restocking before the year is out.

Estimates on the gross national product vary from $460 billion to $480 billion for the year ahead. This will compare with about $435 billion for 1958.

These estimates all confirm the somewhat monotonous predictions of good business ahead. Perhaps some of you will say that you won't mind that kind of monotony. It doesn't take any seer to read these signs; and with the strong note with which many segments of business ended 1958, one is on pretty safe ground to forecast a continuation of the recovery.

There continue at work many major forces, however, that give one concern when he looks beyond the immediate future.

I think on this occasion I will devote most of my time to some observations on long-range problems. Before doing so, however, I will speak specifically of one or two significant events of 1958 and perhaps observe more particularly regarding some of the situations within Oregon that would have meaning to you on a more individual and day-to-day basis.

What has sustained our economy here in the State in the last half year has been improvement in lumber prices, which firmed up again in December after a dip between then and early fall. The lumber business, as you know, is closely tied to housing, and housing is closely tied to credit. Credit

opened up as money eased but is still the No. 1 problem in housing. I think credit will be forthcoming, but at somewhat higher prices. I believe one of the first things to which the Federal Congress will apply itself is legislation in the area of housing. So housing starts should be greater in number in 1959, which is particularly meaningful to us Oregonians, although there appears to be no unanimity of opinion on that subject.

Construction, of course, played a strong part, and projects presently under way and those on the drawing boards will maintain a high level of employment in that industry for 1959.

A high level of farming income also helped last year. Crops were good. Prices were up only moderately.

Our centennial celebration will attract thousands of tourists. And that industry—our third biggest—should have a banner year.

We start the year with a new Federal Congress and a new State legislature. While there are carryovers in both bodies, the number of new faces likely will be greater than at any time in history.

So, again, when one takes a look at the longer-range economic picture, the first place to start is with the legislators, both State and national. What they do in coping with some of the basic problems that confront us will determine very much the long-range economic well-being of us all.

Locally the voters indicated their attitude by turning down everything that had to do with spending money. Even measures on the ballot such as for an increase in veterans' loans by the State were rejected. The State legislature will confront that declared attitude of the people and also have before it a very good report prepared by Dr. Sly and his associates on the tax situation in Oregon.

The National Congress will confront various demands that will add up in increased spending. The President has presented a budget that balances at the figure of $77 billion. Increases in the gasoline tax and in postal rates were recommended by him. It is obvious to everyone that we can't have another $12 billion deficit. And it is equally obvious that over a period of time we cannot permit the forces of inflation to keep up their persistent inroads on the purchasing power of the dollar.

Inflation is something about which everyone talks but does little. Some economists say it isn't all bad. And some go further to say any chance to curb it is remote. However, it is hard to accept the latter philosophy. Inflation is an insidious thing. In small doses it is pleasant but in large doses it is fatal.

We have just witnessed the further devaluation of the franc by the De Gaulle government. Things had gotten pretty well out of hand in France, as everyone knows. How well the people of that country will accept an austerity program remains to be seen.

Along with that devaluation came an adjustment in other currencies of the European group. This could have limiting effects on our foreign trade. Already the industrial development of many countries has begun to have its impact in world trade. An example of that is in the automobile business. Almost overnight our automobile industry has shifted from a net exports to a net imports basis. Imports now outnumber exports three to one.

Beyond that there has been some shift in general international trade against us, all at a time when the forces of inflation are still proceeding. This has some Europeans using the term "soft" dollar. The term "flight from the dollar" has appeared here and there.

Certain it is that markets we used to consider secure are threatened not only with competition from countries within the Western bloc who have learned a good deal of our know-how, but with the continuing threat of Russian competition at prices we cannot meet.

While an increase in the price of gold is not likely, I remind you that there was movement of gold out of the country during the past year and that we are being looked at very closely by our overseas friends regarding what action we may take to retard further decline in the value of the dollar.

Perhaps while we have roughly 4 million unemployed and some idle plant capacity, these influences will tend to stabilize prices.

However, the matter of inflation cannot be dismissed that easily. Somehow we have to get over the idea that we can get more out of our economy than we put into it. Responsibility for controlling inflation, it seems to me, rests squarely with the Congress. The executive branch of the Government cannot spend anything the Congress does not authorize and appropriate.

A significant remark was made a few months ago by Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, when he told his colleagues, "When you go home at the close of this session and your people complain about the high cost of living, do not pass the buck. Tell them the facts. Tell them the national debt is higher because you voted to make it higher. Tell them the dollar has gone down and the cost of groceries has gone up because you voted to depreciate the dollar and voted to raise prices."

Unfortunately there do not appear to be many Congressmen as candid and forthright as Representative CANNON. I took his remarks from a speech made recently by James F. Oates, Jr., president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Mr. Oates went on to say that the statements of Representative CANNON "place responsibility squarely where it belongs—with the Congress of the United States. It is high time that we stop fencing with windmills and concentrate our attention on the political scene where the malignancy of inflation originates * * * It is high time for those of us in the business and financial community to attack the problem of inflation at its source, first by making certain that all Congressmen undersand fully the inflationary implications of their day-to-day legislative activities and, second, by offering them vigorous support for strong public policies to preserve the integrity of the dollar."

That is forceful language. How can Mr. Oates, or I who quote him, produce not only the depth of interest but action as well on the part of us all? Many are inclined to shrug off the possibilities of doing anything with the Federal Congress.

Some say that since 60 to 70 percent of our budget goes for defense there isn't very much left to work on. But I say to you, as a businessman, that if we were to take that attitude to our respective businesses we would soon be in financial trouble. All of us have an area of fixed expense that we cannot avoid. It is in the area of controllable expenses where we have to make savings in order to produce a profit—and without profits our economy would be in a sad state indeed.

What can be done? It is not the kind of issue that prompts a march on Washington. Housewives will not parade the streets with banners reading "Stop Inflation."

One simple way, some say, would be to provide the President of the United States with stand-by controls which could be invoked if matters got out of hand. If labor unions set about for a hefty increase in wages, a control could be imposed. The same could be done with regard to a business that proposed a hefty price increase.

But would that be the way to do? If we were ever to establish price controls by legislative action and executive decree, would we ever take them away again? Maybe. True, we did have controls during wartime in the field of installment credit. But as a fixed instrument of national policy, would controls be in the democratic tradition? I don't think so. What then can be done?

One suggestion I have to make to you, unpalatable as it may be, is that no increase in spending be undertaken without a comparable increase in taxes.

Another suggestion is that the new Congress revise the Employment Act of 1946 so as to include as an objective reasonable stability in the value of the dollar. The act now makes it a policy for the Federal Government to promote maximum employment and production, and foster free competitive enterprise and the general welfare. This law is supposed to reflect and guide Congress' general economic philosophy. As it stands, it encourages the idea of maximum employment at any cost. It does not carry the implication that inflation is bad, as is unemployment. As you probably remember, the Employment Act was passed at a time when the greatest fear was of a serious postwar recession. Little consideration was given to what actually has happened—a postwar boom and inflation.

William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, on returning from a recent world tour said he ran into this question: Since America is the richest country in the world, it can afford whatever amounts are needed for the national defense of the United States and for social benefits the American public demands as well. Since Americans can clearly afford these expenditures, why don't they pay for them? That is, why don't they pay in taxes or reduce other programs instead of giving I O U's and simply printing more paper dollars?

He stated further that he was amazed to see how closely our budgetary developments were being followed in such remote areas as Thailand and Hong Kong, and how many people there knew our precise budget figures better than most Americans. He said their interest is stimulated by personal experience. They remember the stern lectures America has given foreign countries about their need to have the moral fiber to put their finances in order. He continued, it is only natural that foreign countries should be wondering if we have that same moral fiber to take the medicine we have so freely prescribed for others.

When the British, a year ago, faced a crisis of sorts, they took the bull by the horns. They applied a real stiff dose of old-fashioned monetary medicine. The discount rate was raised to 7 percent and restrictions on imports imposed. They had courage and it paid off.

America needs to pause and take a look at itself. We have had a long period of prosperity, interrupted of course by some short-lived recessions. During that period of boom the Federal Government was barely able to make both ends meet during the best of years and even with the highest tax rates in peacetime history.

We have accepted the theory of enormous Government spending as not only an essential element of modern life but as the very lifeblood of our prosperity. Business, the farmer, and the individual have all sought to lean on the special crutch of Federal aid. Even defense spending, which absorbs some 60 percent of all Federal outlays, is treated as a prop to prosperity rather than, as it really is, a necessary but horrible burden on the economy.

And so, if America is at an economic crossroads, we as voters, as well as the Congress, are to blame. More inflation will only put us on an endless merry-go-round which will some day burst under internal stresses. This is our clear danger.

So, as I conclude these remarks, I urge upon each and every one of you the very great importance of developing a dedicated interest in national affairs with particular emphasis on the vital matter of inflation. It could be the most important New Year's resolution you have ever made.

Flexibility in Approach to West Berlin Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Mr. Walter Lippmann's column in the Washington Post of February 10 emphasizes the importance of flexibility in our approach to the problem of West Berlin. Mr. Lippmann's thoughts, it seems to me, are of value to us and I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON FLEXIBILITY

(By Walter Lippmann)

The new word in western diplomacy is flexibility. It has become fashionable because just under the surface of the official formulae there is going on in Washington, in London, and in Bonn a reappraisal of the German problem. It is a wholly false picture of what is going on to suppose that the issue in this reappraisal is between surrendering and standing firm, between appeasement and principle, between being soft and being strong.

The real issue, to which the reappraisal is addressed, is whether to stand pat on positions that have become untenable or to move to new positions from which the Western Allies can recover the political initiative.

Let us take Berlin for a concrete example, remembering, of course, that it is only the focal point of the whole larger German problem. At present there are two streams of traffic between West Berlin and West Germany. One, which is much the larger, is civilian traffic. This traffic is regulated by an agreement between the West German Government and the East German Government and it is by this traffic that the civilian population of West Berlin lives and does its business. The other traffic is military. It is between the British, French and American forces in West Germany and their garrisons in West Berlin. This traffic is regulated by allied agreement with the Soviet Union.

Moscow has now said that if there is no other negotiation about the status of Berlin, it will on May 27 turn over to the East German Government its authority over the military traffic. If this is done, it will mean that at the checkpoints on the highways and railroads and canals Allied military traffic will be met by East German rather than by Soviet officials.

The immediate and specific questions about Berlin are: (1) What will we do when we meet these East German officials; and (2) what will the East German officials do about our military traffic?

This is where the difference between an inflexible and a flexible policy shows itself. The inflexibles say that we do not recognize the East German Government, and that we cannot, therefore, allow them to have anything to do with our traffic to Berlin. The flexibles reply that as long as no one interferes with our traffic to Berlin, it does not make any difference whether the official who stamps the papers wears an East German or a Soviet uniform. They add that if Dr. Adenauer can allow East German officials to stamp his papers for the civilian traffic, he is in no position to insist that President Eisenhower be more inflexible than he is himself.

In speculating about the use of force to keep open access to Berlin, the first question to be decided is whether we ought to be ready to go to war if we meet an East German official at the checkpoints on the highway. Do we fight because the official who wants to see the papers carried by the truck wears an East German uniform, or do we fight if he closes the highway? The flexibles say that a blockade of West Berlin is a fighting matter but that whether the official is East German or Soviet is not a fighting matter.

The flexibles say, moreover, that to announce you will fight about the official at the checkpoint is not a strong policy but a foolish one, and because it is foolish, it is weak. It is weak because the people of the Western World cannot conceivably be united to fight a world war on such an idiotic issue.

As we know, the mayor of West Berlin, the highly esteemed Willy Brandt, can be counted among the flexibles. He has suggested that the East German officials might be recognized as agents of the Soviet Union. An easier, and as good a way, to accomplish the same result would be to ask a Soviet guarantee of access to West Berlin until a new status can be arranged by negotiations covering the two Germanys and the two Berlins. What we want is that West Berlin should not be blockaded and strangled and that Berlin should become again the capital of a reunited Germany.

This flexible position is a strong one. We stand firm on the substance, which is that West Berlin is not to be blockaded. We are indifferent to the formalities which do not matter as long as access to West Berlin is open. We keep alive our real objective, which is not to maintain West Berlin as an island within East Germany but to restore its status as the capital city to which all parts of Germany must have equal access.

It may well be that the Soviet Union will refuse to guarantee access during the period, which would have to be a long one, when the whole German problem is being negotiated. If that is what happens, the Soviet Union will find itself in a dangerous position. It will have given the East Germans a free hand to impose a blockade, which would be an act of war, and it will be committed to come to the defense of the East Germans if they provoke a war.

This is a much bigger gamble than Moscow has ever taken before, and we need not jump to the conclusion that it will take the gamble now.

"Abraham Lincoln," Poem by Herbert L. Oberer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an original poem, by Mr. Herbert L. Oberer, of Youngstown, Ohio, which is extremely appropriate on this day, in recognition of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Abraham Lincoln—in prose and in rhyme
His praises will echo through unending time
And the things that he did and the things that he said,
Throughout all the world have been heard and been read.
When chosen to pilot our land's ship of state
The perils he faced were both many and great:
A nation divided by cruel civil war
Was restored, through his efforts, to union once more.

Abraham Lincoln—with sorrows beset;
With wisdom and patience his trials he met.
Though heavy the load he was called on to bear,
He never gave way to the gloom of despair.
In the hearts of all mankind secure is his place
For he loosened the shackles that bound a whole race.
In his life's darkest moments he never lost sight
Of the power of mercy to kindle a light.

Abraham Lincoln—his well-earned renown
Was further exalted by martyrdom's crown.
Derided by many political foes,
Unafraid and undaunted, in stature he rose,
And those who had snubbed him acknowledged his worth
When his great, benign soul winged its way from this earth;
Abraham Lincoln—how solid his fame!
Abraham Lincoln—how hallowed his name!

—*Herbert L. Oberer.*

"I Will Support and Defend the Constitution"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the September 1958 issue of Navy. This article was written by an outstanding legal scholar and successful practicing attorney and an experienced naval officer, Comdr. Robert W. Collins, USNR, of Yazoo City, Miss.

This article, entitled "I Will Support and Defend the Constitution," is exceedingly well written; and I call it to the special attention of all those who are interested in a brief, but detailed, discussion and study of this most precious document, the Constitution of the United States.

As Commander Collins points out in this article, the Constitution is the guiding rudder of our Nation.

Our Nation should heed the suggestions of outstanding men like Commander Collins endeavoring to preserve and foster respect for our Constitution. I commend Commander Collins for his excellent presentation and recommend it

to be worthy of the special study and attention of all Members of Congress as well as all other citizens of our great Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I WILL SUPPORT AND DEFEND THE CONSTITUTION"

(By Comdr. Robert W. Collins, USNR)

When I accepted this invitation to give a message on appreciation of the United States Constitution from the viewpoint of a Naval Reserve legal-specialist officer, I did so in serious thoughts and reflections on that day so many years ago when I was first commissioned in the U.S. Naval Reserve and swore "that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same."

In celebrating the 171st anniversary of the adoption of the United States Constitution, we are paying just tribute to the very foundation of our Government, that is, the Constitution itself.

On the 17th of September 1787, a convention of delegates of the people of the United States, selected from the original 13 States, adopted and made public that document, which consisted of a preamble and seven articles expressed in the language of the common law.

When accepted and ratified by those States on behalf of the people of these United States, our charter of Government came into being.

It should be remembered that the Constitution at that stage in American history was much clearer in its definition of responsibility and its imposition of obligation on its citizens and member States than at a shortly later date in our history.

Four years later there came into force and effect the first ten amendments, commonly called then and at all times since, including the present moment in history, the Bill of Rights. These early amendments did not alter in any manner the form of our constitutional government. However, they did write into the charter itself certain rights, largely of the individual, guaranteed to them by their Government in this basic compact of their own creation.

Perhaps the Constitution was better understood in its terms and in its meaning at the time of its adoption than it is presently understood, although thoughtful Americans have at all times recognized that the obligations of citizenship are implicit and inherent in the Constitution. To support and defend the Constitution is part of the oath required in all services, but it is a definite obligation on all citizens with or without a formal oath. The struggle to maintain the Constitution of the United States is an unending one, and we would do well to remember the old adage that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

As we take time from our ordinary pursuits to honor such an event as the adoption of our Constitution, it is well for us to consider whether or not the American people had the same appreciation then as we now have of this basic instrument of our lives and Government.

The people did understand the document, but the degree of appreciation and support was far from what we now have. History teaches us that only 55 of the 65 delegates of the Constitutional Convention attended that Convention. Only 12 of the 13 Original States were represented in the deliberations. Of the delegates in attendance participating in the drafting of the Constitution, 16 failed or refused to sign the document at the time of its adoption. When the secrecy was broken and the proposed plan was published, a tempest of debate over its merits began to blow. Critics fell upon it. Scarcely a single sentence or line of the Constitution escaped attack. While this public debate over the plan was in full course, conventions duly elected in the States assembled to pass upon it.

Within 3 months three States ratified it, Delaware and New Jersey and Pennsylvania, after a hot contest. Early in 1788, Georgia and Connecticut added their approval. By a close vote Massachusetts accepted it in February. Maryland and South Carolina soon followed. The New Hampshire convention, at first opposed or hesitant, decided favorably before the end of June. Nine States, the number necessary to make the Constitution effective and binding between the States so ratifying same, had now made their fateful decision. Two large States wavered. In New York and Virginia the result was long in doubt, and it was not until the late summer of 1788 that New York and Virginia ratified on the same day. Two States still remained aloof. North Carolina withheld its approval until November 1789, and Rhode Island, which had sent no delegates to the Convention, would have nothing to do with the new Constitution until the spring of 1790, when it added its own ratification. Upon that event the full acceptance of the charter was accomplished. It had stood the test of scrutiny and searching criticism and survived. Its great ideal, its great body of principles, its great hope for the human race then became the basic charter of the United States, binding and effective at the same time on all of the people in all of the States of our great Nation.

If proof be needed that the Constitution was clear and explicit, permit me to show briefly how that document provided the basic authority for the existence of that department of the Government in which we of the Navy League have particular interest. The Department of the Navy exists due to the following items:

Article I, section 8 provides:

"The Congress shall have power—

* * * * *

"(13) to provide and maintain a navy;

"(14) to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

"(18) to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

The only other reference to the Department of the Navy in the Constitution is contained in article II, section 2(1), which provides: "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."

It may be interesting to note that during its first years the Navy operated without the benefit of being a separate department. It was a great soldier-statesman who urged the creation of a permanent Navy and the founding of the Department of the Navy which was accomplished April 30, 1798. Washington's recommendation hereon contained the following language which we cherish: "To secure respect of a neutral flag requires a naval force, organized and ready to vindicate it from insults and aggression. This may even prevent the necessity of going to war by discouraging belligerent powers from committing such violations of the rights of the neutral party as may, first or last, leave no other option." The prime mission of the Navy Department was then, as it is now, to assist the people of the United States to provide for their common defense and this is one of the people's prime obligations under the Constitution.

When the Constitution was adopted our Nation was living in a period described at that time as "These are the times that try men's souls." There have been various times during our history when the expression would have been appropriate and it is particularly appropriate today. We are fortunate that the framers of the Constitution were moralists. They were to a man moralists to the degree that they held that every right has its corresponding responsibility. They knew that benefits and rights flow from the fulfillment of just and honorable obligations.

The Constitution as framed by the great convention and reluctantly and somewhat grudgingly ratified by the American States was at the same time the wisest and the noblest assertion of constitutional morality in the annals of statecraft. If the Founding Fathers were dubious of the future of that Constitution, it was not they questioned its wisdom so much as they doubted the willingness of successive generations of American citizens to accept its wise restraints and fulfill its implied and inherent obligations. Washington himself was very reserved as to the merits of the Constitution, but as months passed he came to feel that the result had been wiser than he had anticipated. After stating that the powers of Government had been wisely distributed so as to prevent any undue concentration of power in any one man or body of men, he stated that the new Government would not be other than good, "so long as there shall remain any virtue in the body of the people."

It is recorded in our history that the great delegate from Pennsylvania, Benjamin Franklin, with tears in his eyes implored his fellow delegates to sign the compact. He said in an answer to those who saw fatal objections in the Constitution: "There is no form of government but what may be a blessing to the people if well administered for a course of years, and can only end in despotism, as other forms have done before it, when the people shall become so corrupted as to need despotic government, being incapable of any other."

In these statements, Washington and Franklin were giving similar advice and warning of an earlier statesman of our colonial era. It was William Penn who expressed the same principle in this simple analogy. He said: "Governments, like clocks, go from the motion men give them; and as governments are made and moved by men, so by them they are ruined, too. Therefore, governments depend upon men rather than men upon governments."

Our Constitution, as a scheme of Government, is a Government under law, and not under men. Nevertheless, our Government depends upon its citizens to fulfill their individual responsibilities in the manner set forth in the precepts handed to us by those great early Americans we have mentioned. The Constitution is the organic expression of our national unity and has brought unbounded blessings to the millions of Americans that have come and gone.

The great English historian, Macauley, nearly 70 years after the adoption of the Constitution, made this studied criticism: "Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor." The terms of that critique stimulate my interest. What that great writer probably had in mind was the suggestion that no written document could wholly restrain the excesses of democracy. His underlying suggestion is not incorrect, but possibly it would be more accurate to State that the Constitution has proved to be more of a rudder than an anchor. No state of human society is wholly static; there was no occasion for the Constitution to be an anchor. Its purpose was, and is, to guide rather than to hold.

Another great and disinterested witness of American institutions rendered his opinion on the occasion of the centennial anniversary of the American Constitution. Gladstone, the English statesman, wrote the committee in charge of that celebration: "I have always regarded that Constitution as the most re-

markable work known to me in modern times to have been produced by the human intellect, at a single stroke, so to speak, in its application to political affairs." We have reason to consider that he believed most strongly that opinion, for earlier the same Gladstone had written the following: "The American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

We Americans and generations which follow us will do well on occasions such as this if we will remember the advice of the ancient proverb in our actions in relation to the Constitution of the United States: "Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set."

The Multitude of Government Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, unquestionably many of my colleagues have been receiving much correspondence from small businessmen complaining of high taxes, Government waste, and unnecessary expenditures. Admittedly, until the budget is balanced and the huge multibillion-dollar deficit is reduced, there can be no marked degree of tax relief. Congress and the agencies of the Federal Government however can, right now, provide some relief for these businessmen and at the same time reduce Government spending by calling a halt to the ever mounting volume of paper work imposed upon business.

Mr. President, I present the views of the editor of the Rittman (Ohio) Press on this subject, so ably stated in the editorial which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT: THERE ARE A LOT OF MAD AMERICANS

Mr. PRESIDENT: There are a lot of Americans who are just plain mad at the multitude of Government reports that have to be made out. It seems that every year they are getting more burdensome than the year before. Just ask the average businessman. He'll tell you how he feels. He is just loaded down with work in getting reports out for this department and that department.

The Government bureaucrats have learned the art of the crackdown and threats. Every report carries a deadline and a threat of a fine plus interest.

Many small businessmen have been holding up their hands in disgust. They have their wits scared out of them when a Government agent darkens their doorway.

These departments have been able to raise their budgets so they hire more agents to harass business firms.

So you lean back in your chair and say, "Why doesn't the businessman comply?" He does or else. But this working for the Government takes a lot of time and adds to the cost of doing business.

Besides business firms have to collect sales taxes for the State and they just about get their heads knocked off if they innocently make a mistake in forgetting to charge a tax on one out of thousands of sales. Or the Federal agents swoop down on the little guy who doesn't withhold money for income taxes from an employee.

Why it's getting to be criminal the way the little man is being pushed around and made to collect money from his employees and customers, which a self-respecting merchant never would do.

But the little businessman doesn't talk out loud because he's afraid of two things: Either he is afraid that these Government agents will pull further reprisals on him, or he is afraid inwardly that to protest might seem to be unpatriotic. So, he goes along and submits meekly like a Russian slave.

If he gets a heavy fine for being late with a Government report, he meekly pays it and keeps his mouth shut. He's learned that there is not much use in writing to Congressmen or Senators, because they don't get anything done to lighten up on the load or they are too busy serving on national committees drafting laws to spend more of our tax money.

Mr. President, we need relief from this type of badgering and harassment which in the past we have associated only with dictatorships.

Attacking Segregation in the North

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, no one can make the assertion that we have true equality for all races in the North. However, I am pleased to state that we are attacking the problem with a view to its solution. I hope that before long we will be able to say that true equality exists.

In this connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article written by Naomi Levine, program director of the American Jewish Congress. Miss Levine's article appeared in the January 19, 1959, issue of Congress Bi-Weekly:

ATTACKING SEGREGATION IN THE NORTH

(By Naomi Levine)

On December 15, 1958, Justice Justine Wise Polier issued a decision in the domestic relations court of New York City in a case involving de facto segregation in the New York public schools, that is destined to become a major contribution in the struggle to achieve genuine equality in education for all children, in the North as well as in the South.

In a sense this case began 2 years ago with the adoption by the New York City Board of Education of six reports submitted by its commission on integration, which conducted a series of studies to investigate the charges of the Public Education Association that the schools in New York City were in fact segregated. The reports established the fact that public schools in the North were indeed segregated, notwithstanding the Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in public schools. These segregated schools were, moreover providing inadequate and unequal educational facilities. Thus the reports sustained the charge made by the Public Education Association that the schools in New York City were not only separate but unequal.

The reports also contained detailed suggestions for eliminating segregation and for improving the curriculum, facilities, and staff of the segregated schools. While recognizing that segregated schools in the North are largely a consequence of residential segregation, the reports pointed to techniques that can be used to integrate these schools despite this factor. For example, the zoning report, while recognizing the problem of schools built in the heart of segregated residential districts, suggested techniques of rezoning, permissive transfers, bus transportation, new site selection, etc., to promote integration despite the segregated housing patterns.

The other reports were concerned largely with equalizing educational facilities for the segregated schools. The board of education and the organizations that supported the integration reports held "that improved zoning procedures, however effective in achieving more racially balanced schools, will fall short of the board's stated objective regarding integration unless equal concern and direction is given to teacher assignment, improved facilities, curriculum, proper guidance, and educational stimulation."

One of the major problems in implementing these reports concerned teacher assignments. The teacher assignment report stated simply that the needs of the children must be given preference over the needs of the teachers. As soon as this principle was announced teachers voiced loud opposition. They made it clear that teaching in the difficult schools was an unpleasant and trying experience, and they insisted on their right to choose the schools in which they wanted to teach. These vehement protests had their effect. The board of education refused to implement or even interpret any part of the teacher assignment report in a way that might suggest compulsory assignment. Instead, it concentrated its efforts on recruiting volunteers for these difficult schools. To date, the program of volunteer recruitment has been a dismal failure.

In fact, it is no exaggeration to state that the implementation of all the six reports has been profoundly disappointing. The board of education has refused to take any major step to put into effect the basic recommendations of these reports. No effort has been made to develop a comprehensive zoning plan aimed at the eventual elimination of de facto segregation. Only a meager effort has been made to improve the physical plants of the segregated schools. No real guidance program and educational motivation program has been developed to raise the academic level in the segregated schools. And no real effort has been made to improve the quality of the teaching staff in these schools.

It is no wonder that organizations and individuals which praised the board of education when it adopted the integration reports have become sharply critical. More important is the impatience of those parents whose children are attending the segregated schools and are receiving inadequate and unequal education. Several of these parents during the past year have picketed the segregated schools; others have refused outright to send their children to these schools. Several brought suits against the board of education charging discrimination and inequality; and still others have been brought into court by the board of education on charges that they willfully have kept their children out of schools. It was such a case that was presented to Justice Polier.

The facts in the case are simple. Two sets of parents, Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Skipwith and Mr. and Mrs. Charles Rector, refused to send their children to Junior High Schools Nos. 136 and 139 on the ground that these two schools offered inferior educational opportunities as compared with those offered in the schools whose pupil poulation was largely white. They asserted that this inferiority of educational facilities was caused by two conditions: de facto racial segregation and discriminatory teacher staffing. Finally, they contended that as a consequence of the situation in the two schools

the children attending them were being denied equal educational opportunities in violation of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment of the Constitution.

The board of education argued that these constitutional objectives were not properly before the court and must be addressed to the commissioner of education. The court held, however, that it had jurisdiction to consider the constitutional issues involved in the case, stating: "The board of education contends that one arm of the State—this court—must blindly enforce the unconstitutional denial of constitutional rights of another arm of the State—the board of education. Such a proposition is abhorrent to the American doctrine of supremacy of the law * * *."

The court found that de facto racial segregation exists in the junior high schools of New York City. The 2 schools involved in the case had a student population of 100 percent Negro and Puerto Rican. There are 7 additional junior high schools in New York City in which the student population is 95 percent Negro and Puerto Rican. In 40 junior high schools the student population is 95 percent white. Among the 127 junior high schools in New York City there are 16 schools with more than 85 percent Negro children and 52 schools with more than 85 percent white children. School segregation, the court observed, decreases the motivation of minority children and impairs their ability to learn. The court cited Dr. Kenneth Clark, distinguished psychologist and social scientist, who said:

"It is my considered judgment and opinion as a consequence of extensive study of segregation in schools, both in those regions of the country where segregated schools were maintained previously by law and in regions of the country where segregation in schools exists as a consequence of residential segregation or mores, that the segregated schools and the general characteristics usually found associated with the segregated schools depress the ability of children to learn, as reflected in low achievement scores, in low IQ scores, to the extent that these IQ scores are the result of what the child has or has not been taught."

The court found, too, that discrimination in the staffing of the segregated school does exist, that schools attended by Negro and Puerto Rican children are taught by less qualified teachers, and that such children, as a consequence, suffer educational disadvantages. The court noted that as of September 11, 1958, the schools with 85 percent Negro and Puerto Rican children had an average percentage of vacancies of 49.5 percent, while the percentage of vacancies in schools with 85 percent white children was only 29.6 percent. Moreover, a far greater percentage of positions in the segregated schools were filed by substitute teachers—not qualified licensed teachers.

Responding to an observation made by a school official that the board of education had no power to transfer licensed teachers, the court pointed out that the report of the commission on integration, adopted by the board of education in 1957, stated unequivocally that teacher assignment should be based on the needs of the schools rather than the preferences of the teacher. The board has no right to permit teachers to choose the schools in which they want to teach. The assignment of teachers is a governmental function and cannot be delegated to the teachers themselves. The court stated:

The board of education can no more plead not guilty than could the police commissioner if he allowed patrolmen to choose not to accept dangerous or unpleasant assignments.

Finally, the court held that the board of education has the constitutional duty to provide equal educational facilities for all the children of this city. Obviously it is not the duty of the court to decide how the board of education should achieve this; these are educational problems which the board must deal with. But they are no more difficult than the problems faced by cities like Washington, D.C., Baltimore, and Louisville, which have changed from segregated to desegregated school systems:

"Here, as there, determination, resourcefulness, and leadership can bring the situation in the New York City school system into line with the constitutional guarantee of equal protection of the laws. Until then, the board of education has no moral or legal right to ask that this court shall punish parents, or deprive them of custody of their children, for refusal to accept an unconstitutional condition which exists in the schools to which the board has assigned their children.

"I hold the defense on grounds of inferior educational opportunities in those schools by reason of racial discrimination to be established and to bar an adjudication of neglect.

"These parents have the constitutionally guaranteed right to elect no education for their children rather than to subject them to discriminatorily inferior education."

The implications of Judge Polier's decision are plain and should help to clear the confused atmosphere surrounding the problem of segregated schools. First, she makes it clear that the board of education in New York City cannot delegate to the teachers the right to decide what school they will teach in. No city can surrender its obligation of providing capable teachers for all of its schools. Second, the decision gives judicial cognizance to the existence of widespread de facto segregation in the northern schools and recognizes the evils that flow from the perpetuation of this system. It states: "The record in this case fully sustains the contention that the separation of children by race, whether it be the result of governmental action, or of private housing segregation, creates factors inimical to the full and equal educational opportunities."

Implicit in this statement is a recognition that school boards must not only seek to eliminate overt acts of segregation but must also take affirmative action to achieve genuine integration. They must view educational integration not merely as a social problem but as an integral part of their responsibilities in administering public education. In brief, they must recognize that one of the primary goals of public education in a democracy "is to promote ethnic and racial integration as a positive educational experience of which no child should be deprived."

The decision of Judge Polier goes a long way in giving the stamp of judicial acceptance to these far-reaching educational ideas. Its acceptance as the law of the land is an essential step if we are to achieve real integration in education for all children.

Forestry Conservation in Republic of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, mankind has devasted forests all during his occupancy of earth. One of the first great stands of timber to pay the toll for our recklessness was the mighty Cedars of Lebanon, of Biblical fame.

Yet, in the Middle East, where these rich groves once were destroyed, efforts are being made at conservation and restoration. This is especially true in the Republic of Israel, where a strong sense of social consciousness moves the people and their leaders in government. We in Oregon have a special interest in this situation because Oregon, with some 433 billion board feet of standing timber, is the No. 1 lumber-producing State in this Nation.

Therefore, Israel's achievements in the realm of forestry fascinated Roy J. Beadle, editor of the editorial page of the Oregon Daily Journal of Portland, when he recently toured that burgeoning new land. In an article published in the Journal of February 2 Mr. Beadle has noted succinctly Israel's program to become, once more, a forested land—to recover from the devastation of past centuries, long before the creation of the Republic of Israel.

Because conservation of trees and forests is a major obligation of the Congress and our Government as a whole, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Beadle's article, entitled "More and More Trees Vision of New Israel," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREES AND MORE TREES VISION OF NEW ISRAEL

(By Roy Beadle)

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL.—In ancient times Israel had many forested areas.

Well preserved woodlands were reported to have existed through the eras of the Roman and Byzantine occupations and up to the time of the Moslem conquest.

Then came the increase of the goat, called the curse of the Middle East. The Bedouin invasion, the Moslem civil war and the Crusades brought in their wake the cutting down of trees. During the time of the Ottoman Empire, taxes were levied on trees and on the planting of new ones.

Despite this, as recently as a century ago, what is now northern Israel had many trees, but goat-grazing, neglect, forest fires and heavy use of the ax in two world wars made heavy inroads.

Toward the end of the Turkish rule, Jewish settlers began planting eucalyptus forests, and in the period of the British mandate large areas were set aside for forest plantations.

Since establishment of the state of Israel, a stepped-up program of reforestation has been carried on.

No one from Oregon can be impressed by the trees he now sees in Israel, although the roadsides everywhere are lined with eucalyptus, part of the reforestation program.

But the Government is bent on making Israel once more a forested land. It wants trees for timber production, roadside beautification, protection against soil erosion, sand dune fixation and control of water flow.

Dr. Rene Karschon, forestry official at the Government's forestry department headquarters at Nathanya, north of Tel Aviv, told me Israel now must import 90 percent of its timber. He foresees the day when it will be able to produce 30 percent of its requirements.

What commercial tree harvest Israel now has, largely from the fast-growing eucalyptus, goes into fence posts, agricultural

stakes, telephone poles and packing cases for agricultural products.

The Government's program ahead is to plant 10 million trees a year for the next 10 years.

The forestry headquarters station at Nathanya is also a central nursery, where 2,000,000 saplings are being grown. It has a wood utilization plant and forestry research institute.

Here I met R. D. Carpenter of New York, in Israel with the U.S. overseas mission to advise the Israelis on wood utilization. He is helping them improve their methods of preserving wood. Carpenter, who had been with the U.S. Forest Service for 15 years, is acquainted with C. Herbert Stone, our regional forester. I had hoped to meet Ahmed Goor, Israel's chief forester, with whom Stone had gone to school at Yale, but Goor is out of the country.

Israel has 8 forestry districts and another 10 or 12 tree nurseries. Trees grow faster here than in Oregon, and only 1 year is required to grow saplings big enough to plant.

Israel has a program to interest its children in trees and observes an annual Arbor Day in the latter part of January, when the youngsters do ceremonial planting.

Emergency Resolution of Cleveland City Council for Program of Public Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, notwithstanding recent indication, in several phases of our economy, that a widespread upturn in business and employment could be expected, obviously there remain many soft spots where conditions are critical and may become worse. This is set forth in an emergency resolution, recently adopted by the Cleveland City Council, and which I call to the attention of the Senate; and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 248-59

An emergency resolution memorializing the Senate and the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to institute a program of public works so as to provide employment for those persons who are suffering economic hardships resulting from the present recession

Whereas, due to the present economic recession, unemployment, not only within the city of Cleveland but throughout the entire country, has risen to numbers reminiscent of the depression of 3 decades ago; and

Whereas means of sustenance could be provided to the unemployed and their families by creating employment through the inauguration of a public works program which shall be of benefit not only to the unemployed but also to all citizens throughout the Nation; and

Whereas this resolution constitutes an emergency measure providing for the usual daily operation of a municipal department: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Cleveland:

SECTION 1. That the Senate and the Congress of the United States be and the same is hereby memorialized to take immediate steps to institute a program of public works so as to provide employment for those persons who are suffering economic hardships resulting from the present recession.

SEC. 2. That the clerk of council be and he hereby is requested to transmit a copy of this resolution to each of the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Ohio.

SEC. 3. That this resolution is hereby declared to be an emergency measure and provided it receives the affirmative vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to council, it shall take effect and be in force immediately upon its adoption and approval by the mayor; otherwise it shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

Adopted February 2, 1959.

JACK P. RUSSELL,
President of Council.
THAD FUSCO,
Clerk of Council.

Approved by:

ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Mayor.

FEBRUARY 4, 1959.
Effective February 4, 1959.

America's Respect for Old Soldiers Seems To Be Fading Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, to paraphrase a much-used Army proverb: "America's respect for old soldiers never dies, it just fades away."

Right now, Americans are breaking a promise which we made to the men and women of our Armed Forces. It was a mutual trust and they kept their bargain. They worked for the safety of our homes and families as a deterrent force and, when necessary, we called on them to go into battle and they did so. They kept their part of the agreement, but by not paying equal pay to some 99,000 retired members of the armed services, we seem to be letting our respect for these people fade away. In addition, our respect for ourselves must be fading too in that we failed to keep our word, failed to keep faith with these people who believed in us when we outlined an Armed Forces retirement program.

Under the military pay bill, passed by the 85th Congress in 1958, members of the Armed Forces who retire after May 31, 1958, receive pensions based upon a percentage of the current pay for persons on active duty, which is higher than the percentage granted those already retired. A straight 6 percent increase was granted those who retired prior to that time.

Thus, two persons who were in the same service—perhaps faced identical dangers—and retired at the same rank can be paid on different scales. This goes against the old tradition of pay according to a percentage of the pay for persons on active duty.

I have joined in cosponsoring a bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the armed services. This bill carries out the recommendation of the Cordiner Report that retirement pay scales be refigured each time laws pertaining to them are changed. It has been endorsed by a number of military and veterans' organizations. It will help keep the retirement program abreast of economic conditions of the future.

When the call to face death to defend our country came, these military personnel did not fade away. And we now should not fade away when we have a chance to demonstrate our respect and gratitude for them, and what they did.

Mr. President, in support of my statements, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which was published in the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal for Saturday, February 7, 1959, under the heading "Pending Pay Legislation Would Cut Losses to 99,000 Retired Prior to 1 June 1958," and a comparison table which accompanies the article under the heading "Here's What Retired Pay Injustice Costs," with the letter of transmittal to me from the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal, dated February 6, 1959.

There being no objection, the letter, article, and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE JOURNAL,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1959.

The Honorable RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Recently your office inquired if the Journal had ever published statistical tables comparing the difference in pay for members of the Armed Forces retired prior to June 1, 1958, and those retired after that date.

We were able to furnish you with comparative statistics in the more senior grades, but discovered that we had never published a table such as you had in mind. The idea, however, appeared to be an excellent one and we have now compiled statistical information showing the differences in pay. These tables and an article pointing up the disparity between pay for the two categories of retired military personnel will be published in our February 7 issue.

I am enclosing tear sheets for your information, and with the thought that you may desire to insert the article and tables in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a ready reference for other Senators who are interested.

Sincerely,

LOU STOCKSTILL,
Legislative Editor.

[From the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal, February 1959]

PENDING PAY LEGISLATION WOULD CUT LOSSES TO 99,000 RETIRED PRIOR TO JUNE 1, 1958

Approximately 29,000 officers, 10,000 warrant officers, and 60,000 senior sergeants retired prior to June 1, 1958, will win pay increases if Congress approves legislation authorizing recomputation of retired pay on the basis of the 1958 Military Pay Act scales.

The cost of the plan has been estimated in the Senate at about $30 million. If this figure proves correct, approximately one-third of the total will go to Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps colonels and Navy captains.

At the time of the pay hearings last year, there were 7,117 colonels/captains on the

retired list with 30 years' service and another 3,283 with 20 to 29 years' service. Those with more than 30 years would receive an increase of $93.85 per month if the proposed retired pay plan is enacted; those with 20 years' service would receive an increase of $49.67 per month.

Together, the yearly cost for both groups would be in the neighborhood of at least $10 million.

The biggest single increase, $391.51 per month would go to Adm. Arthur W. Radford, U.S. Navy (retired) and to four-star officers who served as Chief of their service.

The second biggest increases would go to other full generals and admirals ($260.26), lieutenant generals and vice admirals ($188.76), major generals and rear admirals of the upper half ($156.76), and one-star officers ($112.33) with 30 years' service.

For those retired with 20 years' service, the increase would amount to $123.51 per month for four-star officers, $76.71 per month for three-star officers, $108.45 per month for two-star officers, and $136.89 per month for one-star officers.

Officers in pay grades O–1, O–2, and O–3 (except for those with 4 years' enlisted service) would receive no increase as a result of the legislation. A savings clause contained in the 1958 Military Pay Act would, however, prevent them from taking a reduction.

Among those with 4 years' enlisted service, who retired after 20, the increase would be nominal, ranging from $1.57 per month to $5.90. Those with 4 years' enlisted service who retired in pay grades O–1 and O–2, after 30 years' service, would receive monthly pay increases of $2.35 and $8.85, respectively.

All warrant officers in the 20-year-service category would receive increases ranging from $7.69 to $20.03 per month. However, only W–4's and W–3's in the 30-year-service group would benefit. W–4's would receive $14.58 per month and W–3's $14.44.

No increases would go to enlisted men retired prior to June 1, 1958, with 30 years' service and only those in pay grades E–7 and E–6 would benefit in the 20-year-service category. In the latter group, E–7's would win an additional $13.77 per month and E–6's would receive a 31-cent monthly increase.

Majors and lieutenant commanders retired with 30 years' service, before the effective date of the new pay law, would benefit only slightly from the legislation. Officers in this group now receive $471.28 per month if retired before June 1, 1958. Those retired after June 1 receive $472.50. Thus, the former group would receive an increase of only $1.22 per month.

Here's what retired pay injustice costs

30 YEARS' SERVICE

	Before June 1	After June 1	Difference
Chief of Staff	[1] $1,014.74	$1,406.25	$391.51
O–10	[1] 1,014.74	1,275.00	260.26
O–9	[1] 936.24	1,125.00	188.76
O–8	855.74	1,012.50	156.76
O–7	768.92	881.25	112.33
O–6	644.90	738.75	93.85
O–5	533.29	581.25	47.96
O–4	471.28	472.50	1.22
O–3	409.27	393.75	−15.52
O–2	328.65	285.00	−43.65
O–1	297.65	235.50	−62.15
Commissioned officers with over 4 years' active enlisted service:			
O–3	409.27	401.25	−8.02
O–2	328.65	337.50	8.85
O–1	297.65	300.00	2.35
Warrant:			
W–4	431.67	446.25	14.58
W–3	365.06	379.50	14.44
W–2	334.06	330.00	−4.06
W–1	292.72	292.50	−.22

Footnote at end of table.

Here's what retired pay injustice costs—Con.

20 YEARS' SERVICE

	Before June 1	After June 1	Difference
O–10	[1] $676.49	$800.00	$123.51
O–9	[1] 623.29	700.00	76.71
O–8	541.55	650.00	108.45
O–7	450.61	587.50	136.89
O–6	380.33	430.00	49.67
O–5	322.45	372.50	50.05
O–4	297.65	315.00	17.35
O–3	264.58	262.50	−2.08
O–2	219.10	190.00	−29.10
O–1	198.43	152.00	−46.43
Commissioned officers with over 4 years' active enlisted service:			
O–3	264.58	267.50	2.92
O–2	219.10	225.00	5.90
O–1	198.43	200.00	1.57
Warrant:			
W–4	256.31	264.00	7.69
W–3	214.97	235.00	20.03
W–2	197.90	208.50	10.60
W–1	178.61	195.00	16.39

[1] These officers were authorized by the 1958 Pay Act to recompute their pay on active duty base pay of $1,276.40 for 4-star officers and $1,176.40 for 3-star officers, plus 6 percent.

Our Government Must Live Within Its Income—A Letter From Martin Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DOWDY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from our recent colleague, the Honorable Martin Dies, which is addressed to the Texas delegation in Congress, but which I feel deserves and demands the attention of every Member of the House and Senate.

It states economic facts which cannot be controverted. I respectfully request that the letter be incorporated in the daily RECORD.

The letter follows:

OUR GOVERNMENT MUST LIVE WITHIN ITS INCOME

To the Texas Delegation in Congress:

DEAR FORMER COLLEAGUES: One of the most serious, if not the most serious, issue which faces our Nation is inflation. Whether we can survive the economic, military, and subversive aggressions of communism will depend to a large degree upon our willingness as a nation to stop inflation. Inflation has already robbed our dollar, savings, pensions, annuities, insurance policies, social security, etc., of more than one-half of their purchasing power and real value. It has increased the cost of Government more than 100 percent, thereby raising taxes more than 100 percent. As the dollar buys less and less each year, the cost of national defense rises more and more, thereby seriously crippling this country and the free world in their life-and-death struggle for survival against the disciplined forces of communism.

One of the chief causes of inflation is the Government spending more money in appropriations than it receives in taxation. This policy is responsible for our national debt of 280 billions. The more money a government owes the less its obligations are worth. One of our Government's obligations is its paper money, which is a promissory note to pay the bearer gold, or, in the case of silver certificates, silver at some time in the future. These notes are by law made the medium of exchange which gives some advantage over ordinary notes. However, just as the value of notes of individuals and corporations are determined by their solvency and financial condition so is the value of the currency notes of the Federal Government determined by the solvency and financial condition of the Government.

Since our Government has gone in debt more than all the other governments in the world and since Congress continues to spend more money than it takes in, thereby piling up more debt for our children, the money obligations of our Government have been falling in value year by year for a long time. If this keeps up for a few more years our money will be worthless and the savings of our people for old age, sickness, and for their children will be wiped out. This is more than a possibility. It is a certainty if Congress continues its spending spree. If there is any doubt about this, read the history of nations in ancient and modern times. The handwriting is on the wall for all to read but the blind.

This is a period in the early stages of inflation when the owners of equities such as stocks, land, commodities, etc., appear to either hold their own or profit from inflation. This doesn't last long. As history shows, the owners of such equities are finally wiped out. Under inflation stocks earn less and less dividends and ultimately their value is based upon dividends. Taxes on real property mount ever higher because of inflation until it makes ownership of real property unprofitable. In France and Germany, where inflation was unchecked, the people vainly sought refuge through every type of investment. They all came to the same end—bankruptcy.

The truth is that no one profits in the end from inflation except communism, and everyone is finally destroyed.

Because of these fundamental but, unfortunately, little understood truths, it is evident that your greatest duty to the people of Texas is to insist by speeches and votes that our Government live within its income and that deficit spending during these times of peace and prosperity must stop.

Is it asking too much of Congress to do what we as citizens are compelled to do?

For the sake of our country and our children we ask you to vote and speak against deficit spending.

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN DIES.

Kosciuszko: Polish-American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today, February 12, is the birthday of a great Polish-American patriot. Tadeusz Kosciuszko was one of those unique European statesmen whose thinking was far beyond his contemporary lifetime.

Above all, Kosciuszko was a Democrat in the tradition of Jefferson and Lafay-

ette. He implicitly believed in man's desire and ability to grow, develop, and become strong under the democratic form of government. Throughout his long life—February 12, 1746, to April 2, 1817—Kosciuszko devoted his entire energy and talent to furthering this belief in practical form.

Aside from Kosciuszko's leadership in Poland as well as in all of Central Europe in the cause of national and individual freedom, this great man played one of the most significant roles of any individual in America's fight for independence. He came to the United States in 1776 as a young man and distinguished himself as a brilliant military strategist, especially in New York and at the battle of Yorktown. As recognition of his services, General Washington promoted Kosciuszko to the rank of Colonel of Artillery and made him his Adjutant. In 1783, after American independence was firmly established, Kusciouszko was rewarded for his services to the cause of U.S. independence with the thanks of Congress, the privilege of American citizenship, a considerable annual pension with landed estates, and the rank of brigadier general. A year later he returned to his native Poland for many years he led the struggling Polish people in their unending battle for independence. In 1796 he came to the United States for a second visit and lived in Philadelphia until May 1798. Gaining new insights into the democratic process, he returned to Europe and made one last, but fruitless attempt to restore the soverignty of his homeland at the Congress of Vienna. At length he retired to his estates. His last act before his death on April 2, 1817, was typical of a lifetime devoted to the freedom of the individual and belief in the dignity of man. He freed all the serfs in his care, insisting only on the maintenance of schools on the liberated estates.

Today, with a world so torn with fear and ideological conflict it is well that we in the United States pause to pay tribute to a great military leader, a great statesman, and a great American. His energy, his insight and his unfailing belief in man as a rational political being provide a contemporary lesson for us all. Poland still fights in the name of Kosciuszko. America remembers.

The Cadillac for Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, recently I received a very pointed letter from Mr. E. H. Heinbaugh of Canton, Ohio, in which he expresses his complaint over incidents of free handed spending by Congress.

The letter is typical of others I have received on the same subject.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and the newspaper article referred to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANTON, OHIO,
January 17, 1959.

Hon. FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Attached you will find a clipping from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 17, 1959.

This kind of thing makes me sick. In order to pay my income taxes, I have to drive a 1956 auto. Is it possible that his highness Mr. MARTIN can't ride in an automobile that isn't air conditioned, could he not ride in a Buick or even a "Chevvy?"

If they must have a "Caddy," would not a regular model be nice enough?

Someday the legislators of this great country of ours are going to go too far with their foolish spending. It seems the more you make available to them, the more silly things they can think up to spend it for.

I pay taxes for schools, hospitals, care of aged, preparedness, etc., cheerfully, but I don't like this kind of thing and there are many that feel as I do.

From one who has voted for you many times.

E. H. HEINBAUGH.

MARTIN RECEIVES $11,000 CADILLAC

WASHINGTON, January 16.—Ousted Republican Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., ended up better off today than all the congressional leaders at least in one respect: He had the newest chauffeur-driven Cadillac limousine.

The shiny, new air-conditioned, fully equipped limousine complete with white-wall tires and extras purred up to the Capitol today. Congressional sources said it cost the taxpayers $11,000.

The House decided last Monday that MARTIN should continue to be provided with a chauffeur-driven car at taxpayers expense, even though Republicans had ousted him as their floor leader.

Some lawmakers had assumed that MARTIN would keep his 1956 limousine and that a new one would be ordered for the new Republican leader, Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana.

As it turned out, HALLECK and MARTIN both were ordered new Cadillac limousines. HALLECK's has not yet arrived.

Anniversary of the Birth of Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 12 marks the 213th anniversary of the birth of Thaddeus Kosciusko, who contributed greatly to the battle for freedom both in his native Poland and in America.

Born in Poland in 1746 and educated in the military schools of Poland and France, Kosciusko came to our shores during the dark days of the Revolution and unselfishly devoted his great ability to the establishment of freedom and independence in America.

To the cause of the struggling colonies Kosciusko brought three things: Scientific knowledge, strength of character, and unwavering enthusiasm for the cause of liberty. His contribution to the struggle for American independence was rivaled only by his fight for the freedom of his native Poland.

Today all the people of America join with Americans of Polish descent in paying tribute to this great Polish patriot. His name will live always in the hearts of all people who believe in justice, freedom, and self-government.

Extension of the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN V. CARTER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have cast my vote against H.R. 2260, the resolution which proposes to extend the present draft law for a period of 4 years and which was overwhelmingly passed by the House of Representatives. Only 20 Members of the House voted against the bill, although you and I know that there were many more who did not, deep in their hearts, favor the extension of a national conscription. This fact in itself may be indicative of the inordinate amount of influence that the past 20 years of military presence has imposed on our thinking. True, this military presence has been a most necessary one, but one nevertheless that should be continuously reevaluated in the light of these rapidly changing times.

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, that there is no longer a need for military forces. I think that we all recognize such a need is self-evident. The question is, what kind of military forces do we need? We are constantly told that the Armed Forces need highly professional, highly trained, highly skilled, highly technical, and highly motivated personnel in this age in which we live. Are those the words that describe the draftee? I think we all realize that they are not. Furthermore, I think we all realize that the average draftee never receives the incentives that will convert him into the type of person fitted by these descriptive words. The so-called incentive pay bill of the last Congress was badly misnamed. The only incentive that can be read into this bill is based on the assumption that everyone who enters the Armed Forces is convinced he will become an admiral or a general. We know that such an assumption would be entirely erroneous. Since the flag positions, which were really the only ones to substantially benefit from the incentive pay bill, are usually available only to graduates of the service academies who, presumably, are already provided with necessary incentives, there actually re-

mains little or nothing for the conscriptee or volunteer to entice him to become a career military man.

Mr. Speaker, the draft has been with us for almost 20 years now, far too long. We all know it is not being fairly and impartially administered and is far from universal in its effect. Only one of the three armed services is actually using it to any extent. So the true purpose of the draft is to act as a club to force young men to enter the Armed Forces. Those who volunteer for the Navy and the Air Force are only indicating their desire, not to faithfully serve those particular arms, but rather to avoid the rigors of Army life. Those who wait for the draft are simply saying, in effect, that they want to take the quickest way out. In either instance, the psychological approach of these young men to military service is the exact opposite of what it should be, and what I think it can be. Without the draft, the armed services would be forced to make a military career the attractive thing that it must become in order to get the type of individual they proclaim to be so necessary in this technical era. They would have to look elsewhere for the cooks, sweepers, chauffeurs, and assorted coolie labor for which today's conscripts are being used.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in youth work for a number of years, and I also have two teenage sons. I think we can all recall from our own lives and experiences, as well as those we have observed, the fact that there is a naturally occurring amount of uncertainty and indecision during the years approaching adulthood. Our draft law is simply aggravating this uncertainty and is, in fact, a substantial contributing factor to our national problem of juvenile delinquency. Our destiny and survival may very well rest in the heads and hands of the youth which are today subject to the draft. If the pitched battle for survival comes, it must surely come, it seems, within the next 30 years, or even sooner. From every quarter, voices cry out that we need scientists, educators, philosophers, artists, and political leaders to revivify the essences and guts of Americanism, and to meet the challenge of communism all over the world. But what do we do to the very number from which these people are to come? We cast over them the dark cloud of frustration and uncertainty in the form of the draft. We discourage, delay, and, in some cases, deny the steps that will lead them to lives of leadership and service in their chosen field and on a high level. Our youth can not help but wonder why we have huge armies that train and retrain, while Asian, Middle Eastern, and South American nations continue to fall under the influence, if not the domination, of communism. These youth have a vague feeling of uneasiness, to which they are probably unable to give expression in most cases, that perhaps we have here an enemy who must be fought in other ways. They are told that we are engaged in an ideological conflict for men's minds. Yet many of our youth who are sufficiently endowed to prepare themselves for this conflict are conscripted for a period of years, in which they perform menial tasks, and they either lose the impetus or the opportunity to sufficiently prepare themselves for the defense of democracy. A further perplexing factor to our youth is the fact that our Nation's leaders, whom they feel certainly must be wise men, fail to furnish them the opportunities and inspiration, even the example, as to how this enemy should be fought. Could it be that the vistas of our leadership are too limited and too interwoven with the traditional ideas of what constitutes national power to see that we are immolating much of the potential of our youth on the altar of national conscription.

Let us liberate our youth, during that period of unique vitality, to follow whatever constructive paths they may choose. Let one of these choices be a career in an attractive Military Establishment where only the dedicated and proficient volunteer can exist.

It is my sincere hope that we can eliminate these shackles and hindrances which are so repugnant to the basic Amercan concept of individual freedom and initiative, which has always been the keystone of our greatness.

Krebiozen Showdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the Krebiozen controversy remains at the "do nothing yet" dead center stage; its test committee conferences never seem to reach a true solution as to the selection of an honest method to be used to scientifically test the drug in its reaction on the cancer patient.

Meanwhile, thousands die of the malady and other thousands suffer the poisoning agonies of the putrefaction of live body tissues of the victim approaching death. No one seems to care. Certainly, no one in the million dollar fundraising cancer clinics are excited over the almost miraculous 9-year record of the Krebiozen Research Foundation's medical records; and reports of the 500 doctors who used Krebiozen in the treatment of cancer patients, all terminal cases. Yes, other doctors told loved ones, "It is hopeless, the patient will die shortly, nothing can be done. It's only a matter of time."

But there are real God-fearing men in the medical profession who love humanity and live by the sacred oath of Hippocrates.

They used Krebiozen, some secretly, in order to escape the vicious opposition of their fellows, and these kept a steady vigil over the sick, registering every change in the patient. These records are the undeniable testimonials to the scientific value of Krebiozen in cancer study:

First. Krebiozen relieved pain when sedatives failed.

Second. Krebiozen reduced the size of the carcinoma in certain types of cancer cases.

Third. Krebiozen stimulated the appetite of the patient to partake of food, thus gaining natural strength.

Fourth. It caused bed patients, 8 months abed, to leave their beds and become ambulatory.

Fifth. Krebiozen is biologically active.

Sixth. Krebiozen is the key to the arrestment and control of cancer.

Seventh. Krebiozen is one of the answers to a study of new scientific areas and methods in the fight on cancer which will ultimately result in a cure for cancer.

FEBRUARY 1, 1959.

DR. J. R. HELLER,
Director, National Cancer Institute, U.S. Public Health Service, Bethesda, Md.

DEAR DR. HELLER: First, I should reiterate that the proposal for giving Krebiozen a fair test in the cancer patient made by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS on the floor of the U.S. Senate in August 1958 was immediately accepted by the Krebiozen Research Foundation and by me (A. C. Ivy) the research adviser of the foundation.

The proposal was accepted by me without hesitation because it is based on the principles we have advocated since 1952. First, it provides for the appointment of a three-person arbitration type of committee, consisting of (1) an appointee of the U.S. Public Health Service, (2) an appointee of the Krebiozen Research Foundation who would be myself, and (3) a biostatistician who would be selected by the U.S. Public Health Service and me. Second, it provides that the committee would design a study which would give me the opportunity of demonstrating unequivocally whether Krebiozen is sufficiently beneficial in certain types of cancer patients, so that I, by judging from changes in the cancer patients, could distinguish the patients who received the contents of ampules containing Krebiozen from those patients which received the contents of ampules containing no Krebiozen. Third, the proposal provided that I would serve with physicians appointed by the committee or U.S. Public Health Service in the selection and treatment of the patients, but neither I nor anyone connected with the study would know the identity of the ampules. Fourth, the proposal provided that after completion of the study I, on the basis of a report of the observations on patients, would state which set of ampules contained Krebiozen. Fifth, the proposal provided for the publication of the observations.

Senator DOUGLAS concluded his speech with the statement that he believed his proposal was fair. We also believe that his proposal is scientific and fair.

The USPHS has not accepted Senator DOUGLAS' proposal, but has made a new proposal of its own. Without committing myself to accept the proposal of the USPHS, I agreed to explore it because I believe it was made in good faith.

The USPHS proposal contains three basic provisions. First, it provides for the appointment of an "independent committee" of five members, of which I am not a member. Second, I shall be appointed a consultant to the committee. Third, a double-blind type of controlled study of Krebiozen shall be made, the detailed methods to be designed by the committee.

The proposal of the USPHS has been explored with the following progress to date. First, a committee of five has been tentatively selected for consideration. I have agreed that the five men tentatively selected are good scientists and that they are individually honest men. I know three of them quite well. But I know only one of the

three well enough to know that he would stand for the right regardless of pressure. By this I do not imply that the others would not stand for the right regardless of pressure. Second, I have agreed to state the conditions under which I would serve as a consultant to the committee should the Krebiozen Research Foundation and I agree to accept the proposal made by the USPHS.

I have formulated and attach my conditions. They are in accordance with the principles I have been proposing since 1952 for settling the Krebiozen controversy.

The conditions in brief provide that I would take part in the design of the study which would be of the "blind type," and would take part in the selection and treatment of the patients. The attending physician and I, who would treat and observe the patients and make the records, would be given two or more lots of ampules labeled "A," "B," "C," and so forth, for administration to the patients, the key to the code being sealed and held by Senator DOUGLAS. At the end of the study, I would write a report at the end of which I would conclude which lot of ampules contains Krebiozen on the basis of the observed improvement of the patients. This conclusion would be checked with the key of the code held and sealed by Senator DOUGLAS. The report of the findings would then be published in a medical journal.

The conditions which I have formulated are based on the fact that I am the individual who has had the most extensive experience with the administration of Krebiozen to cancer patients of many types and stages and at the same time have devoted the most study to the observations made and reported by numerous physicians to the Krebiozen Research Foundation. To turn over any test to one or more individuals who are not thoroughly qualified by specific experience with a new therapy would not be a test. It would be only another experiment carried on by novices with the new therapy.

If my conditions are acceptable, the only remaining question would be the desirability and necessity of a three-man arbitration type of committee with me on it, as proposed by Senator DOUGLAS, or of a five-man committee without me on it, as proposed by the Public Health Service.

I should say that the alternative proposal made by the Public Health Service has not been considered by me to be a rejection of Senator DOUGLAS' proposal. I believe the counterproposal was made in good faith because the officials of the Public Health Service actually thought that a committee without me on it would be more acceptable to a majority of the scientific community. In other words, unless the double-blind test is done under direction of a so-called independent committee, the results would not be accepted by a majority of the professional guild. But, it may be asked: Who is going to guarantee the absolute independence or lack of prejudice of each of the members of a so-called independent committee?

What does the suggested need for an independent committee to insure the acceptance of the results by a majority of the professional guild, imply? Does it imply that the majority of the professional guild is biased or prejudiced? Does it mean that they would not accept results obtained by a double-blind test performed under conditions which are devoid of, and which cannot be suspected of, permitting the operation of conscious or unconscious prejudice? Should it be our desire to satisfy the majority of a guild, or should it be to satisfy the interests of truth, science, and humanity as soon as possible?

Obviously, it is implied that my presence on the committee would make the results suspect by the majority of the scientific community. Would my presence on an arbitration type of committee deprive the committee of its independence? Would not the results obtained by an arbitration type of committee using an experimental method in which prejudice cannot operate speak for themselves when published?

Suspicion seems to exist on both sides of this matter. One side does not want to agree to a test performed by a committee with me on the committee, and the other side does not want to agree to a test performed by a committee without me on the committee.

To neutralize such suspicion it became necessary for me to propose the performance of a double-blind test by an arbitration type of committee. I have made such a proposal repeatedly since 1952. Senator DOUGLAS also detected the suspicion on both sides and proposed an arbitration type of committee. He has proposed and has served on such committees throughout his career.

Why should anyone object to the appointment of a committee with both sides represented on it?

Someone has said "sides" should not exist in science. But the fact is that they do exist and the history of science shows that progress is made only on the basis of scientific controversy. But the controversy and skepticism should be constructive and not barren or destructive. Unfortunately, and too frequently, too much of the skepticism has been destructive in nature. In the case of Krebiozen there has been an impasse since 1952. An inexcusable, unfortunate, unscientific, inhumane impasse.

The Krebiozen side will accept the results of a test conducted by an arbitration type of committee but not the results of a so-called independent committee. The anti-Krebiozen side will accept the results of a so-called independent committee but not those of an arbitration type of committee.

This situation has been permitted to continue by responsible scientific and professional organizations and governmental groups, presumably interested in scientific and human welfare. It has continued to exist regardless of the fact that the results of a test conducted by an arbitration type of committee using the double-blind type of test cannot be rationally suspected. Furthermore, the Krebiozen side of this controversy has been clamoring for such a test since 1952.

The test has been denied because of various excuses, false rumors and fallacious analogies. For example, it has been said that I should not be on the so-called independent committee because one cannot be a party litigant and at the same time a judge. That is obviously a fallacious analogy offered in ignorance or with the intent to mislead. To use such an analogy, without the intent to mislead, is to manifest a lack of understanding of the meaning of an arbitration type of committee and a "double-blind test" in which the person who knows the most about the therapy is allowed to take part. I desire only to demonstrate, by the use of an unequivocal method, that Krebiozen has merit in the treatment of cancer.

The basic question, as I analyze the situation is: Can Dr. A. C. Ivy, working under strictly controlled conditions where an honest bias or prejudice cannot operate, demonstrate that Krebiozen has merit? I ask only the opportunity to demonstrate that I can.

Suspicion can only be dissolved by the appointment of an arbitration type of committee which will prescribe fair conditions for a fair test in which bias or prejudice cannot operate. No other way is known or has ever been tried in such a situation.

Therefore, I am forced to agree with the Krebiozen Research Foundation that for a test of Krebiozen to be fair I should be a member of an arbitration type of committee and be a party to the administration of the therapy and the interpretation of the results under conditions where bias cannot operate.

This group reiterates its acceptance of the principles outlined in the proposal of Senator DOUGLAS and is anxious to explore his proposal with you and to place it into action as soon as possible.

With best wishes I am,

Yours sincerely,

A. C. IVY,
Ph. D., M.D., D. Sc., LL. D., F.A.C.P.

CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH I WOULD SERVE AS THE CONSULTANT TO THE COMMITTEE PROPOSED BY THE USPHS SHOULD THE PROPOSAL BE ACCEPTED BY THE KREBIOZEN RESEARCH FOUNDATION AND BY ME

METHOD FOR THE PRESERVATION ON THE ANONYMITY OF THE DIFFERENT SETS OF AMPULES

Two or more sets of identically appearing ampules, one set containing Krebiozen and the other set or sets containing No. 9 light mineral oil (Standard Oil Co. of Indiana) would be given to Senator DOUGLAS. The Senator would arrange for the two or more sets of ampules to be marked with letters of the alphabet, such as A for one set, B for a second set, etc. He would be the only person to possess the key to the code. His signed statement as to the key to the code, or their designation by letters of the alphabet would be placed in a well-sealed envelope in a safe to which he or an alternate in case of his disability shall have access.

Each ampule in the A lot or A set would be labeled "A," and each ampule in the B lot would be labeled "B," etc. The ampule in each lot would be placed in identical appearing cardboard containers. In order to avoid errors in labeling, the lot of ampules containing Krebiozen would be sent to Senator DOUGLAS for labeling with the code letter of his selection on one date, and the amuples containing only mineral oil would be sent to him later, after he has labeled the lot containing Krebiozen.

The sets of ampules would be placed in a safety deposit vault of a bank or trust company, requiring two keys for its opening. One key would be kept by a representative of the committee of the USPHS, and the other by me (A. C. Ivy) so that the ampules may be removed jointly as required for use in the treatment of patients.

After a report of the study on patients had been prepared by the committee and by me (vide infra) and I had concluded which set of ampules contain Krebiozen, Senator DOUGLAS would reveal the key to his code.

MY RELATION TO THE DESIGN, CONDUCT, AND PUBLICATION OF THE STUDY

1. A study of the sort under consideration cannot be properly designed and conducted unless the objectives are clearly defined and accepted.

It is understood that the true objective of this study is to determine by the most probative method possible, whether Krebiozen is of any value in the treatment of cancer, or whether the favorable changes observed after the administration of Krebiozen to numerous cancer patients, are due to delayed effects of prior therapy or to spontaneous natural causes, resulting from variations in the natural resistance of the host to cancer.

It is understood that the objective is not to determine whether Krebiozen is a cure for cancer, or whether it is better than other forms of treatment now being used. I make this negative statement because such "straw men" or false assumptions have been proposed for the purpose of destructively criticizing past efforts.

It is understood that the most probative method for testing a new treatment of a disease (a) utilizes the experience and understanding of the person or persons who know the most about the new treatment and (b) an experimental design in which the

honest bias of enthusiasm and conviction, or the prejudice of barren or destructive skepticism, or the prejudice of face saving cannot operate.

The objective of this study is not to determine whether persons, without experience and understanding of a new therapy, can obtain favorable results. That is a secondary objective. I make this negative statement because it has been used recently as an argument against the proposal of an arbitration type of committee and a double-blind test. For example, it has been said that the test proposed by me (also that of Senator DOUGLAS) would not yield results which would demonstrate that other physicians could obtain the same results. That is a reasonable objective, but it is not the purpose of the proposed test. We now have plenty of evidence showing that many physicians obtain favorable results with Krebiozen, a matter to be considered in due season. Furthermore, who has taken a vote to determine whether a majority of the scientific community would not accept the results obtained by an arbitration committee (with me on it) using a double-blind type of study devoid of the operation of prejudice. I agree that it would be desirable to obtain results by the ordinary methods used by a majority of a scientific community. But when prejudice prevails, such methods may not be probative; then unusual probative methods must be used. In the case of Krebiozen it is known that malignant prejudice exists. (See app. I).

These objectives are important for two reasons: One reason is to test therapeutically an important scientific theory or hypothesis (see app. II); the other reason is humanitarian, namely, to establish as soon as possible whether the product called Krebiozen has any therapeutic merits in the treatment of cancer in man, and, if so, to develop the product and make it available to the physicians of cancer patients.

2. It is understood that I would be notified and expected to attend all meetings of the committee.

3. It is understood that I should have the right to approve or disapprove the type of controlled study or experimental design, in regard to whether it is devoid of the operation of prejudice and is designed to attain the objective set forth above. It is understood that I shall provide a list of signs and symptoms which would represent a minimum list to be observed by measures and subjective reports.

4. It is understood that only one type of tumor patient would be selected for study. The type much preferred by me and the Krebiozen Research Foundation, would be proven cases of primary brain tumor; cases which have been written-off by the neurosurgeon or neurologist. Such patients are preferred because they most consistently show a favorable response a few weeks after the initiation of Krebiozen therapy. The second preferred type of tumor would be cases of breast tumor with metastases to the bone but without extensive metastases to the lung. The patients should have proven refractory to the therapies usually tried in cancer therapy.

5. It is understood that the type of tumor and patient selected for treatment would be subject to my approval because I know the approximate percentages of those types of tumors and patients who respond favorably to Krebiozen as it is now available for use.

6. It is understood that the patient would be a patient of the attending physician designated or appointed by the committee.

7. It is understood that the contents of the ampules, would be administered by me or in my presence, as a consultant to the attending physician designated by the committee. It is understood that I could designate some physican to administer the drug, as a substitute consultant for me, should I become incapacitated. This is to make certain that no error is made in the lot and number of ampules the patient had been designated to receive and to avoid lapses in therapy due to unavoidable absence.

8. It is understood that I would determine the dosage rate each patient is to receive at the start of the treatment and the increases or decreases to be made after the start of the treatment. (Krebiozen is not given according to a rule-of-thumb method.) The reason for the increase or decrease would be recorded on the patient's chart by me or some physician designated by me in the presence of the attending physician designated by the committee.

It is understood that, if after 2 or 3 months there is no improvement in the condition of the patient, I shall in the presence of and with the consulation of the attending physician designated by the committee, determine whether the lettered ampule the patient has received should be changed to a letter ampule of a different lot, or whether the patient's tenure in the study be ended.

It is understood that the continuance or introduction of new adjunctive therapy, such as analgetics, sedatives and physical therapy, should be determined by the attending physician designated by the committee in consultation with me.

9. It is understood that all therapy and recommendations of therapy and all observations including my own or those of my substitute would be recorded in the patient's official record.

In addition, it is understood that I should have the right to make notes on the diagnosis, complications, past therapy, and progress of the patient, after the start of the proposed new therapy, from the official record of the patient. I desire to possess such notes for the purpose of study relative to making changes in the dosage rate of the contents of the ampules. A copy of these notes would be given to the committee.

10. It is understood that it would be preferable to have all the patients treated in one clinic in one city and certainly not more than two cities.

11. It is understood that at the conclusion of the study, as determined by the design of the experiment, I would prepare a report of my observations and would conclude, on the basis of the observations, which set of ampules contain Krebiozen. My conclusion then would be checked with the code prepared and placed previously in a safe by Senator DOUGLAS, and favorable or unfavorable it would be understood to be the criterion of the activity of Krebiozen.

12. The results would be announced jointly by Senator DOUGLAS, the National Cancer Institute, and the committee, and within 6 months thereafter published as a scientific report in the Journal of the National Cancer Institute or some other appropriate publication.

A. C. IVY.

APPENDIX I

I painfully regret the necessity of calling attention to the following proven facts or facts which can still be proven and indicate the extent of malignant prejudice regarding Krebiozen. It is necessary because many persons are not acquainted with these facts and it is only because of the existence of these facts that it became necessary to propose an arbitration type of committee to give Krebiozen a test under conditions devoid of the possibility or suspicion of the operation of bias or prejudice. These facts are the cause of the controversy and of the need of an unusual test method to end the controversy.

1. A dishonest (in part) and superficial (in toto) report on Krebiozen was published in the J.A.M.A., October 1951. These charges were established under oath and never denied under oath at the hearings of a commission of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois.

2. I (A. C. Ivy) was suspended from the Chicago Medical Society under false charges, an action later admitted by the president of the society to have been a mistake.

3. It was rumored throughout the medical world in the United States that "Dr. Ivy was off his rocker," "had suffered a minor stroke." The truth is that during the period of my alleged affliction I was the author or coauthor of approximately 65 scientific articles printed in medical journals on subjects other than Krebiozen; I have spoken on subjects other than Krebiozen at numerous medical scientific meetings, and have been on six lecture tours in Europe and three round the world including Australia. Incidentally I also took part in raising $45 million worth of medical buildings for the West Side Medical Center in Chicago.

4. A committee appointed to study the observations collected by the Krebiozen Research Foundation did not consider or evaluate the reports of the observations of three physicians, two of whom are associated with university tumor clinics, the other being the pathologist of a hospital in Chicago.

5. One cancer specialist working in a university tumor clinic treated 40 patients with proven cancer with Krebiozen. He has been prevented by his chief from publishing his observations. Even up to as recently as December 1958, he has asked permission to publish them.

6. I had three articles on Krebiozen accepted for publication by a medical journal and they were sent to the printer to set into type. Later they were rejected because the publisher did not wish to experience difficulties due to pressure from certain AMA officials.

7. I was invited by the editor of a lay magazine with a large circulation to write a brief of the story of Krebiozen. I prepared the article and it was accepted for publication by the editor with much praise. It was sent to the printer, but then returned because of pressure exerted by two AMA officials.

8. Physicians working in a large cancer clinic have written that they had tested Krebiozen and found it to be inactive; whereas they had never had any Krebiozen to test. Numerous similar stories have been told about Krebiozen.

9. One well-known physician was removed from a hospital staff because he used Krebiozen; later because he was a friend of a local newspaper publisher who came to his assistance, he was reinstated and permitted to use Krebiozen.

Other physicians have been threatened, if they should use Krebiozen.

10. The therapeutic trial of Krebiozen has been banned by numerous hospitals, though it is distributed to physicians for clinical trial according to the regulations of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act.

11. At two hospitals, part of the records of two of our "7-year cures" have been lost. At another hospital the surgeon has refused to provide to a physician a copy of the surgical and pathological report of a "6-year cure." And, these were honorable men.

12. An associate professor of medicine at a medical school under pressure gave up his study of Krebiozen and renounced the observations he had reported to the Krebiozen Research Foundation.

13. Recently I was invited to report our observations to a well-known cancer society. I accepted the invitation and was thanked for accepting. Later the program committee under pressure withdrew the invitation.

14. Former Surg. Gen. Leonard Scheele (USPHS) agreed with me, Dr. Ivy, several years ago to the effect that the situation regarding Krebiozen was so prejudiced

that it would be practically impossible to obtain an unprejudiced report by an independent committee of medical or cancer specialists. I believe hidden and open pressure would be brought to bear on the members of such a committee. I have been told orally and in writing that the pressures against me would cease if I wrote and published a report to the effect that Krebiozen had no significant value.

15. Numerous other incidents revealing almost incredible prejudice in unexpected places could be cited. For example, certain AMA officials lodged charges against Judge and Dr. Durovic with the Immigration Office to prevent them from becoming citizens of the United States of America. And, on the occasion of their taking the oath of citizenship an Immigration official read publicly these charges and reported that after extensive investigation they were found to be entirely false.

APPENDIX II

THEORY

I believe that that the existence of natural defenses in the mammalian body against cancer has been firmly established, and that these defenses may be affected favorably or unfavorably. One type of defense mechanism is illustrated by the role which autacoids, or hormones, or the glands of internal secretion play in the excitation or inhibition of the growth and spread of certain types of cancer cells before they lose their physiological property of responding to such growth controlling chemicals. Another type or group of autacoids is more primitive. They may be referred to as "local autacoids" which are resident in all the cells of the body, particularly in the reticuloendothelial cells, and are locally concerned (a) in regulating the normal repair of extracellular or intracellular injury, (b) in the prevention of the development of benign and malignant tumors, (c) in the inhibition of the local "invasion" of the cells of malignant tumors into adjacent normal tissues, and (d) in the inhibition of the growth of the malignant cells which enter the blood and lymph streams and lodge in the capillaries of distant organs.

The former type of autacoids has been exploited therapeutically in cancer for some 15 or 20 years. The latter type has not been developed and exploited therapeutically except in the case of Krebiozen. Only very recently has it been studied therapeutically in mice in the laboratory.

Krebiozen was produced on the basis of the hypothesis that it represents a product of the reticuloendothelial cells which is concerned with one of the primitive types of body defense against abnormal growth. The experimental use of products purporting to be "immunological agents" and of Krebiozen in animals and patients with cancer represent the therapeutic exploitation of the second type of body defense against cancer. The development of the Krebiozen hypothesis will undoubtedly lead to very fruitful therapeutic knowledge; Krebiozen as we understand it today is probably only an opening wedge.

Mr. Jack Mabley, the Chicago Daily News feature columnist, in a recent highly informative article, treated the Krebiozen question fairly.

[From the Chicago Daily News, January 31, 1959]

KREBIOZEN SHOWDOWN—IS IT A FAKE OR A MIRACLE?

(By Jack Mabley)

Scores of people in this country—dozens here in Chicago—who were in the agonising final stages of cancer, are leading healthful, useful lives today. They are free of cancer.

They have been, or are being treated with Krebiozen.

Krebiozen is given to cancer patients only after doctors have termed the cases terminal, when there is no hope.

In 70 percent of these cases Krebiozen is effective. Sometimes it only relieves the unbearable pain, lets the patient live his final weeks in relative peace.

Sometimes it brings total recovery.

HE'S CRUSADING FOR KREBIOZEN

These statements were made to me by John M. Davis, president of one of the Nation's major construction companies.

Davis is devoting virtually all of his time to crusading for Krebiozen. He is president of the Committee for a Fair Test of Krebiozen, 343 South Dearborn.

He has impressive evidence. He can produce a parade of recovered victims. More than 300 doctors in this country are administering Krebiozen to cancer victims.

A careful record is kept of each treatment and the 70-percent effectiveness is documented.

The names of most of the doctors who administer this drug are kept secret because they fear retribution from the American Medical Association.

This association has declared that Krebiozen is worthless.

The American Cancer Society sides with the AMA. It has refused to conduct a test of the drug and has gotten into a bitter brawl with the committee for a fair test.

EFFECTIVE, SAYS DR. IVY

The most prominent backer of Krebiozen is Dr. Andrew Ivy, professor of physiology and head of the Department of Clinical Science at the University of Illinois.

Dr. Ivy has never wavered in his belief that Krebiozen is an effective weapon against cancer.

He is not only one of the most distinguished medical scientists in this Nation; he is one of the scrappiest men in Chicago.

He now is fighting for a fair test of the drug. If the test confirms his beliefs, the Government would be able to approve general use.

Dr. Ivy believes that literally hundreds of thousands of cancer victims would be spared the horror of the disease.

Powerful forces are fighting the test.

If Krebiozen is proved effective, the AMA and the Cancer Society will suffer irreparable damage.

CONSPIRACY IS CHARGED

Charges have been made that businessmen who sought control of Krebiozen, and failed, have conspired with the AMA to discredit the drug.

The charges, if not true, are extremely libelous. Those who made the charges keep repeating them, in print and orally, and they have not been sued for libel.

The controversy over Krebiozen has been simmering for several years and is about to erupt. A showdown must come.

Someone is terribly wrong. Either the drug is a fraud or one of the worst scandals in the history of the American medical profession is about to explode.

Boy Scout Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, this is Boy Scout Week when we look back over the 49 years that scouting has existed in America. Twenty-six million people have been touched by it; nearly 5 million lads have joined up—Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, Explorers, and so forth, learning what it means to be God-fearing citizens of a free land.

This is what a Scout subscribes to when he joins up:

On my honor—

I will do my best to serve God and my country.

To help other people at all times.

To keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight.

Strong meat, perhaps—but it builds strong youth and fine men.

Nor are we the only country in which scouting flourishes. There are 7,589,183 Scouts and leaders in 67 countries of the world and there is a constant interchange among them. Could there be a better road to understanding? Could there be a better way to tie us all together under God?

Edgar Guest has painted a very descriptive picture entitled "The Boy," which I include as follows:

A possible man of affairs,
A possible leader of men,
Back of the grin that he wears
There may be the courage of ten;
Lawyer or merchant or priest,
Artist or singer of joy,
This, when his strength is increased,
Is what may become of the boy.

Heedless and mischievous now,
Spending his boyhood in play,
Yet glory may rest on his brow
And fame may exalt him some day;
A skill that the world shall admire,
Strength that the world shall employ,
And faith that shall burn as a fire,
Are what may be found in the boy.

He with the freckles and tan,
He with that fun-loving grin,
May rise to great heights as a man,
And many a battle may win;
Back of the slang of the streets,
And back of the love of a toy,
It may be a Great Spirit beats;
Lincoln once played as a boy.

Trace them all back to their youth,
All the great heroes we sing,
Seeking and serving the truth,
President, poet, and king,
Washington, Caesar, and Paul,
Homer who sang about Troy,
Jesus the greatest of all,
Each in his time was a boy.

The Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this is an appropriate day to recall a statement by Abraham Lincoln which represents one of the guiding principles in his private life and a basic tenet of his approach to government

In 1843, Mr. Lincoln said:

As an individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest, and next, no one left to borrow from, so it must be with a government.

Certainly no one can dispute the effect of continued borrowing on the finaces of an individual. No one can hope to live forever by borrowing, for he will in truth be eaten up by interest.

It is likewise true that governments cannot continue to live by borrowing. We are in our third decade of the era of deficit spending. Since 1930 there have been only 6 years in whieh the Federal Government has lived within its income. Yet in the recent years this country has recorded unparalleled growth and prosperity, and in such times of record-breaking income, both individuals and governments must seize the opportunity to retire debts.

We are faced this year with a precariously balanced budget. It is doubtful that the budget will remain balanced in view of the action by Congress on the first few spending bills which have been brought before the two Houses. Many responsible persons in and out of Congress feel that unless there is bold action to balance the budget this year and in the immediate future, there will never again be a balanced budget.

I share the view that we are reaching a financial crisis, that if we are to remain a nation with strong economic policies and a sound dollar—or perhaps I should say a sound 50-cent dollar in view of past inflationary spirals—we must act boldly and strongly.

Accordingly, I am introducing a resolution on this anniversary of Lincoln's birth which would set the wheels in motion for a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget except in war or other grave emergency.

I do not feel a sense-of-Congress resolution or any other act of Congress can do the job, for it is agreed that an act of one Congress does not necessarily bind succeeding Congresses. We must put this resolve—if the people express their desire for it—in such a way that it cannot be circumvented in future years.

My mail shows a growing concern by persons throughout the country about inflation and deficit spending. I know other Members who also report the same trend. People realize you cannot live forever on borrowed money and they know that Uncle Sam cannot either.

I urge my colleagues to let the people decide through their State legislatures whether they want to continue deficit spending and inflation or whether we will live within our income. Let the people decide and then we will do their bidding.

An Address by Hon. M. A. MacIntyre, Under Secretary of the Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a very interesting and informative address delivered by Hon. M. A. MacIntyre, Under Secretary of the Air Force, before the Yale Law School Alumni Association, at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York City, on January 30, 1959.

The address follows:

Gentlemen: You are a part of a privileged group—the people of the United States. This group to which you belong has the highest material standards of living in the world. It has, within the past 50 years, absorbed and harnessed, to a degree which no others have, the automobile, the radio, and the airplane. It is now somewhat indigestibly absorbing TV, air conditioning, and advanced electronics. But it has yet to put in perspective, real or imaginative, the rockets and missiles of the space age which is upon us.

Like all other breakthroughs in human knowledge and reasons, we know they are usable for good or for evil, for peace or for war. To such alternate ends has the automobile been directed—and the airplane.

On the vistas opened by the space age to peaceful purposes I will not dwell. They are, however, legion in imagination and had we time we could dream together.

But it is the more immediate military significance of this age that I should like to discuss with you. I say immediate because trips to the moon, while perhaps essential to assure a knowledge of outer space and an ability to deny to others its uses for other than peaceful purposes, are still somewhat ahead of us in time. But the rocketry which creates the capability for orbitting satellites and probes to the moon and beyond is here right now. And it has present convertibility to the launching of intercontinental ballistic missiles with atomic warheads.

It is, therefore, appropriate and exceedingly timely that we be realistic about these weapons; their effects upon our other weapons; our military capabilities, and the policies which such capabilities can and must support.

First of all as to the characteristics of the missile itself. In range it will suffice to span the distance from the United States to Russia, East or West, and vice versa. It will travel such distances in approximately 30 minutes. The shorter range, the so-called IRBM, or intermediate range ballistic missile, will travel its 1,200-to- 1,500-mile range in 10 to 12 minutes. While initial warheads will not be as large as those carried by long-range bombers they will be many times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb. Their accuracy, dependent on radio or all-inertial guidance, is a matter of experience but can be well within the destructive range of their warheads. Their overall reliability—that is, the chances of a successful launch, flight, and impact in an expected circle of probable error in one continuous operation—is, as you might expect, dependent likewise on experience, but could be very high. However, high probability of accuracy is more important than reliability of launch. Two or three missiles can take care of one target if the accuracy is sufficient.

These are formidable dimensions of speed of attack, warhead power, accuracy, and reliability. Clearly, the warhead size, degree of accuracy, and degree of reliability will become more refined and we must, in our own self-defense, seek the utmost refinements with the greatest intensity. The sputniks and lunik alone reveal the power and guidance which others have already successfully achieved.

Clearly, any of us can conclude, from our own test shots of Atlas, our first ICBM, and the sputniks, Explorers, and lunik, that operational intercontinental ballistic missiles are around the corner. Unlike the initial atom bombs, we will not be the only possessor. How many we or they will have or could have and by what dates I do not propose to discuss. Such matters involve not only intelligence but alternative considerations of operational concept and assumptions as to accuracies. They affect numbers but are immaterial to other important general implications which are being drawn, some erroneously, which I will discuss.

These implications must, in particular, be measured against our expressed national policy of depending upon an ability to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our choosing. It would be wrong to assume, however, that this means we must take the first blow on the continental United States. The President himself has stated that he sees no reason for saying we necessarily have to accept a major nuclear attack on the continental United States before we can act.

It is conceivable the first blow at us might not involve the continental United States as it could be a blow at the forces of an ally. We are, in short, under all circumstances undertaking to have a capability to exercise retaliation at our discretion. This is the heart and soul of what is spoken of as the deterrent. And militarily the basic ingredient is the capability to destroy, or substantially so, those major forces which could destroy us—not just some forces, or the peripheral forces. All our forces—land, sea, and air—contribute in varying degree to this deterrent. The force which today contributes in the greatest degree is the Strategic Air Command and its bombers. This alone today can reach to and destroy the inner core bomber forces and military targets that represent the only forces which militarily might prevail over us.

It is only natural that, in the transition of thought from these present day bombers to missiles having the characteristics I have described, some might draw the implication that our deterrent can rest solely on the possession of forces which, after initial attack upon us, could survive to assure retaliation by general devastation. This I believe would be a diluted deterrent. And I come to this conclusion by reason of the intensive nature of the concept, whether or not it be assumed that bombers give way to missiles, under sea or underground, as the backbone of such survival forces. For the danger of the concept is this: The survival forces that could indeed effect general devastation are so relatively small that they might not be capable of the substantial destruction of the major military forces of intercontinental bombers and missiles available to devastate us. Even though we are firm in our principle to strike only in retaliation for injury inflicted upon us, we must have this capability of destroying our enemy's ability to destroy us, or our deterrent can never be exercised except at the expense of our own destruction and our opponent would know this.

As Henry Kissinger and others have pointed out, an effective deterrent only exists if there are the forces to carry it out, the will to do so, and the belief of the opponent that both the forces and the will exist. But will an opponent believe that we would unleash our forces if our military capability is known by him to be limited to devastation capability and is not sufficient to prevent him from devastating us in return? And even if he did believe us, would we be as firm in the face of peripheral prods at the Berlins and Formosas or at the bargaining table?

It would, therefore, seem that we cannot allow the missile age to deflect us from attempting, within the confines of that age, to maintain the capability of neutralizing the bomber and missile forces that could devastate us. This will be difficult and many different weapons and means must be considered—including the airplane, the submarine, and the missile. The composition of such a force is, of course, on a quite different premise and many of its elements may indeed

be vulnerable or unsuitable for a pure survival force, expected only to exact a toll of devastation in retaliation for a nuclear blow struck at us.

The role of the airplane, which may more and more itself become a missile platform, is quite flexible for an infinite variety of attacks, particularly upon targets whose locations are not accurately known. It provides the means to bring human perception and judgment closest to the target. It is susceptible in quantity, of 15-minute alert and in lesser quantity of airborne alert. Whether, and the extent to which such measures plus dispersal now well under way, improve the bomber posture depend to great degree on the equally timely receipt of warning. The ballistic missile early warning we are building in the far north and other measures are designed to achieve this objective. The anti-ICBM missile on which ARPA and the Army are working and which is a problem of great difficulty could further add protective coverage. These considerations serve to highlight other less obvious but very important as well as correct implications of the missile age.

Until the advent of the missile, forces which could survive an attempted direct attack on them, generally speaking, were of the same character as those which would be usable prior to any direct surprise attack. But the compression of time and distance brought by the missile involves a closer and separate look at the before forces and the after forces.

It has been suggested that the missile age involves a further withdrawal to fortress America rendering overseas bases and installations useless. The emphasis, of course, is upon the compression of time for attack at shorter ranges than in the case of the continental United States. There seems to be also the countersuggestion that since the missile age may bring an assured retaliatory stalemate of devastation there is more need than ever for bases from which to be prepared for local aggression.

It is, of course, conceivable that it might become impossible for any one power to prevent retaliatory devastation by another. This is another way of stating that one cannot substantially neutralize the military forces of an enemy, which I do not now concede. But in any event, it is difficult to see how this increases the likelihood or scope of what are loosely called limited wars. Limited wars, there may certainly be, where the capability of one participant is limited as to the nature or number of weapons possessed. These, however, seem extremely limited and outside of the outright Communist bloc where the limitations are solely imposed by the discretionary will of the dominant partner, now and in the future. There is, of course, the exception of Communist China as a present and continually growing special case. Possible, if we were to assume a stalemate in capability of devastation among the major powers, encouragement of satellites or the growing independence of Communist China could precipitate more intense indirect aggression and local conflicts. Certainly our experiences when in possession of a strong deterrent cannot lead us to believe that we will need any less bases under a stalemate.

Part of the very reason I do not make the concession of a possible stalemate is the existence of those overseas bases and forces. Our allies and our forces among them, scattered throughout the world, represent a necessary target for our potential enemy that is a far more complex job successfully to attack by surprise than would be the continental United States alone.

Let me now, if I may, briefly summarize what I think is good defense thinking in the missile age.

First, our national policy does not require, nor does any intrinsic military deficiency, that if an aggressor makes an attack upon us or our allies overseas, we must grant him the advantage of an attack on the continental United States before launching our nuclear missile retaliation.

Second, were we to accept a military posture that limited our forces only to those which, after a surprise missile attack on the continental United States, would be sufficient to enable us to effect general devastation, we would then possess a deterrent, but a less believable one than when the capability to neutralize his major military forces of intercontinental bombers and missiles is possessed.

Thirdly, the missile age requires forces measured separately for capability to neutralize substantially the military forces of a potential enemy and for assurance of general devastation after surprise attack upon us.

Fourthly, whether or not the before attack missile age forces can be created and whether or not, therefore, a stalemate is created, limited conflicts controlled by limited capacities or limited willingness of indirect aggressors will require allies and bases throughout the world either to meet the prods under a stalemate or to complicate the surprise attack burden of a common potential enemy.

Abraham Lincoln—Tadeusz Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, we have gathered here today in the Halls of the Congress to observe the 150th birthday anniversary of the 16th President and one of the greatest sons of our country, Abraham Lincoln. On this day, also, we commemorate the birthday of a famous adopted son of our country, and a hero of the Revolutionary War, Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko.

In their backgrounds, Lincoln and Kosciuszko were far apart. Lincoln was born in a log cabin in Kentucky, received little formal education, and advanced from his humble originis to the highest office in our land.

Kosciuszko, in contrast, was born in Poland, of a well-to-do family, and received excellent education. He was a graduate of the Military Academy in Warsaw and the Military School of Artillery in Paris. Unlike Lincoln, he was principally a soldier.

But in spite of their divergent backgrounds, Lincoln and Kosciuszko were alike in their love and liberty and justice, and in their belief in the dignity and basic equality of men.

It is these convictions which they shared, and for which they lived and died, that have earned them our love, gratitude, and honor.

The lives of these two men, and their achievements, are well known to all of us. I shall not endeavor to repeat them. I would, however, like to bring out one point which seems very significant, and very pertinent to the problems which our Nation, and the rest of the free world, face today,

Both Lincoln and Kosciuszko were involved directly in tremendous struggles to assure the freedom, and the unity, of our Nation. And they both clearly realized, and so indicated in their speeches and writings, that those wars were not fought solely for the sake of the then-living generations. Those wars were fought so that generations to come could enjoy liberty, justice, and progress in a free, democratic, and united nation.

We, too, are involved in a great and terrible conflict: the conflict between the free world and communism. The outcome of this conflict may well determine the survival of our Western Civilization, and the survival of the priceless heritage which came to us through the efforts and sacrifices of men like Lincoln and Kosciuszko.

We must realize and remember, therefore, as they did so clearly, that what is at stake in this conflict is not only our own future, but also the future of our children and of our children's children for many generations to come. Our actions today will determine the framework of the society in which they will live for decades and even centuries to come.

With God's help, and a firm stand and willingness to sacrifice on our part, we may preserve our heritage and pass it on to our children, so that they too will be able to enjoy liberty and justice.

This is our responsibility. God give us strength that, inspired by the example of Lincoln and Kosciuszko, our Nation today and in the days to come may live up to that responsibility.

Treasury Bows to Market—Avoids Long-Term Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been urging that the Treasury Department increase the interest payable on U.S. savings bonds—E bonds—at the same time waiving the payment of income taxes on such bonds provided that the bonds are not redeemed for at least 10 years after their maturity.

On January 7, 1959, I again introduced bills which would accomplish the foregoing. They are H.R. 596 and H.R. 597, respectively.

The following article by Leslie Gould, financial editor of the New York Journal-American, points up the necessity for enactment of these measures. The article appeared in the New York Journal-American of January 30, 1959:

TREASURY BOWS TO MARKET—AVOIDS LONG-TERM ISSUES

(By Leslie Gould)

The U.S. Treasury in its newest financing—$15 billions—faced realities and passed up for the time being any further switch of the debt into long-term securities.

The two previous long-term offerings—last spring and earlier this month—missed the market.

DEBACLE IN BONDS

Last year's long term issue resulted in a demoralized market, from which it has yet to recover. The crackup last spring and summer was one of the worst debacles in bond market history.

The long term bonds sold earlier this month are selling below the offering price even after a 2-day rally in governments.

The Treasury could hardly take another crack on the head or a kick elsewhere on the anatomy.

NEXT FINANCING APRIL

The new financing is all in short term securities—3-year 4 percent notes and 1-year 3¾ percent certificates. This is a "roll-over." The new securities will be issued only in exchange for maturing issues. There will be no cash subscriptions.

Outside the regular short term bill offerings—none of which will be for cash under the new Treasury policy—there will be no more Treasury financing until April. The Treasury, to meet payrolls and other cash needs will have to come into the market then.

EIGHTY AND ONE-HALF BILLION DOLLARS DEBT DUE

The Treasury in the year ahead has more than $80½ billion in securities maturing, including the issues to be swapped for the new offering. This $80½ billion also includes nearly $2 billion in E-bonds, and $1¾ billion in savings F and G bonds.

The Treasury is on the spot, largely as a result of its failure 5 and 6 years ago to refinance more of its debt into long term issues. Then it could have financed at around 2½ percent. Now it has trouble getting money at 4 percent.

The Federal Reserve has had a role in this, putting up money rates.

LITTLE GUY GETS ONLY 3¼ PERCENT

What the Treasury and the Federal do sets the pattern for the money market. The public fails to realize this, and when investors see Government bonds dumped because of the changing interest pattern they put part of the blame on a flight from the dollar. If there ever is a real flight from the dollar, the Treasury will be in trouble. So, will everyone else.

One thing the Treasury can never explain is why a little E savings bond investor can get only 3¼ percent for his money—and then only after holding his bonds more than 8 years—while large bonds nearly 9 years—while large institutional investors now can get 4 percent.

Unemployment Still No. 1 Domestic Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, this year I have received many letters asserting that inflation is the great No. 1 domestic problem. The President in his budget message proceeds on the assumption that inflation is our greatest danger. By legerdemain or juggling, he has apparently submitted a balanced budget. Other people contend that international communism is our greatest problem. I know that the fear of inflation and the fear of international communism are disturbing a great many people. However, in my area, the problem of unemployment is a serious one. The problem of unemployment appears to me to be the major domestic problem in my congressional district. My opinion is fortified by the results of a questionnaire which I forwarded to the voters of my district during the early part of January. In response to one of the questions, I received a very alarming answer. I asked the following question:

In connection with your standards of living, are you employed full time, employed part time, unemployed, or retired?

I have tabulated the answers and I find this alarming situation. Sixty-four percent of the people declared they are employed full time, 8 percent indicated that they are employed part time, 8 percent are unemployed, and 12 percent stated that they are retired.

It appears, therefore, that the domestic problem of unemployment is still a major problem in my area. This is in the great city of New York where the country feels prosperity abounds. The percentage above, if projected, indicates that my area is suffering from lack of employment, either fully or partly. Sixteen percent of those who responded to my questionnaire declared that they are not employed full time. An additional 12 percent are on fixed incomes inasmuch as they are retired.

The problems of my district apparently are problems throughout the United States. We must not relax in our efforts to expand our economy and to provide measures for the relief of the unemployed. Throughout the United States reports are heard that unemployment is still the No. 1 domestic problem.

In the February issue of the magazine, The Laborer, there was this illuminating editorial. I set it forth for the reading of all those who wish to know what is going on. After reading it, they will be better informed as to what they should do:

Unemployment, someone once said, is like an iceberg. The chunk that rises above the surface—the actual unemployed—is only a small part of the story. Resting quietly beneath the jobless waters are the bewildered, hungry faces of millions of children and dependents of the unemployed worker.

As the year 1958 rang down, the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Statistics issued its last report for the old year on the number of unemployed—4,100,000, or 6.1 percent, of the labor force.

Coinciding with the release of unemployment figures, President Eisenhower issued his seventh state of the Union message to Congress. The theme running through the entire message was the need to balance the budget. During the reading of his message the President was applauded some 27 times, but the only unanimity of applause in the heavily Democratic Congress occurred when the President stated that there would be no retreat on Berlin.

HOPE OFFERED

When the President had finished his message the consensus was that Congress had a major task ahead on the economic front.

One hope for restoring jobs to the unemployed came soon after Congress convened last month when Representative ALBERT RAINS, Democrat, of Alabama, introduced an omnibus housing bill.

If passed, the bill would provide $500 million a year for 3 years for slum clearance and urban renewal, with a clause providing an additional $100 million accelerator fund to be added at any time. This compares with the administration's proposal last year for a $250 million annual program, with the Federal share declining in later years. The bill would also remove some restrictions on the public housing program; provide $500 million for the Federal National Mortgage Association's special assistance program for purchase of some housing mortgages; set up a new loan program for housing for the elderly, and provide $500 million for the college housing loan program.

Another area where the unemployed can hope to find employment is in airport construction (see January 1959 Laborer). The Democrats in the Senate have already listed Federal aid to airports as a top priority on their 1959 calendar. Also, the Democratic leadership has promised dollars and cents aid to depressed areas of our country.

A recent edition of a leading business magazine has predicted a half billion dollar economy by early 1960.

Early in its story, the magazine announced that the economy is "moving up again, somewhat anxiously and hesitantly, but in a healthy and broad-based way." Near the end of the article, there was a section on unemployment. One of the reasons given for the rise in unemployment during the postwar years was technological advances. It was noted that technological unemployment, not a serious threat to wage earners yet, can expect to be felt more and more in 1959.

AUTOMATION BLAMED

One of the industries hardest hit by technological advances has been the auto industry.

A Michigan State University professor, reporting on the large number of layoffs in this industry, says that he has firsthand knowledge of "auto workers with 12 years' seniority who haven't been called back to work yet. The feeling is that only those with 10 years or more seniority will go back to work this year." Others evidence of the inroads automation has made on this industry is the fact that auto makers are turning out cars with only 75 percent as many machine tools as it used in 1953.

The hardships presented by automation should be a joint labor-management problem and should look to a solution from these two groups.

Relief for the displaced worker could be sought through a program to help the worker find new employment elsewhere or to retrain him, if he is capable, in the new technology. Those who cannot be retrained and are not young enough to look elsewhere for work should be retired at an earlier age.

Studies conducted by the Department of Labor in industries where automation has made the biggest inroads, e.g., the baking and chemical industries, have brought out one salient fact—the necessity to give workers sufficient notice of an impending automated program. Many workers then have a chance to make up their minds whether they will train for new jobs, take downgraded jobs at the same pay, or find other employment opportunities.

The year 1959 offers a clear cut challenge to all members of organized labor to see that the unemployed worker does not remain a mere cipher lost in an impersonal maze of statistics.

For the record, we will here cite the December 1958 report of the Department of Labor on unemployment and then next year perhaps we can return to these figures to check for any signs of improvement.

The increase in unemployment was the largest since June 1958 when 500,000 workers were added to the jobless rolls.

WORKWEEK INCREASED

Manufacturing employment dipped by 50,000 to 15.7 million mostly because of seasonal declines in canning and food processing.

The factory workweek increased three-tenths of an hour to 40.2 hours, bringing average weekly factory earnings to $88.04, a new high.

Insured unemployment for the week ending December 27 was 2,811,467.

Estimates indicate that about 200,000 persons exhausted their regular jobless benefits in December, compared to 180,000 in November.

As this issue of the Laborer was going to press, the President submitted his budget to Congress. In the $77 billion balanced budget the President called for:

A breathing spell in starting new public works projects. Federal expenditures for public works in fiscal 1960 would be the highest in history, but the President said "no additional funds are proposed in 1960 for starting new water-resources projects, general office buildings, and veterans' hospitals."

A glowing picture was painted of the employment of our people and resources at high levels, but no mention was made of the unemployment problems facing our country. The budget message further proposed an end to the emergency spending to extend jobless benefits and stimulate homebuilding. The President said a new plan for loans and grants to depressed areas will be submitted to Congress shortly.

An increase in interest rate on GI home loans from 4¾ to 5¼ percent.

Federal aid for school construction was not mentioned in the budget message and it is assumed that there will be no Government funds for this purpose. However, Arthur Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said "the issue is not foreclosed."

Estimated receipts in the budget were placed at $77.1 billion and expenditures at $77.03 billion, for a surplus of $70 million. If realized, it would be the third Eisenhower budget in balance. Four have shown a deficit.

Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to implement the seven recommendations made by the President in his civil rights message of February 5, 1959.

This proposed Civil Rights Act of 1959 constitutes a moderate, practical, sound, and, I believe, generally acceptable step forward.

First. Title I would make it a criminal offense to interfere with the exercise of rights or the performance of duties under orders of U.S. courts in school desegregation cases.

Second. Title II of the bill would make it a Federal offense to cross State lines to avoid prosecution or confinement for destroying or attempting to destroy by fire or explosive any structure used for educational or religious purposes. This legislation will clarify the authority of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to assist local enforcement authorities to track down the perpetrators of such offenses.

Third. The President has said that the right to vote is the keystone of democratic self-government. Title III of my bill will require election officers to retain and preserve for 3 years all records and papers which come into their possession relating to elections involving candidates for Federal office. The measure will also authorize the Attorney General to demand their production for examination and copying with recourse to the courts in the event of noncompliance.

Fourth. In establishing the Commission on Civil Rights, the 85th Congress provided that the Commission shall terminate its existence not later than 2 years and 60 days after the date of the enactment of the Civil Rights Act. This would mean that in the absence of an extension the Civil Rights Commission would, at the latest, cease to exist early in November of this year. The President has recommended, and title IV of this bill will accomplish, a 2-year extension in order that the Commission may adequately perform the job for which it was created. The bill also provides for the President and the Congress to be advised in an interim report to be submitted not later than September 1, 1959, as to Commission activities as of that date.

Fifth. Title V will give legislative stature and independent existence to a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts. The 15 member Presidential Commission would be authorized to continue and to expand the work which has been done in recent years to promote equal job opportunity in the performance of Government contracts without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin.

Sixth. Title VI of the bill would appropriately amend Public Laws 815 and 874 of the 81st Congress, which authorize Federal payments to school districts which provide free public education to children whose parents reside or work on Federal property not subject to State or local taxation to include children of members of the Armed Forces whether they reside on Federal property or not. This title will also authorize the acquisition of certain school buildings as rental property, to be used for providing for children of military personnel education necessitated by the closing of the public schools.

Seventh. The final substantive title, title VII, will authorize the Federal Government to provide technical assistance to States which prior to the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954—Brown against Board of Education—maintained segregated schools and which seek to comply with the decision of the Supreme Court. It would accomplish this purpose by making Federal grants available to the States. Also, at the request of the States or local agencies, the Commissioner of Education would be authorized to provide technical assistance and information in the development of desegregation programs and upon request of such officials will initiate or participate in conferences dealing with the educational aspects of problems arising from desegregation of public schools.

As indicated at the outset of this statement, I am convinced that this bill is a sensible, middle course which the Congress should look upon with favor. I sincerely hope it will receive consideration at an early date.

The 20th Anniversary of Marian Anderson's Concert on the Steps of the Lincoln Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, today Members of Congress have joined in tribute to the man whom many Americans regard as the greatest figure in the history of our country, Abraham Lincoln.

We have heard a distinguished American, Carl Sandburg, speak on the 150th anniversary of the birth of a man who has been described by Walt Whitman as "the grandest figure on the crowded canvas of the drama of the 19th century."

Mr. Sandburg declared just a few days ago that Abraham Lincoln took the word "liberty" as precious, saying in 1858:

Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms. Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere.

Not only, Mr. Speaker, is 1959 the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. It is also just 20 years ago that Lincoln's memory was honored in a concert on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, a concert given by one of the grandest figures on the crowded canvas of the drama of our century, Miss Marian Anderson.

It seemed to me most fitting that Miss Anderson, one of the world's greatest musicians and one of America's finest citizens, should be invited to sing at the joint session of Congress today when we commemorate the birth of Abraham Lincoln. For this reason, last month I wrote a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Arrangements on the Joint Session urging that Miss Anderson be invited. I am pleased to say that I understand the committee did extend to this great lady an invitation and that only the pressures of the late hour prevented her being with us today.

I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point my letter to the chairman of the committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 29, 1959.

The Honorable FRED SCHWENGEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCHWENGEL: I am writing to you in your capacity as Chairman of the Committee on Arrangements on the Joint Session of Congress for the commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

It is my understanding that your committee has invited former Presidents Herbert Hoover and Harry S. Truman to take part in the ceremonies of February 12, 1959, and that your committee has also arranged for participation in the ceremonies of the distinguished American poet, Mr. Carl Sandburg,

and the distinguished American actor, Mr. Frederick March.

I wish to congratulate you and your colleagues on your plans for honoring the memory of this towering figure in our country's history.

I should like to suggest, however, that you invite another distinguished American to take part in the activities of February 12—Miss Marion Anderson, one of the world's greatest musicians and one of America's finest citizens.

I was among those who on May 26, 1957, watched Marion Anderson receive the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws from the President of Saint Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana. The degree citation read in part:

"Arturo Toscannini said of Marian Anderson that a voice like hers happens once in a hundred years. The distinguished composer Sibelius protested that the roof of his house was too low for her voice * * * Chiefs of State representing their people have celebrated her public triumphs. At the invitation of our own Government, Marian Anderson has sung to honor the visit of royalty, the return of a hero from a war and the inauguration of a President."

Miss Anderson has indeed served our country nobly and in many capacities, most recently as an Alternate Delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations. She won much friendship for the United States by her 1956 and 1957 concert tours in Europe and the Far and Near East.

Her accomplishments are many and could be multiplied and, as the President of Saint Mary's College said in 1957, "All these achievements Miss Anderson has accomplished in a spirit of profound Christian faith."

It was just 20 years ago, in 1939, that Marian Anderson gave her now legendary Easter concert before 75,000 persons in Washington, D.C. She sang from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial.

I believe it would be most fitting for your committee to invite Miss Anderson once again to sing in the shadow of Lincoln's memory as the Members of both Houses of the Congress of the United States join to pay tribute to the man who is the symbol of America's dedication to freedom.

I hope, sir, that you and your colleagues on the committee will invite Miss Anderson to take part in the ceremonies of February 12, 1959, before the joint session of Congress.

With highest regard and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN BRADEMAS,
Member of Congress.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, February 12 marks a very special day for all of us who cherish freedom in our hearts. I am proud to join in commemorating the birthday anniversary of Tadeusz Kosciuszko, who fought for freedom on two continents.

Kosciuszko was born in Poland on February 12, 1746. Benefiting from an education in Poland and in France, the 30-year-old captain of artillery joined with the American patriots of 1776 in support of the great moral and political principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

A skilled military leader and a tireless fighter for human liberty, he served with distinction at Saratoga, Yorktown, and Charleston. Through his talents he became a brigadier general in the Continental Army.

When it seemed that there was hope for the cause of freedom in his native Poland he returned to join the struggle. Although the small but inspired Polish army fought gallantly against the Russian hordes, defeat was inevitable. After an imprisonment of 2 years in Russia, he returned to America in 1797 for a brief visit. He formed a close friendship with Thomas Jefferson who wrote of him:

I see Kosciuszko often. He is the purest son of liberty among you all that I have ever known.

The next year he returned to Europe to champion once more the cause of Polish independence. He died in exile in Switzerland in 1817.

To Kosciuszko, the gallant fighter for the cause of human freedom, we offer this tribute to perpetuate his memory and our gratitude.

Birthday of a Great Patriot, Leader, and Revolutionary War Hero: Thaddeus Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, today, February 12, we commemorate in this country not only the anniversary of one of our great national leaders, the great emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, but also we commemorate the anniversary of a great American Revolutionary War hero and patriot, who came from his native land to help us with the liberty for which we are today so grateful, Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

It is indeed significant that the fight for freedom and democracy which brought about the independence of this country caught fire across the seas and rallied to American standards outstanding men from other countries who shared our sentiments. One of the greatest of these was Kosciuszko, an outstanding military engineer, whose efforts contributed toward the military fortifications at West Point in 1778, and who played a prominent part in the decisive Saratoga and Carolina campaigns of the American Revolution. In recognition of his great service to American independence, Kosciuszko was made a brigadier general in the American Army by Congress on October 13, 1783.

After he returned to Poland, Kosciuszko, with the same spirit of freedom, became one of the great champions of Polish independence, leading his countrymen in uprisings against their Russian and Prussian oppressors.

But the brave Polish fight for independence faced heavy odds from totalitarian aggressors, and General Kosciuszko was driven out of his homeland and died in exile in Switzerland in 1817.

On this anniversary of his birth let us pause today, Mr. Speaker, to pay honor to the memory of a great and gallant Polish officer who left home, friends, and fortunes to serve the cause of freedom in this country. May his memory remind us that the cause of freedom is indivisible, and that when the freedom of any country is menaced the freedom of all men is menaced.

Just as Kosciuszko left home to fight for American freedom, may we in days to come dedicate our energies and resources to the end of restoring freedom from Communist oppressors to the Polish homeland which he loved so well and served so faithfully.

Restoration of the Historic Relationship Between Pay of Active Officers and Pensions of Retired Officers of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to the following editorial which appeared in the February 10 issue of the Washington Post, Washington, D.C. This editorial sets forth effective and convincing arguments as to the need for restoring the historic relationship between the pay of active officers and the pensions of retired officers of the armed services. I have introduced H.R. 703 to accomplish this objective. Many other Members have introduced similar bills. I hope that this legislation can be given an early hearing by the Armed Services Committee.

MILITARY PAY AND PENSIONS

Thirty-one Senators and 25 Representatives have opened a campaign to remedy a serious defect in the military pay bill passed by Congress last year. Their objective is an amendment to the legislation that would restore the relationship between pay of active officers and military pensions. The law ought to be changed in fairness to officers already retired and in consideration of the importance attached to retirement benefits by men pursuing military careers.

Congress modified a 100-year-old military tradition that retirement benefits should be related to active duty pay when it provided 6-percent increases in benefits for officers who had retired before June 1, 1958, and continued the pay-benefit relationship only for persons retired after last June 1. The Cordiner Committee report on military pay noted that "military retirement and its firm tie-in with active duty compensation is perhaps the most powerful long-term career incentive existing within the military compensation system."

It would cost $30 million this year to restore this relationship, and the cost would decline in succeeding years as death de-

creased the number of retired officers affected. This is not too high a cost when it is measured in terms of a strengthened career military service and the moral obligation to officers who retired in years past.

Agricultural Production Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a very courteous letter from the president of the Ellis County Farm Bureau in Texas. Attached to this letter was a pamphlet attacking the direct or compensatory payment approach as a basis for a farm program.

Since there is obviously much misunderstanding as to this program as well as to the alternatives that are available and especially since I have introduced a direct payment plan for cotton, I have felt that I should attempt, as best I can, to explain the proposal and to point out some of the answers which will suggest themselves to the charges in the pamphlet.

I have written a rather comprehensive letter on this subject to Mr. Joe B. Shirley. The letter, which is self-explanatory, follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1959.

Mr. JOE B. SHIRLEY,
President, Ellis County Farm Bureau,
Waxahachie, Tex.

DEAR MR. SHIRLEY: Your letter of the 6th, together with the attached statement or circular condemning production payments as "a long step toward socializing agriculture" was just received. I deeply appreciate the fine, fair attitude which you and the other members of your local bureau expressed. I recognize that the production payment approach, like all other agricultural programs with which I am acquainted, has imperfections and weaknesses, but for a good many years I have been trying to compare the strength and weakness of various programs and I think that it must be on a comparative basis that we must make our decisions. If I am right on this, we must then answer these questions: (1) What programs are available? and (2) Which program offers us the most?

Basically there are but three approaches to the farm problem:

First, there is the philosophy of laissez-faire—no controls and no supports. This is what the President and Mr. Benson both strive to achieve, although they would not reach their goal immediately. This means that we would abandon all controls over agriculture and all efforts to support agricultural prices and farm income. It has a very strong appeal for most people and I think that I would support such a course were the farmer not the only element in our economy who is called upon to operate without any stabilization of his income.

If it were possible for the farmer to buy in a completely free market, uninfluenced by governmental regulations, minimum wages, price floors, Government profit assuring contracts, etc., then I think that I would be compelled to agree that the farmer should have no more protection than is accorded to labor, industry, and commerce, but we do not live in that kind of a dream world. The farmer buys in a market of administered prices—that is, prices that are determined in a large degree by governmental actions. Certainly the minimum wage laws directly affect the price of what a farmer pays for a tractor. Certainly the policy of guaranteeing remunerative contracts to the producers of missiles, atomic weapons, etc., adds to the farmer's taxes. Certainly the Railroad Retirement System adds to the freight bill on everything that the farmer buys, as well as everything that he sells, and he pays the freight both ways. The average income of people on farms is today only $1,027, while the average income of people not living on the farms is $2,040. In other words, the average person on the farm is making just one-half as much as the person not on the farm and one-third of all of the income of people on the farms comes from nonfarm sources.

To deliberately adopt a policy that would still further decrease this pitifully small farm income, while holding nonfarm income to its present levels, is so contrary to my feeling of right and wrong that I cannot seriously consider going back to the freedoms of 1932.

The second basic approach to the farm problem is that of the Agricultural Adjustment and Soil Conservation Act of 1937 (fundamentally the present system). It consists basically of an attempt to balance supplies with demand; first, by controlling the acres of crops produced, and, second, by removing any remaining surplus into Government warehouses through a nonrecourse loan. In the case of cotton and wheat the loan establishes the market price. This is our present system. It has, of course, undergone a great many changes as to the exact degree of controls and the level of Government assistance (the loan). Its distinguishing mark, however, remains the same—the use of a nonrecourse loan to secure for the grower the desired level of support.

Mr. Benson, the President, and Mr. Shuman have all urged that this supplemental governmental support should be reduced, and it has been reduced very materially during the present Eisenhower administration. The amounts paid farmers for their cotton, corn, and wheat is far less than it was. The reduction in the rate of Government loan has not, however, achieved any of the promised savings to the taxpayers.

It has not reduced Government costs. Prior to January 1, 1953, the loan support program of our six basic commodities had cost the U.S. Government nothing for the entire 20 years previous. On the contrary, the Commodity Credit Corporation had accumulated a small profit of $13 million as a result of its support of these commodities. Since 1952, and through 1958, the losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation have amounted to approximately $2,500 million in its support operations involving the six basic commodities.

This reduction in the support prices has not reduced surpluses as it was claimed that it would. On the day Mr. Benson became Secretary of Agriculture the stocks and commodity loans of the Commodity Credit Corporation amounted to $2,452 million. On January 1 of this year the stocks and loans of Commodity Credit Corporation totaled $8,710 million and the President's message to Congress said that by July 1 they will exceed $9 billion. In other words, flexible supports, always flexing downward, have not only aggravated the farmers' problems; they have been terribly expensive to the taxpayer.

I am well aware of the fact that the American Farm Bureau Federation has urged that we cut our supports entirely loose from the parity concept and, instead, let them drop year by year to a point 10 percent below the level of prices for the preceding 3 years. For any commodity, the price of which is actually supported, this means progressive reduction until we reach a point as low or lower than the support price itself. It could only require a few years to make every support price which fixes the market price totally ineffective. In his message to Congress the President supports this approach but asks that it be speeded up.

He asks authority to lower supports 25 percent below the market price "in recent years." In the case of every basic commodity this would mean that in 1 year he would eliminate all effective supports and would drop the support price to a figure below the present market price. We don't have much need for support prices when we can get more on the market.

Obviously, if it were possible to bring the supply of farm commodities to a sufficiently low level, it would be possible in most cases of commodities, except cotton, to raise the price to almost any desired figure, but as a practical matter farmers do not have the resources to accept the drastic cuts that would be necessary. With its far greater resources the oil industry has used this device very successfully. It is called "proration" in our oil laws.

I stated that at this time it would not be practical to reduce the production of cotton to a point where we could force the price to a remunerative level, because to do so would result in a greatly increased use of synthetic fibers. Our mills would simply use less cotton. This, of course, is not true in the case of wheat, where the public is not going to turn to corn meal, even though the price of wheat were doubled. It is for this reason that I have felt that we stood in special need of a better system of maintaining cotton income, but I think it is clear that our present method of maintaining all farm prices is ineffectual. On this point I agree with the President and with Mr. Benson, although I think that their active sabotage of the program has come a long way toward proving the case that they wanted to prove.

Third. We now come to what seems to me to be the only alternative—that is, direct compensatory payments to adjust the difference between farm income obtained in the open competitive market and the level of income which has been predetermined to be the nearest attainable approach to a fair income.

This is not, as Mr. Benson and Mr. Shuman have tried to indicate, some new plan, nor was the inclusion of such proposal in the plan suggested by former Secretary Brannan anything new or unique. At that time this method had been used in the case of sugar for something like 15 years before Mr. Brannan suggested that it be expanded, and it was only about 5 years after Mr. Brannan made this suggestion that the present Secretary of Agriculture proposed that this method should be used to support the price of wool. It is doubtless a pure coincidence that wool and sugar are major crops in the State of Utah—but I am sure that Secretary Benson would not knowingly advocate a program which be considered to be either wicked or ineffective for the farmers of his home State.

The sugar program, which has been in effect for 22 years, uses production quotas to prevent the overall quantity of sugar from becoming too great and direct Government payments to make up the difference between the world price and 98 percent of parity. It has resulted in a very stable market for sugar, very acceptable returns to the producers, and reasonable prices to consumers. The wool program, the extension of which our own Texas sheep and goat people vigorously supported this year after having opposed the original bill, does not involve any production controls because there is no foreseeable danger of growing more wool than we want, but

it has resulted in returns to wool growers in excess of 100 percent of parity and has enabled woolen fibers to sell at price levels competitive with foreign wool and with synthetic substitutes. It was presented to the Congress by the present Secretary of Agriculture, who seems to feel that it would be quite wicked to use a similar program for cotton.

I recognize that there are a great many difficult details involved in working out a comprehensive program for all crops. I think that anyone can point out defects and difficulties in the administration of any such program. I have not tried, or at least I have not been successful in producing, an overall payment program that I want to present as worthy of public support, but I have worked out the details of a compensatory payment program for cotton which I am happy to defend. I have proposed that we go ahead with cotton because it cannot use some of the other programs as effectively as can other commodities. This is because of the competitive situation to which I have already made reference.

That there may be no misunderstanding, the bill I have introduced on cotton, H.R. 3684, does not undertake to increase the amount of money that we are now authorized to spend. I would like to see every commodity bring the farmer a full 100 percent of parity. Until we can do that, I don't think we have met our full obligation, but I also recognize that it is important to protect our taxpayers. This bill only proposes to support the price of cotton at 82 percent of parity—approximately the support level of the past year. The best calculations I can make, this can be achieved without any increase whatever in our expenditures, but it would mean that all of the money spent in the way of subsidies would go directly to the producer—the American producer—the farmer.

As it is now, we are paying out vast sums in direct subsidies—more than one-half billion dollars during the first year of the present cotton support program, but that one-half billion dollars did not go to the farmers. Most of it went to pay storage and carrying charges. I don't know why our taxpayers should be burdened with this storage. The President says that the present program is going to result in storage charges of more than a billion dollars a year and undoubtedly if we continue the existing program, those costs will increase and not decrease. The direct payment program would eliminate all storage charges except on commodities that we have already accumulated. That would be a tremendous saving to start with.

Another matter of importance is that these vast expenditures are not providing competitively priced cotton for American mills. Our cotton is not competitive with synthetics in the mills of Carolina, but we are subsidizing cheap cotton into the mills of Italy, Germany, and Japan. What is there about a subsidy to these foreign mills that makes it sound and just, while a subsidy paid directly to American farmers is, in the opinion of the writer of the sheet you enclosed wicked and immoral?

I am not going to undertake to discuss the whole problem of supports for all agricultural commodities, but I do want to attempt to discuss the criticisms contained in the sheet you sent me as they relate to the cotton program which I have proposed in H.R. 3684 and which I am sponsoring.

The crux of the support provided by this bill is found in the provisions requiring the Secretary to make equalization payments to the first buyer of cotton from a "cooperator." This means the first purchaser of cotton from the farmer, and the payment required is the difference between the average market price for the preceding calendar week and 82 percent of parity. The bill contains provisions to protect the Government from payments to any buyer who has not passed the payment on to the producer and provides a limitation of $5,000 on the payments made to any one producer in any 1 year. This means that the largest producer will still receive payments on about 200 bales of cotton and that everyone who produces less than that amount would receive payments on all of his cotton.

The bill provides that we will maintain a minimum national acreage allotment of 16 million acres, which will be increased if the demand for cotton increases. So long as the present existing surplus exists, the allotment will be decreased by the equivalent of 1 million bales, this for the purpose of eliminating the surplus Mr. Benson has built up. As a matter of protection against losing anything good that we have, the bill will retain an emergency loan provision at not more than 3 percent less than the estimated average world price. Obviously, no one would take advantage of such a loan except as a means of financing holding operations. The bill does make provision for continuing the existing loan level if for any reason funds are not made available for carrying out the provisions of the act. I believe you will immediately see that many of the objections raised in the circular are not applicable to this bill.

The first of the so-called basic objections raised by the author of the circular is that direct payments "would stimulate production, depress market prices, and make farmers dependent on congressional appropriations for all their net income." This bill does not encourage excessive production—in fact it retains all of the production limitations that we have at the present time and in spite of repeated statements by Mr. Benson, Mr. Shuman, and others to the contrary, the assurance of a high price for cotton has never resulted in overproduction. On the contrary, our largest crops have been grown when prices were low and when it was known in advance that they were going to be low. The largest cotton crop this Nation has ever had was produced in 1937, with a support price of 52 percent of parity. According to the logic of this circular, we should have imported cotton in 1937. There have been many years since that time when there have been much higher prices and when there was no control on the production of cotton, but we have never approached the production of those low price years. The reason is that when a farmer who is growing cotton or any other cash crop in a one-crop country (and that is where most of our basics are grown) finds that he is faced with a lower price, he tries to make up in volume what he expects to lose in price. I believe that wheat farmers, tobacco farmers, peanut farmers, and others will react exactly like cotton farmers react and will try to maintain their family's living standards through increased production when they see lower prices coming. In my opinion, this assumption that a fair price for farm products will automatically result in overproduction is the fatal defect in the Bensonian philosophy. If Mr. Benson and Mr. Shuman are correct in this assumption, how do we account for the tremendous increase in surpluses that have been produced by our farmers in the last 6 years, during which time farm prices have been constantly declining? Of course, the reference to depressed market prices is entirely dependent upon the assumption that supports would result in overproduction.

The complaint that it would make farmers depend upon congressional appropriations has no more validity when applied to a direct payment program than it has to the present program. Our present loan support program is entirely dependent upon congressional appropriations. So is any other program that depends upon the Government. A direct payment program, costing the same amount of money as the loan program, is no more dependent upon congressional appropriations than the existing program. In either case, Congress must appropriate money to keep the program going, and it is an insult to the intelligence of the American farmers to suggest that they do not know that the present program is dependent upon congressional appropriations. How do we get the money to pay our present export subsidies; how do we get the money to pay the losses of Commodity Credit Corporation, if it is not from congressional appropriations; and what would happen to the present program if congressional appropriations stopped?

Point 2 in the circular criticizes the Talmadge plan because it is limited to the six basic commodities, but point 3 condemns the expansion of a program to cover all commodities as being tremendously expensive. I have not introduced a compensatory payment bill for anything except cotton, but I think that some of the figures that are used to condemn a general compensatory program are quite misleading. Of course, the cost depends upon the level of support one achieves, but I think we might get some idea about what the cost will be by considering the fact that the total gross farmers received from marketing of all farm products in 1958, including livestock and milk, amounted to somewhere between $25 billion and $32 billion (there is a difference in the figures of the Department and the Census Bureau). Let us take the larger estimate. The average price of all farm products was approximately 82 percent of parity. If we guaranteed the average of all farm income at 82 percent of parity, as provided in my bill, for cotton, this should have involved no cost at all in 1958 except to bring up some of the lowest priced items. This, of course, is a far cry from the $8 billion to $16 billion suggested by the circular. As a matter of fact, $16 billion is just about exactly one-half of the total gross value of all farm products. Since it would only take an increase of 20 percent from the value of all farm products to bring the average to 100 percent of parity, it seems to me that somebody has been figuring with a very dull pencil. Of course, I know that last year's price level is not stable. Mr. Benson says it will go up, but I rather expect it to go down, and on the six basic commodities the shift from our present loan-supported prices would naturally tend to reduce the world price and make the spread somewhat greater, but I think you can readily see that these figures seem to be for propaganda purposes only.

The fourth objection is that this program would result in cheap food. As far as I can see, cheap food is highly desired. It seems to me that if we are going to spend tax money on an agricultural program that it makes more sense to let that tax money result in lower prices to the consumers rather than using their money to force up the very prices those same citizens must pay. I don't think that we can long expect to have the support of the consumers of the big cities for a farm program that is based upon and must inevitably result in forcing their prices to higher levels. While I am firmly convinced that our consumers are buying the greatest bargain of history in the food they consume, I think that Secretary Benson has done a magnificent job of convincing them that they are being robbed, and, as I see it, the chances of losing congressional support for a farm program are far greater if we continue to rely on forcing up consumer prices than if we offer our consumers a program in which they will at least feel that they have some selfish interest.

Of course, the last statement on page 3, "Because it would encourage inefficiency, its ultimate effect would be high priced food to consumers," is a gratuitous and unsubstantiated conclusion that nobody will attempt to establish on the basis of fact. Have the wool and the sugar programs re-

sulted in a decrease in the efficiency of Utah farmers?

Point 5 is the one that is discussed at greatest length by the author of the pamphlet and is doubtless the basis of much of the real opposition to this proposal. The author of the pamphlet states that "Production payments would lead to a ceiling on opportunity in agriculture and a leveling of producer income." He bases this conclusion on the assumption that any direct payment bill would have a limit on the size of the payments, and he assumes that any such limit would be bad. I think he is correct in assuming that Congress is going to place a limit on the size of payments whether they are made through direct payments or whether they are made through a continuation of the present program. I think the American people are about fed up with seeing one wheat grower draw $330,268 and one cotton farmer draw $1,167,502, and this is particularly true when these large producers are so frequently heard to proclaim that if the Government would leave them alone they could produce and sell cotton for 20 cents and wheat for $1. I think it is true that some of these large producers, Mr. Benson's "efficient farmers," can produce and sell commodities substantially lower than the average sized farmer can. Therefore, it seems to me to be logical that we should extend our help to those who need the help rather than to those who say they do not need it. But in the final analysis a limitation on the amount of payments is no essential part of a direct payment program and should stand or fall on its own merits.

The sixth objection, "Any temporary advantages that might accrue to individual farmers as a result of a payment program would be short lived," seems to be open to the same criticism that applies to the last part of the first point—that is, exactly the same suggesions can be made in regard to the present program. Certainly our present cotton allotments have value to the extent that they result in increasing the income of the holder of the allotment. These advantages can be transferred by sale of the land under the present law just as truly as under a direct payment. As a matter of fact, they have been incorporated into the capitalization of farm values. This is particularly true of tobacco allotments. I can see no way where it can be fairly argued that direct payments would change this threat unless it is admitted that the direct payments would be more advantageous to the farmer and therefore more valuable. If that is true—and I think it is—it seems to me to be a good argument for using the direct payments.

The seventh and last criticism of course relates only to those programs that involve payments on the domestic portion of production. The bill I have introduced applies to all cotton grown regardless of where it is sold. I don't think it makes a great deal of difference to the producer where his cotton finally goes. What he wants to know is what he is going to get for it. I might, however, point out that spokesmen for the American Farm Bureau Federation have repeatedly urged the payment of a direct subsidy on all cotton that is exported. Certainly this involves a much more serious basis for criticism as dumping then would the payment of subsidies at home, and it does not put the money where I think it should go—that is, into the pockets of the farmers.

I have gone into a considerable amount of detail, discussing the effect of this program and the objections that the pamphlet you enclosed has made because I know that you are seriously and sincerely interested as cotton producers, and I believe that you should hear both sides of this argument. I may have overlooked some important points. If I have, I will be glad for you to suggest them to me. On the other hand, if I have been able to answer any of the points raised by the opponents of this bill, I hope that the Ellis County Farm Bureau will avail itself of the much advertised democracy of the Farm Bureau system and express your local views in favor of the program that will be of the greatest benefit to Ellis County cotton producers. If you don't agree that that is a direct payment program, ask yourself what system will better serve your needs. If you find a better program, support it and let me know what it is. I want to support it too. And finally, carefully note that the unsigned author of the pamphlet did not suggest anything better. It, therefore, seems to me that as far as this article is concerned, all you have to choose from is the production payment plan, or a continuation of the present program with low supports, reducing farm income, high priced, and consequently noncompetitive, cotton, reducing the market for cotton at home and a direct subsidy system for the benefit of foreign purchasers.

Thanking you, and with best wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely,

W. R. POAGE,
Congressman.

National Advertising Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, this being National Advertising Week, I think it is most appropriate to bring to the attention of the Members a letter I received from Robert Kearns, sales manager, WIBW radio and WIBW–TV, Stauffer Publications, Topeka, Kans. While Mr. Kearns topic is mainly advertising taxes, he does clearly state the role advertising plays in the growth of our economy. I strongly urge that each Member take the time to read Mr. Kearns' comments.

The letter follows:

WIBW, WIBW–TV,
Topeka, Kans., February 2, 1959.

Hon. WM. H. AVERY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: Recently, I had occasion to write to your attention in regard to a subject of advertising taxes. We have known each other for many a year and as you know, this profession provides my income as well as the income of many thousands of Americans. Undoubtedly, this subject will rear its head throughout this session of Congress or some session of Congress in the next several years.

Recently, I was reading a book entitled, "The Story of Advertising," written by James Wood and in this volume I ran across some interesting things in regard to the subject. I will quote from page 112:

"The dual taxation of newspapers through most of the 18th century and the first half of the 19th century acted restrictively on advertising in the English press. The taxes first levied in 1714 were increased at various times so that by the year 1804 the newspaper tax was 3 pence, and the tax on every advertisement inserted in a newspaper was 3 shillings and sixpence. The principal effect of these taxes on knowledge was to keep the news from the many and to keep the products of British manufacturers, multiplying under the stimulus of the industrial revolution which overtook England between 1760 and 1800, from reaching wide domestic markets."

It has been written as you know, BILL, by some great men in this field that advertising is information and from the paragraph quoted about the trials and tribulations of advertising taxes which, by the way, in the year 1836 was reduced, I believe that certainly in our lifetime could put a curb on industrial expansion and growth. Advertising has a prime duty and responsibility of keeping America's economy on a growing cycle and letting more and more people know about new products and urging them to buy these products so that prosperity continues to grow in this very wonderful land.

I thought I would pass along these few thoughts so that in the event you had the opportunity to speak on behalf of the advertising profession that you would have a source of information.

Thank you very much for past courtesies and lots of good luck in 1959.

Sincerely,

BOB KEARNS,
Sales Manager.

Housing for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a housing bill which should be of substantial assistance in relieving the shortage of housing for elderly persons and in increasing rental housing and related special health facilities for elderly families. My bill is directed toward the accomplishment of two objectives:

First. Assistance in obtaining more liberal FHA financing for the construction of rental and sales housing, especially designed in whole or in part for our senior citizens; and

Second. Provision of adequate health and medical facilities as an integral part of such elderly family housing projects.

This bill makes a substantial amendment to the existing FHA program for Section 213 cooperative housing, and in addition, provides for an entirely new FHA insured-loan program for elderly family rental housing and for nursing homes. The program for improving the financing of elderly family rental housing is set forth in a new section proposed for inclusion under Title II of the National Housing Act, as amended.

This new section, 229, would increase the dollar limits on insured loans for elderly family rental units and provide for insurance of a loan up to the full replacement cost of a project as estimated by FHA. A significant change from existing law is that this bill provides for FHA insurance of loans for both profit corporations and nonprofit organizations. Present law is limited to nonprofit operations.

In my bill, the maximum interest rate would be 4½ percent and a priority of occupancy is assured for elderly persons or families—60 years of age or over. At

least 50 percent of the units in such a project would have to be especially designed for occupancy by elderly persons.

By special definition, the mortgage on an elderly family rental project would be able to cover structures and facilities designed for assisting the elderly occupants in the care of their health. These special facilities would be such structures as infirmaries, inpatient or outpatient health facilities, therapeutic facilities or such other facilities as the Commissioner of FHA might approve and deem adequate to serve the elderly occupants of the project.

In addition, my bill amends the existing law on cooperative housing to provide than an FHA section 213 cooperative housing mortgage, for either sale or rental housing, can cover the cost of special facilities which are of the type I have just described. In this way, a cooperative housing project which, in many areas of the country, is an ideal vehicle for the supply of low-cost, liberally financed housing suitable for our senior citizens, will be even more able to serve their needs. Existing law already permits cooperative rental projects to cover needed commercial and community facilities. It makes sense, therefore, to add this further provision and thus make possible in its most beneficial way, the availability of cooperative housing for our elderly families.

In one further way, this bill should prove of real assistance for elderly family housing projects. I have included provisions in this bill which have already received the approval of the other body, covering a new program for the insurance of a loan for the construction of a nursing home especially directed toward the care of elderly persons. In my bill, I have included in addition, however, a provision directing the FHA to encourage the construction of such nursing homes at or near the site of elderly family housing projects. In particular, I am anxious for the facilities made available by these FHA programs to result in coordinated and integrated projects of most benefit and economical use for our elderly families. Wherever possible, I feel, that projects of housing designed for our senior citizens should be set up so as to become a fully equipped community for their better enjoyment of life.

I would hope in the future that a program can be devised, using private financing and private construction but with the insurance provided under the FHA programs, so that our large, single family housing projects under the basic section 203 of FHA, can be developed as planned communities including the facilities and services, with FHA financing aid, if needed, that seem best suited to the majority of the occupants for which the project is built.

Let me note that the amendments to existing law which are contained in this bill and the provisions of a proposed new program for FHA rental housing, are no burden upon current budget proposals in any manner whatsoever. At the most, in the long distance future, there is, of course, a contingent liability as now exists on all FHA insured loans. Experience has demonstrated conclusively, however, that the security of the construction, coupled with the debenture system of FHA, are more than adequate, together with its very substantial financial reserves, to protect the Government's interest, without drain, in any way, upon taxpayers.

Railroad Workers' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, a committee of this distinguished House is currently considering a measure vital to the interests of the railroad workers of America. It concerns increased retirement and unemployment benefits to bring them to an equality with retired career civil service employees and those under the social security system who have attained the age of retirement or have suffered economic setbacks through the loss of jobs.

It is my sincere hope—actually my expectation—that this important bill will soon be reported favorably and that the Congress will discharge its responsibility imposed by the Railroad Retirement Act to remove the injustice currently prevalent respecting the railroad workers. I know that this disadvantage was not premeditated. It was merely an oversight on the part of the Senate and House, which in increasing retirement and unemployment benefits to other classes of workers, neglected those railroad employees who are so necessary to a healthy national economy and a strong national defense. It is axiomatic that too often the wheels of justice grind slowly.

My purpose is not to be repetitious. It is rather to impress on this distinguished body the necessity of correcting at this session of the Congress the omission we have made with respect to the railroaders. With that thought in mind and with the permission of the House I shall here include my remarks made before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee during hearings of a number of bills, including one which I introduced, designed to bring these workers to a par with other workers enjoying additional benefits under the civil service and social security systems.

My testimony before that committee follows:

This distinguished committee has before it today important proposals affecting hundreds of retired workers of the Nation's railroads. Across the Potomac, in the congressional district I have the honor to represent, is located one of the largest railroad yards in the world. I personally know many men and women employed in Potomac yards. I know their problems and I know these problems are shared by their fellow workers in all parts of the United States.

Today there are wagging the cow's tail. Discharging our responsibilities respecting Federal and social security employees we have increased their benefits to bring them more into line with the cost of living. But to date we have neglected the railroad workers, who are also our responsibility. We have assumed this responsibility through the enactment of the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. Without action by the Congress, retired and unemployed railroad employees must continue to drag behind those in the Government service and those covered under the Social Security System.

The railroad workers are not fat cats. They are people who are in an income bracket comparable to many other groups who devote most of the fruits of their labor to current expenses. They are dependent on adequate retirement and unemployment insurance to meet these situations. If there are savings, they are indeed meager. Little opportunity is offered to set aside funds for old age and emergencies.

Now, I am appreciative of the economic difficulties of the eastern railroads. Competition has reduced their earning power. They have been compelled to curtail certain types of services. But such difficulties are inherent in our system of free enterprise. Business has its ups and downs. That is to be expected.

In my own business—the building industry—we are sometimes faced with the necessity of reducing original prices to sell homes. But that is not the fault of our construction workers and we certainly do not make them the victims of our failure to properly evaluate the housing market. It is my hope that the economic plight of the eastern railroads will improve and that if necessary the Federal Government will lend some sort of helping hand. Rail transportation is essential to our national welfare. We must do what we can to make it economically healthy.

The necessity of liberalization of the congressional acts affecting our railroad workers is further emphasized by the long-range actuarial deficit now existing in these programs. We must restore to a sound actuarial footing.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to follow your footsteps in presenting a companion bill to yours in order to accomplish the aforementioned purposes. The same measure was the subject of a number of bills introduced in the 85th Congress. It was passed by the Senate last August, but was not called up for floor action in this House in time to receive proper consideration before adjournment.

The bill contains a number of benefit improvements under both the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. But, to my mind, the primary purpose which will be accomplished under the bill will be to put both of these systems on firmer financial bases.

The railroad retirement system has been operating at a deficit for the past several years. This situation must be corrected without delay if we are to maintain a retirement system in which the railroad workers of this Nation can place their confidence. Under the bill, it is proposed to increase the tax rate and raise the maximum wage base sufficiently to finance the benefit increases contained in the bill, as well as to help liquidate the present actuarial deficiency in the railroad retirement fund.

Taxes would be increased from a current rate of 6¼ percent on railroad employers and employees to 6¾ percent beginning with the current year and to 7¼ percent commencing in 1962. Thereafter the tax rate increases would match those taking place under the social security old-age and survivors insurance program.

The wage base maximum would be increased from $350 to $400 a month. This would put the railroad retirement system on a par with the social security system, which, under amendments enacted last year, covers earnings up to $4,800 a year.

The financial basis of the railroad unemployment insurance system would be strengthened to provide funds for the additional benefits proposed in the bill and to take care of the current deficiency which

exists also in this fund. This would be accomplished by increasing the tax base from $350 to $400 a month and changing the tax rate to provide for a range from a minimum of 1½ percent to a maximum of 3½ percent, depending upon the current balance in the railroad unemployment insurance account. Minimum annual earnings needed to qualify for unemployment benefits would be raised from $400 to $500 a year.

The benefit increases proposed under the Railroad Retirement Act include a general 10-percent increase in monthly pension and retirement payments. When the 85th Congress came to a close it had granted pay or retirement increases for practically every group whose rates of compensation are established by law, with one major exception—the retired railroad worker. Civil service retirees were granted a 10-percent increase, those under social security 7 percent. It is no more than simple justice that the retired railroad worker, who has borne the brunt of increased living costs to the same degree as his retired neighbors, be given equal treatment.

Other major changes proposed in the Railroad Retirement Act are:

1. Lowering the retirement age for women employees with 10 to 30 years' service and wives of retirees to age 62 with a reduction in annuities. This would allow the same privilege of receiving a reduced annuity now available to women under social security. The same privilege would be offered to male workers at age 62 with 30 years of service.

2. Raising the maximum compensation used in computing benefits from $350 to $400 a month for services rendered after this year.

3. Allowing those retired on account of disability to earn up to $1,200 a year in casual or intermittent employment without loss of benefits.

4. Allowing survivors living in foreign countries to earn up to $1,200 a year, the same as survivors in this country. Under present law survivors living outside the United States, principally in Canada, are allowed no benefits for any month in which they work 6 days.

Under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act benefits increases would range from 50 cents to $1.70 a day depending upon rates. The maximum benefit would be $10.20 a day as compared to the present $8.50.

The bill would also extend the benefit year, or the periods during which unemployment benefits may be paid to an employee. These extensions apply principally to workers with considerable railroad service. Those with over 15 years would be extended another 130 days of benefits, those with 10 to 15 years another 65 days.

I sincerely hope that this measure will receive the thorough consideration of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at its earliest convenience. I am sure that after having done so, the committee will issue a favorable report upon it, so that the urgent necessities for strengthening the finances of both of these systems and bringing their benefits in line with present living costs will be met.

Chaplain Nash P. Geany Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of January 30, the Reserve Officers Association of the United States gave its Chaplain of the Year Award to an outstanding man of God who has rendered outstanding service to the Armed Forces of this Nation, Chaplain Nash P. Geany, deputy staff chaplain, Eastern Transport Air Force—MATS—McGuire Air Force Base, N.J.

This award has some significance to this body which has a great responsibility for the men and women in the military services. The ROA is due some recognition, and appreciation, for thus encouraging the oft-forgotten chaplain in his work.

I include herewith ROA's statement relative to the presentation of the Chaplain of the Year Award:

Chaplain Geany has been selected for the Reserve Officers Association's Chaplain of the Year award for his outstanding contributions to the religious and moral welfare of military personnel and their dependents as well as his charitable activities in civilian communities.

During the 38 months he served at Rhine-Main he evidenced a dynamic ministry and pursued his salutary works with a persevering industry in proportion to his many gifts.

His impressive physical stature commands attention. His outstanding speaking ability emphasizes the leadership qualities inherent in a dedicated servant of God.

It is a colloquialism to state that Chaplain Geany has a heart as big as he is yet this has never been more true of any chaplain.

His charitable concern embraces all ranks and all faiths. His solicitude for the welfare of children in local orphanages and the aged in old folks homes made a valuable contribution to the improvement of German-American relations.

Chaplain Geany has been termed a "chaplain's chaplain." This complimentary title has been earned by his practice of caring for the needs of chaplains arriving or leaving the European theater via his installation.

No matter how late the hour, Chaplain Geany at all times generously extended hospitality and accommodations to chaplains en route to their assignments.

The association presents its 1959 Chaplain of the Year Award to this outstanding representative of the chaplain apostolate.

Profit-Sharing Fund Pays $289,000 to Retiring Truckdriver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON. L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, a lot of lipservice has been given to various profit-sharing plans in the past, but in industry as a whole these plans do not appear to have obtained the attention they deserve. As an illustration of this, I would like to include with my remarks an Associated Press story from Chicago pertaining to the big dividends a Sears-Roebuck profit-sharing fund is now paying to retiring workers.

The article follows:

EMPLOYEE GETS $289,000 ON $5,928 PROFIT SHARE

CHICAGO, February 11.—A profit-sharing fund started by Sears, Roebuck & Co. 43 years ago is paying big dividends to retiring workers.

James M. Barker, chairman of the board of trustees of Sears, profit-sharing fund, said today a study of the fund's operations showed these returns to workers who participated in the program and retired during 1958:

Employees who retired after more than 40 years' service and who had contributed $6,321 to the fund withdrew an average of $154,767. Among these was a truck driver with 44 years of service, who amassed $289,000 on a total of $5,928 invested in the profit-sharing pool.

The average withdrawal of workers with 35 to 40 years of service was $123,054 for a $6,092 investment; $93,019 for 30- to 35-year workers who invested $5,791; $67,089 for 25- to 30-year workers with a total investment of $4,899; $36,695 for workers who contributed $3,593 during 20 to 25 years' employment.

Employee members of the fund contribute a straight 5 percent of their wages and salaries up to a maximum of $500 a year. The company contributes up to 10 percent of its net income before taxes.

Resolution Adopted by the Illinois General Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I have received a communication from the members of the Illinois General Assembly enclosing a copy of the house resolution 23, as adopted in the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, relative to an amendment to Public Law 85–316, which would provide for the entry of members of many families whose petitions have piled up and created a backlog within the fourth preference quota and would facilitate the reuniting of such families.

I am in full accord with this resolution, which follows herewith.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
Springfield, February 10, 1959.

HON. ROLAND VICTOR LIBONATI,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As authorized, I am enclosing herewith a copy of House Resolution 23 as adopted in the 71st General Assembly of this State.

Sincerely,

CHARLES CARPENTIER,
Secretary of State.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 23

Whereas there are many Americans who have filed petitions with the immigration authorities of the United States for the entry of their sons, daughters, brothers and sisters, which petitions are classified in the fourth preference quota of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and

Whereas of the four preference quotas established by the Federal Immigration and Nationality Act, the first, second and third quotas are allotted 100 percent of the total annual entry quota; and

Whereas as a result, those persons who fall within the fourth preference section must depend for entry into this country upon deficiencies in the first three quotas; and

Whereas there is frustration and despair resulting from the law that gives hope to Americans by permitting them to file petitions, getting them approved, and then compelling them to wait for their kin who may never come; and

Whereas thousands of discontented people abroad, whose hopes are first raised and then dashed, certainly cannot believe in the good will we try to engender through our foreign policy, and thus become easy prey to the propaganda of unfriendly nations; and

Whereas Congress has recognized and alleviated a similar problem through Public Law 85–316, which includes a provision for reuniting spouses and minor children of aliens legally residing in this country whose petitions were approved prior to July 1, 1957: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That this house respectfully request the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States to amend the provisions of Public Law 85–316 to include cases which fall within the fourth preference quota, in order to provide for entry of the many thousands, petitions for whom have piled up in a backlog in prior years; that in order not to create another problem of separated families, those applicants who are married and have families be permitted to bring them; and that a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be sent by the secretary of state to each Congressman and United States Senator from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the house, February 3, 1959.

PAUL POWELL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
CLARENCE BOYLE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Wanted: Four Million Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is time that some notice be taken of the state of unemployment in New England. Although the recession has eased in other parts of the Nation, economic recovery in the New England States is lagging behind.

It is my belief that this economic problem has remained unnoticed long enough, and that it is time something be done. The economy of New England, and especially of Maine, can best be helped by stimulating, through badly needed Federal programs, the gross national product.

Automation has had its part in addition to the contraction of the textile industry, in increasing the unemployment ratio, and now some steps must be taken to create new jobs for those who find themselves out of work. Certainly, I do not agree that unemployment should become a permanent fixture in our economy. I feel that the long-range program of renewing the economic vitality of our country should take precedence over the present concern in some quarters with balancing the budget at all costs.

Following is an editorial taken from the Boston Daily Globe on February 9 which brings the problem of unemployment in New England into clear focus:

WANTED: FOUR MILLION JOBS

It was Disraeli who first heaped abuse on statistics, and Mark Twain was happy to quote him. Statistics can be a long word for a lie. But in the 20th century we live by such figures. They are the instrument to tap the pulse of our economy so that we may smile and turn away from the patient's bedside, or purse our lips and frown and rummage in our store of specifics. Here the patient is employment, and he isn't doing too well. His temperature is way up and his pulse is way down, particularly in New England, while the doctors have stood by admiring somebody else's chart.

This region was hard hit in the 1957–58 recession. It still drags its heels behind the recovery wagon, chiefly because the durable goods industry suffered so badly. New England lost 200,000 jobs between December 1956 and May 1958 and has recovered only 52,000 of them. If the slack is going to be taken in, it will require imaginative leadership and joint action of private industry and the States.

The fact is that the national employment picture is not bright, and it is against this background that New England must appraise her own bleaker picture. The national seasonally adjusted unemployment rate, which stood at 5.0 in December 1957 was at 6.1 in December 1958. That was after 8 months of so-called recovery. Recovery it was, but not sufficient. Because of our developing technology, which makes for job displacement, a more rapid rate of recovery from such setbacks is required than has previously been the case.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics consistently declines to make any predictions. Certain of its figures speak for themselves in that they indicate the magnitude of the task before the American economy. If the present rate of productivity increase is to be maintained, the economy must provide at least 2,750,000 new jobs each year. Of these, 750,000 are for new entrants to the labor field, such as high-school or college graduates. The 2 million is the figure demanded by the annual increase in our productivity rate, an estimated 3 percent.

But above the 2.5 million so-called hard core of unemployed, there are at present 1,250,000 jobless who, statistics say, want to work and should be working. This means that to bring the economy into ideal balance for 1959, 4 million new jobs must be found this year. This in turn means that we must increase the national product by an estimated $40 billion this year. There the Bureau of Labor Statistics stops, but the next step is not too difficult. The national product is not increasing at that rate.

The U.S. economy has two new major forces pressing on it. One is automation and the other is international leadership. The first promises that consistently fewer man-hours will be needed for an increasing national product, which in turn must be sold; and the second necessitates our strengthening allies who become competitors for the markets where we must sell that product. For the first time in history the dollar volume of our automobile imports has exceeded our exports.

The problem of reducing existing unemployment, of finding jobs for the newcomers each year brings to the labor force, and of creating new and adequate jobs for those persons displaced by automation is not going to yield to a purely fiscal solution. New England has the national problem superimposed on her own. Regional consideration of both cannot begin here too soon.

Realism on REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the morning Post and Times Herald reports a stirring defense of REA on the part of certain political leaders, who urge the convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association to fight with beer bottles, if necessary, to keep the advantages they now have under the law. They were urged to fight for the right to borrow Federal funds at 2 percent, though the Government has to pay 4 percent for that same money.

It is interesting to note that some of these very cooperatives who are borrowing money at 2 percent, rather than let it lie idle in the bank until used, put it into Federal securities at 4 percent, thereby making money off their loans from the Government.

No one denies the magnificent achievement of the REA in the past, but a very able editorial in the same Post and Times Herald the day before, clearly points out that the time for this racketeering could and should be terminated.

I ask unanimous consent to include the editorial:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 9, 1952]

REALISM ON REA

The convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association which begins today in the National Guard Armory will generate much criticism of the administration's power policies. President Eisenhower's private power predilection is not above criticism, of course, but the reexamination of the REA program which the administration is seeking surely is needed. The program has fulfilled its original goals of 1935 and there is a real question whether the Government should continue its present REA role.

At a relatively small cost to the Federal Government the REA loan program not only has brought the benefits of electricity to rural America, but it has also greatly expanded the market for electrical appliances and other equipment. Hundreds of thousands of Americans who may have never been on a farm have been indirect beneficiaries of this far-sighted program.

But should the Government continue to provide extremely low-cost loans to REA co-ops that are going concerns and in many cases have become highly successful electric utilities? Once an REA co-op is established ought it not to seek its capital in the open market as other utilities do?

When Congress set up the REA loan program in 1935 to bring electricity to farmers only 11 percent of the persons who lived in rural areas had electric lights and power. Today 95 percent of them enjoy such service. Now the REA loans, which still bear an interest rate of only 2 percent, are being used to expand and improve existing co-ops. President Eisenhower has recommended that REA financing be gradually shifted to non-Government sources.

Perhaps the Government should not completely withdraw from REA financing. There may be some situations where direct Gov-

ernment loans are still needed, but it would seem reasonable for the Government to limit its participation generally to the insurance of loans or some other indirect device which would let the REA co-ops build on their own strong foundations with a minimum of Federal aid. The not inconsiderable resources of the NRECA and the very size of its convention, which will be attended by more than 7,000 delegates, indicate the strength of the REA co-ops.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, February is the month of heroes. To Americans the greatness of Washington and Lincoln is called to mind. To Lithuanians there are joyful recollections of independence, heroically won, only to be bitterly lost in the tragic recent past, but still celebrated in this month of honor. And to Polish people all over the world there is no date in memory more notable than February 12, the birthday of the great Polish statesman, military engineer extraordinary, democrat and patriot of two continents: Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

Never was there a man more inclined to dream of the impossible, yet at the same time so capable of fulfilling his dreams. Born into the mid-Eighteenth Century world, at a time when Poland was plagued by foreign armies, Kosciuszko grew up burning with the desire to drive the foreigners, once and for all, from Polish soil. Was this a practical dream? Was it practical to expect the people of a nation with no natural boundaries and little in the way of political unity to expel and hold at bay the arms of Europe's mightiest nations? Perhaps not, but Kosciuszko nonetheless conceived this dream and clung to it as long as he lived.

Kosciuszko's role in the American Revolution is legend. No sooner had he entered upon the miiltary scene than his talents at fortification construction earned him wide renown. The defenses erected at Ticonderoga early in the war were his work, and his removal from that post and a revision of the defenses there brought forth an anguished cry from a superior officer, who prophesied disaster unless Kosciuszko returned. The protest was prophetic for, in Kosciuszko's absence, Ticonderoga fell to British assault.

Not wanting to commit the same blunder a second time, the American Army authorities now turned over their main defensive operations to Kosciuszko. At Saratoga he laid out defenses that enabled the Americans to overwhelm the British attack. This victory, in turn, won for America her alliance with France and her recognition as an independent nation by Louis XVI.

Now fully cognizant of the abilities of this engineering genius, the Army appointed Kosciuszko to oversee the defense of the Hudson River, with headquarters at West Point, the so-called Gibraltar of the Hudson. Kosciuszko's work at West Point was the longest and most important of his undertakings in the United States and is inseparably connected in the American mind with his name. Little is now left of his fortifications, but the monument raised in his honor by the American youth, with the inscription: "To the hero of two worlds," remains a grateful tribute to his memory.

That the military students of the United States can look back to West Point as their alma mater is in great measure Kosciuszko's doing. When it was first resolved to found a training school in arms for the young men of the States, Kosciuszko urged that it should be placed at West Point, and suggested the spot where it now stands.

When he sailed from American shores in 1786, Kosciuszko left behind an enviable record. Living up to his constant dream of democratic achievement in the face of heavy odds, he had assisted in the liberation of a colonial people from the yoke of the most powerful military nation in the world. His remuneration had been slight, but that was no matter—a dream had been fulfilled.

Kosciuszko now returned to Poland in the hopes of serving the Polish people as he had served the Americans, and on the occasion of the reorganization of the Polish Army in 1789 he was appointed major general. The stage was now set for the closing drama of his career and his final contribution to the world's awkward struggle for perfection.

The democratic tidal wave generated by the American Revolution was now rushing upon Europe and compelling members of every class and creed to line up, either on the side of the revolutionary doctrine of the rights of man, or in defense of ancient European laissez-faire traditions. When this tidal wave struck Poland in May of 1791, Kosciuszko immediately announced himself as a democrat, calling upon the people to establish constitutional government. He was with the forces that carried the day.

A constitutional and hereditary government was established; burghers were granted equal civic rights with the nobility, and the condition of the peasants was ameliorated. At long last it appeared that political unity had come to Poland; that finally there existed the basis for the growth and success of a Polish state supported by the people. But such a development would deal a death blow to the designs of conquest of those who had fed so long on Polish weakness, including the neighboring state of Russia.

In consequence of this, Russia invaded Poland in May of 1792 and Kosciuszko, for the second time in his career, found himself engaged in the forefront of the world's battle for democracy. But on this occasion the odds were impossible. Notwithstanding Kosciuszko's brilliant generalship, the Polish Army was overwhelmed after two months of some of the most gallant fighting in military history.

When Poland was partitioned following the war, Kosciuszko withdrew from the army and retired to Leipzig. But the next year he was back again, leading an insurrectionary army against the Russians with astonishing success until, once again overcome by the heavy odds, he was defeated for the final time.

What had Kosciuszko's military performance achieved for Poland? The cynical might observe that nothing was accomplished. But life is not so simple as to be governed solely by skirmishes won and lost on a battlefield. Kosciuszko's brilliant, courageous, and idealistic attempt to drive the foreign invader from Polish soil, in the name of democracy, created a tradition, which persists to this day; a tradition that will never be eradicated.

In his zeal for democratic government, Kosciuszko was following in the footsteps of the United States. But that was not always the order of things. In April 1817, 6 months before he died, he issued a letter of emancipation to the serfs on his estate in Poland. It was to be almost half a century before the United States was able to emulate this departing gesture of one of Europe's truly great democrats, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the "hero of two worlds."

A Plea for U.S. Diplomatic Relations With the Vatican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most forceful and compelling forces in the struggle against communism and one of the strongest influences for peace in the world today is the Vatican. We are living in a most difficult age, a challenging age which calls for wise leadership and effective action if freedom is to survive. We must leave no stone unturned in meeting this challenge. By our refusal to establish diplomatic relations with the Vatican, however, we are ignoring a very important center of information and intelligence. In so doing, we are harming ourselves and the cause of freedom to a very considerable extent.

The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt realized the importance of maintaining diplomatic relations with the Vatican when he sent Ambassador Myron Taylor there as his emissary. The results of Mr. Taylor's mission were highly satisfactory to the interests of our Government and our people, because it enabled us to obtain certain political and economic intelligence which we would not have had otherwise.

Today the free world is in a life-and-death struggle with the evil forces of communism. If communism should emerge triumphant, it will make little difference whether we are Catholics, Protestants, or Jews—all believers, regardless of creed, will be doomed. Under such circumstances, it stands to reason that we should all be united in our

efforts against those who seek to destroy us. In that case, it is unthinkable that any reasonable man would raise objection to the United States being represented by a diplomatic mission at the Vatican.

It is a very strange situation to me when I see full-fledged U.S. diplomatic missions in the Soviet Union and in the satellite countries of Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria, but no such representation at the Holy See. At the time of the Hungarian revolt in 1956 we condemned the Communist regime of that country and we protested against the brutalities of the Soviet troops in Hungary, but we did not withdraw our diplomatic missions from Budapest or from Moscow. When people in this country asked why this was not done, we were told by responsible Government officials that we would lose important listening posts behind the Iron Curtain.

While that is very true, we are ignoring an important listening post at the Vatican which could be no less valuable to us. There our mission could obtain vital information from all parts of the world, including from countries behind the Iron Curtain, which flows daily into the Vatican in large volume. My experience as an intelligence officer with OSS during World War II had taught me that the Holy See is au courant with everything that is going on in the world, and sometimes was even more informed than we were.

Such antiquated reasons that having a U.S. envoy at the Vatican would be showing special favoritism toward one particular religion or that the Pope would rule the White House are too ridiculous for our day and age. We are interested in preserving the security of our Nation and of the free world; we are interested in maintaining peace in the world and genuine understanding among the nations. It is, therefore, most logical to stand together in a common cause with all those forces who think as we do, who seek the same goals, who are fighting the same enemy. In other words, as I see it, it would constitute a step in the direction of greater unity of the free world which believes in the supremacy of the Almighty God as against godless communism which seeks the enslavement of the whole world.

About 3 years ago, at Christmas, 1955, the late Pope Pius XII held audiences with members of the diplomatic corps assigned to the Vatican. He discussed with them the possibility of reaching an accord between the East and the West on nuclear disarmament, but he noted at the time that it was impossible for the Vatican to undertake international mediation "when two of the greatest powers are not represented at the Holy See." The Pontiff was referring to the United States and Soviet Russia, neither of whom maintain diplomatic relations with the Vatican.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the unenviable position of being classified with Communist Russia as the two great powers in the world today lacking diplomatic representation at the Vatican. What a strange position for us to be in at a crucial time such as this, when we claim to be the moral leader of the free world. It is a fact that the Vatican maintains diplomatic relations with some 50 countries throughout the world. Among them are such Protestant countries as Great Britain, the Netherlands, West Germany, and others, who find it advantageous to have official representatives attached to the Holy See.

Our failure to be represented at the Vatican leaves us in the same category with Soviet Russia—as well as with Communist China, which has no representation there—which is not only a paradoxical and embarrassing situation for us, but it also creates considerable doubt in the minds of our friends and allies who are inclined to regard our attitude as immature action unbefitting a great nation.

This is a situation which needs to be corrected. In the past, the maintenance for separation of church and state was advanced as a major argument against recognition of the Vatican. Such an indictment in connection with Vatican representation is wholly fantastic. All of us are deeply aware of the constitutional and historic role of religion in American life. I dare say that the American people would not brook a distortion of that role any more than it would approve religious bigotry and intolerance. Consequently, the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Vatican would be entirely in accord with our Constitution, our history and our traditions. It is motivated solely by the desire for the promotion of world peace and understanding.

Fortunately, the successor to Pope Pius XII, the present Pontiff, Pope John XXIII, is pursuing the same attitude toward the attainment of world peace, and the same desires for achieving understanding among the nations of the world. At a time when from many corners of the earth we hear the voices of doom and destruction, the voice of Pope John is one of calmness and comfort. We must help strengthen it, so that it does not remain a voice crying in the wilderness.

Whether we like it or not, we are at war with Communist Russia on all fronts. They are bent on destroying the free world, and particularly the faith of the free world in a Supreme Being. I regard this as a most propitious time to establish relations with the Holy See, in view of Pope John's elevation to the Papal Throne and his strong appeal for unity in the ranks of Christendom.

As a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I am particularly concerned about the challenge being made to the invincible powers of God. I would think that religious men of all faiths would want to work together to prevent the atheists not only from destroying our bodies, but also our souls. It so happens that the Vatican is today the only existing world religious center having diplomatic relations with other nations—the only nations not represented are the United States, Soviet Russia, and Red China. If other faiths had a similar world organization, I would be the first to advocate diplomatic representation in such a body.

For these reasons, I am now introducing a resolution which calls for the immediate establishment of diplomatic relations with the Vatican through the appointment of an envoy as a gesture of our friendship and our desire to help promote world peace and greater understanding. In sending a diplomatic mission to the Vatican, the United States would demonstrate to the world that it has the highest esteem for the Catholic Church and the broad principles of religious freedom for which it stands. The Vatican is most certainly in a position to serve as a force for unity and strength of the free world. Let us seek its wise counsel, its moral strength, its worldwide support.

Of What Use Is Scouting?—What Does It Really Do for Boys?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, many people this week are asking, Of what use is scouting? What does it really do for boys? No story I have ever seen tells so much as this story of two mothers—reprinted by the Los Angeles Examiner from the American Weekly of February 6, 1955—which, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks:

MURDER—AND TWO MOTHERS

(By Will Oursler)

In the bright morning sun, two boys rolled in the dust, locked in combat, while a handful of bystanders watched and cheered. One boy was Mexican, the other Negro. Suddenly a knife flashed in the hand of the Mexican lad, glittering an instant and plunging down The Negro boy gave a cry and twisted away and lay still. The onlookers were frightened. Someone cried out that the boy was dead and the police were coming and they had better run.

For some months this area of Los Angeles—the adjoining districts of Aliso Village and Pico Gardens—had been a trouble spot, with its mounting postwar population, its overcrowding, its poverty and filth and crime and interracial conflicts.

Police officials, social agencies, church groups, and special project workers of the Boy Scouts had waged an intensive drive to improve conditions. But the drive had made slow progress in the face of indifference. In the past 6 months there had been 57 arrests of youth in the area for crimes that included armed robbery, burglary, rape, assault with deadly weapons. Now it was murder.

Word of the stabbing raced through the area. Both boys had been members of rival gangs. Both gangs held secret conclaves, one to map plans for vengeance, the other tactics of defense. Nor was the threat of trouble limited to the gangs. Groups of adults began gathering in small meetings, behind closed doors and drawn shades. A tense, wordless terror closed in. Some of the noisier troublemakers were calling an indignation meeting—to decide how to strike back.

The peril was immediate, and a young man named Andy Sais, who had fought derision and indifference for months as a Boy Scout worker trying to launch Scout troops in the

area, decided on a daring countermeasure against this impending riot.

The Negro boy had been in one of the troops Sais had been trying to start. The Mexican boy had been one Sais had hoped to interest in scouting. Sais paid a visit—to the Mexican boy's mother.

He found her alone in the house, sobbing hysterically, repeating over and over, "What can I do? He killed him. What can I do now?"

Sais told her gently, "I want you to come with me—to meet that boy's mother."

Together the Scout worker and the Mexican woman walked the ominously quiet streets to the home of the slain Negro boy. The mothers, one grieving for the loss of her boy, the other for what her boy had done, met and talked. They agreed that there should be no more violence.

Word of the meeting of the two mothers swept through the troubled neighborhood. They had met and wept together, people said. There was no hate between them.

The indignation meeting was still on. But Sais called together—as a second step—his own "gang," all the Scouts he had been organizing into troops over the past months. He talked to these boys—some of them also members of the rival gangs—about the Scout law of friendliness to all people and all creeds and all races.

The mass meeting was held as scheduled. But there was no threat of violence. The story of the meeting of those mothers—and the conclave of the Scouts—had cleared the air. With the men and women at this unusual town meeting were some of their own youngsters—boys of various factions within the district, seated side by side, as Scouts. Sais talked and men and women began to stand up and talk about what they could do to make it a better place, this district, for their children to grow up.

Steps were begun with authorities to launch, not the punishment, but the rehabilitation of the boy whose tragic deed had upset the community. Church groups and social agencies pitched in to aid this lad and others, and in the months that followed a completely new era dawned in the area where hoodlumism and crime had flourished.

Half a dozen Scout troops were fully organized under Sais, and performed literally hundreds of neighborhood good turns—boys of all creeds and races working together, cleaning out alleys and fire hazards and school yards, repairing and painting school buildings and churches, collecting clothes and food for needy families.

There were many in the city who found it hard to understand how such a miracle could sweep over a neighborhood of trouble—particularly after the slaying of a boy. But a Scout worker and two mothers understand.

February 12, 1959, a Day of Homage for Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, at a time in our history when the emphasis on military and defense requirements is so constant as to be commonplace, it is especially fitting that we pay more than ordinary homage to a great soldier who rendered extraordinary military service to this country at a time when men of his kind were few and far between, and very much in demand.

I speak of course of Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko, the great Polish-American hero of the Revolutionary War. Both his exceptional service as a military commander in the Saratoga and Carolina campaigns of the Revolutionary War and his engineering feats as the man who built the fortifications at West Point mark his for greatness.

Today, it is imperative that we recall the great example set by General Kosciuszko for yet another reason. After the Revolution this popular hero returned to his native Poland to champion his own people's fight for independence. This is a fight that is not yet over, a fight that could well benefit from the likes of another Tadeusz Kosciuszko.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of gratitude and admiration that I join in this salute to General Kosciuszko on the anniversary of his birth 213 years ago.

The Nebraska Farmer Magazine Has Reported History of State From Lincoln's Day Until Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD F. McGINLEY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. McGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most memorable and lovable characteristics of Abraham Lincoln was his sedate, but sharp sense of humor. There is a story behind the naming of Nebraska's capital city—Lincoln—which I think would have amused Mr. Lincoln, had he been living at the time.

The Platte River, in its east to west course cuts the State of Nebraska into approximate halves, north and south. Early territorial politics—1854–67—were colored with a sectional rivalry over location of the territorial capital site. The first acting Governor, Thomas B. Cuming, chose Omaha, north of the Platte, as the territorial capital rather than another historic Missouri River town, Bellevue, south of the Platte.

The location controversy continued and became hotter as Nebraska became a State on March 1, 1867. One of the acts of the first State legislature in 1867 was to make a final capital site determination.

The South Platte members, many of whom were Democrats, were in the majority in the first State legislature and were determined to relocate the capital city. They had chosen the small inland village of Lancaster on Salt Creek, because of the expected wealth of the salt reserves in that area.

Forced to strategy, the North Platte group, who hoped to retain the capital of Omaha, offered an amendment to rename the village of Lancaster as "Lincoln." By this maneuver, the northern members hoped to make the relocation measure distasteful to the South Platte Democratic members and thus break up the political strength of the South Platte majority.

However, the South Platte members accepted the amendment and on July 29, 1867, the little village of Lancaster, on Salt Creek, was officially designated as the State capital and renamed as the city of Lincoln.

Thus did the controversy over this minor issue cease, as it were, by accident, and symbolized the later acceptance of Abraham Lincoln by all parts of the Nation as a good and great man who saved the Union of the United States of America.

It is then, Mr. Speaker, further proof that men of vision make history both by their direct efforts and by the force of their being.

On this anniversary of the birth of a man of principle and foresight, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues another birthday. This birthday is of an institution born in the mind of man of many Lincoln-like attributes.

This year marks the 100th anniversary of the Nebraska Farmer, a farm magazine that reported the history of the State from Lincoln's day until now.

Its founder was Robert W. Furnas. He was a farmer, fruitgrower, horticulturist, soldier, politician, and newspaperman.

When that first edition was published, the Territory was vast in size, with most of the people living along the eastern boundary of the Territory. There were 24 counties represented in the Sixth Territorial legislature in 1859. Nebraska City was the largest town, with a population of 1,922. Omaha's population was 1,883.

Furnas continued to publish the magazine until going to war in 1862. He returned to his publication and was elected the second Governor of the State in 1872.

This was the heritage of the Nebraska Farmer and it reflected as almost a creed: ruggedness, adaptability, honesty.

Its pages were dedicated to the farmer of Nebraska. It was interested in his economic welfare, his opportunity for education, his right and privilege of good government.

And the Nebraska Farmer has never lost that personality.

Another man was to rise over the horizon of Nebraska history and shine with the strength and brightness of a Nebraska summer day upon the people and the land. He was Sam McKelvie, born on a homestead in the State he loved.

He guided the Nebraska Farmer for half a century, was to become Governor of the State at the age of 37 and bring into focus the greatness of agriculture and to especially enshrine the sandhills of Nebraska as the greatest cattle land in America.

As the farmers of Nebraska struggled against adversity so did this publication. The anniversary issue relates an era in the history of the Nebraska Farmer which could have spelled its doom or—as was the outcome—nurtured the publication on the sparse diet of adversity and the strengthening qualities of austerity.

A period of depression hit business in Nebraska in 1921. In 1923, Sam McKelvie was broke. It was a despondent Sam who boarded a train for Omaha to try to tap one of the fading hopes of obtaining the $50,000 needed to keep the business going.

Walter Head, president of the Omaha National Bank, listened to this man's plea and heard the publisher expound his belief that the Nebraska Farmer could come back.

The banker and friend of Sam wrote out the check and said:

Sam, Nebraska needs a good farm paper. Let's keep the Nebraska Farmer going.

Sam's name was the only security ever offered to protect that loan.

There are many more stories of the growth of the Nebraska Farmer under the guidance of Sam McKelvie. Too many to relate here.

The Nebraska Farmer is like a jewel of many facets. Its organization is a family in a real sense. The employees own stock in the company and its almost negligible turnover in employees is testimony of the loyalty and devotion of its people. Sam's will provided for the employees to own the business.

Like Sam McKelvie, its present president and publisher, Glenn Buck, came up from the ranks. He started over 30 years ago as an advertising salesman.

The Nebraska Farmer story is in the finest traditions of Americana. It was and is interested in progress but not plunging; government but not political power; education but not preachments.

It is the true chronicle of Nebraska history.

The Press and Its Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the kind of government, the amount of tax paid by the citizen, the service he gets, depend to a large extent upon the press, upon what the editors and the columnists, influenced as the latter all too often are by pressure groups, print.

The lobbyists and the pressure groups, through their paid representatives, wield a tremendous influence here in Washington—while the average citizen must depend upon his chosen representative, often with little time of his own to give to the study of proposed legislation.

It is unfortunate that the Congress and Washington do not have in the District a daily publication which represents the thinking of the country as a whole.

The situation here is somewhat similar to that which existed when the United States of America sought, through the press, to give people abroad a view of American thinking.

What did the then administration do to convey American thought to, for example, London?

It purchased and distributed copies of the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune. Certainly, both are influential publications—but represent not at all the thinking of the people west of New York.

Apparently, those wanting to convey American ideals to the people of other lands do not have the slightest conception of the needs, the desires, the ideals of the people outside of the great State of New York, which, it might be said, is dominated by people from other lands.

Fortunate indeed are we that we have throughout the country not only thousands of weekly publications whose editors represent their communities, but we have dailies, many in towns of less than 100,000 people, which speak for millions of Americans.

There are seven such publications in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan.

Typical of the group is the News-Palladium of Benton Harbor, Mich., a daily which, by actual comparison, carries as great a volume of real news as do many of the publications in cities of 200,000 population.

An editorial from the News-Palladium of February 10 gives that publication's conception of a newspaper's duty. It reads:

THE NEWSPAPERS' DUTY

Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of two newspapers in Indianapolis, Ind., and two in Phoenix, Ariz., uttered some pretty definite political observations in a recent speech before the California-Nevada Associated Press Association, meeting in San Francisco.

The essence of Mr. Pulliam's remarks was that if the Republican Party is to be saved from political suicide, it must cease trying to exist as an echo of Democratic theories and practices.

Urging newspapermen to remember that their most important responsibility is the preservation of the Republic and individual freedom, the Hoosier publisher complained that this country has been drifting toward a one-party system for the last 5 or 6 years. The drift, he added, has been due to Washington bureaucrats.

Pulliam asserted that both parties have the same elements, that neither stands for anything definite and unequivocable. "There is no difference between the Republican and Democratic parties as far as their governmental objectives are concerned," the Associated Press executives were told. "No wonder the Republican Party got dumped in the ash can last fall. It is no longer a national party with definite principles. It has abandoned the very people who gave it power and position in this country for the first time in 20 years. * * *"

The net result, Pulliam stated, has been a steady drift toward a welfare state and "now both parties are dedicated to some type of it."

To a great degree, the publisher went on, it is up to the newspapers to teach the people that in 5,000 years of history it has been proved that socialism has failed miserably in every country where it has been adopted. This is true today in Soviet Russia.

The press will not always win popular support by upholding the principles of iniative, capitalism and genuine freedom not tied to paternalism, but neither will the press earn or deserve influence or confidence if it evades its duty in speaking out for its convictions.

In the field within which it operates, this newspaper has not intentionally or deliberately ever ducked what was deemed to be an issue requiring a stand, local, State, or National. We have no doubt made enemies, but we think we have made more friends, as our circulation figures show.

We believe this country must again have two strong parties representing divergence of opinion. If this does not come about more and more confused voters will feel that the choice they have is insignificant.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko, Hero of the American Revolution (1746–1817)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the success of the American Revolution was assured by the unrelenting efforts and untold sacrifices made by the people here struggling for their independence. Other peoples, not native to this country, but equally great fighters for the cause of liberty, also contributed significantly to the successful culmination of that historic and glorious event. Tadeusz Kosciuszko of Poland, that intrepid, gallant and gifted soldier of freedom, was one of those whose personal participation in the American Revolution marks him as one of the great heroes of his day.

This great man was born into an impoverished family on February 12, 1746. At the age of 13 he lost his father, but his yearning for education led him to the Royal School at Warsaw in 1765. He was graduated with the rank of captain in 1769, and was awarded a scholarship to France where he studied at the famous military school at Mezieres, specializing in artillery and engineering. In 1776 he was in Paris when he heard of the American Revolution. That stirred his imagination; he saw his chance for action in a good cause, and with borrowed money he sailed for America. He arrived in Philadelphia in August and immediately applied for military service. He was admitted, and charged with the drawing up of plans for fortifying the Delaware River. The immediate success of this work earned him a commission as colonel of engineers in the Continental Army.

In the spring of the following year he joined the Northern Army at Ticonderoga. Later the fortifications he erected at Saratoga contributed greatly to the brilliant victory of our forces there. During the next 2 years he was placed in charge of the building of fortifications at West Point. Subsequently he took part in the Battle of Charleston, and was among the first of the Continentals to enter that city after its evacuation by the British. On October 13, 1783, in recognition of his outstanding services, Congress made him a brigadier general.

Having served this country and its noble cause successfully and brilliantly, in July of 1784 he returned to Poland, hoping to carry on the fight for the freedom of his countrymen there. For more than 20 years he continued his brave but unfortunately futile efforts for Poland's freedom and was fated to die in exile in Switzerland on October 15, 1817.

Today, on the anniversary of his birth, we solemnly honor his memory. We do this not only because he fought for our independence, but also because he was a gallant and unwavering champion of the universal cause of human freedom.

The Real Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be an ironic rule of history at work when it comes to dealing with great men.

It might almost be said that the greater the man and the farther removed in time he is from our own generation, the more freely he is quoted and the more loosely he is interpreted.

Thus, few people in our Nation's history have been more vigorously embraced by representatives of more diverse points of view than has Abraham Lincoln.

In a very real sense, this is a tribute to Lincoln's greatness. He was a unifier, a builder, a man who loved his fellow men regardless of political differences.

In another sense, however, this is unfortunate. For it obscures what Lincoln really believed and sometimes what he really said and meant.

And worst of all, it tends to hide the real Lincoln—a man from whom other men in all ages have much to learn.

It behooves us, then, to see him now as he really was. In this, our purpose may be better served by examining the characteristics of the man Lincoln, rather the words and the policies by means of which the public figure Lincoln dealt with the concrete political realities of his particular time

Granted the importance and the wisdom of what he said and what he did, we must do Lincoln the justice of dealing with him in the perspective of his time. And this means restraining ourselves from using his words to serve our own ends.

The irony in this should be apparent. For Lincoln was addicted to the truth. It has been said of him that he was morbidly preoccupied with truth—morbid, perhaps, because to few of his contemporaries, as too few of ours, gave evidence of valuing it as highly.

Lincoln was a man with a passion to be understood. He abhorred indirection, despised glittering generalities, shrank from evasion and ambiguity.

His respect for man's mind led him to rely on demonstration, rather than on emotional appeal, to convince those with whom he dealt.

His outward style—his manner, his taste and his writing—reflected the inner Lincoln: self-contained, direct, clear, sometimes terse, precise, simple, and undecorated.

He was a realist, about himself and about others. He lacked sentimentality of any kind. And he would, it is certain, have scorned those who, however sincerely, have sentimentalized him. For he recognized that sentimentality destroys a man's integrity, fuzzies up the truth about him, and makes him a pliable instrument for the service of others' interests.

Lincoln was no storybook hero, no romantic fool. He was a difficult, complex human being, the material of true greatness.

He valued excellence. He recognized it in others. He understood the painstaking, laborious price of achieving it, and willingly paid that price. And, afterward, he appreciated honestly what he knew to be his own great worth.

This self-control, this mastery of himself—no easy accomplishment for this giant of many moods and passions and ambitions—was the source of his strength and his mastery of others.

Was Lincoln really modest and humble? Not in the conventional sense of false self-effacement or self-righteousness, but genuinely so, as on ewho knew and understood himself as he really was.

He was a great man—a man for our age and every age.

The Significance of Lincoln's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following excerpt from "The Faith of America," by Mordecai Kaplan, J. Paul Williams, and Eugene Kohn:

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY

This day is gratefully dedicated to the remembrance of Abraham Lincoln, who led the United States through 4 years of civil strife to keep the Nation one, and who used the power of his office to free the Negroes from slavery. His memory is both an inspiration and a challenge. It inspires us to dedicate our lives as he did his, to freeing the bound. It challenges us to make of our country a land in which all men are accepted by their fellow men for what they are and for what they can make of themselves.

We are wont in family life to accept our brother; we assume his right to be himself, to seek him own welfare in his own way; we ask of him only that he share with us a common devotion to the family. So let us in our public life accept our fellow man in brotherhood. Let us acknowledge his right to his own interests, his own beliefs, his own loyalties. Let us ask of him only that he share with us a common devotion to the cause of all humanity.

Ours is a nation built by men of different races, different faiths, different cultural traditions. To recognize all of them as our brothers is to show respect for their right to be different from us. It is to learn to value the special contribution which each can bring to the common cause. It is to welcome his cooperation in the building of a common civilization. That civilization should be great enough to embrace all the diversities among us. Let us make America safe for differences and liberate all those who today are oppressed by unbrotherly prejudice and rancor. Thus and then only can we honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln and bring victory to the cause for which he lived and died.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, from the time of Catherine the Great to 1917, Ukraine, like Poland and Georgia, was submerged as a nation in the czarist Russian Empire. During this period, autocratic czardom suppressed and attempted to eradicate the culture and the national identity of the Ukrainian people. It attempted to demolish what we in the West esteem as praiseworthy, Ukrainian traits and qualities, notably their invincible desire to establish the natural rights of man and to exercise these rights in a self-determined and independent Ukrainian state.

Toward the end of World War I, the glorious opportunity for the expression of these God-given rights and for the full exercise of the Wilsonian principle of national self-determination presented itself with the collapse of the Russian Empire. On January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian National Republic was proclaimed and a new day was ushered in for the second largest Slavic nation in Europe. That memorable day is a landmark in Ukrainian history and it will always remain a bright spot in their entire history. It is celebrated annually as a national holiday and although the Republic did not last more than 2 years when it was overrun by Soviet Russia—R.S.F.S.R.—that short period has left its indelible impression of freedom on all Ukrainians. All of them would like to observe this historic anniversary but not all Ukrainians are permitted and privileged to do so. To 40 million Ukrainians who have suffered under the Soviet regime since 1920, that supreme privilege is denied in their homeland. But in the free world we gladly join in this celebration of Americans of Ukrainian origin, on this 41st anniversary of Ukrainan Independence Day.

The following editorial from the Washington Star and the news story from the Washington Post and Times Herald are worthy tributes:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 23, 1959]

UKRAINIAN DREAM

At this time 41 years ago, after having ben held captive for centuries by the Rus-

sian Czardom, the ancient and highly civilized Ukrainian people—who now number about 40 million—reestablished themselves as an independent nation. But their new status, their new freedom, was short-lived. For the imperialistic Bolshevik revolutionists soon moved into their land and subjugated them all over again. Even so, throughout the four decades that have since passed they have maintained their own language and separate identity within the Soviet Union, and great numbers of them still yearn and strive for complete self-rule. In fact, although it has mercilessly repressed them, the Kremlin itself has recognized their special position in many ways, including the arrangement under which their make-believe "autonomous republic" is fictitiously represented in the United Nations by a delegation of its own.

As things stand today, of course, it may seem almost quixotic that any of these people should still harbor hopes for real autonomy. But the same used to be said of other independence-seeking nationalities—such as the Irish—and what needs to be remembered in matters of this sort is that the world is always changing. Tyrannies, after all, not only rise, but also fall, and so it is not utterly inconceivable that the Ukrainians will once again attain—permanently—the liberty they enjoyed for just a little while in 1918. In any event, as one of their spokesmen has written, large segments of them can be counted upon to keep alive their "undying movement" to restore their country to full self-mastery "as a vital and indispensable element in a free Europe and in a free world."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Jan. 23, 1959]

HOUSE MARKS BIRTHDAY OF UKRAINIAN REPUBLIC

The 41st anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian Republic was commemorated yesterday in brief remarks and ceremonies in the House of Representatives.

Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, Massachusetts, House majority leader, and Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, Pennsylvania, led House Members in praise of the Republic, which was gobbled up by the Soviet Union shortly after its independence was declared.

They were joined in their remarks by Representatives FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania, and Representative MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, Republican, Illinois. A resolution has been submitted in the Senate by Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, Republican, Connecticut, to have the President proclaim each January 22, a day to honor the republic's independence.

Earlier yesterday, FLOOD was host to Lev Dobriansky, Georgetown University professor and chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, at picture-taking ceremonies. Also attending were MCCORMACK and Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, Ohio, and BARRATT O'HARA, Democrat, Illinois.

Address on 100th Anniversary of Lincoln's Birth by Booker T. Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, all of us were proud and pleased with the program today celebrating the 150th anniversary of the birth of our great President, Abraham Lincoln. At this time, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the words of another great American who had words of praise for President Lincoln. These remarks were made 50 years ago to this day by Booker T. Washington, born a slave but who became a great, free American who has served as an inspiration to all of us. The Booker T. Washington Goodwill Building Commission at Tuskegee Institute in Alabama has asked my help in inserting his remarks in the RECORD, which I am most happy to do at this point:

AN ADDRESS ON ABRAHAM LINCOLN DELIVERED BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN CLUB OF NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 12, 1909, BY BOOKER T. WASHINGTON ON THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF LINCOLN'S BIRTH

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, you ask that which he found a piece of property and turned into a free American citizen to speak to you tonight on Abraham Lincoln. I am not fitted by ancestry or training to be your teacher tonight for, as I have stated, I was born a slave.

My first knowledge of Abraham Lincoln came in this way: I was awakened early one morning before the dawn of day, as I lay wrapped in a bundle of rags on the dirt floor of our slave cabin, by the prayers of my mother, just before leaving for her day's work, as she was kneeling over my body earnestly praying that Abraham Lincoln might succeed, and that one day she and her boy might be free. You give me the opportunity here this evening to celebrate with you and the Nation the answer to that prayer.

Says the Greak Book somewhere, "Though a man die, yet shall he live." If this is true of the ordinary man, how much more true is it of the hero of the hour and the hero of the century—Abraham Lincoln. One hundred years of the life and influence of Lincoln is the story of the struggles, the trials, ambitions, and triumphs of the people of our complex American civilization. Interwoven into the warp and woof of this human complexity is the moving story of men and women of nearly every race and color in progress from slavery to freedom, from poverty to wealth, from weakness to power, from ignorance to intelligence. Knit into the life of Abraham Lincoln is the story and success of the Nation in the blending of all tongues, religions, colors, races into one composite Nation, leaving each group and race free to live its own separate social life, and yet all a part of the great whole.

If a man die, shall he live? Answering this question as applied to our martyred President, perhaps you expect me to confine my words of appreciation to the great boon which, through him, was conferred upon my race. My undying gratitude and that of 10 millions of my race for this and yet more. To have been the instrument used by Providence through which 4 millions of slaves, now grown into 10 millions of free citizens, were made free would bring eternal fame within itself, but this is not the only claim that Lincoln has upon our sense of gratitude and appreciation.

By the side of Armstrong and Garrison, Lincoln lives today. In the very highest sense he lives in the present more potently than 100 years ago; for that which is seen is temporal, that which is unseen is eternal. He lives in the 32,000 young men and women of the Negro race learning trades and useful occupations; in the 200,000 farms acquired by those he freed; in the more than 400,000 homes built; in the 46 banks established and 10,000 stores owned; in the $550 million worth of taxable property in hand; in the 28,000 public schools existing, with 30,000 teachers; in the 170 industrial schools and colleges; in the 23,000 ministers and 26,000 churches.

But, above all this, he lives in the steady and unalterable determination of 10 millions of black citizens to continue to climb year by year the ladder of the highest usefulness and to perfect themselves in strong, robust character. For making all this possible, Lincoln lives.

But, again, for a higher reason he lives tonight in every corner of the Republic. To set the physical man free is much. To set the spiritual man free is more. So often the keeper is on the inside of the prison bars and the prisoner on the outside.

As an individual, grateful as I am to Lincoln for freedom of body, my gratitude is still greater for freedom of soul—the liberty which permits one to live up in that atmosphere where he refuses to permit sectional or racial hatred to drag down, to warp and narrow his soul.

The signing of the Emancipation Proclamation was a great event, and yet it was but the symbol of another, still greater and more momentous. We who celebrate this anniversary should not forget that the same pen that gave freedom to 4 millions of African slaves at the same time struck the shackles from the souls of 27 millions of Americans of another color.

In any country, regardless of what its laws say, wherever people act upon the idea that the disadvantage of one man is the good of another, there slavery exists. Wherever in any country the whole people feel that the happiness of all is dependent upon the happiness of the weakest, there freedom exists.

In abolishing slavery, Lincoln proclaimed the principle that, even in the case of the humblest and weakest of mankind, the welfare of each is still the good of all. In reestablishing in this country the principle that, at bottom, the interests of humanity and of the individual are one, he freed men's souls from spiritual bondage; he freed them to mutual helpfulness. Henceforce no man of any race, either in the North or in the South, need feel constrained to fear or hate his brother.

By the same token that Lincoln made America free, he pushed back the boundaries of freedom everywhere, gave the spirit of liberty a wider influence throughout the world, and reestablished the dignity of man as man.

By the same act that freed my race, he said to the civilized and uncivilized world that man everywhere must be free, and that man everywhere must be enlightened, and the Lincoln spirit of freedom and fair play will never cease to spread and grow in power till throughout the world all men shall know the truth, and the truth shall make them free.

Lincoln in his day was wise enough to recognize that which is true in the present and for all time: that in a state of slavery and ignorance man renders the lowest and most costly form of service to his fellows. In a state of freedom and enlightenment he renders the highest and most helpful form of service.

The world is fast learning that of all forms of slavery there is none that is so harmful and degrading as that form of slavery which tempts one human being to hate another by reason of his race or color. One man cannot hold another man down in the ditch without remaining down in the ditch with him. One who goes through life with his eyes closed against all that is good in another race is weakened and circumscribed, as one who fights in a battle with one hand tied behind him. Lincoln was in the truest sense great because he unfettered himself. He climbed up out of the valley, where his vision was narrowed and weakened by the fog and miasma, onto the mountain top, where in a pure and unclouded atmosphere he could see the

truth which enabled him to rate all men at their true worth. Growing out of this anniversary season and atmosphere, may there crystallize a resolve throughout the Nation that on such a mountain the American people will strive to live.

We owe, then, to Lincoln physical freedom, moral freedom, and yet this is not all. There is a debt of gratitude which we as individuals, no matter of what race or Nation, must recognize as due Abraham Lincoln—not for what he did as Chief Executive of the Nation, but for what he did as a man. In his rise from the most abject poverty and ignorance to a position of high usefulness and power, he taught the world one of the greatest of all lessons. In fighting his own battle up from obscurity and squalor, he fought the battle of every other individual and race that is down, and so helped to pull up every other human who was down. People so often forget that by every inch that the lowest man crawls up he makes it easier for every other man to get up. Today, throughout the world, because Lincoln lived, struggled, and triumphed, every boy who is ignorant, is in poverty, is despised or discouraged, holds his head a little higher. His heart beats a little faster, his ambition to do something and be something is a little stronger, because Lincoln blazed the way.

To my race, the life of Abraham Lincoln has its special lession at this point in our career. Insofar as his life emphasizes patience, long suffering, sincerity, naturalness, dogged determination, and courage—courage to avoid the superficial, courage to persistently seek the substance instead of the shadow—it points the road for my people to travel.

As a race we are learning, I believe, in an increasing degree that the best way for us to honor the memory of our emancipator is by seeking to imitate him. Like Lincoln, the Negro race should seek to be simple, without bigotry and without ostentation. There is great power in simplicity. We as a race should, like Lincoln, have moral courage to be what we are, and not pretend to be what we are not. We should keep in mind that no one can degrade us except ourselves; that if we are worthy, no influence can defeat us. Like other races, the Negro will often meet obstacles, often be sorely tried and tempted; but we must keep in mind that freedom, in the broadest and highest sense, has never been a bequest; it has been a conquest.

In the final test, the success of our race will be in proportion to the service that it renders to the world. In the long run, the badge of service is the badge of sovereignty.

With all his other elements of strength, Abraham Lincoln possessed in the highest degree patience and, as I have said, courage. The highest form of courage is not always that exhibited on the battlefield in the midst of the blare of trumpets and the waving of banners. The highest courage is of the Lincoln kind. It is the same kind of courage, made possible by the new life and the new possibilities furnished by Lincoln's proclamation, displayed by thousands of men and women of my race every year who are going out from Tuskegee and other Negro institutions in the South to lift up their fellows. When they go, often into lonely and secluded districts, with little thought of salary, with little thought of personal welfare, no drums beat, no banners fly, no friends stand by to cheer them on; but these brave young souls who are erecting schoolhouses, creating school systems, prolonging school terms, teaching the people to buy homes, build houses, and live decent lives by fighting the battles of this country just as truly and bravely as any persons who go forth to fight battles against a foreign foe.

In paying my tribute of respect to the great emancipator of my race, I desire to say a word here and now in behalf of an element of brave and true white men of the South who, though they saw in Lincoln's policy the ruin of all they believed in and hoped for, have loyally accepted the results of the Civil War, and are today working with a courage few people in the North can understand to uplift the Negro in the South and complete the emancipation that Lincoln began. I am tempted to say that it certainly required as high a degree of courage for men of the type of Robert E. Lee and John D. Gordon to accept the results of the war in the manner and spirit in which they did, as that which Grant and Sherman displayed in fighting the physical battles that saved the Union.

Lincoln also was a southern man by birth, but he was one of those white men, of whom there is a large and growing class, who resented the idea that in order to assert and maintain the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race it was necessary that another group of humanity should be kept in ignorance.

Lincoln was not afraid or ashamed to come into contact with the lowly of all races. His reputation and social position were not of such a transitory and transparent kind that he was afraid that he would lose them by being just and kind, even to a man of dark skin. I always pity from the bottom of my heart any man who feels that somebody else must be kept down or in ignorance in order that he may appear great by comparison. It requires no courage for a strong man to kick a weak one down.

Lincoln lives today because he had the courage which made him refuse to hate the man at the South or the man at the North when they did not agree with him. He had the courage as well as the patience and foresight to suffer in silence, to be misunderstood, to be abused, to refuse to revile when reviled. For he knew that, if he was right, the ridicule of today would be the applause of tomorrow. He knew, too, that at some time in the distant future our Nation would repent of the folly of cursing our public servants while they live and blessing them only when they die. In this connection I cannot refrain from suggesting the question to the millions of voices raised today in his praise: "Why did you not say it yesterday?" Yesterday, when one word of approval and gratitude would have meant so much to him in strengthening his hand and heart.

As we recall tonight his deeds and words, we can do so with grateful hearts and strong faith in the future for the spread of righteousness. The civilization of the world is going forward, not backward. Here and there for a little season the progress of mankind may seem to halt or tarry by the wayside, or even appear to slide backward, but the trend is ever onward and upward, and will be until someone can invent and enforce a law to stop the progress of civilization. In goodness and liberality the world moves forward. It goes forward beneficently, but it moves forward relentlessly. In the last analysis the forces of nature are behind the moral progress of the world, and these forces will crush into powder any group of humanity that resists this progress.

As we gather here, brothers all, in common joy and thanksgiving for the life of Lincoln, may I not ask that you, the worthy representatives of 70 million of white Americans, join heart and hand with the 10 million of black Americans—these 10 million who speak your tongue, profess your religion—who have never lifted their voices or hands except in defense of their country's honor and their countrys' flag—and swear eternal fealty to the memory and the traditions of the sainted Lincoln? I repeat, may we not join with your race, and let all of us here highly resolve that justice, goodwill, and peace shall be the motto of our lives? If this be true, in the highest sense Lincoln shall not have lived and died in vain.

And, finally, gathering inspiration and encouragement from this hour and Lincoln's life, I pledge to you and to the Nation that my race, insofar as I can speak for it, which in the past, whether in ignorance or intelligence, whether in slavery or in freedom, has always been true to the Stars and Stripes and to the highest and best interests of this country, will strive to so deport itself that it shall reflect nothing but the highest credit upon the whole people in the North and in the South.

Lincoln Benedicto: Catawba College Cuban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include three newspaper articles and one letter to the editor, which tell a compelling story of a young Cuban patriot in the United States, a 22-year-old university student who has found himself in the position of defending his country's recent revolution to his friends in this country. He has been doing a fine job of it as I am sure you will agree when you read his story. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to introduce to you, to the other Members of the House of Representatives, and to the general readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Lincoln Benedicto:

[From the Salisbury (N.C.) Sunday Post, Jan. 18, 1959]

STUDENT TELLS OF BATISTA CRUELTIES

(By Bill Jackson)

"They drove nails into people's heads. They crucified them by nailing them to the walls. They gouged out their eyes, cut out their tongues. They pulled toenails from toes, fingernails from fingers."

As the young Cuban talked, he pulled himself closer to the edge of his chair. Then he exclaimed, "There is nothing exaggerated in what I say. It is the whole truth."

For Lincoln Benedicto, 22, a senior in political science at Catawba College, had just received a letter from home. It was the first in 5 weeks, and originated from Benedicto's home town of Holguin, in Cuba's now-famed Oriente Province. The writer was the young student's mother.

He grasped the envelope in his hand as he talked. This letter had descriptive passages that made the sounds of Castro's guns seem to echo in the very room in which the student sat. One paragraph had driven home a spine-chilling revelation: The Benedicto homeplace in Holguin had been used as a headquarters for Castro's revolutionary movement in that town of 90,000.

ARRESTED

"My mother served as a liaison between the revolutionaries in the hills and visiting newsmen from other countries," said Benedicto. "In mid-October of last year, she was arrested by the Batista regime and threatened with death."

His mother had been alone in the house; the father had been dead many years. Then, a daughter moved in with her three children, and Benedicto speculates this was because his sister knew of many contacts she could make with the rebels.

"The house is a big one by the average American standard, and could easily accom-

modate 40 persons," Benedicto related. "It was located about three blocks from the city square. Mother ran a filling station nearby."

A personal tragedy confronted the young Cuban as he read one portion of the letter. When he first entered this country as a young high school sudent in 1951, attending the Blue Ridge School at Hendersonville, he became acquainted with a young man from Ecuador. A warm friendship evolved, and on graduation the South American returned to his native soil and accepted a job as reporter on a newspaper in Quito, Ecuador's capital city.

Desiring a personal interview with Castro for a newspaper story, the reporter was sent to Cuba bearing official papers documenting him as a newspaper correspondent. He went directly to Holguin and made contact with Benedicto's mother. She arranged for the clandestine rendezvous with the rebels in the hills of Oriente Province.

KILLED

On obtaining his interview with the rebel chief, the reporter returned to Holguin. He was immediately assassinated by Batista followers.

The mother also revealed the tragic story of a young lawyer, known as Captain Herrera, who had stayed in her home for some time engaged in undercover work for the rebels. One day, while visiting at another home, agents of the S.I.M. (Service of Military Intelligence) arrested the lawyer. Rather than face the impending torture by government agents, he hanged himself.

One of the sordid pictures painted by the mother's words in her letter was that of photographs taken by rebel cameramen and circulated in Oriente Province. Shown in these photographs were neighborhood dogs roaming about the countryside with parts of human bodies in their mouths.

When the S.I.M. entered the Benedicto home in October, they arrested her and told her she would not live long if she did not confess her past deeds and divulge all information relating to her work with the rebels. She protested strongly and maintained her innocence. By the intervention of influential friends, she was set free.

After this, she closed the big house in Holguin and traveled with her daughter and children to Victoria de las Tunas, where they lived until the overthrow of Batista.

"Like many Cubans," said Benedicto, "my mother took a big gamble. Unlike the fate of many Cubans, the gamble paid off, and she's alive today."

He defended the current series of firing squad executions that are taking place in Cuba. "The American people and American politicians have objected strongly to these executions," he said, "but they have forgotten about the massacres and crimes committed by the Batista regime. At the time of these terrible inhumanities, there were no objections from the United States about Batista's treatment of the rebels and their sympathizers. The Americans have forgotten all of this."

Political Science Student Lincoln Benedicto, aptly named after another political scientist, Abraham Lincoln, came to Salisbury and entered Catawba College on the advice of a friend from Brevard. He is president of the International Relations Club at Catawba.

"Not long ago the money from home stopped coming and I was unable to finance my education," he said. "Being an alien, I had to obtain permission from the U.S. Immigration Service in Washington in order to work and earn money to pay my tuition. They don't readily give such permission, but Mr. Cooper (Peter Cooper, public relations director) wrote them a letter and they gave in."

He worked in many jobs, even dug ditches as a laborer. He now works at the Winn-Dixie Store "doing a little bit of everything."

"I haven't been home in 4 years," he said. "I haven't had any desire to go home with things the way they were. I wanted to remain in the United States to study English and try to understand the American people. It has taken me 6 years to understand them."

In an appearance before the Salisbury Rotary Club last August, Benedicto made a speech in which he predicted the strong arm of Fulgencio Batista would break within 6 months. Recent events have proved him to be an expert in crystal ball gazing.

"I now have another prediction to make," he said last week. "The only remaining dictator in Latin America will fall before the might of the oppressed people when the Dominician Republic follows the example of Argentina and Cuba and topples General Trujillo. I believe this will come within the next 3 years."

[From the Catawba College Pioneer, Feb. 7, 1959]

CUBAN STUDENT REVEALS VIEWS ON REVOLUTION

(By Richard Dorn)

Probably the loneliest man on today's international scene is Cuban Rebel Chief Fidel Castro Ruz. For five and one-half years, the countries of the free world have turned hopeful eyes toward the balmy island of Cuba in expectation that a new democracy would rise out of the fray. The rebels did win out. The world rejoiced.

Then the execution of Batista's henchmen began and a deluge of criticisms and bitter protests rained down around the head of Fidel from those same sources that had a few days before praised him and recognized his new government. The United States, in particular, has termed the executions as "regrettable," "inhuman," "sadistic." Castro says: "I am determined to show no mercy."

LINCOLN INTERVIEWED

In an effort to obtain an unadulterated Cuban viewpoint on the Cuban situation, we have interviewed Lincoln Benedicto. Lincoln's mother and sister worked in the rebel underground during the course of the revolt and one of Lincoln's closest friends was assassinated by Batista's police.

When questioned about his views concerning the executions, he replied: "I am not in favor of capital punishment. The Constitution of Cuba does not sanction it, but at the same time I believe that these executions are serving a necessary purpose. I know what the people feel in this matter and how they think. If Castro did not execute those connected with Batista's regime, I am sure that the people would take the law into their own hands and do it for him. Things would get out of hand; they would kill innocent people. Castro's way is best. It does not spill innocent blood."

Lincoln also pointed out the reason for the peoples' hatred of Batista and all those connected with him. He recounted stories of torture of the most inhuman kind and sadistic terrorization inflicted on Cuban citizens by the Batista government. The army even went so far as to ship the dismembered bodies of the students home to their mothers as examples of what happens to rebel cohorts.

QUOTES FROM CASTRO

Fidel Castro has been quoted as saying that he wants no position in the government. "Power does not interest me, and I will not take it." Still, he dictates the every policy of his present provisional military government and metes out justice via kangaroo courts. The liberal onlooker, Puerto Rico's Muñoz-Marín labels these actions as "a bad thing happening in the midst of a great thing," but what will happen after the executions are accomplished? Will democracy replace military law in Cuba?

Here's what Lincoln has to say: "I believe that Fidel Castro is sincere when he says he wants no part of the government. He is not the President of Cuba; Manuel Urrutia is. Castro is carrying out the responsibilities of the government. Urrutia handles the diplomacy. He is a good man for President because of his long experience with Cuban law and his high democratic ideals. Military law will no longer be necessary within 18 months to 2 years from now just as Castro predicts. Castro has promised democracy and he will give it."

CASTRO PRESIDENT?

"I think Castro will eventually become President of Cuba, not because he wants to be President, but because the people will demand it of him. Castro is capable and would adhere to democratic principles."

In answer to questions about Raul Castro and Ernesto Guevarra and the Communist leanings, these two rebel leaders have shown, Lincoln would only say this: "To one man communism may be just another form of government. To another it may be a totally nonexistent form of government." Lincoln denied any possibility of the Communists gaining any voice in Cuban affairs and was quick to point out that although 5 of the approximately 13 seats on the newly formed National Labor Union Committee were grabbed by Communists, they have since been "relieved" of their positions.

LINCOLN WELL-INFORMED

Lincoln's study is a virtual library of information on the Cuban revolt. To write here all that he has had to say about the situation would be impossible. The accounts that he is able to relate about the atrocities committed by Fulgencio Batista and his killer cops against the Cuban people are endless. If you have any doubts about the validity of the feelings of the Cuban people, spend a few minutes with Lincoln in his study. He'll show you newspaper clippings, references of testimony in the U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, relate to you shocking accounts of brutality received firsthand via letters from his mother. It will be an enlightening experience.

[From the Iredell Morning News, Statesville, N. C., Feb. 5, 1959]

NORTH IREDELL LEGION HEARS CUBAN CATAWBA COLLEGE STUDENT ON CASTRO

(By McK. R. Long, Sr.)

Lincoln Benedicto is a political science student at Catawba College, and is president of the International Relations Club at Catawba. He gave the legion an account of the atrocities of the Batista junta, more compact and brief than he has given elsewhere to the press in this State. These closely resemble the horrors inflicted by Nasser on the Israelis, castration and rape, and the known liquidation of 20,000 innocent people. Mr. Benedicto acknowledged that 400 war criminals had been given the gun by Castro's warrant, but insisted it had been done by due process, the disparity between atrocity killings by the Cuban tiger, and Castro's judicial life taking, revealed moderation by Castro.

Again and again he appealed for understanding by the American people, who had been misled by press accounts, in their opinions as to the Castro revolution, which he described as a triumph of democracy. Doubtless when he hears Castro likened to a designing Nasser, the Nasser of the Caribbean, he feels resentment; since General Fidel has about him a cabinet, and has set up rule under President Manuel Urrutia, Mr. Benedicto believes that his hero will follow the constructive line of Magsaysay in the Pacific, and not the Mahomet-like line of the Egyptian dictator. One can see how he boils and writhes with protest, as the press

glibly predicts what Castro will do, when he is only in the process of doing it. Why not give a great liberator the chance to truly show his hand, he asks. Why not concede that to lead a country out of such misery and oppression would tax the abilities of the greatest man—Washington or Bolivar? These are his thoughts, even when his speech is convulsed with patriotic anguish, and remembrance that his own mother was arrested only last October by Batista agents, her life threatened, and Mao-like pressure brought on her to inform against the cause. To know how he feels one would have to be aware that his own home, which can house 40, in Holguin, a town of 90,000, was headquarters for the Castro movement in Oriente Province. His mother, like the mother of Andrew Jackson who patched the breeches of the old continentals, fed them, nursed them and finally died because of them, bred in the son a desperate furor for freedom. A heroic mother makes a passionate partisan of a son. Sonora Benedicto was and is the sort of woman who made America possible.

And her son, who works hard in the summer to finish his course in law, is a worthy brave devotee to the cause. Benedicto believes with all his soul, that his bearded leader, a huge man of 6 feet 2, is "the noblest Roman of them all," that he knows where he is going, the reforms he will bring, and that America and the world, should give him time to work things out. No one hearing him can say no to that. Personally, we believe most legionnaires wish Castro well, and that if he stabilizes Cuba permanently, it will help all South America.

[From the Charlotte Observer, Feb. 5, 1959]

THE CUBAN EXECUTIONS?—MERE JUSTICE

The meaning of words is not in the words; it is in us.

What did the Cuban revolution mean to the American people and the rest of the world? It only meant another revolution in Latin America to get rid of another dictator.

To us Cubans it meant victory, freedom, peace, joy, mourning, tears, and the destruction of a rotten rule and a group of vicious, cruel, implacable, and blood-thirsty men who killed over 20,000 innocent people.

Is there anything wrong with firing squadrons in Cuba? Perhaps to the rest of the world it is the wrong thing to do. But why don't the same people stop criticizing and start thinking of the executions committed by Batista's followers without any mercy when the revolution was growing in power and size?

This very same group of men was not content with shooting the young, as well as the old, without even giving them a fair trial, but also torturing them with the most horrible, despicable, cruel, barbaric, and inhuman ways ever seen in society.

Now that Castro's men are carrying out executions the people's mind revolts and criticizes this procedure.

Have people thought for a minute how many innocent Cubans will die if these executions are not carried out? The relatives of those who were killed will take the law into their own hands. Then what will the American people have to say about it?

The people of Cuba are asking for these executions and even saying that the Government is acting too leniently against the war criminals.

The American people talk about bringing legal charges and have these men put to trial. But what better legal charges can be brought against these soulless human beasts, when relatives and friends have seen them killing their own people and have brought the legal charges before the rebel jury?

Why are some people protesting the executions in Cuba when they did not even bother to mention the massacres of Batista's regime—a reign of terror which has brought mourning to thousands of Cuban homes and tears to mothers' eyes at the right of the mutilated bodies of their sons.

It is my opinion that some people are only concerned with the present, but forget to go back to the past and judge some of its truth.

Since when has the Congress of the United States acquired or bought the rights to manage the domestic affairs of Cuba?

Some Congressmen who did not even bother to stop the selling of arms to the Batista regime, which killed thousands of Cubans, now take the floor and bring charges against the blood bath in Cuba. What role are these men trying to play now? Do they hope to achieve national popularity through such hypocrisy?

For too many years, too many individuals in this country who do not even understand the difference of cultural traits, have stuck or tried to stick their nose into the domestic affairs of other countries in this hemisphere.

The 26th of July revolution led by Fidel Castro and his follower is the best thing that has happened to Cuba since its proclamation of independence.

There has been speculation about the new regime sympathizing with communism and even heading toward another dictatorship. These convictions without doubt have been the ideas of some professional criticizers whose thoughts and opinions have gone beyond their imaginations.

Let the people of the United States know that Urrutia is running the internal affairs of Cuba and Castro is the chief of a dignified armed force.

Let the vultures of Batista criticize Castro and his cannon policy. These human beasts have no longer power or a clean voice. They have already spotted their name with innocent blood—the blood of their own people.

The Cuban revolution had and has a different meaning to us Cubans. We know the meaning of our thoughts, feelings, and words.

Unfortunately these same actions are not understood and are even confused by outsiders with a different concept of ideas and judgment.

Let Senor Urrutia and the Cuban Congress run the internal affairs of the island. Let our leader Senor Fidel Castro Rux be our guide, our democratic hope.

These feelings of ours are not in the feelings of others; they are in us, they are our feelings.

LINCOLN BENEDICTO.

Constitutionality of 14th Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion over the years as to whether or not the 14th amendment to the Constitution was adopted in accordance with constitutional processes.

On last Thursday, February 5, 1959, one of the distinguished and able members of the house of representatives of the 62d general assembly of the State of Arkansas, the Honorable Talbot Feild, Jr., addressed the Arkansas State Legislature in a most provocative speech on this question. At the same time, he introduced a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, dealing with this subject.

Our forefathers, framers of the Constitution of the United States, in their wisdom provided the right of petition. In petitioning the Congress to consider his proposal, Mr. Feild has given us the benefit of a great deal of research. In a most commendable manner, he points up the difficult problems which are causing so much concern among our people today and proposes a method which he conceived that would resolve these difficulties and would accordingly relieve the imponderable and frustrating concern with so many of our people.

It is with this thought, Mr. Speaker, and under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, that I include the speech of Mr. Feild as he gave to the general assembly of our State:

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the house, a moment ago I introduced a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States. By your leave I have been granted the privilege of speaking at this time on my proposal. For this privilege I am indeed grateful. We were recently assembled here in an extraordinary session of the general assembly by virtue of a constitutional call issued by our Governor, the Honorable Orval E. Faubus. We considered and enacted laws to regulate the administration and financing of public schools and education, and made appropriations for such purposes.

Additional proposals pertaining to our schools we must soon take under advisement. Before considering any of them we should turn our attention to the 14th amendment, for in the end, only the Constitution of the United States can resolve our crisis. What does it say? We must understand the 14th amendment. It was this amendment that was supposedly interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1954 when it also took into consideration psychology and sociology. And, in basing its 1954 decision on the 14th amendment it did so on the assumption that the 14th amendment was constitutionally valid. We are only concerned with the last phrase of section 1 of the 14th amendment. It reads as follows:

"No State shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law."

In the case styled *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka*, decided on May 17, 1954, for the first time since our country was founded our Supreme Court based one of its decisions upon alleged psychological and sociological authority to sustain its view of what the 14th amendment should mean. And, it did this although the highest courts of 23 of the States which adopted the 14th amendment have held that it did not abolish segregation. Neither did the 39th Congress that proposed the 14th amendment, nor a single one of the States that considered it, understand that the 14th amendment, of and by itself, outlawed segregation by race in the public schools. Moreover, the 39th Congress which unconstitutionally submitted the 14th amendment simultaneously passed a law establishing segregated schools in the District of Columbia. At that very time the 39th Congress refused to accept a proposed constitution by South Carolina which included a provision requiring racial integration in the schools. But why, after more than 90 years since the 39th Congress was in session, has the Supreme Court of the United States decided to charter a course more radical, extreme, and unconstitutional than that which Congress inaugurated, submitted, and approved? Is it because those who would destroy our constitutional system of three coordinate branches of Government and States rights see the Negro voter as an avenue through which to accomplish their

purpose and centralize more power in Washington? In the 1954 decision this particular language was used:

"Such considerations apply with added force to children in grade and high schools. To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone."

That ambiguous language suggested and resulted in this phraseology being incorporated into Act 7 of the 2d extraordinary session of the 61st General Assembly of Arkansas, which became effective on September 12, 1958:

"Whereas, the Supreme Court of the United States predicated its school integration decision upon the psychological effect of segregated classes upon children of the Negro race, and at the same time, ignored the psychological impact of integrated schools upon certain white children who observe segregation of the races as a way of life; and

"Whereas, legislation is necessary in order to protect the health, welfare, well-being, and educational opportunities for such white children;" etc.

In the Brown case all decisions of the Supreme Court prior thereto which had interpreted the 14th amendment to permit the separate but equal doctrine were overturned, but not the hopes of the Republican Party.

The Emancipation Proclamation by President Abraham Lincoln furnished a dramatic appeal to the Negroes of that day and when the War Between the States ended, Negro voters were brought en masse into the Republican Party. There they stayed until 1936 when a majority of them moved over to the Democratic Party, then under the leadership of President Franklin Roosevelt. It is no secret today that the Republicans are trying to win back a majority of the Negro vote outside the South. President Dwight Eisenhower made wide gains among Negro voters in the North in 1956, but still his Democratic opponent, making the same appeals for their votes, secured 2 out of every 3 Negro votes cast outside the South. Yet in the 1956 election, which followed the 1954 Supreme Court decision overturning the separate but equal doctrine, Eisenhower's share of the vote in 35 congressional districts having more than 10 percent Negro population climbed only from an average of 42 percent in his first election to 47 percent. After soldiers were sent to Little Rock the Republican Party strategy board thought it would climb much higher. However, we all know that they were proven wrong by the returns of the general election last November. Nevertheless, based on the 1956 November elections and voting patterns established thereby 4 million Negro voters hold the balance of power in 14 key States outside the South. In those States the number of Negroes ranges from 4.6 to 15.6 percent of the voting age population, as follows: California, 4.6; Indiana, 4.8; West Virginia, 6.4; New York, 6.5; Oklahoma, 6.6; Pennsylvania, 6.7; Ohio, 6.8; New Jersey, 6.9; Michigan, 7.5; Illinois, 8.1; Kentucky, 8.2; Missouri, 8.3; Delaware, 13.3; and Maryland, 15.6. The total electoral vote in those States is 261. Needed to win the White House, 269. In 1948 it was the announced purpose of the States' Rights Party with Strom Thurmond as its presidential candidate to secure enough electoral votes to throw the election into the House of Representatives where each State would have only one vote. Thurmond received 39 electoral votes and almost succeeded because the loss by President Harry Truman of 16,807 votes in Illinois and 3,555 in Ohio would have resulted in the President being elected in the House. There the voice of the South would carry more political weight than the scattered Negro votes outside the South. Two Presidents have been chosen by elections in the House of Representatives. They were Thomas Jefferson in 1800 and John Quincy Adams in 1824.

As our present-day political parties, the Democratic and Republican, were founded by Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, respectively, let us direct our attention to their attitude concerning our pressing problem. Thomas Jefferson was the author of our immortal Declaration of Independence. He was our third President. He favored freedom for Negroes, but he also favored deportation and colonization. He had much to say in regard to the race problem. In one instance he said:

"Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free; nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government. Nature, habit, opinion have drawn indelible lines of distinction between them. It is still in our power to direct the process of emancipation and deportation peaceably and in such slow degree as that the evil will wear off insensibly, and their place filled up by white laborers."

In his fourth joint debate with Douglas, Abraham Lincoln thus spoke in September 1858, the 50th year of his life:

"I will say then, that I am not, nor have I ever been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races—that I am not, nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold offices, nor to intermarry with white people, and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality, and inasmuch as they cannot so live, there must be a position of superior and inferior, and I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

In that same debate he said, "I will add one further word, which is this: that I do not understand that there is any place where an alteration of the social and political relations of the Negro and the white man can be made except in the State legislature—not in the Congress of the United States."

As President he received a delegation of approximately 500 free Negroes at the White House in Washington on August 14, 1862. After preliminaries were over President Lincoln explained that money had been put at his disposal by Congress for the purpose of colonizing people of African descent, a cause he had long favored. Then he said:

"You and we are different races. We have between us a broader difference than exists between almost any other two races. Whether it be right or wrong I need not discuss; but this physical difference is a great disadvantage to us both, as I think.

"Your race suffered very greatly, many of them by living among us, while ours suffer from your presence. In a word we suffer on each side. If this is admitted, it affords a reason, at least why we should be separated.

"Even when you cease to be slaves, you are far removed from being placed on an equality with white people. On this broad continent not a single man of your race is made the equal of a single man of ours. Go where you are treated best, and the ban is still on you. I cannot alter it if I would. * * * See your present condition, the country engaged in war, our white people cutting one another's throats, and then consider what we know to be true. But for your race among us there would be no war, although many men engaged on either side do not care for you one way or the other. It is better for us both, therefore, to be separated."

It has been 96 years since President Lincoln thus expressed himself. Perhaps we should clearly and frankly examine our attitude today in the South. Our position is clear. The basis of our civilization is the vitality of our culture. It has been preserved by our unwritten law.

The sending of troops to Little Rock was only the beginning of what the South is to face in the months ahead. The chief counsel for the NAACP, Thurgood Marshall, was reported in the Arkansas Democrat on October 3, 1957, to have told an overflow audience of 2,000 at a Negro church:

"We've got the other side licked, its just a matter of time. The period of peace and quiet has passed. Whichever State continues to defy the law will have to answer in court. We will finish the fight * * * and not for one moment deviate from our tactics and our goal." And he said that the goal is the elimination of every form of segregation in every form of life in every part of the country.

In our deliberations here we must enact measures which will present a law-abiding stand for the principles set forth in the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of Arkansas. Let no one tell you that the Supreme Court of the United States can amend the Constitution of the United States. Only the States can amend the Constitution. We hear much of late concerning the supreme law of the land. What is it? Article VI of the Constitution tells us. It is often urged that it is what the Supreme Court says it is. That is far from the truth. It would be true if article VI read, "The Constitution as interpreted, modified, and revised by decrees of the Supreme Court, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof," etc., "shall be the supreme law of the land." But there is no reference to the Supreme Court in article VI and, of course, the words as interpreted, modified, and revised by the decrees of the Supreme Court do not appear therein. There is much evidence indicating that even those strongest advocates of an all-powerful Supreme Court are becoming concerned as more and more citizens realize that decisions of the Supreme Court are not the supreme law of the land. The Associated Press, under a New York dateline of last December 12, reported Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, as saying that a constitutional amendment is needed to settle once and for all that the Supreme Court has the final say on the constitutionality of any law. And, he was quoted as saying, "The Constitution does not now specifically vest the Supreme Court with authority as a final tribunal to declare an act of Congress or a law of a State to be contrary to the United States Constitution, but tradition, historical acceptance, and the continuity of the Court decisions for over 150 years have confirmed this authority."

Every citizen must speak out. Jefferson lighted the path for the Democrats, and Lincoln did the same for the Republicans. The power of the Supreme Court must be curbed, Congress must act, the States must act, and recent decisions must be reversed. The 1954 decision is insignificant in comparison with other recent ones. Among many new concepts adopted by the Court are the views that a witness need not answer even though he knows where an atomic time bomb is hidden which may blow up an entire city; that persons may preach openly the forcible overthrow of our State and Federal Government; that the various States may not punish those who would overthrow the Government by force; that permit confessed rapists and other criminals to go scot free on technicalities; and that restrict the power of Congress itself to get information needed for legislative purposes. Curbing the Supreme Court should become the business of all 49 States. Both Jefferson and Lincoln often spoke out against the Supreme Court of the United States. They both favored law and order as we well know, but they well realized that a reckless Su-

preme Court could pervert the Constitution and destroy our Republic.

They said the exact opposite of what the six judges of the Eighth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals said in their majority opinion delivered in St. Louis on August 18, 1958, in implying that "popular opposition" to Supreme Court rulings could be made the basis for Court injunctions. In effect this is in violation of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States for it would end free speech and free assembly once a Federal court order was put into effect on an issue in public controversy.

Certainly we should recall what Abraham Lincoln said 100 years ago with reference to the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court. It is important to remember that the Dred Scott decision established the false idea that the Court could hold anything unconstitutional for any reason suitable to the Court, whether warranted by the express words of the Constitution or not. Using as authority Chief Justice Marshall's assertion that the Court had a right to declare a law unconstitutional, the Court went far beyond anything dreamed of by Marshall. From the Dred Scott decision sprang the notion, still prevalent, that the Supreme Court is the highest of the three branches of Government, although the Constitution established the three branches as coordinate and equal. Presumptuous and extravagantly despotic, the Court proclaimed, in effect, not only supremacy over the two other branches of Government, but superiority over the will of the people. In magnanimous language the Court announced that questions of "peace and harmony of the country required a settlement of them by judicial decision." It was this case, then that really made of the Supreme Court a superlegislature without responsibility—one above the constitutionally elected legislature of the people. About this decision of the Supreme Court President Lincoln said:

"If this important decision * * * had been before the Court more than once, and had there been affirmed and reaffirmed through a course of years, it then might be, perhaps would be, factious, nay, even revolutionary, not to acquiesce in it as a precedent.

"But when, as is true, we find it wanting in all these claims to the public confidence, it is not resistance, it is not factious, it is not even disrespectful, to treat it as not having quite yet established a settled doctrine for the country."

Thomas Jefferson on one occasion had this to say:

"It has long, however, been my opinion, and I have never shrunk from its expression * * * that the germ of dissolution of our Federal Government is in the constitution of the Federal judiciary; and irresponsible for impeachment is scarcely a scarecrow—working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief, over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the States, and the Government of all be consolidated into one.

"To this I am opposed; because when all government, domestic and foreign, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will render powerless the checks provided of one government or another, and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated."

Recently, on October 3, 1957, the Honorable Stanley F. Reed of Kentucky, a retired Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, who participated in the 1954 decision, made a speech before the State Bar of California. In that speech he quoted the view expressed by President Andrew Jackson in a message to Congress on July 10, 1832. President Jackson said:

"The authority of the Supreme Court must not, therefore, be permitted to control the Congress or the executive when acting in their legislative capacities, but to have only such influence as the force of their reasoning may deserve."

It is not only the South that is alarmed over today's Supreme Court. Almost 2 years ago, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Arizona made a speech in Phoenix before the Hiram Club. He declared that the present Court (and I quote him) "is a greater danger to our democratic form of Government and American way of life than any forces alined against us outside our boundaries." And in regard to the 1954 decision, he said:

"Regardless of what we as individuals may think about the justice or injustice of segregation, I here assert without hesitation or reservation that the decision was not based upon logic or law.

"I further charge that the processes followed in reaching the decision's conclusion violate all procedures of due process known to American jurisprudence."

In 1957, a special committee, the committee on Federal-State relationships as affected by judicial decisions, was appointed by the National Conference of Chief Justices. This special committee submitted its conclusions in a resolution submitted to the Conference of Chief Justices in Pasadena, Calif. On August 23, 1958, by a vote of 36 to 8, with 2 members abstaining and 4 not present, the resolution was adopted. Therein on 12 occasions they pinpoint the 14th amendment and in one instance gently but pointedly stated:

"We do not believe that either the framers of the original Constitution or the possibly somewhat less gifted draftsmen of the 14th amendment ever contemplated that the Supreme Court would, or should, have the almost unlimited policymaking powers which it now exercises."

At another place in the report one could not fail to read with alarm the following:

"It has long been an American boast that we have a government of laws and not of men. We believe that any study of recent decisions of the Supreme Court will raise at least considerable doubt as to the validity of that boast."

The special committee that was headed by Chief Judge Frederick W. Brune of the Maryland Court of Appeals, included top judges from seven Northern States and three Southern States. Although our own Chief Justice Carlton Harris was not present at the conference he was quoted by the Associated Press on October 5, 1958, as having said that the resolution cogently expressed his sentiments. The Gazette Press Service under a Pasadena, Calif., dateline reported that the resolution accused the Supreme Court of making hasty, impatient, decisions without proper judicial restraint and acting as a policymaker.

The crisis existing in the Commonwealth of Virginia as well as the situation confronting us of Arkansas and the rest of the Nation has mainly resulted from the 1954 decision which has attempted to change the long-respected interpretation of the 14th amendment. Yet, that amendment was never constitutionally ratified. In fact, it was not even constitutionally submitted by the Congress to the States. Let us turn back the pages of history. After the death of President Lincoln, President Andrew Johnson pledged to carry out the policies of his predecessor. Two months before the end of the War Between the States Congress passed the 13th amendment and at the close of the war it was being considered by the various States. Following Lincoln's plan, white loyal governments were organized in the South. Certain conditions were required of the defeated Confederacy. They were met and all the newly elected legislatures ratified the 13th amendment. Thus, in the summer of 1865 the Southern States were formally and officially counted back in the Union. Yet in December of the same year the duly elected Representatives and Senators from the Southern States were not admitted to their seats in the 39th Congress. They were blocked by Thaddeus Stevens, a Congressman from Pennsylvania. So, with the 39th Congress unconstitutionally excluding the Representatives and Senators, Congress did not on June 16, 1866, by sufficient valid votes submit the 14th amendment to the various State legislatures for ratification. Even the language of the article V of the Constitution of the United States that governs the method of amending the Constitution clearly sets forth "that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

The 14th amendment was promptly rejected and ratification failed. Let us examine the vote of the legislatures of the Southern States at that time. The following States rejected the 14th amendment as hereinafter indicated:

Rejection

	House	Senate	Date
Texas	70 to 5	21 to 1	Oct. 13, 1866
Georgia	147 to 2	38 to 0	Nov. 9, 1866
Florida	49 to 0	20 to 0	Dec. 3, 1866
Alabama	66 to 8	28 to 3	Dec. 7, 1866
North Carolina	93 to 10	45 to 1	Dec. 13, 1866
Arkansas	68 to 2	24 to 1	Dec. 17, 1866
South Carolina	95 to 1	Rejected	Dec. 20, 1866
Virginia	74 to 1	27 to 0	Jan. 9, 1867
Mississippi	88 to 0	do	Jan. 25, 1867
Louisiana	Unanimous	Unanimous	Feb. 5, 1867

Tennessee had ratified the amendment in July of 1866, although public sentiment in the State was against ratification. Outside the South, six States also failed to ratify the amendment. They were New Jersey, Ohio, Kentucky, California, Delaware, and Maryland. Since there were then 37 States in the Union, 28 were necessary for ratification. Only 21 had responded favorably, Oregon withdrew its ratification before adoption was proclaimed. Failure of the amendment to be ratified infuriated Thaddeus Stevens and his followers. They decided they would force the South to ratify the 14th amendment so they passed in the Congress a Federal law that abolished all the Southern State governments and placed the South under military rule. President Johnson vetoed the act, but in March of 1867 they passed it over his veto containing the provision that no Southern States could be readmitted to the Union until the 14th amendment had been ratified. The South was divided into five military districts with a general in command of each.

During this period of military control designed to force the Southern States to ratify the 14th amendment, a newspaper editor in Mississippi named McCardle exercising his freedom of the press guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, wrote strong protesting editorials. He was arrested by Federal troops and held for trial before a Federal military

commission. The Supreme Court had theretofore held that the military did not have jurisdiction to try civilians if the civil courts were available. The military ignored that decision, so upon being denied a writ of habeas corpus by the lower Federal court he appealed to the Supreme Court. After the case had been argued before the Supreme Court and a decision was awaited, what do you suppose happened? The Congress quickly passed a law depriving the Supreme Court of jurisdictions in such appeals. Although President Johnson vetoed the law it was passed over his veto and the Supreme Court then held that the Congress had the power to withdraw the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court at any time. So, you see another example of how the Constitution of the United States was disregarded in order that the 14th amendment could be forced into the Constitution.

It was the duty of each commanding general to provide for the election of delegates to a constitutional convention. Large numbers of illiterate Negroes sat in all the conventions which were mainly controlled by the carpetbaggers and scalawags to adopt new State constitutions and govern the State elections. Nothing Hitler or Stalin ever did in conducting elections in Germany or Russia was any worse than what then happened in the South. The Negroes were brought into the Republican Party. Terror reigned over the South. There was really no law. Few southern white people were permitted to vote. The voting and the counting of the ballots was a farce. Negroes, carpetbaggers and scalawags were swept into office under the banner of the Republican Party.

We are here assembled in the 62d general assembly, but it was the 17th general assembly that is recorded as ratifying the 14th amendment for Arkansas. There never was any 17th general assembly. Mr. Speaker, the records should be corrected. The so-called members of the so-called 17th general assembly were never elected, nor were they legally appointed or selected. Staples in his book, "Reconstruction in Arkansas," has reported:

"The voting took place not in or near the county concerned, but on the streets of Little Rock. It was charged that when it was deemed necessary to have a county represented, William Fishback would pick out some fellow to represent it, let him vote, certify the election, and let the member take his seat in the legislature. A member of the legislature claiming to represent Hempstead County died, and his successor was seated before the man was scarcely buried. Nixon, the representative-elect from Franklin County, was killed while on his way to Little Rock; and in a day or two before an order for an election could have reached the county, a distance of more than 100 miles from the capitol, a man appeared and took his seat as representative from Franklin County."

I hold in my hand photostatic copies of the four pages comprising the Weekly Arkansas Gazette dated April 7, 1868. It reports firsthand how those who called themselves the elected representatives of the people, with the aid of a locksmith, gained entrance to the capitol building, prepared it for their legislative session, and how they went about voting to ratify the 14th amendment by the unanimous vote of 56 to 0 in the house and 23 to 0 in the senate. On the front page of this paper this is written:

"Were the people of Arkansas free citizens of the Republic, enjoying the rights and privileges sought to be guaranteed to all under the National Constitution, if civil law were recognized and the fundamental law framed by the people held sacred, then we would not be compelled to witness with humiliation the overthrow of our State government and the setting up of the rule of a few conspirators of bad character backed by a horde of ignorant black dupes.

"The instrument under which they claim to be a legislature, has been rejected by the people by a large majority."

Is there any wonder that the legislatures then ratified the 14th amendment? Here is the ratification by States:

	House	Senate	Date
Arkansas	56 to 0	23 to 0	Apr. 6, 1868
Florida	23 to 6	10 to 3	June 8, 1868
North Carolina	82 to 19	34 to 2	July 2, 1868
South Carolina	108 to 12	23 to 5	July 9, 1868
Louisiana	Ratified	22 to 11	Do.
Alabama	94 to 3	33 to 0	July 13, 1868
Georgia	89 to 71	Ratified	July 21, 1868
Virginia	126 to 6	34 to 4	Oct. 7, 1869
Mississippi	87 to 6	23 to 2	Jan. 7, 1870
Texas	Ratified	Ratified	Feb. 18, 1870

Even when Secretary of State Seward by official proclamation dated July 28, 1868, declared the 14th amendment ratified he did so with reservations. If ratification by all of the southern States be counted, and there were Virginia, Mississippi, and Texas recorded as ratifying after adoption was declared, there is strong evidence that even the unconstitutional ratification failed by one State. Let all American citizens ponder and forever remember these two facts: First, not a single member in any State legislature of the United States, North or South, who belonged to the Democratic Party, voted for ratification of the 14th amendment; and second, in every State legislature, North or South, where the Democrats outnumbered the Republicans the 14th amendment was rejected. In the bitterness of defeat the South offered no further contest. It was to remain helpless under military occupation and rule for 10 years. Nevertheless, the issue was raised but the Supreme Court said the action was political, not justiciable. As recently as 1939 the Supreme Court again indicated that it would not look into the political departments of the Government. Involved was the question of whether a State legislature that had once rejected an amendment could later ratify it. The Court's refusal was based on the fact that the Secretary of State alone is authorized to make the determination. Yet, the right of a State, by action of its legislature, to change its mind at any time before the proclamation of adoption is issued by the Secretary of State has been confirmed in connection with other constitutional amendments.

Following the unconstitutional adoption of the 14th amendment the illegally elected Representatives and Senators were seated in Congress. Thaddeus Stevens and his Republican colleagues were gleeful for it seemed to them that they had indeed achieved a brilliant coup and that with their control of the Negroes the Republican Party would always remain the dominant party of the South. It is because of what happened during this tragic era that even today many among us refuse to vote for any candidate of the Republican Party. Finally, under the coordinated efforts of resourceful and capable southern leaders, the South held the balance of power in the presidential election of 1876, and Rutherford B. Hayes, a Republican, was elected. President Hays withdrew the last Federal troops from the South in 1878. But the sordid story of these tragic years which was worse than the 4 years of war has been handed down from generation to generation so that even today the Republican Party receives little consideration in the Southern States.

Already racial conflicts are spreading throughout the United States. It could well be, if no solution is forthcoming within the next few years, that Congressmen from Northern and Western States will appeal in the Congress to their southern colleagues for assistance and votes in order that they may solve their own racial problems.

From Washington, D.C., came the report in the fall of 1958 that its integrated public school system contained 78 percent Negro children. In 1930 the percentage of Negro children was only 27.1 but it is now predicted that by the fall term of 1961 the percentage will be 90. That is only 2 years away. And, in December it was reported that public school officials in the District of Columbia are faced with a staggering problem of babies born to unmarried schoolgirls under 16 years old and increasing venereal infection of schoolboys and girls through the age of 17. There were 896 reported cases of the disease for the 12-month period ending June 30, 1958.

We will soon be preparing to act upon the measures which have been submitted for our consideration. Beyond the passage or defeat of these proposals we, and everyone, should be hopeful of a constitutional solution. Today I submit to you and to the Nation, a solution. The solution hereinafter proposed is, in my opinion, constitutional. Violence and chaos cannot be permitted. The Constitution of the United States must be upheld. We must all be law-abiding citizens.

The history of the adoption of the 14th amendment has been reviewed. Fortunately the Constitution of the United States provides that any citizen may petition the Congress or the legislatures of the various States to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States. My proposal is a proposal that should appeal to all citizens, whether from North or South, sense of fair play and justice. It will afford citizens of every State an opportunity to take a stand for the Constitution, for compliance with the constitutional processes, and for upholding the law—the supreme law of the land, if you please. Let me now read the proposal to you.

1. The chairmen of the standing committees of the Congress of the United States shall each, within 30 days of the ratification of this article as an amendment, appoint one member to a Commission to be known as Commission on the Constitutionality of the 14th Amendment, not withstanding other provisions of the Constitution vesting appointive power in the executive branch of the Government.

2. No person shall be appointed who shall have not obtained the age of 45 years and been 30 years a citizen of the United States and for 20 consecutive years been engaged in the general practice of law.

3. Within 60 days of said appointment the said Commission shall begin hearings to determine the constitutionality of the deprival of equal suffrage in the Senate of the 39th Congress, the submission, and ratification of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, prior to the date of December 31, 1870.

4. Within 18 months of said appointments a formal written report of the findings of said Commission shall be filed with the Secretary of State of the United States and copies thereof made public.

5. Upon the filing of a finding that there was an unconstitutional deprival of equal suffrage in said Senate, or said submission, or ratification then said amendment shall after 30 days become null and void, unless within 30 days a national referendum be called as provided herein.

6. Within 30 days of the filing of said findings the Secretary of State shall upon the application of the legislatures of five States call for a nationwide referendum to be conducted on the first Tuesday following a period of 120 days from the filing of the findings in accordance with the laws of the various States. There shall appear on the ballot only "Approve Commission finding" and "Disapprove Commission finding." Should the Commission finding disclose an unconstitutional action in either of the three instances then upon a majority vote of

all those voting in the 49 States to "Approve Commission finding" said amendment shall become null and void. Should the Commission finding not disclose an unconstitutional action in either of the three instances then upon a majority vote of all those voting in the 49 States to "Disapprove Commission finding" said amendment shall become null and void. The result of said election shall be final, decisions of the Supreme Court notwithstanding.

7. The Congress shall promptly provide adequate compensation for members of said Commission, its staff and all other expenses.

It has been suggested that a nonprofit association be formed for the purpose of explaining and circulating this proposed amendment so that it might be proposed and passed in at least the necessary two-thirds of the legislatures of the 49 States. Congress would then have to call a Convention for the consideration of the proposed amendment.

The fathers of many of us here today survived those tragic years, and the story of those dark and horrible days of Reconstruction are known to all of us. We are all aware of the complex problems we face. Because life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness was denied the people of the South during reconstruction there has been kept alive within all of us the frightening knowledge of what disaster would befall the United States should strife and turmoil within our country contribute to the weakening of our defenses against enemies of our Republic.

In closing, I say we must dedicate ourselves to the preservation of the United States of America. Our Republic was founded upon a deep and abiding faith in God. May our labors and efforts in these trying days be blessed by divine guidance so that the Stars and Stripes shall forever wave over the land of the free and the home of the brave and that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness shall never vanish from this wonderful country of ours, the United States of America.

How Many Latin Americans Have Died Under U.S. Guns?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ernest Galarza, Ph. D., former Director of Labor and Economic Affairs for Latin America of the Pan American Union, which appeared in the Gazette and Daily, of York, Pa., on January 27, 1959:

A GREAT BETRAYAL: AMERICA'S COUNTERFEIT DEMOCRACY

(By Ernest Galarza, Ph. D.)

WASHINGTON.—It seems to me that recent protestations by the State Department to the effect that it had not been sympathetic with the Batista government of Cuba require some critical examination.

It recently was quoted widely as declaring that it had objected repeatedly to what it called the Batista government's misuse of military aid provided for the defense of the Western Hemisphere as a whole. It also pointed out that arms shipments were halted last spring.

Yet Batista's record as an unscrupulous political buccaneer has been public knowledge for 20 years. The terror that he has maintained in Cuba since he last seized power was enforced with U.S. military equipment and in the presence of a U.S. military mission.

Was the American Ambassador finally moved to compassion last spring when our arms shipments stopped? I believe that the real reasons for this change have still to be made clear to the American people.

The truth that starkly faces the Cuban people is that our diplomatic and military agents in Cuba, representing the awful might of our country, coexisted comfortably with Batista's terror.

The importance of this fact comes into focus when one realizes that the people of Cuba are not alone. Throughout Latin America the coexistence of our democratic piousness with insolent, bloody military dictatorship has been exhibited.

Our arms, mostly obsolete for military operations against a great power, are still modern enough to shoot down civilians in the streets, the factories, and the jails. They have gone to Odria in Peru, Somoza in Nicaragua, Perez Jimenez in Venezuela, and Trujillo in Santo Domingo, to mention only a few.

Surely State Department representatives arguing now on behalf of our democratic government will not plead that the Department did not know what was going on. I, for one, cannot believe that such massive ignorance is possible with diplomats. But if it is possible, then those who permitted so much damage from such vast incompetence ought to get out.

I say damage in many contexts. Who can compile the roster of those who have been murdered, tortured, and maimed in the last 10 years in the jails of Santiago de Cuba, Havana, Bogota, Caracas, Lima, Buenos Aires, Cuidad Trujillo, and Managua? Are they hundreds, thousands, or tens of thousands who, since Pearl Harbor, have been summarily executed in Latin America, without trial or appeal, because they disagreed with dictators we had armed?

How many trade-union leaders have disappeared without trace for trying to do what 50,000 union representatives do every day in the United States? How wide and deep is the damage done by the system of indentured labor to which the Governments of the United States and Mexico, acting through their diplomatic agents, have agreed by consigning half a million Mexican workers every year to the corporation farms of our country?

There are many Latin Americans who love the United States and its democratic promise with a passionate devotion. I am one of them. But many of the men who have been officially the stewards of our relations with Latin America have undermined that promise.

And the gap between many of these officials and Latin America widens into suspicion, bewilderment, and finally hatred. Our expected democracy has frequently been counterfeited in this process.

I have had the opportunity to observe at close quarters this counterfeiting process at work—and with increasing nausea. During World War II, when the issue between democracy and totalitarianism was at deadly heat, we mobilized the support of Latin America to our cause.

This mobilization was economic, military, and moral. A new agency was created in our Government for the specific purpose—the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. And never before or since have we done so much to stir in the minds of the Latin American people so burning a desire for the American democratic promise.

But, even as the war progressed, our arms were used to destroy trade unions, suppress civil liberties, and crush constitutional government. And these means were justified to the end of maintaining war production to defend democracy.

Hostilities ended; and not long afterward our ally General Penaranda, of Bolivia, massacred the tin miners of Catavi with his regiments and our arms. We rewarded the general with an honorary degree from Columbia University—an ingenious public relations touch suggested by the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. Penaranda was an illiterate professional militarist.

In the Senate's forthcoming investigation of our relations with Latin America, I hope we shall pick up the thread of our wartime commitments. I think we shall find that we have acted as though World War II gave American business an insider's chance to "move in."

Militarily, we have continued selling arms to dictators who didn't mind our moving in as long as they could collect fortunes in tribute and loot. Morally, we have abandoned democracy to dubious battle with those we armed with money, prestige, and guns.

I do not think it is possible to condone the wave of counter-terror which is now sweeping Cuba, because it is never possible to condone terror. To challenge terror, to discredit it morally, to shackle it, and finally to destroy its threats to individual and political fulfillment, has been the great historic task of democracy. We may, therefore, rightfully call upon Castro to put an end to the wholesale killings now taking place in Cuba. We may ask him to use the power he now has to bring a new Cuba into life, rather than bring the old one to its death.

But in asking this, we must face ourselves as well as Castro. We must admit that when Castro asks us where we were in not protesting when Batista's Tigers killed systematically—and for pay—he is raising legitimate questions. For what Castro asks, and through him all of Latin America asks, is this:

Are we opposed to terror only when people, out of a closed and furious despair, rise and kill their tormentors? Is there an acceptable kind of terror, when it is practiced by political henchmen of ours such as Batista, Somoza, Trujillo, and Perez Jimenez?

Or are we opposed to terror anywhere and everywhere? And, if so, are we willing to join hands at last with those who have suffered from terror, and who only want, as we have promised them, our sympathy, our understanding, and our active material and moral support to establish the democracy that challenges, shackles, and finally destroys terror?

Behind the blind passion of the momentary terror in Cuba, there are, I believe, demands of the human spirit that have been mutilated and betrayed. I believe that with the Cuban people, as with many other people of Latin America, these are just demands.

Unless we begin to help the democratic aspirations of these people instead of continuing to hinder, we shall end by losing their trust and friendship completely—and we shall deserve it.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*.....6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*.....1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*.....
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*.....
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*.....
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*.....
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*.....
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*.....
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Engle, Clair, *Calif*.....3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*.....University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*.....
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*.....
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*.....
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*.....5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*.....
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*.....3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*.....
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*.....419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*.....The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*.....
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*.....
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*.....Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*.....
Proxmire, William, *Wis*.....
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John, *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*.....
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*.....

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS JUSTICES ASSIGNED TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio.*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio.*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio.*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho.*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio.*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Lennon, Alton, *N. C.*
Lesinski, John, *Mich.*
Levering, Robert W., *Ohio*
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.*—224 C St. NE.
Lindsay, John V., *N. Y.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn.*—The Congressional
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, William M., *Ohio*—4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McFall, John J., *Calif.*—507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGinley, Donald F., *Nebr.*
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak.*
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*
McSween, Harold B., *La.*
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—115 Dale Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
May, Catherine, *Wash.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Meyer, William H., *Vt.*
Michel, Robert H., *Ill.*
Miller, Clement W., *Calif.*
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—6601 Radnor Rd., Bethesda, Md.
Milliken, William H., Jr., *Pa.*
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*—8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga.*
Moeller, Walter H., *Ohio*
Monagan, John S., *Conn.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va.*
Moorhead, William S., *Pa.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morris, Thomas G., *N. Mex.*
Morris, Toby, *Okla.*—220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*—204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murphy, William T., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*
Nelsen, Ancher, *Minn.*
Nix, Robert N. C., *Pa.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, James G., *Mich.*
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass.*
Oliver, James C., *Maine*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Pirnie, Alexander, *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—228 2d St. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio*
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg.*
Powell, Adam C., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Prokop, Stanley A., *Pa.*
Pucinski, Roman C., *Ill.*
Quie, Albert H., *Minn.*—The Coronet Apt., 200 C St. SE.
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—5603 24th Ave. SE., Hillcrest Hgts., Wash. 21, D. C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Rivers, Ralph J., *Alaska*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y.*
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rostenkowski, Dan, *Ill.*
Roush, J. Edward, *Ind.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y.*
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.*—2601 Woodley Pl.
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio.*
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Shipley, George E., *Ill.*
Short, Don L., *N. Dak.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Edna Oakes, *Ill.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Slack, John M., Jr., *W. Va.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Neal, *Iowa.*
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Stratton, Samuel S., *N. Y.*—107 Martha's Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Stubblefield, Frank A., *Ky.*
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y.*—Mayflower Hotel
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—3301 Mass. Ave.
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Toll, Herman, *Pa.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Ullman, Al, *Oreg.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Wallhauser, George M., *N. J.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Wampler, Fred, *Ind.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Weis, Jessica McC., *N. Y.*
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Rd. S., Arlington, Va.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolf, Leonard G., *Iowa.*
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, John, *Tex.*
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Burns, John A., *Hawaii*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 216 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Serles, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Place SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Appendix

Texas School Arouses Envy of Observers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, nearly everyone talks about the need to improve our educational system. But the citizens of San Angelo, Tex., are doing something about it. In fact, they were doing something about it long before the launching of the first Soviet satellite dramatized our problems.

In the fall of 1955, school officials in San Angelo set about to establish a bold, new program for grade-school education. These early efforts are now producing gratifying results, as an Associated Press article, published in the Chicago Sunday Tribune of February 8, points out.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS SCHOOL AROUSES ENVY OF OBSERVERS—PROGRAM IS RADICALLY DIFFERENT

SAN ANGELO, TEX., February 7.—Word is getting around that this west Texas city has come up with something radically different in public school programs.

Even the most violent critics of American education are impressed by the curriculum. School people come to take a look at the physical layout, and walk away talking to themselves in envy.

As the word spreads, the mail pours in: "How did you do it?"

The school authorities here do it by letting their imaginations run wild, then taking infinite pains with the details. They keep the best of the old, and try the most promising of the new—and all the time they work toward just one goal: The best possible education for every child, regardless of his capabilities.

LEARN MORE AND MORE

This approach has touched off a chain reaction in San Angelo. As the pupils learn more in the lower grades, the courses in the upper grades must be beefed up to hold their interest.

Consider, for instance, the limited teaching of science in the elementary grades.

In the fall of 1955, Robert H. Mayfield, curriculum project director, set about to find a new approach to make a grade school science program effective.

For 2 years Mayfield and his assistant, a physics teacher, Claude C. Wooley, studied the problem. They held long conferences with the teachers of grades one through six, then called in junior high teachers to insure continuity of the program.

COVER SIX AREAS

It was first decided to cover six major areas of science in each of the first six grades. These are nature (biology, zoology), the universe (astronomy, space meteorology), the earth (geology), simple machines (levers, inclined planes, wheels, and pulleys), electricity and magnetism (door bells and compasses), and heat, light, and sound.

Few grade schoolteachers could handle such a program. It was necessary to teach the teachers how to teach science.

This was taken up in a series of teachers' handbooks which outline just what scientific concepts are attainable by the pupils in each grade.

Next came the mobile library-laboratory units. Each unit is in the form of a desk and is designed especially to deal with one of the six major study areas listed above.

HOW PROGRAM WORKS

The program was ready to go in the fall of 1957. This is the way it works:

At least once each week, a mobile unit is wheeled into every grade-school classroom in San Angelo. The teacher, from her handbook, has decided what experiment she can conduct to illustrate best the day's lesson.

A card file in the desk shows her just where to find each item of equipment needed. Another card file shows her how to carry out the experiment, the observations to be made, and the conclusions to be reached. A third card file lists suggestions for the pupils, outlining separate projects they can tackle on their own; and pegged to their levels of achievement.

SIX UNITS ROTATE

A complete set of six units, covering all six of the major areas of studies, is assigned to a group of six buildings. Each 6 weeks the units are interchanged within the buildings. Thus while the pupils in one school are studying simple machines, those in another school are studying electricity and magnetism.

The libraries which are part of the mobile units are not pegged to any one reading level.

START NEW COURSE

Mayfield estimates each unit has an original cost of $600 and the annual cost of maintenance and improvement is about $125. Since one unit serves six buildings during a year, that $600 provides each school with about $3,600 worth of equipment.

Last year the new science program was in effect only in grades one through six. This year a new course was started for the seventh grade, introducing science of measurement, elementary astronomy, botany and chemistry, functional anatomy, and heat, light, and sound.

That same course is also being taught to this year's eighth graders. Since the seventh graders are getting it this year, a new course must be ready for them when they start the eighth grade next year.

This system, while it obviously improves the teaching of science, has some built-in work-makers. It seems likely that the whole science curriculum, from first grade through high school, must be overhauled.

BOOST ALL ALONG LINE

"By the time kids have 8 years of science as we are teaching it," says Mayfield, "they're going to be too far advanced for what is now ninth-grade science. We're going to have to boost this thing up all along the line."

This comment bears out what Superintendent George B. Wadzeck says about the San Angelo system: "In 15 years, the kids with the IQs of 75 (well below average) are going to be learning as much as the average student is today."

Mayfield emphasizes, however, there is no desire to produce a high school graduating class composed strictly of budding scientists.

"This is a science exposure program," he says. "We want to expose the student to science the same way he is exposed to measles. Just like the measles, it won't take on all of them."

WARY OF NEW IDEAS

The grade school science program is just an illustration. Every course of study in the San Angelo schools is being developed in the same way—and it isn't easy.

Teachers with many years' experience are sometimes loath to adopt new ideas. Students who have their hearts set on being engineers, although they can't add 2 and 2, don't like being told they can't take physics because their math grades aren't high enough.

Address by Hon. Alan Bible, of Nevada, Before the Almas Temple Shrine Club, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] made a very interesting speech before the Almas Temple Shrine Club in Washington, D.C. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ALAN BIBLE, ALMAS TEMPLE SHRINE CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 13, 1959

Fellow nobles, I deem it a real pleasure and a distinct honor to be afforded the opportunity of speaking to the Almas Temple Shrine Luncheon Club today—and, before going any further, I bring you the warmest expressions of goodwill from Kerak Temple in Reno, Nev.

In a world that seems bent on devising means to bring about its own destruction, it is refreshing to participate today among men of good will, who espouse the high principles of peace and understanding.

Only this week I had the pleasure of reading the definition of a Mason and a Shriner—from no less an authority than George E. Stringfellow, imperial potentate of the Shrine of North America.

A Mason, he said, is a man who believes in God and practices that belief. A Mason is a man who believes in brotherly love and practices his belief. A Mason is a man who uses the symbols of the builder to set for himself and his brethren a code of life which refines his thoughts, purifies his sympathy, and broadens his outlook, it amplifies his

friendship, exalts his morality, and tames his passions.

Mr. Stringfellow described a Shriner as a Mason who realizes the work of his craft—exemplifying the high code of morality—requires refreshment. In obtaining that refreshment, Shriners adopted the code, 59 years ago, of pleasure without intemperance, hospitality without rudeness, and jollity without coarseness.

We live today in a world of tensions. The ever-quickening tempo of our times would seem to exclude anything but the mad rush for material gains, yet I have detected in frequent trips through our land a spiritual reawakening and a rebirth of tolerance that give ample evidence of a brighter future. Surely the great work of the Shrine in behalf of crippled children—regardless of race, color, or creed—epitomizes to the fullest extent the fact that charity is not a forgotten virtue.

As Americans we must summon all of our collective strength to meet the challenges posed by Soviet Russia and its ill-disguised efforts to gain world domination. But in this life-and-death race for survival, we must not for one instant lose sight of our dependence upon divine providence for spiritual guidance and the constant realization that "man does not live by bread alone."

Unquestionably, these are times that demand the utmost cooperation and effort of all citizens toward making our country stronger in a material sense. Equally important, in my opinion, is the need for even greater effort to utilize more fully our vast resources of the spirit. Only by so doing can we demonstrably prove to all the world that strength really does come from unity.

Although most of you here today are familiar with the event, I am sure you will not mind if I recall the valiant epic of the four chaplains who, with arms linked, perished with their ship in the North Atlantic in World War II, after giving their own life preservers to others.

I read this magnificent story in a book called "Sea of Glory," by Francis Beauchesne Thornton. The four chaplains were George Lansing Fox and Clark V. Poling, Protestant ministers; Father John P. Washington, a Catholic priest, and Alexander D. Goode, a Jewish rabbi.

The chaplains and their unit were en route to Greenland early in 1943—in the terrible days of German submarine supremacy, when the U-boats unmercifully menaced our shipping lanes and made that particular run a thing of danger and terror.

Their ship was a lumbering old freighter, capable of 10 knots at best. Precisely at 1 a.m. of a February morning, the cold Atlantic silence was broken by a shattering explosion as a German torpedo found its mark amidships. As Mr. Thornton described it: "Everywhere about the ship in the terror-ridden interior and on the crazily tilted deck, the four chaplains moved among the men with helpful words, giving some the strength to live and some the courage to die."

When pandemonium was at its height, when it became apparent that the ship would soon sink, those chaplains gave their life preservers to other men and made the heroic decision to stay with the ship. As the author states: "Catholic, Jew, and Protestant each proved that night that courage knows no distinction of creed, bravery no division of caste."

Here we see exemplified the highest type of courage and self-sacrifice. There are other kinds of courage, too, and I refer particularly to the courage to live. While we feel that the present age confronts us with problems of almost staggering proportions, we should remember that every generation in our history has had problems—and we have always had men of courage who would rise to the challenge.

Yesterday we observed the 150th anniversary of the birth of such a man. If any person had cause on many occasions to despair and throw in the sponge, it was Abraham Lincoln. His political career was a succession of set-backs. He was defeated for the legislature, he was defeated twice for Congress and twice for the Senate, and he was defeated for nomination as Vice President in 1856. His election to the Presidency in 1860 thrust upon him a burden that was almost insupportable, yet his faith propelled him through the darkest hour in our country's history. Lincoln firmly believed that God had entrusted him with a mission, and in this knowledge he gained the strength that sustained both him and the Nation for which he labored. Lincoln had his watchword. It was stated simply, "With God's help, I shall not fail."

This is a creed all of us could well adopt today, not as a mere utterance but as something to put into practice in our daily lives. As Masons we should strive all the more to translate our precepts into our everyday living—to fight bigotry and intolerance wherever we find it, to inculcate into our youth the importance of fair play, to broaden our horizons beyond our own little circumscribed areas; in short, to give proof that we are alert to our responsibilities as citizens of the greatest country on earth.

In this respect, the great poet, Edwin Markham, wrote:

"We are all blind, until we see
That in the human plan
Nothing is worth the making if
It does not make the man.
Why build these cities glorious
If man unbuilded goes:
In vain we build the work, unless
The builder also grows."

If we are to move forward and maintain our place as leaders of the free world, if we are to leave a legacy of strength and determination for our children—indeed, if we are to survive at all in an age of potential destruction—we must shoulder today's burdens and responsibilities—willingly, resolutely, and courageously.

Fortunately, the great majority of Americans are turning more toward the truths of religion which spell out a code of conduct that can only lead to a stronger country and happier citizens. A look at Russia makes the contrast all the more startling. There we have the sordid spectacle of an ideology which demands that personal honor and integrity be subjugated to the state—not only in the field of government, but in art, literature, science, medicine, and all lines of endeavor.

We in America are bountifully blessed with the resources needed to keep our defenses strong. To complement this pool of resources, I believe we should all draw more upon that even greater reservoir of the spirit that has abounded in our country since its founding more than 180 years ago.

As Masons committed unequivocally to upholding freedom and justice, not only in America but throughout the world wherever tyranny rears its head, we should be leading the way in man's constant battle for human betterment. We should be more than lodge members. We should be articulate spokesmen in a world that sorely needs a voice of hope—and courage—and truth. To fulfill the obligations of our order we can do no less—to fulfill our responsibilities as Americans we must do more.

Television Booster Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under privilege to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a news report by Mr. Frank W. Vaille, an able reporter for the Associated Press for the West, which appeared in the Wenatchee Daily World, Wenatchee, Wash., recently. This article concerns the problems we are having in attempting to protect the rights of people in remote areas, particularly in the mountains, where deep canyons prohibit the reception of direct radio TV impulses:

HORAN, MAGNUSON SEEK TV SOLUTION

Two Washington Congressmen are soliciting views of other western Members on a proposed bill to solve the knotty problem of television booster stations.

The bipartisan move has been undertaken by Representatives DON MAGNUSON, Democrat, and WALT HORAN, Republican, in the wake of continued opposition by the Federal Communications Commission to booster station operations.

The Commission Tuesday extended until June 30 its deadline for operators of VHF (very high frequency) boosters to convert to UHF (ultra high frequency) translators. Boosters and translators are TV systems that serve small isolated areas.

The Magnuson-Horan proposal would create within the Commission a community television bureau to study technical and financial problems faced by small communities in obtaining TV service.

All applications for UHF translators or any other facilities which may be authorized for operation in the future would be referred to the bureau for study and recommendation.

As used in the bill, the term "small community" is defined to be one with fewer than 25,000 inhabitants.

The bill takes no position as to whether the Commission should or should not license the VHF boosters it now frowns upon. It does say, however, that should the Commission decide to license such operations, it will waive for stations in existence prior to 1959 the present requirement that construction licenses be obtained before construction is started.

One theory behind the new approach is that the present controversy between the Commission and operators of booster stations, mainly in the West, result in part from a lack of understanding by both sides as to the problems faced by the other.

Through creation of the bureau, it is felt, both sides will obtain a better understanding of the problems and come to an acceptable decision.

I would also like to include the following article which appeared in the Wenatchee Daily World newspaper describing just how much it would cost the people in my State to convert from VHF boosters to UHF translators:

COMPLETE UHF CHANGE WOULD COST $11 MILLION

PATEROS.—The Washington State Television Reflector Association estimated today

that it would cost $11 million to convert all the reflectors and home sets in the State to UHF.

Francis Adams, president, said this cost included converting community transmitting antennas from VHF to UHF and converting individual sets and home antennas.

Adams said the association was urging citizens to write their Congressman in protest against the costly changeover being demanded by the Federal Communications Commission.

"Let Congressmen know we can't afford it," he urged.

Along with these news reports, I would like to include a brief résumé of the problem which now faces those of us in Congress, the Federal Communications Commission as well as those I want to continue to have the privilege and benefits of television.

One of the primary purposes of the Federal Communications Commission is to provide good, as well as economical television reception for the people of America. In my congressional district, however, hundreds of TV screens, operated by means of VHF booster stations, were dimmed recently by an FCC decision.

As I have indicated, the topographical terrain in my State is wide and varied—from the flat, rolling plains of the wheat country to the rugged mountains in the entire northern and western portions.

When television first came into being years ago, almost everyone became interested. Nearly every family acquired a television set. Three television stations began operations in Spokane and have been providing good TV ever since.

But, some of our people, living in the valleys and canyons or in small isolated communities, found that their sets simply could not get the picture. As a result, they began looking for ways to bring the signal into their homes.

The first solution was found in community antenna television operations. A private organization simply brought the TV signal into the sets of their subscribers via the cable. The picture was satisfactory and the cost, in localities where there were enough patrons, was not too prohibitive. But, in the small, isolated communities—maybe 20 or 30 families—the CATV system was ineffective simply because there were not enough subscribers to make it economical and practical for the companies.

Thus, other solutions were sought.

I believe the next method employed was the UHF translators. These facilities picked up a signal and retransmitted it on the ultra high frequency band. There were two basic objections to the UHF translators, however. The cost made it impossible to put them to practical use in the small communities. Besides this, they had never been tested in the rugged mountainous areas.

Finally, another method was found in the VHF boosters. These boosters were similar to the translator operations except they operated on a different band of the television spectrum. The boosters were relatively inexpensive and they provided a good picture even in the rugged hills. Folks in my district cooperated in erecting their booster stations. They pooled their money, their work, and their ingenuity and put up their towers. Then they watched television.

The Federal Communications Commission, however, announced that these boosters could not be licensed because they were causing interference and they could not find a way of regulating their operations. They recommended that UHF translators be substituted. The people protested this action and as a result, the FCC allowed the boosters to remain in operation until a complete investigation was accomplished. This survey was made although I do not believe it was complete. UHF translators were not put to practical test in the mountains; no consideration was given to the economic impact on the small, rural, or isolated communities and it was never proven that all VHF boosters caused interference. As a result of their investigation, the FCC declared the boosters to be illegal operations and ruled that they be discontinued. Ninety days were allowed for the booster districts to file an intention of conversion to UHF translators or to shut down. To many people, this was a cruel blow. Many protests were received, once again, from both the television viewers and from the Members of Congress. The FCC then extended their 3-month conversion period to 6 months.

I wish to make it clear that the FCC is faced with a terrific task in trying to solve this problem. But, the problem is not solved by any means. This situation does not exist only in my district, but in many sections of the country. Recently, I, along with several colleagues in the House and Senate, introduced a resolution which states that it is the sense of Congress that the FCC should authorize the operation of VHF booster facilities where it is a matter of public convenience and necessity and where such operation does not actually cause objectionable interference. I am hopeful that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will see fit to call for an on-the-spot investigation to be made into this situation to determine if they actually cause interference and, also, if UHF translators will work.

Perhaps this problem could be solved if all the facts were considered. In my opinion, this problem could and should have been prevented. In order that future, similar situations do not arise, I have introduced a bill which would establish a Community Television Bureau in the Federal Communications Commission. This Bureau would study the technical and financial problems involved in bringing television service to the residents of small communities and rural and isolated areas. They would also consult with and advise small communities on such problems. I feel that this would help to establish a good relationship between the viewers and the Federal Communications Commission and would enable them to settle their problems on a mutual basis.

I do hope that my colleagues will lend their full support to these measures in an effort to provide all of the people of our country with satisfactory television.

What Are Missiles For?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Are Missiles For?" which appeared in the February 6 edition of the Washington Post.

I found it to be a very challenging commentary on the status of our missile program and the importance of keeping abreast in the arms race. The editorial points out quite correctly that only with an adequate defense program can we hope to negotiate realistically with the Communist bloc in an attempt to reduce the dangers of a hot war.

I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ARE MISSILES FOR?

What is the fundamental purpose of the American missile and defense program? In the immediate sense the purpose, of course, is to deter attack upon the United States and its allies—or, if worst comes to worst, to destroy the warmaking capability of the enemy. But in the larger sense, surely, the purpose of this country's defense efforts is to make possible realistic negotiations with the Soviet Union and Communist bloc to remove some of the causes of friction and reduce the danger of nuclear annihilation.

Such negotiations in a mutual interest, if they are practicable at all, probably must proceed from a basis of rough parity of military power. Fruitful negotiations proved impossible when the Russians were in a position of military inferiority; every device of Soviet diplomacy and propaganda was directed toward frustrating the sort of discussion in which the Soviet Union might be at a disadvantage.

The opposite side of the coin is that if the Russians were in a position of military superiority, the United States and its allies themselves would be at a disadvantage in seeking beneficial negotiations on arms control and some useful accommodation on Germany and European security. We have already witnessed the attempts of the Soviet leaders to throw their weight around in the wake of their success with the intercontinental missile. Their boasts do not necessarily connote an intention to provoke a war, but obviously the Russians are not going to make significant concessions if they think that they can frighten the West into accepting their asking price.

The meaning of all this, in terms of the present argument over the missile program, is that what the administration says and does now can have a great influence on the Soviet attitude toward negotiations. Lamentably, the impact of most of the official statements so far has been to weaken the bargaining position of the West.

Secretary McElroy has acknowledged that it is administration policy to accept a numerical inferiority in intercontinental missiles over the next few years, on the stated assumption that other weapons and means of delivery will keep a balance. The real explanation, evidently, is the effort to maintain a fictitious budget balance. Such arguments conspicuously omit comparisons of Soviet

and American intermediate missiles as well as this country's neglected limited war capability.

Admittedly the present liquid-fuel missiles such as Atlas are primitive and cumbersome when contrasted with the more sophisticated types under development. Conceivably the administration's hope is to overcome any numerical inferiority quickly when such solid-fuel missiles as Minuteman and Polaris become available. But there is no guarantee that some new budget drive will not limit an effort to regain parity. Overly futuristic planning, moreover, ignores the effects of inferiority over the next several years.

More recently Mr. McElroy has shifted ground to make it appear as if the United States will nearly equal the Soviet Union in intercontinental missiles this year. This approach both misleads the public and begs the question, for it conceals a calculated decision to accept numerical inferiority in the not-distant future. It is very unlikely that the Russians are deceived by such a maneuver; indeed, some of their recent intransigence at Geneva and elsewhere may reflect an awareness of American intentions. The real victims are the American people who have not been told the straight facts about the country's defense position.

It is therefore quite understandable that many Members of Congress, including some of the administration's stanchest Republican supporters, are seriously worried by the missile numbers game and by their inability to get frank information. Senator CLIFFORD CASE made the point in his comment on the assurances by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee about the testimony of General Twining, himself under restraints: "How much better * * * if the public generally knew the grounds for his confidence—and the grounds for the apprehension for the future that he also expressed."

Inasmuch as judgments are involved, it is very difficult to obtain a single flat version of objective truth in the missile muddle. But one thing that congressional leaders who are disturbed by the lack of candor can do is to question more pointedly the responsible military officers concerned and to insist that the administration gag rule be cast aside. Another thing they can do is ask to see the intelligence estimates upon which administration policy is based and to make their own evaluation. Intelligence is an inexact science, but there is a long record in the administration of distorting the meaning of available intelligence under a gloss of optimism.

The most basic responsibility, however, is that of the administration—to its own constituents, the American people, and to the cause of world peace. One would have thought that the ghastly miscalculation in advance of the first Soviet sputnik would have placed the administration on guard against the disastrous psychological impact of American inferiority. The net effect of the present refusal to state and face the facts could well be to undermine the chance of real negotiations and, apart from the danger of inviting Soviet adventurism, to blight the hope of a secure peace.

NEA Not Serving Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in this age of specialization, education has come to be one of the most crucial issues of our time. Not all who work in this field are contributing to the best interests of our Nation. The able editor of the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., has pointed this out most realistically in an editorial entitled "NEA Not Serving Education," published on February 15, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEA NOT SERVING EDUCATION

Among the thousands of special interest groups lobbying in Washington, none is more active than the National Education Association.

The association supports a sizable staff which, in addition to buttonholing Congressmen, grinds out an endless stream of news releases, handsomely printed and costly brochures, motion pictures, and other propaganda material.

All this is designed to persuade all who will look or listen that the country is doomed unless the Federal Government undertakes a massive aid-to-education program immediately.

At best, much of this stuff is wasteful. Occasionally, it is downright deceptive.

An example arrived at our desk the other day. It was a brochure entitled "Can America Afford Better Schools," and an accompanying news release summarizing the pamphlet. Both exhibit the same characteristics of slanted, misleading statements, distortions, and deliberate omissions.

Both are patently designed to prove that local and State efforts can never—no never—be sufficient to support a decent school system, and that the only possible alternative is Federal aid to education.

As an example of how this point is dragged in through the back door is the following statement:

"Right now, the Federal Government with its efficient, streamlined collection system brings in almost 3 out of every 4 tax dollars."

Nowhere does the association argue the point that the Federal tax system is efficient or streamlined. It merely states that it is, and then goes on to use the statement to bolster another point.

Of course the Federal Government's tax system is neither efficient nor streamlined. It is archaic, unjust, wasteful, discriminatory and staggeringly complicated as every Collector of Internal Revenue within recent memory has publicly testified and as every Member of Congress will admit.

It is part of the National Education Association's creed, however, that nothing the Federal Government does can possibly be wrong, and nothing State and local governments do can possibly be right, and so the facts are abandoned.

Unless the Federal Government assumes a reasonable share of school costs, the association's most recent publication asserts several communities, none of whom are identified, face some really hair-raising tax increases. Of course, it never occurs to the pundits of NEA that these increases might be averted if the Federal Government would decrease some of its taxes and allow that money to go instead to State and local treasuries.

This serves also to illustrate another of the association's blind spots. School costs are bound to go up, it declares, and if local and State agencies remain the chief support of schools, then local taxes are going to increase, which is bad.

But won't Federal taxes go up, too, if the Federal Government attempts to meet those costs? And isn't that just as bad? Not, apparently, to the National Education Association.

This is the basis for all the liberal, free-spending arguments. Government money—that is, Federal Government money—is as free as the air; it comes from nowhere, at no cost, and it can be spent and spent and spent.

The fact is that, as has been proven time and again, the more efficient way to both collect and disburse tax moneys is at the local level. This avoids the hidden costs of bureaucratic proliferation, unsupervised projects of dubious value, and mistakes of judgment due to lack of familiarity with local problems.

This newspaper firmly believes that a greater effort, financially and otherwise, is due our schools. We have urged, and will continue to urge, that school patrons in Greenville County support the increased local taxes so vitally needed for the future of our children.

If that effort is made, we are confident that our schools can perform the tasks they should, the National Education Association to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is little short of tragic that the association should dissipate its efforts, not to mention the dues of its well-meaning members, in belittling local support of the Nation's schools. In so doing, it is not serving the best interests of education.

The fact is that State and local governments can and should meet their own educational needs, and they can do it better and more cheaply than it could be done under any program administered by a vast new Federal bureaucracy.

Greenville County, and the State of South Carolina are a case in point.

Considering the many handicaps under which we have labored, the long war period when no schools could be built and the rapid increase in the school population, we have done well up to now. We need to do more, of course, and we presently face something of an emergency which has been gradually building up.

But we can meet the emergency; we believe we will do it; and we believe further that we will go on to meet the needs as they develop in the future.

A week from Tuesday the voters of the Greenville County School District will express their views on a proposed local bond issue to supplement State funds for the building program. It is a crucial vote, and it might have a bearing on whether we continue to manage our own schools and educate our children in our own way, or gradually turn them over to the Federal Government with heaven knows what results.

In the interest of presenting all the facts, News Reporter Gil Rowland, who is a former teacher, has made an intensive study of the schools and has a background of years of reporting news of education, has prepared a nine-part series on our present school situation.

To those who express an interest in education and who say they have not been fully informed, we commend this series of stories, which starts today. Anyone who reads them and thinks about them and, if he desires, checks behind them at the source, will be prepared to cast an intelligent vote on February 24.

Getting Along Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been intensely

interested in all efforts that our country can make to present America to those who live elsewhere, in the best possible light. My experience as a soldier in foreign lands in World War II underlined for me the need for building friendships among the peoples of other lands, preferably friendships based upon personal contacts and mutual understanding and respect. I can remember very well that as we left New Guinea and approached the Philippine Islands early in 1945, we were given by the Army simple, understandable and interesting reading material to orient us and to allow us to be more truly friends of the people we were to meet and assist in their efforts for freedom. Despite all the good work our Diplomatic Corps may be able to do toward establishing good relationships with people in foreign countries, they could never make anywhere near the impact that is made by numerous Americans traveling abroad.

In the first Congress in which I served—the 81st—I wrote to the Department of State and urged that a program of this nature be established within the Department of State. I suggested printed material, moving pictures aboard tourist liners, and other devices. Through the years that have followed, I have persistently interested myself in this and I am glad to record that both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations made very significant steps forward in this field.

There have been two substantial difficulties in this. One is that there has been a feeling in the Department of State that the Government of the United States should not be the chief source of such activity, and the other difficulty has been the obvious one of trying to evade lecturing people on what they should do. The two difficulties are interlocked. I have never had much sympathy with those who feel that the Federal Government should not be active in this field. Characteristic of the Department's position through the years is the following statement from an August 5, 1950, letter to me from the Department of State:

> It is definitely felt that the Department should not put itself in the position of trying to tell private individuals how to behave when traveling abroad.

Similarly I heard from the Department of State on March 4, 1953, as follows:

> It has been found from experience that participation by non-government organizations and groups in this type of venture is of great psychological benefit and eliminates the element of "propagandizing" the American public.

I am glad to see that this reluctance on the part of the Department of State has been giving way to a more realistic appreciation of the urgency of the matter and to the needs of the security of our country. Although there has not been a complete abandonment of the early reluctance by the Department, there has been a gradually increasing emphasis on what can be done in this field. The person-to-person program now underway is outstanding, although still not doing all that it should do.

I am happy to include at this point in the RECORD an excellent publication published by the Department of State this month entitled "Getting Along Abroad." This is largely the result of the dedicated public service of Miss Frances G. Knight, Director of the Passport Office of the Department of State. The publication reads as follows:

GETTING ALONG ABROAD

The passport of the United States is a valued credential. It requests that in the countries you intend to visit there be provided you, as an American citizen, safe passage, lawful aid, and protection in case of need. As the holder of this passport, you will be the guest of our neighbors and friends in the world family of nations.

Year after year increasing numbers of our citizens travel to foreign countries. In most of these lands there exists a reservoir of good will for the United States, but in some areas our country and its aspirations are less well understood. To all the varied peoples of these many countries, the bearer of an American passport represents the United States of America.

Most Americans know that they will get better results and enjoyment from their travels abroad if they conduct themselves with the same restraint, understanding, and good manners they would expect from visitors at home. Most Americans who travel abroad are aware that their conduct as guests in a foreign country can have an important bearing on the good will of other nations toward the United States. Consequently they try to understand and appreciate the economic problems, customs, restrictions, and regulations of the lands they visit.

Many citizens also try to learn something about the countries they intend to visit before they get there. In that way they are better able to appreciate the contributions of those countries to the world's culture. They seek to respect the local laws and try to avoid inadvertent acts or misinterpretations which could be embarrassing. They familiarize themselves with local customs, such as the manner in which people dress in churches, restaurants, theaters, and other public places. In short, they show abroad the same consideration for others that they do at home and, consequently, they are our most effective and welcome ambassadors of good will.

As you travel abroad, the respect you show for foreign laws and customs, your courteous regard for other ways of life, and your speech and manner help to mold the reputation of our country. Thus you represent us all in bringing assurance to the people you meet that the United States is a friendly nation, dedicated to the search for world peace and to the promotion of the well-being and security of the community of nations.

Also from the Department of State is the following publication entitled "Do's and Don'ts Information and Travel Tips." This 1959 publication is also the product of Miss Knight and her fine staff and it reads as follows:

"DO'S AND DON'TS INFORMATION AND TRAVEL TIPS"

LOST PASSPORTS

Every year the Passport Office spends considerable time and effort in tracing lost passports, issuing limited passports to citizens who lose or misplace them, and warning citizens against altering or mutilating their passports. Travelers are cautioned to protect their passports from loss, mutilation, or misuse.

DO'S AND DON'TS FOR EVERY TRAVELER

Safeguarding passports, checking their validity, and acquiring visas are the responsibilities of passport bearers. This is true in all countries in the world. As a potential traveler, the following information is brought to your attention. Observance of these suggestions may save you embarrassment, delay, expense, or difficulty with officials of foreign governments.

Do sign your passport as indicated on page 2 of the passport. It is not valid unless it is signed by the bearer.

Do fill in the information required on the inside front cover. In case of accident, or other circumstance, it may be necessary to contact designated agent or next of kin.

Do register it if you must mail it.

Do keep it safe. Your passport is a valuable document. Its loss or disappearance can cause you considerable delay and expense.

Do notify the Passport Office, Washington, D.C., if your passport is lost or stolen; or, if abroad, notify the nearest American consul.

Do check the validity of your passport before you travel. If in doubt, consult the Passport Office or the nearest American consul.

Do check the visa requirements of the countries you plan to visit. This is your responsibility.

Don't led your passport for use by a friend or stranger. Remember that it is an official Government document for use only by the person or persons to whom it is issued.

Don't use your passport as collateral or pledge.

Don't alter, insert, or overwrite any information or entry in the passport. If a change is necessary, it must be made officially by authorized Government agents.

Don't tamper with the passport picture. Insist on getting a good one and then accept it as part of your official identification.

Don't use the passport as a notebook, scrapbook, or autograph book.

Don't pack it in your luggage. When traveling, keep it readily available but safe.

Don't tear or substitute pages in your passport.

Death of Maj. Gen. Thomas E. Rilea, Commandant of Oregon National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of Oregon's outstanding soldiers and military leaders, Maj. Gen. Thomas E. Rilea, died recently in our State at the age of 63. Mrs. Neuberger and I knew him well, because as adjutant general of the Oregon National Guard, he had many contacts with our State legislature and with the Federal Government. He was typically a product of our State, and I can remember visiting his pioneer parents in the remote hamlet of Agness, far up the canyons of the beautiful Rogue River.

The Oregon Daily Statesman of Salem of February 5, 1959, paid a merited and deserved editorial tribute to the late General Rilea under the title of "All His Life a Soldier." Because the editorial so appropriately epitomizes this illustrious son of Oregon and leader of our National Guard, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL HIS LIFE A SOLDIER

All his life from age 18 on Tom Rilea was a soldier, and a good soldier. He enlisted in the Oregon National Guard in 1914, and remained a member of the guard until his death Tuesday at age 63, save for the periods when the guard was summoned into Federal service. For him that was three times, first when he served as bugler for his regiment when it stood guard on the Mexican border in 1916, next in the First World War when he rose from rank of regimental sergeant to captain, and third in the Second World War when he was assistant commander and for a time acting commander of the 41st Division in whose training he had played an important part. After field service in the action in New Guinea he was called back to Australia to administer the great supply base at Sydney. He returned home under physical disability which required his hospitalization for a time. On discharge from Federal service in December 1946 he assumed the office of adjutant general to which he had been appointed in 1941 to succeed the late Maj. Gen. George A. White. Named brigadier general in 1931 at age 35 he was advanced to major general in the National Guard in 1948.

General Rilea was devoted to the Army and to the guard. Under his leadership the Oregon National Guard has rated high. He insisted on high standards of performance and gave due recognition to achievement. High military honors have been his; and now in death he merits the high commendation of the people of Oregon for service well performed.

Reds Map Your Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, by Louis Francis Budenz, entitled "Reds Map Your Death." The article appeared in the February 7 issue of the Manchester (N.H.) Union-Leader.

Although the article is sobering reading, it is vital reading for all of us, because it gives further evidence of the constant plotting and planning by the Soviet Union for the destruction and enslavement of this country. Certainly, for all who can and will read, there is clear and ample warning of the Soviet blueprint which plots for us economic strangulation as a substitute for military destruction. We must gear ourselves immediately for as effective a defense against this economic warfare as we have geared ourselves for in the case of defense against military aggression.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS MAP YOUR DEATH

(By Louis Francis Budenz)

Long before the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union convened in Moscow last week, advance Red acclamations for its projected proposals ringed the globe. The Communists everywhere beheld in this congress the promise of big things, and above all, the ability to get America to dig its own grave.

Every outstanding occurrence in the "motherland of the toilers" occasions expressions of devotion to Soviet Russia among the comrades everywhere. This is strikingly the case with the party congresses of the mother party, because at these congresses the dictator of the world's Reds tells his followers in all lands how they are to think and what they are to do.

When the national committee of the Communist Party of the United States hailed the congress from afar, in special greetings to the party of the Soviet Union, that was not surprising. When it proclaimed the congress itself to be a momentous event, that was also to be expected. And it was to be noted that the American Reds concentrated on the glories of the 7-year plan which Khrushchev had brought forward and which was to be approved at the congress.

The plan was effusively saluted as a guarantee of peace and peaceful coexistence, in the fact that it would bring about a stimulus to the growing number of exchanges and visits, such as that recently made by Mikoyan.

Most significantly, these greetings of the American party omitted any reference to the boasted purpose of the plan, to outstrip the United States in production by 1965 or 1970. The corollary of that end was also omitted, namely, the eventual achievement of communism and therefore the necessity for world Soviet dictatorship and the obliteration of the United States as a nation.

Without doubt, this omission was intentionally carried through, so that the party here could not be accused of plotting with Moscow to degrade the United States, which is precisely what is being done.

The party leaders here had certainly read and digested the preview of the congress appearing in the December issue of International Affairs and entitled "Great Vistas." There we read that it is evident from Khrushchev's advance theses that the 21st congress will make a decisive contribution to the victory of the new Communist system over the old, capitalist order. It is proclaimed to be a milestone along the path under which "the glorious Communist Party of the Soviet Union is bringing this happy time, the era of communism, nearer to our day."

And so we learn further from International Affairs: "The theses of Khrushchev's report (released for study in advance of the congress) show that the Soviet Union has entered a new phase—the phase of the large-scale building of a Communist society—in its transition from socialism to communism."

And thus, the comrades are fired with the frenzied notion that the promise of Marx and Engels—that "an earthly paradise" would come into being as a result of the Soviet dictatorship—is coming true.

But every comrade knows that this Communist society, which constitutes the "earthly paradise," cannot be achieved in full until the world Soviet dictatorship is first established. And thus it is that when Khrushchev envisages such an upsurge as will relegate to the second place "all capitalist countries, and chiefly the United States and then looks forward to communism," he is calling the Reds everywhere to a worldwide crusade for the sabotaging and subjugation of all opponents of the socialist system.

It is most singular that the omission registered by the Communist Party here of any mention of this oncoming communism, so that the party cannot be accused of planning our ruin, finds its reflection in a similar omission of this promise in the general press of the Nation. As often as such incidents have occurred in the past this latest is a startling one, as it fails to let the American people know that the whole scheme of "cultural exchanges," Mikoyan visits, and other such peaceful enterprises open the door for widespread industrial and political espionage intended for our destruction."

This open pledge by the 21st Red congress to effect our demise by strangulation appears in other features of Khrushchev's report, which has also been omitted from the general press. With these we shall deal later. For the moment the intrigues of the 21st congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union furnish a warning to us that if we wish to save ourselves we must immediately insist that Washington end all relations with the Soviet world.

Huntington, W. Va., Is Lauded by Senator Randolph as All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, each year 11 U.S. cities are selected by a jury of distinguished citizens and experts on government impaneled by the National Municipal League to receive awards presented under the joint sponsorship of the league and Look magazine for outstanding action in bringing about civic improvements.

West Virginians were happy when one of their cities—Huntington, the county seat of Cabell County, situated on the Ohio River—was honored with a place on the 1958 All America City team.

It seems timely to mention that Clarksburg, W. Va., was so recognized in a previous year.

Presentation of the award was made at appropriate ceremonies in the city of Huntington the evening of February 10, 1959. It was my privilege to have accepted an invitation to participate in the program. Weather conditions prevented me from making the air trip from Washington. I had prepared comments for the event, copies of which were made available to the chairman of the award committee and presented to officials of the city of Huntington.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, extracts from my salute to the officials and citizens of Huntington on the occasion of the celebration of the All America City Award which was so justly deserved.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT ISSUED BY U.S. SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH ON THE OCCASION OF THE HUNTINGTON, W. VA., ALL-AMERICA CITY AWARD CELEBRATION, FEBRUARY 10, 1959

The fine people of Huntington—officials and voters together—have given dramatic evidence of the continued vitality of democracy. Too frequently today we Americans, as private citizens, are inclined to respond to the problems that face us with complaints rather than constructive efforts. Too often the complaint is followed by the purely rhetorical question: "But what can the mere individual do?"

Yes, the people of Huntington have answered that question in unmistakable terms. They have shown with eloquent testimony the resources of the individual citizen when he or she joins others in a voluntary and cooperative venture. And, in so doing, they have translated the ideals of modern democracy into the realities of Huntington today.

Democracy means more than merely a way of electing one's representatives. It means more than the traditional 18th century regard for individual liberties.

Modern democracy means, first of all, the participation of the individual in public affairs. And, secondly, it means that public affairs encompass more than matters of Government policy alone. In a modern society the quality of democracy must permeate all of our cultural institutions; it cannot be restricted to elections and the matter of the ballot alone. This ideal condition of democracy the fine and faithful folk of Huntington have achieved in fact as well as in principle.

In Huntington's new schools, swimming pools, art gallery, and hospitals, as well as the new form of city government—in all of these, and more—it is clear that its people have, through citizen effort, defined the meaning of a democratic culture in the 20th century.

May the rest of West Virginia and the Nation read the lesson of the past 10 dynamic years in Huntington.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, numerous statements have been made recently commemorating the long struggle of the Ukrainian people for freedom. I have read with great interest the very fine address made by the Honorable Robert Gray, Secretary to the Cabinet, before the Ukrainian Congress Committee in Philadelphia on January 24. I believe it should receive wider notice and attention, and ask unanimous consent for the address to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT GRAY, SECRETARY TO THE CABINET, BEFORE THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE IN PHILADELPHIA, PA., JANUARY 24, 1959

I hope I can express fully to you my pleasure at being with you tonight and the honor I feel in being associated with this meeting of free men and women, assembled in rededication to the sacred cause of liberty.

This anniversary which stirs the hearts of freemen everywhere has its background in history a hundred years ago when Taras Shevchenko, the Ukrainian people's greatest poet, pleaded for human liberation. Based on a rich historical heritage which had developed during the preceding 11 decades in spite of repressive Russian rule, this occasion tonight was then born.

A great deal has happened to the world of freemen in the century that has passed. In our own country, it was less than 100 years ago that Abraham Lincoln was first elected to the Presidency. At that time, 31 million Americans were America, and ahead of them lay a struggle which would challenge not only our survival as a nation, but democracy's survival as an instrument of government for freedom-loving people. Today America is the fortress of freedom, not only for the 175 million citizens who proudly call themselves Americans, but for countless millions in lands other than our own.

What has brought the United States to her position of leadership among the nations championing freedom's cause? What has inspired this youth among the great powers of the world to take on with such missionary zeal the task of serving and relieving the oppressed peoples of the globe? To answer those questions, our natural inclination is to turn to our own fight for liberty and the heritage of the Pilgrim fathers and the spirit of 1776. But there are none alive today who heard the original toll of the Liberty Bell, and our compassion for those in freedom's fight might also be dead if it had not been rekindled by subsequent forces down through the years. The most powerful of these forces is the new blood which has been transfused into this Nation from every nationality on earth, bringing with it the traditions and the creeds and the colors and the religions and the artistic talents of the peoples all over the globe. And bringing with it, too, fresh awareness and compassion for the oppressed of the world's citizenry.

America's reputation as the melting pot of nationalities comes not from some shallow slogan which reads well in the international press, but has had no effect on us as a country. The numbers migrating to this country since our struggle for freedom have not been in token amounts but of flood proportions. Our records go back only to 1820, but from that year to the beginning of this one, over 41 million foreign nationals have migrated to our shores. This gives America the right to call herself the fortress of freedom. This is her badge of honor and this is her greatest point of pride.

If you have not done so, treat yourself to the opportunity of greeting an immigrant on the day his papers become final and as a citizen he takes the oath of allegiance to the United States for the first time. I guarantee you it will be a long time before you again take your citizenship for granted.

Perhaps the melting pot is a poor simile to use in describing the assimilation of these foreign nationals and their Americanization, for it implies that the wide variety of ingredients that go into the pot are completely uniform when they come out, and have lost all individuality and all identification with foreign lands. Thank God this is not so, for America would be a great loser if it were. What takes place in the Americanization of a new citizen is not a canceling out of old family ties and heritage backgrounds, but the superimposing of a first allegiance to the United States. There is no more fiercely patriotic group in our country than those who, through naturalization, have gained their citizenship the hard way—studying our history, becoming acquainted with our laws, and making declarations of loyalty and allegiance which many natural-born citizens have never been called upon to make. But these citizens have brought with them more than a burning loyalty to their new land. They have brought with them and have passed on to the natural-born citizens who are their sons and grandsons, the rich heritage of other lands and the knowledge of the oppressions, the hardships, and the struggles of other peoples.

I hope you begin to see how each of us in this room tonight is here identified. I am positive that the great majority of you have never been to the Ukraine. I am equally sure that the majority of you are natural-born Americans. You meet as Americans of Ukrainian extraction, proud of your heritage and background and aware that your responsibility for keeping alive the hope of the oppressed peoples of the Ukraine, for working in their behalf, and in making America aware of their plight—aware that all this is among your patriotic duties as American citizens.

May I tell you the greatest truth I have learned in 3 years in Washington? As a citizen of Nebraska, I used to indulge myself in that favorite American pastime—that luxury of life in a democracy—grousing about my government. I would say "Why don't they do this or that," or "They ought to"—they, they. But I have learned a big truth in my days in the Capital and it is this: In a democracy, we—you and I and our fellow Americans—we are the "they" in government. Our Government will serve us well only if we serve it well. It will be intelligent and well informed only if we are. It will have a conscience only if we do. This is why I urge every individual to take a more active, intelligent, patriotic part in government. We must keep interested and informed in the affairs of our Nation and we must keep our Nation interested and informed in the affairs of the world.

To this end, your efforts in keeping your Government aware of the plight of the Ukrainians is good citizenship of the highest order.

Absorbed into the Soviet Communist bloc following a series of invasions and bloody battles in 1919 and 1920, the people of the Ukraine today are forced to work for the aggrandizement of the Soviet Communist State. Long known as the breadbasket of Europe, the Ukraine is now the breadbasket of Russia. She is producing 70 percent of Russia's sugar and a quarter of her grain. She provides Russia with half of her coal and half of her iron ore. Yes, Russia benefits greatly from the captive lands and peoples in her empire. But for her it must be a disquieting thought to realize that non-Russian peoples are the majority peoples of the Soviet Union. This is the weakest link in the Soviet plan for world conquest, and one of the great threats to Soviet imperialism today is the strong nationalist feeling in the Ukraine.

The people of the Ukraine became one of the first peoples to be subjugated by communism. Following this event, the world began to realize that in Communist expansionism, free peoples everywhere faced one of the worst types of aggressive imperialism. Communism is the grave enemy of freedom and national independence. Wherever it penetrates, it agitates, subverts, and destroys. The system itself is based on mechanistic conformity, both in terms of human beings and national groups. It turns men into cogs in the materialistic machine, thinking and acting under central dictatorship.

Thus the men in the Kremlin have been implementing the Marxist-Leninist blueprint for world conquest. The Soviet threat is as old as communism. Thirty-five years ago Lenin said, "First we will take Eastern Europe, next the masses of Asia, and finally we will encircle the last bastion of capitalism, the United States." This Lenin statement charts the strategy, and it has been like a polar star to the succession of rulers in the Kremlin. To Russia, world domination was and world domination is, the goal.

International communism seeks domination through the use of every conceivable weapon—propaganda, subversion, infiltration, offers of Trojan Horse economic assistance, and outright aggression. It uses these weapons singly or in various combinations.

America cannot stand alone in this kind of world. Since 1945 we have entered into collective security treaties with 42 other nations. This system of collective security with its massive defensive strength has

brought to a halt outright armed aggression and has given assurance to nations exposed to attack. With our allies we face aggressors in the world with this resolve: We believe that there is strength in guided motives as well as in guided missiles but we will make whatever sacrifices are necessary to back up those principles with the necessary manpower, material, missiles, and money.

We are in an age which holds great hopes and at the same time grave perils for mankind. In our nuclear world there is no acceptable alternative to persevering in our quest for a durable peace. But the peace we seek is a peace founded on justice, freedom, and economic and social progress—a true peace, based upon the eternal values which are the foundation of our enlightened civilization.

Freedom is the most precious of these eternal values. The whole political history of the human race is the unfolding of the never-ending fight for freedom, and as long as there are people in the world who are not free, that fight will go on. History, with its oft-repeated record, can give little satisfaction to the Russians, for it repeats this story over and over. No oppressed people has remained forever enslaved.

President Eisenhower has said, "All history testifies that the memory of freedom is not erased by the fear of guns, and the love of freedom is more enduring than the power of tyrants." Meanwhile, freedom-loving people everywhere owe it to the cause of liberty to continue to keep alive before the world's conscience the great injustice of the subjugation of some of the peoples of the earth. America must work to sustain the faith of the Ukraine and the faith of her people in the ideals of freedom. May God give his rich blessing on the cause for which you work and on you all. Thank you and goodnight.

Russian Actions Compared to Mikoyan Treatment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which was published in the Nashua Telegraph, one of New Hampshire's leading newspapers, on Thursday, February 10, 1959.

Editor Fred H. Dobens, editor of the Nashua Telegraph, an outstanding newspaperman and a fine American, points to the tape recording of how the Russians plotted to shoot down an unarmed U.S. transport plane as a justification for my disapproval of the red carpet treatment recently given to Mikoyan in this country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIDGES RIGHT AGAIN

New Hampshire's Senator STYLES BRIDGES was almost alone among his colleagues, a few weeks ago, when he scored the red carpet treatment given Anastas Mikoyan, Russian leader, by U.S. businessmen. BRIDGES was called everything by some, principally for attempting to throw a roadblock into possible peaceful U.S.-Russian relations.

The tape recorder incident, showing how Russians deliberately shot down a U.S. plane seems to indicate that they never will have good relations with us and that Senator BRIDGES has sized them up pretty well, all along for many years.

He says:

"On January 17, 1959, I rose on the floor of the U.S. Senate to deplore the red carpet treatment accorded Deputy Premier Mikoyan by some of our industrialists and Wall Street bankers. I also decried the action of some of my senatorial colleagues who had seen fit to honor and to lunch with Mikoyan under the very dome of the U.S. Capitol, that citadel of freedom and beacon light to the free world. I stood almost alone on the floor that day in upholding my position but I was not disturbed because I knew full well that it would eventually be justified.

"I yet did not realize how soon my stand would be vindicated. Today's shocking and incontrovertible revelation by our State Department should be proof enough to anyone that Soviet duplicity and ruthlessness are still the order of the day and that Mikoyan's visit was one more cheap Soviet ruse. My patriotic blood was never more stirred than when I heard the tape recording of the Russian duck shoot, over Armenia, of our unarmed transport plane. Feeling as I do myself, the feelings of the mothers, fathers, wives, children, and friends of our airmen must be indescribable.

"In my Senate speech, I noted that 6 bodies of the 17 men aboard had been returned to us and I called upon Mikoyan for an accounting of the other 11. Mikoyan was also questioned by our State Department. In the light of the disclosed evidence, Mikoyan's replies that 'the plane had crashed' and that 'the Soviet Government had given all the information it had' only reveals continuing Soviet perfidy of the highest order.

"I could only wish that all who feted Mikoyan and all who thought the Russians could now be trusted in negotiation should have continually dinned in their ears the tape recording of this act of murder which was applauded by Soviet commanding officers and high officials."

Missions or Missiles—This World or the Moon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a sermon by the Rev. Clay Cooper, of Spokane, Wash. I think that Reverend Cooper has pointed out some things that are well worth our heeding.

The sermon follows:

MISSIONS OR MISSILES—THIS WORLD OR THE MOON?

(Sermon delivered by Rev. Clay Cooper on Horizons Unlimited, the missionary radio network of Vision, Inc., Spokane, Wash.)

"And Christ said unto them, 'Go ye into all the (this) world and preach the Gospel to every creature.'" (Mark 16:15.)

"The heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord's: but the earth hath He given to the children of men." (Psalms 115:16.)

There's a lot of talk about getting a man to the moon. Had you taken a pair of scissors and deleted everything from the morning press that had to do with moonshots, satellites, and communism you'd probably have had shredded newspaper for breakfast. In fact, getting to the moon all but monopolizes the imagination of tens of millions of Americans. The whole atmosphere is filled with "oh's and ah's" every time the next Russian sputnik rockets into the sky.

With all this furor about getting a man to the moon, it had better be soon, or there will be a lot of disappointed scientists—and a lot of dissipated dollars. Everybody knows it's borrowed billions we're spending to get a man up there, but few seem to comprehend one grave danger in this wild, headlong scamper to keep pace with the Reds in their probes into outer space. We are so all-fired concerned that the Russians may beat us there we are actually stampeding into a crash spending program, seemingly unaware that we are about to satellite ourselves into bankruptcy.

This is a reminder that while striving for the moon, we could be losing the earth. And let us not be deceived, that's what the Commies want more than anything else. This world, the one right down here, every hemisphere of it—lock, stock, and pickle barrel. And we are falling for their "other world" diversionary tactics head over heels. And they are expert in the field. Remember how they focused our attention elsewhere while they were carving Korea? While we were parleying in Geneva, they were parceling Vietnam. While our eyes were glued on Lebanon, they were chipping away at Matsu and Quemoy. While we were digging out from under the rubble there, they were opening the Berlin front. Now, they draw our attention to worlds above as a feint to decoy us away from this world below, the real focal point of their prime and ultimate objective. It's this world they want. They don't want the moon half so much. What would they do with it after they got it? Let people everywhere pray God to jar us from this trance, for that's what it is, a profound state of abstraction of mind and spirit which is causing us, like the children of Hamelin, to follow the siren notes of Red Pied Piperism. It is leading us, in this hypnotic state, off into oblivion by diverting our attention from the world to the moon.

For us to act suddenly and unconcertedly from some common panic-impulse or technological inferiority complex, and in a hasty, frightened manner, is exactly what the Russians are hoping we will do. If we can be stampeded, like a herd of cattle, into a race for the moon, this world is theirs. They are playing for high stakes, the world, this world, bear in mind . . . not the Moon or Mars. And unless we wise up to their strategy of diverting our attention away from their real pearl, it will wind up being another case of "while we were busy here and there, it was gone." If they can keep us engrossed with the moon, they'll have a lot less trouble engulfing the earth.

It's time we stopped chiding ourselves about Russia having attained the conquest of outer space. A misnomer, if there ever was one. "Penetration" is a far more suitable word, and penetration falls far short of conquest. And besides, if (I say if) the Moral Governor of this universe interprets this penetration as an intrusion on His preserve, His domain—as some hold—let us be glad the Russians have this questioned honor. Perhaps there was more of God in our failures than in their successes. Many conscientious people feel, most sincerely, that such aspirations are rank presumption

with a tinge of Tower of Babel added. They base their convictions on such verses in Holy Writ as, "The heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord's; but the earth hath He given to the children of men." Psalm 115: 16.

Now, what is to be our attitude? A negation of the scientific achievements of the Kremlin's crowd? A minimization of the fact they are farther down the road than we are in certain fields of technology and the use of psychological weaponry? Shall we pooh-pooh their sputniks and asteroids? Keep our fingers crossed and hope we can catch up with them before they can absorb us, or annihilate us?

Laboring under the notion that whoever gets up there "fustest with the mostest" will decide the fate of the world, is to act under sheer delusion. News of a landing on the moon would leave two-thirds of the people of the world cold. What could landing a man on the moon possibly mean to a starving man in Morocco? News of the landing of the Son of God on this planet, one starlit night, would mean a lot more, and this is the news the majority of mankind is waiting to intelligently hear for the first time. Or, having heard, understand by witnessing in you and me the reality of the Transforming Truth "that makes men free." We need to keep in mind it's not something we shoot from earth up into the heavens, that is going to save the world. It is rather someone, who came down from heaven to earth. That was the pivotal point in history. Not the launching pad at Cape Canaveral, but the manger at Bethlehem, and the night the Saviour descended from the upper world (wherever it is), to grace this planet and bring personal salvation with the promise of the "life that now is, and that which is to come."

It is a source of amazement that so-called Christian nations are frantically competing with Communists in quest of the moon. Let the Reds reach unknown worlds first, if they will. We are to major on this one. This world is to be the world of our main concern, this world with all its known people and their known problems. Seeking to plant the Stars and Stripes on the pock-marked moon, when the blood stained banner of the cross has yet to be lifted over more than half of this terra firma, falling victim to a celestial megalomania, under the planned and announced prodding of the Reds, all oblivious to our terrestrial mission, could prove the fatal mistake.

We are not to get side-tracked. Nowhere is the Christian—individual, church or Nation—commissioned or commanded to go to some other world, but there are multiplied commands to go, or make it possible for others to go, with the transforming message, the blessings and provisions of Christianity "into all this world." We are to keep on the job of telling it (and living it), until it rings in the ear of every living man. It is our solemn responsibility to see to it that that message with all its wondrous significance is brought to him. Herein lies the very heart and core of the troubles of this crises-ridden age, our having not been enough mission-minded in the past. Now we are crowded into being missile-minded.

This, then, is the message every God-fearing nation needs to hear. Sending men and missiles to the moon, is not half so important as sending missionaries to Madagascar and Martinique. Why should we spend billions to learn if there are men on Mars, when we already know of millions of miserable men in Mexico and Mozambique? People who cry for our recognition of their poverty of body and spirit? People needing and deserving our attention? Pointing a needle-nosed Atlas or Jupiter, into the azure, is not nearly so convincing to a crippled Asian leper, or a syphilitic-blinded child in Africa, as the needle on the end of the syringe in the missionary doctor's hand. That needle holds hope of a better world for him, something an orbiting satellite cannot do. And he represents about a billion and a half people in a similar or worse condition. The have-not nations of the world look to us expectantly, and we must beware lest we frustrate the purposes of providence in the race to space while neglecting the men at our gates.

I leave to the theologizer and politicians the moral and political issues involved in going to other worlds, but as the utter need and necessity of our "going into all the (this) world with the Gospel," in obedience to the command of Christ, there can be no argument. If we had our job all done, down here; if the great commission, as given by Christ, had now reached completion; if we had now successfully prosecuted the cause of world missions; if the world, this world, were now saturated with truth; if disciples had now been made of every kindred, tongue, tribe, and nation, that would be a horse of another color. But, the world predicament being what it is, if it's a toss between trillions for missiles and trifles for missions, a man on the moon or a missionary on Madagascar, we must not hesitate to choose the better part. Not that this is an appeal to scrap every reasonable security measure. It is not. But it goes beyond keeping our powder dry and our fingers crossed. To keeping our knees bent.

Finally, this is an appeal to Christian nations to take care lest they be duped into majoring on missiles and minoring on missions, and wake up too late to realize that while they were looking at the moon, they lost the earth. Let Russia's sputniks encircle the sun, we'll keep our arms around this world. And if our own beloved Nation should go down, serving and saving humanity, obediently trying to fulfill the great commission, honoring and trusting God, then glory be. It's certain she'll go down if she doesn't.

Lessons of the Mikoyan Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Christopher Emmet entitled "Lessons of the Mikoyan Visit," which was published in the January 31 edition of America magazine.

I found the article to be a very informative résumé of the visit of the Soviet Deputy Premier as well as a forthright commentary on the lavish treatment accorded him on his recent visit to this country. I believe Mr. Emmet performs a distinct service by his forthright presentation of the facts surrounding the Mikoyan visit last month.

I was so impressed with Mr. Emmet's approach to this situation that I am using this means to bring it to the further attention of the American people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LESSONS OF THE MIKOYAN VISIT
(By Christopher Emmet)

It is universally conceded that the visit of Anastas Mikoyan, Deputy Premier of the U.S.S.R. to our country has been a great public-relations success. Qualified observers like Edward R. Murrow and Harrison Salisbury go further and point out that it is also a political success for the Soviet Union. There has been almost no political reaction, except from refugees, or publicity to balance the skillful utterances of the deputy Soviet leader and the praise heaped upon him by his hosts, who include many of the leading industrialists of the country as well as Senators and leading State officials, notably the newly elected Governor of California.

A luncheon was also given for Mikoyan by James Carey, secretary of the United Electrical Workers, which was attended by Walter Reuther. However, George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, refused to attend because he would "not sit down with the representative of a nation under whose guns hundreds of working people die each day." Other notable dissenters from the chorus of praise were Congressman WALTER H. JUDD of Minnesota, famous as a former medical missionary and authority on China; Al Hayes, president of the Machinists International Union; Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston; and Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, all of whom condemned the fulsome receptions. Later the roster of critics received a notable addition in the person of former President Harry S. Truman in an article published by the North American Newspaper Alliance on January 19.

HATS OFF TO A BUTCHER

The critics do not oppose serious negotiations with the Soviet Union. What they do object to is fraternization with the spokesman of a bloody-handed dictatorship which is responsible for the torture and death of untold tens of millions, which holds 100 million East Europeans in bondage today, and which has placed a gun at our heads at this very moment by its ultimatum on Berlin.

It has been wrongly reported that Mr. Mikoyan had withdrawn the Soviet ultimatum. All he did was to refuse to call it an ultimatum. He did not change an item in the Soviet plan nor change the date on which it will be put into effect. Therefore, his call for counterproposals under the threat of the ultimatum amounts to blackmailing us into offering at least some new concessions. We cannot negotiate with the deputy Soviet leader in honor or on equal terms until that threat has been withdrawn. Still less is it a time to fraternize with him, overwhelm him with hospitality, and give him the impression that the American people are indifferent about Soviet crimes and aggressions, in which Mikoyan personally participated in Hungary.

What is happening is not negotiation. It is not even a dialog, where two sides are presented. It is a triumphal tour by Mikoyan, during which he is given a platform from which to cajole and deceive audiences of leading citizens throughout the country. Harrison Salisbury in the New York Times on January 10 reported: "Mr. Mikoyan's remarks won him a rousing ovation by an audience of over 300 of Chicago's most important lawyers." The following day he wrote: "The fact is that * * * he is having an impact on many leading Americans."

The customs of politeness and hospitality prevent his hosts on these occasions from stating the free world's point of view with any force or frankness, even if they were capable of it. And anyway, how many private American citizens are equipped to debate political questions with the No. 2 political leader of the Soviet Union? The audience is allowed to ask him questions, but considerations of courtesy censor the questions also.

How, for instance, can one politely ask Mr. Mikoyan why he participated in the betrayal of General Maleter, who was captured while negotiating under a flag of truce in Hungary,

where Mikoyan handled the preliminary negotiations; or whether it is true that Mikoyan shot Beria in the back of the head, as Khrushchev told a delegation of visiting French Socialists? How can one politely say that the Soviet Government has violated a hundred treaties, promises, and agreements and, therefore, cannot be trusted? The result is that the American side of the debate automatically goes by default and the tour takes on the aspects of a Soviet political as well as personal triumph. That is why such discussions should be left to trained diplomats, whose function it is to negotiate for specific, limited and self-enforcing agreements.

Some who welcome Mr. Mikoyan's visit advance the argument that he will see with his own eyes America's immense economic strength. This is supposed to make him return to Russia resolved to sin on more. But why should anyone imagine that Mikoyan, for generations the leading economic administrator in the Soviet Union, underrates the power of America's economy? Mikoyan, who was in charge of the distribution of United States lend-lease to Russia during the war, should know better than anyone else the miraculous feats of American production and technology, which rushed vast quantities of desperately needed arms and materials to Russia across mountains and even over the submarine-infested Murmansk run. He certainly knows that those supplies saved the Soviet regime and his own job.

Mikoyan did not come here to look at America's economic strength but to look for America's political weakness. He wants to find how far the American people will continue to support the heavy risks and sacrifices needed to stand behind their allies in Berlin and elsewhere. If he finds no evidence of real resentment toward Soviet policies among the American elite whom he meets every night, why should he attempt to change them?

Mikoyan is asking us to trust his government at the very moment when it is proving itself once again to be unworthy of trust. Most of what Mikoyan says is an indirect appeal to American industrial leaders, and to all others who will listen, to repudiate the announced policy of our Government. He appeals for trust and the leading lawyers of Chicago applaud him, just after the President's state of the Union message reminded us that because the Soviet Union has broken innumerable agreements we cannot make new agreements unless they are self-enforcing.

But the visit is something more than a propaganda effort to butter up and soften up American public opinion. Mikoyan has another angle which may kill three birds with one stone. He hopes that his visit will deceive the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain, including the Russians, about how Americans really feel. When Mr. Mikoyan met Secretary Dulles, the American photographers naturally took pictures of the two men. But Mikoyan's Russian photographers concentrated on getting shots of the American cameramen begging Mikoyan for just one more picture. These Soviet photographs, and others showing smiling receptions to Mikoyan, are being used in every newspaper, moving-picture house, and TV newsreel behind the Iron Curtain to give the impression of Mikoyan's popularity in America, and thus discourage further resistance.

In the Nazi regime, Herman Goering occupied a position roughly parallel to that of Mikoyan in the U.S.S.R. Goering, too, played a great role in the economic organization of a totalitarian state. He, too, was more friendly and flexible with foreigners than the other Nazi leaders, and his joviality and flexibility were used to persuade the Federation of British Industries to make their infamous agreement with Goering on the eve of the Munich Conference. One of the arguments the British appeasers used to justify these deals was that they would strengthen the peaceful elements in the Nazi government, supposedly represented by Goering. Mikoyan's apparent reasonableness is being used to fool Americans in the same manner today.

Another grim parallel suggests itself: Is it conceivable that American public opinion would have "stood still" for a similar triumphal visit to the country by Goering during the days of our cold war with Hitler before Pearl Harbor, or any time after the Munich Conference? And yet, before the attack on Poland in September 1939—in which Soviet Russia joined—the record of Nazi crimes and aggressions had been trivial compared to that of the Soviet Russia of today. Mikoyan has been the beneficiary of all those crimes, for he has not only survived but advanced with each new turn of Soviet politics. For instance, he negotiated and administered the economic agreements under the Hitler-Stalin pact which helped the Nazi war effort during the first 2 years of the war—and then distributed United States lend-lease.

THOSE WHO PROTEST

Because of all this we are grateful to the humble refugee pickets who alone have tried to remind the American people of the fundamental issues between the Soviets and ourselves. Although their methods of protest may not always be well chosen (who in conscience can blame them?), we believe their attitude is more representative of the way the average American really feels than that of Mr. Mikoyan's wealthy hosts.

Adlai Stevenson has appealed for an end to these hostile demonstrations on the ground that he and other leading American citizens were well received in the Soviet Union. Mr. Stevenson's analogy would be more apt if he, too, had participated in breaking treaties and betraying the freedom of small nations. Mr. Mikoyan has turned what was announced as a private, informal vacation into a triumphal state visit at the very time of the Berlin ultimatum. And what of the recent stoning of the American Embassy in Moscow with the connivance of Soviet police?

Nothing need be added to this editorial comment from the New York Mirror of January 13:

A sickening paragraph about Anastas I. Mikoyan comes under the byline of Harrison E. Salisbury in the New York Times:

"The outbursts [against Mikoyan] have begun to take on more and more the aspect in miniature of the disorders that attended Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON'S tour of South America last spring."

Rot. Demonstrations against Mikoyan are by people whose kin and friends were murdered in the Soviet rape of Hungary, a crime in which Mikoyan played a bloody, double-crossing role.

Whom did NIXON murder? The Communist rigged riots against him were directed at the United States for Communist purposes.

Mikoyan is entitled to formal courtesy and physical protection, no more. Any attempt to gloss over his brutal crimes is an insult to humanity and the ideal of human freedom.

Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful letter written by David K. E. Bruce, our Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany, which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, paying tribute to the life of Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM DONOVAN—GENERAL'S QUALITIES OF LEADERSHIP, VIVID PERSONALITY RECALLED

(The writer of the following letter is U.S. Ambassador to West Germany.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The news of Bill Donovan's death is a profound shock to all of his associates, friends, and acquaintances. It hardly seems possible that this ageless man, this almost elemental force of nature, has been removed from our immediate contact.

Wherever there was a stir, and especially whenever—all too frequently—trouble brewed, Donovan was there. He was an adventurer, in the best sense of the word, in the modern world.

Imagination and the quality of great leadership were his dominant characteristics. The word "impossible" was not in his lexicon. What man had done was only a springboard from which to vault into the unknown.

CAREER OF OSS

I was most closely familiar with him during more than 4 years' service in his Office of Strategic Services organization. There he was the inspirer of more than 30,000 people. All were fish in his net, tumbled together in what, organizationally, appeared to be chaos.

His mandate was almost unlimited in the field of clandestine activities. Nor did any chief ever as readily respond to such a challenge. Something had to knit together beings so disparate, recruited for tasks so indefinite. The polarization came from one individual—Donovan.

In the midst of the gravest preoccupations, with a task so comprehensive as, at times, to appall his subordinates, the general remained unruffled, calm to deal with the exigencies of worldwide covert operations, but able to turn what seemed an equal concentration on the marital, or extramarital, problems, the health or illness, the financial tribulations or any other concerns of those who worked for him.

He contracted enmities, but never as readily as he made friends. Giving complete loyalty himself, he commanded it from others.

He taxed his brain and body without mercy. In his sixties, he was still a threatening opponent on a squash court. Sleep he scarcely considered a necessity but an imposition by nature on man's obligation for self-improvement. For him no moment was an occasion for idleness. On uncomfortable and dangerous airplane flights he was usually discovered amusing himself with a German, French, Spanish, Italian, or other grammar, unless he was concocting a complicated scheme to harass the enemy.

EXCITEMENT OVER IDEAS

His personal charm was disarming. His sympathies were almost universal. He could not abide cowardice, being so constituted that this weakness was incomprehensible to him.

His imagination was unlimited. Ideas were his playthings. Excitement made him snort like a race horse. Woe to the officer who turned down a project because, on its face, it seemed ridiculous, or at least unusual. For painful weeks under his command I tested the possibility of using bats—taken from concentrations in western caves—to destroy Tokyo. The general, backed by the intrigued President Roosevelt, was only

dissuaded from further experiments in this field when it appeared probable that the cave bats would not survive a trans-Pacific flight at high altitudes.

He was a torchbearer of much that was most luminous during American participation in wars. In civil life he was adamant in the protection of our liberties and traditions.

I feel I can speak for thousands of others who served him during his great period in saying that I wish we had adequately conveyed to him during his lifetime the deep affection and admiration we always entertained for him.

DAVID K. E. BRUCE.

BERLIN, *February 9, 1959.*

Oregon Reviews 100 Years of Statehood, Looks Forward to Another Century of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, celebration of a historical milestone represents an opportunity both to recall the past and assess the future. The occasion of Oregon's centennial has stimulated such dual analysis by two of my State's leading newspapers, the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal. Both papers have contributed significantly to Oregon's development; both comment from a rich background of service to the people of Oregon. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial titled "Oregon Has Come a Long Way" from the February 8, 1959, centennial issue of the Oregon Journal and an editorial headed "Reading, Living History" from the Oregonian's centennial issue of February 11, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Journal, Feb. 8, 1959]

OREGON HAS COME A LONG WAY

This is Oregon's year to celebrate, joyfully and proudly, 100 years of statehood.

It is a time to look at history—from the days of British, French, Spanish, Russian, and American exploration, more than a century and a half ago; through the great fur-trading era, when McLoughlin and Astor, Bonneville and Wyeth probed the wilderness, built forts, sought quick riches by bartering with the Indians who had filtered down into the Northwest from Asia, via the Aleutians, 10,000 years before.

It is a time to review the deeds of the hardy men who attended the "divide" meeting at Champoeg, who acquired 2,500,000 virgin acres in donation land claims, cleared the trees away, built towns, schools, churches, mills, river boats, roads and railroads, pioneered the agriculture, horticulture, lumber, textile, and fishing industries, and passed successfully through provisional and territorial governments to statehood. That was the real beginning.

As times goes, it seems only yesterday that the first settlers came over the Oregon Trail in the 1840's and 1850's—first a handful, then by hundreds, then by thousands—seeking their fortunes in a benign green land.

Yet when you weigh the progress Oregon has made, when you see the strides we've taken in industry, in food raising and processing, in transportation, education and the arts, in taming great rivers, in developing world trade, it seems centuries ago.

It's a long way we've come—from the trading posts and missions to great cities and the teeming ports; from covered wagons to jets; from tiny sawmills in the wilderness to giant woodworking plants; from crude blacksmith shops to light metal plants; from oxen to atomic energy; from Indian canoes to oceangoing freighters and the tug-barge combos that ply our rivers.

It's a wonderful story, all in all, this story of the 33d State in the Union.

And we'll tell this story to the world this year, in the Exposition and International Trade Fair and the International Garden of Tomorrow. We'll read it in pagentry, in music and drama, in historical and commercial displays. We'll sell it anew to ourselves and our several million visitors, some of whom will see for the first time our magic mountains, our great rivers, our friendly cities, our teeming industries—and will want to come again.

Part of this centennial story is told today in the Journal's centennial edition, which in itself is a tribute to Oregon's glorious past, its leadership in commerce and industry and the arts, its future opportunities. Each is unexcelled.

So we repeat: This is Oregon's year to celebrate, joyfully and proudly, 100 years of statehood. They've been exciting, wondrous years. They've been good to us all.

[From the Oregonian, Feb. 11, 1959]

READING, LIVING HISTORY

One certain, positive benefit to flow from the observance of Oregon's Centennial year will be the instruction of Oregonians in their history and their heritage. This is not to imply that we are merely taking note of events that are dead and gone, that the act of celebration of 100 years of statehood is no more than the contemplation of those 100 years and what went before. Quite the contrary, the real value in a knowledge of history is to obtain thereby a perspective on the present and future.

If there were no Oregon future, there would be no sense in reviewing the Oregon past. If there were no Oregon future, there would be no purpose in an Oregon centennial. While we read history, we make history, and, if it were not so, the reading of history and the commemoration of its milestones would both be a waste of time.

When Oregon had been but 3 years a State, a man who understood the uses of history had this advice for his countrymen: "Fellow citizens," said President Abraham Lincoln, "we cannot escape history. We * * * will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the last generation."

So it is for Oregonians who this week have both the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, Thursday, and the 100th anniversary of statehood, Saturday, from which to draw the inspiration that can come from the knowledge of great events and great deeds of the past. We, too, will soon be a part of that past. Will we so build that future generations will find it worthwhile to reflect on this period in our history? That is the question of the centennial year. How it is answered will determine whether or not Oregon is worthy of its past.

The natural wonders that attracted the explorers and settlers to Oregon in the dawn of its recorded history remain wonders in the 20th century. The Columbia River is not the Northwest Passage of legend, but it is a water system in some respects second to none other on the continent. The rich land that drew men and their families the breadth of the country has been found to be even more exceptional where its specialties have been discovered and exploited. The trees are here, some of them dating from other centuries; and history has taught lessons of silviculture and moderation in harvest.

We are heirs to a marvelous land and a dramatic tradition. The full potentialities of our endowments have scarcely yet been realized. No other corner of the Nation is more appealing in an age of dwindling resources of space, land and water. No other region promises more certainly the fulfillment of human desires in an era of ever-increasing leisure. No people anywhere can call up, from a look backward into history, a more powerful inspiration for achievement in the future.

The people of Oregon need blame only themselves if Oregon's second century is not better than the first. It should be—vastly so—not merely in material progress, but in the more profound aspects of living. It will be if Oregonians read their history with understanding.

Lt. Col. Richard J. Meskill, an Active Servant of His Country and His God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am sure all agree that high ideals are a wonderful things, but unless these beliefs are translated into actions, they have no effect.

My home State of Texas, and this Nation, suffered a great loss recently with the untimely death of Lt. Col. Richard J. Meskill, U.S. Army, retired, in San Antonio, Tex. Colonel Meskill was a man who not only held to his high beliefs, but governed his actions accordingly. He served his Nation and his God honorably and well.

During his active military career, Colonel Meskill distinguished himself in international riding and shooting championships. He continued to serve this Nation with the U.S. customs service and later as postmaster at Texas City, Tex., until his retirement in 1952.

He was a charter grand knight of the Father Roach Council, Texas City Knights of Columbus, and a charter member of the St. Mary's Holy Name Society, Texas City, and a Third Order Dominican.

In addition, he held offices in the Postmasters Association of Texas and the Retired Officers Association.

Colonel Meskill's life can well serve as a guide for others. He lives on in the fine lives of his family. One of his sons, Mr. Dick Meskill, is editor of the Alamo Messenger, official Catholic newspaper of the archdiocese of San Antonio.

Mr. President, as a special recognition of this fine life, I request unanimous

consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on Colonel Meskill which appeared in a recent issue of the Alamo Messenger, under the heading, "Ordinary Presides at Funeral Rites for Colonel Meskill."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECROD, as follows:

ORDINARY PRESIDES AT FUNERAL RITES FOR COLONEL MESKILL

Archbishop Robert E. Lucey presided at solemn funeral services for Lt. Col. Richard J. Meskill, 72, U.S. Army, Retired, in St. Peter Prince of Apostles Church on January 20. Colonel Meskill died in Brooke Army Hospital January 17 after an illness of several months. His home was at 111 Windmill Road in St. Mary Magdalen's Parish.

Father Carlos J. Quintana, of St. Peter's Parish, was celebrant of the requiem mass, assisted by Father Joseph L. Daspit, C.M., of Assumption Seminary, and Father John Kukral, of Texas City, as deacon and subdeacon, respectively. Msgr. Alexander C. Wangler, of the Alamo Messenger, was master of ceremonies.

The sermon was preached by Father Charles M. Sacco, of Beaumont. Attending in the sanctuary was Auxiliary Bishop Stephen A. Leven. Other members of the clergy attended in the transect of the church. The archbishop gave the final absolution after expressing his condolences to the family of Colonel Meskill.

Colonel Meskill had retired as postmaster of Texas City, April 30, 1952, after a period of 7 years' service. Prior to that he served with notable distinction in the Army, having won several international and interallied horsemanship and shooting championships following World War I.

Following his military retirement in 1930, Colonel Meskill served as inspector with U.S. Customs Service until May 1945, when he was appointed by President Harry Truman to fill the vacancy in the Texas City Postoffice.

Colonel Meskill was charter grandknight of the Father Roach Council, Texas City Knights of Columbus, and an active member of the Postmasters Association of Texas, and the Retired Officers Association, in both of which organizations he held offices.

He was also a charter member of the St. Mary's Holy Name Society, Texas City, and a Third Order Dominican.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Cora M. Tarpey Meskill, daughter of a pioneer Texas City family, and by two sons, Richard J. Meskill, Jr., and William D. Meskill; and by daughters, Sister Miriam, V.I., Houston, and Misses Cora E. and Catherine Jane Meskill, both of San Antonio.

In addition to listed survivors, Colonel Meskill is survived by three sisters, Mrs. M. J. Herwood, Los Angeles; Mrs. Mary Chamberlain, Springfield, Mass.; and Miss Josie Meskill, Ireland; and by three brothers, Dan Meskill, Bronx, N.Y.; John and James Meskill, County Cork, Ireland.

Honorary pallbearers were Carl Nessler, K.H.S.; George Carrague, John C. Gee, and Richard Carroll, all of Texas City, and Judge Andrew A. Hickey, of Alta Loma, and former postmaster, Raymond A. Stewart, of Galveston, as well as Felix Stehling, Fredericksburg, and Paul C. Pfeiffer, San Antonio.

Active pallbearers were James A. Whalen, K.S.G.; Chester Griffin (Texas City), Albert Greene, John Fox, Edward Culligan, and Maj. Gen. Neill C. Johnson, all of San Antonio.

Interment was in Fort Sam Houston National Cemetery with full military honors. Zizik-Kearns Funeral Home was in charge of arrangements.

Oregon Commemorative Stamp Released at Historic Astoria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 14, Oregon celebrated its centennial, commemorating the 100th anniversary of statehood. Quite appropriately, the Post Office Department has issued a 4-cent Oregon statehood centennial commemorative stamp, which was first placed on sale February 14 at the post office at Astoria. An initial printing of 120 million copies of the centennial stamp has been made, and it is estimated that more than 500,000 first day covers were issued by the Astoria postmaster, Neil L. Morfitt, and his fine staff.

It is indeed appropriate that historic Astoria, at the mouth of the great Columbia River, with Fort Clatsop National Memorial located nearby, was chosen as the city for the first day issue. The Oregon centennial stamp, printed in a blue-green color, emphasizes the rear view of an unhorsed covered Conestoga wagon, typical of those used over the Oregon Trail by early settlers, with Mt. Hood to the right. There has been some public criticism of the stark realism of the stamp design.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Post Office Department, Mr. L. Rohe Walter, special assistant to the Postmaster General, gave the dedication address for the Oregon centennial postage stamp at Astoria. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Post Office Department release on Mr. Walter's able speech.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALK BY L. ROHE WALTER, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE POSTMASTER GENERAL, OREGON STATEHOOD COMMEMORATIVE STAMP CEREMONY, ASTORIA, OREG., FEBRUARY 14, 1959

We are gathered here today in Astoria, Oreg., the site of the first post office and customhouse on the Pacific coast, to dedicate a U.S. postage stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the statehood of Oregon.

We do so with gratitude to the sturdy people of this scenically beautiful and highly productive State, who, over the years have made and are making such remarkable contributions to the national heritage and welfare of the United States.

As we look back, we recall that in May of 1792, an American sea captain, John Robert Gray of Boston, Mass., sailed his ship, the *Columbia*, up the river of the west to become the first to drop anchor in the inland waters of this vast and legendary body of water.

Claiming this area for his new Nation and naming the river after his ship, Captain Grey and his hardy crew penetrated lands which for generations had intrigued and mystified the greatest explorers from many lands, including Sir Francis Drake, who had seen this wilderness in 1579 and poetically named it New Albion.

Thirteen years after Captain Gray's trip, the famed explorers Lewis and Clark, under direct authority of President Jefferson to determine direct and practicable water communications across the continent, for the purpose of navigation, reached the headwaters of the Columbia.

Their published accounts, as the first explorers to reach Oregon by an overland route, created national interest leading to the establishment, in 1811, of John Jacob Astor's Pacific Fur Co. and an awareness by many others of the lucrative potentials of this region.

From those early days to the present, Oregon's history is replete with the names of individuals whose deeds form an inspiring story in the growth of our Nation and of the Beaver State, the 33d to be admitted to the Union.

Typical of these great leaders who have contributed to Oregon's welfare were the "white-headed eagle," Dr. John McLoughlin, who for 20 years governed this area from his home, Fort Victoria; Hale Jackson Kelly, the ex-Boston schoolmaster whose lectures and writings contributed so much to the encouragement of emigration to Oregon that he earned the title "Father of Oregon"; and, of course, the missionaries of many faiths who left comfortable and established parishes to teach Christian religion and ethics to the Indians, to build churches and missions, and to implant the teachings of faith in God, so necessary in the development and progress of a new and free land.

Joining with them, of course, were the pioneering thousands of men and women who, in the Oregon-or-bust wagon trains, made the long, arduous, and dangerous 2,000-mile trek along the Oregon Trail from the banks of the Missouri to the virgin lands of this great State.

The nearly 2 million Americans who now live in your 97,000 square miles of beautiful mountains, rich river valleys, and seashore coasts, and your impressive cities, represent the sturdy pioneers of many lands who saw, and achieved here the fulfillment of their individual desires for freedom under a democratic form of Government. And each left his special imprint upon his—and your—free land.

You today, as those who preceded you, are men and women possessed of great strength; of abiding faith; of calm but courageous understanding; of infinite wisdom and vision.

All America—and the world for that matter—is aware of the contributions your great State of Oregon has made in the fields of fishing, shipbuilding, national defense, public education, hydroelectric power, food products, and the beef cattle and sheep industries.

To the fisherman, the hunter, to those who enjoy the quiet beauties of nature or the zest of vacationing beside fresh-running streams, in rugged mountain country, in fertile valleys, or along sandy ocean beaches, Oregon is an unparalleled attraction.

In this Oregon statehood centennial stamp the Post Office Department has tried to symbolize the history, the beauty, and the richness of Oregon. By issuing 120 million of these stamps, we hope to remind not only Americans but all peoples of the contributions the State of Oregon has made to their progress and welfare.

The design of this beautiful new stamp was the inspiration of the noted artist, Robert Hallock, of Newtown, Conn., who is present here today.

After first-day sales here in Astoria, 120 million Oregon statehood stamps will go on sale throughout the Nation in 36,000 U.S. post offices. As part of the centennial celebration, it is our hope these stamps will also serve as invitations for Americans to

visit the Oregon Centennial Exposition and International Trade Fair, opening in Portland, Oreg., on June 10.

In concluding, it is my privilege to now present albums of these new 4-cent Oregon statehood stamps, autographed by Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, to a group of distinguished Americans.

Health-for-Peace Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], has long been recognized as the Senate's "Mr. Health." His dedication and devotion to the cause of medical research and to public health have won him acclaim throughout the country. Programs which he has sponsored have been beneficial to people in every nook and corner of this land.

In keeping with this record of concern for the public welfare, the senior Senator from Alabama is now sponsoring a proposal which would expand U.S. support of international medical research. Fifty-nine Senators were pleased to join with him. I am happy to be one of them. Through Senator HILL's health-for-peace plan, we can take another step forward toward that international understanding which is so necessary if world tensions are ever to end.

An excellent article written by Dr. Howard A. Rusk regarding this proposal was published in the Sunday edition of the New York Times of February 8, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ANALYSIS OF SCIENTIFIC TEAMWORK BEHIND THE HEALTH-FOR-PEACE BILLS

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Last Monday Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat of Alabama, reintroduced in the Senate his bill to expand U.S. support of international medical research. In a strong show of bipartisan support, 59 of Senator HILL's colleagues joined him in cosponsoring the legislation.

Representative JOHN FOGARTY, Democrat of Rhode Island, has also reintroduced a similar bill in the House of Representatives.

This legislation, known popularly as the health-for-peace bill, would create within the National Institutes of Health a new National Institute of International Medical Research with an annual appropriation of $50 million.

These funds would be used to encourage and support research and the exchange of information on research, the training of research personnel and the improvement of research facilities throughout the world.

The bill would authorize grants to support such activities ranging from research in basic science to research in rehabilitation. Grants could be made to foreign and American universities and research organizations and to voluntary and governmental international agencies such as the World Health Organization.

Under the plan, a National Advisory Council for International Medical Research, composed of nongovernmental leaders, would establish policies, make recommendations and approve grants and loans under the program.

COUNCILS WOULD ADVISE

The existing specialized advisory councils on heart, cancer, arthritis and metabolic diseases, neurological diseases and blindness, vocational rehabilitation and similar specialized fields would advise the new National Advisory Council for International Medical Research on specific projects within their particular area of interest and competence.

The program would not replace any of our current programs of multilateral international health activities through the World Health Organization or UNICEF or any of our bilateral activities conducted through the International Cooperation Administration.

Nor would it supplant the research programs being conducted through the International Cooperation Administration.

Nor would it supplant the research programs being conducted in the United States through the National Institutes of Health. It would enhance these activities and at the same time provide a mechanism and funds for uniting science throughout the world in a greatly expanded global attack on disease and disability.

The key factor in grants from the new National Institute for International Medical Research, over and above the usual criteria applied to research projects, would be their international implications.

Although there are innumerable corollary values in Senator Hill's proposal, it is based primarily on recognition of the fact that medical research is so highly complex and interrelated that victory over any disease or disability can be achieved only through the research results of many scientists throughout the world.

FULL OF EXAMPLES

The history of medicine is replete with examples of this.

It was a Dutch scientist in 1676 who first revealed the world of micro-organisms. An English physician, Edward Jenner, who observed in 1796 that vaccination prevented smallpox, provided the basis for modern immunological concepts.

Iwanowski, a Russian, identified the first virus in 1892. Two Canadians, Sir Frederick Banting and Charles Best, were the first to isolate insulin in 1921.

The Spanish neuroanatomist, Santiago Ramon y Cajal, and the Italian histologist, Camillo Golgi, shared the Nobel prize in 1906 for their work on the structure of the nervous system.

The list goes on and on—penicillin from England, cortisone from the United States, rauwolfia from India, sulfonamides from Germany.

The health-for-peace bill is a direct outgrowth of the proposals of President Eisenhower in his 1958 state of the Union message for a science-for-peace plan to attain a good life for all. As the first step in such a plan, President Eisenhower at that time invited the Soviet Union to join in the current 5-year program for the global eradication of malaria.

The President then stated our willingness to pool our efforts with the Russians in other campaigns against cancer and heart disease and the other scourges of mankind. "If the people can get together on such projects," he said, "is it not possible that we could then go on to a full-scale cooperative program of science for peace?"

DISCUSSED IN MOSCOW

It was to discuss the proposals for a greatly expanded international medical research program that Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, went to Moscow in early December for his now-famous 8-hour interview with Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev. The first 2 hours of the interview were spent discussing international medical research.

In a statement issued in Moscow after the interview, Senator HUMPHREY reported the Soviet Premier had given enthusiastic approval to the proposal.

He said further: "During my interview with the Premier I had noted that areas of disagreement between our respective foreign policies remain broad and deep. It does not appear that, for a considerable time, these differences will be resolved. In the meantime, we need to learn how to work together, and the best place to start is in the nonpolitical area. The world is hungry for some evidence of effective Soviet-American collaboration. One of the best areas in which to start is in the field of health."

The fact that 59 other Senators joined with Senator HILL in cosponsoring his health-for-peace bill indicates that a majority of the Senate agree with the statement of Senator HUMPHREY on the need for such a program and with Senator HILL that his proposals would help meet that need.

They realize that not only will such a program improve international understanding but also may well provide a breakthrough on the killing and crippling diseases that plague mankind.

Every citizen in the United States has a personal stake in this program.

The enthusiastic congressional support of the health-for-peace bill gives dimension and significance to the aphorism of the late Sir William Osler, who once said: "The great republic of medicine knows and has known no national boundaries."

Observations on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on February 10 the Greenwood Index of Greenwood, S.C., editorially demonstrated what appears to me to be a crucial issue with respect to our foreign policy. I ask unanimous consent that this enlightening editorial entitled, "Observations" be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the observations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBSERVATIONS

Modern diplomatic quandries arise from surging nationalism among underprivileged peoples. Shall the United States foster this feeling, in the spirit of our own revolution, or is the course of realism to say that these people are not yet ready for self-government?

There is no sure answer. This observation by William Henry Chamberlain in the Wall Street Journal is worth reading on the subject: "A few conclusions may be drawn from the experience of the ups and downs of democracy. This system must grow from within; it cannot be artificially implanted by a few young enthusiasts drawing up an

admirable paper constitution and shouting a few slogans. Democracy has no reality without widespread education and a diffused ownership of private property. The United States will be well advised to frame its foreign policy not by abstract considerations of whether a foreign country is a democracy or a dictatorship, but by positive evidence that the country is going our way politically and recognizes bonds of common interest."

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland at Lincoln Day Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a speech delivered last Thursday, February 12, 1959, by the Honorable William F. Knowland at the annual Lincoln Day banquet of the Young Men's Republican Club of King County, in Seattle, Wash.

A Member of the U.S. Senate for 13 years, during which time he served as both majority and minority leader, Senator Knowland draws from his vast experience to outline several goals for the Republican Party and for America, as a whole. The speech, delivered on the birthday of our first great Republican President, presents a very straightforward approach to the grave problems facing our Government today, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND AT THE ANNUAL BANQUET, YOUNG MEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUB OF KING COUNTY, FEBRUARY 12, 1959, SEATTLE, WASH.

Fellow Americans, this is no time for defeatism. It is the time for reflection, for constructive criticism of past action or inaction, for reorganization and for a forward movement along the whole front.

It was Abraham Lincoln in 1858, the year of his defeat for the Senate and 2 years before his election to the Presidency, who said:

"If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could then better judge what to do and how to do it."

For us as Americans and for us as Republicans has come simultaneously the imperative need to stop, look, and listen in order to determine, if possible, where we are and whither we are tending.

The Whig Party failed to do this in the 1850's and passed out of existence.

The Nation in the 1840's and 1850's failed to solve the slavery question and the decisions were finally made in the fiery crucible of a great civil war.

There is much talk these days about the need for precinct organization. This is, of course, vitally important. But to make this No. 1 on the list is to put the cart before the horse.

It seems to me that as Republicans we must first determine for what we stand rather than for whom we stand.

Neither our domestic problems nor our international dangers can be determined safely by officials selected on the basis of the best "Pepsodent smile" nor on the basis that regardless of the principles or policies for which he stands that the incumbent of one's own party has permanent tenure in the office he holds.

Such an approach in these critical times can lead to decay in our party and disaster to our Nation.

It is far less fatal for a party to lose an election than to become all things to all men in order to win.

Would it not be well for Republicans (and Democrats, for that matter) to hold annual conventions in each of our States in order to get a real grassroots understanding as to what the rank and file think and the things for which they want their party to stand?

I do not believe this can or should be left to the office holders alone. The party is far bigger than any gathering of incumbents on the local, county, State, or National level.

At times the officeholder may think his own reelection is more important than giving the people clear-cut decisions on major policy matters. To him it may be, but to the party and the Nation vacillation, and postponing the decision may lead to a more violent outburst later on, as was the case 100 years ago.

Some basic decisions need to be thought out and fought out ahead of the national nominating conventions.

No single person or small group has the answer to all our problems as a Nation or a party. But I do have a confidence that out of the ranks of the people will come the principles and the leadership to again save our Nation at one of the great turning points of history.

Nations, parties, and individuals have both victories and defeats. They can and should learn from both.

I have no regrets for having raised the issues or having made the fight in California last year. It helped, I believe, to alert the people of our State and of the Nation to some of the problems ahead of us.

Despite misrepresentation of my position and the propaganda efforts of the labor bosses, the facts of the matter are that I believe in strong and effective unions.

I said last year and I repeat now:

"Unions should be responsible to their own membership and to the American public. With power must always go responsibility. Collective bargaining must not become collective bludgeoning."

Since last November, James Hoffa has announced his intention to have every policeman wear a Teamster membership button.

I do not believe this would be conducive to impartial law enforcement, for the public good, nor indeed in the best interests of labor unionism as a whole.

How can we best preserve our priceless heritage? This is our challenge as a Nation, as a party, and as individuals.

You here will play a part in the great decisions that will win or lose this historic battle.

What are my beliefs in this regard?

I give them to you, as the reflections of one who for 30 years has been active in the ranks of the Republican Party and for the past 13 years as a Member of the U.S. Senate during the last 6 years of which I served as both majority and minority leader:

1. We must preserve the Federal constitutional system and actively oppose the tendency to break down State lines.

2. We must preserve American competitive enterprise from the monopolistic onslaughts of both big business and big labor.

3. We must stand for responsible and solvent government on the local, State, and National level.

4. We must stand for the protection of the individual citizen against the encroachments of the criminal underworld, labor goonsters or business racketeers, and this is and should remain primarily the responsibility of local and State authorities.

5. We must stand for the protection of our Nation, its constitutional government and the free world, and for this we must primarily depend on the Federal Government and such reliable allies that care to be associated with us in this common effort. We must understand that you cannot purchase either individual or collective friendship.

6. We must preserve the incentives that will continue to encourage investors to take risks to start new businesses or enlarge existing ones so that more job opportunities will open up for our increasing population. Too high a tax structure, invasion of the Government into price fixing, and labor's encroachment upon responsibilities belonging to management can weaken, if not destroy, these incentives.

7. Government should not become confiscatory in its tax levying. Except in case of war, Federal income taxes should not exceed 33⅓ percent of personal income nor more than 40 percent of corporate income. Out of the earnings of corporations and the savings of individuals must come the capital investment to keep American industry ahead of that of the totalitarian Socialist-Communist state.

8. Every American citizen of voting age is entitled to vote, based on standards of qualification applicable without regard to race, color, or sex. The citizens of all the States have an interest in seeing that the citizens of none of the States are denied such rights.

9. Federal funds will ultimately lead to Federal controls. Federal encroachment in the field of education should be resisted.

10. In guarding the rights of one group we must not abuse the rights of other groups. The right to determine one's religious, fraternal, and social associations is fundamental and should not be surrendered upon any pretext of protecting minority rights.

Now these are not all inclusive by any means. But to me all are pretty fundamental and furnish a point around which large numbers of present-day Republicans, Democrats, and Independents (north, south, east, and west) might join together with a common objective and a mutuality of interest.

Once we establish a large area of agreement on principles we are then in a position to sign up large numbers of workers who can campaign with intelligence and enthusiasm for the candidates running on an understandable and agreed program.

Too often now the worker is unclear as to what his party stands for or who the party spokesman is. He may find his candidates for several offices opposed to each other on rather fundamental issues. This only adds to disunity and discouragement to the precinct worker and confusion among the voters.

Our Nation would not have been founded and the Union would not have been preserved if men and women had not been prepared to stand for certain fundamental principles, regardless of cost.

The preamble to our Constitution states:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The Constitution provides for its own amendment. By two-thirds vote of both houses and ratification by three-fourths of the States.

Under this and related provisions our Constitution has been amended 22 times.

While it is a cumbersome process neither the executive, legislative, or judicial branches should seek to or be allowed to short circuit this procedure in letter or in spirit.

Relating back now to the 10 principles of constitutionalism let us examine specifics.

1. The growth of the Federal Government has been astronomical in character. The executive, legislative, and judicial branches have all at one time or another expanded Federal power and whittled away at the rights of the States. This trend needs to be reversed now before we pass the point of no return.

2. The Republican Party should forthrightly fight for the American private enterprise system. New Dealers with governmental economic control of prices and wages are as dangerous to the future of free enterprise as are avowed Socialists who believe in Government ownership of the means of production. Whenever the people want New Dealism or socialism they will take the original and not a faded carbon copy.

3. No responsible official can ignore the fact that today our public debt is over $300 billion and that the interest on it amounts to over $8 billion a year.

This interest charge is greater than all income into the Treasury as late as 1941 and all expenditures as late as 1938.

The time has come for a drastic curtailment of foreign aid as a necessary step to putting our domestic finances in order. Foreign aid is used as a leverage for all kinds of local projects.

Sooner or later the overburdened taxpayer is going to ask if there is any more excuse for his paying for unconsumed agricultural products than for unsold refrigerators, unused paper or uncrated bicycles.

4. A government that cannot protect the legal and constitutional rights of its citizens is not worthy of being supported.

Our ancestors left the Old World to get away from compulsory church membership. Compulsory union membership can negate the basic freedom of choice which Americans once held dear.

5. Freedom is indivisible. Lincoln said our Nation cannot be half slave and half free. Nor in our time can the world.

It has never made sense to me for American funds to be used in support of Communist Yugoslavia or Poland. Between them they have received over $2 billion.

This same sum of money very likely could have given us an earth satellite ahead of the Soviet sputnik.

How much more effective this would have been on friend, neutral, and Communist alike than pouring our free enterprise dollars into these Communist sinkholes.

6. At Washington and throughout the Nation there are doctrinaire forces that believe in a regimented economy.

Under the slightest pretext they will move openly to reestablish OPA-type controls over prices. Inevitably this will lead to wage and commodity allocation controls and to the same chaotic conditions existing in 1946 and 1947, which brought the end to OPA.

There has been, in some quarters, a steady encroachment of labor upon the responsibilities of management that is becoming a detriment to small business and tends to cause small operators to sell out to large competitors. This trend whether resulting from inequitable labor demands or a growing multiplicity of tax burdens is most harmful to our economic structure of which small business is an integral part.

7. Today the Federal Government is a major partner in most of the larger companies of the Nation, taking 52 percent in corporate income taxes.

The personal income taxes, Federal and State, are at the point where they put a wet blanket on the incentive which helped to build our Nation from a small colony of 3 million on the Atlantic coast to a great world power of 170 million, the most productive the world has ever known.

The drying up of savings for investment could slow down the continued modernization of American industry which is so essential if our productivity is to keep ahead of the Soviet Union.

8. Those who believe in States rights, as I do, will be on firmer ground if the constitutional right of citizens to vote without discrimination on grounds of race or color is clearly manifest in all 49 States.

Then the power and dignity of the States to run their own affairs will rest on a firm foundation not easily assailable by those who would make the States, in effect, Federal provinces.

9. If there is any function in which the local people should keep control it is in the field of education. Where Federal funds go, ultimately Federal control will follow.

There is no such thing as free Federal money. It comes from the people residing in the 49 States. However, a dollar flowing from the States to Washington suffers substantial attrition before it comes back as a grant in aid.

10. The American Constitution was founded on the principle that the individual had certain rights that neither the Government nor even tyrannical temporary majorities could take from him.

For example, not even a unanimous vote of Congress, the approval of the President, or the action of the Supreme Court can take away his freedom of religion, press, or right to peaceably assemble and petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude—15th amendment—or by reason of sex—19th amendment.

As we have already pointed out, approval of amendments takes a two-thirds vote of each House of Congress and three-fourths ratification by the States. No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed—section 9, article I.

There is one section of the Constitution that cannot be amended even by the amending process. Article V states "and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

Minorities as well as majorities can at times be arbitrary as against the right of an individual to select his religion, his occupation, his fraternal colleagues, or his individual associates.

The great asset of our way of life is that we uphold the dignity and independence of the individual citizen and our Constitution makes certain that the State is his servant and not his master. We believe in a divine being and communism is a godless tyranny.

These are the great contrasts with totalitarian communism or fascism.

On these basic differences there is not and there cannot be any weakening of our faith or our beliefs.

We are admonished by Second Corinthians:

"Be yet not unequally yoked together with unbelievers for what fellowship has righteousnesa with unrighteousness and what communion has light with darkness?"

Almost 100 years have passed since Abraham Lincoln's election to the Presidency. His words come ringing down through the ages: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. * * * The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in history to the latest generation. In giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. * * * We shall meanly lose or nobly save this last best hope of earth."

A Southern Editor's Views on Forced Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, for the benefit of the many who did not have the opportunity of hearing Thomas R. Waring, editor of the Charleston News and Courier, present his brilliant defense of the southern position on forced integration of the races on the nationally telecast Chet Huntley Show of Sunday, February 8, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Waring's statement, entitled "Editor Offers a Southerner's Views," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITOR OFFERS A SOUTHERNER'S VIEWS

(By Thomas R. Waring)

Mr. Huntley's proposal that the NAACP withdraw from the South would meet with hearty approval, I believe, among most southerners—but not for the reasons Mr. Huntley has expressed. As I understand it, Mr. Huntley believes that mingling of the races could be accomplished with more speed and harmony if the NAACP removed itself. Mr. Huntley has presented legal and other reasons why mixing the races is right. I would like to offer a different viewpoint.

OPPOSED TO IT NOW OR LATER

I am a spokesman for no organization or group of people. I am a newspaper editor in a position that offers opportunities to observe and report on people in the region where I live.

I believe it is a fact that the overwhelming majority of southern people are unalterably opposed to mixing races in public schools. They are opposed to it now or later.

They hold this view not on account of hatred or bigotry, as you may have been told. They hold it because they sincerely believe, on the basis of firsthand experience, that separate schools are best for both races.

In presenting this as the view of the majority of southerners, I refer to white southerners, because they are about 75 percent of the population. But the proportion varies greatly. In my home community, for instance, the population is about 50–50. In some neighborhoods, Negroes outnumber whites 10 to 1. In many school districts integration would mean sending white children to Negro schools.

While I do not pose as a spokesman for the colored people, nor pretend to read their minds, I believe that most of them are happy and satisfied. I do not believe the NAACP by any means represents a unanimous feeling among the southern Negroes.

If some southerners are willing to accept token integration rather than shut down their schools it does not mean that they approve, or accept it permanently. Even token integration brings tension and constant threat of disorder, as well as fear of other evils.

If integration is wrong, as we believe it is, we do not concede that a little bit of it is right. The strength of resistance testifies to the depth of this belief. The choice between separate schools and no schools is an agonizing one for people who have spent years developing an education system.

TRAPPINGS OF THE POLICE STATE

Cordons of police ringed the school at Arlington to enforce admission of four colored children. Not even parents were allowed near the schoolhouse. An Associated Press reporter said the scene presented a picture of Alcatraz, southern style. The trappings of the police state were mounted within sight of the U.S. Capitol.

It is not alone the entrance of a few colored children at Arlington or elsewhere that created all this furor. White southerners are more accustomed to Negroes than people in other regions. It is the seizure of rights and powers for local self-government that makes southern hearts turn cold.

The Supreme Court has rewritten the Constitution it swore to uphold. Chief Justice Holmes, Justice Brandeis, and other liberals accepted the law of the land to mean the States had a right to operate separate but equal schools.

Whether the South closes public schools under threat of mixing, or struggles in some regions with the perils of integration, public education will be damaged.

For white pupils, standards of education will decline. This has been the experience in Washington, D.C., and in other places that have undergone mass integration. The statement is well documented and I haven't time to explore it further.

For colored pupils, the relaxed and familiar conditions of their own schools are lost. Discipline breaks down. We have no blackboard jungles in the South, and we do not want them.

PUBLIC EDUCATION IS BOUND TO SUFFER

Though not all southern schools, white or Negro, have achieved the highest standards, they have vastly improved in recent years. Southerners have spent billions of dollars on them. They had a contract with the Federal Government that guaranteed separation of the races. They would not have taxed themselves for mixed schools. And nobody knows how long they would continue to support schools they don't control. In any event, public education is bound to suffer.

Local self-government, through division of State and Federal powers, is the keystone of our Republic. It is being torn apart for the sake of a sociological experiment. If a police state is substituted for the Republic, no race will gain.

Once before, in prohibition, the United States experimented with sociology. Prohibition was a failure. It brought on bootlegging and a crime wave. Eventually the people came to their senses. They repealed prohibition. At least, it had the authority of lawful constitutional amendment. This time the experiment is with the lives of children—on the basis of court decrees.

Southerners are concerned for the welfare of both races. They realize the need to educate colored people as well as white. They need colored citizens for manpower in the burgeoning new industries. They want to build the earning power of Negro workers so they can carry more of their share of the economy.

GOVERNOR COLLINS' COMMENTS

In his inaugural address last month, South Carolina's young Governor, Ernest F. Hollings referred to these problems. He said, and I quote:

"I shall not dwell on the subject of segregation as it affects race relations. We have all heard too much on this subject and there is too much to be done in the days ahead for us to waste our energies and arouse our tempers over a subject upon which we, in South Carolina, are in essential agreement.

"We are fortunate in having a well nigh boundless store of good will and understanding among all races and beliefs in South Carolina. In our schools, peace patrols the school corridors; unlike New York, we do not need armed guards. The Negroes of our State feel that schools are intended for education. They feel that their Governor and general assembly are doing everything possible to provide them the best educational program and the best opportunity to succeed on an individual basis. Let alone, we shall continue to do this.

"As a practical matter, this can only be done in the segregated pattern, and for those who would by integration destroy the education, culture, opportunity and friendship of both races, I simply state that our position of determined resistance remains unchanged."

Southern people are not, as you may have been told, captives of blind leaders who will not or cannot read the signs of progress.

DEFINITION OF A MODERATE

The people demand that their piblic schools be separate. We hear sometimes about Southern moderates. A moderate is an integrationist who isn't in too big a hurry. Fast or slow, most southerners are convinced that mingling the schools would be disastrous.

What is the aim of integration?

It is not improvement for white pupils. Educational standards in mixed schools would have to be reduced to the lowest common denominator.

LEARNING NOT PROMOTED BY TENSION

It will not improve education for Negro pupils. An atmosphere of tension does not promote learning. Discipline would have to suffer when any classroom incident is likely to explode into a racial incident.

It would not promote good relations between the races. Both North and South, integation or attempts at it have created racial trouble.

It will not create respect abroad for the United States. Internal squabbles involving troops, police, and constant arguments over rights and freedoms are signs of unstable conditions.

If the aim of integration is to sustain legal and sociological theories, without regard to practical effects on human beings, it is not defensible.

If the aim is to humiliate the white southerners, it is beneath contempt.

If the aim is to raise the status of the Negro, it won't work. The Negro needs many things more than he needs association with white people on an involuntary basis.

While national diplomacy courts favor in foreign countries, on the domestic front the American Government is not seeking to win friends and influence people in Southern States.

I shall not attempt to explore the reason for those policies. They are in large measure political.

NAACP CREATES DIVISION, ANIMOSITY

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has been able to exploit these political forces. It has achieved a balance of power out of all proportion to its actual worth. Millions of white southerners have become an unorganized and oppressed minority.

The NAACP creates division and animosity. Some of its leaders have official records of contacts with subversive organizations. Their names have been published in reports of congressional committees.

With its political allies, the NAACP has set up a virtual censorship on race.

One minor bit of evidence is the removal of dialect from magazines, books, and newspapers. Though Negro dialect is forbidden, a California cartoonist who lampooned the southern speech of Governor Faubus was singled out recently for some kind of freedom award.

Negro crime in cities is appalling, but the facts are being deliberately disguised in the Paper Curtain press.

Superior force may overwhelm the South, as it has done before. But troops and police cannot forever suppress millions of resourceful people.

I do not believe the rest of the country wants some of the States to become concentration camps for the sake of mixing white and colored children against their parents' will.

Lee Wooden Talks to Vernonia High School Students on Rural Electrification

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, at a time when the rural electrification movement is under attack, it is well that Senators and Representatives should be refreshed regarding its origins and accomplishments.

One of the great pioneers of rural electrification in the Pacific Northwest is my good friend, 77-year-old Lee Wooden, of Jewell, Oreg., who is the longtime president of the Oregon Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Mr. Wooden is a frontier farmer and lumberman, now retired. In his own words, he remembers what it was like in the Northwest and in Oregon during the era of kerosene lamps and candles. I know, too, not from personal experience but because Mrs. Neuberger's farm family had none of the blessings of electricity until Bonneville Dam was built and the REA financed rural powerlines.

In the February issue of Northwest Ruralite for 1959, there is reprinted a sincere and direct speech which Lee Wooden delivered to the students of Vernonia High School in the lumbering town of Vernonia. The speech is entitled "What Rural Youngsters Should Know." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Lee Wooden's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT RURAL YOUNGSTER SHOULD KNOW

(By Lee Wooden)

(Seventy-seven year-old Lee Wooden, president of the Oregon Rural Electric Cooperative Association and pioneer Clatsop County timberman and farmer, tells people he has retired. Lately, he has been making a hobby of bringing to the young people of his State an awareness of the meaning of rural electrification. In case you never knew, or have almost forgotten what Mr. Wooden knows so well, Ruralite reprints here some of the story he recently told students at the Vernonia, Oreg., high school.)

Prior to 1935 only 1 farm in 10 had electricity at the turn of a switch. On May 11, 1935, the Rural Electrification Administration was created by executive order of President Roosevelt. That order not only established REA, it also appointed that famous engineer, Morris L. Cook, as the first Administrator.

Congress immediately appropriated $100 million to be loaned to both commercial and public utilities. This money was only for

the extension of existing electric lines into farm areas which at that time did not have electric service. The order made no mention of the formation of electric cooperatives to do the job.

One full year was lost in a futile effort to introduce the existing electric utilities to borrow the money at a low rate of interest, and then Congress realized that it was useless to try further persuasion, and passed the Norris-Rayburn Act, known as the REA Act of 1936.

The Norris-Rayburn Act was signed into law on May 20, 1936, by President Roosevelt. This act gave to the farmers and rural people the right to form their own electric cooperatives and to borrow the money at a low rate of interest to build their own electric systems.

Today, more than 21 years since the REA Act of 1936 was passed, not 1 farm in 10, but 96 percent have electricity at the turn of a switch. Electricity does more to raise the standard of living in the home than any other commodity, and does many more jobs on the farms than is required by the city dweller.

Each cooperative member has a voice and a vote at the annual membership meetings. The members elect a board of directors and establish the policies that govern the management of the cooperative.

On May 11, 1935, when President Roosevelt signed the Executive order creating the Rural Electrification Administration, commonly referred to as REA, he had two main objectives in mind. First, there was a great need to extend electric lines into farm areas, not only to raise the standard of living in the homes and on the farms of America, but also to eliminate much of the drudgery of farm life and make the farm homes a better and much more pleasant place to live, and increase their productivity. Second, the Nation was in the worst depression ever known in the history of this country.

This new business, created by the building of nearly 1,000 electric cooperative systems throughout the Nation, has had a great stabilizing effect nationwide. This wonderful program has created new wealth, new business, where none existed before, and new jobs in untold numbers.

It is estimated that for every dollar loaned to electric cooperatives, more than $6 have been spent for appliances and equipment, thereby greatly increasing employment, and greatly benefiting the entire economy.

All of the nearly $3 billion loaned to electric cooperatives by REA is being repaid over a 35-year period at 2-percent interest, and to date better than 39.9 percent of all payments, both principal and interest, are either current or paid in advance of the due date.

While the REA was not created to make a profit on the money loaned to the cooperatives, according to figures as of February 1957, the Government had netted $47.5 million. That is, the money collected as interest was that much more than the cost of money to the Government.

The members of an REA-financed cooperative own their electric systems and, since such cooperatives are nonprofit organizations, any surplus at the end of the year is credited to the member's account in direct proportion to his yearly payment for service. The 4 million members of the nearly 1,000 REA-financed electric cooperatives represent more than 15 million people. Oregon's 15 REA-financed electric cooperatives have 33,000 members and represent more than 100,000 people.

Many of the new members do not remember the tallow candle and the kerosene lamp and lantern. Most all newspapers and magazines, as well as all other media, carry vicious propaganda advertising against locally owned electric cooperatives. The fight is being carried on both at the State and national level and unless the members fight for their rights they may become weary of the struggle and lose their own electric systems.

Supreme Court Not Sacred to Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there has been in recent times much controversial discussion concerning the morality of criticism aimed at the U.S. Supreme Court. While even the greatest statesmen of every age were not infallible, a review of their attitudes can often be helpful in deciding current controversies. The able columnist, Mr. David Lawrence, has made a definite contribution by discussing the attitude of President Lincoln toward the Court in his column entitled, "Supreme Court Not Sacred to Lincoln," published in the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., on February 15. I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT NOT SACRED TO LINCOLN

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The Nation celebrated last week the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. Eloquent eulogies were spoken—and he deserves them all. But if what Abraham Lincoln said just 100 years ago were attributed today to anyone else in public life, the same utterances would be denounced as coming from a racist, or extremist, or a person who defies the Constitution.

Few people realize how outspoken Abraham Lincoln was against a Supreme Court decision and how he insisted that a mere overturning of precedent in a ruling was not settled law. It was just 100 years ago when Abraham Lincoln was debating with Stephen Douglas in the State of Illinois. Only a few months ago the Library of Congress published a book containing facsimiles of the printers' copy of the stenographic record of Lincoln-Douglas debates as edited and prepared for the press by Abraham Lincoln.

Following is a quotation from Mr. Lincoln's speech delivered on July 13, 1858, at Chicago:

"The sacredness that Judge Douglas throws around this decision (of the Supreme Court of the United States) is a degree of sacredness that has never been before thrown around any other decision. I have never heard of such a thing. Why, decisions apparently contrary to that decision, or that good lawyers thought were contrary to that decision, have been made by that very Court before. It is the first of its kind; it is an astonisher in legal history—it is a new wonder of the world."

In speaking further of the Dred Scott decision, Mr. Lincoln said at Quincy, Ill., on October 13, 1858:

"But we nevertheless do oppose that decision as a political rule which shall be binding on the voter to vote for nobody who thinks it wrong, which shall be binding on the Members of Congress or the President to favor no measure that does not actually concur with the principles of that decision. We do not propose to be bound by it as a political rule in that way. * * * We propose so resisting it as to have it reversed if we can, and a new judicial rule established upon this subject."

In another speech delivered in Chicago on July 17, 1858, Mr. Lincoln quoted with approval a letter from Thomas Jefferson, written in 1820, which declared that if the judges of the Supreme Court are to be considered as "the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions," this could be a "very dangerous doctrine indeed and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy."

In a speech delivered at Ottawa, Ill., on August 21, 1858, Mr. Lincoln took up the race question. He denounced slavery, but then added:

"I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and the black races. There is a physical difference between the two, which in my judgment will probably forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality, and inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I, as well as Judge Douglas, am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position. I have never said anything to the contrary, but I hold that notwithstanding all this, there is no reason in the world why the Negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. I hold that he is as much entitled to these as the white man. I agree with Judge Douglas, he is not my equal in many respects—certainly not in color, perhaps not in moral or intellectual endowment. But in the right to eat the bread, without leave of anybody else, which his own hands earns, he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man.

"What next? Free them and make them politically and socially our equals? My own feelings will not admit of this; and if mine would, we well know that those of the great mass of white people will not. Whether this feeling accords with justice and sound judgment is not the sole question, if indeed it is any part of it. A universal feeling whether well or ill-founded, cannot be safely disregarded. We cannot, then, make them equal."

Jobless Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial which appeared in the February 3, 1959, edition of the Muskegon Chronicle supporting Federal standards in the field of unemployment compensation. On this exrtemely important issue, one which I hope this Congress will resolve along the line suggested by the Muskegon Chronicle, I am sure all will profit from a reading of this editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOBLESS PAY

Congress is getting a number of proposals for setting up a nationwide minimum standard for unemployment compensation, instead of leaving this to the action of each separate State.

There is a tremendous need for national legislation on this subject. Congress has talked about it now for several years, but nothing definite has been done.

Why should States be permitted to compete with one another on the basis of below-minimum unemployment schedules? That is the way it is now. Just as we have a national minimum wage law for industry engaged in interstate commerce, so we should have a national minimum jobless pay level.

The advantage to Michigan is obvious. Our State is one of those that have shown a decent concern for people in industrial employment who are laid off through no fault of their own. Nearly all States have a lower standard of jobless pay than Michigan.

Yet in the process this State has placed itself at a competitive disadvantage with the others that adhere to niggardly standards as a lure to industry, or because labor in those States has a weak voice in its law-making process.

Ever since he became President, Mr. Eisenhower and his Secretary of Labor have urged an increase in the amount, duration and coverage of jobless benefits.

But the situation is as uneven as ever on a State-by-State basis. It should be as apparent to Members of Congress as to everybody else that a national minimum standard is the only solution.

Not many days ago somebody introduced a bill at Lansing to provide unemployment compensation in this State for as long as a person is out of a job. In view of the condition facing Michigan, it is a nonsensical proposal, the main purpose of which was to serve as an entering wedge to extend the present limit.

The cure for Michigan's unemployment is more jobs, not more penalties on present employers and a still greater discrepancy between the jobless pay level of this State and the considerably lower level in most other States.

National legislation, bringing all States to a decent minimum jobless pay standard, is the answer. Michigan Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, should unite behind such a measure.

Foreign Alumni: One of America's Greatest Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today we recognize that tensions in the world which result in fear, distrust, and misunderstanding are a deterrent to world peace. Currently, we are trying to find ways and means of breaking through the barriers to create better understanding among the peoples of the world.

Recently Mr. Don Anderson, vice president of the Wisconsin Alumni Association, published a thought-provoking article in the Wisconsin Alumnus, entitled "Foreign Alumni: One of America's Great Assets."

In his article, Mr. Anderson points out that men and women from other lands—educated in American colleges and universities—can and are serving in their own nations as important reflections of our way of life.

Educated in our principles and ideals, they are acting to create better understanding, and often to correct the distortions being spread about us by Communist propaganda.

I am pleased to say that the University of Wisconsin—a truly great institution of learning—is now educating about 649 students from 70 nations. Over the years, almost every country in the world has been represented at this fine university.

As alumni of Wisconsin, many of these students will carry back to their homeland a better understanding of this great country.

As a basis for activities, a number of these alumni have organized groups or clubs abroad. Today, for example, Wisconsin has alumni clubs in Bangkok, Manila, Tokyo, and Honolulu. In other nations there are informal get-togethers of alumni.

The expansion of such efforts—based on private initiative, foresight, and constructive thinking—would indeed make an important contribution to creating a better understanding of us among the nations of the world.

To give my colleagues the benefit of Mr. Anderson's thinking on this program, I request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN ALUMNI: ONE OF AMERICA'S GREAT ASSETS

(By Don Anderson)

I hope that the day will come when every country in the world has an organized group of Wisconsin alumni, meeting regularly, continuing to learn the lessons that any good school has to teach its children no matter how long they have been out of the classrooms, sending back to this campus the experience and support that every school needs from its alumni.

Dr. Hu Shih, scholar and former Chinese Ambassador to the United States, once said that America's greatest contribution to education was its revolutionary concept of the alumnus, its concept of the former student as an understandable responsible partner and champion.

Wisconsin has been fortunate, especially in recent years, in having strong alumni relations. I would ask that this spirit be extended in a larger degree to the foreign students who come to study here. From classroom and laboratory they get much that a university has to offer. I would like to see them better encouraged to be loyal Wisconsin alumni after they have returned to their homelands. It can be a source of continuing benefit to them, a source of new wealth to the University itself.

It is not known exactly when the first foreign student registered here. There were none in the 1870's. In 1905 there were 33. This year we have 649 students from 70 nations. The leading country is India with about 100 students.

It is estimated that altogether 3,800 foreign students have attended school here. Practically every nation in the world has been represented. If a university gives its students not only knowledge but loyalties as well, is it too much to suggest that there is a little flavor of Wisconsin in every one of the world's communities? Would it not enrich us and the rest of the world to have those loyalties deepened and strengthened?

This program is one that cannot be carried out by faculty and administration alone. It calls for planning and effort by the student body. It will require planning and programing by the alumni association, because it is easy to lose these alumni once they have gone back to their native lands. It needs the understanding and the hospitality of Madison and other Wisconsin communities to help give our foreign guests an understanding and an appreciation of American home and family life.

Much has been done along these lines already, but there is room for improvement.

Too many Americans fail to appreciate the importance of having foreign students here to live and study with us. I think that failure of understanding is almost as common in the university community itself as it is elsewhere in the American scene outside the halls of ivy. Too often we look at these visitors in terms of a favor we are doing them, a privilege they could not enjoy were it not for the largesse of the American taxpayer and his tax dollar. I suggest that if there is anything of merit in our social order, in our economics or our politics, if there is any importance in impressing the rest of the world with the validity of our philosophies, then we are the ones who benefit when the foreign visitor is exposed to our ideas and our way of life which often show to their best advantage in our American university communities. We should be the ones who are grateful for the opportunity offered us.

Roy L. Matson, editor of the Wisconsin State Journal, recently returned from a 3-month tour of duty in India for the State Department. He also visited Thailand, Hong Kong, and Japan. He lectured and talked informally to thousands of people of every conceivable variety of political opinion and ideology. Along the way he met hostility, disbelief, or scorn for the United States and the West. Always there was one shining exception, one person or group of persons, who at least understood us, even if they did not always agree with us. That exception almost invariably turned out to be the graduate of an American university.

If, in their mind, there was not complete agreement, there at least was understanding and that is not a little thing.

The American, face-to-face and in association, is not the frightening thing his detractors abroad sometimes paint him. In no better way can the American be drawn in his true light than by having the man from abroad live with him and learn with him. In no better way can the man from abroad learn that behind and beneath the American's breezy front, his laughter, his insanity at world series time and football season there lies the American ideal.

It is a thing that is discovered with some surprise by many if not most from abroad: the American concern for opportunity and justice for the common man. Once discovered it is a thing remembered, appreciated, and treasured. And it is a thing that is as powerful to American friendship and advantage as all the defense alliances and power pacts we can devise around the world.

As important as these larger values are the smaller ones that accrue. They are the friendships which develop between classmates. An intelligent and cultured foreign student brings breadth and delight to dor-

mitroy, fraternity or rooming house. Those of us who have had them live in our homes know how much richer our family has been made by the contact, and the deep and lasting friendships that have come from them.

Wisconsin now has alumni clubs in Bangkok, Manila, Tokyo, and Honolulu. Tom Brittingham's Vikings get together informally on occasion in Scandinavia. I hope that the day will come when every country in the world has an organized group of Wisconsin alumni, meeting regularly, continuing to learn the lessons that any good school has to teach its children no matter how long they have been out of the classrooms, sending back to this campus the experience and support that every school needs from its alumni.

Wisconsin has two great declarations of principle and policy. The first is the one on winnowing and sifting on the plaque at Bascom Hall. The other is that the boundaries of the State shall be the borders of the campus.

Can anything but good come from extending the borders and the boundaries to include the sons and daughters of Wisconsin wherever they live in this whole world?

How They Steal and Hide Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the recent Cuban revolution is bringing to light many sordid facts concerning the deposted Batista regime. Looting seems to be the common practice of Latin American dictators.

Jack Anderson exposes Batista's methods in an illuminating article published in the Parade magazine section of yesterday's Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "How They Steal and Hide Millions," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW THEY STEAL AND HIDE MILLIONS

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Swiss bankers who specialize in secrecy helped ex-dictator Fulgencio Batista rob the Cuban people of millions before his blood-and-booty rule came to an end. Yet he is only the latest in a long line of Latin American dictators to get away with vast loot and retire to a life of luxury.

Argentina's Juan Peron, kicked out by an army revolt in 1955; Peru's Manual Odria, ousted in 1956; Colombia's Rojas Pinilla, toppled from power in 1957; Venezuela's Perez Jimenez, thrown out by his people a year ago—all escaped with the fabulous fruit of years of graft and corruption.

The surviving dictators, Rafael Trujillo of the Dominican Republic and Alfredo Stroessner of Paraguay, are reported to have huge fortunes salted away against the day they may be forced to flee. Nicaragua's Anastasio Somoza was similarly prepared against poverty when an assassin's bullet (one of the hazards of his profession) found his heart in September 1956. His misfortune may well have been some Swiss banker's windfall. The money in his secret accounts may have been so well hidden that no one knew how to claim it all. In that case it would have had to revert to the bankers.

The drama of Batista's New Year's Eve flight to the Dominican Republic, reputedly with suitcases stuffed with high denomination bills, poses a problem not only for Latin America, where dictatorship flourishes, but for the United States, too. With billions of American tax dollars being poured into the Latin American aid program, it is important to know how these vital funds can be raided so ruthlessly and huge sums vanish so completely.

Since Batista's exist, Parade has made an exhaustive investigation of the great dictatorship racket. How do the dictators rob their people? More important, how do they cache the money? Parade contacted authorities in Havana and here in Washington, talked with top officials of the Cuban Embassy here, interviewed Batista henchmen who have taken refuge in this country, checked with the State and Treasury Departments, even succeeded in prying loose exclusive information from the cagey Swiss bankers who hold the accounts of the dictators, both fallen and fearful.

THE REAL TREASURE

From this mass of material, one startling fact emerges. While there are many ways of robbing a country and hiding money, the dictator's real treasure chests lie far away, in Geneva and Berne, to be unlocked only by secret codes. Their accounts are identified only by numbers so closely guarded they never are committed to paper, only to memory.

Parade was permitted to see a Swiss code account held by one Batista aide. There is nothing like it elsewhere in the whole system of banking. The secrecy of Swiss banks is protected by the bulky Swiss constitution itself. Not even the Government can force a bank to disclose the name of a depositor, the amount to his credit or the record of his deposits and withdrawals. Result: the Swiss have become the world's leading bankers and their vaults the repository of most of the world's shady money. Not only dictators but gangsters, gun smugglers, dope traffickers, and the white slavers have stacked their money with the Swiss.

Swiss secrecy has become such a valuable commodity, in fact, that the banks of Geneva and Berne pay commissions of 3 to 5 percent to anyone who can bring in a large secret account. Some banks go further and offer an additional 10 percent of all that can be salvaged should the depositor suffer an accident and the money remain unclaimed. After a reasonable waiting period, the bank concerned usually seizes the money. No wonder Latin American dictators, with their high casualty rate, are welcome clients.

Swiss bank transactions can be bizarre. Although one representative insisted that the total number of secret accounts is far smaller than generally believed, he did acknowledge that it would be impossible for the Swiss Government or anyone else to guess the number of such accounts or how much is contained in them. He told how his bank had once received $4 million in French francs that had been floated across a lake.

The secret depositor apparently could not escape across the French border with the money. So he packed it in a barrel and painted instructions on the outside, asking the finder to take it to a certain bank in return for a reward. Inside the barrel were code instructions telling his bank to whom it belonged and how much reward should be paid. The depositor then waited for a favorable wind, launched the barrel and watched it drift into the darkness. It was picked up next morning by a Swiss fisherman, who scrupulously obeyed the painted instructions.

The code system is so complex that it defies breaking. The depositor is given a secret code number, then is provided with a set of tables that enables him to communicate with the bank by other code numbers. His account number is known only to himself and the bank managers. The set of tables provides serial numbers for messages; even the date and type of currency must be identified by a number from the secret tables.

Without this elaborate code, he would have to negotiate in person. He would then identify himself by his memorized number and supply whatever additional confirmation the bank required. This would depend on instructions given by the depositor on opening the account; perhaps some incident from his childhood, or the name and age of a distant relative.

Holders of numbered accounts receive statements only upon request. Then the statements are mailed in plain envelopes with the address scribbled, looking on the outside like a letter from a friend.

Beyond the slightest doubt, Batista, Peron, and the others have not one but many such accounts. They have siphoned millions into secret Swiss accounts, held by themselves and their graft-grabbing compatriots.

HOW MANY MILLIONS?

Batista may have left Havana with dollar-crammed suitcases, but it would be only his petty cash. The fortune he amassed was too huge for so picayune a means of transport. He had been getting booty out of Cuba for years. How many millions he acquired probably never will be known. It is doubtful that he even knows the amount himself. The new Cuban Government is working day and night trying to unravel Batista's financial skullduggery, but it will be months before even a faint outline of the plot emerges.

Some authorities in Havana estimate that he got away with $200 million. Congressman CHARLES PORTER, Democrat, of Oregan, who championed the rebel cause in Congress by putting pressure on the State Department to stop the flow of U.S. arms to Batista, believes that $500 million is nearer the mark.

"I intend to ask the Treasury and Justice Department to investigate Batista's holdings in this country," PORTER informed Parade. "I also intend to explore what steps can be taken to return this money to the Cuban people from whom it was filched."

During the first Batista years in power (1933–44), he amassed a personal fortune of more than $60 million. This much became a matter of official court record when he divorced his first wife, Elisa Godinez, to marry his mistress, Marta Fernandez. The divorce settlement: $15 million in cash, checks, and property.

It was generally conceded the $60 million was only the part of the Batista financial iceberg showing above water. The bulk of it was well below the surface. His code accounts in Switzerland were beginning to bulge. He siphoned off other funds into U.S. banks, stuffed safety deposit boxes with bearer bonds, bought real estate in Jacksonville and Daytona Beach, Fla.

Outside Havana he built the luxurious Kuquine estate, giving it all the fancy trimmings he had dreamed about as a peasant boy. All the rooms were marble-floored, the cellar mahogany-paneled. He built another mansion at Daytona Beach to house him during his voluntary exile (1944–51).

But it was not until he returned to Cuba in 1951 that the ex-sergeant (who got his stripes for his skill at shorthand, not soldiering) really hit the jackpot by taking charge of Korean war profits. This was the period known in Cuba as the Dance of the Millions. Sugar almost came to be worth its weight in gold dust; the price soared from ½ cent to 8 cents a pound. He also changed the gambling laws, to make Havana a wide-open rival to Las Vegas and Reno. Batista raked in the greenbacks like autumn leaves.

THE GANGSTERS MOVE IN

For the Cuban people, the Dance of the Millions rapidly became a Danse Macabre. Headed by Meyer Lansky, one-time beer baron who had become acquainted with Batista in Florida, American gangsters began to move in. If they thought they had anything to teach Batista, they soon learned differently.

Batista's grip on Cuba was so complete and ruthless they were left openmouthed. His rakeoffs went right down from the biggest companies to the smallest bootblack. Little shopkeepers paid $2 for opening each morning, another $2 for closing each night. Taxi drivers paid $1 for the privilege of parking in a given spot. The national lottery, always a feature of Cuban life, had become almost Batista's personal property. His associates were paid off in batches of tickets that they could either sell or hold. They also ran five illegal lotteries, called Molitos, without interference.

Batista's vivacious wife, taking her lead from Argentina's notorious Evita Peron, received a monthly check of $70,000 to spend on charities. It was money to spend as she wished. Her brother, Roberto Fernandez, as Cuba's Government Sports Director was the country's slot-machine king. He tapped every gambling machine in the island for 50 percent of the take, including those on which children played during the village fiestas. General Francisco Tabernilla, the army chief, pocketed a percentage of every bottle of Scotch whisky imported into Cuba. (Whisky came to be known as Old Tabernilla.) Other Batista men drained off tribute from prostitution, trade unions, public work projects. Under the table, the dictator always got his cut.

U.S. racketeers, graduates of the roaring twenties, gained a grudging admiration for Batista as they planned their lavish hotel casinos. He was ready with Government millions to provide financing. He gave special low-tariff rates for materials such as steel and concrete that had to be imported. Here were lush pickings. Contractors imported twice as much as they needed, then sold off the surplus for huge profits on the open, eager market. But in every case Batista, the donor of this financial banquet, expected his kickback, and his police were around to see that he got it.

Batista was quick to devise a means of keeping the enormous sums he was accumulating out of the Cuban banking system, which, clinging to old-fashioned honesty, required bookkeeping. He set up an institution with the impressive name, Banco de Dessarrollo Economico y Social (Bank of Economic and Social Development). It was less formally known as Bandes.

AN OPEN SECRET

On the surface, Bandes was supposed to be a special bank for handling a $350 million fund earmarked for public works. Actually it functioned as a clearinghouse for graft, complete with numbered accounts patterned after the Swiss system. It was not a particularly well-kept secret that the military and public works projects processed through Bandes were handled on a 50–50 basis—50 percent for the project, 50 percent for Batista and his friends.

The day after the Castro rebels moved into Havana, they acted swiftly to sequester the bank accounts and seal the safety deposit boxes of everybody connected with Batista. Through a special Ministery for the Recovery of Stolen Property, the new Government is attempting to recoup some of the graft.

A Castro spokesman told Parade that investigators already had unearthed an office that controlled 40 companies worth an estimated $40 million. Most of the stock was issued in blank to the bearer. They have traced much of the stock to members of Batista's family, and are satisfied that the 40 companies are merely fronts for the ex-dictator himself.

However much the new Cuban Government may recover of Batista's loot, it will still be only a fraction of the millions extracted from Cuba.

Other dictators and racketeers, present and future, will go on escaping with millions, just so long as there are welcoming bolt holes into which they can pour their money. Bolt holes like those Swiss banks, where a man is only a number, and where the laws of a country can be used to protect his perfidy.

A Little Dog Named Butch "Writes" to Senator Thurmond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as we in the Congress read our daily mail, it is a great relief to discover correspondence of a purely human-interest nature, especially when it is in the lighter vein. I recently received a letter from one of my canine constituents which is so well expressed that I believe it is deserving of wide distribution. I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I received from a dog named Butch in Columbia, S.C., be printed in the appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 5, 1959.

Hon. STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a little dog about 7 months old. I am considered a mild-mannered dog. Well liked by my master and mistress, I am well cared for. I take my shots for rabies; I buy my city license each year. I try very hard to abide by the city laws, because I have been taught that way.

But the real reason I am writing you is, I believe the Government should make some provision whereby my master could use me as a dependent, because I am solely dependent on my master to provide me with food, shelter, and medical care; because I do my best to see that he is protected while he sleeps; I act as a doorbell because when someone who is in trouble and wants to use my master's telephone, I always let him know that a stranger is near; and should a storm suddenly strike at night, I usually wake him and let him know. I am always mindful of fires, or prowlers at night; I watch and care for my mistress while my master is working.

I eat an awful lot; I get very seldom sick or need medical care, but I am confident should the need become apparent I can rest assured that I would be given the necessary treatment.

I do try very hard to protect my master's property from stray animals and persons who come for no good reason.

I am very polite to my master's friends; I romp with joy when I hear them brag about how well I look and how polite and considerate I am when they visit my master.

You know I was put here by God; I am a creature; I live and breathe like you; I have feelings that can be hurt; I must have food, water, and medical care; I cannot ask for it because I don't speak; I depend solely on my master because he understands me. He knows when I am sick, and he knows when I should be fed. I provide many hours of happiness and joy for my master by romping and playing. I run many miles a day bringing back sticks which my master throws in the yard and creeks. I cannot live without my master. I do not have to sleep under bridges or houses at night and I do not have to turn over garbage cans for food. I do not have to beg or pretend to like someone to get a bone or food because my master provides me with everything I need. I realize it costs money to keep me, but my master never complains. He is kind and generous; he is ever mindful of my welfare. Please help me so I can help my master. He is Mr. (and Mrs.) G. H. Orr, 4329 Colonial Drive, Columbia, S.C.

Yours very truly,

BUTCH.

Support for a Needed Move To Preserve Padre Island in the Gulf of Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the first bill which I introduced this session provided for the establishment of Padre Island, stretching along the coast of the Gulf of Mexico between Corpus Christi and Brownsville, Tex., as a national park.

This island features some of the finest beaches to be found anywhere in our United States. In addition, they are almost in the same State as they were when the Karankawa Indians lived on the island, when the Spanish explorer Alonso Alvarez de Pineda set foot on the shores in 1519, to be followed by Cabeza de Vaca, David Ingram, and others, and when a young lieutenant named George G. Meade sailed down Laguna Madre on the island's landward side to see if Gen. Zachary Taylor could take his artillery to Mexico by water.

It is an unfortunate truth that in many sections of our country the shoreline was vanished from public use. According to a national survey, only 240 miles of the 3,700 miles of shoreline constituting the Atlantic and Gulf coasts are in Federal and State ownership for public recreation use.

I believe a national park on Padre Island is sorely needed to preserve some of our coastline for the enjoyment of all. If it is made a park, I confidently predict Padre Island will become a winter playground for the Nation.

What better place could there be than this sandy island on which Texas longhorns once grazed and where one can still visit the wrecked hulls of fishing boats and pick up glass colored by the sun marking the sites of towns established here by early settlers? The story of the centuries lends flavor to this island, rich in legend of Indians, pirate treasure, explorers, soldiers, cowmen, and fishermen and sailors.

In addition, the island provides sanctuary for birds and wildlife and the water around it yields fine surf fishing.

Its unique combination of geographical formations, scenery, history, climate, and wildlife cannot be duplicated anywhere else in the Nation.

Mr. President, in further support of my reasons for wanting to preserve this last substantial strip of the American coastline which is still almost entirely in its natural State, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution of the Guild of the Houston (Tex.) Museum of Natural History, of February 9, 1959.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF GUILD OF HOUSTON, TEX., MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, FEBRUARY 9, 1959

The Guild of the Houston Museum of Natural History recognizes that Padre Island is unique in that it is the longest sand barrier island in the world; that its dunes and sand beaches are the finest along the Gulf coast; that bird values are outstanding and its marine life fascinating; and that its historical and recreational values are important.

It recognizes also that the island is largely unspoiled but that easy accessibility, due to three causeways, will soon destroy its natural beauty and its value for public recreation and study: Therefore

Resolved, That this organization go on record as favoring the acquisition of Padre Island for public recreation and for conservation of its beauty and study values.

Resolved further, That this guild take whatever action seems expedient to bring about the perpetuity of the island in its natural state.

Bigness Gives Power, Not Efficiency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, some time ago I had called to my attention an excellent article which apeared in the St. Petersburg Times of November 29, 1958, entitled "Bigness Gives Power, Not Efficiency" by Mr. Theodore K. Quinn.

The author is one of the Nation's outstanding authorities on problems of monopoly and bigness in business. He is the author of numerous books and articles on industry and labor and has been a frequent witness before congressional committees on problems of monopoly.

In order that Senators may have an opportunity to read this enlightening article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIGNESS GIVES POWER, NOT EFFICIENCY

(By Theodore K. Quinn)

(The author of this guest column is one of the nation's outstanding authorities on problems of monopoly and bigness in business. Former chairman of the board of General Electric Finance Co., now president of the Monitor Equipment and of T. K. Quinn Co., Inc., business consultants in New York, he has worked with Senators O'Mahoney and Kefauver on problems of monopoly, been a frequent witness before congressional committees, and is the author of numerous books and articles on industry and labor. He maintains a home in Largo as well as one in Roxbury, Conn.—The Editors.)

The distinguished physicist, Dr. Chauncey Starr, head of Atomics International, to whom you refer in your November 20 editorial "Bigness vs. Efficiency Problem," should not be taken seriously when he protests the governmental, economic policy of awarding nuclear power component contracts to small companies. His position is wholly self-serving whether or not he so intends it.

There is, to be sure, an optimum point of production efficiency—that is, lowest cost in relation to investment—in the production of every product. It runs into greater volume in the production of automobiles, for example, and is quite small in tool making, to use an opposite, extreme example. But there is no rule of thumb, and bigness is never efficient per se. On the contrary, the opposite is most likely to be true.

Unfortunately, efficiency in our society is dangerously confused with power. In this sense James Hoffa is efficient; so is Frank Costello. None of the 80 and more billionaire capital corporations need to be as immense as they are for any reason of efficiency. They swelled up through capital power, almost invariably by absorbing and combining other companies. Usually they have many separable departments and divisions not often related to any single product where concentration and the division of labor could produce efficiency.

General Motors, the world's largest manufacturing corporation, like the other giants, is huge because it combines dozens of formerly independent companies. Its production of Cadillacs does not make its production of Chevrolets, Buicks, Pontiacs, Oldsmobiles, etc., more efficient. It does not have also to be in the home appliance business, the bus line operating business, diesel engine business, insurance, finance, etc.—not for any reason of efficiency.

But, and this is the whole point, its tremendous size gives it proportionate power of a coercive kind, in purchasing influence over hundreds of banks it patronizes, over railroads handling its enormous shipping, over magazines, newspapers, and broadcast media—to which it pays over a hundred million dollars a year. All of this spells power, sheer might, not efficiency.

Less than 40 corporations the size of General Motors could handle our entire economy's output of goods and services, including nuclear components. Is this what America really wants? Wouldn't that be too much like Russia, where there is but a single, arbitrary, undemocratic authority?

The available evidence indicates that the biggest companies are not the most efficient producers. Neither United States Steel nor Bethlehem, the two largest, are the lowest cost operators or producers of steel. General Electric, with which I was associated for many years in official capacities, was never the lowest cost producer of any of its many, many lines, except where it was the only producer.

But it had the advantage of certain high profit, monopolistic lines, such as electric lamps and certain big generators, which enabled it to absorb losses on other lines until competitors realized they could not overcome their capital disadvantage, and joined, legally, of course, in livable profit margins and prices.

It makes little ultimate difference to the public from the purely dollars and cents standpoint whether essential independence in smaller companies is subsidized directly or whether, on the other hand, monopoly is supported and encouraged by the Government favoring giant corporations, which eventually resort to administered prices and extort as much or more in high profit rates.

The vital difference is that we can, through smaller companies, maintain a measure of healthy competition and save our American system, or what remains of it, instead of encouraging more and more monopolistic, concentrated control in private hands with the deadly social suffocation to which it leads.

Ten-Percent Tax on the Transportation of Persons Should Be Repealed

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, I introduced H.R. 1364, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Act of 1954 to repeal the tax presently imposed on the transportation of persons.

During the 85th Congress, the 3-percent excise tax on the transportation of property was repealed but unfortunately its counterpart, the 10-percent tax on travelers, was retained.

All of us are familiar, I am sure, with the original purposes of this tax which was imposed in 1941 as a temporary measure to help fill revenue needs and to discourage the general public's use of the airlines, railroads, and buses during World War II. Despite the fact that the reasons for imposing this tax have disappeared, it is unfortunately still with us. We must rid ourselves of it now.

If we ever lose the ability to move quickly and safely from one place to another, either in this country or throughout the world, we as a nation will be as impotent as you and I would be if we lose our ability to walk or talk. There is no doubt about our transportation industry's essentiality and importance to the economy of the country. The general public needs adequate and modern travel facilities. Our transportation system must continue to move forward and expand not only to prepare for the predicted 60 million increase in our population by 1975 but in fact even to exist in this age of electronics and atomic energy. No deterrent should be allowed to stand in the way which might discourage the general public from using common carriers to the limit of their capacity. The 10 percent tax on travel is just such a deterrent and should be repealed as quickly as possible.

By discouraging travel on commercial carriers, the tax places a heavy burden upon one of the Nation's most vital industries. The American transportation system is the envy of the world. During the Korean conflict and World War II, it performed a tremendous job of speedily and efficiently transporting essential personnel and material. If another national emergency should develop, the industry would again be asked to perform miracles of transportation while the automobile would again be

curtailed as a luxury this Nation couldn't afford. Public carriers must be prepared.

To be ready for a national emergency requires the most efficient use of our economic resources. One of the most important ways to accomplish this is to fully utilize and properly maintain our commercial transportation system. The existence of such a system in periods of limited resources depends upon its being permitted to use its facilities economically in periods of abundant resources, a fact too often overlooked. We should therefore encourage the growth of a sound and healthy common carrier system rather than discourage, by tax, the use of such industry's facilities on the part of the traveling public.

Here is a tax that no one has testified is good, fair, or beneficial. It is equally disliked by all regulated carriers and the traveling public. Members of Congress, executives of our airlines, railroads, intercity buslines and shipping companies, trade association officials and the man of the street have all appeared at one time or another before congressional committees urging its repeal. I cannot understand why, if the income derived from the tax amounts to about $200 million a year, Congress refuses to repeal it, particularly when many economists have stated that it is very probable that the Government stands to collect more revenue through increased use of our public carriers.

And do we realize that the effect of this tax on passengers adds to today's already high cost of living. Let me show you how. Since one-third of passenger transportation, it has been conservatively estimated, is for necessary business travel, the taxes on transportation will be included in operating expenses of the companies incurring them and passed on, at least partially, in the pricing of their products. The cost of collecting the tax is borne by the carriers and is included in operating expenses and thus affects the level of fares. And finally inadequate passenger revenues in the case of the railroads must be recovered from freight transportation by increases in rates. So here we have a tax which is not only unnecessary but also inflationary.

Another objectionable feature of the tax is that its burden is greater on the low-income families which spend most if not all of their income on the necessities of life. This group, consisting of about one-third of the families in the United States, it has been estimated, have no other means of travel than our common carriers. For them travel is not a luxury but a necessity and the travel tax which is collected by common carriers competes with the food and clothing dollar.

Not only does this 10 percent tax discriminate against the low income families but because it was imposed as a penalty surcharge, only on travel furnished by for-hire carriers, the tax is inherently discriminatory. As originally enacted, the tax applied to all amounts paid within the United States for transportation by rail, motor vehicle, water or air. This was not unfair in the beginning because there was no discrimination between competing carriers although it did give an advantage to the automobiles which, however, during the war was practically nonexistent. If, as expected, the tax had been repealed at the end of World War II, the inherent discrimination of the tax could not have developed fully. Instead, gas rationing, the device used to discourage private travel, was terminated and the travel tax was and is still being continued.

To make the tax further discriminatory, Congress has amended the law on several occasions so that today only travel within the continental United States and a 225-mile buffer zone is subjected to the tax. International travel is thus encouraged at the expense of domestic travel. Millions of dollars have been spent on our national parks for the benefit of Americans, and they, with our foreign guests, must pay a penalty to visit these places by train, airline, or bus. This is a curious and unhealthy situation.

The effect of the tax in discouraging travel in the United States by commercial means is very visibly demonstrated by the change in the character of intercity travel between 1946, the first full postwar year, and 1958. In 1946 common carriers transported 27 percent of all intercity travelers. Today this figure has dropped to slightly more than 10 percent in spite of the fact that total intercity miles have almost doubled during the 12-year period. How are people getting from city to city? Almost 90 percent of them are traveling with their families in the automobile which is not subjected to the travel tax.

This drop in intercity mileage which our large common carriers have experienced is extremely detrimental to the future of our transportation industry. With the airlines trying valiantly to find the money to order new jet airplanes, with the railroads' passenger car fleet totally inadequate for an emergency according to the Department of the Army, and with revenue of the bus companies—about 80 percent of which are small business—inadequate to cope with rising costs, why does the Congress of the United States, by refusing to repeal the travel tax, not recognize that it is fostering unsound economic conditions in the transportation industry and inadequacy of the transportation plant to meet the needs of commerce and national defense? The travel tax is in derogation of the national transportation policy which is spelled out in the Interstate Commerce Act. How much longer can we go on talking out of both sides of our months at once? Let us let our right hand act in concert with our left. Let us keep our transportation system second to none—one that is ready at all times for anything that might come. Let us repeal immediately the 10 percent tax on the transportation of persons.

Mr. J. Francis Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, J. Francis Smith, of Waterbury, Conn., died on February 5, 1959. Mr. Smith was one of the most prominent men of his generation in Waterbury and in the State of Connecticut. He was active in the political field, in the business field, and in the field of community activities. He gave generously of himself in activities which benefited the public and brought him no return other than the satisfaction of knowing that he had contributed to the welfare of his fellow man. His death will be a great loss to his community and to the State of Connecticut.

Mr. Smith was chairman of the first Waterbury U.S. savings bond drive during World War II and also headed the first Waterbury Community Chest drive.

He was a member of the boards of directors of many companies, including Connecticut Light & Power, and First Federal Savings & Loan Association. He was chairman of the advisory board of the Waterbury Trust Office and honorary director of the Connecticut National Bank with which Waterbury Trust is affiliated.

Mr. Smith was also a director of the Small Tube Products, Inc., now of Altoona, Pa.; the United Corp. of New York; True-Temper Corp., Cleveland, Ohio; the old Waterburg Farrel Foundry & Machine Co.; now a division of Textron, Inc.; and a former director of the New Haven Railroad.

BUSINESS INTERESTS

In addition to heading the lumber company founded by his father, he was president of the Waterbury Ready Mixed Concrete Co., and Connecticut Wholesale Supply Co. He was president at one time of the Northwestern Lumber Dealers Association and the Connecticut Lumber Dealers Association.

A graduate of Driggs School, Crosby High School, and Dartmouth College, he developed an interest in tennis as a boy, and developed his skill in the sport to win many championships. He was on the Dartmouth tennis team, was winner of the Waterbury city tennis championship nine times, the State doubles championship three times, and also the southern New England championship. In recent years he had been rated as an excellent golf player. He was always considered the most outstanding tennis player developed in Waterbury.

ACTIVE IN POLITICS

Mr. Smith was elected secretary of the Democratic State central committee in 1932 and became chairman in 1934.

Gov. Abraham Ribicoff said of Mr. Smith:

The death of J. Francis Smith is a great loss to all of us. Throughout the years, he has been a close personal friend and adviser. Fran was an outstanding citizen of our State, who always gave of himself to the civic, religious, charitable, and political life of his community. He served the people well.

Mrs. Ribicoff joins me in extending deepest sympathy to Mrs. Smith and the other members of his family. The State of Connecticut will mourn him and miss him throughout the coming years.

LAUDED BY FARLEY

Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and former chairman of the Democratic National Committee said of Mr. Smith:

News of the sudden death of Fran Smith shocks me, as I had recently talked with one of his brothers, who indicated some progress and imminent release from the hospital. For many years, I have had tremendous admiration and genuine affection for Fran Smith.

There never was any doubt as to his position on any issue. He was never a middle-of-the-roader, which convinced me more than ever, if the Democratic Party in every State had one leader like him, the party would be much stronger.

He had the admiration and respect of everyone with whom he came into contact. I've always enjoyed working with him and it was always a delight, in recent years to talk with him when he came to New York City, or by telephone at his office in Waterbury. My sincere condolences go to his brothers and his family.

U.S. Senator THOMAS J. DODD said of Mr. Smith:

Fran Smith was a great and dear friend of mine for 27 years. His untimely death comes as a great loss to me.

He was a brilliant man and always a clear thinker. He was a man dedicated to his country and the greatest State chairman either party ever had.

He was always a most charitable person and a man of the highest integrity.

His passing is a great loss to Waterbury and Connecticut, and I wish to express my sincere sympathy to his family.

U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH said of Mr. Smith:

I am saddened by the news of the death of J. Francis Smith. The State of Connecticut and the city of Waterbury have lost one of their most distinguished and public-spirited citizens. I extend the sympathy of Mrs. Bush and myself to members of his family at this most difficult time.

Hon. John M. Bailey, chairman of the Democratic State central committee, said of Mr. Smith:

J. Francis Smith's death was a shock to many of us. He had many friends throughout the State. I have lost a close personal friend of long standing, and also a man who was a valued adviser to me as chairman of the Democratic State central committee. The State has indeed lost a valued citizen in the passing of J. Francis Smith.

Former Mayor Edward D. Bergin, chairman of the Waterbury Democratic Town Committee, said of Mr. Smith:

The untimely death of Francis Smith is a real loss to the city of Waterbury. A man of keen intellect, sound judgment, and decisive, direct action, his influence, though little publicized, has been widely felt in all phases of our community life.

His firm adherence to the basic principles of our democratic system of government will be missed in the Democratic Party.

Mayor Raymond E. Snyder said of Mr. Smith:

Mrs. Snyder and I are deeply shocked to hear of the sudden death of J. Francis Smith. His passing has left a void that will be felt by all who have ever known or met him. J. Francis Smith's gentlemanly behavior and wise counsel have won the admiration and respect of all who have known him on the political scene, in civic matters, and in business. There have been few such dedicated men. It is a great loss.

Francis Smith was my dear friend. My interest in public service came solely from him. From my boyhood he advised and stimulated me. He was one person who had the stature to give disinterested advice. I admired his brilliant mind, his independence of thought, his courage, and his idealism.

He was a big man in a time of little men. He had the capacity to cut through any problem to its essentials and to make its solution come easy. He brought to political life an idealism and a concentration on the long views which have too often been obscured in these days of mass thinking. He gave generously of his time and energy in the effort to turn political movements in the direction of principle and away from expediency.

The success of our democratic system requires active participation by its citizens.

If all men gave as prodigally of their talents to the public welfare as did Francis Smith, the future security of our country would be much more certain.

The following is an editorial from the Waterbury Republican on February 6, 1959:

J. FRANCIS SMITH

Our city and the State are made poorer indeed by the untimely death of an outstanding businessman and citizen.

There is a sad irony in J. Francis Smith's death. He had apparently made a strong recovery a couple of years ago from a long, serious sickness, had resumed control of his business affairs, and, in managing Senator THOMAS DODD's campaign for the Democratic nomination, had shown last summer that he still possessed an old political warrior's skill. Then came the heart attack which, after weeks in the hospital, has claimed his life.

A hardheaded sense of what was practical guided him. His was a fierce competitive spirit, shown on the tennis court when he was younger, later on the links, and carried over into business, politics, community service. He had a shrewd, analytical mind. His success as president of J. E. Smith & Co. led to other business connections, to bank and corporation directorship and trade association honors. On the political side, his service as Democratic State charman when the late Wilbur L. Cross was Governor was a very distinguished one, and the part he played over the whole political range from local to national was notable.

As drive chairman for community cases and worker for community betterment he had no superior and few peers. However much you might narrow down a list of pivotal local leaders in business, in politics, and in movements for civic improvement, his name would be bound to be there.

Such men are few, precious, hard to spare.

The following is an editorial from the Waterbury American of February 6, 1959:

J. FRANCIS SMITH

J. Francis Smith was an outstanding man in his generation in Waterbury. He had varied interests, and he served in many capacities; and in practically everything in which he engaged he was successful.

In the business world he was known as a leader of men. The lumber industry nationally recognized him as a person of unusual attainments, and called on him to provide capable direction to many industrywide movements. In politics his record is unrivaled by any person in Waterbury in the past several decades.

Not only in Waterbury but in statewide politics he proved himself a master organizer. And even after ill health had forced him to retire from that field for a number of years, it took him only a few short months to demonstrate, through the nomination of THOMAS J. DODD for the Senate, that he still had the magic touch to win.

In public life, otherwise, Mr. Smith gave his talents willingly to forward projects that were for the common good. Two firsts tell the story. He was chairman of the first U.S. bond sale drive during World War II and first chairman of the community chest after that organization came into being. Of course both campaigns were outstanding successes. But in many instances Mr. Smith was happy to serve in a vigorous and able capacity behind the scenes. It was that way in politics, and it was that way again in aiding various agencies which worked for the community good.

Francis Smith was a man of positive character. In that virtue rested much of his success. He was a man for facts—getting facts and then appraising them in a most intelligent manner. Having done this, he mapped a campaign to attain his goal; and from then on he drove with powerful insistence toward a successful climax. Men in all walks of life valued his counsel. That his judgment was held high in financial circles was shown by the number of companies that invited him to serve as director.

Francis Smith was good for Waterbury. He gave a lot to the city. The city will suffer by his loss. Certainly he felt an example of public service that should be inspirational to all citizens.

The following is an editorial from the Naugatuck News of February 6, 1959:

J. FRANCIS SMITH

"The death of J. Francis Smith is a great loss to all of us."

Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff said that as part of his tribute to an astute Waterbury business executive and State political leader who succumbed yesterday to a heart attack, at a time he appeared to be recovering from a serious illness.

The Governor's words were representative of the sentiments expressed with deep sincerity by business and political leaders in high echelons, including James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and National Democratic chairman; U.S. Senators Thomas J. Dodd and Prescott Bush; Congressman John S. Monagan; Waterbury Mayor Raymond E. Snyder and former Mayor Edward Bergin; and Mayor Adam Mengacci of Naugatuck.

All who knew him, and they were countless, marveled at his keen analytical mind, his driving power and organizational ability.

As an athlete in his younger years, as a financier and businessman, and in government and politics, he was a leader who had the capacity to cut through any problem to its essentials and make its solution come easy.

He came most prominently to the foreground of public activity as Democratic State chairman when the late Wilbur L. Cross was Governor. After several years of comparative inactivity he reentered the political arena last year to demonstrate his masterful touch as he managed the successful campaign of THOMAS DODD for U.S. Senator.

But his abilities were neither confined nor limited to politics and government; his was the opinion sought on a wide range of activities extending beyond the boundaries of city and State.

In many respects, Fran Smith was a genius and he gave willingly of his talents in community causes, as well as in the other fields in which he was prominently identified.

Murdock's Little Colorado River Project Explained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John Murdock, a former Member of the House from Arizona and a former chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has—after years of official study plus some 8 years of private study—developed a comprehensive plan for putting to beneficial use the waters of the Little Colorado River in Arizona.

In an earlier insertion in the RECORD, entitled "An Alternate Murdock Plan for Furnishing Water to the Western Portion of the Navajo Indian Reservation," a general view of his proposal was presented.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD at this point a more detailed explanation of Mr. Murdock's proposal so that it may be studied by interested persons:

MURDOCK'S LITTLE COLORADO RIVER PROJECT EXPLAINED

Because a foregoing installment in this series is entitled, "Murdock's Alternate Plan to Furnish Water for the Western Portion of the Navajo Reservation," it may be asked, "Why an alternate plan, if one already outlined is not only good but is the best?" Well, in mapping a complex plan it is well to have a choice. Practically all great water developments now in existence in our West have undergone more or less modifications from their original proposals and designs. Even the best of experienced engineers can only dimly see the end at the beginning. Not being an engineer myself, I should logically expect through the coming years that engineering skill would modify any detailed plan that even good engineers could design today, and such would be especially true of the proposals of a layman, however good a well-wisher he might be. In fact, the very purpose of these statements of mine, dealing with a Little Colorado River project, is to furnish future builders in Arizona these general proposals for their study, acceptance, rejection or necessary modification, in order to obtain the stated objectives of this suggested program.

Besides the engineer and the public works builder, the politician and the statesman will have a say if and when this proposal is considered. This is also because of controversial matters. One of the most controversial items for the Government officials to consider in this plan of mine is the placing of a low diversion dam immediately below the mouth of the Little Colorado River, which site is now within the Grand Canyon National Park. Both engineering and legal questions are involved. Although this would be a low dam, as here proposed—it might even be a rock-filled dam, probably about 150 feet high, and for the purposes of this objective, need not be a power dam, but merely a diversion dam, or weir; even so, the bare suggestion of a dam in the National Park will raise a great cry of opposition. The question then arises, "To carry out this general objective would it be necessary to have this diversion dam on the main stream below the mouth of the Little Colorado?"

Well, no. To get main stream water touching the reservation, it would not be absolutely necesary to build such a diversion dam in the park. A change in the park boundry there could eliminate this site and improve the national park situation. This move I favor. Another alternate plan instead would call for the building of a multiple-purpose dam, which probably will eventually be built anyway, at the Red Walls Dam site in Marble Gorge. However, without such diversion dam, or weir, for the purpose of this objective, a multimillion-dollar tunnel would have to be built through the Navajo Reservation, bypassing the Grand Canyon National Park. Also, such other alternate plan than mine, including this expensive tunnel, would be far less efficient than the original Murdock proposal and of questionable economic feasibility. Naturally, I favor most the alternate plan discussed herein and I have no personal ax to grind.

NATIONAL PARKS MUST BE SANELY PRESERVED

No one has a higher regard for our national parks than have I. No one wants to save them from degradation and commercialization more than do I. By a simple readjustment of two sections of the boundary line of the Grand Canyon National Park, Congress could, under existing and modified law, preserve the principle of national park integrity, as Congress should, and at the same time better the park situation in Arizona while greatly benefiting thousands of Hopi and Navajo Indians who have no powerful lobby at Washington to speak for them.

All during my service on the Public Lands and Interior Committees during 16 years in Congress—and especially during the years that I was chairman of the House Interior Committee—I heard strong and rightful protests from nature lovers against the invasion of our parks and monuments by the engineers who want to build power dams for commercial purposes. I am heartily in sympathy with that attitude for park preservation, although I have known cases in which I have agreed with the engineers and their purposes of construction, if it seemed to me such work would do no harm to a national park, but would do great good to a vast community. Knowing how difficult it is to get Congress to authorize and appropriate a multimillion dollars or any other sum for any Indian tribe, I am reluctant to state this other alternative, without the low diversion dam at the mouth of the river, because of its greater cost and its lesser efficiency.

The favored plan proposes a low diversion dam of about 150 feet in height, more or less, in order to form a V-shaped lake at and below the mouth of the Little Colorado River in order to force the waters of the main Colorado up the Little Colorado several miles to a point east of the present boundary line between the Grand Canyon National Park and the Navajo Indian Reservation. It is only a matter of about 4 miles up to the reservation, and the waters from the main Colorado would have to be forced up the Little Colorado less than 8 miles to a good damsite where a 400-foot multiple-purpose dam could be built within the Indian reservation. By looking at the map it will be clearly seen that by such a diversion a given quantity of mainstream Colorado River water would be forced by its own flow to penetrate the Navajo Reservation several miles eastward merely by building this low diversion dam or weir below the mouth of the Little Colorado as I have here proposed. Knowing the attitude toward power dams in national parks, I want to distinguish such from my plan for furnishing water for biological purposes where so vitally needed.

A COSTLY ALTERNATIVE

Because I do not want to invade a national park with a power dam—nor even by low diversion dam or weir which would do the park no harm—I am also suggesting that this particular site for the low diversion dam be properly eliminated by law from the park. However, if the boundary line of the park is not changed and no construction of whatever kind or for whatever humane purpose is to be permitted in the Grand Canyon National Park at this point, then the other alternative, the long and deep tunnel, must be considered as another method of diversion, although very expensive.

Such a tunnel would run 20-odd miles from the Red Walls Dam site in Marble Canyon—which powerful political forces are determined shall eventually be built—to a point on the Little Colorado a few miles east of the park boundary. Such a tunnel would be very expensive but it would be the Government's price to pay to save deserving Indians—for whom the Government has an obligation and for whom humanity has an obligation—because of a persistent maintenance of an illogical boundary line of the Grand Canyon National Park at its northeast corner.

NORTHEAST BOUNDARY ILLOGICAL

Why do I say that the boundary line at this point is illogical? Because to maintain it unchanged is of little value to the park, and of a great cost, direct and indirect, to the Government and of an inestimable loss to many thousands of Hopi and Navajo Indians, not only who are alive today but many yet unborn. The future—yes, the fate—of the most unique Indians in the Nation is involved here.

Before discussing the change in the boundary line, where it now touches on the Little Colorado River, I must comment on the Indian needs for a long future. The Hopi Indians have made their home in this area for several thousand years. They were there long before Columbus discovered America. And they have accomplished a marvelous existence against harsh nature with only a minimum supply of water. Because they have existed on this barren land for many centuries it is not to be supposed that their children could continue, under modern and changing conditions, to exist there very much longer without a more adequate water supply. A few will move out, but most will refuse to do so, and I do not want to force them. Praying for rain in a ceremony involving handling live and poisonous rattlesnakes will not much longer suffice.

I have for several years felt that the Grand Canyon National Park should not extend northward entirely to the mouth of the Little Colorado. At present there is a little tongue of land in the park less than 4 miles wide extending to the south bank of the Little Colorado and lying east of the main Colorado River. In my judgment, a block of that land, smaller than one fourth of the District of Columbia, should be taken out of the Grand Canyon National Park and returned to the public domain or added to the Navajo Reservation. Thus the "water works" mentioned herein could be built on the Navajo Reservation mainly, and some on the Hopi Reservation, because the Hopi Reservation is within the Navajo Reservation and entirely surrounded by it.

FEW TOURISTS CAN SEE JUNCTION OF THESE RIVERS

My attention was again called and focused on this strategic area by the tragic happen-

ings there in the summer of 1956. It may be recalled that 2 giant airplanes collided high above the Grand Canyon on June 30 of that year and fell, carrying 128 human beings to their death. Although the planes collided, the crash sites of the two were about 1 mile apart. They fell very near the Colorado River, right opposite the mouth of the Little Colorado. The key site of this proposal is near where they fell. Being in Flagstaff at that time, I went to the Grand Canyon by way of Cameron, taking a pair of powerful binoculars with me. I went to the Indian watchtower which is at the farthest point northward in the Grand Canyon Park which can be reached by auto. I wondered whether the crash sites of this airplane tragedy could be seen from any point in the park which ordinary tourists might conveniently reach. I climbed the Indian tower for a better chance of observation, for it is only about 10 miles south from the scene of the tragedy at the mouth of the Little Colorado.

I knew that there were telescopes on the top of the watchtower which were more powerful than my binoculars. When I got up there, of course, I could not see the mouth of the Little Colorado with the aid of any of the glasses, for the canyon is not straight and winds and curves in those 10 miles between. So I found, as I had already surmised, that tourists, even atop the Indian watchtower cannot see anything within miles of the mouth of the Little Colorado on a horizontal line or within several thousand feet on a vertical line. All that I could see pertaining to the air tragedy from up there on the tower was a fleet of army helicopters circling a mighty hole in the ground and waving their ungainly arms as they descended into the canyon to bring out what they could. If I or any tourist had wished to examine the area of the crash or take a picture of it where each plane fell, we would have had to do what some of my friends did—fly over the area to take pictures. Tourists without air or water transport ordinarily do not get closer than 10 miles of the mouth of the Little Colorado River.

Do not assume for a moment that the building of a dam or weir at that point to divert and force water up the Little Colorado would be an unsightly thing to the millions of people who visit the Grand Canyon National Park in Arizona. It is safe to say that not one-tenth of 1 percent of those who have visited the Grand Canyon have ever seen the mouth of the Little Colorado River. To eliminate that site would do no harm. However, it may be said that since the Grand Canyon National Park extends north to the Little Colorado today it may be, in course of time, that the Park Service will build an automobile road up to a point where tourists will be above the mouth of the Little Colorado and thus may view that part of the Canyon country. I very much doubt it.

There is good reason why the park roads today extend north only to the Indian Watch Tower, 10 miles short of the Little Colorado. My offhand guess is that to build a park road 10 miles in length from the Indian Tower to a point above the Little Colorado and its mouth would call for bridge construction as expensive as bridging the Hudson River at New York City, and in addition the cost of first-class highway building as expensive as any 10 miles of the Alcan Highway. With all the hundreds of miles of very deep canyons now viewable in the park area, I do not believe it would be worth the money cost to make the point of land above the mouth of the Little Colorado accessible to the automobile of the tourist—certainly not without going a long, roundabout way across the Navajo Reservation. And for that and other reasons this area at the mouth of the Little Colorado should be available to the Indians to create a V-shaped lake about 100 feet deep at that point. My advice to those who must see the mouth of the Little Colorado is to get a helicopter or an unsinkable boat, or fly high over it in a plane with no other plane near.

NARROW CANYONS IDEAL FOR STORAGE

The very narrow, winding, and deep canyons of the Little Colorado are of such a character that to fill any section of the river labyrinth with water to a depth of from 10 to 400 feet would make no significant change in the impression which the tourist gets in viewing it from the rim for 40 miles eastward. I am speaking now of the 40 miles of the lower portion of the Little Colorado but, of course, all of that section of the river excepting the last or lowest 4 miles is in the Navajo Reservation, and can be improved for their benefit. I would put this lowest 4 miles of the Little Colorado River along with the rest of it in the Navajo Reservation, or return it to public domain.

It requires some study of the relatively precipitous fall, the abrupt descent in its final length; of the Little Colorado to understand why I am proposing that several dams, from 12 to 20 miles apart, be built in that lower section of the river. No better surface storage in a hot climate, where evaporation is terrific, can be found than several man-made lakes at the bottom of the deepest Little Colorado canyons. The reason for this is obvious. When man stores water for future use in hot, dry country, he would like to minimize evaporation losses by having the reservoirs deep and narrow, and thus presenting a minimum of water surface exposed to the thirsty atmosphere. Certainly, the several winding reservoirs at the bottom of the lower end of the Little Colorado River canyons would be ideal for that purpose, large enough for the storage required, and deep enough throughout their narrow lengths to permit the very minimum of evaporation loss. Also their lake surfaces could be protected more easily by a film coating for the same purpose.

It must be apparent that this arrangement of the several storage sections is designed to step some water of the main Colorado River—say 50,000 acre-feet annually, at least—up 300 to 400 feet with each dam on the Little Colorado which will mean, of course, that some water from the main Colorado will have to be pumped up at each of those dams. Since this is a reversal of the usual procedure, considerable explanation is due on this point. It is true that each of these proposed dams down in the Little Colorado is to have a powerplant, but not the usual kind, not to produce electric power but to use windpower to pump water into the reservoir above.

MY COMMITTEE HEARD DR. PERCY THOMAS

After hearing Dr. Percy Thomas as a witness before my committee, and two other witnesses, one from the Bureau of Reclamation and the other from the Federal Power Commission with him testifying concerning the amazing possibilities of wind power, I introduced a bill on the subject in the 82d Congress, May 28, 1951. This was H.R. 4286 of that Congress. A second hearing was held September 19, 1951. Between the time of the preliminary hearing and before introducing the bill, I made a trip through Idaho along the Snake River from the Wyoming border to the Oregon boundary. As I stood on a mountain side in a narrow gorge which is the site for the Palisades Dam, I thought I had never felt such a terrific wind, other than hurricane, blowing naturally through that funnel between the mountains. Then it was that I recalled the lengthy and scientific testimony of Dr. Percy Thomas and the other two power witnesses, and then and there I resolved to introduce the bill.

I thought at the time I had never seen a better situation and locality for an engineering development to extract power from the wind as that site over the Palisades Dam on the Upper Snake River. But I did think that there was a situation equalling the Palisades Gorge—and possibly excelling it—on the lower reaches of the Little Colorado River in Arizona. Now, on further study, I am convinced of the latter.

I have read some of the testimony of aircraft navigators about the treacherous and terrific winds encountered in the Grand Canyon and it is branch canyons of which the Little Colorado River Canyon is one of the most noted. Air pilots would not think of attempting to fly a plane up the Little Colorado, low over it, between its walls from its mouth to a point 40 or 50 miles above, even before the recent tragic happening there. Before it was established that the two giant planes collided there at an altitude of 21,000 feet on June 30, 1956, when it seemed incredible that they could have done so, experienced airmen, knowing the turbulence of the air in those great canyons, expressed the opinion that those two planes were actually "tossed together" by the force of the winds which caused the disaster. Every explorer on foot, of which there are not many, in the lower part of the Little Colorado River Canyon, comments on the consistent and violent winds flowing through the winding, narrow gorge with almost as great a force as the blast through an experimental wind tunnel. In fact, I am convinced that in many places along the winding, narrow canyons of the Little Colorado, wind driven plants which Dr. Percy Thomas advocated could find a maximum source of wind power, even more than at the Palisades site in Idaho.

FAR CRY FROM WINDMILLS TO WIND-DRIVEN GENERATORS

Of course, when one talks about a powerplant deriving its power from the wind, one is apt to think of a small windmill pumping water from a well out on the plains. Now, that is not what Dr. Percy Thomas was talking about, and that is not what distinguished British and Dutch visitors who came from abroad to interview him regarding windpower were concerned about. They came from the very historic home of windmills to learn how to use windpower in a big way.

Has this windpower idea ever been tried out? Yes, in this lengthy hearing before my committee on September 19, 1951, Dr. Thomas and the other witnesses gave the history of such a trial in New England, where a great private utility built a huge wind-driven powerplant on trial and placed it on a nearby elevation, known as Grandpa Knob in Vermont, and connected it with their other regular powerlines where it functioned well until a storm destroyed it.

All of the engineers of the Vermont utility, trying this idea out under private enterprise, were greatly impressed with the tremendous electric power which it contributed to their electric system, with no cost for fuel. The variability of the winds was less of an argument against it. However, the blades of this private powerplant were nearly 100 feet in length, and were ripped off in a storm after efficiently producing power for its owners for more than a year. Since the powerplant towers we are discussing must be built at least 200 feet into the air above their base, the building of such Eifel Towers is an engineering job. And engineers today, including Dr. Percy Thomas, say that a much better powerplant can be produced now than were built with the materials available for the Vermont experiment years ago. Recent improvements in metallurgy with light and strong metals make this possible.

In his testimony before the House Committee on September 19, 1951, Dr. Thomas was talking about a similar but improved air powerplant built on somewhat the same model as the Grandpa Knob power facility. However, that plant generated electricity—in

fact enough electricity on an average for a town of 2,000 inhabitants, but because the wind is so variable it needed numerous gadgets to protect it and to regulate it. Those gadgets were Dr. Thomas' inventions which the Grandpa Knob plant did not have. Since Dr. Thomas was a Federal employe, those patent rights belong to the Government. It is important to note that in answer to my questions, Dr. Thomas explained that, without producing electric power, but for merely pumping water, construction costs would be much less than for a wind-driven electric powerhouse. My thought here is that each of the proposed high dams should have such a pumping plant on it.

CANYON LAKES TO SERVE AS STAIRSTEPS

With the foregoing explanation it should be noted that the total natural flow of the Little Colorado will be collected in these several reservoirs in the lower reaches of the river. Also, let it be noted that from all these storage basins some of that Little Colorado River water may be pumped from lower to higher basins, thus reversing its march to the sea. So, these several reservoirs collect and conserve the waters of the lower 50 miles of the Little Colorado which are considerable, and which have not heretofore been much used by man. Why have they not been much used by man?

No water is diverted from the Little Colorado below the Grand Falls for irrigation purposes. It is known that the greater portion of the total drainage of the Little Colorado enters it below the lowest point of practical diversion. Yet, in more than 90 percent of the time, observers looking at the streambed of the Little Colorado will observe that it seems practically dry. It is like the main Colorado, a very variable stream. It is dry today in the state of nature between flash floods because the drainage of a vast area usually percolates into the streambed so slowly that it is largely returned to the atmosphere by evapotranspiration as it comes in. Take any given quantity of water in the river at Cameron, the chances are, in the state of nature, that practically all of it will return to the atmosphere before it can reach the power plant at Hoover Dam after a 350-mile journey under turbulent winds in a hot climate. What this proposal of mine is, is this: that we catch in these several reservoirs in the lower river all of this drainage which falls on the watershed of the Little Colorado, the silt as well, and make the water usable for the Indians, especially those near the Moencopi and higher areas. Let me now discuss a manmade means of minimizing evaporation losses so that there could be much less loss from surface exposure of water in the several basins than is now lost naturally from exposure in the streambed itself throughout the same length.

SILT PROTECTION BELOW OFFSETS WATER RETAINED

Without the manmade technique of minimizing evaporation losses, the natural evaporation losses are enormous. It is not too much to assume that for every 100,000 acre-feet of Little Colorado River total flow, less than 10,000 acre-feet ever reach the power plants at Boulder Dam. Since this is water which has fallen upon Arizona soil and most of it on the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, it is logical that no other human use has a better claim than those Indians have to whatever amount of this drainage that can be conserved. Of course, there will be a "talking point" by the power users in Arizona, California, and Nevada, that this proposal of mine, mostly for the benefit of Indians, will keep some water from producing power hundreds of miles away in powerplants on the lower reaches of the Colorado River. When we consider the very small proportion of this drainage water reaching those distant lower powerplants under the present natural conditions, it makes any complaint by power users in Los Angeles or Phoenix or Las Vegas seem picayunish. Any loss of hydropower production by this plan would be more than offset by silt retention to protect the lower river investments.

In general, I am assuming that when these numerous reservoirs are created on the Lower Little Colorado that more than two-thirds of the water gathered behind those dams will be water which has come from the watershed itself of that river. Now, because of the variableness of the precipitation on that watershed the river's flow will vary in its contributions. If we wish those several reservoirs to have at all times some usable water it will be necessary, no doubt, to depend upon getting about a third or a fourth of that water in constant daily supply from the main Colorado, by pumping it out of the V-shaped lake at the mouth of the Little Colorado which extends up the Little Colorado a distance of 8 miles or so, where the first high dam is to be built. Thus, we see that the 50,000 acre-feet of main stream water, which I am assuming will be assigned to these Arizona Indians as "exchange water," will serve to regulate the volume in the reservoirs. This supply may be counted on consistently and regularly because it is "let down" at Lee Ferry by the upper basin States according to their compact.

DIFFERENT KIND OF "PUMP PRIMING"

The expression "pump priming" has come in the last 25 years to have a financial meaning with an economic effect. An older generation of citizens will recall that pump priming with water had a literal physical effect. All but the very youngest among us will remember that the original idea of "pump priming" was to pour a little water at hand into a dry pump in order to make it pump up and deliver in a steady volume many times the amount of water which was used for priming. My proposal on the Little Colorado is not exactly that, but there is considerable similarity to actual pump priming in water supply on the farm which we knew in childhood.

The 50,000 acre-feet of main stream water which may be had in constant supply of about 140 acre-feet daily will also serve as a regulator to even out the fluctuating supplies of the river drainage into the five reservoirs. Without this constant volume from the main river it is conceivable, really probable, that after the five dams are built and before any pumping is done on any of them, some of the five reservoirs in flood time would be filled several times to overflowing in flash floods, and some probably empty or almost empty during the dry season of the year. But with 50,000 acre-feet annually, diverted from the main Colorado into the Navajo Reservation it is assumed that that constant supply added to a fluctuated supply from drainage, totaling two or three times that amount, will always keep some water in the "pipeline" system. It is expected that more than 50,000 acre-feet annually can thus be delivered in daily portions for use on the reservations and still furnish water for diversion to the Verde.

Some will say these are violent assumptions. In the first place what is the authority for the 50,000 acre-feet annually out of the main Colorado River? I am assuming that the 50,000 acre-feet to be used here for regulatory purposes as well as partial supply is the same 50,000 acre-feet annually which the upper basin States' compact agrees to let down and furnish to Arizona. Does the upper basin compact apportion such water to those Indians? No, it apportions that amount of water to Arizona as her share of the upper basin apportionment of the 1922 compact because a part of Arizona is in the upper basin. What part of Arizona is in the upper basin? The Navajo Indian Reservation. It might logically be said that the quota released from the upper basin should go legally in perpetuity to the Indians on that reservation. But the law does not say that. There is nothing in the law which says that that should be done but commonsense and justice logically assume that something short of that may be done. Congress is likely to see the logic and the justice of giving the Indians some use of that 50,000 acre-feet annually on an exchange basis and the Legislature of Arizona might reasonably be expected to support that move by resolution. As I view it, untold benefits from it to the entire State of Arizona would make it to her advantage to take this step.

If neither lawmaking body, at Washington or at Phoenix, saw fit to make this move for such a diversion, then this whole plan would be changed, and probably greatly reduced in efficiency. However, even if Congress and the Legislature of Arizona failed so to interpret the upper basin compact regarding the 50,000 acre-feet for Arizona, a series of four or five dams as heretofore explained might yet serve a useful purpose to these Indian reservations and be worth their cost.

Of course, if there can never be legislation at Phoenix and at Washington applying the 50,000 acre-feet from the upper basin to these Arizona Indian lands there would then be no need of a low diversion dam below the mouth of the Little Colorado. In such a case no multimillion-dollar tunnel from the Red Wall Dam site in Marble Gorge to a point on the little Colorado outside the national park would be needed. However, it might be that without this 50,000 acre-feet quota a part of this system heretofore described could be partially effective in supplying, say half as much water as the system otherwise would furnish. But anyone wishing to obstruct the fulfillment of this plan could do so by preventing the diversion of the 50,000 acre-feet into the Navajo Reservation for the use of those Indians, without realizing the vital connection between this highland water plan and the future of central Arizona.

To my mind, such obstruction policy would be a terrible mistake, with devastating effects upon an area half as large as the State of West Virginia and occupied by not less than 50,000 Indians today and which could be the home of hundreds of thousands in years to come. Moreover, to obstruct or destroy some such plan as herein contained for the Navajo and Hopi Indians would have adverse effects on the total growth of Arizona, reaching far beyond the Indian lands.

In the 60 miles of the Little Colorado streambed between Cameron and the main Colorado the evaporation losses now are enormous. Is it conceivable, if that entire distance should be converted into, say, five reservoirs with surfaces exposed to the strongest winds that blow in that canyon country, that the evaporation losses would be any less than they have been in a state of nature by evapotranspiration? Yes, they may be made less. We know that scientists have recently developed a relatively cheap and effective technique for minimizing evaporation losses from reservoir surfaces by a film covering. I believe with all of those reservoirs full of water, or partly full, they could be so treated at relative low cost so as to cut the present evaporation losses in the same stretch of river by at least 70 percent.

All through the West for the last half century we have built great dams and stored large bodies of water in surface storage, knowing full well that there would be evaporation losses from the flowing water in rivers and canals and from the surface of lakes and reservoirs. So long as we must use surface storage we should find a way to minimize such evaporation losses. I believe that an effective technique is now known to accomplish that. This technique is to

cover the surface of the water with a chemical film which largely prevents the drying winds from picking up the molecules of water. This could be one way to conserve water where it is so desperately needed.

Government water studies indicate an average flow of the Little Colorado River of several hundred thousand acre-feet annually, only a little of which is taken out above Grand Falls, and none below. It is conservative to estimate that less than one-tenth of the flow below Grand Falls ever reaches any existing powerplant hundreds of miles below. The large fraction now wasted, if conserved, could be the support of a larger population and a greater civilization. My purpose in courageously writing this is to beg engineers and true statesmen to give serious consideration to some such plan on the Little Colorado.

An Engineer's View of Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, among the many activities of the International Geophysical Year, an 18-month period of extensive, simultaneous studies, by scientists of 64 countries, of the earth, atmosphere, and sun, was a conference in Moscow in August 1958.

Attending as a delegate of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences at this meeting was Capt. Elliott B. Roberts, who is the distinguished Chief of the Geophysical Division of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey in the Department of Commerce.

The report of his observations on this mission and conclusions, as published in the January–February 1959 issue of the Military Engineer, the journal of the Society of American Military Engineers with headquarters in the Nation's Capital, is most illuminating, timely, and constructive.

In order that Captain Roberts' contribution may have a wider circulation and be permanently recorded in the annals of the Congress, under leave granted to extend, I quote its text at this point in the RECORD.

AN ENGINEER'S VIEW OF MOSCOW

(By Elliott B. Roberts, captain, U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey)

Attendance as a delegate to the recent Moscow conference on the International Geophysical Year provided an opportunity to meet Soviet scientists, visit research institutions, walk the streets, and see the display of scientific and industrial strength in the Soviet Union.

IMPRESSIONS AND CONTRASTS

On arrival at the vast Moscow airport one's first impression is likely to be unbelief at the number of large jet transport airplanes, TU–104A's, parked about the edges of the field. In turn they approach the landing area to load passengers for Tbilisi, Tashkent, Kiev, and other cities of the Union, and for Paris, Copenhagen, Stockholm, and Helsinki, carrying on routine operations not matched in America. They climb quickly to 35,000 feet, and streak across the skies at 550 miles an hour. The planes have very sturdy seat belts and oxygen masks at every seat. They are excellent aircraft, longtime holders of an international weight-carrying record. One cannot but muse that they comprise a formidable air fleet, capable of carrying large numbers of troops to practically any point on short notice. Russians build and use equipment of this kind because it is necessary to the plan.

By contrast, in stores or at a cashier's desk change is computed on the abacus, an archaic device, still used throughout the Union because the factories are kept busy producing equipment which is considered more necessary than cash registers.

Also, in contrast to the ultra-modern planes, the airport terminal building has all the appeal of a warehouse or a drab 19th century railway station—a fitting introduction to the shabbiness and dreariness of the whole city. Moscow produces a sense of profound and enduring depression which even the flowering parks in summer cannot relieve.

Stark contrasts are everywhere. There is a strange composite of dilapidated, century-old log houses, which the police do not want foreigners to photograph, plain apartment blocks, their walls spalling and pocked, and seven resplendent multistory buildings, the old-time grandeur of which can hardly be described. The architecture is 19th century in style, with star-tipped spires that gleam redly at night in glorification of the Soviet state.

The seven tall buildings include the Moscow State University, an aggregation of 6,000 rooms clustered about a central spire that reaches higher than any structure in Europe except the Eiffel Tower. The marble surfaces and ornate decorations of the vast halls and auditoriums of this showplace are fabulous. Facing a long, landscaped mall reaching down to the Moscow River bluff overlooking the city, this impressive edifice dominates the southwest section of Moscow.

Moscow's newest hotel, the 2-year-old Ukraine, is the latest, and reportedly final, one of the seven multistory buildings. Although it has marble foyers, oriental rugs on the floors, and original oil paintings on the bedroom walls, the parque floors were not planed smooth, the bathroom fixtures are falling from the walls, and the hot water is highly uncertain. A local whim of the management requires that stairway doors be locked, making it necessary to wait for elevators which may be 10 or 15 minutes in arriving.

Every taxi and bus has its clock, which actually runs on time. This minor marvel is matched by the city streets, perhaps the widest in the world, and certainly the cleanest, with old women swinging twig brooms relentlessly. Almost nothing, however, matches the sparkle of the 50-odd stations of the subway—marble palaces, resplendent with statuary, paintings, gold and mosaic decorations, and crystal chandeliers. Through such halls swarm Moscow's workers, going to and from squalid homes where families are crowded into single rooms, and community kitchens and bathrooms are often a block away. There is schooling for all and the state boasts a vanishing illiteracy rate. Yet the workers must buy their sleazy clothing and cheap necessities in state stores where the queues are always long and the smells sometimes overpowering.

As if cowed by the city, the people of Moscow plod through life, stolid and apathetic. Evenings and off-duty days are often spent swarming on the sidewalks, which are hardly more crowded and certainly more pleasant than their poor lodgings. Furtive glances are given passing foreigners, but there are few direct looks or words, except by young boys who have learned that Americans may have chewing gum—a highly negotiable commodity in Moscow.

Clothing generally is shapeless and ugly. Crowds of admiring women gather about the store windows when such exotic items as high heels and stylish clothes are displayed. Women and girls, of all ages above childhood, work at digging, lugging bricks and mortar, operating trucks, buses, and construction cranes, or mowing with rusty shears the grass lawns of the seven tall buildings. A few wear coveralls, but most wear dresses. A prudish modesty prevails.

One wonders about the contrast between the dreary lives of the people and the grandiose buildings, ornate subway stations, and the fanciful pavilions, malls, gardens, pools, and fountains of the city's industrial exposition. Why, when the workers have so little, does the state make such lavish show? The U.S.S.R., straining for industrial supremacy, is in no mood to squander its resources on trifles. The reason cannot have been simple exhibitionism, produced by an inferiority complex and indulged for the amazement of foreign tourists, for there were none until recently. It must be a fulfillment of a need of the people—people who have nothing, yet must slave their lives away. They slave because the lavish displays, always before them, provide a vision of the future—a promise of future luxuries—to be theirs if they work hard enough to beat America.

HOUSING

Overriding the effect of the seven skyscrapers and the log huts in the visible aspect of Moscow is the mass of uncounted thousands of great apartment blocks, as dreary as the long rows of tenements in city slums. From the tower of the Hotel Ukraine the city is a mosaic of such blocks, ranging from dull grey to the ugly yellow-ochre of the newer buildings. This color, so characteristic of Moscow, extends as far as the eye can reach. It is appalling to think of all the rooms in these vast blocks, each jammed with one or more families, living without privacy, quiet, or dignity. There are nearly 8 million workers in greater Moscow, and the population is rapidly growing.

A housing program to meet the population problem is now in progress. Although it will fall far short of the need, it is a tremendous undertaking. Mile after mile of urban land is sprouting ochre-colored buildings of the Moscow style, 10-story warrens of several hundred apartments each. They rise up without framework or scaffolding, by assembly of precast concrete slabs and beams, like building blocks, hoisted by cranes and fitted together by men and women workers. Whatever the engineers' appraisal of this system may be, it is fast and economical, certainly an advantage when attempting to create 600,000 new family units at a rate of more than 50,000 a year.

The miles of cells and cubicles are the future homes of Muscovites who may think themselves lucky. However, style and beauty are sacrificed to utility, and deterioration is widely evident before such a building is even finished. One is told that the design is to provide 3- and 4-room apartments, but, in fact, it will be a highly favored family, perhaps that of a writer or scientist, who will get more than one room. Street floors contain food and clothing stores.

Narrow garden areas separate the blocks, and supervised playgrounds are provided for children, most of whose mothers must work. Wide boulevards, many with center parks, thread the new living areas, and trackless trolley wires promise transportation for the swarms of workers without cars. It is all so regimented that it is utterly dreary.

INDUSTRY

Newspapers and magazines remind the people incessantly of high production figures in the factories, the mileage of railways newly electrified, the size and weight of Russian

rockets and sputniks, and the glory of Russian achievement. The material is so profusely illustrated with diagrams and photographs that even the most stupid workers must understand it and realize the value of his labor.

There are wide industrial areas near Moscow. Workers flock to the factories marked by busy smokestacks. There is no unemployment. Underground trains run on 40-second headway. Tunnels are being extended. A new bridge is under construction across the Moscow River. Heavy construction equipment is seen about the city and on display at the industrial exposition.

Power production is rising rapidly. At Kuibyshev, on the Volga, is the world's largest hydroelectric power project, designed to produce 2 million kilowatts. At the other end of the scale, production of radio sets was 25 million in 1955 and nearly 1 million TV receivers were produced. It is assumed that the propaganda value of these items was not overlooked when such production quotas were set.

Schooling is rigorously disciplined, every child taking heavy courses of mathematics and physics under Kremlin-controlled curriculums designed to produce trained manpower—like a commodity—for industry. American experts report that the Soviet system as a whole is a very effective tool to achieve economic progress.

The regimentation of Soviet resources, efforts, and labors of the people has produced an industrial production which, while still far below that of America, is climbing at an annual increase of 11 percent.

TRANSPORT

Transportation, the life stream of industry, keeps in pace. Aeroflot, one of the largest airlines in the world, has introduced, in addition to the jets, the TU–114, a turboprop plane, capable of carrying 220 passengers, or of flying nonstop from Moscow to Peking or New York. The rail system wrecked by the retreating Germans in 1944 has been rebuilt, and the nation's 120,000 miles of lines are being extended. Diesel-electric and electric power are coming rapidly into use. The Moscow subway, comprising some 50 miles of tunnel nearly 300 feet below ground, is a well-run municipal railway.

Construction is being conducted in extending the canal system which connects the major rivers of European Russia from the Arctic Ocean to the Black Sea. Diesel ships carry vast tonnages on these waterways. For navigation in the Arctic, the atom-powered *Lenin*, a 16,000-ton icebreaker, has been built.

Motor trucks, widely used, comprise most of the street traffic in urban areas. Nearly 500,000 vehicles are built annually, of which a few are passenger cars for government officials and specialists. The cars resemble American automobiles of 10 or 15 years ago. They are light, simple, and economical—far different from the elaborate cars of the American highways.

The Soviet Academy of Sciences maintains more than 90 specialized institutes. The research stations contain equipment which, although perhaps not equal to that of America, is in some cases highly advanced. At Dubno, near Moscow, for instance, there is a proton synchrotron rated at 10 billion electron volts.

At conferences the delegates wear tiny transistor radio receivers, with selector switches for choice of languages. These are beautiful miniature instruments.

Russia is not a prostrate giant. Moscow and its factory-strewn suburbs are emerging almost explosively from their old lethargy. Russia's purpose and industry have given her the strength, in the few years since World War II, to toss her sputniks into space ahead of the world. Those people can and will surpass America—unless, of course, an equal or greater determination is set against them.

As one watches the concentration upon labor and industry at the cost of so much human comfort and happiness, and sees the fanatical striving for superiority, one ponders the eventual outcome. The battle has, in a way, been joined. One wonders if America can afford to continue an economy based so largely on such wastful luxuries as planned obsolescence of consumer products—annual models of automobiles outmoding their predecessors, for instance. Can America afford the economic loss of restrictive production rules in industry? Can America afford to continue expending three-quarters of her productive capacity on the manufacture of nondurable goods in the face of such regimented, determined competition?

Failure to heed the danger signs could mean loss of international markets, foreign allies and friends, and world position as well. America must not become hopelessly steeped in her luxury, as was Rome in her heyday, but with renewed determination must remain strong and alert to the needs of the world.

Mrs. Charles W. Gunn, National President of American Legion Auxiliary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, all of Oregon is proud of Mrs. Charles W. Gunn, national president of the American Legion Auxiliary. Mrs. Gunn has devoted her life to helping and working with people.

It was 33 years ago that Mrs. Gunn joined Hood River Unit 22, and she has been a member ever since. A graduate of Oregon College of Education, at Monmouth, Oreg., Mrs. Gunn has established an enviable record as a schoolteacher at Hood River, and later as principal of the Parkdale Grade School; as an executive of the Charles F. Berg women's wear store in Portland, and as national director of the Volunteer Hospital Workers program. Her election as national president of the American Legion Auxiliary is a well-deserved honor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the fine biography of Mrs. Gunn, written by Edward W. Atkinson, which was published in the February 1959 issue of the American Legion magazine.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In Hood River, Oreg., in 1924, a young World War I veteran was attending a picnic when he was attracted by cries for help. He traced the cries to a nearby creek, where another picnicker, a young lady, had slipped and fallen into the water. He rushed to the stream and rescued her, and the two naturally became acquainted. Their friendship—so spectacularly begun—soon blossomed into a courtship.

That young veteran was Charles W. Gunn, who, as a young man, had come to Hood River from Illinois. The young lady was Cecelia J. Thompson, then a student at the Oregon College of Education at Monmouth. When she was graduated from college 1 year later, she married the man she had met at what turned out to be the most important picnic of either of their lives. It was through Charles Gunn's service in the AEF and his membership in Hood River Post 22 that his bride became eligible for membership in the American Legion Auxiliary. She joined Hood River Unit 22 and has been a continuous member of that unit for 33 years.

Thirty-four years after her dramatic introduction to her husband, Mrs. Charles W. Gunn was elected National President of the American Legion Auxiliary at that body's 38th National Convention at Chicago last September. In the interim she had established an enviable record of accomplishment as a schoolteacher, retailing executive, and a leader in the auxiliary.

The brown-eyed, dark-haired woman, who now heads the Nation's largest organization of patriotic women, comes from a background that might well be described as "all American." She was born in New Tazewell, Tenn., the daughter of Nathaniel and Della (Standiford) Thompson. Her mother was born in Iowa, her father in Virginia. Ce (short for Cecelia, pronounced "See") was the first of six children in the Thompson family. While she was still a small child, her family moved from Tennessee to a wheat ranch in central Oregon. They subsequently operated an apple ranch, and in both places, Ce Thompson was given ample opportunity to learn the meaning of responsibility and work.

She attended grade and high school in Madras, Oreg. After her graduation from College she taught school in Hood River and in Parkdale, a town at the foot of Mount Hood. She taught all grades (usually she had the fifth and sixth grades), and she was principal of the grade school in Parkdale.

When she joined the auxiliary, she became something more than just a "card carrying" member. She took an active part in her unit's affairs as her husband did in his Legion post. (After service in the 306th Butchery Company and as a corporal in the army of occupation, Charles Gunn had returned to Hood River and had become a charter member of post 22 on Armistice Day, 1919.) The Gunns have, in a sense made a family affair of their Legion and Auxiliary membership. Charles Gunn was commander of post 22 in 1927–28, and his wife was president of unit 22 that same year.

Mrs. Gunn has maintained her membership in unit 22 even after her husband's job made it necessary for them to move to Portland in 1942. Charles Gunn has always worked in the fruit business, either as a rancher or in some phase of food processing. He is presently plant superintendent of the Terminal Ice & Coal Storage Co. in Portland.

After Mrs. Gunn had served her unit as its president, she was district president, then department president (1934–35). In 1946 she was Oregon's representative to the auxiliary's volunteer hospital workers school in Detroit.

Upon completion of that course, she returned to Oregon and set up a department school for volunteer hospital workers. From 1949 through 1953 she was volunteer hospital director for the entire auxiliary.

When she was asked recently what auxiliary job she has found most rewarding, Ce Gunn said, without hesitation, "I enjoyed most the job of director of volunteer hospital workers. Work in this field has been the most rewarding to me because it is an activity which brings one in touch with people who need help.

"To illustrate what I mean," she went on, "let me tell you about a young World War II veteran whom I met in a VA hospital. This young man was in a neuropsychiatric ward, and had been there for some time when I first came to know him. He was, to put it frankly,

in a bad way then. He had been a professional musician before the war, but while he was in the hospital he would demonstrate no interest whatsoever in music. He would go to the piano, but he would not play.

"It was my good fortune to interest a volunteer hospital worker in this particular boy's case. She began to try to draw him out of himself, to attempt to find some way to make him rediscover himself. She worked with him patiently, and before long she met with some success. He began to take an interest in things. Soon, he began to play the piano. Before much time had elapsed, this veteran was well on the road to complete recovery. Eventually he returned to work as a violinist, and when I last heard of him he was doing fine."

Although the Auxiliary's new national president has personally found her richest experiences in the job of national director of the volunteer hospital workers program, the Auxiliary has seen fit to utilize her talents in many other national jobs as well. She has held a number of national chairmanships. Among them: Americanism, Publications, Girls State (for 2 years), Child Welfare, Rehabilitation. And she was chairman and director of Girls Nation for 2 years.

While serving as national Americanism chairman, she directed an Auxiliary program which aimed at placing Clarence Manion's "Key to Peace" in every high school and library in the United States. That project was so successful that it won a Freedoms Foundation citation for the Auxiliary.

The Auxiliary's vast and varied rehabilitation program prospered under her direction. In 1957–58 she was the Auxiliary's rehabilitation director, and the rehabilitation committe racked up an outstanding record of service to veterans under Ce Gunn's leadership. During that year, 11,847 volunteer hospital workers served an amazing total of 941,935½ hours in 171 Veterans' Administration and 236 non-VA hospitals. American Legion Auxiliary units and Departments furnished $571,539.43 worth of Christmas gifts to 177,516 veterans in VA hospitals. The Auxiliary's outlay for its entire Christmas program was a whopping $942,583.72. In all of its rehabilitation work in 1957–58 the Auxiliary spent, Mrs. Gunn was able to report to the organization's 38th National Convention, a total of $2,784,348.84.

As the woman who directed this enormous benevolent enterprise, Ce Gunn added still more luster to her already long and impressive list of major accomplishments as one of the Auxiliary's top officers. Small wonder that the 834 delegates meeting in the Terrace Ballroom at the Morrison Hotel in Chicago last September 4, unanimously voted to pay her the highest honor they could—to elect her to the national presidency of the American Legion Auxiliary.

The Nation's No. 1 auxiliare joined the Auxiliary because, as she puts it, she is "interested in people." She was attracted by the Auxiliary's programs which "permit a person to work with people—veterans and their families—people who are here where the results of your work can be seen."

In the Auxiliary, she felt, she had found an organization tailor-made for a person who wants to help others. Correctly she perceived that this is an organization whose reason for existence and whose secret of success can be summed up in one word: "service."

Likewise in her business career Ce Gunn's work has been directly with and for people. The obvious personal aspects of the teaching profession are so well known that no comment on them is required here. But in Portland, where Mrs. Gunn worked for 10 years in a ladies specialty store (the Charles F. Berg Co.), she was also directly and closely associated with people in various capacities. Hers was not a cold, impersonal, paper-shuffling job.

She began as "Betty Buyer," a job in which she shopped for others, especially for men at Christmastime. Later she was floor manager of a department, and during World War II she was bond coordinator for the store. As such, she made radio addresses urging the purcase of bonds, and helped to run the store's bond program. The U.S. Treasury Department awarded her a citation for her bond-selling activity. In addition, Ce Gunn did other volunteer work in World War II. For the Red Cross, she made bandages and gave blood. For the USO she served food to servicemen and was hostess at dances

Another facet of her business experience again brought her into close contact with people. While she was working at Berg's, she taught retail selling in the Portland public schools as part of that school system's vocational training program. She was also the store's club representative. In this capacity she served as the store's contact with professional and service organizations, such as the 50–50 Club (an organization similar to the Rotary) and the Business and Professional Women's Club.

But it was her assignment as the store's bridal consultant that was perhaps her most fascinating—and sometimes most nerve-wracking—job. In this position she helped prospective brides to plan their weddings. It proved to be interesting work, and it gave Ce Gunn an opportunity to observe the wedding ceremonies of many different religions. "It was," she says today, "a very delightful experience." There were, however, aspects of the job that would have turned strong men weak.

For instance, one night Mrs. Gunn had three weddings. They were to take place in various parts of Portland, and the brides-to-be were every bit as desirous of looking their best as any girl would be at such an important time in her life. Everything went well until not long before the ceremonies were to begin. Then it became clear that two of the wedding gowns—a size 12 and a size 18—had been sent to the wrong addresses. The brides, as might be expected, were in a state of near panic.

"That," says Ce Gunn, "was my most hectic experience as a bridal consultant. For a while I had cabs going back and forth all over Portland, but finally the mixup was straightened out and the girls got the right gowns."

Later Ce Gunn worked as personnel and operating manager for a chain of five women's specialty stores.

The auxiliary's new national president has also been active in church work. She is a member of the Riverside Community Church. Shortly after she was graduated from high school, she was president of the Christian Endeavor in the northwestern United States. She originally joined that organization for much the same reason that she became an auxiliare: to, as she puts it, "help humanity if I can."

This background of dedicated service and solid accomplishment has made Ce Gunn well aware of the root purposes of the auxiliary and has acquainted her well with its program. It has also particularly fitted her for the important, always demanding, often difficult, sometimes trying job of national president of the auxiliary.

When she was elected to the auxiliary's highest office last September, she was, as any woman would be, tremendously flattered and enormously pleased. "To be elected national president is," she said, "a very exhilarating and happy experience." But it was also plain that Ce Gunn knew that a year's hard work lay waiting for her. No starry-eyed dreamer, she faced up to the fact that she had accepted a year of almost constant traveling, speechmaking, and gruelling hard work.

That she was ready for it was clear in her acceptance speech at the auxiliary's national convention. She proposed no grandiose schemes; no cute gimmicks; no new, temporary projects. Instead she cast a practical eye over the auxiliary scene, sized up the state of the auxiliary and of the Nation, and matter-of-factly told the delegates:

"We do not have to search for new horizons, nor discover new ways to be of service. But what we do have to do is work and labor to keep what we already have. * * * We already have the firmest of foundations and the finest of programs. * * * But in this era of easy living and many pleasures and distractions, we are prone to lose sight of our goals, and to take the priceless heritage known as the American way of life too much for granted. There is no organization better qualified (than the auxiliary) to appreciate and to maintain these freedoms and this way of life."

She then issued a challenge to all auxiliaries, calling on them to examine and evaluate the situation she had described and urging them to join her in her efforts to maintain and to strengthen the auxiliary's basic programs.

A few weeks after she was elected national president, she stated her views once more with equal directness: "The task facing us today," she asserted, "is to fulfill the challenge to work to maintain and make stronger the auxiliary's basic programs. We must ask ourselves, 'Are we doing our best?' My answer to that question, is quite frankly, 'No,' I think that we can do better."

When she was asked, not long after she began her administration as national president, what she thought was the greatest problem facing the United States of America today, she unhesitatingly replied: "The apathy of the people, the widespread attitude of taking our blessings for granted. There is a great need for us to put less stress on material things. That, I believe sincerely."

The auxiliary, she feels, can help to correct this situation by telling America what the auxiliary believes in, stands for, and does. The place to begin, as Ce Gunn sees it, is the place where the work of the organization is really done, where its programs are actually put into effect. "The auxiliary—and the Legion—" she says, "can best help by improving their units, their posts, their hometowns. The auxiliary can be no stronger than the sum total of its units." The strength of both national organizations, she is convinced, lies in the local branches, in the units and posts.

Her administration, she stoutly avers, will be marked by an adherence to the fundamental principles of the United States of America, the auxiliary, and the Legion. "Every ounce of strength I have," she declared, "will be devoted to carrying out these principles."

The Rose, Our National Flower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to bring the attention of this body to a resolution adopted by the General Federation of Women's Clubs, endorsing the rose as our national flower. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the United States of America has no national flower; and

Whereas the rose grows in profusion in all States and blooms in all seasons of the year and lends itself to multiple use; and

Whereas the rose by its beauty has won a place in the hearts of the American people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges the Congress of the United States to designate the flower commonly known as the rose as the national flower of the United States.

Communism on the March in the Caribbean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, over the past year we have observed many political events in the Caribbean area that have led to the overturn of two governments, Venezuela and Cuba. Accompanying these revolutionary upsets, influence of international communism, which likes to fish in troubled waters, has been present.

The story culminating in the present situation is complicated and long, but essential for properly understanding of the problems involved. An enlightening summary of this recent history by Harold Lord Varney was published in February 1959 issue of American Mercury and is extremely pertinent in connection with developments affecting the Panama-United States relations, about which I shall address the House in the near future.

Under leave to extend, I include the indicated article:

COMMUNISM ON THE MARCH IN THE CARIBBEAN

(By Harold Lord Varney)

If Soviet Russia is in search of America's Achilles heel, it will not be difficult to find it. Today, despite the $60 billion anti-Communist ramparts which we have erected with our foreign aid, there is one spot where the United States stands perilously exposed. That danger spot is our own front yard, the Caribbean.

It is conceivable that America could still survive if all Asia and even Western Europe went down the drain. But it is difficult to imagine American survival if communism succeeded in entrenching itself powerfully within the 1,500 mile perimeter of the Caribbean. This is our part of the world—as truly a link in America's home defenses as Cape Canaveral or the Pentagon. Today, while we are preoccupied with our oversea efforts, the Caribbean area is offering an open opportunity, at numerous points, for Soviet Russia to infiltrate and enter our hemisphere.

Four and a half years ago, when Jacobo Arbenz and his Communist-ridden regime were tossed out of Guatemala, most Americans optimistically congratulated themselves that the fight against communism had been won in this area. We should have known communism better. Now we are making the painful discovery that communism was not wiped out, it was merely diffused. Today, 4 years later, there are at least four major Red danger points, and as many secondary ones, in the Caribbean region. Any one of these is capable of erupting overnight into an intolerable threat to American safety.

The frightening truth is that the political situation has been steadily worsening for the United States in the whole Caribbean area. Four years ago, after the cleanup of Guatemala, the Caribbean was ringed with a girdle of strong governments which, although differing sharply among themselves, had one thing in common. All were uncompromisingly anti-Communist. All were pro-American. As nearly as possible, in the fluid field of politics, America's back door was safe.

In Guatemala itself, the pro-American Castillo Armas had replaced the pro-Soviet Arbenz. In Nicaragua sat the elder Somoza, veteran of a hundred successful battles with the Communists. In Venezuela, power seemed firmly in the hands of Marcos Perez-Jimenez, backstopped by one of the sternest anti-Communist security officers in the hemisphere, Pedro Estrada. Cuba was under the experienced rule of Fulgencio Batista who had once tried coalition with the Communists and had learned his lesson. In the Dominican Republic was the granite figure of Rafael Trujillo. In Britain's Jamaica, anti-Communist Bustamente seemed to be a fixture.

The startling speed with which this comfortable situation reversed itself in 4 years should be an eye opener for Americans. Jamaica has turned out Bustamente and has replaced him with the Socialist Norman Manley. The elder Somoza was assassinated and succeeded by his son who, although pro-American, is more conciliatory. Guatemala's Castillo was assassinated by a Communist. Perez-Jimenez in Venezuela was deposed by a surprise revolution: his successor, Larrazabal, had been a pliant and unpredictable tool of the pro-Communist factions. Batista in Cuba has been plagued by a Castro revolution which is both anti-American and pro-Communist, and which today has spread over a part of Oriente Province. Only Trujillo remains with undiminished power, and he has endured the full fury of the Liberal smearpot brigade in the United States during the last 2 years. A situation which was copper-riveted in favor of the United States 4 years ago now appears to be coming apart at all its seams.

In the face of such poisonous developments, it would be supposed that the United States would be reacting with alertness and with a realistic facing of the hard facts. Unfortunately, no such reaction has taken place. Aside from a few lonely voices, such as those of Senator Olin D. Johnson, Congressman Carroll E. Reece and Spruille Braden, most of the public comment on Latin America has actually been favorable to the forces which are working against America. The old American weakness for backing the wrong horse abroad is again manifesting itself, just as it did in China in the early 1940's when most of our writers went ga-ga over Mao Tse-tung. While Russia and its agents pursue a shrewd and unrelenting plan of subversion in the Caribbean countries, most of our so-called Latin American "experts" fail to see the pattern. With the same blindness that was shown in China, they are hailing potential enemies as friends and reviling proven friends as dictators or worse. No wonder Russia wins.

Take the appalling situation which is building up in Venezuela. Most of our national magazines and newspapers are completely misleading us concerning what is actually going on in that unhappy country.

Before this article is printed, Venezuela will have held a Presidential election. Whether the successful candidate is Romulo Betancourt, boss of the Leftist ACCION Party, or the Communist-dominated Larrazabal, the result will be equally disastrous for America. It will be certain that Venezuela, for the next 5 years, will be in hands much more unfriendly to the United States than was the scorned Perez-Jimenez government.

And yet, to take a single example, the New York Herald Tribune on November 3, 1958 hailed the coming election as a "democratic landmark" and remarked foolishly that, whatever the outcome: "Venezuelans will not have to worry too much about the overthow of their present democratic government." The implication was that what has been happening in Venzuela since the revolution of January 1958, should be applauded by Americans.

The bitter truth is that Venezuela will either elect the figurehead, Larrazabal, or else it will put in power a man, Romulo Betancourt, who has been described by Senator JOHNSTON (without denial) as the actual leader of all the Communists in Latin America. Any yet the Herald Tribune has the political naivete to describe such an impending election as a "democratic landmark."

Americans would be wise to keep their eyes steadily on this man Betancourt. He is bad news for the United States. A slippery, phrase-mongering demagogue who knows how to exploit the grievances of the voters, he is now posing in Caracas as an "anti-Communist." This is the same man who, while an exile from Venezuela, founded and led the Communist Party of Costa Rica for 5 years.

Betancourt is one of the Venzuelans who shed crocodile tears over the stoning of DICK NIXON in Caracas last May. And yet, with one of his ACCION Party henchmen then holding the office of Minister of the Interior under the present junta, and another serving as chief of the security police (Pedro Estrada's old office) he could have prevented the outrage by the mere lifting of his hand. The complete unreality of the coverage of the Nixon episode in the American press is shown by the fact that no one pointed out this overall responsibility of Betancourt, the man who gives the Communists their orders.

What is happening in Venezuela, since Perez-Jimenez's overthrow, is the projection onto the political stage of two Communist-manipulated parties—a small official Communist Party and a large ACCION Party. Publicly rivals, they actually are working toward the same power end. The Communist Party operates the Caracas street mob and controls some of the nation's key unions, but it has no hope of winning immediate power in its own name. The party which is being groomed to win is Betancourt's ACCIO Party with its demagogic appeal to the non-Communists. It is a shrewd squeeze play, and a play whose far-reaching consequences have been almost completely ignored by the writers and publications which assumedly keep Americans informed about Latin America.

The blindness of American liberals to Latin American realities was shown on February 5, 1958, when a large group of prominent American writers and publicists staged a farewell dinner to Betancourt in New York on the eve of his return to Venezuela after the revolution. The dinner was held under the auspices of the Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom, which claims to be non-Communist.

If and when the Communists come to power in Venezuela, they will have their clutches on the richest prize in the Caribbean. Venezuela is vitally necessary to the United States as the world's second largest oil-producing area. Recently, it has become also an important iron-producing nation. Its geographical location gives it a key strategic importance in any scheme for the defense of the whole Caribbean region. The

first principle of a sound American defense plan should be to keep this fabulously rich area out of the hands of the Communists. There are no evidences that Washington has any such coherent plan. Since the fall of Perez-Jimenez, official America has been content to drift with the events.

The unfolding of the Communist pattern for the Caribbean has been speeded since the Venezuela revolution by what has happened in Cuba. That Venezuela and Cuba are now linked closely in Red plans is shown by the aid which junta-ruled Venezuela has given to the Castro revolution against President Batista.

Prior to the fall of Perez-Jimenez, Venezuela was a closed area to the leftist Cuban rebels trying to pull down the pro-American regime of Batista. Fidel Castro's remote mountain base in Oriente Province was supplied furtively by gunrunners, operating from the Florida coast, and by some irregular aid from Mexico and Costa Rican agents. No prorebel radio broadcast reached the Cuban people.

The success of the January revolution in Venezuela put the dwindling Castro rebellion back into business. Under the Communist-pampering Larrazabal regime, Venezuela has become the supply base for the Castro movement. Shortly after his return to Venezuela, Romulo Betancourt called a Caracas anti-Batista conference to aid Castro. A radio station in Venezuela began daily broadcasts to the Cuban people inciting them to rebellion against Batista. These broadcasts continued until the eve of the Venezuelan presidential election, when, to avoid campaign talk, they were halted.

While Washington shortsightedly pursues a policy of embargoing arms to Batista (how reminiscent this of General Marshall's embargo on arms to Chiang Kai-shek in 1946), Venezuela covertly supplies Castro's forces with Garands, howitzers, and other materiel. Steadily, an axis is being welded between the leftists of Cuba and those of Venezuela under the complacent eye of American "liberal" Latin American counselors. The Caribbean is slipping away from us by continued stages, and we are doing nothing about it.

The paradox of the situation is that the Castro revolt against Batista was largely hothoused by a group of supposedly responsible American publications, including the New York Times, Life, Look, etc., and by the radio and TV commentator, Edward R. Murrow. Without the terrific buildup which these non-Communist publications have given him, Castro, with his initial 80 followers, would still remain a mountain-locked bandit. Although the pace of Castro heroization has slowed down since he and his brother began kidnaping Americans, it still continues fitfully. After one of Raul Castro's raids on Americans, the New York Times actually profiled him admiringly in its Man of the Day column. When it is recalled that Fidel Castro has a long record of both anti-Americanism and close association with Communists, all of which is documented in the files of the Police Department of Mexico City, his nomination by American liberals to be Batista's successor becomes all the more fantastic. And yet it is happening.

When we proceed further in our tour of the Caribbean, we find another smoldering danger point in the Dominican Republic. Under Rafael Trujillo, the Dominican Republic is the strongest bastion of anticommunism in the Americas. Repeatedly, the Moscow agents have attempted to precipitate revolution against him. Always, Trujillo has repelled them, and has forged sufficient strength to aid anti-Communist action in other parts of the area. Without passing upon the merits of his absolutist form of government, it would seem that Americans would welcome such a rugged ally in the life-and-death struggle against communism.

However, with an irresponsibility little short of suicidal, a large coterie of non-Communist Americans are devoting their energies to the fantastic task of driving Trujillo out of the Caribbean. In this mission, an important part of the Nation's press has approvingly publicized them. The Galindez disappearance, an obvious Leftist hoax, has been played up in the press ad nauseum and when even such a lifelong liberal as Morris L. Ernst painstakingly exploded the myths which surrounded the case, his documented report was greeted with contempt and unbelief. The press, headed by the New York Times, continued to reiterate the lies.

The venom with which a group of American magazines and newspapers have pursued Trujillo's politics and even the private life of his family has little parallel in the history of Latin American relations. Were Trujillo an uncertain factor for America, the animus might be understandable. But behind him lies a record of 30 years of unwavering support of the United States in the Caribbean. His overthrow would usher in a reign of chaos in the Dominican Republic which would be an open invitation to the Communists. They would rush in to fill the vacuum. And yet this ghastly prospect does not have the slightest deterring effect upon the vengeful Liberal Americans who are dedicated to the task of Trujillo destruction. No wonder Moscow laughs.

Meanwhile, in British Guiana, just beyond the Venezuela border, we have the obscene spectacle of a Communist government actually in power. Dr. Cheddi Jargan, a fanatical Communist, with a talent for exploiting race grievances, won a majority of the seats in the Legislative Council of British Guiana in 1953 when London incautiously granted the colony self-government. At that time the British were realistic enough to deny Jargan the Prime Ministership. But in the general softening of the West in this hemisphere, the British lacked the stamina to veto Jargan when he won a second election. He was elevated to the Premiership where he sits as the living symbol of Communist victory in the Caribbean.

The events in British Guiana have had a profound influence upon adjacent Trinidad where an anti-American Socialist, Dr. Eric E. Williams, has attained the Premiership. The whole British chain of Caribbean possessions has become an open gash upon the anti-Communist solidarity of the region.

Nothing is more self-evident than the fact that we are on the threshold of tragic events in the Caribbean. They may be events which will point a deadly knife at the political security of America in its own hemisphere. As almost happened in Guatemala, they may conceivably admit Russian-directed communism into our own backyard.

The Reds themselves have now reached the boasting stage. The Moscow Kommunist, the theoretical monthly of the Russian central committee, announced in its November issue that there are now 360,000 card-holding Communist members in Latin America—20,000 of them in Venezuela.

There is still hope that America can halt this dangerous drift before it goes too far. But if America does this, it must speedily change its strategy in the Caribbean. Its publicists and opinion leaders must stop crucifying the rulers in Latin America who are willing to back up the United States in its struggle with communism. They must stop pampering and heroizing America's enemies and Moscow's friends.

The State Department must stop playing footsie, as it is now reported to be doing in Venezuela, with such equivocal characters as Romulo Betancourt.

It may be hard for some Americans to abandon their enjoyable sport of needling the strong men in the Caribbean. But if they don't execute a quick change in their attitude, we may see all the important nations in the area slipping away from us. Change, when it comes, comes quickly in the Americas. Time is definitely running out for the United States, even in this hemisphere, unless Americans quickly learn how to fight and more importantly, how not to fight the Communists.

A New Report on U.S. Defenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there appears in the U.S. News & World Report for February 20, 1959, an article entitled "From the Navy's Top Admiral: A New Report on U.S. Defenses." Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament on January 30, 1959. Among other things, he said, according to subheads preceding the article:

Don't rely on any arms agreement to ward off a first blow.

No controls can guarantee against a surprise attack by an aggressor.

Soviets can't be trusted, ever.

Polaris submarine is best United States weapon.

If atomic tests ended, Polaris and other weapons would suffer.

United States safeguard: ability to retaliate.

I ask unanimous consent that this particularly newsworthy article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM THE NAVY'S TOP ADMIRAL: A NEW REPORT ON U.S. DEFENSES

(Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, January 30, 1959. His answers are from the transcript.)

Can surprise attack be prevented?

There are certain fundamental aspects of this problem. Surprise attack is not limited to attacks only by ICBM's (intercontinental ballistic missiles) or long-range bombers, but can involve attack through rapid movement of sea or land forces as well. This is of particular concern to our allies.

No known control measures can guarantee the prevention of surprise attack by a determined aggressor.

The best that can be expected is that certain control measures may discourage an aggressor from launching a surprise attack by depriving him of the assurance of complete surprise.

We must be wary of proposals which would reduce or restrict our ability to deter general nuclear war through the maintenance of a diversified retaliatory force.

Also we must be wary of proposals which would reduce or restrict our ability to respond quickly with adequate military force to Soviet probes at the free world wherever they occur.

Can submarines launch surprise attacks?

The possibility of a surprise attack by submarines is very great, and it is causing us a great deal of concern. [Deleted.] But we

have forces at sea all the time, searching up and down both coasts. We have our various patrol squadrons that operate. [Deleted.]

Could the United States keep enough atomic weapons on submarines so that, if an attack were launched, the enemy could not possibly catch the submarines?

That is right.

Enough nuclear weapons could be stored at sea on submarines to retaliate with great destructive force?

That, of course, is the philosophy behind Polaris submarines, sir. It is difficult for us to find those submarines with all of our capability, and it will be equally difficult for them (the Soviets). They cannot find all of them simultaneously, but they might find one. If they drop on one, that is an indication for all the rest.

Our strength now, our position of power now with these submarines is that, no matter what he [the enemy] does, he cannot avoid being destroyed. He cannot avoid it. So that is where we have retaliatory strength.

When we get significant numbers of these over the ocean, then he cannot do anything we cannot do.

How are Polaris submarines coming along?

The first one is scheduled to be in full operation in the fall of 1960, and then they will follow through at the rate of, under the present budget, about three a year.

When we get some of those submarines at sea, the Russians are not going to know which submarines are where. They are never going to know whether a submarine is a ballistic-missile submarine, an ordinary submarine, or how many there are or where they are or their condition, or anything about them. They will never know.

And if we have 10 submarines that are built, they will never know where 9 of them are; and every time they pick up a submarine contact, that might be a missile submarine, and the reverse is equally true.

Would submarines have a rather difficult time making much of a missile attack on the Soviet Union?

It would depend upon the number of submarines we wanted to place and where we wanted to place them. [Deleted.] The Arctic Ocean is a very good place because there are holes in the Arctic ice, and you can put a submarine into the holes and it launches through them or it can come up next to the coastline and it is very difficult to detect.

Major population centers of the Soviet Union are far from there, are they not?

Yes, sir. But you could hit Murmansk. * * * With 1,500 miles range you can cover all but a very small part of Russia from launching positions at sea.

Would you have missiles that shoot 1,500 miles?

Yes, sir; yes, sir.

What about this Polaris missile, have we really got one?

No, sir, we do not have one yet, but we started several years ago, sir, on this, and we are right on our schedule.

Does Russia have a considerable number of missile-carrying submarines already?

No, sir; I do not think they have a considerable number. I do think they have done considerable research in them, and I think they are probably doing most of their research based upon their land research data on ballistic missiles. So I think they could have ballistic submarines now. I do not think they have very many.

If the Soviets built a great many underground shelters, would there be any possibility that vast numbers of their people could survive an all-out hydrogen-bomb attack?

No, sir. If we were to launch a retaliatory attack against Russia, large numbers of their people would die, no matter how many shelters they had.

How many do you mean?

Twenty, thirty, forty percent. Of course, it depends on what they do, the direction which their wind blows, how good their facilities are, how long they stay in their underground shelters, but there is a limit on the amount of time they can stay under, and a large portion will die.

Recognizing that the date is approaching when the United States and Russia can each have at sea enough weapons almost to destroy the other, is the time near when neither side will dare to use hydrogen bombs on each other?

I think we have reached that already, sir. I think they are convinced that we will not start a general nuclear war. I believe they are convinced of that. I think they are also convinced that, if they start a general nuclear war, they have had it, they are destroyed, and both of us will have serious damage.

In effect, is there not already a tacit, unwritten agreement that there is not going to be a war with hydrogen bombs, by mutual recognition of the terrible consequences?

Yes, sir; except that an agreement has been made with a congenital liar.

Does that indicate the type of fighting most likely would be the conventional type?

It would be a limited war; yes, sir. We may use small nuclear weapons in limited wars on certain occasions, too.

If the United States gets into a position in which it is not able to fight a limited war, is that not when the enemy is going to attempt that kind of war?

Yes, sir; and he is about to probe, just as Mikoyan came over here probing, finding weak spots, looking for weak spots in our businessmen, finding any place at all where he thinks the United States is weak so he can drive a wedge in that would be military, political subversion, economic, every way possible. And when they find that weak spot, they are going to try to have the capability of taking advantage of it.

They haven't the capability now, perhaps, in all the ways—I mean in all aspects—but they will. I think they are going to try to get that capability. And when they do—they find a weak spot—they cash in.

Operation Nibble?

Operation Nibble; yes, sir.

Do you see any prospect of achieving something in the field of disarmament?

It is possible, sir. I do not see much prospect of it; no, sir. * * * If Russia wants to decrease tensions, the first thing she should know, and I think she does, is that she has got to create confidence in the rest of the world.

I think she is trying to. She is trying to put up a false front to create a situation in which we have confidence in her which is not deserved.

We have to watch that. That is the most dangerous thing there is.

The chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Twining, said in U.S. News & World Report last April:

"Our defenses would be affected if atomic tests were to be stopped, as we would be unable to proceed with desired improvement." He meant in nuclear weapons. Would that statement be true today with respect to Navy defense requirements?

Yes, sir.

Why do you say that?

Because there are great prospects of increasing the yield and decreasing the size of weapons—smaller weapons, with greater yield. In Polaris, for example, we have a satisfactory warhead, but if the tests were to continue we could probably get a warhead weighing the same amount which will have two or three times the present yield.

Also, we would like to go into real small weapons. Take depth charges that could be fired from a [deleted] gun, for example. Some day you will be able to achieve that if testing continues.

But if you do not have a test, you do know whether you have it or not.

Would you even want to consider an agreement with Russia limiting development of rocket engines?

No, sir; because we entered into a naval agreement, you know, and we got rooked.

Dr. Walter H. Hitchler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of February 6, 1959, upon the passing of Dr. Walter H. Hitchler, former dean of the Dickinson School of Law, and native of Plymouth, Pa.:

DR. WALTER H. HITCHLER

As an educator, public official, and citizen, Dr. Walter Harrison Hitchler, native of Plymouth and retired dean of Dickinson School of Law, easily qualified for a place among the distinguished Pennsylvanians of his generation. This was no mean achievement when the record of the past half century is examined. From the Nottingham mine, where he launched his career, to the eminence he attained in the profession and in public affairs is impressive progress by any yardstick.

Member of an old and respected family, Dr. Hitchler carved a remarkable career by combining law and education. He joined the law faculty of Dickinson in 1906 and was named dean in 1930, a post he held until his retirement in 1955, after 48 years of service. One of his pupils was former Gov. John S. Fine, and a boyhood friend was former Gov. Arthur H. James, with whom he worked in the mines. Scores of Luzerne County lawyers came under his supervision at the Carlisle institution with which his name was linked so long and intimately as an instructor and administrator.

Pennsylvania called on him repeatedly for a helping hand. He was a member of various commissions to revise the laws of the Commonwealth and he wrote extensively on criminal law. He served in the office of the secretary of the commonwealth and Governor James drafted him to chairman the State liquor control board. During the Second World War he headed the Alien Enemy Hearing Board in the middle district. He also added to his reputation nationally through his service on the National Panel of Arbitrators. But the law school was his principal interest and he served it with fidelity and distinction.

Many honors were heaped on him, including five doctorates from higher institutions of learning. Hitchler House on the Dickinson campus is one of the memorials a grateful college provided in acknowledgment of its indebtedness to him and as an expression of its appreciation. The profession paid tribute to him on a number of occasions for his dedication to the law and the public interest, as well as for his modesty and unselfishness.

With his passing, a useful life has come to an end.

The Catholic Church in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the House the fact that Sunday was observed as a day of reparation and prayer for the people of China by Catholics throughout the world. This observance was asked by Pope John XXIII and special devotions were held to mark the day.

I request unanimous consent to enter in the Appendix to the RECORD a brief statement on the facts concerning the church in China. This statement was released by the National Catholic Welfare Conference to accompany remarks made by the four American cardinals urging that Catholics in Red China remain loyal to their faith.

I am troubled by the fact that we Americans often concentrate on the military and economic threat posed by the Soviet regime and fail to recognize the greater spiritual, moral and intellectual threat of communism, whether it is practiced in Moscow or Peiping. Indeed, we tend to think of China in second place, while it remains a major threat to world peace.

The tragic effect of the tyrannical effort to force all people of China into one mold, the so-called rectifications of error that provides for the breaking up of families, forced labor, jail or worse, is not compatible with any idea of justice. China's behavior toward her obligations, her refusal to release American prisoners despite her promises, her eagerness to acquire an atomic capability while her military force increases, all must attract the constant concern of our people.

The record of Red China's treatment of her native Christians is a frightening one. I hope all of the Members will give it close attention.

WASHINGTON, February 13.—Ever since the Communists gained control of Red China in 1949, Chinese Catholics have been under relentless pressure to erect a schismatic church.

Schism would occur if the Catholic Church in China renounced the Pope's jurisdiction.

Pope John XXIII warned last December that schism is now threatening the Catholic community of China.

"We cannot but beseech Almighty God that in His mercy He may avert such a calamity," the Pope said.

Within the last year about 20 Communist-sponsored priests have been consecrated bishops in defiance of the holy see.

Catholics in China have never been many, numbering some 4 million in a total population of over 500 million. But missionary influence has been far reaching and deep.

In 1949 there were 2,557 Chinese priests and 3,080 foreign ones. There were 5,112 Chinese and 2,351 foreign sisters. The hierarchy comprised 27 Chinese and about 100 foreign bishops.

The Catholic educational system consisted of 3 universities, over 150 high schools, 1,546 elementary schools, and 2,742 catechetical schools. Other institutions included 216 hospitals, 781 dispensaries, 5 leprosaria, and 254 orphanages.

None of the schools or institutions remain. The only exception is a Catholic school taught by European nuns in Peking for dependents of foreign diplomats.

The foreign missionaries have been expelled or killed, and four are in jail. Among them is Bishop James E. Walsh, of Cumberland, Md. The Communist Government confirmed his arrest last December. U.S. State Department efforts to secure his release have been so far unfruitful.

The Chinese clergy has not fared any better. More than 1,000 have been imprisoned or killed.

In 1951 the Communists launched a three-autonomy movement to end completely all foreign contact. Churches could not accept financial support nor missionaries from abroad. All relations with foreign countries, especially with the Holy See, were prohibited. Sermons on the Gospel had to support communism.

In 1954 the Government announced the formation of the patriotic association of Chinese Catholics to supplant the three-autonomy movement.

The late Pope Pius XII roundly condemned the association in an encyclical secretly circulated among Chinese Catholics last summer. The association aims "at making Catholics gradually embrace tenets of atheistic materialism by which God Himself is denied and the principles of religion rejected," the Pontiff declared.

Through the association the Communists wear down resistance. A steady diet of indoctrination is one of the Reds' most deadly weapons. In a letter smuggled from Red China to Hong Kong, a priest wrote:

"These indoctrination courses are deadly, there is no escape. You couldn't imagine how rapid, rabid talkers can force you to think, repeat, concede, admit, and at last get you on their side to prattle the same misleading, ambiguous statements as they spit out. * * * They insist, repeat, insist again and again always on the same statement—wearing us out, breaking us down—until unable to hold out any longer one is finally prepared to say, 'Well, have it your way.'"

News reports from the Communist press indicate that at least 32 Chinese priests have been elected bishops through the patriotc association. About 20 of the bishops have reportedly been consecrated. A decree of the Holy See provides automatic excommunication for clergymen who take an active part in unauthorized consecration ceremonies.

Church authorities, however, are reluctant to pass judgment on those who take part in illicit consecration ceremonies until more is known.

Rev. Frederick A. McGuire, C.M., organizer and former head of the Catholic Central Bureau in Shanghai, which coordinated missionary activities in China before the Reds took over, said he is optimistic that the majority of Chinese Catholics have remained loyal to the Holy See. He pointed out that tight censorship in Red China restricts what is learned to items from the Communist press and from indirect reports.

Father McGuire is now director of the mission secretariat at the National Catholic Welfare Conference in Washington.

A Communist newspaper recently indicated that Catholic opposition has not been shattered. The newspaper, Chieh-fang Jih-pao of Shanghai, denounced reactionary forces among Catholics who opposed the efforts to support Communist leadership as well as to get rid of the Vatican's reactionary controls.

Forced labor for sisters and priests leaves little time for religious duties. A Communist publication, the Review of Tientsin, published an enthusiastic account allegedly written by a sister superior:

"All the sisters as well as the bishops and priests are taking part in work in the fields. This lasts from 6 in the morning until 9 at night. At midday we take our meals in turns so that work is not interrupted. Those who dig the ground change teams every 20 minutes and those who are breaking stones every 10 minutes. When wells are being dug supper is passed over and work continues on an empty stomach until 9:30 in the evening."

Protestantism, no less than Catholicism, has been the target of the Communists' intense campaign to eradicate God. The China Committee of the National Council of Churches of Christ recently reported that all church bodies have been merged into one. Ministers must register with a government group and are closely restricted. The more than 200 churches once in Shanghai have been reduced to 12.

"Attendance has much fallen off, partly because so many work on Sunday—one of the latest resolutions is that services on Sunday must not be allowed to interfere with work," a letter reaching the NCCC noted.

The pattern that has emerged in Red China is a deliberated methodical campaign to destroy the spiritual allegiance of the Chinese people. In its place the Red Government wants to substitute a national church subservient to the aims of the totalitarian regime.

Col. William P. Jones, Jr., a Superior Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, all to seldom are we given the opportunity to join in a special public expression of appreciation and esteem for the men and women who carry out the great public programs authorized by the Congress. One such rare instance is the recognition accorded Col. William P. Jones, Jr., Army District Engineer at Memphis, Tenn., since July 1957, upon his transfer to the Army War College.

Colonel Jones truly has rendered outstanding public service in carrying out the tremendous responsibilities of the Corps of Engineers in the lower Mississippi Valley. The corps' program for flood control, drainage, and navigation directly affects the lives and well-being of the millions of people served by this great waterway. Colonel Jones' exceptional professional ability, as well as his understanding of and sympathy with our needs, has contributed immeasurably to the solution of many difficult problems. His service at Memphis has been in the highest tradition of the Corps of Engineers.

I am sure that I speak not only for myself, but for all of our people, in paying tribute to Colonel Jones for his superior service at Memphis. Our regret at losing a district engineer of such qualities is tempered by sense of gratification that our judgment of this fine officer is confirmed by official recognition in his new assignment for training to undertake still higher responsibilities.

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the following editorial

from the Commercial Appeal at Memphis for January 31, 1959, with respect to the services of Colonel Jones:

A SUPERIOR OFFICER

No Army district engineer who has served in Memphis has better fitted himself into the community's life or to that of the Midsouth he serves than Col. William E. Jones. His impending transfer to the War College must be, therefore, a cause for genuine regret. The only compensating factor lies in the Army's recognition that he is general officer material and for that reason must be given War College training.

If civilian authorities throughout the Midsouth had the power to make out an efficiency report for his personnel file they would use the designation superior for every rating classification. It would not be exaggeration of the quality of service Colonel Jones has given Memphis and the Midsouth.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, there is no aspect of human events so mighty in its consequences as militant revolution. Throughout history reformers and pseudoreformers have repeatedly raised the revolutionary banner, inciting insurrection against national governments in the name of liberty. The results have been many and varied, sometimes mighty in their beneficence, sometimes mighty only in their destructiveness, and sometimes productive not of liberty but only of a mightier tyranny than any that existed before.

The people of all nations have strong feelings about revolutionary leaders. To those who profess a love for liberty, yet actually seek only personal gain, the people accord nothing but scorn. Yet to those who actually fight for liberty, the people willingly pay eternal devotion. It is the distinction of the Polish people to honor as one of their revolutionary heroes a man regarded by the freedom-loving citizens of all nations as the outstanding democratic revolutionist of his age and one of the outstanding of all ages: Thaddeus Kosciuszko, universally acclaimed as the hero of two worlds.

Kosciuszko's breadth of vision and ability gave his career a fictional quality. Of noble birth he rose above the narrow outlook of the 18th century Polish nobility to espouse democratic reform. With no prospect of personal gain he crossed an ocean to aid a foreign people in overthrowing British tyranny. Hailed in the New World for his part in the American Revolution he forsook all honors to carry the spirit of revolutionary democracy back to Poland. Defying his own class, the Polish nobility, he campaigned politically in behalf of constitutional government in Poland and when Polish nobles and Russian and Prussian troops sought to thwart the popular will, he took up arms against them. Although achieving fame in the American Revolution as an engineering genius he now appeared in the role of military tactician, leading a minute Polish Army against the Russian horde in some of the most brilliant defensive military campaigns in history.

Triumphant as a democratic revolutionist in foreign parts, Kosciuszko was defeated in his efforts in Poland's behalf. But only physically and in the short-term sense. Actually, the classic heroism of his actions captured the imagination of the Polish people and of the world at large, and established him as a national symbol—a symbol which stands today, not only representative of Poland's past, but of Poland's future. The democratic dreams generated by Kosciuszko's actions and beliefs have taken permanent hold of the Polish spirit and no temporary tyranny, no foreign ideology is strong enough to snuff them out.

As we in America have seen, democracy is a hardy institution. It can withstand the rigors of devastation and deprivation, and ultimately come back from apparent defeat to overwhelm its enemies. This was the philosophy, the living philosophy, preached by Thaddeus Kosciuszko, and Polish patriots throughout the world have learned it well.

The man we honor on this occasion undoubtedly deserves our tribute for his political and military accomplishments, for in these respects he has few equals. But it is to Kosciuszko the philosopher, the father of democratic Polish thought, to whom we owe our greatest debt, for the fate of Poland's future is still, to this day, in the hands of his spiritual heirs.

John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the consistent admirers and constant supporters of our distinguished Secretary of State I can only contemplate with the deepest concern the prospects of his being immobilized at the moment in history when we need his strong hand at the diplomatic helm more than ever before.

The irony of the situation centers in the fact that many of his most violent critics are now wringing their hands as they desperately scan the horizon for some one to take his place. All of which points up the fact that most of his traducers took their positions for political reasons and show by their concern that they have never had a constructive alternative to Secretary Dulles' firm resistence to international communism.

In my book the only real test of a nation's foreign policy is the avoidance of war, and under John Foster Dulles' guiding hand we have weathered six crises—count them: Straits of Formosa, Suez, Syria-Turkey controversy, Southeast Asia, Lebanon, Quemoy—without firing a shot. And his policy of being able to take the Nation to the brink of war without plunging in has exhibited an adroitness which none of his more recent predecessors ever seemed to possess.

The alarm with which the Secretary's illness has been recorded abroad attests to the respect in which he is held by our allies and the satisfaction with which the Communists must be presumed to welcome his withdrawal from the active conducting of our affairs of state points up as nothing else can the vital necessity of securing in his successor, if and when a selection must be made, a man who will carry on his policies to the minutest detail.

In addition to being a great statesman and a great patriot, John Foster Dulles is a great churchman and we can only prayerfully petition the Almighty God upon Whom he has ever leaned that He will have His servant in His care and that in His good time this great and dedicated American will be restored to full health and strength and the resumption of his ceaseless efforts in the cause of peace.

The Unfolding Role of Russian Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to direct to the attention of my colleagues a speech made on February 7 by Mr. L. L. Huelsdonk, of Downieville, Calif., before the National Western Mining Congress in Denver. Mr. Huelsdonk is a member of the California State Mining Board and a recognized authority on gold. His observations make good sense and I hope his suggestions on setting the price of gold at a realistic value will be adopted. I have introduced a bill for that purpose.

His speech follows:

THE UNFOLDING ROLE OF RUSSIAN GOLD

I was glad to be asked to appear again before the National Western Mining Conference and talk about gold—even at the risk of being dubbed a crackpot on the subject. However, it is my intention to prove that the real crackpot is not the man with his feet on the ground, but rather, the long-haired dreamer who challenges the deeprooted credence of gold, then saddles up a puff of smoke to chase both ends of a rainbow. Today, because of these starry-eyed vendors of inflation, we are well able to say—with the help of Shakespeare—that gold "is a custom more honored in the breach than the observance."

During a Lions zone meeting shortly after the November 4 election, the president of the host club called upon me to substitute for their program which had failed to show. Knowing my political affiliation and convictions regarding gold, he set the stage in a spirit of good fellowship by satirically suggesting that perhaps the Democrat Party—since it had done about everything else—would now raise the price of gold. This

point of humor, of course, was well waxed with the usual witticism that such a meeting generates. However, in the remarks that followed, a rather serious vein developed when it was pointed out—with good reason—that neither the Democrat nor Republican Party, but rather the Communist Party, would be the first to raise the price of gold.

Today I intend to elaborate upon this danger by showing when, why, how, and where this will be done and the tremendous impact it will have upon the economy of the United States.

In the beginning, it will be necessary to briefly analyze a growth of developments which—over the years—have been undermining the very foundations and cornerstones of our Nation. First of all, we must recognize that inflation is not only our most dangerous foe—but it is also our most vulnerable spot. Many distinguished writers have recently pointed this out with emphasis. Inflation devours our uncommitted savings—which in the final analysis is the only firm basis for sound monetary reserves. It fosters uncontrolled repudiation of Government debt at the expense and misery of the people. It causes the debauchery of currency through the collapse of money value. It throws a serious burden upon fixed income of all types. It generates price-wage spirals which shifts its destructive force into high gear. Its unseen power can completely collapse civilized order. In short—the catastrophic malignancy of inflation, whether it continues to creep or strike rapidly, is more far-reaching and devastating than anything known to man. It is imperative that this cancer be killed—and in order to do this, its roots must be sought out and destroyed. Trying to hide these roots by spreading out the top of the bush is hypocritical, false and foolhardy.

If the real cause for the uncontrolled growth of inflation is to be unraveled, we must first distinguish between proper and improper money, because the roots of inflation are fertilized when an oversupply of improper money is dumped helter-skelter into an economy. Under such conditions, money—like anything else which is oversupplied—becomes cheap and easily available. As a result the banks become glutted and a surplus piles up beyond the needs for healthy economic growth. The cheap offering of this surplus is a natural incentive which induces everybody to spend and borrow until new and greater demands are created for goods and services beyond our normal productive capacities. This generates higher bidding in a race for things that become hard to get and in turn motivates the producers to increase their capacities in a skirmish to maintain their markets against competition. The resultant buildup of factories and the enlargement of auxiliary production facilities engenders still more demand and higher bidding for the materials and services that are necessary to further expand. With money as no object, because of its easy creation and oversupply through more borrowing—inflation takes over and a false prosperity rides high. However, industrial capability soon catches up to such a wayward economy and in time passes its false boom. Everyone has two cars and two refrigerators and they don't want any more. Conveyor belts continue to roll, but the goods pile up in inventories and warehouses because more has been produced than can be used. At this point deflation sets in. Factories are forced to curtail and lay off workers. Demand for raw materials ceases; the deferred payments on the fast-but-false money supply are called for, but cannot be met and mortgages are foreclosed. In short, this is the inevitable consequence of oversupplying an economy with improper money. And, unquestionably, the longer that corrective measures are deferred, the more severe is the backfire.

History has recorded this story many times and it is currently being somewhat demonstrated in France and Argentina where inflationary pressures have forced programs of austerity and currency devaluation as a retaliatory means against external trade competition. Such drastic moves could easily lead to international trade ware with realistic reevaluation of all inflated currencies through a general depression. The Western World is vulnerable to this type of pitfall because the supply of tangible or proper money has not been allowed to keep pace with the demands for the new amounts of money which its present rate of economic growth and population increase is requiring. As a result fractional reserves have been abused, excessive deficit spending has become the rule and government indebtedness has been outraged to provide these undeniable needs for money. In a race of this sort, improper money is easily and irradically oversupplied and currencies are weakened by dilution and instability. This points to the importance of recognizing the difference between proper (or real money) and improper (or fiat money) if the explosive mirages of inflation are ever to be absorbed into the permanence of an honest prosperity.

Simply speaking, if a dollar is to be borrowed—someone must own a dollar to lend. However, if the owner of the dollar is able to lend it 10 times and still keep it, he has created $9 of improper money or ghost money that is to be counted, but does not exist tangibly. Many world-renowned economists consider only gold as proper money because it must always be weighted before it can be counted—and because it is now and always has been, the guarantee of redemption throughout the world. It is the only universal measure of value and the standard for all currencies. Even our mighty dollar is used with gold and as gold in foreign monetary reserves only because we guarantee its redemption 100 percent in gold (through the Bretton Woods Agreement) upon demand by the foreigner. And, mind you, this guarantee holds good no matter how many ghost dollars we send abroad or how low their purchasing power may sink—so long as we have enough gold to pay off. This guarantee is the only reason that our dollar holds its high prestige in international exchange. The loss of our gold would result in the immediate loss of our dollar prestige and the Communists know this as well as anybody else. This fact alone lays the foundation for schemes which they do not intend to overlook.

Gold is different from the inflationary supplies of new money which can be created through the facilities of a commercial or central banking system, because it cannot be simply provided by a stroke of a pen. Gold cannot, in any sense, be considered as inflationary money for the simple reason that the cost of its production must be paid for before it can be used as payment. This is true no matter to what extent the demand for funds in an economy exceeds the supply of its savings. This makes gold proper money. This makes gold real and positive money and this is the reason why it holds disciplinary action over the inflationary expansion of fiat money when deficit spending ratios are not allowed to be abused or when reserve requirements are not indiscriminately changed.

On the other hand improper money can be briefly defined as a supply of fractional reserve paper in the form of private and public debt which has been dumped upon an economy to be honored in kind as specie. Although this obligatory paper is thrust into the world markets on a parity with proper money, the determination of its true value must necessarily wait until its liabilities have been liquidated in the uncertainty of future terms. In other words, the degree of inflation at the time of settlement determines the worth of this money—and the amount of this money that has flooded the markets determines the degree of inflation.

The vulnerability of our money to any outside scheme for its debauchery is being augmented by the continual cheapening of our dollar through the undisciplined monetization of too much debt. This is true because distinction cannot be made between the proper and improper dollars that are held in foreign government account. They all command and collect 100 percent of their face value in gold from our Treasury Department on demand. They act with gold and as gold in foreign reserve accounts and therefore our debts do not only create and inflate our own money, but they do double duty by creating and inflating foreign money. The only difference being that in the final analysis, we are underwriting foreign inflation with our gold.

Under these conditions, continual pressure for more free trade, foreign aid and dollar investment abroad further impairs our position. Through the impact of our generosity in these fields it is already apparent that we can no longer be expected to compete with low foreign costs through high unit output alone. Mechanization is not an exclusive privilege; so from our point of view, certainly freer trade cannot be carried on with justice to our standard of living unless the same pay for like-services in the other nations can be reconciled to our level through the convertibility of sound currencies. The order of natural availability for the fair distribution and utilization of the world's resources is a commendable goal, but not for the United States so long as she is forced by international agreement to underwrite foreign currency through the sacrifice of her gold without provisions to compensate for the depreciation of her own dollar.

It can be readily seen that if our monetary authorities and Congress continue to fail in protecting the purchasing value of our dollar, it will—someday soon—be worth only one-tenth of the value which it contained when the Bretton Woods Agreement was ratified back in 1945. This simply means that in the near future foreign-held dollars will be in a position to demand—and proportionately take—10 times more gold from our Treasury than the original agreement called for.

This situation lays the door wide open to any eager design that the Communists might have to collapse our dollar in favor of ruble prestige. It points to the importance of immediately tying the dollar realistically to gold in order to forestall its further weakening by the calculated drainage of its last drop of blood.

Such a move would take congressional courage—but it would be action and not reaction against any economic manipulations that the Communists are planning. So far we have only reacted to their moves. In the Middle East they acted and we reacted by sending in the Marines. In Quemoy they acted and we reacted by sending in the 7th Fleet. In Berlin they acted and we are still reacting. They put a satellite in orbit and we reacted by outsputniking them and now they have placed us in another secondary position by outmooning us.

They will no doubt be the first to raise the price of gold and force us again into reaction. This time it will be much more serious because, if we cannot immediately counteract to meet the consequences, it will lead to the complete degeneration of our dollar. An initiative on our part would take bold action because the opponents to the revaluation of gold are mostly powerful gentlemen of influence who self-seek by the collection of multifold interest on the expansion of the money supply through the debts of the people. The interest on the public debt alone is now over $7 billion annually. Thus, American citizens must now dig up over 4

times the amount of money, just for the payment of this interest, that it cost to run the entire Government of the United States (including the armed services) when the power to create money was taken from Congress and given to these powerful interests, who are now—in essence—saying that if some of their power to create debt is regulated by an increase in the price of gold that inflation will be the consequence and Russia will be helped.

With all due respect for the feelings of these people, it is impossible to understand how an increase in the price of gold—which would be geared primarily for the control of inflation—could cause inflation. In fact the great shortage of gold for the safe coverage of our presently over-issued currency is the main reason for the inflated prices of today's goods and services. Certainly, inflation is here now and certainly the price of gold has not been raised. Inflation is consistently growing because the function of gold—which has been set up on an international basis as the controlling factor for the discipline of currency expansion—has been ignored usuriously through the abuse of fractional reserves for the sake of reaping multiple profits. This abuse hurts the United States more than any other nation because she is the only nation in the world obligated by international agreement to convert outside holdings of currency to gold. It simply means that in the long run our chances to gain gold without producing it are nil. We cannot possibly use our dollars to build up the gold reserves of the other nations without tearing down our own gold reserve—unless enough new production of gold or gold value can be furnished to keep pace with the issuance of our dollar. The growth of money must keep up with the growth of population and its economic needs if prosperity is to be maintained. However, this growth of money cannot be substituted by the dilution of money, if periods of depression are not to be expected. It must all grow from the increase of proper money (with reserve ratios static) if inflation is to be avoided.

There are many ways to adjust the issuance of money to a reevaluation of gold without inflationary effect. As one example—under existing law, the profits from an increase in the price of gold could be sterilized and held by the Treasury as a stabilizing fund to be fed back into the economy by the retirement of public debt in adequate amounts to supply enough money to stimulate and support the needs for normal economic growth. In such a case the purchasing value of the dollar would remain constant, if fractional reserves were not allowed to change. The creation of the main supply of money would be properly in the hands of Government with qualified backing for convertibility at home as well as abroad. The lending of money would be properly in the hands of the banks but limited to positive reserve ratios. This would not be inflationary.

Of course, an increase in the price of gold wold definitely aid Russia, because she is a large producer of the metal. But, to say that an increase at this time wold give her an advantage over the free world is ill-advised. Certainly, if a raise in the price were to her advantage now, she would not wait for someone else to make the move. She wold do it herself. She is not a member of the international monetary fund. She is not bound by agreements of any kind to hold the price. She is currently supporting such an all-out gold production program that her physical facilities to produce are being taxed to the limit. So—at the present time—an increase in the price could not materially increase her volume of gold—whereas in the free world a revaluation upwards would result in the reopening of closed mines and the mining of marginal ores to such an extent that the volume of its gold through new production wold climb by many fold. Such a situation would be a definite disadvantage to Russia in fighting the economic war that was declared on America by Khrushchev in a recent speech where the challenge was made brutally clear in these words: "We declare a war we will win on the United States—in the peaceful field of trade." And then he added confidently. "We will bury you."

In order to enter into such a war with any assurance of reasonable success, the Russians know that they must first possess a fully convertible ruble that will be guaranteed on a sound exchange basis for world trade. Therefore, it is clearly evident that the main reason behind their all-out effort for the production of gold, is to build up their monetary gold reserves to a point where this can be safely accomplished as the when of the when, why, and how and where that the Communists will be the first to raise the price of gold. With the realization of such a reserve objective, their next move wold be to disorganize confidence in the American dollar and capture its prestige with convertible trade rubles. And this is the why of our story—because if an increased price for gold in the term of our dollar was first offered by Russia in soundly convertible rubles, an immediate run would be created on our gold through the redemption of foreign-held dollars. This race would be made by the foreign owners of American dollars in order to gain gold to sell to Russia where more benefit in convertible currency could be received by them than by their retention of our dollars. The immediate effect of such action wold be to place Russian rubles in a trade position among members of the International Monetary Fund and discredit the American dollar by sending it home for the unpleasant job of divesting not only itself of its own gold backing, but also that of three other dollars. A dollar shortage wold once again develop abroad, but this time the gap would be bridged by Russian rubles. The how and where follow axiomatically. It will be simply by proclamation from Moscow. There need be no consent, no legislation, no red-tape.

We are now vulnerable to such an ambush, because we ratified the terms of the Bretton Woods Agreement without having first incorporated into it a protective provision for the depreciation of our dollar and then by immediately embracing the professional means of depreciating it through the hocus-pocus of mysterious money.

When Russia raises the price of gold, our Congress will be forced into immediate reaction by groping for fast legislative procedure to meet or beat the price she dictates—or stand resolved to gamble away the tangible backing of our dollar and be judged in history as the prize pigeons of the century. The only other alternative would be to scrap our agreement with foreign friends which guarantees gold redemption for the dollars they hold and thereby sacrifice our international prestige. Last year alone, without cause for a run on our gold, other than the inflationary sickness of our dollar, we lost over one-tenth of our reserve source at Fort Knox—and let us not forget that this amount is the direct backing for over $8 billion of Federal Reserve notes. This drain has pulled our reserves down to $20 billion and of this amount we legally need to hold about $12 billion to cover Federal Reserve deposits and notes. This leaves only $8 billion in gold for the redemption of nearly 16 billion foreign-held dollars. Foreign governments and central banks alone own about one-half of these holdings which can immediately draw on our gold. This means that we could be wiped clean before we could react through our legislative processes.

We can take but one sound step to halt this coming economic onslaught and that step is to set the price of gold to a realistic value in terms of the dollar. But we must take the initiative and move first or else our leverage will be weakened against the weight of gold which we had been told was old fashioned.

In conclusion, I would like to warn Congress again of its responsibility. Under the influence of skillful propaganda, its majority of both parties have, for some time now, been suffering under the illusion that it has been elected for the purpose of giving away the assets of this Nation—and that by sending us to the poorhouse, it can make the whole world rich. Congress should understand that so long as we have our heads under a direct national debt of over $280 billion— which we are apparently not capable of reducing—that we have no assets to spare. A nation should first learn the fundamental of providing its own fiscal needs before embarking upon an experiment of furnishing money for a world.

Air Reservists at the University of Florida Are Being Educated to the *N*th Degree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take great pride in inserting in the RECORD an article by Lt. Col. Franklin Hibel, which appeared in the February 1959 issue of the Air Reservist. I am proud of the accomplishments of this Air Force Reserve unit in Gainesville, Fla., in my congressional district, and I know my colleagues and the American people will feel, as I do, that they have reflected considerable credit upon themselves and their country.

The article follows:

AIR RESERVISTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA ARE BEING EDUCATED TO THE *N*TH DEGREE

(By Lt. Col. Franklin Hibel)

Not only can the Gainesville, Fla.'s 9886th Air Reserve Squadron be called ready, but they're ready made.

With over 75 percent of the squadron strength composed of students and professors at the University of Florida, it is only logical they meet on the school campus.

Half of the 100-plus reservists are students, while 18 are professors. Another 10 are university employees.

Lt. Col. C. J. "Pete" O'Connor, squadron commander, said it best: "The availability of specialists in the many fields of endeavor in which the university group is normally associated has made available to the 9886th a tremendous pool of top-flight professional instructors and speakers."

Since the population of Greater Gainsville is 44,500 and the University of Florida has 12,304 students this year, it can readily be noted that much of the city's civic life is centered around the university.

A progressive and cultural center, Gainesville points with pride to its university, the largest land-grant institution of higher learning in the Southeast. The city is justly proud, too, of the 9,886's educator reservists, who have gained national, and in some instances, international renown.

TALENT GALORE

The available talent can best be observed through the following capsule comments

concerning four of the professors, selected at random:

Lt. Col. Frank E. Maloney, acting dean of the College of Law. Holds a bachelor of laws degree with high honors (University of Florida) and a bachelor of arts degree (University of Toronto, where he also did graduate work in philosophy). He became a professor in 1950.

Colonel Maloney has written many articles on law subjects. He has had such professional recognition as chairman, Equity Round Table Council, Association of American Law Schools, and adviser to the Florida bar.

Col. Robert B. Mautz, dean of academic affairs. Holds a bachelor of laws degree from Yale. Has a bachelor of arts degree (magna cum laude with honors, Miami University, Ohio). He has served on the advisory board of Journal of Legal Education, and has been chairman, Southern Law Review Conference. Incidentally, both Colonels Mautz and Maloney have completed their residence requirement for J.S.D.

Lt. Col. Manning J. Dauer, professor of political science. He has been with the university 25 years, with time out—1942-46—for military leave with the Army Air Force.

Colonel Dauer authored two books, "The Adams Federalists," and one covering political "Scope and Method." He has acted as consultant to congressional committees and is much in demand as a lecturer. The professor is also managing editor of the Journal of Politics, a leading political science journal, circulating in the United States and in 50 foreign countries.

Lt. Col. Willard M. Fifield, provost for agriculture at the university. He holds a bachelor of science degree in agriculture (University of Florida) and a master of science degree. He is a past chairman of the Committee of Nine (nine State experiment station directors), adviser to the Secretary of Agriculture on regional agriculture research.

Colonel Fifield has been a committee member of the institutional projects abroad of the American Council on Education. Also indicative of his ability is the fact he was named Man of the Year in Florida Agriculture for 1955 by the Progressive Farmer.

A unit under the Jacksonville Air Reserve Center (2686th AResC), the Gainesville squadron was organized early in 1949. First commander was Lt. Col. James S. Lanham (USAF retired), now head professor of accounting.

The 9886th's legal detachment was the first in the 14th AF geographical area at the time and one of the pioneer flights in the Air Force Reserve. Officially organized on September 12, 1949, the legal unit has developed a mock court-martial which has earned considerable praise from higher echelon.

Called Operation Court-Martial, the trial put on by the legal reservists—professors and law students—is a model of military court procedure. So professionally proficient have the participants become in the mock court-martial, that they have presented their "show" on several occasions outside of Gainesville.

Regarding the squadron's degrees, take a reading of the following percentages: close to 30 percent hold bachelors; over 16 percent have masters; nearly 10 percent carry doctors of philosophy, while approximately 6 percent earned doctors of law.

What have all these degrees got to do with the squadron in general? Glad you asked that. The Gainesville reservists are benefiting by instruction from No. 1 instructors—instruction which would normally cost plenty of cash.

"In 26 years of military service," emphasized Colonel O'Connor, "including a varied number of assignments from squadron to theater command level, the responsibility of command of the 9886th has been one of the enjoyable tasks of my military career."

"It is my opinion that our squadron," he concluded, "with its vast resources in manpower drawn from the University of Florida, is one of the outstanding Air Reserve squadrons within the structure of the Air Force Reserve and has the potential to meet many of the specialized requirements that may be needed in times of emergency."

No one has to have a degree to absorb the significance of that statement.

Need for Economic Rehabilitation of Distressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, recently, a friend of mine had the unhappy experience of being on hand for the distribution of surplus agricultural commodities in one of the counties of the Fifth Congressional District.

It was truly a heartbreaking scene. Able-bodied men, eager and willing to work, had to line up and await their turn to receive a limited supply of food for their families. Defeat and resignation were written on the faces of these men.

"For goodness sake, do everything you possibly can to help provide jobs for these men," my friend told me after this experience. "They want to work. It is a crying same that jobs simply are not available."

Mr. Speaker, my primary job this year is to do everything I possibly can to help create new jobs in West Virginia. It is difficult at times to make people from other areas, which are not plagued by chronic unemployment, understand the gravity of the situation. Our two Senators—BYRD and RANDOLPH—are doing an excellent job of setting forth in the Senate the need for an economic rehabilitation program. I am convinced there is a much wider interest in the problem in the House now than there was last year.

A Federal program of loans and grants to enable areas such as West Virginia to attract new industries is an indispensable part of any overall coordinated program. But we must not overlook the fact that local initiative is another necessary ingredient.

Mr. Speaker, West Virginia has much to offer to industry. Our manpower supply is pentiful. The supply of coal for fuel is almost inexhaustible. Water is plentiful. Excellent transportation facilities bring the markets of the country within easy shipping distance of West Virginia.

These and other facts, which make our State an attractive location, must be made available to industry. The electric utilities and other industries, which realize that their progress is tied to that of the State as a whole, have done an outstanding job of industrial promotion. A number of counties have started industrial development committees.

Mr. Speaker, all of this activity, I believe, demonstrates a commendable resolve on the part of the people in my State to work ourselves out of the economic difficulty in which the State temporarily finds itself. I am sure these local groups would agree that a sensible, workable program of Federal assistance is essential. But I am sure they would further agree that to rely entirely upon the Federal Government would be a fatal mistake.

The bill which I am pushing in the House for the economic rehabilitation of distressed areas calls for a coordinated effort. No Federal handout is involved. Rather, it is a program that will help the States—and their subdivisions—to help themselves.

There can be no doubt that everyone would benefit from a program that would create new jobs for the thousands of men in West Virginia who cannot find gainful employment. Mr. Speaker, the investment in dollars would be repaid many times over. Just think of the tax revenue that would be generated by an additional 200,000 jobs in the State and how great the demand would be for new services. Each new dollar in wages thus created would circulate many times through the economy.

I am convinced that during the months ahead we will see much progress in West Virginia toward working our way out of our present economic difficulties. Eventually, we will build in West Virginia an economy based upon widely diversified industries, providing jobs for men who are now displaced by machines and technological advancements.

Don't Let Antarctic Go by Default

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an excellent article by Jim Lucas, Scripps-Howard staff writer, which appeared in the Washington Daily News on February 13, 1959.

The article follows:

DON'T LET ANTARCTIC GO BY DEFAULT

(By Jim G. Lucas)

A former U.S. Pacific commander, Adm. Felix Stump, today urged the Nation not to let the Antarctic go by default.

Admiral Stump said it could become an important military asset to the nation or nations controlling it.

As U.S. Pacific commander, Admiral Stump was responsible for supplying American forces in the Antarctic during the recent International Geophysical Year. He now is with the Freedom Foundation in Gettysburg.

With the conclusion of the IGY, eight nations, including the United States and Russia, said they plan to maintain Antarctic bases indefinitely.

Meanwhile, representatives of 12 nations, which participated in the IGY, are meeting here in Washington in an attempt to insure

that it be used only for peaceful purposes and that it does not become a political football. There have been reports that the Russians have blocked the kind of treaty President Eisenhower proposed last May.

Admiral Stump noted that the United States takes the position it neither asserts nor recognizes territorial claims in the Antarctic. But he advocated the establishment of additional U.S. bases there, adding frankly his reason was to "keep it out of the hands of some of our so-called former allies."

He said we should put bases in all ice-free areas of the continent. "Possession is nine points of the law," he remarked.

Admiral Stump said the Antarctic could become a major space launching platform, a military staging area or be used for control stations on a great circle commercial air route between Europe and Australia.

John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial concerning John Foster Dulles from the Sunday Call-Chronicle, Allentown, Pa., February 15, 1959:

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles went to Walter Reed Hospital in Washington last week for what normally would be considered a routine operation. It was performed successfully, but doctors found an old intestinal cancer had become active. Suddenly his health became just about the most important matter in the world.

Even those who have been clamoring for his scalp, both in this country and abroad, for one reason or another, found it almost intolerable to consider the vacuum that would be created were this 70-year-old combination of an iron constitution and steel nerves to abruptly disappear from the scene.

He is almost universally considered the architect of the plans and policies by which the Western powers managed to keep the cold war from turning hot. His opinions have prevailed with few exceptions within the councils of the alliance, even when strongly opposed. There is an old saying that the best steel blade bends a little. This aptly describes Dulles. He might have bent a little on occasion, but never much and he has steadfastly refused to deviate far from his determined course.

A man of such stubborness of will, a man who refuses to compromise when it would seem to be the easier thing to do, a man who holds the trump cards so forcefully that he can usually command others to do his bidding, is bound to create enemies. John Foster Dulles has done this in a big way. He is thoroughly disliked in the capitals of many friendly nations. He has been mercilessly lambasted by critics at home, within his own party and without. He is the No. 1 enemy of Moscow, for when others showed an inclination to listen to Russia's sweet talk, he managed to squelch any movement toward appeasement.

Yet, despite all this, he has somehow retained a deep and abiding respect on the part of those who love and those who hate him. And as the man who enjoys the complete confidence of President Eisenhower, he is considered by many the most powerful individual in the world today. By the way of illustration, the story is told that when the Quemoy crisis developed last summer, Dulles flew to Newport where the President was vacationing and in the matter of a few hours had outlined the problem and secured Eisenhower's agreement to announce the defense of the offshore islands with American forces if that became necessary.

John Foster Dulles is unique in a number of other respects. No Secretary of State in American history has been so well prepared for the work he has been called upon to do. His was anything but a political appointment when Mr. Eisenhower first took office.

He was 65 when he got the job, but he had been getting himself ready since he was 19, when he attended the second Peace Conference at The Hague in 1907 as a secretary to his uncle, Robert Lansing, then Secretary of State to President Wilson. His maternal grandfather, John W. Foster, was Secretary of State under President Harrison.

Ten years later President Wilson sent Dulles to Central America to negotiate successfully for the protection of the Panama Canal after we had broken relations with Germany.

After the armistice of World War I, he was a member of the U.S. delegation to the Versailles Peace Conference, where he served as the chief of American counsel on reparations. Later he served in other important capacities relating to the peace treaty with Germany.

Between wars he conducted an outstanding practice in international affairs. In 1938 he wrote a book in which he pointed out the inevitability of war between this country and Japan.

As a Republican adviser, he accompanied Secretary of State James Byrnes to the meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers in 1945. In 1947 he went with Secretary of State George Marshall to Moscow, and in 1949 he accompanied Secretary of State Dean Acheson to Paris.

When, in the same year, President Truman needed someone especially able to deal with the Japanese, he picked John Foster Dulles as his personal envoy with authority to speak directly for the President in negotiating a peace treaty. This treaty he subsequently wrote. Earlier he had served under Franklin D. Roosevelt as an adviser to the American delegation in the formation of the United Nations at San Francisco.

If anyone ever was in a position to give American foreign policy continuity across several administrations, if anyone has had the opportunity to gain a broad perspective of its problems, it has been Secretary Dulles.

Dulles' many public statements, all made with typical candor, added to his reputation as a controversial character. Probably the most controversial is what is now known as his brink-of-war declaration. Made in the course of an interview with Life magazine, it said:

"You have to take chances for peace, just as you must take chances for war. Some say that we were brought to the verge of war. The ability to get to the verge without getting into the war is the necessary art. If you try to run away from it, if you are scared to go to the brink, you are lost. We had to look it square in the face—on the question of enlarging the Korean war, on the question of getting into the Indochina war, on the question of Formosa. We walked to the brink and we looked it in the face. We took strong action."

This paragraph pretty well sums up the man and his philosophy. History may prove his policies were what caused Russia to back up time after time when the chips were down.

Last week, as he underwent the surgeon's knife, the air was filled with rumors. Dulles would never return. His convalescence would take many months. He would resign and Under Secretary Christian Herter or some other understudy would take his place. At his age and under all the accompanying circumstances, these rumors were accorded a certain degree of credibility. Yesterday the doctors confirmed that he has cancer and the worst fears were realized. The Secretary of State will not be on the job for a long time, if ever.

Is John Foster Dulles an indispensable man? Of course he isn't. Why then the deep concern so suddenly manifested in so many quarters, even by those who only a short while ago cried for his scalp?

The answer is that without him there is bound to be a period of grave uncertainty. The vacuum created by his withdrawal would immediately be filled with a mass of conflicting opinion. For awhile no one would know where the United States stood, or its allies either for that matter, a situation made to order for Moscow. With John Foster Dulles in charge there has never been any doubt.

Perhaps the world is just beginning to realize how much it owes this quiet, determined, unflinching man who prepared himself over more than threescore years for the most difficult job his country could ask him to perform—to walk to the brink and look it in the face.

Upping Airport Subsidies; or, Piling Pork on Pork

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the February 14, 1959, issue of the Milwaukee Journal on the question of airport subsidies. The support of the Milwaukee Journal of the President's airport program is significant since this particular newspaper is antiadministration about 99 percent of the time:

UPPING AIRPORT SUBSIDIES; OR, PILING PORK ON PORK

The very first Senate bill introduced and reported out for action would more than double the amount which the administration had proposed for airport construction subsidy in the next 4 or 5 years.

Senator MONRONEY, Democrat of Oklahoma, the author, was sure of support from both sides of the aisle. State agencies and local governments have been clamoring for more Federal money—which has to be matched with State and local money—for airport expansion.

The chief justification offered has been that airliners are beginning to fly and that, to accommodate them safely, very large sums will have to be spent on extending and strengthening runways. (The airports aid bill does not cover safety and traffic control devices provided wholly at Federal expense.)

But the subsidy boosters are just as interested in tossing more thousands to hundreds of little airports back home which will not see a jet transport or provide a nationally necessary service in the foreseeable future. Millions, too, will subsidize terminal lounges, lobbies, outlook balconies, and the like at metropolitan airports. This for special benefit of air travelers and the commercial air-

lines, but adding nothing to the capacity to handle jet planes or any others.

The $50 million a year the Eisenhower administration proposed should be ample to cover the Federal Government's proper responsibility in local airport improvements. It should be more than enough if spent only where and as needed for improvements essential to the national security and welfare.

The money will be allotted politically, however, as it has been in the past. A move to restrict Federal aid to field improvements (not terminal buildings, etc.) was turned down in committee. So this is, in other words, another pork-barrel proposition. The President is willing to go on doling out some pork. The Monroney bill backers just want a lot more.

All-American Athlete From All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, in these times when juvenile delinquency is so frequently mentioned on the front pages of our newspapers, I am happy to commend to your attention a young man of an entirely different sort, a young man whose courage, faith, and determination make him a living symbol of all that is decent in America's youth.

The young man is named Leo Byrd. At this time, he is climaxing a sterling scholastic and collegiate basketball career at Marshall College in my hometown of Huntington, W. Va.

As major colleges go, Marshall is not a very large one, and as collegiate basketball players go, Leo Byrd is rather on the small side. But in character, talent, and personality, Leo's stature is tall indeed.

When Leo Byrd was 12 years old, the dreams of basketball glory he had cherished since babyhood seemed turned to dust. He was a patient in a hospital, stricken with poliomyelitis and partially paralyzed.

Many a boy would have accepted defeat at this point, but Leo did not. As soon as he was able to get up, he started running and training to strengthen his weakened legs, although he says "This hurt me a lot, but I wouldn't let them know."

He recovered sufficiently to play junior high school and later high school basketball. His first 3 years of high school competition were comparatively undistinguished, and even as he played through his senior year, he did not enjoy the publicity accolades often accorded promising young players.

His star soared cometlike into the heavens, however, in the 1955 West Virginia High School tournament. Leading a lightly regarded Huntington High School team into the event, he broke the existing tournament record for scoring by making 48 points in a game that eliminated the school that had won 4 consecutive State championships. The following night he snapped his own record with a 49-point performance, and proved to be the start of the tournament.

Later that spring, he was named "Mr. Basketball USA" after appearing in an intersectional high school all-star game.

Leo enrolled at Marshall College, only a few blocks from his home, after spurning the offers of glittering scholarships from other schools.

Here he has brought continuing credit to his family, his school, and his community. Under the tutelage of Jule Rivlin, Marshall's able basketball coach, he has blossomed into a universally respected college star. His basket-shooting ability is regarded as almost uncanny, and although he is only 6 feet, 1 inch tall, he relies on aggressiveness and remarkable coordination to outplay men far taller than he.

Last year, Leo Byrd teamed up with Hal Greer, the first Negro player in Marshall hisory, to give his squad an awesome scoring attack. With Greer gone, and winning fame as a professional player with Syracuse, Leo has done a remarkable job of carrying the offensive load for his team this year.

All season long, he has remained near the top among the Nation's scorers. As I speak today, he is second in the Nation only to Cincinnati's widely acclaimed Oscar Robertson. Leo never lets down. In fact, his scoring ability has improved as the season has progressed.

As glamorous as Leo Byrd's career has been, his personal life, however, is at least equal to it in stature.

He is modest and unassuming, yet talks about his basketball feats frankly and with great sincerity if asked.

He is the son of a Methodist minister, Rev. Joseph P. Byrd, who was himself a versatile college athlete. The Christian training of Byrd's early days have remained with him. He is universally saluted by his opponents for his clean play and good sportsmanship.

A former leader in the youth fellowship in his father's church, Leo has kept religion as his guide, and before each Marshall game, Leo leads his teammates in prayer.

The city of Huntington this year was one of the few American communities honored with an All America Award. The community is justly proud of its civic progress. And Huntingtonians also may take great pride in the fact that Leo Byrd, a native son who elected to stay in his hometown for a sparkling collegiate athletic career, seems a sure bet to collect some all-American honors himself at the close of the basketball season.

Israel and the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, on November 14, 1958, the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, of which the Dayton Jewish Community Council is a member, adopted a resolution entitled "Israel and the Middle East." The Council, which is a coordinating association of 213 local-central Jewish community organizations, represents more than 800 Jewish communities in the United States and Canada. Following is this resolution which should be of interest to all Members of Congress:

ISRAEL AND THE MIDDLE EAST

This assembly records its strong support of the U.S. Government's economic aid to the Middle East, so fundamental to the welfare and progress of the peoples of those countries and to strengthening democratic institutions in that strategic and vital area.

The representatives of this Council have viewed at first hand the profound achievements made possible by this economic assistance to Israel.

We commend the President and the Congress for these enlightened programs, and we urge the continuation and the extension of such aid, in the interests of the humanitarian needs of these underdeveloped countries, the stability of the region, and the peace of the world.

Public Law 480

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ODIN LANGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, today I should like to add my voice to the voices of certain of my colleagues by introducing an amendment to the Agricultural Trade Development Assistance Act of 1954, commonly known as Public Law 480, which would permit this act to operate for 5 years without need of congressional action.

At a time when our farms are involved in the largest production in our history, we find nations all over the world in need of these products, while we at the same time are lamenting their existence. This law was enacted for the sole purpose of expediting this situation; it was enacted to permit our Nation to provide for those countries in need of our commodities. This is possible in a manner not calculated to upset or hinder their economies, but rather in a fashion which will enable them to purchase what they need, when they need it, in a sound economic and businesslike fashion. We, by the same token, as a nation are profiting in a bilateral capacity. We are able to sell our excess products for currency or credit on the international market, while reducing the surpluses presently costing the Government millions of dollars in storage.

Public Law 480 has provided this Nation with the opportunity of winning countless friends among the nations of the world where a food deficit is in existence. It has permitted disposal of approximately $5 billion of surpluses on the world market from our markets. This program has served us well; it has stood the test of almost 5 years, and has proven itself to be one of the better laws passed

by the Congress when one evaluates its results on the domestic agricultural market and its benefits to our farm families.

I have introduced this amendment because I feel a program which has proved its worth in this manner should no longer be restricted by year-to-year operation. Effective as this provision has been in its present form, it stands to reason that long-range commitments by the Department of Agriculture could better be made and utilized if the Department could make assurances of delivery, as permitted by this amendment.

Because of the effect of Public Law 480 on our international policies and because of the advantageous effect it has on our farm economy, I urge the favorable consideration of this amendment.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of my newsletter which was released today:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

Congress suspended its deliberations on Thursday, February 12, to observe the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. Carl Sandburg, the famed poet and author of a monumental biography of the Civil War President, spoke at a joint session of the Senate and House.

Lincoln was the founder of the Republican Party. His birthday each year is the occasion for party dinners throughout the country, at which funds to finance future campaigns are raised. Democrats use the birthdays of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson for their fundraising events.

But Lincoln does not belong to the Republican Party, just as Jefferson and Jackson are not the exclusive property of the Democrats. These great Americans belong to the entire country and they are revered and remembered by all of us, regardless of party.

There can be no denying the fact that Lincoln was a great man. His was a tragic life and the sense of doom, of impending tragedy, which haunted him his entire adult life, became a reality when John Wilkes Booth put a bullet through his body in Ford's Theater in Washington. Lincoln had a devotion to the Union which guided his public life. He had to lead this Nation through a bloody and cruel Civil War in which 500,000 men on both sides fell, to prove the insolubility of the Union.

Lincoln was a vilified President. The cruel, bitter things which were said about him when he was President are almost beyond belief today. He was pictured in cartoons as an ape, a monster, and a maniac.

Lincoln was a noble soul. There was a touch of the poet about him. In an age of florid prose, he spoke and wrote in simple terms. He was preceded on the platform at Gettysburg by Charles Sumner who spoke for 2 hours. Lincoln spoke for 5 minutes. What Sumner said was forgotten; Lincoln's Gettysburg Address has attained immortality, a masterpiece of prose, a speech which every schoolchild has to learn by heart.

All of Lincoln's speeches were memorable. He coined phrases which are quoted as the epitome of wisdom. Yet he was a modest man. He had grave doubts of his ability to govern the country in its most trying hour.

Lincoln was a masterful politician. Surrounded by a hostile and disloyal Cabinet, imposed upon him by his party, he persevered, outmaneuvered and, in the end, had his way. He fought with Congress and firmly established the precedent of a strong President—the head of a coequal branch of the Government as the Constitution decreed.

Upon his death people forgot the cruel, unkind things said about Lincoln. Instead they remembered his nobility, his long suffering to hold the Union together. Men wept openly in the streets of Washington upon learning the sad news. They realized the Nation faced a period of adjustment, of binding up the Nation's wounds, as critical and dangerous as the war period. They were afraid of that future without the steady hand of Lincoln at the helm.

How the course of history might have been changed had this man been spared. He wanted to bring the South back into the Union. He sought no vengeance. Had he lived, the South would have escaped the indignities and humiliations which were forced upon her by radicals bent upon revenge. Had Lincoln lived, the South would not have turned to counterviolence. The Nation could well have been spared a legacy of hate and suspicion which is still with us today.

It is fitting and proper that the birthday of our great heroes be observed each year. Lincoln, Jefferson, Jackson—these and others who built this country—have much to teach us today. It is unfortunate that we have not learned better the lessons of the past.

Where Is the Money Coming From?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, an article in the February 1 edition of the Omaha World-Herald properly gives recognition to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] for his fight against heavy Government spending, and I desire to include the article as part of my remarks:

For many years, the most vocal critic of heavy Government spending in the House of Representatives was former Representative Robert Rich (Republican, of Pennsylvania).

Mr. Rich's frequent query: "Where is the money coming from?" became famous.

He retired from Congress a few years ago, however—and now an Iowan appears to have taken over his role.

This is Representative H. R. GROSS (Republican).

Mr. GROSS is a man with little tolerance for a lot of the Government's spending and it makes no difference to him whether it is by agencies or by his brethren in the House.

His latest assault came when an effort was made to put a man on the Federal payroll at $11,600 annually, to make plans for the visit to this country of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentarian's Conference.

The past 4 years these meetings have been held in Paris, attended by United States delegates from Senate and House. The next one will be here, and the employee—whom Mr. GROSS described as a "flunkey"— would make arrangements.

Not caring on whose toes he stepped, Mr. GROSS called the conference a junketing organization. Members of Congress shudder when their inspection trips and the like are described as junkets.

Mr. GROSS told one member of the Parliamentary Conference that he and his fellow junketeers had been traveling by military transport, and using the armed services to haul their baggage around Europe.

The Iowan succeeded in halting a vote on employment of the "flunkey" until Monday.

Hero of Democracy: Thaddeus Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, to Polish people all over the world there is no date more worthy of note than February 12, the birthday of the great Polish statesman, military engineer extraordinary, democrat, and patriot of two continents, Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

Revolution in behalf of any cause is a perilous undertaking. Not only does it inflict suffering on the government it assaults, but on the revolutionary party as well, not to mention the thousands of persons not directly involved in the struggle. For this reason history looks with a critical eye upon all revolutionary leaders and observes closely their merits and shortcomings.

Professedly democratic revolutions are no exception to the rule. Far too often self-styled democrats have instigated revolution, overthrown tyranny and then, in a burst of postwar confusion or villainy, established a government as tyrannical as that which it replaced. The world owes nothing to such misguided zeal but contempt, reserving its respect only for the truly democratic result, an all-too-rare occurrence in revolutionary history.

In this country, following our War for Independence, we had the good fortune to come under the guidance of George Washington, a revolutionist of genuinely democratic spirit, and our progress as a Nation is to a large extent the result of that happy occurrence. But Washington was not the only great statesman to emerge from this struggle, nor his democratic outlook peculiar to him alone. Numerous leaders in the American Revolutionary Army were to become exponents of the democratic dream and one of the most remarkable of these was the man we honored on February 12, Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

No one in history more deserves the title of democrat than Kosciuszko, whose sympathy for the oppressed carried him across the seas to fight for principle on a foreign shore. His participation in the Revolution was vital. A master in the art of fortification construction, he is credited with laying the groundwork for some of the Americans' most outstanding military achievements. And once the war was over and America was free, the

people of his adopted land poured honors on Kosciuszko and bid him remain, as a distinguished and respected citizen.

But the ideal of democracy is a moving force, and it would not let Kosciuszko rest. In a few years he was back in his native Poland, campaigning as an apostle of constitutional government. Long subjected to the presence of foreign troops on their soil, the Polish people grasped at the teachings of democracy, and in 1791 rose up to form a constitutional monarchy, in the hope of at last attaining political unity and repelling foreign domination. When the neighboring states of Russia and Prussia combined with certain Polish nobles to quell this democratic demonstration Kosciuszko met them on the battlefield and though initially defeated he returned in 1794 at the head of an insurrectionary army to revive the democratic cause.

For a moment, and for a moment only, Kosciuszko sat at the head of the counsels of a free Poland. Temporarily triumphant, the Polish democrats foresaw a glorious future, such as that already spreading before the Americans, and in honor of Kosciuszko's leadership in battle they chose him as President. In this capacity Kosciuszko's attitude was the same as that of the American leader, George Washington. Despite his noble background and militaristic career, he gave to free Poland its first taste of genuine democracy, initiating democratic reforms that were immediately incorporated into the Polish tradition.

Although eventually overcome by the military might of their powerful neighbors, the followers of Kosciuszko realized that they had taken up a cause that could not be suppressed by armies alone or by any other force, and from that time to the present the democratic flame has burned brightly in the Polish heart. The result is directly attributable to Kosciuszko, whose love of democracy kindled that flame. Democratic people the world over have good reason to do him honor. His abilities, his deeds, his courage, and his foresight are unsurpassable. Indeed, among the many heroes of democracy, Thaddeus Kosciuszko ranks second to none.

The Governor Said It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in a news article datelined Harrisburg, Pa., February 11, Democrat Gov. David Lawrence came out firmly for less frills—and that should mean less expense—in our school construction program.

Frankly, I would have been happier to have such a forward-looking stand taken by a Republican official but perhaps the pronouncement coming from a topnotcher in the party that has always enjoyed a reputation for handouts and spending will have a farther reaching effect.

The Governor displayed his annoyance over the fact that most of our school buildings stand idle a third of the year, a defect in our system which would not and could not be countenanced in industry. And the Governor has reopened the way for renewed consideration of round-the-year utilization of our schools through staggered enrollments.

The Governor then very properly vented most of his denunciation on deluxe, palacelike structures which have nothing whatever to do with the proper education of the youth of America. And as an aside he says that he will insist on a measure of standardization so as to eliminate the duplication of architectural fees.

The Governor's firm stand is undoubtedly predicated on the realization that we have reached a crisis in educational expense and that the heavily-burdened taxpayer can no longer be expected to supinely accept these country club, Taj Mahal-types of school buildings.

The news article to which I have referred appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on February 12, and is included in full as follows:

LAWRENCE URGES SCHOOL ECONOMIES

HARRISBURG.—Gov. David L. Lawrence today called for economies in school building construction and operation because there's just not enough money to meet the costs of elaborate structures for use on a part-time basis.

Attending his first meeting of the State Public School Building Authority, Lawrence, who was elected president of the agency, urged a revaluation of school construction practices and the use of educational structures.

The Governor told the board he had been "annoyed for many years" by the long periods when school buildings remain empty and unused.

He added that when school buildings are use only 6 or 7 hours a day, 5 days a week and 9 months a year they represent a poor return on the investment.

His remarks were followed by a general discussion reviewing possible economies in the construction of school plants.

These include:

Standardized plans and specifications so the could be used for different buildings in a move to save architect's and engineers' fees.

A ban on the erection of deluxe buildings when State aid is involved, and requiring local districts, who insist on the palace-like structures, to assume a greater basic share of the costs.

Larger classrooms, particularly for the use of closed-circuit television, so a reduction could be made in perpetual teachers' salary expenses for smaller classes.

Employment of architects and engineers by the State in a move to save fee expenses, or use the same architects' plans a second time at a 2 percent fee, instead of paying 6 percent twice.

Another issue raised by the Governor centered on the control of the tremendous cafeterias and gymnasiums in school buildings.

Secretary of Property and Supplies Andrew M. Bradley said costs of planning new structures should be reduced as a result of a departmental ruling adopting standards for component parts of public buildings, such as window frames.

Meanwhile, Senate Minority Leader Charles R. Weiner said that the authority was planning to ask the legislature to raise the $925 million ceiling on school building construction, by possibly $300 million or more, because the limit has already been reached, thus barring new construction. Applications for millions in new school construction are on file with the authority.

At the same time Weiner, also attending his first meeting as a member of the authority, challenged payment of $850 to the Provident Tradesmens Bank and Trust Co., Philadelphia, for transporting $18 million in negotiable bonds from New York to Philadelphia.

Weiner claimed the job could have been done by the State police for a great deal less. Lawrence agreed the charge appeared to be excessive.

The bank, however, actually paid the $850 to Brink's Inc., an armored car service which transported the bonds. It is agent for the authority.

Natural Gas Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it appears that a national gas bill is due to be considered again. The following resolution adopted by the mayor and the Common Council of the City of Detroit expresses my views and the position I have consistently taken on natural gas bills.

RESOLUTION

Whereas our attention has been directed to the fact that certain bills have been introduced in the U.S. Congress to amend the Natural Gas Act by releasing producers of natural gas from effective regulation by the Federal Power Commission; and

Whereas we have voiced our strongest opposition to such measures in the past because of the extremely adverse effect they would have on the prices paid by consumers of natural gas in our community as well as throughout the country; and

Whereas in the absence of effective regulation of all segments of the natural gas industry—producers, pipeline and distributing companies alike—the consumer is at the mercy of those who will charge what the traffic will bear; and

Whereas it is our duty and obligation to do all that we can to protect the consumers of natural gas in the city of Detroit from being charged unreasonably high prices; and

Whereas we are unalterably opposed to any measures which would remove any of the safeguards presently afforded such consumers by the provisions of the Natural Gas Act; and

Whereas it is imperative that public hearings be conducted on any bill proposing an amendment to the Natural Gas Act in order that those representing the consumer's interests be given an opportunity to be heard: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the corporation counsel be and he is hereby authorized and directed to take the appropirate action necessary to voice the city of Detroit's opposition to any proposed amendment to the Natural Gas Act which would adversely affect the consumers in the city of Detroit; be it further

Resolved, That our Michigan Senators and Congressmen be advised of Detroit's position in this regard and urged to join with Detroit

in opposition to any such amendments and voice their strong protest to any attempt to avoid public hearings on the merits of such amendments; be it further

Resolved, That the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Governor of Michigan, the Honorable Paul Adams, attorney general of Michigan, and the chairman and members of the Michigan Public Service Commission be advised of Detroit's position herein and urged to do all in their power to obtain public hearings and to prevent the passage of new amendments to the Natural Gas Act deemed detrimental to the consumers in Michigan, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all the above-mentioned officials and officers. Adopted unanimously.

The Gleaner and Journal—50 Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, if cities and communities are to progress they must be the recipients of up-to-date news coverage. The citizens of the Second Congressional District of Kentucky are fortunate in being served by newspapers whose editors and owners are men and women of exceptional ability and character, capable of disseminating the news in an interesting and unbiased manner. One of the outstanding newspapers in my district is the Gleaner and Journal, of Henderson, Ky. The Gleaner and Journal this month celebrated its 50th anniversary.

On February 9, 1909, Mr. Leigh Harris brought his family to Henderson, Ky., from the State of Illinois. Several weeks previously he had purchased a newspaper then called the Journal. Subsequently another newspaper in Henderson, known as the Gleaner, was consolidated with the Journal, and thus the Gleaner and Journal came into being. After arriving in Henderson, Mr. Harris' first editorial, now world famous, consisted of the following sentence:

I have come to Henderson to run a newspaper.

And until his retirement, in 1950, he ably edited and published the Gleaner and Journal. Mr. Harris possessed firm beliefs and convictions, but this fact did not deter him from imparting in his paper true facts and events as they actually transpired. He was a dedicated citizen, who gave of his talents, time, and efforts to the betterment of his community.

The two great interests in Mr. Harris' life were his newspaper and his family. Love for his work was only exceeded by devotion to his wife and children. And, fortunately, he has passed on to his children the freshness of the deep springs of life, a quality of imagination and vigor of emotions. His daughter, Francele Harris Armstrong, as editor of the Gleaner and Journal, is now guiding its policies with a firm and efficient hand.

Kentucky and the Second Congressional District owe a debt of gratitude to such gentlemen as the late Mr. Leigh Harris, who, in their journalistic capacities and through the medium of their newspapers, have made our communities and our entire Nation a better place in which to live.

Some Footnotes of History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, a form of negative sour grapes which is abroad in the world today—in which the man who does not succeed in any way in life calls the other fellow's success luck—received a real exposure in the Flint Journal of February 12. Using Abraham Lincoln, as the springboard for his remarks, the editor pointed out that while luck gave the first republican president opportunity, it did not give him his greatness. This is something a man chisels out in long chipping at the stone of wisdom. The great knowledge which Mr. Lincoln displayed in the White House he learned by living, reading, talking, and listening.

Young people today who believe that exposure to lectures in high schools and colleges will give them wisdom would do well to read this editorial and some of the less known facts of Lincoln's life and realize that these are only a first step to real learning.

I submit the attached editorial for inclusion in the RECORD.

SOME FOOTNOTES OF HISTORY

Three footnotes of history come to mind today as we observe the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

One is that Lincoln, although martyred by an assassin's bullet, was a special darling of fate. Another—most pertinent at this time because of our concern for education—is the way Honest Abe obtained his learning. Lastly, this date recalls the almost-forgotten fact that another man also gave an oration at Gettysburg.

Most Americans remember that Lincoln was elected President in 1860 and was reelected 4 years later. But few history books tell us how important a part chance, or luck, played in his nomination in 1860.

Lincoln was known nationally in 1860 but he was not the foremost candidate. He had been runner-up for the vice-presidential nomination in 1856 but, luckily, he did not win. The word lucky applies because the GOP team was defeated in 1856 and a defeated vice-presidential nominee was no better a presidential prospect in 1860 than today.

The historic Lincoln-Douglas debates of 1858 boosted Lincoln's standing with the party and made him the foremost Republican in Illinois. But he didn't carry a favorite-son label when his former campaign manager persuaded the party to hold its 1860 convention in Chicago because it was a neutral city in a State which did not have a candidate.

Lincoln later won the endorsement of the Illinois GOP convention. When the national convention got under way, his campaign managers were able to pack the galleries with Lincoln supporters, just as Franklin D. Roosevelt's backers did later.

Senator William H. Seward of New York was the front-runner in 1860. In another parallel with a recent convention, Seward's opponents sold GOP delegates on the idea that Seward can't win. The same thing happened to Senator Robert A. Taft in 1952.

The "can't win" label and the support of the galleries helped Lincoln win the nomination. The luck that was his in 1856, 1858, and 1860 helped him become President.

Luck did not make Lincoln a great President and a great humanitarian. But it opened the way for him to win election to the position in which he achieved greatness.

Lincoln was just about as short on formal education as he was long on luck in those years, but the lack of formal schooling did not prevent him from acquiring a great amount of useful knowledge.

Although Lincoln had to read by firelight, he developed to the utmost his learning potential. He drank up knowledge wherever and whenever he could. He learned by living, by reading, by talking, by listening. He had the desire to acquire knowledge and use it to the fullest.

Plenty of Lincoln's contemporaries were better educated, but it was Lincoln who became great. Lincoln had the talent to develop to the utmost the learning he gained from books and from just living.

No one is suggesting that Lincoln's method of education should be utilized in 1959. Extensive formal education is much more important now than in his time. But everyone can add to his knowledge and understanding by drinking eagerly from the sources of information which are available in everyday living.

The modern pooh-poohing of the other speech delivered at Gettysburg on November 19, 1863, is just one of the ways in which legend has eclipsed historical fact.

Almost every child who has memorized Lincoln's justly famous Gettysburg Address has done so with the idea that the day's main oration, by Edward Everett, was so poor and long that Lincoln's speech gained attention because of its brevity.

Lincoln's comments became a part of America's heritage because of greatness, not because Everett did so poorly.

Everett was one of the finest scholars and public speakers of his day. He spent 2 months preparing his address, which was a detailed analysis of the Battle of Gettysburg and its significance to the Union cause. Historians say it is a remarkably accurate and valuable account of the 3-day battle.

Lincoln's 2-minute speech is revered today, while Everett's 2-hour oration is ridiculed, because in those few words Lincoln painted a graphic picture of personal humility and devotion to the ideals of freedom.

Those characteristics are among the reasons Lincoln's greatness increases with each passing generation.

The Late Montgomery Phister

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish, first, to insert into the RECORD a resolution unanimously adopted on Jan-

uary 25, 1959, by the Assembly of the Legislature of the State of California, honoring the memory of the late Montgomery Phister, and in addition thereto, within a few words, to pay my own tribute to a great Californian and a great American, who passed away on last Christmas Day, December 25, 1958, at the age of 61, at the peak of his career.

Montgomery Phister was a lawyer, a banker, and an industrialist and a great civic worker, whose remarkable mental and physical energies were dedicated and expended primarily in the development and protection of American fisheries and the fishing interests of these United States. He served as vice president and secretary, as well as legal counsel, to the Van Camp Sea Food Co., Inc., formerly of San Pedro, Calif., and now of Long Beach, Calif.

Among many other posts, Mr. Phister served as a past president of the California Fish Canners Association, chairman of the American Bar Association's Committee on Fisheries and Territorial Waters, member of the State Committee on Natural Resources, member of the advisory committees to the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission, Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, and the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission. He was a leader in obtaining the special assistant for fisheries in the Under Secretary of State's Office, and the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife in the Department of the Interior. He was active in the establishment of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, the California Cooperative Oceanic Investigation, and the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.

He served as a member of the Fishery Products Committee of the National Canners Association from its inception, and was its chairman in 1958. He was elected to the board of directors of the National Canners Association in 1957.

It has been my privilege to know and work with Montgomery Phister here for the many years that I have been in public life. While not of the same political faith, I found him to be a great American and I can say that, in all my dealings, he was forthright, constructive, helpful, and cooperative in any matter which inured to the benefit of the public. On no occasion did he fear the truth nor did he withhold it. Nothing contributed more to his renowned trait of dependability nor to the highest esteem in which he was held by all who knew him. My district, the State of California, the Van Camp Sea Food Co., Inc., our Nation, and the fishing industry have lost a stalwart and substantial leader.

The resolution of the Assembly of the California Legislature is as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 45, RELATIVE TO THE PASSING OF MONTGOMERY PHISTER

Whereas the members of this house have, with profound sorrow and deepest regret, learned of the passing, on December 25, 1958, at the age of 61, of one of the most respected and loved leaders of the American fishing industry, Mr. Montgomery Phister; and

Whereas "Monty," as he was affectionately known by his host of friends and admirers, was born in Denver, Colo., on September 6, 1897, and it was California's good fortune that he came to this State in 1909; and

Whereas after receiving the degree of doctor of jurisprudence from the University of Southern California School of Law, he began the practice of law and rapidly developed a wide reputation, among fellow lawyers and the general public, as a competent, scholarly and fearless representative of his clients' interests; and

Whereas in 1937 he became associated with the Van Camp Sea Food Co. and thereafter advanced to the high office of vice president and secretary of that corporation; and

Whereas his accomplishments on behalf of the fishing industry were many, and some of his more noteworthy projects included the establishment of offices within the U.S. Department of State and the Department of Interior to deal with fisheries, the establishment of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission and the founding of the Fishermen's and Merchants' Bank, now a branch of the California Bank; and

Whereas Mr. Phister was unstinting in giving his time and energy to the service of his profession, his Government and his beloved fishing industry, having served as president of the California Fish Canners' Association, chairman of the American Bar Association's Committee on Fisheries and Territorial Waters, member of the California State Committee on Natural Resources and other boards and commissions too numerous to mention; and

Whereas this man was active in civic affairs at the local level, having served on the San Pedro Y.M.C.A. Board, the board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce and the mayor's committee on transportation; and

Whereas "Monty" has been the living example of those famous words of Theodore Roosevelt, "I would rather wear out than rust out"; and

Whereas it is fitting and proper that this house, as the representative of those people who have benefited from the services of this man, should honor him: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the members of this house desire to express their deep regret at the loss of so outstanding a citizen and adopt this resolution of testimony to his great contributions to his Government, his industry and his fellow men; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to his widow, Helga Phister, his two children, Montgomery Phister, Jr., and Mrs. Susan Holt, and to his brother, Henry Phister.

Alabama Press Association Resolution Deploring Action by the Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1959, in my remarks contained in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I called attention to the resolution adopted by the Alabama Press Association condemning the Washington Post and Times Herald for refusing to carry the Putnam letter as a paid advertisement.

So that the record will be complete, I have obtained a copy of this excellently written resolution and I ask unanimous consent that it, too, be included in the RECORD.

The APA resolution follows:

Whereas it is a fundamental tenet of this association that the American people have an inherent right to know every side of the great debates that take place in our society; and

Whereas the Washington Post and Times Herald, published in the Capital City of this great country, has heretofore been a leader in the fight for journalism freedom; but

Whereas the said Washington Post did recently deviate from its longstanding policy of upholding freedom of expression by rejecting a paid advertisement known as the Putnam letter; and

Whereas that letter set forth a strong argument by a reputable author and business executive contrary to the present policy of said newspaper in favor of mixing the races in the common schools of this country: Therefore this association, in convention assembled, does deplore and condemn the betrayal of the freedom of the press, or the right of the people to know all sides of a public issue, by the Washington Post management; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be given to the press for the information and enlightenment of all the citizens of the United States.

Man of the Ages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to be full of wonderment at the greatness of Abraham Lincoln in inspiring for nearly 100 years some of the most effective editorials in our daily press. The genius of the first Republican President transmits itself to the pens of the men who write about him. I submit herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, a particularly effective editorial in the Lansing State Journal of February 12, in which "the man of the ages" is the springboard for some very excellent editorial writing.

MAN OF THE AGES

Lincoln's greatness was recognized in his lifetime, even by many who hated him. The Union had been saved and the war won before the assassin struck. But at his death few men would have believed that generation after generation would find absorbing interest in his life and words and deeds.

On the 150th anniversary of his birth the stream of books about Lincoln in unceasing. Every line of his writings, almost all of his speeches have been published. Many of his jokes, every anecdote about him, the details of his domestic life, and much fable and fiction may be found in the many shelves of Lincoln biographies.

Each year brings notable new works. His wife and associates continue to interest the public. Some of this interest can be accounted for simply by the fact that he was the principal figure in the Nation's most tragic ordeal. Any man who had carried the United States successfully through that fearful crisis would have achieved immortality.

But there is more to the Lincoln legend. There is Abraham Lincoln.

An earthy personality was combined with a subtle intellect and a spirituality that had overtones of mysticism. To this was added, despite an absence of formal education, rhetorical skill that produced some of the most memorable prose in the English tongue. Here was a paradox, and the paradox is ever fascinating.

It was natural that some should write with a warmth of admiration that amounts to adulation. By this uncritical school Lincoln has been elevated to political sainthood, enshrined as a folk god.

But responsible scholarship has preserved the perspective, discussing freely what they regard as his faults. This objective approach to a towering figure has saved Lincoln from turning into marble or bronze.

The research has strengthened popular understanding of Lincoln's problems and motives. It has not diminished, but enhanced, his stature. It has confirmed the judgment that rates him one of the great men of all time.

Every man, on his own birthday, must look back on his past and wonder, a little or much, at what has happened to him. President Abraham Lincoln, on his 56th birthday, February 12, 1865—2 months before he was assassinated—must have marveled at the circumstances that had entrusted to him the leadership of the young republic during a civil war that threatened to destroy it, and with it the American dream.

He could recall his youth in the backwoods—as railsplitter, raftsman, store clerk, surveyor, volunteer soldier, student of law. He could live again through the events that made him a State legislator, member of the bar and rising trial lawyer, Representative in Congress, unsuccessful candidate for the U.S. Senate, and eventually the nominee of the new Republican Party for President.

Lincoln seemed to have had a mystic sense of being the instrument of a power too great and inscrutable for any man to understand. There was no pride in that feeling, only humility, but it was there. It is expressed in some measure in the second inaugural address, and it may be that Lincoln already had that great document well in mind on this day in the year 1865.

It is worth reading again, not only for the splendor of the passage beginning "With malice toward none" but for Lincoln's words on the causes of the conflict that he then knew to be ending. He also saw, that while the war was nearly over—and victory sure—the battle for freedom and justice is never fully won.

The Paragould, Ark., Kiwanis Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 9, Representative GEORGE P. MILLER placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most splendid report on the fine work of the Newark, Calif., Kiwanis Club. It was pointed out by Mr. MILLER that in the city of Newark the Kiwanis have devoted some 2,400 man-hours to civic and charitable endeavors.

This is characteristic of the Kiwanis Clubs of America. As indicative, may I call attention to the 2,983 man-hours of community building by the Paragould, Ark., Kiwanis Club. Paragould, located in Greene County, Ark., has three active civic organizations, of which the Kiwanis is one. During 1958, working together, the members of the Paragould Kiwanis Club devoted themselves to the following activities:

BOYS' AND GIRLS' WORK

First. Sponsored local Explorer Scout Troop furnishing advisor, institutional representative, committeemen, and financial aid.

Second. Sponsored little league baseball team and Pee Wee basketball team, furnishing uniforms, manager, and coaches.

Third. Sponsored Key Club at Paragould High School.

Fourth. Donated over 50 percent of all foodstuffs, toys, and clothing used by Goodfellows, Inc., for Christmas baskets.

Fifth. Served as "newsboys" selling papers for Christmas baskets.

Sixth. Fifty new toys donated to Goodfellows, Inc., for use in baskets for the needy.

Seventh. Leased 40 acres of wooded land with stocked pond for use of the scouts.

Eighth. Sponsored representative at Boys and Girls State.

Ninth. Gave registered Duroc pigs to deserving 4–H students.

Tenth. Kiwanian served as chairman for city's annual Christmas parade.

Eleventh. The club was the recipient of Kiwanis Appreciation Day give by high school.

Twelfth. Assisted in manning concession stands at football games.

Thirteenth. Assisted in fund drive for Boy and Girl Scouts.

PUBLIC AND BUSINESS AFFAIRS

First. A Kiwanian was selected as Citizen of the Year.

Second. Worked with local chamber of commerce in all civic affairs.

Third. Assisted with securing full-time employed for physically handicapped and students during summer months.

Fourth. Members manned gates for county fair.

Fifth. Met with county RCI clubs furnishing speaker on farm safety, soil conservation, and international farm exchange student.

Sixth. Participation in 4–H contests and banquets.

Seventh. Awarded an additional prize for 4–H pigs shown at county fair.

Eighth. Participated in Dairy Day.

VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE

First. Assisted school officials in setting up industrial tours.

Second. Presented club scholarship to outstanding student.

Third. Honored all local teachers with banquet, teachers appreciation.

Fourth. Recognized 10th-, 11th-, and 12th-grade honor students with scholastic achievement banquet.

Fifth. Furnished club counselors for students in selecting occupations.

SUPPORT OF CHURCHES

First. Furnished public eating places with prayer cards.

Second. Furnished hotels and motels with "Attend Church Regularly" signs.

Third. Members serve individual churches as officers, teachers, and lay speakers.

Fourth. Erected road signs urging church attendance.

The primary objective of the Kiwanians of Paragould is to serve underprivileged children. During 1958 the Kiwanis Club of Paragould bought shoes, clothing, groceries, school lunches, books, dental work, and glasses as a part of this program. The club paid graduation expenses for needy senior students as well as medical expenses of children and their transportation to the Crippled Childrens Hospital. Through the untiring efforts of the Kiwanis Club and with the assistance of a city noted for its generosity, 197 needy and indigent children received vital assistance.

And, what is the purpose behind all this work? I believe that President Walter J. "Bud" Branch, affable head of the Paragould Kiwanis Club, makes good answer:

> We ask not for commendation or reward but rather to offer thanks that we are in a position to give assistance, realizing but for the grace of God we could very well be the recipients of these things we now give to others.

These are the men who make America great. Voluntarily, and because of their faith in a God who inspires them, they work in Paragould—in Newark—and in other communities of this land to make a better life for their fellows.

Vigorous Supporter of Reclamation Takes Chair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Nation as a whole and we in the Congress are fortunate to have WAYNE N. ASPINALL as chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Chairman ASPINALL has a broad knowledge and understanding of all the matters within the jurisdiction of this committee. In particular, he is an expert in water matters and problems relating to development of our water resources. Upon many occasions he has expressed the necessity for continuing the orderly development of our water resources as a means of expanding and strengthening our national economy. He has been one of the most vigorous supporters of the Federal reclamation program and it is a pleasure for me, as chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee, to be associated with him in this field. Most reclamation areas and interests recognize their good fortune at having Mr. ASPINALL as committee chairman. As an example, I am cluding an editorial from the January 27, 1959, edition of the Yuma (Ariz.) Sun.

The editorial follows:

VIGOROUS SUPPORTER OF RECLAMATION TAKES CHAIR

Yuma farm and reclamation people will be interested in knowing more about the man who is the new chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. This is the committee which, among other items, deals with reclamation.

The new chairman is Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Colorado Democrat. He succeeds CLAIR ENGLE of California, now a Senator. ASPINALL is an expert in water and mining law. He also is a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

ASPINALL is a strong Democratic partisan. He frequently has been critical of the Republican administration's policies on natural resources. He has denounced the administration's ban on starting new water projects. Likewise he criticized Secretary Benson for his skepticism about bringing more land into cultivation while there are farm surpluses in this country. "Whenever this Nation refuses to take advantage of developing the frontier left in this country, then it is already showing signs of decay," he said.

ASPINALL is a strong believer in basin-wide development of water resources by the Federal Government. He startled a meeting of the National Reclamation Association in 1956 by calling the administration's "partnership" power program "partitionship." He said the private development of the Hells Canyon power sites dealt "a body blow" to the "maximum and comprehensive development of the Columbia basin."

ASPINALL is a veteran of many a legislative and legal fight over water. He is best known for his sponsorship of the law authorizing the $760 million Colorado River storage project, largest reclamation project ever authorized by Congress.

He favors continuing the 160-acre limitation on reclamation projects "as a general policy." However, he would relax it when a larger tract of land is necessary to support a family-size farm.

He does not favor a change in the present pay-out period of 40 years for water and power users to reimburse the Government for the construction of reclamation projects.

ASPINALL sponsored a law creating a new $10 million program to build five demonstration plants to desalt sea and brackish water—a program which some day can mean much to both California and Arizona.

This western Colorado Congressman presented to the House Appropriations Committee in 1958 a proposal for a long-range reclamation program to run at the rate of about $300 annually. ASPINALL said it was "designed to meet a real need * * * for a consistent rate of construction of reclamation projects if we are to obtain maximum benefits from our expenditures."

At the time, he recommended the start of eight new reclamation projects. Congress approved money for seven of them, and two others as well.

With Representative WAYNE ASPINALL as chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, reclamation interests can be assured of vigorous and forthright leadership.

One Style of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include, as of possible interest to the many friends the Honorable James A. Farley has made and retained outside his home State, an editorial which appeared in the Syracuse, N.Y., Post-Standard of January 17, 1959:

THE JIM FARLEY EXAMPLE: PRIMARY ELECTION REFORM VITAL

If Jim Farley had been nominated for U.S. Senator last year, he undoubtedly would have been elected.

Further, there is a distinct possibility that his popularity would have carried the State ticket for the Democrats. Governor Harriman might have been reelected.

But Mr. Farley was not nominated, even though he was the favorite candidate of the people. A good man was picked to run in his place, but he was not widely known and went down to defeat.

The bosses picked the candidates—and lost. If the party's voters had been given a voice in choosing them, they would have won the senatorial office at least.

Mr. Farley is known in every city and hamlet in New York State. The people like his warmth and sincerity, his integrity and fine principles; he was the logical man for the office but was passed by.

This case is an example of the need for an open primary system in New York State, to replace the closed system of conventions which shuts the people out and gives the bosses sole control of selecting nominees for office.

Under the open primary system, Mr. Farley would have obtained the necessary petitions in at least half of the counties of the State and would have been placed on the primary lists as a candidate. His selection as the one candidate to represent the Democratic Party would have been a foregone conclusion.

Had his strength been added to the ticket, it would have fared far better than it did.

Mr. Farley unquestionably would have been elected.

The Farley example shows not only how the State's people are shut out when it comes to picking nominees, but how a major political party can lose, as well.

Under the open primary system, which we should have in the State, independent candidates would be able to place their names before the voters more easily.

The voters would have a direct voice in selecting them. The present failure of primary elections would be overcome.

The power of the smoke-filled hotel room would be cut down to size. Political dictation would be stopped.

No one can say a good word about the existing primary elections and make it stand up. The system is a failure.

If open primaries were established, every weakness in the primary situation would be overcome.

The power of the political clique in control to put rubberstamp members on political committees would be ended.

The lack of interest in primary elections would be overcome.

The invisible but nonetheless strong link between politics and the underworld would be severed, at least partially.

Legislators and officeholders would be more independent and good Government would be strengthened.

The State needs the reform. Existing bills in the legislature to assure it deserve the strong support of every legislator.

It's time to get rid of the mock primaries we have now and replace them with constructive, useful ones.

Mr. Speaker, I also include an editorial which appeared in the New York (N.Y.) Mirror of January 24, 1959.

WHOSE BOSSISM?

The grass roots crusade started on the sidewalks of New York to re-create the State's Democrats more in the image of the New Deal-A.D.A. tradition is a fascinating development.

Former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and former Air Force Secretary Thomas K. Finletter are the originators of this venture, which is known as the New York State Committee for Democratic Voters but is referred to in some quarters, perhaps uncharitably, as the youth movement.

At any rate, it is aimed directly at Carmine De Sapio, Tammany leader and national committeeman, and not quite so directly at Michael H. Prendergast, Democratic State chairman.

The liberals, as represented by the above-named trio, are still smarting over the fact that New York District Attorney Frank S. Hogan got the nomination for U.S. Senator, backed by De Sapio, over the man of their choice, Finletter.

Hogan, in the face of the Rockefeller whirlwind, ran beautifully—far ahead of his ticket, indeed—but was defeated by the Republican senatorial candidate, Representative KENNETH B. KEATING. Any political realist must wonder whether Finletter could have made a better showing.

It is significant that former Governor Harriman, importuned by Lehman and Finletter to join the anti-De Sapio rebellion, is reported to have given a firm no and to have called the venture "ridiculous."

Harriman, of course, may remember how his own presidential hopes were scuttled by the liberals in favor of Adlai Stevenson in 1956, and he may sense that these same people would like to give Stevenson another go at it in 1960.

We may point out, on our part, that the liberals joined gleefully in the brushoff of that grand Democrat, James A. Farley, who also sought the Senate nomination and might just have been the man to win the seat.

In this tumultuous picture, conservative and left wing Democrats are alined against each other over what the latter calls the issue of bossism.

One can ask, Whose bossism?

Eric Sevareid Views Integration in Alexandria, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have inserted in the RECORD the very lucid and penetrating remarks of a most distinquished news analyst and well-recognized CBS commentator, Mr. Eric Sevareid. I am sure that many of my colleagues will agree with me that it is a tempting thought to place Mr. Sevareid's daily commentary in the RECORD on a regular basis.

On February 10, Eric Sevareid's radio broadcast brought to his listeners a close personal experience in the matter of school integration and a story far removed from the usually impersonal analysis of events of the day.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of that broadcast, as follows:

THE ERIC SEVAREID BROADCAST OF FEBRUARY 10, 1959

Good evening. This reporter has had his home, the last 13 years, in the Virginia city

of Alexandria; it is an old city, proud of its traditions and very southern; Washington laid out some of its streets as a young surveyor; its newspaper is the oldest daily paper in America. It can be hard for a community so imbued with and formed by the old and the past, to confront the new and the present.

But Alexandria did so this morning, because when the final test comes, the sharp wind of the here and the now generally prevails over the drifting mists of the past; three Alexandria public schools admitted Negro children to their classes. The adults kept their dignity; so did the white children, as far as is known; and so did the handful of Negro children, who walked, without trembling, through the early morning gantlet of officials, policemen and the staring knots of the curious.

One of the three schools is the new city high school, a quarter mile up the lane from my house. It was a lane; just a few years ago this was open country, outside the city limits; there was a scrub pine where the school now stands; a place for secret caves; a place the quail would fly into for refuge when you surprised them on the lane. If you knew the hidden path, as my boys did, it was a place to idle your pony and cool him off on the homeward stretch.

Schools take a time to build, country lanes a time to widen and pave; the change came gradually; and we have all been accustomed, for some time now, to the groups of children walking up the road in the morning frost, swinging their books, kicking an idle stone. I can remember no tension, no act of violence along that little road. This morning, there was the crowd, slightly tense; there were the policemen in their cars. There was trouble in the air and it was hard to bring back to mind the pine wood and the pony path. But the trouble did not erupt; and for selfish reasons also, one can be thankful for that; an ugly scene at that corner, I'm afraid, would have wiped out and forever replaced the more tender memories all of us there would prefer to keep.

So Negro children can walk along there, too, from now on, kicking an idle stone if the spirit so moves. I can remember when they had to ride a bus some 30 miles if they wished a high school education.

Perhaps it will be news to some in that old city if I say that this is not the first instance of racial integration in an Alexandria school. There is an elementary school there, a private, cooperative school, integrated now for several years; possibly the first integrated school of any kind in Virginia since Reconstruction days.

I know about this school because my wife and I were among the 12 families who founded it, the year after the war ended and the overcrowded public schools were in a bad way.

We decided at the start that if Negro kids wanted to come and their parents would pay and would work on the place like the rest of us—why, they could come. They have been coming for the last 9 years; about 20 of them, 1 year, as I recollect. When they started coming, there was no fuss; only 4 or 5 families dropped out; the school is bigger and better and more prosperous now than ever. We integrated that little school, not as a challenge to anybody, not as a precedent; just because it seemed a good thing to do, on behalf of our own children, who must learn to live, after all, in a country that doesn't belong to any particular group.

We had no trouble; those three public schools had no trouble today. Letting all little children go to the school nearest their homes doesn't have to bring the world to an end.

This is Eric Sevareid in Washington.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include in my comments a letter I have received from one of my constituents in Indiana, since it contains a compelling argument bearing on an issue which will confront us shortly—the matter of statehood for Hawaii.

On three occasions in the past I have voted for Hawaiian statehood and it occurs to me that had this legislation been approved before now the situation about which my correspondent writes might well have never come to pass.

Having just returned from the district in Indiana it is my privilege to represent, I can attest to the accuracy with which the writer describes conditions there.

The letter follows:

VALPARAISO, IND., *February 12, 1959.*
Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK,
The Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It was gratifying to learn of your recent elevation in the party which to some of us was an overdue recognition of leadership long since evidenced.

I will come quickly to the point of this letter which is to urge you to use the influence of your high office to obtain statehood at the earliest possible moment for beautiful Hawaii.

Although you are enjoying the comparative protection of District of Columbia's geographical location, you must be aware by now that your fellow Hoosiers have been suffering untold hardships from severe cold, snow, and flood conditions ever since Alaska was admitted to the Union.

Although our inclination at first was to rejoice with our new countrymen, it cannot be denied that wave upon wave of cold and icy blasts have descended upon the Second Congressional District of Indiana and elsewhere.

And while we were prone to welcome the Alaskans with open arms and warm heart, a "chill" has overtaken us, and a (change of) heart condition may develop.

Please do not regard the calamities that now beset us as being just punishment for the way Hoosiers acted at the polls last November. Be assured the Alaskan reveler strikes without regard to party line.

One way streets are at an all time high. Icebergs outline the business districts of Indiana towns. Automobile graveyards are mushrooming. Pedestrian traffic may soon overtake mobile units. With humor running low, those not yet bitten by Jack Frost are being bit by fellow Hoosiers.

No doubt it will seem elementary for me to mention at this point that the one ray of hope for the relief of your people is the hope that emergency action will be taken by the Congress to quickly admit our greatest possession. And when the people of Hawaii are overcome by joy at this long awaited action, great waves of warm balmy air will emanate from their good will, the icy northern blasts will be dispelled, and the people of Indiana will once more be able to resume normal, useful lives.

CHARLEY, the people of the Second Congressional District, whom you have taken such good care of for the past 20 years, are now looking to you to save them from the worst plight to afflict them since you first went to Washington. This may prove to be your finest achievement. Don't wait.

Cordially,

ED JOHNSON.

Senator Morgan's Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, development of Alabama's vast potential of waterways is destined to become a reality. One of the greatest of these waterways, the Coosa-Alabama, is seeing some of this development at the present time. This was envisioned by an outstanding Alabamian, the late John Tyler Morgan, who served in the Congress as a distinguished Senator.

An editorial on this subject recently appeared in the Anniston (Ala.) Star, and I ask under unanimous consent for it to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

MORGAN'S DREAM IS COMING TRUE

Hardly had he doffed his uniform as a general in the Army of the Confederacy, before the great John Tyler Morgan, later to become U.S. Senator, hung up his shingle as an attorney at law on the square in Jacksonville and began to talk about the development of the Coosa-Alabama River.

That was before he had been to France and other European countries as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. But following his observations of the waterway uses in the Old World he became more interested than ever in the development of our own streams.

On one occasion during a political rally at Oxford Lake he made a rousing address and predicted the time would come when the waters of the Coosa would be brought to our doorstep here in Anniston by means of the canalization of the Choccolocco Creek, just as Houston, Tex., did later by tapping the waters of Galveston Bay.

But a cursory investigation a few years ago proved tentatively that the Choccolocco Creek project was geologically impracticable. Yet with the developments now taking place on the Coosa Dam sites, we will be near enough to take advantage of river traffic and industrial water.

This was called to our mind by reason of the Tennessee Dock having been authorized by the State at Decatur. It is of interest to note, too, that Memphis and Nashville river docks add greatly to their economy.

And in a progress edition of The Spokesman Review, published at Spokane, Wash., there are pictures in the magazine section that show ports on the Columbia-Snake Rivers now numbering 33, and they carry cargo that is valued in many millions every year.

We eventually will profit likewise and not only bring to pass the dream of our great Senator Morgan with respect to river traffic, but also realize his long battle for an interoceanic canal at Lake Nicaragua, as Panama is now becoming obsolete in several respects.

As is well known, the great project that Morgan conceived and fought for so many

years would have been consummated but for the ambitions of Teddy Roosevelt and New York lawyers who represented the French interests that attempted to build a canal at Panama but failed.

This paper happens to know that countries adjacent to or abutting Nicaragua are giving serious consideration to a revival of the project that Morgan formed. And it is not inconceivable that a sea-level canal could be constructed as a consequence of more modern imaginary genius.

Thirty Years Ago Today I Landed on the North Plains of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my dear and good friend, Mr. J. H. Nichols, of Spearman, Hansford County, Tex., is a gentleman of great heart. He is one of the pioneers of the Southwest and came to the great Panhandle of Texas 30 years ago this month. He has penned his worthwhile comments on the Panhandle scene in that period which are, at the same time, notable for their generality and their succinctness. These notes were published in the Spearman (Tex.) Reporter on January 22, 1959, and I insert them herein under unanimous consent:

THIRTY YEARS AGO TODAY I LANDED ON THE NORTH PLAINS OF TEXAS

(By J. H. Nichols)

There has been oceans of water run under the bridges, since I crossed the Mississippi River headed west. Thirty marks on the calendar, which means I have passed up 30 mile posts, and the time has flown by like a weaver's shuttle. As we look back over our past life, we wonder where it has gone and what we have done with it. What have we accomplished? Nothing of any worth as we look at it. The mountains stand still but Old Man River rolls on. We take up our pictures from childhood and look at them, and see the many changes there have been, then we are reminded we are living in a different world. You see the family together; now they are most of them gone over the river of Jordan. Some are scattered and we seldom ever see them. If we did not live in another world, from that we lived in as children, what would life be anyway? I could not have made it if I had not had a father and mother to take care of me when I was a little barefooted boy. Now I am on my own, and they have gone to their reward. This has changed the scenery around the old landmark as a boy, moving out in all directions of the United States has given me a different scenery on the beauties of this old world. The world has been better to me than I have been to the world. I have enjoyed every step of the way, some of it has been rough and rocky and uphill. These experiences make us enjoy the long streched out road on the endless prairies in the western country. For the benefit of those who may read this span of thirty years I am going to only touch on some of the high places, time and space will not permit me to try to go into detail on some of the heartbreaking experiences I have had in the span of time when I arrived and now. This western country has completely revolutionized its self here in three decades. There is no more nor less acres of land, but there has been such a change it is hard to recognize them.

History will bear me out on this statement, I have seen the same section of land bought and lost several times. Today you cannot get anyone to price his land. Real estate men were on every corner in these western towns begging you to buy this land. Now they are begging you to price your land.

Those who have it know it is sold, if they even price it at any price. Less than one-half of a century ago you could file on this land. The oil industry has revolutionized this country. Wagon trails across the open prairies then and paved highways now. The spring roundups with horses in the spring to brand the cattle has changed to cattle following jeeps and pickups to get their feed. They will follow their herds into the corral and there is where they are branded in the shute. With the good wheat pasture and the care of good cowmen they can put a good beef on the market as they take them off of the cows. They can put four beeves on the market in 1 year as large as they used to put a 4-year-old steer on the market. Things have been speeded up. Irrigation has whipped the drought years down when it comes to having crop failures. When I read in the Bible the desert shall blossom as the rose I have seen this prophecy come true in this short span I have been here. Towns and cities have sprung up overnight here in the West. We find gas wells furnishing our towns, where they once picked up cow chips for fuel. Kindling was a premium when I came here on a cold morning to start a fire. Today I cannot give away a truckload of kindling. Wood is as obsolete for fires here, where we have gas, as a double-shovel plow. There is no more market for oxyokes unless someone wants to hang one over his place of business as an old relic. Model T's are only used in parades on rodeo days to show the progress here in the West and for the best.

When a southern or an eastern man comes to this country on the North Plains of the Panhandle of Texas, and he looks in front of him and the earth and sky meets. He has gone his limit until he puts on some field glasses which will lengthen his vision. When he looks down the railroad and he sees the rails running together, his eyes have gone their limit. With all the progress in 30 years here in the west, it is unbelievable. Yes, we miss the hills, mountains, creeks and valleys back east and south. These bubbling springs always make us want to go back and get a cold drink out of them and refresh our boyhood days. I have had a drink of water from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific and from Canada to Old Mexico. God being my judge there is no better water in the world than this deep well water on the north plains. To see irrigation running like a creek when we are accustomed to dust storms over the same ditch, which has revolutionized farming industry here in the west. Would I be stretching my imagination to say this North Plains is the garden spot of the world? Water the plains down and turf it down we will not see it changing hands in a dust storm any more. This land is too valuable to blow away. The soil conservation has been doing all they can to stop erosion and they have done a capital job of it. Many a farmer who lost his land during the dust-bowl days. When he left his land looking like it was following him in a dust storm. This gave the Panhandle the name of the dust-bowl. Scientific farming will change it to the garden of Eden. There is not a healthier country in the world. The wind takes care of the heat in the summer time, and in the winter the blizzards are soon passed over. People are not eat up here with chiggers and ticks. It is a good saying you cannot get all the coons up one tree for they will not all go up there. Very few of our southern people if they should arrive here during a dust storm would have this country. Some of the northern capitalist evidently saw great gain here and a great future for this country. They bought it in blocks. They believed this was the coming country of the United States. Others, all they saw was prairie dogs and jackrabbits and hearing the coyotes howl all night and they were willing to leave it to them. They saw the skeleton of the buffaloes lying in the sand and their bones bleached by the burning sun. They thought all of these wild animals starved to death and they better get out. This was only a testimony of the waste of the white man who robbed the Indians of their happy hunting ground. There are still signs of buffalo wallows and Indian battle grounds here. There is no country in the world which has made the progress since the turn of the century as this western country of the Panhandle of Texas, has made. The "headers" and the old threshing machines have been parked in the fence corners. The combines have taken their place. There is no more need for horses here, for the tractors have put them in the museum, when it comes to hauling loads and riding them to town. The automobile and good roads have kept the horses in the pasture, what are left here. This country has been one of the greatest opportunities for progresive people of any country in the world. This is still a coming country for men with vision and capital to put their vision in motion. There is not a doubt the opportunities here haven't scratched the surface on what is here. We all know the oil is here for it is being produced in abundance. God only knows how many more hidden treasures there are here which man knows nothing about. We read the stories about men getting lost in the west. Now you never get out of sight of a tall grain elevator which looks like they will punch a hole in the sky; with a light on them to bring any man home out of the dark they stand as a beacon light.

There is something majestic about an open country which gives elbowroom and man can reason and think and bring some of these thoughts to the hearts and minds of people. Laura V. Hamner is a living testimony of a woman who loves the history of the West, and she has always said, "light and hitch with me. The Panhandle is the grandest spot on earth." I believe she is right. We can always get our eyes full when we look toward the mountains. Our imagination will run on after our eyes have played out here on the endless prairies. Amen. This is the white spot of the world. Eastern industry and capital have their eyes on this section and they will move in and develop the natural resources God had depostied here for the advancement of the world. When some one said there would be 60,000 people here in the next 10 years, this is not prophecy for the people will come to develop the natural resources as they are discovered. This will naturally revolutionize the farming industry. All this country needs is water and it is here and they have learned how to lift it out of the ground and spread it on the dry ground, which has proven a great step up in production. When the real estate man would say they are not making any more land, we all knew they were right, but we have learned to make more on what is already made. The time may come when more people will live on 50 acres of land, and live better than they are living on a section now. Waste land is like dormant ability going to waste, no one is getting any benefit out of it. Waste water is destructive to both man and the community. Conserve the soil and the water for the coming generation. Leave it better than you found it. This country shows what it can do for the people. The people show the world what

they can do with this country where they have the opportunity. The golden opportunity has always been here. The Indians never did and they never would have developed the natural resources which are here today. They said the oil was here but if they took it out of the ground the world would go to creaking; it must stay there to grease the axle tree of the world. They might have been right for something has started this old world to cracking. This country could be layed underneath with uranium and other metals we know nothing about. The churches and good buildings, schools, and roads have made the greatest stride of any country I know anything about. Men with money and vision have never come from the dugout, which they owe their allegiance to, those who stayed here when only he-men and fearless women would stay and develop a country. They paved the way to prosperity. This town has some of the best residences in it of any town west of the Mississippi River and east of the Rockies. We have a cosmopolitan class of people who have the Anglo Saxon background in them who come from every nook and corner of the world. There are no finer people on earth than the people who moved out in the West to have elbowroom. They have developed a new country and this country had developed a class of people who have seen the dreams of their forefathers; saw when it was hard to settle up a new country. It is not bragging to be a Texan, it is good to be an adopted son or daughter of one of the grandest States in the United States. We will still hold to the old traditional thought, Texas is the largest State in the United States. We only think of Alaska as a foreign country which has been annexed to the United States. It is not bragging and boasting to say we are proud and glad to be a Texan. We can all say this and only stating facts, and not bragging and boasting. It is the people in other parts of the United States who are sailing under false colors; they think every man living in Texas has a ranch and oil wells. They think everybody is rich just because we have the natural resources here that makes this the richest State in the Union. Think of this. It is good to be here.

Forty-first Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join many of my colleagues in marking this 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Despite the tramp of the Soviet military boot which has echoed over Lithuania since 1939, the people of Lithuania, and of the other nations now ruled by Russia through force, live with hope and memory. Their hope is for the day when they and their children will have a second Lithuanian Independence Day to mark the day when the Soviet rule will be thrown off. Their memory is of the years of freedom from this day 41 years ago until the black day in 1939 when the Russians moved in to rule with steel.

I join my colleagues in sending greetings to the people of Lithuania wherever they are on this memorable anniversary. May their ideals and memories stay alive, may their courage and hope never fail them. If there is right in this world, the people of Lithuania will someday be able to know freedom and independence again.

Even If They Die, We Make Our Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the American Cancer Society refuses to test Krebiozen alleging that the double blind test plan is not a scientifically valid plan for conducting an objective and meaningful evaluation.

What tommyrot. The American Cancer Society collects millions of dollars of public moneys to find a cure for the treatment of cancer; and if not a cure, a scientific area of a type of research to develop studied methods of the control of cancer. And presently, an avenue of study is open—a biologically active substance derived from the injection of a mold in animals—the effect of Krebiozen on the cancer victim is known to 500 medical men who used it on their patients, terminal cases; and several research scientists, Dr. Andrew Ivy, Dr. Stevan Durovic, the discoverer of Krebiozen, and others. Yet the American Cancer Institute knowing of the volcanic eruption in Illinois caused by the suppression of Krebiozen research over 7 years ago and the public hearings conducted by the Illinois Legislature joint committee and commission, broadcast all over the Nation by leading commentators; books written; debates on radio and television broadcasts.

And the American Cancer Society for some reason was not interested. And is not interested now. But on the other hand refuses to approve the test of Krebiozen advanced by Dr. Andrew Ivy because it might prove that the American Medical Association's report on Krebiozen was false, that certain officials of the American Medical Association had perpetrated a fraud on the public—and changed the results of successful scientific findings by forgery.

At the termination of the present negotiations between the National Cancer Institute that stepped in the breach, and Dr. Andrew Ivy representing the Krebiozen Research Foundation—if no agreement is reached and nothing is done; then by proper Federal enactment I shall ask for an investigation of this entire matter. It is a sad commentary on the American History of Research in Science that a handful of pseudo medics, politically appointed members of the official family of the American Medical Association; can "ham string" a whole nation with false and forged evidence; and by vicious pressures prevent the honest scientific research, for the evaluation of a drug, whose merit as a biologically active substance is conceded by hundreds of medical men. Also over 50 terminal case patients are living testimonials to the scientific results obtained in the use of this drug administered by brave God fearing doctors, members of the same society, working for humanity in the secret underground of the medical world.

STATEMENT OF KREBIOZEN RESEARCH FOUNDATION REGARDING AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY RELEASE OF REJECTION

The Krebiozen Research Foundation is astonished at the refusal of the American Cancer Society to test Krebiozen and the reasons given for their action.

The American Cancer Society based its refusal to test Krebiozen on the assertion that the double blind controlled experiment we proposed does not provide "a scientifically valid plan for conducting an objective and meaningful evaluation."

At the invitation of the American Cancer Society to submit a proposal for a fair evaluation of Krebiozen the Foundation and Dr. Ivy proposed that a committee of outstanding scientists be chosen half by the American Cancer Society and half by the Krebiozen Research Foundation and that the members thus chosen select a fifth member of the committee.

This committee was to select 200 terminal cancer patients and administer Krebiozen to 100 of them, while giving the other 100 plain mineral oil. Neither the doctors nor the patients were to know who were receiving Krebiozen. A comparison of the two groups of patients at the end of the period would determine whether or not Krebiozen had shown any effect. Such a double blind controlled test has historically been accepted by science as the best method to evaluate a treatment with a minimum of prejudice and subjective impressions by either the physician giving the drug or the patient receiving it.

Therefore, the American Cancer Society is not accurate in stating that "the proposal does not provide a scientifically valid plan for conducting an objective and meaningful evaluation." A double blind experiment is in reality a machine for the exclusion of prejudice, professional misjudgment and human error and records only the facts. Science has yet to devise a better or more accurate method of evaluating a new form of therapy.

Neither is the contention valid that "the proposal does not provide for the trial to be conducted by an independent group of clinical investigators recognized as being objective and competent by the scientific community at large."

When we proposed that half of the members of the evaluating committee be chosen by the American Cancer Society can it be supposed that the American Cancer Society would not select competent and objective investigators? Or does the American Cancer Society suggest the committee would lose its independence because of Dr. Ivy's presence? It is equally inaccurate that the proposed test provides no clear-cut standards for measuring either the results desired or defining or measuring the results obtained. Since we propose to measure the effects of the drug by comparing the patients who rereived it with the patients who did not, this method would not only show whether Krebiozen is active but would measure precisely in terms of relief of pain and diminution or disappearance of tumor, how great or small that activity might be.

The statement that the test does not permit an opportunity to determine whether physicians generally can obtain the same results since it provides for the administration of the drug by the proponents only, is meaningless in this connection. The question at issue here is whether the drug is active or not. If it is active it will give the same results in every physician's hands when used

as prescribed. For the last 7 years physicians in all parts of the United States working independently of each other have uniformly obtained the same percentage of beneficial results.

We proposed that Dr. Ivy administer the drug because he has the widest experience with it and the most exact knowledge of the dosage required in different cases. Furthermore, we felt that it was proper to suggest Dr. Ivy since every scientists is entitled to the opportunity to demonstrate his scientific claims.

The American Cancer Society has stated that it is currently testing hundreds of indifferent drugs merely on the possibility that they may be found to have some activity against cancer. It is difficult to understand why they should refuse to test this one alone which at least has the evidence of some hundreds of physicians as to its activity in the cancer patient. Furthermore, this evidence shows that out of 300 terminal cancer patients approximately 50 are now cancer-free by all known tests.

The reasons given by the American Cancer Society fail to justify its refusal to test Krebiozen and reveal an unwillingness to end the controversy over this drug.

The American Cancer Society has withheld its decision on our proposal for many months and gives it only now when we are already discussing with the National Cancer Institute arrangements to perform substantially the same test under Government auspices.

STEVAN DUROVIC, M.D.
(For the Krebiozen Research Foundation.)
CHICAGO, ILL., *October 24, 1958.*

Reporter Harold Hutchings, of the Chicago Tribune, gives the American Cancer Society's version of its position in the controversy—like the babbling brook—its opposition goes on forever; similar to the opposition of the American Medical Society. I wonder if their purposes are parallel:

REJECTS IVY'S PLAN FOR TEST OF KREBIOZEN—CANCER SOCIETY GIVES THREE REASONS

(By Harold Hutchings)

NEW YORK, October 24.—The American Cancer Society's board of directors voted Friday against a proposal that it conduct a test of the drug Krebiozen. The proposal had been made, February 10, 1958, by Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, head of the department of clinical science at the University of Illinois, and the Krebiozen Research Foundation.

Krebiozen is a controversial substance claimed to have properties for the treatment of cancer patients. It was extracted from a horse blood serum by its owner, Dr. Stevan Durovic, a Yugoslav physician now residing in Chicago.

The American Cancer Society's board took action in its annual meeting here.

NO VALID EVALUATION PLAN

The decision was in effect an approval of a report by the society's medical and scientific committee on the Krebiozen Research Foundation.

The board held that the proposal for testing krebiozen does not provide a scientifically valid plan for conducting an objective and meaningful evaluation, according to an official press statement.

It was noted that full consideration had been given by the board not only to the krebiozen proposal, but also to the recommendation made in connection with it by the American Cancer Society's advisory committee on research on the therapy of cancer, the research advisory council and the committee on new or unproved methods of treatment of cancer.

THREE POINTS IN DECISION

Three points in support of its decision were cited by the board as showing how unsatisfactory the krebiozen proposal was:

1. The plan does not provide for the trial to be conducted by an independent group of clinical investigators recognized as being objective and competent by the scientific community at large.

2. It does not permit an opportunity to determine whether physicians generally can obtain the same results since it provides for the administration of the drug by the proponent only.

3. It provides no clear standard for measuring either the result desired or the finding or measuring the results obtained.

New Bethlehem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress whose district or any part of it is plagued by unemployment will be vitally interested in an editorial broadcast February 1 by Jerome R. Reeves, general manager of KDKA-TV in Pittsburgh. It is the account of a courageous and determined community which—during an economic low point marked by joblessness, poverty, and frustration—found the necessary imagination and leadership to undertake an aggressive industrialization campaign that is inspiring all cities and towns within hearing distance of this success story.

New Bethlehem, population 1,604, is 75 miles northeast of Pittsburgh, with a good number of the residents of this community belonging to the 22d Congressional District. Mr. Reeves' editorial, though brief, describes the efforts of New Bethlehem's businessmen so expertly that I shall not attempt to supplement it. Needless to say, we are proud of what has been accomplished and of the attention that has come to this community.

Some of the approaches used in New Bethlehem to attract new business are original and unique, yet townsmen did not attempt to keep their ideas a secret. They are happy to have their strategy recounted for the benefit of other areas that have been stricken by shutdowns and idleness, and I invite my colleagues to relay this story to surplus labor areas in their own districts. Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Reeves' editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

NEW BETHLEHEM POINTS THE WAY

(An editorial by Jerome R. Reeves, general manager, KDKA-TV, broadcast February 1, 1959)

Good afternoon and think you for spending the afternoon with channel 2.

All of us know and realize the terrible tragedy much of western Pennsylvania and Ohio suffered in the recent flood, and although it will never seem so to the people whose homes were lost or damaged—it may well be a blessing in disguise. It has established the need and urgency of upstate flood protection and there is little likelihood of further delays.

But the flood that we want to talk about for a few moments is the flood of unemployment that has literally chased thousands of families from their hometowns. The flood of unemployment is a sinister, creeping paralysis that has been with us for a long time and cannot be explained away by the 1958 recession, or for that matter, by any recession.

Governor Lawrence in his inauguration address labelled this as our major problem in the Commonwealth. Specifically, he said that Pennsylvania has a series of economic problems, many years in the making, that can bring us a grave crisis in the future if we don't learn to act together and act now.

Nearly 12 percent of our labor force of more than a million people were without jobs. In the last 25 years, the number of manufacturing plants in the four adjacent counties to Pittsburgh increased only half as much as similar areas throughout the Nation. Allegheny County actually lost manufacturing plants—500 plants, to be exact.

We are not keeping pace with the industrial growth of the Nation, nor are we diversifying and creating employment to soften the blows of the slumps in coal and railroading.

Many of you live in towns faced with severe economic troubles. A few of you live and work in towns that face a bright, prosperous future. When you look at communities which have solved their problems you find only one thing. The people and the town helped themselves.

How can you do it in your town? Well, let's take a look at a pretty good example.

This is New Bethlehem, Pa., some 75 miles northeast of Pittsburgh—population 1604.

Over the years the town had only a small lumber company, a little peanut butter firm that wandered in after the war, and several modest tile and firebrick firms—and on the deficit side, a rapidly depleted strip mining industry. They had an unemployment problem, and were designated a surplus labor area. Their youngsters grew up and graduated from school and those who didn't migrate just didn't find jobs.

This is a pattern not unlike hundreds of other towns within the range of the channel 2 signal.

But in New Bethlehem businessmen became tired of singing the blues and wringing their hands, and in 1953 they set out to do something about their predicament.

Their first step was to form a "New Industry Committee" and they had every businessman include in the envelope of every bill paid to suppliers a note with a pointed question: "Is your firm thinking of expanding? If so, let us know about it." The committee button-holed every salesman who came to town and asked the same question.

In 1954, roughly 1 year later, Milo Palaggo and his partner Joseph Constable, who operated the J and M Furniture Co., popped the question to Joe Schaffer—a salesman for Crawford Furniture Co. Mr. Schaffer responded in the affirmative: "Yes; we are thinking of expanding."

Charley Leech, the town's industrial committee secretary, promptly arranged a meeting with Clyne Crawford, president and owner of the Crawford firm in Jamestown, N.Y.

Meetings were held. Crawford was impressed, impressed with the labor pool, the nearness of hardwood such as maple, cherry, and oak. Mr. Crawford was also a man of action and said if the town would build him a 70,000 square foot building they'd set up operations in New Bethlehem.

The town then formed the New Bethlehem Area Development Corporation, with W. C. Martin as president, Dean Bowersox as vice president, W. K. Millison as treasurer, and Charley Leech as secretary and moving force.

Their first move was to go to the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., of Boston, where they obtained a $360,000 loan. Then they went to the townspeople to sell bonds, with each merchant urged to buy at least a thousand dollars worth, but no more than 10. One hundred and forty people bought $292,000 worth of bonds. A 30-acre site on the edge of town was secured.

To finish the building the group went to the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority and obtained $60,000.

On July 1, 1955, New Bethlehem celebrated the opening of the $700,000 plant, the first hardwood manufacturing plant north of the Mason-Dixon line since the First World War.

It is now running in two shifts with jobs for close to 200 men.

Most towns would have been satisfied to slow down at this point, but whetted by their initial success, the committee threw itself into the development of 25 additional leads. One of them, turned up by the West Penn Power Co., was the Hawthorne Manufacturing Co. of Youngstown, Ohio, which was looking for a relocation site.

Well, you perhaps guess by now, Hawthorne did relocate. The development committee obtained an eight-acre site, the New Bethlehem Bank put up $75,000 first mortgage money, the State industrial development authority $45,000, and the townspeople bought $30,000 worth of bonds.

Did New Bethlehem stop here? They did not. They kept plugging away and New Bethlehem hit the jackpot as these things go by landing the Rola Co. of Cleveland—an electronics firm employing mostly women for intricate bench work. Four hundred and seventy people responded to the first employment ad.

Rola came to New Bethlehem for two important reasons: the labor pool of female workers, and a low interest loan for their building.

The First Senace Bank & Trust Co. came up with a 4½-percent first mortgage loan for $125,000. The local people secured this loan with the original Crawford Furniture plant, which freed the same amount of town money earning 2 percent when the Rola loan would average out a 3¼ return. The high finance isn't as complicated as it may sound. It's a simple process of the townspeople converting or shifting their resources to finance manufacturing plants in their area. Beside the employment and economic considerations of the actions, the money lended earns hard cash dividends in terms of interest.

And here we are. New Bethlehem, population 1,600, created 500 new jobs with an annual payroll of over $2 million a year. And they did it in the last 5 years.

New homes have been built. Not so many people commute elsewhere for employment, and the high school graduate has a better opportunity of earning a living in his home town.

What's the formula? Well, you need cooperative property owners who are willing to sell land at a fair price. You need low real estate and occupational taxes to attract outside firms. You need a group of energetic people in your community to aggressively seek out potential industry. You have got to make decisions fast and not get trapped in your own red tape.

And as Charley Leech so aptly puts it, "and any community willing to put their money where their mouth is can do it."

To this, KDKA television says a solemn amen for every town in the channel 2 area.

If you think your town can use any of the material used in my remarks, along with additional research data pin-pointing the New Bethlehem story, kindly write me here at KDKA Television, No. 1 Gateway Center, and we will be happy to supply it.

Thank you very much.

A few samples of immediate response from the towns:

FEBRUARY 1, 1959.

DEAR SIR: I heard your broadcast on community development this afternoon and I didn't even want to wait for tomorrow to write. It was quite an inspiration.

I was just elected president of the Dunbar Community Development Association just formed 2 days ago. We are or rather were a small town with an advanced case of ennui as far as progress was concerned. Now we have taken the first treatment toward recovery. But what a long, long convalescence ahead. How can you impress, inspire, drive a patient that appears happy being ill. * * *

Please send us all you can that might help.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. ROCKWELL, Jr.

DUNBAR, PA.

EAST LIVERPOOL, OHIO, *February 2, 1959.*

Mr. JEROME R. REEVES,
KDKA–TV, Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR SIR: Please send information from your talk on Sunday's program about the small town (New Bethlehem) which located new industries.

I will be grateful for your help and will turn the information over to those who will make use of it. Thank you.

Mrs. ALICE BANKS.

BENTLEYVILLE, PA., *February 1, 1959.*

Mr. JEROME R. REEVES,
KDKA–TV, Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR SIR: I have heard part of your program on Channel 2 today and I would like to have the information on community development and how to get the town folks interested enough in their community.

Thank you.

Mrs. FRANK DOCHENETZ.

Y.E.L.P. SERVICE, INC.,
East Liverpool, Ohio, February 2, 1959.

KDKA–TV,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

GENTLEMEN: Yesterday, February 1, at 5 p.m. on channel 2, I happened to catch the end of a program I believe entitled the "New Bethlehem" program. It was on the order of an editorial with respect to community development.

I believe it was noted that further information with respect to programs for community development could be obtained by writing to your station.

I am deeply interested in community development in this East Liverpool area and if you have any information that could be forwarded to me I would greatly appreciate it. If any cost is connected it will be taken care of promptly.

Thanks for your kind cooperation.

Very truly yours,

ALVIN T. BABB,
Vice President.

A Program To Retire the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I am including under leave to extend my remarks two editorials which appeared in the Fort Worth Star Telegram last Wednesday, February 11. One appeared in the Morning Star Telegram, and the other was published in the Evening Star Telegram.

These editorials relate to the proposal I advanced last week for a systematic program to retire the national debt in not more than 100 years.

This proposal has evoked favorable editorial comment generally throughout the country, but the thing which distresses me is that most such comments seem to proceed upon the assumption that Congress will do nothing about this. I am certain that the country would be glad to have this Congress dispell any such cynicism as to our intentions by taking affirmative action:

[From the Fort Worth Morning Star-Telegram, Feb. 11, 1959]

HUNDRED YEAR PLAN

Representative WRIGHT, sounding like a voice in the wilderness, has proposed a plan for retiring the huge national debt on a gradual and orderly basis. It calls for yearly repayment of not less than 1 percent of the present indebtedness. That would mean about $2.8 billion annually, in addition to interest, but in 100 years "the debt would be completely paid and the slate wiped clean."

This plea must have brought a stunned silence in the halls of Congress, where cries of "spend, spend" echo constantly. For at the time, Representative WRIGHT's colleagues were preoccupied with discussions of further Federal spending, which inevitably would increase, not reduce, the monstrous national debt. There was talk of more money for housing, more for aid to airports, more for schools and education and more for defense.

Nearly all these projects have merit, though in most cases the proposed allocations are ridiculously extravagant, but none is more worthy than the national defense. And this was one on which the Fort Worth Congressman pinned his appeal. Now the country is struggling to buy each year from 30 to 40 B–58 bombers with the $9.8 billion in interest the debt soon will cost annually, more than 700 of these super-weapon systems could be bought, he pointed out.

Of course, the interest still would have to be met even if regular payments on the principal were to be set up. But as the principal went down, the interest also would fall. Before many years, the savings in interest would offset the debt payments, and the benefits would be realized long before the final installment was paid a century from now. The psychological effect of a determined effort to remove this staggering load from the Nation's shoulders would be an immediate boon to the country's economic health.

The chatter over the various spending proposals no doubt was resumed in the Capitol, as soon as Congressmen had recuperated from their initial shock, but it can be hoped that Representative WRIGHT has planted a seed that may one day germinate and bear fruit. For if it should, the Nation's future could—despite any temporary inconvenience imposed by the payments—be pictured in a considerably less dismal light.

[From the Fort Worth Evening Star-Telegram, Feb. 11, 1959]

THE NATIONAL DEBT SHOULD BE PAID

What with Walter Reuther demanding increased Government spending and the proposed next Federal budget already thrown out of balance by Congress, the prospects for approval of Congressman WRIGHT'S resolution for orderly retirement of the national debt do not seem very promising.

But even in introducing the proposal the Texas Representative has performed a public service, for he has reminded the American people of the tremendous weight of debt under which the National Government is attempting to operate and of the necessity of reducing it if ultimate bankruptcy is to be avoided.

Congressman WRIGHT'S proposal, despite the poor light in which his colleagues are likely to regard it, is eminently practical. It calls for retirement of the $285 billion debt over a period of 100 years at a rate of $2.8 billion a year.

Before other Members of the Congress dismiss the suggestion as politically undesirable and a poor substitute for vote-wheedling spending programs they should reflect upon what the political situation may be if the debt continues to rise and repudiation becomes the only way out.

The fact that an entire century would be required under the Wright resolution to correct what war and governmental irresponsibility have brought about in a quarter of a century is a measure of the improvidence under which the national establishment has been operated.

A hundred years of paying back what is owed is a might long time, but we owe a mighty big debt, far beyond anything which any government ever owed before. The interest rate alone is costing the taxpayer more than $8 billion a year.

The debt would be serious enough if it had no other effect upon the economy than that of the requirement to pay the heavy interest charge. But its presence, and the constant fact of budgetary deficits in the effort to keep political wheels turning, has profoundly disturbed American economics. The debt is a supercharger of inflation and inflation has so weakened the value of the U.S. dollar that it is worth less than half what it was worth 20 years ago.

Clearly no greater fallacy was ever uttered than that advanced when the great debt was in the early processes of creation, that it was of no moment because "we owe the money to ourselves." Debt is debt, whether it is public or private. The obligation has to be discharged some time, in some manner—by honest repayment, by erosion of the people's savings through inflation, or by outright repudiation.

We are far from the last, but we are engaging in the second under political euphemisms, and we are dodging the first. To undertake the honest and orderly repayment of the debt would produce great economic benefits long before the debt itself were fully repaid. Confidence in Federal fiscal integrity would return in a short time and a powerful influence would be brought to bear against the inflationary processes.

What is needed now is a start toward debt retirement under a program of budgeted annual repayments, instead of a program of annual budget deficits that are added to the sum already owed. This Nation, unless it returns to financial responsibility, can destroy itself as it destroys the people's money. There is no reason, except political cowardice, for postponing such a program as Congressman WRIGHT proposes.

Enterprise Versus Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the February 10 issue of the Savanna Times-Journal, Savanna, Ill., entitled "Enterprise Versus Socialism":

ENTERPRISE VERSUS SOCIALISM

Near the end of January, the power-producing facilities were completed at a new, giant-sized hydroelectric dam. And this, in the light of past circumstances, was something of an historic occasion.

The dam's name is Brownlee, and it is situated on the nationally famous Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River, along the Idaho-Oregon border. It was built by the Idaho Power Co., one of the Nation's many publicly regulated, taxpaying private utilities. But, as everyone who has followed the news knows, every conceivable effort and device was used by the public power groups to prevent construction. They wanted Hells Canyon development to be undertaken as a tax-subsidized Federal monopoly.

These groups did delay the dam's building for years. But at last all the legal and administrative obstacles were cleared, and Idaho Power was permitted to go ahead. Brownlee, with its 360,000-kilowatt capacity, is the result.

And Brownlee is only the beginning. It is the first project in a three-dam program in which the company has already invested more than $110 million—every nickel of it private money. The entire development is licensed by the Federal Power Commission, and the cost will be about $164 million.

In addition to harnessing the full potential of the Hells Canyon reach, the development will provide benefits in the form of flood control, downstream navigation, fish conservation, recreation—and tax revenues totaling some $10 million a year to local, State, and Federal governments.

And that's the United States idea of enterprise versus socialism.

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the second-place Iowa winner of the 12th annual Voice of Democracy contest was Larry Phelps, the son of Dr. and Mrs. Gardner Phelps, of Waterloo, Iowa, and it is with pleasure that I include his contest paper as part of my remarks:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

The march of civilization may be compared to the march of science. As one looks over the various civilizations, he almost senses a supreme power, experimenting with man as a scientist experiments with the laws of nature. All of these civilizations seem to be attempts, on the part of this supreme power, toward a perfect society. These experiments date back to ancient times with such great attempts as the Babylonian and the Egyptian civilizations.

Sometimes in a scientific experiment, the most important aspect is overlooked. The same thing occurred when democracy first appeared in a civilization of man. It was first exploded in ancient Athens and reappeared in several more recent civilizations. However, not until 1776, when our Forefathers launched the type of society we know of as democracy was its full potential realized. In the minds of those men was the idea of a country in which all men are equal in their own right. In this society each man would be free to guide himself and have the right to shape his own destiny. Today, 182 years later, this society still exists. Those men may be compared to a group of scientists standing around a test tube in a biological research laboratory. In this test tube is a tiny green specimen, the first artificial living thing. Before 1776, democracy, as we know it, was like that bit of life before it was created; it existed solely in the minds of men, waiting for the proper time to come into the world. As would the scientists who created artificial life be acclaimed, so were the men who created our democracy acclaimed by thinking men the world over.

The test-tube life would lead its creators to new and useful discoveries concerning the nature of things. Democracy has similarly led man to many great and wonderful discoveries concerning himself. It has exposed the most admirable traits in man and has served as the breeding place for many great social advances. Through a competitive society we have developed one of the highest standards of living known to man.

Another similarity is seen in the fact that as a blob of laboratory life would serve as a guide for future experiments, so has our democracy served as a proving ground for those who have followed. Our Constitution, which is the oldest in the world still in use, has seen many nations built around its basic concepts.

The imaginary laboratory specimen will lead its creators to new discoveries without the waste of time and money. In like matter, our democracy has prevented us from going astray in the most expensive directions; such as nazism, fascism, and communism. These would be paid for not only with time and money but with human lives and liberties. While democracy has guided us around these pitfalls, our liberties and freedom have remained.

The hypothetical creatures will change and react to changes in stimulus and environment caused by its creator. Likewise, our democracy, built on a wonderfully flexible basis, has changed and will continue to change in response to the needs and desires of its creators. This distinguishes it from other inferior forms of society.

Perhaps the greatest similarity which the manmade life has to democracy is that as this artificial creature is dependent on its creator, the scientist, and its every move is guided by him, so is our democracy guided by the only proper force. This force is its creator, the people. Other forms of society have failed because one man or small group has led millions of people according to his whims and ideas. We have attained a society in which each individual man is free to have his part in his government.

The successful scientist has always been free to guide himself and his creations. Our democracy has been successful because, in guiding ourselves and our Government, we, the people have always been free.

Man in the Middle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have gone into the RECORD in the past week with newspaper articles outlining in detail conditions which exist in West Virginia with regard to the economc plight of our people.

My colleague [Mr. SLACK] of the Sixth District has done a great and gracious service in touring his area in southern West Virginia with a newspaper reporter who has given a graphic and compelling description of the unemployment and the destitution which exists there.

I take the liberty today of letting the House know that this condition is not confined to southern West Virginia. It is widespread in our 55 counties. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include for reprinting an article from the edition of February 5 of the Fairmont West Virginian, one of our distinguished newspapers, which relates the plight of the man in the middle. As the newspaper account states, this man can be found all over the State; he is not alone. And while my distinguished colleague investigated conditions in southern West Virginia, the source of this story is 250 miles north of his district. I mention this to indicate that West Virginia's economic condition is extremely grave and widespread.

During the past week, there have been meetings with Secretary of Commerce, Lewis Strauss, and Gov. Leo Heogh, concerning imports of residual fuel oil. Our coal industry representatives and representatives of our great coal-carrying railroads are extremely interested in seeing that mandatory quotas are placed upon imports of this fuel. I mention this in passing, but my main concern is to have Mr. Herst's article printed for all to see:

MARION COUNTY HAS CLASSIC EXAMPLE: MAN IN THE MIDDLE SUFFERS

(By Ray Herst)

He is West Virginia's man in the middle—the employable who cannot get a job and who is not eligible for aid from the department of public assistance.

He lives next door to you or maybe in Wetzel County or in Tayler County. He can be found all over the State.

One such man in the middle and his family live here in Marion County: They are not alone—theirs is a typical case.

For breakfast last Sunday they had chicken gravy and bread; for lunch they had chicken gravy and bread, and for dinner they each had some of the meat—but how far does a chicken go for a family of 10?

The previous day there was nothing in the house to eat and no money to buy food. The family traded an old motor for a rooster. When that was gone, they had nothing again.

This man in the middle—let's call him Mr. Booth—has been out of work for the past 2 years. He was alid off from his job with the State road commission.

NO JOB

Like so many others, he has been unable to get another job. And because he is considered employable he cannot receive aid from the DPA. This is why he is the man in the middle—the man stranded in the middle of a no-man's land that is barren and bleak and surrounded by walls of frustration.

Mr. Booth is 58 years old and has arthritis of the spine—and he is beaten.

This family of 10 has an income of exactly $2.50 a week—this comes from Mrs. Booth, who, every other week, cleans house for another woman. She gets paid $5.

Theirs is a story that seems impossible to believe, but it is a true story and one which hundreds of families in the State can also tell.

Their eyes would probably be empty of sparkle and life as Mrs. Booth's are and their voices would sound as desperate as hers when she said, "We can't keep our home together much longer and if something isn't done pretty soon, I don't know what will happen.

How Mr. and Mrs. Booth have kept their family together for the past 2 years, God only knows.

IN DARKNESS

For a year now, the family has lived in virtual darkness. Their electricity was shut off when they were unable to pay the bill. But they kept on as best they could.

Six of the eight children in the family are in school. Each night they gather in the living room, pull their chairs around in a semicircle and study by the weak light from two oil lanterns.

Yes that's right, oil lanterns. The lights dance and smoke and throw grotesque shadows over the wills but the children study and they study hard.

One of the girls—she is 19—is scheduled to graduate from high school in June. She may not. It's not that her grades are bad—they're good—it's because she and the other children do not have the necessary paper and pencils needed to carry on their school work.

The girl, a pretty lass, is thin from the meager diet of the past 2 years and pale with frustration. She is determined to finish high school and get a job as a secretary if possible.

"That will be the proudest day in our lives," her mother said.

GIRL OF COURAGE

It will indeed be a proud day—for here is a girl with courage seldom found in young women of her age. Her clothes were worn and sometimes too small and most of the time out of style and repaired hundreds of times; she couldn't participate in school activities because there was no money—but she stuck with it and soon she will be rewarded.

All of the family is in dire need of clothing—their coats are thin and worn and it seems as though the lightest breath could be felt through them. They don't have proper shoes and they are hungry.

And they and their parents face spring without a home. They haven't paid rent since they moved there. The landlord told them they could stay rent free if they would keep the property up, but now he has told them he wants to sell the house and they will have to move.

The only problem is they have no place to go. Moving the furniture would present no problem—if you could call the few pitiful sticks that they have in the house furniture. It's that they have no place to go.

Mrs. Booth said, "I love it here in this community. The people are wonderful and kind. I would like to stay here the rest of my life."

SOME ROOMS COLD

The six-room house is heated with gas—that is, in all but two of the rooms. In one of the rooms the Booths' 17-year-old son sleeps and in the other, two of the girls and one of the boys sleep. The kitchen is heated by the cooking stove. They have a gas bill of more than $20 that needs to be paid.

They get some aid. The family received commodities which last them less than a week and during 1958 they received a total of $100 from the emergency relief fund of the DPA.

For a year Mrs. Booth has washed the family's clothes as her grandmother did—with a washtub and a scrubboard; she ironed with an old-fashioned flatiron, heated on the stove.

But they are a family—a true family. They have stuck together and worked together. They know hunger and cold and need and they remember the days when they laughed and had enough clothing to go around or dishes to eat on or when the baby had milk to drink.

IN THE MIDDLE

But they are in the middle—stuck fast in the middle and no matter which way they turn they find the slick, high walls of frustration. But through a small peephole in the wall comes a glimpse of sunlight and hope—hope that the children will be able to finish school and have enough to eat and perhaps, eventually find the gate to the wall and live a little better life than they are now.

Dr. Clyde J. Wright, county commissioner, who knows the family and has tried to help them and who took this reporter to visit the family made this statement:

"The health and welfare of every citizen should be first and foremost in the consideration of public officials. We are all proud we live in a free country, but we have some conditions in our county that none of us could be proud of.

"Every person should be free to earn a living for himself and family. The discharging of people from their jobs because of their political affiliation is un-American. Personally, I am opposed to such despotic methods of political tyranny. Pressuring people into starvation so that by force they must submit themselves to certain groups, is foreign to the principles and philosophy of our American way of life.

HELP NEEDED

"Those who are not physically able to earn their bread must be cared for. The little children who are victims of circumstances because of the lack of assistance will break the heart of anyone who hears their feeble cries for food. Our Saviour was so concerned about children when He said 'Whosoever shall offend one of these little ones, it is better for him that a millstone was hanged about his neck and he were cast into the depths of the sea.' "

Instead, this family and the hundreds of families like them—Virginia's Man in the Middle—has been cast into the depths of the sea and left to drown of frustration and hunger.

February 16 Marks 41st Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON. L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the fact that today, February 16, is Lithuania Independence Day. But the plain fact is that this day, first celebrated 41 years ago, serves to remind us that Lithuania is no longer free to celebrate this proud day in its history.

The vast majority of freedom-loving American people, I am confident, join with me in a sincere hope that some day the efforts of the free world may result in bringing Lithuania and other freedom-loving countries out from behind the Iron Curtain.

The people of Lithuania have my profound sympathy, and I am sure efforts will continue to be made to bring about the freedom of Lithuania which the people of that country so ardently desire.

Nixon Can Unite GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I append herewith a very enlightening article by Gould Lincoln in Sunday's Washington Star regarding the Vice President and his ability to weld together all phases of the Republican Party. It is a good article—well put—and most convincing, about a man who is widely accepted to be the coming leader of his party:

NIXON CAN UNITE GOP
(By Gould Lincoln)

Dark horses for the Republican presidential nomination in 1960 are scarcer than hens' teeth. And by the same token, there are two outstanding Republicans who, according to insiders in the party councils, may make the race for the GOP nomination next year as keen as that between Mr. Eisenhower and Senator Taft in 1952. They are, of course, Vice President NIXON and Governor Rockefeller, of New York. The very fact that there is a dearth of dark-horse and favorite-son candidates will make the contest between the Californian and the New Yorker—if it comes—more interesting. It makes the race a real struggle.

Vice President NIXON, through his wide experience as Congressman, Senator, and 6 years in his present office, has a better grasp of Government affairs and the problems that confront the Nation than any other candidate, Republican or Democrat. And he has ability of a high order. Careful inquiry shows he is widely liked and highly regarded among the party leaders in many States.

Governor Rockefeller is an attractive new figure in elective politics. His victory last November in New York catapulted him into the presidential picture. He carried a New York Republican senatorial candidate along with him to victory.

COULD UNIFY FACTIONS

The 1958 elections, on the other hand, did Mr. NIXON no good. California voters defeated former Senator Knowland for Governor, and former Governor Knight for Senator (both Republicans)—and badly. Mr. NIXON himself was not a candidate, of course. The picture might have been vastly different had Senator Knowland been content to run again for Congress, leaving Governor Knight to seek relection. Senator Knowland's insistence on the governorship nomination spilled the beans. When he also seized on the right-to-work issue and made it his own, the jig really was up.

As between Mr. NIXON and Governor Rockefeller today, the Vice President stands a far better chance to unite the two wings of the Republican Party. The conservative wing can go for him 100 percent. The strong and loyal support he has given President Eisenhower should certainly encourage the "modern" Eisenhower Republicans to go for him.

Governor Rockefeller, on the other hand, has been regarded as too far left of center by many of the conservative Republicans. He has yet to prove himself a good executive and Governor. His demand for higher taxes in order to balance New York's budget has not been popular with a lot of voters. The fact he has accompanied his high tax program with a spending program has not endeared him to many conservative Republicans. Further, no one yet knows how a Rockefeller, as a presidential candidate, would sit with the Republicans of the Midwest, an area the GOP must carry if it is to win next year's national election.

If this is to be a race between Mr. NIXON and Governor Rockefeller, the presidential primaries offer a real field for tests of popular strength. Both men would be considered far more than favorite-son candidates—candidates who go to a national convention with their own State delegations lined up for them, and little else, hoping the lightning will strike. Each will have, however, his State's delegation all wrapped up. Senator Knowland, who had been a possible contender in California—and Knight—have been eliminated by their sorry showing last November.

OTHER GOP POSSIBILITIES

What Republican dark horses and favorite-son candidates are on the horizons? There is former Gov. Thomas E. Dewey of New York, who likes Mr. Rockefeller and will not himself be a candidate. Senator CASE of New Jersey, one of the modern group, is another possibility. Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson, who has been described as an Eisenhower Republican from Texas (who now is from Greenwich, Conn.), has support in some circles. So has Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., our representative at the United Nations.

Republican governors of States have been reduced to a pitiful number, especially in the primary States. In Minnesota, where former Gov. Harold E. Stassen at one time could hold the State's delegation at the national convention, he no longer figures materially. Further, he has moved to Pennsylvania, where he would not have a chance against either Mr. NIXON or Governor Rockefeller in the presidential primary.

The argument has been urged against Mr. NIXON—as it was against the late Senator Bob Taft of Ohio—that he could not win if nominated. From the 1952 presidential results, it can well be argued that Senator Taft would have won, if he had defeated Mr. Eisenhower for the nomination. Mr. NIXON is a resourceful campaigner—wonderfully effective on television. Opponents say he would not get the independent vote and no Democratic votes. They could be far wrong. Further, a lot will depend on the Democrat who is nominated for President. None of the so-called candidates are politically flawless. A country at peace and reasonably prosperous could go for Mr. NIXON.

Mr. NIXON should win the first primary in New Hampshire in a walk if he enters it. He is popular there, where thousands of Republicans took the trouble to write his name in for Vice President in the 1956 primary. Minnesota, Wisconsin, Ohio, Oregon, Nebraska, Pennsylvania and New Jersey all could provide Mr. NIXON and Mr. Rockefeller with real battlegrounds.

"Maine" Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, in Connecticut, Governor Ribicoff proclaimed Sunday, February 15, as *Maine* Memorial Day to commemorate the sinking of the battleship *Maine* at Havana. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Governor Ribicoff's proclamation:

We are soon to observe the 61st anniversary of the tragic event that was the immediate cause of the Spanish-American War, the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in the harbor at Havana, Cuba, on February 15, 1898.

There are comparatively few among us who have personal recollections of the time when the war cry "Remember the *Maine*" was heard throughout the Nation, but it is as meaningful today as it was then.

Today America is determined to stand firm when her security is threatened or attacked. America's sympathies for oppressed people, and her resolution to aid them in every way possible, are as strong as they were 61 years ago.

It is fitting, therefore, that we keep alive the memory of this episode in our history, and in accordance with our statutes I hereby proclaim Sunday, February 15 to be *Maine* Memorial Day.

It will be appropriate on this day for our public and private buildings to display our National and State flags. Fitting exercises may be held in our schools and other public places especially honoring the 266 officers and men who went down with the *Maine* and the some 3,400 Connecticut volunteers who served in the Spanish-American War.

Boy Scout Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, last week 12 Explorer Scouts made an official report to the Nation representing the 3½ million Boy Scouts of American. Naturally I was proud to have a Scout from my own district, Steven D. Peterson from Topeka, Kans. It was my privilege to attend a special breakfast honoring these Scouts on last Tuesday and I would like to observe that it is reassuring to see 12 such fine and capable young men representing the youth of America. The Nation owes a special tribute to the 125,000 volunteer leaders of the Scout organization. It is by virtue of the unselfish and tireless effort of these public-spirited citizens that we are able to attract our youth into the Boy Scout organization.

On Sunday, February 15 many churches throughout the Nation appropriately paid tribute and recognized the Boy Scouts of America. Many churches are counted among the 81,000 organizations sponsoring Boy Scout troops throughout the land. In many instances the church makes their facilities available to Scout troops for a place of meeting even though the troop may be sponsored by a nonsecular organization.

In recognizing the Boy Scouts of America it was a common practice for a Boy Scout to be selected to deliver what is described as the Patrick Henry address during one of the church services. Typical of the Scouts selected to make this address was Bob Singleton, of Bethesda,

Md., who spoke during the church service at the Bethesda Methodist Church. Bob was presented by the Reverend Marion S. Michael.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 14, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth Congressional District, Texas)

Capitol activity this week centered around a joint session of Congress on Thursday called to pay tribute to the memory of Abraham Lincoln on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

In this week's newsletter, instead of talking about Lincoln, perhaps we might all benefit more by letting Mr. Lincoln talk to us about citizenship and government:

GOVERNMENT

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities.

"In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere" (July 1, 1854).

DUTY

"We hold the true republican position. In leaving the people's business in their hands we cannot be wrong" (Congress, July 27, 1848).

SOLVENCY

"As an individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest, and next, no one left to borrow from, so must it be with a government" (Whig circular, March 4, 1843).

ECONOMIC FREEDOM

"I believe each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruit of his labor, so far as it in no wise interferes with any other man's rights" (Chicago, Ill., July 10, 1858).

"We see it, and to us it appears like principle, and the best sort of principle at that—the principle of allowing the people to do as they please with their own business," Congress, July 27, 1848.

"The primary cause of our great prosperity • • • is the principle of 'Liberty to all'—the principle that clears the path for all—gives hope to all—and, by consequence, enterprise and industry to all," Fragment on the Constitution and Union, January 1861.

LIBERTY AND SECURITY

"If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a Nation of free men, we must live through all time or die by suicide," speech to Young Men's Lyceum, January 27, 1838.

CAPITAL/LABOR

"The strongest bond of human sympathy, outside of the family relation, should be one uniting all working people, of all nations, and tongues, and kindreds. Nor should this lead to a war upon property, or the owners of property. Property is the fruit of labor—property is desirable—is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another; but let him labor diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built," to New York Workingmen's Democratic Republican Association, March 21, 1864.

"I don't believe in a law to prevent a man from getting rich; it would do more harm than good. So while we do not propose any war upon capital, we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else. When one starts poor, as most do in the race of life, free society is such that he knows he can better his condition; he knows that there is no fixed condition of labor, for his whole life," March 6, 1860.

DEPENDENCE ON GOD

"The purposes of the Almighty are perfect, and must prevail, though we erring mortals may fail to accurately perceive them in advance. We hoped for a happy termination of this terrible war long before this but God knows best, and has ruled otherwise. We shall yet acknowledge His Wisdom and our own error therein," to Mrs. Gurney, September 4, 1864.

DUTY

"Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it," at Cooper Institute, New York City, February 27, 1860.

Administration's Farm Proposals a Confession of Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1959, the Wisconsin Farmers Union News printed an editorial which I feel neatly sums up the appalling farm price situation which would result if the administration's 1959 farm proposals were put into effect. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a copy of that editorial in the RECORD:

PRESIDENT'S FARM PROPOSALS

Faced with the prospect of being buried under mountainous farm surpluses of its own making, the Eisenhower administration has proposed solutions of such a reckless nature that they are a sure sign of panic and a confession of failure.

The President has offered Congress two courses of action: (1) Abandon the parity concept and set price supports between 75 and 90 percent of the average market price for the immediate preceding years (probably three), or (2) retain the parity standard but give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to set price supports anywhere between zero and 90 percent of parity.

If either proposal were adopted, Secretary Benson would have the power to make "price supports" completely meaningless because the free market level would usually prevail.

Let us suppose that Congress would approve the President's first recommendation, giving Benson the authority to drop the price floor to 75 percent of the average market price for the last 3 years. Manufacturing milk could then be supported as low as $2.45 a hundred pounds as compared to $3.06 for the present marketing year; butterfat at 47.6 cents a pound compared with this year's 59 cents; corn 96 cents a bushel compared with this year's prospective $1.14; and wheat could go as low as $1.43 a bushel compared with $1.82 set for this year.

Both the President and Benson have made much of the argument that Government price support programs have been unrealistic. If the above farm prices are a sample of the new realism in Washington, then we'll take the dream world that farmers purportedly have been living in.

The Federal Penal System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, due to overcrowding in our Federal penal system, the U.S. Bureau of Prisons has submitted an urgent request to Congress for funds with which to construct a maximum security Federal penitentiary. The budget request submitted to Congress is not to exceed $9,875,000.

In an effort to discredit the need for this maximum security penitentiary, the Wall Street Journal has printed an editorial listing the cost at $110 million. This, of course, is grossly in error. In order to set the record straight, I have asked the Wall Street Journal for a correction of their editorial and have written the letter below concerning this matter, and with permission previously granted, request that it be printed herein.

Should a prison riot occur in one of our overcrowded Federal prisons, far more damage could be done in one prison riot than the cost of the new proposed maximum security institution. Therefore, I hope Congress will favorably consider this urgent request for funds and ignore such efforts to discredit the urgent need for this new institution.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1959.

Mr. JOSEPH E. EVANS,
Wall Street Journal,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. EVANS: I would like to take this opportunity to point out an error which appeared in your editorial comments in Review and Outlook of the February 12 edition of your publication. You stated, and I quote, "The prison will house 600 men and the estimated cost of the Illinois prison is set at $110 million."

Mr. Evans, the figure of $110 million is $100 million in error. If you will check the printed budget request submitted by the President, on page 761 in the right column under the heading "Buildings and Facilities," you will find an item requesting moneys not to exceed $9,875,000 for this proposed prison. I am quite sure that you will agree this figure is quite different from the figure you quote in your editorial of February 12. Naturally, with this error the further figure of $183,333 per man used in your editorial is likewise in gross error.

I sincerely feel that, in justice to your readers who look to your publication and editorials for correct information, you will want to right this error at the earliest possible time. And, I might add, that the actual budget request for $9,875,000 might also change you editorial thinking on this matter.

If I can be of any further help to you in getting the factual information on this or any other matter, please do not hesitate to call on me.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH J. GRAY,
U.S. Congressman.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the attention of my colleagues to an address by Adm. James S. Russell, U.S. Navy, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, delivered recently in Seattle, Wash. This distinguished naval officer was the cowinner of the Collier Trophy in 1956 for his work in developing the supersonic F8U Crusader jet fighter. I believe Admiral Russell's remarks to be particularly timely as the Congress is called upon to assess the nature of the military threat our Nation now faces:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

(Address by Adm. James S. Russell, U.S. Navy, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, Before the World Affairs Council of Seattle, Seattle, Wash., February 4, 1959)

It is a privilege to be asked to address the Council of World Affairs of Seattle and their many distinguished guests here today. It is particularly pleasant for me since the occasion is in the nature of a homecoming. As some of you may know, I grew up here in the Pacific Northwest and throughout my Navy career have maintained a home on the shore of American Lake just south of Tacoma.

So devoted is my family to the local deep water, the tall fir trees and the glacier-clad peaks that we have recently purchased a tract of land on the western shores of Puget Sound, and when the time comes to retire, it is our intention to return and there to build the house of our retirement.

I am especially happy to have this opportunity to discuss with you, my neighbors, a subject which is of great importance to all of us—national defense. While in my discussion I may understandably deal more with the affairs of the Navy, I do not for a minute minimize the vital roles of our brother services, the Army and the Air Force. All of the services have an important place in the defense of our country.

This country of ours is now in the greatest competition in its history, and the very survival of our way of life is going to depend in large measure upon the extent to which we, all of us, industrialists, businessmen, educators, clergymen, statesmen, labor leaders, and military men, recognize this competition and its very long-term implications.

National security is a goal which can be attained only by national effort, participated in by every citizen of this Nation. Its achievement in these perilous times is a full-sized job and not one to underrate. This Nation can remain free only by a combination of political, economic, spiritual, psychological, and military strengths, including the will to apply appropriate military force when forced to by aggression. The price of security is high. It will probably go higher. The biggest single item of our security bill is our Military Establishment. The rising costs of everything make it mandatory that we make the most exacting appraisal of just what this overall establishment should contain. We must maintain adequate strength in all necessary areas, for, if we do not, the enemy will find and exploit our weaknesses. But by the same token, we must not overexpend in any one area, for, if we do, our resources in dollars, materials, and manpower simply won't be enough to provide for other equally vital forms of military strength.

Bear in mind, if you please, that the final decision as to our overall military posture is not made by the military, but by the civilian side of our Government—the Secretary of Defense, the President, and the Congress. The ultimate authority properly resides in the hands of our voting citizens, and so must the ultimate responsibility.

The Soviet sputniks brought our national security problems sharply into the focus of public attention. The comparative success of the Soviet lunar probe launched on January 2, 1959, again brought us face to face with the fact of Soviet technical progress. In whatever way we view this progress, its military implications are more long-term than immediate. What we do in response must look toward our long-term security. We are going to have to live with Communist imperialism for a long time. Our problem is an enduring one.

Bear in mind, also, that decisions we make today concerning our military posture require several years to implement. It takes years to build ships, airplanes, and missiles. Hence, what we plan now will take shape and be in service 3, 5, or 10 years from now.

Our national task—and that of the free world—is to establish a just and lasting peace in the world in which the rights and independence of all countries are safeguarded in conformity with the charter of the United Nations. To fulfill this national task we may be forced to go to war—and war may be of different kinds. General war may be defined as a war involving a massive nuclear exchange between the United States and the Sino-Soviet bloc. I know of no one who is not convinced that such an exchange would be something less than beneficial to both sides. It is therefore unlikely to happen, barring an insane and desperate choice on the part of the Communist leaders. Nevertheless, we much insure this unlikelihood by maintaining a deterrent to the deliberate initiation of all-out war by the Soviets. The overall deterrent, of course, is the collective strength of the free world, but a substantial part of the deterrence is a retaliatory atomic strike capability which the Soviets know will be capable of inflicting unacceptable damage to them, even if they deliver a surprise attack upon us.

Bearing in mind that this essential retaliatory capability is very expensive and in competition with other elements of our national strength, the country and our military planners must answer three questions:

1. How much de we need?
2. What form shall it take?
3. Does national security demand any other form of military power—and if so, what and how much?

To deal with the first question as to how much deterrent, we need enough so that the Communists know that if they attack us, they will be destroyed. Thus, deterrence is a state of mind: but, and this is important, sufficiency in this particular is absolute, not relative; it bears no ratio, no relationship, to a like capability on the part of the Soviets. It specifically does not mean matching them bomber for bomber, or missile for missile.

As to what form it should take, you might decide to build up a huge force, highly vulnerable to surprise attack, but big enough so that its residual capability, which you calculate will survive a surprise attack, will still do the job. This is a very expensive and rather dangerous choice, because either you might miscalculate, or the enemy might. He might figure that a really good surprise attack would get enough of your force so that he could survive the residual attack, and he might be strongly tempted to try it.

On the other hand, a small but highly invulnerable force is not only attainable within reasonable financial limits, but by its very invulnerability it removes the temptation from the enemy to have a go at trying to wipe it out. This invulnerability to surprise attack can be achieved only by resorting to dispersal, concealment, movement, and hardening.

We must face the fact that as the number of long-range rockets in the enemy's arsenal increases, the capability of either manned bombers or missiles operating from unhardened fixed bases to provide the necessary residual retaliatory capacity becomes progressively less. Similarly, the capability of manned bombers to penetrate constantly improving air defenses declines. We shall, perforce, rely more and more on missiles for this task.

A truly effective retaliatory force should meet the following criteria:

1. The enemy should have a wholesome fear of it; and to this end, it should be able to reach, with requisite accuracy and effectiveness, any target in the Russian Communist bloc.

2. It should not be so located that attempts to destroy it before it is launched would collaterally wreak damage on nonmilitary targets.

3. It should be highly invulnerable to all forms of enemy military attack including ballistic missiles.

4. Its launching points should be such that it cannot be located accurately in advance by an enemy, and such that its most probable trajectories cannot be precalculated by an enemy.

5. After it is launched, it should be as invulnerable as possible to all forms of countermeasures.

6. It should be an invulnerable as possible to enemy efforts of sabotage, subversion and espionage.

7. It should have a minimum reaction time; that is, the time between the decision to fire, and actual launching, should be as small as possible.

8. It should so complicate the enemy's defense problems that absolute defense against it is either technically or financially infeasible.

It so happens, not by coincidence, but by intention, that the foregoing criteria are met by the system in which the ballistic missile, Polaris, is mounted in submarines.

The Polaris submarine system will be unique in that it is a weapons system which combines the advantages of attack by ballistic missile with the already established potential of concealment and mobility offered by the nuclear powered submarine. By moving about, remaining submerged for long periods, and constantly changing positions, the Polaris submarine is virtually invulnerable to surprise attack. Surrounding the potential aggressor are oceans and seas providing millions of miles of underwater concealment within missile range of vital targets. A relatively small fleet of these atomic powered submarines, each carrying

more than 10 ballistic missiles in its hold, and capable of firing them at distant targets while completely submerged, represents for this country the capability to retaliate, so quickly, and so inevitably, that the potential attacker has the certain knowledge that once his attack is launched, he will himself be destroyed.

Besides Polaris other comparatively invulnerable systems are now being developed, but to be effective they also must be mobile and concealable, or else they must be fired from bases so hardened as to be virtually indestructible.

However, I do not think we should go overboard, even on Polaris. Like all retaliatory weapons, it is one which paradoxically, if truly successful will never be used, and we should make every effort to tailor its number to an adequate minimum. Further, if you accept the premise that we must not overexpend in any one area of our military strength, then logically, funds devoted to Polaris should come from those allocated to the retaliatory forces—not from those so badly needed for other naval forces—as those in antisubmarine warfare, in amphibious employment, and in fleet air defense.

Despite all the military virtue one finds in the Polaris submarine system, I would not advocate having it as the only retaliatory system. A single system can be met with a single countermeasure, and although that countermeasure against Polaris is not now evident, in consideration of it we should have some variety in our retaliatory locker.

As to the third question: Do we need anything except the deterrent to general war.

The answer is an emphatic "yes." We need the forces to deter, or, if hostilities are forced upon us, to prosecute successfully limited or peripheral wars. The growing atomic parity makes all-out war increasingly unlikely. This means, not that the Communists will give up their imperialistic goal of world domination, but that they will seek other means to attain their ends. Wars of limited objectives will become increasingly more likely, efforts will be made to enslave free countries by subverted revolutionary uprisings from within and through limited offensives by puppet governments from without. Following this pattern was Greece in 1947, Korea in 1950, Vietnam in 1954, and this year we had our forces ashore in Lebanon to prevent such a move and we augmented the Seventh Fleet and forces ashore in the Taiwan area to counter the offensive against Quemoy. Unless we are equipped to deal promptly and effectively with such wars, we must choose between losing the free world a little at a time, or invoking the atomic holocaust.

It follows that all our armed services must maintain a strong limited war capability. But for a conflict to remain limited, there must be restraint in the selection of targets and in the size of weapons, and precision and discrimination in their delivery. These are qualities which the long-range rocket and the large nuclear weapon do not possess.

A limited war will not be fought in North America or necessarily in Russia. If limited war should be forced on a third country by an aggressor, to help that third country we must be prepared to exert power—limited and discriminating power—on the other side of some ocean. We must get that power there quickly and get it ashore quickly. We may have to keep it there, and keep it supplied, for protracted periods. To do this, we must have three capabilities. First, a capability to control the sea routes to the area of aggression, and any other sea routes along which we are threatened or harrassed. Second, a capability to strike within the area of aggression, precisely and with discrimination, using weapons appropriate to the scale of the war. Third, a capability to put forces ashore promptly in the objective area against whatever resistance there may be. In sum, naval forces, including their amphibious marines, can freely operate from international waters, to provide the spearhead and the shield to defeat limited aggression, and to do so without triggering unlimited catastrophe.

The forces for these purposes must be reasonably large to match the size of the enemy's forces and the extent of the oceans and their shorelines. Our forces must be in being and in a high state of readiness. We are not able to resort to megaton weapons to cover any quantitative weaknesses in this type of war.

The world situation which the popular writers like to describe as the balance of terror, the situation which Sir Winston Churchill dolefully calls the melancholy paradox, brings with it an increasing requirement for seapower.

Certainly seapower will play a vital role in any limited war. Upon reflection, to fight such a war without command of the sea on the part of the United States and its allies in the free world is unthinkable. And should the deterrent fail and general war ensue, the seas will give us the time and space factors we need for early warning and for defense in depth; as well as vast maneuver areas for dispersal and concealment of our striking forces. To me, one of the most telling arguments supporting the importance of command of the seas is the trouble and expense to which the Soviets have gone in their endeavor to be ready to take it away from us. Since World War II they have built a formidable surface and subsurface navy. Today they have more than a score of heavy and light cruisers, 140-odd destroyers and 450 submarines. Russia ranks today as the world's second largest seapower.

An essential ingredient of the Navy's limited war capability is the attack carrier and its complement of manned aircraft capable of applying precise striking power—precise as to degree and as to target. It is the most versatile single weapon system on the face of the earth. Its mobility permits it to reach most of the peripheral areas where limited aggression may threaten. There are many places in the world in which carriers, as mobile airbases in international waters, provide the only means of applying this precise airpower, and of doing it soon enough to keep the situation from getting out of control. The carrier force is a powerful instrument of national policy in a period of international tension, and a most effective stabilizer of cold war disturbances. Attack carriers are vital to the Navy's ability to control the seas, and hence to this Nation's ability to win a war of any kind—small, medium or large.

In summary: Over the long term, we must maintain an overall military force adequate to our security needs, and do it without wrecking our economy. The steadily increasing cost of weapons makes it mandatory that we make the most searching appraisal of what our military force should contain, to the end that it has enough of everything we do need, but not more than we need.

We must, of course, be ready to meet the ultimate threat—but not to the exclusion of being able to cope with lesser, more likely, threats. To this end all services must maintain a capability for limited wars, which although limited in area and in objectives, may not be small wars. Seapower—the ability to use the seas for our purposes and to prevent their use by the enemy—is vital to our security and an essential part of our overall military structure.

Wonders of the Universe: Safe Rocket for Young Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, we need to develop promptly safe rocket and space equipment for the young people who are so deeply interested in outer space and flight problems.

Likewise our U.S. agencies and scientists should cooperate with our amateur and home-kit experimenters for the protection and the development of the legitimate interest of these part time and zealous pioneers on the rapidly widening space front at home.

To call attention to this need, I enclose an article that I believe to be a start or pointer in this direction of safety and adequate participation by the amateurs of all ages in the wonderful and exciting new space age:

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Feb. 2, 1959]

WONDERS OF THE UNIVERSE: SAFE ROCKET FOR YOUNG SCIENTISTS

(By Dr. I. M. Levitt)

Here's a tip for youngsters experimenting with homemade rockets.

In tinkering with explosive fuel mixtures you can avoid danger and also have an almost guaranteed successful series of flights by using a model rocket perfected by C. Harry Stine, a rocket expert who has spent most of his professional career at the White Sands Proving Grounds and with the Martin Co. in Denver.

To get first-hand experience with the Stine rocket, my son Peter and I spent an afternoon in a Philadelphia park launching the rocket many times to heights of hundreds of feet. Both of us had a wonderful time learning how well the rocket operates and planning further experiments.

OPERATES LIKE BIG BROTHER

The device is a small scale model of the Aerobee-Hi using a solid propellant of about a pound-second thrust. The model weighs but a few ounces but operates like its big brother on takeoff.

The thrust can carry it upward to 500 feet. Once it reaches this altitude the nose cone is blown off and out comes a thin plastic parachute carrying the outfit safely back to earth. Thus it can be used over and over again.

The rocket is completely safe. In talking to Stine at the annual meeting of the American Rocket Society in New York last November I learned there had been 10,000 models fired without a mishap.

An expert in full-scale rocketry, Stine developed the rocket knowing that countless youngsters in the United States, unable to get proper chemicals, were experimenting with dangerous materials—match heads, say. There has been a growing toll of injuries and even deaths from these experiments.

Stine's rockets give teenagers a motor unit with excellent thrust combined with the utmost in safety. But there is also another advantage.

The units can be combined to allow youngsters to learn at first hand the design requirements of multithrust rockets.

For instance, my son and I have designed a model of the Viking Rocket weighing con-

siderably more than the Aerobee-Hi model. We plan to cluster four of the rocket motors together to power the model. Special wiring will be required and here we face the same problem professional rocket makers are confronted with in clustering Jupiter motors to achieve a thrust of 1½ million pounds.

Once the tiny motors ignite perfectly, Peter and I will watch our miniature Viking zip upward to a yet undetermined altitude. Yet the rocket will not be lost, because of the parachute device in the nose cone.

TEACHES ABSORBING SCIENCE

Parents should be grateful to engineers like Harry Stine who invest time and capital to work out the details for safe rockets.

While this rocket is a toy, in practice it teaches the teenager many facets of this most absorbing science.

He can, for example, use telescopes to find the height of the rocket and in so doing improve his knowledge of arithmetic and trigonometry. If he is a ham radio operator he can design a small transmitter to telemeter information to the launching site. He can exercise his ingenuity in designing various rocket shapes.

These are just several of the bonuses accruing from the use of Stine's toy.

Interested parents should get in touch with Mr. Stine at 1165 South Cherokee Street, Denver 23, Colo.

Forty-first Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of the 41st anniversary of the Lithuanian independence proclamation, I, under unanimous consent, insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my recent remarks to the Lithuanian American Council, Inc.

The coming 41st anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania on Monday, February 16, gives me this welcome opportunity to express my most sincere hopes for a renewal of that freedom that Lithuania experienced for the 22 years following 1918. Americans have not ceased to be horrified and angered by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic's forcible termination of Lithuanian independence in 1940, and will never recognize that attempt to subjugate a people who have historically demonstrated their love of freedom and their ability to flourish under a free system.

Yet, I know that the Soviet Union's blatant violation of the Law of Nations has not accomplished its purpose, in spite of the annexation of Lithuanian territory, for the Lithuanian peoples have demonstrated that they will not be enslaved in spirit. Their determined search for the support of the Western democracies, their continued listening to the Voice of America, and the very existence of your organization prove that in Lithuania are peoples of courage, fortitude, and devotion to belief in the dignity of man and the inherent value of free institutions.

Although the people of Lithuania in their own country are forbidden to celebrate the anniversary of the restoration, I join my fellow Americans in remembrance of that day to wish for renewed Lithuanian freedom, to admire Lithuanian fortitude, and to praise the devoted work of the Lithuanian American Council, Inc.

Appreciation Dinner in Honor of Hon. William R. Williams, Former Member of House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the text of an address given by me February 10, 1959, at Oneida, N.Y., on the occasion of an appreciation dinner in honor of the long and devoted public service of the Honorable William R. Williams, formerly a Representative of this esteemed body, sponsored by his friends and associates of Madison County, N.Y.:

One hundred and fifty years will have passed on February 12, 1959 since Abraham Lincoln was born in a log cabin of backwoods Kentucky. There was little at the time to suggest that the event was of any great significance, even in Hardin County where it happened. There wasn't one, excepting possibly the courageous, saintly mother, who dreamed that life had been breathed into a soul that, in the short span of 56 years, would experience the heartaches of poverty, abuse, and disappointment, and yet the glory of high responsibilities, inspired leadership and supreme martyrdom. Yes, no great American ever was ushered into this world with so little promise—yet the story of his life is really the story of our country—an expression of all that is basic and true in our way of life. It is fitting, therefore, that all America pause on this special anniversary to glimpse once again the nobility of the man and the eternal wisdom of his philosophy. While the noble Lincoln made richer the heritage of all Americans, to those of us who continue the Republican Party which he founded, he passed on a torch of dedicated leadership. It does us a great honor but imposes upon us a heavy responsibility. Our task would be performed, our obligation fully met if we were to apply to the problems of this day, the simple honesty, the tolerant understanding and quiet courage of our great founder. He dared to do what he believed to be right—sometimes he felt only God approved what he was doing, and in his darkest hours maybe he wasn't so sure he had that approval, but he held fast against all the forces which would divide and destroy our country. It would confer a great blessing upon us all if we could relive the struggle of his 56 years so that we might more fully understand his sense of values, so that we might more readily appreciate the dangers of which he warned and so that we might rededicate ourselves to the task which is ahead. The party of Lincoln can and must remain faithful to its trust, worthy of its founder.

There is a symbolic adherence to that trust in the life and service of the great Republican we especially honor tonight, our own Bill Williams. Approximately 75 years ago this rugged stalwart breathed first the invigorating air of Madison County. There was little in his early days to suggest the distinguished service which he was to render. He says he was so busy chasing Indians and panthers that he didn't have time for extensive schooling, but the truth is—Bill has attended school all his life—observing, thinking, and applying his commonsense to each situation as it arose. I'm reminded of what Robert Burns, the Scotch poet, so well said—"Give me a spark of nature's fire—it's all the learning I require." Surely Bill Williams had that spark which he kindled into a flame by hard work, rugged honesty and hearty friendliness. Speaking as I am to those who have followed his career, marked by over 25 years of public service as a State legislator, as sheriff and a Congressman, I need not remind you that he never lost an election, nor did he ever lose his head. Popularity and good fortune never gave him any false notions of grandeur—he remained jovial and approachable. He sensed that with added responsibilities came opportunities for greater service which he was proud and glad to render. Years of working for the people have brought countless friendships. During the past campaign, I had the privilege of seeing and hearing the expressions of those friendships. I will retain in my memory always that striding form, the friendly, lively countenance, the campaign hat which looked as though its wearer was going backward as he strode along the street, in and out of buildings, retracing campaign trails of former years, proud and happy that he was so enthusiastically remembered. I said then and I repeat it now—Bill Williams was reaping and enjoying the greatest reward of public service, the devoted appreciation of those whom you've tried to serve.

During the past few weeks I have been privileged to be with many of Bill's old friends in the Congress and, to a man, these former colleagues have spoken earnestly of his friendliness and dependability as he worked with them for sound Republican principles. He was a man of his word and applied common sense to the solution of many different problems. His unfailing good humor carried him through many a trying situation. It may interest you to hear the very words used by his colleague in describing their impressions of his character and services as set forth in letters I've just received.

(At this time communications from the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, the Honorable HAROLD OSTERTAG, the Honorable JOHN TABER, the Honorable CHARLES HOEVEN, and the Honorable R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, were read and presented to Mr. Williams.)

There is still another chapter. When personal considerations dictated withdrawal from his Washington duties, all of us hoped he would remain an active force in our party and that he would continue his close associations on the local scene. The sad death of Oneida County's Republican chairman necessitated choice of a new leader and Bill became the unanimous choice for this very important job. With vigor and a sincere purpose he is on the way to new achievements.

So it is that Bill Williams has brought honor and distinction to his party. As Republicans and as Americans we are proud that the tradition of Lincoln has been so faithfully followed by him whom we honor. However, he would not want this event to be simply an occasion of praise. We will do him far greater honor if we accept his contribution as a strong and enduring link in the great chain of dedicated service which began with our great Lincoln and which we must continue so that this country may remain strong, united, and free.

Wabash River Flood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED WAMPLER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from my home in the Sixth District of Indiana, Terre Haute, where I surveyed the tragic amount of sheer waste and devastation caused by the rampaging floodwaters of the Wabash River.

The need for remedial flood-control construction in this area, Mr. Speaker, is desperately urgent. The annual human, agricultural, and property damage resulting from Wabash River floodings is incredible.

In the small town of Clinton, Ind., with a population slightly in excess of 5,000, where I witnessed that city's heroic flood-control efforts, the Wabash was being fought with 8,000 sandbags purchased by the local citizenry for 14 cents apiece. Those sandbags were not purchased this year, Mr. Speaker; they were bought several years ago, during a previous flood, and when the danger was past were emptied and stored so that they could be used again, when the Wabash River would inevitably threaten the area's people and their homes.

West Terre Haute has been flooded out 3 years running. Flood crestings are so frequent and so severe that Terre Haute no longer records flood levels at the 14-foot mark; the 20-foot level is now the only recorded level.

These few further word pictures, Mr. Speaker, can but only begin to describe the extent of the flood's devastation or to dramatize the urgent need for flood control planning and construction along the Wabash River. In Terre Haute, 80,000 sandbags have been used in an attempt to control the floodwaters, and the people of Terre Haute are still filling and using sandbags. In Attica, Ind., some 20 homes have been submerged. State Road 41, which is a national highway, is being swept by a 20-foot current. People in Williamsport, Ind., who travel but a mile and a half to 2 miles to work in Attica, are now being transported by helicopter, and should they be forced to drive, they would have to travel approximately 45 miles. People returning home from their working day find themselves looking for a place to sleep. The farmers of the area are currently uninterested in the question of price supports; they are more interested in looking for a piece of land to farm.

A copy of a telegram to the President, which I received this morning, I think graphically portrays the plight of the people along the Wabash. From Cara-Jean Baldwin, chairman, Parke County, Ind., chapter, and director of the Wabash Valley Association, the wire reads:

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House, Washington, D.C.:

We are experiencing the third flood in this territory in 5 weeks. After devastating damage of 1957 and 1958, our farmers cannot endure or gamble on planting 1959 crops without some assurance conditions will be corrected as soon as possible. All of this tragedy could have been averted with proper flood control in Wabash Valley. Implementation of funds for approved Mississinewa, Salomonie, and Huntington flood-control reservoirs with funds to expedite surveys and reports on Sugar Creek, Wildcat Creek, and Big Pine Creek would cost taxpayers millions less than flood damage costs year after year.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of the House will fully appreciate the seriousness of the damaging flood conditions in the Wabash River area, and will lend their support to the efforts which I, and I feel sure, the other Members of the Indiana delegation, intend to make toward securing the appropriations necessary to start and hopefully complete flood-control construction along the Wabash River.

The Revere Journal—On Its 78th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, freedom of speech would mean little without freedom of the press. Even today, newspapers are the best medium for gathering factual reports about people and events; communicating this information to thousands of people; and pointing up important issues of the day with clear and concise editorials. The more we learn about censorship in other countries, the more we appreciate our independent and responsible press.

Outstanding among the hometown weeklies that have survived the competition and have prospered because of a loyal and appreciative reader following, is the Revere Journal, of Revere, Mass. It is a distinguished member of the American Press Half-Century Club.

In recognition of this sturdy weekly, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the Journal's editorial of February 5, 1959, entitled "78 Years Old Today":

SEVENTY-EIGHT YEARS OLD TODAY

The Revere Journal is 78 years old today. For more than three-quarters of a century, since February 5, 1881, this newspaper has served the residents and the community by presenting all the local news of interest, as well as offering advertising space to those with something to sell the public. And it has been proved through the years that both of these functions were of equal importance, for one could not exist without the other and still have the newspaper remain free and not subsidized by the Government or other interests.

The Revere Journal is proud of the part it has played in the growth of the city. It is proud of its effort to record current events, not only to enlighten the public at that moment but for history. And it is with a sense of accomplishment that the publisher and his staff can thumb through the back issues and trace the growth of this community from a section of another city to its present independent status as a city today. And there is evidence of the Revere Journal's growth as it adjusted to meet the demands of the growing community.

But the pages of the present and of history are not closed. There is no doubt that Revere still has many unused potentials, more than most cities and towns in the area. It is expected that these potentials, coupled with the enterprise of the residents, will boost Revere still further both in size and prosperity. And the Revere Journal, on its 78th birthday, stands ready to do all it can to continue this progress by constantly examining its role in the community and making every effort to render the best possible service to both its readers and its advertisers.

Tribute to the Late Major General William J. Donovan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, a great American, a dedicated citizen-soldier who had served his country well, was laid to rest with his comrades in arms at Arlington National Cemetery. I served under Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan during World War II, and I have the highest regard for what he accomplished for his country both in private and in public life.

He well deserved the tribute paid to him by so many hundreds of his friends at his last rites. He can go to his final reward well pleased with the accomplishment of a life's work.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD a tribute paid by another soldier who served under General Donovan, Maj. Max Corvo, now editor of the Middletown Bulletin in my State:

Few in their lifetime are given the opportunity to serve their country in the manner that William J. Donovan served this Nation in a lifespan that inspired two generations and carved out a solid niche in the history of America.

Born in humble circumstances he worked his way through school and eventually earned a reputation as an outstanding lawyer; thrown into the maelstrom of battle during World War I he led the Fighting 69th to immortal glory and won for himself this Nation's three highest decorations for valor; called by five Presidents of this Nation to serve in various important capacities, he acquitted himself with distinction in each one of the tasks that he undertook; called by President Roosevelt at the inception of World War II to martial this Nation's intelligence forces he won fame as the head of the Office of Strategic Services, a huge collection of devil-may-care officers and men dedicated to advancing the cause of the Nation; appointed U.S. Ambassador to Thailand by President Eisenhower at a time when the Nation was being enfeebled by internal and external Communist pressures, he paved the way for the return of southeast Asia into the orbit of freedom.

This was William J. Donovan. A man born in humble circumstances who had achieved the pinnacle of success but who

had learned to walk with humility in his daily contacts with the world.

Always in the forefront when danger was ever present he asked of none that which he himself was not willing to do.

His passing from the mortal scene leaves a great void in a never-ending circle of friends but indelibly inscribed a page in the history of individual achievement and service dedicated to an enduring cause—the cause of freedom.

Lincoln Alone Saw Our Struggle as World's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, much has been written on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the birth of the great American President, Abraham Lincoln. One of the most interesting articles that I have read was written expressly for the Associated Press by the noted American historian and Pulitzer Prize winner, Allan Nevins. He quotes an Emancipation Proclamation editorial from one of the most eminent and well respected newspapers of that era, the Springfield (Mass.) Republican, which is still published as a Sunday newspaper in my home city.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have Professor Nevins' article, taken from the Springfield Union, printed with my remarks:

LINCOLN ALONE SAW OUR STRUGGLE AS WORLD'S—HISTORIAN NEVINS PAYS TRIBUTE TO HIS GREATEST QUALITIES: SAGACITY, MAGNANIMITY, UNERRING FAITH, AND VISION

(By Allan Nevins)

It is 150 years since Abraham Lincoln opened his eyes in a one-windowed, dirt-floored cabin near Hodgeville, Ky.; it is almost 94 years since Stanton broke the hush at his deathbed with words, "Now he belongs to the ages."

No statesman ever grew more sturdily than Lincoln grew between 1854 and 1865: grew from a prairie politician to be the beneficent dictator of a great Nation in its most terrible crisis.

No leader of modern times has grown more steadily in fame and worldwide influence since his death.

He is like the mountain peak that at near view seemed little more than equal with its fellows, but that as we recede and gain perspective rises higher and higher above their level.

The romance of his life furnishes part of his appeal. "This man," wrote his Springfield law partner Herndon, "this long, bony, wiry, sad man, floated into our country in 1831 in a frail canoe, down the north fork of the Sangamon River, friendless, penniless, powerless, and alone—ragged, struggling for the common necessities of life. This man, this peculiar man, left us in 1861, the President of the United States, backed by friends, power, fame, and all human force."

The self-taught railsplitter reached Washington relatively unknown and untested. He died so trusted that the once-skeptical New York diarist, G. T. Strong wrote: "No prince, no leader of a people, was ever so lamented * * * his name is faithful and true. He will stand in history beside Washington, perhaps higher."

What is the deeper secret of the hold this son of the prairies had taken on the imagination of the world? More books, foreign and domestic, are written on him than on any other civil ruler of the past.

His statue stands in many cities; his writings are in all collections of the classics of the English tongue; his sayings are alike the treasure of the humbler and the inspiration of the great.

The Hindu student, the South African Negro, the British statesman, the Latin American publicist, find his name what Lord Charnwood called it, "the greatest among those associated with the cause of popular government." He belongs equally to the masters of statecraft and to plain men and women. Just why is this so?

HE ACTUALLY OPPOSED ABRUPT EMANCIPATION

We would look in vain for the explanation merely in his principal public acts.

He was the great emancipator, but he was a reluctant emancipator, who for all his intense desire to free the slaves would have preferred gradual compensated emancipation to an abrupt liberation.

He was an unmatched war leader, but never a highly efficient administrator; two other wartime Presidents, Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt, showed more skill in organizing the energies of the Nation.

He was a farsighted national chieftain, but never an astute planner with the many-sided talents of a Theodore Roosevelt.

We reach a partial understanding of his grip on succeeding generations when we turn from his acts to examine two underlying traits, his sagacity and his magnanimity.

The sagacity with which he was always correctly credited did not lie in a simple grasp of what was expedient. It lay in his ability to pierce to the heart of a complex problem, where right and wrong seem inextricably mingled, with unerring logic.

The supreme illustration of this wisdom is offered by his proposal for meeting the terrible national disease of slavery and sectional friction.

From 1854 onward he preached that the Nation could not endure half slave and half free; that a crisis must be reached and passed before it could be safe.

He was our first statesman to define that crisis without evasion.

What did passing the crisis mean? Not a decision to abolish slavery immediately. No, simply a decision to put bounds around slavery, to contain it, accepting the principle that within a reasonable time it must be gradually erased; and meanwhile to sit down and calmly consider ways and reasons for erasing it.

This was the one courageous, morally sound, and practical remedy ever proposed for the difficulties of racial readjustment, economic revolution, and regional strife bound up in slavery.

Its sagacity, had Americans adopted it, would have saved the country a million lives, a mountain of treasure, and a grievous retardation of growth.

His magnanimity, innate and unfailing, matched his sagacity.

In the course of a long, bitter war he never once uttered an abusive word about the southern people.

Throughout that war he maintained his hope that it should end in no mere political reunion, but a reunion of hearts and purposes.

A young Frenchman, the Marquis de Chambrun, who was sometimes at the White House in 1865, tells us that whenever Lincoln heard men talk about putting the conquered South under iron controls, he exhibited an unconcealable "fatigue and weariness."

In the last weeks of the war, when the foe was plainly vanquished, he proposed to his Cabinet a plan for giving the South, if it stopped fighting at once, a general amnesty, a release of all confiscated property, and a grant of $400 million toward regaining its feet.

When he heard from Grant at the time of Lee's surrender that Union troops might capture Jefferson Davis, a radical northerner exclaimed, "He must be hanged." But Lincoln replied with a free quotation from the Bible: "Judge not, that we be not judged."

HE KNEW STRENGTH OF THE PLAIN PEOPLE

Lincoln's greatest qualities, however, lap deeper than sagacity and magnanimity. One was his passionate faith in the virtue and strength of the plain people.

God must have loved them, he said, or He would never have made so many of them; you could never fool all of the people all of the time; government of, by, and for the people was not only the best government, but the hope of the world.

As an expounder of democracy he had the same fervent faith as a poet he loved, Robert Burns.

Out of his passionate regard for common folk came his unerring instinct for popular sentiment; he knew just how far and fast he could go in leading the country without losing touch with the majority. Out of it came his consistent refusal to talk down to the people or appeal to their passions. As Lowell said, he never played the cleon, the demagoge.

Instead, he presented the people with careful arguments, addressed to their reason and their best sentiments. "I beg of you a calm and enlarged considertaion of them," he said of one set of reasons.

This instinct for the popular heart made his most memorable public act, the Emancipation Proclamation, seem to good judges just right. The Springfield Republican said: "The President's action is timely—neither too soon nor too late. It is thorough—neither defeating itself by halfway measures nor by passionate excess. It is just and magnanimous, doing no wrong to any loyal man, and offering no exasperation to the disloyal. It will be sustained by the great mass of the loyal people, North and South; and thus, by the courage and prudence of the President, the greatest social and political revolution of the age will be triumphantly carried through in the midst of a civil war."

SAW IT AS STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY

And out of his deep feeling for popular government was born Lincoln's crowning quality: his vision of the larger meaning of the grim struggle he had to conduct. It mine whether the Union should survive or perish.

It was an ordeal to determine whether democracy had sufficient strength to survive, whether America would repay the devotion of the hosts who died for it by seeking a new birth of freedom, and whether the Republic would serve the future of mankind.

From the Bible, from Shakespeare, from long reflection, Lincoln had gained an understanding of the meaning of history.

He knew that whatever is done in one part of the globe affects the lot of peoples in other parts.

He knew that the adventure of mankind has but begun, and that the course chosen by a continental power like the United States must have its influence on the long ages to come.

This conviction, expressed with his memorable eloquence, gave the struggle a spiritual significance, and made victory for union and freedom seem the opening of gates on a better world.

Five years after the Gettysburg Address, the British Parliament passed its new reform bill, partly because American democracy had vindicated itself.

Seven years after the address, France erected the Third Republic, partly because the

American Republic had survived its ordeal.

These facts gave new significance to the letter to J. C. Conkling in which Lincoln had expressed the Nation's gratitude to the men who died for their ideals on all the fields—Shiloh, Antietam, Chancellorsville, Vicksburg.

"Thanks to all," he had written, "for the great Republic—for the principle it lives by and keeps alive—for man's vast future—thanks to all."

The truest tribute the American people can pay Lincoln on every celebration of his birthday is to try to share his earnest conviction that the Republic has a great world destiny; that in every crisis men must do their duty not for the country alone but for all countries, and not for the hour only, but for the long generations ahead.

The 41st Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor and privilege, yesterday, to participate in exercises, commemorating the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, which were held in Our Lady of Vilna Church Hall, Worcester, Mass.

The meeting and ceremonies were sponsored by the Committee for Commemoration of Lithuania's Independence, Joseph W. Glavickas, president; Olga A. Kersis, secretary. The assemblage, which overran the capacity of the hall, consisted of the members of the two great local Lithuanian parishes of St. Casimir's, and Our Lady of Vilna, together with representatives from 55 other Lithuanian groups within our community.

In connection with this eventful occasion I have been requested to include in the RECORD resolutions unanimously adopted by the assembly, and speeches delivered by myself and Anthony J. Miller, a prominent Worcester attorney of Lithuanian descent; the resolutions and speeches follow:

THE 41ST ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, WORCESTER, MASS.

(Speech Delivered by the Honorable HAROLD D. DONOHUE, of Massachusetts)

I am, very glad, as your Representative in the Federal Congress, to again take part in these ceremonies commemorating another anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence.

While this occasion necessarily and sorrowfully reminds us that Lithuania is still suffering under the cruel heel of Russian Communist imperialism, we are not gathered here in any atmosphere of casual surrender or regretful abandonment of the hope that Lithuania and her good people will eventually be freed.

We are, rather, assembled to voice our righteous protest of outrageous Communist conduct, and exert our best efforts to give heart to the courageous and long-suffering Lithuanian people for the continuation of their struggle against enslavement. Our confidence for the future of Lithuania is based in great part upon our knowledge of her past history.

You know, and I know, that at one time, and for a number of centuries, the Lithuanian kingdom was a powerful force for good in the whole of eastern Europe. The Lithuanians not only had succeeded in repelling the barbarian invaders from the East, but they were also the gallant champions, and formed the advance guard of Christianity in that part of Europe. A high place of respect and admiration for Lithuania among the nations of the world seemed to be assured.

The Lithuanian state came into being as an independent unit in the year 1253, more than 700 years ago. I do not have to recount to you her glorious history through the following centures up to the tragic time, late in the 18th century, when she was ruthlessly absorbed into the old Russian Empire.

However, when World War I ended, Lithuania regained her independence and succeeded in reestablishing an individual national state, and proclaimed themselves as such on February 16, 1918, after 123 years of Russian domination.

During the long period of subjugation, the devout and dedicated people of Lithuania had persevered in their resistance to tyranny and faithfully preserved the heritage of faith and freedom.

It does not surprise us then that modern history shows that following that fateful February day in 1918 there was an immediate resurgence of national culture and a prompt expansion of her free institutions.

The Lithuanian people established a democratic form of government. Under it they prospered, economically, socially, and religiously.

Suddenly, on June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union violated all of its treaty commitments with Lithuania, and the Red army moved in. Without provocation or justification, and in utter contempt of international law and morality, the Communist Kremlin overran Lithuania, and the other independent Baltic countries, and installed regimes deliberately designed to destroy the newborn freedoms of all the peoples within those brave states.

Since that time, Soviet Russia has purposely used the whole force of its overpowering totalitarian might to exterminate the Lithuanian sense of nationhood. The Soviet system has been imposed and Lithuania has actually been incorporated in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Thousands of Lithuanians have been executed and hundreds of thousands have been shipped to slavery in Siberia.

Every conceivable barbarian effort has been made to suffocate the patriotic independent sentiment of the Lithuanian people.

Today our hearts and our minds are moved with compassion by the suffering and the persecution we know the good people of Lithuania are undergoing this very hour. At the same time, our minds and our hearts are inspired by them and for them because we also know they have bravely and gloriously survived and conquered other and earlier periods of cruel foreign tyranny.

The people of Lithuania are neither broken nor discouraged by the stark and terrible realities of oppression under which they now, unfortunately, live. The burning fever of basic liberty and freedom is heightened within them, not diminished, by their current adversity.

We know that their courage and their indomitable will to resist subjugation grows stronger with every outrage committed against them by those who seek to become the atheistic masters of their spirits as well as their bodies.

We in America take courage from the valor of the Lithuanian people. They are sustaining us by their example of devotion to our common cause.

They inspire us here, and her countless friends throughout the still free world, to remain true in our struggle to relieve Lithuania, and the other oppressed nations, from the Communist yoke.

We will continue the struggle with every resource at our command to overcome the godless scourge which is trying to enslave the whole world and which presently has unfortunate and gallant Lithuania within its horrible grasp.

Today we specially remind ourselves that no people anywhere have been more heroic nor fought more bravely against countless odds for liberty and freedom than the Lithuanian people. We are reminded that the destiny of Lithuania and her freedom-loving neighbors is linked with the future of America. We cannot ourselves expect to remain free if we do not exert every possible effort to promote the freedom of Lithuania.

Let us then here pledge ourselves to work unceasingly for the liberation of Lithuania and the other captive nations, and may divine providence grant that that glorious and Christian objective be accomplished in the near future.

FORTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, WORCESTER, MASS.

(Speech delivered by Attorney Anthony J. Miller)

As an American of Lithuanian descent, it is an honor for me to join with Congressman DONOHUE in this program commemorating the 41st anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence.

I want to emphasize the word "independence" because, to my mind, and I am sure to yours, independence is not a matter to be dwelt upon or spoken about on only 1 day a year.

The history and tradition of Lithuanian independence is a living thing and a blessed thing within us and among us, except when we give sorrowful thought to our Lithuanian homeland and her unfortunate people.

On this occasion, we are reminded that the Russian Communists cannot stop or forbid this program, or any other similar exercises that are being held throughout the United States and in other free countries in honor and in respect to Lithuania.

Appreciating our own blessings as citizens of the United States, we should, therefore, not permit a day to pass without thinking and planning and praying for the time when our native land will be liberated from Communist tyranny.

As Americans, we know that the generous heart of this country has always welcomed and assisted exiles and refugees.

Because this Nation fought for its own independence, it encourages independence for others.

Because we, as Lithuanian descendants, have advanced in the United States, and because we have a part in the development of this country, we are thereby helping to sustain the strength of the Lithuanian homeland. I think that is a substantial hope and comfort to our friends and relatives there. They know that we have a voice, as good Americans, in the formation of American foreign policy so that it will never be permitted, by any possible subversives, to forget its moral obligation to work for the freedom of Lithuania and the other suppressed nations.

Some of our people appear to be worried about the development of American foreign policy. They feel that we may gradually forget Lithuania and the other Baltic victims of Red Russian conquests. They fear that we may be tempted to make a settlement with the Communists and that we may be fooled by an invitation to peacefully coexist.

Let me clearly state to you my opinion that so long as we have representatives like

Mr. Donohue, and other fine Americans in our Government, neither the Congress nor the executive department will ever be fooled into such a betrayal. No diplomatic arrangement, no matter how convenient for the moment, would be tolerated by the American people whose traditional rule of life and conduct is fair play.

If we, ourselves, ever entertained such a thought, we then would be betraying the traditions that have inspired every generation of Americans and we would be faithless to the historic devotion to freedom that has made America what it is today.

We, and all our fellow Americans, realize we have had sufficient experience with Communist promises, pledges, and treaties, to know that we can trust them only at our own peril.

We remember very well the peace treaty that was signed by Lithuania and Russia at Moscow on July 12, 1920. By this treaty, the Soviet Government recognized, and I quote, "the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory," end of quote. On September 22, 1921, Lithuania was admitted into the League of Nations, becoming a full, free, and equal member of the international community. These are historical facts which the Russian Communists cannot change because they cannot burn or distort all of the history books in existence. Although they have since unjustly seized Lithuania and have done everything within their cruel power to communize it, they cannot justify their action in front of the conscience of the world.

Every other still free nation, including our own, knows that we will suffer the same tragic fate of Lithuania if we allow ourselves to be compromised or become so foolish as to place any reliance upon mere Soviet promises. We, as good Americans, also know that if we do not stand up and testify for our friends, we may some day find ourselves alone and without friends.

That is why all our fellow Americans join with us in working for the liberation of Lithuania and all of the other unfortunate nations that have come under Communist Russian subjugation.

That is why we must unceasingly strive with our own united words and actions, and commemorations of this kind, to keep the historic spirit of liberty and freedom burning high within the minds and hearts of the people of our Lithuania homeland.

That is why we can hope, even on this sorrowful occasion, that with our help, the help of our fellow Americans, and with God's help, to live to see the bright day when the persecuted people of Lithuania, and the other suffering nations, will again be free and independent in a peaceful world.

Having assembled at Our Lady of Vilna Parish Hall, Worcester, Mass., on February 15, 1959, to commemorate the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day (February 16, 1918), the members of the committee, as well as the members of the two Lithuanian parishes in Worcester, St. Casimir's and Our Lady of Vilna, and of the Lithuanian-American community of Worcester, comprising in all 55 Lithuanian groups, unanimously adopted and passed the following resolutions:

"Whereas the Government of the United States has ever been a stanch defender of the inalienable right that all nations, both large and small, have to enjoy freedom and to determine for themselves the form of government under which they wish to live; and

"Whereas Soviet Russia has denied this right to Lithuania and, in violation of the treaties of peace and nonaggression, with Lithuania in particular, and of various international agreements in general, has unjustly seized the territory of Lithuania and has subjected her people to the horrors of oppression, terrorization, dispossession, persecution, mass deportations and mass annihilations which, according to international law, constitutes the heinous crime of genocide; and

"Whereas the Republic of Lithuania, a small freedom-loving nation, ardently desires to exercise her solemn right of self-government and has proven that she is capable of self-rule by a remarkable progress made in all fields of endeavor during the years in which she enjoyed independence (1253–1795 and particularly 1918–39); and

"Whereas, the Government of the United States since 1940 has steadfastly refused to recognize de jure the unjust absorption of Lithuania within the Soviet orbit: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Government of the United States continue to maintain and adhere to its present policy of recognizing the de jure independence of Lithuania despite her present unlawful and unprincipled occupation by Soviet Russia; be it further

"*Resolved*, That Soviet Russia, having no sovereign rights over Lithuania or her territory, be forced to leave Lithuania immediately, thus restoring freedom to the nation, and to return at once to Lithuania all Lithuanian nationals, now exiled in Siberia and other foreign lands; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Republic of Lithuania be duly admitted and fully approved as a full-fledged member of the United Nations and that her appointed representatives be allowed to maintain with full privileges the status of duly-elected delegates of that Organization; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Fulles, Jr.; to the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.; to the Senators of Massachusetts, the Honorable John F. Kennedy and the Honorable Leverett Saltonstall; to the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Massachusetts, the Honorable Harold D. Donohue, and to the press."

Mr. JOSEPH W. GLAVICKAS,
Chairman.

WORCESTER, MASS.

MISS OLGA O. KERSIS,
Secretary.

WORCESTER, MASS.

Gordon E. Dunn of the Miami Hurricane Forecast Center—Citation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is always pleasant to note recognition given to an outstanding public servant. Mr. Gordon E. Dunn, Weather Bureau meteorologist in charge of the Miami Hurricane Forecast Center, today received a Department of Commerce Gold Medal Citation for his outstanding contributions to the public service in the field of hurricane warnings.

We in the community have for some time considered his ability and experience in this field of great value to the areas served by the Miami center and are particularly pleased to see that the agency of which he is a part has presented to him this award.

The Germination of Religious Acknowledgments in Political Documents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, and in connection with the introduction of a resolution proposing a Christian amendment to the United States Constitution, I hereby insert the fourth in a series of 13 radio programs delivered by Dr. R. J. G. McKnight delivered on the Christian Amendment Hour, entitled "The Termination of Religious Acknowledgments in Political Documents." Dr. McKnight, Pittsburgh, Pa., is a great student of history, philosophy and the Bible. A complete set of the 13 radio addresses can be secured by writing to the Christian Amendment Movement, Box 92, Pittsburgh, Pa. The address follows:

At the close of our last broadcast we quoted a statement made by Justice Story in his "Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States." This is the quotation: "Every American colony, from its foundation down to the Revolution, did openly, by the whole course of its institutions, support and sustain, in some form, the Christian religion."

The evidence for this statement is abundant and available. It abounds in all the charters granted by kings of England from James I to George II. In every one of these charters: the charter of Virginia (April 10, 1606) granted by James I; the charters of Pennsylvania, Massachusetts Bay, Maryland, Connecticut, Carolina, Rhode Island, Georgia, and the colonial compacts of government.

The sentiment of all these charters may be summarized and exhibited in the oath taken by John Haynes who was elected Governor of Connecticut in 1639. This is the oath taken by Governor Haynes: "I, John Haynes, being now chosen to be Governor within this jurisdiction * * * do swear by the great and dreadful name of the everliving God, to promote the public good and peace of the same according to the best of my skill * * * and will further the execution of justice according to the rule of God's word. So help me God, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ."

Compare this oath, framed in the days of the colonies, with the feeble constitutional oath: "I do solemnly swear—solemnly (not in a religious sense)—that I will faithfully execute the office of the President of the United States," etc. No recognition of God by Whom men are commanded to swear; not even, "So help me God."

This oath of John Haynes has been quoted to show that the dominant sentiment of all the charters, colonial compacts, and civil documents of the pre-Revolution days was Christian—that in all of them God, Christ, and the Bible were recognized.

All of this continued "from the foundation of every colony down to the Revolution," as Justice Story says ("Down to the Revolution"). Justice Story's keen legal mind, in writing of the history of our Constitution, discerned the turning point.

Times passes on, May 17, 1776, was kept as "a day of humiliation, fasting and prayer, by appointment of the Continental Congress, that they, with the colonies, might confess and bewail sin, and by a sincere repentance and amendment of life, appease God's righteous displeasure, and through the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ, obtain His pardon and forgiveness."

On July 2, 1776, a resolution was passed dissolving all political connections with Great Britain. Then on July 4, 1776, was adopted that immortal instrument, in which, while asserting the Nation's independence of oppressive human authority, the Continental Congress acknowledged their own and the Nation's dependence on God, closing with these words: "And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

On October 31, 1777, a committee was appointed by Congress to prepare a recommendation to the States to set apart a Day of Thanksgiving for their signal success. On December 18, 1777, the Thanksgiving Day was observed. The closing words of that Thanksgiving Proclamation are as follows: "That the people may join in the penitent confession of their manifold sins, whereby they had forfeited every favor, and their humble and earnest supplication that it may please God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, mercifully to forgive and blot them out of remembrance * * * that it may please God to take schools and seminaries of education * * * under His nurturing hand and to prosper the means of religion for the promotion and enlargement of that Kingdom which consisteth in righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."

Time passes on. In September, 1783, the Definitive Treaty of Peace between Great Britain and the United States was drawn up and signed by representatives of both nations in Paris on September 3, 1783.

The Revolutionary War, with all its horhors and bloodshed was over. The United States of America was recognized by Great Britain as a free and independent sovereign nation. By December 1783, the British troops evacuated New York City, the Continental Army was dissolved, George Washington gave a farewell message, and there was peace.

You will remember that Justice Story said: " 'Down to the Revolution' every American Colony did openly, by the whole course of its institutions, support and sustain the Christian religion." The 6 years that followed were years of confusion and chaos in Government.

J. Fiske says in his book "Critical Period of American History" (p. 55): "It is not too much to say that the period of 5 years following the peace of 1783 was the most critical in all the history of the American people." Trade and industry declined to the lowest point. As we read the history of these 5 years, there were arguments, debates on matters concerning human rights, lines of territory, taxes, and a thousand other material problems. But in all this history you find no single line acknowledging the need for dependence upon Almighty God, no prayer for divine guidance.

The religious fervor of the early Colonists had evaporated. The confessed need, expressed in the Colonial Compacts, for pardon of sins and for reconciliation with God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, was entirely absent.

As H. C. Lodge says "Life and Letters of George Cabot": "Thomas Jefferson, arrived in New York from France, filled with the wild democratic theories which his susceptible nature had readily imbibed in France (and) soon infused them into the minds of most of his followers."

It was at this point in history that "We the people" assumed the task of writing the Constitution of the United States. It was at this point that we the people of the United States undertook the colossal task of writing the Constitution of the United States which was to govern our people for generations to come without any recognition of the sovereign God who created all nations.

Murray-Metcalf Bill Strengthens Local and State Control Over Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 4, 1959, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] introduced into the House of Representatives a bill to provide money for educational purposes termed free from any Federal controls. The gentleman from Washington stated:

> Therefore, I am introducing a no-strings-attached alternative bill to pay back some of their own money to the respective States and Hawaii for educational purposes free from any Federal controls. My bill would authorize an appropriation equal to 2 percent of all Federal income taxes collected in each State and Hawaii for education in the common or public schools. That is all. No standards or specifications of any sort are stipulated.

In introducing his bill, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] clearly recognizes that there is need for the Federal Government to take action in assisting local and State authorities in the financial support of schools. He said:

> If some of our local school districts' financial affairs are critical, and I am convinced such is the case, let us give the local and State authorities help but refrain from dictating how they must solve their problems.

By some twist of the imagination the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] asserted in his speech that the Murray-Metcalf bill—H.R. 22—sets forth limitations and definitions of the State educational program that would make it unnecessary for State and local education agencies "to abdicate jurisdiction over educational process." Such a contention is incorrect. There is nothing in the Murray-Metcalf bill that would require even in the slightest any abdication of State and local jurisdiction over the educational process. On the contrary, the Murray-Metcalf bill was drawn up in such a way as to specifically strengthen the local and State control over education in this Nation.

In an attempt to document his contention that the Murray-Metcalf bill sets forth limitations on the States' education programs, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] cited section 4, subsection (b), of the bill, which he says "spells out specifically that this money shall be used for school construction and teachers' salaries." It is impossible to see how anyone could consider that the Congress, through providing money to the States to be used for either school construction or teachers' salaries, could be accused of setting forth limitations on the States' education programs. Such a contention is somewhat analogous to the story of the father of a 12-year-old newspaper boy who was earning some of his own spending money. The father gave the boy $20 to buy shoes and clothing that the boy needed badly. It would be absurd to argue that in giving the boy money to be used for these two purposes, the father was limiting his son's discretion over how he would spend his earnings from his paper route.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] stated that section 5 of the Murray-Metcalf bill, "by inference sets forth priorities for school buildings, removing from the State the latitude of determining its own needs." Actually, all section 5 of the bill does is say that the State education agency shall certify that the portion of its Murray-Metcalf funds that are allocated within the State for school construction shall be so distributed that "priority is given to school districts which have the greatest additional need for school facilities and which, in terms of the economic resources available to them are least able to finance the cost of need school facilities." This provision of the bill leaves the priorities that are to be developed wholly up to the State. The U.S. Commissioner of Education does not have the authority to say whether or not the priorities that the States set up are adequate or inadequate; he has neither the power to approve or to disapprove the States' priority methods. Hence, the gentleman's contention that these priorities would remove from the States the latitude of determining their own needs is completely false. Again, this is somewhat analgous to the case of the father of the 12-year-old newspaper boy giving his son the $20 bill with which to buy needed clothing and saying:

> Son, first sit down and draw up a list of the clothes you need and with this money buy the items you need most.

Such a specification by the father certainly could not be considered as removing from the son the latitude of determining his own clothing needs.

All the Murray-Metcalf bill does in section 5 is to say to the States that if they use for school construction some of the money provided under this bill, they must agree to send the money to those school districts that need it the most. Certainly such a specification could not be considered as causing the States "to abdicate local and State jurisdiction over educational process."

In his speech, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] stated:

> If some of our local school districts' financial affairs are critical, and I am convinced such is the case, let us give the local and State authorities help.

Let us look for a moment at the type of help that the gentleman would give State and local school districts under his

proposed return of 2 percent of all the Federal income taxes collected in each State to be used for "education in the common or public schools." The Pelly bill introduced would provide $71 per child of school age in New York but in his own State of Washington it would provide only $25 per child of school age, while in the State of Mississippi it would provide only $4. These figures are obtained by dividing the States' 2 percent of 1957 Federal income tax payments, given by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] in his speech, by the estimated school age population, 5–17 years, for 1957. It is most difficult to see how the Pelly bill would provide help to those school districts that have the most critical need for such support from the Federal Government. Actually, the gentleman's proposal would provide for equalization in reverse, for it would give proportionately the greatest amount of money to the States that had proportionately the least number of school age children. On the other hand, the Murray-Metcalf bill would collect the money from the States in which the wealth is located and distribute it to the States in which the children actually reside and are to be educated. Hence, there is a substantial equalizing effect in the collection and distribution of funds under the Murray-Metcalf bill.

Moreover, there would be hardly any more administrative costs involved in the Murray-Metcalf bill than there would be in Mr. PELLY's proposal. After all, it is the same revenue agency that would be collecting the taxes and the same Treasury Department that would be sending a check to each State. The only additional cost involved in the Murray-Metcalf bill would be a fraction of one person's time needed to determine the amount to be paid to each State under the formula provided in the bill and to receive reports from the States. These administrative costs should amount to not over $10,000. Such an amount is infinitesimal in comparison with the $4.7 billion that the Murray-Metcalf bill would annually make available to the States for the vital needs of school construction and teachers' salaries.

The College Student Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under the impact of Russian technological progress and the hard-driving educational system on which it is based, the United States is slowly waking up to the challenge.

Education—in the long run—will prove to be the decisive factor in the struggle between freedom and communism for world leadership.

Our attitude toward education must—and will—change.

No longer can we regard it as secondary to luxuries. If necessary, we must make sacrifices to guarantee the development of the world's best educational system.

As evidence of this definite trend, I ask for unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the February 4 issue of the Lawrence Daily Eagle, entitled, "Federal Education Loan Plan Popular":

FEDERAL EDUCATION LOAN PLAN POPULAR

The college student loan plan written into the National Defense Education Act last year has turned up a major surprise in popularity.

It was substituted for a $75 million scholarship program after an intellectual wrestling match in the closing weeks of the last Congress. The lawmakers in their infinite wisdom killed the scholarship plan and put a $295 million, 4-year loan program in its place.

Few educators thought it would work. For, as Dr. Arthur Flemming, former president of Ohio Wesleyan and now secretary of Health Education and Welfare declares, up until recently, college loan funds had gone begging.

The most optimistic prediction was that not more than 800 of the 1,950 U.S. institutions of higher learning would take part in the new Government student loan program.

In the first 4 months, 1,230 colleges and universities have applied for participation, asking for $62 million in Government money for this year.

This figure is double the amount Office of Education now has in sight. Congress appropriated $6 million to get the program started this year. A supplemental $25 million is being asked to run the program until June 30. Unless the colleges are being overoptimistic in estimating student demand, it won't be enough.

Loans applied for now are expected to be small, to run students short of cash through this college year. For the next college year beginning in September, it is believed that loan applications will be larger, to cover a full 9 months. But Office of Education has so far requested only another $31 million for the year beginning July 1.

Congress originally authorized—but has not appropriated for the student loan program—$47½ million the first year, $75 million the second, $82½ million the third and $90 million the fourth. This $295-million total would take care of 590,000 1-year loans of $500 average.

No student will be permitted to borrow over $1,000 a year, or $5,000 over 5 or more years. Interest is 2 percent while the student is in college, and 1 year thereafter. Then the interest rates goes to 4 percent. The loan must be repaid in 10 years.

There is a 10 percent forgiveness every year for 5 years to students who go into grade or high school teaching. To this extent the loan program is a scholarship.

Also, the law offers fellowships to graduate students preparing for college teaching. They will provide grants of $2,000 for the first year, $2,200 the second, $2,400 the third, plus $400 a year for each dependent.

One thousand such fellowships were to be granted the first year. But in the first 4 months of the program, 6,000 applications have been received. This response is likewise far heavier than was anticipated. Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick will make the first 160 grants early in February.

Last October DHEW Secretary Flemming declared that scholarships would still be needed, in addition to the loan and fellowship programs. The original plan was to give up to $1,000 a year for 4 years to exceptional students who could not pay for a higher education.

Unexpected popularity of the loan program, however, has shelved the scholarship idea. It is not mentioned in President Eisenhower's new budget. The administration's austerity program may have had something to do with killing it.

If the loan program turns out to be as good as it now looks, Secretary Flemming is of the opinion that corporations and private foundations which have granted most of the scholarships in the past may change their programs.

U.S. Money Troubles Grow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, for many months, through the medium of my weekly newsletters and otherwise, I have warned the people of the Third Congressional District in Iowa that their Government is facing serious trouble in refinancing the huge Federal debt.

Early last August, I called attention to the fact that beginning in 1958 and running for 5 years, the U.S. Treasury would be confronted with the herculean job of refinancing some $216 billion of the then existing Federal debt, plus any deficit spending during that period. It was obvious even then that investors were not enthusiastic about Government securities and subsequent developments have made that completely clear, despite almost unbelievable increases in interest rates.

Bringing the debt management situation up to date, I recommend the reading of an article by Sylvia Porter, a writer for the Hall Syndicate, Inc., which appeared in the Washington Star of February 15, 1959. The article follows:

MASS REFUSAL OF U.S. I O U's

Something rather frightening is going on in Wall Street, involving the credit and financial reputation of the Government.

Administration policymakers are starting to talk in almost evangelistic tones of the urgent need for balancing the budget now. They insist it's imperative to squelch now the belief that inflation is inevitable in this country. They're stressing inflation dangers so much now—a time when prices are fairly stable, unemployment is disturbingly high, lots of industrial plants are idle. Here's the story:

Yesterday and today over $9 billion of Treasury securities, held by institutions and wealthy individuals the Nation over, mature. Since the Treasury hasn't the cash on hand to pay off the securities, early last week it asked owners of the I O U's to extend them. And to induce the extensions, it offered close to the highest interest rates in a quarter century—3¾ percent for a 1-year extension, 4 percent interest for a 3-year extension.

TWENTY-TWO PERCENT SAY "NO"

Holders of more than 22 percent—or $2 billion—of the I O U's, said "No." They are demanding their cash this weekend.

This was one of the biggest mass refusals of Treasury securities on record. To meet the cash demands, the Treasury has been forced to borrow a large chunk of money against the taxes it will collect next September.

Why did these investors turn down the new Treasury securities?

Because many think that as today's economic advance progresses, they'll need the money for other, more profitable activities. They don't want to extend loans to the Treasury even for a year.

Because many have become increasingly disenchanted with buying Treasury securities during the past several months of a huge budget deficit and constant Treasury borrowings.

Because many are convinced that the combination of Government-business-labor policies will keep us in a long-term inflation cycle. They don't want to own fixed-income securities in a period of inflation.

Because many believe that as inflation accompanies the business upswing, interest rates will go even higher. They're waiting for some sort of climax in the market before they buy more Government securities.

Although prices on marketable Treasury obligations have sunk to the lowest levels in years and the market is highly nervous, a climax hasn't occurred and hopefully, it won't occur.

But financiers are beginning to shudder at the magnitude of the debt management problems facing the Treasury.

NEAR DEBT LIMIT

In its new borrowing the Treasury is bumping against the legal debt ceiling.

In its sale of securities the Treasury also is approaching the 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling on new bonds set up by Congress in the World War I era.

Now the evangelistic attitudes become understandable. Spokesmen for the White House, the Treasury, the Federal Reserve System are crying out that the budget must be balanced—so the Treasury can avoid borrowing more new money and the inflation feeding deficit can be erased.

Even as the Treasury was counting the refusals on its IOUs, its chief, Secretary Anderson, was standing before a joint House-Senate Economic Committee, solemnly warning that, "if we ever reach the point where people believe that to speculate is safe, but to save is to gamble, then we are indeed in trouble."

There is no simple way out of this one. Actually, I can't recall when experts in this field have been so lacking in solutions—except, "balance the budget, squelch inflation fears, convince investors that Treasury securities at these interest rates are sound buys." So easy to write, so hard to achieve.

No Enfant Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, an important facet of improving international relations is that which can be done by the people themselves. Improvement of international relationships and exchanges on a government-to-government basis through the usual means, such as treaties, diplomatic channels, memberships in international organizations, the mutual security program, cultural and student exchange programs, and others, are all excellent but limited in their impact upon the great mass of the people. It remains for the people themselves—individually and as a group—to act affirmatively to bring about better understanding among each other and to achieve world peace.

An extremely effective effort is being carried out under the people-to-people program. An excellent example of what can be done and of what is being done is the one of the "sister cities" of Coral Gables, Fla., and Cartagena, Colombia. Fifty-nine residents of the south Florida community have returned today from a 4-day visit to Cartagena as guests of Cartagena's mayor and people-to-people committee. Last November, some 15 visitors from Cartagena were the guests of Coral Gables on a similar 4-day visit. During their visit, many of the Cartagenans stayed in the homes of their hosts in order to see how Americans live and work. The success of this visit led to the return invitation.

Both groups of visitors were feted at social and civic functions attended by local dignitaries and enthusiastic residents of the host communities. The very important part of these exchanged hospitalities is the face-to-face contacts between civic, business, and educational leaders of both cities, about which the Coral Gables Times, a Knight publication, made the following appropriate remarks:

NO ENFANT TERRIBLE

Back in the twenties American tourists slapped French francs on the outside of their luggage, zipped through the Louvre and other venerable museums on the European continent in 10 minutes and carried away tons of souvenirs.

Thus was born the reputation of the American tourist as enfant terrible, a reputation that we bear to this day, regardless of the area where we set foot as sightseers and visitors.

That this stigma is one of the concerns of our Government is borne out by the fact that the U.S. Information Agency sent one of its executives to Coral Gables to instruct our local citizens about Colombia where a group of them will spend this weekend as exchange visitors in President Eisenhower's people-to-people program.

To our surprise he presented the audience with a pamphlet reassuring, and at the same time advising, them that they are not the vulgar tourists that is the stereotype of the American visitor which exists in the minds of natives of foreign countries.

But the fact that this advice had to be given at all is indicative of the responsibility that lies with every American in a foreign port.

That is why we believe so heartily in the people-to-people program. It will send to Latin American countries Americans who are the leaders and most respected members of their communities.

Coral Gables is proud of the delegation which will represent the United States in Cartagena, Colombia, this weekend. Their presence will show the Colombians that America is a land whose leaders on the municipal level are cultured, educated, and interested in the affairs of foreign neighbors.

Only the individual traveler can help to erase the idea, which is outmoded and unfair to our country, that our tourists are still roaring down on foreign cities out of the crazy heyday of the twenties.

I am proud that citizens in my district are playing such an important part in our international relations and have such a keen realization of what we as Americans must do to fight for freedom and understanding.

Right Place To Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Mansfield (Ohio) News-Journal for Wednesday, February 11, 1959.

I not only welcome the letters that may come to me as a result of this thoughtful editorial, I congratulate the News-Journal for devoting editorials to the great issues that face our people.

As this alert editor so correctly implies, these matters relating to billions, and to Federal spending generally, are not matters that are divorced from the day-by-day activities of the people themselves. The people are the ones who must pay the bills, through their own work. They have a vital stake in the budget, not only their own, their city, county, and State, but of their Federal Government.

I have always been in favor of economy in local spending, in State spending, and in Federal spending, and I always will be. The more facts the people can learn about how their money is being spent, and the more they think on these vital matters, the better off we will all be.

The editorial follows:

RIGHT PLACE TO START

While it is difficult to go along with the Democratic leaders in Congress who want to whoop up virtually all of President Eisenhower's recommendations for funneling more taxes through Washington for housing, schools, airports, farm subsidies and the like, one thing must be said for the idea.

If the Government is going to continue to tax and tax and spend and spend, it's better for the money to stay at home among the folks who pay the taxes.

The Democratic leadership is eyeing foreign aid as a place to cut down the overall budget and maybe even balance it.

That is certainly the right place to start.

The President has asked for $3,900,000,000 for foreign aid this year.

What the American people have not been told is how much of their tax money is already appropriated for foreign aid but not yet spent.

A good guess, based on last year's figures, would be that the foreign aid spenders already have $5 billion or $6 billion at their disposal which Congress cannot touch. It was appropriated in past sessions of Congress and remains unspent.

Why not spend this first—if we must keep on with this monstrous folly which has already cost an estimated $60 billion U.S. tax dollars—before the people are saddled with more foreign aid taxes?

Why not slash this year's appropriation drastically or take it out of the budget entirely?

The foreign aiders would still have billions to operate on, the budget might actually be brought into balance and something applied on the debt we have been piling up for our children to pay.

The Democrats definitely have the right idea in attacking this wasteful section of the budget. They can earn the gratitude of the

Nation by slashing this phase of Federal spending.

They need go no farther in other directions, but this would be a sound start. Let's encourage them. Write your Senators FRANK J. LAUSCHE and STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Senate Office Building, and your Congressman, ROBERT W. LEVERING, 324 House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

A 4-cent postage stamp could help save you literally hundreds of dollars in future taxes if you use it now.

I Can Hardly Wait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, here is a gem for the information of my colleagues:

LEGAL INFLUENCE

There are ways that you can influence your Congressmen—legally.

We've had a lot of mail on this subject from clients who are wondering whether it's safe for them to dabble in politics in view of such exposés as the Goldfine case.

The answer is: Yes, you can get into politics. You can get to know your Congressmen, and you can use many methods to influence their opinions and votes—without any danger of involvement or embarrassment.

How do you go about it? Arrange first to meet your Representatives and Senators either at home or in Washington, whichever is convenient. You'll find that nearly all of them are very approachable, very human.

Don't limit your contact to a formal conference, explaining your views. It's better to talk about other things first, matters on which there is no controversy.

Find some fields of common interest—people back home, sports, hobbies, etc. Invite your Congressman to lunch or dinner, or to a social affair. Make him feel you think he's smart and important. Ask him questions about subjects on which he's expert. Be a good, agreeable listener.

Don't overspend on entertainment, but don't be afraid to order a sufficiency of the best. Very important: Don't give gifts of any kind.

Develop future personal contacts—an affair back home, a speech or visit by your Congressman at a trade meeting or convention, a fishing trip, golf game, visits to your home, etc. Gradually build a close personal friendship.

After you're on a first-name basis, casually ask his advice about a personal or business problem * * * let him develop a reputation as a problem solver. Praise him for his astuteness.

Very soon you'll find him wanting to live up to this developed reputation. At that stage, you'll be surprised at how open-minded he will become on issues on which you previously thought him bitterly opposed.

He'll give you a fair hearing * * * and will avoid arbitrary votes against your point of view. He'll be embarrassed if he cannot logically defend his oppositional vote.

To some, this procedure may sound like trickery. Actually, it is the type of public relations being practiced every day by those who are guiding the Nation down the road to socialism.

Unless fire is fought with fire, American businessmen may just as well sit back and await the inevitable.

What Lincoln Said

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of February 13, 1959, entitled "What Lincoln Said." It is a well-known fact, historically, that the problems of one generation vary from those of a preceding generation. The editorial of the Washington Post clearly recognizes this fact in connection with a statement recently made by President Eisenhower, where he went back nearly 100 years in making a quotation from a speech made by the late Abraham Lincoln while he was a Member of Congress. One could just as well make the argument that we should not today enter into any military pacts or agreements with any other nation because of what George Washington said in his Farewell Address relating to no "entangling alliances." To me, the answer to such a statement would clearly be that the problems of America in the world of today are entirely different than they were during the infant days of our Government, or 100 years ago.

Everyone with common sense wants a balanced budget but there are few persons in Washington, and objective minds throughout the country, who are not aware of the fact that the President's budget is not a balanced one. If the President really wanted to balance his budget, he would have recommended that new taxes be imposed. I have stated publicly that leadership on his part in the world of today would have called for more taxes in order to assure us greater national defense. The people of our country would willingly make the sacrifices of paying more taxes if they knew that the additional revenue was to be used for the security of our country through stronger military preparations. The responsibility of recommending such increased taxes for greater military strength rests with the President. For the Congress to increase taxes to make larger appropriations for military purposes might result in, first, taxes being imposed, and the additional revenue collected; and, second, greater appropriations being made for defense, and the President freezing the same. If recommendation came from the President for more taxes for stronger national defense, the Members of Congress, and the people, would know if new taxes are imposed, that the additional revenue would be used for the national interest in the defense of our country.

In any event, the editorial appearing in the Washington Post of February 13 shows that President Eisenhower's reference to President Lincoln has no application to the conditions of today:

WHAT LINCOLN SAID

President Eisenhower did little honor to Abraham Lincoln in attempting to suggest that he would have supported the present Administration's retrenchment on Federal spending. It is, of course, a pretty thin tactic to begin with—to go back 111 years when Lincoln was a Member of Congress for even a general judgment on how present-day Federal finances should be managed. But if such guidance is to be sought from Lincoln, he ought to be read whole.

Lincoln did say, in the quotation attributed to him by Mr. Eisenhower, "The tendency to undue expansion is unquestionably the chief difficulty." But just before addressing those words to the House of Representatives on June 20, 1848, Lincoln said, "Determine that the thing can and shall be done, and then we shall find the way." His speech was in reply to President Polk's veto of an internal improvements bill. Throughout this speech Lincoln espoused the responsibility of the Federal Government to undertake the kind of "local" improvements which Mr. Eisenhower so often speaks of as being the primary responsibility of the localities involved.

We are not certain where Lincoln would stand in the present budget debate; but we suspect that if Mr. Eisenhower had been a party to the debates of the 1840's on the proper role of the Federal Government, he would have been arrayed against Lincoln.

Debt Refunding and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article written by Harold B. Dorsey in today's edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

The writer explains, in a very understandable fashion, exactly how the Government has come to experience unusual difficulties this month in the financing of its long-term securities.

It shows also how the new short-term issues of Government securities, purchased largely by the banks, are feeding the fires of inflation by having the exact effect of creating money for which there is no actual offsetting security.

It would be good, I believe, for all Members of the Congress to read and understand this article. It serves to point out that, in the interest of dollar stability, it would be an exceedingly good thing to begin some plan of systematic reduction of the national debt, as I proposed last week in the introduction of a resolution calling for such a plan.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 16, 1959]

DEBT REFUNDING AND INFLATION

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

It is most unfortunate so few people will understand the mechanics involved in an example last week of one of the dynamic consequences of current inflationary pressures. If the public—and if those well-meaning national leaders who have been generating the inflation pressures—understood this particular matter, there would be a better prospect that commonsense based on a more complete knowledge of the facts would dictate policies which are vital to the public welfare.

The instance concerns the refinancing of the Government's mid-February debt maturities totaling $14.9 billion. At the risk of incurring the criticism of purists in the field of money and credit techniques, I would like to explain this refunding operation with the hope that it will promote a broader comprehension among average people of the way that circumstances are making it necessary to create money by the simple stroke of the pen.

Approximately $9.2 billion of the total mid-February Federal debt maturities was held by the public, the remainder being held by the Federal Reserve banks and by Government investment accounts which almost invariably swap their maturing securities for the new securities in exchange. On the latter portion of the refinancing operation the matter of money supply was not involved, because savings of the economy that had formerly been loaned to the Government were merely transferred from one kind of security to another.

However, the holders of nearly $2.1 billion (approximately 23 percent of the publicly held maturities) refused the offer to relend the Government their savings for 1 year at 3¾ percent or for 3 years at 4 percent. They elected to have their savings paid back to them in the form of cash.

As a result of this unexpected cash requirement to pay off its creditors, the Treasury Department had to offer an even shorter-term issue (217-day maturity) for $1.5 billion. To a greater and greater extent, the Government is finding it necessary to use such short-term issues to finance the Government deficit and to refinance its maturities. Usually, this kind of issue is purchased largely by banks. The savings that might otherwise have been absorbed by investment in Government securities—in the current instance some $2.1 billion—thus becomes available to increase the demand for common stocks or for goods and services.

But let us see how the Government gets the money to pay off this $2 billion. What takes place on the books of the banks, which probably will be buying a large portion of the $1.5 billion of 217-day-maturity new certificates that were offered to raise the major part of the necessary cash? It is this particular operation that is so broadly misunderstood.

A given bank will agree to take $1 million of these certificates. It will receive a piece of paper signifying that the Government owes the bank a million dollars and will add this piece of paper to its assets under the heading of "Holdings of Government Securities." It then credits the deposit account of the Government with a million dollars. This latter credit represents money that the Government can spend. Presumably, in the current instance, the Government will draw a check against its deposit account and will deliver that check to some holder of the maturing Government debt issue. The receipient will then deposit the check in his checking account with some bank. Thus it becomes money that he can spend for whatever purpose he chooses.

Recognize then that the net result of the whole transaction is an increase in the indebtedness of the Government to the bank, and by the simple stroke of a pen—without even using a printing press to manufacture currency—there is created a million dollars of spendable funds. The latter increases the wherewithal to enlarge the demand for common stocks, or for all types of goods and services.

One does not have to be a professional economist to understand that the artificially created increase in demand, without an offsetting increase in supply, creates an inflationary pressure for higher prices.

It appears to be an unfortunate fact that the inflation situation has reached the dangerous breeding stage. The saver's fear of inflation, concretely demonstrated by the foregoing incident, has made him unwilling to invest a normal proportion of his funds in longer term debt instruments. There is a very understandable hesitancy to lend money when there continues to be such a distinct threat that it will be repaid in dollars of lower purchasing power.

Herein, we can see the simple facts underpinning Federal Reserve Board Chairman Martin's recent observation to the Joint Economic Committee that: "There can be no effective control of inflation if the banking system is made the major source of funds to finance Government deficits." We have just seen an incident wherein the banking system had to be an important source of funds to refinance a portion of the Government's old debt. By the way, the interest charges alone on the Government's accumulated deficit of past years are budgeted at $185 per average family of four for the next fiscal year—which presumes that the Federal debt will not be increased further.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate Lithuanians are among the most stout-hearted and bravest fighters for liberty and freedom. Yet, freedom and independence have been denied to them for centuries.

Except for the short but happy interlude of interwar years, they have had the misfortune to suffer under the oppressive and at times almost unbearable alien yoke in their homeland for almost two centuries. During the First World War, it seemed that their woes had come to an end by the overthrow of the czarist Russian regime, when they regained their freedom by proclaiming their national independence on February 16, in 1918. For about two decades fate was kind to them, and they lived happily in their free country. But, as the clouds of war began to gather over eastern Europe in 1939, their situation became extremely precarious, and early in the war their independence was shattered by the forces of the Red army.

Since then the unhappy Lithuanians have not known freedom, and have been held down by their Communist overlords. In their own country they lead the lives of prisoners in a vast prison camp, working as long as humanly possible, and under most wretched conditions, for their masters in the Kremlin. There is no trace of freedom, neither of speech, nor of movement, nor of correspondence; not even the freedom to lead a quiet life in any corner of the country.

But they have the satisfaction of knowing that they have friends and sympathizers in the free world, and particularly in America.

Today on the 41st anniversary celebration of the independence day I gladly join hosts of Americans of Lithuanian descent and echo their true liberty-loving sentiments.

That Old Gag That You Cannot Tell the Difference Between Republicans and Democrats Not True Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the February 4 issue of the Sterling Daily Gazette, Sterling Ill., entitled "That Old Gag That You Cannot Tell the Difference Between Republicans and Democrats Not True Now."

THAT OLD GAG THAT YOU CANNOT TELL THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS NOT TRUE NOW

That old gag about it being impossible to tell the difference between Republicans and Democrats is no good any more.

In the first month of this new session of Congress, programs of the Eisenhower administration and the Democratic majorities on Capitol Hill have been spelled out so clearly that the differences are unmistakable.

The principal difference is in ideas about the amount of money the Federal Government should spend, and whether the budget shall be kept in balance or operated at a deficit.

In three areas alone—Federal aid to education, airport construction, and housing—Democrats now propose spending $1½ billion more than the Republican administration proposes for the next fiscal year. Over the full 6 or 7 years of the conflicting programs, the Democrats would spend $13 billion more.

These proposals do not cover national defense, aids to agriculture and public works, on which the Democrats are considered likely to increase heavily Eisenhower budget figures.

In campaign speeches at Pittsburgh and Charleston last October 27, President Eisenhower identified the Democrats as "the spendthrift league" and accused them of urging a raid on the taxpayers' dollars.

The charge was resentfully denied by Democratic orators. But from the way things are shaping up in the new session of Congress, the President's charge seems justified.

Take housing. The administration called for a $1,660 million program, spread over 6 years. Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat of Alabama, introduced a bill which would cost nearly $3 billion, spread over 7 years.

For the fiscal year 1960, this bill as approved by the Senate would cost $15 million more than the President requested. A bill passed by the House would cost $300 million more. The differences would be for direct loans to veterans which the administration proposes.

House and Senate bills have to be compromised, with no telling what the outcome. President Eisenhower will give no hint on whether he will sign or veto a bill that goes so far beyond his recommendations. But this will bring to a head the question of whether the Government will unbalance its budget and embark on deficit financing.

Take aid to airports. The administration program calls for $200 million spread over 4 years. The bill introduced by Senator A. S. MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, calls for $575 million spread over 5 years.

Take Federal aids to education. The administration called for nothing beyond last

year's National Defense Education Act. But Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, has introduced a bill for school construction and other benefits which would cost $1.1 billion the first year and increase by that amount or more to $4.7 billion the 4th year. The total cost would be $11.3 billion.

In the field of Government lending programs, the administraion proposed $55 million for depressed areas suffering from chronic high unemployment. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, topped this with a $375 million program. President Eisenhower vetoed a similar bill last year.

All the foregoing illustrate differences in approach to spending bills. In addition, there are wide differences in Republican administration and Democratic congressional bills on labor legislation, civil rights, social security, atomic energy power development, space exploration, missile development, and foreign policy.

The new Congress is already bogged down with legislative proposals not recommended by the administration. In the first month of the session, 820 new bills were introduced in the Senate and 3,833 in the House for a total of 4,653. This is a record for any first month.

Many of these bills call for increased Government expenditures. The challenge which they throw up to Democratic leaders is how they will curb inflation if they allow Government appropriations to keep on going up.

Smear of Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial concerning the FBI which appeared in the February 9, 1959, Los Angeles Examiner, entitled "Smear of Fear."

I believe this editorial, which discusses the reasons behind the various propaganda barrages against the FBI, is very timely and will be of interest to all Members of Congress and the public.

The editorial follows:

SMEAR OF FEAR

American leftwingers and political pinkos appear to be pressing another propaganda barrage against the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

An indication of this is the unusual emphasis given to a long-winded magazine article which purports to show the FBI as an ineffectual crime prevention agency and a menace to civil liberties.

The line is a familiar one to anyone who has given any study to the subject, and the motivation for this antagonism to the FBI isn't hard to understand.

It is precisely because the FBI, under Director J. Edgar Hoover, has been so successful in exposing saboteurs, traitors, and subversives, that it has incurred the enmity of their sympathizers and dupes.

The FBI's record as a law enforcement agency and as protector both of the Nation's security and of the legitimate rights of individual American citizens is one to be proud of.

No comparable agency in the world has been more zealous in its regard for legal propriety, nor more careful not to overstep the bounds of its proper functions and jurisdiction.

As Hoover himself has emphasized time and again, the FBI is not a prosecuting agency but an investigative agency, constrained by, and observant of, the limits of the law.

Law abiding and patriotic Americans have no reason to fear the FBI and every reason to be grateful to it. The smear accusations that the FBI is a sort of a gestapo are generated by those who, because of their activities or associations, have reason to fear that the FBI will expose or apprehend them, and Hoover and the bureau are to be congratulated on the enemies they have made.

The 41st Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Emphasizes the Sad Plight of a Liberty-Loving Nation and Calls to Mind the Contribution of Lithuanian-Americans to American Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the roots of American strength and greatness have been the diversity of its population. It has been the transfusion of foreign cultures into the circulation of American life that makes our country what it is today. The reasons for immigration to our shores have been varied, but the most tragic of these has been the loss of freedom in the homeland. This was the case in Lithuania.

In the latter part of the 18th century, when Russia absorbed Lithuania, many oppressed Lithuanians, finding freedom and justice more precious than the ties of their native soil, fled to our free shores.

Once in this country, these brave Lithuanians never ceased in their struggle to achieve liberty for their persecuted homeland. Numerous Lithuanian organizations throughout the United States worked vigorously for Lithuanian freedom. This work was not to be in vain, for on February 16, 1918, independence was finally realized. Happily, many Lithuanians returned home, but many more decided to remain in their adopted country.

Lithuania's loss was to be America's gain. Despite the strangeness of our laws, customs, and language, these eager Lithuanians quickly adjusted to the American way of life. Although naturally concerned about the fate of their homeland, these people identified themselves completely with America. They became solid American citizens and have never ceased to be grateful for the opportunities that this country has provided.

On the other hand, Americans have been equally grateful for the contributions of these Lithuanians to the growth of their culture. Evidence of these contributions is shown by the success of Lithuanian-Americans in various fields of endeavor.

The list of their achievements is long. Such names as Mikas Petraukas, Shirley White, and Ivan Lebedeff are familiar to music and theater lovers. Sport fans have cheered Jack Sharkey, Jack Goodman, and Vito Tamulis. In addition many more have served faithfully in public offices throughout the United States.

These few examples are indicative of the Lithuanian-American contributions to American life.

Nevertheless, although Americans first, these American citizens have a natural concern for the land of their ancestors which once again is not free. Ever since 1940, this helpless country has been incorporated into the Soviet Union. Although today is the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence, Lithuanian-American hearts are sad, for today will not be one for rejoicing in the land of their forebears.

Consequently, I would like to take this opportunity, on the anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, to express with all Lithuanian-Americans their hope of freedom for their oppressed homeland. Moreover, all the free world should resolve on this February 16 to work unceasingly for conditions that will bring peace to the world, allowing all nations to live in an environment of self-government, peace, and justice.

Gallant Lithuanians Sustain Persecution Through Faith and Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, just a few short weeks ago it was my privilege to participate in the observance of the 41st anniversary of Urkainian freedom.

What I said then can be mirrored today in our commemoration of the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Before the outbreak of World War II, Lithuania, along with her sister Baltic nations, Estonia and Latvia, was still an independent and democratic state.

But in June 1940 the cherished freedom of Lithuania evaporated with the cruel and unjust seizure of the country by Soviet Russia.

Within 2 days Soviet military troops invaded and tramped through the territory of Lithuania, as well as of Estonia and Latvia.

Lithuania has not been free since that time, but the spirit of freedom, hidden though it is behind the Iron Curtain, remains alive in the hearts and minds of Lithuanians.

Always a proud, virile nation which, through its long history, survived other oppressions, we of free America have little doubt that Lithuania will survive her present persecution and tyranny.

Ruling Lithuania, just as in other Soviet satellite nations, is a detested puppet regime that has stolen from the Lithua-

nian people all of their political and social rights and has forced them to vote for a single list of candidates designated by the Communist Party.

The people of Lithuania live in constant fear and terror. Their personal security is nonexistent. They are harassed every minute of every day by the agents of the secret police.

Without reason, without fair trials, they are imprisoned, investigated, executed, or deported for slave labor to remote areas of the Soviet Union.

Seven major waves of mass deportations, carried out under inhuman conditions, have diminished the total population of Lithuania by more than 350,000. Lithuania, a predominantly Roman Catholic population, has also seen her priests murdered, jailed, deported, or exiled. Of nearly 2,000 priests, we are told less than 750 remain free and alive.

Monasteries have been closed. Church property has been confiscated. Religious instruction has been forbidden.

What, then, keeps the faint, flickering hopes of the oppressed Lithuanian people alive?

What gives these gallant people the strength to sustain a persecution and a tyranny the like of which the world has not seen for centuries?

Two things, Mr. Speaker, just two things—an unrelenting faith in God and an indomitable courage born of tremendous hope.

And one day, I am confident, this great faith, this fantastic courage will be rewarded, and Lithuania will be delivered from enslavement, as will all the other oppressed peoples under the yoke of Soviet tyranny.

Commemoration of the 41st Anniversary of Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct privilege for me to add my small voice to the growing demands for freedom on the part of millions of Lithuanians and other nationalistic groups who are being kept in a captive status under the Soviet Communist rule.

Although, Premier Nikita Khrushchev continues to boast of the military strength and the economic advances of the Soviet, he fails to recognize that this apparent strength is based upon a compulsive labor economy that is held together by fear, by military tanks and guns, and by the cloak, spy, and dagger machinations of the select Communist Party membership and leadership.

I am sure that the spirit and the desire for freedom on the part of the Lithuanian people cannot be quenched and will continue to grow. The nationalistic spirit and the desire for freedom on the part of millions of people under the domination of the Soviet Socialist Republics will continue to be a fatal weakness in the miscalculations of Mr. Khrushchev and his Politburo Bureau.

I join with the Lithuanian American Council in today's celebration of the 41st anniversary of the restoration of independence of Lithuania. I join with the millions of Americans of Lithuanian extraction in their aspirations for the liberation of the Lithuanian Nation.

Cooperation by the Bureau of Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our attention is often called to wrong-doing by Government departments. Too seldom do we give credit to a Government agency that does a good job.

I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter, dated February 6, 1959, which came to me unsolicited from my friend, Solomon Dimond, a practicing attorney in Washington, D.C.:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: Members of Congress and the congressional committees have long been the traditional sounding boards for registering complaints concerning the various instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government. As representatives of the people, Congress has generally recognized its responsibility to sift grievances with a view to determining the need for remedial legislation.

It is very rare, and probably newsworthy, when the attention of Congress is directed to an unusual and outstanding accomplishment of a Government bureau in improving its relationships with an important national defense industry. It is highly important that Congress should be so informed for it indicates a sensible, practical solution to similar problems of other industries in their dealings with Government departments, bureaus, and agencies.

Due to the widespread dissatisfaction of the small ship and boat industry with the manner in which the Bureau of Ships was awarding and administering contracts for the construction of small ships and boats, with an attendant relatively large number of insolvencies of small ship and boat manufacturers as a result of undertaking Government contracts, the American Boat Builders and Repairers Association set up a Government contracts committee. This industry's grievances were aired in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of January 9, 1958, at page A-89. On March 6, 1958, a meeting was held at the Bureau of Ships between members of the committee, including me as counsel to the committee, and the Chief of the Bureau of Ships, his counsel and his top-level contract administrators.

Following the meeting, the Bureau of Ships decided to make a survey of the entire industry to determine its grievances as well as its suggested improvements in procedures. Letters were sent to over 500 shipyards, which shipyards included all companies that had expressed interest in undertaking Government contracts, inviting them to attend regional conferences. These conferences were held in Seattle, Philadelphia, Boston, New Orleans, Great Lakes, and Long Beach, California. Everyone present at the conferences was given as much time as he desired to present his views. The suggestions made were analyzed by the Bureau of Ships and collated into 101 different categories that were then considered by a study group set up by the Bureau of Ships.

As stated in its report, the study group accepted almost two-thirds of the suggestions in whole or in part. In each instance in which the Bureau rejected a suggestion, a detailed explanation of its reasons for rejection was set forth. The report is divided into two sections, the first of which is dated November 25, 1958, and the second of which is dated January 30, 1959. Enclosed you will find copies of these reports. It is my understanding that the Bureau of Ships has already put many of the agreed changes in procedure into effect, and is expeditiously proceeding to put the others into operation.

The efficient, thorough and prompt manner in which the Bureau of Ships cooperated with the small ship and boat industry is highly commendable. While the individual members of the industry might not agree with all the conclusions reached by the Bureau of Ships, they certainly would have to concede that they had the opportunity to present their views, that the Bureau of Ships carefully considered those views and that the resultant changes in procedures will materially improve the award and administration of contracts. The general discontent of the industry would have warranted a very time consuming exhaustive survey by a congressional committee. This was avoided by prompt administrative action. It was a fine job of public relations for which the Bureau of Ships should be officially commended.

Sincerely,

SOLOMON DIMO

Spending Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Marys (Pa.) Daily Press of January 30, 1959:

SPENDING CRUSADE

Americans have their ears dinned with crusades for this, crusades for that, and in most cases respond with what they think they can afford.

But few seem to take any part in any crusade to halt congressional spending in Washington. Mr. Eisenhower submitted a $77 billion budget to the lawmakers with the implication that if spending were kept within that limit, tax reform legislation would follow with the possibility Federal taxes could be reduced.

Yesterday he sent a bill to Congress on the farm program asking that the $5 billion per year subsidy be brought within reasonable limits and something be done about surplus crops, that under present legislation, the U.S. Government is compelled to buy and store. Storage rental for the stuff costs millions of dollars per annum.

The farm bloc in Congress says Mr. Eisenhower's program has no chance of passing and American taxpayers will continue to pay high subsidy rates.

Some Members of Congress are not satisfied with the $47 billion budgeted amount for national defense and want to go beyond that figure. Those who oppose the limita-

tion set by the White House, say United States must spend more to make up for what they call the "missile lag" between this country and the Soviet Union.

So the possibility of spending beyond the $77 billion is quite apparent and all this spending means the dollar you get in salary or wages has less purchasing power. The dollar today buys less than 50 cents of its real value as compared with the dollar's worth prior to World War II, and the end does not seem in sight.

Many Members of Congress were elected last November on promises of spending more money on Government-sponsored projects, and they seem determined to live up to their campaign pledges unless more conservative heads hold the whip hand in both Houses of Congress.

The voice of Senator BYRD of Virginia, who has long been an advocate of less spending, is becoming weaker and weaker with each passing Congress, filled with some who seem to think spending American money is the first objective of their office. The free wheelers in Congress may ruin the value of American currency unless brought to the realization the money they spend comes out of the pockets of the folks back home, who today are pretty well fed up with the American system of taxation and its confiscatory clamming onto what the wage earner earns before he ever sees it, knowing only it has been taken from him, willingly or unwillingly by the deduction explanation attached to his pay voucher.

Patriotic Advertising—"Life Line" Broadcast, December 3, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding radio programs of the present day is the "Life Line" broadcast, produced by Life Line Foundation, Inc., a religious and patriotic educational movement. This program, conducted 6 days a week by Mr. J. Wayne Poucher, radio minister for "Life Line," is broadcast from a large number of radio stations throughout the Nation.

Mr. Poucher's broadcast is unique in that the first half of each program is devoted to a forthright discussion of public affairs and the last half to a religious sermon.

The current affairs portion of a recent "Life Line" program dealt with a matter of vital concern to American business and its customers—the importance of adding patriotism to advertising. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text, slightly revised for publication, of this broadcast by Mr. J. Wayne Poucher:

PATRIOTIC ADVERTISING—"LIFE LINE" BROADCAST, DECEMBER 3, 1958, DELIVERED BY MR. J. WAYNE POUCHER

American business today finds itself at the crossroads of its very existence. It must make a choice of following the mistaken lane to its destruction or the right lane to survival. Business has sought every possible customer in its effort to make every possible dollar. Business has carefully avoided any intentional offense toward any person or group for fear of losing a present or potential customer. Business has refused to participate in programs with a patriotic theme for fear of losing a few sales dollars and arousing threats of boycott from the mistaken. As further concessions, business spends fabulous sums in sponsoring some programs which sadly have a positive anti-American propaganda line. This is done on the true but terrifying premise that good Americans won't complain, and it will keep the vocally boisterous pinks in silent appeasement.

To date, business has not extended its vision beyond the next quarterly report to stockholders. In the zeal of business to avoid having red figures to explain away, business has not considered how it will explain its total demise under a Red regime. It has not realized that someday, just around the economic corner, stockholders are going to ask "What destroyed the capitalistic system that made our business possible? What caused the political and economic debacle that took our system, our company, and every other company built on the solid virtues of hard work, individual effort, courage to invest and to produce a better product under the goad of free competition?" They will also then be asking, "What happened to history's highest standard of living that all these things produced?"

Business will have no choice of explanation to make if the mistaken trend continues in America. It will be too late. And the only truthful reason for the destruction of the American free enterprise system will be obvious. Through its blind fear of losing a few customers, business will have lost them all. Through the fear of offending a piddling number of radicals who make loud splashes throwing rocks in the shallows of America's economic river, business will have permitted the great, but silent mainstream of America to flow unrestrained over the precipice of collectivism * * * never to be retrieved. Through fear of reprisal from some in Government, business has failed to take a stand in favor of the Constitution and what it guarantees * * * through fear, yes, through fear, business * * * well, that's all there was to it, fear.

But right now at this moment it is not too late. There is something wrong when management decrees the kind of advertising that praises the American way yet is overruled at lower levels. There is something wrong when men of lower rank in a business tell those above they can't afford to defend America. There is something wrong when the owner of the business is told by those on his payroll he can't spend his money to advocate the system that made his business, even their own jobs, possible. If this is happening in your business, don't look now, it might be embarrassing.

Whether business likes it or not, it has now reached the place where the road divides. It is not an unmarked trail like the proud pioneers pondered and then summoned courage to make a choice on which to stake their canteen contents and the only life they had. Rather, it is a well-marked crossroads that has been traveled many times by many people. The road signs are in large letters and are easy to read. The pages of history interpret them in clear and unmistakable language so all may understand. Many civilizations have been lulled by the sedatives of prosperity, apathy, and fear until the point of no return was reached down the wrong fork of the road. And its further stretches are strewed by their wreckage.

"Life Line" believes that the vast and overwhelming majority of the American people, the customers of business, if you please, would drive an extra mile to greet and extol a firm which uses its advertising to help keep America free. Business must make a choice, and soon, of saving itself and America with its mass of customers or business may elect to keep the vocal minority on its books and lose the books, business, and all.

People Want Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks a speech delivered by Mr. Harry Sears on gold before the National Western Mining Conference in Denver on February 7. Mr. Sears is president of the Calaveras Gold Mining Co., at Angels Camp, Calif., and is chairman of the Western States Gold Committee. I am sure that the Members of the House will be interested in his observations on this important subject, which follow herewith:

PEOPLE WANT GOLD

Three words describe a condition as old as civilization: People want gold.

They express human emotions, the desire for power, wealth, adornment, or merely personal satisfaction, plus some sense of safety.

For 25 years our people in this country have been denied the possession of gold, except in the form of manufactured products. The Government asserts complete control.

But we have reached the time when this Government, having failed to provide us with sound money and a sane and honest fiscal policy, find themselves deeply enmeshed in a rapidly growing inflation, with the greatest indebtedness in the history of the world, with an irredeemable paper currency, based only on debt, with no sound monetary reserves which can be used under their present system, and from all quarters come their confessions that they need some solution to their problems, but have not found it.

We still talk about dollars, but do not use them. The Federal Reserve notes which we use instead of money merely carry the insignia which has been familiar to us for years, but because of constantly shrinking purchasing power this paper currency is valued only in pennies, and when translated into an equivalent of what a dollar should be in value, for almost any transaction in our daily lives, we are met with high prices, but these are merely the result of multiplying our currency units, because of their constant loss of purchasing power, into the number required to bring their usefulness to the necessary amount demanded for goods and services in our daily transactions.

There is one outstanding exception to this perfect pattern. The price of gold, which was set by Government decree in 1934, and which the Treasury has refused to alter, has been steadily reduced since the originally proclaimed $35 per ounce, so that, translated into the purchasing power of the paper currency which is paid for it by the Treasury, the price of gold becomes $16.80 per ounce with a 48-cent dollar, $11.55 per ounce with a 33-cent dollar, $8.75 per ounce with a 25-cent dollar, $3.50 per ounce with a 10-cent dollar, 35 cents per ounce with a 1-cent dollar.

And, by applying the same factual figures to the sales of gold by the Treasury, we find that during the past year between $2 and $3 billion in gold has been sold to foreign central banks and their governments and private customers, in addition to all the gold which was supplied by the Treasury for commercial use in this country and abroad, at the same reduced prices.

The proponents of this suicidal and fantastic stupidity have the audacity to call such results the "value of gold," and groups of economists and "monetary experts" are

constantly seeking to have conversion of this Federal Reserve currency into gold at the $35 price, and a favorite slogan with them is that any increase in the price of gold would be inflationary.

The root cause of the inflation stems from the practices of the Federal Reserve System, their multiplication of printed currency based on debts, the removal of gold from all monetary use in the United States and the unlawful Treasury practices and propaganda regarding gold.

The inflation has been built by the Government because they wanted to build it, but it is getting beyond control and the people are searching for safety and a way out of the confusion. They are beginning to turn to gold.

We are at the date of an important anniversary. Twenty-five years ago the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 was passed by Congress. This is claimed as the authority for the gold regulations and practices of the Treasury; and that Congress acted under its constitutional power to coin money and regulate the value thereof, but Congress has used no such power with regard to this act, and the Treasury has been clothed with no authority.

That was some time ago, the details may be quite dim in your memories, but again please note the title, "The Gold Reserve Act of 1934." This very title is misleading and its interpretation has been appalling. Few people have read it and realize its actual powers and limitations and during this quarter of a century we have been taught fundamental errors and have been herded into mistaken understandings and have been taught false beliefs regarding gold. Our Government officials have promoted fictions and claimed powers which are outside the law and which they do not possess.

Our rights and the peoples' rights are fully supported by law and are directly contrary to the claims and practices of the Treasury.

So that there may be some order in this confusion we review provisions and purposes of the act.

The Government took title for the United States, to the gold coins and monetary gold bars which had been in the vaults of banks for many years or which had been turned in at the Treasury or Federal Reserve Banks by our citizens in accordance with Presidential demands.

We need not here determine the legality and morality of Congress in blindly following Presidential orders and stripping the American public of their gold, in 1933.

This was in the period when the President ordered Congress to pass laws and not to hestitate because of doubts as to their constitutionality, so acting under the assumption that possession denoted authority, title to this bold was declared by the act, to pass to the Government.

But it is extremely important that we know what was provided as to gold owned by the Government, we therefore quote from the act:

"No gold shall hereafter be coined, and no gold coin shall hereafter be paid out or delivered by the United States.

"All gold coin of the United States shall be withdrawn from circulation and together with all other gold owned by the United States, shall be formed into bars of such weight and degree of fineness as the Secretary of the Treasury may direct. No currency of the United States shall be redeemable in gold."

This is the important provision of the act and through improper interpretation of these words, or through intentional disregard of their meaning, the Treasury and other Government departments have indulged in a program of skullduggery toward gold which violated the basic property rights of all citizens and has almost entirely destroyed the gold mines and gold producing districts in 13 Western States.

They have confiscated the gold which was taken from its owners, in defiance of law, and they have been parties to the imposition of frauds on our citizens generally, through misrepresentation to them that gold was the basis of a reserve to provide safety for users of the present irredeemable currency.

With gold clearly and completely removed from all monetary use in the United States it lost its former identity as money, and became a simple commodity and Congress then had no greater power over it than over any other commodity.

The fact that some of it is stored in Treasury or Federal Reserve vaults, or Fort Knox, gives it no monetary standing or character for the Gold Reserve Act specifically terminated any monetary use of gold in this country. The term "bullion" has no monetary significance. It merely means "metal in the mass" and the term has been in common use for centuries.

All gold owned by the United States thus became merely a commodity stored in Government warehouses in 1934, and the Secretary of the Treasury merely became the custodian of the warehouses. It is thus exactly the same as the commodity gold produced from the mines and is subject to all safeguards for property which our Constitution and laws provide.

The act gave no authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to set a price for gold and to maintain such a set price during the years of inflation when the purchasing power of irredeemable Federal Reserve currency dropped steadily so that now it is only accepted on the basis of from 25 cents to 33 cents on the face value of the so-called dollar. This means that in buying gold from a producer the Treasury pays for it with irredeemable paper currency of which the purchasing power has been so reduced that it pays only from $8.75 to $11.50 per ounce, and not the much touted $35 which is publicly held forth as the rate the Treasury pays.

The Secretary has a set of regulations but owing to the fact that he is only dealing in commodity gold, just as any private citizen would deal in it, he has no authority to control or enforce them because Congress had no power to grant althority to control commodity gold. But in spite of this he compels gold producers to secure a license from him before they can melt their gold and place it in marketable form and he also demands that they contract to sell the gold to him, at his price, to avoid having this license cancelled.

Of course gold cannot be produced at these prices, except in a few special cases and as a byproduct from other metals.

There were about 4,000 operating gold mines in production when they were peremptorily closed as an asserted war necessity, in 1942. After years of idleness the great majority of these could not attempt reopening because economic difficulties of inflation and currency depreciation had made a higher gold price mandatory. A few mines attempted reopening but after heavy losses were forced to again close down. This is the condition of more than 95 percent of all gold mines in the country.

FRAUDS ON THE PEOPLE

Another provision of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 gave the Secretary of the Treasury authority to buy and sell gold, "at home and abroad." Sections 3699 and 3700 provide for his purchases and sales at varying prices, with no special price specified. As this was virtually a public trust it was his duty to see that these purchases and sales would be properly conducted and the laws respected, but this has never been done.

The gold policy of the Treasury was concisely stated by former Under Secretary Randolph Burgess in testimony before a Senate Committee in 1954; when he said: "We buy and sell gold freely with other countries * * * at the price of 35 an ounce and we sell gold * * * to foreign banks and private owners as well."

There was a lot of loose language and fancy phrases in the act and in the proclamation of the President which announced it in 1934, but none of this could vary the essential fact which the act established.

When gold was completely removed from monetary use in the United States there could be:

No gold dollar.

No gold content of the dollar.

No gold monetary reserves.

In addition, there is a statute which declares that no obligation of the United States could be measured in gold, therefore no matter what the President said, surplus language describing unauthorized and nonexisting facts have no effect and establish no rights, but in view of what has since happened one announcement by the President should be remembered. He said:

"In pure theory, of course, a government could issue meer tokens to serve as money—tokens which would be accepted at their face value if it were certain that the amount of these tokens were permanently limited and confined to the total amount necessary for the daily cash needs of the community."

This could well have been an advance description of managed currency and the present Federal Reserve notes. Since they have no ascertainable value they fit the description of a "mere token to serve as money." They are accepted far below face value for it is certain that the amount of these tokens is not limited, either permanently or temporarily, and they are not confined to the daily cash needs of the community but are contributed in fantastic amounts as gifts all over the world. Thus vast amounts accrue in the hands of "foreign banks and private owners as well," which are given the fancy title of foreign trade balances and the Treasury honors these by selling them gold at $35 an ounce.

Nevertheless throughout the years, Government officials, bankers, business advisers, economists, teachers and Members of Congress continue to think and talk about these non-existent gold formulae and our currency as though they were real. They have been so effectively brain washed that they continue to delude themselves and others by repetition of untrue and wholly fallacious theories.

For years we have been conducting our lives under this irredeemable and constantly depreciating currency. In testifying before the Senate Finance Committee in 1957, retiring Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, who had just admitted that the purchasing power of the dollar had dropped to 48 cents, was asked:

"But you do think that as long as this inflation keeps up, the savers and pensioners and people who have paid on insurance for 20 to 30 years, are the forgotten people, are they not?"

To this Secretary Humphrey replied:

"They are definitely forgotten people who have been injured. * * * They are severely injured."

In these words was the confession of the Secretary of the Treasury regarding your bank balances and savings.

In spite of the contempt for the legal and property rights of our citizens and gold owners, as shown by the gold regulations and Treasury practices, gold is extremely important to the Treasury as a screen to conceal their real position.

If the depositors in our banks are injured by saving our shrinking currency, there could be no question that gold producers have a greater injury illegally forced upon them. Their gold is taken under coercion

by a Treasury acting without authority and they are forced to accept Federal Reserve currency in exchange for their gold. They are brazenly robbed.

In spite of the Treasury's repeated insistence that U.S. citizens cannot possess gold, they misrepresent gold to the people in order to mislead the public. In hearings before the Senate Finance Committee in 1957, former Treasury Under Secretary Randolph Burgess admitted:

"We have got a kind of gold standard and to the extent the people have confidence that we are going to keep the money nailed down to the value of gold, it is easier to sell the bonds."

THE TREASURY CAN NO LONGER EVADE THE LAW

We have had no gold money or monetary gold in this country for a quarter of a century. Gold held by our Government is merely metallic gold as a commodity.

It is in the same class as the gold which is owned in the thousands of gold mines and properties throughout our Western States.

The rights to produce this gold and sell it are on an equal footing with the rights of our citizens to purchase it and to hold it, or to sell it as they may choose.

Congress has no power to enact laws or to authorize regulations which abridge these rights of possession and when the Secretary of the Treasury attempts to enforce such regulations he is acting illegally and without authority.

A current case in the Federal court bears directly on this. It concerns possession of gold bullion by a man in the State of Washington, charging him with a criminal act for which he was arrested, tried and sentenced. During recent years there have been many instances where others have been treated in this fashion and in most cases they have not contested, having been overawed by the long standing propaganda and claims that the government had this power, or they could not afford the cost of an appeal.

This case was appealed, and after consideration by the Court of Appeals, has been remanded to the original court for corrective action or dismissal. The criminal charge for gold possession was based on original emergency orders of the President early in 1933 and upon subsequent Treasury regulations and the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, but it was found by the U.S. Court of Appeals that there are no criminal penalties provided in the Gold Reserve Act for possession of gold and no criminal statutes authorized by Congress.

Of course the conditions under which the original presidential emergency orders were issued, no longer exist. In 1933 they were used to force the people to turn their gold coins and bullion over to the Treasury and later, title to this gold was given to the United States in the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. It all became commodity gold and gold coinage was wiped out.

In fact, even the Treasury has recently lifted bans on the possession of gold coins and they are now permissible to be held by the public and are classed as collectors' items. But the old criminal bogey, as to gold bullion, is still held over the heads of the people by the Treasury. It is interesting to note the language of the court of appeals in reversing this case:

"It seems vital as a matter of national policy that emergency regulations and almost dictatorial powers granted or conceded in the turmoil of war, cold war, economic revolution and the struggle to preserve a balanced democratic way of life, should be discarded upon return to normal conditions, lest we grow used to them as the fittings of ordinary existence. Executive regulations drafted and confirmed for an emergency should expire with the emergency."

Since the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 established the status of gold owned by the United States as merely commodity gold, and abolished any former status it may have had as money, or monetary gold, it had the effect of establishing all gold in the United States as commodity gold and as private property.

Neither Congress nor the Secretary has any power or authority to prevent U.S. citizens from buying, selling, or holding gold; or

To prevent the mining or processing of gold in the United States, or to make regulations which would interfere with the proper conduct of such business by the owners of this gold, or any mineral deposit containing same; or

To set a price limit on gold, or to compel its owners or producers to sell it in any manner, or at any price which does not conform to valid laws regarding private property; or

To require gold miners and producers to have any form of license in order to melt their gold, which is a necessary part of mining to change it from the form of a concentrate in which it is mingled with other metals, and to prepare it for sale; or

To confiscate privately owned gold or to assess any owner with a penalty or a threat of penalty, because of its possession; or

To appropriate or take possession of privately owned gold, in any manner which violates the property rights of the owners, or contrary to any valid law made to protect them; or

To misrepresent the status of gold owned by the United States and to state or imply that it is in any manner connected with the present irredeemable currency in common use.

In considering newly mined gold from properties in the United States and summarizing the laws which must be obeyed, by the Secretary of the Treasury, we find he is governed by the following well settled legal principles:

Price control of commodities and private property is unconstitutional;

Private property and property rights of all U.S. citizens are protected under our Constitution and must be so recognized and respected;

Private property of citizens is protected from seizure or confiscation;

Private property cannot be taken for public use without just compensation and this cannot be determined without a hearing.

It should come as a welcome breath of hope for the future of the gold-mining industry to consider that although in the past we have been singled out and made the victims of lawless treatment by our Government, we have well-settled rights which can be invoked and can reverse this condition for the future.

Gold producers have been an isolated industry with limited public contacts in the past but the drastic effects of the manufactured inflation has brought gold into fresh prominence and as the cycle of inflation continues the doubts and the growing resentment of the people can compel the Government to establish and use real reserves of gold, for there could be swift collapse of the multiplication of paper currency now being used.

PEOPLE WANT GOLD

In recent years there has been increased buying of gold in free countries abroad. Our substantial citizens have been adding to their holdings, but these had to be handled as bulk purchases since the sales were large and the storage abroad was expensive, so this was never a practical market for our modest citizens.

But there has been preparation underway for some months to bring the advantages of a free gold market to us close at home, and on such a scale that it could be a popular market. With expenses cut to a minimum it can serve all classes. This is about ready to function in Canada and trading would be on the open commodity markets both there and here in the United States. The gold will remain in bank vaults in Canada and warehouse receipts will be traded on the market.

Even in its preliminary steps the volume of demand for gold is causing surprise in Canada and they see that here is a world market in the making. But we can forsee that it will not be necessary even to go to Canada or to trade there, for we now know that morally and legally there is a clear right for us to have a free gold market here in the United States, and to start the building of such a market, the growing fear and unrest in the minds of our own people can be a factor of great importance.

Among other steps, there is a carefully prepared case in progress in the Federal courts to terminate all control of newly-mined gold through Treasury regulations.

Our citizens have watched their bank accounts wither and fade in the purchasing power of their deposits and they have plunged into the stock market to multiply their shrinking dollars only to find that this is now even a bigger gamble than horse racing.

They want something tangible, that could be safe and dependable but whose value can grow as it attracts increased public demands for its possession.

Throughout history, this has always been the function of gold. It has not been permitted to register its value in this country during the past 25 years. That value should soon show at more than $100 per ounce.

Let us therefore view this as a fresh start when we turn away from the past and foresee a far different future.

In Defense of the Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Barron's weekly recently published an article criticizing the operation of the Small Business Administration. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, immediately took exception to this criticism. Under date of February 9, 1959, he wrote to the editor of Barron's giving facts and figures which negate the conclusions contained in the article.

Let us continue to be critical of Government agencies when they are wrong. But let us always be fair and by all means constructive.

I commend Mr. Berger's letter to the attention of our colleagues.

FEBRUARY 9, 1959.

EDITOR, BARRON'S WEEKLY,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: You take the cake for emphasizing the negative in your article, "Easy Mark", dealing with the Small Business Administration, which appears in your February issue.

If one's knowledge of this agency were limited to the facts and charges presented, he could reach only one conclusion: that the Small Business Administration and those it

serves are leeches on the body taxpayer. We believe this is just not an accurate picture.

For instance, you cite the need for a "long, hard look" at the agency. Why not advise your readers that the Small Business Administration is under constant scrutiny by Congress and congressional committees?

You refer to the agency's distribution of "largesse." Why did you not bother to inform your readers of the fact that the agency's lending functions are under constant policy control by a three-man board composed of the SBA Administrator and the Secretaries of Treasury and Commerce. Even if the SBA Administrator were a free-handed man with Government funds (we have heard him criticized frequently for being too stingy), certainly there are few who would charge this to the two Secretaries.

You talk about the rising rate of delinquencies and defaults. Why did you not advise your readers of the fact that out of $364,981,000 in business loans disbursed to June 30, 1958, the agency had suffered a loss totaling only $235,316.91, which amounts to 0.0007 percent of all moneys allocated to that date. Why did you not report that some 7,704 of the 8,135 businesses who actually received payments from the agency to June 30, 1958, were right on the button with their payments?

You cite some instances in which lending functions have been handled unwisely. May we ask if you have made any check to find if these questionable procedures are the rule, rather than the exception to the rule. Frankly, for the past 3 years I have been making trips across the country, making on-the-spot investigations of the agency's operations. From what I have seen I can say, without fear of contradiction, that by and large Small Business Administration personnel are doing as efficient and as honest a job in their lending activities as any of the private banks (ranging from the Chase of New York down to country banks). I have had the pleasure of doing business with in my 50 years experience in the business world. I say this as a person who owned and operated his own business for 35 of these 50 years.

Believe me, I do not hold, nor does the federation hold, that the Small Business Administration is perfect. There is room for improvement in it, just as there is in every last other organization in the world. The important thing, as we see it, is that the agency is rendering a necessary service to small businessmen, and that as it goes along it is taking steps to make its operations more efficient and effective. We believe it and its operations should be open always to inspection and criticism. However, in all fairness, we believe these should be of the balanced variety.

With all best wishes,

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

Economic Lifeline Severed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, while the subject of the following article from the Charleston Gazette is not located in my district, it is a parallel to similar conditions which exist in my district.

I am indebted beyond measure to my colleague [Mr. SLACK] from the Sixth West Virginia District who has undertaken the arduous task of touring his southern West Virginia area for a first-hand experience with the stark facts of hunger due to unemployment.

The community in point used to contain the operation of the coal mine, one of our Nation's major steel operations. It, thus, reflects a condition afflicting not only the coal industry, but other industries as well.

This town is located in a rather remote section of West Virginia. It is situated in Boone County, W. Va., and there is nothing by which industrious men may earn their daily bread, other than the coal-mining industry.

It is, as is quite common in southern West Virginia, a one-industry area and when a mine is exhausted or when a lack of markets shuts off production, unemployment results.

I will not confine my observations to the southern section of my State—which, as a whole, outproduces the world in soft coal—since there are many coal communities in my district which share a common burden of economic distress.

This is the third graphic newspaper account of our West Virginia situation which I have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD, and I respectfully call the House's attention to this article:

NELLIS' LIFELINE CUT BY SHUTDOWN IN 1956

(By John G. Morgan)

NELLIS.—The economic lifeline of the little community in Boone County coal country snapped 3 years ago.

One hundred and fifty men lost their jobs when the mine shut down.

They were the last on a payroll that at one time carried 400 names.

A closed theater and snack bar and a failing real estate venture under the fancy name of Acorn Village are evidence of the times that were.

Bethel Pauley, a small, meek, 40-year-old man with auburn hair, lives in a little yellow house on a hill in this oddly-situated town.

He is an unemployed coal miner. He and his wife have six children who are 6 to 18 years old.

Representative JOHN M. SLACK, Jr., of West Virginia's Sixth Congressional District paused to visit the Pauleys during his tour of coal regions hit by unemployment.

In the neat little four-room house, the Congressman was given a word picture generally brighter than that for most families victimized by economic trends and mechanization in the mines.

Among other things, Pauley has clerical skills that have enabled him to land and hold the part-time job of recording secretary for the local union, which still carries on.

Pauley explained that he studied bookkeeping at high school. As a soldier during World War II, he continued his studies in night school at the University of Hawaii.

His part-time job pays $40 monthly, but all of that is earmarked as the precise amount of the monthly payment on his house. Original cost of the house was $3,000. He has chopped it down to $1,800.

The ex-miner has been out of a full-time job only a month. But this isn't the first time. His employment in small mines has been sporadic over a long period.

He's a man who likes to go by the record. When asked about his employment history, he consulted a book that he had stowed away in a small safe.

Pauley said he owns a 1947 car which he bought during a period of employment for $150. He has a garden and a small amount of other land near the house.

His TV set works, and he has been subscribing to a newspaper.

Despite the fact that his living conditions are better than those of perhaps thousands of other unemployed miners, Pauley admitted:

"The future doesn't look too good."

SLACK asked him if he had thought about seeking employment in another State.

"I have studied about it, but I haven't found the answer," he said.

In Nellis, the Congressman also talked to Harold Javins, Earl Dodrill, Billy Joe Prichard, Russell T. Hoover, and Griff Abshire.

At least one of them has been unemployed since March, and most of the others are dependent on small punch mine operations for a substandard living.

While in a small restaurant within the lonely town, SLACK accommodatingly dropped a few coins into a juke box and chose selections to meet the tastes of two teenage couples.

They danced rather wildly but with a measure of grace across wavering boards, just as any teenagers will dance when so much of life is before them and when there is so little to worry about.

Proposed Amendment to the Constitution

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment to the Constitution introduced by my good friend and colleague from my neighboring State of Florida, Mr. SIKES, has my wholehearted support and I fully concur in his remarks concerning the urgent necessity for the adoption of this amendment by this Congress.

I have read the report which was adopted by 36 State chief justices at their 1958 meeting, in which report these chief justices from 36 of our sovereign States declared that our Supreme Court has tended to adopt the role of policymaker without judicial restraint. I have had occasion to personally discuss this report with nearly half of these chief justices, and on many occasions before and since this report was issued I spent hours with many outstanding men, going over this matter, including a great and good American who we thought made one of the greatest speeches ever made on this issue, and I am referring to our own Judge J. Ed Livingston, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Alabama, one of the most learned lawyers of all time.

I believe that all right-thinking Americans will support my good friend and colleague, BOB SIKES, in his proposed amendment.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 41st anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence. Because of the many folks of Lithuanian descent in my Third District of Ohio, I feel that it is especially fitting to call attention to this day in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In 1918 our country rejoiced with the Lithuanian people when they became a free nation. By decree in 1940 Soviet Russia cut short this independence by absorbing this little, freedom-loving nation. Nevertheless, this act of tyranny could not stamp out the steadily-burning flame of liberty which lives in the Lithuanian people.

We as citizens of a free, democratic nation join with these people and with those of Lithuanian descent in the United States in the fervent hope and prayer that freedom will one day be restored to this long-suffering nation.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Monday, February 16, 1959

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Life insurance company taxation bill cleared for floor action by Rules Committee.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 2063–2156

Bills Introduced: 34 bills and 2 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1041–1074; S.J. Res. 49; and S. Res. 79. **Pages 2068–2069**

Secretary of State Dulles: In accordance with provisions of S. Res. 79, adopted today, Senate stood in silent prayer for the early and complete recovery of Secretary of State Dulles. **Page 2063**

Nominations: The following nominations were received: 1 civilian; 4 judicial; 705 Foreign Service; 298 postmasters; 2 to be alternate representatives to 13th Session of General Assembly, U.N.; and 2 Army. **Pages 2157–2162**

Confirmations: The following nominations were confirmed: Philip W. Bonsal, of D.C., to be Ambassador to Cuba; Philip K. Crowe, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to Union of South Africa; Sheldon T. Mills, of Oregon, to be Ambassador to Jordan; William C. Trimble, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to Cambodia; and Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia (who is Ambassador to United Arab Republic), to serve concurrently as Minister to Yemen. **Page 2162**

Program for Tuesday: Senate met today at noon and adjourned at 4:54 p.m. until noon Tuesday, February 17. **Pages 2121, 2156–2157**

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

PRESIDENT'S FARM PROGRAM

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Committee heard Secretary of Agriculture Benson and his associates testify and answer questions with regard to the President's farm recommendations.

Mr. Benson will continue his testimony tomorrow.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Special subcommittee continued its executive consideration of the nominations of 22 Air Force colonels for promotion to temporary brigadier generals, but made no announcements, and adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

POWER MARKETING

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Committee continued its hearings on Federal power generation and marketing in relation to the Department of the Interior, with testimony from Governor Loveless, of Iowa; Representative Coad; Gus Norwood, Northwest Public Power Association; Alex Radin, American Public Power Association; and Lloyd Caulkins, of LeMars, Iowa.

On Saturday, February 14, testimony on this subject was heard from G. W. Cornog, KEM Electric Cooperative, Linton, N. Dak.; Ed Schlender, Snake River Power Association; Howard Scott, Upper Colorado Basin Preference Users Committee; Norton Davis, Plains Electric G. & T. Cooperative, Albuquerque, N. Mex.; William Fraser, Omaha Public Power District; W. P. Venable, Consumers Public Power District, Columbus, Nebr.; and Dewey J. DeBoer, Nebraska Public Power System, Columbus.

On Friday, February 13, committee began these hearings, with testimony from Senators Mansfield and Langer, the latter of whom introduced a North Dakota delegation; Charles Mahoney and Henry Swenson, both of the Upper Missouri G. & T. Cooperative; Kenneth Holum, A. S. Wendel, Robert St. Cyr, Eugene E. Hull, and Oscar Bergman, Jr., all of the Midwest Electric Consumers Association; J. W. Grimes, South Dakota Water Resources Commission; Virgil Hanlon, East River Power Cooperative, South Dakota; S. A. Forseth, Williams County Electric Cooperative, North Dakota; R. L. Potts, Burke-Divide Electric Cooperative, North Dakota; Teleford Anderson, North Dakota Statewide Association of REA Cooperatives; William E. Trommershausen, a utility engineer, Columbus, Nebr.; Max Stanley, Iowa Committee on Missouri Basin; E. C. Myrland, Northwest Iowa Municipal Power Group; A. L. Chantry, Cuming County Rural

Appendix

Asleep Under Spires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the U.S. Senate and the Nation are indeed fortunate during these years of crisis to have in the post of Senate Chaplain so great a spiritual leader as Dr. Frederick Brown Harris.

Dr. Harris brings to the deliberations of the Senate each day a clear perception of the moral nature of the struggle between freedom and communism. He brings to us as well an informed and scholarly view of national and international affairs, and a determined courage to speak the truth as he sees it.

Not often do we find all these qualities so wonderfully combined in one man.

Fortunately, the good influence of Dr. Harris is not confined to the Senate. He is a nationally renowned churchman. His writings are widely read and his highly esteemed newspaper columns are syndicated and appear in many papers across the country.

We in Washington are particularly fortunate to have his column appear each Sunday in the Washington Star, and I earnestly recommend it as "must" reading.

We are living in a period when we hear a great deal about flexibility, accommodation, and mutual concessions. It is therefore vitally important that as wide a hearing as possible be given to Dr. Harris, who has such a clear understanding of the uncompromising evil of communism and the inflexibility of moral values.

I wish to join Dr. Harris in recommending to all Americans the book, "What We Must Know About Communism," by Harry and Bonaro Overstreet. And I also invite all to read Dr. Harris' fine column, "Asleep Under Spires," which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on February 15, 1959.

I ask unanimous consent to have this column printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASLEEP UNDER SPIRES

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

Everything a spire symbolizes is now under the most formidable assault that Christianity has faced since the first spire was lifted against the sky. It is for the defense of the values at the heart of that faith that astronomical sums are being spent as a shield from the threatened massive attacks of the godless who scorn our Christ and assail His ways. The most vital debate now raging inside our Government has to do with making sure that we have the physical weapons to meet even surprise attempts to enslave us. Our standard of morals, the outgrowth of our religious faith, deters us from attacking first, no matter what the peril may be. Only the enemy's fear of our arms saves them and us from a world holocaust.

It is startlingly true that the next 2 or 3 years may determine the fate of the American Republic. We are now faced not by a secret but by an open conspiracy. The failure of America to preserve its promise and its life will not be due finally to America's weakness at decisive moments. It will be due to the refusal of the American people to see the obvious, to believe what the enemy has openly put on paper, to be so comfort-loving as to refuse to believe what the enemy disdains to deny.

Nothing could be more clear than that the present competitive coexistence drive is nothing but an invitation to assist in cutting our own throats. The recent smiling Soviet salesman in this as yet land of the free did not, in any of his applauded blandishments quote a recent declaration of his Kremlin master, "We must recognize that we cannot coexist eternally. One of us must go to his grave. We do not want to go to the grave. They do not want to go to their graves either. So what must be done? We must push them to their graves."

But what has this to do with spires? Answer: everything. Strange and unbelievable as it may be, some church leaders, especially members of denominational hierarchies, rather than pastors, are more concerned about the faults of democracy than they are about the ominous plottings of the sinister system constantly growing in strength, fantastically dedicated to the destruction of democracy, faults, and flaws and all. The results of the tranquilizers and sleeping tablets being concocted by doctors of divinity to lull the church to slumber in this fearful day of destiny are plainly indicated as exhibit 1 in the recent report of certain churchmen meeting in Cleveland. Their recommendations regarding communism are like lifting an umbrella with the funnel of a cyclone headed for those singing complacently "what can shake our sure repose."

History repeats itself. There were religious leaders during our American Revolution who made George Washington's almost impossible task harder. There were many of the best people in that day, including religious leaders, who were spiritually and morally asleep to the implications of the Revolution and agitated for negotiation and appeasement with the British forces. There are some in the present global conflict who might profit by reading the correspondence of George Washington with church people—especially with preachers who wanted nothing but peace, even if it was based on supine surrender to the English tyranny. Even in the struggle which brought our freedom there were those, as now, asleep under the spires.

Will Rogers once said that what Americans needed most was to have their speedometers taken away and exchanged for alarm clocks. An alarm clock is now available for America and for all the free world. Its bell tolls for all who remain asleep and perhaps for the rest of us, too. It is a volume whose reading is a must for every intelligent American. Its authors are Harry and Bonaro Overstreet, whose ability to capture, in scintillating chapters, deep human insights, is already well known. Its arresting title is, "What We Must Know About Communism." And it is just that. What we must know before it is too late. When America knows the unvarnished truth about this diabolical conspiracy the battle will be half won. Our dedicated might will complete the conquest.

The clanging truth in this book transferred to the minds of the American people would be terrible as an army with banners. Between the covers of "What We Must Know About Communism" this foul thing stands revealed in all its horror and terror. Here it is with all masks off, its doubletalk made plain, its twisted duplicity, its seductive lullabies, its refuge of lies, its continuing revolution which can never end until this putrid despotism of freedom is dead.

To be sure, at times, this abomination of abominations may be like the smiling flower, but always it is like the serpent under it. What happened to Hungary and to the murdered millions in their own coerced lands as they continue to liquidate all opposition is the fate they decree for every people who defy the Marxist wave of the future.

In a dozen years this is the first time "Spires" have urged the reading of a modern book. It is done now at no one's suggestion or request, but because we verily believe that this stark revelation, accepted by our people, will go far to save all we hold dear. This book is a call to arms. If necessary, sell your coat or radio to get it, and then, when all the family has read it, loan it to neighbors. It is available at all bookstores. It is a must in this day of danger and of destiny—"What We Must Know About Communism." On its cover could well be emblazoned St. Paul's words to the ancient church, "Awake, O sleeper, arise and Christ shall give you light. Make the most of time, because the days are evil." And time is fast running out.

The Growing Horror of Lung Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the renewed illness of our illustrious Secretary of State has made us all conscious of the great questions of medical research, cancer, heart disease, and other serious illnesses.

It is particularly distressing when people punish themselves so deliberately that they may come down with one of these diseases. An article published in Today's Health, official periodical of the American Medical Association, on the whole question of cigarettes and lung cancer, raises just this burning and crucial question. The article from Today's

Health by J. D. Ratcliff, noted writer on medical problems, is reprinted in the March 1959 number of the Reader's Digest.

This article notes that deaths from lung cancer in the United States have risen from 2,500 in 1930 to an estimated 35,000 last year. The article claims that this is almost exactly proportionate to the increase in cigarette sales.

The article from Reader's Digest, entitled "The Growing Horror of Lung Cancer," is based on information from the internationally known chest surgeon, Dr. Alton Ochsner, of New Orleans, La. I believe all Members of the Senate and House should be informed as to the contents of this article and, therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GROWING HORROR OF LUNG CANCER

(Condensed from Today's Health, published by American Medical Association)

(By J. D. Ratcliff)

William Brown[1] is a successful businessman in a large southern city. Had he drawn up a personal balance sheet last spring, it would have shown that life had been good to him. At 55, he owned a thriving business and an attractive home. He was happily married and had two sons doing well in college. Except for minor ailments, he had enjoyed excellent health all his life.

True, in recent months Brown had been coughing with increasing frequency. But all smokers cough, and he paid little attention. An increasing shortness of breath he accepted as a normal part of the aging process. A small decrease in weight he put down on the good side of the ledger. Also, he had had a slight chest pain, but nothing serious enough to bother a doctor with. Then one morning last June while brushing his teeth he coughed deeply and brought up sputum slightly streaked with blood.

Brown, of course, had read about lung cancer and its apparent association with smoking. A two-pack-a-day man, he had even thought vaguely about cutting down. Now as he shaved he ran through the lung cancer symptoms he knew: bloody sputum, he remembered, was one. By the time he had finished he was frankly worried, and after breakfast, instead of driving to his office, he went to his doctor.

The physician's suspicions were immediately aroused by the symptoms. Yet a number of things could cause chest pain, cough, weight loss, bloody sputum—such things as lung abscess, inflamation, tuberculosis. Diagnostic step No. 1 was chest X-rays. When they revealed a suspicious shadow the doctor advised Brown to go to a chest surgeon.

Two days later Brown reported to the specialist. Another set of X-rays was taken. Then came a sputum test. Lung cancer frequently sheds cells which the pathologist can identify in specimens from the deep chest. This test gave a positive answer. To resolve all possible doubts, a bronchoscopic examination followed. A slender tube was slipped down Brown's throat. Through the barrel of this instrument the specialist can often see the suspicious mass and even take a pinch of it for examination by a pathologist. This test, too, said yes. Brown had lung cancer.

"Those two words, 'lung cancer,' are the ugliest in all medicine," says one physician. But Brown had the emotional stability to face the facts, and was told the truth. He asked about his chances.

Of 100 people who get lung cancer today, the physician told him, 45 will be inoperable by the time they consult a doctor, their cancer so widespread that surgery would be futile. Chests of the remaining 55 will be opened. This is drastic surgery and as many as 11 of the 55 patients may die of it. Inspection of the chest cavity will often give clear evidence of cancer spread, possibly even to the heart itself. In such cases the surgeon may leave the lung untouched and simply close the wound. These patients—perhaps 12—will be dead in a few months.

By now the original 100 has dwindled to 32 patients who are operable. The surgeon removes all or part of the diseased lung and prays that no cancer seeds have been left behind. But in a distressingly large percentage of cases, clusters of these cells lurk in hidden recesses, to continue their growth. According to present statistics, only 5 of the 32 patients who survive the operation will be alive—and presumably cured—at the end of 5 years. Thus the score stands: 5 survivors out of 100 victims.

Brown accepted these grim statistics with outward calm. Advised that haste was all-important, he said a week would be sufficient to get his affairs in order. It was, understandably, a bad week.

When he reported to the hospital there was still much to be done. Before surgery, doctors have to decide whether the patient can get along with one lung, or will face gasping suffocation. The average healthy adult has about eight times as much lung function as needed in sedentary activity, but years of heavy smoking wreck lung tissue and erase the margin of safety. "Then," says Dr. Alton Ochsner, internationally known chest surgeon, "we have only the dregs to work with."

Brown's tests indicated that he would have barely enough reserve to get by. During the next 3 days he took a course of breathing exercises to prepare himself for life with one lung. On advice of the physician he had stopped smoking a week earlier, at the time of his first visit.

Finally, the day of surgery arrived.

In many kinds of surgery, one is impressed by the delicacy of the technique. In pneumonectomy—lung removal—the strongest impression is of the bloody massiveness of the operation.

Brown was propped on his side on the table, arm above head. A tube was slipped down his windpipe to give the anesthesiologist a clear airway. Then the surgeon made a great sweeping incision extending nearly halfway around Brown's body. It began under the nipple, dipped under the arm, ended just short of the spine.

Layers of skin, fat and muscle were parted, exposing the ribs. With heavy shears the fifth rib was removed and discarded. Spreaders were then applied to push other ribs apart. The resulting opening was vast, cavernous, to permit the surgeon to examine the entire chest cavity for signs of cancer's spread.

With Brown's chest cavity exposed, the first step was to sever the pulmonary artery. Two ties of cotton about an inch apart choked off the flow of blood. Then the artery was cut between the ties. The stump leading to the heart was curled back, delicately surtured.

Next the two pulmonary veins were similarly treated. That left one final point of attachment for the lung: the main bronchus, one of the Y forks from the windpipe. This too was clamped and out, then the lung was lifted out of Brown's chest. Subsequent examination showed the cancer to be approximately the size of a goose egg.

Now the surgeon turned his attention again to the bronchus. It is vital that this be sealed off with absolute tightness, otherwise bacteria-laden air from the outside may seep into the chest cavity to cause devastating infection. To seal it, the tube was sutured tightly, and a bit of tissue borrowed from the chest wall was grafted over the end. The seal was then checked for leaks, much as an inner tube is checked: the chest cavity was filled with saline solution and the observers watched for telltale bubbles. In Brown's case the seal was tight.

A minute examination of the chest cavity came next. Often there are little pea- or grape-sized cancers, usually gray-pink in color, along lymphatic ducts. These are meticulously dissected away and so are any other bits of obviously cancerous tissue—a painstaking task that may take up to 6 hours. But Brown was fortunate. There was no indication that the cancer had spread beyond the lung.

There were still several final steps to be taken. Chest nerves were injected with pain-deadening drugs whose effect would persist for several days. The ribs were pulled back into place and wired together. Finally, the gaping wound was closed over the huge emptiness where the lung had been. In time the remaining lung will enlarge to fill part of the space, and the rest is soon filled in with fibrous tissue.

For a day after surgery Brown was in an oxygen tent, to ease the burden on his remaining lung. Despite the drugs he was beset by almost constant pain and racked by coughs. But gradually the pain subsided and wound healing began. After 10 days he left the hospital to convalesce at home.

His prospects? It is too early to say. If he survives, he will have to live with uncertainty for 5 years. Only at the expiration of that period will his cancer be considered cured.

A few years ago, lung cancer was a medical problem of no consequence. A survey of world medical literature in 1912 showed a total of only 347 cases reported. Today annual deaths are measured by the tens of thousands. Tomorrow?

"It frightens me to think of what is going to happen in another decade when our present smoking habits catch up with us," says Dr. Ochsner. "Already, lung cancer has achieved pandemic proportions. Holland had a twentyfold increase in deaths between 1924 and 1951. Death rates in England and Wales have climbed tenfold. In the United States the record is about the same—the toll rising from 2,500 in 1930 to an estimated 35,000 last year. It is significant that the sharp increase in lung cancer is almost exactly proportionate to the increase in cigarette sales. It is my firm conviction that every heavy smoker will develop lung cancer—unless heart disease or some other sickness claims him earlier."

Is there, then, any protection for the heavy smoker? Dr. Ochsner, a nonsmoker himself, believes there is. Most lung cancers appear to grow rapidly. It is therefore highly important to detect them at the earliest possible moment before they have spread to other organs or tissues. In sum, before they give any outward symptoms.

Only X-ray and sputum tests can discover cancer at this stage. Dr. Ochsner believes that after the age of 40 every pack-a-day smoker should have chest X-rays at least every 6 months, preferably every 3 months. A set of chest X-rays, front and side views, usually costs from $15 to $25—expensive, but no more so than the cigarettes themselves. If enough people took such precautions, Dr. Ochsner believes, lung cancer might become 50 percent curable, instead of 95 percent fatal.

[1] The name is fictitious for obvious reasons.

The Farmer's Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three of the GTA Daily Radio Roundup Digests, for February 5, February 9, and February 12, 1959.

There being no objection, the digests were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF FEBRUARY 5, 1959

Here is a United Press news item that deserves the close attention of every consumer, farmer, and businessman. We'll read it to you: "The Agriculture Department says the farmer's share of the consumer food dollar dropped to 39 cents in the last quarter of 1958. The drop was caused by lower farm prices and higher costs of processing and distributing farm products. Despite the farm price decline, retail grocery prices in 1958 were three percent higher than the year before."

So you see, farm prices are down, retail food prices are up. An old story, familiar to both farmers and consumers. Nobody likes inflation, but it is doubly hard on farmers when they have inflation for what they buy, and deflation for what they sell.

Maybe you farmers noticed a big advertisement that ran in most of the Nation's daily papers a week or so ago. It had a headline that went like this: "Do You Want to Buy Even Less for a Buck." The large illustration showed two baskets of food, one full to represent what a dollar bought back in 1939, and the other almost empty to show what a dollar buys now in a grocery store. The ad ends up with a big boldface type line that says: "Inflation robs us all."

Who paid for the ad? The American Iron and Steel Institute. Maybe the steel industry ad writers didn't understand the farm and food price situation, which is shown so clearly in the news item we just read to you. No doubt, the farmers themselves could write some pretty good advertisements about inflation, because they know how much tractor prices, and the prices of other heavy machinery made mostly out of steel, have gone up.

Still, that is beside the point here. The unfortunate thing is that the millions of consumers in the big cities, who, undoubtedly, read that steel industry inflation ad, will tend to blame farmers.

And as every farmer knows, this is an unfair situation. Farm prices are down more than 20 percent from 1952 levels, and that's been a tremendous brake on inflation. This farm depression has held food prices down, because surely they would be considerably higher if farm prices were not way down. This has meant that consumers have more money left over, after buying all the food they can eat, for purchases of houses and cars and clothes and TV sets. That's been of direct benefit to businessmen, manufacturers, and consumers.

And it is fair to ask, are food prices really high? The Federal Government has done some research into this question. It says that a worker in an American factory buys—today—a loaf of bread, a quart of milk, a dozen eggs and a two-pound chuck roast with what he earns from 1 hour of labor. That's pretty good eating. Back in 1940, he had to work an hour and one-half for enough pay to buy that much food.

So we wonder if it is fair to say, as the steel industry does in this big advertisement, that food prices are high and "inflation is robbing us all."

Maybe the steel industry, and all the rest of us, should be grateful to farmers for holding back inflation, and furnishing us with all the food and fiber we can use, with some left over.

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF FEBRUARY 9, 1959

The experts are calling it VI now, but you'll recognize it as "vertical integration." It is becoming a familiar term in almost every farm household, as it becomes more and more a part of family farm living.

Just what is vertical integration? It is a concentration of business activities under one single management. Just for example, a chain of grocery supermarkets that owns processing plants, and distributing centers to gather and prepare the food. It may contract directly with farmers to raise crops or livestock. It may even own the farms, and hire the farmers.

A lot of people are concerned about what may happen to family farms and food prices as vertical integration expands. Farm, Government, religious leaders, and many businessmen, too. Your co-ops are very concerned, because your survival and theirs depends upon the direction vertical integration takes.

The Reverend Louis J. Miller, Catholic rural life director of the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., diocese, writes about the problem in the diocese newspaper. He warns that if VI goes the wrong way, farmers may be forced to surrender their traditional management responsibilities—such as marketing, feeding, purchasing, breeding stock selection, and so forth.

In California, he says, 90 percent of the beef cattle are produced by 275 farmers, and they are not family farmers. "How would you like about 300 such operations fattening an average of 14,000 head in our fair State of South Dakota?" the Catholic leader asks.

And Reverend Miller gets right to the core of the vertical integration problem with these questions: "Who will control it? For whose benefit will it be operated?" That's what farmers all over are asking. They understand that vertical integration—is an invention of corporate business—because it was logical in the drive for more profits. That's fair enough, and good business, but the farmers don't want to lose control of their family operations, and they feel they are entitled to their share of the profits.

One cooperative leader put it this way: "It makes a great deal of difference whether contract farming (another form of vertical integration) originates with the farm, or cooperative on behalf of the farm, or whether it is started by outside interests, usually at the expense of the farmer."

And Reverend Miller has a direct message for farmers. He says: "Vertical integration is here in strength. You, the farmers, can control it. You cannot ignore it, except to lose farming as a way of life. You must study it through your farm organization, and find means of controlling it through your farmer's cooperative, so as to channel a just share of its benefits to your families on the land."

That's quite a challenge, of course. But your cooperatives are moving to meet it. And how can you help? How can the individual farmer help? First, buy and sell co-op all the way. It is your business that makes your co-ops strong enough to meet bigness with bigness. Build your co-ops to work for you.

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF FEBRUARY 12, 1959

These are busy days for cooperatives, here at home, and in the State legislatures, and in Washington. President Eisenhower made news when he used interest-payments as an excuse to tell REA co-ops that they were being subsidized.

The President talked to 8,000 delegates, and got a cool reception when he told them, "REA co-ops do not need, do not deserve, and should not accept any special help from the Government."

Many delegates pointed out that it was Government policy and special help that boosted bank interest rates from 2 to 4 percent, and bankers did not complain.

And this approach by the President comes on top of the unpalatable recommendation by his Secretary of the Treasury that gives the impression co-ops do not pay taxes. The Secretary said, in effect, "We'll tell you how to run your business, and here's how: You must pay 4 percent interest on your savings. You must pay out everything after 3 years; liquidate your savings. And, if you do that," he said, "I'll recommend that you pay no income tax to Uncle Sam."

All self-respecting co-ops would turn down such a deal as undesirable, unsound, and in bad faith. But the reason there's so much confusion about co-ops is that the propaganda mills keep grinding away on half-truths, complete untruths, and outright lies.

And the erroneous statements in papers like the Wall Street Journal do not help, as it's sharp readers well know. For example, here is one letter the editors of this business and financial paper got. It is from C. H. Lishbough, a reader. Mr. Lishbough says: "Your editorial in the Wall Street Journal, 'Share and Share Alike,' contains several misleading and incorrect inferences regarding the business and taxation practices of cooperatives.

"Although you do not mention it by name, the patronage rebate to which you repeatedly refer is, of course, non-taxable to any type of business, whether legally organized as a cooperative or not.

"Thus, in that long-forgotten year when Henry Ford refunded $50 to the purchaser of each new car he produced, he was paying a patronage rebate.

"Under today's tax laws, Ford Motor Co. could do the same thing with impunity fully equal to that enjoyed by the cooperatives. The much happier owners of new Fords would not have to pay income tax on the rebate either.

"But the interesting fact is that the issuance of stock dividends by noncooperative corporations is usually undertaken for much the same reason used by the cooperatives in establishing revolving funds for the delayed disbursement of patronage rebates: The conservation of working capital. In each case, such action must be taken with the support and approval of the stockholder owners.

"And this may be the crux of the matter, for while we hear a great deal, indeed, about the great tax advantages enjoyed by cooperatives, we see very few corporations taking advantage of the opportunity which is legally open to all, to organize themselves as cooperatives.

"Perchance, the basic reason for this is the very substantial difference in the exercise of controls by the stockholders in the cooperatives, as compared to ordinary corporations. The cooperative stockholder has one vote, regardless of the number of shares which he may own, while the owner of common voting stock in other corporations has one vote per share.

"Many corporate managers, born and bred in the world of proxy contests, would sincerely prefer to avoid confronting themselves

with such an utterly democratic group of stockholders—and no doubt many cooperative managers feverishly wish they didn't have to either. And so the practical disadvantages must outweigh the small tax advantages which certainly carefully defined types of cooperatives do enjoy."

And that is the view of a reader of the August Wall Street Journal, on co-ops. And, concludes reader Lishbough, "Alas, the cooperative society is not just around the corner."

Excerpts From Remarks Made by Governor Williams, of Michigan, at a Meeting of the Michigan Soil Conservation Districts, Michigan State University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this week the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on which I am privileged to serve, has been hearing the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson. It strikes me that the remarks of Hon. G. Mennen Williams, Governor of Michigan, at a meeting of the Michigan State University Soil Conservation District personnel on January 23, would be of help to all of us as we seek to improve our agricultural economy. I ask unanimouse consent that the text of the remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the remarks was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY GOV. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS AT A MEETING OF THE MICHIGAN SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS, KELLOGG CENTER, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST LANSING, MICH., JANUARY 23, 1959

It certainly is a pleasure to have this opportunity to speak to a group whose work is as important to the future of the State of Michigan as is the work you are engaged in.

It's not necessary for me, I am sure, to tell you how important soil conservation is, nor how we have progressed in this area over the years. As in many other programs, we've come a long way, but we still have a long way to go.

In 1938, there was one soil conservation district in Michigan. In 1949, there were 18. Now there are 75.

In other words, Michigan in the decade preceding 1949 added 17 soil conservation districts, and in the decade since 1949, we have added 57. This is a record of growth in which every citizen can take great pride.

Soil conservation districts now embrace more than 90 percent of the land area of Michigan. There are, I am told, more than 34,000 farmers actively cooperating with these districts, while uncounted thousands more have been persuaded to improve their farming practices through the varied activities sponsored by these districts.

It would be difficult to overemphasize the importance of this growth in soil conservation work. Sound conservation practices are among the most precious gifts one generation can pass on to the next. Truly you build a stronger Michigan for your children by the work that brings you here.

Among the activities related to soil conservation is reforestation, and in this area Michigan has a bright record indeed. More than 54,000 acres of State land have been reforested in the last 10 years.

In the same period of time, the capacity of State nurseries to produce seedlings has been increased from 6 million a year to more than 25 million.

Ten years ago, the forest-planted areas of the State totaled 874,000 acres. Now the total is close to 1,300,000 acres.

It is worth noting that of this gain in forest acreage, more than one-half is in private plantings, and a great part of this was brought about through the use of State-grown seedlings made available at cost.

Tree farms, as against forest-planted areas, also show a steady growth in Michigan. Under the State's tree farm program, there are now close to 1,443,000 acres involved in the State's tree farm program, ranging in size from farmer's woodlots to sizable commercial holdings.

And we're saving what we're growing—as witness the sharp reduction in forest fire losses in the past 10 to 15 years. For example, one report shows 106,385 acres of forest lost through fires in the period 1945 through 1949, compared with 32,095 acres in the period 1950 to 1955.

Michigan's forest growth today exceeds the amount removed by harvesting and fires. We are therefore renewing a great resource, and at the same time realizing from that resource concurrent benefits in conservation, and in food for Michigan game animals. As you know, thousands of deer have been saved from starvation by the renewal of feeding areas.

Commercially, not including the Christmas tree business, the forest products industries in Michigan taken together are a $300 million a year business, and show every promise of playing an increasingly important role in our economic growth over the next 25 years.

So much for figures. The evidence of progress in Michigan is heartening. This does not mean, however, that the job of conservation is finished. It is not finished. Every generation faces all over again the great struggle between those who would deplete the soil, either through ignorance, carelessness, or greed, and those who would conserve our soil, and other basic resources, as a gift from the past to be improved as it is turned over to the future.

This century has seen two eras of dramatic attention to conservation. The first era was opened by President Theodore Roosevelt. Natural resources, he told the Governors' Conference on Conservation in May 1908, are the final basis of national power and perpetuity. Almost a year before, he had signed the Forest Reserve Act, which was the the beginning of the end of the American cycle of cut, slash, fire, and land abandonment, as one observer described it.

The other era came with President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The dark cloud of depression unemployment produced the silver lining of tremendous conservation projects through the famous Civilian Conservation Corps. People today are reaping the benefits of the work done by the CCC. Not only were idle men given useful work, but the land they renewed has benefited the people ever since.

This characteristic of conservation—the wise use of today's resources in order to provide tomorrow's growth—is a pretty good description of what your State government is trying to do to meet the challenges which face us.

During the next several months, it is likely that questions of taxation and appropriations will dominate most of the governmental news out of Lansing.

Debates over budgets for an enterprise the size of this great State, as well as discussions of how such budgets can be equitably financed, quite frequently become so involved that it is easy to lose sight of what the discussion is all about.

Fundamentally, the question is the level of State services. Are we going to increase our educational facilities in keeping with the increasing population of school-age children and youth, or are we going to hold off the tide of new pupils coming up each year?

Are we going to give proper treatment to the mentally ill and retarded children, or are we going to neglect them? Are we going to have better parks for our people? Adequate State police protection? Are we going to treat our senior citizens like human beings deserve to be treated, or are we going to discard them?

These are just some of the things the State budget means when it is translated into human terms.

Your State government is concerned both with the immediate needs of the people—public health and public safety measures, for example—and also with the longer range problems arising out of the revolutionary scientific changes in the world about us.

Michigan pioneered the age of the automobile, and put the whole world on wheels. We became the arsenal of democracy in World War II, dazzling the free world with prodigious feats of production. Well, now we've got to find our way into a new era—an era of electronics, automation, atomic energy, missiles, and the exploration of outer space.

We're going to master this new era as we have the other challenges in the past. It's going to take hard work and a lot of cooperation, but the rewards are well worth the effort.

Right now, 100 of Michigan's leading business and industrial leaders, along with labor and agricultural leaders, are working together as a Commission on Michigan's Economic Future—or COMEF. This group will blueprint workable plans for the future, based upon a realistic assessment of resources human and natural with which we are blessed.

Also at work is a science advisory board, composed of top scientists from our industries and our universities. They already have given a preliminary report which clearly shows how important science is in Michigan's economic future, and what we must do now to move ahead in the science-based industries of the future.

So let's not let the immediate crisis of State finances—serious as it is—obscure the fact that Michigan is rich in opportunities for growth. We have the resources, we have a dynamic population, we have great leaders in every kind of endeavor—if we put them together in the right combination, we'll build a new economy for the people of Michigan, bigger and better and stronger than any since our history began.

You who are in conservation know better than others how important it is to keep driving for long-range gains while you work through the immediate problems. So it is in State government today.

The immediate needs and the long-range problems are both being worked on. I think the results will be worthwhile both in resolving the financial distress of State government, and in providing an atmosphere for future growth.

School-Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have read with considerable interest an editorial in the Newark Star-Ledger of February 10, 1959, concerning

the school-aid program in New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO HELP FOR US

The school-aid program proposed yesterday by President Eisenhower is not likely to have much effect on financing construction programs in New Jersey.

At a news conference on the President's bill, Welfare Secretary Flemming emphasized that it would apply only to those areas which lack the financial resources to do the job themselves.

New Jersey, with a high per capita income, is not likely to qualify as a distress area. But this leaves the delicate question of deciding just what constitutes a distress area.

Willingness to shoulder the burden of school costs also plays a part in determining how much an area will do to provide more and better schools. The voters in school districts where classrooms are badly overcrowded have been known to reject bond issues to pay for new school buildings. In these cases, would the districts be considered distress areas? The parents of children doubled up in overcrowded classrooms might think so. But their opinion might not be shared by authorities in Washington who will dispense the school-aid dollars.

Areas which do not have the resources to provide adequate schools merit aid. But some sound basis must be developed for determining just what qualifies an area for help.

Land Reform in Pakistan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times on Monday, January 26, 1959, dealing with the subject of "Land Reform in Pakistan." I recently had the pleasure of discussing this subject with the distinguished Ambassador from Pakistan to the United States, His Excellency Mohammed Ali. I want to take this occasion to wish the people of Pakistan and their President, General Ayub, the very best in their efforts to strengthen the stability of their nation. It is my sincere hope that the Government of Pakistan will, without unnecessary delay, act to restore constitutional democracy to the people of Pakistan so that both the spirit and the letter of representative government will reign. President Ayub has given every indication that he wishes these constitutional reforms to get underway expeditiously. The friends of Pakistan in the United States await this development.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAND REFORM IN PAKISTAN

When General Ayub took over sweeping powers in Pakistan last October, assumed the Presidency and set aside the previous constitutional structures for the time being, it was remarked here that his action would ultimately have to be judged by the use to which he put those powers. He has now set into operation one of the sweeping reforms that he promised, a drastic revision of the land tenure system. Pakistan will have agrarian reform with a vengeance.

The pattern, however, is totally different from that of the agrarian reformers in Red China, where the program was simply to kill the landlord, take his land, give to to the peasants with much fanfare and then systematically take it back. In Pakistan the large estates—about 6,000—will be broken up, but the landlords will receive just compensation in the form of interest-bearing bonds. Former tenants will have the opportunity to purchase on easy terms, and security of tenure will be guaranteed.

President Ayub insists that he is acting on scientific and economic grounds rather than on the basis of any doctrinaire emotion. In spite of the fact that West Pakistan is about the size of Texas there is enormous pressure on the land from its 40 million people, because relatively little is arable without massive irrigation.

Two problems have to be faced. The first is absentee landlordism, which has proved economically unsound and has also, according to President Ayub, built up undesirable concentrations of political power. The other problem is at the opposite end of the scale. This is fragmentation through inheritance customs. Thus, while some of the holdings are too large and will be reduced in size, many others are much too small and there must be a program of consolidation.

As the plans have been outlined there appears to be a high regard for both human and property rights and an attempt to safeguard them. The reform is needed, and the President is committed to it and has acted boldly. He is deserving of congratulation and of success.

Where Integrated Schools Break Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Where Integrated Schools Break Down, published in the Daily Press, of Newport News, Va., on February 16, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE INTEGRATED SCHOOLS BREAK DOWN

From time to time in this space, there has been an exploration into what has been called "the disintegration of the public school system under integration."

And, almost without exception, these observations are followed by letters from readers who deplore our pessimism about the continued operation of racially mixed schools.

We venture into the fray again, with our arsenal filled with reports supplied by Richmond Times-Dispatch researcher Larry Weekly. He reports that the classroom problems resulting from the integration of Washington schools, where Negroes outnumber whites by 3 to 1, were so severe that the Washington school officials immediately started a drastic regrouping program.

After a year of integration, for instance, Washington school officials found that two-thirds of the ninth-graders couldn't read as well as the national average; two-thirds were below the norm in arithmetic, and more than one-third of the retarded group were from 1 to 3 years behind their age group.

Furthermore, 90 percent of the retarded students, according to the national achievement tests, were Negro.

With these results, Washington school planners immediately tightened their standards of grading. Failure rates in the elementary schools have increased from 5.3 percent when integration was ordered started to 12.7 percent this past June.

Now the Nation's Capital is beginning to think about expanding its programs.

When integration began in 1954, there were the usual two tracks or preparatory programs, under which a student prepared himself for further study, or, in the general course, a student prepared himself for immediate entry into the commercial world.

Now, Washington officials have found it necessary to break up (or down) their school system into six different tracks in order to maintain their requirement for eventual promotion of the students. There is the usual preprofessional course, and a college preparatory course which does aim him at a general college. Then there's a general course for those who don't expect to attend college, and at the bottom is a fourth track for youngsters, most of them Negroes, who expect to need elementary reading, writing, and arithmetic to get self-sustaining jobs.

But in addition to these 4 tracks, there are 2 more. A fifth program is strictly vocational, in which the student is taught basic skills of the easier trades. And a sixth is for boys, mostly Negroes, who are severe behavior problems.

There is a wide gap existing between the dropout age of 18 and the working age of 18, filled mostly with Negroes. One police officer reported "most of them wouldn't work even if you gave him a job."

They blame this pool of idle youth for the sickening waves of crime that have made Washington streets almost bare after the early evening hours.

But it boils down to this:

Washington, the showcase of integration, is finding it cannot operate a successful, efficient school system on a racially mixed basis. Two-thirds of its ninth-graders are below the national average in reading and arithmetic, the two basic subjects for an elementary education. And in spite of some tightening of standards, the situation does not improve, in spite of the efforts being made to show the Nation integration will work.

It won't, and Washington and Harlem are showcasing the problem before the world.

Annual Report of Dr. A. J. Kreft, Oregon State Izaak Walton League President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most useful organizations in the Nation is the Izaak Walton League, which consists of sportsmen who are dedicated to the cause of wise use and preservation of our natural resources. The instances of its leadership in this field are too numerous to detail here.

On November 28, 1958, the State president of the Izaak Walton League in Oregon, delivered his annual report to the membership. Dr. Alfred J. Kreft's address is so full of valuable information on such topics as cleaning up our polluted rivers, enhancing safety in the woods during hunting season, safeguarding upland watersheds and encouraging young people in conservation education, that I believe it should be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the benefit of the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of Dr. A. J. Kreft, of Portland, to the State convention of the Izaak Walton League of Oregon, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF STATE PRESIDENT DR. A. J. KREFT AT THE STATE CONVENTION, NOVEMBER 28, 1958, EUGENE, OREG., UPON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT AS DIVISION PRESIDENT

Fellow Waltonians and guests, I wish to thank each of you for coming to this convention and helping us mold our policy for next year and the future. As a president retires from office, he has an opporunity in his final report to place in the record the accomplishments of his regime.

There is much of which we may boast, but little of it is due to my personal efforts. In the 2 years that I was honored to serve you, I only called a few signals, the teamwork was yours.

During this period, you have added nine new chapters to the Oregon division. You have won national recognition and citation for your work, as two members of the Oregon division, Art Roberts and Irv Luiten, won national IWL honor awards at the Colorado Springs National Izaak Walton League Convention. The American National Cattlemen's Association and the Oregon Farm Bureau recognized your work in the two citations awarded to Jack Binford. In addition Mrs. Marion T. Weatherford and Ken McLeod—both members of the league, won coveted American Motors-Nash conservation awards the past year.

Several years ago we were in debt, now we have a sound bank balance. Part of this is due to the savings accomplished by the contribution of Art Roberts and his secretary, Mrs. Barbara Wood, and their organization in helping with the secretarial work. At this convention there will be distributed to each chapter president only a copy of the booklet, "So Now You're Program Chairman." This is the work of Kramer Adams. The booklet was printed by his company, the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., and the cover was done by Art Roberts and the West Coast Lumbermen's Association. This work, done in the name of the Oregon division, will surely gain more recognition for the division.

Four of our chapters—Waldport, Salem, Eugene, and the Portland Air Force—will be Gavel and Gong award winners in 1958.

The Eugene chapter is pioneering in the formation of a youth chapter. I hope that each of you meet the members of McKenzie High School group and encourage them. We again are privileged to hold another Young Waltonian Conference—this is the fourth year that Jack Binford has been chairman; and as usual, he has an excellent committee to make for another successful youth conference.

On the national legislative front in 1958 you will hear this has been a very wonderful year in the passage of much excellent conservation legislation. The most important bill to win congressional approval, you will recall one of your resolutions of last year, was the recently enacted amendment to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (Public Law 732). The act clearly authorized Federal construction agencies to include fish and wildlife conservation measures, for both mitigation of damage and for enhancement and improvement, regardless of the date of authorization of the water-use project. An existing backlog of 800 authorized projects, costing an estimated $10 billion, are subject to this provision.

Fish and wildlife conservation can now have an equal place at the bar of public opinion and congressional decision in the development and disposition of water in related land resources. This has been basic in the Oregon water resources law from the beginning—thanks to those Waltonians who helped Governor Patterson and the 1953 legislators in formulating our model water resources board.

Congress also authorized the $3 duck stamp law, to take effect next year. All of the income will be spent for wetlands acquisition and development—as it was intended in the original Duck Stamp Act.

The successful termination of the Klamath Indian Termination Act (Public Law 587) is history. For his efforts in this legislation, Senator NEUBERGER will be given special recognition by the division at Saturday's luncheon. We owe much also to Rollin Bowles for following closely the legislation and getting the South Dakota and California divisions alerted at a crucial time in the legislative proceedings. Again, the importance of belonging to and having a strong national organization is pointed out.

You are all familiar with the Outdoor Recreation Resources Act and the fact that Joe Penfold, our Washington league representative, was appointed by the President as one of seven citizens of the United States to the Commission. It will be up to the division to cooperate with this body and help in supplying the necessary information to help them make their report, which is due in 1961. We also are fortunate in having two of the Oregon congressional delegation selected to the 15-member Commission.

You have read of all the national legislative achievements in Outdoor America in Joe Penfold's column.

Again, this year as in 1957, the Waltonians in Oregon have erected a bronze plaque to the memory of highly deserving, pioneering conservationists. I refer to the tablet erected on October 25, 1958, at the Malheur Refuge in honor of William Finley and Stanley Jewett.

The past year saw the passing of two past State presidents; we lost Rex Sanford, State president in 1951 and Clark Bachman, president in 1945. These men may not be known to new members of the league, but let us never forget those conservation giants of yesterday who did so much—who gave of themselves so completely—when the conservation idea was not as well known as it is today. Both of these men did a lot for the Oregon division. It is up to all of us to carry on in the manner that they would want, so that the league will continue to grow in prestige and membership.

Today througout Oregon, your chapters are a respected group of conservation leaders, whose influence goes far beyond your membership. Some of you have heard a lot from me about increasing your membership. However, we have not concentrated all of our energies in solicitation to show numerical gains. The league has to be judged on the basis of service to resource management; and membership, as such, is important only, as it contributes to this effectiveness. Since we don't have any fund-raising projects for the benefit of the division treasury, it is necessary that adequate funds be on hand to carry out the work in Oregon on the high level that we expect of all great organizations. And the amount of work is increasing so a higher membership is necessary.

The division's record of conservation achievement is a source of inspiration to the national organization and to other divisions. This fact was mentioned to me several times at the national convention at Colorado Springs, which I was privileged to attend as your representative.

I visited the new national office in October. It is a fine place, and I hope that each of you will have an opportunity to see it sometime. They are a busy group—trying to help you do a better job. The new Outdoor America is a magazine that I am proud to display in my office. I would like, however, to see a newspaper type of format used several times a year, so that all league activities could be printed. Their new share-the league membership campaign is well conceived and well written. I hope that each chapter board of directors will carefully read the material and apply it to their community.

We are hopeful that each chapter and individuals will donate at least $50 to help equip the library of the new national headquarters. I ask that you prayerfully consider this so that the Oregon division will be successful in this project. Let's show them that we are behind them in their program which is really our program. It is our organization also, not just that of the members of the Middle West.

I am particularly impressed with Frank Gregg, our national executive secretary. I hope that he can visit us at a future State convention. Ed Cooney is a consecrated Waltonian, struggling always with the membership problem. It is a big job.

Mr. Gregg Smith is the editor of Outdoor America. He asks that our chapters send in material for publication. He is very anxious to hear what you are doing.

The chapters of the Oregon division continue to work with others who do not always agree with us. We have discovered that we are a potent pressure group that can influence legislation and public opinion; but we have endeavored with humility and unselfishness to wield the influence for the public good.

The recent attempt by petition to make steelhead a game fish put this policy to a severe test. We Waltonians want our magnificent game fish, the steelhead, set aside entirely for recreational pursuit. The quandary is in the Columbia River where steelhead will inevitably be taken while there is a commercial fishery. It seems that the subject of a February closure could be more realistically reviewed by the Oregon Fish Commission. The bulk of that season's catch have been steelhead fish that support a great winter recreation, followed by thousands of ardent anglers in southwest Washington and on the Willamette and Sandy River watersheds in Oregon. The sportsmen of the two States will not be put off on assignment of those winter steelhead to recreational fishing. It can be done here with the least interference to the overall fishing industry on the lower Columbia River. The steelhead petitions will be back, if this is not done.

I wish to again commend the Oregon Game Commission and their employees for their participation in our affairs and the cooperation that they have given us.

I wish to commend John McKean for his studies on the Silver Lake deerherd. The league recognizes that this type of study should have been done years ago. They are now doing excellent research on the effect of heavy harvesting, studying hunter attitudes, range habitat, actual numbers of deer present and taken out by hunters, what numbers of bucks and does are harvested, the condition of the animals and other important items. I wait with great interest their continuing reports.

Our treasurer has reported on the dollars that have passed through his hands, but these figures will not reflect more than a

small portion of the money expended in league work.

Our national directors, Jack Binford, Rollin Bowles and Luhr Jensen, Jr., have made many trips to national meetings and on national business. Prior to them Bill Niskanen, Joe Smith and Dr. Charlton were our national directors. Dr. Charlton has been attending national meetings for over 20 years—when he was the only person present from the Pacific coast. We owe these men a great deal for their personal contribution in energy, time and funds.

We are indebted to Charles Hoonan for being editor of Outdoor Oregon. My wish is that we have an issue every 2 months or oftener. There is much material that could be sent out.

The convention folder lists our division committees. Some of the committee chairmen have put in a lot of time in league work for the division. I especially commend Carl Etling, Colonel Weiland, Dave Dobbins, Dan Allen, John Benneth, and Hardy Glascock—just to name a few. You will hear from many of the committee chairmen at this meeting. Hardy Glascock has spoken to you on three occasions in 1958 on the wilderness bill. The State division, after months of deliberations and three meetings, presented a statement at the Bend hearings on November 7, according to your instructions. The statement was given by Vick Withrow, president of our Salem chapter. Senator NEUBERGER may touch on the wilderness bill tomorrow noon.

This year we again are presenting four Golden Beaver awards to very worthy recipients. You will enjoy meeting these fine men at the Saturday luncheon. Also, in line with the new national policy of recognizing deserving members of the league who have made outstanding contributions to the cause of conservation, the Oregon division is recognizing the work of a member of the Portland chapter. I mentioned the contribution of Senator NEUBERGER in the Klamath Indian Termination Act legislation. Each of you is eligible next year, so I hope that all will become more active and try to win this award. I hope that you will approve of the award appearance. It is being done by Irwin McFadden, a Portland artist.

I am asking the convention to approve a change in the bylaws to allow for more vice presidents, who can help the division president be of more service to the chapters. It is impossible for a few to visit all of our chapters at least twice a year to help them with their programs and meetings. (As we increase in numbers, so increases our bureaucracy.)

The Conservation Education Workshop at Hoodoo Ski Bowl was again a big success. Sixteen teachers had to be denied admission to the courses because the enrollment was full. So next year the school will run for three 1-week periods. The league has made a big contribution to the success of the workshop; but in my personal opinion, we are not getting the credit for it.

Now let me make some suggestions for the future work of the division.

Next year will be a legislative year. Get to know your legislators real well so that they will have confidence in you. Someone has said, "The man with the voters' mandate gets the job done best." It is going to be hard to replace Rollin Bowles now that he has become a member of the State Game Commission. Give your 1959 legislative chairman all the help possible. He will need your considered opinion and also your presence at legislative hearings.

Hunting safety courses should be a prerequisite before any juvenile 16 years of age or younger can obtain his first hunting license. We don't just give a child the keys to our car and tell him to go drive away. In the State of Washington anybody below the age of 17 must take such a course. To make this successful will require the help of a lot of sportsmen. Some of you will have to give up some of your leisure time to make the program a success in order to qualify our youth for hunting licenses.

Tonight you will hear the report of the joint house-senate interim committee to investigate fish and game conditions and their recommendations for the 1959 legislature. I wish to thank the many chapters who made statements at the 33 hearings that this committee held throughout Oregon this summer.

One of their chief recommendations will be that of combining the game and fish commissions. In considering this, I urge you to consider what is best for the resource. Each of us has our own opinion on this. If proper safeguards are written into the bill, the sportsmen should approve this recommendation. Three of our chapters have already given their approval at hearings. Dan Allen, chairman of the Portland chapter committee which did a lot of careful work on this problem, will be glad to explain his report to you. Copies are available. The committee did an excellent job.

The antilitterbug campaign is at a standstill. Maybe we should develop a keep Oregon clean committee, as is functioning so well in Maryland. We have the red hat days committee to use as a guide in getting other organizations to work with us.

The red hat days committee did another excellent job. You will hear their reports tomorrow. This committee should be continued, but another method of selecting county chairmen is needed. We hope to remedy this in 1959. To continue to show success accidents by juvenile hunters must be reduced.

You will be asked to vote on a resolution concerning a more aggressive campaign of pollution abatement. One hundred and six Oregon communities require 186 projects to speed up the cleaning up of Oregon streams. The league has traditionally fought for cleaner streams and lakes. I urge that you give your help in the next legislature to get additional funds for the sanitary authority so that it can do the job that we expect of them.

Our division watershed usage committee has been doing a superlative job the past year. This committee should be encouraged to continue their research. I hope that the division publishes the findings of this committee and make it more effective, by asking other groups to have representation on it. I await tomorrow's panel with a great deal of interest.

There are a lot of problems connected with logging at the higher elevations that have not been entirely solved. There has been some discussion about the Windego Pass timber sale to the Diamond Lake Lumber Co. Concern has been expressed about the future of the Cascade Crest—the future of the snow water basins. We have been assured that the Forest Service will follow the cutting of the sub-alpine timber very closely. The slope is gentle. There will be small cutting units. From the water standpoint, there will be a possible increase in water yield as the snow pack will be increased. Slash disposal will be guarded.

In this connection we are having problems in the Siletz and Rogue River watersheds. The temperatures of those two great streams was quite high last summer so that concern for fish life was expressed. Chapters are urged to do more research to help our State and Federal agencies and private operators do a better job.

We could make better use of the soil bank plan in Oregon. The Eugene and Silverton chapters for the past few years have been working with farmers to improve wildlife habitat. Linn and Lane Counties are good examples of usage of this program.

More high school chapters should be encouraged. I hope that the present youth conference will be of great help to you in this regard. However, the chapters will need the benefit of adults who know basic league policies and programs, or trouble will arise.

In regard to membership, the goal in Oregon is a healthy chapter in every county-seat town. There are many vacancies, so let's reach this goal.

I have had ready telephone access the past 2 years to our immediate past State presidents and have consulted them often. I appreciate very much the help of Rollin Bowles, Dan Allen, Jack Binford, Joe Smith, Dr. Charlton, and Merle Brown. I pledge to my successor the same cooperation that these gentlemen have given to me.

Your secretary and I have tried to keep the chapters informed of all developments through a monthly chapter bulletin and letters. In checking up I find that only 160 envelopes remain out of the 3,500 that we purchased, so your division officers have sent out 3,340 communications to league members and on other league business. A number of telegrams were sent, when needed; and many telephone calls were made. I like to use the telephone rather than write a letter. Telephone calls are a good business practice, so why not apply the principles of management to conservation?

The whole is greater than the sum of all its parts—due to organization. I hope that I leave the Oregon division with a better organization, due mainly to better training of chapter officers by you. My four vice presidents have had a great deal to do with improving our organization. I am very grateful to all of them and to our division treasurer and secretary for their prompt help.

To your new officers may I counsel them to make a great effort to get improvement in understanding with other groups. As our standard of living rises, more and more of our renewable and nonrenewable resources are being used up. Let us try to keep Oregon the place that we want to live in. We in Oregon are not crowded to death. We have so much to be thankful for. Let us appreciate what we have out here. Teach others also to be appreciative, and become league members.

So in the spirit of yesterday, when we gave thanks to God for our many bountiful blessings, let us pause occasionally and orientate ourselves. Let us attend frequent chapter meetings; read a lot about conservation; teach others to do likewise.

Let us be thankful that we live in a country where we can have a great organization like the Izaak Walton League and are permitted to hold meetings like this. The fact that I was State president is not important, but what is important is that an organization like the league exists.

It has been a great honor to me to have been your president. I am thankful for the opportunity of having been of some service to my State and country. It has been a very pleasant and enlightening experience, most especially for the wonderful people that I have met.

The Benson Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have received from the Fargo City Commission, regarding the farm policy as administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Throughout this general area people are keenly interested in the growth, progress and economic development of the city of Fargo and its inhabitants. Correspondingly, the people of Fargo are also keenly interested in economic conditions and the well-being of its friends and neighbors in surrounding rural areas.

It is universally recognized these days that our economy is an interdependent economy, and that which adversely affects agriculture sooner or later has an adverse effect on business, labor and the general public. It has now been clearly established that one vital segment of the economy such as agriculture cannot suffer without there being cumulative effects on the rest of the people. Therefore, the interdependence of agriculture, industry, business and labor must be recognized.

Fargo is the center of a great farm belt and our people depend upon agriculture for their sustenance and livelihood. Therefore, Fargo, like any agricultural community, cannot afford to stand back and permit the deterioration of our agricultural economy, and the continuing decline of farm income, accompanied by the general accelerated move away from the farm.

The news reported by the Associated Press as late as last Saturday, January 31, was headlined "Farm Income to Decrease by Many Millions—Benson Shakes Up Price Supports in Agriculture" and heralds the downward spiral of farm income and its ultimate effect on this area and our people.

Therefore, recognizing that the peril of agriculture is the peril of all citizens in this area, whether they live in villages, towns or cities, or on the farm, we call for the immediate resignation of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, whose policies have contributed to this unfortunate decline in our agricultural economy and farm income. We regret that Secretary Benson, by his policies appears to regard farmers and farms as just so many increments or statistics on a chart, and Secretary Benson also appears by his policies to lack feeling or concern for the plight of the individual farmer.

The Benson policy, as announced and administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, can only mean eventual ruination to many of our family farms and imposes a cumulative unfortunate effect on the rest of our economy.

In the event Mr. Benson does not submit his resignation, we respectfully call on the President of the United States to ask for Mr. Benson's resignation and to replace the Secretary of Agriculture with a new face and a new policy, based upon determined bipartisan attempts to help restore farm income and save the family sized farm.

FARGO CITY COMMISSION,
HERSCHEL LASHKOWITZ.
J. W. MARKEY.
E. J. MCCANNEL.
FRED C. HAGEN.
PAUL K. LEWIS.

Meeting of February 3, 1959.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on Sunday, February 15, it was my great privilege to be the guest of the Detroit Lithuanian Organization Center in connection with the 41st anniversary of the Lithuanian independence commemoration ceremonies.

A magnificent program was presented by men and women who are faithful to their God and church, devotedly loyal to America, and strong in their contributions to the city of Detroit and the State of Michigan.

The organization adopted a resolution which reflects their firm convictions, and I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix, along with the remarks I made, so that all may know the sentiments and plea of these fine Americans of Lithuanian origin.

There being no objection, the resolution and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

During the 41st commemoration of the reinstatement declaration of Lithuanian's independence, sponsored by the Detroit Lithuanian Organization Center, held at Western High School, 1500 Scotten Avenue, Detroit, Mich., on February 15, 1959, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas in June 1940, Soviet Russia did invade the sovereign independent Republic of Lithuania with armed forces to protect Lithuanian independence and, against the will of the people, annex her to the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas the armed forces of the Soviet Union are still presently residing in Lithuania in complete and total disregard of the agreements, policies, and treaties which existed between the Soviet Union and other allies of World War II: and

"Whereas Russian Communists are still currently perpetrating deportations and exterminations of whole ethnic groups, plundering people and institutions, and separating the members of family, one from another: Therefore be it

"Resolved—

"That, on this 41st anniversary, we express our deep gratitude to the Government of the United States for nonacknowledgement of the fabricated incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union and for allowing the many thousands of refugees to find new homes in this country.

"That, we respectively recommend that our U.S. Government abstain from entrance into any alliance, pact, or agreement which would in any way whatsoever recognize the present day Russian empire.

"That the Government of the United States be urged to use all possible means to protect enslaved peoples from genocidal destruction and preserve their hope of eventual liberation.

"Finally, that a copy of this resolution, signed by the presiding officers, be transmitted to the President of the United States, Secretary of State, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Michigan State Governor, and U.S. Senators and Congressmen from the State of Michigan."

DETROIT LITHUANIAN ORGANIZATION CENTER,
ALFONSAS NAKAS, *President.*
JONAS GAIBUTIS, *Secretary.*

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY SENATOR PHILIP A. HART, DEMOCRAT, OF MICHIGAN, TO THE DETROIT LITHUANIAN ORGANIZATION, DETROIT, MICH., HONORING LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Tomorrow, February 16, marks the 41st anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania. From 1918 to 1940 Lithuania stood among the family of free nations and made her contribution to the society of free peoples.

Thereafter, Lithuania was absorbed behind the Iron Curtain. There is no commerce, either commercial or cultural, between our shores and theirs. Not even newsmen are allowed to visit the occupied country.

And yet we have ways of knowing that the spirit of independence there has not been crushed. We have every reason to hope that one day it will again be a free and independent nation. Meanwhile it is noteworthy that our own country has never recognized the annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union,. and that our broadcasts in the Lithuanian language are providing a tangible evidence of our interest as well as a source of knowledge of the free world.

We are also fortunate that our own civilization is enriched by a million Lithuanian Americans who are making their special contribution to the growth of our Nation. In our own State of Michigan, they are counted among our most civic-minded, upstanding citizens.

It is my hope and belief that you can be counted upon to insist that our foreign policy be based on a realization that as the strongest free nation of the world we must cooperate with the peoples of the world who are aspiring to gain or regain the right to determine their fate and the opportunity to improve their standard of living. This may mean some sacrifice on our part; and there are some 4½ million in this country, unemployed, who are in no position to be sharing at this time. But I am confident that we have the resources and the ability, given the proper leadership, to solve these perplexing problems here at home and still be able to lend a helping hand to those in other lands temporarily less fortunate than ourselves.

With the best effort of us all, I'm sure we can do it.

Tribute to Wendell Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this week we celebrate the birthday of a great American, Wendell Willkie. Mr. Willkie was born on February 18, 1892.

Upon the death of Mr. Willkie in 1944, a 16-year-old girl, Mary Taylor Pryor—now Mrs. Lowell Thomas, Jr.—set down her thoughts on this fine man. Mr. Willkie had been her parents' house guest for 2 weeks prior to his death.

His stature is fully reflected in what this young girl put down in writing. It was read at his funeral by the late Mayor Fiorello La Guardia.

In commemoration of the birth date of this great American, I ask unanimous consent that the inspired words written by Mary Pryor, as delivered at the funeral by Mayor La Guardia, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ECHO

(By Mary Taylor Pryor)

The flames of the fire leapt upward piercing the blackness of the night. Seated on the sand around it, each of us stared hypnotically at the strange dancing shapes. The night was cold and clear, and millions of stars formed the roof over our heads. The rippling lake reflecting the starlight stretched from our feet to the purple mountains in the distance.

He seemed reoccupied that night. Sitting apart from us his thoughts were far away. Then the shrill cry of a loon pierced the stillness, and seemed to awaken him. He came forward by the fire. His face lit up and his eyes shone, and the soft night breezes rumpled his hair. Suddenly all was still, even the crackling of the fire seemed to cease. He was speaking, not only to us but to everything under that roof of stars; speaking in a strong, husky voice; speaking of something familiar to every element of nature, freedom. Everything listened, even the stately old pine trees seemed to be bending toward him so as to hear all of his philosophy. His words rang with sincerity and his unwavering convictions gave them amazing strength. They were words that reflected his warm, friendly personality, his determination and above all his honesty.

Then, as though some unseen force had beckoned to him, he withdrew into the shadows. The fire had suddenly died down and dark clouds hid the stars. But above the moaning of the pine trees his ringing voice still echoed over the silent lake and mountains. And today everyone everywhere hears the echo of those words of Wendell Willkie.

Advisory Council on Global Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the path ahead for the free world is beset by obstacles, obstacles which it is important for us to discern and to surmount. Mr. Goodhue Livingston, Jr., chairman of the Policy Committee of the Committee for Collective Security, has advanced a stimulating proposal as to how we can achieve effectiveness in planning and programing in the difficult days ahead. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Livingston's suggestions, in the form of a letter to the editor of the Christian Science Monitor, and invite the attention of my colleagues to it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLOBAL STRATEGY

To the Christian Science Monitor: The major problem facing the free world is the steadily growing threat of Communist aggression. The relatively monolithic Communist bloc has a more dynamic and united leadership and is more effective in its propaganda and subversion because it is both ruthless and unscrupulous.

The basic principles motivating the free world can prevail if soundly expounded and forcefully prompted. However, the free world suffers from inept leadership, whether the Democratic or Republican Party or a conservative or labor government is in power in the two great countries to which the rest of the free world looks for direction.

Our foreign policy should be formulated on a sounder basis and should provide alternative policies to meet possible contingencies. For example, what will be our position on Germany when Chancellor Adenauer is no longer in power? What steps should we take to offset indirect aggression by Soviet Russia if it continues its present policies? What would be our attitude if Yugoslavia rejoins the Communist bloc? What will we do concerning Formosa when Chiang Kai-shek is no longer president?

What will be our position if the growing industrialization of the People's Republic of China makes it an important factor in world trade? What disarmament plans will we propose if the smaller nations acquire the capacity to wage nuclear warfare? How should we mobilize pressure by the free world upon the Arab States and Israel to adjust their differences if the present efforts of the United Nations fail?

Our foreign policy, seeking universal peace and justice, should be based on global strategy rather than on tactical maneuvering. The Committee for Collective Security proposes the establishment by law of an advisory council for global strategy, to consist of private citizens, appointed by the President, qualified to advise the Department of State on matters of policy. This group, with a permanent secretariat and access to classified information, should include representatives of the natural and social sciences skilled in dealing with political, psychological, and economic problems.

Perhaps too frequently the State Department sees the trees but fails to see the forest, and a group of private citizens would help in broadening its vision. Our foreign policy should be determined on the basis of a balanced assessment of all the dimensions and approaches of the problems facing this country and the free world. We should initiate a course of action rather than seek to effectuate our aims only when action is forced upon us. The keynote of our efforts to attain our global strategic objectives should be action, not reaction.

GOODHUE LIVINGSTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Policy Committee, Committee for Collective Security.
NEW YORK, N.Y.

Boggs-Daniel Narcotic Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat of Louisiana, today released statistics on the results of the Boggs-Daniel Narcotic Control Act of 1956.

Congressman BOGGS said:

"Since the Congress passed the Boggs-Daniel Narcotic Control Act of July 1956, with its severe minimum mandatory penalties against illegal sellers of narcotics, the improvement in the narcotic situation in the United States has been remarkable. One of the most realistic and accurate yardsticks to gage this improvement is the number of addicts reported in 1958 as compared with the number reported in 1956.

"The District of Columbia shows that the count of new addicts dropped from 200 in 1956 to only 60 in the first 11 months of 1958. In Louisiana there was a decrease in the number of addicts reported from 142 in 1956 to 50 in the first 11 months of 1958."

Mr. BOGGS also pointed out other States which show a significant overall improvement. These are as follows:

State	1956	1958 (1st 11 months)
Texas	523	175
Ohio	92	37
Michigan	543	264
New York	4,138	2,836
Illinois	908	631
Missouri	210	133
California	1,568	1,276

In considering the statistics given above for Ohio, it should be pointed out there had already been a decrease of 80 percent in 1956 from 1955, the year in which the Ohio State law providing for a 20-year minimum mandatory penalty for illegal sale of narcotics was enacted.

"I am tremendously gratified," the Congressman said, "by the figures which have now been compiled showing the operation of the Boggs-Daniel Narcotics Code. Despite the tremendously growing population, the number of addicts has decreased since the enactment of the act.

"I would hope that these figures would persuade some of the people both in the medical and legal profession who have been attempting to sabotage the Boggs-Daniel Narcotics Code. I do not question their good intentions, but it seems to me that these figures show that their approach providing narcotics for addicts is wrong."

Nixon Now Leads Rockefeller by 2 to 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I attach hereto an article from the Washington Sunday Star of February 15, which is a compilation of the Trendex News Poll. This poll indicates that NIXON now leads Rockefeller by more than 2 to 1 across the country.

The poll, showing NIXON a 2-to-1 favorite, is among all voters. Among Republicans NIXON leads Rockefeller by better than 5 to 1.

This is some indication of the impression which the Vice President has made not only upon Republicans, but on people generally throughout the country.

The article follows:

NIXON NOW LEADS ROCKEFELLER BY 2 TO 1

(By Jack Boyle)

NEW YORK.—Public opinion has dramatically switched from Nelson A. Rockefeller to RICHARD M. NIXON as Republican President nominee, last week's Trendex News Poll shows.

Governor Rockefeller's program for a $277 million tax jump in New York was an important factor in his loss of popularity nationally.

Vice President NIXON now is almost a 2-to-1 favorite over Mr. Rockefeller. Among Republicans, he ranks better than 5 to 1.

Last November Mr. Rockefeller was a 5-to-4 favorite over Mr. NIXON.

Immediately after the last election, when Governor Rockefeller easily defeated Averell Harriman, Trendex interviewers asked a scientifically selected cross section of Americans: "As of right now, do you think RICHARD NIXON or Nelson Rockefeller would get

the most votes for the Presidency as the nominee of the Republican Party?"

Last week, while Governor Rockefeller was defending his budget and Vice President NIXON was in Venezuela for the inauguration of Romulo Betancourt as President, Trendex terviewers asked the same question of a similar, though not identical, cross section.

Here is a comparison of responses by regions and in percentages:

	East	West and Mid-west	South	Total
Rockefeller:				
November 1958	34.5	36.2	48.6	45.9
Now	23.1	33.4	27.8	27.9
Nixon:				
November 1958	30.3	44.0	37.1	37.6
Now	60.4	38.3	66.4	51.8
No opinion:				
November 1958	15.2	19.8	14.3	16.5
Now	16.5	28.3	5.8	20.3

The figures show that Mr. Rockefeller's greatest losses, and Mr. NIXON'S greatest gains, were in the East, which includes Governor Rockefeller's own State, and in the South.

In the current poll, interviewers asked the party leanings of those interviewed. This was not done during the 1958 poll. When the preferences were divided by parties and independents, the current opinion was, in percent:

	Democrats	Republicans	Independents
Rockefeller	36.5	13.8	34.3
NIXON	44.3	76.4	29.8
No opinion	19.2	9.8	35.9

While independents seem to favor Mr. Rockefeller, more than a third of them have not yet made up their minds.

All interviewed were invited to explain their answers and the dislike of the Rockefeller tax plan appeared strongly in replies.

Many favored either Mr. Rockefeller or Mr. NIXON because of their personality or "because he appeals to me most."

Some said they favored one or the other because he was younger. (Mr. Rockefeller is 50, Mr. NIXON, 45.) Some said they favored one or the other because he had greater experience in foreign affairs, or more experience in government. Mr. NIXON has made several trips out of the country; Mr. Rockefeller was coordinator of inter-American affairs during World War II.

Many of those who had no opinion said the question was academic because the Democrats would win the next election.

National Shoreline in Danger, but Oregon's Seacoast Preserved for Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the February 15, 1959, issue of Parade magazine entitled "What's Happening to Our Shoreline?" The issue of Parade was published with the Washington Post and Times Herald and with the Oregonian in my own native city of Portland. Author of the article is Michael Frome.

Mr. Frome's article warns that the coastal and beach areas available for the recreation of 173 million people are becoming less in quantity and quality nearly every year. I am making this inclusion in the Appendix in tribute to one of Oregon's illustrious ex-Governors, Oswald West, who still lives in retirement in Portland at the age of 85.

Oswald West was Oregon's Governor from 1911 to 1915. During that period he kept one of the most beautiful seacoasts anywhere from being exploited for private greed and gain. He saw to it that the law of riparian rights safeguarded the 300-mile Oregon shoreline for perpetual public benefit, rather than permitting it to be gobbled up for dredging, wharving, and similar commercial uses. Today a great State park on the seacoast is named Oswald West State Park in tribute to this deed.

Oregon's seacoast is praised as the most magnificent on earth in an article in the February issue of Holiday magazine by Robert Carson, noted novelist. He even calls it more lovely than that of his own California. That this shore of white, sandy beaches and timbered headlands has not been defiled or looted is due to the foresight, vision, and courage of ex-Gov. Oswald West. In his honor, I ask that Mr. Michael Frome's article from Parade about our national shoreline be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S HAPPENING TO OUR SHORELINE?

(By Michael Frome)

On sun-flecked sandspits like Miami Beach, Waikiki, Coronado, and others the winter season is in full cry. As you read this vacationers fleeing winter's bite lie on poolside patios soaking up sunshine. Visitors in shirt sleeves promenade in grand hotels and talk about the temperatures back home.

Sunshine and warm weather have their appeal, but a few feet from the hotels laps the greatest appeal of all: the ocean. Winter or summer, in Miami, Cape Cod, or even Fargo, N. Dak., America's greatest natural resource is water. Water nourishes industry, feeds crops, and soothes parched throats. And water—and the land bordering it—provides almost boundless opportunities for fun.

Today both water and land—the Nation's thousands of miles of seacoast and major lakefront—have problems. They are under tremendous pressures from many different directions. And these pressures are steadily growing stronger.

One simple statistic measures some of this pressure:

In 1904 in the United States 15,000 boats were used for recreation. By 1947 the number had increased to 2,440,000. Last year the total was 7,330,000, and it probably will top 8 million this year.

Where will all these boats manever, dock, gas up? How will they compete against other demands for water and shorefront—for industry, irrigation, defense, wildlife preservation, navigation, home use?

While demands come from all sides, the supply of available shorefront is being eaten up. Recently, the National Park Service surveyed 3,700 miles of Atlantic and gulf coast, found only 240 miles used for public recreation, marked 640 miles more still available and worth saving.

A Park Service survey just completed of the 2,410-mile Pacific coast, which is due to be released soon, shows only 17 percent in public lands, recommends saving 75 areas. California's division of beaches and parks is conducting a similar survey of its shore. A third Park Service survey, on the 8,300-mile Great Lakes shore, will be released in June. It is expected to suggest preserving 65 acres, many in Michigan.

In the meantime, industry, attracted by bountiful water (the most-used industrial chemical), has been edging into the shore, particularly around the lakes. In its lake survey, the Park Service is expected to point out that recreational, primitive lakefront is fast losing ground to smokestacks. In a similar survey, the Michigan department of conservation said much the same thing.

Complicating matters on the coastline is that many beaches are being eaten away by wind and waves, narrowing the amount of space even more. Complicating the water-and-shore problem countrywide is the increasing use of water. Industrial, irrigational and domestic use is expected to double its 1955 consumption by 1975—with possibly severe effects on water levels for recreation and wildlife.

EVERYONE'S IN THE WATER

And recreational demands themselves increase by leaps and bounds. No one, for instance, can catch up with the statistics on skindiving and water skiing—two rapidly growing sports that virtually were unknown 10 years ago.

And every day some water lover seems to come up with a new water sport. In the last few years officials of the National Recreation Association have watched the rise of houseboating, "boateling," underwater archeology, backyard swimming pools (now increasing at the rate of 30,000 a year), surfboarding, water "shoeing," even hunting for pirate gold.

Then there are 21 million fishermen, spending nearly $100 a year apiece and asking that trout and mackerel be considered in all debates over water and shore. Their numbers are increasing steadily.

And there is the greatest success story of all: boating. Along with the increase in number of boats has come an increase in average horsepower of boats. The average outboard sold today has a beefy 20-plus horsepower engine. What this means is that boats are being used less for fishing, more for speedboating, cruising and water skiing, all of which require elbow room.

With these demands from all sides, conflicts are frequent and sometimes violent. Recently, recreation leaders have cast covetous eyes at Army installations on Sandy Hook, in New York Harbor. The Navy once discussed plans for expanding its Cape Hatteras installations at the expense of the National Seashore Recreation Area. (A compromise finally was worked out.) Inland, in Iowa, farmers, fishermen, and boat enthusiasts are wrangling over whether irrigation is ruining fishing and boating.

Is there any way to shoehorn all these interests into the fixed amount of coastline and shorefront?

The offensive to ease the pressure on the shoreline is underway on all sides:

Beach erosion

The Army Corps of Engineers now has underway 69 projects, costing $118 million, to keep beaches from crumbling. Included is construction of sand feeder beaches, concrete jetties, expensive seawalls. In addition, studies of erosion are being conducted by officials of New Jersey, San Diego, Calif., and Long Island, N.Y.

Stream pollution

Many experts believe a major answer to water and shorefront pressure is to clean up inland rivers and streams, thus offer industry clean water for its needs and recreation lovers beach resorts not now usable. This project is making headway; in the Ohio Valley alone, $1 billion a year is being spent to clean up streams.

New lakes

Multipurpose dams are being thrown up rapidly around the country, answering needs for flood control, irrigation, water supply—and recreation. By one estimate, there are now 2,800 such new lakes. Even such unlikely places as Oklahoma and South Dakota are affected. In Chamberlain, S. Dak., site of an artificial lake, a car dealer now makes more money from outboards and boats than from car sales.

Government programs

The Park Service shoreline surveys point the way to preserving some beachfront for recreation. Other Federal agencies, such as the Reclamation Bureau, Corps of Engineers and Forest Service, now work to preserve land around artificial lakes. TVA led the way in the South 25 years ago, now has 12 State parks on its lake shores.

Better use

The country's great new dams and lakes fill a comprehensive mission—providing power, water storage, wildlife refuge and recreation. Carefully planned Glen Canyon Dam, under construction in Arizona, will be a dramatic example of the true multipurpose concept.

More use

For more use of the shoreline, there is no organized program; it depends on waterlovers themselves. Often, while some shorefront areas are overrun, others are underpopulated.

Last month, the United States added 25,000 miles of virtually unused shoreline by admitting Alaska to the Union. But even in the other 48 States, sections of shoreline often are overlooked. In more extensive and more sensible use of all her shoreline may lie the solution to America's problem of her hard-pressed shores.

Public Law 480: Food in Democracy's Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, democracy's arsenal is no mere armorer's shed; it is a library, it is a university, it is a newspaper, a radio transmitter, and a grain elevator. Golden grains combine with golden ores to fill the treasury houses of democracy. The over $30 billion of annual American farm production comprise in great part democracy's sinews not only because of the intrinsic worth of this production as food products but also what these farm products can do for us.

Since Public Law 480 was first enacted in 1954, it has served as the catalyst to transform our vast agricultural production into an effective instrument of foreign policy. This program has been extended by the Congress several times and expires this year—its continuation should be again authorized by the Congress.

I am submitting articles from Foreign Agriculture, Capper's Farmer, and the Christian Science Monitor, devoted to the Public Law 480 program. I insert this explanation and comment for the information that it conveys and in tribute to the public servants who operate it for the Public Law 480 program has not only been an operation in agriculture but also one in diplomacy, one in national and international economics, and one in the service of humanity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD various articles on the extension of Public Law 480, to continue our farm export programs in 1959.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Foreign Agriculture, December 1958]

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAW 480 TO CONTINUE FARM EXPORT PROGRAMS THROUGH 1959

When Congress voted this fall to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480) through 1959, it retained a basic export tool for U.S. agriculture. This law has accounted for a fourth of all U.S. farm exports in the last 4 years.

To cover sales for foreign currencies under title I of the act, Congress authorized $2.25 billion. The previous authorization of $4 billion, which expired June 30, 1958, was fully committed under agreements with 37 friendly countries, and about 90 percent of this program has already been shipped. Some products it covered are:

Wheat	million bushels	617
Corn	do	66
Barley	do	64
Grain sorghums	do	21
Rice	million hundredweight	28
Cotton	million bales	3.2
Soybean and cottonseed oil	billion pounds	2
Tobacco	million pounds	208

Public Law 480 specifies the ways the foreign currencies received may be used. The agreements usually set aside a large share for economic development loans—both to the foreign government and to U.S. and foreign private companies. Other important uses include military procurement for the common defense, developing U.S. agricultural markets abroad, educational exchange, and paying U.S. Government expenses overseas. New uses now added include these: Financing scientific activities abroad; acquiring sites and buildings for U.S. Government use; purchasing and handling foreign publications of technical or cultural significance here; aiding U.S. sponsored educational institutions abroad; supporting foreign workshops and chairs in American studies.

The new law also extends the title II program of famine relief and other assistance. It does not, however, increase the previous $800 million authorization, for more than $300 million of that fund is still uncommitted. This program permits the President to make emergency grants of farm commodities from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks to friendly governments, or to friendly peoples without regard to the friendliness of their governments. For instance, 65,000 tons of U.S. wheat went to Lebanon, to aid people affected by severe drought and crop failure, as well as by the reecnt disturbances. Also to relieve hardship from drought, 3,000 tons of U.S. wheat were programed for Libya. In Tunisia, U.S. wheat is being supplied to help pay workers on public works projects designed to relieve unemployment and emergency famine conditions. Over $9 million of wheat flour and rice went to Ceylon for those in need due to floods.

In title III, revised language instructs the Secretary of Agriculture to barter or exchange CCC commodities for strategic or other materials when he determines that such action is in the best interests of the United States. It also instructs him not to put restrictions on the free world countries into which barter deliveries may be made, except insofar as he finds it necessary in safeguarding usual U.S. marketings and assuring that these deliveries will not unduly disrupt world prices or replace cash sales for dollars. USDA recently reviewed its barter program in the light of this new language, to devise the best way of continuing the program as an important tool in disposing of CCC surpluses.

Title III also authorizes donations of surpluses to needy people at home and abroad. An amendment now permits distribution on the same basis in areas under U.S. jurisdiction, such as the trust islands of the Pacific and the Ryukyu Islands. It further authorizes CCC to purchase products of oilseeds and edible oils and fats, for donation to needy people outside the United States, and to purchase wheat flour and corn meal for donations instead of processing its own wheat and corn.

During the past year, all the Public Law 480 programs together—foreign currency sales, emergency grants and loans, and barter—accounted for more than half the volume of U.S. wheat, rice, and vegetable oil exports and for about a quarter of the corn and cotton.

[From Capper's Farmer, September 1958]

YANKEE FARM PRODUCTS M-M-M GOOD—WE'RE BOOSTING OUR EXPORT SALES WITH TASTY SAMPLES AND ATTRACTIVE EXHIBITS AT FOREIGN TRADE FAIRS

We are not just telling foreign buyers about U.S. farm products—we're showing them. And that means more dollars in your pocket. Our salesmen are carrying attractive samples of what we want to sell. They are going where they can meet the most customers—to the fairs.

Folks in foreign lands are seeing, sniffing, and tasting products of American farms. And they like 'em. Wheat-flour do-nuts, fried chicken, potato chips, recombined whole milk—all hit the spot, the world over.

Your products, ready for use, have been put on exhibit at 21 of these foreign trade fairs thus far. Grower groups, like the wheat and soybean associations, trade organizations, and the Foreign Agricultural Service of USDA are combining forces in this sales effort.

Our trade fair exhibits are a part of the growing effort to expand our export markets for a variety of foods.

Here's how important the foreign market is to U.S. farmers. Production from one crop acre in five moves abroad. Twelve cents of every U.S. farm income dollar comes from export sales, on the average. The figure is 51 cents for wheat, 37 cents for soybeans, 57 cents for cotton, 43 cents for dry milk, 85 cents for rice. About $4.7 billion worth of U.S. farm products were shipped to other lands last year, a new high both in volume and value.

Besides selling for dollars, we have three other channels for maintaining our farm exports: (1) We trade some of our products for strategic goods like chrome ore and industrial diamonds; (2) we sell some for foreign money, which we in turn spend in those countries; (3) the Government gives from our surpluses to countries in need due to drought, disaster, poverty.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 13, 1956]

SALESMANSHIP FOR FARM SURPLUSES

(By Josephine Ripley)

Go almost anywhere in the world and you can buy American goods, from soft drinks and phonograph records to cameras and automobiles. That is because far-traveling, fast-talking American salesmen have been there before you.

That is the kind of salesmanship Agriculture Secretary Benson has envisaged for American farm products. To him it is the key to farm prosperity—a worldwide market for the bounty of the fields, a bigger market.

This is the kind of salesmanship which Congress also had in mind when it put up money in 1954, and recently increased it, for the purpose of underwriting a vigorous sales campaign abroad.

This sales drive has been the least publicized, but perhaps one of the most dramatic aspects of the entire farm program. Samples of milk and ice-cream cones made from powdered milk, sweet rolls and cake made from American surplus flour have been handed out in Japan.

In Rome, Italians swarmed to see a fabulous American-made supermarket exhibit, full-scale and complete in every major detail. In South America, salesmen have spearheaded a drive for the sale of American wheat flour in Colombia.

There is a campaign to work off some of the Government's tobacco surplus in Spain. Tobacco buyers from Thailand and Korea have been invited to the United States to inspect the supplies personally. Cotton buyers from Japan and France are also planning to come here to discuss business, at the invitation of the U.S. Government.

American soybean and poultry experts are now in Europe drumming up trade for these excess commodities. There is also a drive to interest Japan in American soybeans and tobacco.

American advertising and sales techniques figure prominently in all these activities. Cooperative programs to expand the use of cotton in France and Japan have been undertaken. A Japanese-American soybean council has been set up to promote the use of soybeans and soybean products.

Trade fairs featuring American products—machinery as well as food—have been held all over the world. These exhibits are organized in cooperation with private trade groups. The U.S. Government organizes and manages the exhibits, rents the space, provides for the design, construction, and operation of the exhibits, and ships exhibit material.

All in all, as of July 1, 1956, funds equivalent to approximately $20,300,000 in foreign currencies have been tentatively planned in 26 countries for the development and expansion of foreign markets for American farm surpluses.

It has been a long pull. The work, up to this point, has been unspectacular. But at last, it is proceeding on a worldwide scale, although it is still in the early stages of what is seen as a long-range operation.

It is an effort in which the United States is competing with other nations also in the business of making sales, but at least this country is now better represented in the foreign field than previously. There was a time when Soviet Russia and its satellites dominated the international trade fairs.

American representatives abroad sent urgent pleas for more and better U.S. participation. The result has been a marked stepup in trade representation abroad, both in the interest of sales and as a weapon to counter Russian anti-American propaganda.

Meanwhile, under another phase of the farm program, the Government has been almost spectacularly successful in its effort to sell surplus farm products to foreign governments.

Up to date, the Government has disposed of some $2,300 million worth of these surpluses. Largest single sale so far was the highly publicized deal with India involving some $360,100,000.

All this does not furnish a basic solution to the problem of farm surpluses, but it does indicate that the surplus disposal program is now well off the ground.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today is an anniversary—the anniversary of Lithuanian independence. We in the United States have never known the haunting fear of having our independence physically threatened, let alone the reality of foreign occupation. We can speak of the plight and the bravery of the Lithuanian people, but for most of us we understand their plight only through our imagination. But, nevertheless, here are people—almost 3 million people—that are realistic symbols of man's inhumanity to his fellow man.

The significance of Lithuania to those of us of Western culture is this: From a glorious and ancient past in which the Duchy of Lithuania stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea the Lithuanian people have again and again been bled by richer and more powerful neighbors. From 1385 until the end of the 18th century Lithuania was part of Poland; then when Poland was annexed by Czarist Russia in 1795 Lithuania shared the same fate. Finally, in 1918, taking dual advantage of President Wilson's 14 points and the Russian revolution, the Lithuanian people declared their independence. This was their first taste of freedom since the 14th century; it lasted 22 years. In June 1940 Soviet troops took over the country. Then almost immediately the land was overrun by the German Army. German occupation lasted from 1941 until 1944, when it was displaced once again by the death grip of the Russian Bear.

I give this thumbnail sketch of the woes of Lithuania not to prove that history can be cruel but, rather, to point a meaningful moral. The Lithuanian people have been relentlessly submerged by force. They are now the unwilling victims of a political religion that seeks converts by every means known. The people of Lithuania in their present political dilemma represent the very thing that America fights against in word and in deed the world over. As such, we honor the people of Lithuania and their friends, relatives, and countrymen that live in the United States as men who have upheld the tenets of western political culture. These men and women believe in the highest ideals of freedom, justice, and right. They have not been corrupted by Russian words but have seen and felt the sword of social and political tyranny beneath the phrases.

On this anniversary of Lithuanian independence I am proud to be one of those Americans commemorating this day in hopes that Lithuanian independence will soon be the reality that so many have fought, died, and lived for.

State Sovereignty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the Milwaukie (Oreg.) weekly Review for February 5, 1959, State Senator Monroe Sweetland, who is well versed in Oregon history, published a brief essay by Governor West himself regarding his theories of riparian rights.

In tribute to Governor West and Oregon's centennial year, I ask unanimous consent that Senator Sweetland's article from the Milwaukie Review to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE SOVEREIGNTY

(By Oswald West, former Governor of Oregon)

It was Governor Oswald West who, during his administration 1911–1915, secured for the people of Oregon the use and enjoyment of the beaches of the Pacific forever. In many States the beaches may be blocked to public access, and ownership is permitted out into the surf. But Oregon's matchless beaches, from the Columbia River to the California line, are freely available to all the public, thanks to Governor West's interest almost 50 years ago. Because of interest in making more firm and certain this policy of the State, Governor West has written us recently on the subject, and we are glad to publish his comments. The present session of the legislature may have this problem before it again.

The settlers of Oregon, like the colonists of the Atlantic States, coming from a country in which the common law prevailed to one that had no organized government, brought with them, as their birthright, the principles of that common law—insofar as suited to the conditions in their new home. The jurisprudence of Oregon, therefore, was based on that law.

The land laws adopted by the provisional government of Oregon regulated occupation only; the settlers acquired no title to the soil. The United States, on assuming dominion over the territory, became the owner of all the lands therein, but the provisions of the then general land laws were not applicable to Oregon Territory. Not before 1850 was there a statute (D.L.C.) under which anyone could acquire a legal title from the United States to lands in Oregon.

Public lands, as habitually used in legislation, are such lands as are subject to sale or disposal under the general laws of the United States. The seashores, and other lands under tidewater, being incapable of ordinary private occupation, cultivation, and improvement, become incident to sovereignty.

As the U.S. Supreme Court in the leading case of *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U.S. 1) pointed out: As such lands are of great value to the public for the purpose of commerce, navigation, and fishery, title and control are vested in the sovereign power for the benefit of the whole people.

In the United States, all navigable water courses are a species of highway, and come under the control of the State (subject to the right of Congress to control commerce and navigation). A State has the same power to improve such waters as it has in the case of any highway—and collect tolls.

The riparian proprietor owns to high water mark only on all navigable rivers. The beds of such streams, between the lines of ordinary high water on their opposite sides, belong to the State, to be held and controlled by and for the public.

The navigability rule, as administered by the courts of this country, is that all rivers which are found of sufficient capacity to float the products of the mines, the forests, or the tillage of the country to market are regarded as navigable. On unnavigable streams the riparian owner owns to the center of the stream.

Problem of Federal Debt Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Sun, which is universally recognized as one of our country's great daily newspapers has recently commented editorially on the Federal Treasury's refunding difficulties. This editorial graphically illustrates the seriousness of the situation which faces the Treasury. I believe the editorial is significant and worthy of the attention of the American public and of the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks I include this editorial:

HAND TO MOUTH

Getting back to the Federal Treasury's refunding fiasco of last week.

The Treasury has to meet matured obligations of $14.9 billion, but hasn't got the money. It sought to stall off its creditors by offering more attractive obligations (bearing a higher interest) in exchange. But Government securities aren't snatched up the way they used to be. The Treasury was unable to find takers to cover the maturing obligations. It fell short by about $2 billion.

So what is the Government going to do now?

It is doing two things:

1. It is making heavy drafts on the accounts which it has in private banks, planning to scrape up about $500 million in this way. These account consist of funds, such as accumulated withholding taxes, which under balanced-budget conditions would normally go to pay current Government expenses. This move is a form of robbing the piggy bank.

2. Today it is putting up for auction $1.5 billion of 7-month tax anticipation bills, maturing on September 21 and acceptable for the payment of taxes due on September 15. On these tax anticipation bills it does not even venture to set an interest rate. It sells them at whatever discount the market will offer.

This is about as close to hand-to-mouth financing as a government can get. It is an admission that faith in Government securities, and confidence in the stability of the dollar, has sunk to a point where orderly debt management is not possible. The Government is a little bit like a man being hounded by creditors, who first borrows to pay his bills, then borrows to pay that loan off, and is finally reduced to pledging the wages he needs for current expenses. Not a pretty picture. A very good argument for balancing the budget and not making the nightmare of debt management any worse.

The Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of February 9, 1959.

OFF THE RECORD

Congress is beginning to feel some alarm over the future of the American textile industry. It's about time. Congress signed a death warrant for the industry back in 1947 when the Trade Agreements Act was passed permitting the State Department and its economic advisers to participate in an international poker game organized at Geneva, Switzerland, under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

At regular intervals the 35 nations belonging to GATT gather at Geneva to play for high stakes. This Nation's blue chips are American prosperity, our high standard of living, and our productive ability. We play against I O U's. Other nations promise not to go Communist and to remain friendly to the United States in return for tariff concessions and a slice of our trade.

Cotton textiles, one of the big blue chips in the American economy, was tossed into the pot in 1955 to prevent Japan from being overinfluenced by trade opportunities with Communist nations. Although the State Department has steadfastly denied that the American textile industry was considered expendable, the effect was the same. Tariffs on Japanese imports were cut to the bone, American cotton was sold to Japanese mills at 10 cents per pound less than it could be bought by U.S. mills and the administration turned a deaf ear to the howls of anguish from domestic manufacturers.

The idea behind all this, stripped of its diplomatic and economic doubletalk, was somewhat Freudian. This Nation had a guilt complex because of its prosperity and high standard of living. The one-world idea was in its acendancy. We would export our prosperity and standard of living.

The record of that experiment since 1955 has been one of mill closings, bankruptcy, and general deterioration in the American textile industry. Foreign manufacturers have taken over a large part of our world market and are shipping goods made of American cotton back into the United States at prices no domestic manufacturer can match.

Now Congress is alarmed. Last week the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee called for mandatory quotas on textile imports as an essential step in a program to save an industry vital to our national defense. This was based on a finding by the Defense Department that textile mill products rated second only to steel in terms of military needs.

This reversal of attitude has been a long time in coming. While a committee report does not mean that favorable action will inevitably follow, it does present the issues clearly and in terms which Congress can hardly ignore.

Columbus Discovers Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Columbus Discovers Itself," which appeared in the December 1958 issue of the Kiwanis magazine.

The article tells how this progressive Montana community is successfully developing small industries. I place this article in the RECORD because I am proud of this Montana community's accomplishment, and because the example of Columbus may inspire and benefit civic leaders in other towns.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBUS DISCOVERS ITSELF

(By Lafayette Smith)

the town of Columbus, Mont., isn't considered large even by Montana standards. Its population barely exceeded 1,000 when the 1950 census was taken, and most of the residents seemed to feel that it had slipped since then. With the trend in agriculture going toward larger farms and fewer farmers, there didn't seem to be as much room for the little farmer any more—and Columbus was mainly a town of little farmers.

As Columbus was a small town, so was its Kiwanis club, averaging between 20 to 25 members. For its size, though, the club was active. It conducted a countywide 4–H Club fair and livestock sale every year. It also entertained the townspeople with a minstrel show, thus collecting some money, and built a park in the center of town, planting grass and providing benches. "If we didn't have faith in the town's future," claims Club President William B. Witt, "we never would have built that park."

That faith got its first practical expression one noon during the fall of 1956. Gene Davey, who sold and fixed automobiles and was the Kiwanis president too, showed up at the Liberty Cafe, where the club met every Tuesday, with clipping in hand. The clipping noted that the old building down by the railroad tracks was for sale.

The building, measuring 200 feet long and 115 feet wide, had been built during the war by the U.S. Government and was used as a service station for trucks coming out of the Beartooth Mountains 35 miles to the south, laden with chromite ore. After the war the Bureau of Reclamation used it for some time as a warehouse, but now it stood empty.

Following the Kiwanis meeting, 10 members stayed late to talk about the building. "Why don't we buy it, and use it as a lure to bring a new industry to our town?" said Gene Davey. The idea was discussed, accepted, and soon eight Kiwanians were pulling checkbooks out of their pockets, and two others were running home to get theirs.

Within a few hours $10,000 had been pledged. Thus was Columbus Enterprises, Inc., formed—by men who were pledged to the preservation of their home town.

Bob Johnson, editor and publisher of the town's only newspaper, the Columbus News, journeyed to Seattle, Wash., to make a bid on the building. Gene Davey soon received a wire: "Purchased building for $26,000 stop find us an industry."

Finding an industry, now that they had acquired a site for one, proved to be no easy task. Columbus Enterprises advertised in the Wall Street Journal and Business Week. A variety of answers soon flooded Gene Davey's desk. One man wanted to use the building as a cattle feed lot, but he didn't intend to employ anyone. His offer was respectfully declined. A company manufacturing trailers and busses applied. No prospects for future growth, decided the Kiwanians. Several obliging contractors offered to dismantle the building. They were politely thanked.

Then as chance might have it, Gene Davey and Bob Johnson heard of two men named Ralph Heiken and Thelmar Mosdal, who during the lax winter season were building barn beams in a small corrugated steel shed in nearby Broadview, only 55 miles from Columbus. They needed more room. Soon they were invited to come to Columbus.

Also invited to come to Columbus was another Montana citizen named Ken Davenport. Ken had graduated from Montana State College of Engineering in 1950, had spent an inevitable 2 years in the service, then had sold Fords in Big Timber, Montana. Ken, however, wasn't quite certain that he wanted a Ford in his future, so when several of his friends in Columbus told him that a new industry was starting he offered his services. Another Montanan, Russell Wolfe, was hired as a sales expert, and these two, along with Mosdal and Heiken, left for the West Coast to observe and report on the beam manufacturing industry. They were particularly concerned with the prospects of glue lamination in beam construction.

"Today, 60-foot trees are a rarity," they reported on their return. "Within a dozen years or so, 30-foot trees will be just as rare. Yet with modern construction demands, structural beams of over 100 feet are needed, especially in the construction of modern schools, churches, and auditoriums."

With this favorable report, the construction of laminated wooden beams in Columbus began and the organization was officially titled Timberweld, Inc., with Ken Davenport, president and sales manager; Wolfe, secretary-treasurer; and Heiken and Gene Davey, vice presidents. The 15 members of Columbus Enterprises purchased $50,000 worth of stock, while approximately 75 other Columbus citizens accounted for $50,000 more. Very shortly that stock began to pay dividends, and has been doing so ever since.

Ken Davenport explains his company's success this way: "In Montana, it is very difficult to find types of industry that can be carried on economically for manufacturing and shipment of material to other points in the United States. There are many reasons for this: freight, the availability of raw materials, and concentration of markets. However, in the case of glu-lam material, we have found that it can be manufactured and shipped to virtually 75 percent of the United States on a very competitive basis with other glu-lam fabricators in other parts of the country. Presently we've shipped glue-laminated material for schools, churches, and industrial buildings to New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Wyoming, Colorado, and other Midwestern States. Our intended volume for the year 1958 has been doubled over our sales for 1957." With the country in the midst of a recession, these were encouraging words.

The increase in Timberweld's sales for 1958 was first reflected in the increase in manpower in their plant—later, in the pockets of Columbus citizens. At present, 30 men and women are employed by the company with an annual payroll of more than $100,000. According to estimates made by the State planning board, for every additional four persons brought to a town, it takes one more person (such as a grocer, druggist, dentist, etc.) to service him. Conversely, when a town loses four residents through migration to another area, one of its shopowners might as well close up.

Kiwanis president William B. Witt has commented on this situation: "Already we notice a lot of new faces on the streets. Timberweld's payroll has stabilized the real estate market for one thing. Before, there wasn't enough demand for living quarters and prices were dropping. Now prices are remaining where they should be."

Shortly after Timberweld received its start in Columbus, Kiwanians and the townspeople in general began passing the word to their friends and business acquaintances that the welcome mat was out to new industry. In July of 1957, Sherman Lang, an engineer for Mouat Industries, a chemical producing firm, appeared in Columbus to have a look at this town he had heard so much about. His company was leased 5 acres of land at tax cost and within a few months a pilot plant to process chrome had been established under his supervision. Eight men began carrying on daily experiments to determine whether or not to establish a larger factory. Should that occur, it would perhaps mean a payroll of 300 employees.

The fame of Columbus spread even further. The Montana State Planning Board in Helena issued a pamphlet called simply: "The Columbus Success Story." It was subtitled: "Community Action for Economic Development Pays Dividends." This pamphlet was distributed throughout the United States.

As for the town's future, Bob Johnson is glad to talk about it: "Mouat Industries have been successful in producing their basic product (sodium chromate), and are enthusiastic about their future in this field. While no other industries have moved into Columbus to date, there have been several inquiries. The American Chrome Co. south of Columbus has received a go ahead on construction of a pilot smelter to test the feasibility of producing ferrochrome on a competitive basis with foreign ores. If successful, and they are reasonably confident that they will be, Columbus may become the railhead for movement of this ore to the steel mills."

At a recent meeting of the city council, three Kiwanians moved that a strip of land 1 mile long by 300 feet wide along the railroad tracks be set aside for potential industries. Their motion was unanimously carried. Columbus, as usual, was looking ahead.

Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence. I consider it an honor and a duty to record my congratulations to the people of Lithuania, whose determination to achieve independence has set an example for all free people. Now, once again, despite the most ruthless suppression at home, Lithuanians everywhere keep alive the embers of liberty. The Soviet efforts to extinguish Lithuania's national identity are a sufficent answer to any who would relax our vigilance or our resistance to further efforts of Soviet expansion. Ultimately Lithuania's determination to regain independence must win out.

Remarks to Florida Division, Investors League, Inc., by Dr. J. W. Annis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD, the text of a speech delivered by Dr. J. W. Annis before the members of the Florida division, Investors League, Inc., at Winter Haven, Fla., on January 19, 1959. Dr. Annis is an eminent physician and a very prominent and capable civic leader at Lakeland, Fla. He is presently serving as president of the Florida Medical Association:

REMARKS TO FLORIDA DIVISION, INVESTORS LEAGUE, INC., BY J. W. ANNIS, M.D., PRESIDENT OF THE FLORIDA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, WINTER HAVEN, FLA., JANUARY 1959

When I received Dr. Odeneal's letter asking me to pinch-hit for Dr. Orr, president-elect of the AMA, in addressing this organization, I wondered why I should be asked to fulfill such an assignment. I am still wondering, gentlemen, why I am here to talk to you—the Florida division of the Investors League—certainly not to speak to you about an investment program. I am definitely not qualified in that respect. Nor was I, I am sure, asked to come before you—an organization of whose existence I have not even been aware until I recived Dr. Odeneal's letter—to discuss reduction or repeal of any specific tax levies which might effect personal gain for you, or me, or any other individual. This would certainly be a very mean and personal motive which could in no way justify my taking my time from my practice, and you yours from your businesses.

Why, then, am I here? The reason I came, at least, was to bring to you, from another discipline, a discussion and a point of view of a much broader principle—of a fundamental concept on which our forefathers founded this country—the principle and concept of free enterprise—the privilege and right of unrestricted individual endeavor and achievement, just as long as we trespass against no other man. I mentioned our forefathers. We have inherited from them a certain free and reactionary approach to life—a revolutionary spirit, if you will, which molds our thinking and guides our actions—and should provide us with a kind of moral integrity by which we can conduct our daily life.

As you know, my profession is that of medicine. It stems from the earliest recorded history, indeed from legendary times. Perhaps the first real individual, of whom any actual record and objective proof exists, was a physician, Imhotep, personal physician to the ruler of Egypt, and designer of the Step pyramid, the oldest manmade structure in the world. Certainly this profession of ours,

which is the oldest of all professions, has ever been one which has advocated and carried out a system of free enterprise—a system advocating a completely free and unrestrained search for truth—a system of freedom of action, thought, belief and enterprise, where the importance of opportunity and accomplishment replaces that of security. Physicians, like priests, have died for their beliefs and for the refusal to give even lipservice to a lie or a liar—or a dictator. And physicians today resent and oppose regimentation in any form which will hamper their freedom of action—their freedom to practice their art.

We feel that a fundamental human right is this freedom of enterprise—this competitive spirit—this right to be wrong—that has made our country as great as it is. We feel that, through our daily contact with the human body and soul, in sickness and in health, we have come to know it fairly well, and we feel that its innate frailties must be as realistically viewed as its many virtues. We believe that competitive and unrestrained enterprise is essential for that sense of achievement—that sense of accomplishment—which is so necessary for our physical, mental, and moral growth. This is the reason that we feel so strongly that freedom of choice of a physician—and a physician of his patients—is so necessary to our way of life. A patient should select his physician carefully and without pressure of any sort, and should realize his obligation to him, just as the physician must accept this employment and realize his deep obligation to the patient. This right must remain inviolate if we are to continue providing the best possible medical care.

Let me now speak to you briefly about two subjects in which the Florida Medical Association has been extremely interested, and in which areas we have already taken decisive, and I hope, fruitful action. The first is the problem of indigent medical care within our State. This certainly is a very real problem, and a very real obligation; but, in our opinion, it is one which falls within the realm of responsibility of the local community and the State. It is our conviction that the care of these unfortunate individuals is, again, the obligation and the responsibility of the neighborhood, the community, the county, and lastly, the State. We feel that the Federal Government should not be called—nor should it insert itself—into the problem of financing this care. We feel that the local physicians should willingly give of their services here without charge, just as they have done in the past. We feel that the local community should provide part—if not all—of the ancillary care necessary to these patients. We can see no advantage in sending our dollars to Washington, only to get them back shrunk to less than half their original size, to be used in the case of these same patients. This is a luxury which we can ill afford. The responsibility of our indigent sick is our own. The responsibility of providing a livelihood for the personnel of a Washington office—to care for these sick folks—is definitely not ours.

Furthermore, we believe that the problem of the indigent sick, or the medically indigent, is the problem of the total medical care of the people in Florida—not a problem of the indigent care of Florida people by the U.S. Government. The health of us all—its standards, its criteria, and its performance—depends upon a properly balanced and administered program of medical education throughout the State. This involves teaching hospitals, universities, residencies, scholarships, and training programs. This is important if we are to develop and maintain proper standards of medical care—so that you and I, as individuals who can afford to pay for this care, may have it available. This can be done only if the medically indigent are fitted into this program—particularly into its teaching facet—so that progress can be made and students can be taught. For this reason, as I have said before, we consider this problem of the medically indigent primarily a medical problem—not one of public assistance.

With this philosophy in mind, the Florida Medical Association, several years ago, approached Governor Collins with the suggestion that he appoint a committee to study the problem of indigent medical care throughout the State. He agreed, and this committee, after quite an exhaustive study, came up with a very concrete and workable recommendation. The State legislature, in turn, appropriated $4 million for the last biennium to be used in the hospital care of these individuals. Briefly, the procedural technicalities are as follows:

State money is made available to the various counties as matching funds—that is, the county puts up a given amount of money, which the State then matches up to a limited and proportioned amount. This money is for the sole purpose of defraying hospital expense in already-existing institutions within the county, and is not to interfere in any way with any program which the county may have for the care of these indigent people. In other words, the county hospitals in the various areas are not eligible for these funds. The purpose of this is to use the already existing beds, rather than building additional beds, and to put the responsibility back where it belongs—on the county—so that it shall provide at least half of all funds necessary for the hospitalization of these people. No provision is made for the payment of the physician, it being felt by the profession that he should make no charge in the case of truly indigent people, unless some other member of the family or friend wishes to pay the bill. Practically all the counties of the State have participated in this program. I believe that there are only four—these all small counties in west Florida—which have not taken part in it. The program has worked well and has just about used up the funds at the scheduled rate.

In other words, about half a million dollars are being spent quarterly for this program. Unfortunately, hard times may be ahead for the program, inasmuch as the Federal Government has apportioned $12 million for the State of Florida, which money can be obtained for the use of the sick in the State, provided the State itself supplies matching funds. This is a very tempting offer—an apparent something-for-nothing deal—and obviously is contrary to the principle about which we are talking; that is, the principle of the responsibility of each community for its own local problems. This paternalistic approach, which would strengthen the Federal Government immensely, is an extremely tempting and juicy plum to dangle before the coming legislature, inasmuch as it involves $12 million. I hope that the legislature will resist this tempting offer and beware of the Greeks bringing gifts. Our problems—and this includes our successes and our failures—our losses, as well as our gains—should be our own and not the responsibility of our Federal Government. I am sure that our program of indigent care can be improved upon—and I am sure that it will be improved upon. The important thing to me is that we, as a State, have made a definite and sincere attempt to solve this problem for ourselves and not go running to Washington with it. Once this kind of initiative and enterprise ceases to exist, we will have forsworn our American type of democracy.

The second subject which I wish to discuss with you is that of the aging population within the State, particularly with regard to their medical care, since it is with this aspect of the problem that I am best acquainted. It is no new problem, nor is it one which we in Florida are just beginning to investigate. For the past 4 to 5 years there has been a State committee studying it; and one of the members of our State association has been very active in its operation, as well as in the national program.

Just about 1 year ago, the Florida Medical Association's Committee on Legislation went to Washington to talk with our Representatives and Senators. We spent 1 day in a most profitable discussion of many problems with these gentlemen; and perhaps the most interesting talks which we had with them were in regard to H.R. 9467, with which I am sure you are familiar. It was surprising that several of our Representatives knew little or nothing of this bill, but all were most cooperative in looking into it and discussing it with us. Furthermore, all agreed that this was unsound legislation, and they individually and collectively stated that they would oppose it. We have followed this bill from its inception. Members of our State committee on aging have perused the many volumes of published hearings pertaining to it, and we of the medical association are well aware of the fact that there is no logical or scientific basis for the enactment of this type legislation. The idea of adding the medical, surgical, and hospital care of some 13 million Americans to a program which is already basically unsound and insolvent, as is the social security program, is so ridiculous as to be laughable, if the seriousness of the situation were not so apparent. Indeed, the only thing which outstrips the unsoundness and ridiculousness of this type legislation is its vote-getting ability. There can be no question of this, nor can there be any question that such legislation, if introduced on the floor of the House of Representatives, would, in this coming session of Congress, be passed. This is not my opinion, but that of each of the half dozen or so Representatives to whom I have talked. Florida, fortunately, has a conservative congressional delegation.

In Washington, a year ago, our group spent considerable time with Mr. Schottland, the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, discussing our views on the care of the aging and the medically indigent. We were politely and respectfully received, but had the feeling that we had accomplished nothing insofar as changing the opinion of the bureaucracy which manages and manipulates this large department of the Government. Consequently, we appointed a comittee within our association to study the problems of the aging in our own State, to determine, insofar as possible what these problems were, with particular regard to the ability of these people to meet their medical needs. In the first place, what are these medical needs? What is the average amount expended for medicines, physicians, hospitals, nursing homes, etc.? And how is the average family in Florida, beyond the age of 65, equipped to meet these needs? What sort of health insurance can they afford on a voluntary basis? What would they be willing to pay for health protection? How many of their problems could be handled in the nursing-home rather than in the hospital? How many by an attendant or companion within their homes? What is the place of meals-on-wheels in supplying these individuals with the proper diet and warm meals regularly at their homes? All these—and many other questions—remain unanswered. Of course, they are of little import to legislators who, not bothered with the problem, concern themselves merely with the remedy—knowing nothing of the magnitude of the difficulty which they are undertaking to correct.

As I have said, we of the medical profession in Florida, in cooperation with certain

other agencies, are in the process now of conducting such a thorough and complete investigation, so that we can definitely and scientifically outline the problem of supplying adequate medical care to the aging population, and then propound a reasonable solution. What that solution should be, certainly no one knows at the present time until the problem itself is more clearly outlined. Only then can we intelligently hope to evolve a workable corrective procedure.

We earnestly hope that the Congress will be good enough to postpone any hasty action in this regard until the results of our survey, and those of others, can present to them a clear and detailed picture of the ills which they are being asked to correct. It is certainly touching to see the deep concern that is expressed for the "poor old folks" of this country. These elderly people are as appealing a group as the little children—and they have the further advantage that each one of them has a vote. Here again we return to a fundamental divergence on the basis of principle between a group such as those of us who are gathered here today and those individuals in Washington who advocate a Strong Central or Federal Government. Here again we become involved as to whether the responsibility of this aging population is a Federal or a local and State obligation—whether we are dutybound and honorbound to take care of our own in sickness and in health, or whether we should pass on the responsibility of their care to an omnipotent and somewhat callous Federal Government.

These principles, gentlemen, can never be reconciled. We must accept the obligations implied in a Government based on the principle of States' and individual rights, if we are to reap its rewards. We must believe either in the competitive free enterprise system of our forefathers which has made America a great country—or we must believe in the strong, centralized anarchistic or fascist governments of Europe. We must make up our minds whether we wish to raise our families in a democracy or in a socialistic or communistic state. And, having made up our minds, we must act accordingly to see that the proper legislation is enacted in Washington which will support our views. There can be nothing mean, personal, or selfish in our approach. It must be independent of any personal gain or reward on our part as individuals. It must carry the banner of an ideal which will be for the betterment of our immediate community, our State, and our entire Nation.

Let us look ahead for a minute and anticipate, if we can, what the opponents of the philosophy which we are championing propose for the future. Let us try to understand the enemies' viewpoint and the ways and means by which they plan to promulgate it. Since everyone loves to make predictions, let me give you mine. Briefly, they are as follows:

I believe that one of the first items of business which will be introduced into the Senate at the beginning of the new Congress will be a resolution to change the rules of the Senate, so that new rules would be enacted with each new Congress, just as they are in the House. This is a complex and seemingly innocuous procedure. However, it does away with the continuity of the Senate as a body. As you know, Senators are elected on a staggered basis and the Senate is thought of as a continuing body—the majority of which are always held over from the previous sessions. The same rules govern it from one year to the next, and its personnel never completely changes at one time. This is in contradistinction to the House which is elected or reelected in its entirety every 2 years, and in which new rules are laid down for each separate group. The effect of such a change in the Senate would be to periodically allow such things as the limitation of debate, etc., to come up and periodically jeopardize the rights and privileges of a minority group. If, for instance, debate were limited and the filibuster done away with, the South in particular would lose a great deal of its effective guardianship of the conservative principles of government. It would, I am sure, be an extremely bad thing for our kind of America—and I certainly hope that you will oppose any such change by all the means at your disposal. The effects of such a change would by extremely far reaching and deleterious.

The second thing that I predict will take place early in the 86th Congress is the introduction of legislation along the lines of H.R. 9467. As you know, the composition of the House of Representatives this year is such that passage of legislation of this type is a foregone conclusion. This type of legislation, however, is so palpably impractical and costly that, even in a favorable Congress, I predict that, when introduced, it will be considerably watered down; that it will take care, perhaps, only of hospital payments on individuals 70 years of age or over (instead of 65), and that it will not provide for younger people or for medical and surgical payments. This would sugarcoat the pill to the degree that it might be acceptable to Congress and would provide the wedge, or foot in the door, necessary so that next year, and the following years, additional benefits could be added to the existing skeleton program to make it as broad, or even broader, than the original. Any such legislation of this type must, of course, be resisted and resisted as vigorously as possible, if we are to preserve our democratic principles and keep from becoming an entirely socialistic state. I believe that the Senate will defeat it in this first session if we advise them of our opposition—but their action in an election year is an entirely different proposition. Between now and then, groups such as this throughout the country must make their voices heard—their will known—if we are not to be inundated by the threatening and all-engulfing wave of socialism.

Conventional Death or Unconventional Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the development and stockpiling of weapons whose power is so immense as to threaten the very existence of the human race has been a constant preoccupation of the major powers ever since the end of World War II. With a few notable exceptions, people in policymaking positions seem to have assumed that this treadmill to oblivion is the best and even the only possible way in which we can proceed. To suggest that weapons posing as grave a threat to the user as to the intended victim are not really contributions to defense has been assailed as soft and unrealistic thinking. But recently, at a meeting in Washington of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, a paper was read which proposed some new, though perhaps unconventional, ideas in the realm of defense. But, more significantly for our purposes, this paper made some very penetrating observations about the difficulties which are faced by the Congress in attempting to exercise our clear constitutional responsibility for the direction of the Nation's defense policy. The author's ideas have been described by the editors of the Saturday Review of Literature as "unsponsored, controversial, imaginative and, we hope, provocative of new ways to peace." Since every Member of the Congress would welcome suggestions, which might even indirectly lead to new and fresh thinking about ways to peace, I ask unanimous consent that the following article, by Lewis A. Dexter, from the Saturday Review of Literature of February 7, 1959, be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

CONVENTIONAL DEATH OR UNCONVENTIONAL SURVIVAL?

(By Lewis A. Dexter)

The Constitution of the United States of America plainly says that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress." Among these powers are specifically included "power to provide for the common defense * * * to raise and support armies * * * to provide and maintain a navy * * * to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces" and further "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

Yet the Congress does not in any very significant degree exercise these powers to check and balance the military or the Executive in shaping military policy. Indeed, in interviews I have conducted during the last 7 years (among others, under contract for the Center for International Studies at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and for the Advisory Committee on Civil Defense of the National Research Council) several Members of Congress and congressional staff executives have expressed the belief that because the President is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces the Congress does not actually hold the same responsibility in military matters as it does in other affairs. My own contention is that scientific analysis of the role of Congress in military policy is not only proper but could aid in reducing the likelihood that we will suffer the worse consequences of modern warfare.

How has our constitutional system come to be modified in practice from the system intended by the men who wrote the basic document on which American government is built? The departure occurs through failure to distinguish military policy from war plans, tactics, weapons manufacture, and other aspects of warfare. By military policy I mean the grand strategy, or what has been called the politics of warfare underlying, guiding, and limiting strategic, tactical, and material decisions. Military policy is thus concerned with such questions as: What kind of war are we going to fight? What kind of military doctrine(s) are related to our overall political and long-range purposes as a people?

It is entirely possible for a nation to conduct a cold war or a hot one without a military policy. So far as the naked eye of this particular observer can discern, it is not clear that we have in this country at the present time a military policy. We do, of course, have a military doctrine, or perhaps several military doctrines, of which the best known is deterrence through the threat of massive retaliation. But it is not clear that this is related to political objectives. In fact, the doctrine of massive retaliation arose in very large measure from our prior and for some time unique possession of the A-bomb.

An overall military policy would commence not with weapons but with the question: What kind of weapons do we need for the kinds of wars—or deterrence—which empirically and ideologically are most likely to fit our political purposes? This question may be asked at the highest levels—by the National Security Council or the President—but if so it and the answers to it are classified or held *in petto* and not in the public domain. Similarly, military policy would determine such questions as unification of the Army, Navy, and Air Force in accordance with the answer to a larger question: What kinds of organization of the military services are likely to produce the kinds of military thinking and action which will best fit our overall political purposes? Although some discussion of unification and service missions purports to be in these terms, questions of military organization are tackled in general as though military organization and political purpose are autonomous, separable entities.

The idea of military policy just put forward will serve to reveal the writer's biases, the reasons why I am concerned with the position of the Congress in the formulation of military policy. Probably, a person largely satisfied with current military doctrine would be less likely to ask questions which at least suggest that policy could be formulated differently. However, those who do not share my doubts about our current approach to military problems may nevertheless find some interest in exploring how in a complex society do politicians legislate on technological issues where some element of crisis is involved and whether the suspicion of the expert and the specialist can be utilized in any sensible way to guide military policy decisions.

My interviews with Congressmen have brough met to five conclusions:

1. Most Congressmen believe that Congress has very little to say about military policy. They allege that the military matters it is concerned with are the peripheral matters of production, waste, living conditions, etc.

2. Most Congressmen are suspicious and distrustful of the military, its representations and claims. But they have no technique by which they can get at them except by leaks and differences of opinion arising from conflicts among the services, which they therefore welcome.

3. No Congressman interviewed claimed that he heard from constituents or persons of prominence about overall problems of military policy or about purposes of military organization—in the way in which Congressmen do hear overall economic views as well as arguments for or against specific economic proposals.

4. A number of Members interviewed would like to have some resource—they don't quite know what—in the field of military policy which would provide them with the stimulus and ammunition about overall purposes which they do get, for instance, on economic matters.

5. The legal background and experience of Members of Congress play a larger role in how testimony is sought, received, and evaluated than is always recognized. Again and again, members of committees refer to their quasi-judicial function. For instance, a member of an Appropriations Committee panel said, "We're like a grand jury; the plaintiff may ask $50,000, the defendant offer nothing, and we say it should be $22,350.08. We're like a grand jury * * * that goes out and investigates * * * that can walk into the homes of litigants * * * and haul people in, high and low."

A grand jury does investigate complaints; but the complaints usually have to be offered by someone. A judge even more clearly decides between litigants. But who are the litigants here? Except in cases of waste, graft, local complaint, or personal injustice, there are on matters of military policy only one set of litigants—the armed services, struggling for prestige missions and a higher proportion of defense appropriations. This differs from political conflicts coming before Congressional committees over tariff protection and reciprocal trade, national fiscal policy, taxes, agricultural programs, conservation of natural resources—for in all these latter instances general arguments of national policy, national interest, and political philosophy are presented on both or several sides. It is quite possible that analysis of testimony on military matters during the 1930's would show far more concern with fundamental issues of military policy than is shown now, because in those days isolationists and pacifists were heard; their challenges of the military were expected and were considered.

It is not without relevance to free inquiry into military policy today that three or four senior civil servants in the Defense Department have objected to any notion of Congressional responsibility in this area. One of them whose responsibility and training orients him constantly towards civil-military legislative relationships told me vehemently that he thought it improper to even begin any such study as I was undertaking. Of what conceivable use could it be? When I replied that possibly my work might help crystallize awareness on Capitol Hill of how military policy is dealt with, he said "G. . . d . . . it, that's just it. That's downright unpatriotic; D . . . it, if a Congressman wants to know what he should think about such matters, all he has to do is ask us!"

Upon my refusing to give up the study, this man swore that he would see to it that the study was given up, and he did in fact write an extremely strong letter along that line to my supervisor at MIT. He is, I judge and presume, an aberrant case; but sometimes the explicit assertion of an extreme opinion helps shed some light on the drift of elements in the general point of view.

The critic of prevailing military doctrines is thus seen not engaged in a relatively innocuous intellectual disputation; he is threatening the status, the securtiy, and in many cases the sense of dedication of a number of his colleagues and comrades. Because weapons systems, service missions, etc., are all dependent upon military doctrines, and weapons systems and service missions encyst the status, security, and aspirations of a good many men.

It would be at least worth exploring the part which the defense contractors play in determining military orthodoxy. If, as has been quoted in testimony before congressional committees, 70 percent of the weapons ideas come thence, it is likely that the ideas put forward will be selected according to a process which does not encourage radical revolutions in conception because radical changes are (a) expensive to a contractor with a given staff and way of doing things, and (b) dangerous in the sense that if they are rejected they may destroy the contractor's good relationships with the military.

So the Congress, practically speaking, finds itself forced to rely upon those whom it distrusts—distrusts because it knows or believes it knows they are speaking for vested interests. One Member epitomized the situation by saying perhaps a dozen times in the course of a 1-hour interview, "Who am I to say 'No' to the military? They say a certain thing should be done; who am I to say 'No'?"

He is right in one sense. Committees of Congress are not now properly staffed to analyze Executive recommendations on military matters. However, any committee which chose to do so could provide itself with an adequate staff of reasonably critical and imaginative natural and social scientists as free as possible of loyalties to current military institutions and doctrines. The subcommittee members of the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee who study the budget requests for the Defense Department and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization are more continuously in touch with military operations than any other group in Congress; and it is encouraging that one of these men, Representative DANIEL FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, has proposed that the House set up a select committee on Fiscal Organization and Procedures by resolution, "for the purpose of strengthening congressional control over the public purse through the * * * strengthening of its review of the annual budget * * * enabling (the Congress) better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution." I showed Mr. FLOOD the first two paragraphs of this paper, and his reaction was that the precise reason why Congress "does not in any very significant degree exercise its power to check and balance the military" is that Congress lacks the tools to get behind budget requests or to determine their operational meaning. Whether a select committee is necessary, or whether his purpose could be achieved simply by a present Appropriations Committee decision to utilize politically sophisticated natural and social scientists routinely to study the meaning of the budgets that committee is asked to approve, may be open to discussion.

There are several other congressional committees which have or could have significant responsibilities along the same line. The Armed Services Committee comes to mind. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has a special responsibility in the field of military aid. And, in fact, as an experienced staff member once remarked to me, "In Congress, 9 times out of 10, assertion is jurisdiction." So almost any committee could—if its senior members wished it to do so—tackle the problem of a really new look at military policy.

Any committee approaching the problem along the lines here suggested could profitably start by raising a question posed earlier in this essay: What kinds of war would best fit into the political purposes which we have in mind?

Such an approach would demand at least one revision in the characteristic picture of war now drawn in this country—that war must be as destructive as possible, to the death, an unconditional surrender type of thing, with the corresponding mechanisms of savage threats and promises of retaliation. Such a war, and such an attitude toward cold war, does not involve policy at all. Policy implies consideration of the best and least hazardous way of achieving ends.

I would guess that consistent, significant concern by any congressional committee which would make military policy a subject of serious intellectual interest to civilians would very shortly lead to a questioning of premises. For instance, the theory of deterrence, as its very name implies, rests upon a psychologically unproven premise; the belief that a potential enemy will refrain from acting because he fears your capacity to injure him. There are times and circumstances, no doubt, when the belief is true, but the relative unsuccess of both American and Russian police in controlling hooliganism and juvenile delinquency leads one to doubt its universal applicability. The practice of deterrence may, in fact, provoke preventive or preemptive action.

There is another solution: The development of weapons to fit our purposes. It is apparently possible to develop giggle gases, sleep-inducing gases, sneezing gases, if need be gases producing the symptoms of dysentery for a couple of weeks, which have no lethal or long-range destructive effect on a civilization or a people. It is conceivable, indeed, that gases can be produced which merely have the effect of making people so

extremely happy, so euphoric, that they simply will not take the pains or bother to man attack or defense stations, launch missiles, or do any productive work. These gases would, in effect, intoxicate the whole population.

Whether such gases can in fact be delivered, nobody knows; but surely the whole atomic bomb would have seemed incredible in 1930, even to most atomic scientists of that date.

Suppose that, as a result of a reconsideration of national military policy of the sort which Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON has indicated he hopes to see the Congress undertake this session, the Congress should, by resolution, make some such announcement as the following:

"We have been devoting x billion dollars over the last 15 years to thermonuclear weapons and their delivery. This threatens the survival of the entire human species. We propose therefore that beginning tomorrow we reduce this sum by x dollars and that the x dollars which we save be devoted to the development and delivery of gases which cannot possibly exterminate the species.

"Since we know that in basic research, there are no secrets, we freely offer (a specified portion—perhaps one-quarter) of the whole sum to the United Nations to be spent and developed under United Nations auspices."

Our friends, and those who are not so sure of our good intentions as we like to think they are, would immediately see the advantages of happy gas over tactical nuclear weapons. Happy gas could be used by a U.N. police force, for example, to prevent aggression against Lebanon or Iran without fear that such police action might lead to destruction of the human race. If the idea were publicized to the people of Russia it could exert a considerable pressure on the regime itself. As publicized among the scientists of the world, it would recruit the full enthusiasm and capacity of many who in recent years have stayed away from defense work or dragged their feet on it; and it would give a period of hope, during which other matters of bitter dispute could be better negotiated.

During that period of hope, of course, both the U.S.S.R. and the United States would keep thermonuclear weapons; through aggression or miscalculation they might still go off. It is essential that our approach provide a basis for honorable disarmament and reconciliation. It must refocus the loci of terror in such terms that both major groups of powers will in their own self-interest work toward an early solution and that each will be convinced that the other is not going to engage in preventive war.

The elements of such a solution could include exchange of hostages. An exchange could be arranged between Russia and her satellites and the United States and Great Britain of 2-year visits by relatives and associates of the leading political, military, and perhaps economic figures in each country to the other. If, for instance, Maj. John Eisenhower were to be assigned to spend a year teaching literature or some other field in which he is qualified in some Russian city, not far removed from one of their major industrial complexes, and bring his family with him, the Russians surely would realize that President Eisenhower was not likely to launch planes or missiles against the U.S.S.R.

The strain on parental feelings and on the feelings of those involved must be considered. But if people realize that otherwise thermonuclear war might take place, I believe most of them would be willing to take the risk involved. Many families today send young children away to summer camp, partly to be hardened. Such an exchange as here proposed would be no more difficult than that—and it would have advantages for the individuals themselves, in most instances, far greater than the best summer camp.

While this experiment in restoration of good will was proceeding, pinpricks (or massive insults, however they are regarded) in connection with passports, trade barriers, and the like should be removed. The emphasis must be on what we can and shall share and exchange.

The key word here is emphasis and the spirit underlying it must be "accentuate the positive; underplay the negative." There will continue to be, presumably, developmental techniques in weaponry which it would be idiotic to share. But American policy, so far as the rest of the world knows it (with the exception of point 4 and the atoms-for-peace program) in recent years has frequently stressed what cannot or will not be done or what will be done in an unpleasant and bothersome manner. We have rarely proclaimed what we are trying to do.

There are always a great many people who would rather die by techniques which have come to seem familiar and natural than take the risk of the unfamiliar with its somewhat unconventional methods. Such people (doctrinaire Marxists in Russia, conventional military men in this country, enthusiastic nationalists in some other nations) may lead the world to disaster. Clearly we must go as far as it is possible to go to reassure them. Is there any stronger reassurance for them than the traditional, open working of the checks and balances in our own democratic system? Could we possibly do better than to resolve the conflict which many Congressmen feel between the technologically based Defense Department of today and the hope for civilian responsibility and civilian protection tomorrow? May it not be that the cure for science is more science—science in the Congress?

Poison in Your Water—No. 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the RECORD an article appearing in the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer on March 2, 1958. The article describes how sanitary conditions of Lake Washington and Puget Sound are so bad that it is expected to shortly have a disastrous effect on real estate values in the area.

This is just another consequence of the dirty, foul water in this country. The water which was once pure and clear has become clouded with sewage, municipal waste and industrial waste so that it is no longer fit to drink or even swim in.

This is just another reason why the full appropriation of $45 million under Public Law 660 should be made and why that law should be extended and liberalized so that our country may once again become a land of pure, clear water usable for drinking, industrial purposes, fishing, boating, and swimming.

The article follows:

POLLUTION SEEN AS THREAT TO PROPERTY VALUE

Continued pollution of Lake Washington and Puget Sound will have a disastrous effect upon real estate values. Seattle realtors Henry Broderick and John L. Scott warned Saturday.

They estimated waterfront property values will drop at least 50 percent unless pollution is halted. They said such a situation would be a civic disaster.

Broderick said the Metro plan is the only solution proposed to halt pollution.

"I feel confident Metro can do the job," Broderick declared. "The important thing is that it must be done right now. If we wait, it will be too late."

Scott said the sanitary condition of Lake Washington is already so bad many lakeside residents are building swimming pools. He said waterfront property's chief asset comes from swimming facilities and that such property will greatly decline in value if it becomes merely view property.

Coal by Wire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, for 40 years the gasoline-powered automobile has dominated the American road. The old steam-powered and electric-powered cars have long since vanished into limbo—or museums. At any rate, that is what we have been taught.

However, I would like to commend to your attention the following article which indicates the electric auto may be making a comeback. It relates how manufacture already has begun on a new type of electric car which is cheap to operate, has few complicated parts, and is ideally suited to certain types of business use.

This article, which was published in the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News and was written by a personal friend of mine, Marie Wood, details fully the description of this new car, which soon will be a familiar sight on the streets of Parkersburg, and soon may be in general use all over the country.

My interest in these cars, and my purpose in bringing them to your attention, is more than incidental. Because they are powered with electricity, I am particularly interested in their development. Electricity is cheap and plentiful in my home State of West Virginia, because of the abundance of coal, which powers the huge generators throughout the region. In fact, the utility companies boast that electricity is coal by wire.

I wish every success for the popularity of these new vehicles, which are another outstanding use of coal by wire:

NEW ELECTRIC AUTOS ARE COMING TO CITY

(By Marie Wood)

Electric automobiles with a 55-mile-an-hour speed, a driving range of 80 miles (enough for 1 day) and constructed of fiberglass and aluminum are about to make their appearance in Parkersburg with Monongahela Power to have one of the first, it was learned last night.

Fuel costs will be 8 cents a day if the cars are plugged in to 220 volts for recharging and 18 cents a day if plugged in to 110 volts.

A west coast company which formerly manufactured airplanes is turning out the

4-passenger small cars and Monongahela Power is one of a number of eastern utility companies which have ordered—and paid for—the first 100.

Cost will be around $2,000.

The cars will weigh 1,875 pounds empty with the body accounting for 300 pounds and the batteries (1 to each rear wheel) another 528 pounds.

Utility companies plan to assign the electric cars to meter readers as speedily as they can get sufficient number.

The first electric car to go into production in approximately 40 years these "Volts Wagons," as they already have been nicknamed, will have a fiberglass body and measure 13½ feet long and five feet wide—with choice of black, blue, gray, or bronze.

Height will be 4 feet 9 inches. The electric motors and transmission will be in the rear (eliminating any floor tunnel) and the trunk will use all the space up forward under the hood.

The welded aluminum frame will be strong enough to prevent crushing in case the car should flip over.

There will be no exhaust—so no smog problem.

The only motor sound will be a slight whine when the car is in operation.

When it is halted for any reason—including traffic lights—the car will be silent. It won't be using any current.

To go backward there is a backward button on the dashboard.

The steering post will have a hand shift with two positions: low range for brisk takeoffs or hills and driving range for average touring.

Hydraulic brakes will be equipped with 2-inch wide drums because an electrical braking system would have increased cost, complexity and weight.

There will be no oil or temperature gauges but a voltmeter with a face that reads like a gasoline gage will have two-thirds of the range painted green. The remaining one-third will be yellow and red.

When the needle hits red it's time to head for the nearest charging outlet.

If the car dies on the road manufacturers have arranged the batteries so they have a last-gasp recuperative power they promise—and the driver sits idle with power off for five minutes and then he can drive 6 more miles at 30 miles per hour.

Manufacturer is the Stinson Aircraft Tool & Engine Co., of San Diego, Calif., and the electric car has been christened the Charles-Town in honor of the financial godfather, Dr. Charles H. Graves, 40, a San Diego dentist, inventor and real estate man.

Congressman Carl Elliott Receives Parents' Magazine Award for Outstanding Service to Children in 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, our able colleague, Representative CARL ELLIOTT, of Alabama, who guided the National Defense Education Act of 1958 through the Congress, has recently been given a most coveted award—the Parents' Magazine Award for outstanding service to children in 1958. As one who served on the subcommittee chaired by Congressman ELLIOTT, I came to appreciate his intense devotion to the welfare of America's youth and his earnest desire to strengthen American educational standards. I know that the Members of Congress and those interested in the future of our Nation's young people, join Parents' magazine in saluting CARL ELLIOTT for his remarkable record in the Congress on behalf of youth.

I include at this point a press statement from Parents' magazine together with the citation which appeared in the January 1959 issue of the magazine:

Congressman CARL ELLIOTT, of Alabama's Seventh District, was today presented with an award by Parents' magazine for outstanding service to children in 1958.

The award was presented in Washington, D.C., by Robert Cramer vice president of Parents' Institute, publishers of the magazine.

Congressman ELLIOTT was cited as a stanch supporter of education, who has worked hard over the years to help America's schoolchildren." The passage of the National Defense Education Act in the closing days of the 85th Congress was hailed as "a singular achievement for Mr. ELLIOTT, who as chairman of the Subcommittee on Special Education of the House of Representatives took the lead in piloting the bill through rough legislative seas."

The award for outstanding service to children has been an annual event since 1928. In past years the award has gone to such persons as Senator Lister Hill, of Alabama, former Senator Charles Potter of Michigan, Dr. Jonas Salk, and Defense Secretary Neil McElroy.

A stanch champion of Federal aid to education, this distinguished legislator from Alabama has worked assiduously over the years to help America's school children. Passage last August of the National Defense Education Act—most important aid-to-education measure enacted by Congress in 40 years—was a singular achievement for Mr. ELLIOTT. As chairman of the House Education Subcommittee, he took the lead in piloting the bill through rough legislative seas. Today and in the future, this 45-year-old lawyer and father of four can be counted on to strive for what he believes—better education for all U.S. youngsters.

Loan Act Questions Our Loyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call your attention to student reaction to provisions of the National Defense Education Act as appears from the following editorial from the February 13 issue of the student paper, the Dakota Student, which is published on the campus of the University of North Dakota at Grand Forks:

LOAN ACT QUESTIONS OUR LOYALTY

In the last session of the United States Congress the National Defense Education Act was passed. This act provides $826 million in Federal funds to help support education in the next 4 years.

During the hectic hours at the close of the session, Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, added to the bill a loyalty oath requirement which reads as follows: "No * * * funds * * * shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, is not a member of, and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

The addition of this loyalty oath requirement has since raised a great deal of controversy. Arthur Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has noted publicly that the provision would do little or no good.

The University of North Dakota Chapter of the AAUP has also voiced its objections to the provisions of the bill. Princeton University has declined to apply for funds under the act, in part because of the loyalty oath requirement.

Why has this act raised such a furor? There are several reasons. First of these is the nature of an oath itself. It, by its very existence, implies a doubt and distrust of a certain group of people—the students and educators of America. When any group is singled out for a test such as this is, it indicates a general suspicion of the group.

Secondly, although the oath creates a general atmosphere of distrust in regard to these people, it will be ineffective in regard to its primary purposes. It will not uncover Communists in education, since any Communist would sign the oath with no scruples. It would be odd indeed if a movement aiming to swallow a whole country by force were to choke on an oath.

Third, it is a direct violation of civil rights, and it suppresses the necessary experimentalism of a person's college years. If certain groups are taboo, how is the student to know what they are? The end result is that students will join no groups. Can the oath be so construed that a student or professor studying Russian economics will be accused of supporting communism by subscribing to an economics journal? The very vagueness of the provision eats away at academic freedom and the right to know.

In the long run this loyalty oath provision will catch no Communists. It will create a distrust of students and their teachers as a group, it will stifle academic freedom, and in truth it strikes at the very core of the democratic philosophy.

If students cannot be trusted to sift truth from error, if indeed we fear that education is going to lead students astray from democracy, it will take a good deal more than loyalty oaths to help us.

Alaska: Salute to the 49th State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mrs. Greta Drumm, Shuart Lane, Ramsey, N.J., recently composed a poem saluting the entrance of Alaska into statehood. It was published in the Ramsey Journal. I feel that the message it carries deserves a wider audience and I am pleased to in-

clude the fine tribute that it contains in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ALASKA

(Salute to the 49th State)

The Stars and Stripes forever
And every shining star
Flashes a welcome twinkle
To her sister from afar.

Now in the breezy weather
When the flag blows wild and free
We'll salute the forty-niners
Who are not here to see.

The grim men, the lost men,
The seekers after gold—
The pioneers who lingered
Through bitterness and cold.

The loud men, the rough men,
The dreamers, too, who saw
The future in the Northern Lights
Upon that barren shore.

The women, all the women,
The faithful and the gay,
Who lived in little shanties
And cheered men on their way.

The diggers and the builders,
The good and not so good,
Who laughed and cried and labored
For this day of proud statehood.

So dip your stars a moment
In wonder and in awe—
She's coming into statehood
As her sisters came before.

Forever, now, a forty-niner
In memory of her past.
May their spirit ever guide her,
And all they dreamed of last.

—*Greta Drumm.*

Surplus Food in a Hungry World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most challenging paradoxes of our time is the accumulation of farm surpluses in a world where nearly 1 billion people are crying for food. Recently I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 60 expressing the sense of the Congress that the American people must more fully employ the plentiful resources of the American farmer to enhance the standard of living throughout the free world and to bolster the political and economic stability of those nations which have embarked upon programs of economic construction.

Writing for the McClure Newspaper Syndicate in a column dated October 15, 1958, Mr. Ray Tucker has effectively posed the No. 1 problem confronting a large share of the world's population—the painful and demoralizing problem of human hunger. I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Tucker's article which follows:

NEARLY BILLION PEOPLE IN WORLD WHO NEVER ENJOY A SQUARE MEAL

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON.—While Washington and Moscow wrangle over desert lands in the Middle East and the rocky islands of Quemoy and Matsu, the principal cause of war and the world's greatest need today is food. It means more to millions in allied and neutral countries than even the American concepts of democracy and liberty.

With $7 billion of surplus edibles in Secretary Ezra Taft Benson's granaries at a storage cost of a million dollars a day, it is almost impossible for Americans, including our highest officials and diplomats, to appreciate or seek to solve this basic problem.

Nevertheless, according to United Nations surveys recently released, there are a billion persons who, from their cradles to their graves, never enjoy a "square meal." There are more than 100 million babies who go to bed hungry nightly.

Millions die from starvation, although their deaths are attributed erroneously to tuberculosis, malaria, tropical diseases, Asian germs, etc. The real cause of this mortality is hunger.

WHERE HUNGER STALKS

Nor is it only coincidence that hunger stalks humanity most severely in the very areas which are current sources of international friction and possible war—the Far East, Asia, the Middle East, and north Africa. In Latin America, these conditions result in revolutions, popular unrest and outbreaks like those against Vice President NIXON.

The world's hungriest nations today are China, north Africa, Asia, and the countries which have joined Nasser's United Arab Republic. It is hardly necessary to emphasize the equation between want of food and envy of well-fed Western peoples, which can easily lead to war. It should also be noted that they do not eat too well within Khrushchev's Communist empire.

Fortunately, Western humanitarians have recently begun to move into areas where statesmen and politicians fear to tread.

NEW HOOVER GROUP

The United Nations Economic and Social Council has invited all interested countries to consider establishment of an international food reserve. Countries with surpluses would contribute or sell at low prices their unusable crops to a central distributing body.

When a similar project was proposed by Costa Rica in 1954, before the Middle and Far East flare-ups, it was opposed and blocked by the United States and Great Britain. They objected on the ground that the scheme would upset commodity prices and trading, and on the further fact that the U.N. was studying the question.

Under the auspices of Herbert Hoover, Columbia University has set up an international institute of nutrition science. With expert guidance, it will explore and try to solve the imbalance in world food supplies and production.

Philanthropic Giving by One American Corporation—Polish National Alliance Has Benefited American Education in the Amount of Nearly $5 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, most leading statesmen of this country agree that furnishing opportunities for more education to a greater mass of our American youth is one of the most important problems facing our Nation today. Many of us in Congress and Government have been urging that Federal action and aid be augmented to relieve the critical shortages. But this is not merely a Federal problem. State and local organizations, private corporations and individuals must also do their part.

It is, therefore, as a member of the Polish National Alliance that I take great pride in advising my colleagues what that one fraternal corporation has done and is continuing to do in that field. I submit herewith a statement made by Dr. Arthur P. Coleman, president of the Alliance College, Cambridge Springs, Pa., of which I am proud to say that both I and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FRANK KOWALSKI] are alumni. I should add also that this educational institution is open to all students, regardless of racial or national origin, or sex, providing that they have the required educational qualifications.

Dr. Coleman's statement follows:

In connection with the recent interest on the part of many American corporations in supporting independent higher education I take pleasure in calling attention to the magnificent record of the Polish National Alliance, a fraternal benefit insurance corporation doing business in 32 States and the District of Columbia. Founded in 1880 in historic Philadelphia, this great American institution has long benefited independent higher education in America. When the first Poles landed in Jamestown in 1608 they little realized the impact of their successors on this continent.

Up to 1929 the Polish National Alliance (headquarters now in Chicago) had given to Alliance College alone the considerable sum of $1,595,190.58. Annual gifts thereafter have amounted to:

1930	$119,985.73
1931	124,496.28
1932	124,377.04
1933	116,149.70
1934	116,995.60
1935	110,946.34
1936	133,449.21
1937	126,229.58
1938	129,032.77
1939	122,814.03
1940	82,240.37
1941	76,497.72
1942	76,143.68
1943	80,511.33
1944	81,486.93
1945	83,894.03
1946	85,588.14
1947	83,816.48
1948	135,208.75
1949	78,650.07
1950	80,515.73
1951	92,249.08
1952	123,079.46
1953	119,069.70
1954	119,161.12
1955	115,732.92
1956	164,026.69
1957	113,713.40
1958	108,363.24

Total from 1912 through June 30, 1958, $4,719,615.75.

This makes a grand total of nearly $5 million already given to American higher education by this one American corporation, composed largely of the sons and daughters of immigrants from Poland, a land now suffering under a Communist dictatorship.

Alliance College, beneficiary of this generosity, is naturally grateful, but I submit that the general American community should be proud of the pioneer efforts on behalf of American education by this single corporation owned by some 340,000 Ameri-

cans of Polish or Slavic extraction. With the Polish National Alliance, corporate aid to education is not something new, rather it has been practiced for many years.

I should like, as an American educator, to express my admiration for this distinguished pioneer example of wise and long-range aid to independent American education.

I believe Americans of older stock will agree with me that if privately supported higher education is to survive, in the United States we need many more such corporations.

Bill Could Help Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Lexington Herald, of Lexington, Ky., under date of February 14, 1959, as follows:

BILL COULD HELP DEPRESSED AREAS

Opposition to the proposed bill of Representative EUGENE SILER, of the Eighth District, which would provide tax exemption to corporations setting up plants in depressed areas, was expressed recently by Representative FRANK BURKE, of the third, or Louisville district. The Louisville Democrat did not elaborate on his reasons for saying that the bill would not work.

The measure introduced by Representative SILER would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and set up some rather rigid conditions under which tax relief would be provided corporations moving into any depressed areas. The measure appears sound, and any defects, if such exist, easily could be ironed out through amendments while the measure is under study by the House Ways and Means Committee. Basically, the Siler bill would exempt from corporate income taxes corporations which would operate in economically depressed areas and where a minimum of 200 workers would be employed.

The exemptions would continue for a maximum of 5 years, after which the corporations would begin paying the regular taxes. There is a large reserve of employable labor in the depressed areas of this and other States, and more men will be thrown out of employment in Eastern Kentucky under the new coal contracts unless some concessions are made by the United Mine Workers of America. No new coal companies are expected to take advantage of such tax relief programs, however, because they will not have the question of profits to worry about if they try to operate under the new contract. But other industries could come into the coal fields of Eastern Kentucky, where many counties are listed as in the depressed areas.

The minimum employment specification of 200 workers would serve to attract big industries. The bill will not allow benefits where an industry decides to move from one depressed area to another, which is sound. It is to be hoped that the House committee entrusted with this measure will give it an early hearing so that defects, if any, may be brought to light and remedies provided. Tax exemption for 5 years may be just the thing that is needed to bring industry into an area where labor supplies are abundant and the people are ready for any program that will help restore the economy.

Needed: A Balanced Educational Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article written by Dr. Earl McGrath, former commissioner of education, who is presently executive officer of the Institute of Higher Education, Columbia University. The article, "Needed: A Balanced Educational Policy," follows:

NEEDED: A BALANCED EDUCATIONAL POLICY

(By Earl J. McGrath)

American citizens have properly been proud of their educational system, which they have considered superior to any other. It is not surprising, therefore, that in October 1957 we as a people were shocked to learn that in at least one field of intellectual endeavor we had been surpassed by another nation. For this very reason, the success of the Russians in space science will doubtless prove a boon to American education. What have been the consequences during the past 15 months?

The launching of the first satellite focused public attention on certain inadequacies. But the basic information about the deteriorating condition of American education has been available for years. Debate concerning needed action has, to be sure, been obfuscated by uninformed or prejudiced reactionaries, in the profession and outside, who have viewed the schools of today as in a state of decadence, as well as by some Micawber-like educators who have described our educational institutions as better than any we, or other nations, have ever known. Between these two extremes the realities lie.

Some of our educational institutions today are better than any of their predecessors and better than those in any other land. But, unfortunately, the percentage of schools with adequate educational programs and the essential facilities to carry them out is very small and, in the main, such schools are located in atypical wealthy school districts. And almost all colleges and universities are operating below their potential contribution. In many communities, schools are understaffed, physically inadequate, and manned by teachers with preparation below accepted professional standards. Many colleges and universities are likewise undermanned; short of buildings, laboratories, and library facilities, and operating on deficit spending.

The explosion of the space age has shocked thoughtful citizens into an awareness of this situation and the realization that education is our most important asset, the element in our society without which we cannot continue to prosper, nor even to endure as a first-class Nation.

Ever since this Nation became a highly developed society with rapid mobility and all-embracing social, economic, and cultural problems, education should have been a matter of national concern. But the tradition of State and local control has resulted in a lack of any real national educational planning. America has come of age in most other aspects of its national life, but in education it still exhibits the stumbling, halting, and insecure gait of childhood.

The mastering of our material and human resources in the effort to advance the cause of human freedom against the thoughtfully conceived and well-organized efforts of totalitarianism must be a national enterprise. And since education is one of the most effective instruments in this effort, the lack of a comprehensive Federal policy and program for eduaction weakens our international position and impairs our domestic well-being. The Federal Government has the responsibility of considering the whole of our educational effort in relation to the large purposes of American society, domestic, and international.

A SICKLY CONDITION

Why is the educational enterprise in a sickly condition when most other features of our economic and social life have been in such relative good health? Many factors are at work in this complex situation. One, however, not so obvious as others, is the general view that the doctrine of State and local control of education implies no studying, planning, or financing at the national level. The broad principle that education is a State and local matter, sound enough in its proper context, has actually become an obstruction to the necessary consideration of an adequate program for American education.

Indeed the thoughtless mouthing of this idea and its deliberate use as a bogy in public discussions of the responsibility of the Government for education largely explain the present halting efforts to come to grips with educational problems on a national scale. If there had been the same lack of governmental concern for the military, business, labor, agricultural, maritime, and aviation affairs of the Nation as there has been for education, our national posture would be weak indeed.

Logic does not require that he who believes in State and local control of education must also believe that the Federal Government should have no responsibility for examining the condition of education in the United States, for pressing educational authorities to correct inadequacies, and, if need be, as is now clearly the case, for providing the financial assistance needed to bring the total educational enterprise up to the working efficiency required in the national interest.

As a matter of fact, all the heated discussion about whether the Federal Government should take responsibility for education is merely rhetoric. The Government has played a part in education from the earliest days of the republic. The small initial grants have increased enormously through the years, to the point where the total now runs into billions of dollars scattered unnoticed through virtually every branch of the Federal structure. The national welfare now demands even greater expenditures. No one in Government or outside knows how much.

Before added subventions are provided for education, the present meaningless patchwork of Federal aid ought to be replaced by a design developed upon a clearly conceived philosophy. A comprehensive Federal policy on education is imperatively needed.

Millions of dollars have been appropriated for hearings, some in the most recent session of the Congress, on one or another educational program which the Government has been asked to support. Thousands of pages of congressional publications record these discussions. Even the casual reader will observe, however, that in the main these discussions have not dealt with fundamental matters—with policy—but rather with the relative merits of special projects under consideration.

The 86th Congress could do nothing more instrumental in advancing American education than to appropriate a sum of money for hearings and other appropriate activities concerned with the development of an unequivocal and firm Federal policy in respect to education.

These hearings should not be concerned with such matters as whether the Federal

Government should provide more or less support for vocational education, for education by television, for school lunch programs, for military education in the colleges. Instead such broad subjects should be considered as the condition of education in the United States and the responsibility which the Federal Government ought to assume in connection with current and future educational problems, so closely connected with our welfare and destiny as a people.

SPECIAL CONCERN LAST

Leaders in the educational profession and outside it should have an opportunity to express their views on public policy, views which under the present circumstances surrounding such hearings are often neglected, suppressed, or disguised in behalf of the special interests of the moment. With skillful direction, such public discussions should lead to the shaping of a comprehensive and stable Federal educational policy. A statement of such policy, unmistakable in intent and unequivocal in language, should serve as a guide to the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government and instruct our people generally in regard to the things which the Government should or should not be expected to do in the field of education.

If this were done, pressure groups for special educational projects would in the future be required to defend their requests in terms of large national policies rather than their own special concerns. And special interest lobby groups which oppose any Federal aid for any form of education would be required to face the larger implications of their position in terms of the general welfare of the Nation. They would be forced to raise the discussion above the type of debate on detailed figures which has been the refuge of those who will choose any alternative to that of increasing Federal expenditures for education.

The development of a national policy would also provide the basis for a reappraisal of the present large governmental expenditures for education as well as for evaluation of the many new proposals annually urged upon the administration and Congress. The present interest in education, excited by the launching of the satellites, guarantees a strong affirmative support for such an effort. As a byproduct, the responsibilities of State and local governments would simultaneously be clarified.

In addition, such hearings would highlight the further responsibilities which individuals, corporations, alumni groups, and professional organizations may be expected to assume if private interest and support of education, especially at the higher levels, is to continue to be a significant feature of American education. If these things could be accomplished, recent scientific developments in Russia would have assisted indirectly in the improvement of American education.

NOT AN UNMIXED BLESSING

The interest generated by orbiting artificial moons has not, however, been an unmixed blessing. The very nature of the instruments which initiated the present preoccupation with educational matters has narrowly limited the thinking of many of our people with respect to what ought now to be done to restore our educational effectiveness and prestige.

Because the penetration of outer space was based on scientific and mathematical knowledge, many have proposed corrective measures which would excessively emphasize instruction in science and mathematics and thus upset the proper balance in our educational efforts. It has been proposed, for example, that all students be required to study more science and mathematics, that standards be set high in these subjects, and that all who cannot reach them be placed in vocational programs, or sent to work; that larger salaries be paid to science teachers; that a special branch of the Government be established to deal with science education, and a host of other procedures and policies conceived in a moment of quick and unreflective reaction to an event in another country which hurt our national pride.

Most of these proposals to aggrandize science education at the expense of other forms of instruction are at best fruitless and at worst culturally damaging. They are futile, because recent observers of education in Russia, such as the U.S. Commission on Education, have reported that the Russians intend to surpass us in all branches of cultural endeavor.

INFINITE RANGE OF ABILITIES

The Russians are doubtless working on many other discoveries and inventions in no way related to space science. Trying to match them item by item, as their various developments are revealed, would place us behind them at every turn. And such a policy would introduce fitful changes of policy and practice which would eventually lead to chaos, or the domination of education in this country by the shifting events and policies of a totalitarian regime.

There is only one permanently sound plan for maintaining intellectual superiority in the world and simultaneously preserving the free society we cherish. The policies of all educational agencies—public and private, local, State, or national—must rest on the principle that all the infinite range of abilities and interests of all our people must be cultivated to the fullest extent. This is the plan which, in principle at least, has guided the development of our educational system from the beginning.

Except in time of great national danger, when customary policies and practices may temporarily have to be suspended for the more compelling purposes of the moment, any policy which imposes on any youth an intellectual activity, a curricular program, or a vocation repugnant to his basic interests, or uncongenial to his demonstrable abilities, is inconsistent with our democratic philosophy and with the national welfare.

Such a policy will lay the basis for later personal disgruntlement and social instability. It will wither the vital force without which no educational program can achieve lasting results. It will narrow the collective achievements of our people. And in the long run it will, perhaps imperceptibly, change the United States from a free into a controlled society—into the type of social order and political system we are now spending much of our personal and national wealth to combat. Few Americans would consciously embrace policies which involve Government dominance, or even policies among private educational agencies of the kind implied. Yet the same results could occur through forces operating indirectly to the same ends.

The U.S. Cultural Attaché

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, recently there has come to my attention an excellent article by Mr. George W. Oakes which appeared in the September 28, 1958, Washington Star in which the author discusses the difficult problem of securing qualified persons to serve as cultural attachés with American embassies abroad. Recognizing the importance of our cultural relations with the other people of the globe, I believe that the Members of Congress will find the article by Mr. Oakes, which follows, of considerable interest:

HARDEST GOVERNMENT JOBS TO FILL

(By George W. Oakes)

The Government is having a hard time filling one very desirable kind of job because the intellectual standards are so high.

It's the job of cultural attaché in our embassies of important foreign countries. And the word "cultural" is not used loosely. The Government means what it says, for the man who fills the job must know: American history, literature, the social sciences, education, music, painting, philosophy, sports.

And what is more, he must know also what the foreign country is doing in cultural affairs so that he may compare our achievements.

In practice these are the things that the cultural attaché must know. In Government words this is what he is expected to do with this knowledge:

To act as consultant to the Ambassador on all cultural matters, to direct our Government's educational and cultural program in the foreign country, to address intellectual and educational organizations, and to conduct extensive personal contacts in academic and cultural circles.

It is the last named that, perhaps, contains the most pitfalls. A man can get by with knowing less in a formal speech than he can in the give-and-take of a fast conversation with a real intellectual. To mix on an equal footing with a country's top figures in education, literature, and the arts, the cultural attaché must be an individual of superior ability, reputation, and personality.

IMPORTANCE OF THE JOB

Americans abroad, aware of the fact that cultural relations provide one of the most lasting and least controversial ways to foster a truer understanding of the United States, especially in the minds of leaders of thought and opinion, have frequently observed that next to the ambassador the cultural attaché has perhaps the greatest single opportunity to reach a receptive audience and to make a favorable impression. From London to Tokyo there is a widespread and intense curiosity to learn more about American culture.

The cultural attaché can fulfill a special function in the emerging countries of Asia and Africa. These nations in transition, trying in a few years to bridge the gap from colonialism to independence, are desperately seeking advice and help in spreading literacy, developing their educational setup, and achieving scientific and technical competence. In this quest they turn to the best-qualified representative of a foreign country—American or Russian.

Educators, just back from consultations in southeast Asia, report that the United States is weak in cultural attachés who have proper acceptance, can assess local needs, and can assist the governments and peoples of these underdeveloped areas. Cultural foreign aid, they point out, is no less vital than economic in alining these areas with the West.

The post of cultural attaché originated in 1941 when cultural officers were assigned to Latin America. In 1946 the program was expanded to nine countries outside the Western Hemisphere. Today there is a cultural attaché in 51 countries throughout the world, plus more than 100 cultural affairs officers in 58 countries.

MOST ARE U.S. EMPLOYEES

Although a few cultural attachés in the major capitals are university professors specially recruited for a short period, the

great preponderance of our cultural representatives are longtime government officials with a certain amount of academic background.

In a major European country, the recently appointed cultural attaché is a philosophy professor on 2 years' leave of absence. In a most important Asian country, the cultural attaché is a former provost of a State university. But, in a smaller European capital, the attaché is a former public-school official who has been in government educational programs abroad ever since the war. Some have had publishing experience before entering government.

Twenty-five foreign countries have diplomatic officers in Washington who devote at least part of their time to cultural activities. Germany, Spain, Indonesia, and some smaller countries consider the post sufficiently important to assign a special cultural counselor. Most are Foreign Service staff officers. However, the German cultural counselor is a former free-lance writer, art and drama critic. The French, who place great stress on their cultural tradition, are represented by a former public relations counselor who heads all their informational and cultural activities.

The British do not have an Embassy official designated as cultural attaché. Instead they arrange for distinguished educators and cultural leaders to lecture and travel in the United States under private auspices such as the English-Speaking Union.

THEY ARE HARD TO FIND

The USIA, which chooses the cultural attachés, has great difficulty in recruiting outstanding individuals, especially for the most important posts, who can adequately transmit the pulse of our cultural life. Nine men were aproached before one could be found to serve as cultural attaché in a major Western European capital. In order to fill such a position it frequently is necessary to select men who are not up to their responsibilities and opportunities. Few of those now serving have a recognized reputation even in this country.

That too many of our cultural representatives are inadequately qualified for their important duties is being increasingly noticed by Americans prominent in the academic and cultural world in the course of their travels.

PROFESSORS PREFERRED

The search for suitable cultural attachés centers largely in the academic world. Experience indicates that university professors are most likely to have the breadth of knowledge, ability to speak well, and the personal quality of mixing easily in intellectual and cultural circles.

Yet the demands of academic life are most frequently given as major reasons why outstanding educators refuse to accept the job. Frst of all, it is essential that he serve at least 2 years in order to develop the minimum contacts and get himself known. Universities generally grant leaves of absence for only 1 year and considerable pressure is required for even another 12 months. Consequently, more use has been made of retired faculty members.

Many professors who would be eminently qualified are unwilling to interrupt their academic careers and postpone their research and writing commitments. They much prefer a 1-year visiting professorship, such as a Fulbright, during which they can concentrate on their own special fields of study.

It is generally agreed that salary consideration is not a major deterrent. In the top embassies the cultural attaché can be given in pay and living allowances as much financial compensation as he is likely to receive in his professional post—even in the best-paying universities.

DISCOURAGING ANGLES

Prominent educators feel that the present status of the cultural attaché in the embassy discourages many outstanding prospects. Distinguished academic figures often instinctively distrust and shun any connection with a Government organization like USIA engaged in official propaganda and cold war activities. They feel that American culture is too vital and all-embracing an aspect of our national life to be tied to such an association which also is inimical to acedemic ideals of objective scholarship. Then, too, an eminent retired university president, for example, cannot be expected to serve, as do present cultural attachés, under the USIA's public affairs officer who is also the embassy's top press and public relations man.

Leaders in the cultural, educational and foundation world are convinced that if the cultural attaché were given equal status on the ambassador's staff with the military naval and air attachés and relieved of operating and administrative duties and USIA connections, top-flight prospects could be attracted.

As a State Department diplomatic officer, he would feel free to devote his entire time to personal contact work and public appearances which our most successful cultural attachés have found to be particularly effective. Then, too, the dignity of the position would encourage more pressure to be exerted, if necessary by the Secretary of State or even the President, to persuade reluctant universities and other organizations to forget about convenience and release outstanding individuals who can represent American culture abroad with distinction.

Peace on Earth Through World Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, one of the last meetings I attended in my hometown of Watertown, Wis., before leaving for Washington, D.C., to take up my duties in the 86th Congress was the December meeting of the Jefferson County Bar Association. The speaker was a distinguished member of the Wisconsin bar who now is serving as chairman of the State bar association's committee on world peace through law, Mr. Bruno V. Bitker.

Mr. Bitker has studied this timely topic with great erudition and with a real feeling of urgency. As men search for ways to establish peace and order in the world, I think that all of us must ponder the proposals made by Mr. Bitker and others in the bar association.

The United States has frequently turned to arbitration of international disputes when it suited our purposes. Do not the horrible prospects of thermonuclear warfare present us with the necessity for relying more and more on arbitration through the International Court of Justice as a means of averting the possible extinction of mankind?

The Milwaukee Journal has featured the substance of Mr. Bitker's speech in a special Sunday section article. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the Milwaukee Journal article:

PEACE ON EARTH THROUGH WORLD LAW

(By Bruno V. Bitker, chairman, committee on world peace through law, State bar of Wisconsin)

This is the age of science. It is science which through advances in transportation and communication has changed the phrase "It's a small world" from a bromide to an almost overwhelming fact. It is science which has devised weapons capable of destroying a civilization in a few seconds. It is science which is struggling to devise adequate defense.

As conditions exist today, we can only hope that our scientists can produce new and better armaments as fast or faster than our potential enemies.

But great as are the brains of these scientists, they alone cannot save us from the destruction which they have made possible. Unless we are to exist, if at all, in an endless, uneasy stalemate, some solution outside science must be found through which all the peoples of the world can live at ease and at peace together.

WHEN COURTS CAME, SHOOTING IRONS WENT

Peace will ultimately rest, as the late Judge John Parker said, not upon scientific achievement but upon the establishment of law in the world community.

Peace through law is not the same as peace through disarmament. The first is legal, the other political. We will deal here with the legal approach, which may be a necessary foundation for stable political arrangements.

There is long historical precedent for first creating a court system as a basis for political progress. Examples are to be found in ancient Greece and Rome, with their law codes extended into many lands.

In medieval England, it was only after the king's courts were established that the lords and barons gave up their armies and let the law resolve their disputes. And on our own western frontier it was only after the courts began to function that the settlers gradually gave up their shooting irons. This may also be the case in the world today.

If there were to be established a system of world courts, what law would the courts apply?

While there is already in operation a world court, the International Court of Justice at The Hague, it is true that there exists no worldwide legislative institution. The United Nations is a world organization but not a world government. It has no law-making powers.

Despite the lack of a universal parliament, there actually is universal law. When men deal with each other across international boundaries, rules and standards are devised which are enforced by the common consent of civilized peoples.

These rules and standards are frequently recognized by court decisions, by treaties between nations, by the writings of legal scholars. They become international law. If a peaceful world order is to exist, such law must be developed further.

THE ARBITRATION RECORD

There is also strong historical precedent for settling international disputes by such legal-like means as arbitration. This is the voluntary submission of differences to a third party other than a court.

The whole modern development in international arbitration stems from the Jay Treaty of 1794 between Britain and the United States after the Revolutionary War. The treaty provided for settling any remaining disputes between the two nations by arbitration.

The principal dispute concerned the boundary line between Maine and Nova Scotia. The treaty originally set the boundary at the St. Croix River, but it was discovered that there were two rivers by the same name. The arbitration commission

split it down the middle and set the boundary midway between the two rivers.

During the 100 years after the Jay arbitration, similar settlements of disputes between nations were used in over 177 cases. The United States was a party to 79 of these decisions.

Many of the disputes were of a highly controversial political nature.

In the presidential election of 1844 President Polk campaigned and won on the slogan "54–40 or fight." Despite intense nationalistic emotions against Britons, the dispute was peacefully settled by arbitration. The boundary was placed at the 49th parallel.

In 1872 the prestige of arbitration reached another high point in the *Alabama* claims case against Great Britain arising out of damage during the Civil War by English-built warships. The arbitration tribunal awarded the United States $15,500,000, which Britain paid.

HAGUE COURT CREATED NEARLY 60 YEARS AGO

As relationships between nations grew more complex, the need for a real court grew with it. In 1899 leading nations created the Permanent Court of Arbitration for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes at The Hague, Netherlands. The Hague Court was not actually a court of law. It was a permanent panel from which the parties could select arbitrators to resolve disputes.

Before World War I, The Hague Court decided 15 cases between nations. One of these was a dispute of long standing between the United States and Great Britain over the fishing rights of Americans off the coast of Newfoundland. The arbitrators decided favorably to the United States, and Great Britain abided by the award.

During the early 1900's, various nations, including the United States, made treaties whereby they agreed to submit to arbitration any future disputes between thm. Despite President Theodore Roosevelt's strenuous support of these treaties, the Senate in 1905 refused to ratify them without a reservation requiring the submission of each decision to the Senate for its advice and consent. This action was a major setback to this method of settling disputes between nations.

It was not until 1920 that there was created a real court. In that year, the League of Nations established the Permanent Court of International Justice, in The Hague. This was the first judicial body in history with worldwide jurisdiction over controversies between states. It was the greatest single advance in the judicial settlement of international disputes.

Though never a member of the League of Nations, the United States took a leading part in creating the new court. In 1923, President Harding asked the Senate to ratify the treaty establishing the Court, but the two-thirds majority required for ratification was never obtained.

NEW WORLD COURT

Although the United States failed to adhere to the permanent court, during its existence it rendered 32 judgments and 27 advisory opinions. It performed its duties fairly and competently and its decisions were never disregarded. When the League of Nations was dissolved in 1946, the Court was abolished.

The present International Court of Justice was established in 1946 as the judicial organ of the United Nations. Although 36 nations, including the United States, have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court, only some 20 have done so without significant reservations.

United States participation excludes from the Court's jurisdiction, disputes on matters within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States as determined by the United States. This is a serious deterrent to the Court's power.

Great Britain, too, has reserved from the Court's jurisdiction, matters which in its opinion affect its national security. France has done likewise. Russia never has recognized the Court's jurisdiction.

SCHUMAN PLAN COURT SET UP

Meanwhile, there have been growing up procedures for the peaceful settlement of international disputes within specified regions.

In 1948 the International Conference of American States adopted the so-called Bogota pact, providing that controversies between the states of North and South America were to be referred to the world court. The United States attached to its acceptance of the Bogota pact also jurisdictional reservations. Our example unfortunately was followed by several other nations.

In Western Europe regional procedures have also developed since World War II. The so-called Schuman plan treaty of 1952 created a court open not only to the member states but to individuals as well. This court likewise serves the Europeon Economic Community and the European Atomic Energy Community. The Council of Europe in 1957 named the World Court as the place of reference for all legal disputes under the treaty.

What is the situation at the end of 1958? While arbitration was a great success during the 19th century, in mid-20th century no major nation is willing to recognize, without strings attached, the jurisdiction of the World Court which it helped create.

Yet there are many encouraging developments. One is the increasing realization, particularly among lawyers and bar associations everywhere, that the same rule of law applying between individuals must be followed within the community of nations, if we are to survive.

The American Bar Association participated in the establishment of the present World Court. It favors the repeal of the U.S. reservation which allows the United States to determine whether a dispute is of domestic jurisdiction only. This article is based in part on material published by the association.

OBJECTIONS RAISED

Objections have been raised, of course, to expanding the use of law to settle international disputes. Some of these were outlined and answered by Charles S. Rhyne in a recent address to the American Bar Association:

"1. The plan is too idealistic. It is true that the rule of law among men is an ideal: But the basis of our own Government is the rule of law. Such a plan was pure idealism when adopted, but it has worked.

"2. The court might make some erroneous decisions adverse to us. It is true that the World Court system would be manned by human beings, who might decide cases contrary to our wishes. But no one would demand the abolition of the courts within nations simply because some decisions are questionable.

"3. An effective international judicial system will be too difficult to get going. Man has never let difficulties prevent him from accomplishing other seemingly impossible goals. A short time ago the manmade satellite was a fantasy.

"4. Russia will not cooperate. True, it is unlikely that Russia at the outset would recognize the rule of law in a worldwide court system. But that is no reason for the rest of us to refuse to try it. If it worked for the Western Nations it would be bound to attract the neutrals and thus grow toward wider use. Moreover, if Russia refused to use the courts while the free world did so, it would be one more blatant demonstration to the world that Russia prefers the law of the jungle to the law of civilized man."

SEVERAL RECENT HOPEFUL SIGNS

The prospect that attainment of world peace through law is no idle dream is based upon several practical considerations:

1. Man's new weapons. The destructive potential of the new nuclear weapons defies imagination.

2. Special pressure from smaller nations which come more and more directly under the threat of destruction by nuclear weapons, particularly ballistic missiles carrying nuclear bombs.

3. The money burden. As of 1957–58 the annual world cost of armaments is estimated at $100 billion. This expense holds back the economic and social progress of many nations, even the richer countries.

4. Outer space. Recent achievements of both the United States and the Soviet Union is the firing of satellites and current programs of space exploration make urgent some agreement on the international law of outer space.

The ideal of turning to law instead of weapons will not be easy to achieve. There is formidable opposition to be overcome—fear and hatred, narrow nationalism and the fetish of sovereignty. But strong as these influences are, the desire of mankind to survive is stronger still.

The Arab Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is time we learned the down-to-earth truth about the Arab refugee problem. It is bad enough that our stagnant foreign policy is satisfied with the status quo—reluctant to take a single positive step to relieve the situation by insisting that refugee camps are no place for human beings. It is far worse that we allow the problem to be used to fraudulently mulct us of our money. We are the most generous people in the world, opening our heart and our pockets without hesitation to all needy, regardless of race, color or creed. Without changing that divinely inspired trait, let us refuse to be made to look like fools, because of our well-intentioned charity.

The following article by Joseph B. Schechtman which appeared in Congress Bi-Weekly of February 2, 1959, is most apropos.

A CENSUS OF ARAB REFUGEES

(By Joseph B. Schechtman)

At the last session of the United Nations General Assembly, the United States served notice that it did not favor the continuation of the UN Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) program of aid to the Arab refugees beyond June 30, 1960, when the Agency's mandate expires. George McGregor Harrison, the U.S. representative on the General Assembly's Political Committee, described the 10-year effort to solve the problem of Arab refugees as disappointing and said that it was not good enough to perpetuate relief. Some better system must be found, he declared. What the better system was to be Mr. Harrison was apparently not authorized to explain, and was thus not in a position to offer any definite alternative to the present mere relief. Yet the suggestion

of a revision of the absurd and patently bankrupt practice of international dole was in itself an important step in the right direction.

This valiant attempt at putting some sense of perspective into the UNWRA operations failed. The carefully worded U.S. resolution (cosponsored by Great Britain, New Zealand, and the Netherlands) proposing a U.N. study of what should be done for the Arab refugees after 1960, to be submitted to the next session in 1959, met with fierce resistance on the part of the Arab delegations. They unconditionally opposed any suggestion not only of discontinuing the relief operation but even of having the U.N. examine such an eventuality. And they had their way. The U.S. resolution contained a modest provision that U.N. Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjold, makes a special study of the refugee problem and report back to the next assembly. But even such an innocent proposal proved objectionable to the Arabs and was dropped. Instead, the assembly took notice of a statement by the Secretary General that as part of his regular duties he would look into the technical operations of the Arab refugee aid program and make such proposals as he deemed helpful to the next assembly.

The outcome of the U.S. initiative is, of course, unsatisfactory and disappointing. It represents a clear victory for Arab immobilism. Although the 10 delegations of the Arab States abstained from voting even on the modified resolution, along with the Soviet bloc, they were, after the session, outspoken in interpreting it as endorsing the status quo and as being tantamount to an indefinite continuation of international aid.

Nevertheless, if Mr. Hammarskjold earnestly intends to carry out his charge, or even if he only looks into the mere technical operations of the Arab refugee aid, there is one crucial aspect of these operations which he cannot, at the very least, avoid singling out and recomemnding for drastic change. He is duty bound to insist on conducting the first genuine census of the Arab refugees.

Incredible as it may seem, the actual number of Arab refugees has never been established by a really thorough count. All the figures—nearly a million, 900,000, 875,000—submitted with such assurance by UNWRA and accepted unquestioningly by the U.N. budgeting bodies, as well as by public opinion, are either guesswork or based on fraud.

The First Interim Report of the U.N. Economic Survey Mission for the Middle East, headed by Gordon R. Clapp, candidly stated on November 17, 1949, that no one knows exactly how many refugees there are. Testifying 3 months later before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. Clapp admitted that his mission did not undertake to count the refugees and that population statistics in the Middle East are tricky. Years elapsed, and in 1955 Dr. Marguerite Cartwright, a sociology professor at New York's Hunter College, met Henry R. Labouisse, then head of UNWRA, in Lebanon and asked him, "How close do you feel that you have come to estimating the actual number of people in the camps?" "Not very close," he confided. "In fact, we really don't have any idea. * * * We just can't get in for accurate count."

The governments of the Arab countries, in which the sixty-odd refugee camps are located, have indeed refused permission to the relief agencies to get in for conducting a census of the camp inmates. As late as January 25, 1956, the Jordan daily Falastin reported smugly that the Amman Government had forbidden UNWRA to make a count of the newborn children among the refugees A similar intransigent attitude was adopted by the Arab authorities in Syria, Lebanon, and the Egyptian-controlled Gaza strip. Obviously, the Arab Governments are not interested in establishing the actual number of refugees in their respective countries.

All the figures bandied about since 1948 are, therefore, based not on a census but on the number of applications for refugee ration cards registered by relief agencies operating under agreements with the U.N. bodies. How such registration has been handled from the very beginning can be seen from a report related by Associate Court Justice William O. Douglas in his book "Strange Lands and Friendly Peoples." On a visit to Amman, the Justice was told by a Franciscan monk, Father William, in the presence of Karl Reiser, head of the Red Cross in that area, of Reiser's experiences in registering a group of Bedouin refugees on the Red Cross roll: "The first day he enrolled 300. The next day he enrolled 500." Puzzled by these swollen figures, Reiser hired a local Arab to mingle with the Bedouins and determine the origin of the exaggeration. He learned that there were in actual fact barely 100 Bedouin refugees, but that those who had already registered "went off on their camels behind a hill about a mile distant, reorganized their group, and reappeared as new Bedouin refugees. * * * Some had registered 20 times under different names * * * all a Bedouin with a mustache had to do the second time was to cover it with his kaffiyah. They appear with different women and children. A man with a donkey would ride a camel the next time, and so on."

This technique was, however, not limited to the Bedouins of Transjordan. Dr. Marguerite Cartwright raised the question of an accurate count with one of the camp workers in Lebanon. His answer was: "We try to count them, but they are coming and going all the time; or we count them in Western clothes, then they return in aba and kaffiyah, and we count the same ones again." He admitted that "fingerprinting had never been tried, nor did it seem that the counting had been taken very seriously."

And, indeed, the U.N. relief agencies seem to have accepted this state of affairs complacently, almost fatalistically. The report of the U.N. Relief for Palestine Refugees (UNRPR—the precursor of UNWRA) for the period December 1, 1948-September 30, 1949, claimed that "considerable duplication in relief operations and registration was inevitable." The agency's director "did not consider it practicable for the operating agencies to impose any kind of eligibility test" and he himself "had no observers of his own for this purpose." Thus it appears that an accurate check was neither intended nor carried out from the very start.

The slovenliness—and indeed the fraudulence—of the original registration has been perpetuated by every imaginable stratagem and subterfuge on the part of the refugees, The UNWRA report of October 19, 1950, admitted: "There is reason to believe that births are always registered for ration purposes, but deaths are often, if not usually, concealed so that the family may continue to collect rations for the deceased." At one time the refugees were offered a burial bonus of $14, but this sum was weighed against the advantages of keeping their deceased on the ration rolls and the offer found no takers. A ration card is too precious an asset to be surrendered. Its holders, as Time magazine put it, "gradually found themselves better off materially than they had been at home: they have a higher daily calorie ration (1500-1600) than some of the fellahin in Nasser's Egypt, better health and sanitation services than they had ever known in Palestine." There is a thriving black market in ration cards, and in oil, sugar, flour, and clothing rations.

Ration cards have thus been accumulating incessantly, with relief rolls swelling accordingly. And since every ration card is supposed to stand for an Arab refugee, the inflated figures of alleged registered refugees have been mounting from year to year, unchecked and unverified. The Clapp Mission estimated that in the third quarter of 1950 about 492,000 relief rations would be needed monthly, but when UNWRA took over its field of duties on May 1, 1950, it distributed more than 860,000 rations—an increase of 75 percent over the Clapp estimates. By the end of 1950, there were already 960,000 refugees on the agency's roll. During the following 3 years (1951–53) sizable deletions from ration rolls were made, and in 1953 the total was reduced to 871,748. But soon thereafter the total again began to swell, and by the end of 1957 the number of registered refugees rose to 1,037,821—an average yearly increase of 41,000.

These numerical ups and downs testify to a complete absence of any reliable system of control for counting the refugee mass. The UNWRA personnel in charge of the camps are not at all eager to check the rolls scrupulously. It is little know that UNWRA field workers in the camps, on whose reports the agency's leadership are fully dependent, are almost to a man themselves Palestinian refugees. They are the least likely to care for the accuracy of the relief count, and prefer to keep the camps hermetically sealed to any outside control.

Not all refugees, however, live in the camps. Hundreds of thousands who are classified as refugees and receive relief live elsewhere, in cities and villages. In Jordan, this outside category even constitutes an overwhelming majority—357,000 as against some 177,000 living in 25 camps. Many among them have in the meantime established themselves in business or trade, in government service, and have grown quite prosperous. But they jealously hold on to their ration cards and their refugee status. Recent reports relate that thousands of well-to-do families—merchants, artisans, civil servants, members of liberal professions—were sending their domestic servants once a month to relief stores to collect their rations.

This state of affairs makes no sense and should not be allowed to continue. The international community, which in the last ten years has spent $300 million for Arab refugee relief, is entitled to know the exact number of genuine, not faked, Arab refugees. The prerequisite for a realistic approach to, and solution of, their problem is a general census of the refugees, both inside and outside the camps. The falsely magnified figures frustrate any sober discussion. It is therefore to be hoped that the Secretary General of the United Nations will earnestly look into this technical aspect, and that his investigation will lead to a census of the Arab refugees.

People-to-People Contacts To Promote International Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, as the cold war continues, with both sides separated by the wide gulf of suspicion, fear, and stubborn refusal to consider new approaches, it behooves the peoples of the various countries to take matters into their own hands in an effort to thaw the rigidities of government-to-government contacts.

The American people, because they are free, are in the best position to extend the hand of friendship.

The cultivation of this program can do much to ease international misunderstandings.

When the people of Russia get to know us, I am sure it will be mutually beneficial.

Pointing up this need is a hopeful editorial of much substance titled "People-to-People," that appeared in the February 8 editorial of the Lawrençe Sunday Sun. Under unanimous consent I include this editorial for reprinting in the RECORD:

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE

In September 1956 President Eisenhower called a group of some 50 leaders in American life to the White House and presented a plan. Its aim, he said, was to build a massive system of communications between Americans and the peoples of other countries. This marked the official launching of the people-to-people program.

The thought behind it was a compelling one. Governments operate on high levels of political, military, economic and diplomatic affairs. But governments are remote and impersonal. So, the President emphasized, Americans outside of government must work out thousands of methods by which people can gradually learn a little bit more of each other. People-to-people, in sum, involves a sort of grassroots approach to better knowledge and understanding. Additionally, as Secretary Dulles told the original White House group, "You have got the job, and others like you, of making it clear throughout the world that freedom is the preferable form of society."

People-to-people has come a long way since that original meeting. Some 40 committees were formed to reach into virtually every phase of American life and activity. These committees have more than 1,100 members, of which 700 represent organizations, associations, clubs, and other groups. Their geographical spread blankets the nation, and practically all vocations and professions are represented.

Prior to this, other groups—such as the Lions International and the 4–H Clubs—had been conducting comparable activities on a person-to-person or group-to-group basis. The formal people-to-people-program, however, brought these groups into closer contact with each other, and sharpened the focus on the objective of greater international understanding through a multitude of contacts between Americans and other peoples.

The success of such a program, in which all Americans in every walk of life can participate, is largely measured by the multiplicity of the projects which are undertaken. Judged by such a yardstick, people-to-people has compiled an impressive record. To select a few examples, the public relations committee drafted a pamphlet entitled "Make a Friend This Trip" for Americans preparing to visit other countries, and a million copies were distributed. To meet a specific request from the Sudan, another committee collected 16,000 books and sent them overseas. More than 70 American communities in this country are now affiliated with communities of comparable size and kindred interests abroad, and a like number are in the planning stage. A sports committee sponsored the American tour of the Pakistan Cricket team. A 50-member American rifle team was sent abroad to compete in Germany, Switzerland, Sweden, and the Soviet Union. There are committees of the handicapped, of cartoonists, of people concerned with hobbies and the arts, and so on and on. The internationally publicized achievement of the Texas pianist Van Cliburn in winning the great Tschaikovsky competition in Moscow was an end result of one committee's work.

In Senator HUMPHREY'S words: "People-to-people efforts at building friendship are not bound by the restrictions and handicaps which encumber official government-to-government dealings and can often be more effective." And the program is and must be a two-way street. As the chairman of its Foreign Affairs Committee phrases the matter: "If it is important that the peoples of foreign lands understand the American position, American policies and American way of life, it is equally important that we have similar understanding with respect to other countries."

Equalization of Pay for Retired Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 14, I was privileged to join the members of the New London, Conn., Chapter of the Retired Officers' Association for luncheon and to address the group on a subject most vital to them—that is, legislation necessary to correct the discrimination and injustices of Public Law 85–422.

A distinguished gentleman and soldier, Raymond T. J. Higgins, captain, U.S. Army, retired, made the opening presentation. I shall always remember the stirring picture of Captain Higgins seated in his wheelchair, proud and dignified, appealing to the 86th Congress through me to restore equality in retired pay for the "inferiors" who retired prior to May 31, 1958, with the "elites" who are now on active duty.

To experience the full emotional impact of Captain Higgins' presentation, one would have to hear and see him. However, because what he said was so significant, I should like here to record his presentation in full:

SPEECH BY RAYMOND T. J. HIGGINS, CAPTAIN, U.S. ARMY, RETIRED

Our chapter president, Admiral Moseley, has given me the assignment of presenting to our honored guest, Col. FRANK KOWALSKI, U.S. Army, retired, Congressman at large from the State of Connecticut, a résumé of the feelings of retired officers about Public Law 85–422, known as the military pay bill of 1958. Colonel, because you, yourself, are a retired officer, and in addition are a member of the House Armed Service Committee, I know that you know a great deal more about the feeling of officers, both active and retired, concerning the 1958 pay bill than do I. But, if you will permit me, I will try to sum up the effects of Public Law 85–422 on the uniformed services in an attempt to explore the possibility of finding a cure for the ills resulting from that legislation.

One of the greatest defects of Public Law 85–422 is the discrimination made in the pay of retired officers. The effect of this discrimination has been to create the so-called elite list and the so-called inferior list of retired personnel. The elites are those retired after June 1, 1958, and their retired pay is computed on the basis of their active duty pay, which was considerably increased by the new law which was effective after June 1, 1958. The inferiors are those retired before June 1, 1958, and their retired pay continues to be computed on the basis of active duty pay prior to the new law.

Included among the inferiors are many distinguished officers—officers who, on active duty, held high commands in war and in peace. The cruelty of this discriminatory legislation may be illustrated by the fact that a major general of 30 years' service who retired prior to June 1, 1958, receives, I am told, $2,125 less annually than a major general of 30 years' service who retired after June 1, 1958.

Since the inception of the present military retirement system, it had been practically the undeviating policy that the pay of a retired officer be directly geared to the active duty pay of an officer of the same rank and length of service. In the past, whenever the pay of the active duty officer was increased, the pay of the retired officer was automatically increased correspondingly. Public Law 85–422, however, scrapped this cardinal principle in the military retirement system.

The action of the Congress in departing from this long established principle upsets the traditional relationship between active duty and retired pay and creates unwarranted and unjust disparities between the pay rates of retired officers of similar rank and terms of service. The establishment of two pay scales for equal merit and equal service is not consistant with a policy based on fairness.

Perhaps the greatest defect in Public Law 85–422 is that the breaking of faith with previously retired officers will have an adverse effect upon the retention rates of personnel currently on active duty, thereby destroying the principal objective of the law in question. This pay bill was primarily intended to provide material incentives for service careers and, hence, to reduce the tremendous turnover of personnel and the loss of skilled men. The increase in pay would indeed be a stimulus to men in uniform—but the act defeats itself by breaking the traditional relationship between active duty and retired pay. For years, one of the chief attractions of a service career was the provision made for retirement. Young officers who might make the service a career will not be blind to the discrimination made in retired pay rates. If officers already retired can be discriminated against, this can happen again now that the tradition has been broken and a precedent established.

Now, Colonel, here is a situation that many retired officers cannot understand. The establishment of two pay scales for retired officers was not proposed by the Congress but it was recommended to the Congress and insisted upon by the Defense Department. Even the 6-percent increase eventually given by the Congress to the retired officers was vigorously opposed by the Defense Department. It is a fact that it was common gossip last spring in Washington and the service journals published that if the Defense Department policies prevailed never again would retired officers receive a raise in pay.

The Secretary of Defense, his deputies, and the secretaries of the subdivisions of the Department are civilians. But, is it not true that a very large part of Defense Department personnel is made up of active duty officers of the uniformed services? How shortsighted can these officers be? True, they recommended that Congress feather their own nests, so to speak, but in so doing they have broken the tradition and have established the precedent for discriminatory legislation against themselves by a new crop of Defense personnel sometime in the future. It is the feeling of some retired officers that the knife of discrimination was plunged into our backs by our own flesh and blood—our brother officers pres-

ently on active duty with the Defense Department.

I once heard the retiring president of an organization say, "There is nothing so past as a past president." But he is wrong, there is nothing so past as an officer who days of active duty are past.

What can be done to correct these injustices?

Retired officers can expect no help from the Defense Department.

Retired officers have no might political power organization. There are about 300,000 officers on active duty and about 115,000 retired officers. Out of a potential strength of 415,000 there are only 35,000 of us banded together in the Retired Officers Association, of which this group here assembled is the Connecticut chapter. If we hope to right the wrong done retired officers, our only salvation is to urge the 86th Congress, in its mature and broad judgment, to reestablish the time honored national policy with reference to the computation of retired pay, and restore the inferiors to full retired pay percentages, to equality with the elites.

Colonel, this is our story, we place our reliance in the fairmindedness of the 86th Congress. If you find merit in our cause, will you help us?

American Farm Bureau Declaration Enunciates Important Fundamentals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the American Farm Bureau, representing over a million and a half member families in 48 States, has just presented Members of Congress with that organization's philosophy of government, and I commend its study to all of my colleagues.

There is a tendency in many areas today to drift away from the concept of government enunciated by the original framers and this declaration focuses the spotlight on the fundamental principles of our Government, and we must protect and respect these principles if our land is to continue as the government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The Farm Bureau declaration follows:

FARM BUREAU PHILOSOPHY OF GOVERNMENT

The Constitution of the United States of America was conceived and purposely designed to make secure the God-given liberties of each individual against the domination of government. This provision was made by a division of authority among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of our Federal Republic, the diffusion of government powers, and the retention by the people of those powers not specifically delegated to government.

America's unparalleled progress is based on the freedom and dignity of the individual, initiative, and equal opportunity, sustained by our faith in God and our basic moral and ethical values.

The principles of our competitive enterprise system derive from, and are consistent with, our religious values and the highest goals that mankind seeks. Through this system the American people have produced abundant goods and services and provided widespread educational advantages and religious opportunities.

The full realization of man's dreams as envisioned by our Founding Fathers can only be achieved if each individual assumes active responsibility for maintaining and strengthening of the principles upon which our Republic was founded and vigorously opposes all programs and policies which erode the very foundation of our American system.

We, as Farm Bureau members, believe:

In our constitutional form of government and its division of powers.

In freedom of speech, press, and peaceful assembly.

In separation of church and State and in the right of each individual to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience.

That self-government is a precious heritage which can be preserved only by the active, intelligent assumption of basic citizenship responsibilities by all people.

In the American competitive enterprise system, in which property is privately owned, privately managed, and operated for profit and individual satisfaction, and in which supply and demand are the ultimate determinants of market price.

That efficiency of production and maximum per capita production are primary elements in determining standards of living.

That property rights cannot be separated from human rights and are essential to the preservation of individual rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

That the exercise of free will, rather than force, is consistent with the maintenance of liberty.

In the right of every man to choose his own occupation; to be rewarded according to his productive contribution to society; and to save, invest, and spend, or convey to his heirs, his earnings as he chooses.

That the centralization of power and authority in the Federal Government, the movement to socialize America, the apathy of the American people toward this trend, and the apparent lack of responsibility on the part of individual citizens are among the greatest dangers threatening our Republic and our system of competitive enterprise.

That the Constitution is the basic law of the land and that it should be interpreted in accordance with the intent of its authors.

That the trend toward increased centralization of power in the Federal Government, if left unchecked, will lead to socialism and thus to communism.

That such "planned economy" concepts as socialism, fascism, communism, and other forms of totalitarianism should be opposed wherever and in whatever form they may be found.

That their personal beliefs with respect to private capitalism, socialism, and communism should be stated by candidates for public office and employees of governments at all levels.

That, in his quest for "security," the individual must oppose policies leading to the curtailment of individual freedom and opportunity.

That monopoly in any form—whether by government, industry, labor, or agriculture—jeopardizes freedom and self-government.

In government by law, impartially administered, without special privilege.

That government propagandizing of the electorate threatens the maintenance of self-government.

That establishment by the government of organizations of citizens which may in any way remain under its political influence or control threatens the continuation of self-government.

That secrecy in government affairs should not be tolerated except as actually essential to national security.

In strong and responsible State and local units of government and in protection of State laws against Federal preemption.

That farm people have the right and the responsibility to speak for themselves through organizations of their choice without government coercion or intervention.

That the powers not specifically delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution are reserved to the States or to the people and that such powers cannot be preempted by Federal statutes and must not be preempted by the courts.

Alexander Hamilton, His Spirit Is Alive Today—An Address by J. Harvie Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected, influential, and patriotic of our forebears was an immortal American, Alexander Hamilton. His ability, influence, and foresight played one of the most important parts, if not the most, in the defense, establishment, and future of the United States of America.

There recently appeared in the February issue of the American Bar Association Journal an article based on a speech made by a very dear and close friend and a most outstanding American, the Honorable J. Harvie Williams, during the bicentennial celebration of his birth. Mr. Williams was at that time the director of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission. He served that body well and devotedly.

This discourse by Mr. Williams has attained national recognition, and its reproduction in the Journal is a great distinction. I am proud that such attention has been paid both to a great student and to his subject of such import.

Alexander Hamilton was the incomparable man of the American revolutionary period and of the following era that brought about the Constitution of the United States and its adoption by the States. Mr. Williams has pointed out many of the pertinent and important facts of his reasoning and foresight to apply them to the problems of today. I think it advisable that this body attend the sound thinking and modern views of Alexander Hamilton and ask that the remarks of Mr. Williams be included in the RECORD at this time.

On Saturday, October 19, 1781, the decisive battle of the American War for Independence took place at Yorktown, Va. In 1957, the celebration of the 176th anniversary of this battle was a major event in the bicentennial years of Alexander Hamilton and the Marquis de Lafayette, and in the celebration of the 350th anniversary of the establishment of the first permanent English colony on this continent.

Alexander Hamilton led the American troops in the successful bayonet assault at night on Redoubt 10, which made Lord Cornwallis' position untenable.

Alexander Hamilton should be a subject of extraordinary interest to young people. He did so much while so young. His career is a challenge to every young man and woman on every college campus in the United States.

At 19, before he had finished Kings College (now Columbia University), he was given command, as captain, of the Provincial Company of Artillery of New York. Hamilton and his company were engaged in the Battle of Long Island, at White Plains, at Trenton and at Princeton. His growing reputation brought him to the attention of General Washington.

At 20, Hamilton was appointed aide-de-camp to General Washington, with the rank of lieutenant colonel. During the 4 years he served on Washington's staff, Alexander Hamilton was at the center of events. Washington entrusted him with the most delicate missions—missions on which hung the success of the war and his own reputation. Hamilton also handled Washington's correspondence with the Continental Congress.

Even during these busy years Hamilton found time to broaden his knowledge and indulge in extracurricular activities. At 20 he was writing to Robert Morris about what a constitution should include for adequate administration of government and using the doctrine of separation of powers.

The next year he published his first Publius letters, deploring the feebleness and laxity of the Continental Congress. Two years later, May 1780, Hamilton submitted anonymously to Robert Morris, Superintendent of Finance, his first plan for a national bank to stabilize public funds. That same year, at the age of 23, Hamilton wrote to James Duane the first of his great treatises on constitutional government and called for a convention to establish a general confederation with adequate power.

In the midst of all this activity, being a normal young man, Hamilton found time for the successful courtship of Elizabeth Schuyler, whom he married in December 1780.

On the 1st day of April 1781 Alexander Hamilton resigned from General Washington's staff. It was not until July 31 that he was given command of a battalion of light infantry and ordered to Virginia. During these 4 months of military inactivity he began the publication of a series of six papers entitled "The Continentalist." The final number, published on July 4, 1782, 8 months after Yorktown, ended with these tremendously significant paragraphs:

"There is something noble and magnificent in the perspective of a great Federal Republic, closely linked in the pursuit of a common interest, tranquil, and prosperous at home, respectable abroad; but there is something proportionably diminutive and contemptible in the prospect of a number of petty States with the appearance only of union, jarring, jealous, and perverse, without any determined direction, fluctuating and unhappy at home, weak and insignificant by their dissensions in the eyes of other nations.

"Happy America, if those to whom thou hast intrusted the guardianship of thy infancy know how to provide for thy future repose, but miserable and undone, if their negligence or ignorance permits the spirit of discord to erect her banner on the ruins of thy tranquility."

Thus, at the age of 25, 5 years before the Constitutional Convention, Alexander Hamilton had a clear vision of the great Federal Republic he wished to see established on this continent. For the next 2 decades he worked unremittingly toward that objective.

In this world of 1959, it is not easy to realize the one-time nonexistence of the United States. Nor is it any less difficult to realize that the United States of today began in 1789 with only 11 States and less than 4 million people—about one-half as many as now live in New York City.

Nevertheless, in order to understand and appreciate what was done for us by those now long gone, we must educe in our mind's eye a clear picture of those early days for comparison with what we see today.

Today the political and economic growth of the United States is unprecedented in the annals of mankind. This unique position was achieved in only one and two-thirds centuries (1789–1959).

To students of history and government who have inquiring minds and possess the gift of wonder and power of analysis, the why and how of the United States must always be an absorbing subject.

Shortly after Yorktown, Hamilton was relieved from active Army service and returned to his family at Albany. Here, the following spring he began to read law in the office of his old friend, Robert Troup. After three months' study, Hamilton was admitted to the Bar as attorney-at-law. During that brief time, however, he wrote a legal handbook, Practical Proceedings in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, which became the groundwork for subsequent treatises by others. This item is the prize possession of the library of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

That same month, July 1782, Alexander Hamilton persuaded the New York Legislature to pass a resolution calling for a general convention of the states to amend the Articles of Confederation, and the following day that legislature appointed him a delegate to the Continental Congress. There he had wider opportunity to work for a general convention to provide for a closer union of the States.

Four years later, as a member of the 1786 Annapolis Convention, Alexander Hamilton wrote the report which set in motion the events which brought on the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, of which he was also a member.

Alexander Hamilton has rarely been given credit for his achievements at the Philadelphia convention. Most historians, reading the dry records, conclude that he was without influence because his two colleagues from New York decided the vote of that State. The fact is that his great speech on June 18, 1787, was designed to defeat—and did defeat—the New Jersey plan and brought success to the Virginia plan as the basis of the convention's work. Thus, the notion of a continuing league of sovereign States was put aside in favor of a National Government under a limited Constitution.

THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION, A UNIQUE DOCUMENT

The Constitution signed on September 17, 1787, was unique in all time:

1. It created a limited constitution of government—a national sovereignty limited to its proper objects, and by certain specified exceptions to legislative authority; and State sovereignty limited to its proper sphere. This divided sovereignty was seen as reconcilable.

2. It established the formal separation of the national sovereign powers into three functional categories: legislative, executive, and judicial.

3. It established a representative Federal union of States on the basis of unequal representation in the House of Representatives, according to the unequal populations of the States, and equal representation in the Senate as coequal political societies regardless of populations. These two different principles of representation were combined to give each State the exact numerical representation in the electoral college, which underpins the executive branch, that it has in a joint session of the Congress.

4. It provided for an independent judiciary under the Constitution.

Although the proposed Constitution was a mere rearrangement of familiar things, it was sufficiently different to arouse substantial opposition in many quarters, especially from officeholders whose prestige would be diminished under the new system. While the campaign for ratification was the most important campaign ever waged in this country, it was also one of the most intense. In this campaign Alexander Hamilton, who had done more than any other man to prepare the way and bring on the Constitutional Convention, rose to new heights. He was 30 years old.

Some 172 years ago there appeared in The Independent Journal, a New York City newspaper, an article addressed: "To the People of the State of New York." This article by Alexander Hamilton, over the nom de plume "Publius," the first of 85 Federalist Papers, raised a question that remains unanswered. It was, and is:

"Whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force."

As crucial as the question was then, it is equally crucial now. And we can say now, as Hamilton said then, "A wrong election of the part we shall act may, in this view, deserve to be considered as the general misfortune of mankind."

"The Federalist" is universally regarded as the classic work on government, especially on the Constitution of the United States. Thomas Jefferson said it is "in my opinion, the best commentary on the principles of government which was ever written." On two occasions, the Supreme Court, in opinions by Chief Justice John Marshall, gave it unstinted praise.

In *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* the Court said in 1819:

"In the course of the argument, 'The Federalist' has been quoted; and the opinions expressed by the authors of that work have been justly supposed to be entitled to great respect in expounding the Constitution. No tribute can be paid to them which exceeds their merit."

Two years later the Court said in *Cohens* v. *Virginia:*

"The opinion of 'The Federalist' has always been considered as of great authority. It is a complete commentary on our Constitution; and is appealed to by all parties in the questions to which that instrument has given birth. Its intrinsic merit entitles it to this high rank; and the part two of its authors performed in framing the Constitution put it very much in their power to explain the views with which it was framed."

In addition to the many editions of "The Federalist" published in this country and in England, it has been translated into French, German, Spanish, Portuguese, lately into Italian, and, I am told, into Russian.

Here I should like to be personal for a moment. For the good of the future of the United States I should like to see "The Federalist" a required textbook in a required course in government in every college and university in the land. My reason is, understanding of the nature, structure, and scope of the Constitution of the United States, the capstone of the American political system, is constantly narrowing. Formal study of "The Federalist," as I suggest, would broaden and deepen that understanding and give a new lease on life to the greatest constitution of government ever written and established.

When publication of "The Federalist" was completed, Alexander Hamilton was well prepared for the New York convention to consider ratification. In the membership of the convention, which met at Poughkeepsie, Hamilton's forces were outnumbered by more than 2 to 1. But before the debate was concluded, after 44 days, Hamilton carried the day by the vote of 30 to 27, including the vote of Melancthon Smith, leader of the opposition. This result, which brought New York into the Union, is regarded as one of the greatest forensic achievements of all time.

With the Constitution adopted by the necessary nine States—New Hampshire was 9th and Virginia 10th—and with New York in the Union, the Continental Congress resolved that the Presidential electors meet in their State capitals on February 4, 1789, and that the new Government become effective 1 month later.

George Washington was unanimously elected President and was inaugurated on April 30 in New York City. At the President's request, Hamilton prepared a detailed plan of Presidential protocol for entertaining and receiving public officials.

President Washington's first Cabinet appointment on September 11, was Alexander Hamilton to be Secretary of the Treasury. Ten days later the House of Representatives requested a report on a plan for the support of the public credit. On January 9, 1790, Hamilton submitted to the Congress the first of his great state papers, the "First Report on the Public Credit."

The next of Hamilton's great state papers was the "Report on a National Bank," which was followed by his even more important letter to the President on the constitutionality of the bank, more important because of his criteria of objects for the constitutionality of measures, and because of his development of the doctrine of implied powers.

These reports were followed by the "Report on Manufactures" at the end of 1791, and the "Second Report on the Public Credit" in January 1795, just before his resignation from public office.

During his 5½ years as Secretary of the Treasury in Washington's administration—during which the new Government of the United States was organized and set in motion—Alexander Hamilton became, in effect, Washington's "prime minister." No other Cabinet member in any administration has wielded such influence and power. Hamilton's hand was active in every aspect of government.

After returning to the private practice of law in New York City, Hamilton continued to be President Washington's principal adviser and the administration's number one publicist. After leaving office, Hamilton not only drafted the President's messages to Congress on the state of the Union, but he wrote at length for publication on questions which were agitating the public mind. His "Camillus Letters," 38 in number, in defense of the second treaty with Great Britain, rank with, if not above, his contributions to "The Federalist." In them he discusses and exhausts the question of relations between nations and the constitutionality of treaties, and reconciles the treaty power with the legislative power under the Constitution. It is ironic that these writings were not even referred to during the recent Senate debate on the treaty power.

In a letter to Rufus King, then Minister to Great Britain, Hamilton wrote:

"The object of the legislative power is to prescribe a rule of action for our own Nation, which includes foreigners among us.

"The object of the treaty power is to prescribe a rule of action between two nations, binding on both.

"These objects are essentially different, and in a constitutional sense, cannot interfere.

"This construction reconciles the two powers and assigns them distinguishable spheres of action.

"[Thus] whatever is a proper subject of a compact between nation and nation, may be embraced in a treaty between the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the correspondent organ of a foreign state."

Alexander Hamilton's last great literary service to President Washington and the United States was Washington's Farewell Address, in describing which I would join Vice President John A. Krout of Columbia University who says that if any paper deserved to be called "coauthored" this was it—coauthored by George Washington and Alexander Hamilton.

One cannot briefly describe all of Alexander Hamilton's contributions to the United States. To become familiar with them requires a good deal of reading time. To understand them requires actual study, which means rereading until the whole of it comes into balance, proportion and clear focus.

I hope I have touched upon enough to justify my assertion that Alexander Hamilton was the architect of American Union; and that his understanding of the structure he built will serve us mightily today if we but recur to his own work, passing over what so many others—friends and foes—have said about him.

Before coming down to specific contemporary problems for which Alexander Hamilton has clear solutions, may I bring on two supporting witnesses. The first is the late Prof. Ansel Daniel Morse, of Amherst, who wrote:

"Any just estimate of Hamilton's work must take into the account what he did for the education of the public. His usual method of seeking support was through appeals to the reason of thoughtful and patriotic citizens. In this his success was phenomenal. Friends and foes testified that in the qualities which enable a writer to convince, Hamilton was without a rival. In what he wrote there was rarely a trace of the partisan, never of the demagog. Much of his work was done while questions relating to the Constitution engaged the attention of the public. For the treatment of such themes he had a singular aptitude. The extent of his writings is as remarkable as their solidarity. He wrote, often at considerable length, on every important public question which arose during the Federalist period. The result was a collection of writings which embody the best political thought of the time. Indeed, considering both range and quality, it is scarcely venturesome to say that Hamilton's works exceed in value those of any other American statesman."

The second witness is Chief Judge Ambrose Spencer of the State of New York, who had this to say:

"Alexander Hamilton was the greatest man this country ever produced. I knew him well. I was in situations often to observe and study him. I saw him at the bar and at home. He argued cases before me while I sat as judge on the bench. Webster has done the same. In power of reasoning Hamilton was the equal of Webster; and more than this can be said of no man. In creative power Hamilton was infinitely Webster's superior. • • • It was he, more than any other man, who thought out the Constitution of the United States and the details of the Government of the Union; and, out of the chaos that existed after the Revolution, raised a fabric every part of which is instinct with his thought. I can truly say that hundreds of politicians and statesmen of the day get both the web and the woof of their thoughts from Hamilton's brains. He, more than any other man, did the thinking of the time."

I agree with Judge Spencer that Alexander Hamilton did the thinking of the time. But I would add that Alexander Hamilton has done much of the fundamental thinking for our own time. As a leader, as youthful as he was, Hamilton saw clearly what his followers and supporters saw only dimly.

In fiscal policy the detail of every Hamilton proposal was grounded in honor and integrity. For these are the bases of credit, public or private, in any political system.

In foreign policy the missionary complex was as alien to Alexander Hamilton as the devil is to holy water. To him the long-term interests of the Nation were paramount to every other consideration. With him international prestige was based on national strength, honor, integrity and fair dealing. Anything else was illusory, and therefore dangerous.

To Alexander Hamilton the treaty power of the United States is limited to proper objects of treaty—things over which the United States lacks complete jurisdiction and can only gain such jurisdiction by agreement with the other nation or nations concerned. By that token, objects over which we have complete jurisdiction are outside the limits of the treaty power.

Alexander Hamilton was ever clear on the principle that public officials were bound by the Constitution. Of public officials and their powers he stated:

"If they exceed them it is a treasonable usurpation upon the power and majesty of the people, and by the same rule that they may take away from a single individual the rights he claims under the Constitution, they may erect themselves into perpetual dictators."

Of courts, including the Supreme Court, Hamilton wrote: They "must declare the sense of the law; and if they should be disposed to exercise will instead of judgement, the consequence would equally be the substitution of their pleasure to that of the legislative body."

To Hamilton the exercise of will by a court was outside the scope of judicial power and an invasion of the field of legislative power. To him judges were bound, by their oaths to uphold the Constitution, to exercise judgment only, on the intent of the Constitution and the laws pursuant thereto, in deciding cases at the bar.

Recalling the case in ancient Macedonia where the condemned man appealed from Philip drunk to Philip sober, we must give consideration to situations in which appeals can be taken from the will of a court to its judgment. The historic rules for judgments by judges are clear enough.

To Alexander Hamilton, will was the prerogative of the legislator. But judgment was the sworn duty of the judges. It follows that the exercise of will by a high court results in a spurious edict pretending to be law but not law at all, and not binding on any other judge mindful of his own oath to the Constitution and not to the higher court.

Alexander Hamilton well knew that law long antedated the Constitution. He knew well that law was the eternal sense of justice of the community; that law is because law was, unwritten and unfolding as man moved slowly toward civilization. He knew all too well that spurious edicts of kings, courts and parliaments were struck down when the law was restored.

But Hamilton knew even better that constitutions, once adopted by the people, were fixed permanently, were unalterable by government, or by any branch of Government, legislative, executive or judicial; and were alterable only by the people in the manner they had ordained for the making of such changes.

I suggest that Alexander Hamilton is as alive today as he was when he was laying and clarifying the foundations of the Government of the United States. Many among us are unhappy—some, even bitter—about the direction of the drift in American public affairs. I must confess that I, too, am uneasy in the great constitutional crisis in which we are enmeshed.

Nevertheless, I am confident that if we recur to the hard and clear thinking of Alexander Hamilton, and spurn the sentimentality of nonsensical phrases that abort liberty and the Republic, this Nation will live forever.

Slichter Says "Need To Raise Productivity and Per Capita Income Comes First"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Sumner H. Slichter, the distinguished economist at Harvard University, disagrees with President Eisenhower. In Slichter's opinion, inflation is a secondary problem.

This substantiates the current policies of the Democratic Party in the Congress of the United States that are aimed at an expansion of production, an increase of per capita income, and the removal of color barriers in employment.

The excessive caution of the administration is endangering national defense, and is restricting the economic development of the Nation. Isolated from the mainstream of American thought and action, and depending more and more upon the advice of those who lack confidence in our people's determination and in their capacity for progress, the administration is thinking in terms of holding the line instead of going forward.

As Professor Slichter observes:

The misunderstanding [about inflation] is attributable to the spreading of fallacies by many distinguished businessmen, Government officials, and economists who discuss inflation without having informed themselves of the facts.

In support of the Democratic Party's insistence on the vigorous leadership that reflects our past, and is even more necessary for our future, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the following article titled "Slichter Holds Inflation Is Not Chief Problem," that appeared in the February 8, 1959, edition of the Boston Sunday Herald.

SLICHTER HOLDS INFLATION IS NOT CHIEF PROBLEM—HARVARD ECONOMIST SEES PRODUCTIVITY, JOB RACE BIAS FIRST

(By Juan Cameron)

Is the chief economic problem of the United States today that of halting inflation?

President Eisenhower believes it is, and said so in his recent Economic Report to Congress.

HE DISAGREES

But one of the Nation's eminent economists, Sumner H. Slichter, Lamont University professor at Harvard, contends that inflation is a secondary problem. Far more important, he says, is the need to raise the Nation's productivity and per capita income and to remove color barriers in employment.

In deliberate overstatement to emphasize his point, the economist, in an interview with the Herald last week said:

"The only people who talk about inflation are the President and a few well-heeled businessmen, who by no stretch of the imagination are hurt by rising prices. They are honest, but don't understand conditions in America. They are, in fact, a group of spokesmen without followers."

Slichter does not think inflation is a good thing. But slowly rising prices are infinitely preferable to price controls, restrictive use of the Federal Reserve's credit weapon, or wage controls that might be used uncertainly to control inflation, he argues.

SEES EXAGGERATION

And, he adds, at any rate the evil effects of inflation on people with fixed incomes; on the foundations of our society; on the integrity of our dollar are exaggerated.

Suggestions, such as that put forth by the President in his economic report, that labor must limit its demand for higher wages without increasing productivity correspondingly, Slichter characterizes wishful thinking.

He adds:

"The misunderstanding (about inflation) is attributable to the spreading of fallacies by many distinguished businessmen, Government officials and economists who discuss inflation without having informed themselves of the facts."

Some misunderstandings Slichter points to and refutes:

1. Creeping inflation becomes galloping: No country outside the Iron Curtain in Europe, Canada, and the United States, all of which have had creeping inflation (1 to 2 percent a year), have experienced a faster rate of inflation in the past 10 years. Generally on the contrary, the rise in consumer prices has slowed between 1953 and 1957; as compared to 1948–53. (In the United States, for instance, from 11.1 to 5 percent in these two periods.)

2. Inflation discourages production: When unions are strong, as in the United States, inflation tends to encourage production. Inflation adjusts the price level to rising labor costs that accompany strong unionism. If prices didn't rise, much productive capacity could not be profitably operated.

3. Inflation discourages savings: The opposite is often true. Investment determines the rate of savings. Inflation encourages investment, therefore savings also. Remember investment is the cause, savings the result in this cause-effect relationship.

4. Creeping inflation causes injustice, but does not avert it: It does both. The alternative to creeping inflation is creeping unemployment. Who can say whether creeping unemployment (brought about, for instance, by Federal Reserve credit stringency) is a worse evil than the slow decline in purchasing power of pensions, life insurance, and fixed-dollar assets? (Slichter says these types of income can be adjusted various ways to adopt them to an age of inflation.)

Prices, the labor economist admits, can be stabilized if U.S. unemployment is kept around 5 or 6 percent of the labor force (unemployment was 6.1 percent in December 1958 when 4.1 million people were out of work). But the cost of this unemployment would be about $9 to $14 billion annually in lost gross national product, the Nation's total output of goods and services. This is intolerable, Slichter believes.

Wage and price controls, found by the Nation during wartime to distort production, are both alien and too objectionable in peacetime, the economist adds. (Slichter points out manufacturers find ways to bring out new goods—sport shirts, for example, instead of white shirts—to get away from price ceilings.)

Sovereignty in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the problem of how outer space is to be controlled is facing us today in the 86th Congress. We all agree that the rule of law must prevail if world peace is to be insured. The problem is, what law shall apply to outer space? My good friend, Prof. John C. Cooper of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton and McGill Universities, one of the world's most eminent authorities on air law has written a brilliant article on this topic. I commend its careful study by my colleagues.

SOVEREIGNTY IN SPACE

(By John C. Cooper)

Airpower, as I have long insisted, is the ability of a nation to use controlled flight. Such airpower is indivisible, used at times for civil air transport and at times for military striking force. A major limitation, however, of the Nation's airpower springs from basic political and legal considerations which may be thus summarized:

Every sovereign state in time of peace, and every neutral state in time of war, has the complete, unilateral, and exclusive right to control all foreign movement in its territory, unless such movement is authorized by its prior consent or accepted rules of international law.

The territory of a state is three dimensional, including the airspace above its lands, internal waters, and national marginal seas.

Each state may, therefore, at will determine which, if any, flight instrumentalities of foreign origin, are permitted to enter or pass through its national airspace, either in transit or for the purpose of landing.

The doctrine of freedom of innocent passage, applicable to the passage of foreign vessels through national marginal seas, has never been accepted as part of the law of international flight.

The principles thus stated are implicit in certain treaties to which the United States is a party and in our own statutes. For example, article I, entitled "Sovereignty," of the Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation of 1944, which the United States signed and ratified says "The contracting states recognize that every state has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace above its territory."

And section 1108(a) of the recently adopted Federal Aviation Act of 1958, reenacting similar provisions in the Air Commerce Act of 1926 and the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, reads as follows: "The United States of America is hereby declared to possess and exercise complete and exclusive national sovereignty in the airspace of the United States, including the airspace above all inland waters and the airspace above those portions of the adjacent marginal high seas, bays, and lakes over which by international law or treaty or convention the United States exercises national jurisdiction."

Every state in the international community claims similar airspace sovereignty. But neither the Chicago Convention nor our statutes define airspace, nor do they fix the status of usable space beyond. Obviously the extent of our national airspace will determine, in many cases, the measure of our right to control foreign flight above us. Similarly the extent upward of the national airspace of other states will limit our rights to high-altitude flight. Both of these factors wil affect our ultimate airpower. What is meant by "airspace" is an airpower factor which must not be pushed aside.

INTERNATIONAL USE OF TERM "AIR SPACE"

Article I of the Paris Convention of 1919 on the Regulation of Aerial Navigation signed but not ratified by the United States, said: "The high contracting parties recognize that every power has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the air space above its territory."

The background of this acceptance of a prior existing rule of international law was, briefly, as follows:

From 1911 various states asserted a unilateral right by statute, decree, and other-

wise, to regulate flight and admit or deny aircraft entry above their surface territory.

At the outbreak of World War I, belligerent and neutral states closed their air boundaries.

During the 1919 Paris Peace Conference, an Aeronautical Commission was organized for the purpose, among others, of drafting a convention on international air navigation in time of peace. A draft was submitted by Great Britain which opened with the statement that "The high contracting parties recognize the full and absolute sovereignty of every state over the air above its territories and territorial waters. * * *"

At an early session, the Commission, on the motion of an American delegate, Rear Admiral Knapp, adopted the following principle: "Recognition: (1) of the principle of the full and absolute sovereignty of each State over the air above its territories and territorial waters carrying with it the right of exclusion of foreign aircraft; (2) of the right of each state to impose its jurisdiction over the air above its territory and territorial waters."

The legal subcommittee, in its report to the commission, submitting the text of the eventual convention, referred to the accepted position of the "full and exclusive subjection of the air space to the sovereignty of the territory underlying it," adding that "it is only when the column of air rests upon a res nullius or communis, the sea, that freedom becomes the rule of the air"; and, "It follows that in consequence of its sovereignty the underlying state within the limits of its frontiers may forbid flight over, and a fortiori, landing upon its territory."

The Paris Convention was signed officially in French and Italian as well as in English. The words "air space" in the English text appear in the French version as "espace atmosphérique" and in the Italian as "spazio atmosferico." No distinction was made between air space and atmospheric space as designating the area above the earth's surface characterized by the presence of "the column of air." This area was declared to be under exclusive territorial sovereignty of the subjacent state.

In many articles of this 1919 Paris Convention the flight instrumentalities to be regulated are described as "aircraft" and their nationality is recognized. Certain subsequently adopted annexes, part of the convention itself, provide that the word "aircraft" shall "comprise all machines which can derive support in the atmosphere from reactions of the air." Included in the classes of aircraft were balloons, airships, land planes, and helicopters. The term "atmosphere" was certainly here used as meaning the same area called in article I of the convention "air space," and "air" was the gaseous substance providing aerodynamic lift.

Article I was nothing more than a declaration of the law as it already existed. The article referred to every power as having airspace sovereignty, whether such power was or was not a party to the convention. States had, in fact, by their acts before and during World War I, asserted rights to control flight in the superjacent airspace then used by aircraft. Taking the declaration in article I with the definition of aircraft, it may be argued that the 1919 Paris Convention did nothing more than state customary existing international law recognized by all states accepting, as part of the territory of the state below, those areas of space where sufficient gaseous air was present to lift and support balloons, airships, airplanes, and any other type of flight instrumentality which could derive support in the atmosphere from reactions of the air. Man had not yet conceived of the possibility of any other type of flight instrumentality, nor had he had occasion to regulate areas of space, other than those used by aircraft. Consequently, no customary international law existed as to the use of areas above the airspace, and the airspace meant, as pointed out by the legal subcommission which drafted the convention, the area characterized by a column of air.

Nothing, however, in the Paris Convention limited the territorial sovereignty of a state by the technical ability of that state to control the upper areas of the airspace. This would have resulted in strong states having sovereign rights to great heights and weak states having practically no such rights. The preamble of the Paris Convention recognized that "the establishment of regulations of universal application will be the interest of all." Any construction of the convention providing unequal airspace sovereignty between states based on power to control the superjacent airspace would have been inconsistent with this objective.

As improved types of aircraft were produced, the sovereignty of each state in the international community became equally applicable and effective up to the limits of aerodynamic lift then scientifically available to any state. The existence of this sovereignty was recognized as a right inherent in each state, just as the international community recognizes the sovereign territorial rights of such comparatively weak states as Nepal, which includes Mount Everest within its boundaries, even though Nepal cannot make its laws effective up to the vast heights of the Himalayas.

At the same time the Paris Convention cannot be construed as recognizing state sovereignty upward without limit into space. As said earlier, no flight existed nor was considered in the area beyond the column of air.

The Paris Convention was followed by the less important Ibero-American Convention and the Havana Convention. Both asserted the same doctrine of national airspace sovereignty. Nor did the legal situation otherwise change prior to the outbreak of World War II.

THE CHICAGO CONVENTION

The Chicago Convention of 1944 reasserted in article I practically the same statement as to national airspace sovereignty found in article I of the Paris Convention. The fact that rockets of the V–2 type had been in actual combat use for a few months before the Chicago Convention was drafted was not discussed or taken into consideration. The Chicago Conference recommended a definition for the term aircraft in approximately the language of the Paris Convention Annex, limiting the term to those instrumentalities "which can derive support in the atmosphere from reactions of the air."

Article I of the Chicago convention was, like the Paris sovereignty article, a restatement of existing customary international law. International practice by which each State recognized the right of every other State to control then existing types of flight instrumentalities in areas then used had matured into a principle of law. At the same time, nothing in the Chicago convention sought to limit claims of any individual State to additional sovereignty, nor did the convention directly or indirectly deal with areas of space not then used.

With this background, various definitions of the term air space have been suggested seeking to fix the upper limit of the right of a State to admit or refuse the entry of flight instrumentalities in space above its lands and waters. Since sputnik I was launched, these discussions have left the academic area and become both practical and important. On the height of the upper air space boundary hinges the answer to the question whether the satellites launched during the past year have passed through the sovereign territorial air space of many States. The minimum height above the earth of their orbits have been as follows:

	Miles
Sputnik I	142
Sputnik II	140
Explorer I	224
Vanguard I	404
Explorer III	118
Sputnik III	130
Explorer IV	178

An examination of the suggested definitions is in order. It has been authoritatively stated that the United States has in no way committed itself as to the height of its sovereign claims.

UPPER AIRSPACE BOUNDARY IN CERTAIN PROPOSED DEFINITIONS

(a) Height up to which aircraft (instrumentalities requiring aerodynamic lift) can ascend.

(b) Height at which aerodynamic lift ceases and Kepler force takes over.

(c) Height at which a satellite may be put in orbit.

(d) Height at which atmosphere is found in space.

(e) Height without limit.

(f) Height to which a state may exercise effective control.

PROPOSAL FOR NEW INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

A. Agreements fixing upper airspace boundary

Jurists are not in entire accord as to whether it is possible legally, or practical politically, to enter into new agreements to fix the upper air space boundary. Some believe that a solution such as (a), (b), or (c) above should be reached as to the present extent upward of territorial airspace, and that when this is done, astronomical and other factors prevent any agreement extending sovereignty farther upward into space.

Others feel that nothing in the Chicago Convention, or in general customary international law, or in the physical status of space, prevents an agreement fixing an upper limit of sovereignty for the protection of the state below at heights above those suggested in (a), (b), or (c) proposals have been made for possible agreement to include in the air space of each state areas up to a limit which would include all flight except completely free satellite flight where drag is practically nonexistent, or even higher so as to include areas of guided missile flight, thus preventing belligerent guided missile flight over neutral states without violating the neutrality of the latter. If any such new agreement is to be made, all possible physical data must be considered dealing with flight problems in areas both within and beyond the atmosphere. No new agreement should be made until all needed data as to the areas concerned is available.

B. Agreements for control of high altitude flight without fixing boundary between airspace and outer space

Many jurists are convinced that it is impossible, or at least impractical to agree on any definition of airspace, or to fix an outer boundary by new international agreement. They feel that it is much more practical to leave the legal situation as it stands insofar as the technical legal status of different areas of space is concerned, and to direct efforts toward international understanding as to the conduct of high altitude flight generally, or as to particular flights or categories of flight generally, or as to particular flights or categories of flight instrumentalities. For example, it has been suggested that as an early step, each state about to launch a satellite could register its intent to do so with an international agency and furnish technical data. Agreement might be reached to refrain from using certain instrumentalities, or use them only under international

inspection. If a gradual approach toward international control is thus developed, it is argued that no need exists to fix a definite upper boundary or state sovereignty.

These views have been ably argued. They impel the jurist as well as the statesman to proceed with caution. A mistake made now in fixing an upper airspace boundary might lead to grave future difficulties.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this memorandum has been to state the problem—not to suggest an answer. It is hoped, however, that the analysis of the difficulties may assist in a final policy solution.

A Budget Also More Meaningful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following editorial, "A Budget Also More Meaningful," which appeared in the February 2, 1959, issue of Life magazine:

A BUDGET ALSO MORE MEANINGFUL

Any effort to draw clean political lines around a U.S. budget has one drawback: our budget system, in the words of Dr. Gabriel Hague, is "nearly obsolete and meaningless." The U.S. Government does not even have a budget in the sense that a responsible household, or most State governments, or the British government has a budget. At no point in the fiscal year does Congress, which votes both the income and outgo sides of the Federal ledger, take a bifocal look at what it is doing and adjust either side to the other.

This procedural defect has been a scandal for years. It got a lot of attention from the Hoover Commission. Congress in 1946 experimented with a joint budget committee to set ceilings on spending, but it never established its authority and the budget remains a mere ritual admonition. Already the Democrats have introduced expensive new bills (housing, airports, etc.) without having any plan for where the money is coming from.

Besides aiming at a balance, it is an additional virtue of Eisenhower's 1960 budget that it takes several steps toward checking this nonsense and making the budgetary process more meaningful. First, it urges Congress to have another try at enabling itself to "look at the fiscal situation as a whole." More important, it implements one of the few major budget reforms since the war, which Congress with a great effort of will authorized last year. This is the accrual system of accounting long urged by the Hoover Commission. It means that instead of letting past appropriations pile up as carryovers, Congress can annually reconsider these old appropriations which the executive has not managed (or managed not) to spend. Thus Congress regains some say in the actual rate of Government spending. But a third and still more important reform will be necessary before our system of divided powers is really capable of keeping these huge budgets under rational control.

This reform is the item veto. President Eisenhower, like Presidents Grant, Hayes, Arthur, Taft, Wilson, F. D. Roosevelt, and Truman before him, has repeatedly asked Congress to give him this power. It would enable him to veto the obviously wasteful parts of an appropriation bill without killing the whole. It would stop those logrolling and pork-barrel appropriations of which President Arthur said: "As the bill becomes more objectionable it secures more support." Most State governors enjoy the item veto, as did the Presidency in the Confederate constitution. It is the commonsense way to check a built-in thriftlessness of the democratic process. But because it would jiggle the balance of budgetary power between Congress and the Executive, Congress has refused to consider it seriously. When he came to this recommendation in his state of the Union address to Congress, Ike was greeted by a hearty and rather sinister laugh.

It's easy for a Congressman to make headlines these days by attacking the administration. Members should first look at Congress' own defects. The many technical flaws in our system of government can be corrected, even those most hallowed by tradition. Democracy to stay alive must keep its own procedures up to date. The whole idea of a formal budget dates only from 1921. With modern budgets taking a fifth of the Nation's income, the item veto has become essential to good housekeeping. Any Congressman or Senator who wants to defy his colleagues' laughter and espouse this reform now will earn the Nation's gratitude in the long run.

Greater Phoenix Must Tap the Highlands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include in the RECORD the third of three articles by the Honorable John Murdock, of Arizona, a former Member of the House, in which he sets forth his proposal for the development of the waters of the Little Colorado River in Arizona.

The two previous installments dealt with the details of his proposal for furnishing water to the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations. Mr. Murdock's comprehensive plan also contemplates the supply of municipal water for the rapidly growing city of Phoenix. Under the Murdock plan water would be transported from the Little Colorado River to the Verde River for use by the Greater Phoenix and central Arizona areas by use of the principle of exchange of water, a principle which has long been established in the semiarid regions of the West.

Mr. Murdock's article follows:

GREATER PHOENIX MUST TAP THE HIGHLANDS
(By John R. Murdock)

Phoenix, the capital city of Arizona, is the largest of Arizona cities and growing most rapidly. It is in the heart of the largest agricultural area of Arizona, and its urban water supply is inextricably mixed, physically and legally, with the irrigation waters of the valley. Several times already in recent decades Greater Phoenix has had to go far beyond the limits of the valley to augment its city water supply. At the rate at which the metropolitan area of Phoenix is growing, including more than a half dozen surrounding cities, it could rival Los Angeles or San Francisco in frantically reaching out for a dependable source of water.

Of course, it should do this without totally depriving the 250,000 acres of the richest and most productive lands in the West in our big reclamation project in the valley of all irrigation water. Only to the extent that the farmland is being paved and turned into urban areas may the city transfer irrigation water into its mains for municipal use. And although this transfer is taking place, and will continue to take place, the time will soon come when Greater Phoenix must depend upon distant sources of water in the northern highlands. Her outside sources now, other than the Salt River, are the Verde River and its tributaries which have their heads in northern Arizona not far from the Little Colorado River. And while I believe that much additional water can be developed on the Verde watershed, I believe that some water will have to be imported for the city of Phoenix into the Verde watershed from another river or rivers. The other river or rivers could be the Little Colorado at a point near Williams, or it could be the main Colorado River at a point near Peach Springs and Diamond Creek, or from both. My preference would be the former, if engineering and economic data will permit. My plan for the Little Colorado River project fits in well here.

LONGEST TUNNEL NOT FAVORED

At this point I must most emphatically say that I am not proposing the long tunnel—140-odd miles—from the Grand Canyon to Oak Creek Canyon in the vicinity of Flagstaff which has so often been suggested. Several engineers and planners have proposed such a long and deep tunnel to bring the waters of the Colorado River by gravity to Oak Creek Canyon or into one of the other tributaries of the Verde. I am not here now passing judgment upon such a tunnel, whether I think it feasible or not, but it has been so long and so often discussed that I want it clearly understood such a tunnel is not a part of my proposal. There is little similarity between that proposal and mine except the exchange of the same water involved.

Central Arizona, including Salt River Valley, is the heart of the State, and any water development of great importance to Arizona, must have a vital relationship to the central Arizona area. In an earlier statement I said that the development of my Little Colorado River project would have a vital bearing, not only upon northern Arizona Indians, but upon the entire State as well. That vital connection I want to make clear now in this statement. Naturally I am concerned here with municipal water supply. Of course, the agricultural supply for irrigation is tremendously important, too, but I expect to deal separately with that later.

PHOENIX HAS LESSON IN LOS ANGELES

Phoenix has already spent millions in dollars to bring water from the Verde into her city reservoirs, but such is only a beginning. Greater Phoenix, including more than a half dozen small cities which have heretofore relied upon well water, is now making a heavy pull upon the Verde River, and it is a question how much more water there is in the Verde River watershed for Greater Phoenix. Obviously there could be some more water coming down from the north by development, but to get it is going to require expensive engineering.

Phoenix is already larger now than Los Angeles was five decades ago when Los Angeles reached out hundreds of miles up into the high Sierras to supplement her municipal supplies. Later, Los Angeles spent upward of $200 million for an aqueduct to bring water from the Colorado River to her metropolitan area. This was and is an expensive water supply because every gallon of water taken out of the Colorado River for use by the metropolitan district of Southern California has to be pumped over the mountains,

and thus lifted more than 1,600 feet before it will flow to the west coast cities of southern California.

Of course, one would suppose that Los Angeles would much prefer to get most of its city water, if possible from the melting snow of the high Sierras, and have the water come by gravity, producing power as it comes rather than to get inferior city water from the distant Colorado River and be required to use expensive power to lift it over the mountains. The point I want to make here is, that the growing city of Los Angeles is now and has been to this hour getting most of her good water by gravity from the high mountains, and a smaller part of her less desirable water by an expensive pump-lift from the Colorado River. When Los Angeles, years hence, gets around to using their canal to its full capacity—if it ever does—the cost of its capital investment will have been doubled.

In the case of Greater Phoenix, she may expect to get a part of her augmented water supply from the high mountains of Arizona, but also the chances are good that Phoenix may have to resort to an expensive pump-lift to get main stream Colorado River water. Even so, I believe that Phoenix can get Colorado River water—certainly Little Colorado River water—with less of a pump-lift than the 1600-foot lift required for Los Angeles from the same source.

ARIZONA'S GEOGRAPHY POINTS WAY

Let us study the geography of this highland area on which Phoenix would have to depend. The Verde River reaches far north to the Mogollon Rim in the mountain divide near Williams. Oak Creek originates under the Mogollon Rim. Further west, Sycamore Creek heads near the rim in the mountain divide near Williams. There is, west of the San Francisco Mountains, a comparatively low area where the water divides, some going south into the Sycamore, and some going north into the Little Colorado. I am positive from a study of maps and from numerous inspections by automobile trips and from the air that it would not be anything like an impossible task to transfer water from one of the upper man-made lakes on the Little Colorado—such as I indicated in one of my preceding articles—over this relatively low divide to the Sycamore Canyon watershed. This transfer might be served by a short tunnel, but more than likely could best be done by high pressure pipeline for pumps.

Hold in mind that we are talking now about municipal water and not irrigation water which cannot bear so high a cost. Of course, any water imported by Phoenix would have to come from Arizona's allotment of Colorado River water either as confirmed by court decree or through an exchange of water, as for instance, out of the 50,000 acre-feet furnished Arizona annually under the upper basin States compact.

HOW USE THE ASSURED 50,000 ACRE-FEET?

In my discussion of the Little Colorado River project I could only suggest, and of course not be sure, that the annual 50,000 acre-feet guaranteed to Arizona by the upper basin States would thus be freely assigned to the Indians. Many will say that that is a reckless assumption, when we consider how short Arizona is of water. Perhaps so. It may be recalled that I undertook to say clearly that my Little Colorado project plan almost absolutely depends upon that "block of water"—50,000 acre-feet annually—being assigned to the use of those Indians, and that to prevent its going to them would go far towards wrecking that project. That is the way I view it.

It might occur to some that I made the suggestion that this block of "compact water" go to the Arizona Indians merely to gain good will for the Little Colorado River project through the natural good will of the public for our neglected Indians, and now it may seem that I am making that "safe and sure" quantity of water—50,000 acre-feet annually furnished by the upper basin—an Indian gift in another sense, in deliberately trying to take it away from the Indians to bring it to Phoenix. No, I have not tried to deceive anyone. I really mean that that assured quantity of water can be used in a pump priming sense and this stabilizing supply may be the means of getting some mainstream Colorado River water to Phoenix. If this engineering plan is viewed in all of its prospects there is nothing mystical about it. The same water can serve both purposes even if not actually used in both places.

THE "EXCHANGE" PRINCIPLE

How would that be possible? A clear understanding of my proposal in the Little Colorado project reveals that it will yield to the Indian reservation much more water than it will take out of the main Colorado for those Indians. When the system is complete and functioning the Little Colorado system water will be more than enough for the Indian reservations, and there will be water to spare to be imported by Phoenix as well as return flow from the reservation. The whole arrangement legally would simply involve an exchange of water so that it may serve both purposes. The exchange of water is an old and well known legal and engineering principle in the West, and, desperate as semiarid regions may be for water, they know well how to make its usefulness go further by the exchange principle.

Let it be known that it doesn't matter so much whose water the 50,000 acre-feet annually of the upper basin contribution may be legally, so long as the exchange principle will permit it to be used in perpetuity in Arizona. So much the better if it can be used both ways as here indicated. Let it also be known that without its use for the benefit of the Navajo and Hopi Indians and also its use for the benefit of Greater Phoenix, it cannot be used any other way in the State of Arizona with such maximum results. In fact, it might otherwise go on down the river as the rest of the Colorado River flow is going and not be used as consumed water any place in Arizona. This sobering thought should cool any hotheads who might emphatically declare that the block of 50,000 acre-feet of water should never go to any Indians.

OF WHAT IS THIS WATERSHED CAPABLE?

Those who know the Little Colorado now in the state of nature may not agree with me that it could furnish as much water to the Indian Reservations and also to contribute additionally to Greater Phoenix as I have suggested in this article and in other statements. Even assuming an average constant daily contribution from the main Colorado River totaling 50,000 acre-feet annually, used as intended as a regulatory and pump-priming effect, doubting Thomases may say there would not be that much water in the Little Colorado system.

To answer that objection, I would say that there would be a contributing factor, not heretofore participating, as follows: First, it is a detail of my plan that additional useful water can be developed on sites in the reservations. To illustrate: Of the first 20 deep wells put down 9 or 10 years ago by the Navajos, 19 were producers, and there are other possibilities of increasing the water supply on the reservations by conservation methods. Modern science can bring the Indians rain better than can their rattlesnake messengers to the rain gods. These same conservative methods will also contribute to the useable supply in the Little Colorado River for additional uses.

The Vanishing American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, Americans have fought on many battlefields to preserve their individual freedom. Ironically, over the last 25 years, during peacetime, they have gradually surrendered to the Federal Government more and more of those responsibilities which are inseparable from personal liberty.

This Congress is being urged by powerful pressure groups to enact legislation which would encroach still further on the fundamental right to make our own decisions and to plan our own individual futures. The threat of socialism is grave and real.

My good friend, Mr. Elmer Lindseth, president of the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., accurately evaluated this threat in an outstanding speech recently before the Cleveland Rotary Club. Mr. Lindseth's speech can be classified as "recommended reading" for every citizen concerned about his country's future—and "required reading" for every Member of Congress whose votes will help decide that future.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit Mr. Lindseth's speech:

THE VANISHING AMERICAN

(An address by Elmer L. Lindseth, president, the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., at a luncheon meeting of the Cleveland Rotary Club, Cleveland, Ohio, January 29, 1959)

I

When the United States was born, some 200 years ago, it was dedicated to a new and bold concept of citizenship: freedom of the individual from domination by government. This philosophy became the so-called American way of life, which by any yardstick is an impressive phenomenon.

Materially, it has given us Americans the highest standard of living in the world.

It has given us more years and better health too, with which to enjoy our material wealth. Since 1900, the average American's life expectancy has risen from 47 to 70 years.

It has brought the benefits of education within reach of all. Some 3 million young people are today enrolled in our institutions of higher learning alone.

And, notwithstanding the jibes of some critics both foreign and domestic, it has given us a rich cultural life.

But I need not go on. As a Nation, we have grown rich. And by all indications, we have every intention of growing richer, materially, culturally, and in every other way.

Few of us doubt that we can grow richer. We look back at what has been accomplished in the past 200 years by hard work in an atmosphere of freedom, and we feel that without question we have the formula for unlimited progress. With freedom, we have traveled far; with continued freedom, we can travel a lot farther yet.

II

With continued freedom? Let's think about that for a moment. Are we as free as we think we are?

The fact is that the American, as the world knew him not many years ago, is today a vanishing breed.

The thing he feared most—the thing he tried to prevent in his Constitution—has been happening apace. The bonds he placed on Government have been loosened, one by one, while for the most part he stood idly by. And the American people, who once stood out in sharp relief as individuals, are fast becoming regimented into the mediocrity of collectivism.

Because this process has been gradual, spanning generations, it has largely gone unnoticed. Only when we look back do we see what a tremendous change has taken place in the social, political, and business climate of these United States.

In the beginning, we assigned to Government only its legitimate functions—foreign affairs, national defense, law enforcement, the postal service, to name a few of them.

Today, the Government is not only carrying on all those legitimate functions, but in addition is regulating the economy and engaging in business in a big way, in competition with its own citizens. A whole multitude of Government regulatory bureaus and business agencies has sprung up, playing so prominent a part in the Nation's life that people recognize them by their initials alone: FHA, FPC, TVA, ICC, SEC, NASA, FTC, and so on. Some even bear affectionate nicknames like Fannie Mae.

The Government today has become the most dominant single factor in our economy. It buys, sells, competes, regulates, protects, subsidizes, manufactures, lends, borrows—and, of course, spends on a corresponding scale.

In 1950 the well-known American Communist, Earl Browder, spoke these words: "State capitalism, in substance if not in formal aspects, has progressed farther in America than in Great Britain under the Labor government, despite Britain's nationalization of certain industries, which is a formal stage not yet reached in America. The actual, substantial concentration of the guiding reins of national economy in governmental hands is probably on a higher level in the United States of America."

III

American business is full of success stories, in the Horatio Alger tradition. But ironically enough, the biggest success story in all the annals of American business is the Government's rise to wealth and power in business.

How did this happen?

Many Government-in-business operations began as emergency measures, particularly in wartime. It was tacitly understood that they would be dissolved as soon as the emergency had passed. But many of them were overlooked, and, like Old Man River, "they just keep rollin' along."

In 1933 a special committee of the House of Representatives took a look at Government business enterprises. The committee found 232 of them created during World War I and still operating, although the war had been over for 15 years.

If 232 Government business enterprises sounds like a lot, it is only a drop in the bucket by today's standards. Last year there were over 19,000 commercial and industrial enterprises in the civilian branches of Government alone. And there were at least 2,500 more in the Defense Department.

This the Hoover Commission brought out in a scholarly and monumental work which created quite a stir when it was published some years ago. A citizens committee was formed to press for curtailment of these unnecessary Government activities.

But their efforts and similar efforts have met with very limited success. True, the Inland Waterways Corporation was liquidated around 1950. In the midfifties, 900,000 Government housing units were disposed of, and 27 synthetic rubber plants were sold to private industry. In 1957, the Director of the Federal Budget reported that 137 business operations in the civilian branches of the Government had been closed. Nevertheless, Government's stake in business went on getting bigger, not smaller.

Today, the U.S. Government manufactures surgical, medical, and dental equipment, rope, chain, watches, clocks, fertilizer, paint, and a thousand other commercial products. It operates motion picture studios, coffee roasting plants, sawmills, rum distilleries, furniture repair shops, printing plants, powerplants, and garden nurseries. It is in the aluminum-sweating business, the plastic-laminating business, the cement business, the railroad business, and the wood-preservation business. At military posts all over the country are Government-run supermarkets and department stores selling at tax-subsidized prices, in competition with local retailers.

We obviously have not time to name all the businesses the Government is in. If it is not yet in your business, you—and we—are lucky. But it may be only a matter of time.

Some of you may be in the life insurance business. If so, you are well acquainted with national service life insurance. By 1957, this Government-operated business had written 6½ million life insurance policies with a total face value of $44 billion, one-sixth of all ordinary life insurance in force in the country.

This vast Government insurance business exhibits all the bad features of virtually every Government business enterprise. It pays no tax on property or income, leaving the entire taxload to be carried by citizens who for the most part are not its customers. It taxes these same citizens again for direct subsidies. And because of these financial advantages it is able to undersell private business and thus weaken our free enterprise economy through unfair competition.

Its administration requires a vast number of civil servants in Washington and throughout the Nation, who become entrenched in their jobs and effectively resist any effort to displace them. It develops a core of friends and supporters in Congress who are able to perpetuate its existence by log rolling and trading votes with other legislators, in return for support of their pet projects.

Thus it lives—and grows—and prospers.

In 1932, just a quarter of a century ago, two-thirds of all tax dollars went to local and State governments, and one-third to the Federal Government. Today that proportion is reversed. The Federal Government now gets 2 tax dollars out of every 3. And I hardly need add that the total number of tax dollars is vastly greater today than it was in 1932.

Competent economists say a free society is in trouble when 20 to 25 percent of its wealth goes to government in taxes. Today, our various levels of government—local, State, and Federal—take more than 30 percent of the wealth we create. One in every six employed persons in America today works for the Federal, State, or local government.

What does this mean in plain language? It means that we—you and I and our fellow Americans—have abdicated to government the responsibility for controlling almost one-third of this country's total income. If we think we can throw away that much responsibility without losing some of our freedom, we are sadly deluding ourselves.

IV

All these pieces fit into a pattern, the name of which is an ugly word: socialism.

Repeatedly, through surveys and public opinion polls, Americans have stated they want no part of socialism. When a socialist government came into power in Britain, we shook our heads sadly at the folly of the British. When that same government was defeated, we told ourselves that the British had finally regained their senses.

Yet all the while we were buying socialism for ourselves, piece by piece.

This is certainly a paradoxical state of affairs. But it is not particularly astonishing, because it could have been predicted. In fact, it has been predicted by Socialists themselves, who played a prominent part in bringing it about. They knew us better than we knew ourselves.

The Fabian Society in England became well known for its philosophy of gradualism. The society was founded in 1883 by a group of British intellectuals, and took its name from the Roman general Fabius, who made some notable conquests by avoiding major battles. His method was to isolate small parts of the enemy's forces and wipe them out, one at a time.

That's the method the Fabians used in putting socialism over in Britain. They were smart enough to see that the Marxists, with their "all-or-nothing" approach, would get nowhere. But they had the shrewd idea that people would buy so-called welfare schemes, one by one, until they wound up with a Socialist society.

It took the Fabians a long time in Britain—from 1883 to 1945—but they succeeded.

It is already well on its way, in part because we have our Fabians here too, using the same methods that worked so well in Britain. The prominent American Socialist Stephen Raushenbush, advocated "encroaching control" in the New York Leader in 1927. He urged Socialists to get jobs in the Government; to work toward a program of Government ownership of electric power; to work for political control and management of all key industries.

Another well-known American Socialist, Norman Thomas, said this in 1940: "The people of America will never buy socialism in one package. But they will buy TVA, social security, compulsory health insurance, Federal aid to education, and all the others, one at a time." The language is his.

Those are the key words: "one at a time." No matter how loudly we Americans may protest that we want no truck with socialism, we are today buying socialism by that typically American method, the installment plan. The end result, unless we do something about it, inevitably will be outright ownership—except that rather than our owning socialism, socialism will own us.

V

Let's look for a moment at a single case history, a classic example of how a socialistic measure, once it gets its foot in the door, starts taking over the entire household. This is the electric power business. I use this example, first, because I am in the business and know something about it at first hand; and second, because the power industry is so fundamental to our economy that it is a prime target of Socialists everywhere in the world.

In the early decades of this century, with the growth of the conservation movement in the West, a number of Government dams were erected for irrigation and flood control purposes. Rather than waste the water power available at these dams, the Government installed generators and began the incidental production of electric power.

But in 1933, with the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the picture took on a different aspect. True enough, the TVA Act specified that the dams on the Tennessee River were for navigation, irrigation, and flood control, and any electric power produced was to be incidental. But those who nurtured the TVA had their own definition of the word "incidental." Soon TVA assumed the role of sole supplier of electric power to the surrounding territory, and achieved the complete elimination of all

investor-owned power companies in the area.

This was accepted by the people in the valley, because TVA electric bills were low. Naturally they were low, and still are. TVA pays no Federal taxes at all, and only one-third as much in local taxes as a privately owned power company would pay. It pays no interest on money loaned to it from the Federal Treasury, and returns to the Treasury virtually none of these borrowed funds. Thus relieved of three of the biggest cost items on taxpaying power companies' books, it can well afford to price its power below theirs.

It wasn't long, either, before TVA began building coal-burning generating plants. By this time the word "incidental" had lost all meaning.

Today, 25 years after TVA's birth, more than four-fifths of its total investment is in electric power facilities. It is the Nation's largest electric power producer, generating almost two-thirds of its power in coal-burning plants. Estimates of how much tax income has been lost through TVA vary between one-quarter and one-half billion dollars. Total investment of taxpayers' money in TVA as of June 30, 1958, is just under $2 billion. To date, the interest payments alone that TVA has escaped paying to the Federal Treasury total some $240 million. And it avoids taxes of $55 million a year.

We Ohioans, however, lose more than our share of the amounts paid out directly to TVA. The tax on electric power must be collected from somebody, and since TVA customers are exempt, the entire burden falls on the customers of taxpaying utilities—you and me. Our taxes are thus higher than they otherwise would be. Further, untaxed electric power is a drawing-card for industry, especially those companies whose power usage is high. Many an industry which might otherwise have located in Ohio, creating jobs and paying taxes here, has gone to Tennessee to take advantage of the low-priced power that we help to subsidize.

It would seem that TVA has already expanded far beyond any proper place it might have in the economy, and become a liability rather than an asset. Yet every session of Congress sees bills introduced by the backers of so-called public power which seek still further to expand the TVA empire. A typical bill, S. 1869, introduced at the last session, had provisions that would remove TVA from the limited budgetary control Congress still has over it and would give it virtually unlimited spending rights. It would authorize TVA to spread over another 25,000 square miles of adjacent territory, an area greater than the combined areas of Delaware, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Rhode Island. Similar bills can be expected to be introduced during the present session. Most Americans are never even aware of them. The President's so-called balanced budget is in part predicated on passage of a TVA revenue bond bill which would remove TVA spending from the Federal budget and from congressional control.

TVA is the biggest Federal power project, but by no means the only one. Prominent among the others are the Southwest Power Administration in Arkansas and Texas; the Southeastern Power Administration, in Georgia and North and South Carolina; and the Bonneville Power Administration in the Pacific Northwest.

All told, Federal power installations supply power for one-fifth of the population of this country. This means that one American in five receives tax-free power, at the expense of the other four. Of revenues received by tax-paying electric utility companies, about 25 cents out of every dollar goes to the various levels of government in taxes. Customers of such companies comprise four-fifths of American citizens, who pay higher taxes in order that a privileged one-fifth may obtain power subsidized from the Public Treasury.

When government power expands, so does this privileged class of customers expand, and the demand on those who pay the subsidy grows heavier. Thus, whenever public power wins—you lose. Whenever public power wins, we move closer to the complete socialization of a major industry already one-fifth socialized.

VI

But we need not go outside our own State for examples of government in the power business. There are 102 tax-free municipal power systems in Ohio alone. In fact, we need not go outside our own city. The municipal electric light plant in Cleveland is government power on a substantial, though local, scale. Fewer customers are involved, and lesser amounts of money than in the TVA for example. But the principle is precisely the same.

The municipal light plant competes directly with the Illuminating Co. for customers and business. However, it pays no taxes of any kind, while the Illuminating Co. must of necessity charge its customers enough to cover its taxes as well as its ordinary operating expenses. And those taxes amount to more than 24 cents out of every dollar we take in.

The municipal light plant does render certain services to the city at rates lower than the fully taxed and regulated rates of the Illuminating Co. But such reduced rates are quite inadequate to offset the amount of taxes avoided through Government ownership. The vast bulk of the tax exemption is passed on to private residential, commercial, and industrial customers, many of them your competitors.

The municipal light plant serves about one-fifth of the electric customers in Cleveland—which is just about the same proportion of customers, you may remember, that is served by Federal Government power projects on a nationwide scale. Thus, the same picture holds true in Cleveland as across the country: one-fifth of Cleveland's citizens enjoy tax-free electricity, while the entire utility tax bill is carried by the other four-fifths.

Imagine what would happen if one-fifth of the people of Cleveland were to be exempted from paying the 3-percent sales tax on retail purchases. Suppose this one-fifth were picked at random—say, all those whose names started with the letters J through N. Wouldn't the other four-fifths have a valid basis for charging preference and discrimination? Fair play dictates that they would.

Yet, that's precisely the situation we have in regard to the tax on electric service, except that whether or not you pay it depends not on the first letter of your surname, but on whether you happen to be a customer of the municipal light plant of the Illuminating Co. It's just as inequitable, but the victims of this inequity—80 percent of the citizens of Cleveland—don't seem to be concerned about it. Many of them aren't even aware of it.

Incidentally, there's a simple way to remedy the unequal distribution of taxes on electric service in Cleveland, just as there is nationally. It won't cure the evil of socialistic ownership, but it will end the tax discrimination. It would involve merely raising the rates of the municipal light plant service to private consumers to the level of Illuminating Co. rates, which are commission regulated and include a full component of Federal, State, and local taxes.

The increased income to the municipal light plant—the equivalent of its tax exemption—could then be applied for the benefit of the entire community by the municipal plant reducing rates charged for public uses, such as city buildings, street and traffic lighting, and other similar charges against the general fund; water pumping and sewage disposal; countywide services; and other similar public users, thus reducing correspondingly the tax revenues collected from you and me.

The municipal light plant, with its tax-exempt rates to some private citizens, is only a small slice of the socialism that we in Cleveland have bought. It is all of a piece with national service life insurance, Government-operated factories and truck lines, TVA and all the other 19,000 Government-owned business enterprises which you and I pay to support and which compete with private citizens in at least 142 different fields of business, probably including your own.

VII

We Americans—if our words are to be believed—consider individual freedom as precious as life itself.

Then why, one asks, do we buy this socialism a piece at a time?

I believe it is because we are just plain complacent and apathetic. And our complacency and apathy stem from the fact that we fail to see what is going on before our very eyes.

It is like putting together a jigsaw puzzle. As we fit the pieces of socialism into place, one by one, the picture grows steadily bigger. But we still haven't quite recognized the whole picture for what it is.

Surveys repeatedly have shown that the American people are unaware of the danger they are plunging into. Typical is a 1955 nationwide survey conducted by Opinion Research Corp. In replying to questions about broad issues, those questioned clearly favored free enterprise over Government control. For instance, 72 percent were opposed to Government ownership of industry. Sixty-three percent preferred free competition to price control, to keep prices fair. Seventy-eight percent were against imposing a top limit on salaries. When asked their opinion of the business setup in this country, only 10 percent gave unfavorable replies. And 72 percent said the best way to keep the country prosperous is to let business do its own planning, as against only 19 percent who favored Government planning.

But when the questions narrowed down to specific issues, it was a different story. Nearly half—48 percent—favored farm price supports. Three out of four favored government housing. Five out six—83 percent—favored Federal aid to education. And three out of four favored Government help for small business.

Apparently people don't think of these things as socialism. The Fabians, it seems, were 100 percent right.

Another national public opinion poll, this one by Central Surveys, revealed the extent to which the American people are misinformed and uninformed. One-third of those interviewed had never even heard of TVA; presumably they didn't even know the Government is in the power business at all. What about the two-thirds who had heard of TVA? More than one-half said they approved of TVA. Only one in eight disapproved of TVA. One-third didn't even have an opinion.

This looks like a clear-cut victory for socialized power. But there's more to it than this. Those people who had heard of TVA were asked whether TVA pays taxes at the same rate electric companies do. Only one in three was aware that it does not. More than one-half didn't know.

There are a lot of people—among those who say they favor TVA and other socialistic measures, and among those with no opinion—who would be against these same socialistic measures if they only knew the facts. This was brought out too in the survey, which asked if they thought TVA should pay taxes at the same rate electric companies do. A majority said they thought it

should. Even in the very area which TVA serves with tax-free power, only one in five thought TVA should not pay taxes.

These and other surveys have shown beyond question that the better-informed a man or woman is, the more opposed he or she is to socialism. Obviously, a vigorous campaign to inform the public could work wonders in stimulating active opposition to socialism in the American economy. Once people know the facts, they'll make the right decisions.

VIII

But who is going to see that they get the facts?

George isn't going to—so it's no use saying "let George do it." That's the very philosophy that got us started on the socialistic road in the first place. It's a job for you and me. It's the biggest and most important do-it-yourself project any of us has ever faced.

We do we start?

Right now. The hour is late enough at it is. And on top of that, we are just embarking on the most challenging era in history—an era that promises a lot of changes, including social upheavals. That means that this issue of socialism will intensify, unless we do something about it now.

We are on the threshold of the atomic age, the space age, and the age of automation. A new dimension is being added to international affairs with the emergency of the so-called backward nations. A quarter-century from now, today's world will seem mid-Victorian.

These developments lend a special urgency to the need for decision. We have our choice, but we may not have it much longer. With a rebirth of self-reliance, we can fit these changes into the framework of our free institutions. If we remain apathetic, the new forces in our society will be harnessed to the cause of socialism.

If we want to keep the freedoms we still have, there's a big job for each one of us of informing and enlightening. We can start right here at home. It's a good place to start—one of the most highly industrialized areas in the Nation, and one of the leading educational centers.

What, specifically, can we do, you and I?

Our first job, obviously, is to inform ourselves—and be sure that we keep informed.

Second. Let's inform others. Our audience is everybody—friends, neighbors, employees, chance acquaintances, anybody who will listen. It's later than we think, and government in business is something we should all be taking about, writing about, giving speeches about—using all possible means for getting the facts across.

Third. Let's help the younger generation through our educational institutions. Surveys show that today's young people, if anything, are even more misinformed and uninformed about economic facts than their elders. The schools sorely need all the support and cooperation we can give them.

Fourth. Let's take a more active part in self-government. Let's each support and take part in the political party of his choice. Each of us can join, and provide leadership to, one or more organizations dedicated to opposing creeping socialism. We must take time from our leisure to do this, while we still have leisure.

Fifth. It goes without saying that we should all be sure we are registered as voters, and that we vote. You may be sure that the people who want more socialism are voting. More support at the polls for those candidates who are opposed to socialism would encourage them to keep up the fight. It might even affect the thinking of those politicians who support socialistic measures, not because they believe in them, but because they think that's the way to get elected.

Sixth. Let's resolve to make our views known to our elected representatives. There's no other way in which they can find out what we want them to do.

And, finally, let's make sure we are never guilty ourselves of using Government as a crutch. If the abuse of subsidies is wrong for other people, their abuse is wrong for us. If Government favoritism is wrong when bestowed on some other business, it's equally wrong when it favors our business.

IX

We can never—nor do I think would we want to—get back to the life of colonial days. The world today is a different world, vastly more complex, and it will become more so. But the important principles that should govern our national life have not changed one iota. They are as simple and straightforward today as they were when our country was born. But they stand in need of protection today more than at any time in the past.

Near the outset of this talk I referred to the kind of American that built this great country of ours as a vanishing breed.

He hasn't quite vanished yet, although it's later than we think. However, it's not too late. Let's all pledge ourselves as we enter 1959 to do what we can to bring him back. For if we don't, our 200-year experiment with freedom will have been in vain. And that must not come to pass.

Poison in Your Water—No. 13

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the RECORD an article appearing in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune on February 25, 1958. The article entitled "Payrolls and Pollution," tells how three industrial firms in the Pryor area have agreed to start construction immediately on a plant to eliminate pollution in the Pryor Creek, in Oklahoma.

The article concludes that industry does not need to be a destroyer of nature. Pollution can be eliminated but requires vigorous action. The article is as follows:

PAYROLLS AND POLLUTION

Three industrial firms in the Pryor area—the National Gypsum Co., the Bestwall Gypsum Co., and the John Deere Co.—have agreed to start construction immediately on an aeration treating plant to eliminate pollution in Pryor Creek.

We hope the plant is big enough and effective enough to do the job, for surely the great fish-kills in Fort Gibson Lake, which were apparently set off after rainstorms flushed out Pryor Creek, have been ominous.

Industry does not need to be a destroyer of nature. The dramatic clean-ups that have been enforced on the Raritan River in New Jersey and the Wisconsin River in Wisconsin prove that there are very few industrial plants that cannot treat their wastes in such a way as to render them innocuous to human beings and fish.

Oklahoma's great new lakes have already brought the State millions in tourist spending and will be worth uncounted billions more. Oklahoma also welcomes and needs industrial payrolls. But a payroll can be very expensive if it makes our waters too foul to be enjoyed.

We hope the aeration plant at Pryor demonstrates how payrolls and nature can remain at peace.

A Real Leader Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct attention to the following brief but pithy remarks of the Honorable Carmine G. DeSapio, Democratic national committeeman for the State of New York, as delivered by him on February 14, 1959, to the New York State Democratic dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE CARMINE G. DESAPIO

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, Mrs. Wagner, Mayor Wagner, Arthur Levitt, Mike Prendergast, George DeLuca, Edna Kelly, and distinguished ladies and gentlemen, I wish I could say that this was an evening of celebration which we Democrats might characterize as an opportunity to assess the gains which we have made in the recent past.

But I would deceive no one if I attempted to do so—nor can any of us achieve any valid purpose by pretending that our gains in the State legislature and in Congress last November were not mitigated by the loss of two important State offices and our failure to win two other posts previously held by Republicans.

And any honest attempt to evaluate the results of the 1958 State elections, in terms of the present and future of our party in New York State, must acknowledge the simple fact that, with certain significant exceptions, we did not emerge from those contests as winners.

Often, in the sadness and disappointment of defeat, it is tempting to snatch at the easiest explanation, and even to create rationalizations which may have no validity whatever. This is a natural human failing, and it would be naive for any of us to assume that politicans are immune to it. For even the most sophisticated and most experienced politician may find it difficult to accept disappointment without succumbing to certain emotional pressures—from within, from without, or both—pressures which find expression in hasty or ill-considered actions.

Now it is no secret that there are some people within our party who have reacted to our recent reverses in a manner which does not reflect the traditional resilience of which all of us here tonight are so justly proud.

There are others—let's face it—who also have fallen into the error, or who have been goaded into it, of taking sides over a nonexistent issue. And it is sad to think that our party—or at least certain of our fellow Democrats—may allow themselves to dissipate the strength we need to meet the challenge which we must face during the next 4 years.

And it is sadder still to realize that this squabbling—for it is just that—revolves around a question of semantics which has no practical application.

This question of semantics—about who or what is or is not a liberal, and which threatens to sap so much strength and vitality from our organization—can serve no constructive purpose.

Anyone can call himself a liberal. And almost everyone has at one time or another. To reactionary Republicans Dwight Eisenhower is a liberal. In 1952, Candidate Eisenhower characterized himself as a liberal. In 1958, Eisenhower denounced liberals.

Today, some Republicans will tell you that Nelson Rockefeller is a liberal, although there are others who would disagree with them.

My friends, telling people that you are a liberal doesn't make it so, nor does calling someone otherwise necessarily make him so.

The character and philosophy of a politician or of any public figure is molded and defined by his beliefs, by his principles, and by his actions.

And the character and philosophy of a political party evolves from the record of performance compiled by its members.

By these standards—and they are the only true standards—our Democratic Party is an association of men and women whose political creed is founded upon a concept of public service which has as its only goal the advancement of all of the people through a comprehensive program for social progress.

Our party is a party of and for those who subscribe to this liberal philosophy and who are not afraid to work to achieve it, who understand that political success ultimately depends upon the will of the majority of the people, and who do not interpret a temporary setback from unique causes as a manifestation of irreparable tragedy. Indeed, our country is a free nation, of and for those who subscribe to the principle of a two-party system of government.

Yes, there is a Republican Governor in Albany for the simple reason that the people of our State elected him. No crevices have opened in the earth. The structure of democracy has not come crashing down upon our heads. Armageddon has not arrived. The world has not come to an end.

But the cause of liberalism, the cause of progress, will not be advanced by disunity. Those who work divisively within our party prevent themselves from contributing to the tasks and problems which do face us. Not the least among these tasks is the election of a Democratic President in 1960. And not the least among the problems which confront us are the awesome increase in unemployment and the onerous and burdensome taxes which are contemplated for our wage earners.

These are the important issues, not the synthetic issues created by those who claim to have a monopoly on liberalism, but whose disruptive tactics served rather the cause of reaction. It may be considered by some to be fashionable to resort to name calling and characterization, but this does incalculable disservice to our party, our country, and to the very liberalism which they pretend to represent.

All of us—all of us who are dedicated to a liberal philosophy of government—must work together during the ensuing years with the legislature, within our own political organization, with responsible civic groups, and with the people, to uphold and to strengthen the tradition of liberal democracy to which every Democrat is heir.

If we can influence the course of progress in our State in the face of a Republican administration—and I believe that we can—then we will earn and we will deserve the friendship and the respect of the people. And their friendship, their respect, and their support will enable us, as a party, as their party, to reassume the titular, as well as the moral, responsibility for political leadership in our State.

Let us make that our goal. Let us work; let us build; let us gain new strength, new confidence, new inspiration, and new unity from that challenge.

Let us prove to the people that we are good losers, and that, even as losers, we are still strong leaders. And let us build upon the foundation of a forthright acceptance of adversity, a new, a greater and, ultimately, a more meaningful promise and prospect of victory.

Thank you very much.

New England Manufacturers Are Concerned About High Taxes and Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the New England Council has taken a sample of the sentiments entertained by manufacturers in the New England area. Because the findings reflect not only local but national concerns as well, I am submitting them to the RECORD:

NEW ENGLAND MANUFACTURERS ARE CONCERNED ABOUT HIGH TAXES AND DEBT

BOSTON.—Higher taxes and increasing Government debt head the list of New England's most serious current problems, according to a survey of the region's manufacturers announced today by the New England Council.

The study by the economic development organization pinpointed the tax situation and the growing debt at all levels of government—Federal, State, and local.

Manufacturers in the six States also are concerned about the cost of transporting some raw materials into the region and moving finished goods to other sections of the country because of the distance from major markets.

Concern over some labor unions and productivity by employees also were mentioned frequently in the survey.

Many manufacturers replying to the New England Council questionnaire also were self-critical. They deplored the lack of interest by businessmen in politics and mentioned the need for more aggressive management that would be alert to existing opportunities.

One northern New England company official said, "In this section of the region our problem is transportation and the import duties into Canada. Winter weather is a slowing factor but there isn't much we can do about that."

Among other quotes on New England's problems were: "Waste in government through expenditures we cannot afford.

"Lack of diversification of industry in some areas.

"Failure to appreciate that the greatest good for all is not dispensed by the Government but must be provided by the productivity and initiative of individuals.

"Need qualified politicians to halt the waste of taxpayers' dollars and who are interested in the future welfare of the region to counteract the trend toward socialism by a tendency to mass vote."

The New England manufacturers were equally vocal with their suggestions for helping to solve or alleviate the region's problems.

They called for:

"Less dependency upon Government and outside factors, and more ingenuity. There is little wrong with business which cannot be solved by a vigorous attack and more individual initiative.

"An educational program to teach our people to understand and appreciate New England.

"A reduction of Government spending and taxing, and recognition by the politicians that there can be no jobs without successful and profitable industries.

"Establishment of a conservative party with sincere men from both present parties, to speak up and espouse the old New England virtues of thrift and good government.

"Greater cooperation by business, labor and government to help halt inflation.

"A campaign for more citizens to vote, and to study what they are voting for.

"More interest by business in economic and political activities.

"Greater economy by legislators and a more active role by competent businessmen and women in local and State politics."

In the NEC survey, the responding manufacturers said that many of their problems were national in nature and not merely local. None expressed the least desire to move elsewhere and many pointed out that "New England still is the ideal part of the United States in which to live, work, and vacation."

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I have received many, many letters in the past few weeks from my constituents urging that the Congress not delay action on legislation to grant statehood to Hawaii. It is my personal view that Hawaii has been more than patient in its long quest for statehood. When the measure to confer statehood to Hawaii comes before the House, I intend to vote for it.

A radio commentary on the subject by W. Earl Hall, the distinguished and learned editor of the Globe Gazette of Mason City, Iowa, which appeared in the Globe Gazette, one of the leading newspapers of northern Iowa, on February 9, states the view, I believe, of the majority of Iowans in the most cogent terms. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit this very forceful article for the RECORD:

HAWAII, LAND OF INFINITE PATIENCE

If there's any reason, or semblance of reason, for further delay in admitting the Territory of Hawaii into the Union as its 50th State, it has been most effectively concealed It has escaped the eyes and ears of all fair-minded Americans known to me.

Everything else—and especially God—has been extremely kind to the cluster of islands known as Crossroads of the Pacific. Of the more than 60 lands I've visited in my world travels, Hawaii comes nearest to measuring up to all advance notices.

Only Uncle Sam in this one broken pledge has dealt inconsiderately with the islands, except for that act of infamy set down in world history as Pearl Harbor. For at least a dozen years or so, Congress has been playing what can only be described as the old shell game with the islanders.

Time after time an unconditional pledge has been included in the two party platforms to admit both Hawaii and Alaska to statehood. Presidential nominees have promised it in their campaigns and Presidents have pleaded for it in their messages to Congress. Public opinion polls have unfailingly disclosed an overwhelming favor for admitting both.

Last year for reasons which never made sense, Alaska was given statehood but the door was slammed shut in Hawaii's face. Here I should explain that the action on Alaska had the islanders' fullest blessing despite the affront to Hawaii implicit in the matter.

There was, and is, every good reason that the situation will be righted in the present Congress. But if I were an Hawaiian and had

seen the rug pulled out from under me as often as the island dwellers have, I'd be loath to take anything for granted. Consider this record:

The proposal to accord statehood to Hawaii has been passed by the House of Representatives in Washington three times. The first time, in 1947, it was by a margin of 196 to 133. The Senate committee decided to conduct further investigation. The bill never got to President Truman for his signature.

In March of 1950 the House repeated its approval, this time by the convincing vote of 262 to 110. After public hearings the Senate Committee on Interior Affairs reported favorably on the bill. This was in June and again the Senate failed to act on it before adjournment.

Third passage in the lower branch of Congress took place on March 10, 1953. This time the margin was 274 to 138. The Senate combined the Hawaii and Alaska statehood measures and on April 1, 1954, passed the Hawaii-Alaska enabling act, 58 to 28. But, believe it or not, Congress adjourned before the House could act on the combined statehood measure.

Instead of taking up where the previous session had left off, the 84th Congress pretty much let the statehood matter lie dormant. The House on May 10, 1955, voted (218 to 170) to recommit the Hawaii-Alaska bill to the body's Committee on Interior Affairs.

It was in the 85th Congress, of course, that Alaskan statehood was authorized, 208 to 166 in the House, 64 to 20 in the Senate. The appropriate committees in both Houses, after prolonged hearings, again issued favorable reports on statehood for Hawaii and strongly recommended passage of the bill. But nothing happened.

This Congress, the 86th, has the proposal for Hawaiian statehood before it. There is an assumption by the press and by the public that passage of the legislation is assured, that only the time of the action is in doubt. Only occasionally does one find buried deep in some political commentary a hint that Southern opposition to another State may jeopardize passage of the measure.

Alaska, of course, is just one more argument for prompt admission of Hawaii to the Union. The course with respect to the 49th State has been enthusiastically applauded by the American public. On the light side we've been glad to have a State bigger than Texas. It just isn't to be doubted that Hawaii's admittance as our 50th State would be joyfully received.

Our most northerly State has discovered that statehood isn't an unmixed blessing. For one thing, its citizens—there are 215,000 of them—are having to pick up a good many checks that formerly could be passed on to paternal Washington. Would this happen in the case of Hawaii? Probably not because Hawaii, with 2½ times as much population, is far further along in its industrial, political, and educational development.

Just why should the 575,000 people in Hawaii want statehood?

That they do, of course, has been demonstrated numerous times. Every Delegate sent to Washington since 1900 has been ardently prostatehood. In a plebiscite back in 1940, 67 percent of those voting favored statehood. In 1949 a State constitution was drafted for ratification the following year, 3 to 1 popular vote. In February 1954, 116,000 islanders signed a petition for statehood. It was addressed to the U.S. Senate.

Now for the answer to my question, "Why is statehood wanted?" I draw on a statement in a giant edition of the Honolulu Advertiser prepared for Congress and titled "The Case of Hawaii Statehood:"

"Hawaii's people have fulfilled the obligations of citizenship for more than half a century without enjoying all the privileges. "They pay taxes as residents of the States do and serve on battlefronts equally, but have no voice in either tax or draft legislation. Taxation without representation violates a basic American precept.

"Statehood for Hawaii will mean—

"1. Full voting representation in Congress.

"2. The right to vote for President.

"3. The right to elect its State officials.

"4. The right to broad lawmaking by its legislature.

"5. The right to choose its own judges.

"6. The right to eliminate overlapping Federal-local authority.

"7. The right to equal share in Federal grants.

"8. The right to a voice in amending the Constitution.

And all these rights will be irrevocable."

Now let's reverse the question: "Why, aside from the fact that we've promised it many times, does the United States need Hawaii as a State?"

The reasons for this are even more numerous and extended than the reasons why the Territory of Hawaii would like to become the State of Hawaii.

Foremost is the fact that Hawaii has an economy of proved soundness. Its gross income approaches $2 billion a year. In the years since Hawaii became a Territory of the United States (at its request, incidentally), the islanders have paid more than $2.3 billion in Federal taxes.

Sugar last year was a $147 million crop. Pineapples, second in importance, brought $110 million. A record total of 168,000 travelers, a great majority of them from the mainland, spent $77 million in Hawaii. Honolulu's airport ranked as America's 10th busiest and 1,300 overseas ships dropped anchor in the Honolulu Harbor.

Different from the situation in Alaska, Hawaii has a highly developed system of public schools, with attendance well above the national average. Again different from Alaska, there are modern roads everywhere, water systems, police and fire departments, parks, museums, symphony orchestras, community theater, libraries and numerous churches, 250 on Oahu alone.

Opponents of statehood have resorted to three basic arguments:

1. Distance and noncontiguity.
2. Small population.
3. Doubts about loyalty.

Alaska has shattered the distance argument; both Alaska and California knocked the noncontiguity objection into a cocked hat.

It's true that the individual Hawaiian voter would have a much greater voice than the average New Yorker or Californian in the selection of a U.S. Senator. But it's likewise true that one Nevada voter would have two or three times greater voice than the average Hawaiian. In the case of Alaska, the disparity would be much greater.

Hawaii's record in World War II and the Korean police action proved that its people were as loyal and patriotic as any other section of the entire United States. Though made up of many races, there was no case of espionage or treason during the war years. Hawaiians fought with distinction on every battlefront.

The average citizen of Hawaii is anything but proud of that imported character Harry Bridges, head of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. He didn't land in Hawaii because he was invited there by the Hawaiians, any more than he settled down on California by invitation of rank-and-file Californians.

There is no denying that Bridges and his union wield a large influence over the island economy. But the same can be said of his influence over the Pacific coast's economy. He must be dealt with by Federal law, or maybe State law. But in its Territorial status Hawaii has been without power to trim his wings.

So far as Communist infiltration is concerned, Hawaii has passed every test. Congressional committees, Government departments, military leaders, and others have marked her "A" for loyalty to America.

Statehood for Hawaii would be an example for the world of American democracy in action. As the crossroads of the Pacific, Hawaii is a showcase for the Orient and for many other uncommitted peoples of the world. Statehood would make Hawaii a center where Pacific peoples could study American traditions.

For almost as long as Hawaii has been ours by volunteer annexation, the islands have been our principal military bastion in the Pacific. Presently there are five major commands there. Statehood would be a stabilizing influence in that regard.

The people of Hawaii have proved their liking for the United States. They asked for annexation as a Territory and there was at least the implicit promise on our part that statehood would one day be forthcoming.

Our Government was wholly right in its insistence that Hawaii demonstrate its capacity for assuming the obligations and responsibilities of a commonwealth in our family of States. That test has been applied more rigorously than in the case of any Territory ever admitted to the Union, it might be added.

The people of Hawaii are deeply desirous of statehood. The people of the United States have demonstrated many times and in many ways that they want Hawaii admitted to statehood. It remains only for Congress to translate these two demonstrated desires into reality—and the sooner the better.

Someone Must Pay the Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Evening Herald, Rock Hill, S.C., of February 10, 1959:

SOMEONE MUST PAY THE BILL

President Eisenhower sent a delicately balanced budget proposal to Congress last month. He warned that the utmost care would be needed to keep the budget from edging upward into the red.

Congress has paid about as much attention to the warning as a youngster who's told not to eat that bar of candy before supper.

In a little more than 24 hours last week, the U.S. Senate topped Eisenhower's budget proposals by $1,250 million.

The Senate pushed through an omnibus housing bill calling for $2,675 million—or more than a billion dollars above Ike's budget request.

The next day, the Senate came up with a $465 million item for airport construction, to be spread over 4 years. Ike had proposed $200 million.

If its action on these two items is an indication of the spending mood of the Senate this year, then we are headed for a mighty big budget—one that will far exceed our income.

And if that happens, the value of your savings, insurance, social security, and pay-

check will go down, because dollars will lose just a bit more of their worth.

So far, the Senate seems to be in no mood to observe still another Eisenhower request—a to-the-point challenge that Congress provide higher taxes in every spending bill that would unbalance the budget.

Congressmen seem to find it important to increase spending—but they dodge the inescapable need to increase taxes as the spending goes up.

Is that responsible lawmaking?

There's No Scholarship Surplus: It's a Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 1959, I introduced H.R. 4220 to provide for a college scholarship program.

In this connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial by Dr. Charles A. Bucher, professor of education at New York University. Dr. Bucher's editorial appeared in the November 15, 1958, issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

THERE'S NO SCHOLARSHIP SURPLUS: IT'S A SHORTAGE

(By Charles A. Bucher)

A New York City newspaper recently published an article entitled "Scholarships Go Begging." The piece played up the fact that a scholarship at Pembroke College was lying idle. This Harriet Rogers Jewett Scholarship is available to an upright needy girl who doesn't smoke. The grant, established in 1932, consists of a $1,000 endowment, yielding about $25 per year. Nevertheless Pembroke received hundreds of inquiries from hopeful applicants all over the country.

Deceptive headlines I have gleaned from the Nation's newspapers during the past 12 months read: "Scholarships Wither on the Vine," "Financial Aid Going to Waste," "More Scholarships Not Needed," "Students Ignore Financial Help," "College Education for Free." These journalistic forays into the unknown do not reflect the true picture. I surveyed 135 donors of financial help: colleges, war-service groups, labor organizations, foundations, state governments, benevolent societies and industrial firms. They gave the same answer: scholarships do not go unclaimed.

There are a few restricted scholarships which lie idle. For example, Rutgers University awards a scholarship to a poultry-husbandry major from a county in New Jersey where the poultry business is rapidly disintegrating because of Western competition. It is understandable that no youngster in that area is interested in this occupation.

Then, there is the Lithopolis Scholarship for boys and girls who live in the town of Lithopolis, Ohio (population 350); a fund maintained by a small New England town for the improvement and education of young ladies who have seen better days; and an award that goes to a person with the name of Randolph who desires to study gunsmithing.

The much-publicized, out-of-focus scholarship picture builds up false hopes in the minds of many high-school students aspiring to a sheepskin. When they find out they have been deceived by some misinformed writer, drastic changes have to be made in their college plans. Dean W. J. Bender, of Harvard, who knows the accurate picture, pointed out that newspapers were doing "a grave disservice to American higher education." He continued, "It simply is not true that lots of scholarships lie idle * * * I know of no college in the country which has any significant number of scholarship funds which are not being used * * *."

Instead of scholarships going begging, there is a need for more. John S. Hafer, dean of admissions at Syracuse University, writes, "This year our scholarship applications increased by approximately 30 percent, so that we received a total of 1,800 scholarship candidates for approximately 275 scholarships. To date, we have overcommitted our funds by approximately $12,000 and still have 210 extremely worthy candidates who wish to attend the university if financial assistance is given." Colleges in the North and South paint a similar picture.

Scholarships do not go begging. Instead, they are needed in greater numbers if we are to provide college education for all those who can qualify for it.

Should Stop Selling Savings Bonds Until Inflation Halted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an interesting resolution submitted by Mr. R. W. Robbins, Pratt, Kans., at the American National Cattlemen's convention, Omaha, Nebr., assembled on January 17, 1959:

The thrifty and patriotic citizens who own the vast bulk of the $42 billion of U.S. savings bonds outstanding are entitled to protection of the value of the principal and interest of their investment in Government bonds.

So far the Government has failed to give them that protection, and those who have held these bonds since the early offering years have lost over 50 percent of their savings in terms of buying power. This record stands as a shocking indictment of the fiscal integrity of our Government.

If this confiscation of savings by inflation continues, these bond owners, who qualify as the most patriotic of our citizens and also as the segment of our citizenry who can least afford to lose will be financially wiped out to the degree they have trusted their Government.

Accordingly we propose that the Government face up to this problem now, and that it take immediate steps to give these frugal and trusting creditors a square deal.

To this end we propose either of the following alternatives:

(1) That the sale of savings bonds be halted until the President has achieved at least a 2-year period of stability in the cost of living, or

(2) That savings bonds issued from February 1 on carry an escalator clause on both principal and interest, giving the owner a guaranteed increase of both interest and principal proportionate to further increases in the cost of living.

As citizens deeply interested in the economic and political independence of the people of America, we contend that further temporizing with this grave injustice cannot be tolerated.

We urge that President Eisenhower, in his current stand against reckless and inflationary spending, recognize the significance of this evil, and that he make its correction a project for immediate action. We suggest that such prompt action on his part would do much to halt the "flight from the dollar" that is so apparent in the stock exchanges and trading markets of the Nation.

Address of Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson Before Texas State Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last the senior Senator from Texas, Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, made a memorable address at the luncheon meeting of the Texas State Society.

Honored at the luncheon were their Excellencies, the Ambassador from Spain, the Ambassador from France and the Ambassador from Mexico, and members of their families.

Senator JOHNSON'S speech was such a splendid contribution to our understandstanding and good relations with these countries that I am asking leave to have it printed here:

This is a pleasant occasion and, in my opinion, a significant one as well.

As a longtime member of the Texas State Society, I am most pleased to be here. And to our honored guests I would say, sincerely and from the heart: Welcome, our friends from Mexico; welcome, our friends from France; welcome, our friends from Spain.

As the official represenatives in America of three great nations whose flags once floated over the land of Texas, I want you to know we are happy you are here to break bread with us and to enjoy a period of friendly companionship on this Sabbath Day.

You are gracious to have come. You are triply welcome.

In honor of this occasion, our program committee asked that I speak today on "Our Spanish, French, and Mexican Heritage."

It says something for the character of our State that such a topic should be assigned to a man named JOHNSON.

If we are some day privileged to honor our considérable debt to the British—who built our State capital and developed much of our West—an Irishman such as BOB CASEY will probably be handed the speaking assignment.

There is to me something deeply moving and deeply meaningful in the fact that you of Mexico and France and Spain should meet with us of Texas in the Capital City of the United States.

It is a long way, in time and in distance, from the Texas in which I grew up to the great city in which we find ourselves today. Texas is a State where many, many place names and many, many person names may be traced back to the heritage that came down from France and Spain and Mexico—all powers in the world of 1959.

And this city of Washington—not so very many years ago a fever-ridden village on the banks of the Potomac—has become a place where men and women cope daily with problems in the successful solution of which

the free people of all the world have a vital interest.

We owe much to the heritage of our past. Yet, I cannot today speak of our heritage in the past tense. Nor can I speak of it in the sense of a one-way debt.

As Spain and France and Mexico each meant much to Texas in the past, so also did Texas mean much to the national experience of each of those nations.

The lure of Texas—the dream of the seven cities of gold on the Texas prairies—did much to stimulate in both Spain and France the force of their periods of great vigor and adventure and strength.

Texas, in centuries past, was for men of many nations a new horizon of hope and promise and opportunity. Today it is my strong conviction that we are returning on the cycle of history to such a time again.

Coronado, Cabeza de Vaca, DeSoto, LaSalle, and others who opened Texas were unaware that their explorations had scarcely penetrated the vastness of the American West—and that four centuries later we are only now coming to the time when the potential of the American West and of Mexico can be fulfilled.

The demands of our century leave us with no position but to build in the West a new capital of opportunity and strength for free men.

Our position today is comparable to that of the pioneers of our own country, who came into a wilderness brooding not upon the dangers they faced but joyously contemplating the opportunities they saw on the other side of danger.

With freedom as their guide and faith in the future as the force that impelled them constantly onward, those pioneers conquered the wilderness. They beat down the dangers. They embraced the opportunities. Time may have obsured our memory of these facts. But the facts remain unchanged.

We should build monuments to the past—but they should be monuments which recapture the values of the past and focus them upon the realities of the present.

One of these monuments could be the Big Bend National Park. When men first dreamed of this park, they thought of it as an international reservation where the people of Mexico and the United States could mingle freely—enjoying in common the rich beauties of the land.

I would hope that dream could be revived. I would hope that the park could lie on both sides of the border—as a symbol that our border is in territory only and not in friendship and good will.

It would be a potent force in advancing the Western Hemispheric community.

The hope of our hemisphere and the hope of free men everywhere is this: That we may have the wisdom to see in many lands greater promise than now meets the eye.

Spain, France, and Mexico were old before Texas was known. All had achieved greatness before our own Nation came into being. But today in those countries—and many more—there is a new surge of confidence and life and zest and determination. We, as Americans, are challenged to match it. In that thought is the special pride of this gathering today.

We from Texas realize ours is a young State and a strong State. A State now emerging into the fulfillment of a great promise.

We realize even more that these lands from whence came our origins are now once again young with us, and that the world is young together.

We are moving to a new world. Not new on the maps, but new in men's minds and lives and dreams.

We are hastening to the day when we shall together cross the plains of the future to seek, and I believe find, treasures greater than the fabled cities of gold. Our heritage is not of the past. Rather, it is a common inheritance of a common future, a future of peace, a future of freedom, a future of opportunities unlimited.

This new era—and we are already beyond the threshold—can be, will be, an era of new and higher standards, of new and greater accomplishments, of new and wider potentials.

My friends, fellow Texans, and honored guests, we are fortunate to be living at the beginning of such an age as the one now before us. Our thoughts, our decisions, our actions, can shape the destiny of men for all time to come. This is the challenge. And there is the opportunity.

I like to think of the answer that my friend and truly great American, Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, gave recently when a reporter asked him what was the most interesting time he had known during his 92 years of life.

"Why," said Senator GREEN, "it's right now." Let this wise man's words speak for all of us.

To the Ambassadors who are our guests, I would say on behalf of all Texas that, next to being freemen and Americans, Texans are most proud of their traditions of character.

We thank you for the pride of the Spanish, for the love of liberty of the French, and for the courage of our great neighbor of Mexico. Without these traits, Texas could not be Texas. Texans would not be Texans.

Air Force's New Agency—ADSID

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article on the new management agency established by the Air Force, as prepared for publication in the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal by Maj. Gen. Kenneth P. Bergquist, USAF, Commander of the Air Defense Systems Integration Division, Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass.:

ADSID—AIR DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION DIVISION

The Air Force has established a new management agency called the Air Defense Systems Integration Division (ADSID). Its purpose is to coordinate air defense planning, programing, and implementation in accordance with Air Force responsibilities. The organization is located at Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass.

Air Force Regulation 20-13 prescribes the mission of ADSID "* * * provide the necessary managerial guidance for command action required to insure an effective, properly time-phased, and technically compatible integrated air defense mission system, in accordance with approved plans, requirements, and procedures." The air defense mission system consists of all weapons systems, electronic environment systems, and support systems employed in air defense.

To insure that the Nation possesses the best feasible air defense capability, special effort is required to integrate the various and complex components of the air defense mission system. In the past, the operating comcand could accomplish the integration by using men as conversion links in utilizing the separate components; however, the required increase in automaticity largely eliminates the human conversion links and replaces them with mechanical and electronic devices. Effective air defense now demands technically compatible and highly automatic components, designed, developed, produced, and installed to mesh with the requirements for an overall integrated system.

The air defense mission system must be continuously operational; therefore, timephasing of changes or additions, and component relationships, are exacting stipulations. System integration has become a very intricate mixture of operational requirements, technical development and logistic support. Involved in this mixture are the efforts of the scientific community and industry, as well as various functional military organizations and other Government agencies. Coordination of activities to achieve air defense systems integration does indeed require a special mangement effort—an effort specialized and detailed to the point of being inappropriate to the Pentagon policy level, yet beyond the assigned functional responsibilities of the commands involved.

In July 1957 the Air Force established the air defense systems management office (ADSMO) as a joint ARDC-AMC-ADC organization to provide the managerial guidance for integration of air defense systems. Experience resulted in the decision to reinforce ADSMO, redesignate it as the Air Defense Systems Integration Division and support the organization with a technical group in the form of a central contractor. In March 1958 Secretary James H. Douglas enunciated the concept and basic policies by stating:

"For the past number of years the Air Force has been vitally concerned regarding the difficult task of integrating both the ground environment and the weapons associated with the ground environment to insure that this Nation will possess the best possible aid defense capability. Proposals were made over a year ago on the organization of an integrated command structure of personnel from ADC, AMC, and ARDC to form the nucleus of an air defense team which could be supported by a civilian technical systems management team.

"To further improve the status of this Air Force organization which is now called the Aid Defense Systems Integration Division, the Air Force has appointed Maj. Gen. K. P. Bergquist to command this organization. In this capacity, General Bergquist will have ample authority comparable to that enjoyed by the commander of the ballistic missile division in his field, to make final decisions for the Air Force on the integration of the air defense mission systems. He will have effective control of the funds necessary to discharge the system engineering responsibility of his office and to implement his decisions."

On March 31, 1958, the Air Force published AFR 20-13 prescribing policy and responsibilities for the formation, organization, and operation of ADSID. The new organization is a joint office manned by AMC, ARDC and ADC. The Commander ARDC is the Executive Agent. The ADSID is charged with analysis, guidance and monitorship, but not with responsibility for implementation of individual systems. Such implementation remains charged to appropriate commands in accordance with their assigned functions. The senior ADSID representatives of AMC, ARDC and ADC function as ADSID staff officers and also as senior members of the respective commander's staff.

The regulation assigned the following tasks to ADSID: (1) Assemble and maintain a current master plan and schedule for development and implementation of approved additions and improvements to the air defense mission system; (2) assemble and maintain a current set of individual system performance specifications; (3) conduct analysis and

initiate necessary actions or corrective measures to insure compatibility and effectiveness of components, systems and supporting activities; (4) monitor progress of actions and insure coordination, with respect to development, implementation, plans, schedules and funding; (5) assist ADC, ARDC and AMC in forming their plans as they pertain to the air defense mission; (6) develop test concepts to be used as a basis for system testing programs, and (7) evaluate requirements, established by other agencies, which affect the air defense mission system.

On July 30, 1958, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology entered into a contract with the USAF to serve as "principal systems adviser" on an interim basis to the ADSID. MIT proposed that the support should ultimately be given by a separate nonprofit organization, and agreed to sponsor such a corporation and support it until it could operate independently. As a part of the agreement, it was planned that those Lincoln Laboratory people directly engaged in ADSID support would be transferred to the new corporation as rapidly as possible and that the new corporation should seek a direct contract with the Air Force as soon as this could be arranged. The MIT proposal was accepted by Secretary Douglas.

The new systems engineering organization was formally incorporated as the MITRE Corporation. Heading the Board of Trustees is H. Rowan Gaither, Jr., chairman of the board of the Ford Foundation. The Executive Committee is chaired by William A. Webster, executive vice president of the New England Electric System. Included in the Board of Trustees are such well known individuals as Luis W. Alvarez, Charles A. Coolidge, Dr. Julius A. Stratton, and Robert C. Sprague. The president of MITRE is Mr. C. W. Halligan, formerly director of military engineering at the Bell Telephone Laboratories.

The systems integration task centers around the point at which decisions are made to introduce changes and additions to the air defense mission system. The principal function is to insure that the resulting system works and that it—or major segments—can be turned over to the operating commander on a specific date.

Solving the many and varied integration problems requires the utmost in teamwork. Scientific-industry-military team effort is applied to the problems to make thorough analyses, carefully balance the operational-development-logistic factors, advise as to priorities of effort within budget limitations, and prepare the managerial guidance required for coordinated action "* * * to insure an effective, properly time-phased, and technically compatible integrated air defense mission system."

Workmen's Benefit Fund Celebrates Its 75th Anniversary Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUDWIG TELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, on October 19, 1884, a small group of German-American immigrants founded the Workmen's Benefit Fund of the United States of America, to provide mutual help in times of economic crises. Since that time, this fine fraternal order has grown to a membership of 58,000 in 26 States.

This year, the Workmen's Benefit Fund celebrates its 75th anniversary with a series of outstanding events, including its 75th anniversary national convention which will be held in Atlantic City, N.J., from June 15, 1959, to June 21, 1959, and a diamond jubilee celebration which will be held in New York City on Sunday, October 18, 1959. I am very pleased that this event will be held at a site in my district and take this opportunity to welcome the officers and the members of the Workmen's Benefit Fund and to wish them success on the occasion of their 75th anniversary year.

Forty-first Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JESSICA WEIS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I returned from Rochester, Sunday, to find 3 feet of water in my basement, and, yesterday, while others were paying tribute to the courageous people of Lithuania on the 41st anniversary of their independence, I was wading, barefoot, through my basement, in rather frantic pursuit of a number of trunks and footlockers which were floating about.

However, I do want to join with my colleagues in wishing Godspeed to the people of Lithuania in the fulfillment of their dream of once again, someday, breathing the fresh air of liberty and democratic self-government.

For century after century, Lithuania has been subjected to conquest—by Teutonic knights, Tartars, Russian czars, Nazis, and now, since 1940, by the Red terror which rules the Kremlin. From East and West alike, the power hungry of Europe have trampled back and forth across the face of this tiny nation with almost sickening regularity, pillaging and plundering, terrorizing and murdering as only ruthless barbarians are able. Yet, all of the bloodshed and brutality which has been the recurring fate of the people of Lithuania, has not, for all of its physical violence, been able to destroy the will to freedom and independence which has become their hallmark.

Forty-one years ago, at the height of the Russian Revolution, Lithuania declared her independence from the disintegrating Russian Empire, and for a little over two decades she struggled to maintain her status as a free, democratic nation. But from the very beginning her existence was a terrifyingly precarious one, for she was wedged squarely between two growing young totalitarian giants, Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany, and both were waiting only for that moment when the fortunes of history would present one of them with a chance to again engulf this little nation. The brief alliance between Stalin and Hitler gave the Soviets the opportunity for which they had been waiting, and by the summer of 1940, Lithuania was once more in the iron grip of the Kremlin.

Almost 19 years have now passed since that fateful summer, and virtually every device known to the twisted despotic mind has been employed in an attempt to destroy the passion for freedom, the deep-rooted national consciousness, and the religious fervor of the people of Lithuania. But love of God, of country, and of liberty continues to burn as brightly as ever in the hearts and minds of Lithuanians everywhere—proof positive that such inborn yearnings will never be extinguished by the godless brutes of this or any other generation.

As they celebrate the 41st anniversary of their independence, I salute the brave and wonderful people of Lithuania, and I join with them in their prayers for a better, more peaceful world tomorrow.

International Crew Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, throughout history sports have contributed to a better understanding between nations. And, I believe, competition in sports has and will continue to ease the strain of international tensions.

Examples along this line are the crew races in London and Moscow last summer. I am pleased that a crew representing my State of Washington perhaps brought a bit of better understanding by its members' conduct, their sportsmanship, and ability, especially when they were in Russia.

Now there is a movement to return the hospitality accorded this crew by extending an invitation to crews representing the U.S.S.R. to come to Seattle, Wash., to participate in similar competition.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution unanimously passed by the Washington State House of Representatives, requesting the cooperation of the Secretary of State in assisting to bring about the contest I have mentioned.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the University of Washington is a recognized leader of the world in all phases of eight-oared crew racing, its oarsmen, coaches, shells, methods, its consistency in winning national, international, and Olympic championships, all attest to its universal preeminence in one of the few remaining sports untainted by any touch of professionalism; and

Whereas in furtherance of this highly desirable sport, the University of Washington crew accepted an invitation to compete against the crews of other nations at London and Moscow and was accorded full hospitality by the Governments of the host nations; and

Whereas officials of the civic promotional organization known as Greater Seattle, Inc., have proposed to the U.S. Department of State that the University of Washington re-

ciprocate with a like invitation to crews representing the Soviet Union to compete with the University of Washington and other invited American crews as part of the 1959 Seattle Seafair celebration; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Government and particularly the Secretary of State of the United States consider and give the greatest amount of cooperation possible to the submitted plans and assist in bringing about the realization of this highly desirable international contest; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, the Hon. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State of the United States, the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Chief Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Members of the U.S. Congress representing the State of Washington.

Communism Brings New Dark Ages to China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in Red China today we see the tragic picture of an entire civilization being uprooted and destroyed, a panorama of pillage on a scale never known previously in the range of modern history.

Details of this story are presented dramatically in Edward Hunter's new documentary, "Black Book on Red China." I ask that I may insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a review of that scholarly work, as prepared by Mr. Lawrence Sullivan, the Coordinator of Information for the House of Representatives. Mr. Sullivan's review is as follows:

COMMUNISM BRINGS NEW DARK AGES TO CHINA

(By Lawrence Sullivan, Coordinator of Information, U.S. House of Representatives)

WASHINGTON.—In China today roughly one-fourth of the world's total population is being starved and ruthlessly destroyed by communism.

Only fanatical class hatreds motivate the firing squads which enforce the made-in-Moscow whims of Mao Tse-tung.

A great and bountiful civilization, dating almost from the beginnings of recorded history, is being plowed under by psychopathic vandals, as a gigantic ant hill is leveled by the horse's hoof.

Full documentation of this appalling human tragedy is presented by Edward Hunter in his "Black Book on Red China," published by the Bookmailer, New York 16, N.Y., at $2 retail.

The story is told largely from Communist sources on the China mainland, as collated by International Research on Communist Techniques, Inc. Distribution is sponsored by the Committee of One Million, 17 Park Avenue, New York 17, N.Y., which is organized in all our 53 States and Territories, to block admission of Red China into the United Nations.

China's population, now more than 600 million, increases by 13 million a year, net. But only about 1 million of this new labor force are put to work each year in the Moscow-planned industrial development program. The other 12 million are added each year to the roving bands of hungry, landless vagrants, human degradation on a scale never before known on God's good earth.

"Under these unbearable conditions, people began to migrate in droves, hoping against hope to find something not quite so awful somewhere else. Farmers roamed into the cities, and city folk wandered into the country."

Such is the 10-year flower of Mao Tse-tung's progressive agrarian reform movement of 1940–45, which promised "land for the peasants, land for the tenant farmers, a plot of land for every Chinese family that tilled the soil."

It was precisely these promises which established communism in China. But today the farmers of China have been relegated to the craven status of serfs, more exploited than the serfs of czarist Russia ever were.

Roughly 500 million of these new made serfs now are shackled to the commune farm system. Before the Red wreckers moved in the average Chinese farmer had roughly 2½ acres for his family of five. Today, each prisoner in the communes gets the average yield of only 1.3 acres for his family of five. This means that under communism the living standard of the average Chinese farmer already has been cut in half, in 10 years.

How many thousands of times farmers, at the end of their endurance, rioted and even killed the intruders, then fled into the valleys and hills to form little guerrilla bands will never be known.

But these scattered defenders could never consolidate their anti-Communist insurrection.

The Chinese on Taiwan already were having some success in advising and supplying these solitary and struggling guerrilla bands when the war began in Korea (June 1950). The U.S. Fleet, hurriedly ordered to blockade the China coast, was somehow also instructed to cut off help to the mainland insurgents. That was the end of effective peasant resistance to communism on the mainland, almost precisely on the timetable foreseen in 1948 by some of the professors in Johns Hopkins University.

Red China actively encourages freedom of religion so long as the churches serve as a conscious patriotic movement. From Peiping, patriotism is defined officially by Chang Chih-yi, Minister for the United Front: "To be patriotic one must love socialism and the New China under the leadership of the Chinese Community Party." For Peiping, religion is that simple.

Humiliation and degradation visited upon both Chinese and foreign missionaries since 1945 is a story of savagery without parallel in modern history. The wrath of the Reds fell alike upon Christians, Moslems, and Buddhists. As long-imprisoned clergymen approached death in their putrid cells, they would be put on stretchers and rushed across the border to Hong Kong, so it could not be said that they had actually died on Chinese soil.

Red China's principal source of foreign exchange is the narcotics traffic. Hong Kong documents a single offer of 500 tons of opium to Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd. The offer was rejected, although Peking had guaranteed delivery under protection of the Red army to Hong Kong. Reputable financial circles estimate that the Moscow-Peiping axis currently clears about one million U.S. dollars a week through Swiss banks to Soviet spies and narcotics pushers in the West.

Under Chiang Kai-shek, the Nationalist Government for 25 years had persistently discouraged poppy cultivation, almost to the point of extinction as a source of exports. The resumption of this nefarious trade by Peiping has restored the vast poppy fields of China.

One seizure of Chinese heroin in Switzerland in the summer of 1958 was valued at $50 million. Three peddlers were convicted, and one Swiss agent committed suicide after the trial. Another Peking shipment of raw opium seized in Bangkok measured 35 tons.

Peiping consistently directs huge shipments of opium and heroin to Indonesia and Malaya, to help break down nationalist pride by developing a steadily growing army of dope addicts—a very practical help to the roving bands of Red fifth columnists despatched earlier to the struggling independent countries of Southeast Asia.

Before all the world, the aggressive Communist dope monopoly in Peking is the true measure of Mao Tse-tung's high moral purpose toward China and humanity. Now the world is urged to make this frightful engine of human depravity an integral part of the United Nations.

Perfecting czarish Russia's advanced work in animal psychology, Red China applied Ivan Pavlov's studies in conditioned reflexes on a scale previously undreamed of in the world of science. The 20th century's new scientific terror is the result—brainwashing.

An animal can be induced to follow its master's orders unthinkingly. Lenin thought man could be made to react the same way, once indoctrinated with the appropriate reflexes. Any individual would simply have to be trained to react to a slogan, the way a circus animal responds to a signal—anything from a word to the sound of a whip.

Mao Tse-tung feverishly embraced this established theory of animal psychology and applied it to the entire animal farm of Red China.

Nor does the thought of war alarm official Peking. Mao was a visitor to Moscow in November 1957 for the 40th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution. Mao boasted that if war destroyed even half the population of China, 300 million would be left.

To understand Communist aims, one must be familiar with the special meanings of Communist code words. "Peace" in the Communist lexicon means unquestioning acceptance of Communist disciplines by all. "Aggression" means only one thing—opposition to Communist Party directives and programs. "Learning" signifies knowledge and theory not in conflict with Communist dogma. "Progressive" means pro-Communist ideas in non-Communist countries. In official Communist tracts this word is used interchangeably with "liberal."

During the winter holidays Chinese high school students are mobilized to assist on the collective farms. Illustrating this inspired patriotism, the Chungking Daily reported on February 17, 1958: "Students of 23 schools, including Chungking No. 1 Polytechnic School, No. 1 High School, and No. 4 Girls' High School, gathered a total of more than 6 million patties of manure for the village."

Such is the more abundant life, the affluent society, in Red China today.

Is Earning Out of Date?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Evening Herald, Rock Hill, S.C., of February 13, 1959:

Is Earning Out of Date?

A magazine for parents and teachers says the old idea that children ought to earn their allowance money is out of date.

"It would be false," says the magazine article, "to pretend that a 7-year-old, or even a 12-year-old actually earns his cash through household chores. That is why the idea of the unearned allowance has gradually developed."

The article goes on to include in a child's allowance the money that the youngster spends on bus fare, school lunches, school supplies, and other necessities.

That's not quite cricket. Most parents will agree that a child has a right to expect these things. And most parents provide 'em.

But a lot of parents still feel that the money spent on luxuries and fun—candy, movies, dates, and such—ought to be earned, at least in part. They feel this helps teach children that money represents effort—that we must work for the things we want.

"We must train ourselves to remember," says the article, "that each child is entitled to his allowance in exactly the same way that he is entitled to the other things we give him."

Do you suppose this is why so many young folks figure the world owes them a living?

New Look at Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, Washington was recently the object of an inpouring of many thousands of persons directly concerned with the future of rural electrification. It was my pleasure to visit with many of these fine men and women who have dedicated their lives to the problems of making life easier for the farm families of the Nation.

Recently, the Lincoln Journal, of Lincoln, Nebr., published an editorial on the subject of REA's and their future. Without, at this time, going into the merits or possible drawbacks to the plan they suggest, I would like to place that article in the RECORD that my colleagues might read it and perhaps benefit from such a reading. The editorial follows:

New Look at Rural Electrification

Nebraska's rural electric leaders meeting in Lincoln could count more influential friends than they have had in some time.

A number of new Congressmen and Senators were elected last year with the blessing, if not the active help, of the rural power people. Veteran legislators, such as Senator GEORGE AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, have set out with renewed vigor to help the rural electrification movement.

Nebraska's own Senator CARL CURTIS gladdened the rural folks by introducing a bill to make the Rural Electrification Administration an independent agency, free of the Department of Agriculture, and to keep able Dave Hamil as its head. Senator CURTIS is to be commended for this move.

Such friendship for rural electrification is completely warranted. Probably no other single program has done so much to improve the convenience and productivity of rural America.

Without Government help, rural areas might never have had electricity. Costs of electric service there increase because of long lines needed to serve few customers.

This might be a time, then, for rural electric leaders to bow their necks and resist any effort to change their present access to 2 percent Government loans. They might be successful—for a time.

Time for a Plan

On the other hand, this might be a good time for the rural people to come up with a reasonable, workable plan that will ease their dependence on Government financing. Official opinion is not likely forever to be so favorable to a Government-assisted rural electric program.

This is particularly true while the Government pays more for the money it borrows than the 2 percent interest it charges the rural systems for use of the same money. Taxpayers will not support indefinitely this subsidy. Growing opposition from private power interests and other groups could eventually invoke measures that would seriously hamper the rural power movement.

Leaders and friends of rural electrification would help themselves and the Nation by getting together now to reshape their program in keeping with changing times.

They should come up with a plan that recognizes the continuing need for help in some sparsely settled rural areas, in line with the original concept of the REA.

They should also recognize that in many cases expanding cities, increased rural residence of nonfarmers and the growth of industry in rural areas have made electrical service in the countryside a self-supporting enterprise.

New Approach Offered

Therefore, the Journal suggests a plan based on this principle: A graduated scale of interest rates on Government loans increasing in proportion with the density of electrical service in a rural district—determined by the number of customers or, preferably, the amount of power sold by the district per mile of line operated.

This would mean that districts in sparsely settled, strictly rural regions could continue to get 2-percent Government loans. They are the systems that need help.

More fortunate districts, with ever-expanding service, would pay proportionately higher interest rates. The highest should be comparable to that paid by private utilities, municipalities, or other public power agencies which do not have access to Government loans. These districts could either pay this rate to the Government or go into the private money markets.

The average rate of interest by all the rural systems should equal the Government's cost of borrowing money plus administration of new loans. Thus, any subsidies to low-density districts would, in effect, be paid by the more fortuitous districts, rather than by the Government.

Increased Efficiency

The plan also should outline programs by which all rural districts can cut their costs of doing business. This would call for the best possible management, merger of small districts, campaigns to boost power sales in periods of low power use, and, perhaps, a statewide engineering service to give top quality technical help to all districts.

With this program of graduated interest rates and improved efficiency, the rural power systems over the Nation could move toward their own credit institution. This could be free of the Government and operated by the borrowers themselves, much like the Federal Land Bank.

In the opinion of this newspaper, a detailed plan based on these principles would be of long-range benefit. It might be a subject for discussion at next week's convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association in Washington, D.C.

Human Values in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, here is an excellent and timely editorial by David Lawrence, for the information of my colleagues:

Human Values
(By David Lawrence)

President Eisenhower was asked at his press conference last week whether, in view of his limited recommendation on school aid, he had decided that "it's more dangerous to unbalance the budget now than to run the risk of more inadequately educated citizens later." The interrogator suggested that Mr. Eisenhower differentiate between "difficult fiscal values and human values."

The President said, first of all, that he isn't sure there can be such a differentiation. He then added:

"The human values in America are not going to be promoted unless we are sane and sensible in our fiscal policies * * * I know of nothing that could injure more the great population—174 million people—we have got, than to allow the budgetary process to get out of control, fiscal measures going loosely, in such a way that inflation would absolutely be inevitable."

There seems no question but that every lobby is pressing Congress today for more funds. Each claims the right to assert that "human values" are above all other values.

But what really are the overriding values in the controversy over whether the budget shall continue to go unbalanced? Oddly enough, there isn't any agitation for a surplus, to be used to pay off debt. The drive seems to be to spend more than the Government takes in. Nor are there any signs yet of proposals for higher taxes so as to get the necessary revenues to balance the budget or to meet any increase in expenditures.

Are those "spenders" who really are pursuing a course that could lead to national bankruptcy thinking at all of basic "human values"? Are they aware of what has happened in past history as governments have spent money—and printed more and more paper money—for expenditures that seemingly were to benefit the community, but resulted later only in hardships to the individual and indescribable tragedy to the populace as a whole?

We should reread the story of what happened to paper money during the French Revolution in the 18th century and more recently in the 1920's in Germany, when the Weimar Republic went on the rocks. This writer happened to be in Berlin in 1923 when a taxi ride within the city was paid for by many millions of paper marks. In 1914 the exchange rate had been 4 marks to the dollar. By 1919 it was 30 marks to the dollar, and 4 years later 2 billion marks to the dollar. The German monetary unit had dropped to the point where the mark wasn't worth the paper it was printed on.

And what followed this period of economic and financial chaos during which the cost of living rose to fantastic heights, property values were destroyed, and widespread unemployment brought political upheavals? On the crest of that wave of discontent, which lasted several years, Hitler came into power and was welcomed by the people as a savior. Thus are dictatorships born and human values destroyed.

But it will be said, "It can't happen here." No bigger illusion could be concocted by a wishful-thinking generation. No nation is safe from financial danger if it ignores the laws of arithmetic. The people will not indefinitely retain their confidence in the monetary unit if they come to believe that the Government is wasteful and does not intend to honor its obligations.

There are disquieting symptoms already visible. Our own Government has been trying lately to convert its relatively short-term bonds into longer-term securities. The public balks. The last offering ran into difficulties, as more holders of maturing securities than had been expected demanded cash rather than accept an exchange even at a very attractive interest rate. The holders of securities showed uneasiness about the future value of the bonds they would be buying today. It is important for Congress, by a sound fiscal policy, to do at once the things that will remove such fears.

Confidence is an intangible. Nobody knows how long it will remain, and nobody can predict when a "run" on a monetary unit's value actually will begin.

There's only one safe course—to consider the human values of the millions upon millions of citizens whose fixed incomes and whose savings will be impaired if the Congress fails to heed the age-old laws of thrift. The legislators must soon convince the country that they do not intend to allow the public debt to be increased.

At a time when the Nation's safety and perhaps its survival requires more than $42 billion for armament every year, we must begin to realize that we cannot have all the "butter" we want when we need so much to pay for the "guns."

No government—any more than an individual—can long continue to spend more than it receives. To do so would destroy not merely all hope of adding the very human values that the spenders keep publicizing in their unwitting drive to bankrupt the Treasury but also the basic human values already imbedded in American life.

Resolution Denouncing Showing of Soviet Propaganda Films

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a resolution passed by the Members of the House of Representatives of the New Hampshire General Court on February 11, 1959, denouncing the showing of any Soviet film which contains propaganda either directly or hidden:

Whereas the U.S. State Department has been primarily responsible for the United States entering into a pact with the United Soviet Socialist Republics, providing for cultural exchanges, including the exchange of commercial motion pictures between the two countries to be shown in commercial theaters; and

Whereas the Soviet films may contain clever, subtle Red Russian propaganda: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the House of Representatives of the New Hampshire General Court, go on record as denouncing the showing of any Soviet film which contains propaganda either directly or hidden; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully request the screening or selection board set up by said pact to take cognizance of the possibility of such propaganda and refuse to accept any film which may contain such propaganda; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted to our Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

FRANCIS W. TOLMAN,
Clerk.

Battle of Spenders and Savers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the position of the Federal budget appears destined to hold the center of attention throughout this Congress.

There are those of us who believe we should reduce unecessary expenditures, provide adequate funds to insure our national defense and strive to live within our national means. On the other hand there is the philosophy of continued high level spending in spite of an unbalanced budget.

David Lawrence has recently drawn the line between the "spenders and savers" in one of his syndicated columns. His comments follow:

BATTLE OF SPENDERS AND SAVERS—DEMOCRATIC PARTY VIEWED AS FAVORING POLICIES LEADING TO A 10-CENT DOLLAR

The battle is on between the spenders and the savers. The Democratic Party has taken its position in favor of an unbalanced budget, deficit spending, and policies that could lead to a 10-cent dollar.

The Democratic advisory council, in a statement unanimously approved by its members, claims that "the new Republican budget comes close to being a fraud on the American people. * * * The individual budget items and the related legislative program are an intricate combination of defeat, deception, and denial."

This is strong language from Democrats who, during the 1952 presidential campaign, protested the alleged characterization of the Democratic Party as the party of treason on the Communist issue.

But apparently, in employing such words as "fraud" and "deception" in a description of the Republican Party today, and particularly in applying the comment to a message delivered to Congress by the President of the United States, no holds now are to be barred on the use of invective.

Among the listed sponsors of the statement of the Democratic advisory council are former President Truman and Adlai Stevenson, as well as Governors Williams, of Michigan, and Lawrence, of Pennsylvania, and former Governor Harriman, of New York. Members of Congress on the council who approved the statement are Senators KEFAUVER, of Tennesese, and HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of the House, and Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, of the Senate, resent any implication that the Democratic Party is the party of the spenders. Naturally, as southern conservatives, they oppose any such classification. But party policy apparently is being made by the Democrats from the North, where they have been winning their big majorities. Here is the Democratic Party doctrine as the advisory council sees it:

"The new budget shows, above all, that in the GOP administration there are no modern Republicans and no conservative Republicans but only men who put pocketbooks before people. This the people of the United States will surely remember. What is bad for people is also bad for pocketbooks, both private and public * * *.

"Nothing better symbolizes Republican attitudes than the one big increase in the budget. That is for interest charges which rise from $7.5 billion in the present fiscal year to $8.1 billion in the next. This is exclusively the result of the increase in interest rates. The only people who benefit in a big way from the new budget are those who have money and lend it to the Government."

But are the many millions of persons who buy Government savings bonds to be persuaded in the future to buy them if the interest rates are presumably to be reduced—if the Democrats have their way—while the securities of well-established companies pay a much higher interest rate? The reason for the higher interest payments is that the national debt is increasing and investors are, in effect, demanding an interest rate on Government bonds comparable to some degree with other bonds.

The statement goes on to lament the fact that the States and cities are assuming their local responsibilities and implies that, because they are increasing their debt, the Federal Government should do more and more to relieve them of their obligations. But the key paragraph in the statement about the budget reads as follows:

"National defense outlays are reduced, and reduced even more when proper allowance is made for price changes."

What, indeed, is bringing about those price changes? Monopolistic power exercised by nationwide unions which, by their extortions at the bargaining table, set the pattern that leaders of other unions feel they must match if they are to be reelected to their posts.

The Democratic Party advisory council apparently favors more and more spending, more and more deficits, and more and more inflation. This, they argue, is what the people voted for last November. The Eisenhower administration disagrees and, if it is wrong in its fiscal policy, there will be a chance in 1960 to resolve the issue.

Meanwhile, there must be tens of millions of citizens whose income is from the money they have saved and invested or from retirement and pension funds. Also, many millions of persons, including widows and orphans, are living on the proceeds of insurance policies. These and others on fixed incomes may soon have to decide where the deception begins and ends as they try to compare the purchasing power of their dollar today with what it will be in November 1960, if the budget isn't balanced.

In Praise of John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is repugnant to me that those presidential aspirants in the Democrat Party of the other body, who just a few days ago were most critical of Secretary John Foster Dulles, saying "we should get off dead-center" and he is "too rigid and inflexible," are now adding their voices to the

praises of his efforts. It would seem either that the gentlemen from Minnesota, Massachusetts, and Missouri, and the distinguished Majority Leader did not mean what they said and have been saying for years about Secretary Dulles' statesmanship, or their statements now might reasonably be interpreted to mean that they are not quite so sincere as they should be.

The following is a very perceptive and objective résumé of the accomplishments of our great Secretary of State, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on February 16:

IN THE FRONT LINE OF FREEDOM FIGHT

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

John Foster Dulles has for 2 years remained at his post, working with an intensity that defies a time schedule, disregarding medical advice to let up and take things easier. His spirit has been that of the frontline soldier, who, after being wounded, fights on to his last cartridge and hand grenade.

No man in public life is indispensable. But the incapacitation of Mr. Dulles, in this year when storm clouds seem especially thick over Berlin, would be a grievous loss to the United States and to the entire free world. The trip to Western Europe, from which he returned just before his recent operation in Walter Reed Hospital, is one of many that infused an element of coordinated firmness into NATO.

Like most strong men, Mr. Dulles has aroused his full share of antagonism. Indeed some of his critics seem disposed to make him the scapegoat for everything that has gone wrong with the world since the Second World War, notably for the inevitable consequences of the growth in power of Soviet communism which the Roosevelt administration so fatuously promoted.

Undoubtedly faults of manner, timing, and phrasing can be laid to the account of Mr. Dulles. But if the Secretary finds time, during his enforced rest in the hospital, to turn from the immediate preoccupation of the looming Berlin and German crisis and to look back on the record of his 6 years in office, he will be entitled to pride in the thought of a very responsible and difficult task most ably performed.

USUALLY CORRECT

He has been right in his championship of German rearmament, right in regarding and treating Chancellor Adenauer as a key figure in the Western alliance, right in his aversion to the use of force in the Suez Canal controversy, right in refusing to kowtow to Red China, to sacrifice friends and allies in the Orient in the vain hope of appeasing enemies. He has been everlastingly right in his appreciation of the true nature and designs and tactics of Soviet communism and in his recognition of the need for a long-range policy of pertinacity, constancy, and fortitude in meeting this peril.

The full stature of John Foster Dulles will only be recognized, one suspects, when he is obliged to quit the public service permanently. It wil take a very big man in terms of judgment, experience, firmness, and consistency to fill his shoes. It was no small achievement to have preserved peace with honor during these last 6 troubled years—especially with jittery backseat drivers sometimes shouting contradictory admonitions in his ear.

The views of some possible aspirants, in both parties, for Mr. Dulles' post are enough to send chills down the spine of anyone who regards appeasement, even if disguised by some nice word like "flexibility," as very bad medicine for the prospects of peace and of national honor. For as soon as Dulles' political critics get beyond generalities into the field of positive alternatives all sorts of specters begin to loom up: cloudy and dangerous ideas of German neutralization, abandonment of Formosa and whatnot.

AUSTRIA AND CHINA

It is not true, as is sometimes charged, that Mr. Dulles is inflexible in the sense of an ostrichlike unwillingness to face realities or to negotiate with hostile governments when negotiations offer some prospect of advantage. The general evacuation of Austria was arranged during his term of office. He has waived protocol and carried on informal talks with representatives of Red China at Geneva and Warsaw—without visible results, to be sure. He has incurred the criticism of those who regard our struggle with communism as a straight moral crusade without any nuances of diplomatic finesse, by sponsoring limited economic aid to the dissident and semi-independent Communist regimes in Belgrade and Warsaw.

What Mr. Dulles believes, as he stated in his recent joint declaration with Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of Germany, is that concessions must be on a reciprocal basis. He is not willing, in the name of that famous word, "flexibility," to abandon carefully builtup political and military positions in one-sided retreat. Nor is he willing to say that the cold war is over while Moscow is waging it full blast.

History may be counted on to do justice to John Foster Dulles. His failings are likely to seem smaller in perspective, his achievements greater when others assume his heavy load of work and responsibility. Even now it is notable that voices of strident criticism in foreign capitals tend to become hushed and stilled when there is a prospect that the Dulles leadership will be missing, even for a short time.

Every Communist, every sympathizer with communism, every woolly-minded appeaser, every dreamy utopian, is a bitter critic of the Secretary of State. Perhaps this is his highest title to the respect and confidence of the patriotic majority of the American people. Perhaps, as was once said of Grover Cleveland, he deserves to be loved for the enemies he has made.

Export-Import Bank of Washington Completes 25 Years of Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, our efficient Coordinator of Information, Mr. Lawrence Sullivan, has sent me an outline of the work done by the Export-Import Bank of Washington during the past 25 years. The Bank, under the able direction of my good friend, Mr. Samuel C. Waugh, is doing an outstanding job, and both he and his staff are to be commended:

The Export-Import Bank of Washington today completed 25 years of operations in support of U.S. overseas trade.

While providing direct assistance to U.S. exporters in cooperation with private banks and financial institutions, the Bank became the first public agency, either national or international, to arrange credits for large-scale economic development throughout the world.

The Bank was founded February 12, 1934, with a capitalization of $11 million. Today it is authorized to have loans and guarantees outstanding at any one time of $7 billion.

In 25 years the Bank has authorized over $10 billion in some 1,600 individual credits; disbursed over $6.6 billion (an additional $1.6 billion is committed for disbursements); collected $3.3 billion in repayments; earned gross profit of $997.6 million; paid $438 million to the U.S. Treasury as interest and dividends; paid all administrative expenses out of earnings; charged off losses of $2.9 million; retained net profits of $536 million as reserves; and encouraged more than $1 billion in private investment abroad.

The Export-Import Bank made its first credits for economic development abroad in the late 1930's and has continued making these credits, either to private borrowers or to governments, for more than 20 years. Most of the various programs for economic development have followed in general the path pioneered originally by the Export-Import Bank.

In Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America, and Oceania, the Bank has assisted the development of steel mills; iron, copper, nitrate, manganese, and uranium mining; electric power installations; cement mills; fertilizer plants; chemical plants; innumerable types of industrial plants; large-scale irrigation projects; highways; ports; and public works. The immediate result of these credits has been to provide hundreds of thousands of orders for U.S. industries throughout the country and many millions of hours of employment for American workers. In addition, these projects have resulted in economic growth abroad which has permanently expanded U.S. overseas markets.

Throughout its 25 years the Bank has maintained a flexible lending policy designed to meet changing conditions of world trade incident to a world economic depression, a world war, and a period of reconstruction and development. It has done so within the three basic concepts which Congress has written into its governing statutes: To "aid in financing and the facilitate exports and imports and exchange of commodities" between the United States and other countries; to "supplement and encourage and not compete with private capital"; and to make loans that shall "in the judgment of the Board of Directors offer reasonable assurance of repayment."

In addition to its loans running into billions for economic development projects, the Bank has made hundreds of small loans to assist sales abroad of individual pieces of equipment, has lent approximately $1 billion to finance export sales of U.S. cotton (among other commodities), and has made various types of balance of payments credits to assist other governments in maintaining essential trade relations with the United States.

The Export-Import Bank has actively encouraged new private investment abroad. Since 1952, the earliest year for which complete statistics are available, credits by the Bank have resulted in concurrent loans and participations and equity investment by U.S. private interests in excess of $880 million without guarantee from Export-Import Bank.

Diversion of Water From the Great Lakes Into the Illinois River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under consideration at the moment in the

House Committee on Public Works, of which I am a member, is a perennial subject. That is the question of whether additional water should be drained from the Great Lakes into the Illinois Waterway. I would like to include my remarks before the committee on this subject in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, we who are members of the House Committee on Public Works have a relatively simple problem before us in the matter of an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second diversion of water from the Great Lakes into the Illinois River.

The question is whether we are going to keep our bucket filled after we have punched a hole in the bottom.

All of us agree that a full bucket—in this case the Great Lakes—is a desirable state of affairs, not only for our vast Midwest region surrounding the Great Lakes, but for our neighbor, Canada, as well.

From this year on, we are going to need an especially full bucket. We on this committee are well aware that the St. Lawrence Seaway, our dream in the Midwest for more than a half century, will become a full-fledged working reality later this year.

Now we are going to try to pull the plug.

We in the Great Lakes region have been bothered by inadequate channel depths for a number of years, and we will continue to be bothered in the future when the larger oceangoing ships start plying our waterways in ever-increasing numbers. The proposal before us today is to make these channels even shallower and narrower by the diversion of additional water from the Great Lakes.

We are asked to approve a 1-year test of this extra diversion which will bring the total to an average of some 2,500 feet per second, and much more when peak volumes are drained off Lake Michigan. We can only conclude that most of the water will be diverted during the height of the already short Great Lakes shipping season.

May I point out to my colleagues that there is no reason for a 1-year test of this added diversion plan under existing circumstances. Such tests can only bring harm to the Great Lakes States and Canada.

First of all, we have in the U.S. Corps of Engineers reports from last year stating that the full effects of such diversion would not be felt for a 3-year period at the very earliest. So, next year we will be faced with the prospect of these same people coming in here and asking for a continuation of the extra divergence so they can give this plan a fair test.

But this same engineer's report points out another fact which seems to have been grossly overlooked by some of the members of this committee. That is that it will take some 15 years for the Great Lakes to build up enough water to completely dissipate all effects of the temporary diversion. We are asked, therefore, to give this plan a 1-year trial. Then we will be asked to give another 2-year trial period. But if the calculations of the engineers are not correct and more damage is done to our lake shores, our channels, and our harbor depths, then it is going to take us 15 years to correct the mistake. In my opinion, that is too great a chance for our Nation to take in a matter which has such grave consequences to the economy of such a vast portion of our country.

Now, it has also been indicated in the newspapers that some of our committee members have said that Canada has no objections to this diversion. After checking, I find that such is not the case. Members of the Canadian Parliament not only continue to object to this extra diversion, but Canadian opposition has, in fact, stiffened on this plan during the past few months. As yet, the Canadian Government has not taken a formal stand on this matter. However, a statement of Canadian policy is expected within the next 30 days.

Canada has as much at stake in this matter as we have. The water we drain off the Great Lakes belongs as much to our great ally as it does to us. We should have absolute assurance that Canada has no objections and no reservations to this extra diversion before we take any action whatsoever.

Finally, we have been told that this hearing will be on the basis of facts alone. One of the facts in this matter, gentlemen, is that those States which are opposed to this extra diversion were not given enough time to prepare their cases before this committee hearing.

Because of the lack of time afforded by the committee to the gathering of new facts and the short notice given on the start of these hearings, I would recommend to my colleagues that we continue to take testimony from the gentlemen present and then give them an opportunity to be heard before this committee at a later date during this session of Congress.

Thank you.

Initiation of a Program To Assure U.S. Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a thought-provoking synopsis by John L. McLaughlin, Jr., of Swampscott, Mass.:

INITIATION OF A PROGRAM TO ASSURE U.S. GROWTH

The slow economic growth of the United States in recent years, emphasized by the 1957-58 recession, has most intelligent people genuinely concerned. To reverse the trend, a systematic approach is needed, and this synopsis outlines a possibility. For success, business would have to exert leadership—far more than it has in the past—and the appeal to business would be for its cooperation in the initiation of a program designed to expand markets in predetermined orderly ways.

Such a program would be like an advertising and sales promotion campaign, except that it would lean toward the industrial type, be more rational and educational. It would be scientific and utilize all the best of the modern techniques of management, marketing, sales, and advertising and sales promotion.

The approach to the program would be via study under three main heads: Research, planning, and action. But this must be emphasized: That the study would entail looking at all three and integrating action with time. In short, there'd be some action in 6 months, 1 year, 2 years, 5 years. For simplicity, however, the kind of study that now seems indicated will be explained under each of the three main heads.

RESEARCH

History may yield clues. But it must be simplified. Gross national product looks like the best yardstick. Its four salient phases—Federal, State, and local, capital, and consumer spending—can be plotted together in, say, "an economic map of the United States from 1929 to date." Then the relationship among these four phases, and the effect that each has on the total, can be studied.

In the same way, goals can be plotted; the performance required by each phase or area can be determined and then, at any time, measured.

Thus, history soon ceases to help and statistics on the future become absolute necessities. That should probably be one of the major objectives of the program: to prove that more statistics are vitally necessary to progress. But what kinds of statistics can be ascertained only by envisioning the needs that are called for by the planning.

PLANNING

Plans for the program will be derived from the goals. The facts from the research should have sufficient authority to prove that steady growth of this country can be achieved only by expanding markets in accordance with the needs of the people. So we come to, what could be called managed markets.

Basic needs are five: Food, clothing, shelter, health, and education. Varying with population, they can be calculated, then supplied. Education—buildings, facilities, personnel—makes markets. So, too, do improvements in our cities, towns, and rural areas. Then there are the unbelievably big, and almost untapped, foreign markets. Finally, of course, there is defense.

All these constitute markets that can be managed; that is, expanded in ways that will best assure continuous growth.

Soon will arise the layman's question: Where will the money come from? The campaign will devote most minute care to explaining that hardest-to-understand portion of economics, money.

ACTION

Action would be governed by research and planning, but the kind required should be considered in the initial thinking. If something is known early about what action is to be taken, then the research and planning can be directed toward getting the necessary information.

Gradually, in this way, plans for action would be evolved. The specifics would be obtained by creative writers working closely with economists and then allowing specialists in presentation methods to translate the results into the different media for particular audiences.

Business would be the major audience: Its support is essential to success. Hence, early, the benefits would need to be outlined: managed markets would result in accurate forecasting, orderly expansion, efficient operations, and increased profits. Once sold on the general idea, business could carry on. Its brains and knowledge are needed. A big help here would be the cooperative support of the business press.

Other important audiences would be Government (via the Employment Act of 1946) and labor unions (particularly the economists). Approaches to these would be very humble—couched in terms of "we've all much to learn; is that about right?" When agreements are reached—and not too much would be attempted at one time—then the story could be broadcast to the general public. If it clicks then, the program is assured of a successful start.

The mechanics of the program would be left mainly to the advertising agency or agencies. But as I conceive them now, they would be in four parts: First, completely written-out plans, fully approved by consulting economists; second, oral presentations, with visual aids, designed for particular groups; third, booklets with more details for the same group;, and fourth, publicity of all varieties—from press conferences to news releases of many kinds.

All this presupposes that there'd be genuine news in the program. There must be (and still it must not be too controversial), if the program is to create the excitement that's needed for success.

In the long run, too, that's what our country needs most—excitement. It's been too long on the defensive; it needs to fight, it needs something to fight for—like in a war. Only with a purpose in mind—with visions of how great their country could really be—will the people make the sacrifices that are required. This program could start to supply that purpose.

JOHN L. MCLAUGHLIN, Jr.

FEBRUARY 6, 1959.

Whither GAF?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Binghamton (N.Y.) Press of February 8, 1959, highlights the problem facing a community whose biggest single industry is 97 percent owned by a government which hopes to divest itself of ownership, but cannot do so without action by the Congress.

I wish to point out that my bill, H.R. 1345, offers a logical and feasible approach to this problem and I strongly hope the Congress will at long last take action this session to permit sale of the Government-held shares in General Aniline & Film Corp. to private investors.

BUT WILL IT EVER HAPPEN?

What others outside may think about a question that is close to the interests of the Triple Cities commands our attention. Donald I. Rogers, financial editor of the New York Herald Tribune, speculates, with some facetiousness, on the effects of a decision on the ownership of General Aniline & Film Corp.

The Eisenhower administration will soon propose to Congress a bill that would permit the sale of Aniline shares, of which the Government holds 97 percent, to the public. What Congress, moved by innumerable clashing interests, will do is unpredictable.

But there is a possibility that the question of ownership, already bearded like Father Time, will be so resolved. Triple Citians, whose fond hopes of the past so often have come to naught, are incapable of breathless expectancy, but hope never really dies.

If it happened?

Mr. Rogers comments that with the issue settled, composing rooms of the newspapers of the land would throw away a story that virtually has stood in type for more than 10 years, the heading of which reads roughly, "Aniline Solution Near."

Settlement of the Aniline case conceivably could produce unemployment among lawyers. Rogers notes that enough lawyers to fill all the boxes at Yankee Stadium have been engaged in the Aniline case.

These lawyers have represented German, non-Germans, Swiss, non-Swiss, the U.S. Government and a big assortment of other interests. These lawyers have to be paid. They don't come cheaply. And last year, poor Aniline for the first 9 months had profits of only $3,335,000 on sales of $103 million.

All the evidence suggests that General Aniline is a gallant ship that, under government control, never can put to sea. Always haunting management—and personnel, too—are the morale-hurting questions: Who owns us? Where are we going? What will happen tomorrow?

Government control poses inflexibilities and a rigidity of courses that stand as a bar to maximum exploitation of the company's assets, and as a bar to always needful long-distance planning and even to an adequate and uncomplex meeting of competition.

The Triple Cities has a big stake in what will be the fate of Aniline. Ansco is Binghamton's biggest industry and Ozalid is similarly a vital component in the Triple Cities economy.

We hope, we hope, we hope after years and years of disappointed hopes that a settlement of the Aniline case is near.

If and when Aniline shares pass to public ownership, will the proceeds go to the U.S. Treasury to help sweating American taxpayers?

Aw, you know the answer to that. The $100 million, more or less, will go into foreign pockets. As Rogers laments, "Alas and alack * * * into the pockets of righteous citizens abroad. For the past century or so, it seems, 'twas ever thus."

No-Man's Land in Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin employment-relations board over a period of the last several years, has called to my attention the difficulties which the Wisconsin board has encountered with the so-called no-man's land in the field of labor-management relations. The absence of any remedy for labor disputes in this particular area has been deplored by spokesmen for both management and labor during the past year.

Several proposals have been made and will be considered by this 86th Congress. Among the proposals is my bill H.R. 1140, which has received widespread support throughout the United States and in particular from State labor boards who have been confronted with this problem frequently.

The Wisconsin employment-relations board has prepared a memorandum which has been submitted to the Senate Labor Committee under date of February 12, 1959. I received the following letter from the employment-relations board which I would like to place in the RECORD at this time, to be followed by the memorandum on behalf of the Wisconsin employment-relations board, which was addressed to the Senate Labor Committee:

MADISON, WIS., *February 12, 1959.*
Congressman MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAIRD: The continuance of the no-man's land in labor relations is a serious problem for the smaller employers, their employees, and labor unions in this State. The no-man's land was brought about by the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Guss* v. *Utah*, 353 U.S. 1, in 1957. As a consequence of this decision, labor disputes involving those employers over whom the National Labor Relations Board declines to exercise jurisdiction are not subject to State regulation or any regulation. The absence of any remedy for disputes in this category has been deplored by spokesmen for management and labor. Various proposals are presently being considered by the Congress to remedy the situation.

We are forwarding a copy of a statement transmitted to the Senate Labor Committee of the position of the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board on this problem. We hope that you will have the opportunity to read the statement which describes the problem of the no-man's land in detail.

When the various labor bills are considered by the Congress during this session, we hope that you will lend your best efforts to eliminate the no-man's land problem.

We would be pleased to answer any inquiries that you might have concerning pending legislation.

Very truly yours,
WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD,
L. E. GOODING, *Chairman.*

MEMORANDUM ON BEHALF OF THE WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD TO THE SENATE LABOR COMMITTEE

This memorandum is submitted on the question of the power of the States to regulate labor disputes over which the National Labor Relations Board declines to exercise its jurisdiction.

The State of Wisconsin has had a comprehensive labor relations code since 1939. During the 20 years of its existence, the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board has processed approximately 2,000 representation election matters, 3,000 referendums concerning union security agreements, approximately 1,000 unfair labor practice complaints involving both employer and union practices, 316 arbitrations and over 2,000 mediation cases. Prior to *Guss* v. *Utah*, 353 U.S. 1, the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board exercised jurisdiction in the regulation of labor disputes involving employers whose businesses affected interstate commerce over which the National Labor Relations Board declined to exercise its jurisdiction because said enterprises did not meet the jurisdictional standards established by the National Labor Relations Board. The Guss decision, as the opinion of the court acknowledged, created a vast area subject to no regulation, an area in which Federal power in many instances cannot be practically applied and in which the exercise of State authority has been banned. It has been estimated that the no-man's land area applied to approximately 25 percent of the working force.[1]

Prior to the Guss decision, when this Board was satisfied that the business of the employer was such that the National Labor Relations Board would not exercise its jurisdiction, this Board did so. In no case in what now constitutes the no man's land, when the question of jurisdiction was raised before the Board, was there an appeal taken to the courts on the Board's determination to exercise jurisdiction.

In Wisconsin, it has been estimated that approximately 29 percent of the working force and about 92 percent of all employers were within the no man's land as a result of the Guss decision.[2]

On October 2, 1958, the National Labor Relations Board, pursuant to one of the mandates of the Supreme Court in the Guss decision, announced revised jurisdictional standards. This action was taken subsequent to increased appropriations granted by the

[1] "County Business Patterns," pt. I, 1st quarter, published by U.S. Departments of Commerce and Health, Education, and Welfare, pp. 4–6, table IA. For statistics as to the individual States and Territories, see table IB, pp. 8–52.

[2] Heiser Ready Mix Co. decision, No. 4780, Wisconsin Employment Relations Board, June 1958.

Congress for the purpose of narrowing the extent of the no man's land. Prior to the announcement of the 1958 standards, representatives of the National Labor Relations Board had testified before Congress that the requested increase in appropriations would enable the Board to reduce the no man's land area by approximately 20 percent.[3] Applying the 20 percent assumption to Wisconsin, would still result in approximately 23 percent of the working force being included in the no man's land and about 73 percent of the employers. Regardless of whether the estimates of the National Board are correct, it is recoghized that the workload of the National Board has increased significantly, and with it a backlog of cases, to the extent that many matters which should be expeditiously determined are delayed for such a period of time that they also may be considered in a no man's land.[4]

Of major concern to the Senate committee has been the elimination of racketeering in labor-management relations. It is hard to conceive of a better opportunity for racketeering to flourish than to have no regulation available, either State or Federal, among the smaller employers and smaller collective bargaining units throughout the land. Extensive testimony has been heard by this committee indicating that the service industries, usually employing small groups of persons, have been the most easy prey for the racketeers. The continuance of a vacuum in the labor-relations law encourages rather than discourages the continuance of unsavory practices in labor-management relations.

In addition to the problems of racketeering, the impact of the Guss decision has been very upsetting to normal labor relations. From the viewpoint of administrators who must deal with everyday practical problems of labor relations, we fail to perceive how the interest of uniformity declared by the Supreme Court as a major premise in reaching its conclusion will be achieved by its decision. The only uniformity apparent to us, is the fast growing practice of returning stable labor relations, which have been fostered by State and Federal statutes, to the anarchy which existed prior to the enactment of the Wagner Act, the Employment Peace Act, and the Taft-Hartley Act. In the no-man's land, the right of employees to be represented by a labor union and to engage in collective bargaining will now be determined by economic force rather than by secret ballot; the right of employees to be free from discriminatory discharge because of union activities will be dissipated; and the rights of employers to be free from illegal picketing and from secondary boycotts will go unprotected.

When it is considered that 62 percent of all charges of unfair labor practices filed in the first quarter of 1958 with the National Labor Relations Board were filed by individuals,[5] it is difficult to understand how such individuals over whom the National Labor Relations Board will assert jurisdiction have rights and remedies more worthy of protection by a uniform Federal labor policy than those individuals who are employed in enterprises falling within the no-man's land area. This same argument applies to the rights of labor organizations and employers. We thus have a situation where neither the policies expressed in the Federal or State acts can be applied. The only uniformity apparent to us in the no-man's land is the chaos of no regulation.

The question has been raised in previous hearings before this committee that the State authority in labor relations permits regulation of uniform security agreements, including the enactment of right to work legislation. However, it should be noted that such State authority is not dependent and would not be blocked by the enactment of the proposed legislation since that authority is dependent upon section 14–B of the Taft-Hartley Act. The question has also been raised in previous hearings as to the number of States which do not have a labor relations board or agency, and thus would not benefit from the passage of legislation empowering States to act. While only twelve States and the Territory of Hawaii and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have Labor Relations Act, they include such important industrial States as New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Michigan, Connecticut, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. In these 10 States were located 31½ percent of the nonagricultural employees of the United States in 1955 and during that same year these States accounted for 45 percent of the strikes in the country.[6]

Furthermore, the 10 States do not include the industrial State of Michigan and the State of Kansas which have representation procedures as a part of their State mediation functions. A compilation of various State labor relations laws indicate that some 43 States and Territories have laws protecting the rights of employees to organization and to bargain collectively.[7]

The fact that any particular State chooses not to adopt labor legislation in harmony with the Federal statute, or not to adopt any labor legislation on a particular subject, does not seem persuasive to forbid States from enforcing labor relations statutes if the enterprises which might be subject to such regulation are of such little consequence as to be determined unworthy or impractical of regulation by the National Labor Relations Board.

Since the Guss decision, there has also been an increased interest in utilization of damage actions in labor disputes. Traditionally, students of labor relations have felt that damage actions were not the best means of achieving stable and harmonious labor relations, but increases in such suits can be expected in the absence of any other means of resolving labor disputes.

The Supreme Court in the Guss decision also mentioned that the no man's land could be reduced by the execution of cession agreements between the National Labor Relations Board and various State agencies provided the State statute was consistent with or had received a construction not in consistent with the Federal act. While effective arguments have been made by the States on behalf of such agreements, no cession agreements have been executed to date.[8] It is our feeling that the National Board has construed the word "consistency" to mean identical and has used such argument as means of blocking a cession agreement. Furthermore, there is no assurance that, even if a State statute was conformed to a Federal statute, litigation over consistency of construction could not be advanced in a particular case as a means of delay. With nine circuit courts of appeals passing on National Labor Relations Board decisions, it would be impossible for any State administrative agency to guarantee total consistency of interpretation no matter how hard it tried and no matter what the spirit of the administrators were toward the statute. It is our belief that most arguments against the execution of a cession agreement could be overcome if the National Board were willing to seriously consider entering into such an agreement but that to date such willingness has not been demonstrated. The unsuccessful experience of the State of New York in attempting to reach a cession agreement for the taxicab industry in New York City is the most recent and best detailed. From the legislative and administrative history of the present cession provision, section 10a, it may be concluded that a clarifying amendment of at least the consistency provision should be considered by the Congress if there is to be any hope of implementing the cession provision by the making of such agreements with State agencies.

In submitting this statement to the Senate Labor Committee, the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board wants to make it clear that our primary concern is to remedy the no man's land. The problem can be minimized by directing the National Labor Relations Board to take jurisdiction of all labor disputes arising under the national act and by providing for cession agreements to State agencies. The no man's land can be eliminated entirely in those States which have labor relations acts by amending the National Labor Relations Act so as to empower the National Labor Relations Board to decline jurisdiction and permitting State regulation over those matters which the National Board declines to handle.

As administrator of a State labor relations act, we believe there are many reasons why State administration of local disputes, especially involving smaller employers and smaller collective bargaining units in the no man's land category can be most effectively regulated by the States. However, if the Congress should not provide for State authority where the National Labor Relations Board declines to act, we would hope that the Congress would appropriate sufficient moneys to enable the National Labor Relations Board to fully occupy the no man's land, and further that if the Congress should decide to continue the cession provision of the present statute, that said provision be clarified to make cession agreements possible.

Respectfully submitted,

L. E. GOODING,
Chairman, Wisconsin Employment Relations Board.

FEBRUARY 12, 1959.

[3] Testimony of Chairman Leedom, June 10, 1958, 42LRR185.

[4] Third Quarterly Report, NLRB, 1958, 43LRR55.

[5] First Quarterly Report, NLRB, 1958, 42LRRM14.

[6] Blumrosen, "The Misinterpretation of Section 10a," Labor Law Journal, April 1958, p. 266.

[7] 4CCH, par. 40, 355.

[8] Memorandum to the NLRB on behalf of the New York State Labor Relations Board, by Philip Feldblum, general counsel, 1958.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Communist leaders of the Kremlin are using and will continue to use every diabolical means and method to capture the nations of the free world. These Communist leaders seek to destroy the free world by the method of divide and conquer. During this critical period in history the peoples of the free world must remain alert to the intrigue of the Communist masters in the Kremlin. The free world is forced to remain strong militarily, economically, and spiritually. It is paramount that we act as one—in unison. It is paramount that we stand firm in our commitments to one another. It is paramount that the free world agree on every issue and, last but not least,

that we maintain our faith in the Almighty. Only then can we avoid the pitfall of being engulfed into the orbit of the Communist fold. Let us recall the fate of those peoples and nations who are now the captives of the U.S.S.R.—Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, Eastern Germany, not to mention those on the threshold of enslavement.

None of these nations have lost their craving for liberty. It is important to them that we rekindle their hope for freedom and help them maintain their morale. Therefore, on this February 16 Lithuania commemorates the day of its independence and the day of its national birthday. I join with the Lithuanians on this sad occasion and pray that the future holds for them the day of their liberation to which we in the free world rededicate ourselves.

Poison in Your Water—No. 14

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the water from the Potomac River, one of whose tributary streams is the Shenandoah River, contains the zinc waste compounds dumped into the stream by the Viscose Corp., of America plant at Front Royal. An article setting forth what happened there appeared on the front page of the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald of February 13, 1959. The zinc wastes dumped into the Shenandoah River find their way into the drinking water of the people of the city of Washington, D.C., among whom at least some time during the year are all Members of Congress. This is the water that we drink:

SHENANDOAH WATER TESTED: RIVER POLLUTION FROM ZINC WASTES BLAMED FOR DEATH OF 200,000 FISH

(By Aubrey Graves)

An estimated 200,000 fish have been killed since late December in a 10-mile stretch of the Shenandoah River below Front Royal, Va.

A report made by the staff of the Virginia Water Control Board at Richmond has "tentatively" laid the blame on a high concentration of zinc compounds in wastes dumped into the stream by the Viscose Corp. of America plant at Front Royal.

This was confirmed yesterday by A. H. Paessler, the board's executive secretary. Paessler said the staff report was made to the board on January 29 after a meeting at which Viscose officials were present.

Paessler said investigation by the board and the State game commission had been going on for about a month. Analyses of water samples have been completed but complicated, time-consuming analyses of the flesh of the dead fish are still proceeding in the board's laboratory. Paessler expects a final determination within 2 weeks.

The dead fish appeared in increasing numbers until late in January, then tapered off. Some were observed this week, among them bass up to 9 pounds.

About 15 years ago, the corporation started construction of a million dollar waste treatment plant after thousands of Shenandoah River fish had died from the effects of pollution. Last year the Izaak Walton League gave the corporation an award for its efforts in behalf of conservation.

During recent months the corporation greatly increased its consumption of zinc compounds, used in processing rayon products.

Amzi G. McVay, corporation president, said yesterday he could make "no comment at this time."

Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. R. McC. Pate Receives the Veterans of Foreign Wars Commander in Chief's Citation and Gold Medal Award for Outstanding Contributions to National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday evening, February 3, it was my privilege to attend with more than 400 of the Members of Congress the annual congressional dinner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Gen. Randolph McC. Pate was there to receive the coveted Commander in Chief's Citation and Gold Medal Award in recognition of his outstanding services to the security of our Nation in these troubled times.

The presentation remarks of the distinguished senior vice commander of the VFW, Mr. Louis G. Feldmann, delivered in presenting the citation and gold medal deserve the careful study of all Members.

For there in brief form we find recognition of the very real need for the qualities, strengths and professional combat readiness of the Marine Corps which this Congress strives so unceasingly to insure will always be available to the Nation.

That this tribute to the Marine Corps comes from such a fine organization of American veterans of overseas service as the VFW is highly significant. Very clearly it demonstrates the fact that the deep concern so many of us feel over the slashing cuts in these tense and difficult times in the most ready of our Nation's limited war forces is widely shared by millions of our citizens. Our continuing efforts to provide the Nation with an adequate Marine Corps force-in-readiness do not stem only from the Armed Services Committee or even the Congress itself. They but reflect the awareness of the vast majority of the citizens we represent that such a force is vital in an era of relentless Communist pressure and deliberate incursions upon the interests and the safety of the free world.

I feel that it is particularly noteworthy that the remarks stress the concern of an organization of nearly one and a half million veterans of oversea service. Certainly, of all our citizens, these are men whose judgments in matters of national defense are entitled to more than ordinary consideration.

They support without qualification the repeated efforts of Congress to provide the Nation with the three full Marine divisions and air wings the law requires. They too have noted the events of Lebanon, Suez and Quemoy and turned to view with amazement the slashing cuts—12½ percent below appropriated strength—of the very service which responded so quickly, so decisively in those emergencies.

VFW Senior Vice Commander Feldmann's views concur with the belief held by this body that never before has the Nation's need for a combat ready Marine Corps been more obvious than it is today. Through this VFW presentation those oversea veterans have assured us that in keeping with the resolutions of their last national encampment and the informed views of their national security committee they will continue to support us in our determination to have a Marine Corps adequate to the actual needs of the times.

They share the ever-growing concern that concentration on weapons of massive destruction at the expense of the more versatile, more flexible military capabilities, so well represented by our ready Marine forces, is making us less and less able to cope with the demonstrated and continuing threat of constant Communist pressure tactics.

This firm expression of unqualified support from a group of our citizens so capable and well informed as the VFW should confirm and strengthen the resolve of all of us who have fought over the years to retain in our national defense structure the unique and vitally necessary combatant skills and amphibious know-how of the U.S. Marines.

Equally significant are General Pate's brief words of acceptance. They stress a fundamental faith in the human and moral values of the individual which remain basic to the Marines in an age when too many of us find it all too easy to place our faith in the search for shiny new weapons.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that both Mr. Feldmann's presentation remarks and the acceptance by General Pate be placed in the RECORD:

PRESENTATION REMARKS BY LOUIS G. FELDMANN

General Pate, as a former marine and on behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, it is my privilege and pleasure to present to you this Commander in Chief's Citation with the following wording.

As a token of the high esteem in which you and the Marine Corps are held by the Veterans of Foreign Wars—and by all patriotic citizens of our Nation—it is also my privilege to present to you this gold medal, which accompanies the citation, in recognition of our outstanding services to the security of our Nation in these troubled times.

I hope this medal will, in the years to come, serve as a reminder of the sincere appreciation we veterans have for the competent manner in which you have directed

Congress for the purpose of narrowing the extent of the no man's land. Prior to the announcement of the 1958 standards, representatives of the National Labor Relations Board had testified before Congress that the requested increase in appropriations would enable the Board to reduce the no man's land area by approximately 20 percent.[3] Applying the 20 percent assumption to Wisconsin, would still result in approximately 23 percent of the working force being included in the no man's land and about 73 percent of the employers. Regardless of whether the estimates of the National Board are correct, it is recoghized that the workload of the National Board has increased significantly, and with it a backlog of cases, to the extent that many matters which should be expeditiously determined are delayed for such a period of time that they also may be considered in a no man's land.[4]

Of major concern to the Senate committee has been the elimination of racketeering in labor-management relations. It is hard to conceive of a better opportunity for racketeering to flourish than to have no regulation available, either State or Federal, among the smaller employers and smaller collective bargaining units throughout the land. Extensive testimony has been heard by this committee indicating that the service industries, usually employing small groups of persons, have been the most easy prey for the racketeers. The continuance of a vacuum in the labor-relations law encourages rather than discourages the continuance of unsavory practices in labor-management relations.

In addition to the problems of racketeering, the impact of the Guss decision has been very upsetting to normal labor relations. From the viewpoint of administrators who must deal with everyday practical problems of labor relations, we fail to perceive how the interest of uniformity declared by the Supreme Court as a major premise in reaching its conclusion will be achieved by its decision. The only uniformity apparent to us, is the fast growing practice of returning stable labor relations, which have been fostered by State and Federal statutes, to the anarchy which existed prior to the enactment of the Wagner Act, the Employment Peace Act, and the Taft-Hartley Act. In the no-man's land, the right of employees to be represented by a labor union and to engage in collective bargaining will now be determined by economic force rather than by secret ballot; the right of employees to be free from discriminatory discharge because of union activities will be dissipated; and the rights of employers to be free from illegal picketing and from secondary boycotts will go unprotected.

When it is considered that 62 percent of all charges of unfair labor practices filed in the first quarter of 1958 with the National Labor Relations Board were filed by individuals,[5] it is difficult to understand how such individuals over whom the National Labor Relations Board will assert jurisdiction have rights and remedies more worthy of protection by a uniform Federal labor policy than those individuals who are employed in enterprises falling within the no-man's land area. This same argument applies to the rights of labor organizations and employers. We thus have a situation where neither the policies expressed in the Federal or State acts can be applied. The only uniformity apparent to us in the no-man's land is the chaos of no regulation.

The question has been raised in previous hearings before this committee that the State authority in labor relations permits regulation of uniform security agreements, including the enactment of right to work legislation. However, it should be noted that such State authority is not dependent and would not be blocked by the enactment of the proposed legislation since that authority is dependent upon section 14–B of the Taft-Hartley Act. The question has also been raised in previous hearings as to the number of States which do not have a labor relations board or agency, and thus would not benefit from the passage of legislation empowering States to act. While only twelve States and the Territory of Hawaii and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have Labor Relations Act, they include such important industrial States as New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Michigan, Connecticut, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. In these 10 States were located 31½ percent of the nonagricultural employees of the United States in 1955 and during that same year these States accounted for 45 percent of the strikes in the country.[6]

Furthermore, the 10 States do not include the industrial State of Michigan and the State of Kansas which have representation procedures as a part of their State mediation functions. A compilation of various State labor relations laws indicate that some 43 States and Territories have laws protecting the rights of employees to organization and to bargain collectively.[7]

The fact that any particular State chooses not to adopt labor legislation in harmony with the Federal statute, or not to adopt any labor legislation on a particular subject, does not seem persuasive to forbid States from enforcing labor relations statutes if the enterprises which might be subject to such regulation are of such little consequence as to be determined unworthy or impractical of regulation by the National Labor Relations Board.

Since the Guss decision, there has also been an increased interest in utilization of damage actions in labor disputes. Traditionally, students of labor relations have felt that damage actions were not the best means of achieving stable and harmonious labor relations, but increases in such suits can be expected in the absence of any other means of resolving labor disputes.

The Supreme Court in the Guss decision also mentioned that the no man's land could be reduced by the execution of cession agreements between the National Labor Relations Board and various State agencies provided the State statute was consistent with or had received a construction not in consistent with the Federal act. While effective arguments have been made by the States on behalf of such agreements, no cession agreements have been executed to date.[8] It is our feeling that the National Board has construed the word "consistency" to mean identical and has used such argument as means of blocking a cession agreement. Furthermore, there is no assurance that, even if a State statute was conformed to a Federal statute, litigation over consistency of construction could not be advanced in a particular case as a means of delay. With nine circuit courts of appeals passing on National Labor Relations Board decisions, it would be impossible for any State administrative agency to guarantee total consistency of interpretation no matter how hard it tried and no matter what the spirit of the administrators were toward the statute. It is our belief that most arguments against the execution of a cession agreement could be overcome if the National Board were willing to seriously consider entering into such an agreement but that to date such willingness has not been demonstrated. The unsuccessful experience of the State of New York in attempting to reach a cession agreement for the taxicab industry in New York City is the most recent and best detailed. From the legislative and administrative history of the present cession provision, section 10a, it may be concluded that a clarifying amendment of at least the consistency provision should be considered by the Congress if there is to be any hope of implementing the cession provision by the making of such agreements with State agencies.

In submitting this statement to the Senate Labor Committee, the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board wants to make it clear that our primary concern is to remedy the no man's land. The problem can be minimized by directing the National Labor Relations Board to take jurisdiction of all labor disputes arising under the national act and by providing for cession agreements to State agencies. The no man's land can be eliminated entirely in those States which have labor relations acts by amending the National Labor Relations Act so as to empower the National Labor Relations Board to decline jurisdiction and permitting State regulation over those matters which the National Board declines to handle.

As administrator of a State labor relations act, we believe there are many reasons why State administration of local disputes, especially involving smaller employers and smaller collective bargaining units in the no man's land category can be most effectively regulated by the States. However, if the Congress should not provide for State authority where the National Labor Relations Board declines to act, we would hope that the Congress would appropriate sufficient moneys to enable the National Labor Relations Board to fully occupy the no man's land, and further that if the Congress should decide to continue the cession provision of the present statute, that said provision be clarified to make cession agreements possible.

Respectfully submitted,

L. E. GOODING,
Chairman, Wisconsin Employment Relations Board.

FEBRUARY 12, 1959.

[3] Testimony of Chairman Leedom, June 10, 1958, 42LRR185.

[4] Third Quarterly Report, NLRB, 1958, 43LRR55.

[5] First Quarterly Report, NLRB, 1958, 42LRRM14.

[6] Blumrosen, "The Misinterpretation of Section 10a," Labor Law Journal, April 1958, p. 266.

[7] 4CCH, par. 40, 355.

[8] Memorandum to the NLRB on behalf of the New York State Labor Relations Board, by Philip Feldblum, general counsel, 1958.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Communist leaders of the Kremlin are using and will continue to use every diabolical means and method to capture the nations of the free world. These Communist leaders seek to destroy the free world by the method of divide and conquer. During this critical period in history the peoples of the free world must remain alert to the intrigue of the Communist masters in the Kremlin. The free world is forced to remain strong militarily, economically, and spiritually. It is paramount that we act as one—in unison. It is paramount that we stand firm in our commitments to one another. It is paramount that the free world agree on every issue and, last but not least,

that we maintain our faith in the Almighty. Only then can we avoid the pitfall of being engulfed into the orbit of the Communist fold. Let us recall the fate of those peoples and nations who are now the captives of the U.S.S.R.—Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, Eastern Germany, not to mention those on the threshold of enslavement.

None of these nations have lost their craving for liberty. It is important to them that we rekindle their hope for freedom and help them maintain their morale. Therefore, on this February 16 Lithuania commemorates the day of its independence and the day of its national birthday. I join with the Lithuanians on this sad occasion and pray that the future holds for them the day of their liberation to which we in the free world rededicate ourselves.

Poison in Your Water—No. 14

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the water from the Potomac River, one of whose tributary streams is the Shenandoah River, contains the zinc waste compounds dumped into the stream by the Viscose Corp., of America plant at Front Royal. An article setting forth what happened there appeared on the front page of the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald of February 13, 1959. The zinc wastes dumped into the Shenandoah River find their way into the drinking water of the people of the city of Washington, D.C., among whom at least some time during the year are all Members of Congress. This is the water that we drink:

SHENANDOAH WATER TESTED: RIVER POLLUTION FROM ZINC WASTES BLAMED FOR DEATH OF 200,000 FISH

(By Aubrey Graves)

An estimated 200,000 fish have been killed since late December in a 10-mile stretch of the Shenandoah River below Front Royal, Va.

A report made by the staff of the Virginia Water Control Board at Richmond has "tentatively" laid the blame on a high concentration of zinc compounds in wastes dumped into the stream by the Viscose Corp. of America plant at Front Royal.

This was confirmed yesterday by A. H. Paessler, the board's executive secretary. Paessler said the staff report was made to the board on January 29 after a meeting at which Viscose officials were present.

Paessler said investigation by the board and the State game commission had been going on for about a month. Analyses of water samples have been completed but complicated, time-consuming analyses of the flesh of the dead fish are still proceeding in the board's laboratory. Paessler expects a final determination within 2 weeks.

The dead fish appeared in increasing numbers until late in January, then tapered off. Some were observed this week, among them bass up to 9 pounds.

About 15 years ago, the corporation started construction of a million dollar waste treatment plant after thousands of Shenandoah River fish had died from the effects of pollution. Last year the Izaak Walton League gave the corporation an award for its efforts in behalf of conservation.

During recent months the corporation greatly increased its consumption of zinc compounds, used in processing rayon products.

Amzi G. McVay, corporation president, said yesterday he could make "no comment at this time."

Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. R. McC. Pate Receives the Veterans of Foreign Wars Commander in Chief's Citation and Gold Medal Award for Outstanding Contributions to National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday evening, February 3, it was my privilege to attend with more than 400 of the Members of Congress the annual congressional dinner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Gen. Randolph McC. Pate was there to receive the coveted Commander in Chief's Citation and Gold Medal Award in recognition of his outstanding services to the security of our Nation in these troubled times.

The presentation remarks of the distinguished senior vice commander of the VFW, Mr. Louis G. Feldmann, delivered in presenting the citation and gold medal deserve the careful study of all Members.

For there in brief form we find recognition of the very real need for the qualities, strengths and professional combat readiness of the Marine Corps which this Congress strives so unceasingly to insure will always be available to the Nation.

That this tribute to the Marine Corps comes from such a fine organization of American veterans of overseas service as the VFW is highly significant. Very clearly it demonstrates the fact that the deep concern so many of us feel over the slashing cuts in these tense and difficult times in the most ready of our Nation's limited war forces is widely shared by millions of our citizens. Our continuing efforts to provide the Nation with an adequate Marine Corps force-in-readiness do not stem only from the Armed Services Committee or even the Congress itself. They but reflect the awareness of the vast majority of the citizens we represent that such a force is vital in an era of relentless Communist pressure and deliberate incursions upon the interests and the safety of the free world.

I feel that it is particularly noteworthy that the remarks stress the concern of an organization of nearly one and a half million veterans of oversea service. Certainly, of all our citizens, these are men whose judgments in matters of national defense are entitled to more than ordinary consideration.

They support without qualification the repeated efforts of Congress to provide the Nation with the three full Marine divisions and air wings the law requires. They too have noted the events of Lebanon, Suez and Quemoy and turned to view with amazement the slashing cuts—12½ percent below appropriated strength—of the very service which responded so quickly, so decisively in those emergencies.

VFW Senior Vice Commander Feldmann's views concur with the belief held by this body that never before has the Nation's need for a combat ready Marine Corps been more obvious than it is today. Through this VFW presentation those oversea veterans have assured us that in keeping with the resolutions of their last national encampment and the informed views of their national security committee they will continue to support us in our determination to have a Marine Corps adequate to the actual needs of the times.

They share the ever-growing concern that concentration on weapons of massive destruction at the expense of the more versatile, more flexible military capabilities, so well represented by our ready Marine forces, is making us less and less able to cope with the demonstrated and continuing threat of constant Communist pressure tactics.

This firm expression of unqualified support from a group of our citizens so capable and well informed as the VFW should confirm and strengthen the resolve of all of us who have fought over the years to retain in our national defense structure the unique and vitally necessary combatant skills and amphibious know-how of the U.S. Marines.

Equally significant are General Pate's brief words of acceptance. They stress a fundamental faith in the human and moral values of the individual which remain basic to the Marines in an age when too many of us find it all too easy to place our faith in the search for shiny new weapons.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that both Mr. Feldmann's presentation remarks and the acceptance by General Pate be placed in the RECORD:

PRESENTATION REMARKS BY LOUIS G. FELDMANN

General Pate, as a former marine and on behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, it is my privilege and pleasure to present to you this Commander in Chief's Citation with the following wording.

As a token of the high esteem in which you and the Marine Corps are held by the Veterans of Foreign Wars—and by all patriotic citizens of our Nation—it is also my privilege to present to you this gold medal, which accompanies the citation, in recognition of our outstanding services to the security of our Nation in these troubled times.

I hope this medal will, in the years to come, serve as a reminder of the sincere appreciation we veterans have for the competent manner in which you have directed

the Marine Corps during your tenure as Commandant. Our Nation and the Free World have benefited from your leadership and the manner in which your marines have responded to every call.

The brief inscription on the citation and on the medal cannot fully express the reasons why you so righly deserve this award. In these days when such great emphasis is placed upon technological and material advancement, you and your marines have continued to retain and demonstrate those precious attributes of the spirit and the heart. These characteristics, which have been notably associated with the marines, are esprit, dedication, and unfailing devotion to country and corps. Although these attributes have been the continuing features of your great organization, under your leadership the Marine Corps also has made great technological advances. Since the end of World War II, through the corps conception, and development of the large helicopter as the ship-to-shore vehicle operating from troop-carrying aircraft carriers, our marines are fully capable of being a major factor in modern warfare.

This valuable technological progress reflects the manner in which the Marine Corps is carrying out the job assigned to it by the National Security Act. Under your direction the corps has tended to its own knitting and in so doing has complied with the spirit and intent of the law in developing the techniques of amphibious warfare and in providing the hard-hitting, ready force so vital to our national defense.

As repeated international crises have so well proven—Suez, the Formosan Straits, Syria, and Lebanon—the Marine Corps, under your command, has performed in the competent manner we have come to expect from marines. Its business-like, professional response to each of these crises demonstrates why our marines today are the first echelon of our Nation's limited war forces.

These accomplishments have not come easily. In making this award the Veterans of Foreign Wars recognize that what you have done has been accomplished in the face of extreme difficulties. You are required to maintain three combat divisions and three air wings while being administratively deprived of adequate funds to do so.

Never has the need for a combat-ready Marine Corps been greater. The demands for the flexibility provided by the Marines have rarely been more obvious. Unfortunately, with so much more to do, there does not seem to be enough to go around. Congress recognized the need for an adequate Marine Corps in these troubled times and appropriated funds for the 200,000 marines necessary for you to provide three divisions and three air wings which the law requires.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars are disturbed.

We find that by this procedure of withholding appropriated funds the Marines are being reduced substantially below the strength appropriated and intended by Congress.

You have, however as Marines, gone ahead and done your best.

Speaking for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, as a result of resolutions adopted at our last national encampment and at the recent meeting of our national security committee, we want you and our congressional guests to know that we shall support the intent and efforts of Congress to provide an adequate and combat-ready Marine Corps. My personal congratulations, General Pate.

GENERAL PATE'S REMARKS OF ACCEPTANCE

Commander Mahan, Senator JOHNSON, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

I am happy and proud to accept this handsome and generous award. I do so with the full realization I am accepting it for the great organization which I have the honor and the privilege to command: The U.S. Marine Corps.

I hope you will join with me in looking upon this award as a tribute to marines, past and present. Each one has made a significant and lasting contribution to the fighting force which you honor here this evening, and to the security of our Nation.

I would like to take a moment to tell you about an incident which recently took place in our headquarters and illustrates how deeply we feel about the importance of the individual marine.

A short time ago, a distinguished American artist told me he would like to do a painting of what we in the Marine Corps consider the most notable event or achievement in our history.

I wanted to be sure that our selection was made with a care and deliberation commensurate with the honor the artist offered to our corps, so I appointed a board of officers to consider the matter.

Their conclusion, which I readily and heartily approved, was that the most notable achievement in the history of the Marine Corps is the creation of the individual fighting marine.

The individual U.S. marine, trained to stand confident, resolute, and firm in the adversities of combat is our greatest achievement and our most important contribution to the defense of the Nation.

Of course, we cannot and do not claim full credit for his creation. He is created from the American youth who comes to us from your homes, your churches, and your communities with the spiritual and physical courage, the moral stamina, to accept the rigorous demands of training for combat.

On behalf of marines everywhere I assure you that we will continue to strive to maintain those standards of combat readiness and proficiency for which you have so honored us with this award. Your Marine Corps will exert its every endeavor to continue to give this Nation a faithful performance of the duty and responsibility placed upon Marines by the law—the responsibility of being a combat-ready force of amphibious specialists prepared to move instantaneously toward any trouble spot to protect our national interests.

This is the job assigned us by law. This is the job we do.

We are determined that in doing this job Marines will continue to merit the confidence and the trust which you have accorded to us.

On behalf of marines everywhere, I accept this cherished honor which you have awarded to us this evening.

February 16 Marks the Anniversary of the Birth of an Emancipator of American Women—Susan B. Anthony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this past week, we in the U.S. Congress have been celebrating the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, the emancipator of an entire race. It is fitting that we now pay our tribute in the same way to one who was an emancipator of American women—Susan B. Anthony.

Her birthday is being celebrated February 16 in all parts of the country. Her statue is here in the crypt of our Capitol building, a gift from American women. The 19th amendment to the Constitution, which enfranchised women, is popular known as the Susan B. Anthony amendment. Every year comes new recognition of what she did to elevate the position of the women in our country.

Suffrage for women is, of course, taken for granted to day—and this is well, for we do not like to recall that our mothers, wives and daughters did not always share with us, their husbands and fathers and sons and brothers, the primary right—and duty—of the franchise. Fortunately man's memory is so constituted that we do take for granted what is obviously right and good.

But the ideal for which Susan B. Anthony and her valiant fellow workers had to struggle so long and so mightily—yes, and to endure sacrifices and ridicule and indignity—is not yet realized. We here have the power to complete the task and to erase the blot which makes half our Nation not equal under the law. Let us complete the task now, and within a short time—I feel confident—it will be taken for granted that in the United States all citizens are equal under the law.

On the anniversary of the birth of Susan B. Anthony 200 Members of the House of Representatives announced publicly their intention to carry to a conclusion, as far as Congress can do so, the work to which Susan B. Anthony devoted her life efforts by giving their support to the Equal Rights for Women amendment introduced by the Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE and 38 other Members. There is no better way in which to bring our tribute to Susan B. Anthony.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The National Commander of the Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Massachusetts is proud that one of her distinguished citizens, Judge David B. Williams, of Concord, is the present national commander of the Disabled American Veterans.

The Honorable Christopher H. Phillips, U.S. representative on the United Nations Economic and Social Council, spoke at a testimonial banquet in Concord honoring Judge Williams last November 29. He brought a message from President Eisenhower, and presented some valuable facts as to the work of the Disabled American Veterans. Believing that Members of Congress and others will be interested in his speech, I am including it in extension of my remarks:

Commander Williams, members of the Disabled American Veterans, ladies, and gentlemen, I feel privileged to join in this testimonial to Dave Williams. I am especially pleased to bring you greetings from the President of the United States. He has given me a message which I would like to read to you:

"Please give my congratulations to the members of the Disabled American Veterans gathered in honor of their national commander, Judge David B. Williams. It is gratifying to see the emergence of such leaders as Judge Williams from the ranks of the younger veterans of the Second World War.

"Despite adversity, he has risen in his State to a place of honor and strength and now his leadership will be felt across the Nation.

"As Judge Williams enters his new duties with the DAV, it is a pleasure to send him my congratulations and best wishes.

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

As an old friend of Dave Williams, having served with him in Massachusetts' General Court, I am much impressed by the distinguished company that has gathered for this testimonial dinner. I am almost equally impressed at seeing that such a large number of Commander Williams' friends chose to take part in this banquet on this particular holiday weekend—having taken time out for only 2 days to recover from their Thanksgiving feasts.

The presence of so many Congressmen as well as the Acting Administrator of the Veterans' Administration indicates our deep satisfaction in the fact that Commander Williams' tremendous energies, his capabilities and sense of devotion to public affairs, are being put to work nationally during the next 12 months.

On our national scene there are few causes as deserving of inspired leadership as that of the Disabled American Veterans. As they have in the past, the Disabled American Veterans have now chosen just that kind of leadership.

This good cause and its leadership have earned the widest backing from the rest of the community. And in his labors Commander Williams will be able to count on the kind of top-drawer public and official support that we see represented here this evening. To me this cause, this leadership, and this support look like an unbeatable combination.

In fact, from my own vantage point down in New York at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations, I could well be a little envious of Dave. By good fortune he and Brad are constituents of Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS. Since World War I, in the care, readjustment and rehabilitation of war veterans, Representative ROGERS has ranked as First Lady of the Land. Even if they were not voters in the Fifth Massachusetts District, Dave and Brad could look to Mrs. ROGERS as a legislative tower of strength, a determined and invariably successful task force in any mission concerned with American war veterans.

Every President since the Wilson administration has known of Mrs. ROGERS' unceasing endeavors in behalf of the sick and wounded. She was the personal representative of Presidents Harding and Coolidge in the care of the disabled. Her preeminence in this work was achieved even before she began her illustrious career in the House of Representatives in June 1925, as the successor to her late husband, Congressman John Jacob Rogers.

I said a moment ago that this is a distinguished company. It is distinguished most of all in its dedicated service to our national welfare. Members of the Disabled American Veterans have in heroic measure lived by the watchword of our Republic: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Mrs. ROGERS and others of you here have led in exercising eternal vigilance on the home front, both in times of war and peace.

The qualities which the Disabled American Veterans symbolize were never in greater need than they are today. Much the same kind of "guts" which these men showed in combat is needed now to wage foreign policy in the nuclear stalemate which we see hanging over our future.

In the Soviet Union, the United States faces a determined opponent. Moscow, with its tightly centralized dictatorship, is prepared to play a waiting game, to try to wear us down with alternate crises and phony peace offensives. We can be fairly sure that the Soviets won't intentionally set off a world war III in which there could be no victor. The chances are that they won't try a nuclear play through the center of our line. Instead, they will plan to catch us napping, relaxed in our vigilance, so that they can pull off a sneak end-run play by subversion and indirect aggression.

It is the Communists' cynical belief that the citizens of our democracy will prove to be weak in self-discipline, that they cannot keep their guard up in a long-drawn-out war of nerves. Making liars out of the Communist prophets will continue to be one of the toughest jobs our Nation ever tackled. And in this contest the example of vigilance given to us by the Disabled American Veterans is one of our great assets.

There is a direct parallel between the caliber of alertness which your organization has shown and the sharp watch we must keep as a Nation. The Disabled American Veterans and Congresswoman ROGERS can testify that immediately after the two World Wars our people and their Government have been more than generous in providing veterans benefits and services. But as time passes this enthusiasm tends to fade.

In the same way there is a tendency to forget all of the terrible costs of war. There is a tendency to grow weary at the infinitely smaller costs of defense and mutual security.

The Disabled American Veterans have done a remarkable job in fighting such forgetfulness. Without their unflagging efforts to mobilize public support, the programs for disabled veterans could not have been maintained at present levels. They know that it takes eternal vigilance before the voters and their elected representatives to combat indifference, to resist the wasteful dismantling of worthy programs for enabling the disabled to lead happier and more useful lives.

I see no cause for complaint or regret in this need to keep ourselves steamed up about our responsibilities. To the contrary, it is part of our pride that we can rise to any real challenge. This is the way of men who love liberty.

Turning now to the problems of national security. In keeping the shield of our Republic strong and high we are faced with a task that is like washing the dishes or mowing the lawn. No matter how well we have done the job, it is a job that never stays finished for very long.

We must never forget that our national security today involves a great many complex factors. It rests on far more than the maintenance of adequate Armed Forces—vital though they are. Political, economic, and diplomatic activities constitute a major part of our defense arsenal. Because these activities sometimes seem less directly related to national security, we tend to underestimate their importance. But we can afford to do so only at our grave peril.

Consider how the Communists view the nature of today's struggle. This is what Mr. Khrushchev said:

"We boldly challenge the capitalist world. Let us compete to see who can reach the highest level of productive forces, who will produce more per capita, who will ensure the highest material and cultural standard of living for the people, where are the best opportunities created for the development of all the capabilities of man; whichever regime insures the best conditions for the peoples will win. We are convinced that it is the most progressive socialist regime that will win. The future is with our socialist system. Capitalism is at its ebb, heading for collapse. This does not mean that it is already lying down with its legs stretched out; much work has yet to be done to bring it to such a state but this is inevitable, just as death inevitably comes to a living organism."

This Soviet challenge is reflected in the vast ruble offensive it has undertaken during the past 3 or 4 years. Its activities on the economic front constitute a sort of sneak end-run play that could penetrate where tanks and ballistic missiles would not succeed. Since 1954 the Soviet bloc has made available $2 billion in aid to the underdeveloped countries. During the same period it has double its trade with these have-not countries.

This is one field in which the United States is especially well equipped to meet the So-

viet challenge. Long before the Soviets became interested in these matters, the United States was taking steps to help strengthen freedom in many parts of the world. We have done this through our mutual security programs. Today we are moving to strengthen these programs to make them more effective in meeting this Soviet economic offensive. With bipartisan congressional support, we hope there will emerge during the coming year a new look and increased vigor in our foreign economic policies.

There have already been several indications of increased activity in this field. For example, we have increased the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank by $2 billion. We have taken the initiative to increase the lending authority of the World Bank. We have expressed our willingness to participate in regional economic development institutions in Latin America and the Middle East. And finally, we are considering the possibility of increasing the lending authority of our own Development Loan Fund.

All of these activities are, as I have emphasized, directly related to strengthening our national security.

In Geneva today two conferences are being held which bear directly on another vital matter of national security. These are the talks on suspension of nuclear tests and on the question of surprise attack. Both are part of the broader problem of disarmament. Let me say a brief word about this complex subject.

In the first place, the word "disarmament" is somewhat of a misnomer. What we are really talking about is not disarmament in the literal sense, but rather a limitation of armaments so as to reduce the danger of war. And, of course, closely related to this objective is the problem of minimizing the dangers of surprise attack.

Now, these matters have been under consideration in the United Nations for several years. Progress has been at a snail's pace. This is due to the intransigent position taken by the Soviet Union when it comes to the question of effective inspection and control of any disarmament agreement. For some time now they have engaged in a "ban the bomb" campaign. They have been all too willing to make paper promises. Until more than paper promises are in sight, no really effective arms limitation can take place. For, to agree to a mere paper pledge would give the Soviets a serious toe hold on our security. Despite these obstacles, we will continue to persevere in our efforts for a meaningful agreement. The stakes are high and the need for effective arms limitation is real. If we continue to be persistent and determined, the day may yet come when the Soviets will see the logic of our view.

Now I would like to conclude my remarks with this observation. I have pointed to the parallel between two noble causes—the cause of the Disabled American Veterans and the larger cause of our national security. Members of the DAV have set for us a high standard, as a guide for the exercise of vigilance in guarding our liberties.

All Americans are indebted to them for their wartime sacrifices. Nevertheless, you have an enviable opportunity to do battle again—but this time with words and actions rather than weapons of war.

The Disabled American Veterans have the prestige and respect which can make them a potent force in keeping our guard up as a nation. You are an organization with proven political know-how. You can be a powerful force for bolstering our national strength for what is likely to be a long drawnout contest with the Soviet world. We need perseverance. We need dedication. We need courage. All of those qualities you possess in abundance. Under the distinguished leadership of your new national commander, I know the American people can look to the Disabled American Veterans to set an example of vigilance and perseverance which today, as never before, is indeed the price of liberty.

Free Kosher Kitchen Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an article about the annual dinner of the Free Kosher Kitchen located in my district. This humanitarian effort is directed by my good friend Joe Pearson. The article was published in the Williamsburg News, a weekly newspaper, and reads as follows:

ABOUT IMPORTANT PEOPLE

(By Harvey Rosenfeld)

If we would compare the history of this year's Free Kosher Kitchen banquet—its preparations and occurrence—with last year's, we would find distinctive variations between the two. We would discover that the events preceding the banquets differ somewhat; and even the celebrities attending the affairs were not the same. Yet, the consequences will be the same. Poor people will again be contented, the unfortunate ones will once more be contented.

A few days before the banquet, we revisited "Big Joe's Happiness Exchange Program" on WABC radio in an attempt to aid the cause for the free kitchen. The previous year, we interviewed "Big Joe" on WMGM. But this time, he was on vacation—a very deserved one, indeed. Charity does not take vacations, however. His lovely sister-in-law, Julie Mitchell, filled in for him—ready to talk and assist. Along with us was Ira Pearson, whose father, Joe, directs the humanistic work for the kitchen, located at 228 South First Street. He was there doing his share, too.

Julie called the charitable work that she was performing on the happiness exchange, fun. The former social science schoolteacher said that it was thrilling to see a person in despair leave our program completely changed. The change from sadness to happiness is a most gratifying one to observe. And, to work on behalf of the kitchen was no different.

At the banquet this year there were new faces. But many of the kitchen's old guard returned. There were some of the regular guests, who for personal reasons, were not able to be in attendance. But the poor people will be eating again, as they did last year.

The dais and tables were once more filled with the elite of communal and civic life. Political names and the people's elected officers and delegates were there to guarantee that the food baskets will once again be carried away by the needy. These profiles included: State Senator Harry Gittleson; Edward Lentol, neighborhood assemblyman; comptroller of the State of New York, Col. Arthur Levitt, and his worthy assistant, William B. Volet. In this bracket there were the judges all pronouncing praise on the dedicated institution. In this celebrated clique there were: Judge John MacCrate, chief judge of the appellate division, now in retirement, and his former secretary, Benjamin Groberg; Judges Flagg, Williams, and McLaughlin of the municipal courts; and Judges Marasco and Blangiardo, other vital organs of our judicial systems.

When the stentorian voice of Master of Ceremonies Ira Pearson introduced the personages of the medical world to the audience, one senses the fact that these men will be working with Joe Pearson to help the mentally depressed, and to secure an exit for those who do not belong in those institutions. The list of the doctors include: Charles Buckman, Nathan Beckenstein, and John Bianchi.

Businessmen and members of other dignified vocations were there to express their thanks to Joe Pearson, a man who has solved intricate welfare problems. The Dropkins of the welfare department; Beldner's of Greater New York Mutual; Sylvester P. Eisemann, manager of the Big Four Insurance Co.; a table of the New York League of Locality Mayors; Berko's, of the chocolate sirup company bearing their name; Ringleheim's of the Marcy Do-Nut & Culler Co.; Philip H. Elice, furniture store proprietor; Francis J. Greco, and Sidney Katz, lawyers; Rabbi Stern, Murray Ohl, and the Flintenstein's, and Charles Psaty, who with his Packard delivers food for the poor—all these signify the masses who were ready to guarantee that the poor will once again eat this year.

Even the entertainment was varied from that of the previous year. Lou Stimel and his men returned to play tunes for dancing; Elvira Helal was there with her soprano voice. But Rita Elice, pretty recording and TV personality was missed; as were Sid Katz' jokes. Yet, the unfortunate will still be able to sing their anthem of thanks.

The banquet was once again, this year, in honor of Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO and "Big Joe" Rosenfield, Jr. The former's speech began with an anecdote, as it did last year. But this time it was in a humorous vein. It was about the internal revenue man who ascended to heaven before the rabbi because he had scared more hell out of people on earth than anyone else. However, before leaving for Washington and his Space and Preparedness Committee, he reiterated last year's theme: "Joe Pearson" serves the people all year long.

"Big Joe's" message to the throng differed a little from the previous year. On one count it was longer, and secondly, more personal. But the motif was the same—"If Joe Pearson spent the time he donates to charity on a personal business, he would be a wealthy man."

The Free Kosher Kitchen banquets of 1958 and 1959 show recognizable differences. Yet, to the needy and unfortunate they remain the same.

Progress of Wyoming Historical and Geological Society of Luzerne County, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of February 12, 1959:

HISTORICAL SOCIETY PROGRESS

The progress, reported at the annual meeting of the Wyoming Historical and Geological Society at the annual meeting last night as it completed the first year of the second century of its existence, was most gratifying.

During 1958, the society added 76 names to its membership roll. Through the generosity of Mrs. Frank G. Darte, it acquired Swetland House, to be converted into a public museum. Exhibits and lectures it sponsored attracted thousands of local residents, including many adolescents. This constitutes a substantial contribution to local culture.

Obviously, the society has taken a new lease on life with the completion of the first 100 years. The new interest in its affairs, as the expanding membership and program of activities indicates, is a happy omen for the future. Its possibilities are tremendous.

Formed to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the burning of anthracite in a grate, the society has extended into many fields and with stimulating results. With colleges, high schools, and organizations like the Boy Scouts taking advantage of its facilities, there is added reason for public support and encouragement. To be affiliated with a group, motivated by the high idealism and practical service of the historical society, should be regarded as a high privilege.

Our REA Program Under the Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, last week the national REA convention was held here in Washington, and many of us who are interested in, and sympathetic toward, the REA program had an opportunity to visit with friends from our home States who were here for the convention. These people justifiably feel a great deal of pride in this program which they have helped to initiate in their respective areas and have guided to successful maturity as a stable cooperative enterprise bringing electricity to rural areas.

Having lived beyond the reach of an electric powerline all my life, until REA brought electricity to our ranch 7 years ago, no one has a greater appreciation of what REA has meant to people living in the country. As I have said many times, no one in his right mind has any desire to see the REA program anything but stable and successful in the years to come.

For some reason, there are some folks who would try to make a political football out of REA. For some reason that I can only interpret as a means of attempting to bring discredit to our present administration, the inference has been made repeatedly that the REA program, under the Eisenhower administration, has been curtailed, and restricted in its operation. I believe the record of REA expansion during the past 6 years speaks for itself. I do not believe that that record indicates that anything but friendly, constructive direction and administration has been given to the program.

The remarks of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson at a press conference on February 12, 1958, outline clearly the real progress that the REA program has made during the Eisenhower administration.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the transcript of these remarks of Secretary Benson as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE BENSON ON THE REA PROGRAMS AT PRESS CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 12, 1959

Thousands of the directors and managers of our rural electric co-ops financed by REA end their Washington meeting today. I would like to salute this fine group. We all know they have built well.

Because there have been some efforts through demagoguery and other means to mislead and distort the facts, I would like to set the record straight on a few points this morning.

Some of the so-called friends of REA claim, first, that the Secretary has taken away the authority of the Administrator to approve loans. This is untrue.

Second, they say this administration is destroying REA. This is absolutely false. The record speaks for itself—and let me give you just one or two items from the record.

First, the greatest progress ever made in REA has been made during the last 6 years; loans of $1.2 billion have been made, compared to $2.6 billion loaned in the previous 17½ years.

Annual power sales are approximately 22 billion kilowatt-hours, double the sales made in 1952.

Third, borrowers who are delinquent on loans have dropped from 45 to 6 in the last 6 years; and these co-op organizations today are $139 million ahead of payments. The records of the past have not even approached this splendid record of repayment.

And fourth, the net worth of cooperative borrowers has more than tripled in the last 6 years.

Now, I think we should keep in mind that REA and the REA program, and the area served, have changed somewhat in recent years. Today over 95 percent of the farms and ranches of America have electric service; 75 percent of the new customers being added are industrial and nonfarmer residential consumers, and one-half of the total power sales by the REA system today is for nonfarmer use.

In other words, REA has come of age. It has rendered a great service; it is rendering great service now. But it has come of age. In the interest of fairness to all and in the interest of its own future financial strength, we feel that the system should first pay interest rates at least equal to the cost of money to the Government.

This would eliminate one of the criticisms of REA and a criticism that will increase unless a change is made.

And second, the system should start moving forward to obtain supplemental financing from private sources.

Now, such actions I feel, and my associates feel, would be in line with tradition and with the sound policies followed by the Farm Credit Administration which started out rather heavily helped by the Government and is gradually paying off the Government capital and getting its loan rates on a realistic basis. Such a policy will reduce unnecessary Government participation and thereby protect and strengthen the free enterprise system of which these electric and telephone cooperatives are a vital part. And so this administration will continue to support and strengthen the services of REA to our farmers.

We will just as vigorously oppose efforts to socialize electric power or any other segment of our economy, including agriculture. As one who has spent most of his life promoting farmer cooperatives, I strongly feel that these recommendations, these suggestions will further strengthen the REA system.

FACTS OF REA GROWTH 1953–59 (DISTRIBUTED AT SECRETARY BENSON'S PRESS CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 12, 1959)

1. Loans of about $1.2 billion have been made. This is almost one-third of the $3.8 billion approved since the start of the program.

2. Some 800,000 new consumers and 180,000 miles of line have been added to REA systems, to the point where almost 96 percent of our farms have electricity, more than half of which are served by REA borrowers.

3. Power sales on REA systems have reached an estimated 21.7 billion kilowatt-hours, or double the sales in 1952.

4. Loans were approved to provide facilities for 1,116,000 kilowatts of generating capacity, almost double the total provided in the previous 17½ years.

5. The number of electrification borrowers behind in their loan payments dropped from 45 to 6 out of a total of nearly 1,000. (The systems have made payments on principal and interest in excess of $1 billion. At year-end the systems were ahead on their payments in the amounts of $139 million.)

6. The net worth of electrification borrowers has more than tripled, increasing from $161 million to $512 million. (On January 1, 1959, net worth was about 16.4 percent of total assets.)

There are two other facts which indicate a significant trend in the growth of the REA systems:

1. Three out of every four new customers being added to the systems are industrial and nonfarm residential consumers.

2. About one-half of total power sales by the REA system is now being made to industrial and nonfarm residential consumers.

Airline Safety Before Frills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the February 10 issue of the Rockford Register, Republic, Rockford, Ill., entitled "Airline Safety Before Frills":

AIRLINE SAFETY BEFORE FRILLS

President Eisenhower and Gen. Elwood Quesada, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, take the proper stand that Federal appropriations for civil airports should be earmarked for safety features—runways, control towers, taxiways, and improved ground landing-control devices. Need for this emphasis was pointed up by last week's Electra crash in New York City; the plane was headed for a runway lacking a safety beam to guide its rate of descent.

Yet, Senate Democrats, continuing their hasty rush to pass spending bills, last week approved a $465 million 4-year program of Federal airport grants that would provide funds for terminal buildings, waiting rooms, and other passenger comforts and conveniences.

The President noted that the Federal Government has not built railroad or bus depots, and General Quesada said that facilities "beyond the gate" having nothing to do with aviation safety should be the responsibility of State or local authorities and the airlines themselves. In this respect, it will be noted that future improvements to Chicago's O'Hare field will be financed in part by landing fees charged the airlines.

President Eisenhower, who vetoed an airport-aid bill last year and suggested it was time for the Government to get out of the business of subsidizing airfields, included $50 million a year for 4 years in the 1960 fiscal budget for facilities falling strictly in the safety category. Democrats, however, agreed only to trim the original $565 million bill by $100 million—and then at the urging of their Senate leader, LYNDON JOHNSON.

If the airport bill clears Congress in its present form, it will face the distinct possibility of a presidential veto. The inclusion of funds for nonsafety features is an old trick of congressional spenders; they know that the President lacks powers to disapprove individual items in appropriation bills, so they tack pork-barrel provisions onto measures calling for desirable projects.

Perhaps the House, which last year had a better economy record than the Senate, will trim the fat from the upper Chamber's bill. Taxpayers ought to tell their Congressmen to vote for greater aviation safety, but not for plush airport terminal facilities.

Washington's Dream of Great Port Here Near Realization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a goodly measure of pride that I take this opportunity to report on a wonderful civic endeavor undertaken by a group of public-spirited citizens of Alexandria, Va., and the Washington Metropolitan area.

I am inserting in the RECORD a fine article written by Mr. Raymond L. Tolbert, president of the Potomac River Port Association, entitled "Washington's Dream of Great Port Here Near Realization." This article is a summary of a larger item which appeared in the Alexandria Gazette, the oldest daily newspaper of the United States on the occasion of its 175th anniversary edition, February 5, 1959:

WASHINGTON'S DREAM OF GREAT PORT HERE NEAR REALIZATION—METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON NEEDS SEAPORTS—POTOMAC RIVER PORT ASSOCIATION SEEKS WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT

In 1789 Virginia ceded to the Federal Government a portion of its territory, part of which was the waterfront of Alexandria, to help make a 10-mile square area for the Capital of the United States, and it was of this area that George Washington said, "It is at the head of navigable water reaching to the ocean, so that large vessels could come from all ports of the world. It is likewise on the coastal road from north to south, so the transportation of commodities and persons between these regions would be by way of the Capital City. Here bulk cargoes would be broken up for shipment to the interior. Here great markets and exchanges would be established. The National Capital would become the center of trade and industry, as well as government. It would be the economic capital of the Nation as well as political capital."

GREATEST NATURAL ASSET

It has been 160 years since George Washington gave these reasons for selection of the Capital site—but, at long last, his vision may be close to realization for the pressures of economic growth and an expanding population have made the people of this community conscious of the fact that their greatest natural asset lies decaying on their waterfront. What once was a busy port, a trading post to the world, has, like Rip van Winkle, let time and events pass it by. But the time for sleeping has passed and, belated through it may be, our citizens have awakened to the need for development of the Potomac River channel and for resurgence of their cities as thriving ports.

It is evident that the Alexandria of the early colonial days was conscious of its position in the world of commerce for the seal of the city represents a merchant's scale over a square-rigged merchant ship. Alexandria did, in fact, owe its early prosperity to waterborne commerce. From the back country great caravans of wagons rolled into the city, laden with tobacco, wheat and other farm products for export and returned to their plantations with glass, crockery, and fine merchandise from overseas. And as an evidence of their eagerness to make Alexandria a more thriving port, the good citizens of the community approved a plan which in 1776 resulted in cutting away the hilltop, upon which the early city was founded, to enable carts to traverse a gentler incline to reach the warehouses and wharves at the river's edge.

SIXTH IN NATION

After the Revolution, Alexandria's commerce expanded and flourished. It was common to see many European ships, and some from other parts of the world, alongside the docks, unloading their native goods, or loading the produce of this area into their holds. Alexandria at one time ranked sixth among the ports of the young Nation, in tonnage handled at its docks.

However, the early years of the 19th century saw the decline of Alexandria as an important port. President Madison's embargo on American shipping, imposed in 1809 in an atempt to stop seizure of our ships by the French and British, brought commerce to a standstill, with idle ships and crews lying in port resulting in heavy loss to ship owners. In 1814, as a prelude to their burning of public buildings in Washington, the British took brief possession of Alexandria, captured most of hte ships in the port and seized the contents of the warehouses there. This was another reverse to the merchants and traders whose ships and merchandise were lost. Not content with these tribulations, fate dealt an additional blow in 1827 with a holocaust of fire leveled a large part of the city destroying most of the business area and causing a serious reduction in commercial activity. The coming of the steam-driven ship marked the end of large-scale commerce in Alexandria and in 1860 foreign trade had dwindled to a paltry value of $1,750,000 from a high point of almost $3,750,000 in earlier years. Alexandria's loss of trade, occasioned by the advent of the deep-draft steamship, whose owners feared damage to their vessels in the shallow reaches of the Potomac, was further aggravated by the War Between the States when the Potomac River was the boundary between those warring factions.

SPORADIC EFFORTS MADE

The century that has passed since 1859 has seen sporadic efforts at improvement of the river channels to recapture, for Washington and Alexandria, some measure of their former status as shipping centers. The efforts of local citizens and the action of Congress, however, failed to keep pace with developments in ship construction and though the Potomac River channel was deepened and widened it was, and is, able to accommodate only the smallest seagoing freighters. The last serious effort to improve the Potomac River for commerce started at the turn of the century when, in 1899, the Congress, even then impressed by the necessity for development of the resources of this area, authorized and appropriated funds to deepen the channel to 24 feet, and widen it to 200 feet along the 108 miles from Washington to the Chesapeake entrance. Unfortunately for the metropolitan area as a port, the drawing boards of shipbuilders were busy with design of bigger and better ships—24 feet of water in the Potomac River channel was not enough.

METROPOLITAN GROWTH

While the last hundred years has seen little improvement in the river that passes Alexandria's front door, the communities that once bordered it as a series of sprawling, and sometimes brawling, towns have become a metropolitan area, which includes Washington, D.C., Fairfax, Arlington, in Virginia, and Montgomery County and Prince Georges County in Maryland, and the independent cities of Alexandria and Falls Church, Va. The metropolitan area of Washington has led the 10 largest metropolitan areas in the United States in population growth. Alexandria has shared prominently in this growth, having increased its population from 24,149 in 1930 to 87,000 in 1957 with an estimated population of 105,000 by 1965.

Population is just you and me and many other people. But you and I and these other people must have, for living and for survival, many things—schools and hospitals, streets and highways, police and fire protection, business and industry, work and recreation. These things don't just pop up like magic produced from a magician's tophat. They require revenue for support and careful planning for orderly development. Without one, vital services could not be obtained, without the other a chaotic situation would result.

The communities that make up the metropolitan area are all experiencing growing pains. Each has its problem of land utilization, of economic development, of transportation, of all the things that make up life in an urban setting. Concerned by the impact of these problems in the Washington area a Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems, 85th Congress, 2d session held exhaustive hearings during 1958 to review what is being done by local governments and private organizations of the area to identify their growth problems and, where possible, to solve them. These hearings described population growing by leaps and bounds, with a metropolitan area population now totaling 2 million to become nearly 3,500,000 by 1980. Economic development was pictured which would, by 1970, completely close the corridor between Baltimore and Washington and would have expanded into the area south of Alexandria as far as Woodbridge, Va. The necessity for development of port facilities along the Potomac River, not alone at Alexandria and Washington, but along both shores was expounded as being vital to the future of the metropolitan area. Testimony was given by eminent economists, experts in transportation, engineers of distinction in the field of water use, all of whom emphasized the need to take action now to meet the problems of tomorrow. The committee will make its final report to Congress at this present session and should propose measures which will promote the economic stability of the metropolitan area. Alexandrians are confronted by essentially the same problems of growth that plague the rest of the metropolitan area and they are aware that these problems are insoluble without utilization of every available community resource, natural or manufactured. They see the vital necessity for redevelopment of the Potomac River into an avenue of world trade as a partial solution to the economic problems of their city. This dormant giant, drowsing now for a century, would be awakened and made to be a source of financial support as well as of scenic in-

terest. They recognize that the entire metropolitan area would be a beneficiary of a deepened and widened Potomac River channel, particularly in Alexandria.

ALL HAVE INTEREST

Though Alexandria is the logical first site for a deep-water freight terminal, it is evident that the District of Columbia, Maryland, and the rest of northern Virginia have an equal interest in the entire development project and need to be partners in its formulation and progress. The future can only bring additional growth and what is now visualized as an early development of Washington passenger terminal facilities and cargo handling terminals at Alexandria will undoubtedly result in similar, but later, development on the Maryland shore and south along the Virginia side.

The metropolitan area of Washington, particularly Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland, and Fairfax County in Virginia, are experiencing a tremendous growth in research and development installations. These installations in turn will lead to the production of new ideas in the future. The development of the ports for this area will stimulate and further the development of light industry in these areas.

With this in mind a series of studies on the economic justification for the development of port facilities on the Potomac River was inaugurated by the city of Alexandria, the Alexandria Chamber of Commerce, and the Washington Board of Trade. The report on the first of these studies was made in April 1956 and, though admittedly limited in scope, was highly favorable.

A year later the Virginia State Ports Authority, after a more exhaustive study which included the metropolitan area and surrounding areas, reaching to parts of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio, reported that there is a substantial foreign and intercoastal commerce potential for Potomac River ports, and recommended that everything possible be done to build up Alexandria as a world port.

RECENT STUDY MADE

The most recent study and probably the most important was authorized by the 85th Congress which appropriated $133,000 to the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army to conduct: (1) an economic analysis of additional commerce to be developed by a Potomac port development and the extent of transportation savings, and (2) a survey to determine dredging costs. According to Representative JOEL T. BROYHILL the first part of the Corps of Engineers analysis has been completed with a highly favorable report. This report, with its succeeding analysis of dredging costs, will be the basis for further congressional action to appropriate funds for the actual work of widening and deepening the Potomac River Channel.

These surveys have convinced the civic leaders of the community that they must actively support this project; that its fulfillment will bring a vitally needed economic boost to the entire metropolitan area. One of the first steps that they must take to insure its success is development of the master plan outlining construction which will be required to provide a modern and efficient freight terminal facility. This will necessitate a comprehensive survey of the present waterfront facilities and a detailed recommendation on the most suitable utilization of waterfront land, bearing in mind the need to integrate into the master plan access and egress routes which will provide optimum availability of highway and rail transport. One of the many badly needed highway bypasses that Alexandria is considering might be included in this plan as an elevated highway running the length of the waterfront serving the port activity and through traffic as well. The master plan, while addressing itself primarily to transit and storage facilities essential to an efficient port operation must give consideration to other municipal needs relating to recreational areas, sailing marinas and small-boat facilities. Our planners would need, of course, to establish a time schedule to provide for orderly progression and enable construction to remain an even distance ahead of requirements, obviously it would be uneconomical to build a capacity into either Alexandria or Washington's port facilities which would not be used until long after completion. Consideration should be given to the various possibilities of funding the development and of its operation. Operation of a busy port is a highly competitive and specialized business and selection of the form of port administration most suitable to our plans should not be long delayed. The benefits of a port will not come to this area without concentrated promotion to secure scheduled service by shipping interests and to convince shippers of the advantages to them in moving their goods through this area. As improvement of the Potomac River Channel advances, this promotion will be an important step in insuring the success of the ports of Alexandria and Washington.

VISUALIZE CARGO PORT

In the absence of formal plans, the Potomac River Port Association visualizes a cargo port, with wharf-type berths paralleling the mile-long waterfront of Alexandria. The port facilities should be capable of handling an annual flow of 3 million tons of cargo which will serve the entire metropolitan marketing area of part of Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Virginia, and Maryland, an area that now has a population of over 10 million with a personal income in excess of $16 million. Few cities have going for them the transportation facilities which already exist in the Alexandria area; excellent highways connect with major centers east, south, and west; seven railroads, the Southern, the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac, the Chesapeake & Ohio, the Atlantic Coast Line, the Seaboard Air Line, the Pennsylvania, and the Baltimore & Ohio serve the area. The Potomac Yard is one of the leading freight terminal and classification yards in the Nation. Washington National Airport is one of the most active in the United States and a new airport, now building at Chantilly, Va., not far from Alexandria, will add an even greater capacity for air traffic. With modern port terminal facilities at Alexandria and Washington to accommodate deep draft cargo and passenger ships, this area will be a well-balanced and complete trading center, with transportation readily available by rail, sea, air, and highway.

A POSSIBLE PLAN

It is contemplated that the port development will be fully integrated with other plans affecting both cities. A first step in terminal construction in Alexandria could be utilization of the spoil dredged from the channel to fill behind the bulkhead which will form the wharves, such a procedure will reduce the dredging cost by shortening the distance such material must be transported and will add a considerable usable acreage to the Alexandria waterfront. Storage and transit warehouses will be constructed for nine ship berths, and existing facilities used as far as practicable. A loop highway, connecting with the main arterial highways, will be elevated, running the length of Alexandria's waterfront over the roofs of the transit terminals. Existing rail spurs will be extended to serve all terminal warehouses and loop back into Potomac Yard. A 6-acre open lumber storage area with attendant wharf will be established at the southern extremity of the waterfront. Complete refrigeration services and cold storage facilities will be included in the terminal plans.

What will this revitalized port mean to the area? The terminals for deep draft vessels that are visualized will introduce a vitally needed new source of economic strength into the community. The surveys mentioned earlier have indicated that many millions of dollars could be saved annually to importers and exporters of the metropolitan marketing area by having their goods moved through Alexandria. This saving would be passed on to the consumer in lower prices for goods now received through rail and highway transportation from more distant ports. Passenger traffic through Washington, limited as it has been in the past by the 21-foot channel depth, has proved financially remunerative. With improved terminals and a deeper and wider channel which would accommodate modern cruise ships, Washington could richly support a flourishing and profitable seaborne tourist and cruise business.

MANY BENEFITS SEEN

The 3-year operation of the Yarmouth Castle and the Arosa Star has convinced the business leaders of this profit potential. An increase in the number of industrial plants in Alexandria and its vicinity would result from the increased volume of goods which could be moved to this area by seaborne transportation at reduced freight rates. Experience has shown that direct employment involved in operation of such a port as is planned for Alexandria amounts to over 1,500 men—and, more important, that supporting activity employs three men for every man directly employed by the port. These are direct benefits—savings, employment, payroll. Indirectly, the community will profit in numerous ways. The introduction of new industry, coupled with the activity generated by the movement of goods through the port, will mean a broadening of the economic and tax base of the community. The next 7 years will see an added 400,000 residents in this metropolitan area and the employment and civic services which will be required to support them will be in part found in port activity and the revenues generated there. An active port will not be a panacea for all the growing pains of Alexandria, but it will, as ports have in other areas, contribute in large measure to their cure. There are, unfortunately, still obstacles which must be overcome before the community can be assured of the port development so urgently required. But similar obstacles have been overcome by the enthusiasm and support of citizens of other communities who sought deep water shipping which was denied to them by the lack of adequate channels.

WORK TO BE DONE

Here, in the metropolitan area, while the Corps of Engineers has completed the first phase of their analysis of the value of Potomac River development, the second phase must be expedited. To obtain congressional authorization and appropriations to dredge the channel, the cost of dredging must be determined to finally demonstrate the economic justification for the project. This can only be done through the Corps of Engineers and each one of us must do all in his power to insure prompt action in this field. Improvement of the Potomac River channel and development of its port facilities is a project which will require the coordinated action of two States, the District of Columbia, and the Federal Government.

ASSOCIATION AT WORK

In order to insure that action is not delayed, and to maintain the interest and effort needed to insure the development of Potomac River ports, leading citizens, not only of Alexandria but of Washington and Maryland as well, have formed the Potomac River Port Association, a nonprofit public-service corporation, to spearhead the movement. An indication of the caliber of the men devoting their time and energy to this cause is shown by a listing of the associa-

tion's board of directors, which reads like a Who's Who of the metropolitan area. Their purpose is to collect and prepare data regarding the improvement, development, and uses of the rivers, harbors, and waterways of the metropolitan area, to promote and develop ports in the Alexandria-Washington area and to educate the people of the community to the importance of the development as well as inform them of the benefits which will result from its fulfillment. The association's program includes research into products which can most economically be brought into and shipped from the metropolitan area by water and publication of the results of that research to shippers and to shipowners. Through all possible means of communication the association is spreading information regarding benefits of port development, and its vital necessity to the future of the community, to those whom it would serve. The association is supported in its work by the voluntary memberships of businesses, organizations, and individuals of the metropolitan area who are in sympathy with its objective. If concentration of effort will bring Potomac River improvement to quicker realization, this association will provide the focus of interest and activity necessary to the job.

Lithuanian Independence

SPEECH
OF
HON. STANLEY A. PROKOP
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. PROKOP. Mr. Speaker, I am happy indeed to join in this observance of the 41st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. This small nation, whose sons and daughters have contributed so much to the building of America—is, of course, not independent and free today.

Lithuania is a race of character, courage, and culture.

America is indeed grateful for the contributions that men and women of Lithuanian blood have made to our common strength.

They have a faith that the Soviets cannot destroy.

They have courage that the Soviets can never vanquish.

Lithuania has a character that will survive when all the fraud and force of godless tyrants will have vanished from the face of the earth.

This annual commemoration of her independence which was gained more than 41 years ago serves a most useful purpose. It is a reminder of the tragic fate of Lithuania and other countries that were formerly free but today are fettered by the chains of Communist slavery.

But this occasion is far more than a time for tribulation and sorrow over the fate of Lithuania and these other countries which are existing in the darkness of the Iron Curtain. Let us make it a time of rededication in the eternal fight for freedom and independence.

This observance here and throughout other lands where people of Lithuanian blood are living today will be heard behind the Iron Curtain. It will clearly demonstrate to the people of Lithuania that they are not forgotten, that their struggles are the struggles of the freedom-loving world.

It will help to keep bright in their minds and hearts the flames of hope for the day of liberation.

Our own Nation must also make it abundantly clear to all other nations that we stand for liberation from tyranny and oppression and for self-determination and freedom of choice for all peoples to ordain and to establish their own form of government under democratic processes.

I, therefore, extend congratulations to the Lithuanian people on this anniversary of their independence day. Let us all join them in more than words in their efforts to unloose the shackles of tyrants and reestablish their independence.

All hail to Lithuania on the anniversary of its 41st birthday. May her courageous people soon regain their precious liberties.

Time To End Special Favors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared under date of February 16, in the Rockford Register-Republic, Rockford, Ill., entitled "Time To End Special Favors":

TIME TO END SPECIAL FAVORS

President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson last week answered effectively the false charges of the long-entrenched rural electric cooperative pressure group that the administration is trying to wreck its ambitious program.

Both the President and Benson pointed out the true facts—that the administration in the last 6 years gave out rural electrification loans totaling $1.2 billion, as compared with $3.8 billion in loans for the preceding 17 years of REA's existence; that about half the total power sales of REA cooperatives are now being made to industrial and nonfarm residential consumers; and that at the end of 1958, the cooperatives were $139 million ahead in principal and interest payments on loans.

The President told members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative association, who met in Washington, that they should pay their own way. The Government must live within its means or face inflation and cannot continue to pass out subsidies to favored groups.

Yet the cooperative association, showing hostility to any proposals to take away some of its favorable tax treatment and low-rate-interest privilege, wants to keep on moving into areas served by taxpaying, Government-regulated private power companies. Now that rural electric cooperatives have just about blanketed the areas for which they were established, they are aiming at selling power to suburban residential and industrial consumers.

The REA lobby has succeeded in persuading House Speaker SAM RAYBURN to join in protesting the President's request to increase the interest rate charged by the Government to the cooperatives from 2 to about 4 percent. The 2-percent rate has been in effect since 1935, and in those 23 years the Federal Treasury has loaned REA some $3 billion.

There is no valid reason why a successful enterprise should continue to enjoy what amounts to an outright Government subsidy. The U.S. Treasury loans money to REA at 2 percent, but must pay interest as high as 4 percent to borrow money from the rest of the taxpaying public.

If Speaker RAYBURN believes that the American public should continue to subsidize the electric cooperatives, he should be consistent and vote to restrict REA sales of power to industries and residential users in villages and suburban areas, because electric cooperatives were not set up on that basis.

Some electric cooperatives have devised a way of relieving their shareholders of Federal income tax payments on earnings; the cooperatives issue reports to their shareholders on earnings and amounts invested, but Federal courts have held that these certificates are not taxable as long as earnings are not taken out in cash.

Propaganda activities of the rural cooperative association are also exempt from taxation, a status not enjoyed by private power companies which band togther in public-information advertising campaigns.

Need for Improved Postal Service in Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, a very definite need has arisen in the State of Maine for improved postal service. The discontinuance of railway passenger service in many parts of the State has caused a serious deficiency in the system of postal transportation.

The need of better mail transportation has been evident in my State. For example, when a letter is sent from Rumford to Mexico, a distance of 2 miles, it must first be directed to the Portland terminal and back again, a round-trip distance of approximately 150 miles. Needless to say, the delay which this roundabout method causes is inexcusable. The people of Maine expect and deserve good postal service, which they are not now getting.

A personal example of this slow service is a letter which I sent airmail to Rumford from Washington, D. C. The letter took 5 days to reach its destination, although the plane trip from Washington to Portland, Maine, takes only 3 hours. It was, therefore, a 4-day trip from Portland to Rumford—75 miles.

Growing use is being made in some areas of the Highway Post Office Service—H.P.O.—a method of filling the needs caused by the disbandment of the railroads. Besides providing for better service, the Highway Post Office would also be less expensive to maintain. For these two reasons, I advocate that the Post Office Department extend the use of the H.P.O.

Following is an article, compiled by Robert W. Reed, secretary of the Portland branch of the National Postal Transport Association, which should give a further picture of the problem of mail transportation as it exists in Maine:

THE RISE AND DECLINE OF EN ROUTE DISTRIBUTION OF MAIL IN MAINE

From the time of the establishment of the first post route in what is now the State of Maine, a route from Portsmouth to Falmouth (now Portland), about 1760, until the time of the Civil War, distribution, or sorting of mail en route was unheard of or untried on any practical scale.

The Congress of the United States, on July 7, 1838, provided that every railroad then in operation or that should be thereafter completed should be a post route and the Postmaster General "* * * shall cause the mail to be transported thereon * * *". The first railroad to start operation was the Portland, Saco & Portsmouth Railroad on December 22, 1842. The report of the postmaster for the year ending June 30, 1843, shows service, Portland to Portsmouth, rail, 50 miles, 12 weekly trips, $5,000.

The route agent was the first departure from the custom of turning the mail over to the carrier for transportation. He was an employee of the Post Office Department placed on trains to receive and put off pouches along the route and have custody of the pouches in his possession. People soon came into the habit of handing loose letters to him at the train, when there was not time to mail them in the post office. These he carried with him to the post office at the end of his route.

Where the first experiment in distribution en route was tried, we do not now know, but one day a route agent took with him the key to unlock the pouches and a device to cancel stamps. He opened the necessary pouches and inserted the letters he had received on the train. From that, the next logical step was to take the entire contents of the smaller pouches received and consolidate them with the others. Thus mail for other offices along the line did not have to go to a post office at the end of the route for sorting and be returned the next day. This was about as far as the route agent could go without special equipment being built into the car.

In 1864, under the administration of Postmaster General Blair, a few cars were so equipped and en route distribution as we know it came into being. The savings in time and equipment, and the improved service were so obvious that the new Railway Mail Service spread very rapidly. It is sometimes hard to distinguish from the records that remain whether service at a certain time was by route agent or true en route distribution, but between 1875 and 1879 there seems to have been about 15 railway runs in Maine on which mail was actually distributed. Some of these overlapped to a degree.

Between 1875 and 1905 there are known to have been 28 railway post office runs in operation in Maine. Some authorities show a far greater number than this, but in almost all cases the extra ones will be found to have operated along a part of a longer line. In addition to these, several were operated in electric cars and at least two in summer operated in steamboats along the Maine coast serving the isolated points and islands.

At about the time of the First World War the railroads began curtailing service. This was resumed on a far larger scale after World War II and is now approaching its ultimate conclusion. The Post Office Department has sometimes gone ahead on its own, however, and discontinued railway post office service where trains were still operating.

Thus at the present time we find only seven railway post office runs serving the State of Maine and one of these is now under petition of the railroad for abandonment of service. Furthermore, in nearly every instance, there are far fewer trains per day left on the remaining lines. In other parts of the country highway post offices (HPO's), nicknamed by employees "hypos," have been used successfully, but as yet there are none in Maine. These bus-like vehicles can exchange mail at the post office door, thus saving mail messenger service to and from railroad stations. They are generally cheaper to operate than railway post offices, and since they include some of the functions of star route service, they provide much better mail service to the small towns than can be had by star routes.

Every curtailment in en route distribution brings the State back nearer to the times of 1840 when all mail was hauled to the end of the route to be distributed and either sent back or onward the next day. The only significant difference now is the use of trucks instead of a coach and four.

Policies of Washington Blamed for Missile Lag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. William Hines, Washington Evening Star science writer, which appeared in that paper on Tuesday, February 17, 1959:

POLICIES OF WASHINGTON BLAMED FOR MISSILE LAG

(By William Hines)

A swing through the industrial and military complex we have labeled "Missileland" provides convincing evidence that the scientists, production men, and military officers in the field are doing a superlative job. But at the end of such a trip, there is still a nagging question:

Why are we where we are in missilery—in second place to the Russians?

The first, obvious answer is that we got started later. We waited for the feasibility of a hydrogen bomb to be proved and the Russians didn't, and consequently we are several years behind.

This explains the whole thing away nicely, although it begs the question of the wisdom of our course. But it does not explain the fact that while research, development, production and operating efficiency are high in Missileland, morale is sagging and perplexity is king.

Nor does it explain the widespread feeling out there that Washington is a sort of big brother—always watching, but not wanting to be bothered with a lot of troublesome questions.

OFF AGAIN, ON AGAIN

It leaves unanswered, too, questions about off-again, on-again production schedules; inaccurate public statements by officials that cannot be refuted by officials in the field because of security wraps; contradictory statements of objectives; tangled lines of authority; information policies that swing overnight from arrant press agentry to airtight security.

Too often, the observer feels, distraught missilemen look to Washington for guidance and find the paths of responsible officials crisscrossing like contrails in the sky.

Examples:

The Army is told to acquire some more for land for its White Sands range in the New Mexico desert so the antimissile missile, Nike-Zeus, can be tested there. But now there is doubt whether the Zeus will ever be built.

The Douglas and Chrysler people are ordered to open their Thor and Jupiter assembly lines to press tours at virtually the same moment as Thors and Jupiters are becoming passé

Project officers on the solid-fueled Minuteman ICBM forge doggedly ahead, but cannot be sure that Minuteman will ever get built—much less off the ground.

Congress, the usual thorn in the side of Government activities in the field is less of a vexation than in most cases. There are probably two reasons for this.

First, the missile business is spread rather evenly around the country and a lot of money is being spent. Inclinations to rock the boat are absent.

Second, with the exception of a handful of legislators, Congress doesn't comprehend the complexities of the missile age.

Occasional summonses to Washington to appear before this committee or that committee are regarded by military and industrial leaders in missileland as minor annoyances, rather than as outright harrassment.

INFORMATION POLICIES HIT

There are strong complaints, however, about information policies. Often the fire centers on Assistant Defense Secretary Murray Snyder, head of Pentagon public relations.

"Murray seems to regard public information as a proprietary commodity," one west coast industrialist commented. "He says this or that can't be given out because of security, so we point out that the information has already been published. 'All right,' he says, 'its policy' not to put it out. And how do we answer that?"

It is clear to the visitor to missileland that Mr. Snyder's role there is an important one. Constantly the visitor runs into evidences of a restraining hand on information that seems to go beyond the requirements of security. There is scarcely a plant but has things that can be shown, described in detail, even sketched—but not photographed because the timing isn't right. Hardly an industry publicist but has a drawer full of photographs he can show, but cannot release.

The restrictions are less oppressive than they might be, however, because newsmen have little trouble, given adequate contacts, in getting the information they need from services beyond Pentagon control.

STUNTS CRITICIZED

The other side of the information coin is the use of strategic weapons for publicity stunts. The sober second thought of 2 months since the orbiting of the talking Atlas has left scant doubt that the shot was a stunt, however good, with only secondary scientific advantages. Numerous industrial, scientific, and military men expressed the opinion to this writer that shots which could not stand up on their scientific value alone should not be undertaken.

"At a time when the American public should be aware of its defense and space potential, it is being confused," one scientist prominent in industry said. "Whether the confusion is deliberate or accidental, I am in no position to know."

NUMEROUS AGENCIES

The men in the field attribute a good part of the confusion surrounding the missile program to the complicated governmental setup which finds a sextet of agencies—the civilian National Aeronautics and Space Agency and the Pentagon's Defense Research and Engineering Office, its Advanced Research Projects Agency and the Army, Navy, and

Air Force—all figuring in the space and missiles programs.

The ire and perplexity of industrialists and military men was more than mirrored recently in that of Senate Majority Leader JOHNSON who heads the Senate Space Committe. So criss-crossed were chains of command in the Pentagon that Senator JOHNSON was unable to find out who, among Pentagon, space officials W. M. Holaday, Roy W. Johnson and Herbert F. York, was boss. Dr. York assumed the position—but only retroactively, a day after the go-round before the Space group.

COOPERATION IN THE FIELD

In evaluating America's missile progress, one looks at the obvious things. Cooperation among the services in the field is excellent, and sharply in contrast with the jungle warfare of the Pentagon. The performance of industry oozes efficiency, and whatever slippages in production schedules occur can usually be traced back to a moment of indecision or a change of plans in Washington.

The conclusion one reaches is that our place in the race must be blamed in part at least on this fact: There are seven leading contenders for space and missile supremacy in the world. One is in Moscow. The other six are in Washington.

Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, Ukrainians all over the world, except in Ukrainia, observed the 41st anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence. Normally, it would seem strange that such an event would be celebrated everywhere but in the country most concerned, but under the present conditions, independence there is but a memory, even though a vivid one, and one which sustains Ukrainians wherever they may be, and instills in their hearts a determination to continue their efforts to again make freedom a reality in their homeland.

The Americans of Ukrainian descent in Maryland, commemorated this anniversary with a banquet in Baltimore on January 25, with Federal, State, and municipal representatives present.

On this occasion a resolution was unanimously adopted, which I think is worthy of the consideration of all Members of the House and therefore is inserted in the RECORD herewith:

The following resolutions have been adopted by the Americans of Ukrainian descent of Maryland on the occasion of commemorating the 41st anniversary of the January 22, 1918—proclamation of Ukrainian independence.

The observance held on January 25, 1959, at YWCA, Patterson Park Avenue, Baltimore, Md.:

A. INTRODUCTION

"We, the delegates and representatives of the Ukrainian American organizations, who are organized in the Baltimore branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America—have gathered on this memorable and glorious day of January 22, 1918—proclamation of Ukrainian national independence—to discuss and deliberate problems which have a direct bearing upon us, as citizens of this great and democratic Republic, the United States of America.

"On this occasion it is fitting to recall that our organization, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America had been founded in 1940, at a time when the world was gravely threatened by the totalitarian forces of nazism, fascism, and communism. The U.C.C.A. has proved to be one of the most spirited and ardent antitotalitarian and anti-Communist organizations in the country.

"Strongly supporting the efforts of our U.S.A. Government in maintaining peace, our organization boldly and without hesitation states that a lasting peace could not be achieved without granting freedom and independence to the nations enslaved by the forces of Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism, among which nations is Ukraine, the country of our fathers' origin."

B. THE ENSLAVED UKRAINE

"The suffering of the Ukrainian nation has been largely due to the brutal and enslaving policies of Soviet Russia, which fact is recognized today by everyone, save the stooges of Nikita Khrushchev and die-hard Russian imperialists. Mass deportations and executions of Ukrainian patriots, ruthless destruction of all Ukrainian churches, Russification of Ukrainian culture and language, the unrestricted genocidal policy of Moscow with respect to the Ukrainian people—all these crimes express the fundamental and traditional Russian policy aiming at the destruction of the Ukrainians as a separate ethnic entity.

"Because Ukraine, by virtue of its geographical position, its numerical strength, and its natural resources has been and is a natural springboard for aggressive Russian imperialism, its full and unqualified liberation from the brutal rule of Moscow would contribute considerably to the strengthening of international peace.

"We do resolve—

"1. To support fully and unswervingly the aspiration of the 45 million Ukrainian people in their efforts to regain their political freedom and national independence.

"We call the attention of the U.S. Government and the free world at large to the fact that the Ukrainian people had achieved their full freedom when on January 22, 1918, they proclaimed their independence, and on January 22, 1919, they united all the Ukrainian ethnographic territories into one independent sovereign Ukrainian Democratic Republic, established through a due process of democratic elections and endorsed by the overwhelming majority of the Ukrainian people.

"The new free state of Ukraine was recognized as the legitimate nation of the Ukrainian people by many governments, including that of the Soviet Russia, the latter, however, almost simultaneously with recognition, declared war and conquered by forces the new Ukrainian Republic.

"In place of their free national democratic government, the Ukrainian people were forced upon by Soviet Russia a puppet Soviet Ukrainian Government, which from the very first day never represented the free will of the Ukrainian people.

"The Communist system has brought about the ruin of the Ukrainian people and turned their land into the status of colony of Russian imperialism. Since the final conquest of Ukraine by Russian Communist force of arms and subversion in 1920, Ukraine never surrendered in spirit or gave hope of eventual liberation and complete independence. The heroic struggle of the Ukrainian people today inspires peoples of all nations enslaved by Russia to fight for freedom.

"2. To support fully and unhesitatingly the ever increasing endeavors of the United States in its policy of maintaining peace in the world, and in its growing determination to oppose and challenge the aggressive and imperialistic policies of the Soviets, whose ultimate goal is imposition of slavery upon this country and the destruction of its freedom and independence, as it has already done in Ukraine and in many other non-Russian countries of central and eastern Europe and Asia.

"3. To call the attention of the U.S. Government to the fact that the Soviet Union, with a population of 200 million, is not a monolithic state of the Russian people, but conglomeration of many nationalities, among whom the non-Russian, people comprising 110 million, were conquered by Moscow by force and are kept in slavery and subjugation against their will. Their desire for freedom and independence presents the weakest link in the Soviet system, which, if properly capitalized upon, could greatly enhance our chances of success in combating Soviet Russia imperialistic communism.

"4. To denounce those undemocratic Russian anti-Communist leaders here and in Europe who, in unison with the Kremlin rulers, agitate against the democratic and just aspiration of the Ukrainian people for their basic freedom and independence, thus strengthening the power of Moscow over Ukraine and all other non-Russian countries within the U.S.S.R. and the satellite orbit.

"At the same time, guided by the sense of Christian charity and compassion, we recognize the important distinction between the perennially oppressed Russian masses and the traditionally undemocratic and aggresive Russian leadership; therefore, while denouncing the Russian chauvinist leaders and imperialists who would keep Ukraine in perpetual slavery of Moscow, we deeply sympathize with the Russian masses, who are entitled to a better life and unrestricted freedom, as are the Ukrainians and all other people enslaved in the U.S.S.R.

"5. To call the attention of the U.S. Government and the free world at large that in Ukraine there exists and resists Russian domination an indomitable Ukrainian insurgent army as well as an entire network of underground resistance, which oppose the domination of Moscow and strive for the attainment of a free and independent Ukrainian democratic republic and a free world as well."

C. APPEAL TO THE U.S. GOVERNMENT

"Whereas the U.S. Government is solely able to rally all the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain toward a hopeful and meaningful free world of tomorrow; and whereas, the enslaved peoples of Eastern and Central Europe and of Asia look forward to our moral and political leadership:

"We do resolve, To appeal to and urge the U.S. Government to make it known to the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain that it upholds the rights of all non-Russian peoples within the present U.S.S.R., as well as of the Russian people themselves, to their basic and inalienable freedoms, which include the right of unqualified self-determination and independence. Such a step ranks in importance with NATO, which is primarily designed to safeguard Western Europe against the encroachment of Russian communism and messianism.

"In doing so, the U.S. Government will bring encouragement and hope to those peoples oppressed by Moscow, peoples who are fighting against the same tyrannical power which killed brutally the flower of our youth in Korea and which threatens to thrust into ignominious slavery not only our country, but the entire world as well."

Dr. JAROSLAW SHAWIAK,
Chairman of the Citizens' Committee for the Observance of Ukrainian Independence Day.
STANLEY STELMACH,
PETER WOJTOWYTCH,
ANATOLE BULAWAKA,
Members.

Mr. Speaker, Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, of Baltimore, was unable to be present, but was ably represented by Col. Richard C. O'Connell, superintendent of the bureau of transportation of the city of Baltimore. The address he delivered for the mayor, together with the mayor's proclamation, follow:

Due to a particularly heavy schedule for this afternoon and evening, it is impossible for Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., to be with you in person, as much as I know he would have liked to be able to do so, therefore, he has asked me to bring you his official and personal greetings, and to read to you a copy of his proclamation designating the commemoration of the 41st anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence.

Today, as you observe the 41st anniversary of the declaration of your country's independence, we find the world in turmoil with many countries in Europe under the domination of a government who denies every right to the people of these lands, including your own country.

On behalf of all our people in Baltimore Mayor D'Alesandro asked me to give voice to the hope that is in your hearts, that the delivery of the Ukraine will not be long delayed, and that before many years have passed, not only your loved fatherland, but all the once-free peoples of Europe will be restored to that freedom and equality among the nations that is their just and God-given due. And, again I quote the mayor, who said: "In thus voicing the sentiments of the people of Baltimore, I am speaking not only for those who had America for their birthplace, but I know that I truly represent the feelings of those amongst us who came from the Ukraine and other enslaved nations, or who are descendants of former residents of these countries.

America glories in the fact that the people of other lands, while they have been assimilated into the great melting pot that is America, nevertheless, retain a love for, and a continuing knowledge and appreciation of, the customs and traditions of their fatherland.

We glory in it, I say, and we would not have it otherwise, for we believe that the man or woman, who comes from a foreign land, and who retains his or her love for that land, while giving their first loyalty to America, is the better citizen therefore.

As against the communistic doctrine which states that their form of government must rule the world, by fair means or foul, we, the American people, can stand cleanly before the world and say plainly to any state: "This Government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressor."

Since the origin of the American people, their chief trait has been the hatred of war. And yet these American people are ready to take up their arms against aggression and destroy, if need be, by their might, any nation which would violate the peace of the world.

There can be no compromise with aggression anywhere in the world. For aggression multiplies—in rapid succession—disregard for the rights of man. Freedom when threatened anywhere is at once threatened everywhere.

With the monstrous weapons man already has, humanity is in danger of being trapped in this world by its moral adolescents. Our knowledge of science has clearly outstripped our capacity to control it. We have too many men of science and too few men of God. We have grasped the mystery of the atom and rejected the Sermon on the Mount. Man is stumbling blindly through a spiritual darkness while toying with the precarious secrets of life and death. The world has achieved brilliance without wisdom, power without conscience. Ours is a world of nuclear giants and ethical infants. We know more about war than we know about peace—more about killing than we know about living.

Karl Marx and his theory of communism tried to tell the world that his theory of government would be the salvation of the world. We all know how wrong he was, because the people now in power in the Kremlin only seek to enslave men and women, and deprive them of all those things freemen cherish and hold most dear.

We, here in America, believe in democracy. We believe the people should rule, and not a few dictators. If we will only believe in democracy, use, it, and practice it every day, we shall so strengthen ourselves that nothing can prevail against us—or against those who stand with us in like good faith.

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR., DESIGNATING THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 1959, AS UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY IN BALTIMORE

Whereas January 22, 1959, marks the 41st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Ukraine, proclaimed in the year 1918, in Kiev, the ancient capital of Ukraine; and

Whereas Ukrainians everywhere, especially those who came to America to escape the tyrannic dangers of communism which threaten the peace of the world today, realize that it is vital for all free peoples to combat the rising spread of subversive propaganda by spreading the doctrine of democracy, both here and abroad, and to bear witness to our American way of life; and

Whereas although the Iron Curtain makes it impossible for those subjects under temporary communistic domination to inform the free world as to the real nature of the rule of dictators, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is well aware of the true facts and takes the lead in pointing up for all Americans the danger of communistic world domination:

Now, therefore, I, Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., mayor of the city of Baltimore, do hereby proclaim Thursday, January 22, 1959, as Ukrainian Independence Day in Baltimore, in recognition of the efforts being made by Americans of Ukrainian birth or ancestry to extol the merits of true democracy, and to urge all our people to be alert to the ever-present danger to liberty and justice throughout the free world. I further urge all citizens to joint with the Ukrainian Congress Committee of Baltimore in the hope and prayer that the 40 million Ukrainians, as well as all other persons temporarily behind the Iron Curtain, may soon be able to live as free men and be masters of their own destiny.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the city of Baltimore to be affixed this 21st day of January, in the year of Our Lord 1959.

THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Mayor.

Mr. Speaker, the Governor also issued a proclamation in this connection, which I would like to insert here:

GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION: UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, JANUARY 22, 1959

Forty years ago, on January 22, the free and independent Ukrainian Republic was proclaimed.

Now the Ukraine lies behind the Iron Curtain—after mass Ukrainian deportations and executions, ruthless destruction of churches and Russification of Ukrainian culture and language.

The stalwart Ukrainians and those of Ukrainian descent have not forgotten their lost liberty.

January 22 is observed as a memorial to a once free and independent Ukraine.

Marylanders welcome the opportunity to join with their Ukrainian brethren in a day of prayer and hope that the inalienable rights of all freedom-loving people, to live in harmony with their fellow men, soon will be realized.

Therefore, I, J. Millard Tawes, Governor, do hereby proclaim January 22, 1959, as Ukrainian Independence Day throughout the great State of Maryland.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Maryland, at the city of Annapolis, this 20th day of January, in the year of our Lord, 1959.

By the Governor:

_____, _____,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be present at the banquet and to bring a brief message to the group, which was as follows:

May I first express my thanks and appreciation for the honor and privilege of being invited here today by the Maryland branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America to join you in the observance of the 41st anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence.

We are all aware of the fact that the Ukrainian Congress Committee represents the unification of the Ukrainian people of the United States through numerous social, cultural, fraternal, and political organizations.

The overall purpose of the committee is to build and maintain a common, united front with all other peoples in the general anti-Communist struggle.

The Ukrainian people have no community of fate nor any community of interest in the Bolshevik doctrines of the Soviet Union which is dominated by the greater Russian people. Communist rule has been imposed upon the Ukraine by terror, by starvation, and by extermination.

The Ukraine today is a gigantic state of landlord system of agricultural peonage, enforced by terroristic repression. The Ukrainian peasant has been reduced to a status inferior to the serfdom of the 17th and 18th centuries.

Today the Ukrainian farmer cannot determine the hours of his labor nor the conditions of his labor. He cannot choose the crops he will plant, nor the time of the plantings. He has no choice in the disposition of his harvest nor in what he receives for his labor.

The struggle between 40 million Ukrainian farmers and the dozen men who ruled the Soviet Union came to a climax in that tragic winter and spring of 1932–33.

The Soviet authorities deported whole communities and villages en masse to Siberia. In some areas the people were blockaded from travel for food. The Soviet authorities as a last weapon, plundered and extorted all food from the people where any resistance appeared.

The Soviet's penalizing policy of national famine resulted in the death by starvation and undernourishment of more than 5 million freedom-loving people in the Ukraine.

The suffering and death of these millions of unfortunate human beings need not have been in vain.

If their death will help us to understand the true nature and the false philosophy of communism, then this tragedy may prevent the recurrence of similar mass-murders wherever communism might strike.

Most of us are aware of the denial of God in communistic dogma. We know that communism rejects and ridicules the moral precepts of Christianity and of every other religion.

This country is engaged in a cold war with the Soviet for the friendship and support of the free nations of the world.

The struggle today is not between the capitalism of the United States and the socialism of the Soviet. Rather it is a struggle between sunlight and darkness. Between individual dignity and state slavery.

We can no longer be on the defensive in this ideological war. We must unmask the Soviet and her propaganda of capitalism.

We must expose to the people of the free countries the fact that the Soviet is a new form of tyranny and slavery. We must prove to all free peoples that Soviet socialism, essentially is nothing more than concentrated state monopolistic capitalism, founded upon human slavery and held together by threat of violence.

I would like to assure the Ukrainian people that this country has not abandoned her interest in the freedom-loving peoples of Central Europe. We will continue our efforts to resist further aggression and to point the way toward the liberation of all oppressed peoples.

Liberian Ambassador Urges African Unity in Areas Where Cooperation Is Possible Now

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following releases:

LIBERIAN AMBASSADOR URGES AFRICAN UNITY IN AREAS WHERE COOPERATION IS POSSIBLE NOW

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 10, 1959.—Liberian Ambassador to the United States, George A. Padmore, said recently that the valued cultural diversities among the peoples of Africa might make it necessary to wait until doomsday for an African federation while opportunities would be lost in the areas where cooperation is possible now.

ADDRESSES CAPITAL PRESS CLUB

Addressing a dinner meeting of the Capital Press Club in Washington, D.C., Ambassador Padmore asserted:

"We do not object to federation in the least, provided it is entered into by states which are in a position to make up their own minds, free of outside interference, and which come to the decision that federation is the political arrangement best suited to their needs.

"But we have had a long experience of the way these things are done in the world, and we believe it is a sober truth, and not necessarily a frightening truth, that if we wait for a voluntary federation of all the states, all the tribes, all the peoples of Africa, we may have to wait until doomsday."

SAYS OPPORTUNITIES MAY BE LOST

"And while we wait, opportunities for fruitful cooperation, within the limits of political patterns less rigid than that implied by federation may go begging."

Ambassador Padmore said it was these factors which led President Tubman and his government to propose recently the formation of the Associated States of Africa, an organization which would achieve close association without burying national or international identities.

States associated under this proposal would have a common cultural institution, a regional health authority, a scientific research and training agency, and a uniform tariffs and customs convention.

Comprising this association would be Africa's independent states and dependent territories with fixed independent dates. Other nonindependent states could join when free.

STATES WOULD RETAIN SOVEREIGNTY

"No state entering the association," the Ambassador continued, "would sacrifice even a fraction of its sovereignty. Much less would it be exposed to the risk of being brought under the domination of a state whose language, culture and institutions might bear small resemblance to its own.

"We are convinced that cooperation on this basis is the kind that can be most speedily attained and will be most likely to endure," he added.

He said Liberia stands among those countries "who feel that freedom must not and cannot be unduly delayed unless irreparable harm is to be done to the cause of world peace."

The diplomat cautioned against breaking up Africa's coalition once colonialism has been vanquished, "even if it is only a coalition of the spirit," because poverty and disease are also among the common problems Africa will have to face.

DIVIDE AND RULE MAY ENSUE

Ending the coalition, he added, would also "be an invitation to outside influences to resume the dangerous game of divide and rule."

"We do not wish to see repeated on our continent the feuds and the clash of ambitions and the wrangling over frontiers which for centuries has made Europe a playground for the armies of proud monarchs and scheming dictators," Ambassador Padmore said.

"Unity then," he stated, "must be the continuing watchword for Africa. But how is it to be achieved? We know it cannot come overnight. * * * It is often said that there is as much difference between a tribe in Gabon, for example, and a tribe in Sierra Leone as there is between a Portuguese and a Swede.

"That is true, and perhaps we should be grateful it is, for the solution to the world's troubles lies more in the preservation of the right people to be different from one another than in any misguided attempt to reduce the whole of mankind to a drab conformity."

UNITY GROWS OUT OF DIVERSITY

"Unity should grow out of diversity and not be used to crush it. Eliminating national characteristics is likely to prove as hard a task as eliminating the difference between the sexes.

"Liberia has a unique history. It follows that it has also a unique culture. It has traditions and customs and social institutions of its own. We have no wish either to give them up or to impose them on other people," Ambassador Padmore stated.

The Capital Press Club, which he addressed, has 67 members, including editors, reporters, photographers, radio and television news commentators and public relations practitioners.

Among the media they represent are U.S. News & World Report, United Broadcasting Co., the National Negro Press Association, the Associated Negro Press, the New York Post, the Carolinian, the Cleveland Call and Post, the New York Amsterdam News, the Journal of the National Medical Association, the Afro-American, the Pittsburgh Courier, and the Chicago Defender.

PROMINENT CLUB SPEAKERS

The magazines and newspapers among these media have a combined circulation exceeding 4 million. The radio and television stations service a total area audience exceeding 1 million listeners.

Previous speakers before the club have included Supreme Court Justice Felix H. Frankfurter; Congressmen Adam Clayton Powell, of New York, and William L. Dawson, of Illinois.

Senator Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield; Presidential Press Secretary James C. Hagerty; Democratic National Committee Chairman Paul M. Butler; and Republican National Committee Chairman Meade Alcorn.

[From the Liberia Official Gazette, Jan. 26, 1959]

With the emergence of newly independent states in Africa, Liberia is happy that she no longer stands alone as she did in the age of colonial expansion and exploitation. In that age she lost over half of her territory and suffered unspeakable indignities, discrimination, and perils. But never for once have the Liberian people lost sight of the fact that they are inseparably engaged in the great total human struggle for freedom and independence taking place everywhere and more particularly in Africa.

Liberia has consistently maintained that every people have an inherent right to be free to decide upon the type or form of government they desire as well as the political machinery they wish to employ in the solution of their problems in their own way without interference.

However, when the Liberian Government speaks of noninterference in the affairs of member countries, this cannot be construed to mean that it advocates the principle that any government can violate fundamental human rights of its citizens without such violation being the common concern of the entire world community. Neither can it be interpreted to refer to governments which have not been voluntarily created by the people of their own free will and accord.

Therefore in the United Nations and elsewhere Liberia has sought every opportunity in a constructive manner to advocate the cause of African freedom and independence. She has always maintained that Africa should not be half slave and half free. She has felt that Africa must be totally free so that her peoples might become masters of their own destinies. Thus, even at great risks to her own safety, Liberia has remained an asylum for the oppressed peoples of Africa. But the Liberian people are convinced that only friendly cooperation among all nations and races will insure that degree of peace and prosperity necessary for universal progress.

The Liberian Government and people believe that there is no substitute for freedom except it be greater freedom through equal participation and unlimited fulfillment of the whole purpose of a people. They also believe that any hasty or superficial semblance of unity in areas where conflicting issues are not carefully resolved may undermine the entire structure of any permanent political unity and retard real cooperative effort.

Hence, taking into consideration differing economic systems, differing political allegiances and preferences, differing cultural backgrounds and differing social customs; and not wishing to superimpose any artificial unity upon these differences, it is the opinion of the Liberian Government that the peoples of Africa should resolve to achieve close association and cooperation, without prejudice to their national or international identities, in the following or some similar manner:

1. That a single convention which would provide for a permanent organization to be known as the Associated States of Africa, be concluded among the independent African nations and those which have fixed dates upon which they shall achieve independence, with the understanding that other nonindependent countries of Africa shall have the right to join the organization upon attaining independence.

2. That the Associated States of Africa provide for continuing consultation on problems of common interest and for the peaceful solution of all disputes which may arise among its members.

3. That, within said organization, regional associations be recognized where they already exist or be organized to develop closer unity and provide uniform and common solution to specific problems in certain areas. For instance, it is suggested that in west Africa:

(a) A regional health authority should be created which would concentrate on the eradication of diseases common to the area.

(b) An agency should be developed to direct regional scientific research and training projects.

(c) A common cultural institute for the region should be developed.

(d) A uniform reduction of tariffs and a customs convention should be undertaken.

The Liberian Government feels that these political, social, cultural, and economic actions should be achieved in consonance with the aims of the United Nations and in support of its endeavors to achieve peace and raise the level of living of the inhabitants of the earth.

By order of the President:

J. RUDOLPH GRIMES,
Acting Secretary of State.

Health Benefits for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I have again today introduced a bill providing for the payment of certain health benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program. The measure I introduced today is substantially the same as the proposals I made in the 85th Congress, which are embodied in H.R. 9467, except for the omission of improvements in cash benefits, which were, in large part, enacted last year. I favor additional improvements in cash benefits along the lines proposed before, but I am not pressing that point at this time.

My new bill provides insurance against the cost of certain hospital, skilled nursing home, and surgical services for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits. This is done as part of the established Social Security System. The new benefits would be financed by adding one-quarter percent to the contribution rates of employers and employees and three-eighths of 1 percent to the contribution rates of the self-employed.

A detailed analysis of the earlier bill is available in the printed record of the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means last June—page 880—and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 30, 1957. I shall not repeat that analysis now.

It is my sincere hope that the Ways and Means Committee can arrange promptly for hearings on my proposals so that the House can take action this year. The committee should give consideration to possible improvements along lines which have already been suggested to me or which may be proposed by members of the health professions, and other groups interested in the welfare of the aged.

As I said in the House, in 1957, the present details are not necessarily the best that can be drafted or the final ones that I shall support. But I am even more determined now than ever before to seek constructive legislation at the earliest possible date, because the more I study the problem of the aged the more I see the need for prompt action.

WIDESPREAD SUPPORT

Extraordinary interest has been shown in the provision of health benefits for the aged as part of our national system of social insurance. Many individuals have written me endorsing my efforts and telling their own tragic experience with heavy costs and other obstacles to security and good health care.

Important organizations have again strongly endorsed health benefits under the old-age, survivors and disability insurance program. These include the American Public Welfare Association, the American Nurses' Association, the National Association of Social Workers, the AFL–CIO, the Group Health Federation of America, and other organizations with an intimate knowledge of the problems of the aged and the values of social insurance.

The Governing Council of the American Public Health Association on October 30, 1958, adopted a strong resolution which states that "health services for the aged are inadequate throughout the Nation" and supports "appropriate proposals to provide paid-up insurance for health services required by aged persons."

The American Hospital Association has recognized the need for some type of Federal action and has been exploring alternatives.

The American Medical Association has also acknowledged the need for vigorous action along new lines and urged its member societies to explore and support private programs that will help to avoid Federal legislation.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE ON NEED

Despite efforts to find alternatives stimulated by my proposal, the need for Federal action is greater than ever. A 1957 study by the Social Security Administration shows that only two out of five old-age beneficiaries have some form of health insurance. Much of it is highly inadequate. It is expensive—too expensive considering the meager resources of most of our older citizens. It can be canceled in most cases at the discretion of the carrier, and it may run out completely when lifetime ceilings have exhausted the benefits stated in the policy. Even when in effect, much of this insurance is of very limited amount.

The limits of commercial insurance for the aged are illustrated by a "65-plus" policy now being widely advertised by a national company that has been given publicity by the American Medical Association. The policy costs $6.50 per month per person, but its benefits are very limited. It provides only up to $10 per day for hospital room and board for a maximum of 31 days for each confinement. Have any of my colleagues, any members of their families—or indeed any of our constitutents—found a hospital room recently for $10 per day? Up to $100 is allowed for miscellaneous hospital expenses. Payments for surgery are limited to not more than $200, and the company reserves the right to increase rates or to cancel on a statewide basis.

For many aged, such a policy may well seem better than nothing and in fact the policy to which I refer does appear to be about the most liberal in its terms. Many are far more restrictive. Surely this is not a sufficient answer for people with limited incomes. And the aged, typically, do have limited incomes.

Many aged persons find increasing difficulty in meeting their health problems as charges continue to mount. Hospital charges have risen 4 percent or 5 percent a year, partly because of improved services and long overdue wage increases, but also because of inefficiencies, and the lack of available alternatives.

Welfare agencies are hard-pressed to pay for necessary medical care for their clients. Hospitals wrestle with large deficits as their expenses per patient-day mount above what they can collect. All protection under group plans has been lost by many workers because of continuing unemployment.

The voluntary prepayment plans established by the hospitals and medical societies—Blue Cross and Blue Shield—are threatened by increasingly severe competition from commercial insurance companies. The latter can balance losses in this field with other profitable business. They can and do select for coverage the groups which typically have the least need for health services. Charges can accordingly be reduced on an experience rating basis below the levels possible to the nonprofit associations who are carrying the more expensive load.

THE PROPER CONCERN OF GOVERNMENT

Many Blue Cross plans have raised their rates recently, by amounts ranging up to 40 percent. As a result, a growing number of State insurance commissioners and legislative committees have asserted that the State must intervene in regard to consumer representation on Blue Cross boards' overuse of hospitals, and methods of determining charges.

These and other developments are clarifying the inevitable concern of Government as the agency to which the people turn to seek ways in which they can obtain high quality health care.

The Federal Government has for many years played an active part in the provision and financing of health services. In fact, it was in 1798 that the Congress enacted measures to provide health services for our merchant seamen. The program thus established grew into the United States Public Health Service.

Today the Federal Government provides funds for medical care for millions of persons under the public welfare programs. We have appropriated billions of

dollars for veterans' hospitals, health activities of the armed services, the National Institutes of Health, the Hill-Burton Hospital construction program, and various State health programs, all of which I heartily approve.

The vastly intricate health system of our Nation is going through rapid changes. These developments necessitate congressional consideration of various types of constructive steps that will enable all our citizens to obtain high quality medical care of the type made possible by the remarkable skills and knowledge of members of the health professions.

DESIRE FOR EXPERT ADVICE

Last summer I told the House that I was suggesting to the Committee on Ways and Means that a subcommittee be appointed to look into the question of health care for social security beneficiaries. I added that I hoped that the subcommittee would be given the authority to appoint its own staff with a director and with its own group of advisers. I feel strongly that this should be done.

In developing our final legislative proposals, the committee will certainly want information and advice from persons intimately connected with the problems of the people who need medical care and with the people who furnish that care, whether they are hospital administrators, physicians, nurses, or representatives of other allied health and technical groups.

I repeat my earlier request that such persons come forward and give us the results of their studies and deliberations so that we can get a solution to this distressing problem in the not too distant future.

MINOR CHANGES IN BILL

In preparing the new bill, I have included financing provisions similar to those which related to the health benefits section of the 1957 bill. An additional increase in the contribution rates would take place starting in 1960, consisting of one-fourth of 1 percent more for employees and employers and three-eighth of 1 percent more for the self-employed. The estimates so far available indicate that one-half of 1 percent of taxable earnings will meet the cost of the program for some time at least.

The 1 percent increase in combined contributions provided in the 1957 bill took into account the proposed changes in the cash benefits as well as the health benefits.

Up-to-date cost estimates are due shortly as part of the report which the Ways and Means Committee has requested from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It should certainly be available by March when I hope the committee may be ready to commence hearings. As part of our consideration, we can, if necessary, further adjust the schedule of contribution rates to take into account the best available cost estimates for the program which we recommend.

As usual, I personally shall support adequate financing provisions so as to maintain the soundness of the program, which has just been attested to by the Advisory Council on Financing.

I have at this time made only one substantive change in the provisions of the bill in regard to health benefits. It occurs in paragraph (2) of subsection (c) and has the effect of broadening the group of physicians among whom the patient may select a person to provide surgical services for which payment will be made. Some of my doctor friends told me that the original definition was too limited. Perhaps others will think that the new definition is too broad. I shall welcome suggestions for further improvements.

IMPROVEMENTS TO EXPLORE

Among the strongest backers of my original bill, who have continued serious study of the health needs of the aged, there are some who question the feasibility of including surgical benefits at this time. This is one of the matters which the committee will want to weigh as it hears testimony.

We have had much experience in this country with prepaid medical care programs and private medical care insurance. Such experience indicates that the method of payment for medical care is inseparable from the kind and quality of care provided. The broad extension of prepaid health protection through collective bargaining and other types of private plans has shown that pressures are created on hospitals and physicians to hospitalize people needlessly for diagnostic services when the cost of such services is insured only during hospitalization.

We fortunately can learn from such experience under private programs how to avoid over-hospitalization in connection with the provision of similar benefits under governmental programs. Our first line of defense, of course, must be the integrity of the medical profession and the hospital administrators. As a second line of defense we should help to develop standards such as those we have found appropriate in other areas where public funds are spent and where it is necessary to protect the public interest.

When the Federal Government lets contracts for its veterans' hospitals, it ininsists upon specifications which must be met. When a Federal agency buys a hospital bed or drugs, it uses quality specifications to be sure of getting its money's worth. We should similarly consider proposals for assuring that hospital care or skilled nursing home services paid for from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund are of a quality approved by responsible and respected members of the health professions.

In addition to these safeguards I am most earnestly seeking from expert sources constructive suggestions on the provision of payment for medical services that are an alternative to hospital services. Aged persons typically do not want to be in the hospital unless it is essential, and they will often recover more rapidly if they can be in a more homelike environment. Outstanding hospitals and various private and public groups have developed valuable experience on steps that can be taken to minimize hospital care and encourage rapid and lasting recovery.

I intend to explore the possibility of paying for diagnostic services, such as X-rays and laboratory tests, on an outpatient basis. Payment for such diagnostic service as part of the insurance program might well be valuable in making prompt diagnosis more available to aged persons without the necessity of hospitalization.

I intend also to explore the possibility of including benefits for home nursing care through such responsible agencies as visiting nurses' associations, hospitals, or local health departments. Much valuable work of this kind is already being done by devoted members of the nursing profession.

Another worthwhile suggestion that has been made is that the Congress should provide funds from general revenues for demonstration projects in the treatment and rehabilitation of aged persons. Grants to hospitals and other appropriate organizations could well contribute greatly to patterns and practices that would help our older citizens to lead self-sufficient lives even after serious illness.

I recognize, in view of the immensity and complexity of the problem, that any bill we can enact will have its shortcomings. Not everyone will be satisfied with even our best efforts.

But, we cannot wait, and the older people who look to us, cannot wait for perfection. We must go forward carefully and soundly. We are not attempting to meet the whole of the problem. My bill does not provide payment for as long a period of care or as many forms of care as aged persons and other beneficiaries require. It will still be necessary for such persons to make what provision they can through savings and other forms of insurance to meet medical emergencies.

I am hopeful, however, that we can enact a measure which will result in better health care for millions of Americans, that will relieve many American families of serious financial worries about health bills, that will avoid financial disaster for many aged persons, and that will als lighten public welfare loads and hospital deficits, and bolster the efforts of Blue Cross and similar nonprofit groups to provide protection for the entire community at a reasonable cost.

Adm. William F. Raborn Tells Polaris Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of Jan-

uary 30, 1959, written by Mr. Courtney Sheldon.

ADMIRAL RABORN TELLS POLARIS STORY

(By Courtney Sheldon)

WASHINGTON.—Adm. William F. Raborn oversees the development of one of the Nation's most promising retaliatory weapons—the submarine-launched Polaris missile. In his opinion:

"Upwards of 50 (Polaris submarines) would be a most significant force, bearing in mind that we don't have to be able to clobber every military target in order to have a good deterrent.

"Mobility and using the hidden depths of the sea make the Polaris submarine almost invulnerable."

This is how Admiral Raborn told the Polaris story in an interview with this correspondent:

"What are the great advantages of the Polaris as a war deterrent weapon, Admiral?"

"With an effective deterrent system we would have the ability and the time to retaliate in case of overt action against this country. If a prospective enemy felt he could zero in (pinpoint as a target) the positions where our retaliatory capability is located, he might be misled into taking a calculated risk and try to wipe out our positions in a surprise blow.

"This is one of the reasons why mobile systems—such as Polaris—are so well thought of. Mobility and using the hidden depths of the sea make the Polaris submarine almost invulnerable. Certainly, if an enemy can't zero in Polaris submarines, we can have much more time to make a mature decision to retaliate, if we wish.

"Another desirable feature of Polaris is that it will draw the enemy's bombs to sea, away from population centers in the United States.

"Further, many millions of cubic miles of ocean will be available to the Polaris submarine as launching sites. It will be international real estate not subject to control by other nationalities."

"What would you say were the limitations of Polaris?"

"There is no weapon for any purpose that can be a panacea. The drawbacks—well, it is an expensive system, though it is not any more expensive than any other major war deterrent system that I know of."

"What about the number of missiles a submarine can carry (reportedly 16), the distances it has to operate over, and the ease of communications?"

"I think that people who have made a lot of to-do about these things probably knew the least about them. As far as the number of missiles go, we will have a surprisingly large number of missiles in these submarines. You should keep in mind what you are trying to do, how many targets you are trying to hit, and what constitutes a good deterrent system.

"I for one, feel that we should not have to put all of our money, a sizable portion of our national budget, into systems designed to destroy every military target and major population center in enemy country.

"Communications—we have been talking to submerged submarines ever since World War II and there is no reason to believe that we are suddenly going to forget how."

"When will the first Polaris submarine depart from a U.S. harbor with operational missiles aboard?"

"As far as operational dates, Mr. McElroy has said that Polaris would be available in 1960. I have some very well-defined dates that I have my eye on."

"What is the score on your successes and failures in tests of Polaris?"

"Well, tests to technical men mean tests of the whole system. We have conducted a very large number of tests in each of the major areas that contribute to the system as a whole and to date we have been extremely successful, and we are on schedule."

"At one time there was speculation that Polaris would be used as a land-based solid propellant missile. Then the Air Force was ordered to develop the intercontinental-range ballistic missile Minuteman. Is the difference in capability of those two solid propellant missiles mainly one of range?"

"Principally. A submarine can carry a missile 3,000 or 4,000 miles closer to the enemy. It is therefore more efficient for the Navy to build a shorter-range missile."

"It has been reported that the first Polaris missiles will have a relatively short range, and this will be upped later to 1,600 and ultimately 3,000. Is that correct?"

"The first missile we put in operation in 1960 will be as good a missile as we can possibly build. No one can say definitely what we will have. We know our technical goals, and it is going to be a very usable and useful weapon in a submarine where, if you don't have quite the range you want, you just walk the submarine in a little closer."

"Your goal is 1,500?"

"The Polaris is thought of as an intermediate-range ballistic missile, a 1,500-mile weapon. As we go along, we will make improvements which will permit us, of course, to improve this range. Our submarines have been constructed with this in mind."

"Nine Polaris submarines are, or will be shortly, in the works. What would be your idea of the size of a Polaris fleet necessary to be an effective war deterrent?"

"If you want Polaris submarines to be the only war deterrents, you will have to have one size force, but if you want to have Polaris submarines in combination with other capabilities, it will have to be another size. I would say that upward of 50, something of that sort, would be a most significant force, bearing in mind that we don't have to be able to clobber every military target in order to have a good deterrent."

"Have you solved to your satisfaction the navigation problems with which the Polaris system confronts you?"

"I can say that at this state of development of the entire Polaris system we are ahead in the program for the development of the navigation element of this system. I have no doubt of our ability to perfect the navigation element. It is easier to solve the navigation problems of missile ships than it is missile-carrying airplanes."

"Are there any indications that the Soviets have a solid fuel missile capable of feats you plan for Polaris?"

"I can't pose as exactly an expert on this, but I would say that we are considerably ahead of them in this field."

"Will Polaris be fired from naval ships and installations other than submarines?"

"We can capitalize on our investment in surface vessels hulls and machinery by adding a modest number of Polaris missiles. It would make vessels even more valuable and versatile."

Cost of Second Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an editorial, "Cost of Second Best," appearing in the Washington Post of February 18, 1958.

As the editorial well said:

Mr. MAHON—

Congressman MAHON—

is one of the best-informed men in Congress on military finance, and his judgment is entitled to respect.

Congressman MAHON, one of the most sincere and ablest Members of Congress and a dedicated American is one of the best versed Members of Congress on military matters and national defense. His views are worthy of deep consideration.

The editorial is as follows:

COST OF SECOND BEST

Chairman MAHON, of the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee, has put the defense spending issue into much needed focus. He estimates that $700 million annually in additional spending authority would be sufficient to match possible Soviet production of long-range missiles, and that a total of $1 to $2 billion would meet this and other defense needs now neglected such as limited war preparedness. Mr. MAHON is one of the best informed men in Congress on military finance, and his judgment is entitled to respect.

The net effect of this estimate is to show for what essentially narrow budgetary considerations the administration is willing to jeopardize the country's power position. Secretary McElroy has virtually acknowledged that there has been a deliberate decision to accept a second best position in missiles, with the explanation that other methods of delivery such as manned bombers will maintain an adequate balance. Even if the latter point is true, the psychological consequence of an inferior missile status could be devastating.

The American people have never been willing to accept a second best position in defense, and if they were consulted on the basis of the facts we are confident that they would not do so now. A $2 billion additional expenditure on top of a $41 billion defense budget would not bankrupt the country. Whether the increase were financed by higher taxes or by new borrowing at a time of considerable unemployment, the impact upon a $450 billion economy clearly would not be great. The country can afford what is requires, and it requires at least parity with the Russians.

Apart from the possible military disadvantages if we sat by and counted our dollars while the Russians outproduced us in intercontinental missiles over the next 3 years (as there is general agreement that they could do), fruitful negotiations with the Soviet Union surely would be more difficult if the United States were dealing from real or apparent inferiority. An adequate military posture is as important in the immediate future as 20 years hence and this means increased production of present liquid-fuel missiles until solid-fuel carriers are available. Development of further limited war potential accelerated submarine and submarine-defense programs and perhaps some further intensification of solid-fuel missile efforts would round out the program Mr. MAHON is talking about.

Congress has as much responsibility in this matter as the President. If Members abhor the prospect that the United States will be reduced to a second-best position as much as they ought to abhor it—and many legislators have voiced their apprehensions—it is their duty to vote the military appropriations they think the country really needs. President Eisenhower and Secretary McElroy cannot be compelled to spend the money, but Congress certainly can say emphatically that it thinks the administration approach dan-

gerous. A wise President will reconsider his judgment in such circumstances.

One caveat needs to be added. Unfortunately Mr. MAHON tainted his valuable contribution with the suggestion that higher defense spending might be offset by reductions in foreign aid or in various domestic operations. Cuts of $1 to $2 billion in either area would be disastrous—and totally unnecessary. We do not have to sacrifice one essential element of overall defense to finance another; indeed, economic development help ought to be increased.

The entire $12 billion deficit forecast for fiscal 1959 need not be erased in a single year—and if the economy should pick up faster than is now anticipated a tax increase could cover the extra cost and provide any needed damper on inflation. In any event inflation is a lesser danger, and there has been altogether too much preoccupation with it at the expense of everything else. It is time that Congress broke loose from its close-quarters scuffling with the President about who has saved how much in the past 6 years and addressed itself to the more vital problem of who is going to save the country in the next 6.

School for Solons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the congressional seminars conducted by Congressmen JOHN F. BALDWIN, Republican, of California; FRANK M. COFFIN, Democrat, of Maine; CARL ELLIOTT, Democrat, of Alabama; GERALD R. FORD, JR., Republican, of Michigan; PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., Republican, of New Jersey; JAMES G. FULTON, Republican, of Pennsylvania; MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois; and STEWART L. UDALL, Democrat, of Arizona, for freshman Congressmen was an outstanding contribution to the difficult task of becoming oriented as quickly as possible.

The course was thoughtfully presented. The time and effort of those who conducted it will have a beneficial result, I feel certain. The ability to conduct this type of schooling on a complete nonpartisan basis and with a friendly atmosphere made the course an outstanding one.

I am very proud of the fact that one of the Nation's outstanding newspapers, the Newark Evening News, on February 10, 1959, commented editorially on the seminars, and I am pleased to include the editorial in full in my remarks.

I must admit that I do not recall learning how to get reelected, as suggested by the editorial, but still believe, after attending these very informative seminars, that the voters back home are the only ones who can teach us this part of the subject:

SCHOOL FOR SOLONS

The value of orientation seminars for freshmen Members of Congress was pointed up not too many years ago when a newly elected legislator from New Jersey sought to learn when it would be proper to stop by and introduce himself at the White House.

He was told, of course, to wait until he was invited, but the incident served to dramatize the bewilderment of many a newcomer to the House of Representatives, unable to find his way about Capitol Hill, much less fathom the intricacies of a parliamentary system unlike any other in the world.

The freshman Congressman is aware, of course, that he should be seen more than heard during his first 2 years, but he is also haunted by the fear that if he isn't heard at all during that period, he may never be heard of again.

The frequent consequence is that he introduces too many bills, becomes involved in too many debates, gets into procedural tangles from which he cannot extricate himself, fails to observe proprieties of which he knows nothing and alienates the friendship of veterans who can help him.

The recently concluded course of instruction in Washington for the many whose House of Representatives terms began last month must have been welcomed by all of them. They learned rules, procedures, traditions, etc., from veterans. They learned of research facilities available to them, and of the Legislative Reference Service where talents are at their beck and call.

They learned how and when to speak, how to socialize, and even how to get along with the press.

At the end of the course they learned how to get reelected, which is something every Congressman wants to know.

Relief Food Rolls Gain 12 Percent in Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Washington Post of February 14, 1959:

RELIEF FOOD ROLLS GAIN 12 PERCENT

The number of Americans on relief rolls receiving donations of Government surplus foods at the end of 1958 was the largest since 1942.

Reporting this yesterday, the Agriculture Department said the number increased nearly 12 percent in the past year. It was 5,230,044, as compared with 4,719,300 a year earlier.

Pennsylvania had the most, 829,550. Numbers in other States and areas included: Puerto Rico, 596,076; Michigan, 538,385; Mississippi, 331,441; New York, 348,871; Oklahoma, 246,960; West Virginia, 278,223; Arkansas, 219,354; Kentucky, 254,377; Tennessee, 154,551; Texas, 127,698, and Louisiana, 137,713.

The Department reported that it had donated 347 million pounds of surplus foods to Americans in the last half of 1958 at a cost of $62 million. The foods included dry beans, butter, cheese, corn meal, flour, dry milk, peanut butter and rice.

In addition to those on relief rolls, donations were made to school lunch programs feeding 14 million school children and to charitable institutions housing about 1.4 million.

Illinois Farmers Had Good Year—Best Since 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared under date of February 4, in the Rochelle, Ill., Rochelle News, entitled "Illinois Farmers Had Good Year—Best Since 1951":

ILLINOIS FARMERS HAD GOOD YEAR—BEST SINCE 1951

(By L. H. Simerl)

Most Illinois farmers had a very good year in 1958. Average net income was up 15 to 25 percent, making the year the best since 1951. The year ahead will probably not be so good as the one just ending.

Weather conditions did more than anything else to lift farm income. The weather helped to boost prices of livestock and produce bumper crop yields.

The boost in livestock prices came through the ending of the drought that had been particularly severe in the Southwest. As ranges improved and feed and water supplies increased, ranches and farmers began to hold back calves and cattle to increase their herds. This reduced marketing, lowered output, and raised prices of livestock.

The meat supply shrank 151 pounds per person in 1958, the smallest since 1952.

Where monthly average prices of choice steers ranged from $21 to $26 in 1957, the range was $26 to $30 in 1958. For the year as a whole, prices of fed cattle were the highest since 1952.

Monthly average hog prices, which ranged from $17 to $21 in 1957, were $18 to $23 in 1958. For the year, hog prices were the best since 1954.

Total volume sold by Illinois farmers was probably about the same in the 2 years.

Looking ahead to 1959, we anticipate that increased marketing of hogs, and probably of cattle, will reduce prices of livestock, particularly hogs.

Most cash-grain farmers, too, had a good year. Crop yields were generally much better than in 1957, and well above the 10-year average. The statewide average corn yield in 1958 was 68 bushels—4 bushels more than in 1957 and 13 bushels over the 10-year average.

Soybeans averaged 28½ bushels an acre, which was 3 bushels more than 1957 and 5 bushels above the 10-year average.

Illinois wheat in 1958 yielded 31 bushels, 10 bushels more than the year before and 5 bushels above the 10-year figure.

Oats made 53 bushels an acre, 14 bushels more than in 1957 and 11 bushels over the State 10-year average.

Ordinarily, extra big crops depress prices so that total returns decline. With price supports in effect, however, total returns went up.

Dairymen gained less than most farmers in 1958. Both prices and amount of milk sold remained about the same as in 1957. Dairymen benefited from good pastures, good crop yields and a substantial increase in prices received for calves and cows sold.

The State's poultrymen did not share in the increase in farm income in 1958. Profits from eggs, usually made during the fall, were

low. The broiler business became increasingly competitive. Prices on turkeys were lower than in the previous year.

Looking ahead to 1959, we can see an increase in the output of pork. Increased sales of hogs will offset only half of the expected decline in prices. The increasing abundance of pork and poultry, and a possible increase in beef, may depress prices of cattle.

As for most crops, it seems likely that both yields and price supports will be lower than in 1958. Farm income in the year ahead may be near that of 1957.

United States-Soviet Economic Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken several times about the Federal Government's need for additional tools in order to combat Soviet Russia's declaration of economic war against the United States. I introduced H.R. 2159 to create a U.S. Trading Corporation which I thought would go a long way in providing some of the tools we are lacking. I called attention to the problems created by Soviet Russia buying up Iceland's fish at an economic loss to herself in order to attain a political objective; the problems created by Russia's attempt to buy up the cotton crop of the Sudan for 5 years at uneconomic prices to attain other political objectives; the problems created by Russia swamping the aluminum markets of Western Europe with uneconomically priced aluminum. The private purchasers of Iceland's fish or the Sudan's cotton cannot compete with the state trading of Soviet Russia if she decides to concentrate her economic power in selected and limited areas. Even our powerful aluminum companies cannot compete with the low price for which Russia decides to sell her aluminum in order to disrupt the market.

I am placing in the RECORD an article appearing in the January 24, 1959, Business Week, entitled "Russia's Newest Trade Weapon," which points up another area in which the United States is unequipped to compete.

What is this new item that Russia is selling considerably below cost? School laboratory equipment. It does not take an expert in propaganda to understand what Russia seeks to achieve by underselling the U.S. market on school laboratory equipment. What better way to impress on the minds of our youth the scientific prowess of Russia than to have in the United States school laboratory equipment marked "made in Russia."

I am sending this material to the State Department and the Department of Commerce asking them just how they expect to combat this trade weapon of Russia's unless they have something like a U.S. Trading Corporation which I have proposed as a weapon in their trade arsenal.

The article from Business Week follows:

RUSSIA'S NEWEST TRADE WEAPON—SAMPLES OF SCHOOL LAB EQUIPMENT ARE EXCITING U.S. MAKERS AND CUSTOMERS—QUALITY IS SO GOOD AND PRICES SO LOW

Following a pattern laid down in aluminum and benzene, the Soviet Government's next invasion of the U.S. market will come in the school laboratory equipment market. That seemed clear this week as the first sample lot of 26 items arrived in the United States. The Soviet offer: delivery of the items, f.o.b. New York, at an average price only one-fifth of prevailing prices for comparable U.S.-made items.

In the opinion of educators who viewed the sample Soviet items, there is no question of the quality of merchandise up for sale. "They are," as one expert put it, "fantastically good."

"It would be impossible," according to one MIT scientist who carefully inspected the numerous spectrometers, microscopes, navigation instruction equipment, rotators, and the like, "to hope to buy anything of similar quality made domestically for six times the price. They're offering a top-grade spectrometer for $53, f.o.b. New York, including tariff," he points out. "That's about one-third the price of the cheapest spectrometer on the U.S. market today. And the Russian equipment is good enough for a number of industrial uses, too."

GROWING MARKET

The first shipment to be sold in the United States by the Ealing Corp. of Cambridge, Mass., will be valued at $45,000. This will bring in 300 to 500 of each of 12 different pieces of equipment.

The total U.S. market for school lab equipment is currently about $6 million a year. But with the new Federal bill for education, some experts think the total sales potential in the United States could run many times higher in the years just ahead.

AMERICAN WORRIES

Reaction of U.S. school lab equipment makers to the latest Russian move is a mixture of anger and frank incredulity. In an industry dominated by two manufacturers—Central Scientific Co. and W. M. Welch Scientific Co., both of Chicago—most companies admit they can't hope to fight back against price cuts of this magnitude.

Disturbed as they are over what would seem to be a stunning blow to their business outlook, however, they're banking on the belief that this is just another step in a larger Soviet plan to unbalance first one and then another section of the U.S. business community.

"Maybe," a manufacturer of microscopes suggests hopefully, "they'll shift their interest to somebody else soon."

In the past, this has been the pattern—a large supply of Soviet merchandise would suddenly appear on the market, then as suddenly dry up.

Official Washington is even more unconcerned about the latest Soviet economic maneuver. The average duty on scientific educational materials imported into the United States from Iron Curtain countries is about 42 percent, they point out. This is about as high a tariff bracket as you can find on any legal Russian-made item brought into the States. And it should be enough to protect the U.S. manufacturer, officials say.

MASS PRODUCTION

Why this may not be the case—and why the Russians apparently feel they are now in a position to export quality-grade equipment of this type—is a question that interests industry representatives who have seen the sample items.

One logical answer is supplied by Paul D. Grindle, president of the Ealing Corp. Print order numbers on the instruction books accompanying some of the instruments, he says, indicate that, compared with ours, the Soviet school lab instrument industry is huge.

Science education was one of the announced goals of U.S.S.R. leaders, and one of the first things the postwar Russian economy was tooled up to supply. As a result, the Soviet-produced equipment is the only equipment of its kind being mass-manufactured anywhere in the world today.

MORE TO COME

The economics of mass-manufacturing any standard item are well known. Having amortized engineering and development costs, the Soviet production machine has undoubtedly reached a point at which it costs hardly more than the price of materials to extend production of scientific lab equipment a few hundred thousand items more.

This puts the U.S.S.R. in a position to sell its run-off in world markets on a cut-rate basis. On the basis of reports coming out of Russia, the same over-run may occur sometime soon in other things from communications equipment to high-speed cameras. Grindle himself brought back a suitcase full of catalogs of electronic equipment.

MAKING CONTACT

How this particular deal came about is a story of startling simplicity. Ealing's president Grindle happened to notice a picture on the cover of the U.S. Physical Society's "Physics Today," showing a Russian physics teacher at work in his classroom. On the table top in front of the teacher was an array of lab equipment that would be unusual in a typical U.S. physics classroom.

Grindle asked the U.S. Department of Commerce about the legality of importing sample lots of this equipment and found that it was completely within the law. He inquired about the equipment at the Russian Embassy in Washington and was promptly referred to Amtorg—the Soviet trade corporation in New York. Amtorg suggested a note to the proper authorities in Moscow. This was answered by an encouraging letter and a list of 96 laboratory equipment items that the Soviet Union would be willing to sell, with estimated sales prices.

MISSION TO MOSCOW

Grindle then decided to go to Moscow to look over this bonanza for himself. He found a well-organized sales setup, prepared to handle his requests. Proper Ministry of Trade officials were available for discussions. Raznoexport, the Russian agency charged with handling Soviet consumer products, permitted him to examine any of its sales products.

Almost as startling as this organization and planning is the significance of the quality of the Soviet lab equipment. University professors, looking at the equipment, are flabbergasted at its educational implications. The Soviets seem to have planned it for use in classrooms up to the 11th grade level. In the United States it would be adequate in classrooms up to and including the first year of college.

Moreover, all of the instruments were obviously designed by people who understand and care about science education. "The most awful part about what we saw," says one professor, "is how embarrassingly good it is."

We'll Know Before Long

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to

include the following editorial which appeared in the February 10 issue of the Savanna Times-Journal, Savanna, Ill., entitled "We'll Know Before Long":

WE'LL KNOW BEFORE LONG

Editor Godfrey M. Lebhar of Chain Store Age writes: "If the new Congress is wise enough to curtail public spending in order to curb the dangerous inflation which is otherwise inevitable, the outlook for the economy in general, and for retail sales in particular, will be bright indeed.

"But if, on the other hand, the new Congress should be unwise enough to increase public spending instead of reducing it, we will be following a path which can lead only to economic disaster.

"True enough, adding fuel to the inflationary flames which are already threatening the economy would mean an increase in retail sales in dollars as a result of rising prices, but any increase in dollar sales without a corresponding increase in unit sales hurts our economy instead of helping it. Declining unit sales mean reduced production, increased unemployment and a lower standard of living for all."

Lebhar goes on to say that retail sales are likely to increase this year no matter what Government fiscal policy is followed. But the question—and it's as big a question as the Nation faces—is whether this will be a healthy increase, based on a stabilized currency, or an increase which merely reflects further degradation of the dollar.

We will know before long. The answer is up to Congress.

Forty-first Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, today we think of wars as the worst events in human history, and as the horrors of destruction and death that are sure to be caused by wars in this atomic bomb and nuclear age, we dread the thought of any war. In this we are probably and rightly justified in regarding wars as scourges of the human race. That is the consensus of today. But in the past, even in the relatively recent past, there have been wars which were regarded as the only way out of difficult international situations, and even out of some imminent calamities. Certainly defensive wars are always treated in this spirit. The First World War is also regarded as such by many peoples who found their liberation and independence in the culmination of that war. As that world holocaust drew to its close, autocratic monarchies tumbled down one after the other: The Russian czarist regime, monarchical Germany, the Austro-Hungarian monarchy and the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, all perished in that destructive and devastating war. And that war shattered the chains which held millions of innocent and helpless people in bondage and servitude. The Lithuanians were among these people.

The Lithuanian people have a distinct place in the turbulent history of northeastern Europe. They are justly proud of their long and glorious past. For centuries the Lithuanian kingdom was a powerful force in the whole east European region. At times they not only successfully repelled some of the incursions of barbarian invaders from the east, but they were the stouthearted champions of Christianity and its advance guard in that part of Europe. Late in the 16th century their kingdom was united with the Polish kingdom, and formed a dual monarchy. This union lasted for about 200 years. During that time the destinies of both nations were wedded together. In the late 18th century when Poland was partitioned, most of Poland and with it all Lithuania was incorporated into the Russian Empire. But the loss of national independent almost 200 years ago did not mean the loss of the spirit of freedom on the part of Lithuanians. While they suffered under the autocratic regime of the czars, they worked hard for the attainment of their freedom. They became firmly convinced that individual and national well-being could not be fully achieved or enjoyed without national political independence. They learned that in order to enjoy the benefits of their labor, they should have complete freedom in their homeland. To regain that freedom they worked ceaselessly, but it took them more than a full century to see their cherished dream come true. Not until the detested regime of the czars was overthronw could they have their freedom. In 1917 when that regime was shattered by the Russian Revolution, then, along with other peoples, the Lithuanians felt free. On February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their independence and set up their Republic. That day marks a new day in the modern history of the Lithuanian people.

Both in the attainment of Lithuanian independence and in its maintenance for more than two decades the United States has made important contributions, officially and unofficially. The encouragement which the Lithuanians found in the famous 14 points of our former President Wilson was a boon to their cause. It was a source of inspiration for them to know that their struggle for liberty and independence had the support of our wartime President and our people. Nor was the moral and material aid given to Lithuania by the people of this country, especially by the body of our loyal citizens of Lithuanian descent, of less significance. With such aid, and through their own industry and perseverance, the Lithuanian people turned their war-torn country, in a short time, into a happy habitat for all lovers of freedom and liberty. They worked wonders in making Lithuania a prosperous and progressive democracy, a model in many respects. And during those two decades the people were happy, leading a contented life. But, unfortunately, this period did not last long. As the war-clouds began to thicken in the late 1930's, Lithuania sensed the danger to her independence. No mercy was expected from either totalitarian regimes, neither from Berlin nor from Moscow. In the end, however, it was Moscow that in a series of villainous acts put an end to Lithuanian independence in July of 1940 and enslaved the people.

Today, for more than 18 years, unhappy Lithuanians find themselves once more in chains and cut off from all contacts with the free world. There are some 3 million helpless and innocent souls completely sealed off behind the Iron Curtain. Many elemental means of livelihood and all freedoms are denied to them. They live as in a large prison camp, to work as slaves for their taskmasters in the Kremlin. Communist rulers of the country have been doing their very worst to eradicate any feeling of nationality and, one might say, rationality, among its inhabitants. All national events and the observance are rigidly controlled and prescribed. There is no freedom of speech, of press, of movement, and no one is free to correspond with people in the free world. The only freedom these poor souls have, the one which their heartless overlords cannot take away from them, is to cherish their freedom and pray for deliverance from Communist totalitarianism. On this historic anniversary, on the 41st Lithuanian Independence Day, I hope that they will regain their freedom and once more enjoy it in their historic homeland.

Under One Roof 58 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Sunday, February 15, 1959:

UNDER ONE ROOF 58 YEARS

Last week the Washington Bureau of the Associated Press moved out of the old Star Building to quarters in the spick-and-span new Machinists' Building, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW. Within another 2 or 3 weeks (much about that later) we shall ourselves be leaving, setting up shop overnight in our brand-new building on Virginia Avenue between Second and Third Streets SE.

So ends an era for the AP bureau as well as the Star, and the beginning of a bright new one for both. But having shared the same roof for more than 58 years, the physical parting has not been without regrets. The Associated Press (although its organization and concept are vastly different now) is older than the Star, the first AP Washington correspondent having been stationed here in 1848—4 years before the Star was founded. In 1856 the AP established its lone correspondent in an office, which became the first AP Washington bureau, one of two in the United States. And in 1900, when the Star moved into its ultramodern "marble palace" at Eleventh and Pennsylvania Avenue, the AP bureau moved in with us. We have been together ever since, both of us, in recent years, bursting at the seams as we outgrew what, so few years ago, seemed

unlimited space. Both of us have room now for future expansion—but no longer under the same roof.

The physical separation between the Star and the AP bureau now is measured in miles, rather than feet. Yet, due to the marvels of modern communications, the Star will be in closer contact with the AP bureau, and the news and pictures it receives and send, than when we were separated by a few floors. For more than half a century we exchanged our copy with the AP through pneumatic tubes, a marvelous device when they were installed. Now the AP's battery of teletype machines and photo transmitters, bringing the news from around the world, will be within a few feet of the editors who handle the copy, with direct telephone lines linking the desks in both buildings.

This is all fine, and means progress. Yet 58 years is a long time to have shared a building together, and all the good news and all the bad news that rushed in and out of that building every day in all those years. It is hard to be casual about such a parting.

Truman Endorses Macmillan Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of February 18, 1959:

TRUMAN ENDORSES MACMILLAN VISIT—HOPES MOSCOW JOURNEY WILL OPEN A DOOR—OPPOSES TRIP BY A U.S. LEADER

(By Harry S. Truman)

I hope the visit of Prime Minister Macmillan to the Kremlin results in the opening of a door. I, for one, can see no objection to the initiative of the British Prime Minister.

Macmillan may be able to use this occasion to take soundings of the Soviet's immediate intent. All recent attempts to engage in exchanges and conversations with the Kremlin have proved futile and have been subverted for propaganda purposes.

Despite all the discouragements suffered by the West to date and the continuing skepticism of the Kremlin's peaceful intentions, I think the Macmillan trip is all to the good. This mission cannot be construed as arising out of weakness, or division of the West, or appeasement, and is one not likely to be used by the Russians for external propaganda purposes.

VISIT BY AMERICAN OPPOSED

If the Russians have a grain of peaceful intention in their program, the Macmillan visit might provide them a chance to return to constructive diplomacy where matters may be discussed quietly without the need for waving missiles in public.

In my judgment, this approach could not now be undertaken by the President of the United States or the Vice President without such a move being misunderstood and leading surely to another serious setback.

I have seen some public suggestions that the Vice President undertake a trip to Moscow in return for the Mikoyan visit and address the Soviets and the Russian people, with the stipulation that all of his remarks be published as given.

Because of my well-known personal feelings about the Vice President, I hope that no one will misconstrue the conviction I have that a visit by him to Russia, particularly at this time or a visit by any other leading American official, for that matter, would backfire.

There is another reason why I think a mission such as Macmillan's should be welcomed by us. I feel that the situation in which we find ourselves makes it desirable for our allies to assume equal initiative in the diplomatic field, provided, of course, that they do so in full concert and communication with all their partners.

We must realize that what we are after is not only to keep the peace but to make it durable, and at all stages to leave the door open to reason and conciliation, if we are to be met by a like attitude. And by like attitude, I do not mean flippant statements such as Khrushchev made recently before the Soviet party congress in Moscow when he declared that he is willing to concede victory in the cold war to the West while expecting the West to capitulate on Russian terms.

BLAME FOR THE COLD WAR

The Soviets initiated the cold war and have kept it up ever since with taunts, threats, and broken agreements.

We never wanted the cold war, and we don't like it. It has diverted our economy from further expansion for peaceful purposes at home and abroad. We converted from a war economy, beginning in 1945, and achieved immediate and unprecedented success in full employment and a balanced budget. But Communist aggression in Korea and elsewhere compelled us to redirect some of our economy to measures of defense at great sacrifice to our people.

The Russians have now embarked upon an economic war against us. It is a war they cannot possibly win. They can only bring further privations to their own people. They could not win even if our own leadership failed to put to maximum use our enormous and as yet untapped industrial capacity and economic might.

Let me remind the Kremlin rulers that this would not be a struggle between socialism and capitalism but one between dictatorial state capitalism and a free enterprise system where there are laws protecting the rights and welfare of the individual.

The Russians may feel confident that they possess the ability and the capacity to upset the economy of the entire world. If so, they are laboring under a delusion.

Such a task is beyond their ability or that of any other single power. More and more we see that the future welfare of all mankind is based upon the free cooperation of all nations.

NO MISGIVINGS SEEN

We have no misgivings about the industrial and economic progress of Russia. Neither are we disturbed over the dramatic strides in industry and agriculture in Red China. If the policies of Russia and Red China were aimed at peaceful cooperation with all their neighbors and for the benefit of mankind, we would be the first to acclaim their achievements and extend to them fullest cooperation.

Mikoyan told the Soviet party congress that peace follows trade and that nations that trade with each other are at peace.

If Mikoyan had come here not with the blandishment of trade but with a program of peace, his chances for success would have been greatly enhanced.

But Mikoyan has the mistaken belief, as do the Kremlin leaders and, I suspect, some businessmen here, that trade comes first and is a cure-all for all international differences. They believe that if you have trade, peace automatically follows.

Two world wars have proved that trade alone is not the road to peace.

One thing history teaches us is that dictatorships almost inevitably have led to war. From the days of Augustus Caesar the record on this is clear.

WILL TO BE FREE SPREADS

In this respect, however, I think the world is getting younger, rather than older, and the will to be free is manifesting itself in every part of the world. There is comfort in the fact that in this century of the two most oppressive dictatorships in history, freedom has come to more nations and to more millions of people than has ever been known before.

I hope and believe that in Russia and in China—perhaps not in my lifetime—the indomitable will in the human being to be free will triumph.

This immutable process of the will to be free will take some time. But in the meantime we have the problem of living and getting along with the Russian and Chinese dictatorships as best we can. This means that we must keep our guard up, much as we would prefer not to do it, in order that we secure ourselves against rapacious and foolhardy imperialism.

If Russia would agree to a peaceful unification of Germany, with proper safeguards to Russian as well as European security, that would be an important step in keeping the peace.

If Russia would make another step by abandoning her intrigue in the Middle East so as to create a climate for peaceful international cooperation, the peace of the world would be strengthened.

Success in the direction of peace in these two critical areas could produce a constructive approach to the problems in the Pacific. But let us remember that up to now the Communists use words they do not mean.

THE PRINCIPAL DIFFICULTY

The principal difficulty is that where you have a government which has total control of mind as well as material things, it is hard to find many opportunities for meaningful negotiations.

But limited as the opportunities may be, the statesmen of the West must be on the search and on the alert for any possible chance to advance the cause of peace. The most immediate pressing problem facing the West is the ultimatum date set by Khrushchev to abandon West Berlin.

Russia would like a meeting at the summit without an agenda and we do not know for what purpose. Our experience at the summit conference at Geneva proved it a complete waste of time and effort. It only served as a stage to present Khrushchev and Bulganin to the world as the new rulers of the Kremlin.

It seems to make sense that before we are maneuvered into another such meeting we at least wait for the report of Prime Minister Macmillan after his visit to Russia.

Republicans, by Whatever Name, Are Not the Friends of the Masses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the February 16, 1959, issue of the New Republic:

ROCKEFELLER TAXES

Faced with a large prospective deficit, mandatory increases in State aid programs, and uncertain revenue prospects in the State of New York, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller could

include the following editorial which appeared in the February 10 issue of the Savanna Times-Journal, Savanna, Ill., entitled "We'll Know Before Long":

WE'LL KNOW BEFORE LONG

Editor Godfrey M. Lebhar of Chain Store Age writes: "If the new Congress is wise enough to curtail public spending in order to curb the dangerous inflation which is otherwise inevitable, the outlook for the economy in general, and for retail sales in particular, will be bright indeed.

"But if, on the other hand, the new Congress should be unwise enough to increase public spending instead of reducing it, we will be following a path which can lead only to economic disaster.

"True enough, adding fuel to the inflationary flames which are already threatening the economy would mean an increase in retail sales in dollars as a result of rising prices, but any increase in dollar sales without a corresponding increase in unit sales hurts our economy instead of helping it. Declining unit sales mean reduced production, increased unemployment and a lower standard of living for all."

Lebhar goes on to say that retail sales are likely to increase this year no matter what Government fiscal policy is followed. But the question—and it's as big a question as the Nation faces—is whether this will be a healthy increase, based on a stabilized currency, or an increase which merely reflects further degradation of the dollar.

We will know before long. The answer is up to Congress.

Forty-first Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, today we think of wars as the worst events in human history, and as the horrors of destruction and death that are sure to be caused by wars in this atomic bomb and nuclear age, we dread the thought of any war. In this we are probably and rightly justified in regarding wars as scourges of the human race. That is the consensus of today. But in the past, even in the relatively recent past, there have been wars which were regarded as the only way out of difficult international situations, and even out of some imminent calamities. Certainly defensive wars are always treated in this spirit. The First World War is also regarded as such by many peoples who found their liberation and independence in the culmination of that war. As that world holocaust drew to its close, autocratic monarchies tumbled down one after the other: The Russian czarist regime, monarchical Germany, the Austro-Hungarian monarchy and the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, all perished in that destructive and devastating war. And that war shattered the chains which held millions of innocent and helpless people in bondage and servitude. The Lithuanians were among these people.

The Lithuanian people have a distinct place in the turbulent history of northeastern Europe. They are justly proud of their long and glorious past. For centuries the Lithuanian kingdom was a powerful force in the whole east European region. At times they not only successfully repelled some of the incursions of barbarian invaders from the east, but they were the stouthearted champions of Christianity and its advance guard in that part of Europe. Late in the 16th century their kingdom was united with the Polish kingdom, and formed a dual monarchy. This union lasted for about 200 years. During that time the destinies of both nations were wedded together. In the late 18th century when Poland was partitioned, most of Poland and with it all Lithuania was incorporated into the Russian Empire. But the loss of national independent almost 200 years ago did not mean the loss of the spirit of freedom on the part of Lithuanians. While they suffered under the autocratic regime of the czars, they worked hard for the attainment of their freedom. They became firmly convinced that individual and national well-being could not be fully achieved or enjoyed without national political independence. They learned that in order to enjoy the benefits of their labor, they should have complete freedom in their homeland. To regain that freedom they worked ceaselessly, but it took them more than a full century to see their cherished dream come true. Not until the detested regime of the czars was overthronw could they have their freedom. In 1917 when that regime was shattered by the Russian Revolution, then, along with other peoples, the Lithuanians felt free. On February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their independence and set up their Republic. That day marks a new day in the modern history of the Lithuanian people.

Both in the attainment of Lithuanian independence and in its maintenance for more than two decades the United States has made important contributions, officially and unofficially. The encouragement which the Lithuanians found in the famous 14 points of our former President Wilson was a boon to their cause. It was a source of inspiration for them to know that their struggle for liberty and independence had the support of our wartime President and our people. Nor was the moral and material aid given to Lithuania by the people of this country, especially by the body of our loyal citizens of Lithuanian descent, of less significance. With such aid, and through their own industry and perseverance, the Lithuanian people turned their war-torn country, in a short time, into a happy habitat for all lovers of freedom and liberty. They worked wonders in making Lithuania a prosperous and progressive democracy, a model in many respects. And during those two decades the people were happy, leading a contented life. But, unfortunately, this period did not last long. As the war-clouds began to thicken in the late 1930's, Lithuania sensed the danger to her independence. No mercy was expected from either totalitarian regimes, neither from Berlin nor from Moscow. In the end, however, it was Moscow that in a series of villainous acts put an end to Lithuanian independence in July of 1940 and enslaved the people.

Today, for more than 18 years, unhappy Lithuanians find themselves once more in chains and cut off from all contacts with the free world. There are some 3 million helpless and innocent souls completely sealed off behind the Iron Curtain. Many elemental means of livelihood and all freedoms are denied to them. They live as in a large prison camp, to work as slaves for their taskmasters in the Kremlin. Communist rulers of the country have been doing their very worst to eradicate any feeling of nationality and, one might say, rationality, among its inhabitants. All national events and the observance are rigidly controlled and prescribed. There is no freedom of speech, of press, of movement, and no one is free to correspond with people in the free world. The only freedom these poor souls have, the one which their heartless overlords cannot take away from them, is to cherish their freedom and pray for deliverance from Communist totalitarianism. On this historic anniversary, on the 41st Lithuanian Independence Day, I hope that they will regain their freedom and once more enjoy it in their historic homeland.

Under One Roof 58 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Sunday, February 15, 1959:

UNDER ONE ROOF 58 YEARS

Last week the Washington Bureau of the Associated Press moved out of the old Star Building to quarters in the spick-and-span new Machinists' Building, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW. Within another 2 or 3 weeks (much about that later) we shall ourselves be leaving, setting up shop overnight in our brand-new building on Virginia Avenue between Second and Third Streets SE.

So ends an era for the AP bureau as well as the Star, and the beginning of a bright new one for both. But having shared the same roof for more than 58 years, the physical parting has not been without regrets. The Associated Press (although its organization and concept are vastly different now) is older than the Star, the first AP Washington correspondent having been stationed here in 1848—4 years before the Star was founded. In 1856 the AP established its lone correspondent in an office, which became the first AP Washington bureau, one of two in the United States. And in 1900, when the Star moved into its ultramodern "marble palace" at Eleventh and Pennsylvania Avenue, the AP bureau moved in with us. We have been together ever since, both of us, in recent years, bursting at the seams as we outgrew what, so few years ago, seemed

unlimited space. Both of us have room now for future expansion—but no longer under the same roof.

The physical separation between the Star and the AP bureau now is measured in miles, rather than feet. Yet, due to the marvels of modern communications, the Star will be in closer contact with the AP bureau, and the news and pictures it receives and send, than when we were separated by a few floors. For more than half a century we exchanged our copy with the AP through pneumatic tubes, a marvelous device when they were installed. Now the AP's battery of teletype machines and photo transmitters, bringing the news from around the world, will be within a few feet of the editors who handle the copy, with direct telephone lines linking the desks in both buildings.

This is all fine, and means progress. Yet 58 years is a long time to have shared a building together, and all the good news and all the bad news that rushed in and out of that building every day in all those years. It is hard to be casual about such a parting.

Truman Endorses Macmillan Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of February 18, 1959:

TRUMAN ENDORSES MACMILLAN VISIT—HOPES MOSCOW JOURNEY WILL OPEN A DOOR—OPPOSES TRIP BY A U.S. LEADER

(By Harry S. Truman)

I hope the visit of Prime Minister Macmillan to the Kremlin results in the opening of a door. I, for one, can see no objection to the initiative of the British Prime Minister.

Macmillan may be able to use this occasion to take soundings of the Soviet's immediate intent. All recent attempts to engage in exchanges and conversations with the Kremlin have proved futile and have been subverted for propaganda purposes.

Despite all the discouragements suffered by the West to date and the continuing skepticism of the Kremlin's peaceful intentions, I think the Macmillan trip is all to the good. This mission cannot be construed as arising out of weakness, or division of the West, or appeasement, and is one not likely to be used by the Russians for external propaganda purposes.

VISIT BY AMERICAN OPPOSED

If the Russians have a grain of peaceful intention in their program, the Macmillan visit might provide them a chance to return to constructive diplomacy where matters may be discussed quietly without the need for waving missiles in public.

In my judgment, this approach could not now be undertaken by the President of the United States or the Vice President without such a move being misunderstood and leading surely to another serious setback.

I have seen some public suggestions that the Vice President undertake a trip to Moscow in return for the Mikoyan visit and address the Soviets and the Russian people, with the stipulation that all of his remarks be published as given.

Because of my well-known personal feelings about the Vice President, I hope that no one will misconstrue the conviction I have that a visit by him to Russia, particularly at this time or a visit by any other leading American official, for that matter, would backfire.

There is another reason why I think a mission such as Macmillan's should be welcomed by us. I feel that the situation in which we find ourselves makes it desirable for our allies to assume equal initiative in the diplomatic field, provided, of course, that they do so in full concert and communication with all their partners.

We must realize that what we are after is not only to keep the peace but to make it durable, and at all stages to leave the door open to reason and conciliation, if we are to be met by a like attitude. And by like attitude, I do not mean flippant statements such as Khrushchev made recently before the Soviet party congress in Moscow when he declared that he is willing to concede victory in the cold war to the West while expecting the West to capitulate on Russian terms.

BLAME FOR THE COLD WAR

The Soviets initiated the cold war and have kept it up ever since with taunts, threats, and broken agreements.

We never wanted the cold war, and we don't like it. It has diverted our economy from further expansion for peaceful purposes at home and abroad. We converted from a war economy, beginning in 1945, and achieved immediate and unprecedented success in full employment and a balanced budget. But Communist aggression in Korea and elsewhere compelled us to redirect some of our economy to measures of defense at great sacrifice to our people.

The Russians have now embarked upon an economic war against us. It is a war they cannot possibly win. They can only bring further privations to their own people. They could not win even if our own leadership failed to put to maximum use our enormous and as yet untapped industrial capacity and economic might.

Let me remind the Kremlin rulers that this would not be a struggle between socialism and capitalism but one between dictatorial state capitalism and a free enterprise system where there are laws protecting the rights and welfare of the individual.

The Russians may feel confident that they possess the ability and the capacity to upset the economy of the entire world. If so, they are laboring under a delusion.

Such a task is beyond their ability or that of any other single power. More and more we see that the future welfare of all mankind is based upon the free cooperation of all nations.

NO MISGIVINGS SEEN

We have no misgivings about the industrial and economic progress of Russia. Neither are we disturbed over the dramatic strides in industry and agriculture in Red China. If the policies of Russia and Red China were aimed at peaceful cooperation with all their neighbors and for the benefit of mankind, we would be the first to acclaim their achievements and extend to them fullest cooperation.

Mikoyan told the Soviet party congress that peace follows trade and that nations that trade with each other are at peace.

If Mikoyan had come here not with the blandishment of trade but with a program of peace, his chances for success would have been greatly enhanced.

But Mikoyan has the mistaken belief, as do the Kremlin leaders and, I suspect, some businessmen here, that trade comes first and is a cure-all for all international differences. They believe that if you have trade, peace automatically follows.

Two world wars have proved that trade alone is not the road to peace.

One thing history teaches us is that dictatorships almost inevitably have led to war. From the days of Augustus Caesar the record on this is clear.

WILL TO BE FREE SPREADS

In this respect, however, I think the world is getting younger, rather than older, and the will to be free is manifesting itself in every part of the world. There is comfort in the fact that in this century of the two most oppressive dictatorships in history, freedom has come to more nations and to more millions of people than has ever been known before.

I hope and believe that in Russia and in China—perhaps not in my lifetime—the indomitable will in the human being to be free will triumph.

This immutable process of the will to be free will take some time. But in the meantime we have the problem of living and getting along with the Russian and Chinese dictatorships as best we can. This means that we must keep our guard up, much as we would prefer not to do it, in order that we secure ourselves against rapacious and foolhardy imperialism.

If Russia would agree to a peaceful unification of Germany, with proper safeguards to Russian as well as European security, that would be an important step in keeping the peace.

If Russia would make another step by abandoning her intrigue in the Middle East so as to create a climate for peaceful international cooperation, the peace of the world would be strengthened.

Success in the direction of peace in these two critical areas could produce a constructive approach to the problems in the Pacific. But let us remember that up to now the Communists use words they do not mean.

THE PRINCIPAL DIFFICULTY

The principal difficulty is that where you have a government which has total control of mind as well as material things, it is hard to find many opportunities for meaningful negotiations.

But limited as the opportunities may be, the statesmen of the West must be on the search and on the alert for any possible chance to advance the cause of peace. The most immediate pressing problem facing the West is the ultimatum date set by Khrushchev to abandon West Berlin.

Russia would like a meeting at the summit without an agenda and we do not know for what purpose. Our experience at the summit conference at Geneva proved it a complete waste of time and effort. It only served as a stage to present Khrushchev and Bulganin to the world as the new rulers of the Kremlin.

It seems to make sense that before we are maneuvered into another such meeting we at least wait for the report of Prime Minister Macmillan after his visit to Russia.

Republicans, by Whatever Name, Are Not the Friends of the Masses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the February 16, 1959, issue of the New Republic:

ROCKEFELLER TAXES

Faced with a large prospective deficit, mandatory increases in State aid programs, and uncertain revenue prospects in the State of New York, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller could

have chosen one of two unpleasant alternatives—a cut in spending or an increase in taxes. He creditably refused to curtail programs which he had supported and promised to expand during the successful campaign. He was left only with a tax increase. Quite possibly he has overestimated the gap between receipts and expenditures. Such, at least, is the contention of Arthur Levitt, the only Democrat to survive the Republican landslide in New York. But much more disconcerting to the Governor's liberal admirers is the character of the increases. Of the $277 million in new revenue anticipated, $150 million will come from the State income tax, $47 million from a 2-cent rise in cigarette levies, and $69.5 million from larger gasoline imposts. Given the structure of State finances, the Governor had to depend on these taxes, but he could have moderated their regressive impact. Of these taxes, both the cigarette and the gasoline tax (save possibly in New York City where the poor do not own cars) take a larger percentage from those whose incomes are lower.

The change in the State income tax which might have counteracted these effects seems rather to intensify them. The drastic drop in exemptions from $2,500 for a married couple to $1,200, and from $1,000 for a single person to $600, will add 400,000 new taxpayers to the rolls. The $10 exemption will relieve only 100,000 of them from this new charge. Such changes inevitably fall most heavily on those who earn less than $5,000. For example, a married couple with no children earning $3,500 will pay $39 instead of $13, a rise of 200 percent. If a couple with the same income have a single child, their tax liability rises from $5 to $21, or more than 300 percent. Although the dollar amounts are small, the tendency is unfortunate. It is not as if there were no alternative. Relatively slight increases in the upper brackets and more modest downward shifts in the exemptions would have produced the same revenues.

Eleven Million Dollars Paid to Unemployed in 1958 in Wilkes-Barre Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Wilkes-Barre Record of February 12, 1959:

ELEVEN MILLION DOLLARS PAID IDLE IN WILKES-BARRE—NANTICOKE GETS $5 MILLION AND PITTSTON $2.7 MILLION

Economic impact exerted in 1958 through State unemployment compensation disbursements made in the area covered by Wilkes-Barre office of the Pennsylvania Bureau of Employment Security is indicated in announcement yesterday by the manager of the office, N. J. Haydock, that approximately $11,258,000 was paid last year by the various State unemployment compensation programs to unemployed workers in the immediate Wilkes-Barre area. This sum is estimated to be the equivalent to annual payrolls of a number of substantially large industries.

Total unemployment compensation claims processed by Wilkes-Barre office of the Bureau of Employment Security in 1958 was 397,200.

Manager Haydock announced a breakdown of disbursements and number of claims for the various State unemployment compensation programs last year as follows, through the Wilkes-Barre Bureau of Employment Security office:

Regular unemployment compensation: $9,625,000; 346,200 claims filed.

Unemployment compensation for Federal civilian employees: $61,000; 2,100 claims.

Unemployment compensation for ex-servicemen, under Social Security Act amendment of August 28, 1958: $31,000; 1,100 claims.

Unemployment compensation for veterans under Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1952: $209,000; 8,900 claims.

Temporary unemployment compensation under Federal act approved June 4, 1958: $1,132,000; 38,900 claims.

Mr. Haydock also announced that for 1958, unemployment compensation disbursements totaling $4,972,000 were made to unemployed workers in the area served by the Pittston office of the State Bureau of Employment Security; and a total of $2,768,000 to idle workers serviced by the Nanticoke Bureau of Employment Security office.

Through claims filed at the Hazleton Employment Security office, the fourth in the Wilkes-Barre and Hazleton labor market area, State unemployment compensation payments totaled at $5,314,000 to idle workers in the Hazleton City area.

Of a total of 107 local Bureau of Employment Security offices in Pennsylvania, the Wilkes-Barre office's 1958 unemployment compensation disbursements of $11,258,000 were exceeded by only four other offices. These were: Johnstown, $11,640,000; McKeesport, $11,439,000; Uptown Philadelphia, $11,341,000; Frankford, $11,287,000.

Scranton office unemployment compensation benefit payments totaled $8,847,000.

The Armenian Struggle Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, February 18 is a memorable day in the history of the Armenian people. This is the day on which they successfully challenged the forces of communism in their historic homeland 38 years ago, and for a while evicted them. That event marks one of the first instances in which the forces of evil suffered a setback, even if only a temporary one.

Armenians had lost their independence centuries ago. During modern times their country was divided, for the most part, between Russia and Turkey. Under the autocratic misrule of the czars and the despotic Ottoman sultans they suffered untold miseries. During the First World War they faced almost total extermination in Turkey, when more than 1 million were massacred.

The survivors of that holocaust and their kinsmen in Russian Armenia joined hands in 1918 and proclaimed their national independence.

Soon after the end of that war the country was overrun by Russian Communists and by the end of 1920 it was dominated by them. Communist misrule and cruelty was intolerable, and the people staged a revolt against their unwanted overlords on February 18. The revolt proved successful; in the course of a single week the oppressors were evicted, and once more the people were free.

The freedom thus gained did not last long. Soon the Communists were reinforced and came back with greater force and fury. By early April they again overran the country, and incorporated it into the Soviet Union. Since then Armenian independence has vanished into past history. All those who still cherish freedom and independence, celebrate the anniversary of that day because it marks the beginning of their short-lived but long-remembered liberation from the yoke of totalitarian communism.

I am glad to join these fighters for freedom on the anniversary celebration of that memorable event and with them pray for early deliverance for all tyrants.

The Federal Government Should Assume the Cost of ROTC Facilities at Colleges and Universities Since ROTC Programs Are Essential to the Defense of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the colleges and universities in this country which accommodate ROTC units on their campuses appear to be grateful that I have introduced a bill—H.R. 1983—which seeks to provide Federal financial support for the various facilities occupied by these ROTC units. In the opinion of the State universities and land-grant colleges which accommodate over 80 percent of the students enrolled in ROTC programs this legislation is not only just and needed but is long overdue. Other Representatives and Senators have recognized this need for a long time and have introduced similar bills in previous Congresses. It has been a source of disappointment, discouragement, and disenchantment to these institutions that their efforts have not succeeded.

These institutions must assume that over the years the civilian and military officials in the Defense Department have meant what they have stated on repeated occasions that the ROTC programs are essential to the defense of the Nation. No less a respected authority than Gen. George C. Marshall has stated that our mobilization for World War II would have been delayed much beyond what it was had it not been for the availability of Reserve officers trained through the ROTC. Some 90,000 of the first 120,000 officers mobilized in 1941 were ROTC graduates.

More recently the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, has assured

some distinguished university presidents of the essentiality of the ROTC program to the Defense Establishment. Indeed, I know of no one in authority who has stated otherwise.

All of this being so, there was ample justification for Defense officials as far back as 1945 making commitments to the colleges and universities that they would vigorously support proposals that the Federal Government provide the necessary facilities to accommodate these units. However since 1945 when these commitments were made and continuing to the present when they have been reaffirmed, the Federal Government has yet to build the first facility at any institution.

The universities and colleges in this country simply cannot understand why they should be expected to expend their own limited capital funds to construct and maintain buildings for the exclusive use of the U.S. Government. Some institutions have done so only at the expense of depriving themselves of other sorely needed academic facilities. Still other institutions have been obliged to maintain their ROTC units in completely inadequate structures, some of them being World War I barracks which to say the least ought not to be imposed upon any college or university.

Obviously this matter cannot or certainly should not be confused with the complex or controversial issues involving Federal aid to education. All the institutions seek is a payment from the Government for facilities used by the Government. These institutions believe the Government should pay 100 percent of the cost of ROTC facilities. The bill I have introduced provides only for 50 percent of the cost which I daresay the institutions will willingly accept even though they believe it is but half of that which they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the 86th Congress will give favorable consideration to H.R. 1983 as its provisions will enable the Federal Government to assume at least 50 percent of the cost of ROTC facilities which are borne in full at the present time by our educational institutions causing many of them to divert funds from other badly needed academic facilities.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1959, was the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. This day means so very much not only to our good Lithuanian friends, but to all of us who espouse the cause of freedom.

We who have had occasion to meet Americans of Lithuanian descent realize the debt owed to Lithuania and how much its sons and daughters have contributed to the progress of America.

It is with a sad and heavy heart that we contemplate the present condition of Lithuania enslaved as it is by the brutal forces of Soviet Russia. The recent struggle for fredom against impossible odds by the Hungarian people pointed up and made clear to everyone the cruel suffering and tyranny with which people have been confronted in the captive nations such as Lithuania.

We all know and appreciate Lithuania's fine contributions to civilization during its independence and we all join on this memorable occasion in sympathetic greetings to all those in Lithuania and express to them our wish and prayer that their great country and people will again enjoy freedom as a nation.

Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, once again we pause to observe the anniversary of Lithuanian independence, this year, the 41st. As we do, we realize that the Communist regime is endeavoring to tighten its control over its satellites, a definite indication that there is considerable unrest in these nations, a chafing at the bit, so to speak. We are again reminded that the price of freedom comes high. It is not something that is won once and then remains our possession for as long as the country exists. The price of freedom is still eternal vigilance. Lithuania serves as an example of how freedom can be won and lost.

As it has done for a number of years, the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore commemorated the anniversary of Lithuanian independence with a banquet held in Baltimore on February 14, with the president, Mr. Thomas G. Gray, serving as toastmaster. The invocation and benediction were given by the Reverend Anthony Dranginis of St. Alphonsus Catholic Church. Prominent Federal, State, and city representatives attended to pay tribute to Lithuania.

In this connection, I would like to include in the RECORD, a proclamation issued by the Governor of Maryland and also one by the mayor of Baltimore:

GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION—REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1959

It is not easy to shackle a liberty-loving nation.

It is doubly difficult when the nation has known the experience of freedom.

Lithuania gloried in her liberty.

But her people were deported, enslaved, and mass-murdered. Religion was repressed and freedom obliterated.

No American can take a casual view of the plight of Lithuania. Those whose ancestors came from Lithuania and their friends of all national origins join them in their hopes and prayers for liberation from communism.

In recognition of the faith and courage of the Lithuanian people and in support of all men who fight for freedom, I, J. Millard Tawes, Governor, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1959, the 41st birthday of Lithuania's independence as Republic of Lithuania Day in Maryland.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Maryland, at the city of Annapolis, this 23d day of January, in the year of our Lord, 1959.

[SEAL] J. MILLARD TAWES,
By the Governor.
THOMAS B. FINAN,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR., DESIGNATING MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1959, AS REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY IN BALTIMORE

Whereas on February 16, 1919, liberty-loving Lithuanians unfurled the flag of their country to indicate their independence and to declare that henceforth their country should be free and independent, but recent events have seen the forcible enslavement of Lithuania by the powerful might of ruthless dictators who have, for the time being, crushed all opposition on the part of the freedom-loving people of Lithuania; and

Whereas despite despotic oppression, the people of Lithuania never allow the fires of freedom and justice to burn dim, but work and pray constantly for the day when, once again, Lithuanians can walk erect as freemen in the enjoyment of that freedom that is the birthright of all men; and

Whereas every year, on February 16, the Lithuanian colonies throughout the Nation gather together to observe the independence day of Lithuania and to offer up prayers that their beloved mother country will soon be enabled to enjoy the blessings of freedom not only for their own country but also for all other nations now under the domination of despotic rulers who seek to destroy all those things freemen cherish and hold most dear; and

Whereas the city of Baltimore is justly proud of the many citizens of Lithuanian birth or ancestry who have made important contributions to the civic and industrial life of our community and who have been enabled to enjoy here the freedoms denied their compatriots in Lithuania: Now, therefore,

I, Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., mayor of the city of Baltimore, do hereby proclaim Monday, February 16, 1959, as Republic of Lithuania Day in Baltimore, and do urge all our citizens to join with the people of Lithuania in praying and working unceasingly to the end that the blessings of liberty and justice will again return to the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and cause the great seal of the city of Baltimore to be affixed this second day of February, in the year of our Lord 1959.

[SEAL] THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.,
Mayor.

Mr. Speaker, the following resolution, which I believe will be of interest to all Members of the House, was adopted unanimously at the banquet:

Whereas in this year of 1959 millions of freedom-loving Lithuanians in their homeland are not permitted to openly celebrate or even talk or write about Lithuanian Independence Day; and

Whereas it is manifest the people of Lithuania have bravely resisted all Soviet attempts to convert them to the Communist outlook and the way of life; and

Whereas Kremlin propagandists, such as Menshikov and Mikoyan, talk of their peaceful aims in one breath and boast in the next breath that the future of man shall be determined by scientific achievement and the development of new and terrifying weapons of war:

Now, therefore, we Americans of Lithuanian descent, living in the city of Balti-

more, in the Free State of Maryland, assembled at Lithuanian Hall, under the auspices of the Council of Lithuanian Societies, on this 14th day of February 1959, in commemoration of the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, hereby resolve to remind the American people, and particularly their appointed and elected representatives, that every time we read a newspaper born of our free press, every time we vote in our free elections, every time we celebrate the Fourth of July, we do so in full awareness that millions of our fellow human beings in Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and other subjugated countries are being denied by the Kremlin liberties and freedoms which we in America often take for granted, and, further, let none of us forget the age-old lesson that the human spirit is still the ultimate weapon in any conflict, and men, rather than mechanical weapons developed by them, will decide who shall be the winner in the struggle between freedom and totalitarianism.

COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES OF BALTIMORE,
THOMAS G. GRAY, *President.*
LUCY LASKAUSKAS, *Secretary.*

Relief for Our Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing in the House of Representatives legislation that will provide some small measure of relief for our taxpayers.

The first bill will increase the present income tax exemption of a taxpayer and/or his dependent from the present $600 level to $1,000. The $600 exemption now in effect was adopted over 10 years ago, and, of course, in this day and age is totally unrealistic and unfair.

The second bill grants an exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions. We must be concerned about our older citizens who have been forced to exist on fixed incomes while prices continue to rise. These citizens are over the age limit where they can seek and find employment to supplement any such annuities or pensions, and with the current lack of jobs their situation is more desperate than ever.

The third and last bill would permit a parent to deduct for income tax purposes amounts paid for the care of children while the parent is working, and would allow an income tax exemption for any child under 18 years of age who has been a member of the taxpayer's household, or attending school at the taxpayer's expense, during the entire taxable year. Once again the high cost of living has made it necessary in many instances for both husband and wife to seek work, thus necessitating the care and supervision of any children to another individual or organization. This provision would give much needed relief to those parents who are forced to pay for the care of their children while they themselves are working.

The cost of living in the last decade has continued to skyrocket like a missile and the tax laws have placed a heavy and unfair burden on our middle and lower income families. Recent figures show that there is still too much unhealthy unemployment throughout our country and the trend shows no signs of diminishing in the near future unless we take some steps to place more money into the hands of the consumer.

A tax cut now, even in the form of increased or liberalized exemptions, would increase consumer income and at the same time stimulate purchasing power, thus giving a "shot in the arm" to our sagging economy.

We must take some action, and quickly, to ease the burden of the taxpayer, and I respectfully urge my colleagues to give this immediate consideration to the enactment of a program which will provide that relief.

Steamship "Argentina": Launching and Initial Voyage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the launching of a large vessel and its initial voyage are always thrilling experiences to those who watch the ship slide down the ways to become waterborne, and are fortunate enough to be on board during its first trip at sea.

On March 12, 1958 the Steamship *Argentina*, owned by the Moore-McCormack Lines, was launched at the Ingalls Shipyard, Pascagoula, Miss. It was uniquely fitting that, as special launching and initial voyage guest on this vessel which will run to South America, was Harry W. Frantz, the distinguished foreign correspondent of United Press-International whose extensive writing published in Latin America for more than 38 years have made his name a notable journalistic tradition.

It is fortunate that Mr. Frantz recorded his impressions, later published in a news story in the January 8, 1959 issue of the Mulberry Reporter, Mulberry, Ind.

The indicated news story follows:

A REPORTER ON THE STEAMER "ARGENTINA"
(By Harry W. Frantz, foreign correspondent of United Press-International)

WASHINGTON, December 22, 1958.—The outstanding event of my reportorial life in 1958 was to act as "trigger man" at the launching of the $26 million superliner *Argentina* at the Ingalls shipyard in Pascagoula, Miss.

The Moore-McCormack Lines, owners of this wonderful ship, gave me this task as a mark of good will for 38 years of newswriting for Latin American countries. The *Argentina* was built for first-class passenger service between New York and the east coast ports of South America.

On March 12 I pushed the lever that started the *Argentina* down the ways into the Pascagoula River, and at the same moment the ceremonial champagne bottle was cracked across the bow for the christening. The launching occurred without a hitch, and my reputation for good luck was established with the builders and the owners.

At midnight on December 3, I arrived again at Pascagoula with a newsmen's party, and boarded the *Argentina* for its trial tests and delivery run to New York City. My cabin was No. 174 on the upper deck.

At 6:10 a.m., on December 4, I was awakened by the announcement on the communications system: "Attention. All ashore that are going ashore. The gangway is going off."

On the previous day I had written an advance story, and as a reporter had no immediate reason to get excited. I waited drowsily in bed for the whistles, noise, and commotion which ordinarily attend a big ship's departure.

A radio in the cabin carried a quaint song from a shore station purportedly sung by three chipmunks. I felt no motion and heard no noise, except the radio, and presumed that the departure had been delayed.

Ten minutes later I roused myself and looked out of the port. To my amazement the *Argentina* was already out on the Pascagoula River and on its way to New York. This was my first realization that modern ship designers had accomplished a miracle, creating a 22,770-ton vessel which was almost entirely without vibration or tremor. It meant goodbye to that ancient hazard to ocean travelers—seasickness.

The propulsion machinery was located far aft, and experiments at every stage of construction had progressively eliminated the possibility of abnormal motion.

I soon learned that even in the rough seas, the new Denny-Brown stabilizers could be turned on to reduce the ship's roll; the *Argentina*, therefore, would become something like a floating hotel for its passengers.

When a new steamer takes to sea on its trial cruise, the sequence of events suggests a butterfly emerging from its cocoon. Countless objects are unboxed for the storerooms, carpets are uncovered, swimming pools are filled, teak deck chairs are set on the promenade deck, trash is thrown overboard, all the metal is scoured, and the vacuum cleaners go to work.

There were four reporters aboard, and we were given the freedom of the ship's seven decks, the bridge, and even the engineroom. About 250 officers and crew from the Ingalls shipyard were taking the *Argentina* to New York. Also aboard were about 150 contractors' representatives, Federal inspectors, and Moore-McCormack Lines' officials. Tests of all equipment were in progress.

The Barbadoes suite on the upper deck was assigned to the idling and conviviality of the newsmen and their company escorts. Our hosts were Joe Medaroch and Harold Hatch of New York. At intervals we made excursions to every part of the steamer. Curiously, the reporters seemed to be most fascinated by the wonderful interior decorations of the de luxe liner. The general theme was Spanish Colonial, with special attention to Argentine scenes. The prominent colors in the wool-carpeted lounges were orange and yellow and red, and the long passageways were finished in a bluish plastic called Mikarta.

The dining salon is called the Inter-American room, and the waiters come by escalator from the chrome and stainless steel galley. The deck cafe decorations feature the whaling industry with a mural of whale ships and a cabinet of scrimshaw, the name for the the whale-tooth oddities, logbooks, and other relics of a great period in Yankee shipping. There was a quiet room for passengers not looking for excitement.

On December 5 a news story was indicated and we had to go to work. A hot bearing

had developed on a differential gear between one of the turbines and a propeller shaft on the previous evening. The ship idled for repairs, and we sent news stories to New York by radio-telephone. The ship was in no danger, and the repairs were made at sea.

Trouble with a bearing is more or less routine when a big new ship takes to sea for the first time. There was no other mechanical trouble of any kind during the voyage, and our reportorial holiday continued.

Before dawn on December 6 a passenger tanker flashed a greeting to the *Argentina* with its blinker lights. "Are you the *Argentina*?" the tanker asked. After affirmative reply, the tanker signaled, "Good luck on voyage to New York and then to South America."

This incident was memorable because it was the first greeting to the *Argentina* from another ship, and meant that the marine world already was aware that a new queen of the sea was on the ocean. To me, this was a tipoff that one of my earlier stories had been used in shore-to-ships service.

William D. Dubuisson, port captain for the Ingalls Shipyard, was commander of the trial run to New York. He generously explained the radar, "Loran" navigational system, and other equipment on the bridge. His wife writes feature stories on historical topics for southern newspapers, and I ventured to give him a collection of travel pieces that my wife Kathleen and I had written for the Mulberry Reporter.

In repayment he showed me charts of the Hydrographic Office, which on their back print technical stories about the seas which would be of much value to me as a reporter.

Three engineers from the General Electric Co. spent a lot of time explaining the propulsion machinery to me, and each gave me a good Havana cigar.

Another valuable informant was Harold Pearlman, assistant works manager of the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp. at Pascagoula. He watches the ship construction through every stage, sees all, knows all, and answered every conceivable question.

In the forenoon of December 6 we passed the Dry Tortugas and Sand Point Island, and at noon the *Argentina* passed Key West and entered the Atlantic Ocean for the first time. Now we cruised smoothly northward in the Gulf Stream. By dark we were 30 miles offshore from Miami. In the next 24 hours there was nothing more noteworthy than the fact that the temperature dropped about 50 degrees from Key West until our arrival off Cape Hatteras December 7, at 8:36 a.m.

The *Argentina* easily cruised at its required speed of 23 knots or better, and made up the time lost during repair of the hot bearing. On December 8, at the appointed hour of 11:30 a.m., the pilot boarded from the pilot boat *Romer* to direct the ship into New York harbor for the traditional waterfront welcome.

Fifteen minutes earlier, a 14-foot broom had been hoisted to the radio tower of the *Argentina*. The broom meant clean sweep, and was a symbol that the ship had successfully completed its trial run.

Soon airplanes with cameramen were flying past the ship, and the Jersey coastline was visible.

Thomas Murphy, chief purser, invited us to his cabin for final toasts and Godspeeds, and we raised glasses enthusiastically "to the country and its people for which the *Argentina* is named."

By 12:40 p.m. we were off the Statue of Liberty. The sky was clearing and the sun broke through overhead. Manhattan's mighty skyline lomed ahead. Twenty or more tugs, fireboats, and ferryboats took up the escort, and innumerable ships blasted welcome. Huge fountains of water played from the fireboats. Helicopters and airplanes flew overhead.

The *Argentina* was full-dressed with pennants and flew the blue-and-white flag which meant trial run.

At 1 p.m. we were off the Battery and moving up North River, and an hour later the *Argentina* docked at the Todd Shipyard on the Hoboken side.

In a reporter's life there is no greater thrill than to arrive on a fine new ship at its home port of New York. You can almost feel the surge of interest from the spectators on the waterfront, and in the ship's company there is a strange mood of pride, enthusiasm and eager speculation about voyages yet to come.

I was so thrilled that I forgot to make notes, and only came back to life when aboard a limousine in the Lincoln Tunnel. A traffic jam was delaying the "Special" for Buenos Aires which I would write upon arrival at the newsroom.

On December 12 the *Argentina* departed from the Moore-McCormack Lines, pier 32, North River, on its maiden cruise to Buenos Aires, about 12,500 miles round trip in 31 days.

Trials and Executions in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and editorial:

HAVANA, CUBA, *February 5, 1959.*
The Honorable ADAM C. POWELL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: Thank you for your letter of January 27 and the copy of your speech before the House of Representatives.

A great deal is being said in Congress today about the Provisional Government of Cuba and the executions of some known murderers. In the majority of cases, misleading information and misinterpretation are taking the place of veracity and sound judgment of the Cuban events.

I am glad that you visited our country and had face-to-face conversations with our leaders. You are now in a position to tell your colleagues in Congress that Castro and his bearded ones have nothing to do with the ordering of the executions as such; it is the people of Cuba who demand that the guilty ones be punished exactly as is being done now.

I enclose an editorial by Ralph McGill, one of the most distinguished American writers. This is by far the finest, clearest, most unprejudiced piece I have seen in the American press concerning our trials. It expresses exactly how we feel about the Cuban executions; it is, in fact, the most eloquent exposition of our behavior toward Batista's hired killers.

I hope you will pass this information on to your colleagues and that you will continue to work so effectively for real and amicable Cuban-American relations.

Yours very truly,

J. MIRO CARDONA,
Prime Minister, Republic of Cuba.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Jan. 8, 1959]

A REVOLUTION WE MUST AID

(By Ralph McGill)

This is about the Pearl of the Antilles—Cuba. It needs a text.

Let us take one from so conservative a figure as Eugene Black, president of the World Bank. He said recently that the greatest story of this part of the 20th century was the stir and development going on in the underdeveloped countries of the world.

They are, in final analysis, the last best hope for the future. If we can export to them the western industrial civilization—well and good. If we can't then the Marxists will export theirs.

This brings us back to Cuba.

A viciously ruthless and corrupt dictator, ethically and politically bankrupt, has been driven from Cuba. Fidel Castro and the young people of Cuba have won a revolution. They have not consolidated it. This may be difficult for them to do. Powerful interests will oppose them.

But it should be obvious that Fidel has no intention of going Communist. He is a product of western civilization. Nor do the intellectuals and the people about him consider orienting themselves toward Moscow.

But it is apaprent that if this revolution does not succeed the next one will go far to the left.

A STABLE CUBA

Therefore, it is to the selfish interest of the United States to do all it can to make this revolution, so arduously won, a success. A stable Cuba would have a stabilizing effect on all the Caribbean. That is important to us.

First, we should recall Ambassador Earl E. T. Smith. He several times referred to the revolutionists as bandits. This stamps him as a most unobservant man, and an ambassador who failed to give his country sound information. The U.S. policy there was damaging. Not only was the Ambassador blind to the strength of the Fidel Castro movement, he continued to be very cozy with the Batista crowd.

Happily, the Cuban people are not angry with the United States as a people. They do believe, with reason, that official Washington supported one of the most evil dictators in Latin America.

Secondly, we should assist the Fidel Castro government to carry out at least two of its platforms. One should be easy. Our Government should be rigorous in assisting to root out the gambling underworld from the United States which Batista allowed to proliferate there. It was arrogant and powerful. It once again demonstrated that gambling is the worst of vices. The worst of our gangsters were overlords in Havana. They will try to get back in.

SUGAR LAND

Fidel Castro also wants to expropriate some of the American-owned sugar land—paying an agreed-upon price and carry out a program of land reform. This will not be easy. There are millions of acres of idle land in Cuba, much of it is owned by sugar corporations. Unless some of the thousands of landless squatters are anchored on land of their own, they will remain a focal point of radical infection.

About 35 percent of Cuba's sugar mills are United States owned.

This isn't good for the United States or Cuba. It compels us to be too much concerned about U.S. interests in Cuba and not enough about Cuba herself.

The United States would do well to assist this new Government to affect a land reform. Cuba lives on sugar. About 75 percent of her economy is built on it. To protect a small field of sugar-beet growers we impose a tariff and a quota. It is not as high as the tax on other sugar-producing countries, and it should not be.

It would be good sense for the United States to assist Cuba to own more of her economy and to see to it that her sugar market is at least not restricted. This is the sort of foreign aid which the last half of the 20th century needs.

Cuba, insofar as national security is concerned, is as important as Florida. A sound, democratic Caribbean would be of incalculable value to us.

If we fail to assist this test revolution to find its feet we later will have cause to regret it.

Garnishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish once again to call the attention of our colleagues to an excellent series of articles dealing with garnishment in the District of Columbia appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald. The distressing conditions caused by this archaic law are well known to me and I believe that Mr. Mintz has performed a real service to the community by his excellent analysis of the situation existing today as a result of easy credit operations. The House District of Columbia Committee will commence hearings tomorrow, February 19, and it is my hope that a reasonable solution can be found in order that human misery and grief now present in the District can be eliminated. The first of this series is enclosed at this point in the RECORD.

EASY CREDIT IS WRIT LARGE ON SEVENTH STREET

(By Morton Mintz)

(First of a series)

About 190 times every working day, a deputy U.S. marshal hands a District employer a writ of attachment—a municipal court paper ordering him to freeze the wages owed an employee and turn them over to a creditor.

Some of these writs are the last resort of creditors who have acted in good faith and exhausted every other means of collection from deadbeats. But a huge share originates with a few easy credit stores.

Most of the easy credit stores' customers are such poor risks that they cannot get ordinary credit. At least 9 out of 10 wage attachments are against poor Negroes (earning roughly $30 to $60 a week), uneducated and unequal to both the inner and outer pressures to buy more than they can possibly afford. And when their pay is attached, they often are left with nothing for necessities.

NO CASH, PLEASE

The easy credit stores, unlike other merchants who extend credit, balk at selling for cash, and extremely few of their customers can pay cash. A common denominator of their operation is interest charges concealed in the sales price and little or no concern with whether the buyer is a reasonable credit risk.

What these operators are concerned with is that the customer, or another person whose name gets on the account as a guarantor, is privately employed. This is because they can and do, under the District's bad debt or garnishment law, use the municipal court and private employers as their collection agents. The pay of Federal and District employees cannot be attached.

The District's garnishment law, which will be detailed in later articles, permits a creditor to get successive attachments for the same debt, to attach every cent of wages a man has coming to him, to have a man's wages frozen while he seeks an exemption, to give their demands priority over a court order for support of a man's family. If a head of a household earned more than $400 in the preceding 2 months, some judges understand the law to direct that not a penny of this shall be exempt for food, shelter, or anything else.

Thousands of writs served on employers of one person (a maid, for example) up to those who have thousands working for them—have their roots in a few—not all—easy-credit stores in the 700 block of Seventh Street NW. A Washington resident who shopped but did not buy in these stores reports some of these sights, sound, and practices:

Temptations: "Credit as you like it." "No money down." "One dollar for each new account you bring in." "Free shoes for all the children." "Free—big, juicy, delicious ham for your Easter dinner with every purchase amounting to $15 or more, when opening a new account or reopening an old one."

A prospect looks in the window and a man grabs him by the arm and whisks him inside. "What can I show you?"

"An overcoat."

"Where do you work? Not a Government employee? OK, we'll fix you up. Do you have an account here? No? That's all right; we'll fix you up. Let's open an account first; we have what you want."

"What's the price on this coat?"

"Don't worry about prices; we have what you want to pay. Let me show you this one at $59."

TEN DOLLARS DOWN, MONTHS TO PAY

So saying, he unbuttons the prospect's coat.

"I know you'll like this one—just sold one like it to the famous orchestra leader so-and-so."

"I saw the same one at —— for $45."

"How much can you pay down? About $10? Fine. Pay $2 or $3 a week for 6 months, 6 months, mind you, not 6 weeks."

"That would come to $82."

"But we're not charging you any interest. Can you pay $2.50 a week? You look like a person who could pay $2.50 a week. If you can pay cash you can have it for $40. Let's go back and talk to the gentleman back here."

The gentleman back here: "All right; step right up, $10 down, $2.50 a week for 6 months."

"That would be $70."

"Well, look we gotta have some interest—we can work this thing out, anyway you want to do it."

The prospect starts to leave but is hailed at the door by a third man: "You like the coat, you want the coat, don't be ridiculous; we can work this out to suit you. We're in business to make a profit, but still we're willing to practically give it away to you."

The prospect gets away and goes to another store.

"What are your prices?"

"Forget about prices. We've got a coat you can buy. We don't sell prices. Do you have an account?"

"No."

"We can open one up for you. Where do you work? A private outfit? Good."

The salesman shows a coat he says is priced (there is no price tag) at $69.50.

"I can't pay that," the prospect says.

"You can have it for $60."

"Is it wool?"

"All wool. Pure wool, wool."

The prospect cannot find a label certifying the fabric is all wool.

The salesman whispers secretively: "Look, you want the coat? I'll let you have my profit. I'll let you have it for $55, but for heaven's sake don't go out on the street and tell other people."

The prospect still balks.

"You look like an intelligent, clean-cut young man, and I want you to have a break."

"I saw a gray tweed I liked at —— for $45."

"Gray tweed? That's an old man's coat."

"But this one is dark blue."

"There's a difference between an old man's coat and a conservative coat. This is conservative. How much money do you have on you? Can you pay $15 down?"

"Maybe $10."

Ten dollars, OK, fine.'

Instantly someone nearby starts filling out a sales contract, but the prospect is still hesitant.

The owner approaches; his tone is harsh: "You like the coat, take the coat, take the coat, fellow, for heaven's sakes."

The salesman: "Oh, come on, come on, come on."

The owner, as the prospect leaves: "We just want to talk to you. Nobody's going to hold a gun to you. We'll work out whatever terms you want to work out."

Prices: A conservative estimate is that such stores average on clothing about 50 percent more than for the same or comparable articles elsewhere. However elastic, they include provision for interest and intricate bookkeeping. The merchandise is often shoddy.

From the bag of tricks:

A customer on the phone: "I can't make my payment this week. I'll pay next week."

An employee who calls himself "Jack" replies: "Perfectly all right."

The next day a suit is filed against the customer which could lead to garnishment of his wages. He goes to the store to find out who gave the oral assurance.

"I'm Oscar, he's Joe, she's Wilma. There's no Jack here."

A customer goes to an easy credit store to complain that he is "paying and paying, and I can't seem to see the end." He asks for a copy of his account. This brings on laughter—and a refusal.

A person opens an account. Another name, usually the husband's or wife's, is put on the account as a guarantor.

The purchaser becomes delinquent. A suit is filed. The summons, under rule 4 of the municipal court, is served on an adult on the premises. It happens that the summons is served on the very person who made the purchase, and he tears it up.

Twenty days pass, and no answer is made in court. The court therefore declares a default judgment.

The innocent party—the guarantor—gets his first knowledge of all this when his pay is attached. If the creditor has waited 90 days after the default judgment, it cannot be attacked. Even if it asks more than what is owed, even if otherwise there would have been no legal liability. The guarantor is stuck, and that's it.

The actual purchaser, or one of those innocent guarantors, pleads with the easy credit store not to attach his wages, because if it does he will be fired. He promises to pay, say, $2 a week.

A garnishment is filed despite assurances that none would be. He tries to find out who gave him the assurance. Again, "There no Jack here."

A $35-a-week maid, the sole support of her daughter and four grandchildren, picks out an Easter topper. She is told not to worry about the price.

After it is entered on her account, that is, after it's too late, she finds the price is exorbitant—$109. The store refuses to cancel the sale or give her other, more needed merchandise in exchange.

The store tries to attach her wages but fails, because she has no wages owed her; as

a matter of fact, she is in debt to her employer. Finally she arranges to pay $2 a week.

"As soon as I get in there," she said, "they follow me all the way back to the door, trying to get me to buy something more, but I just won't do it."

Municipal Court Judge Milton S. Kronheim, Jr., testifying before a Senate District Subcommittee June 19, 1957, said of the handful of retail easy-credit merchants who have made a garnishment mill out of the court:

"Their floor personnel and credit manager are instructed to extend credit to workingmen and their families far beyond their ability to pay. Poor people without luxuries are easy prey to a fast-talking salesman who tells them that all they have to do is sign now and pay later. The storekeeper has learned to rely on the garnishment statute to collect his money and some retailers in Washington have lawyers who devote their entire day, every day, to garnishment of wages."

In a statement to the same Judiciary Subcommittee, Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Republican, of Maryland, referred to this handful of easy-credit operators as "credit racketeers; they are nothing more."

Preserving the Family Farm as a Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most alarming developments in recent American history is the accelerated deterioration of the family farming units of our Nation. The replacement of family-size farms with huge corporation style farm operations is not only undercutting the opportunities for young Americans to make their livelihoods in agriculture, but it is a direct threat to the continuance of our rural communities with their schools, churches, and commercial life. When scores of farm families are replaced by one large factory-type operation, we have actually set the stage for a kind of modern day feudalism with the remaining farmers playing the role of serfs.

Deploring this trend, Rev. Louis J. Miller of Colman, S. Dak., rural life director of the Catholic church in South Dakota, recently offered a most urgent and compelling statement to a committee of the South Dakota State Legislature. I urge my colleagues in the Congress to read Father Miller's statement which I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT BEFORE A LEGISLATIVE HEARING AT PIERRE RE THE REORGANIZATION OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, JANUARY 29, 1959

Gentlemen, I appreciate very much the opportunity of appearing before this legislative committee. I am speaking as the director of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference in the eastern part of our State. I also make bold to say that the thinking stated here is widely shared by many farm people not of my religious persuasion.

I am specifically concerned with Senate bill 134, section I on policy, and section 5(c) on rural development. The conference for nearly 40 years has been grappling with serious problems that confront the family unit of agriculture—seeking to apply Christian principles to a solution of its difficulties.

I am sure every member of this committee is concerned about this social institution of the family as the basic unit of agriculture in South Dakota, and throughout the country for that matter. You are concerned that it remain the predominant pattern of farm production. You are interested in maintaining it as an efficient unit, as well as a way of life.

In dealing with any kind of legislation it is vital to have clear objectives. Legislators would not be like some trigger-happy, irresponsible game hunter who fires in all directions at anything he hears or sees. Here, likewise, it is not enough to take a random legislative shot in the general direction of farm problems, make a big noise to kid the folks back home something is being done for them. We need what we have not had in agricultural policy in this State—a clear objective—a rifled aim at the maintenance and development of family unit agriculture and the rural community that springs from it. We need an objective that will seek in season and out of season to help upgrade those family units that have fallen short of a sound operation, and at the same time to discourage and cut back if need be superscale factory farming.

As you know only too well, agriculture is No. 1 both as an industry and as a way of life in our great State of South Dakota. I wish to call to your attention that, despite assurances we have heard from the USDA and other spokesmen as to the continued strength and prevalence of the family farm pattern, the fact remains that there are forces in the economy today that pose a real threat, yes, have already wrought their damage, to family-unit farming.

Let's look at one aspect of the record. According to a study recently published by State College on vertical integration we learn that 275 units, vertically integrated with feed companies in California are producing 90 percent of that State's need for beef—that is an average of about 18,000 head per farm. There you have it—a type of agriculture foreign to our concept we derive from Jefferson. It's here. In California as a matter of fact, the family type operation is no longer the predominant.

There are powerful interests in the country for whom agriculture means this type of operation. Agriculture is simply a profit-making enterprise in the field of food and fiber production instead of in appliances, cars or what have you. These folks even visualize a time when there will be, let's say several thousand hog units to produce the pork of the Nation, so many cattle feeder lots to fatten the beef the Nation consumes, etc. They speak of easier solutions to the problems of surplus, grading, marketing when the factory methods have taken over in the field displacing the family. This is the kind of cold-blooded thinking that is going on.

We feel this whole matter is an urgent one. The family pattern of farming has disappeared in California; it is weakened in other areas of the Southwest where some 500,000 Mexican nationals are being exploited at sub-American wages for the aggrandizement of factory-farm operators. In these days of rapid communication we must recognize that what happens in one State, might conceivably happen in another.

We have been informed by the USDA and farm experts that the greatest single factor of change in the farm picture is a technological revolution. The word "revolution" is well and deliberately chosen, for it is clear to any student of the problem that the changes this technology brings will affect the farm family as radically and disturbingly as the industrial revolution affected urban England more than a century ago. Any reader knows the wretchedness and misery follows as described in Dickens' novels. It was not that mass production technology was evil; rather that the technology was imposed on a nation's economy with almost total disregard for human beings.

I mention this to emphasize the urgency of the subject matter before you in bill 131. One might say we have come to a fork in the road in South Dakota agriculture—take the path to the right and we enter what might well become the golden age of agriculture, the wedding of the farm family to the best modern agricultural know-how; or take the fork to the left and we enter the realm of factory farming, with its depopulated countryside, dependent serfs in what remains of ghosttown communities—an ugly sight to behold.

We do not believe that the sovereign State of South Dakota should sit neutral on the sidelines when a way of life for so many tens of thousands of our farm families is at stake; it is inconceivable that our State government lift nary a finger while blind economic forces be allowed to operate unhampered, monopolizing markets that at present undergird the economy of our families on the land.

We believe that the State of South Dakota should take a positive role in fostering a climate favorable to family unit agriculture, first by an explicit declaration of policy supporting its preservation and growth, and by legislation which will enable it to maintain its level of efficiency, and assist where needed in raising it to a level of sound operation. In view of the mere dollar sign thinking in the field of agriculture, we feel the impact of a legislative policy is needed to focus attention on the value to the State of a family type of agriculture.

For it's more than poetry to speak of farming as a way of life. The greatest product of rural South Dakota is its people. A public relations man, who spent some years in war industry in California, told me the other day—among personnel men the Midwest farm boys were the most sought for in recruiting labor. Why? They were versatile, they had some initiative, responsibility, and, above all, they weren't afraid to work. This is one of the products, believe me, that this State and this Nation can ill afford to lose. So we feel there is no such thing as being neutral when a valuable way of family living is in danger of being replaced by huge factory-farm agriculture.

Be that as it may, not only should the State department of agriculture actively foster the welfare of the family farm, it should also be concerned about what's happening to people in the rural communities of this State. Certainly the State has a role to perform other than recording the demise of one rural community after another in its bureau of statistics.

One of the great reasons why many of our rural communities are dying is because we are sending too many of our raw products outside of the community, yes, outside of the State, to be processed. This is in many cases inexcusable at a time when our farm people, with the enlightened partnership of their Government, have brought power to every community of the State. For whenever we send out such raw materials, we send with them some of the finest talent, brains and brawn in young people along with those materials. We have been at the mercy of out-of-State processors and manufacturers long enough.

One of the most heartbreaking experiences I have as a rural pastor is to see some of our fine lads come back to the community after a stretch in the service. They want to stay in the community; they would like to give their work-span to the community, but we have nothing for them to do. So off they move to the big city where many of our products are being processed. And this is part of that endless subsidy farm folks make

that makes the chambers of commerce of neighboring cities boast of their growth.

If we profess a love and concern for the youth of our State, if we have a regard for the opportunities of our young people, their future, their potential contributions to our State, it is imperative that the State Department of Agriculture be authorized to direct, let's say, an institution like our land grant State college (which Abe Lincoln made possible so the American farmer might not be just a dumb farmer or peasant); commission this institution to give the people the knowledge, the research that is needed if they are to help themselves. I do not mean research on crop varieties, seeds, animal husbandry, etc., which is being done, and is important from the viewpoint of agriculture as an industry.

At the same time we should have more research that has to do with rural people and their resources, rural development; we need, for instance, knowledge on the economic potential areas in the State, the possibilities of rural-related industry, processing, recreation; knowledge of land ownership and tenure, research into how widespread ownership can be maintained with capital outlay so high, problems of and extent of land concentration in this State—and a host of research of this nature that concerns people, and not mere agricultural economics. For knowledge is power, and without it a free people will die.

In driving through the land of magnificent distances that is our State, I have seen a sign: "South Dakota State College—Education With a Purpose." A noble quote indeed. But to this day I have met no two people who agree on what that purpose is supposed to be. We feel that the people, the rural people of the State should supply the answer for our land grant college: place the duty upon it of giving rural South Dakota more research into that aspect of agriculture that is a way of life—people in rural communities, rural development.

There is one more thing I wish to bring to your attention as a kind of background for the big picture. The major problem in the trouble spots of the world today are rural problems. Who shall own the land? Look at South America, China, Spain, Europe behind the Iron Curtain—all of them places where family farming has not been the general state of affairs. Result? Social discontent and revolution.

The family and ownership of land is the natural God-given way of human living and whenever the church or the state or powerful influential people forget that, and take over the ownership of God's land in a disproportionate manner, the economic, spiritual, and social balance of a nation is disturbed and evils of every kind result.

It should not be forgotten by this committee that never before in the history of the human race have so many families enjoyed the privilege of living on land of their own as in the area between the Appalachians and the Rocky Mountains, between the Canadian border and the Mason and Dixon line. It's been a good way of life—it has proven itself. Indeed, this is a heritage that has meant strength for our Nation and our institutions, abundance for our tables, fiber for our factories. It is a heritage that must be passed on to posterity. It has proven its right to survive.

We believe that there is enough down-to-earth commonsense in this heartland of America and the Dakotas to insist that here in this State we foster and strengthen a pattern of agriculture that is at once efficient in the production of food and fiber and at the same time retain a good way of life for tens of thousands of South Dakotans.

For these reasons we believe, and respectfully submit to this committee, that in a rural State such as ours and after 70 years of statehood we have a Department of Agriculture dedicated to clearly defined objectives. We further repeat that, along with a commitment to the traditional Jeffersonian idea of a family owned and controlled agriculture, the Department be given the duty to help strengthen the rural community.

This, we believe, will help maintain an agricultural industry first in productivity in the world, and one that will retain a built-in, cost-free subsidy to the Nation of an endless supply of hardworking people whose feet are on the ground, to help the Nation keep its feet there too.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Rev. Louis J. Miller,
Rural Life Director.

United States Is Facing a Clobbering in the Battle for Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Washington Daily News of Monday, February 16, 1959:

UNITED STATES IS FACING A CLOBBERING IN THE BATTLE FOR MARKETS

(By Charles Lucey)

The United States is beginning to come awake to the fact that we face a clobbering in the battle for world markets.

Partly it's a matter of price. Evidence grows that domestic U.S. inflation is shoving up our costs so that overseas nations can undersell us.

Partly it's technology. No longer do we have any corner of it—and our edge might have been much thinner anyway if western European technology hadn't felt the havoc of two world wars.

Increasingly the gap closes between foreign productive techniques and capabilities and the marvelous big-volume, low-cost American way of pouring out mountains of goods.

The U.S. goal for a decade has been to build our allies economically strong. They've shaped up well. Any blithe notion we're competing today against a scattering of pot-and-kettle tinkers is fatuous. As more and more of the world reaches out for the good life, Japan and western Europe will be competing steadily harder against us to provide it for a price.

Partly, too, the new challenge rises because our competitors are trade-hungry. Exports are their lifeblood. They provide jobs for millions.

Yet the issue is not simply one of whether our foreign competitors take a bigger share of the overseas market. It involves also the ability of foreign-made goods to compete with U.S. goods here at home.

TURNABOUT

Many of these goods from overseas are made by U.S. firms. In the postwar years U.S. firms have increased their direct foreign investments by $20 billion—three times as much as in 1946. So long as U.S. plants overseas sell their output abroad perhaps few U.S. jobs at home are lost. But when they import lower-cost goods in the United States it's a different story.

Many U.S. businessmen believe the danger of the United States pricing itself out of foreign markets is an immediate one. But even if costs and prices are kept in check here at home, more intense, vigorous overseas competition against the United States is a challenge still to be met.

On the broad question of whether the United States is pricing its exports too high, some Government economists are skeptical. They say most commodities or articles cited represent special cases. Others say wages and prices generally have not increased more here than in other competing nations—though the foreign rates, starting lower, could have climbed faster and still be under United States levels.

WARNINGS

Warnings of danger ahead are increasing. In President Eisenhower's economic message to Congress was an insistence that high prices here at home could "lower our capability to compete in world markets."

The National Industrial Conference Board, in a study made partly in response to a suggestion by the House Ways and Means Committee, found that in hardest-competing Western Europe, unit production costs were lower than U.S. costs in 55 of 85 instances analyzed.

Other warnings have come from Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin, United States Steel Chairman Roger Blough, Ford Motor Chairman Ernest R. Breech, and Board Chairman John McCloy, of the Chase Manhatan Bank, former U.S. High Commissioner to Germany.

Said Mr. McCloy:

"We have to face the fact that in many lines we are pricing ourselves right out of the world market. It is up to us to make clear to all that we have to keep prices and costs down, we have to make better products and we have to work harder and longer to make them. There are disconcertingly large numbers of people in this world who are working harder than we, and they are achieving comparable know-how.

"I have referred to Europe but we are all aware of the tremendous strides Russia has made in industrial development. We no longer stand out as the single great supplier of goods we were in the early postwar period."

NO WAGE PRESSURE

Mr. Breech, returning from Europe, praised German and English labor leaders who, he said, had not pressed for wage increases they felt their countries could ill afford. He cited Ford assembly-line workers' hourly wage of $2.44, not counting a 50–60-cent fringe benefit, compared with $1.05 in England, 69 cents in Cologne, Germany.

Mr. Breech found auto factories producing a couple thousand engines and bodies daily, a rate comparing well with U.S. auto plants. He found striking advances in design, making and selling of autos and consumer durable goods; noted a 1958 European total auto output not far behind ours.

Like Mr. McCloy, Mr. Breech cited the disappearance of the long-held U.S. advantage which let this country beat lower wage competition overseas with its greater investment in plant, tools and big volume. He particularly warned of a movement overseas of U.S. products with high labor content.

CHEAPER IMPORTS

Steelman Blough described a Dusseldorf, Germany, steel plant laying down barbed wire in Cleveland at $40 a ton less than wire his own company sold there. Even with Germany's progress, a Cleveland steelworker, with his highly productive tools, can turn out more steel than a German worker. But, said Mr Blough, Cleveland's three-times-higher wages shove U.S. costs above those of Dusseldorf.

Mr. Blough sees the technological revolution that began in the United States in the

early 1900's "sweeping across the face of the globe at a vigorous pace—and happily so."

But it means rougher competition for the United States everywhere.

Labor, of course, has big stakes in this argument. It recognizes the possible inroads on U.S. overseas markets by foreign competitors but it is by no means ready to acknowledge high American wages are a main factor.

Mayor Jess Lanier and Miscellaneous Proposals of Municipal Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, February 17, 1959, a fine group of mayors from 35 different Alabama cities and towns came to Washington for a conference with the Members of the Alabama congressional delegation. The purpose of the visit was to enable the Alabama League of Municipalities to present its views on 20 separate legislative items presently pending before the Congress.

Twenty mayors each presented the position of the league on a particular field of legislation. Among the 20 was the Honorable Jess Lanier, mayor of the progressive and expanding city of Bessemer, Ala., in my district, who commented on the subject of "Miscellaneous Proposals of Municipal Interest."

With the thought that Mayor Lanier's remarks will be of interest to the Members of the Congress, I am privileged to insert them herewith in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MISCELLANEOUS PROPOSALS OF MUNICIPAL INTEREST

(By Jess Lanier)

You gentlemen have been very patient and kind to listen to our expression of municipal views on programs and legislative proposals considered from time to time by Congress. We want to thank you for this courteous hearing and I shall close it with a brief review of miscellaneous programs and legislative proposals which affect the municipal government interest.

ASSISTANCE TO DEPRESSED AREAS

Hearings are to start next week, I believe, on a bill—S. 722—which would create an independent Federal agency to administer a program designed to provide economic redevelopment in industrial and rural areas which are suffering from or are threatened with chronic unemployment and poverty. The program would include loans for private industry at low interest rates, loans for public facilities at low interest, $75 million annually in grants for public facilities—as well as informational, planning, and technical assistance to eligible areas.

Assistance under the proposal would be available to: industrial areas with unemployment equal to 6 percent of its labor force for 18 of 24 months preceding, or 9 percent for 15 of 18 months preceding, or 12 percent for 1 year preceding—or, at the discretion of the agency head, 15 percent for 6 months preceding; and rural areas with the largest number and percentage of low income families and substantial and persistent unemployment.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES TO MUNICIPALITIES

Another bill—S. 910—is of general interest to city and town governments. It would provide limited payments in lieu of municipal taxes on federally owned commercial and industrial property, as well as special assessments levied by municipalities for streets, sidewalks, sewers, etc., on other federally owned property. Municipal officials in Alabama are more interested in the latter feature of the proposal—that the Federal Government come along with other property owners and pay its proportionate part of the cost of public improvements that are financed through the issuance by cities and towns of public improvement assessments bonds. Other classes of property do this and we feel that such improvements improve and enhance the value of Federal property the same as they raise the value of other classes of real estate and property.

CENSUS OF GOVERNMENTAL FACTS AND DATA

We favor ample appropriations to carry on effectively the work of the Federal agency which collects, publishes, and distributes useful and dependable facts and information concerning the operation and programs of all layers of government—the census of governments.

FINANCING GOVERNMENT OFFICE BUILDINGS

Municipal officials all over the United States are aware that a heavy backlog of Federal office buildings exists because no sound method has been established for the construction of such facilities. With the collapse of the Federal lease-purchase arrangement for the construction of such buildings, no new program has emerged which will provide for keeping abreast of the demand for new Federal office buildings. The municipalities have a vital interest in this problem, not only because of the need for improving Federal services to local citizens, but also because such new Federal construction can provide the cornerstone for redevelopment of blighted urban areas. It would seem logical to establish a Federal office building corporation, patterned after the Federal National Mortgage Insurance Agency. It could sell bonds on the open market for the construction of new Federal buildings, which bonds could be retired by charging rentals to the Federal agencies occupying the buildings. Such a device would not only provide a means for keeping abreast of the need for new office facilities, but would eliminate the possibility of adding to the national debt or requiring annual appropriations from Congress. I might say that we have such a law in Alabama whereby municipal governments may issue revenue bonds payable from rents charged various departments and agencies of our municipalities. It is being widely used at this time in our State and frees municipal funds that would normally go into building programs for other municipal uses.

There are other matters we could discuss, but we have already used up the time we planned for this session with you. As bills of interest to cities and towns come up in this session of Congress, we shall be sending you expressions of our interest and policy with respect to them. Thank you again for your courteous and patient interest in our viewpoints. From time to time, representatives of the American Municipal Association and the U.S. conference of mayors will appear before your various congressional committees or discuss pending legislation with you in your offices. Needless to say, we shall appreciate hearings and time given them in acquainting you with the national municipal viewpoint on various bills and programs handled by Congress from session to session.

I thank you again.

The Foreign Affairs Committee Should Review Local Currency Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion during the past few months concerning the possible uses for and the extent of the local currencies held by the United States and of counterpart funds. Counterpart funds are those derived from the mutual security program through the sale of commodities in the foreign country. They do not belong to the United States but are under the joint control of the United States and the local government.

These counterpart funds are, in effect, matching funds provided by the foreign country to those provided by the United States. Up to 10 percent of counterpart funds are set aside for the uses of the U.S. Government such as local currency administrative costs.

Local currencies belonging to the United States are solely owned by the United States. The United States owned local currencies are derived from a variety of sources, United States income tax collections, sales of surplus property, repayment of loans, the 10 percent counterpart described above, and so forth. The greatest portion of these United States owned funds, however, is derived from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities under Public Law 480 and under the Mutual Security Act.

There follows a summary of local currencies owned by the United States and of counterpart under the mutual security program. The figures shown reflect sums on hand as of June 30, 1958.

Mr. Speaker, I should emphasize that many of these funds and much of this counterpart are already committed for new embassies and consulates, for support of armed forces, for development projects, and so forth. Furthermore, most of the Public Law 480 funds can be spent only pursuant to the agreements with the purchasing country which, in many instances, restricts the use of such funds.

Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Budget administers some of these local currencies. The International Cooperation Administration administers others, the Department of Defense still others, and so on. In view of the lack of central control in the executive branch, it would appear that some mechanism should be devised to provide such control both in the executive branch and in the Congress. I think that it would be most appropriate if the Foreign Affairs Committee would undertake a thorough review and study of the entire local currency situation. I think that the Foreign Affairs Committee is best equipped for this task.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, the summary to which I previously referred, of the foreign currencies owned by the United States or jointly controlled by the United States and other countries as of June 30, 1958:

Status of foreign currencies owned by United States or jointly controlled by United States and other countries, as of June 30, 1958

[Dollar equivalent calculated with the June 30, 1958, Treasury market rate]

[In thousands of U.S. dollars and thousands of foreign currency units]

Country	Unit of currency	Exchange rate, foreign currency to $1	Currencies owned by the United States: Dollar equivalent acquired under— Mutual security program surplus agriculture sales (1)	Title I, Public Law 480, surplus agriculture commodities sales (2)	U.S. portion counterpart funds (3)	Lend-lease and surplus property (4)	Miscellaneous (5)	Total: Units of foreign currency (6)	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent (7)	Currencies owned by other countries—But requiring U.S. agreement as to use: Mutual Security Act (8)	Title II, Public Law 480 (9)	Miscellaneous (10)	Total: Units of foreign currency (11)	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent (12)	Grand total: Units of foreign currency (13)	Grand total: U.S. dollar equivalent (14)
Afghanistan	Afghani	57.00	432				551	56,010	983						56,010	983
Argentina	Peso	42.20		8,872			1	374,429	8,873						374,429	8,873
Australia	Pound	.44167				125		55	125						55	125
Austria	Schilling	25.91	8,333	20,254			21	663,497	25,608	42,056	129	130	1,096,373	42,315	1,759,870	67,922
Belgian Congo	Franc	49.55					1	72	1						72	1
Belgium	do	49.82	899	73	193		5	58,282	1,169	408			20,305	408	78,587	1,577
Bolivia	Boliviano	8,850.00	145				44	1,673,258	189	4,222	77	213	39,926,703	4,512	41,599,961	4,701
Brazil	Cruzeiro	132.00		14,495	20		4	1,916,494	14,519						1,916,494	14,519
Burma	Kyat	4.7125		20,375	38		149	96,893	20,560	286			1,347	286	98,240	20,847
Cambodia	Riel	34.772	273		54		577	31,423	903	4,712			163,859	4,712	195,282	5,616
Ceylon	Rupee	4.7375	472				7	2,270	479						2,270	479
Chile	Peso	1,080.00		9,908			85	10,792,703	9,993						10,792,703	9,993
China	New Taiwan dollar	36.08	12,395	3,450	81		86	577,722	16,012	10,350			373,439	10,350	951,161	26,362
Colombia	Peso	7.81		3,911	4			30,577	3,915						30,577	3,915
Costa Rica	Colon	6.63					55	367	55						367	55
Cuba	Peso	1.00					2	2	2						2	2
Cyprus	Pound	.35524					1	(1)	1						(1)	1
Denmark	Krone	6.90125	599		44		8	4,492	651			2,784	19,216	2,784	23,708	3,435
Dominican Republic	RD peso	1.00			12			12	12						12	12
Ecuador	Sucre	16.55		1,771	(1)		(1)	29,309	1,771						29,309	1,771
Egypt	Pound	.436141	1,979	12,212			5	6,191	14,195						6,191	14,195
Ethiopia	Ethiopian dollar	2.48					3	7	3						7	3
Finland	Markka	319.00	94	3,335			4	1,095,125	3,433			7	2,091	7	1,097,216	3,440
France	Franc	420.00	1,160	3,770	545		258	2,408,012	5,733	137			57,646	137	2,465,658	5,871
French West Africa	CFA franc	209.70					2	315	2						315	2
Germany	Deutsche mark West.	4.20	31,295	763	3,322	6,650	30,964	306,577	72,995	19,768			83,026	19,768	389,603	92,763
Do	Deutsche mark East.	16.51					2	32	2						32	2
Ghana	BWA pound	.35241					3	1	3						1	3
Greece	Drachma	30.00	10,672	14,457	19		125	758,196	25,273	123,100			3,692,985	123,100	4,451,181	148,373
Guatemala	Quetzal	1.00	2,907	10				2,917	2,917		159		159	159	3,076	3,076
Haiti	Gourde	5.00								808			4,042	808	4,042	808
Honduras	Lempira	2.00			18			36	18						36	18
Hong Kong	HK dollar	5.78					21	121	21						121	21
Hungary	Forint	48.00				3		145	3						145	3
Iceland	Krona	25.2495		726			4	18,421	730	7,961			201,018	7,961	219,439	8,691
India	Rupee	4.75	44,527	307,541			2,603	1,684,689	354,671						1,684,689	354,671
Indonesia	Rupiah	30.28		33,018			399	1,011,855	33,417	8,864			268,389	8,864	1,280,244	42,280
Iran	Rial	76.00		5,078			17	387,288	5,096	6,011			456,853	6,011	844,141	11,107
Iraq	Dinar	.35635			34		91	45	126						45	126
Ireland	Pound	.35682					1	(1)	1	8,508			3,036	8,508	3,036	8,508
Israel	do	1.80	638	33,534			5,906	72,680	40,378	5,843			10,518	5,843	83,198	46,221
Italy	Lira	625.00	22,868	59,660	849		111	52,180,337	83,489	76,821		34	48,034,140	76,855	100,214,477	160,343
Japan	Yen	360.00	2,555	19,771	1,168		5	8,459,712	23,499						8,459,712	23,499
Jordan	Dinar	.35611					3	1	3	3			1	3	2	6
Kenya	EA shilling	7.09471					2	16	2						16	2
Korea	Hwan	500.00	36,591	20,392	1,035		1,310	29,664,201	59,328	226,750			113,375,007	226,750	143,039,208	286,078
Laos	Kip	35.00	166		1		90	8,965	256	3,260			114,110	3,260	123,075	3,516
Lebanon	Pound	3.18					7	21	7	2,516			8,000	2,516	8,021	2,522
Libya	do	.3544					1	(1)	1						(1)	1
Mexico	Peso	12.49		13,942				174,132	13,942						174,132	13,942
Morocco	Franc	456.00	4,145				2	1,890,788	4,146						1,890,788	4,146
Netherlands	Guilder	3.779375	2,429	308	2	106	8	10,782	2,853						10,782	2,853
New Zealand	Pound	.35695					3	1	3						1	3
Nicaragua	Cordoba	7.40			28			209	28						209	28

Nigeria	W A pound	352224				1		3	1,814	3							1	3
Norway	Krone	7.12						12	626,370	235	98					2,512		353
Pakistan	Rupee	4.7295	1 2,724	122,453	4,733		241	2,465	15,162	132,355	22,846	65	2,024	118,009	24,935	744,379	157,291	
Paraguay	Guaraní	111.10		136					136	136						15,162	136	
Peru	Sol	23.70		3,270	(1)	23			78,045	3,263		176		4,176	176	82,221	3,469	
Philippines	Peso	2.0075		7,121	47	2,695			34,554	17,212	4,527			9,087	4,327	43,641	21,739	
Poland	Zloty	55.00	7,350	31,817					1,749,911	31,817						1,749,911	31,817	
Portugal	Escudo	28.60		2,116	66			6	62,574	2,188	725			20,744	725	83,318	2,913	
Singapore	M. dollar	3.041825						2		2							2	
Spain	Peseta	54.25	12,203	106,782	5,555			478	6,782,201	123,018	21,825			1,184,002	21,825	7,966,203	146,843	
Sudan	Pound	.346938	2					3	1	3						1	3	
Sweden	Krona	5.17						11	59	11						59	11	
Switzerland	Franc	4.284375		201				12	913	213						913	213	
Syria	Pound	3.59						2	6	2						6	2	
Thailand	Baht	20.72		2,707	126			326	65,400	3,156	413,878			287,543	13,878	352,943	17,034	
Tunisia	Franc	419.00	2,255					26	956,098	2,282	1,882			788,467	1,882	1,744,565	4,164	
Turkey	Lira	5.75		62,495	561			1,367	370,431	64,423	5,587			82,124	5,587	402,555	70,010	
United Kingdom	Pound	2.80	38,493	26,605	1,564			502	23,956	67,167	807			958	807	24,244	67,974	
Vietnam	Piastre	69.80	2,513					429	205,433	2,943	24,921			1,739,516	24,921	1,944,949	27,865	
Yugoslavia	Dinar	600.00	31,906	167,269	9,986			805	125,948,852	209,915	13,685		11,523	15,124,280	25,208	141,073,132	235,122	
Total			280,019	1,144,879	30,033	7,125		52,714		1,514,789	663,165		12,129	5,192		680,486		2,195,273

[1] Indicates amounts less than 500.

Adequate National Park Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the San Joaquin Valley Council of the California State Chamber of Commerce recently conducted in that area a most important and significant study meeting, a Sierra Access Conference, which developed opinion and crystallized views about the preservation, availability, and proper use of our magnificent Sierra Nevada, the majestic mountain chain rearing its snow-clad peaks from end to end of the great Central Valley of California and incorporating three great national parks.

One of the thoughtful messages laid before the conference was that of Mr. Chester H. Warlow, a most respected leader for many years in public affairs of the valley and the State of California, and a prominent citizen of my home community of Fresno. I think Mr. Warlow's views will be of interest and importance to conservationists throughout the country, and I have therefore sought and obtained permission to insert his address in the RECORD, where it will be available for study.

Mr. Warlow is eminently qualified to present authoritative views on the preservation and the wise use of our mountain areas and to make specific recommendations about mountain roads and trails required to make available those areas dedicated to public use and enjoyment. I feel sure that reading of his address will show that from his long and varied experience he has developed a philosophy worth considering, particularly in relation to pending controversies about Mission 66, under which our national parks are being rehabilitated.

Mr. Warlow has been actively concerned with our mountains for more than 40 years, during which he has both enjoyed them and contributed materially to making them available for the enjoyment of others. Since 1929 he has been honored with a succession of posts of responsibility in the development of our national parks, park roads, water resources, and State highway matters. For the past 15 years he has been a member of the California State Highway Commission. Last year the Fresno Chamber of Commerce honored him as "Mister Highways."

Mr. Warlow approaches our mountains with reverence. His reverence is coupled with the belief other people are entitled to share with him, in safety and at a cost within their means, the majesty of the mountains, the cathedrals of nature which so perfectly display the hand of the Creator.

I commend to you the eloquent words of a man who has devoted his life to people and to mountains:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I crave your indulgence, but I have something to say which in general is perhaps pertinent to all the matters which have been discussed here today.

First, however, let me remind you that I have been an active member of the San Joaquin Valley Highway Committee of this chamber of commerce since prior to 1927, and that I speak to you today solely as such. I would also like to briefly mention my mountain experiences, with which most of you are entirely unfamiliar.

For nearly 20 years, commencing prior to 1913, I spent most of my vacations in the High Sierra in the territory between Yosemite Valley and Mount Whitney. On two occasions I led the large parties of our local citizens from this valley to the mountain tops of this region. Those who went with me also came back with acute cases of "mountain mania," from which none of us ever recovered. With pack and saddle animals, I wandered in wildernesses. I have to my credit many firsts—passages where only knapsackers had gone before. I love our Sierra. I respect them. I revere them, but I have what I believe to be a rather unselfish attitude toward them because I feel that others are entitled to the inspirations which their grandeurs induce.

These high, hard rocks, these deep canyons, these lofty, snow-covered peaks, the quiet meadows, the roaring rivers with their waterfalls, are all a part of God's cathedral, and our Sierra should be treated as such.

Most of my public activities have been directed to the positive, but today I find myself in a critical mood. I propose to speak frankly to and about some of my very best friends, and also about some of my acquaintances for whom I have the utmost respect. I speak not of their motives or of their sincerities, but solely of their philosophies and their conclusions as to how our mountain areas are to be administered.

Of what value is a cathedral with spiked doors upon which the parish communicants are impaled while seeking to enter We expect all who so desire to enter to enter with safety, to sit quietly in the solitude of the nave and transept and even to approach the rail for communion. But the vestry, the pulpit, and the foot of the altar are reserved for the use of the few. True, the altar and, in many cases, magnificient back altars are in view of the communicant to inspire, elevate, and broaden the horizons of his thoughts, but communicants need not tread upon the more holy ground behind the rail to grasp these inspirations. I ask you, what esthetic values have our mighty mountains unless mankind, the average fellow, is to be able to move at least within reasonable sight distances of these truly magnificient panoramas that have been prepared for him from all eternity by the Great Creator.

What is all this about? Well, a great controversy is raging, most of it entirely under cover. The United States Park Service has a great program of rehabilitation underway, Mission 66, with which most of you are generally familiar. It is in great danger. Our particular interest is in that part of the mission relating to park roads. I hasten to point out that in this whole mission road program, there are only a very few miles of proposed new roads and that mileage is not under dispute. The rest of the entire road program is entirely rehabilitation modernization. Not opening new areas to vehicular traffic—not putting motorcars behind the communion rail, but removing the impaling spikes from the cathedral doors.

Safety, safety of travel for the many who desire to enter the nave of God's cathedral, for the many who desire and need the inspiration of our mountains but who, like some of us who have now grown old, will never be able again to wander in wildernesses, to walk between the altar and the communion rail.

This great controversy is not about from where to where these reconstructed roads shall lead, but only about their basic designs. Many of the apostles of the wilderness vehemently insist that reconstructed secondary park roads should consist of two 9-foot lanes with 3-foot shoulders on the outside, with 12 percent grades, 200-foot sight distances, and hairpin turns.

The Park Service has been lately talking about 10-foot lanes with somewhat lesser grades, and with about the same sight distance and curvature. Even if that is to be the program, why waste the money rebuilding these auto trails when on being finished they will still be wagon roads? No public agency, Federal, State, or county, has built such roads in the last 25 years except logging roads in the timber area and fire protection roads where they are necessary.

I find myself now critical of the Park Service. I speak only as one of their very sincere friends. No one is proposing anything but two lanes for these roads. However, these roads should be built upon not less than the minimum standards set by the State of California for 40-mile-per-hour travel. That means 11-foot lanes, 6-foot shoulders, and the following minimums: 550-foot radius on curves, nonpassing sight distance of 275 feet, and passing sight distance of 1,100 feet. Grades should be kept below 7 percent. When the El Portal, Big Oak Flat, and Ash Mountain entrance roads, and the roads leading into Lassen Park are to be reconstructed, these standards should be considerably stepped up because of the higher volumes of traffic involved. Certainly on these roads the standards should not be less than those provided for 50-mile-an-hour movements.

Returning to our 40-mile-per-hour roads, the limit-standards above suggested should be used only where they are absolutely necessary on account of the terrain or landscaping features. Reasonable turn-outs should be provided at appropriate places so that there would be no stopping on the regular travel lanes.

Imagine a driver of a modest car towing a camp trailer (I refer not to luxurious house trailers 30 feet long and 10 feet wide, but many of the camp trailers are 8 and 10 feet wide). Imagine this driver attempting to negotiate a 12 percent grade. He is either completely stalled or moving in low gear with 6 or 8 cars fussing along behind him until some restless soul tries to pass with only a 200-foot sight distance ahead of him.

Take a look at the fellow with a flat tire on a 9-foot lane with a 3-foot shoulder. He is either running a tire while seeking a safe, wide spot, or is incurring the danger of getting smacked by a passing car while attempting to mount the spare on the wheel at that point where he first noticed the flat.

We are talking about safety and human lives, and reasonable passage ways through country presently open to auto travel.

There is even more to this controversy than this. Unless you see the whole picture the true equities are not apparent. These Apostles of the Wilderness are subject to criticism for they are not only pressuring the Park Service to adopt these obsolete road standards for these reconstructions in areas already open to motor vehicle travel, but they are also being extremely selfish.

Much testimony has been introduced at Congressional Committee hearings reciting that but 1 percent of the visitors to our National Parks and National Forests use exclusively 99 percent of those areas, while 99 percent of the visitors have available for their use but 1 percent of these lands. These Apostles of the Wilderness are not content with what has been assigned to them, but they insist on telling the 99 percent under what conditions they shall be permitted to use their limited part of God's Cathedral.

Except in a very few limited places, this 99 percent, these communicants who look longingly from afar at the majesties of the High Sierra, presently can approach within reasonable viewing distances of these vistas only by auto trails over which they do not dare to travel, roads which long since have become obsolete and now demand moderni-

zation. If a few do dare to travel that way they dare not look at the scenery, but must fasten their eyes continuously on these old roads which demand their undivided attention. They are negotiating a tortuous passage with no safety turn-outs where they can stop their cars, get out and really enjoy the scenery.

I do not point the finger of disapproval toward that great mountain club which is so important to California or toward the great majority of its 10,000 members. I do decry the thinking and what to me appears to be a selfish philosophy of a very small group of that membership—a small group which meets in a tower, feeds on its own thoughts, and then endeavors to fasten its conclusion upon our national parks and national forests, never comprehending that there are other people in this world, and without any conception of the mountain travel limitations of these other people.

It is not a case of the tail wagging the dog, but a situation where the flag at the tip of the tail is temporarily in full control of the vocal apparatus of a very fine, highly pedigreed and very useful creature.

Let me remind you that the National Park Service, the National Forest Service, and the Bureau of Public Roads are in the charge of highly skilled, long service, dedicated groups of men, and within their personnel we find the most experienced road builders and the most capable landscape architects. These men of all three branches cooperate completely and proceed carefully in relation to every problem.

You may perhaps think that I am being inconsistent when I suggest that you do something about this particular problem and at the same time criticize others for attempting to dectate to these services of our Government. Let me suggest that where there is great pressure on these agencies to do something not in the public interest then there is great need for a great organization like the California State Chamber of Commerce to provide a counterirritant to the end that the true public interest be brought into full public view.

Let us look further. A recent publication of that club contained many pictures of a partially constructed park road unmistakably presented to create in the minds of the beholders an impression that great desecration is taking place. Heretofore I had occasion to suggest to you the impropriety of a group placing a great Sequoia log as a part of a picture on the front page of a pamphlet objecting to the construction of the proposed Mammoth Pass highway, when without doubt the producers of that picture knew that there was not a single Sequoia gigantea growing anywhere within many miles of the study lines of that proposed route.

Now I question the ethics behind the set of pictures above referred to because to me they appear to be deliberately misleading.

I question the ethics of publishing a picture which is presented to create the idea of excessive road width when we know that that picture was taken at a place where a view turnout plaza is also being prepared. A narrow angle lense could have been used to make the roadway appear in the picture even wider than it is on the grouhd.

I question the ethics of presenting views of piles of fractured rock, including views of the stumps of scraggily trees along partially cleared rights-of-way, all to show desecration when the construction contract definitely provides that such debris be entirely cleared away before the roadway is accepted as completed.

Who would have, in good conscience, presumption to present a view of a half finished Union Square Garage to show how Union Square Park in San Francisco would not look when the whole undertaking was completed? Do our friends think they are deceiving any thinking persons where they picture partially completed highways?

Take a look at that magnificent double page photograph of Tenaya Lake appearing in the publication which we are now discussing—read the printed caption line of that picture, "We'll do well to remember Tenaya as it used to be * * *." Horrors. Something terrible is to happen to that scenery. Now be informed that the only change which is being made here, and which would appear in a later photograph taken from the same place after all the work is done, will be the absence of the boulder slide which shows in the lower center of the published print. An ugly pile of detritus, a closeup view of which appears on another page of that publication. The removal was necessary to permit construction of a safe road on the identical alinement of the road which has been there in place since long before the establishment of that park.

The sacrifice is a pile of rock to make over a couple of miles of a dangerous one-way auto trail into a two-lane mountain road. And what did they find beneath that rock pile—a much revered, highly polished native granite, polished by the ancient glacier that had passed that way.

I could belabor you further on the subject of that set of pictures, but I will not do so. I must say, however, that Dr. Bradley's photographs presented proper views of very beautiful complete mountain roads though one of them was of a very narrow, winding wagon trail unfit for motor travel.

These Priests of the Pinnacle are unusual people. They strain on a gnat and swallow a camel. Not a single erratic must be moved in putting in a safe road, a road, not a freeway or a highway, but a simple safe road. There are thousands of those glacial erratics and millions of volcanic erratics scattered over the High Sierra. These people shudder with horror at the thought of moving one single such stone. I get the same reaction when I think of rusting spikes and rotting ropes dangling on the face of two of the most magnificent monoliths in the world. These Apostles of the Wildernesses cheered and danced in ecstasy while the climbs to the summits which children could reach by safer routes were taking place. My reactions—well with a hammer and a sufficient number of spikes an ordinary fellow can climb a tall flagpole and monkeys swing on a trapeze. Why deface these magnificent cliffs.

I shock you—well I shock myself. I merely seek to bring out that all these so-called desecrations discussed here today are primarily psychological and to these our minds can be adjusted. That is fortunate because I am not going to get the spikes and ropes removed and they, unless I am badly mistaken, are going to suffer the agony of seeing the 99 percent travel on safe roads, not freeways, not highways—just on safe roads through that part of these wonderlands that the 99 percent are to be permitted to use.

I seek to bring this controversy into the open where public opinion will solve it in the public interest. I am hoping that the pressures of the opposing forces will offset one another so that the skilled, dedicated men of the services will be permitted to do, unhampered, that which ought to be done, and so freed, I will be satisfied with whatever they do.

If these specialists should perchance go too far and make a few errors in all their plans and completions, our friends can take solace in the fact that eventually another glacial age will obliterate the puny scratching of mere man and that God's cathedral will be resculptured to His liking.

Meanwhile, let us give the present tabernacle reasonable opportunity to elevate the plateaus of human existence. I am on the side of the 99 because I believe all of us and all our thinking can be greatly improved.

After study and deliberation, I hope that the California State Chamber of Commerce will take a firm and aggressive stand on this basic problem because there are several national park roads in California which will have to be reconstructed in the next few years. The money must not be wasted building wagon roads.

Connecticut's Labor Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement regarding the number of man-days lost in work stoppages in 1958 in Connecticut, noting that Connecticut's record is better than the national average. The statement by Connecticut's Labor Commissioner, Renato Ricciuti, is from the January issue of the Monthly Bulletin of the Connecticut Labor Department:

Preliminary estimates show that Connecticut had approximately 0.1 percent of man-days lost due to labor disputes in 1958. Once again, this will put Connecticut below the national average, which is estimated at 0.2 percent. Since the end of World War II, Connecticut's labor relations record, based on man-days lost due to work stoppages, has been below the national average in every year except one. In addition, using the same measurement, Connecticut's labor relations record has been consistently better than other industrial States.

This fine record can be attributed in large measure to the generally responsibile leadership of labor and management in our State. Another factor is the work done by the members and agents of our own State Board of Mediation and Arbitration. Quietly and effectively from day to day throughout the year, these people do the groundwork in maintaining industrial peace. They work harmoniously with the representatives of the Federal Mediation Service in Connecticut. * * * In Connecticut the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the State Board of Mediation and Arbitration don't just preach cooperation—they practice it daily. The close coordination of assignments and activities between these two services makes for more effective and efficient service to the parties involved in labor disputes.

Such a labor relations record provides one of the elements necessary for a favorable climate of industrial development. Governor Ribicoff's proposal that labor and management sit down for discussions, away from the emotional pressures of their particular negotiations, is aimed primarily to enlist the assistance of labor and management in further enhancing the favorable atmosphere for industrial development in Connecticut. The enthusiasm with which industrial and trade union leaders have responded to this idea is encouraging.

Although these meetings will concentrate primarily on the broad topics of area development, the groundwork can be laid for a better understanding of other problems which confront labor and management and point up more dramatically many mutual goals. Eventually, the results of these conferences should encourage an even greater degree of stability and maturity in Connecticut labor relations.

Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the following material is submitted for the consideration of my colleagues in the House in connection with remarks which I made on the floor this afternoon.

The material, compiled by Mr. John W. Darley, Jr., an industrial manager engaged in the nuclear aircraft propulsion program, gives a comprehensive picture of the present status of the project along with the trials and tribulations it has gone through since its inception.

I feel that if each Member of the Congress would read carefully this presentation he would have a better understanding of what needs to be done to support this project which is so vital to our national security.

Under leave to do so, I herewith submit a letter from Mr. Darley to me; a letter addressed to President Eisenhower by Mr. Darley, and the text of Mr. Darley's summary of pertinent views on the importance to our national security of the aircraft nuclear propulsion program:

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Subject: The aircraft nuclear propulsion program.

DEAR MR. PRICE: One month ago, on January 14, I sent the attached letter to the President concerning the national aircraft nuclear propulsion program. In this letter, I stated that I did not plan further distribution until after an appropirate period of time had elapsed and would not further distribute this information should he instruct me that such an act would be contrary to the best interests of the United States.

One month has now elapsed. No further word has been received from the White House.

Due to your expressed interest and work in the area of the ANP program, coupled with your responsibilities as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Armed Services Committee, I am here transmitting this information for your use as you see fit.

Speaking frankly, I have become convinced that if any corrective action can be taken, the impetus for same must now come from the legisaltive branch of the Government. All other avenues of approach to the decisionmaking problem appear to have been exhausted.

I join in your conviction that the ANP program badly needs a definitely targeted date for nuclear flight—with programmatic decisions and funding levels consistent with that target. Without same, there is no possible ANP program which can still meet the needs of this Nation.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. DARLEY, Jr.

(NOTE.—Additional copies of this letter to the President are currently being transmitted to Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Representative CARL T. DURHAM, Representative WILLIAM E. HESS, and Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.)

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

Subject: The aircraft nuclear propulsion program.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am an industrial manager engaged in the national aircraft nuclear propulsion program—having been connected with this activity for the past 7 years. I have sought neither counsel nor approval from my associates or superiors, however, for what I am about to say.

I am speaking as a conscientious voting citizen who is sorely troubled by the trend of events taking place in the world around me.

While the individual statements contained within this letter are not security-classified, their overall content is certainly sensitive. Since you occupy the most powerful office in the world and are the only common authority over all of the agencies and departments who effectively administer the national ANP program, however, there are certain things which cannot be left unsaid.

I am trying to gain your understanding that what has been written here has been decided upon after very careful personal thought and after an evaluation of the pending risks versus the responsibilities involved. Opinions, of course, must be properly evaluated; please consider my specialized experience and the personal knowledge thus acquired when you evaluate mine.

On December 10, during your scheduled press conference, and in answer to a question on the subject of aircraft nuclear propulsion from Mr. Merriam Smith, you are reported to have replied as follows: (1) "There is no usefulness that anyone could possibly see from such a plane"; (2) "there is no use of going into a field where the whole purpose would be to get a plane a few hundred feet off the ground"; (3) "there is absolutely no intelligence to back up a report that Russia is flight-testing an atomic-powered airplane."

I recognize that your responses were based upon the best information available to you. I am only concerned as to the quality of that information and, speaking frankly, it is my opinion that you have been on the receiving end of some sloppy staff work, which may be setting some sort of historical records in this direction.

Because I know full well that this letter has only a small chance of reaching you through a buffering staff wall unless some incentives are offered, I have simultaneously prepared copies of this letter for eventual distribution to the managing editors of selected magazines and newspapers. I do not plan to send these copies to these editors until after an appropriate period of time has elapsed, and will not send same if you instruct me that such an act would be contrary to the best interest of the defense of the United States.

You may be wondering why I have delayed so long after your press conference of December 10 before sending you this letter. Speaking frankly, I have been caught on the horns of the dilemma as to whether or not I would be doing the ANP program more harm than good by responding to the situation in this way. The compelling reasons behind my choice were that (1) the situation is urgent, (2) it does not show signs of straightening out through the normal channels, (3) the problems of understanding and motivation are so massive that it appears to me that they can only be overcome by a thorough airing.

The text which I have used, and which is attached to this cover letter, is quite lengthy; to assist you in its understanding, I will be following this outline:

I. Strategic considerations.
II. Soviet ANP capability.
III. The promise and status of the U.S.-ANP program.
IV. Criticisms of the U.S.-ANP program.
V. The national problems of administering the U.S.-ANP program.
VI. Recommendations for action.
VII. Concluding remarks.

It is my hope that by the time you have digested these remarks you may agree with my premise that you have not been receiving the best in information. Further, I hope that, through such an overall view of the ANP program, you will join those of us who are moved by a compelling faith and conviction that the program is vital to the continued security of the United States.

At the least, I hope that I have provided another point of view.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. DARLEY, Jr.

I. STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS

Let me first talk to your first point that "there is no usefulness * * * from such a plane," dealing in order with various elements of national strategy.

If I correctly understand our country's strategic concepts for survival, they are based upon:

(a) Posing a massive retaliatory threat such that a potential enemy cannot help but see that he will suffer considerably more damage than he will be able to inflict should he decide to start anything. In consideration of the amount of effort which is going into it, this seems to be our No. 1 strategy.

(b) Erecting sufficient air defense to warn of an incoming attack in sufficient time to permit the dispatching of our retailatory force, to minimize civilian casualties, and to cause an enemy some loss in his attacking force; included in this element is passive civil defense through dispersal, evacuation, shelters, etc., on which little has been done to date.

(c) Deploying sufficient mobile ground and sea forces to quench local eruptions in so-called police force action or small wars.

No preventative war—what this means

I share with you the absolute conviction that the United States must never engage in a preventative war; this then rightly means that we have effectively granted an enemy any advantage accruing to the initiative. Any retaliatory threat posed by the United States will therefore only prevent a war as long as a potential enemy can only conclude that he will not be able to stop this retaliatory force from destroying those targets which he cannot afford to lose if he is going to eventually prevail in the disagreement.

I agree with you that there will be no winning of any future war—only the prevailing of one ideology over the other. It is my opinion that a disciplined and ruthless enemy will decide that the side which prevails—all other massive destruction forgotten—will be that side which has remaining an active strategic force after all the major stratigic forces of the other side have either been spent or destroyed.

Our real war to end war, then, is the task of convincing of the other side that (a) he cannot save any portion of his active strategic force should he decide to embark on the path of armed conflict, regardless of how mobile and unpredictable in location that strategic force may become; (b) he cannot destroy the strategic striking force of the United States, due to the fact that it is mobile and dispersed beyond his reach or beyond his ability to destroy before it retaliates against his forces.

The concept of mobility—its meaning to us

I realize that the above looks like the application of a double standard to the two systems. The key to this effect is that for the

United States and the Western Allies, mobility provides an even greater advantage than it does for the Soviet Union. This is because of the fact that (1) we are already granting them the initiative; any additional advantage due to mobility is sugar coating to their main capability and mainly defensive against our retaliatory strike, (2) the world's area available for on-alert dispersal of our mobile force far exceeds that behind the Iron and/or Bamboo Curtain.

I will be dealing more with the meaning behind this concept in subsequent paragraphs.

The retaliatory threat

Our No. 1 strategy—the retaliatory threat, including current plans for the implementation of same—involves the use of (1) intercontinental missiles, (2) intermediate-range missiles—ground, air and undersea launched, (3) manned strategic chemically powered bomber aircraft.

Weaknesses of missiles

All of these missiles, since they can hit targets of known importance and location, are certainly vital weapons in the military inventory. They do, however, suffer on two counts one of which is being worked on and the other of which is beyond their reach: (a) In that all missiles have to possess sufficient protection against attack or a sufficiently quick response time to get off the ground after warning and before the enemy's weapons strike—they either have to be put on active standby underground or under the sea—or fueled by propellants which permit the necessary quick response on short notice (hopefully 15 minutes in the case of the ICBM's but shorter in the case of the IRBM's). I can see that both of these methods of improvements are being undertaken; (b) in that missiles, however, are only able to hit targets of known importance and location, they absolutely fall short of being able to hit the highest priority targets—namely those containing or contributing to the enemy's mobile strategic striking force—a force which can only be predicted in location by the most detailed intelligence information. It is my understanding that we do not have nor will we ever have this quality of intelligence coverage. Should the Russians come to possess operational quantities of air-orbiting nuclear-powered aircraft, the problem will become even worse than in our current situation—which is already difficult enough (I will deal more with this later).

Continued need for manned aircraft

Because of this need to pose a threatened strike at these mobile and unpredictable targets of opportunity, the role of the manned aircraft will continue to exist. The availability of human eyes and human minds in target areas—whether on weapons carriers or reconnaissance vehicles—is absolutely needed if these highest priority military targets are to be indentified and subsequently destroyed. That this need will continue into the future is verified by the existence of the B–70 program.

Weaknesses of chemically powered aircraft

Chemically powered aircraft, however, will suffer some definite drawbacks during future years due to the following:

(a) Limitations in airborne time—risks taken: Because of the fact that airborne time—limited by chemical fuel capacity or by the programing or logistic complexities of in-flight-refueling operations—is relatively short compared to ground turn-around maintenance time, only a fairly small proportion of a total chemically propelled bomber force can be in the air at any one time—or, for that matter, be gotten into the air within the period allowed by a 15-minute alert warning time. This means that, assuming that a potential enemy would logically concentrate on such ground-bound targets, only a fairly small proportion—namely that airborne—would survive the initial, all-out blow.

I recognize that it is hoped that geographical base dispersal will save a larger proportion of the force which cannot get off the ground prior to the attack. My only reaction here is that, for the long-term future, the cost of an enemy's missile and launching sites zeroed in on a larger number of dispersed bases will be appreciably less than the cost of these dispersed bases. For those who say that the potential enemy's ICBM's are not as accurate as required, I can only say that if this is true now, it won't be true for long.

(b) Complicated fuel logistics—risks taken: Because of the fact that modern day military strategic aircraft require extensive aerial in-flight refueling in order to reach their targets, the total operation becomes dependent upon a critically linked chain of events involving (1) the availability of aerial tanker bases—both within the continental United States and overseas—all of which are subject to the same manner of obliteration and the need for discouragingly quick response times that apply to the regular bomber force; as a matter of fact, this could be the major weak link in the chain; (2) a critically programed and extremely complicated requirement for rendezvous meetings between the surviving bomber and tanker forces at the right time and at the right place and with the right amount of fuel available.

(c) Vulnerability of chemically powered aircraft at high altitudes: Due to the technical characteristics of air-breathing jet powerplants, chemically powered strategic aircraft—even if suitably refueled near the enemy's perimeter—can only reach the required target areas by flying at high altitudes. If I interpret the recent test results on high-altitude nuclear bursts correctly, the survival of a manned aircraft at high altitudes—almost regardless of the speed at which it is traveling—will become increasingly less probably with the passage of time. If during the target-zone penetration portion of their mission chemically powered aircraft are forced to low altitudes, their range becomes so limited as to reach only a small proportion of the required target coverage.

This then is a technical fact. There is no known way by which any current or proposed chemically propelled strategic aircraft can reach anything more than a very small proportion of required target areas if it is required to approach same at low altitudes. This same limitation does not apply to nuclearly powered aircraft.

The promise of nuclear-powered aircraft

Here, then, due to an imposing combination of the above, is one primary regime of usefulness for the nuclearly powered aircraft, namely, in the area of retaliatory threat, strategic reconnaissance, and bombardment.

1. Nuclear aircraft—extended airborne alert: Because of their inherently large fuel capacity, nuclear aircraft will have much extended airborne time, i.e., the amount of time they spend in the air will grow to equal or perhaps even exceed the amount of time they spend in maintenance turnaround on the ground. This means that a much, much higher percentage of the total number of aircraft will be airborne at all times—airborne and armed at variable and unpredictable locations throughout the world from which they pose a maximum retaliatory threat without range limitations.

In effect, this airborne alert capability raises the percentage of the total force which is saved from the initial enemy blow in order for it to be able to go on and do its job. A potential enemy, recognizing this capability, is thus faced with the realization that he will not be able to eliminate that which will eventually destroy his mobile strategic force. I would call this an improved retaliatory threat.

2. Nuclear aircraft—independence from complicated logistics and foreign bases: Already airborne, the nuclear aircraft can do its job independent of any need for aerial in-flight refueling or foreign-based aerial tanker fleets. It is my opinion that our relations with our allies are or will be increasingly strained by the existence of these tanker fleets based overseas (and which constitute important military targets) in much of the same way that there was definite foreign reaction against the basing of IRBM's in England or Italy. I am not proposing isolationism—only trying to identify a trend in the climate of world opinion.

3. Nuclear aircraft—versatility in application: Once airborne, that portion of the nuclear aircraft force on retaliatory patrol duty is independent of any other logistic need—and only requires a signal that the United States has been attacked and that it should proceed on its assigned retaliation mission. Due to the inherently large weapons carrying capacity of nuclear aircraft, its armament can include a number of air-launched air-to-ground missiles and regular laydown weapons which far exceed the weapons carrying capability of their chemically powered counterparts. This means that fewer aircraft can do the job.

Due to this enlarged load-carrying capability, coupled with high endurance, the nuclear strategic aircraft possesses a tremendously improved versatility in usage which embraces (a) airborne retaliatory patrol, safe from initial attack, (b) missile launching from outside the enemy's defense periphery; (c) reconnaissance and warning near the enemy's periphery; (d) omnidirectional low-altitude penetration under the enemy's radar warning net for reconnaissance and location of the enemy's mobile strategic forces; (e) low-altitude penetration, followed by either missile launching and/or conventional bomb laydown or by a combination of both.

The significance of the low-altitude approach is treated in the following paragraph.

4. Nuclear-aircraft—potency of alternate low-altitude attack: Contrary to the range-limitation of chemically powered aircraft at low altitudes (where survival will become increasingly more probable than penetration at high altitudes), a nuclear-aircraft could actually come down from its cruise altitude and penetrate the enemy's early-warning perimeter from an infinite choice of directions and at extremely low altitudes—holding this low altitude on its way to its assigned target area. If you want to get a reading as to the enormous potential potency of this kind of attack, I would suggest that an answer can be acquired by postulating that an enemy had such a method of delivery. The answer may surprise you.

For those who would say that it is easy for a potential enemy to protect itself against such a manned-retaliatory force, I would suggest that for a country with the land mass and extended perimeter of Russia, they are welcome to try. The Soviet Union could very easily bankrupt itself in just erecting a low-altitude warning net—not to mention the number of active defensive missiles and aircraft which would have to be employed.

5. Nuclear-aircraft—fewer aircraft, fewer bases: Let us talk next as to the number of bases from which nuclear aircraft would need to be deployed. Because of the fact that a higher percentage are airborne at all times, because each aircraft has appreciably more weapons capacity, and because lower comparative attrition can be increasingly expected due to the omni-directional low-altitude attack, a much fewer number of manned strategic aircraft would be needed. This

translates into a fewer number of costly bases.

My best estimate is that from two to three nuclear-aircraft bases—appropriately located on Atlantic and Pacific islands to take an enemy's major attack away from the Continental United States—would do the peacetime job. It is to be assumed that all of these bases would be lost in an initial attack—but an attractive percentage of their based force would have regularly been airborne and would constitute a manned strategic force to fight the war.

The next question here is that of rearming and restriking with this surviving force after their return from their first strike mission. There are two services which will be needed, namely the probable replacement of the nuclear powerplants (in that the remote-handling base facilities for individual detailed powerplant maintenance will no longer be available) and the rearming of the aircraft with new weapons. Both of these services can be provided from mobile ground equipment and at locations which are variable and unpredictable. Any number of currently available landing and take-off areas would do the job. This rearming and restriking problem is essentially no different from that with chemically powered aircraft.

6. Nuclear aircraft—lower total costs than the massive chemical system: As a final note on this matter of a nuclear-aircraft retaliatory force, let us take up the matter of comparative costs. The best information which I have, and which is based upon appropriately detailed study, is that the nuclear-powered retaliatory force will cost appreciably less than its chemically powered counterpart system. I recognize that this statement is hard to believe in these days of accelerating weapons obsolescence; the major factor producing this situation is the fact that our current manned retaliation system is enormously expensive. The cost advantage accruing to the nuclear-aircraft force is predominantly due to (a) a larger percentage of aircraft airborne at all times; therefore, fewer losses on the ground and fewer aircraft required in total; (b) a larger weapons-carrying capacity per aircraft; therefore fewer aircraft required; (c) no tanker aircraft required; (d) no bases required, foreign or domestic, for the basing of the tanker aircraft; (e) no complicated chemical fuel logistics and staging required at a wide number of bases, foreign or domestic; (f) considerably fewer bases from which the manned retaliatory force would need to operate.

And, interesting enough, none of the above cost elements have even stopped to consider (a) that chemically powered aircraft can't even do the job if they are forced, as predicted, to attack at low altitudes, where their range is drastically limited; (b) that omnidirectional nuclear aircraft will suffer fewer losses using low altitude penetration than will their chemically powered brothers at high altitudes—again acting to cut down on the total number of aircraft required.

Practically all of the foregoing reasoning has concentrated in the area of continuing to pose a real threat of retaliation as a means of making the instrument of war appear unprofitable for a potential enemy. While this area alone testifies as to the potential usefulness of nuclear aircraft, the story does not end here.

Static defenses encourage circumvention

At numerous tmies during the history of the world countries have based their longevity upon static, immobile means of defense. The Chinese wall, the Maginot line, and now the DEW line, have all acted to create the popular impression of impregnability. While the DEW line, supplemented by BMEWS equipment for ballistic-missile warning, is heavily useful for protecting the retaliation force, its coverage is still based upon the threat coming from a predictable direction and at a predictable altitude. If history teaches us anything, it is that a potential enemy is thereby provided with an incentive to circumvent the erected defense or warning line.

To me, the DEW or BMEWS line means two things: (1) That a potential enemy will strive to develop a weapon whose manner of attack will neutralize the usefulness of the erected defense; (2) that there is a supplemental need for mobile warning facilities which can react to various technological and political threats by virtue of their mobility.

Soviets advanced in neutralizing fixed defenses

Interestingly enough, the Russians already appear advanced in the development of weapons designed to neutralize the warning line. Their already recognized submarine force—improved in armament through the use of submarine-launched missiles—is in the process of being further supplemented by nuclear aircraft. Both of these threats circumvent our erected warning line.

Nuclear aircraft—Use as a defensive vehicle

If we are to be responsive to these threats, we should not respond by more massive, immobile, narrow-range equipments, but rather by systems whose versatility and mobility are matched to the changing and variable challenge. Air-orbiting, nuclear-powered, radar-warning aircraft constitute one family of such systems.

Ending commentary re usefulness of nuclear aircraft

I have now responded to two of the major comments which you are reported to have made relative to the ANP program—namely, that "there is no usefulness that anyone could possibly see from such a plane" and that "there is no use of going into a field where the whole purpose could be to get a plane a few hundred feet off the ground."

As indicated by the foregoing analysis, there is plenty of "usefulness." The "few hundred feet" comment, as provided to you by your advisers, is a dangerously simple statement which completely misses the point of low-altitude-penetration attack.

I realize that you may think I am proposing that the nuclear aircraft is an "ultimate weapon." Believe me, I am not. I do believe, however, that without them we stand every chance of no longer having a stalemate in the strategic chess game.

II. SOVIET A.N.P. CAPABILITY

The third comment which you are reported to have made went to the effect that "there is absolutely no intelligence to back up a report that Ausisa is flight testing an atomic-powered airplane." The question which prompted your reply was undoubtedly triggered by the article in the December 1 issue of Aviation Week which reported on the estimated status of the Soviet A.N.P. program.

I would like to say, however, that the staff man who provided your text, was a hair-splitter of the first order:

1. Intelligence is available: In the first place, I am positive that there is intelligence on the relative state of the Soviet A.N.P. program. Considering the strategic incentives which we have given them in the form of our DEW line plus their natural interest in showing evidence of technological supremacy, it should not be surprising if they were ahead of us. Maj. Gen. D. J. Keirn, in charge of the U.S. program, made a public statement to this effect a few weeks ago, adding that it would not surprise him if the Soviets flew on nuclear power within a year.

2. Characteristics of Soviet aircraft are significant: To a second point, I understand that there is significant evidence that a Soviet aircraft of the size and configuration described in the Aviation Week article has been sighted.

Using the article's overall design dimensions—and unless the Soviets have suddenly retrogressed in their ability to competently design chemically-powered aircraft—there is little doubt but that this particular airframe is intended for use with nuclear powerplants. As a purely chemical airplane—even with advanced chemical turbojets—it is not a very good aircraft or weapons system.

As a side note, this is the first very large Soviet aircraft with pylon-mounted powerplants—it being the usual Russian design approach in such cases to bury their powerplants within the wing structure. This difference is particularly significant, however, because this is the direction you would take for easier later replacement of chemical with nuclear machinery and subsequent easier maintainability of the nuclear powerplants.

3. Existence of Soviet aircraft verified by their announcement: Subsequent to your December 10 press conference, on January 1, Moscow radio, in a formal multilingual announcement, made two promises for 1959. These were that the Soviets would shoot a rocket to the moon and that they were going to fly a nuclear-powered civil aircraft during the next year.

I think that you will find that your intelligence agencies place a high credibility on this particular type of formal announcement, even without the fact that the Soviets—within 2 days—had a 50-percent scoring record.

Many public comments re Soviet program are not to the point

I agree with your advisers, however, that the Aviation Week article presented no concrete evidence that this Soviet aircraft currently has nuclear powerplants installed. To the contrary, it is difficult to believe that any nuclear engine is currently installed within the comparatively small engine nacelles indicated on their drawings.

Whether or not this aircraft has actually flown on nuclear power, as questioned by your advisers and provided in their text for your use, is not really to the point.

It does not take any classified information to realize that if the United States started today on its prototype-aircraft program for A.N.P. purposes, it would be approximately 3 years before any substantial chemically powered flight-test program on the aircraft would take place. As far as the relative airframe programs are concerned, therefore, we now have a pretty good fix on relative progress.

Sightings of this Soviet aircraft, of course, do not necessarily testify as to the state of progress in the Soviet nuclear powerplant program. Some criticism of the news article takes this direction, with the additional inference that the Soviet nuclear powerplant program is probably only to follow with an installed powerplant at a much later date. Even if this opinion is partially true, as it would be for any such program where the approach must be to take logical sequenced steps, it is a defensive comment and underestimates Russian technological competence in those areas where they really apply their effort. Certainly it does so if you believe, as I do, their January 1 announcement.

Ending commentary re Soviet ANP capability

Completely aside from all of the above, however, I join you in the belief that just because some other country is doing something is no reason for the United States to undertake a similar program in the same direction. That which the United States needs to accomplish should be tailored to its particular situation and to the particular objectives which it must reach in order to survive and prosper.

While I have already adequately dealt with some of the unique usefulness of nuclear-powered aircraft within part I, there are other questions and subjects which need to be discussed.

It is for this reason that I would be irresponsible if I stopped here. Going by the theory that better understanding cannot but help in the evaluation and decision-making process, I would now like to turn to the other issues which are raised by this general subject.

III. THE PROMISE AND STATUS OF THE U.S.-ANP PROGRAM

In the foregoing pages, I have already laid a foundation with respect to the promise of the U.S.-ANP program. We have dealt with (a) the property of versatility and mobility, (b) the airborne alert-force concept, (c) the manned nuclear-aircraft retaliatory mission, (d) low-altitude penetration for reconnaissance and bombardment, (e) the freedom from chemical-tanker logistics, (f) the freedom from foreign-basing restraints, (g) the reduction in the number of bases required, (h) the inherently large load-carrying capacity of nuclear aircraft, (i) the cost implications due to increased simplicity in the total manned retaliatory system, (j) the air-defense potential of nuclear aircraft warning systems.

Promise similar to that of nuclear submarine, but more revolutionary

In many respects, this identified promise for the nuclear aircraft sounds much like that popularly assigned to the nuclear-powered submarine. A pure extrapolation here, however, would undershoot the mark.

The nuclear submarine provides quite a revolution over its diesel-electric-snorkel predecessors but, in terms of the relative gain in total systems simplicity, the revolution in the air due to the nuclear aircraft is of a much higher order of magnitude. By total system I mean the vehicle itself, its weapons, range, lethalness, vulnerability, and the total complex of logistics and communications which permits it to do its job.

Compared to the submarine, nuclear aircraft have a more massive effect on these logistic parts of the overall system which, in the aircrafts' case, constitute a very major part of the whole.

The promise, moreover, does not stop here.

Nuclear aircraft program additionally important

The U.S.-ANP program for manned nuclear aircraft is important beyond the high value of its initial applications; this additional importance is due to the following:

1. Much technology transferable into space vehicles: The basic technologies of the manned nuclear aircraft program are transferable and/or expandable into the nuclear missile, heat transfer, nuclear rocket, and nuclear powered space vehicle areas.

2. Reason to believe aircraft must precede space vehicle: There is serious reason to believe that the United States will never proceed on sure footing into the more exotic nuclear space vehicle regimes until it has learned how to live and operate with a manned nuclear aircraft program. The king sized step otherwise required appears indigestible from a practical mobilization and technological point of view.

3. Technology in forefront of nuclear reactor field: By the very nature of its effort in the area of comparatively lightweight, high-performance nuclear machinery, the ANP powerplant program is automatically working in the forefront of nuclear reactor technology, with resulting long-range ramifications in the atomic-electric field.

Thirteen years now invested

As you know, 13 years have now been invested in the aircraft nuclear propulsion program. With a modest beginning in 1946, feasibility studies into 1951 resulted in the conclusion that the application was feasible and deserving of development effort.

It is interesting to note that studies made during this feasibility period predicted the amount of time and money which would be required to do the job.

The predicted time has now been exceeded; less than half of the predicted amount of money has thus far been spent. In periods of national emergency, we have rightfully excused the trading of more money for less time; in consideration of the threat now around us, I wonder if going so far in the other direction (trading more time for a lesser expenditure per year) makes real sense.

With engineering development beginning in 1951, the program was directed toward a flying-test-bed application in which the initially flyable powerplant would be tested within a worked-over and modified B–36 aircraft—the aircraft retaining its normal chemical powerplants in order to carry the nuclear powerplant aloft for testing purposes. This is normal practice with new aircraft powerplants and is practiced with chemical turbojets today.

Near cancellation in 1953

But what happened? In 1953, the program was cut back (and nearly canceled in total) because the B–36 wouldn't fly high enough or fast enough to make it a military weapon—something which this B–36 was never intended to be in the first place. You may remember the word "shitepoke" which was a term of endearment provided by the Secretary of Defense at that time.

Could have flown by now

It is my firm opinion that had this cutback step not been taken in 1953, we would be flying a nuclear-powered aircraft today.

In consideration of what the Soviets show every sign of doing during this next year, we may live to massively regret this 1953 decision.

Still need an aircraft in the program

At the present time, however, we have yet to go through this flying-test-bed stage—or its equivalent using an experimental aircraft. It is absolutely vital that this step be taken at the earliest possible moment.

The way support seems to be leaning in 1959, however, this event is still some years away.

Don't get me wrong.

The decision in 1953 of heading toward a better airframe for initial testing of the powerplant was not a bad idea.

It is just that (1) at a point practically 6 years later, we have yet to even commit for the airframe part of the program, (2) the announced reason for making this 1953 decision did not reflect any sophisticated understanding of aircraft powerplant development philosophy—or normal research and development practices.

Eight years of engineering development

Actual powerplant development has now been proceeding for practically 8 years, with full-scale reactor and reactor-turbojet-systems tests in process since 1956. Considerable airframe studies have taken place intermittently and at a variable pace during the same period.

During 1954–55, the Air Force—undoubtedly remembering its 1953 experience—began to clothe the ANP development effort in the mantle of a weapons system. It must be remembered that it was the fashion of the day (particularly since 1953) that if more money was needed to get the job done, the only way it would be forthcoming was to prove that the project was going to result in something which flew higher and faster or carried more or what have you.

Uniqueness of initial nuclear-aircraft capabilities not recognized

This originally visualized weapons system (called 125–A) was to do everything that regular chemically powered aircraft could do—and then some—rather than harnessing the particular and special capabilities of nuclear propulsion.

While this 125–A affiliation was undoubtedly on shaky ground from the start—due to nuclear propulsion trying to compete initially with the best of chemical propulsion in the chemical regime's own backyard, it did accomplish one very beneficial result. Some additional money was made available, at least enough to really get a leg up on the powerplant development work.

Since then, some real powerplant development progress has been made.

Development ready to proceed at a faster pace

The powerplant development work is now at a stage where it is ready to proceed at a faster pace. It is true that some solutions in detail (as opposed to feasibility) are required, but these are the reasons why the development is necessary in the first place.

In today's environment, I get the impression that the only way to really get development support is to prove that everything is already comfortably in position—with all challenges answered in minute detail. In such a position, there will be development money made available—when, if such was really the case, the weapon should be in quantity manufacture.

Today's situation on the nuclear-aircraft program is similar to that which prevailed on the missile programs 3 to 5 years ago. At that time, development work was accelerated on propulsion and guidance aspects of the work; today, we are just beginning to see signs that we will have operational missile systems over the next 2 to 4 years.

The same situation can prevail for nuclear aircraft.

Capability in depth available

When I say we are ready to proceed, I am not referring to an informal group of scientists working in the laboratory. I am talking about a balanced and sizable organization of scientists, design engineers, manufacturing engineers, and test engineers—all backed up by a complex of pilot-line manufacturing facilities, raw material sources, subcontractor installations, and hardware vendors.

Promise of the future is great

Of considerable significance to the nuclear-aircraft program is the fact that the initial powerplant and the initial application can now be clearly seen to be the first of a family of improving performers. Enough is known about the designs farther back in the conceptual and preliminary design stages to predict with certainty that the initial hardware approach will improve in performance even beyond that which is now called the requirement.

As a matter of fact, this promise is one of the problems.

The vacillator and the fence sitter want to wait for the 1985 model, although the 1959 model will still manage to outdistance anything on the road.

It is my conviction, however—and I have lots of knowledgeable company—that failure to buy the 1959 model is not going to result in any improvement in what the 1985 model will do in its time.

As a matter of fact, if we delay in facing up to the full-scale development of what can be done today, the 1985 capability won't come out until the year 2000, if ever.

"Camal" mission a unique application

One of the main reasons behind the fact that program acceleration now makes such sense is the unique concept of the "Camal" mission, as described in summary fashion in part I. This approach not only takes perfect advantage of the unique properties accruing to nuclear propulsion; it also turns out to offer a uniquely different and extremely valuable weapon for the defense situation which faces us.

Further, this approach will not only do a real job of using the initially developable airframe and powerplant, but will also improve in performance and capability as the second cousins come out of the developmental brooder.

Let's face it. Nuclear-powered aircraft are inevitable. The sooner we get about really facing up to the job in total, including an airframe, the sooner they are going to be a valuable weapon in our arsenal.

IV. CRITICISMS OF THE U.S.-ANP PROGRAM

With all of the promise and all of the progress which I have talked about thus far, you may well ask: "Where has all the trouble been coming from?"

Let's take a look at the collection of critical comments which have been made against the nuclear aircraft program, examine them in some detail, and see if some pertinent conclusions can be reached.

Criticisms of the U.S.-ANP program can generally be classified into three broad areas; these are: (a) applications (the use to be gained); (b) technology (the state of the development); (c) administration (program decision problems).

Let us deal with each of these areas in sequence.

Applications—oriented criticisms

Critical comments in the area of applications, or the use to which aircraft nuclear propulsion would be put, can be listed as follows:

"The aircraft is too big or too slow."

Here we find the man who wants to go higher and faster all of the time, regardless of where he should be. I can understand the necessity for going higher and faster with part of our retaliatory force—just to force the Soviets to defend against such an attack—but less and less of our total force will be able to penetrate in this way.

This critical comment therefore fails to recognize that the survival of aircraft at high altitudes and even very high supersonic speeds will become increasingly less probable with the passage of time. Attrition in this regime will be markedly higher than that at extremely low altitudes and respectable subsonic speeds. Chemical aircraft can't do the latter. (Please see part I.)

On the comment of size, initial nuclear aircraft will be no bigger, and possibly smaller, than today's larger chemical aircraft. They may weigh more; that is, be "denser" aircraft, but I can't see where the point is. As a matter of fact, nuclear power may very well cause a complete reevaluation as to what constitutes the optimum size of an airplane.

"The aircraft would be easy to shoot down."

This is probably the same gentleman who wants to go high and fast. He doesn't understand the overwhelming defensive requirements superimposed by an omnidirectional, low-altitude penetration attack. He doesn't realize the magnitude of investment required for a low-altitude, radar-warning net and the associated defensive missiles and air-defense aircraft (which are range-limited at these low altitudes).

In short, he hasn't recognized that for a country with the land mass and perimeter of the Soviet Union, he now has the weapon of economics (and possible bankruptcy) on his side.

"We don't really need a nuclear aircraft."

This gentleman either doesn't understand anything mentioned in part I, or else he is a saturation war man. This latter breed says if anything starts we will just plaster everything and everywhere, using an immense number of missiles carrying atomic and hydrogen warheads. This way, he says, we will be sure and hit everything worth hitting.

This reasoning is fallacious on two counts. First, the rest of the world would be in danger of becoming uninhabitable. Second, I don't believe the United States will ever choose to adopt this inhuman and reckless defense posture.

It has been said: "As soon as men decide that all means are permitted to fight an evil, then their good becomes indistinguishable from the evil that they set out to destroy."

"The application being worked on is the wrong one" (regardless of which one is being worked on).

Here is the man who says that we should make up our mind over and over again. Or perhaps he is stating that he doesn't want to do anything until everybody decides to do it his way. I really don't know.

I only know that the application chosen is a particularly valuable one and that after satisfying this first step there will undoubtedly be others.

"I don't understand it."

We have found an honest man; he is one of the gentlemen for whom this letter is written.

Technically oriented criticisms

Critical comments in the area of technology, or the state of the development, are fairly represented by the following:

"An airborne reactor is too dangerous."

What this gentleman is saying is that aircraft are dangerous. As far as the aircraft's crew is concerned, a reactor with its radioactive parts is less dangerous than several tons of inflammable aviation fuel.

It is true, however, that experimental and perhaps operational nuclear aircraft will have to fly in specified corridors when over land to eliminate the danger of a possible crash in populated areas. This will undoubtedly be a function of the demonstrated reliability of the total aircraft system as well as the appropriate selection of locations for the operational bases. Significant study has already been devoted to this problem with encouraging findings.

Please understand that what is being talked about here is not an atomic explosion, but the potential spillage of radioactivity should an aircraft crash.

A fair comment in this area would be: There are some risks; they are the types of risks which can be overcome by operational procedures and system reliability; they are a very long way from being sufficiently large enough to give up what the aircraft has to offer as a military weapon.

"The radiation is too high; the crew can't last."

Without going into a mass of technical data, much of which is classified, let me just state that current design of the system is based upon each operational crew flying for a very appreciable number of days each year, for a very appreciable number of years, and still at the end of the period have received no more radiation exposure than they would have had they spent those years working in an AEC industrial laboratory. And please believe me, this is just about as radiation-safe as you can get—anyplace, anywhere.

"The reactor temperatures aren't high enough."

This is the comment of the man who wants to wait for the 1985 model—as mentioned in part III. The temperatures are high enough to do what needs to be done first; they promise to be higher by the time they need to be higher. If we wait until then before we accomplish development-testing needed now, the whole program will suffer and be delayed.

As a side comment, there is little if any doubt but that as the development progresses, the designed temperature capability of the reactor will come to put extreme engineering pressure on the designers of the remaining parts of the powerplant. Believe me, this is plenty high enough.

"It isn't being done the way I would do it."

No comment appears necessary.

"I don't understand it."

The people who have already built and test-operated reactor-turbojet systems do understand it, and they'll talk to anyone who has a security clearance and a desire to listen. As a matter of fact, they won't let you get away.

Administratively oriented criticisms

Critical comments in the area of administration, or making program decisions, can be summarized as follows:

"Aren't ready; wait until next year when things will be better."

Here is the administrator, either technically or politically motivated, who either wants to wait for the 1985 model or who is too tired to fight for what he believes is right. Perhaps he just doesn't want to risk his position by being a nonconformist in a bureaucratic world. Whatever he is, he is not doing a responsible, risk-taking, managerial job.

"It's too expensive."

Too expensive? Relative to what?

Individual nuclear aircraft will be more expensive than their individual chemical aircraft brothers, just as nuclear submarines are more expensive than conventional submarines. But the total cost of doing the overall larger and necessary job will be less through the nuclear application.

This is the gentleman who either doesn't understand the cost situation, or who equates a currently positive bank balance with lower overall, long-run costs. I will have more to say about this later.

"The other government agency hasn't made up its mind."

This is perhaps better described as the Alphonse-Gaston phenomena. It is the frame of mind which says that the only good decision is the unanimous decision. I firmly believe that many unanimous decisions, appropriately watered down and denatured to achieve unanimity, are the worst kinds of decisions. True, they are better than none at all, but unanimous decisions or "no decisions" appear to me to be the only kinds of decisions the ANP program has had.

"Government leadership on the program is too weak."

Here is a crackerjack. This is hard to believe but some Government representatives have actually withheld enthusiasm for the ANP program because they felt that the Government leadership on the program wasn't strong enough. I can only say: either discard the criticism or fix the situation; don't use it as a reason for continued vacillation.

Criticisms raise major questions of program administration

All of these critical comments raise major questions.

It is evident that little understanding exists, that there are overlaps in responsibility and authority, that people have decided that it is much more politically comfortable to be against something or to be silent than it is to have faith and conviction and to fight for what they believe.

Let's take a look at some of these national problems of administering the U.S.-ANP program.

V. THE NATIONAL PROBLEMS OF ADMINISTERING THE U.S.-ANP PROGRAM

Many administrative problems of the U.S.-ANP program tend to be peculiar to it, and to it alone. These are disturbing.

Many additional problems of the U.S.-ANP program are shared with many other national defense programs. In that these have an even larger effect, they are even more disturbing.

We are trying to compete technologically with inadequate attention to the creaking administrative system for doing the competitive technological job. Our administrative machinery must be as up-to-date as the technology which it energizes.

Let's take a look at some of this machinery.

Problems peculiar to the ANP program

Those major administrative problems which tend to be peculiar to the ANP program can be described as follows:

Multiple Offices, Agencies, and Departments

I would conservatively estimate that there are well over 60 separate and effectively independent offices, agencies, and departments in the U.S. Government which have a measurable influence over the rate of progress of the ANP program. While there is currently existing an ANP office, its relative authority falls far short of that necessary to accomplish the job.

For example, in addition to the ANP office, there are:

1. The AEC (including the Division of Reactor Development, multiple staff groups, various committees, etc.).
2. The USAF (including the Air Research and Development Comamnd, the Air Materiel Command, the Strategic Air Command, at least 15 different staff groups, various committees, study groups, etc.).
3. The USN (including the Bureau of Aeronautics, the Office of Naval Research, staff groups, committees, etc.).
4. The DOD (including the Deputy Secretary and his office, essentially all of the Assistant Secretaries and their offices, various staff groups, committees, study groups, etc.).
5. The NASA (NACA)—(I haven't figured this one out yet).
6. The Bureau of the Budget.
7. The Central Intelligence Agency.

Conflicts From the Contributing Government Departments

In the case of the Air Force, the issue is mostly a question of decisionmaking and delegating authorities to do the job. In many major respects, the decision mechanisms (even for many minor matters) only reside at the very top of the USAF organization. This means that even if major policy decisions are made, many of the individual implementing decisions either have to go bubbling back to the top or be laboriously handled through satellite staff or administrative offices.

The contributions of the Atomic Energy Commission have been very real and valuable. Although the AEC also suffers occasionally from bureaucratic strangulation, you can usually count on them to make a real college try. The AEC's responsibility, however, has been greatly complicated by the problems which the Air Force has had in making up its mind in the face of severe budgetary pressures.

The Navy definitely wants a nuclear aircraft program. But unless they can have a nuclear aircraft as soon or sooner than the Air Force, I am convinced that they will do everything in their power to destroy the Air Force program.

No Strong Governmental Program Leadership

The issues of multiple offices, agencies, and departments and conflicts from contributing departments would be less severe were the ANP program vigorously led by a program manager with appropriately delegated responsibilities and authorities. This has not been the case.

With all due respect to Maj. Gen. D. J. Keirn, he has not received necessary support and authority to do the job (regardless of various surface changes made).

Even if he had received such delegations, however, he is too much of a gentleman to knock heads together when the going gets tough.

With so many different people going in so many different directions, somebody has to be able to say follow me and keep in line.

Problems shared with other defense programs

There are other administrative problems which the nuclear-aircraft program shares with other defense programs. Since some of these are fairly well understood, I will only comment on those which appear to me to need some more understanding.

Remote Decision-Makers Have Meant the Usual (Easy Way Out) Use of Review Committees

The problem here is that most, if not all, review committees are also remote. How a group of men can spend 2 to 4 hours—at intervals of 18 to 24 months—talking with the people who are doing the job—and then say they have reviewed the program is beyond my understanding.

Depending upon their length of time in their positions, most committee members are previously committeed to the support of other programs. Since these members are well aware of the pressures of funding, they are not going to support anything which looks as though it will steal support from something they feel they have already staked their reputations on.

Many committee members are simultaneously in other positions, either in Government or industry, where they can advance competing or delaying proposals of their own. Don't misunderstand; most competition is a good thing. It is just that here is an avenue for the guy who says, "Why don't you do it my way?" He can really delay decisions; after all, he is a member of the committee who will review the new idea he has just proposed.

There are those who say that the use of review committees is a fundamental part of the process of democratic government. This is hard to defend; we had democratic government long before we had review committees. The use of such committees is, in my opinion, a fundamental symptom of faulty organization. If policymakers are so enmeshed that they can't get closer to their decisionmaking job, then their positions are too big and should be split into smaller responsibilities. Adding extra layers of organization doesn't help either, and there are plenty of them.

High Security Classifications and Multiple Security Systems

It should be no surprise that the extent and height of security classification would come under criticism. Enough has been said about this elsewhere.

What is even more difficult to understand is why we continue to need both a military-security system and an atomic-energy security system. They duplicate one another in the military reactor field and only manage to get in one another's way to the detriment of everything else.

Excessive Checks and Balances

Many laws passed by Congress and many other administrative laws created and installed by Government agencies are based upon the premise that it would be horrendous for anybody to make a mistake. Mistakes must be prevented.

The result is that we now have erected an enormous, overlapping, and detailed system which goes significantly beyond the original intent of checks and balances and effectively achieves partial strangulation. Harmful program delays are inevitable.

The Tremendously Large Number of People Who Can Say "No" and the Effective Absence of Anyone Who Can Say "Yes"

I believe that I have adequately commented on this subject on previous pages. It is a shorthand description common to many of our major administrative problems: Extreme competition among the military services; absence of vision re something different, the solutions to problems and the predictable future; complacency re the Soviet threat; the concept of business as usual.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

In consideration of what I have already said, my recommendations should come as no surprise.

The United States desperately needs and must regain the initiative in all fields. In the military area, initiative should be equated to the concept of mobility and mobile forces, as opposed to relying almost solely on static concepts.

The United States should adopt the nuclear aircraft as one prime contributor to the operating concept of mobility; the implementation of this decision requires at this time: (1) The strengthening of Government program leadership in the nuclear-aircraft field; (2) growth in support for the powerplant program; (3) initiation of the prototype airframe program.

VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In closing, I want to quote some extremely pertinent remarks by others on the general question of the defense posture of the United States.

Early in 1958, the Rockefeller report (from panel II) on "International Security—The Military Aspect," had this to say:

1. "The basic requirement * * * is a retaliatory force so well protected and numerous that it can overcome any defense."
2. "The hard core of this striking force, whether based at home or overseas, must be continuously alert, fully armed, and as secure as we can make it against destruction or neutralization by surprise attack."
3. "It is therefore imperative that * * * we develop units which can intervene rapidly and which are able to make their power felt with discrimination and versatility."
4. "Accelerated research and development support should be provided for all key programs including missiles and advanced reconnaissance systems."
5. "The panel is convinced * * * that * * * increases in defense expenditures are essential and fully justified. * * * We can afford to survive."
6. "When the security of the United States and of the free world is at stake, cost cannot be the basic consideration. The cold war cannot be won and a hot war cannot be avoided without a major effort. This is clearly not the time for complacency. * * * What is required throughout the country is an attitude of sustained and informed determination."

Late in 1958, the nonpartisan, nonpolitical National Planning Association issued a significant warning:

"The dismal fact is that unless the United States takes many measures not contemplated in its present military program, the moment is approaching when (the assumption that United States retaliatory power is an effective deterrent to Soviet military action) will have losts its validity. * * * If steps are not promptly taken vastly to strengthen American retaliatory capability, the Soviet Union in the not distant future will be in a position, by the use of ICBM's and IRBM's armed with thermonuclear warheads, to inflict so strong a blow on SAC bases in the United States and Europe that retaliation by the United States would be held within limits acceptable to the Soviet Union."

Any feeling of complacency in this defense area must be based upon a judgment that (1) communism is self-destructive; (2) an internal collapse of the Soviet system is inevitable; (3) only reasonable retaliatory strength is required.

I cannot identify any compelling evidence which supports this judgment.

I am sure, however, that the overwhelming majority of Americans are behind you in the mounting battle to balance the national budget. I believe that your leadership in the fight to eliminate deficit financing makes a real contribution to the noninflationary economic growth required over the next decade.

The problem then is one of making choices.

The Rockefeller report (from panel IV) on "The Challenge to America: Its Economic

and Social Aspects" emphasized this problem of choice—concluding that the United States could afford all defense essential for survival if it decided to do so.

In my opinion, the real danger lies in an underestimation of the American people. They are willing to pay for more national security, even if this means reduced Government services in other less immediate areas.

The proposed Federal budget for fiscal year 1960 has already taken at least part of this willingness into account.

But does it go far enough?

I cannot help but conclude that it does not. I believe that an overwhelming majority of American citizens would prefer to be absolutely sure that the amount of national defense available is adequate for security, rather than risk even a momentary period of potential collapse in retaliatory deterrent.

The nuclear-aircraft program can help to prevent this potential collapse.

Respectfully,

JOHN W. DARLEY, Jr.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *January 14, 1959.*

A Program of Action for the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, several weeks before this 86th Congress convened on January 7, I received a letter from the social relations group of the First Unitarian Church of Toledo, a group of high-minded, forward-looking men and women who take their responsibilities as American citizens very seriously, as indeed they should.

The letter told how shortly after the elections in November this earnest group had carefully reviewed the national scene and compiled a comprehensive legislative program of congressional action to effectively meet the present needs of America.

Their program objectives fall into three main groupings: The first envisages some changes in congressional procedures to permit affirmative majority action; the second relates to recommended congressional action to improve the national economy and the general welfare, while the third aims at ameliorating American foreign relations.

With respect to the work ahead for the 86th Congress, their program impressed me as one of the best of its kind that I had ever seen, perhaps because it reflects a good many ideas and objectives which I share and which I know many of my colleagues also share.

I include the letter here and respectfully commend it to your thoughtful attention:

THE SOCIAL RELATIONS GROUP,
THE FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH,
Toledo, Ohio, November 25, 1958.

Representative THOMAS LUDLOW ASHLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASHLEY: It seems appropriate that our group should frame and present to the administration and to the elected Representatives and Senators who will be present at the opening of the congressional term the first week in January, 1959, an expression of our thinking in the areas of work ahead for the Members of the 86th Congress.

At his post-election press conference President Eisenhower asked, commendably, what the public wanted. It is our firm conviction that those who feel their obligations as voters, and envisage to the best of their ability from study and research what needs to be done, should make their views known to their leadership.

We have worked out this statement of the needs of America as we see them and wish respectfully to present it before the opening of the 86th Congress. The following comments relate to three principal divisions of interest, and do not attempt to cover the entire subject:

1. Changes in congressional procedures to permit affirmative majority action.

(a) Provide for majority cloture in the Senate. (Senate Rule 22 which permits unlimited debate and filibusters has been the major stumbling block to action on civil rights legislation, welfare measures, school construction, etc.)

(b) Restore the 21-day rule in the House. (In 1949 the House voted to let any bill be brought up on the floor if it had been before the Rules Committee for as long as 21 days. This 21-day rule was rescinded after the election of 1950. The 85th Congress ended with several bills such as the $2.5 billion housing bill, authorization for self-financing of TVA, etc., unconsidered because the committee would not grant them rules.)

(c) An expanded and more representative Rules Committee. (Six votes of the 12-man Rules Committee are enough to prevent a measure from coming to a vote on the floor. Moreover, by the operation of the seniority system the present Rules Committee has become controlled by an entrenched sectional block.)

2. The national economy and the general welfare.

(a) Upward revision of social security benefits to include housing for the aged and medical care.

(b) Increased initiation of activity emanating from the Attorney General's office.

(c) Federal aid to public education including school construction, teachers' pay, increased attention to vocational education, and the training of farm youth.

(d) Adoption by Congress of such measures as the community facilities bill, area redevelopment programs, public services of all sorts.

(e) Control of inflation, practical plans for adjusting U.S. economy to genuine disarmament.

(f) Improved civil rights legislation to insure equal opportunity for all our citizens and equal protection by the laws.

(g) Improved channeling of information on governmental activities to the public: "letting the people know."

3. Foreign affairs.

(a) Development of an economic aid program to help prevent the increase in anti-Americanism among the common peoples that has grown by our military support of dictatorships in Formosa, Thailand, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Morocco and Spain. Half of the $30 billion that we have spent militarily in the last 10 years in these countries, if diverted to economic development would have created miracles in improved living conditions, education, and a more stable political rule in each country.

(b) Supporting of the seating of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and then the channeling of the disputes with this country through the good offices of the United Nations.

(c) Making it imperative that all international questions be taken to the United Nations. The United States must display more confidence in the ability of other nations to decide international affairs. The miracle that Abdel Khalik Hassouna performed in the Mid East crisis is an example.

(d) Full support financially and technically to India in these last 2 years of her second 5-year period. In its role as a key country in the Far East, Indian is of vital importance to the Free World. It is in our own self-interest to help maintain a free and independent India.

(e) Developing of an effective program of world disarmament to include the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. The United States should redirect the use of its vast resources toward positive peaceful purposes rather than toward deterrence.

Respectfully yours,

ADRIENNE C. CURTIS,
Secretary.

Address Delivered at the Commissioning of the U.S.S. "Claud Jones" (DE–1033) by Rear Admiral John S. Thach, U.S. Navy, on Tuesday, February 10, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 10, 1959, I had the privilege of attending the ceremony when the U.S.S. *Claud Jones* was commissioned at the U.S. Naval Base, Charleston, S.C., by Rear Adm. John S. Thach, USN. Admiral Thach, who is commander of Carrier Division 16, has flown all types of naval aircraft, including heavy multiengined patrol bombers and high performance fighters. During World War II he developed what was known as the "Thach weave" and evolved the theory that a two plane fighter formation was superior to the old, established, three-plane formation. He is a distinguished leader and has one of the most stupendous jobs in the world, that of defending our shores from attack by enemy submarines. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include the speech made at the commissioning ceremony by Admiral Thach:

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE COMMISSIONING OF THE U.S.S. "CLAUD JONES" (DE–1033) BY REAR ADM. JOHN S. THACH, U.S. NAVY

It's a pleasure and an honor to be present today as a new antisubmarine vessel joins the fleet. This ship is a most welcome addition to our antisubmarine forces, and as the first of a new class of ocean escorts, her performance will in many ways influence the course of antisubmarine defense for years to come. It is significant that she bears the name of *Claud A. Jones,* for there is a striking similarity between her mission of convoy escort and the career of Admiral Jones, who worked so diligently to improve the ships of our Navy. He was not rewarded by public acclaim, but, rather, by that inner realization of a job well done, which was exemplified in the steady material improvement of the fleet. Long hours, hard work, and competence were the ingredients of Admiral Jones career. Such is the stuff of which convoy escort is made.

Today there is not the distinction between peace and war that existed during Admiral Jones' lifetime. Conflicts between nations now cover a wide spectrum, ranging from political maneuvering through an infinite variety of cold war and limited war situations, up to all-out war and mutual suicide at the extreme end of the scale. This extreme of total war and mutual suicide is the least probable situation, but within the range of cold and of limited wars we may struggle for a long time to come.

The United States is an island, and transocean transport is her life's blood. Of this overseas transport, ships are responsible for more than 99 percent of the commercial and military tonnage. This is true because there is no other practical way it can be done. Not only is the United States economy dependent upon this vital sealift but so is the economy of her Allies. We must have a strong antisubmarine warfare force to protect these vital sealanes from any airborne or subsurface threat.

This ship commences her naval career at a critical time. For at this time we are just becoming fully aware of the threat to our national security posed by the Soviet fleet of 450 submarines. In addition to the threat to our shipping, our cities may already be on the Communist submarine target list. Our population centers are at point blank range. To a 1,500-mile missile, not a single square inch of the United States is immune to attack.

The U.S.S. *Jones* will meet her test at a time when the submarine can go deeper, can stay submerged longer and need only reveal itself at the time of launching a missile. The ASW mission of protecting our shipping remains as vital as ever but now there has been superimposed on this mission the necessity of finding and keeping under surveillance every potentially hostile submarine that comes within missile range. This we must do during the current cold war and if we do it well enough, the cold war will never get hot.

As Admiral Jones devoted his life to improving the capabilities of the Navy, as he proved his courage in peacetime disaster; so this ship, his namesake, and her sister ships, may perform a similar mission by developing and improving our antisubmarine defense to the ultimate level required for us to maintain true control of the seas.

So to the commanding officer, the officers and men of this fine ship I wish to express my congratulations. You will be shouldering a great responsibility. To discharge it will require hard work, but from your efforts, and from the efforts of all of us in ASW can come the necessary contribution to the Navy's vital role in the defense of our country.

Herman P. Eberharter

SPEECH
OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House, and especially the Members of the Pennsylvania delegation, were immeasurably saddened when we heard of the untimely passing of our distinguished colleague from Pittsburgh. We paused in that sad hour and recalled his long years of service in this body and the outstanding contribution he had made in our unending quest for a solution to the tax problems confronting our Nation.

The fact remains, however, that our estimate of a colleague's work in most cases rests on our day-by-day observation and how he conducts himself when on the legislation firing line. In HERMAN EBERHARTER'S case, the highest accolade we can award him is to point out that never, even under the most severe provocation, was he observed to desert the role of gentleman which he played to the last.

His latter years in the public service were made doubly arduous due to the loss of his helpmate, who preceded him in death, and his own physical impairment. It can be said of this lovable colleague, however, that he accepted these burdens with a light heart and a cheerful mien, and no one can recall meeting him without receiving a cordial greeting and the firm handclasp of friendship.

Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to the members of his family who are left to mourn his passing, and it is our prayerful hope that they will be comforted by the assurance that we, his colleagues, mourn with them and for them.

James V. Bennett, Director of Federal Bureau of Prisons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 20, the President of the United States presented medals to five distinguished public servants for their contribution to the country in the Federal civilian service. Each of these men has provided a lifetime of leadership in his particular field. I should like to make reference to one recipient of this award, and I single him out only because I have known and worked with him on a close personal basis.

He is James V. Bennett, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. I knew, and had a daily working relationship with Jim Bennett, during the period in 1955 and 1956 when I was executive assistant to the Attorney General of the United States.

Jim Bennett's contribution to the country, and indeed to a great many other countries, cannot be overstated. He has been a credit to several administrations. He is a recognized world authority on the subject of penology. Anyone who has seen the results of his work, firsthand, cannot help but be impressed at the progress that has been made under his leadership. I would guess that no single service in the Federal system has a higher esprit de corps than the prison service despite the lesser pay scale under which it operates compared to some others. This is due almost entirely to Jim Bennett. I have visited three of the Federal institutions and in each place saw examples and evidences of the Bennett touch. The respect for him among the inmates of all Federal institutions is a further example of the model way in which this aspect of the Federal service is managed. The country owes a vote of thanks to Jim Bennett.

A Killer Is on the Loose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert an article entitled "Crusade for Safety," written by Mr. Maurice R. Shochatt, executive secretary of the Safety First Club of Maryland. This article appeared in the February edition of the Baltimore Beacon, of which Mr. Shochatt is the editor and publisher.

The Safety First Club of Maryland, of which I am a member, is a nonprofit organization dedicated to traffic safety. It was organized on February 13, 1956, in Baltimore, with the premise that "Traffic Safety Is Everybody's Business."

Under the able leadership of Mr. J. O. Shuger, the club's president, the organization has enlisted the cooperation of outstanding safety leaders to serve as members of its advisory board and provide guidance in its program. Members of this board include leaders in the business, industrial, and professional spheres in Baltimore City.

The club will extend recognition to personalities who have made contributions in the field of traffic safety at its third annual Wheelmaster banquet to be held in Baltimore on April 14, 1959.

The text of the article is as follows:

CRUSADE FOR SAFETY

(By Maurice R. Shochatt)

A KILLER ON THE LOOSE

He is brutal, savage, cruel. He strikes on the streets, highways, and country lanes. He is within striking distance of each and everyone of us 24 hours around the clock. He's not the type of killer who skulks, lurking in the shadows, fearful and apprehensive when people are around him. In fact, he stalks boldly about—destroying, smashing, and maiming and adding to his long list of victims every hour, every minute, every second.

People are aware of his presence; yet ignore him and, at times, even play dangerous games with him. He never loses, but they always do. He has an inexorable record that neither time nor tide will halt. His devilish game of death and destruction can be predicted, but seemingly cannot be halted or deterred. He snatches a victim every 13 minutes in the United States of America. That doomed victim never returns to the land of the living. He injures a man, a woman, or child in the United States of America every 23 seconds. He is "Murder, Incorporated" of the 20th century. He is the modern monster of death on the highways.

The grim statistics show that 1,081,600 people lost their lives in the United States of America between January 1, 1925 and January 1, 1958, according to the to the National Safety Council.

In Maryland, the traffic toll for 1957 was 552 fatalities; while 504 persons lost their lives in 1958.

According to the Evening Sun of Baltimore the Nation's 1958 automobile driving records, in brief, are estimated thus: 40,000 killed, 10 million accidents, 2,500,000 persons injured, 20 million traffic court cases, and $7 billion economic loss.

Now compare that record with our three recent wars.

In World War I, the United States had 126,000 fatalities, and 234,300 were wounded in the 2 years of that conflict.

During the 4 years of World War II, 407,828 were killed and 670,000 wounded.

In the Korean war from 1950 to 1953, a total of 25,604 Americans were killed, 7,955 listed as missing, and 103,284 were wounded.

"Murder, Incorporated" of the highways must be arrested. All citizens should join the crusade for safety to protect their own lives, their dear ones, their neighbors, their fellow Americans.

Where Do We Stand on Water Rights?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent speech entitled "Where Do We Stand on Water Rights?" This speech was given at the joint commodity, land, and water conference of the American Farm Bureau Federation on December 8, 1958, in Boston, Mass., by Charles Butler, director of land and water use, American Farm Bureau Federation. This speech helped show the alarming possibility which could result from Federal encroachment on established State water rights:

I believe we stand in an extremely precarious position, one from which we could easily and quickly slip to complete Federal control of our water resources. No doubt many of you are thinking: "How could that possibly be true?"

To properly understand what has taken place in the field of water rights it is necessary to review some of our Nation's history.

I like to think that the men who framed our Constitution were political philosophers who had studied the lessons of history—and that upon this background they devised a basic concept to insure the survival of liberty in this Nation.

Their training, experience, and divine guidance told them that liberty could not survive the concentration of power in a strong centralized government, and so they wrote into our Constitution, as clearly as they knew how, the concept that political power should be diffused among the Federal Government and the States by reserving to the States those governmental powers not specifically allotted to the Federal Government.

This political system survived as its authors intended until the thirties and forties of this century. It was then that the protection of the Constitution against excessive concentration of political and economic power was smitten, first by the U.S. Supreme Court to be followed by actions of the Justice Department. It was during this period, when the Socialist-Communist centralization philosophy began to seriously influence our Federal Government, that the Federal supremacy theory in water was advanced. With the implementation of this doctrine no right to the use of water in the United States is safe from Federal preemption.

For over 75 years prior to this period, the citizens of our country living in States where a definite system of water laws has developed, have thought that the State, as trustee for all the people, holds title to the water in the streams. They have never thought it was intended that the reserved rights of the States could be invaded by the U.S. Supreme Court by changing the definition of a navigable stream or by changing the definition of public lands. But that is exactly what has happened. This is how the Federal supremacy theory in water has been implemented.

Our concept of water right administration by the States was not pulled out of thin air. It was built upon judicial decisions of State and Federal courts, including decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court (prior to implementation of the Federal supremacy theory) and upon numerous laws passed by the Congress.

Prior to the passage of any Federal laws relating to the administration of water rights, a definite system of water law had already been formulated by various judicial decisions. The fundamental principles of many of these decisions are still recognized as basic water law.

In 1866 Congress passed the first Federal legislation ratifying the principle of State administration of water rights which had been developed to date in accordance with local customs.

In 1870 Congress reaffirmed its position taken in the act of 1866. Seven years later, in 1877, Congress passed the Desert Land Act which definitely reaffirmed the rights of the States to legislate on all matters concerning nonnavigable waters within their borders. In a discussion of this act the U.S. Supreme Court said, that all nonnavigable waters should be reserved for use of the public under laws of the States. The Court made similar statements on a number of other occasions during this period.

From these citations it can definitely be seen that by 1878 a new body of water law had been recognized by the Congress and the Supreme Court and reserved for State administration. Some students of this subject claim that there have been at least 17 congressional acts and at least an equal number of Supreme Court decisions to support State administration and control of water rights.

A number of years rolled by with the development of the Nation's water resources rapidly taking place. Little thought or question was given to the State's authority in water rights. Then came the 1930's and 1940's with the tremendous increase in the powers of the Federal Government.

Those who were ready, willing, and anxious to increase the powers of the Federal Government, and to form a strong centralized government, looked to the field of water resources with an envious eye—here was a fertile field in which to assert more Federal control.

The federalizers started their activities in the field of navigable waters. They well realized that in this area lie the main restrictions on State control of water because of the powers which the Constitution had conferred on Congress to regulate commerce and control navigable waters.

The Supreme Court gave the federalizers the cue when they said that the Federal Government holds a "dominant servitude" on waters of navigable streams, and that if the Federal Government chooses private rights initiated under State law for use of such water can be wiped out without payment of compensation.

Other Supreme Court decisions further implemented the Federal supremacy theory in water, including the famous Appalachian Power case in Virginia and the First Iowa case.

In the former case the Supreme Court simply adopted a new definition of a navigable stream, which extended Federal control to any stream which might by reasonable improvements be made navigable, even though such improvements were never actually compelled or even authorized.

Under this definition, it is literally possible for a mountain torrent to be classed as a navigable stream.

The net effect of these decisions is that Federal control has not only been extended to the top of the watershed, but also to the entire watershed, which includes your farm and mine.

Why were such decisions handed down? At this time the federalizers realized that it would be most difficult to upset the acts of 1866, 1870, 1877, and the supporting Supreme Court decisions which took nonnavigable waters out of Federal control unless they took advantages of conditions in the East, South, and Middle West. They took this advantage by changing the definition of navigability, and this is why these areas are so extremely vital in the whole question of water-policy and water-right legislation.

By extending Federal control of water to the entire watershed, the federalizers calculated to destroy the authority of the States to claim title to the waters in all streams.

By 1955 the federalizers had found a way to directly upset the congressional acts of 1866, 1870, and 1877, and the Supreme Court decisions supporting these acts. They accomplished this in the now famous Pelton Dam case in Oregon, where the U.S. Supreme Court simply referred to most of our public lands as "reserved lands." By this decision it was held that the acts of Congress and decisions of the Supreme Court under which western water law was established had no application to "reserved lands."

This doctrine of Federal supremacy in water, as now expressed by the Supreme Court and supported by the Justice Department, is exceptionally dangerous because it has the elements of authoritarianism as the supreme law of the land.

These Court decisions bring up the question of the importance of "settled law." Abraham Lincoln defined "settled law" as something that had been affirmed and reaffirmed in decisions for years afterwards.

It seems that on the basis of the many congressional acts and Supreme Court decisions relative to State administration of water rights prior to the 1930's that State control of water and water rights should be a matter of "settled law."

How important is settled law to the future of our Nation? Former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Edward D. White, wrote in 1895:

"Teach the lesson that settled principles may be overthrown at any time and confusion and turmoil must ultimately result. * * * Break down this belief and let it be felt that on great contsitutional questions this Court is to depart from the settled conclusions of its predecessors, and to determine them all according to the mere opinions of those who temporarily fill its benches, and our Constitution will, in my judgment, be bereft of its value and become a most dangerous instrument to the rights and liberties of the people."

Is it possible that we have now reached the stage described by Justice White 63 years ago? One cannot help but wonder when an analysis is made of some of the recent decisions of the Court as they relate to our water resources.

Perhaps you are saying to yourself, "Federal supremacy is nothing more than a theory; it has no application to me; no rights have been threatened or destroyed in my

area." Let us look at the record and then make a decision.

Soon after the Supreme Court's decision in the Pelton Dam case the so-called Hawthorne case broke into the news. Adjacent to the town of Hawthorne in the State of Nevada, the Navy Department operates an ammunition depot on reserved Federal lands. At the time of the Pelton decision, the Navy Department was in the process of applying to the State for a water right to make use of underground water. Following the Pelton decision the Justice Department advised the Navy that it was not necessary for them to obtain a water right under State law since the ammunition depot was located on reserved land.

In compliance with the advice of the Justice Department the Navy withdrew its application for a water right and proceeded to use water to which the town of Hawthorne held a prior right. This case was before the United States district court, and on August 27, 1958, the U.S. district judge ruled that the Federal Government did not have to comply with State water laws; in other words, a decision supporting the contention of the Justice Department.

This is an excellent example of the Federal supremacy theory in action and may have even more far-reaching effects on State control of water than previous decisions since groundwater is the main source of the base flow of streams.

The Justice Department's apparent determination to subordinate private water rights to Federal authority is clearly evident in the Santa Margarita case in southern California. This case has been before the Federal courts in California for the past several years, however, in the spring of 1958 it came to a very serious point.

The controversy over the rights to the use of water in the Santa Margarita River started during World War II when the Federal Government purchased the Santa Margarita ranch as the site for Camp Pendleton, a Marine Corps base. The ranch was not an irrigated area, and the question immediately developed as to the amount of water than went with the land.

Starting in April of this year the Justice Department, through United States marshals, started serving summonses to thousands of landowners and water users in the entire area to prevent their continued use of water rights which had been established for many years under California laws. The summonses were served during all hours of the day and night. Many farmers were awakened in the middle of the night to be served with a summons about the size of the old Sears, Roebuck & Co. catalog, a document which few of them understood.

The suit in which these summonses were served, asked the Federal district court to rule that all the rights to the use of water asserted by the defendants are subject and subordinate to the right of the Federal Government to the continued and undiminished flow of the river, including the rights to underground water. In other words, the Justice Department asked the Court to stop all water users from their continued use of both surface and underground water. Do you realize what this means to farmers in a desert area? What will happen to property values in the Santa Margarita Valley if the request of the Justice Department is upheld?

Each defendant was informed that unless he answered the complaint within 20 days, his right to assert any claim to the use of water would be gone forever.

It is extremely difficult to believe that such a thing as is presently going on in the Santa Margarita Basin could happen in America—that an individual's right to the use of water, a right which had been lawfully acquired under laws of the State, can be claimed by an all-powerful Federal Government without payment of compensation to the individual water users. But it has happened within the past few months; it is the cold, hard facts of the Federal supremacy theory in water.

The Federal supremacy theory in water again raised its ugly head in consideration of Corps of Engineers authorization bill, S. 497, of the 85th Congress. This was the bill to authorize new rivers and harbor and flood control projects estimated to cost $1,600 million. The President vetoed this bill twice and after it was revised and passed by Congress for the third time, the President signed it into law.

The bill which was vetoed on May 15 of this year extended to the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation an extraordinary delegation of congressional authority for water storage to regulate low flow and for present and anticipated future demands for municipal and industrial water. The text of the bill did not mention water rights in any manner. The American Farm Bureau Federation immediately became concerned because we saw in this authority the possibility of serious infringement upon individual water rights which had been obtained under State law.

Western State farm bureaus, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the National Reclamation Association contacted a number of Senators and requested that the controversial section, section 205, be amended by adding the phrase "and storage authorized under this section shall be used in compliance with applicable State water law and interstate compacts." A bipartisan group of 15 Senators presented this language to the Senate-House conferees. Naturally, the Corps of Engineers fought this type of an amendment because they are not used to being hampered by State laws. However, the real resistance to this suggested amendment came from the Justice Department.

This simple, clearly stated amendment was rejected by the conferees who in lieu added the following language: "Nor shall any storage provided under the provisions of this section be operated in such a manner as to adversely affect the lawful uses of water."

No one seemed to really understand the meaning of this ambiguous language. Some of the top lawyers in Washington commented that they could litigate over the meaning of this language for the next 50 years.

In an attempt to clarify the intent of the language Congressman ASPINALL, of Colorado, during a House floor debate on the bill, asked the floor leader, Congressman DAVIS of Tennessee, if the language meant that individual water rights obtained under State law were to be protected. Congressman DAVIS replied that that was exactly the meaning of the language. For some reason the reply of Congressman DAVIS was stricken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Could it be that the supporters of the Federal supremacy theory in water could not permit this kind of legislative history to hurt their cause?

Perhaps they couldn't take this chance and for that reason had the official record of the U.S. Congress stricken in their behalf.

The bill, therefore, emerged from Congress and was sent to the President with a clouded legislative history so far as this vital issue was concerned. The ambiguous language which had been substituted and the legislative history would have sustained the Justice Department in its contention that Federal projects may be constructed and operated without recognition of, or compensation for, the long-standing rights of water users to use water under rights established by State law.

This clear-cut invitation to disregard State law and private rights to the use of water established under State law, an invitation extended by the Justice Department, was too much for the American Farm Bureau Federation and, as a result, the President was requested to veto the bill. The President complied with this request on May 15.

There is yet another chapter to this story. When the revised Corps of Engineers authorization bill came up for consideration, the Senate bill had no reference to water rights. The House bill contained the same language relative to water rights which was in the bill vetoed by the President. Again, Congressman ASPINALL asked Congressman DAVIS, who was piloting the bill through the House, the meaning of the water-right language. Congressman DAVIS' reply indicated that individual water rights were to be protected under State laws. This was too much for the Justice Department, who immediately stepped in and demanded that no language with reference to water rights be included in the bill—and that's exactly what the Nation got.

Here you see unquestionable evidence of the Congress of the United States being forced to bow to the long-standing views of the judicial and Justice arms of the Government to the effect that the Federal Government should in no way and at no time bind itself to observe any rights of this kind. Again you see the Federal supremacy theory over water in action. Please keep in mind that this has just as much application to your area as it has to any other area in the United States.

Perhaps you are asking, "Is this a hopeless situation; have we gone so far down the road toward socialism as it relates to our water resources that there is no turning back, or is there a way to set at rest forever the dangerous doctrine of Federal supremacy as it relates to our water resources?"

This ridiculous situation relative to Federal control of water resources can be put to an end through Federal and State legislation. It must be remembered that there are few, if any congressional acts which definitely support the Federal supremacy theory. Actions in support of this theory are based on decisions of the Supreme Court and other lower Federal courts and Justice Department interpretations. Congress has the authority and the only authority to enact Federal legislation that will rout this dangerous theory.

One of the best methods of paving the way for passage of Federal legislation to protect individual water rights and State control of water resources would be the enactment of the States rights bill which was known as H.R. 3 in the 85th Congress. This bill was written to protect the States against Federal court decisions which have invalidated State laws in various fields under the preemption doctrine. Passage of this bill would underscore the rule, long ignored by the Federal courts and the Justice Department, that no Federal law or court decision takes priority over State law unless Congress decides that it should do so. The enactment of this bill was vigorously opposed by the Justice Department and the AFL–CIO during the 85th Congress.

The next step toward freedom from Federal control of water resources would be definite congressional legislation designed to establish the position of State governments in the control of water resources and the administration of water rights within their borders. Such legislation will be extremely difficult to enact because of the powerful opposition already in existence.

Each State can help put an end to the Federal supremacy theory in water by the enactment of State legislation providing for strong State department of water resources with authority for planning, construction, and operation of water resources projects. Such State legislation should not overlook provisions for the participation of local units of government in water resource development. Basic in any such legislation is the provision of a definite means whereby any individual water user may acquire a legal right to the use of water.

Why do the advocates of Federal supremacy so strongly support this theory? I am going to leave it up to you to answer that question. But I should like to remind you that we can have authoritarian laws and control in this country just as much as in Russia or Red China unless we assume our responsibilities to see that authoritative processes are used instead.

The Fiscal Tragedy of a Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues, as well as to other interested persons, an editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Star on February 12, 1959. It pertains to a matter which, in its implications, is of such vital importance to the future welfare of our great Nation that I believe it should receive the widest possible dissemination.

We find that the great State of Michigan is experiencing the most serious financial crisis in its history. The situation is directly attributable to the unsound policies pursued by the present State administration under the leadership of Gov. G. Mennen Williams and his political mentor, Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers Union.

Not only has Governor Williams spent every available dollar of State funds, but he has compounded the felony by driving taxpaying industrial concerns away from Michigan.

As the people of Michigan have learned, unrestrained spending by government can lead only to disaster. The lesson is clear and should not be lost upon those of us who have the responsibility of formulating Federal policies.

The editorial follows:

[From the Kansas City Star, Feb. 12, 1959]

THE FISCAL TRAGEDY OF A WELFARE STATE

Michigan is one of the wealthiest States in the Union. Its government is broke.

So the bubble of the welfare State bursts and as it does, we see a pointed lesson for the Nation. For the battle of the budget in Washington this year may determine whether the United States is to proceed further down the welfare path, or whether it is to regain its fiscal sanity.

The depth of the Michigan financial crisis is indicated by a recent desperation move by Gov. G. Mennen Williams. Politically underwritten by Walter Reuther of the United Auto Workers, Williams has created what many regard as a totally unfavorable climate for private business and industry. His chief targets have been the big corporations. Now he has appealed to 23 of the largest companies to pay their taxes in advance. Most have agreed.

And for the next fiscal year, the Governor has proposed sweeping new tax proposals that would include the State's first personal income tax. The people of Michigan are learning that even the welfare State cannot provide something for nothing.

A report on the Michigan crisis appears in the current U.S. News & World Report. Politically, the magazine may be guilty of some understatement when it merely says that the Williams administration "is closely alined with Walter Reuther, politically powerful head of the United Auto Workers." We have heard it stated more strongly. At least Williams seems to have accepted much of the Reuther philosophy of welfarism.

The result of that philosophy has been the creation of a State in virtual insolvency. U.S. News refers to the plight of the two big State universities which have been living on money borrowed from banks against tuition fees. It mentions the unpaid bills due contractors.

Through the dawning period of crisis, welfare roles have continued to grow. And certainly Detroit has been the city hardest hit by the recession. In January unemployment was 11 percent. The impact of the business slowdown has been used to rationalize the fiscal crisis in the Williams government. It has been a factor. So has a large population influx. And inflation.

But two basic factors existed long before the recession struck. One was the statist philosophy that created expenditures far in excess of income. Paradoxically, the Michigan Legislature has been willing to go along with spending programs but not with revenue schemes.

Yet the drift of the Reuther-Williams tax line is to take the money out of the hide of business. That is the second large factor behind Michigan's troubles. U.S. News quotes the mayor of a Detroit suburb who pointed out that a large steel company decided against locating there because it didn't like "the political and industrial climate of Michigan." Since 1947 only 30 of the 100 new factories built by the Big Three of the car industry have been located in Michigan.

We see here an immediate moral for the other States. With a better climate for industry, Michigan might have created the new job opportunities that would have taken up some of the slack when motorcar employment fell off. But the lesson for all the American people is even more obvious.

It is particularly pointed when you recall the recent testimony of Walter Reuther before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress. Reuther is the dominant spirit behind the Michigan welfare state. In Washington, Reuther spoke in terms that must have been all too familiar to Michigan.

He called for wage and price increases, a boost in the minimum wage, Federal aid to depressed areas, higher unemployment compensation benefits, stepped-up defense expenditures, more foreign aid, aid to education, and other spending.

We don't know how carefully the Senators and Representatives were listening. But we do know that the Federal Government is piling up a deficit of $12 billion this fiscal year. Strong forces in Congress and in the Nation regard a balanced budget as unimportant. They think that Uncle, too, can exist indefinitely with a philosophy of "spend, spend, spend."

In effect, they are beating the drums for what Reuther was suggesting, without using the precise phrase: "The welfare state."

And in Michigan, the myth of the welfare state has been exploded.

Mr. Speaker, as a further extension of my remarks, I am including the article from U.S. News and World Report of February 13, 1959, to which reference is made in the editorial appearing above. This analysis of the extremely difficult problem confronting the people of Michigan is excellent and I commend it to the attention of all.

The article follows:

A WELFARE STATE RUNS INTO TROUBLE

G. Mennen Williams, now in his 11th year as Governor of the great industrial State of Michigan, saw his State come to the end of its financial road last week. The Governor was forced to appeal to the corporations that he has often fought for money with which to meet the State payroll.

Governor Williams frequently is spoken of as one of the hopefuls for the 1960 Democratic presidential nomination. People of Michigan six times have voted him their chief executive. The Governor is famed as a liberal. His administration is closely alined with Walter Reuther, politically powerful head of the United Auto Workers.

When the money ran out, however, it was the corporations which came to the aid of the State with advance payment of taxes. The Governor appealed to 23 of the State's largest employers to pay taxes early and help ease the financial plight. Most agreed to do so.

OVERDUE OBLIGATIONS

The State's finances had reached the point of crisis. The University of Michigan and Michigan State University received their last payments from the State last November. Both were living on money borrowed from banks against student fees. The banks were unwilling to lend more.

The State fell 3 months behind in payments into its teachers' retirement fund. Bills due contractors in some instances went unpaid. There was a question where money could be found to meet State payrolls. Interest payments of $15 million are due on the State debt March 15, with no clear indication of where the money will come from. A payment of $34.5 million is due on a school fund in May.

Through it all, checks went regularly to those on relief—and welfare rolls continued to swell as unemployment spread through Detroit and many other industrial areas of the State. More than 11 percent of the State's labor force was jobless in January, according to estimates by the Michigan Bureau of Employment Security.

Michigan, in other words, suddenly found that, while it was continuing to spend freely, it had run out of money to meet its bills. Spending from the State's general fund ran ahead of income by $21 million in the fiscal year ended last June 30. A deficit of $89 million is estimated for the current fiscal year.

A JUGGLING ACT

As the State's financial crisis deepened in recent months, Michigan officials searched for new ways to raise additional cash.

Last year, for example, the State government liquidated one of its assets by transferring $19 million, representing liquor inventories held by State-owned liquor stores, to the credit of its general fund. The State also drew down $10 million from a special fund for soldiers' bonuses and from other funds set aside for the redemption of bonds.

This fiscal juggling brought in an extra $29 million of nonrecurring income, but that was still not enough to meet demands for cash. Money went out faster than it came in.

PLEA FOR TAX BOOSTS

As one way out of the financial crisis, Governor Williams last week asked the legislature to boost taxes by 18 percent over what was collected in 1958. He called for enactment of the State's first income tax, and for increases in other taxes that would bring in, all told, an additional $140 million a year.

Included in the Williams tax proposals are some that are certain to run into heavy opposition among Michigan taxpayers and businessmen: a graduated tax on personal incomes, a flat 5 percent tax on corporation

incomes, and a 7 percent tax on the income of banks and other financial institutions.

Meanwhile, as a stopgap measure, the Governor has asked the legislature to mortgage the veterans' trust fund, which now contains securities valued at around $38 million. If the legislators approve, these securities could be used as collateral to secure loans.

SPENDING AS USUAL

In the face of the present cash crisis, the Governor's budget for the fiscal year to start next July 1 calls for still higher spending, over and above that for the present year. He has asked additional outlays centering chiefly on education and mental health programs, and a pay boost for State employees. These would increase the State's general fund expenditures from a current annual rate of $380 million to a rate of $424 million in the coming year. For new public works spending—which lately has been cut sharply—Mr. Williams proposes that the legislature create a State building authority, empowered to issue revenue bonds.

A LONG-TERM PROBLEM

How did Michigan get into its present plight? Look back at the record, and you see that the State's troubles have been years in the making.

For one thing, over the past decade—the years in which the Williams administration has been in office—total State spending has gone up from about $500 million annually to more than $1 billion.

State financial officials say that inflation and the increase in Michigan population have accounted for about half that rise. The other $250 million increase in spending is accounted for by new State services, improvements in old ones, or by a shift in costs from local areas to the State treasury.

For another thing, new revenues coming into the State treasury have not kept pace with the rise in spending. Over the years, Governor Williams has sought approval from the legislature for higher taxes. But the legislators, while generally going along with higher spending have not been eager to provide additional taxes.

A DOUBLE-EDGED RECESSION

Meanwhile, revenues from existing taxes have declined recently because of the recession in business. Sales-tax collections, the largest single source of revenue, fell off. The estimate of revenue from this tax for the current fiscal year had been $323 million. Now the estimate has been reduced to $296 million.

As auto plants and other factories began to lay off workers, welfare costs began to rise. These costs put a heavy drain on State revenues. Normally, the State pays 30 percent of general relief costs, cities and towns 70 percent. Recently the State has shouldered the entire cost in Detroit and some other areas because the local governments ran out of funds.

FRONT RUNNER IN WELFARE

Michigan's spending for many types of State services—for education, highways, health and hospitals, public safety—run well ahead of the average for other States. Most recent figures show that the State's spending for education, for example, was the highest of all States, at about $61 per capita, compared with a nationwide average of $37.41 per capita.

Other factors, having to do with jobs and business activity, have had a long-term effect on Michigan's financial problem.

Since 1950, Michigan has added more than 1.5 million to its population. This population increase included many thousands of people who came from other States, lured by the prospect of high wages on Michigan's world-famous assembly lines. But new jobs over the past few years have not kept pace with the rise in population.

"COLD SHOULDER" FOR BUSINESS?

One reason frequently cited by some businessmen for this decline in jobs is that the State has an unfavorable climate for attracting and holding private business and industry. All through the State government, businessmen say, they run into an attitude of hostility.

Last year, a big Detroit manufacturer closed down its factory with a payroll of 700 workers and moved to Arkansas. There, the company's president says, it will save $75,000 a year in taxes alone—and many times that amount in wages.

In the Detroit suburb of Monroe, Mayor Milton H. Knabusch said that one of the country's largest steel producers decided against building a plant there because the company didn't like the political and industrial climate of Michigan. Since 1947, the Big Three of the auto industry have built or acquired about 100 new plants across the country. Only 30 of these have been located in Michigan. Neighboring Ohio alone got 29.

All these problems have combined to add to the State's financial worries. New business enterprises are slow to come to Michigan. Revenues from existing businesses are down. Spending is way up.

Thus, the people of Michigan, one of the wealthiest States in the United States, now find their government is broke. Many of these people are wondering whether the State can continue to spend as it has in the past—and whether taxpayers are willing to provide the new money that will be needed to support the spending programs already projected for the future.

A New Publication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the Members of the House to a new publication of the Office of Technical Services in the Department of Commerce. As you will recall, the Select Committee on Science and Astronautics last year under the chairmanship of the majority leader expressed concern at the poor flow of scientific information. A great deal of foreign work of quality was not available to our own scientists. Although scientists abroad did publish reports, it was not translated or not brought to the attention of people doing work in comparable fields here.

As a result of the interest shown by Congress, some progress is being made. We still have a long way to go, to remove roadblocks in the path of information. Science, like news, should know no political boundaries, but should move freely across borders. Where language barriers stand in the way, they must be removed. This publication, called Technical Translations, is a step in that direction. It lists articles published in many journals, provides briefs of the contents where possible, and tells how to get copies. Members of the House may wish to bring this to the attention of universities or research centers in their districts.

Antipollution Law Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article which appeared in the Iowa Waltonian, official publication of the Izaak Walton League of America, Iowa division, in its November-December 1957 issue describes the real motive behind the move to return water pollution grants to the States along with the 10-percent tax on telephones.

That article is most timely in view of the nature of the issue.

[From the Iowa Waltonian, November-December 1957]

ANTIPOLLUTION LAW THREATENED—FEDERAL-STATE ACTION COMMITTEE URGES ALL AID TO MUNICIPALITIES BE DROPPED

Under the guise of returning to States some of the powers taken unto itself by the U.S. Government, the Federal-State Action Committee has recently, while meeting in Chicago, voted specifically tha the President should ask Congress in January of 1958 to discontinue the recently begun program of Federal grants to municipalities to build waste treatment plants. Such an action would nullify many years of effort on the part of the league and other conservation groups.

Many Waltonians will recall the stark drama of the moment during the convention in Washington last April when Dr. Preston Bradley called for immediate recess of the convention to permit league members to rescue the Federal Pollution Control Program. They will recall how, after the recess and after Waltonians had had time to contact their Congressmen, that an earlier vote by an economy minded Congress, scuttling the act by refusing to grant the $50 million in funds needed to carry on the work; was overwhelmingly reversed in a later vote.

Now * * * comes a new and more threatening move on the part of the pollutionists.

Why the constant pressure by a certain group to dump this legislation designed to help give the Nation and its citizens clean water? Drew Pearson, in his column in the Washington Post and Times Herald for April 18, 1957, expresses it very plainly as follows:

"Opposition to the grant (program to aid construction of municipal sewage treatment plants) came from the powerful chemical, pulp and paper manufacturers which dump their factory waste into the Nation's streams. Federal aid to clean up municipal pollution, they feared, would eventually focus attention on industrial pollution."

As a result, these firms launched a virtual let-them-drink-sewage campaign.

Iowa Ikes cannot and must not disregard or treat this matter lightly. If we are to have clear clean streams and lakes, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act must be continued and the funds for its operation must be provided.

Pollution control must be kept in Federal hands if for no other reason than that most of the principal lakes and streams of the Nation go beyond the border of the State in which they rise and involve the well-being of the citizens of many States.

The Federal-State Action Committee is made up of people wielding great power. It's recommendations will be listened to.

The committee has on the Federal side, the Secertaries of the Treasury, Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare, the Budget

Director, two Special Assistants, and one Deputy Assistant to the President, and other lesser officials. For the States, membership includes the Governors of these 10 States: Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Maryland, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Texas.

To preserve the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in the face of adverse recommendations of the committee will require action on the part of every Waltonian. Let the people on this committee know how you feel on the subject. Make sure your Congressman and Senator know how you feel. Send protests as individuals and as chapters. Organize opposition to the proposed cut in appropriations in other locals, sports, and civic organizations.

AND DO IT NOW—TODAY

The November issue of Sport Fishing Institute has this to say in part about this vital subject.

"Passage of Public Law 600 climaxed a 30-year-long period of legislative struggle and study. If it would be allowed to operate as Congress intended in the public interest, it would hold the promise of virtually unpolluted water for 50 million Americans who look to clean water for their chief source of vitally needed outdoor recreation.

"Moreover, these same citizens—including a large part of the voting public—not only drink a lot of this water. They also pour $10 billions or more into the annual economy while purchasing all the goods and services they need out fishing, boating, hunting, swimming, picnicking, camping, and the like. All this requires an increasing amount of abundant clean water.

"Now, however, it looks to us as if the water-pollution advocates may come up with a completely new and cleverly appealing scheme for torpedoing this most vitally needed Federal function. This time, apparently, it's to be done under the alluring mantles of economy and State rights. On the contrary, if successful, we believe the public will 'pay through the nose' as never before."

[From the Iowa Waltonian, Nov.-Dec. 1957]

PRINGLE CALLS FOR INCREASED FEDERAL ANTIPOLLUTION FUNDS

WASHINGTON.—The Izaak Walton League of America called today for doubling Federal appropriations to help municipalities fight sewage pollution in the Nation's streams and rivers. This announcement of League action policy was made by League President William H. Pringle, Pierre S. Dak., and released here by J. W. Penfold, League conservation director.

Pringle said that the initial appropriation of $50 million to implement Public Law 660—the bill authorizing municipal-Federal cost sharing on sewage treatment facilities—had "launched the most spectacular gain in water-pollution control in the Nation's history."

"Operating as a strictly voluntary program and recognizing that the demand for pollution control and most of the financing must come from the grass roots, the Federal Aid to Water Pollution Control Act has proved so popular with local and State public health and pollution control experts that a great backlog of requests for cooperative local-State-Federal projects has piled up," Pringle said.

Pringle emphasized that, "this demonstration of local demand to clean up our waterways must not be allowed to founder because of niggardly appropriations."

Pringle sharply disagreed with published reports—notably by a joint Federal-State action committee set up to study delegation of Federal authorities and tax sources to the States—which pointed to pollution control as a strictly State function.

"No citizen organization has had a more constructive record of pollution control activity than the Izaak Walton League," Pringle said. "We've worked since the early twenties to bring a stop to the pollution of the Nation's water resources. We've made good progress, but we all have been hampered by lack of a uniform national pollution control policy and program. We have that now, and we have no intention of seeing it abandoned in the misguided name of economy or of returning Federal powers to the States.

"Pollution is in many cases an interstate problem," Pringle continued. "Rivers don't stop at State boundaries. Moreover, hundreds of communities are unable to completely finance pollution control facilities on their own, even though the benefits in the form of clean and usable water for the home, the farm, industry, and recreation far exceed the investment required."

Pringle said that far from abandoning the pollution control program, the Federal Government should act decisively in the upcoming Congress to put itself unmistakably on record as recognizing the current program as an outstanding success and to further expedite progress made under it by increasing its annual appropriation from the present $50 million per year to $100 million.

"It has proved to be the most effective single piece of pollution control legislation ever passed by Congress and is a heartening example of voluntary cooperation by local, State, and Federal Government to combat a broad, public evil. The Izaak Walton League," Pringle concluded, "will fight with vigor and unity at local, State, and National level to assure continuation of the program and will seek increased appropriations in order that completion of the job can be assured within a reasonable period."

Forty-first Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 15, I was privileged to address a group of approximately 1,200 persons at Maria High School, located in my congressional district, in commemoration of the 41st anniversary of Lithuania's independence. At this meeting the Honorable Petras Dauzvardis, consul of Lithuania, delivered a speech in Lithuanian and I am pleased to include a translation of it in the RECORD:

Lithuanian's Independence Day is February 16. On that day in 1918 the restoration of the state of Lithuania was declared by its National Council in the ancient capital, the city of Vilnius. The restoration of the independence of Lithuania was based on the principle of self-determination of nations proclaimed by Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, and on the long history of the Lithuanian nation.

The history of the Lithuanian nation goes back to the pre-Christian era. The written history of the state of Lithuania began from the ninth century, marking Lithuania's struggles and sacrifices for herself and for Europe through the centuries. It was the Lithuanians who stopped the Mongol surge westward and the Teutonic push eastward in the 14th and 15th centuries. At that time Lithuania was the great power between the east and the west—she was like a bastion in the center of Europe.

Lithuania's neighbors were envious. The Russians especially did everything possible to hinder the Lithuanians. For this reason, and due to lack of strong leaders, after the death of Vytautas the Great in 1430, Lithuania entered into an alliance with Poland in 1569 and finally fell under Russian occupation in 1795. However, the long and severe Russian occupation did not conquer the Lithuanian spirit of freedom. Each succeeding generation of Lithuanians revolted against the occupants and demanded liberty, until eventually the Lithuanians regained their freedom and proclaimed the restoration of their independent state during World War I.

In 22 years of independent existence, the Republic of Lithuania performed near miracles. Starting from scratch, the Lithuanians created a "Little America." Her progress and her people's prosperity were a blessing to the Lithuanians and a thorn in the side her erstwhile occupant and oppressor, Russia.

Disregarding the Lithuanian-Soviet Russian treaties of peace and nonaggression and the fact that both states belonged to the League of Nations, and that both had signed the antiwar Kellogg-Briand pact, the Soviet Communists invaded Lithuania during World War II, occupied her by force and illegally incorporated her in their empire. They robbed the state and its people, converted them into serfs without any rights, murdered or banished to Siberia some 300,000 Lithuanians. Even the cruelest czars hadn't done anything as barbarous.

The people in Lithuania, the farmers and laborers, are now slaves. They are forced into bolshevik sovchozes and kolchozes as hired hands. Their pay is niggardly. Kolchoz workers receive from 50 kopeks and 700 grams of grain to 5 rubles and 2 kilograms of grain per day. Factory and white-collar workers get 200 to 500 rubles a month. The cost of living is fantastically high. For example, a pair of dress shoes costs 200 to 400 rubles, the equivalent of 1 month's wages. Higher officials and Communist Party bosses, on the other hand, receive handsome salaries and enjoy all kinds of luxuries.

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are victims of rapacious and shameless Soviet imperialism and aggression. There are no other such victim nations after this last war. They are forcibly seized and incorporated into the Soviet Union. The incorporation is not legalized by the free world. The states of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are considered by the free world as independent nations occupied by Soviet forces. As such, they put the lie to Soviet leaders' claims to peacefulness and respect for the rights and independence of other nations.

The case of the Baltic States, though brought up by many people, should be raised by many more, with greater firmness and frequency, and directed at the Soviets at every opportunity.

For instance, Khrushchev's right-hand man, Deputy Anastas Mikoyan, visited here recently. While being wined and dined, he boasted and lied to the Amerian people about how good the Soviet Union is, how peaceloving, and how much she wants to be friends with the United States and other nations. At a meeting of the National Press Club in Washington he publicly stated: "It stands to reason one cannot coexist unless international treaties are kept. For that reason we scrupulously keep all commitments."

There is one truth and one untruth in those two sentences. It is true that there can be coexistence without respect for treaties and fulfillment of their respective obligations. It is untrue that the Soviets

scrupulously keep their treaty obligations. A glaring example is the Soviet conduct in Lithuania.

Lithuania and the Soviet Union had freely concluded treaties of peace and nonaggression. In article I of the Peace Treaty signed in Moscow on July 12, 1920, Russia committed herself as follows:

"Russia, without any reservation whatsoever, recognizes Lithuania as a self-governing and independent State with all juridical consequences that follow from such a recognition and in a spirit of free and good will renounces for all time all sovereignty rights of Russia concerning the Lithuanian nation and the Lithuanian territory which previously belonged to her."

The Non-Aggression Pact of September 28, 1926, provided that:

Article 2: "The Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mutually undertake to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other."

Article 3: "Each of the two contracting parties undertakes to refrain from any aggressive action whatsoever against the other party. Should a conflict arise and if impossible to settle it in a diplomatic way, both contracting parties agree in such case to nominate conciliatory commissions."

The Mutual Assistance Pact of October 10, 1939, which was forced upon Lithuania by the Soviets after they had colluded with Hitler to seize Lithuania and other neighboring countries, stated:

"The realization of this treaty must not infringe the sovereign rights of the contracting parties, especially the structure of their state, their economic and social systems, military instruments and altogether the principles of nonintervention of one state in the internal affairs of the other state."

These treaties and pacts completely and solemnly provided for peaceful coexistence, nonaggression against one another of the contracting parties and noninterference in one another's internal affairs. By these treaties Lithuania's independence was recognized and her territorial integrity guaranteed. These points were particularly repeated in the Mutual Assistance Pact. In presenting this pact to the Supreme Soviet for ratification on October 31, 1939, Minister of Foreign Affairs Molotov solemnly and publicly proclaimed:

"This treaty stipulates the inviolability of the sovereignty of the signatory states and the principle of noninterference in each other's affairs. We stand for the scrupulous observance of treaties and declare that all nonsense about sovietizing the Baltic countries is only to the interest of our common enemies and all anti-Soviet provocateurs."

And what, pray tell, happened to all of these solemn agreements and official public pronouncements? Not even 8 months after Molotov's formal statement, the Soviet Union trampled them all underfoot. She executed the criminal secret agreement of September 28, 1939, with Hitler, occupied Lithuania by force, interfered in Lithuania's internal affairs, sovietized Lithuania and, against the people's will, annexed her to the Soviet Empire.

Are these Soviet acts compatible with the high-flown words of Molotov, Mikoyan, Khrushchev, and their comrades?

Of course not. They will be compatible only when they will restore sovereign rights and self-government to Lithuania and other countries which they now occupy and dominate, and abide by their treaties, pledges, and undertakings.

Khrushchev has proposed to withdraw occupation forces from West Berlin and to declare it a free city, guaranteed by the big powers and the United Nations. Why just Berlin? Why this magnanimity to just one-half of one city? Why don't the Soviets withdraw their occupation forces from the Baltic and other states—restore to them their freedom as provided in their peace treaties, and pledge their future inviolability to them and to the United Nations.

The Lithuanian nation demands that the Soviet Union withdraw its troops, police, agents, and colonists from Lithuania, return Lithuanian deportees from Siberia and elsewhere in Russia and keep its pledges, set forth in the treaties of peace and nonaggression, not in words but in acts.

Medicine and the Conquest of Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, throughout the U.S. Air Force, the city of San Antonio, in my home district of Texas, is regarded with the affection reserved for the alma mater. And indeed it was there that great numbers of men—commissioned, and noncommissioned, rated and nonrated—began their Air Force careers.

Many years have passed since the establishmnt of the air training bases near San Antonio. The tremendous pace of progress in the arts and sciences of flight, however, has brought us to the borders of space itself; a logical extension of the conquest of the air.

That such progress was clearly foreseen by the Air Force is attested by an observance on February 9, 1959, at Randolph Air Force Base, in the District I have the honor to represent. This observances was in commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the establishment, within the Air Force School of Aviation Medicine, of a Department of Space Medicine.

This was no impractical, visionary step.

Ten years ago, the Air Force scientists realized that with operational altitudes already at 40,000 feet they were within a scant four miles of the beginning of the space environment itself. It was evident that aviation research and development would soon take the earth-adapted human being into an altogether alien environment. The decision was taken, then, 10 years ago, to prepare for that day when man would be expected not only to enter, but to work in, and to return from, the far reaches of the cosmos.

Today we can salute the foresight of Maj. Gen. Harry G. Armstrong, now retired, but then the Commandant of the Air Force School of Aviation Medicine. And we can salute the guidance given to this work toward space by the distinguished physician and physiologist, Dr. Hubertus Strughold.

A recital of their findings through the years would be too long to undertake today. One example out of dozens of projects and studies is the recent experiment in which Airman Donald Ferrell spent 7 days in a sealed cabin in simulated space flight. This experiment provided valuable data concerning the physiological requirements for one man in a hermetically sealed cabin and vital information relating to performance and behavior under the conditions men will experience when they are actually in space. The studies in the Department of Space Medicine have been directed toward the problem of the human organism in space; however, the earth-bound human has already begun to profit materially from the work of these space medicine pioneers.

A technique developed there, for example, primarily as a research tool, is finding application in operating rooms, where it is used to measure the anesthetic gases absorbed by a patient under surgery. Again and again, humanity benefits from military research.

My specific purpose today is to call attention to the important ongoing work of the Department of Space Medicine in the Air Force School of Aviation Medicine. I wish to commend this group of dedicated workers to the Nation on the 10th anniversary of their work, and to remind all of us that we may be thankful for their farsightedness and intelligent devotion in their self-appointed tasks—work which we must remember was undertaken at a time when there was little support or general comprehension of their purposes. As we peer into the future, awake to the full meaning of our conquest of space, we must resolve for continuing support of these farsighted Air Force scientists who help point the way to our success in space. In addition to commending this group, as responsible citizens we should charge them to pursue this Air Force research so vitally concerned with the practical orientation of man in space.

Integrated Housing Called for in New York To End Discrimination Evil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the statement of Dr. Gardner C. Taylor, president of the Protestant Council of the City of New York, before the Federal Civil Rights Commission hearing on discrimination in housing on February 3, 1959.

Dr. Taylor's statement appeared in the February 7, 1959, issue of Protestant Church Life:

DR. TAYLOR URGES MORE LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING—PROTESTANT COUNCIL PRESIDENT HEARD BY CIVIL RIGHTS GROUP—INTEGRATED HOUSING CALLED FOR TO END DISCRIMINATION EVIL

I am pleased to speak today in the name of the Protestant community of New York. The very fact that in this greatest city in our Nation, I, the titular leader of one of its three great religious faiths, could be a

member of a racial minority, and the most disadvantaged national minority historically, augurs bright promise for the fulfillment in this country of the purposes for which this commission has been established and for the early resolution of the problems of segregation and discrimination throughout this land.

The home is the basic unit of our society, and in New York City some 600,000 families, or 2 million citizens, occupy dwelling units which are below standard for wholesome and healthy living. These substandard and overcrowded dwelling units are occupied to a marked degree by Negro and Puerto Rican families, and, to a less extent, by Jewish families. All of the reasons why these minorities occupy a disproportionate amount of the substandard dwelling units are not traceable to racial or religious discrimination, but discrimination by race or religion does form entirely too much of the reason. It is a known fact that these racial and religious minorities, easily discernible by color or accent or religious practices, find the greatest difficulty because of irrational prejudices in escaping the ghettos in their quest for better living conditions. Also, the oldest housing falls to those least able to pay for better housing, and those least able to pay, because of economic discrimination, are Negroes and Puerto Ricans. Thus great, dark, depressed, seething geographical and psychological ghettos scar the city and the Nation. Those outside the slum area fear the alien monolith represented by the ghetto and libel and label as inferior or dirty or violent all who live on the racial or religious reservation. The residents of the ghetto, on the other hand, develop angry and bitter resentments toward those who live beyond their ragged, run-down borders, all of whom they feel are somehow responsible for the conditions under which they must live and rear their children.

There are those who say that the people who inhabit the ghettos are dirty people who depress property values wherever they live. It is an open secret, however, among minorities that the suppliers of private housing in our cities, the real estate interests, keep the supply of housing available to minorities at a trickle, while the demand remains enormous, in order to keep the price exhorbitant. Thus an area, block by block, is made available to minorities. The great rush for the thin supply inevitably means that overcrowding and excessive purchase price doom the area to blight, if it is not already blighted by the time the minority families secure occupancy.

In such an area, crime increase at a frightening rate. A few years ago, the New York Academy of Medicine reported that the 2½ million people living in substandard areas, and comprising 20 percent of the metropolitan residential area, accounted for 45 percent of our crimes, 55 percent of our juvenile delinquency, and 60 percent of our disease. An overcrowded living condition strains family life, induces frustration, encourages immorality, breeds violence, and cripples the minds and bodies of growing children. This, indeed, is a form of infanticide.

In junior high schools whose population is composed of minority groups the percentage of substitute teachers is 30 percent higher as compared to areas whose school population is not drawn from minority groups. The facilities are often the oldest, the background of the children the poorest, the learning motivation the weakest, the teaching the least efficient.

The city of New York is aware of the problems. Under the courageous leadership of Robert Wagner and the city council this city has begun an honest, forthright war on discrimination in housing. The Brown-Sharkey-Isaacs bill has put the city solidly on the side of integrated housing. The full impact of this legislation cannot yet be measured, but its effect is bound to change the face of New York in housing time. The Baker-Metcalf bills in State housing promise a far brighter housing picture for all of New York State.

The Federal Government must not only continue but increase its housing programs for low-income and middle-income dwellings if we are to win the battle for good housing for all our citizens. Better, more equitable plans for relocation of tenants in slum clearance areas must be devised. Almost invariably the slum-clearance area is unbelievably overcrowded. Often there have not been dwelling units available for those who are compelled to move. By throwing a number of evicted people into an already inadequate housing market larger than the number for whom housing in the cleared area is provided, the problem's solution becomes a part of the problem itself. Also, many persons operating small business have lost their locations without adequate compensation. There is a question in many minds as to whether the Federal and State and local governments have been as solicitous as they might have been in the equal preservation of the churches and synagogues of the major faiths which are located in housing developments.

The need for federally aided middle-income housing is very great. Since middle-income families are ineligible for low-income publicly supported housing they have been driven to increase the number of slum dwellers or move to the suburbs, thus depriving the city of their great strength, perhaps the chief financial and moral strength of any city. The housing provisions that have been made for these middle-income families are far from adequate.

Gentlemen, the great unsolved riddle of our democracy is the problem of discrimination because of race or religion. This is the dangerous disease in our body politic. The symptoms may vary in intensity in different parts of the body, but the malady is throughout the Republic. The Nation's moral health depends so much on cleansing our Nation of the guilt and shame of segregation and discrimination. In all likelihood, this Nation's permanent appointment with history may well depend on whether or not we free ourselves of these destructive divisions and enmities of color and creed and origin. A fair and freely integrated housing pattern in this city, and all cities, will go far, very far, toward solving America's greatest problem—discrimination.

White Doctors Elect Negro President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I enclose in my extension of remarks a most interesting and informative article appearing in the Boston Sunday Globe of February 15, 1959, relating to Dr. L. M. Donalson of Fayetteville, Tenn., and the understanding and constructive community spirit action of the doctor members of the Lincoln County Medical Association in electing Dr. Donalson as president of their medical association.

More than anything else, nobility of mind such as possessed by Dr. Donalson and what such nobility of mind symbolizes to others is the road to understanding and progress in our association with each other. In different spheres of human activity in all parts of our country, and without regard to race, color or creed, there are countless persons who by their fine life are missionaries of understanding, and who reduce areas of misunderstanding and tension by widening areas of understanding and respect.

WHITE DOCTORS ELECT NEGRO PRESIDENT

FAYETTEVILLE, TENN., February 21.—He came to Fayetteville with little more than a diploma and a 98-cent medical bag.

And in those penny-hard depression days, he began his long service ministering to the medical needs of his fellow Negroes.

For his service, Dr. L. M. Donalson, 51, has won praise and recognition.

But no honor can touch the one recently given him. His colleagues—all of them white—picked him to be 1960 president of the Lincoln County Medical Association.

Nowhere else in the southland does a Negro head such a white professional group.

How did Donalson react to his election?

He seemed somewhat embarrassed by the attention focused upon him.

"I'm just a country doctor trying to make a living," he says.

The doctor showed similar reticence about having the county's Negro hospital named after him.

When the Lincoln County court announced that it would be known as the Donalson Hospital, he suggested:

"Call it the Booker T. Washington Hospital."

"Booker T. Washington was a fine man," Donalson was told, "but he never did anything for Lincoln County."

Naming the hospital for Donalson as well as his selection as association president-elect were accepted locally as the rightful thing to happen to a man of proved ability.

Thus, white and Negro residents of the county were astonished that there was such widespread attention given Donalson's election.

Negroes in the area are "very, very proud he received such an honor," says James Lemons, Lincoln County Negro leader who is an agriculture teacher at Fayetteville's Negro high school. He adds: "However, Dr. Donalson is high qualified."

Whites and Negroes alike point with pride not only to the Donalson Hospital but to the well equipped Negro high school, a big new Negro elementary school, and a summer recreation program for Negroes.

"Let the preachers handle this," Dr. Donalson, who has a number of white patients, says of integration. "All I can do is practice medicine. I think doctors should stay in their place and let politics alone. We have no problem in this county at all."

The white doctors who elected Donalson call the move routine. Young Dr. Lex Patrick, the current head of the association, explains that Donalson was a qualified member in good standing, and it was about time he took over the president's chores. The election was without opposition.

The doctor's arrival in Fayetteville in 1932 after graduating from Meharry, a highly ranked medical college at Nashville 85 miles away, is something of a local legend.

Donalson picked Fayetteville, because it was small enough so he could walk from patient to patient. He had no car and no hope of getting one.

Before boarding the bus in Nashville, he bought his equipment—a 98-cent medical bag, one 40-cent roll of gauze, a roll of adhesive, 1 artery clamp, and a stethoscope. With that he set up a practice.

That practice led him for 6 months on foot, then in a borrowed car, to Negro homes in the town and for miles around. There were frequent stops at the offices of his new friends, the town's white doctors, who not

only assisted in difficult operations, but opened their supply rooms to him.

Lack of facilities didn't stop the need for operations.

"Most of them took surgery at home," Dr. Donalson says. It was usually a good choice. The town's first Negro hospital, opened in 1936, was a rundown double tenement house with two beds.

Donalson put a request before the county court for a real hospital for Negroes. The court gave him an old dormitory from the white hospital, provided the Negroes could raise $500 to move the structure to the town's Negro section.

The newly established hospital was destroyed by the 1952 tornado.

Donalson went to the court again. This time it offered to pay rent on a house to be used as a temporary hospital.

Then the court granted the hard-working doctor's biggest dream. A new $100,000 hospital. Included were an operating room, a delivery room, X-ray room, office, treatment rooms, a laboratory, a small nursery and rooms for about a dozen patients.

Almost as soon as it was built the hospital, which is nearly self-supporting, was overcrowded. Again Donalson appealed to the county court.

"They've never turned me down," he says. The court authorized a 10-bed wing and construction is already underway. Donalson gives the court most of the credit for the modern medical service to Negroes in the area.

He plans another appearance there soon. "What I really want," he says, "is a pediatrics wing staffed by interns and resident specialists from Meharry."

When he started his Fayetteville practice, Dr. Donalson had one thing in mind: Earn enough money to get to New York City and practice there. It wasn't long before local white doctors talked him into staying. Now he is trying to get young Negro doctors to do likewise in places like Fayetteville.

"Everybody's grateful to Dr. Donalson," says Mrs. Herbert Baker, a patient of Donalson for 18 years.

And Dr. Donalson is grateful to everyone. An extremely modest man, his own description of his work consists of credits to others, his college, the Lincoln County Court, Fayetteville's white physicians and the towns' business and civic leaders of both races.

He's not sure he likes the amount of publicity his new medical association office has brought him. Like his fellow townsmen he prefers to take it quietly in this stride. Had he known he was coming, he told one of a recent string of visiting newsmen, "I would have been out somewhere hunting rabbits."

Mayor Hubert Kilgore and "The Need for Federal Aid for Schoolhouse Facilities"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, February 17, 1959, a fine group of mayors from 35 different Alabama cities and towns came to Washington for a conference with the members of the Alabama congressional delegation. The purpose of the visit was to enable the Alabama League of Municipalities to present its views on 20 separate legislative items presently pending before the Congress.

Twenty mayors each presented the position of the league on a particular field of legislation. Among the 20 was the Honorable Hubert Kilgore, mayor of the progressive and expanding city of Irondale, Ala., in my district, who commented on the subject of "The Need for Federal Aid for Schoolhouse Facilities."

With the thought that Mayor Kilgore's remarks will be of interest to the Members of the Congress, I am privileged to insert them herewith in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE NEED FOR FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOLHOUSE FACILITIES

(By Hubert Kilgore)

I am certain that there is no more pressing need in Alabama communities today than that of our schools for adequate classroom facilities. Our school population is increasing at a very rapid rate year by year, and the need for more classrooms increases just as fast—but the supply of decent or standard schoolhouse facilities is falling behind all the time.

This is not a problem just in Alabama. It is Nationwide—no matter how rich or poor the States may be. The problem is that there simply is not the taxing power in the States and local communities to raise anything like the amount of money needed for construction of adequate schoolrooms. Only the Federal Government has that kind of revenue-raising power.

I was impressed by an article that able and far-sighted Congressman CARL ELLIOTT of the Seventh Alabama District wrote back in 1955 for the Alabama Municipal Journal on the subject of education and the need for a Federal-aid program to help solve school-building needs. He quoted Walter Lippmann, famous newspaper columnist, as writing this about our failure to provide national support for education. I quote from that item:

"We must measure our educational effort as we do our military effort. That is to say, we must measure it not by what it would be easy and convenient to do, but by what is necessary to do in order that the Nation may survive and flourish. We have learned that we are quite rich enough to defend ourselves, whatever the cost. We must now learn that we are quite rich enough to educate ourselves as we need to be educated."

IS FEDERAL-AID NEEDED?

Mr. ELLIOTT went on to inquire: "Does this mean Federal aid for a school-building program?" He then added: "Yes, it does. It means first of all that the Federal Government is going to give grants-in-aid to the States for highways and hospitals, and I agree that it should. It must be prepared to do the same thing for schoolhouse construction. It is common knowledge that our States are inclined to extend themselves where their efforts are matched by Federal dollars. * * * I feel very strongly that the Federal Government has a definite and measurable responsibility toward providing educational facilities for our Nation's children."

I agree wholeheartedly with Congressman ELLIOTT. To bridge the gap between the need for schoolhouse facilities and the ability of the States and municipalities to finance needed classrooms and related facilities, we simply must have an adequate Federal-aid program. I am not familiar with the details of the proposed school-aid bill recommended last week to Congress by the President, but I can say as a small city mayor that if anything like what is needed in a program of this sort is to be had, Congress needs to look the President's proposal over with great care because he isn't noted for favoring domestic programs to anything like the size and extent he is foreign aid programs—including the building of all kinds of community facilities in foreign nations while we suffer here for the lack of them.

THE SCHOOLHOUSE SHORTAGE IN ALABAMA TODAY

To give you gentlemen some idea of the school facilities deficiency in our State today, I would like to cite facts and figures made available to us just last week by the State department of education. They are based on a survey conducted in recent months by the Alabama Education Commission, a study group set up by the State legislature to look into education problems in our State.

To bring our schoolhouse program up to a reasonable standard we need 8,000 more classrooms. In addition, the space needed in the school buildings to provide libraries, lunchrooms, cafeterias, auditoriums and gymnasiums would amount to the equivalent of 4,000 more classrooms—making a total of 12,000 classrooms needed. The cost of such a program would amount to $317 million.

Even though education is a State government function in Alabama under the provisions of our Constitution, you gentlemen will be interested in the fact that the State does not invest one dime in school buildings. All schoolhouse facilities we have are built by municipal governing bodies, county and city school boards. The total annual expenditures of all 300 incorporated towns and cities in Alabama for all municipal purposes amount to $50 million. So if every dime of our revenue were used for school construction for 6 years—providing no support for police, fire, water, street, sanitation, public works and other municipal services—we still would not be able to build school facilities fast enough to catch up with the demand.

I think it is easy for all of us to see that there must be Federal aid if the local communities are to have the classrooms and related school facilities needed to take care of our ever-expanding school population.

Point of No Return After Planter Takes A or B Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Jackson Daily News of February 15:

POINT OF NO RETURN AFTER PLANTER TAKES A OR B PLAN

(By Florence Sillers Ogden)

The $64 million question is upon us.

Will the cotton planter take the A or the B plan?

Inexorably we move closer and closer to the ides of March, the deadline. The planter must make up his mind by the 16th day of March and sign on the dotted line.

There is no point of return.

From then on he is in the hands of the elements and the Government, and may soon be on the welfare.

It's fewer acres under A, with a higher price guarantee, or increased acres and lower price—from 4 to 6 cents a pound less.

Farmers, like merchants, have to have a reasonable turnover. Yet, on the other hand, they can't produce cotton below production cost. They cant' pay high for what they have to buy and sell low. They cannot compete with the pauper wages of foreign growers, under a controlled program, while U.S. labor and farm supplies run wide open with the sky as the limit.

Cotton trade advances the theory that cotton is pricing itself out of the market. That really stirs up my red hair. The manufactured good, machinery, etc., the farmer buys, and the labor boys are what is pricing cotton out of the market.

TRADE SUGGESTION

The trade suggests that the farmer reduce by 15 points the parity price. Well, if the farmer has to reduce, why not the warehousemen, the poison dealers, the farm equipment people, labor, compresses, banks, buyers, oil mills, and cotton mills take their share of the reduction? Then the farmer might be able to make a small profit and retain a just share of the world market for the United States.

But no, the cotton grower is the only one anyone ever suggests to take the licking.

When will the farmers ever learn that somebody else is doing their talking for them?

Surely no farmer in his right mind is going to go about crying that cotton is too high, when everything he buys or uses is skyrocketing to the moon.

As for the A and B plan:

To add to the joys of making the great decision on just how you're going broke, on the eve of the day of decision the Department of Agriculture announces a reduction in parity via a new way of figuring parity.

Now this new rule is some strange thing born in the Department—and out of wedlock, I feel sure—the brain child of the bureaucrats. Nobody understands this will-o'-the-wisp called change in parity, least of all the Department of Agriculture, or else they never could have reduced it when everything is selling at the highest prices ever known except farm products.

PARITY FIGURE

Parity is based supposedly on the relative value of farm products and other goods in 1912, or thereabouts.

How they arrived at the present parity reduction, only the bureaucrat knows. How they reduced it in the face of rising prices for everything but farm products, only the Department of Agriculture knows. Where it is taking us only the Lord knows.

When people yell about farmers deliberately building up a cotton surplus for the U.S. Government to hold, I say: "'Taint so."

The surplus foundation was built in the fall of 1950 when the Government placed an embargo on American cotton, stopped all shipments to foreign markets, closed down the cotton exchange, put a ceiling on our cotton of around 40 cents a pound.

What happened? Foreign cotton sold in the world market for from 75 cents to $1 a pound.

That was when we lost our foreign markets.

American capital went to foreign countries, financed foreign production. The U.S. farmers were left holding the bag.

More than that, our Government (and misguided farm organizations) put on a campaign in 1950 marketing season which urged American growers to produce 16 million bales for 1951. This was put on a patriotic basis, a stockpile, because of the Korean war.

The United States lost the Korean war but the farmers came through with the 16 million bales. We've had a surplus ever since.

FARMER IS LAMB

As long as the things the cotton farmer buys are sold in an uncontrolled, protective market through high tariffs, and he sells in a world market in competition to pauper labor, the farmer is a lamb to the slaughter. You can put that in your pipe and smoke it.

Last month in Washington I was reminded of 1929. Everyone is rolling in money up there. Business is swell, money is on the loose, the rich are getting richer every day.

In the late summer of 1929 I went to Chicago on a round trip excursion rate ticket in a last year's dress to visit my husband's kin. Everybody up there was rich but me. At home everybody was poor, including me. But Chicago was crazy with money. Washwomen were making thousands of dollars overnight on stocks, porters and clerks were riding the waves of prosperity. I felt like Little Orphan Annie at Belshazzar's feast.

After I got home it wasn't long before down here in the cotton patch we heard the reverberation of the big guns of the depression as they fired on Chicago. And believe me, it was some reverberation.

I say: Beware of the Ides of March.

Export-Import Picture Has Changed in Last 2 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of February 17, 1959:

EXPORT-IMPORT PICTURE HAS CHANGED IN LAST 2 YEARS

(By Charles Lucey)

Autos, sewing machines, typewriters, bicycles, steel—almost all the way across the industrial front today the United States is drawing a rising challenge from oversea competitors in export markets.

At one time it must have seemed nobody could peddle sewing machines around the world the way Americans could. But the picture has changed, as shown in our own export-import figures for the last 2 years. In 1956 and 1957 we shipped abroad 80,000 sewing machines; we imported 2 million.

In 1957 we exported about 100,000 typewriters and imported 337,000. In January–September of 1958 we shipped 42,000 typewriters overseas and took in 280,000.

As for bicycles. Arrivals last year—800,000. Exports—negligible.

REPORT

President Eisenhower's economic report to Congress the other day noted our auto exports have shown a pronounced decline, even in the boom oversea selling year 1957. In the first half of 1958 foreign car imports were five times U.S. auto exports.

The overall figures suggest no cavein of U.S. selling abroad. The roughly $16 billion of exports in 1958 was perhaps $4 billion under the high rate achieved in the first part of 1957. But due to the Suez crisis and other causes, sales abroad had been abnormally high in the earlier year. Comparison of 1958 with 1956—years not too different—may be fairer.

Yet Mr. Eisenhower told Congress:

"While imports were well maintained, exports declined sharply after mid-1957 * * *. From the first half of 1957 to the first half of 1958 the value of U.S. merchandise exports fell more—in relative, as well as in absolute terms—than those of all other countries combined.

"Exports of the industrially developed countries declined relatively little, and unlike those of the United States, remained significantly higher in the first 6 months of 1958 than in the first half of 1956."

SIX MAJOR ITEMS

By far the greater part of the recent falloff in U.S. exports—and this was true of the 1957 export rise—came in six major commodities. That is, petroleum, cotton, wheat, metals, coal, and autos. The President observed also that the effect of this changed world market situation on U.S. steel exports has been aggravated by intensified price competition from foreign suppliers.

There always must be give and take in foreign trade: old markets and traditional product lines are supplanted by new ones. Western Europe's industrial development may cut into our exports of finished goods but the United States may sell Western Europe more raw materials and machine tools to help make such finished goods.

But overseas competitors, especially Western Europe and the Japanese, have been closing the gap in technology and increasingly exports may rise or fall on superiority of product design or lower prices. Studies made up to now still leave some economists skeptical on how great the advantages really are in favor of lower cost output abroad, yet many businessmen are convinced of the great danger of high U.S. costs.

LABOR VIEW

Labor economists by no means accept the notion that high wage rates here will be the factor to lose export markets for this country—and hence jobs for Americans—in future foreign trade competition.

They insist that placing blame on high wages is a smokescreen, arguing that most of the inflationary price rise of the last 2 or 3 years has come in food increases, advances in costs of services and in other areas quite outside the industries where collective bargaining by unions has forced prices upward.

They contend the greatest danger is likely to come by establishment of United States factories overseas, especially in the new European common market area, to escape tariff and quota discrimination against United States-made products.

The labor people contend also that technology advances abroad are not the only answer. They say availability of raw materials and presence of mass markets, both of which the United States has, still will enable this country to produce goods to compete price-wise with lower labor-cost nations.

CONTENTION

AFL-CIO Secretary James B. Carey, who studied European industry extensively, contends the United States still has the technology and the better work habits of American workers to outproduce them. He contends—as do other labor spokesmen—that prices on too many United States products are set at levels to produce a too-high profit.

He says they reflect low volume production instead of the cheaper unit prices possible with a high consumption, high volume economy.

It's an argument bound to be fought out harder in days to come. The possible loss of a sizable share of our foreign markets—for reasons of inability to compete because of high costs and for other reasons—represents too great a hazard to be accepted without much travail here at home.

Department of Defense Multibillion Dollar Supply Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, during the past decade, there have been a number of objective studies, investigations, and reports by qualified people which point to the need for better management of the many common supply and service systems in the Department of Defense, which have stock valued at $46 billion. Within the past year, the Comptroller General of the United States has issued a number of reports which show beyond doubt that much needs to be done to improve these systems.

In 1951 the Secretary of Defense ordered a study to test the feasibility of one service handling medical and dental supplies and equipment for all services. The test, though successful, was terminated in November 1954, over strong protests of many Members of both Houses of Congress and others. A year later, the Secretary of Defense started similar tests along broader lines to handle subsistence, clothing, medical, and petroleum products under a unified approach called single manager plans.

Numerous statements by officials in the Department of Defense during the past 2 years indicate that the single manager plans point to much-needed progress. However, Secretary McNeil seemed to testify to the contrary on February 10, 1959, before the Joint Economic Committee. I have, therefore, requested Secretary McElroy to clarify the matter. My letter to him on February 15, 1959, is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1959.

Hon. NEIL H. McELROY,
Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have reviewed the testimony of Assistant Secretary McNeil before the Joint Economic Committee on February 10, 1959, concerning the effectiveness, economy, and efficiency of the single manager plans for subsistence, clothing, medical, and petroleum products.

It is disturbing to note the wide disparity in Secretary McNeil's testimony with that of other Department of Defense witnesses before congressional committees in recent years.

I would think that sufficient time has elapsed since the plans were initiated to permit the Department of Defense to issue a factual evaluation of them. The enormous overlapping, duplicative and wasteful supply systems in the numerous divisions of the Department of Defense contain stocks valued at $46,585,403,000 as of June 30, 1958 according to figures you have furnished the Government Operations Committee of the House.

Even a casual review of the distribution and ownership of the staggering total reveals the excesses and duplications within and among the departments. I might add that this inventory of $46 billion is more than the entire 1960 budget for the Department of Defense, is over 60 percent of the national budget of $77 billion and is almost one-sixth of the national debt. Yet the supply systems inventories of $46 billion are only a portion of the worldwide Department of Defense personal property inventories of $120 billion from which a $10 billion surplus disposal program is expected in fiscal 1960.

Furthermore, the many hearings of congressional committees, the Hoover Commission reports, studies of the National Chamber of Commerce, numerous reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and others attest to the degree of waste and the need for much better management in these areas in the Department of Defense. There can be little doubt about it.

This is no new idea, Mr. Secretary, which has been provoked by recent events. The O'Mahoney amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, called upon the Secretary of Defense to develop an integrated supply system. Many Members of Congress from both Houses and parties sponsored the measure, and some early progress was made in implementing it.

After the termination of the Alameda medical supply test, which was a single-manager plan, I wrote to your predecessor on October 24, 1955, and stated, in part:

"The whole story of the Alameda test was detailed to you in Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS' 13-page letter of January 19, 1955. Certain of the Hoover reports confirm the conclusions of the congressional reports and enactments as to the need for more integration among the military services with respect to common supplies and services and as to the necessity of following applicable laws and regulations.

"As I view the situation, Mr. Secretary, not only is the basic problem of constitutional government involved, but many other issues of real concern to the American people. I will comment briefly on some of them.

"The facts are conclusive that our educational facilities—though basic to defense—need great assistance. Large sums are required for the development and conservation of basic natural resources. Billions are needed for highways and public works. Costly outlays for fundamental and applied research are a must if we are to keep ahead in the technological race. Our health institutions are not in th state we desire. Oppressive taxes should be reduced, especially for the low-income groups. The budget requires balancing in its turn and the ever-growing national debt reduced.

"As you know, I am, and have always been, an advocate for a strong national defense upon which to support a foreign policy. It is also essential to our survival. I will not be beguiled into laxity by the palliative tactics now emanating from the Kremlin. No one dares be. I believe that our defenses and basic institutions should be strengthened in every possible way for the long pull ahead.

"But the evidence is conclusive that the overlapping, duplication, and waste is of such magnitude in and among the military services as to make possible enormous savings, with no loss of efficiency or military effectiveness, and thus release funds badly needed for the objectives listed above."

Since that date our fiscal and defensive positions have, in my opinion, worsened. The national debt continues to grow and the budget, if balanced, as some contend, is from the bookkeeping point of view. It does not provide for investment expenditures in many fields.

It was for these reasons that I sponsored the amendment to which you agreed in the Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1958 empowering you to "provide for the carrying out of any supply or service activity common to more than one military department by a single agency or such other organizational entities as [you] deem appropriate." I realize that this statute has been in effect for only 6 months, but the single-manager plans have been operating for a considerable period of time.

I will appreciate an authoritative evaluation from you as to the success of the single-manager plans and what is programed for the future as to other common classes of supply and service functions. I might add that it is not my contention that the single-manager plans are the ultimate. I can visualize that it may prove to be impracticable to have two or more single managers operating in the same depot under different departments, and that something more general may be required. However, it does seem apparent that steady progress must be made.

This is a subject of wide interest, so I will insert this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and will afford your reply the same consideration.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Majority Leader.

Mayor Claud Smithson—"The Increasing Importance of Intergovernmental Relations"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, February 17, 1959, a fine group of mayors from 35 different Alabama cities and towns came to Washington for a conference with the members of the Alabama Congressional Delegation. The purpose of the visit was to enable the Alabama League of Municipalities to present its views on 20 separate legislative items presently pending before the Congress.

Twenty mayors each presented the position of the league on a particular field of legislation. Among the 20 was the Honorable Claud J. Smithson, mayor of the progressive and expanding city of Fairfield, Ala., in my district, who commented on the subject of "The Increasing Importance of Intergovernmental Relations."

With the thought that Mayor Smithson's remarks will be of interest to the Members of the Congress, I am privileged to insert them herewith in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE INCREASING IMPORTANCE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

(By Claud J. Smithson)

The relations between the Federal, State, and local governments determine the limits of the ability of municipalities to solve their own problems and to serve their citizens. Therefore, progress in American municipal governments is dependent on a proper relationship and understanding between the various governmental levels and units.

The need for such an understanding is emphasized by looking at the many areas in which questions of intergovernmental policy and action arise. For example:

1. The competition for revenues.

2. The overlapping and duplication of services.

3. The tendency to provide so many independent governmental units in a geographic area that it no longer functions as a recognizable governmental unit.

4. The tremendous effects of State and Federal grants-in-aid on local governments.
5. The impact of State and Federal standards and State and Federal personnel on local affairs.
6. The demand for local services and expenditures growing out of Federal programs.
7. The competition for high grade personnel between the Federal, State, and local governments.
8. The absence of any overall policy on relations between the levels and units of government.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR CONSTRUCTIVE PUBLIC ACTION

All these relations and problems are also opportunities—opportunities for initiative and constructive public action, serving the general community.

There is no inherent antagonism between the Federal Government, the States, and the municipalities. In its overall aspects, government should be conducted as if it were concerned with all of the people and with due regard for its impact on the individual citizen where he lives.

The Alabama League of Municipalities endorses the philosophy expressed in the 30th Report of the Committee on Government Operations in regard to Federal-State-local relations that:

"The interest and initiative for increasing the responsibilities of the States and localities must come from those levels of government. Responsibility cannot be created by a transfer of programs and tax services. It is imperative that the Federal Government do everything possible to promote a favorable climate for the proper functioning of the other levels of government. This includes making available to the States and localities those revenue sources that are not of primary importance to the Federal Government and which are well adapted for State and local use. Such action should be taken independently of Federal decision concerning particular grant programs."

NEED FOR A PERMANENT NATIONAL COMMISSION

We also agree completely with one of the major recommendations of the Committee namely that: A permanent national commission on all phases of Federal-State-local relations be created pursuant to an act of Congress. Its members should be true representatives of each type of government. Few activities are more urgent or more important as a means of proving that a democratic Federal Government can work effectively and harmoniously.

We also believe that the representatives of municipal interests have long been pretty consistently ignored in the development of national policies and programs which vitally concern them. The role of the cities in the national economy has never been fully evaluated or understood.

To a large extent the problem stems directly from the fact that the representatives of urban interests and affairs are not represented as such in the councils that shape fundamental Federal policy.

No single individual or agency at the Federal level is concerned with urban problems. Nowhere at the Federal level has it been recognized that the many urban problems with which the Federal Government now deals, highways, airports, urban renewal, water-pollution control, advance public facility planning loans, etc., are interrelated and cannot be fully effective unless coordinated with one another. Most of the proponents of Federal programs created along functional lines are too limited in their approach and too preoccupied with the progress of their particular effort to make a case for larger and more fundamental problems of urban community development.

DEVELOPING A NATIONAL URBAN POLICY

A national urban policy must be developed on the part of the Federal Government. Only by way of such policy can the various functional programs now operative at the Federal level be related and focused in such a way as to take advantage of the full social and economic potential of the Nation's urban areas.

The question is, then, How do we see to it that such a national urban policy is developed on the Federal level?

The creation of a Department of Urban Affairs has been proposed by many of us who feel that only through Cabinet rank can the urban problems really get the concentrated attention they need.

Also many urban problems are interstate in nature and cannot be handled effectively by the States. Further, the States themselves are neither willing nor able to promote and develop solutions to urban problems.

Other reasons we have for urging a Department of Urban Affairs are: (1) stronger executive leadership in the Government's housing programs must be secured; (2) we need to do a much better job of coordinating existing Federal programs which affect urban areas and governments; and (3) we must fix responsibility for necessary research and policy recommendations concerning urban problems and their solutions.

The Alabama League of Municipalities finds itself in full accord with a resolution passed in Boston by the American Municipal Congress this last December on the subject.

RESOLUTION DISCUSSING URBAN AFFAIRS

The resolution referred to reads as follows:

"Rural areas have been so successful in focusing national attention on the farm problem that our Government today spends more money annually on potatoes than it does on urban renewal of the great metropolitan areas in which more than 70 percent of our people live.

"Unless the city problem is raised to the same level of national consciousness and effective steps taken to halt the steady erosion of our cities, our Nation faces a damaging loss in national strength almost as great as that which could be inflicted by enemy action.

"As a first step in focusing attention on the city problem and granting our urban centers an authoritative voice in the highest levels of our National Government we urge the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs, to be headed by an official of Cabinet rank.

"We further urge that the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate create standing committees on urban affairs, to deal with legislative matters affecting our urban areas.

"As a further step in focusing national attention on the vital problems of our urban areas we urge the President to proclaim a White House Conference on Urban Affairs, which conference would be held a year from the time of issuance of said proclamation, and to be preceded by State conferences throughout the Nation. These conferences would draw together Government officials, technical experts, civic leaders, management, and labor officials, as well as leaders in the many fields of activity involved in urban living, and the conferences would culminate in a national White House conference which would recommend a national urban policy to be followed by our Government."

She Wept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the recent visit to our country of Deputy Premier Mikoyan, of Soviet Russia, was received by the American people with mixed feelings. However, the talented Rev. Owen McEnaney, of St. Helena's Church in the Bronx, expressed poetically the feelings of most when he wrote the following poem:

SHE WEPT

Limousines of varied shade
Led the triumphal parade,
"Welcome! Welcome." the Committee cried,
And a voice was heard:
"Because of him my family died."
Everything was sweetness and light
Festive candles shone brilliantly bright,
Empty smiles linked one with another:
And that voice again was heard:
"He killed my brother."
Red carpets lined the way
Rich bankers led the way
To halls of gold and crimson:
And the voice continued on:
"My son's in a Red prison."
O yes,
A city cheered and roared,
Officials the first to applaud
And decree decorum be kept:
And while this was going on—
The Statue of Liberty wept.

Foreign Policy Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. James Reston which appeared in the New York Times on February 11, entitled "Foreign Policy Officials," which I think should be brought to the attention of every Member:

FOREIGN POLICY OFFICIALS—EISENHOWER, IN CONTRAST TO 1952, SEEKS MEN WHO CAN FILL TASKS ADEQUATELY

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 10.—President Eisenhower made a comment today that illustrates the change that has gradually developed in the selection of top foreign policy officials of the Government.

He defended at his news conference his record of nominating top officials on the ground that in every vacancy that occurs, we try to find a man that can fill it adequately. Political considerations did enter into his choices, he said, but these were always secondary. Finally, he said that he could not give any more time to the supervision of foreign policy matters than he now did without neglecting his responsibilities in other fields.

President Eisenhower's emphasis today on adequacy was quite different from the theme and tone of the early days of his political career in 1952, when he was talking, not about getting adequate men, but about getting the best men in the country to fill these jobs, regardless of party affiliation.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-TWO SPEECH RECALLED

The single standard for filling top executive posts, he told the voters in Duluth, Minn., a month before his first election, shall be merit and not political reward.

Two weeks later, he told a rally at Bridgeport, Conn., "this problem of bringing peace to the world is one that is going to demand in Washington the finest people that this country affords, men and women of prestige

in their own region, men and women who in their combined selves can command the respect of, and unite the people of the United States behind great programs."

This issue is up again because the new chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT of Arkansas charged publicly yesterday that some of the President's ambassadorial appointments had not been up to standard.

Coincidentally, Senator FULBRIGHT and others have complained that partisan political considerations—specifically a protest from the chairman of the Republican National Committee, Meade Alcorn—have blocked the appointment of Henry Labouisse as director of the International Cooperation Administration.

ALCORN PROTESTED

The Acting Secretary of State, C. Douglas Dillon, recommended Mr. Labouisse as the best man for the job, but Mr. Alcorn opposed him on the ground that he registered as a Democrat in one presidential election, 1940.

This is one of those conflicts that might be settled by a little quiet consultation between the President and the Democratic leaders in the Senate, but that could cause considerable trouble in the last 2 years of the Eisenhower administration if it is not resolved.

The President and the Senate share responsibility for appointing ambassadors and other top executive officials. The Democrats, with a 64–34 majority in the Senate, have the power to block the President's appointments, and some of them, particularly Senator FULBRIGHT's colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee, are in a mood to do so if they think the President has reversed his 1952 principle of "merit and not political reward."

The President is in a difficult position in the Labouisse case. The Mutual Security Program, administered by ICA under the State Department, is the President's favorite overseas program. He defended it again today.

ALLOWED EARLIER BLACKBALL

But he permitted Mr. Alcorn to blackball Mr. Labouisse last year for the deputy directorship of the ICA, and he is now seeking the support of a reluctant Congress for another mutual security appropriation while seeming to be indifferent about his own State Department's second attempt to appoint Mr. Labouisse, this time to the directorship.

As a matter of fact, there is a basis for understanding and compromise in this field. The President complained today that he could not appoint anybody but rich men to major ambassadorships because Government allowances for these posts were not high enough.

It is widely believed here, however, that the President could get the support of Speaker SAM RAYBURN in the House, and Senator LYNDON JOHNSON in the Senate for adequate representation allowances provided he would go back to his original principle of appointing the best men available, regardless of party or financial position.

At most, this would cost under $5 million a year to provide adequate allowances for superior ambassadors and their aids in London, Paris, Madrid, and the other expensive posts. The main objective of U.S. policy is to deter wars. This is the function of diplomacy and of the so-called bipartisan policy of strength, supported by both parties but not extended to the selection of the men who must administer it.

The Democrats are not asking for equal appointments. They are merely saying that, when the President's own officials in the State Department select an experienced and even distinguished man for a major job, he should not be rejected merely because he registered as a Democrat 19 years ago.

They are also saying that in this day, it is not good enough to have American Ambassadors in Madrid, Paris, Brussels, The Hague, Bonn, Copenhagen, Oslo, Ankara, and Athens—to mention only a few—who have no working knowledge of the language of those capitals.

In short, they are making a fuss, not because they oppose the appointments policy the President defined in 1952, but because they agree with it but do not think he has redeemed his promise.

Army "Firsts"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. D. E. Beach appeared before the Committee on Science and Astronautics on February 9, 1959, and outlined the Army's progress in the field of missiles. The U.S. Army has a commendable record of firsts in this field.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following "Army Firsts" in the field of missiles:

ARMY FIRSTS

1. First U.S. ballistic missile firing, May 1947: On May 22, 1947, the first full-scale flight test of a Corporal missile was entirely successful. The missile was fired by a team from the Jet Propulsion Laboratories, under contract to the Army, with participation by the First Guided Missile Battalion, Fort Bliss, Tex. and U.S. Army Ordnance personnel of White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex. Fired at White Sands, the Corporal responded accurately to guidance commands and reached a range of 63 miles.

2. First penetration of outer space, February 1949: On February 24, 1949, a two-stage missile consisting of a German V–2 with a WAC Corporal as the second stage, was fired by the team of scientists under Dr. Von Braun at White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex., as part of the Army missile program. Army personnel of the First Guided Missile Group at Fort Bliss and U.S. Army Ordnance personnel of the White Sands Missile Range participated in the firing of this missile, which achieved an altitude of 250 miles, a world record at that time.

3. First successful intercept of aircraft by guided missile November 1951: The Army R & D contractor (Western Electric) accomplished this on November 27, 1951 at White Sands Proving Ground with the first Nike missile fired at an aerial target. The missile detonated about 25 feet from the target. The target was flying at about 15 miles range, 33,000 feet altitude and at a speed of 300 miles per hour.

4. First operational air defense GM unit December 1953: In December 1953, the U.S. Army Air Defense Command (then called the Army Anti-Aircraft Command) placed the first operational surface-to-air missile system on-site in the continental U.S. air defenses. This unit, a Nike Ajax battalion, was deployed in the Washington-Baltimore defenses.

5. First U.S. operational ballistic missile unit, November 1954: In November 1954 the Army's 259th Field Artillery Missile Battalion (Corporal) completed training at Fort Bliss, Tex., to become the first operational U.S. ballistic missile unit. The battalion was deployed to Europe in February 1955 to provide guided missile support for units in the Seventh U.S. Army.

6. First free world successful IRBM firing May 1957: On May 31, 1957, a full-scale Jupiter missile fired at the Atlantic Missile Range, Cape Canaveral, Fla., was the first successful IRBM of the free world. The firing was conducted by the Army ballistic missile team from the Army Ballistic Missile Agency and the Jet Propulsion Laboratories.

7. First free world solution of reentry problem August 1957: On August 8, 1957, a Jupiter-C ballistic missile, fired at the Atlantic Missile Range, Cape Canaveral, Fla., confirmed the first free world solution to the problem of missile nosecone reentry into the atmosphere. Firing was jointly conducted by personnel of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, both agencies of the U.S. Army Ordnance Corps.

8. First free world satellite in orbit January 1958: On January 31, 1958, the first free world satellite, Explorer I, was placed in orbit by a Jupiter-C missile, fired from the Atlantic Missile Range, Cape Canaveral, Fla. This project, a joint achievement of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency and the Jet Propulsion Laboratories, was completed only 84 days after the Army was given the mission.

9. First intercept of very low-altitude aircraft May 1958: In May 1958, a Hawk missile fired by the Army R. & D. contractor (Raytheon) successfully engaged an F80 jet target flying at treetop level at White Sands Proving Ground in New Mexico.

10. First intercept of very high-altitude supersonic target missile November 1958: A Nike Hercules missile, fired by the Army R. & D. contractor (Western Electric) in November 1958, destroyed a supersonic target missile traveling faster than 1,500 miles per hour at an altitude greater than 60,000 feet.

Bill To Permit Use of Social Security Records To Trace Parents of Neglected Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a companion bill to one introduced by Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, to permit the use of social security records to trace parents of neglected minor children.

Thousands of parents escape their moral and legal obligations of child support by simply moving to another State and leaving no forwarding address. In the new place of residence the runaway parent simply gets a new job and continues his participation under the social security system with complete protection of social security regulations which prohibit the disclosure of his new residence. Since abandonment of family is a felony in most States, the social security regulations of secrecy protect the potential felon from apprehension.

The interstate escape of runaway parents is costing the States and the Federal Government billions of dollars in public assistance and welfare funds

which must be spent to support abandoned children. In 1958 alone the total bill for aid to dependent children totaled $902,651,000 for the support of 2,155,151 children. Some runaway fathers are believed to have abandoned different families in several States, compounding the wrong.

Under my bill, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be directed to supply from social security files the most recent address of a father certified as having failed to support his family to a State, or local welfare agency or to a court of competent jurisdiction.

In addition to the neglected children being supported by Federal funds, hundreds of thousands of other abandoned children are being supported through the sole effort of one parent. When the father runs away from his obligation of family support, it is the working mother who single-handedly assumes the burden of child care. Since she usually receives no public help in the support of her family, the effect of social security secrecy regulations is deplorable.

Under present circumstances it is almost impossible for an American to work anywhere without submitting his social security number. It should be equally impossible for such a person to work without contributing to the support of his dependent children. The Social Security Administration should not be a party to the development of an escape route from the legal and natural obligation of parents.

My attention was drawn to the need for this law by a case which arose in my district. Mrs. Irene Boguniecki, of 3607 East 74th Street, mother of two children, Henry 9 and Marianna 8, filed a claim with the Veterans' Administration as the unremarried widow of her war veteran husband who had disappeared for over 7 years. The Veterans' Administration turned down her claim on the ground that it was in receipt of information from the Social Security Administration that her husband was living and working as of December 31, 1957.

Thus, the regulation opens up social security records for the purpose of rejecting her claim and then denies her an opportunity to use the records to apprehend her runaway husband. Since then scores of mothers of abandoned families have written of their desperate and futile efforts to locate runaway fathers. Last autumn I urged the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to modify social security secrecy regulations, making the new residence of runaway husbands available to the agencies in each community administering the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act. This request has been turned down in order to preserve and maintain confidentiality of old-age and survivors insurance records.

On October 14, 1958, I addressed the following letter to the Honorable Arthur Flemming, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

OCTOBER 14, 1958.

Hon. ARTHUR FLEMMING,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has recently come to my attention that a resident of my district, Mrs. Irene Boguniecki of 3607 East 74th Street, Cleveland 5, Ohio, has been refused the cooperation of the Social Security Administration in determining the whereabout or the recent employment of her husband, Anton J. Boguniecki, who abandoned her and their two children over 7 years ago and apparently is employed with Social Security coverage somewhere in the United States.

Mrs. Boguniecki recently filed claim on March 28, 1958 with the Veterans' Administration for widow's pension as an un-remarried widow, alleging the death of the veteran by reason of his 7 years' unexplained absence. The Veterans' Administration turned down the claim on receipt of information from another governmental agency (the Social Security Administration) that their records indicated the veteran was living as of December 31, 1957. Upon recepit of this information, the Veterans' Administration properly disallowed her claim as an un-remarried widow.

Under the code of Federal Regulations, Regulation I, relating to the disclosure of official records and information (part 401, chap. 3, title 20), the employees of the Social Security Administration are precluded from disclosing information relating to the employment or residence of a social security beneficiary or contributor to the fund, unless the information is requested by an agency distributing Federal aid under a public assistance title. Under this provision Mrs. Boguniecki would be assisted in locating her husband if she were a recipient of Federal aid to dependent children. She did not apply for such aid, because she preferred, upon the failure of her husband, to work and provide for these children through her own efforts. It seems to me that her entitlement to information relating to the whereabouts of her husband is even greater than that of a person receiving the benefits of Federal aid.

In checking with the local agency administering the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act in this community, I find that there must be thousands of mothers supporting their own children who are unable to locate the fathers, also responsible for such care. Insofar as this information is denied to these working mothers or to State or local agencies charged with the administration of the Uniform Support Act, the effect of of this regulation is deplorable. Since in Ohio and many other States failure to support dependent children may constitute a felony, the Social Security Administration, in effect, shelters many likely felons from apprehension, indictment and prosecution.

Under present circumstances it is almost impossible for an American citizen to work anywhere without submitting his social security number. It should be equally impossible for such a person to work without contributing to the support of his dependent children. The Social Security Administration should not be a party to the development of an escape route from the legal and natural obligation of parents.

I respectfully urge that you give prompt consideration to the immediate revision of the social security regulation barring the disclosure of residence or employment of a beneficiary or contributor to the social security fund and permit public agencies charged with administering the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act to obtain such information for the benefit of dependent children, regardless of whether Federal funds are involved in their support.

Sincerely,

CHARLES A. VANIK,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, on December 2, 1958, I received the following reply from Mr. C. I. Schottland, Commissioner of the Social Security Administration:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
December 2, 1958.

Hon. CHARLES A. VANIK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VANIK: This is in reply to your letter of October 14 requesting that consideration be given to the revision of the social security regulation barring the disclosure of information to permit public agencies charged with administering the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act to obtain information concerning the residence or employment of a beneficiary or contributor to the social security fund for the benefit of dependent children regardless of whether Federal funds are involved in their support.

As you are no doubt aware, section 1106 of the Social Security Act prohibits disclosure of information from old-age and survivors insurance records except as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may by regulations prescribe. Regulation No. 1, two copies enclosed, sets forth the information which will be disclosed and to whom. As you will note, the regulation does not authorize the disclosure of information in cases such as that of Mrs. Boguniecki.

However, section 402(a) of the Social Security Act requires that State agencies administering the aid-to-dependent-children program give notice to law enforcement officials where a parent has deserted a child receiving aid to dependent children. In connection with this provision of the law, we are furnishing information as to the whereabouts of a deserting parent of a child receiving aid to dependent children to State assistance agencies on an experimental basis. Under this procedure, however, information is furnished only where the State agency has no recent information as to the parent's whereabouts and has exhausted its other resources for locating the parent. The information provided to the State agency under this procedure may be used only for the purpose of fulfilling its responsibilities under section 402(a) of the Social Security Act.

The confidentiality of old-age and survivors insurance records has been maintained ever since the inception of the old-age and survivors insurance program. It stems from a pledge made publicly by the then Social Security Board, in response to a nationwide public demand, that information obtained from employers and employees for the purpose of administration of the program would be used for that purpose and kept confidential and not made generally available for other purposes. Congress implemented that pledge by enacting section 1106(a) above. Pursuant to the pledge, the regulation which authorizes disclosure does so only in those limited areas which involve the administration of the old-age and survivors insurance and closely related programs, and in certain cases relating to the national security.

It will be noted that section 401.3(f) of regulation No. 1 authorizes disclosure of information to other agencies of the Federal Government lawfully charged with the administration of a law providing for public assistance or work relief, or pension, or retirement, or other benefits for the proper administration of such law. In line with this provision of the regulation, procedures have been established under which information is furnished to the Veterans' Administration where it is needed in determining a claimant's entitlement to payments under a law administered by that agency.

The Social Security Administration has sought and secured the coperation of the public by continued adherence to the policy that the information furnished us would be used for the administration of the Social Security Act and related programs. The successful administration of the old-age and survivors insurance program is dependent on

a great degree on the accuracy of the information which is voluntarily furnished us by the public.

Aside from the likelihood that a general relaxation of the policy might be considered as a breach of trust on our part with a resultant loss of good will toward the program, the retention of the policy is essential from an administrative standpoint. A general relaxation of the present policy, with respect to the confidentiality of the records, would probably cause account number holders to apply for new numbers under fictitious names and new applicants for account numbers to give misleading information because of the possibility that correct information might some day be used against them. Were many individuals to obtain account numbers under assumed names or to submit incorrect data for our records, a serious disruption of the basic operations and services for the social security program might well be anticipated.

Administration of the social security program does not necessitate the keeping of current address information with respect to the more than 120 million persons who have been issued social security account numbers. Thus, the only address information in our files is generally the individual's address at the time he applied for a social security account number. Frequently this happened many years ago. Thus, a person's current whereabouts could be ascertained only if a recent report of earnings for him has been submitted, and then, the only address available would be the address of his employer or place of self-employment. Because of the length of time it takes to receive and process wage reports, there is generally a lag of about 9 months between the time a person worked and the time his wages are credited to his earnings account. There is an even longer period in the case of self-employed persons who file their returns on an annual basis. Thus, the information we could furnish, if permissible, would never be very current and would probably be of limited value for the purpose of locating the present whereabouts of persons.

Since the inception of the social-security programs, we have received a wide variety of requests from law-enforcement officials for information indicating the whereabouts of persons who have committed or who are suspected of committing various crimes. These requests have been uniformly refused, the only basic exception being in connection with an investigation of major importance relating to the commission of an act of espionage or sabotage inimical to the national security.

We have on several occasions reviewed our policy regarding the disclosure of information and we shall continue to do so. However, in view of the discussion above, we believe that at present there are greater equities in favor of continuing the present policy than in revising our regulation along the lines you propose.

We hope the above explains our position in this matter. If further information is desired, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

C. I. SCHOTTLAND,
Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the time is long overdue for Congress to review the need for surrounding the social security records with secrecy in the face of the increasing incidence and costliness of child neglect and family abandonment.

Sewage Called Damaging to Northeast Fishing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the Boston (Mass.) Herald on December 11, 1958, telling more about the danger from pollution to fishing and human beings.

That article was an interesting discussion of how everybody points a finger at everybody else on pollution but very few do much about it.

The citizens of New England point to the Navy's dumping of sewage offshore and the Navy points to citizens dumping sewage into the ocean. The result is a thoroughly unsanitary condition for the people in the area as well as serious danger to the fishing and shell fishing industries in the area.

The article follows:

SEWAGE CALLED DAMAGING TO NORTHEAST FISHING—NAVAL DISTRICT HEAD DENIES HIS VESSELS ADD TO POLLUTION

The chairman of the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission charged yesterday that irreparable damage may be caused New England fishing and beaches by the dumping of sewage offshore by naval and merchant vessels.

The commandant of the First Naval District issued a quick denial that the Navy contributed to pollution.

CHARGE MADE IN NEW YORK

Edward T. Dickinson, chairman of the NEIWPCC and a commissioner of the New York Commerce Department, made the charge in a New York speech at a commission meeting.

New England communities spend millions annually, he said, to control water pollution, "yet these efforts are constantly frustrated by the dumping of sewage into offshore waters by vessels with no regard for the efforts and expense of these communities."

"It is highly discouraging," Dickinson added, "for a community to construct with hard-earned tax dollars a facility which will prevent its own sewage from polluting rivers and offshore waters and then to have a vessel—with no apparent concern for pollution—discharge the sewage of hundreds of men.

"There is no excuse for this, when the proper precautions would prevent the pollution of these waters upon which so much of the economy of New England depends."

SAYS PROTESTS IN VAIN

He said the organization has protested to Federal public health authorities oil spills from vessels but that the Commission's attempt to improve the situation have so far been largely in vain.

"It is imperative," he said, "that some action be taken before irreparable damage is done to the beaches of New England and its shellfishing industry."

Rear Adm. Carl F. Espe, First Naval District commandant, denied that naval vessels have polluted offshore waters and pointed out that nobody has made any complaints to us.

ONLY FEW SHIPS

"The only possible place that might be affected," he said, "is Newport, and that's deep tidal water which would carry refuse out to sea.

"We have only a few ships at the navy yard, and we have strict regulations that ships must be a certain number of miles offshore when they refuel or clear their bilges.

"By the way," Admiral Espe added, "don't most of these cities dump their own sewage into the ocean?"

Counselor Clifford Responds for Freedom of Research for Krebiozen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, my personal correspondence with the Honorable Counselor Thomas N. Clifford and his attitude on the subject of krebiozen after correspondence with the American Cancer Society and the American Medical Association references only goes to prove that you cannot fool all the people all the time. The edict that krebiozen shall not pass is herculean in its strength of purpose. But I can only say that a bad bargain is a bad fight and that justice will prevail in the end—even if we who feel the urge of a righteous cause must go searching in the dark corners of this infamous conspiracy. In the end we find the answer.

The medical benefits of krebiozen, even in its early experimentation in Senator Vandenberg's case, will be the answer to the world—meantime we investigate. I am proud of the efforts of Attorney Clifford to clarify the issue. His interest is the honest citizen's interest in seeing that the poor, ailing, unfortunate victims of this dreaded disease get the best treatment that medical science, under the freedom of research, can give to him.

The correspondence follows:

BALTIMORE, MD., *November 26, 1958.*

Congressman ROLAND LIBONATI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIBONATI: I would appeciate it very much if you could send me a copy of your remarks with respect to the drug, krebiozen.

I wish to congratulate you for your efforts in forcing and prodding a national agency to do its duty.

I merely note, in passing, that these same agencies which must be prodded to investigate possible cures never have to be prodded when it comes to asking the public for money and telling the public how much they are doing.

Please keep up the good work; you are getting nationwide attention.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS N. CLIFFORD,
Attorney and Counselor at Law.

BALTIMORE, MD., *February 12, 1959.*
The Honorable ROLAND V. LIBONATI,
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIBONATI: I appreciated your excerpt very much as I had tried to get that issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and was unable to do so. Enclosed please find a copy of my recent correspondence with the American Cancer Society on krebiozen. I have sent copies of this to Senator DOUGLAS but thought you also would be interested.

I commend you and compliment you for the courage you have shown in this matter.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS N. CLIFFORD,
Attorney and Counselor at Law.

FEBRUARY 16, 1959.

Mr. THOMAS N. CLIFFORD,
Attorney at Law, Baltimore, Md.

DEAR COUNSELOR: I certainly appreciate having the copies, which you recently sent to me, of your correspondence with the American Cancer Society on the subject of krebiozen. I could make use of this material, in order to carry a point, relative to the present controversy between the National Cancer Institute and Dr. Andrew C. Ivy and the Krebiozen Research Foundation.

There is no question but that the American Cancer Society is dominated by the American Medical Association, and the evasive answers to your questions only proved that the board of directors and the various committees which passed upon this request, with their "do nothing" policy, is a result of this vicious pressure. I would like to reprint this correspondence in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with your name, if you so desire, deleted. I believe that you realize that you have accomplished a great deal in eliciting answers from them to very pertinent questions, and I believe that it is in the public interest that the public know the attitudes of these individuals who have control over these public funds, and administer these funds in accordance with the whims and caprices of the medical-political professionalists, who dominate the policies of the American Medical Association.

Maybe the raising of millions of dollars of funds for charitable projects has become a "racket," and the longer that they remain in the test-tube stage of development, the longer patronage and job payrollers remain in their soft berths.

Would you please be so kind as to indicate to me your attitude in this matter, as it is important that we trace the malignant jobgrowth of this charity to its source. They quibble too much over procedures for their honesty of purpose while we seek a cure. They complain too loudly against another who, seemingly, has perfected a work that the public expects its charity dollars to do. Maybe we should investigate the American Cancer Society's operations. At least, their "do nothing" attitude creates a suspicion that they don't want a cure or that their desire is to prolong the agony of others, while they fiddle around, trying to perfect their own cure. Some progress should have been made up to this time in the control of cancer by them. Krebiozen has a record that anyone can read in the reports of the Krebiozen Research Foundation, given by 500 doctors in actual cases which they have treated.

I hope that you will agree with me in permitting me to print all correspondence which you have sent to me in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for Americans to read and understand. I hope that this does not embarrass you.

Sincerely,

ROLAND V. LIBONATI,
Member of Congress.

BALTIMORE, MD., *February 17, 1959.*
The Honorable ROLAND V. LIBONATI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIBONATI: I have received your letter of February 16, 1959, acknowledging receipt of my correspondence with the American Cancer Society and requesting permission to print the same in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I grant you that permission and also permission to use my name and address provided you also print this letter along with the correspondence so that I may make my position clear on, one, the charity funds and, two, the American Medical Association.

With respect to the charity funds, it is now obvious to me that at least some of them are becoming honeycombed with abuses that react to the disadvantage of the entire public.

There is a basically unhealthy condition inherent in all charity foundations. It is that unless all services are on a volunteer basis and are fully explained to the public there is an inevitable tendency by officers and employees to perpetuate their jobs by the simple expedient of becoming skeptical about new ideas for cures. The only way to eradicate this danger is to have everybody serve on a volunteer basis or if some people must be paid, then there should be yearly financial statements of income and disbursements published.

I personally feel that a congressional investigation into this matter would be good since the public would then know which are the worthy charities and which are the unworthy charities and the unworthy ones would be promptly eliminated.

I do not feel that I have the same right to criticize the American Medical Association since they are not soliciting public funds to run their organization, whereas, the American Cancer Society is using public funds for purposes which I feel are quite contrary to the public desire.

Nevertheless, if the American Medical Association has an unhealthy contact or relationship with the American Cancer Society and either of them or both of them are working together in any manner to prevent the testing of any product that might be helpful in fighting cancer then this condition must be corrected.

That this controversy should involve the American Medical Association is distressing to me since I feel that I owe my life to an emergency appendectomy performed on me by a Dr. Hart of Duke University. Furthermore, on other occasions where I have consulted practicing physicians, I feel they always did their best to help me.

However, if there is a group of nonpracticing political physicians who have become powerful in the American Medical Association and are creating abuses in that association then that association must submit to correction just as the bar association or the courts or any other group must yield to the public interest.

It is my sincere hope that you may be successful not only in obtaining a test of krebiozen but also inaugurate a new day in our research era whereby those groups which are soliciting funds will be the very first to seek out any treatment or rumored treatment that has shown any promise, and will submit complete records of their activity including yearly financial statements published in the newspapers.

Enclosed please find and feel free to retain after sending me photostats, the original letter of the American Cancer Society of January 6, 1959, and the original letter of the American Cancer Society of January 30, 1959. The subject matter of their letter of December 9, 1958, is in effect repeated and covered in more detail in their letter of January 6, 1959.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS N. CLIFFORD,
Attorney and Counselor at Law.

Send Menshikov Home—Recall Our Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to be temperate when I speak of the Soviet regime and its complete disregard for honor and integrity. Their attitude has been one of duplicity at every turn. Another example of the callousness of the Soviet leaders is the case involving the American plane shot down over Russia on September 2, 1958. One begins to wonder: "Why should we continue to try to maintain relations with this country?"

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial on this subject from the U.S. News & World Report of February 13, 1959:

SEND MENSHIKOV HOME—RECALL OUR AMBASSADOR

(By David Lawrence)

We have reached the end of the line with the present Government of the Soviet Union. Diplomatic relations no longer are of any practical value.

When a government—through its Deputy Premier, through its Foreign Office and through its accredited Ambassador—lies repeatedly to another government, there can be no trust in any promise or pledge or so-called agreement emanating from such a regime.

Ever since September 2 last, when 17 American airmen were deliberately murdered as their unarmed transport strayed a few miles over Russia due to a navigational error, the United States has been trying to elicit the facts from the Soviet Government.

The Moscow regime, its Deputy Premier and its Ambassador in Washington have persistently disclaimed any knowledge, except that the plane crashed and that six bodies were recovered.

Yet, in an aviation journal published in the Soviet Union, about 2 weeks after the episode last September, there is given in detail an account of a so-called practice mission which parallels in large part what actually happened when the American transport was shot down. The same information and almost identical radio conversations between the attacking pilots were recorded on a tape—obtained by American authorities through its efficient intelligence system—at the exact time and place that the American plane went down.

This tape recording tells in dramatic manner how the American plane was shot down even though it was fully recognized as an unarmed transport, and hence entitled to be guided to a safe landing. But the recording of the conversation of the Soviet flyers shows also how they gloated over the murder of the American airmen. All the evidence and the written transcript of the tape recording was presented last November directly to Soviet Ambassador Menshikov in Washington.

When Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan came to this country in January, he was asked specifically by Vice President Nixon and Secretary Dulles about the facts uncovered in the tape recording. The State Department declared last week in a formal statement concerning the Mikoyan conference with Mr. Dulles:

"Mr. Mikoyan said that the Soviet Government had done all that it could, that all the

bodies had been returned and that the Soviet Government did not know about any other personnel. * * * He denied that the plane had been shot down, asserting that it had crashed."

How can any government in the Western World—in the face of the evidence presented—any longer do business with the Soviet regime? Of what use are "new ideas" or the historic devices of diplomacy itself when dealing with a crooked government? Of what avail are summit conferences or tours of Soviet Russia by high officials of the West?

The time has come for the United States to take the lead in cutting off all diplomatic relations with the barbaric dynasty that rules in Moscow.

The time has come for the United States to urge all its allies to do likewise and to embargo all trade with the Soviet empire.

There is no need to go to war, ostracism is a salutary alternative. There is every reason to isolate the Soviet regime and, applying the words of the late President Franklin Roosevelt, to impose a "quarantine" on the Moscow government. Had such a course been followed by our allies in the 1930's the Hitler government would never have gotten the munitions it needed so acutely in order to build up its war machine.

America has been studiously patient. The facts about the tape recording were available to the Soviet Government as far back as last November. The United States tried for months, quietly and without publicity or the display of public emotion, to get the Soviet Government to cooperate at least in establishing the facts—the discussion of responsibility for the error of the unarmed transport could come later.

Most insulting of all, however, was the attitude of Ambassador Menshikov in his meeting with the Deputy Under Secretary of State, Robert Murphy, on November 13 last. The State Department's indictment says:

"Mr. Murphy said that it was Ambassador Menshikov's responsibility, as Soviet Ambassador to the United States, to listen to the representations that were being made to him. The Soviet Ambassador nonetheless refused to listen to the tape recording."

Why should the United States continue to deal with any Ambassador who shows such discourtesy to the Government to which he is accredited? Why should we keep an American Ambassador in Moscow who is refused information about the cold-blooded murder of 17 American citizens?

Millions of Americans would answer: Send Menshikov home—recall our Ambassador.

Lithuania Has Not Died

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, in addition to my remarks of yesterday on the Lithuanian Independence Day, I would also like to insert a very interesting editorial from my home newspaper, the Bayonne Times:

LITHUANIA HAS NOT DIED

On February 16 in the winter after the Bolshevik revolution, little Lithuania proclaimed her independence, and it is testimony to the eternal strength of the human spirit that Lithuanians in the United States have not forgotten it. They might have become discouraged and disillusioned, and they might have abandoned hope, because in June 1940 the Soviet Union confiscated the tiny neighbor that Lenin had pledged to hold inviolate. Loyal Lithuanian citizens were killed, or arrested and transported to scattered points within the Soviet Union where they could be watched and kept isolated.

At that time Stalin broke the promise made by Stalin by the Lenin he claimed to adore, the Soviet Union could and did plead military necessity. That necessity has long since passed, but now the Kremlin looks upon former Lithuania as an integral part of its dominions. It is the glory of the people of Lithuanian descent, here in Bayonne and elsewhere, that they do not agree, and are determined never to agree. We hope they don't.

It may well be that there will never be a Lithuania in the sense that there was one between 1918 and 1940. But if the spirit that prompts observances of Lithuanian Independence Day in the United States is preserved in the hearts of men, we can be sure that tyranny and tyrants will never be permanently enthroned.

Letter by Hon. John J. Rhodes to the Editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to insert in the RECORD the letter which I have today sent to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 18, 1959.

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: An editorial in the Washington Post of February 18 is an example of the kind of thinking which many professional budget-stretchers are indulging in at this time to the harm, I think, of our country. Sounding a note of alarm, the Post insists that we have to add billions of dollars to the administration's defense budget or be faced with national catastrophe.

The Post suggests that we are going to sit by and count our dollars while the Russians outproduce us in intercontinental missiles. It also says, "If Members of Congress abhor the prospect that the United States will be reduced to a second-best position as much as they ought to abhor it * * * it is their duty to vote the military appropriations they think the country really needs." And again, "It is time that Congress * * * addressed itself to the vital problem of who is going to save the country in the next 6 years." And again, "The psychological consequences of an inferior missile status could be devastating."

This is precisely the kind of irresponsible comment which does more psychological damage than we can calculate. It used to be that the great American game was keeping up with the Joneses. Now it is keeping up with the Russians. It is manifestly absurd to believe that any nation can stay ahead of any other nation in all categories. I am sure that we do not produce anywhere near as many drozhkies as the Russians, but who cares? Likewise, as long as we have a Defense Establishment which deters the Russians from attacking us and which will do so for the foreseeable future the possibility that we may be behind in one item of that defense should only bother those who are intent on spreading the psychology of fear among our people.

Nobody ever won a race by looking back over his shoulder continuously. We are ahead in practically every race we are running with the Russians, and we will remain so unless the panicmongers talk us out of it. One element in winning that race consists of maintaining a strong economy. It has always been the aim of the President to adopt an adequate posture of defense and at the same time maintain the enormous strength of the American economy. He has succeeded beautifully except in the eyes of some individuals who insist on looking at the head of a pin instead of the whole pincushion.

While I have often disagreed with your paper, I have never felt before that an attitude you have taken is so completely detrimental to the welfare of our people. I appreciate the candor with which you have always discussed issues, and the fact that you have always been keenly aware of the responsibility the free press of America owes to our people. It is my hope that you will reexamine your editorial policy in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. RHODES,
Member of Congress.

Resolution Honoring Dr. Malcolm Y. Colby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Malcolm Y. Colby, a citizen of Austin, Tex., for many years, has just retired as professor of physics at the University of Texas after 34 years of dedicated and distinguished service in the field of higher education. During this period, Dr. Colby served as chairman of the department of physics at the university.

Indicating the high respect and regard which Texans have for Dr. Colby, the Senate of Texas passed a resolution by Senator Charles F. Herring, senator from the district in which I have the privilege of residing, honoring Dr. Colby.

The resolution as prepared by Senator Herring and as passed by the Senate of Texas is as follows:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 44

"Whereas the people of the State of Texas wish to acknowledge the debt they owe Dr. Malcomb Y. Colby, distinguished member of the faculty of the University of Texas, who has retired after 34 years of devoted service; and

"Whereby Dr. Colby served as chairman of the department of physics for many years; and

"Whereas in addition to his devoted service to the university, he was executive director of the War Research Laboratory during World War II which pursued research vital to the war effort and also served as counselor for the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies from 1953 to 1957; and

"Whereas Dr. Colby has been a source of inspiration to the many thousands of students who have come under his tutelage and they in turn have been greatly enriched by that association; and

"Whereas the State has derived immeasurable benefits from the many years of dedicated service of this devoted educator; and

"Whereas it is the desire of the Senate of 56th Legislature of the State of Texas to acknowledge the contribution to education of this outstanding man: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That when the senate adjourns today, it do so in his honor; and that a page in the permanent senate journal be devoted to the recording of this resolution; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That an enrolled copy of this resolution be sent to Dr. Colby as a token of deep appreciation for the services he has rendered.

"BEN RAMSEY,
"President of the Senate."

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the senate on February 4, 1959.

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

Poison in Your Water—No. 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington (D. C.) Post and Times Herald of May 20, 1958, entitled "Troubled Water," which describes the reasons for continuation of full appropriation of $45 million to carry out the purposes of Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress as well as reasons for further increasing and extending that program.

Remember, this is the water that we drink.

The article is as follows:

TROUBLED WATER

It is astonishing that anyone in Washington with eyes—or a nose—could remain indifferent to the need for expanding pollution controls. The sludgy waters of the Potomac offer a shameful example of the kind of neglect of water resources that is now costing the United States an estimated $1 billion a year. Yet in some hidden sanctuary of the Bureau of the Budget a decision has been made to terminate the promising Federal water pollution control program by 1960 and then dump the problem in the laps of the States. This would reverse legislation already passed by Congress, with administration support, calling for a 10-year, $500 million incentive program to help communities develop sewage treatment plants.

Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, author of the pollution control legislation, is properly outraged by this turnabout. Today, Mr. BLATNIK's House Public Works Subcommittee begins hearing on new legislation to double the present grants of $50 million a year—which would merely bring the program to the size originally contemplated. In the 2 years in which the program has already been operating, Mr. BLATNIK points out, $76 million in Federal funds has helped finance 930 projects. State and local governments have put up $274 million to match the Federal contribution—a ratio of $5 in local funds for each Federal dollar. Surely this is an impressive demonstration of how badly the Federal incentive program was needed.

There is great need to conserve and cleanse the Nation's precious water resources. The problem is particularly pressing the Washington area, where the Potomac has become, in Mr. BLATNIK's rueful phrase, "the best-dressed cesspool in the country." Mr. BLATNIK's efforts to expand and continue the cleanup program should win wide support in Congress, and perhaps persuade the administration to acknowledge more realistically a problem literally under its nose.

Address by the Honorable Rex Bell, Lieutenant Governor of Nevada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the address given by the Honorable Rex Bell, Lieutenant Governor of Nevada, at the Lincoln Day luncheon in Boise, Idaho, February 14, honoring the sesquicentennial birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln.

The address follows:

My friends, it most assuredly is a pleasure for me to be with you, my neighbors, and it is a distinct honor for me to be invited by you to make a Lincoln Day address, for we in this Nation need very badly to refresh our minds on, and dedicate our hearts to, those things for which Abraham Lincoln stood. Returning to that philosophy and to the foundations on which the Republican Party was built, our Nation can remain safe and strong, the haven of the oppressed, the home of free enterprise, and the leader among those who believe in the dignity of man.

I come to you from Nevada, the fastest growing State in our Nation; the State with fewer laws, fewer taxes, fewer restrictions than are to be found in any State in our Union of States. Like you in Idaho, we in Nevada face the future unafraid, because both States are rich in natural resources, both States abound in opportunity for anyone who will work, and both of us are on the threshold of an era of prosperity.

We are pioneer States, frontier States, States where the spirit, the courage, and the fortitude of the men and women who blazed the trails of our Western civilization still abounds. We live close enough to those trailblazers who settled our valleys, crossed our mountains and built our civilization in this frontier to understand that if we fulfill our heritage, if we follow the trials they blazed when they built a State from the vastness of these mountains, if we keep faith with them, we are building a Nation as they built a State, that will be at once an inspiration to those who will follow us, and a safeguard to those who share with us this American way of life.

Abraham Lincoln, too, was a pioneer. He shared the hardships of those who tilled the virgin soils of the West. It was in the log cabin of the early settlers that he first learned those traditions upon which the Republican Party was founded. Abraham Lincoln might have been even closer to us, for he refused the office of secretary and Governor of Oregon Territory, of which this great State was a part in 1849. Eleven years later he was nominated for the presidency on an anti-slavery platform as the standard bearer of the Republican Party. History tells us that 2 weeks from today, on February 28, the Republican Party will be 105 years old, for it was formed at Ripon, Wis., on February 28, 1854, and the first State organization of our party was at Jackson, Mich., on July 6, of that year.

Abraham Lincoln was the standard bearer of a 5-year-old political party, its first standard bearer when he was elected to the Presidency of the United States. Never before and never since has a political party had a leader as was the first presidential candidate elected under the banner of the Republican Party.

Through the century of progress of our great Nation since Abraham Lincoln was elected to the Presidency, our party has furnished our country many of its great leaders, and I will have to include among them Dwight D. Eisenhower, who ended the Korean debacle, who brought us peace, who has kept us out of war, and has given our country its greatest era of prosperity. Never in the years that he has been in the White House has Dwight D. Eisenhower sacrificed the principles of freedom and liberty enunciated by the father of our party, Abraham Lincoln. That is a record of which he, we, and all Americans can be proud and one which we, as Republicans, should carry to the farthest corner of this Western country.

Abraham Lincoln was a child of the prairies, of the wide open spaces. The story of his rail-splitting feats is well known, he furnished the foundation on which the tracks were laid to reclaim the wilderness with the iron horse. As his country expanded and became greater and stronger, so did Abraham Lincoln. He typified the spirit of the pioneer, the dogged determination to overcome every obstacle, the determination to make this a country where man might enjoy the benefits of his own labor, and where what he did, not what he had, was the factor that determined his standing in his community and his chapter in the great history of this Nation.

The principles he enunciated, the platform on which he was first elected, and his loyalty to his belief in the dignity of the individual are the principles of the Republican Party, the party he founded, and they are principles upon which rest the very life of the greatest Nation in the world.

My own Nevada was battle born. Lincoln needed the two votes of Nevada's first Senators and the wealth of Nevada's mines to keep this a unified solid Nation. He proclaimed Nevada a State in 1864, we of Nevada are extremely proud of the part, under the guidance and leadership of Abraham Lincoln, we have played in our country's history.

Boise was a city before Virginia City in Nevada was struck. Idaho and Nevada stand side by side physically and in the story of our development. We became great because of the wealth of our natural resources and the determination of our pioneers.

Both of our States have contributed strong men to the development of the West, and both have furnished our legislative branch of the Government with men who left an indelible mark on the history of our country. Your Senator William Borah, "The Dean of the Senate", is one who should not be overlooked when we seek to point to a champion of the people.

My friends, in many spots in our Nation the Republicans were defeated in the elections of last November. In my own State, we have a Democrat as governor, and most of the State offices now are filled by the members of the Democratic Party. As a matter of fact, I was the only one in State government who survived the landslide in Nevada. Don't take the setback of 1958 too much to heart. A century ago, in 1858, Abraham

Lincoln suffered an equally humiliating defeat at the polls. That is right, 2 years before he was elected to the presidency for the first time, Mr. Lincoln was defeated for the U.S. Senate.

Let us here and now take a leaf from the rule book of the father of our party. He did not cry about his defeat, he did not moan, he did not predict either the end of the world or the end of the Nation. He went to work. He went to the people. He carried the cause of freedom and the love of liberty to the average American in his home. He stuck defiantly and bravely to his platform, freedom and the dignity of man. Two years after going down to defeat at the polls in Illinois, he was elected President of the United States of America. He sacrificed neither his principles, which were the principles upon which the Republic Party was born, nor his faith in the people. He knew, as we who follow in his footsteps should know, that freedom flourishes in the environment of peace, but that to remain free, a nation must be prepared to fight for and defend that freedom.

In Idaho, as in Nevada in 1958, the Republicans lost ground. Indeed the same was true throughout the Nation, save in exceptional instances. My friends, you and I, and all of us must be ready for 1960. We must emulate the Republicans of 100 years ago. We are followers of, devotees of, Abraham Lincoln. History must repeat itself in 1960. Defeated and maybe I can say discouraged in 1858, Abraham Lincoln went out and fought, and in 1860 won the shining victory that has meant so much to our Nation and the whole world.

It is a challenge to you in Idaho, it is a challenge to us in Nevada, it is a challenge to Republicans in every State in the Nation. Can we meet that challenge? Will you, each and every one of you, rededicate your lives to your party, as in time of stress and trouble, you dedicate it to your government.

My friends, it is just that serious. The Republican Party is your government. The principles of Abraham Lincoln are the principles which have made this Nation strong, safe, secure.

Your job and mine is to prove this to the people, our fellow Americans, what our party has done for our Nation, our national security, and for them as individuals. I am not afraid of the judgment of my fellow Americans. Nor should you be, my friends. My only fear, your only fear, your country's only danger lies with us, you and me, Republicans, Americans.

Let you and I make a solemn pledge to one another. I'll take the State pledge of Nevada, which is, "All for our country"; you take the State pledge of Idaho, which is, "Exist Forever." Let us join those two pledges under a common banner, the banner of the Republican Party. If we can persuade enough Americans that the principles of Abraham Lincoln that saved this Nation of ours in one of its most severe crises, we can make it exist forever. If we can prove to the people of our Nation that the freedom, prosperity, and equality that they enjoy are the principles of Abraham Lincoln and the Republican Party, and they, like you and me, should be all for our country, then in 1960 we can return to the White House in Washington the standard bearer of the party of Abraham Lincoln, and indeed, my fellow Republicans, if we give all for our country it will, indeed, exist forever.

So let the spirit of the pioneers who built a nation from a wilderness give us the strength, the courage and the dogged determination to keep faith with the truly great father of the Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln. Your State leader, Governor Smylie, shows you that the Republican Party can win, does win, and will win in Idaho. His leadership should inspire you to go into the farthest corners of your great State to preach the gospel of your party, to expound the principles of the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln. Study your leaders, remember William Borah and his inspired speeches in the U.S. Senate of which he was the dean when he died. Faith in your leadership, faith in your citizens, faith in yourself will carry your party to victory on every level in 1960.

Thumb through the pages of history, of your Nation and of your State. Your happiest days, the days of your greatest prosperity and progress and peace have been enjoyed when those dedicated to the principles of Abraham Lincoln sat in the White House. Just as truly and as bravely as the pioneers of Lincoln's day blazed the trails through your forests, established your communities that became your cities, fought your enemies and made Idaho a safe State in which to live, a good State in which to bring your children up in the American way of life, so you, inspired by their deeds, encouraged by what they accomplished, can go to your citizens of today and show them how closely this Nation's program of peace and prosperity, of equality and justice, is tied to the principles of Abraham Lincoln, and how, only with those principles to guide us, can we as a Nation of free people hope to live at peace with the world. We need not shed the blood of our sons and daughters on the field of battle to create a false prosperity or a false patriotism. We must be strong, we must be able to defend ourselves from all enemies, within and without. This we can do more readily and more safely if we are guided in our thinking by the principles of Abraham Lincoln. George Washington, the father of our country, created the American way of life. Abraham Lincoln saved it, and it is up to us, to you and to me, to preserve it.

Our task is not an easy one. But we in the West, still living on the frontier of opportunity, still close to the spirit of the pioneers, have the strength, the fortitude, and the ability to do it. Moreover, as Americans, we have a duty to perform, and that duty is to keep alive the American system of free enterprise, to preserve the dignity of our citizens, to offer opportunity to all to enjoy the fruits of his labor.

No clear thinking, honest American would change for 1 minute the motivating principles that inspired Abraham Lincoln to become one of the greatest liberators the world has ever known, a champion of all people. Those principles during the past century have seen kings and dictators overthrown and the entire world reach a new high in living. We, as a Nation are the envy of the world. We, as Americans, enjoy more freedom, a greater prosperity, a higher plane of life, than do the citizens of any nation. We paid a small price for that freedom. Humanity throughout the world struggles day after day to reach that goal, the goal that we sometimes hold too lightly. That goal was very simply stated by Abraham Lincoln as he stood on one of the battlefields of the war that preserved our unity as a Nation. I quote:

"That this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

So, my friends, as I say goodbye to you for this time, let me remind you that you and I, as members of the Republican Party, the party of Abraham Lincoln, have a solemn duty, a difficult task, to perform. Each of us, keeping faith with our country, our party, and our leader, must dedicate ourselves to the task that he so nobly performed, the task of keeping alive the high principles of the party of progress, of prosperity and of peace, the Republican Party. No mountain is too high for us to scale, no river too swift for us to ford, no valley too wide for us to cross, no mining shaft too deep for us to invade to carry to the men and women of our great country the message of Abraham Lincoln and the principles for which he stood. If each one of us here tonight will do his or her part, if each of us will give the full measure of our devotion to this great cause, then on the centennial of Abraham Lincoln's election to the Presidency of the United States, we shall place in the White House a man of like faith, a man devoted to keeping this country peaceful and prosperous, where the dignity of man is preserved, and where people of all creeds and all faiths can live to enjoy the fruits of their labor, to educate their children, and hold in their hearts this thought from the second inaugural adddress of Abraham Lincoln:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations."

They did it a century ago, my fellow Republicans, and we can do it again in 1960. We in Nevada are young as a State, you in Idaho are even younger. We have the strength, the enthusiasm, the vitality of youth. We can point the way. We can, by diligence, perseverance, honest effort and ceaseless toil become the leaders of our party. In us, and those like us, lies the hope of the party of Abraham Lincoln, indeed I might say, the hope of the Nation.

As the pioneers of 1860 won their fight, so can we, the pioneers of 1960, win ours. The principles are the same, the challenge is the same. A united and a prosperous family of States, marching forward proudly and unafraid under a common banner, the Stars and Stripes. Let us beware of the hammer and the sickle, let us protect ourselves from the inroads of a Socialist state. Let us keep America free, by keeping alive within our hearts and our borders the thoughts, the principles, and the inspiration that gave our party Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, the true and faithful preserver of the American way of life, the greatest the world has ever known.

Thank you for bearing with me. We are neighbors. Come to visit Nevada when you will. You of Idaho and we of Nevada have much in common. We both are suffering from growing pains, but together we can become increasingly important to our great Nation. We, of the Republican Party, the party of Abraham Lincoln, can do much to make the centennial of his first inauguration as important to our Nation as was his ascendency to the Presidency by returning to the White House in 1960 a man who stands steadfast under his banner, and four square for the principles for which Abraham Lincoln gave the last full measure of his devotion. That is your duty, that is my duty, and with God's help, we shall not fail.

I thank you.

Interparliamentary Union Holds Its 47th Conference in Rio de Janeiro, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Interparliamentary Union Holds Its 47th Conference in Rio de Janeiro, 1958

Introduction

The Interparliamentary Union which held its 47th Conference in Rio de Janeiro, July 24–August 1, 1958, is an international association which is presently composed of national groups from the parliaments of 55 nations. The object of the Union is to promote personal contacts between members of parliaments and to unite them in common action with a view to strengthening and developing democratic institutions; to advance work on behalf of peace and international collaboration; and to contribute to the development and progress of parliamentary institutions.

Part I. Historical Background

The Interparliamentary Union was founded in Paris in 1889. Its first conference was held in June of that year with the participation of 49 deputies representing France, Great Britain, Belgium, Denmark, Hungary, Italy, Liberia, Spain, and the United States of America. In 1892, meeting at Bern, Switzerland, the conference decided to set up a central organ under the name of the "Interparliamentary Bureau for International Arbitration." And in 1894 the fifth Interparliamentary Conference, held at The Hague, adopted the Statutes for the new organization.

The headquarters of the Union were in Bern until 1911, in Brussels from 1911 to 1914, in Oslo from 1914 to 1920, and since 1921 its headquarters have been in Geneva. The permanent secretariat is located at 6 Rue Constantin, Geneva, Switzerland.

Eighteen plenary conferences were held before 1914, and the Union was the guest during this early period of all the great capitals of Europe. From the Bern meeting onward, it met in the Parliament buildings and was soon welcomed by the heads of states and their Ministers. The first meeting on American soil was held at St. Louis, Mo., in 1904. By the time of the outbreak of World War I the Union counted 26 national groups and 3,500 members. Its influence gradually increased over the years, especially in Europe, and its proceedings were followed with attention in governmental circles.

Prior to World War I, during which its activities were suspended, the Interparliamentary Union devoted itself primarily to the cause of peace and international arbitration. After that conflict the Union broadened its activities and undertook, first, to study and seek solutions for all questions of an international character considered suitable for settlement by parliamentary action; and, second, it began to make suggestions for the development of parliamentary institutions with a view to improving their operations and enhancing their prestige.

The Second World War again interrupted the annual conferences of the Interparliamentary Union, but nevertheless the Geneva bureau maintained the structure of the organization. Following the conclusion of that conflict the Union resumed its labors, strengthened by the entry of national groups from 19 countries, some of which had recently obtained their independence. Beginning in 1947 12 annual conferences have been held in the following cities: Cairo, Rome, Stockholm, Dublin, Istanbul, Bern, Washingotn, Vienna, Helsinki, Bangkok, London, and Rio de Janeiro.

Composition and structure

In 1958 the Interparliamentary Union was composed of 55 national groups constituted within the parliaments of the following countries: Albania, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Ceylon, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Great Britain, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Rumania, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, U.S.S.R., United Arab Republic, Vietnam, and Yugoslavia. Only groups formed within the framework of a national parliament, or a parliament as an entity, may become members of the Union.

Within the Interparliamentary Union each national group has its own rules, officers, and secretariat. Groups are expected to exert a continuing influence within their respective parliaments in favor of the general objectives of the Union, and to take steps to secure action on the resolutions adopted by the Interparliamentary Conferences. The national groups also make a financial contribution to the Union, in accordance with a scale fixed by the Interparliamentary Council. Apart from their participation in the general activities of the Union, the national groups are encouraged to develop their mutual relations with each other on either a bilateral or a regional basis.

Organizations of a regional character also function within the framework of the Union. Such is the case of the Northern Interparliamentary Union founded in 1907, which comprises the three Scandinavian Kingdoms, Iceland and Finland. This regional Union holds periodic meetings at which questions of mutual interest are studied, but its members are equally active in supporting the work of the Interparliamentary Union itself. After the Second World War a similar regional body was established within what is known as Benelux, uniting the parliamentary groups of Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. At the 47th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, held at Rio de Janeiro in July, 1958, it was decided to constitute a Pan American Parliamentary Group composed of the nations of the Western Hemisphere, subject to their approval, and also a Latin American Parliamentary Group.

Structurally, the Interparliamentary Union operates through the annual Interparliamentary Conferences, which are held in different countries each year on the invitation of their parliaments; the Interparliamentary Council; the Interparliamentary Bureau; the Executive Committee; and seven standing study committees.

The Conferences speak for the Union on all problems falling within their scope. They do so by adopting resolutions which the national groups are expected to bring to the attention of their respective governments and parliaments. The agenda of the Conferences are fixed by the Council. They normally include a debate based on a report prepared by the Secretary General dealing with recent developments in the world situation, and a study of specific questions chosen by the Council. Apart from their deliberative role, the Conferences give their opinion on proposed amendments to the Statutes and are competent to elect the members of the Executive Committee on the basis of proposals made by the Council.

Each national group is entitled to appoint, to attend a conference, a number of delegates equal to a number of votes allocated to it by the Statutes. Article X of the Statutes stipulates in this respect that each group shall have a minimum of eight votes, with supplementary votes added in proportion to the size of the group and the population of the country which it represents. Voting within the union is thus representative of parliamentary opinion. The right to vote belongs to members of the Union who are present in person. They exercise this right individually and the votes can thus be divided within a single delegation.

The Interparliamentary Council, which is the directing organ of the Union, consists of two members from each regularly affiliated national group. It is the responsibility of the Council to convene Interparliamentary Conferences, to fix their agenda, to approve the annual budget of the Union, to propose to the Conferences candidates for election to the Executive Committee, and to appoint the Secretary General. The President of the Interparliamentary Council is elected for a period of 3 years. He may be reelected for a further term of 2 years, after which he is no longer eligible.

The Executive Committee is the administrative organ of the Union and exercises the functions delegated to it by the Council in conformity with the Statutes. It supervises the work of the Interparliamentary Bureau, and is responsible for examining information received concerning the creation of new groups. The Committee is composed of nine members belonging to different countries. The President of the Council is ex-officio a member and President of the Committee. The eight other members are elected by the plenary conferences for a term of 4 years. The Statutes require that consideration must be given in these elections to the contribution made to the work of the Union by the candidate and his group and that an endeavor be made to ensure a fair geographical distribution.

The Interparliamentary Bureau is the secretariat of the Union. It maintains contact with the national Interparliamentary groups and encourages their formation. It is the responsibility of the Bureau to prepare the questions for submission to the Council and to the Conferences, and to organize all meetings held under the auspices of the Union. It executes the decisions of the Council and the Confernces. Its official organ is the Interparliamentary Bulletin, which appears four times a year in French and in English. In addition to its administrative tasks, the Bureau carries out, according to the instructions of the Council, a program of studies and publications. At the head of the Bureau is a Secretary General who is elected by the Council and who has under him a small permanent staff necessary to carry out the functions of the Bureau.

The work of the plenary Conferences is, as a general rule, prepared by the Standing Study Committees set up within the framework of the Union. There are seven of these committees as follows: Committee on Political and Organization Questions; Committee on Juridical Questions; Committee on Economic and Financial Questions; Committee on Non-Self Governing Territories and Ethnical Questions; Committee on Reduction of Armaments; Committtee on Social and Humanitarian Questions; and Committee on Intellectual Questions. These Committees, on which all groups are entitled to be represented, meet some months before the Conferences and draft resolutions for submission to the latter. For the examination of the questions appearing in their agenda, the study committees have before them documents prepared by members of the Union, by the Interparliamentary Bureau, or by international institutions particularly concerned with the subject.

The officers of the Interparliamentary Union are as follows:

Honorary President: Viscount Stansgate, D.S.O., D.F.C. (Great Britain).

President of the Interparliamentary Council and of the Executive Committee: Prof. G. Codacci-Pisanelli (Italy).

Members of the Executive Committee: S. Braga (Brazil), Erik Hagberg (Sweden), N. A. Mikhailov (U.S.S.R.), I. A. Mulla (Iraq), R. G. Senanayake (Ceylon), Col. Sir Malcolm Stoddart-Scott (Great Britain), M. Zarroug (Sudan), A. Wahab Khan (Pakistan).

Secretary General: André De Blonay.

Member groups: Albania, America (United States of), Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France,

Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Great Britain, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Rumania, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, U.S.S.R., United Arab Republic, Vietnam, Yugoslavia.

Meetings and activities

Since its first meeting in Paris in 1889, the Interparliamentary Union has held 47 conferences of which the most recent was that in Rio de Janeiro in July 1958. The annual plenary meetings of the conference are open. The meetings of the Council and of the standing study committees (twice yearly) and of the executive commitee (three times yearly) are closed. In 1959 the Union will meet in Warsaw and in 1960 in Tokyo. The seven standing subcommittees met at Nice in April 1957 and in Geneva in the spring of 1958.

Since its creation the Interparliamentary Union has examined, studied and debated most of the major problems of international relations. Up to 1914 the Union focused its efforts upon the promotion of arbitration and the rule of law in relations between states. Since World War I the Union has concerned itself with the development of international relations, the codification of international law, the reduction of armaments and the promotion of international security, economic and financial problems such as the control of international trusts and cartels, economic regional agreements, access to raw materials, and currency convertibility; the situation of non-self-governing territories, including the representation of the native population in the deliberative assemblies, and the development of trade unions and labor organizations in nonmetropolitan territories; questions of social policy such as immigration and emigration problems, unemployment, the regulation of hours of work and vocational training, and the refugee problem; also cultural exchanges as a means of international understanding, and the removal of barriers to the unimpeded exchange of information; as well as the development and improvement of representative political institutions and parliamentary practices.

The activities of the permanent secretariat of the Union at Geneva include the technical examination of all international questions suitable for settlement by parliamentary action, the preparation of reports for, and the organization of, the annual conference and Council sessions, as well as the production of Union publications.

Publications

The publications of the Interparliamentary Union include the following:

1. Proceedings of Interparliamentary Conferences, published annually.

2. The Interparliamentary Union—Its Organization and Its Work, a 26-page brochure, Geneva, 1957.

3. The Interparliamentary Union: Statutes and Rules, Geneva, 1957.

4. The Annual Report of the Secretary-General.

5. The Interparliamentary Bulletin, a quarterly periodical which is the official organ of the Union.

6. Constitutional and Parliamentary Information, a quarterly review of constitutional law and parliamentary practice, published by the Association of Secretaries General of Parliaments with the collaboration of the Interparliamentary Bureau. Thirty-five numbers of this quarterly review have appeared to date.

Autonomous Section of Secretaries General of Parliaments

Founded in 1938 within the framework of the Union, the Autonomous Section of Secretaries General of Parliaments brings together the high officials of legislative assemblies.

The Section has its own organization, but its activities are financed from the Budget of the Union itself. The Statutes of the Section were adopted in Cairo in 1947. Its plenary assemblies and the sessions of its Executive Committee generally take place at the same time and in the same city as the Inter-Parliamentary meetings.

The object of the Section is to establish personal contacts between its members, to insure the regular exchange of information and documentation between them, and to encourage common study of the technical problems of parliamentary life.

The studies of the Section usually take the form of international inquiries, in which the secretariats of the different Parliaments take part. The following are among the subjects that have been treated: "The Administrative Organization of Parliaments"; "Parliamentary Immunity"; "Respect of the Law by Parliaments"; "Control of the Constitutionality of Laws"; "The Powers of the Chair in Legislative Assemblies"; "Parliamentary Committees"; "Delegated Legislation."

The Autonomous Section publishes, in French and English editions, a quarterly bulletin entitled "Constitutional and Parliamentary Information." This contains recent constitutional documents of different countries, as well as the results of inquiries conducted by the Section.

Under the direction of Lord Campion, former Clerk of the House of Commons, a comparative study, entitled "European Parliamentary procedure", was published in England in 1953, and was so successful that a French translation appeared in 1955.

The Section works in close association with the Union itself, which calls upon that body whenever it takes up a problem of parliamentary procedure.

Relations with United Nations and other international institutions

The Union maintains regular official relations with the United Nations Organization and its specialized agencies. It is one of the 10 nongovernmental international organizations upon which the Economic and Social Council has conferred category A consultative status. It also has consultative arrangements with the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

These links do not in any way limit the independence of the Union, but permit it to coordinate its activities with those of other international institutions, which have rapidly multiplied since the Union was created.

The Secretary General of the United Nations and the Directors General of the specialized agencies are regularly represented at the Conferences and working sessions of the Union, and cooperation also takes place at the secretariat level.

In addition, the Union maintains steady relations with regional assemblies of a parliamentary nature, such as the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe and the European Coal and Steel Community. It is also in contact with the Organization of American States.

PART II. AMERICAN PARTICIPATION

The United States of America was a charter member of the Interparliamentary Union and has participated in its activities since 1889. The 12th Conference of the Union was held in St. Louis in 1904, and the 42d Conference was held in the Capitol at Washington, October 9–14, 1953.

Every Senator and Representative in Congress is ipso facto a member of the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union. A former Member of Congress, who is or has been a member of the Council of the Union, may, on the recommendation of the American group, and the approval of the Council of the Union, become an honorary member of the group. A former Member of Congress who has rendered distinguished service to the Union, may, upon the recommendation of the American group and the approval of the Council of the Union, become an honorary member of the group.

The officers of the American group, according to its bylaws adopted in 1932, shall be a president, three vice presidents, a secretary, a treasurer, an executive committee of nine members of which the president of the group shall be the chairman and two members of the Council of the Union. These officers hold office for each Congress or until their successors are elected.

In 1958 the officers of the American group were the following:

President: Hon. DANIEL A. REED.

Vice presidents: Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY.

Secretary: Hon. HENRY O. TALLE.

Treasurer: Hon. W. R. POAGE.

Executive committee: Hon. ALBERT GORE, KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, JOHN M. VORYS, ANTONI N. SADLAK, THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., JOHN J. SPARKMAN, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, W. ROBERT POAGE, and DANIEL A. REED.

Council members: Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY and DANIEL A. REED.

The bylaws of the American group define the duties of its officers and provide for its meetings and activities. The group shall meet at least twice a year, one such meeting being the annual meeting of the group which shall be held on the third Monday of January.

Although all members of the U.S. Congress are ex officio members of the Interparliamentary Union, the American group is composed of a score of members who have taken an active interest in the union and its work. This group is organized with its own bylaws, and it is normally from this group that delegates to the annual conferences have been designated by its president.

For many years the United States has made an annual contribution to the Interparliamentary Union. This contribution now amounts to $18,000 a year. Under an act of the 85th Congress an appropriation of $33,000 annually has been authorized, $18,000 of which shall be for the annual contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union; $15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is authorized to assist in meeting the expenses of the American group for each fiscal year. This appropriation is disbursed on vouchers approved by the president and executive secretary of the American group.

PART III. THE RIO DE JANEIRO CONFERENCE

The United States was represented at the 47th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, held at Rio de Janeiro, July 24 to August 1, 1958, by a delegation composed of 4 Senators, 7 Representatives, and former Senator Homer Ferguson, of Michigan. The senatorial delegates were A. S. Mike Monroney, Francis Case, John D. Hoblitzell, Jr., and J. Allen Frear. The delegates from the House of Representatives were Henry O. Talle, chairman, acting for Daniel A. Reed, Hale Boggs, Kenneth B. Keating, W. Robert Poage, Katharine St. George, Antoni N. Sadlak, and Michael A. Feighan. Dr. Franklin Dunham served as secretary general of the American group and Dr. George B. Galloway as secretary of the delegation. Dr. Carl Marcy, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and Dr. Charles J. Zinn, law-revision counsel, House of Representatives, accompanied the U.S. delegation as observers. Col. Charles R. Roderick, Maj. James M. Brower, and Maj. Sidney Kern (medical officer) served as Air Force attachés to the delegation and Mrs. Christine Gallagher as an attaché to the secretariat.

During the conference Representatives TALLE and POAGE represented the American group on the Executive Council of the Union

in the absence of Representatives COOLEY and REED.

Representatives of the American group on the standing study committees were as follows: Committee on Political and Organization Questions, Mr. KEATING; Committee on Juridical Questions, Judge Ferguson; Committee on Economic and Financial Questions, Mr. MONRONEY; Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories and on Ethnical Questions, Mrs. ST. GEORGE; Committee on Reduction of Armaments, Mr. CASE; Committee on Social and Humanitarian Questions, Mr. BOGGS; Committee on Intellectual Questions, Mr. FEIGHAN.

The Rio Conference, first of the IPU meetings ever held in South America, was attended by representatives of 47 Parliaments. The Conference was held in the Chamber of Deputies of the Brazilian Parliament and was opened on July 24 by an address of welcome from the President of Brazil, Hon. Juscelino Kubitschek. Prof. G. Codacci-Pisanelli (Itely), President of the Interparliamentary Council, presided at the opening sessions. Mr. Ranieri Mazzilli, Speaker of the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies, was elected President of the Conference.

Conference agenda

The first 2 days of the meeting were devoted to general debate on the Secretary General's report. This report dealt in a comprehensive and objective manner with the multifarious developments of international relations in the various parts of the world during the past year.

Following the general debate on the Secretary General's report, the Conference devoted 4 days to the detailed consideration of four topics which had been scheduled for consideration, as follows:

1. "Principles Governing the Investment of Foreign, Private, or Governmental Capital in Countries in Process of Economic Development."

2. "The Strengthening of Peace: (a) The Problem of Atomic Weapons and Nuclear Tests. (b) The Possibility of Establishing an International Police Force."

3. "Cultural Relations Between Countries and Freedom of Information: (a) Cultural Agreements and Their Role in Improving Relations Between Peoples. (b) National and International Aspects of Freedom of the Press and Information."

4. "The Development of Representative Assemblies in Non-Self-Governing Territories."

Under the rules of the Conference each participating group was entitled to two 7½ minute speeches or one 10-minute speech on each agenda topic. The spokesmen for the United States during the debate on the Secretary General's report were Representatives Talle and ST. GEORGE. On the topic of capital investment abroad Representative Talle also spoke for the American group. Our second speaker on this topic was to have been Senator MONRONEY, but his legislative duties in Washington delayed his arrival at the conference beyond the day assigned to this topic. On the topic of "Strengthening the Peace" the American spokesmen were Representatives POAGE and KEATING. On "Cultural Relations Between Countries and Freedom of Information," the U.S. speakers were Representative BOGGS and Senator CASE. On the subject of "Representative Assemblies in Non-Self-Governing Territories" our speakers were Representatives FEIGHAN and Sadlak. Their speeches are reproduced below.

The seventh day of the Conference was devoted to meetings of the several standing study committees mentioned above. And the final day was taken up with the reports of the study committees and the voting on the resolutions which had been drafted by the Inter-Parliamentary Council. At the conclusion of the Conference on August 1, Judge Ferguson voiced the thanks and appreciation of the congressional delegation for the hospitality of the Government and people of Brazil and evaluated the achievements of the Conference.

Some high spots of the Rio Conference

The Rio Conference was marked by several dramatic episodes. On the first day, as soon as the opening ceremonies were concluded, the chief Soviet delegate, Alexander P. Volkov, a deputy of the Supreme Soviet, raised the Middle East theme on a point of order. On behalf of his delegation he offered a resolution condemning United States and British aggression in the Middle East and insisting that the Middle East question be added to the Conference agenda. On the previous evening the Council of the Union had voted down a Soviet proposal for a resolution demanding measures to safeguard peace in the Middle East. But the Soviet delegation reopened the subject at the plenary session on the first day of the Conference. This proved to be merely a tactical maneuver to gain the spotlight.

The Soviet delegation, which made repeated efforts during the Conference to obtain at least a full debate on, if not approval, of a resolution demanding the withdrawal of United States and British troops from Lebanon and Jordan, failed in that endeavor.

Along with assertions that Moscow had unilaterally halted nuclear weapons tests, the Soviet group made the Middle East question a major propaganda theme in the Conference. In a farewell speech on the final day the chief Soviet delegate, Mr. Volkov, said that he "regretted" that the meeting had failed to say anything about this "most acute problem of the day."

On the final morning of the Conference delegates from 47 Parliaments on both sides of the Iron Curtain unanimously approved a resolution urging the speedy resumption of big power disarmament talks, preferably within the United Nations, stressing that one of the most urgent aims would be the ending of nuclear weapons tests under proper international control.

They also approved a resolution calling for the establishment on a permanent basis of an international police force. This proposal was opposed, however, by the Soviet Union and Soviet satellites as well as by Yugoslavia and a number of individual delegates. The vote was 371 to 104 with 50 abstentions.

In all its resolutions the Conference addressed an appeal to the national parliaments belonging to the Union to urge their governments to carry out the Rio resolutions.

Over the opposition of the British and Australian groups and a majority of the French delegation, the Conference approved an "anticolonialist" amendment by Chile to a resolution on the development of representative assemblies in non-self-governing territories.

In this connection one of the most dramatic events of the Conference was the address by Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Ohio, who spoke on the draft resolution concerning the development of representative assemblies in non-self-governing territories. Mr. FEIGHAN called attention to "the new colonialism," under the yoke of which, he said, "a long array of politically mature and well established nations, which today are non-self-governing, have been deprived of their free political institutions and whose representative parliamentary bodies have been destroyed." Mr. FEIGHAN charged that "this new colonialism, this new imperialism, has forcefully incorporated no less than 20 once free, democratic and independent nations into its empire. This new imperialism," he said, "seeks to accommodate the rising tide of nationalism by spuriously proclaiming that these nations are independent." After calling attention to the recent popular uprisings in three of these non-self-governing nations—East Germany, Poland, and Hungary—Mr. FEIGHAN proposed that the draft resolution "be amended to reflect the urgent need for developing procedures whereby the people of these once free and independent nations might be accorded the opportunity, under the supervision of the United Nations, freely to determine the substance as well as the form of their government." Subsequently, Mr. FEIGHAN'S amendment was considered at length in the standing committee having jurisdiction of that subject, but further action on it was defererd to the Warsaw Conference next year.

The Rio Conference also unanimously approved a resolution urging greater international cultural relations and exchanges. The Soviet bloc and French Communist deputies abstained on sections of this resolution on freedom of the press and information.

Another development of special interest to the nations of the Western Hemisphere was a special meeting held during the Conference and attended by members of the delegations of the parliamentary groups from the Argentine, Brazil, Chile, United States of America, Haiti, Panama, Paraguay, and Peru. This meeting was called to consider the desirability of the formation of a regional Pan American Parliamentary Group within the framework of the Interparliamentary Union. It was argued that the formation of such a Pan American Parliamentary Group would improve the participation of the Western Hemisphere at the meetings of the Interparliamentary Union and, furthermore, that it would provide a medium for the advance study of the topics on the agenda of the annual conferences of the Union. It was urged, on the one hand, that the new regional group should be confined to the nations of Central and South America and, on the other hand, that it should include the United States and Canada. The first viewpoint was expressed by spokesmen from the Argentine and Chile. The chairman of the United States Group assured those present that the United States group would not be offended if it were not invited to participate in a new Pan American parliamentary body. It was finally decided to call together both a Pan American and a Latin American Parliamentary Group, subject to the approval of their respective governments, and that both groups should meet in Lima, Peru, if possible, within 90 days after the conclusion of the 47th Interparliamentary Conference. There is no assurance that the Interparliamentary Union will accept the affiliation of any limited regional group. In 1956 an attempt was made to organize such a group in the Far East, but it never received recognition as an affiliate of the Union and was subsequently disbanded.

However, an American Interparliamentary group representing all the countries of the Western Hemisphere, apparently, is looked upon favorably by the Interparliamentary Union and a call has gone out to form such a group at Lima, Peru, meeting to take place March 5–10, 1959. The U.S. group has been asked to send at least one voting delegate.

Resolutions adopted

"I. On the Necessity To Convene a Summit Conference To Relax International Tension

"The 47th Interparliamentary Conference—

"Noting the urgent need to lessen the threat of a new war and to improve the prospects for a lasting peace;

"Considering that the fulfillment of this task largely depends on statesmen of all countries and above all on those of the great powers;

"Wholeheartedly supports the idea of holding, after adequate preparation, a summit conference of representatives of states to discuss the most urgent international problems in the interest of easing international tension;

"Calls upon the parliaments of all countries to take the necessary measures facilitating an early convocation of such a conference.

"II. The Principles Governing the Investment of Foreign Private or Governmental Capital in Countries in Process of Economic Development

"The 47th Interparliamentary Conference—

"Recognizing the fact that some countries in process of economic development, more especially those which have recently achieved their independence, have not adequate capital to carry out the task of developing their economic resources to the full;

"Conscious of the reality that, within the next few years, proper development of many countries of the world toward economic independence will require investment of vast amounts of foreign capital, and realizing that no nation alone is capable of properly financing either the funds or goods required to carry out such a program over many years, which would be the best means of securing solidarity between the developed and underdeveloped countries;

"Recognizing the fact that assistance to underdeveloped countries must always be provided in the interests of the indigenous peoples themselves and must therefore be free from strings and conditions which in any way limit the sovereignties of such peoples;

"Considering that foreign capital, private or governmental, must serve as an auxiliary source for financing the economic development of underdeveloped countries while the basic role for providing such facilities belongs to their own resources, and only in the latter case can the economically underdeveloped countries genuinely insure the independent development answering their national interests;

"Considering that loans and financing, either through international sources, government to government, or private investment at fixed terms and at reasonably low bank rates, for the building up of basic resources and facilities, and for the development of industry, are the best means of achieving a mutually beneficial result;

"Appreciating the assistance which has been forthcoming through the specialized agencies of the United Nations and through various bilateral aid and loan programs, but regretting that these programs have been uncertain as to their continuation and scope, thereby making long-range planning and practical financing difficult;

"Realizing that an essential preliminary to large-scale investment is the carrying out of financial and technical studies of projects and resources;

"Conscious of the decision taken by the United Nations at the 12th session of the General Assembly in December 1957 to set up a special fund specifically for such preliminary surveys to facilitate new capital investment;

"Conscious of the need to follow up such surveys in appropriate cases by the large-scale provision of financial aid and long-term loans at low rates of interest, by means of international banking mechanisms, through existing auxiliary organs of the United Nations, on a government-to-government basis or in other ways;

"Conscious also of the need to create an atmosphere of mutual confidence between lending and borrowing countries, its lack having heretofore prevented as adequate an increase as desirable of the flow of capital to the underdeveloped countries;

"Calls upon parliaments of all members of the IPU to urge upon their governments—

"1. That the fullest support should be given to the work of the United Nations in this field;

"2. That, wherever required, financial and technical surveys and studies of projects and resources be provided to the less developed countries with a view to enabling their development along healthy and sound lines;

"3. That multilateral financing of long-term development projects of underdeveloped nations is to be recommended over such financing on a bilateral basis;

"4. That, wherever feasible, such financing should be arranged through the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and/or through other international banking institutions to be established for such purpose, either as auxiliary organs of the UN or otherwise;

"5. That the conclusion, between all the countries concerned, of an 'International Code of Investments' defining the conditions of equitable treatment for both lenders and borrowers, should at the same time be sought for the protection of private investment;

"6. That respect of the provisions of this code be assured by recourse of private investment, in case of dispute, to an international court of justice and guaranteed by the creation of an International Fund set up under the auspices of the United Nations.

"III. The Strengthening of Peace

"(a) The Problem of atomic weapons and nuclear tests

"The 47th Inter-Parliamentary Conference—

"Conscious of the overwhelming desire of all peoples for an honorable and lasting settlement of the grave differences that intensify distrust, anxiety and tension between nations;

"Believing that the continuing accumulation of armaments of all types, nuclear and conventional, represents a serious threat to security and peace; and

"Noting the profound concern of the peoples of the world about the continuing nuclear weapons tests;

"Believing also that nuclear energy should be developed exclusively for peaceful purposes;

"Taking into consideration the urgent necessity of eliminating all harmful consequences of nuclear tests for human life and health;

"Stressing the great responsibility for the people's future which rests with the Parliaments of various states and with the Inter-Parliamentary Union;

"Recalling the resolution adopted unanimously by the 45th Interparliamentary Conference at Bangkok in 1956;

"Reaffirming in particular the belief that, pending the conclusion of a comprehensive disarmament agreement, including measures of conventional and nuclear disarmament and the reduction of armed forces under effective international inspection and control, attention should be given to the possibility of agreeing on the first installment of internationally controlled disarmament which could be put into effect with the least possible delay;

"Deeply regretting that no resolution containing proposals which were in harmony with that belief, submitted to the 12th Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, commanded unanimous support;

"Taking into account also that the cessation of nuclear tests might slow the arms race and would further a solution of the entire problem of disarmament;

"Appeals urgently to parliaments of all members of the IPU to recommend to governments in the strongest possible terms that speedy action be taken to secure resumption of disarmanent negotiations, preferably within the framework of the United Nations, and that one of the most urgent aims of such negotiations should be to secure without delay the cessation, under proper international control, of nuclear weapons tests.

"(b) The possibility of establishing an International Police force

"The 47th Interparliamentary Conference—

"Believing that the institution of a permanent International Police force charged with the task of insuring collective security is highly desirable;

"Is of the opinion that the establishment of such a force should be effected under the aegis of the United Nations;

"And urgently appeals to all parliaments represented within the Union to recommend that their respective governments take all possible steps to establish an International Police force on a permanent basis.

"IV. Cultural Exchanges Between Countries and Freedom of Information

"(a) Cultural agreements and their role in improving relations between peoples

"The 47th Interparliamentary Conference—

"Recognizing the importance and growing volume of international cultural relations, as well as the interest which is shown in their development, and with the object of reaching a better understanding between different countries so as to facilitate the establishment of favorable conditions for peace and for durable friendship between them;

"Stressing the need for eliminating all obstacles which hamper the freedom of cultural exchanges;

"Considering that men living in all countries of the world, by reciprocal appreciation of their cultural achievements and by assimilating the best and most progressive of them in the various national cultures, can learn to understand more completely and deeply the life of other peoples, to respect their originality and national traditions, and to enrich each other spiritually;

"Upholding the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on February 21 and November 28, 1957, stating that wider international cooperation in cultural and scientific matters must be encouraged by agreements and other means, and that no effort should be spared to achieve those noble objectives;

"Taking note of the resolution adopted by the 44th Interparliamentary Conference on the conditions for a true peaceful coexistence between the nations and the resolution adopted at the Ninth General Conference of UNESCO;

"Appeals to all Interparliamentary groups to work for the realization of the UNESCO project on mutual appreciation of cultural values of countries of the East and West;

"Invites all Interparliamentary groups to contribute to the furtherance of regular intellectual exchanges between states as a means toward the conclusion of bilateral, regional, and multilateral agreements on cultural and scientific relations, and also on other forms of cultural exchanges, such as visits and sojourns of students, pupils, and young workers;

"Recommends the creation of administrative bodies and special parliamentary groups for the promotion of a reciprocal policy of cultural relations in those countries where such organs do not already exist;

"Hopes that the member groups of the Inter-Parliamentary Union will use their influence on their respective governments in the sense of the present resolution.

"(b) National and international aspects of freedom of the press and information

"The 47th Interparliamentary Conference—

"Desiring to safeguard the right to freedom of expression and opinion as defined in article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

"Recalling the previous resolutions adopted on the subject by the Interparliamentary Union, the United Nations General Assembly, particularly on November 3, 1947, and the Ninth General Conference of Unesco,

"Declaring that this liberty implies the right, either active or passive, to information through radio, film, television, as well as by books, gramophone records and the press itself;

"Considering that it is of importance to guarantee more effectively the free exchange of objective and nondistorted news, the protection of sources of information, the liberty of movement of foreign correspondents and the physical, social and spiritual security of personnel in the information services;

"Believing that it is necessary to guard against the maltreatment of news by a more equitable distribution of those means which guarantee the full right to information, impartially disseminated, by the development of professional techniques and by national and regional information bodies, which act as important auxiliaries in promoting economic and social progress in those countries which are lacking in this respect, as well as by the creation of councils, both national and international, for purposes of control and arbitration, and designed to bring about respect for different shades of opinion and to eliminate all abuses and rectify errors;

"Stressing the necessity for encouraging the development of intellectual exchanges, the formation of specialized personnel, the creation of educational centers and the consolidation of scientific, cultural, technical and sporting links;

"Affirming the desire to continue its efforts toward the removal of obstacles hampering the free flow and integrity of information;

"Condemning the use of false news which would be its very nature encourage hatred and provoke war, or would lead to the use of nuclear energy for other than peaceful purposes;

"Appeals to its member groups to have adopted in their respective parliaments the necessary measures for a free exchange of news, of information and publications between research institutes, libraries and cultural associations, as well as the free circulation of educational material and travel of persons journeying for journalistic or scholarly ends;

"Invites the representatives of the different countries to approach the competent authorities with a view to putting an end to all restrictions on the exchange of ideas, particularly by aiding in the intensification of action already taken by United Nations organs and specialized agencies in the technical field, and to achieve durable cooperation between the Governments and the professions in question;

"Requests that everything possible be done, either by adherence to international agreements or modification of national laws, to facilitate, in conditions of loyal reciprocity, exchanges of information likely to serve the cause of international peace and promote better understanding among nations as well as among individuals;

"Resolves to appeal to the members of the Union to adopt, in their respective parliaments, the necessary measures to make means of communication accessible to all branches of opinion in such a way that information does not become a privilege or a way of controlling public opinion.

"V. The Development of Representative Assemblies in Non-Self-Governing Territories

"The 47th Interparliamentary conference—

"Believing that the progressive development of representative democratic institutions in non-self-governing territories is of the highest importance for the emancipation of the peoples of those territories;

"Underlining the importance of the obligations laid down in chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations in which states administering such territories are required to 'develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions';

"Convinced that the aim of extending universal suffrage to all non-self-governing territories is directly in line with the ideals and aims of the Interparliamentary Union;

"Appeals to the National Parliamentary Groups of the States responsible for the government of such territories to promote and encourage within their respective parliaments legislation which would have as its object the building up of truly democratic assemblies in non-self-governing territories;

"And proposes:

"1. Rejection of all forms of colonial rule and subjection exercised by force upon the independence and freedom of another country;

"2. Solidarity with all colonized countries which have already obtained their freedom, as well as with all who still fight for their autonomy;

"3. Establishment of an international procedure which would guarantee to peoples desiring to become free of foreign tutelage that the substitution of foreign authorities by self-government would not be detrimental to human rights and the institutional forms of coexistence;

"4. Necessity for those governments, and particularly their parliaments, to be formed as the result of free elections—the only way in which legitimate power can be conferred and the people represented."

GENERAL DEBATE ON THE SECRETARY GENERAL'S REPORT

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE (United States of America). Mr. President, fellow delegates, ladies, and gentlemen, this is indeed a very proud moment for me, a moment which I regard as something of the order of a day of fulfillment. From my childhood days I read about South America and her facinating history and her remarkable people. Seven years ago I had the opportunity to visit every country in this great continent, and I was so pleased with all I saw of resources, and especially of the people, of this great country that I redoubled my efforts in the hope that the day might not be far away when the countries in this great continent would be a stimulating force in the Inter-Parliamentary Union. I must therefore say to Senhor Braga that I owe him a very great debt of gratitude for his remarkable endeavors in this field.

I want to say "thank you" for myself and for the delegates of the United States of North America to everyone who has had a part in making this conference possible; and I bring to you the cordial greetings of my dear and beloved friend, DANIEL A. REED, of New York, who is serving his fourth year as president of the U.S. group. For very good reasons it is not possible for him to appear here, and so I speak on his behalf in bringing to you greetings and all good wishes for the improvement and lasting future of our great organization.

I should like to say that when your distinguished President who addressed us in an inspiring manner this morning visited the Capital of the United States he left an excellent impression and we hope that he will return to us, for we are glad to have him as a visitor.

It would, of course, be very easy, were there time for it, to rhapsodize about the beauty of this country and especially this city, your beaches, your buildings, and all of these beautiful things we see by day and night, and, of course, it would be very easy to speak in hushed tones about the reverence which is exuded by the sacred statue of the Redeemer high on your mountain top. There is not time for that and I will proceed with my message.

The people of Brazil and, indeed, all of the Latin American countries, and the people of the United States of North America have many common historic ties. All of us were colonists of European powers, most of us share the traditions of a struggle for independence, we adl ere to the same spiritual and moral principles and we share the same aspirations. We all have republican governments, and our constitutions are similar. In many ways we share a common ambition for the New World from which so many vigorous ideas have sprung. Indeed, today we are equal partners in a 21-nation organization, the Organization of American States, and we are good partners, friends, and neighbors. President Eisenhower once characterized our Pan American system, and I quote, as "the most successfully sustained venture in international community living the world has ever known."

I must, at this point, say "Thank you," to our Secretary General and his staff. The task they perform is an exceedingly difficult one, they do their work well. Obviously not all of us can be pleased with everything we read in this remarkable report, but I should not like to compete with him in his difficult work. In the Interparliamentary Union the cultivation of better understanding between nations is the ideal for which we strive. To achieve such understanding we must largely rely on the free flow of information within our respective states, and among our states.

I am immensely pleased to find on the agenda two topics which interest me very much. In the first place, national and international aspects of freedom of the press and information. Having devoted many years of my life to the field of education, I am also deeply interested in cultural exchanges, another item on the agenda. At no time in our country has it been so easy for the American citizen, indeed any citizen, to acquire information and wider knowledge of the world and deeper understanding of its problems. He can sit in his easy chair and listen to discussions of the critical issues by some of the country's most astute thinkers. By such listening he can evaluate and compare. This is true not only of my own country but of many other countries. Referring specifically to my own, there are about 11,500 daily and weekly newspapers and about 6,000 weekly, monthly, and quarterly periodicals, there are 2 nationwide press associations, there are 4 radio networks, 3,000 radio and television stations. These media are not in any single ownership by no manner of means; the ownership is widely diversified and there is no monopoly of ownership or control. Under our own Constitution Congress is prevented from interfering with freedom of speech, there are various State constitutions which stipulate that every citizen has the right to speak freely on any subject matter whatsoever, and the history of freedom of the press of the United States antedated the adoption of the U.S. Constitution.

I regret that there is so little time, but I do not want to take time from anyone else and so I close with cordial greetings to all of you and look forward to a very happy conference.

Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE (United States of America). Mr. President and fellow delegates, those of us who come from the Western Hemisphere are especially proud and happy to be here at the first Conference ever to be held in one of our great sister Republics of South America. The friendship and hospitality of the Government and people of Brazil will long be remembered by all members of this Inter-Parliamentary Union, but

especially by those members who belong to other American Republics.

Again this year we come to the Conference fortified by the report of our distinguished Secretary General. I have now attended three of these Conferences and I am more amazed today than ever at this report and all that it covers. Almost every detail of the history and the politics of the nations who are members of this Conference is covered. It is true that world history is moving with great rapidity today and that some extremely significant events have happened since the report was written. At the very opening of the report the Secretary General writes:

"Considering the world situation from the point of view of relations between the great powers an impression of stability is gained, albeit of a superficial nature only. No sign can be seen of any sustained rapprochement, but neither has any direct initiative been taken affecting a status quo which, for the time being, the parties concerned seem to have tacitly accepted."

This situation has changed for the worse and it is devoutly to be hoped that out of the deliberations of this Conference we can achieve a "modus vivendi" that will gradually bring the nations of the world to a true belief that peace cannot be achieved without understanding and tolerance. All nations yearn for peace and it is for us who are members of this Conference to strive mightily for this end.

The Report deals at some length with the problems of atomic tests. Here misunderstandings still prevail and are perhaps those most conducive to disaster. In this field real discipline and self-control must be created. It is impossible to expect one side to abandon tests until positively assured that the other side will do likewise. This is a poor time and place to indulge in demagoguery, and it was disappointing yesterday to hear accusations that the United States and Great Britain were threatening to use atomic bombs. We know of no such threat but we do know that the present head of the Soviet Union said: "We will bury you," to an interviewer from the West. This may have been meant as a joke, but some of us may not find it very funny.

The situation in the Middle East is threatening, but American and British troops are in Lebanon and Jordan only because they were called upon by those two small and free nations for the protection which had been promised them in case of need. We are taking nothing from Lebanon or Jordan. We will not murder people to whom safe conducts have been given. We will help them to maintain their freedom, at their request, because we gave them a solemn promise to that effect and we will keep that pledge. As to oil interests, it is almost silly to mention them. The United States and South America have enough petroleum products to supply the free world for years, if not centuries, to come.

The fact that so many nations today are mere satellites is disheartening in the extreme. The Report quotes Mr. Spaak in reference to NATO in the following words:

"The day when there were no longer any discussions between them would be the day when, having accepted one government as leader, the other governments would be no more than mere satellites—and the alliance would have no further reason for existing."

Again we are confronted by the fact that words do not mean the same thing to all people. Even such words as peace and freedom are not the same in all languages.

Our Secretary General is impartial in his thinking and his writing. This, of course, brings us sometimes to the philosophy of "a plague on both your houses," which is not what we enjoy hearing even though it may be good for the soul.

This report is a great document not only today but for the future when many of us, we hope many of a younger generation, will read and study it with interest and profit as a true and impartial picture of our times. The report also includes the preliminary documents that make up the agenda that we, in this year of grace 1958, considered of the greatest importance.

Since our last Conference in London the clouds that menace and surround parliamentary governments all over the world have not lifted. On the contrary, they have become blacker and more dangerous. On that occasion I spoke somewhat pessimistically about the future of our parliamentary systems. I regret that very little has happened since the London Conference to alter any of these opinions. One thing did happen, however, at our Geneva Conference, which I feel was encouraging, and to which I intend to address myself at this time. On this occasion the Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories, presented in the name of the Committee a resolution on "the Development of Representative Assemblies in Non-Self-Governing Territories" and this item has been put on the agenda for this Conference. Now, why can we feel that this resolution is an encouraging sign? First, because it shows the world that we believe in representative government as the ultimate toward which all peoples strive. Secondly, because we believe that representative government is capable of growth and improvement. And this is perhaps the most important part of all. Any philosophy, whether of government or of any other science, that becomes static and incapable of change or growth is destined to wither and die.

Finally, I would recommend to you the words of a former President of my country, Herbert Hoover, who said recently in Brussels:

"We must unceasingly strive by all peaceable means to make the world safe for representative government. From representative government alone can come respect for your dignity as men and women, your flowering as individuals, your rights to a rising chance in life, to self-expression, and to security from sodden uniformity."

Foreign investment in underdeveloped countries

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE (United States of America). We are gathered today to consider basic issues relating to the role of foreign investment in economic development. I submit that the most direct and significant point of reference for the formulation of a set of principles of foreign investment is to be found in the last four words of the topic of this session. The principles we arrive at will depend in large measure upon our understanding and interpretation of the phrase "process of economic development."

There is the totalitarian road to development. Countries that follow this path seek to advance industrially at the expense of the freedom and liberties of their peoples. Through propaganda, subversion, and more recently, through ostensibly favorable credit terms, they pursue international policies designed to weaken and undermine the independent sovereignty of other nations.

Very different is the democratic process of development based on individual freedom to work, to spend, to save, and to invest. With the demands of modern life and unsettled world conditions, the governments of democratic countries have come to play a much larger role than in earlier periods in promoting economic progress. But this role continues to be nourished in the traditions of free institutions.

All countries, from the most industrially advanced to the relatively backward, are confronted with the problem of obtaining an adequate supply of savings for capital expansion, without which economic progress is not possible. It is to the interest of all the nations of the free world, since they are economically interdependent, that favorable conditions are created for tapping the sources of savings at home and abroad with which to assure economic growth. These conditions must meet the varying needs of countries in different states of development.

The foreign economic policies and programs of the United States recognize the importance both of the principle of interdependence and the principle of diversity of countries in various stages of economic development.

In the interests of our own economy and those of the rest of the free world, we have endeavored to stimulate foreign investment through such a governmentally owned corporation as the Export-Import Bank. Our oldest public institution in this field, it has loaned over $9 billion for development purposes in more than 50 countries. These loans, both to private borrowers and governments, have helped finance, on a sound business basis mutually beneficial to borrower and lender, power-generating installations, transportation facilities, manufacturing plants, and the extraction industries. Only recently the lending authorization of the Export-Import Bank was increased by $2 billion.

The United States is proud of the role it has played in promoting the flow of foreign investment through its participation in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and in strengthening the international currency system through its membership in the International Monetary Fund. The World Bank has successfully promoted the international flow of capital for productive projects either by lending funds directly, guaranteeing loans made by others, or by participating in such loans. The gross total of loans that the Bank has made to 46 countries amounts to $3.5 billion.

Closely affiliated with the World Bank is the International Finance Corporation. It was established in 1956 to overcome two limitations on the Bank's ability to finance a greater number of private development projects—the lack of equity investment in projects and the requirement that loans made to a private firm be guaranteed by the government of its country. With the removal of these obstacles, the International Finance Corporation aims to demonstrate that soundly conceived private investment projects in less-developed areas can be sufficiently attractive to stimulate a much larger flow of private capital into these areas.

About a year ago the United States set up the Development Loan Fund to extend long-range financing to underdeveloped countries. The Fund is not in competition with private investment, nor is it competing with the Export-Import Bank and the World Bank. It aims to facilitate the financing of meritorious developmental projects that have difficulty in obtaining the necessary funds. Many of the less-developed countries have a limited capacity to service dollar loans on the terms required by the International Bank and the Export-Import Bank. Under the more flexible terms of the Loan Fund, repayments can be made in local currencies as well as dollars. It can operate with greater flexibility not only because it recognizes the necessity of repayments in terms of local currencies, but because it can also finance either private or governmental projects on an adjustable basis for as long as 40 years.

This brief review of the major governmental programs to stimulate the flow of investment into developmental projects serves to remind us that a variety of financial tools, public and private, has been proved necessary to meet diverse capital needs. But experience has also shown that in the interests of all of the countries of the free world it is imperative that the economic growth of the underdeveloped areas be ac-

celerated. Such advance depends not only on the readiness of the more industrialized nations to expand the flow of capital to these areas, but also on what the peoples of these countries do for themselves. Their progress depends on the adoption of measures which would encourage investment from inside as well as from outside the country. I have in mind control of inflation, planning for balanced economic growth and administrative and legislative actions that permit the inflow of capital, equipment and services and the outflow of reasonable earnings.

The technically less advanced countries appreciate more than ever before the importance of capital investment in promotion of economic progress. They frequently place their main hope for such progress on the obtaining of capital from abroad. But the flow of capital depends on the existence of certain basic political and social conditions without which private investment cannot operate. In addition, capital requires technical and managerial skills for effective utilization, a working force that is adaptable to changes in technology, and the development of adequate marketing and credit institutions.

The more advanced industrial nations must also provide more favorable conditions for expanding the role of private domestic investment in underdeveloped areas. The United States has taken a number of steps in this direction. These include the maintenance of information and counseling services for potential investors, as well as strengthened government staffs overseas, equipped to understand the importance of foreign investment. The International Cooperation Administration, which provides insurance against loss arising from inconvertibility of local currency earnings, expropriation and war risks, has been steadily expanding its guarantee program. The Government has also negotiated an increasing number of bilateral treaties designed to protect more adequately the interests of private investors. It has also provided tax incentives for overseas investment, although more can be done in this field.

In closing, I should like to refer briefly to the draft resolutions relating to the agenda for this session. The recent events in the Middle East point up all the more the need for strengthening the economies of underdeveloped areas, especially those which have recently achieved their independence. The draft resolution calls upon the Parliaments to adopt the principle of multilateral financing of long-term development projects of underdeveloped nations as against such financing on a bilateral basis. The implications of Resolution No. 3 are far-reaching. The proposal involves the establishment of another international organization with subscription of a substantial amount of funds by many different countries. There are many practical difficulties in the creation of additional institutions for multilateral financing, which require further study if we are to build solidly. Also, may I remind you that there are many experts in the field of foreign investment, including many in the countries receiving investments, who are equally convinced that in the present stage of assistance to underdeveloped areas the bilateral approach has so much merit that it should not deliberately be consigned to a place of secondary importance, as is implied in the draft resolution before us. I, therefore, suggest for your consideration that this resolution be modified to provide for further study of the subject.

The problems of atomic weapons and nuclear tests

Hon. W. R. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, everyone seems to agree that it would be highly desirable for all nations to suspend further atomic tests, and indeed to agree to forego the use of nuclear weapons. I think we can also agree on the desirability of greatly reducing and eventually eliminating all of the military establishments of all types and character throughout the world. In fact, my own country, the United States of America, at the close of World War II, demobilized more than 10 million men. No nation has ever carried out such an extensive demobilization, nor has the Soviet Union, the only other great power with such a large establishment, demobilized to a comparable extent, even though more than a dozen years have now elapsed. We do not know the exact size of the Russian military establishment today, but it is undoubtedly comparable, or even larger than the establishment of all the balance of the world combined. Possibly this tremendous manpower is locked up in unproductive work, because the communistic rulers feel that they do not need to devote the skills and labor of this great force for the improvement of the standard of living of their people. In my country we feel that we need to devote the labor and the skill of our young men to constructive undertakings—to the further improvement of the standards of living of our people and of all the people of the world.

Indeed, it seems to us that, desirable as it may be to limit the testing and the use of atomic weapons, it is even more desirable to reduce the wasteful use of manpower through the maintenance of conventional weapons.

The United States of America has repeatedly expressed its willingness and desire to restrict all types of armaments—both atomic and conventional—but no intelligent person could expect or want us to abandon any weapons without some dependable assurance that the U.S.S.R. will do likewise, and will do it at the same time. Nor do we ask of the Soviet anything which we are unwilling to extend to them. We would no more think of asking the U.S.S.R. to accept our unsupported promises to abandon weapons than we would accept their unsupported promises.

We recognize that the whole buildup of men and weapons throughout the world is the result of lack of confidence in the sincerity and good will of our neighbors. We hope that the time may soon come when all people will feel as secure against their neighbors as I believe the United States and the people of Canada feel, each as regards the other, but until that ideal situation arrives, there can be no substitute for full and unlimited inspection, to assure the compliance of mutual promises. Such acceptance of mutual inspection is an absolute prerequisite to any effective disarmament, or any control of either use or testing of atomic or nuclear weapons.

Nor is it any answer to say that one of the great powers says that it will forego the use of testing of any type of weapons but demands that its possible victims should accept its unsupported promise. This is particularly true in the face of a long record of the use of force wherever and whenever it seemed expedient. And the very refusal to accept the principle of unrestricted inspection can do nothing but strengthen those doubts.

Let me repeat: the United States of America welcomes any practicable program of mutual control of our reduction in all kinds of armaments, but the control must be mutual. We invite complete inspection of our own arms, even of our atomic development, but that inspection must be mutual. Nor does the United States of America wait until it has just completed its annual series of atomic tests and then suggest a period of suspension of such tests. Such obvious insincerity can do nothing but increase the determination of all other countries to see for themselves that all promises are being fulfilled.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my desire to emphasize or widen this mistrust, but I feel that the people of the world should clearly understand that mere words will never take the place of deeds. There have been charges of aggression hurled at my country and at Great Britain at this very conference. These charges stem from the fact that the two great powers have carried out their commitments to protect two small nations from destruction. Of course, we recognize that it would have been far more desirable had the United Nations gone to the protection of these small countries, but the very people who condemn us have stood in the way and refused to allow action by the United Nations. The United States and Great Britain stand ready, as we have always stood, to move out of Lebanon and out of Jordan any day the Soviet is willing to let the United Nations protect these lands. Did Russia make any such offer when she moved troops into Hungary? Let the small nations of the world judge the large powers by their actions, not their words, and let the small nations recognize that it is the military power, and especially the atomic power, of the United States of America, which stands between them and the type of aggression we have witnessed in Korea and Vietnam. We of the United States will not impose our rule on anyone. Ask our neighbors. Ask Canada. Ask Cuba. We want to hold no people under our control. Ask the Philippines. We want to engage in no armament or atomic race. We want to beat our swords into plowshares but we can only do so when we know that others are doing likewise.

We challenge the sincere cooperation of the U.S.S.R. to join in a real, completely inspected program of disarmament We will meet you halfway, but we have no intention of disarming ourselves without absolute assurance that others are doing likewise.

Establishing international police force

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York. The possibility of establishing an international police force is a particularly pertinent and timely topic for the troubled times in which we live. Perhaps never before in the history of the world was there greater need for calm, objective, and broadminded thought on this possible avenue for helping to achieve a more just and secure international order.

Not only is this topic timely. The place in which it is raised is—in a twofold manner—an eminently suitable one for such a discussion. First, as representatives of the legislative bodies of our respective nations, each of us is in a strong position to urge directly the participation of our governments in some kind of an international police group. Second, in no other region on earth are the lessons of international security better exemplified than in Latin America.

Indeed, all the peace-loving nations of the world would do well to examine with care the experience of the nations of South America in carrying out their self-imposed system of inter-American policing. Operating through a collective defense pact, commonly known as the Rio Treaty, and through the machinery of the Organization of American States, this policing program has been in large measure both effective and generally acceptable. By means of voting sanctions, of dispatching investigating committees, and of careful use of military observers, the nations of Latin America have successfully nipped in the bud a number of potentially incendiary situations among nations of this area.

One reason the Rio Treaty has operated so successfully is that it provides a flexible system of inter-American policing which tailors the means to the situation. The fact that sanctions can be imposed up to and including the use of collective armed forces has had the effect of eliminating the danger of aggression among the neighbors of this section of the world. In addition, the

Americas have coordinated their policies to defend themselves against any extra-hemisphere threat. Since the end of World War II no other nations in the world have enjoyed the freedom from fear of aggression from their neighbors and the world as have the Americas.

When the United Nations was organized in 1945 procedures similar in many respects to the inter-American system were envisaged for maintaining peace. The U.N. idea, based on certain fundamental principles, provided procedures for peaceful settlement and for arriving at decisions to enforce the peace. This idea also anticipated the creation of forces to maintain the peace when the use of force became necessary.

It soon became apparent, however, that there was a fundamental division within the United Nations between nations which cherished their independence and desired a stable international order, and the power ambitions and aggressive ideology of the Soviet bloc. This expansionist combination succeeded in subverting and taking over a long list of independent governments. The result was that political consensus, the necessary base for any international policing action, was absent in the world community. Attempts to create world collective security by agreement among the great powers were thus doomed to failure from the start.

However, repeated efforts were made to gain approval of some sort of worldwide army to help maintain order and security. Whenever fighting has started or is threatened in some sector of the world, agitation has begun afresh for the creation of a U.N. army to be dispatched to the scene to calm the troubled situation. These proposals always revive whenever—as in the instance of Korea, Hungary, Egypt, or the present Middle East crisis—the need becomes too obvious and too urgent to ignore.

One extremely useful precedent has been provided in the case of the United Nations Emergency Force, which has done so much to maintain stability and peace in areas of acute tension between Egypt and Israel. The relative success of this Force in patrolling the uneasy cease-fire has drawn praise from many governments. Its long-range value, however, can only be measured in terms of the use to which the time gained will be put to solve the complex problems afflicting that area, and the use to which we can put the experience gained by this adventure in international policing.

The 13 years of experience in the United Nations has demonstrated conclusively that politically speaking, it is a house divided. A gulf separates those nations which believe in the U.N. Charter principle of independence and those which in practice deny that principle—which really believe in a Communist world hegemony, controlled and directed from Moscow and Peiping. The Soviet Union has demonstrated it will do all within its power to exclude from its captive domain any international policing action, even to the extent of barring an investigating committee, such as in the case of Hungary in 1956.

Most recently, of course, the Soviet conspiracy has blocked efforts to organize and dispatch a U.N. peace force to the troubled Middle East, in an effort to calm the potentially explosive situation there. However, this barrier to world unanimity on an international police force should not discourage us. We should not regard the opposition of the Soviet Union to these peace efforts as an insurmountable barrier. We should press forward with all the vigor at our command to gain support for this principle from all men of good will who sincerely desire peace. On the other hand, I believe we are completely justified in questioning the motives of those nations of the world who, by their intransigent attitude, have repeatedly blocked attempts to create the international force which may well represent a key to the future peace of the world.

The United States has repeatedly demonstrated its willingness to participate in an international army for peace. The Congress of the United States today is in the process of officially going on record as approving this principle.

Certainly recent developments in the Near East provide sufficient demonstration of the tremendous need for some sort of a peace force. It should, of course, be under the control of the United Nations, ready to move instantly in case of an international emergency at the request of a member government which believes itself threatened by outside aggression.

In a world contracted by speedy communications, in a world in which even the smallest nations possess the terribly destructive weapons of modern war, any international disturbance—however localized—can spread like a plague and thus present a real threat to world stability. The only feasible answer to this challenge to the peace of the world is to provide a U.N. force capable of so spreading a U.N. mantle over an embattled state as to inhibit—if not directly to prevent—a coup d'etat, infiltration by indirect aggression, or other untoward pressures from outside the nation, such as we have witnessed recently in the Near East.

A U.N. police force need not be a huge, all-powerful army. It might not number more than 50,000 or 60,000. It might perhaps be found best to establish a firm nucleus at all times centered under one command, with other forces in the individual countries, available upon call.

It is my firm conviction that the smaller nations of the world must form the backbone of any international force. This will prevent the bigger powers running the risk of being dragged into a nuclear conflict which could doom all mankind.

Such an international police army could not—and should not—fight wars. It could not prevent isolated assassinations planned by outside aggressors such as we have recently witnessed.

But a permanent U.N. police force can serve as an effective deterrent to hostilities, could be a focus for the moral opinion of the world, and could serve numerous practical uses in observation, patrol, and guard duty between potentially hostile states.

Certainly, in the light of the dangers inherent in man's vast technological and material progress, we must search with imagination and foresight for the answers to the enigmas of world peace. Today we have too little of either—at a time when we stand in desperate need of both.

There has been sufficient study and experience concerning an international police force. There is plenty of evidence to show how great a factor it could be in preserving peace. No nation of good will can in good conscience oppose the creation of such a force.

The time is running short. Each new crisis brings us closer to the potential horrors of a world war III. The next international brush fire may set off that worldwide conflagration if the nations of the world do not rise to the occasion.

A permanent United Nations police force provides a new, decisive means by which the nations of the world which sincerely believe in peace can provide the machinery to quarantine regional conflicts and thus better insure their solution. The resolution before us provides a tangible means for each of us, in behalf of his people back home, to signify support of this key means to preserve the peace of the world. I urge each of you, in your respective countries and respective legislative bodies, to work for this goal. It is one of the strong, sure hopes for the peace for which all men of good will hope and pray.

Cultural exchange and freedom of the press

Hon. HALE BOGGS (United States of America). Mr. President, fellow delegates, the story of Brazil excites sympathetic understanding and respect and admiration from all citizens of the United States. Here the struggle for independence and freedom was much like that struggle in my country. Indeed, like the struggle of free nations everywhere.

Yes, Mr. President, we of the United States are proud to be here with our old friends, the great people of Brazil. We salute our years of uninterrupted friendship.

Brazil and her sister American states—north and south—constitute the greatest regional area for mutually profitable investment and trade. Such mutual confidence as has been demonstrated hemispherewise could well be the pattern for world understanding.

It is this philosophy of mutuality, without sacrifice of any nation's individuality, which is at the heart of our deliberations for a world anchored in peace, in freedom, in progress, and in prosperity for all. To this philosophy Brazil has made tremendous contributions, showing magnificent leadership, particularly in the vital field of international law.

In discussing cultural exchanges and freedom of information I think that I can say without being immodest that the United States has been a major force in the world for the promotion of both concepts. We are attempting to take to heart the admonition of H. G. Wells when he said: "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." I hope, too, that you will agree that these exchanges have planted the seeds of amity and understanding among peoples and are of immense potential good in preventing that ultimate catastrophe of which Mr. Wells spoke.

The United States has concluded negotiations with the Soviet Union expanding exchanges of information and ideas and of technical, scientific and cultural delegations between the two countries. Only recently the Soviet Union made one of its highest cultural awards to a brilliant young pianist from Texas, and American audiences, on their part, applauded enthusiastically a very skillful Russian ballet group from Moscow. The Philadelphia Symphony has been in Russia and another famous Russian ballet is expected in the United States early in 1959. Under the new program a top-flight delegation of American educators has already visited the Soviet Union and studied its educational structure throughout. Soviet educators are now to visit the United States in turn. The agreements contemplate programs by American industry to be offered to the Soviet Government for sale or for exchange through the Department of State of the United States. A meeting this summer in Moscow is aimed at implementing this phase of the negotiations. There is contemplated an exchange of groups of specialists in industry, agriculture, and medicine.

Cultural exchange in our time is the most fruitful and the most effective form of education and perhaps the most indispensable, in the atomic age. How are we to estimate the immense value to international goodwill and international education resulting from the program of scholarships identified all over the world with the name of the United States Senator from Arkansas, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT? Who can say how much good has been accomplished by 33,000 Fulbright scholars from 39 countries in 10 years? This is probably the largest educational exchange in the history of civilization.

The Soviet Union, we are told, has put its mightiest thrust behind the education of Soviet youth. It is my conviction that an educated people, no matter how indoctrinated will demand freedom. Police state doctrines are ultimately doomed in an educated society. Moreover, if the exchange programs do anything, they throw into open contrast the philosophies of the Soviet and Western World. Once that competition of ideas is

free and unrestrained I have only the most optimistic prophecies for the future. What we seek is not coexistence in an atmosphere of atomic hostility, but understanding in an atmosphere of mutual trust.

In the minutes remaining I should like to turn to freedom of the press. Freedom of the press cannot be dissociated from free government. There is no such thing as one without the other. Even benevolent despotisms, however altruistic, cannot abide a free press. Free government—government by consent of the governed—cannot exist without a free press. Unless public expression of private views is untrammeled and unintimidated, the heartbeat goes out of government by the people. Total freedom sometimes leads to abuses, of course. But as between the death of free government and journalistic abuses, which are in any event under free government easily counteracted, the choice is clear. The Constitution of the United States, which is the basic law of our land, asserts in the first of the 10 amendments known as the Bill of Rights, that Congress shall make no law abridging freedom of speech or of the press. With us this is sacred and inviolable. It is the keystone of our democracy. President Franklin D. Roosevelt gave this principle a worldwide significance when he solemnly told the Congress of the United States that of the four freedoms the first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

To the American mind freedom of speech and expression everywhere in the world cannot be separated from free government. We believe that the citizen is free—subject to laws of libel, slander and obscenity, and of sedition and national security—to say and print what he likes for or against government, his own and others. Because the United Nations Convention on Freedom of Information went too far, in their opinion, it was rejected by the Soviet bloc. And precisely because, in the view of my Government, it did not go far enough and might be used as an instrument for the restriction of information, the United States also opposed the convention.

In America the struggle for a free press goes on ceaselessly. It sometimes becomes necessary to fight against forces seeking to stop the flow of information from government and about government to the people. But we have a long-established tradition of vigilance, and no public reaction is so swift as that against any effort to impede the flow of information to the people. Congressional committees are constantly vigilant to efforts to suppress information.

And so, Mr. President, it is my conviction that together—cultural exchange and freedom of the press and information—hold within themselves the key to a free world of free men living in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and peace, under enlightened democratic governments freely chosen by them and governing with their consent.

National and international aspects of freedom of the press and information

Senator FRANCIS CASE (United States of America). Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen of the Conference, if the desires of mankind are what we have heard expressed, the people of the world do not want an atomic war—they do not want any war.

The men and the women who have spoken here have spoken as one on that point. They have differed only on the ways in which we can make the desire for peace come true with liberty and justice for all.

Of all groups of men and women who might be brought together, this Conference of members of parliamentary bodies should be the most accurate in reflecting what is in the hearts and minds of men and women everywhere because each of us comes as the representative of a constituency. Most of us are elected by the votes of that constituency, but whether elected or appointed, each of us is here to speak for the people we were chosen to represent.

To this Conference, then, of parliamentary delegates, I speak on freedom of information with the conviction that on this freedom all other freedoms depend.

To this Conference, I would say that the right to know the truth is a right of the people and is not a proper monopoly of any government.

Our agenda item No. 5 divides the topic into two parts: Exchanges of Culture, and Exchanges of News as Information. I address my remarks to the latter—the exchange of news at home and abroad.

In passing, however, I testify to the good that is accomplished by the exchange of cultures.

It was good for the people of my country to learn of the appreciation accorded in Russia to a great pianist from the State of Texas, Mr. Cliburn. It has been good for the people of my country to learn of good sportsmanship and courtesy when athletes from my country compete with athletes of other lands, regardless of political ideologies. And I trust the ladies at home will forgive me if, in Rio de Janeiro and this atmosphere of Latin American beauty, I confess there may be dividends for international appreciation from the victory by lovely Miss Colombia, in the competition for the title of "Miss Universe" held in the United States of North America only a few days ago.

Such exchanges of culture and skill, of talent and beauty to increase understanding among the people of the world.

The free exchange of other news and information, however, sometimes runs into trouble. This happens most often when the news relates to political programs and ambitions.

Those governments which see the state as the goal of every endeavor are inclined to seize control of information as a tool for the attainment of their ends regardless of the imprisonment which that decrees for honest, clear-minded judgment. Those one-man governments who dare not trust the people with the truth deprive the people of the facts to which every citizen has a right. This practice defeats the hopes in the hearts of mankind for freedom and understanding.

My country's independence began with a declaration that governments are formed to bring life and liberty and to permit people to pursue happiness. We hold that the state belongs to the people, that people are not the chattels of the state.

Consequently, we believe that the people are entitled to have uncensored news. When Premier Khrushchev wrote his letter to President Eisenhower about the situation in the Middle East, a few days ago, the newspapers of my country were free to print every word of the Khrushchev letter. The radio and the television carried whatever portions of the letter they desired to use and that their time permitted. The people of my country reached their judgments on the basis of the statement itself, and in the light of past events in Warsaw, Leipzig, and Budapest, as they had been freely reported insofar as the facts from those places were permitted to get to the world.

Someone once said that religion was an opiate for the people which I do not accept. True religion brings hope and purpose to human life. But there is something which does drug justice and put freedom to sleep. That is the sugar coating of selfish political opinion in the name of news by governments which denies to their people the free exchange of information with other peoples of the world.

There is no colonialism so enslaving as that which imprisons the minds of men and makes them the mental chattels of the state.

As Mr. Philip Klutznick, U.S. representative to the General Assembly of the United Nations, said as lately as December 6, 1957:

"The freest and fullest flow of information is basic to a democratic system of government. * * * In time of peace it is never safe to trust any man or institution of men with the power to decide for others what is good and what is bad information * * *. There may be times when the majority will be mistaken * * * but * * * the truth eventually becomes apparent and right judgments will be made."

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen of the Conference, on the 14th of December 1946, the General Assembly of the United Nations resolved that: "Freedom of information is a fundamental right, and the touchstone of all the freedoms to which the United Nations is consecrated."

Therefore, I would wish that this Conference of the Interparliamentary Union "urge that the free exchange of information be recognized as a right of the people and not as a property of any government."

Those who themselves are the mouthpieces for the people in representative government should be the first to proclaim the importance of the freedom of information. Unless the door is open for the free flow of news, we can never be sure of what is truth. The people must have their right to know recognized if there are to be governments of the people, by the people and for the people.

Draft resolution concerning the development of representative assemblies in non-self-governing territories

Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, U.S. Representative from Ohio. The quest for peace engages the attention and efforts of men of good will in all parts of the world. All humanity is today beset by strife and tensions which, if allowed to persist, will plunge the world into the disaster of another war. This is the overriding challenge of our times. The question before all of us is: How can we remove the strife and tensions which give rise to war?

One of the outstanding causes of strife and tension is injustice. That is, injustice against people and nations.

In our times it is injustices against entire nations which cause unrest on a scale unparalleled in the history of mankind and thereby retards the winning of a lasting peace. The demand for genuine, representative self-government is heard from the people of all nations who are today the victims of colonialism or imperialism in any form.

The old colonialism is giving way to the rising tide of nationalism as the empires of the past are becoming reconciled to the need for a new world order in which all nations shall govern their own affairs and live at peace with their neighbors. This reconciliation carries with it the high responsibility for assisting the people of the old colonial territories in the task of building free political institutions which will assure representative parliamentary bodies. Only through the exercise of a universal vote, free and secret ballots, the right of multiple political parties which take their case to the electorate at fixed intervals, and parliamentary bodies which adhere to the right of the opposition to dissent, can such free political institutions be built and preserved. In turn this requires responsible local leadership which is responsive to the will of the electorate.

This, then, is the challenge which confronts both the statesmen of the administering power of the non-self-governing territories and the people of such territories. It is a common task in which both interests must assume equal responsibility. There is sufficient good will on all sides to assure success once the objectives are clearly de-

fined and a time set for the accomplishment of the task.

Significant and praiseworthy steps have already been taken by the administering powers in many of the non-self-governing territories. In some, democratic and representative parliamentary bodies are in the process of forming, others are undergoing adjustments to make direct representation of the people a reality. In some the tempo of constructive change is not keeping pace with the popular demands of the politically awakened people. But in practically all these territories the need for a change is recognized and the reconciliation which accompanies it provides the necessary basis for a bright and orderly future.

Turning to the new colonialism, one immediately sees under the yoke of this new imperialism a long array of politically mature and well-established nations which today are non-self-governing, which have been deprived of their free political institutions and whose representative parliamentary bodies have been destroyed. These ancient and proud nations, surely no less than the newly awakened nations of Asia and Africa, are worthy of the considerate and continuing interest of this Conference.

During the past 40 years this new colonialism, this new imperialism has forcibly incorporated once free democratic and independent nations into its empire. This new imperialism seeks to accommodate the rising tide of nationalism by spuriously proclaiming that these nations are independent. However, by its own definition the new imperialism limits this independence to hollow form while the substance of the state, that is the very life of the state and its people, is completely controlled by an alien, unwanted and predatory power. Clearly, no nation or territory can be self-governing unless the people therein exercise complete control over the internal affairs of the nation and are undisturbed masters of their destiny. The record of the past 40 years demonstrates that the people of these non-self-governing nations will never be satisfied with national independence which is limited to meaningless forms. So long as they are deprived of the essential substance of national independence, which is the right to govern their own affairs free from alien control or direction, they will continue to exercise the only opportunities open to them to dissent, that is, by internal revolts and freedom revolutions.

Within the past 5 years we have witnessed three outstanding expressions of violent dissent by the people within the orbit of Russian influence. In 1953 there was the mass uprising in East Germany in which the workers and peasants sought to throw off alien rule. This was followed in 1956 by the popular revolts in Poland in which all the people of Poland were in sympathy. Then in October of 1956 the entire Hungarian nation, workers, peasants, soldiers, intellectuals and even some of the new ruling class rose up in a bloody revolution which resulted in the restoration for 5 historic days of national independence in substance as well as in form. All the people of the world know that it took a major military campaign by the Red army to return Hungary to the status of a non-self-governing nation. Time does not permit a full recount of the many popular uprisings which have taken place over a period of many years in Ukraine, Georgia, Turkestan, the Baltic States, and in other non-Russian nations. However, the implicit warning carried by these events urges us to find an honorable remedy to end the human strife and dangerous international tensions which they create.

To that end I propose that the draft resolution now before this Conference be amended to reflect the urgent need for developing procedures whereby the people of once free and independent nations which have been reduced to the status of non-self-governing territories shall be accorded the opportunity, under the United Nations supervision, to freely determine substance as well as the form of their government. Such steps would be in accordance with the spirit and the letter of the United Nations Charter.

Allow me to make one point clear, beyond any doubt. I do not include in my proposal the Russian nation itself which, as is well known, is only one of many nations which will make up the Soviet Union and its population constitutes a minority. It is strictly an internal matter for the Russian people to determine whether their nation is self-governing. This is not a concern of this Conference or should it be a concern of the United Nations.

It has always appeared to me to be grossly unjust that in any consideration of the colonial or dependent territory problem that the burden is placed only upon the old colonialism, which as I have said has largely reconciled itself to the inevitable changes taking place in the world. The new colonialism, the new imperialism carries with it a far greater threat to the winning of the peace. Surely the non-Communist world in and of itself cannot expect to eliminate the dangerous international tensions which give rise to war. These tensions can be eliminated only by an equal amount of good will and desire for changes on the part of the ruling class of the new colonialism. That is, changes which accord with the freely expressed will of the people. The cause of peace and amity among nations requires that this burden be borne by all forms of colonialism and imperialism.

To that end I urge this Conference now and in the future to give equal consideration and attention to the problems of non-self-governing nations as that given to non-self-governing territories.

The development of representative assemblies in non-self-governing territories

Hon. ANTONI N. SADLAK (United States of America). Mr. President, in behalf of the delegation from the United States of North America I wish to emphasize some actual results, some recent accomplishments from our encouragement in the development of representative assemblies in non-self-governing territories. My remarks will, I hope, confirm that we mean whatever we say when the United States participates in the attainment of this worthy goal by a territory. Our deeds, I feel, will speak better than volumes of words on this process of self government to the territories.

Before I make specific mention of the examples, may I stress an obvious truth concerning all territories; namely, that the people of the territories demand freedom because they are not now free and because the governing powers have made them aware of the Western traditions of freedom, of democracy, and of the wealth that has come from industrial civilization.

Often, however, the people of the self-governing areas do not realize that democracy developed slowly in the West over several centuries as the people gradually won greater freedom for themselves and learned how to use it responsibly so that the freedom of their neighbors was not threatened. Today the non-self-governing areas cannot be told to wait 300 years for freedom to come to them. Many demand it now. Others will soon add their voices to the call for liberty. But we know, too, that democracy will probably not work unless the people can receive some training in the democratic process before they become completely self-governing. Thus, democracy today faces a difficult and deeply trying period and, I trust, we parliamentarians have a like and equal and similar understanding of the definition and meaning of the word "democracy."

After all, the representative assembly is one of the most important devices available in trying to solve this seemingly impossible problem of how to create as it were, "instant democracy." The representative assembly provides an opportunity to give the people of the territory experience in the elective process, in enacting laws and administering the nation without giving them full responsibility and power all at once. As it becomes apparent that each new grant of power is used responsibly, the governing nation should increase the powers of the representative assembly and thus gradually bring the territory to self-determination by peaceful means.

May I here insert my complete, unqualified endorsement of the proposed amendment of my colleague, Mr. FEIGHAN, of the United States, who cites his concern and vigorously protests the deprivation of once free, independent nations which successfully attained complete freedom, and have been reduced to the status of non-self-governing nations by a new colonialism or imperialism.

Now for my examples: The Philippine Islands became independent in 1946 by the mutual consent of the Filipinos and the Americans after a lengthy process in which more and more power was gradually extended to a representative Filipino assembly. Today the Philippines are a republic with a working democracy, and have an outstanding delegation here in Rio. They also maintain a close and friendly relationship with the United States. On the other hand Puerto Rico rejected independence from the United States and chose to become a commonwealth in 1952. Puerto Rico has the same autonomy in local affairs as one of the United States and its citizens are also United States citizens, but it neither contributes much to the Treasury of the United States, nor has voting representation in our Congress. The Puerto Ricans are free to change their status and apply either for full statehood in the United States, or to become completely independent. Finally, I would point out that Alaska has just been made our 49th State and the people of Hawaii are also seeking statehood rather than independence. I cite these examples, my fellow delegates, to demonstrate that the development of representative assemblies in non-self-governing territories does not necessarily lead to the independence of the territory or become a device for the expression of hatred toward the governing power if a territory does choose independence. Much depends on the character of the past relationship between the territory and the governing power and the compatability of their interests.

The United States is even beginning the processes of self-government on the 2,000 scattered islands of Micronesia in the South Pacific, which we hold under a U.N. trusteeship agreement. Thus far we have given the islanders a sense of unity that they have never experienced previously. The natives of the more than 1,000 Marshall Islands govern themselves under American guidance by a system of elected officials and a two-house congress, with the upper chamber consisting of hereditary nobles. A constitution is now being drafted for the Ponape district of the Caroline Islands and these same things are taking place for the first time elsewhere in Micronesia which has known only rule by foreign powers for hundreds of years. The goal of the United States is an independent Micronesian federation. I might add that the United States has even permitted the natives of Okinawa and the Bonin Islands to assume a significant degree of local self-government even though these are strategic trusts which we hold under the Japanese Peace Treaty and which will one day be returned to Japan.

In conclusion, I would like to stress once again what the United States feels to be one of the central truths of our time. The peoples of the non-self-governing territories are

demanding self-determination in ever-increasing numbers today and if they are to develop as democracies rather than as totalitarian governments, the Western nations must speed up the process of laying the basis for democracy including the development of responsible representative assemblies. Encouragement from the Interparliamentary Union could play a significant part in increasing the number of such assemblies. I hope this will be one result of our meeting here this year.

And, Mr. President, permit me to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation for the courtesies, for the warmth, and genuine reception by our Brazilian hosts. For me and mine I say—Muito obrigado, caros vizinhos.

Farewell remarks by Hon. Homer Ferguson, United States of America

Hon. HOMER FERGUSON, United States of America. Mr. President, I would like to say a few words to the delegates before I am compelled to leave. Our delegation is required to return to the States because Congress is in session and important matters are on. May I have the permision of the chairman and the delegates to say a few words.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, fellow delegates, and friends, I first want to thank the delegates and the Interparliamentary Union for the fact that they have named me as an honorary member of this organization. I spent many years while in the Senate of the United States as a delegate to these meetings and I valued that privilege highly. I met my old friends here again and, being greatly interested in foreign policy, it is a great honor for me to be an honorary member of this organization; and may I compliment the Secretary General on his marvelous report to the delegates.

As we depart from this famous and fabulous city, this happy and historic land, we want to voice our great appreciation of the wonderful hospitality of our Brazilian hosts. I know you all agree with me as delegates that nothing has been left undone to minister to our pleasure and to our comfort. We are deeply grateful to everyone who has been responsible for the arrangements of the facilities for this Conference. The reception last evening at the Yacht Club was to all of us the brilliant climax to our visit. We shall always remember this hospitality.

The discussion and the debates of the 47th Conference have revealed, I think, a wide consensus of agreement among the delegates of all nations regarding the matters of expanding capital investments abroad under appropriate conditions, the need of strengthening and implementing the peace of the world, the value of cultural exchanges between nations and the acquisition and defense of freedom of information, as well as the importance of pushing ahead with the development of representative political institutions in the non-self-governing territories.

This Conference also has demonstrated by its own performance its belief in the essential role of the legislature in the conduct of public affairs, whose high function in our respective countries is, I believe further, to make the laws, and to make them by elected representatives of the people who are to be governed by those laws, to watch and control the conduct of elected executive officials and, as far as humanly possible, to represent and carry out the will of their constituents.

Mr. President, we think that one of the principal values of this Conference has been the opportunity we have had for forming closer person-to-person contacts between the lawmakers from many lands. We find that differences of language, culture, and political institutions are overshadowed by our basic common needs and aspirations. Above all, in our opinion, we have the humanity question, we have to consider the souls and aspirations of our people. And so, Mr. President, I know we are going to return to our respective homes with hearts full of gratitude to the Government and the people of Brazil, with deep understanding of each other's problems and viewpoints and with renewed faith in the value of representative government in the world today.

May I wish you all Godspeed in your return to your respective homes.

A Wisconsin Tribute to Carl Sandburg, Edward Steichen, and Fredric March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the State of Wisconsin, with its worldwide reputation as producer of the best cheese, milk, butter and—of course—beer, sometimes gets insufficient credit as the producer, or at least contributing producer, of great men.

I am prompted to mention this subject by the memorable appearance in this Chamber, on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, of the renowned poet and biographer, Carl Sandburg, and the famous actor, Fredric March; and by an article in the Washington Post of last Sunday telling of the coming trip to Russia by Mr. Sandburg and his brother-in-law, artist-photographer Edward Steichen, as cultural ambassadors for our country.

All three of these distinguished gentlemen are Wisconsin sons—one by birth, and two by past residence. Wisconsin is proud of them, and regards them as her own.

Edward Steichen began his artistic and photographic career in Milwaukee, where he was sent in 1888—at the age of 9—to be educated. His artistic appreciation and mechanical ability were developed there, and at the age of 15, he was signed as a 4-year apprentice with the American Lithographing Co., of Milwaukee. He supplemented his meager income by drawing program designs, painting watercolors, and becoming unofficial photographer to all picnics and outings in the vicinity.

He organized the Milwaukee Art Students League and directed activities as its president. The league employed instructors, held art classes, and exhibitions. His apprenticeship over, Steichen was promoted to the drafting room, and because of his talent for designing posters, he was soon earning $50 a week.

Steichen divided his spare time between the artist's palette and the camera. His experiments in photography, then hardly recognized as an art, gained as much recognition as his painting.

After having his photographs accepted by the Philadelphia Photographic Salon, and some by the Chicago Art Institute, Steichen gave up his job, took his savings, paintings, and photographs, and about the turn of the century left Milwaukee to pursue his art studies in New York and Europe.

Carl Sandburg spent several years in Milwaukee in the early 1900's, gaining a good deal of practical political experience, and adding to his store of knowledge about men.

Sandburg worked for a year as district organizer for the Wisconsin Socialist Party, and from 1910 to 1912 was secretary to Mayor Emil Seidel of Milwaukee. He was associate editor of System Magazine in 1913, before moving on into the newspaper world in Chicago.

Fredric March was born in Racine, Wis., in 1897, educated in the Racine public schools, and graduated from the University of Wisconsin in 1920. It was at the university that he became interested in the acting career upon which he embarked professionally soon after his graduation, and during which he has given the world so many great performances.

Life in Wisconsin had a profound influence on the directions, the philosophies, the talents, the careers of these three outstanding Americans. It is appropriate for Wisconsin to call them her sons, and for the people of Wisconsin to delight in their accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following article from the Washington Post of Sunday, February 15, 1959, by Jean White:

SANDBURG, STEICHEN TO EXPLAIN MAN'S UNIVERSALITY TO RUSSIANS

(By Jean White)

Two of America's most distinguished men of arts and letters are ready to go overseas this summer to take the message of the universality of "The Family of Man" to Russia.

The two—Poet-Biographer Carl Sandburg, 81, and Artist-Photographer Edward Steichen, 79—will make a striking pair of cultural ambassadors for the United States.

"The Family of Man," the moving camera testament to mankind created by Steichen from 503 photographs, already has been seen by more than 5 million persons around the world. On tour overseas, it has become one of the most successful shows mounted by the U.S. Information Agency. Everywhere the exhibit has gone, in 28 countries, it has been drawing record crowds.

WILL GO TO MOSCOW

The trip of Sandburg and Steichen, at the invitation of USIA, will take them to Moscow for the premier of "The Family of Man" in the Soviet Union.

The photographic exhibit will be one showcase of a big American fair in Moscow's Sokolniki Park to display the technological, educational, and cultural accomplishments of this country. USIA hopes to open the $5 million show around July 4 for a 6-week stand.

In turn, the Russians are to stage their own exhibit in New York City's Coliseum this summer. The exchange of fairs comes under a cultural-exchange agreement signed last year.

Sandburg, who was in Washington last week to address Congress on the 150th anniversary of Lincoln's birth, spoke enthusiastically about his plans to go to Russia with "The Family of Man." As a part-time traveling troubadour, he feels deeply that the photographic collection has something very important to tell.

KINSHIP OF FAMILY

"The people of Russia will be able to feel their kinship to the whole family of man

over the earth," the poet explained in his rich, mellow voice and then paused in thought.

"It's the great epic poem about mankind that mankind everywhere can read and feel. The realities are before their eyes and need no translation * * * It isn't an exhibit of photographs or prize pictures. It's what the camera saw, and you are there where the camera is and you see life. The theme is that people shall see people and people of one country shall see people of another country."

That, from the testimony of personal letters and newspaper comment overseas, is what "The Family of Man" has accomplished on its tours of Asia, Africa, South America, and Europe.

In India, the Bombay Chronicle wrote of its visit: "The greatest single thing the United States has done for India. Not money, not the wheat, not the gift packages. But the exhibition of 'The Family of Man.'"

PRAISE FROM ALL LANDS

In Japan, Mrs. Chimi Baba, president of the Osaka Housewives Association, wrote: "I saw the real meaning of the words of the United Nations Charter."

In South Africa, a Johannesburg Sunday Times writer commented: "I am writing this under the spell of an exhibition that could change the face of South Africa if it were seen and felt and understood by the right people * * * and I say it could change the face of South Africa because no human being seeing it and understanding its message could ever hold race hatred in his heart again."

In Guatemala, Indians came from the mountains to see the exhibit. In sophisticated Paris, the French press turned to superlatives to praise the show. In Seoul, Korea, 420,000 persons came to see the exhibit.

Steichen, with sensitive soul and artistic eye, combed through 2 million photographs before choosing the 503 that best "mirrored the essential oneness of mankind throughout the world." Under his guiding hand, the work of 273 photographers from 68 countries became a moving human document.

The USIA has put nine duplicate versions of "The Family of Man"—first created by Steichen for the Museum of Modern Art—on the road. Three wore out on the heavily booked circuit. The other six still are on tour.

DEDICATED TO DIGNITY

The original dedication of "The Family of Man," in Steichen's words, was "to the dignity of man."

For the Moscow exhibit, he now is planning an addition to express that dedication through the life of one of the greatest Americans, Abraham Lincoln. And no one can speak more eloquently of Lincoln than his traveling companion. For his mighty Lincoln biograhpy, Sandburg won a Pulitzer prize in history and then added one for poetry a few years later.

To be added to "The Family of Man" for the Moscow showing is Steichen's own deeply sensed photographic rendering of the Lincoln life mask in the Meserve collection.

Steichen took the photograph the year Sandburg published "The War Years" of Lincoln's life. For two months the artist-photographer, searching for artistic truth, studied the mask. Often he arose at night to light a candle to study the play of light and shadow on the bronze mask.

Sandburg and Steichen make a remarkable set of brothers-in-law (Sandburg has been married to Steichen's sister, Lillian, for 50 years). Sandburg, the white-haired goat raiser, and Steichen, the handsomely bearded delphinium breeder, also should prove a winning pair of personal ambassadors for the United States.

FULLER BRUSH MEN

"We'll be Fuller brush men," said Steichen, a merry light in his blue eyes.

"Together, side by side, we'll go," intoned his poet companion.

And then added the guitar-playing Sandburg mischievously: "I think I'll go off and take some lessons on the balalaika when we're in Moscow."

When he received the USIA invitation last fall to go to Moscow with "The Family of Man," Sandburg said he answered with alacrity—"Yes."

"The Family of Man," he explained, "is so important."

"All these themes are universal. They run through the 500-or-so-odd photographs like the recurring themes of a symphony. Certain important events in the life of people everywhere are there: love—love is there; weddings, birth, food, children at the breast of the mother; then growth, the growing of the child, school; work—work everywhere—if they don't work they don't eat; and then play, children around the world playing ring-around-the-rosy in the same way; quarrels, wars, dancing—everywhere they dance; death, hunger, hope, fear, dreams. Here is set forth all."

Senator Thomas H. Kuchel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, California's now senior Senator, THOMAS H. KUCHEL, is rising to new prominence in the affairs of the Nation. The Kuchel story was recounted in an article by columnist William Broom, syndicated recently in the Long Beach Press Telegram and other newspapers.

Text of the Broom column is as follows:

NEW TOM KUCHEL EMERGES AS KNOWLAND'S SHADOW RECEDES

WASHINGTON.—In 5 short months, Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL has stepped out of the shadow of ex-Senator William F. Knowland into the bright sunshine of political prominence.

KUCHEL's climb was compounded of many elements. But the major of these was an adroit ability to arrive at the proper place at the proper time. And to disagree without making enemies.

There's a growing suspicion on Capitol Hill that KUCHEL's political skills have been underrated. A case for that view can be made from the record. Since Knowland's footsteps disappeared over the horizon toward his ill-starred gubernatorial campaign, KUCHEL has:

Won election as GOP whip in the Senate, the No. 2 position of responsibility in that body's party leadership.

Captured after vigorous infighting, a seat on the Senate Appropriations Committee, from which all money and therefore much power flows.

As a perquisite of his whip's job, been included in the select band of legislators who have the President's ear at weekly White House meetings.

Emerged as a chief spokesman, if not a leader, of the Senate's GOP liberals who advocate a new image for the party more attractive to the electorate.

Bolstered by those accomplishments, KUCHEL now speaks with more confidence and authority. Californians will get a glimpse of the new KUCHEL when he returns next week for about 10 days of speechmaking in connection with the party's Lincoln Day celebration.

These will urge the California GOP to cast away all antilabor bias in its effort to reclaim its fortunes and may even go so far as to blame right to work support for a big share of the 1958 reversals.

A roundhouse swing also is in the arsenal for Senator BARRY GOLDWATER of Arizona, who recently offered the view that liberals ought to get out of the Republican party. GOLDWATER's remarks left the liberals less than happy and KUCHEL's speeches probably will offer their first public rebuttal.

Chance and the elephantine eminence of Knowland kept KUCHEL in the background during his first 5 years in the Senate. Even the alphabet served to deepen the obscurity. On Senate rollcalls, KUCHEL's name followed that of his senior, so that his vote often sounded like an echo of the then GOP Senate leader. When they voted differently, Knowland invariably seemed startled.

Knowland's departure was the signal for feverish KUCHEL activity. With the senior Californian now out of the picture, it was obvious the Republican leadership in the Senate would be reshuffled.

KUCHEL made no overt move—a practice, incidentally, which has marked his intraparty political career—until GOP candidates fell like wheat in a hailstorm in November. Then he started working both sides of the street, gaining commitments for the whip's job from liberals like GEORGE AIKEN of Vermont and CLIFF CASE of New Jersey, and conservatives such as MILT YOUNG of North Dakota and GOLDWATER.

Later, GOLDWATER withdrew his support, and a pronounced chill set in on relations between the two westerners.

Throughout the bitter jockeying over the leadership jobs, KUCHEL never let an opportunity pass to point out that California will soon be the largest State in the Union and that the GOP should include a member of its fast-receding western representation in the leadership.

With California Republicans threshing about for new leadership, the question of KUCHEL's role naturally arises. Thus far, he has kept silent; but he is aware that he and Vice President NIXON are the only statewide officeholders still on their feet. The relationship between the two has never been particularly close, but neither have there been any clashes.

If KUCHEL follows past practice, he probably will wait for an opportunity to come to him. But meanwhile, he shows every indication of wanting to impress his brand of progressivism and friendship for labor on the new California elephant.

Farm Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years the American farmers have patiently endured an unhealthy condition existing in the agriculture industry. This condition is general in its nature and could be said to be caused by many

different factors or combination thereof, which have been allowed to creep into the industry through an unsympathetic administration of the farm programs as written in the law.

Much has been said and written about this situation and we are all aware that a farm problem exists but one of the best reports I have read on the actual depth and breadth of the deterioration of the farm economy was compiled by E. E. Manuel, president of the George State Bank, George, Iowa. Mr. Manuel's report was made a part of the annual report to the stockholders of the George State Bank. The report follows:

FARM SITUATION

(By E. E. Manuel)

Farmers of the Nation have suffered a loss of income of more than $20 billion in the first 5 years of Mr. Benson's tenure as Secretary of Agriculture.

When this administration came into power in 1953, Benson took over a farm program under which for 11 consecutive years—1942–1952, inclusive—our farmers had enjoyed their greatest prosperity in history. Farm prices in each of those 11 years were at or about 100 percent of parity. During these years, our consumers bought food at fair and reasonable prices. Mr. Benson in 5 years, with the backing of the President, has reduced this program to a shambles.

Here are the figures on the deterioration of farm income under Mr. Benson, taken from the books of the Department of Agriculture:

Total realized net income of farmers (after deducting agricultural production expenses from the total of cash income from farm marketings, Government payments to farmers, value of home consumption of farm-produced foods, and computed rental value of farm dwellings):

Five pre-Benson years

1948	$16,057,000,000
1949	13,789,000,000
1950	13,185,000,000
1951	15,158,000,000
1952	14,416,000,000
Total	72,605,000,000

Five Benson years

1953	$13,899,000,000
1954	12,201,000,000
1955	11,470,000,000
1956	12,111,000,000
1957	10,840,000,000
Total	60,521,000,000

The Department records show that during the last 5 Benson years farmers produced and sold 11 percent more food and nonfood products than in the 5 years, 1948–1952, inclusive. Had our farmers been paid for the larger volume of food and nonfood products marketed in the last 5 years at the same rate as in the 5 years preceding, their net income would have been $80.5 billion or more than $20 billion more than they actually received under Benson.

If farm prices, instead of declining, had increased in proportion to all other prices during these last 5 years, farmers' income would have been much more even than $80 billion. However, under Mr. Benson's constant pressure for lower farm prices, the income aggregated only $60,521 million.

Those who seek an excuse for the farm income debacle in the last 5 years often resort to a contention that prior to Mr. Benson's tenure farm prices were influenced and sustained by the demands of the post-World War II years and by the Korean conflict. It should be pointed out that the demand for feed has been greater in these last 5 years than in any similar period in history, and consumers, during these 5 years, purchased 11 percent more products of our farms than during the 5 preceding years. The difference between the Benson years and previous years is that before Mr. Benson took office the farm program was in sympathetic hands and supplies were kept within reasonable balance with market outlets; while in these recent years Mr. Benson has been tearing down the program, telling both producers and consumers that farm prices are too high, with the result that farmers have suffered a loss in income of at least $20 billion.

Here is a brief summary of the last 5 years, comparing 1957 to 1952:

Farm prices: Down 16 percent.

Farm parity ratio: Down 18 percent.

Realized net farm income: Down 25 percent, lowest point since 1942.

Purchasing power of that farm income: Down 29 percent, lowest since 1940.

Farm debt: At a record high of $22.6 billion.

Farm population: Declined from 24,283,000 in 1952 to 20,396,000 in 1957.

In 1957 the returns to farmworkers for their labor and management reached a low of 69 cents an hour, while the average wage of industrial workers climbed to a high of $2.07 an hour.

Moreover, farm surpluses have trebled, increasing from $2,452 million in 1952 to more than $7 billion today.

Apropriations and authorizations to the Department of Agriculture for all purposes amounted to $6,794 million for fiscal 1958, whereas all such appropriations and authorizations for all the 5 years immediately preceding Mr. Benson's tenure—including the Korean conflict—amounted to only $7,391 million; and employees in the Department of Agriculture have increased more than 17,000 since 1952—from 67,406 as of December 31, 1952, to 85,107 as of January 1, 1958.

Since Mr. Benson began to bring down farm prices 5 years ago, farm income has dropped about $1 billion a year, the cost of farm programs has increased by about $1 billion a year, farm debt has climbed about $1 billion a year, and farm people have been leaving the farms at the rate of about 1 million a year.

It is my opinion that we, who are directly dependent upon farm income, should tell our story—tell two true stories: First, the Benson story; second, the story of the years of agriculture's rise from the great depression to a place of parity and equal economic stature with labor, industry, and business—until the time Mr. Benson took over.

The story of agriculture (pre-Benson) is an account of triumph of the parity principle—agriculture's magna carta. This is the story of 20 pre-Benson years.

Farm income multiplied sixfold, sevenfold, and eightfold in those two decades. As stated previously, for 11 consecutive years prior to 1953, the average prices paid to farmers were at or above 100 percent of parity. Rural people became able to buy the conveniences and comforts hitherto available only to our citizens in the cities. The blessings of electricity were taken to the rural areas. Farmers became financially able to mechanize their farms and to apply new sciences, to bring the blessings of food abundance at low cost to the consumers of the Nation. Now, with the means to do it, farmers devoted their energies to the restoration and conservation of the Nation's most precious resource—the soil. Prosperity on the farms created greater markets for industries in the cities, made jobs, and kept factory wheels turning.

The output per farm worker doubled in those 20 years, and now each farm worker feeds 20 persons. This new efficiency in agriculture made available to American families more and better food for an expenditure of a smaller percentage of their total income than in any other period in history. Although retail prices have increased while farm prices declined in the last 5 years, the average hourly wage of industrial workers will buy twice as much food as in 1929.

Costs: The Commodity Credit Corporation supported the prices of major storable crops for 20 years prior to 1953, and at the end of these two decades this program actually showed a 20-year profit of $13 million. For those 20 years, the CCC programs, for all crops, including a number of perishables, lost only $1,064 million, and CCC investments in surpluses on January 1, 1953 (inventory and loans) amounted to only $2,452 million.

In contrast, during the 5 Benson years, due primarily to the unsympathetic administration of the farm program, CCC deficits in farm price support operations have amounted to four times as much as was lost in the preceding 20 years—or, more than $4 billion in the last 5 years compared to slightly more than $1 billion in 20 years. Meanwhile, CCC investments in surpluses have increased threefold, from $2,452 million in 1052 to more than $7 billion in the most recent report.

It is indeed a melancholy record that Mr. Benson has compiled in the years he should have been the chief champion of our farm people before the Nation. And in my opinion, the worst seems yet ahead. The handwriting is on the wall. Out of his great and dedicated drive for lower and lower farm prices, based upon an extraordinary theory that a poor price will make better income, Mr. Benson has set the stage for an even greater farm debacle within the next 2 years. The reduction in price supports will encourage larger crop outputs as farmers seek to make up in volume what they lose in unit price—all these factors clearly foreshadow these distressing developments: Farm surpluses will mount to a new record high; farm program costs will climb to new heights; meat animal prices and the income of feed and livestock producers will decline sharply. We may see hogs selling at $10 or $12 per hundredweight, and we surely cannot forget the $9–$10 prices of just a couple of years ago. Farm debt will set a new high record. And finally, unless an effective farm program is developed by the next Congress and put into operation in spite of Mr. Benson's objections and threat of veto, farm income will establish a new postwar low, and the effects will be felt not only by our farm people but also by the Nation's total economy.

As you probably know, there were two or more agricultural bills passed by the House and the Senate during the last 5 years to improve the parity ratio for farmers, but they were vetoed twice by the President, so Congress was confronted with the reality that it must give Mr. Benson further price cutting powers or he would impose such short-acreages upon cotton and rice crops as to mean ruin for many farmers and many communities which depend on production of these crops for their economic existence. It was in this situation that the top brass of the American Farm Bureau Federation brought forward a proposition to kill the parity principle completely and thus destroy the very foundation of the farm program. Mr. Benson endorsed legislation embracing the farm bureau proposal. It would have provided price supports for major crops at 90 percent of the average market prices of the previous 3 years, thus removing farm prices entirely from any fair relationship to costs and prices in the rest of the economy and providing a price-support system for farmers at approximately 10 percent less than they could expect to get in the marketplaces anyway. I certainly do not believe the parity killing proposition introduced by the headquarters officials and employees of the American farm bureau in any way whatsoever represented the thinking

and the will of the good farm people who are members of that great organization.

Edward A. O'Neal, late president of the federation, was one of the principal architects of the program to bring farmers into a parity position in our free enterprise economy. He personally welded the farm interest into a united front and was the great leader of agriculture in those pre-Benson days. I cannot believe the present members of that organization would deny and defame the philosophy of Ed O'Neal, destroy the advantages his dedicated life brought to agriculture, and work against their own interests by repealing the parity concept, on which all of agriculture's aspirations and hopes are founded.

The Senate passed S. 4071, embracing the farm bureau proposal to kill the parity principle for cotton, corn, rice, and feed grains. The Senate took this action when it seemed that this was the only way to gain enactment and White House approval of a bill to forestall devastating acreage cuts in 1959, which was the major objective of the sponsors of S. 4071.

However, when this bill came to the House for its consideration, the committee unanimously opposed the destruction of the parity principle. Democrats and Republicans stood solidly against this. The House would have no bill at all if it would destroy parity. The committee of the House won the confidence and support of the Senate, and parity was put back into the law, but of course at a lesser percentage. But the principle was retained with all its dignity and as the foundation on which the subsequent Congresses will rebuild a farm program, fair to farmers and consumers alike, when we can have in Washington a Secretary of Agriculture and an administration that is sympathetic to the principle and cause that the farm families of this Nation have a right to be equal partners in the rewards and blessings of free enterprise and are entitled to a parity position in this Nation's growth and prosperity.

The bill is not what farmers desire or want. The bill is not what any friend of agriculture wanted. It is an offspring of necessity and of the veto power. It protects producers from something worse in 1959, but unless it is repealed or changed it will create greater problems in the years ahead.

The farm program, based on the parity principle, was erected out of an awareness in the Congress that agriculture is the only major element of our total economy that has no device outside of the help of the Government to pattern its production to market needs; that farmers have no way of measuring what should be their individual contribution to a balanced national supply of food and fiber without Government help; that farmers have virtually no bargaining power in the commerce they conduct; that agriculture is the only major industry that does not set its prices to cover costs and reasonable profits, but goes into the marketplace and asks: "What will you give me?"

National propaganda has been trained against the operation of an effective farm program. Four great myths have been planted on the farms of America and have yielded a crop of confusion, uncertainty, and doubt around the future of agriculture. Mistrust has been created among farmers themselves in their own program: (1) Farmers are told that lower prices will solve their problems—prices going down each year; (2) farmers are told that increased efficiency will solve their problems, but efficiency in production has not solved but has intensified the farm problem; (3) farmers are told that movement of people out of agriculture will solve their problems—that is, the problems of those who are left. This, in my opinion, is very dangerous, because the farm family in these United States is actually the backbone of our democracy; (4) farmers and the Nation at large are told that the price-support program is responsible for surplus farm production. But farm output is too great for available market outlets primarily because the technological revolution in agriculture, in the absence of a sympathetically administered farm program, is increasing total output faster than commercial markets can absorb it. I am not too sure but that the abundance of food and fiber in the United States probably is the best insurance policy we could have to avoid war, especially in our present situation with Russia.

As I have said and now repeat again; The land is the source of life itself. Its ownership by fewer and fewer individuals is a dangerous thing. All history testifies to the upheaval, the decline of nations and of peoples, where control of land was concentrated in the hands of a privileged few and the many were denied its access and possession.

Mr. Benson has used his office and his time, not as a chief spokesman for and champion of agriculture; but to sow the seeds of prejudice among city people against our farmers; he has aligned one farm group, one crop, one region against another to divide and confuse our farm people; he has turned the power of government against the small farmer, condemning him as inefficient and unworthy of a place on the land.

When a Minnesota farm wife asked Mr. Benson, "What shall we do?" he replied, "Find other employment."

The unemployment lines and relief rolls in the cities now are packed with people who once enjoyed security and a good life on our farms. I just heard over the radio last night that our unemployed right now aggregates over 4 billion which is about the same number of unemployed during the recent recession of 1958.

The American free-enterprise system was built upon a foundation of free and independent and numerous family-operated farms and I think the Nation needs to take a fresh free-enterprise look at the family farm. It will be a sad day for America if giant corporate farmers supplant our family system in agriculture.

Free enterprise does not live on profits, interest, and rentals alone. It prospers by the incentive to every young man that by devotion to his job and good management of his affairs, some day he may be his own boss—may own his own farm or business.

It is my feeling and my fear that by the proportion we reduce the number of individual units of enterprise we weaken the American individual free-enterprise system; and it is my conviction that for agriculture we cannot afford to substitute a hired hand, corporate-managed system for the independent, free-enterprise family farm operation.

We must protect the agricultural establishment that serves this Nation so well. We cannot forfeit our farmers to an alien philosophy of concentration and bigness.

We must begin in the next Congress to repair the damage that Mr. Benson has done—to build a new and effective farm program with parity as the basic concept.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Lennon, Alton, *N. C.*
Lesinski, John, *Mich.*
Levering, Robert W., *Ohio*
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.*—224 C St. NE.
Lindsay, John V., *N. Y.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn.*—The Congressional
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, William M., *Ohio*—4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McFall, John J., *Calif.*—507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGinley, Donald F., *Nebr.*
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak.*
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*
McSween, Harold B., *La.*
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—115 Dale Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
May, Catherine, *Wash.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Meyer, William H., *Vt.*
Michel, Robert H., *Ill.*
Miller, Clement W., *Calif.*
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—6601 Radnor Rd., Bethesda, Md.
Milliken, William H., Jr., *Pa.*
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*—8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga.*
Moeller, Walter H., *Ohio*
Monagan, John S., *Conn.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va.*
Moorhead, William S., *Pa.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morris, Thomas G., *N. Mex.*
Morris, Toby, *Okla.*—220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*—204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murphy, William T., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*
Nelsen, Ancher, *Minn.*
Nix, Robert N. C., *Pa.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, James G., *Mich.*
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass.*
Oliver, James C., *Maine*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Pirnie, Alexander, *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—228 2d St. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio*
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg.*
Powell, Adam C., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Prokop, Stanley A., *Pa.*
Pucinski, Roman C., *Ill.*
Quie, Albert H., *Minn.*—The Coronet Apt., 200 C St. SE.
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—5603 24th Ave. SE., Hillcrest Hgts., Wash. 21, D. C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Rivers, Ralph J., *Alaska*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y.*
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rostenkowski, Dan, *Ill.*
Roush, J. Edward, *Ind.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y.*
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—2601 Woodley Pl.
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Shipley, George E., *Ill.*
Short, Don L., *N. Dak.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Edna Oakes, *Ill.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Slack, John M., Jr., *W. Va.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Neal, *Iowa*
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Stratton, Samuel S., *N. Y.*—107 Martha's Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Stubblefield, Frank A., *Ky.*
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y.*—Mayflower Hotel
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—3301 Mass. Ave.
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Toll, Herman, *Pa.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Ullman, Al, *Oreg.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Wallhauser, George M., *N. J.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Wampler, Fred, *Ind.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Weis, Jessica McC., *N. Y.*
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Rd. S., Arlington, Va.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolf, Leonard G., *Iowa*
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, John, *Tex.*
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Burns, John A., *Hawaii*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 216 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Serles, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Place SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Appendix

Senator Neuberger's Return to the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we are happy that our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], has returned to us. We rejoice that he is with us. His return has been made possible because of his fortitude and his courage, and because of the knowledge gained and the progress made in medicine through medical research.

Senator NEUBERGER is an outstanding leader in fighting the battles for more medical research and for the health of our people. He has noted that the United States now spends more on chewing gum and permanent waves than on cancer research.

Inspired by Senator NEUBERGER's return and the distressing condition of Secretary Dulles, and by the fact that every 2 minutes a man, woman, or child in the United States dies an agonized death from cancer, we must press forward all the more relentlessly to advance the cause of medical research, which is our hope and our promise to find the answer to the crippling and killing diseases that have baffled and plagued mankind through the centuries.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorials on Senator NEUBERGER and his return to the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 13, 1959]

MR. NEUBERGER'S RETURN

It is altogether gratifying to see that Oregon's likable junior Senator has been able to return to his chores at the Capitol after a courageous bout with cancer. Despite his ordeal, DICK NEUBERGER'S spirits remain chipper, and it is characteristic that he is seeking to turn his private misfortune into an affirmative public purpose. Long before he was stricken, Mr. NEUBERGER had been an eloquent advocate of increased Federal aid to medical research. Now, through the caprices of fortune, Mr. NEUBERGER speaks with poignant personal authority that ought to help bestir his colleagues to greater action against the disease which has felled such noted Senators as Vandenburg, Taft, McNary, Neely, and McMahon. Mr. NEUBERGER points out that he owes the prospects for his recovery to the fruits of the medical laboratories. He also notes that the United States now spends more on chewing gum and permanent waves than on cancer research. The campaign to alter this situation ought to win new support.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Feb. 11, 1959]

LONG ILLNESS MAKES ONE THINK

A generation ago, when tuberculosis was rampant in this area, patients even formed a club and had a camaraderie among themselves. One of the things they most often said was that one never developed a philosophy until he had been ill over a long period.

Modern advances against tuberculosis have virtually licked that disease; but the comment still applies to sufferers from other ailments. A recent evidence of it comes in the Associated Press story from Portland, Oreg., interviewing Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, who said that after his long and apparently successful bout with cancer he did not know where his future career might lie except that he feels a great obligation to further medical research.

It was less than a decade and a half ago that DICK NEUBERGER came in from Alaska, a husky, vigorous captain who was to feel keenly the confining and often frustrating experience of serving in the Pentagon. Time passed and he made what to many would be a fortune, writing books and magazine articles. He married a lovely woman, Maurine, who joined him in a political career which began in the Oregon Legislature and which now has taken him to the junior senatorship from Oregon. This career suddenly went under the knife and the cobalt gun when it was found that NEUBERGER had cancer.

"It would be almost impossible for me now to get angry over a political difference," NEUBERGER, who had plenty of chance to think while he was wondering whether he would die, told the AP. That change in his personality makes politics seem less attractive, even though "I'm always going to be a Democrat."

But like many others who have undergone long and fretful illnesses, who have suffered pain and worry, NEUBERGER has come out of it with a feeling that the medical research which apparently has saved him from an early death should be broadened to save others. He has gone through what he describes as "a maturing experience."

[From the Oregonian, Feb. 5, 1959]

SENATOR'S RECOVERY

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER will return to the Senate next week with a confident report from his physicians that his cancer operation and radiation treatment have been successful. Oregon's citizens join his doctors in gratification that he can resume his normal activities.

One of Senator NEUBERGER'S declared goals is to influence the United States to take leadership in calling for an International Medical Year comparable in organization and scope to the recently concluded International Geophysical Year. The purpose would be a worldwide attack on the diseases, some of obscure or unknown causes, which still assail mankind everywhere despite remarkable progress in medical and surgical research and practices.

This is one field of endeavor in which international politics, fears and ambitions should give way to the common aim of health and security. The Geophysical Year broke down some barriers among the nations. The Medical Year could do more. Thus it could serve a valuable purpose in discouraging mass destruction by war, as well as making man's normal lot easier to bear. Senator NEUBERGER'S own frightening experience with cancer gives him the insight to lead.

[From the Oregon Journal, Feb. 6, 1959]

OREGON PEOPLE WISH SENATOR WELL

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER will return to Washington, following an extended and intensive course of radiation treatment, with the good wishes of the great majority of the people of Oregon, including those who differ with him politically.

It is the best of news that his doctors have stated their belief he is cured of the malignancy which not many months ago threatened his career.

The Senator is the first to say that his experience in the valley of the shadow has helped to mature him and to some degree change the direction of his life. It is fair to add that NEUBERGER had begun to mature in Washington long before he was aware of the malignancy.

He returns to the Senate with interest intensified in medical research. He feels that what has happened to him is almost a mandate to help hasten the day when others can be assured of a cancer cure. He plans to stimulate interest in an International Medical Year, a project he has urged in the past.

NEUBERGER'S interest will not be lessened, we suspect, in countless other projects on which he has spent his energy in the past. But he believes in his own mind his greatest contribution now can be in the medical field. Certainly medicine is an area where all the nations, including Russia, can cooperate, as they have done in the recently ended International Geophysical Year, with lasting gains in understanding as well as medical advance.

In the last session of Congress, Senator NEUBERGER expended himself to the point of exhaustion. His many friends will hope he now recognizes that his illness must of necessity put some limitation on his future activities and that he cannot work as hard as he did before without jeopardizing his health.

The Senator has not decided whether to seek reelection in 1960. But whatever his future he will have a great contribution to make. He must guard his future by taking reasonable care of himself.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Feb. 6, 1959]

BACK TO WORK

DICK NEUBERGER, whom even his enemies call DICK, is going back to work, back to Washington where a unique challenge awaits him. So well has the cancer been arrested that Oregon's junior Senator now speaks of himself as "recovered" from the malignancy discovered last August.

Naturally, his interest in medical research, always strong, was increased as he underwent a long series of radiation treatments and contemplated the miracles of science which enable him to be alive and well today. He has indicated now that he will press even harder for Federal help in the many research projects that are focused on cancer. And he can speak, as no other Senator can, from the heart and from his own experience as one might have fallen, as Senator Robert Taft fell a few years earlier, to the ailment.

He will make another contribution, too. He is nationally known figure, probably held in higher esteem elsewhere in the Nation that he is at home. And there he stands, a man who licked cancer—by the grace of God and radiation. Thus he will be an inspiration and a symbol of hope to millions.

[From the Greater Oregon, Feb. 13, 1959]

BACK IN WASHINGTON

Our newspaper staff joins with more than a million other Oregonians in thankfulness that our Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER is fully recovered from his recent illness, and is now back at his desk in Washington, D.C.

Our Senator's physicians report that his cancer operation and the radiation treatments for the past several months have been entirely successful and that he can now resume his duties at our National Capital without any injury to his health.

Senator NEUBERGER is one of the greatest Senators Oregon has ever had.

One of Senator NEUBERGER's declared goals is to influence the United States to take leadership in calling for an International Medical Year comparable in organization and scope to the recently concluded International Geophysical Year. The purpose would be a worldwide attack on the diseases, some of obscure or unknown causes, which still assail mankind everywhere despite remarkable progress in medical and surgical research and practices.

This is one field of endeavor in which international politics, fears, and ambitions should give way to the common aim of health and security. The Geophysical Year broke down some barriers among nations. The Medical Year could do more. Thus it could serve a valuable purpose in discouraging mass destruction by war, as well as making man's normal lot easier to bear. Senator NEUBERGER's own frightening experience with cancer gives him the insight to lead.

Pope John XXIII and His Role in Resisting Persecution During World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, understanding among religions and among nations is one of the great hopes for enduring world peace.

A most heartening article has been written by Mr. William Zukerman describing how Msgr. Angelo Roncalli, during World War II, played a major role in helping thousands of Jews to escape from the butchery and tyranny of nazism to a haven in Palestine.

The episode takes on special significance today because the former Msgr. Angelo Roncalli is now Pope John XXIII, spiritual leader of the world's 496 million men and women of the Catholic faith.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article from the Jewish Newsletter by William Zukerman, entitled "A Story of Good Will: What Pope John XXIII Did for the Persecuted Jews of Europe," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STORY OF GOOD WILL: WHAT POPE JOHN XXIII DID FOR THE PERSECUTED JEWS OF EUROPE

(By William Zukerman)

This is a story of good will which was enacted during World War II. It seems worthwhile retelling now because it is also the story of a man of great goodness and compassion who has now been elevated to the position of one of the world's great leaders who affect the course of history—Pope John XXIII.

During World War II, Msgr. Angelo Roncalli who is now Pope John XXIII was the papal nuncio in Istanbul, Turkey, a highly important diplomatic post during the war because Turkey was then one of the few neutral countries in Europe. The period was also the darkest in the persecution of European Jews, when hundreds of thousands of them from all over Nazi-occupied territory were being daily deported to concentration and death camps in Poland for extermination.

The Jewish Agency of Jerusalem, which made desperate efforts to remove as many Jews as possible to Palestine, had then concentrated most of its work in Istanbul for the same reason. The head of the immigration department of the agency, Chaim Barlas, who was in charge of that work, had many occasions to meet the present Pope, and he now relates some little known historic facts about the role that Monsignor Roncalli played in that rescue work which throw a fascinating light on the personality of the new Pope.

THOSE MOST TRAGIC YEARS

Among the many pious and good Christians who have helped the Jews during those most tragic years of Nazi persecution, Monsignor Roncalli stands out above others, states Barlas in an article in Davar, official organ of the Israeli Government party Mapai (reprinted in the New York Zionist daily, Journal-Tog Dec. 9).

From the very first meeting with Monsignor Roncalli, Barlas writes, he felt that he was in the presence of a lofty personality whose interest in the Jewish tragedy of the time was not merely formal and superficial. He was deeply and sincerely moved by the suffering of the Jews and showed an eagerness to be of help in every way possible.

"It would often happen that when I would tell him some sad news I had received from Poland, Hungary or Slovakia, Monsignor Roncalli would fold his hands in prayer and tears would appear in his eyes," Barlas writes.

PRESENT POPE IN ACTION

He would always follow with profound interest the tragic stories he was told; he would ask all the particulars, which he would carefully mark down in his own hand. He would never turn over these matters to his secretary or assistant, but would personally attend to everything that had to be done and that he could do.

Barlas describes three important interviews he had with the present Pope in times of great emergency which show the greatness of the man in action. One day Barlas received an urgent report about the planned deportation of all Jews from Slovakia to the death camps of Poland. The Premier of Slovakia at the time was a Catholic priest named Tiso. There were many interventions to save the Slovakian Jews, but they did not help.

Barlas then appealed to Monsignor Roncalli as a last resort. The nuncio received the Jewish representative, as always, with warm friendship and sincere readiness to be of help. As he read the telegrams which Barlas had brought with him, he became greatly disturbed and called out in despair, "What is to be done?"

Barlas then suggested he should appeal directly to the Pope and ask the Holy Father to intervene. Monsignor Roncalli immediately agreed. A few weeks later reports arrived from Switzerland and Bratislava, the capital of Slovakia, that the deportation order had been considerably eased.

A second emergency arose when a report arrived about the planned deportation of Bulgarian Jews. Before coming to Istanbul, Monsignor Roncalli had been papal nuncio in Sofia, and it was, therefore, natural for Barlas to appeal to him for help once more. This time the man who is now Pope John XXIII, after hearing the report, sat down at his typewriter and personally typed a telegram to some friends in high position in Sofia, asking them to do everything possible to avert this deportation.

Barlas relates that he was deeply moved by the promptness and personal interest of the man; that he told him that this telegram would become a historic document in the dark period of the Jews. "If the telegram will accomplish anything," the nuncio replied modestly.

There can be no doubt about the accomplishments. The order for the deportation of the Bulgarian Jews was revoked. They were sent instead to provincial cities in Bulgaria, and thus the entire Jewish community of Bulgaria was saved from death.

The third intervention took place later when the Jews of Hungary were threatened with similar deportation. This time it was Cardinal Spellman who, through the intermediacy of Roncalli, intervened. The cardinal had come to Istanbul for a 1-day visit with the papal nuncio. Barlas asked Monsignor Roncalli to arrange an interview between himself and the cardinal in order to ask him to intervene. Monsignor Roncalli readily agreed to act as an intermediary and carried out his mission with much grace.

When Barlas arrived the next day at the nuncio's home, the house was filled with high diplomatic and church dignitaries who were waiting to see Cardinal Spellman. To Barlas' amazement, he was among the first to be ushered in to see the cardinal. Monsignor Roncalli himself introduced him as "a representative of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem" who has come on an important mission.

The cardinal listened attentively to Barlas' plea and promised to do everything he could. Barlas was later told by the American Ambassador to Turkey, the late Lawrence Steinhardt, that the cardinal's intervention was successful in averting the deportation.

Milk Prices Cut Severely Under Benson Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on the subject of the prices actually received for milk, I have received a letter and factual records which tell with exceptional clarity and force the story of the tragic decline in returns to Wisconsin farmers during recent years.

Mr. and Mrs. L. J. Totten, of Route 1, Box 95, Delavan, Wis., operate a typical family-sized farm, located in one of the best dairy sections of America's dairyland; and this family has been selling milk to the Chicago market, for fluid consumption. The prices quoted, therefore, represent relatively good prices, in comparison to those received by farmers

who sell milk to be manufactured into butter, cheese, and other products.

These records show that the prices received by farmers for their milk have declined sharply—more than 25 percent—since 10 years ago. At the same time, it should be remembered, the farm family's cost of living has been increasing, just as the cost of living of other families has been increasing.

Mr. President, this letter and the records which accompanied it, which tell the story of what the Benson program has done to Wisconsin dairy farmers' incomes, should have the attention of every Member of Congress. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the letter and tabulation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER TO SENATOR PROXMIRE AND GOVERNOR NELSON

FEBRUARY 3, 1959.

Our farm is really a description of thousands of Wisconsin dairy farms. It is 120 acres, in size, and composed of rolling prairie, 19 acres of hilly woodland and cut up into small fields, with a gravel ridge through it. This was adapted, by nature, to dairying and the type of farm that has made Wisconsin a dairy State, the type which the rabid anti-agriculturist Benson, is destroying. We are typical of uncounted numbers and it is our wish to show how Benson's policies really operate. After studying the attached statistics (all backed by our own records), you will agree that we are not receiving a handout from the Agriculture Department but being deprived of basic freedoms.

It is our belief that the bulk of the 4½ million unemployed reflect farmers pushed out of farming. It is to be remembered that farmers who have lost their work do not have seniority in unions and are the last to be put to work when so many are unemployed.

The attached statistics show a month-to-month report of what Wisconsin dairy farmers have actually been paid for their milk, since 1948. This is for grade A, so you can imagine how others have fared. Newspapers report one figure paid while our milk checks show another. It is to be understood that the figures shown represent 3.5 milk (a strong argument for fixing that butterfat content to the consumer per Wisconsin's bill). For as much as half a point below that test we are penalized about 7 cents per point. The 3.5 milk is skimmed of two points of butterfat in Wisconsin (much more elsewhere) before it is sold, adding to butterfat surplus. It is understood that the test above 3.5 rates the same amount of increase per point.

In the past, we wrote Benson regarding dairying. We got a reply to one of our letters (from the Wisconsin Agriculture Department) telling us all about brucellosis. (We had cleared our herd years before at our own expense.) This seems typical of the situation.

You will readily see that to figure dairy farm prices on prices paid recently would be intolerable. The drop from last April is also plainly seen. Dairies, however, have paid less but raised prices. Another increase was announced last week in Milwaukee papers. In the same period companies like Borden, National Dairy Sales, etc., have had the highest profit periods in their history.

From 1947 to 1958 our personal and real estate property tax, on the farm, has risen 400 percent. Our school tax 700 percent. Suburban residents are crowding our schools and the farmer's land is carrying the load, while only the farmer pays personal property tax. Illinois residents pay personal property tax. Why not Wisconsin residents? We lived there (Illinois) many years and feel it a fair way to raise taxes. The class of people who pay only income tax are filling the schools. Has it been considered?

During this same period, that our income has been so drastically reduced, it is interesting to note the amount services and supplies, to us, have risen. We advocate the cause of democracy, yet farming in this country, under Benson, is reverting to the old feudal state. When corporation farming becomes a reality, throughout our land, the feudal state will have arrived. Farming has never been a way of life since the pioneer period, when the farmer was self-sustaining. As soon as he raised crops for export and to build factories it became a business, not a way of life. Businessmen are buying farms everywhere; then putting as much money as possible into them, pulling up trees, refencing, erecting new buildings, etc., and taking farm operations as a loss on income tax returns, thus building up land empires from money that should be paid into the State and U.S. Government as business profits on city income. (It is in our neighborhood, too).

A congressional investigation of the Agricultural Department itself is warranted. Who is actually getting all this $8 billion? Because of our biased publicity, city people often think a farmer gets a big fat subsidy check each month from the Government, which he spends for Cadillacs to pull his manure spreader. Everything written always states that subsidies are used to support "the artificially high prices of farm products." Does not the attached show the lie? They are actually forcing abnormally low prices and thinking men must admit the only thing that has held back runaway inflation is the farmer subsidizing the Nation's food bill in lost income. It is not the farmer who farms for a living who creates the surpluses; it is the wheat and cotton barons, etc., the business friends of our present administration.

We know the stockpile of agricultural products was first built as a patriotic gesture during World War II, by hard labor. After the war was over other war materials were scrapped but farmers are still paying, in lost income. Each night half the world goes to bed hungry. Our surplus food is a blessing that could save the world for democracy, if America would use the common sense of our forefathers who established this country as a democracy.

Farmers protested at the polls but are still told that small farmers must get off the farm. Do the Republicans want 10 million unemployed in the country?

You have our sincere wishes for a successful term of office.

Respectfully,

LYMAN AND MAUDE TOTTEN.
Mr. and Mrs. L. J. Totten.

DELAVAN, WIS.

Prices Wisconsin dairymen received for milk 3.5 test on Chicago market (proof can be furnished)—Grade A milk

DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
1948	4.75	4.78	4.60	4.47	4.39	4.47	4.67	4.95	4.94	4.65	4.20	3.86
1949	3.84	3.62	3.39	3.26	3.13	3.17	3.34	3.60	3.71	3.79	3.76	3.55
1950	3.51	3.46	3.35	3.23	3.13	3.11	3.21	3.42	3.57	3.69	3.74	3.65
1951	3.88	4.04	4.04	4.03	3.88	3.84	4.15	4.18	4.30	4.37	4.40	4.25
1952	4.39	4.47	4.54	4.34	4.08	4.08	4.42	4.75	4.93	4.80	4.80	4.37

REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
1953	4.11	3.96	3.89	3.78	3.57	3.57	3.84	3.93	3.98	3.91	3.91	3.43
1954 [1]	3.25	3.12	3.10	2.92	3.09	2.80	2.84	2.75	3.59	3.64	3.70	3.72
1955	3.47	3.43	[2] 3.01 3.42	[2] 3.01 3.41	[2] 2.96 3.36	[2] 3.02 3.42	3.44	3.77	3.85	3.88	3.87	3.66
1956	3.66	3.63	[2] 3.51	[2] 3.59	[2] 3.67	[2] 3.54	3.67	3.77	3.99	4.15	3.92	3.68
1957	3.63	3.60	[2] 3.26 3.70	[2] 3.28 3.79	[2] 3.15 3.66	[2] 2.91 3.42	3.37	3.62	3.68	3.70	3.91	3.65
1958	3.63	3.61	3.05 3.58	2.98 3.52	2.88 3.43	2.83 3.38	3.40	3.55	3.64	3.55	3.00	3.47

[1] In 1954 had to send milk for several months as grade B as an inspector did not approve of our new well. He had originally approved the design. This was same year had built a $2,000 new milk house and bought a $700 cooler.
[2] Price received for milk sold in excess of base. We are forced to set base for 3 months in fall but it is in effect for 4 months. We must set base at the time of year when pasture is always the shortest.

NOTE.—Above prices are not net to farmer. We have a 5 cents per hundredweight check off to PMA; 2 cents less because of zone, pay hauler for taking milk to milk depot (plus 3 percent of hauling charge as tax for using the public roads). The premium Pure Milk Association pays on a farm of our size would amount to less than $10 a month.

Address by Hon. Hugh G. Grant on School Integration in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Honorable Hugh G. Grant, former United States Minister to Albania and Thailand, made a most enlightening address in Atlanta, Ga., on February 11, 1959. I request unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow citizens of the South, the South's resistance forces against the conspiracy to force racial integration in the public schools and elsewhere are in retreat.

The front battlelines in Virginia against race mixing in the public schools have crumbled. The Old Dominion's strategy of massive resistance has collapsed, leaving only six Southern States with segregated public schools, Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia, and South Carolina. True, there's only limited or token integration in the schools in the South, but when the bars are down the floods will follow. There's talk of "local option" as a solution, but this spells disaster, too.

Georgia appears to be pinpointed for the next major assault, following two Federal

court edicts—mixing the races on the Atlanta trolleys and banning racial bars at Georgia State colleges, with a threat of integration of Atlanta's public schools next September. As the Georgia General Assembly adopted new defensive measures, some authorities predicted that Georgia's battlelines against race mixing would also crumble under the impact of court decrees, as they have in Virginia.

Both Virginia and Georgia appear to be headed for the ultimate abandonment of their public schools. This has resulted in a rising tide of opposition in both States on the part of many white people who do not appear to be willing to pay this price for the retention of segregation. This was reflected at the State level in the remarks of Governor Vandiver's house floor leader, Frank Twitty, indicating the possibility of both segregated and integrated public schools in Georgia.

This opposition to closing the public schools was also reflected at the national level in Senator HERMAN TALMADGE'S switch from his previous sponsorship of private schools, as a means of blocking integration, to his proposal of a constitutional amendment. Said the Senator: "The destruction of public education in an entire region of our Nation would be an unparalleled catastrophe."

The result—the white people of Georgia and her sister States of the South are in a deep fog. There is much confused thinking. Retreat, retreat could mean ultimate defeat. What led up to this deplorable state of affairs?

The answer—the failure of the leaders of the resistance movement in the Southern States to adopt a unified plan of political action—the failure to face up to realities.

For a period of nearly 5 years billions of words have been written and spoken against the infamous sociological, unconstitutional segregation decisions of the Supreme Court and the unwarranted collaboration of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

Ninety-six Senators and Representatives in the Congress from the South issued the "Southern Manifesto" against the usurpation of the Constitution by the Federal judiciary and then filed it away in the congressional archives.

In the States, conferences were held on interposition—nullification of the unconstitutional Supreme Court edicts. Interposition resolutions were subsequently adopted by the legislatures of practically every Southern State and then filed away in the archives of the States.

Georgia has an interposition resolution, approved March 9, 1956, by the overwhelming vote of 218 ayes and 1 nay. Two excerpts reveal its purpose as follows:

"That the State of Georgia has the right to operate and maintain a public school system—and her rights in this respect have not in any wise been delegated to the General Government—that said decisions and orders of the Supreme Court of the United States relating to separation of the races in the public institutions of a State as announced and promulgated by said Court on May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, are null, void, and of no force or effect."

Was this resolution and others like it simply flamboyant gestures? So it would appear, since practically every official act against racial integration so far has been a delaying action, involving legal quibbling, subterfuge, even denial in the Federal courts on the part of State officials that the question of race has entered into the methods and policies of the State in maintaining segregation. Questions about the morality of the applicants for admission to State colleges have been raised as justification for barring the Negroes. Elaborate tests and measurements have been established under certain State public school placement laws. A new Georgia law provides for low age restrictions for admission to State colleges. In brief, all sorts of devices have been framed to prevent integration but race, which is the fundamental factor, has not been mentioned or has been denied as a factor. These measures will not insure the maintenance of segregation. They serve only to postpone the evil day. Furthermore, they are negative and, indirectly, constitute a surrender of the sovereign State to the unconstitutional edicts of the Federal judiciary.

Surely the time has come—the hour is late—for the officials of our States to assert boldly and with forthrightness, in court and out of court, that the State has the constitutional right to separate the races within its boundaries, if it chooses to do so. This is interposition, which has ample historic precedent, and it is significant that the cases have not been restricted to the South. (Read "The Sovereign States," by James Jackson Kilpatrick.)

Finally, we don't need an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Since 1791, we have had the Bill of Rights with its famous article X, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." What more do we need to justify nullification of the unconstitutional decrees of the Supreme Court and its agents, the Federal judges?

Let one, or two, or three southern governors—say, the chief executives of Georgia, Alabama, and South Carolina, backed by their respective legislatures, stand up and proclaim to the Federal usurpers of the constitutional rights of the sovereign States—and to the Nation—"We are going to keep our institutions functioning and segregated as heretofore. That is our constitutional right. That is in conformity with the law of the land."

Such direct political action would bring the millions of grassroots folk throughout the South, who believe in the separation of the races, out of the fog. It would serve to alert the people of the entire Nation to the fact that State sovereignty is not yet dead, is very much alive. It could turn the tide. Let's try it, my fellow citizens.

Reds Dedicated to Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article written by Dr. Ruth Alexander, and published in the New York Sunday Mirror of February 8, 1959. Dr. Alexander is a keen student of current affairs, especially in the field of international relations. Under the heading "Reds Dedicated to Violence," Dr. Alexander gives us information and suggestions which will be of great interest to the Members of the Senate and to the country as a whole.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS DEDICATED TO VIOLENCE
(By Dr. Ruth Alexander)

Conceivably, the United States may go down in history as the first great nation to be the passive spectator of its own destruction.

The Communists are fighting us in unbroken continuity on four fronts—political, economic, ideological, and military. But, by all odds, their greatest victory has been to sell us on the idea that they want peace. Their influential apologists here have successfully equated peace with nonshooting war.

But let's look at the record. In this tinderbox world, there is no such thing as an unimportant war, and in the 13 years since World War II, 18 important wars have occurred.

In every one, the pressure or the presence of Communists was involved, directly or indirectly, officially or unofficially. Each of these wars constituted a grave risk to us and our allies with whom we are inextricably identified. Because of this, we contributed men and munitions directly, as in Korea, or to our allies, as in other areas. Hence, we, as an integral part of the free world, have been involved in 18 shooting wars. What's peaceful about that?

It has become customary to call old-fashioned wars limited wars, as opposed to total unlimited war of the nuclear variety. But limited war does not mean small wars and some of these 18 limited wars demanded significant military operations and caused tragic destruction of American lives. Yet, because we must, of necessity, recognize the primacy of nuclear retaliation in major wars, we tend to brush off limited wars as brush fires of no importance and to provide inadequate forces and equipment with which to fight them.

Limited war is new only in the sense that it now serves as a convenient device for Communists to conquer the world piecemeal, on a military basis, where subversive tactics fail. Obviously, there is an enormous area of conflict between the cold war, itself a dangerous and false concept, and allout nuclear war. Within this area, any aggression against any member of the free world involves immediate risks for the United States militarily, and forces to meet these risks instantaneously are imperative.

Do we have these forces? If not, why not?

The piecemeal destructiveness of limited wars can be as devastating in the long run as the immediate destruction of nuclear war. Both darken our horizon and peace is but an illusion in this century of violence.

The sooner we recognize that communism is irrevocably dedicated to permanent revolution on a global scale, the better our chances for survival. Otherwise, our placid indifference to our predictable fate will cast us in the suicidal role of spectators at our own destruction.

South Carolina's Young Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the South Carolina Junior Chamber of Commerce has selected as South Carolina's Young Man of the Year the distinguished editor of the Orangeburg Times and Democrat, Mr. Edward H. Sims.

Mr. Sims is a noted and able author of the recent book "American Aces," a story of fighter pilots in World War II. Mr. Sims is a most outstanding young man and is very deserving of this fine honor. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in the State, a newspaper of Columbia, S.C., on February 18, 1959, commending Mr. Sim's selection, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN OF THE YEAR

South Carolina's Young Man of the Year is Edward H. Sims, editor of the Times and Democrat in Orangeburg.

A World War II fighter pilot with many missions to his credit, he is author of "American Aces," a book which was published and went into extra editions in 1958. It is of particular significance since technical developments probably have made aerial dogfighting a thing of the past.

Ed made several trips across the Atlantic and into the Pacific to interview individual heroes for his book, and it is the most authoritative work in its field. He flew his own plane to gather some of the information in this country.

He has a long list of civic achievements and is listed in "Who's Who in America." He heads Editor's Copy, a syndicate that supplies more than 500 newspapers, and the Sims News Service of Washington.

The State takes special pride in the statewide honor conferred upon him by the junior chamber of commerce as he also heads this newspaper's Washington news bureau.

Talmadge Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorials entitled, "Why Pick on the Farmer?" from the February 6, 1959, issue of the Moultrie, Ga., Weekly Observer; "Talmadge May Prove We Can Learn From History," from the February 5, 1959, issue of the Baxley, Ga., News-Banner; "Just as Communistic," from the February 6, 1959, issue of the Lavaca County Tribune of Hallettsville, Tex.; and the column by Hon. Joe F. Combs in the February 6, 1959, issue of the Beaumont, Tex., Enterprise.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Moultrie (Ga.) Weekly Observer, Feb. 6, 1959]

WHY PICK ON THE FARMER?

Secretary Benson has done it again. He appears determined to reduce the economy of agricultural sections with arbitrary price support decisions within the scope of his administration.

While the Government is giving lip service to a program for bolstering all forms of economy, Secretary Benson is working overtime on methods of figuring parity which will mean loss of farm income running into many millions.

If there is any form of the national economy which needs stabilizing at a fair level, it is agriculture. Farming has been something of a redheaded stepchild which has been forced to take the brunt of drastic actions.

The national farm program was conceived and put into operation in the mid-1930's when it became evident that agriculture was the backbone of the country's economy. A soil conservation program, acreage controls and other measures were put into effect in a move to stabilize agriculture and give the farmer a fair share of the trade dollar. Much progress was made, even though farmers were forced to give up their freedom and adhere strictly to various practices, allocations, and quotas. This they accepted, however, in the hope of achieving a good balance.

Growers still would prefer to be on a free enterprise plan, but they have recognized the economic factors involved in the natural law of supply and demand, and have cooperated to the best of their ability.

Secretary Benson, in the face of a figured formula which has ruled for years, suddenly has come up with a new way of figuring parity which will mean tremendous losses to farmers.

Why pick on the farmer when every effort is being bended to give the economy impetus rather than strangle it? Instead of giving an ear to the farm program proposed by Georgia's Senator TALMADGE, Secretary Benson is taking a drastic course of action to reduce supports and income. It won't be done, however, without bitter protest from the agricultural areas.

[From the Baxley (Ga.) News-Banner, Feb. 5, 1959]

TALMADGE MAY PROVE WE CAN LEARN FROM HISTORY

Senator TALMADGE may prove by his farm bill entitled the "Agricultural Income Equalization Act of 1959," that we can learn from history. A similar bill, then known as the Domestic Allotment plan, by a Republican administration was refused in the twenties and the greatest depression of all time followed.

Like the Domestic Allotment plan, Senator TALMADGE's plan is designed to accomplish basic controls with a minimum of redtape. It has five easily understood points as follows:

1. Eliminate all acreage controls and Government loans.

2. Assign each farmer growing basic commodities a domestic production quota based on his average production for the preceding 5 years.

3. Guarantee and pay to each farmer a sales price support of the difference between the price he receives for his domestic production quota and 100 percent of parity.

4. Require each farmer to submit a bill of sale with his application for sales price support payments.

5. Impose a maximum of $25,000 on the amount of sales price support that any individual farmer may receive.

Senator TALMADGE states that agricultural marketing experts have estimated that the program he has proposed would save the taxpayers between $2 billion and $3 billion a year and would accomplish the following:

It would let the farmer plant what he wants and sell it has he pleases.

It would take the Federal Government out of the business of buying, storing, and selling farm commodities and place the responsibility for marketing with the farmer and private enterprise where it belongs.

It would guarantee the farmer his proportionate share of the national purchasing power and restore agriculture to a free enterprise, competitive base.

It would end the accumulation of the national farm surplus which has glutted the Nation's markets and stagnated its economy.

It would make the national farm program an estimable budget item which would remain relatively stable over the years.

It would mean lower prices to both the consumer and industry and would put American agricultural products, both raw and processed, back on the world markets at competitive prices.

It would give the farmer protection equivalent to labor's minimum wage and industry's tariff.

And it would mark a new and fresh start which would get away from the stereotyped concepts and failures of the past.

[From the Lavaca County (Tex.) Tribune, of Feb. 6, 1959]

JUST AS COMMUNISTIC

Nothing would benefit the farmers and the whole country more than free farming with direct subsidies, the plan already before the Congress.

This is urged by Congressman W. R. POAGE, of Waco, in the House, and by Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, in the Senate.

The plan is very simple:

1. Take Government out of farming.

2. Domestic allotment would be assigned to every farm, based on the 5-year average of his crop.

3. On this allotment the farmer would get a direct payment, the difference between the market price and the 100 percent parity.

4. He would only submit his sale receipt for the bales sold to get his direct payment.

5. The amount would be limited to $25,000 per farm.

Senator TALMADGE mentioned how a Mississippi planter got in 1 year more than a million dollars. Another, in Kansas, got over $600,000. That's also where most of this money went—to a few percent of the big planters.

Right along the farm programs were slanted for the benefit of the commercial farms—which prospered, while the small farmers were driven out. They talk of their inefficiency, of the marginal farmers, etc. If so, why did they take from them the cotton acreage when they never produced any surpluses and needed every acre to make a living?

President Eisenhower in his farm message is quite right: the farm policies benefited only the commercial farms. This because of the triumvirate: The Extension Service, Farm Bureau, and the agriculture colleges, as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., tells also in his 'The Coming of the New Deal."

As also the Houston Chronicle comments, "These are, in actuality, private corporate organizations which are increasing their riches at the expense of the taxpaying workingman"—while the small farmer is sacrificed.

The triumvirate blames it on mechanization and other excuses. Did these take the cotton acreage away from the small farmers?

Are the farm machines any excuse for piling the farm people into the cities and producing unemployment of millions, wrecking the country?

As declared by Senator LONG, of Louisiana: "Unless something is done along the line suggested by the Senator from Georgia, millions of small farmers, the backbone of America, will be forced out of farming."

A better plan than the $25,000 limit would be in limiting direct payments to so many bales per farm. Any other allotment would again make small farmers the chief victims. Even if limited to 50 to 100 bales, would it not be cheaper than the present hopeless and destructive spending?

A real menace is in the idea that it's good for the country to drive farm people into the cities, denying them, by allotments, their

right to make a living on the land; then calling them inefficient.

Right from the very beginning, what the farmers and the country needed was very simple, as Senator TALMADGE and Congressman POAGE show—just free farming and direct payments, as also a reimbursement for tariff.

Throwing farmers back to where they were, selling at the market price and buying at the protected prices, would lead to nothing better than was the big depression of 1929.

Favoring only big-scale farming, subsidizing it through producing surpluses, is just as communistic as what goes on behind the Iron Curtain.

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise, Feb. 6, 1959]

ENTERPRISE FARM CORNER

(By Joe F. Combs)

The farm program will have special attention by the present Congress and some sort of legislation will most likely come out of the caucuses and conferences being held both in Washington and throughout the farm belt.

One of the most interesting developments so far is the bill introduced by Georgia's Senator HERMAN TALMADGE and cosponsored by Senator OLIN JOHNSTON of South Carolina. These men are both from important agricultural regions and it stands to reason that they are representing the feelings and sentiments of their constituencies when they introduce or support legislation of any kind.

The writer has not seen this bill. From press reports it appears that it provides for some of the things that were included in the old Brannan plan, advocated by certain politicoes in the Truman administration.

However, on first thought the Talmadge bill sounds fairly reasonable and it may gain support. It is in conflict with the suggestions made by the American Farm Bureau Federation in their recent national membership meeting in Boston.

This need not necessarily cause any alarm, since the Farm Bureau has taken some peculiar stands in recent months. That is, peculiar to those of us who do not exactly understand what they are driving at.

Some of their recent public utterances, for example, do not explain themselves. The official newsletter of the Farm Bureau says among other things, in discussing the Talmadge bill, "But the biggest objection of all will come, for obvious reasons, from the American taxpayer."

The trouble with the Farm Bureau statement is that it implies that farmers are on one side and taxpayers on the other, the latter being the payers and the former being the receivers. That is manifestly unfair to farmers, all of whom are taxpayers.

It stands to reason that if the biggest objection comes from taxpayers then the farmers will be entering the biggest objection, for they are taxpayers. The writer questions the right of any farm organization to profess to speak in that manner for farmers.

To be frank about it there is entirely too much loose talk about farm programs and too little to back it up. What we need is a workable farm program and not a lot of ballyhoo.

Briefly, here is what the Talmadge bill would do, judging from the press reports that have come to my attention. It would assign to all farmers who grow basic commodities a domestic production quota, in pounds, bales, or bushels.

It would eliminate price support loans and eliminate acreage allotment. It applies to rice, wheat, corn, peanuts, cotton, and tobacco, and provides compensatory payments only on the domestically-consumed portion of each commodity under its regulations.

That doesn't appear to be such a grave threat to taxpayers, as compared to the multibillion program of the present. It may be that the writer cannot form a fair appraisal with the information at hand. But it looks as of now, that it might be possible to amend it to include ideas advanced by leading rice men a few years ago, as regards the domestically consumed portion of each commodity. In seeking a way out of the present predicament, farm leaders will do well to look into every proposal in an effort to find something better than we have.

Oregon Daily Journal, of Portland, Lauds Senate Leadership of Senator Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on December 15, 1958, the Oregon Daily Journal, which is published in my home community of Portland, paid high tribute to the able senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] as being the Member of this body who has accomplished more constructively for the Pacific Northwest than any other.

Because I share this favorable opinion of the influence and prestige of our distinguished colleague, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I feel certain it will elicit similar endorsement from many other Members of the Senate who have been impressed with the diligence and effectiveness of Senator MAGNUSON.

I particularly desire to confirm what the Oregon Journal's editors have written about the tolerance, patience, friendliness, and understanding of our friend, the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MAGGIE'S" INFLUENCE ON CAPITOL HILL

Whatever one may think of Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, there are few who question his ability to get things done for his constituents.

Those who heard him at the Thursday noon luncheon session of the Inland Empire Waterways Association convention can better understand why he has this capacity.

Senator MAGNUSON has views on water resource development which are very similar, we suspect, to those of the senior Senator from Oregon.

Yet he freely concedes the right of other people to have different views, and he does not call them names for thinking differently than he does.

He is a stanch defender of public works spending for water resource development, and he can present convincing figures as to why such spending is good business, not only for this region but for the country.

Yet he recognizes the place which private utilities have in our economy. And he counts private utility executives among his personal friends.

Douglas McKay is a bad name in some Democratic circles, but MAGNUSON was able to speak of "my good friend, Doug McKay" (who was sitting in the audience).

MAGNUSON predicted that the administration may attempt, because of budget problems, to cut back on the construction schedule of some Northwest projects. He said he thought this would be foolhardy and would seek to resist cutbacks which he thinks will mean economic loss in the long run. But he did not rant and rave or accuse the administration of trying to put the Pacific Northwest in an economic straitjacket.

He said there are some things in the Corps of Engineers 308 review report with which he disagrees, but he did not criticize the engineers. Instead, he gave them credit for doing a thorough, competent job.

The Journal has not always agreed with Senator MAGNUSON. It has sometimes thought his diligence in behalf of Seattle was at Portland's expense.

But it has recognized that no other figure in Congress now is more influential in obtaining funds for Columbia basin resource development which benefit Oregon as well as Washington.

(This is not intended to belittle the growing influence of Oregon's Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, attained in the relatively short time he has been in Congress.)

MAGNUSON's accomplishments, it must be acknowledge, are due in part to his membership on the important Senate Appropriations Committee, but he gets things done too by not being a prima donna, by getting along with others and by conceding the fact there is room for all kinds of people with all kinds of ideas.

New Industry in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an article entitled "Start of Scobey Firm Brings New Industry to Northeast Montana," published in the Poplar (Mont.) Standard of recent date.

The article points out how energetic individuals in my home State are starting successful, practical, and needed new industries. I am proud of their accomplishment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

START OF SCOBEY FIRM BRINGS NEW INDUSTRY TO NORTHEAST MONTANA

Another small business with growth potential for Montana.

Incorporation of the Montana Air-Reel Co., of Scobey on November 27 culminated several years of effort to find a local manufacturer for a Montana invention to serve regional agricultural markets.

The story goes like this, a Rudyard farmer named Curt Phillips invented an attachment for combine harvesters to replace the old bat type reel, which is inefficient when used in short grain. Jet blasts of air on the air-reel force the grain toward the cutting bar and thence, into the combine. The air-reel meets an age-old problem of harvesting by preventing the loss which occurs at the cutter bar when cutting short grain.

WIND-REEL PROVES UP IN FIELD

Actual performance records in the field show average savings of 1.5 bushels of wheat per acre, and two bushels of barley, accord-

ing to Charles Bowman, assistant professor of agricultural engineering at Montana State College. Bowman became interested in the product after Phillips contacted the endowment and research foundation at MSC for help in improving and marketing the product. The MSC team undertook an extensive testing and feasibility study of the product, especially emphasizing its performance in actual harvesting operations.

Finding the wind-reel, as it was then called, a product with potential, the MSC people and the owners of the patent endeavored to find a manufacturer for the product. A midwestern manufacturer was found, but the search was continued for a manufacturer closer to the primary marketing area in the Great Plains.

At the same time, a small Montana manufacturer of another agricultural product was looking for other products to make and sell.

GRAIN BLOWER MADE IN FINE BUILDING

The Truck Grain Blower Co., had been started in 1930 by G. E. and E. J. Schlechter of Whitetail to manufacture their device to blow grain into storage bins and boxcars. An excellent 5,800-square-foot concrete building was built in Whitetail in 1941 and equipped with modern machine tools to manufacture the product. The firm was purchased in 1954 by Harold and Stella Barenz, and the office was moved to Scobey.

The new owners expanded markets to include materials-handling operations all over the country. The blower, renamed the Montana Grain and Feed Blower, is now in regular use from Oregon to New York. Specialized uses include delivery of sawdust and other building materials into two-story broiler houses, handling of bulk salt, and elevating dry ingredients to the mixer in a dog-food factory in Brooklyn. Advantages of this blower over other materials—handling methods are straight-up delivery, nonseparation of ingredients and almost complete lack of damage to pelleted feeds.

STATE BOARD ARRANGES MEETING

Both parties—wind reel and truck grain—blower had contacted the State planning board about their problems. Acting in a liaison function, the State planning board sponsored a meeting in Helena on November 18. From this meeting arose the new Montana Air-Reel Co.

The owners emphasize several positive features of a semirural Montana location for their manufacturing operation:

1. Large quantities of surplus labor are available from October through May, when seasonal farming operations shut down.

2. Much of this labor is mechanically skilled and permanently resident.

3. There is good transportation and a major market within a few hundred miles.

4. Small towns make good places to live.

The State board said, "We wish this new firm good luck. It's another attempt to provide more employment opportunities in Montana by making a product for local and national markets. This is a small business that may grow into an important agricultural implement company."

USIA Cultural Spree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most informative and thought-provoking article by Hon. Eugene W. Castle, of New York—banker, author, world traveler, and one of the Nation's most knowledgeable authorities on the excesses of the U.S. foreign aid and propaganda programs—entitled "A Transfer of Funds," which appears in the March 1959 issue of the American Mercury.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRANSFER OF FUNDS

(By Eugene W. Castle)

When the Congress responded again to the urgent pleas of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and voted new billions for mutual security, it assumed that these vast sums would be used exclusively to safeguard the United States from the menace of world communism.

The Congress and 175 million American taxpayers were unaware of the fact that the funds demanded to defend our country against world communism would be utilized, in part, to promote cultural exchange with the Soviet Union.

Now it has been revealed that, with the approval of the President, $3,600,000 of mutual security funds have been transferred to finance the building of an American exhibit in Sokolniki Park, in the heart of Moscow. This exhibit is to open on July 4, 1959. It is, perhaps, a strange coincidence that the U.S. Department of Commerce spent exactly this amount to produce U.S. trade fairs in not 1 but 18 different locations throughout the world last year.

However, Mr. George V. Allen, the fourth chief press agent to head the U.S. Information Agency since Mr. Eisenhower became President, was selected for his present post chiefly because the White House urgently needed a skillful fund promoter to confront hostil and suspicious congressional appropriations committees.

According to Congressman OTTO PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, Mr. Allen tried to obtain $7,200,000 for the forthcoming Moscow jamboree to be charged in full to the American taxpayers. But, Assistant Secretary of State Christian Herter, who usually responds to White House demands, would not go along with this excessive request and all too obvious open handed switch of mutual security funds. Mr. Herter firmly rejected USIA Director Allen's $7,200,000 demand, backed by the power and prestige of the White House, and the State Department official insisted that the taxpayers could not be imposed upon for more than $3,600,000 to bring the American way of life to all the free citizens in the very heart of godless Russia.

Also, it should be recalled that 100,000 of these very same Soviet citizens stormed the American Embassy in Moscow several months ago and broke every window in our diplomatic establishment in the Red capital. Many of these same citizens are likely to be our guests in Sokolniki Park next July.

Simultaneously with the staging of the American exhibit in Moscow, the Soviets will stage a similar fair in New York. An eight-man delegation, headed by Deputy Trade Minister I. G. Bashahov, left Moscow, November 29, to complete plans here for the presentation of a favorable picture of the abundant and peaceful Soviet way of life. The Soviets, however, are not building an exhibition hall but will lease two floors of the Coliseum in Columbus Circle, New York.

Most of the $3,600,000 to be expended for this newest cultural relations project in Moscow will be utilized to pay for the building to house the exhibits. At the close of the fair's 6-week run, the Soviets will get the building (paid for by the American taxpayers) at a price which will only represent a fraction of the construction cost. Provision for the Russian acquisition of the building was concluded in Washington, D.C., November 9, but no purchase price was mentioned in the agreement. Under Secretary of State William S. B. Lacey, who was originally responsible for the consummation of the now highly questionable cultural exchange agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union, finalized January 27, 1958, was the first to report that the American exhibition hall will go to Russia and at a price that they will determine. It is possible, too, that this newest multimillion-dollar cultural spree may, in the end, prove to be the wrong exhibit, in the wrong country, to the wrong people at the wrong time. This is so because, on November 10, Khrushchev announced to the world from Moscow that the deadline—for the United States, British, and French forces to leave West Berlin—would be about July 1, 1959. Three days later, on July 4, 1959, the U.S. Government-sponsored fair is scheduled to begin a 6-week run in Moscow.

A staunch foe of our Government's mutual security and cultural excesses, Congressman PASSMAN, has challenged the improper use of mutual security funds to promote Russia, rather than to defend the United States, as Congress intended. Mr. PASSMAN, a member of the House Appropriations Committee, in a letter to C. Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State for economic affairs, protested against dillydallying with funds in a manner not intended by Congress.

Mr. Dillon, replying to the Congressman's protest, contended that construction funds had to be committed now and that there was no time to go before Congress to request an extra or supplemental appropriation to cover the Moscow fair.

Mr. Dillon is now the principal White House proponent for an additional billion dollars, over last year's appropriation, for the new foreign aid budget to be presented to Congress in January. He stated that the only money immediately available for this project is $300,000, left over from the 1957 appropriation for an American exhibit in Gorki Park, Moscow, a previous cultural exchange project, which failed to materialize.

"In view of the impossibility of securing supplemental funds through the normal appropriation procedures," Undersecretary Dillon stated, "the executive branch proposes to utilize the authority of section 451 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 as amended, to finance the cost.

"This use of mutual security funds, while entirely appropriate under the above cited authority, is considered to be exceptional. We do not have any additional plans for such financing of similar programs, and it would be our intention to continue to finance exhibitions under the appropriations for the President's special international program."

Undersecretary C. Douglas Dillon did not mention the fact that the $3,600,000 for the Moscow fair was transferred from the mutual security fund almost at the same hour that President Eisenhower issued a stern directive to all Government department heads ordering them to cut their respective budget requests to the bone because of the serious inflationary dangers resulting from the $12 billion deficit now confronting the Nation.

Our Progress in Ballistic Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the President of the United States, a few

weeks ago, referred to the deep concern many of us share over this Nation's apparent lag in missile development; he called it hangdog humiliation.

This was an unfortunate and inaccurate description of what is really and simply a facing up to an important problem. This was the subject of an excellent editorial published in the Friday, January 30, issue of the Milwaukee Sentinel. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHT TO ASK

President Eisenhower used an unfortunate phrase in his press conference Wednesday when he said Americans have no cause for hangdog humiliation over our progress in ballistic missiles.

We could not agree more. But where is the hangdog humiliation? We have seen no evidence of it.

By inference, it is bound to be accepted as an administration label on responsible men like Senator STUART SYMINGTON who are genuinely concerned by what they believe to be a dangerous lag in our missile development against that of Russia.

Although there is undoubtedly an undertow of politics in the differences between Senator SYMINGTON (a not-so-dark presidential horse) and the administration, the Missouri Democrat is neither hangdog nor petty faultfinding. He speaks with a background experience of former Secretary of the Air Force.

The President's remark was in reference to Premier Khrushchev's statement that Russia now has intercontinental ballistic missiles in production. The Russian words Khrushchev used could be taken to mean either serial or mass production.

The main point is that ICBM's, according to Khrushchev, are in production. On the record, Soviet announcements of missile or rocket developments have been found to be accurate. In addition, it is much more in the interest of our security to take it as a fact than to dismiss it as an idle boast.

In contrast, Hanson W. Baldwin, military writer of the New York Times, reports that our first operational Atlas missile is now programed for July. Assuming that the Soviet Premier was announcing a fact, there is obviously a lag.

How serious it is, we do not pretend to know, nor do we dispute the President's assertion that remarkable progress has been made in catching up.

Spendthrift panic is not the answer. Neither is equating honest criticism with hangdog humiliation. We are confident that the administration's program is designed to give us a missile deterrent strength to Communist conquest. We are equally sure that Senator SYMINGTON, and men like him, have the right to question whether the program is good or fast enough.

Indian Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Where Infants Die," published in the Ogden Standard-Examiner of January 15, 1959.

The editorial supports the bill (S. 56) introduced by me and cosponsored by a number of other Senators, which would authorize the Public Health Service to provide basic sanitation facilities on Indian reservations.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE INFANTS DIE

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, announced in the Senate last week that Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, of Utah, and other Senators had joined with him to introduce a bill for Indian welfare. The bill authorizes the Public Health Service to provide basic sanitation on Indian reservations. The Indians favor the bill, and so does the administration. So do all informed American men and women. The reasons are plain.

The U.S. Public Health Service reports that more than a fourth of the Indian babies born in the Dakotas and Nebraska die before they are a year old. Most of the deaths occur in the first months as the babies are taken from the warmth and safety of hospitals to the cold and often unsanitary homes.

The Indian rate for tuberculosis is four times higher than the rate for the general population. The death rate of gastroenteric diseases is six times greater, from influenza and pneumonia four times greater. Indians for the most part are too poor to provide sanitary facilities and decent homes.

We wish the Senators interested in improving the Indians' health would investigate charges that hunger often prevails among Indian groups. It is fantastic to think that impoverished Indians, including children, can go hungry in this land of great food surpluses, but such appears to be the case, to our shame.

Views of McMinnville (Oreg.) News-Register on the Nation's Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the crucial question of a sound farm program has troubled many of us. We are worried over a policy which spends nearly $5 billion for direct payments to the growers of six so-called basics, and which passes by the vast majority of the Nation's farmers—especially the small family-sized farmer who is most in need of succor.

I have done some speaking on this issue in my home State, and I am pleased that a thoughtful and analytical editorial on these speeches was published in the McMinnville (Oreg.) News-Register of December 5, 1958.

Because many Members of the Senate share my desire to have a new farm program which would be less costly to the taxpayers and more fair to average farmers, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial of the McMinnville News-Register be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD—and I would call particular attention to its approval of the two-price plan for wheat, which would not only lower support costs but also channel wheat into feed uses at a price which poultry raisers can afford. This editorial is especially timely now because the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], an outstanding leader in farm legislation, has just introduced his bill for the domestic parity wheat program, and I am pleased to have been invited by him to be a cosponsor of the bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR NEUBERGER'S FARM POLICY

It is said that some persons, on being given responsibility, grow—others just swell. We think that the first part of this description applies well to Oregon's junior Senator, RICHARD L. NEUBERGER. If he keeps moving in his present direction he will reach McNary-like stature.

This was impressed upon us once again by a report in the Oregon Farmer about a speech NEUBERGER made recently to the annual meeting of the Pacific Northwest Farm Council. He urged a thorough revamping of our national farm policy and charged that continuing crop surpluses, record U.S. Department of Agriculture budgets and the lack of any help for the majority of farm families spells out the dismal failure of the present basic Federal farm program.

NEUBERGER pointed out that of the six basic supported crops—corn, cotton, wheat, tobacco, rice, and peanuts—only wheat is grown in this region. "And the absurdity of this conception of what is basic," he said, "is illustrated by the inclusion of peanuts and tobacco, while such necessities as meats, vegetables, and fruits are not deemed worthy of Federal attention."

NEUBERGER suggested that wheatgrowers of the Northwest would benefit far more from a truly bold and imaginative trial of the domestic parity or so-called two-price plan, than from continuous desperate, annual manipulations of parity price support levels and production control quotas under the established program. He indicated that this plan would both help to eliminate the tax costs of the present program and would make lower-priced wheat available as feed to benefit farmers who raise chickens, turkeys, and livestock, as well as the region's wheat farmers.

"To my mind," said the Senator, "a meaningful social policy for farms, must focus on people rather than products, on farm income rather than farm prices. Not only is farm income the point of real significance to farm families, but it is also obvious that a program which stresses farm prices can be divisive between farmers and city consumers."

According to the Oregon Farmer's report, Senator NEUBERGER suggested further that "in the current period of great technological change, both in agriculture itself and in food processing for consumption, the true test of a program for any branch of agriculture should be that it aids farm families—individually or cooperatively—to have the access of capital, the stable markets and the insurance against unforeseeable natural or economic blows, that are needed to keep the family farm operation the basic producing unit in modern agriculture."

It is our opinion that certainly the present farm program is catawampous and that Senator NEUBERGER is moving in the right direction. He may not have a hold on the entire answer, but at least he is reaching for the right end of the stick.

Forty-ninth Anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, throughout the Nation last week, February 7 through 13 to be specific, the 49th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America was celebrated with proper and impressive ceremonies and activities manifestly appropriate in recognition of that good and constructive organization.

Of coincidental significance, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to a very impressive assembly held in the public square in Newark, Ohio, and in which participated 600 uniformed Boy Scouts from central Ohio, where an American flag bearing the 49th star representing the admission of Alaska into the Union was briefly displayed by a Boy Scout honor guard, with special permission.

The master of ceremonies, Common Pleas Judge Charles R. Holtsberry of Newark, Ohio, who is Boy Scout counselor on citizenship of the Newark troop, was told by representatives of the Ohio press witnessing this impressive ceremony that to their knowledge, this was the first ceremony in Ohio, and probably in the Nation, wherein the new flag bearing the 49th star was displayed for such a dual commemorative purpose.

Belatedly, but manifestly not lacking in importance and significance, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this very commendatory article on Boy Scout Week which has been called to my attention by the National Council of Boy Scouts of America, of New Brunswick, N.J.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOY SCOUT WEEK

Founded in 1910 the Boy Scouts of America is 49 years old. Today nearly 5 million boys and adults are participating in the Boy Scout program and, since 1910, the number of boys and adults who have been or are now members totals more than 28 million.

Starting in the United States in the early years of the 20th century, when the frontier period had drawn to a close, Boy Scouting, based on many of the frontier concepts which had welded the United States of America into a hardy and resilient nation, faced a tremendous period of development, industrialization, urbanization, growth, and scientific exploration. These years have perhaps been the most unique in all history.

Each period in history has its special challenge for youth, and today this challenge is as complex as the complicated world in which we live. It is not the purpose of Boy Scouting to remove the hurdles from the pathway of youth, nor to lessen the challenge which confronts them. Rather, it is the purpose of Scouting to help boys recognize the challenge and accept it, to surmount the hurdles.

What is this challenge, and how can we help boys meet it? Isn't the challenge today to live productively in a world of science and rapid change? Movement and change are two elements that characterize the period in which we live. These factors will have a profound effect upon all of us, but particularly upon youth.

We must help youth see that in today's world change must be sought, not fought. We must help youth become adaptable and flexible as they are confronted with change. We must help youth develop inquiring minds—the urge to explore new fields of thought and action. These qualities of thought and spirit are needed by all young Americans who grow to manhood in today's world, and especially in the exploration of new worlds of engineering and science.

But as we strive to meet this challenge we must recognize that it is not our function to determine which boys should undertake scientific careers. However, we should open doors for all boys to have experience in science-related fields and help those who have strong interests to seek and obtain the guidance of local experts in scientific fields.

More than ever before, all boys need the help and encouragement of capable adults in exploring the worlds of work and learning.

It is of the utmost importance, therefore, for boys to learn to understand adults and to learn new and better methods of working with adults. Adults, on their part, must learn to relate themselves to youth and to understand the changing needs of youth.

There is another great challenge today. Although boys live in a rapidly changing world, they need a type of moral stability that can only come from a personal scale of values. This cannot be merely imposed upon them. It must be a way of thinking and living which they build for themselves with the guidance and help of thinking adults.

Boy Scouting has the program, and through the sponsoring bodies of America—120,000 of them—it mobilizes the facilities and the leadership necessary to help youth meet these challenges. Scouting begins with the Cub Scout program, where 8-, 9-, and 10-year-old boys have an opportunity to explore such science-related subjects as radio, machinery, photography, aircraft, electricity, mechanics, conservation, and wheel power.

Cub Scouting also contributes significantly to a wholesome attitude toward adults. This starts at home where Cub Scouts and their parents participate in the program together. The contacts with adults gradually widen as the Cub Scouts work with den mothers, den dads, and other Cub Scout leaders. Through intelligent use of the ideals of Cub Scouting, boys begin to strengthen their code of ethics, a first step toward the development of a stable scale of values.

The Boy Scout program, for boys 11 to 18, opens doors to a much wider exploration of science-related subjects through the merit badge fields—agriculture, astronomy, automobiling, aviation, machinery, metalwork, mechanical drawing, photography, botany, chemistry, electricity, geology, radio, soil and water conservation, surveying, weather, and zoology, to name a few.

Merit badge requirements are constantly being brought up to date with the help of outstanding authorities in special fields. Through the merit badge counseling system boys can be brought into contact with fine local men who are authorities in their fields.

The exploring program, for young men of high school age, goes still further in opening doors in career possibilities. Explorer activities are self-initiated, planned, and carried out by the Explorers themselves, with the help of adult advisers and consultants. This is the age when a job future and the need to make a job choice are of paramount importance. Exploring leads young men toward the development of special interests, radio, archeology, the sciences, visits to industrial plants and laboratories, sessions to spotlight careers, all of which bring them into contact, through advisers and consultants, with adults who can help them develop such interests.

Local experts give Explorers valuable technical advice, and help them develop productive working relationships with interested adults. Thus Exploring provides a new adult-youth relationship, with emphasis on adult coaching. Such a program also gives Explorers opportunities to test their rapidly forming scales of values. This is important when boys are in their final transition to adulthood.

The world has changed a lot since Boy Scouting was founded in the United States a half century ago. The frontier concepts of those days have changed to new frontiers in speed, in scientific change, and in space.

So, in this Boy Scout Week, the 49th anniversary of a great movement which has touched and influenced the lives of more than 28 million boys and adults, scouting is equipped to assist boys to explore this new world and to help them acquire the character habits which will make it a wholesome world in which to live.

The Boy Scout program needs your help as adult members of the community. It needs your financial support, your undertsanding, and your help as leaders, advisors, and as consultants in special fields of interest.

Use of Dairy Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a few days ago the Milwaukee Journal paid a high and well-deserved compliment to Dr. George W. Calver, the chief medical officer in the Capitol. The Journal editorial complimented the vigor and fitness of the Members of the Senate, too, and noted—quite properly—that Dr. Calver deserves at least some of the credit. Certainly each one of us is grateful to Dr. Calver for the conscientious concern with which he helps to guard the health and fitness of members of the legislative branch of our Government.

The Journal editorial, however, was somewhat inaccurate on one point—namely, in stating that "Dr. Calver is telling Congressmen to avoid cream and butter." I have checked with Dr. Calver, who tells me that this is not his general advice to his patients. In fact, only in special, individual cases in which the patients are sufferng from specific problems of high blood cholesterol content does Dr. Calver warn his patients to avoid foods having a high content of animal fat and hydrolized vegetable fats, as well.

Specifically, Dr. Calver tells me, he advises patients to avoid all rich foods, such as gravies, sauces, fried foods, and so forth. He emphasizes that vegetable fats, when used in the preparation of foods, such as in frying, become hydrolized, and, therefore, contribute as seriously to the blood cholesterol problem as do animal facts. Finally, Dr. Calver emphasizes that it is the manner of life of the individual patients—rather than the characteristics of these foods—that is the determining factor as to whether they should avoid them. The fact of

the matter is that fats are extremely high in energy—much higher than are proteins or carbohydrates. As Dr. Calver says, if a man is digging ditches or engaging in some other strenuous form of activity and exercise, he will readily burn up as much energy as he can consume; but a man who spends long hours of work at a desk, with little exercise, does not require a high-energy diet.

I am sure the Milwaukee Journal's editorial writer was being primarily facetious when he suggested that Wisconsin politicians might wish to suppress sound medical advice concerning the effects of diet upon health. Neither Wisconsin's dairy industry nor Wisconsin's official representatives would be party to encouraging individuals who have special health problems to consume foods which are not good for them. But on the other hand, it is important to have a clear and fair picture of precisely what the facts are—as fully as they are known to responsible medical authorities. Without this clarification, I fear that the Milwaukee Journal's editorial may have left its readers with a completely unintended, but nevertheless false, impression of the true health considerations in respect to dairy products. The fact is that milk and milk products are wholesome, nutritious, and health-giving foods; and any suggestion that this is not so would be a greater disservice to the American public than even to the dairy farmers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANGEROUS DIET ADVICE

Watching the United States Senate in action recently we were struck by the physical vigor and trimness of the Members of that venerable body. Many of them had obviously been dieting. Many of them showed the results of exercise. Even 90-year-old Senator GREEN, Democrat, of Rhode Island, seemed physically spry—resulting in part from the fact that he walks to work every day and takes other forms of exercise.

Credit for some of this physical fitness must go to Dr. George W. Calver, resident physician to Congress. He's a great man for exercise—says a Congressman should take a brisk hour's walk before breakfast. And he's a great man for dieting, too. But he's going to have some trouble with Wisconsin's congressional delegation.

Dr. Calver is telling Congressmen to avoid cream and butter. He tells them they can eat oleomargarine. If these are requirements for physical fitness, Wisconsin's delegation won't carry off any fitness prizes. A diet restriction like that would be treason.

And it might—in Wisconsin—even be political suicide.

Electing Fighters for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column published in the February 1959 issue of the South Dakota Bureau Farming. It is entitled "How I Helped Elect Fighters for Freedom," and was written by Mrs. Ernest Telkamp, Route 1, Brookings, S. Dak. The article won for Mrs. Telkamp the national award in competition among farm bureau women.

Mrs. Telkamp points out how, as a farm wife she activated herself in politics as vice chairman of a county committee of one of our great political parties. She does not mention the party in her article, as is appropriate, because the South Dakota Farm Bureau, as is true of all good farm organizations, is not engaged in politics in a partisan manner. However, I can add parenthetically, here in the confidence of the Senate Chamber, that Mrs. Ernest Telkamp is a Republican county vice chairman in the Republican county of Brookings, S. Dak. And—I should add—she is a mighty good and effective worker and leader.

She points out in her article something which I believe all of us would like to have our constituents read, namely, the responsibility of a farm wife to activate herself in the public affairs of her community and to participate in the activities of the party of her choice in a capacity of leadership. It is a most inspiring article, and certainly merits the award which it received. Therefore I should like to call it to the attention of my colleagues by having it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW I HELPED ELECT FIGHTERS FOR FREEDOM

(By Mrs. Ernest Telkamp)

A few short months ago party platforms were quite uninteresting to me. The two words sounded dull; words which would require much study about tiresome issues of which I thought I knew little.

Then I was appointed the woman member of our State's Farm Bureau resolutions committee. I sat at these meetings hearing resolution after resolution from the counties being read. There was discussion after each reading. I awoke to the fact that laws were created by us, the people, about things that were near us, things that we wanted changed for the betterment of ourselves and our communities. These laws weren't dull. I found that I had opinions about them, even a small degree of knowledge about some. I found that it was a pleasant feeling to have a meeting of minds in this committee, out of which came betterment for mankind.

I began to realize that the type of people I was associating with mostly, had a common philosophy of life. This was synonymous with my idea of Americanism. This idea I was ready to go to bat for. It also fit in with my religious beliefs. I had always believed that America was God's gift to a people that sincerely desired to worship Him. A people that were trying to live by His precept "Love thy neighbors." Making resolutions to become laws that would help these neighbors was a way of being a good American.

Soon after this I was asked to become county vice chairman of a political party. I spent the summer working, almost full time, organizing the county women of this party to get out the vote.

Survey cards, with places to mark if the voters needed assistance of any kind to vote, were taken from house to house all over the county. Coffee parties were held in most every precinct to interest more people. Amendments and party platforms were explained at these. More coffee parties were held to introduce the candidates. Rallies, dinners, and picnics were the order of the day. Publicity was used wherever possible. Absentee ballots were sent, registration was urged, ballots were taken to sick people and folks in rest homes. On election day transportation and babysitters were furnished. Workers through the county called neighbors and urged them to vote.

Meanwhile the campaign had been progressing. Accusations and counteraccusations were being hurled at us through all mediums. I began to realize that a party platform wasn't hard to understand when it was interpreted as laws that my neighbors and I would have to live by. I found that the choice lay in a self-government with a competitive enterprise under which the God-given rights of men are protected or a centralized government which controlled and supported the people. The knowledge that this kind of government would control me and my helpers gave us a double incentive, to work for the candidates we believed would give us the kind of government we believed in, and to get out the vote—the vote for free American government.

Judge Oscar C. Dancy, "the Country Judge From Texas," Reflects Credit on His State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, down in southern Texas people will tell you the initial "C." in the name of Oscar C. Dancy stands for "Concrete." They mean it as a compliment.

They mean that Oscar C. Dancey, who calls himself "just a country judge from Texas," is a man of the highest principles and ideals and has never wavered from his beliefs.

The people of Cameron County and of Texas have a right to be proud of Judge Dancy. This man has served them faithfully and unselfishly for almost 27 years.

All example of his devotion to duty is the fact that he is at his desk and working by 5:30 a.m. each day.

But it is the type of work he does that distinguishes this great men. Today, there are more than 360 miles of all-weather, class A highways in Cameron County, which contains only 857 square miles in all. One of the men mainly responsible for this is Judge Oscar C. Dancy. What makes his interest in highway development unusual is that he does not drive an automobile himself.

Since Judge Dancy took office, about $10 million has been spent on various public works in his county.

The judge has been active in other development projects for the good of his home area and the good of the State. For example, he has been extremely active in projects for the conservation of our natural resources, particularly in irrigation and other water problems

which have beset Texas and the Southwest.

Another thing I particularly value from Judge Dancy in his wise counsel. I am proud to say that the judge and I have been friends for many years, and his advice and wisdom have often helped me in making decisions. I value his friendship highly.

Mr. President, as a tribute to Oscar C. Dancy, the "country judge from Texas," a man of character, wisdom, and farsighted and unselfish service, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the well written article "The Country Judge From Texas," written by Clarence Laroche, and published in a recent issue of the San Antonio Fxpress magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COUNTRY JUDGE FROM TEXAS

(By Clarence Laroche)

"I have absolutely no business to warrant such a call," the polite white haired gentleman told the young woman secretary, "but I just want to meet a county judge who spent more money than I did."

The young lady made a brave attempt to present the usual cold front to would-be callers, but she was completely disarmed by the warm, frank glow of the elderly but rugged man. The hard lines on her face thawed and melted into a smile. She asked the gentleman to wait while she checked.

In a few minutes, the President of the United States walked out, face beaming and arm outstretched, as he grabbed for the hand of Oscar C. Dancy, "the country judge from Texas."

"I meant what I told that young lady," Oscar Dancy explained later. "Harry Truman, as county judge of Jackson County, Mo., is the only county judge who outspent me when it came to putting out public funds. Of course, Truman had a bigger and richer county, and the reason I came in second is because I've been doing my spending over a quarter of a century."

After comparing notes that morning, Harry Truman and Oscar Dancy found the former had spent $20 million in bond money during his terms as county judge while the latter had spent about $10 million.

Down in the Rio Grande Valley, they'll tell you the "C" in Judge Dancy's name stands for "Concrete." The quip is a tribute to the judge who has been a pioneer in road construction not only in his own country and section but in the State as well. Today, Cameron County has a total of 363.32 miles of all-weather class A highways, and Oscar "Concrete" Dancy is key figure who helped bring that program about.

Oddly enough, this man who has brought about a great modern paving program to his county and section has never himself driven over the highways he helped build. He has never owned an automobile and has never learned to drive one.

But the lack of an automobile has not stopped this ex-North Carolinian. If anything, the walking he has been reduced to, played a role in keeping him healthy. Despite the exercise, he gets lifts either by regular bus service or by friends. He is usually home by 5:30 in the evening and in bed by 8 p.m. Next morning, if you should happen to be in the Texas Cafe about 5 o'clock, you will probably see one of the waiters looking through the big plate glass up the street. He will turn, draw a cup of coffee and place it before a nonexistent customer. A minute later, Judge Dancy will come through the door and sit before the coffee. He's at his desk in his office at the courthouse by 5:30 a.m.

His trips are frequent to Austin, Washington, and other cities where important measures and policies are formed. Phoenix and Denver, Albuquerque and El Paso know him from the Reclamation Bureau meetings he has attended in regard to valley water projects. He knows his way around Austin about as well as Mayor Tom Miller, and long ago threw away his guide to the Nation's Capital.

In fact, it was at a Washington congressional committee hearing that his "country judge from Texas" tag took hold. His extreme air of honesty and straightforwardness caught fire with a newspaper reporter, who promptly tagged the judge with the colorful—but very fitting—sobriquet in a report of the day's committee activities.

It is this same air of frankness, coupled with his complete honesty and integrity, that have contributed to his success as a politician, helping him to retain his office almost continuously for almost 27 years. The lone break in this long tenure came in 1932.

"It seems I got blamed, along with Hoover, for the depression," the judge explains wryly, "and was forced to take an involuntary leave of absence for a couple of years." It is noteworthy that he was returned to office in 1934 and has been in office ever since.

Still in full harness after over a quarter of a century as Cameron County judge, Dancy is definitely a throwback to a type of statesman of a century ago. In fact, one of the major compliments recently paid him was the reference to him as a "backwoodsman." He considers that a tribute.

Today, at an age when most men become conservative in both their physical and mental attitudes, "the country judge from Texas" refuses to take things easy. He has an open mind, is tolerant and would be classified as a liberal. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, he believes, was the greatest President the country ever had; he's wholeheartedly in favor of many New Deal projects and philosophies, and is bitterly against any attempts by big business to run the country. He is equally as bitter against communism and its potential menace to America.

Senate Seniority System Defeats Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the question of committe domination by the South, through the seniority system, which I have discussed on this floor, has been dealt with in clear and comprehensive fashion by the Milwaukee Journal, one of the leading newspapers of the Nation, in an editorial published on February 10. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Senate Seniority System Defeats Good Government," be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE SENIORITY SYSTEM DEFEATS GOOD GOVERNMENT

If you question the accuracy or justice of Senator PROXMIRE's protest against southern Democratic domination of Senate committees as a result of the seniority system, study this list of committees and chairmen:

Space, JOHNSON, Texas; Agriculture, ELLENDER, Louisiana; Appropriations, HAYDEN, Arizona; Armed Services, RUSSELL, Georgia; Banking and Currency, ROBERTSON, Virginia; Finance, BYRD, Virginia; Foreign Relations, FULBRIGHT, Arkansas; Government Operations, MCCLELLAN, Arkansas; Interior and Insular Affairs, MURRAY, Montana; Interstate and Foreign Commerce, MAGNUSON, Washington; Judiciary, EASTLAND, Mississippi; Labor, HILL, Alabama; Post Office and Civil Service, JOHNSON, South Carolina; Public Works, CHAVEZ, New Mexico; Rules and Administration, HENNINGS, Missouri.

There is not a chairman from the Northwest, the Great Lakes area, or the Middle West. Yet Georgia, Virginia, and Arkansas each have two. Some of these southern Senators are well qualified. Some are not.

Here is why the South does not want to break with the Democratic Party (as is often threatened) or carry the segregation fight too far. It would only risk losing its vast influence in Congress.

The seniority rule—some call it senility rule—provides that committee members rank in accordance with years of continuous service and that the member of the majority party having the longest uninterrupted service shall be chairman.

It's a bad system. It can put time serving incompetents in chairmanships. It frequently keeps the best men out of top jobs. It mocks principles of responsible party government. It is contrary to the idea of a legislature responsible to the electoral mandate.

PROXMIRE's proposal for geographical distribution of chairmanships is no answer, of course. The accident of geography no more assures competency than that of seniority. Committee chairmen should be chosen on the basis of all-around ability—nothing else. But, even as PROXMIRE, we have no illusions that changes will be made.

Seniority provides an escalator for all. Get on it, stay on it, keep moving up and you eventually reach the top. Senators may hate it at first. But they come to like it after a term or two.

Legislative Program of the National Federation of Independent Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it has been my privilege as chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business to work with many good organizations that are interested in the problems of small business. I am sure that other Senators have found, as I have, the recommendations of these organizations to be extremely helpful in connection with the needs of small business. Among these is the National Federation of Independent Business.

The federation's president is Mr. C. Wilson Harder. Its legislative vice president is Mr. George Burger, whom I believe most Senators know. He is an eager and aggressive advocate for small business.

Recently these gentlemen, George Burger and Wilson Harder, presented to

me the federation's legislative program for 1959.

While Senators may not agree with every item of the program, I feel sure that they will agree with most of the recommendations. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the program be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS

To Members of the 86th Congress:

We think you will be interested in the following measures. Federation members have already sent their signed mandate ballots to Congressmen during the last congressional session favoring action on these matters which need your attention:

Stronger enforcement of antitrust laws which promote fairer price competition and break up monopoly-creating mergers.

Enactment of law requiring manufacturers who sell through factory-owned stores and independent dealers, to put their independents on the same overall buying basis as their stores.

Further tax revisions to provide bigger depreciation allowances on new and used equipment bought by small business, to provide encouragement for building private retirement plans, to secure same tax benefits for unincorporated businesses equivalent to those granted corporate enterprise.

Enactment of laws requiring fairer dealings by unions with small business.

Curtailment of Government competition with small business.

Enactment of strong fair trade laws.

Require cooperatives to pay taxes on same basis as privately operated independent business competitors.

Reduction of Government redtape and reporting burdens on independent business.

Further streamlining of rules to give small firms a fairer share of Government contacts and Government financing help.

Provide stronger representation for small business in Congress by making the House Small Business Committee permanent, same as the Senate Small Business Committee.

Educational Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently there has been a great deal said about our educational program and what should be done to strengthen it and to remedy some of its so-called defects. Many suggestions have been made, including the introduction of bills which would grant a great number of scholarships, and dealing with other phases of the program.

I have in my hand an article published in the Wall Street Journal of Tuesday, February 17, 1959, entitled "Education in Revolution—Indianapolis Aims To Restore Excellence to High Schools."

I have stated publicly many times that I thought changes must be brought about first in the living rooms from which the children come, and right on up through grammar school, high school, and college.

The editorial, I am sure, does not have all the answers, and I do not approve of all the points it makes; however, I am sure the suggestions which are made in the article will go a long way toward making worth-while contributions to our program.

I call it particularly to the attention of Members of Congress, and also to the attention of the people of the Nation. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article may be prnted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

EDUCATION REVOLUTION—INDIANAPOLIS AIMS TO RESTORE EXCELLENCE TO HIGH SCHOOLS

(By John Chamberlain)

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind.—Shortridge High, one of Indianapolis' eight high schools, has an old tradition of excellence. In the past it has sent as many as 70 percent of a senior class on to college.

Today, amid changing population patterns in this city of 460,000, Shortridge's share of college-bound students is no longer what it used to be. The local board of education does not like the trend—which is even more pronounced at other Indianapolis high schools. But instead of deploring the laziness of modern students, the board is busy doing something about the situation. With the diploma credit system being upgraded as a starter, Indianapolis is in the throes of an educational revolution designed to restore excellence to its old standing as a desirable commodity. This contrasts with the effort imputed by critics to the progressive, to adjust everybody to mediocrity.

At Shortridge High the revolution cannot go fast enough to satisfy the principal, Dr. Hadley, who remembers the great days of his school. Through years of general apathy about classical tradition, Shortridge has continued to offer courses in Greek and in Hebrew. Since not enough students normally elect these subjects to justify them in the budget, the principal has used ingenious makeshifts to keep them in the catalog. The Greek teacher remains on the payroll by conducting classes in Latin. The Hebrew teacher is a local rabbi who lacks the requisite Indiana credits in educational methodology; he remains on the payroll by virtue of a special certificate which waives the usual board of education teacher requirements.

Shortridge is forced to battle for its ancient tradition because, as a comprehensive high school, it must take IQ's as they come, whether low or high. What saves it is the system known as multiple track. In its English courses, for example, the students are grouped in five separate levels in accordance with their abilities. In a top English class you will hear a boy offering such obiter dicta as "The whole science of war is logistics"—this as a response to a question about Emil Ludwig's biography of Napoleon.

Teachers at Shortridge use their common sense in shuttling back and forth between older methods of instruction and the modern encouragement of learning by doing, which means letting the student set the class pace. A day's assignment of the literature of Puritan New England, for example, will allow for plenty of student talk about the Puritans. But the practice of letting students conduct their own class will be interrupted from time to time as the teacher takes off on some old-fashioned information-giving. At Shortridge the teacher is not only on tap, he is also occasionally on top.

CONCESSIONS IN SCIENCE

Science at Shortridge must make some concessions to the lower IQ student who wants to take his math as general arithmetic and his biology as life science. But multiple track again saves the day for excellence: the brainy student can choose the advanced placement programs in math and science, doubling up on intermediate algebra and solid geometry in 1 year, and taking analytical geometry and calculus (the ordinary college freshman math course) as a senior.

Dr. Herman L. Shibler, Indianapolis' general superintendent of education, believes in ability grouping and enriched programs for students of high aptitude ratings. At Shortridge they have even managed to exceed the range of Dr. Shibler's permissiveness. They have done this by establishing voluntary after-hours classes in the great books of the Western World.

The fact that Shortridge offers good courses, however, has not exempted the school from the general leveling atmosphere which causes even first-rate human material to pick the easy way. In Indiana, the State minimum requirements for the ubiquitous general diploma are set at 16 units, only 9 of which have to be taken in such basic subjects as English, math, and history.

There is no State compulsion in Indiana to take a foreign language—and high school math need be no more than a review of grade school arithmetic plus some instruction in household budgeting and the art of balancing a checkbook. Even in Shortridge it has been possible for a bright boy or girl to laze through 4 years of driver training, home economics and other concessions to the rage for life adjustment.

Inasmuch as some students in any general educational profile are all but ineducable, there can be little argument against the Indiana State minimum. But the local Indianapolis school board observed a year or two ago that the minimum was tending to become synomymous with the maximum. Local high school graduates, armed only with the general diploma units (no foreign language, no solid geometry or trigonometry), were going on to the State universities—and flunking out.

Some members of the local board decided the college preparatory courses must be changed even before sputnik woke the United States up to the need for better training in fundamentals. Within a year there were some drastic innovations.

The first thing to fall was the general diploma system. To Ralph Husted, an Indianapolis Power & Light Co. official who is currently the head of the school board, it seemed pointless to award the same certificate to a boy who had met the rigorous standards of the Latin and Greek curriculum at Shortridge High and a boy who had all but majored in basketball at one of the other Indianapolis high schools. Mr. Husted offered the idea of the differentiated diploma as a cure which was intended not only to reward the student but to prod Indianapolis parents into making Johnny pick more difficult subjects.

The differentiated diploma idea strikes hard at the basic noncompetitive fetish of the progressive educators. It implies a hierarchy of educational values. But to General Superintendent Shibler, though his own training had been in modern methodology, the break seemed worth making. Accordingly, the new system of rewards went into effect last September without a hitch.

NEW ACADEMIC COURSE

Beginning with the high school class which will be graduated in 1962, the Indianapolis student who wishes to take the academic course must enroll for more of the basic academic subjects—English, French, algebra, physics, etc.—and, what is more, he must maintain a C-plus average in them. Upon completion of 18 units of work (two more than State minimal requirements) at considerably better than passing average, the student will receive the academic diploma.

Separate diplomas will be given for the fine and the practical arts courses and the semi-

vocational courses (17 units of work required), and for the general course (16 points, without algebra or a foreign language). In case the academic course student fails to maintain the C-plus average throughout 4 years, he will qualify only for the general diploma.

Besides taking more compulsory courses and being held to a higher standard of marking, the college-destined Indianapolis student may shortly be faced with more difficult work. At any rate, the Indianapolis School Board has ordered a far-reaching reevaluation of local curricula. Instead of calling in professional educators from the teachers' colleges to pass muster on the instruction from the standpoint of educational method, the school board has asked professors from Indiana liberal arts colleges to rate the courses on the basis of their content.

It is still too early to get a line on the results of the investigation. But the school board hasn't waited for the report on Indianapolis English classes to make some changes in the teaching of English rhetoric. Last September the board added 20 new English teachers to the high-school faculties and asked that the average English class be reduced from 35 to 20. With more teachers and smaller classes, the schools were able to start a theme-a-week program which is designed to restore English composition to its old high estate.

There are other innovations in the making at Indianapolis. Students in local high schools may take a bona fide course in economics (not a mere social-study smattering), using a good text by Fred Fairchild and Thomas Shelley or by J. H. Dodd. With funds raised by Indianapolis private industry, high school teachers have recently been sent to M.I.T. for summer mathematics and science courses.

MERIT PAY FOR TEACHERS

Finally, the Indianapolis school board is looking into the feasibility of paying local teachers in accordance with their merit. There is still a good deal of opposition to this particular idea, but it will not be abandoned until (and unless) the school board is satisfied that it would create too much bad blood among Indianapolis' 3,200 teachers.

Indianapolis offers merely one instance of the yeast that is currently rising in the educational world. Though the results of the differentiated diploma system won't be known for a year or so, it is already attracting attention elsewhere. The advisory committee of the Ohio State Board of Education, for example, has recommended looking into the desirability of separate diplomas for academic and vocational degrees.

What Indianapolis has at least done is to return the spotlight to the idea of encouraging excellence. It has resolved to spread the Shortridge High tradition to all of the Indianapolis schools. And this in itself is a far more important phenomenon than anything that may happen to be written on a diploma.

Tax Relief for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, S. 1011 is one of four small business tax relief bills which I have introduced this year. This bill would compel the Internal Revenue Service to accept the decisions of the Federal courts as binding on the Service unless it appeals those decisions.

Recently, I received a letter which illustrates quite well the need for S. 1011. The letter was written to me by Mr. George L. Scott, Jr., Alabaster Lime Co., Alabaster, Ala. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALABASTER LIME CO.,
Alabaster, Ala., February 10, 1959.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: I note from a press release, dated February 9, that you have introduced three bills in the Senate which are designed to help small businessmen, and I am very grateful for your interest in this matter. I am, of course, interested in all three of the bills but am particularly interested in the one at this time that would compel the Treasury Department to accept court decisions in tax matters or take appeal.

We have been in a controversy with the Internal Revenue Service for several years in connection with the method of taking percentage depletion on limestone, and several months ago we filed a claim for a refund which we think is due us, based on several court decisions. So far, this claim has been denied and I presume it would be necessary for us to go to the trouble and expense of entering suit to recover this money, which seems very unfair and very unnecessary. I am enclosing a copy of these decisions with which you are, no doubt, familiar and some of the cases involved are similar if not identical to ours. You will note a recent case decided in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California, involving a case for the California Portland Cement Co. in which the court decided in favor of the taxpayer. This company manufactures portland cement, lime, and crushed limestone, and the court ruled that the stone, when calcined and sold as lime that the percentage depletion should apply on the lime and not limestone, as lime was the first finished product.

Our principal business is manufacturing lime, although we sell some limestone most of which is a byproduct and which is too small to be burned on our kilns. We are contending that the depletion allowed on the stone, when calcined, should apply on lime and it is not marketable until calcined.

As you are well aware it becomes increasingly difficult for small manufacturers to compete with national concerns as through pricing policies, reciprocal deals, and other devices, they have advantages which small concerns do not enjoy, and in our particular industry there is much more lime produced today than there was 20 years ago, although there are not near as many companies now in existence. Some of them have gone out of business through bankruptcy or have been purchased by larger concerns and the tendency for this situation seems to get worse.

I thought this information might be helpful to you and I again assure you that I appreciate your efforts along this line.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE SCOTT, Jr.

Collegiate Nurse Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, it is not only yesterday's headlines about a new weather satellite, the headlines of a few months ago about artificial planets, the fantastic growth and increasing complexity of our techniques of production which give evidence of an everchanging world. The arts of death, it is true, are rapidly making science fiction novels read like historical romances. But, thanks to the efforts of thousands and thousands of unsung men and women, the arts of life are advancing, too.

Today's nurse, though imbued with the same spirit that led Florence Nightingale to the Crimea, and Clara Barton to the battlefields of the Civil War, must operate in an entirely different context. In a former era, the American nurse gave baths, changed bed linen, cleaned up the hospital wards and performed other such vital but nonprofessional labors. It was not every many years ago that a nurse was not authorized to even give injections. But today the heroic figure of the woman—and man—in nurses' white symbolizes not only a person who is willing to give of her time and energy to care for the immediate needs of the sickroom, but in addition a person whose professional, technical, and scientific training is of a quality comparable with that of any profession.

Today's nurse cannot be a high school graduate, whose spirit of applied Christianity alone qualifies her for this service. She is a skilled technician in the war against disease. In her hands any of our own lives may rest some day soon. To her education we should give careful and conscientious study.

Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this 86th Congress, I introduced a bill—H.R.1251—designed to assist in meeting the serious shortage of college-trained nurses. Today, in a nearby legislative body, a similar bill is being introduced by an American statesman whose leadership in the fight for adequate health facilities for the American people is unexcelled—the distinguished and able senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUBERT HUMPHREY]. I have asked leave of the House to address myself to this legislation, and to the needs which prompted it.

The National Defense Education Act of 1958, within its own compass, was a major step forward in meeting the needs of American higher education. But the victory gained by the passage of that act was not solely in terms of its substantive content. It was equally significant as a symbol of the recognition by the Congress and by the American people that higher education is a vital part of this Nation's strength. I do not

refer solely, or even mostly to our military strength, although this is not unimportant. The 1958 act indicated to the Nation and to the world that we again asserted the Jeffersonian belief that an uneducated nation could not long be a free nation. This belief has been a keystone of the American system since our birth as a nation. It is as demonstrably true today as it has always been.

But the National Defense Education Act of 1958 did not have an even effect on all types of higher education. It emphasized science and mathematics, at the expense of other disciplines; and in terms of the context of the bill, this was perhaps justified. But there remains a shadow field, at the margins of science, as that term is used. There remain the healing arts, medicine and nursing. These are not considered as scientific fields within the meaning of the National Defense Education Act. Yet they are professions in which the paraphernalia and techniques of science are of the greatest importance. And they are fields which we must develop for the same reasons that we must develop the fields of science and mathematics. Our national supply of college-trained doctors and nurses—and especially the latter—must be strengthened if we are to meet the demands of the time, if we are to be adequately prepared for the possible needs of a civil defense emergency, if we are to meet the health needs of an evergrowing Nation.

The bill to which I address myself provides for grants-in-aid for the construction of teaching facilities for nursing education at the college level, in the amount of $20 million per year for each of 5 fiscal years; for grants-in-aid to help meet the costs of collegiate nursing instruction in the amount of $10 million per year for the same period, for $10 million yearly for scholarships for college training of nurses, both those just entering the profession and graduate nurses, and for the creation of an advisory committee appointed by the Surgeon General, to assist in the administration of the act. The bill contains appropriate safeguards against the intrusion of Federal control into the field of curriculum, personnel, and administration of the collegiate schools.

What evidence have we of a need for such legislation? To fully explain the desirability of an act such as I have proposed, it is necessary to speak at some length about the present state of nursing education.

In the first place, it is a surprising and sobering fact that of the 430,000 professional graduate nurses in the Nation in 1956, only 30,000—some 7 percent—have bachelor's degrees from an accredited college. One and five-tenths percent of the total number of nurses have master's degrees. In spite of the excellent working of Public Law 911, which the Congress enacted in 1956, the general picture has not changed. The latter act, designed to equip graduate professional nurses for supervisory duties, through assistance in the obtaining of master's degrees, has been less successful than was hoped, largely because of the serious shortage in some areas of nurses who have baccalaureate degrees, and who would thus be eligible for work on advanced degrees.

In the fields of teaching, administration, and supervision the picture is even more discouraging. In these three areas of nursing activity, where one might legitimately expect the percentage of nurses holding bachelor's degrees to be very large, the statistics indicate that only 22.4 percent are actually so prepared. In the very field of nursing education, where the possession of a college degree might legitimately be considered as absolutely essential, we find that only 77 percent of the nurses involved hold bachelor's degrees. I ask unanimous consent that two tables, showing the percentages of degree-holding nurses be inserted at this point in the RECORD, together with explanatory material from the U.S. Public Health Service.

TABLE 1.—*Estimated number and percentage of active graduate nurses holding academic degrees, in the United States, 1952 and 1956*

Degrees held	Number		Percentage	
	1952	1956	1952	1956
Total	374,600	430,000	100.0	100.0
No degree	343,750	393,600	91.8	91.5
Bachelors degree	27,050	30,000	7.2	7.0
Masters degree [1]	3,800	6,400	1.0	1.5

[1] Includes an estimated 75 nurses in 1952 and 125 in 1956 who hold doctorates.

Source: 1952 figures, "How many nurses have college degrees?" by Eugene Levine, Nursing Outlook, January 1954, p. 23; 1956 figures, table 2, this article.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated percentage of active graduate nurses holding academic degrees, by field of nursing, in the United States, in 1956*

Occupational field	Number of nurses				Percentage of nurses		
	Total	Holding bachelors degree	Holding masters degree	Holding no degree	Holding bachelors degree	Holding masters degree	Holding no degree
All fields	430,000	30,000	6,400	393,600	7.0	1.5	91.5
Hospitals	265,800	14,700	2,200	248,900	5.5	.8	93.7
Directors	11,400	2,600	1,300	7,500	22.8	11.4	65.8
Supervisors and assistants	23,900	3,100	600	20,200	13.0	2.5	84.5
Head nurses and assistants	44,000	2,800	200	41,000	6.4	.4	93.2
General duty and others	186,500	6,200	100	180,200	3.3	.1	96.6
Public health	27,200	6,900	1,300	19,000	25.4	4.8	69.8
Supervisors	3,100	1,400	800	900	45.2	25.8	29.0
Staff nurses	24,100	5,500	500	18,100	22.8	2.1	75.1
Nursing education	10,400	5,300	2,700	2,400	51.0	26.0	23.0
Industry	17,000	800	100	16,100	4.7	.6	94.7
Doctors' offices, private duty, and other	109,600	2,300	100	107,200	2.1	.1	97.8

Source: Figures shown in this table are estimates based on published and unpublished sources. A description of the methods used in making these estimates and a list of source references can be obtained from the Division of Nursing Resources, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
From Nursing Outlook, vol. 6, December 1958.

Explanation of sources of data used in table 2 of article "How Many Nurses Now Have College Degrees?" published in Nursing Outlook, vol. 6, p. 689, December 1958

Occupational field	Source of data
Hospitals, all categories of personnel.	Survey of 682 hospitals in the United States, conducted by the Division of Nursing Resources, Public Health Service, in the early part of 1958. The 682 hospitals represent a random sample of the 6,158 hospitals in the United States listed by the American Hospital Association.
Public health	Based on reports received from State health departments in the United States, as of Jan. 1, 1957. Tabulation prepared by Division of Public Health Nursing, Public Health Service.
Nursing education	Based on a 1957 survey of teachers in nursing education programs conducted by the American Nurses Association, a 1956 survey of schools of nursing conducted by the National League for Nursing, and on data collected in State surveys of nursing needs and resources conducted by Division of Nursing Resources during years 1955 to 1958.
Industry	Based on reports gathered by State health departments, Jan. 1, 1957, by occupational health program, Public Health Service.
Doctors' offices, private duty, and other.	Projected from data collected in State surveys of nursing needs and resources conducted by Division of Nursing Resources during years 1955 to 1958.

In an effort to meet the growing needs for college-trained nurses, the nursing profession itself, in the best traditions of American professionalism, has undertaken rigorous self-analysis, and has established a system of priorities, which I ask unanimous consent be printed at this point.

STATEMENT OF PRIORITIES—ADOPTED BY THE ANA BOARD OF DIRECTORS, FEBRUARY 1959

The ANA is concerned with providing the best possible nursing service for the American people. If this is to be accomplished, there must be an adequate supply of qualified professional practitioners of nursing.

The members of the association believe that the public must share in the responsibility of providing adequate financial support for nursing education.

Through its 1958–60 platform, the association is committed to promote legislation which will provide public funds for research, scholarships, and continued improvement in nursing education. At this time, primary needs for public support are in these two areas:

1. Traineeships, or scholarships for nurses in advanced programs preparing for teaching, administration and supervision.

2. Expansion of collegiate programs in nursing through assistance with costs of construction and instruction; and through scholarships for students in supplemental and basic programs leading to the baccalaureate degree.

The first of these has been partially fulfilled by the passage of Public Law 911. The objectives stated in the second priority can be met, at least in part, by the subject legislation.

What are the needs that have called forth this bill? Why are we especially in need of college-trained nurses? In view of the fact that we have managed to get along with a nursing profession in which only a tiny fraction are college trained, why do we now emphasize this type of training instead of asking for assistance, if assistance is needed, for the traditional hospital-based nurse training facilities? These are all questions which may legitimately be asked, and they are questions which I hope the distinguished Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will put to the nursing profession when this bill is brought up for hearings.

But let me, from the information I have at hand, briefly discuss the needs for more nurses and the reasons why training at the college level is urged by the leaders of the nursing profession.

The most reliable figures available indicate that the number of professional nurses in the Nation today is at an all-time high. In January 1956, there were about 430,000 professional nurses employed in the United States. This figure shows a ratio of 259 nurses to every 100,000 population. In a past era when few Americans could afford hospitalization, and even fewer availed themselves of it, this might have been an adequate ratio. But today the situation is vastly different. In 1957, 13 out of every 100 Americans went to a hospital. The growth of hospital insurance, the increasing public concern with health, the growth of other demands on the nursing profession such as industrial nursing, public health nursing, and similar nursing activities outside of the hospitals, the increase in the number of hospitals themselves, the prolonged demand for nurses by the Armed Forces—all these factors have combined to bring the supply of trained professional nurses below the demand. The need for additional nurses is well documented and undeniable. At the insistence of the profession itself, the standards for nurse training, both in and out of the colleges, have been kept at a high level. This fact, of deep comfort to members of the public, whose very lives may some day rest in the hands of a trained nurse, has kept the supply of nurses from growing as it otherwise might.

With the growing gap between the public demand for nursing services and the limited supply of professional nurses, our hospitals have had to resort to varied techniques to fulfill their mission. The priceless skills of the professional nurse have had to be rationed, as it were, and the nonprofessional aspects of what were once the duties of the nurses have had to be handed over to nurses' aides, to practical nurses, and to hospital orderlies. But even with these techniques of stretching available skills, the need for professional nurses remains unfilled.

But, as I suggested earlier, why is it necessary to demand college training when the hospital-trained nurses now comprise such a vast portion of the profession?

Let me say first that no question can be posed as to the great work being done by hospitals in training nurses, nor as to the quality of the work done by these nurses. They are not second-best, they are not in some shadowy area of competence. The professional nurse today, whether hospital trained or college trained, deserves the highest praise and the deepest admiration of her fellow citizens. They are not overpaid by any stretch of the imagination, and they are far from underworked. For most people, the constant strain of the nursing profession, the intimacy with death and disease, the responsibilities that fall upon these dedicated men and women, put nurses in the same category as the members of other professions whose choice of a lifework can only be attributed to the overriding power of conscience and the will to self-sacrifice on behalf of humanity that characterizes, for example, the clergy, or the underpaid school teacher. It is not from any dissatisfaction with the caliber of the work being done by the average nurse today that the nursing profession itself has urged the expansion of college training programs.

First, the nurse today is being called upon increasingly to perform work of a scientific and technical nature which is a far different thing from the job given to the nurse of a generation ago. Let me quote from an article appearing in the New York Times of August 25, 1957, written by Wayne Phillips, a journalist of several years' experience on hospital staffs:

> Besides the basic subjects she is expected to have studied in high school—biology, chemistry, mathematics—the professional nurse today must have a good foundation in anatomy, physiology, microbiology, and nutrition. Through training in the specific needs of different types of patients, she is introduced to the principles not only of simple medicine and surgery, but also of urology, neurology, geriatrics, pediatrics, obstetrics, orthopedics, psychiatry, sociology, gynecology, opthalmology, and otolaryngology. And she must learn the techniques of her profession as practiced in public health and clinical and industrial nursing as well as in hospitals.

The registered nurse today must prepare medications, assist at surgery, and carry out professional duties which not very many years ago were restricted to the medical profession itself. Here is the basic reason for the demands of America's nurses that the newcomers to the profession be encouraged and enabled to pursue their education to the collegiate level.

Today's nurse is doing a magnificent job for inadequate salaries, on the basis of preparation which is not always able to keep up with the increasing complexities of the nurse's job. She is being given more and more responsibility of a supervisory and educational capacity. The demands for a broader based, more professional training program are urgent. The willingness of the persons engaged in the profession is manifest. The time for action, Mr. Speaker, is now.

Mr. Speaker, in the days since H.R. 1251 was introduced, I have received from nurses' associations and from nursing educators, considerable mail in support of this bill. I ask unanimous consent that selections from this mail be printed at this point in the RECORD.

FEBRUARY 14, 1959.

The Honorable EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: District 12 of the Idaho State Nurses Association wishes to inform you that we are very much in favor of bill H.R. 1251, Collegiate Nursing Education Act.

Will you please send me a copy of the bill?

MRS. BARBARA JOHANSEN, R.N.,
Legislative Committee, Route 1, Jerome, Idaho.

NEW YORK STATE NURSES ASSOCIATION,
Albany, N.Y., February 17, 1959.

Hon. EDITH S. GREEN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I am writing to you on behalf of the New York State Nurses Association in support of H.R. 1251, the Collegiate Nursing Education Act of 1959.

It is a well recognized fact in this State that if we are to meet the nursing shortage we must have better qualified teaching and administrative personnel as well as more students entering the nursing profession. If we can increase the number of students entering baccalaureate degree programs we will have taken a step toward remedying both the shortage in bedside nursing and teaching personnel as graduates of these programs may either remain in bedside nursing or in less time than it takes graduates of diploma school programs to prepare themselves for teaching and administrative posts.

The board of regents of the University of the State of New York being cognizant of the nursing shortage appointed a nurse resources study group for the purpose of surveying nursing personnel resources and needs and facilities in professional nursing education. These studies have now been completed, the first one published in 1956, the second only just released and now awaiting publication. Copies of both of these studies are enclosed for your information.

Acting on the recommendations of the nurse resources study group, the regents sponsored the following bills in the State legislature:

Senate Int. 1846, Brydges; Assembly Int. 2563 D. B. Lawrence: It would amend sections 601 and 611 of the education law, to establish 150 additional regents scholarships for basic professional education in nursing, to be awarded on statewide basis to pupils having highest standing on State list arranged in order of merit regardless of residence. The measure, which was referred to the Senate Finance and Assembly Ways and Means Committees carries an appropriation of $46,200.

Senate Int. 2429, Brydges; Assembly Int. 3091, Brady: Adds new section 626, repeals section 613, education law, to change and extend provisions relating to scholarships for advance professional educational nursing to provide for 60 regents fellowships for teachers and administrators of nursing, with awards to be based upon competitive examinations and entitle holder to $2,500 if income is $1,000 or less, and if income exceeds such amount, award shall be diminished by $1 for each $4 over $1,000, with no grant to be less than $500; provides for payments, fixes conditions of awards and appropriates $132,000. Assembly Ways and Means Committee.

Comment: Under the present law, New York State annually grants 30 State scholarships for advanced nursing education. Each such scholarship is for $750 for 1 year of study.

While both of these measures, if passed and signed into law, would be of tremendous assistance to us in this State they would not nearly meet the real need as evidenced in the reports of the nurse resources study group, so you see that even though on a

State level we are making every attempt to secure financial assistance we also need the kind of help proposed in your bill.

We are, therefore, urging you to do all in your power to secure passage of H.R. 1251 not only because it will help to prepare more nurses but because it will be reflected in the kind of care the public deserves.

May we also take this opportunity to thank you for your interest in our profession. Having had the pleasure of hearing you address our group in Washington last year we now feel more than ever indebted to you.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KATHERINE E. REHDER, R.N.,
Executive Director.

ALABAMA STATE NURSES' ASSOCIATION,
Montgomery, Ala., February 17, 1959.

Hon. EDITH S. GREEN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington 25, D.C.

Dear MRS. GREEN: As executive director of the Alabama State Nurses' Association, I wish to express the appreciation of Alabama nurses for your interest in nursing education and your efforts in expanding opportunities for this education in colleges and universities throughout the United States in the introduction of H.R. 1251 in the House of Representatives to authorize a 5-year program of grants and scholarships for collegiate education in the field of nursing. Members of the Alabama State Nurses' Association are cognizant of the vital need in this State for the expansion of collegiate educational facilities and for scholarship assistance.

There is a critical need in Alabama for qualified teachers, supervisors and consultants in nursing if the people of the State are to receive optimum nursing care. Because of the high cost of education and the relatively low salaries in the nursing profession few Alabama nurses can afford to leave their jobs for an extended period of time, obtaining their advanced preparation on a sporadic, piecemeal basis—night classes combined with full or part time employment. According to a recent survey 25 percent of the active nurses in Alabama have earned some credits toward a degree. Every available scholarship on the baccalaureate level is being used and requests for additional scholarship assistance are frequent.

Preparation beyond the basic level is generally considered necessary for nursing education, public health nursing, occupational health nursing, anesthesia and certain levels in institutional nursing. Alabama nurses, however, have been handicapped in securing nursing education to fit them adequately for positions in these fields as indicated by the results of a 1958 Study of Nursing Needs in the State. In the field of nursing education 5 percent are shown to have no preparation beyond the basic level while 29 percent have some hours toward a degree. Approximately 25 percent of the public health nurses, 64 percent of the institutional nurses, 67 percent of occupational health nurses and 20 percent of the anesthetists have no additional education beyond the R.N.

There are two collegiate nursing programs in the State, one at the University of Alabama headed by Dr. Florence Hixson as Dean, the other at Tuskegee Institute, where Mrs. Lillian Harvey is Dean. Both of these schools have limited facilities at present, a problem, which will naturally be emphasized as the student body increases.

Alabama during the past year was unable to use several of the traineeships granted under title II of Public Law 911 as we did not have graduates holding baccalaureate degrees eligible for admission to the master's program.

Assuring you of the full cooperation of the nurses of Alabama, I am,

Sincerely,

MRS. WALTER BRAGG SMITH, R.N.

KANSAS STATE NURSES' ASSOCIATION,
Topeka, Kans., February 16, 1959.

Hon. EDITH S. GREEN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: We are pleased to learn of the bill you are introducing in the House of Representatives which will provide grants and scholarships for collegiate education in the field of nursing. We appreciate your concern and your practical efforts to provide opportunities for programs in nursing education in colleges and universities throughout the United States.

The University of Kansas, department of nursing, is the only collegiate program for nursing education in Kansas. One of the great needs at this school is for qualified faculty to teach the students seeking entrance to the program. This year there were more applicants for this particular school of nursing than could be accepted with the limited number of faculty for the school of nursing. We believe that this bill which you are introducing will assist directly with this critical need in our State.

Sincerely yours,

HULDA O. WEGENER, R.N.,
Executive Secretary.

THE CONNECTICUT
STATE NURSES' ASSOCIATION,
Hartford Conn., February 13, 1959.

Representative EDITH S. GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: We are a constituent of the American Nurses' Association and speak for the graduate nurse population in Connecticut. In this State there are 15,000 active practitioners in professional nursing. Because of the demands of our numerous urban centers, nursing in Connecticut presents a complex picture.

We have just learned through the American Nurses' Association that you have introduced H.R. 1251, to authorize a 5-year program of grants and scholarships for collegiate education in the field of nursing, and for other purposes.

We should like to express sincere appreciation to you on behalf of the nurses of Connecticut for this fine evidence of your public interest. Favorable action on this bill will benefit not only nurses but through them, all citizens in the United States. To increase our schools by at least 40 percent in the next decade and to meet increased demands for nursing service, we too, concur with you that favorable consideration be given to this bill.

We in Connecticut feel very strongly as to the need for such a law. At present we have only two collegiate schools of nursing in our State, the University of Connecticut under the guidance of Dean Carolyn L. Widmer (who is also the president of the Connecticut Nurses' Association) and the University of Bridgeport under the leadership of Dean Marth P. Jayne.

Two additional collegiate schools in Connecticut have closed because of lack of funds, one connected with a liberal arts college (St. Joseph's) and the second a post baccalaureate program at Yale. We in Connecticut have felt the loss of these schools most keenly. Although we know we need 33 percent of our people prepared on a bachelor's level in Connecticut, only 10 percent of our students are enrolled in schools with bachelor's level preparation.

Nursing studies in Connecticut have shown that present faculty members of several of our nursing schools are inadequately prepared for teaching. And not only is there a shortage of teachers, but there is a shortage of qualified supervisory personnel and of professional registered nurses in Connecticut also. The public health nurses in our State ranked 39th nationally in a 1957 survey made by the USPHS in the number of nurses in public health positions who have had at least 1 year of approved preparation in public health nursing.

We are grateful for the Federal traineeships granted in the last legislative session. These have been helpful, but they are only the beginning. Because our need is so great we in Connecticut are taking every opportunity of improving our local area—we have introduced a bill in our 1959 State legislature asking for scholarship aid to registered nurses on a baccalaureate level—but we also need Federal assistance.

We must have well-prepared faculty in order to increase our student nurse enrollment. If we can do this, we can thus offer optimum care to the increased number of patients our ever-increasing lifespan and growing population presage.

We hope sincerely that it will be possible for you to lend your support for an early hearing. We, in turn, shall be happy to submit more detail as the time for the hearing approaches.

Sincerely yours,

ELEANOR LUNDBLAD, R.N.,
Executive Secretary.

COLORADO NURSES' ASSOCIATION,
Denver, Colo., February 16, 1959.

Representative EDITH S. GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: The Colorado Nurses' Association is vitally interested in your bill, H.R. 1251, and is most grateful to you for your interest in the nursing profession. Nursing education is greatly in need of the help that interested and willing persons such as you can give, and we're deeply appreciative.

Since the introduction of your bill, we have discussed it with the directors of the baccalaureate programs in nursing in this State, and all have expressed the same problems.

These boil down to the extreme need for well-qualified teachers and supervisors, and for funds to obtain facilities and instructors to provide these people.

The directors in Colorado feel that persons with adequate preparation in curriculum-building, in supervision, in present-day concepts of how to teach, are sadly lacking, and that the present Federal traineeships help only the students, not the schools of nursing, since the tuition does not begin to meet the cost of obtaining such adequately prepared personnel.

Those with whom we have discussed the situation feel very strongly that there should be a pool of baccalaureate degree people, from which can be prepared in the master's program the teachers, administrators, and supervisors so badly needed. They believe that such a program might encourage a survey of the present master's degree curriculum which presently seems lacking in a number of areas, especially those of outright teaching methods and certain clinical areas, as well as administrative techniques.

We have in Colorado three schools of nursing offering baccalaureate programs. Following is a list of these schools with the names of the directors of the programs. We believe that you will hear from these people, too, about their needs.

Mrs. Henrietta Loughran, Dean, School of Nursing, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.; Miss Louise Golden, Director, School of Nursing, University of Denver, Denver, Colo.; Miss Margaret Metzger, Director, Division of Nursing, Loretto Heights College, Loretto, Colo.

A check with the director of public health nursing in Colorado brought to light the fact that only about 50 percent of the public health supervisors have degrees, and only about 45 percent of the staff nurses in local health units are graduates of degree programs although 80 percent of these nurses have public health preparation. The great need in Colorado is for trained public health nurses for the rural areas. About 4 percent of the Colorado population has no generalized public health nursing service whatever. We were told that about 12–20 qualified public health nurses could be used throughout the State, particularly in the rural areas.

Again, we express our very great appreciation for the work you are doing on behalf of the nursing profession, and assure you of our cooperation and help wherever possible.

Very sincerely,

MARGARET LEWIS,
Chairman, Committee on Legislation.

TENNESSEE NURSES' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Nashville, Tenn., February 16, 1959.

Hon. EDITH S. GREEN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: Those of us present at the ANA conference on legislation in Washington last year still recall your stimulating keynote address with enthusiasm. It is with much satisfaction that we have learned of your introduction of the Collegiate Nursing Education Act of 1959 in this session of Congress.

Since a resurvey of nursing needs and resources in this State in 1955 revealed our critical shortage of adequately prepared nursing personnel, we have been working diligently to bring about solutions to some of our problems. At the moment we have two bills in the State legislature and a third to be introduced. Because of this activity, we have certain reports containing data about nursing needs in Tennessee that will interest you. Also, this information will indicate to you that the enactment of your bill, H.R. 1251, would help to meet the health needs of this particular State.

We deeply appreciate your continued interest in nursing and your willingness to work for expanding opportunities in nursing education in colleges and universities. If we can be of any assistance to you, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

MARY ELIZABETH DUNN,
Registered Nurse.

Forty-first Anniversary of Restoration of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Monday marked the 41st anniversary of the restoration of the independence of the nation of Lithuania.

This normally happy occasion is cloaked in sadness, for this is a nation enslaved—not just dominated and controlled, as in the case of the satellite countries, but a nation actually seized and forcibly incorporated into the Soviet system.

Let the indomitable spirit and abiding hope of the Lithuanian people serve as an inspiration to us all, for here is a nation, only slightly larger in size and population than West Virginia, that has been subjected to two of the greatest tidal waves of tyranny in our times, the columns of Nazi Germany and the armed might of Soviet Russia.

As we of the United States have already joined with the Lithuanian people in refusing to recognize the illegal annexation of that country by Russia, let us join with them today in solemn observance of their independence day and in prayerful hope for future freedom for Lithuania and all subject peoples in the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, in observance of this anniversary, a resolution unanimously adopted early this month at a mass meeting of American citizens of Lithuanian descent in the city of Racine, Wis., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.,
Racine, Wis.

RESOLUTION

Whereas Lithuania, ancestral home of millions of American citizens, is and has been since 1940, under the occupation and subjugation of Soviet Union; and

Whereas the resistance to this Russian oppression has been carried on constantly and continuously by the Lithuanian people; and

Whereas no real peace or security can be achieved in the world while the entire Eastern Europe remains subjugated by the Soviet Union; and

Whereas America joins with Lithuanians everywhere in reasserting the God-given right of all men to be free: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this mass meeting of loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent of this community commemorating the 41st anniversary of the restoration of independence to Lithuania urges the Government of the United States not to trust the talks of peaceful coexistence of the Soviet Union leaders while at the same time unarmed American planes are attacked and personnel killed by their order; and be it further

Resolved, That this mass meeting express its sincere gratitude to the executive and legislative branches of our Government for its efforts to aid all people seeking freedom from communism; and be it finally

Resolved, That this mass meeting urges the Government of the United States to insist on withdrawal of Soviet troops, free elections and restoration of liberty to Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia to implement existing treaties, if a summit conference is called in the near future.

GEORGE KAPOCIUS, *Chairman,*
STANLEY P. BUDRYS, *Secretary.*

The Government's $10 Billion Gift to the Private Banks Last Year, and How Such Gifts Can Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last year the Government of the United States made a free gift of slightly more than $10 billion worth of U.S. Government securities to the private commercial banks of this country.

This will be a surprising statement to some people. If the Government gave away $10 billion under most of the methods of gift-giving, the country would hear a great deal about it, and we would normally debate such a matter in this Chamber at considerable length.

The statement is, however, in no sense a surprise to people versed in the banking system. This sort of thing has happened many times before. Indeed, the amount of the gift of last year is well known in banking circles.

Now, of course, using the term "gift" may seem to exaggerate the matter, because the methods by which $10.4 billion of interest-bearing securities were transferred from the Treasury of the United States into the vaults of the private banks are slightly complex. If this were not so, then, of course, the general public would already know about the matter; and we could expect that a great number of people would be considerably exercised about it. But the term "gift" is literally correct. The Government of the United States gave away these bonds and other interest-bearing securities just as surely as if a convoy of trucks had hauled them from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing directly to the vaults of the private banks.

The more exact amount of this gift is $10,410 million. It was made in several lots between November 27, 1957, and November 26, 1958. The source of my figure is the Federal Reserve Bulletin for January 1959, page 33. This is an official publication of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and it is available to all Members as well as to the general public. By reference to page 33, one may see that at the end of November 1957, all commercial banks in the United States held $56,910 million in U.S. Government obligations. A year later, at the end of November 1958, these banks held $67,320 million of Government securities. Thus the commercial banks increased their holdings of these obligations by $10,410 million within the 12-month period.

Before coming to the mechanics of how the Government put this $10.4 billion of Government securities into the hands of the banks, let me point out how the gift was distributed among the banks.

First, all classes of commercial banks shared to some extent in this gift. These include the New York and Chicago banks, the Reserve city banks, and the country banks. But 72 percent of these securities went to only 2 percent of all the banks in the country. And consider this—$2.3 billion went to only 18 New York City banks.

Now, how did the commercial banks of the country acquire this $10.4 billion of Government securities?

In a nutshell, they created the money with which to buy them. They created new money in this amount on the credit of the United States, which cost them not one penny. The Federal Reserve System gave the banks the wherewithal to create the money, and this meant that the banks could create the money automatically.

GOLDSMITHS OF OLD MANUFACTURED MONEY

More specifically, the Federal Reserve gave its member banks additional "reserves," and because of the fractional-reserve system on which the commercial banks operate, this meant that the banks could create several dollars of new money for each dollar of new reserves.

Now, for those who may not know about the fractional-reserve system, and how money is created under it, let me point out the elementary principles.

The best way to understand the fractional-reserve system is to begin with the operations of the goldsmiths who were the forerunners of our modern banking system.

There was a time—before there were any banks—when people who had gold usually took the gold into the goldsmith and left it with him for safekeeping. When a man left his gold with a goldsmith, the goldsmith would, of course, give the man a receipt, or claim check, for his gold. This receipt was supposed to mean that the depositor could come back and get his gold at any time. The receipts were transferable, so anyone having possession of a goldsmith's receipt was supposed to be able to present it to the goldsmith and obtain the gold.

What happened, of course, was that people who had these receipts found they could use them as money. In other words, people passed them from hand to hand in commercial transactions, without going back to the goldsmith to obtain the actual gold.

Furthermore, the goldsmith soon learned that the people holding these receipts rarely came in and asked for the gold, so he discovered that he could issue more receipts than he had gold. In short, the goldsmith began making "loans," and issuing receipts to people who had no gold on deposit. These receipts went into circulation as money, just as though the goldsmith had enough gold to back them up.

Each goldsmith was operating on the probability that all the people holding his receipts would not come in at one time and demand the gold.

As experience proved, the goldsmith could usually issue receipts in amounts several times the amount of the gold in his vault. The gold in his vault served the purpose of what today is called the bank's reserves. At least a little gold had to be in reserve to cover the possibility that some of the people holding his receipts would come in and demand the gold.

A pamphlet recently circulated by one of the big business associations claims that experience proved these goldsmiths could safely issue $10 in receipts for every dollar of gold. This is presumptive history, however, and is part of the bankers' current campaign to sell the idea that their own required reserves can safely be reduced to 10 percent. Actually, no one can say just how long the odds were that the old goldsmiths could safely play on. But we do know that this system of fractional reserves has given a great deal of trouble throughout its use. Most of the banking reforms and regulations which had been added over the years—including the Federal Deposit Insurance System—have been designed as safeguards against the trouble this system can cause.

PRIVATE BANKS MANUFACTURE MONEY

Today the private commercial banks create money in the same way as did the goldsmiths of old. The banks receive their reserves from the Federal Reserve System—not in the form of gold, but merely as bookkeeping credits. The actual gold is owned by the U.S. Government, buried at Fort Knox, and the Treasury simply issues certificates to the Federal Reserve System to back up whatever money the Federal Reserve System creates.

The Federal Reserve System operates on a fractional-reserve system, too. Under present law it can create money up to $4 for each dollar's worth of gold, or gold certificate. Under present Federal Reserve regulations, the private commercial banks can, in turn, create $7 on each dollar of reserves received from the Federal Reserve System. So, the potential money-creating ability of the whole banking system is $32 for each dollar's worth of gold—$4 created by the Federal Reserve plus $28 created on these $4 by the private commercial banks.

In considering how the commercial banks create money today, we must keep in mind that most of the money in use is in the form of bank deposits. This is what is sometimes called checkbook money.

Each time a commercial bank makes a loan or invests in a security, it creates money. It creates new deposits to the account of the person who receives the loan or sells the security. But the bank does not, of course, make any offsetting reduction in my account, your account, or the accounts of any other depositor. The bank that makes the loan may not, of course, be the same one to enjoy the increased deposits. The new deposits may go to some other bank or banks. But deposits in the banking system as a whole are increased. Furthermore, the person to whom the loan is made may immediately pay out the funds, but someone else's deposit account is increased, so the result is the same. New money has been created. The making of a loan or the purchase of a security by a commercial bank creates new money by that amount.

FEDERAL RESERVE GIVES PRIVATE BANKS RAW MATERIALS FOR MANUFACTURING MONEY

Last year, the percentage of deposits which the Federal Reserve System required its member banks to keep in reserve, on the average, allowed the banking system to create money up to $7, approximately, for each dollar of bank reserves.

As a part of its antirecession program of last year, the Federal Reserve System gave its member banks additional reserves on three different occasions. In February, the Federal Reserve Board reduced required reserves of all member banks by one-half of 1 percent. This gave these banks $491 million of added reserves, on which they could create new money at the rate of 7 to 1. In other words, on the basis of these added reserves the banks could create up to $3.4 billion of new money—by making loans or purchasing securities in this amount.

Then, at the end of March and the beginning of April last year, the Board reduced required reserves another one-half of 1 percent. This gave the member banks more reserves, amounting in this instance, to $495 million. This one-half of 1 percent reduction was also given to all classes of member banks.

Finally, later in April, the Board made another reduction for the banks in New York and Chicago and in the Reserve cities—which accounts for only 5 percent of all the member banks. This time the Board passed over the country banks. Reserves of banks in New York and Chicago were reduced by another 1 percent, and reserves of the Reserve city banks, by another one-half of 1 percent, giving these banks additional reserves of $462 million, which meant they could expand the money supply up to another $3.2 billion.

All of these reserves handed out to the member banks last year came to a total of $1.5 billion, on which the commercial banking system could create new money in an amount up to $14.5 billion.

In addition to these reserves which the Federal Reserve System gave the banks through reductions in required reserves last year, the System also gave these banks other great quantities of reserves through the System's Open Market Committee. But for our present purposes it will not be necessary to discuss these.

It is enough to point out that the $14.5 billion of money-creating power given the banks through reductions in their required reserves were substantially all used by the banks to acquire and hold an added $10.4 billion of U.S. Government obligations.

PRIVATE BANKS SHOULD NOT BE GIVEN USE OF THE GOVERNMENT'S CREDIT TO LEND TO THE GOVERNMENT

The official reason stated for giving out these reserves is that they were intended to help the banks meet business needs for credit. Actually, there was no expansion of business loans during the year, but rather a reduction of $1.5 billion. The money which the banks created was, as I have indicated, substantially all used to acquire interest-bearing obligations of the United States. If these obligations draw interest at an average rate of 3 percent, it will mean that this $10.4 billion gift to the banks will cost the taxpayers about $350 million each year in interest payments, plus, of course $10.4 billion if and when the debt is retired.

Now, I doubt if many serious students of our banking system object to the practice of allowing the private banks to create money to be used to meet the credit needs of business. True, the Federal Reserve has the power to create the money, and to some extent uses it. But when money is created through loans to business or individuals, some risk is involved. The creator of the money assumes a risk in making the loan, and this

is a matter which should be left to private banking decisions. We would not like the Federal Reserve System, a Government-owned agency, to have the job of deciding for which companies or individuals money will be created, and for which would-be borrowers money will not be created. It is better to delegate the Government's money-creating power to the private banks and let them use it for these purposes—within limits, of course, and with proper safeguards.

Personally, however, I have never been able to see any reason for allowing the private banks to create money on the credit of the United States to purchase interest-bearing obligations of the United States. In the purchase of U.S. Government obligations there is no function to be performed in separating the good credit risk from the poor credit risk. And the Government's credit which backs up its interest-bearing obligations is no better or worse than its credit on which the money is created. Finally, in creating money to buy Government obligations, the private banks perform no service for the Government which the Government cannot perform for itself—and without incurring interest charges.

Consequently, I am proposing that Congress take action to eliminate the abuses in this system which resulted in giving away $10.4 billion last year.

Recently I had a note from the research director of a large organization who asked for details about my proposal for eliminating the abuses in the private banks' use of the Government's power of creating money.

I have written the gentleman on this subject, and I hope the Members will be interested in my proposal. Certainly this abuse is no small matter. The $10.4 billion gift to the private banks last year was, for example, about the same as the total Federal deficit expected in the present fiscal year. As another example, it is a great deal more than the cost to the Government of all the farm price-support programs in the whole quarter-century such programs have been in effect.

Consequently, I invite the Members' attention to my letter as follows. I have not asked permission to use the gentleman's name, so I omit that.

FEBRUARY 17, 1959.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your note of February 11 concerning my proposal for raising interest-free funds.

Let me put the matter in its proper context. First of all, let me emphasize that Government securities should, to the maximum extent possible, be paid for out of savings. This means that every effort should be made to sell the securities to individuals and groups who have the money to pay for them, such as individuals, insurance companies, savings banks, pension funds, and so on. In other words, the securities should be sold to anybody and everybody except the commercial banks. Ideally all securities should be paid for out of savings, except to the extent that increases in the money supply are desirable to meet the needs of the economic system.

The practice in recent years has been, however, to sell a large percentage of the new security issues to the commercial banks, which means that the private banking system creates the money with which to buy these securities. For example, in 1958 the Federal Reserve gave member banks additional reserves sufficient to allow them to create up to about $14 billion of new money. About $12 billion was actually created; and $10 billion of this was used by the banks to increase their holdings of interest-bearing Government securities.

In every practical respect we can say that the Federal Government made a gift of $10 billion in Government securities to private banks last year; and this gift, which cost the private banks nothing, will cost the taxpayers about $300 million a year to meet interest charges.

The Constitution reserves to Congress the power of creating and regulating money. There is no doubt about this. The power upheld in the legal tender cases decided by the Supreme Court in 1871 and 1874, and upheld again in the New Deal gold clause cases of 1935.

Congress has, however, delegated this power. It has delegated it primarily to the Federal Reserve System. And it has given the Federal Reserve System authority to delegate the money creating power, within wide limits, to the private banking system. The power to create money is inherent in the fractional-reserve system of the commercial banks and this system is authorized by law. More specifically, however, the Federal Reserve has authority to change, within limits, the fraction of reserves on which the banks may operate. At present, money can be, and is, created both by the Federal Reserve and the private banks. The Federal Reserve may give private banks additional reserves, which automatically allows these banks to create money—at the present time up to a maximum of $7 per dollar of additional reserves.

Or the Federal Reserve can itself create the money in any of several ways. Its principal mechanism is the Open Market Committee, which operates a trading center at the New York Bank. The Open Market Committee may buy Government securities, in which case the Federal Reserve System gives the private banks added reserves in exchange for them.

I have dwelt on the mechanics for this reason. My suggestion, that when money is created to buy Government bonds it ought to be created by the Federal Reserve, is frequently met with the statement that it would be much more "inflationary" for the Federal Reserve to buy a given quantity of bonds than for the private banks to do it. Such statements are only intended to confuse the issue. The statement would be entirely true if the Federal Reserve simply bought the bonds and took no action to offset the added reserves given the private banks, but it is not sensible to think that it would not take such action. It could, for example, use its everyday mechanism of raising reserve requirements to offset the effects, or even more than offset the effects.

My point is that I can see no reason why the private banks should be allowed to create money on the credit of the United States to buy interest-bearing obligations of the United States.

The Federal Reserve System is owned by the Government and its income, including the interest received on Government securities, flows back into the Treasury. At least its net income, after expenses, flows back to the Treasury. Its principal expenses are about $130 million a year for free services—such as cashing checks—to the private banks.

The simplest and the most practical way of accomplishing what I propose is to pass an outright prohibition against commercial banks increasing their holdings of Government securities beyond what they have held in a base period—say the date on which the prohibition is passed. In order to take care of changes in the asset positions of individual banks, the prohibition would need to contain a proviso for individual adjustments. In other words, an individual bank could be allowed to acquire more Government securities as its capital account is increased.

In addition, another new authority would be needed. While the Open Market Committee can purchase and hold an unlimited quantity of Government securities, it must purchase these from the open market, not directly from the Treasury. The Federal Reserve Board, on the other hand, has authority in law to purchase securities directly from the Treasury, but this is limited to a maximum of $5 billion and, furthermore, this authority is intended for use only on a temporary basis. The Federal Reserve Board should then be given enlarged authority for purchasing Government securities directly from the Treasury.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

Troubles Galore That Only Work Will Solve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, the unemployment, underemployment, depressed economy, distressed families, all existing in various parts of our country at the present time, should engage our earnest attention and demand our best legislative talents until these problems are all solved by the Congress for the permanent benefit of our people.

My own bill, H.R. 3696, would tend to solve all these problems successfully, in my opinion, through bringing work into the affected areas. And work, not gifts or doles, is what our people need. Besides, my bill would require no appropriation whatever. Not one dime would the taxpayers have to put up to place my bill in operation. Still further, my bill would require no added bureaucracy. Not one added Federal employee would the taxpayers have on their payroll through operation of my bill.

And now, as an indication of the severe need of work and the existence of want in some of these depressed areas, I invite you to read the following article appearing in the Louisville Courier-Journal on February 17, 1959, written by John Ed Pearce about Harlan County, Ky. The article is as follows:

TROUBLE, HUMAN MISERY HANG OVER COAL CAMPS

(By John Ed Pearce)

Until a year ago, the Reverend Willard E. Smith spent his evenings visiting the sick or preparing Sunday's sermon for his Baptist church at Ages, a small mining town near Harlan. But these days Mr. Smith has little time for meditation, and his evenings, like his days, are spent in good works of a different sort. Seldom does he finish his evening meal before there is a knock on the door, and then Mr. Smith sighs, knowing the nature of the call, and feels again the helplessness that he has come to know so well.

The door opens on a spare figure in overalls and worn, shapeless jacket, hunched against the cold of the rain-whipped evening.

"Evening, Tom," says Mr. Smith.

"Howdy, preacher," the man replies, his voice the soft twang of the mountains. "I was wonderin' if you * * * if you had anything. * * *"

He hesitates, not wanting to put into words his plea for food, and Mr. Smith, knowing this, interrupts.

"I'm sorry, Tom. We just haven't received anything. There's some volunteer firemen from Louisville coming with some things next week, but right now * * *. Your commodities gone?"

"We got some flour," says Tom (he pronounces it "flar.") "And some of that dried milk."

FIVE DOLLARS, FIVE CHILDREN

Once a month Tom lines up and draws his ration of surplus commodities from the county welfare department—some flour, corn meal, rice and dried milk, and occasionally some butter and cheese. According to Federal calculations, these are worth about $5.20 a month. Tom has five children at home.

"The young uns," he says, "they * * * I was hopin'."

Beyond him, a car splashes down the worn road to Harlan, a momentary invasion of light and sound in the quiet, dark coal camp, and when it is gone there is only the sound of the cold wind and the dim bulk of mountains looming black against the wet sky.

Five years ago the coal towns around Harlan throbbed at night with noise and light. There were 13,000 men working in Harlan mines then, each bringing home from $22 to $27 a day, and there was money for new cars and good food and things for the house. The kids had new jackets and blue jeans and there was money for black skirts and bobby socks and for picture shows and the juke boxes.

But now the camps are in trouble. Since 1954 mine employment has slowly dropped (though it bounced back some in 1958) to about 5,500. Some of the big outfits, like Peabody, have shut down and moved away, and along the hollows around Evarts the camps—Verda and Shields, Benito and Kenvir—are idle.

To make matters worse, there is unemployment nationally, and where 5 years ago laid-off miners could go north to look for work, today laid-off factory workers are coming home to Harlan from Detroit and Hamilton and Gary and Cleveland, to draw their unemployment pay for 26 weeks and then join the long lines of job seekers. No one seems sure how many unemployed men there are in Harlan just now. The unemployment office says 2,700. State Representative Nick Johnson says 6,781, and his estimate seems more likely correct.

For Tom and his hungry children and the thousands of others like them are victims of deep changes in our national technology. Private homes have switched from coal to gas for heating. Railroads have gone to diesel. European countries are mining their own coal, and only the continued expansion of the electric-power industry keeps the coal industry in its presently static condition.

Competition for the tightening markets is keen. Only efficient producers, who can afford costly machinery, can survive. And Harlan operators, having no access to water transportation, are caught between high shipping rates and rising costs of production forced on them by John L. Lewis' increasing contract demands. It is this squeeze that has forced them to consider nonunion operation, and today the threat of a prolonged strike in the Harlan field hangs grimly over the coal camps, adding to the despair of men like Mr. Smith and the hungry members of his congregation.

For these men know that their troubles lie deeper than the greed or hostility of operators or union officials. Efficient production demands mechanization of the mines. Higher union wages, in the years following World War II, forced even small operators to replace men with machines, and today a man using modern coal-mining equipment can produce as much coal as 10 men did before the war. It will take a tremendous expansion of the coal industry to reemploy the nine men thus replaced by machines.

In the meantime, men like the Reverend Willard Smith struggle to solve a problem to which there is no local solution. Since December 4, as head of the United Church Relief, Mr. Smith has distributed 120 tons of food and clothing, and whatever cash has been contributed by fellow Kentuckians. But now he finds his supplies exhausted, just at a time when a new demand threatens.

"Come in, Tom," he says wearily, and the man steps reluctantly in from the wet porch. "I think I can find you a can or two of something."

He goes through the kitchen and returns with some cans of beans and a single can of tomatoes.

"It's about all we have left of the donations," he says. "I'm sorry."

Tom accepts them gratefully. Mr. Smith is a man of the Lord, but Tom knows that he is lying, and that the cans of food came from Mr. Smith's own pantry. He knows, too, that Mr. Smith cannot afford to give them, for the church can no longer afford to employ a full-time preacher, with so many of its congregation out of work, and Mr. Smith now runs a garage to make a living, though he spends most of his time "out begging," as he puts it, for food for his hungry people. But then Tom has five children at home, and they are, as he says, awful hungry. They've had nothing but flour biscuits and dried milk for 3 days.

SUFFERING HERE AT HOME

Mr. Smith sags into a chair and wipes his rimless glasses. He is a heavy-set, middle-aging man with thinning blonde hair. The trials of his fellow men have hit him with the shock that people feel who come into social work late in life, unprepared for its desperate realities and unable to view suffering objectivity.

"I tell you, they come up to me and they say, 'Preacher, we gotta have something down our house to eat,' and you see those children's hungry faces, and the women with tears running down their faces, all tired and beaten and hating to have to ask for things, and I tell you, I don't sleep nights. My wife, she keeps my records and helps me out, and last night she just sat down at the table and cried."

There may be reasons why, in this land of farm surpluses, the people in the coal camps must starve. Secretary Benson may have sound fiscal reason for insisting that the surplus commodity program be used not as a relief measure but as a means of balancing our warehouse surplus. But the reasons are not convincing in Harlan County.

"I just can't believe that Kentuckians will let other Kentuckians starve to death," says Mr. Smith. "I know that our economy here in the coalfields can't be righted with food and clothes. We need a lot of things. But right now we need help for hungry, cold people."

Let's Not Forget Power of Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Fred Sparks in the New York World-Telegram and Sun, of Friday, January 30, 1959:

LET'S NOT FORGET POWER OF FAITH
(By Fred Sparks)

Pope John XXIII has called the leaders of different Christian denominations to meet and discuss church unity. Perhaps it is presumptuous for a layman, but I pray if they meet they unite for the deepening ideological war against the Communist anti-Christ.

This could take precedence over ancient schisms. On this every minister and priest can unite in brotherly dedication.

The struggle against the regimented atheist is the most important item of free man's business in this century. Politicians might compromise with communism. Men of God, never.

To our shame the religous factor has been neglected recently as opponents of communism concern themselves with economic and political issues. Is the materialist forcing us to battle on this ground?

True, the Soviet and Red Chinese campaign against God has moved off page one, from violent killings to a more subtle slow death. This because Communists in absolute power no longer fear churches within.

Russia profits by allowing several kept, show churches to operate for foreign observation. They're kept because the minister is a public employee like a postal clerk. His sermons are censored.

China's Mao Tse-tung uses his kept show church to advertise his tyranny. He allows Moslems to tell the story of the prophet Mohammed—if they also tell the story of the prophet Marx. Church Christmas displays can feature Mary in the manger—next to Lenin in Red Square.

Today's naive American tourists are led by the hand like so many school children to witness Sunday services at a Moscow-kept show church. Then these innocents return, insisting communism allows religious freedom. They recall the blind man who grabbed the elephant's tail and said: "An elephant is shaped like a snake."

Tragically, few substantial voices are raised to give the lie.

A massive international conclave of Christian leaders could put the free world back on the spiritual level in its defense against creeping communism.

Flood Stresses Dam Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

[From the Bradford Era]

FLOOD STRESSES DAM NEED

As angry, icy waters swept destructively through western Pennsylvania's river towns and on down the Ohio, the public was reminded again that the flood-control program undertaken for this area 22 years ago is still incomplete.

In the aftermath of the historic flood of March 1936, the Federal Government planned a system of integrated dams and reservoirs extending into the headwaters of the Allegheny and the Monongahela Rivers.

Much of the work has been completed, with enormous benefits to the residents and

industries along the rivers. Army Engineers have constructed 10 dams and reservoirs in western Pennsylvania, 8 of them above Pittsburgh.

But one of the most important links in the chain of control remains to be forged. That is the Allegheny River reservoir above Warren, more commonly designated as Kinzua Dam. Congress first authorized this project in 1938 and a year ago appropriated $1 million to begin construction.

Work has been obstructed, however, by a long and tenacious fight against the project by various interests, including the Seneca Indians, who argue that the reservoir would deprive them of land in violation of a treaty. Valuable time is being lost pending a Supreme Court review of lower court decisions sustaining the Government's right to take the land in the public interest. The Indians would, of course, be compensated like any other American citizens whose property is taken for public purposes.

We are not prepared to argue the extent of which the flood's crest at Pittsburgh—29.21 feet—or at any other point along the Allegheny or Ohio might have been diminished if Kinzua Dam were in operation. That can be left to the estimates of the experts.

It is safe to say, however, that Pittsburgh and other communities would have suffered much greater damage this week if the Government had not undertaken its program 22 years ago. It seems equally plain that danger will remain until the program is completed.

The most important project in the uncompleted part of the flood-control system is Kinzua Dam. Anyone who doubts the urgency or the importance of completing the system needs only to look at the swollen rivers rolling ominously through the Allegheny and Ohio valleys.—Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

One Hundred and Thirteenth Anniversary of Milwaukee, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the great cities of our Nation, and the largest community in my own State of Wisconsin, the city of Milwaukee, recently celebrated its 113th birthday anniversary.

The milestone was appropriately observed by an editorial in the Milwaukee Sentinel, a newspaper whose 122d birthday will be celebrated this summer. I ask unanimous consent that the Milwaukee Sentinel's editorial entitled "113 Years Old," which was published on Monday, February 2, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTEEN YEARS OLD

Saturday was the 113th birthday anniversary of the city of Milwaukee. Incorporated on January 31, 1846, Milwaukee has grown from a village of less than 10,000 population to the 13th largest city in the United States with a population of over 700,000 and an area of some 80 square miles.

Yes, Milwaukee has grown in size and population and commerce and wealth, and it will continue to grow in these respects in the years ahead.

But the thing that makes the Milwaukee Sentinel—founded June 27, 1837, and thus 8½ years the city's senior—most proud at this birthday observation is the fact that Milwaukee, with all its growth, has retained a paramount interest in human values.

For all its size, it has retained the warmth and friendliness of the small town. Perhaps more than anything else, this is what makes Milwaukee unique.

Happy birthday, Milwaukee.

A Bill To Amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 To Encourage Basic Research in Science by the Allowance of a Tax Credit for Contributions and Other Expenditures for Basic Research in Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to permit an allowance of a tax credit for contributions and other expenditures for basic research in science. The bill which I propose would provide a tax concession with respect to contributions to universities and nonprofit organizations for basic research in science as well as a tax concession to industry for basic research in science.

The tax concession in the case of contributions to universities and nonprofit organizations would take the form of a credit against tax to the extent of 90 percent of the contributions made with a further limitation that the credit shall not exceed 5 percent of the tax. In the case of basic research activities by industry the credit would be limited to 75 percent of the expenditures with a further limitation that the credit shall not exceed 3 percent of the tax.

It will be recalled that the report to the President on basic research by the National Science Foundation, dated October 19, 1957, indicated that the Nation's basic research effort must be substantially increased. This bill, I believe, would give effect to the recommendation made by the National Science Foundation by providing increased financial resources for basic science research on the part of universities and other nonprofit organizations as well as providing a positive encouragement to similar efforts on the part of industry.

It is my firm conviction that encouragement of basic research by inducing contributions to organizations covered under this bill and by encouraging industrial expenditures for such purpose is preferable to a system of governmental grants. Under the provisions of the bill interference in research programs by the Federal Government would be kept to a minimum. In the case of contributions to universities and nonprofit institutions, there would be no interference in that under the bill a determination of what consfitutes basic research in science would be left to the conducing institution. In the case of expenditures by industry the bill would provide for the establishment of a certifying authority consisting of a board of eminent scientists appointed by the President on the recommendation of the National Science Foundation. Thus, there will be preserved in the Federal participation in the program, the point of view of the active scientific researcher rather than the point of view of an administrator of a Government agency.

It is my conviction that favorable action on this legislation designed to enhance basic scientific research in the United States would do much to assure the maintenance of our country's scientific and industrial world preeminence and is in the interest of fostering the improvement of humanity and the cause of peace.

Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959

SPEECH
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BAKER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4245) relating to the taxation of the income of life insurance companies.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I support the bill H.R. 4245. I do not contend that it is a perfect bill.

I was a member of the subcommittee which conducted hearings on the bill last fall. I know that we did our best in the subcommittee. I know the full committee has done its best to develop a bill which was fair to all segments of the insurance industry and to the policyholders and to the Government.

I hope this bill works. I hope it will be fair and equitable to all concerned. It is the best we could do, at least at this moment.

It was my privilege to be one of the principal advocates and sponsors of the provision in the bill which allows a deduction against operating gains for nonparticipating insurance equal to 10 percent of the increase in life insurance reserves attributable to such nonparticipating life insurance. It is my belief that this proposal will help stock life insurance companies to accumulate appropriate surplus and capital account that are necessary to provide solvency and financial strength to a growing insurance company.

In addition to this 10 percent adjustment it is possible that other similar adjustments should have been included in

this bill. However, I am sure that I speak for the entire committee membership when I assure my colleagues in the House that the Committee on Ways and Means will continue its study of this problem and will watch carefully the impact of this legislation on the life insurance industry and its policyholders.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Proposed Senate Committee on Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, impressive support has come for the resolution submitted by the two able Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD] to establish a Senate Committee on Water Resources.

The latest evidence of this support is from one of Oregon's outstanding editors, former Gov. Charles A. Sprague, editor of the Oregon Daily Statesman in Salem, as expressed in his column of February 11, 1959. I think all Senators will be interested in the views of ex-Governor Sprague, as they apply to the Murray-Mansfield resolution for a Senate committee devoted exclusively to water resources.

I ask unanimous consent, that the article written by Charles A. Sprague be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

Senators MANSFIELD and MURRAY of Montana have introduced a resolution to set up a Senate Committee on Water Resources. It would be composed of three members each from Committees on Interior and Public Works and two from the Committee on Interstate Commerce which reviews fishery legislation. The resolution authorizes the Commission to make studies on the following:

"(a) The character and extent of water resource projects that will be needed to be in operation between the present time and 1980 in order to supply the water use requirements of population, agriculture, and industry, including but not limited to navigation development and hydroelectric power generation, and with appropriate provision for flood control, and the realization of recreational and wildlife values.

"(b) The character of legislation that may encourage the adoption of new technical methods and improved process for increasing the usefulness of available water resources, including but not limited to weather modification, evaporation reduction, desalination of saline and brackish waters, seepage control, waste-water salvage, and the application of nuclear energy."

Previously America's waters have been run through many filters, both public and private. President Truman set up a committee, headed by Morris Cooke of Philadelphia, to study and report on our rivers. President Eisenhower set up a cabinet committee with the assigned task of tracing the use of waters from the mountaintops to the ocean. After much delay its report was submitted, which was the end of that. Resources for the future gave water resource problems a prominent place in its program for the Mid-Century Conference in 1953. The Hoover Commissions and their task forces studied and reported on the role of government in water resource development and on the designation of administrative responsibility therefor. Many private bodies and groups have wrestled with the problem of insuring an abundance of water for domestic use, farming and mining and manufacturing. The Montana Senators now propose a congressional inquiry, with a report to be made by 1961.

One thing is true; we can't increase the available supply of H_2O. The oceans have vast quantities of water, but it is salty. Ice covers at the poles lock up water in frozen form. Many humid areas have an excess of water, while deserts are parched for lack of it.

Another thing is true: water is used over and over again. It is not "consumed." Its form may be altered—it may go up in water vapor—or it may be contaminated; but in the natural cycle it comes back suitable for human use.

The real problem is one of obtaining water at low cost for use where people want to use it.

What has developed is a sharp conflict over how to use our waters and who shall use them for special purposes. Much of this controversy heads up in Congress or in administrative agencies like the Department of Interior, the Federal Power Commission, the Department of Agriculture. Similar controversies arise in States as groups become rivals for control of the use of water.

Whether the Senate committee can do much more than update the data and rehearse the proposals over water control is doubtful. If it could just write a satisfactory law dividing the authority between the States and the Federal Government that would be a worthwhile accomplishment.

So maybe the Senate should have its turn at the waterholes of the Nation, to see if it can find how to satisfy the growing demand for water at reasonable cost.

Spending and the Taxpayers' Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the public is becoming more and more conscious of the necessity for curtailing excessive expenditures by our Federal Government, thereby paving the way for balancing the budget.

In this connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial by Lowell Nye, editor of the Harvard Herald of Harvard, Ill.:

ARE YOU GOING TO LET IT GO ON?

(By Lowell Nye)

Two big spending bills breezed through the U.S. Senate during the weekend past—both of them far beyond the "balanced" budget offered to the Nation by President Eisenhower. One was $2½ billion for housing and the other $465 millions for airport subsidy. Three billion dollars—just like that.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, voted for the housing bill; Senator E. M. DIRKSEN, Republican, against it. Thus Mr. DOUGLAS demonstrates that he was not sincere when he championed the cause of economy in his utterances of the past few months.

If the Democrats in the Senate, led much too ably by LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, are doing all this merely to put a Republican administration on the spot so that some of this action will have to be vetoed, they are being completely irresponsible. They are betraying their trust to the Nation.

Do the people care? Is it the lot of this country to go through wild, unbridled inflation, merely because we won't write letters to our Congressmen and Senators asking them to vote no on this senseless spending?

Fortunately, the people still have a chance. Both measures referred to above now go to the House, where the citizen has more influence. Your new Congressman for this district is ELMER J. HOFFMAN, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

We are finding out—if we are capable of learning anything at all—that this policy of reckless U.S. spending is coming right back to our own pocketbooks. More money for postage; more money for social security; more money for income tax; as we say, right out of paychecks and our checking accounts and our billfolds. Can you deny it?

Major Amendments Needed in Davis-Bacon Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I join with my able colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], in offering a bill to amend the so-called Davis-Bacon Act, relating to the payment of prevailing wages on Federal construction work. A companion measure is being introduced today in the other body by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Senator MCNAMARA, of Michigan.

This law was first enacted in 1931, and was considerably revised in 1935 to represent what was then a comparatively effective instrument for preventing the purchasing power of the Federal Government from undermining existing labor conditions in the construction industry.

Since 1935, however, experience has revealed many drawbacks in the framework for administering the Davis-Bacon Act. In fact, changing conditions in the construction industry, and in the methods of Federal financing, has required a new look at the way the act operates today. That is the purpose of this bill; namely, to provide a basis for taking a new and more realistic look at the Davis-Bacon Act.

May I say at the outset, that major defects in the Davis-Bacon Act have become apparent over the years.

FIRST. ADMINISTRATION

It has been shown time and time again that the Secretary of Labor does not possess the necessary authority and responsibility to see that the Davis-Bacon Act is properly enforced. No right to

enter and inspect for violations now exists, as it does under similar labor standards laws such as the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act, granting the Secretary of Labor full power to investigate to see that there is compliance with these laws. Furthermore, the Davis-Bacon Act now fails expressly to charge the Secretary with the duty to find violations and to bar contractors from Government work for the prescribed 3-year period. Instead, these powers rest with the contracting officer or with the Comptroller General, with resulting failure in effective enforcement because of diffusion of responsibility.

SECOND. WAGE DETERMINATIONS

Since 1935, the Secretary of Labor has confined himself to determining the basic hourly wage rate as the only prevailing rate required by the act. Nowadays, however, this basic hourly wage rate falls far short of reflecting the actual hourly labor costs on construction jobs. Collective bargaining agreements throughout the industry now cover many additional payments for the welfare of workers—payments which did not exist in 1935. For example, most agreements in many areas of the country now provide for payments, on an hourly or payroll basis, to health and welfare funds, in order to provide much needed sick and hospital and medical benefits to construction workers and their families. Payments are also frequently required for pension funds, for vacation funds and for supplementary unemployment benefit funds. Many agreements also require payments to various training funds of direct benefit to journeymen and apprentices whose skills are the lifeblood of the construction industry and the mainstay of those who depend upon this great industry for their livelihood.

Recent surveys have shown that the payments to these funds are not only a substitute for direct wage increases which workers would otherwise have received as a part of their basic hourly wage rate, but in addition, that these payments now are a very large part of the hourly wage costs in the construction industry.

In the plumbing and pipefitting branches of the construction industry alone, there are funds in more than 68 of 100 cities surveyed by the U.S. Department of Labor. Payments to these funds run as high as 46½ cents per straight-time hour or as high as 12 percent of the basic hourly wage. Other crafts in other cities have negotiated even higher payments.

These payments cannot be ignored or discouraged because they exist to benefit workers for whom they are made. Yet they are ignored and discouraged. In fact they are completely overlooked in the present administration of the Davis-Bacon Act; the Department of Labor is telling the various contracting agencies that the prevailing rate, in one area after another, is as much as 12 percent less than the actual rate. Thus the Department of Labor is extending an open invitation to outside contractors to bring low wages and cheap labor into higher wage communities because these lower labor costs give them a successful bidding advantage on Government work.

This type of unfair wage competition was the very reason for the enactment of the Davis-Bacon Act in the first place. It is the purpose of these amendments to upgrade the act so that it will once more carry out its original purpose.

THIRD. OVERTIME AND PREMIUM PAY

Going hand in hand with fringe benefit payments are overtime and premium pay provisions now prevailing in most labor market areas across the country. These payments and all overtime, Sunday or holiday work were practically unheard of on Government work in 1935. Both the depression and the rigid 8-hour law combined to restrict all work to straight time hours during the normal working day.

But times have changed. The construction industry has been booming ever since the beginning of World War II and the 8-hour law has been waived on Government work wherever time and one-half is paid for overtime work each day. Common practice in almost all major cities in the country has been to pay double the straight time rates for overtime work and for work on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. These practices provide still another aggravating factor which the Labor Department has ignored in determining the prevailing wage rate under the Davis-Bacon Act.

FOURTH. COVERAGE

Today, and for more than 25 years, the Davis-Bacon Act has only covered direct construction contracts of the Federal Government. All other types of federally assisted construction have not been protected by the Davis-Bacon Act, except in those cases where the act has been extended to cover special Federal aid programs. Examples of this type of extension are the Hospital Survey and Construction Act—grants to States and local organizations for hospitals—the Federal Airport Act—grants to local agencies for airport construction—and various Federal housing acts—insuring loans or otherwise aiding multiple housing projects constructed locally. These extensions have been made largely on a "hit or miss" basis.

When the Davis-Bacon Act first became law, Federal aid to local construction did not exist the way it does today. At that time it was not important to cover all federally assisted construction. Nowadays, however, a very large share of the Federal construction dollar is spent by means of various types of grants, loans, payments, or guarantees given to local agencies of one type or another, and it has become increasingly necessary to cover these types of construction expenditures on a fair and permanent basis in order to make the Davis-Bacon Act once more fully operative in accordance with its original purpose.

To remedy these many defects, the bill I am introducing has four major objectives. They are:

First. To broaden the coverage of the present act to include: (a) All nonfarm construction in excess of $25,000 in value, at least one-third of which is financed by Federal funds, loans, payments, grants, or contributions; and (b) all federally insured or guaranteed loans for the purpose of financing any nonfarm construction program other than housing developments of less than 10 units.

Second. To modernize the term "prevailing wage": The Secretary of Labor would be required to predetermine, and Government contractors would be required to pay, not only the prevailing hourly rate as presently specified in the Davis-Bacon Act but also prevailing contractor payments to (a) health and welfare funds, (b) retirement funds, (c) vacation funds, (d) apprenticeship funds.

Third. To put hours of work and overtime on a prevailing basis: The Secretary of Labor would be required to predetermine, and Government contractors would be required to pay, the prevailing overtime rate for each construction craft on a daily and weekly basis including prevailing overtime practice on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays.

In addition, as a minimum requirement, contractors would be required to pay not less than time and one-half for hours worked over 8 per day, over 40 hours per week, over 5 consecutive days, and on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays.

Fourth. To centralize enforcement and create a construction appeals board: under this particular amendment, the Secretary of Labor would have (a) Authority to make uniform enforcement procedures for all Federal Government contracting agencies; (b) direct power—including the use of subpena—to investigate violations; and (c) authority to apply violation penalties, including authority to black list.

In addition, this bill provides for the creation of a Construction Appeals Board, appointed by the President, consisting of one representative from the public, one from contractors, and one from labor. This three-man independent board would be required to review and issue, as expeditiously as possible, final decisions on appeal from the (a) Secretary's wage predeterminations; and (b) the Secretary's findings of violations.

These four major amendments are necessary so that Federal money will not be used to destroy prevailing wages, hours of work and working conditions and to eliminate the present bidding advantage of unfair contractors in those areas where union building trades conditions are in fact the prevailing practice.

An Address on Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, one of the leaders and outstanding workers

in the field of human rights and understanding in the State of Nebraska is a young man of boundless energy and enthusiasm by the name of Neil B. Danberg.

Mr. Danberg is regional director of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in Omaha, and is active in working with the city government in its efforts to promote understanding and tolerance of all people.

Recently Mr. Danberg addressed the students at Westside High School in Omaha and spoke of the work of the NCCJ and Brotherhood Week, sponsored by this organization. Under leave to extend my remarks I include Mr. Danberg's address, and I recommend it to my colleagues and to all the readers of this RECORD:

ADDRESS BY NEIL B. DANBERG, REGIONAL DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS, DELIVERED AT CONVOCATION, WESTSIDE HIGH SCHOOL, OMAHA, NEBR., FEBRUARY 17, 1959

Today, with the whole earth a single neighborhood, we must find a way to realize in concrete terms our ideal of brotherhood. The distance between the ideal and reality can be measured in the numerous injustices that plague society. Injustices reinforce prejudices and discriminations. They are supported in the main by a mass of indifferentism and lack of concern. Persons who keep saying there are no problems show this height of insensitiveness.

On the other hand a person like myself who is constantly working with human relations problems may gain a perspective that overlooks the countless thousands who are good neighbors in daily experience. Each year, the National Conference of Christians and Jews makes three good neighbor awards in Omaha. The hundreds of nominations attest to the fact that many unknown persons do go out of their way for their fellowman. Their moral insight of compassion brings justice.

I am glad that in this school many have joined in our intergroup youth work. During the past year we centered our attention on the Indians living on reservations in our State. In our Nation's history no other racial group are forced to live apart on reservations. Here the moral wrong of segregation has taken its toll. The reservation at Macy, Nebr., has been described as one of the most destitute in the entire Nation.

Our youth group has made trips to the reservation. We have entertained the reservation youth both here in Omaha and at the State university in Lincoln, Nebr. Through this modest program many of you have come to know the modern Indian. The myths and misconceptions about the Indian of today have been dispersed. The stereotypes and prejudgments about the Indian, Negro, and other groups are tested out against a background of reality. Experiencing that it is not wrong to be different and feeling secure enough to be free to differ. Unity in diversity is possible as freedom is given in the programs of creative decisions on the part of the participants.

Through such experiences an awareness and sensitiveness to the needs of our neighbor is gained. At Christmastime 52 families on the reservation were directly aided by NCCJ. A workshop was held in the fall to deal with the lawless aspect of the Macy community. Unfolding are a host of opportunities for service, for action, toward correcting injustices.

Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM has recently lent his support to correcting the overcrowding on the reservations. Similar work and projects are carried out with other racial and religious groups. Intergroup youth is a widening horizon for its participants.

In our State, hate literature has hit an alltime high, an anti-Semitic editor keeps up his devisive writings, discrimination in employment drains off talent and serves as a gate stop for incentive. These and other problems make mockery of the religious truth that proclaims the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

We need to enlist more in our roll of persons of good will who work at various means to correct injustices. I am glad that on this Brotherhood Week that here in this school we have such a roll.

Brotherhood is more than a luxury, more than platitude, it has become a practical necessity. We have been increasing our control over the forces of nature but man has not learned to love his neighbor.

Why are men quick to believe the worst about their fellow man, to hold on to misconceptions, to accept injustices? I have found in countless talks given about our Indian neighbors that most persons do not want to accept their responsibility because it would make them feel guilty or uncomfortable.

Perhaps this is one of our tasks today, to present enough information at various levels to make people uncomfortable in prejudice and to make persons take responsibility for acts of bigotry.

Translating this great ideal of brotherhood into life is our great task, our main unfinished business that becomes everybody's business; peace and freedom itself depends upon it.

Speech by Hon. Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, at the Annual Saginaw County Lincoln Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to submit the speech given in Saginaw, Mich., at the annual Saginaw County Lincoln Day Dinner by Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona. Senator GOLDWATER presented the citizens of Saginaw with a powerful explanation of the damage done to our State by a labor dominated and controlled State government. The results of Mr. Reuther's handiwork has been the destruction of the very thing on which his strength is based, the industrial job opportunities available in our State.

The speech follows:

SAGINAW LINCOLN DAY SPEECH BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, REPUBLICAN, OF ARIZONA, FEBRUARY 9, 1959

It is a real pleasure to be back in Michigan.

This is a State of great beginnings—of great achievements.

As a youngster in Arizona I remember reading about the energy and initiative, the inventiveness of Michigan.

For years I have been driving your great automobiles across rough desert trails. I have been giving them mountain road tests that would make your proving-ground courses seem like Sunday afternoon drives.

And they stand up to it.

Yes, it's a wonderful State.

As I flew in it seemed there must be thousands of lakes here.

Water everywhere.

When I think of what we could do in Arizona with some of this water.

Solidarity House and its landlord you can keep. Just let us have some of the water.

In this month, when we are thinking especially of the name of Lincoln, we Republicans look back to the origins of the Republican Party here in your State. You are citizens of Michigan; I know you love this State. But perhaps you will allow us Republicans from other parts of the country to look with some affection and pride toward the State where began the party of Lincoln—this party of ours which has stood from the beginning for liberty, for the concept of the individual as sacred, this party of ours which has always believed in the full exercise of citizenship rights, without obstruction, without surrender of any part of these rights to any person, or to any group.

I am proud especially to be talking to Saginaw Republicans.

As chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee, I watch political trends down into the counties and into the townships. In the recent November election, you Saginaw Republicans showed vitality and a comeback power that made us proud of you.

In most areas of the Middle West, the Republican Party did not sell itself to the voters. Here in the Saginaw area, you did, and you did it very well. In Michigan, generally, the Republican Party was much better than nearby States where, in some cases, the party lost a Senator, a Governor, and control of both houses in the State capitol.

Your candidate for governor, Paul Bagwell, fought a great battle to turn back a trend. He was backed by a party finance organization which did a great job in the face of adverse economic conditions, and by very effective staff assistance.

Above all, Paul Bagwell struck at a very real issue—the destruction of jobs in Michigan—a loss of jobs which has resulted from the flight of industry to other States. Gradually the realization has spread in this State that industry is fleeing from a hostile business climate created by a Democrat Governor's alliance with a powerful and ruthless union politician.

Was the issue effective? Well, Paul did not overcome this 10-year cumulative trend at a single blow, but he took on a Governor who ordinarily runs ahead of his ticket by a quarter of a million votes, and when Paul was through with him, he stood a poor fifth on the ticket.

Political observers were watching the Governor's race in Michigan with special interest. It was thought that the Governor, whose eagerness to be President is well known, would have to run a very strong race if he were to be considered a serious contender for the Democrat nomination in 1960.

Political observers were looking at this race as a sort of popularity index.

When the election was over, political reporters across the country looked at the Governor's poor result and then marked him off the list of Presidential contenders.

Just a week ago, in Washington, their judgment has again been confirmed. A nonpartisan research agency took a poll of all the Democrats elected to Congress to find what man these leading Democrats would like to see as Democrat candidate for president in 1960. Two hundred and eighty-three Democrat Representatives and 64 Senators were asked the question. The man who looked so eagerly toward the 1960 nomination before the race for the governor's chair now is favored by only two of these

hundreds of national leaders of the Democrat Party.

The fact is, there are seven Democrat Representatives and two Senators in all, nine Michigan Democrats in the Congress. There seems to have been seven who did not express a preference for your Governor.

I believe that is as close to the bottom as you can get, without an absolute zero.

Bagwell was a great candidate, and he had a sound issue.

He took on Walter Reuther's candidate for governor and cut him to size. A fifth-place man in his own state. The fact is, Paul Bagwell seems to have put Walter Reuther's candidate for president completely out of the running.

For this, Michigan citizens owe Paul Bagwell a great vote of thanks. The rest of us, across the nation, owe Paul Bagwell and you Republican workers an even greater vote of thanks.

Now let us look a little more closely at the issue you Republicans had here in Michigan.

On the face of it, the issue looks like a simple bread-and-butter problem, something directly connected with the everyday problems of anyone in Michigan who works for a living.

Some who thought about the importance of this issue went no further in their thinking. They saw that the issue was genuine, and also that it spoke importantly to every man and woman in Michigan who worked, or who depended upon someone who worked. This was enough.

Now I invite you to review again with me, briefly, the genuineness of this issue, considered as a purely economic matter, for a constant effort is being made by the union political propagandists and the Governor to blur and confuse these facts.

Let me say now that the issue here in Michigan has two major aspects, as I see it. On the surface, and very immediately, it is an economic problem—one, as I have said, which touches very directly every citizen of the State. Underneath, and more important, it is a profoundly moral problem—one which touches vitally upon the civil rights of Michigan citizens.

As I talk to you tonight I am reminded of an evening more than a year ago when I stood before an audience of Michigan Republicans in Detroit. Will you forgive me if I recall briefly several things I mentioned that night, because they seem just as pertinent now?

A few years ago, in Washington, as some of us were reviewing the economic trends of the country as a whole, we were paying special attention to the great economic expansion in the country during the period 1950 to 1956, after the Korean war and under the new Republican administration. This period was before the recent recession from which the country is presently recovering.

Now, looking again at the period of great national economic expansion, from 1950 to 1956, we find that 46 States, big and small, increased their number of factory jobs. Almost no State was so backward that it was not carried along by the tremendous expansion.

Only two States in that period lost factory jobs. One was little Rhode Island. The other, surprisingly enough, was Michigan, a great industrial State which we in the rest of the country had come to look upon as a leader, certainly not as a backward and weak State.

Let me remind you that 1955 was the greatest year for the production of automobiles in the history of the industry. The whole Nation was reaching hungrily toward Michigan for more and more automobiles and trucks. Even 1956 was one of the best years in history for automobile sales.

This enormous national demand was directed right at Michigan and should have produced an unprecedented prosperity in the State.

Why, then, did the exact opposite take place? Why, instead of a great gain in factory jobs, was there an actual loss in jobs?

What sickness in this State could be so acute that even a great economic "blood transfusion" from the rest of the Nation would still leave Michigan anemic?

What was so unique about this sickness that not one other lagre industrial State was affected? Why, too, were even small and relatively undeveloped rural States, with no industry like automobiles to attract a national demand, nevertheless increasing factory jobs, while Michigan limped along at the end of the procession?

There was something profoundly wrong with Michigan's economy. That was clear.

We looked with surprise at this State of Michigan, propped up on all sides by the greatest demand for automobiles in the history of the country. How could Michigan be the only State in the whole Middle West to lose factory jobs, almost the only State in this country?

This was almost unbelievable, but it was true.

Now I have, for some years, had a special interest in the State of Michigan. Five years ago a group of Michigan union men came to see me in Washington, because I was on the Senate Labor Committee. They asked for help in solving some of their problems. They told me their civil rights were being undermined by certain politically ambitious union leaders in Michigan.

Now these men were strongly loyal to their union's economic objectives. But they felt that meddling in politics was not the job for union leaders, and they were afraid that they would end up by jeopardizing their economic gains unless certain ambitious union leaders could be kept out of politics.

Deeper still, these men resented having their union-dues money diverted into political slush funds. They had to pay dues to hold their jobs, but they did not believe they ought to have to pay dues money which their union leaders would use for politics, sometimes for candidates actually opposed at the polls by their own union members.

This, the union men told me, was an immoral thing. This, they said, was a basic attack on their civil rights.

I was impressed by the sincerity of these men from Michigan. They were not crackpots or union soreheads. They were solid, family men, one of them a member of the United Automobile Workers for 18 years. As Senator CURTIS and I listened, we could see their problem was real, and it was important.

As I began then to study the Michigan situation, I became more and more struck by the fact that there were elements in your problem here which were national in importance. Since then I have followed developments here very closely. I am convinced now that Michigan is being used as a laboratory, a testing ground, for something new in America, something, in my opinion, that is potentially deadly. And I believe this statement is conservative, based on a compelling array of facts.

The methods used in Michigan, and the results of these methods on the economy and especially on the civil rights of Michigan citizens give us a preview. A preview of what we may expect if these forces in Michigan spread their methods to the rest of the country.

It is Michigan's problem now, but it threatens to be soon the problem of the Nation. In fact, it has already spread to many parts of the country, but only in Michigan do we see this thing in its mature form. We can study here not only cause; we can study some of the results. Not all the results, mind you, because you may have worse to come in this State, if some strong measures are not taken.

Now we are talking about results. Let us look again at the disastrous economic record of Michigan in recent years.

We know that Michigan was the only State in the Middle West, one of only two States in the whole Nation which lost factory jobs between 1950 and 1956. I would remind you again that this was a period of unprecedented economic expansion throughout the Nation. I would remind you again, too, that Michigan's greatest industry, automobiles, was receiving an unheard of stimulus from a prosperous Nation at the very time jobs were disappearing from the State.

While the whole Nation was going forward, Michigan was going backward.

Why?

I believe I know the cause. Paul Bagwell spelled it out. But in the heat of a campaign a picture can be blurred. Statements and counterstatements can lead to confusion, doubt.

The political campaign is over, and it is time now to review again the facts.

Even now there are those who would deliberately confuse this picture. There are those, I regret to say, who have much at stake in covering up or distorting the actual facts.

The simple fact is that industry is fleeing from Michigan. And new industry which the State needs so badly is avoiding the State.

This is no temporary condition. This flight of industry is so great and so swift that it more than made up for the enormous demands made upon the automotive industry in 1955 and 1956. Some people who wish to confuse this picture for political purposes have tried to blame Michigan's economic predicament upon last year's national recession. How do these people account for the very great loss of jobs at the height of the national boom, before there was any sign of a national recession?

Michigan's problem arose before the recession. When the recession came, Michigan was the worst spot in the country. And now, with the rest of the Nation climbing swiftly again, a professor in your State university predicts that Michigan will still continue to have a large pool of unemployed. And for how long? For an indefinite period of time.

Michigan's problem arises within the State itself. That is clear. The attempt to blame Michigan's problem on the national administration was a shoddy political trick.

Nor can the problem, it seems, be related to the large role which the automobile industry plays in the Michigan economy. If this were true the State should have made great increases in factory jobs when the auto industry was at its peak in 1955, 1956, and 1957, which were respectively the first, the fourth, and the third best years in more than a half century of the automobile business. Instead, as we have seen, Michigan was losing jobs at this time.

What then is the cause?

Is this flight of industry and jobs due to an attempt by industry to escape paying Michigan's high wages? Well, it may be true in some cases that a combination of high wages and fringe benefits have put some Michigan business out of competition.

Such is not the case with the major losses you have suffered. The great automobile industry is moving out of Michigan to Ohio and Indiana. These are not low-wage States. Ohio, in fact, was the third highest wage-level in the United States.

I have read that the automobile industry has built 29 new plants in Ohio alone since the war. The industry is certainly not moving to Ohio and Indiana to escape high wages.

No, except for a few marginal cases, wage differential is not the cause for this flight of industry and jobs from Michigan.

Now, finally, there are some who deny entirely that Michigan industry is actually leaving the State. They claim that the

whole issue is artificial. They say it is a trumped-up political issue, without any real substance.

Now I have received a very interesting study by Professor Jamison of the University of Michigan. Professor Jamison shows beyond question that Michigan, once a national leader, has, since 1948, been falling behind the Nation in many types of industry—in furniture manufacture, in pulp paper and paper products, in chemicals, in petroleum and coal products, in rubber products, in leather and leather goods, in stone clay and glass, in primary metal products, in fabricated metal products, in electrical machinery and in transportation equipment.

According to Professor Jamison's report, Michigan not only has lost leadership in industries for which the State was once famous. It goes far deeper than that, Michigan is steadily losing across a broad front, big industries, small industries, and across a broad range of manufacturing.

What is wrong with Michigan's economy is not limited to any special size or type of industry. No, this sickness is general.

Only a few miles from Saginaw you have a great chemical manufacturer, Dow, one of the greatest in the country. Once this was a Michigan industry. You know that this great company has expanded its facilities not so much in Michigan, but outside the State. So great has this outstate expansion been that now less than half of the total assets of the company remain in the State.

You all know this company. You know this outstate expansion to be true. Only recently in my study of your State did I learn of this fact.

No amount of political propaganda can hide facts of such magnitude and importance.

Now we have talked of industry leaving Michigan. What of industry searching for a location?

Is the sickness which is driving industry and jobs out of Michigan also keeping industry from coming into the State?

Since I last spoke in your State, somewhat more than a year ago, several studies have been developed which seem relevant. One was produced by an independent research organization in Chicago, Market Facts, Inc.; another was developed by McGraw-Hill Research for the magazine, Business Week. I found these studies told me a great deal about the attitudes of manufacturers toward coming into Michigan.

In each case the research organizations asked top manufacturing executives to list specific States they would consider if their company were going to select a site for a new plant.

The McGraw-Hill study received replies from 263 executives.

Now how did Michigan compare with other sites as a desirable plant site?

Of the 263 executives expresisng an opinion only 3 considered Michigan a first-choice location. Only 19 would give Michigan any consideration at all. When the size and importance and industrial history of Michigan is considered, I believe you will agree this reflects an attitude toward Michigan which could be disastrous to the economy of your State.

My own State of Arizona, relatively new in manufacturing, received almost twice as many first-choice mentions as did industrial Michigan.

Now let us turn to the Chicago study. Market Facts, Inc., interviewed 113 top manufacturing executives. They were asked to compare five Great Lakes States as desirable plant locations, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

Market Facts asked the executives, as one question, to rate any one of the States as "worst." Do you know that every executive who gave a "worst" rating gave this rating to Michigan?

Now there is no doubt of the objectivity or the competence of either of these research organizations. Each has a national reputation, and each conducted their investigations with great safeguards to avoid bias of any kind.

Let us look at the opinions of these executives. Is there a possibility that their opinions would not necessarily be the same as their actions?

Well, there is a simple way to test their actions. We can look at actual plant construction in Michigan, and compare it with nearby States like Ohio and Indiana.

In the 2-year period, 1956–57, industrial contracts for construction in Indiana were a little short of $1 billion, $889,123,000. Ohio was larger with $921,678,000. This was a plant construction at the rate of $201 for each person in Indiana, $101 for each person in Ohio.

Michigan? Well Michigan's total plant construction in 1956 and 1957 was little more than a fifth that of Indiana or Ohio, and amounted to only $27 for each person in Michigan.

What does this mean to citizens of Michigan? It means that the plants not being built today will be the jobs that will die unborn tomorrow.

To the man looking for a job in Michigan today, this means no hope for new job opportunties tomorrow.

To the man who is paying taxes, the flight of industry and this failure of new industry to come into the States means this: The higher and higher taxes of Michigan will not be shouldered by a growing industry. The taxpayer will have to carry the additional burden which an expanding or incoming industry would otherwise have shared.

Now this is a bitter set of facts. And I hesitated long before deciding to address such an audience on facts which many of you must know better than I.

Yet I felt it might be useful for you to hear how these facts appear to an outsider—not entirely an outsider, I hope, since I have good friends in your State—but to one, not embrolled in the politics of your State, nor with any business interests here.

What facts I have seen convince me that your predicament is a matter not only of concern to Michigan but to the Nation. You are a great State, and what happens to you cannot be a matter of indifference to the rest of us.

Now, if you will be patient with me, I should like to proceed to the next step.

We have seen that the Michigan predicament is not due to the shore-lived national recession, nor to the dominance of one industry in Michigan nor even to the lure of low-wage structures in other States.

We have seen that the Michigan predicament is very real and that there is a widespread conviction in the rest of the country that Michigan is no longer a good place in which to expand or to enter with a new manufacturing business. The McGraw-Hill and Market Facts studies clearly substantiate the fact that these opinions are widespread among manufacturing executives whose job it is to locate plant sites.

It does no good to try to hide these facts. Such facts cannot be hidden.

A doctor who tells a patient with cancer that he is suffering only from a slight stomach ache, to forget it, and it will go away, is doing his patient no favor.

The doctor who tells his patient the cold truth about the cancer gives the patient an opportunity to take realistic measures for a cure.

Now I would not presume to take the role of doctor for the State of Michigan. You have men here in this State who have been telling you the hard truth about your problem. Men who know a great deal more about your State than anyone from the outside could ever know.

It is very difficult for men who live here, who love this State, who have known its greatness, to tell the hard story of its present condition. It takes courage, and it takes integrity.

It is easier by far, especially for men who have more ambition than integrity, to repeat the empty optimistic things. Easier by far, and more popular, to say it is just a little passing stomach ache, or to pretend even that it does not exist at all.

To have a leader who takes this line is to have no leader at all, if the sickness is really acute. Such leadership is a kind of betrayal of trust.

Paul Bagwell said the hard things to the citizens of Michigan. He ran better in the recent election, not worse, because of this. He did not win, but he ran better than any Republican gubernatorial candidate in years. He will win the next time, because he deserves to.

As a man of integrity, as a responsible leader, he spoke the hard truths. The citizens of Michigan can trust a man like that.

We come then to the big question.

We know the great natural advantages of Michigan. We know of the great resources, the power, the skilled men. We know Michigan industry is close to great natural markets.

None of these economic advantages has disappeared.

Now, what has happened in Michigan? Your State has not lost any of the great resources, the great economic advantages it had 10 and 20 years ago.

I'll say tonight again what I said in Detroit over a year ago:

What is wrong with this State is not economic. It is political.

Some politicians in your State have feared that the real facts—the truth—might become apparent to the citizens of the State. Not only have they, in turn, denied the problem exists, they have also set up false causes, and then, finally, they have turned to deliberate obfuscation.

They have tried to make this problem look mysterious. I have read how they set up study committees ostensibly to find out what is causing the disastrous Michigan decline, but I cannot believe they are actually mystified by this problem. They know all too well the cause.

Well-intentioned people seem to have lent their names to these committees and, without intending to do so, have helped politicians to keep alive the myth that this is a mysterious thing. What do these committees accomplish? They have one major, but unexpressed objective—"to take the heat off" the politician.

Now it is not actually very difficult to find out why industry is leaving Michigan, and why other industry is staying out of the State.

In each of these industrial organizations there is a small group of responsible executives at the top who make such decisions. They know why they decide one way or the other. There is nothing mysterious about the process.

And I can tell you this. Their decisions have nothing to do with political partisanship. In my own State of Arizona, both houses of the legislature have heavy Democrat majorities. Yet Arizona is the most swiftly growing State in the Union, industrially. At the same time Michigan was declining in the number of factory jobs, between 1950 and 1956, the State of Arizona was increasing 130 percent.

No, responsible business leaders cannot afford the luxury of party bias when it comes to economic decisions. It is their responsibility to go where the business will thrive, stay out of areas where the business will be harmed.

It is not because your State administration is Democrat. It is because the Demo-

crat Party in your State is a shell—merely a label—taken over by a special interest. That special interest is the United Automobile Workers. And I am not referring to the rank-and-file union members. I am referring to a few politically ambitious union leaders, men with a Socialist background.

These men own and operate the shell of a political party. They have retained only the Democrat label.

The key points in the party are manned by their crew. The machinery is fueled with union dues money from the general treasury of the United Automobile Workers.

This party in Michigan which still carries the label "Democrat" is so far to the left, so irresponsible, that even regular New Deal style Democrats find it very hard to accept.

Only last Friday Governor Docking, Democrat Governor of Kansas, made a public statement about the plight of Michigan. I saw the statement as reported in a Detroit paper. Docking said Michigan is completely broke because of a "bureaucracy" which has "run wild."

Now I ask you this, How bad does the situation have to be, for a New Deal Democrat to describe it as a bureaucracy which is running wild?

No, there is no mystery, no mystery at all, about the decision of business executives to move from this State, or to avoid the State, if they are already outside. No responsible executive could conscientiously expose his business to the hazards of a "bureaucracy running wild."

And I shall venture to suggest, furthermore, that businessmen would be better advised to avoid lending their names to committees set up to "take the heat off" leading politicians who are undermining a State's economy. May I suggest that such businessmen might better serve their State and their business by coming at once to grips with the real problem, which is political, and carrying the actual facts to the people. There is a responsibility to carry the whole story to the citizens of this State so that, better informed, they may make political decisions that are appropriate to the actual facts of their situation.

It can be understood why men in the business, for example, of selling industrial real estate might believe it in their short-run interest to obscure the real facts of Michigan's plight. It can also be understood why utilities executives whose rates are set by the State government, or leading educators on the State payroll, might find it difficult to resist an invitation from the executive office in Lansing to be listed on a committee, which is helpful to the public relations needs of the Governor.

How does any other businesman explain his presence on such a committee?

I have observed with interest the public statements of businessmen who declare their intention to get into politics. These expressions are very commendable. Businessmen, like all other citizens, should be informed and active citizens.

May I suggest as an elementary first step that these businessmen stop playing "footsie" with the forces of destruction? May I suggest that a little intestinal fortitude might be in order at this point?

Across America, in the fast-growing States, businessmen are getting into politics.

In my own State a successful businessman who had never held any political office ran for Governor and was elected Governor.

He fought a clean, hard fight, on principle. Imported union politicians threw everything they had at him and walked off the field with a bloody nose.

You are faced here in Michigan by a labor party, run by a small coterie of labor politicians, and disguised as the Democrat Party.

This political organization is completely ruthless and thoroughly irresponsible. The leaders of the organization make vital political decisions for this State, yet almost none of these decisions can be reached or influenced either by the voters, or by the union members.

Walter Reuther ran for public office only once. The voters had only one chance at him.

It was in 1937. Fresh from the violence of the sitdown strikes, flushed with victory, Reuther thought his prestige as a union leader could be transformed into political power.

Reuther and four other top officials of the union decided to run for city council in Detroit. And what happened? All were defeated.

Reuther ran 15th, out of 18 candidates. I don't know what was wrong with the three who ran behind him. They must have been objectionable in the extreme.

The union members in Detroit wanted Reuther as union leader; they rejected him as a political leader. This same Walter Reuther who could not be elected to the city council of Detroit, now goes to the national convention of the Democrat Party and exercises a veto over the nominations to the Democrat national ticket.

His is the hidden hand behind the policies in the State of Michigan which have brought this great industrial State to its knees, on the verge of bankruptcy.

The stranglehold of the labor politicians on the State of Michigan is a well known fact to businessmen across the country.

Just a year ago the representative of one of the greatest industrial organizations in America cleared the air—took all the supposed mystery out of this situation. The occasion was a meeting of industrial development people and manufacturers from five neighboring States of Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Ohio, and Michigan.

This industrialist told how industry is searching all over the United States for good plant sites. In Ohio, his company has built no less than 19 new plants in the last 5 years. In Michigan they have built only one. They are not planning, he said, to build any more in Michigan.

When he was asked why his company had decided not to build further in Michigan, he said, "Because of your labor government."

There was nothing mysterious about this decision.

Nor is there any doubt that this one industrial decision alone cost Michigan tens of thousands of jobs.

It does not seem to me to be necessary to set up a committee in an effort to discover what this man meant.

It is there, on the face of it.

What is necessary, is that the people of Michigan be given the facts.

Representative government is only sound when the political decisions are made by informed voters.

The great State of Michigan is bankrupt.

The executive is asking for new taxes which are estimated to add $38 to $40 million in taxes to the burden already carried by business and industry. How many more industries will decide to leave because of this new tax burden, no one can say.

The supreme court of your State of Michigan is adding its own special kind of nightmare to the businessman. A former United Automobile Workers organizer, now a justice on your supreme court bench, has just written an opinion which may, in effect, compel industry to finance strikes out of unemployment compensation funds.

This is the final touch. To convert the unemployment compensation fund into a strike fund, financed by industry.

If this trend continues, I venture to predict an increase in the departure of industry from Michigan. As your budgets and your debt become steadily larger, the industrial base which should provide tax revenue will grow smaller.

You will have larger and larger budgets on a smaller and smaller industrial base.

The man whose birthday we are honoring once spoke of such a situation.

Lincoln put it this way: "As an individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest, and next, no one left to borrow from; so must it be with a government."

It was true when Lincoln said it; the same is true today.

Lincoln Day is a mighty good time for us to be honest with ourselves. We must face and acknowledge our problems—not only in Michigan but across the Nation—if we are to solve them.

I can think of no better resolution for today in Michigan than to carry out to the people this idea of the greatest Republican of them all.

You have a great worthwhile task. The future of your State is truly at stake.

The economic problems of this State have an evil political root and it might well be the dedicated purpose of you all here tonight, as citizens first, and secondly as Republicans, to root out this evil cause of your great State's present discontent.

Every natural economic advantage which Michigan ever had, it still has. The economic problem of Michigan originates in a perversion of Michigan politics.

The problem can only be cured by sound political leadership.

In the final analysis, each citizen will solve the economic problem of Michigan alone—in the voting booth.

I wish you well. For success you will need some of the firmness, the devotion to truth, the dedication we knew in Lincoln.

Your task is formidable.

But the energy, the spirit, the inventiveness that always has characterized Michigan—this has not left the State of Michigan. You have not exported your courage.

The character it took to build this great State, will not fail to meet the present challenge.

You can do it.

Across the Nation, we others who are proud to follow in the tradition of Lincoln will be with you in spirit.

A great responsibility rests on you here in Michigan. For what happens here today can happen to the whole Nation tomorrow.

A Joint Economic Mission to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER W. BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks the following joint statement issued today by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW], and myself concerning the concurrent resolution which we have joined in introducing in this body and the other body today:

We are today introducing in both the House of Representatives and the Senate a concurrent resolution urging our Government to take the initiative in consulting other nations of the free world, including

India, about the appropriateness and usefulness of a joint economic mission to India.

This is the great moment of assessment, appraisal, and forward planning for India as it seeks means to complete its second 5-year plan and to set in motion its third plan scheduled to begin in 1961.

There is a wide measure of support for these dramatic and critically important efforts, not only in the United States, but also among other nations of the free world. The 86th Congress, acting on a bipartisan basis in both Houses, can give timely assurances to India of our willingness to explore with other free nations all effective means for joint assistance to India in meeting her vital needs for long term democratic growth.

The text of the concurent resolution follows:

"Whereas the continued vitality and success of the Republic of India is a matter of common free world interest, politically because of her 400 million people and vast land area; startegically because of her commanding geographic location; economically because of her organized national development effort; and morally because of her heartening commitment to the goals and institutions of democracy: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*: That it is the sense of Congress that the United States Government should invite other friendly and democratic nations to join in a free world mission to consult with India on the detailed possibilities for joint action to assure the fulfillment of India's second five-year plan and the effective design of its third plan; and that the Secretary of State report to the Congress on the feasibility of such a mission after consultation with interested governments and with the Republic of India."

Bank Credit Expansion and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, readers of the New York Times may have noted a letter to the editor by Dr. Elgin Groseclose in the issue of February 3, 1959. Dr. Groseclose is a noted writer and recognized authority on economics. The American Banker was quick to note the analysis of bank credit which Dr. Groseclose treated in his letter to the Times and has acknowledged the recognition it deserves in the following editorial of February 6, 1959:

BANK CREDIT EXPANSION AND INFLATION—A MORAL ISSUE

In the letters column of the New York Times during the past few days an exchange of letters has appeared dealing with inflation from two radically differing viewpoints.

First appeared a letter from Professor Emeritus Alvin H. Hansen, of Harvard University in which he pointed out that a characteristic of the American economy is that wholesale prices have been rising for a good many decades, and the prospect that they may continue to rise a couple of percentage points more or less annually should not be regarded as abnormal or unduly disconcerting.

In reply there came to the Times a letter from Dr. Elgin Groseclose, also an economist of national stature, in which he discusses the Hansen thesis of complacency and remarks that "a disease is not the less serious because it is chronic."

Then in an enlightening discussion of the underlying causes of this disease, Dr. Groseclose puts the finger of blame upon our predilection for expansion of bank credit in a degree which has exceeded the rate of the Nation's growth. Commercial bank deposits, he notes, increased 17½ times between 1890 and 1930, while pig iron production rose 4½ times; exports 5 times, coal production 5 times, and freight traffic 5 times.

CREDIT UP; GOLD RATIO DOWN

The increase in bank credit was accompanied by a lessening of the ratio of our gold stock to bank deposits, which had dropped from 23.9 percent in 1880 to 20.4 percent in 1900, 14.2 percent in 1910, and 10.4 percent in 1930.

Other fuels than coal, of course, have entered our economy, and other metals besides iron and other transportation besides freight. But still the spread between the rate of growth of the 3 basic industries cited, which was 4 or 5 times in the 50-year period, and the 17½ times growth of bank deposits appears excessive. It is more than a coincidence that in the same period, prices of things were rising along with our supply of bank credit.

Dr. Groseclose does not pursue this point further, but any one familiar with the history of the years since 1930 knows that the expansion of bank credit since the devaluation of the dollar in 1933–34 has been at an accelerated rate, and that prices generally have more than doubled.

A dwindling of our gold ratio below 14 percent has been pointed to in the past as a danger sign, and so it proved in the early 1930's. Whether it may prove so again if present trends of bank credit inflation and gold outflow continue is one of those questions about which we can speculate but never surely predict.

Meanwhile, it is true that we progressively have monetized an increasing volume of capital credits in our banking system. Inflation has been the inevitable attendant effect. And we continue to do so in the degree that U.S. Government securities, other governmental bonds, stock collateral loans, mortgages, consumer credit, industrial long-term credits, and other capital loans, become part of our commercial banking structure in excess of the true savings balances of these banks. In Europe, after the inflations of the 1920's, the currency depreciative effect of wartime monetization of capital assets became recognized clearly as an evil which banking systems must avoid. But how easy it has been to fall back on the opiate of increase in bank credit as a substitute for increase in savings capital.

THE MORAL QUESTION

In his letter's close Dr. Groseclose writes: "Regardless of whether rising prices, with their stimulus to business venture, or cheapening prices, with the incentives to consumption and their distributive effects on the possession of goods, is the better condition for the economy, it seems to many that the issue must be decided on other grounds: any process that is morally dishonest cannot be good in the long run for the economy or for the people of the country, and deliberate inflation is morally indefensible.

In any case, we have again the historical record of the effects of the inflationary process in the repeated breakdowns of the credit mechanism, the successive panics, crises and depressions with their consequences of bankruptcies, foreclosures, unemployment, breadlines and social unrest. We may mention those of 1873, 1879, 1890, 1893, 1907, and that of 1930, to which many serious historians attribute the onset of World War II and its fatal consequences."

The points made by Professor Hansen and Dr. Groseclose are basic to the policy decisions which are being made in Washington this year. The President's new Committee on Inflation, which Vice President NIXON has been named to head, is throwing its weight on the side of a stable dollar and viewpoint which Dr. Groseclose voices. We do not believe that every thinking banker needs must uphold this new committee's hand.

A Bill Which Proposes Congressional Procedures for Handling Contempt of Congress Citations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which will amend section 194 of title II of the United States Code to provide in substance that all contempt citations which issue out of a House committee will be referred to the House Judiciary Committee for its study, recommendations and report to the House. Contempt proceedings are serious and should not be lightly entertained. If the present House procedures which treat them casually without adequate study are not changed the House will continue to find it difficult to have contempt citations enforced by the courts in judicial proceedings. The result will be that the investigating powers of the House will continue to be badly weakened. It is the basic prerogative of the Congress to investigate and legislate in legitimate areas of inquiry. This is not an unlimited right. It is subject to reasonable and necessary restraints which are contained in the same instrument which created this legislative prerogative, the Constitution. In its search for information it is necessary for the Congress to bring before its committee forums hundreds of citizens to testify and to relate their experiences pertinent to the legislative matter in question. If we in the Congress are to perform the duties prescribed for us by the Constitution, it is essential that we have the help and cooperation of all our citizens. We must have respect from the people for our congressional investigative committees for from a healthy respect comes the necessary cooperation. To gain this respect, we in the Congress must in turn respect the individual rights of all citizens who appear before our fact-finding committees to encourage the necessary rapport between the investigator and the witness. It is absolutely essential that we set up proper procedures that will strike a proper balance between committee rights and obligations arising from its legislative power and the rights and obligations of our individual citizen. The very nature of a contempt proceeding denotes disagreement between the investigator and the witness. This disagreement could be the result of one or many complex reasons. It could result from a disregard and disrespect for a duly constituted legislative investigative body. The question then arises what has occasioned this disrespect

for a particular committee. When allegations are made that a committee has itself violated the individual and constitutional rights of a citizen who has appeared before its committee then a legitimate point of inquiry is raised which forms a very important part of the bundle of facts leading up to the request by the committee for a contempt citation.

Is the citing committee an appropriate judge of its alleged abuse and disregard of the rights of the individual witness? I submit that it is not. Is it consistent with our basic sense of fair play to permit the accuser to try and find guilty the accused of an act which may have been the consequence of the accuser's act? To ask the question is to answer it. What then is the solution? A possible solution lies in a fair and impartial congressional review by an appropriate House committee. I submit that the House Judiciary Committee in this instance would be an appropriate committee for review. Under present House rules it is possible for the particular committee in question to come before the House with its request for the contempt citation of an allegedly recalcitrant witness to present the matter under a rule limiting debate where only one point of view is presented and to secure House action on such a serious matter without a full inquiry into all of the facts leading up to the committee's request for such citation. The allegation has been made that a particular House committee has violated House rules of procedure and disregarded the individual rights of the particular witness. Then it is appropriate and necessary for the House of Representatives to make inquiry into these charges to determine their validity or invalidity as the case may be. The House must determine for itself whether one of its committees has exceeded the bounds when a report and resolution for a contempt citation is presented to it by one of its committees. It should consider among other things, first, what are the limits of the constitutional authorities of the Congress to investigate; second, what is the extent of the jurisdiction that the House granted to the committee involved; third, has the committee followed the rules of procedure established by the Congress in conducting the investigation and which gave rise to the alleged contempt. The failure of the House of Representatives to thoroughly consider each request for a contempt citation has resulted in the judicial reprimands contained in the Watkins decision and the Arthur Miller case and others. The review of each request for a contempt citation by an impartial third party will make each of us more aware of the constitutional rights of our citizens who appear before our committees and the duties which they demand for their protection and preservation. It will then be self-discipline that will thwart possible congressional committee abuses rather than attempt by the judiciary to discipline the Congress. If this is done the constitutional rights of our citizens will be preserved and the dignity and integrity and powers of the Congress will be maintained. I earnestly suggest, Mr. Speaker, that my proposed bill will fill the obvious needs as above outlined. I am hopeful that the Congress will act upon this bill this year.

The Filibuster Debate—Barrier Against Steamrollers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the January 8 issue of the Reporter there appeared an article entitled "The Filibuster Debate — Barrier Against Steamrollers." This most objective analysis was written by Mr. Lindsay Rogers, who has been the Burgess professor of public law and government at Columbia University since 1929. I request unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, since it makes a distinct contribution to the debates on this issue which took place earlier this year.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FILIBUSTER DEBATE—BARRIER AGAINST STEAMROLLERS

(By Lindsay Rogers)

"The Senate of the United States is the only legislative body in the world which cannot act when its majority is ready for action." Thus Woodrow Wilson early in 1917 when a Senate filibuster killed his proposal to arm American merchant ships. The "little group of willful men" were successful only because we then had "short sessions" of Congress that had to come to an end on March 4. The check was not a catastrophe. The ships were armed under authority conferred by an old statute that had been forgotten.

In 1917 the Senate was powerless to end a debate so long as any Senator insisted on holding the floor, but debate can now be ended by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn. It is this much debated rule XXII that the northern liberals hope to change in order to prevent southern Senators from using a filibuster to prevent the passage of drastic civil-rights legislation.

The northern liberals proposed two amendments. The first of these is that 2 days after a petition has been filed to end debate, two-thirds of the Senate present and voting may so decree. This is not very important; if such a cloture resolution were up, practically all of the Senators duly chosen and sworn would be present and vote. But the northern liberals have a further proposal; that 15 days after the filing of a petition to end debate, a majority of the entire Senate may so decree. Garrulity would still be permitted; each Senator could speak for an hour, but under such circumstances only the filibusterers would do so. Then a vote. No longer could a filibusterer interpose a veto as it is sometimes done in the past.

Such a change in the rule would, I think, be a mistake. Not so, says retiring Senator Irving M. Ives, Republican, of New York, who maintains that the principle of majority rule is at stake. It is only in the Senate of the United States, exclaims Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, that an opposition must be beaten down by physical exhaustion and where the medieval practice of trial by ordeal still survives.

With great respect to Senator IVES, the term "majority rule" is meaningless as he uses it. Does he want to amend the Constitution so that the Senate would advise and consent to the ratification of a treaty by a majority instead of a two-thirds vote? Is he uneasy because of the theoretical possibility that the minority which defeats a treaty (or a proposed constitutional amendment) might come from the 17 smallest States with a total population less than that of New York? Or that a Senate majority might be drawn from 25 States with a population of less than 29 millions? We elect Presidents not by a national popular majority or even plurality, but by counting the ballots federally; each State's presidential electors do the choosing. Fifty-one percent may be a numerical majority, but in many cases it is not the majority that our constitutional practices contemplate. Our Federal arrangements take account of what has been called "the gravity and the impact of the decision." Thus, when one great section of our country opposes a proposed decision, attention may well be paid to gravity and impact.

And when Senator CASE brands the Senate as the only legislative assembly in which verbal avoirdupois plays a role along with numbers, so what? The northern liberals have sometimes insisted on trial by ordeal. Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, boasts that in 1954 he "spoke for 3 days against the offshore oil bill and in 1956 for 4 days against the natural gas bill. In each case, with my colleagues of the so-called liberal group, we kept the discussion going for approximately a month." Mr. DOUGLAS applauds "stunts such as Senator MORSE's record-breaking 22½-hour speech delivered without sitting down or leaving the chamber." The stunters were not attempting to prevent a vote from being taken. They simply believed that in these cases many of our colleagues were not fully acquainted with the real issues which were at stake. This is not a veto, Mr. DOUGLAS insists, but only an endeavor to educate Senators who were poorly informed. I would allow a substantial group of Senators who are well informed who come from a great section of the country, and who are united in purpose, to impose a veto unless two-thirds of their colleagues are prepared to overrule them.

BLOCKING THE STEAMROLLER

Gladstone called the Senate the most remarkable of all the inventions of modern politics, and it has remained remarkable in that, contrary to the fate of practically every other upper chamber, it has not become secondary and suffered a loss of authority either by constitutional amendment or by custom. It is the only legislative body in the world made up of representatives from commonwealths no one of which, without its consent, can be deprived of its equal representation and whose rights, even though steadily dwindling, still remain substantial. Where in other assemblies is there anything resembling our Senate's rule that its Members must not refer offensively to any State of the Union?

The filibuster is a weapon that the constitutional framers who constructed the Senate failed to anticipate but one that they would view with favor. "A dependence on the people is, no doubt, the primary control on the Government," No. 51 of "The Federalist" tells us, "but experience has taught mankind the necessity of auxiliary precautions." The framers sought to have "in the society so many separate descriptions of citizens as will render an unjust combination of the majority of the whole very improbable, if not impracticable." The filibuster is no more

than a modern auxiliary precaution against what one more than one-third of the Senators may consider an unjust combination of the majority; and I am not impressed when I am told that no other legislative body in the world allows a minority to have such a formidable weapon of defense.

With us the Executive holds office for a fixed term and never appears before the Legislature to account for his actions. Hence, it is an auxiliary precaution that there be some place in the congressional system at which a party steamroller will meet an effective barrier. The House of Representatives cannot serve this purpose. There, debate is often more severely limited and freedom of decision is more restricted than in any other legislative chamber in the world. A two-thirds majority can suspend the rules, and after 40 minutes of discussion, it can pass a measure with no opportunity to offer amendments. A special order from the Rules Committee can allocate time for debate between the majority and minority and require that the House can say only "Yes" or "No." Since the Senators number only 98 and show more qualities of prima donnas than do Representatives, they would refuse to shackle themselves as do Members of the House when they approve a special order from the Committee on Rules; Senators would insist that they be permitted to vote on amendments. But without the possibility of parliamentary obstruction—that is, filibustering—a party steamroller, driven by a President and party leaders, could on occasion move almost as ruthlessly on the Senate side as it does on the House side of the Capitol.

Thirty-odd years ago in a book called "The American Senate," which now occasionally enjoys what William James called the immortality of a footnote, I argued the case for the filibuster. I began the book during the Harding administration and finished when Coolidge was in the White House—the era of the Teapot Dome scandals. The Republican Party machine was then powerful enough to prevent any investigation by a House committee, and Republicans in the Senate were not anxious to uncover wrongdoing. The Republican leaders knew that Senator Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana, and other Democrats could hold up important business; hence they had to consent to the thoroughgoing inquiry that was demanded. As to whether the threatened filibuster that brought about this result was in the public interest, it is sufficient to remark that 3 out of 10 Cabinet members were permitted or pressed to resign, and that there were several indictments and 2 suicides.

Those desiring Federal civil-rights legislation talk a great deal about the high-handed behavior of a minority. The Southern Senators, it is charged, are able to defy not only a majority in the Senate, but a majority in the country at large. Probably a majority in the country at large is willing for more civil-rights legislation to be passed, but we must not forget that one of the main reasons the framers of the Constitution provided two Senators for each State, large or small, was precisely in order to protect the rights of sections against a majority in the country at large.

December 5, 1958, marked the twenty-fifth anniversary of an event on which the Northern liberals might pause to reflect: the end of national prohibition, which was, perhaps, in President Herbert Hoover's phrase, an experiment noble in motive but which was certainly a spectacular and disastrous failure. In 1918, when the State legislatures began to vote on the proposed prohibition amendment, saloons were illegal in approximately 90 percent of the area of the Nation, which contained nearly two-thirds of the population of the country. Temperance societies and the Anti-Saloon League (the most powerful pressure group that ever worked on Congress and State legislatures) insisted that aridity be complete. The drys marched to a battle that they won. Then they lost the war.

One concluding observation. Ours is the only major country with a two-party system where the laws that get on the Federal statute books, or that fail to get there, usually have bipartisan support and bipartisan opposition. In academic quarters one sometimes hears laments that American political parties are not "disciplined"; that their leadership is sometimes shadowy or undiscoverable, and that they do not present to the electorate clashing bodies of doctrine. But in a country as vast as the United States, with different sectional interests, a political providence has been good in seeing to it that a party majority does not pass party legislation which is opposed by a powerful and determined party minority; that on policies our parties prefer concessions to Pyrrhic victories. The filibuster is undemocratic if democracy means that anywhere, and particularly in a Federal system, any majority should be able to do what it wishes on any issue at any time. Do the northern liberals thus define democracy? Federalism was the means of forming the Nation and it remains the means of preserving it. Congress, as well as the Supreme Court, is the Federal system's manager, and a Senate filibuster, is well worthwhile if, on occasion, it prevents the congressional manager from being tyrannical.

Social Security Benefits Should Be Tailored to Current Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an excellent editorial which appeared in the January 29 issue of the Gratiot County Herald, a weekly newspaper in my district, commenting on the social security program as well as one of the bills I recently introduced to amend the Social Security Act:

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS SHOULD BE TAILORED TO CURRENT CONDITIONS

Congressman ALVIN M. BENTLEY took another look at the social security legislation he had introduced early in the present session of Congress and decided to withdraw it and substittue a bill incorporating only the second section of his original proposal.

The section which he deleted would have required all income, from whatever source, to be included in the earned income subject to limitation. The second section raised the maximum earned income of a person drawing social security benefits from $1,200 per year to $1,800.

What apparently happened was that BENTLEY felt that the social security program was primarily an insurance program, that an arbitrary and fixed retirement age was not sound or realistic and that there was a question of whether people of sound mind and body should be forced to retire from gainful employment upon reaching their 65th birthday, if they desired to avail themselves of the benefits of social security. He stated that his original bill was primarily for the purpose of focusing attention of Congress on what he believed to be inequities and unsound concepts of the present law.

In some respects we agree with him. But on the original purpose of the law, we must differ. We are in entire agreement with BENTLEY's action in withdrawing his original bill and introducing a bill which would raise the maximum amount a person could earn, while drawing social security, to $1,800.

The difference in the purchasing power of the dollar, from the date which the social security program was first adopted, to the present, would certainly justify such an advance.

Going back to the original purpose of the social security program, we must consider the conditions under which it was proposed and adopted in the thirties.

At that time unemployment was very high and, as we understand it, one of the chief purposes of social security was to take older men out of regular employment through old age benefits, in order to make room for younger men in the available jobs.

It wasn't merely a matter of setting up an insurance program as such, but was tailored to meet a very serious unemployment problem. That was the reason for limiting the amount a person could earn who had reached the age of social security eligibility. The amount he received for rents, investments, and so forth, had no bearing on his allowable earned income. Whether or not he was holding down a job and was earning more than $1,200 through this job or a combination of jobs and thus depriving others of gainful employment, was the determining factor.

We believe the same fundamental principles hold true now. In this way a person who has saved during his productive lifetime and made sound investments—in a retirement plan, in a farm, in rentable property, or in industry, is not penalized for his thrift and foresighted planning for his later years. And the present law encourages him to do just that—at least it does not discourage him from attempting to provide for his future. Such a program also enables older people to maintain a better standard of living and a higher rate of spending in their later years and thus remain a boon to the general economy of the Nation, rather than forcing upon them a marginal existence in which they might become public wards in the event of any unforeseen exigency.

On the other hand, we have never been able to justify in our minds the lifting of all restrictions on earned income when a person reaches the age of 72. Actually, there are probably few who would seek full-time employment at that age, and few of those who sought it would find it. But if the principle of encouraging men to drop out of the labor market at 65 is sound, we can see no reason for providing that they can reenter it at 72 and continue to draw social security.

In the light of the original dual purpose of the law, BENTLEY's new proposal to raise the maximum amount of allowable earned income for persons who wish to qualify for social security, takes care of the greatest weakness under present-day conditions. To remove any earned income restrictions would defeat entirely the one, and perhaps the most important objective of social security. It certainly would be a mistake under current unemployment conditions.

To prohibit any earned income would also be a mistake. In allowing a person to earn up to a set amount, less than that required for his entire support, the law recognizes that the social security program is a means of supplementing the income of those who have made some provision for their later years, and permits many to retire from the active labor market who would not be able to otherwise.

Another adjustment that may be warranted in years to come, particularly if the inflation spiral continues, is further increased benefits to retired and qualified workers.

There have already been several adjustments. Funds for such increases have come from larger payrolls and a higher taxable income. This year the taxable income was raised from $4,200 to $4,800 and the percentage of tax raised from 2¼ to 2½ percent for employees and employers. Further adjustments may be necessary in this regard; in fact, are already scheduled.

One other revision has been proposed that should receive thoughtful consideration, depending upon the effect of technological advances on the employment of available labor in the future. This is the matter of reducing the age of eligibility from the present 65.

No matter what the theoretical conclusions, some minimum age limitation seems mandatory from the practical standpoint. And if through automation, there develops what seems to be a permanent and abnormal surplus of labor, then perhaps lowering the eligible age for maximum benefits to 60 should be considered.

The Future of Junior Colleges in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in an address before the California Junior College Association, Dr. Roy E. Simpson, superintendent of public instruction in the State of California, presented a strong case for the expansion of public junior community colleges.

I think anyone interested in the future development of American education will find Dr. Simpson's remarks of great value. Consequently, I commend it to my colleagues for their careful consideration.

The address follows:

THE FUTURE OF JUNIOR COLLEGES IN CALIFORNIA

(By Dr. Roy E. Simpson)

In the next few minutes I wish to discuss with you something about the importance of public junior colleges for higher education in California, their contributions to vocational education, and the record of success of junior college graduates who continue their schooling at the University of California. Throughout the Nation the public junior colleges of California have long been notable for the size of their student bodies, the range of their offerings in both terminal and preprofessional fields, the competence of their professional staffs, and the facilities for instruction provided by the districts which maintain them. Like all institutions of higher learning, the junior colleges are facing shortages of instructors, overcrowded classes, and difficulties in providing equipment and facilities for their laboratories, libraries, and shops.

The Liaison Committee of the Regents of the University of California and the State board of education has before it the recommendation for consideration for submission to its parent bodies that priorities for the establishment of any additional campuses of the university or State colleges should be predicated on the assumption that adequate junior college facilities have first been provided. Personally, I am heartily in favor of such a policy. Junior colleges are not engaged in competition with State colleges or branches of the university, but are an indispensable foundation for higher education in California. Already the public junior colleges are caring for three-fifths of all lower division students in California with the remainder distributed among the 4-year institutions as follows: on the campuses of the University of California, one-ninth; among the State colleges, one-eighth; and in all the private colleges and universities, one-sixth. Within the decade we are now considering the total number of high school graduates will double the 100,000 we had in June of this year. Since neither the State colleges nor the university considers expansion of their facilities to accommodate such tremendous increases in lower division students the responsibilities of junior colleges become evident. More State resources must be appropriated for facilities for urgently needed upper division and graduate studies as well as for local districts. The local districts must continue to assume a large proportion of responsibility for providing education in grades 13 and 14.

The need for junior colleges to serve densely populated areas where junior colleges have not been established can easily be demonstrated. Alameda County, for example, has only the junior college in Oakland immediately in the area although junior colleges are available in adjacent Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara Counties together with the University of California at Berkeley and San Francisco State College. Only 42 percent of Alameda's high school graduates were continuing their education last year. Of these, 10 percent enrolled at the university; 8 percent at State colleges; almost 20 percent in junior colleges; and not quite 5 percent at private institutions.

By comparison, Orange County has three junior colleges and although it is more removed from the University of California at Los Angeles and slightly less so from the State colleges at Long Beach and Los Angeles, 54 percent of its high school graduates continued education in 1955–56. The distribution was 3 percent to the university; 4 percent to State colleges; 7 percent to private institutions; and 40 percent to junior colleges. It is clear that the doorways to opportunity for high school graduates to obtain a college education consist in large measure of the available junior colleges in proximity to their homes. Even in Fresno County where the State college is the single higher institution of prominence in the area the percentage of the county's high school graduates attending State college (18 percent) exceeds by only 1 percent enrollments in junior college (17 percent).

If opportunity for education beyond the high school is to become a reality in California, junior colleges must be established in such populous areas as presently lack them. Among these may be listed two centers in Alameda County: Berkeley and the Hayward-San Leandro Districts. Nearby are the Palo Alto and Sequoia areas which San Jose and San Mateo Junior Colleges have no facilities to serve. In Los Angeles County a tier of districts lying between Citrus, Mount San Antonio, Compton, Pasadena, and Los Angeles junior college districts denies junior college opportunities to high-school graduates from Arcadia, Monrovia, Alhambra, El Monte, Montebello, Whittier, and Downey. In San Diego County the Grossmont-Sweetwater area needs a junior college. And the Merced-Madera and Palm Springs-Coachella Valley regions likewise have no junior college readily available to their graduates.

The lack of junior college services in several of these regions is in no sense due to the indifference of the people to the advantages which would accrue from the establishment of junior colleges. The plain fact is that the initial capital outlay required for junior college facilities frequently is beyond the limited assessed wealth of many populous districts to provide. It will be to the interest of the State to assist in some way, perhaps through matching funds, such districts of restricted resources to acquire the means for offering junior college education. I have urged that such a change in the laws be made. Once a district has developed the facilities originally required, it can enlarge these through its own financial efforts and with the usual State apportionment for average daily attendance units continue to support instruction by the district's ordinary rates of taxation.

In this connection must be noted the service junior colleges provide in the fields of vocational education. Graduates of 2-year curricula who are thus made ready for immediate employment in general settle down in the area and become contributors to its annual earnings and assessed wealth. Training for employment is considered a part of the community services rendered by a junior college—its alumni who find work in the vicinity and make their homes nearby help to upbuild and develop the community served by the junior college. While students who transfer to 4-year institutions for professional education often fail to return to their home communities, the so-called terminal students continue to be assets to the junior college districts.

Special commendation is due the junior colleges for their pioneering efforts in work experience programs to give reality to vocational education. Through work experience students learn what employment demands of them not only in skills but in attitude and ability to concentrate upon continuous output over the entire working day. In April, 1954, members of the Los Angeles Association of Merchants and Manufacturers assessed the value of junior college trainees in their employ as follows:

Better prepared for jobs at which employed, 71 percent.

Better adjusted at outset for beginning jobs, 61 percent.

Positive advantages in securing promotion, 61 percent.

The vocational program of the junior college is more expensive than the straight academic programs. It is my feeling that the real strength of the junior college program lies with an expanded vocational program. If the costs are great, we must in some way provide funds for the expansion of the vocational program. We must not let the dollar control our educational effectiveness.

THE SUCCESS OF JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFERS TO CAMPUSES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Over the 5-year period, 1951–55, the junior colleges graduated more than 50,000 students of whom almost a quarter (24.51 percent) transferred to the University of California at Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, Riverside, or Santa Barbara. A study of the performance of junior college transfers entering the junior year at Berkeley in the fall of 1951 has been prepared by the office of relations with schools. Comparison was made between the persistence and achievement of junior college transfers and native students likewise entering the junior year in 1951. Junior college transfers who at the time they enrolled in junior college would have been eligible for admission to the University of California completed their fourth or senior year at Berkeley in the same proportion (77.9 percent) as students who had in 1951 entered the university as freshmen. They even had a slightly higher grade-point average overall (1.80 as compared with 1.73 for native students). Clearly the junior colleges as a whole provide satisfactory preparation for upper division studies and do as good a job as the university in the instance of students

whose high school preparation met university requirements for admission.

The study also gives parallel percentages for junior college transfers who originally could not have obtained admission to the university on the basis of their high school subjects and marks. For this group the figures show that the junior colleges also have done a competent job of salvaging and rehabilitating many of them to achieve well at the university. Five-sixths of these students originally ineligible for university admission upon transfer from junior college completed their senior year in the normal time. Their over-all grade-point average was 1.59, well below that of both native students and their fellow-transfers whose high school record had been sufficient to have warranted university admission in the first place. Nevertheless they were able to graduate from the university. Again, the junior colleges demonstrate that they do a capable and significant job of salvaging the late-maturing students. We must continue our efforts to more clearly define this relationship with the university to avoid confusion concerning acceptable transfer courses.

To sum up, the people of California have authorized three kinds of higher institutions to assure the education of their youth. The university and State colleges are charged to provide professional and occupational education, to conduct research and to encourage the pursuit of advanced studies. The numerous junior colleges are primarily and always centers of instructtion in which the great teacher finds scope for his genius and recognition of his capabilities in direction of learning.

A junior college is a local institution. It is responsive to community needs. The State assists in its support but imposses no restrictions to the variety of offerings for grades 13 and 14. These are limited in range only by employment opportunities and the aspirations and abilities of its students, and may be as rich as the financial resources of its district can afford. The governing board of the junior college district has original and financial authority to conduct the institution in such fashion as the electorate approve. A junior college operates to advance students in their post high school studies, to guide them into wise choices of vocations, and to build a firm foundation for lifelong learning in their chosen careers. Just as the 4-year institutions seek to attract scholars to explore the frontiers of knowledge, so junior colleges are centers of learning, intimately concerned for the communities which they serve but mindful of the issues confronting the Nation and holding fast to the enduring ideals humankind has found good.

CONCLUSIONS

The policy of the State Department of Education stated in other words recognizes and supports:

1. The uniqueness of the junior college. It is both a vertical and a horizontal relationship as it relates to secondary and college education.

2. That every high school should eventually be in a junior college district. Our laws should be so written to make that possible and effective.

3. That junior colleges should be established in a community before future state colleges or university branches are established.

4. That funds for capital outlay should be provided for qualifying junior college districts.

5. A bureau in the State Department of Education devoting full time to junior college problems.

6. An increase in financial support for apportionment purposes.

Finally, I want to express appreciation to your present officers for the very fine relationship that they have created with our department. Your State Department is anxious, ready, and willing to serve you. We want to work with you individually and as an association. Your very legal structure gives you the opportunity to continue to do great work for your communities. It is thrugh this community interest that your students develop and your junior colleges improve. These are not idle words. We in the State office believe in you. May that confidence be reflected in all that we say and do together.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles: A Man of Great Character and Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. LANE, Mr. Speaker, the Communists do not like John Foster Dulles.

That is the highest accolade that any man of the free world can earn.

For it proves that our Secretary of State is never confused, or intimidated, or taken in by the devious twists and turns of communism.

In the person of John Foster Dulles, communism is opposed by a man who never loses sight of the fact that genuine peace must be built on the twin foundations of freedom and justice.

His profound faith in the dignity of man speaks for the whole western world, and for the unsatisfied longings of the submerged human beings in Russia and China and elsewhere who look forward to the day of their liberation.

Our Secretary of State has given his mind and heart and spirit to this cause with a devotion that has seldom been equaled in history.

We admire Mr. Dulles; we need him; and we pray to God for his complete recovery.

I would like to add the following tribute to the thousands that are coming in. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the following article by James H. Powers from the February 15 issue of the Boston Sunday Globe:

HE HAS WORLD'S TOUGHEST JOB—DULLES' ILLNESS THROWS SPOTLIGHT ON HIS TIRELESS LABORS TO CARRY OUT FOREIGN POLICIES AS PROBLEMS OF AMERICA MOUNT IN WORLD AT FLUX

(By James H. Powers)

The indefinite withdrawal of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles from active direction of the Nation's foreign policy has jolted official Washington more severely than any event since President Eisenhower underwent surgery in June 1956. It has also thrown the spotlight again upon what has been called the most difficult job in the world, that of charting course for the United States and her allies through one of the most hazardous periods in the annals of the West.

Mr. Dulles' hope to resume eventually his tasks will find echo among his fellow countrymen, whether critics or friends. Few occupants of his office have labored more tirelessly; none with greater self-dedication. Since the Organic Act of 1789 set up the Department of State, only four of his predecessors in that office have held the post longer: James Madison, John Quincy Adams, Hamilton Fish, and Cordell Hull, whose 13-year tenure set an alltime record.

TASK ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE

In this position many legendary figures in this history of the Republic either crowned careers or found a steppingstone to higher honors. For John Marshall, it was a way station to the Chief Justiceship of the United States. For Jefferson, Madison, John Quincy Adams, Martin Van Buren, and James Buchanan, it was preparation for the Presidency.

Talleyrand's unforgotten quip that "politics is the art of the possible," needs amendment when applied to the two highly political tasks confronting a Secretary of State at Washington: Direction of foreign policy under the President, and getting along with Congress. That is an assignment to exercise the art of the almost impossible, as Mr. Dulles and many a predecessor in his office have discovered.

Especially is this true when, as today, the powerful influence of the Presidency in shaping foreign policy is attenuated, whether because the incumbent in the White House is unfamiliar with the intricacies of foreign affairs, or because of his philosophy of government. Some Presidents, Grant for instance, frankly abandoned a task temperamentally uncongenial, merely invoking Executive power at appropriate times to sustain decisions made by the Secretary of State.

AUTHORITY PRESIDENT'S

That caused Grant little trouble because he happened to have an exceedingly able foreign policy director in Hamilton Fish. For other Chief Executives, the experiment unleashed many a sea of trouble. Especially in Congress. The storms swirling around Mr. Dulles on Capitol Hill, these past 6 years, are thus not without precedent. His immediate predecessor also faced them—with Mr. Dulles among the critics.

Strong Presidents, from Washington down, have jealously maintained the constitutional prerogatives of their office in relations with their Secretaries of State. Authority and responsibility for the Nation's foreign policy is, of course, actually theirs alone.

Jefferson bypassed his Secretary in deciding upon the Louisiana Purchase. Tyler conducted his own campaign to bring Texas into the Union. McKinley overrode a protesting John Hay to annex Hawaii. Yet the Secretary of State, whether left to do the real homework in foreign policy, reduced to the role of a mere subordinate, like Van Buren, or functioning in close harmony with a like-minded President expert and alert in foreign policy matters (like Madison under Jefferson) remains first among the select in the President's official family.

BURDENS OF OFFICE MOUNT

The burdens of the Secretary have multiplied fabulously since Jefferson inaugurated the long succession at the Department of State with a budget of $6,500 to pay for its operations. Today a Secretary of State rules over a small empire numbering close to 18,000 persons and reaching to the far corners of the globe, with a budget approximating $130 million.

He occupies the chair at the President's right hand at every Cabinet meeting, has precedence over all other Cabinet members at official functions, is the most intimate adviser to a Chief Executive, and has almost as much influence in the broad appropirations picture as the Secretary of the Treasury, owing to the range of his policy domain.

FUNCTIONS MULTIPLY

Though many functions originally assigned to the Department of State have long since been shifted to other Federal organs—responsibility for the census, for patents, for copyrights, and pardons—this country's world influence and its leadership role among the

free nations have multiplied new and more onerous duties for State. Inevtiably, the change has also multiplied Monday morning quarterbacks, in and out of Congress. That is an essential feature in the democartic process.

Mr. Dulles' strength and weakness lie in this: As troubleshooter extraordinary in foreign policy, his mistakes reverberate; his successes, in the nature of things, can be but temporary in a world at flux.

Sister M. Madeleva of Saint Mary's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, Sister M. Madeleva, C.S.C., is one of the most remarkable citizens of Indiana. She is a poet and a college president, a Catholic sister and a person of lively wit and humor.

For the last 25 years Sister Madeleva has been president of Saint Mary's College, Notre Dame, Ind., an outstanding college for Catholic women. Before coming to Congress, I had the great pleasure of serving on the faculty of Saint Mary's College in the department of political science. I came to know Sister Madeleva and to join her band of admirers throughout our country.

This week Sister Madeleva has published her autobiography entitled, "My First 70 Years," in which she describes her remarkable career. I am sure that many persons will be interested in reading the story of this noble and gifted sister. I should therefore like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article by Walton R. Collins of the South Bend Tribune concerning Sister Madeleva and her new book.

SISTER MADELEVA CITES DREAMS, WORK

(By Walton R. Collins)

"I came to St. Mary's College (as president) at the all-low ebb of the depression, 1934.

"I found myself responsible for a school 90 years old, a great heritage, a magnificent campus, potentials in faculty and students to dream of and work with. The best qualifications I brought to my office were these: my ability to dream, my capacities to work."

So, nearly a quarter century of dreaming and working later, writes Sister M. Madeleva, C.S.C. in a slim, highly readable autobiography published by the MacMillan Co., New York.

Briskly titled "My First 70 Years," the book races through the nun's full and enormously varied life by means of vignettes and rough sketches which add up to a series of distinct impressions. Among them are Sister Madeleva's indefatigable energy, her enormous faith, her generous endowment of common sense and a God-given sense of humor which she is capable of turning upon herself.

The nun followed a curious and often exciting path to the offices she now occupies at the college for women located north of the city limits of South Bend.

STARTS IN WISCONSIN

The path started in the island city of Cumberland, Wis., in 1887, with the birth of Mary Evaline Wolff. It led through a girlhood marked by a joy in nature and the tentative unfoldings of a restless intellectual curiosity. It led to the mental and spiritual blossoming of college days, first at the University of Wisconsin and then at St. Mary's College, Notre Dame.

It reached a first plateau when Mary Evaline Wolff decided to take the habit of a Sister of the Holy Cross, and entered the order's novitiate on the St. Mary's campus.

Life's tempo picked up speed for Sister Madeleva. There were new degrees (master of arts at Notre Dame, doctor of philosophy at the University of California in Berkeley, and graduate study at Oxford University in England) and new jobs.

The jobs were teaching at Sacred Heart Academy in Ogden, Utah, where the student body was predominantly of the Mormon faith; teaching at St. Mary's College, Notre Dame; the presidency of the College of St. Mary's-of-the-Wasatch in Salt Lake City, and eventually the presidency of the college off U.S. 31 north.

TRIUMPHS, DEFEATS

There were also triumphs, defeats, and friendships, but this book concentrates on the friendships. Sister Madeleva at times sounds like a name-dropper as she recounts her contacts with the great and near-great in this country and abroad. She is not, of course.

Among those whose associations she obviously treasures are Father James Keller, Bernard DeVoto, Joyce Kilmer, Phyllis McGinley, Robert Hugh Benson, Edna St. Vincent Millay, C. S. Lewis, Sigrid Undset, and Evelyn Waugh. There are many more.

In this book, the poet-nun wisely shies away, for the most part, from attempts at detailed introspection into the motives and philosophies that have shaped her life. Such introspections, interesting as they might be, would be out of place in the fast-moving account of people, places, and events in "My First 70 Years."

There are, however, some hints. Typifying the love of nature she alludes to throughout the book is this passage: "I rushed into the Pacific for the first time, breathlessly confident that I could hold the entire ocean and it could hold me, each in the other's arms."

Her self-directed sense of humor (and her faith) comes out in this recollection:

"On the eve and the day of my first holy communion, I surprised my parents with the only signs of asceticism they ever saw in me. Like most good German families we always ended our day with our glass of beer. This evening I walked quietly over to my father and mother to kiss them good night. 'But you haven't taken your nightcap,' said my father in surprise, 'I don't think I care for any,' I said lamely. Mother helped me out. 'Let her alone,' she said, 'if she wants to do this.'"

The same lively humor crops up later when Sister Madeleva describes her first days as president of St. Mary's. She sets the stage by reporting a conversation she once overheard on a Great Lakes boat:

"Wife: Who runs this boat?
"Husband: The captain.
"Wife: What does he do?
"Husband: Nothing.
"Wife: Oh, but he must do something.
"Husband: No, he doesn't. He doesn't do a thing.
"Wife: Who does the work?
"Husband: The crew.
"Wife (still unconvinced): Well, I suppose there has to be someone to take the blame for things."

THIS IS MY STORY

Adds Sister Madeleva, "This is my story for the past 25 years—taking the blame for things."

Along with the blame comes the credit, of course, and the St. Mary's president's outline of her career lists more than is praiseworthy than blameworthy. She tells of the building of the college's new science hall and of its Moreau Hall fine arts center, a project obviously close to the nun's heart.

She tells of her educational aims and the trailbreaking decision to put theology in the center of the educational system at St. Mary's.

She reveals her personal courage in writing poems which she offered first to secular publications, to prove that a Catholic and a sister could write well enough for acceptance by the secular press and also because "I resolved not to permit mediocrity in my writing to be attributed to my religion."

RELIGION IS VITAL

Her religion, nevertheless, is a vital and basic part of Sister Madeleva's existence, and she doesn't have to say so in as many words. It is obvious in almost every paragraph of the book.

South Bend area readers will especially enjoy the autobiography's references to the two educational institutions, St. Mary's and Notre Dame, and that are the city's neighbors. Local people and events pop up regularly in the narrative.

Admirers and former students of Sister Madeleva and her work will enjoy the chatty reiminiscences and personal relations of the human being they have known.

Not even the casual reader will be disappointed in "My First 70 Years." Apart from all other considerations, Sister Madeleva's life is excellent material for an autobiography.

John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, John Foster Dulles has the prayers of all of us. As I ofttimes have said, he has proven to be one of the greatest Secretaries of State this Nation have ever had. His knowledge of foreign affairs is unexceled by anyone, and, with unequaled courage, he has applied that knowledge for the maintenance of peace in the world and the advancement of freedom.

An editorial which appeared in the Minonk News-Dispatch, which is published in my district, expresses my sentiments, and I am sure the majority of the people of my district, with respect to this truly great American.

The editorial follows:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Too often we wait until a man has passed on to extoll his virtues and what he has done for his country and humanity. If there has been a public figure in our country during the past 50 years who has so unselfishly devoted himself to his country, it is John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State.

Here is a man up in his seventies devoting practically every hour of his time trying to get peace established in the world. His salary of $25,000 is about one-tenth of what he could make in his leisurely private law practice in New York City.

He has no political ambitions, and, to the detriment of his health—he has had two major surgical operations within the past 2 years—has traveled all over the world trying to get things settled. What success he has had remains to be seen, but at least we have been kept out of a shooting war for the

past 6 years. He has cemented closer relations with Britain, France, and West Germany to deter further aggressions by the Soviets.

There are few others who have given so much of their energy, time, and finances to try to help our country. He deserves much praise and commendation from the people of this country for his untiring efforts. He doubtless has made some mistakes in judgment, but they are few compared to what he has accomplished. He deserves the thanks of our Nation.

President Frondizi's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed in the first month of 1959 a friendly and good will conquest of the United States by the scholar-statesman President of Argentina, Dr. Arturo Frondizi. Next month the Chief Executives of Eire and El Salvador visit Washington and other great cities of our Nation. These visits are far more important than mere junkets; they present to America the image of our allies and they present to our allies a proper image of the United States.

There were many special aspects of the visit of President Frondizi; first, he came in the wake of the publicized tour of Soviet Russia's Mikoyan, who tried to sell us on comradeship with the Communists. As the head of International Packers in Chicago, A. Thomas Taylor, said in introducing President Frondizi:

> We prefer the spirit of partnership offered by Argentina to the spirit of comradeship offered by Russia.

During his 10 conference-filled days in 10 cities, President Frondizi dispelled any lingering doubts in the minds of American business and industrial interests that we have anything to fear in the partnership he offers our investors in the development of the enormous resources of his country. As DeGaulle has done in France, as Britain's belt-tightening did after the war, so has Frondizi's austerity program impressed all of us with his dedicated determination to solve the economic problems of his country with a courageous disregard for the normal political perils.

Further, a group of 25 Argentine business and industrial leaders have come here to visit their counterparts in America, and they have candidly explained that most of them were opposed to Dr. Frondizi in his elections which made him President, but his courage since inauguration has so impressed them that they now find themselves in full support of his efforts to strengthen the economy of their country. Theirs is eloquent testimony to the Frondizi leadership.

All of this is of the utmost importance to our country, because we know the many shrewd moves of Soviet Russia to infiltrate not only the culture and government of countries in the Western Hemisphere, but also their economy. For a time, following the angry outbursts against us throughout Latin America at the time of Vice President NIXON'S trip to South America, we were shocked and shamed by the obvious weaknesses in our relations with our onetime good neighbors. President Frondizi has reassured us that at least in the southernmost anchorage of the hemisphere, we have strong and good friends who are eager to be partners with us.

Certainly, in this connection, the work of the State Department's Division of Protocol, under Wiley Buchanan and his Deputy Chief, Clem Conger, is to be highly commended. And, also, in passing, I would like to note another role in this fine presentation of a clear image of Argentina to the United States. I refer to the splendid public relations in the handling of the informational task of the Frondizi trip. I understand this was handled through Tex McCrary's public relations firm. He and his associate, Jerry Finkelstein, are to be commended for performing a valuable service to this country when they make available to the U.S. press quickly and concisely, all the necessary background information on the Government they represent.

We all know our failing as a nation to think of other nations in terms of individual images—nearly 400 million people of India are symbolized in Premier Nehru; France was almost anonymous until De Gaulle; England is the Royal Family and Sir Winston Churchill; and unfortunately, a few dictators have cast their shadows across the image of the whole of Latin America: Perón, Batista, Pérez-Jiménez, and still Trujillo. But now there is emerging a new image of Latin America: In El Salvador, José María Lemus; in Chile, Jorge Allessandri; in Mexico, Adolfo Lopez Mateos; in Venezuela, Romulo Betancourt.

And clearest image of all, reminiscent of our own Woodrow Wilson, is Frondizi of Argentina, who has in 10 days almost wiped out the memory of Perón. Of Dr. Frondizi it can be truly said: "He came, we saw, he conquered." This is a healthy victory for international public relations.

A Discouraging Sight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, it is important, I think, to know what responsible newspaper editors throughout the country are saying about the visit of Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan. Illustrative of such is an editorial from the Kendallville News-Sun which I include herewith. It brings to our minds again the caution which must be exercised in dealing with the Russian Communists.

A DISCOURAGING SIGHT

You can't expose a man to television cameras for a solid hour, as we did Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan, without learning a good deal about him. And what Americans saw and heard can hardly be a cause for cheering, or even modest hopes.

The real news was not what he said about Berlin, or Germany, or the cold war. It was the disheartening revelation of the Russian Communist pattern of thinking.

Magnified under the glare of TV closeups, this was a genuine shock. Terribly clear now is the fact that we are not just poles apart from the Soviet Union, but are traveling in totally different thinking orbits.

Mikoyan answered almost no question directly in his appearance on NBC's "Meet the Press." But it misses the point simply to say he ducked and dodged.

He offered answers which may seem perfectly valid to Russian Reds. By the Kremlin's accepted standard of double-think—turning facts upside down, giving them any meaning that suits purpose—it made sense to say we are at fault everywhere and Russia nowhere, not even in repressed Hungary.

Watching Mikoyan at work on TV you get the idea, however, that something more than double-think is involved. He seemed to turn almost instinctively from straight dealing on any topic—except thank you and goodby.

One could not help but be reminded here of documented diplomatic accounts of Russian diplomacy in the 19th century, long before the Communists gained power.

Western diplomats then were in wide agreement that Russian diplomats regarded lying, duplicity, broken promises, and all the other devices of distrust as the vital tools of their trade. The Russians were notorious throughout Europe as being totally untrustworthy.

No one imagines the Communists have any respect for truth. But in their formal practice of deception as the rule of life, they appear only to be compounding a duplicity already firmly fixed in the character of Russian Government.

As a Russian and a Communist, Mikoyan did not let tradition down.

He left us with the big question: How do you negotiate reasonably with men who believe that because they lie to gain their ends, everyone else must surely lie, too?

Three Kentucky Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BURKE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, we have within the past week paid grateful and loving tribute to the memory of one of Kentucky's most heroic sons, Abraham Lincoln. It is altogether fitting and proper that we do this.

I believe, however, that in the frantic world of 1959 we tend to forget that heroes walk the earth, sail the seas and, yes, fly through the sky today.

Just as we approached the 150th anniversary of Lincoln's birth, all Americans were stunned into mute, fist-clenching righteous anger by the disclosure by the

State Department of the villainous assault by Soviet fighter aircraft upon an unarmed American Air Force transport plane last September. I shall not dwell upon the depths of infamy implicit in that base and cowardly crime.

Two of the members of the crew of the ravaged American transport plane were Kentuckians. These two young men are among those whose fate remains unknown. Sgt. Leroy Price was a native of Larue County, Ky.—of the very same neighborhood where Abraham Lincoln was born. Airman Joe L. Fields was a native of Cynthiana, in the beautiful bluegrass country.

As Lincoln was shot from the back by a mad assasin, so were the 17 crew members of the American transport plane shot from the back by mad assasins who gloated over their base crime.

As we paid tribute to Lincoln let us also honor these heroic airmen whose fate is unknown, but whose heroic devotion to duty is unquestioned.

Mr. Speaker, in the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 16, an article, datelined Hodgenville, Ky.—Lincoln's birthplace—depicts with simple eloquence the plight of the family of Sergeant Price. There are 16 other American families similarly injured. I insert that article at this point, and ask all to join with me in fervent prayer that the 11 members of this crew who are missing may soon be returned alive and well to their homes and their loved ones.

LARUE PARENTS FIGHT GRAY DESPAIR WHILE AWAITING WORD OF SON'S FATE

(By Alan Levy)

HODGENVILLE, KY.—The father works alone in his fields of corn and tobacco.

The mother irons when she wants to forget and tunes into every newscast when she remembers, which is nearly always.

Thus time trudges past for the parents of Air Force Sgt. Leroy Price, who may be alive or dead in Russia or may have been buried recently in Arlington National Cemetery.

Sergeant Price, 29, and another Kentuckian, Airman Joe L. Fields, of Cynthiana, were in an unarmed Air Force transport plane that was downed over Russia last September. The United States claims the craft was shot down by Soviet fighters.

The fate of 11 of the 17 crew members is still uncertain. Six bodies were returned by the Russians, but two of them were unidentifiable. Neither of the Kentuckians was among the four identified.

COLD WAR HAS BECOME A REALITY

"Sometimes I try to have hopes," said Price's thin-lipped, gray-haired mother as she skimmed her iron across a wet blouse. "But when I get to thinking, there really isn't much hope. If we only knew who those two were that they buried."

The missing sergeant's 52-year-old parents, Mr. and Mrs. Horace Price, live on their 194-acre farm in an isolated section of LaRue County, about 7 miles southeast of Hodgenville. They have no telephone, but they do have television.

"We used to watch a quiz show and all the cowboys," said the tall father in blue coveralls. "Now my wife seldom misses a news program."

The mother tried to express her mystification over the cold war. The continuing crisis once seemed remote to the rural couple.

TAPE RECORDING DIMMED HOPES

"Used to be we'd hear the local news, the farm news, or something," she said. "We'd listen to other news programs with half an ear, in case they mentioned the name of someone we knew.

"Now we listen for Leroy's name. The Air Force keeps us posted, but I listen in anyway just in case someone may have another scrap of information."

The case reappeared in the headlines recently when the State Department played a recording of voices that were identified as those of Soviet pilots sending Sergeant Price's plane into its death plunge.

"That tape made me lose hope," said the father.

"Seems like they're hardhearted people. They must know something. Eleven boys are over there dead or alive one."

The father clenched his hands and sat erect in a suddenly stilled rocking chair.

"You don't know nothing. You can't do nothing," he growled. "I say one minute I'm going to do something and then I say not. I get all sorts of ideas. I start thinking maybe they're not doing enough in Washington and I'll go look for him myself."

He relaxed limply in the chair.

"I wish I had some education so I'd know where to look and how."

The missing son was a 1948 graduate of Hart Memorial High School. He farmed with his father in Hart County for 2 years, then joined the Air Force and became a flight engineer.

WIFE AND TWO SONS LIVE IN TEXAS

Leroy married while in service and has two sons—Mike, 3, and Randy, 4—who reside with his wife, Marian, in Dallas.

"He was due out of the service in 1960," the father said. "He told me he wanted to come back here, rest a while, and then go back to farming. Maybe I'd be able to buy a farm for them."

The new uncertainty of this future dream is an ordeal for both parents. They have another married son. A daughter—Phyllis Jane, 14—died 3 years ago after a long illness.

"We sat by her bedside for 11 months," the father recalled. "When she went, we knew she was going and we knew where she'd went. But this with Leroy * * * it's all uncalled for."

When Leroy's 29th birthday neared recently, his mother did what she always does. She addressed a birthday card to him.

"Then I remembered that this time I didn't have any address for him," she said sadly.

The Constructive Negative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch on February 15, 1959, and was written, I presume, by the distinguished Pulitzer Prize winning editor of that fine newspaper, Mr. Virginius Dabney. In this Congress, when so many Members must in good conscience vote against much of the legislation that comes to the floor of the House, this editorial is both timely and reassuring.

STRAUSS' CONSTRUCTIVE NEGATIVE

Long speeches are not remembered, except for an occasional highlight—a brief phrase that sums up the gist.

In reading over the speech delivered last Wednesday by Secretary of Commerce Lewis L. Strauss, we came across one such happy phrase.

The speech was about the evils of inflation, and its misguided advocates in Congress. We have read many such speeches and have ourselves published a few thousand words on the subject.

Nevertheless, we keep reading, or at least glancing through, reams of mimeographed copy, hoping to find some nugget of logic, which, repeated in print, might bring home the need of resistance to inflationary deficit spending and price-inflationary wage boosts.

We found one in Secretary Strauss' speech—a two-word phrase which expresses precisely why conservative Congressman must vote against, and why the President must veto, all nonessential spending. Said Mr. Strauss:

The word "no," used as a restraint on Government, appears in the original seven articles of the Constitution 26 times, and five times in the Bill of Rights. The Founding Fathers quite evidently had respect for the constructive negative.

We need to us it now—as a stoplight on those pressure groups whose fascination for deficit spending, unnecessary programs and government competition with private industry would scuttle prosperity, stunt economic growth and expose us to the disease of inflation.

The key phrase, of course, is "the constructive negative." This is the opposite of saying "no" because of a lack of intelligent concern for defense programs or other essential projects.

We commend Mr. Strauss' phrase to Congress. It expresses conservatism-at-its-best. It tells why we must oppose all deficit spending. Such spending would impose either more burdensome taxes, or a debt which a credit-depleted government would have to finance with inflated, printing-press dollars.

Davis Lee: Negro Editor States Case for Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Negro newspaper editor Davis Lee, who publishes a number of newspapers in New Jersey and other States of the Union, made a speech in an Anderson, S.C., church on the very pressing and serious integration-segregation controversy. This prominent newspaper editor struck out at those members of the Negro race who are causing the critical deterioration of race relations in the South by continuing to push for complete and absolute integration in the school systems in that section of the country. Lee's speech and a followup editorial which he wrote for publication in the Anderson Herald, a weekly newspaper he operates in Anderson, S.C., have received very favorable comments in the press throughout the South.

It is my privilege to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of an editorial which appeared in one of our weekly newspapers published in Birmingham, Ala. I commend this editorial for the careful reading of all

Members of Congress who really stand for justice for our Negro citizens.

DAVIS LEE: NEGRO EDITOR HITS INTEGRATIONISTS

Davis Lee, Negro newspaper editor, who publishes a number of newspapers in New Jersey and other States, is still trying to pound sense into the heads of members of his race by his forthright editorials against integration. In a speech in an Anderson, S.C., church and in an editorial in a paper he publishes there, he is quoted as saying:

"The liberals who are frothing at the mouth and shedding crocodile tears over the plight of the poor Negro in the South, will gladly offer him integration, but won't give him a job or provide his family with clothing or bread.

"Southerners won't want him to have integration, but they will gladly give him a job, and help him to clothe and feed his family.

"The liberals will open their schools to Negro children, but they won't hire many Negro teachers.

"The South will give the Negro his own school manned by teachers of his race, and all this without cost.

"There are forms of segregation that are degrading and humiliating, but to have one's own school and teachers is not one of them. Giving the Negro his own school and teachers is more in keeping with that concept of freedom, just and equal opportunity that the Founding Fathers had in mind than an integrated system of education."

Other excerpts include:

"In no section of the country does the Negro enjoy the educational, employment, and economic opportunities which he enjoys in the South.

"There are more Negro carpenters, bricklayers, and building contractors in North and South Carolina than there are in the 33 integrated States.

"Negroes cannot eat integration. They need jobs and opportunities to develop their talents, skills, and abilities in fields of their own choosing. The South is the only section in this Nation that offers such opportunities.

"If these liberals and agitators are the Negro's friend and southern whites are his enemies, then someone needs to protect him from his friends."

No doubt Lee speaks for a large number of southern Negroes. Unfortunately not enough of them are speaking out as Lee does against the so-called minority Negro leadership.

Airports and Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I append herewith an editorial from the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, February 18, with reference to a bill which will come to the floor sometime soon with reference to the philosophy with reference to appropriations for airports. The question will arise this year as to whether we, the Federal Government, are going to be responsible for safety facilities such as control towers, airways guides, weather information and other safety factors—or whether we shall continue to accept the responsibility for building air terminals, baggage and passenger facilities which are largely local and have nothing to do with safety:

AIRPORTS AND PHILOSOPHY

In the dispute between the Eisenhower administration and a subsidy-minded bloc in Congress over Federal appropriations for local airports, E. R. Quesada, the Federal Aviation Administrator, says the issue is philosophy, a way of government, and not just the money.

Airports and airport buildings, he argues, are community problems, so the communities should pick up the tab. Only the Federal Government can handle the safety facilities—control towers, airways guides, weather information. And it has it hands full with these.

But the philosophy involves money—the taxpayers' money. And when Washington takes the taxpayers' money and doles it back for local airport building, a big gob of it gets lost on the way. The cost to the taxpayers goes up.

General Quesada may argue philosophically with the subsidizers in Congress, but if he loses the battle, the taxpayers will pick up the tab, whether they want it or not.

Airports make money and can pay their own way. The U.S. Treasury is having trouble borrowing enough to meet expenses.

We hope General Quesada's arguments, philosophic or otherwise, are effective enough to block this handout. Because it's our money he's philosophizing about.

Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, again this year, the battle of the budget is about to be joined. Basic in this battle are the contending philosophies of enlarging the Federal role in our daily affairs as opposed to checking the expansion of Federal activities.

One cannot fairly question the sincerity of Members of Congress who express a philosophy of ever greater spending in Washington. However, I believe one must question where this process is leading us. Our Government does not produce or create the wealth of this Nation. It is wholly dependent upon our factories, our farms, and the efforts of those who create products from the abundance of raw materials. Too often, today, the Congress attempts to be all things to all people. This is a demonstration of the good and sometimes of bad aspects of the responsiveness of the Congress to popular pressures. Costly programs enacted without regard to how they will be paid for is an abdication of fiscal responsibility by the Congress. A consistent pursuit of such a policy in the affairs of this Nation, resulting in spending more than our income from already heavy taxes during times of peak prosperity, is, in my opinion, dangerous to the public interest.

This morning, I received a letter from one of my constituents which has impressed me deeply. I want to call the attention of the House to his remarks, since I believe they are an excellent statement of the responsibility of every member of Congress today. The letter is as follows:

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We, your constituents, apparently expect miracles from you.

First, we complain about taxes, taxes, taxes. They're too high. We ask you to see that they're cut.

Then we turn around and ask you for Federal aid for roads, Federal aid for education, Federal aid for this, Federal aid for that.

We don't make sense. We don't realize that when we ask the Federal Government to give us something, we're going to get the bill for it.

Yours is not an enviable position. We put you on a spot.

Since we won't use commonsense, I hope you will. Please help cut our taxes the only way it can be done—by cutting Federal spending.

Don't give us everything we ask for. Let's cut out some of this Federal aid and force us to return a lot of our governmental functions to the local level. Help us wean ourselves away from Washington, for the formula is getting too expensive.

Sincerely.

Preservation of the Tennessee Valley Authority Is Vitally Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include a resolution adopted by the 81st General Assembly of Tennessee, denouncing the report of the natural resources department of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce which proposed the dismemberment of the TVA.

The preservation and continuance of the Tennessee Valley Authority is vitally essential to the seven-State valley area and this attack by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's natural resources department should be condemned.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 16

Whereas the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has issued a biased and inaccurate report entitled "TVA: What's Next?" which proposed that TVA be dismembered, dispersed, and its power facilities sold; and

Whereas the TVA Board promptly and categorically refuted the above report and denounced it as a misrepresentation of TVA and a disservice to the general public and the members of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; and

Whereas the action proposed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce report would destroy a great public agency whose retention and growth is vitally essential to the welfare of the seven-State valley area, and moreover, since a vast amount of its generated power is channeled into atomic energy and allied defense industries, its preservation and continuance is absolutely necessary to a strong and vigorous national defense program; and

Whereas it is proper that the 1959 General Assembly of the State of Tennessee take

action on this paramount issue: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 81st General Assembly of Tennessee (the Senate concurring), That the report prepared by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's natural resources department, as titled in the preamble hereof, be forthwith rejected and the action suggested by said report be condemned as unsound, unfair, and impractical in its attack on the Tennessee Valley Authority and indirectly upon the national defenses of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the members of the Tennessee delegation to Congress, and to the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Adopted: January 28, 1959.

JAMES L. BOMAR,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
WM. D. BAIRD,
Speaker of the Senate.

Approved: February 4, 1959.

BUFORD ELLINGTON,
Governor.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania was declared an independent state on February 16, 1918, 41 years ago. Each year Lithuanians in the free world commemorate this occasion remembering their fellow countrymen held captive behind the Iron Curtain, who cannot overtly join in any celebration of this historic event.

The development and growth of Lithuania as an independent republic was brought to a tragic end in 1940 when this proud nation again fell prey to the superior force of the Soviet Union. Lithuania along with the other Baltic States was fraudulently annexed to the Soviet Union under the guise of a free election. A puppet government which does not express the will of the people was established.

The example of Lithuania is typical of Communist aggression. In every case the Communists have come to power by means of subversion and infiltration by Soviet agents and occupation of the territory by the Red army and political elements from the Kremlin. The Communists then enslave the people by threats and such inhuman means, wholesale deportations and forced famines.

What little information is obtained from behind the Iron Curtain clearly shows that the Communists in Lithuania and in other captive nations maintain a completely tyrannical rule over the people. Lithuanians can no longer enjoy freedom of expression or religion or any of the inherent rights of individuals. Free labor has been abolished as have all other aspects of individual enterprise. Under Communists rule, the family is no longer the basic unit of society. The state takes the major share of responsibility for the training of youth in order to insure their complete allegiance to the Soviet Communist Union.

These things could happen to all the free people of the world if we do not remain vigilant. Communism is a conspiracy which plans to conquer the whole world and bring all peoples under the domination of the Kremlin.

The people of Lithuania have never stopped wanting their national independence or remaining faithful to the ideals of the free world. But these people need our help and continued assurance of our sympathy and interest in their plight. Let us not forget the Lithuanians who have so bravely and steadfastly fought for freedom in the past and who depend on the friendship and solidarity of the free people of the world.

Reuther Dumps Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an editorial which appeared in the February 10 issue of the Detroit News and concerns Walter Reuther's proposal to impose import duties on foreign automobiles which would be equivalent to the differential between foreign and domestic wages:

LOOK WHO'S IN BED

We hope that Walter Reuther, proposing import duties on automobiles to protect American wages from cheap foreign competition, will have the grace to nod at least to his strange bedfellows.

We refer not only to some sturdy high tariff men in the National Association of Manufacturers but to the dead—the McKinleys and Aldriches, the Hawleys and Smoots, all the late misguided souls who stood against the march of progress and were buried by it.

Mr. Reuther, of course, is worried. Recovery has come to the automobile industry without reabsorbing many thousands of unemployed UAW members. Imported cars are making serious inroads on the American market. Worst of all American industry, including the automobile manufacturers, is investing even more heavily in factories abroad. This means both less domestic production for export and increased foreign production for sale here—a double squeeze on American jobs.

Mr. Reuther's proposed answer is an international fair labor standard—meaning uniform or roughly uniform wage scales in automobile factories everywhere so that no manufacturer would enjoy a material competitive advantage based on labor costs. To enforce such a standard he suggests import duties equivalent to the differential between foreign and domestic wages.

Despite the direct tie-up proposed between tariff rates and wage scales, Mr. Reuther's idea remains the oldest and most discredited in the book. It assumes that high wages in America cannot be justified by anything more substantial than the desire to have high wages and cannot be maintained except by political power.

The assumptions are demonstrably untrue. America has developed its high wage scales mostly in competition with low-paid foreign industry, by and large without effective tariff protection. High wages have resulted from high labor productivity which in turn has been the product of mechanization and high management skill. We could pay more, in short, because we got more for the wage dollar.

If that is no longer true, then there is the problem that demands solution. No ingenuity in ducking it will serve. In the long run none can profit from artifically maintained high wages and high prices in a closed market. Mr. Reuther knows that. It is sad to see him abandoning his principles in unseemly haste to find any old refuge from his current troubles.

A World Attack on Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written for United Press International by my friend and colleague in the Senate, Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, which appeared in the February 12, 1959, edition of the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard:

THANKFUL TO BE ALIVE—NEUBERGER ASKS WORLD ATTACK ON CANCER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Last fall, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, 46-year-old Democratic Senator from Oregon, underwent surgery for removal of a cancerous tumor. Wednesday, he was en route back to Washington, grateful for being alive. In this dispatch, Senator NEUBERGER speaks frankly of his experience and, as he prepares to "resume a normal schedule of activity"—his physician's words—offers a message of hope to other cancer sufferers. He also speaks, from the basis of his own trying experience, of what he feels this country must do to bring the possibility of cure to all cancer victims.)

(By Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER)

It has become almost axiomatic to protest about our modern age. Yet if I did not live in a modern age, I would probably be dead now. Three miracles of modern medical science have given me a prospect for recovery from cancer which my doctors regard as excellent.

These miracles are (1) early detection of the tumor; (2) skillful surgery; and (3) the twin agents of cobalt radiation and chemotherapy, with their destructive impact on any of the tumor which might have spread.

Even before cancer was diagnosed in me, I stood on the floor of the U.S. Senate and advocated vastly increased Federal support of medical research. Yet I used glibly the reference that 40 million Americans were destined to have cancer. I never thought I might be among the 40 million. I always felt that this would be somebody else. I suppose countless citizens feel this way—otherwise we would not tolerate spending more on chewing gum than on cancer research, and many times more on such things as permanent waves and cigarettes.

INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL YEAR

Along with my colleagues, Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and Senator HUBERT

HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, I have been proposing an International Medical Year and a pooling of medical discoveries made by all nations. This has a particularly urgent meaning for me today. Cobalt radiation, a vital factor in the successful treatment I have undergone, was developed by such illustrous scientists of Canada as Dr. David A. Keyes and Dr. H. F. Batho. I am fortunate that no unwise import quota kept this marvel of their intellects from coming to the United States.

A brush with cancer tends to place many things in true perspective. First, one becomes profoundly grateful to all those who, through the long history of medical research, have contributed to the advances thus far made in treatment of this grim disease. Secondly, old antagonisms fade away. I no longer can transform political disagreements into any feelings of personal malice. When one is grateful to be alive, it is difficult to dislike a fellow human being.

I am keenly aware that some of the most eminent Members of the Senate have died of cancer during recent years—among them Charles L. McNary, of my own State of Oregon; Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan; Matthew Neely of West Virginia; and Brian McMahon, of Connecticut. That is why I regard it as so crucially important if I can stand in the Senate and stress to my colleagues that my own life has been spared, because I have had a type of cancer which has responded to a discovery thus far made in the realm of medical research.

Is it not vital that we devote every effort to extending these discoveries, if possible, into other areas of cancer where successful treatment has not yet been achieved? Does it make sense to invest in cancer research only about 1 percent of what we spend on research into armaments and weapons of war? Two out of every three American families are in peril of affliction from cancer.

From the very beginning, I told my doctors to include candidly in their medical bulletins the fact that my illness has been diagnosed as cancer. I realize that has not been done in the case of some public figures. Yet we need to have full understanding of this disease if it is to be conquered.

Medical scientists inform me that some people, knowing they may have cancer, still hesitate to seek treatment because they fear it is inevitably hopeless. Thus, if a person in public life does recover from cancer, it is an event which can give hope and courage for many millions of others.

The American Cancer Society reports that, already, about 30 or 35 percent of cancer victims are being saved. As new findings are attained in the field of chemotherapy, this percentage undoubtedly will be increased—especially if people seek immediate medical care.

MANY COMPETENT DOCTORS

While much remains to be known about cancer, I think it is essential that Americans have faith in the competence of their doctors. Some believe that capable care can be received only at a few nationally known medical centers. I chose to remain for treatment in my native city of Portland, Oreg., because I believe that knowledge and competence in this field are not confined to one or two famous places. I think I have been confirmed in this decision by the fact that, in my travels around our State this past fall and winter, I have met quite a few men and women who have recovered from cancer under the able auspices of their own local physicians.

The National Cancer Institute, which is part of our U.S. Public Health Service, makes grants throughout the Nation to all promising avenues in the area of cancer research. Your own life or that of a loved one might potentially be saved if you urge your Senator to vote full and adequate appropriations for this vital Government agency, which provides about 72 percent of the funds for research into the causes and possible cures of the series of diseases known as cancer.

An Effective Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert an editorial which appeared in the Observer (N.J.), February 12, 1959, entitled "An Effective Program," which is noteworthy and significant in that it gives emphasis to the need for expanding our people-to-people program in an effort to build a bridge of friendship across the world.

I can think of nothing that has more impact, and nothing more constructive than such a device for bringing about greater understanding among the people of the earth. This is indeed a crossroads approach toward the way to peace and stability in the world.

The editorial reads as follows:

AN EFFECTIVE PROGRAM

In September 1956 President Eisenhower called a group of some 50 leaders in American life to the White House and presented a plan. First aim, he said, was to build a massive system of communications between Americans and the peoples of other countries. This marked the official launching of the people-to-people program.

The thought behind it was a compelling one. Governments operate on high levels of political, military, economic, and diplomatic affairs. But governments are remote and impersonal. So, the President emphasized, Americans outside of Government must work out thousands of methods by which people can gradually learn a little bit more of each other. People-to-people, in sum, involves a sort of grassroots approach to better knowledge and understanding.

People-to-people has come a long way since that original meeting. Some 40 committees were formed to reach into virtually every phase of American life and activity. These committees have more than 1,100 members, of which 700 represent organizations, associations, clubs, and other groups. Their geographical spread blankets the Nation, and practically all vocations and professions are represented.

Prior to this other groups—such as the Lions International, and the 4–H clubs—had been conducting comparable activities on a person-to-person or group-to-group basis. The formal people-to-people program, however, brought these groups into closer contact with each other, and sharpened the focus on the objective of greater international understanding through a multitude of contacts between Americans and other peoples.

The success of such a program, in which all Americans in every walk of life can participate, is largely measured by the multiplicity of the projects which are undertaken. Judged by such a yardstick, people-to-people has compiled an impressive record. To select a few examples, the public relations committee drafted a pamphlet entitled "Make a Friend This Trip" for Americans preparing to visit other countries, and a million copies were distributed. To meet a specific request from the Sudan, another committee collected 16,000 books and sent them overseas. More than 70 American communities in this country are now affiliated with communities of comparable size and kindred interests abroad, and a like number are in the planning stage. A sports committee sponsored the American tour of the Pakistan cricket team. A 50-member American rifle team was sent abroad to compete in Germany, Switzerland, Sweden, and the Soviet Union. There are committees of the handicapped, of cartoonists, of people concerned with hobbies and the arts, and so on and on.

In Senator HUMPHREY'S words: "People-to-people efforts at building friendship are not bound by the restrictions and handicaps which encumber official government-to-government dealings, and can often be more effective." And the program is and must be a two-way street.

Three Thousand Farm Folks Speak Out on REA Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, 1959, the Chippewa Valley Electric Cooperative held its 22d annual membership meeting at Cornell, Wis. At tihs meeting, 4 resolutions were passed which express the wishes of the 3,000 members of that cooperative on current issues confronting the rural electrification program. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include those resolutions in the RECORD:

REA REORGANIZATION

Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate, for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

Whereas Secretary Benson has supported a bill in Congress which would drastically increase interests rates and drive electric and telephone cooperative to Wall Street for their financing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA; and be it further

Resolved, That as soon as the new Congress convenes in 1959 a bill which would restore to the REA Administrator all of the functions and authority vested in him by the original act of 1936, be introduced and passed.

INTEREST RATES

Whereas a member of bills and proposals were presented to the 85th Congress to increase REA interest rates; and

Whereas the Congress, by enacting the Pace Act of 1944, and fixing the interest rate of 2 percent, therein made a covenant with the rural electric cooperatives to proceed with area coverage at reasonable, retail rates; and

Whereas we believe the continuance of the 2-percent-interest rate is necessary to enable rural electric systems to compete the task

of providing full, efficient and reasonably priced electric service on an area coverage basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to vigorously oppose any change or proposed change in the law, the effects of which would increase REA interest rates.

REA LOAN SOURCE

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture last February sent to the Congress a proposed bill which provided that the cooperatives secure their financing in Wall Street for which no legislator would act as sponsor; and

Whereas such bill would double or triple interest rates to the rural electric systems; and

Whereas such bill would virtually kill the program and bankrupt many distribution cooperatives; and

Whereas the Congress has always evidenced its wholehearted support of the REA program by consistently providing sufficient loan funds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to oppose any and all proposals which would send the rural electric systems into the private money market for their financing, and we urge Congress to continue its fine support of the rural electric program which means so much to the people of rural America and to the country as a whole.

SELLOUT PROTECTION

Whereas forces opposing the rural electrification program are moving in on cooperatives in various parts of the country, e.g., the New Jersey and Arizona cases, for the expressed purpose of buying them out; and

Whereas it is evident that the power companies instituting sellout are being directed by executives hired and maintained by their holding companies; and

Whereas electric consumers in and outside the program will pay more for electricity if these sellouts become more widespread: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge REA to provide more aggressive assistance to cooperatives needing its help to continue their existence—such as was the case of cooperatives in New Jersey and Arizona; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge our State legislatures to provide us with the machinery to function as public agencies or utility districts where such a step is necessary to preserve consumer ownership; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to protect rural electrics and all electric consumers by abolishing the electric holding companies; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to investigate and expose the apparent master plan to cripple and destroy the rural electrification program, and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to thoroughly investigate the sellout cases that have now occurred in order that the Rural Electrification Act may be strengthened as a means of protecting the interest of consumers and all Americans who are concerned about the contributions rural electrics are making.

Nixon Defines War on Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Nixon Defines War on Reds," which appeared in the Daily Pentagraph of Bloomington, Ill., on February 13.

It is a commentary on the speech delivered by Vice President NIXON at Fordham College with respect to how best to deal with communism.

As the editorial points out, there is no stronger foe to communism than Mr. NIXON and no one knows better than he how best to deal with this threat to our security and freedom:

NIXON DEFINES WAR ON REDS

When it comes to fighting the Communists inside or outside the United States Vice President NIXON has no peers. Mr. NIXON's views command attention. Among his most pertinent comments on the subject of communism in general and the visit of Deputy Premier Mikoyan to this country in particular are his observations in a Fordham College Alumni Association dinner January 27.

Mr. NIXON does not discount the ability of the Soviet leader. "In several respects," he said, "I would have to rate Mr. Mikoyan as the equal of any leader I have met." He said the Russian Deputy Premier "has a steel-like toughness of character and an almost arrogant faith that his cause was right and that it inevitably would prevail."

This led Mr. NIXON to observe that the United States is not going to "change Communist policy with a handshake. They are hardheaded realists motivated by their own self-interest. They will respect us only if we stand firmly by our principles and our ideals."

The Communists, said Mr. NIXON, have nothing but contempt for those who are dupes and who can be deceived by what the Reds know as obvious untruths; they respect those who oppose them on principle.

"I have been deeply concerned at the naive attitude and lack of understanding of communism displayed by some Americans, both in Government and out."

Among these he might have included the "whipping boys of Communist propaganda, the Wall Street bankers and businessmen," who received Mr. Mikoyan and his promises of greater trade with much less critical judgment than did the leaders of our free trade unions. Mr. Mikoyan admitted that he found these latter the strongest defenders of the American system and the most vigorous critics of communism.

Mr. NIXON urges a better job at the college and university level in teaching the fundamentals of Communist philosophy, strategy and tactics. "The only effective answer to combat a false idea is not ignorance," he said, "but the truth."

Mr. NIXON warned against an assault in the name of economy on our programs for technical assistance, developmental loans, exchange and information. "Anyone with even an elementary knowledge of tactics knows we could make no more disastrous mistake," he declared.

The Vice President said the United States can be the strongest military power in the world and still lose the struggle for the world without a missile being launched "if we don't have the vision to counter the massive Communist offensive in the economic, propaganda, and political areas."

But, said Mr. NIXON, competition on the material level, while essential, is not enough. He holds that material achievements do not meet the deeper needs of mankind.

"Man needs the higher freedoms, freedom to know, to debate freely, to write, and express his views. He needs the freedom that law and justice guarantee to every individual so that neither privilege nor power may make any man subservient before the law. He wants the freedom to travel and to learn from other peoples and cultures. He wants freedom for worship.

"To us, these are the most precious aspects of our civilization. We would be happy if others were to compete in this sphere and try to surpass our achievements."

Mr. NIXON urges that we speak less of the threat of communism and more of the promise of freedom. He would have us adopt the primary objective, not of the defeat of communism, but the victory of plenty over want, of health over disease, of freedom over tyranny.

The Vice President urged that this country present its programs to underdeveloped countries in terms of their aspirations and their aims rather than our own. This should be easy since the United States seeks no new land; it has no goal of dominating the world.

And in our struggle with the Communists, says Mr. NIXON, we must realize that we are confronting men with iron determination, fanatical dedication, and superb mental discipline.

"The soft, the flabby, the naive, the lazy will not win in a struggle with men like this," he warns. "We must have men who are worthy of those causes we profess."

This is a realistic approach to the challenge we face. We cannot wish the Communist threat away. We must face it with knowledge, courage, dedication, discipline, and with conviction in the ideals we espouse. Mr. NIXON is such a man himself.

Importance of the Boy Scout Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 13 last, it was my privilege to address a meeting of Scouters and their parents at the Windermere M.E. Church in East Cleveland on the "Importance of the Scout Movement." It was particularly significant that Boy Scout Week was being celebrated all over the Nation at the same time that Americans everywhere were commemorating the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the text of my speech herewith:

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON, WESTERN RESERVE DISTRICT, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA, WINDERMERE METHODIST CHURCH, CLEVELAND, OHIO, FEBRUARY 13, 1959

Members of the board of the Western Reserve District (District No. 7) of the Greater Cleveland Council (No. 440) of the Boy Scouts of America, Den Mothers, Cubmasters, Scoutmasters, Explorer advisers, Scouters of every sort and kind, executive staffs and such Scouts as may be here, as well as your many guests: I greet you with a deep sense of the privilege it is to be amongst you here in this great Windermere Methodist Church on this fellowship night.

Yesterday in Washington a joint session of the Congress gathered to do honor to the humble, modest, magnificent Abraham Lincoln, of whom it was said that when he went to a town, a village, or just a gathering, "he brought light with him."

Gathered in the House Chamber at 11 a.m. on Thursday, February 12, were Members of the Senate and House, the Supreme Court, the Cabinet, and a very large representation

of the diplomatic corps. The Army orchestra played in the Speakers Lobby, the choir of the Coast Guard Academy sang in the Chamber, Frederick March recited the Gettysburg Address and Carl Sandburg, who of all others has studied every word Lincoln spoke and wrote, gave an address none present will forget. It was a deeply moving hour, I can assure you.

It seems to me peculiarly fitting that the week set aside as "Boy Scout Week" should contain the date of Lincoln's birth. And this year we celebrate the 150th anniversary. Could one find anywhere a more inspiring example for Scouts and Scout leaders than this great man?

Indeed, I would like to suggest that wherever and whenever Scouts from Cubs on up meet, they would ask that their hours of togetherness might be infiltrated by his simple ways, his deep understanding, and the challenge of his courage and his faith. I am very certain that his spirit rejoices that there are nearly 5 million Scouts and leaders currently in America; 26 million persons who have felt the impact of the Scout oath and are infinitely better for it.

Let us turn now to Scouting.

This is a wonderful organization to whom Congress granted a Federal charter on February 8, 1910. On this last evening of Boy Scout Week in the year of Our Lord 1959, let us glance over the long list of achievements, remembering that more than 4,780,000 active Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, Explorers and their leaders have been meeting together in happy, earnest observance.

Since 1911, 331,719 Americans have qualified for Eagle Scout rank; 199 awards for heroism or meritorious service were made in 1957 by the Boy Scouts' National Court of Honor. The Safety merit badge has been earned by 869,756 Boy Scouts and Explorers. This is only part of a wonderful record. And let us rejoice that there are 7,589,183 Boy Scouts and leaders in 67 nations around the world.

A year or more ago I foregathered with many of you in a tent on the Chagrin Reservation. It had been raining heavily and the ground was soggy, the air water-charged. But there were no empty chairs and no one grumbled! It was my first direct contact with Scout leaders and it was a thrilling experience!

And here we are tonight under the delightfully friendly hospitable roof of this Windermere Methodist Church which gives such wonderful service to this community.

What a miraculous thing it is, this togetherness. Never in our history have we so needed strength of body, mind and soul, individually and collectively, as we do at this moment. We are pitted against an adversary who, in denying the very existence of God, signed his own ultimate death warrant, but who is terrible indeed in his present strength. We have found him to be ingenious, in some things brilliant, in others not. We know him to be cruel, ruthless, deceiving and deceitful. We have found him to be without morals and without honor. And we must have realized by now that we are in a long, dark, treacherous battle for the survival not only of the nation that Mr. Lincoln hoped would go "onward and upward," that "will not pass away," but of free men across the world.

And then it is as if someone lighted a little candle and set it upon a rock and darkness gathered her cloak about her and oh, so reluctantly, turned from us and began her long way through the gloom of hatred toward the pity and forgiveness of Him whom she had tried to destroy.

"On my honor I will do my best to do my duty to God and my country, and to obey the Scout law; to help other people at all times; to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight."

These lads and those who volunteer as leaders believe that "because God is, I am," their strength can be the support of free men and women everywhere. Their faith can uphold the weakest among us, and even as it was with Lincoln they can bring light with them.

An organization such as the Boy Scouts of America does not come forth suddenly from the heart and mind of one man. No, a dream precedes it, a vision brings into being a tiny infant, lusty, perhaps, but not full-grown or fully panoplied as Minerva when she sprang from the head of Zeus. Yet, from the moment of birth this infant has drawn to itself the ever-increasing many whose dreams have been but fleeting, whose vision takes time to clear—the infant has become a powerful force in the Nation, praise Heaven and makes itself felt across the world.

So has it been with this great Nation of ours which was indeed conceived in a dream and born because a few men with vision joined together to build a nation under God. But a nation is not built of bricks and mortar to fall in the first storm, but rather is it built and held together by the hopes and fears, the love and the labor of millions of men and women seeking a way to the infinite. So it is with Scouting. It rests upon the patient collaboration of literally millions of men and women determined that American boys no matter where they live shall have the opportunities that spell faith, hope and love, the greatest of the three.

I have said that the United States came into being because a few great souls saw a vision and determined that a nation dedicated to freedom, to the dignity of the individual and to the Eternal God should be born. It is not yet 200 years that we have lived—nor have we been too successful in giving true freedom of the spirit as well as freedom under law to every American. There is yet so much, so very much to do. And why not—for is not this great adventure we call living, as we come out of unconscious perfection and go toward perfected consciousness, given us that we may strive constantly to strengthen ourselves and those around us to the end that man everywhere may indeed be free?

What group is there better equipped than you of the Scouting world? What does Scouting stand for? Is it not training and discipline each of himself, each helping those with whom he comes in contact? Is it not very basic, very fundamental, not just for the Cub, the Scout, etc., but for the leaders as well, indeed, first of all? When you sit down with yourselves—alone—at the end of a Scout year and take stock, don't you find that you, as an individual, have grown in many directions? Do you not realize more and more each year the truth you came across long since and only half believed, that you cannot teach another (least of all an intuitive youngster) anything very vital about a character quality which you do not possess? Do you not find increasingly that as Walt Whitman so well said, "The gift is to the giver and comes back most to him"?

We need more Scouts, so we must have more trained and dedicated leaders. I have seen your plans toward this end and am glad indeed to add my earnest hope that the very fire of the need for men who will stand up individually and together to strengthen the great army of righteousness, will be a light which will inspire hundreds and thousands and millions to take up their part of the load.

Little by little in these years since Scouting was brought to these shores people are realizing that as President Coolidge said in 1926, Scouting is a movement that has a "unique power for fusing together in a common citizenhood in one generation, the different elements that make up the United States, which would otherwise take two or three generations of schooling and legislation."

Scouting makes visible the elements that have made us a Nation of free men, united in the certainty that in a land such as ours, "one Nation under God" there can be "liberty and justice for all."

Out of this community there can and must come a great tide of desire in the hearts of many to play a simple, quiet but very effective role in giving youngsters a clearer picture of what freedom means—of showing them that character is what makes a man and builds a nation—that honor and loyalty and courage and faith bound together intelligently with understanding will inevitably become a cleansing force not only here in these United States, but also throughout the world.

What must a boy do when he joins up? He must take the Scout oath solemnly, and as we say on Capitol Hill—"without reservations." Listen all over again as I read it to you:

"On my honor I will do my best to do my duty to God and my country, and to obey the Scout law; to help other people at all times; to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight."

Strong meat, friends, but potent, for the young respond to these things with every fiber of their threefold being. How much there is in those 40 words, friends. There is a promise in them so rich in possibility that one could sing for joy.

"To keep myself"—not anyone else for him—"physically strong." I watch the many Scout troops that flow in and out of Washington when winter is done with a real thrill. Oh, they often are hot and tired and their uniforms are mussed and tell the story of hikes in dust and rain. But Scouts do not slouch and shuffle along, as all too many school groups do, even at the end of a long, hard, and exciting day. Praise Allah, we have 4¾ million youngsters who can walk.

"To keep myself mentally awake." Just sit down with a group of them—they are like hungry vultures tearing at your brains.

Just the acknowledgment of their recognition of moral values puts the whole country outside the Iron Curtain and all it has grown to mean of atheistic materialism.

So it is not casually said that a Scout is trustworthy for when a Scout repeats the oath—the Scout law—he is really saying that he will be trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent. Rather wonderful, that—especially when one realizes that just the words have little value to the Scout unless they are backed by dedicated, constructive action.

Surely there are—just around the corner at least—the 600 who are needed right away, men and women like yourselves who have dreamed dreams of a strong, healthy, God-fearing land, and who will find such volunteer service more enriching than they would now believe.

I agree wholeheartedly with a statement contained in a recent Boy Scout annual report, which says:

"The development of our youth to be physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight, to be citizens of character, with high spiritual ideals and motives, is not just a desirable thing, but it is essential if America is to fulfill its mission as the leader of the free world."

Let us remember that: "Scouting is a way of living. It values deeds above words. It builds character through habit and citizenship through service. It develops cooperation through cooperating. It learns through doing. Its outdoor craft enhealthens, deepens, and enriches boy life. Scouting is a process of making real men out of real boys, by a real program—an interest-gripping, growth-producing, character-building pro-

gram of activities. Scout activities are of great worth in themselves as well as in their byproducts of habits and attitudes."

Again my deep appreciation for this privilege of sharing this fellowship night with you. And may the Infinite bless this work, strengthen and keep you, and may His light shine before you on whatever road you travel.

Tony Moyer, Bellflower High School Boy in 23d Congressional District, Los Angeles County, Calif., Wins California Statewide Democracy Scriptwriting Contest Sponsored by National Association of Broadcasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased and very proud indeed to present the text of the California statewide winning script written by my young friend and congressional constituent, Tony Moyer, of the Bellflower High School, Bellflower, Los Angeles County, Calif., in the nationwide State-by-State contest which was sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters.

As I say, Tony Moyer was the top winner throughout the State of California.

I am pleased to say that this distinguished high school lad from my native State of California, together with the top winners of the 48 other States of the United States, is to arrive in Washington, D.C., during the day of Sunday, February 22, and thereafter is to be entertained and looked out for by the National Association of Broadcasters, which association has arranged a thoroughgoing and splendid program of information and inspection for all these distinguished lads who will come from throughout our Nation. Their visitations to famous places and monuments, memorials, and programs and facilities in and about Washington includes a visit to historical Mount Vernon where there will be a special program for them.

On Monday next they will visit our Capitol and attend a session of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives. On Wednesday, February 25, at 12:30 p.m., in the Presidential Ballroom of the Statler-Hilton here at Washington will occur the Voice of Democracy National Awards luncheon and I will have the great pleasure of eating luncheon with that distinguished young guest from my great 23d Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and every other Member of this great legislative body will join with me in complimenting the National Association of Broadcasters upon initiating and carrying forward this Voice of Democracy scriptwriting contest. I know too that you will join with me in my sense of pride and pleasure in having one of the distinguished lads from my own congressional district be the statewide winner of this significant contest from all the schools of California.

Herewith follows the text of letter to me of January 19, 1959, from Mr. Harold E. Fellows, chairman, Voice of Democracy Policy Committee of the National Association of Broadcasters; and, the text of the winning script of Tony Moyer, the California statewide winner:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF BROADCASTERS,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1959.

The Honorable CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. DOYLE: I thought you would like to know that the California State winner in the 1958–59 Voice of Democracy broadcast scriptwriting contest is Tony Moyer, of 10038 Rose Avenue, Bellflower, a student at Bellflower High School. He is the son of the Reverend Otis H. Moyer, a resident of your congressional district.

Tony competed among high school students throughout your State by writing and delivering orally a 5-minute script on the theme, "I Speak for Democracy." A panel of judges in California determined that this script was the best of all submitted in the statewide contest. It was selected as California's entry in the national contest finals.

Tony and the top winners from the other 48 States will each receive a 4-day, all-expenses-paid trip to Washington, D.C., next month to see their Government in action. Their activities in the Nation's Capital will begin on Sunday, February 22 (George Washington's Birthday), and will be climaxed by a national awards program at the Statler Hilton Hotel on Wednesday, February 25, to which you will shortly receive a formal invitation. The State winners' schedule will include a visit to Capitol Hill.

The Voice of Democracy Contest is designed to stimulate American youth to think about the meaning of our form of government in their own lives and to communicate their ideas to others.

The contest is sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters and the Electronic Industries Association in cooperation with the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It has been endorsed by the U.S. Office of Education and approved by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (a department of the National Education Association).

If Tony is selected as the top national winner, he will receive a $1,500 scholarship to any college he chooses. If he is one of the four national finalists, he will be offered a $500 scholarship by the University of Missouri School of Journalism. The finalists and the top national winner will be announced at the awards program on February 25.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. FELLOWS,
Chairman, Voice of Democracy Policy Committee.

ENTRY OF TONY MOYER, 10038 ROSE AVENUE, BELLFLOWER, CALIFORNIA, IN THE 1958–59 VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCRIPTWRITING CONTEST

There are many voices to be heard in our lives, among them the voices of freedom, the voices of knowledge, the voices of religion and the voices of democracy.

I listen to all these voices, knowing that each has for me a message of great significance. I have been born in a democratic nation. I have listened with special attention to the voices of our democracy. Everywhere I look, I see democracy at work and hear its many voices. Yes, the voices of democracy ring out in clarion tones which echo from one end of our Nation to the other, trumpeting the blessings we Americans enjoy. The voices of democracy proclaim the message of freedom: freedom of speech, freedom of thught, freedom of religion, freedom to pursue happiness as I interpret happiness, freedom to choose for myself a life that will bring personal satisfaction and whatever measure of personal security I feel is necessary to my wellbeing, freedom to develop to the maximum of my potentialities.

Democracy makes it crystal clear that the individual is important. Each individual may walk along life's way with dignity, knowing that he or she will never be swallowed up by the oblivion of a collectivized society. Democracy guarantees me the right to live my own life; yet democracy warns me against infringing upon and abusing the rights of others. Democracy demands that I respect other men if I am to be respected by them.

Democracy also has something to say about duty as well as freedom. Democracy affords me the opportunity and imposes upon me the responsibility to vote. My right to vote gives me a say in who shall hold public office and make the laws by which we are to be governed. If people like myself make a mistake and elect the wrong man to public office, we do not need to resort to barbarous force to remove him. Democracy provides a civilized and sensible way—the ballot box. As long as we heed the voice of democracy and assume these duties and discharge our responsibilities, the voices of American freedom will continue to proclaim the blessings which dignify the lives of our people. To listen to only some of the voices of democracy or to disregard the duties that political and economic freedom imposes upon us will soon destroy freedom itself.

Remember, democracy is by and of the people. This means that we decide our way of life and that it is our duty to sustain it. God help us that we as a people never turn over to a few the responsibilities of governing this Nation. If we do, the few will appropriate to themselves these, our corresponding blessings. Therefore, the voice of democracy constantly reminds me that I cannot be selfish and demand the good things of life without doing my part to sustain the system that provides these good things. Too many who do not heed the voice of democracy think that life owes them a living and happiness. It is this very thing that produces dictators and totalitarian systems. Democracy can survive only in a nation where everyone is willing to bear their part of the burden as well as enjoy the rewards.

I wish I could make the voice of democracy heard by all the young people of all lands. If they could but learn of all that democracy offers, I believe that they would in a few years foster democracy in their own lands. We, the teen-agers of our day, could have a mighty impact upon world affairs if we could but reach those of our own ages in other lands. If every school in our land would produce five students each year who could speak fluently a foreign language and would study democracy with a view of speaking to the youth of other lands, I believe it would influence world affairs as much as any other one thing on earth.

We then add our own voice to the voices of freedom wherever they may exist in this world, lest the enemies of democracy crush us into eternal silence.

Surgeon for Statesmen: Leonard Dudley Heaton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article from the New York Times, dated February 14, entitled "Surgeon for Statesmen: Leonard Dudley Heaton."

SURGEON FOR STATESMEN: LEONARD DUDLEY HEATON

WASHINGTON, February 13.—Even among surgeons, Maj. Gen. Leonard Dudley Heaton is known as a cool hand with a scalpel.

He performed an operation for ileitis on President Eisenhower in 1956, an associate remarked, with the same calm assurance that he showed when he tended the wounded in the first hours of the attack on Pearl Harbor. Today he operated on John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, for a hernia. A little more than 2 years ago, in November 1956, he had successfully operated on the Secretary for a cancer.

General Heaton, now commandant of Walter Reed Hospital, was chief of surgical services at Schofield Barracks, T.H., when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor in 1941.

He was officially commended for the way in which he handled the wounded. He received a Legion of Merit for his work in the weeks that followed.

General Heaton was born in Parkersburg, W.Va., on Nov. 18, 1902. He received his degree of doctor of medicine from the University of Louisville, Ky., in 1926.

COMMISSIONED IN 1927

He was appointed a first lieutenant in the Medical Corps Reserve and assigned to active duty almost immediately upon graduation. He took his regular commission August 3, 1927.

After serving as an intern at Letterman General Hospital at San Francisco, he served at other hospitals. These included Walter Reed, where he attended Army Medical School in 1928.

After his service at Schofield Barracks, he was transferred in November 1942 to Woodrow Wilson General Hospital at Staunton, Va. He was then placed in command of the 160th General Hospital at Atlantic City, N.J., and took that unit to Europe in March 1944.

When hostilities in Europe ended in 1945, he was in command of the 802d Hospital Center at Blandford, England. He returned to Letterman and became chief of surgical service there.

And in June 1948 he assumed the additional duty of director of professional services at Letterman and became commanding general of the hospital in July 1950.

At Walter Reed, where he assumed command April 1, 1953, his associates speak almost reverently of General Heaton as a dedicated teacher as well as practicing surgeon.

He spends 3 days a week in the surgical rooms, occasionally performing operations, frequently assisting the resident surgeons and interns.

Not only the famous men, General Heaton's associates point out, but also private soldiers and others of little public note receive his personal attention.

He is a devout Baptist. His brother, a prominent Baptist minister in Charlotte, N.C., is a consultant with the Department of Labor.

General Heaton reads a great deal, not only almost every professional journal and book that comes out, but popular fiction and books on public affairs as well.

His second great diversion is golf. He has the reputation of being able to wield a club as well as he does his scalpel. He scores around 80, often breaking that figure.

His wife is the former Sara Hill Richardson, with whom he resides at the commandant's house at the Walter Reed Medical Center.

They have a daughter, Mrs. Sara Heaton Mason, whose husband, a West Point graduate, is studying medicine at Georgetown University in Washington.

Crime Prevention Week Observed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad fact that crime has become big business in the United States. Major crimes last year neared the 3 million mark, an appalling increase of 50 percent since 1952.

Recently, J. Edgar Hoover said:

One of the greatest obstacles which law enforcement faces today is the apathy and disinterest of a large segment of the population. Far too many of our citizens seem to look upon lawlessness as a matter of concern only to the courts, the police, and others in related professional fields.

Last week, the Exchange Club of Fairview Park, Ohio, which lies in the 23d District, took a giant step in dispelling their community's apathy and disinterest in crime prevention.

Mr. Arlin Weardahl was chairman of the Exchange Club's observance of Crime Prevention Week, February 8–14, in Fairview Park. Mr. Weardahl and his committee performed a yeoman service in rallying local churches, parent-teacher organizations, youth clubs, service groups, and law-enforcement agencies in an impressive, week-long series of crime prevention programs.

The Fairview Herald, published by Mr. Emil M. Uschelbec, gave strong support to the week's activities, featuring a four-page spread on crime prevention in its February 5 edition. Commenting in its editorial columns, the newspaper stressed:

Such a program also depends upon the interest of the average resident—your neighbor and mine—who helps the police, the schools and the churches to do the job. Crime is not absent from suburban communities such as ours—but we feel it is being effectively combated by such a program as this one.

Highlights of the week included special church services; talks by Juvenile Court Judge Albert A. Woldman, Detective Robert Lee and Patrolman Fred Standen, and Cuyahoga County Prosecutor John T. Corrigan; a special proclamation by Mayor James A. Dunson; open house at the Fairview Police Department under the charge of Chief Albert Burkhart.

Cooperating with the Exchange Club in sponsoring Crime Prevention Week in Fairview Park were the city administration, the police department, the Boosters Club, the recreation department, the amateur coaches association, the Fairview Athletic Club, and the board of education.

Mr. Weardahl's committee was composed of the Reverend Fred E. Blue, Jr., and Bill Gillam, of the Exchange Club, and Mayor Dunson, Chief Burkhart, Dr. Frank Barr, of the Fairview Park schools, and Recreation Director Nelson Russ.

Rural Electric Co-ops Have Remained Silent Too Long

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for years the public has been bombarded with propaganda advertising directed against the rural electric cooperatives by the private utilities. Meanwhile, the co-ops have quietly gone about their business of electrifying the farms of America—a job that the utilities had refused to undertake. I feel that the rural electric systems should tell their story, and John Van Meter, editor of the New Richmond (Wis.) News, very ably expressed the same conviction in an editorial in the February 12, 1959, issue of his weekly newspaper. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a copy of that editorial in the RECORD:

The hundreds of rural electric cooperatives throughout the Nation are growing up, and waking up, too. They are bringing their message to the attention of the public through newspaper advertisements in the various communities served by each cooperative.

Rural electric co-ops have too long remained silent while the mighty electric power companies have hammered away at them, hindered their progress and generally been a pain in the neck. We believe there is a place for both services—we can't imagine private electric energy companies ever attempting to tap the sparse rural areas with its lines—them boys like to sell electric energy, but in populated areas where the demand is great—one or two customers to the mile is not their meat but they would have the public think they would eventually come to this market.

In the meantime, energetic farmers devised a way to get electric energy to any farmer and more power to them for their success. It appears to have been easier to get set up in business than to stay in—the electric cooperatives are under a bit of pressure from so-called private enterprise for their success. Private enterprise makes some wild claims against the eletcric co-ops but the main thing is that the co-ops are getting electric energy through to any farmer who wants it, and that's the important thing. Tt us it's quite a thrill to have to get up before daylight occasionally to start on a long drive and see the farms along the way safely lighted with electric energy instead of the old-fashioned way of a farmer having to carry a lantern which oftentimes burned down the barn it was supposed to light up.

You wonder what brought all this on at this time? It was the following letter from Manager David Rodli, manager of the St. Croix County Electric Cooperative at Baldwin who recently induced his board of directors to take the advertising columns of the newspapers in the co-op's area to state its side of the case, and they are doing a good job of it:

"During the week of February 9, your newspaper will carry another in the series of advertisements we have scheduled for your publication during the current year. 'Did someone say taxes?' is the question we ask. The point we try to make is that rural electric cooperatives do pay taxes, substantial taxes. This fact is known to all who seek and use facts as they concern the position of cooperatives in our business economy.

"A fact that is not too well known, or fully appreciated, is that rural electric cooperatives are new business, organized within the past 25 years. Consequent to this fact, the taxes we pay are new taxes, where none were paid before for the reason that the rural electric cooperatives were organized and operate in areas previously regarded as uneconomical for electric service.

"Rural power lines are costly to build and maintain, with few consumers per mile. It was difficult for any electric company to justify the expense of constructing rural lines when expected revenues would hardly cover this expense, much less return any profit. Thus, as late as 1935, only 1 out of 10 of the Nation's farms was electrified. This was justification enough for the U.S. Congress to establish the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) and make funds available for rural line building. Congress decided it was in the public interest, socially and economically, to encourage rural electricity. Private companies, municipal systems, and cooperative groups were invited to participate in the program.

"In our local area, as in a thousand other sections of the Nation, the farmers themselves organized a cooperative to accomplish a job that wasn't being done in any other way. They overcame many obstacles in establishing this new and strange business, and they have succeeded where others would not try. One essential to progress was that rates be kept low enough to encourage a maximum use of electricity. Cooperative service at cost was probably the only way in which this job could ever have been done.

"Members of the rural electric cooperatives are justifiably proud to be providing themselves with modern electric service, to be repaying their REA loans with interest, and to be paying a fair share of taxes, new taxes, where none were paid before."

So far as electric energy users are concerned in New Richmond, did you ever stop to realize we get our electric service somewhat along the lines of hideous co-op methods? We buy the electric energy wholesale, distribute it through a municipal commission, and don't charge ourselves with a full slate of taxes. We should be happy to cooperate with the co-ops—we practice what they preach.

Columbus Day Should Be a National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on February 5 I introduced a bill, H.R. 4188, to make October 12, Columbus Day, a legal holiday.

Columbus Day is already a State holiday in 39 out of our 49 States.

In fact the only States which do not pay honor to the discovery of America are Alaska, the District of Columbia, Idaho, Maine, Massachusetts, North Carolina, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, and Wyoming.

It is not always called Columbus Day. In Alabama October 12 is designated as Fraternal Day. In Indiana, North Dakota, and Ohio it is called Discovery Day, and in Wisconsin it is known as Landing Day.

Arkansas, Iowa, and Oregon call it Memorial Day.

It seems to me that with so many of the States celebrating October 12 each year as a legal or public holiday, the time has come to make it known as a national holiday for all Americans.

Certainly there is no event deserving more of nationwide acknowledgment and celebration than the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus.

There is no person in history, to whom the American citizenry is more indebted, than Christopher Columbus; no person of greater fortitude and determination; no person who better exemplifies the American impulse to discover new horizons, to press forward, to prove for ourselves the falseness of outmoded theories; and no person has made greater self-sacrifice or taken greater risks in order to serve the future of humanity.

It is only fitting that Columbus Day be declared by Congress as a legal national holiday.

Resolution to Commemorate the 41st Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following resolution which was adopted on the occasion of the 41st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey at St. Georges Hall, Newark, N.J., on February 15, 1959.

Resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Newark, State of New Jersey, sponsored by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey and held on February 15, 1959, at St. Georges Hall, 180 New York Avenue, Newark, N.J., to commemorate the 41st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania:

"Whereas in 1940 the Soviet Union in conspiracy with the Hitlerite Germany and in brutal violation of all treaties and obligations, signed by her, invaded Lithuania with armed forces and against the will of the people, annexed her to the Communist empire; and

"Whereas since that time the freedom of Lithuanian people is suppressed by cruel means of the Communist dictatorship which strives to dominate all the world; and

"Whereas the fate of Lithuania, as well as of other subjugated eastern European nations, will depend on the success of the foreign policy of the United States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this gathering of loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Newark calls upon the Government of the United States to stand firm against the expansion of Communist imperialism and do all in its power to liberate the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain; be it further

"*Resolved*, That this meeting urges the Government of United States to continue its opposition to the United Nation's Code of Offenses which prohibits lending assistance to, and liberation of, captive nations; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That the Government of the United States refrain from signing any new treaties with the Soviet Union until the latter agrees to restore freedom and sovereign rights to Lithuania and the other enslaved European nations."

LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF NEW JERSEY,
WALTER J. DILIS, *Chairman*.
ALBIN S. TRECIOKAS, *Secretary*.
NEWARK, N.J., *February 15, 1959*.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to insert in the RECORD the following article on Thaddeus Kosciuszko which appeared in the February 14, 1959, issue of the Polish-American Journal, commemorating the birth of this great man:

THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO

February 12 marked the anniversary of the birth of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Poland's great patriot and national leader and America's Revolutionary War general and aid to George Washington.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko was born in 1746 at Siechnowicze, Poland. He was the brilliant son of a prominent but impoverished family. After briefly attending a Jesuit college, young Kosciuszko entered the Polish corps of cadets. He completed his military course with the rank of captain. The king of Poland, impressed with his natural ability for engineering, sent him to France to pursue further studies.

After 7 years of studies abroad, he returned to Poland in 1774. He found little employment for his talents because of conditions prevailing in Poland after the First Partition. He left Poland when he heard of the outbreak of hostilities in America. He was determined to go to the aid of America—a Polish knight in the cause of liberty.

In the summer of 1776, Kosciuszko arrived in America at his own initiative and at his own expense. He was compissioned by Act of Congress, October 18, 1776, as an engineer in the Continental service with pay of $60 a month and the rank of colonel.

In the spring of 1777, he joined the Northern Army, where his ability as an engineer was of valuable use in the campaign against Burgoyne. His fortification at Van Schaick and elsewhere, his able judgment in the

choice of battlegrounds, contributed much to the skillful retreats and the firm stands of the Continental Army before Burgoyne's rash advance. He was ordered by General Gates to erect the fortification in the defense of Saratoga, and his task was accomplished with great brilliancy and speed.

With justified pride Poles regard the role played by their national hero in the victory at Saratoga, a victory which won for America not only a campaign but France's recognition of her independence.

To secure the defense of the Hudson River Kosciuszko was chosen over the French engineer, Radiere, to build the fortifications at West Point. Little is now left of the fortification, but the monument erected to his memory at West Point by American youth will remain a grateful tribute forever. That America today can regard West Point with pride is, in large measure, due to Kosciuszko who first suggested for a national military school the spot where it now stands.

General Gates requested Washington to transfer Kosciuszko to the South. Gates, however, ruined himself at Camden before the Polish engineer could join him. While awaiting the arrival of Gen. Nathaniel Greene, who succeeded Gates, Kosciuszko spent some time in Virginia among the planters. There he saw the Negroes at close quarters and was brought face to face with the Negro slavery. It was then that, with his keen susceptibility to every form of human suffering, he acquired the profound sympathy for the American Negro which 17 years later was to dictate his parting testament to the New World.

Kosciuszko was present through the whole campaign of the Carolinas. When Charleston fell, he was among the first to enter the city. He fought for 6 years in the American Army. General Greene wrote "Colonel Kosciuszko belonged to the number of my most useful and dearest comrades in arms. I can liken to nothing his zeal in the public service, and in the solution of important problems, nothing could have been more helpful than his judgment, vigilance, and diligence. He was fearless of every danger. He never manifested desires or claims to himself, and never let opportunity pass of calling attention to and recommending the merits of others."

Congress, in 1783 belatedly conferred upon Thaddeus Kosciuszko the rank of Brigadier-General with an acknowlegement of its "high sense of his long, faithful, and meritorious service." He was given the privileges of American citizenship. He was granted lands and money.

In the fall of 1784, Kosciuszko returned to Poland. A further wave of patriotic ardour swept over Poland after the second partition in 1792. General Kosciuszko hastened to Krakow, summoned the people to arms, proclaiming new decrees in favor of the peasants. He attacked the Russians at Raclawice. Infuriated, Catherine of Russia sent a large army to fight Kosciusko and his poorly equipped army at Maciejowice in the south of Poland. The two forces met, three horses were killed under him, and bleeding from many wounds he was taken prisoner. With him fell the independence of Poland. He was cast into a dungeon in Petersburg, and only after Catherine's death her successor Paul I liberated the Polish hero.

In December, 1796, Kosciuszko sailed for Philadelphia, arriving on June 18, 1797. He was warmly received by Thomas Jefferson. He lived briefly in Philadelphia. His grants of American land and American money were very considerable for the time. He turned them over to Jefferson with the stipulation that the gifts be used to found a Negro school and to buy and free Negro slaves. In 1826 the legacy went to found the Colored School at Newark, the first educational institute for Negroes in the United States and which bore Kosciuszko's name.

By the end of June, 1798, Kosciuszko reached Paris. He began negotiating at length with the Government of France for her help in the restoration of Polish independence. Napoleon, in 1806, summoned Kosciuszko to assume leadership of the revolting Poles. But Kosciuszko had little faith in the fortune of the Emperor and none in his promises. He declined to obey the call, and remained in Paris.

Leaving France Kosciuszko settled in Switzerland. And here, on the sad autumn evening of October 15, 1817, far from his motherland, though close in spirit, among strangers, with not a Polish face nor a Polish word to gladden his heart, Kosciuszko died.

Kosciuszko's body now rests in the Wawel Cathedral in Krakow, where lie Poland's kings and her most honored dead. To this day the name of Thaddeus Kosciuszko lives in the hearts of the Polish people, not only as the object of their profound and passionate love, but as the symbol of their dearest national aspirations. His pictures, his relics, are venerated as with the devotion paid to a patron saint. Legend and music have gathered about his name.

The spirit of Kosciuszko, however, will never rest in peace until there is restored to her proper place at the council table of the nations of the world a free and independent and sovereign state—the Republic of Poland.

The spirit of the Polish people is the spirit of Kosciuszko. It is an unconquerable spirit that will never die.

KOSCIUSZKO'S WILL

"I, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, being just in my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States thereby authorize my friend, Thomas Jefferson, to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own as any others and giving them liberty in my name in giving them an education in trades and otherwise, and in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality which may make them good neighbors, good fathers or mothers, husbands or wives, and in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country and of the good order of society and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful, and I make the said Thomas Jefferson my executor of this.

"T. KOSCIUSZKO.

"5th day of May 1798."

National Historic Shrine Assured Near Astoria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excellent article by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, regarding the Fort Clatsop National Memorial:

NATIONAL HISTORIC SHRINE ASSURED NEAR ASTORIA

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, U.S. Senator for Oregon)

As Oregon commemorates 100 years of eventful history as a State, talented men and women of the U.S. National Park Service are bending over drawing boards at their regional offices in San Francisco, designing the visitors' center and museum building for the first national historical shrine ever to be located in Oregon.

This is the Fort Clatsop National Memorial, which Congress and the President have recently authorized for construction at a cost of approximately $350,000 near Astoria.

Fort Clatsop National Memorial will herald an epochal event which occurred more than half a century before statehood—the original crossing of the continent by Americans, when Meriwether Lewis and William Clark ended their overland pilgrimage at the mouth of the Columbia River. They spent the winter of 1804–05 in a primitive stockade of logs which they named "Fort Clatsop." It was the first such habitation by citizens of the United States along the Pacific seaboard.

The site of this occupancy, some 125 acres in expanded dimensions, will be the Fort Clatsop National Memorial.

In November I conferred at San Francisco with the National Park Service officials in charge of preparing plans for the great undertaking. They share my view that the buildings of the memorial should be in keeping with their Pacific Northwest locale, and that perhaps such native materials as field stone and Douglas-fir siding should characterize the edifices. These officials assured me of their enthusiasm for the project, because they believe our system of national historical shrines has too long neglected the Lewis and Clark expedition.

Representative WALTER NORBLAD of the First Oregon District and I jointly sponsored the legislation authorizing Fort Clatsop National Memorial, which passed both Chambers of Congress unanimously and was signed by President Eisenhower. Several months ago I presented to the Clatsop County Historical Society the pen which the President used for this purpose.

Both Representative NORBLAD and I consider it particularly appropriate that the first national historical shrine ever to be built in Oregon should be under way just as Oregon marks its first century of statehood.

In view of the existence of McLoughlin House at Oregon City, even many Oregon historians are perplexed by the claim that Fort Clatsop National Memorial will be our State's first historical shrine of national proportions.

McLoughlin House, which pays tribute to the career of the illustrious Dr. John McLoughlin of the Hudson's Bay Co., is a national historical site, but it is under non-Federal ownership. It is privately owned and privately administered. Federal funds do not contribute to its operation or maintenance.

Fort Clatsop National Memorial, by contrast, will be developed and administered entirely by the U.S. Government. Title to the land will be vested in the Federal Government. Federal funds and personnel will be used in its administration—and, incidentally, the budget for operation will be about $22,000 annually.

Other similar national memorials of great fame are the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials in Washington, D.C., and the De Soto National Memorial of Florida. There also is the Wright Brothers National Memorial of Kitty Hawk, N.C., where two brothers named Orville and Wilbur Wright flew their handmade flying machine in 1903.

The Fort Clatsop National Memorial, which will be along U.S. 101, represents a longtime goal of the Oregon Historical Society. Through the years the society carefully marked the site of original Fort Clatsop, as the logs crumbled back into the earth from whence they had come. Without this diligence on the part of the historical society, there might have been so much doubt about the location of the winter headquarters of Lewis and Clark that the memorial never could have been authorized.

The Clatsop County Historical Society also has played a key role in the plans for Fort Clatsop. Two of its leaders, Otto Owen and Burnby M. Bell, have been particularly assiduous in marking out the location of the historic winter encampment of the Lewis and Clark party. These local people in Astoria will see the memorial actually under construction during the fiscal year which commences July 1, 1959, because the administration budget includes $157,250 for the start of work on the undertaking.

Such a sum will be sufficient to finance building of the houses to be occupied by the personnel of the memorial shrine. It also will provide for installation of sewage facilities, parking lots, access roads, wells for a domestic water supply and for rehabilitation and protection of the recreated log fort.

It is highly likely that Congress will go along with the administration's budget recommendations in this field, because the project is not controversial. Our Fort Clatsop legislation passed both the Senate and House unanimously.

The memorial will include the rebuilt log Fort Clatsop, which was a joint project of the Astoria Junior Chamber of Commerce and the Crown-Zellerbach Timber Co. at the time of the Lewis and Clark sesquicentennial in 1955. Buildings added by the National Park Service will be featured by the museum and visitors' center, and also by two staff residences for the superintendent and the historian of the project. Roads, trails and parking areas will complete the undertaking.

Lectures on the dramatic Lewis and Clark trek will take place daily at Fort Clatsop National Memorial for schoolchildren and other visitors. A booklet distributed by the Government will explain the historical significance of the site. Such men as Herbert E. Kahler, chief historian of the National Park Service, tell me that they expect Fort Clatsop National Memorial to become a mecca on the Pacific coast for families interested in American history.

I believe the entire project should be constructed and ready for formal dedication some time late in 1960 or early in 1961. It is hoped that the dedicatory address will be given by the President of the United States, whoever he may be, at that time. After all, Lewis and Clark, whom the memorial honors, were sent westward on their journey of high destiny by our country's eminent third President, Thomas Jefferson.

(Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER was the first Member of Congress to propose Fort Clatsop National Memorial. He and Representative WALTER NORBLAD were the successful sponsors of the legislation which President Eisenhower signed late last summer creating the historical shrine near Astoria.)

Textile Industry Is Alarmed Over Imports From Tokyo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the great American textile industry is alarmed over imports from Tokyo. The textile industry was hoping that Assistant Secretary Henry Kearns on his present trip to Tokyo would stand up for the American industry and its employees. I was shocked a moment ago to receive the following telegram from Mr. Leon Lowenstein of New York. Mr. Lowenstein is a patriotic American who is desperately trying to furnish employment for Americans. Mr. Lowenstein is working night and day to keep his industry going:

Hon. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Today's news record reports U.S. Assistant Secretary of Commerce Henry Kearns as saying in Tokyo, "U.S. Government is interested in helping to expand the market for Japanese textile industry and is interested in seeing the Japanese textile market expand in the United States as much as the Japanese are interested." If such quotation is correct I wonder whether Mr. Kearns reflects official U.S. policy. By virtue of what authority does any department of our Government seek to expand markets for Japanese industry in the United States?

LEON LOWENSTEIN.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in response to Mr. Lowenstein's telegram, I am sending the following wire to the Honorable Lewis L. Strauss, Acting Secretary of Commerce:

Hon. LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Acting Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.:

Fairchild News Service, under date of February 18 from Tokyo, Japan, reported Assistant Secretary Kearns as having said, "the U.S. Government is interested in helping to expand the market for the Japanese textile industry and is interested in seeing the Japanese textile market expand in the United States as much as the Japanese are interested."

I would be interested in knowing the source of the policy on which the Kearns statement is based. The American industry is presently sharing its textile markets with the Japanese to such an extent that it is injurious to our industry and its employees. Please advise why, in view of the present ease of access to our markets, the Assistant Secretary deems it a matter of policy to encourage the Japanese to seek an even larger share. The U.S. economy cannot be expected to absorb the Japanese industrial capacity which has been largely rebuilt with American tax dollars.

WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time for this Congress to know whether or not the State Department and the Department of Commerce are really interested in helping the industry and labor of America or whether or not their first allegiance is to industry and labor in foreign lands.

This Congress has a continuing responsibility to see that our trade laws and agreements are properly administered by executive agencies.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*.
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss*., 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*., 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*.
Albert, Carl, *Okla*., 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*.
Alford, Dale, *Ark*.
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*.
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*., University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*., 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont*., 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*., 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*.
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*., 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*.
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*.
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*., Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*., 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*.
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*.
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*.
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*.
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*., 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*.
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind*., Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*.
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y*.
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*.
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*.
Bates, William H., *Mass*.
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*.
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*.
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*., 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*., 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*., 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*.
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*.
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga*.
Boggs, Hale, *La*.
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*.
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*., 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio*., 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*., Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*., 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn*.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*., The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*.
Brademas, John, *Ind*.
Bray, William G., *Ind*.
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans*.
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*.
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr*.
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*.
Brooks, Overton, *La*., 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich*.
Brown, Charles H., *Mo*., 3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*., Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*., Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*.
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*.
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*.
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak*.
Burke, Frank W., *Ky*.
Burke, James A., *Mass*.
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*., 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*.
Byrne, James A., *Pa*.
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*., 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J*.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*.
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*.
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*.
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*.
Casey, Bob, *Tex*.
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*.
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*., The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich*.
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*.
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*.
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*., 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill*., 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*., 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*.
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*.
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*., 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*.
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*.
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*.
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*., 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*.
Cramer, William C., *Fla*., 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*., 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*.
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*., 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*.
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*.
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*.
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J*.
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*., 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga*.
Dawson, William L., *Ill*.
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*.
Dent, John H., *Pa*.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*.
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*.
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*.
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*.
Dingell, John D., *Mich*.
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*., 1617 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*.
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y*.
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*.
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*.
Dowdy, John, *Tex*.
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*.
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*., 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y*.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*., The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J*.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*.
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*.
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*., 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*.
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y*.
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*.
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*.
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*., 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*.
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*., Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*., The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis*.
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*.
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*., 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md*.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*., 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*., 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*.
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*., The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn*., Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*., 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*.
Fulton, James G., *Pa*.
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J*.
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*.
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*.
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*., 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*.
George, Newell A., *Kans*.
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*.
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J*., Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa*.
Grant, George M., *Ala*., 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*.
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*.
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*.
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich*.
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*.
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*.
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*.
Haley, James A., *Fla*.
Hall, David M., *N. C*.
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*., 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y*.
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*.
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans*.
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind*.
Harris, Oren, *Ark*., 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*., 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y*.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*., 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*.
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C*.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*.
Hess, William E., *Ohio*.
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*.
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*., 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*., 3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill*.
Hogan, Earl, *Ind*.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*.
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*.
Holt, Joe, *Calif*.
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*.
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*.
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*.
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*.
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*., The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*.
Jarman, John, *Okla*.
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*.
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*., 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*.
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo*.
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*.
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md*.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*.
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*., 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*.
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*., 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*.
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*.
Kasem, George A., *Calif*.
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis*.
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*., Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va*., 2000 Mass. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y*.
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*., The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*.
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*., 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*., 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif*.
King, David S., *Utah*.
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*.
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C*.
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*.
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*.
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn*.
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa*.
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*.
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*.

Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*	
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Lennon, Alton, *N. C.*	
Lesinski; John, *Mich.*	
Levering, Robert W., *Ohio*	
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.*	224 C St. NE.
Lindsay, John V., *N. Y.*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn.*	The Congressional
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*	The Washington
McCulloch, William M., *Ohio*	4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif.*	
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*	
McFall, John J., *Calif.*	507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGinley, Donald F., *Nebr.*	
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak.*	
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*	220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*	
McSween, Harold B., *La.*	
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*	
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*	115 Dale Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*	
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*	
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*	
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*	
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*	Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*	
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*	
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.*	The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*	The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*	
May, Catherine, *Wash.*	
Meader, George, *Mich.*	3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*	
Meyer, William H., *Vt.*	
Michel, Robert H., *Ill.*	
Miller, Clement W., *Calif.*	
Miller, George P., *Calif.*	
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*	6601 Radnor Rd., Bethesda, Md.
Milliken, William H., Jr., *Pa.*	
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*	2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*	8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga.*	
Moeller, Walter H., *Ohio*	
Monagan, John S., *Conn.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Moorhead, William S., *Pa.*	
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*	
Morris, Thomas G., *N. Mex.*	
Morris, Toby, *Okla.*	220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La.*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*	204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*	
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*	
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*	The Coronet
Murphy, William T., *Ill.*	
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*	
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*	
Nelsen, Ancher, *Minn.*	
Nix, Robert N. C., *Pa.*	
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*	
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*	2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*	
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*	The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*	The Congressional
O'Hara, James G., *Mich.*	
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass.*	
Oliver, James C., *Maine*	
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*	
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*	100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*	
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*	117 Carroll St. SE.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*	
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*	
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho*	
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*	
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*	
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*	
Pirnie, Alexander, *N. Y.*	
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*	228 2d St. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*	
Polk, James G., *Ohio*	
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg.*	
Powell, Adam C., *N. Y.*	
Preston, Prince H., *Ga.*	
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*	
Prokop, Stanley A., *Pa.*	
Pucinski, Roman C., *Ill.*	
Quie, Albert H., *Minn.*	The Coronet Apt., 200 C St. SE.
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*	
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*	
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*	
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*	
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*	
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*	
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*	1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*	6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*	5603 24th Ave. SE., Hillcrest Hgts., Wash. 21, D. C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*	
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*	3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*	
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*	
Rivers, Ralph J., *Alaska*	
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*	6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y.*	
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*	
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*	
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass.*	The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*	Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*	
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*	
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*	
Rostenkowski, Dan, *Ill.*	
Roush, J. Edward, *Ind.*	
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*	
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y.*	
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y.*	
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif.*	
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*	
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*	
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*	
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C.*	
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*	433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*	
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*	
Shipley, George E., *Ill.*	
Short, Don L., *N. Dak.*	
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*	
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*	
Simpson, Edna Oakes, *Ill.*	
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*	5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*	
Slack, John M., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*	
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif.*	
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*	204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Neal, *Iowa*	
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*	
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*	Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*	
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*	
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*	
Stratton, Samuel S., *N. Y.*	107 Martha's Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Stubblefield, Frank A., *Ky.*	
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*	
Taber, John, *N. Y.*	
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*	
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*	
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*	6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y.*	Mayflower Hotel
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*	2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*	3301 Mass. Ave.
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*	
Thompson, T. A., *La.*	1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, Keith, *Wyo.*	
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*	
Toll, Herman, *Pa.*	
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*	
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*	
Tuck, William M., *Va.*	
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*	
Ullman, Al, *Oreg.*	
Utt, James B., *Calif.*	
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*	
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*	
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*	4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*	
Wallhauser, George M., *N. J.*	
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*	
Wampler, Fred, *Ind.*	
Watts, John C., *Ky.*	
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*	9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Weis, Jessica McC., *N. Y.*	
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*	
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*	
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C.*	
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*	5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*	
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*	
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*	1001 26th Rd. S., Arlington, Va.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*	
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*	
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*	
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*	
Wolf, Leonard G., *Iowa*	
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*	
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*	
Young, John, *Tex.*	
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*	4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*	
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*	

DELEGATES

Burns, John A., *Hawaii*	

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*	2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 216 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Serles, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Place SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Appendix

The Role of the Supreme Court as the Interpreter of the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have served in the Senate with many able lawyers. However, I do not believe that I have ever served with or known a greater lawyer than the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. He is a jurist of experience and a scholar of many years of labor. He delivered a very noteworthy speech before the trust division of the American Bankers' Association in New York City on February 11 entitled "The Role of the Supreme Court as the Interpreter of the Constitution."

I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD so that it will be available to all who are interested in the preservation of the Constitution of the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF THE SUPREME COURT AS THE INTERPRETER OF THE CONSTITUTION

(Address by U.S. Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., Democrat of North Carolina, before a meeting of the trust division of the American Bankers Association, New York City)

The constitution of my native State of North Carolina has always contained a warning which all Americans would do well to heed. It is this: "A frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty." Let us pause for a few moments, and recur to some fundamental principles.

The men who composed the Constitutional Convention of 1787 were wise men. They had read the history of the long and bitter struggle of man for freedom, and had found this shocking but everlasting truth inscribed upon each page of that history: No man or set of men can be safely trusted with governmental power of an unlimited nature. As a consequence, they were determined, above all things, to establish a government of laws and not of men.

To prevent the exercise of arbitrary power by the Federal Government, they embodied in the Constitution the doctrine of the separation of governmental powers. In so doing, they utilized this doctrine in a twofold way. They delegated to the Federal Government the powers necessary to enable it to discharge its functions as a central government, and they left to each State the power to regulate its own internal affairs. It was this use of the doctrine of the separation of powers which prompted Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase to make this trenchant observation in *Texas* v. *White:* "The Constitution, in all its provisions, looks to an indestructible union, composed of indestructible States."

In their other utilization of the doctrine of the separation of governmental powers, the members of the Convention of 1787 vested the power to make laws in the Congress, the power to execute laws in the President, and the power to interpret laws in the Supreme Court and such inferior courts as the Congress might establish. Moreover, they declared, in essence, that the legislative, the executive, and the judicial powers of the Federal Government should forever remain separate and distinct from each other.

This brings me to my subject: "The Role of the Supreme Court as the Interpreter of the Constitution."

In discussing this subject, I must tell you the truth about the Supreme Court.

I know it is not popular in some quarters to tell the truth about this tribunal. Admonitions of this character come to us daily from such quarters: When the Supreme Court speaks, its decisions must be accepted as sacrosanct by the bench, the bar, and the people of America, even though they constitute encroachments on the constitutional domain of the President or the Congress, or tend to reduce the States to meaningless zeros on the Nation's map. Indeed, the bench, the bar, and the people must do more than this. They must speak of the Supreme Court at all times with a reverence akin to that which inspired Job to speak thus of Jehovah: "Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him."

To be sure, all Americans should obey the decrees in cases to which they are parties, even though they may honestly and reasonably deem such degrees unwarranted. But it is sheer intellectual rubbish to contend that Americans are required to believe in the infallibility of judges, or to make mental obeisance to judicial aberrations. They have an inalienable right to think and speak their honest thoughts concerning all things under the sun, including the decisions of Supreme Court majorities. It is well this is so because the late Chief Justice Harlan F. Stone spoke an indisputable truth when he said: "Where the courts deal, as ours do, with great public questions, the only protection against unwise decisions, and even judicial usurpation, is careful scrutiny of their action, and fearless comment upon it."

As one whose major efforts have centered in the administration of justice, I have the abiding conviction that tyranny on the bench is as objectionable as tyranny on the throne and that my loyalty to constitutional government compels me to oppose it. In entertaining this conviction, I find myself in the company of such great Americans as Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, and Abraham Lincoln, who refused to accept in abject silence what they conceived to be judicial usurpations.

I do not find it easy to express my disapproval of the action of the Supreme Court. I was taught in my youth to repose an absolute confidence in that Tribunal by my father, an active practitioner of law in North Carolina for 65 years, who was accustomed to refer to it with almost reverential awe. He used to say that the Supreme Court would administer justice according to law even though the heavens fell.

I regret to say, however, that the course of the Supreme Court in recent years has been such as to cause me to ponder the question whether fidelity to fact ought not to induce its members to remove from the portal of the building which houses it the majestic words, "Equal Justice Under Law" and to substitute for them the superscription, "Not justice under law, but justice according to the personal notions of the temporary occupants of this building."

Let me confess that I live in the South. Let me also confess that I deem the school desegregation decisions constitutionally indefensible. Nevertheless I assure you that I would be compelled to hold the opinion I have just expressed even if the school desegregation decisions had never been made.

The truth is that on many occasions during recent years the Supreme Court has usurped and exercised the power of the Congress and the States to amend the Constitution while professing to interpret it.

In so doing, the Supreme Court has encroached upon the constitutional powers of Congress as the Nation's legislative body, and struck down State action and State legislation in areas clearly committed to the States by our system of constitutional government. This action has been accompanied by overruling, repudiating, or ignoring many contrary precedents of earlier years.

A study of the decisions invalidating State action and State legislation compels the conclusion that some Supreme Court Justices now deem themselves to be the final and infallible supervisors of the desirability or wisdom of all State action and all State legislation.

This is tragic indeed, because there is nothing truer than the belief attributed to the late Justice Louis D. Brandeis by Judge Learned Hand, that the States are the only breakwater against the ever-pounding surf which threatens to submerge the individual and destroy the only kind of society in which personality can survive.

Time does not permit me to analyze or even enumerate all of the decisions which sustain what I have said. I must content myself with stating in summary form the effect of only a few of them.

Congress is told by the Court that it really did not mean what it said in exceedingly plain English when it enacted statutes to regulate the naturalization of aliens and to punish criminal conspiracies to overthrow the Government by force. Congress is told by the Court that its committees must conduct their investigations according to rules imposed by the Court which make it virtually certain that no information will ever be obtained from an unwilling witness. Political parties are told by the Court that they must admit to their membership persons who oppose the things for which they stand. California is told by the Court that it cannot punish its residents for criminal offenses committed within its borders if such residents are ignorant of the statutes creating such criminal offenses. California and New Mexico are told by the Court that they cannot determine the fitness or qualifications of those who apply to them for licenses to practice law in their courts. New Hampshire and Pennsylvania are told by the Court that they cannot investigate or punish seditious activities within their borders. New York is told by the Court that it cannot prescribe standards of propriety and fitness for its teachers. North Carolina is told by the Court that it cannot determine the status of its own citizens within its own borders. Pennsylvania and the trustees of the will of Stephen Girard, who has slumbered "in the

tongueless silence of the dreamless dust" for 126 years, are told by the Courts that the 14th amendment empowers the Court to write a postmortem codicil to the will which Stephen Girard made while he walked earth's surface and entertained the belief that disposing of private property by will is a matter for its owner rather than judges.

In saying these things, I am not a lone voice crying in a legal wilderness. The concurring opinion of the late Justice Robert H. Jackson in *Brown* v. *Allen*, and the resolution adopted by 36 State chief justices in Pasadena, Calif., disclose that a substantial portion of the judges and lawyers of America believe the Supreme Court is not confining itself to its allotted constitutional sphere.

I quote these words from Justice Jackson's concurring opinion: "Rightly or wrongly, the belief is widely held by the practicing profession that this Court no longer respects impersonal rules of law but is guided in these matters by personal impressions which from time to time may be shared by a majority of the justices. Whatever has been intended, this Court also has generated an impression in much of the judiciary that regard for precedents and authorities is obsolete, that words no longer mean what they have always meant to the profession, that the law knows no fixed principles." Justice Jackson closed his observations on this score with this sage comment: "I know of no way we can have equal justice under law except we have some law."

Let us consider and weigh the reasoning of those who seek to justify the proposition that it is permissible for the Supreme Court to amend the Constitution under the guise of interpreting it.

They make these assertions: The Constitution must change to meet changing conditions. As its authorized interpreter, the Supreme Court has the rightful power at all times to make the Constitution conform to the views of the majority of its members. Since the doctrine of stare decisis, i.e., the rule that judges stand by and follow the decisions of their own court, might handicap the Supreme Court in making the Constitution conform to the views of a majority of its members on some occasions, the Supreme Court is not bound by its own decisions on constitutional questions.

These arguments rest upon a wholly fallacious premise, namely, that the power to interpret and the power to amend are identical. The distinction between these powers is as wide as the gulf which yawns between Lazarus in Abraham's bosom and Dives in hell. The power to interpret the Constitution is the power to ascertain its meaning, and the power to amend the Constitution is the power to change its meaning.

It seems at first blush that those who advance these arguments overlook the significant fact that article V of the Constitution vests the power to amend the Constitution in the Congress and the States, and not in the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court. But not so. They simply nullify article V with these neat assertions:

The method of amendment authorized by article V is too cumbersome and slow. Consequently, the Supreme Court must do the amending. The alternative is to let the Constitution freeze in the pattern which one generation gave it.

To a country lawyer, this is merely a high falutin' way of saying that the oath of a Supreme Court Justice to support the Constitution does not obligate him to pay any attention to article V or any other provision displeasing to him.

When all is said, the thesis that the Supreme Court has the rightful power to amend the Constitution under the guise of interpreting it is repugnant to the end the Founding Fathers had in mind when they gave this country a written Constitution. Indeed, it is incompatible with the primary object of all law.

"The Federalist," Judge Thomas M. Cooley's monumental treatise on "Constitutional Limitation," and certain great decisions of the Supreme Court antedating the last quarter of a century, reveal with unmistakable clarity the end the Founding Fathers had in mind in giving our country a written Constitution.

The Founding Fathers "were not mere visionaries toying with speculations or theories, but practical men, dealing with the facts of political life as they understood them." (*South Carolina* v. *United States.*)

They understood the facts of political life exceedingly well. The history of the world had taught them that what was done in the past might be attempted in the future. In consequence, they foresaw that the fundamentals of the Government they desired to establish and the liberties of the citizen they wished to secure would be put in peril in troublous times by both the Government and the people unless they protected such fundaments of government and such liberties by irrepealable law binding equally upon the Government and the governed at all times and under all circumstances. (Ex parte Milligan.)

The Founding Fathers knew that the surest way to protect the fundamentals of the Government they desired to establish and the liberties of the citizen they wished to secure was to enshrine them in a written Constitution, and thus put them beyond the control of impatient public officials, temporary majorities, and the varying moods of public opinion. To this end, they framed and adopted a written Constitution, thereby putting into form the Government they were creating and prescribing the powers that Government was to take (*South Carolina* v. *United States;* "Constitutional Limitations.")

The Founding Fathers knew that useful alterations of some provisions of the Constitution would be suggested by experience. Consequently they made provision for amendment as set out in article V. James Madison, whom historians rightly call the father of the Constitution, informs us that the Constitutional Convention preferred this mode for amending the Constitution because "it guards equally against that extreme facility, which would render the Constitution too mutable, and that extreme difficulty, which might perpetuate its discovered faults." ("The Federalist.")

Since the Constitution is a written instrument, its meaning does not alter, unless its wording is changed by amendment in the manner prescribed by article V. "That which it means when adopted it means now. * * * Those things which are within its grants of power, as those grants were understood when made, are still within them, and those things not within them remain still excluded." (*South Carolina* v. *United States.*)

Chief Justice John Marshall declared in his great opinion in *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* that "the enlightened patriots who framed our Constitution and the people who adopted it must be understood * * * to have intended what they said."

This being true, it is as clear as the noonday sun that the role of the Supreme Court as the interpreter of the Constitution is simply to ascertain and give effect to the intent of its framers and the people who adopted it. (*Gibbons* v. *Ogden; Ogden* v. *Saunders; Lake County* v. *Rollins.*) As Justice Miller said in ex parte Bain: "It is never to be forgotten that in the construction of the language of the Constitution here relied on, as indeed in all other instances where construction becomes necessary, we are to place ourselves as nearly as possible in the condition of the men who framed that instrument."

Since the meaning of a written Constitution is fixed when it is adopted and is not different at any subsequent time when a court has occasion to pass upon it, Judge Cooley was justified in declaring in his "Constitutional Limitations" that "a court * * * which should allow a change in public sentiment to influence it in giving a written constitution a construction not warranted by the intention of its founders would be justly chargeable with reckless disregard of official oath and public duty."

I know that in recurring to fundamental principles I lay myself open to the charge that I am setting the clock back. As one who believes truth to be eternal, I am not troubled by this charge. Moreover, I have observed that the charge is usually made by those who labor under the delusion that there was little, if any, wisdom on earth before they arrived. It was a wise man and not a wag who suggested that these persons object to setting the clock back because it would require them to adjust their clocks and their minds forward.

Let us reflect at this point on the primary object of all law.

Laws are designed to furnish rules of conduct for government and people. As a consequence, a law is destitute of value unless it has sufficient stability to afford reliable rules to govern the conduct of government and people, and unless it can be found with reasonable certainty in established legal precedents. Justice Louis D. Brandeis had this truth in mind when he said: "It is usually more important that a rule of law be settled, than that it be settled right. Even where the error in declaring the rule is a matter of serious concern, it is ordinarily better to seek correction by legislation."

If the thesis that a majority of the members of the Supreme Court have the rightful power to change the meaning of the Constitution under the guise of interpreting it every time a sitting Justice wavers in mind or a newly appointed Justice ascends the Bench should find permanent acceptance, the Constitution would become to all practical intents and purposes an uncertain and unstable document of no beneficial value to the country. Yea, more than this, it would become a constant menace to sound government at all levels, and to the freedom of the millions of Americans who are not at liberty to join Supreme Court Justices in saying that Supreme Court decisions on constitutional questions are not binding on them.

I cannot forbear expressing my opinion that the notion that Supreme Court Justices are not bound by the decisions of the Court on constitutional questions exalts Supreme Court Justices above all other men, and is of the stuff of which judicial oligarchies are made. Be this as it may, what Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo said in "The Nature of the Judicial Process" concerning the contention that the judge is always privileged to substitute his individual sense of justice for rules of law applies with equal force to this notion. "That might result in a benevolent despotism if the judges were benevolent men. It would put an end to the reign of law."

What I have said on this point finds full support in the ringing words of Edward Douglas White, one of the ablest lawyers and wisest judges ever to grace the Supreme Court bench. He said: "In the discharge of its function of interpreting the Constitution, this Court exercises an august power. * * * It seems to me that the accomplishment of its lofty mission can only be secured by the stability of its teachings and the sanctity which surrounds them. * * * The fundamental conception of a judicial body is that of one hedged about by precedents which are binding on the Court without regard to the personality of its members. Break down this belief in judicial continuity, and let it be felt that on great constitutional questions

this Court is to depart from the settled conclusions of its predecessors, and to determine them all according to the mere opinion of those who temporarily fill its bench, and our Constitution will, in my judgment, be bereft of value and become a most dangerous instrument to the rights and liberties of the people."

What has been said does not deny to the Supreme Court the power to overrule a prior decision in any instance where proper judicial restraint justifies such action. A sound criterion for determining when proper judicial restraint justifies a judge in overruling a precedent is to be found in the standard which Judge Learned Hand says his friend and colleague, Judge Thomas Swan, set for his own guidance: "He will not overrule a precedent unless he can be satisfied beyond peradventure that it was untenable when made; and not even then, if it has gathered around it the support of a substantial body of decisions based on it."

In ending this phase of my remarks, I wish to emphasize the precedents set by the Supreme Court on constitutional questions were tenable when made if they conformed to the intention of those who framed and adopted the constitutional provisions involved, no matter how inconsistent they may be with the views of Justices subsequently ascending the bench.

This brings me to the argument that Supreme Court Justices must nullify article V and usurp the power to amend the Constitution while pretending to interpret it to keep the Constitution from freezing in the pattern which one generation gave it.

I assert with all the emphasis at my command that there is really no substantial vadidity in this argument. I take this position for three reasons:

First. Although the Constitution does not change its meaning in the absence of amendment under article V, the provisions of the Constitution are pliable in the sense that they reach into the future and embrace all new conditions falling within the scope of the powers which they in terms confer. (*Missouri P. R. Co.* v. *United States; South Carolina* v. *United States.*) Existing grants of constitutional powers will enable the Federal Government to take action in virtually all new fields in which action on its part will be appropriate.

Second. As the possessor of all the legislative power of the Federal Government, Congress has complete authority at all times to make, amend, or repeal laws relating to all matters committed by the Constitution to the Federal Government.

Third. For these reasons, occasions which really call for amendments to the Constitution are comparatively rare. While it is frequently asserted that the method for amending the Constitution prescribed by article V is too cumbersome and slow for practical purposes, those who make the assertion furnish no satisfactory proof of its truth. To be sure, they cite as evidence the failure of Congress and the States to make constitutional changes they deem desirable. They overlook the fact, however, that the evidence they cite has just as logical a tendency to prove that the wisdom of Congress and the States exceeds theirs. Thomas Riley Marshall said that "it is as easy to amend the Constitution of the United States as it used to be to draw a cork." While this statement is not literally true, it is substantially true in instances where Congress and the States believe a constitutional amendment to be advisable.

In the final analysis, those who contend that Supreme Court Justices are justified in changing the meaning of constiutional provisions while pretending to interpret them confuse right and power.

What Justice Cardozo said of the judge as a legislation, in "The Nature of the Judicial Process," is relevant here.

He said: "I think the difficulty has its origin in the failure to distinguish between right and power, between the command embodied in a judgment and the jural principle to which the obedience of the judge is due. Judges have, of course, the power though not the right to ignore the mandate of a statute, and render judgment in despite of it. They have the power, though not the right, to travel beyond the walls of the interstices, the bounds set to judicial innovation by precedent and custom. Nonetheless, by that abuse of power, they violate the law."

Twenty years ago a great American, William E. Borah, a Senator from Idaho, made this moving statement:

"We do not know what the future has in store for us as a nation, but do know that the system of government which was brought forth on this continent nearly 150 years ago, baptized with the blessings and crowned with the wisdom of great leaders, has brought greater contentment and prosperity and more freedom to the average man and women than any form of government yet devised. This fact alone should burn into our very souls the determination to preserve it in all its essential principles. It is one thing to adopt and adjust principles to new conditions; it is another thing to permit new conditions to disregard principles; the former is the highest achievement of the statesman and the lawgiver, the latter the work of the timeserver and the adventurer."

In closing, I add this observation to Senator Borah's stirring words: We shall not preserve any of the essential principles of the Government which brought these great blessings to America if we permit the Constitution to be destroyed by judicial usurpation.

Speech Delivered by Hon. Lister Hill, of Alabama, at the Dedication of the National Education Association Headquarters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama delivered a remarkable speech at the dedication of the National Education Association headquarters in Washington, D.C., on February 10, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed the Appendix of the RECORD.

I was present at the dedication of the National Education Association headquarters and heard Senator HILL deliver his speech. The Senate has heard him speak many times on the floor of the Senate, and many of us have heard him in other forums. He always speaks eloquently and well. However, as I heard the distinguished Senator from Alabama speak before the delegates to the National Education Association on the educational problems of our country I thought that it was one of his finest speeches. The subject itself related to defense, the economic growth of the Nation, the necessity of our citizens being prepared to participate fully in democratic government, and to our basic concept of the full development of man.

The speech of the Senator from Alabama was philosophical, practical, and eloquent. It is a call for thought and action by our Government both at the local and Federal levels, and by the people of our Nation. It is a statement of permanent value for the people of our country.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. LISTER HILL, OF ALABAMA, AT THE DEDICATION OF NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION HEADQUARTERS, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 10, 1959

Dr. Givens, Mr. Secretary, Commissioner Derthick, Dr. Carr, officers, and friends of the National Education Association and of American education, it is an honor to be with you today to take part in the dedication of this magnificent building, the new headquarters for the National Education Association.

Impressive as is this fine new building, is the record of splendid service that NEA has rendered during the past century to the teachers, to education, and to the people of America.

As NEA begins its second century of service, it is fitting that these handsome new quarters become the home of the efficient and busy nerve center of the largest professional organization in the world.

I know the many services to your 700,000 members, the information and guidance you give to the teachers of the Nation to help them advance their professional competence and improve their economic status. I know your efforts to improve American education.

As your organization has worked to advance the cause of education on all fronts, your greatest fight has been made for educational opportunity for every American child.

Today, as your executive secretary and my friend, Dr. William G. Carr, has so aptly put it: "We have been concerned that every child get into school. Now we must ask what every child gets out of school."

The responsibilities of education have never been better summed up than in the blunt phrase of Thomas Jefferson:

"If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be."

America is challenged as never before by a ruthless, ambitious Communist Russia that has deliberately geared its education system to take advantage of the emerging new age of science, with massive and ever-increasing demands for more trained manpower and for new skills and techniques, with a premium upon intellectual excellence, and with its demand for devotion to the hard labor of rigorous thought.

America's traditional values of the dignity, the essential worth, and the inalienable rights of the individual are challenged by the Communist concept of the all-powerful state, where the individual is simply the tool of the state.

Our religious and cultural heritage is challenged by a society of dynamic, atheistic materialism.

Our system of economic opportunity through free enterprise and individual initiative faces driving competition from a regimented economy whose resources are used as political and diplomatic weapons.

Our science and technology are challenged and have been presently surpassed by sputnik, lunik, and other evidence of Russia's amazing scientific progress within a single generation.

And hanging darkly over all is the ominous possibility of nuclear war.

What are the resources of our people—resources of the mind and of the spirit—for

meeting the challenge of a dynamic and ruthless Communist Russia, and the challenge of a swiftly changing world?

At the very roots of our resources and our capabilities lies America's system of education. Education provides not only the knowledge and technical training, but the intellectual discipline and incentives for meeting the challenge. In our democracy, education has a vast responsibility for instilling the patriotism, the sense of duty, the moral commitment to make a choice, to work in the cause of justice and human liberty. For well we know the uncommitted mind leads to the cynicism and decadence of the uncommitted heart.

The successful launching of Russia's sputniks struck a severe blow at the self-confidence of the American people and at our prestige in the world. Rarely have Americans questioned one another so intensively about our military posture, our scientific stature, and our educational system. In the wave of reproach and criticism that has swept America a principal target has been our system of education.

American education, it is charged, is obsessed with the teaching of "social adjustment," with gearing education to the lowest common denominator, with pressing America's children into an educational lockstep that moves them from grade to grade without regard for individual talents and capacities.

Some of these charges are true. For some time, you and I have been concerned over the vastly increased number of nonacademic courses in the secondary schools. We have been concerned that English language and literature have been diluted; that physics and chemistry have become general science; that algebra has become general mathematics. We have been concerned that education does not demand the rigorous effort, the mental discipline, the creative thinking, and the respect for learning that American education must have.

But education in America is not determined by the educators and the teachers alone. Education in America reflects the attitudes of a whole people. Our educational programs are determined by:

The businessman, the labor leader, the banker, and the mother who sit on the local school board;

By the industrialist whose factories provide jobs in the community and thereby influence the kind of education provided to fill those jobs;

By parents whose indulgence or whose desire for material success, prestige, and good incomes for their children shape so deeply the child's sense of values and his selection of courses;

By Government—Federal, State, and local—through the administrative agencies and the legislatures, through the funds they provide and the limitations and requirements they impose;

By the foundations and the philanthropists, in the types of grants and endowments they give; and

By the newspapers, radio and television, and the Nation's other mass communications media, as they contribute to public opinion and public attitudes.

It is fitting and proper that all these segments of American democracy play their rightful part in determining the shape and emphasis and function of American education. But when we come to assess the needs and deficiencies of American education, they should stand up and be counted and accept their share of the responsibility. The burden must not be put solely on the educators and the teachers, many of whom are dedicated men and women who give their lives to teaching, who, in their devotion and self-sacrifice, spend and are spent in the cause of educating America's children.

It is important to remember that our aim is to attack the problem, not the schools. Criticism and difference of opinion help to clear the air, but they are only part of the process of decision. Criticism is a measure of our desire for excellence, but it does not alone achieve excellence.

In the words of John Milton, "Where there is much desire to learn, there of necessity will be much argument, much writing, many opinions; for opinion in good men is but knowledge in the making."

We must not permit criticism to destroy our faith in the essential value, the proven success, and the democratic validity of our American school system—the great training ground for democracy. Are we to be made self-doubters by our aspirations and ideals?

What, then, is the American, this new man, who has made the deserts bloom, who has taken the drudgery out of farming and removed the backbreaking toil from factory labor, whose productivity per worker is by far the highest there is, who is surrounded by the world's best systems of communication and transportation, and who enjoys the highest standard of living in the world?

Was this progress made by a people with an inferior educational system?

There are some who look with trepidation on the incoming flood of school and college students that will double the present school population by 1970. There are some who feel this greatly increasing school population endangers the quality of American education. We need not feel besieged by the rising tide of students. Their claims to education are a sign of national health and vitality. Their millions constitute a national asset—a vast reservoir of skills and ambition and intellect. From so broad a base we can discover and develop the most talented young intellects.

In the last session of Congress—with the enactment of the National Defense Education Act—we took a major step for discovering and encouraging the Nation's potential intellectual talent, for creating wider opportunities for advanced training of our gifted young people, for providing better training and equipment for our teachers.

The principal objective of the National Defense Education Act is to help correct the serious imbalance in our educational system that for some years has been unfavorable to the teaching of mathematics, the sciences and foreign languages. Student loans at low interest rates and fellowship grants for advanced study give the able and qualified student an opportunity to complete his education and give the Nation the benefit of his maximum capabilities. Teachers may attend special institutes where they can learn the newest developments in their fields of study. Aptitude tests will reveal talented pupils at an early age. Guidance and counseling services will help students select the paths of study best suited to their individual capacities.

The act provides for research and experimentation into new uses for radio, television, films, and other teaching aids. Language centers are provided to give instruction in the language and culture of foreign peoples.

Expansion of area vocational educational schools will help provide the technicians so vitally needed to support the Nation's scientists and engineers. The latest findings of scientific research throughout the world will be assembled and translated.

As the National Defense Education Act strengthens America's education in mathematics, the sciences and languages, we must move to strengthen our whole educational system. The need for mobilizing our intellectual resources has been dramatized chiefly by the shortage of scientists and engineers. But this deficiency is only part of a general shortage of specialized talent which affects virtually every aspect of our society and the strength of our America. We need more of every kind of talent, not morely more nuclear physicists and engineers, but more first rate biologists and doctors, teachers and politicians, economists and ministers, writers, poets, and philosophers—and leaders in all the varied activities that make up our national life. And this calls for total effort from the Nation.

In this effort, we recognize that the primary and basic responsibility for and the control and administration of our educational system, sensitive to the needs and desires of the people, rests with the States, the local communities and their college and universities. In enacting the National Defense Education Act, Congress reaffirmed this principle and the act declares:

"The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education."

In this effort, we recognize that education is a total responsibility of the Nation and that the Federal Government has primarily a twofold duty in American education: To strengthen the intellectual resources of our people to meet the needs of national security; to help relieve the disparities in the wealth of the individual States which impose an undue burden on the less wealthy States in their efforts to maintain adequate education programs. Assistance from the Federal Government should stimulate and encourage and challenge State and local action and never be a substitute for such action.

There are great disparities in the wealth of the States, and consequently in their ability to raise revenue and to support adequate educational programs.

It is axiomatic to say that taxes can be levied only where wealth exists. The disparity in taxable wealth between States is dramatically pointed out in a pamphlet prepared by Prof. R. L. Johns, of the University of Florida, and published last year by the NEA legisaltive commission. In this pamphlet, entitled "Ability and Effort of the States to Support the Public Schools," Dr. Johns showed that in 1955 the concentration of taxable wealth in five great industrial and commercial States—Illinois, Michigan, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania—was so great that over 60 percent of the total U.S. corporation income and profits taxes were raised in these States, although they have less than 30 percent of the school-age children of this country to educate. On the other hand, Dr. Johns points out that 21 nonindustrial and noncommercial States, having roughly the same number of children to educate, have taxable wealth which produced only slightly more than 8 percent of the corporation income and profits taxes of the United States. To put it another way, these five great industrial States have many times more the tax collecting possibilities than exist in the 21 nonindustrial and noncommercial States.

In our concern with sputniks, with rising enrollments, with the teaching potential of television and other mass communications media, we must not forget that the teacher is the central figure in the education process.

Inevitably the qualities and influence of the teacher are woven into the character of the Nation. We entrust the minds and characters of our most precious resource—our children—to the teacher for many hours of the day. We look to the teacher to help mold the child for the responsibilities of manhood and womanhood.

Teaching has for a long time been called a profession. It is time to make it a profession in fact.

The hour demands a bill of rights for the teacher, a bill of rights guaranteeing a salary that will enable the teacher to enjoy a good standard of living, permit recreation and travel, continued study and educational growth, and insure security in old age.

The bill of rights must go further. It must recognize the essential worth and dignity of the teacher and assure him of full opportunity to take part in the life of the community, outside the classroom.

But a bill of rights for the teacher is not self-enforcing. To become reality, such a bill of rights requires public understanding and public support. There must be a new consciousness by the public and by State and local officials of their obligations. You, the teachers, must inform the public of your needs and the needs of the schools.

I know that you have organized the citizenship committee of the National Education Association, and it has been an active, agressive organization. Yet a recent survey by NEA revealed that two-thirds of the teachers in the United States felt a kind of pride in being aloof from politics and public affairs.

You cannot fulfill your obligations as teachers and as citizens by standing apart. Perhaps more than others, you have an opportunity—through your teaching and through your active example—to serve as a constructive and influential force in public affairs.

We stand today at one of the great watersheds of history. It is a commonplace that they are seldom noted until, looking back, we see them rising out of what Tennyson called "the eternal landscape of the past." Our generation can realize, in awe and humility, that we have been permitted the rare experience of crossing an epochal divide into a new valley of civilization.

To meet the challenge of this new epoch, to reap the rich harvest of its promises, we shall need unwavering determination and a burning resolve to reach the new heights demanded of us.

More than any other kind of society, democracy requires talent and leadership, widespread among all the people. The goal of our educational system must be the opportunity and the incentive for the fullest exercise of each individual's ability. America's strength requires that we have a people who hold a deep respect for education and intellectual attainment, who recognize that intellectual discipline is essential to our national purpose, who know the hard labor of intensive study and devoted, rigorous thought.

But for our people to meet the challenge of the Communist world, for them to measure up to the demands of the hour, the answer lies not alone in learning, and in such wisdom as they may acquire.

The foundation of the whole matter lies in the character of our people.

The great task of American education is to build this character, to instill the ideals and the faith to know what is right, and to instill the courage and resolution to choose to work and to fight for it.

Let us build upon the rock of the commandment of Joshua to his troops: "Choose you this day whom ye will serve; as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord."

The Late Honorable Herman P. Eberharter

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of great sadness that I join here in the House in paying a well-deserved tribute to our departed colleague and friend, the Honorable HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, who at the time of his passing on September 9, 1958, represented the 28th District of Pennsylvania.

When I came to Congress in June 1944 HERMAN EBERHARTER was most kind and helpful to me. During the years we served together we found that we had much in common and worked together in seeking solutions to many legislative problems in which we shared an interest.

HERMAN was an outstanding Member of the House and of the Ways and Means Committee. He made substantial contributions to and sponsored much important legislation beneficial to the welfare of the people he represented in his district, his State, and our country. He was a man possessed of great political wisdom and personal courage. I considered him one of my close friends in this body and one in whom I had great faith and trust. I miss him greatly and I am sure that his colleagues on both sides of the aisle share these sentiments.

His sons, Herman P., Jr., and James Jacob Eberharter, have every reason to be proud of their father's illustrious career and his humanitarian principles. They have my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

His memory is as dear today
As in the hour he passed away.

Foreign Relations, 1796–1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Saturday night it was my privilege to deliver an address before the Sons of the Revolution, at Troy, N.Y. The meeting was a very interesting one. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my remarks on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN RELATIONS, 1796–1959

(Excerpts of text prepared for delivery by Senator WILEY before Sons of the Revolution, at Troy, N.Y., Feb. 21, 1959, at 7 p.m.)

If Washington could revisit the United States today, about the only thing he would recognize would be the institutions of the Government which he helped to found and of which he was the first Chief Executive. In every physical respect, the country has changed and so has its place in the world, since 1796. Indeed, the change which has occurred in these 163 years is greater than the change which had occurred in all the time from 1796 back to Adam's bite out of the apple in the Garden of Eden. This change is continuing, and at an accelerating pace.

The challenge of 1796 was whether a new and relatively weak country, with a government founded on new and revolutionary principles, could survive in a skeptical and largely hostile world. The challenge of 1959 is whether this same country, now grown to be the richest and strongest on earth, can adapt itself with sufficient speed and flexibility to the rapidly changing world environment in which it finds itself.

The fact that Washington would still recognize the institutions of his Government is a tribute to the skill and wisdom with which he and his contemporaries laid the foundations for those institutions. The triangular structure of the Federal Government has proved itself both durable and flexible. It has, of course, grown to meet the new demands with which it has been confronted in each succeeding generation of its existence; but at the same time, it has retained in basic form the beautiful simplicity with which the Founding Fathers endowed it.

Washington became President at a time when Britain and France, the two titans of Europe, were engaged in bitter struggle. They were entering the last quarter of the Second Hundred Years War, and neither was overly respectful of the rights of the insignificant neutral on the western side of the Atlantic. From the long history of European wars and from the circumstances of the time, Washington correctly sensed that a policy of neutrality—or more accurately a policy of noninvolvement—was most likely to promote the national interests of the United States.

It was by no means certain, as Washington assumed the Presidency, that the United States was strong enough to resist involvement in the European war. This question was still in doubt at the end of Washington's second term, and he recognized this fact in his farewell address when he said:

"If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off • • • when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected."

Washington hoped that the period was not far off; he knew it had not yet arrived. And in fact, within less than two decades of the farewell address, the United States was drawn into the final convulsion of the Anglo-French war.

In the same sentence which I have just quoted from his Farewell Address, Washington also predicted the period to be not far off "when we may defy material injury from external annoyance."

"Why," he asked, "forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?"

It was, and is, a good question. The only trouble is that the period which Washington foresaw to be not far off—the period "when we may defy material injury from external annoyance"—has come and gone. Thanks in part to the benign presence on the high seas of the British Navy, we enjoyed such a period for the century which intervened between the end of the Napoleonic Wars and the beginning of World War I.

But increasingly since 1914, the onrush of technology has ended our physical isolation in the world. And it has correspondingly made impossible a policy of political isolation.

Some, who were not convinced of this by World War I, were convinced by Pearl Harbor.

Others, who were not convinced by Pearl Harbor, were convinced by Hiroshima.

Others, who still remained skeptical, were convinced by the ICBM.

And finally, any who even then were not convinced, must certainly have been persuaded by sputnik.

This snowballing technology, on which no Nation has a monopoly, is at the bottom of the biggest political problem we face today; indeed, it is the heart and core of that problem.

It has given both to us and to the Soviet Union the means literally of destroying the human race.

It has awakened the aspirations of those two-thirds of the human race who for centuries have been somnolent under the pall of a deadening and all-pervading poverty.

It has made a better life possible for the hundreds of millions of Asia and Africa; and, through its improvements in communications, it has made it possible for these millions to glimpse the better life.

It has likewise made possible a better life for us, the American people, and we have been enjoying this better life. Never have so many lived so well.

This greater material well-being may have within it the seeds of its own destruction unless we come to grips with the implications of technological growth. I am frank to say I do not think we have even begun to glimpse those implications.

We are confronted, literally, with a choice between life and death, in a form in which it has never been presented before. If it is death, it will be, as I said, total death. If it is life, it can be—perhaps we can even say it will have to be—a more abundant life than has ever been known.

This has all come about so rapidly that we have not yet adjusted our thinking and our habits of living to it. What complicates the matter is that this change is not a single incident in history; it can not be neatly bounded in time. It is a continuing process, and it is continuing at a rapidly growing rate. Great as has been its progress up till now, I think we are still only on the threshold of this technological revolution. And make no mistake about it: It is by far the greatest, the most portentious revolution of all time.

The possibilities, and the problems, which are opened up to us by this revolution are as boundless as the revolution itself. We can content ourselves with using the instruments it gives us for our own comfort and luxury and can for a period—I fear it will be a brief one—wallow in our private swimming pools, with the color television sets, the station wagons, and the hi-fi apparatus which are spewed out by our technology and our industry.

Or, we can use the new tools which we have acquired to secure our own place in the world and thereby put our rising standard of living on a firmer base. For example, we can—and we must use our new sources of energy to provide ourselves with better missiles and other means of defense. But we should also use these new sources to power the kind of irrigation projects which will make the deserts of the world bloom.

We can use our new found knowledge of electronics to bring Steve Allen into half the living rooms of America. But we should also use this same knoweldge to communicate the truth about ourselves to the hundreds of millions of people who are living in intellectual darkness.

What I am trying to say is that technology has now put into the hands of man instruments of the most awful potential for good or for evil. I emphasize that these instruments are in the hands of man; they are not in our hands alone. They can be used, I think—if we are wise enough—not only for strictly technical purposes, but also for broader sociological purposes. Science and technology, in other words, offer one means of building at least some kind of a bridge—fragile though it may be—between us and the Russians. One advantage of this approach is that it is nonpolitical and emphasizes the things that are common to all men. Most people would rather be well-fed than hungry, warm rather than cold, healthy rather than sick. There is no ideology in a slide rule, or hybrid corn, or a vial of penicillin. We should seize every opportunity, however, slight, to work together for constructive purposes rather than to work separately for mutual destruction.

On the foreign scene, the technological revolution has complicated our problems, as I have described, primarily because it has transformed communications, transportation, and weapons.

On the domestic scene, it has created what may well be an even bigger problem. At the same time that it has made the physical side of life easier, it has made the intellectual side of life enormously more difficult. The educational effort which must now go into producing a scientist or an engineer is vastly greater than what was required even a generation ago. But even so, it is a great deal easier for an individual to become a qualified atomic scientist than it is for him to become a qualified atomic statesman, and I hope those in charge of our schools will keep this fact in mind.

It has not been very long since leisure was the exclusive property of the upper class. The technological revolution could quite conceivably reverse that. We already have a situation where the factory laborer works 40 hours a week and spends his weekends on the golf course or at the movies or just puttering about the house; while, on the other hand, the factory manager works 6 days a week and spends most of Sunday worrying about next week. The Government clerk works a 40-hour week; his boss is likely to work 60 or 70 hours. What we are seeing, I think, is a reverse twist on the old Marxist doctrine—life is getting easier and easier for more and more people while it is getting harder and harder for fewer and fewer. This has within it political and social implications of the most profound and incalculable nature.

I shall certainly not attempt to deal with all of these implications, but let me comment in passing on only one of them, and this is a rather superficial one. It is frequently said these days, especially since sputnik went up, that children don't have to work hard enough in school. That may or may not be true, but it is difficult for me to understand how a father can logically expect his child to work harder than the father himself does. If a father sets an example of spending Saturday afternoon in front of a television set, does he really expect his son to spend Saturday afternoon with an algebra book?

I don't know what to do about this, or about the other problems I have mentioned. I do know that the first step in solving a problem is to define it, and I think that we haven't yet even begun to define some of our problems very precisely.

Now let me mention just one more change which has occurred since Washington's time—this on a somewhat different level from those I have been talking about. In 1790 the budget request for the domestic expenses of the Department of State was a little less than $8,000. This included the salary of the Secretary, which was $3,500, and eight employees—five clerks, a French interpreter, and two messengers. In addition, it included $691 to pay for rent, firewood, stationery, and newspapers.

Congress reduced the total from a little less than $8,000 to a little more than $6,000.

In 1792 the estimated cost of the Foreign Service—as distinguished from the domestic expenses of the State Department—was $40,000. This included the cost of 5 Ministers and 16 consular officers abroad.

By way of contrast, in the President's budget currently before Congress for the fiscal year 1960 the requests for the State Department, including both its foreign and domestic expenses, total $243 million. To this should be added requests of $107 million for the U.S. Information Agency and $3,498 million for the mutual security program.

Despite these and other changes, however, there has been an enduring quality, not only in our institutions, as I mentioned at the outset, but also in our basic approach to policy. This can be very clearly traced in the policy pronouncements of our first and our present Secretary of State. Ten days after assuming the Office of Secretary of 1790, Jefferson wrote to his friend, the Marquis de Lafayette:

"I think, with others, that nations are to be governed with regard to their own interests, but I am convinced that it is to their interest, in the long run, to be grateful, faithful to their engagements, even in the worst of circumstances, and honorable and generous always. If I had not known that the head of our Government was in these sentiments, and that his national and private ethics were the same, I would never have been where I am."

The same ideas, of course, recur in the writings of the then head of the Government, that is, General Washington. And I am sure that our Secretary of State would also say that he would not be Secretary unless these ideas were shared likewise by the present head of the Government, General Eisenhower. And compare Jefferson's letter with a speech which Dulles made less than a month before he assumed the office of Secretary:

"I believe that we can still follow the good American tradition of openness, simplicity, and morality in foreign policy. The need today is to rekindle faith in freedom, and make it contagious, by a fresh demonstration of what to do with freedom."

That was good doctrine in 1796; it was good doctrine in 1952; and it remains good doctrine in 1959. It is, as Lincoln said of the Declaration of Independence, a sentiment "which gave liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but, I hope, to the world for all future time."

May I summarize foreign relations, 1796–1959:

In the earlier date there were two great nations, France and England. Now there are two—Russia and the United States.

Then we stood alone against the world—now England and France and the West stand with us against the Kremlin.

Then the world was large, taking months to cross the Atlantic—now we fly around the world in 40 hours.

Then there was no radio, or telegraph, or television, or telephone; no steam, or electric engines; no aircraft; no electronics. Now, as indicated, we are in the heart of a new great revolutionary age.

Then we were the laughing stock of the kingdoms of the world—now we are the envy.

Then we were experimenting with the rights of man while the kings were experimenting with curtailing those rights.

Then we stood alone, apart as the new experiment in government, independent and flexing our muscles. Now we stand, not alone, but interdependent and providing the bedrock for the free nations to rest on.

Then we had but a pittance of a national income and a national market—now we have one-half of the market of the world, and one-half of the income.

Then we talked of noninvolvement in the affairs of Europe—now, because every nation is neighbor to every other nation, we are involved not only in the affairs of Europe, but in the affairs of the whole earth.

Then we were about 15 percent urban and 85 percent agricultural. Now, the reverse is the truth.

Then we stretched along the Atlantic coast, now we encompass the whole distance between the oceans and the gulf.

Then a people of 4 million, now a people of 175 million.

I conclude in the words of Washington: "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair."

Making Fresh Water From Salt Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the 85th Congress began consideration of a pressing problem for the United States and particularly for the Southwest—the problem of abundant water.

One of the avenues of research in this long-range program to find a solution for the problem was the establishment of experimental demonstration plants designed to convert sea water to fresh water.

One of the finest locales available for the construction of such a plant would be the Texas gulf coast. This area is just beginning to realize its industrial potential, but one of the factors which is hampering its growth at an even more rapid rate is the lack of fresh water for industrial and other uses.

In addition, the Texas gulf coast is near the lands of the southwestern and midwestern United States, which need more fresh water.

Construction of a conversion plant on the Texas gulf coast would greatly bolster the economy and would benefit the country as a whole. It could provide fresh water for industry, irrigation of farmlands, residential consumption, and many other uses.

We have seen the blossoming of the agricultural and industrial potential of previously arid areas where plentiful water is made available. Such a supply of water could do the same thing for the Southwest.

Building a conversion plant on the Texas gulf coast would be an investment in the future prosperity of our Nation. I strongly urge that Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton and the Members of Congress seriously consider the many brilliant qualifications of the Texas gulf coast as the site for such a plant.

Mr. President, the Honorable J. Charles Whitfield, Jr. of the Texas House of Representatives, has sent to me a resolution introduced by himself and Representatives Miller, Daily, and Bridges and passed by that body recently. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix to the RECORD, and earnestly commend its content.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 87

"Whereas the great Texas coast is in the center of the fertile crescent of America; and

"Whereas to that area there is a growing migration of heavy industry; and

"Whereas heavy industry cannot survive save with an abundance of fresh water; and

"Whereas the 85th Congress of the United States, by Joint Resolution 135 of September 2, 1958, has addressed itself to the long-range solution of the water problem; and

"Whereas that Congress has appropriated $10 million for the construction of demonstration plants designed to convert sea water to fresh water; and

"Whereas, one of those plants is to be on the gulf coast; and

"Whereas the Texas gulf coast is the most logical location, considering its industry growth potential, together with its nearness to arid lands of the interior of our great Midwest and Southwest; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton, will on or before March 3, 1959, begin this program: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the members of the house of representatives, do petition the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, to consider the Texas coast as the first site for this monumental undertaking, and express to him and to our scientists our confidence in their ability ultimately to solve the various problems of cheap and abundant sea water conversion; and, be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of Congress from Texas.

"WAGGONER CARR,
"*Speaker of the House.*"

I hereby certify that House Resolution 87 was adopted by the house on February 12, 1959.

DOROTHY HALLMON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

George Washington and Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we in Brooklyn are not only celebrating the 227th anniversary of the birth of the Father of our Country, but also the 335th anniversary of the formal settlement of Brooklyn.

The first actual purchase of land on the present site of Brooklyn was made in 1636 at about what is now Gowanus Bay. Between the following year and 1654 a colony of Walloons built their dwellings on Waal-boght, which we now know as Wallabout Bay.

As early as 1642—only 6 years after the first land purchase—a ferry had been establishede by one Cornelis Dircksen, operating from Peck Slip, over in Manhattan, to what is now Fulton Street.

Nearby, at the intersection of Fulton and South Streets, the settlement of Breukelen—Broken Land—was established. It was named for a village in Old Holland.

In 1643 Lady Deborah Moody, having been excommunicated by the Puritan Church in Massachusetts because of her disbelief in infant baptism, settled with some English followers at Gravesend.

By 1660—the year of the Restoration in England—New Utrecht, Midwout—Midwood—and Bushwick had been established.

These Dutch-Walloon settlers brought to Manhattan and Long Island a type of culture and community life entirely their own, of which the Dutch Reformed Church was the focal point. Around it all else revolved. Even after the American Revolution, the pattern was still strong enough to impress itself upon the village and, later, the city. That pattern was, as one writer has described it, one of "order, sobriety, piety."

Oddly enough, the Dutch and Walloons cared nothing, in these early days, for waterfront rights: they were interested in farming the hinterland; it was the enterprising Yankee across the river who established warehouses, slaughterhouses, and tanneries to which the Long Island burghers brought their cattle bred on the salt meadows sloping down to Wallabout and Gowanus.

With the coming of American independence and the consolidation into a closely knit union, Brooklyn, like her neighbor on Manhattan, thrived and prospered. When it was proposed in 1883, that the Long Island town be incorporated into the city of New York as a sensible and practical step, mutually advantageous to both communities, a roar of protest went up from the old-timers. Stout old Gen. Jeremiah Johnson, of Wallabout, speaking for the majority, roundly declared:

Between New York and Brooklyn there is nothing in common, either in object, interest, or feeling—nothing that even apparently tends to their connection, unless it be the waters that flow between them. And even those waters, instead of, in fact, uniting them, form a barrier between them which, however frequently passed, still form and must forever continue to form an unsurmountable obstacle to their union.

The forerunner of the argument that Hawaii is too far from the mainland to be a State.

The following year the intrepid general and his triumphant followers secured from the legislature a city charter for the village. But, as one historian observes:

The general's defiance was fateful. Geographically and hence commercially, Brooklyn was bound to the island of Manhattan; yet it became a city and remained one for 64 years. When incorporation finally took place, in 1898, the insurmountable obstacle to the union had already been spanned by the mighty Brooklyn Bridge. The Williamsburg and the Manhattan bridges followed and the high-sounding words of General Johnson have long since been lost in the roar of three subways under the river.

By daybreak of August 27, 1776, the powerful British Army, landing under the guns of the fleet, threatened the encirclement and complete annihilation of the scanty and divided American forces. Perceiving the peril of the situation—the fate of the American cause hung indeed in the balance during these 2 days—Washington, in a masterly decision, evacuated his entire army from Brooklyn Heights during the night of the 29th in a counterstroke, unsurpassed for swiftness and efficiency in military annals. What is more, he had managed to bring back intact all the cannons, small arms, ammunition, tools, horns, and foodstuffs, so that when the bewildered British, puzzled by the strange silence, finally climbed into the empty works, they found, in the words of a contemporary historian, not "so much as a biscuit or a glass of rum wherewith to console themselves." Though men did not then perceive it, the independence of America was secured.

It is well that we inhabitants of old Breukelen think of those great days as we celebrate the birthday of the Father of our Country and our own civic anniversary.

Who's Who and What Is Going on in Space—A Space Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Abe Silverstein is Director of Space Flight Development at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration headquarters in Washington, D.C. Before the NASA was established, on October 1, 1958, he was associate director of the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory, Cleveland, Ohio, a research center of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which formed the nucleus of the NASA.

Silverstein directs those NASA programs aimed at the development of space flight. Development programs under his direction includes space probes and manned and unmanned satellite systems. He is also responsible for the development of propulsion systems capable of powering these space vehicles.

Silverstein is a native of Terre Haute, Ind., where he attended local grammar and high schools. He earned a bachelor of science in mechanical engineering degree in 1929, and a mechanical engineering degree in 1929, and a mechanical engineer professional degree in 1934, from Rose Polytechnic Institute. He was awarded an honoary Ph. D. degree by Case Institute of Technology in 1958.

Silverstein joined the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics in 1929 and soon after helped design the full-scale wind tunnel at the Langley Aeronautical Laboratory. He later was placed in charge of this facility and directed research which increased the high-speed performance of most of the combat aircraft of World War II. This work was recognized as a major factor in gaining U.S. air superiority during the war.

In 1943 he was transferred to the Lewis Laboratory at Cleveland to select and train a staff which he directed in research at the altitude wind tunnel. These investigations led to significant improvements in both reciprocating and early turbojet aircraft engines. He also pioneered with large-scale ramjet engines, now used on certain missiles.

At the end of World War II, Silverstein was directing the work at several major research facilities at Lewis. He directed the erection of the $9 million NACA 8- by 6-foot supersonic wind tunnel, first operated in 1949, and the $33 million NACA 10- by 10-foot supersonic wind tunnel, completed in 1956. These facilities, the largest wind tunnels of their kind in the world, have greatly accelerated the development of supersonic aircraft. In 1952 he was appointed associate director of the Lewis Laboratory, a post he held until he was named to the headquarters staff of the NASA.

Silverstein was a member of several NACA committees and subcommittees, including: Committee on Aerodynamics, 1946 to 1947; Subcommittee on Self-Propelled Guided Missiles, 1945 to 1947; Subcommittee on Internal Flow, 1947; Subcommittee on High-Speed Aerodynamics, 1945 to 1957; Committee on Powerplants for Aircraft, 1951 to 1957; and the Special Committee on Space Technology, 1958.

He served as chairman of the Cleveland section of the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences, 1946 to 1947. He was a member of the committee on arrangements for the joint meeting of the Institute of the Aeronautical Sciences and the Royal Aeronautical Society, held in New York City, in 1949. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development appointed him a member of the Technical Advisory Panel on Aeronautics for the year 1955, and as chairman of the ad hoc working group on rockets for 1956. He was a member of the scientific advisory board of the Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, for 1956 and 1957, and chairman of the OASD technical advisory panel on aeronautics, ad hoc group on propulsion for aircraft and missiles. He was a member of the Assistant Secretary of Defense's steering group of the Advisory Panel on Aeronautics for 1958.

Silverstein was American representative to the joint meeting of the Institute of the Aeronautical Sciences and the Royal Aeronautical Society, in London, in 1947. He delivered the annual Wright Brothers Lecture before the IAS in 1949.

He is a member of Tau Beta Pi, and a fellow of the Institute of the Aeronautical Sciences.

Silverstein, his wife Marion, and their three children, Joseph, Judith, and David, live at 7205 Rollingwood Drive, Chevy Chase, Md.

Glen Canyon Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, today, at Glen Canyon Dam, currently the largest construction job in the United States, a major accomplishment is being celebrated.

The States of Utah and Arizona are now connected by a new bridge over the Colorado River at the damsite, making it possible for a traveling America to visit and explore some of the most colorful and hitherto most inaccessible area of the old West.

Following is a brief statement of facts on this important construction achievement:

The spectacular Glen Canyon Bridge is the final link forged in a new highway joining the States of Arizona and Utah in a colorful corner of the Nation. Spanning the 1,200-foot-wide, 700-foot-deep gorge of the Colorado River at Glen Canyon damsite, the bridge eliminates the major obstacle in the building of Glen Cayon Dam.

Glen Canyon Bridge was designed by the Bureau of Reclamation; financed jointly by the State of Arizona, U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation; and built by Kiewit-Judson Pacific Murphy under a competitively bid contract of $4,139,277.

Work started at the bridge site in May 1957 with excavation for skewbacks and building the abutments. As work proceeded at the damsite, the steel was fabricated in California. On May 7, 1958, the first steel beam was placed. Erection proceeded rapidly from both sides, and on August 6, 1958, the arch was closed as the last piece was pinned into place.

Now, the Glen Canyon Bridge is completed—the highest of its type in the world. For years to come it will stretch gracefully across the Glen Canyon of the Colorado—an engineering wonder—and a servant to the people of the Nation.

Administered Price Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in the course of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee hearings there has been considerable testimony to the effect that a primary cause of the high prices and inflation plaguing the consumer today has been the upward manipulation of prices in the concentrated administered price industries.

I want to place in the RECORD a letter which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald. It is written by Eugene Havas, a prominent financier and economist. It is a vivid statement of how prices are raised in administered price industries, especially in steel, in the face of remarkably high profits. The effect on the cost of living is obvious. It hits every consumer in this country, directly or indirectly, right in his pocketbook.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE ADMINISTERED PRICES

Congratulations on your forceful editorial of February 8 on "Those Administered Prices," and Bernard D. Nossiter's lucid presentation of this new type of inflation.

You have performed a great public service by printing Dr. Gardiner Means' charts comparing the administrative type inflation of 1953–58 with the wartime inflation of 1942–47, so that the average man can understand what is plaguing us and could urge Congress to do something about it.

It is clear from Dr. Means' conclusions that the steel industry passed on to the con-

sumer not only the wage increases granted to its employees, but much more. Indeed in the last 10 years, the leader of the steel industry, the United States Steel Corp., increased its dividend fourfold from 4 or 5 percent to 18 percent on their investment, reinvested more than $1,250 million from undistributed profits, set up a pension fund of $1 billion, and wrote off about $2 billion in normal and accelerated depreciation.

No wonder that the equity of the United States Steel, which was valued about $550 million by the stock market in 1948 increased to about $5 billion at current stock exchange prices. Somewhat similar is the story of the Bethlehem Steel Corp., which increased its dividend in the period of 1947 to 1957 from 6 percent to 28 percent.

These two corporations are producing about half of the total of the steel output and dictate the price policy of the industry. Had they refused to increase their prices in August 1958, following the announcement of a $4.50 per ton increase of the other companies such as Armco Steel, Jones-Laughlin, Republic Steel, there is no doubt that the price increases would have been rescinded by these lesser producers.

Whether some of the less efficient marginal steel companies needed the increase to maintain profitable operation is debatable; what is certain is that some of the big companies such as United States Steel, Bethlehem, Republic, etc., did not need it. Unless, of course, we are willing to acquiesce that United States Steel and Bethlehem Steel needed to earn close to 100 percent on their equity capital (before taxes) or that they needed to continue to pay a dividend of 18 percent or 28 percent, inaugurated in the prosperous years of 1956–57.

The average man does not realize that the so-called regular quarterly dividend of 75 cents for United States Steel, or 60 cents for Bethlehem Steel corresponds to 18 percent or 28 percent because the $100 par value stock was split in 1949 and in 1955 to the ratio of 1 to 6 in the case of United States Steel and 1 to 12 in the case of Bethlehem Steel. In the first half of 1957, when the steel industry operated at about 90 percent capacity, these two companies earned more than 100 percent on their equities before taxes, and at the present more than 80 percent operating capacity they are approximating that high profit ratio again.

Is it surprising that in face of such high profits steelworkers are restless and want another wage increase in the coming negotiations this spring. They can point to the huge benefits the managers are obtaining from their stock options. The annual report of United States Steel states that options were granted at $18.50 per share in 1953. These shares are now quoted around $90, so that in 5 years there is a capital gain of 500 percent, a free ride on the waves of administered price inflation.

This clearly demonstrates that the managers of the big corporations have a vested interest to make good on their stock option and that their pricing practices are not unrelated to their own interest, which is not identical with the public interest.

That such a situation calls for action by Congress is obvious. It is useless to hope that either the policy of the Federal Reserve System or budgetary measures, however sound and necessary they are by themselves, can stop inflation spurred by administrative price increases. The executive officers of the giant corporations cannot be unbiased judges of what is good for the country, when their actions of raising prices could so enhance their private fortunes.

Secretary Anderson, testifying before the joint congressional committee, said that when speculation is safe and saving is a gamble, the country is in a bad way. Nothing can be more true. Let us hope that Secretary Anderson will act in accord with his wise statement and present Congress with effective measures to stop the free ride on inflation.

He can do that by taxing profits realized on stock options at regular income tax rates, instead of the 25 percent capital gain rates. He can propose taxes for stock splits which are characteristic of an inflationary psychology: that it is safe to speculate and foolish to save or invest in Government bonds.

All the efforts of the administration to achieve price stability, balanced budget and last but not least the easier and less expensive refinancing of the $80 billion Government debt due in a year, will be in vain if no appropriate measures are taken to end the now prevailing administrative pricing practices in the steel industry. Another steel price increase in July 1959, would further impair the present disequilibrium of our economy and the soundness of the dollar.

EUGENE HAVAS.

WASHINGTON.

Billion Dollar Bundle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, one of the most engaging and provocative speeches I have encountered in a long time is that made by Mr. Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board of directors of the United States Steel Corp., when he addressed the annual meeting of the Minnesota Editorial Association at Minneapolis. Mr. Blough's speech deals with inflation and the current challenges. I recommend his speech as essential reading for every Member of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLION DOLLAR BUNDLE

(An address by Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board of directors, United States Steel Corp., at the annual meeting of the Minnesota Editorial Association, Minneapolis, Minn., February 20, 1959)

If anyone could be happier these days than a hypochondriac at a medical convention, it is, I suppose, a businessman at a meeting of the press. The reason in both cases is the same. Each feels that at last he can tell his troubles to a group which can really do something about them.

So when you honored me with your welcome invitation to come out here and talk with you today, I accepted it with even more alacrity than usual.

This may have been a mistake. Since receiving your invitation, I have run across a recently published book entitled the Sugar Pill, whose author sets out to prove that you really aren't much interested in news anyhow; and that the vaunted power of the press is a mere delusion. In fact, I believe that claptrap was the word he used in describing it.

Now needless to say, it was quite a shock to me to learn from this, shall I say, authoritative source, that the influence of you members of the biggest and, I think, the most powerful, press in the world is merely a figment, so to speak, of your own imaginative egos. But if it is any consolation to you, let me offer you the sympathy of one who fully shares your partnership in pain; for over the years, we of United States Steel have suffered a veritable hailstorm of sugar pills that have been aimed in our direction by a number of self-appointed critics who were doubtless equally well meaning.

It is true, of course, that none of these critics, so far as I can recall, ever accused us of being powerless. Conversely, they have sought with great unanimity, to prove that we possessed some vast, mysterious and unhappy power to crush our competitors and thus to work great evil upon society. So I have had frequent occasion to ponder, at length, this question of power, or the lack of it; and it has always puzzled me.

It just happens, you see, that in 1901—the first year of its existence—United States Steel produced about two-thirds of all the steel that was made in America—in other words, twice as much as all of its competitors put together. But last year, our company produced only 28 percent of America's steel; and our competitors turned out more than 2½ times as much as we did.

So you will understand my natural desire to get my hands on this enormous power that we are supposed to have; because if I ever find it, I know exactly what I want to do with it. I want to give it, with my blessing, to Bethlehem, Republic, National, Armco, Jones & Laughlin, and one or two hundred other competitors of ours who have been crushed to such heights of success since United States Steel was born.

Meanwhile I shall continue to take my sugar pills with a grain of salt; and my confidence in the power of the press will remain undiminished. In fact if there is any understandable complaint that can be lodged against the American press today by a tired and harassed reader, it is that you are doing your job so thoroughly.

You recall that onetime colleague of yours, the late, lamented humorist, Will Rogers, once said that if his audience ever walked out on his act, he would bundle up his family and head for the tall grass of Oklahoma. There he planned to get a high-powered rifle, point it down the road, and cut loose at the first man who approached with a newspaper. That way, he said, he could just keep on living in ignorance.

Now living in ignorance, as a solution to all of the problems that confront us daily in the headlines, sometimes sounds mighty appealing; and despite the rising circulation of your newspapers, I suppose that a great many of us would welcome escape from the tidings they so often bring. With pressures and tensions building up on every side of us, we wish perhaps that we might forget the news and seek some quiet wilderness where we could commune, in peace, with nature. But even that word "commune" has lost its restful magic. Today it is usually used as a noun that depicts only terror, oppression, and the degradation of human life—as millions of people in China can attest.

No; today there is no escape—no beckoning Walden.

The news is too demanding. It is filled with questions pressing for answers. And only an informed people can hope to come up with the right answers in a republic such as ours.

So I, for one, am devoutly thankful for the power and the freedom of the press in America—a press which has the energy, initiative, enterprise, and integrity to search every corner of the world for meaningful news, whether it be good or bad, to report that news honestly and fully, to comment upon it intelligently, and thus to maintain in this country of ours an informed and enlightened citizenry.

That, as I see it, is the great, unchallenged power of the free American press. And since

the power to provoke thought is vastly more important than the power to control thought, it stands today, I think, as our first, best hope of survival.

So in talking here with you members of the Minnesota Editorial Association, I first want to say that all of us at United States Steel recognize and commend the well-informed reporting and editorial comment that has generally characterized the Minnesota press in dealing with our mutual problems on the iron range. In company with your distinguished guests, you have discussed the local aspects of these problems at length with many of my colleagues; and you have shown a deep understanding of the difficulties we encounter in our joint search for a solution.

But you also recognize, I know, that the production problems which beset us here are not merely local. They are not unique to Minnesota, nor to the mining industry. Actually, they resolve themselves into one, basic economic problem that confronts every industry in every State of the Nation, and in nations across the world.

And that problem is to keep our production costs competitive with those of other producers both here and abroad.

You know this era that we live in has been called the atomic age, the space age, and by many similarly imaginative titles; but economic historians of the future may call it—more correctly, perhaps—the age of competition; for never before in history, probably, has the ability of man to survive depended so directly upon his ability to compete on a national and international scale.

Today the industrial leadership which America has enjoyed throughout the present century is being challenged by nations all over the world and on both sides of the Iron Curtain. The so-called cold war is centering more and more upon the battlefield of industrial production. But to call it merely a war of production is to miss the point. It is primarily a war of productivity—a struggle on the part of every company, every industry, and every nation to become the low-cost producer of the things which it offers for sale in world markets.

There is no doubt, for example, that if Minnesota's iron mines were the most economical source of supply for all of the steel mills in America, employment on the iron range would increase substantially. And if Minnesota ores could undersell their competitors in foreign markets generally, the iron range would be booming. The same thing is true of steel and almost any other product you can name.

So over the years, American industrial management has striven in every conceivable way to increase its productive efficiency and cut down its operating costs. In its laboratories and its factories, it has devised and developed machines which have multiplied the output of its workers enormously. It has discovered and installed the techniques of mass production. It has streamlined its organization and has hammered away at methods improvement and cost reduction programs until it would seem that there is almost nothing left in this field to hammer—although there is still a plenty.

Yes, it has done everything in the book, and has even rewritten the book. Yet all the economies that it has effected so steadily in the costs that it could control have not balanced out the rising costs that lie beyond its control. And so today we see our production costs mounting on every side; we see prices rising as a result; and we see many of the products of our foreign competitors underselling ours—not only in markets abroad, but often here at home.

In short we see the inevitable harvest of inflation.

Now there is a school of thought, of course, which holds that inflation is a kind of heaven-sent answer to our problems. The adherents of this school believe—sincerely, I am sure—that if Government will just quit worrying about the deficits which are one of the major sources of inflation, and will spend its borrowed money liberally enough, it will touch off such a spree of industrial production and employment that the resulting increase in the tax yield will balance the national budget and bury the specter of inflation forever in its grave.

But if there were any validity in that convenient argument, inflation should have been a dead duck many years ago; for—including World War II and Korea—our Federal Government has operated in the red for 23 out of the last 28 years. Our national debt is at an alltime high, and we are about to raise the debt limit again for the fourth time in 13 years. And our interest payments alone, on that debt, now about to $7½ billion a year. That is more than the total Federal budget was in 1938; and it amounts to—$43 apiece for every man, woman, and child in our land.

Nor have our States been backward in the testing of this theory. Seven years ago, 19 of them were spending more than their general revenues could cover. In 1957, that number had increased to 29. So going into the red has become more popular each year; and the net result of this inflationary cure for inflation has been to reduce the value of the American dollar to less than 50 cents in the course of the past 20 years.

Still the quaint belief persists that the way to treat this form of economic intoxication is to administer ever-increasing quantities of the intoxicant to the hapless victim; and while this may make everything look rosy, temporarily, the result is inevitably fatal. From the ancient days of Greece and Rome, inflation has brought collapse not only to nation after nation, but to whole civilizations.

We saw what it did in Germany, Poland, Russia, Hungary, and Austria after World War I; and now, in France—where the cost of living is 37 times greater than it was just 32 years ago—Antoine Pinay, the former Premier who has been put in charge of the treasury by President De Gaulle, has this interesting and expert comment to offer:

"Inflation," says M. Pinay, "corrupts everything, a balanced budget, investments, job security, social legislation, the moral health of all classes, even national prestige abroad."

All our wishful thinking to the contrary, therefore, we know that we cannot spend ourselves into prosperity or inflate ourselves into a position of international security and leadership. We cannot go on forever getting more and more for producing less and less. And we merely delude ourselves when we seek to increase consumer purchasing power by adding more dollars to our pay envelopes, on the one hand, and by ignoring the shrinking value of those dollars on the other. Ultimately, the inflated dollar becomes worthless, and whether we double, triple, or quadruple nothing, the result is still nothing.

Yet this year, unless we can prevent it, the probability is that we shall go orbiting off on another great round of inflation, as unions in a dozen major industries make wage demands that exceed any conceivably possible increase in national productive efficiency. And since one of these industries is steelmaking, I should like to discuss this aspect of inflation with you briefly.

In recent years, our Nation has witnessed a new phenomenon which is known among economists as cost-push inflation and which made its appearance simultaneously with the growth of the powerful industrywide unions that we have today.

Cost-push inflation occurs when wages, and other production costs, are pushed up more rapidly than national productive efficiency increases. This, in turn, forces prices to rise where competition permits, and diminishes the purchasing power of the dollar accordingly. Where competition prevents the recovery of increased costs through higher prices, the producer ultimately goes out of business. There is no other alternative.

But I do not need to tell you ladies and gentlemen of the press about the dangers of this spiral of wages, costs and prices. People in your industry tell me that rising costs have been largely responsible for the disappearance of some 217 daily newspapers in the United States in the past 10 years.

Now there are many costs, of course, which enter into the production process, but by far the most important of these is the cost of employment. If we take the entire production process from the raw materials right through to the finished product, unemployment costs—direct and indirect—account for 75 to 80 percent of all costs. That means that an unearned rise in employment costs has from three to four times as much inflationary effect as a corresponding rise in all the remaining costs of production put together.

So bearing this all-important fact in mind, let us look for a moment at the wage picture that confronts us. Of the major wage contracts on file with the Department of Labor, 154 will come up for negotiation this year. These contracts cover about 4½ million workers, and among the many unions involved, one of the largest and most powerful is the steelworkers union with about 1¼ million workers. Its present 3-year agreement with the steel-producing companies expires on June 30.

Now presumably most of these unions will come up with demands for a "package" embracing higher wages and benefits; but the steel union union isn't talking in terms of a mere package— it's talking about a billion-dollar bundle.

In the advertisements which it has been running in your newspapers, this union has been telling us how an extra billion dollars, in the pockets of the steelworkers, will increase the sales and the profits of the automobile industry, the moving-picture houses, and the homebuilders of America, and so on, ad infinitum. So it is going to do the whole Nation a great favor by getting that billion-dollar bundle for its members.

And that sounds just dandy; but why be so selfish about it? Why limit it to 1¼ million steelworkers? Why not do the same for all of the 65 million gainfully employed people in America, and thus raise the ante of $52 billion? In short, why not go on a real inflationary bender while we're at it? It should be lots of fun, while it lasts.

Unhappily for all of us, however, you don't find a billion-dollar bundle in a 5-and-10-cent store—not even in these days of inflation. And when the union, in its advertisements, speaks as it has about a billion dollars in new money, it is describing the sutuation more accurately and more prophetically, perhaps, than it had really intended. For that is precisely what it would be in the end—new money, fresh off the printing press and worth exactly that.

Now it is not my purpose to argue the steel wage case here today. That would take a great deal more time than any of us can spare on this occasion. But I do want to discuss two points that will be hotly debated in the press, no doubt, as the negotiations in steel and all these other industries develop during the year:

First we will be told that these new wage demands can be met out of increased productivity, and thus will not be inflationary. And second we will be told that the real cause of this cost-push inflation is to be found—not in rising wages—but in exorbitant industrial profits. Let's look at these statements a little.

In the case of productivity, we must remember that it is not, by any means, the

same thing as output per man hour. In any one company or industry, for example, an increase in output per man hour may be completely offset by the increased cost of machines or materials that made the higher output possible. So when we talk in terms of output per man hour we are usually exaggerating greatly any increase in real productivity that may have occurred.

We must also remember that productivity—as an offsetting factor to inflationary wage increases—cannot be measured on a short term basis covering a month, a few months, or even a few years.

For example, if we take the records of the American Iron and Steel Institute, and do a little arithmetic, we find that in 1956—the year in which our present steel wage agreement was signed—the industry turned out considerably more steel per thousand man hours than it did last year. Over that period, in fact, output per man hour declined by more than 7 percent.

That, of course, was due primarily to the sharp drop in steel production during a period of recession; and now that the demand for steel is rising rapidly, it may be expected that output per man hour will do likewise. So if the steel union seeks to justify its wage demands by claiming some spectacular rise in output per man hour during the coming months, it may fool a number of people; but that will not make its demands one whit less inflationary.

The truth is, of course, that from 1940 through 1957, hourly employment costs in the steel industry have gone up an average of 7.6 percent for 17 solid years. And in contrast, the reports of the Department of Labor show that output per man-hour has risen by only 2.6 percent per year. And, as I pointed out before, using "output per man-hour" overstates the real produotivity gains.

So there you have it: 7.6 percent against 2.6 percent, each year for 17 years. The difference spelled wage inflation.

Now, let's take a look at those profits.

The argument here is that rising corporate profits, rather than wages, are responsible for the ever-mounting cost of living. And the trouble with this argument is that corporate profits haven't been rising for years. In fact, only twice during the present decade have the after-tax profits of corporations as a whole been as high as they were in 1950. In all other years they were lower. And Government reports show that last year they were $5 billion less than they were in 1950.

The same Government reports also show, however, that compensation of employees, throughout the Nation, has risen by $100 billion during these same 9 years. So I leave it to you; whence cometh this cost-push inflation?

I should add, however, that this decline in corporate profits may have contributed, in one respect, to the inflationary effect of the wage increases; because, you see, there is only one way in which these corporate profits can be spent. They all go to pay for the use and improvement of the tools and other capital facilities necessary to production * * * and had the profits of all corporations risen as they should have, during this period, there is no doubt that many of the cost-reducing improvements that American industry is still waiting to make in its facilities would have already been installed and would now be yielding the fruits of increased efficiency.

So when we hear union leaders say that higher wage costs can, and should, come out of profits, let us remember one little economic maxim: that less profit means fewer tools—or poorer tools—of production; and that this, in turn, means less efficiency, higher production costs, higher prices, shrinking purchasing power, diminishing markets, and fewer jobs. It is just as simple as that.

Ladies and gentlemen, at the outset of this little talk I said I wanted to discuss my problems with you because you could really do something about them. As you see, however, they are not my problems alone. They are the problems of all of us, of you, of the men in the mines and the mills, and of union members and leaders alike; for no matter what economic group we may belong to, and no matter what the conflicting interests of these groups may seem to be, we are a Nation of 175 million consumers and each one of us has a vital stake in the task of protecting the consumer purchasing power of all of us.

If there is one banner under which we should all unite, I suppose it would read something like this: "Hold that line in 1959."

No single group of us can do it alone. We who represent the steel companies are going to do our full part, but in saying that, let me remind you that at the American bargaining table, in these days of industrywide unions, the power that is concentrated on the labor side normally outweighs by a considerable margin that on the management side. This is especially true when any single company is negotiating with the union and is still likely to be true even when a group of companies have joined together for bargaining purposes.

Unless the representatives of the union are fully satisfied when our present steel contracts expire, they can strike the plants and close down about 90 percent of the steel industry. And they have done so five times in the last 13 years.

The steel companies have taken these costly strikes in an effort to help check the rising tide of wage-cost inflation; but they have never succeeded in doing so; for a strike in steel is not a weapon that is aimed at the companies alone. After it has gone on for a few weeks, many of our customers begin to run out of steel. Thus they face a shutdown of their plants and a layoff of their employees. The flow of steel needed for defense is shut off too; and so the pressure upon the companies to settle finally reaches a point where it is difficult to withstand any longer. It comes from our customers, from the public, and—frequently—from the Government itself.

Settle, they tell us; and settle we must. So the companies alone cannot stop wage inflation. Neither can the Government, I think, under present circumstances. Conceivably it might legislate a more equal distribution of power at the bargaining table, but I cherish little hope that it will do so. Failing that, it could resort to the peacetime imposition of wage and price controls; but those have been tried in nation after nation for more than 2,000 years, and never yet have they stopped inflation. They have only stopped production and progress.

Yet there is, I believe, one great, irresistible force in this country that can stop wage inflation at its source. That is the force of informed public opinion. And the power to create an informed public opinion is the power of the press.

Now I know that the issues in any wage negotiation are many and complex; and that working as you do under the inexorable pressure of the clock, you have little time to delve into them fully. I also know that a wage negotiation, even in a nationwide industry, is pretty small potatoes as news goes, these days, and that there is very little space that you can give it.

It is true, moreover, that you have fully and fairly discharged your reportorial duties when you give both sides of the story. You tell your readers that the union says its wage demands will cost X cents per hour; but the companies claim that it will cost a good many cents more per hour. So the reader, who is often a pretty busy fellow himself, is likely to conclude that both sides are protesting too much, and that it really doesn't matter much because they're only haggling over a few pennies anyway.

But which side is protesting too much? And just how much does it matter?

Well it matters a great deal, because, you see, an increase of 1 little cent per hour in the cost of employment will add some $15 million a year to the industry's cost of making steel. And in saying that, I am referring only to the direct employment cost. As similar wage boosts occur in other industries and are reflected in our purchased goods, services, taxes, and so on, the increase in our indirect employment costs soon mounts up to an equal sum. So as a kind of rough rule of thumb, we may say that each 1 cent increase in steel wages and benefits means some $30 million of increased costs to add to the inflation spiral.

But it lies within the power of the press to determine what the exact facts are. You men and women have the opportunity to go to the source of these conflicting statements on both sides, to check the figures for yourselves, and to tell your readers of your findings.

My purpose here today is to invite you most cordially to do so; because unless the public can be fully and truthfully informed, it looks as if we may have another billion-dollar bundle of unwanted inflation on our national doorstep for keeps.

Industrialization of the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Sentinel recently printed a table showing the degree of industrialization of each of the 48 States excluding Alaska, as measured by percentages of personal income derived from manufacturing wages and salaries.

It will surprise many Members of Congress to discover that the State of Wisconsin is now seventh in the country in industrialization by this measure and ranks ahead of such States as Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Illinois, New York, California, and Texas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table and the interesting article accompanying it, written by William A. Norris of the Sentinel be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE RESIDENTS' INCOME HEAVILY DEPENDENT UPON MANUFACTURING

(By William A. Norris)

Here's a good method of measuring the degree of Wisconsin's industrialization, its dependence on manufacturing for its economic life:

Out of every dollar of personal income received by Wisconsin people, 30 cents comes from manufacturers in the form of wages and salaries.

The remaining 70 cents of the State's total personal income are derived from wages and salaries in all nonmanufacturing occupations, and from the professions, interest and dividends, profits on farms and businesses, pensions, annuities and other nonwage sources.

The figures used in this column are based on reports of the Department of Commerce

for 1957 (percentages by courtesy of my slide-rule).

Only six States get a higher percentage of personal income from manufacturing wages and salaries than does Wisconsin.

At the top of the list is Michigan, with 36.8 percent; at the bottom is North Dakota, with only 2.6 percent. The national average is 23.4 percent.

The following table does not show which States have the most manufacturing, but it does show which States have the most manufacturing in relation to all their other sources of personal income.

As a result, some rather surprising things appear. New York, which leads all States in total value of manufacturing, is No. 19 on the list, slightly below the national average. That's because New York has tremendous sources of personal income other than manufacturing—financial institutions, shipping, vast wholesale and retail structures, service industries, utilities, transportation of all sorts. Manufacturing is relatively less important to New York than it is to Wisconsin.

On the other hand, little Delaware, with manufacturing output only about one-sixth of Wisconsin's, is tied with us in the list because its total personal income is only about one-sixth of ours. Relatively, Delaware is as highly industrialized as we are. Some other small States, such as New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont, are higher on the list than you might expect.

Some industrial giants, like California and Texas, whose manufacturing volume exceeds Wisconsin's, are far down on the list because their economies include big nonmanufacturing resources. Here's the list:

Percentage of personal income derived from manufacturing wages and salaries

1. Michigan	36.8
2. Indiana	35.2
3. Connecticut	34.5
4. Ohio	34.2
5. New Jersey	31.4
6. Pennsylvania	31.0
7. Wisconsin	30.4
8. Delaware	30.4
9. New Hampshire	28.7
10. Rhode Island	27.6
11. Massachusetts	26.8
12. South Carolina	26.1
13. Illinois	25.7
14. North Carolina	25.0
15. Maine	24.6
16. Tennessee	23.4
U.S. average	23.4
17. Alabama	22.5
18. Vermont	22.4
19. New York	22.0
20. Missouri	21.4
21. Maryland	20.8
22. Georgia	20.4
23. West Virginia	20.2
24. California	19.5
25. Washington	19.5
26. Kentucky	19.2
27. Oregon	19.0
28. Minnesota	17.5
29. Kansas	16.3
30. Texas	16.0
31. Iowa	15.6
32. Mississippi	15.5
33. Virginia	15.5
34. Arkansas	13.8
35. Louisiana	13.5
36. Utah	12.4
37. Idaho	11.5
38. Oklahoma	10.9
39. Colorado	10.7
40. Arizona	9.9
41. Nebraska	9.5
42. Florida	8.1
43. Montana	7.6
44. Wyoming	5.3
45. New Mexico	4.9
46. Nevada	4.5
47. South Dakota	4.5
48. North Dakota	2.6

(Apologies to Alaska, for which we have no figures.)

This list, perhaps, will help to impress public officials and private citizens alike with the vital necessity of preserving and expanding our State's manufacturing industries.

The Vanguard Weather Satellite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT OF DR. ABE SILVERSTEIN, DIRECTOR OF SPACE FLIGHT DEVELOPMENT, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS, FEBRUARY 18, 1959

As you know, we launched a 21½-pound Vanguard weather satellite yesterday morning. From all indications, it is transmitting valuable cloud cover data which can be related to the overall meteorology of the earth.

This is a very exciting, historic, experiment. It represents a first step toward obtaining continuous, 24-hour-a-day weather mapping of global scope. At the present time, by means of weather ships, balloons, etc., we are able to map only 10 percent of the world's weather, so it's not hard to see why we are excited about this experiment.

I'd like to review, briefly, the history of Project Vanguard because I feel there has been considerable misunderstanding about this project from the very beginning. And at the outset, I'd like to pay tribute to Dr. John Peter Hagen, chief of NASA's Vanguard division, whose faith in the Vanguard rocket, and the project in general, has never wavered.

On July 29, 1955, the White House announced that the United States planned to launch earth satellites as part of this country's contribution to the International Geophysical Year which ended formally on December 31, 1958. Project Vanguard was the name assigned to that part of the satellite program which was under management of the Chief of Naval Research, Adm. Rawson Bennett. The Naval Research Laboratory (NRL) in Washington, D.C., under the leadership of Capt. P. H. Horn, had responsibility for technical aspects of the program.

Here, I would like to emphasize a fact that is too often forgotten: the Navy set out to produce, essentially from scratch, a satellite launching vehicle in a remarkably short time. The very production of this vehicle was to be, in a sense, one of the most significant contributions of the IGY. The Vanguard vehicle is an advanced rocket, parts of which are in use in other U.S. rockets and missiles.

On October 1, 1958, the President by Executive Order 10783 transferred "all functions (including powers, duties, activities, and parts of functions) of the Department of Defense, or of any officer or organizational entity of the Department of Defense with respect to * * * the U.S. scientific satellite project (Project Vanguard)" to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Under authority of this Executive order, 133 members of the Vanguard group at the Naval Research Laboratory and 25 persons in other divisions of the Naval Research Laboratory devoting substantially full time to the Vanguard project, a total of 158 persons, were transferred to NASA on November 30. Of these, 86 are scientists, 42 technicians, and 30 administrative and support personnel. Project Vanguard developed not only the Vanguard vehicle but also the IGY radio tracking net (Minitrack) which has been used not only for Vanguard but for observations of every active satellite so far launched, United States and Russian. With the transfer, responsibility for this network passed to NASA.

At the time of transfer to NASA the engineering and manufacture of the vehicles was essentially completed. Seven three-stage vehicles, i.e., test vehicles TV-3, TV-3BU, TV-4, TV-5, and satellite launch vehicles SLV-1, SLV-2, SLV-3, had been launched. Modifications which resulted from study of records from each launching attempt were being incorporated in the remaining vehicles. Additional preflight operations, intended to eliminate the causes of low performance of the second stage in previous flights, had been adopted and were being applied to SLV-4. Four satellite launching vehicles remained to be fired.

When responsibility for the Vanguard program was given to NASA, we reviewed the complete history of the project. The Vanguard vehicle is comparable in complexity and application of advanced techniques to military ballistic missiles. Its early flight experience is substantially the same as that of the other missiles, whose failures and successes were not made a matter of public record. The personnel of the Vanguard group are highly competent, and we are pleased that their services have been made available. They have joined in the overall activity of NASA with highly cooperative spirit and are active in the formulation of the national space program.

As a result of administrative review of Vanguard history, NASA decided to postpone the Vanguard firing scheduled for December 1958 to February 1959 to provide time for an objective technical review of the vehicle to determine whether any additional steps might be taken to increase the probability of success. A working committee composed of experts having no previous connection with Vanguard studied in detail the systems involved in the vehicle and vehicle launching. The committee examined all pertinent data from the Vanguard launchings and from the use of Vanguard components in other vehicles such the Thor-Able reentry and moon-probe vehicles. Numerous modifications in the system and operational practices were made as a result of the work of the review teams and the Vanguard and industrial teams working together.

Whether any of these modifications definitively helped in achieving success of Vanguard II is difficult to say. Definitely the conservative engineering approach that led to a deliberate look by all the participants at their equipment and operating practices was correct in principle.

Prior to yesterday's successful experiment, one Vanguard satellite had achieved orbit—a three-and-one-quarter-pound test sphere which was launched on March 17, 1958. (Its 50-pound third stage rocket casing also went into orbit.) Vanguard I, as it was christened, is still aloft, with an expected lifetime of hundreds of years. Its solar batteries are still doing their job and the Army Map Service has been making electronic observations of the satellite from Pacific islands to pinpoint their location more exactly. The satellite is also being used for more exact determination of the earth's shape.

The Vanguard II cloud cover satellite is the first in a series of meteorological satellites to be launched by NASA during the next few years. These satellites should gain information about the weather and how it develops. Substantial economic returns—to say nothing of returns in the form of lives saved by accurate forcasting of hurricanes, typhoons, etc.—can be expected as the technology is developed.

Before closing, I would like to note the contributions of the U.S. Army Signal Research and Development Laboratory, Fort Monmouth, N.J., which developed the instrumentation in the cloud cover satellite; also, the contributions of the industrial firms which have been associated with Project Vanguard under the Martin Co. as prime contractor. The General Electric Co. provided the first-stage rocket. The Aerojet General Corp. provided the rocket for the second-stage booster, and the Grand Central Rocket Co. made the third-stage rocket. The guidance and control equipment was developed from contributions by the Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., Designers for Industry, Air Associates, and the Martin Co. The fine contributions of these industrial teams are representative of the high level of the Nation's industrial technology and lead us to a feeling of confidence in the future of our programs.

New Challenges to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it was recently my pleasure and privilege to address the Texas breakfast at the National School Administrators convention held in Atlantic City, N.J.

The school administrators of this Nation are a most important group. To them and the teachers under their supervision falls the vital task of training the youth of the United States. The excellent record they have already established stands as a living monument to their skill and dedication to duty, particularly when we consider they have been forced to work with inadequate facilities and are generally underpaid. To remain at their posts and continue to work for the betterment of young people requires a missionary zeal. These people are to be heartily commended.

At the request of friends, I am asking unanimous consent to have my address, given February 17, 1959, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW CHALLENGES TO EDUCATION

(Address by U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH at the annual Texas breakfast at the National Association of School Administrators convention, Atlantic City, N.J., February 17, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, fellow Texans, fellow Americans, I am very grateful for the privilege of participating in your annual meeting. This is a doubly pleasurable meeting to me, because some of the happiest days of my life have been spent in school—most of them as a student under inspiring teachers.

Although some of my former students in the Piney Woods country of the Neches River Valley may feel differently about those times, my 3 years as a country schoolteacher in Henderson County were to me some of the happiest days of all.

Now, as a member of the Senate Education Subcommittee, I am having an exceptional opportunity to learn something of the many complex problems facing our schools today.

In common with most informed Americans, I am deeply concerned about the lagging progress of public education and I am particularly concerned about it in Texas. This does not mean that I am critical of you and of our teachers. On the contrary, I commend you for doing an excellent job despite limited tools, inadequate pay, and lukewarm public support. It is my job, and the responsibility of every thinking citizen, to do everything possible to see that you have the funds to pay adequate teachers' salaries and to build adequate classrooms.

I firmly believe that teachers' pay in Texas should be raised from 50 percent to 100 percent, but not because I feel that every teacher is worth twice as much as he or she is now receiving. I am convinced that doubling teacher pay would not only solve the teacher shortage, it would create competition for the jobs. Then you as administrators would be in position to demand a high degree of excellence in this vital profession.

To those who say we "can't afford it," my answer is—we cannot afford to do otherwise. Like it or not, we cannot afford either having only half of our Texans educated, or having all Texans half educated. Yet, we are dangerously near that point.

Only one Texan in three over the age of 25 years has completed 4 years of high school. Texans rank 38th among people from all the States in the percentage qualified through the selective service mental test. Likewise, our students rank 38th among the students of other States in the per capita average number of days they attend school each year, under Texas' generally unenforceable compulsory school attendance law.

It is a shocking disgrace for big, rich Texas to rank 32d among the States in public school expenditures for each pupil in average daily attendance. But one must confess that is what might be expected in a State where an inept Government is blind to the needs of education. It taxed students by raising university tuition fees, and refused to tax the interests that are exploiting Texas, her people, and her resources.

A century and a quarter ago, our Texas forefathers revolted because of the failure of the general government to establish a public system of education in Texas.

Texas was ravaged by fire and by sword, her cities besieged, her towns burned, her heroes killed. But her right to a system of public education was won. Are we, the inheritors of those rights, to fail this, and the next generation? Are we too weak, too conformist, too servile and supine, to fight for what we know is right? Is big money to connote big ignorance? I call on every Texan to rally now, and help us build the best system of public education in the United States.

Proud, wealthy Texas is paying its elementary teachers an average of only $4,296 yearly, considerably below the national average. This is criminal neglect because the student is the casualty in the long run. As your representative in the Senate, I am working for the solution of this problem.

As a member of the Senate Education Subcommittee, I have been present at hearings on Senate bill No. 2, the so-called School Support Act of 1959 introduced by Senator MURRAY, of Montana. Under this provision, Texas would be eligible to receive an allotment of $25 per school age child in fiscal 1959–60, $50 the next year, $75 the next year, and $100 per student in 1962–63. The estimated allotments for Texas by respective year would total $63.8 million; $132.9 million, $206.4 million, and $285.3 million.

This money, and I want to emphasize this—without any Federal controls or intervention—would be available to local school districts to use as local boards see fit, either for teacher pay increases or construction of new school rooms, or both.

Regardless of whether this bill passes, you can count on me to fight to see that we do not lose any of the good programs already underway. I will continue to strenuously oppose moves to abolish or to limit the school-lunch program, and the school-milk program, vocational education programs, and Federal assistance to federally impacted areas. I am working to expand all of these programs. You know, some of these people who are against spending money on public education, no matter why or where the money is needed, have been running around the State saying, "Why you've got to watch out for old RALPH YARBOROUGH. He's for Federal aid to education."

I'd like to clear that point up once and for all. I'm not just for Federal aid to education. I'm for all aid to education. The soundest investment we can make in America is in developing the minds of our young people. The need for more funds in the field of public education is so critical that revenues from local districts, cities, States, and the Federal Government all are required.

With this in mind, I have been shocked and saddened to learn that the board of regents of our Texas State teachers colleges have declined by an official resolution to participate in the student loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. As you know, this is the act which primarily is designed to start us on the road to higher educational achievement, particularly in the field of science.

One provision of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which, incidentally, I had the honor of coauthoring, provides funds for loans to college students. Most colleges in Texas and throughout the Nation have responded enthusiastically to this loan program as a very worthwhile means of assisting worthy students in securing a college education. But I was astonished to learn that the board of regents of Texas State teachers colleges have denied participation in these loans to students in five colleges.

Despite the fact that college officials had estimated a student loan need totaling $195,333, the board saw fit to deny this loan program to students at Sam Houston Teachers College, Southwest Texas State Teachers College, Stephen F. Austin, East Texas State, and Sul Ross College.

The board of regents of these colleges has made a decision which I would not want on my conscience. If a single student drops out of a single one of these schools for lack of funds, the regents should be held accountable. Ironically, one of the colleges which the regents prohibited from participating in the loan program has this statement of purpose printed on its letterhead: "Founded to promote the advancement of the profession of teaching. Dedicated to the cause of better schools. Devoted to the welfare of children and youth."

It is my sincere hope that the board of regents of Texas State teachers colleges, for the good of the students, will reconsider its position on this matter: A total of $21,758 has been reserved for the five colleges involved. If the regents finally deny this aid to their students, I shall make every effort to see that these funds are apportioned to other Texas students in other schools so that they will not be diverted to other States.

In my opinion, the people who make the mistake of opposing the granting of sufficient funds for the Nation's educational program are doing this country, themselves, and particularly our children, one of the greatest injustices of which they are capable.

Basically, the cold war now raging between democracy and communism around the world is a struggle for the minds of men. Enlightenment has always been free men's bulwark against tyranny. Education is the foundation stone of democracy, and it is an ever-increasing factor in the standard of living each man and his family can enjoy. We cannot, we must not, and we will not continue to deny all our students an education of the first class.

It would be simpler if I could say at this point, "Well, we are going to help you get some money, and that will solve the educational problems in America in general, and in Texas in particular."

But it isn't that simple. The educational problem facing us all goes much deeper than money. The thing we need most in education cannot be bought with money; it must grow again in the hearts and minds of the American people. I refer to the once proud dream that this land would be the world's model of universal educational attainment and cultural development. I refer to the spirit which made a backwoods boy named Abraham Lincoln study by firelight because he and other young people of his time recognized that knowledge is an invaluable stepping stone to happiness and to greatness.

What has become of the insatiable and inexorable quest for knowledge which played such a dominant role in pioneering of our Nation? Does it exist no more? Is a penchant for a be-bop ducktail culture a passing fad, or evidence of the long decline?

As a people we have more time free from work and drudgery than any other people in the history of mankind. But are we Americans using this time, even a small portion of this free time, to improve our minds through new educational attainment or even serious thought?

The answer is all too obvious. We have become a Nation with its head stuck in a television set; a people establishing new records annually in the consumption of alcohol and happy pills. We spend our lives vainly searching for happiness from a bottle. We are more concerned with the tearful soap opera TV heroine than with Communist terror in Hungary.

This is a deadly trend. As Adlai Stevenson has said: "We have confused the free with the free and easy." We threaten to become a people whose principal purpose is piling up profits and partaking of fleeting pleasures.

In the words of Abraham Lincoln, "We cannot escape history. * * * We will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or the other of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation."

There must be an awakening. As a people and a Nation we cannot afford to retire in the prime of our lives. We have reached what might be considered a breathing point in American history. But our indolence and vacuity and indifference cannot continue. This breathing point must not become a permanent campsite. Let us adopt as a national educational aim the motto of an American State "Ad astra per aspera," "To the stars through difficulties."

We must recapture our desire for high educational excellence, and unflinchingly meet the mental disciplines and hard work basic to superior knowledge.

Mass education of all the people, once an American monopoly, is fast coming to the whole world. We can maintain our leadership only by moving faster and working harder for educational progress than other countries now turning their efforts to mass education.

The parent, the teacher, and the politician must all make up their minds that easy courses, little discipline, and stinted funds for education will never add up to high educational standards. Major emphasis on athletic spectacles and academic trivia cannot produce a high percentage of well-educated citizens. It is more likely to produce mediocrity.

We must turn from mediocrity to educational excellence, not only in pursuit of happiness for more Americans, but to achieve educational superiority.

Never before in the history of man have the talents and the specially developed abilities of educated men been in more urgent demand. Never have the opportunities for educated, thinking, freemen been so great. The next 10, 20, or 30 years will tell whether this Nation produces the large numbers of high caliber citizens it so needs.

The brunt of the burden is on your shoulders. Those of us in public service can assist in the work of making known the need, and by helping to make funds available. But the real job of turning out young men and women who are intellectually prepared to be responsible Americans is up to you.

Upon the success or failure of your mission may well rest the eventual fate of freemen everywhere.

I wish you Godspeed.

REA Co-ops Deserve Protection and Encouragement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the rural electric cooperatives of Wisconsin and of America have been the agencies through which the greatest benefit to farmers has been accomplished in all the history of public action in agricultural policy. Now, unfortunately, these REA co-ops are under attack.

From one of Wisconsin's finest REA co-ops, which held its annual members' meeting early this month, I have received a number of resolutions. The policies advocated by these resolutions are sound and, in my opinion, fully merited. I agree with these co-op members that REA should be taken out of politics; in fact I am a cosponsor of the Senate bill to accomplish this. I agree also that REA should not now withdraw from its traditional role as the banker to the rural electrification program, and that its rate of interest should not be raised above the present 2 percent. This rate of interest has been sufficient to cover the cost of money to the Treasury most of the time since REA was established 23 years ago, and there is no reason why it should not do so at present, if our Government would abandon its high interest policy of forcing interest charges to go up. In any event, these co-ops are undertaking considerable expenses and obligations on behalf of the public, particularly in their complete area coverage policy, which entitle them to an interest charge of no more than 2 percent.

Mr. President, because these matters are of such great and direct concern to all of our rural citizens, I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY MEMBERS OF THE CHIPPEWA VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, CORNELL, WIS., AT ANNUAL MEETING OF FEBRUARY 6, 1959

REA REORGANIZATION

Whereas the original REA act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

Whereas Secretary Benson has supported a bill in Congress which would drastically increase interest rates and drive electric and telephone cooperatives to Wall Street for their financing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA; and be it further

Resolved, That as soon as the new Congress convenes in 1959 a bill which would restore to the REA Administrator all of the functions and authority vested in him by the original act of 1936, be introduced and passed.

INTEREST RATES

Whereas a number of bills and proposals were presented to the 85th Congress to increase REA interest rates; and

Whereas the Congress, by enacting the Pace Act in 1944, and fixing the interest rate of 2 percent, therein made a covenant with the rural electric cooperatives to proceed with area coverage at reasonable, retail rates; and

Whereas we believe the continuance of the 2 percent interest rate is necessary to enable the rural electric systems to complete the task of providing full, efficient, and reasonably priced electric service on an area coverage basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to vigorously oppose any change or proposed change in the law, the effects of which would increase REA interest rates.

REA LOAN SOURCE

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture last February sent to the Congress a proposed bill which provided that the cooperatives secure their financing in Wall Street—for which no legislator would act as sponsor; and

Whereas such bill would double or triple interest rates to the rural electric systems; and

Whereas such bill would virtually kill the program and bankrupt many distribution cooperatives; and

Whereas the Congress has always evidenced its wholehearted support of the REA program by consistently providing sufficient loan funds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to oppose any and all proposals which would send the rural electric systems into the private money market for their financing, and we urge Congress to continue its fine support of the rural electric program which means so much to the people of rural America and to the country as a whole.

SELLOUT PROTECTION

Whereas forces opposing the rural electrification program are moving in on cooperatives in various parts of the country, e.g., the New Jersey and Arizona cases, for the expressed purpose of buying them out; and

Whereas it is evident that the power companies instituting sellouts are being directed by executives hired and maintained by their holding companies; and

Whereas electric consumers in and outside the program will pay more for electricity if these sellouts become more widespread: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge REA to provide more aggressive assistance to cooperatives needing its help to continue their existence—such as was the case of cooperatives in New Jersey and Arizona; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge our State legislatures to provide use with the machinery to function as public agenices or utility districts where such a step is necessary to preserve consumer ownership; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to protect rural electrics and all electric consumers by

abolishing the electric holding companies; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to investigate and expose the apparent master plan to cripple and destroy the rural electrification program; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to thoroughly investigate the sellout cases that have now occurred in order that the Rural Electrification Act may be strengthened as a means of protecting the interest of consumers and all Americans who are concerned about the contributions rural electrics are making.

Peach Pioneer of the Piedmont: Ben Gramling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the great farm leaders of South Carolina, Mr. Ben Gramling, of Gramling, Spartanburg County, died on Friday, February 20. Known as the "Peach Pioneer of the Piedmont," Mr. Gramling not only pioneered and engineered Spartanburg County in front of the entire State of Georgia in peach production but also led an inspiring life.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent biographical sketch of Mr. Gramling entitled "Peach Pioneer Ben Gramling," which was published in the April 16, 1958, edition of the South Carolinian, edited and published by Brent Breedin.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed ni the RECORD, as follows:

PEACH PIONEER BEN GRAMLING

Ben M. Gramling, who will observe both his 83d birthday and his 60th year of blissful marriage this November, is a villain in Georgia, sometimes referred to as "The Peach State."

His crime—pioneering and successfully engineering his county of Spartanburg in front of the entire State of Georgia in peach production.

His defense—there was no premeditation in his "crime" against his Georgia neighbors. When he and three Spartanburg County friends, Andy Harris, P. J. Woodfin, and M. F. Johnson, each planted 5 acres of peach trees in 1921, the intention was simply to go along with one of the new cash-crop schemes of County Agent Ernest Carnes, who had become alarmed by the presence of the boll weevil in cotton-producing Spartanburg acreage. In fact, there was no actual objection from Georgians until 25 years after the first peach trees were put down in Spartanburg soil by Gramling and his associates. It was at this stage that the U.S. Agriculture Department statisticians revealed that Spartanburg County was producing more peaches than all the orchards combined in Georgia and that "The Peach State" tag was no longer appropriate for Georgia.

Georgian Joe Nunn, who worked for inexperienced peach-grower Gramling in the early years, might have returned to his home State to warn friends there about his South Carolina employer and associates, but he didn't. Instead he fell under the magic of the Gremling personality to such an extent that on one occasion he offered Ben the loan of $4,000 he had saved in a Georgia bank if it would tide him over following a disastrous peach crop year.

"I really appreciated Joe's sentiments," the reflective Gramling says today, "but I told him that I had been fortunate enough to put up a little money of my own for such an emergency and didn't need any financial help."

Ben has never needed help for lack of foresight. Planning and industry have been the keys to his success in fulfilling the adage, "If you can build a better mousetrap, the world will beat a path to your door." He lived all his life within a mile of his birthplace; yet, Gramling's "Sweet n' Juicy" peaches are in demand throughout the country. In staying home, he has added probably the most colorful and useful chapter to date in the Gramling book of South Carolina history.

His great-great-grandfather Adam Gramling migrated to South Carolina from Germany in 1750 and was given land in the Orangeburg area by the English rulers. It was a practice in pre-Revolutionary War days to welcome non-English settlers to South Carolina, the British using these settlers as a buffer between Charleston and the Indians in the upcountry.

Great-grandfather Martin Luther Gramling (born in 1765) served his neighbors in the Orangeburg sector as a Methodist preacher.

Grandfather Reuben Gramling (born in 1791) started the 19th century by moving into the Spartanburg County area.

And father Henry H. Gramling (born in 1823) amassed one of Spartanburg County's largest estates following the War Between the States, first as a worker on the railroad between Spartanburg and Asheville and later as the biggest producer of ties for the railroad following his purchase of 1,800 acres of virgin timber about 15 miles north of Spartanburg (site of Gramling today) and the setting up of a sawmill. Ben, born on November 1, 1875, can still recall the oxen teams hauling fallen trees from the forest to the mill. It was during this period that the community of Gramling came into existence, getting the name from railroad officials who referred to "Gramling Siding" as the spot at which they could pick up the lumber for their construction.

Ben, literally a chip off the old block, was slated for a full college education after attending a country school at Gramling for 5 years and following graduation from high school in Spartanburg (where he lived with his sister). One year at Wofford, however, and the 18-year-old Gramling was ready to begin work, which he did for merchant W. R. Ballard at a salary of $10 monthly. A year later he attended business college in Nashville, Tenn., returning home in 1895 following the completion of a bookkeeping course in order to be near a sick father. When Henry Gramling died in July of that year, Ben returned to work for Ballard at $15 a month. One year later the young businessman borrowed $200 and went into business for himself at Gramling. And 2 years after that, on November 17, 1898, he married Cora Turpin of nearby Landrum.

Inheriting 150 acres of land from his father, Ben was quick to put his legacy to work in becoming an independent businessman-farmer. Ultimately he purchased the inherited estates to his two brothers and four sisters as well as other lands, putting them all to such excellent usage through the years that he was named one of South Carolina's first "Master Farmers" in 1939. Cotton, wheat, oats, corn, peas, sorghum, alfalfa, and grazing crops for his dairy and beef cattle have all been planted successfully along with his peaches.

Businessman that he always has been, farmer Gramling stepped naturally into matters allied to agriculture—public ginnery, community fertilizer plant, country store, and country bank. When the bank closed in the depression, all obligations were met. The other enterprises are still operating successfully to the advantage of the entire community.

Ben's leadership has not been limited to the fields of business and agriculture but also touches public service and religion. His happy marriage, which he obviously enjoys as much today as he did at the beginning—seven children, seven grandchildren, and five great-grandchildren ago—has been an inspiration to friends and associates. He was a trustee of the Gramling School at age 21 and has served as Spartanburg County's Democratic Party committeeman. At Gramling Methodist Church he has been a steward for years and was Sunday school superintendent for a quarter of a century, "missing attendance only when my children were born at home," he points out.

The management of Gramling Marketing Co., Inc., and the peach orchards have been turned over to the fifth generation of South Carolina Gramlings, while the fourth generation leads an inactive (physically) but nimble (mentally) life in and around his handsome, while unpretentious house. He prefers to discuss current events but can be prodded into reminiscing about his own experiences.

Peaches have been good to the Gramlings and their Spartanburg neighbors. They've meant a new way of life and a higher standard of living, but the success found here has never blinded Ben, or his family, to civic, professional, and religious responsibilities. Three plaques hang on the wall in the Gramlings' front room which testify to this.

"Master farmer award, 1939: 'For notable accomplishments in farming, homemaking, and citizenship' (presented by Progressive Farmer and Extension Service).

"Spartanburg County's No. 1 citizen, 1945: (Presented by Spartanburg Kiwanis Club).

"Chairman of building committee, 1952: 'As an expression of our grateful acknowledgment for his untiring and faithful service to our church' (presented by Gramling Methodist congregation)."

Rewriting of Stephen Foster Songs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the able editor of the Johnston (S.C.) Ridge Citizen, J. Luther Aull, expresses concern with the tampering of song lyrics by NAACP-subdued publishers and TV program directors in a February 19 editorial entitled "Foster Rewritten."

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOSTER REWRITTEN

We just paused to look up at the teevee, having heard the announcement that a program of Stephen Foster songs was about to be presented. The program was the Eddie Fisher program. We were interested to see if they would sing it as Foster wrote it, but they didn't.

"Swanee River" was never taught to us as having any such line in it as "Oh, how my

heart is growing weary," but that was the awkward way the line was rendered by the "teevee-ers." Foster wrote it, "Oh Darkies, how my heart grows weary," but that is not pleasing now to the NAACP which has succeeded in having all such references banned on the networks.

That incident serves to point up one of the troubles with the country—too many pressure groups, all too sensitive. Nobody can laugh at anybody any more. All kinds of dialect jokes are taboo, except of course what passes for southern dialect. We even understand that the Plasterers Union is protesting the use of the term "plastered" as a synonym for intoxicated.

Slow Pace of Watershed Protection Program Is Severe Disappointment to Wisconsin's Coulee Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the world's most beautiful regions is located in southwestern Wisconsin. This area is absolutely unique; nowhere else on earth is there a region which has been completely surrounded by glacial ice but never covered. In fact, the Wisconsin coulee country has been surrounded by glaciers several times. Because of this unique geologic history, this region has a distinctive pattern of steep, deep valleys or coulees, separated by high ridges.

Beautiful as it is, and productive also, the distinctive topography of the coulee country makes it unusually vulnerable to the ravages of flood and soil erosion. After the forests were cut off the steep hillsides, erosion has been taking a grimly costly toll of rich topsoil. Frequent flash floods ravage the valley bottoms, ruining farm crops, farm buildings, and property in the small villages and cities located there. Tremendous strides have been made by farmers and their local soil conservation districts, in cooperation with the Federal Soil Conservation Service and other agricultural agencies, to apply contour cropping, terracing, and other practices to help hold the soil and water in place. But these efforts are not adequate. A broader conception is needed. This need gave rise to the watershed protection program established several years ago—which, if applied with energy and determination, could finally do the job.

Many of us are disturbed by the extremely slow progress which is being made under the watershed program. No one is more disturbed, and no one has a better appreciation of the dangers and costs of delay and procrastination in applying this fine program to the Wisconsin coulee country, than Mr. Lewis C. French of the Milwaukee Journal staff.

Mr. French has written a splendid report on this problem for American Forests magazine. It was published in the October 1958, issue. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. French's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATERSHED FORESTER
(By Lewis C. French)

Richard Sartz, age 39, a watershed forester, goes to work in a new research station on critical land problems in the upper Mississippi River Valley with headquarters in La Crosse, Wis.

In a three-way cooperative agreement between the Federal Government, the Wisconsin Conservation Department, and the Lake States Forest Experiment Station, this new research agency will seek the answers for a more effective means of curbing erosion and curbing upstream floods on some 7,800,000 acres in the fertile Mississippi River Valley.

The plain facts are that conservationists must do something with this whole area—rather than patchwork watershed programs here and there—or more and more land will be gutted by floods and ruined beyond repair.

If this upper Mississippi Valley is worth saving—and it is—then action must soon be taken on a wholesale scale rather than a slowpoke piecemeal basis. Time is running out in the land of the coulees. Under the aforesaid arrangement, Congress authorized $30,000 a year for the station. The Wisconsin Conservation Department will lease or buy the problem land where the research tests will be run. Under consideration by the State commission is the Russian Coulee not far from La Crosse in the famed Coon Valley watershed, the birthplace of modern soil conservation. It is neglected land, farmed with scant success; a valley wedged in between high ridges with steep slopes, just now a bramble.

As the third partner in the research station, the Lake States Experiment Station will direct the technical program. Currently a memorandum as to definite obligations between the three partners is being prepared. What's the problem?

Starting in northeastern Illinois around Galena and running straight north on the fringe of "Old Man River" past La Crosse and into St. Croix County, of Wisconsin, is land the glaciers missed, the driftless area. There are 100,000 acres in Illinois and 5 million acres in the coulee country of Wisconsin which are flooded periodically, spilling millions of tons of the thin skin of top soil into the Mississippi and on down to the delta.

On the western side of the Mississippi there are about 700,000 acres in the northeastern corner of Iowa and 2 million acres of Minnesota having the same problem.

True, the slopes on the Minnesota side are not as sharp, nor the ridges as high, nor the problem as great as in Wisconsin, but every section of this whole area has erosion and flood problems.

Even in areas given a fairly good treatment of strip cropping, terracing and contour farming, and waterways, periodically the meandering, deep-banked creeks and tributary streams threading through these valleys flood. The dry run creeks, fed by a hundred or a thousand drain pipes, run down those slopes, rolling up a tidal volume of water that, with increased velocity, picks up the top soil, carries off the fences, sweeps the lowland corn out of the field, or silts the alfalfa land, washes out bridges and roads to wreck buildings and hopes in its path.

This happens during the spring thaws and through the summer and fall, right until the area is locked in winter ice. It can be in March, when the snows melt, or in August, when the crops are ready. Let there be a steady downpour and all too often these floods will occur.

Even an untrained newspaper reporter can understand that when the steep, tin-roof slopes are still frozen with the snow when the rain comes, the water cannot seep into the soil very much and rushes to the bottom land creeks.

But what about those summertime floods when there are grass and crops?

First is the sad mistake of cutting the original timber off those ridges, and especially down those slopes—exposed land.

Then, too, farmers try to stretch their forage supplies by pasturing this land or putting it into crops.

The technicians are now finding out that during the summer those southern slopes, exposed to the sun, denuded of grass and cover, are baked to a hard, tight crust.

Now let a storm hit and the water rushes down these crusted slopes, generally following those blasted cow trails that become gullies, pouring a sheet of water into what was a harmless dry run the day before. And watch out downstream. Run for the hills.

There was an enthusiastic dedication of the 24,000-acre East Willow Creek watershed on the Minnesota side. Twelve solid earthen dams were built, often utilizing a highway grade as the barrier to stop the destruction of 155 farms.

Lovely country, this Minnesota valleyland; the slopes are more gentle and the valleys much wider than in much of the Wisconsin coulee country across the big river.

There had been considerable soil conservation work in this area, here and there—strip corn farms with terraces and contours—but never one solid program for the whole watershed.

Eight years ago, in a spring flood, there were 4 inches of rain within 6 hours. Down poured that flood of water from the slopes, concentrating into the East Willow Creek.

Even in Preston, Editor Ludwig Gartner of the Preston Republican, two blocks from the creek, points to the type cases in his plant and says, "Water clear up to the top."

In a few hours that rip-roaring flood cascading downstream ripped out a gully 15 feet deep and 150 feet wide. The engineers and fieldmen going to work to repair the damage had to climb in and out of that gully with ladders.

There was 100-bushel-an-acre corn on farms where this gully had been. Bulldozers scraped dirt into the gulch. The rills in the farmlands that became deep gullies had been healed. The upstream dams so far stopped a flood threat with the series of reservoirs and ponds. Still, look close and you see slope timberland slashed with gullies.

This Minnesota watershed, like all the rest in the whole upper Mississippi River Valley, needs and deserves a better answer to the cancerlike erosion.

And every place even a novice looks, there is the crying need for trees.

The mass of paper and blueprints for the famed Coon Valley watershed of 93,000 acres on the Wisconsin side finally wallowed through Washington, D.C., redtape to get approval. Normally this Coon Creek is a harmless stream meandering on its way through Coon Valley and Chaseburg and Stoddard to unload in the Mississippi. However, there have been two severe floods in recent years, with every landowner nervous over the dangers.

Having their own blueprint system, and not being tied to a desk, wild beaver moved into Coon Creek to build their own dams * * * but in the wrong places.

The application for a full watershed treatment is now for the Bad Axe section adjoining Coon Valley, around 122,000 acres. Dams are scheduled to be built on a small watershed near the Mississippi. The pilot watershed built by the Government on the Kickapoo River is working.

The East Willow Creek project in Minnesota and the Wisconsin programs, such as historic Coon Valley, are fine. But they are only comparative patches of the 7.8 million

acres of land needing better erosion control. Go down almost any side road in this vast area and you can see land that needs attention now.

"There is alarming need for one overall program for the whole upper Mississippi River Valley," says David Mackie, Madison executive secretary of the Wisconsin Conservation Department during the first conference at La Crosse for this new research station.

"The job ahead is to find what cover does the best job protecting those slopes and valley land," said Sidney Weitzman, St. Paul, watershed supervisor of the Lake States Experiment Station.

The stern fact of the matter is that some of these slopes exposed toward the south have been washed so thin and robbed of fertility so much that many trees will not thrive. The survival rate is too low to be practical.

Red cedar has been used. But there is the problem of this tough tree being the host to a variety of apple rust. Now the genetics divisions of the Lake States station seeks a resistant red cedar strain.

For the start, this new research station is quartered in the La Crosse fish hatchery of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

"It may take time, but we want the right answers," says the committee setting up the program.

It will be Forester Sartz' job to make an analysis of the area problems, then carefully measure the successes and failures of past practices, including cover crops and trees. He will try out practices recommended by the Lake States Experiment Station and others, and in time put the result to work.

Is this upper Mississippi Valley worth saving?

Some early August day when you want a scenic feast, travel to the coulee country, via Coon Valley or the Alma (Wis.) drive back to this quiet haven. Get up on a high ridge.

As far as you can see is a masterpiece of color: the green of the trees and corn and lush alfalfa, then curving bands of gold, the ripe oats and wheat, some as bright as new gold and some burnished bronze of old antiques. Set back is a white church with a tall steeple inviting a prayer of thanks for such beauty and abundance. And farms are nestled into the nooks and valley land; the so-called two story farming, the lowland and the highland.

Here is beauty, the green and gold with bright-colored combines and forage choppers in the distance looking for all the world like huge crawling bugs gobbling up the grain.

Only a statistical dolt with a sliderule brain submerged by administrative redtape could see this scene of preharvest glory and still say the costs are too great for the benefits.

Just go to the Mississippi with its series of big dams—26 of them, each costing $5 million or more to harness the floods of the river and protect the channel—and watch. Look at the finest topsoil of the area. How much better to keep that soil and that extra water upstream on the farms and have fewer dredging costs down the big stem.

We should either do something about repairing this upper Wisconsin valley area or junk much of the soil conservation program. For right in these valleys was intended the basic proof that modern soil conservation would work to preserve the land and abundance.

Either make it work, or in eons of time this area will be the grand canyon of the upper Mississippi.

Graduated from the University of Pennsylvania forestry school, Sartz first went to work for the Forestry Service in the Quaker State. Then he specialized in watershed controls and restoration work near Philadelphia and outside Portland, Oreg., on the Columbia River. More recently he was in the White Mountain forests and watershed of the East, being stationed at Laconia, N.H.

Now he will try for the answers to heal the scars of the upper Mississippi Valley, once so rich with pine and hardwoods.

Representative Charles O. Porter Heralded as Friend of Democracy in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, recognition has again been accorded to my good friend, Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, of Oregon, for his outspoken declarations against Latin American dictatorships. Throughout Central and South America, CHARLIE PORTER is heralded as the champion of freedom and democracy and as a crusader against dictatorial tyranny.

Last week the Washington correspondent for the Oregonian, Mr. A. Robert Smith, journeyed to Venezuela to assess the effect of CHARLIE PORTER'S efforts on relations between the United States and Latin American countries. It is not surprising to learn that Mr. Smith heard widespread acclaim for what Mr. PORTER has accomplished in fighting despotism and Communist influence. So that the facts can be known of the effectiveness and vigor of Mr. PORTER'S activities for the improvement of our relations with Venezuela and other Latin American countries, I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article, entitled "CHARLES PORTER, Foe of Dictators, Hero to Venezuelan Populace," written by A. Robert Smith, and published in the Oregonian of February 19, 1959.

I wish to emphasize that Mr. Smith is an able, accurate, and responsible journalist. I feel certain that he has reported only the facts in describing the widespread favorable impact which Representative PORTER has had on the populace of Venezuela. For example, Mr. Smith has contrasted Mr. PORTER'S forthright defense of democracy with the equivocal and straddling attitude taken by ex-Governor Thomas E. Dewey when he toured Venezuela recently, as the head of the official American delegation to the inauguration of Venezuelan President Romulo Betancourt. This comparison is definitely to the advantage and benefit of CHARLIE PORTER.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLES PORTER, FOE OF DICTATORS, HERO TO VENEZUELAN POPULACE

(By A. Robert Smith)

CARACAS, VENEZUELA.—As this leading South American country struggles back upon the road to democractic self-government, often blocked in the past by military coups, many of its political leaders are looking for moral support from friends throughout the hemisphere.

One of their valued friends, one quickly finds, is Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, who has for 2 years been conducted almost a one-man campaign in Congress against the sort of Latin dictator Venezuela has only so recently been rid of. Gen. Perez Jimenez was ousted a year ago, and last week Venezuela inaugurated its newly elected President, Romulo Betancourt.

Congressman PORTER came down here last week to wish the new government well. Venezuela invited Congress to send the customary delegation to the inauguration. PORTER was the only Congressman who went. To conclude, after many interviews, that PORTER has had a beneficial effect on the attitude of Venezuelans toward the United States since Vice President RICHARD NIXON was stoned here last summer seems undisputed.

SHARP LINE DRAWN

An American newspaperman who has been here 25 years told me that Venezuelans tend to regard U.S. public figures as either good or bad Americans. He said about the only good Americans in their minds today are Porter, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, and Herbert Matthews, veteran New York Times writer to whom a "Good Neighbor" trophy was given here last weekend by President Betancourt.

"That's an improvement," the newsman said, "because not long ago they thought all Americans were bad."

A Venezuelan born here, educated at Columbia University and a long-time resident of New York before returning here, said substantially the same thing.

"There is a great man," he said of PORTER.

PORTER became such a figure in the minds of Venezuelans starting with his crusade against Dominican Republic Gen. Raphael Trujillo, who is despised here; his criticism of the United States giving military aid to Latin dictators, including Perez Jimenez; his coming here after the NIXON incident last summer and again last week to bolster democratic elements and assure Venezuelans that Americans are friendly toward them and are prodemocracy and antidictatorship, whatever State Department policy might indicate to the contrary.

PORTER STANDS ALONE

PORTER, in a word, is the only American official, among numerous other leaders in this hemisphere (such as Jose Figueras of Costa Rica and Gov. Munoz Marin of Puerto Rico) who has lent open support to democratic forces in this rich oil-producing country where military dictatorships have been the rule and not the exception. Betancourt is only the second freely elected president of Venezuela.

Venezuelans have been sore at the United States because of a medal awarded their dictator by President Eisenhower in 1955, along with a laudatory citation. They suspect the State Department of playing footsie with Perez Jimenez, buttering him up with this prestige-making award, in behalf of large U.S. corporations seeking new oil and iron ore concessions from him. Whether there was any connection or not, Venezuelans believe there was. Anti-American feeling ran high, even months after Perez Jimenez fled, one official said. This was exploited by Communists and other agitators in the demonstrations against NIXON.

BUSINESS LIKES DICTATORS

America's image in this country of sharp contrasts between luxurious oil wealth and stark poverty is not improved by the fact that most of the intrenched U.S. business interests here would prefer a dictatorship to a democracy, the American newsman said.

"When PORTER'S name is mentioned, they shudder," he observed, recalling his many contacts with the business community here.

U.S. businessmen found Perez Jimenez not difficult to do business with. He abolished a decree of the previous president against granting further concessions to U.S. firms for resource exploitation. Businessmen feel uneasy about a democracy, which may be less profitable to deal with. The new government has already raised income taxes to tap more oil revenue for public improvements such as schools, thus permitting less oil money to flow into hands of foreign investors.

REDS DISLIKE PORTER

PORTER has opposition from still another group, the Communist Party, which now numbers about 50,000 persons in this country of 6 million population. In the December election, the Communist Party elected nine men to Congress, one of whom is Gustavo Machado, their leader.

"PORTER is interfering in the internal affairs of Venezuela," Machado told me resentfully when asked what he thought of PORTER's remarks here a few days before.

The Oregon Congressman criticized local Communists for trying to represent their party as just a nationalistic movement without ties with Russia. The Caracas Daily Journal reported PORTER told a press conference:

"If a man is a Communist, unless he doesn't know better, he must put the Soviet Union first. I don't see how anyone who believes in liberty can believe in communism when he sees how the satellites such as Hungary are treated."

In his inaugural address, President Betancourt, who himself was a Communist briefly as a youth some 30 years ago, said much the same thing as PORTER and reiterated that his new coalition government had no room for Communists. He was roundly applauded by the new Congress, whose members jammed into the senate chamber with other dignitaries to hear him.

This offered a strong rebuttal to those U.S. Congressmen who in recent years have said the United States should back Latin dictators, such as Trujillo and Perez Jimenez, on grounds they were needed as bastions of anticommunism.

PORTER also suggested in public statements here that he thinks the tide is running against dictatorship throughout the hemisphere. He predicted Trujillo will fall before the year is out. He said Dominican rebels are obtaining arms and are organizing within and outside Santo Domingo.

In contrast to PORTER's statements here, Thomas E. Dewey, head of the delegation sent to the inauguration by President Eisenhower, ducked all political questions. In a real way, Dewey personified the administration's oft-expressed Latin American policy of showing no partiality for either democracies or dictatorships.

The latest administration expression of Latin American policy, by Milton Eisenhower after a trip through Central America, reiterated what PORTER, first, and NIXON, second, had said—that we ought to give Latin democracies an embrace and give dictators only a cold, formal handshake, thus leaving no doubt in this hemisphere which form of government our sympathies lie with.

HERO STATUS EXPLAINED

A Venezuelan said his people can see little sign that this new policy is being implemented. He said they think only a change of administration in Washington will do it.

This helps to explain PORTER's hero status in Latin America. He stands almost alone among Washington officials in embracing popular Latin democratic leaders, offering them verbal and moral support, shunning the dictators and consulting with exiled foes of the dictators about ways and means of undermining the despots' political strength.

There are several skilled diplomats on the U.S. Embassy staff here who are well received by Venezuelans and display their preference for democratic processes. But one stumbles easily across an example of harmful, bumbling staffing, as depicted in the best-seller, "The Ugly American." At a reception at Ambassador Edward Sparks' home on inauguration night, one U.S. military attaché was sounding off loudly that Venezuela would be better off under a dictatorship. Some guests were shocked to find this sort of "military mind" assigned to any diplomatic post, much less in a country where military officers have often needed little encouragement to grab the reins of power.

As long as the State Department doesn't implement Milton Eisenhower's policy proposals more vividly, Congressman PORTER will undoubtedly continue to be regarded as a big man and much-needed friend in this part of the hemisphere where Latins are sensitive to the impression that most North Americans haven't much cared whether their struggle for liberty succeeded or not.

Congress Should "Thumbs Down" Any Increase for Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which was published in the Columbus Citizen of February 18, 1959, entitled "Thumbs Down."

The Columbus Citizen is one of Ohio's great newspapers, a member of the Scripps-Howard league of newspapers. The editorial indicates that Congress should "thumbs down" any increase for civil defense.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THUMBS DOWN

The Democratic majority in Congress, irked by charges of free spending, promises to cut into the administration's economy budget.

This is a commendable objective, and a good place to start is on civil defense, which has escaped the economy ax and is down for $87 million next year—actually double what it gets this year.

Civil defense is a handy example of the tendency of Government to expand steadily, regardless of the useful services they perform, if any. As recently as 1955 this office had 787 salaried employees. Now it has 1,634 and wants 1,750.

Leading off the Democratic attack, Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio, said that half a billion dollars has been appropriated for this purpose in the last 9 years and "most of this money has been wasted."

The money has gone mainly for fanciful and conflicting plans, facilities, and advice pamphlets on what to do in a bomb raid—run for the hills one month and sit tight the next.

In the new budget is more money for sample fallout shelters and matching funds to States to expand their own salaried civil defense personnel, all tending to build up an officious bureaucracy, complete with uniforms and armbands, which would drain defense resources and, more than likely, would just be in the way in event of a real disaster.

No one knows the defense against H-bombs, if there is any. The only reliable protection is retaliatory force so strong it will discourage the firing of bombs, and that's where the money should go.

Congress should thumbs down this increase, and, while at it, should inquire what portions of present expenditures are buying anything worth the money.

Why Are We So Smug About the Dangers of Berlin?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in his column in yesterday's Washington Post, Joseph Alsop pointed up a matter which has mystified and troubled me for some weeks—and that is the smug air here in Washington regarding the situation in Berlin.

In the light of the statements made by Mr. Khrushchev, both last fall and recently, Berlin appears to me to be a very dangerous area. The Senator from Minnesota, [Mr. HUMPHREY], after a long interview with Mr. Khrushchev, stated that he was convinced that the Russians intend to be tough about Berlin. Notwithstanding these indications of real trouble, word keeps getting around Washington that everything is going to work out all right.

The danger with this frame of mind is, first, that it may be based upon entirely erroneous assumptions; and, second, if this is so, we may end up in a shooting war—small or large—with the American people wholly unprepared for it either psychologically, militarily, or any other way. Mr. Alsop says the present complacency stems from two words—"Quemoy" and "Bison." I call his explanation on these two words to the particular attention of my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACK OF THE BERLIN COMPLACENCY

(By Joseph Alsop)

A question of great importance is underlined by Nikita Khrushchev's angry, warlike answer to the Western allies' note on Berlin. The question is why the American Government is so remarkably complacent about the Berlin crisis.

On the face of the facts, complacency is utterly unjustified. At the very outset, Khrushchev committed himself to use force, if need be, to get his way at Berlin. He has now renewed that commitment in unvarnished terms. For just these reasons, partial military mobilization is actually advocated by many old hands at dealing with the Soviets. These men are Dean G. Acheson, who strongly supports the firm policy of John Foster Dulles, and George F. Kennan, who bitterly criticizes the Dulles policy.

But instead of mobilization, we have continued disarmament. And instead of the earnest concern that is being voiced by men like Acheson, the most intelligent officials

of the State Department went on parroting the story that the Kremlin has got itself into a box on Berlin and wants out. At least, they did this until Khrushchev's last speech.

The American Government has been complacent, in short, because the American Government has been cheerfully convinced that Nikita Khrushchev did not mean a word that he said about fighting to get his way at Berlin. The reason for this conviction can be given, in turn, in four short words: "Quemoy and the Bison."

To begin with the first part of this seemingly magical formula, Quemoy's profound effect on the State Department is really impossible to exaggerate. The decision was taken—by Secretary of State Dulles almost singlehanded—to risk war rather than permit the Communists to seize the offshore islands by naked force. The gamble paid off, too.

Furthermore, there can be very little doubt (and Secretary Dulles feels no doubt at all) that the gamble paid off because of the American deterrent, which lay in wait far from the battlefront. The test of nerves on the islands, with what may not be called false weapons, convinced the Communist high command that there was real danger of the eventual use of real weapons. To avoid this danger, the attack on Quemoy was called off.

From this experience, Secretary Dulles reasoned by analogy that the threat to Berlin will also be withdrawn if the Communist high command is again convinced that there is real danger of the eventual use of real weapons. This was the most constantly repeated Dulles argument, both before Christmas and again on his last courageous trip abroad.

As for the other part of the seemingly magical formula, an overestimate of Soviet production of the Bison bomber has also affected the Defense Department in a way that cannot possibly be exaggerated. In response to this Bison overestimate, former Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson was driven to increase output of our own B–52 bomber. This was just as well, since the B–52's are about the only effective force-in-being we now have. Yet the Defense Department has never recovered from the apparently shattering experience of being driven to increase its own efforts by an overestimate of the Soviet's effort.

"We gave them too much credit in the Bison case," the defense leaders are always in effect saying, "and by God, we're not going to make the same mistake again." Because of the Bison story, in other words, the Defense leaders think that they can safely ignore Khrushchev's claims to great power with long- and medium-range missiles, just as the State Department makes light of Khrushchev's highly specific threats to Berlin, because of the Quemoy story.

The two arguments, from the Bison experience and the Quemoy experience, may both be right. God knows, every American and every other friend of freedom everywhere must pray that these arguments are indeed right, in every minute detail.

But one cannot forget that the Bison overestimate is the only one on record in a long trail of American national estimates which have been much too smugly optimistic about Soviet military capabilities. One cannot forget either that there is no room at Berlin for the kind of safe test of nerves that took place at Quemoy.

Above all, one cannot forget the tone taken by Nikita Khrushchev. For all these reasons, the further question arises: whether Dean Acheson's judgment of the risks is not better than the prevailing official judgment.

Mrs. J. Q. Anderson Sets a High Standard for Us To Meet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in the current issue of the Health-O-Gram, the publication issued by the South Dakota Tuberculosis and Health Association, there is an excellent article paying tribute to Mrs. J. Q. Anderson, of Chamberlain, S. Dak., who recently passed away.

In reading this tribute, we can readily agree that Mrs. Anderson is one of the Nation's unsung heroines. Despite physical handicaps and other adversity, this noble woman found time to work in behalf of unfortunate people, especially those afflicted with tuberculosis.

We may often wonder, Mr. President, why community projects or national projects are carried out so effectively. It is almost wholly due to the personal effort and sacrifice of such people as Mrs. Anderson, who serve unselfishly in behalf of worthy causes.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article concerning Mrs. Anderson so that her example in life may serve as inspiration to all of us, and that her work may set a high standard for Americans to meet.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEATH CALLS PIONEER SEAL SALE CHAIRMAN

Word has reached the South Dakota Tuberculosis Health Association office of the death of Mrs. J. Q. Anderson, 84, at the Community Bailey Hospital in Chamberlain on February 6.

Mrs. Anderson had been Brule County Christmas seal chairman since 1917. Her long service in the tuberculosis control movement has set a record in South Dakota and her 41 year term as Christmas seal chairman may very well be the longest of anyone in the United States.

Mrs. Anderson became interested in preventing tuberculosis after she had observed the heavy toll the disease was taking in the Fort Thompson community after several employees at the ranch and trading post which she and her husband operated, many of them Indians, had succumbed to the disease.

She helped organize her county for the fight against tuberculosis shortly after the State association was formed in 1913. In 1917, she became Brule County chairman and has served continuously since then, having conducted her 41st seal sale last fall.

Since 1950, when Mrs. Anderson had both limbs amputated because of diabetic ulcers, she has managed the annual seal sale from her wheel chair. Earlier she had both breasts removed because of cancer. For the last 2 or 3 years she has been a resident of the Community Bailey Nursing Home in Chamberlain. At the June 1957 South Dakota Tuberculosis Health Association annual meeting, Mrs. Anderson was recipient of the Agnes M. Holdridge award conferred by the South Dakota Tuberculosis and Health Association in recognition of her outstanding services and contributions to the work for which the State association was founded.

Mrs. Anderson's husband, J. Q. Anderson who died in 1937, was a pioneer rancher and trader in the Fort Thompson area and well known as a successful rancher, banker, and State legislator. He was influential in promoting the construction of the early pontoon Missouri River crossing at Chamberlain.

In the first quarter of the century the Andersons built up a ranch of some 30,000 acres and operated a successful trading post at Fort Thompson. During the crash of the thirties Mr. Anderson, who was then vice president of the Brule County National Bank, mortgaged their holdings and sold cattle at $25 a head to pay off $135,000 of indebtedness and save the bank. After her husband's death, Mrs. Anderson was able to salvage about 1,000 acres from the shambles as she called it, and most of the rest became part of the Geppert ranch.

The Andersons had no children of their own but raised the family of a brother who died in 1930 of pneumonia. One of the children, Myron, the oldest, was blinded in an ammunition explosion in France during World War II. Another nephew, Robert W. Beckwith, has been administrator of the Community Bailey Hospital at Chamberlain for several years and has taken an important part in various State organizations interested in promoting better health.

In an interview for an article written by Ida B. Alseth 2 or 3 years ago, Mrs. Anderson said, "I have had my ups and downs but truly life has been very good to me." In her articles Mrs. Alseth paid tribute to Mrs. Anderson by saying "When one notes her accomplishments, her work in outside activities, her ability to do many things for herself, despite her disabilities that would put many persons so afflicted on the total disability list, one must admit that she is truly a pioneer, with that inbred pioneer spirit that would see her through just such tragedies as she has experienced. Yet, you see her rise above them all with a smile to live a full life dedicated to self-reliance and the service of others. Such is one's reaction to Mrs. Anderson who tops the list of Christmas seal workers in years of service to the cause."

Harry S. Truman Selects Six Great Turning Points of American History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the interesting article which follows appeared in the February 22, 1959, issue of This Week. I am confident that the historians of the future will recognize Harry S. Truman as one of our country's great Presidents:

HARRY S. TRUMAN SELECTS SIX GREAT TURNING POINTS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

(By Jhan and June Robbins)

INDEPENDENCE, MO.—More than half a century ago Miss Maggie Phelps, a vigorous country schoolmarm, taught American history to a serious, spectacled youngster named Harry Truman.

"I think Miss Maggie made a special effort to interest me," Mr. Truman recalls, "because she knew I was too shortsighted to play baseball. She sensed that I needed a substitute. She taught me that the events that altered the course of our country's history are some of the most exciting moments the world has ever seen. Right then and there I decided to try to become a history scholar."

Professional historians acknowledge that Mr. Truman has done a pretty good job. He is the only President in recent years who has displayed no interest in whodunits or other escape literature. He rested from his spirited bouts with Congress by reading a relaxing chapter about Yorktown or Chancellorsville.

"Men make history and not the other way 'round," Mr. Truman decided. "In periods where there is no leadership, society stands still. Progress occurs when courageous, skillful leaders seize the opportunity to change things for the better."

TO LOOK FORWARD, HE LOOKS BACK

Today, at 74, Mr. Truman watches with keen interest while modern history unwinds at its dizzy rate. In an exclusive interview granted to This Week at the Truman Memorial Library here, he declared, "When I want to understand what is happening today or try to decide what will happen tomorrow I look back. 'A page of history is worth a volume of logic.' Justice Holmes said that."

The former President added feelingly, "I know something about American history. We have had many glorious moments. Many of those which have been of important, lasting benefit to the American people have occurred during the administrations of strong Presidents. This can be no coincidence. We need our system of checks and balances but we must have leaders who can see what needs to be done and who do it. We've been lucky enough to elect a number of such men to the presidency. It is because of their efforts that we have the best government that has ever been organized in the history of the world."

Mr. Truman, who has had quite a bit to do with history himself, believes there are certain key moments in our past which have brought the United States to its present position. Studied together, he believes, they may reveal a predictable pattern for the future. Here, in his own words, he describes six of these key events in American history—and their significance for This Week readers.

1. WASHINGTON STOPS THE WHISKY REBELLION

When Congress in 1791 passed an excise-tax law, levying 4 pence per gallon on all distilled spirits, the counties west of the Alleghenies rose in violent protest.

"A government may be organized under the highest ethical ideals. On paper, it may sound efficient. Yet the real test of any government is: How authoritatively can it govern?

"George Washington, today, is a name that evokes no controversy. From earliest school years our children are taught to love his memory and admire his works. Yet in his own time he was opposed politically, reviled by the press, mocked by professional critics. He was the first leader of a federated nation—a new experiment in modern government. Could the laws that Congress passed be enforced in the 14 member States, even when they were unpopular?

"Washington met his greatest test as President in 1791 when Congress, with his endorsement, passed a law that levied a tax on liquor. The Monongahela Valley in western Pennsylvania was a good place to grow corn.

"The Allegheny Mountains separated the area from its markets. The cheapest and easiest way to ship its major products over the hills to market was in the form of distilled liquor. The new whisky excise tax hit hard. In 1794, open rebellion broke out in Pennsylvania. Organized squads of armed infantry began drilling. They declared: 'The whisky tax will never be collected.'

"It must have been a sore dilemma for Washington. Many of those antagonistic mountaineers had been his best soldiers in the Revolution. Yet he did not hesitate. He was President of the United States, sworn to uphold and execute its laws. He called on the Governors of 4 States and ordered 15,000 troops to occupy the area, restore order, and enforce the law. The rebels quickly put down their arms. Only a handful of them were taken into custody. Only two were tried, convicted, and imprisoned and Washington quickly pardoned them. He could afford to be generous. He had proved what all the world of his time wanted to know.

"The new Federal Government could collect the taxes it levied. It could enforce the laws it passed."

2. JEFFERSON PUSHES US ACROSS THE CONTINENT

In 1803 the United States purchased from France for $15 million over 800,000 square miles of territory, nearly doubling the size of the Republic.

"One of the tests of a great leader is the ability to recognize and seize unexpected opportunity. When President Jefferson sent James Monroe on his historic mission to Napoleon, he was merely concerned with securing freedom for American exporters to ship their goods through the port of New Orleans, then a French possession. Jefferson expected Napoleon to refuse and gave Monroe an 'ace in the hole'—a threat that the United States would make a defensive alliance with Britain, then France's enemy.

"To Monroe's surprise Napoleon was anxious to sell the entire French possession of Louisiana. He felt that Britain would probably capture the area anyway. To push the deal, he threw in what we now know as the Louisiana Territory—the entire west side of the Missouri-Mississippi valley, some 800,000 square miles stretching nearly all the way to the Pacific Ocean. At roughly 3 cents per acre, it was probably history's greatest real estate bargain.

"Imagine President Jefferson's excitement when he heard the news. Here was a chance for his struggling little Atlantic seaboard country to become a mighty continental power. But there was a big 'if.' Jefferson was a strict constitutionalist. He believed that the survival of the new Federal Union and the continued freedom of its citizens depended on hewing to the laws of the Constitution down to the last letter. And nowhere in the Constitution was there any mention of the right to acquire any new territory. What should he do?

"Jefferson decided to take a broad general view of his constitutional powers and go ahead with the purchase. He argued that the power to govern territory obviously implies the prior right to acquire it. He relied on our system of checks and balances to stop him if he were wrong. But the Supreme Court upheld his move. Because of Thomas Jefferson's farsighted courage—which included even the courage to modify his own public position—the United States of America was on its way to our historic destiny as a rich, major power."

3. JACKSON UPHOLDS THE POWER OF CONGRESS

In 1832 the State of South Carolina, under the leadership of U.S. Vice President John C. Calhoun, called a legislative convention and declared that the Federal excise tax law of 1828 was null and void and was therefore no longer enforceable in South Carolina.

"In 1828 Congress had passed a tariff law imposing high import duties on textiles, glass, earthenware and paper. The law pleased the industrial North, infuriated the agricultural South. It brought to a head a question that had been debated for many years. Can a State legally nullify the force of an act of Congress within its own borders?

"South Carolina, under the leadership of John Calhoun, called a special convention in 1832 and declared that the Federal tariff law was nullified in that State. Citizens of South Carolina were ordered to stop paying or collecting it. The State militia was ordered to back them up in their intransigent stand.

"Andrew Jackson was President. He was himself a southerner. These were his people, of his own faith, his own kind. What's more, Jackson frankly stated his conviction that the tariff worked injustice to the people of the South. He agreed that it was abominable.

"But he denied that nullification was legal. He said it was not even peaceable—that it was an act of open rebellion, directly inciting to treason and war.

"In a moving speech, he begged the people of South Carolina to honor the Union first and to put States rights second.

Then, to show that he meant business, he ordered Gen. Wilfield Scott to command Federal troops in South Carolina, sent two warships to anchor in Charleston harbor. The tax, President Jackson warned, would be collected by force if necessary. The best way to settle disputes over States rights, he firmly believed, was by means of debate and compromise—not by threats of rebellion.

4. LINCOLN HOLDS THE UNION TOGETHER

When Lincoln took the oath of office as President of the United States, on March 4, 1861, the Nation was facing one of its darkest hours; seven States had renounced the Union. Four more would soon join them. Six weeks later our country's bloodiest conflict started. At a cost of 359,528 northern lives and 133,785 southern lives, peace was finally restored and the Union preserved.

"Very few members of my family have shared my admiration for Abraham Lincoln. They were southern in their sympathies. But to me Lincoln is one our most important Presidents because he closed the door for all time on the right of a State to leave the Union. Ironically, the single act for which he is best remembered—the emancipation proclamation—is not clearly understood even by those who revere him most.

"Lincoln was not an abolitionist. He believed that slavery was morally wrong. He often expressed his personal wish that all men everywhere could be free. But he believed that under the Constitution it was a matter that each State had the right to decide for itself. He knew very well that the men of the North did not answer his call to arms in order to free the slaves. The objective was to preserve the Union. Everything else was secondary to that goal.

"In a letter to Horace Greely, editor of the New York Tribune, Lincoln stated his point of view. It's astonishing that so few people today are familiar with it. He wrote, 'If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it. If I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it. If I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that.'

"The emancipation was conceived as an act of military necessity. Lincoln acted under his emergency wartime powers. Legally speaking, what he did was to seize and dispose of a large amount of private property—something he could never have got away with in peacetime, no matter how much he longed to do it.

"The proclamation was a master stroke of psychological warfare. It was intended to underscore the withdrawal of Lee's troops after the battle of Antietam, an indecisive contest in which the North claimed victory. Lincoln also hoped that it would draw off some of the slave labor forces that were supporting the armies in the South and help swing opinion in Europe, particularly in England, in favor of the North.

"Today we have still to solve the problems which the emancipation has bequeathed us. If we had had strong, able men in the White House between 1850 and 1860, the issues concerned in the secession could probably have been settled and the slaves freed peacefully and justly. The Civil War would never have occurred and we would not now be living with its bitter racial aftermath that distorts the harmonious democracy we so wish to show the world."

5. CLEVELAND RESTORES THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

An aftermath of the Civil War was the almost complete domination of the national political scene by the Republican Party, the party of Lincoln and of the victorious North. From 1861 to 1885 the administration was in Republican hands for six successive terms.

"Grover Cleveland, a Democrat, was elected to office in 1884, ending 24 years of Republican rule in the White House. It marked the recovery of our healthy two-party system. It also marked the end of a period in which Congress had pushed Chief Executives this way and that and usurped many Presidential powers. Cleveland was not the man to stand for that. During his first term, the Presidential vetoes came down like hailstones.

"When a President doesn't have a fight or two with Congress, you know there is something wrong. A man with thin skin has no busines being President. These scraps are not personal. It's part of our scheme of government that the executive and legislative branches jealously guard their rights against infringements. But in 1885, Congress had had things pretty much its own way for a long time.

"Cleveland vetoed 414 bills during his first administration. Many of them were private pension bills—thinly disguised graft. He braved the wrath of the Grand Army of the Republic, the politically powerful veterans' organization, when he knocked out the dependent pension bill which would eventually have put nearly every veteran in the United States on the public payroll. He forced through the repeal of the Tenure of Office Act and regained Presidential control over appointment to and removal from executive office.

"Under Cleveland, our democracy once again began to function as our founders had intended that it should. Our Government was ready to face the massive problems of the 20th century, prompted by a newly alert public and powered by a Chief Executive who had recovered his independence."

6. THE UNITED STATES JOINS THE WORLD COMMUNITY

Under the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt and later by Harry S. Truman, the United States for the first time committed itself to membership in a world organization of nations. Woodrow Wilson, a generation earlier, was unable to persuade this country to join the League of Nations, but his efforts paved the way for the change in public opinion that eventually resulted in our present leadership in the United Nations. Wilson was right—the irreconcilables were wrong.

"Credit for the sixth, and perhaps the greatest, event in our country's history must be shared by two men—Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt.

"We followed an isolationist policy for the first 150 years of our existence. It took 30 years, 2 dreadful wars, and 2 great leaders who literally struggled to their deaths to lead us to our rightful place in the world.

"Many people think that Woodrow Wilson's second term was a failure because he could not persuade the U.S. Senate to let us join the League of Nations. Yet it's quite possible that if Wilson hadn't tried, Roosevelt couldn't have succeeded. Both of these men understood what we are dangerously close to forgetting today—that it is the President's duty to lead the Nation in the conduct of its foreign affairs. This is a responsibility that cannot be delegated and must not be avoided.

"Wilson was a great historian and a great leader. Under him, we became international minded. He failed only as a politician. He was unable to enlist the support of the irreconcilables. These Senators abused their power to approve treaties, kept us out of the League of Nations and, in my opinion, played a large role in causing World War II.

"Roosevelt early recognized the need to keep the United Nations project above and beyond politicis. When the U.N. opened for business, Arthur Vandenberg, a Republican and former isolationist, was a leading member of our delegation. In this way, we showed the world that our isolationist period had come conclusively to an end.

"When I became President, my first act was to reaffirm the U.S. desire to see a world organization that would preserve peace. Within a few minutes of my taking the oath of office, I announced that we would carry on with the historic assembly that is now known as the San Francisco Conference. In this way, at last a mature Nation, we joined the world community."

We asked the former President what he considered the most important event of his administration. He answered unhesitatingly, "Containment of communism." He ticked off these four major moves:

Preservation of the freedom of Greece and Turkey.

Marshall plan aid that balked Communist political campaigns in Western Europe.

The Berlin airlift that prevented an East German putsch.

Our stand in Korea that met aggression with force and restored the legal status quo.

"It's been proved beyond doubt that the President has the power to meet emergencies when they arise," said Mr. Truman. "Sometimes he has to take the bull by the horns. And he must be strong enough to hold on when he does."

What will history say about Harry Truman?

"A man who has to try to answer that," said the former President, "is in a terrible fix because there is no way anyone can tell today or for the next half century. I do know one thing. People seldom honor the names of men who try to obstruct something that needs to be done. Who can recall the identity of the men who attacked Washington because of the Jay Treaty and vilified Jefferson at time of the Louisiana Purchase?

"I tried to do the right thing and I suppose eventually the facts will come out. I'll probably be holding a conference with St. Peter when that happens. However when I'm finally carried out feet first I hope it will be said of me, 'He did his damnedest.'"

Ex-Gov. Charles A. Sprague, of Oregon, Analyzes State Administration of Gov. Robert D. Holmes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate became familiar with Robert D. Holmes during his service as Governor of Oregon.

Last November, Mr. Holmes, a Democrat, was defeated for reelection by Mark O. Hatfield, a Republican.

On January 12, 1959, a former Republican Governor of Oregon, Charles A. Sprague, published an estimate of the Holmes administration in his daily paper, the Oregon Statesman, of Salem. Mr. Sprague is one of the distinguished editors of the Pacific Northwest, a man of integrity and fairness. He has declared editorially:

And (Robert D.) Holmes is entitled to the respect of all the people for the high character of his administration.

Mr. Sprague also speaks highly of the capable services performed by John Richardson, State director of finance, and Howard Morgan, State commissioner of public utilities under Governor Holmes.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the thoughtful editorial entitled "Changing of the Guard," written by ex-Gov. Charles A. Sprague, of Oregon, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANGING OF THE GUARD

As he retires today from 2 years' service as Governor of Oregon, Robert D. Holmes can take much satisfaction in the accomplishments of his administration. Standards of administrative services have been well maintained. Notable improvements have been made at the many institutions of the State, both educational, charitable, and penal or correctional. His administration has been remarkably free of scandal. He has sought to spur business expansion.

Holmes has upheld the dignity of the office, without show of conceit. He has held firm to convictions even when, as with certain commutations, he has provoked much protest. And Mrs. Holmes has been a most gracious first lady.

Almost any Governor on retiring from office is aware of errors he has made and of tasks left unperformed. Presumably Holmes is normal in this respect and has the added disappointment of failing to win reelection. These regrets, however, should not becloud the pride he is entitled to feel for what has been achieved during his short term. And Holmes is entitled to the respect of all the people for the high character of his administration.

Among the Holmes appointees who leave office today we would like to mention particularly John Richardson, director of finance and business administration, and Howard Morgan, public utility commissioner. Richardson quickly showed his competence in management of the State's fiscal affairs. He was objective, free of partisan bias in administering his responsibilities, and eminently fair in his relations with State officials and the public.

The hostilities which Howard Morgan had incurred in his political battles pursued him in the office of public utilities commissioner. But his administration of this sensitive office appeared to be in strict conformity with the law and with the function of the office, to safeguard the public interest in the regulation of public utilities. His grip was firm, and in this office it must be kept firm, especially in time like the present when inflation is in the air. Morgan has been blamed for extra curricular activity as adviser to Holmes. Of that we have no knowledge and little interest. On the particular job given him, he has done his duty, efficiently and conscientiously.

Survival of Minor League Baseball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Wirt Gammon is the very able sports editor of the Chattanooga Times. In an article appearing in the Times February 16 he analyzes the bill, S. 886, which I have introduced in connection with the application of the antitrust laws to team sports. Mr. Gammon concludes that this bill would be the salvation of minor leagues, and would thereby help the major leagues also. This was certainly my intention.

I invite the attention of my fellow Members of Congress to this article, and I hope it will be read by all those who are interested in the survival and success of team sports. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUST BETWEEN US FANS

(By Wirt Gammon)

LIFESAVER FOR THE MINORS

The Kefauver bill would be good for minor league baseball.

We think it would be good for the majors, too, but there is difference of opinion on that. Yet it looks like a gift from heaven for the minors, at a time when there is danger of the smaller leagues going broke.

"I'd say most of the baseball provisions of the bill," Senator KEFAUVER says, "are the result of things the minor league people have told us would help them. I am satisfied that unless a bill similar to this one is enacted into law, very little hope will remain for the continuation of minor league baseball."

KEFAUVER has gained a lot of baseball knowledge since asking Casey Stengel in Senate testimony last summer how many major league teams there are.

Ford Frick, baseball commissioner, testified in the suit for $250,000 against baseball by a Portsmouth former owner—a case dismissed because no contract was broken—that "the only way I can see that radio and TV can be forbidden in the minor league cities is by legislation. I would like to see such legislation."

Well, it is in the Kefauver bill. Frick has been told by the Justice Department that baseball itself can't make such a law; it would be collusion (against the television-radio businesses).

The minors are hurting, and need the legislation fast.

"We are hurting most because games are televised into our cities on the days we have games," one minor league club official told us by telephone the other day. "The Kefauver bill would help. Anything would be better than the way it is now." We will quote again later from this unnamed official.

KEFAUVER'S bill opens the road for agreements among teams to keep TV games out, but leaves it up to the FCC to make them show that such agreements are necessary to survival. The FCC thus is cast in a role of striking a balance, as KEFAUVER puts it, between the two public interests of the minor league ball club's rights and the rights of the television viewer and station owner.

Unless an agreement among the top baseball officials had the sanction of the FCC as being in the public interest, it would be almost impossible to avoid prosecution under the antitrust laws. But if the FCC has approved the agreement after hearings and a vote by the Commission's seven members, the owners could not be prosecuted for obeying a Federal regulation.

The major leagues and the television business have been running the show and doing very well for themselves. For this no one blames them, for they have broken no rules. But the feeling that the minor league stake in the matter rightfully makes it a three-way proposition has resulted in this bill.

KEFAUVER is the first to make a proposal from the minor league point of view. It recognizes a basic weakness in the baseball structure, pointed out here some months ago, that the minors have no voice in baseball's own law. They are made by the major moguls. KEFAUVER'S bill would save the minors by enforcing their rights on the majors and on television.

It's either that or let the minors die, as we see it. Some may not care whether the minors live. They should be against this bill.

MAJORS WOULD BENEFIT, TOO

In another way, the bill also would save the majors from themselves, we believe. That is on giving large bonuses.

Some claim the Kefauver bill would kill the minors because it limits each major club to a total of 80 players, and so the majors would cut down the subsidies to minor league clubs.

On the contrary, the 80 limit would, first of all, cause major clubs to cut down very much on the size of scouting staffs, and on giving out large bonuses to a large number of players.

That would turn the field over to the minor league clubs after each major club gets its 80. The rest of the players could be signed by the minor clubs. They'd be back in business for themselves, instead of being subsidized.

Here's a case in point, as told by the unnamed club official mentioned above: "There was a top prospect near our city last spring. A friend of ours there was watching him and was going to bring him to us after he finished high school ball. But he told us later that he didn't have a chance. The thousands of major league scouts looking behind every bush in the land to line up a lot of players, they found him. The boy just sat still and let them bid. The bidding went up and up, over $100,000. Way out of reason.

"Now if this bill goes into effect, there won't be these major league scouts everywhere. A kid like that, being near us, will be brought in to us, we'll pay him what we can to sign and we minor league clubs will be able to field our own teams and eventually sell our players to the majors."

Thus, the bill could help the independent club owner to come back.

It could help the major league club with a small farm system, like Washington, too. Washington could still send player help to its main farms, Chattanooga and Charlotte. But the Yankees and Braves would have to cut down on their 250 or so players.

Yet, to say the bill tries to bring the Yankees and Braves down to the level of the rest of the majors is erroneous. The bill tries to keep the minors from disappearing.

WHEN 500 G'S IS PEANUTS

There was a story the other day that the Washington farm system lost $502,000 in 1958.

This is an imposing figure. But the Senator officials didn't jump on their men in Chattanooga and Charlotte about it. Why? First, farm losses of some of the other major league clubs run over $1 million. Second, such figures include all phases of the procurement of ball players—the money paid bonus players, salaries of the many scouts, the cost of spring training, salaries of the head men in the farm system.

In the rat race that major league clubs find themselves now, $502,000 is not much. Why, Baltimore paid $125,000 for one player, Dave Nicholson, last year. Incidentally, he was no star at Knoxville.

Surely the Kefauver bill would cut down on this rat race.

The way we see it, the bill would help both the minors and majors.

Education of Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the literate and incisive Eric Sevareid, in his broadcast on February 13, spoke of a problem of concern to all of us—educating our youth in spite of the discord of TV, movies, and automobiles. The fact that he made a reference to my State gives me the opportunity to insert his comment in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening. Here it is, Friday sermon time and we find ourself in the predicament of the old time Negro preacher who said, "I ain't had time to prepare no reglar, theologic sermon, so I'm just gwine let the Bible drap open and wheresoever my eyes rest."

Well, we just let the newspapers drap open, and our eyes rested immediately on two stories dealing with the same subject—kids, cars, and high school courses. In one story the subject had been approached by the methods of social science; in the other by the humanistic approach. The humanities, at a rough definition, concern people as persons, as individuals, in their intimate minds, hearts, and spirits, often as reflected in music, literature, and the arts. The social sciences are concerned with persons as people—in the group, where methodistic measurement is used. And it's surprising how often the humanist's pure instinct and intuition lead him to the same conclusions as the social scientist's charts and graphs.

Sam Levenson, the former teacher, is a humanist; he goes by instinct and experience; and what Sam has been saying on TV this week about kids and cars, as retailed for us by critic John Crosby, is just what a group of social scientists have been discovering in their charts and graphs. To wit: Giving a car to a teen-ager is doing him positive, provable injury. The glory of having his own car not only goes to his head but drives out whatever else was in his head.

As a high school official in Los Angeles puts it: the boys are joyriding themselves right out of an education. He cites a study made in Idaho as typical of the country at large. Not one of the straight-A students observed owned a car; only 15 percent of the B students had a car; 41 percent of the C students had one, 71 percent of the D students and nearly all—83 percent—of the flunkers drove cars.

Why parents allow it, says the Los Angeles educator, is almost beyond comprehension.

Sam Levenson, humanist, is concerned not only about what the car does to a kid's education; but what it does to the kid, period.

Kid ownership of cars, he maintains, is just one illustration of the fact that the teenagers are the ruling class in the country. They've overthrown the Government, says Sam. Certainly, they have overthrown their parents; or the parents have abdicated; they haven't the guts to be parents, says Samuel.

"You do a kid no good by giving him everything in life," he goes on. "The only thing he gets out of it is the habit of receiving. You've denied him the joy of achieving * * * the car is only a symbol of the unearned increment that a kid should not be given unless it's absolutely necessary."

Even in simple, practical terms, matching a teenager to a car makes no sense, according to the Los Angeles gentleman; what happens, time after time, is that the boy quits school or quits athletics at least, in order to get a job to keep his buggy rolling; almost invariably, he finds that keeping a car costs much more than he had expected.

Levenson is convinced that the motor car is mixed up in the whole problem of truancy and corruption and sex. He's found, he says, that the truant invariably ended up in a car somewhere; the car has become the American boudoir; it's led to sex experience at an early age; the antidote, he thinks, is simply in teaching kids the wonder, the miracle, the reverence for the creation of life itself.

As for rock and roll; it's something, says Sam the humanist and teacher, approaching musical alcoholism.

Thus ended the sermon for today.

This is Eric Sevareid in Washington.

Way To Tackle Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Peoria Journal Star regarding a recent trip to Peoria by our Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which on this occasion was chairmanned by my good friend, the very able and likable gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. FRED MARSHALL. FRED certainly knows the hog business and handled the subcommittee on this factfinding tour in such a manner as to provoke praise from many quarters not the least of which comes from my own hometown newspaper:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Feb. 18, 1959]

WAY TO TACKLE FARM PROBLEM

Peoria and central Illinois this week observed a demonstration of the proper way in which to seek a solution to the farm problem.

A subcommittee of the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee, visiting here, expressed more interest in efforts to develop a leaner type of hog, which will improve marketing conditions, than in anything else.

Representative FRED MARSHALL, Democrat of Minnesota, speaking for the committee, stressed the fact that development of a leaner type of hog is essential to retention of the national market for pork. This also has an effect on corn and grain products because if the demand for pork falls off and fewer hogs are raised on American farms, the demand for corn and grain also will be affected adversely.

Best solution to the farm surplus problem, of course, is development of additional markets. Development of a leaner hog, with more appeal for the meat purchaser, would go a long way toward cutting down the surpluses not only of pork but of corn and grain.

Artificial support of prices never will provide a lasting solution to the farm problem. Development of additional markets and increases in consumption are the only sound approach. By indicating its interest in the development of a more attractive type of pork the committee has indicated its interest in a sound and lasting solution, rather than a temporary lessening of the surplus problem.

Washington Gave All for His Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there will be many meaningful tributes to George Washington on the anniversary of the birth of the first President of the United States.

Few, if any, will be more inspiring than the column by Walter Winchell. His words of strength about the Father of Our Country are couched in classic prose.

I felt a lift of the spirit as I read Winchell's merited praise of this matchless patriot. He wrote:

During the Nation's darkest hour, he carried the brightest torch. At Valley Forge a winter of suffering made possible the springtime of democracy. Although weapons become obsolete and maps change, the principles of George Washington remain constant.

This complete newspaper column, published nationwide on February 22, 1959, is as follows:

WASHINGTON GAVE ALL FOR HIS COUNTRY

(By Walter Winchell)

He was a light in the darkness. The immensity of George Washington's contributions are exceeded only by the knowledge of what he relinquished to make them possible. He was a wealthy man who surrendered material abundance for the burdens of arduous duties. He exchanged personal security for bitter peril. He traded the security of his farm for the torture of battlefields. He sacrificed almost everything for a hope. But he never surrendered his conscience.

His birthday is a time for profound inspiration. It arouses renewed dedication to the Nation's mightiest force: Devotion to liberty. The homage tendered the Founding Father is more than respect for valor. It exceeds the shimmer of personal glory. For it represents a testament of national faith in the concepts his sacrifices gained. The vibrancy of his spirit has always been evoked by the Nation in time of crisis.

For internal obstacles he endured and eventually surmounted offer a finer tribute to his generalship than his final success on the battlefield. The Continental Congress was plagued by corruption. The Nation's credit almost crumbled. There were times when Washington could not send ordinary military dispatches because he was unable to pay the riders. During the second winter at Morristown the Nation was almost numbed by despair. There were wild demands for General Washington's dismissal. When the future seemed dismal, a friend wrote to Washington—urging him to surrender. The general replied: "Death will provide peace."

The shaping of farmer-patriots in the form of an army was one of Washington's more formidable tasks. He was appalled by the lack of essential discipline. Nevertheless, his fixity of purpose, personal dignity and profound faith in the Nation's objectives won the loyalty of his soldiers. He once began an address to his unpaid and discontented troops with the words: "Gentlemen, you will have to permit me to put on my spectacles for I have not only grown gray, but almost blind in the service of my country." Many hardened warriors who heard those words openly wept.

He became Chief Executive amid the earnest acclaim of his countrymen. The singing quality of the high honor (as Washington's successors learned) marks the overture for the solemn beat of harsh realities. The Presidency is a national institution—the President is a man. His problems are not only political, economic, and military. They are also extremely personal. He must be equipped with moral endurance plus philosophic conviction. His physical stamina will be constantly challenged and his spiritual strength severely tested. Glory is transient, the duties are arduous and history is a stern judge.

It is difficult to imagine that the man who achieved an exalted position in history was the target of venomous opposition during his lifetime. The fierce disputes over the Constitution's ratification left burning scars. The controversy incited by the French Revolution and the Jay Treaty rocked the Nation. And there was violent opposition to the whisky tax. Washington was vilified in dailies and denounced at mass meetings. There was an assassination attempt. One paper forged letters in an effort to embarrass him.

The scurrilous press campaigns inspired Washington to write to a friend: "But in what will this abuse terminate? For the result, as it respects itself, I care not; for I have a consolation within that no earthly effort can deprive me of, and that is that neither ambition nor interested motives have influenced my conduct. The arrows of malevolence, therefore, however barbed and well-pointed, never can reach the most vulnerable part of me; though, whilst I am up as a mark, they will continually be aimed."

He urged Congress to repeal the transportation tax on newspapers by reminding the legislators: "No resource is so firm for the Government of the United States as the affection of the people, guided by an enlightened policy; and to this primary good nothing can conduce more than a faithful representation of public proceedings diffused without restraint throughout the United States."

When he embraced the serenity of Mount Vernon, Washington began his historic journey to the viewless heights. During the Nation's darkest hour he carried the brightest torch. At Valley Forge, a winter of suffering made possible the springtime of democracy. Although weapons become obsolete and maps change, the principles of George Washington remain constant. Undoubtedly, he was a man of immense proportions. You can measure the Nation's basic ideals by his character. He was the incomparable magician who transformed sprawling Colonies into a vigorous Nation. He was the Father of our Country.

Even more—he was a brother to every American.

All citizens of the United States would do well to recall the admonition of Washington when he said:

Citizens by birth or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections.

This challenge, as necessary today as when Washington gave it on September 19, 1796, was embraced in his Farewell Address on that memorable occasion. He continued by declaring:

The name of American, which belongs to you, in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discrimination. With slight shades of differences, you have the same religion, matters, habits and political principles. You have in common cause fought and triumphed together. The independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint counsels and joint efforts; of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

Washington, as a young surveyor, climbed the hills in what is now West Virginia. He often visited sections which are known as Jefferson and Morgan Counties as well as many other areas of the State.

Diversion of Water of Lake Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Tuesday I appeared before the House Public Works Committee in opposition to the Chicago water bill. I ask unanimous consent that my statement before that committee be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAM PROXMIRE, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1959, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

H.R. 1 should be rejected because in the 6 years this kind of measure has been before the Congress there has never been a showing that the study which is the only authorized purpose of this bill is necessary.

The study is unnecessary for these reasons:

1. The Corps of Engineers has already testified (pp. 193, 194, in hearings before Senate Public Works Committee, July 19, 28, 29, and August 7, 1958) that they are fully satisfied that additional diversion will not improve navigation on the Illinois waterway, and will have an adverse effect on navigation on the Great Lakes (p. 18057 in 1958 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD). In 6 years of consideration there has never been a showing that a study would contribute any useful information to a better understanding of navigation consequences. I challenge the author to show that this bill would provide any useful information on navigation although the effect on navigation is the only stated purpose of the bill.

2. The Corps of Engineers has also testified to certain knowledge of the effect of additional diversion on power generation—that it would be favorable at Lockport but far more unfavorable on the St. Lawrence—with a total net loss of power. There is no indication in 6 years of consideration that the study authorized in this bill would contribute even one fact necessary to a better understanding of the consequences of diversion on power. Again I challenge the author to show that this bill would provide such information.

3. The only remaining purpose the study authorized in this bill could serve is the effect of additional diversion on sanitation. Although similar study bills have been introduced in three successive Congresses, there has never been a finding by the Public Health Service, the Illinois Board of Health, the Chicago Board of Health, any public health group of any kind, or even of a single competent or for that matter incompetent public health authority that increased diversion would be necessary for improved sanitation or public health or even desirable.

On the other hand the most competent public health survey ever made of Chicago (the Chicago and Cook County health survey by the U.S. Public Health Service) called for a series of other recommendations to improve sanitation in Chicago. It specifically considered additional diversion and failed to recommend it.

It is true that this previous study was made nearly 12 years ago. Nevertheless there have been no contrary findings by the Public Health Service since the publication of this book. It would seem to me that since improved sanitation is the only possible beneficial consequence of this bill—that the Public Health Service should be requested to furnish the Congress with a report on the public health justification, if any, for this study.

4. This bill is unnecessary because the Supreme Court has established jurisdiction over diversion by Chicago for some 50 years. Everything provided in this bill could be granted by the Supreme Court. The Court has been willing to grant Chicago temporary increases in diversion in the past. It did so as recently as 1956. It would do so again if the Court deemed such increase merited. Through the appointment of special masters the Court has built up a record of great competence in this matter. Obviously only lack of merit keeps Chicago from going to the Court for the diversion authorized in this bill.

Before the committee votes on this bill I respectfully suggest that it request the Public Health Service to indicate whether a 3-year study is necessary to provide conclusions on the consequences of additional diversion on the sanitary quality of water in the Illinois Waterway.

In the event the committee favorably considers the bill I respectfully suggest the following changes:

1. The bill calls for a recommendation from the Army only. Yet the study authorized by the bill will be entirely concerned with the sanitary quality of water on the Illinois Waterway. This is within the competence of the Public Health Service. Therefore the Public Health Service should be called on to provide its own recommendations.

2. The bill calls for a recommendation but provides no standards for judgment on which such a recommendation should be based. The Public Health Service should be asked to specify the standards that it would be necessary for additional diversion to achieve in order to warrant a favorable recommendation. In the absence of such prestated standards for favorable recommendation—the Congress is guaranteeing Chicago a favorable recommendation. The deck is being stacked in advance: The favorable-to-Chicago recommendation is inevitable. What Chicago wants is a stacked deck, a study that will provide a preconceived conclusion—a guarantee of a permanent additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet of water per second.

3. The Public Health Service should be asked to indicate whether or not a study of alternative sanitation methods to achieve comparable purification without additional diversion would be necessary to permit reasonable recommendations. A Public Health Service staff report, dated April 8, 1957, and entitled "Estimated Costs of Treatment Measures Equivalent to Increased Diversion of Lake Michigan Water for Sanitation Purposes at Chicago" was submitted at the request of the Bureau of the Budget on April 29, 1957. The report was submitted to Roger W. Jones, Assistant Director for Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, by Marion B. Folsom, then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This staff report indicated that its information was based on limited data. On two of the four alternatives the Public Health Service declared that they were not in a position to estimate the effectiveness. The cost estimates are at variance with firm estimates made by the president of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Chicago. The Chicago estimates are substantially lower. The head of the sanitation district himself states that the cost of one of the alternatives to diversion "would not be beyond the ability of the sanitary district." The Public Health Service concludes its staff study by declaring of another alternative, "Its use for reducing oxygen demand may be economically justified and found effective in meeting the unusual conditions at Chicago either alone or in combination with other approaches." If either of these conclusions should prove to be the case, they would in my judgment demolish any reason for consideration of diversion by Chicago.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee, Wis., Common Council has recently adopted a resolution declaring the opposition of our largest city to this water diversion proposal. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION DECLARING CITY OF MILWAUKEE OPPOSITION TO WATER DIVERSION PROPOSALS

Whereas by prior resolutions, this common council has recorded the position of the city of Milwaukee in opposition to proposals for diversion of water from Lake Michigan for the purposes of the Chicago Sanitary District; and

Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States bills to authorize additional diversion of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago; and

Whereas one of these bills is H.R. 1, introduced in the House of Representatives January 7, 1959: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, as follows:

1. That the city of Milwaukee reiterates its position in opposition to increased or unreasonable diversion of water from Lake Michigan for the purposes of the Chicago Sanitary District, or comparable diversions of water elsewhere in the Great Lakes Basin; and

2. That the mayor, the deputy city attorney, and the municipal port director be and they are hereby authorized and directed to appear before congressional committees either in the House of Representatives or in the U.S. Senate holding hearings in Washington or elsewhere, and to express the opposition of the city of Milwaukee to legislation which would in any manner authorize the diversion of additional volumes of water from the Great Lakes Basin; and

3. That the city of Milwaukee hereby specifically declares its opposition to H.R. 1 pending before the Congress of the United States, or bills similar in intent; and

4. That the aforesaid persons enumerated

in paragraph 2 are hereby authorized to confer with representatives of Great Lakes cities of Canada for the purpose of discussing matters pertaining to water diversion, and they are also authorized to meet with other representatives of the principal cities of the Great Lakes area in the United States for the purpose of discussing opposition to water diversion legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the city clerk to the President of the United States, to the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, and to the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives; to Senators and Representatives from the State of Wisconsin; to the attorneys general of the Great Lakes States opposing water diversion; to the Great Lakes Harbors Association; to the Great Lakes Compact Commission; and to the Lake Carriers Association; and that the city representatives herein enumerated be authorized to collaborate with the legislators and regional groups designated with a view to achieving collaboration and effective opposition to any and all proposals for extraction of water from the Great Lakes Basin; to the injury of the port cities and the maritime interests of the Great Lakes.

Charles A. Plumley, Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the RECORD I include a notable address by a former Member of the House, the Honorable Charles A. Plumley, of Vermont, delivered on the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

Dr. Plumley is the distinguished son of a worthy sire, his father having served as a Member of this body through the 61st, 62d, and 63d Congresses.

Representing his father's district, which included the entire State of Vermont, Dr. Plumley served here from the 73d to the 81st Congresses, inclusive. He came to the House as a nationally known educator and university president, and his scholarly address reflects his long and ardent admiration for the great war President.

The address follows:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN: THE UNCOMMON COMMONER

We honor ourselves today as we appropriately observe the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, uncommon commoner, great American emancipator, and savior of the Nation; a type that nature wills to plan but once in all a people's years; he was one who owned no common soul:

"Some opulent force of genius, soul, and race,
Some deep life current from far centuries
Flowed to his mind and lighted his sad eyes,
And gave his name, among great names, high place.

"Unschooled scholar! How did you learn
The wisdom a lifetime may not earn?
Unsainted martyr! Higher than a saint!
You were a man, with a man's constraint,
In the world, of the world was your lot;
With it and for it the fight you fought
And never till time is itself forgot
And the heart of man is a pulseless clot
Shall the blood flow slow, when we think the thought
Of Lincoln."

It is universally conceded that by his courage, his justice, his even temper, his fertile counsels, his humanity, he stood a heroic figure in the center of an heroic epoch. He is the true history of the American people in his time. Step by step he walked before them; slow with their slowness, guidening his march by theirs, the true representation of this continent; an entirely public man; father of his country; the pulse of 20 millions throbbing in his heart. The thought of their minds articulated by his tongue.

His cautious, but steady advances, militarily, during the war were like those of a Roman Army. He left behind him a firm road on which public confidence followed, as he took America with him wherever he went. What he gained, he occupied. His advanced posts became his colonies.

It is not generally recognized, but it is a fact, that Lincoln stands out as a great war President, probably the greatest in our history, and as a great natural strategist, a better one than any of his generals. He was in actuality, as well as in title, the Commander in Chief, who, by his larger strategy, did more, in the opinion of those qualified and competent to express one, than Grant or any general to win the war for the Union.

As Commander in Chief, he visited General Grant and his army at City Point in the spring of 1865. He wanted to see Grant defeat Lee and end the war. He wanted to witness a victory.

On the 7th of April 1865, Sheridan, smashing victoriously at the Confederates, telegraphed General Grant: "If the thing be pressed, I think Lee will surrender." General Grant sent Sheridan's telegram to President Lincoln, who wired General Grant: "Let the thing be pressed."

That was his last important order as Commander in Chief.

The era in which he lived and moved was but the beginning of things for the United States of America, whose destiny he prophetically saw was foreordained as the savior of the world.

In the grandeur of his soul, he visioned a world unshackled, willed to us the duty and the obligation to carry high the torch of liberty he threw into our hands; to the end that all men everywhere eventually shall be truly free.

"It is for us the living," said he, "to see to it that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

This is the burden and the challenge of our undertaking, today.

His wisdom, they agree, was made up of a knowledge of things as well as of men; his sagacity resulted from a clear perception and honest acknowledgment of difficulties, which enabled him to see that the only durable triumph of political opinion is based not on abstract right, but upon so much of justice, the highest attainable at any given moment in human affairs, as may be had in the balance of mutual concession. Of course, he had an ideal, but it was the ideal of a practical statesman, namely to aim at the best, and to take the next best, if lucky enough to get even that.

His rugged, honest, steadfast perseverance and stanch Americanism still stand as examples, as objectives which the Nation and all of us as individuals may well try to emulate. Unwavering in his loyalty to the fundamentals of American Government, his genuine respect for the Constitution, and his great concern for the destiny of the Republic ended only with his death.

It was Abraham Lincoln who first said: "You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you own. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could do for themselves."

Interesting, also, just now, is his letter with respect to the draft, which letter of date August 15 (?), 1863, he concludes as follows:

"The principle of the draft, which is involuntary or enforced service, is not new. It has been practiced in all ages of the world. It was well known to the framers of our Constitution as one of the modes of raising armies. At the time they placed in that instrument the provision that 'the Congress shall have the power to raise and support armies.' It had been used just before in establishing our independence. It was also used under the Constitution in 1812. Wherein is the peculiar hardship now? Shall we shrink from the necessary means to maintain our free Government, which our grandfathers employed to establish it and our own fathers have already employed (once) to maintain it? Are we degenerate? Has the manhood of our race run out?"

It appears today that without the draft the armed services would fall 700,000 short of the 2.3 million men needed.

Some form of compulsion is necessary to build up the Nation's defense.

"A sad commentary on the willingness of Americans to guard their own country," says the Free Press.

However, we can find comfort in the fact, and it is to our credit, that the fanatical religous zealots—the Jehovah Witness type of citizens—the dedicated conscientious objectors, and the common run of the mill slackers and draft dodgers, Communists, parlor pinks, fellow travelers, and the rest of the lunatic fringe, who by weakening rather than strengthening our defense would give aid and comfort to our enemies, constitute but a very small minority of citizens who do not believe that their country, worth living in, is worth defending, bearing arms if necessary and fighting for.

It is as true today as when Capt. Alden Partridge said 140 years ago that, "In every republic the due cultivation of a proper military spirit among the great mass of the people and a general diffusion of military information are indispensably necessary for the preservation of liberty. The liberties of Rome were safe, while military information was generally diffused and every Roman citizen considered and felt himself a soldier."

History surely repeats itself. "We cannot escape it," says Fitzgerald:

"The moving finger writes; and having writ,
Moves on: Nor all your piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it."

We will be remembered "in spite of ourselves," and lighted down "in honor or dishonor, to the latest generations," as Lincoln said.

Abraham Lincoln's standing before posterity will not be exalted by mere praise of his virtues and abilities, nor by any concealment of his limitations and faults. The stature of this great man, one of whose peculiar charms consisted in his being so unlike all other great men, will rather lose than gain by the idealization which so easily runs into the commonplace.

It was distinctly the weird mixture of qualities and forces in him, of the lofty with the common, the ideal with the uncouth, of that which he had not ceased to be, that made him so fascinating a character among his fellow men, gave him his singular power over their minds and hearts, and fitted him to be the greatest leader in the greatest crisis of our national life, the uncommon commoner.

We seldom think of Lincoln as an orator, though the speech at Gettysburg has no parallel in the English language. It was his

happy lot to rise in the realm of oratory by the power of his poetic spirit higher than any American, save probably Emerson, has done in other fields of literature. On the theme of slavery, where his unerring moral sense had free sway, he became our supreme orator, transcending even Webster in grandeur of thought and beauty of its expression. His periods are not as sonorous as our Olympian New England orator's but their accents will reach as far and resound even longer by the carrying and sustaining power of the ideas which they express.

He takes the wind out of Seward's sails by his "Divided House" speech, wins the nomination over Chase, Cameron, Bates, and Seward, and when elected takes up the desperate task of government with his old political enemies for his Cabinet advisers, quietly confident that he is more than a match for them all. Stanton sneers at him as "the imbecile in the White House"; and what is Lincoln's revenge? Only this, that Stanton stood beside his corpse and said: "Here lies the greatest ruler of men the world has ever seen." Born in abject poverty, spending most of his life in squalid or commonplace surroundings, he takes his seat for the ages in a marble temple that Phidias might have fashioned, whose walls on either hand are inscribed with his own words, that will outlast the temple. Could contradiction any further go?

The American people will long remember two of his so-called perorations. Said he: "I am loath to close. We are not enemies, but friends; we must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature."

And that closing paragraph of his second inaugural:

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations."

Neither oration has any parallel or equal in the English language.

There was a dream that men could one day speak the thoughts of their own choosing. There was a hope that men could one day stroll through streets at evening unafraid. There was a prayer that each could speak to his own God, in his own church. That dream, that hope, that prayer became America. Great strength, youthful heart, vast enterprise, and hard work made it so. Now, that same America is the dream, the hope, the prayer of the world. Our freedom its dream. Our strength its hope. Our swift race against time its prayer.

Let us undertake to emulate his sturdy virtues, accepting and appreciating the great responsibility of the white man's burden he laid upon our shoulders, welcoming the opportunity to show the world the stuff of which we are made.

"The fiber will hold.
The colors have not faded nor has rot
Weakened the fabric of our ancient might.
Through centuries our forefathers have guarded
Freedom and justice with a jealous pride.
We are the heirs of those whose deeds were lauded."
Do we disgrace them? Let the world decide.

"And so he came.
From prairie cabin up to Capitol,
One fair ideal led our chieftain on.
Forevermore he burned to do his deed
With the fine stroke and gesture of a king.
He built the rail pile as he built the State,
Pouring his splendid strength through every blow,
The conscience of him testing every stroke,
To make his deed the measure of a man.
So came the Captain with the mighty heart;
And when the step of earthquake shook the house,
Wresting the rafters from their ancient hold,
He held the ridge-pole up and spiked again
The rafters of the Home. He held his place!
Held the long purpose like a growing tree—
Held on through blame, and faltered not at praise!
And when he fell, in whirlwind, he went down
As when a kingly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky."

"Now he belongs to the ages."

The Death of John Quincy Adams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the birth of George Washington. Much has been said about the accomplishments and life of this great American. As his Farewell Address is read to us we are all aware of the fact that had we followed his admonitions, the world and this Nation would not be facing the perilous days we see ahead. Nor would there have been the great concern for the economy of this Nation, for had we followed the dictates of that farewell address, our fiscal house would be in order and we could be looking to the horizons of tomorrow with confidence rather than the fear that our irresponsibility may be placing a yoke upon our children and our children's children which they may not be able to throw off.

Mr. Speaker, as one reads the history of our Nation, and particularly of its legislative branch, we find that we are privileged to stand here in the shadow of giants. We should walk with humility as we look back upon those who gave so much which we now take so lightly.

I am reminded on this 23rd day of February that it too is an anniversary, the anniversary of the passing in 1848 of a truly great American, one who served in this House after having served in the Presidency of the United States, in the Senate, in the President's Cabinet, and as a minister abroad, a man truly dedicated to those things in which he believed, who made no compromise with principle and wielded with distinction a trowl which helped to build the foundation and the framework of this great Republic.

I think it is well to look to the past so that we may better appreciate the future. In "Benton's 30 Years View" there is a chapter on the death of John Quincy Adams. I ask unanimous consent to include with these remarks that chapter, which follows:

DEATH OF MR. ADAMS

"Just after the yeas and nays were taken on a question, and the Speaker had risen to put another question to the House, a sudden cry was heard on the left of the chair, 'Mr. Adams is dying!' Turning our eyes to the spot, we beheld the venerable man in the act of falling over the left arm of his chair, while his right arm was extended, grasping his desk for support. He would have dropped upon the floor had he not been caught in the arms of the Members sitting next him. A great sensation was created in the House: Members from all quarters rushing from their seats, and gathering round the fallen statesman, who was immediately lifted into the area in front of the Clerk's table. The Speaker instantly suggested that some gentleman move an adjournment, which being promptly done, the House adjourned."

So wrote the editors of the National Intelligencer, friends and associates of Mr. Adams for 40 years, and now witnesses of the last scene—the sudden sinking in his chair, which was to end in his death. The news flew to the Senate Chamber, the Senate then in session, and engaged in business, which Mr. Benton interrupted, standing up, and saying to the President of the body and the Senators:

"I am called on to make a painful announcement to the Senate. I have just been informed that the House of Representatives has this instant adjourned under the most afflictive circumstances. A calamitous visitation has fallen on one of its oldest and most valuable Members—one who has been President of the United States, and whose character has inspired the highest respect and esteem. Mr. Adams has just sunk down in his chair, and has been carried into an adjoining room, and may be at this moment passing from the earth, under the roof that covers us, and almost in our presence. In these circumstances the whole Senate will feel alike, and feel wholly unable to attend to any business. I, therefore, move the immediate adjournment of the Senate."

The Senate immediately adjourned, and all inquiries were directed to the condition of the stricken statesman. He had been removed to the Speaker's room, where he slightly recovered the use of his speech, and uttered in faltering accents, the intelligible words, "This is the last of earth;" and soon after, "I am composed." These were the last words he ever spoke. He lingered 2 days, and died on the evening of the 23d—struck the day before, and dying the day after the anniversary of Washington's birth—and attended by every circumstance which he could have chosen to give felicity in death. It was on the field of his labors—in the presence of the national representation, presided by a son of Massachusets (Robert C. Winthrop, Esq.) in the full possession of his faculties, and of their faithful use—at octogenarian age—without a pang—hung over in his last unconscious moments by her who had been for more than 50 years the worthy partner of his bosom. Such a death was the "crowning mercy" of a long life of eminent and patriotic service, filled with every incident that gives dignity and luster to human existence.

I was sitting in my library room in the twilight of a raw and blustering day, the lamp not yet lit, when a note was delivered to me from Mr. Webster—I had saved it 7 years, just 7—when it was destroyed in that conflagration of my house which consumed, in a moment, so much which I had long cherished. The note was to inform me that Mr. Adams had breathed his last; and to say that the Massachusetts delegation had fixed upon me to second the motion, which would be made in the Senate the next day, for the customary funeral honors to his

memory. Seconding the motion on such an occasion always requires a brief discourse on the life and character of the deceased. I was taken by surprise, for I had not expected such an honor: I was oppressed; for a feeling of inability and unworthiness fell upon me. I went immediately to Mr. Winthrop, who was nearest, to inquire if some other Senator had been named to take my place if I should find it impossible to comply with the request. He said there was none—that Mr. Davis, of Massachusetts, would make the motion, and that I was the only one named to second him. My part was then fixed. I went to the other end of the city to see Mr. Davis, and so to arrange with him as to avoid repetitions—which was done, that he should speak of events, and I of characteristics. It was late in the night when I got back to my house, and took pen and paper to note the heads of what I should say. Never did I feel so much the weight of Cicero's admonition—"Choose with discretion out of the plenty that lies before you." The plenty was too much. It was a field crowded with fruits and flowers, of which you could only cull a few—a mine filled with gems, of which you could only snatch a handfull. By midnight I had finished the task, and was ready for the ceremony.

Mr. Adams died a Member of the House, and the honors to his memory commenced there, to be finished in the Senate. Mr. Webster was suffering from domestic affliction—the death of a son and a daughter—and could not appear among the speakers. Several Members of the House spoke justly and beautifully; and of these, the preeminent beauty and justic of the discourse delivered by Mr. James McDowell, of Virginia (even if he had not bèen a near connection, the brother of Mrs. Benton), would lead me to give it the preference in selecting some passages from the tributes of the House. With a feeling and melodious delivery, he said:

"It is not for Massachusetts to mourn alone over a solitary and exclusive bereavement. It is not for her to feel alone a solitary and exclusive sorrow. No, sir; No. Her sister Commonwealths gather to her side in this hour of her affliction, and, intertwining their arms with hers, they bend together over the bier of her illustrious son—feeling as she feels, and weeping as she weeps, over a sage, a patriot, and a statesman gone. It was in these great characteristics of individual and of public man that his country reverenced tht son when living, and such, with a painful sense of her common loss, will she deplore him now that he is dead.

"Born in our revolutionary day, and brought up in early and cherished intimacy with the fathers and founders of the republic, he was a living bond of connection between the present and the past—the venerable representative of the memories of another age, and the zealous, watchful, and powerful one of the expectations, interests, and progressive knowledge of his own.

"There he sat, with his intense eye upon everything that passed, a picturesque and rare one man, unapproachable by all others in the unity of his character and in the thousandfold anxieties which centered upon him. No human being ever entered this hall without turning habitually and with heartfelt deference first to him, and few ever left it without pausing, as they went, to pour out their blessings upon that spirit of consecration to the country which brought and which kept him here.

"Standing upon the extreme boundary of human life, and disdaining all the relaxations and exemptions of age, his outer framework only was crumbling away. The glorious engine within still worked on unhurt, uninjured, amid all the dilapidations around it, and worked on with its wonted and its iron power, until the blow was sent from above which crushed it into fragments before us. And, however, appalling that blow, and however profoundly it smote upon our own feelings as we beheld its extinguishing effect upon his, where else could it have fallen so fitly upon him? Where else could he have been relieved from the yoke of his labors so well as in the field where he bore them? Where else would he himself have been so willing to have yielded up his life, as upon the post of duty, and by the side of that very altar to which he had devoted it? Where but in the Capitol of his country, to which all the throbbings and hopes of his heart had been given, would the dying patriot be so willing that those hopes and throbbings should cease? And where but from this mansion-house of liberty on earth, could this dying Christian more fitly go to his mansion-house of eternal liberty on high?"

Mr. Benton concluded in the Senate the ceremonies which had commenced in the House, pronouncing the brief discourse which was intended to group into one cluster the varied characteristics of the public and private life of this most remarkable man:

"The voice of his native State has been heard, through one of the Senators of Massachusetts, announcing the death of her aged and most distinguished son. The voice of the other Senator from Massachusetts is not heard, nor is his presence seen. A domestic calamity, known to us all and felt by us all, confines him to the chamber of grief while the Senate is occupied with the public manifestations of a respect and sorrow which a national loss inspires. In the absence of that Senator, and as the Member of this body longest here, it is not unfitting or unbecoming in me to second the motion which has been made for extending the last honors of the Senate to him who, 45 years ago, was a Member of this body, who, at the time of his death, was among the oldest Members of the House of Representatives, and who, putting the years of his service together, was the oldest of all the Members of the American Government.

"The eulogium of Mr. Adams is made in the facts of his life, which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAVIS] has so strikingly stated, that from early manhood to octogenarian age, he has been constantly and most honorably employed in the public service. For a period of more than 50 years, from the time of his first appointment as Minister abroad under Washington, to his last election to the House of Representatives by the people of his native district, he has been constantly retained in the public service, and that, not by the favor of a sovereign, or by hereditary title, but by the elections and appointments of republican government. This fact makes the eulogy of the illustrious deceased. For what, except a union of all the qualities which command the esteem and confidence of man, could have insured a public service so long, by appointments free and popular, and from sources so various and exalted? Minister many times abroad, Member of this body, Member of the House of Representatives, Cabinet minister, President of the United States—such has been the galaxy of his splendid appointments. And what but moral excellence the most perfect; intellectual ability the most eminent; fidelity the most unwavering; service the most useful; would have commanded such a succession of appointments so exalted, and from sources so various and so eminent? Nothing less could have commanded such a series of appointments; and accordingly we see the union of all these great qualities in him who has received them.

"In this long career of public service, Mr. Adams was distinguished not only by faithful attention to all the great duties of his stations, but to all their less and minor duties. He was not the Salaminian galley, to be launched only on extraordinary occasions; but he was the ready vessel, always under sail when the duties of his station required it, be the occasion great or small. As President, as Cabinet minister, as Minister abroad, he examined all questions that came before him, and examined all, in all their parts—in all the minutiae of their detail, as well as in all the vastness of their comprehension. As Senator, and as a Member of the House of Representatives, the obscure committeeroom was as much the witness of his laborious application to the drudgery of legislation, as the Halls of the two Houses were to the ever-ready speech, replete with knowledge, which instructed all hearers, enlightened all subjects, and gave dignity and ornament to all debate.

"In the observance of all the proprieties of life, Mr. Adams was a most noble and impressive example. He cultivated the minor as well as the greater virtues. Wherever his presence could give aid and countenance to what the useful and honorable to man, there he was. In the exercises of the school and of the college—in the meritorious meetings of the agricultural, mechanical, and commercial societies—in attendance upon divine worship—he gave the punctual attendance rarely seen but in those who are free from the weight of public cares.

"Punctual to every duty, death found him at the post of duty; and where else could it have found him, at any stage of his career, for the 50 years of his illustrious public life? From the time of his first appointment by Washington to his last election by the people of his native town, where could death have found him but at the post of duty? At that post, in the fullness of age, in the ripeness of renown, crowned with honors, surrounded by his family, his friends, and admirers, and in the very presence of the national representation, he has been gathered to his fathers, leaving behind him the memory of public services which are the history of his country for half a century, and the example of a life, public and private, which should be the study and the model of the generations of his countrymen."

The whole ceremony was inconceivably impressive. The two Houses of Congress were filled to their utmost capacity, and of all that Washington contained, and neighboring cities could send—the President, his Cabinet, foreign ministers, judges of the Supreme Court, Senators and Representatives, citizens and visitors.

Isthmian Canal Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under a previous order of the House, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] will address this body tomorrow on the most timely and gravely serious subject of the Panama Canal—its control and jurisdiction.

As Members of this body know, he has made extensive studies of Isthmian problems, especially the diplomatic and juridical, and starting on March 26, 1958, made one of the most comprehensive series of addresses on this subject in Isthmian history.

Ever since the 1956 Suez Canal crisis, world attention has become increasingly focused on the Panama Canal. Thus, it is of the highest importance that the

Congress, which is the ultimate authority in the determination of Panama Canal policies, should be fully informed.

I am sure that his address will be highly informative, definitely constructive, and delivered in his usual brilliant form.

Adequate Meat Inspection Appropriation a Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve the protection of adequate meat inspection. Toward that end, those groups that are responsible for providing adequate meat supplies for the American table have joined together in calling upon the Congress to approve the budget request for the Meat Inspection Division of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. John A. Killick, executive secretary of the National Independent Meat Packers Association, wrote me on February 19, 1959, and included a joint statement supporting meat inspection appropriations. Believing this statement should receive the serious consideration of the Congress, I include it at this point in the RECORD, together with the names of the signatory organizations.

The statement follows:

JOINT STATEMENT SUPPORTING MEAT INSPECTION APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. Homemaker demands assurance that the meat she buys for her family's dinner table is clean and wholesome. Congress, more than a half century ago, decided that she has the right to this guarantee. It, therefore, established a meat inspection agency.

We, the officers of consumer, public health, farm, livestock, producer, labor and management organizations, agree that Mrs. Homemaker and her family must be fully and effectively protected. We are, therefore, anxious that the Meat Inspection Division of the Department of Agriculture obtain sufficient funds to employ an adequate staff of inspectors.

For a period, which fortunately ended last year, the Meat Inspection Division was inadequately supported. It could not increase its staff of inspectors to meet the steadily rising demands, which resulted from the meat industry's decentralization and growth. The increase in funds in the appropriation and supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1959 have, we are glad to say, again put the Division on the road to full effectiveness.

The $21,475,000 budget request for the Meat Inspection Division for fiscal year 1960, although hardly generous, does promise to continue to permit the hiring of new and needed inspectors. We, frankly, would have liked to have seen a somewhat higher request, but we hope this amount will prove adequate.

We, therefore, urge Congress to approve the budget request of $21,475,000 for the Meat Inspection Division of the Department of Agriculture. We believe it is the minimum amount necessary to permit the Division to keep an adequate staff of inspectors, who must provide the consumer protection so necessary to our Nation's health.

Thomas J. Lloyd and Patrick E. Gorman, president and secretary-treasurer, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (AFL–CIO); Radford Hall, executive secretary, American National Cattlemen's Association; Homer R. Davison, president, American Meat Institute; A. Z. Baker, president, American Stock Yards Association; James G. Patton, president, The National Farmers Union; Herschel D. Newsom, master, The National Grange; John A. Killick, executive secretary, National Independent Meat Packers Association; Dr. R. A. Hendershott, secretary, U.S. Livestock Sanitary Association; E. F. Forbes, president and general manager, Western States Meat Packers Association.

Lake Michigan Water Diversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the attorney general of Wisconsin, Mr. John Reynolds, appeared before the House Committee on Public Works last Tuesday. His persuasive and thoughtful presentation deserves the consideration of the entire Congress. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that his statement before the committee be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. REYNOLDS, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WISCONSIN, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 17, 1959

Gentlemen, my name is John W. Reynolds and I am the attorney general of the State of Wisconsin. I would like to thank you for the opportunity you have given me to appear before you.

Speaking on behalf of the State of Wisconsin, the city of Milwaukee, and the Milwaukee Port Authority, I urge this committee to take no action on H.R. 1 at this time for the following reasons:

1. The matter of the diversion of Lake Michigan water is presently the subject of litigation. In December 1958, Wisconsin, joining with the other Great Lakes States, which were parties to the original action in the case of *Wisconsin et al. v. Illinois and the Chicago Sanitary District*, filed its application with the Supreme Court of the United States to reopen the decree of April 21, 1930. By that decree the U.S. Supreme Court retained jurisdiction over the subject matter of H.R. 1. Wisconsin's present application to the U.S. Supreme Court is for the purpose of requesting the Court to appoint a special master to take evidence to determine whether Chicago should be compelled to follow the practice of all other Great Lakes cities and return its unused domestic pumpage, after it had passed through its waterworks and purification system, to the Great Lakes Basin.

The State of Illinois and the sanitary district filed their brief in opposition to our application in January of this year.

In connection with this litigation, I would like to point out that the Solicitor General of the United States, Mr. J. Lee Rankin, is taking an active interest in this case. He has notified the U.S. Supreme Court that in order to protect the sovereign interests of the United States he will file a brief in March of this year.

In addition, the Solicitor General has called a conference on March 2, 1959, of all the Great Lakes States concerned, including Illinois. I cannot predict what results may be reached at that conference, but I respectfully and specifically request that the records of this committee be kept open to receive a report of that conference.

2. The second reason that we request this committee to take no action on H.R. 1 at this time is that on February 25 and 26 of this year there is going to be held in Detroit a meeting of Senators, Governors, attorneys general, and mayors of Wisconsin, Ohio, New York, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Minnesota, and mayors of several Canadian cities, to plan unified opposition to bills and suits on the diversion of water from the Great Lakes. I also request that the records of this committee be kept open to receive a report of that conference.

On behalf of the State of Wisconsin I am here to reiterate our strenuous objection to the never-ending effort of the Chicago Sanitary District to take the waters of Lake Michigan. No other city on the Great Lakes in the United States or Canada has ever sought or asserted the right to deplete the waters of the Great Lakes Basin.

Wisconsin has been fighting for 30 years to preserve and protect the water of Lake Michigan. As a matter of fact, it was my father as attorney general of Wisconsin who get the original decree from the Supreme Court of the United States in 1930, which established the present limit on the amount of water that Chicago may take from Lake Michigan.

Since our time as well as the subject matter at this hearing is strictly limited, I would like permission to incorporate in the record at this point two statements of the attorney general of Wisconsin. The first was made to this subcommittee in March 1956 and recorded in the report of this committee on the hearings of H.R. 2, March 26 and 27, 1956, pages 66–68. The second is reported in the hearings before a Subcommitte of the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate on H.R. 2 and S. 1123, held July 28–29 and August 7, 1958, pages 273–275.

These two statements outline the position of Wisconsin. First, that it is a scientific fact that the diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second of Lake Michigan water will have no effect upon pollution in the Chicago drainage canal or the Illinois River Waterway; and second, that an attempt by the U.S. Congress unilaterally to divert this water from an international system of lakes and rivers is violative of international law and would create a dangerous precedent in our dealings and negotiations with Canada over the mutually beneficial use of international waters.

The present bill proposed on behalf of the Chicago Sanitary District, H.R. 1, is considerably watered down from previous bills which have been before the House of Representatives and before your committee. It makes the comparatively modest proposals to increase the diversion of water by the city of Chicago by 1,000 cubic feet per second for 1 year. The alleged purpose of the bill is to permit the U.S. Public Health Service to determine the effect of such increased diversion upon Chicago's woefully mismanaged sewage disposal problem and the problem of pollution in the Chicago drainage canal and the Illinois River Waterway.

Our primary objection to this bill is twofold. First, such a bill would establish a

highly undesirable precedent. Our second objection is that according to the best scientific and professional advice that we can obtain, we know in advance it is not going to do the city of Chicago or the Chicago Sanitary District one iota of good. The available evidence which we have already accumulated indicates that the mismanagement by the city of Chicago of its sewage disposal facilities has now resulted in a pollution problem so great that nothing less than the diversion of 10,000 cubic feet of water per second would do any good.

Surely, gentlemen, if you propose to recommend this bill for passage you should insist that the proponents of this bill present the testimony of at least one competent and qualified sanitary engineer that there is at least a possibility that the proposed diversion will have a beneficial effect upon the pollution caused by the city of Chicago in its drainage canal and the Illinois River Waterway. According to the best advice I can obtain, the proponents cannot obtain such testimony.

This bill would interfere with a difficult and perilous international question. To increase Chicago's take of Lake Michigan water could seriously jeopardize the negotiations which I understand our State Department is now conducting with Canada concerning our mutual rights and obligations in the use of all international waters including, particularly, the Columbia River.

In this connection I would respectfully call your attention to two publications. The first is entitled, "Document on the Use and Control of Waters of Interstate and International Streams," which is a compilation of compacts, treaties, and adjudications affecting the use of interstate and international waters, published by the U.S. Department of the Interior in 1956. The second is the proceedings of the 10th conference of the Inter-American Bar Association held in 1957 at Buenos Aires, Argentina, entitled, "Principles of Law Governing the Uses of International Rivers and Lakes," published in Washington, D.C., in April 1958.

It is my considered opinion that these two publications establish beyond all reasonable doubt the principle that no state or nation can act unilaterally on a matter affecting an international water in a manner which will adversely affect some other state or some other nation.

The distinguished authority on international law, Lauterpacht, who is now a judge of the International Court of Justice, has stated that "the duty of the state not to interfere with the flow of a river to the detriment of other riparian states" is "one of those general principles of law recognized by civilized states which the Permanent Court is bound to apply to virtue of article 38 of its statute." (1 Oppenheim, "International Law," pp. 346–347, 8th ed. Lauterpacht, 1955.)

The so-called Harmon doctrine, under which former U.S. Attorney General Harmon asserted in 1895 that the United States could deal with the waters of the Rio Grande without regard to the rights of the united Mexican States, has never been followed. In fact, by the Rio Grande Convention negotiated in 1906 by the President of the United States of America and the President of the United States of Mexico, the United States agreed to insure delivery to Mexico of 60,000 acre-feet of water annually. And in our relations with Canada we have entered into four separate treaties: the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909; the Lake of the Woods Convention of 1925; the Rainy Lake Convention of 1938; and the Niagara River Water Diversion Treaty of 1950.

If we are to protect and preserve our amicable relations with Canada, I most respectfully suggest to you that no diversions of water whatsoever from the Great Lakes Basin should be authorized or permitted in the absence of a specific convention or agreement ratified by our own U.S. Government and the Government of Canada.

In conclusion, it is Wisconsin's position that to permit an additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second so that the U.S. Public Health Service can make a so-called study of the effect of a diversion is totally unjustified for the following reasons:

1. Such a study would be fruitless and a wast of the time of an important Federal agency as well as the taxpayers' money.

2. Such unilateral additional diversion would violate international law and seriously affect our relations with Canada.

3. Such additional diversion would create a disastrous precedent, and if followed by other Great Lakes cities would have the effect of seriously diminishing the value of the St. Lawrence Seaway project.

4. Such additional diversion would interfere with the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court.

I would like to remind the committee of our sincere belief that the riparian rights of the Great Lakes States of the United States are subject to the jurisdiction only of the U.S. Supreme Court under the decree of April 21, 1930, and of any modification that the Court may make thereof upon proper application. As I have stated, there is litigation presently pending affecting those rights, and I most respectfully urge upon the Congress that it should do nothing which would prejudice the outcome of that litigation.

Gentlemen, I would like to again thank you for your consideration.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal discussed the telling points made by Attorney General Reynolds in a recent lead editorial. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial summarizing and emphasizing the case made by the attorney general be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

ATTORNEY GENERAL ABLY PUTS THE DIVERSION BILL IN FOCUS

Wisconsin's Attorney General Reynolds has ably restated, to the House Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors in Washington, the considerations of national public policy that argue against any act of legislation letting Chicago drain off Great Lakes water and not return it.

The amount of Chicago's diversion is not without pertinence in the discussion—some is now sanctioned by rule of the U.S. Supreme Court, and two-thirds more is sought from Congress—but the mere question of how much is not at all the central one that Members ought to weigh in voting on the current bill or any others.

Reynolds instead emphasized three other issues. One is the dangerous precedent. Once Congress started granting water diversion privileges, other sections than Chicago would have the same entitlement and quite likely the same temptation. Cumulative diversions could indeed imperil other users of the same water sources, and be seriously crippling to navigation and water power.

Another point of national import is the indiscretion and even, says Reynolds, illegality of one nation's acting to divert international waters without consulting and agreeing with others affected. Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, cannot make stick his claim, heard in Milwaukee the other night, that Lake Michigan is not Canada's concern. For all water purposes it is one body with Lake Huron, and any effect on its levels is felt all the way to tidewater below Montreal.

Canada, though now again going on record against the Chicago diversion, has been blowing hot and cold on it. Passage of the bill might give her just the needed excuse to do some diverting of her own without our consent, where the great Columbia and Yukon Rivers rise in Canada and flow into the States, for instance. Thus the Chicago bill, far from having only local import, may prove an international trap.

Thirdly, Reynolds reminded that the subject matter is within the purview of the Supreme Court. When it placed the present limit on Chicago diversion 29 years ago, it retained jurisdiction, and is even now being asked by Wisconsin and other aggrieved States to consider whether the diversion should be halted altogether. Thus the bill shifts a judicial question into the political arena.

And that arena is an especially poor place to make this sort of decision because most Members of Congress, from their own regional viewpoints, don't much care. It's the kind of bill they tend to vote for if they don't happen to feel strongly opposed, or by way of scratching the back of some friend who does care. And the Illinoisans are in key position to line up that kind of support, which is not on the merits.

If Reynolds can direct more congressional attention to the national concern for precedent, propriety and foreign relations, he will well serve the antidiversion cause.

The Farm Folly of a $9 Billion Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, by July of 1959 the U.S. Government will have over $9 billion of surplus farm commodities in Government inventories and under loan. It will cost the Treasury of the Government of the United States $1 billion a year—that is $1,000 million a year, Mr. President—merely to provide storage for the accumulated farm surpluses.

On January 30, 1959, in San Francisco, the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, made a speech on farm problems generally and on the problems of the sugar beet industry in particular. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARM FOLLY OF A $9 BILLION SURPLUS

I am pleased to participate in this meeting sponsored by the California Beet Growers Association. I count it an added privilege to find here also so many representatives from other sugar beet areas throughout the country. It is always a joy to visit this historic and beautiful city in the Nation's leading agricultural State.

The development of the beet sugar industry is one of the most fascinating chapters in the history of American agriculture. It is a story of vision, initiative, struggle, of repeated failures and final success. It is a story of the triumph of perseverance by free men in a free economy in a free land. Perhaps it will not be amiss for us to refresh our minds on a point or two of that story.

Early in the history of this Nation, men of vision watched with keen interest the

development of the beet sugar industry in Europe. The United States was then almost completely dependent on foreign countries for sugar. These men saw that if we could produce beet sugar here in the United States, great advantages would result. A new industry would bring new life to the economy. A new and profitable crop would be added to our agriculture.

Back in the 1830's the first recorded attempts were made to establish a beet sugar industry in this country. The Beet Sugar Society of Philadelphia in 1836 obtained 600 pounds of beet seed from Europe. But the seed was planted too late and no sugar resulted. Then about 1839 a factory at Northampton, Mass., succeeded in producing some 1,300 pounds of beet sugar. After operating for about 2 years, this factory closed its doors.

In the next few decades no less than 13 beet sugar factories were established in widely separated localities from Maine to California. One after the other, they all failed.

One of these attempts that is most interesting to me concerns the efforts of the Mormon pioneers to establish a beet sugar industry in Utah. In these early days, more than a century ago, the people of Utah, including some of my progenitors, were buying sugar for $1 a pound—at a time when a dollar went a great deal further than it does today.

After a study of beet sugar operations in France, Mormon Church officials organized the Deseret Manufacturing Co., intending to establish the industry in Utah. The company bought a complete sugar manufacturing outfit and shipped it from France to New Orleans. It arrived in April 1852. They brought the plant up the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers to Fort Leavenworth. There they loaded it into covered wagons. In November 1852, after many difficulties and hardships, the equipment reached its destination.

I wish I could say that this tremendous effort immediately resulted in the birth of a new industry in Utah and in the Nation. Unfortunately, history records that the promoters lacked sufficient technical knowledge and the factory produced only inedible syrup. Not until over a quarter of a century later was the first beet sugar industry in the United States established on a truly successful basis.

That was in 1879 at Alvarado, Calif.

Without taking anything away from California, however, I am happy to say that the people in Utah also persisted and eventually developed a flourishing sugar-beet industry.

In the past 80 years, the sugar-beet industry has had a steady growth. Some 64 factories now produce over 2 million tons of refined sugar annually.

California, the home of the first successful sugar-beet factory, is now also the Nation's largest producer of sugar beets.

Last year, despite a poor planting season and sharply reduced yields, California produced about one-fourth of all the sugar beets grown in the United States.

The sugar-beet industry is in a solid position. Production last year was about 15.3 million tons. This was about 30 percent above the 10-year average and only slightly below the all-time high of 1957. Yields per acre in the past 2 years have been higher than ever before. But you are not burdened with surpluses as producers of some other crops are. The industry has been doing a good job of expanding production and markets simultaneously.

Your operations have been realistic—geared to market conditions.

The Sugar Act is realistic legislation. It has brought benefits to sugar-beet and sugarcane farmers, to consumers of sugar, to the sugar industry as a whole, and to our foreign suppliers.

But the sugar program cannot be used as a model for farm crops in general, particularly those produced in quantities beyond our domestic needs. We import much of the sugar we consume. Therefore surpluses of sugar, when they develop, tend to occur abroad rather than in this country. We have helped alleviate the problem of surplus abroad. The U.S. Government and the domestic sugar industry have participated in the development of an international sugar agreement designed to stabilize the world market. I know it is due in no small part to the cooperation of many of you that no major difficulties have been encountered in adjusting our domestic production so as to prevent the piling up of surpluses here at home.

By keeping prices at reasonable levels the danger of pricing sugar out of the market has been avoided.

The program has permitted and encouraged more efficient production. Here in California from 1924 to 157 yields per acre rose 127 percent. In our country's beet area the acreage per farm has doubled since the prewar period. This has permitted the use of labor-saving machines which have simplified production and harvesting problems and have reduced costs. During the past decade the man-hours required to produce a ton of beets have declined by at least one-third.

But, I repeat, the sugar program cannot be used as a model for wheat, cotton, corn, rice, peanuts, and tobacco programs, except in this respect, the sugar program has been realistic.

The programs for the six legislatively designated basic crops have not been realistic. The sugar program has been adapted to the particular circumstances surrounding U.S. production of sugar. The same cannot be said of the past programs for the basic crops.

Unrealistic programs have priced the basics out of some of their oldtime markets. Competitors at home and abroad used the artificial price umbrella to expand their production and move in. Surpluses piled up at home, followed by more and more cutbacks in acreage.

Last year we harvested 16 percent more acres of sugar beets than the 10-year average from 1947 to 1956. But last year, compared with the average for the same 10 years, we harvested 10 percent fewer acres of corn, 16 percent fewer acres of wheat, 25 percent fewer acres of peanuts, 26 percent fewer acres of rice, 34 percent fewer acres of tobacco, and 46 percent fewer acres of cotton.

Now I know there will be some who will quickly point out that comparing an import crop with export crops is not very meaningful. I don't want to read too much into this comparison. All I want to do is to show that where we have realistic programs—programs adapted to market conditions—programs that make sense—we can have an expanding agriculture. Where we have programs that are outmoded, unrealistic, not adapted to market conditions, we have a contracting agriculture.

As you know, the Administration has recommended that the Sugar Act be extended. Senator ELLENDER has introduced a bill to make the Sugar Act permanent. This measure is cosponsored by many Senators from Western States, including Senators KUCHEL and ENGLE of this State. These proposals illustrate the importance of this legislation, not only to farmers but to all our people.

It seems paradoxical, but the sugar program's popularity may constitute its greatest weakness. When the pressures to increase production are as great as they are in the case of domestic sugar beets and mainland cane, they demand attention.

The Department of Agriculture is charged with administering the act in a manner that will protect the welfare of consumers as well as the welfare of those engaged in the domestic sugar-producing industry—and that includes the growers.

I trust that all branches of our domestic sugar industry will collaborate with the Department in dealing with the problems that appear to face us in administering the sugar program. The success of the past has been due in large part to the fact that the sugar industry has borne an major share of responsibility for the administration of this program. Let us continue to face facts honestly and courageously. I feel confident that if we join in support of fearless and essential administrative actions, the sugar program will continue to be an effective force, bringing benefits to producers, the domestic sugar industry, and consumers.

Your future progress, like that of all agriculture, depends on how successfully you lower costs, improve quality, and expand markets.

As one who grew up in sugar-beet country, who was thinning beets with a short-handled hoe at the age of 7, I'm delighted to see the advances that are being made.

With your great record of achievement, you can look ahead to still further progress—to improved varieties, better control of disease, and such developments as the monogerm seed to bring greater efficiency and more profits in the future. The productive new varieties you are now growing have done well in holding down our old enemy, curly top. You've learned a lot about using fertilizer to increase yields. The sugar beet has been tailored to fit the machine, and machines have been built to take over most of the tasks in the fields.

But new problems are always arising. The new varieties don't stand up to virus yellows. And we have not yet achieved a quality in machine harvest that is as good as the best when beets are harvested by hand.

The search for the right answers is being carried forward on many fronts. Some of the solutions will come out of production research; others will grow out of research on processing problems. Still other advances will come from the basic research of our new pioneering laboratories.

With all these efforts we are building for the future—for greater efficiency in production and marketing, which means lower costs, for higher quality, and for new markets at home and abroad.

This is the road to a truly prosperous, expanding, and free agriculture.

Immediately before us, however, is the task of completing a long overdue revision of the farm price support programs as applied to the basic crops.

The President yesterday sent a special agricultural message to Congress. This was his fourth agricultural message. Again he called for changes in a farm program that has become outmoded, costly, discriminatory, and harmful.

We still have only a small part of the program the Administration asked for and that farmers need. We have had to fight every inch of the way to get more flexibility into the pricing mechanism. On some commodities—tobacco for example—nothing has been done. On others we got a little flexibility but not enough. That is why it has been necessary to devise and maintain such emergency programs as the soil bank and Public Law 480.

Our program really has never been put into operation. It has never been given a real try.

That is why the surpluses have built up. That is why a few farm commodities still have serious problems.

Yet our technicians estimate that, even with the little legislation we have been able to get on price supports, we have expanded markets and cut costs to taxpayers by a billion dollars in 1958. And farmers are taxpayers, too.

My fellow citizens, the situation is critical.

The present price support, acreage control program as it applies to wheat is bankrupt. Tobacco and peanuts are also in trouble.

Wheat is our No. 1 problem. Harvested wheat acreage has been cut by over 20 million acres since 1949—yet, under artificial pricing, combined with good weather, we now have by far the greatest wheat surplus in all history.

By July 1960 the carryover of wheat will be about 1½ billion bushels—enough to supply our normal domestic requirements for 2½ years. We will have $3½ billion tied up in wheat alone. We cannot continue to produce wheat for government by government-provided incentives.

We have spread the Wheat Belt all over America. Wheat acreage has increased in areas of high cost, while acres have been cut back in areas where production is most efficient. This doesn't make sense.

The cost of farm price and income stabilization programs have risen dangerously high.

By next July we will have over $9 billion of surplus farm commodities in Government inventory and under loan. The cost of storage and interest on these Government stocks will be $1 billion a year. This is fantastic and indefensible.

The program is unfair and discriminatory.

Farmers produce commercially about 250 farm crops. Only a very few are price supported. And 85 percent of our Federal inventory of farm commodities consists of just three crops—wheat, cotton, and corn.

Less than one-third of our farms account for by far the greater part of our price support outlays.

About one-fourth of the cotton farms have three-fourths of the cotton acreage allotments.

Two-fifths of the farms with wheat allotments have 90 percent of the allotted acres.

Thus, relatively small numbers of farms—usually those with the highest income—account for practically all of the Government price support outlays.

Finally, the old program is harmful not only to producers of wheat, tobacco, and peanuts—but harmful to agriculture as a whole.

It has caused distortions throughout our agricultural economy.

It has caused many people to regard farm programs with suspicion and resentment.

It has depressed farm income.

It has wasted farm resources.

It has placed a ceiling on farm opportunity.

It has enmeshed farmers in a maze of Government controls.

The President again recommended to the Congress further forthright changes in our farm price supports. He urged that price supports no longer be related to a standard 45 years old, but to a percentage of the average market price during the previous 3 years.

If the Congress still prefers to relate price supports to outmoded standards, the President urged that discretion be provided for establishing the level in accordance with guidelines fixed by law. This is now the case for all commodities except the few for which supports are mandatory.

The alternatives before us are clear. Take wheat. Either we must clamp down with more rigorous controls on wheat producers than we have ever had before—more controls that Congress has ever been willing to impose—or we must move toward market expansion and greater freedom to produce and compete.

The controls we have don't control. Wheat allotments have been cut. But wheat yields have nearly doubled in about 20 years. And last year's crop was the biggest ever.

Moreover, the controls provided by earlier Congresses have been watered down by later Congresses. The allotments used to be based on planted acres—now they are based on harvested acres. The minimum national allotment for wheat is 55 million acres, required by law. But if we applied the formula in the old 1938 law, still in effect, to wheat in 1959—please note this—the national allotment would be zero acres—no what production at all.

A far better approach, I believe, would be to provide wheatgrowers with a program that moves toward freedom to produce and compete for markets.

When such a program became fully effective, it would eliminate all acreage allotment and marketing quotas for wheat.

It would relate price supports for wheat to realistic market conditions.

Preferred quality wheat would then sell in the markets at premiums above support.

With such a program, wheat could really compete on its own merits. Better land use would result. High-hazard land would go into pasture and hay.

Other conservation measures would be adopted by farmers.

Farmers could more effectively manage their farms and their crop rotations.

There would be an adjustment of acreage between such competing crops as corn, grain sorghums, and soybeans.

Changes are needed for tobacco and peanuts also. The present laws require price supports at continually rising levels. As prices of U.S. tobacco increase, foreign buyers change their blends and turn to other sources of supply. Legislation is needed to permit adjustments in support levels.

For peanuts, too, the law should be changed so that growers can expand their markets.

The Agricultural Act of 1958 was a step toward more realistic programs for producers of corn, cotton, and rice. Now we need prompt and effective action in behalf of producers of wheat, tobacco, and peanuts.

This is not only the wheat, tobacco, and peanut producers' battle for realistic farm programs. This is your battle—the battle of everyone in every phase of agriculture.

Our present costly farm programs contribute to unbalancing the budget. That is of utmost concern to every citizen. No nation can go on indefinitely living beyond its income.

The President last week submitted a balanced budget for the coming fiscal year—a budget that "will help prevent further increases in the cost of living and the hidden and unfair tax that inflation imposes on personal savings and incomes."

As the President said in his Economic Report: "Our objective must be to establish a firm foundation for extending economic growth with stable prices into the months and years ahead. This will not come about automatically * * *. An indispensable condition for achieving vigorous and continuing economic growth is firm confidence that the value of the dollar will be reasonably stable in the years ahead."

This is of vital importance to all of us. During periods of economic expansion, the demand for sugar increases. Your prosperity, like that of our agriculture in general, depends on the soundness of the American economy.

We must keep our economy strong. Yes; we must keep America strong—strong economically, strong socially, but, above all, spiritually strong—so that our way of life may endure. This is your challenge and mine—a challenge to every American, no matter who or what he may be. "God grants liberty only to those who love it and are ready to guard and defend it." (Daniel Webster.)

Feeding the World's Hungry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most inspiring efforts in the world today is the work of religious institutions that are ministering to the needs of starving people in all parts of the globe. Churches and other voluntary groups have been responsible for the distribution of vast quantities of food made available to them for overseas use under title III of the Public Law 480 program. Under this program $1 given through the church world relief organizations provides approximately $28 worth of surplus Government-held farm commodities for distribution to hungry men, women, and children in foreign countries. What better method could be devised to convert our farm surplus into foreign policy assets and more important to apply the ancient spiritual injunctions of our faith?

This is the thought behind an article authored by the Reverend Richard Ginder which appeared in the March 1, 1959, issue of Our Sunday Visitor, which follows:

HARDEST FACT OF LIFE

(By Rev. Richard Ginder)

In talking with our missionaries at work in the field, one learns that perhaps the hardest fact in their life is having people of all ages starve to death before their very eyes. They want to help, they spread their resources as thin as they can, and still they can reach only a pitifully small minority of the hungry.

When we read these things at home in the snug security of our armchair, they are only vague abstractions. But to the missionary they are tragically vivid. He is haunted, for instance, by the great sunken eyes of that big-bellied child, to listless now even to extend an open palm. He noticed the child this morning on the way to the post office.

"Should I help that particular boy?" he thought. "But why him, when I passed at least 17 like him in the same short walk?"

Reported in the United States, the situation can only be summarized in statistics, and statistics are impersonal. But, like the missionary doing His work, God has no use for statistics. He sees only individuals. He does not think to Himself: "There are five hungry children in that Chinese family." His thought is, rather—"John and Charles and Peter, Helen and Mary Wu are hungry, and little Mary is likely to die if she doesn't soon get some milk."

To paraphrase Bishop Sheen in one of his recent newspaper columns, "The feeding of one hungry mortal in the name of Jesus Christ is a greater thing than the launching of the sputnik."

The bishops' relief collection will be taken up in your parish next Sunday. Every dollar you give will buy $28 worth of milk, rice, and other food for the hungry. This is possible through our U.S. surplus-food program. Your dollar just about pays the freight on $27 worth of supplies given to us by the Government. If you donate $5, you will be

shipping $140 worth of food and supplies to Hong Kong, Formosa, Macao, to Korea, Vietnam, India, Africa—wherever God's children are hungry.

Think of how many children you could have to dinner for $28. Think of yourself walking along a crowded street, let us say, in Hong Kong and inviting the children to follow you. Soon you are like the Pied Piper. You have 35 or 40 children romping around your knees. By now you are at St. Joseph's Mission.

"Sister," you say, "here is some money. Get us some food and we'll eat"—and you hand her the $28. In a few minutes you are watching your little guests drinking their milk and enjoying what may well be the first square meal of their lives.

Those children will always be grateful to you—and so will the good God. And on judgment day, maybe things will be going badly for you, when suddenly a chorus of treble voices will ring out in your defense: "We were thirsty and he gave us to drink. We were hungry and he gave us to eat."

Then God will say: "Come, blessed of my Father, and enjoy the kingdom prepared for you. Inasmuch as you have done it to one of these, my least brethren, you have done it unto me."

Want to make that dream come true? Give a dollar, just one dollar—but why stop there? Give as much as you can possibly afford next Sunday to the bishops' relief collection. Remember: whatever you give will be multiplied by 28 here on earth, and by 10,000 up above.

Unbalanced Budgets and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the people of the Nation will not continue to tolerate an unbalanced budget and the ensuing inflation indefinitely. Able editors like Howard Cooper, of the fast-growing Beaufort (S.C.) Gazette are busy informing their readers in simple terms what inflation is doing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD one of the Gazette's February 19 editorials, entitled "Enough Is Enough."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

Have you had enough?

Have you had enough of the high taxes, deficit spending, and galloping inflation that are incinerating your money and threatening your Nation with disaster in a worldwide cold war?

T. Coleman Andrews, former U.S. Commissioner of Internal Revenue who once had the job of trying to collect your taxes as fast as the Government could spend them, apparently has had enough.

He declared recently in a publication for the Economic Research Associates as follows:

"Inflation must and can be stopped. It cannot be stopped by more inflation. It can be stopped only by removing the causes. There are several causes, but the primary one is wasteful spending. Reprehensible on moral grounds, it is equally bad because it gives the Government too much choice, and leaves the people too little choice, as to how their own income will be spent.

"Tax reduction is urgently needed. But tax reduction without equivalent expenditure reduction would invite resumption of deficit spending and intensify the forces that are driving prices up and thus make the already bad situation worse.

"Any individual who gets into the habit of overspending his income has no choice but to balance his budget or suffer the shame of bankruptcy. It is the same with nations because a nation is but organized people. Its finances come only from its people. It cannot afford anything its people can't, and it cannot violate the rules of thrift and provident living without suffering the consequences that people do for the same offense."

Of course, those are opinions, but here are some of the facts on which those opinions are based:

In 1939, the unmarried recipient of an income of $2,000 had left after taxes $1,975. A person with that same income in 1957 had income after taxes worth only $863, because taxes had increased by $215 and inflation had taken $897—the price of a new car in 1939.

In 1957 a single person would have had to have an income of $4,806 to match a 1939 income of $2,000. And here's why: The increase would have entailed additional taxes of $755 and inflation had already taken away $2,051—the price of a small bungalow in 1939.

The way things are going now (and who's trying to stop it?), in 1975 a single man will have to have an income of $10,538 to match in buying power a 1939 income of $2,000.

Are you sure you have had enough?

Eyes on the ABA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York News of February 18:

EYES ON THE ABA

The House Committee on Un-American Activities this week released a report entitled "Communist Legal Subversion," detailing activities of a small knot of Red lawyers who act as an "elite corps" to push their cause in U.S. courts.

Eight of these characters operate in New York, including John J. Abt, Nathan Witt, and Harry Sacher.

All Commy lawyers, remarked the committee, should be disbarred. It is foolish and dangerous to let persons dedicated to our Government's violent overthrow act as officers of this country's courts.

HOW ABOUT THAT 1958 DOCUMENT?

Ross L. Malone, new American Bar Association president, welcomed the committee's report with loud cheers. Mr. Malone added that he was sending copies to all State bar associations for appropriate action.

We hope he gets it—though we wouldn't bet on it in the case of New York City, where local bar associations have long been extremely tender about traitors in their ranks.

We also hope Mr. Malone will stand fast against what looks like a conspiracy to force the ABA to disavow the smashing, slashing 1958 report of its special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives.

This document, drawn up under the direction of Peter Campbell Brown, astutely analyzed Red methods in the United States, and summed up the worst 204 of the Earl Warren Supreme Court's pro-Communist decisions. Through some finagling not yet cleared up, it was partially sidetracked at the ABA's Los Angeles convention last year.

Nevertheless, it got into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD via Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican of New Hampshire; is now circulated at 10 cents a copy by America's Future, Inc., 542 Main Street, New Rochelle, N.Y.; and continues invaluable to anybody who wants to know how U.S. Reds operate.

The question now is: Will the ABA board of governors and house of delegates, at their Chicago meetings February 20–21 and 23–24, respectively, adopt as an official ABA paper some watered-down version of the 1958 report, making little if any reference to the Warren court, and throw out the 1958 document?

Keep an eye on these ABA metings, folks. They'll give you an idea as to the courage or otherwise of the ABA's top brass.

Coal Files New Protest With United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herewith an editorial entitled "Coal Files New Protest With United States," which appeared in the February 18, 1959, issue of the Messenger of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

COAL FILES NEW PROTEST WITH UNITED STATES

The National Coal Association called on the Washington Government last week to impose mandatory restrictions on the import of cheap foreign residual oil being dumped on our shores. The NCA formal protest called such imports a threat to the national security.

The coal association, speaking for producers of two-thirds of the Nation's commercially mined soft coal, filed the statement with the Office of Civilian and Defense Mobilization, which is conducting an investigation of the oil import situation—a situation which is costing the jobs of several thousand American miners.

The Office is expected to recommend a new program late this month to the Cabinet Committee on Oil Imports, which in turn will make recommendations to President Eisenhower.

The coal industry says President Eisenhower has both the power and the responsibility to clamp import controls on residual oil if they are imposed on crude petroleum. NCA points out that Congress has provided that when imports of any product are limited in the interest of national security, imports of its derivatives must also be limited.

Where is the logic in controlling importation of crude oil to prevent the impairment of national security, and, at the same time, allowing the unrestricted flow into the country of residual fuel oil? It is a fair question, this one which was posed to the mobilization office.

As NCA puts it:

"Uncontrolled imports of residual fuel oil contribute substantially to cutting coal production capacity and distribution below the level required for national defense.

"The future threats of unlimited residual imports inhibit the growth of the coal industry to meet projected defense requirements.

"The concentrated use of imported residual oil by eastern seaboard industry makes this industry unusually vulnerable to interruption by enemy action."

It should be plain to everybody that electric utilities and industrial plants along our east coast have, through dependency upon cheap foreign oil, mostly from Venezuela, developed a "built-in vulnerability" which could be serious in wartime.

NCA points out that tankers carrying this oil to our east coast could be sunk or blockaded in wartime, depriving the heavily industrialized Atlantic seaboard of much of its energy supply.

This would create a demand for more than 150 million additional tons of soft coal, though foreign oil imports are so weakening the coal industry that there is great doubt that it could expand production to meet sudden new demands.

The number of operating coal mines has declined from 9,429 to 7,855 since 1950. Closed mines cannot be easily reopened—in fact, it would be as easy to open new mines in emergency, which takes 2 to 4 years.

Anybody but bureaucrats, it would seem, could see the folly of tearing down our country's coal mines and building up Poland, Venezuela, and West Germany and other fuel-producing areas which for some years past have been smiled upon by Washington.

It will be interesting to see if the new protests succeed where former protests have produced nothing but vague expressions of interest.

Forty-six Thousand Scholarships by United States Is Ridiculous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Bureau County Republican which emphasizes that private funds are, and will continue to do a good job of providing scholarships for qualified college students without the intervention and encroachment of the Federal Government:

[From the Bureau County Republican, Princeton, Ill., Feb. 19, 1959]

OUR OPINION—FORTY-SIX THOUSAND SCHOLARSHIPS BY THE UNITED STATES IS RIDICULOUS

National total of 10,000 high school students, including Lorinne Lane of Princeton High School, have reached the finals of the 1958–59 national merit scholarship program, and 700 of this number will be named merit scholars.

Names of the 10,000 certificate of merit winners will be sent to colleges for consideration for thousands of other privately financed scholarships.

Interest by the National Merit Scholarship Corp. and numerous other private agencies in helping worthy students obtain recognition toward scholarships points up the silliness of the proposal this week by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, that the Federal Government finance 46,000 scholarships.

Over 478,000 students were tested in the national merit scholarship program. Those most worthy of help in obtaining higher education have been located by this testing program. Private funds are doing a good job without intervention of the Federal Government.

For ordinary citizens to warn Congress against extravagant intrusion into the fields in which people are meeting their needs seems futile with the present composition of Congress, but it nevertheless is the responsibility of every citizen to hammer home at every opportunity the necessity for this Government to restrict its activities to those fields where Government funds are needed.

A Letter to Nikita Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge has been a unique and effective force in inculcating in Americans of all walks of life a real appreciation of the form of government under which our Nation has achieved its enviable position of world leadership, internal strength, record of spiritual and material growth, and solid foundation for the future.

The annual awards to individuals who speak up for freedom are an inspiration to a wide variety of citizens to inspire in their fellow countrymen greater devotion to our concepts of liberty.

Among this year's award winners is a man who wears the uniform of the Armed Forces of the United States, a citizen of California, Lt. Col. T. N. Greene, now on active duty with the Marine Corps at Quantico, Va. For his essay, entitled "A Letter to Nikita Khrushchev," he was cited as author of the most penetrating article on the subject, "My Part in Winning Friends for Freedom." He is winner of the top award of an encased George Washington Honor Medal and the principal prize for members of our Armed Forces.

Because of the inspirational character of Colonel Greene's entry, I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV,
The Kremlin,
Moscow, U.S.S.R.

DEAR MR. KHRUSHCHEV: Don't look now. There's someone behind you.

You say you will bury us. You say the peoples of the world yearn for change. You claim change will pull the rug out from under the world we know. And so, Mr. Khrushchev, your agents swarm like termites gnawing and boring in a thousand dark and rotting beams. You count too much on tearing down, on destruction, despair, and decay.

Revolution truly is loose in the world today. Change does come. Rotten beams are tumbling. But Mr. Khrushchev, this is a revolution begun in 1776 and clearly stamped "Made in U.S.A."

Do you think Americans fear a changing world? Listen, Mr. Khrushchev:

There was taxation without representation. We changed that.

Soldiers quartered in private homes. We changed that.

The cold hand of tyranny choked life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We changed that, too.

And we changed slavery, and child labor, and the 80-hour workweek, and poverty, and ignorance, and sickness.

We changed them by building up, by building a better world. That job's just begun.

Today our money and our skills work around the world, building economies with more jobs, more goods, more prosperity for all to share.

Our technicians share their secrets—how to grow more food on this plot of ground, how to stamp out that plague, how to teach, to learn, to progress.

And our arms, our might, and our sons help our friends patrol the beat, guarding the new world we build from wreckers, vandals, and firebugs.

More than 160 million apostles of freedom are agents of revolution on your terms. We stand for those inalienable rights with which each man is endowed by his Creator. Each American abroad—the serviceman, the technician, the tourist—carries subversion toward the tools of tyranny: the sudden knock on the door, the rifle butt, the concentration camp, the knout, and the enforced work quota. We'll change them. And we'll change the invitations to tyranny on which you count: Lunger, poverty, disease, and ignorance.

Tremble, Mr. Khrushchev, but you can't turn back the clock. We bring change—light and free air to the dark places on which you and your kind feed. Let your dupes froth and scream, "Yankee, go home." We won't go home.

Not until the world is on the march toward a better life for all.

You shall not herd the peoples of the world, dragging their chains, behind your bloody, red banners.

Even now, nation to nation and man to man we join hands in our living revolution to change the world and build a better tomorrow. We march proudly, heads high as befits freemen. Hear the fife and drum, as they have since 1776, pipe the music that strikes fear to tyrants—the march of freedom.

Yes, Mr. Khrushchev, there's someone behind you, and he's coming closer.

A YANKEE WHO WON'T GO HOME.
Lt. Col. T. N. GREENE,
U.S. Marine Corps.

QUANTICO, VA.

Fifty Chambers of Commerce Protest Misrepresentations of U.S. Chamber of Commerce on TVA and Causes Change in Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the United States Chamber of Commerce during the past several months has published many misleading statements regarding the operations and programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Many of these were so remarkable in the misrepresentation of facts about the TVA that in view of many it has reflected on the integrity

of the U.S. chamber. More than 50 chambers of commerce in the Tennessee Valley area have protested these misrepresentations, and several southern chambers of commerce have resigned from the U.S. chamber. More recently, the U.S. chamber has modified its position as a result of these protests. This week the policy committee of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce held hearings on this subject. In this connection, Mr. George R. Dempster, former mayor of Knoxville, and Mr. Will C. Mickle, editor of the Huntsville Times of Huntsville, Ala., appeared before the above-mentioned policy committee on behalf of the more than 50 chambers of commerce in the Tennessee Valley. Following these hearings, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has announced that it has modified its position on the TVA.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to have reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement made by Mr. Dempster and Mr. Mickle, and the Associated Press report on the hearings and the chamber's decision to change its policy.

The statement and the AP report follow:

STATEMENT BEFORE THE U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE POLICY COMMITTEE IN WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 17, 1959

(By George R. Dempster and Will C. Mickle for the Associated Tennessee Valley Chambers of Commerce)

We come before you today as members of the chamber of commerce. Specifically, we represent more than 50 chambers of the Tennessee Valley—members of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce which you represent—which have banded together as the Associated Tennessee Valley Chambers of Commerce to promote the valley region and to protect its interests wherever possible.

Today we ask you, as policymakers for the organization to which we all belong, to reconsider a statement of chamber policy which we believe detrimental to the valley and to the Nation.

We refer to the statement of policy contained in the U.S. Chamber publication, "TVA: What's Next?"

In its place we urge a new policy based on unbiased fact—not on misrepresentations and incomplete facts—a policy aimed at improving the welfare of all the Nation—not on improving the welfare of a select group of citizens or corporations.

It is not our purpose here to argue point by point the many misrepresentations that run through the publication, "TVA: What's Next?" To a sufficient extent that has already been done by TVA itself.

We presume you are familiar with the TVA's comments on the publication. However, in the event you are not, a copy of those comments is submitted with this statement.

We do want to protest the obvious bias, unfairness, and lack of objectivity of the publication. We regard it as an imposition on the public, to which it is presented as representing the well thought out, well grounded conclusions of a responsible business organization.

More specifically, we protest it as a disservice to the members of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. And we mean all members of the chamber, not simply those members located in the Tennessee Valley region which have had experience with TVA and have watched its work for a quarter of a century.

We submit that the publication is even more unfair to those members scattered throughout the rest of the country who, having no direct experience or observation, have no way of judging its validity and must accept it at face value.

In fact, the character of the report, to our mind, is such that if the research staff of a private corporation were to submit such a report to its officials as a basis for reaching a sound decision, they would be promptly sent back to do the job over again. They would be asked to bring in all the pertinent facts, and not a selected variety; they would be asked to place the report in the proper context of public policy and practice; they would be asked to recommend progressive steps to achieve greater effectiveness, not a policy of retrogression which would sacrifice the gains that have been made in technology and administrative efficiency.

On all these scores, the publication is deficient. It treats TVA as an isolated phenomenon in the field of Federal resource development activities, falsely assuming that it is a special favor to a particular region. The fact is that this project is well within the traditional framework of national policy with respect to the development of natural resources and within the policies on the character of utilities as a public service. Counterparts of TVA's activities are carried on in other regions and river valleys across the Nation.

If there is one aspect which should be carefully weighed by a business association such as the chamber, it should be the effect of TVA activities on business and industry. Yet this publication ignores, if it does not positively exclude, virtually all the evidence that TVA has been a boon and a stimulus to private enterprise, not only in the Tennessee Valley but in other important areas as well.

The efficiency and economy of large, integrated power areas served by central stations with high capacity, economical, and efficient generating units and interconnecting transmission lines has been well established by experience. Such systems take advantage of improved technology. Yet this publication, in effect, proposes breaking up a large and efficient operating system, modern in every respect, into smaller, less economic and less efficient units. This is a proposal which no business man, in his own affairs, would countenance for an instant.

The objective inherent in the publication is the destruction of TVA. Indeed, "TVA: What's Next?" quotes approvingly from the earlier publication of the chamber's natural resources department, "The Continuing Cost of TVA," to this effect:

"The job is not to patch up TVA to make it acceptable, or even less objectionable. No corporate creation of Congress should be continued unless there is a clear, definable public interest to be served that cannot be served in any other way."

What is meant by "any other way"? By ignoring some of the other factors of public interest, electric service could of course be provided in the Tennessee Valley by other means than at present. However, today that power is provided by a system that is an integral part of a broader project producing multiple benefits. After a fashion, power could still be provided if, as apparently advocated by the natural resources department, this integrated system were broken down and the power system itself fragmented into smaller units.

It is difficult to see what public interest would be served by thus returning the Tennessee Valley region to outmoded, uneconomic practices that have been left behind, wherever possible, by the electric utility industry itself.

That this would endanger the national defense in a time of extreme tension—that it would put in question power supplies to the Atomic Energy Commission, Air Force research facilities, and missile and space research installations, not to speak of basic electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries—is apparently of no concern to the authors of "TVA: What's Next?"

One of the most carefully ignored, or carefully suppressed, facts about TVA in this publication is that for the past 4 years more than half of all the TVA power output has been devoted to atomic energy, air research, and space and missile research of vital importance to the whole Nation.

This omission by no means is the end of the effort. The intent to destroy is revealed in the facility with which your natural resources department switches—indeed reverses itself—to suit its purposes.

To wit: For the past several years the Administration has recommended and the people of the Tennessee Valley have urged that the Congress pass enabling legislation to permit the TVA to issue bonds in order to finance generating and transmitting facilities which are desperately needed to assure ample and continuing power supplies for the region now served by TVA power.

This the chamber opposes. It has provided witnesses from the utility industry to testify against the proposals in congressional committees and has opposed it in public statements. "TVA: What's Next?" complains that through this proposal TVA "would be practicaly assured that it will always be the sole supplier of electricity in an 80,000-square-mile area." This proposition is advanced as unique, although public utilities generally—whether publicly or privately owned—are by customer, law, and regulation the sole suppliers of their service areas.

In 1954, however, the situation was different. No bond proposal was before the Congress. No organizations or people in the valley region were urging it. What was the position of the chamber, or of its Natural Resources Department, then? The view was expressed in the publication "The Continuing Cost of TVA," as follows:

"Most all municipally owned and operated electric plants are now financed in whole or part through the sale of revenue bonds—i.e., bonds backed only by the anticipated revenue of the municipal utility. Surely the TVA, which as far back as 1945 produced more kilowatt hours than any other power system in the United States and which in 1952 alone had a gross power revenue of $95 million, could market its revenue bonds as easily as municipal plants can. And more positively: TVA power should be financed through the sale of revenue bonds."

We believe the conclusion to be drawn from these contradictory statements is inescapable. In 1954, the Natural Resources Department advocated financing TVA power through revenue bonds because it appeared that this would seriously embarrass, if it did not destroy, the TVA system. Today the TVA and the people of the Tennessee Valley are supporting revenue bonds as a sound and workable proposition which will enable the power system to go on meeting the electricity demands of the region efficiently and at reasonable rates.

Yet today, fearful that the valley region is right and that the proposition the national chamber itself advanced in 1954 is sound and workable, the chamber reverses itself and opposes it.

We believe it is time the chamber, as a responsible organization, put an end to this kind of patent chicanery.

The chamber puts itself in the position of advocating unbusinesslike procedures for TVA by elimination of the sole supplier clause from its contracts. What private utility would build generating capacity, transmission lines, and substations to serve a large wholesale customer and then fail to protect its investment by assuring that the facilities would be used to supply the cus-

tomer over a reasonable period of time? Common business sense dictates the answer. Aside from this, it must be remembered that the contracts are equitable and advantageous to both parties. What municipality, cooperative, or industry would sign a contract with a wholesale supplier of electricity, publicly or privately owned, without concrete assurance that its power supply would be continuously available over a reasonable term of years?

As similarly destructive measure, the natural resources department would turn over operation of the TVA dams to the Army engineers and split up other resource development functions among other Government departments. If this splintering and devisiveness could be shown to contribute to the efficiency and effectiveness of the resource development activities carried on in the Tennessee Valley as part of the national policy, then by all means it should be done.

But no case can be made for it; certainly the natural resources department has made no such case. On the contrary, the Tennessee is generally conceded to be the best-managed river in the country, yielding a balanced measure of benefits of all kinds—flood control, navigation, generation of power, municipal and industrial water supplies, malaria control, recreation, fish and wildlife development. One of the major reasons for this high degree of achievement is the fact that all these related operations and activities are under a unified administrative control. The proposal to emasculate an efficiently working system can only be regarded as destructive in purpose.

These are only a few of the ways in which the chamber, through the publications of its natural resources department, has placed itself on record with respect to TVA as advocating unsound and unbusinesslike policies and procedures.

We believe that it is time that the national chamber reassess its position on the TVA and, in the interest not only of an important region but of the Nation itself, assert itself on the side of progress.

[From the Huntsville (Ala.) Times]

CHAMBER GROUP BOWS ON TVA—COMMITTEE BACKS DOWN ON POLICY—VOTES TO DROP STAND AGAINST AGENCY IN NATIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE STATEMENT—FULL MEMBERSHIP APPROVAL NEEDED

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Chamber of Commerce's policy committee yesterday acceded to a request from local chambers in the Tennessee Valley area and backtracked on its stand against the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The U.S. Chamber has long demanded that the Federal Government get rid of TVA's power facilities.

But the policy committee voted to eliminate any reference to the future of TVA power from the organization's policy statement.

The proposed change will go before the chamber's annual membership meeting in April for acceptance or rejection.

SPOKESMEN APPEAR

The action came one day after spokesmen for 50 valley chamber units appeared before the policy committee and voiced strong disapproval of the U.S. Chamber's stand on TVA.

The group called for a new policy "based on unbiased facts * * * not on misrepresentation and incomplete facts." It was particularly critical of a U.S. chamber publication called "TVA: What's Next?" referring to what it said was the "obvious bias, unfairness and lack of objectivity" of the booklet.

The chamber has been urging since the start of the TVA that the authority's power facilities be turned over to local or State organizations, either public or private, for operation. This would have been done under a plan agreed upon by Congress and the valley States.

Under the proposed change, the chamber's policy statement no longer would say what it wants done with the TVA power facilities.

STILL OPPOSES CONTRACTS

But the policy committee reaffirmed its long-standing opposition to sole supplier TVA contracts, and issuance of revenue bonds by the authority.

Smith explained that under present contracts, purchasers of power from the TVA now must buy all their electricity from the authority. By eliminating this requirement, he said, power buyers could build their own plants for part of their power needs, or buy some of their requirements from other sources, such as private utilities.

A STEP IN RIGHT DIRECTION, MOST VALLEY OFFICIALS SAY

The national chamber of commerce policy committee's change brought a generally favorable reaction in the valley last night.

Most officials interviewed agreed with former Memphis Chamber of Commerce president J. T. Roach and a leader in the fight there that the decision was "a step in the right direction."

Some, however, felt that the U.S. chamber did not go far enough.

Here are some of the comments:

Brig. Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, chairman of the TVA board:

"I am delighted at the policy committee's action.

"The people who went up there to Washington did a fine job and are to be congratulated. I hope this means that from now on the chamber of commerce will take a broader view of the problem of developing an adequate power supply for the Nation."

George Dempster, former mayor of Knoxville and one of two spokesmen for the protesting Associated Tennessee Valley Chambers of Commerce, who appeared before the policy committee:

"It's better than we thought. We had about 45 minutes with them (the committee) and we roughed 'em up to the best of our ability. I asked them how many had ever been in the valley and only about half of them raised their hands.

"I told them: 'Gentlemen, you're not in any position to tell us what to do.'"

Public Policy, Rural Electrification, and the Farm Telephone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable achievements of the past quarter of a century is the extension of electricity and telephone service to the farms of America. No one can fully measure the benefits that have come to rural families in the form of electric lights, washing machines, refrigeration, telephones, and power equipment, all of which have lightened the labors and enriched the lives of farm families.

Both rural electrification and rural telephone service have been made possible largely through low-cost Federal loans to farmers' cooperatives. It is gratifying to know that this grassroots experiment in rural democracy has actually returned a profit to the Government as cooperatives have honored their loans and paid them back ahead of schedule. Furthermore, the program has brought countless millions of dollars to the mainstreets of America, as farmers have purchased electrical equipment and appliance of all kinds.

Recently, I have been alarmed by Federal practices and proposals that jeopardize the continued growth and reasonable operation of the REA program. The proposal in the President's current budget message that REA interest rates be increased would, if actually applied, stifle rural electrification and telephone service.

The REA's for more than two decades have paid back their loans at the present 2-percent rate to the mutual benefit of both themselves and the American public.

Even if one recognizes that the administration has deliberately raised its own costs of borrowing money above the 2-percent level, it would be a wise public investment for the REA program to be conducted as in the past. Vast Federal outlays were made to build the Nation's railway system and other needed services. Why not a small investment in the blessings of rural electricity? Or better still, why not a rollback of interest rates so that the Government can once again borrow its needed funds at a reasonable level?

In a recent column, Sylvia Porter, the financial analyst, points out that during World War II, military spending sent our national debt to $280 billion. The interest charge on that debt was $4.7 billion. "Today, the debt is about the same, $283 billion," writes Miss Porter. "Yet, the interest payment is much higher, up to $8 billion. This has been no accidental swelling in interest payments," she writes. "Instead, it has been the result of deliberate policies adopted at the higher policymaking levels in Washington."

I feel sure that many of my colleagues believe as I do that we must fight any disruption of the REA program that would certainly be caused by jumping interest rates on the rural electric association loans.

Recently, I received from Mr. Lawrence Stoley, Highmore, S. Dak., the secretary of the South Dakota Rural Telephone Association, a copy of the resolutions passed by that distinguished association at its annual meeting. I have also been honored recently with an invitation to address the annual meeting of the National Telephone Cooperative Association in Washington.

Believing that they will be of interest to my colleagues, I include a copy of the South Dakota resolutions, together with the text of my remarks to the national association:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN GEORGE S. McGOVERN TO THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 7, 1959

I feel honored to appear before the National Telephone Cooperative Association. Since I have lived most of my life in the agricultural heartland of America, your work has long been of keen interest to me.

I have enjoyed my associations with your colleauges in South Dakota and the able staff representing your interests here in Washington. You have made progress in spite of heavy odds. I admire your spirit and determination. You have my support and that of many of my colleagues as you continue your efforts to build a healthy and prosperous rural America.

Never before has American agriculture been faced with so clear a worldwide challenge. We are the possessors of a mighty weapon—agricultural abundance in a hungry world. I use the word "weapon" in referring to the only kind of war the American people want to fight, the war against poverty and hunger and disease. That is why I have sponsored in the Congress a "Food for Peace Resolution," which calls upon our Government to use our farm surplus as a tool for freedom and peace.

More than ever before, our Nation needs men of vision and courage of the type exemplified by the people comprising your organization. As we meet here today, our Nation is caught up in a titanic struggle for military and scientific supremacy. All the world and the space beyond has suddenly been turned into an enormous laboratory, with the launching of globe-circling satellites a commonplace occurrence.

As we concentrate more and more on scientific achievement, I believe a word of caution is in order. Just as we have learned that man cannot live by bread alone, so we should not forget that a nation cannot live by science alone. Our concentration on the secrets of outer space must not replace our concern over the welfare of our fellow human beings. Our world needs more than ever the timeless message of the Good Samaritan.

Given that premise, I see no reason why a nation which has the brainpower to put a half dozen man-made satellites into orbit in outer space, send an atomic-powered submarine beneath the polar icecap, and break the speed of sound, cannot find a way to achieve for its rural people a standard of living equal to that of its city dwellers. Is it too much to ask that farmers receive an income comparable to urbanites and enjoy such blessings as the telephone?

Basically, I believe our farm problem is one of attitude—a misplacement of values. If, for instance, the present administration had as much concern for farmers as it does for the investment bankers, most of your problems would vanish. You would have two telephones in every farm home and an extra one in the barn.

Of course, farmers do not enjoy such favor. I do not want to be partisan today but it is a fact that when this administration took over the reigns of government, it set out to flex farm prices downward and interest rates upward. Since 1952 farmers have lost about $18 billion in income. On the other hand, the money lenders have increased their incomes many billions of dollars.

Last week the President's budget message denounced the farm price support program and called for virtual abandonment of the parity concept for farm prices. He gave as his reason the excessive cost of the farm program—not taking note of the fact that much of this cost stems from Secretary Benson's mismanagement and mistaken views.

Significantly enough, the interest on the national debt in this fiscal year will cost us $8 billion—highest in history and the second largest item on the President's budget. Only the defense outlay costs more. Yet the President said nothing about reducing the exorbitant interest rates we are paying the investment bankers holding Government notes. As a matter of fact he implied that higher interest rates were forthcoming. And you and I get socked more and more on all of the money we borrow. The budget message clearly calls for an increase in interest rates on REA loans—an increase which would throttle rural electrification and rural telephone expansion.

I do want to discuss the rural telephone program now and offer some suggestions. But I felt it important to quickly sketch in a few broad background strokes.

The drive to bring modern communications to rural America began a half century ago. It progressed nicely through the years just following World War I when 38 percent of all farm homes were equipped with telephones.

Then came the 1920's, a steadily deteriorating farm economy, followed by the depression years. The rural telephone program languished for more than 2 decades. In 1945, there were actually fewer telephones on farms than there were in 1920. It was then that farmers, having climbed out the economic basement, began a concerted drive once again for an effective rural telephone program.

With the support of farmers the Nation over, and the help of friends in Congress, you and others like you pushed through a new Telephone Act in 1949. On October 28 of that year President Truman signed it into law.

It was a program of great promise and farmers' hopes were high. But, if I interpret correctly letters I have received from my constituents and official Government reports, the vast potentiality of the act has not been realized.

The information that has come to me leads me to conclude that the rural telephone program is in need of a booster charge.

A decade has gone by since the program was passed. Yet the percentage of farm homes with telephones has only increased from 38 percent to 56 percent.

Henry Ward Beecher once said: "Laws and institutions are constantly tending to gravitate. Like clocks, they must be occasionally cleaned and wound up, and set to true time."

Clearly, the rural telephone program has gravitated away from its original purpose. And just as clearly, it needs to be brought up to date in light of mid-20th century living conditions.

Actually, there doesn't seem to be any singel roadblock holding the program back, but a combination of many.

For one thing, telephone co-ops have been plagued by restrictive rulings. Take, for instance, the equity fund requirement for cooperatives. This has been a tremendous hurdle. I know it has been modified somewhat because I was working with your representatives including Dick Dell at the time it was changed. We had been putting pressure on the people administering the program for a long time. But we all know the problem has not been eliminated. Further special considerations for cooperatives are necessary.

The fact that you must borrow your money from the Federal Government complicates matters, when you have an unfriendly administration in power. It is no secret that this administration is cool, if not hostile, toward your program.

Look at the President's budgetary recommendations for next year. Like those of the other years, his request for the rural telephone programs is too small to do the job. Fortunately, Congress has refused to go along with the President's telephone budget in the past and I feel confident that we will increase it this year.

It is bad enough to struggle with insufficient funds, but now the White House wants to increase interest rates on the money you borrow. I promise you that I, for one, will fight this move with all my strength. You need higher interest rates on your loans like a drowning man needs a millstone around his neck. You know it, and I know it.

Furthermore, the administration knows it. Just last year REA Administrator Hamil said in a statement before a Senate committee:

"I have loan applications that have come to me in REA, particularly in the telephone program where an increased interest rate would be difficult to handle. As a matter of fact, Senator, I have had applications in the telephone program that we have been unable to grant with a 2 percent interest rate."

It seems obvious that the administration is deliberately trying to freeze both the rural telephone and the rural electric programs.

Certainly it has given no indication that it intends to tailor its policies in accordance with the intentions of Congress, reiterated last spring by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. In its report, the committee said:

"The committee feels that the Rural Electrification Administration has a responsibility for assisting and promoting rural telephone cooperatives where necessary to secure telephone service to farmers."

The progress report on REA's telephone loans reveals, however, that this admonition has not been carried out. It shows that as of December 1957, REA had approved loans to 205 cooperative-type borrowers and 371 commercial company borrowers. As of December 1958, aggregate loans approved to cooperatives totaled 209, with loans approved to 429 commercial borrowers. Last year, REA approved loans to 62 new borrowers. Of these, 58 were commercial companies and only 4 were cooperatives. That's a 14 to 1 ratio. Furthermore, the official report shows that 75 percent of the total money loaned went to commercial borrowers. It is quite evident again that the administration has little stomach for promoting telephone cooperatives.

No one would quarrel with this record, if it represented the most effective means of getting service into the remote rural areas. But the truth is that it does not.

As of December 1958, telephone cooperatives were serving approximately 2.5 subscribers per mile of line. In contrast, the commercial companies were serving nearly twice as many—4.6 subscribers per mile of line. It is obvious which type borrowers is serving the sparsely populated areas. It is also clear which type borrowers has the greatest expenditure to make in getting started. When a cooperative gets a loan from REA, it can retain on the average of 32 miles of line in its old system. The commercial companies on the average retain about 77 miles of line.

Thus two points become clear: Cooperatives are the most effective instrument for getting service into the thinly populated areas, and they have greater handicaps to overcome than do their commercial counterparts.

On the face of the record, it is evident that we have a program suffering from malnutrition. To write a proper recovery prescription, we should do what all good doctors do with an ailing patient. Diagnose the trouble and take steps to correct the ailment.

Knowing that the commercial telephone companies do not like the RTA program, you can expect no help from that quarter. The Rural Electrification Administration itself seems preoccupied with the maintenance of an alleged neutrality policy, which says: "Don't do anything to offend anyone." All this seems to place the responsibility for improvement squarely on your shoulders.

For my part, I offer to you whatever assistance that is within the power of my office. I want to discuss legislation with you which you feel necessary to your program, and I would be happy and willing to meet with your representatives anytime to work out feasible proposals. May I suggest some steps we ought to consider immediately.

As a starting point, I would like to suggest the possibility of doing something about getting town and country to join forces in the extension of rural lines. Perhaps the time has come when we should raise or

eliminate altogether the 1,500-population limitation that is now in the act.

We need also to fully explore the problem of cooperatives that are prevented from adding rural subscribers to their membership roles because they are barred from making the central town or small city a part of the same system.

Experience in the rural electric program has taught us that there would have been no program if REA personnel had not gone out into the rural areas and actually organized many cooperatives themselves. Perhaps the same type of assistance and promotion is needed here.

It may be that we should provide legislation transferring the funds and responsibility for co-op promotion from REA to the Farmer Cooperative Service, a branch of the Department of Agriculture exclusively devoted to cooperative problems and their solution. The best co-op talent in the Department could be brought into full play in this way. Since all agencies are now fully assimilated into the Department as a result of the Secretary's reorganization, I do not believe this transfer of assignment would cause any administrative problem. On the contrary, I believe the change would expedite the program.

Finally, Congress should move now to end the 10 percent wartime imposed excise tax on telephone service both for rural and city users. This is a discriminatory tax that was added as a war emergency measure which should be repealed.

I have touched upon a few of the more important points demanding attention in the rural telephone program. Before this fine convention concludes, I am sure you will have discussed many more.

Sometime prior to the time you leave this convention city for your homes, I would suggest that you pay a visit to your Congressmen and Senators up on the Hill. Sit down with them. Inform them of your problems. I can assure you, you will find willing listeners. Many of them look to you for guidance and leadership in this technical field.

When you get back to your homes, talk up the rural telephone cause among your neighbors at every opportunity. Marshall your strength. It is imperative that you revitalize your program. If you chart your course of action properly, and stick to it, I have no doubt that the promise of the Rural Telephone Act of 1949 will be fulfilled, as your part in the building of a more abundant rural America.

ANNUAL MEETING, SOUTH DAKOTA RURAL TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, MARVIN HUGHITT HOTEL, HURON, S. DAK., DECEMBER 12, 1958

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

1. Increased interest rates

Whereas the President and the Administration appear determined to increase REA interest rates by two or three fold; and

Whereas it is also proposed to increase the cost of financing still further by adding administrative costs on to and in addition to the regular interest; and

Whereas the rural electrification and rural telephone programs have successfully operated over the past years at the normal 2 percent interest rate and have shown a profit to the United States Treasury; and

Whereas the present loans made to rural telephone cooperatives are made to serve rural areas with low density and low operating revenue; and

Whereas approximately 50 percent of the rural population does not have adequate telephone service; and

Whereas good telephone service to all areas of the United States is vital to the defense of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States vigorously oppose any increase in REA interest rates and that the present interest rate of 2 percent be maintained and preserved.

2. Federal telephone excise tax

Whereas the Federal telephone excise tax was initiated as a wartime measure, and justified in the name of the national defense; and

Whereas the Federal telephone excise tax is still in effect, and continues to work an undue hardship on the rural telephone cooperative program; and

Whereas an excise tax is not in keeping with the concept which prevails under our Federal tax laws in that it is a form of regressive taxation, not in keeping with the concept of ability to pay and burdens those least able to pay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we here at the annual South Dakota Rural Telephone Cooperative Association meeting condemn this discriminatory tax and petition the Congress this session for its immediate repeal.

3. Encourage development of telephone cooperatives

Whereas the major portion of REA telephone loans are now being made to commercial companies, and

Whereas many areas now needing telephone service are undesirable to commercial companies, and

Whereas formation of cooperatives seems to be the only way in which such service may be made available to such areas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That REA be requested to encourage organization of cooperatives to provide such service.

4. Participation in NRECA insurance program

Whereas the NRECA has made available its retirement and security program to telephone cooperatives, and

Whereas this provides a plan tailored to the needs of telephone cooperatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That all telephone cooperatives in the State be encouraged to participate in this group insurance plan.

5. REA service to telephone cooperatives

Whereas a number of telephone cooperatives find it difficult to set up an accounting system acceptable to REA: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That REA increase the number of field auditors to meet this need.

6. REA Administrator

Whereas the REA Act of 1935 provided for the strict nonpartisan administration of REA, by stipulating the appointment of an Administrator by the President of the United States, with confirmation by the Senate, for a 10-year term, to insure the nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration of REA; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture, did in 1957, require that all loans to REA borrowers of $500,000 or more, and that all loans of any amount requested by new borrowers, be reviewed by the Secretary's office: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the South Dakota Rural Telephone Cooperative Association, in annual meeting assembled, apprise the Congress of the United States of its vigorous opposition to any and all impairment of the authority of the Administrator as granted by the REA Act of 1935; and be it further

Resolved, That this association urge the Congress of the United States, as soon as it convenes in 1959 to pass a bill which would clearly and completely restore to the Administrator of REA all authority and functions vested in him by the REA Act of 1935.

John N. Robertson, Director of Highways for the District of Columbia Since 1948, Retires

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected and best liked of the public officials of the District of Columbia is John N. Robertson, who has served as Director of Highways for the District since September 1948. Mr. Robertson began work with the District of Columbia Department of Highways in April 1917. He has been concerned with the streets and highways of the District of Columbia in various capacities for almost 42 years.

The Nation's Capital will lose one of its most valuable public servants at the end of this month, when Mr. Robertson retires. He has been a progressive and forward looking leader, a forthright advocate of a highway program for the District that would handle the requirements of modern traffic loads while preserving the traditional and historic values of District streets and avenues. A large part of his effectiveness has been due to his natural friendliness of manner and his willingness to talk frankly and honestly with the proponents of all points of view. He has played a great role in the planning and execution of projects for Washington freeways.

His abilities are nationally recognized. He is a vice president of the American Association of State Highway Officials and a member of the executive committee of that organization. He is a past president of the American Road Builders' Association, and the present treasurer of that organization. I know of no highway official who is held in greater esteem and affection throughout the country.

In my work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, I have come to place a high value on his expert advice, and on his friendship.

The esteem with which John N. Robertson is regarded is well expressed in the following editorial, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on the occasion of the announcement of his retirement:

ROBERTSON'S RETIREMENT

The Commissioners are facing a tremendously tough job in finding a successor for Jack Robertson as city highway director. "J. N." has been synonymous with Washington highways for so long that he seems to most of us to symbolize them.

The reason, of course, is that that's exactly the way Mr. Robertson feels himself. As he recalls, he never has wanted to do anything but build roads here from the time he was "big enough to talk." A third-generation Washingtonian, he knows the city like the back of his hand and loves every bit of it. The District has reason to be proud of Mr. Robertson's accomplishments in the national field of highway legislation and administration. Locally, his contributions during 42 years in the department are too

numerous to single out. Just look out the window of your car the next time you drive; the chances are that Jack Robertson built or rebuilt the road you're on.

More than an exceptional public official, however, Mr. Robertson is a gentleman and a friend to thousands of Washingtonians who treasure the relationship. His mild temperament seldom gave way except in battles with planning and park officials over highway locations. When there were two sides to a question and one of them involved highways, however, Jack never faked any sympathy for the other side. His job was to build highways—and that's what he did.

It's no surprise that "J. N." and Mrs. Robertson intend to remain in Washington. Anything else would be unthinkable. Furthermore, our guess is that retirement isn't going to take him out of the picture. We'll look forward to hearing from him on the state of our highways for some time to come.

Senator Mundt Address at Joint Celebration of Four Patriotic Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report of the George Washington Memorial Services held in the U.S. Department of the Interior auditorium, February 22, sponsored by four of our patriotic organizations:

SENATOR MUNDT ADDRESS AT JOINT CELEBRATION OF FOUR PATRIOTIC ORGANIZATIONS

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 22, 1959.—This afternoon before a large and responsive audience gathered in the U.S. Department of the Interior auditorium, for the purpose of commemorating the 227th anniversary of the birth of George Washington, the Honorable KARL E. MUNDT, U.S. Senator from South Dakota, chose as the subject for his address: "Washington—Then and Now."

Today's observance was the 45th joint celebration of the birth of George Washington that has been sponsored by the District of Columbia Societies of the Children of the American Revolution, Sons of the American Revolution, Sons of the Revolution, and Daughters of the Revolution.

Conducting of this annual program rotates among the societies. This year the Children of the American Revolution, Mrs. Joseph P. Hall, senior State president, general chairman, and Miss Patience C. Veitch, State president, presiding, conducted the program.

Senator MUNDT briefly reviewed outstanding highlights in the life of George Washington and then stated that the governmental principles upheld by him are still applicable today. As evidence that Washington and others who aided him had great foresight, Senator MUNDT pointed out that the United States is now the only large nation that has continued to operate to date from its founding under the same basic principles. He called attention to the fact that in Washington's time certain people thought that he should be a king, and then others wished that he would accept nomination for a third term as President, but Washington declined and in doing so emphatically warned the Nation against the danger of one person having too much power, or continuing in office as President over too long a period.

Senator MUNDT tried to think of some of the things that Washington might have said had he addressed a patriotic meeting today. He felt that he would have again warned of too great power in too few hands, with particular reference toward today's tendency of centralized government.

As examples of the evils of overcentralized government, Italy and its downfall through fascism; Germany and nazism; and Russia and communism, were cited by Senator MUNDT.

In conclusion, Senator MUNDT stated that he was greatly pleased to find that organizations such as those sponsoring this observance were able to bring out a large audience, and he felt sure that with their patriotic zeal much had been done and would continue to be done to prevent disruption of the governmental principles of this country that have proved so trustworthy over the generations from George Washington's days to the present time.

Musical selections were presented by the orchestra of the U.S. Marine Band, M. Sgt. Ralph Bucca, conducting, before and during the program, also for the advancing and retiring of the colors.

Hoosier Guardsmen Defend Lives and Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago, the National Guard of the United States introduced a slogan which reads: "Sleep well tonight, your National Guard is awake." This slogan seemed most appropriate to those of us who appreciate the important role the guard plays in our Nation's defense picture, for we realize that without these thousands of citizen soldiers our manpower problem would indeed be critical.

Though this slogan was undoubtedly conceived to dramatize the guard's important position in defending our country, it carries an implication in Indiana that brings it much closer to Hoosier hearts and homes.

For it was National Guardsmen who, day and night, worked and fought to help control the rampaging ice and water of the flooding Wabash River. Called from their own homes and families, from their civilian occupations, these Hoosier Guardsmen built dikes of sandbags, they evacuated stranded families, they literally moved small communities to safety.

When they were called, they moved quickly and without confusion. There was no question about rations, about transportation, about equipment, or anything else. They were ready and they were trained.

Every one of us—and every freedom loving citizen of this country—should thank God for the National Guard. We can sleep well because the National Guard is awake. Just ask the families along the Wabash River Valley.

Friendly Relations Between Sewart Air Force Base and the People of Murfreesboro, Tenn., Point the Pattern for Civilian and Military Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of my colleagues the remarkable spirit of cooperation existing between the personnel of Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tenn., and the people of the adjoining city of Murfreesboro, both of which are located in the district which I have the honor to represent in the House.

This most commendable relationship is the subject of a letter from the Murfreesboro and Rutherford County Chamber of Commerce, to Col. Edwin R. Bane, base commander, and another letter from Colonel Bane addressed to me. It is also described in a brief article in the Air Force Times for January 7, 1959.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting these letters and article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The letters and article follow:

HEADQUARTERS,
839TH AIR BASE GROUP,
SEWART AIR FORCE BASE, TENN.,
February 9, 1959.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EVINS: You will recall that during your holiday season visit to Sewart Air Force Base, we discussed at length the friendly relationship and remarkable spirit of cooperation existing between Sewart personnel and the townspeople of Murfreesboro. During our conversation I displayed to you a letter from the Murfreesboro-Rutherford County Chamber of Commerce, endorsing our Base Exchange and commissary sales facility, which you felt to constitute such important evidence of our amicable community relationship that it might appropriately be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Since the writing of this letter, the directors of the chamber of commerce have further honored Sewart by electing its commander to permanent ex-officio membership on the board. I am enclosing, along with a copy of this letter, a clipping from the Air Force Times of January 7, 1959, which mentions this and several of the many other instances demonstrative of the natural friendliness of middle Tennesseans.

The feeling of belonging to a fine and progressive community, which the citizens of Murfreesboro have instilled in our personnel, has contributed in great measure to our unusually high reenlistment rate of 100 percent for December and 73.3 percent for the first 7 months of the current fiscal year. The hospitality of our civilian neighbors may thus be credited in part with the saving of many thousands of tax dollars which would otherwise have been expended for recruitment, training, and personnel movement.

For this tangible and the countless other less apparent results of their graciousness toward us, we at Sewart feel that the people of middle Tennessee cannot be praised too greatly nor thanked too much. We shall be as proud and grateful as they for any con-

gressional recognition of their contribution toward the defense effort.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN R. BANE,
Colonel, USAF, Base Commander.

MURFREESBORO AND RUTHERFORD COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
November 25, 1958.

Col. EDWIN R. BANE,
Commander, Sewart Air Force Base, Tenn.

DEAR COLONEL BANE: In the past the relationship of personnel at Sewart Air Force Base and the townspeople of Murfreesboro has been a credit to both communities. This amiable association is not limited to social contacts between individuals of our two communities but extends as well to business relations.

We feel that this friendly relationship in no way has been affected by the operation of the post exchange and commissary on your installation. We wish to commend the command at Sewart for the excellent manner in which these two facilities are operated. We feel that every effort has been made to carry on these activities in strict accord with the spirit in which they were established, that is, to promote the morale and general welfare of the personnel of our uniformed services without permitting undue competition with local civilian enterprise.

While it is a normal ambition of the civilian merchants to gain the largest possible portion of any available market, we feel that the contributions of base exchanges and commissaries outweigh any loss of trade these facilities might cause to them in civilian counterparts. We recognize, furthermore, that any savings gained by your personnel in trade with these two establishments are not lost to our local businessmen but instead are channeled into our economy through increased purchases of goods not available at these two facilities.

Therefore, we wish you to know that we look with favor upon these facilities at Sewart, maintained within their present limit, as to the type of items sold.

At the James K. Polk Hotel, a meeting of the members of the chamber of commerce unanimously voted to publicly endorse the operation of these facilities at your installation as permanent necessities of our Armed Forces personnel and we, the directors of the Murfreesboro and Rutherford County Chamber of Commerce, concur in their resolution.

Sincerely yours,

W. D. ADKERSON,
President, Chamber of Commerce.

[From the Air Force Times, Jan. 7, 1959]

COMMUNITY RELATIONS FIRST RATE AT SEWART

SEWART AIR FORCE BASE, TENN.—The personnel at this middle Tennessee base claim friendly relations with nearby Murfreesboro have reached the highest possible level.

Backing up this claim is the recent campaign by the city that netted $4,500 for a base beautification program. The money was raised by selling "Murfreesboro likes Stewart" posters to the city merchants.

The city has gone all out to give Sewart personnel a feeling of friendship. The beautification was just one of the things the city has started.

In an unprecedented move, the base exchange and commissary at Sewart were recently indorsed by a letter from the Murfreesboro-Rutherford County, Tenn., Chamber of Commerce. Drafted by the chamber's board of directors, the letter was received by Base Commander Col. Edwin R. Bane.

The letter said: "* * * the chamber of commerce unanimously voted to publicly endorse the operation of these facilities at your installation as permanent necessities of our Armed Forces personnel, and we, the directors of the Murfreesboro and Rutherford County Chamber of Commerce, concur in their resolution."

In another portion, the letter cited the state of mutual good relations existing here. "The relationship of personnel at the base is nicer than at any place I have ever been," is a common expression among newcomers.

An atmosphere of this type pays off in better morale among Air Force personnel. In turn, better morale increases efficiency, enabling the base to provide more defense per dollar.

A town of some 26,000 population, Murfreesboro is situated 17 miles south of Sewart. Although in an area which is primarily agricultural, Murfreesboro is a progressive city which is growing rapidly through the attraction of industry.

Many factors make the area attractive to industry, not the least of which is the quality and quantity of labor available. Marvin Beck, manager of a General Electric plant recently established here, has been impressed by the people he has employed.

"Our plant," he says, "reached its expected level of production well ahead of company requirements, and has continued to produce more than its quota. I attribute this to the industry and efficiency of our employees."

Crop Control Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of February 20, 1959:

CROP CONTROL FAILURE

The 17 million bushels of corn stored in bins owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation in the Peoria area are a monument to the failure of Government crop controls. Other millions of bushels are stored by the Government in private warehouses.

But this corn surplus is only part of the problem. The Government has more than doubled its facilities for storing grain in the last 8 years. It can now store more than 7½ billion bushels. But warehouses are full and the surplus continues to grow. If 1959 is a good crop year, more storage capacity will be needed.

The Government now owns about 1.3 billion bushels of wheat, enough to make all the bread the people of the United States will eat in 3 years.

These growing surpluses worry farmers, for obvious reasons. They worry others, too. The money which subsidized the production of so much grain that cannot be used came from the pockets of all taxpayers. Not only that, but the cost of storing the grain is a continued and growing expense to taxpayers. It is estimated that storage and interest charges on the funds tied up in surpluses will reach a rate of $1 billion a year this year. Peoria County taxpayers will pay about $1⅔ million of this. The average cost to every person in the United States is about $5.70 a year.

President Eisenhower, in his recent farm message to Congress, said that incentives for excess production should be cut. "The control program doesn't control," he declared, and he has plenty of evidence to prove it.

The President also pointed out that most of the Federal money spent to support farm prices and encourage overproduction has gone to a relatively few larger producers and has done little to help the farmers in the greatest difficulty.

President Eisenhower's appeal for abandoning mandatory high price supports makes good economic sense, but whether it makes good enough political sense remains to be seen.

Duel Over Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD a thoughtful editorial appearing in the Saturday, February 7, 1959, St. Louis Post-Dispatch. I am particularly anxious for my colleagues in the Congress who style themselves as liberals to read this editorial. Naturally, I am pleased with it because it says kind words about the administration's labor bill:

DUEL OVER LABOR LAW

The labor reform issue has produced a face-to-face duel between Secretary of Labor Mitchell and Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, two men avowedly interested in the 1960 political race. Senator KENNEDY is said by one reporter to have "moved in with the intensity of one who felt that his political future depended on this encounter."

Because of the Senator's overeagerness, we think, Secretary Mitchell made the better appearance. The Labor Secretary avoided attacking the Kennedy bill, and confined himself to defending his administration bill.

In general, the Kennedy and administration bills could be amalgamated with reference to union democracy and financial reports, if some spirit of compromise existed.

The Senator's principal targets, however, are the blackmail picketing and secondary boycott provisions of the administration bill. Neither one supports his charge that the bill is "an open invitation to collusion between corrupt employers and labor racketeers."

The bill would prohibit a union from picketing an employer if his employes showed no interest in joining the union. It would prohibit boycotts of an employer who is not a party to a labor dispute. Both proposals are fair. Neither invites collusion.

When he offered his limited bill, Senator KENNEDY argued that major amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act such as the administration's proposed restraints on boycotts and picketing be left for a separate measure because they were too controversial. Now he no longer disguises the fact he left them out of his bill because he is against them.

That is worth clearing up. It is also worth noting that his attack on the administration bill was mimeographed and given to reporters before Secretary Mitchell had even completed his testimony. Such hasty acts of partisanship can only muddle the labor issue and will not, we imagine, help anybody's presidential ambitions. Senator KENNEDY is a little too obviously trying to appear antilabor to some people and prolabor to others. That Secretary Mitchell may be doing the same thing does not justify Senator KENNEDY.

The public interest in this affair is an effective but moderate and nonpunitive labor law which includes reasonable restraints on picketing and secondary boycotts as well as rules for funds reporting and union democracy. The administration bill meets that requirement; the Kennedy bill does not.

Making the Employment Act of 1946 More Effective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on January 15 and 17, 1959, there were introduced in the House and Senate bills—H.R. 2561 and S. 497—to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to do two things:

First. Request the President to include in his Economic Report and annual economic program and recommendations a discussion of monetary and credit policies "to the same extent as all other policies affecting employment, production, and purchasing power."

Second. Assign to the Council of Economic Advisers in the Executive Office of the President the responsibility for holding public hearings on price or wage increases which appear to threaten economic stability and to issue advisory statements, where advisable, as to whether the proposed increases are justified.

Explanatory statements by the bills' authors, Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and myself, are contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 15, 1959, pages 665 to 666, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 17, 1959, pages 724 to 725.

The filing by the President of his Economic Report on January 20, 1959, and the weeks of hearings on this report which have been held by the Joint Economic Committee, have reinforced the need for the two amendments included in H.R. 2561 and S. 497. In addition, they have disclosed the need for three additional amendments to the Employment Act of 1946 in order to provide for its more effective administration. Comprehensive new bills, which include the two earlier amendments and the three additional ones, are accordingly being introduced by the same sponsors.

The text of H.R. 4870, introduced by me, follows:

H.R. 4870

A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide for its more effective administration and to bring to bear an informed public opinion upon price and wage increases which threaten economic stability

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1023) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6. It is the sense of Congress that the President, and the Federal Government, in executing this Act, shall give due effect to the following provisions of the Act:

"(a) The provision of section 2 setting forth the goals of maximum employment, production (including the concept of sustained growth), and purchasing power (including the concept of reasonable price stability).

"(b) The provisions of section 3(a) requiring the President to include in each year's economic report, in quantitative terms, the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power which he deems maximum, and current and foreseeable trends.

"(c) The provision of section 3(b) for the discretionary periodic transmittal of supplementary or revised recommendations.

"(d) The provisions of section 3(a)(3) for a review, and of sections 3(a)(4) and 3(b) for program and recommendations, including therein monetary and credit policies to the same extent as all other policies affecting employment, production, and purchasing power: *Provided*, That if the Federal agency directly responsible for the execution of such monetary and credit policies disagrees with such program and recommendations, the President shall report such disagreement to the Congress, together with a statement from the disagreeing agency of its reasons."

SEC. 2. Section 4(c) of the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1021 and the following) is amended by adding an additional subsection (c)(6) as follows:

"(6) to hold public hearings concerning (a) price increases, proposed in industries where most of the output is produced by relatively few firms, which increases appear to threaten economic stability, and (b) wage increases where the firm proposing such price increases declares such wage increases to be a cause of the price increases; to issue factual summaries of such hearings; and, where the Council deems it advisable, to issue advisory statements."

The first of the three new amendments explicitly declares that the statutory goal of the Employment Act of "maximum purchasing power"—which is a coordinate goal with maximum employment and maximum production—includes the concept of reasonable price stability. The ordinary meaning of "maximum purchasing power" would certainly seem to include "reasonable price stability." Maximum purchasing power can never be attained without reasonable price stability, since in an inflation, as we all know, incomes and hence purchasing power rise with great inequality. Moreover, the first two chairmen of the Council of Economic Advisers—1947–52—Dr. Edwin G. Nourse and Leon H. Keyserling, have both recently testified that the words "maximum purchasing power" of the act constitute an anti-inflationary mandate to bring about reasonable price stability.

The President, however, has cast doubt upon whether the Employment Act, as it is, really does contain the mandate of reasonable price stability. On January 20 the President asked the Congress "to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to make reasonable price stability an explicit goal of Federal economic policy, coordinate with the goals of maximum production, employment, and purchasing power now specified in that act." The first amendment, accordingly, explicitly adds the President's words "reasonable price stability" to the definition of the act's goals, without at the same time stigmatizing Dr. Nourse, Mr. Keyserling, and several thousand other reputable economists and public officials as wrong in thinking that reasonable price stability has been a goal of the act ever since 1946.

This amendment also explicitly states that the goal of the Employment Act of "maximum production" includes the concept of sustained growth. Economic growth is plainly comprehended by the term "maximum production," just as reasonable price stability is implied by "maximum purchasing power." However, the clarification of "maximum purchasing power" requires an equal clarification of what was intended by "maximum production."

The second of the three new amendments requires the President to include in his Economic Report the actual quantitative levels of employment, production, and purchasing power which he thinks are needed to carry out the act's goals—namely, maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. It would also require him to set forth current and foreseeable trends in the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power. Actually, the setting forth of these levels is required by the plain language of the 1946 act. The congressional mandate was faithfully adhered to by the executive branch from the first report in 1947 through 1952. In each case, a serious effort was made to project quantitative levels for employment, production, and purchasing power as they were likely to be in the upcoming year, and as they ought to be. But, since 1952, this vital portion of the Economic Report has been omitted. In the January 1959 report, for example, there is no mention whatever of quantitative levels. Obviously, unless the President is willing to project what is likely to be, and then declare what ought to be, his program for altering events so that what actually is becomes as near as possible to what ought to be, will prove inadequate.

The third of the three new amendments has to do with the requirement of section 3(b) of the 1946 act permitting the President to add to his January 20 annual report, where conditions warrant it, by making supplementary or revised recommendations. Again, the custodians in the executive branch of the Employment Act of 1946 during the period 1947–52, found it desirable each year to issue a supplementary report, usually around July. Since then, the Council of Economic Advisers is heard from on January 20, but is then heard from no more. Certainly, if there are major changes in the economic situation at any time during the year, Congress wants to be informed of them. Accordingly, the existence of the power to make supplementary recommendations needs to be made clear.

Hon. Daniel A. Reed

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I express my sympathy to the family of my close colleague, DANIEL A. REED. A chapter is finished and those of us who had a chance to read from this chapter have been enriched. It is a long chapter, a meaningful chapter, and a unique chapter. The sorrow is not for our

friend who wrote it, but for those remaining who now must interpret it. The library of life is composed of many books and we are privileged to read from only one chapter in any book. The chapter preceding and following remain a holy mystery, but I believe we can get glimpses of the past and future through some of the more noble chapters available to us. The chapter written by DANIEL A. REED was among the noblest.

Resistance—Dignified, Determined, Effective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, to the dismay of the Federal judiciary which had ordered it, and to the chagrin of the ill-informed among the editorialists and news commentators who had chortled that Virginia's will to resist had evaporated in the experiences of Arlington and Norfolk, the Warren County High School at Front Royal, Va., did not integrate its classes on February 18, 1959.

The citizens of Warren County demonstrated again the determination which had impelled them, against heartbreaking odds, to create a new school in which their children might continue their education in accordance with the sincere and firm beliefs of the community, rather than in forced conformity to the arrogant fiats of philosophizing Federal judges.

Under court order, Warren County High School did reopen on February 19. The entire student body in this 30-room building which can accommodate 1,000, consisted of 22 Negroes.

Some who claim qualifications to appraise public affairs in Virginia have suggested that the white students, who have been attending the private high school in Front Royal, did not return merely because their parents did not want them to switch classes again during this term, and not because there were any compunctions about racial integration. These observers, I believe, grossly underestimate the will of the citizens of Warren County to defend their right to control public education as guaranteed them by the Constitution.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include editorial comment which appeared in Virginia newspapers:

[From the Northern Virginia Daily, Strasburg, Va., Feb. 19, 1959]

TURNING POINT IN SCHOOL STRUGGLE

Warren County citizens helped to write a new chapter in history yesterday, when their million dollar high-school building was occupied by 22 Negro students and not one single white student showed up to integrate the school. The 100-odd newsmen, photographers and TV cameramen who milled around trying to get a story may have missed the real significance of the occasion.

It was the first small county in the South which has successfully defended its rights against the overwhelming powers of the Constitution-flaunting Supreme Court. If Front Royal citizens can win their struggle against forced school integration, so can the other smaller communities and counties in the South.

Front Royal was truly valiantly fighting in the front lines of the cold war on race mixing yesterday and certainly Warren County people deserve the highest commendation for their exemplary deportment under heavy fire.

It was a heart warming exhibition of genteel Virginia and Southern conduct, and did not give the horde of alert integrationist critics the slightest legitimate opportunity to defame the good name of Warren County

There were less than 50 citizens who gathered to view the proceedings, and they were orderly. Despite the klieg-light atmosphere and the realization that the lenses of the world were focused upon them, the vast majority of Front Royal people went about their daily lives in routine fashion.

The officials of the school administration, the county, and the city had laid their plans well. They had anticipated every move in advance. There were no uncertain or awkward moments, and the only chagrined people we saw were the Northern newsmen scurrying in search of a story which did not occur.

The law enforcement officers had the situation under control at all times. Once or twice they found it necessary to declare certain areas off limits, but this was done in a firm, yet friendly manner which commanded respect and obedience.

We could sum up the situation with the comment that Warren County met the supreme test with flying colors. They obeyed the unfair and unconstitutional order of the Federal courts and yet won their point of not mixing the races in their high school. The slurs of the integrationist press and the insults of two Federal judges were shrugged off without attempt at retaliation.

We cannot emphasize the fact too strongly that the fight is not yet over. There will no doubt be immediate effort on the part of the NAACP and their race-mixing friends to induce some white students to enroll in the school. While the odds are against their success in this effort, it could happen. Such a turn of events would certainly nullify the victory won yesterday and mar its brilliant luster.

The issue is not yet finally resolved. That there will be other action within the immediate future is a certainty we must all anticipate. Warren County people have successfully passed the vital tests thus far, and we have confidence they will resolutely face and solve those which are to come.

Freedom-loving people of the South and the Nation should certainly be proud of the citizens of Warren County today. We have already received telegrams and phone calls expressing this spirit. This encouragement should help freedom fighters in their resolve to press on to complete victory.

[From the Daily News-Record, Harrisonburg, Va., Feb. 20, 1959]

WARREN COUNTY'S ANSWER

In court hearings involving the reopening of the Warren County High School at Front Royal, not only segregationists but those who would accept integration to maintain the public schools appealed for moderation and common sense from the Federal bench. In a body, responsible white citizens on both sides of the question of public schools told the district court in Harrisonburg that to transfer to the school now would mean untold confusion to the white students attending private schools and public schools in other counties.

The same plea was voiced before Chief Judge Simon E. Sobeloff of the U.S. 4th Circuit Court of Appeals. He was told, in effect, that few, if any, white students would transfer to the high school upon its reopening for the admission of 22 Negro students. To this plea, Judge Sobeloff is quoted as replying:

"One way to find out is to open the school and register them."

Instead of judicial moderation or understanding of their difficult situation, Warren County white residents received only stern, legalistic answers directed at complying with the Supreme Court's infamous 1954 decision. The desires of 22 Negroes, who already had won from courts sympathetic to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, their fight to attend the school, was placed above 1,000 white students whose parents made it manifest that the schooling of their children shouldn't be interrupted now.

The parents' pleas through their spokesmen went unheeded. At Harrisonburg and at Baltimore, their motives were impugned. Said Judge John Paul in an astounding statement:

"The legislature may devise some futile laws as they did in 1956. My feeling is that you want to wait until next fall in the hopes some way to avoid integration will be found."

That, as it already has been pointed out by other Virginia newspapers, is deciding a case on the basis of speculation about what the legislature may or may not do in the future.

Said Judge Sobeloff:

"I think by any standard that what Warren County has been doing is indefensible."

Yet what Warren County was asking was no more than what Judge Sobeloff already had granted Charlottesville in allowing that school board to delay integration until next September.

Wednesday and again yesterday, it was Warren County's turn to take the stand in the oldest forum known to man—before the people themselves. Its white children stayed away from the school. There are indications that not a single one of them will register for the questionable school term.

Harassed at every turn by the NAACP through courts that prefer to give ear to the theory of Federal domination of community schools, Warren County citizens have elected the honorable way of standing on their rights. They are telling the world that they—and they alone—know what is best for their own children.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Feb. 19, 1959]

WARREN'S STONEWALL RESISTANCE

The Warren County High School at Front Royal reopened yesterday on a federally prescribed, integrated basis.

Twenty-two well-dressed Negro girls and boys entered the architecturally beautiful, 30-room building, with a capacity of 1,000.

They found themselves alone, with 15 white teachers still under contract to the public school system.

Five blocks away, in makeshift, privately financed schools, nearly 900 white children continued their self-segregated education.

Not a single one had enrolled at the erstwhile alma mater.

Their parents had preferred to accept whatever inconvenience or sacrifices might eventuate, rather than submit to compulsory, nominal integration.

In the gloomy annals of the 5-year constitutional crisis, Warren's stonewall refusal to surrender, will remain a bright spot remembered.

The people of Warren peacefully reopened their high school to the children of colored fellow citizens—as ordered by the court.

But they refused, as Virginians, to send their children to a federally dominated school.

The unanimity of the Warren Court was thus matched, by the unanimity of Warren County.

The county thereby set an example of adherence to a dual code of balanced loyalty inherent in the Constitution of the United States—to the Nation, and to the State.

In doing so the citizens of that county have, despite provocative attrition, maintained an imperturable dignity of citizenship which, we like to believe, will always be part of the Virginia tradition.

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times, Feb. 19, 1959]

INTEGRATION DAY IN FRONT ROYAL

The white-columned school was still there, looking just as it did on the day months ago when its 1,000 pupils departed. People went about their business as if scarcely aware that something unusual was happening in their community.

It was integration day in Front Royal. Twenty-two Negro children presented themselves, as the Federal courts said was their right, to be enrolled in the school where—until it closed on that fateful day last year—only white children were eligible for instruction.

The Negroes had won a great victory, or so it must have seemed to them, in gaining the right to attend the white people's school. Only the victory now appeared to be a hollow one, for not a single white former student showed up at the school. Most of the white children were attending private schools. Some were in public schools outside the community. A few who had little liking for education in the first place were not going to school at all because under the new law they are not compelled to do so.

So the 22 Negro students had the big high school all to themselves except for six white teachers who reported for duty. Tension was there, to be sure, but nothing happened to mar the peace of the town. Police were on hand just in case but they had little to do beyond routine chores. The sensible people of Front Royal showed they want nothing to do with threats and violence, for which they deserve the utmost praise.

Well, nobody knows how things are going to turn out. Will the white children—or at least some of them whose parents do not object to mixed schools—come back? Or will the Negro children be the only students? What kind of integration is it where there is none of the other race to be "integrated"?

One thing can be said, however. It is that Front Royal has given the Nation the most dramatic demonstration of passive resistance it has seen since the drive for compulsory school integration began. Nothing else the community could have done by way of expressing its protest could have approached this in eloquence.

Analysis of H.R. 3000 and H.R. 3001

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, on January 21, 1959, my distinguished friend and fellow member of the Committee on Ways and Means, A. S. HERLONG, Jr., and I introduced H.R. 3000 and H.R. 3001 which provide for a basic reform of Federal tax rates and methods in five major tax areas. At the time these bills were offered to the Congress for consideration we stated:

The present Federal tax structure stunts economic growth since it both prohibits adequate capital accumulation and destroys capital once accumulated. We can no longer afford a Federal fiscal policy based only on short-term considerations, from fighting inflation in one year to fighting recession in another, while neglecting the root source of fiscal crises.

By removing tax blocks to progress, our bills would contribute more than any other possible Government action to our economic well-being and national security. In enabling the economy to grow much more rapidly and consistently than in recent years, these bills would counter the challenge of Russian communism for world economic leadership; encourage other nations outside the Communist orbit to reorganize their tax systems to permit more rapid development out of their own capital; increase the supply and mobility of venture capital, thus insuring a rebirth of the American genius for the starting and development of businesses; provide new and better job opportunities; insure adequate revenues for military preparedness and all other necessary Federal expenditures; smother inflation with growth.

These bills advocate the principle of tax reduction whereby there would be scheduled annual cuts of individual taxes and corporate taxes over a period of 5 years. After the first reduction, further scheduled reductions would go into effect if budget expenditures were not in excess of $77 billion or, regardless, if the reductions would not result in budget unbalance. In addition, the bills would establish by statute more realistic depreciation service lives; defer the capital-gains tax on sales of long-term capital assets which are reinvested within the taxable year; and reduce the rates of tax on estates and gifts.

Because of the widespread interest that has already been manifested in this meritorious legislative proposal, my able cosponsor the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] and I have prepared a section by section analysis description of the purposes and provisions of our bills.

Sections 1 and 2 of the bills amend the Internal Revenue Code by adding new tax tables relating to annual reductions from January 1, 1959 through 1963 for individual taxpayers, including the rates applicable to heads of households. Section 3 of the proposals covers the new rate tables for the optional income tax where the taxpayer has adjusted gross income of less than $5,000.

Thus, beginning with January 1, 1959, there would be five annual coordinated reductions in all the graduated individual tax rates with the first bracket ultimately being reduced from the present 20 to 15 percent. The top graduated rate would be reduced from the present 91 to 47 percent over the 5 years, subject only to the postponement featurs of the legislation covered in section 5 below.

Section 4 of the bills amends code section 11 relating to the tax imposed on corporate taxpayers. The present law provides for a corporate normal tax of 30 percent on taxable income and a 22-percent surtax on taxable income in excess of $25,000. The legislation provides five annual rate reductions spread between the normal and surtax. The first 3 reduction would reduce the normal tax 1 percentage point each year reducing this from 30 to 27 percent. The last 2 corporate tax reductions would reduce the surtax from 22 to 20 percent. Thus, at the end of the reduction period the corporate rate would be 47 percent, the same as the top individual graduated tax rate. The following summary will illustrate the scheduled corporate reductions:

Jan. 1, 1959:	
Normal	29
Surtax	22
Combined	51
Jan. 1, 1960:	
Normal	28
Surtax	22
Combined	50
Jan. 1, 1961:	
Normal	27
Surtax	22
Combined	49
Jan. 1, 1962:	
Normal	27
Surtax	21
Combined	48
Jan. 1, 1963:	
Normal	27
Surtax	20
Combined	47

Section 5 of H.R. 3000 and H.R. 3001 would add a new section 22 to the code setting forth the criteria to be considered in postponing any scheduled tax cut. At the time of introduction of the bills, we explained the mechanics of postponement as follows:

Taking the President's 1960 budget estimate as the benchmark, the legislation provides that income tax rate reductions may be postponed after those to be effectuated as of January 1, 1959. Postponement would be made in the event of determination as of November 15 in any year that spending for the fiscal year is running in excess of $77 billion, and a state of budget unbalance is threatened.

While the postponement procedures may be applied separately as between corporate and individual tax rate reductions, every postponement of an individual tax rate cut must be accompanied by a postponement of a corporate tax cut. The only limitation on this linkage is where the result would be to postpone a corporate reduction for more than 1 year.

The bills further provide that each scheduled reduction in either the individual or corporate tax may be postponed for only 1 year with the schedule of subsequent reductions also being moved ahead 1 year. Thus, if spending should not be kept under control, it would be possible to space out the income tax cuts over a maximum period of 9 years without new enabling legislation.

The legislation places the responsibility for initiating postponement in the hands of the President. Balance has been struck as between the Congress and the Executive in the final exercise of postponement authority.

This balance arises in that adequate opportunity is afforded the Congress, and its tax writing committees, to review the Federal revenue requirements as related to the proposed budget. The bills provide that Congress may take several alternative actions. When the President has postponed a scheduled individual rate reduction from January 1

to July 1, the Congress may, by means of a joint resolution approved before May 15, act to make the reduction become effective as of July 1. In the alternative, a scheduled reduction may be further postponed by the Congress until the next January 1. The same alternative disposition may be made with respect to corporate income taxes. Thus, the Congress may make effective on July 1 a previously postponed corporate reduction or postpone it further until January 1.

Provision is then made under the bills that where the Congress has not so acted by joint resolution the President, by May 15, may further postpone until the next January 1 any corporate or individual cut previously postponed. The criterion for such postponements under the presidential authority "shall be used so as to permit the maximum possible reduction to take effect on July 1 next in the taxes imposed by sections 1, 3, 11, and 3402 without causing an imbalance in the budget of the Federal Government for the following fiscal year."

Subsection 5(d) of the bills provides that a total postponement of any date upon which a scheduled rate reduction shall take effect cannot be for more than 1 year. Subsection 5(e) is a deferral provision wherein if a scheduled reduction is postponed under any of the alternative procedures outlined above, subsequent rate reduction dates not affected by the current postponement "shall be deferred for 1 year." It is by virtue of this postponement authority and the deferral provision of the bills that the rate reductions scheduled for 5 years may be deferred for a maximum of 9 years without revising the statute. Subsection 5(f) of the bills proposes definitions of the terms of reference "imbalance in the budget," "rate reduction date," "current fiscal year" and "following fiscal year."

Section 6 of the bills would amend code section 167 by adding new provisions relating to the tax treatment of depreciable property. The intent of these provisions is that their use be at the election of the taxpayer. This new approach would add six broad statutory classifications of property subject to depreciation and also set forth the maximum useful life to be applied to such classes, as follows:

Classification	*Maximum useful life, years*
Buildings	30
Standard and general-purpose machinery and equipment, including buildings useful only to house such machinery and equipment	12
Furniture and related equipment	10
Special-purpose machinery and equipment, including buildings useful only to house such machinery and equipment	6
Miscellaneous small equipment chargeable to capital account, including office machines	4
Automotive equipment	3

There are several limitations set forth in applying these provisions. The statutory reduction would be applicable only as to property with a useful life of 3 years or more and involves new acquisitions of business plant and equipment. The advantages of this reduction in useful life is phased out over a 5-year period so that on property acquired in the first year affected taxpayers may take only one-fifth of the amount of reduction. As to property acquired in the second and each succeeding years, an additional one-fifth of such amount may be taken each year during each of the succeeding 4 years as to property acquired in each of such later years, with this limitation terminating entirely after December 31, 1963.

For example, assume a taxpayer acquired standard and general purpose machinery, which, under present law, would have a useful life of 16 years. Under the bill, the property would then fall into the standard and general purpose machinery category and for that property acquired in 1959, would have a useful life of 15½ years: 16−12=4÷5=⅘; 16−⅘=15⅕. Property in the same classification acquired in 1960 would have a useful life of 14⅖ and so on for property acquired in succeeding years until 1964, at which time the property acquired would have a useful life in this category of 12 years.

The bills also provide that except for taxpayers whose accounting is prescribed by a Federal or State regulatory body, the reductions in useful life of depreciable property "shall be applicable only to taxpayers whose books and records are kept in accordance with the determination of useful life there set forth."

As previously stated, we believe:

In practical effect, the new lives available for use in regard to property acquisitions in the fifth and succeeding years would permit an average increase of one-third in the rates of depreciation allowances. These increases would come on top of the liberal alowances in early years under the sum-of-the-year's digits and double declining balance methods, made available to taxpayers through the 1954 revenue code, and the extra first-year allowance granted to small business taxpayers in the legislation of 1958.

Section 6(b) of the legislation amends code section 1231, relating to capital gains and losses on property used in the trade or business, by providing that property subject to the special rule for depreciation shall not be entitled to capital gains treatment "except to that portion of the consideration received on the sale or exchange which exceeds the original cost or other basis of said property in the hands of the taxpayer." Thus, there is a limitation on the extent to which the long-term capital gains privilege may be applied to the adjusted basis of depreciable property.

Section 7 of the bills would add a new code section 1037 providing for the nonrecognition of gain on certain sales or exchanges of capital assets.

Our intention in offering this amendment is as follows:

In accordance with the precedent already established on the sale and repurchase of homes, our bills make statutory provision for tax-free transfer of capital by individuals, but not by corporations, from one investment to another when the transactions are completed within the taxable year, and the investments sold have been held by the taxpayer for at least 6 months. The result would be a deferral of tax on long-term gains until such time as the taxpayer disinvests. We have included this application of the rollover principle in the legislation since the only possible justification for taxing at any time the proceeds from sale of a long-term investment is that the seller is disinvesting with the intention of using capital gains as income for consumption purposes.

This deferral of tax on long-term gains is accomplished by providing that if capital assets are sold by an individual and within the same taxable year other such assets are purchased, any gain shall not be recognized to the extent that the aggregate purchase prices of such assets exceed the adjusted basis of capital assets sold during the year. Capital assets include those as defined in code section 1221 or property used in the trade or business as defined in code section 1231(b)(1). Where the purchase of capital assets results in such nonrecognition of gain there must be an adjustment to the basis of each of the capital assets purchased and held at the end of the taxable year. These adjustments to basis "shall include a reduction by an amount equal to the total amount of gain not so recognized allocated to each capital asset so purchased in the proportion that the purchase price bears to the aggregate of the purchase prices of all such assets" purchased and held at the end of such taxable year.

For example, assume a taxpayer electing to apply this provision at the end of his taxable year to asset A costing $2,000, asset B costing $3,000, and asset C costing $5,000 purchased during such year. For the same taxable year under the bills, assume a gain from sales of other capital assets in the amount of $4,000 was elected not to be recognized. This nonrecognized gain would be allocated to the assets held in proportion to their purchase price so that asset A would have its $2,000 basis reduced by $800, asset B would have its basis reduced by $1,200, and asset C would have its basis reduced by $2,000. Therefore, the basis of the assets for the purposes of measuring gains on such assets on future transactions would be as follows: Asset A, $1,200; asset B, $1,800; asset C, $3,000.

In other words, as to assets purchased during any year any tax-free gain must be proportionately allocated to each such asset. The formula for allocation is the ratio of the purchase price of any one asset in relation to the total of purchase prices of similarly acquired assets during the same tax year. The right to invoke this nonrecognition or "rollover" of capital gain may be made at the election of the taxpayer.

Section 8 of the bills would reduce the top rate of estate tax and proportionately reduce the lowest and intervening rates. Section 9 would reduce the gift tax rates. Upon introduction we outlined these reductions as follows:

Instead of establishing a new formula for setting tax rates on estates and gifts, our bills would simply bring the top rate of estate tax down to 47 percent to coincide with the top rates of individual and corporate tax after 5 years, and consistent with the present relationship, reduce the top rate of gift tax to three-fourths of this figure, or 35.25 percent. All lower rates would be re-

duced in proportion. Thus, the estate tax rates would range by taxable brackets from 1.75 to 47 percent, compared with the present 3 to 77 percent, and the gift tax rates from 1.25 to 35.25 percent, compared with the present 2.25 to 57.75 percent.

Section 10 of the bills amends the withholding provisions of the code—section 3402—so as to conform the withholding tables and rates with the forward scheduled individual income tax reductions provided under the bills. Section 11 would amend the code provisions relating to declaration of estimated tax by individuals—section 6015—and corporations—section 6016—to make it clear that such declarations could be filed on the basis of the tax rates in effect on the last day prescribed for the timely filing of the declaration of estimated tax.

Mr. Speaker, in closing we hope that this analysis will be helpful in furthering the objectives of our bills and understanding of the methods by which we seek to attain these objectives. Federal fiscal policy needs a new look—a long-range look that will provide greater economic growth, greater stability to Government revenues, and greater incentives to taxpayers. We believe our bills would contribute more than any other possible Government action to our economic well-being and national security.

Observation on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of February 18, 1959, and a letter from an Indiana schoolgirl:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 18, 1959]

GFWC PRESIDENT REPORTS ON CUBA

(By Mary L. Vaughan)

Cuba's population is wholeheartedly backing, by almost 100 percent, their new Premier Fidel Castro. That's the opinion of Miss Chloe Gifford, just back from a firsthand check of Cuba's two member clubs of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, which she heads.

As president, she is overseer to nearly 11 million women spread around the globe in approximately 13,000 member club organizations.

Miss Gifford toured San Juan, St. Thomas, Jamaica, and Cuba, leaving here on the first day of February and arriving back in Washington last Saturday.

Her mission included visiting with officials of the GFWC member clubs in Havana—the Lyceum and Tennis Lawn Club and the Havana Women's Club.

The latter club, she stressed, took no active part in the revolution.

BACKED CASTRO

Lyceum members, however, backed Castro 100 percent and worked actively for him while transporting supplies and living in caves in Oriente Province for 2 years, Miss Gifford said.

In addition to her GFWC overseeing duties, Miss Gifford visited the revolution-torn areas in Cuba in a double capacity as vice president of CARE.

During her mission she helped distribute 25,000 CARE packages of food, clothing, and medical supplies.

The people in Cuba, she observed, back Premier Castor and buck the U.S. Government.

"They have great bitterness toward the U.S. Government," she stated, "but they differentiate between the citizens and our Government. They think our Government supported and furnished ammunition and guns to Batista."

Miss Gifford, while observing the adulation to Castro paid by the Cuban population, had reservations on that score.

"As a purely personal observation," she commented, "the people of Cuba worried me since I have never seen such dedication, such adulation given to one man as they are giving to Castro. It is dangerous—he is but 32 years of age and may find it difficult to keep his feet on the ground and not become a dictator."

CUBA NEGLECTED

Miss Gifford said she was distressed by the fact a country like Cuba "only 1 hour's flying time from this country" has been neglected in relationships.

In touring the rebel territory, Miss Gifford addressed the Cuban village people.

"I stood on a jeep and smiled and waved since I speak no Spanish," she revealed. "I did not attempt to interfere in their politics but brought greetings from the American people and wished them hope and prayers for unity and good government."

It was Miss Gifford's first visit to Cuba, she said. In Havana, she stayed in the Conrad Hilton Hotel when Premier Castro also was a fellow resident but she caught not even a glimpse of him.

"On the elevators I rode up and down many times with the rebels who wore beards and guns slung over their shoulders," she noted.

"They were most polite, always smiling and helpful," she added.

VISITS OFFICERS

Miss Gifford said she visited with the GFWC member club presidents—Senora Rosario Rexach de Leon of the Lyceum and Mrs. William T. Wright of the Havana Women's Club.

Miss Gifford said her trip will result in more active participation between the parent GFWC and its Cuban club membership.

Miss Gifford, of Lexington, Ky., will be seen by television fans on Friday night when Edward R. Murrow visits her local GFWC living quarters on his "Person to Person" show.

MARY'S CATHOLIC CIVICS CLUB,
Decatur, Ind., Feb. 4, 1959.

DEAR MR. POWELL: Today, Sister Joan of Arc read to us from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 27, 1959, pages 1117 to 1118, the speech you made on Cuba. We, the members of Mary's Catholic Civics Club, wish to congratulate you on the fine, just, and honest report you made to the House on Dr. Castro. Sister has been reading to us the true side of the Cuban situation from Catholic periodicals, so we knew, but many, who read only the secular press didn't. We are glad that you suggested to the House Members that United States rally to the Cuban hero instead of denouncing him.

Since my name is Powell too, sister asked that I write to you. I am in the seventh grade of St. Joseph's school, Decatur, Ind.

It is through our Representative E. ROSS ADAIR that we get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS. With those and other material Mr. ADAIR is sending, we hope to be able to organize debate matter for our mock congressional sessions this month.

We belong to a national club sponsored by the Commission on American Citizenship in Washington, D.C.

Sister and the club join me in saying, "God bless you and more power to you."

Sincerely yours,

PATRICIA POWELL.

Public Housing and the Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a balanced budget is the most critical goal which must be attained in this session of Congress. It is up to Congress, but here is a picture of just what makes this goal so difficult to reach.

The Constitution provides that no moneys be withdrawn from the Treasury of the United States without an appropriation authorized by law. For the last 20 years, it has been customary for several congressional committees to draft legislation providing for a so-called back-door approach to the Treasury, instead of going to the Congress and asking for an appropriation when said legislation calls for money to be spent for any purpose. This is done with a provision which authorizes the head of an agency, like the Housing Agency, to go to the Secretary of the Treasury, deliver to him a note or notes for whatever amount they might wish to draw, and apply it against the total sum which is made available by the bill. With such a provision, an agency can use the money without restraint, and can do just about as it wishes with it. The agency is not required either annually or at any other time, to go before a committee of Congress, and say what it would do with the money. There is no annual or other review provided for its operations. It is just a freelance in the spending of the money.

Clause 4 of rule XXI of the House rules provided for the solution of these problems and the appropriation of money through the Appropriations Committee. To quote the rule:

No bill or joint resolution carrying appropriations shall be reported by any committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations, nor shall an amendment proposing an appropriation be in order during the consideration of a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee not having that jurisdiction. A question of order on an appropriation in any such bill, joint resolution, or amendment thereto may be raised at any time.

This has been interpreted in several parliamentary rulings in the House of Representatives over the past 15 or 20 years in such a way that congressional committees other than the Appropriations Committee could bring in a bill with a provision for the back-door approach to the Treasury, such as I have described, and as a result of it, we have had a tremendous amount of irresponsible legislation. Over $5 billion was appro-

priated last year by the Congress through the back-door method. Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, has introduced a resolution, which is now up for consideration before the Rules Committee, which resolution would do away with this practice and force those people who have been avoiding a proper justification for withdrawing money from the Treasury to come before the Appropriations Committee for their money.

Conditions have come to pass where there has been no review of a lot of these Federal expenditures. It is absolutely necessary if we are going to maintain the liberties of the United States that we keep in the Appropriations Committee of the Congress the power to appropriate funds. If we allow legislation to continue to make provisions such as the recent housing bill passed by the Senate; namely, to turn over $3.7 billion to the Public Housing Administration to spend on public housing without any restrictions whatever and without any control and without any review over the 5½ years that is the period covered by the authority written into the bill, the Congress is simply shirking its responsibilities. Time after time, we find cases where expenditures have been made and will be made that the Congress did not approve and that the very people who are urging this type of legislation did not approve themselves. For instance, there is no control in the housing legislation as to what sort of construction there should be; there is no such thing as an attempt to maintain a good, clean job. The housing bill, as it presently is before the House committee, calls for $1.5 billion for urban renewal, $3.7 billion for housing, $400 million for college housing loans, and for veterans' housing, $300 million. The Founding Fathers who drew the Constitution, after having gone through a long period of war with Great Britain to obtain their liberties, thought that it was necessary to place a provision in the Constitution prohibiting the spending of money without an appropriation. When there is no appropriation of money, frankly, it appears to me as though the language was not sufficient to comply with the Constitution requirement for the proper appropriation of funds. With that in mind, Congressman SMITH has prepared and has before the Rules Committee House Resolution 161. It would require that these funds should pass through the Appropriations Committee, after being authorized by other committees by bills coming from them. It would require an annual review of what is going to be spent and what it is going to be spent for. We must protect our people from what is going on through a bloc of bureaucrats. Surely, that would save more money than any other action that we could take at this time. This resolution is the only way to restore to Congress the power to appropriate money given it by the Constitution.

These various projects—the public housing construction program where buildings are erected and rented to people who have incomes as high as $10,000 a year—are probably the most ridiculous of our governmental expenditures. The rents that these people pay are calculated to just above cover the cost of the maintenance of the buildings and the accessories. They do not pay a substantial amount into the Treasury. They pay no taxes upon the buildings and we are taxing the poor people who have been thrifty enough to buy and pay for their own houses, to pay for the cost and maintenance of these public housing projects.

Many of these property owners have less income than the people who are living in these public houses, and if there is any project whatever that we could get along without, this is it.

The urban renewal projects and the college housing projects and the veterans loan project can be taken care of by local and private capital, if the proper efforts are made to provide that sort of thing.

Somewhere, somehow, there must come a sense of responsibility and of meeting our obligations to the Government of the United States; to the necessity for keeping down our Federal budget so that we can prevent any more outbreaks of the inflation which has plagued the United States terrifically since the end of World War II.

The Now Indispensable Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD a very fine editorial appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat Thursday, February 19, 1959, in tribute to John Foster Dulles.

My Democratic friends in the Congress and who write newspaper columns and comment on the news as radio and television news commentators might well read this editorial and explain, for the benefit of their constituents, readers, and listeners, why Secretary Dulles' illness has produced this great change of attitude on their part.

I suggest that the reason for the change lies in the fact that they have been placing American foreign policy into partisan politics in a snide and indirect way, and all the time they have been protesting that foreign policy should not be the subject of partisan attack. Now that they think that building up Secretary Dulles' stature is no longer a threat to this kind of undercover attack because he will not remain on the scene to embarrass them with his prestige, they praise him. I suspect that their real purpose is to try to appear to be nonpartisan and objective so that they can continue their partisan sniping of the Eisenhower administration.

If anyone reading this who does not have the privileges of the use of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would care to comment on this editorial or my comments, I would be glad to place their remarks in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

THE NOW INDISPENSABLE DULLES

John Foster Dulles, afflicted with a probably incurable cancer, has suddenly become an outstanding patriot, a genius of American statesmanship, the indispensable man in the State Department.

Only a month, a week ago nothing like such prestige attached to his name.

Long, bitter critics of the Secretary of State now view with jittery foreboding his possible departure from the cold war arena, where for six terribly difficult years he has been the West's bulkhead against each Red crisis in the Soviet's campaign for world aggrandisement.

Yet this is the same Mr. Dulles whose resignation has been demanded in some quarters for more than a year. This is the same architect of U.S. policy who has been mercilessly grilled and blasted in the Senate, whose comments have been ridiculed or turned into dirty words.

This is the same Secretary Dulles who has been flayed also in allied capitals.

Today many of the same men in public life, who made him so frequently the butt of lacerating criticism, call him a "great Secretary of State" and express fear at his loss in a time of "desperate need."

Among such are Senator FULBRIGHT of Arkansas and Senator MANSFIELD, Montana's minor sage of foreign affairs.

This overnight reversal of political opinion is somewhat nauseating. It is understandable, justified. But it makes many sincere observers of our foreign conduct sick at the stomach.

The desperate illness of Mr. Dulles evokes natural feelings of sympathy. But that is not responsible for this shift in critics' attitude. Men with any kind of knowledge about the dangerous power complex look with grave trepidation at possible loss of Foster Dulles.

One reason assigned for the sudden upsurge of Dulles repute is that we are in the midst of a delicate crisis over Berlin and Germany. He has laid most of the plans for allied cooperation in this issue, and for the foreign ministers conference.

But Secretary Dulles has confronted a virtually incessant series of crises vis-a-vis Russia and China during this administration. He has drafted and led strategy to balk Soviet and Peiping threats time after time.

He is doing the same job now that he has long done. Where were these latter-day back slappers, where was the approval of political potshotters then?

When the crisis chips were down, the Dulles programs were backed on signally non-partisan basis. But after the heat abated, he was again the target for rasping antagonism that sought to discredit his efforts, to lever him out of office.

Now in London, Paris, and Bonn it is regarded as unthinkable that Mr. Dulles should be replaced. Leaders in each of these capitals, however, have often in the past opposed Mr. Dulles and his policies as inflexible, too moralistic.

Sometimes perhaps, Mr. Dulles gave that impression. He has made mistakes. But it was his courage and indefatigable purpose that has thrust backbone into western diplomacy ever since Mr. Eisenhower became President.

The Secretary has exhibited like an oriflamme America's determination to manifest strength in the teeth of Communist threats. He has refused to back down on principle once, his concessions being ones of procedure and approach.

That has preserved peace without frittering away our position in the Far East, in Europe, in the Middle East where the problem has been the most treacherous of all. No other Secretary of State in our history has possessed so much power. The President has

called him the greatest ever to occupy this post, indispensable to U.S. foreign policy.

While indispensable is a relative term—no one is unqualifiedly indispensable—Mr. Dulles has come close to the role. But this is not a sudden development. His efforts, knowledge, and resource in piloting foreign policy have been the same for years, during those same years his foes—sincere and opportunist drivelers—were knifing at his back.

He should remain in office as long as he is able to counsel and direct the Nation's intricate policy abroad. When he is no longer able, he will resign.

Letter From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article written by Richard H. Rovere which appeared in the February 14, 1959, issue of the New Yorker.

The article is as follows:

LETTER FROM WASHINGTON

FEBRUARY 4.

For the fourth or fifth time within a week, the Secretary of Defense has insisted that our missile program is coming along fine, that we are spending on it all the money we need to spend, and that the Russians are not to be believed when they claim to be able to strike any point on earth with their long-range missiles. There is a powerful, almost enveloping tendency here, though, to reject Mr. McElroy's word and to assume that his opposite number, Marshal Rodion Y. Malinovsky, the Soviet Defense Minister, was speaking the essential truth when he addressed us from Moscow yesterday and said, "Your arms are too short, gentlemen." Of course, the information available to both men is of such a nature as to allow wide differences of interpretation and a broad exercise of sophistry. Mr. McElroy hasn't seen or counted Marshal Malinovsky's missiles, and Marshal Malinovsky hasn't seen or counted Mr. McElroy's. Even the most pessimistic of informed American observers are inclined to believe that the Russians have not yet achieved the striking power they boast of, and it could well be that, as of this moment, the literal truth would confirm the skepticism that Mr. McElroy showed when he said he doubted whether the Russians have intercontinental ballistic missiles ready for combat today. A figure that is accepted by a large number of people is that the Russians are producing about 15 ICBM's a month; at that rate, impressive as it is, it would take a good many months', if not a good many years', production to give them any assurance of being able to destroy us with missiles alone. But to just about everyone but Mr. McElroy, this is a fact of only secondary importance; nobody, after all, is predicting the firing of missiles tomorrow afternoon. The important truth that is known and conceded, even by Mr. McElroy, is that not a single American ICBM is today ready for military use. Mr. McElroy says that the first few Atlases, an Atlas being an Air Force weapon of superior performance, will be emplaced on a site in California by July 1. But this, too, is disputed by people in the Pentagon and in industry whose acquaintenance with such matters is as great as Mr. McElroy's acquaintenance with soap; they say they will be surprised to see the first Atlas squadron before the end of next year. As far as it is possible to learn, the United does not have, right now, today, a ballistic missile that is, in the local patois, operational and that could reach Greenwich, Conn., from Washington, D.C. (The Redstone, an Army missile, can arch its way over 200 surface miles with a quite satisfactory degree of accuracy.)

The administration's logic, as it is found in Mr. McElroy's testimony before congressional committees and in his statements to the press, is that since we don't have any missiles ready for use and since the Russians don't have enough missiles to destroy every one of our military installations here and abroad, a rough parity exists. It could also be argued that since there is no "missile gap" between the United States and Liechtenstein. The administration clings lovingly to the present tense. But its critics—and on this matter it is hard to find anyone who isn't a critic—seem able to destroy its case by accepting the least terrifying of its figures and projecting them no more than 22 months ahead. It is known for a certainty that the Russians have a wide variety of missiles of less than intercontinental range. These have been in production at a rate doubtless greater than 15 a month for a year, at the very least. The stockpile is assumed by some to be in the thousands and by the most cautious intelligence analysts to be in the hundreds. If their ICBM production has been at the rate of 15 a month for 5 to 6 months, and if they maintain this rate throughout this year and next (the chances are certainly that the rate will be stepped up), the Russians will have a number of intercontinental missiles—somewhere between four and five hundred—that simply will not be subject to the kind of cheerful comparisons offered today by the President and Mr. McElroy. Such a quantity of ICBM's, plus a somewhat greater quantity of shorter-range missiles, would, unless our experts are talking through their hats, put Mr. Khrushchev in a position to employ the finite strategy that we ourselves hope someday to be in a position to employ; that is, to proceed from the assumption that the destructive capacity already achieved is adequate to any earthly requirements for destruction. Mr. McElroy has assured troubled Congressmen that well before this point is reached by the Russians, we shall have a squadron of Atlases emplaced on the west coast. One squadron, 10 Atlases. Even if the first squadron is soon joined by another, the relative position of the Russians will be the same. The gap will be for some certain period a chasm of almost immeasurable size.

Attempts to measure it tend, if anything, to make it seem less awesome than in fact it is. Senator SYMINGTON, of Missouri, has said that "through 1961 our planning envisages the Russians having over four times as many operational ICBMs as the United States." (Senator SYMINGTON has been aided in most of his calculations by an old associate in the Air Force, Mr. Tom Lanphier, now of Convair, which is making the Atlas. Mr. Lanphier surely knows what his plant is doing, and he thinks the 4-to-1 ratio is the most sanguine possible.) But 4 to 1, 5 to 1, even 10 to 1—no ratio reflects what Senator SYMINGTON says is the simple fact that we will at some point be without effective retaliatory power. At that point, there isn't much practical difference between 10 to 1 and and a million to nothing.

It has frequently been recalled in recent weeks that, historically, the most discouraging readings of the Russians' claims for their technology and military strength have been confirmed by the facts when the facts have become known. Some highly discouraging readings have been made in recent weeks, and the effect of them has been to make the moment of most extreme danger seem closer to the present than it does in a reading that merely extrapolates from the facts that are almost universally conceded. There are people with access to all the intelligence gathered by our several agencies who believe that the Russians right now have not dozens or hundreds but thousands of missiles ready for business. There are some students of test performances who regard Mr. McElroy's statement that it was not "our intent or policy to match [the Russians] missile for missile" as a macabre joke; they maintain that if by some miracle we did have the precise number they have, they would still be twice as powerful, because their missiles are twice as effective as those we are currently planning to build. A distinguished military critic, Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, writing in the Reporter, says that Russian missiles have anywhere from 3 to 5 times the power of ours and that ours are 25 percent behind theirs in accuracy. When these factors are reckoned in, he says, it would take 33 of our most powerful missiles to give us 90 percent assurance of destroying a fortified missile site in the Soviet Union, while 15 of theirs would give them 90 percent assurance of destroying a fortified site on this continent; one of their missiles is worth more than two of ours, and a true matching would require us to have twice the number they have. To be sure, there are estimable men, on and off the Government payroll who dispute this and think that our products are, if anything, somewhat superior. But since we aren't producing our products, the whole matter is academic.

The strategic and diplomatic consequences of the missile gap, and of the possibility of missile warfare even when no gap exists, are absorbing the thoughts of a good many people here; these consequences appear staggering in their dimensions and revolutionary in their nature. One common assumption after another is going by the board. At some stage, it seems plain, the whole notion of mutual deterrence—on which both we and the Russians have placed great reliance—will be of highly questionable validity. To be sure, it is not quite ready for the discard yet. In a general war fought today, manned bombers would still be used by both sides—presupposing, as all but a fairly small number of our strategists do, that the Russians have yet to achieve the capacity for pushbutton extermination. The ability of a handful of manned bombers to get close enough to their targets for retaliatory purposes would seem sufficient to deter any government of sane men—sane enough, that is, to wish to go on living and governing—from taking the initiative. The Strategic Air Command may compare to the Russian forces that could be marshaled for attack as a sheriff's posse compares to a Panzer division, yet even with as little as between 4 and 6 percent of SAC's planes on airborne alert (it used to be said that between 20 and 30 percent were always airborne, well fueled, and carrying bombs, but these figures have lately been challenged without any response from Mr. McElroy's office) we have a capacity for visiting intolerable destruction on the Soviet Union. But the moment the Russians are ready with a truly versatile collection of ballistic and guided missiles, they could—in theory, at least—destroy the better part of our civilization without incurring any danger to themselves except that which might descend upon them when the winds returned to their skies some of the fallout from the warheads rained on us. To achieve a victory so nearly total, they would need a sufficient number of missiles to destroy the missile sites in this country, our SAC bases in other countries, and the few SAC bombers that might come lumbering into Russian air space on instructions from communications centers communicating their

last instructions. The SAC planes might be destroyed by guided air-defense rockets with a hundred-mile range—rockets the Russians claim they will shortly have. Thus, with a well-coordinated war plan, an aggressor could eliminate an adversary without suffering the loss of a single life among his own nationals. Never before in the history of warfare has this been so.

The day is coming, then, when we shall no longer be able to place any degree of trust in the "melancholy paradox," as Churchill put it, of peace being maintained through mutual fear of destruction. As long as piloted aircraft are still useful, terror will be roughly in balance and war will continue to seem inviting only to men with an unconquerable impulse for suicide. But when the Russians are really ready for combat with missiles, then aggression, meaning war, may very well appear a sane idea—even, one can imagine, a prudent idea. The doctrine of "preventive war" may once more make sense—for them, anyway. And this is by no means the worst of it. The balance of terror will still not be restored when—assuming that it ever happens—the missile gap is closed. For the speed of ballistic missiles gives the aggressor an almost absolute advantage over any enemy. The enemy may have the means of retaliation, but he has practically no time in which to decide to retaliate. He may have superb devices for detecting, at the earliest possible moment, that destruction is soaring toward him. His decision, once he has made it, may be communicated at the speed of light, which is still faster than that of any man-made object. But something has to happen between the moment of detection and the moment of response—and that something is quite a lot, and it has to happen in human minds. The procedure by which a decision to retaliate would be made is perhaps the most closely guarded of our military secrets. We know, though, that under the Atomic Energy Act the President is the only person who can authorize the use of nuclear or thermonuclear weapons, so, presumably, the President must be found, given the facts, and given time to make his grave decision. And even before this there has to be some evaluation of the data about the attack. Is the radar working properly? Could it possibly be a flock of geese showing up as missiles? (Geese have been mistaken for weapons on radar.) All ambiguities, presumably, must be filtered out. And then there are the unknown terms of our agreements with our allies. It may be necessary to get in touch with Downing Street or Bonn or the Elysée or Mecca. After evaluation and consultation must come the decision and the communication of it down the chain of command. No doubt the deciding and the communicating can be done in minutes, even seconds. But after all this comes the countdown, which must be gone through as long as all our rockets are fueled with liquid oxygen—a substance that cannot be stored as gasoline is stored in a car. The minimum time for this is about 20 minutes. It is estimated that the maximum elapsed time between the detection of the launching of ICBMs aimed at us and their impact on their targets would be 30 minutes. That leaves 10 minutes for everything else.

There is a possibility of restoring the balance of terror by the development of solid-fuel missiles that could be launched either from concealed and nearly indestructible sites or from mobile ones. Solid, and therefore storable, fuel would eliminate the need for a countdown, and missiles might be launched as soon as a decision has been reached. Indeed, if the means of detection were foolproof and if the necessary legal and political arrangements could be made, an aggressor's launching could simply trigger a retaliatory launching. A mobile site, such as a railroad flatcar or a submarine, or an impregnable one, such as the ocean floor or the inside of a mountain, would—in the foreseeable future, anyway—eliminate the likelihod of all our missiles being destroyed on the ground while the President was being fetched. We have no solid-fuel or mobile-base missiles operational now, and the only one that is in an advanced state of development—the Navy's Polaris, designed for release from a submerged submarine—has a short range, a low accuracy rating, and not very much of a warhead. (And the problem of communicating a decision to a submerged submarine is formidable, to say the least.) The most promising of our solid-fuel projects (it is an odd world in which "promising" comes to mind as a term for an instrument whose use would make certain the end of life over large areas of the globe) is the Air Force's Minuteman, an ICBM that is being designed for firing from anywhere, anytime. The Minuteman may be ready by 1965.

Our arms may prove useless as a deterrent force. We have, however, the capacity for a surprise attack of our own. It would not be preventive war, for we could not conceivably hope to destroy the present Soviet power of retaliation. And even if we had a good number of working missiles and could, in aggression, hope for as cheap a victory as Khrushchev may soon have in prospect, we would not, in our present frame of mind, strike the first blow. We know this, and we keep saying it, but if Khrushchev does not believe us when we say it, he would have to give the most serious kind of consideration to destroying us. Even if he accepted our good intentions, he might reasonably consider bring about our destruction, simply because it would be prudential insurance against an accidental war—the possibility of which increases every time a missile is mounted on its pad, every time a new radar tracking system is set up.

Fortunately, there are deterrents other than American arms. One must be the self-doubt of the Russians. They cannot ever be sure of their ability to destroy our power of retaliation. Another must lie in whatever remains of the consciences of the rulers of the Kremlin; they are human beings, and none of them could relish the responsibility that would be theirs for a willful act of aggression of such magnitude. Still another is in their view of life and history; they wish to inherit civilizations, and believe that they will. And, too, there is a certain amount of deterrent power in their own arms. An attack on a scale large enough to wipe us out would poison their air as well as ours, the more surely since thermonuclear warheads would have to be deposited on American bases all around the perimeter of their world. Furthermore, the destruction of those bases would mean war with the allies who have permitted us to place the bases on their soil. In many cases, the resources and populations which the Russians covet, would be destroyed. For the present, our need for our allies, our need for placing some part of our strength in their hands, may be greater than any need they have for us. In a full-scale war, our overseas bases would probably be useless from a military point of view; the Russians know where all of them are, and they could knock out every last one with missiles. But the existence of those bases is now immensely precious to us, for it greatly complicates any decisions the Russians must make. Still, there are people here who can foresee a day when the rules of the Kremlin might make a cool, purposeful decision—one meeting most of the requirements of good sense as they understand good sense—to lay waste to the United States and several of its allies.

It is not beyond our means to take many steps that would tend to discourage such a decision—to remove from it the elements of good sense and replace them with elements of folly. Some steps would be in the direction of more armament, some in the direction of disarmament. In the peculiar dialectic of the cold war, it seems always necessary to sprint in the armaments race and at the same time do our utmost to call the whole thing off; mobilization and demobilization are simultaneous aims. The Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee is receiving expert testimony to the effect that our missiles program could be greatly accelerated—and specifically that we could double our Atlas ICBM production in the period just ahead. It is also being told that our airborne alert could be more alert and more airborne. The outlook for disarmament and for agreements to diminish the dangers of accidental war seems as bleak as ever at the moment, but the very effort to obtain such agreements in good faith has some of the value the agreements themselves would have. It keeps the issues alive and under discussion, it demonstrates concern, it encourages an awareness of the awful responsibilities of those who possess modern armaments. "We arm to parley," Churchill said, and we can parley to disarm—if not with hope of an early reduction of destructive force, at least with the hope of reaching honorable settlements of political questions by political rather than military means.

RICHARD H. ROVERE.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 21, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

FEBRUARY 21, 1959.

The Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959 was the year's first tax bill and major legislation from the Ways and Means Committee in which I participated as a committee member. Because this bill affects many people (there are even more insurance policyholders than taxpayers), because insurance is a unique corporate type of business, and its taxation is extremely complicated and technical, I had a real tax baptism. Insurance is already the most heavily taxed thrift institution and the trend is well established away from savings in favor of protection only. At the least, I suggested in debate that the economic impact of State and Federal taxes plus this increase should be more carefully studied. While the bill attempted to improve existing law, and did in several ways, I opposed it finally because of the 90 percent increase in taxes over last year which may well result in increasing insurance premiums and in expanding social security, the Government's competitive provision for everyone's future. (My brief analysis of this insurance bill will be mailed to anyone requesting it.)

Labor leaders' joint pronouncements deserve everyone's attention. AFL–CIO's Reuther announced a march on Washington of the unemployed. AFL–CIO's Meany, in Puerto Rico, announced labor's decision to demand more pay and shorter hours. How's that for logic? You are out of work, so your labor leader demands higher pay and Government intervention. Of course, the whole trouble of these two pronouncements

springs from the fallacious unconstitutional reasoning behind the 1946 Employment Act which implies that the Federal Government is responsible for employment.

In economic fact, this cannot be, regardless of the political and demagogic appeal. Nor do I think Reuther and Meany believe it either. They know, too, that elbow grease, initiative, and work provide employment, not another government made-work contract which must first drain the tax money from the people. The fact that government does not first get the money in before spending it does not change the simple economic logic that if you spend more than you take in, live beyond your income, you build inflation resulting in weakened currency and ultimate economic crash. The logic of Mssrs. Reuther and Meany is consistent only with that of socialists, not with freedom and free enterprise. If, because of government control and big spending economic freedom is lost, then necessarily all personal freedoms will go. This attempted economic security sought by government handout is not security at all, but a cancellation of all our freedoms, even as the prisoner in jail has the security of food, clothing and housing but lacks real freedom—to direct his life minute by minute, day by day, as he sees fit.

Battle of the budget department (U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 13). "Democrats are pushing programs they know the President will reject. Bills are framed to offer huge sums of aid to large groups. The political strategy: Show that the Democrats want to help people, but that a Republican President won't let them." Political attempts of this kind to take credit and place blame by spending our taxpayers' money, along with the labor leaders' demands, is absolutely contrary to the economic philosophy of free enterprise, the American way. Perhaps we should remember the 10 cannots, a modern addition to the Ten Commandments.

"You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot help small men by tearing down big men. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage-payer. You cannot help the poor man by destroying the rich. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred. You cannot establish security on borrowed money. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

It was this philosophy of economic liberty which Abe Lincoln personified and which I endeavored to present in speeches over Lincoln's birthday. Liberals, the big spenders charging our costs of government to the future, as I see it, are doing something absolutely immoral, charging our bills to our children and grandchildren. Taxpayers today can vote. Taxpayers as yet unborn cannot vote. Let's unburden our grandchildren. Further, let's not talk about cutting our debt and taxes without practicing what we preach, namely, by cutting down the wasteful government spending programs and those in the welfare field.

George Washington's counsel in his "Farewell Address" has never been disproved: "As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasions, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate."

So, it's up to the voter—that's all there is to it. When will the people recognize, praise, and demand fiscal responsibility of the Congress? Now is the time.

A People-to-People Ship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1959, a group of private physicians and public spirited business leaders, with the enthusiastic endorsement of President Eisenhower and the medical and dental professions of the United States, announced one of the finest citizen efforts yet launched in the field of foreign relations.

Identified as project HOPE—health opportunity for people everywhere—the People to People Health Foundation announced plans to send the converted hospital ship *Consolation* on a continuing good-will mission to southeast Asia. This will be a floating medical center, visiting nations in that area of the world at the invitation of the medical professions of those nations—a truly people-to-people gesture of friendship.

The plan is to stay long enough in each area to give nationals of each country a chance to learn the latest in American medical technology. The ship will carry the latest in equipment, drugs, skilled doctors, dentists, and nurses. In addition, drugs, training aids, and equipment will be left behind for use in each country.

Expansion and improvement of medical teaching by the profession in countries visited will be a primary objective of the mission. The ship will also operate as combination floating hospital center medical schools, training and treatment center, a base for medical, nursing, and sanitation teams, and a logistical center for medical and health and exchange programs.

With the hope that everyone will get behind this splendid effort, I should like to include at this point in my remarks an editorial from the New York Times of February 9, headed "A People-to-People Ship":

A PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE SHIP

The plan to take the Navy hospital ship *Consolation* out of mothballs and send her on a year's visit to Southeast Asia is most imaginative and at the same time relatively simple. The vessel will be a combination hospital and medical school. She will carry a complement of about 200 doctors and an equal number of nurses.

The possibilities of this operation are enormous. It is strictly a "people-to-people" project, appropriately sponsored by the People-to-People Health Foundation. The necessary funds will be provided from private sources, and the ship will be operated at cost by the American President Lines.

A first objective, of course, is to bring medical care to some remote areas where help is needed. The ship will actually serve as a hospital, a clinic, and a laboratory. Presumably it will stay for a considerable time in some ports where it is especially needed. But the plans go beyond this. The ship will also be used as a training school for persons in the various areas, who can get a sound first-hand look at certain techniques that would not otherwise be within their reach. In turn, those serving on the ship will have an extraordinary opportunity to make observations, to exchange experiences with persons in the field.

We have repeatedly commented on the need to make the exchange of technical skill and information and the actual giving of assistance as simple, human, and "person-to-person" as is possible. A congent criticism leveled against some of our programs has dealt with the plethora of blueprints, redtape, and the lack of human contacts.

The voyage of the *Consolation* should be subject to no such criticism, since it will attempt to go directly to the heart of the exchange of skills and the giving of aid. The ship itself will be seen. Its doctors and nurses will be there. And persons with whom we are concerned will realize that other persons really care about them and their welfare. There should also be no difficulty in obtaining the funds to pay for this mission. They could not be spent in a better cause.

An Answer to the Wheat Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1959, I introduced H.R. 4749, a bill which would establish a domestic parity plan for wheat.

I am convinced this legislation is a sound approach to our present wheat problems and I am hopeful that it will receive prompt congressional attention.

The February 5 issue of the Oregon Farmer contained an excellent article describing this program. I think Mr. Clancy Jean, executive vice president of the Oregon Wheatgrowers League is to be commended, not only for this fine statement, but also for his consistent and valuable work in support of the wheatgrowers of America:

GROWERS SEEK AN ANSWER TO THE WHEAT PROBLEM—SUGGESTED BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEATGROWERS: A MODIFICATION OF THE TWO PRICE PLAN AND BUSHEL ALLOTMENTS

(By Clancy Jean)

Only a person completely sheltered from newspapers, magazines, radio, and television doesn't know that wheat is the No. 1 farm problem in the United States today.

It might be of some interest to take a look at what the wheatgrowers have to say about the problem, since it is they who, in the final analysis, will have to make the necessary adjustments if a path is to be blazed out of the present maze.

When the National Association of Wheatgrowers met for its ninth annual convention in Denver just before Christmas, growers took

a long, hard look at their own situation and at the national picture.

Essentially, they gave cognizance to two basic factors: (1) There's lots of wheat. Further, in any evaluation of the present program, which resulted in the 1958 wheat crop of 1,450 million bushels, it is evident that present production control laws are inadequate. It would appear that, with respect to this point, they would be in agreement with Secretary Benson. So, the growers say a new approach is needed to stabilize production.

(2) From the grower's standpoint, the most pressing problem is that of maintaining sufficient income to purchase the products of industry and labor, which he needs for his operation as well as to retain a satisfactory standard of living in face of reduced acreage and rising costs of production. Thus, a new approach is definitely needed to stabilize income.

In developing their plan the Nation's wheat growers kept four basic concepts in mind:

Wheat growers' net income must be maintained if they are to reduce production below the current level;

The buildup of CCC stocks must be stopped and gradually reduced to a normal level;

Further reduction in acreage of wheat must not be shifted to other crops.

Increased yields per acre must not be reflected in increased Government holdings of wheat.

What is needed, the growers say, is to stop the buiudup of Commodity Credit's stocks, and even reduce them, while also reducing production through a program that takes increased yields into consideration and prevents diverted wheat acres from creating problems with other crops—do these things and maintain growers' incomes.

To accomplish this the Nation's wheat producers are proposing a production and income stabilization plan.

First off, they say, do away with acreage allotments and checking of compliance along with current marketing quotas—and substitute for these marketing allotments expressed in bushels.

They want marketing allotments based on the wheat base acreage for the average of the 1952–53 planted acreage. Each farm would receive a bushel allotment. This would be arrived at by multiplying the base acreage by the normal yield per acre, factored to the county allotment. Normal yields, they say should be based on the period that provides the most equitable relationship between counties and States.

For example, it would have worked out this way for 1958:

	Bushels
Estimated amount used for food in the United States	485,000,000
Estimated amount of U.S. exports	430,000,000
Total estimated demand	915,000,000
Less amount of wheat to be moved out of CCC stocks each year	75,000,000
National marketing allotment	840,000,000

The plan also calls for price supports of $1.60 per bushel for the national marketing allotment. This allotment, as shown above, would be spelled out for each farm in bushels and there would be a price support on this amount of $1.60 per bushel.

In addition, certificates would be issued on each grower's share of the 485 million bushels used for food in the United States. These certificates would be redeemable in an amount to return to the grower full parity on that portion of his production. Using 1958 as an example, food uses of wheat were equal to about 60 percent of the national marketing allotment suggested by the plan.

But, in order to be eligible to receive these certificates, the grower would have to put at least 20 percent—but not more than 30 percent—of his wheat base in the conservation reserve. Moreover, wheat growers insist that neither the $5,000 limitation nor the depletion of the soil bank base requirements should apply under this plan. They recognize, moreover, that a suitable cover must be maintained on the acreage placed in the conservation reserve.

Nor is this all the plan includes. The growers further believe that redemption of the certificates should be provided through the sale of the certificates to processors. This provision is taken from the domestic parity plan, long advocated by wheatgrowers. This would relieve the taxpayer of a major part of the costs of the stabilization plan, it is pointed out.

Wheatgrowers have long held that they are entitled to full parity for at least that portion of their crop that is used for food consumption in the United States.

The proposal, officers of the National Association of Wheat Growers maintain, would save the Federal Government an estimated $500 million per year, based on current costs. A condensed list of the possible savings shows the program would save the Federal Government $100 million from reduced export subsidies; $75 million for the annual storage costs of the proposed defense stockpile and remaining CCC stocks; $10 million for administrative costs due to elimination of acreage allotments and market quotas; $310 milion, brought about by not only arresting the annual increase in CCC stocks, but also by moving 75 million bushels from CCC stocks each year.

Additionally, the growers' plan calls for no restrictions on the use of wheat on farms where produced or when sold to other farmers or to bonded feed processors.

As outlined, the plan would provide a wheatgrower with income from four sources: (1) He would receive $1.60 (approximately 65 percent of parity) for his share of the national allotment, which is computed to be 840 million bushels for 1958. (2) About 60 percent of his bushel quota would be eligible to receive certificates, which when redeemed would provide him full parity on this part of his production. (3) He would receive soil bank payments from placing 20 to 30 percent of his wheat base acreage in the conservation reserve, which is a requisition of the plan in order to obtain certificates. And (4) should his production exceed his bushel allotment, this wheat could be marketed only to bonded feed processors, other farmers, or fed on his own farm—at no support level at all.

To implement the program, the growers believe that at least 500 million bushels of the present CCC stocks should be set aside in a defense stockpile. The wheatgrowers point out that stockpiles of food are equal in importance to munitions and strategic materials and this stockpile, like others, should be maintained as part of our national defense program. This is generally recognized as the minimum level of carryover advisable under current world tensions. The growers also note that costs of storage could be greatly reduced if bids for this defense stockpile were asked on a 5-year contract with a schedule of premiums and discounts that would permit turning of stocks by warehousemen.

The National Association of Wheat Growers insist the proposal will work only if adopted in its entirety. The association proposes that the plan be offered to farmers in a national referendum. Eligibility to vote would be based on those eligible to vote in the last wheat marketing quota referendum, and a simple majority of those voting should be sufficient to make it effective.

We Tolerate the Saturday Evening Post Editorials—But Just Barely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the February 14, 1959, edition of the Saturday Evening Post and an editorial comment on the Post's opinions by my hometown newspaper, the distinguished Eugene Register-Guard:

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Feb. 14, 1959]

WE TOLERATE DEMOCRACIES OR DICTATORS, AS NATION'S INTEREST DEMANDS

Apparently following Dr. Milton Eisenhower's advice to embrace democrats and brush off dictators, the State Department recognized the regime set up by Fidel Castro in Cuba before Castro had even arrived at the capital. Immediately the Castro regime proceeded to demonstrate its democratic attributes by bumping off some of Batista's followers without trial and announcing the trial of hundreds of "war criminals." Since Nurenberg, the doctrine that a general in a lost cause is ipso facto a war criminal is presumably democratic. Nevertheless, Castro's acts, plus certain items in his history, might suggest the wisdom of letting the dust settle before deciding that Castro was just the democrat to embrace.

There appears to be considerable confusion in the ranks of those who think we should eschew dictators and embrace democrats. Some of those who took a lofty line toward Perón have no compunction about offering aid to Sukarno, who is doing a fair job at dictating in Indonesia. Others want us to recognize Mao Tse-tung's dictatorship over Red China—a dictatorship which even Yugoslavia's dictator Tito has criticized as too tough—but are horror-stricken because we haven't kicked dictator Trujillo, of the Dominican Republic, in the teeth.

What it all shakes down to is that an adult country shakes hands with democrats or dictators, whichever is in the national interest of the United States. We are polite to Franco because we need missile bases in Spain. We refuse to deal with Red China because of its threat to our security in the Pacific. We are generous to Tito because we hope to ferment continued discord between his type of communism and the old family brand put out by Moscow. We tolerate Trujillo and tolerated Batista because, with the Communists penetrating Latin America, it is a good idea to deal with men who can keep the Red penetrators under control.

Why we were so promptly cordial to Castro is more difficult to understand. As mentioned above, he has been trying and shooting his erstwhile rivals in true dictator style. He seized British property on the ground that the British Government had sent arms to Batista, as it had a perfect right to do. If the standard of "by their fruits ye shall know them" is still in force, Castro wouldn't rate high as a democrat. Indeed the Soviet press greets his victory as a fatal blow to "American imperialism" in Cuba.

But so squeamish has everybody become about dictators—except for Red ones like Mao, Khrushchev, and Tito—that a Latin American who overthrows a dictator is automatically embraced as a democrat. In England, which once would have sent a sharp demand to Castro to give back that prop-

erty or else, the London Daily Telegraph rebuked the Government for giving arms to Batista in the first place. And the United States, whose embargo on arms to the Batista regime is to a considerable extent responsible for Castro's triumph, has appeared indifferent to the precise nature of his regime.

Our advice, for what it is worth, is to forget "images" and judge these regimes according to their impact on the national interest of the United States. Once that simple standard is raised, it will be a lot easier to decide whom to embrace and whom to brush off.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Feb. 17, 1959]

SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT QUICK RECOGNITION

The Saturday Evening Post, in an editorial, questions the readiness with which this country recognized the new Cuban Government of Fidel Castro. Would it not have been better, the magazine wonders, if we had waited for the dust to settle before giving Castro the benefits of U.S. recognition? The magazine goes on to be critical of some of the strong-arm stuff that went on in Cuba early this year, and asks why so many are so tolerant of Castro, who beat a dictator, yet so prone to advocate recognition of dictators like Mao Tse-tung.

The criterion for recognition, says the Post, should be the national interest of the United States, that and nothing more. We should "shake hands with democrats or dictators, whichever is in the national interest of the United States," says the Post.

We find several holes in the Post's arguments:

1. Recognition does not necessarily mean approval. We recognize Franco's Spain, Khrushchev's Russia, Tito's Yugoslavia, Trujillo's Dominican Republic, and Stroessner's Paraguay. Yet, few Americans approve of these regimes any more than we approve of Red China, which government we don't recognize. There seems to be little correlation between approval and recognition. Recognition, indeed, is not a warm embrace, but rather an official handshake.

2. Who is to determine the national interest of the United States? Is it not possible that our speedy recognition of the Castro government will make it less likely that Castro, a man who needs friends, will turn to Moscow? And is that not very much to the best interest of this country?

3. Today's best interests may turn out to be fodder for tomorrow's recriminations. From 1941 to 1945 the United States embraced the Communist regime in Russia. With American troops being shot at by Germans, it seemed in our best interest to encourage and help those who were shooting Germans. Included, to no small degree, were the Russians. Today, some of those who put the most faith in Saturday Evening Post editorials argue that we should not have been so helpful to the Russians because the Russian regime is, and was, per se evil. They criticise us for not having made a value judgment 15 years ago, but call us foolish if we attempt to make value judgments today.

4. If we were wrong in not waiting for the dust to settle before recognizing Castro, how settled should the dust have been before we made our choice? We waited 15 years before recognizing Russia. It has been 10 years since the Communists kicked out Chiang. Didn't we wait long enough in the Russian case, and have we waited too long in the case of China?

5. As we indicated in objection No. 2, sometimes "best interest" is a long-range gamble. If Spain is a hotbed of intrigue, with a revolution ready to blow up at any moment, as some observers think, should we withdraw recognition from Franco now, so that we'll appear to have been right when the new regime comes in? Would we have been wise to have withdrawn our representation in Batista's Havana when Castro's strength became apparent?

6. What ever happened to morality? How can one argue that it's right to urge revolution against the de facto government of China and wrong, because of national interest, to urge revolution against Trujillo?

Garnishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the second of a series of articles dealing with garnishment in the District of Columbia is inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1959]

FORTY-SEVEN THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVEN GARNISHEED UNDER ANTIQUE LAW

(By Morton Mintz)

The District's bad debt law will be 58 years old March 3. No birthday parties are planned.

The garnishment law may some day, perhaps this year, undergo radical surgery in Congress. Meanwhile its get-up-and-go is positively youthful.

Last year, for example, it kept a couple of platoons of deputy U.S. marshals hopping around the city with 47,877 writs of attachment to be served on employers.

Because March 3 happens to fall on a Tuesday, a municipal court judge will find himself marking the law's birthday by spending hours hearing, granting, and denying requests for exemption.

Joining in this observance, a solemn one, will be numerous victims of garnishment, busy executives who have left their jobs to bring in payroll records, and many lawyers. It's really just another day—nothing special.

Let it be said that the law does have a band of devoted friends, the easy-credit operators. The reason for their devotion, of course, is that their friend the law lets them use the court as their collector.

The clerical staffs of the municipal court's small claims (up to $50) and "M" ($50 to $3,000) divisions compiled the following figures at the request of the Washington Post. They are for the year 1957, the last for which complete information is available:

Suits asking judgment against debtors filed by—	In small claims	In M division	Total
Hollywood Credit Clothing Co., 703 7th St. NW	1,471	2,311	3,882
Marvins Credit, Inc., 734 7th St. NW., and the same firm trading as Eiseman's, 7th at F St. NW	429	1,976	2,405
Crown Co., Inc., 827 7th St. NW	669	760	1,429
Bernard and Bertha Goldberg, copartners trading as Long's Clothiers, 731 7th St. NW	481	839	1,320
Leon A. Tashof, trading as New York Jewelry Co., 719 7th St. NW	342	927	1,269
Union Clothiers, Inc., 415 7th St. NW	652	526	1,178
Royal Credit Co., clothing, 741 7th St. NW	405	819	1,024

USERS OF SYSTEM

These seven firms lead the list. No one else sought so many judgments against debtors.

There is one exception, but it only emphasizes the point: The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. But the phone company, unlike the other firms, a spokesman said, has almost never used a judgment as a springboard for garnishment; almost invariably it has negotiated settlements.

The phone company, as a public utility, must give service to all applicants, except where a customer's credit has not been established (in that case, it requires a deposit).

A total of 58,225 cases were filed in the two court branches. The seven easy-credit firms filed 12,507 of these, or roughly 1 out of 5. Hollywood alone filed about 1 in 15. Each suit can lead to one or more wage attachments.

The combined business volume of the seven firms is known to be well into the millions. Hollywood's president, Herbert Kapiloff, in an appearance in municipal court on July 18, 1949, was told by Judge Milton S. Kronheim, Jr.:

"You are the owner of the business; you set the policy."

Kapiloff replied:

"Yes, sir; I am the owner, but we have 45,000 accounts, and I cannot watch each of them."

In a letter to the editor published in the Washington Post on July 23 of that year, Kapiloff said, "We file suit only as a last resort, after there has been a clear default in payment and the debtor by his conduct indicates no intention to pay."

LAW IN OPERATION

Yesterday's article illustrated some faults in the garnishment law; today's will take a closer look.

Who gets the bill? Persons who had nothing to do with an easy-credit purchase frequently find their wages attached to pay for it. Usually the unknowing guarantor is the husband or wife of the customer, but sometimes the name entered on the account is that of a relative. And there are cases in which an unrelated person's name has been used, for example, a landlady-customer's roomer.

If the supposed guarantor establishes that he is not liable for the debt he is in the clear. But if he should have the misfortune not to get the summons (it can be served on another adult on the premises, even on the purchaser who may wish to keep him in ignorance); if a default judgment is declared against him, and if the creditor sits tight for 90 days before attaching his wages—then the judgment is almost invulnerable to attack, and the guarantor must pay.

LOSS OF TWO CASES

Hollywood Credit recently lost two cases in this area:

A relative bought $100 worth of household goods under the name of Mrs. Blanche Wright, 2651 Nichols Avenue SE. The firm discovered the misrepresentation and sued the relative and then Mrs. Wright. Her first knowledge of the entire matter came when her wages were attached (the attachment was later set aside). She filed suit charging Hollywood with malicious abuse of the legal process. The store's lawyers said the attachment was made "in the regular course of collecting" and without malice. A $1,000 verdict in her favor was returned by a municipal court jury last December 9.

Harston Hall bought $91.25 worth of clothing in 1953. His wife Eula, 1327 U Street SE., said she had nothing to do with the purchase. The Halls later separated. The store sued her for the sum in 1957 and obtained a judgment. The municipal court

vacated the judgment and stopped the attachment. Despite this, she contended, the store went ahead and attached her wages, and the court upheld its action. But she appealed, and last Monday the municipal court of appeals upheld her. Judge Thomas D. Quinn said the store had abused its garnishment powers. Further, he added, "the existence of an ulterior motive may be inferred from this action which appellee is alleged to have done with full knowledge of the situation."

NO PROTECTION

Nonresidents of the District: However weak the exemption provisions are for District residents, they offer no protection at all for residents of Maryland, Virginia and other areas outside the District. The key point under the law is not where the purchase was made, but whether the customer's employer has an office in the District. If the employer does, the debtor's wages can be attached even if he made the purchase in Timbuktu, lives and works in Timbuktu and never set foot outside of Timbuktu.

Exemptions: The law says that 2-months' earnings, "not to exceed $200 each month," shall be exempt from attachment if the debtor is head of a household. (Sixty dollars if he is single.) However reasonable this might sound, it is so vague and weak that it breeds these troubles:

If the head of a household has earned less than $400 in the 2 months immediately preceding issuance of the attachment and wants an exemption, he must ask the court for a hearing to certify that he is head of a household. His employer must bring in pay records to prove the debtor's earnings.

Pending the court determination, his wages are frozen for a week to 10 days.

If he does not apply for an exemption he cannot get it; his wages will be attached. At least three out of five debtors do not apply.

Successive attachments may be obtained on a debt until it is satisfied. An exemption does not carry over from one attachment to another. Therefore, the debtor, if he wants an exemption, must go through the court process each time his wages are garnisheed.

A man may get one exemption. But, by an accident of the calendar, there comes a month in which he has five instead of four paydays, putting him over the $400 mark for 2 months.

CONFUSION CAUSED

This is one of the instances in which the vagueness of the law causes major confusion. For some judges interpret it to mean that only the sum in excess of $400 can be attached, while others say the entire sum can be attached and there is no exemption. It depends on which judge is on the bench. No case testing the interpretation of the judges in either group has ever been taken to the municipal court of appeals.

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK (Democrat, Pennsylvania), put the case against the law's exemption provision this way:

It "is unworkable and economically unsound in that the majority of defendants never take advantage of it and it promotes a coercive influence on defendants due to the holdup of the defendant's salary until the litigation is determined."

Disrespect for judicial process: Chief Judge Leonard P. Walsh of the municipal court, says the garnishment law breeds this disrespect because the court is "used as a collection agency * * * rightly or wrongly, the employer and employee receive mandatory demands on them in the name of the court * * * the court appears to be in cahoots with the seller."

CREDIT FOR BANKRUPT

As the law now operates, even a bankrupt can get credit.

There is one case in which a mentally-ill woman made some purchases at three easy credit stores. Her husband did not know he was being made responsible for the debt. The upshot was that his pay was attached so many times that he lost his job and he was declared a bankrupt. Despite all this and the additional fact that he himself was a financial incompetent, two of these same stores again sold to him on credit.

A member of a District Bar Association group that studied the laws of 48 States says there are "probably more garnishments per capita here than anywhere else."

There were almost 48,000 of them here last year. And each of them, Municipal Court Judge Kronheim told a Senate District Subcommittee "is a tragedy—not a tragedy in a theater, but a tragedy for people consisting of flesh and blood."

Some intimates of the garnishment law believe the legislators who fathered and amended it through the years would be horrified by the true nature of their child. They might agree with Judge Kronheim that it is a monster.

In Memory of the Twelve Hundred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, there is a nationwide appeal for funds to construct a worthy shrine on the USS *Arizona*. This great ship, sunk by Japanese bombs on December 7, 1941, rests on the bottom of Pearl Harbor. Its metal sides are rapidly eroding, and the appearance it presents hardly does honor to the memory of the men who are entombed there.

One of our fine veteran educators of Arizona, Mr. Harold W. Smith, superintendent of the elementary schools of Glendale, Ariz., feels very strongly concerning the need to do something, not only to make the *Arizona* a fitting last resting place for those who gave up their lives, but to remind the Nation of the debt we owe to them and the many other brave men and women who perished on December 7, 1941. Mr. Smith's thoughts have been expressed in the following poem:

IN MEMORY OF THE TWELVE HUNDRED
(Who died about the battleship *Arizona* at Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941)

They lie beneath the sea in watery graves of steel.
In their dark tombs they cannot see or feel
The sunshine and the light;
Theirs is the dark, the black eternal night.
Entombed in sacrifice that freedom might survive,
They now are dead while we are still alive.
Confined within the walls of dank and Stygian grave,
Those honored dead, they speak in pleading voice
On every wave that washes overhead and seals them in the night,
Reminding us that through the life they gave,
We still may walk in sunshine and in light.
Give us the grace, humility, and power
To build within our hearts an altar
Where burns the flame of freedom.
May we not falter till liberty and justice
Walk hand in hand wherever men abide.
Then shall those honored dead be free to walk with us
And see the reason why they died.

—*Harold W. Smith.*

Kentucky Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, it is a good time today and at this moment to emphasize and reemphasize again the economic conditions as they now exist in southeastern Kentucky and in other places at the present time. It is much better, I believe, for us to work up some jobs of ordinary livelihood for our own people than to continue to build airfields for Afghanistan or multimillion-dollar highways for Siam, as we have continually been doing under our foreign aid programs of the past few years.

My own bill, H.R. 3696, would, if adopted, serve to correct conditions and to invite industry into our depressed areas all over America through giving those industries income-tax exemptions that are willing to move into depressed areas and furnish jobs to the unemployed people. And the beauty about this entire proposal is that it neither requires any appropriation nor adds any employees to the Federal payroll.

In order to indicate the conditions now existing in one southeastern Kentucky county, I would like to call your attention to an article in the February 23, 1959, issue of Time magazine. These conditions cry out for correction. The need is jobs. The article follows:

KENTUCKY

NEVER A TIME SO BAD

"This mining town I live in is a sad and lonely place
Where pity and starvation are pictured on every face."

—*Harlan County Ballad.*

The pine-backed Cumberland Mountains walling off Kentucky's Harlan County from the rest of the world breed into the Harlan-born a primitive defiance. In years past, Harlan moonshiners disdained to dodge revenuers; safe on impenetrable hilltops, they patted rifles and taunted Federal agents with doggerel. Harlan justice was rudimentary; seldom was a killer hanged, but often one murder was avenged with another. And when the United Mine Workers set out 30 years ago to organize Harlan's prosperous coal mines, pitched battles between bloody Harlan's miners and company police brought out the National Guard so often that guardsmen were on first-name terms with miners they tossed into jail by the scores.

But bloody Harlan's defiance has long since given in to chilling despair. As the United States puts recession behind it, most cities and towns are speeding up production lines or hunting up new industry. Harlan County's one industry—mining—is dying; because of geography the county is unlikely to find others. Hundreds of unemployed coal miners are in privation's clutch, haunted by the specter of expired unemployment compensation and dwindling food supplies. Kentucky's Governor A. B. (Happy) Chandler has declared Harlan an emergency area. President Eisenhower was informed of the distress last week by Kentucky's two Senators, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER and THRUSTON B. MORTON. Private agencies make the rounds regularly with minimum food and clothes.

Prosperity's victims

Harlan's crisis has a combination of sources. For one, demand for its rich bituminous coal will never again match the good old day of the twenties, when production zoomed to 14.5 million tons a year. For another, Harlan's miners, members of the U.M.W. for the past 18 years, are in a sense victims of other miners' prosperity. Rising labor costs (Harlan operators have so far refused to sign a new U.M.W. contract under which miners would bet $14.25 a day to enter a mine, 76 cents more per ton to load coal) have spurred mine owners to mechanize. But Harlan's shallow (32 in. to 48 in.) seams make mechanization impractical. A third reason: rail costs from the heart of the Appalachian soft coal field have soared.

Ten years ago, 32 big mines were operating; today there are 9. The number of working miners has dipped from 12,500 in 1950 to 5,000. Few other jobs are available. Harlan is all hill and hollow, and the hollows are too narrow for farming or factories.

Rusty red dog

Despite the billion tons of rich bituminous coal still underground, conveyors and tipples are being sold for scrap metal; white-frame company towns such as Red Bud, Golden Ash, and Kenvir are boarded up and rotting; in Closplint and Punkin Center, streets rust-colored from a half century of "red dog"—slate and clinker dust—are quiet and deserted. Miners who could afford to have gone off to Paducah, Louisville, Cincinnati, or even Chicago. Others, who could not, are in worse trouble than in the depression thirties. In Kenvir (population 800), where the Peabody Coal Co. closed its mine a year ago and left 450 jobless, miner Orville Gibson, 44, stays behind because he cannot afford to move his 10 children. Hoping to find work in one of the smaller mines still operating, Gibson meanwhile feeds his family U.S. surplus rice, flour, and cornmeal, gets clothes and shoes from the Baptist Church.

Says Levi McGeorge, pastor of the Closplint Church of God: "I've been preachin' the gospel for 25 years, and I've never seen a time so bad." Adds 63-year-old Ben Middleton, a third-generation Harlan resident and a power in county Republican politics: "I watched this county build up, and now I'm awatchin' it go down. I don't see no hope."

Representative Daniel A. Reed

SPEECH
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a fine man and a great American, Representative DANIEL REED.

I have been in Congress only a few weeks and had looked forward to his kindly assistance and wise counsel. I envy those who have had the privilage to receive his advice and guidance.

Mr. REED may not always have been in agreement with others, but he respected their thinking. Any time he participated in debate, he gave factual and concrete analysis of his thinking. Mr. REED was rugged in work but mild in heart, and was one of the great humanitarians of our time.

The good Lord has called him to his reward. Not only the State of New York but the entire country has sustained a great loss. We will find it most difficult to replace a man of his stature.

I would like to extend my sincerest sympathy to Mr. REED's wife, his son, and family.

Crime Prevention Is Concern of All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herewith an editorial entitled "Crime Prevention Is Concern of All," which appeared in the February 13, 1959, issue of the Messenger of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

CRIME PREVENTION IS CONCERN OF ALL

This is National Crime Prevention Week. And if people are to judge by the reports which come at stated periods from J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, such a special week is badly needed.

During this week, civic clubs and other groups all over America are making special efforts to enlist the citizen in a greater program of crime prevention. Such a program, if properly planned and carried out, could prove to be one of the most worthwhile efforts of our crime-ridden age.

It is a sad fact, but true, that crime and rackets and easy money and big gangsters and the little gangsters who bear the unprintable name conspire to make crime pay in a big way—financially, that is. Some there are who think the total take of crime and rackets in the United States today rivals the gross national product—which means the total of goods and services produced and rendered by the law-abiding citizens of the United States of America.

People once thought that setting up strong walls and doors, posting guards and patrols, and other like measures would be effective crime preventatives. History shows these are but deterrents. The criminal too often has found means to penetrate these defenses.

True crime prevention must be a long-range matter, one in which all persons are enlisted from their youth.

Children need to be taught the need for self-control, the basic requirements of discipline, the fact that law and order are essential to modern society.

The children who learn these and related facts tend to grow into what we call law-abiding citizens.

Their elders have some lessons which they, too, can learn for the good of all.

The example of parents, the lives parents live, the manner in which parents obey the law instead of working to evade it, these things make a greater impression on their children than do words by the hour.

Nor should we minimize the effect of crime prosecution and the manner of its punishment.

A "slap on the wrist" for murder may satisfy the "bleeding heart" element, but it may so influence children and others that they, too, come to place a small price on human life.

Efforts to fix a parking ticket may seem unimportant to an adult, but they can fix in his child's mind the fact that anything is all right if you can get by with it through influence or other means.

So long as this age lasts, crime will be with us because there are those who disregard all but their own desires. But we can reduce the amount of crime by controlling our own actions and teaching our children to be law-abiding citizens.

We can also speak up for law and order, and back it with our votes at the polls.

Are Goods Being Priced Out of Market?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, for some time now there has been a cloud on the horizon no bigger than the palm of a man's hand. This cloud, though small, is very black and is made up of inflation and of the fact that we are being priced out of the world's market.

The following article by Harold B. Dorsey appeared today, February 23, in the Washington Post and Times Herald. The article gives the facts that we do not want to face, and tells a story we do not want to hear.

Mr. Speaker, when the storm breaks, it will be too late to face the facts or to listen to the story:

ARE GOODS BEING PRICED OUT OF MARKET?
(By Harold B. Dorsey)

The recent weakness in the price of crude oil both here and abroad, points up a condition that permits some generalizations on the subject of commodity prices, a matter of very practical interest at this particular juncture when there is so much talk about inflation.

The explanation for the price weakness in oil is quite simple. There's just too much oil in relation to current and intermediate-term demand. But this fact seems to be true of a great many other commodities.

Stimulated by Government price supports which have cost the American taxpayers billions of dollars, we now have a condition of overwhelming surpluses for practically the entire agricultural group. Very recently there was a cut in the domestic price of lead, in spite of the fact that we are experiencing an industrial recovery and have placed a partial embargo on lead imports. Our industrial recovery has increased the demand for copper and this has permitted some increases in the price. However, the industry's leaders are loath to see the price of the red metal climb much further because they fear that their customers will be driven to purchasing aluminum, of which there is an abundance.

There seems to be growing realization that the price of steel is already high enough to encourage imports of certain types of steel for the seaboard markets and that the price of steel included in fabricated products is already so high that it is helping to price such products out of world markets.

A friend recently returned from Europe tells us that he asked the head of one of the large foreign automobile producers if he was alarmed by the prospect that the large American auto manufacturers were going to put a small car on the market. The foreign manufacturer was entirely complacent about

his prospect, feeling positive that he would be able to serve the American market with a better value because his costs were lower.

There recently have been two published examples of English bids to supply electric power generating equipment to the United States at prices substantially below the lowest bid of the domestic manufacturers. In these instances, everybody's bid had to conform with the same specifications; so the lower foreign bid was probably a fairly accurate measurement of contrasting United States with foreign costs.

But how about textiles, where prices have been firming recently? In the first place, the prices are rising from a level that was practically profitless. Fortunately, the industry's inventories were low enough and demand was recovering enough to permit some price increases to offset the currently rising wage costs. Here again, it is quite clear that foreign production costs are lower than those of the United States industry, which happens to be a leader in the employment of American labor.

All of these facts pertaining to conditions that are operating in a negative way on commodity prices suggest that our price structure may already be too high as a result of (1) artificial price supports stimulating production and discouraging consumption, or (2) the wage-price spiral which is pricing some goods out of either domestic or foreign markets, or both, or (3) the complete restoration during the postwar period of foreign production facilities, and (4) the tremendous strides on the part of foreign producers in the direction of improved efficiency.

At least in retrospect, it is clear that the inflationary wage-price spiral could operate as long as the demand for goods both here and abroad was abnormally high as a result of (1) the restoration of producers' equipment abroad, (2) the sharp expansion of producers' and distributors' equipment in the United States, and (3) when there was an expansion of private debt at a rate that could not possibly continue without trouble. More recently, signs have developed that productive capacities both here and abroad may have been temporarily overexpanded. At any rate, that seems to be the story that is currently being told by an analysis of the supply-demand price conditions of important industries.

No doubt it will be contended that the foregoing condition does not represent excessive capacity or overproduction, but that the problem is associated with underconsumption. That is the argument presented to support recommendations that demand should be stimulated by Government deficit spending and by liberal credit that would stimulate another wave of excessive expansion of non-Government debt. The weakness in the argument centers around the simple fact that debt has to be repaid. The interest charges and repayment on debt must necessarily be a subtraction from the purchasing power of future earnings.

As pointed out in this space last week, interest charges on the Federal Government debt for the next fiscal year are budgeted at $185 per average family of four. And the servicing of private debt subtracts stil further from the purchasing power of current earnings. And whenever there is a sharp deviation from that principle, we head for trouble. There is an old economic adage which says: "There ain't no such thing as a free lunch."

The evidence is not all in yet, but the clues that are coming to hand are beginning to suggest very strongly that our price structure may already have been inflated to the point where workers and their output are being priced out of their respective markets.

Fair Trade Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced a bill—H.R. 1253—to establish a national fair trade law. This legislation would make it lawful for a manufacturer to establish and control, by notice to his distributors, stipulated or minimum resale prices for his trademarked or brand-named merchandise, if such merchandise is in interstate commerce, or is held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce, and is in free and open competition with merchandise of the same general class produced by others.

The bill would make it unlawful for a distributor, with notice of applicable stipulated or minimum resale price on such merchandise, to sell, offer to sell, or advertise such merchandise in interstate commerce at a different, or lower price, as the case may be. Any person suffering, or reasonably anticipating, damage by reason of violation of this legislation may sue in any State or Federal court of competent jurisdiction for damages and injunctive relief and be entitled to recover the cost of the suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

This bill is for the purpose of aiding small business from the onslaught of unrestrained, cutthroat competition of large chainstores, department stores, and discount houses which have been flourishing as a result of a breakdown of effective State fair trade laws. It is substantially identical to the bill recommended by the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the last session of the 85th Congress.

My attention has been brought to an excellent statement on this subject by Mr. Ed Wimmer, which appeared in the January 12, 1959, issue of the Cincinnati Enquirer. Mr. Wimmer is vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business which has a membership of approximately 120,000 members made up exclusively of independent business and professional men.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include Mr. Wimmer's statement:

CONSUMPTION CUT BY CHEAP PRICES—UNFAIR TRADE CREATES MONOPOLY, DESTROYS JOBS, REDUCES TAX REVENUE

(By Ed Wimmer)

The growing realization that unfair competition is not only destroying thousands of businesses, but is lessening production and decreasing employment in the distribution field, promises passage of a strong fair trade law during this session of Congress. As summed up by John W. Hubbell, vice president of the Simmons (mattress) Co.: "In the wake of price cutting, there is a shortened markup and profitless selling by the retailer. This creates a chain reaction, which results in the unwillingness of most stores to sell this merchandise at an inadequate markup. In fact, the salespeople in the stores are compelled to discourage purchase of profitless items, leading to misrepresentation and a diminished volume of total goods sold."

Let me ask you: shouldn't a manufacturer who spends millions to develop and market a quality product, and who spends more millions to establish acceptance, have the right to protect that product from a type of competition that ruins its reputation and sales?

The discounter claims that once he obtains ownership of a product by purchasing it from the maker or a distributor, that it is his to do with as he pleases—no matter what the consequences. He loudly claims that any attempt to protect the maker or reputable distributors from his depredations, is harmful to the consumer.

Fair traders, like ourselves, have never believed that predatory competition is good for anyone but the most predatory, and it is good for them only so long as their unscrupulous practices are unexposed. When an item is offered as a lure—and is sold at or below cost—its sale provides no profits to the seller, so he must make up for the loss in one way or another. His competitors may meet his tactics for awhile, but soon they quit handling the bootlegged product, which caused layoffs at the factory, in the stores, and in all other channels affected by an unsteady flow of goods.

There is a false impression in this country that cheap prices result in more buying, but in every area of the economy where cutthoat competition has been at its worst, volume goes down, tax revenues are reduced, jobs disappear, stores are emptied, salesmen and clerks are laid off, expansion and modernization plans are dropped, advertising revenue falls, and public confidence wanes. Isn't this what we had in 1932—with hamburger 6 cents a pound?

Even in the case of cheap milk sales no increased consumption showed up in the worst hit areas; except in home deliveries where consumers bought their regular needs at regular prices. When they quit home delivery for the low price offers consumption dropped off.

This is a profit country and if legitimate profits are not widely spread throughout the economy there is no real expansion, no new venture, no real progress in any direction. When consumers deprive a service station operator of his profits by demanding trading stamps or buy gas in a price war, they help themselves only for the moment, for by depriving others of their just returns for their services, goods, or labor, the prosperity level of the community is hurt that much, setting in motion the chain reaction mentioned by Mr. Hubbell.

Companies like Sunbeam, Bissell, Fisher Pen, Parker Pen, Champion Spark Plug, E. I. Lilley, Colgate, and others, who have fought for fair trade laws, are not inefficient people looking for an umbrella, as the discounters claim. They are reputable firms who know that fair wages and fair profits must come out of fair prices and that unfair competition destroys all three.

The Late Honorable Daniel Alden Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in

the Appendix of the RECORD the following telegram from the St. Bonaventure Alumni Association, of which our late colleague, Daniel Alden Reed, was a member:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *February 19, 1959.*
Representative KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We have suffered great loss in the passing of our distinguished honorary alumnus Daniel A. Reed and join with all his friends and admirers in their expression of sympathy on this sad occasion.

WASHINGTON D.C. CHAPTER ST. BONAVENTURE UNIVERSITY ALUMNI ASSOCIATION.
WILLIAM J. ANGER, *President.*

"And All Her People One"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I delivered last Friday night, February 13, before some 300 Oregon Democrats gathered for a fund raising dinner in Salem, Oreg.:

EARTH MIGHT BE FAIR

On January 4, the Sunday just before the convening of the 86th Congress, I attended a church service in Washington, D.C., invoking the blessings of God on the work of this Congress. One of the hymns, "Turn Back O Man," was familiar but it took on a particular meaning for me in connection with the jobs we Democrats have to do in Salem and in Washington, D.C. You may remember the exhortation, "Turn back O man, forswear thy foolish ways."

Here is the second verse:

"Earth might be fair and all men glad and wise,
Age after age their tragic empires rise,
Built while they dream, and in that dreaming weep,
Would man but wake from out his haunted sleep,
Earth might be fair and all men glad and wise."

Earth might be fair. We have the resources, human and physical. This evening I will talk about some foolish ways we might well forswear and about four places on this earth: Latin America, Washington, D.C., Oregon, and China.

Yesterday morning I was in Venezuela as a guest of the President who was formally inaugurated today. A few weeks ago I went to Cuba and spoke with Fidel Castro. Next weekend I shall confer with him again and make a speech in Santiago near San Juan Hill where Americans and Cubans mingled their blood on the battlefields in their common cause against the Spanish oppressors.

THE POLICY WAS TO KOWTOW

In my first term in Congress I accepted invitations twice to Puerto Rico and once each in Costa Rico, Colombia, Venezuela, and Honduras. As you may remember, my interest in this area arose from my investigation into the disappearance of Gerry Murphy of Eugene. The Dominican official explanation of his death was officially rejected by the United States, but only after a period of reluctance during which I learned, to my surprise and dismay, that our usual policy was to kowtow to non-Communist dictators.

Certainly this is a foolish way we must forswear, and we are in the process of doing just that, if earth is to be fair. We cannot attempt to lead the free world and appear to be faithless to our own revolutionary origins and deepest traditions of freedom.

It is a surprise for me, and at times a little embarrassing, to see how famous I am in Latin America and how newspapers up here refer to me as a Latin American "expert" or "specialist." All I have done is reaffirm that we norteamericanos remember our own Revolution against a tyrant. We like governments of and by the people based on law. We hate tyrants. Nothing very new or radical about that position, except that somehow our State Department had given the impression in Latin America that democracy was only for us and that we preferred to deal with "strong man" governments. This was wonderful for the Communists but not for us. The United States was identified with the tyrants and the Communists with the democratic elements opposed to tyrants.

A CHANGE FOR THE BETTER

It is gratifying to be able to say that our official policies are changing for the better in this respect, thanks to the Vice President's exciting trip, Milton Eisenhower's report, and perhaps some of the protests made by me, the New York Times, the AFL–CIO, and many others.

In all these matters I am conscious of my ignorance and I try to keep in touch with experts, including those in the State Department. Generally, my activities for democracy and against dictators have been warmly approved by career men in the Department of State. Recently I received an enthusiastic letter from the top man in our Embassy in Havana with respect to my visit in Cuba.

NOT FOR THE GOP ALONE

Yesterday was the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, a man I refuse to give to the Republicans, a man much respected and loved in Latin America. One hundred and one years ago Lincoln said: "Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms. Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere."

Let us now leave Latin America and turn to Washington, D.C., that city of alcohol, protocol, and Geritol. We do have a feverish pace. Last week my very able right-hand man, Jack Billings of Eugene, collapsed to the floor by his desk and had to be carried out on a stretcher. The doctors finally decided he had had a coronary without damage. He spent 4 days in the hospital and is now back at his desk.

As in Salem we in Washington, D.C., face great and urgent legislative challenges. We Democrats with our majorities have the opportunity and the responsibility. In Washington Senator JOHNSON has outlined a fine legislative program, a positive program, which I will be discussing as I travel around the Fourth Congressional District in the next few days.

"JUST A POLITICIAN"

The other day my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, PAUL BROWN, told me about the politician who found a farmer in the backyard milking a cow. The farmer's wife called from the house to ask who he was and the farmer answered, "Just a politician." "You come right in the house," she yelled back, "and bring that cow with you."

Politicians are, as the libel lawyers put it, objects of fair comment which, you may have noticed, often includes a lot of unfair comment. "If you can't stand the heat, stay out of the kitchen," Harry Truman advises.

Alben Barkley and several brother Senators were once on a junket in a Middle Western State. Their bus stopped at a crossroads store. Alben and another Senator got out to stretch their legs. Alben spotted a native leaning against the store and proceeded to impress on him what a superduper Congressman this man had working for him in Washington. As they got back on the bus, the other Senator asked Alben, "By the way, what is the name of the Congressman from this district?" "Darned if I know," shrugged Barkley, "just some guy like you and me, trying to get along."

IN THE PUBLIC EYE

We politicians are, after all, only human beings, human beings often under tremendous strains. Of course, this is true in other lines of work except that the results do not receive so much public attention.

Let us consider the case of our two Senators. We talk about this privately. I think it is time to say something publicly. DICK and WAYNE were not getting along as we would wish. WAYNE's reception of DICK yesterday in the Senate and DICK's remarks are most encouraging. Both these men drive themselves hard. They are conscientious, intelligent, and courageous. They are human beings.

In partisan politics there is a tendency to choose up sides, a sort of polarization along adversary lines. This hasn't happened but it could happen. The Knight-Knowland rift didn't help the Republicans in California, nor would a MORSE-NEUBERGER split be an advantage to us in 1960.

I know that a few of you here tonight and some who are not here have already decided you are for one Senator and, hence, against the other. I tell you this is wrong. You don't and you can't know enough of all the circumstances to make any such judgment.

NO SIDES TO CHOOSE

I tell you this is unnecessary. The differences between them have not kept them from working effectively together on almost every issue. Naturally some of the newspapers try to blow the matter up. Last year I saw them quietly conferring in the Senate at a time when, if you believed some of the newspapers in Oregon, they were practically at each other's throats. Of course the Republicans want to encourage them to fight each other. How foolish of any Democrat to help in any way.

The test to apply to our Senators is not how amicably they get along but rather what they accomplish for the peace, prosperity, and freedom of the Nation. By this test they rank high on any list of leading Senators. They deserve our support and our friendship and I believe they have both. We are proud of them and their deeds which have earned them outstanding national reputations for political courage and intelligence. We grieve when they do not get along. We hope and pray that, for their own peace of mind, their differences will end. We will do all we can to speed that day.

NOT SAINTS, NOT LOST SINNERS

A politician, like anyone else, makes mistakes. Excessive adulation and excessive vilification are heaped on him. Seldom is he seen as just a guy trying to get along, to do this important, complex, and trying job as best he can.

Earth will be fair indeed when more citizens will evaluate their public officials as human beings, not as irreproachable saints or as unredeemable sinners.

Turning now to Oregon where the earth is fair in so many ways, but where too many persons are unemployed and where our per capita income is distressingly low. Our State is 100 years old tomorrow and naturally we look forward as well as into the past.

Certainly this celebration should call for a political truce. I congratulate Bob Holmes

and the Democrats for their nonpartisan spirit in this matter. I reproach the few Republicans who delayed the issuance of the invitations to Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt, the Trumans, and Mr. Hoover. The centennial has no room for petty politics. The next hundred years will give us ample time for both petty and grand politics.

WHAT IS ESSENTIAL?

I read the Governor's inaugural address with great interest. Much had merit, just like the messages the President sends to Congress. What we now look for is deeds to match words. The spirit, however, seemed to me to be defeatist as indicated by his slogan, "Is this essential or merely desirable"? To the extent it has any meaning it denotes conservatism, caution, fear, when what we need, if earth is to be fair, is courage and confidence in the future of our great State. Hope, not desperation, is what we need now.

Oregon should stride into its second century, erect and unafraid. Is it essential that our children be able to go to college or just desirable? Only 18 out of every 100 of Oregon's eligible young men and women enter a 4-year college now. Is it essential that we have a full-time parole board or just desirable? Is it essential that Oregon families eat three meals a day or merely desirable?

Governor Hatfield's historic slogan belongs in history. It cannot help him or you or me answer our problems of progress in the present and future. All it really shows is a Republican attitude of despair and defeat.

OUR PROBLEMS ARE CHALLENGES

Our present economic position is bad. The latest figures from the Department of Labor show that 10.4 percent of the insured Oregon workers are drawing unemployment benefits. This is the highest in the Nation. We were also atop this dubious pinnnacle in January of 1957. Last year, in January 1958, we were one-tenth of a percent from the top with only Montana edging us out for this tragic booby prize.

We have areas of chronic unemployment. The Labor Department's list of major labor surplus areas includes Portland, Albany, Coos Bay, Eugene, Pendleton and Roseburg. Our per capita income figure for 1957 was $1,914, California's was $2,504, Washington's $2,128, and the national average was $2,027.

Between 1940 and 1953 the average Oregonian made 1.2 percent to 11.9 percent more money than the average American. Since then, that is since the coming of the Republican Eisenhower administration, Oregon's personal income has risen but not as fast as the national average, with the gap growing even wider. We Oregonians make our living mainly from our timber resources, then, much less, from agriculture and tourists. Each area is capable of tremendous expansion. Our potentialities give us no reason for despair. We can hope to provide our citizens with many desirable services. Our problems are challenges, not chains.

TRADE WITH MAINLAND CHINA

I want to conclude by recommending a change of national policy that could help Oregon become a prosperous State, in fact, a truly maritime State. Oregon fronts on the Pacific Ocean, a great highway for trade. We can only improve the benefits to cost ratios for harbors like Reedsport and many others if we open up trade with mainland China and vicinity. We now enforce a total embargo on our trade with China, a policy that began in 1950. The position of the administration remains as stated to me in a letter from the State Department April 17, 1957, "This country definitely intends to continue the embargo."

We who want this trade resumed only ask that we be permitted trade with China on the same basis we now trade with the Soviet Union. This of course means trade in only nonstrategic items.

China's trade is estimated at about $500 million per year.

In 1931 Oregon and Washington sent 314 million board-feet of lumber to China, whereas in 1956 these States only sent 299 million board-feet to all other nations. In terms of 1954 dollars the 1931 China trade in lumber alone would have meant $16,221,004 for operators, woodworkers and longshoremen in these two States. A similar situation exists for wheat and flour.

POTENTIAL IS STAGGERING

Ivan Bloch, a leading industrial consultant in Portland, says "potentials of this trade stagger the imagination." He predicts "a great possibility of numerous new jobs and industry in the Pacific Northwest if trade with China is reopened."

Restrictions on trade only serve to postpone, but cannot prevent, the development of the military power of Red China. Effects of embargoes are now evaded by purchase or barter from other countries of the items which we refuse to ship to Red China. To say that certain items cannot be shipped to Red China and then permit them to be shipped to Russia, from where they are forwarded to Red China, serves no purpose so far as hampering the Red China regime is concerned. What is accomplished is to strengthen the ties between the Communist countries. On the other hand, increased trade between the United States and Red China would be a means of weaning her away from the Soviet bloc.

Removal of barriers to trade with China would greatly benefit Japan, whose primary market has historically been the Asiatic mainland, mostly China. Resumption of trade with China would reduce the need for the export of many Japanese goods to the United States. Opening of the Chinese markets to Japan would remove from competition in the domestic markets of the United States many goods which are now a primary target for domestic protectionists.

TRADE FOR TRADE'S SAKE

Questions of trade and of diplomatic recognition of the Peiping regime can be considered separately. Trade should be considered on the basis of "trade for trade's sake" and trade questions not mixed with international politics. Efforts of "Yankee traders" were prime factors in the greatness achieved by the United States. That trade should not be unduly hampered now, trade itself being the greatest weapon in the hands of a diplomat and, if skillfully used, can be a great instrument of government policy.

Some former "China traders" are of the opinion that United States machinery, trucks, automobiles, metals, specialized equipment of all kinds, petroleum, and certain agricultural products could now find a good market in China. The Peiping regime has indicated interest in the purchase of capital goods and petroleum. Trade is now conducted by the Peiping regime, which tend sto bypass traders and warehouses to deal directly with governments, or, if that is impossible, directly with producers in the country from which they purchase goods.

Advocates of increased trade see a market for large quantities of capital goods continuing over many years. They are dissatisfied with restrictions which keep them out of the trade and permit Great Britain and other European country traders to lay the foundations for possible future trade. United States trade with mainland China would contribute to an improved standard of living for the Chinese people, creating a market for many of our consumer goods. Chinese people would be able to see how much better goods are produced in the United States.

A SOURCE OF IRRITATION

The United States must create friendships with other peoples. Increased trade with China would remove a source of irritation. The smoothing of trade relations would pave the way toward long-range adjustment of Asian problems. Hostility is determined by many factors other than economic strength; a strong industrialized Red China would not necessarily be an increased threat to the United States. Rather, Red China, through economic strength, will be in a position to assert independence of the Soviet Union and to oppose further Soviet penetration of the Chinese economy. Since trade with the West would not be a temporary, but a continuing benefit to China, it would be difficult to see why she would endanger that benefit by action which would threaten the United States, since China would have so much more to lose by any such action.

American policy should be based on considerations of the benefits to the West from trade in nonstrategic goods as well as consideration of that portion of trade which benefits the Communist world. Certain goods, when sold, are strategic to the selling nation's economy. Where trade yields a net advantage to the West, it should be allowed and should be used, if possible, as an instrument for extending Western influence inside the Communist borders.

The blockade is ineffective. The Red China regime has not been undermined, but only forced to rely almost exclusively on the Soviet Union. The time for a change in our policy is here.

Last Year the Oregon grange strongly endorsed this point of view.

Senator Knowland has been removed from politics. In January last year the California Democratic Council urged resumption of trade with China.

SENATOR MORSE ON DULLES POLICY

On July 4, 1957, Senator MORSE said, "One of the results of the shortsighted Dulles policy is to turn over to our allies the economic advantages of trade in nonstrategic goods. Pacific coast States are suffering great losses as a result of the boycott."

Henry Ford II, in January of 1957, pleaded for realism with respect to trade with satellites. He asked: "Shouldn't we give the people of Red China some alternatives to their present ties with the Kremlin?"

Even President Eisenhower in June of 1957 said, "I am personally of the school that believes that trade, in the long run, cannot be stopped * * * I don't see as much advantage in maintaining the differential as some people do, although I have never advocated its complete elimination." The "differential" to which he refers is the additional embargoed list for China over the list for the Soviet Union. It is, of course, too much to hope that the President's views would be reflected in action.

THE TIME IS NOW

My chief legislative project in the 86th Congress is the removal of this embargo. Nothing could mean more to Oregon's economy. I am having the necessary legislation drafted. I am encouraging the organization of the many persons who believe strongly in the political and economic benefits of trade with China. We are, I am sure, more powerful than the miscalled China lobby and the committee of one million. I am talking with Pacific coast Congressmen like JACK SHELLEY, of San Francisco. I am gathering evidence from Government departments, shipping companies, and elsewhere. I hope that the Committee for Trade with China, now being formed, will soon send a delegation to Washington to confer with congressional proponents, with the Secretary of State and the President. If it is not possible to arrange immediately for a congressional sponsorship of a trade mission to China, then the Committee for Trade with China should sponsor such a mission. I would gladly be a member of such a mission

and I know other Congressmen and other Oregonians who want to be included.

The time for Oregon to became a maritime State is now.

FOOLISH WAYS, FOOLISH WAYS

Oregon's unemployment must go down and her per capita income must go up. Foolish ways, such as no new construction starts for public works, tight money policies that depress the lumber market, trade policies that cut us off from natural markets—all these and more foolish ways must be forsworn if our earth will be fair and all men glad and wise.

It is up to us Democrats to provide the leadership. We will meet the challenge both in Salem and in Washington, D.C. We will go forward into another hundred years of achievement for the families who make Oregon their home. We Democrats believe that we can improve our society if we are determined and if we use the abilities God gave us—and if we are not afraid to make mistakes from time to time and start again.

We Democrats are fully in accord with the closing verse of "Turn Back O Man":

"Earth shall be fair, and all her people one,
Nor till that hour shall God's whole will be done.
Now, even now, once more from earth to sky
Peals forth in joy man's old undaunted cry,
'Earth shall be fair, and all her folks be one'."

Thank you very much.

UMWA Vice President Kennedy Says Russians Would Cut Your Throat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 23, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Hon. Thomas Kennedy, vice president of the United Mine Workers of America, appearing in the United Mine Workers Journal of February 15, 1959, in which he advises Soviet friends in the United States that Russians would cut your throat.

KENNEDY RAPS SOVIET FRIENDS IN UNITED STATES—SAYS RUSSIANS WOULD CUT YOUR THROAT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—UMWA Vice President Thomas Kennedy is a longtime foe of communism. His hatred of that philosophy is based on personal observation of "Commies" at work here in the United States and on what he has seen during his extensive travels in foreign lands. Recent Soviet attempts to lure the United States down the primrose path of peace and coexistence reminded Kennedy of similar attempts in the past. In a recent speech, he warned that this was only another approach toward Russia's real goal, world domination and control. He formalized the thoughts he voiced in that speech into a formal statement for the press. The full text is printed below.)

Is history being repeated? In the late 1920's a distinguished public relations firm in the United States started to build up a case in the public's mind for recognition of the Soviet Union of Russia by the Government of the United States. This public relations outfit represented some of the largest industrial and financial interests in this Nation.

At that time the United Mine Workers of America opposed recognition of Russia and pointed out the dangers involved if our Government accorded such recognition. Briefly, we pointed out that it would result in all of the consular agencies of Russia in the United States being the means of infiltration, propaganda, espionage and everything else, which subsequently proved to be correct.

The basic policy of Soviet communism is for world domination and control. In fact, one of the founders of this ideology is quoted as saying that "Russia could live and coexist with other governments and with other countries to the point where it was necessary to accomplish world aims."

At the present time in the United States, it seems to me that vigorous attempts are being made build up cases for the American people to coexist and get along with Russia. The recent visit of Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan to many sections of the United States was probably the principal propaganda effort thus far in support of the coexistence program.

It is surprising to me in my travels to talk to people throughout this country who mostly voice the same opinion on this subject. I might emphasize, however, that this attitude comes not from among the ranks of labor or among the officers of labor unions, notwithstanding that officers of a subordinate labor union, under guise of freedom of speech, held meetings with Mr. Mikoyan during his American visit. This maneuver on the part of these individuals will be exploited in Russia and I venture the statement that there is very little, if any, freedom of speech in Russia.

From our experience with the Soviets, the first attempt to make inroads in the United States was to attempt to destroy the United Mine Workers of America. In their efforts to accomplish that purpose, a union was formed in Moscow called the National Miners' Union. Fortunately, however, the mineworkers of the United States resisted the infiltrating tactics of the Soviet regime. As an illustration of the attitude and action of the United Mine Workers of America, the leaders of the Communist movement were driven out of the State of Illinois with pick handles. Furthermore the Commies held a convention in Pittsburgh, Pa., which was the first and last they held anywhere in the United States.

If the American people adopt the program that is being built up for them, we can look for repetition of what happened in the past. Personally I have no desire to work with, or coexist with, people who would cut your throat at the opportune time. Russia, at this moment, through bartering arrangements brought about as a result of subsidies and loans, is helping to destroy the American coal and other markets in Europe, insofar as American exports are concerned. They are also bartering with the Scandinavian and Latin American countries. They have made barter arrangements with France and Belgium. In fact, just recently the West Germans purchased a million tons of brown coal in Eastern Germany. Furthermore, France has been importing Russian anthracite to displace American anthracite at a much higher cost to the consumer than American anthracite.

As further proof of why we should mistrust Russia on all fronts, I would point that a recent State Department release of information concerning the shooting down of an unarmed American plane should be enough to open up anybody's eyes. This is just another instance of Russian policy over the years and, in my judgment, it will continue to be their policy. However, despite the fact that Russia has been putting the knife into our backs in all of these economic and military situations, they still have the gall to ask us for cooperation and coexistence, which to my mind is utterly ridiculous.

As one who is a little familiar with the situation in Europe, I am putting these few words together as a matter of information and hope they will be of some value and interest to the American people and our Government.

A Tribute to the Late Daniel A. Reed

SPEECH
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, when our colleague, DAN REED, passed away, a towering oak fell making a great gap in the forest of men that time and time alone can fill. This House of Representatives will not be the same without DAN REED.

Several years ago I spoke for Congressman REED in his congressional district. On that occasion I said that his people must have selected him to represent them in Congress as the Israelites of old selected King Saul, their first king. They looked around for a man who stood head and shoulders above the common crowd. As the Good Book expresses it:

He was higher than any of the people from his shoulders and upward * * * there is none like him among all the people.

DAN REED towered above the rank and file of men. Physically, mentally, morally, and spiritually he stood head and shoulders above the average member of society. He was a man among men, a leader, an inspiration to others, a man of strong convictions, steadfast and true.

Congressman REED will be missed—by his friends, by his people, but most of all by those who were near and dear to him.

To his loved ones and to his friends I offer the following comforting words from an unknown poet. They are words of faith and hope in the midst of sorrow and loss:

THERE IS NO DEATH

There is no death! The stars go down
To rise upon some other shore,
And bright in heaven's jeweled crown
They shine forevermore.

There is no death! The dust we tread
Shall change beneath the summer showers
To golden grain, or mellow fruit,
Or rainbow-tinted flowers.

There is no death! Although we grieve
When beautiful familiar forms
That we have learned to love
Are torn from our embracing arms.

Although with bowed and breaking heart,
With sable garb and silent tread,
We bear their senseless dust to earth,
And say that they are dead.

They are not dead! They have but passed
Beyond the mists that blind us here
Into the new and larger life
Of that serener sphere.

Tho' disenthralled and glorified,
They still are here and love us yet:
The dear ones they have left behind
They never can forget.

Appendix

The Conspiracy Is Unfolding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, time is of the essence in everything but medical science. But if we wait long enough, we may discover that the cocoon—plot—comes first, and then after the chrysalis—scheming—stage, we may get a butterfly—conspiracy.

And so it is with Krebiozen, as the persevering and innocent Dr. Andrew Ivy battles his way through the barriers set up by the opposition—more and more the conspiracy unfolds.

I notice that on the board of directors of the American Cancer Society are familiar names; one, a powerful, important, and influential person who has been a star performer in the Krebiozen question from the very beginning. No wonder the American Cancer Society first, sidesteps the issue, then procrastinates about the technicalities involved in the tests, and finally after nearly a year, issues a flat refusal.

A distinguished attorney and counselor, the Honorable Thomas N. Clifford, of Baltimore, became very interested in the Krebiozen issue because of his tremendous interest in the cancer problem and the scientific efforts to arrest or control its ravages upon the human family. These letters speak for themselves. No wonder Mr. Clifford is disgusted. So are many other civic-spirited citizens.

The great tragedy of this generation is the iron handed grip of control that the American Medical Association, in its unbending and unyielding arbitrary will, exerts over the fearsome attitude of its unsuspecting membership: We set the policy—right or wrong.

The letters follow:

NOVEMBER 26, 1958.

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: I would appreciate it very much if you would send me some information with respect to the new drug Krebiozen.

I would like to know if you have tested the same and if so, what was the result of your tests.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS N. CLIFFORD.

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY,
New York, N.Y., December 9, 1958.

Mr. THOMAS N. CLIFFORD,
Attorney and Counselor at Law,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. CLIFFORD: I have your letter of November 26 relative to Krebiozen.

The American Cancer Society is doing everything possible to find a preventive or effective treatment for cancer. However, it has a responsibility also to protect the public against being misled in regard to unproved methods of treatment, no matter how earnest or how loud spoken their supporters may be.

As you probably know, case records of patients treated with this preparation were investigated several years ago, not only by the American Medical Association but also by other groups of physicians and scientists experienced in cancer research. The conclusions of all these groups was that they could find no evidence that Krebiozen had any value in the treatment of patients with cancer. Up to the present time, no information has been made available to us which would justify the belief that these conclusions were no longer valid.

Recently, the American Cancer Society has had some correspondence with the Krebiozen Research Foundation relative to a possible further evaluation of this preparation on the basis of what is claimed to be additional evidence not previously considered. This proposal was considered by several groups of distinguished scientists, expert and experienced in cancer research. After full consideration of this proposal, these groups of scientists advised the American Cancer Society that the proposal does not provide a scientifically valid plan for conducting an objective and meaningful evaluation, inasmuch as the plan proposed has many defects when compared with the well-established scientific methods now existing for the test of products proposed for human use.

These were three points that were particularly unsatisfactory:

1. The plan did not provide for the trial to be conducted by an independent group of clinical investigators recognized as being objective and competent by the scientific community at large.

2. It did not permit an opportunity to determine whether physicians generally can obtain the same results, since it provided for the administration of the drug by the proponent only.

3. It provided no clear-cut standards for measuring either the results desired or defining or measuring the results to be obtained.

The American Cancer Society reiterates its willingness to support the testing of any substance proposed for the prevention, treatment, or cure of cancer provided the substance is available for testing under the well-established scientific methods known and accepted for all products proposed for human use, and further, provided that satisfactory preliminary evidence exists that the substance has shown promise of being useful in the treatment of cancer.

I hope that the above explanation will be helpful to you in understanding the American Cancer Society's position in regard to Krebiozen and to the support of cancer research in general.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. PRESS, M.D.,
Associate Director, Professional Education.

DECEMBER 16, 1958.

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY,
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: I have your letter of December 9, 1958, and I am enclosing a copy of Senator DOUGLAS' letter to me and a copy of his statement on this matter. I am further sending a copy of your letter to me and my answer to your letter along to Senator DOUGLAS in order that he may have the same available to him for his use before the appropriate committees of Congress.

As to the second paragraph in your letter, you state that case records of patients treated with Krebiozen were investigated several years ago not only by the American Medical Association but also by other groups of physicians and scientists. You do not mention who these other groups of physicians or scientists are. As to the American Medical Association, you do not state that this medical association conducted any test, you only state that case records of patients treated with this preparation were investigated. You do not say how many patients were used in the course of your test nor the exact nature of the tests which you ran. In short, just from your letter, I must conclude that the tests or investigations were on the skimpy side.

Senator DOUGLAS states in his proposal of August 22, 1958, that errors were made by the developers of Krebiozen but that errors have also been made by the opponents of Krebiozen. He then went on to say, "Variout statements of fact have apparently been made about numerous cases alleged to have been treated with Krebiozen in an effort to discredit the use of that preparation." He then goes on to state that Dr. Ivy is not only a world-famous physiologist and scientist but that on the basis of a long acquaintanceship with him, he, Senator DOUGLAS, trusts Dr. Ivy's personal integrity. If a man of the stature and integrity of Senator DOUGLAS feels that way about Dr. Ivy, I feel that the least that should happen should be a thorough examination of Dr. Ivy's product and contention.

Further in your letter of December 9, you refer to a proposal by the Krebiozen Research Foundation with respect to new evidence. You then turn down the idea of testing the product even with the new evidence mainly on the basis that the proposal did not provide for a test along certain traditional scientific lines.

I cannot believe your point 1 that the trial cannot be conducted by an independ- group of clinical investigators. With Senator DOUGLAS' services available, I see no reason why a group from the American Cancer Society, a group from the American Medical Association and a group suitable to Dr. Ivy cannot jointly evaluate the test, if necessary, publishing majority and minority reports.

Your refusal to accept or even suggest on your own any mutually acceptable independent group of clinical investigators is exactly the same as if two litigants in a legal matter could not get to court because the defendant kept claiming no suitable judge or group of judges could be found in the United States and, therefore, the defendant could not be sued.

As to point two that the test would not provide an opportunity to determine whether physicians generally can obtain the same results since it provided for the administration of the drug by the proponent only, I am utterly astounded. If the new product has any value, who is going to be able to demonstrate the value of it, the men who created it and are familiar with it or someone who is not familiar with it. Furthermore, the purpose of the test at this time is not to determine whether physicians generally can

obtain the same results as the proponents but to determine if the product has any value. If it is proven that the product has any value, I have no doubt whatsoever that the practicing physicians can easily master the procedure used by the proponents of the method.

As to point 3 that no clear-cut standrds for measuring the results desired or defining or measuring the results to be obtained, this is equally confusing. The results desired are immediately clear to any and every layman. They are purely and simply either a cure of the disease or any degree of improvement. The simple idea being that even if there is some degree of improvement the treatment may have some value which can be further developed.

As for obtaining a precise measurement of the results of the treatment, I think you are quibbling over trivial technicalities. The person who is sick and dying of cancer is quite competent of judging any favorable result in his condition. I admit that this is not a scientific test and must be accepted with limitation and only gradually applied to larger numbers of people but it is certainly one of the many ways of measuring results. Furthermore, any doctor can easily measure marked improvement merely by observing the patient before and after treatment and questioning the patient before and after treatment. In addition, the patient can be photographed both before and after treatment so that a larger group of doctors can then make their own evaluation of results with a case record of photographs, tests and observations of the physicians' treating the patient. Last but by no means least, the patients themselves would be available to other doctors for further questioning.

As to your next-to-the-last paragraph in which you state that you are willing to support the testing of any product providing the substance is available for testing under the well-established scientific methods known and accepted for all products proposed for human use and provided further that satisfactory preliminary evidence exists that the substance has shown promise. I am amazed at your scientific rigidity in approaching a problem that has defied analysis by all ordinary approaches.

What you are saying in plain English is two things; first, that unless a substance or method of treatment is available for testing under certain traditional time-honored, ancient methods, you will not consider testing.

The second point that you make is that you are, in effect, saying that the product has to be practically proven to be a cure before you are willing to test it. If you are going to sit back and wait until a product is proven beyond any doubt to have value before you test it, what is your organization doing with its contributions?

Furthermore, how can you determine whether or not a substance shows promise of being useful unless and until you first test it? That is the purpose of testing to see if a product shows promise.

From the standpoint of the general public, it is totally immaterial whether a cancer cure is discovered by Drs. Ivy and Durovic or by another group of doctors, or by chemists or druggists or other groups. The essential thing is that a cure be discovered, and the only truly scientific procedure is to run down each and every possible clue.

In conclusion, if you are going to insist upon elaborate screening techniques and procedures before even testing any products, I, in turn, have no choice but to apply a similar set of elaborate qualifications and screening techniques before responding with a financial contribution upon the approach of any of your solicitors.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS N. CLIFFORD.

JANUARY 6, 1959.

Mr. THOMAS N. CLIFFORD,
Attorney and Counselor at Law,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. CLIFFORD: In response to your letter of December 16, 1958, I would like to develop for you the circumstances which led up to a consideration by the American Cancer Society of the proposal made by Dr. Ivy last February.

In the summer of 1957 in response to the query of a science writer we stated publicly, and to Dr. Ivy directly, that any proposal for an objective test of Krebiozen would receive careful consideration by our advisory committees and by our board. In their collective responsible opinion this plan did not provide for a valid and objective test of Krebiozen. We have made known to the Krebiozen Research Foundation the reasons for this decision.

In the first place the society rejected Dr. Ivy's proposal because it called for a joint committee of the Krebiozen Research Foundation and of the American Cancer Society to arrange for and conduct a so-called "double blind controlled test." Under this plan it was further stipulated that the substance was to be administered to the patients solely by Dr. Ivy who is the principal spokesman for the drug. It was obvious to our advisory committees and to the Board, that a test under which the arrangements are to be made by a committee on which the promoters of the drug are represented equally with the group presumable responsible for the objectivity of the test, and in which the principal spokesman for the drug is the person to administer it to patients, was not objective within the scientific meaning of this word.

Our Board considers that unless the test is carried out wholly independently of the Krebiozen Research Foundation the results would have no real significance and would not be generally accepted by the doctors who treat cancer. The Board felt that to assent to and participate in a test of the sort proposed by Dr. Ivy would in effect by aiding and abetting a procedure which could serve no useful purpose.

In the second place, the proposed test gave no basis for determining whether the substance, when administered by physicians generally would produce the same results because no independent appraisal by others was to be permitted. To have validity, one of the primary criteria of any scientific experiment is the ability to duplicate it with similar or comparable results by other investigators.

In the third place, the proposal provided no definite standards for measuring either the results anticipated or the results obtained. The final step in the test as proposed was to record Dr. Ivy's opinion as to which patients had been given Krebiozen and which had been given mineral oil. On a pure guesswork basis he would have a 50–50 chance of being right. On the basis of his selection of patients who had received Krebiozen and those who had received mineral oil the cancer society would have been placed in the position of seeming to certify as to the efficacy of this drug. Our board felt that this would have only further confounded an already thoroughly confused situation and misled thousands of patients suffering from the disease.

Moreover, the proposal from the Krebiozen Research Foundation required that plans for a so-called double blind controlled study be agreed upon by the society prior to a study of the case histories of patients who have received the drug, which are stated to be on file with the foundation. Obviously, one would be working in a partial vacuum in attempting to define the conditions of any evaluation without knowledge of results already achieved.

There were other objections to the test but these were the essential reasons for our board taking the action it did.

The American Cancer Society is responsible not only for exploring all possible avenues in its search for an answer to cancer but equally for protecting the public from the unhappy results which would follow if unjustified confidence were placed in any particular substance which would delay cancer victims from receiving the only treatments presently known to produce a cure—surgery or radiation.

However, there are now, and there always have been, channels open to Krebiozen which, if followed, will produce conclusive results.

The society does not operate clinics or research laboratories of its own and therefore cannot conduct tests itself. For many years, however, it has supported the experimental investigation of drugs and substances which may be useful in the management of cancer. Its purpose in this program is to provide support to qualified investigators in the expectation that from this program a cancer cure will be developed.

As we repeatedly pointed out the American Cancer Society would welcome any arrangement which Dr. Ivy makes with a responsible laboratory receiving financial support from the American Cancer Society for them to test Krebiozen as they are currently testing thousands of other drugs. The results of these tests would then be published by the scientists or clinicians who carried them out and Krebiozen would have to stand or fall, as does any other drug, on the collective results.

This research procedure has been responsible for the discovery and testing of the many compounds now being used in cancer therapy. To mention some which are being used by physicians in the treatment of this disease we list Triethylene thiophosphoramide, Triethylene melamine, and other nitrogen mustard derivatives, 6-mercaptopurine, 5-fluro-premidine derivatives, Methotrexate, and other antimetabolites, isotopes, hormones, and so on. If Krebiozen has a useful place in this armamentarium, it can be established beyond argument in the same way that the efficacy of these other drugs has been established.

The above facts make it clear that the society did not refuse to test Krebiozen but that it refused to participate in a procedure which, in its responsible opinion, would serve no useful scientific purpose and which might well have further misled the public.

To repeat, avenues of scientific appraisal are open for Krebiozen. What is closed is any proposal under which the Cancer Society would lend its name to a test which is not carried out on a scientifically acceptable basis. Any test in which the society is involved must be conducted and documented in accordance with the impeccable principles of the medical profession and the scientific community at large.

The onus of delay and of obstruction rests clearly with those promoting Krebiozen and not with us nor with the medical profession. If there was any reliable evidence that Krebiozen is useful in the treatment of cancer, we believe its proponents have a moral responsibility to submit this substance properly to the scientific community for an assessment of its work.

This is the position of the society whose affairs are directed by openminded, public spirited citizens serving the interest of their fellow citizens without pay and without hope of personal gain.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. PRESS, M.D.,
Associate Director, Professional Education.

JANUARY 15, 1959.

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: I received your letter of January 6, 1959, and have read it very carefully and thank you for your time and effort in answering my letter.

One of the main reasons that led me to write you was that from time to time in the course of drawing wills, I, and for that matter many other lawyers, are called upon, especially for elderly people, to recommend certain worthy charities as recipients for donations. Thus I, as well as many other lawyers, are frequently called upon to answer all sorts of questions such as "Is it a worthy charity?" "Why don't they do this?" "Why don't they do that?" "Which one do you prefer?" Not to mention the obvious questions, as "Would the donation be eligible for a tax deduction?"

You can naturally understand my legal predicament, besides whatever personal feelings I may have on the matter, when I discovered Senator DOUGLAS' resolution to force the testing of Krebiozen.

I must frankly and honestly state that your refusal to test the drug under any procedure other than your own constitutes, in my mind, behavior that is either out of date in this modern, changing, and fast-moving world or else is evidence of stiffness on your part that having once taken a certain position you will under no circumstances change and submit to a test that might prove you wrong.

Upon reviewing your correspondence, it seems to me that your basic position is simply that unless the test is done 100 percent the way you want it done, that is by the time honored, traditional methods, which, incidentally, have not led to any results in this particular disease, you will not consider any method of testing Krebiozen.

Basically, it seems that your objection to the Krebiozen plan as per paragraph 3, page 1, of your letter of January 6, 1959, was that Dr. Ivy, who is the spokesman for the drug, would administer it and that there would be equal representation by the Krebiozen Research Foundation and the American Cancer Society.

Apparently, you seem to feel that there is something unfair about equal representation. Neither I nor any of my clients ever felt that this is the American viewpoint.

As to your objection to Dr. Ivy administering the drug, it is inconceivable to me that you would even want or allow someone else to administer it since on the first trial, at least, obviously the best results could only be obtained by the person most familiar with the drug who would know just how to vary dosage with individual need.

Furthermore, I consider it totally unfair to Dr. Ivy not to allow him to conduct the test. Since this refusal to test Krebiozen has blown up into such a national issue that it is now before Senators in Washington, Dr. Ivy is in the position of being either a hero or a quack. If he is a hero, he should be honored; if he is a quack, he should be exposed. However, assuming that Krebiozen has merit, it would be unfair to Dr. Ivy to let some person unfamiliar with it test the drug, have a failure not due to the drug but due to improper administration of the drug and thereby have his medical reputation ruined—not to mention the loss to the public of a valuable treatment.

And what incentive to research does anyone have if he looks at the case of Dr. Ivy and reads your letters in which the American Cancer Society refuses a test based on equal representation.

On page 2, paragraph 5, of your letter of January 6, 1959, you state that the American Cancer Society is responsible not only for exploring all possible avenues in its search for an answer to cancer but also for protecting the public from unhappy results that would follow if unjustified confidence were placed in any particular substance which would prevent cancer victims from receiving treatment presently believed to be more beneficial.

I am very much afraid that your society is not doing its duty under your own definition per paragraph 5, page 2, of your letter of January 6, 1959, since first of all, I think the general public feel and is under the impression that you are diligently searching the length and the breadth of the land for every treatment or rumored treatment and taking steps to have it tested. To find that this money is not being so used would be quite disturbing to them.

Furthermore, under your definition of your responsibility, I would also feel that you have a duty to expose quacks and fakes. The only way to do this is to test their products and, I think, any developer of a drug is entitled to equal representation in the test under the most elementary rules of fair play.

With reference to your next to the last paragraph in which you state that the onus of delay rests with those promoting Krebiozen and not with those of the medical profession, I agree with you as to the fact that it is not the fault of the medical profession. A doctor engaged in practice does not have the time to do research. Furthermore, he does not have funds pouring into him with which to subsidize tests. No blame can possibly be laid at the feet of the practicing physicians.

However, to have one group of doctors led by Dr. Ivy claim they found helpful treatment and then to find an organization such as yours which has received public funds and is a trustee of the public's money do nothing except form committees to decide whether or not to test the material is unfair to the public.

It borders on the absurd that a group of doctors led by Dr. Ivy should have to appeal to a U.S. Senator to try to get the American Cancer Society, who have been collecting research funds from the public, to test a possible cure under conditions of equal representation.

In addition to everything else, I personally, have some doubts as to the legality of your position. You have received public funds, you are administering these funds as a trustee with a duty to search out and make tests for cancer cures and a responsibility as per page 2, paragraph 5 of your letter of January 6, 1959, to protect the public from unhappy results such as being preyed upon by charities and even well-meaning but misguided people. If your funds are not applied diligently toward these ends, then I doubt that a court would let you retain these deposits of public money placed with you under public trust.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS N. CLIFFORD.

JANUARY 30, 1959.

Mr. THOMAS N. CLIFFORD,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. CLIFFORD: Your letter of January 15 has been referred to me for reply. This letter, which I have read with care, raises a number of questions, in part general and in part legalistic, as to the decision of the American Cancer Society not to sponsor a test of Krebiozen under the terms proposed by Dr. Ivy and the Krebiozen Foundation. You question also the procedures which led to this decision.

As Mr. Runyon's letter to Mr. Davis explained, the American Cancer Society does not have research laboratories under its control or cancer patients under its care but supports cancer research in the universities, medical centers and hospitals of the country. Grants for the support of research projects are made upon the recommendation of advisory committees which consist of scientists from all parts of the United States, experienced and distinguished in various aspects of cancer research. The only way, therefore, that the American Cancer Society could proceed to get any further test of Krebiozen made would be to go to certain cancer hospitals and request them to undertake such a test. The fact however that our advisory committees consider Dr. Ivy's proposal scientifically unsound and unacceptable make it clearly impossible for us to proceed further with this proposal.

The Cancer Society has never received a request from a responsible group of investigators for the support of a proposal for the test of Krebiozen. If the Society did receive such a request, it would receive careful consideration and very probably would be granted.

Your letter also questions the legality of the position of the ACS in this matter. Relative to this I can only say that on our board of directors and on the various committees which passed upon this request, we have a number of able lawyers—individuals, I might add, who are just as anxious as anyone could possibly be to find an effective preventive or cure for cancer.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD S. DIEHL, M.D.

Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1959, I introduced H.R. 3983 to repeal excise taxes on jewelry, furs, cosmetics, luggage, motor vehicles, appliances, telephone calls, and admissions to cabarets, theaters motion-picture houses, concerts, and operas.

These World War II taxes have long been a deterrent to business growth and they are still in effect even though World War II ended nearly 14 years ago.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on this subject from the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N.J., which appeared on February 5, 1959:

OLD TAXES TOO DESERVE HONORABLE RETIREMENT

Representative OSMERS, Republican, Ninth District, has just commented on a classic shortcoming of Government, one which all public officials understand but few care to discuss: it's a tough job to repeal a tax. Once a tax is imposed, even though it be at a specific time for a specific purpose, there it stays long after the time has expired and long after the purpose, if any, has been served.

Mr. OSMERS pointed out that only one of the special excise taxes enacted during World War II has been repealed. It was on the transportation of property. All the rest are still being collected, and the war ended 14 years ago.

The Ninth District Representative makes this argument:

Wartime excise taxes were placed against commodities like jewelry, luggage, or photographic equipment not so much to raise revenue as to discourage purchase. In an expanding economy what we want to do is encourage buying, but there the excise taxes stay. If they are repealed the stimulated interest in buying at resulting lower prices

will raise more revenue for the Government through business income taxes than is being raised through the excise taxes.

Mr. OSMERS must have looked into the arithmetic of this argument. But, whether new tax income of one kind will offset taxes of another kind lost by repealing the excises, they ought to go. Mr. OSMERS has introduced a bill to accomplish just that, and it would be a refreshing change and an economic shot in the arm to see a tax repealed.

Congress Should Have More, Not Less, Control Over TVA—H.R. 3460 and Similar Bills Should Not Pass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, a reading of the record of TVA from its inception in 1933 discloses that TVA has engaged in a progressive assumption and usurpation of powers that Congress never intended it should have. In fact, TVA officials and its proponents have from time to time denied the authority and the intention to do the very things that were later assumed or claimed. Such an agency should have greater congressional control, not less.

It would take volumes on volumes to set forth all the various statements and claims that TVA and its proponents have made relative to the future programs or actions of TVA, and the record of failure to perform in accordance with such claims or contentions. A few of the more obvious failures of TVA to act in accordance with the expressions of its officials and proponents are here noted.

In regard to the cost of TVA, the author of the TVA bill in the House stated that the entire proposed TVA program could be completed for less than $150 million. An opponent who prophesied at the time that it would be a billion-dollar program was only half right. It now has cost $2 billion in money appropriated out of the U.S. Treasury, in addition to the loss of freedom and initiative of the people in the TVA region itself due to the autocratic power placed in the hands of a three-man board.

Surely an agency that has had almost unlimited and dictatorial control of the spending of over $3,760,000,000 from its inception to June 30, 1958, and whose annual gross income now approaches one quarter billion dollars, should have more congressional control, not less.

TVA's 14,600 employees are under the almost unlimited control of the three men who run TVA. It would seem more proper to provide that these 14,600 TVA employees come under the United States Civil Service Commission laws and regulations as do most Federal employees, rather than to continue or expand the almost unlimited control that three men now have over these TVA employees.

TVA DENIED IT PLANNED TO CONSTRUCT STEAM PLANTS

TVA told the U.S. Court of Appeals with reference to the Sheffield steam plant near Wilson Dam that was turned over to TVA:

Said steam electric generating plant has not been and is not being operated and there is no plan or intention to operate said plant now or in the future, or to construct or operate any other steam electric generating plants.

This contention to a high U.S. court was made in order to obtain a favorable ruling on the question of the legality of TVA's operations and program. The record of failure on this point is highlighted by the later operation of the steam plant in question and the construction of many other steam electric plants by TVA, one of which is now boastfully claimed by TVA to be the largest steam electric plant in the world.

Such action clearly indicates that the people's representatives in Congress should have more, not less, control over the operations and expansions of the TVA power empire.

TVA told the U.S. Court of Appeals that TVA "has disposed of and will dispose of only such electric energy as is generated from waterpower inevitably created by the operations of the said dams for navigation and flood control and which is not needed for governmental purposes and which would otherwise be wasted."

Today more than 72 percent of the electric power TVA disposes of comes from steam electric plants This is another indication of why TVA cannot be trusted and should have more congressional control, not less.

TVA officials have gradually usurped or assumed a utility responsibility for the area in which they operate, and after such assumption try to claim that Congress by its action in providing the bond issue to purchase the Tennessee Electric Power Co. properties gave TVA such a utility responsibility.

This of course is not in keeping with the TVA position before the congressional investigation of TVA in 1938. At that time a high TVA official who was in charge of the negotiations for acquisition of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. system said in reply to a question as to whether TVA intended to purchase the Tennessee Electric Power Co. steam plants:

In the case of the acquisition the plan has been that TVA would acquire the hydro plants in the Tennessee River system and the local public agencies would acquire the major steam plants.

And in regard to operation of these steam plants the same official also said:

My point on it is this, that these steam plants are located near these large cities. TVA at the present time is not set up to operate these large steam plants where the local public agencies would have a substantial organization and crew, and very probably the operation of the steam plant would fit in better with the organization setup of those agencies than it would with ours.

Take the Memphis situation, for example, there is a large steam plant at Memphis, which the city will probably purchase in case of an acquisition. Now, that plant would very probably be operated by the city to support our service to Memphis. In recognition of the support to our service to Memphis we would make an adjustment in our power bill. But the city would operate the plant, and I think that arrangement would be better than TVA operating the plant because we would have to maintain a steam plant personnel over in Memphis for that purpose alone. And the same thing would apply at Nashville.

Of course the record is clear on the failure of TVA to follow this claimed program for acquisition and operation of the utility company steam plants.

As a matter of fact, the contracts TVA executed with these local public agencies were "captive" contracts that prevented the very type of operation TVA told the Congress it intended to accomplish under the proposed bond issue amendment to the TVA Act. There can be no question that the distributors of TVA power such as Memphis, Nashville, Chattanooga, Knoxville, and others could have constructed steam electric plants to provide for the load growth of their respective areas that was in excess of the hydroelectric capabilities of the TVA system. Such operation could have been integrated with the TVA system for maximum benefit and economy.

TVA officials also told the Congress that the TVA power contracts with the industrial customers provided for cancellation and utilization of such power for the preference customers of TVA.

I can find no record of any cancellation of such contracts in accord with these TVA statements. In fact TVA has, over the years, steadily promoted and increased the sale of power to industry.

This is but another example of why TVA cannot be trusted with more corporate power but should have greater congressional control.

TVA officials have from time to time attempted to claim that they have not encouraged industry to locate or move to the TVA territory. Yet a TVA Director early in TVA existence made it quite clear that TVA did have a policy or intention to promote such industrial expansion in the TVA area. He said in a speech:

I am very definitely of the opinion that it is the Authority's duty to encourage and stimulate the growth of large-scale industry in the Tennessee Valley area. We are making provision for one of the largest hydroelectric developments in the world, with a potential 3 million horsepower available. We are expending and expect to expend, millions upon millions of dollars in construction activities, all looking toward the development of more and more power. Although we are bending every effort to greatly increase the use of electricity in the home and on the farm, it is obvious that only a large-scale industrial expansion will absorb the great pool of power which is thus being created. As we lay our plans for developing this cheap power in great quantities, it seems to me to be mandatory that we also lay plans for utilizing it in an industrial expansion program.

And a few years later at a congressional hearing this same TVA Director said:

But industries don't set themselves up in a region automatically. There must be some organizing force, with technical and research

facilities. We believe it is appropriate that some of this technical and research work should be undertaken by the Tennessee Valley Authority as an agency of all the people.

One could spend a full year in going over the thousands and thousands of pages of TVA record of its claims and contentions in public speeches, releases, and congressional testimony and the record of later failure to act in compliance with one after another of the earlier claimed actions, programs, and policies. This record gives abundant reason why TVA cannot be trusted with more corporate power but should have greater and more strict congressional control than it has had in the past.

The three TVA directors now have more power than three good men should want or more than three bad men should ever have. The present congressional control of TVA as now interpreted by TVA and as acquiesced in by some committees of Congress gives them almost unlimited control over the spending of nearly one-quarter billion dollars a year. To relieve them of even the present limited control should be unthinkable to any representative of the American people who has sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States and its American form of government. Steps should be taken to reestablish the congressional controls that are inherent under the Constitution.

The Constitution of the United States provided for three separate branches of government. This was to act as a system of balances and checks. The people's representatives in Congress were given a most important task of writing the laws for the executive department to administer. The Constitution also provided for the House of Representatives to initiate the revenue measures needed to provide the funds necessary for the operations of the Government. This authority to provide revenues and the authorization and appropriation of the funds needed to carry out the various acts of Congress was the check on the operations of the executive department through control of the purse strings. To relinquish this inherent control as provided for by the Constitution would be a betrayal of the oath of office to uphold the Constitution. It is quite clear that under H.R. 3460 and similar bills the legislative branch would be relinquishing its responsibility to maintain the check provided for by the framers of the Constitution. TVA needs more control by the people's representatives in Congress, not less.

Last year in the discussion of H.R. 8002, Congressman after Congressman stood on the floor of the House to say that there was a great need for more control by the Congress on the funds being expended by the executive department. Certainly this need for greater congressional control applies to TVA as much, if not more so, than to any other executive department of the Government.

If TVA had operated in the manner in which its officials initially told the Congress it was going to operate, then there would be less need to insist on greater control. But after 20-odd years of progressive failure to so operate and the gradual but continuing usurpation and assumption of powers not intended by the Congress, it is time to call a halt. TVA needs more congressional control, not less.

Under unanimous consent, I include along with my own remarks, an editorial from the Argus, of Rock Island, Ill., dated December 1, 1958:

TVA, 25-YEAR FRAUD

One of the largest and most amazing projects of the 20th century, the Tennessee Valley Authority, is starting on its second quarter-century.

Built at the taxpayers' expense, at a total cost of $1.5 billion, it is the Nation's largest power generating enterprise.

It buys more coal than any enterprise in America. It generates more power annually than all of France. It is now studying the possibilities of utilizing atomic power.

Yet when the TVA act was established, power wasn't even mentioned in the purpose preamble. The whole project was put over, and was approved by the U.S. Supreme Court, as a flood-control scheme.

It is concerned also with navigation, develops fertilizer and reforests eroded areas.

Originally intended to utilize hydroelectric power, it gets 75 percent of its electricity from steamplants—an aim originally disavowed.

It has the backing of hot-eyed southern conservatives who receive its cheap power at the expense of the rest of the Nation, of wild-eyed radicals in the North and of plain and fancy crackpots everywhere.

Norman Thomas, the Socialist leader, called it the only genuine socialistic measure of the New Deal.

Intended to serve electricity only to valley homes and farms, it distributes 51 percent of its power to U.S. defense agencies.

And it isn't satisfied with that. It seeks the authority—which was denied in the last session of Congress—to issue bonds for the construction of more plants.

It disavows any intentions to expand, but Philip Sporn, head of the American Electric Power Co., says a careful study of its proposal shows it would be able to take in 25,000 more square miles—a 30 percent increase—where private utilities now operate, and that it might go even farther.

That would be fully in accord with TVA's history.

It can move with confidence because it has a tremendous tax advantage over the private utilities. The latter pay 23.4 percent of their revenue from electric operations to State and Federal governments. TVA pays 5 percent to local and State governments and nothing to Washington, though it has returned $250 million on its original investment, at the rate of 4 percent.

TVA paid only $4,148,000 in taxes in 1956, last year for which figures are available. But it did better than some Government power schemes at that. The Hoover Dam project pays $600,000 a year to Nevada and Arizona, but all other Federal power projects pay no taxes. If they were taxed at the rate of private utilities, they would pay a total of $82,523,610 into all governments.

What they fail to pay has to be made up by taxpayers in all parts of the country. As one utility executive put it, TVA's waters flow through three States and drain the other 45.

And TVA uses its 4-to-1 tax advantage to club the private companies out of existence.

This will continute as long as the American people, through their Congress, allow TVA to get away with it.

The private companies are asking that TVA be sold off to private and municipal interests. But TVA is still fighting to expand and will renew its bonding request in the next session of Congress.

There is a big principle involved in this unfair advantage which TVA is allowed to use against private companies. Congress ought to stop it.

Even if there were no such principle, the Nation as a whole should be tired of subsidizing the relatively small area which uses cheap TVA power. If private companies were operating throughout this area, Federal tax money would be swelled and the load on the rest of the Nation would be reduced accordingly.

TVA is a fraud against free enterprise and a fraud against the Nation's taxpayers.

The New Jersey Labor Herald Calls for a National Labor-Management Assembly, and Declares a True Labor-Management Accord Could Usher in a New Era of Enlightened Capitalism Which Would Excite the Admiration of the Entire World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the New Jersey Labor Herald, a fine labor paper officially endorsed by the New Jersey State Federation of Labor, affiliate of the AFL–CIO, recently called for a national labor-management assembly to be held in Washington, D.C. It said that a labor-management accord could usher in a new era of enlightened capitalism that would excite the admiration of the entire world. In fact, it is the sole hope for the survival of free enterprise in America, as organized labor is the greatest bulwark against the Communist menace.

In a recent speech at the University of California, Deputy Under Secretary of Labor Millard Cass said:

Labor and management can, however, do more for themselves and for the country by trying to get along together than by trying to harm each other.

It is apparent that New Jersey Labor Herald proposal is bearing fruit. At the New Jersey congressional dinner in Washington on February 5, 1959, Mr. Lansing Shield, president of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce urged that a labor-management accord be reached through a conference.

A labor-management conference was proposed by the New Jersey Labor Herald editorially in December 1958 in the following language:

We respectfully submit the suggestion for convening of a semiannual labor-management assembly, preferably in Washington sponsored, but not dominated, by government, composed of 10 representatives each, from labor and management. We are confident that AFL–CIO President George Meany would welcome such an opportunity.

I include here the text of the editorial for the information of my colleagues because of its importance:

THE WITHERED OLIVE BRANCH

In the spirit of the Prince of Peace * * * whose birth is celebrated at this season, we once again extend a sincere invitation of labor to the masters of American industry, to cease sharpening their spears * * * and agree to confer with leaders of organized labor, in the hope that our tremendous joint powers might, at long last, be devoted to the future welfare of our country.

Surely, the millions of dollars wasted by the National Association of Manufacturers and U.S. Chamber of Commerce, in financing hate-labor campaigns, could more profitably be utilized in helping such fields as higher education * * * or, even the sincere enhancement of sound labor-management relations. To fair, hard-headed business executives this certainly must appeal as "good business."

The only losers when and if labor-management peace is finally achieved, would be the hired mercenaries of NAM who would lose their soft jobs. These parasites thrive solely during times of travail—generated mostly by themselves.

In a recent speech at the University of California, Deputy Under Secretary of Labor, Millard Cass, pointed out that "Labor and management, can and should, do more for themselves and for our country by trying to get along together, than by trying to harm each other." This desirable cooperation should not be too difficult of achievement, he said, when one considers the fact that over the past decade the total working time lost by strikes, has been only one-third of 1 percent.

This is a remarkable record when more than 80,000 collective bargaining contracts are negotiated annually—95 percent without a strike or lockout.

Labor-management accord could usher in a new era of enlightened capitalism that would excite the admiration of the entire world. In fact, it is the sole hope for the survival of free enterprise in America, as organized labor is the greatest bulwark against Communist menace.

An excellent beginning has already been made in several important industries of national magnitude, including the sprawling electrical field. It is interesting to note the success of periodic conferences, on the national and regional levels, by the National Electrical Contractors Association and International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, which deal with every phase of the industry through a council on industrial relations. There are a number of other industries in which joint energies are being channeled into plans for the common good.

They are successful because they spell good business, higher production, and better profits and wages without benefit of Government meddling.

We respectfully submit the suggestion for convening of a semiannual Labor-Management Assembly, preferably in Washington sponsored, but not dominated, by Government, composed of 10 representatives each, from labor and management. We are confident that AFL–CIO President George Meany would welcome such an opportunity.

Here is a major objective for the newly elected president of the NAM, Mr. Stanley C. Hope who, because of his long and distinguished business career, must realize the potentialities of such an accord and the benefits that could flow from it, for the workers, management, and what is of utmost importance—this last real bastion of freedom in a world torn asunder by power-maddened tyrants parading under the blood-soaked banner of communism.

North Dakota Legislature Urges Reinstatement of Local Grain Testing by Agriculture Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, hardship has been suffered by North Dakota farmers as a result of the Department of Agriculture's ruling that local testing programs for grains subject to an application for a Federal loan must be abandoned in favor of testing at one central station. Where farmers could previously take their grain to local elevators for moisture content and grading purposes, they have found that the new central testing program occasions delays of from 3 to 6 weeks on the approval of loans.

Mr. Speaker, the North Dakota Legislature is justifiably concerned about the effects of this so-called testing system, and has forwarded me the following Concurrent Resolution F:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION F

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture to reestablish a local testing program for grains that are subject to an application for a Federal loan

Whereas it has long been the practice of the Agricultural Stabilization Committee to permit local elevator operators to test grain for moisture content and grading purposes prior to the approval of a loan thereon by the Agricultural Stabilization Committee; and

Whereas such policies have now been changed to require that such testing and grading be carried on at one central station; and

Whereas such central testing practices result in a delay of from 3 to 6 weeks in the approval of loans with a resultant inconvenience and often hardship to the owners of the grain who are seeking a loan thereon from the Agricultural Stabilization Committee: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby urged to discontinue the central testing system now in existence, and that the Agricultural Stabilization Committee accept the results of tests carried on by local elevator operators for the purpose of approving processing and approving applications for grain loans from the Agricultural Stabilization Committee; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the Secretary of Agriculture and each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,
Speaker of the House.
GERALD L. STAIR,
Chief Clerk of the House.
C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
VIC GILBREATH,
Secretary of the Senate.

I am today contacting the Secretary of Agriculture on this problem, and it is hoped that the Department will reinstitute its former policy of local testing.

Leslie L. Biffle Signally Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, recently my constituent, the Honorable Leslie L. Biffle, was recognized signally by a vast number of well-wishing friends on completing 50 years of public service in the Nation's Capital.

I include a newsletter distributed under date of January 23, 1959, regarding this tribute to Mr. Biffle:

LESLIE L. BIFFLE SIGNALLY HONORED

Thoroughness, attentiveness to duty, loyalty to friends, and hard work brought fame and distinction to Leslie L. Biffle, of Piggott, Ark. He was honored at a magnificient testimonial dinner after 50 years of outstanding public service in the Nation's Capitol. More than 1,200 friends swelled the grand ballroom to overuowing in the swank Mayflower Hotel. The requests for tickets had to be shut off a few days before the banquet was held for lack of space in the five ballrooms which were thrown together for the event. The $15-a-plate dinner featured music and songs by recognized artists, addresses by leaders from both major political parties, and presentation of gifts.

Here are some of the tributes paid to Les Biffle by speakers on the program:

"He's affable, courteous, and deserving of our admiration and esteem."

"His personality endeared him to the hearts of all of us."

"Distinguished public servant, who knew what the word 'loyalty' meant."

"Only man who could whisper to Senators without moving his lips."

"The Senator at Large from the United States."

"His counsel was sought. He was adviser to those in the highest places of responsibility."

"He never forgets a friend and never fails to reward one."

"Confidant of Presidents."

"A pinnacle few men attained."

"Walking encyclopedia."

"He makes no demands; all he asks is to do something for his friends."

"Never puts off until tomorrow * * * did his job to perfection."

Former President Truman said at a news conference while in office, "They don't come any better than Les Biffle."

"The Arkansas Polister of 1948." (This label given him was due to his activities during the presidential campaign of that year in which he dressed as a chicken peddler and drove through several States in a dilapidated pickup to get the tenor of the voters in rural America. He reported that the trend was to Truman.)

The words of praise came with genuine fervor and earnestness. It was evident that each of those who made remarks admired

and respected the soft-spoken Arkansan who had served as Secretary of the U.S. Senate and in many other capacities over the past 50 years.

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, the toastmaster, introduced celebrities from Government and business. He read the laudatory joint resolution which was passed unanimously by the Arkansas General Assembly commending Mr. Biffle's outstanding public service. Mr. and Mrs. Biffle were presented wristwatches and a large color television set.

The lavish function featured a musical spectacular and other numbers which were concluded at a late hour.

THE MENU

Fresh fruit cocktail, terrapin soup, hearts of pascal celery, mixed olives, grilled heart of filet mignon sur canope with mushrooms, sauce perijourdine, asparagus tips polonaise, potatoes au gratin, salade verte (mixed green) de saison, Lorenzo dressing, coupe aux marrons, ice cream with whipped cream, cakes, coffee.

Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, last week the membership of the House of Representatives approved legislation known as the Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959.

Since 1921 this area of taxation has posed a most difficult and perplexing problem. It is therefore appropriate for me to compliment my committee chairman and each fellow member of the committee who have labored so diligently and with such efficiency to prepare this legislation for consideration.

The insurance company of today is not the simple protective agency of yesterday, but rather today it serves its policyholders as bank and protection agency. The result has been that the savings operation has become so intertwined with the pure insurance function that it is difficult to determine who is the beneficiary of the investment income. The problem of taxing the company's income and not the income necessary to meet long-range contingencies and commitments is difficult of solution.

It is my belief that this legislation takes the most practical and effective approach to the problem. No longer will this industry be taxed by means of a fictitious formula that taxes investment income of a company even though that company sustained a net loss on its year's operation.

This bill, H.R. 4245, departs from the present unequitable system by including the various types of income in the tax base. The underwriting gains which were previously untaxed are now included in the tax base along with the free investment income and with capital gains.

Although I concur generally with the approach this legislation takes to the solution of the problem, it was with some hesitancy that I voted affirmatively. I question whether there has been sufficient consideration given to what the economic impact will be under circumstances of retroactively imposing such a substantial tax increase on this industry. We must be certain that this legislation will not result in such a burden as to discourage saving through the purchase of life insurance. It is essential to the future economic well-being of this country that our people are encouraged to provide for their own future security.

It must also be noted that the insurance industry is heavily taxed at the State level and the cumulative burden of all taxes must be weighed in considering the appropriateness of a particular tax.

It was for these reasons that I felt compelled to express my views on the possible ramifications of this bill. I am confident that during the legislation's further study in the Congress careful consideration will be given to these economic factors.

Military Draft Versus Sound U.S. Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, a small minority of us sought a 2-year extension of the draft in order that a thorough and comprehensive review might be made of our military manpower procurement problem. Our efforts failed, and the majority of my distinguished colleagues voted to continue the draft for another 4 years. I opposed this arbitrary extension in order to point out to the people the urgency of the need for a reevaluation of our manpower problem in the military service. To this end, my "nay" vote proved most successful. My mail has been overwhelmingly in support of the position I took. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch and the Waukesha (Wis.) Daily Freeman, which are in support of my position:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

THE DRAFT IS OUTMODED

If the Armed Forces are to have the newest and best weapons that science and industry can provide, they should have men who are fully qualified to use them. Therein lies a manpower problem. A vastly improved National Defense Establishment could be had if a way were found to solve this manpower problem, the crux of which is the draft. The draft simply is not supplying the type of recruits that are needed, nor is it fair to the youth of the land.

As matters stand right now, military conscription is necessary until some better substitute can be devised. The draft inspires many to volunteer so that they can pick their own branch of service as well as the time they want to begin serving. If there were no draft, there would be insufficient volunteers. This is proved by the fact that during 1948–49 the armed services tried to maintain a combined force of less than 2 million men without draft quotas—and failed miserably.

There is little chance to devise a substitute for the draft between now and June 30, when the law will expire unless extended. It seems certain to be extended. The House voted last Thursday, 381 to 20, to extend it for 4 years.

Why would it not be wise to extend the bill just for 2 years, and during that time have a joint congressional committee, or a civilian-military committee, study the manpower problem seriously in an effort to reach a solution?

A good long look at the draft and how it has been functioning is badly needed. The Army is the only service using the draft. In recent months it has called about 8,000 men per month; less than 7,000 are inducted for the 2-year period of duty. About 90,000 sign up annually for a 6-month period of service followed by 5 years in the Reserve or the National Guard. Thousands of others volunteer for duty in the Air Force, Navy, Marines and Coast Guard, which do not depend on draftees.

Some 1,200,000 youths come of military age every year. According to the Pentagon, some 660,000 persons enter the services, only 180,000 being inductees. Thus the chances are excellent the vast majority of the class that attains military age every year will not see service. That is not fair to those who are drafted or who volunteer.

Reference is sometimes made to the military pay increase bill which was passed last year by Congress after it had somewhat watered down the Cordiner report which stressed the need for better pay to keep the best men in the service. The matter of higher pay begs the question for those who enter in the lowest ranks. And even the higher pay now permitted is not sufficient to retain many of the very best and most badly needed men.

Surely a group of men such as those who turned in the Rockefeller and Johnson committee reports should be able to find a better solution to the manpower problem. The draft, as it stands now, is badly outmoded in this era of atomic-powered submarines, radar, ballistic missiles, and space satellites. A thoughtful study to devise a space-age substitute is needed.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Daily Freeman]

MILITARY DRAFT VERSUS SOUND U.S. DEFENSE

Second District Congressman ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER was among 20 Members of the House of Representatives who last week voted against extension of the military draft for 4 more years. His position is sound and the people of this district should give full approval to it. We are particularly impressed with the reasons for his vote when he said:

"I am convinced that our future military position requires an immediate and comprehensive study of how we can best maintain a well trained and highly skilled military force to operate the equipment developed in this age of nuclear weapons and space travel.

"Therefore, I supported unequivocally the 2-year draft extension coupled with a thorough national review of the entire manpower problem. The 2-year extension failed. I could not in good conscience support the arbitrary 4-year extension, which to my way of thinking is merely sweeping our military manpower problem under the rug for another 4 years. It is my belief that our future military security depends on how quickly we reevaluate our needs in the light of recent technological advances."

The Freeman has been a consistent foe of the universal military training system under which the armed services are operating. The day Congress adopted this legislation it was installing an outdated form of military service which has become more grotesque in its application with each passing year.

The longer the United States extends the Military Draft Act the more unprepared it will be to meet tomorrow's national defense requirements. This act is guilty of fastening onto the Nation a wasteful and unnecessary program of nonpreparedness. It is forcing young men into military service who have no business there, who through no fault of their own are contributing nothing to the national defense and because of this are wasting their own time and the time of those attempting to instruct them. Considerably more important, the Nation is spending billions of dollars unnecessarily going through the motions of giving these men a smattering of useless military training simply to satisfy the advocates of universal military training, who claim that every red-blooded American boy should know how to shoulder a gun and dress in a fatigue uniform.

The study Representative KASTENMEIER is requesting would, if it is done honestly and impartially, reveal that an immediate return to voluntary enlistment is the Nation's best course. It would give our military services an opportunity to appeal directly to those who by personality, mentality, and interest would make the type of military personnel we require. The effective defense of this country is no longer dependent on how many young men who are able to carry a gun can be mustered. If we continue to rely upon the safety which was once found in numbers, the United States will fall victim to its own monumental error. We must put an end to thinking of military service as a necessary physical exercise which every youth must taste to qualify him for manhood. As KASTENMEIER says, unless we reevaluate our needs in the light of recent technological advances we will fall as far behind the times in an effective national defense program as we have in the conquest of outer space.

The Neighbors Are Important

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Evening Herald, Rock Hill, S.C., February 16, 1959:

THE NEIGHBORS ARE IMPORTANT

In trying to build friends, the United States often overlooks its near neighbors.

For that reason, President Eisenhower's meeting this week with Mexico's new President, Adolfo Lopez Mateos, is important.

Mexico is an important link with Central and South America, where U.S. stock does not rate as high as we'd like.

Eisenhower and Lopez Mateos are to meet in Acapulco, Mexico. What they'll talk about may never be announced—just as no announcement was made 3 years ago when Eisenhower met with Mexico's President Adolfo Ruiz Cortines in White Sulphur Springs, W. Va.

But the need to build better understanding must be in the front of both men's minds.

Mexico's lower level of education and lower standard of living throw up roadblocks. The language barrier slows the spread of better understanding. Anti-American feeling has been something of a political tradition in Mexico—although this feeling is not nearly as strong as it used to be. Mexico is 98 percent Catholic, whereas the United States is predominantly Protestant.

Still, there are forces pulling the two countries together.

The United States is Mexico's main customer. And Mexico, in turn, buys more of its supplies from the United States than from any other country.

The United States has given Mexico about $109 million in net aid since World War II—far less than it has given many other countries, but still a big help.

Half a million Mexicans come into the United States each year to work as migrant farmworkers. They pick up some knowledge of U.S. customs, which they take home with them—though it must be added that some of these workers are abused and take home bad impressions.

Relations between the United States and its near neighbors become more important every day. Long neglected fields close to home could stand a lot more cultivation. One of those fields is Mexico.

Hate Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1959, I introduced H.R. 1934 which curbs hate mailers by prohibiting the transmission through the mails of matter calculated to arouse racial hostility.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a January 25, 1959, editorial and a February 2, 1959, article, both of which were published in the New York Times:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1959]

HATE LITERATURE

It is now reported that the distribution of racist and hate literature in this country reached a new postwar high last year. The chairman of the national executive board of the American Jewish Committee, in making this report, made some suggestions about constructive community action to meet this menace. He urges against unilateral retaliation, giving undue publicity, and the entering into logical disputes. He hopes for better support for interfaith community programs.

This is good as far as it goes. No one can criticize generosity and moderation. But the menace must be met on a sterner ground. The hate literature is not merely a matter of interfaith misunderstanding. It is directed, not just against Jews, but against Negroes, Roman Catholics, liberal Protestants, and indeed against any and all men of good will who wish to solve the problems of community living on the basis of reasonable understanding.

When this literature can be tied up to overt action such as bombing of public buildings or organized lynchings it becomes a problem in the preservation of public order, of life and of property and thus touches the law itself.

Manifestly, some of our legislative processes need to be tightened up in this field. Most of our statutes concerning the distribution of printed matter are concerned with only two things, obscenity or fraud. And it is possible for the hatemongers to do incalculable damage without being even faintly obscene (although some of them are) and without the provable intent to defraud.

We are jealous of the right to print and publish and distribute expressions of free opinion. But, as an eminent Justice of our Supreme Court once pointed out, the right of free speech does not permit a person to raise a false cry of "fire" in a crowded theater. The legal ground upon which the hatemongers can be met is complicated and occasionally tricky. For this reason, there must be more, and more careful, study of how to meet what is an obvious danger to our freedom, our social dignity and our community self-respect.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 2, 1959]

HEAD OF HADASSAH ASKS U.S. LAW TO BAN HATE LITERATURE SPREAD

(By Irving Spiegel)

The head of Hadassah, the women's Zionist organization of America, called on Congress last night to enact legislation to ban the distribution of hate literature.

Dr. Miriam K. Freund, president of Hadassah, declared that "the activities of the hatemongers and bigots in the United States give aid and comfort to those forces which seek our destruction."

"Soviet leaders," she added, "seeking to undermine American prestige abroad, have chided us about the existence of hatemongering in the United States."

She spoke at the opening session of a four-day midwinter conference at Hadassah's headquarters, 65 East 52d Street. Hadassah has 318,000 members.

Dr. Freund told the delegates, representing every section of the country and Puerto Rico, that an increasing distribution of hate literature "betrays an apathy of Americans toward this crucial problem."

She declared that President Eisenhower should take the lead in a campaign against bigotry, hate and discrimination.

"The activities of the hatemongers and bigots," she said, "provide a vehicle for foreign governments to strike at certain religious, racial and ethnic groups in efforts to divide the American people.

"Soviet publications are only too eager to play up incidents that present America in a derogatory light."

Dr. Freund disputed First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan on his assertion that the Jews within the Soviet Union had the right to develop their cultural facilities.

"But he says the Jews want to become a part of Russian culture," she said. "It is inconceivable that three million Jews would decide overnight to scuttle their Jewish cultural heritage."

Discussing President Eisenhower's proposed budget for foreign aid, Dr. Freund declared that the requested $3,930 million must be increased by Congress to provide larger funds for vital economic assistance programs.

Mrs. Alexander M. Dushkin, chairman of the Hadassah Council in Israel, said that Hadassah facilities there were being prepared to aid in receiving the expected heavy influx of immigrants.

Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1959, I introduced H.R. 1933 which will severely punish "hate bombers" by prohibiting certain acts involving the importation, transportation, pos-

session, or use of explosives, and H.R. 1934 which curbs "hate mailers" by prohibiting the transmission through the mails of matter calculated to arouse racial hostility.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem, which is extremely timely and fitting in these material days. It was written by the author of such famous songs as "Honeysuckle Rose," "In the Mood," "Memories of You" and "S'posin'." Andy Razaf, the uathor of these songs and this poem, was a resident of Englewood, N.J., in my congressional district, for many years. He is now residing in Los Angeles, Calif.:

A MIXED-UP WORLD

There's plenty to do in this mixed-up world
For all of us each day,
Sweeping the dirt beneath the rug
Is not the honest way.

Let's clean up the human misery,
Hypocrisy, greed and hate,
And practice the noble things we preach
Before it is too late.

Too long have we worshiped material things,
With our eyes on worthless goals,
Improving our gadgets and machines
But not improving our souls.

Too long have we turned away from God
And disobeyed His commands;
Too many speak of serving Him
With unwilling hearts and hands.

The angels must weep as they look at man,
Now striving to conquer space
Before he has learned to conquer himself
And make earth a decent place.

What can we hope to do on the moon
Or on some planet afar?
When so much good is left undone
Down here, right where we are!

North Dakota Legislature Asks Early Action on Bills To Start Construction of Garrison Diversion Unit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, at the time the Garrison Dam was started, there was a clear understanding and a tacit promise that the irrigation development in North Dakota should go forward with all possible speed. This golden promise of irrigation benefits was to help compensate us for the loss of our lush river bottom lands, above Garrison, which were flooded out when the dam was completed, and to help stabilize agriculture in a large area of the State. 460,000 acres were taken for Garrison Reservoir and 88,000 acres of North Dakota lands were taken for the Oahe project. Till now, despite the promise, not one single irrigated acre has been developed.

The North Dakota Legislature, now in session, is understandably concerned that no action has yet been taken on the diversion unit, and I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the following concurrent resolution, which has the unanimous support of North Dakota's delegation in Congress:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION H

A concurrent resolution endorsing and approving the Bureau of Reclamation project plan report on the Garrison diversion unit and supporting and urging early enactment of desirable and needed modifying and confirming legislation authorizing the construction thereof

Whereas the Garrison diversion unit, Garrison division, Missouri River Basin project, located in North Dakota (and a small segment in South Dakota) was in general authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944, and when developed will:

1. Enhance the future economic welfare and prosperity of the people of the State, particularly those within the project area;

2. Provide for the eventual irrigation of over 1 million acres of land periodically subjected to drought which will result in a more diversified and stabilized agriculture in a large region of North Dakota;

3. Replenish and restore the depleted waters of several lakes, rivers, and streams and augment the levels and flows therein; and

4. Make available within affected areas water diverted from the Missouri River for irrigation, domestic, municipal, and industrial needs, production of hydroelectric power, recreation, fish and wildlife, and other public beneficial uses; and

Whereas the construction of the Garrison diversion unit will result in a greatly expanded and more dependable agricultural and business economy in North Dakota, which will result in an accelerated population growth and increased prosperity in the area; and

Whereas the investigations and studies by the Bureau of Reclamation indicate that the project is economically feasible and the Bureau advises that it is in a position to initiate construction thereof as soon as appropriate modifying legislation now pending in Congress has been enacted and funds made available; and

Whereas the farmers in the project areas and all North Dakotans have shown a definite interest in and demand for the early construction and development of the Garrison diversion unit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the senate concurring therein, That the 36th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota favors and approves the Garrison diversion unit, and respectfully urges the appropriate committees of Congress to schedule hearings at the earliest date possible on S. 147, H.R. 1891, and H.R. 1963 to make certain provisions in connection with the authorization and construction of said unit, to the end that construction thereof may be undertaken as soon as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof be mailed by the secretary of state to Hon. James E. Murray, chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall, chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; Senators William Langer and Milton R. Young; Representatives Quentin N. Burdick and Don L. Short; Hon. Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior; Hon. Fred G. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior; and Hon. W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation.

HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,
Speaker of the House.
GERALD L. STAIR,
Chief Clerk of the House.
C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
VIC GILBREATH,
Secretary of the Senate.

Is It Evil To Own a Large Farm?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, propagandists are busy in an effort to build up resentment against a farmer because he owns or operates a sizable acreage. These people would lead one to believe that a large operation is wicked and evil since such farmers allegedly receive the major part of Government benefits.

If that argument were valid it could just as well be argued that the farm programs are just a dole or handout to farmers irrespective of the size of this participation by them.

A few days ago I received a letter from Mr. Lloyd Godley, of Osceola, Ark., on this subject. The writer of the letter is a farmer, general manager of the Mississippi County (Ark.) Production Credit Association, and one of the Nation's foremost agricultural leaders. His letter is recommended reading.

I am attaching also my reply to Mr. Godley's letter:

OSCEOLA, ARK., *February 11, 1959.*

Hon. E. C. "TOOK" GATHINGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR "TOOK": Why is there such a persistent drive to sway public opinion on our farm problems by condemning larger than family-size farming operations?

It is distressing that some of our stanchest friends seem to have succumbed to the idea that bigness in agriculture is evil. They say that big farmers get most of the price support money, but ignore the fact that 20 percent of the farmers grow 80 percent of the crops.

Farmers, large or small, do not generally approve of discrimination because of the size of a farming operation. They feel that we should have a sound farm economic program, not a farm relief program.

Most people are aware of the fact that our Nation has been made great because of every man's privilege of becoming as big as his energy, inclination, and ingenuity will permit. They do not believe that the farmer should be singled out by his Government as being one entitled to less consideration than those of other economic groups.

A few days ago I was talking with a typical so-called family-type farmer and here is what he said. "My son likes farming and I would like to send him to an agricultural college for a degree in agriculture. He and I have talked it over and we have just about decided that it may be wiser for him or any other ambitious farm boy to prepare for some other field. Here is my son's thinking and I agree with him, the Government will in the years to come limit the benefit of farm programs to small operators. In that case the ambitious farmer who wishes to fully apply his managerial ability will be materially handicapped by Government restrictions relative to the size of his farming operation."

I could not disagree with the thinking of this father and son.

Most certainly I do not wish to criticize those very fine and able Congressmen and Senators who are devoted to the cause of agriculture, but I do think it is a disservice to the cause of agriculture when farmers are divided as to the size of their operation and

when one group is set apart as deserving of less consideration because of his apparent success.

This farmer's son could prepare to enter big business, big industry, or big labor without fear of economic restrictions or reprisals and with the knowledge that he would be permitted full exercise of his managerial and executive ability. But, not so in agriculture if limitations become law. It would be easy to understand if this were the enemies of agriculture advocating this policy, not the friends.

Our farm leaders who have joined themselves together for the purpose of formulating programs to present to the Congress are constantly haunted by the fear that program benefits will be limited to a certain size farming operation.

If we may console ourselves by the fact that no compulsory program has ever had limitations due to size of operation then we may be led to believe that none ever will.

On the other hand, if all big farmers were exempt from allotment compliance we would indeed be buried by surplus.

To be sure we farmers have much unfair competition but it doesn't come from the legitimate farmer. It comes from those who make their money in some other business and enter farming as a fascinating hobby.

If there can be any legal way, this type of farming should be eliminated but not at the expense of honest-to-goodness farmers who have through their own efforts built up a large farming operation.

No industrial corporation has ever had tariff benefits limited because of the size of the business, nor has any fast tax write-off or any other subsidy been limited to industry or business because of size—then why discriminate against agriculture.

What we need is farm legislation that will permit agriculture a fair share of the national income. It should not be tied in with social legislation.

When farm people have a stable expanding income consistant with the progress of the other segments of our economy, farmers will set and maintain their own social pattern which will not be inconsistent with the well-being and traditions of this Nation.

It is a fact that small farmers have made a mighty contribution to the social and economic structure of this Nation, but they have never been deprived by law from expanding to the full extent of their ability.

They should never be so handicapped.

Many farmers believe that the issue of "limitations" is the greatest stumbling block in the road to sound and permanent farm legislation.

I am writing this with the hope that a farmer's viewpoint may be of value to you in your deliberation on this vital issue.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LLOYD GODLEY.

FEBRUARY 19, 1959.

Mr. LLOYD GODLEY,
Osceola, Ark.

DEAR LLOYD: Your letter is greatly appreciated and so clearly depicts the valid and sound arguments in opposition to payment limitation movements which have grown up in recent years. I have in my file an earlier letter from you on this subject which I prize most highly. This story needs to be told and reiterated.

It is true that larger farm operators receive the greater return from benefits provided by the Government. The message is being related and emphasized as if such a person is a culprit, scoundrel, or grand rascal. His participation in these programs is greater since his contributions in volume output are larger. It is an effort to poison and prejudice the minds of the American people that the large farmer should be made smaller. That theory—if carried to its ultimate end conclusion—would mean that if a person had saved his money and lived frugally and acquired new holdings from time to time he would find himself confronted with a movement to split up his operations among his less fortunate brother farmers. That type of philosophy is not in keeping with the principles of equality of opportunity to the citizen. The incentive of the individual should be encouraged under our system.

You are right when you say that no effort is being made to penalize large industry. Subsidies for railroads are not being made on the basis of the length of the line or the amount of equipment and other properties that the railroads possess; subsidies to the airlines and steamship people have no such limitations. Fast tax writeoffs have benefited all size operators. Your letter is most convincing, plausible, and informative upon this subject; and I am grateful to you for writing me.

With personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely,

E. C. GATHINGS.

Gov. G. Mennen Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me especially appropriate on the occasion yesterday of the birthday of a distinguished American statesman, G. Mennen Williams, six times Governor of Michigan, to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an extremely informative and capsule biography of this brilliant and effective leader of our time.

Governor Williams is easily one of the foremost Americans of this generation and has contributed enormously to the wise administration and progressive leadership of one of the most powerful States of the Union.

This biography is particularly pertinent because it reached the people on the occasion of the election of the Governor for the sixth time to the highest office within the gift of the people of his Commonwealth:

G. Mennen Williams, the first man in the Nation's history to win six consecutive terms as Governor of a State, was born in Detroit, February 23, 1911, the son of Henry P. Williams and Elma Mennen Williams. He attended the Detroit University School, Salisbury School, Salisbury, Conn., and was graduated from Princeton University in 1933 with an A.B. degree, and from the University of Michigan law school in 1936 with a J.D. degree. His scholastic attainments are indicated by his membership in Phi Beta Kappa at Princeton and the Order of Coif at the University of Michigan.

He began his career of public service in 1936 as an attorney for the Social Security Board in Washington. From that time, through the days of World War II naval service in the Pacific, on to his unmatched record of governmental and political leadership, Governor Williams has devoted his life to public service.

In 1938, he became assistant attorney general of Michigan. In 1939–40, he was executive assistant to Frank Murphy, then U.S. Attorney General; and in 1940–41, he was special assistant to the U.S. Attorney General, Criminal Division.

After service on the Carriers *Essex, Bunker Hill, Hornet,* and *Yorktown,* he was separated with the rank of lieutenant commander in March 1946. During his war service, he received 10 battle stars, the Legion of Merit with Combat V, and three Presidential citations.

On his return from war, he became Deputy Director of the O.P.A. for Michigan, and later was named Democratic member of the Michigan Liquor Control Commission. He resigned the latter post in 1948 to run for Governor of Michigan, and in that successful effort began a new chapter of his remarkable career.

Six times the people of Michigan have elected him to the highest governmental position within their power to bestow. This repeated endorsement of his executive leadership did not come about by chance. It reflects the fact that his administrations have given the people of Michigan—businessmen, farmers, workers, nationalities, minorities, schoolteachers, the aged, housewives, all the people—the kind of governmental and political leadership they want in these times.

Governor Williams is nationally known for his firm adherence to programs for the common good, for his executive and political leadership, and for his deep personal faith in the spiritual values which underlie our Nation and its democratic processes. He is a devoted family man, a scholar, a traveler whose journeys have taken him across Europe, into Russia, Africa, South America, areas of the Far East, into Israel and the Middle East, and across the Nation from its borders to its shores.

In 1937, he married Nancy Lee Quirk of Ypsilanti, Mich. They have one son, Gery, a student at Princeton, and two daughters, Nancy and Wendy, in school in Lansing.

James W. Riddleberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, there has been favorable, and bipartisan, reaction to President Eisenhower's nomination of Mr. James W. Riddleberger to head the International Cooperation Administration, which is responsible for the management of the foreign aid program.

Mr. Riddleberger is from Woodstock, in the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia, which I have the honor to represent, and is a member of a widely respected Shenandoah Valley family. His many friends share the pleasure of this new recognition which has come to a distinguished career officer of the Foreign Service of the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Roanoke (Va.) Times of February 21, 1959:

RIDDLEBERGER: MAN WITH SKILL

A dispute between the State Department and Republican National Chairman Alcorn over who shall head the International Cooperation Administration apparently has been settled by President Eisenhower. As a successor to James H. Smith, who resigned last month, the State Department favored

Henry R. Labouisse, a highly regarded career officer presently directing United Nations relief work among Palestinian refugees.

Chairman Alcorn is reported to have objected strongly to appointment of Mr. Labouisse because the latter once registered as a Democrat in Connecticut. Mr. Alcorn is said to have insisted that the job of running the Agency which administers the foreign aid program be given to a deserving Republican.

Mr. Eisenhower's new choice for the post is James W. Riddleberger, member of a well-known Virginia family, whose home is at Woodstock. Mr. Riddleberger is now Ambassador to Greece and has no known political affiliation. He is a graduate of Randolph-Macon College and a veteran of the diplomatic service. He was chief of the State Department's Division of Central European Affairs immediately after World War II and later Ambassador to Yugoslavia where he served for nearly 5 years. In the latter post he had a leading role in the Trieste settlement between Yugoslavia and Italy.

Mr. Riddleberger's qualifications have been tested in numerous difficult and sensitive situations abroad. He stands high in the esteem of congressional leaders, Democrats and Republicans. If confirmed by the Senate—and that appears to be a virtual certainty—he will bring to his new task a broad background of knowledge of foreign affairs and demonstrated skill in diplomacy.

They Never Quit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Journal-American, in an editorial on January 27, 1959, entitled "They Never Quit," calls attention to the unremitting attack over the years against J. Edgar Hoover, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The members of the Committee on Un-American Activities are grateful for the support of this fine newspaper. With such backing by the press I am certain that the American people are not going to be misled by the current vicious campaign to discredit the committee, the FBI and its great Director. The editorial follows:

THEY NEVER QUIT

It has become clear that the pseudo-liberals, anti-anti-Communists and leftists have singled out two targets for 1959. One is to discredit J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI. The other is to wreck the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The attack on Mr. Hoover and the great organization he heads has taken the form of articles insidiously slanted to undermine confidence in the fairness and meticulous care to protect both witnesses and accused by which the FBI operates.

The attack on the House Un-American Activities Committee is more open. Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, California Democrat, has introduced a resolution to junk it and shift its jurisdiction to the Judiciary Committee.

He continued to press the attack yesterday and based his objections to the committee on the fact that "it has subpenaed people who were former Communists after having learned their names from the testimony of friendly witnesses."

What would he have the committee do—subpena members of sewing circles?

The committee has been vilified for years by peseudoliberals, anti-anti-Communists and leftists because it has been one of the most effective forces we have for exposing the Communist conspiracy.

Fortunately, there is every reason to believe it will keep on being so. A far greater Democrat than JIMMY ROOSEVELT, by name of SAM RAYBURN, is adamantly opposed to the ROOSEVELT resolution and promises it will be overwhelmingly defeated if it ever reaches the floor.

But this effort together with the smear campaigns against Mr. Hoover and the FBI are a challenge to vigilance. The counterfeit liberals and the others never give up.

The United States, Thought of Abroad as Materialistic and Without Interest in Cultural Affairs, Subsidizes Music and Art at State, County, and City Levels of Government—George Antheil, Famous New Jersey Composer, Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Trenton Symphony Orchestra Association, Joseph D'Annunzio, recently advised the city commission of Trenton, N.J., the Mercer County, N.J., Board of Chosen Freeholders, and Mercer County Counsel Joseph S. Bash that the Trenton Symphony Orchestra has been operating 37 years as a nonprofit organization. In all that time, he said, it has depended for its support on its patrons, donors and subscribers. He added that unless they were able to get some additional aid this year the Trenton Symphony Orchestra could not carry on.

Mr. D'Annunzio, one of the leading businessmen of Trenton, N.J., pointed to the substantial subsidies provided their orchestras by other cities in the United States. Philadelphia, he said, gives the Philadelphia orchestra $100,000 each year and $50,000 for operas; Detroit gives the Detroit symphony $50,000 yearly; San Francisco gives its orchestra $45,000 plus free use of two auditoriums. Baltimore, Atlanta, and Denver each give their orchestras $60,000; St. Louis provides $75,000; Milwaukee and Indianapolis each gives their orchestra $50,000.

In Indiana, according to Mr. D'Annunzio, a State law was passed in 1941 making it mandatory for the educational fund to contribute to the orchestra. Many U.S. cities furnish auditoriums free of cost for orchestral concerts, in return for which the orchestras agree to make a limited number of student tickets available at reduced prices.

Showing sympathy for the financial woes of the Trenton Symphony Orchestra, the City Commission of Trenton, N.J., has agreed to do what it could to help out. One of the steps under the study by the city commission is the purchase of $5,000 worth of concert tickets every year for distribution through the city schools. The Mercer County Board of Chosen Freeholders is considering a similar step.

A NEW JERSEY STATE ART COMMISSION PROPOSED AS A LIVING MEMORIAL TO GEORGE ANTHEIL, WORLD-FAMOUS COMPOSER, WHO WAS BORN AND EDUCATED IN TRENTON, N.J.

Actually, of course, the arts at home and the arts as a vital part of our foreign policy overseas are but two sides of the same coin. The New York Times on January 12, 1959, reported that two New York State legislators, Senator MacNeil Mitchell, Republican, and Assemblyman Bentley Cassal, Democrat, are sponsoring a bill to create a 15-member New York State Arts Council. This plan has the support of many cultural leaders in our country. If this plan is good for New York State, with all of its myriad art groups, it should be equally good for New Jersey's cultural groups, like the Trenton Symphony Orchestra, to establish a similar arts council in New Jersey. Such an arts council would be most appropriate as a living memorial in honor of George Antheil, one of New Jersey's world-famous sons, who died recently, it has been suggested by William H. Falcey, county clerk of Mercer County, Trenton, N.J., a leading backer of the Trenton Symphony Orchestra and a member of the board of governors of the orchestra.

A number of States, among them Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Utah, Virginia, and Wisconsin have established State agencies of various kinds to assist the arts through such means as advice, grants-in-aid, and so forth. The States thereby have aided theaters and orchestras, managed museums and libraries—the New Jersey State Museum and the New Jersey State Library are outstanding examples of this—arranged for exhibits and supervised the artistic improvement of State buildings and whole sections of cities.

A New Jersey State art commission would be able to make an important contribution to our own fine cultural organizations, such as the Trenton Symphony Orchestra.

There is deep concern with the finer things of life on the part of our people away from the great cities, and surely if there is a native American cluture it is expressed at least as much by the Trenton Symphony Orchestra as by the Metropolitan Opera Co. After all, there are more than 700 such orchestras spread across our country from coast to coast and from Canada to Mexico. In the world of today the race is for political, economic, scientific, and cultural supremacy. In this situation in which we find ourselves, cultural organizations, such as the Trenton Symphony Orchestra have a major role to perform in raising the standards of our people and acquainting them with our noble cultural heritage. We must understand our own culture and assist our own artists in order to better understand and

appreciate the culture of other peoples—this is basic to our country's continued leadership of the peoples of the free world and to the hope we give to many of the people in the totalitarian states that they, too, will one day be free.

I include here several items relating to the Trenton Symphony Orchestra and George Antheil from the Trentonian, the Trenton Evening Times, and La Nuova Capitale:

[From the Trentonian, Jan. 23, 1959]

TRENTON'S SYMPHONY IN TROUBLE

The news that Trenton's 37-year-old symphony orchestra may expire because of financial ills is distressing indeed, even though it has been apparent for some time that the Symphony Association was encountering heavy going.

As Joseph D'Annunzio, Sr., the association's president, makes clear, the group has been caught in a squeeze from which it cannot escape unless aid is forthcoming. Because of its limited budget, the association cannot book the type of artists who would draw well. Consequently, receipts are insufficient to maintain the operation. Two types of aid are suggested—subsidization by the city and county and increased public support.

The value of the symphony to the Trenton area cannot be overstressed, and the lack of public support is not readily understandable. Perhaps the difficulty which now besets the musical enterprise will serve to engender the support it needs to complete this season and to plan for the next one.

[From the Trenton Evening Times, Jan. 22, 1959]

THE ORCHESTRA'S PLIGHT

The Trenton Symphony Orchestra has been one of the city's major cultural assets for 37 years. It had its origin with a small group of enthusiastic and talented local musicians whose number grew with the passing years and whose artistic merits gained substantial recognition. Although cultural enterprises are seldom attended by impressive financial success, the Trenton Symphony has managed to attract adequate patronage and support and to survive even the economic stringencies of the long depression era.

Ironically, it is in a period of at least relative affluence that the orchestra is experiencing its most acute financial difficulties. Announcement has been made that unless the city and county provide "substantial aid this year" the orchestra will find it necessary to close its career.

This is bad news for music lovers of Trenton and it is a far from creditable reflection upon the city's cultural standards. The Trenton Symphony Orchestra has come to be recognized as a musical organization of fine quality and one whose programs over the years have been of a high order. It has earned public support.

[From the Trenton (N.J.) La Nuova Capitale, Feb. 6, 1959]

NEED FINANCIAL AID OR SYMPHONY MUST QUIT

The president of the Trenton Symphony Association told the Mercer County Freeholders yesterday that unless the orchestra receives substantial financial help it will not be able to prevent a concert series next year.

Joseph D'Annunzio also indicated at a closed conference with the county board that the symphony may even have to cancel two of its three remaining concerts this season unless it obtains additional funds.

D'Annunzio said the association would try its hardest to finish the season, but that its financial picture was so dark it might be physically impossible to do so.

The symphony president declined today to reveal how much financial aid he sought from the freeholders.

He said he would meet tomorrow with the city commission to present a similar appeal. The freeholders turned D'Annunzio's request over to its budget study. County Counsel Joseph S. Bash said he wasn't sure whether the county could legally give financial aid to the symphony.

D'Annunzio said the symphony's board of governors would meet on Friday to decide the orchestra's future. He said a decision would have to be made soon because detailed plans for next season's concerts must be made far ahead of time if it is found feasible to continue.

In a letter to the freeholders, D'Annunzio pointed out that the Trenton Symphony has been operating for 37 years as a nonprofit organization and is so recognized by the Internal Revenue Bureau. In all that time, he said, it has depended for its support on three sources—ticket sales, patrons, and honors, and the generosity of a few civic-minded individuals on whom the association could depend at the end of each season.

"Our position is somewhat changed insofar as being able to expect financial aid from the latter source now," he said, "and unless we are able to get some substantial aid this year it will be quite impossible to carry on."

D'Annunzio pointed to the substantial subsidies provided for orchestras in other cities. Philadelphia, he said, gives the Philadelphia Orchestra $100,000 each year and $50,000 for operas; Detroit gives the Detroit Symphony $50,000 yearly, San Francisco gives its orchestra $45,000 plus free use of two auditoriums. Baltimore, Atlanta, and Denver each give their orchestras $60,000, St. Louis provides $75,000, Milwaukee and Indianapolis $50,000.

In Indiana, he said, a State law was passed in 1914 making it mandatory for the educational fund to contribute to the orchestra.

"All of these cities furnish an auditorium free of cost for the concerts and the orchestras agree to have a limited number of student tickets available at reduced prices," he said.

"In Trenton nothing has ever been done for our orchestra."

D'Annunzio told the freeholders that the Trenton symphony has only one paid employee. All others are volunteers. More than 60 percent of its budget is for musicians' payroll, 6 percent is for soloists, 4 percent for war-memorial building rental, and 30 percent for other expenses such as printing of tickets, brochures, music rental, postage, telephone, advertising programs, etc.

He pointed out that through the generosity of the Mifflin Piano Co. the orchestra never has had to pay for the use of pianos or organs for its concerts.

"Our board of governors feels that this civic project is Trenton's outstanding cultural asset," he continued, "and that we are all richer for having had it these many years.

"Men in public life are realizing more than ever their responsibilities for the welfare of the people and that bread alone does not satisfy the soul."

[From the Trenton Evening Times, Feb. 20, 1959]

PLEA FOR SYMPHONY

Sir: Upon returning from a 3-week trip out of State, I was aghast to find newspapers, local and Philadelphia, reporting that the Trenton Symphony was in dire straits, financially, and that if the city would not come to its rescue, disbanding of the orchestra was imminent.

For shame, Trenton. How can such a situation exist in a city which for generations has been proud of its culture?

Saving the symphony should be the work of every man, woman, and child in and around Trenton—from the mayor, through the chamber of commerce, to the lowest grade in the schools.

What about the people behind the scenes of the symphony, who have given so much for so little? Are you not willing to stand behind them?

Every successful symphony has its city 100 percent behind it.

In practically every major orchestra in this country you will find men, who, because of their great artistic ability, have been recruited from the ranks of the Trenton Symphony, nearly every one a first-chair man. The roster reads like a "Who's Who in Music."

Good music, like good bread, is a real staff of life, for, like bread, which from time immemorial has been the symbol of bodily nourishment, so music is the symbol of cultural advancement. Guard your musical knowledge and appreciation as you would a priceless jewel. Without it, you sink into the abyss of cultural degeneration and one of the greatest gifts ever offered man is denied you.

LEONA RUTH STODDARD.

[From the Trentonian, Feb. 14, 1959]

GEORGE ANTHEIL DIES AT 58; NOTED MODERN COMPOSER

Former Trentonian George Antheil, 58, noted author and composer Thursday night died of a heart attack in his New York home, of 610 West End Avenue.

Born in Trenton, Antheil was graduated from Trenton High School in 1918. He made frequent visits to Trenton with his family and at one time wrote "McKonkey's Ferry" a musical based on Washington's crossing the Delaware, using Trenton as the background.

He conducted some of his own compositions with the Trenton Symphony Orchestra during one of his longer visits here.

Antheil toured Europe as a concert pianist, and then in the late 1920's became the first American ever to hold the position of assistant music director of the Berlin State Theater.

Returning to the United States in 1933, he became musical director for Eastern Paramount Studios, and composer for Hollywood Paramount and Columbia Studios. With his young bride, Mrs. Boske Markus Antheil, he moved back to Trenton. It was here a few years later that his wife became a United States citizen.

As an author, he contributed many articles to Esquire magazine on endocrinology, wrote, "Every Man His Own Detective," and "Death in the Dark."

His book "Bad Boy of Music," was based on his own experiences as a modern composer, and told at length of his boyhood in Trenton.

His most recent efforts have been scores for the "Twentieth Century" series on CBS and music for "Happy Journey" which is to appear next season.

Funeral arrangements have not been completed. He is survived by his sister, Mrs. Justine McTighe of Delaware Avenue, New York, and his son, Peter, 22, who attends a west coast school.

[From the Trenton Evening Times, Feb. 13, 1959]

HEART ATTACK FATAL FOR GEORGE ANTHEIL—TRENTON PIANIST AND COMPOSER WON WIDE ACCLAIM

George Antheil, the gifted Trenton composer and pianist, died last night at his home, 610 West End Avenue, New York City, at the age of 58. Death was attributed to a heart attack.

His sister, Mrs. Justine McTighe and her husband, Arthur D. McTighe of 40 Delaware

Avenue, were summoned to the composer's home shortly after 9 o'clock last night. Word was also sent to the composer's son, Peter, 22, who is a student at a west coast college. He flew into New York today.

Funeral arrangements have not yet been completed.

Antheil, one of the world's great composers of what has been termed "modern music," always regarded Trenton as his real home, although many of his years were spent abroad or in California where he composed his highly original scores and also music for the motion picture industry.

BORN IN TRENTON

He was born here, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Antheil, Sr., attended the old Hamilton School, and graduated from Trenton High School in 1918. From time to time he returned to Trenton for visits with his family and on one of these trips composed his unique opera "Helen Retires" which was based on the life of Helen of Troy. This superb work was created at the home of his parents on North Broad Street, near Academy Street.

Although Antheil had numerous first-rate compositions to his credit, including some symphonies which have been played by the leading orchestras of the United States and Europe, he was especially well-known for a single composition he had written in his early days. This was the "Ballet Mecanique," scored for xylophones, electric bells, a player piano, and airplane propellers.

CREATED SMALL RIOT

At its premiere in New York City reaction from both critics and the audience was so violent that a small riot broke out among those attending the performance. Years later, when the same composition was played again, there was only applause for the man who had helped to create a new style for the modern age.

Antheil began to study the piano at the age of 6. At 10 he began composition lessons with Constantin von Sternberg in Philadelphia, and later with Ernest Bloch.

An opportunity to tour Europe arose when a Philadelphia concert manager sought a soloist of the "fiery, ultra-modern variety." Antheil practiced the piano for 36 hours straight, got the job, and proceeded on a concert tour of the continent that resulted in his being dubbed the "Bad Boy of Music." In later years he recalled his experiences in an autobiography, "Bad Boy of Music," in which he wrote at length of his boyhood in Trenton.

His First Symphony was given its premiere by the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra in 1922, and it was said to be the first symphonic piece in which jazz was recognized.

MORE TIME TO WRITING MUSIC

It was around this time that Antheil gave up personal appearances to devote himself almost entirely to writing music. He went to Paris and among his friends and acquaintances were counted Gertrude Stein, Pavel Tchelitchew, Ezra Pound, and Ernest Hemingway. It was there, also, that he met a young woman, member of a prominent Viennese family.

He married her and for a number of years later on they resided in Trenton. It was in Trenton that Mrs. Boske Markus Antheil became an American citizen.

Antheil wrote such stage works as "Transatlantic," an opera, and a ballet, "Fighting the Waves." Several years after his return to the United States, the composer began to do film scores for Charles MacArthur and Ben Hecht. These included "The Scoundrel" and "Once in a Blue Moon." In 1936, he became a composer for both Paramount and Columbia studios.

After writing the scores for many other films, including the original production of "The Buccaneer" and "Make Way for Tomorrow," Antheil wrote an article for The American Scholar in which he propounded the idea that serious music could be written for the films.

A prolific writer, he contributed many articles on endocrinology to Esquire magazine, and his interest in police activities (he was an honorary member of the Paris detective force) led to his writing of "Every Man His Own Detective."

The composer's recent creations included "The Capital of the World," a ballet based on a short story by Hemingway. It was performed by the Ballet Theater in 1953. He also did the film score for "The Pride and the Passion" and his third opera, "Volpone," was presented in New York in 1953.

He also composed scores for various television shows, including the "Twentieth Century" series which is presented over the Columbia Broadcasting System. He wrote the music for "Happy Journey" in which Alfred Drake is to appear next season.

His association with Trenton resulted in several compositions which had a local background, the outstanding one being "McKonkey's Ferry" which gave a musical version of the crossing of the Delaware by Washington.

And on one of his longer visits here he conducted the Trenton Symphony Orchestra in some of his own compositions.

No matter where he went, whether it was on the Riviera, in Paris, Berlin, or north Africa, he made news. Once he was reported lost and stories were flashed across the Atlantic to that effect. It turned out that he was not lost. He had just failed to keep up contacts.

Federal Aid to Depressed Areas

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, or yesterday, I introduced H.R. 4878, a bill to aid depressed areas.

It might be said that what we need right now is not new bills to aid depressed areas but an act signed by the President which would bring Federal assistance to the scores of communities in the United States which have for years been plagued with chronic unemployment. I fully agree with this view.

My record in favor of depressed area legislation is crystal clear.

For years I have cooperated with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle interested in this type of legislation and my disappointment was as great as theirs when the President vetoed the Douglas-Spence bill last fall.

Mr. Speaker, on the subject of Federal aid to depressed areas there are some excellent bills pending before this session of Congress. In this connection, it would not be difficult for me to support the bill introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], and its companion bill in the Senate introduced by Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

At this point, however, it is pertinent to ask—and I do so in all sincerity—why solicit a repetition of last year's veto by having the Douglas-Flood bill given similar treatment since it resembles to a marked degree the Douglas-Spence bill in the 85th Congress.

Frankly, the possibility of another veto is cause for great concern.

While there is no one in the Senate or the House who would stoop to playing politics with the misery of unemployment, we cannot ignore the fact that unless a bill is enacted the suffering of the people in the depressed areas is not going to be alleviated.

Mr. Speaker, among the sponsors of depressed area legislation there exist two conflicting points of view.

To begin with, in principle the administration has endorsed aid to depressed areas.

In addition, the two great major political parties also endorsed the principle in their 1956 platforms.

Therefore, the question that Congress must resolve is the extent of aid to the depressed areas of the Nation.

In an effort to reach this common objective, it is imperative that reasonable people should be willing to compromise.

In this connection, it is my belief that the President will find it possible to accept a reasonable compromise between the administration bill and the Douglas-Flood version of the legislation.

In my plea for a reasonable compromise, it must be thoroughly understood that I am not presuming to speak for the administration nor have I had any consultations with administration leaders on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, let us be practical and face the facts concerning depressed area legislation.

In the event of a Presidential veto of the Douglas-Flood bill, I have been unable to find anyone willing to flatly predict that the veto will be overridden by the House of Representatives.

The fear of being unable to override a veto is based on the fact that it requires two-thirds of the votes cast to accomplish that purpose.

Therefore—looking the facts right in the face—when you review the position of those Members of the House today in relation to their last year's vote on the Douglas-Spence bill, one finds that the margin of victory would be insufficient to override a possible Presidential veto of the Douglas-Flood bill.

Mr. Speaker, to improve our chances of enacting depressed area legislation, I introduced H.R. 4878 a bill which represents a compromise between the administration's approach and the Douglas-Flood proposal.

With a few exceptions, my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, offers the same types of aid contained in the Douglas-Spence bill vetoed last year.

For example, instead of making every depressed area eligible for the same types of assistance, my bill provides different degrees of Federal assistance based upon the level of chronic unemployment and the need in such areas.

In this connection, it is my belief that areas which have suffered greater levels of unemployment should be entitled to a greater degree of aid than those communities whose problems of unemployment are of a lesser degree.

Briefly, my bill, H.R. 4878, provides for the following programs:

First. Technical assistance: Depressed areas would be eligible for technical assistance to help the communities to appraise their physical and human resources, which would prepare them to plan constructive programs to attract new businesses and expand existing businesses in these areas.

Second. Community loans: Depressed communities would be eligible to receive loans from a revolving fund of $100 million.

We know that the conventional lending facilities in depressed areas are not as venturesome as those in growing and expanding communities.

The fund would put the depressed areas on a more equal footing with other communities in attracting new jobs.

Third. Public facilities: some communities need improvement in public facilities before they would become sufficiently attractive to new businesses which might desire to locate in these areas.

My bill provides for an establishment of a $25 million revolving fund from which these communities would be able to borrow.

While the figure may appear modest, attention is called to the fact that legislation is pending before the House which would establish special funds for community facilities.

Meanwhile, under my bill, H.R. 4878, a smaller fund would be allocated and earmarked to aid depressed areas.

In addition, the most depressed communities which do not have the sufficient resources to borrow funds would be eligible to receive grants up to a maximum of $25 million.

At this point, let me stress that this is not an annual appropriation but is intended to be a $25 million revolving fund from which these communities would be able to borrow.

The administrator of the program would be expected to limit the grants only to communities with the greatest need for aid and which do not have sufficient resources to repay the loans in the foreseeable future.

It should be stressed that this is no giveaway program; under the provisions of my bill grants would be made only for projects which would provide lasting improvements and thus broaden the economic base of the communities.

Fourth. Vocational training and subsistence: One of the big problems of the people in depressed areas is the fact that many of their industries have declined or disappeared and, consequently, the demand for the skills acquired by the people in these areas has also diminished or vanished.

In order to enable these people whose skills have become obsolete to gain new employment, we must provide facilities to retrain them.

But many have been unemployed for a long period of time, and it would be unreasonable to expect that they could undergo an effective period of vocational training without any means of support.

Consequently, while the unemployed are undergoing training and if they are no longer eligible for unemployment compensation, they would be receiving subsistence payments equal to the average unemployment insurance in their States during the period while they are undergoing training, but not for a period exceeding 13 weeks.

Only the unemployed residing in the communities with the highest level of unemployment would be eligible for this type of aid and the total amount that would be appropriated for this program would be limited to $5 million a year.

Mr. Speaker, in brief, these are the provisions of my compromise bill, H.R. 4878.

They are modest, but at the same time will provide a sound program of Federal assistance to depressed areas.

All of us are deeply concerned by the latest reports about the rise of unemployment.

Experience has shown that the people in depressed areas are the ones that are mostly hit by any rise in unemployment and are the last to recover from the onslaught of recession.

Therefore, it is urged that we enact the program contained in my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, as a realistic means of providing an effective program to aid the chronically depressed areas of the Nation.

Since the cost of depressed area legislation has proved a stumbling block in the past and impeded our efforts, let me point out that the cost of the Douglas-Flood bill is $389.5 million as compared to the cost of the administration bill which is $53 million.

By way of contrast, my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, will cost $158 million or just about midway between the cost of the Douglas-Flood bill and the administration bill.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks I should like to include the following comparative analysis of the provisions and costs of the Douglas-Flood, administration, and Van Zandt bills:

Main provisions of the Douglas-Flood, administration, and Van Zandt bills

Douglas-Flood bill	Administration bill	Van Zandt bill
Title: Area Redevelopment Act	Area Assistance Act of 1959	Same as administration bill.
Purpose: To establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas.	To assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes.	Do.
Organization: Establishes the Area Redevelopment Administration as an independent agency.	President appoints an Area Assistance Administrator who reports to the Secretary of Commerce.	Do.
Criteria for area eligibility:		
a. Industrial areas with unemployment of 12 percent for 12 months; or 9 percent for 15 out of 18 months; or 6 percent for 18 out of 24 months, or 15 percent for 6 months if causes are not temporary.	a. Labor market areas where the nontemporary unemployment rate (1) is currently 6 percent and (2) has averaged at least 6 percent—	a. Same as administration bill.
	(a) for 4 out of preceding 5 years and has been 50 percent above national average.	a(2)a. Designated category I.
	(b) for 3 out of preceding 4 years and has been 75 percent above the national average, or	a(2)b. Designated category II.
	(c) for 2 out of preceding 3 years and has been 100 percent above the national average.	a(2)c. Designated category III.
	(3) Also, nonagricultural employment has declined, or has increased less than in the country as a whole, during preceding 5 years. (Loans and technical assistance grants.)	
b. Rural areas with the largest number and percentage of low-income families and having a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment. (NOTE.—The term "redevelopment area" may include 1 or more counties, or 1 or more municipalities, or a part of a county or municipality.)	b. "1 industry" towns, small towns in rural areas and rural low-income areas (technical assistance grants only.)	
Loans:		
a. $100 for industrial redevelopment areas	a. $50,000,000 for eligible labor market areas	a. Same as Douglas-Flood bill.
b. $100 for rural redevelopment areas	(NOTE.—Area assistance fund to be financed by congressional appropriation.)	b. $25,000,000 for public facilities (categories II and III only).
c. $100 for public facilities.		
(NOTE.—Area redevelopment fund to be financed by public debt transactions.)		
Terms for industrial loans:		
a. Up to 65 percent of project cost for 30 years with interest at Treasury cost plus 0.5 percent minimum of 10 percent State and local and 5 percent private funds.	a. Up to 35 percent of project cost for 25 years at rate of interest to be determined; at least 15 percent funds from State or local sources.	a. Up to 33⅓ percent of the project cost for category I, 50 percent, category II, and 75 percent category III; at least 15 percent from State or local sources.
b. Loans for land, construction and machinery	b. Loans for land and buildings only	b. Same as Douglas-Flood bill.
c. Loans must be approved by the official State or local development agency. If none exists, the Administrator appoints a local redevelopment committee.	c. Loans must be approved by State development agency	c. Same as administration bill.
d. Project must be consistent with an overall economic development program.	d. Project must be consistent with an overall economic development program	d. Same as administration and Douglas-Flood bills.

Main provisions of the Douglas-Flood, administration, and Van Zandt bills—Continued

Douglas-Flood bill	Administration bill	Van Zandt bill
Grants: a. Provides $75,000,000 for community facilities grants	a. No grants for community facilities. However, amends title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 to give first priority for public facilities loans in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment.	a. Provides $25,000,000 for community facilities (category III only).
b. Provides $4,500,000 annually for economic studies and technical assistance grants.	b. Provides $3,000,000 annually for technical assistance grants. Of this amount $1,500,000 is available for "1 industry" towns, small towns in rural areas, and low-income areas not otherwise eligible.	b. Same as administration bill.
Technical assistance: Information, advice, and technical assistance limited to redevelopment areas.	Technical assistance on economic development available to all areas.	Same as Douglas-Flood bill but Federal share limited to 33⅓ (category I), 50 percent (category II) and 75 percent (category III).
Housing amendment: Amends Housing Act of 1949 to permit industrial development of urban renewal areas and the Housing Act of 1954 to extend urban planning grants to industrial redevelopment areas.	Amends Housing Act of 1949 to permit industrial development of urban renewal areas and the Housing Act of 1954 to extend urban planning grants to industrial redevelopment areas.	Same as Douglas-Flood bill.
Vocational training: Provides for vocational training through the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. If State vocational education agency is unable to provide facilities and services, administrator may contract for them.	Provides for vocational training through the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.	Do.
Retraining payments: Secretary of Labor makes retraining subsistence payments for up to 13 weeks for those undergoing vocational training or retraining.	None provided	Same as Douglas-Flood bill but limited to category III communities.
Total costs: $369,500,000 in loans and grants, including $10,000,000 annual ceiling on retraining subsistence payment. (Other costs not specified.)	$53,000,000 in loans and technical assistance grants. (Other costs not specified.)	$158,000,000, including $5,000,000 annual ceiling on retraining subsistence payments (other costs not specified).

Summary costs of the Douglas-Flood, administration, and Van Zandt bills

	Douglas-Flood bill	Administration bill	Van Zandt bill
Loans:			
Industrial areas	$100,000,000	$30,000,000	$100,000,000
Rural areas	100,000,000		
Public facilities	100,000,000		25,000,000
Total	[1] 300,000,000	[2] 30,000,000	[1] 125,000,000
Grants (annual):			
Public facilities	75,000,000		25,000,000
Technical assistance, annual	4,500,000	3,000,000	[3] 3,000,000
Total loans and grants	379,500,000	53,000,000	153,000,000
Administration	(?)	(?)	(?)
Retraining subsistence training payments to States	[4] 10,000,000	None	5,000,000
Vocational training	(?)	(?)	(?)

[1] Financed by public debt transactions.
[2] Financed by congressional appropriation.
[3] Not specified.
[4] Annually.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with depressed area legislation, let me state that I have no pride of authorship.

My sole desire is to aid the people in the depressed areas and to attain such a laudable objective the spirit of compromise should be dominant in our minds.

As one who represents two chronically depressed areas in Pennsylvania with unemployment as high as 14 percent of our labor force and which has plagued us for years, my goal is that Congress enact without delay an effective bill in a form acceptable to the President, thereby eliminating the prospects of another presidential veto.

Mr. Speaker, the residents of the 269 depressed areas of the Nation are entitled to this type of legislation, and it is my sincere hope that we can compromise any differences and enact a depressed area bill without further delay.

Judicial Tyranny Can Be Met

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, in brief comment yesterday on the proven determination of the citizens of Warren County, Va., to retain their constitutional control over the education of their children, I included in the Appendix certain editorial comment.

Now, under further leave to extend my remarks, I should like to bring to the attention of the House a news article and two additional editorials.

From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, of February 20, 1959:

PRIVATE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN WARREN PROUD OF CLASSES

(By Ed Young)

FRONT ROYAL, February 19.—The office of the principal is a city block from the nearest classroom of the Warrent County Educational Foundation's private high school here.

On the wall of an anteroom hangs a small, framed certificate of which the principal, John Pond, is inordinately proud. It announces that the school has been recognized by the State board of education as an accredited high school.

It is the Warren County Educational Foundation High School in which all of the county's white high school students now are enrolled, and in which they chose to remain when Warren County High School reopened Wednesday under court orders to admit 24 Negro pupils.

There is no present expectation that the private school, financed by contributions from in and out of the county, will continue in operation beyond the end of the current session. Next fall, presumably, those of its 780 students who have not been graduated will reenroll in Warren County High.

THEY ARE SITTING TIGHT

But for the present they are sitting tight, leaving the public high school to 23 Negro pupils who have been enrolled.

Pond, a tall, long-legged, dark-haired Hampden-Sydney College graduate, was assistant principal of Warren County High when it was closed last September 12 to prevent integration. He was one of 26 of the high school's 41 faculty members who signed a teaching contract with the educational foundation. Like the others, he is staying with the foundation but will be offered a contract to return to Warren County High next fall.

He says he believes the foundation's students are somewhat more serious about their studies than when they were enrolled in the expensively equipped county high school. And there is no doubt in his mind that the white children are getting an excellent education in the private schools.

"When Warren County High closed last fall and they were left without a high school, they suddenly realized what they had lost," he said. "You know, you sometimes have to lose something before you appreciate what it meant to you."

Thousands of dollars in solicited and unsolicited contributions have been poured into operation of the foundation's school since it opened. Most has gone for teacher salaries, some to the county to pay for school bus transportation for students, a little for school equipment. Thousands more must be spent before the 1958–59 term is completed.

NOTHING FOR FACILITIES

But for facilities, the foundation has had to pay nothing.

The private school is scattered over a

radius of about 3½ blocks, near downtown Front Royal. Five different buildings with about 30 classrooms are being used—three of them Sunday school buildings for Methodist, Baptist, and Episcopal churches; one a museum for the United Daughters of the Confederacy; one a rather ramshackle former private home of frame construction that served as a youth center before the private classes moved in.

Each building generally serves one grade, from the 8th to the 12th. There are 95 12th graders—seniors who will receive the first diplomas from the foundation next spring. About 200 are enrolled in the largest grade, the 10th, and nearly that many in the 8th.

Three times each week, chemistry students have 2-hour laboratory classes at Randolph-Macon Academy, a prep school in the town.

Pond says the only classes offered at Warren County High not available at the foundation's school are agriculture, home economics, and shop, and that agriculture and home economics could be offered if there were sufficient demand.

The principal can visit on foot all the various buildings serving the private school in the space of 30 minutes, and does so daily. He, himself, teaches one class, general science.

BLACKBOARDS, NO DESKS

At the Methodist Church, a block from Pond's office near the county courthouse, 10th graders are taught on the third floor in Sunday school classrooms. There are blackboards, but no desks. The students seem serious, are quietly attentive.

"If you stayed, you would like what you see," says J. M. Brownlee, an English teacher, who leaves his class for a moment to greet visitors.

A block distant is the old youth center, where senior classes are in progress on the first and second floors. A sign on the wall announces a dance for the seniors, who plan a trip to Washington to see Congress in action.

"We have social events quite often," says Pond. "About the only thing we don't have is student clubs, and I'm not so sure that's bad."

The school paper and annual are missing this year. But seniors have arranged for the taking of individual photographs to be exchanged.

Juniors are planning for the annual junior-senior prom. And the basketball team, playing under the foundation name, has had a winning season.

Another block and you come to the UDC building. Exhibits have been stored away to make room for the youngsters, but still adorning the walls are pictures of Lee, Jackson, Davis, Mosby. There is unusual noise from one downstairs classroom and it turns out to be a typing class for 10th and 11th graders. There are classrooms upstairs, too.

Next door is the public library where, Pond says, "You see a lot more students these days than you used to."

UP-TO-DATE LIBRARY

About 15 are there. It is quiet, as libraries are, and up to date.

A half-block away is the Baptist Church Sunday school annex. Ninth graders are here in six classrooms fashioned from what used to be a private home.

Around the corner is the Episcopal Church. A room in the stone parish house serves as a study hall for eighth graders. Across the street in the cinderblock Sunday school building there are seven classrooms, only six of them used.

Three classroomas are in the basement, three on the ground floor. A teacher steps into the hall and rings an old-fashioned hand bell. It is 11:25 a.m.—time for classes to change.

On your tour, you pass the Front Royal elementary school. It is a large, handsome school with 1,260 students, all white. Four Negroes have applied for admission, and may have to be enrolled next September.

Who knows, Pond observes, this too may be empty in the fall.

From the Shreveport (La.) Journal of February 19, 1959:

ALL PRAISE TO FRONT ROYAL

All praise to the people of Front Royal, Va.

When the Warren County High School at Front Royal was finally reopened on a integrated basis Wednesday in compliance with the Supreme Court's idiotic race-mixing decree, not a single white pupil showed up. Again today, the white pupils stayed away.

The 22 Negro pupils who gained admission to the previously all-white school found themselves still segregated. With ten teachers and a principal on hand in obedience to court orders, the situation which resulted represented a new high in absurdities created by the Supreme Court: One white instructor for every two Negroes—and no acceptable public school facilities at all for the white children.

The majority of the 1,000 displaced white pupils calmly continued their studies in emergency private, segregated classes.

Front Royal now takes its place with Little Rock in showing the parents of America how to save their children from the socialistic existence to which judicial crackpots would doom them. Every time the courts force racial integration upon a white school, simply keep the white pupils away and send them to private schools instead. With no white students available to attend the public schools, State legislatures certainly will have no obligation to continue operating the institutions for Negroes alone.

The really glorious aspect of the situation in Front Royal is that the Supreme Court is powerless to impose its senseless will further upon the white parents and their children. Against the unity of determined citizens who are willing to build a new school system rather than submit to its tyranny, the Supreme Court is as impotent as the reasoning on which its race-mixing decision is based.

Front Royal's display of strength could not have come at a better time. Just a few days ago an Associated Press reported trumpeted to the world that the proud old State of Virginia had calmly thrust aside the color barrier. He theorized, apparently, that if two Virginia communities would yield to token integration, the whole State would capitulate.

Thank God for the people of Front Royal.

From the Staunton (Va.) News-Leader of February 22, 1959:

FEDERAL DESPOTISM STUMPED

Someone has asked a good question: Will Federal Judge John Paul, of the western district of Virginia, jail the 1,000 or so white students who have prevented integration of the Warren County High School? They have done this by simply staying away, most of them attending private schools, or public schools in other communities. Isn't this outrageous defiance of the court order to integrate, and of the overriding power of the Federal Government?

The logic of the various Federal court rulings in integration cases clearly dictates condign action against the students, their parents and the teachers conducting the private school serving white students in Front Royal. They have conspired to thwart the court order. Lacking enough cells in which to confine them, the logic of Federal actions since the illegal 1954 Supreme Court decision against segregation in the public schools could move on to herding them in a concentration camp. Federal despotism toward southern Americans hasn't gone quite that far, although it did in the case of Japanese-Americans after Pearl Harbor.

Warren County has given the Nation an example of gallant passive resistance to Federal despotism. Its people, under orders as to how to run affairs which constitutionally were always theirs to run until the Supreme Court presumed to make law in 1954, have reacted with dignity, determination and orderliness. Let Judge Paul try to punish them if he dares. To do so, he would have to overlook again the fact that the Supreme Court did not order integration—it ruled that there must be no exclusion from public school's on account of race. Judge Paul, who has joined the judicial despots in his old age, could be impeached for trying to exceed the arrogance of his nine old superiors in Washington.

Toward a Budget Based on National Goals Rather Than Political Expediency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most intelligent discussions of the Federal budget that has come to my attention was offered by Mr. Nate White in a recent column of the Christian Science Monitor, which follows:

WHY NOT TRY A PROGRAM BUDGET?

(By Nate White)

Washington's budget debate would be more effective if less emphasis were put on the words "spend" and "save" and budget "balance" and more on what is known as "program budgeting."

Current news from Washington tends to separate the sheep from the goats. Everyone who is against the Eisenhower budget is labeled a "spender," and those who are for it are called "savers." This name calling does not produce much economic light.

The United States is a great and powerful nation, and it is not on the brink of economic collapse, as some oversea sources—particularly those with interest in gold stocks would like to argue. Inflation in the United States has been serious and every possible effort to stop it should be encouraged. But this inflation is considerably less than the rate of inflation in other nations. It is not an inflation which is going to push the country into sudden crisis.

The budget debate, therefore, is not a crisis debate—that is, having to do with a threat of sudden collapse if the buget is not balanced—and it should not be discussed in these terms.

Program budgeting is budgeting in which the administration and the Congress determine what the United States must do to progress, grow, and gain superiority in the missiles race, and at the same time take care of its urgent needs for better schools, handle the unemployment problem better, and give greater consideration to the needs of the young people who every year enter the productive force.

The Nation, having determined what it needs to do, should then tailor the program budget to accomplish this end. If this means higher taxes—and the programs are desirable and economically achievable—then a budget with higher taxes is required.

Program budgeting, however, cannot be done as a once-a-year, all-out thing in which hairs are split every year over dollars spent.

Program budgeting is long range. It is achieved in the councils of government, preferably where the Executive and the Congress work together. It cannot be contained within 1 year for a nation as large and strong as the United States. A program necessarily requires consideration for its long-range effect, and it can be achieved step by step economically over a period of years. Some years will take more money than others as a matter of practical necessity.

Over a period of say 5 years the overall picture should show a budget surplus rather than a deficit if the program budgeting is carefully done and tax revenue progressively planned to take care of it in each stage of the program.

In program budgeting it is necessary for the Executive to work closely with the Congress in the planning stage. The system today, calls for extensive examination by the Congress after a budget is submitted.

In the present usage the yearly budget is an economic anachronism. It is useful as an educational tool for both the Congress and the public. As a budgetmaking process for a great nation it is an outmoded system.

The budget can never be made the supreme objective in government or business. If it is, the cart has been put before the horse, and the government and the business which does this will not make progress. They will stagnate and fossilize. On this point business leaders and careful students of the Federal budget agree.

In a business, the stewards of the business decide what they wish to accomplish in a given period of time. An automobile company, for instance, determines when it wishes to launch a new automobile, when it wishes to expand its research, and so on, and it budgets for this purpose. It spends money on a new product in order to gain future profit.

A Federal, State, or local government can bring order into its financial affairs if it sets its objectives and budgets for them.

The threat in the current debate is that the Nation's overall objectives will be lost sight of on the issue of spend versus save. This is not keeping the eye on the ball.

Economic growth is the ball. How to budget best for this progress—so that progress is assured—is the real issue. Program budgeting holds the answer.

The Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the people know more about a balanced budget and deficit financing than we give them credit for. They know that from personal experience. For example, they know that when they live within their means, they are operating on a balanced budget. They know that when they spend more than they make, they are going into debt, which is exactly the same thing as deficit financing. There are a few of them who do not care one way or another, but most of them do. They know that their habits should not be more costly than their own purse can buy. And make no mistake about it, they expect the President and the Congress to find a way not to spend more money than the Government takes in. We will be hearing more and more about this subject, and so far as I am concerned, I am willing to stand up and be counted right now.

But first let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe in name calling. I want to express my personal views without regard to conservative, liberal, Democratic, Republican, or any other kind of partisan politics.

In my opinion, the most serious threat to our economy is inflation. Deficit spending breeds inflation and inflation in turn reduces the value of the dollar. In his "History of the French Revolution," Carlyle once said, "You cannot quench fire with oil. You must choke a deficit or else it will swallow you." In short, I believe in and have made it a practice in my own way to vote against deficit spending and for a balanced budget. In fact, I believe we should try to go one step farther. We should strive to spend less than we take in and apply the difference against the public debt, because I, frankly, do not see how we can hope to have a general tax reduction until that is done. If we cannot do it now, how can we expect to do it in case of a more serious national emergency.

Now, in Government as in business, a budget is composed of two parts, the income and the outgo. When the one is equal to the other, then the budget is in balance. But when the proposed expenditures exceed the anticipated revenues, then the budget is out of balance. We cannot have our cake and eat it too, and in this situation, in order to bring it back into balance, we must either reduce the expenditures or increase the taxes. That is exactly the position the President found himself in when he received the estimate of income and expenses from the Budget Bureau. In other words, the Budget Bureau estimated the outgo to be more than the income under all existing taxes, and they had to either trim down the expenses some more or propose new taxes. They chose to recommend new taxes. That is the hitch.

Let us take a look at the President's budget itself. We call it the budget for the fiscal year 1960, but it actually covers the period from July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960. It is a very complex document, containing over 1,000 pages and weighing over 10 pounds. It provides for the operation and services of every branch of the Government in every congressional district and in every section of the country. We refer to it as the President's budget because in the final analysis, the occupant of the White House, whoever he may be, directs the policy of his administration and has the right on a broad scale to reduce or increase the expenditures of this or that department or function of our Government. We all know, however, that the President himself does not and cannot possibly be expected to prepare his budget. The job is done by the Bureau of the Budget, which is the right arm of the President. It is a big job, indeed, and a year round checking and bookkeeping operation. Every single item of proposed expenditure, and each and all demands made upon our Government must be weighed and considered, approved, increased, shaved down or disapproved. They cannot possibly please everyone. In the end, some people feel that the proposed expenditures are too low, while others, with equal sincerity, believe that they are too high; some people, or some sections in the country, are glad, some are half-pleased, some are displeased, and still others are downright mad. As I said, a few people just do not care, but most of them are dead serious in wanting to know at least one thing: does it balance? It is to these people that I address myself.

Well then, does this one balance? The answer is "Yes," provided the Budget Bureau has correctly estimated the expenses at $77 billion; and provided they have correctly estimated the revenues, under all existing taxes, at $76 billion, and provided further that Congress adopts their recommendations and imposes $1 billion of new taxes to make up the difference. In order to make my points clearer, I speak in round figures throughout.

I want to be more specific. After screening the demands of all the Federal departments and agencies, including requirements for public improvements, flood control, navigation, highways, public housing, veterans, welfare and social security, agriculture, postal services, the administration of justice, and the manifold other functions of our Government; the interest on the public debt and the staggering cost of our national defense, the Bureau of the Budget estimated that the expenditures for the next fiscal year, which actually covers the period from July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960, will amount to about $77 billion. So much for the outgo.

Now let us consider the estimated income for the same period, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960.

For the information of Members of Congress and others, the Bureau of the Budget issued a pamphlet entitled "The Federal Budget in Brief." According to this pamphlet, the income of our Government from all sources and under all existing taxes for the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959 was as follows:

Fiscal year:	*Income (in billions)*
1957 (July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957)	$71
1958 (July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1958)	69
1959 (July 1, 1958, to June 30, 1959)	68

Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly obvious that if the business trend in the last 3 fiscal years should continue, the estimated expenditures for the next fiscal year, amounting to $77 billion, would far exceed the income. And if that should happen, the proposed budget of the President would be way out of balance. But in the pamphlet I refer to, the Bureau of the Budget states that "with continued vigorous economic recovery" the revenues during next fiscal year will amount to about $76 billion. Now the Bureau of the Budget has been operating as an agency of the executive department of the Government for a very long time.

And I respect their expert opinion. They certainly are in a much better position than I am to make an educated guess about anticipated revenues. I am sure that they would not deliberately mislead Congress. In fact, it has been their practice to stay on the conservative side over the years. I know they are sincere, and I hope they are right. Nevertheless, their estimate of income is certainly based on an optimistic business outlook, and that is why I said that the budget, as presented, is in balance, "provided they have correctly estimated the revenues."

But let us assume that the estimates are correct and that the income from all sources and under all existing taxes will turn out to be $76 billion against their estimated expenditures of about $77 billion. At this point the budget is still out of balance, and as I previously indicated, in order to bring it into balance, the President and his advisers had to either recommend trimming down the estimated expenses or increasing the revenues somehow to the tune of about $1 billion. Do you realize what $1 billion is? Let me illustrate. If you placed 1,000 dollar bills one on top of the other, the stack would be as high or higher than the Washington Monument. Or put it this way. Using round figures again, only about 1 billion minutes have gone by since the birth of our Lord, Jesus Christ. Take up your pencil and figure it for yourself.

In any event, in order to make up the difference between the income and the outgo, whatever that exact figure might be, the President wants Congress to make sexen new tax adjustments.

But, Mr. Speaker, a rose by any other name would still smell the same. In plain language, they want Congress to impose a brandnew tax on jet fuel, raise the general gasoline tax, raise the postal rates, raise the income tax of life insurance companies, raise the taxes on cooperatives, and reduce or juggle the 27½-percent depletion allowance, which is another name for raising the taxes on income derived from oil and gas. They also suggest an adjustment of other fees and charges so that persons receiving special services will more nearly pay the cost of those services. I do not know exactly what is meant by this particular item. I might be able to go along with the general idea, but I will want more information about it. In fact, all the proposals have been made in such very general terms that we will not know what each one means in dollars and cents until the administration bills are actually introduced.

I recognize that certain tax injustices have developed over the years and I believe that this should properly be the subject of a broad study by the Committee on Ways and Means, but I doubt that this can be done overnight, so to speak. I have great respect for the Committee on Ways and Means and if and as they make recommendations, I will most certainly consider them.

And I want to say that I, for one, applaud the President's determination to balance the budget. I am for it because I firmly believe in fiscal integrity. In short, I agree with the President on the necessity for a balanced budget but I disagree with him on his way of achieving it. He recommends that we do it by first increasing taxes, while I think we should first try to do it by reducing certain expenditures.

My policy will be this. I will study each item of expenditure and each item of appropriation as they are presented on the floor for debate. I realize full well that different people in my congressional district, or in any other given area for that matter, have different ideas about where to cut and we have to try to reflect the views of the majority. Even that becomes a difficult task at times, but we have to do the best we can under the circumstances existing when we cast our votes.

But when all my votes for expenditures are laid side by side with those for appropriations, they will spell out a balanced budget. In other words, I will not personally vote to spend more than we take in. And I think that, at least, is the general feeling of the people I represent. Just to give one example, I am quite sure that the people of my district would prefer for me to vote to cut down on foreign aid rather than to vote for an increase in the gasoline tax. As a matter of fact, I have always voted against all foreign aid. The President's budget calls for almost $4 billion for foreign aid. If we should eliminate this one item in toto, as I will vote to do, or if we even cut it in half, the budget would not only be in balance, without new taxes, but there would be enough left to boot to apply a sizable sum against the national debt.

The Nation's Capital Is Not a Cultural Backwater—A Report on the National Cultural Center and Culture in the Nation's Capital

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the able drama critic of the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, Richard L. Coe, reminds us that—

When the White House announced the names of trustees for the National Cultural Center, it also announced that the advisory committee would be appointed next week. That was 4 weeks ago.

Mr. Coe might well have gone on to say that the legislation establishing the National Cultural Center passed the Congress on August 22, 1958, and was signed into law by the President on September 2, 1958. He might have pointed out that the President at that time asked a number of national organizations in the fine arts field, including the National Music Council and the American National Theater and Academy, to submit names for the advisory committee. These names were submitted but, as Mr. Coe has pointed out, the appointments have not been made.

Mr. Coe made the point last week—February 21, 1959—that—

"Next month," said HEW Secretary Flemming, when asked about when the first meeting of the auditorium trustees would be held. "Next month" was the answer to the same question last month.

In its February 23, 1959, issue Time magazine referred to the Nation's Capital as a city that has long been known as a cultural backwater." In the same report Time praised the Washington Opera Society, its promising ballet company, and the fine National Symphony, whose reputation has grown steadily, until it today is not far from the top echelon of U.S. orchestras.

The New York Times hailed Washington's opera for a recent production which was attended by Walter Lippmann, the Secretaries of Commerce and the Air Force, and a sprinkling of ambassadors. It said "there will be an opera troupe to move in" the National Cultural Center when and if it is realized.

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia recently established a National Arts Committee which represents all of the many cultural groups and great institutions in the Nation's Capital. This committee will have a national and internaitonal importance, and will contribute to the new image of America abroad which is developing.

The District of Columbia Recreation Department, created by the Congress in 1942, is carrying out its mandate to establish activities in the arts. One of the most progressive and forward-looking cultural programs of any American city has been established. The department sponsors a summer music festival, as well as the outstanding Washington Civic Opera Co. The latter company is directed by Frederick Fall, a distinguished European opera and symphony conductor. A resident company, it gives hundreds of people in the Washington, D.C.-Baltimore, Md., area an opportunity to participate in cultural activities which would otherwise be denied them.

The groundwork is clearly being laid in the National Capital for resident companies in the performing arts which one day will be of great national importance and which will encourage the development of similar companies in many other American cities. When this transpires the United States, once thought of as materialistic, will be able to assert its cultural leadership throughout the world.

I include articles from the New York Times, Time magazine, the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, and the Washington (D.C.) Star which attest to the fact that the Nation's Capital is definitely not "a cultural backwater":

[From the New York Times, Feb. 22, 1959]

CAPITAL REVIVAL—AN OPERA TROUPE GROWS IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

(By Howard Taubman)

Though sound is in abundant supply in the Nation's Capital, one must have sharp ears to hear any euphony in it. But underneath the tocsins of the public servants, the murmurs of the diplomats and the clamor of the politicians, one may discover, if one

listens carefully, shy noises that are music. For Washington is making a determined effort to build up its musical institutions.

The city on the Potomac was once regarded as a horrible example of a world capital that was provincial in its neglect of the cultural amenities. Compared with London, Paris, Rome, Berlin, and Moscow, it looked like an esthetic desert. Foreigners who liked to scoff at the United States would point to the paucity of artistic activity in Washington as another demonstration of American materialism.

The comparison was never quite fair, for Washington has always been an artificial city, a Government center whose population fluctuates substantially with shifts in party power. Nevertheless, there seemed to be a basis for the charge that the community cared for little but the political and social game. The symphony orchestra was in the doldrums; there was no opera, and apart from Zelda Fichandler's Arena Stage, no continuous theater.

BURIED IN COMMITTEE

Some citizens complained that Washington was missing an opportunity. No longer a village on Foggy Bottom, they insisted, it ought to behave with the pride of a great capital. It ought to be a showplace in the humanities and arts. Conscientious Congressmen introduced legislation to promote this aim, and generally it was interred in committee.

Last year, however, a law was enacted to make possible a cultural center in Washington. It avoided committing the Government's money, but arranged for official approval of an apparatus to raise $25 million and build a center. When this project will become a reality is open to speculation. In any event, no one need be puffed up with optimism.

Fortunately, some Washingtonians have not waited for cultural amelioration wafted on wings of Government action. In recent years the National Symphony Orchestra has had an infusion of energy. Its conductor, Howard Mitchell, has brought a modern point of view to program making. By means of good ideas and personal drive, he has strengthened and orchestra, lengthened its season, and magnified its prestige.

For several years an opera company has been taking shape. The organization, backed by local people, was formed in September 1956. It began its active career with "The Abduction From the Seraglio" on January 31, 1957. It used professional elements on the stage and in the pit. Economies were urgent, of course, and properties were borrowed, including some from the Turkish Embassy.

OPERA COMPANY

In April the Opera Society of Washington followed with a Menotti program: "The Old Maid and the Thief" and "The Unicorn, the Gorgon, and the Manticore." Like the Mozart production, the Menotti twin bill had two performances. One could not say that the company was swollen with ambition.

In its second season, the Opera Society ventured on three productions: "Fidelio," "Ariadne auf Naxos," and "Cosi Fan Tutte." Each had three performances.

In the current season, the third, four works are on the agenda: "The Marriage of Figaro," Monteverdi's "Orfeo," and "The Rake's Progress" have been presented, and "Falstaff" will wind up the schedule.

This repertory is enough to make clear that this is no ordinary company. It has no interest in pursuing success down the easiest road. "Bohéme," "Traviata," and "Carmen," admirable works all, would be obvious selections if one wanted sure-fire attractions. But the Opera Society, much as it enjoys sellouts, prefers pieces likely to be less familiar to its clientele. To the company's great delight, productions like "Ariadne" and "Figaro" have played to full houses.

NATIONAL SYMPHONY

The general manager of the enterprise is Day Thorpe, music critic of the Washington Star. Mr. Thorpe is a brave man, and his paper is generous to let him risk his reputation on the firing line. Critics everywhere are indebted to him, for he proves what a protean lot we are. Who but a critic could do his job and manage an opera company with his left hand, as it were? Mr. Thorpe, of course, does not review his own productions. That would be too much of a good thing, wouldn't it? The Star uses guest critics for Opera Society openings.

The company operates on thoughtfully conceived principles. Its standards are professional, but it does not depend on big names. Its objective is ensemble spirit. It pays its Figaro and Don Curzio the same fee, and it expects both to be equally prepared. The singers, though young, are generally experienced; quite a few come from the New York City Opera.

GENERAL MANAGER

The orchestra is the National Symphony. For each of its productions the Opera Society takes over the orchestra for an entire week, and it is thus available without interruption for rehearsals and performances. The chorus, made up of singers with professional training, is local. So is the conductor, Paul Callaway. Stage directors and designers may be brought in from New York and other cities.

"The Rake's Progress," the most recent production, cannot be used as a gage of the Opera Society's accomplishments. But, in spite of misfortunes, it was a performance of which the company and the city need not have been ashamed.

Less than 24 hours before curtain time, a 23-year-old tenor, Sgt. Mallory Walker, took over the role of Tom Rackwell and carried on with amazing aplomb, though he had not had a rehearsal. In the main soprano part there was Phyllis Frankel, who had replaced another singer and had learned the role from scratch in less than 10 days.

In a way, this miserable luck turned out to be good luck. It showed that the company was resourceful enough to survive the buffetings of fate. "The Rake's Progress," by the way, gave evidence of its durability, for its music was appealing in the face of a handicapped performance.

The Opera Society's budget this year is about $100,000, with half coming in at the box office and the remainder from contributions. If the company could raise more money, it would undertake more productions. At the moment, it has no choice but to play in the Lisner Auditorium, where part of the orchestra must be stationed in front of the limited pit. But, much as a proper opera house would be welcome, the company is the important thing. If the Washintgon Cultural Center ever materializes, there will be an opera troupe to move in.

[From Time magazine, Feb. 23, 1959]

CAPITAL CULTURE

It was the kind of disaster-and-triumph series that makes opera legends. Rehearsing the part of Anne Trulove in Washington's Opera Society production of Stravinsky's "The Rake's Progress," the soprano was felled by a virus; she left the role to Baltimore's Phyllis Frankel, a singer who studied for an operatic career with famed Soprano Rosa Ponselle, has appeared with New York City Opera. Then the title-role tenor came down with laryngitis during dress rehearsal, was replaced by Mallory Walker, a 23-year-old soldier from Fort Myer, Va., where he is singing in the U.S. Army Chorus. Walker had never sung the Rake role before but had learned it as understudy, hopes to become a professional singer after he gets out of the Army. Finally, Tenor Hugues Cuenod lost his voice, responded enough to frantic, last-minute medication to carry off his role.

Despite the crises, audience and critics last week applauded. Said the Washington Daily News' Milton Berliner: "A topnotch performance."

CULTURAL BACKWATER

Much of the credit for Rake's success goes to its director, tiny (5 feet 2 inches) Paul Callaway, 49, organist and choirmaster at Washington Cathedral (Protestant Episcopal), who organized the Opera Society in 1956. In a city that has long been known as a cultural backwater, the company was financed by contributions averaging $100, plus some sizable gifts from Washington society's cave dwellers, including Mrs. Herbert May (formerly Mrs. Merriweather Post), Mrs. Robert Low Bacon, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Woods Bliss.

Deciding from the start to limit the repertory to rarely heard operas performed in their original language, Director Callaway set such a high standard with last year's staging of Richard Strauss' "Ariadne auf Naxos" that one critic feared listeners would expect a triumph every time. In fact there have been many triumphs, including stand-out productions of Mozart's "Cosi fan Tutte" and Monteverdi's "Orfeo." Audience response matched the performances: paid season subscriptions rose from 322 in 1957 to nearly 2,000 this season.

PROMISING BOOM

Last week's production of the 8-year-old "Rake's Progress" brought out as rare an operagoer as Walter Lippmann, also the Secretaries of Commerce and the Air Force, a sprinkling of ambassadors—all of whom seemed to glow at Washington's cultural boom. The opera company is not alone. Washington also has a promising ballet company and the fine National Symphony, whose reputation has grown steadily, today is not far from the top echelon of U.S. orchestras. This season the orchestra hopes to repeat last year's feat of landing in the black. Propelled by Conductor Howard Mitchell, the symphony this summer goes on a 10-week Latin American tour, also gives some 30 concerts a year for visiting teenage tourists.

Last week the National Park Service prepared to add a final touch to Capital culture. By 1965, it hopes to restore Ford's Theater, which failed after Lincoln's assassination, was long used as a museum. Needed for the project: $1,750,000.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 23, 1959]

D.C. CULTURE IS DEFENDED BY HAYES

Concert manager Patrick Hayes gave the back of his hand to Time magazine yesterday.

Hayes spoke over Radio Station WGMS and said he was sorrowed at a short phrase in this week's issue of the news magazine.

The phrase is: "In a city (Washington) that has long been known as a cultural backwater." A Time writer used it in a story describing the success of the Washington Opera Society's production of Stravinsky's "The Rake's Progress."

Washington makes out pretty well in the magazine story, which sees recent art and theater activity here as indicative of a cultural boom, but Hayes wasn't placated.

"Today, the back of my hand goes to Time magazine," he said.

He commented on the Time writer's statement that a final touch to the cultural boom would be the restoration of the old Ford Theater, where Lincoln was assassinated. Hayes doesn't think that's the final touch and he doesn't think the city's in such bad shape right now.

Hayes said, "Between now and 1965, while we wait for restoration of the Ford Theater, we will have to suffer along with our backwater.

"All we have to look forward to are the daily showings at the National Gallery of Art, the Corcoran, Freer and the Phillips and half dozen or so smaller galleries. Scholars will have to get along as best they can at the Library of Congress and the Folger Shakespeare Library. Music lovers will have to be content with about 1,000 programs of merit each season * * * Our six universities in the area * * * will lumber along culturally. The National Theater will continue to book shows and now and then an Old Vic Company will visit us."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Jan. 30, 1959]

CZECH BASSO IMPRESSIVE IN OPERATIC EXCERPTS

(By Paul Hume)

The Washington Civic Opera Association presented an evening of operatic excerpts last night in Roosevelt Auditorium. Frederick Fall conducted, and the difficult assignment of simulating the operatic orchestra was handled in yeomanly manner by pianists Paul Higinbotham and Richard Weilenmann.

The stage was simply set with four large candelabra, against which the chorus was arrayed, some 60 strong.

The evening was especially fortunate in the presence of the Czech bass, Jan Rubes, of the New York City Center Opera. Rubes, who has been heard here in past productions of both the Civic Opera and the Opera Society, contributed the evening's noblest moment in his impressive delivery of Sarastro's "O Isis and Osiris," from Mozart's "Magic Flute." With the men of the chorus, this was an elevated scene.

It was Rubes also, later in the evening, who gave us the touch of real theater that removed us from the school auditorium and the well-meaning level of things with his remarkably well handled Coronation Scene and Death of Boris, from Moussorgsky's "Boris Godounoff."

It was interesting to note how warm his voice became in the second scene, which he sang in Russian, precisely as it had in the Mozart, in German. His first "Boris" scene, and his opening scene, from Smetana's "Bartered Bride," were in English, and neither of them came off as well as the succeeding episodes. Frankly, there are moments in the role of Boris that lie too high for Rubes to negotiate at all. But his voice in its middle and lower registers has a voluninous sound that he used with great effect.

Working in front of a plain curtain in the middle of a spotlight, he yet captured the drama and tenderness, the fear and hope of the final scene with telling impact. The chorus, properly behind the scenes, sang the closing lines, and learned the minimal Russian needed. Their work in the Coronation Scene, which is a great wall of choral sound, was alert, though they could not provide that real mass of tone needed. How much easier they would have found it to sing "Slava" on those high lines rather than the awkward "Glory." But we must pretend to like our opera in English. If a chorus can learn a little Russian, surely it can learn a little more.

The evening's other soloists included Lida Brodenova, soprano, who sang in scenes from "Bartered Bride;" Carolyn Friday, soprano, and Jacob Barkin, tenor. Miss Friday, also imported from New York, joined Barkin in the last act duet from "Traviata," and later sang Marguerite's spinning song and Jewel Song, from "Faust," before winding up the evening with Barkin and Rubes in the closing scene from that opera.

Miss Friday was not in happy estate. Her Violetta was routine, her "Roi de Thule" dull and flat, and her Jewel Song shrill, accompanied by an unceasing waving of the arms in a kind of night-clubby way. There are sopranos in Washington and Baltimore who sing better than Miss Friday. The Washington Civic Opera, which usually makes a point of giving the home team the nod, will probably not make this mistake again.

Barkin was in excellent voice in arias from "Rigoletto" and "Faust," as well as in his ensemble roles. It was nevertheless disturbing to see him singing of the most romantic love, with the attractive Miss Friday right next to him, while he kept his eyes glued to his little black book. In programs such as this, one is expected to have the thing in mind.

Frederick Fall displayed his customary sound knowledge of the subtleties and nuances of every scene.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 29, 1959]

JAN RUBES STANDS OUT IN OPERATIC EXCERPTS

(By Day Thorpe)

The Washington Civic Opera Association last night put on an evening of music from various well-loved operas, using the local talent of its chorus, Jacob Barkin, tenor, and Lida Brodenova, soprano, together with two able pianists, Paul Higinbotham and Richard Weilenmann, and importing two stars, Jan Rubes and Carolyn Friday. It was a relaxed unassuming and often quite enjoyable evening.

Miss Brodenova is a one-time opera singer who now, after her retirement, is teaching at Mount Vernon School. That her voice is past its prime is of much less moment than that the musical style and eloquence with which she imbues her singing could be an object lesson to many a younger artist. Her aria, sung in Czech, from "The Bartered Bride" was natural and appealing.

Miss Friday, a talented young soprano with a pleasant voice, was suffering from bronchitis. Cantor Jacob Barkin is one of Washington's best tenors. His strong and romantic voice is heard in synagogue, opera, and oratoric.

It is surprising that a good singer whose musical life is so close to operatic music makes not the slightest effort to act or live his role. It is not that Cantor Barkin is a poor actor—he simply does not act at all, but sings his notes without any histrionic emotion, usually from a score. Of course, last night's show had neither staging nor sets, but the other singers created their situations by effective pantomime.

Dr. Fall's mixed chorus of about 50 voices sings for the love of it. More rehearsal would help it, for it is a bit ragged. Mr. Higinbotham, to whose lot fell most of the accompanying, was excellent throughout a long evening of many styles of music.

That leaves us with Mr. Rubes, bass of the Toronto Opera. It was he who gave the concert its real character and kept the customers happy. He is a singer of tremendous vitality, a rich and smooth voice and exceptional acting ability. His two solo scenes from "Boris Godounov," one sung in English, the other in Russian, coming as they did intermingled with a variety of quasi-amateur operatic numbers, gave the evening its charge of electric excitement which it needed to make it memorable.

Mr. Rubes' aria of Sarastro from "The Magic Flute" was marred by the glee club sound and the false entrances of the men's chorus, while his fine comic aria from "The Bartered Bride" was vulgarized beyond all excuse by the paltry cliches of the English translation.

In considering this evening of opera, put on by the D.C. Recreation Department, one must remember that it is created with virtually no budget. The interest of Congress in opera in Washington will, of course, blossom with the advent of an opera house—until that time it is concerned only that other world capitals outshine us. The recreation department does quite well with what it has to do with, but I wonder if it could not put together an operatic evening of more unity and dramatic intensity. That would be a question more of ingenuity than money.

Rural Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the rural towns and communities of this Nation are presently under great pressure. Farm population in some of these areas has been steadily decreasing. Young people, raised, educated, and trained at great expense, have gone elsewhere to make their contribution to society. The cost of public services has skyrocketed in the face of declining area income.

Ironically, while many of our rural towns are caught in a squeeze between declining incomes and rising costs, our cities and industrial areas are struggling desperately to meet the overwhelming demands put upon them by an influx of people attracted by the high level of jobs and wage rates prevalent over the past decade.

The decline of many rural trading centers and crowded conditions in our cities are two sides of the same coin. Both problems arise from the same cause. Both can find a partial solution in sound programs to develop, to their fullest potential, the resources of our rural towns, trading centers, and farm communities. The Nation needs more effective programs of resource development in rural areas: Industry dispersal, strengthening of small businesses, better organized farm marketing and processing, and programs of training and education that will build skills into the area.

It is true that Federal and State agencies and many private groups, such as chambers of commerce and civic clubs, are spearheading resource development programs in many parts of the Nation. Certainly the Federal-State rural development program now going forward in some 30 States, is a big step in the right direction. Ohio's two pilot counties, Guernsey and Monroe, in this program are located in the 15th Congressional District.

However, I wish to point out that we have only begun to scratch the surface. A much greater effort will be needed at all levels, an effort that fully mobilizes both Government and private services and personnel, if "rural development" is to solve the grave national problem of our declining small towns, with all the economic, social, and political calamity this problem implies.

Pointing out that "the situation calls for some real thinking on the part of leaders in all farm communities," the American Farm Bureau Federation's magazine, Nation's Agriculture, printed last year an objective review of the whole issue of farm-town development. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

WHAT'S AHEAD FOR YOUR COMMUNITY?

What happened last time a farm house burned down in your community? Was it rebuilt or did the family move off, leaving a neighbor to work the land?

Look around and see what happened to the 80-acre farm that used to support a family. Chances are it has been combined with another to make a practical-sized family farming operation.

Consider the main street of the closest town of less than 500 population. Think about how many business firms there are compared to 10 or 15 years ago.

Does your church have more trouble making its budget than it used to? How is the local school getting along? Capable teachers won't work for a song any more. Also they want good buildings and equipment.

If your community has been keeping education up to standard, you have probably found that the taxload per acre is getting rather heavy.

After you have thought about these various problems you may come to this conclusion. Farming as a business has gone through some terrific changes in recent years, adapting a great many new methods.

Most of the communities in which this business is carried out have not yet adjusted to these rapid changes in agriculture. Technical advances are often made in a short time—the social adjustments that they cause may take a generation.

It is difficult for the smaller number of people you have left on the farm to support the same churches, schools, organizations, and business firms that were formerly used by many more folks.

In 1940, farm people made up 23 percent of the total population. Now they represent only about 12 percent. This fact has meaning for every farming community in the Nation.

Looking ahead, it appears that the heavy migration of workers from farms is apt to continue. Dr. Harry J. Reed, Coordinator for the rural development program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, points out that there is underemployment on more than one-third of the farms in this country.

The U.S. Department of Labor predicts that between 1955 and 1965 the number of professional and technical workers will increase 37 percent—at the same time they expect a 15 percent drop in employment of farmers and farmworkers.

This situation calls for some real thinking on the part of leaders in all farm communities. A decision must be made—either by default or after some careful study. The decision is whether to do nothing and watch these people leave the home community or to attempt to provide employment for them where they are now.

Assume you do nothing and the number of farm people in your area continues to decrease at the same rate as in recent years. There are some changes that will eventually occur in your neighborhood and community, whether you like it or not.

Reorganization of schools is one of the first things that you will face with a shrinking farm population. In many places this has already happened. The total number of school districts in the United States decreased from 110,000 in 1944 to 66,000 in 1954.

Most people hate to see the small, local high school pass out of the picture. There is lots of loyalty for the basketball team and so on.

However, there is a need to be realistic. Over one-half of the young people growing up in rural areas today will not farm. They deserve the best of schooling so they can compete on an equal basis in whatever occupation they choose. Also, college can be difficult if you don't have thorough training in chemistry, physics, and higher mathematics.

Not only is it difficult to provide topnotch education in too small a high school, but it is costly to taxpayers. By expanding the boundaries of the high-school district, the tax cost per acre may be held down somewhat.

In reorganizing school districts, one approach is to maintain local grade schools close by and then send the high-school students to a larger, centrally located school. PTA groups can be built up around the elementary schools and they can be a center for some social activities.

If the school leaves, chances are the local church will go also. Rural churches in all parts of the country are finding the going is tougher each year. We find that in some denominations, national church organizations are now wrestling with the problem of what their policy shall be toward providing ministers for small, rural churches.

With a rapidly growing population, there often are not enough young clergymen to meet the needs. In many cases country churches will be forced to consolidate because no minister will be provided.

With today's modern roads and automobiles, it is not unreasonable to drive 10 miles to church. By joining together with another church in a larger town, you may be able to have a strong active group that does not face the perennial problem of raising enough money to keep going. Often small towns are trying to support two or three churches of different denominations and it is very discouraging because of small attendance and heavy costs.

There is much reluctance to give up small country or village churches because of memories and tradition. However, the young folks are going to the larger towns for amusement and it may be better to have the church there, too, so that more of their recreational activities can be associated with the church.

You can easily see that if the high school and the church move to the larger county seat town, much of your social activity is going to take place there also. This is a gradual thing but it is taking place all the time. More farmers are belonging to service clubs in town. Farmer-merchant dinners and other such activities pull them into town.

Also farmers' interests are more similar to townspeople's than in past generations.

The passing of the smalltown merchant is one of several sad things in all this transition. Many of them today are living on their capital, unable to realize that the need for them has passed.

An Iowa State College sociologist comments: "Small grocery stores, the small independent hardware stores, general stores, and men's and women's clothing stores of the typical small Iowa community now have to compete with the larger, more specialized business houses of the county seat town. They no longer have the advantages which were gained from monopoly of position in the days when people were restricted pretty much to shopping in the area in which they lived.

"The local merchant who has a relatively small volume of business cannot operate on the markups that are being used by his large competitors who make their incomes on the basis of a rapid turnover of inventory."

The further decrease in farm population in the future will aggravate the problems of the smalltown businessman even more. This is especially true if the school and church are moved on to a larger town.

Farmer cooperatives also have to consider their position in this changing agriculture. Midwest creameries are an example of a need for consolidation in order to cut down per unit costs of production. One dairy industry expert mentions that in some areas as many as 6 to 12 plants are handling a volume of milk that might be processed cheaper by 1 plant. These co-op plants often compete fiercely for milk or cream, and routes overlap considerably.

Let's say that the leaders of your community decide to try and keep the people where they are, rather than to make the many adjustments listed above. The first thing necessary is to provide gainful employment for them. Basically, this can come from a more intensive type of agriculture or from industry.

If there is an outlet for specialty crops, they can use up a lot of extra labor. For instance, a Tennessee community found they could profitably produce peppers for a canning factory.

A Louisiana parish, going out of cotton production, faces a choice as to what type of farming to go into. Some suggest going into cattle. This will not require many of the farm workers now living there and will eliminate most of the existing business firms. One planter suggests using supplemental irrigation to raise sweetpotatoes, strawberries, or other high labor crops so the small farmers can remain in the area.

In an agricultural development program for Gadsden County, Fla., our research people suggested raising fall vegetables to use the available labor after the shade tobacco was harvested. With the coming of supplemental irrigation and new marketing practices, it is now practical to raise vegetables in places where they could not be considered a few years ago. The demand is growing for many specialty crops.

Bringing in a new industry is certainly an effective way to provide employment for people not needed in agriculture and to keep local business concerns going. A survey has shown that each 100 factory jobs create enough new business to provide $590,000 more personal income each year and $360,000 more in retail sales.

Attracting a new factory to your town is not easy. Hundreds of other towns are working hard at the job. It is not uncommon for a company to pit two or three towns against each other and give the plant to the one that will promise the most.

Many towns have established industrial development corporations for the purpose of encouraging the location of industry in their areas. Sometimes a tract of land is bought and set aside for industrial use.

It is often best to obtain outside help in deciding the types of industry that will be most desirable and those that can operate profitably in your town. Companies want to know their costs if they locate there and what labor conditions are like. It takes skilled research to size up a town and present the information about it in the best form.

Recreation is a possibility that you don't want to overlook in considering opportunities for employing local people. With the large amount of leisure time available to city workers, there is more interest in fishing, boating, camping, and hunting than ever before.

The main thing is to get a really good inventory of the resources in your community and then act in an organized manner to develop these to their fullest extent.

It takes real leadership and some effort on everyone's part, but many communities have found that they can do a good job of farming, attract an industry to provide extra employment for workers not needed in agriculture and then weld all of this together into a group that is proud of its churches, schools, and its good standard of living.

The Puerto Rican in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Ruth Gruber, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of December 6, 1958:

THE PUERTO RICAN IN NEW YORK

(By Ruth Gruber)

Street gangs, until this year, were almost unknown in Puerto Rico. Not only are street gangs a new phenomenon, according to Puerto Rican authorities, they are a New York export.

The leaders of the two or three gangs that have made headlines this year are largely boys who were in trouble in New York and whose families brought them home to Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico's youth are still not "shook up" at home. Gangs, vice, and narcotics, though they exist, are still largely alien to the Puerto Ricans in Puerto Rico. Less than one-third of 1 percent of Puerto Rico's youth are registered as delinquents. What happens to them when they migrate to New York is another story, a story of the tragedy of upheaval, of rejection, of prejudices.

The leaders in Puerto Rico are doing a good deal of soul-searching to understand these changes. During a recent visit to Puerto Rico I spent long hours with Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, his wife, Dona Ines, Commonwealth officials and the man on the street, discussing the problems of Puerto Ricans in New York.

Certainly anyone who has driven through the hills of Puerto Rico, talked to the kindly jibaros living a pastoral unhurried life in a little wooden shack, or watched the people in the mountains, dressed in their Sunday best, clustering happily around their little country store, the "colmado," listening to jukebox music which floods out to the road, or seen a whole family at night in a one-room shack, the door wide open, securely absorbed in a television program, soon realizes the problem these people face in adjusting to the hectic, competitive, pressure-ridden life in New York.

In the hills, the jibaro lives in a small shack surrounded by sunshine and air and green living things. When he washes his face in his bowl of water, he throws his water out of the window. He is sharing his water with the universe. But when he comes to New York and throws his water out of the window, it is not the universe. It is a slum on East 110th Street. Up in the hills, sitting under the stars, he doesn't worry about time. If he feels like singing at midnight, he sings and he disturbs no one. But in New York, if he sings at midnight, he will probably be waking 10 families who have to get up at 6 the next morning.

Yet Puerto Ricans have adjusted faster to New York in 10 years than most immigrant groups adjusted in a whole generation. Puerto Rico is the only country that has followed its people to New York, to watch over them, help them adjust to the new culture, help them find jobs, and overcome some of the bewilderment and frustrations of being the last-comers.

Through the Office of the Labor Department of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, known familiarly to all Puerto Ricans as "the office," located at 322 West 45th Street. Governor Muñoz told me "we give help and information to the people in New York. We have maintained a fruitful exchange of information with the governments of New York City, Chicago, etc. We send teachers of English into New Jersey to the farm workers' camps. We pay for the teachers. No other country ever did this. That's why I think the adaptation of the Puerto Ricans is quicker already, and will continue to be quicker than all the other groups which came in.

"Someday," the Governor said, "I hope to spend about 3 weeks living in New York incognito, and see how the Puerto Rican people are living and get a spontaneous relationship with them."

Earlier this year the Governor's wife spent such a day in New York, although it was as difficult for her to be incognito among the thousands of people who love her as it would be for her husband.

"I am sick at what I saw," she told me one evening in San Juan. "I think we should try to keep our people here. It is a terrible destiny for people to emigrate. They are better off here. They have schools here, milk stations, everything—but not enough work. They talk of progress when they go to New York. It is heartbreaking. I know what they are going through for progress. They are warm and kind people. But look what happens to them in New York.

"Gangs prosper in New York partly because there the young people try to go out of their anonymous existence. They become a kind of Robin Hood—to get publicity, to get their pictures in the papers. Here gangs won't prosper because here the boys are not anonymous. A seamstress is a very respected person here. Her son is a very respected person. We have no gangs here because the family is very strong. In New York this changes. Family life is broken. The woman usually gets the first job—in needlework. If the husband doesn't get a job, he deteriorates. In New York, he is no longer the head of the family. The children begin to leave the house. How can they live in that terrible housing? People make fine conciliatory speeches. That is not enough. Now is the time to be strong and honest. They have to enforce the law on the landlords. We need leaders, real leaders, who will live right among the people and teach them to help themselves. That's what we are doing in Puerto Rico and that's what we must do in New York. It doesn't matter whether the leaders are white or Negro or Puerto Rican. It just matters that they help our people to help themselves."

Not all the Puerto Ricans in New York live in slums. According to Joe Monserrat, director of the New York City office of the Migration Division of the Commonwealth, about half the Puerto Rican population lives in decent houses in the city and in the suburbs.

"The painful and tragic thing," he told me, "is that most New Yorkers assume the Puerto Ricans are all living in slums. But New York is divided into 352 health areas. Puerto Ricans live in every one of them. There isn't a section of the city where Puerto Ricans don't live. Yet you don't hear of those people. The great majority of Puerto Ricans are fair-skinned enough to be able to buy houses in Westchester, N.J., and even Greenwich, Conn., and many of them do.

"There is a tremendous dynamic and cultural life being lived by Puerto Ricans in this community," he said. "There are Puerto Rican art exhibits. There are Puerto Rican plays being produced in Spanish. Two groups of young people are struggling to develop off-Broadway theaters. We have a group of young second-generation Puerto Ricans called the Hispanic Young Adult Association who maintain a list of every available scholarship in the United States, so that qualified students may apply. A lot of industries would fold up if there were no Puerto Rican workers."

The young second-generation Puerto Rican men and women working at the office of the Commonwealth, fine-looking men like Joe Monserrat and Joe Morales, wince under the stereotype of the Puerto Rican. They feel they have their own contribution to make to life in New York. Some of them disagree emphatically with the argument that the Puerto Ricans were better off in Puerto Rico.

"My father," one of them said to me in New York, "would never agree that he should have stayed in Puerto Rico, instead of coming here when I was a baby, and giving me my chance to go to college. Nor would the fathers of my friends who are engineers, doctors, social workers or flyers in the Air Force. Sure we began in the slums. But I don't know that the slum left a mark on me. I think the fire-escape education made it possible for me to understand my people better and to help them.

"Yet even we second-generation Puerto Ricans know what prejudice means. My 6-year-old daughter is darkskinned. She came home from school one day and said, 'Daddy, why am I different?'"

He swallowed hard as he said it. "Maybe that's why I'm working so hard for the Puerto Ricans coming here now, so that their sons and daughters and my daughter's daughter won't have that kind of wound."

Effects of the Federal Tax on Gasoline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, with the possibility of an additional Federal tax of 1½ cents per gallon on gasoline, I believe we ought to take a good look at just what we are doing to automobile travel these days.

Just how far Government is going to go to absolutely smother the American automobile owner, I dont' know. But it would seem to me that we are heaping more and more onto the shoulders of the folks who drive automobiles, 75 percent of whom use their cars for business purposes or to drive to and from their place of employment. Automobiles are more of a necessity than a luxury these days.

It has been suggested in justification of this legislation that this additional tax revenue is needed to foot the bill for the Federal highway program. If this is true, then why was only $2.1 billion of the 1958 revenue from gasoline taxes allocated to the highway trust fund, while $1.5 billion was funneled into the general fund of the U.S. Treasury?

At the present time, taxes on the most modestly priced new cars with a discount price of $2,500 amount to $600. This is $100 in excess of the $500 distribution cost and nearly half of the $1,400 manufacturing cost. But this is only part of the story. First, the manufacturer pays $490 in taxes, including the Federal excise tax, which amounts to about $200; property, income, and other classified taxes must be figured at approximately $150; and taxes in the price of purchased materials and parts, about $140.

Then the car moves to the dealer, who, in turn, is gouged by the tax bug. Prop-

erty, income, and other such taxes are levied against him to the extent of $20. This is one of his costs of doing business and helps get the final price of the automobile up to $2,500.

Finally comes the buyer or consumer into the picture, and if he looks closely he will find that taxes are not playing him any favorite. Boldly included in the $2,500 discount price are these items: State sales tax, $75; license and title fees, $15; total, $90.

How simple it would be to exercise just a little fiscal prudence when we are voting on the appropriation bills and on those pet projects that eat into the Federal budget each year. A little bit of fat trimmed from one pork-barrel project and a little bit from another would easily fill the hole in the Federal highway trust fund and the proposed 1½ cents tax on gasoline becomes unnecessary.

I petition the Members of this body to read carefully the article from the publication Oak Leaves, of Oak Park, Ill., which so vividly points out the inequity of the increased tax on gasoline—a necessary commodity for the American people who are already overloaded with State and Federal levies:

PROPOSED GAS TAX INCREASE WOULD COST VILLAGERS PLENTY

Forty times around the equator.

Place the pennies from a suggested increase in the Federal gasoline tax around the hemisphere, and in 1 year as estimated by the Automobile Manufacturers Association, they would reach around the globe 40 times.

What would this increase, proposed by President Eisenhower in his annual budget message to Congress, mean to residents of Oak Park and River Forest?

In Oak Park, it could result in owners of passenger automobiles paying out $201,262 more in gasoline taxes in 1 year than they paid in 1958.

In River Forest, passenger car owners could pay an additional $48,850 over the amount they paid in Federal gasoline taxes last year.

The President proposed that the tax on every gallon of gasoline be raised from 3 cents to 4½ cents. Proceeds from the increased tax would go into the highway trust fund to "preserve the pay-as-we-go principle, so that contributions from general funds to build Federal highways will not be necessary." Enactment of the tax rests with Congress.

To determine the effect of this proposal on suburbanites who drive automobiles, Oak Park and River Forest officials were asked about the number of cars and trucks owned in these suburbs.

Figures taken from the number of auto stickers issued during the past year indicate that Oak Park residents applied for tickets on 20,600 passenger autos and 796 trucks. In River Forest, 5,000 applications were filed for autos and 350 for trucks.

If the new tax increase were passed, how would it affect your pocketbook for the next year? From A.M.A. statistics, it has been estimated that the average suburban car owner drives his car 9,348 miles per year, averages 14.36 miles to the gallon, and uses 651 gallons of gasoline per year.

As an Illinois resident, you pay about 30 cents per gallon for gasoline. Of this amount, 5 cents is earmarked for the State tax, 3 cents for the Federal tax, and seven-eights one hundredths cent for an occupation tax.

The total tax on each gallon of gasoline amounts to about 30 percent of your gasoline bill. For comparison, you are paying about three times as much for gasoline taxes, as you would pay for a luxury tax on furs or jewelry.

Determined from the average figures quoted, you are paying about $56.64 per year for State and Federal taxes on gasoline. If the suggested cent and a half increase were passed, you would be paying 10.2 cents on every gallon. Apply this amount to your car's yearly consumption of fuel, and it will boost your tax bill from $56.64 to $66.41—an increase of $9.77.

Federal receipts from gasoline taxes are not providing enough to meet the costs of the new highway program, stated Washington officials. The word is that the highway trust fund will wind up this year about $900 million short. How much would the Federal Government stand to gain by the tax increase from Oak Park and River Forest residents?

Multiplying the number of autos in Oak Park (20,600) by the individual revenue which the tax would bring ($9.77), it seems motorists would be paying out $201,262 above what they paid last year. Truck owners (796) would be taxed for an increase of $19.53, yielding additional revenue of $15,545.

The suburbanites of River Forest, who own 5,000 automobiles, would be assessed for an additional $48,850, while firms owning trucks (350) would increase the Federal purse by $6,835.

J. W. Lemon, of the American Petroleum Institute, 624 South Michigan, Chicago, read a report from the institute. "In the fiscal year of 1958, the Federal Government collected $3.6 billion from special excise taxes on gasoline.

"Of that amount," he continued, "$2.1 billion was allocated to the highway trust fund while the remaining $1.5 billion went into the general fund of the Treasury."

A Proposal for Individual Voluntary Deferral of Tax in Peak-Income Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I respectfully submit the following article, which appeared in the Journal of Taxation of October 1958. The authors of this article, Mr. Carl M. Esenoff and Mr. Herbert L. Beckett, are good friends and outstanding citizens of the district which I represent. Their thoughtful and unique appraisal of this one facet of our country's income tax structure is worthy of your attention:

A PROPOSAL FOR INDIVIDUAL VOLUNTARY DEFERRAL OF TAX IN PEAK-INCOME YEARS

(By Carl M. Esenoff and Herbert L. Beckett)

(NOTE.—The high tax cost of bunching income into a few peak years is acknowledged to be one of the great evils of our progressive income tax system. Many proposals for averaging to eliminate this harsh tax treatment of those with fluctuating incomes have been offered. All such plans have suffered from being too complicated. The plan proposed here is exceedingly simple. It would permit the taxpayer to control his top bracket in any year, would spread out peaks of income, and would not reduce Government revenues and would have all the necessary controls built into it. Administration by the Government would be simple. While policy matters of this kind are not the usual business of the Journal, your editors are so struck with the appeal of this plan that we want to expose it for consideration by taxmen. Comments will be welcomed.)

Many authorities on income tax matters recognize that a means of averaging income over a period of years would be a desirable change in the Federal income tax laws. The results of measuring and taxing earnings on an annual basis are extremely harsh on any taxpayer whose income fluctuates from year to year. Taxpayers thus affected include farmers, members of professions, executives, wage earners, actors, athletes, businessmen, and many others.

A number of relief provisions have been adopted to alleviate somewhat the inequities of the annual tax. Particular reference may be made to the tax treatment of compensation for services rendered over 36 months or more (sec. 1301); the special provisions relating to income from certain inventions, artistic works, back pay, and compensatory damages for patent infringement (secs. 1302, 1303, 1304); the net operating loss carryover and carryback (sec. 172); reporting of income on an installment basis (sec. 453); the capital gain provisions of section 1202; and the regulations which permit farmers to report on a cash basis even though required use of inventories would more clearly reflect income as generally defined.

The deferral of income has received much attention in recent years. Pension and profit sharing plans (sec. 402) are becoming very popular; the increasing millions of dollars which are placed each year in these trusts and income from such trust investments are, to a great extent, escaping the current annual tax and the special relief provisions will permit many millions of such funds to escape Federal income taxes entirely. The employee stock option provisions of the code (sec. 421) permit deferral of income and special tax treatment for taxpayers who qualify. Adoption of the Jenkins-Keogh bill would permit deferral of income by another group of taxpayers, the self-employed. (Reference to the Jenkins-Keogh bill here is not intended to indicate an objection to such a bill, since in equity self-employed taxpayers should be entitled to treatment similar to employees.)

Other methods of deferring income are constantly being devised, without specific congressional or Treasury Department approval, by executives, entertainers, and many other taxpayers whose income may be expected to decline in later years. All of these plans for deferral of income seriously diminish the current revenues from income taxes with benefit to a very small percentage of all the taxpayers. If such plans for deferral of income are to be expanded, the resultant burden on taxpayers who cannot participate will consequently become greater.

Many plans for averaging of income have been advocated and considered by congressional committees and other authorities on income taxation. However, all such plans which have come to our attention have involved serious accounting problems with respect to maintaining income averages and recomputing taxes for the millions of taxpayers. Further special legislation to provide the relief for special groups or particular types of income would only make our tax laws more complicated. All of the income averaging plans of which we are aware provide for methods whereby the taxpayer keeps his income, but adjusts the tax based on retroactive computations. Our proposal considers only prospective elections.

Furthermore, our proposal presents what we believe to be a practical and easily administered plan which is designed to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Remedy the present inequities which result from the graduated tax rates as ap-

plied to income determined on an arbitrary period of 12 months.

2. Provide the U.S. Treasury with greater funds than are presently received during years of high income and high tax rates.

3. Permit the U.S. Treasury to hold certain funds without interest.

4. Provide a means and an incentive for all taxpayers to save for retirement or periods of economic depression.

5. Provide a method whereby Congress could exercise better control during inflationary periods, as well as periods of depressions.

6. Eliminate the necessity for further special group tax relief and perhaps allow for the repeal of some such laws previously adopted.

The plan briefly is this: Every individual taxpayer would be permitted to take a deduction in computing adjusted gross income for amounts deposited with the U.S. Treasury Department. Such deposit would be represented by a deferred income certificate. The certificates would bear no interest and would be redeemable on demand subject to a deduction for the estimated tax applicable to such certificate. In the year of redemption, the face amount of the certificate redeemed would be included in gross income and the deduction for estimated tax would be taken as a tax credit.

This plan would permit each individual taxpayer to average his income in the future at his own election by turning in to the U.S. Treasury any amount of income on which he did not desire to pay income tax in that year. In exchange for the cash thus deposited, the taxpayer would receive the noninterest-bearing certificates. The deferred income certificates would be nontransferable and could not be used as collateral on loans. However, since the certificates would be redeemable in cash at the option of the taxpayer, he could have income whenever he chose to pay tax on the deferred amounts.

Thus, under the plan, in the year of deposit, instead of receiving income taxes which might vary from 20 percent to 91 percent of the income, the Treasury Department would receive 100 percent of such deferred income. These funds would be used without payment of interest until the taxpayer redeemed the deferred income certificates. A simple procedure could be that, at the time of redemption, the taxpayer would prepare a form which would be comparable to the declaration of estimated tax form. The face amount of the certificates redeemed, less the estimated tax attributable to taking such income into account in the year of redemption, would be paid to the taxpayer. The taxpayer's tax return for the year of redemption of deferred income certificates would include the face amount of such certificates as income. The income tax would be computed in the regular manner, just as if the income had been earned in that year; the taxpayer would claim credit for tax withheld from salaries and wages, tax withheld from deferred income certificates, and other payments on estimated tax.

The deferred income certificates included in the estate of a deceased taxpayer could and probably should be subject to a special income tax. Any of several formulas might be applied. The deferred income could be treated in a manner similar to compensation for services rendered over 36 months or more (sec. 1301); or perhaps the tax could be computed as if earned in a period of not more than 5 years, the only variation in years being the first 4 years after enactment of the plan.

At first glance, it might appear that this income deferral plan would provide undue benefit to the taxpayer with a large income. This would undoubtedly be true with respect to the taxpayer who deferred large amounts of income for a few years; then realized little or no income and spread the deferred income over many years. However, it is our guess that this would not be the case with an unduly large number of taxpayers. Furthermore, interest savings would compensate for some of the loss of tax revenue from such taxpayers. On the other hand, the interest savings and the special taxes at death would probebly equalize the long-term tax burden of most of the taxpayers.

This plan for deferral of income would surely appeal to all classes of taxpayers. There would be an incentive to save by deferring income—always with the thought of providing financial security in the future and the possibility of paying less income tax.

The wage earner and the small salary earner might well make deposits for deferred income certificates—80-cent dollars which might some day come back to him as tax-free dollars.

The cash basis farmer could sell his crops at the most propitious time without regard to his income in that particular year. The excess income could well be deferred to a time when his farm income was down. He might defer income for 1, 5, 10 years or even longer, but that deferred income could always be a source of great satisfaction as well as very helpful in time of diminishing income.

The businessman, professional man, and the executive would probably defer considerable income. All could look to financial security as a result of the backlog of deferred income. Inasmuch as the income of these taxpayers is often greater during the later years of their lives, it is probable that substantial sums of deferred income would be held interest free for many years.

The highly paid actor, entertainer, athlete, or others who might have high earning capacity for only a few years could earn without regard for taxes and could defer income.

The present schemes for income deferral, converting ordinary income to capital gains, and earnings abroad might be less attractive. Taxpayers could devote time once more to earning income and security rather than searching for tax loopholes. Incomes would surely be increased and more money would flow into the U.S. Treasury in the form of taxes and deferred income. Some groups of taxpayers might benefit more than others, but surely the Treasury would benefit through interest savings and higher ordinary income during the normal productive lives of taxpayers.

During inflationary periods, high tax rates would cause more deferral of income. This would provide the U.S. Treasury with extra funds and would be more of a curb on inflation than high tax rates alone.

Lowered tax rates when there was danger of recession or depression would encourage taxpayers to realize their deferred income. This could place money in the hands of many taxpayers and would have a stabilizing effect on our economy. Taxpayers holding deferred income certificates who suffered unemployment, ill health, or other temporary periods without earnings could be helped over such period by cashing their certificates. While there might be a loss of tax revenue in individual cases, the income produced from spending of the deferred income could well produce more tax revenue from others.

The Challenge of Educational TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most exciting recent development in the field of education is the impact of educational television. In response to the promise of this new media, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] and I are sponsoring bills—H.R. 1981 and H.R. 2926—which would provide grants of $1 million to each of the 49 States to encourage the establishment of statewide educational TV networks. A similar bill, sponsored by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the senior Senator from Washington, passed the other body last year, and hearings have already been held this session by that committee on identical legislation.

In order to underscore the challenge presented by educational television and the hope it holds out for improvement of our educational system, I am appending to these remarks an article written by Loren B. Pope, education editor of the New York Times, which appeared in that newspaper a few days ago. The principle points made by Mr. Pope are these: First, that educational TV offers striking new opportunities for better teaching; second, that ultimately educational TV may both improve teaching techniques and produce substantial accompanying savings in basic school operation outlays; third, that educational TV may open a new door to a broadened program of adult education; fourth, that educational TV has already proven itself as an effective media for specialized instruction and programs which enrich the school curriculums.

Mr. Pope's article follows:

EDUCATION IN REVIEW: TELEVISION CLASSES ARE SEEN AS MEANS TO BETTER TEACHING AT LOW COST

(By Loren B. Pope)

Teaching by television is the fastest growing development in the history of American education. This powerful means of communication offers new opportunities for better teaching at—many educators believe—a saving in teachers and buildings, since it makes much larger classes feasible.

While there was practically no use of television in the schools 4 years ago, more than 550 school districts and 110 colleges use it today. Another 240 colleges give credit for a nationally televised physics course.

Last week the Fund for the Advancement of Education completed a report on the results of the first year of a 3-year test. And New York State started the second semester of a much less specific experiment to learn the value of television as a supplement to the classroom teacher's efforts. The two projects have produced many of the same benefits and problems.

The fund's program involved 223 schools and 40,000 students in 14 States. In 110 comparisons, the performance of television students was superior to that of control students in 68 cases. The differences were large enough to be statistically significant in 38 of the 110 cases, and 29 of them were in favor of the television classes.

LARGE CLASSES

Because the television students were taught in large classes—ranging from 175 in elementary schools to 500 in high schools—several systems reported substantial savings. Dade County, Fla., with 5,600 pupils in the television schools, reported saving the equivalent of 27 teaching positions and 29 classrooms. The savings, the fund reported, were not made at any sacrifice in quality.

No student received all of his instruction by television. The courses taught varied widely. In the elementary schools, television classes usually were in science, social studies, physical education, health, and safety.

Reading, writing, and arithmetic were taught by conventional methods in small classes.

In junior and senior high schools and television instruction was usually in mathematics, English, physics, chemistry, and history.

Methods also varied, but in general an elementary teacher had about 5 minutes to prepare the students, with the aid of a teacher's guide, for a 20-minute telecast. Afterward, the teacher answered questions, stimulated discussion, reinforced the main points of the telecast or went beyond it. In junior and senior high schools the telecasts were usually about 30 minutes long.

ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

In New York the State Department of Education finances what it calls an enrichment program of about 15 hours a week of television instruction plus offerings for teenagers and adults and for inservice training of teachers. The programs, broadcast over channel 11 from New York City, use outstanding teachers in the metropolitan area.

They can be viewed over an area in which 60 percent of the States school children live. But, because of lack of television sets, it was estimated that only about half, or 1,500, of the schools in the viewing area outside the city, and 262, or one-third of the schools in the city, use any of the television lessons. There are an estimated 350 sets in the city schools. Parent groups and the board of education are buying 110 more sets.

The program's use is largely limited to elementary schools because the television classes, which began after the start of the term, do not mesh with many junior and senior high school's rigid class schedules.

For elementary schools, 7 hours of 20-minute telecasts are offered in languages, science, art, music, and social studies. For junior and senior high schools there are nearly 8 hours of 30-minute telecasts in physics, history, English, mathematics, science, and languages. Board of education officials report that fewer than 20 junior high schools, and still fewer senior high schools, use any one of these courses.

FAVORABLE REACTION

The reactions of both teachers and students in two elementary schools were generally favorable. Typical were the responses of the third grade in Public School 40 at 320 East 20th Street to a televised science lesson. Nearly every child gave full attention when the television teacher announced she would tell how phonograph records and tapes save sounds. When she asked who was the first to make records, a dozen hands shot up. When she asked semirhetorical questions, there was a scattering of spontaneous answers.

Afterward, they said they looked forward to the lessons and volunteered a half a dozen things they had learned. A few contended the programs were either too elementary or too advanced, but most of the class pronounced them just right.

Their teacher, Mrs. Cynthia Thorne, found the television lessons stimulated an interest that helped her to do a better job. The television teachers usually are well prepared and have a wide variety of resources and visual aids not available in most classrooms.

As in the fund's program, the television lessons filled in weak or special areas—music, art, and science. They also function, by example, as an effective teacher-training device.

PROBLEMS MET

Identical problems were confronted in the New York and the fund programs. One of the principal ones was welding the telecast and the classroom followup into a unified teaching effort. One aspect of this problem is how to get a steady feedback of questions from students and suggestions from classroom teachers. Another is how to adapt the new technique to the varying abilities of students reached in a single telecast.

The New York program is being evaluated this semester by surveys and by controlled tests. The fund's tests are continuing this year, with 402 schools and 90,000 pupils.

Those involved do not see television going beyond a supplemental role. Rather than displacing teachers, they see it helping to hasten a better or more efficient way of using instructors, which is needed just to stay even with demand. They predict it will be used increasingly to spread the influence of the very best teachers, or to give small rural schools the benefit of courses and teaching available to large ones.

They also predict that because television's potential for presenting new concepts has such unplumbed possibilities it will stimulate important new revisions and expansions of course content.

Alabama Waterways Development a Major Municipal Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, we in Alabama are acutely conscious of the importance of our waterways and in recent years our State has made remarkable progress in waterway development.

The Honorable I. I. (Zeke) Fox, mayor of Alexander City, Ala., discussed municipal interest in the waterway programs at a recent meeting of Alabama mayors with our congressional delegation here. Mayor Fox's statement was of considerable interest and I would call the attention of Congress to Alabama's river development program.

Following is Mayor Fox's statement:

ALABAMA WATERWAYS DEVELOPMENT A MAJOR MUNICIPAL INTEREST

(By I. I. (Zeke) Fox, mayor of Alexander City)

Alabama's system of waterways is one of her greatest assets. There are more than 1,600 miles of navigable and potentially navigable streams within the boundaries of the State as determined by the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army. Alabama ranks fourth in the Nation in improved waterways for navigation, although less than one-half of the potentially navigable streams are improved.

There are approximately 700 miles of navigable waterways that have been improved and have a channel of at least 9 feet in depth. These include the Tennessee, Warrior-Tombigbee, the Chattahoochee to Columbia, Ala., the Gulf Intracoastal Canal, and Mobile Bay.

Development of the above rivers for navigation and allied purposes has materially increased the economy of not only the adjacent areas, but has strengthened the economy of the entire State and the southeastern region. This is evidenced by the expansion and location of industrial plants along and within the basins of the improved waterways. New industries located within the Tennessee and Warrior-Tombigbee Basins will approximate 65 percent of all industries that have located within the State of Alabama during the past several years. Records indicate that since 1955 the Warrior-Tombigbee Valley has secured a total of $287 million in capital investment in industry. The Tennessee Valley since the improvement of the river some 20 years ago has shown a phenomenal growth in the expansion and location of new industry and commercial enterprises which represent capital investments totaling hundreds of millions of dollars. Another indication of the growth of the area is the increase in tonnage on the river—in 1933 there were only 940,000 tons of commodities transported on the river system, and in 1957 shipments in excess of 12 million tons were moved on the river, representing a saving in transportation costs of more than $21 million for that year.

WATER FOR TRANSPORTATION AND INDUSTRY

The excellent economic conditions prevalent in the Tennessee River Basin are directly attributed to the ample water and power available for transporting, processing, and manufacturing which has lured industry to that area. The resulting growth and improved economy here is in sharp contrast to that in areas not possessing improved navigable waterways.

For many years the Tennessee River has been developed for navigation, hydro-electric power, flood control, soil conservation, and other water resource programs. The entire system has a total of 31 major dams (the majority of these are multiple-purpose) and in addition has seven large steam plants producing electricity.

The Warrior-Tombigbee River is one of the oldest Federal navigation projects in the United States, the original system of locks and dams having been completed in 1915. A modernization program which has been underway for the past several years has replaced some of the old locks and dams with high dams and modern locks. The Corps of Engineers' program is well under way with two new locks and dams having been completed, a third now in its third year of construction, and recently a fourth dam was approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

FAST STEPUP IN TRANSPORTATION TONNAGE

Records indicate that the first year following improvement of this river for navigation a total of only 407,245 tons were transported, whereas today the river system is handling approximately 5 million tons of various commodities annually. Indications are that tonnage on this system will continue to mount as it serves not only the industrial center of Alabama, namely, Birmingham, but numerous other towns along its course which are rapidly forging to the front industrially.

The Intracoastal Canal has for many years been operated by the Federal Government and is of untold value to the economy of the State of Alabama and especially to the southwest or Mobile area. Mobile has more than doubled its population within a period of 20 years and its rapid growth has been attributed to improvement of the waterways along the coast, Mobile Harbor, and improvement of the State docks. This area has come to be known as an industrial empire and the majority of the industry has located in the area within the past two decades. It is evident that the Mobile area will continue to grow more rapidly than other sections of the State because of its accessibility to ample water for all purposes.

The Corps of Engineers are now improving the Chattahoochee River, having completed the Jim Woodruff multiple-purpose dam near Chattahoochee, Flo., in 1957, and are now in the process of constructing the Walter F. George multiple-purpose dam at Fort Gaines and the Columbia lock and dam at Columbia. It is assumed that Congress will continue to make appropriations to complete these dams and their completion will provide navigation from the Gulf of Mexico to Phenix City, Ala., and Columbus, Ga. Development of this river system will provide greater economic

benefits to the southeastern area of Alabama, southwestern Georgia, and northern Florida. Indications are that commerce has already been stimulated by the improvement of this waterway and the economic growth of the area is certain to follow completion of the projects now under construction.

EIGHTY-FIFTH CONGRESS VOTES FUNDS

The 85th Congress appropriated sufficient funds for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a traffic survey of the Choctawhatchee-Pea River system to determine the feasibility of navigation on these rivers. The citizens of this area have been exceedingly enthusiastic in their requests to the Corps of Engineers and Congress for improvement of this waterway. Again it can be stated that the entire area will prosper from the improvement of this waterway if it is found to be economically justified.

The proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal was authorized by Congress several years ago, however to date no improvements on this proposed waterway have been initiated. The Corps of Engineers has recently completed a study to determine the continuing economic feasibility of this proposed connection of the Tennessee River with the Tombigbee at Demopolis, Ala. The Engineers have not released the report to date, consequently it is not known whether or not the project will be economically justified. In the event the feasibility of this connecting water link is established, it will make accessible the north, midwest, and east, save approximately 700 miles of water transportation, provide markets for the South's many products, and reflect considerable savings in transportation costs on grains and other products from the North and Midwest. While navigation is available from Demopolis to Mobile, three additional counties in Alabama would be served by this connecting waterway and, of course, these counties would greatly benefit from the improvement.

IMPROVEMENT OF COOSA-ALABAMA NEEDED

The largest unimproved and longest river system in the State of Alabama is only partially developed and this development has been accomplished by private capital. The Coosa-Alabama River System is the second largest in the southeastern region and is only exceeded in size by the Tennessee River. This waterway traverses the State from the southwest to the northeast, a distance of approximately 600 river miles. The commercial tributary area comprises approximately 26,000 square miles in the States of Alabama, Georgia, and Tennessee. There are 29 counties within the State of Alabama wholly or partially within the drainage area of this river system, more than one-third of the entire area of the State is within its basin, and it contains a population of approximately 1 million. For many years the upper section of the river has produced hydroelectric power at the three dams constructed by the Alabama Power Co. more than 30 years ago. You will recall that Congress authorized the issuance of a license to the power company to construct four additional hydroelectric power dams on the Coosa River and the first of these namely, Weiss Dam, is now under construction. When these dams are completed they will double the capacity of electric output for the river system.

The Coosa-Alabama River System was authorized by Congress in 1945 and additional studies have been made since that time, the most recent one being completed last year by the Corps of Engineers. This report definitely indicates the continuing economic feasibility of the entire river system for navigation. Plans for development of this river system consist of two multiple-purpose dams and one navigation dam on the Alabama River and installation of locks in the three dams already constructed on the Coosa and the four dams to be constructed by the power company.

RIVER NEEDS FIT INTO EXECUTIVE POLICY

The river system is unique in that it complies with the present administration's policy and was brought to the attention of Congress by the President of the United States on January 6, 1955, and I quote from his state of the Union message as follows: "At the foundation of our economic growth are the raw materials and energy produced from our minerals and fuels, lands and forests, and water resources. With respect to them, I believe that the Nation must adhere to three fundamental policies: first, to develop, wisely use, and to conserve basic resources from generation to generation; second, to follow the historic pattern of developing these resources primarily by private citizens under fair provisions of law, including restraints for proper conservation; and third, to treat resource development as a partnership undertaking—a partnership in which the participation of private citizens and State and local governments is as necessary as is Federal participation.

"The Federal Government and local and private organizations have been encouraged to coordinate their developments. This is very important because Federal hydroelectric developments supply but a very small fraction of the Nation's power needs. Such partnership projects as Priest Rapids in Washington, the Coosa River development in Alabama, the Markham Ferry in Oklahoma already have the approval of this Congress. This year justifiable projects of a similar nature will again have administration support."

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR WATERWAYS DEVELOPMENT

Traditionally through the years it has been the responsibility of the Federal Government to improve waterways throughout the Nation for navigation and other purposes as the founding fathers of this Government stated in effect that the inland waterways of the Nation would always be free for transportation of commerce.

It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to construct the projects as authorized by the Congress and in accordance with the established plans of the Corps of Engineers. Local participation in certain improvements is already underway and it is now time for Congress to expedite construction of the locks and dams on the rivers that have been determined economically feasible.

Complete development of these rivers will ultimately mean more to the cities and towns of Alabama than any other single natural resource.

We urge your continued efforts to secure funds to expedite construction of these projects in order that the entire State of Alabama may reap the abundant economic benefits that are rightfully hers.

Good Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the spenders are now engaged in a fantastic effort to convince the Nation that black is, after all, really white; that evil is composed largely of good, and that a balanced budget is, after all, only the last refuge of scoundrels.

These attacks on the idea of a balanced budget are nothing less than attacks on the idea of responsibility itself. They are, to me at least, incredible. I cannot believe that the American people, with their instinctive distaste for the welsher, will succumb to the argument that our national strength lies in the permanent refusal of Congress to pay for what it proposes to spend.

Yet, as the President has asked, if we cannot live within our means in these prosperous times, when are we going to do it? As the editorial from the Washington Star which I include as part of my remarks points out, if we do not have a balanced budget in 1960, we will never have one. We will have adopted perpetual deficits as a national policy and inflation as a national way of life and the outcome of that fatal decision can only be national weakness and ruin:

GOOD QUESTION

President Eisenhower answered a question with another question at his news conference yesterday. Queried about his repeated insistence that the Federal budget for fiscal 1960 should be balanced, the President replied: If we cannot live within our means as prosperity is growing and developing, when are we going to do it?

This is, perhaps, a distressingly old-fashioned sort of attitude and quite out of keeping with some of the fuzzy-headed theories of today that only budgets written in red ink are worthy of forward-looking governments. Of course those who are wailing loudest in protest against a balanced budget today would wail even louder, if possible, in a time of depression. And it is a matter of record, as the President pointed out, that no "fetish" was made during the sharp 1957–58 recession of trying to maintain a balanced budget in a period when emergency Government aid helped turn the tide to recovery. But the economic indexes show that this recovery has been steady and substantial since last spring.

There must be others who share with Mr. Eisenhower his wonder at the fact that "suddenly a balanced budget is getting to be a bad word," and his belief that "it is rather a good thing to be a bit frugal and say that we can live within our income." Our answer to the President's question is that if we do not do it in a time of developing prosperity, we will not do it ever. And if we do not, then we can set our sights on disaster—rather than progress or security.

A Triumph of Character

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to join with the friends and admirers of John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, in wishing for him a speedy recovery. While I may not have always agreed with Secretary Dulles, I have respected his devotion to duty, in a most exacting job, on behalf of the people of the United States. He has truly been a Rock of Gibraltar in his dealings with Communist Russia and, in

these times of crisis, Berlin, his advice and guidance is essential in steering our future course.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial by David Lawrence which appears in the February 27, 1959, issue of the U.S. News & World Report.

The editorial follows:

A TRIUMPH OF CHARACTER

(By David Lawrence)

They ridiculed his phrases—but now they are singing his praises.

Why is there today wide acclaim for John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, when only yesterday there was such bitter criticism? Americans have been told repeatedly by Democratic Party spokesmen for the last 2 or 3 years that the United States has "no friends in Europe," that our allies have been "alienated," that the administration really has had "no foreign policy," and that Mr. Dulles is to blame.

Still more recently, certain Members of Congress made the headlines by crying out that our policy is "inflexible," that Mr. Dulles is "too rigid," and that we should get off "dead center."

The Kremlin, of course, has long been saying through its propaganda—over the radio and to newsmen through Soviet Ambassadors everywhere—that the main obstacle to the ending of the "cold war" is John Foster Dulles. If only he could be removed as Secretary of State, the Communists have said openly, everything would be rosy.

Plainly the Soviets do not like Mr. Dulles because he will not appease, he will not surrender, and he will not barter away the basic principles of international morality for the sake of expediency.

Events have proved Mr. Dulles was right in his stoical resistance to the insidious propaganda of those who sought peace at any price. That's why there has come, at last, a true appreciation of his services, just as he faces the tragic months ahead in fighting cancer.

There have been some occasions when Mr. Dulles has incurred the displeasure of our allies, especially in his stern stand against a punitive war over Suez. But what has happened since proves he was right.

Time and again Mr. Dulles has been assailed for views which were deliberately distorted in the press of the world. Even today, some critics still say he was wrong in espousing the cause of liberation for the peoples of the captive states of Eastern Europe. His plea for liberation was twisted to mean a threat to use military force.

The critics did not—or would not—perceive that moral force has always been the principal weapon in the arsenal of John Foster Dulles.

The Secretary is, however, no pacifist. His phrase "massive retaliation" has stood the test of time—the concept has proved a powerful deterrent of war. He has always been ready, as he once acknowledged, to go to "the brink of war" to show the sincerity of American purpose and a willingness to make every sacrifice for principle. The critics derided this as "brinkmanship," but they witnessed a successful manifestation of it recently in our decision to protect Quemoy and Matsu if it appeared that any military measures taken there by the Red Chinese were to be the forerunner of an invasion of Formosa itself.

Although Congress, by joint resolution in 1955, had given the President full power to deploy our military forces in defense of Formosa, there emerged in recent months some fainthearted men in Congress and elsewhere who exhibited peace at any price weaknesses. They were inclined to a deal whereby Red China would be taken into the bosom of the free nations of the world and we would let bygones be bygones. But Mr. Dulles never forgot the sacrifices made by American boys in Korea—the many who died or suffered grievous wounds to repel the attack of the Communist Chinese, aided openly, as they were, by the Soviets. He could see no reason to reward an aggressor.

In its latest threat, the Kremlin startled the world by trying to detach Berlin from West Germany. The Moscow Government thought the time had come to test out the strength and determination of the West. This was promptly countered by the conference of Secretary Dulles with the heads of the British, French, and West German Governments. Though suffering excruciating pain physically, Mr. Dulles, undaunted, continued to perform his great mission. He was able to bind together the members of the Western alliance. A demonstration of allied unity has in itself proved to be one of the best ways to prevent the Soviets from assuming that the West is weakening. A miscalculation on that point by Moscow could plunge us into war.

John Foster Dulles has steadfastly adhered to principle. He has tenaciously maintained the ideals of free peoples everywhere. He has refused to be bullied by the Communists abroad or disheartened by the snipings of the partisans at home. He has fought for the best interests of the United States just as bravely as if he were a soldier facing the fire of the enemy. The world has indeed witnessed in his skillful conduct of American policy a heroism which will be engraved on the pages of history.

While the years of life itself are numbered, the years of a man's fame are unnumbered. In the career of John Foster Dulles, we see a triumph of courage, a triumph of unselfish devotion to public service, and, above all, a triumph of character.

Senator Hayden Views the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the senior Senator from my State, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, last week began his 48th consecutive year of service in the Congress, a record unequalled by any person since the founding of our Republic. In addition, since March 4, 1927, Senator Hayden has been a member of the Appropriations Committee of the other body, and thus has participated in the preparation of more appropriations than any other Member of the Congress.

In my opinion, Senator HAYDEN'S wide experience as a legislator and the deep insight he has acquired over the years into fiscal matters makes his views unusually valuable in analyzing the present budget pending before the Congress. Last week there appeared in some Arizona newspapers a statement by the Senator regarding the controversy over Federal fiscal policies. Mr. Speaker, I believe Senator HAYDEN'S perspective on the budget will be of interest to many of our colleagues, and consequently I am inserting the full text of his statement below:

I can think of no better way to begin a prompt response to your letter of January 29, and the attached editorial than to ask you to look over the enclosed copy of The Federal Budget in Brief for the fiscal year beginning on the first of next July, which is just off the press. The details set forth in the pamphlet should be helpful to you in appraising the financial problem with which the Congress is faced.

At page 18 is a breakdown of the $45,805 million for the costs of major national security which requires 59.5 cents out of the taxpayer's dollar. Paying for the cost of past wars by benefits to veterans, p. 30, and interest on the public debt, p. 32, requires an additional 17.1 cents or a total of over 76 cents of high priority demands against his dollar. Add to that about 5.4 cents for welfare costs, p. 26, and 2.2 cents to maintain the general Government, p. 34, where there is no prospect of reduction, leaves a margin of 16 cents out of which, with difficulty, some cuts could be made.

Only a small part of the $45 billion requested by the President for national security would be required if we could live our own lives in our own way without regard to what is being done in the rest of the world. But to do so we would have to ignore completely the fact that Russian controlled communism is an actual menace which must be met by the free world being prepared to either win a war against it or by being so strong that the dictators in Moscow will be afraid to start a war.

So much has happened in the meantime that there is no possible way to get government back where it was intended to be—in 1776. We now live in a nation where many men, from the Revolution to this day, have been perfectly willing to give up their lives ahead of time to make our Nation free and to keep it free. That very freedom has made it possible to create such favorable living conditions that the average American can now expect to live 20 years longer than he could hope to do when I was born some 80 years ago. That there is an ever increasing number of older people who are no longer capable of supporting themselves is a fact from which we cannot escape. The present social security system and the other welfare activities undoubtedly have their defects, for which time and experience will find a remedy; but something very much like them just has to be in existence, and Congress will do well to hold what they will continue to cost close to 5 cents out of the taxpayer's dollar.

The objective of all Federal aid for the construction of highways is to make it possible to move people and things from where they are to where they are needed in the least time and at the least cost. It is a capital investment which is certain to pay good dividends. To supply the money required to build the needed highways, Congress has provided that the receipts from the Federal excise taxes on gasoline, motor oil, automobiles and accessories shall be deposited in a trust fund in the Treasury, to be available only for the construction and improvement of highways. Since the highway users rather than the general taxpayers pay their costs, highway funds are not included in the Budget.

The tabulation on page 58 of the Budget pamphlet shows that during the New Deal from 1933 to 1940 the public debt was increased by $20,429 million. From 1941 to 1946, the World War II period, the public debt mounted rapidly from $48,961 million to a peak of $269,422 million. The Budget was balanced in 1947 and 1948 with resulting debt reductions, but the costs of the fighting in Korea again caused deficits and there were no payments on the national debt until 1956 and 1957. Expenditures due to the cold war are the primary cause of the existing deficit.

I point out these figures to indicate the situation with which the Congress is faced. The one sure way to balance the budget is to increase the rates of Federal taxation, but nobody wants to pay more taxes. The Constitution provides that all revenue legisla-

tion originate in the House of Representatives. The indications are that the Committee on Ways and Means, which reports revenue bills to that body, will not do more than recommend the enactment of legislation designed to plug loopholes in the existing tax laws which may possibly produce about a billion dollars in additional revenue. That sum will not go very far in taking care of an estimated deficit which could amount to over $10 billion if business conditions do not improve as the President has predicted that they will. We can all join in the hope that he has made a good guess.

Except in time of war, Congress has never, during my service as a member of the Appropriations Committee, granted to any President as much money as he asked for in his annual Budget estimates. At the last session of Congress the appropriations were $600 million less than the Budget requests.

Puerto Rico Is Like Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Ruth Gruber which recently appeared in the New York Herald Tribune. Miss Gruber directs attention to the many similarities between the problems of Puerto Rico and those of the State of Israel:

PUERTO RICO IS LIKE ISRAEL

(By Ruth Gruber)

Puerto Rico and Israel are startlingly alike. Both are new democracies on old soil.

Both are pulling themselves up by the bootstraps with the same dynamic and creative spirit. Both countries, still underdeveloped lands, have begun their own point 4 programs to teach other underdeveloped lands the exciting things that each has learned through 10 years of trial and error.

Both have strong ties to the United States, and stronger and more emotional ties to the people of New York than to any other city in the world.

Each country is led by a man who is a dreamer, an idealist, a statesman, and a shrewd hardheaded politician who controls his party completely.

Luis Munoz-Marin, now 60, the chief architect of Puerto Rico's Operation Bootstrap, became the island's first elected Governor in 1948. David Ben-Gurion, now 72, the chief architect in the re-creation of Israel, became Israel's first Prime Minister in the same year.

Both are strong men in a hurry. Both are philosophers who need constantly to withdraw from the madding crowd to find themselves again, to think, to be purified and regenerated. Ben-Gurion goes to the desert; Munoz goes to the mountains.

Both are prophetic men, poets deeply concerned with ideas and words. Ben-Gurion at 60 was studying Greek to read the classics, and at 70 was studying Spanish to read Cervantes. "To read the classics in translation," he once told me, quoting the Hebrew poet Bialik, "is like kissing a woman through a veil."

Munoz, as a young man, left his native Puerto Rico to live a Bohemian life in Greenwich Village as a freelance writer.

Both want to build a society based not on materialism but on creativity and a better life.

The Puerto Ricans have risen from anguish and misery with a threefold bill of rights dreamed up by Munoz and carried through like the stages of a battle. In the forties, he created Operation Bootstrap, which established new industries, health centers, schools; he led the people up the long road out of poverty, sickness, and despair. In 1952 came Operation Commonwealth. Puerto Rico became a strong democracy within the American Union, the most creative political system of our time. Now Munoz is working on Operation Serenity.

Sitting on the terrace of his mountaintop retreat in Jajome Alto recently, I asked Munoz to tell me about Operation Serenity. He leaned back in his chair. The green fertile land dropped almost perpendicular below us. The sun was setting behind dark mountainous clouds.

"OUR PEOPLE FEEL PROUD"

"Operation Serenity," he said, "is mostly an affirmation of purpose—of not letting our civilization be blinded by economics as an end in itself. To create more personal freedom, deeper, better education—to make it possible for every citizen to have the chance to be just as good as God meant him to be.

"Its essential meaning," he said, "is that through political consciousness and education, the people will realize that the economic effort is a servant of the spiritual purpose, not an end in itself.

"Its practical implications, when it begins to get into policymaking, is the policy of decentralizing cities through zoning and green belts, so that our cities don't grow too monstrous. It is the decentralization of the whole island, placing the new factories in smaller towns.

"You can see Operation Serenity," he said, "in the whole change that has taken place in our country, materially and spiritually. Spiritual energies, creative powers have been released. After 450 years of colonialism, our people no longer feel ashamed. They feel proud."

Last year two and a half new industries opened every week on the island. More jobs were created. More Puerto Ricans stayed in Puerto Rico to live the good life.

Operation Serenity, though less tangible than Bootstrap and Commonwealth, gives deeper meaning to them both.

"You can see Operation Serenity," he said, "in the Puerto Rican who migrates. He carries it with him. You see it in the Casals Festival. You see it in the faces of our people here. In 1940, 35 percent of the familes of Puerto Rico had an income for a whole family of $200 to $300 a year. That's terrific poverty. Now about 3 percent of the population, instead of 35 percent, are down to $300 per family. You still have pockets of extreme poverty, but they are being reduced all the time. We have a growing middle class. Our per capita income is growing all the time. We don't have great wealth but we don't have extreme poverty either."

The miracle of Israel's rebirth and of Puerto Rico's regeneration have brushed off on the rest of the world. Robust children whose modern history is less than 10 years old, they have both become teachers as well as students under their own point 4 programs.

Burma and Ghana have now turned to Israel for technical aid. People from 107 lands have come to Puerto Rico to learn of the three operations. Puerto Ricans have been invited to most of the underdeveloped countries of the world to teach them Operation Bootstrap and Operation Commonwealth, and ultimately Operation Serenity.

Puerto Rico and Israel are showing what small nations can do for each other, teaching other small powers what they have learned in housing, health, sanitation, agriculture, and in building a decent life for the people. Their contribution is more, too—it is the fearlessness of their spirit and the joyousness of their youth.

Each year Puerto Rico receives more than a thousand official visitors who come under the U.S. International Cooperation Administration which has succeeded point 4. Some come as representatives of the United Nations or the Organization of American States. Others are students on scholarships given by the Puerto Rican Department of State. These people care little about propaganda from the United States. They want to learn about Puerto Rico for the benefit of their own people in their own lands.

THEY CAN SWAP KNOW-HOW

The two countries have much to learn from each other. In agriculture, Israel has taken giant steps. Israel was a desert which the Jews are turning fantastically green. Puerto Rico could learn from Israel the art of large-scale industrial farming. True in the west and on the coastal plains, Puerto Rico is doing some good mechanized farming. But in the mountains and the valleys of the interior, Puerto Rico's farmers are still farming like sharecroppers, and some of them are still peons on the land.

In industry, Puerto Rico has taken the giant steps, while Israel's industries have not kept pace with her agriculture. Puerto Rico's gross national income, since she has begun attracting industries from the States, is now over $50 million a year. Israel could learn much too from the island's self-help program, low-cost public housing, slum clearance, and the inspired program of $300 cooperatively built houses.

It is in the problem of migration that the two countries are completely dissimilar. Israel has two million people, Puerto Rico has 2,300,000. But Israel is a land of immigration, Puerto Rico is a land of emigration. The solution to Israel's problem of defense, of security, of making the desert bloom again, lies in the people. Israel needs people and the people need the land. Puerto Rico still cannot feed all its people, whose death rate keeps falling, and whose life expectancy is now 68 years.

There are ties in New York to both Puerto Rico and Israel, ties of friendship, ties of religion, ties of family, and friends. But Israel has created a reservoir of good will in New York, while Puerto Rico remains little known and vastly misunderstood.

Daniel A. Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 22, final respects were paid to our late colleague Daniel A. Reed at Dunkirk, N.Y.

On February 21 there appeared in the Dunkirk Evening Observer an editorial which I know all of his colleagues will want to read. It is a wonderful tribute to a great man.

GREAT IN DEED, BELOVED IN OUR HEARTS

Men die, and if they were great enough, an epoch dies with them.

Was Daniel Alden Reed of that stature? The four decades and more in which Dunkirk's first citizen served the nation as one of the most revered and respected men in the Congress bridge the gap from old concepts of America to new; from Victorian attitudes to these modern times; from the

horse and buggy to the space age; from the days when the young giant which was America had not yet flexed his muscles, until today this, our country, is the world's greatest power.

From the days of the First World War, through the greatest and most grievious of depressions, in another great war, in times of perilous peace, in all the days of Hitler and Mussolini and Lenin and Trotsky and Churchhill and Stalin, in the time of Franco and Chamberlain, of Roosevelt, of Hoover, of Coolidge, of Wilson, of Harding, of Truman and of Eisenhower—through all these days Dan Reed was on the stage if not in the precise center. In the grave issues which involved these historic figures and their dramatic times, Dan Deed had to form his judgments and make his decisions.

In four decades Daniel A. Reed as your Representative in your Congress made historic voting decisions in your behalf. He was under your guidance even as he guided and led you. Your grandfather, perhaps your greatgrandfather, voted for or against Dan Reed in his long span of service. Perhaps you agreed with him always; perhaps never, perhaps on some occasions, not on others, but you always knew you were represented by an honest, conscientious, utterly sincere, well-informed and completely courageous man. You might or might not agree but you could always be proud of the man who represented you, proud of his appearance, his integrity and his intellectual capacity. He could defy Presidents when he believed they were in error.

As history unfolds it will be shown that Dan Reed, as a legislator, made some errors, but we think on balance it will be clear that his judgment was right far more often than it was wrong, that his ideas were clear cut, direct and followed a pattern of the oldtime and deeply respected virtues which characterized his country and his countrymen. Conservative? Indeed, yes, but not to the point of obstructionism. Progressive? Yes, but not to the point of radicalism. He could countenance change, and sought it, but he believed that a mighty country need not move on impulse or whim, or be guided by illogical theory. He sought the sound course to a sound destiny. The Nation did not always follow the course which Dan Reed might have charted but it kept closer to it through the vigor of his labors, the persuasive force of his eloquence and his prodigious influence among the colleagues who respected his sincerity and loved him for the sterling qualities of his character.

Dan Reed was in the Congress for a period which embraced virtually one-fourth of the life of the Republic. His life span covered one-half of all the years since this Nation was founded. His public service career, in one form or another, covered well over half a century. In his earlier years he preached civic rectitude in cities from coast to coast. He organized the instruments which guided the growth and development of hundreds of cities. He could move men to a better concept of their civic responsibilities and inspire a spirit of nobler, more unselfish public service. His influence, nationwide, was immeasureably extensive, and always for good. It is doubtful if his hometown or home district audiences have much knowledge or appreciation of the thousands of citizens who were inspired to better citizenship by the towering, almost majestic speaker who preached a lofty doctrine of community service. He believed and put into practice every word he preached.

Reed's great theme in the days of his civic campaigning was the Athenian oath. He inspired hundreds to the grand ideal of transmitting their cities, not only not less, but greater, better, and more beautiful, than they were transmitted to them.

It is not possible to do justice to so distinguished a career in one column, or two, or a hundred. Nor are the paltry words lesser men may write adequate to the task.

Mr. Reed achieved a great age. Only a few, a very few, men now surviving were witness to all the years of his many-faceted career. The aged, stalwart oak may fall but the forest remains. Other branches extend to continue the serenity and protection of the soft shadows. Life goes on and there are no records to tell in adequate fashion the long and beautiful story of what the mighty tree has seen in its day and the service so freely given to those who walked beneath its spreading leaves.

The cold summary which might be written in the record can reveal so little of the real warmth of the life story. For as the mighty oak was the stalwart of the forest, Dan Reed was the stalwart among men. He was a great legislator in the service of all, both a leader and a servant of men. His capacity to serve either as a powerful representative in your business with your government, or as a neighbor, was never withheld. His obligation to his fellows was never evaded. He was never too busy for a friendly greeting, an interested inquiry, a letter of introduction, the adjustment of a pension, a personal contribution, or intercession with a government department in your behalf.

What manner of man was Reed? The word great is a relative term, sometimes loosely and cheaply used. Could you find 200 or 300 men in all the history of your country who played so long and so useful a part in its political guidance? Probably not, and so you will have to conclude that Dan Reed's name belongs in that little list of the outstanding men of the generations. This district will not find his like soon, for even if we be served by approximate capabilities it will take long years to match the experience.

How did Reed rate with all men? No one can say, but to many of us who have known and watched him through the years he was a beloved friend, an inspiring leader, and a splendid example of the sincerity, the decency, the courage, and the intellect we have a right to expect of all men in public life but so rarely get in such rich abundance.

Great men, good men, prominent men, useful men die from time to time and the Nation pauses for mourning in the formal use of the term.

But the mourning becomes personal when the great, the good, the prominent and the useful was also a beloved friend. Great in the records, beloved in the hearts of so many, and in that respect there is no replacement for Dan Reed.

For Limited Warfare, Strong Marine Corps Vital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that a recent editorial, entitled "For Limited Warfare, Strong Marine Corps Vital," from the February 11, 1959, issue of the San Diego Union, be inserted in the RECORD.

The article, reasoned and thoughtful in tone, mirrors the growing anxiety of millions of citizens as they observe the current severe cut in combat-ready Marine Corps units.

We all recognize the difficult problem which faces our country in providing an adequate defense structure in these times. Certainly the decisions as to where our available resources may be most effectively applied are not easy ones to make.

Yet I would be remiss if I did not say that the deep cuts in ready Marine forces are causing grave concern. Certainly, in the atmosphere of these times and in light of the known Communist record of constant pressure, incursions, and criminal adventure, a ready, fighting service such as the Marine Corps should be the very last to suffer cuts in combat units.

The combat units of this famed corps have demonstrated time and again in recent years the highest order of combat readiness, flexibility, and ability to be on the spot in time to stabilize a dangerous situation—prevent a minor conflagration from literally mushrooming into total disaster.

The meaning of these oft-demonstrated capabilities has not been lost on the vast majority of thinking citizens. None of us need be deep students of international relations or high-level strategy to look about us and see no relaxation in the world struggle between East and West. None of us need be military experts to note that time and again we have been forced to move, not with atom-tipped missiles or intercontinental heavy bombers, but with the very type of versatile Marine combat units now being lost to us through deactivation.

It is my sincere hope that just such public expressions of anxiety as are contained in this editorial from the San Diego Union will alert Congress to the prudent need for renewed attention to this serious weakening of our national ability to cope with the ever-present threat of limited war.

[From the San Diego Union, Feb. 11, 1959]

FOR LIMITED WARFARE—STRONG MARINE CORPS VITAL

The Marine Corps is going up against the political gun. More than a third of its fighting strength is due to be cut off in order to reach manpower reductions.

This famed fighting force, the epitome of courage and loyalty, is being reduced from 200,000 to 175,000 men while at the same time the need for a military organization of this type and training is rising with the growing possibilities of future limited wars.

This seems a strange anomaly but that is often the way of government and politics. The American people perhaps may want to have something to say about their Marine Corps.

Public Law 416 specifies 3 Marine divisions, 3 air wings, and support troops. Gen. Randolph McC. Pate, commandant of the Marine Corps, told Congress that in order to reach the required end-strength of 175,000 Marines by June 30 the Marines are being forced to deactivate 2 battalions in each of the 3 divisions, and to delete 6 aircraft squadrons and 100 other aircraft from its 3 aircraft wings.

This, presumably, is a way around the requirements of the law, and also, as General Pate testified, will enable the remaining battalions to be kept at combat strength. Experience in Lebanon and the Far East proved the fallacy, he said, of maintaining units below combat strength.

What has happened to the Marines?

Budget considerations, of course, always dictate the size of military establishments.

But that is in overall strength of a country's defense. The suspicions arise that the Marine Corps is being asked by the Pentagon to surrender some of its fighting role on behalf of the Army—to keep the Army in business, as it were. Too, the drive of the Democrats in Congress to increase domestic vote-getting spending will take more and more money that could go to beefing up the military services. There are just so many tax dollars.

The role of the Marines today is as important, or more important, than at any time in our history. A growing nuclear stalemate increases the possibility of more actions as around Formosa, in Lebanon and perhaps Berlin.

The Marines should be the first to go in. And they should always be ready. The cuts will make it difficult, if not impossible, to keep the Marines a sufficiently large and powerful enough combat force to blunt or counter such major moves of the enemy, or beat him to the first punch.

The Marines may be reduced to a police force, instead of a fighting force.

America never more needed a Navy-Marine team than it does today. This country must be able to reach across the seas, not only with missiles, but with guns, tanks and planes, and men.

You have to apply force, or a threat of force, of the type needed where it is needed—at the moment it is needed. No fighting team can do this better than the U.S. Navy and the Marine Corps. Why dull the spear of our ready power?

Memo From Havana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, Look magazine was one of the first publications in the United States to take seriously the Castro rebellion in Cuba. A year ago, this publication anticipated the downfall of the Batista dictatorship.

A few weeks ago Mr. William Attwood, the foreign editor of Look, went to Cuba to learn firsthand the temper and reaction of the people. His report, to be found in last week's issue of Look magazine, is worthy of the most serious consideration and it is for that reason that I insert it in the RECORD:

INSIDE CUBA'S REVOLUTION

(By William Attwood)

HAVANA, CUBA.—Not many Americans gave Cuba's Fidel Castro much of a chance when Look reported on his rebel movement a year ago (Look, Feb. 4, 1958). He was a Robin Hood figure in the hills—a screwball to some, a bearded bandit to others, a dead man according to one U.S. news agency. Now, he's Mr. Cuba—a winner. But he's still controversial. So I came down here to have a new look at a story that has been making headlines all winter.

Havana has become a gay and relaxed city. The gaudy cruise ship Havana is dead: the tourist brothels empty, the luxury hotels in trouble, the gambling hotels shut down. But the Cuban Havana is joyful. People are no longer afraid. The press, muzzled for so long, is free. I saw Castro's bearded, gun-toting partisans swarm through the streets and hotel lobbies looking like brigands and acting like Boy Scouts. (You couldn't buy one a meal or a drink: "Thank you, but Fidel said no.") There were no cops, but traffic moved and crime was hard to find—perhaps, as someone said, because all the crooks were in Batista's police force.

This was a clean and disciplined revolution. In the words of a longtime Cuban friend, "It was an uprising of decent people against indecency." And for some reason, we wound up on the wrong side.

That is what makes it embarrassing to be an American in Havana these days. As a reporter, you are made welcome everywhere. People are eager to talk to you. At demonstrations, they make room for you—"so that you can see the truth and write about it." But they are hurt and angry, and full of questions: Why did you support Batista so long? Why did you send him military missions? Why do you criticize the executions? Why are you against us?

Some of their questions are hard to answer, especially after you have been here a few days, talking to people you know and trust, getting an idea of what was and has been going on: As a reporter for 20 years in a lot of countries on both sides of the Iron Curtain, I am satisfied that seldom did a regime so deserve to be overthrown as Batista's, and seldom did men—if they can be so called—more richly deserve execution than the thugs who carried out his orders. Yet Batista was our ally—a partner in "hemispheric defense."

This is the real story that has been inadequately reported in America. The few hundred executions of murderers (whose crimes were attested to) have been thoroughly reported because the press has been free to witness them. They made the headlines—as violence seen always does. And they provoked pious indignation among many Americans who didn't know or didn't stop to think of what had gone on before.

The press was not invited to the torture chambers of Batista's police, where sadists were free to indulge in perversions that cannot be printed here. Disgusting things were done to certain parts of people's bodies, things were done to prisoners' wives in front of their husbands, things were done to children. Castro claims that 20,000 rebel sympathizers were murdered during Batista's rule. I checked this figure with the most conservative Cuban businessman I know. He said it was probably accurate, since he knew for a fact that, just since last April, people were being killed at the rate of 50 a day.

This was going on just 90 miles from Florida, behind the respectable facade of a government whose army we were training and (until last March) supplying with weapons. It happened while American tourists frolicked with Havana's B-girls, or crowded its casinos run mainly by American gangsters (who split their take with Batista). And nobody wondered aloud why the city was so full of cops or why the chief of police came to gamble with a retinue of gunmen.

Is it any wonder that every Cuban I talked to was hurt and angry? "If you had protested then," I was told, "we might not resent your criticism so much today." And I was often reminded that Americans who deplored the trials of Batista's henchmen did not denounce the Hungarian freedom fighters for lynching the Communist secret police.

As of now, Castro is to Cuba what de Gaulle was to France in 1944. He can do no wrong. Wherever he goes—and he was all over Havana, day and night, during my visit—he is surrounded by adoring crowds. When I accompanied him through a hotel lobby one evening, it took us an hour to reach the door. He listened to anyone with something to say, and answered anyone with a question to ask. He was exhausted, hoarse, but sustained by that secret source of energy without which no genuine political leader could long survive.

Technically, of course, Castro is not a political leader, but only chief of the revolutionary army. The government is in the hands of his civilian supporters. And as this long victory celebration subsides, new political parties will begin to take shape. The dominant group will be Castro's 26th of July movement, whose program will be modeled on that of Roosevelt's New Deal. An opposition will eventually emerge, also democratic and anti-Batista, but built around elements of the Auténtico Party. Also among the opposition groups will be the Communists, now vainly trying to get aboard the Castro bandwagon; active mainly in Havana, they will do their best to fan the embers of anti-Americanism. (Castro has no use for them, but will let them operate in the open.) Elections will be held within 2 years. Whether or not Castro runs for office, he now plans to keep control of the new army as a kind of watchdog to make sure the government doesn't betray the goals of the revolution—that is, social and economic reform and an end to graft and corruption.

WHO WILL RUN THE GOVERNMENT?

Luckily for the Cubans, theirs is a rich land. It exports more sugar than any country in the world, nearly $700 million worth a year, a lot of money for a nation of 6 million. If the new government succeeds in diversifying and rationalizing the economy and eliminating graft in high places, there is no reason why Cuba won't be stable and prosperous as well as democratic. Tourism may decline if the casinos stay closed, but only the hotel owners (many of them American) seem to be really worried.

The one big problem is finding people to run the government. This was a revolution of young people like Castro (who is only 32), of farmers, doctors, country lawyers, small businessmen, teachers, and clergymen. Or as one Cuban told me, "The peasants, the Rotarians, and the Lions beat Batista. They wanted to clean up the mess in Cuba, but they don't want to run the place now that it's done. They want to go back to their farms and their jobs. I spoke to one top official, just 40 years old, who said that, under Batista, the job he now held was worth a fortune in graft; now, it is just hard work and he is anxious to go home to Santiago and run his business.

Cuba's new government needs our sympathy and help more than our hasty sermonizing about how to finish a revolution we had no part of. It needs to sell us more sugar. Our new career Ambassador, Philip Bonsal, may be able to win back some of the respect for America that was lost by our last two politically appointed envoys. With the knowledge and approval of the State Department, their contact with Cubans was largely confined to the wealthy Batistans they associated with at the Havana Country Club.

The American business community is going to have to get used to dealing with officials who won't demand bribes in exchange for special favors, and with police officers who can't be put on company payrolls in case of labor troubles. For many, the Batista dictatorship represented a kind of stability. But as one businessman remarked, "The competition we'll get now will probably be good for everybody—and we'll save on kickbacks."

SOME LESSONS WE NEED TO LEARN

A visit to Havana these days reminds you that we Americans have other lessons to learn—lessons we should have learned long ago. The first is that we'll wind up on the losing side every time we back unpopular rulers. What happened in Venezuela and Iraq only recently should have taught us this much. Yet we kept three military missions in Cuba right up to the end. Can anyone explain to the taxpayers of the United States what useful purpose the missions were serving there? Did anyone seriously expect that Batista's army was being trained to repel a

Russian cossack charge on San Juan Hill? His troops couldn't even lick Castro, whose army was just 12 strong a couple of years ago.

You hear the argument that since we recognized Batista we had to be nice to him. But we weren't so squeamish about helping the Guatemalan rebels overthrow their pro-Communist dictatorship. And our envoys to other police states like Hungary don't pal around with the power elite there the way we did with the Batista crowd.

Another lesson to remember is that we can no longer take Latin America for granted. The stereotypes don't fit any more. The drowsy peons and the quaint palace revolutions are things of the past. Cuba's popular uprising was a fight for all ideals we claim to stand for against the kind of tyranny that we oppose in the cold war. Yet the Communists, seeing that Castro was bound to win, tried to get in his corner to cheer him on while we stood pat with our protocol and military missions. We can thank our lucky stars that Castro was no Communist; the situation was made to order for them. But if this was going on in our front yard, it might be a good idea to start wondering about the Dominion Republic, Spain, Nicaragua, Saudi Arabia and a few of the other police states we are hooked up with. In this troubled and revolutionary world, it's not farfetched to say that the outcome of the cold war depends on our learning the lessons of this Cuban revolution—and applying them in the future.

Finally, we need better reporting. And we'll get it if we care enough. But who cared about Cuba—even though we fought a war to free it from Spain? Only a handful of American publications bothered to send reporters to see Castro in the hills. The brutality and corruption of the Batista dictatorship were scarcely reported, while millions of American readers were treated to pro-Batista Sunday newspaper supplements, loaded with Cuban advertising. The Washington lobbyist and the three New York public-relations firms employed by Batista served him well; so did all the Cuban editors and journalists who concealed the real facts in exchange for his bribes or subsidies. The U.S. embassy may or may not have reported the facts to Washington; if it did, the reports were filed and locked up.

Anyway, we didn't care enough, and the result is that an American in Havana is embarrassed today. Batista has fled to Ciudad Trujillo with his loot, but he would have been gone sooner and many lives would have been saved if the Americans now carping at Castro had shown some indignation a few years back. One of these days, if we don't learn our lesson, a lot of people may change their minds about what we stand for. And if that ever happens, however big our missiles, we are in trouble.

Union Economic Researcher Calls U.S. Deficit Inflation Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a very thought-provoking article written by Mr. Solomon Barkin, director of research for the Textile Workers Union of America, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on January 5, 1959:

UNION ECONOMIC RESEARCHER CALLS U.S. DEFICIT INFLATION THREAT

(NOTE.—Everyone has an idea on what to do about inflation. In several articles over the past few months, the Christian Science Monitor has presented many views and many facets of the problem. Today, one of labor's most thoughtful research specialists, Solomon Barkin, director of research for the Textile Workers Union of America, discusses the question as he sees it.)

(By Solomon Barkin)

NEW YORK.—The country now faces the paradox of threats of inflation at a time when the price level is stable. Farm prices are dropping sufficiently to offset increases in other sectors of the market. Industry has not yet initiated a general wave of price boosts which would send costs skyrocketing. It is waiting for business recovery to proceed far enough to permit it to apply higher prices without immediate adverse effects. The pressure for rising costs from these sources for the immediate future will be moderate. But the real menace will come from the inept financing of the funds needed to cover our huge Federal deficit.

Big business, the U.S. Treasury, the administration, and the Federal Reserve Board launched an anti-inflationary campaign in the early summer to scare the American people and to thwart labor negotiations in the automobile industry.

The Committee for Economic Development, a businessman's organization, had hardly distributed its report urging tax reductions to aid business recovery when, in late spring, it published its program for controlling inflation aimed at getting restrictive labor legislation.

The administration in mid-August announced a shift from antirecession to antiinflation policies. The Federal Reserve Board also began increasing its margin requirements for stock purchases, raising its rediscount rates, and curbing credit in the commercial banking field.

STOCK PRICE RISE RECALLED

Then followed the investors' flight from the Government bond and mortgage markets into the stock market. Stock prices soared and interest rates moved up. The Government must now raise its needed funds at higher interest rates. Treasury spokesmen are plaintively seeking to quiet these inflationary fears and appeal to the patriotism of investors to buy Government issues. The President, as head of the Republican Party, also changed his tune and began stressing the stability of the dollar. It was only after the election that he returned to the theme of the damage wrought by inflation.

To cope with the problem of rising prices, the CED, business interests, and a few economists urged amending the Employment Act of 1946 to instruct the administration specifically to seek not only maximum employment, production, and purchasing power but also a stable price level.

Most American economists have avoided this position; they believe the present act sufficient and see no need for amendments. This goal has been the overriding objective of the present administration; it requires no additional legislative support.

A third group has maintained that at no time should maximum employment and production be sacrificed for purposes of maintaining a level statistical index of prices.

BOOMERANG HINTED

More serious than the above dispute on legislative purpose are the wide differences among business and labor spokesmen and academic economists on the program needed to keep a stable price structure. Business leaders and the administration appear intent upon achieving this end through the use of indirect monetary controls such as are now possessed by the Federal Reserve Board; the imposition of shackles on trade unions; and the curtailment of Federal expenditures.

Besides being inadequate to stop the upward price movements, they may tend to boomerang—as the current speculation on the stock market suggests—and produce group and class conflicts. They will stop necessary public works and activities and nip business recovery in the bud.

Actually a program for stopping inflation must be broader in scope and rest on a new set of administrative concepts and procedures. Pressures which raise the cost of living come from various sources. The money and capital markets are only one such set of forces. If a price-stabilization program is to be undertaken, many different programs must be coordinated; no one control will do the job.

PRICE PRACTICES HIT

Attention should be first directed to the practices of the large business firms which dominate American industries. Their price practices have been inflationary. Increases in recent years have tended to widen their profit margins. The Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, in reviewing the testimony on the price rises in the steel industry, concluded that "the price increases substantially exceeded the cost increases in 1957 and apparently also in 1956."

It found that the break-even point for the United States Steel Co. dropped to 32 percent of capacity, indicating that higher levels of production would bring huge profit bonanzas. Similar conclusions would be reached with respect to most other large industries.

The proposal has therefore been made that Congress empower the Federal Trade Commission or other appropriate agency to consider the breaking up of some large corporations and to review the propriety of price increases and later informing the American public as to their justification.

Much blame for the current price increases has been directed at trade unions. Actually, they represent a limited area of the American economy. Moreover, salary increases made since 1953 have tended to outdistance wage increases, and the former are not negotiated through collective bargaining.

LEVELS PROTESTED

While there are cases where a trade union drives a hard bargain, they are the result of bilateral agreements and not unilateral decisions as are "administered prices." If restraints are to be imposed, they should be placed on business to limit its willingness to grant wage increases. Wage raises have been moderate where profits are modest.

Trade unions have protested the rising price levels and have sought to induce management to restrain them. But employers have rebuffed union efforts to secure price reductions as they consider them to be beyond the union's province. In this state of affairs, unions have had no alternative but to protect their members against inflation.

Indicative of the degree to which prices have outdistanced the increase in unit labor costs is the fact that unit labor costs in the durable-goods industries increased by 15 percent between 1947 and 1957, while wholesale prices in the same period rose by 53 percent.

One way out of this dilemma is for management and trade union leaders to meet annually to discuss management price and production policies and levels of wage adjustment and seek to reach a consensus on economic policies prior to each annual cycle of negotiations.

SERVICE COSTS NOTED

A third important area is agricultural prices. It is not necessary to maintain inordinately high agricultural prices to protect farmers' income. A full-fledged pro-

gram of agricultural adjustment should be combined with one designed to raise incomes of low-income farmers and help redevelop distressed rural counties.

In the discussion of the rising cost of living, many have underscored the importance of the higher costs of services. People have accepted them as inevitable, failing to realize that they are as amenable to improvement in efficiency as are other industries. Moreover, the efficiency of the services must be advanced if the consumer's price level is to be controlled.

From June 1955 to June 1958 commodity prices rose by 7.1 percent but service costs increased by 10.7 percent. Medical care costs alone soared 12.8 percent. Many people are now seeking to reorganize medical care to provide better care at a lower cost.

It has, therefore, been suggested that a national productivity center for the services be established to promote higher efficiency in the service areas. The Government proposed such agencies to other countries under its foreign-aid program; they should be equally applicable in the United States.

PROPOSALS OFFERED

There is widespread recognition that the authority of the Federal Reserve Board is inadequate to deal with the inflationary and speculative problems of our economy. Current procedures and policies often accelerate speculation and higher costs. A number of different proposals should be considered for this purpose.

One is to increase the Board's authority beyond the commercial banks to embrace the credit and investment policies of all financial institutions and nonfinancial businesses engaged in leading activities. Consumer credit should also be under its supervision.

Closer coordination should be established among the Federal monetary, fiscal, tax, and debt managing agencies.

Special lower interest rates should be provided for loans to small business groups and public agencies which suffer in periods of tight money controls.

Key materials such as steel should be allocated in expansionist boom periods.

A program for controlling inflation in the United States during periods of economic expansion cannot be built on current monetary controls, restricted Federal expenditures, or a program for weakening the trade union movement.

The major sources of inflation are speculation, excessive power in the hands of the big business firms, the failure to improve efficiency in the service industries, and the excessively high agricultural prices. Specialized controls directed at these areas would help stabilize the price level.

Military Pension Law Discriminates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Bloomington (Ill.) Pantagraph of February 19, 1959:

MILITARY PENSION LAW DISCRIMINATES

When Congress passed the military pay bill in 1958 it broke a 100-year tradition which has kept pay of retired military personnel tied in with active-duty pay. They went up together and by like percentages. This bill provided that members of the armed services who retired prior to the passage of the bill would get a flat 6-percent increase in retirement pay. Those who retire after passage of the bill get much higher retirement pay.

This was done despite the recommendations of such reports as that of the Cordiner Committee, which said:

"Military retirement and its firm tie-in with active-duty compensation is perhaps the most powerful long-term career incentive existing within the military compensation system. It represents a qualified equity of specific dollar value and is, in fact, the principal traditional benefit available to military personnel.

"The Committeee has, therefore, concluded that the incentive value of its existing military retirement program depends to a major degree upon its integral relationship with active-duty compensation and the confidence which has been built up in the military body that no breach of faith or breach of retirement contract has ever been permitted by the Congress and the American people * * *."

The principle that retirement pay, once earned, will continue to be at the established percentages of active pay helps to attract men to military carecrs.

The bill passed last year and now in effect departs from this principle. It creates two classes of retired military personnel. Included in the inferior group are men who fought in three wars. Their sin is having been old enough to retire prior to passage of the pay bill last year.

The bill would at least have been consistent if it had made the break in this traditional policy apply to all retired personnel. But it applies only to those who had retired before its passage.

This is unfair discrimination and should be corrected. Some 31 Senators and 25 Representatives have opened a campaign to correct this defect by restoring the traditional relationship between pay of active officers and military pensions.

This correction would cost $30 million a year, but the cost would decline in succeeding years as death decreases the number of retired personnel affected.

If we want competent military forces led by highly qualified men we must provide incentives. We can best do this by returning to the traditional relationship between retirement pay and pay of those on active duty restored.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Estonians are one of the smallest and bravest of the non-Russian nationality groups upon whom Soviet communism was forced in July 1940.

These sturdy and stouthearted people, living in their ancient homeland from time immemorial on the northeastern shore of the Baltic, have had difficulty in maintaining their national independence, yet they have never been completely subdued by their conquerors. For more than 200 years before the First World War their country was part of the Russian Empire, where they lived there under the oppressive regimes of the czars. Nevertheless they succeeded in maintaining their distinct national character and clung steadfastly to their common goal, that of attaining their independence. When the Czar of Russia was overthrown, they had their chance, and on February 24, 1918, they proclaimed their independence.

That was 41 years ago. For about two decades they enjoyed their richly deserved independence in their newly constituted Republic. They lost their independence early in the last war and since then have been suffering under the worst of tyrannies. Today, these helpless but not hopeless people bear the heavy yoke of their Communist taskmasters in the firm belief that in the end they will once more regain their freedom and independence. We in the free world, in observing the 41st anniversary of Estonian Independence Day, ardently join them in that expectation. We pray that they all will live to see that day.

Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite the attention of this legislative body to a newspaper editorial that appeared in the Floyd County Times under date of February 19, 1959, supporting my own efforts to produce a sound, workable piece of legislation that should persuade industry to come into the depressed areas of our Nation, yet would require no appropriation, would add no Federal employees to the payroll, would engage in no Socialistic experiment. My bill is H.R. 3696, a measure that would give Federal income tax exemptions to corporations willing to come into stricken eastern Kentucky and into other depressed areas of our country. The Floyd County Times and the Lexington Herald have both supported editorially my efforts and yet both papers are, I believe, Democratic in political affiliation and they both know of my Republican affiliation. Nevertheless, their interest in eastern Kentucky transcends their partisanship in a matter that should always be entirely nonpartisan. The editorial is as follows:

THE USUAL HAIR-SPLITTING ACT

Congressman FRANK BURKE, of Louisville, this week got into the hair-splitting act that invariably holds center stage when any plan is proposed to help eastern Kentucky in its economic distress.

He gave with the sage opinion that Congressman EUGENE SILER'S bill providing for special tax exemptions to industries that locate in depressed areas is unworkable. BURKE said it would be "too hard to tell which plants qualify for special exemptions."

Which, to us, is another way of dodging the eastern Kentucky issue. Why too hard? Could not the legislation itself define what industries would be exempt? Coal mines, it might be agreed, would not be exempt, since the region is a coal-mining center. Nor would any old business or any that would

not employ men or women in numbers sufficient to improve the economy of the area.

Surely this would not be a task too arduous for the Federal Government which has so many thousands on the payroll, this job of determining those bonafide industries entitled to special tax exemptions in return for venturing into this part of America that has so long been verboten to those industries which make and sell things to other parts of America.

Congressman BURKE, according to a news dispatch, left off till the last the clincher. He commended SILER for his efforts but said Congress would "emerge with another type of solution" to the eastern Kentucky problem.

And that is exactly what we fear—another type of solution that doubtless will mean more beans and cheese, more of the dole, nothing of a constructive, permanent nature.

Lessons From Canadian Experience With Self-Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Glenn Garbutt, which appeared in the December issue of Trusts and Estates magazine. Mr. Garbutt is an independent management consultant in New York City and an experienced observer in the collective investment and fiduciary fields. He is a former associate editor of Trusts and Estates. His article is based on a marketing study conducted for the Bank of New York, through whose courtesy the article was published:

LESSONS FROM CANADIAN EXPERIENCE WITH SELF-PENSIONS

(By Glenn Garbutt)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Under the encouragement of special tax provisions, retirement programs for employed persons have become widespread. But self-employed individuals cannot be their own employees, hence they cannot qualify for favored tax treatment. The inequity in the position of the self-employed was put to an end through legislative action in Great Britain in 1956, and in Canada and New Zealand in 1957. In 1958, the Keogh proposal to permit self-employed individuals in this country to set aside tax-deferred dollars into restricted retirement savings was reported favorably by the House Ways and Means Committee—for the first time since its original introduction in 1951. Late in July the bill passed the House by an overwhelming vote, but, in the Senate the bill was stalled in the Finance Committee for lack of time to schedule hearings and finally, on August 12, after debate on the floor of the Senate, was sidetracked by parliamentary maneuver when offered as an amendment to another tax bill. Nevertheless, the resulting vote on the amendment brought forth a strong show of strength for individual self-pensions, with 32 Senators going on record as in favor—despite the fact that the Senate policy position of both parties at the time opposed such legislation. The opposition, in general, was based on the prospective loss of tax revenue and, in particular, on inadequate time to study the measure. Inasmuch as persons close to the legislative process expect the Keogh bill to be reintroduced substantially in its present form when the 86th Congress convenes in January, the following authoritative report on the Canadian experience with self-pensions is both timely and revealing.)

Taxpayers in Canada, under the terms of legislation enacted on April 12, 1957, are allowed a deduction of amounts up to 10 percent of earned income set aside for the purchase of retirement annuities commencing any time before age 71. The dollar amounts so set aside may not exceed $2,500 a year for self-employed persons, or $1,500 in the case of an employee under a pension plan, including his own contributions to both employer-sponsored and individual plans.

The new legislation represents something more than is implied in the phrase "removal of discrimination against the self-employed," explained Dr. A. K. Eaton, Canada's then Assistant Deputy Finance Minister: "The new legislation opens up income spreading as a new positive policy of general application. It is available to everybody."

This significant tax change was introduced by the Honorable Walter Harris, Minister of Finance, with these observations in his budget speech on March 14, 1957:

"The cash effects on our revenue in the coming year will be negligible, partly because it will take some time for insurance companies and others to design policies and organize plans, and partly because taxpayers will in many instances derive their benefit from a tax refund at the end of the year.

"The subsequent years, if widespread use is made of the plan, it is possible that the annual yield of the income tax may in future be reduced by as much as $40 million. Whatever the subsequent loss in revenue may be it can, however, be regarded as an indication of the volume of provision being made by Canadians toward freedom from financial worry at a time when their earnings power has lessened.

"To me this policy makes good sense. Moreover, the broad effect of this policy will be antiinflationary since it will be an encouragement to increase immediate savings which will be productively employed. Encouragement such as that now proposed is, I think, amply justified and will, I believe, be well received on all sides."

The step taken by the Minister of Finance was in recognition of agitation by taxpayer groups over a 10-year period—primarily on the plea of inequity—rather than of views expressed by financial institutions or the life insurance companies.

The Ministry of Finance had an equally strong record of opposition over the 10-year period. Principal reasons: The expected decrease in tax revenue and the prospective increase in administrative detail, not the question of principle. However, with permissive self-pension an accomplished fact and the first year of experience behind them, finance ministry officials have disclosed that: (1) the changeover was far simpler than anticipated, and (2) the loss of revenue in the first year—unofficially estimated at $7 million—was considerably less than the long-term projection of $40 million made by the Minister of Finance.

PATTERN OF ACCEPTANCE

The Canadian taxpayer has a wide range of choice for the investment administration of his accumulated retirement savings. Commenting upon the freedom of investment, Assistant Deputy Minister Eaton, said:

"I mention this aspect of the law in relation to two matters which in current Canadian thought are frequently referred to on public platforms or in the press: The first of these relates to the degree of Canadian ownership in Canadian industry. The second is the question of the future stability of the purchasing power of the Canadian dollar, whether gradual inflation can be avoided or whether prudence dictates a form of investment providing some hedge against a gradual decline of the value of the dollar. * * * This policy is in line with the removal last year of the restrictions on trustees investing pension funds."

The four general types of investment administration are: (1) Life insurance companies' contracts; (2) Dominion government annuities; (3) trust companies' plans; (4) mutual funds and negotiated investment contracts.

Although discussions leading to the tax amendment continued over several years, passage of the legislation found both the Government and financial agencies unprepared. Thus the Canadian development is revealing, because in the administration of individual retirement savings new methods and procedures had to be evolved.

Life insurance actuaries and officials, for example, were cool to the early proposals for permissive individual retirement plans. Reasons: Restricted policies with a locked up savings side might (1) upset the traditional relationship between the insurer and the insured, (2) encourage the cancellation of existing life insurance policies unless both old and new contracts could qualify for registration, (3) call for new types of policies with variable premium problems, and (4) bring forth agitation for variable annuities.

With the insurance fraternity divided in general as to the desirability of the new legislation, some companies started out with a negative approach, tending to point out problems rather than opportunities to their agents and field men. Consequently, they took a relatively minor part in the early marketing development of this new method of saving.

Companies with a positive approach, on the other hand, received a ready response from the field and a satisfactory experience resulted. Sales results, in fact, indicate that interest in retirement savings among individuals is communitywide and about evenly divided as concerns professional people versus proprietors and management people. A representative sample of over 800 contracts registered through two large insurance underwriters indicates that some two-thirds of registered policies were new contracts issued in 1957, the remaining one-third being old contracts from earlier years. Policies being registered in 1958 are mostly with new people.

Insurance officials in general have found that the new legislation created a considerable educational problem for salesmen and savers alike. While some officials feel that the market opened to the insurance companies is not impressive, other sales-minded officials find the tax-deferment privilege has served as good reason to review present individual insurance programs with satisfactory results, and they assess the possibilities presented as most favorable.

Trust companies, unlike the life insurance companies, had neither the products nor the sales power ready to seek individual tax savers. It was late in 1957 before most of the trust companies completed their plans for handling registered retirement savings.

In general, the trust companies' plans are designed for the use of collective investment, in order to achieve economy of administration and adequate diversification for the pooled accounts of individuals with annual contributions of $2,500 or less. The plans range from a single fund to a combination of funds with different investment objectives.

Some of these plans provide special savings accounts to facilitate the accumulation of allowable contributions. A contributor thus might know his exact income before determining the final amount to be registered, inasmuch as transfers to a registered plan may be deferred to the end of February and still apply to the preceding tax year.

Lacking a field force, the trust companies employed direct-mail and newspaper adver-

tising to call attention to their registered plans, and particularly to point out the advantage of equity investment in the event of further inflation. Now, with retirement savings funds in operation, trustmen feel they have broadened their range of services and that, while the educational problem is formidable, indeed, it opens to them a mass market not heretofore available on a practical basis. In future years, they feel, a large portion of the moneys set aside in retirement savings will be administered by corporate trustees.

Mutual funds worked out two types of retirement savings plans—one similar to the trust companies' type of plan, with a corporate trustee acting as custodian and the mutual funds providing the investment medium and management; the other similar to annuity contracts of the insurance company, with a face amount certificate payable over a period of years.

Canadian Government annuities drew the largest single group of the registrations of retirement savers. There is no comparable investment medium in this country to these annuities, which are administered by the Department of Labor and may be purchased by Canadian taxpayers in amounts between $10 and $1,200 a year. The annuities system is provided at cost—the Government pays all administration expenses and guarantees the fixed yearly income. Premiums may be paid to the Receiver General at any Accounting Post Office.

Director Charles R. McCord, who heads the Government annuity program in Ottawa, commented: "A review of first-year results indicates: (1) A stimulation of interest in general in Government annuities, (2) a revival of interest in many old and dormant contracts, and (3) the attraction of interest in new contracts among men and women under 40 years of age in particular."

Altogether some 60,000 contracts were found to be eligible under the amended tax legislation and these annuitants were advised during 1957. Director McCord revealed that about 15,000 plans were registered—two-thirds of them old contracts, one-third of them new.

Association plans were worked out by professional groups to enable members to take advantage of the tax exemption privilege through contributions to a professionwide program. The Canadian Medical Association, for example, registered a plan with (1) an insured annuity segment—guaranteeing fixed dollar income—administered by a life insurance company, and (2) a common stock investment fund administered by a trust company. The program was designed in the belief that the split-fund type of savings plan would go a long way toward answering the problem of how to put aside for retirement and yet protect savings against the inroads of inflation. Contributing members may decide for themselves how much they wish to invest in each segment of the plan.

The pattern of acceptance of the Canadian Medical Association plan was described by Dr. A. D. Kelly, general secretary of the association, as follows:

"Late in September we mailed information on the plan to 16,000 members and received in return roundly 2,000 registrations, most of them within the tax-year 1957. The split-funded allocations approximated two-thirds to the trusted common stock fund, one-third to the insured group annuity. In dollars of contributions, this amounted to approximately 60 percent in common stocks and 40 percent in group annuities."

This indicates early acceptance of the plan by one of every eight members of the association. However, an equal number of medical men were found to have chosen other channels of registration. Here again, therefore, one out of four is believed to be a proper proportion to use as the early pattern of acceptance by physicians.

Other association plans have been formed but have not been as successful in general as the Canadian Medical Association plan. Some, however, were formed too late for full consideration in the tax year 1957.

OVERALL PICTURE

Taxpayers in Canada have until April 30 to file their income tax returns. Registrations for the retirement savings privilege must be made by December 30 of the tax year, with an additional two months allowed for making the contribution commitment.

Within the tax year 1957, following enactment of the law in April, a total of 32,000 individual registrations were filed with the Department of National Revenue. An estimated breakdown of the different types of investment administration used follows:

Investment administration

	No. of plans
Government annuities plans	15,000
Life insurance contracts (regular cases of annuities and life insurance with savings side registered)	9,000
Trust companies' own plans (excluding association plans)	3,750
Association plans (funded through group annuities and trust companies)	2,250
Mutual funds plans	2,000
Total of registered plans (estimated)	32,000

Of particular interest is the finding that almost one of every four taxpayers who registered through the trust companies failed in the foreshortened first year to make a contribution to their plan within the allowable time limit. Principal reason: Lack of immediate savings ready for long-term commitment.

In summary, then, the study of Canadian experience with self-pensions during the first year indicates that—

Individual interest in tax deferment is widespread, but a relatively small proportion of taxpayers have immediate savings ready to commit under permissive self-pension legislation.

Government and investment administrative officials alike find that 2 to 3 years or more will be required for the pattern of acceptance of individual retirement savings to become fully formed.

The tax revenue loss for the first year—estimated at $7 million—was substantially less than the $40 million projected loss estimate of the Finance Minister.

The educational problem posed by this new form of saving for investment administrators and savers alike is formidable.

These findings lend support to the statement made by Dr. Roger F. Murray[1] at the hearing of the House Ways and Means Committee last January 24, when he said with reference to the proposed Keogh bill:

This kind of provision takes a long time to become fully effective. The bill is only enabling legislation, in a sense; it does not automatically make available the arrangements for a single individual to make his retirement deposit. The needed facilities require time and effort for their development. Even a widespread understanding of the bill's provisions would require months of educational work. We are probably talking about 1960 before really large numbers of the self-employed would know how or where to make a retirement deposit."

Therefore, Mr. Murray concluded, "The loss in current tax revenues represented by the tax deferral would be very modest for several years."

[1] S. Sloan Colt, professor of banking and finance, Columbia University Graduate School of Banking.

Divine Instructions Relative to Nations That Reject God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and apropos to my reintroduction today of a resolution proposing a Christian amendment to our Constitution, I wish to quote the radio message of the Reverend R. J. G. McKnight, delivered on the "Christian Amendment Hour" under the title of "Divine Instructions Relative to Nations That Reject God."

The message is as follows:

"DOWN TO THE REVOLUTION"

That phrase, in Justice Story's "Commentaries on the Constitution," has the deepest significance. Let us recall it, in its setting. He says: "Every American Colony from its foundation down to the Revolution did openly, by the whole course of its institutions, support and sustain, in some form, the Christian religion." We have seen the evidence for that statement in the Rhode Island Compact, which is representative of all the colonial compacts.

To make absolutely clear that they did support and sustain the Christian religion, let us look again at the enacting clause of the Rhode Island Compact. It says: "We whose names are underwritten do solemnly, in the presence of Jehovah, incorporate ourselves into a body politic; and as He shall help, will submit our persons, lives, and estates unto our Lord Jesus Christ, the King of kings and the Lord of lords, and to all those perfect and absolute laws of His, given us in His holy word of truth, to be judged and guided thereby."

Where did the men of colonial times get their conception of a proper enacting clause to stand at the beginning of a civil compact? They got it from God's holy word of truth. Two-thirds of the Old Testament deals with God's relation to nations. They had read the Bible—God's holy word of truth. They believed what they read. For example, they had read the Second Psalm.

Let us read it.

The Psalmist has taken his stand, in vision, upon a high vantage point from which he surveys the nations of the earth. He listens: he hears the sound of rebellion. He waits: the picture becomes clearer. Then, he speaks:

"Why do the heathen rage and the people imagine a vain thing?" He can scarcely believe it is true. "Yes," he says, "it is true."

Verse 2: "The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord, and against His Anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us."

What will be the reaction of the eternal God upon His high throne? The Psalmist tells us: "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh" (there is no mirth in that laugh—it is the laugh of absolute scorn)—"He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. Yet—(notwithstanding this vocal rebellion) yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion."

Then God's "Anointed"—His eternal "Son"—against whom the rebellion is most vocal—steps forward to deliver His inaugural address: "I will declare the decree: the Lord

hath said unto me, 'Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.'"

Christ is the only begotten Son of God. To Him God the Father has given authority over all nations. And when "the kings of the earth * * * and the rulers take counsel together" against God and His Son—whom He has anointed to reign over the nations—God has made plain what will happen: (verse 9) "Thou shalt break them" (the nations) "with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."

It is no small thing for a nation to reject the sovereign King whom God has appointed to rule over all nations. The consequences are tragic. And the history of nations is evidence that the nation that rejects God's Anointed will be shattered like a brittle piece of pottery under a heavy blow from an iron rod. The size of the nation, the importance, the wealth, the influence, the wisdom—these things are no protection against the "rod of iron," when God's hour strikes.

God is fair in His dealings with nations. He gives repeated warnings before the "rod of iron" strikes.

He sent Moses to Egypt; Pharaoh refused to bow to God's demands. Egypt went down into the graveyard of nations.

God sent Jonah to Nineveh, at the peak of Assyria's dominance. The city repented for a period. But the repentance period soon passed, and the "iron rod" descended, and Assyria today is but a memory.

God sent Daniel to Babylon where King Nebuchadnezzar was boasting: "Is not this great Babylon that I have built for the house of the kingdom, by the might of my power, and for the honor of my majesty?" Quite a boast. But read on: "While the word was in the king's mouth, there fell a voice from heaven, saying, O King Nebuchadnezzar, to thee it is spoken: the kingdom is departed from thee." And today great Babylon is buried beneath the sands of the Euphrates Valley.

God sent His servant Paul to Greece and to Rome, at a time when Greece boasted of the excellence of its human philosophy, and Rome ruled the world. The Roman legions were irresistible. Rome was the eternal city—they thought. Paul went to Rome as a prisoner. He was in chains. He told the Romans of Christ, and of His love. He said: "I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also. For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power (dynamite) of God unto salvation." Rome rejected the gospel, and the "iron rod" fell and the Roman empire was shattered like a potter's vessel. The ruins of the Coliseum are today a warning to powerful sinful nations. How long will it take the world to learn that battleships, airplanes and bombs mean nothing when God's hour strikes and the "iron rod" descends in wrath.

So the Psalmist counsel the nations—every nation—any nation: "Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in Him."

Lincoln: A Guide for Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the San Diego, Calif., Union, February 12, 1959:

LINCOLN: A GUIDE FOR NIXON

During this month, which marks the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, the still-meaningful words of the railsplitter are being quoted widely again.

There is inspiration for all in the life of Mr. Lincoln.

But if we were called upon to single out one man to whom Mr. Lincoln's life should mean most, our nomination would be RICHARD M. NIXON.

This would be true if we looked only upon the controversy which surrounded Mr. Lincoln during most of his political life. He was a man who gave his views directly. His debates with Stephen Douglas were openly argued and acclaimed. He was widely criticized by all three of his opponents as he ran for President. As President he was denounced often in the press. Things reached a point where his sons were taunted by schoolmates.

Even on the eve of the Gettysburg Address there were fights in the street below his hotel.

Mr. Lincoln remained above it all with "malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness for the right."

RICHARD NIXON, too, has been controversial during most of his political career. He won his seat in Congress after widely publicized debates against Representative H. Jerry Voorhis. As a Senator and as Vice President of the United States, few have criticized his ability or devotion to duty. But political opponents of this administration have made him their center of attack. Cartoonists have caused one of his daughters to cry as she was taunted in school.

Mr. NIXON is dedicated to young people. He visits many schools to advise students to take an interest in government.

The parallel does not stop there. Mr. Lincoln was greatest during crisis. Mr. NIXON has this quality, also—witness his 1952 fund speech, the President's heart attacks, his experiences with mad mobs in Latin America.

Both were strong in their Republican philosophical fervor for the rights of the individual.

Both men struggled to finish law studies. Both were greatly influenced by early religious training. Both were marked by personal courage. Both profit from the quality of humility.

No one knows what the next chapter will be in Mr. NIXON's life. But he, like most of us, can find inspiration and guidance in Mr. Lincoln's words:

"Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

Columbus, Ohio—All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Municipal League and Look magazine honored the city of Columbus, Ohio, as an All America City for high standards of citizen action realized through public improvements made possible by voter approval.

This national award is particularly pleasing to me since Columbus, Ohio, is in the heart of my congressional district. The citizens of that community have, over the years, demonstrated great community interest and local concern with their own problems and have had the courage to do something about it.

Columbus, Ohio, is a fine example of a city that does not find it necessary to always look to the Federal Government for benevolent assistance but to the contrary, in true American tradition, is better satisfied to solve its own problems.

I wish to quote an article from the Columbus Dispatch which details the events at the time the award was made to Paul R. Gingher, chairman of the metropolitan committee, who accepted the plaque on behalf of the city of Columbus:

ALL AMERICA CITY FESTIVITIES OPEN

"All America City" Year in Columbus officially opened at a noon luncheon Friday as Paul R. Gingher, chairman of the metropolitan committee, accepted the plaque on behalf of the city.

Approximately 600 persons attending a luncheon in the Deshler Hilton Hotel were told by Gingher the award came to Columbus because citizens did what they knew had to be done.

The All America City Award is cosponsored by the National Municipal League and Look magazine. Columbus was honored as a 1958 All America City for high standards of citizen action realized through public improvements made possible by voter approval.

Gingher said no one had to tell us we needed new schools, hospital facilities, and sewage improvements.

Columbus knew and met its need through the combined efforts and cooperation of all its citizens, Gingher said.

We have been successful because we are a great American community, he said, with greater things to be done tomorrow.

Philip C. Ebeling, of the National Municipal League, who presented the award to Gingher, congratulated Columbus for its accomplishments since civic improvement efforts were started in 1945.

Joel Harnett, the magazine representative, said "you are better citizens because of your fight and victory in overcoming traffic, school, and municipal problems."

"You are passing another milepost on the road of success," he said. "There are many more mileposts ahead of you."

Alvin W. Jones, president of the Chillicothe Chamber of Commerce, accepted an honorable mention award for his city from Ebeling. Chillicothe placed in the top 22 cities in the 1958 judging although not the top 11 All America Cities.

Protest Against Further Increases in the Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include a letter I received from Harry J. Kennedy, president of the Western Petroleum Refineries Association of Tulsa, Okla. I feel the comments in Mr. Kennedy's letter are very timely and to the point.

The Western Petroleum Refiners Association, organized in 1912, is national in scope, and represents a major segment of the re-

fining industry. Its member companies are located in various areas of the United States. Its roster includes refiners, both large and small. A number of its members have grown from humble starts, to organizations that are large in stature.

The Western Petroleum Refiners Association protests vigorously the proposal recently made to increase the Federal gasoline tax.

The excuse given for this increase is that the Federal highway trust fund, now derived from the Federal taxes on motor fuels, tires, tubes, retread rubber, truck use and one-half the tax on trucks and busses will not be large enough to defray the cost of the Federal road-building program.

The original program, designed for the construction of 40,000 miles of interstate highways, was expected to cost $27.6 billion of which the Federal Government was expected to provide $25 billion. The cost, as now estimated, will be $40 billion and the Federal share $36 billion. The increase in the gasoline tax is proposed as necessary to meet anticipated deficits in the highway trust fund.

This view is erroneous.

Under the present plan, the Federal road-building program is to receive only $2.2 billion in 1959 and $2.8 billion in 1960, but at the same time an additional $1.3 billion in 1959 and $1.3 billion in 1960 is anticipated from Federal excise taxes on automobiles, parts and accessories, and the remaining half of the tax on trucks and buses, which are to be paid into the general fund of the Treasury.

This diversion of the automotive tax receipts from proper allocation to the highway trust fund is the cause of the so-called "deficit." This diversion is also the occasion for the proposal to increase already heavy taxes on gasoline. The answer lies in the deposit of these additional automotive tax receipts in the highway trust fund, where they should have been assigned from the start of the program.

An alternative plan, which assumes a continuation of the present diversion, is to extend the life of the project. Under this plan of "stretching out" the highway construction, only so much of the program would be accomplished within each year, as there is money in the highway trust fund available to pay for it.

GASOLINE TAX INCREASE THREATENS U.S. ECONOMY

The proposal to increase the gasoline tax ignores the function of gasoline in our economy. What has gasoline become in American life? Not so long ago we were considering gasoline as something of a luxury. Now, it affects everybody. It affects everything that is grown, or manufactured, or sold. The automobile, which depends on gasoline, after being thought of as a novelty, a pleasure vehicle, a show-piece for the rich, has become a workhorse, a necessity. The truck, fueled by gasoline, has become a transportation factor involved in literally innumerable business activities. With automobile and truck, you can go anywhere, and take anything.

The American economy is geared to motor transportation. Its cost must not be made prohibitive.

Those who are proposing an increase in the already burdensome share of the tax load which gasoline carries, fail to take into account the fact that no necessary commodity can bear, without limit, the increases in price which are proposed and implied for the future by the proposal.

The vicious cycle is this: More tax—higher prices; higher prices—more tax, etc. The consequence of imposing constantly mounting gasoline tax is that the cycle is unending and self-defeating. When transportation costs rise, they jeopardize the volume to be moved, and an increase in the tax on gasoline is an automatic increase in automotive transportation costs. The national economy needs free-moving commodities. A higher tax on highway fuels is a restraint of trade.

The relation of the gasoline tax to the price of basic petroleum shows in itself how highly the tax on gasoline has been imposed already:

The gasoline taxes of the States already average 6 cents a gallon; the Federal tax on gasoline is already 3 cents a gallon; combined, this is an average of 9 cents a gallon. This average of combined taxes is equal to 80 percent of the refinery price; 54 percent of the tank-wagon price; and 41 percent of the retail price.

If the Congress were to finance the so-called deficits in the highway trust fund by successive increases in the gasoline tax, the combined average of Federal and State taxes would become 115 percent of the refinery price of gasoline; 78 percent of the tank-wagon price; and 59 percent of the average retail price.

It is a fixed principle of taxation that if a tax is to remain productive it must be moderate in amount and it must be reasonably related to the market price (before tax). There gets to be a point in the increase in a tax with relation to the market price of the commodity where the tax defeats the sale of the commodity, or weights it down so as to destroy sales volume and also tax receipts.

THE GASOLINE TAX INCREASE AND INFLATION

Everybody knows that transportation costs must be added to price. The current effort to curb inflationary price increases is wholly inconsistent with any proposal which inevitably increases costs—whether transportation costs or otherwise. Anyone who defends increased taxes on gasoline used on our highways must be prepared to defend inflationary price increases.

Jobs for Relatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following editorial will be of interest to the Members:

[From the Des Moines Register, Feb. 21, 1959]

JOBS FOR RELATIVES

Two of Iowa's new Congressmen have hired close relatives for jobs in their offices. It is difficult to understand this disregard for the long-established public disapproval of this practice.

Representative STEVEN CARTER, Democrat, of the Fourth District, has placed his 19-year-old son on his office payroll at a salary of $11,000 a year. The boy is a part-time student at a university in Washington, D.C.

Representative LEONARD G. WOLF, Democrat, of the Second District, has employed his wife as secretary in his congressional office at $11,000 or $12,000 a year. The exact salary still appears to be in question.

Both Congressmen have defended their actions on the grounds that these members of their immediate family are highly capable and will render very valuable service in their respective capacities.

Both recognize that their actions will be sharply criticized but indicate that they do not intend to be swayed by this criticism.

Both have attempted to justify their actions by pointing out that it is a common practice among Members of Congress.

Representative WOLF added that his predecessor, Henry O. Talle, had his wife on his office payroll at a salary similar to that paid WOLF'S wife.

These explanations and justifications do not make the practice of political nepotism—the hiring of relatives—any more acceptable. It still has all the attributes of overcrowding the public trough. It still bears the label of the worst form of the spoils system.

Much in the manner of smallpox, it does not become a more desirable disease because it has been allowed to become an epidemic and has infected an entire community.

Nepotism isn't so new that a first-term Member of Congress might innocently fall victim to its financial attractions.

The "Encyclopedia of Social Sciences" traces its origin back to the practices of the early popes of the Catholic church who distributed powers, principalities, and titles among their immediate relatives. The practice served to undermine the prestige of the church and contributed greatly to the reformation.

Describing nepotism as an embryonic type of the spoils system, the encyclopedia adds that "nepotism is still common in many countries, although it is frowned upon in communities with more advanced political morals."

If Congressmen WOLF and CARTER have not had the benefit of encyclopedia references they can find discussions of nepotism in almost any high school civic textbook.

Congressman CARTER has spoken very highly of his son's usefulness in research work. Both he and Congressman WOLF might benefit considerably if young Carter were put to work researching the history of nepotism.

Knowledge of the fundamental principles of good government is sometimes as useful and important to the continued tenure in office of a Member of Congress as guiding visiting constituents around the Capitol on sightseeing tours.

Ike Pinpoints Labor Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial "Ike Pinpoints Labor Issues," which appeared in the Daily Pantagraph of Bloomington, Ill., on Friday, February 20.

This editorial is worthy of insertion because it clarifies a major issue confronting us with respect to the much-needed remedial labor legislation. My hope is that this Congress will have the courage to meet the issues with respect to secondary boycotts and certain types of picketing squarely. To do so is in the interest of the workingman himself, as well as the general people:

IKE PINPOINTS LABOR ISSUES

President Eisenhower said at his recent press conference that Congress should enact legislation to curb secondary boycotts and some types of picketing. These proposals, he said, are decent and just.

Therein lies the biggest difference between the administration labor bill and that proposed by Senator KENNEDY.

The administration proposes to deal with the secondary boycott by prohibiting direct coercion of employers to cease doing business with another. It also would ban inducement of individual employees to refuse to perform service.

This is not covered in the Kennedy bill.

The administration bill would make picketing an unfair labor practice, subject to mandatory injunction, where a union cannot establish sufficient employee interest in having a union represent them in cases where the employer has observed the law.

The Kennedy bill proposes only to prohibit picketing for the purposes of extortion.

There are other differences. The administration covers provisions on representation elections, non-Communist oaths for employers, reopening bargaining agreements and procedures for naming an Acting General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

These are not covered in the Kennedy bill.

The Kennedy bill would tighten the definition of a supervisor. The effect would make more supervisors eligible for union membership and thus take them out of the management group.

This is not covered in the administration bill.

The two bills are substantially the same on reporting of union financial conditions, union elections, and collective bargaining elections.

Chairman BARDEN, of the House Labor Committee, has offered a bill aimed at curbing the power of union heads through required revision of the union constitutions. This may not get the support of either group.

Senator MCCLELLAN, head of the labor rackets committee, is drawing up his own bill which should be introduced any time. This may be a good compromise between the two.

But the issues of the secondary boycott and picketing where neither the workers nor the employers want a union should be dealt with in any measure getting congressional approval.

Defense Before All Else

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the San Diego Union, February 9, 1959:

DEFENSE BEFORE ALL ELSE

This Nation—its people and its politicians—must divorce themselves of the idea that sacrifice is reserved exclusively for shooting wars. The harsh truth is that cold wars require disciplines that must be met as soberly and realistically as the sacrifices demanded by shooting wars.

The word "sacrifice" apparently is not in the lexicon of the Democratic spending block in the Congress. The effort to ramrod through multi-billion-dollar housing and airport construction bills is symptomatic of the budgetary schizophrenia which President Eisenhower has attributed to the Democratic spenders.

Schizophrenia is a loss of contact with reality. It certainly is unrealistic to persist in the idea that we can supply all we need in national defense without cutting back on social welfare and without using restraint in desirable but not vital projects.

As yet we have no idea what the final bill will be for national security. Indeed, there is no end in sight. Defense needs are constantly under scrutiny by our military experts. They may well exceed the $40 billion asked by the President in his budget of $77,300,000,000.

National security must take priority over everything else. It is the big issue. Every effort must be made to balance the budget. But if an imbalance results, it must be in behalf of defense, nothing else.

We do not fight wars with pork-barrel legislation. We fight them with hard-muscled air, land, and sea arms. We fight them with missiles and nuclear power. The largesse of the Democratic spenders would be better directed to the Marine Corps, which stands to lose one-third of combat strength; to the retaliatory naval forces asked by Adm. Arleigh Burke, the Chief of Naval Operations. Admiral Burke has warned that antisubmarine warfare is lagging considerably behind the capability to combat enemy submarines.

By July, he said, Russia will have four times as many submarines as the United States.

These are the voices of national security. They must be heard above the clamor of pressure groups, lobbyists, and vote-seeking politicians.

The security problems posed by the nuclear and space ages do not permit a life as usual attitude. They require toughmindedness, a willingness to sacrifice for the greater good. And they require putting first things first. Either we tighten our belts, or we tighten the noose around military and economic survival.

Garnishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the third of a series of articles dealing with garnishment in the District of Columbia is inserted at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 3, 1959]

DEBTORS' DILEMMA—BAD RISKS IN EASY CREDIT SYSTEM PROVE COSTLY TO DISTRICT TAXPAYERS

(By Morton Mintz)

District taxpayers foot a hidden part of the bill when an easy-credit operator sells something to a poor credit risk and the debt goes bad.

The costs to the public are largely incurred in both tax- and charity-supported welfare programs, the municipal court and crime.

Richard D. Gibbs, secretary of Peoples Drug Stores, was one of two witnesses who touched on the crime aspect in testimony on May 27, 1957. He told a House District Subcommittee hearing on proposed reforms of the District's garnishment or bad debt law.

"We cannot tolerate these [employees] who are bad credit risks where we are dealing in open merchandise and cash, and we have found them to start stealing in a great many cases. * * * When they do not draw a salary, they are going to eat, and they will get it any way they can. * * *"

Most authorities believe only an insignificant amount of crime stems from attachment of wages. Some observers, however, make these points:

An employer who would unhesitatingly seek the arrest and prosecution of a thief who is unknown to him is less likely to do the same to an employee caught stealing. He may only fire him, being aware that garnishment has left the employee, a human being he knows, without funds for food or shelter.

It is hard to detect some thefts, especially those from a cafeteria or restaurant.

Authorities do not make a special point of looking for garnishment as a root of crime. University of Maryland Criminologist Peter P. Lejins said he knows of no study of the question but added that one should be made.

Previous articles have pointed out the inner and outer pressures on poor persons to buy on easy credit, the tricks used on them, and the calamities that frequently follow for themselves and their families. Here are more costs to the public relating to the same source of trouble, the District's garnishment statute:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

The Washington Post pointed out in 1956 that under the garnishment law the head of a household could be stripped of every cent he earns, even if it means his children will go hungry. Members of the juvenile court advisory committee heard a father plead he was unable to meet support payments because he had to pay other bills. If his wages were attached, he said, he would be fired and unable to support his family or pay his debts. The then juvenile court judge later said this situation is fairly common.

A man fired because of garnishment legally remains "employable," and so he and his family are ineligible for relief. A man who deliberately deserts his family so it can get a support order—and Welfare Director Gerard M. Shea agrees the statute provides an incentive to do this—becomes liable to a year's imprisonment and/or a $200 fine.

But in doing so he makes sure, once the court order is issued, that his children will eat. Authorities say there are many such cases, but no one knows how many. The Department of Public Welfare makes varying welfare payments; an adult with four children gets a maximum of $195 a month.

UNITED GIVERS FUND AGENCY

The Salvation Army estimates it spends at least $3,750 of UGF funds for direct relief—food and rent—to families impoverished by garnishment. Also affected are Family and Children's Service and Catholic Charities.

On a bookkeeping basis, the Legal Aid Bureau, in representing about 500 garnishment defendants a year, accounts for about 1,300 of UGF funds.

THE MUNICIPAL COURT

Last year, deputy U.S. marshals set out to serve 47,877 writs of attachment on employers. There were countless court hearings on requests for exemptions. Just how much waste of both litigants' and taxpayers' funds is involved in all this no one can say for certain.

However, one estimate from a most reliable—and cautious—source is that a more reasonable garnishment statute would save the taxpayers "several thousand dollars a year."

Oregon's First Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, 1859, Gen. Joseph Lane was

sworn in as Oregon's first U.S. Senator to serve in Congress from the newest State in the Union, Oregon. Editor Charles V. Stanton of the Roseburg News-Review, in my district, has summed up the work of this outstanding man who was later to be candidate for the second highest elective office in our land. His editorial of February 14, 1959, follows under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD:

OREGON'S FIRST SENATOR

(By Charles V. Stanton)

One hundred years ago today a man from Douglas County held up his right hand in Washington, D.C., and swore to uphold the Constitution of the United States. Thus Gen. Joseph Lane became the first Senator to serve in Congress from the then newest State, Oregon.

Today appropriate ceremonies are being held at General Lane's tomb. It is a tribute well deserved, for perhaps no man contributed more to Oregon's early success. At the same time perhaps no man in the State's history was more cruelly treated when he remained firm to his convictions.

General Lane was brave and vigorous. He was a serious worker on behalf of Oregon Territory and later the State of Oregon. But General Lane was a firm believer in States rights. When he threw in with the Confederacy on the question of States rights, he was immediately assailed by emotional abolitionists.

Although the War Between the States was fought on a question of States rights and southern rebellion against domination by Northern States, history books have all too often made slavery a primary cause of the war. Actually, slavery was a secondary issue. The Emancipation Proclamation was a document to destroy southern economy rather than settlement of moral issue. But it was a decided victory for the abolitionists of the day.

ELECTED TO CONGRESS

Gen. Joseph Lane was born in North Carolina and, as a youth, moved with his parents to Kentucky. Thus he was steeped in southern beliefs.

Interested in politics, he was an active party worker in Indiana, where he moved as a young man. He served in the Indiana Legislature when barely past 21 years of age, gaining election to the house and later to the senate.

He fought with Indiana volunteer troops during the war with Mexico, where he was advanced through successive ranks from major to general. He was wounded twice.

His prominence and bravery in the war caused President Polk to name him Governor of Oregon Territory, August 18, 1848. He set out overland, arriving in March 1849 to take up his new duties.

He served in 1851 as a Delegate to Congress from the Oregon Territory, then was again made Governor in 1853, but served only briefly before being again elected to Congress.

His congressional work was interrupted when he resumed his military career to conduct the successful Indian war in southern Oregon. Again he was wounded, but fought through the 1855–56 campaigns.

Returning from the Indian fights, he was once more elected to Congress and, when Oregon became a State, he was named as the first Senator from the State. He took office February 14, 1859, the day Oregon was admitted.

SETTLED NEAR ROSEBURG

He was an unsuccessful candidate for Vice President of the United States with John C. Breckenridge.

One of his first acts in coming to Oregon was to find a suitable place for a home.

He decided to locate in the Umpqua Valley. In 1851, 2 years after his arrival, he took up a donation land claim in Douglas County. His property was on Deer Creek, east of Dixonville, on what is now known as the Buckhorn Road.

Because of his sympathies for the South, he lost much of his political influence in Oregon, which had joined the North in the struggle between the States. Emotion was permitted to turn thought away from much of the good General Lane had accomplished for the State.

Today, however, Oregon is proud of this man who was so active in the politics of its early day and who did so much for the Territory and the State.

As we begin the celebration of our birthday as a State, it is most fitting, I believe, that one of the first to be honored is Gen. Joseph Lane, a Douglas County man who was Oregon's first U.S. Senator.

Civil Affairs and Military Government Combat Support Axioms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the January 1959 issue of the Military Review, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College publication, as a supplement to "CAMG Operations in Atomic Age Warfare," which appeared in the January 1958 issue of the same publication.

This splendid contribution entitled "CAMG Combat Support Axioms" was written by our distinguished junior Senator, STROM THURMOND, brigadier general, U.S. Army Reserve:

CAMG COMBAT SUPPORT AXIOMS

(By Brig. Gen. STROM THURMOND, U.S. Army Reserve)

(This article supplements "CAMG Operations in Atomic Age Warfare" written by Brig. Gen. STROM THURMOND and published in the January 1958 issue of the Military Review—Editor.)

The primary objective of civil affairs and military government operations (CAMGO) is to provide CAMG combat support. Toward this end, all energies, all actions, and all thought must be focused.

For this reason, CAMGO personnel devote themselves to acquiring a more specific, a more practical understanding of the combat commander's needs and problems and of the CAMG support that they can give him to assist in accomplishing fully the combat mission which has been assigned to him.

Before proceeding it would be well to decide what is meant by the term "CAMG combat support."

Referring to the "Dictionary of U.S. Army Terms," published by the Department of the Army in November 1953, as Special Regulations 320–5–1, we find that combat support is defined as: "operational assistance furnished combat elements."

After considering also the definition, therein, of such other terms as combat element, tactical element, and tactical troops, the following synthesis is submitted:

CAMG combat support is CAMG operational assistance furnished in a combat operation. CAMG troops provide CAMG operational assistance in direct support of combat troops, and are engaged under a combat commander, to operate as a part of his unit in combat.

COMMUNISM

Another basic CAMGO objective is to support and implement our national policies. Foremost of these policies is to combat and neutralize Communist social and political orientation of an area liberated by military force from Communist control.

The combat commander, as the one personally responsible for achieving CAMGO objectives, must be fully cognizant of these political military objectives of the Armed Forces of our country. He is the one who must constantly consider the human, political, and economic aspects of the area of his combat operations. The CAMG organization at his disposal is the instrument with which he removes or neutralizes all Communist influences in areas occupied by the military forces he controls. Any neglect of this responsibility will cause a vacuum quickly filled by Communist oriented policy.

Of value in this connection is a little-known study of the 3 years of intensive Communist CAMG planning and subsequent occupation of a community entitled The Reds Take a City: The Communist Occupation of Seoul, by John W. Riley, Jr., and Wilbur Schramm, and published in 1951.

It is evident that our own CAMG planning must include a full comprehension of Communist CAMG planning. As a minimum, our CAMG planning must be directed at neutralizing the effectiveness of Communist aggressive efforts.

Furthermore, we must be constantly vigilant in our awareness that, as an instrument of foreign policy, CAMG is for us as it is for the Communists a weapon for waging war. It is an adjunct to other military weapons, perhaps, but, nevertheless, an essential military accessory for winning not only the war, but also the peace.

MILITARY VERSUS CIVIL AUTHORITY

Still another basic objective of CAMG operations is to provide for the early transfer of responsibility from the military commander to a designated civil agency of government.

CAMGO personnel are not engaged in social or economic experiments or studies for their own delectation or for academic professional interest.

The CAMGO job is to get things done as expeditiously as possible, to achieve actual military operational objectives, and to withdraw as soon as the military operational need has been met.

The pace is quick, not leisurely.

It must be kept in mind that prolonged military occupation is not the task before us.

TRANSFER TO CIVIL CONTROL

In order to facilitate the smooth transfer of control, civilian organizations under military supervision should be introduced early in the more stable parts of the area of operations and gradually replace specialized CAMG units and activities.

It is a cardinal rule, though, that there cannot be divided responsibility for the control of an area. Either the civil or the military authority must control the area. The agencies of either, however, can be used to support the other before and after the transfer of control, which must be accomplished smoothly, whether control is being transferred from civil to military authority or from military back to civil authority.

Historical examples of civilian organizations which served under military control are the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) in World War

II and the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) in Korea.

Such civilian organizations, under the control of the theater army commander, and in turn under the supervision of his G5, definitely reduce the requirement of CAMGO personnel. CAMG units replaced move forward to augment the CAMG combat support units.

INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS

The remaining objective basic to CAMG operations is to comply with international treaties, agreements, or customary law.

For this reason, among others, there is in the modern nuclear age army a fifth general staff section concerned with all military-civil matters including the government, economy, inhabitants, and institutions in areas where U.S. Armed Forces are employed.

This insures that the combat commander is properly advised of his responsibilities, of the limitations on his courses of action, and of his capabilities deriving from political, economic, and social factors.

In his estimates of the combat situation, the combat commander carefully weighs these civil affairs and military government factors along with those dealing with personnel, intelligence, operations, and logistics.

The combat commander's decisions are influenced not only by his own and the enemy's relative combat power and disposition of forces, and not only by such factors as weather and terrain, but also by civil conditions in the area of his combat operations.

CAMG ACTIVITY

The CAMG activity is not new to the Army; only the organization of that activity is fairly recent.

Our CAMG experiences during World War I, and the preceding foreign military engagements of our Armed Forces, strongly indicated early in World War II the urgency and importance of organizing the CAMG activity that inevitably accompanies combat operations.

The scope of the CAMG activity is vast; the details of possible actions are numerous; and volumes could be written on each functional segment of the CAMG activity.

Because generalizations often seem vague, there is a need to search assiduously for clear, complete axiomatic statements to identify the elements of CAMG activity.

Concrete definitions are needed, sufficiently comprehensive in scope and in conveying understanding, of the practical part performed by CAMGO personnel as an operational element in the combat commander's organization.

Toward this end, axioms of CAMG combat support will be explored in an effort to determine how to achieve the basic objectives of CAMG operations previously mentioned.

Were warfare conducted in an arena set apart, such as the jousts of medieval knights, or as in many modern military maneuvers on military reservations, the combat commander could limit his concern to the factors of terrain and weather and the dispositions of friendly and enemy forces, their firepower, and capabilities. However, this is not the way it actually happens on the fields of battle.

Wherever we fight there are people, except perhaps in certain parts like the interior of deserts, at sea, or in an arctic region. It is because people interfere with war and war interferes with people that military commanders must consider the effect on projected combat operations of people, their actions, attitudes, institutions, and resources.

COMBAT COMMANDER RESPONSIBLE

Independence of action often results in the belief that subordinates concerned with particular CAMG matters are responsible for CAMG operations.

This is far from true and we must reemphasize again that the responsibility for CAMG operations is lodged only in the military commander of the area to whom CAMG authority has been delegated, whoever he may be, and regardless of whatever other concerns he may have.

The CAMG mission is part of the combat commander's mission. He must accomplish it even without using the CAMGO personnel and units specifically designated and available to him.

The CAMG organization assists the combat commander as any other service assists him in its particular sphere, but he is responsible.

Specifically trained SAMGO personnel, backed by CAMG organizations extending from the front to the rear through all the echelons of command, increase the combat commander's CAMG capability many hundredfold.

And, what is equally important, the combat commander is not compelled to divert from combat tasks personnel whose special training and competence is needed elsewhere to engage with the enemy.

COMBAT ELEMENT

It is the combat element which first contacts the civilian element upon the initial entry of our Armed Forces into enemy-held territory. It is the combat commander who first establishes the military control which must later be transferred to a civil agency.

The manner in which the people are handled at this early moment by the combat commander determines their first and most lasting attitude toward our Armed Forces. That attitude may become actively hostile or passively neutral. On the other hand, that attitude may be cultivated to become one of cooperation and, perhaps, even result in active assistance to the operations of the combat commander.

In view of the tremendous drain upon our own resources of modern atomic age warfare, it is essential that maximum utilization be made of the resources, including manpower, in areas where our Armed Forces are employed.

While it is true that international law requires the combat commander to restore and maintain public order and safety and to provide for the well being of the inhabitants of an area coming under his military control, the combat commander can do this in such a way as will contribute to his combat success.

CONVERSION PROCESS

The conversion of formerly enemy-held territory to reinforce and even augment the commander's combat power, in terms of resource utilization, is a significant aspect of CAMG combat support.

A paradox arises, however, in this CAMG conversion process. In order to exploit efficiently and effectively the resource potential in support of combat operations, it is not only necessary but also desirable to comply with the provisions of international law regarding restoring and maintaining public order and safety and providing for the well being of the inhabitants.

In the resulting climate of good will, CAMG personnel, by working through civil officials, can make labor available for building military roads, bridges, warehouses, bunkers, and other facilities. They can locate and cause to be utilized for military purposes sawmills, stone quarries, workshops, pure water sources, stockpiles of construction materials, raw and processed materials, and many other civilian supplies, services, and facilities.

CAMG WEAPON

In the search for weapons of greater combat effectiveness, it is found that the CAMG weapon, as an instrument of the foreign policy of our Government, has proved itself on many battlefields throughout the world. It delivers on the ground, in the combat environment, an augmentation of combat power—in terms of usable resources—of tremendous magnitude.

Every person, organization, and echelon in the military structure, from the front to the rear, is required to contribute to the support of combat operations. This is equally true of the CAMG organization, and all CAMG actions must be directed toward this common goal, even at the expense, if necessary, of long-range rehabilitation and reconstruction programs in rear areas.

PERSONNEL COMPETENCE

It is of primary importance not only to have the CAMG organization, as such, but also to have the technological and professional competence of CAMGO personnel brought to peak efficiency for functioning in the combat environment.

Because CAMG concerns primarily are operational in nature, it is necessary that CAMGO personnel be thoroughly grounded in the various aspects of military science and tactics. To perform their part in combat operations, CAMGO personnel must have a comprehensive knowledge of the functions of the G3 section. Only in this way can they understand how the G5 section plays its operational role in the integrated staff of the combat commander.

The precept of Thomas Paine unqualifiedly applies: "Where knowledge is duty, ignorance is a crime."

It is the duty of every CAMG officer to qualify himself fully as an alter ego to the combat commander, capable of contributing to estimates of the combat situation and of participating in the formulation and implementation of combat decisions.

COMBAT SUPPORT TASKS

The exploration for axioms of CAMG combat support reveals that there are certain actions which are conditional, while there are others which recur in all cases. It may be concluded from this that CAMG combat support has two categories of tasks—conditional and recurring.

Conditional tasks are such as arise out of U.S. policy with regard to a particular area and the limitations imposed by the natural conditions of the area.

Recurring CAMG combat support tasks, on the other hand, may be defined, in general, as gaining assistance and avoiding interference of the inhabitants, their economy, and institutions in areas where U.S. Armed Forces are engaged in combat.

More specifically stated, recurring CAMG combat support tasks fall into six additional categories:

1. Civil conditions: Preventing and suppressing disease, starvation, unrest, and other conditions which derive from combat relationships and which would handicap or obstruct tactical and logistical operations, and combating enemy efforts to exploit such conditions.

2. Resource utilization: Promoting the availability and utilization of local resources, facilities, and services, and of governmental, economic, and social agencies, for the benefit of the tactical and logistical effort, and denying their use to the enemy.

3. Civil security: Assuring the security of combat troops from civil sources, using public safety agencies to eliminate active and passive sabotage and guerrilla activity, and coordinating civil defense with military area security and damage control operations.

4. International law.—Complying with international law and agreements. This includes provisions for restoring and maintaining public order and safety, for civilian relief supply, and for the care and movement of civilian war and disaster victims, such as casualties, refugees, evacuees, concentration camp internees, displaced persons, and other needy persons.

5. Civil authority.—Reestablishing civil authority; transferring the area from mili-

tary to civil control; and providing assistance to established civil authority in emergencies and disasters and, where indicated, in the routine conduct of government.

6. Military-civil matters.—Providing a focal point for handling all military-civil matters and, thereby, avoiding a diversion of combat and other military personnel from their primary military tasks by concern with civil as well as with military-civil matters.

CONCLUSION

This presentation is intended only to be suggestive of the vast range of CAMG combat support. A great deal of effort is yet required to define in practical terms all aspects of the CAMG capability to support the combat commander's operations.

There must be a mutual understanding on the part of combat commanders and CAMGO personnel of the responsibilities and capabilities of each in this increasingly vital field.

(Brig. Gen. STROM THURMOND is a 1923 graduate of Clemson College. He was admitted to the South Carolina Bar in 1930 and to practice in all Federal courts, including the U.S. Supreme Court. He has served as county superintendent of education; State senator; circuit judge; and Governor of South Carolina. He volunteered for service in World War II and served from 1942 to 1945 in Europe with Headquarters, First Army, participating in the Normandy invasion with the 82d Airborne Division. He served in the Philippines until the war with Japan terminated. A past national president of the Reserve Officers' Association, he is President of the Military Government Association. He was elected to the U.S. Senate from South Carolina in 1954 as a write-in candidate for the term ending January 1961.)

An Address by Adlai E. Stevenson, "Improving Education: A Free People's Responsibility"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, more and more the people of America are coming to realize that if our society is to remain free, we must invest more of our material resources in our human resources, in the education of the children of our country.

As a member of the General Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I was deeply pleased to see the recent address delivered by the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson on the subject of education and a free society. The speech was delivered by Governor Stevenson in San Francisco, Calif., on January 26, 1959, at a convention of the National School Boards Association. The address follows:

IMPROVING EDUCATION: A FREE PEOPLE'S RESPONSIBILITY

(Address by Adlai E. Stevenson)

You have asked me to speak on the subject of "Improving Education: A Free People's Responsibility." Certainly the improvement is imperative, and certainly it is the responsibility of all of us; because all of us, in one way or another, are teachers and teach ourselves and others. Parents are teachers. Churchmen are teachers. Editors are teachers. Friends are teachers. Even politicians should be teachers.

But our chief concern today is with the part of teaching that goes on in the public schools where the shape of the future is cast.

The basis for those schools was laid down in a former era when our national air was charged with promise. America was to be a New Eden. And the individual American was to be a New Adam—granted a second chance to raise a new breed of men who would liberate and purify mankind.

This being the heroic hope, the plainest citizen was not long in seeing how and why its realization depended on public education. Let me read from "A Plea For Public Education," drawn up in 1830 by the Philadelphia Working Men's Committee:

"The original element of despotism is a monopoly of talent, which consigns the multitude to comparative ignorance and secures the balance of knowledge on the side of the rich and the rulers. If then the healthy existence of a free government be * * * rooted in the will of the American people, it follows as a necessary consequence, of a government based upon that will, that this monopoly should be broken up and that the means of equal knowledge (the only security for equal liberty) should be rendered, by legal provision, the common property of all classes."

When plain working men could think in these terms, when they demanded a wedding between liberty and learning, freedom and enlightenment, fate itself was bound to be kind to such vision. And so it was. It gave the American an open continent whose rich natural resources held out the promise of material bounties to come. It gave him two oceans as a shield behind which he could experiment, free from outside intrusion. It augmented the ranks of the original settlers with waves of vigorous immigrants who made their difficulties the source of their ideals, and who thought of success as but a down payment on tasks yet to be performed.

The performance of the early American often fell short of the idealized vision he had of himself and his mission. But on balance, America's solid achievements in cultivating the moral and material environment of the New World, captured the imagination of humanity everywhere. Wherever men felt the stirring of a will to remake themselves, it was to America that they looked for a guiding light.

But if this was true in the past, it is only a qualified truth today. In our national conscience, we have, I think, an even keener sense about social injustice than was the case with our forebears. Yet the ironic fact is, that we no longer hold a worldwide monopoly over the meaning of human progress and the way to attain it. Our Communist adversaries challenge our claim everywhere. At every point of human endeavor they exhibit the same restless drive we associate with the generation of Americans who sacrificed the comforts of the present, that they or their children might reap larger benefits later on.

The Russians have a saying that "with good schools and hard work we will earn our place on the earth—and on the moon, too." The zeal of the Russians for education, and their progress in converting an illiterate, backward, agrarian society into a literate, advanced, industrial state in little more than a generation, has been a spectacular achievement. It has not gone unnoticed anywhere in the world, and is profoundly attractive to the poor, less developed nations where illiteracy is still a curse.

Yet the Russians are dissatisfied with their system of education. Just as we are waking up and examining theirs, they are reexamining theirs and making dramatic changes. Already competetive beyond anything we know, they are making it more so. They told me—and Khrushchev is angry about it—that too many of those with university educations are unwilling to work with their hands, and think manual labor beneath them. So instead of 10 years of precollege education, the rulers in the Kremlin are changing it to 8, followed by 2 years of work in farm or factory. During the 2 work years, those who are patient and industrious and demonstrate a thirst for learning will be allowed time off to go to school. If they persevere at both work and studies, they can qualify for higher education after the 2-year work interval.

There is one exception to this new system—those who apply themselves during the first 8 years and show exceptional ability in music, the arts, and mathematics, will not be required to put in 2 years on a farm or in a plant. But for all the others, advanced education will have to be earned on the job. And the effect will be to reduce and upgrade those who go on to higher education.

What the Russians propose to prevent is what we all know so well—that around 30 percent of our students have no purpose in higher education and only take up time of the teachers and hold back the more gifted.

It is well to remember that heretofore education has been the only road to material success and distinction in Soviet society—a society that puts the members of the Academy of Sciences, the professors, artists and intellectuals at the very top of the economic and social structure, both in pay and public respect. But in our fortunate country we have many roads to success. And that very fact has doubtless diminished the value that we place on education, and often encouraged the average student to get by rather than to excel.

Is this attitude then more a product of our culture and our varied economic opportunities than of some defect in our educational system? And if so, what can the school boards and you educators do to create a better public understanding of the importance of education, irrespective of material rewards?

Dr. Robert Hutchins, who has never been accused of flabby complacence about our education, said something last week that is worth repeating:

"History will have trouble with American education in the 20th century. It will see a people who say they are dedicated to education and unwilling to pay for it. It will see an educational system that delivers less education per dollar than almost any other, saying that all it needs is more money. The people and the educators are united only in this: they both want education without pain, either intellectual or financial. History will find it hard to explain how a nation that is one, a nation in which the political subdivisions have almost no relation to social or economic life and very little to political life, can entrust its future to these subdivisions by relegating education to them. History will smile sardonically at the spectacle of this great country getting interested, slightly and temporarily, in education only because of the technical achievements of Russia, and then being able to act as a nation only by assimilating education to the cold war and calling an education bill a defense act.

"We might as well make up our minds to it. If our hopes of democracy are to be realized, every citizen of this country is going to have to be educated to the limit of his capacity. And I don't mean trained, amused, exercised, accommodated, or adjusted. I mean that his intellectual power must be developed."

That is your responsibility—you who are members of our school boards and charged with developing the thirst for learning and excellence of our young people. I don't envy you your job. I know none more difficult, more exacting, more necessary. You have both the anti-intellectualism of so many

communities, the inertia of so many pupils, and the poverty of so many school districts to overcome.

I wish you well—my future, my children's and yours are at your mercy and in your hands—far more of it is in your hands than in the hands of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Foreign Service, because if you fail they can't save us.

Admittedly American education has had serious defects. I suppose it is because we as a people have never given the education of our young a top priority in our sense of values. Nor is education at the top of the list of alternative uses to which our tax dollar can be put. In the uses to which we can put our individual time, thought, and energy, the problems of education have never had priority. The reason why our scholars and educators don't enjoy the social and economic status which most countries—especially the Communist—have accorded them is that education has never commanded the status which it merits.

Why is this? Now, that we have been jolted into a realization of our inadequacy, why do we find it so difficult to cope with the problem?

The political fact is that education is a national problem which, alone among our national problems, is not handled on a national basis. Such universal problems as security and defense are treated nationally. The Government studies the needs, appropriates the money, raises the revenue, and administers the program. But the governmental function of education has been left to the locality, to the separate community, to the separate school board. The fear of surrendering to centralized control the responsibility for the education of our young is, I think, still valid. Because in a vast country like this, the further you remove the responsibility for education from the locality, the more you endanger the interest and concern and the sense of responsibility of the individual citizens in the community. And what we desperately need is more, not less individual concern for education. Indeed I think this need transcends classrooms, teachers, and all other school needs.

So we are confronted with a great national problem incapable of a national solution. And the deficiencies of our schools are nothing new. As Governor of Illinois, I was struggling with them 10 years before sputnik—that blessed, brazen angel which at last disturbed our slothful slumber.

You know better than I what the urgent needs are and what all the critics of the American schools—the Educational Policies Commission, the White House conference, the Rockefeller report, and all the other reports—say we must have for survival. I don't want to talk about the need for more classrooms, for more counseling and guidance, for better opportunities for the exceptional student, and for better instruction in mathematics, sciences, and languages. I know, too, that an improvement in the working conditions of teachers, in their compensation, in their social status is demanded in every report and every speech on education.

And I know, too, that to bring about these improvements there must be a substantial breakthrough in educational financing. I have talked about it during every congressional election in recent years—and even more emphatically during some recent presidential campaigns.

It is often said that we are now offering much more schooling of a more expensive sort to very many more pupils than was the case 50 years ago. Yet the truth is that, compared to all other public expenditures, the ratio of what we are spending on education is not more but very much less than was the case 50 years ago. And the further truth is, that unless we start at once to divert more of our resources to education, even our physical plant will collapse once it is hit by the present explosion in our population.

The best estimates put the bill for elementary and secondary school education at around $12 billion. In 10 years it will have to be raised to around $22 billion. Today, the bill for higher education comes to around $3 billion. In 10 years it will have increased to around $9 billion—for a total rise of from $15 billion annually to $31 billion annually. With the best will in the world, State, and local governments cannot do the educational job unaided.

But it was not of these familiar themes that I wanted to speak here today. Moreover, I understand you are soon going to hear Dr. Conant's report on his exhaustive investigation of our high schools and their needs. There are, however, some other aspects of education in America which deserve, I think, more attention than they get.

One is teacher training. I will not go so far as to say that every advance in education is made over the dead bodies of 10,000 professors. But it seems to me that we should acknowledge the unhappy fact that our schools of education and teachers' colleges in the main live in isolation from the sources of intellectual ferment in the great universities. Chancellor Kimpton, of the University of Chicago, has reported that these schools of education over the years have developed their courses not in psychology, but in educational psychology, not in physics but in how to teach physics, not in history but in the techniques of teaching history. And all this, reinforced by State licensing laws, has made the student the ultimate casualty. There has been too much emphasis on how to teach a child, rather than what to teach him. Courses in education—especially at the primary level where techniques such as how to read and write must be taught—are certainly valuable. But the emphasis must be restored to teaching teachers the solid content of history, science, English, etc., instead of the techniques of teaching.

I was interested to find this same concern in the Soviet Union, where there is widespread feeling that the pedagogical institutes were overdoing the study of methods at the expense of subject matter. But in the U.S.S.R., a university graduate—who has had no courses in education—is qualified to teach. He may then compensate for this lack by attending one of the 100 in-service teacher training institutes. Here teachers, during free hours in the day or evening, can attend classes in their own fields or get help about specific problems. These schools are, of course, free and attendance voluntary.

Personally, I doubt if we ever again have enough teachers, let alone enough good ones. We will have to have more recourse to the new techniques of teaching by film and television. Happily, the American teacher, no longer dependent on the printed page, can now draw from a vast library of remarkable educational films to open the doors of a child's mind. At last we are learning—and so are the Russians—about the enormous potential in this teaching resource. The easiest, cheapest, best method of presenting more subjects—and sometimes the only method—is films. For example, the Harvey White elementary physics course—now I suppose familiar to all—will in the long run be cheaper than hiring the requisite number of qualified teachers, even if they could be had. And if they could be had, they would probably not be as good teachers as Professor White.

Every change in education is a change in the habits of teachers. Nobody of my generation ever taught with a film or was ever taught by one. And I suspect all teachers have some vague fear of technological unemployment. The facts are, of course, that these new techniques could be used in every course in the United States without throwing a single teacher out of work. The educational demands of the present time cannot possibly be met without resorting to technology as we have in every other field when manpower was short.

I wonder if the introduction of the book seemed to the teachers of those days to threaten them with technological unemployment. Actually, the book, by helping to make possible the rapid spread of education, greatly increased the demand for teachers. The book also did what the film can do: it made it possible for the teacher to increase the value of his own contribution by making it unnecessary for him to do himself what the book could do for him. If the history teacher today had to recite the contents of the textbooks, he would never get around to making his own specific, personal contribution.

But I have saved for the last what is to me the most important problem of education. Some call it excellence—how to make our young people want to excel in their studies; some talk about motivation—how to make education desirable; others complain that our education is too soft, that it fails to challenge the talents of students.

But are they not all expressions of the same thing—the attitude of the parents and the community? Don't we always have to look to the adult community for our ideals and values? Isn't our education, like our politics, just a reflection of us—of the prevailing attitudes and ideals of the adult community? Won't our politics pump up a cross-section of the community? Won't our schools mirror the respect for excellence, and the intellectual motivation of parents and community? Doesn't the curriculum, hard or soft, reflect the demands of the school board, and doesn't the school board reflect the demands of the parents, and are not the parents a cross-section of the community? Isn't it the community that decides whether the school bond issue passes and the board has the money it needs? And, let's face it, don't those among us who emphasize cost too often prevail over those who emphasize value?

I read that students and their families are reluctant to borrow for education. They will buy TV's, autos, washing machines, even travel, on time and credit, but not education for their children. Is it less necessary?

And isn't Dr. Hutchins too often right when he says that what we seem to want is education without pain, either intellectually or financially?

A member of the Chicago Board of Education recently said to me: "A school system reflects with almost terrifying accuracy the concerns of the community it serves. If parents are interested, if children are brought up with books, the whole system shows it. Principals and teachers, of course, can make an enormous difference, but by and large the community's attitude is the controlling factor."

It has been said that a study of the education of a people can be a clue to what a given culture considers important. The overemphasis in our schools and colleges on athletics and athletic ability at the expense of intellectual attainment wouldn't last a day without public approval—probably more accurately public demand.

And when I complain about the status of teachers in this country—that here in the healthiest, strongest, richest democracy the world has ever seen, the teacher, the intellectual, the scholar, by and large, have less prestige, status and compensation than in the Communist countries—couldn't I say the same thing about many school boards? We insist on managing our education locally; yet how much attention does the average taxpayer give to the selection of the school board? And how much respect, honor, and

recognition do the members get from the community?

And, worse of all, the spurt that sputnik gave us is dying down.

It seems to me that education in the importance of education is the most important job of education. Dr. James Killian, of MIT, put it this way recently:

"What we are concerned with basically is the importance which the American people give to the factor of excellence in our society. It is basically important that we achieve a greater respect for learning, a greater pride in intellectual achievement."

I conclude that it is we the people, we the parents, we the community, that are most to blame for the failures of our education. If in their homes and their environment outside the school the child is indulged, how can the school be expected to turn out a better product? The courses that are taught will not be independent of the feelings, attitudes and demands of the surrounding community. If the community wants driver education or bachelor cooking instead of Latin and mathematics, it will get it. And if colleges give scholarships to boys with coordinated bodies rather than to those with coordinated minds, what will a student value?

I think it is time we, all of us, asked ourselves some searching questions about our values, about what kind of people we really are, about who we are, as the psychologists say. As I have said, if our freedom means ease alone, if it means shirking the hard disciplines of learning, if it means evading the rigors and rewards of creative activity, if it means more expenditure on advertising than education, if it means in the schools the steady cult of the trivial and the mediocre, if it means—worst of all—indifference or even contempt for all but athletic excellence, we may keep for a time the forms of free society, but its spirit will be dead.

I believe we have had enough of adjustment, conformity, easy options and the least common denominator in our social system. We need instead to see the pursuit of happiness in terms which are historically proven and psychologically correct. There is no boredom or misery to equal the pursuit of distraction alone. We do not slip into happiness. It is strenuously sought and earned. A nation glued to the television screen is not simply at a loss before the iron pioneers of the new collective society. It isn't even having a good time. No society has ever spent as much as we do on drink and tranquilizers. Can one argue that this is evidence of universal fun?

But perhaps this misunderstanding of the true nature of happiness and of the conditions of its pursuit is simply an aspect of something else—our misunderstanding of the real nature of freedom. I recall the words of the wise Judge Learned Hand, who warned us that freedom would not survive in our Constitution if it had already died in the hearts of the people. We shall not have a free society unless we have freemen.

I doubt if any society in history has faced so great a moral challenge as ours, or needed more desperately to draw on the deepest sources of courage and responsibility. Ours is the first human community in which resources are so abundant that almost no policies lie beyond our capacities for purely physical reasons. What we decide to do, we can do. The inhibitions of poverty, lack of resources, lack of power—do not hold us back. We can accomplish what we aim at. Thus, perhaps for the first time in the world, choice, not means, ends, not instruments, are decisive.

I hope we choose to upgrade education, and quickly. For as Alfred North Whitehead said 43 years ago: "In the conditions of modern life, the rule is absolute—the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, not all your wit, not all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated."

The Cotton Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. COFFIN
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who come from areas relying on the cotton textile industry are accustomed to two lines of reasoning: First, the industry is ailing and going downhill; and, second, measures seeking to assist the industry involve subsidies or other types of governmental assistance and should therefore be avoided.

Both statements ignore one vital phenomenon which affects no other industry in so great a degree as cotton textiles. I do not know of any other industry where our Government follows a policy of paying about one-fourth of the price of cotton going to an overseas manufacturer. Indeed, what the Government is actually doing is giving an overseas manufacturer a free bale of cotton for every three he buys. Think what our own manufacturers could do if one bale in four were free. As it is, however, not only must they pay the full price for all bales, but they have the doubtful pleasure of knowing that their taxes have helped pay for that extra fourth bale that is given to their competitors.

The recent news of an increase in the cotton export subsidy ran through all the cotton mills north and south like a wintry breeze. It was almost unbelievable that, at a time when the Congress has been working toward a lessening of this differential, the official policy of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has served to aggravate the situation, thus putting our domestic manufacturers at a greater disadvantage in competing with foreign manufacturers and contributing to unrest in cotton growing areas in other nations by further depressing the world market price.

On February 4, 1959, the Secretary of Agriculture announced that it will pay a subsidy of 8 cents per pound on cotton exports during the crop year beginning August 1, 1959. This is 1.5 cents per pound more than the export subsidy which the Department has been paying this year.

Under the program we will be furnishing foreign cotton mills with U.S. cotton at a price of 23.5 cents, while our own manufacturers will be paying 31.5 cents a pound for the same cotton. This will mean a 34-percent differential in raw material costs, to the detriment of American mills.

In announcing the projected price drop on export cotton, the Secretary of Agriculture served notice on foreign buyers that by holding off on purchases of U.S. cotton until after August 1, great savings could be realized. This reduces our exports and contributes further to cotton surpluses. It hurts the farmer, the exporter, and the manufacturer. Unless the administration is willing to modify its approach to this problem, Congress will have no alternative but to adopt legislation which will effectively protect domestic manufacturers in the pricing of domestic cotton.

The Municipal Interest in the Hill-Burton Hospital Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, municipal interest in the Hill-Burton hospital program was outlined to the Alabama congressional delegation last week by one of the outstanding city officials in Alabama, Mayor W. H. Powell, of Centre.

Dr. Powell was here with a number of other Alabama mayors to discuss municipal programs and needs with members of our State delegation. Every congressional district in the Nation has benefited from the Hill-Burton program, and in view of the wide interest in hospital and health legislation I submit Mayor Powell's remarks for the benefit of my colleagues.

Dr. Powell's statement follows:

THE MUNICIPAL INTEREST IN THE HILL-BURTON HOSPITAL PROGRAM

(By Dr. W. H. Powell)

In the 11 years of the Hill-Burton program in Alabama, the progress in the fields of hospitals and related facilities has been one of the bright spots in the development of the State. Through the generous assistance of the Hill-Burton Act, the State is now, for the first time in its history, approaching the accomplishment of a system of general hospitals which can provide the hospital and medical care necessary to the achievement and maintenance of a healthy, growing population. In 1947, Alabama had 4,804 acceptable general hospital beds. In 1958, the State hospital plant reached a total of 9,981 general hospital beds. Of these, 3,871 have been or are being provided under the Hill-Burton program. The percentage of need met has increased from 39.16 percent in 1947 to 69.36 percent in 1958. Thus it is seen that although the progress has been remarkable, the goal of achieving a truly adequate system of general hospitals has not yet been met.

GREAT PROGRESS MADE SINCE 1947

In 1947, only 34 of Alabama's 67 counties had acceptable hospital facilities. Nineteen of the sixty-seven counties had no hospital facilities of any kind. Through the Hill-Burton construction program, the number of counties without general hospital facilities has been reducted to three. But these figures, while showing advancement toward extending general hospital services to the entire State, cannot be considered a measure of adequacy. On January 1, 1959, only 20 of the 67 counties could boast of having met 90 percent or more of their needs for general hospital beds. And in the face of this increase in beds, there has been a sig-

nificant increase in the utilization of general hospital services. Every year more and more hospitals report overcrowded occupancies and are requesting assistance in making additions and alterations to meet the public's increasing demand for hospital care.

During the same period, considerable progress toward the provision of adequate facilities for public health has been made through the construction of 38 public health centers and 7 public health laboratories. This has been a commendable extension of public health services. But 18 counties still do not have adequate public health facilities.

Probably the only field in which the State is approaching adequacy in hospital facilities is in the provision of tuberculosis sanatoria. Four sanatoria with 530 beds have been constructed. But even the adequacy of this type facility is open to question. There is a critical need for a 100-bed addition to the sanatorium in Montgomery and all of the existing sanatoria are operating at or near maximum occupancy.

While some progress has been made in providing mental hospitals and schools of nursing, Alabama has a critical need for additional facilities of these types. The increase in the number of hospital beds has concurrently enlarged the need for competent, trained, and capable nurses. Leaders in both these fields, as in the others included within the scope of the Hill-Burton program, are ready and anxious to meet these needs with the assistance of the Hill-Burton program.

THE GREAT NEED FOR NURSING HOMES

Due to the limited appropriations, only minor progress has been made in the fields represented by the 1954 amendments to the Hill-Burton Act. Without question, the most critical need in the health facility program in Alabama is for the provision of modern, well-equipped, efficient, and adequate nursing homes. Everyone is in general agreement that we have, in this Nation, an aging population. The remarkable advancement of medicine in recent years has materially increased life expectancy and more and more of our citizens are reaching the age where nursing homes are essential to their life and well-being. In 1958, Alabama had only 514 suitable nursing home beds whereas a total of 6,252 were needed. Due to limited funds available, only 100 nursing home beds had been constructed through 1958.

Progress in the provision of adequate facilities for the care and treatment of chronic diseases has also been slow due to the serious limitation of funds. In 1958, the State had only 160 chronic disease beds, of which 120 had been constructed under the Hill-Burton program. During the same year, the State needed 6,252 beds to meet its needs in this field.

Progress toward adequacy in the vitally needed field of rehabilitation centers has been appreciable. One of the finest comprehensive rehabilitation centers in the Nation has been completed in Mobile and a small center has been opened in Huntsville, both constructed under the Hill-Burton program. In addition to these, Alabama should have comprehensive rehabilitation centers in Montgomery and Birmingham and four small centers to serve local needs. In addition, the comprehensive rehabilitation center in Tuskegee should be enlarged and remodeled.

FACILITIES FOR AMBULANT PATIENTS

The only category of facilities included within the scope of the Hill-Burton program which has not been wholeheartedly and widely accepted by the people of Alabama is diagnostic and treatment centers. Completed projects include an outpatient department of a general hospital, and a tuberculosis screening center. One mental health clinic is under construction and one has been approved for construction. The actual need in this field is rather nebulous, but it can be truthfully stated that there is a real need for additional facilities for ambulant patients.

A summary of the hospital construction program in Alabama shows that the 139 facilities completed, under construction, and approved are located in 69 cities and towns in 56 counties. The total value of these projects is in excess of $76 million. In addition to these facilities, the State department of public health has on file applications for 55 additional projects located in 38 cities and towns in 33 counties. These 55 projects are estimated to cost in excess of $35 million. There is, in addition to these proposed projects, the extensive medical center being planned in Birmingham. Although the full scope of the medical center is yet to be determined, it is known that it will include one or more facilities such as general hospitals, outpatient services, chronic disease hospital, rehabilitation center, nursing home, school of nursing, public health facilities, and several specialized hospitals.

WE ARE STILL SOME DISTANCE FROM OUR GOALS

Progress toward a truly adequate system of health facilities to serve the citizens of Alabama has been remarkable. But there is still a very long way to go before Alabama can reach its goal. The people of the State, its municipalities, its county governing bodies, and the State itself have all proven their genuine interest in providing an adequate hospital system. This interest is increasing, but help is needed from Hill-Burton sources to permit Alabama to provide the facilities it needs. Alabama's share of the maximum authorized Hill-Burton program is vitally needed and both can and will be wisely spent for many years to come.

Dulles: Exemplar of Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an excellent editorial by Msgr. Joseph C. Walen, editor of the Western Michigan Catholic, published at Grand Rapids, Mich.:

DULLES: EXEMPLAR OF DEDICATION
(By Msgr. Joseph C. Walen)

The request of President Eisenhower that Americans pray for the recovery of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles should gain a ready response from all who believe in prayer—and even from those in our country who don't.

The sense of public service which drove Dulles on to work ceaselessly is altogether too rare. As he faces the battle with cancer for his life, Americans in a spirit of gratitude should seek God's help that this dedicated man be spared suffering, and if it be the will of Providence, that he continue for a while to fight for peace for the human race of our time.

STOOD UP TO RUSSIANS

In the fantastically complex business of international relations of modern times Dulles has consistently sought the good of all freedom-loving nations. He has been criticized, sometimes mercilessly by our own allies. This is not to say that some disagreements with his views were not justified by other leaders in the United States or in other countries. The fact stands out, however, that his firmness in the face of Russian demands for everything they can get is much more to be admired than the pleas of the appeasers who have urged that we learn to live with the Soviets. Dulles was willing to do the latter, too, but not that the life would be one of slavery.

I liked the appraisal of Dulles' spirit by Joseph Alsop, syndicated columnist whose writings appear in this territory in the Grand Rapids Herald.

In his Tuesday piece Alsop pointed out that such a spirit is becoming more and more rare. Alsop wrote that Dulles' critics have accused him of being moralistic in the approach to the cold war. These critics berated him, observes Alsop, as seeing this war too much in terms of right and wrong.

NOT FOOLED BY MIKOYAN

Alsop also refers to the fact that Dulles' view of Anastas Mikoyan as a murderer was better than the view of the big businessmen who were charmed by the insinuating Mikoyan manners, or who saw him as the people of Chicago saw him, who mobbed his opera box to get the Mikoyan autograph. Since Mikoyan is very obviously an immensely complex character, necessarily mingling some good with evil, the Dulles' view of him no doubt is too uncomplicated.

"By the same token, the Dulles' vision of the cold war as a gigantic contest between good and evil, in which one could not give an inch without being guilty of surrender to the powers of darkness, is immeasurably more accurate than the vision of the cold war held by those who denounce Dulles for inflexibility."

John Foster Dulles has served his country untiringly, without regard of partisan politics in the face of national crises. He has felt the whiplash of unjustified criticism often while he went about in the performance of his duties.

AMERICANS, PLEASE NOTE

His exemplary Americanism should not go unnoticed nor unacknowledged. It is tragically true that many Americans are so unwilling to serve their country that they are too lazy or too indifferent to vote, to say nothing of their lack of willingness to give up some of their recreation time to render community service. The exaggerated devotion to the concept that after 40 hours of work a week, Americans should be totally absorbed in recreation and loafing in recent years has brought about a lamentable unwillingness to work and sweat among many of us, and that starts with the young people in our schools, from elementary grades on up, to many workers at varied jobs.

Secretary Dulles on his bed of pain is a solemn reminder that morality and love of freedom has a martyr in our time, but also another reminder that a scarcity of such martyrs can bring about the loss of this freedom to the tyranny of communism.

A Resolution Adopted by the Council of International Relations of San Antonio, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a resolution adopted on Feb-

ruary 9, 1959, by the Council of International Relations of San Antonio, Tex.

The Council of International Relations is an organization of dedicated citizens of San Antonio sincerely interested in foreign affairs and the participation of our country therein.

I solicit the attention of the membership of the House to the resolution adopted by this organization.

Whereas the Council of International Relations is an international group of more than 400 men and women with a board of governors of military and civilian leaders from civic, cultural, patriotic, professional and educational organizations, and

Whereas the council has for its major objective the strengthening of the ties of friendship and understanding between our land and the free nations of the world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Council of International Relations in regular session assembled, does tonight express its sincere appreciation of the firm, courageous stand taken by our beloved President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and our illustrious Secretary of State, Hon. John Foster Dulles, in support of our ally, the Republic of China, during these difficult months through which she has been passing; be it further

Resolved, That we as citizens of a Christian nation urge a continuance of our unswerving support of these noble people who have suffered so greatly at the hands of their ruthless oppressor, Red China; be it further

Resolved, That we as intelligent men and women realize that to admit Red China into our United Nations Organization would be a disastrous mistake. By its admission we would condone the actions of those who have desecrated every noble principle and ideal upon which the great nation of China was established and have enslaved millions of liberty loving people behind its iron curtain; we urge our great leaders to continue their wise stand against its admission; and be it further

Resolved, That the more than 100,000 men and women who are represented through our board of governors join us in a united protest of any official recognition of the godless, Communist nation, Red China; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, Hon. Watson M. Wise, United Nations delegate, Chinese Consul Raymond S. H. Hoo, Houston, Tex., the press, and that a copy be spread upon the minutes of our organization.

Approved this the 9th day of February 1959, San Antonio, Tex.

Resolutions committee:

JOHN D. PALMER,
Mrs. HENRY SHAFER, Sr.,
L. C. ROBALIN,
Mrs. CHARLES R. ALLEN,
Maj. Gen. J. R. SHEETZ,
Mrs. PRESTON H. DIAL,
President.

Address of E. S. Fields to Indiana Technical College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, during the past few years there has been considerable attention given to the quality of training available in the scientific and technical fields. One of the educational institutions in this country which is making a fine and valuable contribution to the Nation's needs in this respect is the Indiana Technical College at Fort Wayne, Ind.

The midwinter graduating class of the college was addressed recently by one of the country's outstanding executives, E. S. Fields, president of the Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co.

His remarks are of such significance that I feel my colleagues in the House should have the benefit of his observations. Mr. Fields' address follows:

Mr. President, members of the board of trustees, members of the faculty, guests, and members of the graduating class of Indiana Technical College, I am deeply appreciative of the opportunity to participate with you in your program today and speaking to you on this very important occasion.

Several weeks ago I made a visit here to the college. As I was flying to Fort Wayne on that occasion, the particular thought came to me in that temporary detachment from the business world which usually occupies me on such a day, that it was a rare privilege for a businessman to be able to spend a day on the campus of an institution of higher learning.

This particularly so for a person whose college life was many years behind him—more decades than he cares to remember.

In looking through some papers I had brought along for reading on that trip, I came across a leaflet issued by the Council for Financial Aid to Education which intensified my interest in making that visit and the anticipation of being here today.

In that leaflet was the information that now 1 out of every 3 young men and women of college age in the United States is attending college while 50 years ago it was only 1 out of 24. This is indicative of the growth of our country in size and quality and the vast demand for college-educated men and women in all walks of life.

As the plane on that earlier trip came into Fort Wayne, the element of growth of our country was evidenced by the new industries and homes that could be seen spreading out in all directions around your city, a characteristic scene these days throughout the length and breadth of our land.

My attention was attracted, quite naturally I presume, to the sight of the great steel tower electric transmission lines and the scars on the ground marking the presence of high-pressure underground gas lines, both converging on the city. To me, those great transporters of energy exemplified the quality aspect of our country. They represented the contributions of college-educated people to the development of adequate energy sources that are vital to the needs of our modern existence. Their importance lies in the fact that the energy requirements to support the expanding economy of the country are increasing at a rate 10 times that of our population increase.

The leaflet on education went on to state that by 1970 the country's college enrollment will be double what it is now. I am sure that this fantastic increase in demand for higher education does not disturb the administrative heads and faculties of the colleges and universities, as they are dedicated to the proposition that our future well-being depends upon increased numbers of highly educated men and women.

There was ample proof of this at the ninth Thomas Alva Edison Foundation Institute held 2 weeks ago at the University of Cincinnati. The theme of the meeting was "Appraising Science Education." The study of science education in this country has been intensified, and justifiably so, since our leadership in this field has been recently challeged, as evidenced by the Russian launching of the sputniks and their progress in the nuclear fields.

You would have been impressed by the seriousness with which the several hundred teachers of science in attendance at this meeting discussed the student, teacher, and subject relationship to increase the amount of take-home knowledge right down to the preparatory work in the high schools.

If these educators have any concern at all, I believe it is involved in the questions whether there will be sufficient teachers and have available to them the facilities to do the job adequately.

With evidences of expansion of our country on all sides of us, it seemed to me to be appropriate to this occasion to sketch out some concepts of the future, using the next 15 to 20 years for the picture. Here is how you, the members of this graduating class, will be involved. At that time the members of this class will be approximately 40 years of age; you will have matured in your chosen field of endeavor; and it is you and your contemporaries coming out of the colleges of the country that must be depended upon to assume positions of leadership and responsibility in the business, social, and political structures of the time.

The forecasts for the period ahead that are used are those developed by the country's most qualified students of economic trends and they are generally accepted as possible of attainment.

There are two basic premises underlying these forecasts: First, that the population of the country will continue to grow at a rapid pace; and second, that the people of this country will continue to exert their efforts, skills, and ingenuities to raise their standard of living.

In a general way, the economists use two measures to forecast the business volume at any near future date—the number of customers (population) and how much in goods and services it takes to supply them. Simply stated, the expansion derives from more people requiring more things.

As to the first point, the population of the country is now 175 million and there will be some 57 million more people; that is, consumers of goods and services, by the year 1975, an increase of 34 percent. There could be a lesser increase in number of workers, as it appears that the populations at the two ends of the age scale will increase more rapidly than those of employable age in the middle of the scale. In any event, to achieve our ambitions for a higher standard of living, each worker must then be producing about 50 percent more than he produces today.

Concerning the second point, there is no reason to speculate here on what specific things will be provided to meet the people's future demands other than to reiterate that there will be more people requiring more things such as housing, clothing, food, automobiles, home appliances, and so forth, and many new things not yet in the minds of men. Our total energy requirements at the time, another measure of our standard of living, could be three times what they are today.

We are a Nation with only 7 percent of the world's population, yet we have approximately half of the things that add to the pleasures and comforts of modern living.

Keep in mind that this status has been acquired under a freedom of life that brought our ancestors to this country and a freedom of enterprise under which each of us can profit from the fruits of our own genius and labor.

While it is not the subject of this discussion, we must be eternally on guard against the siren calls of those advocates of the easier life through dependence upon the Government—the result can only be a further erosion of the liberties that we prize so highly.

The split world and the split atom dominate the onrushing current of events of our time, and the only way we can possibly attain the goals set for ourselves is to use to capacity our most powerful resource—our brainpower. This is too wonderful and exciting a time for loafers or free riders.

A year ago outer space was something for the cartoon strips and the science-fiction magazines. Today there are satellites on the edge of space; submarines powered and homes lighted by nuclear fission; computers solving problems for business and industry; radar in daily commercial use; and people watching television in remote places of the world.

Not one of these phenomena was happening 20 years ago. Yet, startling as those changes are, they are a mere foretaste of what will almost certainly happen during the next 20 years. For the rate of change is continuing, possibly even accelerating.

New materials, new products, and new machines will present a host of challenging opportunities to individuals willing and able to exploit them.

We are already in the shift from mass production, for which we are noted, into that technological revolution we term automation. Many processes we use today will become obsolete and supplanted by larger and faster machines, and manual effort will be supplemented to an ever-increasing degree by mechanical power.

The laborer will lose out to the semiskilled, as some of the jobs formerly performed by laborers are done by machines. The semiskilled, in turn, will lose out to the skilled, as the machine-operative jobs and servicing of the machines become complicated in the automated process. Many new processes requiring special skills will appear, and many with which we are now familiar will disappear. Please keep in mind, however, that machines cannot think, they cannot exercise judgment, nor do they have imagination. That has to be the contribution of quality educated and trained people in this new order of things.

As we look into the era ahead, it is interesting to trace man's quest for power to supplement the sole efforts of his own muscles. It was centuries before he learned to use the muscles of animals, and it was relatively recent that the wind was resorted to for pumping water and that mill towns grew up along the rivers and streams where falling water could be harnessed to drive machines. Modern industry began with the invention of the steam engine for conversion of the energy of our stored-up fuels—coal, oil, and gas—into mechanical power to drive more machines. And with the advent of mass transportation and electric power the limitation as to location of people and industry was removed.

Human progress has been in proportion to the adaptation of power to the world's work. Beyond the time of exhaustion of our coal, oil, and gas reserves lie the inexhaustible potential power resources available from the most recently discovered process of atomic fission and the possibilities for the controlled use of hydrogen fusion. Our continued progress, which these new sources of energy make possible, can only be assured by the increasing numbers of people freed from manual labors devoting themselves to creative work.

And I would like to say here, parenthetically, that one of the most creative fields, both present and future, is that of teaching.

Now for some thoughts for your consideration upon graduation.

Since a young engineer cannot continue his formal education on a full-time basis indefinitely, he must continue to grow after graduation if he is to equip himself adequately to assume a place of leadership in the future.

Closing the gap between the attitudes of the college campus and the realities of earning a living and making progress in the complex situation of modern business is not an easy task.

While many companies have definite training programs for the young college men that join them, there is much a young man can do on his own initiative to contribute to his self-development by being alert and inquisitive and learning all he can about his employer's business.

The march of progress is constantly occurring and the young engineer must continue to advance his knowledge or be left behind. His college education is a firm foundation on which he can continue to build throughout his lifetime. In addition to advanced technical knowledge he will profit by a deeper understanding of human behavior and motivation; and from a broader appreciation of the business and social institutions of our environment.

It is equally important that the young engineer understand himself. Periodic self analysis can serve as a means of strengthening confidence by recognition of admitted shortcomings. This he can do within his own counsels.

Two of the most important attributes the successful man must possess are first, the ability to deal with men and affairs and second, the ability to read and absorb the written experience of others. A planned reading program of good books and articles of lasting value to broaden and deepen social and technical knowledge will add much personal enjoyment.

Those of you who aspire to leadership of business enterprises must take note of the new and dynamic concepts in the business management fields. The new ideas concerning management now emerging are predicted upon the assumption that management is an identifiable, measurable, and transferable activity that can be mastered, as can any other skill.

In closing, let me leave one more thought with you that is aside from these more or less materialistic points of view.

We are in an international technological race, because a formidable adversary has made it a race. We emphasize the need for technological speed-up, but on the need for a spiritual speed-up much less has been said.

We must not simply overwhelm ourselves with the physical sciences leading to the materialistic; rather we must gain for ourselves an understanding of man's spiritual and emotional progress as reflected in his literature, art, music, history, and philosophy. The man or woman who concentrates on "things" can hardly be trusted to use those "things" for the essential good of mankind.

Only those who have guided the development of their spirit as well as their mind are really educated and qualified to use wisely the things that man's reason has enabled him to fashion out of nature's raw materials.

I extend to you my heartiest congratulations and best wishes.

The Value of the Federal Grant Program for Sewage Treatment Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, last week a number of Alabama mayors came to Washington to discuss the various municipal problems with Alabama's congressional delegation. There are several Federal programs which provide much-needed help to cities and towns across the country and we were anxious to hear the views of our local officials on these programs.

The Honorable Hugh Patterson, mayor of Gadsden, Ala., my hometown, discussed the value of the Federal grant program for sewage treatment plants and I am sure that his remarks apply to hundreds of towns and cities. I submit Mayor Patterson's statement for the benefit of my colleagues:

THE VALUE OF THE FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAM FOR SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANTS

(By Hugh Patterson)

It is a privilege to appear before you in the interest of Federal aid to municipalities for the construction of sewage treatment works. Alabama's municipal officials appreciate the unfailing support our congressional delegation has given to Public Law 660 and to appropriations authorized by this law—for grants to cities and towns. Your record on this legislation and appropriation measures speaks for itself and we take pride in the delegation's unanimous support of the entire program.

Each and every community has the responsibility for providing adequate sewage collection and disposal systems to protect the health of its citizens and of those residing in adjoining areas that may be affected by the discharge of improperly treated sewage from the community. Community sewage must also be treated and disposed of in a manner that will be least objectionable, will protect property values and will permit reasonable use of waters into which it is discharged.

A community's growth and prosperity depends upon its facilities and services. There are Alabama communities in which residential expansion has been restricted by the lack of adequate sewage collection and treatment works. I also feel sure that some municipalities have been bypassed by industries seeking a location because of inadequate sewerage facilities.

COST OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT CONTINUALLY RISING

The cost of municipal government continues to rise and municipal governing officials are repeatedly requested to expand services and utilities. Revenues have not kept pace with costs and we have been forced to impose higher tax burdens or increase the utility cost to our citizens. The Federal grant program for municipal sewage works construction has made it easier for many communities to undertake improvements in sewage disposal. Many communities cannot finance construction of these improvements without help from this or other sources. These grants have also stimulated interest in providing for adequate sewage treatment works and are a definite incentive to a community.

Since July 1956, allotments of grant funds to Alabama from appropriations under Public Law 660 have ben made to 21 municipalities—an average of 7 new projects per fiscal year. The total construction cost of these 21 projects is approximately $23,700,000, of which $3,272,000 will be from Federal grants. The high proportion of this cost borne by local government—86.2 percent—has led one of Alabama's leading daily newspapers to editorially praise the Federal grant program to municipalities. It should be recognized that the Federal Government participates only to the extent of 30 percent of the cost of sewage treatment works with the maximum of any one grant set at $250,000. The municipality must bear the total cost of col-

lecting sewers, which are ineligible for Federal participation.

WILL SERVE 700,000 PERSONS

The sewage treatment facilities made available by these 21 projects will have a capacity for 700,000 persons. During the 2-year period the grant program has been in effect 12 projects with a capacity for 42,000 persons and involving construction costs totaling $1,970,000 have been started without grant aid. As a comparison, 15 projects having a capacity for 230,000 persons and costing $3,300,000 were begun during the 3 years prior to the effective date of Public Law 660. It is apparent that municipal sewage disposal problems of long standing are being corrected and public health hazards eliminated through financial assistance from the Federal Government.

While accomplishments during the first 2½ years of the aid program provided by Public Law 660 have been outstanding, we have only scratched the surface in our efforts to correct problems created by unsatisfactory sewage disposal. I am told that 105 communities in Alabama are in need of sewage disposal improvements. These 105 projects would represent an estimated expenditure of $29 million for sewage treatment works alone and, under the present method of grant allocations, will require $5,600,000 in Federal funds. According to the Alabama State Department of Health and the State water improvement commission, these figures do not include replacement and expansion of systems that may become inadequate within the next 5 years. Replacement and expansion costs are estimated to run as high as $2 million annually.

SMALLER COMMUNITIES SERIOUSLY AFFECTED

Among the 105 communities with pressing problems of sewage disposal are Alabama's smaller municipalities which find it more difficult—if not impossible—to finance the cost of necessary improvements without aid. In my own city of Gadsden, we are faced with the necessity for expanding our sewage collection system and replacement of overloaded and inadequate sewage treatment facilities. Our problem has been discussed with representatives of Alabama's health agencies and we have been promised financial assistance if, and when, Federal funds are available for this purpose. We know that Alabama's annual allotment for the Federal grants to municipalities has been slightly over $1,100,000 and recognize that this amount will help only a few and must be distributed on a priority basis. Our city is not alone as I am informed that 23 other communities have requested grant aid to the extent of over $2 million.

Although accomplishments under the grant program have been most encouraging, we are far from attaining the level of sewage works construction necessary to eliminate the many situations of sewage pollution. We must bear in mind that municipal improvements delayed during the war years left our communities with a tremendous financial burden. While the present grant program is most helpful, it is obvious that it must be expanded if we are to meet our responsibilities.

NEED FOR SUPPORT OF BROADER PROGRAM

I am confident that you recognize the importance of adequate sewage disposal and the urgent need for continuing and expanding the grant program authorized by Public Law 660. Three bills introduced in the 85th Congress, H.R. 11472 by Mr. PRICE, of Illinois, H.R. 11714 by Mr. BLATNIK, of Minnesota, and S. 3576 by Senator CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, sought to increase Federal aid to municipalities for sewage treatment works construction. These bills were supported by municipal government. Alabama's municipal officials join me in asking you to continue your support of appropriations authorized by Public Law 660 and to exercise your influence in securing passage of legislation to expand this program.

ABOLISHMENT OF PROGRAM IS INCONCEIVABLE

I understand that President Eisenhower has again asked the Congress to bring to an end the Federal grant-in-aid program for sewage treatment facilities. This is a shocking attitude for a man supposed to be big enough to preside over the governmental affairs of the world's greatest Nation. In that connection I would like to quote from an item appearing in a recent issue of the American Municipal News, indicating that even the President's advisers differ with his viewpoint on this great program. I quote:

"Presidential advisers on water pollution problems again have taken issue with the administration's proposal to end Federal grants to local communities for construction of sewage treatment plants.

"The nine-member Water Pollution Control Advisory Board at its December 16 meeting, by unanimous vote, urged that the present grants-in-aid be continued.

"Milton P. Adams, Vice Chairman of the Board, is reported to have stated, 'the President could have been better advised,' when he recommended that the Federal Government turn the program over to the States. 'He did not ask us,' Adams told a press conference.

"Adams, who like the other members of the Board, is appointed by the President, described the proposal as 'a hot potato' and pointed out that the telephone companies are lobbying for repeal of the tax which was a wartime measure.

"Board members approved a resolution stating that the budget that will be presented to Congress next month should contain at least the $45 million that was appropriated for the program during the current year. Consideration should be given to increasing the amount available for construction, they said.

"The Federal Government now makes the grants under a 1956 law providing an incentive for communities to build sewage treatment facilities by contributing up to 30 percent of the cost. The law calls for a 10-year program and authorizes up to $50 million a year.

"Board members estimated a need of $70 million to $75 million each year in Federal grants to bring community participation up to a satisfactory level."

I thank you, gentlemen, for your courteous hearing of our comments on this very worthwhile Federal-municipal program.

Three Winning Essays by Elementary Students at Mark Twain Elementary School, Lynwood, Los Angeles County, Calif., in the Great 23d Congressional District

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I herewith present to your attention the text of three essays on Abraham Lincoln written by students at the Mark Twain Elementary School, Lynwood, Calif., which is in the great 23d District, Los Angeles, Calif., which I represent in this legislative body Mrs. Amy J. Sherlock is the principal and Donald D. Reber is the superintendent of schools.

I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, join in congratulations to the principal of this school and to the teachers and instructors thereat for emphasizing the birth and life of Abraham Lincoln. That school also had a special assembly in commemoration of this great American and who knows but that one or more of these youngsters in my native State of California writing these essays may someday sit in Congress as a Member thereof, in a joint meeting of the House and the Senate as we present Members joined with the Senate and the Supreme Court and the President's Cabinet and the Ambassadors on the recent date of February 12, when the distinguished historian, Carl Sandburg, read his magnificent tribute to Lincoln and when the distinguished American, Fredric March, read the Lincoln's Gettysburg Address so feelingly:

THE 16TH PRESIDENT

(An essay by Hillary Barsky, a member of the fifth grade class at Mark Twain Elementary School, Lynwood, Calif.)

Even though Abraham Lincoln had a humble beginning he went to the White House. Abe Lincoln was born on February 12, in a small log cabin. Lincoln had little schooling, but he taught himself. He liked the river too.

Lincoln liked politics also, but failed on his first attempt. He served in the Illinois Legislature.

When Lincoln was President, the Civil War broke out. But Lincoln was strong, he believed in democracy, he preserved our Nation and held together what our forefathers fought for. If it had not been for Lincoln our country might have been split in two.

The war lasted nearly 4 years. Then Lincoln was elected for another term.

Then a terrible thing happened. Lincoln was shot while watching a play, by John Wilkes Booth.

Abraham Lincoln will always be remembered one of America's greatest men. Sometimes he is called the Second Father of our Country.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

(An essay by Rodney Henke, a student at Mark Twain Elementary School, Lynwood, Calif.)

Abraham Lincoln was born in 1809 and died in 1865. He was our 16th President. He was one of the most hated as well as one of the most loved American Presidents.

He was born in a log cabin on a farm in Kentucky. His father was Thomas Lincoln, a pioneer farmer.

The greatest thing Lincoln did during his term as President was when he set the slaves free in the States on January 1, 1863.

On April 14, in a theater with his family, he was shot by John Booth and died the very next day. This caused the whole world much grief and sorrow.

There have been lots of monuments, shrines and memorials erected and dedicated to his memory.

OUR LINCOLN

(An essay by Deborah Cosman, a fifth-grade student at Mark Twain Elementary School, Lynwood, Calif.)

"Fourscore and seven yours ago, our forefathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

The Gettysburg Address had its beginning in Abe's younger life. Born in a crude log cabin, of humble parents, he studied and worked hard. Rising from town postmaster, he was elected to the State legislature. Defeated in the election for U.S. Senator, he went on to become the 16th President of the United States. He remained true to his ideals of human equality by freeing the slaves and finally giving his life for this cause.

In his lifetime, Lincoln was one of the most hated, as well as one of the most loved, of American Presidents. Time has erased hatred, and today Lincoln is known throughout the world as "The Great Emancipator," champion of freedom, and hero of American history.

Dedication Ceremonies, New Supreme Court Building, Brooklyn, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James V. Mangano, general clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, second judicial district, at the dedication ceremonies of the new Supreme Court Building in Brooklyn, N.Y., on January 5, 1959, together with an address by Hon. J. Vincent Keough, justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JAMES V. MANGANO

Reverend clergy, associate judge of the court of appeals, Charles W. Froessel; presiding justice of the appellate division, Gerald Nolan; the representative of the mayor of the city of New York; associate justices of the appellate division; chairman and senior justice of the board of justices of the supreme court, second judicial district; Anthony J. DiGiovanna, borough president of Brooklyn; the Honorable John Cashmore, commissioner of public works; Frederick Zurmuhlen, State administrator of the judicial conference; John B. Johnston, justices of our court; distinguished guests; representatives of the bar and of the bench; public officials; ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the board of justices of the second judicial district may I extend to you a most cordial welcome on this memorable occasion, the dedication of the new Supreme Court Building, Kings County.

At this time as general clerk of the supreme court and its administrative director, and by the direction of the board of justices of the supreme court, second judicial district, I hereby declare the formal and official opening of these ceremonies and of the business of this court.

We are about to start a new year and a new era in a new building. As I have watched this building rise to completion, I have been mindful of the following words:

"If we work upon marble, it will perish; if we work upon brass, time will efface it; if we rear temples, they will crumble into dust; but if we work upon the immortal soul, if we imbue it with principles, with a just fear of God and love for our fellow men, then we engrave on that tablet something which will brighten all eternity."

May we carry on with that thought in mind, ladies and gentlemen.

I also wish to express my sincere thanks to the chairman of the new courthouse committee, the members of that committee, the board of justices for the cooperation and coordination which were extended to me and my staff during my incumbency as the general clerk of this court and during the transition from the old to the new courthouse.

I cannot permit to go unnoticed the efficiency and interest manifested by the chairman of our justices' committee on the new courthouse during his many dealings with many agencies.

I am sure that through his efforts and energy there evolved a better, mutual understanding among the board of justices, the city administration, the department of public works under the commissionership of Commissioner Zurmuhlen, and the department of purchase under the able commissionership of Joseph Spagna, culminating in this beautiful temple of justice, this new Supreme Court Building.

I also cannot permit to go unnoticed the efforts and the energies extended by the chairman of the house committee in the past, and who will continue to cooperate with our staff, the Honorable Justice Walter Hart.

I also wish to publicly acknowledge the able leadership of our chairman of the board of justices. We are very proud of the members of our judiciary in this court, but I am particularly grateful and appreciative to the chairman of our board of justices.

Now it is my extreme pleasure to present to you a man who has done a Herculean job in bringing about the orderly arrangement between city departments and this court. I hope that this is the beginning of a great and mutual understanding between the city departments and our court. I present to you the energetic, able jurist, the chairman of the new courthouse committee, the Honorable J. Vincent Keogh. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE J. VINCENT KEOGH

Mr. Mangano; reverend clergy; our borough president; Mr. Cashmore, associate judge of the court of appeals; Judge Froessel; Judge Nolan, and all other distinguished justices and judges of this great court and of all other courts represented here today; distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, as chairman of the justices' committee of this new Supreme Court Building, which at one time not too long ago wasn't even a gleam in a budgetary eye, I should like to express composite appreciation of my colleagues, the staff and personnel of this court.

Particularly do we realize that my immediate predecessor as chairman, now still of this supreme court but by gubernatorial appointment a distinguished member of our appellate division, really must be given credit for the accomplishment that we dedicate today, the Honorable Henry L. Ughetta, not only a lawyer but an engineer and judge.

To our mayor, borough president, our commissioner of public works, Commissioner Zurmuhlen, commissioner of purchase, Mr. Spagna, and to all of you, our taxpaying friends, our heartfelt thanks.

A modest, efficient, and quietly industrious member of our court personnel anticipated the many details, heard suggestions, listened to what was usually constructive criticism, and in general was the complaint department. He went down the line to this very end and supervised, as you all saw, today's ceremonies. I want to pay public tribute to my loyal assistant, Max Benjamin. [Applause.]

To the members of the committee on the new building, Judges DiGiovanna, Brown, McDonald, A. David Benjamin, and Surrogate Moss, my sincere thanks.

And to another member of the committee who has been indefatigable in making certain the highest traditions and standards are ever maintained, the man you just heard, the Honorable James V. Mangano, our general clerk. [Applause]

To you, Mr. Mangano, I am very happy to throw the housekeeping torch because the committee on the new building is no more. After all, we are here and, as they say in condemnation, the improvement is complete and, technically, depreciation has already set in. [Laughter]

Joseph H. Choate of international legal reputation must have had in mind a man with the credentials of a beloved colleague of ours who we are proud to call chief. Mr. Choate remarked, "Law is the expression and perfection of commonsense." The "expression and perfection of the law" come only from men endowed with a rich spirit, full learning, and humility of soul.

It will be no new experience for our friend to preside at these historic ceremonies. The highest ranking judicial officer of this department, he is presiding justice of our appellate division, which appellate division has and, we all know, will continue to enjoy, a formidable reputation among the members of the bench and bar. Our new 10th home, this building which we dedicate today, represents, to a very great extent, this man's kindly and intense interest in legal and judicial standards.

It is my great pleasure to present our presiding officer of the day, the Honorable Gerald Nolan. [Applause]

Address by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, USN, Chief of Naval Operations, Charleston, S.C., Friday, February 20, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith a speech given at the Francis Marion Hotel, Charleston, S.C., Friday, February 20, 1959, by the distinguished Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh A. Burke.

This magnificent speech was delivered at the 182d annual meeting of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, which is the oldest chamber of commerce in the United States. This timely address is a warning to all Americans who want this country to survive in the days that lie ahead:

ADDRESS BY ADM. ARLEIGH A. BURKE, USN, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, BEFORE THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF CHARLESTON, S.C., CHARLESTON, S.C., FEBRUARY 20, 1959

It is a pleasure to be here in Charleston—and I am particularly pleased to have this opportunity to talk to leaders of a community which has always been important to the U.S. Navy—and which is now becoming even more so.

Charleston is becoming more important as the Navy goes forward with its fleet dispersal program. This is a program which has been instituted in recognition of constantly changing needs in national security.

World conditions are very fluid. The situation is constantly changing. We have seen rapid advances in technology. We are wit-

nessing rapid and sometimes unpredictable progress in weapon-system development.

For this reason we must constantly reexamine the nature and degree of the threat facing us, and we must keep under constant review our needs to meet it. This means that we must continually reevaluate our military posture.

In reexamining the threat confronting us, we must recognize at the very outset that the Soviets have no intention of gaining their objectives slowly by the use of military force.

This is one of the most misunderstood facts of life today. The Communists have demonstrated over and over again—both in word and deed—that military force is only one of many means which they expect to use in their efforts to take over the world.

Indeed the danger could come more from an economic Communist offensive leveled against the free world.

It is important for us to understand that a cardinal rule of the Soviet leaders is that the destiny of communism must not be jeopardized by harebrained risk.

It is not saber rattling to say that the Soviets know that the United States has the ability—right now, in being—to destroy the Soviet Union. We can do it in several ways—and several times over with our powerful Strategic Air Command of the U.S. Air Force—with carrier striking forces of the U.S. Navy—with tactical air—and with intermediate range ballistic missiles which are now being installed in certain European sites.

The Soviet Union cannot prevent our retaliatory strikes should the Kremlin leaders decide to initiate general nuclear war.

Therefore, the probability of general nuclear war is remote, for it would be suicide for the U.S.S.R.

The advent of ballistic missiles for delivery of mass destruction warheads has raised some basic considerations in the role of armed force as an instrument of national policy.

Missiles have placed new emphasis upon the importance of concealment and surprise. This makes our own installations and cities more vulnerable than ever before.

In the remote possibility that the Soviets might undertake to initiate a general nuclear war—their prime objective would be to eliminate the ability of the United States to retaliate.

To do this the Soviet Union would launch its missiles against our known positions. Everybody knows where our bases and installations are located. Everybody knows the locations of our strategic air bases here at home and abroad. Our missile sites also will be known no matter how many we build—or how much we attempt to keep them secret.

This poses a major problem for the United States. In the past 100 years of history of our wonderful country—we have considered that anything in the continental limits of the United States was relatively safe.

With the distances involved—and the limitations then inherent in the weapons of war—when the United States became a first-class seapower we recognized that it was a good thing to base our military strength primarily in our own homeland until it was needed in war.

In an age of ballistic missiles—it is now just the opposite. The security of bases in the continental limits of the United States will no longer be fully available to us when ballistic missiles become fully operational.

We face the further problem, on the other hand, that we will not have knowledge of the location of each and every enemy missile site. Even if we could expect to have this knoweldge, we recognize that in general nuclear war missile forces can no longer attempt to destroy their enemy counterpart without destroying the corporate body of the enemy state itself, provided all these forces are stationed within the heart of the homeland.

This works both ways. All the world knows that the United States will not initiate war, or take steps designed to provoke war. In such circumstances—what do we do in the face of a growing Soviet missile capability?

There has ben considerable concern in this country about a missile gap. Most of this concern has been centered primarily upon a numerical difference between U.S. missile strength and that of the Soviet Union.

However, it is not a quantitative gap we should be concerned about. Rather it is a qualitative gap we must be careful to avoid.

In this connection the United States is ahead of the Russians in retaliatory powers. It is far more powerful than the Soviet Union, and this is a status which we can and will maintain.

As we move into the age of ballistic missiles, however, we must have missile sites whose locations are not known to the Soviets. This would reduce any advantage of enemy surprise or initiative. This would present to the enemy a U.S. ballistic missile posture which assures the enemy that he will be destroyed if he launches a nuclear attack against us or any of our allies.

The real question, then is, can we avoid the qualitative gap which could develop in the years immediately ahead? The answer is yes.

It has been in response to these problems that we designed the Navy's fleet ballistic missile system—Polaris—to be carried in submarines. A seagoing system answers these problems. It provides the best answer now in sight. It is a system which will be hidden and moving in the depths of the sea.

The enemy will be unable to pinpoint these fleet ballistic missile forces in advance for a surprise attack because their locations at sea will not be known, and the nuclear submarines carrying Polaris will be constantly on the move. Any attempt to neutralize these forces will draw the enemy's attacks to sea—away from population centers on land.

We will not need many of these fleet ballistic missile systems. We will need enough to do the job. But the United States should not place its reliance for deterrence solely on Polaris—or any other single system. We should retain diversified capabilities.

We must, of course, keep in mind what has to be done. We must make sure that Russia knows we have enough to destroy the Soviet Union, and that we will use it if she launches a nuclear attack.

There is no point trying to equate our requirements and capabilities with the enemy's. Our requirements are entirely different and our capabilities must be developed around our own needs. We do not need to engage in an endless arms race with the Soviets in ballistic missiles—any more than we have attempted to race them in numbers of submarines or army divisions.

The really important thing about a deterrent force is not numbers—but invulnerability not total numbers built—but numbers we will be able to use. In making our retaliatory forces secure from enemy attack—we do not need great numbers of missiles and bombers.

Whether the U.S.S.R. has one-half as many or several times as many missiles as the United States—is really academic as long as we have the assured capability of destroying Russia—and as long as the Soviets know it—and are really convinced of it.

There is—in fact—far greater psychological advantage for the United States in having this capability than in allowing ourselves to be drawn into a fruitless and unnecessary race on Soviet terms.

Hiding behind the Iron Curtain the Kremlin can tell us what they want us to know—and they are able to conceal fairly effectively that which they don't want us to know.

If they had a particular capability, would they make such statements as to cause us to build an appropriate response to that particular threat?

If the Kremlin really intends to exploit an advantage, would it not be better for them to remain quiet and surprise us with deeds rather than words?

The United States is embarked upon a defense program aimed at meeting our security needs. By not entering a numbers race with the Soviets on their terms we also avoid the limitless economic drain which such a race would involve.

We can afford what we have to afford for U.S. security, but also we must spend our funds for what we need. We must apportion our funds carefully to meet all the contingencies facing us.

A general nuclear war deterrent will deter mainly that, little else. Our powerful retaliatory capability has not always deterred lesser assaults in the past, and it will not in the future.

We know that the Soviet expansionist policy is continuing. There have been local aggressions—local uprisings, local crises in the past—which could not be dealt with by the use of mass destruction capabilities.

These will continue to face us in the future, and we will be able to deal with them effectively only by measures which fit the local circumstances.

This means controlled—precision forces which can be operated with discrimination and finesse—forces armed with conventional weapons and small atomic weapons—forces which can apply the right degree of power with pinpoint accuracy.

Our military requirements cover a very wide spectrum of possible situations. But even this is not enough. Military measures by themselves are not enough.

Let us look for a moment at what the Communists themselves have been telling us.

We can debate at length among ourselves on what proper military measures to take in our own defense. We can discuss budgets, military posture, and the various forms of modern warfare. We can examine our weapons systems and our progress in research and development.

But we can lose the entire stamina and integrity of our civilization if we do not recognize the challenge presented to us by a nation sworn to take us over.

Distinguished American visitors to the Soviet Union in recent weeks have told me that the most dangerous thing they saw in Russia is the look on the faces of the people.

What Americans have seen in their visits to Russia is the grim look of determination, the cool and deliberate confidence of people who are going places who know they are missing a lot of life, who know they are being forced to sacrifice both tangible and intangible human values—but who are resolute in their aim to beat the United States in everything.

And what do they expect to gain by this? Simply this, they expect to gain prestige in the eyes of the rest of the world. They expect to gain greater respectability in the world. They expect to demonstrate that their way is the way of the future. How better can they prove all this than by beating the United States in everything—in athletics, in the arts, in scientific achievement, in industry, political maneuver, and everything else.

This is the challenge which faces the United States. The Soviets have not said they were going to take the world through general war. What they have said is that communism is the wave of the future—and will take over the world.

Fifteen years ago we thought the Soviet Union would build a massive force of long range aircraft. They certainly had the capa-

bility of doing it. But they did not build many.

Two years ago we were given a jolt with their unveiling of a new and powerful long-range jet bomber—the Bison. But the Soviets did not build many of these either.

Today their space achievements are impressive. Their objectives is twofold. First, they want to be really able to develop the military capability which is implied by such achievements. They need not necessarily do it, but they want to be able to if they think they have to.

Their second objective is to demonstrate to the world the technological proficiency of the U.S.S.R.—they want to show the world that they can do it.

Both of these have their roots in Soviet psychological pressure on us—on our allies—and on the rest of the world, both within and outside the Sino-Soviet bloc.

We fall into their mousetrap when we ourselves become so obsessed or preoccupied with these worthy accomplishments as to ignore all the other things they are doing to undermine freedom, to upset the stability of independent nations, and to insinuate their philosophy into the thinking of freemen everywhere.

Let us not underestimate the capabilities of the Soviets. Their scientific achievements along certain lines have been superior. But let this not blind us to all the other much less spectacular things they are doing—the many little, devious, conspiratorial inroads they are making everywhere.

We have many problems before us in facing up to this Communist challenge. We must not become enchanted with the prospects of military power in the space age at the expense of the many other demands upon us. The competition covers a far wider range of effort than military effort alone. The range now extends to include everybody—not just the military.

Ladies and gentlemen, our country has grown strong in an environment of personal liberty in which the spirit of competition runs strong among us. The United States has become a world leader as a result of the effort of many hardworking people to whom the concepts of private enterprise and individual initiative have real meaning.

But today we run the grave risk of becoming complacent in our position of world leadership, and of becoming indifferent to the hard realities of the competition we face as a nation.

The U.S.S.R. long ago declared cold war on us, and they have been working hard at it ever since. We cannot stay aloof from this challenge. We are in a competition now for our national existence. We are engaged in a war of attrition in which the Communists intend to make each victory irreversible—no matter how minor it may seem to us. Taken together over the long haul these victories could be decisive.

We are ahead of the Soviet Union now. We are industrially ahead. We are ahead of the Soviets in the application of nuclear power in our naval forces. We are ahead in the development of solid propellants for ballistic missiles—a capability, incidentally, which was first developed by the Navy over 30 years ago at the Naval Engineering Experiment Station, based on early work by Dr. Robert H. Goddard.

We are ahead in the development of a fleet ballistic missile system—the Navy's Polaris missile.

The United States is ahead in its ability to use and exploit the sea, in antisubmarine warfare doctrine and capabilities, in the application of naval air power from carriers at sea, in guided missiles at sea.

These capabilities did not come overnight. They are the result of solid thinking and hard work—hours, days, and years of attention to the many jobs the Navy has to do. They are the result of cool determination, and the intelligent application of always limited resources.

This is the challenge which faces the entire Nation today. It is the challenge of facing Communist competition in every line of human endeavor. It is a challenge which will not be met with slogans, gimmicks, and simple answers.

It is a challenge which summons all Americans once again to reaffirm our purpose in the world community of nations, and to pursue that purpose with vigor, and not be deflected by the cold winds of communism.

Let us take a hard look at what is happening in the world—a hard look at what is happening to our markets in the world—and let us look at the Soviet economic offensive and determine how well we are responding to it.

Let us take a hard look at what we need in military hardware.

The answers will not be found in mathematical equations or with masterstroke answers. We are talking about the whole spectrum of human endeavor, for which there is no single or simple formula.

The United States is ahead today, but we will stay ahead only by the dint of hard work, by higher standards of individual achievement, by the exercise of free initiative, and by placing our personal comforts and interests second to the interests of a strong, virile, and dynamic United States.

This is not a one-man job. It is not a 100-man job, nor a job only for a million men. It is a challenge to 170 million Americans. It is a job for you and for me, for all of us—for your children, and your children's children—for as long as they live they will live in competition.

Dealing With Unemployment—An Editorial Appearing in the Christian Science Monitor, Friday, February 20, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 12, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to call your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, to a very timely and pertinent editorial appearing the the Christian Science Monitor on Friday, February 20, 1959. It seems to me this editorial is very timely on account of the reported high load of unemployment thoughout our great Nation:

DEALING WITH UNEMPLOYMENT

The exchange of barbed pleasantries between President Eisenhower and Walter Reuther has not helped noticeably with the unemployment problem. Both men could make more useful approaches to the situation than they have so far.

We question whether the Reuther plan for a march on Washington by unemployed workers holds any real solution. But the best White House answer would be such manifest awareness of human distress as Mr. Eisenhower displayed last year when he proposed extra Federal aid. Assumption that returning prosperity is wiping out special problems like that in Michigan only supports the argument that a dramatic gesture is required to focus attention on them.

The jibe at labor leaders on Puerto Rican beaches boomeranged all the way to Acapulo—leaving the problems of slow reemployment and of special distress areas still unsolved.

The unemployment problem is spotty and might well be dealt with by spot remedies. We fully understand the President's feeling that in a period of strong economic recovery the Federal Government should not continue a general program designed for last year's recession emergency. But we question whether he can with equal reason reject measures for aid to distressed areas where unemployment remains heavy.

Both humanity and sound economics argue for stopping the waste of idle men and idle plants. This is not primarily a national responsibility. In Michigan, for instance, concentration on one industry is proving a weakness. Both labor and management have made mistakes that contribute to unemployment.

Reported plans of Detroit's "Big Three" to bring out new small cars reflect recognition of a market which rejected the bigger, gaudier—and costlier—sales pitch. Union policies which push wages faster than productivity or prefer high wage rates to high employment are also in the picture. And a thriftier State government—one which had not built political power on welfare generosity—would now be better able to carry burdens Washington is asked to lift.

The responsibility of private industry, labor, and local government can rightly be emphasized. Yet the whole Nation is affected by weak spots in the economy. There is much reason for rejecting general inflationary spending programs as a cure. But by the same logic there is reason for seeking effective spot treatment.

Last year the President vetoed a bill to give special aid to distressed areas. It had some glaring faults. Yet the method makes sense. A better measure, requiring more evidence of local self-help efforts and providing safeguards against abuses, should win wide support. And the President might well encourage such steps. They could prove a real help to the Nation directly by relieving distress and indirectly by easing pressures for unwise "shotgun" spending programs designed to spur employment.

Connecticut Area Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article by W. F. Jennings, president of the Postal Transport Association for the first division, in Lynn, Mass., which appeared in the Postal Transport Journal for February 1959:

CONNECTICUT AREA PLAN

(By W. F. Jennings)

There is an old saying that nothing remains the same for any length of time—things either improve or retrogress according to conditions. All eyes are looking to the operation of the Connecticut area plan to estimate its value as an efficient method of mail distribution. At this writing, opinions are mixed as to the improvement over the previous methods of mail handling.

As time goes on we will see new plans of distribution in all parts of the country. The

Department has launched a program calling for such systems in all large centers, terming them metro systems. The first one was developed in the New York City area comprising 27 counties in New York and New Jersey, together with Fairfield County in Connecticut. Results of this first plan were judged to be favorable and so we have the expansion of the idea in all parts of the country.

The metro system is a development of the old trapping centers which were established a few years ago. It was found that the use of the word "trapping" was ill-advised because the word connoted delay. New terminology was recently applied to the trapping centers. They were designated as "mail expediting centers," and this term was used in the "Operation Christmas" orders of 1958. To identify some units in the metro system the term "sectional centers" was used, but the abbreviation "S.C." was confused with South Carolina. Now, the terms "area centers" and "concentration centers" are applied to the appropriate units.

The objectives sought when the Connecticut plan was devised were to provide next-day delivery for all mail in the post offices at 5 p.m., development of a 24-hour scheme of distribution that would never change, and removal of distribution from mobile units. From the viewpoint of postal patrons next-day delivery is highly desirable, but surely the guarantee of such delivery on 5 p.m. mailing is not an ambitious objective. In an area as thickly populated as Connecticut, distances between offices are comparatively short, and it would be reasonable to expect next-day delivery if the letters are mailed at any time during the evening. At one time, such service was the rule and taken as a matter of course. Now it seems to be something to strive for.

It is obvious from an inspection of the plan that large quantities of mail will be massed on area centers and this mail cannot move out until procesesd. A problem is thereby created, a problem that troubled post office people over 100 years ago. Those were the days before mobile units, and all mail was massed on some distributing post office for processing. The problem became acute in such centers as St. Joseph, Mo., where mail for the West was distributed. After the arrival of the day's mail by railroad many hours would elapse before the dispatches could be made ready. The problem was solved by the assistant postmaster of St. Joseph, William A. Davis. He received authority to equip two baggage cars with distributing facilities so that clerks could sort the incoming mail en route. The Hannibal & St. Joseph Railroad cooperated and remodeled the cars so that 65 separations could be made. The first trip was made on July 7, 1862, and the first mobile unit in this country was put in operation. The results were spectacular because the en route distribution advanced the transcontinental mail by 14 hours. This bit of history is mentioned because prior to 1860 all large post offices were trapping centers and congestion at the centers was eliminated by en route distribution. Surely, reverting to the methods of over a century ago will bring about the same problems.

The idea proposed by Mr. Davis received attention in Washington, and 2 years later George B. Armstrong, assistant postmaster at Chicago, Ill., was instructed to test the plan of en route distribution. The tests showed the plan to be an unqualified success, and so the railway mail service was born. In the following few years other routes were established. Opposition soon developed, however, because the postmasters of the great eastern distributing centers became alarmed for they thought that the sorting of mail en route would somehow reduce the importance of their offices.

Now we have the Connecticut plan, which is designed to operate without en route distribution as far as possible. I submit to the reader the thought that a comparison of the plan with the methods of a century ago will show that they are identical. Time has not marched on in this case.

The costs of the Connecticut plan are not available, but the additional truck routes necessary to implement it have been published. Using the average cost of truck operation, the new routes would cost an additional $100,000 to $120,000. Clerk hire necessary in area centers is another item, no figures being available on this expenditure.

We in the N.P.T.A. believe that good mail service will come in direct proportion to the amount of en route distribution that is performed. Any plan of distribution, no matter how efficient, would be better if implemented with mobile distributed units.

The Cuban Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of all the Members, a firsthand account of the situation in Cuba as told by Mr. Robert M. Cox, the president of one of the local radio stations in my district as well as a prominent businessman of McKeesport, Pa., upon his recent trip to Cuba.

His story from the McKeesport (Pa.) Daily News, of January 28 and 29, 1959, follows:

MON-YOUGH BROADCASTING CO., INC.

McKeesport, Pa., January 31, 1959.

Hon. ELMER HOLLAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ELMER: Enclosed herewith are copies of articles covering my recent visit to Cuba during which I observed, among other things, that the political prisoners are being treated well in La Cabana Fortress, that they anticipate fair trials, that communism in Cuba does not appear to pose the threat that we often are led to believe that it does, that the revolutionary soldiers are courteous and well-behaved and that Fidel Castro is respected as a modern-day "Zorro", liberator of an oppressed people.

From 1956, when I first visited Havana, to 1959, the change from dictatorial oppression to revolutionary freedom is like the change from night to day, for now the Cubans are a happy, laughing and free-talking people.

In my opinion, too much of what we have been told by our reporters has been anti-Castro while Batista's murdering went unnoticed. My own interviews in Havana and in the fortress indicate that the people feel strongly that the United States stood by idly when Cuba was being mutilated by a dictator, while now we are being all-too-critical of their attempts to bring their murderers to justice.

The feeling, in some quarters at least, is that an understanding U.S. Ambassador could do much to help in this period of readjustment and to cement a good relationship between the United States and the 7 million people on this neighboring island which should be our friend and ally.

It is my earnest hope that our Government will temper its criticism with sympathy and understanding in an attempt to make friends of these fine people and if there is any way in which I, in my small way, may contribute toward the accomplishment of this friendship, please be assured that I stand ready, willing and, I believe, able to serve.

Sincerely,

ROBERT M. COX,
President.

[From the McKeesport (Pa.) Daily News, Jan. 28, 1959]

CITY MAN TALKS TO PRISONERS IN HAVANA FORTRESS—ROBERT COX FINDS BEARDED AND ARMED CASTRO FOLLOWERS SET TEMPO IN CUBAN CAPITAL; MADE TRIP FROM FLORIDA VACATION

Bearded young men, armed with smiles and a various assortment of weapons, set the tempo in Havana today, according to Robert M. Cox, McKeesport businessman, who returned recently from the Cuban capital.

Mr. Cox said he was one of the few Americans permitted to enter La Cabana Fortress in Havana to interview Fidel Castro's political prisoners.

He went to Cuba on sudden impulse last week while vacationing in Florida. "I wanted to see what was happening," he said.

His 1-day journey into the troubled country began from Fort Lauderdale, where he took off by plane at 9:15 a.m. last Tuesday.

In 90 minutes, the Mackey Airlines plane had touched down in Havana. Castro at the time was preparing for a huge demonstration called in support of the revolutionary Government's summary execution of captive followers of the deposed dictator Batista.

WORE TENNIS SHOES

Having read accounts of rioting in Havana, Mr. Cox said he wore tennis shoes to permit fast footwork just in case it was needed.

Upon landing in Havana, Mr. Cox said the first person he saw was a young bearded soldier who approached him with a stern command to halt.

Having forgotten the little Spanish he knew, Mr. Cox explained that he used the international language to greet the soldier—a smile. He said:

"From that minutes on the soldier was very friendly and courteous. He led me to the immigration desk where I was passed through with little trouble."

The next phase of his trip was by taxi to the tourist office of Mike Magua where he hired a limousine, chauffeur, and interpreter.

The agency was recommended by the plane's pilot, Capt. Joe Bruby. The pilot had attempted to dissuade him from going to the fortress.

AMONG FRIENDS

"But when I saw the smiles on the faces of the soldiers at the airport, the taxi drivers and people in the streets, I felt I was among friends," Mr. Cox said.

"In fact the only trouble I had up to this time was at the airport when a tyke approached me from behind, stuck a toy pistol in my back and asked, 'Shine, mister?'"

Mr. Cox had been in Cuba in June 1956 when Fulgencio Batista was in power.

"I felt the oppression under the Batista regime at that time," he said, "the people were afraid to talk. Feeling sympathetic to the Castro cause, I felt I had to go back. I went there as a friend.

"The streets of Havana now are filled with smiling faces. The soldiers are courteous. It appears that they want the United States to understand their position."

After picking up his interpreter, Rudolfo Alfonso, and chauffeur, Mario G. Mesa, Mr. Cox said he would like to interview the prisoners in La Cabana Fortress.

DECIDES TO TRY

The interpreter told him that under the Batista government no Americans were permitted to enter the prison, not even the U.S. Ambassador. But he added, with a shrug: "We try."

Mr. Cox said his rented limousine was stopped 50 feet from in front of the fortress by another young, bearded soldier who carefully examined his press card.

The entrance to the prison was guarded by a score of soldiers "all of whom were in gay spirits, laughing and very respectful," he said.

After gaining entrance, Mr. Cox was met by Capt. Alfonso Zayas, who wore a 22-month growth of beard and who further questioned him on his motives and again examined his press card.

The captain then led him to the prison proper and conducted him on his tour of interviews with the prisoners.

[From the McKeesport (Pa.) Daily News, Jan. 29, 1959]

CUBAN CAPTIVES DENY GUILT TO CITY MAN—COX INTERVIEWS INMATES OF FORTRESS JAIL; FORMER BATISTA CABINET MINISTER SAYS HE RESIGNED BECAUSE HE OPPOSED REGIME'S POLICIES

La Cabana fortress in Havana, Cuba, is a huge military prison where Fidel Castro keeps many of the revolutionary government's political prisoners awaiting trial.

Robert M. Cox, McKeesport businessman, said he is one of the few Americans who was permitted to enter the fortress to interview the imprisoned people. He went to Havana last week and spent part of a day there.

He said he was guided through the prison by a polite captain named Alfonso Zayas, who wore a 22-month growth of beard and carried a 45-caliber automatic.

He was led first into a large courtyard filled with prisoners who were milling about at will. The courtyard was bordered on two sides by tunnel-like cells. One side housed the Castro soldiers and the other the prisoners.

CELL DOORS OPEN

Mr. Cox said all the cell doors were open at the time of his visit with the exception of two, where persons accused of murder were imprisoned.

He emphasized the point the prisoners' living quarters were equal, if not better, than those of their rebel guards. He said every man interviewed stated that he was receiving fair treatment.

The first prisoner interviewed by Mr. Cox through a hired interpreter was a young army lieutenant, accused of persecuting Communists.

Mr. Cox said he then asked about the number of Communists in Cuba. He was taken by Captain Zayas to a prisoner who held the post of Minister of Information under the Batista regime until 1954.

The former Cabinet member, who said he was arrested January 4, told Mr. Cox that there are 12,000 Communists and perhaps 90,000 fellow travelers out of Cuba's population of 7 million.

"The man said he resigned from his post because he disagreed with the Batista policies and practices," Mr. Cox reported.

WROTE ARTICLES

"The prisoner said he then began writing a series of articles subtly condemning the Batista practice. Some of these articles, I was told, appeared in two of Cuba's major magazines."

The next prisoner to converse with Mr. Cox was a former Havana police chief who said he filled that post from 1956 until last March. He said he quit because he did not agree with Batista policies.

The prisoner was dressed in a colorful sport shirt and slacks and wore sunglasses.

"He was smoking a large cigar as I interviewed him," Mr. Cox said. "The man anticipated a just trial. The majority of the prisoners wore blue denim trousers and jackets with a white P printed on the jacket."

Mr. Cox then talked to a man accused of murder. He said:

"The prisoner had been a captain in the Cuban Army for 34 years and was stationed at Santa Clara, where he was accused of murdering 16 people and burying them in a common grave.

BURNS ON FOREHEAD

"The prisoner had burns on the forehead. My guide said they were received when a sugarcane field in which he was hiding was set afire to flush him out.

"The man told me he was innocent, while his tearful daughter clung to his shoulder. The prisoners are permitted visitors three times a week."

Another prisoner interviewed was a former colonel in the Cuban Army with 40 years of service. Mr. Cox said he was accused of mistreating rebel soldiers and taking a considerable amount of government money for private use.

"The man claimed he received the money from a former wife," Mr. Cox said. "On the mistreating charge, he said he merely gave captured rebel soldiers a kick in the pants before sending them on their way."

Mr. Cox added:

"Every prisoner I interviewed said he was getting fair treatment and expected to receive a just trial."

He asked Captain Zayas if he were a Communist, to which the rebel officer replied:

"Certainly not. I am a Catholic and catholicism and communism do not mix."

The captain, like many of the soldiers, wore a Catholic medal on a chain around his neck.

INTERPRETER WONDERS

After leaving the fortress, Mr. Cox said his interpreter declared that he could not understand why executions under Batista either were condoned or not noticed in the United States even though they ran into the thousands, while the execution of war criminals after trials now are severely criticized.

Mr. Cox said he boarded his plane back to Florida at 6:30 p.m. last Tuesday, only about 7 hours after he first landed in the Cuban capital. He concluded:

"As I left Cuba, I could not help but be impressed that here was a large island with now happy people ready to be our friends and allies if we just showed some brotherly consideration in this time of need."

Legislation To Prevent Free or Special Travel Rates to Government Officials on Private Passenger Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce the introduction of a bill to regulate the granting of free or reduced travel rates to Federal employees and their families.

Last July, during House consideration of the conference report on a bill to authorize construction of two superliner passenger vessels, I expressed regret that the conferees had not retained a provision from the Senate version prohibiting private shipping lines from extending free or reduced rates to Government officials and their families. This new bill would correct that situation.

It has seemed to me that Members of Congress or anyone on the Government payroll either in the legislative, executive, or judicial branches, or any of their relatives, should not be permitted by law to receive favorable treatment as against the general public in travel. No such privilege is allowed in connection with air or rail transportation and I see no reason for there to be any difference when it comes to travel by water. It certainly is inappropriate for persons who adjudicate, regulate and negotiate as well as legislate on shipping matters to be recipients of special favors. The contracts and subsidies involved amount to hundreds of millions of dollars a year, and public confidence, it seems to me, requires a strict standard in this respect.

In my bill I make a distinction as to the historic custom of invitational cruises of newly constructed or modernized ships in that I specifically exempt excursion or trial run voyages when all guests are on an invitational basis.

My bill does not affect the right of the U.S. Government to contract with these same shipping companies for reduced rate costs involving the transportation of military or civilian personnel when such employees are traveling on official business and when such transportation costs are being paid by the U.S. Government.

My bill would restrict, however, any shipping company from giving to any official or employee of the U.S. Government or to any member of that employee's immediate family free or reduced transportation rates below those rates which are offered to the general public.

Lithuanian Resolution for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting held February 15, 1959, at the Lithuanian Naturalization Club, Worcester, Mass., under the auspices of the Lithuanian Aid Society.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the 16th day of February 1959 marks the 41st anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania as a free and independent republic.

Whereas the unlawful, by force of arms, occupation of the Republic of Lithuania by Russia, and the commitment of atrocities against her people, the destructions of her institutions, and her democratic form of government, by Russia, are continued at the present day,

Whereas the Soviet Union has consistently and unilaterly violated all the pacts and declarations solemnly underwritten by the

Soviet Union, viz: peace and nonaggression pacts with the Baltic states, the Atlantic Charter, Four Freedoms, United Nations Charter, Yalta Declaration, and the Potsdam Agreement: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., do most vigorously condemn and protest against Russia's such unlawful by force of arms occupation of the Republic of Lithuania, and the commitment of atrocities against her people, the destructions of her institutions and her democratic form of government, the violation of pacts and peace treaties; and be it further

Resolved, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., petition the Government of the United States of America, to reassert the principles of the Atlantic Charter, by demanding that all Russian military forces, government, and agents be forthwith evacuated from Lithuania and all other countries now behind the Iron Curtain, and that Lithuania, her people, and all other enslaved and occupied countries and their peoples, be liberated and restored as free and independent nations among the nations of the world as enunciated according to the principles in the Atlantic Charter.

Freedom in United States of America for U.S.S.R. but Not Vice Versa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, under our Constitution, freedom of speech extends not only to citizens of our country, but as well to noncitizens within our borders. It even extends to members of the Diplomatic Corps of foreign nations who are assigned to United States of America posts. It extends not only to the spoken word, but as well to written words and the media to convey them, the mails, radio, newspapers, and so on.

A recent example of the extent to which our constitutional freedoms extend is the mailing via first-class U.S. mail by the Embassy of the U.S.S.R. in Washington of a press release to an extensive list of U.S. newspapers. The obvious purpose was to have the information further transmitted to the newspaper's readers by way of the news columns. The press release concerned the text of a telegram from Mikoyan to Dulles. It was, in fact, carried as a news item by a number of newspapers at the discretion, in each instance, of the individual editor.

No U.S. censor in the Post Office Department intercepted the press releases. There are no such censors in the United States of America. There occured no censorship of U.S. news editors. There are no such censors in the United States of America. No secret policemen sought to check off the names of readers who read the story in the newspapers. There are no such secret policemen in the United States of America.

In fact, the whole incident was so typical of the characteristic freedom which is part and parcel of the American way of life that nobody even thought to comment on it.

But what would have been the result if the U.S. Embassy in Moscow had mailed to Soviet editors a press release on a similar telegram from Dulles to Mikoyan, using the Soviet postal system?

Here is how the Soviet Tass News Agency's dispatch to Chinese Communist news agencies might have read:

Moscow (Tass).—Comrade Premier Khrushchev disclosed that alert People's police have discovered a Capitalist warmongering plot against the Soviet free people financed by Wall Street and masterminded by the spying American Ambassador from inside the spying American Embassy.

Comrade Khrushchev declared the despicable American plot is further proof of the warmongering American warlike attitude toward the peace-loving Soviet free people. The arch-criminal American-hoodlum, Dulles, attempted to send secret counterrevolutionary instructions to enemies of the free peace-loving Soviet People's Republic.

Reactionary criminal conspirators against the glorious People's Republic who infiltrated our glorious Soviet postal system have been discovered by the glorious people's police and the usual glorious penalties for traitors have been imposed.

The criminal-hoodlum-reactionary-traitor-spy-American paid-conspirator counterrevolutionary editor of the Petropovlovsk Daily Free Soviet People's World attempted to print the cleverly coded arch-criminal American-hoodlum, Dulles', capitalist warmongering instructions to criminal-hoodlum-reactionary-traitor-spy-American paid counterrevolutionary conspirators.

He has been given the penalties prescribed by the Free Soviet People's Code of Supreme Justice. His deviationist staff of reporters has been replaced and assigned to reindoctrination centers.

Simultaneously alert Petropovlovsk police rounded up other criminal members of the Wall Street-financed capitalistic-hoodlum-reactionary - traitor - spy - criminal - reactionary-American plot against the glorious freedoms of the peace-loving Soviet peoples. They were apprehended brazenly decoding the arch-criminal-American Dulles' foul instructions printed in an early edition of the Petropovlovsk Daily Free Soviet People's World.

These traitors have been dealt with appropriately. Their families have been sent to reindoctrination centers. They have voluntarily turned over their possessions to the glorious People's Republic in atonement of their sins.

Long live glorious Comrade Premier Khrushchev and our glorious People's Free Republic.

Forty-first Anniversary of Declaration of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we of the free world should always keep in mind the character of the Government of the U.S.S.R. There are today many who are presently living involuntarily under the domination of this Government. In commemoration of the 41st anniversary of the declaration of the independence of Lithuania—one such nation of captive people—I should like to present for the consideration of my colleagues the following resolution which was adopted on February 15 at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Miami, Fla.:

Resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Miami, Fla., sponsored by the Lithuanian Council of Miami, Fla., and held February 15, 1959, in Miami Lithuanian American Citizens Club, 3655 NW. 34th Street to commemorate the 41st anniversary of the declaration of the independence of Lithuania:

"Whereas in 1940 the Soviet Union in conspiracy with the Hitlerite Germany and in brutal violation of all the treaties and obligations, signed by her, invaded Lithuania with armed forces and against the will of the people, annexed her to the Communist empire; and

"Whereas since that time the freedom of Lithuanian people is suppressed by cruel means of Communist dictatorship which strives to dominate all the world; and

"Whereas the fate of Lithuania as well as of other subjugated eastern European nations will depend on the success of the foreign policy of the United States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this meeting of Loyal Americans of Lithuanian Descent of the city of Miami calls upon the Government of the United States to stand firm against the expansion of Communist imperialism and do all in its power to liberate the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain; be it further

"*Resolved*, That this gathering urges the Government of United States to continue its opposition to the United Nations' Draft Code of offenses which prohibits lending assistance to and liberation of captive nations; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That the Government of the United States refrain from signing any new treaties with the Soviet Union until the latter agrees to restore freedom and sovereign rights to Lithuania and the other enslaved European nations."

LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF MIAMI, FLA.,
ANTANAS ZDANIS,
President.
HELEN VERBELA,
Resolutions Chairman.
MIAMI, FLA., *February 15, 1959.*

Pedernales Soil Conservation District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of us are familiar with the excellent work being performed by the soil conservation districts throughout the Nation.

Those of us from Texas are proud of the constructive and effective program conducted by the officers and members of these districts in our State.

I am particularly proud of the Pedernales Soil Conservation District which is located in the 10th Congressional District of Texas which I am privileged to

represent. This district was named as one of the three outstanding districts in the State of Texas during 1958. I have just received a copy of the annual report of the Pedernales Conservation District and from reading this report I can well understand why it received this splendid recognition.

The Pedernales Soil Conservation District is doing considerable work with the young people living in its area. In addition, the churches in the area are included in its programs. The business people are informed of the work being done.

I believe that this annual report will be of great interest to the Members of Congress. Therefore, I respectfully request that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The report is as follows:

ANNUAL REPORT OF PEDERNALES SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT, 1958

I. The District received its certificate of organization in 1944. Technical assistance was received in 1946. The Board meets regularly on the first Thursday of each month at Johnson City, Tex. In 1958 the Board held 18 regular and called meetings with an average attendance of 85 percent.

II. (a) During 1958, 20 tours and meetings were held with neighborhood groups, rural clubs and other groups of cooperators. The Board of Supervisors participated in 10 of these tours. Other tours outside the District were made by the Supervisors to learn new techniques and enable them to be of better service to the Cooperators. The committees selected by the Board in 1954 are still active and assisting the District. The Legislative Committee has contacted legislators on State appropriations for District needs.

(b) There are 620 operating units in the District with a total of 450,981 acres in farms and ranches. Five hundred eighty-two Cooperators with 440,000 acres of land are actively cooperating with the District. Contacts are made regularly with non-cooperators in an effort to interest them in becoming District Cooperators. Basic conservation plans have been developed on all but 50 of the above agreements.

(c) Considerable work with young people was carried out by the District during the year. Five conservation movies were shown to students this year. Information was furnished the Vocational Agriculture departments of each school for land and grass judging contests. Both schools were urged to write essays for the Fort Worth Press awards program. It is an assignment in the Johnson City school.

(d) The attitude of the business people has been good and they are supporting the District's works. Ads were sold for the District's calendar for the 6th straight year. The District is able to advertise conservation and make a small profit to meet incidental expenses. All business people contacted let the District put displays in their windows during Soil Stewardship Week. Most churches observed Soil Stewardship Sunday in some way. The Board arranged a tour for the ministers so that they could see conservation applied on the land. The District participated in the Fort Worth Press awards program, Goodyear contest, National Farm Life contest, and the Soil Stewardship programs. The District won first place in the Goodyear contest for the second time. This is the seventh consecutive year in which some award has been received by the District.

(e) The district has continued to have a strong publicity and information program. The Johnson City paper carries a regular weekly news column. Feature stories are carried on different practices during the year. Radio stations in San Antonio and Fredericksburg feature the district's news releases on their farm programs. A conservation booth was again erected during the Blanco County Fair and Centennial. To correspond with the centennial, the exhibit was entitled "100 Years of Range Use." Pictures showed the decline of rangelands and then the improvement through the use of improved management practices. Several magazine articles were published concerning conservation carried out by district cooperators.

(f) Statistical report on practice application:

Practice applied in 1958: contour farming, 829 acres; cover cropping, 341 acres; crop residue utilization, 1,002 acres; rotation hay and pasture, 1,237 acres; brush control, 3,386 acres; deferred grazing, 31,235 acres; fertilizing, 283 acres; pasture planting, 444 acres; proper use, 27,764 acres; range seeding, 355 acres; wildlife area improvement, 56 acres; diversion construction, 2.5 miles; ponds, 17; spring development, 1; terracing, 4 miles; fencing, 7 miles; wells, 2; waterways, 3.

Above average rainfall was received in the district for the second year in a row. Some of the rains came as hard downpours with large amounts of runoff. Results from such practices as deferred grazing, proper use, and grass seeding gave good results in most cases. Conservation farming and ranching has continued to pay off for district cooperators. J. J. and J. C. Stewart report that their calves weighed over 550 pounds. Mr. Stewart contributes this to maintaining a cover on the land by proper stocking and to good quality livestock. Bill Stribling again got more than a 100 percent kid crop from his nannies. Good range cover and excellent management during kidding time helped him to obtain this high figure. Willie Haas has continued to improve the physical condition of his soil through the use of soil improving legumes. Hubam clover, alfalfa, and Brabhom peas are used regularly in rotations with other crops. Crop yields have been increased due to improved soil condition and fertility. Melvin Ross seeded a field to blue panic and got good grazing from it during the summer.

(g) All of the appropriated funds have been used to buy equipment for landowners to use. Some of the older equipment was disposed of due to high cost of maintenance. An additional appropriation would enable the district to give more and better service to its cooperators.

(h) Relations with other agencies are good. The Board cooperates with the Lower Colorado River Authority, ASC, FHA, and the Extension Service. These agencies are cooperative at most times and quite helpful to the Board in carrying out its objectives.

III. The attitude and understanding of the cooperators are good. Many have carried out conservation practices this year. As a whole, they have been encouraged by favorable rainfall conditions during the past 2 years. The largest need is for such practices as proper use, deferred grazing, and establishing grass on old fields. The Board feels that a 3-man technical staff is needed to give adequate service to the large number of cooperators. More financial assistance is needed to carry out promotional work and replace worn out equipment.

IV. The Soil Conservation Service personnel spent all their time promoting and assisting with district activities. A total of 25 meetings and tours were held during the year. A large ACP load during most of the year prevented carrying out some of the planned activities.

IRVINE AHRENS,
Chairman, Board of Supervisors, Pedernales Soil Conservation District.

H.R. 2412

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Commander in Chief Thomas Hammond, of the United Spanish War Veterans, who as a boy of 17 fought with the 2d Massachusetts in all the battles around Santiago in Cuba, I have introduced H.R. 2412. As to the merits of this bill, I respectfully urge upon my colleagues the careful reading of the following editorial from the National Tribune of February 19, 1959:

JUST AND GENEROUS

Among the many hardships, which veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Boxer Rebellion, and the Philippine Insurrection suffered were poor rations—at times none at all—and fighting in tropical jungles in climates to which these volunteers were unaccustomed.

As a result of the poor food and campaigns under fierce heat or torrential rains, these campaigns developed many types of disease for which, due to a lack of medical help, they tried to treat themselves.

Even when medical care was available either the element of time coupled with no facilities for keeping records of treatment brought about a situation in which many of these veterans carried for years the residuals of disease, some even to their last days.

This was also true with respect to injuries received in line of duty in service. Failure to keep records resulted in failure on the part of veterans to prove service connection and thus receive proper recompense for their maladies.

A report from the Veterans' Administration shows that on December 20, 1958, there were 41,531 veterans of these campaigns on the VA rolls and of this number only 258 were able to prove service connection for their disabilities.

Under the terms of the World War Veterans Act of 1924 Congress enacted into law a provision whereby veterans of World War I with disabilities not shown to have resulted in service were granted hospitalization in Veterans' Administration hospitals whenever beds were available. A few years later Congress passed an amendment to the World War Veterans Act granting similar privileges to the veterans of 1898–1902.

Both of these provisions were just and reasonable and showed that a grateful nation was willing to discharge its obligation to the men who had fought the Nation's battles.

Only a few years ago Congress, realizing the fact that the absence of medical records in the case of the men of 1898–1902 had prevented practically all of them from proving service-connected disability, passed a law granting service connection for all disabilities to this group for the purpose of receiving outpatient treatment from the Veterans' Administration. This was a step in the right direction and one for which the Congress of the United States received the gratitude of the veterans concerned.

There was introduced in Congress on January 15, a bill—H.R. 2412—by Representative BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois, which would extend to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Rebellion the same eligibility for hospital care for any disability from the

Veterans' Administration as they now enjoy with respect to out-patient medical service.

In view of the service rendered this group of veterans this would seem to be the next logical step in the care of these aged veterans. It is interesting to note that Representative O'HARA is the only veteran of the Spanish-American War in the House of Representatives—one who knows of the hardship his group suffered.

It must be thoroughly understood that H.R. 2412 does not contemplate granting compensation for these disabilities, merely service connection in order to secure immediate hospital care when needed so that these men would not be required to wait weeks, sometimes months, to receive care from the VA whenever a bed was available.

As we have said, this move is the next logical step in the care of these veterans and there are many reasons why it should be made a part of the laws relating to veterans' welfare.

We have already pointed out that the lack of medical records has deprived many of these men of compensation to which they are justly due.

It would appear that inasmuch as Congress admitted that these veterans were service connected for outpatient treatment, they should also be service connected for hospital care.

As was the case for many veterans of later wars, this earlier group gave no thought to securing aid from the Government until their disabilities grew more serious in later years and when they attempted to secure affidavits from comrades to prove their claim they were unable to do so because many of their comrades were dead and the others scattered to all portions of the world.

It must be borne in mind that this older veteran class did not receive the benefits granted to those who served in later wars. They were paid no bonus as were the men of World War I nor was any GI bill of rights enacted to aid them in reestablishing themselves upon their return from service.

As we have also pointed out, they were not given medical care by the Veterans' Administration until some years after such privileges had been granted to the men of World War I.

In other words, these were truly the forgotten men of a country's war—a war which among other things, was the only one which reaped dividends for their country, a war which brought about the construction of the Panama Canal, a war which united the North and the South and improved conditions under which men who wore the uniform in later years served, a war which was the beginning of a standing army which would find the country not entirely unprepared in any future war.

As the latest figures from the Veterans' Administration have shown, there were on the rolls 41,531 of the men who fought from 1898–1902, as of December 20, 1958. Since that date, not quite 2 months ago, hundreds of those then listed have died.

Actually, they are dying at the rate of more than 7,000 a year, and it is sad to contemplate that with another 6 years there will be but a handful left to receive any type of aid from their Government.

For these reasons we believe that enactment of H.R. 2412 into law would be the final action of a grateful country—one that would enable these men, who are now in their eighties, to face the few years remaining to them with the knowledge that they would be certain of hospital care when it was needed. The satisfaction of knowing that their service was recognized in their greatest hour of need should alone be almost sufficient reason for passing H.R. 2412 and we trust that our aging veterans will not be disappointed.

Frank L. Magee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Frank L. Magee, president, director, and member of the executive committee of Aluminum Co. of America, was born April 13, 1896, in Shamokin, Pa., the son of Bethlehem Business College President William F. Magee, and Ida Lillian Boyer Magee.

He attended Bethlehem, Pa., public schools and Bethlehem Preparatory School, and was graduated from Lehigh University in 1917 with a degree in electrical engineering.

In college he was a member of the soccer team and president of the Electrical Engineering Society and Alpha Chi Rho fraternity.

Upon graduation from Lehigh, Mr. Magee joined Alcoa as an apprentice at New Kensington, Pa., but soon entered military service for 2 years' duty in the United States and France as a sergeant in the Army's Signal Corps during World War I.

In 1919, he resumed his Alcoa training program at New Kensington and Pittsburgh, and a year later was assigned to the New Haven, Conn., sales office.

From New Haven, Mr. Magee went to a number of sales offices, including New York City; Edgewater, N.J.; Pittsburgh; and Newark, N.J. He was named manager of the Albany, N.Y., office in 1925.

In 1926, Mr. Magee became a plant representative at Alcoa's Massena, N.Y., works, and assistant product manager for wire, rod, and bar products. From 1929 to 1937, he was district sales manager at Atlanta, Ga.

Subsequently, he served as manager of sheet sales, general production manager, and assistant to the vice president. In 1946, Mr. Magee was elected vice president and general production manager, and in 1952, became a director of Aluminum Co. of America. On April 21, 1955, he was elected executive vice president. In April, 1956, he became a member of Alcoa's executive committee, and in 1957, was elected president. Mr. Magee is also an officer and director of a number of Alcoa subsidiaries.

Mr. Magee was named Pittsburgh's 1958 Man of the Year by the junior chamber of commerce. He was Pittsburgh's United Fund campaign chairman in 1958, and currently is chairman of the finance committee, Pittsburgh Bicentennial Association.

A director of the Presbyterian Hospital, Health and Welfare Federation of Allegheny County, Community Chest of Allegheny County, and Fidelity Trust Co., Mr. Magee also is a corporate trustee of Lehigh University; member of the executive committee, Pennsylvania Economy League, and a member of Oakmont, Pa., County Club. He also is a member of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers, Western Pennsylvania Engineers Society, Longue Vue Country Club, University Club, Rolling Rock Club, Fox Chapel Golf Club, and is a former president and director of Pittsburgh's Duquesne Club.

In 1948, Mr. Magee was awarded the President's Certificate of Merit in recognition of his contribution to the military production effort during World War II.

In 1956, Lehigh University presented him with an honorary degree of doctor of engineering. In 1958, he received the honorary degree of doctor of laws from Maryville, Tenn., College.

Mr. Magee is a member of Calvary Episcopal Church, Pittsburgh.

His first wife, the former Marie Janet Weston, died in 1935. A son, Curtis W. Magee, is attached to Alcoa's Cleveland sales office. In 1938, Mr. Magee married the former Dorothy C. Hurlock, of Pittsburgh. She has two sons by a previous marriage, George L. Hoffman, Jr., and William H. Hoffman, the latter an Alcoan at Lafayette, Ind.

Mr. and Mrs. Magee reside at 301 South Linden Avenue, Pittsburgh.

The following special award winners deserve mention: Peter Muller-Munk, art; Michael Late Benedum, business; C. Lee Rumberger, chemistry; John C. Weaver, communications; Mildred E. Everett, education; Jerome R. Reeves, entertainment; Maurice H. Goldstein, good government; E. E. Moore, human relations; Hal C. Davis, labor; Hon. Hugh C. Boyle, law; Charles Fletcher Lewis, literature; Dr. Edmund R. McCluskey, medicine; Alan G. Nicholas, President's award; Dr. Clarence Zener, science; Daniel Edward Murtaugh, sports.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech by Mr. Magee given at the 19th annual Man of the Year awards dinner:

SPEECH BY F. L. MAGEE GIVEN AT 19TH ANNUAL MAN OF THE YEAR AWARDS DINNER, THURSDAY, JANUARY 29, 1959

The fabric of history is not made by the few whose names have been recorded for posterity. Instead, its strands are the lives of thousands rarely honored nor rewarded for their participation. It is with keen awareness of this fact that I accept the honor you have awarded me tonight.

My embarrassment in accepting this award is somewhat relieved by your parallel and well-deserved recognition of 15 distinguished fellow citizens. I am sure if all 16 of us were asked right now "Who did the most to build up the spirits of Pittsburghers in a year of some discouragements?" we would unanimously vote Danny Murtaugh and his Pirates top Men of the Year.

In all fairness, it must be admitted that my honor tonight resulted largely from the great publicity effort during the united fund campaign. Many of you worked with our team of 38,000 in making the 1958 united fund campaign a success. In a very real sense, you men of the Jaycees are all Men of the Year and share in the awards.

Jaycees have made important contributions, both individually and as a group, to the rebirth of Pittsburgh. You are widely known for your recreation and education program, naturalization ceremonies for new citizens, teenage rodeo, amateur art show, junior golf tournament, and get-out-the-vote drive for Allegheny County. Through

leadership and service, your organization has built an enviable reputation; your active participation in community affairs is a vital element of civic progress.

There are many subjects that would be approriate for a Pittsburgh audience in this bicentennial year. With only limited time available, however, I should like to focus our attention on a single, constructive message that seems vitally important to the future of our area and our Nation. Since the shape of things to come depends so greatly upon our younger generation, I am taking the liberty of directing this message to the organization that is our host.

As a dynamic element of our business economy, the Jaycees are certain to find increasing opportunities for community service. Business and industry have the important responsibility of providing the talent and energy of their leaders to deal with problems which affect the general welfare. Your services will be welcomed and, as you complete your work with the Jaycees, I hope you will be encouraged to seek even greater horizons of responsibility.

Not the least of these responsibilities for members of the business community is that of conveying, through deeds and persuasion, the broader economic understandings of our free enterprise system. Much good can be accomplished through speeches, forums and even indirect financial support of activities that strengthen our heritage of freedom. But there is another form of civic participation in public affairs that I would like to have you consider with me for a few minutes—a form of participation that all too often has been an anathema to the businessman of my generation. I am referring, of course, to personal individual participation in politics.

Active political participation on the part of interested, informed Americans is essential to the survival of the American way of life, as we know and enjoy it. This fact is axiomatic. It is no more true today than it has been in the past, but the disturbing indifference of recent years on the part of good citizens has certainly lent it a sense of urgency.

Broad participation in politics—regardless of party affiliation—is the substructure of good government. Politics, in this sense, is the basis of our democratic way of life—the machinery that offers the privilege of dissenting—that collective personality that achieves conclusions through an interchange of differing concepts and opinions. If you want to share in this all-important process, I urge each of you to become as active as possible in the party of your choice.

To the framers of our Constitution, politics was a living reality. They themselves spent much of their lives and substance in the performance of political responsibilities they regarded as supremely important. You may all remember the familiar story told about Benjamin Franklin, who was present at the critical moment in history when our Government was being established. As he left the session, Franklin was besieged by anxious citizens with questions. "Mr. Franklin," shouted one questioner, "do we have a monarchy or a republic?" Franklin's answer was a challenge to which every generation must respond: "You have a republic, if you can keep it."

In no way do I discount the many selfless public servants who are devoting their lives to this cause. Each one who does his part is worthy of commendation, regardless of political affiliation. But the general public apathy where political affairs are concerned is a well-known, though deplorable fact. Today, we still have a Republic in form, but somewhere along the line, we have lost much of the substance.

One highly important aspect of participation, of course, is voting. But voting alone is not enough. The ballot is simply the visible end product of our political system—somewhat like the glittering automobile body that is lowered into place in the final stage of assembly. The all-important political machinery of our Republic functions—like the motor under the hood—quietly and out of sight. The real power behind the ballot is an active, informed citizenry, and an alert, devoted group of elected officials.

Our first duty is to learn as much as possible about the machinery of government, and the needs and responsibilities of the communities in which we live. No voter, and certainly no public servant can perform his role intelligently without acquiring as much information on each issue as he can obtain; an uninformed voter may be even more harmful than a nonvoter. Armed with this information, we must then be willing to use our influence to the utmost and, if necessary, bear the burden of office.

Our second, but no less important duty is to take an active, personal interest in the political affairs of our community. If we want good laws in this country, it is timely that the businessman should give his attention to two participants in our governmental system which are nearest to the level where the lawmaking process begins: namely, the precinct captain and the county chairman. Any lawmaker will tell you that in his confusion of pressures from organized groups—whether they be identified with business, labor, farmer, or any other vocal element—he ultimately returns to the grassroots politician for his guidance. If more Americans were concerned with what takes place in their local political organizations, we might have a better choice of candidates, and more effective laws.

The tendency to observe rather than participate is one of the greatest dangers that our free society must face. In reality, political inactivity is alien to the concept on which our Government was based. Our Constitution and Bill of Rights assume that free men can and must work out their mutual destinies—not as victims, but as masters of their political system. If this theory is to function as it was intended, we must not be satisfied with the role of an observer, a Monday morning quarterback or an armchair general.

The willingness of citizens who are not professional politicians to enter politics has been one of the great strengths of our republic. Wherever freedom has been won or retained, people have always thought it worth the price of personal sacrifice. Even though political activity sometimes requires sacrifice, it rewards are great. For it provides the opportunity to perform dedicated public service, and to maintain confidence in popular government.

Win or lose, a good candidate contributes greatly to the democratic process—by informing the public and by putting the opposition on its mettle. Moreover, the example of a respected, qualified citizen participating in an election is far more effective than mere exhortation in combating the inertia of fellow citizens.

Groups of various kinds have a significant and important role in politics, but they cannot substitute for individual participation. And selfish minority pressure groups can cause the passage of laws which transgress the rights of individual citizens in opposition to the concept of constitutional liberties.

The way to make our representative form of Government work is for civic-minded individuals to replace political opportunists as office-seekers. I trust that you who are members of the Jaycee organization will consider this a challenge, for if enough people of your experience and ability become active participants in Government, we have no need to fear the future.

Frank Galliano Dies, Beloved Union Advocate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, last week a friendly, understanding, and gentle man passed on in the Providence Hospital, Oakland, Calif. James Frank Galliano had long been a leader among the liberal thinking people of Alameda County, Calif. He was a lawyer who specialized in labor law and was the counselor of the Central Labor Council for over two decades.

"Gally," as he was familiarly known to thousands of people, was one of those spontaneous individuals who was never too busy to greet his friends or never too much in a hurry to do them a favor. He was an understanding man and loved by all.

Some 8 years ago he was appointed as a commissioner of the port of Oakland and continued to serve in that capacity until his death.

James F. Galliano will be missed in the Oakland scene.

I make part of these remarks an article which appeared in the East Bay Labor Journal for Friday, February 20, paying tribute to him:

FRANK GALLIANO DIES, BELOVED UNION ADVOCATE

James Frank Galliano died in Providence Hospital early Tuesday at the age of 63.

The night before, at the meeting of the Central Labor Council, when Secretary Robert S. Ash told the delegates that the beloved union advocate, counselor of the CLC for two decades, was very ill, a great sigh went through the room. For everybody knew Frank Galliano, and some of those present thought of troublous days in the thirties, when "Gally," as many affectionately called him, was in effect godfather to their union.

Ash paused a moment after making the painful announcement, paused to get control of his voice, and then added that "any of you who pray, pray for Frank Galliano, that he may stay with us."

But already the counselor, who had been found unconscious on the floor of his bedroom by his wife Emilie early Monday morning, was very near death, and earnest prayers were unavailing.

The funeral services were scheduled for Thursday, February 19, at 10 a.m., at the Laurel chapel of the Albert Engle Mortuary Co., the rosary was recited the evening before at the chapel.

The counselor is survived by his wife Emilie, and by a son, Traynor Galliano, and by a grandson.

Galliano was a graduate of the Stanford University Law School, and was admitted to the bar in 1925. A lieutenant in the U.S. Infantry in World War I, he attended Trinity College, Dublin, for a year after the war.

Many of the labor people who were active in this area in the thirties remember how unfailingly Galliano stood by them in those difficult days. Among those who knew him so well at that time were Charles Wagner of the Butchers, Otto Munschner of the Bakers, Bill Franklin and Fred Irvin and Bill Conboy of the Teamsters, Ernie Vernon of the Auto-

motive Machinists, Jim Suffridge of the Food Clerks, and of course G. A. Silverthorn and the late Bill Spooner, secretaries of the Central Labor Council.

Galliano was made counselor to the Central Labor Council in 1939, and had continued as that to the day of his death. He was appointed to the Oakland Port Commission in 1947 by the then mayor of Oakland, Joseph E. Smith, and was still a member of the commission at the time of his passing.

Repeatedly Galliano won cases for unions which established principles for dealing with labor cases in California jurisprudence.

One famous case was that of the Food Clerks and Guy's Drug Stores years ago involving the question of picketing and other important points. Over in San Francisco, M. O. Tobriner was handling a similar case for the Auto Salesmen against the Howard Auto Co. Galliano and Tobriner pooled their abilities in these cases and won for the unions.

Another famous case involved a dairy in Stockton and this one was won by Galliano for the Teamsters. Bill Conboy has vivid memories of this case.

Galliano's relationship with the Retail Clerks was very close. In 1937 he was instrumental in landing a good basic contract for the Food Clerks and he kept a fatherly eye on all their doings ever since. Some years ago, when Dave Beck was at the height of his power, it was Galliano who supplied the legal acumen and the friendly patience through the great struggle in the courts with Safeway.

No one familiar with the labor movement in Alameda County would ever make the mistake of thinking of Frank Galliano as just one more labor lawyer. He was so much more. He was the union advocate in every sense of the word, their skilled legal advocate, but, so much more than that, their advocate for a place in the sun and for an honorable place in American society.

Galliano, in line with his feeling he had for unions as children of his heart and, so many of them, as offspring of his powerful intellect, did not believe that a lawyer achieved greatness by the size of his fees. As a matter of fact, some members of the famous closed shop of lawyers had a feeling that on occasion, when a union was poor and in a desperate plight, Galliano would hand out some free advice of priceless value to the struggling organization. At any rate, all realized that wealth was not Galliano's prime interest. His profound interest was not in money, but in people, the people in the unions. His heart was in the "good and welfare of the union" part of the agenda.

It is already, long since, written firmly into the invisible heartfelt minutes of the unions of Alameda County that goodness and greatness were the traits of James F. Galliano. And now that he is gone those traits are remembered and lovingly dwelt upon.

Washington State Legislature Pays Tribute to First Woman To Represent State in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives of the State of Washington by formal resolution has honored our colleague, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

This resolution speaks for itself especially as it is a tribute to a Republican from a legislative body two-thirds Democratic.

Under unanimous consent, I include the resolution for printing in the RECORD immediately following these remarks:

Whereas Congresswoman CATHERINE MAY of Yakima has been recently elected from the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington to the U.S. House of Representatives, being the first woman from the State of Washington to be elected to the U.S. Congress, and

Whereas CATHERINE MAY ably served three terms as a Member of the House, contributing to the progress of the State in many ways, and particularly in her dedicated efforts to improve the institutional programs and the programs for retarded children, and

Whereas, during these three terms the Members of both parties of the House have developed a very real affection for CATHERINE and a great admiration for her ability and effectiveness and her friendliness and charm, and

Whereas CATHERINE MAY has made a unique achievement in combining a successful political career with a successful career as a wife and mother: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the house of representatives do hereby express to CATHERINE MAY their deep appreciation for her past assistance and contributions to the State and their warmest wishes for all success in her new position; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to Congresswoman CATHERINE MAY, and to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

America's Outstanding Democrat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a well-deserved editorial on America's outstanding Democrat, National House Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK:

AMERICA'S OUTSTANDING DEMOCRAT: MCCORMACK ROLE AS LEADER CITED

(By Frank Daley)

Propelled by the positive conviction—based on 1958 election returns from countless American communities—that our public needs are only adequately met under the guidance of Democratic leadership, the Democratic Party has never had a more brilliant future. Nor has it ever had the certain assurance of continuity in office and for greater gains in State and national offices as it now faces.

The net gains made by the Democratic Party in the 1958 elections of 6 Governorships, 15 U.S. Senate seats, 47 House seats, and 12 State legislatures, presents a political picture of the thinking public.

It brings forth the resentment of the people against the Republican blueprint for stagnation program and the approval of the more positive and vigorous action of Democratic leadership to make democracy work as an instrument to promote human happiness.

When we think of Democratic leadership, its only natural to think of the leader of leaders, the National House Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK. No other Democrat has done more for the Democratic Party in the past 25 years or was more responsible for the party's landslide victories in the last November elections than Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

He sponsored or directed the enactment into law which gave labor the right to organize although 94 percent of the House G.O.P. voted no.

Congressman MCCORMACK has played a vital and extremely effective role in having enacted into law social security, minimum wage, and fair working conditions, and he has been a part, a prominent part, in every major legislation enacted into law which provided economical, education and social gains for the people during the past 25 years.

It should be noted that 93 percent of the House G.O.P. voted no against social security, 61 percent of the House G.O.P. voted no on minimum wage and 80 percent of the G.O.P. House voted to oppose fair working conditions.

The House, in fact, was once the breeding place for Presidents. During the first 8 decades of the Constitution, 12 of the 25 Presidents could look back to service in the House. Years later came the first national conventions, and gradually the nominating machinery passed into the hands of leaders outside Congress.

The tremendous victory for the Democrats last November, when it is all said and done, adds up to one simple fact and that is, the elections proved that Americans do not want a veto of the 20th century.

An amazing thing is, from what the Republicans have been saying since last November 4, it does not appear that they have even yet grasped this simple fact. Perhaps they never will.

Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, during their entire modern history Estonians have enjoyed national independence for a very short time, for only two decades. After living under the mild sovereignty of the Swedes during the 16th and 17th centuries, and after enduring the oppressive regime of the Russian czars in the 18th and 19th centuries, early in the 20th they attained their freedom and national independence toward the end of the First World War. That was the culmination of their long struggles, and the realization of their national dream. When the autocratic Russian regime was shattered, they proclaimed their independence and on February 24, 1918, established the Estonian Republic. Thenceforth in the midst of hard but pleasant work, they all were happy and joyful in their homeland. And all seemed to be going well for about two decades. Then the evil forces of the world were let loose; the Second World War started, and the Estonians, with a host of other countries, saw the doom of their independent status as a nation and the loss of freedom as individuals. In 1940 Estonia was overrun by the Red

Army and in July the country was annexed to the Soviet Union.

Since then, for almost two decades, Estonians have been suffering under totalitarian dictatorship, and have been bearing the brunt of alien philosophies imposed upon them by godless Communists. In this indescribable suffering all seems gloomy, and the immediate future does not look bright. But these courageous and tough fighters for freedom, long schooled in adversity, cling tenaciously to their ideals of freedom and never entertain any doubt about the victory of their righteous cause, the cause of freedom and independence. On this 41st anniversary celebration of their independence day we can heartily echo their genuine and patriotic sentiments and hope for the realization of their goal.

H.R. 209 and H.R. 210

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, unless we do something about it, and do it quickly, new slums will spring up in our big cities as quickly as we remove the old slums. All the money and effort we are spending on urban renewal programs, laudable as is their purpose, will be wasted if we do not provide means of financing and the incentive for the modernization of residences in districts, once most desirable, that step by step are approaching the slum state. All that is needed to restore them to their former state of high desirability for family homes is a program such as envisioned by H.R. 209 and H.R. 210, which I introduced early in the session and on which I hope the Banking and Currency Committee, operating through its very efficient Housing Subcommittee, will schedule public hearings at the very earliest date possible. This is an entirely new approach to a solution of the problem of the slums. It furnishes a preventative remedy and is based upon modern medical thought that the best way to cure an illness is to prevent it.

In drafting H.R. 209 and H.R. 210 I was aided by the findings and recommendations of the Shinner Foundation of Chicago, which made an exhaustive nationwide study of the causes of slums and their prevention. If our big cities are to escape the spread of the "gray belt of decay to the city limits" envisioned by Dr. Raymond Vernon in an article by Homer Bigart in the New York Times of February 22, 1959, it is imperative that we step on the gas and quickly enact H.R. 209 and H.R. 210. The article from the New York Times follows:

SPREAD OF SLUMS IN CITY FORESEEN

(By Homer Bigart)

Slums will march from downtown business districts to the suburbs in New York and 12 other major cities, according to a paper published yesterday by the Committee for Economic Development.

This gloomy evaluation was made by Dr. Raymond Vernon, director of the New York Metropolitan Region Study. He saw a "gray belt" of urban decay spreading from downtown skyscrapers to the city line.

He also saw scant prospect of arresting the flight of middle-income families to the suburbs. When this group abandons an area, he said, the vacated buildings are converted to intensive low-income use. Thus the wave of slums moves gradually outward to the edges of the city and into the older portions of suburban towns.

STUDIES POPULATION TRENDS

The Committee for Economic Development is a business research and policy group consisting of 150 leading business executives and educators. Its main purpose is to explore national economic problems in the hope of establishing sound policies for the guidance of our economic life.

Dr. Vernon has been engaged since 1956 in various studies of the New York metropolitan area sponsored by the Harvard Graduate School of Business. He is attempting to project the economic and population trends of this area for the next 25 years.

About the only comfort he could offer the cities was: There will always be a downtown.

Downtown will keep its vitality as a center for finance and amusement, Dr. Vernon said, as well as for the sale of products and services that involve a great deal of comparative shopping.

But even the affinity of the financial community for downtown areas may be weakened by the redistribution of population, he warned.

INSURANCE COMPANIES CITED

Insurance companies, for example, he noted, put their main offices in cities where a large pool of literate women clerks is available. However, he said, as the central cities decline in population and as Negroes and other groups with more restricted job opportunities dominate the remaining population, young women who form the labor force for the insurance companies tend to move to the suburbs.

With commuting distances lengthening and mass transit facilities deteriorating in most cities, he warned, downtown may cease to be the best point for recruiting the preferred office labor force.

Moreover, he said, a considerable segment of banking activity has followed the general outward redistribution of population and jobs.

Still, he said he expected continued vitality downtown because office activities would expand even though "the central cities may not capture quite as high a proportion of such activity as they have in the past."

It was the rest of the city, the "gray belt", that seemed doomed to Dr. Vernon. For this area he predicted only a growing obsolescence.

He saw the blight spreading outward from the old slum districts where there has been a sharp decline in population.

MOVEMENT OF SLUMS

The old slums, he explained in an interview, are now inhabited by a growing proportion of aged couples whose children have moved to other areas. Although population is down, there are few vacancies in the tenements. Consequently the low-income groups are settling in brownstones vacated by middle-income families.

In this expanding gray area Dr. Vernon predicted in his report a long-run decline in the intensive use of space as sites for homes and jobs. The high cost of recapturing obsolescent factory sites would rule out the return of industries, he believed.

He cited two possibilities for arresting slum growth: a return in great numbers of middle-income families to the city and government subsidies to low-income housing or park projects. He discounted the first possibility by saying that such a movement would fly in the face of deep-seated historical trends based on powerful sociological forces.

The use of Government subsidies would require a scale of intervention much larger than any previously contemplated, he said.

Examining the comparative advantages to industry of locating in the city or in the suburbs, Dr. Vernon said that the old multistory mill-style building found in the cities was inappropriate to assembly-line techniques and other developments in handling materials.

FACTORY STRUCTURES CHANGE

The preferred type of structure is a long one-story building requiring large sites with the easy possibility of expansion—sites that usually cannot be found in the cities.

Small plants are still being pulled to the central city, but the big ones are being pushed away, Dr. Vernon said. One reason is that the size and internal organization of the big plants has freed them from dependence on many of the services in the congested areas that the smaller competitors find indispensable.

"This independence of larger firms from their environment is reflected," he said, "in a dozen different ways—in their reliance on truckload, instead of less-than-truckload, freight; in their ability to install their own transformers; in their ability to provide their own protective services, and so on."

Eventually the big cities of America will lose large manufacturing plants and become more and more like Manhattan, an island of office workers, he predicted.

His conclusions were pessimistic:

"The outward movement of people will be matched by an outward movement of jobs. Retail trade will follow the populations. Manufacturing and wholesaling establishments will continue to respond to obsolescence by looking for new quarters and by renting in structures in the suburban industrial areas where obsolescence is less advanced. The movement of jobs will reinforce the movement of residences."

Dr. Vernon's study was confined to the New York area, but he stressed that the same problems were to be found in 12 other major cities—Baltimore, Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and San Francisco.

Cuba Revisited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I delivered last Saturday night in Santiago de Cuba in Oriente Province, Cuba. I was invited to speak there under the sponsorship of the Committee for the Industrialization and Progress of Santiago. However, representatives attended the dinner meeting from a number of other organizations including the 20–30 Club, the Rotary, the Lions Club, and the chamber of commerce. In all, some 250 businessmen attended in the dining room of the Casa Grande Hotel. The hospitality of Santiago was typically Cuban—that is, wonderful and gracious.

CASTRO'S CUBA: A CHALLENGE FOR CUBANS AND AMERICANS

I am sure that a year ago, I could not have addressed you as I am today. In the first place, I am sure Fulgencio Batista would not have permitted an invitation to be extended. In the second place, I am told that your organization, as a demonstration of protest against Batista's tyrannical regime, had refused to convene any meeting or hold elections until civil liberties were restored. Your distinguished president informs me that this is your first meeting of 1959 in free Cuba. Let me say, therefore, that all of us owe a debt of gratitude to Fidel Castro.

Cuba is called the Pearl of the Antilles; she is described as one of the most beautiful islands in the Americas, but how much more beautiful she is now that freedom is restored. Yet, what Castro has won for the Cuban people is but a promise of what great expectations lie ahead.

It is customary in speeches by visiting politicians from one foreign country to another to stress traditional ties. Sometimes this is done as nothing more than a gesture, a courtesy extended as a matter of form. With me, I assure you, it is not merely a formality when I say that Fidel Castro has done more than perhaps any other Cuban to stir the consciences and emotions of the American people and to remind your friends to the north of the deep-rooted historic ties of friendship that bind Cuba and the United States. Ours is a relationship born in a common tradition. It is a tradition of democratic idealism, of revolution. Castro has captured the spirit of that tradition of democratic idealism and has elevated it to a new level of prominence not only throughout the Western Hemisphere but also throughout the world.

More than anything else the spirit of democratic idealism, it seems to me, was one of the primary motivating forces underlying Castro's 26th of July movement. There is something remarkably attractive about the drive, the dedication, the sense of nationality of all these men. A year ago they were regarded in some countries as a group of dreamy idealists caught up in a hopeless cause, adventurers of a sort guided more by self-delusion than by any serious, genuine compulsion. Yet, against apparent overwhelming odds the men of this movement have succeeded with almost miraculous speed in sweeping away a regime of terror, violence, and corruption. Press reports in the United States have stressed the totality of Cuban support behind the Castro forces. This was, indeed, a national revolution; of dimensions like that of the Mexican Revolution. Perhaps, this fact coupled with the democratic idealism that is at the heart of the 26th of July movement and the leadership of a young Oriente lawyer, driven by an inner compulsion to bring democracy to his people, were more responsible than anything else for the success of democracy in Cuba and the overthrow of the Batista regime.

At first, many persons in my country were shocked by what seemed to be the excesses of the Castro forces. The belief became widespread that a virtual reign of terror was being directed against the Batista followers. It was difficult for them to comprehend the reality of the situation. They had had insufficient evidence of Batista's oppression. It was difficult to grasp the seeming contradiction of a democratic leader governing in apparent irresponsibility, and, as it seemed to them, governing ruthlessly. Americans neither understood the implications of this crisis nor the complications engendered by a nation caught up in violent revolution. Nor did they understand that the pent up indignation of a morally sensitive, oppressed people had to have some outlet, and that the public trial of known murderers was in fact a safety valve for a nation that demanded retribution against its oppressors.

Now, I believe, the American people realize the magnitude and the high morality of the 26th of July movement. Gradually the knowledge is becoming more widespread in the United States that these revolutionaries are not a rabble in arms but are a restrained, disciplined, and dedicated group of patriots who have the overwhelming support of the Cuban people and who are trying under great difficulties to bring to Cuba genuine democracy. The norteamericanos are becoming more and more conscious of the great problems facing your young lawyer and as a consequence a genuine feeling of sympathy and understanding seems to be taking shape.

Certainly, Cubans do not have to be reminded of the great political and economic problems besetting their new government. In any revolution there always follows a difficult period of adjustment once the fighting has stopped and the tyrant has been overthrown. The legacy of the old regime is always a tremendous burden for the new government. The general problem of firmly establishing the legitimacy of the new government in a period of transition is fraught with grave dangers. The problem of reconciling the broadening of democracy with the necessity of maintaining a steady, centralized authority to insure public order and national progress, all in a revolutionary atmosphere, is a tremendous task for any new government. In our own national history it took almost a decade to establish a viable constitutional order after our war of liberation.

Nor are the economic problems facing Fidel Castro and the Cuban people any less burdensome. The economic legacy of the Batista regime would certainly be sufficiently oppressive to crush the enthusiasm of a far less devoted and energetic leader. Corruption and waste had completely enveloped the Batista regime. It is said that many Batista officials deposited millions of dollars in United States and Swiss banks. I hasten to add, money that was taken from the Cuban people. It is also reported that Batista himself has set aside upward of $200 million to $600 million for himself, for the most part no doubt in Swiss numbered accounts, before his flight to the Dominican Republic—again, money that belongs to the Cuban people, and which, by the way, I am encouraging our Government to locate and return if at all possible.

The war for Cuban liberation has also added to the great economic burden. Destruction by the revolution has been estimated at an insured cost of about $15 million. Damage and destruction to railroad bridges, and other means of transport and communication has been extensive. In all, the Government faces a staggering national debt of some $1,500 million.

The political and economic problems facing the Castro government are great, but they are not impossible. From abroad one gets the impression that political stability and orderly government prevails in Cuba. This is a happy beginning because out of political stability economic and social progress will emerge and flourish. Unless he removed himself entirely from politics for a while, Fidel Castro was right to assume the premiership and to participate actively in the management of governmental affairs. Political responsibility, it seems to me, cannot be disassociated from political authority. To govern effectively, and efficiently, responsibility and authority must be indivisible. He now has both the actual and the legal authority.

It is gratifying also to hear that the Castro government is planning extensive reforms within Cuba. Certainly plans for agrarian reforms calling for the distribution of government land to the people, proposals to ease unemployment, and the reorganization of the government and the army will be widely acclaimed in the United States and elsewhere as demonstrations of the genuine democratic idealism of the Castro movement.

Serious problems face Fidel Castro and the Cuban people in their quest for a solid democratic order. Yet, I am confident they will meet the challenges thrust upon them. Certainly, the United States can do much to make these challenges more bearable. I am gratified by the speed with which the United States recognized the Castro government, and I am equally gratified to know that our Ambassador to free Cuba, Philip Wilson Bonsal, is a man who knows Latin America and has a genuine sympathetic understanding of the problems that beset the area. His position with respect to dictators is unequivocal. He doesn't like them.

Problems are bound to arise in Cuban-American relations and the great burdens borne by Castro and his Cuban people are not mainly the concern of persons solely in executive authority. It is important, of course, that understandings be reached on the government level, but it is even more important, I believe, that as a people, we in the United States should more clearly understand the real meaning of the July 26th movement, not only for Cuba, but also for the Western Hemisphere and even the whole world. It is well, it seems to me, that we should think of Cuba and recent events here in the broad perspective of Latin American affairs.

The winds of democracy are blowing fresh and vigorous throughout Latin America. The Cuban experience is not only the most recent, but the most dramatic, demonstration of the rollback of totalitarianism in the Western Hemisphere. The Cuban revolution is the fulfillment of a dream of a great leader; it is the rededication of a people to democracy. There is, of course, no way of measuring the impact upon the world this event has made, but I am sure that the emergency of a democratic Cuba gives cause for grave concern to all dictators whether of the left or the right, not that Cuba could ever be a physical threat to them, but that Cuba can be the symbol of what they fear most, the rule of the people.

We in the United States are beginning to see the deep implications of the 26th of July movement, and many of us, indeed I hope all of us, are trying in every way to make the golden opportunity of Castro's revolution a reality. As a Nation we must maintain an undiminished confidence in the Cuban people to achieve a genuine democratic order. We must work desperately hard on the practical level to help the Cuban people succeed.

We can give Castro undiminished support in the solution of his political problems but there is also much to be done on the economic side. Here, the United States is prepared to help Cuba in this period of revolutionary transition. American economic aid to the Batista regime had been negligible. If I had had my way, there would have been none, economic or military. Even the military aid, which regrettably was given and widely publicized, actually amounted to very little. In the past a small technical assistance program operated in Cuba costing an average of $500,000 a year. At present only 12 technicians are active in Cuba under this program. These technical assistance activities carried on by the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) were designed to aid in the solution of specific problems in the Cuban economy. The broad objective of the program was, however, to point up the spirit of mutual cooperation between the people of Cuba and the United States. Specifically, the program was geared to consultation and in-service training of personnel in agriculture with a view to increasing production of a variety of crops such as tomatoes, cucumbers, cacao, coffee, and tropical fruits for domestic consumption and also for export. This operation undoubtedly

contributed to Cuba's economic welfare and diversification. It is even said that production of some crops has increased to such an extent that some imports are no longer needed and small amounts of produce are being exported.

Assistance has also been given in Cuba's mining industry. A civilian aviation project, we hope, has been helpful in working with the Cuban Aeronautical Commission on technical matters such as air traffic control, air safety, equipment procurement, and training. This project has aided in improving air safety and contributed to the growth of Cuban aviation. The technical assistance program has also contributed to improvements in Cuba in the education of aircraft mechanics and the technical advice in public administration provided to the census and statistics services of the Cuban Government in preparation of the coming 1960 census. These activities were carried on throughout all Cuba. I would like to note particularly that a U.S. technician has carried on some specific research work in Cacao here in Oriente Province.

Cuba has, however, received no grant aid from ICA and no loans from the Development Loan Fund. On the other hand, she has received credits from the Export-Import Bank. The most recent of these in the last 8 years was the $17,500,000 credit to expand Cuba's telephone system, an installation that should be of benefit to large numbers of people regardless of the regime which ruled here.

On the whole, official American aid activity in Cuba appears to have been very small, although, of course, private investment of U.S. capital has been substantial. According to one estimate, the total U.S. investment in Cuba is more than $1 billion. Apparently, there was at first some concern in American business circles during the change in governments, but the promise of Provisional President Manuel Urrutia to "actively encourage" U.S. investments in Cuba undoubtedly has reassured the fearful. Reportedly, the system of graft prevailing under the Batista regime has been a deterrent to investment capital, but recently one American businessman was quoted as saying, in reference to the Castro government, "With an honest government, this island could be an economic paradise—it could go ahead and realize its potential." It is possible that if the revolution can be consolidated efficiently and in order and political stability achieved along the lines Castro has promised, Cuba may well become an economic paradise and the development of its great economic potential a reality.

In conclusion, and in all humility, I want to make three suggestions for your consideration, as you go ahead to build a free, honest, and prosperous Cuba.

First, realize that you have the sympathy and support of my country. Call on us for assistance, whether it be more food and clothing for impoverished victims of the revolution, advice on how to attract and hold new industries, or ideas from our experiences how best to solve various social problems. We don't pretend to have all the resources or answers but please realize, as many of you do, our wish to help you establish yourselves in freedom and prosperity.

Second, don't expect too much too soon from the revolution. Insist on civil liberties, yes, and preparations for free elections, but do not expect increased profits and higher wages for everyone immediately. It is one thing to topple a dictatorship, another to build a democracy. Freedom means the right, indeed often the duty, to criticize. It means being able to disagree without being disagreeable. Sometimes it looks awfully sloppy and disorganized, but no better method has been devised for human happiness and governmental strength.

Here I want to leave Cuba a moment and talk about proposals by Cuban and Venezuelan leaders to kick the tyrannies out of the Organization of American States. Certainly this is something to discuss at Quito next year when the O.A.S. convenes there. For my part I believe in universal membership in international organizations, but of course with constant reminders of and obedience to the governing charters. Article 5, part (d), of the O.A.S. charter reads as follows:

"The solidarity of the American States and the high aims which are sought through it require the political organization of those States on the basis of the effective exercise of representative democracy."

I am reliably informed that the O.A.S. at Quito will have an opportunity to consider a concrete, specific definition of "the effective exercise of representative democracy," a yardstick which would disclose at once the respective shortcomings of Trujillo, Stroesner, Somoza, and Duvalier.

It can't all be done in a day—but it will be done if Cubans exercise self-control, tolerance, a sense of humor, and faith in democracy.

Finally, and this injunction is also not needed by most of you, beware of Communists who would try to make you believe they speak as Cubans, Cubans devoted to Cuba and speedy social and economic changes. Communists, of course, thrive on disorganization and are trained to take advantage of it. Their social justice anti-U.S.A. and pro-Cuba themes should fool no one, certainly not any Cuban who hated Batista and would fight against the resurgence of his counterpart in Cuban politics. Cuba's destiny is not that of Hungary today, Hungary where a local revolt cannot win because of the Soviet Union's intercession from outside its borders.

In Oregon, my home State, last week I heard Vice President NIXON—with whom I often do not agree—say something we all might ponder: "We should be more concerned about the meaning of the American Revolution," he said, "and less afraid of the Russian revolution." High officials in our Department of State would do well to heed the Vice President's timely advice.

In the final analysis, therefore, the greatest burden seems to rest upon Fidel Castro and his associates. In a very real sense he is a man of destiny; for if he fulfills the promise of his revolution and succeeds in imparting throughout all Cuba the zeal, the energy, the dedication to duty, and the democratic idealism that is so much part of his personality, there can be no doubt that Cuba and her people will emerge in a new age of progress and prosperity. But, we must all be patient with this man; as he himself recently said: "I am a man, not a god. We cannot do everything in 1 day." Indeed he can't do everything in 1 day. Nor can he do what is to be done without the support of the Cuban people and his friends in the Western Hemisphere. I do not doubt for one mintue that Fidel Castro has the overwhelming support of the Cuban people. Nor do I doubt that there are millions of my own countrymen who feel as I do that this man deserves the sympathy and support of our Nation.

Fidel Castro has advanced the trend toward total hemispheric democracy one more significant step. Neither we in the United States, nor you in Cuba can permit him to fail, for, after all, he is the symbol of what all of us desire most: a world of freemen.

Prompt Start on Libby Dam—Resolution of Montana Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Montana's 36th Legislative Assembly has sent a joint memorial to the Congress in support of legislation providing for a prompt start on Libby Dam, the most important multipurpose project remaining to be built in the Pacific Northwest.

Libby, a $285 million project, would rise in the Kootenai River in northwestern Montana. It would back up 5,985,000 acre-feet of flood control storage, or more than one-fifth of the 27 million acre-feet of upstream storage which the Corps of Engineers says is necessary to control floods of record in the Columbia River Basin.

In addition to its ultimate installed generating capacity of 800,000 kilowatts of power, the corps project would provide regulated streamflow to add 805,000 kilowatts of energy to production at Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph, the Dalles, and Bonneville Dams. It is estimated that another 90,000 kilowatts would be generated in Canada by Libby storage. Libby also would provide substantial recreation, navigation, wildlife, and other conservation benefits.

The project was authorized by Congress in 1950. But, because this major unit in the Columbia River power and flood-control program would back up a reservoir into Canada, its construction is contingent upon an agreement with Canada under terms of the Boundary Water Treaty, signed on January 11, 1909, by the United States and Canada. Canadian representatives on the International Joint Commission have refused to approve the project, meantime proceeding with studies of development plans which could shut off the water of the Kootenai in the United States.

Proposed Canadian diversions of the Kootenai north of the border could cut the average annual flow of the river at the Libby site by more than 70 percent, thus making the project unfeasible.

Instead of sitting around until Canada shuts the water off, I propose to amend the authorization to provide for construction of the dam in two stages. The first stage would back water up to the Canadian border. The second stage would be added when agreement is reached with Canada. This measure, H.R. 3339, is sponsored in the Senate by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

We have the assurance from the Corps of Engineers that the two-stage construction idea is sound engineering.

It will take about 3½ years to do the detailed planning and design work. Agreement with Canada while this planning work is going on could speed up completion of this needed project by up to 3 years.

House Joint Memorial No. 3 of the 36th Montana Legislative Assembly follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

Introduced by Shelden (Lincoln), Jensen, Helding, Gill, Broeder, Harball, and Tonner

A joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower; the Congress of the United States; James E. Murray and Mike Mansfield, Senators from the State of Montana; Lee Metcalf and Leroy Anderson, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana; the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate; the Committee on Public Works of the United States House of Representatives; the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate; the Committee on Appropriations of the United States House of Representatives; the Secretary of the Army, Wilber M. Brucker; the Chief of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner; and the Director of the Budget, Maurice H. Stans; urging construction of Libby Dam in two stages, with work beginning on the initial stage as soon as possible in order to protect the national interest in water and water resources rising in the United States; and requesting sufficient appropriations so that detailed planning and design work can begin immediately

Whereas Libby Dam site is located in Lincoln County in western Montana and Libby Dam will be constructed across the Kootenai River some 15 miles upstream from Libby, Mont.; and

Whereas preliminary geological and engineering investigation and planning of the Libby Dam project have been carefully completed and the findings compiled; and

Whereas Libby Dam, the biggest storage project remaining to be built in the Pacific Northwest, will be designed to provide flood control, hydroelectric power, recreation and navigation benefits to Montana, the Pacific Northwest and the Nation; and

Whereas the Libby project's tremendous storage of water—5,985,000 acre-feet—would provide valuable flood control for several hundred miles along the Kootenai and Columbia Rivers and also would substantially aid flood control and navigation on the Columbia River below Pasco, Wash.; and

Whereas Libby Dam will have an initial installed electric generating capacity of 600,000 kilowatts, an ultimate installation of 800,000 kilowatts of power, which Montana and the Northwest need to bring in new industry; and

Whereas Libby Dam storage would also firm up power production in the projects downstream on the Columbia River; would provide a regulated streamflow which would add 805,000 kilowatts to the production at Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph, McNary, the Dalles, and Bonneville dams; and

Whereas no other proposed single dam on the Columbia River system would provide for generation of as much salable power at site and downstream; and

Whereas the rapidly increasing population of the Pacific Northwest and the Nation places upon this generation a special responsibility for the maximum utilization of all the great natural resources bestowed upon this country by divine providence; and

Whereas any lesser development of the Libby damsite would result in great loss of storage capacity and both at-site and downstream power benefits, which can create thousands of jobs urgently needed to provide for our burgeoning population and the future defense and welfare of our region and the Nation; and

Whereas the Pacific Northwest is isolated from the major population centers of the Nation by great distances and high freight rates and must rely upon the full development of its own natural resources in providing for its future growth and economic welfare; and

Whereas hydroelectric power is the only truly inexhaustible energy resource available to a civilization whose entire future growth and economic strength will be increasingly dependent upon the provision of adequate supplies of electric energy; and

Whereas the industrial development of Montana and the entire Pacific Northwest will be greatly enhanced by the large amounts of low-cost power made available by the full development of the potential of the Libby Dam site; and

Whereas the people of the State of Montana have seen in the examples of Hungry Horse Dam on the south fork of the Flathead River in their State and many other dams in the Pacific Northwest the immense benefits which accrue as a direct result of the construction of such great projects not only to the State in which they are constructed but also to the entire region and the Nation; and

Whereas revenues from the sale of power from Libby Dam represent the most feasible source of funds to aid in the rapid construction and the maintenance of major future irrigation projects in the State of Montana, which developments can provide homes for any farm families which may be displaced by the construction of Libby Dam; and

Whereas large amounts of storage are required in the Columbia River and Clark Fork River Basins to provide adequate protection against the seasonal floods which periodically cause great loss of life and the destruction of millions of dollars worth of property, causing great hardship throughout the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas many of the large storage projects planned by the Army Engineers for the control of floods in the Columbia River Basin have been and are being lost due to conflicting uses and inadequate development, so that it is seriously doubtful that even the minimum flood control storage requirements of the region can be met; and

Whereas Libby Dam, with 5,985,000 acre-feet of usable storage in its reservoir is one of the few remaining great storage projects still feasible and not involved in serious controversy in the Columbia River Basin and can provide more usable flood control storage than a combination of all the other feasible potential projects in the Clark Fork River Basin; and

Whereas Libby Dam, as planned and authorized, must have the approval of the International Joint Commission; and

Whereas the International Joint Commission has for years been unable to reach agreement on the project and says it will not give approval until the Canadian Government's investigation of alternative uses of the Kootenai waters in Canada has been completed; and

Whereas one of the Canadian proposals is to divert part of the Kootenai River flow into the Columbia River at Canal Flats, in order to generate additional power at sites in Canada; and

Whereas such a diversion would materially reduce the amount of water available for storage and generation at the proposed Libby site, and could reduce the amount to the point where Libby Dam would be unfeasible; and

Whereas in order to protect Montana's and the national interest in water and water resources rising in the United States, in order to provide for at least partial flood control and storage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That the Representatives of the State of Montana in the Congress of the United States be urged and requested to introduce and the Congress of the United States be urged and requested to enact into law an amendment to the existing authorization of the Libby project, necessary to provide for construction in two stages, the first backing water up to the international boundary, the second to be added when agreement is reached with Canada; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to provide sufficient appropriations so that detailed planning and design work for two-stage construction can begin immediately and that construction can begin as soon as design work is completed; and be it further

Resolved, That the amendment include reservation of a block of power for Montana; and be it further

Resolved, That this assembly request the Congress, in making appropriations for the construction of the Libby project, to define the compensations that shall be received from the Government of the United States by the County of Lincoln and by affected cities and school districts in said county for extraordinary expenses resulting from expanded services required in the fields of school and hospital facilities, health and sanitation, and police protection incidental to the construction of said projects; and to provide all necessary funds and take all needed action to insure the construction of all transportation and other facilities needed to provide opportunity equal to that now existing of access to mines, to forests in Federal, State, and private ownership, and to manufacturing and refining plants, to the end that the present steady and continuous employment of Montana people depending upon forests and mines for their livelihood will not be adversely affected; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be submitted by the secretary of the State of Montana to each of the individuals and to the chairmen of each of the committees named in the title of this memorial and also to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the Congress of the United States, RICHARD M. NIXON and SAM E. RAYBURN.

JOHN J. MACDONALD,
Speaker of the House.
PAUL CANNON,
President of the Senate.

Installation Banquet Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Boston Naval Shipyard Barrack No. 1240, Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herein part of an address delivered by me at the installation banquet conducted by the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Boston Naval Shipyard Barrack No. 1240, held at the Linwood

Grille, near Fenway Park in Boston, Mass., on Monday evening, February 23, 1959. Outgoing Comdr. Anthony D. Tieso officiated as the toastmaster of the evening, and the welcoming remarks were given by Department Commander Melvin D. Eddy. The installation of the newly elected officers was conducted by Department Senior Vice Commander Frank Farnham. The newly elected Comdr. William Francis Cooney extended the thanks of the organization to all invitees and the members, and presented an appropriate gift to Past Department Commander Francis W. Powers, and Department Commander Melvin D. Eddy:

It was George Washington who recommended that all officers who should continue in service to the end of the Revolutionary War should be entitled to half pay during life.

The Congress took favorable action on his recommendation.

We have come a long way since those days, regarding the coverage and the substance of pensions for veterans.

In spite of the fact that there is a movement underway—in 1959—to renege on the Nation's obligation to its veterans.

Those who are conducting this campaign do not dare to make a frontal attack for they know it would arouse a storm of opposition.

Instead, they are trying to divide the veterans by making a distinction between needy and nonneedy veterans in order to promote confusion and dissension. This is the opening wedge to reduce present pensions, and to throw a permanent roadblock in the way of pensions for all honorably discharged veterans of World War I which they see coming up over the horizon.

Unfortunately, many corporations and wealthy individuals seem to have persuaded the President that the budget must be balanced at all costs at the expense of our missile and space programs, the economic expansion of our country, and the American tradition of providing pensions for its ageing veterans.

These are the very same people who solemnly asserted that "nothing is too good for our boys" back in 1917 and 1918.

But today they want to forget those assurances and those promises.

During the very month that they honor the birthdays of two great Presidents they conveniently overlook George Washington's recommendations, and they avoid Abraham Lincoln's reminder that we must "care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan."

But no matter how hard they try, no matter what devious techniques they employ they cannot get around the precedent, and the moral obligation of providing pensions, that are deeply rooted in our history.

The first national pension law was passed by the Continental Congress on August 26, 1776. Every officer, soldier, or sailor losing a limb in any engagement, or being so disabled in the service of the United States as to render him incapable of earning his livelihood, was promised half pay for life, or during disability.

The Revolutionary service pension law of 1818, introduced a new principle into this field of legislation. Before this time, disability was the firm requirement for the payment of any pension. With the new law, mere service in the Armed Forces, together with poverty, became the basis for entitlement.

Congress adopted a pure service pension schedule for the Revolutionary War survivors, on June 7, 1832. This act granted full pay for life to veterans who had served a minimum of 2 years.

The Mexican War Pension Act of 1887 granted a pension, if the veteran was suffering from disabilities to a pensionable degree. Veterans 62 years of age or older, were entitled to a disability pension, regardless of any disability.

The trend was plain to see. Congress was becoming more liberal with the experience of each successive war.

In the debate on the Mexican War Pension Act, Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, pleaded for uniformity, for consistency of action on the part of Congress. He explained that if the Government were bound as a matter of principle, to pension soldiers or sailors who do not need a pension, and who are under no disability, then it is a universal principle, and, as such, the veterans of all wars are entitled to the pension. Enactment of the bill, said the Senator, would very shortly compel the Congress to take the next step—a pure service pension for the Civil War veterans.

The Mexican War Pension Act was debated for 3 years, but logic and honor finally prevailed, and Congress passed the bill in January of 1887.

The Dependent Pension Act of 1890 was a service-pension law. Pensioners, however, were required to demonstrate their inability to perform manual labor as a means of supporting themselves. Because of this strange twist, the law spawned many abuses, and gave rise to much dissatisfaction.

Widespread agitation led to the act of May 11, 1912, setting up a formula whereby the Civil War veteran must have served at least 90 days in that conflict, and that he must be 62 years of age or older. The payments, provided for on a graduated scale according to length of service, were increased by subsequent legislation.

The act of June 5, 1920, was entitled "An act to pension soldiers and sailors of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition."

It provided that any such veteran who has reached the age of 62 years shall, upon making proof of such fact, be placed upon the pension roll.

As for pure service pensions, the Spanish-American War is the most recent conflict where such provisions have been authorized by the Congress. Obviously, the veterans of World War I are next in line for this entitlement.

When Congress passed a bill to provide adjusted compensation for the veterans of 1917–18, it was vetoed by President Harding on September 19, 1922. In the message explaining his action, the President was looking to the future when he said that it is inevitable, as the years pass, that pension provision for World War veterans will be made, as it has been made for those who served in previous wars.

That prophecy was made over 36 years ago.

When we average out the length of time that the veterans of five previous wars in American history—up to and including the Spanish-American War—had to wait before service pensions were authorized, we find that it takes nearly 43 years.

We, the veterans of World War I, with over 40 years behind us, are getting close to the time of our entitlement.

When we consider that our honored seniors, the Spanish American War veterans, only had to wait 22 years for their pensions, it would appear that favorable action on our claim cannot be delayed much longer.

In the last session of the Congress, when my bill to provide a Federal charter for our organization was being debated, there were a few who opposed the bill. They insisted that our group was organized for the sole purpose of "lobbying through Congress a general pension bill that would provide $100 monthly to all World War I veterans regardless of need or length of service beyond 90 days."

I objected to that general accusation, pointing out that our organization serves the social and fraternal needs of its members. It also makes a positive contribution to every community in which there is a barrack, by its example of good citizenship, and by its perpetuation of those ideals that give young Americans in every generation, the faith and the courage to work for, and if necessary to fight in the defense of our freedoms.

But as to the charge that we are seeking a pension I say, "So what?"

There is nothing sudden or surprising in such a proposal—more than 40 years after World War I, and following a precedent that was firmly established long ago.

We believe that the veteran who is 62 years of age or older is entitled to a pension of $100 per month upon proof of age and honorable service, as a matter of right.

We are confident that this formula is the simplest and fairest method by which the Nation's obligation to the aging veterans of World War I will be honored.

In the school of practical experience, we have learned that few people in positions of leadership and influence showed any interest in our objective, until our organization was founded. Its rapid growth within the period of several years, has opened the eyes of our legislators, and is reminding a grateful, but sometimes absent-minded nation, that the pension issue is approaching decision day.

We are building unity and strength and inspiring comradeship through our membership in the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. We realize that only by such mobilization of our forces, directed toward the goal of a pension for all veterans of that conflict, can we win to our side, the public support that is necessary for victory in this campaign.

That is why we attack the administration's sly proposal, whereby the benefits for needy veterans—covering both compensation and pensions—might actually be increased.

No self-respecting veteran is opposed to additional aid for our needy comrades.

But we resent the deception inherent in this proposal.

Under the guise of helping the neediest veterans, it seeks, eventually, to determine eligibility on the basis of need alone, and thus completely undermine the obligation to provide a pure service pension to all aging veterans.

It is a clever maneuver, but it does not fool us.

We will not permit this administration to turn back the clock.

An old trick, being dusted off for use again, is to scare the public by estimating the cost of veterans' benefits some years from now. But this one-sided slanting of the facts fails to mention the mortality rates.

There are few survivors of the Spanish-American War.

The ranks of World War I veterans have been thinned in the space course of 40 years. Even as the veterans of World War II, are beginning to decline in number. In any case, about 22 more years must pass before they, in turn, become eligible for pensions.

It is no coincidence, therefore, that the administration and its big business advisers would like to readjust the Nation's pension program.

It is designed to block the veterans of World War I.

We would like to believe that it is motivated by fear of our growing strength, and that it merely represents a last-ditch effort to stop or slow down our drive.

That is only true in part.

They have had this idea in the back of their minds for a long time.

Some years after every war, when they think that people have forgotten the promises that were made in time of national emergency, certain financial interests always attempt to sabotage veterans' benefits so that they can keep more for themselves.

Under the current excuse of balancing the budget they believe that the opportunity they have been waiting for has arrived.

But the people on November 4, 1958—and in no uncertain fashion—demonstrated that they are in no mood for the Federal Government to abandon its responsibilities.

As employees of the Boston Naval Shipyard you are well aware of other moves they would like to make in the name of economy.

If they had their way, everything would be farmed out to private contractors—including the U.S. Navy, the Veterans' Administration hospitals, the civil service, and perhaps the Government itself.

If they had their way.

But the people have the final authority over their representative form of government. As long as we have truly enterprising organizations like the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., the economizers will not be able to default on their obligations.

We know that we are on the right course, and we intend to follow it until we reach our goal.

Report of Water Pollution Control Advisory Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting here in mid-December, one of President Eisenhower's advisory groups took an unheard of action. Its members unanimously opposed a recommendation by the man who had appointed them.

The group is the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board. The recommendation of President Eisenhower is that the Federal Government in fiscal year 1961 discontinue Federal grants to States and local governments to help them plan and build treatment works to prevent discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into public waters.

Indirectly, at least, the Board also endorsed the principal objective of H.R. 3610, by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], now pending in the Committee on Public Works.

The Blatnik bill would double the $50 million a year construction grants program for 10 years. It would likewise increase the grants available for individual projects from $250,000 or 30 percent of the estimated cost, whichever is smaller, to $500,000 or 30 percent, whichever is smaller. It would provide for reallocation of funds from States not using them to others having approved projects for which grants have not been made because of the lack of money.

For the information of my colleagues, I append the Board's report to the Surgeon General under date of February 11, 1959. I have deleted the section headed "Acknowledgments." In addition to the usual thank you's, Acting Chairman Milton P. Adams reported that "some members expressed to me the hope that they might count on a larger share of your—the Surgeon General's—time at future meetings."

Mr. Adams said this meeting "will stand out as the one containing subject matter most pertinent to the discharge of our duties under Public Law 660." He also noted that all actions taken were by unanimous vote by the members present.

The report follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1959.

THE SURGEON GENERAL,
Public Health Service,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. BURNEY: The fifth meeting of the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board was held in Washington on December 15 and 16, 1958. The purpose of this meeting was to discharge the responsibilities prescribed under the terms of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for reviewing the policy and program of the Public Health Service and making recommendations to the Surgeon General.

Several important matters affecting certain phases of the water supply and water pollution control program have developed since our last meeting. Being fully aware of this situation, we devoted our time and energies to considering all of the issues possible during the 2 days we met.

Having in mind the policy of the Congress, as stated in Public Law 660, "to recognize, preserve and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution * * *" the Board gave careful consideration in its deliberations to the results of a survey of the States, conducted by one of the Board members, Mr. Milton P. Adams. A questionnaire was sent to all State and interstate water pollution control administrators and State sanitary engineers to ascertain their opinions on the effectiveness of the Federal program, or what changes they believed should be made.

Answers were received from all States, four of the six interstate agencies, Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia. Replies to the survey were incorporated in a 14-page memorandum dated December 12, 1958, addressed to the Chairman, Members of the Board and staff of the Public Health Service.

The Board found this memorandum of great interest and of much value in certain of its deliberations. The members directed that it be accepted and made a part of the official minutes of the meeting.

"Summary of Results of Poll" (p. 5 of the memorandum) is reproduced here as part of this report. The number of affirmative and negative answers received has been placed after each of the 10 specific questions as asked.

MUNICIPAL SEWAGE DISPOSAL CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

1. Are current Federal allocations resulting in stimulation of sewage plant construction within your jurisdiction? Yes, 43; no, 9.

2. Do you favor doubling the authorization of construction grant allocations through reintroduction and enactment of the Blatnik bill (H.R. 11714, 85th Cong.) or its equivalent? Yes, 38; no, 13.

3. Do you favor elimination of further Federal construction grants by repeal of section 6, Public Law 660? Yes, 2½ [1], no, 48½.[1]

4. Do you favor repeal of section 6 with future sewage disposal construction grants to become an exclusive State function financed out of proceeds of a State excise tax on local telephone services as per Federal-State action committee recommendations? Yes, 2; no. 48.

5. If your answer to (4) is "yes," do you think your legislature would enact such a tax in 1959? Yes, 1; no, 12.

6. If your answer to (5) is "yes," do you think your legislature would appropriate from the proceeds of such a tax, funds in an amount equal to or greater than you are now receiving for sewage disposal construction grants? Yes, 1; no, 10.

OTHER MATTERS

7. Do you favor creation of a new position of Assistant Secretary of Water Pollution Control within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as per H.R. 13839 (Blatnik), 85th Congress, or its equivalent? Yes, 16; no, 28.

8. Do you favor continuance of Federal program grants to States and interstate agencies (sec. 5, Public Law 660)? Yes, 49½ [1]; no, 3½ [1].

9. Are you satisfied with progress to date toward solution of interstate water pollution control problems in which the Public Health Service has participated? Yes, 44; no, 1.

10. Since industry cannot qualify for grants, but its taxes assist in providing grants to cities, States, and the Public Health Service, would you favor amendments of the internal revenue laws to permit industry an accelerated amortization rate for such capital investments as are necessary to meet State or interstate water pollution control objectives? Yes, 51; no, 3.

This report covers those items of major concern to us, and which, we believe, need your immediate attention.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Board submits to you its recommendations on the following:

1. The proposal of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee of September 9, 1958, that Congress on its part amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a tax credit to the States against the local telephone service tax for a 5-year period, and the States on their part enact and collect a 3-percent excise tax on local phone service. This credit would equal 30 percent of the Federal tax, or 3 percentage points of the present 10 percent tax conditioned, of course, on each State's enacting a 3 percent phone service tax satisfactory to the Federal Treasury. In addition, the committee proposed that Congress authorize the Treasury to distribute the revenue equivalent of 1 percent tax on local telephone service to certain low income States. The combined tax credit and revenue distribution to the States would equal 40 percent of the Federal revenues now derived from the local telephone service tax, if, as, and when each State had met the Federal requirements. Whether the proceeds of the 3 percent State excise tax on phone service, if enacted, would ever be made available for sewage disposal construction grants to take the place of Federal funds now authorized, rests within each State legislature, and, of course, is not subject to the will either of Congress or the Federal Treasury. Present grants for vocational education and sewage treatment projects and the related Federal responsibility for administration, would become an unfunded State obligation if and as a new system goes into effect. The Treasury's distribution of these revenues would be discontinued at the end of 5 years with the States assuming full financial responsibility for the two programs.

The Board rejected the committee's proposal as not feasible, despite the knowledge and understanding on the part of each member that the current plan reportedly had administration blessing. Here are some of the reasons discussed leading up to their unimous action:

(a) The telephone companies have already alerted their customers to seek repeal of the entire 10 percent Federal excise tax on local phone service as an unfair tax on them.

Footnote at end of speech.

(b) The plan described above still fails to meet requirements of the resolution adopted at the Governors' conference at Miami, Fla., last May.

(c) The plan further leaves the States within the control or even dictation of some Federal official.

(d) There would be an unnecessary loss and dissipation of $60 million of Federal revenue annually, even if every State enacted a federally approved 3-percent State excise tax on phone service (see Dr. Flemming's press statement of October 6, 1958, released October 10).

(e) Our members are convinced that few, of any, State legislatures could be prevailed upon to enact a 3-percent State excise tax on local phone service because of the following reasons: (1) Adverse lobbying pressure against such a new tax; (2) the fact that phone service is not a measure of sewage disposal or vocational benefits and cannot be sold as such; (3) legislators from such cities as Pittsburgh, New York, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Milwaukee, and a host of smaller places where sewage treatment has been provided, without the aid of Federal grants, could hardly be expected to support such local excise tax legislation for the benefits sought, or as a substitute for present Federal funds.

We believe that the construction grants program is operating effectively at the present time and should, if anything, be increased. If an increase is impossible, then we recommend that it be continued at its present level of operation.

2. The bills introduced in the 85th Congress to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, H.R. 13420, H.R. 13839, and S. 4321, which we understand will be reintroduced in the 86th Congress. In general, these bills proposed to amend Public Law 660 to: (1) Increase the maximum grant limit on an individual project to $500,000; (2) permit municipalities to join together to build joint treatment facilities with the amount of grant allocable to each community as if it were a separate project; (3) increase to $100 million for construction grants for each annual appropriation; (4) permit reallocation of unused allotments; and (5) establish an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the administration of the Water Pollution Control Act and transfer all functions and responsibilities for water pollution control from the Surgeon General to the Assistant Secretary.

Though the Board approved of doubling the limitation on individual grants, and the provision for reallocation of unused construction grant funds, we resolved that the annual budget be increased only to the level necessary for meeting the States' construction grants needs.

We unanimously opposed the provisions of H.R. 13839 and S. 4321 establishing an Assistant Secretary for the water pollution control program. However, we are deeply concerned with the present low status of this program within the Public Health Service. We strongly recommend that you take immediate action to elevate the program's status in order to offset the congressional sentiment for removing the water pollution control responsibilities from the Service.

3. The impact with the expiration of program grants (sec. 5, Public Law 660) on June 30, 1961, will have upon the State and interstate agencies in their efforts to control pollution.

In view of the overwhelming number of State administrators who favor continuing the Federal program grants, the Board firmly believes that Congress should be requested to extend these grants to June 30, 1970.

4. The need for an accelerated tax amortization rate on the construction of industrial waste treatment facilities.

Since industry cannot qualify under Public Law 660 for grants to aid in the construction of such treatment works, the Board favors amending the internal revenue laws to provide an incentive for building these necessary treatment plants. Thus, industry can fulfill its role in the effort to abate and control water pollution.

5. Public awareness activities by the Public Health Service to educate and inform the various publics on the serious pollution threat to this Nation's water resources.

The Board is still deeply concerned with this lack of public knowledge, though we commend the water supply and water pollution control program for its accomplishments with a limited budget. We therefore reaffirm our previous recommendation that more definite steps be taken to formulate an organized public awareness program that will not only inform the people, but make them acutely aware of this problem.

We urge that adequate funds be requested to conduct such a program effectively and that the Surgeon General and his staff utilize national radio and television networks to further enlighten the general public, and consider calling a national conference on water pollution similar to the recent national air pollution conference held in Washington.

6. The budget resources and needs of the water supply and water pollution control program.

The presentation by the chief of the program confirmed our prior impressions and opinions that his program accomplishes a great deal with very limited resources. There is need, however, for even greater accomplishment. The Board therefore urges that immediate consideration be given to requesting a budget increase so that the program will be more effective.

7. The activities of the interstate enforcement section in carrying out its responsibilities under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

The Board is eminently satisfied with the activities and progress to date. We strongly support the Service's efforts to protect this Nation's vital water resources against pollution through its vigorous application of the letter and spirit of the act's interstate enforcement provisions.

In addition to the above items, the Board also considered: (1) Pollution control from Federal installations; (2) working relationships, Corps of Engineers-Public Health Service, title III, Public Law 85–500; and (3) Model Water Use Act, State legislation.

* * * * *

We are looking forward to seeing you again in the spring.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON P. ADAMS,
Acting Chairman, Water Pollution Control Advisory Board.

Members present at fifth meeting: Milton P. Adams, Irwin T. Bode, William F. Duckworth, Dr. Harold M. Erickson, Seth Gordon, Fred C. Heinz, Anton Hulman, Jr., Frank E. Long, William W. Wise.

Official:

ROBERT C. AYERS.
Executive Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Adams is executive secretary of the Michigan Water Resources Commission. Mr. Bode is director of conservation, State of Missouri. Mr. Duckworth is an auto dealer and mayor of Norfolk, Va. Dr. Erickson is the Oregon State Health Officer. Mr. Gordon is director of the California Fish and Game Commission and a member of the California Water Pollution Control Board. Mr. Heinz is vice president of the H. J. Heinz Pickle Co. Mr. Hulman is a Terre Haute, Ind., industrialist and chairman of the Indiana Flood Control Commission. Mr. Long is a Buffalo, Wyo., rancher and banker. Mr. Wise is director of the Connecticut Water Pollution Control Commission.

[1] In jurisdictions where the responsibility for water pollution control is divided as between a State water pollution control agency and a State health department or its sanitary engineer, one-half vote was assigned to each. In some cases, the two agencies voted differently. A one-half vote was also registered where the administrator of one State voted both "yes" and "no" on a question.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla.*	5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*	
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*	
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*	
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.*	University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.*	911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.*	3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.*	113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*	
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*	
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*	
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*	
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*	
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.*	Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*	
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*	
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*	
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*	
Bates, William H., *Mass.*	
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*	
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*	
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.*	1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.*	3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*	
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*	
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*	
Boggs, Hale, *La.*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.*	3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.*	Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*	
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*	
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.*	The Washington.
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*	
Brademas, John, *Ind.*	
Bray, William G., *Ind.*	
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*	
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*	
Brooks, Overton, *La.*	4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.*	3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*	Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.*	Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*	
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*	
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*	
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*	
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*	
Burke, James A., *Mass.*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.*	2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.*	1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*	
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*	
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*	
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*	
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*	
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*	
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.*	1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.*	3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*	
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.*	2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*	
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*	
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.*	2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla.*	6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.*	4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*	
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.*	3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*	
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*	
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.*	4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*	
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*	
Dent, John H., *Pa.*	
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*	
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*	
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*	1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*	
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*	
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*	
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*	
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*	
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.*	3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*	
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.*	The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*	
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.*	3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.*	The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*	
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*	
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.*	1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*	
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.*	4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*	
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.*	The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.*	Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*	
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.*	6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*	
George, Newell A., *Kans.*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*	
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*	
Grant, George M., *Ala.*	4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*	
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*	
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*	
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*	
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*	
Haley, James A., *Fla.*	
Hall, David M., *N. C.*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*	
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*	
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*	
Harris, Oren, *Ark.*	1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*	
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*	
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*	
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*	
Hess, William E., *Ohio*	
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*	
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*	100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.*	3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*	
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*	
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*	
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*	
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*	
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*	
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.*	The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*	
Jarman, John, *Okla.*	
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*	
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*	2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*	
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*	
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*	
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.*	1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*	
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.*	3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*	
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.*	Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*	
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*	
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*	
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.*	The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*	
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.*	3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.*	4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*	
King, David S., *Utah*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*	
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*	
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*	
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*	

Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*	
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Lennon, Alton, *N. C.*	
Lesinski, John, *Mich.*	
Levering, Robert W., *Ohio*	
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.*	224 C St. NE.
Lindsay, John V., *N. Y.*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn.*	The Congressional
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*	The Washington
McCulloch, William M., *Ohio*	4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif.*	
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*	
McFall, John J., *Calif.*	507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGinley, Donald F., *Nebr.*	
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak.*	
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*	220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*	
McSween, Harold B., *La.*	
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*	
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*	115 Dale Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*	
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*	
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*	
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*	
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*	Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*	
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*	
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.*	The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*	The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*	
May, Catherine, *Wash.*	
Meader, George, *Mich.*	3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*	
Meyer, William H., *Vt.*	
Michel, Robert H., *Ill.*	
Miller, Clement W., *Calif.*	
Miller, George P., *Calif.*	
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*	6601 Radnor Rd., Bethesda, Md.
Milliken, William H., Jr., *Pa.*	
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*	2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*	8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga.*	
Moeller, Walter H., *Ohio*	
Monagan, John S., *Conn.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Moorhead, William S., *Pa.*	
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*	
Morris, Thomas G., *N. Mex.*	
Morris, Toby, *Okla.*	220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La.*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*	204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*	
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*	
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*	The Coronet
Murphy, William T., *Ill.*	
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*	
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*	
Nelsen, Ancher, *Minn.*	
Nix, Robert N. C., *Pa.*	
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*	
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*	2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*	
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*	The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*	The Congressional
O'Hara, James G., *Mich.*	
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass.*	
Oliver, James C., *Maine*	
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*	
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*	100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*	
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*	117 Carroll St. SE.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*	
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*	
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho*	
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*	
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*	
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*	
Pirnie, Alexander, *N. Y.*	
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*	228 2d St. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*	
Polk, James G., *Ohio*	
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg.*	
Powell, Adam C., *N. Y.*	
Preston, Prince H., *Ga.*	
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*	
Prokop, Stanley A., *Pa.*	
Pucinski, Roman C., *Ill.*	
Quie, Albert H., *Minn.*	The Coronet Apt., 200 C St. SE.
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*	
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*	
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*	
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*	
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*	
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*	
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*	1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*	6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*	5603 24th Ave. SE., Hillcrest Hgts., Wash. 21, D. C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*	
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*	3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*	
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*	
Rivers, Ralph J., *Alaska*	
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*	6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y.*	
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*	
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*	
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass.*	The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*	Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*	
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*	
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*	
Rostenkowski, Dan, *Ill.*	
Roush, J. Edward, *Ind.*	
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*	
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y.*	
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y.*	
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif.*	
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*	
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*	
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*	
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C.*	
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*	433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*	
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*	
Shipley, George E., *Ill.*	
Short, Don L., *N. Dak.*	
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*	
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*	
Simpson, Edna Oakes, *Ill.*	
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*	5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*	
Slack, John M., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*	
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif.*	
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*	204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Neal, *Iowa*	
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*	
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*	Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*	
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*	
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*	
Stratton, Samuel S., *N. Y.*	107 Martha's Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Stubblefield, Frank A., *Ky.*	
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*	
Taber, John, *N. Y.*	
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*	
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*	
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*	6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y.*	Mayflower Hotel
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*	2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*	3301 Mass. Ave.
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*	
Thompson, T. A., *La.*	1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, Keith, *Wyo.*	
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*	
Toll, Herman, *Pa.*	
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*	
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*	
Tuck, William M., *Va.*	
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*	
Ullman, Al, *Oreg.*	
Utt, James B., *Calif.*	
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*	
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*	
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*	4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*	
Wallhauser, George M., *N. J.*	
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*	
Wampler, Fred, *Ind.*	
Watts, John C., *Ky.*	
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*	9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Weis, Jessica McC., *N. Y.*	
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*	
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*	
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C.*	
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*	5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*	
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*	
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*	1001 26th Rd. S., Arlington, Va.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*	
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*	
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*	
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*	
Wolf, Leonard G., *Iowa*	
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*	
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*	
Young, John, *Tex.*	
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*	4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*	
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*	

DELEGATES

Burns, John A., *Hawaii*	

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*	2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 216 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Serles, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Place SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Appendix

American Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, a lucid and penetrating appraisal of the farm problem in America was made in a recent speech before a convention of Ruritan National by Senator SYMINGTON, of Missouri.

This speech by Senator SYMINGTON, a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee and the astute sponsor of intelligent farm legislation, should be required reading for every American genuinely concerned with recent trends in American agriculture and interested in restoring prosperity to our rural areas.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address by Senator SYMINGTON:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR STUART SYMINGTON, OF MISSOURI, RURITAN NATIONAL, 30TH ANNIVERSARY CONVENTION, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, JANUARY 26, 1959

It is a privilege to speak here before the 30th anniversary convention of Ruritan National.

I am especially proud to be here, because the speakers at your past conventions constitute a most distinguished group—one which includes my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Virginia, HARRY BYRD.

There is always a bond between a speaker and the audience when they share common beliefs and philosophies.

I believe this is true tonight.

As Ruritans, you recognize the true and enduring values of rural life; and you have dedicated your organization to promoting and serving those values.

Your basic objective is to bring about a closer union and a better understanding between the farmer and the business and professional man, so as to make the rural community a better place in which to live.

In serving rural communities as you do, you are making a great contribution to your community.

You are also serving a larger cause—that of our Nation.

The influence of agriculture extends far beyond the farm, or even the rural community.

While some 20 million Americans actually live and work on the farms, it is estimated that 42 million are involved in the transporting, processing and retailing of farm products, or in supplying the farmers' needs.

In other words, an estimated three out of every eight Americans are directly involved in the feeding and clothing of the Nation.

Remember those figures, when anybody tries to argue that agriculture is no longer important.

Each year agriculture uses more finished steel than is used in a year's output of passenger cars.

Each year, farmers use more crude petroleum than any other industry in the country.

Each year, American farmers keep 2 to 3 million nonfarm workers employed solely in supplying their needs.

So agriculture is today, as it always has been, one of the pillars of our Nation's economy.

As Ruritans, you are aware of, and concerned with, the close relationship between rural and urban America.

You know well that the small town cannot long survive, much less grow or prosper, in the face of continued depressed economic conditions in agriculture.

A decline in farm income is like an economic cancer. It spreads slowly at first, but soon covers an entire area.

It is only natural that, as farm income and purchasing power decline, the farm family is forced to postpone or curtail purchases of needed or desired goods.

If a farmer cannot afford to buy a new tractor, the sales of local implement dealers drop.

As a result, the implement dealer postpones his planned purchase of a new car.

This means the auto dealer must postpone his remodeling or building a home.

And the chain of reduced purchasing power soon engulfs the entire community.

But it spreads even further—to the factories, the firms, and the people of larger cities.

To see the effect, we need only look at the last few pages of our book of economic history.

Farm prosperity reached record levels in the post-World War II period.

In the early 1950's it began to slump.

Conditions continued to worsen, until in 1957 family farm purchasing power reached its lowest point in 17 years.

As farm income dropped steadily, our small towns and rural communities bore the brunt.

Gradually, however, it spread to the larger cities, to the point where, in 1957, and continuing throughout most of 1958, our entire national economy staggered under the most severe recession since the mid-1930's.

I do not want to imply that our most recent recession was caused solely by a sick farm economy. But most economists agreee that continued drops in farm income and purchasing power helped bog us down as much as anything else.

This is why many farmers, farm leaders, and some of us—not enough—in the Congress, are so concerned when various people make light of agriculture—its people, its importance, and its problems.

Wouldn't we like to get hold of that Madison Avenue fellow who started the story that nearly all farmers are now driving Cadillacs?

Farm workers put in a 10-hour day. That we know.

I don't know of many farmers who work less than a 6-day week.

Do you?

The work of no one else is more directly concerned with the well-being of each of us.

For what could be more important than our food?

American farmers are the most efficient and productive farmers in the world.

And we are improving, every year.

Last year, average per acre yields on nearly every major commodity set new records.

On 57 acres, we now produce the same amount of food and fiber that we did in 1940 on 100 acres.

We can produce more pounds of meat, with less feed, than ever before.

Milk production, per cow, has increased 39 percent since 1944.

Yes, Americans are the best fed, and best clothed people on the face of the earth.

And this food and clothing is becoming less and less expensive, in terms of the amount of work required to earn the purchase price.

Thirty years ago the average laborer had to work 15 minutes to earn enough to buy a quart of milk.

This year, he will work just half that time for that quart; and his milk will come in a more sanitary package, pasteurized, homogenized, and irradiated with vitamins.

It now requires less than one-third the worktime of 30 years ago to buy a dozen eggs.

And half the time for a pound of meat.

Now in most industries, increases in efficiency or productiveness are rewarded by higher wages or profits.

This has not been true in agriculture. Despite the fact our farmers feed us well, and help to feed needy people in other lands, they have not shared fully in the benefits of their accomplishments.

Per capita income in agriculture is less than half the level of the nonfarm population.

In 1958, farm workers' wages averaged 76 cents per hour; whereas factory workers' wages averaged more than $2 per hour.

Reports comparing rural and urban standards of living consistently point out that farm families are far short of the conveniences and necessities enjoyed by urban families.

One-fourth of the Nation's farm families have no automobile.

Only half have telephones.

Nearly 2 million farm homes have no running water.

The median income level in agriculture in 1957 was $1,555. This is less than one-third of the median income in wholesaling, manufacturing, transporting, mining—and by far the lowest for any industry group.

Is it not truly a paradox that one of the most efficient and productive segments of our economy is earning so much less than any other?

How, then, can we find ways to help farm families earn a fair return for their effort, without resorting to programs which, in the long run, will hurt farmers, the rural community, and the national economy?

Before entering Government service, I spent nearly 30 years in private business.

Therefore I naturally view this farm problem, or any similar Government problem, from the standpoint of what we used to call "good business practice under sound accounting principles."

With that premise, may we look briefly at a current Government farm problem which invariably is one of management's most important problems, inventory.

All of us know the importance of sound inventory management, and the dangers incident to excess inventory.

We have an inventory problem in Government today which may be the greatest inventory problem ever faced by anybody in peace-

time—the inventory currently in the hands of the Department of Agriculture.

As we know, the Department of Agriculture price-support program operates through the making of loans on commodities.

Unless the loan is redeemed, the commodity is taken over by the Commodity Credit Corporation, a legal instrument created to carry out this operation.

In recent years, there has been a tremendous increase in the quantity of farm products moving into the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and it is now clear that this condition has been caused primarily by the Department of Agriculture giving price support without meaningful production controls.

In effect, the Department of Agriculture has been telling farmers in many crops to produce all they can; and at the same time has provided them with a guaranteed price.

There has been no adequate market for this guaranteed production. Therefore it has piled up in Government inventory at a truly appalling rate.

As of November 30, 1958, the most recent Department of Agriculture report, the CCC inventory of Government-owned farm commodities was valued at $5.5 billion. (In January 1953, this inventory was $1 billion.)

But that tells only part of the story.

That 5.5 billion represents the value of the crops actually owned by the CCC.

In addition, there is some $2.7 billion of commodities pledged for loans, most of which will be turned over to the Government within the next few months.

According to the President's 1960 budget message, the CCC actual inventory will be $6.7 billion by next June 30, and $9.1 billion by June of 1960.

If these 1960 estimates are accurate, the Government holdings of surplus farm commodities will have been multiplied 9 times in an 8-year period.

And this does not include any loan pledges, the cost of which may be several billions more.

At the present time, two crops, corn and wheat, make up approximately 75 percent of this total investment; and the prominence of these two crops will continue.

The new corn program of the Department of Agriculture calls for higher price support for most corn farmers; and at the same time does away with all measures of production control.

So we are certain to have even greater corn production; and therefore an even larger Government inventory.

Wheat production is expected to continue at an equally high level.

The figures again.

This Commodity Credit Corporation inventory is nearly $6 billion now; it soon will be $9 billion; and the total obligation—loans and inventory—will be some $10.5 billion.

Therefore the present policy, price support without effective controls just doesn't make sense.

To a farmer, with this gigantic supply hanging over his market, it guarantees heavy trouble.

To all of us, as citizens and taxpayers sharing the cost of this program, including the now heavy storage charges, it constitutes a heavy burden.

To the people who are now entering their 7th year in control of our Department of Agriculture, it is a problem which must now be faced up to.

For that reason all of us, in and out of Congress, hope for sound proposals from the Department of Agriculture this year.

Now what can be done with this $9 billion agriculture inventory?

As I see it, here are the alternatives.

We can continue to store the inventory.

(At present inventory levels, the cost of storage and handling is $420 million per year. As the size of the inventory increases, this cost will, of course increase to, according to the President's state of the Union address, $1 billion per year in storage charges alone.)

At this rate, we will soon run out of places to store our idle surplus crops. Then tens of millions more dollars will have to be spent to build more storage space.

Just not good business.

Secondly, the Secretary of Agriculture can sell these stocks on the market, for what they will bring.

That would be normal business practice, in manufacturing or wholesaling, or retailing.

This latter action would result in sharp cuts in the price of beef and hogs.

Some believe, however, that this day of reckoning is due.

In fact, hog prices are already skidding. In recent months they have dropped from $23 to $17 per hundred pounds; and, according to Department of Agriculture reports, by next fall they may be down to $10–$12, as low as they were in 1955.

Cattle prices, which are now doing fairly well, can only drop heavily if we move our inventory of more than 2.5 billion bushels of Government stocked corn, and possibly wheat, into the market.

Thirdly, we could destroy these surplus stocks.

That would be a heavy levy on every citizen of the United States. All the money invested would be lost.

With hundreds of millions of hungry people around the world, that action might be misunderstood by many.

Fourth, perhaps we could move much of this inventory into the hands of hungry people, all over the world.

To that end, I have introduced a bill which requires that not less than 25 percent of our foreign economic aid be given in surplus farm commodities.

In this way we would be using more of the productive capacity of our American farm families as a weapon in the struggle for world freedom and a just and lasting peace.

Already we are selling some of our surplus stocks for foreign currencies. This is under the Public Law 480 program.

A bill has been introduced in this Congress to allow countries to purchase our food and fiber stocks under long-term contracts, so they can be assured of a supply while they are developing their own resources.

It has also been suggested that the free nations set up a world bank, in which storable food could be deposited, withdrawn, or loaned, in order to meet emergencies of the member nations.

As long as we are going to be in the business, and properly, of strengthening countries to resist communism, why not do it partly with food, of which we have plenty, instead of dollars, with which we are having increasing troubles.

So there they are, the four possible solutions to this growing agriculture inventory problem.

We can destroy this inventory.

We can sell it.

We can use more of it for economic aid.

Or we can keep on storing it.

As Ruritans you are vitally interested in a prosperous rural America.

But you know there can be no true farm prosperity so long as the Department of Agriculture continues to sit on this gigantic surplus of farm commodities.

It is a situation which must be faced; and in the interest of the country as well as the farmer, it should be faced now.

As a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I am one of those eager to find the right answer, so the families on the farms, and in the rural communities of America, can share more fully in the unprecedented prosperity of our Nation.

Let us all dedicate ourselves to the right, and therefore the wise, solution to this farm problem.

We would then be striving to do our share toward the attainment of a free and prosperous America.

In that way we would be serving the objective of Ruritan, "to make our community a better place in which to live."

Some Problems of Our Neighbor to the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, our attention has been directed in recent days on our good neighbor to the south by the visit of President Eisenhower to Mexico.

A recent letter which I have received from an acquaintance, who has made his home for several years in Mexico, sets forth very dramatically and cogently some of the problems which that country has to solve.

This letter, I think, expounds very accurately the great potentiality of Mexico, and will impress upon the people of the United States the desirability of cooperation on the part of our Government with the new President of Mexico in his efforts to raise the living standard of the majority of the Mexican people and to make the Government more stable and responsible:

Mexico is another story politically. Although its heritage reaches back to more than 100 years before the pilgrims landed, politically and economically it is a younger country than the United States.

Mexico City is one of the most modern and cosmopolitan cities in the world which stands comparison with New York or Paris, but politically it is at the stage the United States was when trustbuster Teddy Roosevelt came on the scene. The wealth here is in the hands of the very few. In Guadalajara alone there are probably more millionaires than in the whole United States. Palaces, and mansions, unbelievably large and elaborate, are almost commonplace here. Yet in this very city hundreds of people go hungry, and the blind and crippled and fatherless are left to beg on the streets because the Government and its appointed or elected officers serve only the rich. A person here who is the equivalent of a Congressman in the United States begins his office with only one thought in mind—how to become as rich as possible before his term ends by fair means or foul, with no thought of serving the people.

There are no strong unions in Mexico with the exception of the railroad workers, telegraph workers, etc. who go on strike often, but the rest of the vast army of skilled and unskilled workers are virtually slaves of their employers. Men in politics who are honest are the rare exception here and often get shot in the back by the henchmen of less scrupulous rivals. It will take a host of Teddy Roosevelts and F.D.R.'s to clean up the Government and introduce welfare programs before this will be a real democratic nation. But, nevertheless, progress is being made. The new President, Lopez Mateos, issued a decree the other day. For the first

time in Mexico's history public schoolchildren next year will receive free textbooks. Many of the poor children couldn't afford to buy their books even though Mexico's laws state that public education shall be free. For the first time many children will be able to go to school.

Mexico is a wonderful and fascinating country in many ways. It has great natural resources, breathtakingly beautiful scenery, and the climate in Guadalajara is one of the most perfect in the world, as is the climate in much of Mexico. All the country needs is good government and a healthy system of unions to raise the living standard of the working people and to create a large middle class. The majority of the people are either filthy rich or desperately poor. Unlike the Hollywood stereotype of a Mexican, the average Mexican is hardworking, good natured, proud, high moraled, and extremely devout. Surely a people with such qualities deserve all the privileges of a truly democratic nation, and little by little I think they will win them.

Every American should get on his knees and thank God that he has a political system which provides honest leaders. Unfortunately, most Americans take their democratic government too much for granted. Many a Mexican has sighed and said to me "If only our Mexico had a government like you have up there." I am sure others say the same thing in many countries all over the world.

One should be proud to be a public servant of the people in a land where no man starves to death while his millionaire fellow citizen looks on uncaring; where no blind or crippled person or orphaned child goes uncared for; where no rich man can build a palace while his very laborers are starving on the wages he pays for their backbreaking work.

I love Mexico and her people, but not her rich people. They profess to be devout Catholics but they're not Christians. I love the poor people, proud and even noble in their poverty; the struggling small shopkeepers and skilled craftsmen who barely make a living, the farmers who are robbed of their crops by the unscrupulous banks which lend them money on usurers' terms. They are the real Mexicans and in them lies the hope of Mexico's future, not in the few and privileged rich.

The New Inflation: Administered Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, during the last few years everyone has become aware of the dangerous inflationary trend. The President, in his state of the Union message, called upon Congress to stop inflation. Although everyone is aware of the problem, no one seems to know just what to do about it. I think that all Members of this body, no matter to what committee assigned, should do everything in their power to set machinery in motion which would either solve the problem of inflation or in some way bring the power of public opinion to bear upon those responsible for it.

My attention was recently called to the testimony of Gardner C. Means, a distinguished economist, before the Senate Antitrust Judiciary Committee. Dr. Means made a brilliant analysis of the situation which is summarized in an article, "Inflation Besetting Us Is of a New Breed," by Bernard D. Nossiter, in the February 8, 1959, Washington Post and Times Herald. Under unanimous consent, I include the article following my own remarks. Dr. Means' analysis indicates that the current price inflation is limited to the concentrated industries which includes steel, automobiles, and others in which a relatively few companies have dominant control.

It appears in these industries that an administered price system is operating. Under the administered price system, prices are not responsive to supply and demand. On the contrary, when demand falls off prices in the administered price industries go up. I will not take the time to recount the numerous instances in the last few years when prices were pushed up arbitrarily. It is significant that only a short time ago United States Steel raised its prices when demand fell to 49 percent of capacity and that the automobile industry raised its prices during the period when demand for passenger automobiles fell by about 50 percent.

Dr. Means' analysis also shows that we have, at the same time these prices are being pushed up, an entirely different situation in the competitive industries. Agricultural prices, for example, either have been declining or have come up very little. The farmer, in other words, receiving relatively low prices for what he had to sell, has had his net income further reduced by having to pay relatively high prices.

Legislation which I introduced today which is similar to the bill introduced by Senator O'MAHONEY on January 12, will put the big corporations on notice that they no longer will be permitted to raise prices unnecessarily without public review. This bill will not apply to small consumers or to small business. It is limited to the eight largest corporations in any manufacturing industry, if they account for 50 percent of the industry's sales. An analysis of the material introduced by Dr. Means indicates that the administered price system only operates in areas of economic concentration. It is easy to see why this situation obtains.

If two, three, or four large corporations account for most of an industry's production and sales, they are able, by sheer market power, to operate successfully a price-fixing system. I do not mean they necessarily conspire to do so. The corporations, over a period of years, have developed a highly sophisticated method of fixing prices. They merely follow the leader. If United States Steel, which is the leader in the steel industry, raises its prices, all the steel companies do likewise. If General Motors raises its prices, then other automobile manufacturers raise theirs.

The bill which I am introducing would require the 8 largest companies in an industry to announce their proposed price increase 30 days in advance. During that time, the Federal Trade Commission would hold public hearing and the corporations would be required to come in and justify their proposed increase. Farm, labor, and other organizations would be permitted to come in and express their views. In this way, the price increase would receive public attention and consideration.

I believe that this procedure would have a healthy effect on our economy. The proposal admittedly will not necessarily solve the inflation problem, but it will be a step in the right direction.

The above-mentioned article follows:

INFLATION BESETTING US IS OF A NEW BREED

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

A pioneering approach to the peculiar price inflation that marked our recent past is embodied in the strange-looking charts at right.

[Charts omitted in RECORD.]

They were put together by Gardiner C. Means, of Vienna, Va., a distinguished but lonely economist. He held a slew of Government posts in New Deal days and was recently an adviser to a relatively sophisticated business group, the Committee for Economic Development. Twenty-seven years ago Means rocked economic thinking when he and Adolf A. Berle wrote "The Modern Corporation and Private Property."

What the Means charts show is that contemporary inflation is a very different animal from the classical demand inflation. The chief difference lies in whether big price increases come in competitive or concentrated industries.

In other words, what Means has done is violate a sacred taboo of economic thinking. He has actually gone and looked at where the price increases are taking place and asked whether the differences over separate periods of time aren't meaningful.

To compound his sins, he has married economic theory to economic fact. And, as everybody in the business knows, the gulf between the institutionalists (fact men) and theoreticians is as wide as the breach between Montagues and Capulets.

Classical inflation is pictured in the top chart, covering the war and immediate postwar years. This was a money phenomenon, an increase in money demand which was not offset by an equivalent increase in goods—what Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin likes to call too much money chasing too few goods.

In drastically oversimplified form, this is what happened:

The staggering war expenses were paid by the Government through borrowing (deficit financing). To the extent that the Government borrowed (sold bonds) to commercial banks, the Government was simply printing money. The goods this money bought were shot off, exploded, dropped on cities, or left to rot in military warehouses. So, when controls came off, the extra money in the hands of people and businesses bid up prices, much more than it induced increased production. Even with the best will in the world, increased production could not come about quickly enough because resources of men and materials were almost fully employed—too much money was chasing too few goods.

According to Means' charts, the biggest price increases came in the highly competitive industries—lumber, farm products, processed foods, textiles. In these, producers can't control their prices which are set by those impersonal market forces so dear to Adam Smith.

But the concentrated industries with few producers—steel, autos, aluminum, electrical machinery—held back. They do have considerable discretion over price and didn't take full advantage of the big increase in money demand.

Now, the new inflation presents a different picture. All the price push comes from the concentrated industries. The competitive industries in several cases cut prices—textiles, farm products, miscellaneous. And there is

a logic in this. The period under study, 1953 to October 1958 (the last month for which Means got data), was a time of much less than full employment. The period spans two recessions (1953–54 and 1957–58). The money supply did not zoom upward.

So, only industries who need not rely on impersonal market forces but have considerable control over their prices could make increases stick. And the charts show that they did.

Many economists will quarrel with Means' interpretation of his charts. They will contend that the ability to administer prices has nothing to do with whether an industry is competitive or concentrated. They will argue that all Means is showing in his new inflation chart is what you would expect in a period of investment boom—and the Nation certainly was enjoying one from 1955 through 1957—steeply rising prices in steel and other producer goods industries as the result of extra demand for producer goods.

This debate can't be settled in this space or anywhere else now because relatively little is still known about administered prices, or for that matter, concentration.

Let's take a closer look at the charts. The solid black bars are industries or industry groups which are highly concentrated—a handful of producers account for most of their production. The cross-hatched bars are mixed concentrated and competitive—chemicals, furniture and the like. The light gray bars are the competitive industries with thousands of producers, no one of them big enough to affect prevailing prices or production.

The bars are two-dimensional, but that's not as scary as it sounds. The height of each bar measures the percentage of price increase or decrease at wholesale in each industry. For example, in the bottom chart, steel prices went up 36 percent between 1953 and October 1958; farm products prices went down 5 percent.

The width of each bar measures the industry's weight in the wholesale price index—that is, the amount of sales of that industry in relation to the amount of sales of the other industries. If steel sales during 1953-October 1958 were $8 billion and farm products sales were $24 billion, then the farm products bar would be three times wider than the steel bar.

The height of any bar times its width is its area. In these charts, the height (price increase) times width (economic weight) gives a graphic picture of the economic impact of each industry on the price level. In other words, the area of each bar shows how much force each industry or industry group had on the price level.

We can see very quickly that the competitive industries accounted for almost all the pull in the war period. There is much more light gray than black in this picture.

But in the recent period, the push comes from the concentrated industries. Means figures that they account for 85 percent of the gross increase in the wholesale index. If they hadn't gone up in price, the wholesale index would have risen less than 1 percent instead of 8 percent. And this is what you would expect during a period when total output of goods is increasing little and so is the money supply.

There is one other point to note. In the bottom chart Means has broken out steel and fabricated steel from the broad category of metal and metal products. He did this to demonstrate the overwhelming force of the steel and steel-using industries (machinery and motive) in pushing up recent prices.

While Means appears to have demonstrated that the new inflation stems from the concentrated industries, he still hasn't answered the question agitating political debate: Is it the unions or is it the corporations?

Is it Roger Blough's United States Steel, Frederick Donner's General Motors, Ralph Cordiner's General Electric? Or is it David McDonald's United Steelworkers, Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers, James Carey's International Union of Electrical Workers? Or have both sides embarked on an unspoken wage-price or price-wage collaboration?

The charts are of no help here. But Means, who prepared his material for the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, went back into the committee's steel hearings for some arithmetic. After lengthy calculations, based on a series of arguable assumptions, he concluded that labor costs per ton went up $1.75 during 1956–57; prices went up $11 a ton.

This would appear to make United States Steel, the industry's price leader, the chief culprit. However, it must be repeated that Means' computation is derived from assumptions which can be debated. At best his conclusion is suggestive.

Who are these concentrated steel and steel-using industries? They can be reduced to 10 corporations. In terms of ingot capacity, steel is United States Steel (29 percent); Bethlehem (16 percent), and Republic (9 percent).

The motive end of the machinery and motive category is: General Motors (51 percent of 1958 auto production); Ford (29 percent), and Chrysler (14 percent).

The machinery end is tremendously complicated by definitions. But electrical machinery is General Electric (owned 16 percent of the industry's assets in 1947, the last data year); Westinghouse (13 percent); Western Electric Co., an American Telephone & Telegraph subsidiary (13 percent); and Radio Corp. of America (6 percent).

Some policy implications flowing from Means' analysis were spelled out by Chairman ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, of the Senate subcommittee. If Means is right, then:

A tight-money policy won't hold down prices without bringing on a recession because corporate giants are the least affected by a shortage of lendable funds. They raise their expansion money largely from profits, not borrowing.

A balanced Federal budget is irrelevant because this is not a money, but an administered price inflation.

To be sure, easy money and unbalanced budgets would, according to anybody's analysis, worsen the situation by piling a money inflation on top of an administered price inflation.

(However, a minority group of economists headed by Leon Keyserling paradoxically argues that easy money and budget deficits will stimulate an offsetting amount of extra production when, as now, men and resources are not fully employed.)

But what Means is really saying is that some new institutional devices must be invented to control concentrated industries and/or their unions if price stability is to be achieved.

What form the new devices should take might well be on the agenda of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON's new Cabinet committee on inflation and the massive congressional study Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, once proposed for the Joint Economic Committee.

When Men in High Places Get Sick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article written by Frances Burns for the Boston Globe and appearing in their issue for February 22, 1959:

WHEN MEN IN HIGH PLACES GET SICK—DISEASES REMAIN UNCONQUERED BUT WE HAVE MATURED MEDICALLY—AS A NATION AND AS INDIVIDUALS WE ARE LEARNING TO FACE THE FACTS OF NATURE OPENLY AND COURAGEOUSLY

(By Frances Burns)

One of Boston's ablest physicians has observed to colleagues that his crippling arthritis has been wonderful because there were so many things he was not asked to do.

His disease has cleared the decks and left him increasingly free as he grows older for the work that seems important to him.

It may be another generation before anyone knows the consequences of the illnesses that have bedeviled the administration of the American Government in the 1950's. But whether this Nation and the world prove to have been better or worse off because the President, his Secretary of State, and the leader of the opposition suffered severe illnesses and carried on their duties in spite of them, there will be a wealth of information available on which to base judgment.

For it has been a period of unparalleled candor about the health of people in high places.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles last week began the drastic X-ray treatment which is expected to prolong his life and, perhaps, save him pain, after the recurrence of cancer for which he underwent surgery a little more than 2 years ago. Barring what amounts to a medical miracle, known to doctors as a spontaneous remission, which rarely, for no observable reason, halts the disease, there is little likelihood that treatment will provide more than a temporary delay in its course.

AT CRITICAL TIME

The Secretary's illness comes at a critical time in the relations between the East and the West—though has there been any time in the past decade when relations were not critical—and the reaction among our allies in England, France, Germany has been one of great anxiety. For Mr. Dulles has conspicuously run a one-man State Department; his the single, firm, and dominating grasp on the Nation's foreign policy. Other Western statesmen are said to fear that either there may be a lack of continuity in it, or that, partly incapacitated but carrying on, Mr. Dulles might freeze what has seemed to be necessarily a fluid situation, unwilling to start anything new that he would be unable to see through.

EXPERIENCE FACTOR

Yet this Nation remains calm. It may be that "Wolf! wolf!" has been cried too often in the past few years when interpreters of news predicted disaster from decisions made in the face of the President's illnesses. It may be that the American people are maturing medically. So many Americans are seeing cancer, heart disease, arthritis, at close hand, in themselves or members of their families, that they may agree with Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, of Oregon, who is preparing to return to his job in Washington after 5 months of surgery and radiation for cancer, commented that no one really grows up until he realizes he has to die.

Certainly his own experience must be a factor in Mr. Eisenhower's refusal to let Mr. Dulles leave the Government so long as there is a possibility that he may be able to carry on. For the President has learned that it is possible to ignore the body and continue work, freed from the fear that most active people have of disease, and with an excuse at hand to escape some of the unessential burdens placed on heads of state today.

PUBLIC IN DARK

Part of the growing up of the American people has been an increased understanding of the nature of chronic disease and of the efforts to do something about it. People are, on the whole, less likely to fear the known than the unknown.

No one up to now has been able even to guess how much, if at all, history has been changed by the illnesses of those in high places. For many years these illnesses were concealed from the people, often from those in Government itself.

Grover Cleveland learned that he had cancer of the throat at a time when the Nation was threatened with financial crisis. He was spirited to a boat from the cape, where he summered, and somewhere off Long Island was operated on, successfully. Almost no one knew of it until nearly a quarter of a century later when, some years after his death, his surgeon reported it.

No candid report was given to the Government or the people on the illness of Woodrow Wilson, who suffered a stroke on a western tour to appeal for his League of Nations. In the multiplying rumors resulting from the secrecy, all chance for the success of this crowning of his life's work was lost.

The sequel to the blackout of news on the death of President Harding was a batch of scurrilous rumors. It is quite evident today in the light of the symptoms that he suffered a heart attack, and even then doctors must have known it.

F.D.R.'S ILLNESS

And it is doubtful if stories that grew out of lack of frankness about Franklin Roosevelt's physical condition and illness in his last years ever will be scotched. Yet he suffered from high blood pressure and a natural weariness. Candor about them might have avoided damaging reports after his death.

Whatever else the Eisenhower administration may or may not have done, it has showed that the details of disease suffered by those in high places may safely be given to the public. It is doubtful if, in this country, it ever again will be possible to conceal them.

Certainly no one knows whether the people are best served by continuing on active duty men who have had heart disease, cancer and arthritis, or whether there should be a conscious effort to have younger men in Government. At any rate, the question is out in the open, with something now on which to base an answer.

Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, there are still some people in our great common country who reside north of the Mason-Dixon line that harbor ill will toward those who reside in the so-called Southland.

It has been nearly 100 years since that unfortunate fratricidal strife known as the War Between the States ended. Fortunately, the bitterness engendered by this tragic and unnecessary strife has been in the process of slowly dying out. But with the advent of the equally unfortunate decision of the Supreme Court in the school segregation case and the "civil wrongs" legislation, that spirit seems to have been revived by too many of our so-called northern brethren. A recent example of this tragic sectionalism was a letter written by someone here in Washington spewing his venom at my great State of Mississippi. Possibly such exhibitions of hatred and ignorance should be ignored but, for the enlightenment of any persons of like mind, my good friend, Mr. Oliver Emmerich, the distinguished editor of the State Times, a prominent daily newspaper published in Jackson, Miss., has taken justifiable pride in pointing out the great progress that is being made in the State of Mississippi in an editorial. The editorial follows:

NO, MY FRIEND, MISSISSIPPI IS NOT SLOWLY DYING

(By Oliver Emmerich)

The State Times is in receipt of the following message—a product of the campaign of hate waged in the East against the people of the South:

"Happy 1959, Mississippi. You are losing population. I hope you will die more slowly in 1959, 1960, 1961, 1692, etc., etc., than you have been dying up to now. Please, Mississippi, die slowly.

"C. A. CASTLE."

Harry Emerson Fosdick once said, "Prayer is dominant desire." We feel sorry for any individual whose desire stems from hate. What spiritual foundation other than hate could wish slow death to a whole State?

The savagery of the Dark Ages aroused such vicious feeling that men were often condemned to the excruciating pain of slow death. Once a King of England decreed that two robbers be skinned alive. Their skins were tacked to the outer walls of Westminster Abbey.

In this more enlightened age it is tragic to find any person, whose vision is so blurred and whose understanding is so blighted, as to pray for a return of the spirit of the Dark Ages.

Any individual who wishes slow death for Mississippi will find disappointment in the revitalized spirit of this State. Here is the true story of Mississippi:

One hundred years ago Mississippi was the fifth richest State in the Union. Then came the devastation of war, the exploitation of Reconstruction, and finally the resurrection of a triumphant faith which now is sweeping this State to new plateaus of progress and glory.

Slow death? Let's check the industrial life of Mississippi. Twenty years ago Mississippi had only 843 factories, 47,890 industrial workers, and a total industrial output of only $175 million.

Last year the new industrial life of Mississippi had increased our industries to 2,041, our industrial workers to 113,800, and our total industrial output to $1,605 million, an increase of 850 percent.

No signs of rigor mortis here.

Slow death? Let's look at Mississippi's financial progress. Twenty years ago—in 1938—Mississippi banks had on deposit $195,008,000. Last year the total deposits were $1,153,157,000. We are very much alive in this category, as it is easy to see.

Die slowly? Take a peep at Mississippi's agriculture. Total cash farm sales in 1938 were $134,964,000. In 1956 the total was more than 400 percent greater—$596,065,000.

Mississippi dying? Let's look at the educational picture. In 1938 Mississippi spent $24.55 per pupil in elementary schools, or a total of $12 million. Last year Mississippi spent $81,500,000 on elementary education, or $181 per schoolchild.

Mississippi also is in the midst of a $120 million building program for new elementary- and high-school buildings, seeking to equalize the school facilities of the two races. This program was voluntary. It was enacted in 1953, before the U.S. Supreme Court's school-segregation decision.

In addition, our State has budgeted $21 million for higher education, plus $7 million for university and college buildings.

The State of Mississippi is second from the top among the States in the percentage of total tax budget spent for education. A State with this concept of learning is very much alive, forward looking, and on the march.

What's the racial situation? The answer is that racially, Mississippi is up and coming. This State has more Negro college presidents than all of the New England States combined; more Negro schoolteachers (7,217) than all of the Mid-Atlantic States. These teachers meet the same regulations and enjoy the same salary scale as white teachers.

Of the nearly $40 million spent annually in Mississippi for old-age assistance, aid for the blind, dependent children, and total and permanent disabilities, Negroes who represent 45 percent of the population receive 60 percent of the total. White people, representing 55 percent of the population, receive 40 percent.

Eighty percent of public health funds spent for combatting venereal diseases go to Negro residents. Of the total expenditures for public health, our Negro people get a rightful share. This applies to our charity hospitals as well.

What about bombings? Unlike situations in Boston, Peoria, and some parts of the Southland, no churches or other buildings have been bombed in Mississippi. There have been no incidents of racial violence. The two races live here as friends in this, the hospitality State of America.

What about public health? In the past 20 years death from communicable diseases has been reduced more than 85 percent. Twenty years ago, Mississippi suffered from widespread effects of malaria and typhoid fever. In 1957, there was not a single death from either of these diseases in Mississippi.

Other communicable diseases are being blotted out. Mississippi is a place to live long for this is a State where good health prevails. There's nothing deathlike, slow or fast, in this progressive State.

Now, what is the truth about Mississippi's population? The U.S. census figures for January 1, 1959, reveal that Mississippi is gaining population. She lost 4,882 in population between 1940 and 1950. But what mossback of the past wants to apply 1940 population figures in the year of our Lord 1959?

Mississippi had no large municipalities a few decades ago. Jackson, our capital, went from 48,282 in 1930 to 128,000 in 1959.

In the same period Hattiesburg jumped from 18,601 to 35,891; Biloxi from 14,850 to over 45,000; Greenville from 22,943 to 44,574; Pascagoula from 4,339 to more than 25,000; Natchez from 13,422 to 25,195.

This is the population trend today in Mississippi. In the next quarter of a century America will see happening in Mississippi what has happened in California during the last quarter of a century.

Remember this, friends, everywhere: The last half of the 20th century belongs to the South—and Mississippi intends to claim and acquire her share of it.

Slow death? How could any description fit less the revitalized and triumphantly growing State of Mississippi?

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, commemorating the 41st anniversary of Estonian independence is in fact a study of and a tribute to the spirit of nationalism and freedom. Estonia has demonstrated a spirit strong enough to outlive German landlords and Russian governors; strong enough to withstand, at the end of the First World War, first a Bolshevik invasion, then a German invasion, then another Bolshevik invasion; and strong enough to establish a republic and to maintain it through the trials of over 22 years.

Estonia had been independent from its early beginning until the 13th century. Then it found itself a pawn in the power politics of larger, aggressive neighbors, culminating in Russian rule in 1710. For more than 200 years they lived under oppressive Russian rule. Their chief desire during all that time was to be free, though they were unable to attain their freedom without help from others. But history took pity on these heroic people during World War I. With the Russian revolution of 1917 czarist autocracy was overthrown and that government's authority over other nationalities was shattered. Estonians felt a taste of freedom, and on February 24, 1918, they proclaimed their independence. In 1920 the U.S.S.R. signed a peace treaty renouncing all rights to Estonian territory. In 1932 a further guaranty was agreed upon, a nonaggression pact. Thus Estonia built its foundations of sovereignty upon the treacherous sands of Soviet paper promises.

But in 1940, the curtain came down on independent Estonia. As one of the first nations to be subjugated by the Soviet Union after the Hitler-Stalin Pact, Estonia was directly incorporated into the Soviet Union. After being occupied by the Nazis during World War II, Estonia was again returned to Soviet rule. Untold hardships and suffering have been inflicted upon this small nation—deportation, execution, imprisonment, and mobilization—total and brutal sovietization of Estonia.

The unhappy Estonians continue to suffer under totalitarian tyranny. But their hope for freedom and their desire for independence is not dead. It is living in the hearts and minds of Estonians still struggling for their liberty. Estonia no longer remains on the map of Europe, but it does remain in the hearts of all freedom-loving people. The United States still refuses to recognize Estonia as part of the Soviet Union de jure.

Estonians have a spirit—a feeling—of belonging together. This feeling has survived the centuries of division, invasion, and oppression. It was this feeling which, taking the 19th century form of nationalism, founded the Estonian state. The people of Estonia—with their tenacity and their flexibility, their energy, and their courage, their stoicism, and their wit—have suffered the trials of invasion and oppression without being broken or embittered, without losing their capacity for self-government and toleration. We cannot fail to feel in their debt. We encourage the Estonian people in their hope for a complete restoration of freedom; heartily applaud their moral resistance to Communist tyranny, and humbly pay tribute to this long-suffering patriotism.

Irish Came Here With Governor Winthrop and Latchstring Has Been Out Since

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article written by George F. Weston, Jr., which will be of interest to my colleagues and which appeared in the Boston Herald Traveler on February 20, 1959:

IRISH CAME HERE WITH GOVERNOR WINTHROP AND LATCHSTRING HAS BEEN OUT SINCE

(By George F. Weston, Jr.)

The Irish form a large percentage of Boston's population, and there were many honored men of Irish ancestry here from the very earliest days.

The list includes such famous men as Gen. Henry Knox, chief of artillery under Washington; the artist, John Singleton Copley; and the patriot, John Hancock.

IRISH AMONG EARLY SETTLERS

It is generally believed that the first Irishmen to settle in Boston came at the time of the devastating potato famine in 1846–47. It is not the fact. There were many here long before that.

Governor Winthrop's fleet brought several: John Coggan, the first storekeeper in Boston, for one; and George Downing of Dublin, who later married Governor Winthrop's sister, for another.

The ship, *St. Patrick*, which belonged to Thomas Wentworth of Ireland, arrived in Boston, probably in 1632. The records show an edict issued by Governor Endicott which reads:

"It is ordered, that the Scottishe and Irishe gentlemen which intends to come hither shall have liberty to sit down in any place upp Merimacke Ryver not possessed by any."

The rebellion in Ireland in 1644–49 led by "Rory" O'Moore caused some Irishmen to emigrate to America. Governor Winthrop welcomed them by ordering "that the goods of these persone come from Ireland shall be free from ye rat."

The Governor was not thinking of rodents. He meant that the goods should be free from the rate—not taxed.

PURITANS WELCOMED THE NEWCOMERS

It is evident that the Puritans of 17th century Boston had a friendly feeling toward the Irish and gave a cordial reception to those who chose to make their homes in Massachusetts.

That this attitude was appreciated was amply demonstrated at a time when the courage and resources of the Bostonians were nearly exhausted.

The Indians under the leadership of King Philip organized a war whose objective was the complete extermination of white settlers.

The Indians, themselves, were nearly exterminated, instead, and the war ended shortly after the death of Philip on August 12, 1676.

The colonists were victorious, but at a terrible price. Fully a tenth of the men had been killed, crops were ruined, and there were sickness and destitution everywhere.

At this tragic time the good people of Ireland sent to Boston a shipload of food and other necessities "for the releiffe of such as are Impoverished, Destressed, and in Nesessitie by the late Indian Warr."

LEPRECHAUNS CAME WITH THE POTATOES

According to tradition, potatoes and leprechauns first were transported to New England on this relief ship. The potatoes, throve, but the leprechauns must have found the Puritan climate inhospitable. They apparently returned to their own country.

It was nearly 200 years before the people of Boston had an opportunity to repay this kindness.

In 1847 Ireland was famine stricken. It was no mere food shortage, but a complete crop failure which left the people starving.

New Englanders, remembering the help which their ancestors had received, sent prompt assistance.

The people of Boston persuaded the Government to lend them the man-of-war *Jamestown* as a relief ship.

The *Jamestown*, which was at the Charlestown Navy Yard, was promptly loaded with $115,000 worth of food and medical supplies.

The Laborers Aid Society, composed of poor Irishmen, gave its services in loading the ship. Significantly, the loading began on St. Patrick's Day.

The ship, under Capt. Robert Forbes, put to sea on April 12, and arrived in Cork 15 days later—an amazingly fast trip.

ONLY ONE TACK IN ENTIRE VOYAGE

Captain Forbes was a remarkable man. His first voyage was at the age of 13. He was master at 20, and captain of his own ship at 26. He took the *Jamestown* across the Atlantic making only one tack in the entire voyage.

The ship was greeted by a band playing what they believed to be "Yankee Doodle" and by a reception committee whose chairman said, "A thousand lips pale with woe, and a thousand tongues half paralyzed with hunger utter the feeble exclamation, 'God Bless America.' "

The grateful people greeted Captain Forbes and his crew with cheers wherever they were seen. Many of the babies born at about that time were named "Forbes," "Boston," or "James." The last was, of course, short for "Jamestown."

Several other communities sent ships, also. One vessel from Isleboro, Maine, had great difficulty in finding a return cargo.

Finally her hold was filled with sods to act as ballast. These were placed on some of the farms in Isleboro and, a few years later, they were found to be producing genuine Irish shamrocks.

May they continue to grow there forever.

We Are Winning in the North

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to

insert in the RECORD a very fine editorial which recently appeared in the Selma, (Ala.) Times-Journal.

There follows the editorial:

WE ARE WINNING IN THE NORTH

An audience of 200 southern businessmen, in luncheon session at Augusta, Ga., to honor Gen. Robert E. Wood, retired board chairman of Sears, Roebuck & Co., was surprised and delighted to hear this Republican stalwart from Chicago rip into the U.S. Supreme Court for its desegregation decree.

"This racial problem could have been settled—given time and patience—by the South itself," fiery General Wood declared.

His comments were greeted with spirited applause by businessmen gathered for unveiling of a plaque in his honor at a new Sears store.

"Hundreds of thousands of northerners feel the Court's desegregation decree was a mistake," he said. "I resent very much the interference of the States rights by the Supreme Court which, to my mind, is the worst Supreme Court we have had in 100 years."

The general, who said he voted straight Republican, described Georgia's Democratic Senators HERMAN TALMADGE and RICHARD B. RUSSELL as "two of the best in the U.S. Senate today."

Calling Earl E. Warren the President's "worst appointment," Wood said the Chief Justice's "own people in California found him out."

Here is new evidence that intelligent citizens of the North, as the Times-Journal persistently has predicted, are beginning to realize that legal abortions aimed at the South ultimately will cripple all other sections of the Nation, as well.

When that realization becomes general above the Mason and Dixon line, the demogogs who are willing to sell out Americanism for minority bloc votes are going to be driven into exile, and decent representation will become the rule in Washington.

Then the Constitution as interpreted and reinterpreted by able justices again will prevail, and the South will be given ample opportunity to solve its own problems in its own way.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial on this subject recently appeared in the Talladega (Ala.) Daily Home, and I ask also that this well-written article be inserted.

There follows the editorial:

TALKING TURKEY

According to the Associated Press story, it was with amazed delight that some 200 southern businessmen at Augusa, Ga., heard Gen. Robert E. Wood, retired chairman of the board of Sears, Roebuck & Co. rip into the U.S. Supreme Court for its integration decree.

Present for a luncheon given in connection with the unveiling of a plaque in his honor at a new Sears store, the lifetime Republican and prominent business leader talked the sort of language it is strange to hear nowadays in the era of tacit censorship against any presentation of the constitutional viewpoint, which also happens to be the southern viewpoint.

"Hundreds of thousands of northerners feel the Court's desegregation decree was a mistake," he said. "I resent very much the interference with States rights by the Supreme Court, which to my mind is the worst Supreme Court we have had in 100 years."

The crowd, of course, was in hearty agreement with those words, as well as with the statement that Chief Justice Earl Warren is President Eisenhower's worst appointment.

For such expressions to come from such a source is to bring renewed hope that time is on the side of the South. If men like General Wood see so clearly the menace of the Court's recent rulings, we may be sure that many others hold similar ideas and one day will impress them upon northern political leaders.

Urgent Need for Developing Coosa-Alabama Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the Coosa-Alabama River is one of America's potentially great waterways. I am sure the Members will recall my many statements pointing up the benefits which will accrue Alabama and the Nation upon complete development of this waterway.

Very soon, the Congress will be asked again to keep the faith promised 14 years ago when Congress authorized three locks and dams on the Alabama River. You will be asked to provide the appropriation of $150,000 needed for planning and design on the Millers Ferry lock and dam. We hope and believe Congress will not turn this request down.

An editorial on this subject appeared in the Talladega (Ala.) Daily Home of February 16, 1959. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was included as follows:

AN URGENT NEED

The importance of full development of the Coosa-Alabama Waterway system cannot be overemphasized.

The matter will come up again in Washington soon and it is urgent that backers of the waterway development lend wholehearted support to the Coosa-Alabama River Improvement Association which for many years has promoted this project.

A comparatively small sum is needed for advanced planning of Millers Ferry lock and dam on the Alabama River, a key phase in the development program.

There is nothing that could bring greater prosperity to the 29 counties in Alabama which are considered to be commercially tributary to the vast river system.

Completion of Millers Ferry lock and dam and installation of locks on existing dams and proposed dams on the waterway would provide navigation facilities which would bring great benefits to the valley and to all of Alabama and adjacent States.

The waterway would open up to the inland cities and towns trade and commerce with the world. It would bring new industries and industrial payrolls that could add greatly to the prosperity of the area.

Full development of the waterway would also bring great potentialities for recreation in the form of boating, fishing, and other sports.

But primarily it would mean more dollars, more jobs, and more prosperity for the area.

It is estimated that within a 20-year period the tributary area of the rivers would secure additional industry that would involve the expenditure of millions of dollars, an estimated 65-percent increase in population requiring 120,000 additional housing units costing more than a billion dollars, and an increase in industrial empolyment by more than 55,000 with payrolls of $150 million.

It is something that should receive all-out support of the people of the area and careful consideration of the congressional committees and Government agencies involved.

Mr. Speaker, I have an editorial pointing up the importance of development of the Coosa-Alabama River which appeared in the Tallahassee Tribune of February 19, 1959. I also wish to insert this editorial with my remarks.

The editorial follows:

THE COOSA-ALABAMA

It is to be hoped that representatives of the Coosa-Alabama River Improvement Association meet with success when they appear before the appropriations committees of the Congress to secure funds for advance planning of Millers Ferry lock and dam, Alabama River.

This is no "pork barrel" project, but the initial step in the development of the Coosa-Alabama River system.

Development of the Coosa-Alabama is important to our State and Nation. The area considered to be commercially tributary to the system includes all or part of 43 counties, 29 of which are in Alabama, 14 in Georgia, and 1 in Tennessee.

These counties have an area of approximately 26,000 square miles and include a population of 1,547,000, according to the 1950 census. Sixty-six percent of this population is in Alabama and the Alabama area contains a third of the entire population of the State.

One of the benefits to be obtained through this development would be lower transportation cost on bulk materials and stabilization of transportation rates throughout the river basin.

However, from where we sit, the principal benefit to be derived would be the attraction of new industries, a project which is of vital concern to all our citizens from Gov. John Patterson to many a small farmer who would have the benefit of at least part time employment to help compensate for the shrinking cotton acreage in our State.

The fact that many new industries are seeking waterside locations is borne out in a recent report of the American Waterways Operators which records a total of 404 waterside industrial locations for the first 9 months of 1958.

We hope our Senators and Congressmen will listen with great interest as representatives of the Coosa-Alabama River Improvement Association unfold their plans at the committee hearings. And we hope further that they will lend their good offices in cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, the Association of American Railroads has submitted a protest to the Corps of Engineers on development of the Coosa-Alabama River, and this subject is discussed in an editorial which appeared in the Anniston, Ala., Star of February 15, 1959. I also ask consent to have this editorial inserted in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

RAILROADS STILL THINKING NEGATIVELY

It is no wonder that the railroads of this country have been having economic difficulties in recent years, for it seems that they are always thinking negatively instead of positively. If they had spent half as much on research as they have spent in fighting other means of transportation, their status would be much better today.

Instead of improving their own methods, however, they have wasted their time and energy in opposition to truck transportation, which they should have initiated, and now

they are sitting still and watching the airways take over their passenger service.

They are fighting the development of the Coosa-Alabama River enterprise and have filed a protest with the Army Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, in which they contend that the findings by the Engineers in this particular are erroneous and misrepresentative.

But this is nothing new. For here in Alabama the railroads fought the dock development at Mobile and river transportation on the Tennessee, not to mention their long battle against Senator John Tyler Morgan when he was leading the fight for an isthmian canal.

They even tried to bribe the eminent Alabama Senator, but they got kicked out of his office pronto.

If it had not been for their ability to barge heavy tonnage down the Warrior to Mobile, the U.S. Steel Corp. probably would never have organized the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co.

But all of these waterway developments have meant billions of dollars in revenue to the rails, in spite of their opposition.

The railroads should keep in mind the fact that there always will be instances wherein either they or the trucks will have to transport tonnage to the ports; and as far as we are concerned, we prefer the railroads, as they do not clutter up or tear down the highways.

But the fact remains that today industrial water is essential to the manufacturing process in a majority of instances. And the city or State that makes that facility available will make jobs for the railroads as well as for the seaborne or river traffic that justifies waterway development.

Last Sunday there was an editorial in this paper that referred to the vast tonnage that now plies up and down the Tennessee and the waterways of the Northwest. We now learn that industrial enterprises valued at $13 billion have been located on the Ohio River and its tributaries since 1950.

The Coosa-Alabama River system is one of the greatest undeveloped waterways in the United States, if not in the world. And now that the Alabama Power Co. is investing more than $100 million on these streams, it is a foregone conclusion that billions of dollars worth of new industrial development will follow suit in time.

If the Coosa and the Alabama had been located in almost any region north of the Mason and Dixon line, they would have been developed years ago and we would have prospered as much as have the people on the Ohio.

But both Senators Morgan and Pettus in their day found themselves stymied by sectional prejudice.

Those prejudices are giving way to a more enlightened industrial statesmanship today, however, and this part of the South is growing as fast in material development as any other American region. And in the field of chemistry we are leading the Nation, thanks largely to our abundance of water.

Alabama Mayors Discuss Municipal Improvement Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Alabama congressional delegation were privileged last week to meet with a group of representatives of the Alabama League of Municipalities who came to Washington to report to us on the progress of various Federal-municipal programs. At the meeting the organization's capable executive director, Ed E. Reid, presented a number of Alabama mayors who each discussed for us an important, Federal-aid program. These reports by the mayors are most enlightening and, since they are concerned with the use of Federal funds for the betterment of municipalities, I think it is appropriate that they be shared with other Members of Congress. My congressional district was represented at this meeting by the mayor of Tuscaloosa, Ala., the Honorable George Van Tassel, and the mayor of Uniontown, Ala., the Honorable T. Ralston Long. Mayor Van Tassel gave a report on airport construction and Mayor Long reported on planning assistance. Their statements are as follows:

THE NEED FOR FEDERAL AID FOR MUNICIPAL AIRPORT CONSTRUCTION

(By George Van Tassel, mayor of Tuscaloosa, Ala.)

The recent action of the U.S. Senate in approving a $465 million airport aid bill for the next 4 years was extremely gratifying to Alabama municipal officials. We strongly hope that the House will do as well for our future airport construction program. I would like to list some reasons why our towns and cities are interested in this type of legislation:

1. There is a national interest in municipal airports—as well as a local interest.

2. There is likewise a national responsibility as well as local responsibility for such airports.

3. Aviation is now an essential transportation element contributing to the economic strength of the country, in addition to contributing to national defense.

4. Because airfields, both large and small, serve or can serve national defense needs—because they are important to the national economy and because they are used for interstate flight operations—the development of an adequate airport system within the State, as a segment of an adequate national airport system, is a joint responsibility of the Federal Government in partnership with State and local governments.

AIRPORTS USED IN INTERSTATE FLIGHTS

5. In Alabama there is not a single public field—the small ones as well as large—that has not been used by aircraft in interstate flight. Many are used regularly.

6. Many Alabama airfields—including some very small ones with strips as short as 1,700 and 2,000 feet—have also been used for emergency landings of military aircraft and have thus saved the aircraft, thereby also saving the taxpayers, millions of dollars in aircraft losses. Wherever there is an airport there is insurance for emergency needs, as well as for general use.

7. If there is justification for Federal highway aid—and there certainly is—then there is justification for Federal airport aid. Both serve the transportation needs of the country and are vital to the entire national economy.

8. No one will challenge the statement that Federal aid is essential for highway construction. This is substantiated by steadily growing Federal appropriations. It should be recognized just as strongly that Federal aid is also necessary and essential for airport construction.

9. The two situations are very similar as to needs, as to utilization and usefulness and as to the inability of State and local governments to finance them alone.

IN THE AREA OF INTERSTATE OPERATIONS

10. Military aviation is in the area of interstate operations; airline aviation is likewise in the same category, as is most executive and business flying. Flying is no longer mainly a local operation. As the Federal Government assumes control and jurisdiction over all types of flying—both interstate and intrastate—it has an obligation to assist with the construction of facilities for their airport needs.

11. Federal aid should not be limited to any class or category of airport or landing area. There have been reports that the President believed Federal aid should be furnished only to jet airports during his proposed tapering off, transitional period. All airports, both large and small, are important to adequate State and national airport systems.

12. The cities must have Federal aid for the resealing of runways and for filling of runway joints. This is not just a simple maintenance job, as the CAA ruled, thus making them ineligible for Federal grants. Therefore, the proposed amendment covering the eligibility of periodic seal coating of flexible airport pavement and the filling of joints in rigid airport pavement is most important to the cities and should be approved.

Many small communities are now required to maintain airports with runways of 5,000 to 6,000 feet in length to accommodate the type of aircraft now utilizing them. As aircraft are now growing larger, heavier, and provide greater impact on the paving, the situation has passed beyond just fair wear and tear and has created additional heavy costs, which some cities cannot afford.

OUR STATE'S IS A $13 MILLION PROGRAM

13. Alabama's Federal aid program to date has amounted to $13,521,000, with the Federal Government providing $6,754,000 and the State and cities providing $6,767,000. Alabama could not possibly have financed this program alone. Neither could any of the other States.

14. It has been estimated by the Alabama Department of Aeronautics and the Civil Aeronautics Administration, just prior to the CAA transfer to the Federal Aviation Agency, that over $24 million will be needed in local, State, and Federal funds during the next 4 years (1959–62), if Alabama is to be provided with the new airport facilities the State now needs or will need. It should be obvious that Alabama alone cannot provide this amount.

15. For 1959, the Alabama Department of Aeronautics recommended 76 Alabama cities to CAA for inclusion in the 1959 edition of the national airport plan. As airport needs are steadily growing and some suddenly developed because of new industrial requirements, this list is certain to be increased within the proposed 4-year extension of the Federal Airport Act, that the Senate has voted. Actually, we need a minimum extension of 5 years for the Federal Airport Act.

COMMUNITIES RECOMMENDED FOR AIRPORT PLAN

The 76 cities recommended are as follows:

Abbeville, Albertville, Alexander City, Aliceville, Andalusia, Anniston, Ashland-Lineville, Atmore, Auburn-Opelika, Bay Minette, Bessemer, Birmingham, Brewton, Brundidge, Butler, Camden, Centreville, Centre, Citronelle, Clanton, Columbiana, Cullman, Decatur-Athens, Demopolis, Dothan, Elba, Enterprise, Eufaula, Eutaw, Evergreen, Fairhope, Fayette, Foley, Fort Payne, Gadsden, Geneva, Greensboro, Greenville, Grove Hill, Guntersville, Haleyville, Hamilton, Headland, Heflin, Huntsville, Jackson, Jasper, LaFayette, Lanett, Leeds, Linden, Livingston, Luverne, Marion, Mobile, Montgomery, Monroeville, Muscle Shoals, Oneonta, Ozark, Phenix City, Red Bay, Roanoke, Russellville, Scottsboro, Selma, Sylacauga, Talladega, Tallassee, Troy, Tuscaloosa,

Tuskegee, Union Springs, Uniontown, Vernon, Wetumpka.

COMMUNITIES DERIVE GREAT VALUE FROM PLANNING ASSISTANCE

(By T. Ralston Long, mayor of Uniontown, Ala.)

The 701 program of Federal grants through the Housing and Home Finance Agency to our State planning and industrial development board to assist in the preparation of comprehensive master plans for municipalities of under 25,000 persons has been of great value to the municipalities which have received this technical assistance. Ninety-one cities and towns in Alabama have received substantial technical assistance through this program. Our State agency has completed the work called for in three projects and they are currently performing the work called for in the Alabama P–4 contract. This latter project provides for work in 43 municipalities.

An additional project (Alabama P–5) which would have provided for assistance to 12 cities, had been applied for last summer and failed to materialize because of a shortage of Federal funds for the current fiscal year. All of these cities are in desperate need of help.

In addition to the above, several cities have asked the State agency for help on their planning problems and have been placed on a waiting list for the next application for a 701 grant.

MUNICIPAL PLANNING SHOULD BE CONTINUING

That the city planning, made possible through the 701 grants, has been of great value to the municipalities, the area of the State in which each is located, and to the State as a whole is unquestioned in most every informed mind in the State. This is demonstrated by the fact that practically every city which has prepared a city plan has continued their city planning program after the plan itself has been completed—usually with proper technical assistance. For instance, 26 municipalities which have had city plans prepared and completed with 701 grants, are receiving currently monthly consulting advice under a contractual arrangement with the State planning and industrial development board.

The desire for, and need of city planning derives from a number of causes in Alabama. Many Alabama communities are growing very rapidly and this condition imposes the real need for land use controls, and community facility planning to satisfy immediate needs as well as long range needs. The interstate highways and other important highway planning and construction is causing municipal problems which can only be solved within the framework of comprehensive city planning. Chambers of commerce and other municipal industrial development groups often feel that city planning is one of the musts that a city should have to successfully compete for commercial and industrial growth. Probably of greatest importance in creating the demand for city planning in Alabama, is the desire of our communities to rejuvenate or renew the physical plant of the city. City planning is probably the most important of the several tools necessary to achieve a worthwhile urban renewal program.

RECIPIENTS IN STATE GEOGRAPHICALLY DISTRIBUTED

All of these reasons are causing the requests for city planning Federal grants in Alabama.

The 91 municipalities which have received city planning assistance are fairly evenly distributed geographically throughout the State. The number of cities by congressional districts is as follows:

	Municipalities
District 1	9
District 2	10
District 3	13
District 4	10
District 5	9
District 6	9
District 7	13
District 8	9
District 9	9

It is anticipated that the future program from 701 grants to the State of Alabama will also be well distributed over the State.

Some reference has been made previously to the fact that industrial development is one of the causes for city planning. The point is sufficiently important to be emphasized. Certainly the Alabama State Planning and Industrial Development Board believes this to be so, since, for nearly 20 years they have alloted a part of their appropriation to maintain a staff of technically trained personnel to assist Alabama communities in city planning problems. This feeling of the importance of creating better cities to help spur industrial development of the State is also shared by the State chamber of commerce, and most local chambers of commerce.

REGIONAL AND METROPOLITAN PLANNING

Up until the present, the metropolitan and regional features of the Federal 701 program have not been used because Alabama State laws do not make sufficient provision for these types of programs. Bills have been prepared and will be introduced in the Alabama State Legislature which meets in regular session in May. It appears that the legislation will receive favorable action and the Housing and Home Finance Agency will likely have a number of requests for metropolitan or regional 701 programs during the next year.

We strongly believe that the 701 program of local planning assistance grants has been extremely valuable to the municipalities and the State of Alabama in the past. We strongly urge the strengthening of the appropriations for these activities whereby sufficient Federal money will be available to match local money.

Masonry Supports Public Schools and Freedom of Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit the following article from the Knoxville Scottish Rite News, for November 1958, by Mr. E. E. Patton, a well-known historian of Knoxville, Tenn.:

MASONRY SUPPORTS PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND FREEDOM OF RELIGION

(By E. E. Patton)

On the back cover of the New Age, the official publication of the Supreme Council of Scottish Rite Masons, may be found the following sentence: "The supreme council favors the American public school, nonpartisan, nonsectarian, efficient, democratic, for all of the children of all the people." Masonry favors an efficient teaching force—teachers elected and retained because of their ability and not because of kinship, friendly relations, or political influence. The Masonic fraternity favors the teaching of civics, history, and government, including the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, with all its amendments. This should be done without prejudice or partisanship on the part of the teacher or supervisor. It favors democratic operation of the public school system throughout the Nation. In the public school the son of the section hand is given as much consideration, credit, and honor as the son of a millionaire. That is democracy in the Masonic manner.

The supreme council further favors the inculcation of patriotism, respect for law and order, and undying loyalty to the Constitution of the United States of America. It is true that the civic record of some Masons has not been so attractive and commendable, but 99 percent of American Masons are law abiding and loyal to the American flag. It should be remembered that Jesus had 12 disciples, and 1 of them betrayed him. American Masons do not criticize the loyalty of Masons of other countries to their flag and the concern for the safety and security of their native land. Jacob A. Riis was born, reared, and educated in Denmark and he said he loved the flag of Denmark better than any other flag, except the flag of his manhood and his children, the American flag. Americans honored him for his loyalty to the flag of his native country. If an American Mason is disloyal to the American flag, he is a Mason only in words, not in morality and affection.

The supreme council also favors the compulsory use of English as the language of instruction in the grammar grades of our public schools. The reason for this is so basic that discussion is not necessary. John Quincy Adams accompanied his father to Europe at the beginning of the Revolutionary War. He acted as his father's secretary and learned all the languages of Europe, but when he became Secretary of State and later President of the United States, he conducted all his official business in the language of America—the English language. He was not a Mason but he followed the Masonic custom.

The Tennessee General Assembly of 1919 passed an act which requires every public schoolteacher of this State to be an American citizen. The general assembly of 1851 passed an act requiring every high school in Tennessee to have not less than 1 year of American history and Government. Every Mason of the State and Nation has given his wholehearted support to both these acts. They tend to make sure of the safety and security of the Nation and that is what all loyal Americans want and demand.

The supreme council goes yet a step further in this attempt to safeguard the security of our Nation. It favors adequate provision in the American public schools for the education of the alien population in the principles of American institutions and ideals of citizenship. Every naturalized citizen should be able to speak the English language. He should have a knowledge of our great civic documents; the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution. He should have a working knowledge of the liberty, freedoms, privileges, and safeguards he enjoys under our form of Government. If he fails or refuses to meet these requirements then he should be sent back to his former home. We do not want him or any of his kind.

The Scottish Rite is a strong and outspoken proponent of the principle of the entire separation of church and state, and opposition to every attempt to appropriate public money—Federal, State, or local—directly or indirectly, for the support of sectarian or private institutions. Public money

for private or sectarian schools would be on a par with public money for the support of churches—the church that could produce the greatest number of members and supporters. It should never be done.

The person who is opposed to the principle of separation of church and state could not by any manner of means be regarded as a loyal and devoted American. Our great country is founded on this basic principle. Just bear this in mind; where religion is free, Masonry is free and where Masonry is free religion is free. All loyal Americans believe in this motto and they are willing to sacrifice their lives in order to bequeath it to their children and their children's children.

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

State, Nation Seen in Fiscal Fight for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the State Journal of Lansing-East Lansing, Mich., on Sunday, February 8, 1959. The writer of the article, Harold Thompson, is a Detroit businessman, who was deputy secretary of state in 1947 and 1948 in the State of Michigan.

There is much food for thought in Mr. Thompson's statements. Spending more than our income, whether it be ours as individuals, or that of local, State, or Federal Government can lead only to disaster.

The article follows:

STATE, NATION SEEN IN FISCAL FIGHT FOR SURVIVAL

(By Harold Thompson)

It would seem that we, the people, are in a mess. Our National Government is in debt to the sum of $300 billion, our State is bankrupt, our cities have serious financial problems and our schools are in jeopardy for lack of money. The only answer to date on the horizon is to borrow more money—that is, increase the national debt, borrow from the veterans' trust fund, and (in Detroit) put out a huge bond issue for the rehabilitation of our school buildings.

Very few of our elected representatives at any level are looking the cause squarely in the face. The effect is obvious but the cause is equally obvious and simply is that we are spending more than our income. This is true in our Federal Government, it is true in our State government, and it is true at local levels.

Any American housewife knows the answer when faced with this problem in her little domain. Sure, the family can borrow money and then borrow more money, which our governments are now doing. They call it refinancing. The average man and his wife, however, know that to keep piling debt on top of debt simply means that in the end they will be wiped out. They know they would lose their home, their car, and anything else they are buying on time.

FACE PROBLEM SQUARELY

Knowing this, the average man and his wife simply face squarely their problem and do the only thing they can do to save their little world. They simply cut down expenses, regardless of how deep they have to cut. They know no other way of survival, and indeed there isn't any.

If this sounds like oversimplification, it is only because the last 20 years have produced too many politicians who appeal to their voters by promising everything in sight. Promising something for nothing, under the illusion that in issuing new U.S. bonds and borrowing from the veterans' trust fund for example, we are borrowing merely from ourselves.

This is the great American lie and history will record of us that we were in fact dishonest.

Proof of this lies in the fact that nowhere do we find any elected representative talking about paying off our national debt, and at local levels we find our representatives talking only about how to raise more money. As far as the national debt is concerned, we, the present people, have no intention of paying any part of the $300 billion, but are passing the buck to our great-grandchildren and indeed to our great-great-grandchildren, children as yet unborn, children being taxed without representation.

EXPENSES NEED HARD LOOK

It seems to this humble citizen that we first, therefore, should take a hard look at our expenses of government, and by this I do not mean the defense costs. I mean the tremendous number of new agencies that have cropped up during the past 25 years. Undoubtedly some of them are good, but many of them are luxuries. Are we being honest in having such luxuries and at the same time forcing future generations to pay for them? In short, are we not overgoverned? Do we not have far too many government employees?

This is particularly true at our State level, but yet no one seems to be seriously concerned.

One would like to know what was the total number of State employees 15 years ago and what is that number now?

One would like to know what new agencies have been created during these past 15 years.

One would also like to know how many employees are being carried by different departments in Lansing that have not been certified by civil service.

In other words, this humble citizen would like someone to really get at the facts toward the end of seeing how many functions could be abolished and how many people could be taken off the State payroll.

Such a suggestion will horrify those who use our money to buy votes, but then there are those among our representatives surely who must clearly see that the end is in sight, as indeed the average man and his wife see their end in sight when they embark on a program of borrowing and reborrowing.

RUSSIAN PURPOSE NOTED

The question here is not how to preserve those new functions of the Government which are doing some good, but rather how to save the State and the Union from going under. The object of Russia in conducting the cold war is to deplete us financially; thus those among our representatives who continually subscribe to these everlasting borrowing and inflationary policies are aiding and abetting Russia in her economic attack on this country.

Russia's intent at this stage of the game is not important. The fact is she is bringing this beloved land of ours to its knees by everlastingly weakening its financial structure. We are way past such things as political expediency, and are now in fact fighting for survival.

Thus I suggest that some legislative branch of our State government really get hard-boiled about this matter of being overgoverned. It is not a task for the administration. It is a task for all those of our elected representatives who have to do with spending money. Possibly the State senate is the best body.

Having done this and then followed through by pruning down to the ground, we can then discuss ways and means of raising more money with the least amount of overhead.

In this connection this humble citizen subscribes to the philosophy that all of us should pitch in and help just as all of our boys in the Armed Forces do their task regardless of individual or economic status.

This citizen does not believe most of our people want to steal from their great-grandchildren. This citizen believes that most of our people are good Americans and will help when the need is made clear.

We are past the day of soaking one group to gain favor with another group. We are almost in the position of passengers on the ship that is going down and we are in the lifeboats. We are now in the position of all being in danger if the lifeboat capsizes.

My prayer therefore is that the elected representatives of the people throw partisan politics out of the window and look this whole question right in the face, and, having done this, take such action as is necessary to get us back on the right track, regardless of teh effect on such representatives or their political parties.

Arms and the Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act which the House recently passed, the following editorial from the New York Post of February 18, 1959, deserves the thoughtful consideration of every Member of Congress. This editorial endorses the position which I took on this legislation—that a 2-year extension would be adequate while a thorough review is made of our military manpower needs and our military manpower procurement policies. I hope that every Senator will have the opportunity to read this editorial prior to taking a position on the extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act when it comes up for Senate action:

ARMS AND THE MAN

One of the more dubious institutions of our time is the military conscription law. We are a democracy in the space age; our Army depends primarily on complicated scientific gadgets that require special technical skills instead of massive unskilled manpower; the democratic principle of universal service, understandable in time of war, is increasingly inapplicable because exemptions now are generous. Yet the House of Representatives has again bowed to the Pentagon's flag-waving man hunt and voted overwhelmingly to extend the law for another 4 years.

The action was dutiful obeisance to a sacred cow being rushed through the House with a red, white, and blue ribbon. A small group of dissenters with a strong sense of reality did put up a fight for a new look at the Pentagon's flim-flam. But when the vote came they were swamped. Even members who privately expressed doubts about the necessity for the draft timidly refrained from blocking the cow's passage.

The bill is now in the Senate. It deserves much more careful scrutiny there. Many thoughtful men believe that a 2-year extension will certainly suffice while a thorough review is made of the law's merits and our true military manpower needs in this strange new world. We agree.

Dedication of the New Supreme Court Building in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am glad to place in the RECORD the following remarks made by Justice Gerald Nolan and the address made by Francis M. Verrilli, esq., at the recent dedication ceremonies of the new Supreme Court building in New York:

ADDRESS BY JUSTICE GERALD NOLAN

As the one presiding over the ceremonies I am compelled to say, "Mr. Roscoe, we enjoyed your message very much." Later in the day I hope to have the pleasure of saying, "Andy, you did very well."

I can testify as presiding justice that in Brooklyn we have a very fine and a very active bar association. The officers, trustees, and members of that association are always mindful of the high ideals of an honored profession. They have always been most cooperative in every project initiated by the bench and by the bar, designed to promote, sustain, or to improve the administration of justice.

The leaders of that association have been men of great legal attainment, and the present incumbent of the office of president is no exception to that rule. He exemplifies in the full the spirit of the great association which he represents, and he is a fitting successor to the many distinguished men who have preceded him in that great office.

It is my privilege to present to you at this time the president of the Brooklyn Bar Association, Mr. Francis M. Verrilli. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY FRANCIS M. VERRILLI

Judge Nolan, honorable justices, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very touched by the very gracious introduction of Judge Nolan.

It is a very pleasant task that has been assigned to me today to say a few words on behalf of the Brooklyn Bar Association on the historic occasion of the dedication of its very beautiful edifice.

Every citizen is justly proud of this imposing building, for its simple beauty and practical usefulness, but we are not concerned with marble and gilt, but rather the purposes for which the building has been erected, that is, the full and efficient administration of justice.

It is entirely fitting, therefore, for us, the members of the bar and the able justices of this court, to rededicate ourselves to the continued development of the law and the true administration of justice to all men without fear or favor and without regard to race, creed, or color.

While we have traveled far along this road, there is much to be done and we should continue to strive to give to all the litigants who will enter these halls not only the appearance of justice but the very essence of justice by courtesy, kindly consideration, and patient understanding of their problems.

The layman is often confused and bewildered at the law's delay, and the multiplicity of courts, which constitute our judicial system. The judicial conference, of which you will hear more this morning, I am sure, has set forth a plan for the reorganization of the courts which warrants our most careful and thoughtful consideration, and it is our duty as members of the bench and of the bar to help evolve a workable plan of court reorganization.

The public looks to us, the bench and bar, to solve these problems, and if we face up to them with courage and vision, then we will add honor and luster to the noble profession of the law.

The Brooklyn Bar Association adds its congratulations and felicitations to all those who have made this very historic occasion possible. Thank you. [Applause.]

Need for Flexibility in Cotton Acreage Allotments Cited by Alabama Gov. John Patterson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, Alabama cotton farmers realize perhaps better than anyone the dire necessity of congressional modification of the laws regulating allocation of acreages.

A survey conducted in our State shows that unless flexibility in acreage allotments is provided whereby one farmer can transfer unwanted allotments to other farmers in the same county, Alabama will stand to lose the creation of new wealth on nearly 100,000 acres of good cotton land.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 2428, to provide for lease and transfer of acreage allotments, which, I believe, will help to revitalize cotton production.

I have received from Alabama's new and able Governor, the Honorable John Patterson, a letter pointing up the pressing need for legislation such as I propose, and offering the support of the State of Alabama.

We are hopeful for early consideration of and approval of this legislation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the letter from Governor Patterson:

STATE OF ALABAMA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Montgomery, February 11, 1959.

Hon. KENNETH ROBERTS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR KENNETH: Farm leaders all over Alabama are concerned about the wholesale abandonment of cotton allotments due to the situation on many of our farms where small allotments coupled with low prices have rendered cotton production unprofitable.

A survey conducted in each of Alabama's 67 counties indicates that unless the flexibility in acreage allotments which the leasing measure that you support provides is effected for 1959, that Alabama will stand to lose the creation of new wealth on nearly 100,000 acres of good cotton land. Even at present prices and yields the leasing of allotments within the counties as you propose has been estimated to prevent the loss of over $15 million worth of new wealth for Alabama in 1959 alone.

Consequently, this cotton measure could well be one of the most important measures to come before the Congress in 1959 insofar as the economy of the State of Alabama is concerned.

I am sure that I do not need to call it to your attention that while the Nation has allotted to cotton 75.7 percent of its 1950 allotment, Alabama has been assigned only 60.8 percent of its 1950 allotment for 1959.

Therefore, I take this means to urge you to renew your efforts so that Alabama farmers who depend upon the production of cotton for their livelihood may be given the opportunity to plant any acreage not used by their neighbors, protecting the State's allotment whereby Alabama can from this day forward, at least maintain its relative position as a cotton-producing State.

In this connection I offer the full support of this administration and the State of Alabama.

Yours for a greater Alabama.

JOHN PATTERSON,
Governor.

Welfare State?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, disciples of deficit spending should be observing what it has done to the State of Michigan, and maybe their hurry to put the United States in the same boat might be slowed up a bit.

I was glad to see that the Washington Evening Star of February 23 devoted a substantial editorial to a presentation of Michigan's current financial situation.

If my colleagues have not read this article, or do not know about what has happened in Michigan, they will find it most informative and helpful in their own decisions to spend or not to spend the public's money. I submit it for inclusion in the RECORD:

WELFARE STATE?

The State of Michigan leads the world in production of motor vehicles and parts. It ranks very high in other lines of manufacturing, in mining, and in agriculture. It is divided by Lake Michigan into two parts, adding immeasurably to its resort attractions and accounting for its official motto: "Si quaeris peninsulam amoenam circumspice"—If you seek a pleasant peninsula, look about you. It is also broke, financially speaking, or so close to it that the disciples of deficit spending should be enjoying a happy holiday in their hearts.

That it was not literally broke on February 15, according to an Associated Press dispatch from the capital city of Lansing, was due entirely to the willingness of Michigan in-

dustry to hand over more than $35 million in taxes from 2 to 4 months ahead of their due date. Without such prepayment, the State treasury would have been bare of money on February 15—"collapse day," as it had become known. The taxes, of varied types, were due between April 15 and June 15. Gov. Mennen Williams, sometimes mentioned as a Democratic Presidential hopeful, invited Michigan industry to help avert the crisis that Michigan politicians—Democrats and Republicans alike—had created. With the $35 million plus, the State was able to make first payments since last November to the three State universities, to honor overdue obligations to townships and cities, and even to meet such welfare needs as aid to dependent children and the aged.

There is a possibility that "collapse day" may be rescheduled on April 15, but Mr. Williams has some ideas on how to cope with that. He has proposed a constitutional amendment referendum on April 6 to raise from $250,000 to $50 million the amount the State can borrow without express vote, and he has suggested that a veterans' trust fund of $50 million be made available for collateral. He also has proposed bigger taxes—on industry profits and personal income. The news dispatch did not mention any recommendation for cutting down expenditures—now or ever.

Time To Repeal Telephone Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation designed to repeal the excise tax on telephone service. The 10-percent sales tax on telephone users was levied during World War II as a temporary measure to reduce the load on overburdened telephone facilities and to raise funds for financing the war effort. The original purposes of this tax have long since faded from the scene, and yet this burdensome tax remains.

It may be argued that all taxes are burdensome, but that they are necessary to finance the vital services provided by the Federal Government. However, the tax on communications facilities is particularly severe, and I believe unfair, because it is a regressive sales tax which is imposed on everyone alike without reference to ability to pay. I have always opposed the use of a sales tax where it was not designed to fulfill a specific need.

Now, Federal sales taxes are levied on luxury items such as jewelry, liquor, and nightclub entertainment, and these I believe are well justified. But certainly one cannot put telephone service in the same category as these luxury items. Telephone service is a public utility of the same nature as electricity, gas, and water on which there are no Federal excise taxes.

This tax is also illogical in view of the Federal Government's efforts to promote the extension of telephone coverage through the telephone program of the REA. This program has greatly benefited the rural people of our Nation. But one should note that over 40 percent of our farm families today are still without the benefit, indeed, the vital necessity of telephone service. It is time to repeal this excise tax which runs directly counter to the stated aims of the Federal Government to promote telephone service.

Repeal of Excise Tax on Transportation of Passengers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ODIN LANGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of Resolution 1 of the 1959 Minnesota Legislature, which expresses the concern of the people and the legislature in Minnesota relative to the repeal of the Federal excise tax upon the transportation of passengers.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 1

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the repeal of the Federal excise tax upon the transportation of passengers

Whereas the Federal excise tax upon the transportation of passengers was adopted as a wartime tax to discourage the movement of civilian passengers during World War II; and

Whereas today, 13 years after the cessation of hostilities, there continues a 10-percent levy on the transportation of passengers (title VI, sec. 609 (a) United States Code), which tax while collected by the common carriers of transportation by rail, by highway, by water, and in the air, is imposed upon and collected from the users of such transportation; and

Whereas millions of dollars in revenues are paid to the State of Minnesota by those common carriers; and

Whereas the 10-percent tax on transportation of passengers discourages the use of public transportation systems and tends to decrease the revenue of the State and local government by reason of the lesser earnings or volume of business of said public system of transportation; and

Whereas there exists ample facilities for the public transportation of persons throughout the State of Minnesota and the Nation and the purpose for which said tax was imposed has long since ceased to exist; and

Whereas the decrease in revenue by reason of the small amount received for said excise tax on the transportation of passengers will largely be made up by the increased income taxes paid by the passengers of common carriers and other excise taxes paid on the facilities and equipment used by said common carriers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to repeal the Federal excise taxes upon the transportation of persons; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each member of the Minnesota delegation in the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives.

KARL F. ROLVAAG,
President of the Senate.
E. J. CHILGREN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 6th day of February 1959.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 16th day of February 1958.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Approved February 19, 1959.

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Filed February 20, 1959.

JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
Secretary of State.

AMVETS 1959 Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, several days ago Dr. Winston E. Burdine, national commander of AMVETS, appeared before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and presented the 1959 legislative program of his organization. AMVETS deserves a great deal of credit for their well-thoughtout legislative program.

I was particularly impressed with the stand of the organization regarding nonservice-connected pensions and find myself in complete agreement with the statements made regarding the relationships which should exist between nonservice-connected pensions and service-connected disability and death compensation for veterans, widows, orphans, and dependent parents.

In its legislative program, AMVETS calls for first consideration for service-connected compensation programs and hospital and medical programs. AMVETS supports pensions based on need but have rejected pension demands which would result in non-service-connected payments for a few days service, which would be greater than payments being made to seriously disabled service-connected veterans, dependent parents, and dependent children.

I hope that every Member of the House will have an opportunity to read Dr. Burdine's statement:

STATEMENT OF WINSTON E. BURDINE, M.D., NATIONAL COMMANDER, AMVETS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON AMVETS' 1959 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM, FEBRUARY 19, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I deeply appreciate your courtesy in granting me the opportunity to appear today for the purpose of presenting the highlights of AMVETS' legislative program for 1959. Having been engaged in the activities of organized veterans since the end of World War II, I am not entirely unfamiliar with the many accomplishments of this committee on behalf of the Nation's war veterans and their dependents. I can assure you that I am highly honored by this privilege today.

AMVETS, as you know, is an organization composed exclusively of World War II and Korean conflict veterans. During our brief existence a definite philosophy has gradually evolved. It is a philosophy that recognizes that the veteran has a vital stake in the economy of this Nation—that he has an obligation as a citizen as well as a veteran—that he will not overburden the economy with unreasonable demands that cannot be fully justified. We are motivated by a desire to perfect a sound enduring structure of benefits that will adequately and properly discharge the Nation's responsibility to its veterans and at the same time merit the respect of the American people. This philosophy has been reiterated in our current legislative program.

PENSIONS

Undoubtedly the most controversial subject in the field of veterans' legislation now facing this committee involves non-service-connected pensions. The administration, congressional leaders, and organized veterans all agree that the present non-service-connected pension system requires revision. Here the unanimity seems to end. Some would expand the program by adding persons to the rolls with no disability and little or no financial need. Others would increase monthly payments to those pensioners who are truly in need, while curtailing monthly payments for those having independent income.

AMVETS position with respect to the non-service-connected pension program was made crystal clear in a policy statement unanimously adopted at the 1957 national convention and reiterated at the most recent national convention in August 1958. This policy states that "AMVETS regard compensation for the service-connected disabled veteran and the surviving dependents of those who lost their lives from a service-connected cause as a paramount objective of the veterans' program. Nevertheless, AMVETS support the non-service connected pension program for veterans and their dependents so long as the program is based on realistic tests of need. The present non-service-connected pension program is deficient in some respects in that it fails to distinguish between various levels of need, thus resulting in thousands of veterans and widows being denied benefits or having to exist on a small pension with no other income when many other fortunate individuals have considerable income and resources and receive the same pension payment. AMVETS reject proposals which would further liberalize the pension program by adding persons to the rolls who are not actually in need. Instead, AMVETS would prefer to see any additional expenditure for non-service-connected pension directed to those most in need. Of particular concern are those unfortunate individuals who are so disabled as to require the aid and attendance of another person. The widows of World War II and Korean veterans are causing particular concern because widows and small children are not eligible for pension unless the veteran had a service-connected disability ratable at an ascertainable degree at the time of his death.

"We cannot disregard the precarious position of the Nation's finances at this time in that 7 percent of the Nation's annual income is being expended for veterans' benefits, yet it is inevitable that as unwarranted expenditures for non-service-connected pensions arise, it will be increasingly difficult to obtain and maintain adequate compensation for the service-connected disabled. We must assume adequate compensation programs, medical services, and adequate pensions for those truly in need rather than embark on pension programs which are actually in the nature of a service bonus."

This policy, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, was not formulated overnight at a national convention, but resulted from mature deliberation and analysis of the present pension program and the many proposals offered in the 85th Congress to expand the program. Our study revealed some obvious but still rather startling facts. Most Americans know that there exists today a non-service-connected pension program for veterans of World Wars I and II and Korea, but few realize the scope of the program. There are approximately 800,000 pensioners on the rolls today. A great deal is being said about the inadequacy of the pension system, yet the fact remains that at age 65, a veteran may be working half time, have only 10-percent disability, and still qualify for a pension. If he is married, he may have personal income of $2,700 per year. There is no limitation on income received by his wife, and there are no restrictions on liquid assets or net worth.

Your committee, Mr. Chairman, in the results of a survey recently released, reported details of cases of veterans on the pension rolls with liquid assets in excess of $50,000. Numerous cases were reported where the veteran and his wife had more income than the average American family, yet he was receiving a pension and had been on the rolls for many years. The committee survey indicated that about 20,000 of the married pensioners now on the rolls have family income in excess of $5,000. More than 13,000 pensioners have liquid assets of $15,000.

On the other hand, the survey revealed that at the bottom of the scale there are about 46,000 married pensioners who have no income other than their pension and approximately 114,000 have incomes of less than $500 exclusive of pension.

Yet each, irrespective of outside income, receives the same monthly rate of pension—$66.15 or $78.75, if he is 65 years of age or has been in receipt of pension for 10 years. The rate is $135.45 if the veteran requires the aid and attendance of another person.

We of AMVETS are keenly aware of the fact that a seriously disabled veteran with no other source of income cannot live on this meager pension. It is essential that this unfortunate group be granted an adequate pension, yet it is equally important that we guard against providing a windfall or a bonanza for those with substantial independent means. The solution does not lie in increasing the income limits as some have suggested. This would only add more veterans with substantial means to the rolls. The seriously disabled, no-income veteran couldn't care less. Nor does an arbitrary across the board increase for all pensioners solve the problem. Not only would the cost be prohibitive, but inequities with respect to the service-connected compensation program would result.

For example, the highly publicized program of one group advocates a $100 per month pension for all World War I veterans at age 60, irrespective of income or disability. The Veterans' Administration has estimated the cost of this proposal to be $2.3 billion in its first year of operation, then a rapid rise in cost each year until in 1976, just 18 years from now, it will reach the fantastic cost of $26 billion.

Aside from the cost, however, the inequities are apparent. You will be paying the nondisabled veteran with as little as 90 days' service the same monthly amount you pay the veteran who is 50 percent disabled from war wounds incurred in combat. Parents who lost a son in service receive only $50 each provided they are able to meet the severe criteria of dependency that has been established. Two orphaned children whose father lost his life in service receive only $50 each per month.

In other words, we would see veterans with relatively short service and no need actually receiving more consideration from their Government than thousands of war casualties, children orphaned by war and dependent parents. The gross unfairness of this situation is readily apparent.

The solution to the problem confronting us lies in the capable hands of this committee and the Congress. It is the position of AMVETS that first consideration should go to the veteran and his family having little or no outside income and that pensions should not be paid in cases where little or no need exists. The only purpose served by paying a pension to a family with substantial income and net worth is the building of an estate to be passed on to their heirs.

We respectfully urge that you resist the pressures for a greatly expanded non-service-connected pension program of this nature. Instead we urge you to give serious consideration to the establishment of a greatly revised and realistic pension program. In the considered judgment of AMVETS, such legislation should provide that the amount of monthly pension payments be directly related to the amount of independent family income received. The veteran with little or no income should receive a substantial increase in pension payments. As the income increases, the pension payment should be lowered or conversely, the lower the income, the greater the pension payment. In this manner, persons with less than $500 per year income would receive the maximum pension and persons with substantial income would receive the minimum or none.

Inasmuch as family income rather than the income of the veteran alone would be considered, it is suggested that additional payments be made and separate income tables be utilized when dependents such as wife and minor children are involved.

In the opinion of AMVETS, any consideration of pension legislation must necessarily include provisions for establishing the eligibility of World War II and Korean widows to pension on the same basis as is provided for widows of World War I veterans. As you know, widows of World War II and Korean conflict veterans to be eligible for pension must establish that the veteran upon whose death the application for pension is based was separated from service for medical reasons or that he had an ascertainable degree of service-connected disability at the time of death. The widows of World War I veterans applying for this benefit are spared this requirement and may qualify merely on the establishment of 90 days service and a discharge other than dishonorable. We can see no logical reason for the disparity and recommend its correction.

The sliding scale formula of income inversely related to monthly pension payments previously mentioned should be applied to the widow's pension program as well as to veterans. Provisions should be made, however, for the deduction of burial expenses from the proceeds of commercial life insurance in determining a widow's annual income for entitlement to non-service-connected death pension. In many instances, a widow is denied pension for a year because the proceeds from a small insurance policy, most of it consumed by the expense of burial, causes her to exceed the statutory income limit.

We do not propose to offer here a panacea for all deficiencies in the pension program. We do, however, believe that the implementation of AMVETS suggestions will result in a more sensible distribution of the pension dollar and at the same time remove certain inequities now existent.

SERVICE-CONNECTED NEEDS

In considering the service-connected compensation program we come to a matter of priority. Great demands are being made on the Congress to liberalize pensions. We presently have an income limit of $2,700 for a married pensioner. He receives his pension in addition to this or, in other words, has a total income of about $3,450 and yet be carried on the pension rolls on the basis of need.

There are demands from all sides to raise income limits or, in fact, abandon them altogether in favor of a general pension without a needs test.

Consider these demands in comparison to the income pattern of the service-connected disabled. In a survey conducted by the administration it was learned that the income of a 100-percent service-connected disabled veteran, without statutory awards, was only $2,900 per year including compensation. The rate of compensation for this group is $2,700 per year. Therefore, it is apparent that their ability to earn additional income is nil. In the face of this fact, some have the temerity to suggest that we should adopt a pension program which would carry hundreds of thousands of veterans, many with a few days service, to levels of income from $3,500 to $5,000.

The greatest need in the area of service-connected compensation, in the judgment of AMVETS, is greater recognition of the limited or negligible earning capacity of the more seriously disabled veterans. This committee and the Congress recognized it in the 85th Congress by increasing the rates of compensation for certain categories of paraplegic and blinded veterans. There are, however, many seriously disabled veterans who are unable to work because of their disability and receive only $225 per month.

The President in his recent budget message indicated that increases in compensation for some of the seriously disabled was warranted.

Consideration should be given to extending the benefits of the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956 to the children of service connected totally disabled veterans. This group of veterans, for the most part, are unable to provide for their children's education because of their disability. In short, the special needs of the seriously disabled service connected veteran should receive first consideration.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

One of the most important programs administered by the Veterans' Administration is its hospital and medical program. This program, representing as it does, the greatest single Government medical program in the world, merits the continuing attention and scrutiny of this committee. We are grateful for the exhaustive study of this subject by your committee in the last session of Congress.

AMVETS position on VA hospitals, though spelled out in several resolutions, may be summed up clearly and concisely. We are seeking a policy that permits maximum utilization of available facilities and a dynamic and ambitious program of hospital modernization, renovation, and replacement. To accomplish the first objective, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs should have authority to adjust the care and treatment program to the changing characteristics of the veteran population without unwarranted intervention by the Bureau of the Budget.

In this connection, we believe that existing facilities no longer required for certain types of treatment should be used wherever possible for the care and treatment of chronic, long-term patients, particularly selected mental cases. This would alleviate the acute problem now existing in this field of medicine.

In short, the program should be geared to present day requirements rather than budgetary limitations. We are encouraged by the 1960 VA budget for inpatient care which reflects an increase over the current budget. We are told that not only will this permit an increase in the average daily patient load, but the staffing ratios in hospitals will be improved. In other words, there will be more professional and skilled employees per thousand patients than the present budget permits.

We are extremely disappointed that the 1960 budget as presented failed to include funds for the construction of replacement hospitals in Oakland, Calif.; Cleveland, Ohio, and Washington, D.C. It is essential that sufficient funds for increasing the tempo of the replacement and modernization program be provided. As a doctor and a hospital administrator, I am well aware of the exorbitant and unnecesary cost involved in operating hospitals that are outmoded or badly in need of repair or renovation. Money saved by failure to appropriate funds for this purpose is false economy indeed. AMVETS are seeking an increase in the funds for this program and for medical research.

Before leaving this subject, I want to voice AMVETS continuing support of the policy that permits war veterans to receive treatment for non-service-connected disabilities in VA hospitals, provided a bed is available and they are unable to pay. If this humanitarian policy were ever discontinued, I am confident that the quality of VA medicine would deteriorate.

As you know, a good doctor makes a great financial sacrifice in practicing medicine in a Veterans' Administration hospital. This financial loss is offset by the wealth of knowledge and experience gained in treating practically every ailment known to man. If the care and treatment program were limited to service connected there would be little incentive to practice VA medicine.

The result would be the inability to recruit doctors. Obviously, the service-connected veteran would suffer from the inability to staff hospitals and the resultant inadequate medical care.

Here again I must comment upon the relative merits of the needs in the VA hospital program and the demands for pensions. Certainly there can be no question in anyone's mind that the providing of hospital care to needy veterans and the repair and replacement of older hospitals merits a higher priority and fills a far greater need than adding persons who are financially independent to the pension rolls.

Notwithstanding our support of non-service-connected hospitalization, however, I want to make it crystal clear that AMVETS will not condone abuses in this program. If a veteran can afford to pay for his non-service-connected hospitalization, he should not occupy a bed at the Federal Government's expense. We believe that admitting procedures now in effect have held abuses of this nature to a minimum.

PEACETIME BENEFITS

The question of benefits for persons who served after January 31, 1955, has long been a matter of concern to AMVETS. The President's proclamation of January 1, 1955, established January 31, 1955, as the terminal date for entitlement to wartime veterans' benefits. Consequently, persons entering service after that date are not entitled to education and training, housing-loan guarantee and other benefits offered war veterans.

These men do not qualify as war veterans because their service is limited to time of peace. They certainly should not be placed in the straight peacetime service category because, for the most part, they were drafted or entered service under the compulsion of the draft. In many instances the service was even more hazardous than that experienced by some war veterans. So they represent a new category for whom no precedent with respect to veterans benefits has been set. In the 85th Congress, extensive hearings on peacetime benefits were held by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. A bill making this group eligible for unemployment compensation was the only legislation enacted.

It is the considered view of AMVETS that one of the most pressing needs of this group is an educational benefit. The results obtained from World War II and the Korean GI bills is dramatic proof of the value to the Nation of such a program. Not only do we have a better educated citizenry but the ability of these people to earn higher incomes has resulted in more taxes for the Federal Government.

I believe my own case will illustrate this. I received $3,200 worth of education under the World War II GI bill. In the 5 years following the receipt of this education, I paid the Federal Government $30,000 more in income taxes than I had paid in the 5 years preceeding it. I would like to have a return of this nature on some of my investments.

Developments in science and engineering have pointed up the alarming shortage of persons educated and qualified for careers in these important fields. Statistics will reveal that more than 25 percent of those who attended colleges and universities under the World War II GI bill became scientists and engineers. There is every reason to believe that the same ratio would prevail today.

Even the Bradley Commission, not particularly noted for its praise of veterans' benefits, had these kind words to say about the World War II GI bill, "the veterans' educational program was a major contribution to the national welfare, and the country would be weaker educationally, economically, and in terms of national defense, if educators, veterans' organizations, the President, and the Congress had not seen fit to embark upon this new and momentous educational enterprise."

We of AMVETS are confident that a program of education and training for the post-Korean group would be equally productive of results. The distinguished chairman of this commitee has introduced at the request of AMVETS, H.R. 2259, a bill creating a program of education and training for persons with service after January 31, 1955. We urge this committee to give early consideration to this measure and other pending bills on this important subject.

JUDICIAL REVIEW AND FORFEITURE

Two long-standing procedures in the Veterans' Administration adjudication process in our judgment are in need of further study and revision. The first involves the so-called judicial review or review by an independent court or board of Veterans' Administration decisions in claims for disability and death compensation.

Under the present system, these claims are first adjudicated by a board in the local Veterans' Administration regional office. In the event of an adverse decision, the veteran may appeal. The appeal is handled by the Board of Veterans' Appeals in the Veterans' Administration in Washington. It is the view of AMVETS that there should be a further avenue of appeal outside the Veterans' Administration.

The second procedure requiring revision is the system of forfeiture. In a study released in the 2d session of the 85th Congress this committee pointed up the inequities existing in the archaic forfeiture laws. These laws provide that any veteran who makes a false statement to the Veterans' Administration in connection with any claim is subject to losing all his rights and privileges as a veteran.

Your study revealed that a veteran could forge or alter a VA check and forfeit all his rights, while the same action with respect to a social security check or a postal money order would not affect his VA benefits. Two veterans, one of them disabled and in receipt of compensation, commit the same offense. Both forfeit their rights to VA benefits. The disabled veteran is, in effect, receiving a life sentence in the loss of his compensation, while the other veteran, by comparison, escapes punishment.

These are but a few of the inequities brought to light by your study. We urge you to consider corrective legislation during this session of Congress.

CONCLUSION

The matters that we have discussed this morning merely touch upon some of the highlights of AMVETS legislative program. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would

like to submit for the record the complete digest of our legislative program as adopted by our most recent national convention. Our legislative director will present more detailed testimony on many of these subjects as the session progresses.

In this, my first public appearance before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I desire to reaffirm that AMVETS is dedicated to promoting the welfare of the veteran, particularly those who are disabled, and their dependents. We know that this committee and its capable staff are similarly dedicated. We pledge to you our cooperation and objective thinking in arriving at our mutual objectives.

The Value of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of Congress will be interested in reading an address delivered by Circuit Judge W. D. Debardelaben, of Anniston, Ala., at a recent meeting of the Helping Hand Club of Anniston.

The address follows:

THE VALUE OF FREEDOM

Mr. President and my friends, your organization's gracious invitation to take part in this meeting accorded to me a rare honor, distinction, and pleasure, for here I find an outstanding leadership in our community.

In casting about for a subject for discussion with which I have some limited familiarity and appropriate, as I believe, to fit this occasion, I have chosen for presentation a matter which I have named "The Value of Freedom." Although this matter to be laid before you has often been stated in varying forms, nevertheless, I subscribe to the thought that repetition is justified to remind you and me of the luxury of freedom wrapped about us as American citizens under the law of this land. Constant consciousness and jealousy of its rewards are indispensable in the perpetuation and defense of our liberties.

From the beginning of time man has been in constant quest of a perfect and just freedom. God, in His infinite wisdom, wove through His sacrifice and example the righteous pattern of life threaded with the divine pronouncement of a just freedom for all of us, should we obey His commandments and support His cause.

American justice and its counterpart, liberty, were guaranteed and made secure by the people themselves upon the adoption of the Constitution and its amendments of the United States. Our Constitution, bought with the lives, blood, and sacrifices of our forebears, and kept inviolate by succeeding generations, which Constitution claims the distinction in the annals of literature as the shining masterpiece of composition and superb importance to all Americans, outranked and superseded in importance by only the Holy Bible, itself. This instrument of ours, I say, must at all costs be preserved, and it will be, provided we all do our full share to this end. It protects us, comforts us, and inspires us, and sets the true course to be followed in the relationship of men, with the full and complete recognition of the existence of a supreme being. We, its beneficiaries, must ever be vigilant and alert to defend it against all enemies from within and from without our country and to keep it in our service.

The first 10 amendments, known as the Bill of Rights, to the Constitution of the United States rings out in clear and unmistakable terms freedom for all people who come under the influence of its protection. I feel sure that all of us at one time or another have read the Bill of Rights, but even so, I hold to the proposition that we should, from time to time, refresh our recollection of its contents and to appreciate anew its provisions. With this idea in view, and with your indulgence, I now present to you the Bill of Rights:

"ARTICLE I

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof: or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press: or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

"ARTICLE II

"A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

"ARTICLE III

"No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

"ARTICLE IV

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

"ARTICLE V

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger, nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb: nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

"ARTICLE VI

"In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

"ARTICLE VII

"In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed $20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

"ARTICLE VIII

"Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

"ARTICLE IX

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

"ARTICLE X

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

There you find inspiration for all of us.

Throughout the length and breadth of this land thousands of our boys have borne arms from time to time in defense of our country, enduring the brunt of sacrifice with courage and bravery and earning for themselves the eternal respect and gratitude of all free men. Yes, many of them in the cause of liberty, gave the last full measure of their devotion and now rest in eternal sleep. Let us always keep in our memory an honored place for those who gave so much for us.

As is well known by us, our system of democratic laws consists of three branches of government: the legislative, executive, and judicial, each with its peculiar sphere of limited authority. Thus established we find a time honored form of government by checks and balances so designed that no branch thereof is permittd to usurp and encroach upon the rightful powers of the other branches. All of this is provided for in the name and interest of freedom and justice. No manmade government insures more freedom for the people. This is so for the governed enacted the laws through their chosen representatives for limited terms of office, and they cannot continue therein after the expiration of their tenure of office, although legally eligible to succeed themselves, except at the pleasure of a majority vote of the people. This is democracy in its truest form. Democracy says that those who govern must derive this right from the consent of the governed.

We Americans are all stockholders in the government we have set up for ourselves and the value of the share of stock we hold therein is dependent upon our individual efforts to sustain, maintain, and improve it. No organization, by whatever name it may be called, can prosper to its fullest extent without the constant cooperation of its officers and membership. To function properly each must put his hand to the task, for then and only then will there be a full realization of the benefits desired.

The riches and abundance of America were made possible through the freedom of the individual to manufacture his goods, till his soil, and harvest his crops, ply his trade, and follow his profession in a competitive economy and to sell his talents and products in an open market. Thus we see the real incentive—freedom—stimulating the American citizen to use his capabilities to the fullest degree in the economic field, for he has the certain assurance that he shall reap such reward as his efforts produce and nothing more. Herein lies the financial prosperity of America basking in the sunshine of democracy and guided to its present destiny by the divine authority.

To continue our journey on the road of freedom and to enjoy the happiness that it gives at every milestone along its way, we must be ever mindful and have an abiding conviction of the value of our privileges as American citizens and be ever sensitive to the challenge of all antidemocratic movements acting to destroy our precious heritage.

Peace in our times, as well as for those who come after us, is the uppermost thought of all right-thinking people everywhere. To achieve this there must be a reawakening of the spirit of fellowship all over the world and the unceasing practice of the divine doctrine "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Unfortunately, this spirit of fellowship does not prevail in some places on this earth, consequently, in the interests of self-preservation, we must keep and maintain a mighty Army, Navy, and Air Corps, equipped with the latest sinews and armaments, and bear the heavy burden of taxation for this purpose. Let us all bear in mind that whatever may be the cost in taking these protective measures, the cause of freedom warrants it. We shall and must assess the value, as American citizens, of our greatest

assets which are, in general: freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom of religious worship and freedom of speech and freedom of the press we enjoy from day to day, which you and I are prone to consider as commonplace. We should give our thanks from day to day to almighty God for the many blessings He has bestowed upon us in this free land—constantly reminding ourselves that in many other countries such freedoms do not abound.

Freedom in all her glorious aspects finds the true symbol in the flag of our country, bearing in majesty, in beauty, and dignity the visual message, the import, and significance of her calling.

This flag of ours embraces the hopes, the aspirations, and the inspirations of all Americans, wherever they may be, for the continuation and survival of the democratic process and the liberties we claim as our own.

With God's help and the faithful allegiance of all true Americans to her indispensable cause, she, Old Glory, will forever wave in proud supremacy and with victory won against all enemies who may challenge her eminence in the sun.

Poverty in economic advantages; poverty in educational advancements; and poverty in health are all to be deplored, but the worst poverty of them all is the poverty in freedom.

Freedom, as we all agree, is the firm foundation upon which is rested and built our American fortress of democratic privileges. Without this bedrock foundation, the structure of Americanism established thereon would collapse, and thus we would find ourselves committed to the tyranny of blackness, despair, and oppression. Freedom, I believe therefore, is the most honored and respected word in any language, with the exception of the revered word "God," for God is the supreme being of the universe and the ruler of all mankind, unto whom we, His followers, offer our petitions, supplications, and prayers from time to time for His divine guidance and direction in the preservation of our freedoms and well-being.

The darkness of tyranny covers many areas of the world today, spread and controlled by the godless ideology of communism. One such area is Budapest upon which recently the eyes of the world were focused on the struggle of its people for liberation from enslavement. These brave freedom warriors bought with their sacrifices, daring and even death a short-lived freedom. This, their love of freedom, transcended all other considerations and their acts and deeds warrant the plaudits of everyone who believe in right and justice.

I believe that freedom for the downtrodden people of Budapest will not long be denied, for their will for victory is everlasting and determined. No power can long endure without justice supporting it.

The Budapest incident is a concrete illustration of what it means to be deprived of liberty and freedom.

Let it, therefore, be always remembered by we Americans that freedom may in piecemeal or all at once be denied us, even by forces operating from within our country, if we do not remain alert and ready at all times to combat with all we have the antidemocratic forces which seek to conquer and subdue us by various guises and means and destroy the true meaning of our Bill of Rights as it is clearly written.

What is America?. God built a continent with glory and filled it with treasures untold. He bedecked it with soft, rolling prairies and pillared it with thundering mountains. He studded it with sweetly flowing fountains and encompassed it with long, winding streams. He graced it with deep shadowed forests and filled them with song. These treasures would have meant little if myriads of people, the bravest of the races, had not come, each bearing a gift and a hope. They had the glow of adventure in their eyes and the glory of hope in their souls, and out of them was fashioned a nation blessed with a purpose sublime. They called it America.

Freedom has been woven into the fabric of our lives as Americans. There are those who would confuse with high-sounding phrases; others who would swap it for the tasteless pottage of security; yet others who would encompass and limit it with their definitions.

But freedom is not a thing to be pinned down and defined or to barter away. It is many things. It is everything. It is, in fact, all that we have.

Freedom is the light shining in the window of a church house. It is the call of school bells on the frosty air. It is the pride of a man who says, "This is mine." Freedom is the whistle of a train in the night and the knowing that you might be aboard.

Freedom is the vagabond who sleeps by the tracks, the clerk who decides to go in business for himself, the dreamer who works on a new machine, or the sign that says, "Gone fishing. Back tomorrow." Freedom is the key to the front door, the pencil in your pocket. It is the postcard you send your Congressman, the letters you write, the paper you print, the words you speak. It is your right to agree or disagree, and it is that hushed, fateful moment behind the drawn curtains when you are alone with your ballot. It is your right to go to church or to stay home and sleep.

It is the radio by the window with the knob that sends long pointed fingers searching across the world for voices. Many voices. Any voices.

Freedom is the gun in the top drawer, your top drawer in your home. It is the rifle on the rack above the kitchen door. It is the hardware store where you can buy a box of shells and no questions asked.

Freedom is the luxury of rest, the sound soul-building sleep of one who goes to bed at night afraid of no man. It is the right to grow; to be more of a person this year than last; to become learned if you can, or rich if you are able.

Freedom is the bounty of the harvest, the foods you buy as you please, and use as liberally as you like.

Freedom is the gladness of a little boy running home for supper, and the bright new day that is tomorrow, yours to use and to treasure.

Freedom is the right to hold and to use whatever inventions the future may bring us; but it also is the tear you brush away as the parade goes by, and the bugles cry, and the drums rolls out their stirring notes of a patriotic air. It is some of the sorrow and glory in your heart.

It is the dawn wind on a high mountain peak, the innate respect for the human form, the love of man, the fear of God.

But freedom isn't free. It is the dearest thing we have. It was bought for us and handed down to us at the cost of life, of loneliness, and of torture.

The value of freedom can be no better voiced than in the inspired and immortal words of the patriot, Patrick Henry, of historical fame, when he said for all ages to hear: "I do not know what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

The 56 American patriots, who signed the Declaration of Independence, our honored and cherished document of freedom from tyranny, knowingly accepted the risk inherent in winning liberty and in so doing they on freedom's altar pledged our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

You and I, as individuals are responsible for the successes and failures of America. What we do, or fail to do, as citizens, will add up to the strength or the weakness of our Nation.

How To Encourage American Investment Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I presented before the international section of the New York Board of Trade on February 10, 1959:

HOW TO ENCOURAGE AMERICAN INVESTMENT ABROAD

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to join you today to discuss the subject, "How To Encourage American Investment Abroad." This very important problem engages your interest as American businessmen and my interest as a Member of the U.S. Congress. We appreciate the critical importance of this subject and of the need for developing public policy and programs that are adequate.

The London Economist, a week or so ago, put the problem very well. It said that "Provided there is no thermonuclear war, the whole future balance of international manpower is likely to depend on one factor: On whether the poorer nations can be offered the prospect of getting richer within the free world's economic and political system than they would within the Communist one."

When we talk about foreign economic policy as a whole and foreign investment policy in particular, we are talking about policy for national survival. There is no question about it. We are engaged in a life-and-death struggle to save and promote the kind of social, political, and economic system—in short, the kind of world order—that is the heritage of Western democracy. We are trying to do this, challenged by the most artful and persistent foe that we have ever faced. The conflict is all the more trying because we are waging it at this stage without adequate weapons. We have, in fact, an excessive preoccupation with the military side of any prospective conflict. I do not say that military preparedness is not absolutely essential—it is, but by being in the soundest military posture we are assuming hopefully that the Russians will not begin a war with us. Thus, military preparedness only buys time and prevents the conflict from breaking out into a shooting war. The outcome of the long-run competition will not depend on military weapons. The battlefield where the conflict is really joined today and for the future is in the competition for men's minds and allegiances and hence it is where our foreign economic policy, as the economist pointed out, is of such critical importance.

I am afraid that in this department of our strategy for survival we are not well stocked with weapons. In fact, not only have we not devised and put into use the kinds of policies and programs that are essential but we have had a bad habit of stumbling and falling back. One example has come to me very graphically. I am sure that you have all read about the Turbine case under the Buy-American Act which led to a Government contract being awarded a domestic manufacturer despite the fact that the British bidder was $300,000 below the American bid. There are many wrinkles to this case, but what is most striking to me is that the contract was awarded to the domestic firm, despite all the rules and regulations of the Buy-American Act and the Executive or-

der that was proclaimed to implement it, on the grounds of national security. That is, we are asked to believe that letting the contract in England would have jeopardized the national security of the United States. The reason that was given—national security—was just an excuse because it was the only excuse available. What is appalling is the use of such an excuse.

Not only is it ridiculous to think that our national security would be impaired if the two turbines were produced by the British firm in a country that is perhaps our staunchest ally, but what is even more significant is the narrow parochial meaning that this action gives to the concept of national security.

Our national security is not impaired by a liberal trade policy. Quite the contrary. It is through the expansion of trade and investment that we can, in a very real sense, assure our national security. The concept of national security has meaning, of course, only in the context of the threats and dangers that beset us. It is World War I thinking at its worst that defines national security as the maintenance of economic isolationism. In a world where the military threat is one posed by thermonuclear weapons delivered by intercontinental ballistic missiles, if a full-scale war ever gets started, it will be decided in a matter of days. The target of our enemies will be Continental United States. We enjoy no military isolation. How can we bemuse ourselves with economic isolation? No, even on purely military grounds, this kind of national security thinking is a phony, at best, and dangerous, at worst. The danger stems from the fact that this attitude shows no comprehension of what the real issues are and what we must do to wage the cold, nonshooting, war that we are already in.

What we must do and I think, if we apply ourselves, can do very well indeed is to give our kind of economic system a chance to work its wonders throughout the world. We must realize that unlike the Soviet Union that can mobilize all its resources through the State by engaging in State trade and aid activities, because we believe in free enterprise, the role of Government in our society is necessarily limited. That makes it all the more important that we use governmental policy properly to produce the results we want to achieve. We want to see the growth of international trade in an increasingly free environment. In this way, we can stimulate productivity throughout the world and thus increase standards of living. By avoiding conflicts over trade through restrictionist policies, we would avoid some of the most damaging blows to amity and cooperation among the free world countries.

We seek the expansion of private investment. Private investment through the capital and techniques that it employs is the engine of economic growth. Through its growth we look to the expanded use of economic resources throughout the world and that is the essential base for economic progress.

I want to concentrate today on private investment policy since this seems to me to be a critical area from the point of view of Government policy today. That is not to say that trade policy is not significant or that there is not an intimate relationship between trade and investment policy. I think there is, but we have an established trade policy. Last year the trade agreements legislation was renewed for an unprecedented 4-year period. We are, however, deficient as far as investment policy is concerned. This is a subject that has been under intensive study and discussion for a decade but as yet we have not broken out of the chains of uncertainty and come forward with a meaningful policy.

From what we know about private investment and the incentives and obstacles that promote and deter it, I think we can fairly conclude that it is in the field of tax reform that the most effective incentives to private foreign investment can be found. To be sure, the Government can moderate the nonbusiness risks of doing business abroad through such things as the investment guaranty program and through the consummation of treaties and conventions for the protection of private property and to assure equal rights for American citizens and corporations. But when we talk about private investment, we talk about economic decisions by American corporations that are made on the basis of a calculated profit. Foreign investment, by and large, does not assure the investor that he will earn sufficiently higher returns than he can on domestic investment. Through tax policy, the take-home profit for foreign investment can be enhanced and, in addition, the investor can be encouraged to commit his earnings from foreign operations to new investment.

I know that there is a view held in some quarters that the tax system is not an appropriate instrument to use to achieve public policy objectives. I regard that as an unduly sterile approach to tax policy. It is clear to begin with that our system of taxation does, in fact, impart willy-nilly incentives and disincentives to certain types of economic activity and business pursuits. Any system of taxation is bound to.

Moreover, there have been consciously built into the tax system incentives of one sort or another. The real question is whether any particular change in tax policy that is proposed will be successful in accomplishing a legitimate and desired goal. I think that in the case of private investment, because we want such investment to continue to be private, tax reform is in many respects the only good and effective instrument we have. Now, even aside from the question of providing tax incentives to private foreign investment, it would seem to me that our tax system as it applies to foreign source income could stand reform on equity grounds alone. The operation of the foreign tax credit limitation is an example of this. It is a happy coincidence that in suggesting intelligent tax reform we can accomplish both the objectives of bringing greater equity into the tax picture as well as adapting the tax system so as to provide proper incentives to private foreign investment.

As you know, I introduced a bill on the first day of this Congress, known as H.R. 5, which I believe will help accomplish the objective we have in mind. I want to say at the start that while I believe H.R. 5 to be a good bill, soundly conceived, and one that will bring important benefits, it is by no means perfect in every detail. Some changes have already been brought to my attention that may well deserve incorporation in the bill. Most of these have been of a complicated technical nature and have to be given careful scrutiny. The essential thing to my mind is to strike a balance by including, as I believe I did in H.R. 5, provisions that are realistic and effective. I am sure that not everyone in the business community would feel that H.R. 5 does everything that he feels is necessary, but I would suggest to such people that they realize that we may be in danger of accomplishing nothing if we seek to accomplish everything. That would be as foolish as throwing out the baby with the bath water.

The principal provision of H.R. 5 is that establishing a special class of domestic corporation known as a foreign business corporation to conduct the foreign operations of American firms. The foreign business corporation would enjoy the privilege of deferral of U.S. taxes on its income.

This proposal would, therefore, permit the domestication of foreign base corporations established in tax haven countries and would accord the same tax benefits that are enjoyed by such corporations to the foreign business corporation. The question may well be raised as to what advantage the foreign business corporation form offers American business in view of the fact that they can already avail themselves of the tax advantages of this form through the incorporation of holding companies in foreign tax havens. The answer, I think, is that there are significant advantages and the best test of this is that the American business community has, in the hearings which our subcommittee held, expressed its vigorous interest and support for the proposal.

This support reflects several factors. Foreign incorporation may be a cumbersome and expensive proposition. It may mean committing personnel to a foreign country; it means putting your foreign operations under the sometimes uncertain tax policies of a foreign sovereignty. It also means some uncertainty as to whether the United States tax benefits will continue to be enjoyed. As you know, some of the advantages of a foreign base corporation depend on regulations of the Treasury Department.

These could presumably be revised at some time in the future. Moreover, some commentators have been casting sidewise glances at foreign base corporations and suggesting that these are nothing more than tax evasion propositions. By providing explicitly in U.S. statute for the foreign business corporation and by according status and permanency to the privilege of tax deferral and the other collateral tax advantages, a great deal of the uncertainty that presently exists would be dispelled as would a good deal of the inconvenience and expense of foreign incorporation.

Thus, there are, it seems to me, tangible advantages to the American business engaged in foreign operations to be found in the foreign business corporation proposal. I think that it is as well an important and effective stimulus to expand private foreign investment. Recent Department of Commerce studies have shown that something in excess of 50 percent of the earnings from foreign operations are retained for reinvestment purposes.

Tax deferral recognizes this practice and encourages it by, in effect, giving the foreign investor an interest-free loan equal to the amount of income that would have had to be paid to the U.S. Treasury.

The provision of the bill contained in section 3 relating to transfers and reorganizations should be read in the context of the foreign business corporation provisions. This provision would permit the transfer of property from a U.S. corporation to a foreign corporation without any tax penalties resulting from the transfer. Thus, foreign operations presently organized in the branch form can move into a foreign corporation and enjoy the advantages that that form of enterprise may afford. I would expect that in many instances the foreign branch activities would be shipped into the foreign business corporation. Since these are transfers entirely between domestic corporations, no tax consequences would, of course, arise and, therefore, no special legislation is required.

There is one respect in which section 3 of the bill that I have been referring to might very well be changed. As it presently stands, it does not permit the liquidation, say, of a Panamanian corporation and the tax-free transfer of the assets of such corporation to the foreign business corporation. To the extent that we wish to have the foreign business corporation form used instead of a foreign holding company, where the investor decides to liquidate his foreign base corporation and reorganize his foreign activities under the foreign business corpora-

tion, he should be permitted to do so without incurring tax liabilities.

Section 4 of the bill extends, with very minor modifications, the present Western Hemisphere trade corporation provisions and the consequent tax advantages to foreign source income without regard to the geographic source of such income. The extension of Western Hemisphere trade corporation treatment to the Eastern Hemisphere seems to me to be entirely reasonable. In 1942 when the Western Hemisphere trade corporation provision was first enacted, there may have been special considerations of foreign economic policy favoring special treatment to Western Hemisphere trade and investment.

Today, the Western Hemisphere does not stand in a unique position with respect to the rest of the world. Increasingly, our foreign economic policy objectives have come to comprehend the entire free world. To implement these broader objectives, it is appropriate to generalize what has hitherto been very special treatment.

Tax reduction, of course, has a very direct effect on increasing the profitability of foreign operations, and it is for this reason that it is perhaps the most potent tool in the tax arsenal. It must be recognized, however, that the revenue consequences of across-the-board tax reduction are more serious than of other proposals, and for this reason, this provision of my bill is likely to occasion the most opposition.

What I think is not sufficiently appreciated about section 4 is that any tax reduction is not, in effect, an across-the-board reduction. A 14-point reduction will not yield 14 points of tax abatement on all foreign source income. In those cases where the foreign tax rate is above 38 percent, the amount of the abatement will be commensurately less. What is significant, however, is that, by and large, the lower tax rates are found in the less developed countries.

Hence, the maximum benefits from the 14-point tax reduction will be enjoyed on income earned in such countries. The 14-point proposal, therefore, has in practice a selective effect, and it is a selective effect which coincides with the high priority objectives of public policy in the field of private investment; namely, the stimulation of private investment in the less developed areas of the world.

Skipping section 5 for a moment and turning to section 6, the section relating to tax sparing, this provision takes account of the fact that even in many underdeveloped countries tax rates are high and present a barrier to the expansion of investment. If underdeveloped countries wish to enact incentive tax legislation in order to foster private investment, they should be encouraged to do so. The operation of our foreign tax credit system, however, at present frustrates the achievement of such an objective. To the extent that foreign tax rates are lowered, the U.S. tax liability of the U.S. taxpayer is generally increased. The Treasury and State Departments have been much interested in this problem and have recommended the use of tax treaties containing tax-sparing provisions as the appropriate solution.

H.R. 5 suggests, as an alternative, that there be a legislative mandate to recognize incentive tax sparing by foreign countries as taxes paid for the purpose of the U.S. foreign tax credit. Embodying this policy in legislation seems to me to have many virtues. The principal one, of course, is that it avoids the very important criticism that can be directed at tax sparing through treaties, namely, the circumvention of congressional authority in the field of taxation. In addition, under a general legislative mandate, the Secretary of State would not have to negotiate complicated and time-consuming tax treaties. He could, if he wished merely certify unilaterally which foreign tax sparing legislation would be accorded the treatment provided for. Alternatively, he could use this general authority to negotiate executive agreements in order to obtain reciprocal benefits. Such agreements are simpler to negotiate and do not require the advice and consent of the Senate. Thus, the tax sparing provision of section 6 continues the principle of selectivity inherent in section 4 and gives it broader scope.

Sections 5 and 6 of the bill are provisions that can be supported on equity grounds, pure and simple. Affording the taxpayer the option to choose between the country by country limitation and an overall limitation on the amount of tax credit he can take against his U.S. tax liability, would give effect to the principle of equality of treatment on which the foreign tax credit provisions are based. At present, under the existing country by country limitation, foreign source income can be subject to a higher rate of taxation than domestic source income of an equal amount. By permitting the option of an overall limitation, this inequity would be removed in those instances where the taxpayer derives foreign source income from other countries where he has unused tax credits. Section 7 similarly rectifies an inequity in present law relating to the question of gain or involuntary conversion of property of foreign subsidiaries. There does not seem to me to be any good reason why a domestic parent corporation that has insured the property of its wholly-owned foreign subsidiary must pay a tax on the insurance proceeds if the property of that subsidiary is involuntarily destroyed or converted. This contingent tax penalty that may arise against the domestic parent deters investment in those countries in which it is either impossible or difficult to secure arequate insurance coverage and where, as a result, the domestic parent must insure the property involved.

H.R. 5 in itself represents, I firmly believe, a balanced and moderate proposal for tax reform in the field of foreign source income that I am confident would go a long way in providing the kinds of incentives that are necessary in order to promote the expansion of private foreign investment. There really is nothing startling new or revolutionary about these proposals. In fact, they have been under consideration for some years. I am persuaded of one thing, however: The time has come to do something about the subject. We can no longer afford the vacillation and delay that has characterized discussions of public policy in this critical area. I am encouraged to learn that the public advisory groups established to advise the President in this field will come forward with constructive recommendations in the tax leld. We, of course, have to wait for the publication of these reports and findings in order to ascertain what these specific proposals are. But I am encouraged by the initial evidence, at least, that the administration in Washington is bestirring itself, and I hope that a good conclusion will come out of these efforts.

Meanwhile, it is up to the business community, alert businessmen such as yourselves, who are concerned with private enterprise and our foreign economic policy, who are acutely aware of the challenges that confront us, to work unstintingly for the development of sound and constructive policy in this area. In the final analysis, you are the people who will decide what our country will do.

Alabama Delegation Urges Consideration of Coosa-Alabama River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the development of the Coosa-Alabama River system has been authorized for some 14 years. An item in the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1956, 84th Congress, called for a comprehensive investigation of the entire river system. An interim report has been submitted to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. However, the Board has not scheduled this report for its next meeting in March of this year. Inasmuch as this project has been authorized and a favorable report submitted to the Board and since this project has been inserted as a Senate amendment to the Public Works Appropriation Act for the past 3 years, the Members of Congress affected by this project have submitted a letter to the Chairman of the Board, Gen. Walter K. Wilson, Jr., requesting the Board to schedule this project for the March meeting. Under unanimous consent I ask that this letter be printed in the RECORD:

Maj. Gen. WALTER K. WILSON, Jr.,
Chairman, Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, Office, Chief of Engineers, T-7, Gravelly Point, Va.

DEAR GENERAL WILSON: We, the undersigned Members of Congress, respectfully urge that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors consider the report on navigation plans for the Coosa-Alabama River system at their meeting early in March of this year.

It is realized that the agenda for this meeting has been established. However, due to the importance of the development of the Coosa-Alabama River system and in conformance with the remarks of President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message in 1955 indicating that the plan for the development of this waterway is the kind of partnership he would like to see, we urgently request that this report be placed on the agenda for consideration at the March meeting of the Board.

As you undoubtedly know, the development of the Coosa-Alabama was authorized in the 79th Congress in 1945, including construction of a multipurpose dam at Miller's Ferry and two other dams on the Alabama River. Since that time a private concern, the Alabama Power Co., has begun a multimillion-dollar series of dams on the upper stretches of the waterway. The Federal Government has not kept pace, and the work on the Alabama River remains unstarted.

An item in the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1956, Public Law 163, 84th Congress, called for a comprehensive investigation of the entire Alabama-Coosa River. In partial response to this act, an interim report was prepared by the division engineer, South Atlantic Division, and was forwarded to the Chief of Engineers early last fall. This report indicates that the reporting officers have found that the estimated benefits exceed the estimated cost and early construction of the project is warranted.

We realize that, while there is only a short time prior to the Board meeting in March to consider and analyze the data submitted, we believe that the importance of this project makes it imperative that action be taken which will permit the start of construction at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely yours,

LISTER HILL, U.S. Senator; JOHN SPARKMAN, U.S. Senator; ERWIN MITCHELL, FRANK BOYKIN, GEORGE GRANT, ALBERT RAINS, KENNETH A. ROBERTS, ARMISTEAD SELDEN, GEORGE ANDREWS, ROBERT E. JONES, CARL ELLIOTT, GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Members of Congress.

Salute to the National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, National Guard units of my State, South Dakota, observed Muster Day. I should like to take this opportunity to express my personal appreciation for the service to all of us provided by the men of the guard. The valiant role played by South Dakota guardsmen during World War II is a vivid memory of mine going back to the early 1940's when many of my college classmates were mobilized as guard units to defend our national interest in the critical opening months of that great struggle. National Guardsmen have served us well in other conflicts and have conducted themselves with great credit during peacetime.

A fitting tribute to the National Guard is the editorial which appeared in the Rapid City Journal for Saturday, February 21, which follows:

GUARDSMEN HANDY TO HAVE

The National Guard Sunday celebrates Muster Day. It is the birthdate of Gen. George Washington who was a member of the Virginia Militia, and it is a time to honor the guardsmen, as we call them now.

In its foundling years, this Nation had to depend on its civilian soldiers—Washington's militia—and we still must plan on our guardsmen who rate as the Nation's oldest fighting organization.

We tend to forget our National Guard during years of peace.

It seems strange that this should be; that after 300 years of fighting Indians, invaders and dictators, floods, fires, and tornadoes, the National Guard should have to prove itself. But prove itself it did, and in 1945, after the smoke of 4 years of battle had cleared away, National Guardsmen had won 14 Medals of Honor and 88 Presidential unit citations. Eighteen National Guard Infantry Divisions had fought throughout Europe and the Pacific, compiling one of the proudest combat records in our history.

The guard's participation in World War II is a perfect example of the unyielding spirit of free citizens who take up arms in the defense of their Nation. And there were dark hours during the war when it was that spirit alone which turned the tide of battle.

Week in and week out, while most of us are enjoying the leisure of hours after work and of weekends, 470,000 Army and Air National Guardsmen are giving of their time in the most vigorous training program of their organization's history. They know that in modern warfare a citizen must be not only willing, but prepared to fight as well.

We are much safer for having them.

Boyhood Heroism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. FOLEY
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the problems facing the growth of America are natural subjects of concern for all of us as parents, public officials, and citizens. Great publicity is given to individual delinquent acts involving a very small porcentage of our young people. Very little or no recognition is given to the many acts of heroism which daily are performed by a much larger percentage of our young citizens. Because of this general omission, I am proud to bring the attention of the Members of the House to a recent act of boyhood heroism by Jimmy Lewis of Eckhart, Md. I feel it will warm your hearts and stir your pride as it did mine. There are many unsung Jimmy Lewises who daily show kindness toward their fellow man and devotion to the welfare of dumb creatures.

In their honor and to the honor of Jimmy Lewis, I have inserted the true story of the saving of the lives of Rex, Bing, and Sam, three beagles:

PLAQUE WILL BE GIVEN TO ECKHART BOY

A plaque will be presented to Jimmy Lewis, 17, of Eckhart, by the Animal Welfare Society for his heroism and kindness in rescuing three beagle dogs which were trapped in an abandoned coal mine last fall.

According to Mrs. W. Earle Cobey, president of the Animal Society, the organization's executive committee took note of Jimmy's action after a news account of the rescue was published. Immediate steps were taken to show him some recognition.

The plaque is to be presented at the meeting of the society January 26 at 7:30 p.m., in the Cumberland Free Public Library. At this meeting, the annual report for 1958 will be given and officers will be elected for 1959.

Mrs. Cobey, commenting upon the award to Jimmy Lewis, recounted the report of the rescue of the three beagle hounds, Rex, Bing, and Sam, as it was first recorded by Herbert L. Knepp, president of the Western Maryland Wildlife Federation. The report shows that:

George W. Lewis, Jimmy's father, was hunting with the dogs when they sighted a huge cat—the kind that goes wild and feeds on game—and chased it into the mouth of the abandoned mine. Fallen timbers and rock had so clogged the mine tunnel that the dogs were able to squeeze through, but were unable to find their way out again.

The elder Lewis had almost given the dogs up for lost when Jimmy remembered an old air shaft that descended to the mine. Checking at this point next day, the dogs were heard whining below, where, it is presumed, they went to get fresh air.

Jimmy prevailed upon his father and two of his friends, William Filsinger and Noah Shroyer, to lower him into the air shaft on a rope—a distance of some 50 feet from the surface—to try to save the dogs. Reluctantly, the men acceded to the wishes of the boy, and he went down into the abandoned pit, where weakened timbers could have sent tons of rock and earth tumbling in upon him. Jimmy put the joyous pups in burlap bags and the men pulled them to the surface.

Jimmy lives at Eckhart with his parents, and is student manager of the Beall High football team. He is advisor to the Eckhart Square Circle Boys Club.

THE ANIMAL WELFARE SOCIETY
OF ALLEGANY COUNTY, INC.,
Cumberland, Md.

Mr. JAMES LEWIS,
Eckhart, Md.

DEAR JIMMY: It is with a great deal of pleasure that we, the Animal Welfare Society of Allegany County, Inc., present to you this special award of 1958 in recognition of your courageous act in saving the lives of three beagle hounds on November 23, 1958.

We feel that you are a very worthy recipient of this award, the first we have ever presented anyone.

Presented January 26, 1959.

VIRGINIA B. COBEY,
WINIFRED A. BIGLER,
HELEN POWELL WISE,
DOROTHY BORDEN,
LOUIS B. YOUNG,
Executive Committee.

JANUARY 26, 1959.

JIMMY LEWIS,
Animal Welfare Society, Cumberland Free Public Library, Cumberland, Md.:

My congratulations for the recognition being so deservedly given you this evening by the Animal Welfare Society. Your heroism and kindness in rescuing Rex, Bing, and Sam is an examplification of the best qualities of true American boyhood.

My commendations also to the individuals and organizations which have taken due note of your noble action.

With sincere best wishes to you for all future success.

JOHN R. FOLEY,
Member of Congress.

Rev. Ralph A. Weatherly, Pastor of Grace Episcopal Church in Kingston, Pa., Announces Plans for Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News of Saturday, February 14, 1959:

GRACE RECTOR'S RETIREMENT

The community and the diocese of Bethlehem will share the mixed emotions of Grace Episcopal Church, Kingston, in the wake of the announcement that the Reverend Ralph A. Weatherly will leave the westside charge on October 1. After 41 years in the priesthood of the Episcopal Church, 31 of which were in the service of Grace Church, there will be general agreement he has earned a measure of leisure. The fact that two sons have followed in his footsteps, thus paying him a high compliment, also will have a tendency to modify the normal distress, resulting from the knowledge a notable career is approaching its close.

A North Carolinian by birth and the son of an educator, the Reverend Mr. Weatherly has been at home here for three decades. The community has respected him as a good neighbor and citizen as well as an outstanding churchman. It has been grateful for interest in its welfare, as manifested in many organizations as well as in his church. One who possesses the courage of his convictions, he has never hesitated to make his position clear on issues, in which the public interest was involved. A sense of humor has not been the least of his assets.

The diocese of Bethlehem will miss his counsel and leadership. As chairman of its standing committee, he has occupied a key post, thus making his influence felt far beyond the confines of his congregation.

Greater Wilkes-Barre will wish him well in his future endeavors.

Right on Target

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am cheered by the fact that certain responsible editors in our country have refused to be buffaloed into the jitters by the current war of nerves.

I am glad to see that the editor of the Evening Star in Washington has commended Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, on his recent statements regarding the stupidity of trying to play a missile-by-missile game with the Russians, and the necessity rather for maintaining enough strength to retaliate after the first blow, and in such force that no one will risk making the initial strike.

I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the article in the February 23 copy of the Star:

RIGHT ON TARGET

Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, has scored a direct verbal hit on the heart of the missile controversy.

Addressing a South Carolina audience, the admiral decried any numbers game approach to appraising our missile strength in relation to Russia's. The important thing, he said, is not whether Russia has half as many or twice as many ICBM's as the United States. What is important, so far as discouraging an attack on this country is concerned, is that we maintain enough strength to retaliate after the first blow has been struck, and to retaliate in such force that no one will risk making the initial strike.

Admiral Burke believes we have this retaliatory capacity today and that the Russians know we have it. Furthermore, he says, we can and will retain this retaliatory capability. In his judgment, we should not engage in "an endless arms race with the Soviets in ballistic missiles, any more than we have attempted to race them in numbers of submarines or Army divisions."

The reassuring thing here is Admiral Burke's belief that we have and will retain the capacity to destroy Russia if we are attacked. It is on this point that the current controversy hinges, the administration's critics contending that we lack or will soon lose the essential retaliatory capacity. At bottom, of course, this is a matter of judgment. Admiral Burke could be wrong. But so could the critics. Admiral Burke is thoroughly competent to judge a matter of this kind, and, despite insinuations that the Chiefs of Staff have been pressured into making soothing statements, we do not believe for a moment that he would make a public speech of this nature unless he fully believed his own words.

Fast-Thinking Sheriff Miller Shows Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, in this telephone, radar, and automobile age we constantly think in terms of law enforcement as the FBI, the city police, and the State police.

There are still left some really good law-enforcement people at the sheriff's level. In downstate Illinois we ordinarily look to the sheriff for all of our rural protection.

One of these fine sheriffs in my congressional district is Sheriff Eugene Miller in Douglas County, Tuscola, Ill. He recently pulled off an arrest that would have done credit to Wyatt Earp, Matt Dillon, or any other of the famous old sheriffs that show up on Saturday night's TV. For this fine piece of work the Champaign-Urbana (Ill.) News-Gazette wrote an editorial on last Friday, February 20, 1959, and I herewith append it:

[From the News-Gazette, Feb. 20, 1959]

FAST-THINKING SHERIFF MILLER SHOWS COURAGE

Fast-thinking, quick-acting Douglas County Sheriff Eugene Miller thwarted a wild, dangerous escapee from an Indiana reformatory in what might have ended in a trail of tragedy.

The Douglas sheriff, using his auto as well as his head, interrupted the fleeing desperado's flight at a Decatur intersection by a split-second act of good timing and heroism.

As a result, the crime spree of an Ohio youth, perpetrated at Tuscola and resulting in the terrorizing of three persons and the kidnaping of two men, came to an abrupt end—and a much more fortunate one than might have been, were it not for the fast action and fortitude of an alert law-enforcement officer.

Sheriffs, elected officials, aren't always expert police officers. Their role usually is more that of an administrator than one of an apprehender.

But in the case of this bizarre nighttime chase, starting as a varied chain of events after a young stranger attempted to burglarize a Tuscola store, Sheriff Miller proved himself capable in the best tradition of a public law officer doing his duty when he faced a tough situation, regardless of the personal danger involved.

No sheriff out of the old West, not even on TV, could have performed with more bravery and success in getting his man—and saving possible death or injury to others in the desperado's grasp.

Congratulations, Sheriff Miller, for your competence and your courage.

A Laboring Man Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard and read of labor's influence on its members, both with respect to candidates for political office and recommendations for the enactment of certain legislation.

Few men are willing or are fearful to speak their reactions to such suggestions or pressures. I am submitting, with the writer's permission, a letter which cogently expresses his reaction to the Committee on Political Education directing union members to write to their Congressmen in support of their recommendations. The letter follows:

NAPERVILLE, ILL., *February 16, 1959.*
Representative ELMER J. HOFFMAN,
Wheaton, Ill.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HOFFMAN: Two weeks ago I received the latest issue of the IBEW's Newsletter. Several pages were used to expound COPE's political position, and directing union members to write to their Congressmen in support of their recommendations. I took this newsletter to work and it was discussed over lunch boxes for several days. There were members of various construction trades involved, and not one man was in favor of COPE's recommendations.

The greater majority of the opinion was in complete accord with mine, some of which is as follows:

1. Cut unnecessary expense in the Federal Government by stopping the airport and housing bills that just recently passed the Senate. Follow the ideas presented last year by the Byrd committee report and by Representative GWINN's bill, House Joint Resolution 355.

2. Help smaller corporations and increase tax receipts by cutting corporate tax to around 40 percent from 52 percent. Special consideration to new equipment would help modernize, reducing the many present repair expenses used to circumvent the high tax rate.

3. Collect from those getting facilities and loans for little or nothing. Barge lines get channels and the use of locks at the expense of the taxpayer; truck lines pay only a small share of the extra initial cost and repairs they cause to highways. They should both pay their way, and this would probably help solve the railroad problem as well.

4. Cut unnecessary subsidies. Some few are necessary but the majority are actually harmful to the economy. Farm supports are a glaring example, being inflationary in both Federal and consumer levels, reduces gross national product, and costs billions to maintain.

5. Increase pay of officers and skilled members of our Armed Forces. The reduction in waste and training would more than pay the bill. The increased combat efficiency resulting from some better men staying in would be a pleasant bonus to the taxpayer.

6. Increase appropriations for use in research and development, especially in the fields of nuclear and space equipment. Properly applied, the propaganda and industrial applications would greatly reduce the effective cost. The armed services should all be made stronger but the Titan, Polaris, and Minuteman missiles, atomic missile submarines should be pushed to cut the 1960–63

missile gap, propagandize, and learn what we can to build better in the future.

7. Get the "hard sell" into diplomacy. Let the world know that most of the cold war emergencies are due to the failure of the Russians to keep agreements.

8. Protect the workers, public, and the union movement by adequate legislation. The good unions would not be hurt by the correct laws but the controls applied could limit the racketeers in the unions, keep them from using the money and power of unions for themselves, and in general protect the workers and public. A point of interest: The IBEW claims to spend no money in politics in spite of directing us to write in favor of certain legislation, especially the Kennedy bill, which is too weak to help the workers, and if passed would probably hold up adequate legislation for many years.

Please consider the above in your new position of public trust.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD D. HOLLE.

The Pressing Need for a Community Facilities Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include for the RECORD a talk entitled "The Pressing Need for a Community Facilities Loan Program," made by the Honorable J. F. Crawford, mayor of Abbeville, Ala., during the recent annual meeting of the Alabama League of Municipalities with the Alabama congressional delegation in Washington:

THE PRESSING NEED FOR A COMMUNITY FACILITIES LOAN PROGRAM

(By J. F. Crawford)

In my opinion the community facilities problem is one of the most serious problems facing our communities. Even now the blunt truth is that we are falling behind in our constant efforts to provide the public works and community facilities which our expanding community needs require.

The community facilities problem did not appear overnight—it is a problem which has been brewing for years, and unfortunately it is a problem which will greatly intensify in magnitude in the decade of the 1960's when family formation will skyrocket.

WE DESPERATELY NEED LOCAL PUBLIC WORKS

Our communities desperately need sewer facilities, water facilities, roads, parks, public buildings, hospitals—in other words all of the facilities essential to a growing community.

The mass exodus to the suburbs of our central cities is no temporary phenomenon—it will continue to be with us and will approach a truly sensational rush in the next decade. This, of course, will aggravate the community facilities program still further.

We recognize that these facilities must be paid for and nothing would please us greater than to finance all the facilities we need from local resources. But the plain truth is that our cities are already in difficult financial straits. It is an open fact of life that the Federal Government through the income tax has staked a claim upon the great bulk of tax revenue. There is just nothing new left for us to tax locally.

Put simply, we need these additional facilities and yet we cannot pay for all we need from current revenue. And another hard fact of life is that we cannot borrow funds to finance our community facilities at a reasonable interest rate and on reasonable terms in the private capital market.

LAST YEAR'S BILL WOULD PROVIDE SOLUTION

We believe that community facilities legislation along the lines of last year's legislation will provide the solution.

If our communities can obtain long-term loans up to 50 years at an interest rate of approximately 3 or 3¼ percent I can think of no greater helping hand in assisting us to cope with the community facilities problem. I think also that the very existence of legislation of this kind would help bring down interest rates in the private capital market.

WE HOPE FOR FAVORABLE CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

We were most favorably impressed by the forceful and persuasive speech in favor of community facilities legislation recently made by Congressman ALBERT RAINS, one of our great Alabama legislators, before the Annual Convention of the National Association of Home Builders. I understand that he is going to introduce the bill again this year and I am hopeful that the Congress will see the wisdom of his proposed legislation and adopt it. Let's review last year's Rains bill.

In expanding the present community facilities loan program (authorized in the Housing Amendments of 1955) of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, this bill Mr. RAINS introduced last year would provide a fund of $2 billion for loans to eligible projects. Of this sum $400 million would constitute a revolving fund, with a provision which would permit proceeds of loans made under the "old program" (the 1955 act) to go into this revolving fund.

The interest rate agreed on by the House Banking and Currency Committee would amount to 2⅝ percent—the lowest rate practicable to cover the cost of the money to the U.S. Government.

Under the bill a borrowing municipality can specify a loan maturity of 50 years or, if it chooses, a term of shorter duration.

ALL CITIES COULD PARTICIPATE

Who is eligible to borrow this money? While smaller communities will be among the principal beneficiaries of the program, the bill removes priorities in existing law and extends eligibility without regard to population size. The unemployment problem is general throughout the country, affecting cities of all population ranges, and it is our belief that the economic stimulant of this loan program should be available to all entities of local government, from the smallest to the largest. At the same time we recognize the crying need for such projects as last year's bill would permit—from the town square to the largest metropolitan municipal center.

TYPE OF PROJECTS ELIGIBLE

What kind of projects could be undertaken? Under existing law, priority is given to applications involving the construction of basic public works, such as water works and sewer systems. Realizing that this priority system excluded many worthwhile and important community projects which could be started at once if liberal loans were available, the Rains bill spelled out the eligible projects.

It would permit loans for:

(1) The construction, repair and improvement of public streets, sidewalks, highways, parkways, bridges, parking lots, airports and other public transportation facilities.

(2) Public parks and other public recreational facilities.

(3) Public hospitals, rehabilitation and health centers, public nursing homes and public convalescent homes.

(4) Public refuse and garbage disposal facilities, water, sewage and sanitary facilities as well as other public utility facilities.

POLICE AND FIRE FACILITIES

(5) Public police and fire protection facilities; civil defense needs; public wholesale farm produce markets, public libraries and offices and other public buildings (other than schools), and public land, water and timber conservation facilities.

(6) In addition the bill would allow loans to nonprofit hospitals to finance specific projects for hospital construction, repair or improvement.

I hope this review of the importance of a community facilities loan program will serve to point up its importance to Alabama cities and towns—small and large.

Address by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell at Lincoln Day Banquet, Middlesex Republican Club, Boston, Mass., February 12, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Middlesex Republican Club of Massachusetts, the oldest Republican organization in the United States, was honored to have Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell deliver the principal address at its Lincoln Day banquet in Boston on February 12, 1959. He spoke, in part, as follows:

Lincoln Day has always been a challenging one for Republicans, for it brings vividly to mind the first principles of that great President, and commands us to measure our actions against them.

This day is one for frank talk.

And I am going to talk frankly to you this evening.

We must face facts in the same way that Mr. Catton's brilliant oration has told us that Lincoln faced them.

Lincoln knew that victory, to be meaningful, had to be of the people—by a party that showed clearly that it was for the people—all of the people.

In the same way, if we are to win in 1960—and we can win in 1960—it must also be a triumph by the people and in their interest.

There is no greater issue upon which Republicanism stands more solidly with all Americans than that of personal freedom—in the field of personal rights, in the field of labor-management practices, in the field of sympathetic social legislation that recognizes the need for local initiative and responsibility, in the field of fiscal management, in the harmony and balance of big and small governments.

The President who wrote the Emancipation Proclamation and signed the Homestead Act did leave behind him, alive and enduring in this party, a veneration for personal rights, and a determination that they shall be protected.

The dignity of the free human being and the majesty of the free human will exercising its own decisions—whether in the person of a Negro voter in Atlanta, a labor union member in Detroit, a small businessman in Los Angeles, a farmer in Iowa—is the central cause of Republicanism. It always has been, since Lincoln, it still is under President Eisenhower, and it will continue to be under the next Republican President in 1960.

It is because of our philosophy of personal rights that Republicans often find themselves at variance with the political philoso-

phies that cluster together under the expandable label of Democratic.

Obviously, the most direct application of the principles of Abraham Lincoln is in the area of civil rights, the rights proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed by the Constitution.

Some Americans are now being denied these personal rights. Reason and moderation demand that this denial be brought to an end with all deliberate speed.

This is the law of the land, and the requirement of a regard to human dignity.

We seek the support of all Americans who agree with us that none of us is secure in our rights while a single American is denied his rights.

They either exist for all or they do not exist for any, for long. Lincoln reminded us that no nation can endure that is only partly free. This job is not yet finished; it is ours to complete his work.

But, first, we must make certain that our meaning is clear to all the people. This means straightforward and honest campaigns not obscured with issues secondary to that of personal freedom. And it means good candidates.

Good candidates are essential.

Also essential are the precinct workers behind them. The recruit-now-for-'60 program, aimed at enlisting 2 million more precinct workers for the 1960 campaign, is underway.

This party is already on the move to victory.

In this undertaking, too, Lincoln sets the example.

His was defeated in 1858. We were defeated in 1958. He achieved victory in 1860. What can he tell us?

He offered affirmative programs.

Looking over an America gripped in the most terrible dilemma it has ever faced, he affirmed the fact that personal rights precede comfort or expediency.

He stood up, and against the counsel of fear, he asserted the fact that right makes might.

And we, how do we look to America?

Lincoln, in defeat, got his strength to go forward from a belief in personal rights. We can do the same.

How does a respect for personal rights, for human dignity, affect our decisions of today?

First, it requires a courageous determination to maintain the purchasing power of the dollar. Holding the line against inflation means holding the line against governmental extravagance. It means refusing to give way before political pressures. It means creating a stable value in the wages and salaries we earn, so Americans can plan ahead. Insurance policies, pension funds, savings must be protected against those who would drive down the value of the dollar by driving up the rate of Federal expenditure. This takes courage. Pressure groups won't like it. But the growth of our economy must have a firm foundation, a foundation which assures that the American wage earner will be able to plan for a secure future.

Second, it requires that we help the labor movement rid itself of the gangsters and hoodlums who stamp down the personal rights of union members.

Third, it requires that we help all our citizens to equal opportunity for employment and advancement.

Fourth, it requires protecting equally and fairly all persons at work in an industrial economy.

Fifth, it requires helping all our citizens to make use of their right to vote.

Sixth, it requires support for President Eisenhower's policy of encouraging the States and local communities to take full responsibility for protecting those rights of all citizens which are not national concern.

Ours is not a narrow objective—we do not seek to build a fence of favors around the undue influence of some parts of our society. Rights are universal, and our approach to them is also as wide as American opportunity.

It was this approach that extended unemployment insurance to 4 million additional workers, and social security to 10 million more men and women—and began the largest public improvement ever undertaken, the highway program.

It was this approach that granted the largest tax cut in our history in 1954 and created the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

This approach raised the standard of living in this country to an all-time high, fostered an economy that has brought personal income, wages and profits to new and expansive levels.

This approach has established a new agency for aviation, and a new agency for outer space.

Republicanism has been a positive and virile force in this country but sometimes I think we are trying to keep it a secret.

There are new and grave problems ahead of us in the fields of education, of defense, of international strength, of labor-management relations.

These things are the concern of most Americans, and they are seeking the right answers.

We have a proud record and we have a proud opportunity ahead. In looking toward 1960, and beyond, we must remember that as Republicans, our tradition demands that veneration for the personal rights of all the people—high or low, white or black, urban or rural, rich or poor—that inspired Lincoln and has animated all our party in its finest hours.

That veneration determines our approach to the solution of any national problem, whether in education, politics, business or anywhere else.

We have the positive program.

We have the best way to a new and better America.

Let our opponents, grouped haphazardly together for mutual self-advantage, paint the distorted pictures and use the distorted facts and plaster us with distorted labels—this fact will stand out.

When it comes to personal rights for all Americans, no Republican owes a debt—political, financial, or moral—to any one group, any one faction, any one system or organization. The compromises are all on their side. The implied promise and the part performance is all theirs.

In this respect, we are the majority. We are America. And in 1960 our triumph, like Lincoln's, will be a victory for personal rights, and for the popular confidence of Americans in the party that respects these rights as inalienable.

But keep this in mind—to win, we must deserve to win.

Thank you.

Lithuania's Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, Evening News of February 16, 1959:

LITHUANIA'S CHALLENGE

The free world today observed Lithuanian Independence Day, although this Baltic country has been absorbed by the Soviet Union and freedom has disappeared there. Be that as it may, today's celebration is fully justified as a reminder that, so far as the United States is concerned officially and all who love liberty above life are concerned, Lithuania still exists and the hope is one day it will throw off the yoke of Communist oppression and take its rightful place in the family of nations.

It was on February 16, 1918, that Lithuania emerged from the bondage of czarist Russia after 123 years. There followed 22 precious years of independence. Then in 1940, the hapless country, with its neighbors, Estonia and Latvia, was overwhelmed by Red Russia and 19 years of slavery and tyranny ensued with thousands in exile and unspeakable hardships visited on the survivors.

But the struggle for freedom goes on in the name of Lithuania. Much to the chagrin of the gang in Moscow, Lithuanian Independence Day is observed annually without fail to remind the Kremlin that it has not succeeded in its purpose although it dominates the scene by force and also to remind the world of Soviet perfidy as well as Lithuania's legitimate aspirations.

An enslaved Lithuania points an accusing finger at Nikita Khrushchev as it did at Joseph Stalin. And it will at Khrushchev's successor if Lithuania does not attain its aspirations in the meantime. For this struggle can have only one ending—the liberation of Lithuania.

Freedom always wins the last battle and it will in the case of Lithuania. Sometimes, the conflict is long and costly, but the outcome is inevitable. It took 123 years before freedom triumphed in Lithuania over czarist Russia; the hope will be that the waiting period will be reduced considerably in the case of dethroning the Reds. In view of the developing crisis, the climax may come sooner than generally anticipated.

Railroad Retirement Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. Several of the major features of this bill include: An increase in retirement and survivor annuities and pensions by 10 percent; an increase in unemployment benefits rates, and an extension of unemployment benefits periods beyond the 130 days allowed by present laws; and a reduction from 65 to 62 in the age at which spouses and women employees may receive annuities at a reduced rate.

The Railroad Retirement Act has been a great boon to the railroad people of this country, providing well deserved security in the years after they have left active railroad service. However, this legislation is now in need of amendment to keep it in tune with the times.

It is well known that in periods of rising prices such as we have had over the past few years, that persons on fixed incomes are most severely hurt. The increases granted to retired railroad employees have not kept pace with the increases in the cost of living.

I believe that this bill will provide the necessary liberalization in railroad retirement provisions and railroad unemployment insurance while, at the same time, by alterations in the financing of these benefits, insure the continuance of the program on a sound financial basis.

Two Senators Put Berlin Focus Where It Should Be

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the main issue in Berlin is not a city, but whether the West will hold its correct moral and legal position, or will yield to intimidation and thereby start the collapse of world collective security.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following release on this vital subject:

[Release from General Features Corp., Feb. 23, 1959]

TWO SENATORS PUT BERLIN FOCUS WHERE IT SHOULD BE

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Two U.S. Senators have skillfully brought the Berlin debate back to the central issue and cut short the efforts of other Senators who, in the name of flexibility, have confused it.

The two are JACOB JAVITS, of New York, Republican, and THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut, Democrat. The issue is whether the United States, Britain, and France, with West Germany's backing, are going to be bluffed into yielding something by Nikita Khrushchev's Berlin threat or are going resolutely to call the bluff—and seek to benefit by it.

Specifically, the two Senators have introduced separate resolutions calling upon the Allies to stand firm at Berlin and to negotiate the future of Germany with the Russians, rather than bringing the two Germanies together in separate negotiations. For the latter would mean, as Senator JAVITS correctly insisted, that West Germany would be lost. In an inspired burst, the Republican also suggested that the U.S. Senate delegate seven of its Members to be present in West Berlin on May 27, the day when the Soviet ultimatum expires, to dare the Russians to come and take it.

Whether the Senate acts on either resolution is dubious. Neither sponsor is a member of the exclusive Senate Committee on Foreign Relations whose members generally succeed in keeping these all-important matters strictly within the family. But the committee is now pretty well dominated by such champions of flexibility as Democrats FULBRIGHT and MANSFIELD (whose recent plan for a German settlement shocked our firm friend Chancellor Adenauer) and Republican WILEY.

Now none of the Senators mentioned opposes more negotiations as such. During the last few years, partisans of flexibility have persuaded the free peoples that peace through negotiations with the Russians should be possible in the near future since neither side wants war. Even those who believe that each negotiation inevitably strengthens the Communists and weakens the West feel obliged to go along.

But Senators JAVITS and DODD, backed by KEATING, of New York, and MORTON, of Kentucky, want to be sure that any coming negotiations do not undercut the Allies' right to keep West Berlin independent and accessible and that the West does not start by giving Khrushchev any of the things he wants.

For the debate in the United States on German policy is being held against the background of two things—Khrushchev's reiterated threat of war if the Allies insist on maintaining their rights and Prime Minister Macmillan's visit to Moscow.

Khrushchev has obviously been encouraged by the readiness of such Americans and Britishers to negotiate in the name of peace. The more the Allies hurry to get a meeting with Moscow before the expiration of Khrushchev's ultimatum, the more the Russian must believe that his intimidation is succeeding.

To be sure, President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles have so far stood firm on the central issue—no concessions on Berlin—and the President has warned that Khrushchev will have to shoot first. If they had simply said "nuts" to Khrushchev and waited for him to ask for a four-power meeting, there would have been no confusion. But their desire also to appear flexible, has apparently reassured Nikita that by threat he can at least obtain something.

Macmillan's quick offer to visit Russia must further have convinced the Kremlin that it has nothing to fear and something to gain by intransigence and more big talk.

In short, this Berlin sparring is just another revelation of the situation of the West ever since President Eisenhower at the summit meeting in 1955 assured the Soviets that far from seeking to regain what it has lost, the United States will act only in self-defense. That permanently leaves the initiative with the Russians for they have nothing to fear so long as they do not actually start shooting. (And the lack of American reaction to their cold-blooded destruction of the unarmed American plane may have fathered the thought that minor shooting on their part will be permitted.)

It is hard to see how, if the Soviets persist in aggression, they can fail to gain by it. For pure defense never yet won any kind of a struggle.

A Giant Among Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JESSICA WEIS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, to a man, the great leaders of this Congress have already risen to pay their final respects to the memory of Dan Reed, and there is nothing that I, as a newcomer to Congress, can hope to add to what they have already said. The men and women who knew him longest and best have eloquently attested to his greatness, and to their everlasting respect and affection for him, and no greater tribute could be paid any man.

He has made his indelible mark upon all of us, and nothing could be said which would add to the stature of Dan Reed, but I do want his wife and family to know that all of us share with them the deepest kind of regret.

Dan Reed was, very simply, a great and good man—strong, courageous, dedicated, kind. Men of his mettle do not come our way in every generation, and his place here will be exceedingly hard to fill.

Programs and Actions of Congress Vitally Affect Towns and Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include for the RECORD a talk entitled "Programs and Actions of Congress Vitally Affect Towns and Cities," made by the Honorable M. N. Brown, mayor of Enterprise, Ala., who is president of the Alabama League of Municipalities, during that organization's recent annual meeting in Washington with the Alabama congressional delegation:

PROGRAMS AND ACTIONS OF CONGRESS VITALLY AFFECT TOWNS AND CITIES

(By M. N. (Jug) Brown)

On behalf of the full membership of the Alabama League of Municipalities—the 255 towns and cities it represents—I want to express grateful appreciation to the congressional delegation for granting us this opportunity to appear before you to discuss the municipal interest in 20-odd areas of congressional activity.

There has never been a time when a close and effective relationship between the Federal Government and the communities of the Nation was more important than at the present. There are many reasons for this, not the least being the failure of the States to move in and extend a helping hand to the municipalities as they struggle to meet the challenge of the times by providing adequate community services and facilities for the major part of the Nation's population. The cities and towns have been practically deserted by their parent governments—the States. They have been left alone as far as the States are concerned and in effect told to "root hog or die." But, the Federal Government has been much more aware of municipal needs and the Congress has stepped in and provided programs that have literally saved our towns and cities from utter and complete decay. We are grateful to the Alabama congressional delegation for the very important role it has played in this development.

FACTORS THAT CAUSE FEDERAL-MUNICIPAL PROGRAMS TO BE NECESSARY

One may inquire as to why the States have neglected the needs of the cities and towns—the places where an overwhelming part of the country's population lives. Continued rural domination of State legislatures is the chief though not the sole reason. Unequal representation in State legislatures has held back municipal progress. Opposition from large and powerful business groups to progressive legislative measures needed to enable our towns and cities to progress and grow is another handicap we

have faced. The same groups that bombard Congress week after week in an effort to defeat sound Federal-local programs are the ones that hang around the State legislatures in clusters to lobby against public interest programs considered there. Their influence, in controlling legislative policy in the States is considerably greater than their ability to prevent Congress from enacting sound and workable programs designed to help our local communities to grow and become stronger.

They shout "return government back to the States" but at the State level they would bring every possible pressure to bear to see that programs now operated jointly by the Federal and municipal governments never get the State assistance they would have to have were the Federal Government to drop out of the picture as far as financial support is concerned.

The inadequacy of the revenue-raising powers of the municipalities is so great that without outside assistance few, if any, towns and cities could carry on decent services and programs so much needed today by local citizens and businesses.

The competition between the States and their municipalities for revenues to support their services is much greater than would ever be the case between the Federal and the State governments. The overwhelming share of the cost of the State of Alabama's five major publicly supported programs comes from the Federal Government. Not one dime of State assistance goes into the operation and maintenance of the five major services and programs of the city and town governments of our State.

SUMMARY OF OUR INTEREST IN FEDERAL-LOCAL PROGRAMS

We hope you'll bear in mind, as the mayors who follow me to this witness table testify, that the partnership between the Federal Government, on one hand, and the municipal governments, on the other, is enabling our Nation to become stronger and better able to serve the daily governmental needs of all our people. The continuation of these 20-odd Federal-municipal programs are much more important than pleasing the propagandists of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. Let me also remind you that if Congress had listened through the years to these big-business groups, our country would not today have thousands of federally supported National Guard armories, public hospitals, the social security program, the great Tennessee Valley Authority. No, and we would not have the Federal-aid airport program, the water-pollution control program, public housing, or urban renewal. We would still be in the horse-and-buggy days as far as effective and serviceable government is concerned.

My colleagues here will summarize our interest in—

(1) The airport-construction program; (2) the urban interest in the Federal-aid highway program; (3) a strong civil defense program; (4) the need for continued regulation of natural-gas wellhead prices; (5) traffic safety measures before the Congress; (6) the need for continuing the water-pollution control program; (7) low-rent public housing; (8) need for an expanded urban-renewal program; (9) need for assistance to depressed areas; (10) the value of Federal planning assistance to our cities and towns; (11) the urgency of enacting legislation to make possible a community facilities' loan program; (12) proposed laws affecting municipal bonds; (13) the TVA self-financing legislation; (14) assistance to public libraries; (15) waterways development; (16) legislation affecting school programs; (17) legislation affecting intergovernmental relationships; (18) hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act; (19) the social security program and its coverage of municipal employees; (20) miscellaneous bills now pending before the Congress.

Let me again thank you for the interest and time that you give us as we present some municipal viewpoints on the several Federal-municipal programs I have listed. I know my fellow mayors will be glad to answer any questions about these programs as we submit testimony during the time we spend here with you.

Speaking as president of the League of Municipalities, I want to generously praise you for the great job you do for Alabama and her people, and especially for the support and help you give the municipal governments and their officials from day to day. I am proud of the reputation you have across the country as being the greatest urban-minded delegation in the entire Congress of the United States.

Remarks by Treasury Secretary Robert B. Anderson, to the Grand Masters of Masonry, Hotel Statler, Washington, D.C., Tuesday, February 24, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an address made by the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Robert B. Anderson, to the Grand Masters of Masonry, in Washington on February 24, 1959.

Mr. Speaker, there is no member of the President's Cabinet who is more highly respected, admired, or in whom the Congress and the public have more confidence than Mr. Robert B. Anderson. Those of us who have worked with Mr. Anderson throughout his years of service as the Secretary of the Navy, Deputy Secretary of Defense, and now Secretary of the Treasury, regard him as a dedicated American. In his present position of world service, freedom-loving people look to him for leadership. He is fulfilling their hopes and aspirations.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ROBERT B. ANDERSON

Over 300 years ago, Francis Bacon made this statement: "The true and lawful goal of the sciences is simply this, that human life be enriched by new discoveries and powers."

Bacon was pleading with the scientists of his day to use their skills in improving the ordinary conditions of living. This was a radical suggestion for his time. The new world was just opening up; the compass and the printing press were just beginning to have their incalculable influence in enlarging not only man's physical surroundings but the larger creative environment in which new discoveries can take place.

Yet how cramped a world this seems compared with our own.

We live in a period of great international tension—yet it is a period also of unparalleled inventiveness and achievement. The scientists of today have made it possible for us to believe that sources of energy are available which can in time replace most human toil. For the first time in history, there is a possibility that conditions permitting the full exercise of man's creative abilities can be realized for the many, not just for the few.

A great deal has been said about the need to accomplish greater brotherhood of mankind. Our own order is dedicated to this principle. But translated into real terms, brotherhood begins with improvement in the conditions of living. It begins with getting help to people where they need it.

For help of this sort to be effective it must be adapted to differences in cultural backgrounds as well as in the material conditions of living. We must give frank and honest recognition to dissimilarities in customs, history, philosophy, and religion. We must think in terms of minimizing differences—however sharp they may seem on the surface—and maximizing common interests.

I believe it is a little easier to do this if we remember that our own culture is to a very large extent a borrowed one. The mathematics we use today to send a satellite into space had its beginning long ago in Egypt, in Persia, in Greece. Our art, our music, the body of science we build on, all came initially from others.

We have also been givers. Not only our great proponents of freedom and democracy, but Edison, Morse, Kettering, Einstein, Salk, and many other but less well-known Americans have helped change the conditions of life throughout the world. With all that we have given in the past, however, our greatest opportunity may be now, when the aspirations of millions of people to live better are finding tangible expression in many areas for the first time.

During the past 15 years 700 million people in 20 countries have won political independence. But this is not enough. Brotherhood among men is laudable as an ideal. To be meaningful it must be translated into terms of understandable reality. Though much remains to be done the record of our Government and our people has been a commendable one. I should like to illustrate this first by telling you a story—a true story about a little village in India which I visited last fall, in connection with my participation in the international monetary conferences being held in New Delhi.

This village was the site of a foreign assistance project, sponsored and financed by an American nonprofit institution. There were no impressive structures in the village. There were two Americans giving technical assistance. A team of bullocks was slowly moving around in a circle turning a large arm. Each turn produced 1,600 revolutions in the apparatus which generated electricity—sufficient for one light in each house at night, and for power during the day to run a small woodworking plant employing 50 people.

The same bullock-powered equipment pumped water into pipes which ran along the streets of the village with a tap in front of each house. For thousands of years, the villagers had traveled long distances for water. Now, they could step outside the door and draw water whenever they needed it. Moreover, the excess water went into a reservoir and was sufficient to irrigate 50 acres of land. By means of a simple mechanism thought up by an American agricultural specialist, the village had taken its first steps toward the twentieth century. Here surely is the place where emphasis should be put—at the point where people can be given the means of helping themselves through bettering actual living conditions in their own communities.

The technical assistance programs now in progress are, of course, of many different kinds and are carried on under many different national and international auspices.

In every case, the projects are joint operations with the countries concerned. The United States and U.S. technicians, however, have been in the forefront of all of the efforts during the postwar period to help people lift themselves above the level of a bare struggle for existence and into a situation where backbreaking toil does not constitute the whole of living. While there are honest differences of opinion as to scope and detail, I would like to mention a few efforts of our Nation in helping other nations of the world.

Closely allied to the technical assistance programs have been the programs for cultural exchange. These are performing the immensely important service of making possible person-to-person contacts between people of different countries. Through scholarships and exchange of personnel, through on-the-job help when it is most needed, technical assistance and cultural exchange together are probably achieving the most practical results which up to now have been devised for promoting greater well-being among the nations of the free world.

For long-range stability and improvement in standards of living in the less developed countries, however, there must be substantial capital investment extending over a period of years. There must be transportation facilities, powerplants, harbor installations, and industrial equipment of many varieties. Our Government has been a leader throughout the postwar period in the establishment and support of financial institutions providing long-term developmental funds of this type.

The Export-Import Bank, set up by this country in the thirties, has continued since the war to provide financing for the export of American equipment for industrial purposes of many different kinds. In recent years its loans have been largely concentrated in Latin America and Asia.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, formed at the end of the war by the allied countries under our leadership, provides financing for long-run investment programs of various types when private investment is not available on reasonable terms. Recently, the Bank has devoted its funds primarily to assisting economic development in Asia, Latin America, and Africa, contributing enormously to economic development in these areas. The International Bank has had no losses on its loans.

We are hoping that the Congress will promptly authorize the increased subscription to the International Bank proposed in the President's message of February 12. These subscriptions require no cash outlays. The subscriptions to the capital stock of the Banks constitute a contingent liability of all the member governments to meet the obligations of the Bank. In this way the Bank is able to secure adequate loan funds at reasonable rates of interest in the open market.

The President's message of February 12 also proposed to increase our quota in the International Monetary Fund, a companion organization of the International Bank. This institution makes short-term advances to its members in order to facilitates the exchange stability which is an essential condition of healthy international trade.

Unlike the International Bank, the Fund requires outlays on the part of the member countries on a quota basis—one-fourth payable in gold, and the remainder payable in non-interest-bearing securities of the member country. The Fund's activities have grown and have become increasingly effective. To fulfill its obligations properly under conditions of expanding world trade, an increase in the quotas of member countries is imperative. We hope for prompt action on this request also.

The Development Loan Fund, established by the United States, has further assisted economic development by making loans to both governments and private business when a given project cannot obtain financing from the other institutions or from private capital sources. In some cases, the loans granted by this Fund are repayable in the borrower's own currency.

Discussion is now going on within our Government and with foreign countries exploring the desirability of establishing an International Development Association which would be an affiliate of the International Bank. This institution would supplement the functions of the bank by providing loans for development which could not be financed on hard currency repayment terms. It would also permit members with accumulations of nonconvertible currencies, to use their accumulations for constructive loan purposes.

In addition to the programs already mentioned, we are engaged at the present time in negotiations with the countries of Latin America, looking toward the establishment of an inter-American banking institution which would assist economic development in the countries of this hemisphere.

There have been other important governmental programs which could be mentioned. One which was of immense importance to the free world was the Marshall plan for aid to the devastated countries of Western Europe, shortly after the close of World War II.

Through our timely assistance and through their own efforts, the Western European countries were not only able to get back on their feet, they have since come to enjoy a higher standard of living and a better level of production than ever before. Likewise, countries in Asia—many of them newly established as independent nations—have been assisted in their efforts to improve living conditions, to put their economies on a going basis, and to resist aggression.

Still another program which has paid large dividends in human terms has been our plan for exporting part of our agricultural surplus. Under this program, payment for the goods we send overseas can be made in local currencies, thus permitting countries in need of food and certain other agricultural products to benefit from our abundance, even though they may lack dollar exchange.

The story of America's assistance to other countries has and should continue to emphasize the tremendously important role played by American private capital during the past 15 years and in the years ahead. This capital has aided resources for economic growth in other countries. It has brought to these countries a high degree of technical and managerial skill which they lacked. It has contributed to the development of export industries which provide the means for purchasing needed goods from our own country and from elsewhere.

American business today has investments abroad valued at about $40 billion. Each year there has been a movement of capital from the United States to other countries. For the last 3 years, this annual outflow has been at the rate of about $4 billion a year.

Under present world conditions, private investment faces real difficulties. These stem from frequent political instability, the threat of aggression, and subversion in some foreign countries, and the obstacles to capital investment in areas where economic conditions are unstable and relatively less advanced. For these reasons our Government has tried to assist the expansion of private investment through such devices as tax treaties and guarantees against the incontrovertibility of earnings and the risk of confiscation or possible loss from war.

Private capital is a stern analyst. Even with the encouragement of our Government, private investment is made principally in those countries which are willing to compete for it by the establishment of sound fiscal policies, adequate protection, and the recognition of the right of capital to earn. Both the Government and private organizations are continuing to have a major role in promoting the spread of capital and thus insuring better economic conditions in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

Our Government has also had to provide military assistance. This is in our own interest, as well as in the interest of friendly nations threatened with aggression. Without help, the Soviets would have had a clear road for the pursuit of their program of world domination. I need mention only the Near East and you will understand what I mean.

One of the favorite themes of Communist propaganda is the supposed concern of Communist dictatorships for human beings and their welfare. The Western nations who are leaders of the free world must continue to bring out the true facts with respect to these claims.

To do this we have only to note what has actually happened when a country has fallen under Communist control.

In Soviet Russia, the aristocracy of the Communist Party has been substituted for the aristocracy of the czar. There are some 200 million people in the U.S.S.R. Out of this number there are something like 5 or 6 million Communist Party members. These 5 or 6 million are ruled by a bare handful of dictatorial leaders, and these leaders are subject essentially to the orders of one man.

From China, we are told that the Communist regime has devoted itself to furthering the advancement of man. But what has it done in fact?

Families have been ruthlessly torn apart. Vast numbers of people have been herded into communes, without the slightest effort to obtain their consent.

We hear the Communists speak of the people's rights under their form of government. But there are no free elections, in any meaningful sense of the term. There is no free press. There is no freedom of belief. There is no freedom of choice to work. Human resources are regimented for production as if they were so many tons of steel or coal.

The Communists also like to refer in their propaganda to their respect for the rights of other nations. But we cannot erase from our minds the tragic fate of the Baltic Republics, of Bulgaria, of Hungary, of Poland, of Czechoslovakia, of East Germany. All of these peoples have lost the right to direct their own destinies. When they have tried to reassert that right, they have been cruelly suppressed. We cannot ignore the threats of subversion in other countries.

In contrast, our country has moved steadily forward since the close of World War II to further the brotherhood of man. Our most valued export is still, as it has been throughout our history, the concept of freedom and humanity for which our Nation stands. We can be rightly proud that the first postage stamps issued by the Republic of Indonesia turned out to bear the portraits of Washington, Lincoln, Franklin, and Hamilton, side by side with the founders of the new Republic. But we can also be proud of the countless ways in which our sharing of know-how, capital, and just plain friendliness during recent years has helped strengthen the basis of fellowship and understanding throughout the free world. This is brotherhood in action.

Poison in Your Water—No. 15

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the Winston-Salem, N.C.,

Twin City Sentinel on February 18, 1958, describing pollution in Rockingham County of that lovely State.

Those who doubt the evils of pollution should contemplate this situation which is repeated in State and county after State and county all across the United States.

This is the water we drink.

One of the real things which this Congress and the United States has done to clean up this horrible situation has been the enactment of Public Law 660 in the 84th Congress. Under that law grants were made to municipalities across this country of up to $45 million a year on a matching basis.

The progress made because of this legislation has enabled us for the first time to keep pace with the population growth in this country and to actually catch up very slightly on the filth and pollution which we dump into our streams.

During this Congress the President cut the amount of grants under this program by reducing the budget request from the full $45 million to only $20 million. This strikes a tremendous blow at the program.

It is my hope that the House will consider this article and use it and others which I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as the basis for appropriating the full $45 million authorized under Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress:

TWELVE TOWNS, FIRMS POLLUTE STREAMS

(By Gene Whitman)

The State stream sanitation committee listed a dozen Rockingham County towns and industrial firms today as significant pollution sources in the Roanoke River Basin.

It identified Draper, Leaksville, Madison, Mayodan, Reidsville, Spray, and Stoneville in Rockingham, and Walnut Cove across the line in Stokes, as communities which have insufficient sewage treatment, or none at all.

It listed Fieldcrest Mills at Draper, Leaksville, and Spray, Leaksville Woolen Mills, Inc., at Spray, and Washington Mills Co. at Mayodan as industrial polluters. Other towns and firms further east were listed.

The cities and industrial firms are expected to advise the division of water pollution control of the State board of health within 60 days whether they contemplate voluntary action to abate the pollution and apply for a temporary permit.

COULD CONTINUE

Under the temporary permit, they would be allowed to continue discharging wastes into the streams under a satisfactory time schedule for building adequate treatment facilities.

The North Carolina policy is not to start enforcement action if satisfactory compliance from the towns and industries is obtained voluntarily.

There was no estimate of the money which will be required to treat the sewage and industrial wastes. The committee suggested that towns and their industries get together on treatment plans, if possible.

Committee conclusions on the pollution and the steps needed to abate it included:

Draper: A system expected to serve 3,500 persons discharges sewage without treatment. A treatment plant should be built as soon as possible.

Leaksville: A system collecting sewage from an estimated 5,000 provides no treatment. A plant should be built as soon as possible.

TWO SEPTIC TANKS

Madison: Sewage from approximately 1,200 flows through two septic tanks that are grossly overloaded. A secondary treatment plant should be built as soon as possible.

Mayodan: A municipal sewage system serves an estimated 2,000 and receives domestic sewage from Washington Mills. A small intermediate treatment plant is overloaded and not properly operated and maintained. It should be either enlarged or replaced.

Reidsville: Sewage from a plant serving about 4,000 is discharged into the Roanoke basin, increasing the coliform bacteria. No further physical improvements are indicated at present, but the city should begin planning to enlarge its facilities or pump the wastes into its new plant for treatment.

Spray: The sewage system collecting wastes from an estimated 5,000 provides no treatment. Proper treatment facilities should be built as soon as possible.

Stoneville: A sewage system serves an estimated 530 and gives both primary and secondary treatment, but needed repairs and alterations should be provided.

Walnut Cove: The sewage system serves only about 566 people—a small portion of the town. A primary treatment plant is overloaded and some sewage is discharged without treatment. The town should consider extending its sewer lines into areas not now served and providing treatment in a single plant.

Fieldcrest Mills, Draper: Sewage from each mill is given partial treatment in a septic tank, then discharged into the river; treatment equal to secondary treatment should be provided.

Fieldcrest Mills, Leaksville: Sanitary sewage, dye house and finishing wastes are discharged without treatment. Facilities should be built, providing the equivalent of secondary treatment.

Fieldcrest Mills, Spray: Sanitary sewage, dye house and finishing wastes are discharged without treatment. Facilities should be built, providing the equivalent of secondary treatment.

Leaksville Woolen Mills, Spray: Sanitary sewage and a small amount of industrial waste are discharged without treatment. If the town of Spray will not accept waste, the company should determine the most practical method of treatment.

Washington Mills Co., Mayodan: Overflow sanitary bleach and dye wastes are discharged without treatment. They should be treated prior to discharge.

Rev. Joseph J. Losieniecki, New Pastor of St. Hedwig's Church, Kingston, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, Evening News of February 12, 1959:

ST. HEDWIG'S NEW PASTOR

The Reverend Joseph J. Losieniecki, new pastor of St. Hedwig's Church, Kingston, one of the leading charges in the Roman Catholic Diocese of Scranton for Americans of Polish extraction, is no stranger to the community.

A brother of the Right Reverend Monsignor W. A. Losieniecki, pastor of St. Mary's Church of the Maternity, Wilkes-Barre, the Reverend Father Losieniecki devoted 26 of his 43 years in the priesthood to the Park Avenue Parish his brother now serves and to St. Joseph's Church, Wyoming. He has labored at Greenwood in Lackawanna County the past 17 years.

A reputation as a devout churchman and excellent administrator precedes him to the West Side parish where he succeeds the late Reverend Paul Kopicki and the late Reverend James E. Gryczka, whose name was identified with St. Hedwig's for four decades.

In all the parishes in which he served and in local Polish circles, the Reverend Father Losieniecki has been known for his warm personality and even disposition. His ready smile, unfailing cheerfulness, and infinite patience have won for him a legion of friends.

Members of St. Hedwig's Parish are fortunate to have a clergyman of his qualifications as their spiritual guide. He will be an asset to Greater Wilkes-Barre as well.

Juvenile Delinquency Control

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill H.R. 3464, entitled the "Juvenile Delinquency Control Projects Act."

Every year the problem of youthful lawbreakers grows more serious. Every year we are confronted by a barrage of articles in popular and scholarly magazines about what should be done to stop juvenile delinquency. Every year a large number of bills is introduced suggesting action by the Federal Government to help States and communities solve this appalling problem.

During the last Congress, the subcommitte on special education of the Committee on Education and Labor, of which I have the honor to be chairman, held extended hearings on the general subject of juvenile delinquency.

Many of the Nation's outstanding leaders in the field of youth work testified before our committee. They strongly agreed that we need to know far more than we do at present about the causes of delinquency, the effectiveness of present methods of treatment and control, and development of new ways of handling juveniles who go against society.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Mr. Speaker, my bill provides for this.

It provides $5 million a year for 5 years to pay part of the cost of projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

Projects may be proposed by States or other public or nonprofit private organizations.

Such projects would be evaluated by a National Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency consisting of 12 recognized authorities in professional or technical

fields related to juvenile delinquency and members of the general public.

The Advisory Committee will make recommendations on the projects to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This bill provides for demonstration projects. We expect that projects approved under the bill will be of an action-research nature—that is, actual field trials of methods and techniques in controlling delinquency.

The bill requires complete reporting of results. The Secretary is directed to disseminate any significant findings on juvenile delinquency control as soon as they occur. He is also directed, at the end of the 5-year period, to make a complete evaluation of how knowledge about juvenile delinquency has been advanced by all the projects taken together. In the interim, the Secretary is to make annual reports of his actions on the recommendations of the National Advisory Council, and to submit to Congress recommendations about the administration of the act or further legislation he thinks desirable.

PROPOSED PROJECTS

Mr. Speaker, as an illustration of the results we might expect from this bill, let me recount a few examples of projects suggested by witnesses before our committee:

A former Commissioner of Social Security would like to prove what one or more good, well-trained probation officers can do with juvenile offenders.

The chief of a State child welfare bureau wants to demonstrate what could be done by working thoroughly through the schools, where early truancy and misbehavior often spell future trouble but where understaffed faculties can do little about it.

The director of a private welfare agency thinks they could learn how to perform their present services more efficiently.

A prominent psychiatrist favors a detailed study of one segment of a city to try to identify predelinquent children.

A former Chief of the U.S. Children's Bureau would like to see cities of different sizes experiment on different methods of how to train police for work with juveniles and different methods of organizing police bureaus.

A training school superintendent thinks the ingredients of the personality of adults who are able to influence youths to go straight could be identified.

A State youth control official wants to change one of his training schools to a therapeutic community with high grade social workers to try to work changes in attitudes among those committed.

A correctional official hopes to perfect techniques to identify the few truly dangerous psychotic personalities among the thousands of juveniles he screens for probation, because he is scared to death he may miss one.

EXPECTED RESULTS

Mr. Speaker, I think we can expect significant results from a bill such as this. We have learned the value of demonstrations and research in many fields of endeavor. Not only in scientific fields does it pay off. Our Nation has realized wonderful results from similar demonstration and research projects in the fields of public health, vocational rehabilitation, and education. What could be a more practical step at this time than to assemble and spread what knowledge we now have about juvenile delinquency control, and to launch a broad, coordinated plan of demonstration projects to uncover and test new ways of dealing with this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill will go far in finding more effective ways to prevent and treat juvenile delinquency. I think this will begin a coordinated effort that will assure that all promising avenues of development are followed in the most efficient manner. Even more important, perhaps, I think that we can assure that what is known and discovered through projects begun under this bill will be made available to the States and communities, schools and churches, of this country. Only then can they deal with this difficult and growing problem in the soundest possible ways. Many of the ideas so readily advanced today about what should be done about delinquency may be sound. We will not know which are sound and under which conditions they will work until we go about testing these ideas in actual situations.

This bill is an example of the best kind of role for the Federal Government to play in solving our major social problems. The States and local units of government, the private voluntary organizations and individual families must ultimately do the job of eradicating juvenile delinquency. But we here at this level can help to provide them with the leadership, the coordination, and some of the knowledge and tools to do their job better.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this bill will receive early, favorable consideration.

Rev. Robert Graham, Late Pastor of Ashley (Pa.) Presbyterian Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of February 13, 1959:

REV. ROBERT GRAHAM

After he had served Ashley Presbyterian Church as pastor for 35 years, the announcement in 1956 that Rev. Robert Graham would resign caused widespread regret. He was persuaded by his congregation to remain in the pastorate several months beyond the date he had fixed for leaving. This was to give time to consider the selection of a successor. The request was a measure of the esteem in which he was held in his own church.

In October 1951 members of the Ashley church and officers of Lackawanna Presbytery gathered to observe his 30th anniversary as pastor. Many from other faiths, clergymen and laymen alike, were present to pay tribute. This was likewise true when a dinner was given Mr. Graham on the eve of his retirement. He was admired in his calling and as a citizen for many good qualities not the least of which were his kindliness and his neighborly spirit.

His was the longest tenure of any of the six pastors of the Ashley Presbyterian Church from the time it was formally organized in 1866. Lackawanna Presbytery which knew him as a dedicated member honored him with many calls for service, several terms as moderator. He had been a delegate to both the senate and the general assembly and had long service as State clerk.

Upon his retirement Rev. Mr. Graham became pastor emeritus of the Ashley church and was frequently called upon to officiate or to assist at special ceremonies. For several months last year he served as the acting pastor of a Presbyterian church in Washington, D.C.

In his death this community has lost a clergyman who reflected great credit on his calling, an earnest citizen and an unfailing friend.

Deficiencies in Headquarters, USAF, Manpower and Personnel Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, on February 11, 1959, I inserted in the RECORD a report made by the Council of Defense Lodges—American Federation of Government Employees—concerning the conflict of military and civilian personnel in the Pentagon.

I am also submitting herewith a copy of a letter written to the Secretary of the Air Force by Mr. John Mann, president, Lodge 1092, American Federation of Government Employees, AFL–CIO, Headquarters, USAF, outlining key deficiencies in headquarters USAF manpower and personnel policies:

AMERICAN FEDERATION
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES,
February 6, 1959.

The Honorable JAMES H. DOUGLAS,
Secretary of the Air Force,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In Report No. 2512 dated August 7, 1958, the House Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization outlined the following problem:

"The Hoover Commission in 1955 recommended 'that civilians with broad management and accounting experience and competency be appointed as comptrollers.' Three years later, in 1958, the Department of Defense has 970 comptrollers, of whom only 24 percent are civilians. In fact, as recently as July 1, 1958, the Air Force issued an order requiring that all comptrollers in that service must be military except as designated by the Secretary of the Air Force. April 24, 1957, the Secretary of Defense issued a Department of Defense directive—No. 1100.9, Military-Civilian Staffing in Management Positions and Support Activities—which called for the gradual replacement of military in such civilian-type positions as comptrollerships. Present personnel data do not indicate any widespread implementation. Actually, there might be a trend in the opposite direction.

"With the built-in rotation cycle of the military officers, there are generally civilian

deputies in the 740 military comptrollers. The exception is the Air Force where only 11 percent of the comptrollers or deputy comptrollers are civilians."

An interesting question arises from this data: Could the Headquarters, USAF, by increasing the proportion of civilians in the key jobs, improve its fiscal management operations and to what degree of dual staffing exists in the fiscal management?

While this report deals primarily with the comptroller function (accounting, finance, budget, statistical services, and management analysis), we feel that this same situation prevails in many other functional areas throughout Headquarters, USAF. Malutilization of military manpower exists in many other support functions such as administrative services, supply, transportation, maintenance-engineering, procurement, installations, manpower, and management.

Staffing of civilian-type support positions with military personnel has approached a point which, we feel, actually jeopardizes economic completion of the Air Force combat mission. Recent military and civilian pay raises have a direct bearing upon this problem. The assignment of military personnel to civilian or administrative-type duties has become prohibitively expensive. Pay fringe benefits have increased costs to where today's enlisted man can earn over $10,000 per year. In the officer category, the career cost amortization of one full colonel may involve as much as $33,000 per year. This includes base pay, quarters' allowance, longevity pay, flying pay, responsibility pay, PCS costs, dislocation allowances, training costs, retirement, medicare, and other fringe benefits not inherent in civilian manpower costs.

In terms of overall manpower implications, the problem involves much more than simple comparisons of take-home pay between military and civilian personnel. An Air Force major and a GS–12 civilian, for example, may have similar take-home pay in terms of dollars. However, in terms of true cost to the taxpayer, a military man involves many costs, benefits, and investments (education, training, facilities, housing, retirement, etc.) not accorded a GS–12, or other comparable career civilian.

In many areas in Headquarters, USAF, commissioned officers spend their entire tour of duty in nonmilitary, nondefense, noncombat, functional assignments. This is unnecessarily expensive. More importantly, it is creating a misleading manpower picture in terms of defense readiness and combat capability. Manpower totals are padded with thousands of uniformed personnel who are not engaged in, or even prepared for, defense or military-type duties. We feel that this is neither the spirit nor intent of Congress in putting a man in uniform. The assignment of military personnel to administrative and support-type activities may well constitute the most expensive form of bureaucracy in the Federal Government.

Compounding this situation is the fact that the military man often does not have the motivation, aptitude, background, or training for support-type duties. He knows he will probably be rotated in 3 years into an entirely different career category. He also realizes that interim civilian-type assignments tend to jeopardize his long-range military advancement potential. In the support areas, particularly, this has created officer and civilian morale problems, poor management leadership, lost continuity, and inadequate technical specialization. In many cases, important projects or programs are canceled prematurely or reorganizations undertaken at considerable loss in Air Force funds and resources, simply to coincide with an individual officer's rotation. In others, costly or ill-considered decisions are made as a result of disinterest, lack of training, or personnel instability. We feel that this type of transient management is costing the American taxpayer millions of dollars in excess defense costs. During recent Senate appropriations hearings, considerable discussion was centered upon the high cost of personnel instability within Headquarters, USAF.

The problem, as we see it, involves much more than simple mismanagement or labor relations as such. The entire concept of civilian-military relationships, roles, and teamwork must be reexamined within Headquarters, USAF. By comparison the Navy and Army have relatively progressive policies and concepts in the area of military-civilian teamwork. The Navy, for example, has a full-time Industrial Relations Office and has civilianized many of its support functions for purposes of continuity and technical specialization. It also makes greater use of civilian comptrollers. The Army has assigned civilian deputies in many of its support activities. For some reason, Headquarters, USAF, continues to pursue a costly and illogical manpower policy concerning the utilization of civilians. The impact of this policy upon defense capability and costs should be obvious.

We also feel that the proposed 2-percent reduction in DOD civilian manpower will actually increase overall defense payroll costs. Reductions in civilian manpower, in many instances, simply mean that military personnel will be assigned to perform civilian duties. Direct and indirect payroll costs will actually be increased in many areas. This process will then be compounded by a secondary manpower cycle wherein Headquarters USAF will demonstrate a need for additional military manpower. In contrast to this, it is accepted knowledge that advancing weapon systems, technology, and airpower concepts (missiles and spacecraft) will require progressively greater concentration of stabilized civilian manpower in the direct and indirect support areas.

We could cite many more arguments and examples of why greater utilization should be made of civilian manpower in support type activities in headquarters USAF. However, numerous studies by outside consultants and citizen groups (Hoover Commission, Sarnoff Commission, Ford Foundation, Rockefeller report) have indicated similar conclusions. We feel that corrective action is long overdue.

As a point of departure, the following proposals are submitted:

1. Establishment of civilian deputies at headquarters USAF, at all levels, in such functional areas as procurement, manpower, supply, transportation, information services, accounting and finance, and maintenance-engineering.

2. Establishment of civilian comptrollers, and deputies, within Headquarters USAF.

3. Review of Headquarters USAF civilian-military manning ratios in all direct and indirect support functions. Progressive civilianization of appropriate broad functional areas and activities, throughout headquarters USAF, as outlined in DOD 1100.9.

4. Require absolute compliance with existing directives concerning utilization of civilian manpower as outlined in AFR 40–3, AFR 30–22, and DOD directive 1100.9.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN MANN,
President, AFGE Lodge 1092 (AFL–CIO), Headquarters USAF.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that the deficiencies pointed out in the above letter to the Secretary of the Air Force is further substantive proof that the interests of our Nation would be best served by removing military jurisdiction from civilian employees in the Government service.

Jazz: A Means of Direct Intercultural Communication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, evidence of the importance of the special international program for cultural presentation has recently come to my attention, and I wish, in turn, to place it before all Members of Congress.

Engaged as we are in efforts to communicate on diplomatic, legislative and political levels, we may overlook the fact that certain kinds of immediate and direct experience are much more meaningful to most citizens of other countries. Friendship comes from interests held in common, but more particularly from enjoyments shared.

In August of 1958 the Woody Herman band toured 19 countries of South America and the results of that tour are to the point. The following comments are excerpted from articles in the December 14, 1958, and December 21, 1958, editions of the San Francisco Chronicle by Mr. Ralph J. Gleason, the able editor of that newspaper's Rhythm section:

Just back from a 30,000-mile, 3-month tour of Central and South America for the U.S. State Department, Bandleader Woody Herman has a simple recommendation on how to make friends south of the border.

"Send them more jazz groups," he said last week in Hollywood.

One of the most amazing things was the reaction of the members of the band. "Week after week," he said, "those New York hippies were personal ambassadors. Every man a diplomat. It was beautiful. And the reception we got everywhere was almost frightening. We couldn't lose."

In Montevideo, for instance, the Herman band outdrew the Russian Ballet which was playing opposite them, and in several halls the band set attendance records.

One of the surprise features of this tour was a series of free concerts which Herman gave at schools and universities.

The first took place in Caracas, Venezuela, in August. Local representatives of the State Department were dubious as to the possible reaction, but Herman felt that if the students had a chance to hear jazz, they would appreciate it. Thousands jammed the beautiful Caracas University hall and thousands more tried vainly to get in. "It was wonderful," Herman said. Then, convinced of the practicality of the free school concerts, they were repeated.

Throughout the tour, South American musicians swarmed around the band and set up friendships that will likely last for years. Members of the Herman band are now involved in sending back music and recordings to musicians all over South America.

Our diplomacy in South America in recent years has not been notable for its success and there has been a growing feeling that if we concentrate more on something, such as jazz, which communicates directly and less on formal diplomacy, we may make more friends more quickly.

One of the main obstacles to the sending of more cultural missions to South America, Herman said, is the difficulty in obtaining funds for this purpose from Congress.

"There has been no publicity here about the success of these tours, therefore Congress doesn't feel the necessity of spending the money," he said.

As proof of the success of the tour, Herman proudly displays an editorial from the Daily Journal of Caracas following the band's appearance there.

"During the course of recent history," the editorial says, "we have seen several excellent ways of how not to win friends and influence people abroad.

"White-tie diplomacy, as Vice President NIXON called it, is on the way out.

"Just how many friends * * * have been made with a round of formal cocktail parties we never did find out. But we have a pretty good idea of how many friends musical ambassadors such as Louis Armstrong, Leonard Bernstein, and now Woody Herman have made for the United States.

"Keep up the good work, Uncle Sam, and send us more of these 'cats'."

Poison in Your Water—No. 16

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the New York Journal-American on January 10, 1958. That article entitled "Water Pollution Perils Upstate City" sets forth more reasons why the full $45 million authorized under Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress should be appropriated for grants to cities and municipalities to clean up their sewage disposal.

This article sets forth how the county health board president announced he would issue a "boiled water" order on Monday unless the supplies of water in Rensselaer County are cleaned up. He said:

City water in Rensselaer is so polluted it is dangerous for home consumption.

Dr. Quinlan said:

I will prohibit its use next Monday unless something is done.

His grim statement continued:

A disastrously widespread outbreak of hepatitis and allied liver diseases is to be greatly feared.

The water of this area is drawn from the Hudson, one of our great waterways, just above the city of Albany.

This is just another danger to our people which stems from foul, filthy, dirty water full of municipal sewage and industrial waste. This situation goes on in hundreds of cities and communities throughout the United States and lives and health of millions of Americans are endangered thereby:

WATER POLLUTION PERILS UPSTATE CITY—HEPATITIS EPIDEMIC FEARED

RENSSELAER, N.Y., January 10.—An epidemic of infectious hepatitis, a serious liver disease, from polluted water supplies threatened the entire 11,000 population of this city today.

The threat was defined by the Rensselaer County Board of Health in a survey rushed to completion in less than 4 days.

Dr. John J. Quinlan, county health board president, said he would issue a "boiled water" order to public on Monday unless the supplies are cleaned up.

"City water in Rensselaer is so polluted it is dangerous for human consumption," Dr. Quinlan said. "I will prohibit its use next Monday unless something is done.

"Our survey revealed that the supplies, drawn from the Hudson just above Albany, are inadequately filtrated and chlorinated * * * and have a soaring bacterial count in the water mains.

"A disastrously widespread outbreak of hepatitis and allied liver diseases is to be greatly feared."

Dr. Quinlan said the condition had worsened steadily during the past several months.

He said a copy of the country report had been forwarded to State Health Commissioner Dr. Herman E. Hilleboe with a request for his urgent attention.

A Virginian Sparks the Drive To Strengthen Small Business in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, all of us are familiar with the Small Business Administration which was created by Congress in 1953 and made into a permanent Federal agency by action of the 85th Congress.

Under the able direction of its Administrator, Wendell B. Barnes, the Small Business Administration has been of immeasurable help to the entire national economy. SBA has done this through its program of helping to rehabilitate, to expand and generally revitalize thousands of small business enterprises throughout the land.

Through efforts of SBA, many millions of dollars of Government defense contracts have been diverted to small business enterprises, thereby enabling them to maintain steady employment and healthy business conditions in countless communities.

Last year the Congress created the Small Business Investment Act, the objective of which is to furnish long-term and equity-type financing to small business enterprises—a kind of financing not easily to be found through commercial banks. The interest in this plan has been widespread in all parts of the country.

Sensing that the Investment Division was to become one of the most effective segments of the Small Business Administration, Mr. Barnes sought a highly-qualified banker and financial expert to take charge of the division. He found Mr. Duncan H. Read of Middleburg, Va., president of the Middleburg bank, a former partner in the nationally known firm of Dillon, Read & Co., and favorably known in American financial circles. As a Deputy SBA Director in control of the Investment Division, Mr. Read now is rapidly bringing the Division to a level of high operational efficiency.

Mr. Read addressed a meeting in Washington February 20, of the SBA's Region Four Advisory Board embracing Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

Because of a widespread interest in the Small Business Investment Division on the part of Members of Congress, as well as by bankers, investment people and small business throughout the country, I herewith offer the text of Mr. Read's remarks for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REMARKS OF DUNCAN H. READ, SBA DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, INVESTMENT DIVISION, BEFORE SBA'S REGION 4 ADVISORY BOARD

The activities of the Investment Division of the Small Business Administration, created by the Small Business Investment Act last summer, are twofold:

(1) To make loans to State and local development companies, and

(2) To license, regulate and give financial assistance to privately organized, privately financed companies, called small business investment companies.

The provision for loans to local development companies has aroused considerable interest because of the opportunities under title 5 of the act, which permits loans up to $250,000 for assistance to an identifiable small business. Loans can be obtained under section 502 of this portion of the act to help a small business purchase needed equipment, build additional facilities, and even to acquire property deemed necessary to carry out the purposes of small business expansion.

While the law limits to $250,000 the amount we can lend for a single small business, it should be remembered that the number of loans to a local development company for additional small businesses is not necessarily limited. Thus, for example, four loans for as many small businesses may be negotiated if their getting established in the community will carry out the aims and purposes of the act.

Local development companies in Virginia and North Carolina, as well as several further south, already have availed themselves of the opportunity to obtain Federal funds to carry out such aims.

The Small Business Investment Act aims to keep the Government out of business, and to assist and encourage private organizations to provide a source of long-term loans and equity capital for small business, hitherto difficult to obtain. The assistance to the small business investment company provided by the act, is twofold:

First, there are tax advantages for the SBICs and the investors who form them. These advantages may be found in section 57 of the Technical Amendments Act of 1958, and may be summarized as follows:

(1) The investment companies are allowed an ordinary loss deduction, rather than a capital loss deduction, or losses realized on the convertible debentures of small business concerns (including stock received pursuant to the conversion privilege);

(2) Taxpayers investing in the stock of the investment companies also are allowed an ordinary loss deduction, rather than a capital loss allowance, on losses arising from the worthlessness, or sale of such stock;

(3) The companies are allowed a deduction for 100 percent of the dividends received from a taxable domestic corporation rather than the 85 percent deduction generally allowed corporate taxpayers.

I think you regional advisers might be interested in a brief résumé of our analysis of what kind of people and organizations are applying for licensing as a small business investment company; and what they apparently expect in the way of results by forming such companies.

First, for the first time in 25 years, banks are permitted to engage (directly, if you will) in equity and long-term financing. Today, this is their only opportunity to do so. Investment companies are being formed by banks, with and without the participation of private individuals or investment underwriting firms. Such companies would be expected to operate at a profit to all stockholders, but would also create satisfactory relationships of various kinds for the banks and underwriting firms involved.

Second, several investment companies are in the formation stage at the instigation of groups of small business concerns themselves for the purpose of providing these concerns with a source of equity and long-term capital. Such investment companies would be operated at a profit, but primarily for the benefit of the borrowers, and would confine their activities probably to long-term loans not involving the equity of the borrowers. Manufacturers supplying small business concerns would be logical stockholders of such investment companies.

Third, another category of investment companies would be those formed principally as venture capital undertakings, where the incentive is to finance enterprises that have a promising growth potential. Private individuals in high tax brackets who see advantages of putting their capital to work through the formation of an investment company, rather than directly, should be the main source of establishing investment companies in this category.

Now, the profit potentialities of SBIC's will naturally vary with the nature of the business. For instance, certain profit potentialities are available to investment companies in all three categories. First is the differential between the interest paid on borrowings and interest charged on loans; and a second is the income received for services of all kinds rendered to the small business concerns. These two sources of profit might be expected to keep solvent an investment company that wishes to operate primarily pro bono publico, without sharing in the growth of the borrowing companies.

For SBIC's not operating pro bono publico, the third and main source of profit, of course, is in sharing in the growth of successful small businesses through acquisition of their convertible debentures. I think this needs no elaboration.

There are also supplemental or incidental advantages to certain types of stockholders of an SBIC, depending upon the nature of their businesses. Banks, for instance, which form SBIC's might expect to expand their banking business because of the investment company's activities; investment underwriting companies owning stock in SBIC's might expect to develop opportunities for public security offerings; insurance companies interested in SBIC's lending, for example, to real estate developers, might expect to handle considerable insurance in the field of title search and insurance, fidelity bonding, and other types of insurance that the construction industry needs.

But whatever the source of profit might be, there can be no substitute for able management experienced in the lending and investment field.

In reviewing the applications received to date, we have found that applications received from people with previous experience in banking and investments, and in the preparation of financial statements and documents, have required a minimum of implementation and correction.

It will not be surprising to you, therefore, to know that of the 10 proposals for which the applicants have been told to proceed, 5 of these proposals have been submitted with a bank as either sole stockholder or at least one of the stockholders.

One or two applications have been prepared by people with little or no experience in complying with statutory requirements or in the preparation of financial statements. These have been returned to the applicants for corrections of all kinds.

We are constantly being asked when the first SBIC group will be licensed.

We cannot set such a date right now. We can say only that out of 43 applications, we have told 10 that they may proceed to organize as described in their proposals.

We have told another eight applicants that final consideration of their proposals cannot be given until they have furnished further information or amended their proposals.

We advised one applicant that his proposal, as submitted, was not satisfactory for a variety of reasons.

You will see from this chart that there has been a steady stream of proposals coming into Washington, and I hope that the next time we meet I can tell you that most of them have been licensed and that their investment companies are in business.

I think you all may know that SBA organized three briefing sessions in Los Angeles, Kansas City, and as recently as January 30, in Philadelphia. Mr. Barnes was accompanied by several people from SBA's Washington office, as well as two representatives of the Securities and Exchange Commission. We expect to issue very soon copies of the remarks made by Mr. Barnes and the others at the Philadelphia briefing session, with typical questions and answers received at all three meetings.

Judge Bernard C. Brominski Honored by His Hometown of Swoyerville, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News of February 11, 1959:

HOMETOWN HONORS JURIST

It was interesting to note that more than 500 persons turned out for a community testimonial dinner in Swoyerville in honor of Judge Bernard C. Brominski. That was an impressive tribute to a native son.

It has been written that no man is a hero to his valet. By the same token, an individual, no matter what eminence he may attain elsewhere, too often does not impress his neighbors when success knocks at his door. Judge Brominski is a refreshing exception to the rule as the gathering in the auditorium of Holy Trinity Church demonstrated.

There are several contributing factors. He is a member of a family that has played a prominent role in Swoyerville, his father, the late Dr. John Brominski, having been a civic leader and burgess. The young jurist himself, endowed with a warm personality, has been a popular figure in the West Side borough. And the people are understandably proud of the contribution he has made to the prestige of his hometown by his elevation to the bench, a distinction Swoyerville shares with him.

In recent years, Swoyerville has developed an esprit de corps through the success of its high school teams and the recognition that has come to other local residents, including its clergymen. The newly developed pride is reflected also in the development of its residential districts. The addition of a jurist to the role of citizens has just about filled its cup of joy to overflowing, if the response to the testimonial is any criterion.

Lincoln as an Extremist on Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 12, 1959]

LINCOLN AS AN EXTREMIST ON COURT—CIVIL WAR PRESIDENT CALLED OUTSPOKEN IN VIEWS ON DRED SCOTT DECISION

(By David Lawrence)

The Nation is celebrating this week the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. Eloquent eulogies are being spoken—and he deserves them all. But if what Abraham Lincoln said just 100 years ago were attributed today to anyone else in public life, the same utterances would be denounced as coming from a racist, or a person who defies the Constitution.

Few persons realize how outspoken Abraham Lincoln was against a Supreme Court decision and how he insisted that a mere overturning of precedent in a ruling was not settled law. It was just 100 years ago when Abraham Lincoln was debating with Stephen Douglas in the State of Illinois. Only a few months ago the Library of Congress published a book containing facsimiles of the printers' copy of the stenographic record of the Lincoln-Douglas debates as edited and prepared for the press by Abraham Lincoln.

Following is a quotation from Mr. Lincoln's speech delivered on July 13, 1858, at Chicago:

"The sacredness that Judge Douglas throws around this decision (of the Supreme Court of the United States) is a degree of sacredness that has never been before thrown around any other decision. I have never heard of such a thing. Why, decisions apparently contrary to that decision, or that good lawyers thought were contrary to that decision, have been made by that very Court before. It is the first of its kind; it is an astonisher in legal history—it is a new wonder of the world."

In speaking further of the Dred Scott decision, Mr. Lincoln said at Quincy, Ill., on October 13, 1858:

"But we nevertheless do oppose that decision as a political rule which shall be binding on the voter to vote for nobody who thinks it wrong, which shall be binding on the Members of Congress or the President to favor no measure that does not actually concur with the principles of that decision. We do not propose to be bound by it as a political rule in that way. * * * We propose so resisting it as to have it reversed if we can, and a new judicial rule established upon this subject."

In another speech delivered in Chicago on July 17, 1858, Mr. Lincoln quoted with approval a letter from Thomas Jefferson, written in 1820, which declared that if the

judges of the Supreme Court are to be considered as "the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions," this could be a "very dangerous doctrine indeed and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy."

In a speech delivered at Ottawa, Ill., on August 21, 1858, Mr. Lincoln took up the race question. He denounced slavery, but then added:

"I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and the black races. There is a physical difference between the two, which in my judgment will probably forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality, and inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I, as well as Judge Douglas, am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position. I have never said anything to the contrary, but I hold that notwithstanding all this, there is no reason in the world why the Negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I hold that he is as much entitled to these as the white man. I agree with Judge Douglas, he is not my equal in many respects—certainly not in color, perhaps not in moral or intellectual endowment. But in the right to eat the bread, without leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man. * * *

"What next? Free them and make them politically and socially our equals? My own feelings will not admit of this; and if mine would, we well know that those of the great mass of white people will not. Whether this feeling accords with justice and sound judgment is not the sole question, if, indeed it is any part of it. A universal feeling, whether well or ill founded, cannot be safely disregarded.. We cannot, then, make them equals."

With further reference to the equality or inequality of the races, Mr. Lincoln said, on September 18, 1858, at Charleston, Ill.:

"I will say then that I am not, nor ever have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races—that I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race. I will add to this that I have never seen to my knowledge a man, woman, or child who was in favor of producing a perfect equality, social and political, between Negroes and white men."

Poison in Your Water—No. 17

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, another area of our country became closed to water sports and to recreation because of health danger. An article describing the situation appeared in the San Francisco, Calif., Call-Bulletin on December 17, 1957. The article pointed out how the Redwood City harbor had become so polluted that it was a health danger. Raw sewage drifts into the bay and surrounding areas from improper operation of nearby sewage disposal plants. The result is that citizens who could play and recreate in once pure and beautiful waters are denied that enjoyment because of the health danger from sewage and pollution in the area:

WATER SPORTS HELD POLLUTION DANGER

(By Stuart W. Welch, Call-Bulletin peninsula reporter)

REDWOOD CITY, December 17.—Water contact sports should not be allowed in Redwood City's harbor or connecting slough because of the health danger, according to the county health department.

A letter to this effect was read last night to the city council here by Dr. Harold D. Chope, county health director.

Any type of swimming, water skiing, or skin diving would be dangerous, Dr. Chope wrote, because of water pollution.

The health director pointed out that sewage drifts into the bay and sloughs from improper operation of nearby sewage disposal plants.

It is expected the council will pass an ordinance banning all water sports except boating by next spring.

Protest Against Electrical Equipment From Foreign Concerns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I present herewith for the attention of the Congress a resolution passed by the General Assembly of Pennsylvania. The resolution is self-explanatory and is a protest against the purchase of certain electrical equipment from foreign concerns by American agencies. You will note that this is a bipartisan resolution. I sincerely pray that the Members of this body will take cognizance of the seriousness of the effects of the continuation of this policy by Government agencies:

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) is seriously jeopardizing American recovery from the recession by awarding sizable contracts to foreign concerns; and

Whereas our immediate concern is the loss of a multi-million dollar turbo-generator contract to the C. A. Parsons Company of England while the Westinghouse Electric Corporation, East Pittsburgh, Pa., was the lowest domestic bidder; and

Whereas the importation of this electrical apparatus will result in the loss of more than one million man-hours of work for the Westinghouse Electric Corporation employees which is comparable to work for 700 employees for one (1) year or 350 employees for two (2) years; and

Whereas there will also result a loss of direct and indirect taxes in the amount of $3,255,500 Federal and $363,300 State; and

Whereas during 11 months of 1958 the Federal Government awarded $30,530,114 in heavy electrical apparatus contracts and foreign manufacturers were awarded 35 percent or $10,711,070; and

Whereas we believe that in addition to the effect this policy has on our economy, it is a reckless and hazardous policy for the security of our Nation, as this equipment will now be dependent on a foreign company, from across the ocean, for maintenance and repair; and

Whereas the Government of England stands steadfast in its policy that no equipment as referred to herein shall be purchased by English concerns from a foreign country because of national security; and

Whereas we believe the Government should look beyond the price alone and evaluate the health of our own economy and the soundness of our national defense: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to establish a congressional committee to investigate the policies of the Tennessee Valley Authority so that further loss of employment in the United States, at a time when employment is now of grave concern, will be avoided; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of each House of Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the House of Representatives.

HIRAM G. ANDREWS,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
JAS. MINSKY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Garnishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the fourth of a series of articles dealing with garnishment in the District of Columbia is inserted at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 4, 1959]

EMPLOYERS DENOUNCE GARNISHMENT AS DISRUPTING FUNCTION OF PERSONNEL

(By Morton Mintz)

"I object to the fact that three or four firms in the city of Washington are causing this hearing. It (garnishment of wages) is causing my firm to use one clerk's time some 3 hours a week, and it is expensive. My time is also involved."

This was Richard D. Gibbs, secretary of Peoples Drug Stores, testifying before the House District Judiciary Subcommittee on May 27, 1957. He continued:

"Most of the people think that Peoples Drug Stores are doing something to them by holding their salaries, and they think we influence these garnishments, whereas, we do everything to discourage them."

The grief caused easy-credit customers and the public under the District's bad debt or garnishment law has been set out in preceding articles. But employers have a host of complaints, too. More of these were placed before the House subcommittee by Victor Ottenstein, representing the District News Co.

He spoke of the many times easy-credit stores and small-loan companies phone his

firm, learn that an employee who wants to buy from them is being garnished—and sell to him anyway.

"I feel," he testified, "that it is a promiscuous extension of credit when they know that the employee will probably default, and it is a nuisance to the employer.

"We train our employees and it takes a while before they catch onto the work, and then they get a garnishment and they might leave the job and go somewhere else, which means we have to go to the trouble of employing someone else to replace them.

"A new person makes mistakes which cause us annoyance. Some employees who might have their salaries attached this week will have them attached next week by another firm. A person with a family has to pay rent and has to buy food and they cannot exist without some sort of income, and in some cases it makes thieves out of these employees * * *.

"Now, it is not only a nuisance at our place of business, because it takes executive time out to handle these matters, or to see the employee about these situations, and to train new employees, but when we have to appear in court to say that the employee earns only so much and should get an exemption, it takes the whole day, and we just cannot afford to spend that time."

Ottenstein then went into the effects of the bar on attaching wages of Federal and District Government employees. He said it is "unfair to non-Government commercial establishments * * * to have employees threatened with garnishment because it is difficult to hire employees. There is a scarcity in the labor market, and these employees figure, 'Well, I'll get a job with the Government, and they cannot attach me.'"

Here are illustrations, based on interviews with employers, of points made by Ottenstein and others:

One large employer, Government Services, Inc., had to handle 531 attachments last year. The source of more than 100 of these was two easy-credit stores, which stresses once again that a huge share of the garnishments originates with a very few firms.

This employer, at the request of the Washington Post, made a detailed study of its cost of handling these attachments. The estimate: $10 each.

The pay of one valued GSI employee was attached for 2 consecutive months. "It just doesn't make any sense working here and not getting a paycheck," he said. He quit.

Another major employer, Washington Terminal Co., had to process 623 garnishments last year. The estimated average amount: $150. This company estimated a smaller cost of handling, $4 each.

One employer of fewer than 150 persons made a study for the Washington Post of the cost of training replacements for five employees who, heavily in debt, began to steal, were caught and were fired. His estimate: $460 in direct payroll costs.

From a letter to Municipal Judge Milton S. Kronheim, Jr., from Nicholas Costin, a restaurant operator: "Some of these garnishments are granted against people who have never been in my employ, or who have left my employ many months ago. This only proves that sales are made without any check upon the purchaser's credit. We who are employers are obliged to answer a garnishment and often find ourselves obligated to these unscrupulous creditors when such an answer has gone astray."

Many employers end up making loans, often out of their own pockets, to garnished employees. If an employer advances wages to an employee whose pay has been attached, he can be sued by the creditor.

The creditor's right to sue is effective under the garnishment law for a 6-month period or until the debt is paid, even if the garnishment itself expires. Such a suit was filed against a real estate firm in 1957 by Hollywood Credit Clothing Co., Inc., 703 7th Street, NW. Municipal Court Judge Milton S. Kronheim Jr. dismissed the case, ruling the realty firm, in advancing wages to a $50-a-month janitor after it received a Hollywood attachment, was not trying to help the janitor evade the judgment, but only to help him exist.

John Crosby States the Case for Pay Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I present below a most provocative article written by the respected television critic, John Crosby, which appeared today in the New York Herald Tribune. Mr. Crosby's article follows:

IS PAY TV THE ANSWER?

Costs are becoming an awful problem on television. Gad, I remember way back when the Milton Berle show—the whole hour, including musicians, writers, chorus girls, guest stars, and Berle—came to $17,000 a week. Today you can hardly get the dog act for that. You can hardly get anything for $17,000 except prolonged commercials on daytime television.

Sure, television is graced by an occasional Hamlet or For Whom the Bell Tolls. But, increasingly, the specials and even the regulars, such as Palyhouse 90, are falling behind their budgets. Television more and more is in an era of deficit financing, like Government. Sometimes the deficits are fairly formidable, too. Eventually, they will be downright frightening.

Already See It Now has vanished, mostly, though not solely, because it was too expensive. The other serious operations on television—many of them anyway—are sustained by deficit financing that cannot go on forever. However, even apart from the shows that have disappeared altogether, as See It Now, the rising problem of cost has cut the quality of television in less spectacular ways.

Already, a good many writers, including several who started in television, say they won't write for TV because TV can't afford them. That applies also to actors. To get a cast like that in For Whom the Bell Tolls you have to go way over your budget. If the best writers are unobtainable you must take lesser writers and get a lesser script.

All of which leads me to ask the question aloud that I have been asking myself for a long time: Can the advertiser afford television much longer? Or, to put it another way, can it afford good television, which is what we are primarily concerned with here? Sure, the advertiser can afford to turn on the network and fill it almost uninterruptedly with commercials, as is being done on daytime television. Or, it could fill the nighttime air with garbage—westerns and parlor games.

But is this enough? It's not enough for me. I am increasingly in favor of pay television, because I think it is the only solution to the interesting problems. I have never been naive enough to suppose that pay TV would automatically open the floodgates to operas, symphonies, and really worthwhile things. Let's not delude ourselves with great expectations. There will be plenty of junk on pay TV, too.

But at least there will be plenty of money to put on decent dramas. Actors we got; writers we got; directors we got, and the creative energy of this country is at white heat. All we haven't got is money, at least on television we haven't. I would dearly love to see a top producer like Fred Coe given enough money to pull together all the elements he needs in writing and acting and then thrown into competition with the junk merchants at the box office.

Television should be restored to the hands of the showmen instead of the advertisers. Again, this will not necessarily lead to Nirvana. There have been some awfully shoddy, sensational, cheap-jack showmen. But at least the aim of any showman is to entertain, not simply to sell goods. Just the absence of commercials would add so much to some shows. Already good directors are driven out of their wits by inserting underarm deodorant advertisements in the middle of tender, dramatic scenes. When such commercials become the price of survival, then your serious writer and director leave the medium altogether.

Why not pay TV? Well, the chief cry against it is that it is un-American. Free broadcasting is the American tradition. But is any television really free? They add the cost of "As the World Turns" to the soap chips. And I don't even like "As the World Turns." I'm forced to pay for a program I don't want—and so are you. This isn't free TV; it is pay TV, and you don't have any control over what you're paying for.

I don't think sponsored television will disappear altogether, either. If you wanted to play "Concentration" or to watch Dick Clark's teenagers dancing to rock and roll music, or to see "Secret Storm," it would have to be on free television because no one in his right mind would pay to see those things.

A concert by the Philharmonic would not attract an audience big enough to interest Procter & Gamble, but it would sure attract a big enough one to interest Sol Hurok, whereas no one would pay 10 cents to see "Name That Tune"—the rating notwithstanding.

Besides, all the arguments are going to pale eventually before the single overriding argument of economics. If costs continue to mount, the advertisers won't be able to pay the bills and it will have to be pay TV.

Addresses at Ceremonies Dedicating New Supreme Court Building, Brooklyn, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include herewith the following remarks of the Honorable Gerald Nolan, presiding justice of the appellate division, second department, Supreme Court of the State of New York, and the address made by Mr. Andrew S. Roscoe, president of the Downtown Brooklyn Association, at the ceremonies dedicating the new Supreme Court Building, in Brooklyn, N.Y., on January 5, 1959:

PRESIDING JUSTICE NOLAN. When we think of courthouses, this type of building, I suppose we all think of judges, lawyers, jurors, and litigants. If we stop to consider the matter I think we will all agree that what

goes on in courthouses, the administration of jusice, affects directly or indirectly every segment of our community. This program would not be balanced nor would it be complete if we did not hear from a representative of commerce, industry, banking.

We are very happy that we have with us today on this occasion one who has been for many years a friend of the court, a dynamic booster for everything that Brooklyn stands for, a keen student of political science, and a leader in the banking circles of the borough.

It is a privilege at this time to present to you the president of the Downtown Brooklyn Association, Mr. Andrew S. Roscoe. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY MR. ANDREW S. ROSCOE

Our distinguished presiding officer, so well equipped for his duties, since he is also the presiding justice of the appellate division, Right Reverend Bishop DeWolfe, Right Reverend Monsignor Rev. Dr. Steinbach, Mr. Borough President, distinguished justices, not only of this great court but of all other courts, distinguished guests, my ladies and gentlemen, it is a great honor to be here. No one could wish for a more eloquent background to a speaker's platform than this supreme courthouse, which stands as an integral part of a civic center unmatched in any other community. This striking and imposing structure represents a very tangible achievement—the result of skills of labor, architects, and engineers, of planning and financing. It represents a happy conclusion to years of effort. This is sufficient reason for pride.

But I, for one, find this a time and an occasion for humble gratitude.

It is said if we hold any object close enough to our eyes, the object, however small, is big enough to blot out the sun.

This very wonderful supreme court building is very close to all of us, but being this close, it could blot out something larger, stronger and, if you please, more beautiful. This "something"—for it has no convenient and all inclusive label—is the spirit, the drive and the inherent hopes of a free community which recognizes justice as the keystone and the pillar of good government.

As an individual I am grateful to those before my time, to the symbolic body politic which has continuously fought for the rights of a free citizenry against external enemies and those enemies within ourselves such as doubt, timidity, and the instincts of inordinate self-aggrandizement.

A combination of geography and a unique community spirit have given to Brooklyn its deserved reputation as a frontier town or, if you will, an "open port" to our America. For 300 years Brooklyn has been a gateway and a sanctuary, an experimental area for people of different backgrounds and cultures to work and to live together with consequent inestimable benefit to themselves and their neighbors. That has been no simple, automatic accomplishment.

Just as a man cannot be called truly honest if he has never faced and rejected the temptation to steal, he cannot be called a true citizen unless and until he has firmly adopted the rigorous principles that demand political, religious, and racial tolerance for all others as well as for himself. Brooklyn has served and is serving as a "melting pot"—I think I would rather call it a crucible, a testing place of the American spirit. From this crucible prejudice has been sifted and human understanding has been nurtured. Ours is a divine and human faith, a vital philosophy. Such faith inspires progress.

In 1861, when the old Supreme Court Building opened, Brooklyn had a population of 279,000. Today its citizens number about 3 million. The borough has become a world-recognized center of commerce, industry, education, and the arts. Aggregate family income in Brooklyn has leaped in 25 years from $1½ billion to over $5 billion.

But let us recognize an essential of civil progress. In this growth the people have relied upon the law—its administration and just interpretation. Different points of view demand interpretation. The rapid and just disposition of litigation has played a vital role in the borough's tremendous progress over the years.

The ideal concept of absolute justice for all enables us to plan for a future community, secure in the hopes of all our citizenry who come to recognize equality before the law, integrity in the administration of justice. It is rightful that the Supreme Court Building be part of a civic center, for it gives stern recognition that without the law and respect for it we have no society, no commerce, no industry—and most important, no hope for an even better future.

This building will enable the distinguished members of the supreme court of the second judicial district to function in improved physical facilities. However, the strength of our judicial system does not lie principally in physical facilities. The source of strength lies in the knowledge, the character and the heart of the men who serve on the bench and thus serve their community.

I noted before my gratitude to the body politic. I note now the deepest kind of gratitude to the members of the supreme court who are continuing with distinction and greatness the brillian traditions of justice, justice humanly administered.

I thank God we live in a society where justice can not be dispensed by electronic machines, for only the creatures of the Lord are endowed to judge, to understand their fellow mortals.

I sometimes wonder if we adequately conceive the tremendous burdens that have been placed upon the distinguished jurists to whom we owe so great a debt.

More than a quarter of a century has gone by without any addition to the number of justices of the Supreme Court of the Second Judicial District. In 1932, this body of jurists handled 3,342 cases. In 1958, still with 15 justices exclusive of the appellate division, over 5,000 cases have been adjudicated. It has been a stupendous task and a magnificant accomplishment. In 1932, automobile registration was modest, commercial aviation was in its infancy, labor legislation was just beginning to become a part of our legal system, sociology and psychology were tenuous, timid studies. Today our judges must treat with and properly administer infinitely vaster areas of legislation, and dispense justice in the administration of a progressively increasing caseload. They accept new theories of dynamic justice and are required to employ new, infinitely broader areas of social science in the expanding role of justice.

The assignment to this district of 3 city court judges and a justice of the 10th district is recognition that too much is being asked of too few.

The action on studies of modernization of judicial procedures I leave to legal authorities.

But I know I am voicing the sentiments of businessmen whom I am honored to represent as president of the Downtown Brooklyn Association when I say that even further steps should be taken to lighten the heavy burdens which the members of the Supreme Court in this district have shouldered without complaint and with such dedication to the service of the people of Brooklyn.

As a businessman, I know the volume of business can not be increased beyond a given point without proportionately increasing the manpower. Because the borough faces a future of economic and social growth, the Court too faces additional tasks. The issue of more justices is urgent; time itself can be an element of justice or injustice. "The law's delays" of Hamlet's grim soliloquy may well constitute a form of tyranny itself.

I voice my congratulations, and a hope that the Governor of New York, the Mayor of New York and the members of the Board of Directors of the State, the members of the legislature, in the best public interest will give favorable attention to easing the burdens of the dedicated and devoted men whom the people are proud to know as the Supreme Court of the great State of New York.

What Would It Prove?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Mesa Tribune, Mesa, Ariz., under date of February 16, 1959, entitled "What Would It Prove?"

WHAT WOULD IT PROVE?

Throughout Soviet history the Communists have sought to tantalize the world's gullible millions with false lures. Not the least of the frauds is that they do more for humanity, economically, than do their capitalist rivals.

The truth on this score, of course, is that most Russians have been living for decades in a planned depression. As recently as half a dozen years ago, their housing was worse, on the average, than under the hated czars.

Obviously it won't always be this way. Living standards have risen in some parts of Soviet life and will continue to climb. The day may come when ordinary Russians really are provided for adequately, though that time probably is not as near as Premier Khrushchev forecasts.

Just for argument's sake, however, let's say the Russians will at some future point match or even surpass the economic output of the United States.

Khrushchev assumes—and this is one place where the Reds probably believe their own stuff—that this will "prove" the superiority of the Communist system.

He assumes, too, that whether this particular economic lure has worked up to that time or not, it will surely attract the millions thereafter.

The questions for us are: Will it lure the uncommitted peoples and will it prove the superiority of Soviet communism?

We have to fear that the lure will work on some. It even works to some extent in this day and age, when we know it to be a fraud.

But it is not likely to work on men who have tasted genuine freedom.

Nor will it demonstrate the superiority of the Russians' way of life over our own.

Man is not just a machine to be stoked. As a human being, he has a crowning spirit. This spirit comes to fullest, truest flower only when he is free.

Even in the fanciful prospect that the Russians should some day outproduce us 4 to 1, they will not be superior. They will not begin to match us until they are free men living in individual dignity, enjoying the fruits of the mind and heart—not just of the factory and farm.

New Supreme Court Building Dedicated in Brooklyn, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the remarks by Justice Gerald Nolan and the address by Hon. Charles W. Froessell at the dedication ceremonies of the new supreme court building in Brooklyn, N.Y., on January 5, 1959:

PRESIDING JUSTICE NOLAN. To those of us who are from Brooklyn—and I say that advisedly because I speak of the sons of Brooklyn who are sons by birth and those who are sons by inclination—to those of us who brag that we come from Brooklyn, which might be more accurate, it seems to me when we think of the court of appeals we think of it as a strictly Brooklyn institution because of our distinguished friend and neighbor, the chief judge of the court of appeals, the Honorable Albert Conway, who is unfortunately unable to be here today, but we have, of course, other judges in that court, and I am about to present to you one of them.

No one, I think, is better able than he is to appreciate this beautiful building because he knew the problems that faced the judges who sat in the old courthouse which this magnificent building has replaced, and for many years he served with great honor and distinction as a justice of the supreme court and held court in that old courthouse.

I am sure that he is very, very happy to be here on this occasion, and we are happy to have him. It is my pleasure to present at this time associate judge of the court of appeals, one of our neighbors from the county of Queens, the Honorable Charles W. Froessel.

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES W. FROESSEL

Mr. Justice Nolan, Judge Keogh, Reverend Clergy, my brethren of the bench and of the bar, ladies and gentlemen, may I add to that introduction of Judge Nolan's that I was born in Brooklyn. I think he meant to imply that, but I wanted to make that certain. Secondly, the very gentle yet incisive suggestion that the speakers be brief will not go unheeded, I am sure, provided, of course, that we agree upon the definition of the word brevity. But let me assure you that that last clause should not alarm you.

At the outset I should like to bring to you the greetings of my chief judge, Albert Conway, and all of the associate judges of the court of appeals. I know that every one would have been delighted to be with you this morning and to join with you, excepting for the fact that this is the opening of our January term. We meet at 2 o'clock this afternoon, and since lawyers travel from great distances to be at that court, we could not very well suspend operations.

As we lift the curtain upon this very delightful event that is being unfolded here this morning, we witness the opening of another chapter in the long history of the supreme court of the State of New York. It was originally established 268 years ago on May 6, 1691 by the colonial legislature of our then State.

Some 86 years later the framers of our first constitution, the constitution of 1777, not only recognized this court but continued its existence. Some 70 years thereafter, and in 1847, the powers and jurisdiction of the court of chancery were transferred to this court. It was in that setting in the closing days of the Civil War that the late home of the supreme court in Kings County was established, thus manifesting that even in those very critical days, when the Nation was plagued with problems that they wondered whether they would ever solve, our forebears recognized that no matter what the time, no matter what the crisis, justice must be served. Thus the supreme court has functioned there ever since.

Meanwhile, other courts have had their jurisdiction transferred to this court. It acquired appellate jurisdiction, first in general term, then in the appellate division, and the appellate term. So that now the supreme court of the State of New York is the highest court of original general jurisdiction, in law and in equity, in matters civil and matters criminal, with appellate jurisdiction, subject only to that jurisdiction which the constitution has laid down for the court of appeals of the State of New York.

The supreme court is one of the great courts of the world, and we are delighted that they have found this new home which has long been overdue. Today as you move into your new home, this very beautiful new building, we find it fittingly set upon the site where freedom of speech was exercised by two great newspapers published in this county and the city of New York.

It is also appropriate, is it not, that these exercises this morning should be held in the part in which you will select juries which Magna Charta insisted on as the principal bulwark of their liberties.

When I think of some of the courthouses that I have seen all over the world—and I am thinking now of one in particular in the bush of African Uganda, and others in other places—this certainly is a dream.

Judge Conway and I the other day were talking about your dedication, for we both served on this court and in this county over a long period of years. We talked then of the new courthouse, I mean when we served on the court, for plans for this new building were conceived many years ago, and we both looked forward to the day when we might be privileged to sit here as part of the circuit that all supreme court judges traveled in those days from St. George to Riverhead and sometimes upstate.

But after all is said and done, limestone and granite, and all the other accessories of this delightful modern building, while affording comfort to those who serve here, certainly will not in themselves render justice, will they? That can come only from dedicated judges, jurors, and court staffs who recognize that they are not merely dealing with cases but have in their hands the lives and the liberties and the treasuries of our people, who recognize that to perform their duty they must appreciate that the art of doing justice is doing what you have to do better than you have to do it.

The psalmist said that justice is the insurance we have on our lives and our property, and obedience is the premium that we pay for it. As judges, we must insure justice by giving our very best, by competence, industry, patience, and integrity. At best, justice is a very frail thing, is it not, as all things human. But we do our best, and even when we do our best, we are not always sure that we are always right. That applies to the court of appeals as well as to every other court in the State.

It is particularly difficult in this tremendously complex civilization in which we live, when the contest for power anud for the control of men's minds, and now for the control of outer space, is in high gear, when the law of the sea is undergoing debate in the United Nations for radical changes, and lawyers are pondering already about the laws of outer space. With all that we still have our congested calendars, so-called court reform, and the countless other problems to perplex and challenge us.

You will recall Judge Cardozo's reference in his "Nature of the Judicial Process" to the concern that he felt, and the troubled spirit that he had in the early days on the bench when he looked for certainty in the law and found that it was a trackless ocean, and the search was futile, for the haven was always beyond. Our problem is to find it as nearly as we can, whenever we are called upon to do so.

A genius has been said to be a common man doing common things uncommonly well. I would like to be that sort of a common man in my work as a judge, and I am sure that every judge present in this courtroom feels likewise. Perhaps we can approach the goal if we try hard enough.

So, my friends, this morning let us not merely dedicate a building which in all its beauty is a quiet yet forceful symbol of justice, and all that justice implies, let us rededicate ourselves to see to it so far as we are concerned and so far as we possibly can, each one of us, that we shall do our best to make that noble symbol a reality.

Statement of Hon. Lymon Goolsby, Mayor of Winfield, Ala., on the Library Services Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on February 17 members of the legislative committee of the Alabama League of Municipalities met with the Alabama congressional delegation to discuss municipal problems. It was a great day of exchange of views on many problems.

Among the statements made on the occasion was a very fine statement by the Honorable Lymon Goolsby, mayor of Winfield, Ala., entitled "What the Library Services Act Has Done for Alabama."

I include Mayor Goolsby's statement as part of my remarks and commend its reading to interested Members of the U.S. House of Representatives:

WHAT THE LIBRARY SERVICES ACT HAS DONE FOR ALABAMA

(By Lymon Goolsby)

Tremendous stimulus has been given to the development and improvement of library service in Alabama by the grants from the Library Services Act (Public Law 597, 84th Cong.), passed in June 1956. The first allotment of $40,000 was received in March 1957. In the second year of the act, fiscal 1958–59, Alabama received $139,644, and in the current or third year, fiscal 1959–60, Alabama is receiving $161,369. During the 3 years Alabama has received a total of $341,013 of Library Services Act aid. Largely because of the interest aroused and the needs shown by the State plan for the use of the Library Service Act grants, the State legislature increased the State appropriation for the public library service division for the biennium 1957–59 by almost 40 percent. This increase in funds has made possible the extension of service to 188,572 people who had no library service prior to 1956 and greatly improved and strengthened service to 519,153 people who had quite inadequate service prior to the act.

The number of counties in Alabama with no free library service has been reduced from 11 to 6. In addition to these direct improvements in local library service, the State agency, the public library service division, has been greatly strengthened so that it can give more service more efficiently to all areas of the State; both in developing new libraries where there are none now and in giving its various services, such as book loans, reference and information help, and professional advice to established libraries. Although not included in the areas receiving direct help from Library Services Act grants, one county which was without any library service prior to 1956 now has a library with a bookmobile serving the entire county, and we feel that much of the impetus for the founding of this library came from the interest generated by the act, and we know that much help was given by the field representatives of the division which before the act would have been impossible. Action of a similar nature, though not on a countywide scale, has occurred in other communities.

INCREASED LIBRARY SERVICE SINCE 1956

In 1956 it was estimated that 38 percent of the State's population had no access to free library service; in 1959 this percentage has dropped to approximately 31 percent, as a direct or indirect result of the Library Services Act. In addition to this, greatly improved service is available to people living in the areas where regional libraries have been established, and to the whole population of the State through the strengthening of the Public Library Service Division and its field services.

The Library Services Act funds have provided almost $25,000 worth of books, including periodicals, filmstrips, and recordings, over $86,000 worth of equipment, including six new bookmobiles (five now operating and one on order), two automobiles for the field staff, two station wagons for regional libraries, library furniture and equipment both for the new regions and the division, office machines and duplicating equipment including such major purchases as a multilith and an addressograph machine. These funds have also purchased the necessary supplies for processing the new books. They have provided for the addition of seven professional librarians, five subprofessional assistants, eight bookmobile clerks and drivers, and clerical help for the new regional libraries and the division's staff. They have made possible the operation of the bookmobiles purchased and much necessary travel both by field staff and attendance at workshops for in-service training by library personnel over the State.

EXTENDING THE REGIONAL LIBRARY PROGRAM

In addition to all this, the increased State appropriation made possible the purchase of $44,000 worth of books for the regions established under the Library Services Act through 1958; in fiscal 1959 the new regions will receive $56,000 worth of books from State appropriations as part of the Alabama State plan under the Library Services Act.

Five new regional libraries have been developed, and two regional libraries have been greatly strengthened with the addition of one or more counties. In these libraries it has been found that use increased dramatically with the new books and equipment and professional guidance. For instance, in the Horsheshoe Bend Regional Library, almost 4 percent more books were circulated in the two counties which had formed the region before the addition of a third county, in the first 9 months of operation than had been circulated in those two counties in the entire previous year; and the number of books circulated in the entire region had doubled, going from an average of over 11,000 volumes per month to more than 22,000 volumes per month. The same kind of increase is seen in the circulation figures of the other regions where there are old figures for comparison.

THERE IS STILL MUCH TO BE DONE

There is still much to be done, even though we are proud of the accomplishments so far. In addition to the 133,280 people in the 6 counties still without public library service of any kind, there are also 21 counties without library service in the rural areas outside of municipal or town libraries, and 12 counties in which the county library, though willing and anxious to serve the residents of the whole county, has no effective means of giving service beyond the town in which the library is located. In these 33 counties almost 831,000 people have no access to library service near where they live. It is these areas which will be disappointed if the present program in the State is curtailed.

The President's budget recommended the appropriation of $5,150,000 for the coming year, but it is hoped by us that Congress will appropriate the full authorized amount of $7,500,000 under the Library Services Act. If the State continues to appropriate funds for library service as it has in the current biennium, Alabama can easily qualify for the full $209,495, which would be its allotment under the full amount authorized. The progress made during the first 2½ years of the effective period of the act, each year with less than the authorized amount having been granted, is a sure indication of the ability of the State to use the money wisely and of demonstrated needs met.

Coal Research Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in extending my remarks in the RECORD, I want to announce that I am introducing tomorrow a new Coal Research Commission bill.

This bill takes into consideration the criticism aimed in the creation of this Commission by those who say that it is an unwarranted raid on the Treasury. I am including in my new legislation a proviso that the coal industry receive a larger percentage as a depletion allowance, and that from this increased depletion allowance the coal producers will pay on a per ton pro rata share the entire cost of the operation of the Research Commission. There are those who may argue that the inclusion of this provision in the enabling act creating the Commission is a contradiction in that two distinct subjects are covered by the same legislation. I know of no other method by which we could pursue the ends we have in mind, except to make both provisions part of one act, namely, the creation of the Commission, detailing its functions, and establishing the revenue for its operation.

In this legislation, I propose that the Federal Treasury advance $5 million for the initial expenses of creating the Commission, and to start it functioning. This money, however, under the terms of my act will be repayable to the Federal Treasury after the act is enforced. At this time I would also like to present the following statements and information heralding the greatest advancement yet made by this important industry in its fight to keep its share of the American economy for the future. The Congress of the United States should take cognizance of the fact that the bituminous coal industry is neither subsidized, nor in any way, receives any public moneys from the U.S. Treasury. It is therefore important that all of us keep abreast of the actions and the thinking of this great segment of our industrial strength.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following releases from the National Coal Policy Conference:

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 25.—Management and labor in the bituminous coal industry and related groups have formed an over-all organization designed to advance and promote the interests of the industry on the broadest possible front.

Formation of the National Coal Policy Conference, organized and supported by the United Mine Workers, the bituminous coal operators, the coal-carrying railroads, coal-using electric utilities, and some industry equipment suppliers, was announced today by George H. Love, chairman of the conference, and chairman of the board of Consolidation Coal Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

"We, of course, are concerned with the immediate future of bituminous coal, but our thinking goes far beyond that," Mr. Love said. "We are concerned with the adequacy and availability of our total energy resources and the assurance that such resources, including coal, have their proper place in the national economy in the decades to come."

Joseph E. Moody, president of Southern Coal Producers' Association, will serve as executive director of the conference. Headquarters will be in Washington, D.C.

Creation of an organization similar to the one now established was suggested by John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, in an address in Cincinnati last May.

In making the announcement, Chairman Love said:

"I think the formation of the National Coal Policy Conference is unprecedented. I know of no other instance where management and labor in a major industry, and related major industries have agreed to work together to advance common interests as they have in this particular case.

"The step we have taken is a most heartening indication for the future of the bituminous coal industry."

Mr. Lewis hailed the formation of the National Coal Policy Conference as follows:

"Formation of the National Coal Policy Conference can only be considered as among the most gigantic forward strides taken by the American coal industry in its long and proud history. Assuredly, the industry and its workers have long needed a common voice to focus the attention of the Government and the American people upon the efficiency of this Nation's basic industry.

"The most valuable natural resource in the United States has far too long been the object of legislative apathy and public ignorance.

"This new effort with its able leadership will be able to speak for our industry with confidence and in a positive manner. Within itself it will be a forum where all segments of the industry can meet to resolve their various problems.

"To the general public it will demonstrate the truth: America's basic resource—coal—its proper utilization and its future must be the concern of all Americans. The National Coal Policy Conference promises to insure that coal will be recoghized for what it is—America's primary source of power."

Howard E. Simpson, president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., said:

"The railroad industry welcomes the formation of the National Coal Policy Conference as a major step toward the economic recovery of America's coal and railroad industries.

"The Nation's railroads have long been concerned by the steady decline in the production, consumption, and transportation of coal.

"The health of the coal industry is essential to the economic well-being of the railroads. Coal depends on efficient rail transportation to market its product."

Philip Sporn, president of American Electric Power Service Corp., said:

"The organization of the National Coal Policy Conference is not only a significant event for the coal industry, but is, I believe, of even much greater significance for the country as a whole. Coal has an indispensable role to play in the coming growth and development of the country over the next 30 to 40 years and a great responsibility in assuring that our dynamic industrial system can continue to have available to it the large share of its total huge energy requirements which cannot be supplied by anything else but coal during that long period."

Among the objectives of the Conference are the following:

1. The development and execution of an intensive nationwide educational campaign to acquaint the public with the vital importance of the coal industry to the national welfare.

2. The broadening of domestic and export markets for bituminous coal.

3. The encouragement and promotion of research into the production, marketing, and utilization of coal.

4. Creation of positive and constructive Government policies toward the bituminous coal industry.

5. Steps to increase coal's depletion allowance in order to meet rapidly rising costs of operation, and to accumulate the capital needed for future expansion.

6. A program to place bituminous coal in a position where the industry can meet the demands for increased production which would be placed upon it in case of war.

7. Action to stop the dumping of residual oil at coal's expense and to put an end to the practice of dumping natural gas for industrial uses to the detriment of the coal market.

8. Action to end extravagance and waste in the program to develop civilian atomic energy here and abroad.

9. The formulation of broad policies for the coal industry in matters agreed upon by the Conference groups.

Coal technology has advanced steadily in recent years. Production efficiency has increased until the current average output is approximately 11 tons per man per day. Labor peace has been maintained in the coal industry over a full decade. Prices at the mine are approximately what they were 13 years ago, an amazing record during an inflationary period. But national consumption of coal has declined since World War II. Compared with the all-time peak for bituminous coal production—631 million tons in 1947—production was down to approximately 400 million tons in 1958.

Coal profits have remained too low for the economic health of the industry as a whole. The cost of opening a new coal mine is more than three times what it was in 1946. Meanwhile, the industry has lost markets; some markets because of legitimate competition, others from what it regards as unfair competition.

Today, residual oil is being imported into the United States at a rate equivalent to 41 million tons of coal annually. Simultaneously, natural gas is being sold at unrealistically low prices to displace coal as boiler fuel, a wasteful use of an extremely valuable and diminishing resource.

Coal is the one industry on which the United States must rely, and will continue to have to rely, for the bulk of its power requirements in time of peace as well as in time of emergency. Without subsidies, the American coal industry speedily expanded production to meet the power crises of two world wars.

However, the coal industry and coal-carrying railroads cannot meet the demands of a national emergency if they continue to operate under existing conditions.

It is vital to national security and well-being that the capacity to mine and transport adequate supplies of bituminous coal is maintained.

The National Coal Policy Conference will take the most vigorous action possible to increase the production and consumption of coal and see to it that the transportation system which will be expected to deliver this coal in an efficient and orderly fashion is in a position to do so.

"The long-term interest of the Nation in this case," Mr. Love said, "clearly coincides with its short-term interest. Our industry contributes $5 billion annually to the national economy and supports, directly or indirectly two million people. Shipments from mine to market add $2 billion to the revenues of the carriers. Twenty-one States out of the forty-nine produce substantial quantities of coal and have a major interest in the industry's prosperity."

Officers of the conference and the executive committee are as follows:

Chairman: George H. Love, chairman of the board, Consolidation Coal Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Executive director: Joseph E. Moody, president, Southern Coal Producers' Association, Washington, D.C.

Members of the executive committee:

Coal operators: George H. Love; F. S. Elfred, chairman of the board of Peabody Coal Co., of St. Louis, Mo.; Harry LaViers, president, South-East Coal Co. of Paintsville, Ky.; C. J. Potter, president of Rochester & Pittsburgh Coal Co., of Indiana, Pa.; Raymond E. Salvati, president of Island Creek Coal Co., of Huntington, W. Va.; and Kenneth A. Spencer, president of Pittsburg & Midway Coal Mining Co., of Pittsburg, Kans.

United Mine Workers: John L. Lewis, president; Thomas Kennedy, vice president; and Michael Widman, Jr., assistant to the president.

Railroads: H. C. Murphy, president and chairman, executive committee of Burlington Lines; Howard E. Simpson, president of Baltimore & Ohio Railway Co.; and John Tilford, president of Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.

Utilities: Philip Sporn, president of American Electric Power Service Corp., of New York.

Coal industry equipment suppliers: J. H. Fulford, president of Jeffrey Manufacturing Co., of Columbus, Ohio; and W. L. Wearly, president of Joy Manufacturing Co., of Pittsburgh.

JOSEPH E. MOODY

Joseph E. Moody, executive director of the National Coal Policy Conference, was born in Hartford, Conn.

After graduating from Cornell, he entered the brokerage business, leaving it in 1929 to become secretary of the Manufacturers' Association of Hartford County, Conn. This association was composed mostly of the manufacturing plants in Hartford County.

In 1937, Mr. Moody became directof of personnel for the Hat Corp. of America in Norwalk, Conn.

He did work with war agencies in Washington during 1941 and part of 1942, and in 1942 he entered the employ of the York Corp. of York, Pa.

Mr. Moody became president of Southern Coal Producers' Association in November 1947.

As spokesman for the southern producers' group, which has mines in Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia, Mr. Moody has been a vigorous advocate of policies aimed at maintaining the industry's competitive position.

In 1956 he aided in forming American Coal Shipping, Inc., an inter-industry effort intended to stimulate coal exports. He also helped in the organization of the High Volatile Coals Export Association and Low Volatile Coal Exports, operators' groups concerned with stabilizing exports.

Mr. Moody's efforts were instrumental in the opening of the Florida utility market for the bituminous coal industry, and he has also been a vigorous and frank critic of Government policies which he considers injurious to the industry.

His work in promoting the interests of the southern producers and of the entire bituminous coal industry has attracted national attention.

He will keep his post as president of Southern Coal Producers' Association.

Mr. Moody married Laura Russell of Friendship, N.Y. They have four children: Mrs. Donald L. Cates of San Anselmo, Calif., Mrs. Robert H. Sowers of Cincinnati, 1st Lt. Bryce Moody, and Margaret Moody.

THE BITUMINOUS COAL INDUSTRY IN BRIEF

1. Where located: The principal bituminous coal-producing States are: Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Montana, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

2. Production: In 1957—the last year for which official figures are available at this time—total production was 492,703,916 tons. The Bureau of Mines has issued a preliminary estimate of 400 million tons for 1958. Peak production was 631 million tons in 1947.

3. Mines: In 1957 there were 8,539 mines in operation; in 1958 there were 7,588 mines producing.

4. Jobs: Average daily employment in 1957 in the industry was 228,000; the estimated daily average employment for 1958 was 190,000.

5. Of the total production about 83 percent is hauled as revenue producing freight by railroads. In 1957 the railroads hauled 382 million tons. The estimated total for 1958 is 332 million tons. (The balance of production is moved by trucks and waterways.)

6. Principal consumers of bituminous coal in 1958 were:

	In millions of tons
Electric Power Public Utilities	153
Steel	84
Other industries, including railroads and chemicals	90
Overseas and Canada	52
Retail sales	36

(Tonnage consumed in excess of the estimated 400 million 1958 production was drawn from previous production.)

STATEMENT BY HOWARD E. SIMPSON, PRESIDENT, BALTIMORE & OHIO RAILROAD CO.

The railroad industry welcomes the formation of the National Coal Policy Conference as a major step toward the economic recovery of America's coal and railroad industries.

The Nation's railroads have long been concerned over the steady decline in the production, consumption, and transportation of coal.

The health of the coal industry is essential to the economic well-being of the rail-

roads. Coal depends on efficient rail transportation to market its product.

In 1957, 422 million tons of coal and coke were transported by rail. The gross revenue received from this transportation was approximately $1¼ billion, representing more than 15 percent of the entire freight revenue of the railroads.

The Baltimore & Ohio, for example, depends upon the transportation of coal and coal byproducts for 30 percent of its gross freight revenues. Certain other railroads look to coal for an even greater proportion of their income.

The decline in coal production, from 631 million tons produced in 1947 to approximately 400 million tons in 1958, has, therefore, had a serious effect on the economy of the railroad industry. It has meant a reduction of personnel. It has meant a loss, through inactivity and deterioration, of valuable rail equipment used in the transportation of coal. It has meant the loss of vitally needed revenue.

With this background, the railroad industry is happy to participate in forming the National Coal Policy Conference. We believe that this conference will be in a position to make an important contribution to the Nation's economy, and will constitute an important example in good labor-management relations.

The aims of the conference deserve the support, not only of those in the coal, railroad, and power businesses, but of every American citizen.

STATEMENT BY GEORGE H. LOVE, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL COAL POLICY CONFERENCE

The future of the bituminous coal industry is of vital importance to the welfare of the entire country.

This being the case, it is time that the industry and other industries heavily dependent upon coal take affirmative action to protect their interests and the Nation's interests.

We, of course, are concerned with the immediate future of bituminous coal, but our thinking goes far beyond that. We are concerned with the adequacy and availability of our total energy resources and the assurance that such resources, including coal, have their proper place in the national economy in the decades to come.

Our group intends to start the campaign to enlarge coal's markets immediately and to continue as long as is necessary.

Another primary aim of the National Coal Policy Conference is to acquaint the public with the pertinent facts about coal.

It is as modern as any source of energy on earth and is an indispensable national asset.

Among the most important of all our objectives is to make certain that the industry will be in a position to make the contribution which would be required of it in the event of a major war. This is necessary for our national security.

The bituminous coal industry has made tremendous strides in efficiency and productivity since World War II, particularly with regard to productivity per mineworker employed. Prices also have been remarkably stable during a period of national inflation. At the mine today they are approximately what they were in 1946.

Unfortunately, the coal industry has not expanded as have other major industries within recent years.

Coal's earnings also have been very low by comparison with other industries. With mining highly mechanized, the situation is such that the ability to expand rapidly in times of emergency is called into question. This is true regardless of the fact that all informed persons agree that coal is our basic energy resource and will be called upon to supply a large part of the rising demand for energy in the future.

The National Coal Policy Conference is not an organization intended to attack other industries or Government. Coal does not seek or expect favoritism. All we ask is fair play and fair competition. These requests are not unreasonable.

It is no secret, however, that we feel that the Federal Government has permitted, and is permitting, discriminatory practices which hurt coal. Among these are heavy importations of residual oil which have displaced coal along the east coast, the dumping of natural gas for industrial uses at coal's expense, and wasteful spending on the civilian atomic energy program.

While we have lots of coal, the industry cannot be expected to remain on a standby basis. It takes from 2 to 3 years to develop a new mine; it takes a lot of capital to buy the machinery and other supplies needed to extract the product. In my opinion, any further reduction in coal output could threaten our national security. A substantial rise in output in the near future would be in the nature of defense insurance.

I think the formation of the National Coal Policy Conference is unprecedented. I know of no other instance where management and labor have agreed to work together to advance common interests as they have in this particular case.

The step we have taken is a most heartening indication for the future of the bituminous coal industry.

The long-term interest of the Nation in this case clearly coincides with its short-term interest. Our industry contributes $5 billion annually to the national economy and supports, directly or indirectly, 2 million people. Shipments from mine to market add $2 billion to the revenues of the carriers. Twenty-one States out of the 49 produce substantial quantities of coal and have a major interest in coal's prosperity.

Statement of Hon. V. H. Albright, Mayor of Haleyville, Ala., on Traffic Safety Measures

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, members of the legislative committee of the Alabama League of Municipalities met with the Alabama congressional delegation to discuss municipal problems. It was a great day of exchange of views on many problems.

Among the statements made on the occasion was a very fine statement by the Honorable V. H. Albright, mayor of Haleyville, Ala., entitled "Reviewing Traffic Safety Measures Before Congress."

I include Mayor Albright's statement as a part of my remarks and commend its reading to interested Members of the U.S. House of Representatives:

REVIEWING TRAFFIC SAFETY MEASURES BEFORE CONGRESS

(By V. H. Albright)

We still have with us the tremendous problem of traffic safety. While last year the national fatality toll dropped slightly to 37,000 killed, I think we can take little comfort in that fact and that any optimism we exhibit be of a very cautious nature.

I am proud that Alabama was one of those States showing a decrease in traffic deaths, dropping from 910 killed in 1957 to 792 killed in 1958.

But it is still a tragic thing that 792 good citizens of Alabama and nearly 37,000 others throughout the country lost their lives on our highways and that traffic accidents caused billions of dollars in property damage and millions of crippling injuries.

Legislation on this subject will be handled by our good Fourth District Congressman Kenneth Roberts, who is chairman of the newly former Subcommittee on Health and Safety.

REVIEWING TRAFFIC SAFETY MEASURES SO FAR INTRODUCED

I would like to review with you briefly some of the traffic safety measures which he had introduced and which will come before his subcommittee.

First, and I think most important, are two bills concerned with safety standards of automobiles as they are manufactured.

Experts have repeatedly said that much could be done which is not now being done to manufacture safer automobiles.

It has been repeatedly demonstrated, for example, that when a crash happens, the driver or passenger who is wearing a seat belt has a far better chance of escaping death or injury than a person who is not wearing a seat belt.

Yet there has been no move to make seat belts standard equipment on new cars.

One of the bills I just mentioned would require the Department of Commerce to determine exactly what safety standards new cars should meet, and then make it unlawful to ship these new cars in interstate commerce unless they meet the required safety standards.

This measure is certain to meet strong opposition from the automobile manufacturing industry, which appears to be more concerned with sales than with safety. And this industry has the money, people and experience to put up a tremendous battle.

The other of the two measures we are talking about may be a back door method of accomplishing the same objective.

This bill would require that all automobiles purchased by the Federal Government would have to meet safety standards prescribed by the Department of Commerce.

The Government is one of Detroit's best customers, and it is believed that if the manufacturers have to provide certain safety equipment for Government-purchased automobiles, that safety equipment will soon become standard equipment on all automobiles.

Another bill which will be considered by this subcommittee is one which would provide some Federal funds for research into driver training programs.

PROPERLY TRAINED DRIVERS NEEDED

This is another area where it has been proven time and again that properly trained drivers have fewer accidents, fewer fatalities, fewer injuries, and fewer traffic law violations.

The Federal funds provided by this act would have to be matched dollar for dollar by the States applying for them. They would not be used for teachers' salaries but for research and study to develop the best possible type of driver training program. And control of these funds would be at the State level.

Still another important piece of legislation is one which would determine how much damage to our health automobile exhaust fumes are causing and require some control of the amount of pollution being discharged into our atmosphere.

At a recent air pollution conference right here in Washington the Public Health Service said there is some ground for belief that

automobile exhaust fumes are a source of lung cancer.

There is expected to be introduced in the near future, if it has not already been introduced, a bill which would set up a central record system of traffic law violations.

CHECKING ON DRIVER'S PREVIOUS RECORD

As the situation is at present, a driver in Alabama can have his license revoked for a traffic law violation, and then skip right across the State line into Tennessee or some other State, complete the necessary residence requirements and get himself a new license which will serve him until he gets into another scrape with the law.

The State issuing the license has no way of checking to see what his previous driving record has been, or even checking to see whether he has been previously licensed in Alabama.

With a central records section reporting on all license revocations and traffic law violations, the examining officer could check any applicant's previous driving record in much the same manner that a law enforcement officer can check a suspect's criminal record with the FBI.

These are but a few of the many bills concerned with the safety of all of us which will be referred to the Health and Safety Subcommittee, but certainly these are some of the most important.

I feel sure that all of us will want to give the chairman all the help we can in getting as many as possible of these bills enacted into law.

Educational Television—Advertising's Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I recently had occasion to attend the midwinter conference of the Advertising Federation of America. Because the advertising industry is often the subject of misunderstanding and adverse criticism, I was particularly impressed and pleased by a speech on the topic of educational TV delivered by Mr. John P. Cunningham, chairman of the board, Cunningham & Walsh, Inc.

Educational TV has in the last 10 years mushroomed from 1 established station to 36 stations now broadcasting with at least 12 applications pending for additional broadcasting permits. Because business must take the lead in putting educational television stations on a sound financial footing, it is commendable and noteworthy, I believe, that the advertising industry has put its best foot forward in recognizing its responsibility to stimulate the expansion and use of educational television. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to insert the full text of Mr. Cunningham's remarks in the RECORD:

I am not going to use this platform to brag about the power and glory of advertising.

I would rather use it to face up to a responsibility that I believe we have that is not yet recognized by very many of us. Yet, in my opinion, it is the most important unsolved problem that has confronted us in this generation—the problem of properly harnessing television in the educational area.

It is the problem of releasing to the country the tremendous latent forces of television to the task of upgrading our national mind. In importance, it ranks with the problem of releasing the forces of nuclear energy to the task of upgrading our national industrial vigor.

Until this television force is released, I don't see how any one of us can be completely comfortable about the tremendous commercial franchise we hold in this medium.

Hardly more than 10 years ago, this amazing new instrument was thrust by the precise fingers of science into our somewhat clumsy hands—willing and energetic though they may be.

As the 10 years have rolled by, television has proved itself to have two great powers beyond any other means of communication.

First, it has an exposure-power hitherto unknown in communications. The average American citizen sits before that little square screen for over 3 hours a day—for over 22 hours a week. More than at any other occupation except working and sleeping.

Secondly, unlike any other means of communication, it has immediacy.

Now, a man can sit by his own hearth and look around the curve of the earth. He can see his own destiny being shaped. At the moment. Live. On stage. He can peer into the parliaments of man. Sitting in his own armchair, he can view the eternal conflicts taking place that will mold his future and that of his children.

All the stored-up knowledge of the ages—science, music, art, culture—can be spilled into his living room. Soon he will be able to roam the entire world from his own armchair.

But so far it is little more than a highly magnetic new plaything.

Its editorial content was almost wholly turned over to American business. I make no excuses. We have done astonishingly well with it in the field of entertainment. We are delivering the world's most talented artists to your living room every night—6 feet away from your own personal box seat—a couple of hundred dollars's worth of free theater tickets each week.

But we are being widely criticized by a highly vocal, highly intelligent and responsible minority.

Too many commercials, too silly, too repetitive. Too many western, giveaways, etc. Too much pallid programing. Not enough cultural fare.

I will not dwell on the criticisms. We are all well aware of them.

All of us in business, I'm sure, recognize the great unused educational power of television and would like to see it exercised.

But we tend to walk away from this problem and say it is not ours. We tend to say that it is the responsibility of the educators, the legislators, the broadcasters.

I say let us walk away from it no longer. As custodians of so large a share of the airwaves, it is our problem. As responsible citizens of the United States, it is our problem.

Let us face it.

Well, what is the character of the problem? What should be our objectives? What are we after?

First, let me explore with you what it is possible to get out of television—what television can contribute to the forward march of the mind—project headway—if I may call it that.

For one thing, it can give us a much better informed and intelligent electorate. For instance, sessions of Congress should be televised on a regular schedule—dull though they may be. Let us see our representatives in action—or in inaction. Let us see the empty seats. The filibustering. The logrolling. The pork-barrelism. Let us also see the wisdom, the patience, the vision of the men opposed to these undemocratic forces.

Let us send Congress into the classrooms of the country—to bring life to the tomes and the teachings. Let our children examine first-hand what we hopefully expect them to improve.

Let our school children also look into sessions of the Supreme Court—not the trials perhaps—but certainly the majestic simplicity of this ultimate Court on the days of decision—those famous Mondays.

The United Nations, too, is worthy of a wider theater.

International broadcasting is very near. That was the portent of our recently launched Atlas satellite which tossed President Eisenhower's Christmas words back to earth.

International television will enable the nations of the earth to exchange their cultures—and their national aspirations—from fireside to fireside. It holds promise of being the greatest force yet in the promotion of permanent peace.

Television can cultivate new interests in young rock-and-roll brainpans. Our cold war with communism is no longer a conflict between two classes of thought. It is a conflict between 2 million classrooms of thought—and we must throw the greatest cross-country classroom of all into it—the TV set.

Television is the one instrument through which sleeping interest in science, chemistry, and the arts can best be aroused.

It reaches homes where books are seldom read.

It reaches homes where beauty is absent.

Television can teach foreign languages more quickly and coherently than any book ever written.

Locked in that mess of tubes and wires behind the screen is the capacity to raise the intellectual and scientific attainments of our whole people to new levels.

It has often been said that there are many good teachers—but few great teachers. Television can bring those few great teachers into every man's living room. It can be used in teacher-training. It can upgrade the entire teaching staff of the Nation.

The great immediate thing that television can do is to make a college degree available to every single American. The only action required of the television student would be to go to a central place in his city four times a year to take an examination. It might take the TV student 5 to 10 years to acquire the credits for a degree now piled up in our 4 bright college years—but what is that to a hungry mind?

Our collegiate admissions system, as compared with Russia's, seems to have one very serious mechanical defect. The intake valve is corroded—corroded with privilege. It admits many youngsters to a college education who sometimes don't want it very much—but who are persuaded to go to college by family tradition, ease of money, and social status—a sort of self-perpetuating collegiate class—while college is denied to many minds potentially more valuable to the Nation—that are forced into work.

Television today alone can correct this dreadful inequity—with some sort of countrywide televarsity.

How does Russia look at this opportunity?

Let me give you the words of Dmitry Chesnokov, who is No. 1 of the Soviet airwaves.

In an interview in Moscow with our Mike Wallace recently, he said:

"Each television program should improve the human being. Our main purpose is to raise the culture of the people."

"What about laughter?" Wallace asked him. "What do you do for comedy, for humor?"

Chesnokov replied, "When a program of so-called humor is deprived of meaning and sense, it is not humor. It must have a purpose. It must point out a shortcoming in

society, a social deformity. We do not believe in laughter, just for the sake of laughter."

Which means that there are no Milton Berlovitches on the two Russian networks—first and second service, they call them.

Well, what do we need to do?

We need made available to every single farm and apartment, tenement and garret in this country a full-time 24-hour-a-day TV educational channel. That's all, and that isn't much.

What is the situation now?

There are some inspiring early morning educational efforts now on the networks, such as "Continental Classroom" on NBC, sponsored by A.T. & T., General Foods, and others. There is "Sunrise Semester" on CBS. The networks now are willingly contributing much free time to Project Headway.

Thirty-six cities have educational TV. But two-thirds of the Nation's population has no access to these channels.

There are only 60,000 TV sets in America's 1,520,000 individual classrooms, about 4 percent.

Many colleges—299 to be exact—allow credits for TV courses toward their regular college degree. But they can't easily reach the great mass of our working populace, because in very few cities is prime evening time or weekend time available, and that is the time obviously most essential, since 85 to 90 percent of our workers are on the job all day.

The Metropolitan Educational Television Association in New York City operates its staff, its studio, its live programing, and its educational kinescopes on an annual budget of $400,000—$400,000 a year, I said—which is less than the cost of two Dinah Shore Chevy shows.

* * * * *

Television can even do some things better than the college classroom. It can give students front-row closeup seats for important demonstrations. It can bring the finest laboratory facilities to remote schools which could not otherwise afford them. It can provide postgraduate courses to college graduates—while they work.

To give all our people equal opportunity will require a nationwide 24-hour-a-day clearance that will reach every television set in the United States, either on a single channel or multichannel basis.

Some people have felt that opening up the ultra high frequency channels, of which there are 70, as opposed to VHF's 12 channels, was the answer. But today, UHF seems to be slowly passing away. UHF stations are closing and UHF set production has declined to around 8 percent of total sets.

There is no question in my mind but that American business would like to see this Project Headway on the airtracks—including advertisers, broadcasters, and advertising people.

* * * * *

American industry very much wants a pool of scientific-minded youngsters available. It spends millions a year in employee recruitment programs now to get them—Western Electric, General Electric, Sperry, Westinghouse, etc.

American industry today not only supports many educational programs directly—but many more indirectly.

Last week alone in New York in addition to the regular educational channel WPIX there were 37 programs that could be conceded as educational, put on by the broadcasters—sustaining. No sponsor. But who paid for them? As far as I know, the networks have no source of income except from advertisers. So the producing costs, studio, and camera costs for these daytime programs all were paid for by the sponsors of "The Nervous Guns" and "Joe Revolvers" at night.

No complaints.

The problem is manifold.

How can prime time be fairly secured?

How can channels be isolated?

Who's going to pay for it?

Who's going to direct it?

I did not come here with the answer. I came here to take this problem out of the back corridors of our concern and to deposit it out here in the open—and to acknowledge our obligation as advertising people to help solve it.

The whole lumpy and contorted problem, however, is shot through with reassuring rays of light.

Federal and State educational funds can be wooed and won. Legislatures are listening. The big foundations are dabbling—seriously. Many high-minded men are working with the problem—men who recognize the investment that broadcasters have put into their franchises and know these investments must be respected in the solution. Many men who draw their salaries from commercial TV or are involved in the frothiest of TV entertainment are desirous of solving it.

They need our help.

How can we give it to them?

It is a task worthy perhaps of an important spotlight committee, consisting of leading advertisers, broadcasters, and educators, similar in stature to the Hoover Commission, to explore and recommend.

It is a task perhaps worthy of a joint committee formed by our own trade associations—the AFA, the 4–A's, the ANA—and the broadcasting associations—to face it and come to grips with it.

In my own small way, I hope to make a continuing nuisance of myself among advertising people until it is solved.

Even if and when we should get a countrywide educational clearance setup, it will still have need for our advertising and publicity skills.

It must be marketed well to the American citizenry. Its values to the individual and the Nation must be defined and publicized—at least as effectively as the 1960 Buick.

It will be solved someday. But as a nation we cannot afford to allow this great cultural force to lie around unused on into the years.

Only when television is finally well harnessed to the march of the national mind can we in advertising relax comfortably among our ratings, our westerns, our quizzes and our job of entertaining the masses.

To Be Young and a Southerner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, those who would understand the mind of the South give heed to its quiet as well as strident voices. One of the eloquent quiet voices of the South is Ralph McGill, the editor of the Atlanta Constitution. I present below the Blazer lecture which Mr. McGill delivered at the University of Kentucky this month:

TO BE YOUNG AND A SOUTHERNER

There are many times in these great and testing days, when I think of the opening paragraph of "A Tale of Two Cities":

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of light, it was the season of darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us, we were all going direct to heaven, we were all going direct the other way—in short, the period was so far like the present period, that some of its noisiest authorities insisted on its being received, for good or for evil, in the superlative degree of comparison only."

That is as true today as when Charles Dickens wrote it long ago. But then, as now, there are days when it is a wonderful and a fearful thing to be alove. One wakes each morning wondering what new crisis or convulsion news will greet him. And one greets each night a bit weary with confronting all that day has brought.

What will Russia do? What is Prime Minister Nasser plotting in the Middle East? Will General de Gaulle be able to halt the war in Algeria, or will it blind him and France to such weakness that the general and his government will fall, pulling him, and perhaps Europe, into chaos? What is the fate of West Germany and Berlin? Will we awaken one morning to know that war flames about the distant isles of Matsu, Quemoy, and perhaps Formosa?

These are but the main acts in the big drama of our time.

All this daily adds a jigger of adrenalin, the bourbon of the hormone world, to our bloodstream. I am at the age when I think just to be alive is a great and wonderful thing. But to be alive, and also to be a southerner, is the finest luck of all.

It is we who are made, whether we like it or not, participants in one of the most tremendous sociological processes of all time. Try as we will, we cannot be merely spectators. In one degree or another we must participate as the Nation remakes itself, with great travail, and some agony strongly to be a part of the future—and not to slip backward into the hand-wringing apathy of the frustrated and the impotent nations which chose to rest on the old ways and to cry the old shibboleths.

The processes of change are accelerated—all over the world they are quickening. Ideas are as powerful as missiles. New nations appear and still more are clamoring to be born. And we of the United States have chosen to make the American dream bright enough and wide enough to give light to our path as we move to keep pace with events.

And we, in this varied and complex South which we love and serve, have had grievous burdens put upon us. Tremendous opportunities knock at our door. We are a part of history and it is all the more good to be alive and a part of it.

And to be young southerners—that, of course, is the most delightful, mystical and wonderful agony of all.

One of the phrases most familiar to our ears is that of "the new South." Many prophets have proclaimed a new South. The truth is there is always a new South in the making. Sometimes it slows down to a slow pace of a weary man on a tired horse traveling a quiet road. And then again, it speeds up like a square-dance tune or the mad, giddy whirl of a carousel with our leadership trying to catch the brass ring—good for another ride.

This South is new to me. It is not the one I knew as a boy. It certainly is not the one my father knew. My grandfather—like yours, would never have imagined the South of today. And certainly when you are a grandfather you will dwell in a South that will not much resemble that of today.

Valor, courage, integrity and the mighty mysteries and values of God and man remain constant. So do weaknesses, mean-

ness and vanities. But the world changes—and we are a part of the world.

It would be very interesting, indeed, if one could peer into the minds of the young southerners today—and, for that matter, into the heads of all our young citizens.

But none has so great a regional stage show, and so good an opportunity to decide, as the young southerners in college and those just coming into their teens and becoming aware of the forces in their lives. Their leaders are before them and are on trial. They are watching their political representatives in the spotlight of the great drama of human rights and public education.

Since their political leaders are before them so plainly, the young southerners cannqt help but think about these men and about those who speak from pulpit, podium, or press on the same subject.

Not since the period 1855–61 have the young southerners had so stark a contrast or so vivid a drama to watch. Somebody is wrong. That at least is obvious. The Deep South direction is exactly contrary to that of the rest of the country. The debate is joined.

It is a great time and sometimes a dismaying time, to be alive and sensitive to the tremendous issues of our day. They are complex. The young southerner knows even better than his political leaders that the problem which in time will close the doors of his schools is by no means local.

The young southerner also is a product of what cynics call the Bible belt. He is, by and large, a church-going, Sunday school attendant. And this, too, worries him. He understands that what the preacher and the church school teacher say on Sunday runs contrary to what his Governor says on Monday. He keeps trying to rationalize the Sermon on the Mount and the last press conference at his State capitol.

In a way, this is a very lucky thing for the young men and women in their teens, coming with a rush toward maturity. No generation since that of 1855–61 has had so good a chance to compare and contrast what it hears and what it reads.

Even the most blind today can sense that we are caught up in a great convulsion of history. We all know that our lives unalterably are committed to a future which somehow frightens us. None of us has ever been able, of course, to see into that inevitable tomorrow. But this one seems to be making so much noise. And the old wrestlers in the international cockpit of history are not as strong as they once were. The big new giants are Russia and China. And they don't go by the old rules.

All this is plain to all the young persons of America. They know that history is on the march. Missiles are more understandable to them than to their parents. It is no exaggeration to say that, in spirit at least, the young American is closer to the future than his father and mother.

Prophets are never well regarded. But one may venture a prophecy about the future with some assurance of being vindicated by the swiftly moving years. Out of the South's great travail and agony of soul in time will come a new political leadership. It will be more in tune with the industrial South and the future which such a civilization produces. It will open new and better schools, not close them. How long it will take none may say for sure. Years will pass. Perhaps a few. Perhaps many. But that leadership in a time of intercontinental missiles, of machines which think, and of great concentrations of populations, will not consider the greatest issue to be where a colored man shall sit in a streetcar or where his child will go to school. Almost any prophet will see that new political leadership is an inevitable part of that future of which every tomorrow is the opening of a new door.

The story of the Republic is one of frequent struggles with the past, with old cultures and traditions.

This one of our time is nothing new. But it is a great and significant one. And perhaps the luckiest person of all, when all is said and done, is the young southerner. His leadership is on trial. He can see it plainly and he can follow or reject.

Some of you will do the job of recreating the domestic equilibrium of our region and our country. I hope we do not leave you too much to do.

We must agree with Sophocles that the day can be evaluated only after dusk, that it is through death that one judges life.

There is quite a job to do—

In education, for example, we have come a long, hard path. Public education is relatively new in the South.

The report of the U.S. Commissioner of Education for the year 1900–01 showed southern schools to be wholly inadequate, poorly attended, and poorly taught.

The amount spent on public education was about a third of the national average. Then, as now, there was a greater proportion of the children to adults than in the North. In addition to this, about 80 percent of the southern population was rural and sparsely settled. School terms in agricultural areas were confined to a few winter months.

In 1901 Charles W. Dabney of the University of Tennessee said in a report:

"In the Southern States, in schoolhouses costing an average of $276 each, under teachers receiving the average salary of $25 a month, we are giving the children in actual attendance 5 cents' worth of education a day for 87 days only in the year—such means will never educate the people."

In 1900–01, for example, Alabama's Legislature gave the university a mere $10,000. Until 1904 Louisiana had a limit of $15,000 on annual appropriations for Louisiana State University. The total yearly income for the 63 colleges and universities of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Arkansas was $65,843. This is less than the average southern State now spends per year on its schools.

We know, looking at history, that the damage done by the Civil War in property losses was great. The poverty which followed was harsh, often brutal. But the corrosive damage done the spirit and soul of the South was through lack of education. The children, the grandchildren, and the great-grandchildren of the adults of those postwar years did not have a fair chance. I have known many fine men and women who were deprived of any chance at adequate education in those years. My own father was one. These persons had almost a passion for educational opportunity for their children.

By 1901 the situation was so desperately hopeless that it attracted the attention of northern philanthropists. George Foster Peabody was first to help. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and his father poured $53 million into their general education board between 1902 and 1909 to help the South toward education.

The crusade for public schools fervently was preached at barbecues, picnics, in churches, courthouses, schools, fairs, and camp meetings. There was strenuous opposition. Some persons of influence and learning did not believe in free public education. Others did not want the Negro to have it.

Poverty lay heavily on the South. But nowhere was it as burdensome as on the farms—especially the many small ones. The wan man in the faded denim, his sunbonneted wife, and his pinched but eager children, had already shown their resentment in the Populist revolution.

Walter Hines Page described them in a great speech for free education as the forgotten man. Franklin Roosevelt, years later, was to take that phrase and make it a part of our political vocabulary.

By 1913 a certain momentum was attained. Standards of admission and graduation, which were widely debased, were tightened. Public education came to the South.

Teachers and parents have sacrificed and toiled for it. The despair of the first years of the century are but memories for the old or stories to be read in books.

What of education in 1959?

The compulsive determinnation of politicians and many of the people to destroy public education in four or five States is almost incredible even when one lives with it.

To speak the phrase, "close the schools," means a previous process of closing the mind has been completed. The mind must be shut before doors to schools may even be thought of as closed.

In early January of this year the Census Bureau released some figures on education. A part of that report, as sent out by the United Press International, was as follows:

"Arkansas spends less per pupil to educate its children than any of the 31 other States that finance schools through school districts, the Census Bureau reported today.

"Arkansas provided $69,636,000 for its 388,000 schoolchildren, or $154 per child, according to the report covering 1957.

"The next five low rankings all went to southern or border States, South Carolina, $165 per pupil; Alabama, $77; Kentucky, $185; Georgia, $192; and West Virginia, $205."

The obvious question growing out of these school figures for 1957 is, What about the rest of the picture?

Southern schools are still among the lowest in expenditure per pupil. But it must be noted that the amount spent in 1957 was a tremendous increase over that of 20 years ago—and is a moonshot away from the educational totals of the bygone era.

A study of the South's position today reveals a national story of change and shifts, economic, population, and also a pattern of growth and process.

The South has grown, changed, and progressed.

But so have the other regions. It is important, therefore, to know what the picture is. Otherwise, we will not know what the job is.

The progress story, as revealed by Department of Commerce figures, is a spectacular one in Texas and Florida. But because the South started in the industrial revolution without any real manufacturing base, certain paradoxes emerge. In personal income Percentage retail sales gains in the South advance since 1940 is higher than the rest of the Nation. Yet, we are still last in income per capita. There is another paradox. Percentage retail sales gains in the South are the second highest—despite our lowest per capita income. Apparently, our wives spend more of our income dollar.

According to the Department of Commerce, the per capita income for the continental United States for the 4 years from 1954 through 1957 was $2,027, a gain of 14 percent for the 4 years. The per capita income of the 12 Southeastern States in that period was $1,427, exactly $600 a year, or $50 a month below the national average. Yet, this was a gain of 16 percent, second highest in the Nation.

Not even Florida, with all her spectacular growth, reached the national per capita income average. Hers was $1,836. Georgia was second, with $1,431. Mississippi was lowest with $958.

Continuing with the Department of Commerce figures for the past 10 years through 1956, we find these results.

In employment the South is fifth in percentage increase with 24 percent.

If the employment is an indication of industrial development we have here a clear

and interesting picture. Where is the greatest growth in America?

The Pacific States have an employment percentage gain of 67 percent.

The Midwest is up 41 percent.

New England has declined, showing but a 1-percent gain. The Mid-Atlantic States of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York, long heavily industrialized, are just about holding their own.

The West Central States are up 41 percent. But it is the astonishing State of Texas, where employment is up 78 percent, which brings up their average.

And in the South our average is up 24 percent, largely because of Florida which has outdone even Texas in percentage employment gain—a whopping 81 percent in 10 years.

So, we have an answer to the question—Where is the really great growth? It is in the Far West, in Texas, and Florida. We are all familiar with the fact all our cities are growing. The shift is from the fields to factories.

For example, only 1 out of every 10 Negroes now is a farm hand; the rest are in the cities, not just southern cities, but in northern and western cities, too. Migration from the South has not really been slowed down. In the decade from 1910 to 1920, almost 10 percent of the population of the South migrated. In the decade from 1920 to 1930, it was almost 15 percent; in the last decade, ending in 1950, 18.9 percent of the South's population left.

The Negro problem of population annually grows less.

In the years since 1950 through October 1958, there has been a growth in the United States of 15 percent in population. Only two Southern States have reached the national average; Florida with 51.9 percent and Virginia with 15.4 percent. Most of this latter population is a spillover from Washington's great force of Government workers.

Three Southern States lost population, keeping company with Vermont in this category. They are West Virginia, Arkansas, and Mississippi. The Bureau of the Census estimated that after the 1960 census, when Congress by law proceeds with reapportionment, the 17 States of the West will gain 11 House seats, the North will lose 7 and the South 4. With Alaska in the Union the 17 States of the West have 36 of the 98 Senators. This is 14 more Senators than our 12 Southern States. When Hawaii comes in during this session the western count will rise to a majority of 16 more.

What does this cause us to know?

It is that population shifts have rather profound economic and political effects.

This is, in brief, some of the background of the changes which have touched us all, stopping at every door, passing over none.

For all the South's struggle and progress, her needs and lacks in education have remained unmet. She is not alone in this, but to be willing to destroy the advances made is almost too fantastic to be believed at a time when the need for more and better education has been violently thrust upon us.

There are already minds and schools closed in the South. There will be more. But I firmly believe those who take this action are trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored. I mean no irreverence when I say that while public education may be crucified on a cross of willful destruction of it, it will rise again out of the wreckage.

Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, and West Virginia have somehow escaped this ugly compulsion to close schools.

One naturally asks: "Why?"

There is one immediate answer. It is leadership. That leadership, seen by an outsider, is broad in scope. It includes elected officials, educators, students, the churches, newspapers, and the citizen himself. I know, it was not easy. I am sure there is still reluctance and resistance.

But, nonetheless, civilization, the best quality of Americanism, and the best southern tradition have managed to exert the most influence here. I am aware that the percentage of Negro population is less in the States noted than those in the old cotton South. That is, of course, a factor. More of the plantation-type economy exists in the Deep South.

But, let us be candid. The real explanation is leadership.

You did not have so many closed minds. Your resistance, when confronted with law, accepted law.

It puzzles me, looking at the South. Our beginnings were made by those determined persons who came through the mountain passes and spread out into the Southeast. We are, basically, the same sort of people. But the hands of that great potter, economics, was on us all and we are not all shaped the same emotionally or spiritually. It should be plain that a first loyalty must be to one's country. But not all see that.

Kentucky, North Carolina, and Tennessee can go forward toward the job of progress that we must do here in the South. North Carolina has announced, for example, that because her universities are to remain open, she will build a great research center in the triangle between her three largest institutions. A State whose colleges and universities are to remain open can plan and progress. Virginia has accepted a course of law.

Those States which live in frustration, fear, and uncertainty, will pay a price which may not be calculated if they do indeed destroy, even for a time, public education. That it will be severe in terms of education, business, and things of the spirit, is undoubted.

The voices of those States fully committed to processes of law and democracy must continually be raised in support of both.

Our population burgeons. One hears already not the patter of little feet, but the thunder of them. No system of private or parochial schools can do the job. These schools have a real function. But the almost 200 million Americans and their children increasingly crowded into urban areas can be served only by an efficient public school system.

Ignorance, prejudice, and shabiness of mind and values always are careless leaks in the dikes of civilization in which man is a free individual. These forces must always be recognized for what they are and their presence and purpose publicly proclaimed and opposed.

There are many paragraphs in Boris Pasternak's "Dr. Zhivago" which seem to me to apply in our region, and in the Nation as well.

One of them is this:

"If the beast who sleeps in man could be held down by threats—any kind of threats, whether of jail or of retribution after death—then the highest emblem of humanity would be the lion tamer in the circus with his whip, not the prophet who sacrificed himself. But don't you see, that is just the point—what for centuries raised man above the beast is not the cudgel but an inward music: The irrestible power of unarmed truth, the powerful attraction of its example."

If the South loses, or betrays public education into inadequacy, we will lose, too, this inward music, and the ability to offer the example of unarmed truth.

Reuther Wants More of the Same

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reuther Wants More of the Same," which appeared on February 18, 1959, in the Phoenix Gazette, Phoenix, Ariz.:

REUTHER WANTS MORE OF THE SAME

Walter Reuther is seeking to extend his kind of financial and political ruin from the State of Michigan to the United States. He proposes that the entire labor union movement sponsor a march on Washington for jobs to dramatize his personal program for socializing employment.

The kind of policies Reuther demands have bankrupted Michigan, lost his United Auto Workers half a million members and killed Michigan Gov. G. Mennen Williams' fond hopes for a Democratic presidential nomination. Reuther cannot escape responsibility for Michigan, since his UAW virtually controls the State. We shall discuss Michigan's dilemma more in detail at a later date; for now, Reuther's effort to compound his failure deserves a close look.

He proposes vastly greater Federal subsidies for unemployment, including federally financed housing and medical and legal care. He demands a shorter workweek and authority for the President to suspend Federal withholding taxes from wages and salaries. The withholding provision is the craziest item of all, since it would merely delay payment of taxes, not forgive them. It would not apply to the unemployed since they have no current income, but to those who are earning. Reuther says it would provide quick injections of consumer purchasing power.

This infatuation with governmentally manipulated consumer purchasing power is at the root of all Reuther's cockeyed philosophies. Even in the shorter workweek, he would bitterly resist any status quo in hourly wage rates, insisting that they be raised to give each worker the same take-home pay for a shorter week as for a longer one. His idea is that the Government, by legislating the same pay for less work, would force industry to hire more people and thus increase consumer purchasing power.

What Reuther is saying is that more Government domination of the country's economic life would increase the gross national product by making more money available to everyone, thereby boosting demand. It is not a new idea. It is as old as socialism. And it is as false.

The National Tax Foundation has been taking a look at gross national product (GNP) in relation to Government control-through-spending. In 1913, when pump priming as a routine thing was unheard of, GNP amounted to $13 for every $1 of Government spending. Now there is only about $4 of private enterprise production for every Government dollar. Or, to put it another way, GNP today is only 11 times greater than in 1913, but Government expenditures have risen 50 times.

Obviously, increased Government spending has not increased private production in ratio. In fact, the opposite would seem to be true. When we get the bill for today's skyrocketing

welfare state expenditures, the lesson may be driven home even more drastically.

Reuther remains stubbornly blind to the quietly insistent lesson of history. Even Michigan has not opened his eyes by smacking him in the face far more dramatically. He wants Federal domination of the Nation's economy at all costs, and he intends to use his union as a weapon to achieve it.

We hope the people have more sense than to fall for the Reuther panacea.

National Civil Service League Announces Winners of 1959 Career Service Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I believe Members of the House will be interested in a statement of the National Service League identifying the names of career employees who are recipients of career service awards this year:

The National Civil Service League today named the winners of its fifth annual career service awards, the most prized awards conferred upon public employees by a citizen organization. Each year, the league, a nonpartisan organization of citizens for good Government, recognizes and focuses national attention on 10 outstanding Federal employees who exemplify the highest characteristics of public service. A special committee of the league selected the 1959 award winners on the basis of competence, efficiency, character, and continuity of service.

The recipients of the awards will be honnored at a dinner on Monday, March 2, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington. Mr. Frank Pace, Jr., president of General Dynamics Corp., will be the principal speaker. Mr. Pace formerly served as Secretary of the Army and Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The banquet will also feature music of the U.S. Air Force Band and a star performer. Master of ceremonies for the evening will be Mr. Theodore F. Koop, Washington director of news and public affairs for CBS. A scroll and personal memento will be presented to each winner.

The 1959 winners, who represent the best traditions of the career service, are:

Lyle T. Alexander, Chief of the Soil Survey Laboratories, Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture. For three decades Dr. Alexander has been rendering great service to his country in a Government career. A world leader in soil science, he has made outstanding contributions in the fields of soil management, soil genesis, clay minerals, and radioactive materials. He is a top expert on the use of radioactive materials in agricultural research, and especially on the effects of radioactive fallout on soils. He has been highly effective as Chief of the Soil Survey Laboratories.

John B. Barnwell, Assistant Chief Medical Director for Research and Education, Veterans' Administration. An inspiring and humble humanitarian, Dr. Barnwell organized a cooperative study of the chemotherapy of tuberculosis that served as a model for other cooperative studies, improved the treatment of tuberculosis, and saved many lives and millions of dollars. A 16-year veteran in Government service, he is now directing a tremendous medical research program that is favorably affecting a very large segment of the total medical care of the United States.

James C. Evans, civilian assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Personnel, and Reserve. The chief adviser on racial and related matters in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and a principal consultant to other Government agencies on such matters, Mr. Evans has greatly aided our national security in more than 15 years of Federal service. Due to his foresight, ability, and integrity, the Department of Defense has made remarkable strides in integrating military personnel in the armed services and improving the equality of opportunity for both military and civilian personnel.

William F. Finan, Assistant Director for Management and Organization, Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Finan is the key assistant to the Budget Director for the improvement of organization and management in the entire executive establishment. He is widely recognized for his notable contributions to improved administrative performance. There is perhaps no one in the Federal Government who knows as much as he does of the intricacies of its administrative system, and who has done more to find solutions to difficult problems. He has been in the public service for almost a score of years.

Lyle S. Garlock, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Financial Management. Mr. Garlock administers almost one-quarter of the entire Federal budget. For the fiscal year 1959 he is exercising fiscal control of sums in excess of $18.6 billion, the largest single peacetime appropriation ever given to any single organization in the executive department. His expeditious financial handling of the B–52, B–58, B–70, and the advanced missile programs has produced outstanding results. In his 25 years of service he has wisely and successfully borne heavy loads of responsibility matched by few men.

Paul M. McDaniel, Deputy Director, Division of Research, Atomic Energy Commission. Having been in the service of the Nation for more than 16 years, Dr. McDaniel has long been associated with the atomic energy program. His efforts have contributed much to the proper organization and operation of the Atomic Energy Commission to meet the challenges of new discoveries. He was instrumental in establishing the Division of Research study of controlled thermonuclear energy. He also has filled many special assignments for the United States in connection with atomic energy.

Robert J. Myers, Chief Actuary, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. For almost 24 years Mr. Myers has rendered distinguished service to the social security programs of the Nation. He has also been prominent in conducting numerous international actuarial surveys and reviews for foreign governments. His eminence in his profession is internationally recognized, and key personnel in government, here and abroad, have confidence in him and seek his services. His vast knowledge and long experience make him extremely valuable to the public service.

Richard A. Weiss, Scientific Director, Army Research Office, Office of the Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army. Dr. Weiss has played a progressively important role in the evolution of scientific research and development as a basic factor in the national defense effort. He has significantly advanced our defense capabilities through his administrative and personal contributions in such fields as optics, nucleonics, and electronics. Since 1941, this dedicated scientist has devoted himself to the service of the United States, has rejected non-governmental positions offering higher salaries, and has encouraged the youth of the Nation to develop scientific talent.

Joseph E. Winslow, assistant to the Special Assistant to the President for Personnel. The top career official concerned with the personnel policies affecting all departments and agencies of the Government, Mr. Winslow is a dedicated and highly competent civil servant who has materially helped improve Federal personnel management. In his 24-year career, he has participated in drafting significant personnel legislation, and has had a principal role in the development of the recent training authorization legislation, the President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service, and many other important administrative measures. He is frequently consulted by top officials for assistance in Federal personnel matters.

Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior. Having devoted 30 years of public service to the conservation of the Nation's human, cultural, and natural resources, Mr. Wirth has given new vitality to the whole program of the National Park Service. He is one of the best known and most popular bureau administrators in the Federal Government. While preserving the areas of the National Park System inviolate as a priceless heritage for future generations, Mr. Wirth has given inspired leadership and provided commonsense judgment to programs designed to make these areas more meaningful and enjoyable to the cultural and recreational pursuits of their millions of visitors.

Statement of Hon. J. W. Arnold, Mayor of Cullman, Ala., on Bills Relating to Issuance and Sale of Municipal Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, members of the legislative committee of the Alabama League of Municipalities met with the Alabama congressional delegation to discuss municipal problems. It was a great day of exchange of views on many problems.

Among the statements made on the occasion was a very fine statement by the Honorable J. W. Arnold, mayor of Cullman, Ala., entitled "Bills Relating to Issuance and Sale of Municipal Bonds."

I include Mayor Arnold's statement as a part of my remarks and commend its reading to interested Members of the U.S. House of Representatives:

BILLS RELATING TO ISSUANCE AND SALE OF MUNICIPAL BONDS

(By J. W. Arnold)

In each session of Congress numerous bills are offered which relate to and affect the issuance and sale of municipal bonds. Some of them usually are calculated to be of assistance to the issuing bodies. But, sometimes there are bills whose passage would adversely affect the best interests of our local communities. I would like to discuss types of proposed bond legislation falling into those categories so that our delegation in Congress will know our interest and point of view regarding such proposals.

Ever since the spread of industrialization in the South, our cities and towns have been able to secure passage of State legislation to do these things:

1. To finance construction and equipping of industrial plants for lease to industrial

tenants. This is done through issues of revenue bonds.

2. To finance construction of various types of municipal utilities—waterworks, sewers, natural gas and electric systems—through the issuance of revenue (non-general-obligation) bonds.

3. To finance the municipality's share of hospital construction, development of local public housing authority projects and urban connecting link highways.

TAX EXEMPTION HAS STIMULATED INVESTMENT IN MUNICIPAL BONDS

The policy of the Congress to not tax income earned from municipal securities has stimulated a good market for such bonds or other evidences of debt. Many attempts have been made to repeal this exemption, but always Congress has voted on the side of the municipalities. This we hope will continue to be your policy. Without the exemption feature the interest rate on municipal bonds and other evidences of indebtedness would run so high that we would not be able to undertake many of the municipal programs that we currently sponsor.

A determined drive is always put forth by the Treasury to remove this tax exemption from our statute books. We hope you will hold the lines against any such atempt that may again be made by the Treasury in the 86th Congress.

One bill has already been introduced by Representative ABRAHAM MULTER, of New York, to eliminate the tax exemption on bondis issued by communities to finance the construction of industrial plants by public bodies. We hope you will help us either kill it or hold it indefinitely in the House Ways and Means Committee.

ESTABLISHING A BROADER MARKET FOR MUNICIPAL BONDS

To lower interest costs to municipalities in financing their operations and public works programs, we suggest:

1. That Congress amend section 5136 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to authorize commercial banks to underwrite revenue types of public securities and allow commercial banks to compete freely with other financial institutions for these issues.

Cities and towns are turning increasingly torevenue bonds in financing municipal public works. Experts in the public finance field now estimate that one-half of all municipal borrowing is done through the issuance of revenue bonds. Interest charges cities and towns pay on revenue financing is determined to a very important extent by the competition between financial institutions for these issues. Commercial banks may deal in general obligation (full faith and credit) bonds, but are prohibited by law from underwriting revenue bonds of cities and towns. This restriction in competition has the effect of increasing interest costs and as a result, the cost of many municipal improvement programs is unnecesarily high.

2. It has been suggested—as another means of improving the municipal bond market—that Congress enact legislation which will broaden the market for municipal bonds by permitting regulated and unregulated investment companies to distribute interest on such bonds to their shareholders without loss of tax exemption. Legislation is pending now to accomplish this.

Many companies have large sums of money that can be invested in municipal securities if the interest earnings are tax exempt. The interest is now tax exempt as far as the companies are concerned, but when it is passed along to shareholders it becomes taxable as income of individuals. It has been estimated that the cost to the U.S. Treasury would not be heavy. If this is true, the proposed legislation would seem to be in the municipal interest and worthy of your consideration.

Back for a moment to the whole subject of municipal tax exemption, let me say that it is the feeling of municipal governments and their officials that the constitutional immunity of the States and the municipalities and their agencies from Federal taxation is necessary to the preservation of the Federal form of dual sovereignty in American government upon which depends the integrity of local self-government in the United States and with it the firmest possible assurance of democracy and the preservation of human liberties.

I thank you.

Farewell Appearance of J. J. Singh, "Mr. India," Before the Far East Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee To Give His Views on United States-Indian Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. J. Singh, the president of the India League, is leaving the United States and returning to his native India. Mr. Singh, or "J. J." as he is called, has made many good friends here. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include some of the many personal tributes, news articles, and editorials that have appeared in the newspapers and those that were received on the occasion of the farewell public meeting of the India League of America, held on Wednesday, February 11, 1959, at the Community Church of New York, New York City:

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., member of the executive committee of the league:

"INDIA LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
"*New York, N.Y.*

"DEAR FRIENDS: I cannot tell you how much I regret not being able to be with you at this farewell meeting of the India League of America. I feel as if I were saying goodbye to old friends by proxy, and that I know is no way of revealing the depth of friendship and regard I have felt for the members of the India League. I wish I could be with you to tell you of the personal satisfaction I have gained from my association and participation in the work of the India League.

"I want to single out from among the many friends in the India League the one with whom I have worked closest and who has given me so much of his time and thought when there was work I could do as a friend of India in the Halls of Congress. J. J. Singh has been a source of strength and inspiration to all of us; a man of dedication to his principles; a sturdy ambassador of good will for India. I remember the work we did together in accomplishing the passage of legislation that removed the obnoxious India Exclusion Act from our statute books and prepared the way for the naturalization of Indians resident in the United States.

"Though he is leaving our midst, I know that our paths will cross again.

"We who are the friends of India will not forget for one moment that a crucial role in world history is now being played by the people of India. India must be given every opportunity to prove to the world that freedom and economic opportunity can exist side by side and that it is not mandatory that freedom of a people must necessarily exclude its economic well being, or that economic progress can only be made at the expense of freedom. This is the test mankind faces in these troubled times and one of the most significant of all testing foregrounds is the subcontinent. It is not a choice, it is a must that we, in the United States, give economic aid to India, help to increase her trade, and help to finance her new industries. That we have so far failed to recognize the importance of India to the development of a free society everywhere is borne out by the fact that of the $20 billion of trade that the United States carries on, only $500 million relates to India. Yet India gives us the mica, the jute, the manganese, the spices that we ourselves must have in the development of our own economic and scientific progress. To India we look for the attributes of charity and compassion, steeped as she is in spiritual strength. We in the United States cannot afford to take our eyes away from the Indian scene. I have witnessed for myself in my visit to India the heartbreaking problems that face her. I have seen, too, the tremendous work that is being done in the villages. The intelligence and sensitivity of her leadership, her men and women of dedication and sacrifice have left a deep impress on me. The world watches the struggles of a free people of India and the progress made under that freedom as against the brutal totalitarianism of Communist China. In a sense then I say—and I repeat—that herein lies the test tube of whence our civilization shall go.

"I shall miss you all, but I must leave you with the assurance that my work and friendship for India shall continue unabated.

"Sincerely and hopefully,

"EMANUEL CELLER."

Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court of the United States, Washington, D.C., member of the national advisory board of the league:

"DEAR MR. SINGH: It was with deep regret that I received the news of the dissolution of the India League in your letter of January 29.

"The work done by the organization, and particularly yourself, has made a significant contribution to the better understanding of India by people in the United States. Through your efforts, many Americans have seen the close kindship between the people of your country and ours as we both struggle toward our common goals of freedom and peace.

"My sorrow at your departure from our shores is tempered by my admiration for your accomplishments. I wish you Godspeed in whatever you put your many talents to in your native land.

"Yours faithfully,

"W. O. DOUGLAS."

Mr. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States:

"DEAR MR. SINGH: I read with interest and regret the article in the January 18 edition of the New York Times relative to your decision to return to your home in India after 33 years in the United States.

"I can well understand yours and your wife's desire to get back to India again not only for your own, but for your children's sake. You have been a very worthwhile resident of our city and have won the admiration and respect of all who came in contact with you. I want you to know that I have had the opportunity to see and visit with you and like all of your friends, hate to see you leave.

"May I extend to you every good wish for success, health and happiness in your home country.

"Sincerely yours,

"JAMES A. FARLEY."

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senate, Washington, D.C.:

"Thank you so much for your letter of the 31st. I regret that you are retiring and returning to India, but you can rest assured that you have made a great contribution to a better understanding of your country in America during these past years.

"Sincerely yours,

"J. W. FULBRIGHT."

Representative JAMES G. FULTON, member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Washington, D.C., member of the national advisory board of the league:

"DEAR J. J.: As a personal friend, it is a pleasure to add my comments on your valued contribution to the growing friendship between India and the United States, which I believe will be one of the decisive factors in world affairs in the next generation. I do hope that you will keep me advised as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, when there are matters which you think should be brought to my attention in order to maintain this friendship which has been growing steadily through such a difficult period.

"With personal regards and best wishes,

"Sincerely,

"JIM FULTON."

Dr. Frank P. Graham, U.N. representative in India and Pakistan, member national advisory committee of the league:

"DEAR MR. SINGH: I regret your leaving us and wish you, Mrs. Singh and your family every happiness in your return to your native land. You have been a real nonofficial but effective ambassador to the people of the United States. We will deeply miss you here.

"With high esteem and warm regards to you and Mrs. Singh from Mrs. Graham and me,

"Sincerely yours,

"FRANK GRAHAM."

Dr. John Haynes Holmes, minister emeritus of the Community Church of New York, member of the national advisory board of the league:

"DEAR MR. SINGH: This is melancholy news you send me in your letter of the 29th—melancholy for us who lose, by your return to India, and are deprived of your presence and work here in the hour of India's continuing need in the vast struggle for independence, but happy for you and your wife who return to your beloved country to serve the great cause there, as, for so many years, you served it here in America.

"Your work here on behalf of India's liberty has been truly remarkable. You have functioned in various capacities as scholar, teacher, propagandist, orator, and advocate, of a nation's cause, and all of these upon the highest level of integrity, honor, and resourceful leadership. You have been like the watchman on the towers, always alert, always fearless, militant, and courageous. It's easy to see why we shall miss you, for India is still in critical times, and where shall we look for the guidance and tireless service which constituted always so large a measure of our own strength? But, as I have said, what America loses here is straightway gained by India, and thus made a continuing labor on behalf of your heroic people.

"I am deeply sorry that, because of illness, I shall be unable to participate in, or even be present at, the farewell meeting arranged for February 11 next. I take pleasure, therefore, in accepting your invitation to send you a message of farewell which, in due course, I shall forward to you. It has been my privilege to know you and to admire you, and to share with joy in your work. I should count it my great fortune that, thanks to your courtesy, I may send you this message of farewell, for which you ask.

"With renewed greetings, and all best wishes, I remain,

"Very sincerely yours,

"JOHN HAYNES HOLMES."

Mr. Henry R. Luce, publisher, Time-Life-Fortune, member national advisory board of the league:

"DEAR J. J.: As I prepare to leave for Arizona, for a period of concentrated reading, thinking, and writing, I learn that in my absence there will occur the valedictory meeting of the India League of America. I learn, too, that you are soon to leave us and return to India. The two facts add up to a tautology, for it is impossible to imagine an India League with J. J., and vice versa.

"While I may not have been a regular participant in the work of the league, I am proud of my association with it as a member of the advisory board, and I am specifically proud of certain of the league's achievements. Two examples come to mind. One is the securing of UNRRA relief for the victims of the Bengal famine in 1943. The other is the act of Congress enabling Indians to become American citizens. It will always be a cause for gratification to me that my wife, as a Member of Congress, was a sponsor of that law.

"Of course, when one speaks of the India League's activities in these and other good causes, one speaks mostly of J. J. Singh, who brought the organization to life exactly 20 years ago. You have been good for us Americans. You learned our democratic processes better than most of us and employed them wisely and constructively. You have been a good friend and, particularly since your marriage to the enchanting Malti, an ornament to our society.

"I know that my colleagues in Time, Inc., are toasting you and Mrs. Singh at a party in our offices in mid-February. I deeply regret that I shall be absent. In case I am not back in New York in time to speak directly with you, here are my regretful farewells to the J. J. Singhs, and my hopes that you, as an incorrigible ambassador, will visit us soon again.

"Sincerely yours,

"HENRY R. LUCE."

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, the Senate, Washington, D.C., member of the national advisory board of the league:

"DEAR MR. SINGH: It is with deep regret, because of conflicting dates out in South Dakota in connection with the observance of the 150th birthday of Abraham Lincoln, that I cannot be with you for the farewell public meeting being sponsored by the India League of America in New York City on February 11.

"It is with even greater regret that I learned that the Indian League of America is being dissolved and it is with a genuine sense of personal loss that I learned of your decision to return to your native country of India. You have served both India and America well for a long period of time in your self-assigned responsibility as 'Indian Ambassador without portfolio.'

"Knowing you as I do, I am sure that once you are back in India your service to both countries will continue to be significant and that you will do much to bring about in India better understanding of America and the free way of life which it exemplifies and symbolizes. The future of India is with the free world and I know that you will bring to the attention of the leaders of India the continuing importance of cooperation with the free world in the development of policies and programs designed to prevent the further spread of communism, and the dangers to peace which the expansion of communism necessarily provides.

"With every best wish, I am,

"Cordially yours,

"KARL E. MUNDT,
"U.S. Senator."

Hon. William M. Rountree, Assistant Secretary of State, Washington, D.C.:

"DEAR MR. SINGH: Thank you for your letter of January 31, 1959. I share your regret that the India League of America has decided to end its long service for the cause of Indian-American friendship. I am happy to enclose a message on the work done by the league which you may wish to use at the final meeting.

"Your own efforts will be long remembered and your presence in the United States will be missed. Even though you are ending your work here, I am glad that we will have in your person in India a firm friend of the United States who will continue to work to strengthen the bond of friendship between our two countries.

"Sincerely,

"WILLIAM M. ROUNTREE,
"Assistant Secretary."

"To the India League of America:

"It is with a sense of regret that I send these farewell greetings to the India League of America on the occasion of its last meeting. The league can be proud of its contribution to the close and friendly relations which exist between India and the United States. I am confident that, even though the league itself will no longer exist, its work will be continued by the individuals who were members of the organization. My colleagues and I assure you that we will do our utmost to strive for an ever larger measure of friendship and understanding between our two countries.

"WILLIAM M. ROUNTREE,
"Assistant Secretary."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 17, 1959]

The city bade a fond farewell yesterday to Sirdar Jagjit Singh, Indian's unofficial ambassador, who has been supporting the cause of his homeland in New York for the last 33 years.

Mr. Singh—"sirdar" is a Sikh honorific roughly equivalent to "captain"—was the guest of honor at a luncheon at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel sponsored by Mayor Wagner and paid for by the Indian League of America. Mr. Singh is its president. He is leaving for retirement in New Delhi on March 8.

Mr. Singh, or "J. J." as he is known, received a scroll from Mayor Wagner citing him for distinguished and exceptional service to the city.

The citation noted that Mr. Singh "has accomplished so much in furthering mutual friendship and understanding between the people of India, his native land, and the people of the United States, his adopted land for 33 years."

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Brooklyn Democrat and chairman of the House Foreign Relations Committee, praised his old friend for his efforts at United States-Indian understanding even during dark periods.

Mr. Singh, who said that he considered himself a New Yorker, promised that he would tell his people "about the greatness, kindness and decency of the American people."

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 17, 1959]

THE UNOFFICIAL AMBASSADOR

Many friends of India will be saddened by the news that, after 22 years of promoting friendship and understanding between our two countries, the India League of America is being disbanded and its president, J. J. Singh, is taking his family back to India.

The league's membership has never been large, but its work, largely carried on through Mr. Singh's personal diplomacy and his tireless lobbying and letterwriting, has, in a quiet way, helped considerably to bring about a greater American understanding of the

vastly important but long mysterious giant of the East.

The fact that Mr. Singh's departure has signaled the dissolution of the league is an eloquent measure of his personal contribution to it. The league hopes that another organization (Mr. Singh suggests the Asia Society) will carry on its work. As for unofficial ambassador Singh himself, whose return to India after 33 years here is prompted by family considerations, his enthusiasm remains undimmed, and it perhaps is not too much to hope that he will be as effective an interpreter of the United States to his countrymen as he has been an interpreter of India to Americans.

[From the New York Times, February 18, 1959]

AN UNOFFICIAL ENVOY

In giving a farewell luncheon for J. J. Singh, Mayor Wagner has recognized the distinguished part that this unofficial envoy from India has played in the life of our community. We hope that it is not farewell but merely au revoir, and that J. J.—as he is affectionately known to thousands of Americans—will come back to visit soon and often.

After 33 years in this country Mr. Singh has decided to take his charming family back to his native India and to retire there. No one who knows him can accept the idea of his retiring without the broadest reservation. He will continue to work on behalf of his country and on behalf of better understanding between India and the United States. Perhaps he may even form an America League in India, since he was the life and soul of the India League here for 20 years and as he leaves the India League has disbanded, saying "mission accomplished."

He has been singularly successful in presenting the cause of his people to this country. One reason is that he has understood and liked Americans and made them like him. His urbanity, good humor, commonsense, and patriotic devotion have endeared him to everyone who had reason to know him.

J. J. Singh has been an honor to India and a most pleasant vistor here. More like him would do us all good.

Popular Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, when the national defense education bill was before the Congress last year considerable opposition was voiced to the student loan program provision. Many thought that it would not be used. The following editorial from the New Republic of February 23, 1959, gives some interesting statistics concerning the widespread popularity of the program.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 4220, which would provide for a college scholarship program. I cannot too strongly urge upon our colleagues the necessity for enactment of this measure, to supplement the loan program:

POPULAR EDUCATION

A largely ignored report from the U.S. Office of Education shows that the student loan program authorized in last year's National Defense Education Act is 10 times more popular than Congress anticipated. Under the program, college students can borrow up to $1,000 a year for academic expenses. They do not have to begin repaying the loan until 1 year after they graduate, and then the terms are reasonable: 10 years to pay at 3 percent on the unpaid balance.

Congress last fall appropriated $6 million to get this program stated. The colleges have to put $1 of their own into their loan funds for every nine Federal dollars received. By the end of 1959, more than 1,200 colleges and universities had asked for $62 million—466 of them never had a student loan program before.

The administration has responded by proposing that Congress meet the students' demand about half way: the President has requested that another $24 million be appropriated for fiscal 1959 and another $30 million for fiscal 1960.

Addresses of John Cashmore, President of the Borough of Brooklyn, and Frederick Zurmuhlen, Commissioner of the Department of Public Works of the City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses of Hon. John Cashmore, president of the Borough of Brooklyn, and the Honorable Frederick Zurmuhlen, commissioner of the department of public works of the city of New York, at the ceremonies on January 5, 1959, dedicating the new Supreme Court Building in Brooklyn, N.Y.:

ADDRESS OF JOHN CASHMORE, PRESIDENT OF THE BOROUGH OF BROOKLYN

Mr. Justice Nolan, reverend clergy, distinguished members of the bench and bar, ladies and gentlemen, today we dedicate the building which will stand for the next century, at least, as the symbol of justice in Brooklyn. It is a magnificent structure, indeed, and well it should be in keeping with its noble purpose. Constructed at a tremendous cost, it represents no small sacrifice on the part of the people of the great community it is to serve.

But sacrifice in the name of justice is nothing new to this community of Brooklyn, because the very ground on which this structure stands reverberated nearly 200 years ago to the tramp of Washington's soldiers, and the land nearby was literally soaked with the blood of those who gave their lives to throw off tyranny and oppression so that freedom and justice might be the symbols of the American way of life.

And let us not lose sight of the fact that the historic Supreme Court Building across the street, which now gives way to the needs of a new era, was also constructed at equally great financial sacrifice during the War of 1861, when men of the old city of Brooklyn were dying by the thousands to prove the truth of their conviction that no race of people could be kept in bondage and slavery under the American system of justice.

Today, one short century later, the members of the race that was enslaved live side by side in this community with the members of the race that were their tormentors. In this courthouse they will both stand equal before the law.

To be sure, this great structure does represent sacrifice, but the very principle of justice itself has always required sacrifice, constant, never-ending sacrifice, by those who would serve its cause and reap its benefits.

Although the spirit of justice and the self-discipline that are entailed in its preservation seem native and natural to the character of our people, it is also true that some leadership is necessary in undertaking a project so great as this.

Many of our citizens have given much to make this a day of accomplishment, but there is one man who has provided the leadership and the courage to overcome the obstacles that arose during the past 5 years. I am happy to salute him, for when others were fainthearted he pushed on. He is the great mayor of the city of New York, Robert F. Wagner. To him and to Commissioner Zurmuhlen, who have done so much to make this great courthouse a reality, I extend the thanks and appreciation of the Borough of Brooklyn.

And now we, the administrators of the city who have supervised the erection of this structure, which is but stone and mortar, deliver it to you, the justices of the court, to infuse in it the spirit and the soul of justice. Yours is an awesome responsibility indeed. To find the truth, to render exact justice between man and man, to preserve the heritage of liberty and justice that our people of Brooklyn have fought for and died for—these are burdens to try even the strongest and most learned of men.

That Almighty God will give each of you, and those who come after you, the strength, the courage, and the wisdom to face these great tasks is the fervent prayer of all the people of Brooklyn, who have so often proved their complete and unselfish devotion to the cause of justice.

Thank you. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF FREDERICK ZURMUHLEN, COMMISSIONER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, NEW YORK CITY

Justice Nolan, reverend clergy, the resident justices and many judges of many courts that are here today, distinguished guests, and not to forget the borough in which this building lives or is, the Honorable John Cashmore, Mr. Borough President, ladies and gentlemen, as you have been told, we have gathered here today for a formal dedication of what is probably the newest and largest landmark in the Borough of Brooklyn. It is the largest component of this borough's civic center, which has been developed over a long period of time and is based upon a vision and ability to see into the future of many borough planners and many city planners, in addition to the department of public works.

Much of what we see nearby today in arriving or leaving, or which we come in contact with in our day to day pursuits as officials, judges, attorneys, businessmen, or civil service personnel, may be taken for granted among the many facilities this city must afford its citizens, without appreciating or even considering the years and the nights, the days, the hours, the headaches that go into the evolution of the plans and designs that are conceived and then finally consummated by architects, engineers, and then interpreted into actual physical being by skilled and semi-skilled workmen.

The skill of the surgeon, the logic of the advocate, the dedication of the clergyman may be found around us here in counterpart in terms of architecture and engineering. Professional careers may be saved, an innocent suspect may be exonerated, a weighted soul may be redeemed. A lasting facility has been constructed to afford comfort, conven-

ience and protection of our rights in an atmosphere synonymous with the prestige of our democratic way of life, our respect for the Constitution and the constitutional law of our land.

There has already been a whisper of criticism of this building by chronic complainers. An official may falter, the attorney may err, even a clergyman may be remiss on occasion. This is no more or less true of the architect and the engineer. There are those who would scoff when a case is tried and decided, a delicate operation performed or a building built. But to paraphrase a well-known saying, "Let him who is perfect cast the first aspersion."

The department of public works, and I am well into my 12th year as its commissioner, is justly proud and almost smugly happy today to have been responsible for this building. It has been a long time coming. This building was in the budget in 1948 originally, and is only being dedicated in 1959.

Our nonprofessional as well as our registered architects and professional engineers whose efforts are cordinated with those of the outside consultants who were in this case, Shreve, Lamb & Harmon, well-known architects, and Sisco & Hennessey, well-known engineers, the contractors, a coadventure of Castagna & Son, and R. H. Construction—all of these have filled their tasks with the degree of dedication that enabled us to complete this project in time and with some degree of completion.

I mean by that, that we do not feel particularly good about opening or dedicating a building that has no landscaping around it. However, that was due to a lack of money. The landscaping, I am positive, will be in the next capital budget, and will take place during the coming year. However, I think, Judge Keogh, we did provide you with at least an entrance to each one of the courts, and an entrance from each one of the streets on which the court faces.

In my time as commissioner we have completed some $600 million worth of work. That is a lot of money. And the men who have the headache of finding where it comes from are represented here today by the borough president of Brooklyn, not only in his own capacity as borough president, but I understand he is going to represent the mayor also, the members of the board of estimate—without them none of this work would be possible. Almost needless to say, the $600 million included some $200 million worth of hospitals as well as an impressive number of health and welfare stations, firehouses, police stations, new library construction, and rehabilitation, pollution control projects, together with miles and miles of interceptor sewers, bridge repairs, and new bridges.

Simultaneously we have maintained and operated 68 public buildings assigned to our jurisdiction, with more than 7 million square feet of space, larger than Radio City and the Empire State Building. And that makes us one of the largest landlords in this city.

Now some of our tenants have large families. We are going to have a large family in this building. We get along very well. There is never any question about the rent at least, though at times there may be complaints about the services. But then all big landlords have some headaches.

We do our best with limited budgets. And if you read our reports, you will find that we maintain these buildings at less cost per square foot than is done in private industry.

We, in the department of public works, will give the best for the dollars assigned to our department, and all we ask is an appreciation for the things so many take for granted, the incomparable services and protection that the department and other departments afford on a day-to-day basis.

We offer you today, Judge Keogh, and your entire staff of judges, this temple of justice as a monument to democracy, to our way of life and our firm conviction that we know what we want, because we know it is best for us, and not because we have been told that it is best for us; because we have the absolute right to enjoy our use of reason and decide for ourselves as individuals, not in classes, on the best individual interest.

To that simple, honest principle this magnificent building is dedicated. Not with our words, not with our flags, but with our oath of allegiance, with our hearts, with our inbred respect for the law and order which regulates our land, our rights and privileges, and our responsibilities.

It has been a privilege as an engineer and as an architect to have supervised the construction of this landmark. It will stand for generations and command the respect of those whose rights will be protected here.

And may it serve well the present and those future generations for whom we have planned and built here the Brooklyn Civic Center in the greatest city in the world. [Applause.]

National Guard Muster Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, February 22 some 470,000 National Guardsmen honored George Washington by mustering at their respective armories throughout the United States.

The Altoona (Pa.) Mirror recognized the occasion by the following editorial entitled "Let Us Remember," which appeared in the February 21 edition. This editorial is a great tribute to the citizen-soldiers that make up our National Guard and which have contributed greatly to the preservation of our Nation.

The editorial follows:

LET US REMEMBER

Tomorrow is the birthday of Gen. George Washington.

Tomorrow is also National Guard Muster Day—an occasion for more than 470,000 of our citizen-soldiers to honor this same George Washington, an early comrade-in-arms of the Virginia Militia.

This newspaper believes that Muster Day should be more than a day set aside by National Guardsmen. We believe that it should be an occasion for citizens everywhere to honor the National Guardsmen themselves; to acknowledge the great debt they owe to the men of their oldest fighting organization.

We tend to forget our National Guard during the years of peace. Even now many of us have forgotten what World War II should have proved once and for all: That National Guardsmen are capable of meeting any challenge that faces them.

It seems strange that this should be; that after 300 years of fighting Indians, invaders, and dictators, floods, fires, and tornadoes, the National Guard should have to prove itself. But prove itself it did, and in 1945, after the smoke of 4 years of battle had cleared away, National Guardsmen had won 14 Medals of Honor and 88 Presidential Unit Citations. Eighteen National Guard infantry divisions had fought throughout Europe and the Pacific, compiling one of the proudest combat records in our history.

The guard's participation in World War II is a perfect example of the unyielding spirit of free citizens who take up arms in the defense of their Nation. And there were dark hours during the war when it was that spirit alone which turned the tide of battle.

Tomorrow—on Muster Day, 1959—the spirit remains. Week in and week out, while most of us are enjoying the leisure of hours after work and of weekends, 470,000 Army and Air National Guardsmen are giving unselfishly of their time in the most vigorous training program of their organization's history. They know that in modern warfare a citizen must be not only willing, but prepared to fight as well.

They go about their tasks quietly and unobtrusively and we seldom know they are there. Every once in a while disaster will strike locally and they will go into action again, saving lives, guarding property, and restoring order, and we read about their deeds and we praise them. And then we forget; we take them for granted.

Let us remember. Let us honor the past contributions of our National Guardsmen and acknowledge their present-day efforts.

We are much safer for having them.

American Bar Association Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the American Bar Association, at its midwinter meeting in Chicago, overwhelmingly adopted the report of its special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives. This excellent report, resulting from an exhaustive study by this most competent committee, calls for legislative action by the Congress. It should be read and its recommendations carefully considered by every Member of the House and the Senate:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON COMMUNIST TACTICS, STRATEGY, AND OBJECTIVES

FOREWORD

International communism continues its worldwide conquest with the same vigor which has enabled it to bring 900 million people under its control while covering one-quarter of the earth's surface. In these United States its threat increases as far too many of us fail to comprehend its sinister purpose. The objective of worldwide communism has never changed—only do its tactics change in order to more effectively infiltrate life in America, to lower resistance to its propaganda, and to cripple our defenses against this tyrannical and deadly way of life.

There is not one home in our land which is not affected by communism in some manner. Above all, our national economic security has been undermined by the necessity of building our defenses against the threat of Soviet aggression and through the Red impact on world trade. The U.S. gold reserves are becoming alarmingly low. Our country is the lone nation in the civilized world which admits foreign capital from undisclosed owners.

Our internal security has been weakened by a lackadaisical attitude on the part of the public and technicalities raised in judicial decisions which too frequently in the public mind have had the effect of putting on trial the machinery of the judicial process and

free the subversive to go forth and further undermine our Nation. Lenin once stated as a prerequisite for a revolutionary situation which the Communists could exploit, the fact that the ruling classes can no longer govern. Must we admit that we have reached that point?

The Soviet advances in seeking superiority in the control of space have doubtless been aided by the theft of secrets from American scientists in the same manner in which the Soviets gained the know-how to develop nuclear weapons. Should the United States come under attack, it will then be too late to allocate responsibility. Corrective action must be taken now. Time is running out on us.

It is now an established fact that every institution, every force, and every person actively engaged in the forefront of the defense of our country against the rising menace of communism becomes the target of attack and vilification by Communists, Crypto-Communists, fellow travelers, their stooges, and innocent but beguiled persons.

The agencies of Government charged with protecting our internal security have demonstrated by past performance their ability to protect our Nation. We take pride that a lawyer, Director J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and his staff, composed largely of lawyers and others with legal training, have been in the forefront most often under very difficult circumstances. In war and peace the FBI has demonstrated the ability to carry out its responsibilities to the American people in a truly American manner avoiding the excesses of both the NKVD and the gestapo. It, therefore, merits the wholehearted support and continued confidence of the bar and of the American public.

The fight to keep America free and secure must be strengthened by providing those agencies of our Government which are responsible for our internal security with the means to maintain the security of our shores, the fight for a free America cries out for a furthering of the educational program to combat the evil ideas of communism with truth, and the American bar's responsibility has never been so great as at the present time to assume leadership in the preservation of the freedoms so gallantly won by our forefathers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States and an independent judiciary created by the Constitution have been and are the ultimate guardians of the Bill of Rights and the protectors of our freedom, and as such it is the duty of the members of the bar to defend the institutions of the judiciary from unfair and unjust attacks; and

Whereas this association recognizes that sharp differences have been expressed as to the soundness of some of the recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court affecting the national and State security, with particular reference to the activities of domestic and foreign Communists within our country; and

Whereas such differences have given rise not only to severe criticisms of the decisions, but unfortunately to condemnation of the Court itself, and to omnibus proposals for limiting its appellate jurisdiction; and

Whereas while members of this association view some of the decisions to be unsound and incorrect, they deem such broad omnibus proposals at this time unwise and likely to create more problems than they will solve: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Bar Association disapprove proposals to limit any jurisdiction vested in the U.S. Supreme Court; be it further

Resolved, That wherever there are reasonable grounds to believe that as a result of court decisions, weaknesses in internal security have been disclosed, remedial legislation be enacted by the Congress of the United States, including a specific pronouncement of congressional intention that State statutes proscribing sedition against the United States shall have concurrent enforceability.

II

Whereas recent declarations by the U.S. Supreme Court (notably in *Watkins* v. *U.S.*, 354 U.S. 178) have been construed as holding that the House of Representatives has not spelled out with sufficient clarity or detail the authority granted to the Committee on Un-American Activities and queries whether the said committee has been carrying out properly its congressional mandate, which interpretation has resulted in the reversal of trial court convictions for contempt of Congress; and

Whereas it has been deemed by many Members of the Congress, the bar, and the public that such declarations and interpretations thereof tend to impede the work of the Congress through its committees and thereby create a problem, the solution to which must be found; and

Whereas it is the view of this association that the quickest and best solution is for the House of Representatives to rewrite its resolution of authority to its congressional committee investigating internal security and Communist activities in terms so thoroughly, carefully, and precisely worded as to leave no area for reasbnable misunderstanding or evasion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association recommend to the Congress that the House of Representatives rewrite and adopt its basic resolution of authority for the Committee on Un-American Activities under the same name or such name as such legislative body shall designate setting forth that the purpose in creating said committee is to study the operation of existing laws and the requirements of further legislation, in addition to defining clearly and adequately the powers of such committees.

III

Whereas your committee deems it advisable that the precise terms of the basic authority of the congressional committee which subpenas the witness to appear and testify should be made available to each witness subpenaed, for his enlightenment in advance of the hearing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association recommends to the Congress that whenever any of its committees subpena a witness to appear and testify or to give evidence, such committee should furnish the witness at the time he is subpenaed with a copy in writing of the precise terms of the basic authority of the committee.

IV

Whereas recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, in cases involving National and State security and with particular reference to Communist activities, have been severely criticized and deemed unsound by many responsible authorities; and

Whereas problems of safeguarding National and State security have been exposed or created thereby which this association feels would be best solved by the careful study of each decision, and the prompt enactment of sound amendments to existing laws within the constitutional powers of the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association recommend to the Congress the prompt and careful consideration and study of recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court and the preparation and passage of separate amendments to the laws involved so as to remove any doubt as to the intent of the Congress, and to remedy any defect in the existing law revealed by the decisions; be it further

Resolved, That legislation be promptly enacted to eliminate obstacles to the preservation of our internal security in the following areas:

(a) Amend the Smith Act to define the word "organize" to include the recruitment of new party members, the formation of new party units, and the regrouping, expansion, or other activities of an organizational nature performed by members of existing clubs, cells, classes and other units so as to insure the applicability of this section of the act to Communist actionists, agents, organizers, colonists, or members currently performing organizational work;

(b) Amend the Smith Act to make it a crime intentionally to advocate the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States or to teach the necessity, desirability, or duty of seeking to bring about such overthrow; in order that (1) this Nation might take protective steps to prevent acts which, if not prevented, could result in bloodshed and treachery; and (2) this Nation need not be forced to delay the invoking of the judicial process until such time as the resulting damage has already been wrought. (See *Yates* v. *U.S.*);

(c) Establish the right of each branch of government to require as a condition of employment that each employee thereof shall not refuse to answer a query before a duly constituted committee of the Congress or before duly authorized officers of either the executive or judicial branches of the Government with respect to Communist, Communist front or other subversive activities or any other matter bearing upon his loyalty to the United States, as the Government has a right to know his record;

(d) Invest in the executive branch of the Government the right to protect our internal security against the activities of aliens who were or became Communists at any time subsequent to their entry into the United States by providing for their deportation without any deprivation of due process; and the right to make and enforce reasonable restrictions on aliens awaiting deportation to prohibit them from engaging in any activities identical or similar to those upon which the aliens' deportation order was based, with the further right fully to interrogate aliens awaiting deportation concerning their subversive associates or activities;

(e) Strengthen the effectiveness of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1948 by a requirement that political propaganda by agents of foreign principals be labeled for what it is where such agents are situated outside the limits of the United States, but nevertheless directly or indirectly disseminate such propaganda within the United States.

V

Whereas, the respective records of the Subcommittees on Internal Security of the Senate Judiciary Committee and of the House Un-American Activities Committee both charged with the duty of investigating internal security and Communist activities are records of accomplishment and great service to the Nation; and

Whereas the continuation of the work of these committees is essential to the enactment of sound and adequate legislation to safeguard the national and State security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Bar Association recommends that the House of Representatives continue to maintain a committee to investigate matters relating to national security with particular emphasis on Communist activities invested with adequate jurisdiction to accomplish its purpose, and that the Senate continue to maintain and support its Subcommittee on Internal Security; and be it further

Resolved, That such committees maintain close liaison with the Intelligence and Se-

curity Agencies, as well as with the Attorney General of the United States, to the end that they may be kept advised as to legislative needs of the executive branch of the Government required to carry out its responsibilities for internal security.

REPORT

Inasmuch as the house of delegates of the association referred back to the committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives, to study the recommendation that the association endorse H.R. 12949 and the recommendation that the association endorse S. 1411 in cooperation with the special committee on individual rights as affected by national security, this committee submits its recommendations with the body of the report. Such a procedure is followed because the two committees to which the recommendations were referred for further study have not had a sufficient opportunity to jointly discuss their findings. The recommendations are submitted herewith.

Be it resolved, That this committee recommends that legislation be promptly enacted to eliminate obstacles to the preservation of our internal security in the following areas:

1. Restore to the executive branch of our Government the right to determine and to dismiss, if required, those who are security risks in both sensitive and nonsensitive positions in the Government service.

2. Restore to the executive branch of government the right to deny passports to persons knowingly engaged in subversive activities, or activities designed or intended to further international communism by the establishment of criteria and standards to be applied in the issuance of denial of passports. These criteria and standards should be clear and unequivocal, and in addition contain a specific authorization to the Secretary of State empowering him or the Acting Secretary to withhold a passport in the national interest based upon confidential information and upon which he shall certify that it is contrary to the interests of this Nation that a passport be issued to the applicant; and further, to prevent foreign espionage agents from departing this country for the purpose of carrying out their espionage pursuits or to escape disclosure or prosecution; and that such legislation establish adequate appeal procedures which would insure due process of law so as to provide recourse to the individuals concerned in the event of any arbitrary and capricious exercise of discretion not properly founded.

It is with a profound sense of high privilege and grave responsibility that your committee submits the following report to the house of delegates and, through it, to the bar and to the public.

UNLESS

International communism will enslave the peoples of every nation of the free world—including the United States—unless they—

Awaken from their apathy and their indifference to the dangers that exist and threaten.

Learn and appreciate the freedom and the human rights they enjoy—and are determined and prepared to fight to preserve them for themselves and for their children.

Learn and appreciate the meaning of enslavement of the individual as it exists under communism.

Learn and appreciate the difference between the idealistic pretensions of communism and its inhuman reality.

Learn that the Communist ultimate goal of dominating and controlling every nation and every human being, never changes—though its tactics vary from day to day.

Understand that wishes and prayers alone wil not suffice to overcome communism or to avoid its menace.

Know that only by unity, determination, strength—moral, scientific, and military—and a willingness to state their position in advance, and to be ready to fight for it, can they best safeguard the free world and its institutions.

Remember that Communists respect only those with equal or greater strength.

Know that the plea for peaceful coexistence is a fraudulent tactic of international communism seeking to blind the American people to the Soviet record of broken promises and aggression and intended to paralyze and disarm the free world in advance of the coming Soviet onslaught.

Never forget that international communism—particularly the Soviet—has the worst record for broken treaties in all history.

Remember that communism has never sold itself on its merits nor has it ever been adopted by a free vote of a free people.

Realize that free industry and free labor unions in any country are free only so long as communism does not dominate there—and that both industry and labor carry grave responsibilities in the defense of their nations against communism.

Realize and warn that partisan politics by those occupying or seeking public office may be a great aid to international communism and a serious handicap to one's own country.

Remember that subversion—aided by treason and treachery of domestic citizens—has been the most successful tool and tactic of international communism in gaining control of new enslaved nations or in weakening or dulling the resistance by those nations which remain free.

Never forget that international communism still maintains as one of its fundamental tenets—where and when necessary—the overthrow by force and violence of any free nation when such overthrow can be successfully accomplished.

Know that one of the Communists' chief tactics is to keep the free world on the defensive by prodding and creating problem spots in every area of the globe.

Know that without sacrifice free nations cannot be protected or prepare themselves for defense from communism's constant assaults or against outright war.

Realize that the process of weakening the free nations is constantly carried out in many ways through subtle and persistent propaganda, and that the weapon of counter-propaganda by truth has not as yet been adequately or affirmatively used against the Communists.

Never forget that while from time to time we may have to confer and negotiate with Communist Russia or other Communist enslaved nations, their agreements have no sacred or serious meaning to them, will be breached when it is expedient for them to do so, and that such negotiations should be carried on by duly constituted officials of government and not by self-appointed apologists.

Remember that international Communists continue to talk peace but relentlessly wage war in its many forms at the same time.

Never confuse Communists with the freedom-loving peoples of the nations they dominate and control, or fail to appreciate that these peoples crave freedom and a better way of life, peace, and understanding with other nations. But, if the peoples of the free world are alert to what communism is and how it operates and what it costs in determination, dedication, toil, and sacrifice to protect our freedoms and our way of life, then the free world will survive and communism will ultimately dissipate or destroy itself and its devoted followers.

Most persons who are informed on communism think our country now faces its greatest danger. The thesis of J. Edgar Hoover's new book, "Masters of Deceit," is:

"Communism is the major menace of our time. Today it threatens the very existence of our Western civilization." [1]

Footnotes at end of speech.

In his speech to the 1957 national convention of the American Legion, Mr. Hoover warned:

"To dismiss lightly the existence of the subversive threat in the United States is to deliberately commit national suicide. In some quarters we are surely doing just that."

And on December 22, 1958, Mr. Hoover added:

"Sensing a more favorable atmosphere, the Communist Party, USA, and its dupes and sympathizers gained further courage and became more vocal in their attacks upon law enforcement and other professions which are dedicated to preserving our freedoms."

The lawyer-author of the Gaither report to the President on national security recently told our association:

"Our security is in unprecedented peril. * * * The ultimate objection of international communism is world domination, and the Soviet Union will pursue this objective ruthlessly and relentlessly employing every possible political, economic, subversive, and military stratagem and tactic." [2]

COURT DECISIONS RELATED TO COMMUNISM

Mr. Justice Jackson in *American Communications Association* v. *Douds* [3] concluded that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is not a political party but "is a conspiratorial and revolutionary junta organized to reach ends and to use methods which are incompatible with our constitutional system." Likewise, former Chief Justice Stone reached a similar conclusion several years earlier in *Schneiderman* v. *United States*.[4] So, too did former Chief Justice Hughes when, as Secretary of State, he refused to recognize the Communist Government of Russia, and former Chief Justice Vinson in *Dennis* v. *United States* [5] which decision upheld the convictions under the Smith Act of the American Communist leaders.

Similar pronouncements are contained in the preambles to many State sedition laws as well as in the preamble to the Communist Control Act of 1954, where Congress stated specifically that "the Congress finds and declares that the Communist Party of the United States, although purportedly a political party, is in fact an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States." Likewise, the Subversive Activities Control Board has, after protracted hearings, found the Communist Party to be a Communist-action organization required to register under the Internal Security Act of 1950.

In spite of this, much dicta has appeared in recent decisions of the Supreme Court to the effect that the Communist Party is a political organization of a lawful nature similar to the Republican, Democratic, or Socialist Parties, hinting that disclosure of membership therein or association therewith is entitled to the protection of the first amendment. While this view has not been actually held in any known case, language contained in many of the decisions has invited confusion.

Many cases have been decided in such a manner as to encourage an increase in Communist activity in the United States through invalidation of State sedition statutes, and limitation of State and Federal investigating powers in the field of subversion although these cases might readily have been disposed of without so broadly limiting National and State security efforts. The paralysis of our internal security grows largely from construction and interpretation centering around technicalities emanating from our judicial process which the Communists seek to destroy, yet, use as a refuge to masquerade their diabolical objectives. This trend was treated fully in the conference of State chief justices last year when they called upon the U.S. Supreme Court to exercise the power of judicial self-restraint. The dissenting opin-

ions of certain Supreme Court Justices have been crystal clear in charting the effect of the failure of the majority to recognize the underground forces that are at work and to appreciate how these decisions affect our internal security.

It has frequently been said that "justice delayed is justice denied." The delays in arriving at final determinations in criminal proceedings have invited criticism of the American judicial process. In no area has this been more tragically illustrated than in cases dealing with Communists. The proceeding against the Communist Party before the Subversive Activities Control Board is a case in point which makes a mockery of justice. Eight years have now elapsed since the enactment of the Internal Security Act of 1950. The status of the Communist Party continues to remain unadjudicated. The constitutionality of the act remains to be determined by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Communists have used every tactic to delay the determination of this case and subsequent enforcement of this act.

Your committee wishes to make clear that this delay is not the fault of the Subversive Activities Control Board itself which is composed of men and women of great talent who have diligently and courageously maintained a rare judicial attitude and composure despite the Communist vilification which has been heaped upon the Board and the members personally. They have endured frustrations imposed upon them by judicial delays and failures to meet the issues in a decisive manner so that justice might inure to the American people as well as to the accused.

The Subversive Activities Control Board, under the mandate of the Internal Security Act of 1950, issued its order on April 20, 1953.[6] That order, issued after exhaustive hearings and documented in a scholarly manner on a legal basis, found that the Communist Party, U.S.A., was a Communist-action organization and directed that it must comply with the act. This order remains to be enforced. We reassert the views stated in the brief which the American Bar Association filed in the U.S. Supreme Court in support of the Internal Security Act of 1950. If any part of the said act violates the Constitution, the courts should so hold. Congress should then enact new legislation or amend the present act to conform to any constitutional requirements as determined by the courts. If the act is constitutional, the Communist Party should not continue to enjoy immunity from its security provisions during many years of protracted legislation.

The importance of the Communist Party proceeding before the Subversive Activities Control Board justifies a brief résumé of this matter:

1. The Supreme Court did not determine the constitutionality of the act but rather remanded the case to the Board for exploration of charges supported by affidavit made by the party in the court of appeals concerning the credibility of three Government witnesses, namely, Crouch, Johnson, and Matusow. The charges made by the Communist Party in the court of appeals were not controverted by counteraffidavit of the Department of Justice for the reason that there was other overwhelming evidence to sustain the Board's order. The Supreme Court stated that since the assertions were not challenged by the Department it must remand the case to the Board for exploration.

2. When the case was returned to the Board the Department of Justice did not undertake to challenge the veracity of the charges made against these three witnesses. Accordingly under the Supreme Court's opinion the Board had no alternative but to expunge their testimony in its entirety from the record, and on the basis of the remainder of the evidence—testimony and documentary—the Board entered a new order.

3. The case again was argued before the Court of Appeals. After oral argument there and prior to decision by the Court of Appeals, the Supreme Court handed down its opinion in the Jencks case (noted later in this report). The party thereupon filed motions invoking the Jencks doctrine. The Court of Appeals then remanded the case to the Board for production of documents in relation to witness Mary Markward. The Communist Party then filed a petition for rehearing and a motion to adduce additional evidence in relation to witness Budenz. In the course of preparing a reply to the petition for rehearing and the motion the Department discovered the existence of a recording of the initial interviews with Budenz after he left the party, the substance of which had been previously reported. This discovery was made known to the appellate court and it thereupon remanded the Budenz question also for production of documents.

4. All documents ordered by the court to be produced have been furnished by the Department to the Subversive Activities Control Board in relation to the two witnesses. It developed, however, that Budenz was unavailable for further cross-examination due to a grave heart condition. The party now has a motion pending to reopen the case for cross-examination of all FBI agents who interviewed Budenz, claiming among other items that there are inconsistencies between the documents produced and the testimony of Budenz before the Board.

5. On February 9, 1959, the SACB in an order for the third time after months of additional study, required the CPUSA to register in accordance with the Internal Security Act of 1950. In its most recent order, the Board rejected the Communist Party claim that false testimony had been given by a witness in another proceeding. Another round of appeals no doubt will be sought by the Communist Party to further delay a final adjudication of this case.

The following are the principal cases that have been criticized by the public, public officials, and the bar in varying degrees as illustrative of how our security has been weakened:

1. *Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson* (350 U.S. 497 (Apr. 2, 1956)): The Court held 6 to 3 that the Federal Smith Act which prohibits the knowing advocacy of the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force and violence, suspends the enforceability of the Pennsylvania Sedition Act in certain respects—which act proscribes the same conduct—on the grounds that Congress has preempted the field of sedition against the United States to the exclusion of parallel State legislation that the dominant interest of the Federal Government precludes State intervention, and that the administration of the State act would conflict with the operations of the Federal plan. Three Justices dissented in every respect and pointed out that the Court should not void State legislation without a clear mandate from Congress.[7]

2. *Communist Party U.S.A.* v. *Subversive Activities Control Board* (351 U.S. 115 (Apr. 30, 1956)): The Board found the Communist Party to be a Communist-action organization subject to the registration provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. The Communist Party appealed to the U.S. court of appeals and filed a motion for leave to introduce additional evidence before the Board alleging that three Government witnesses had committed perjury in other similar cases which motion was denied. The Government did not challenge the allegations in the motion, but simply contended that the Board's order was amply supported by evidence other than the testimony of the witnesses in question. The Supreme Court held 6 to 3 that the court of appeals had erred in denying the motion and remanded to the Board to permit the evidence to be introduced. Three Justices dissented on the grounds that denial of the motion was within the lower court's discretion and that there had been no abuse of discretion. The dissent criticized the refusal of the majority to deal with the constitutional issues presented.

3. *Watkins* v. *U.S.*, 354 U.S. 178 (June 17, 1957): A union officer appearing as a witness before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities refused to answer questions as to past Communist Party membership of certain persons, objecting on grounds of lack of pertinency to the subject under inquiry by the subcommittee. The Supreme Court held 6 to 1 (two Justices not participating) that under the applicable statute a congressional investigating committee must upon objection of a witness on the grounds of pertinency, state for the record under inquiry at that time and the manner in which the propounded questions are pertinent thereto. The Court stated that the phrase "un-American activities" was vague and that the evidence failed to show that the question under investigative inquiry was ever made specifically known to the witness. The dissent declared that the pertinency of the questions asked to the matter under investigation had been sufficiently shown. (This decision has led to a continuing discussion and challenge by witnesses as to the "pertinency" of questions. No court could function smoothly under such an impediment.)

4. *Cole* v. *Young*, 351 U.S. 536 (June 11, 1956): An employee in the U.S. Health, Education, and Welfare Department, who was charged with "sympathetic association" with individuals reliably reported to be Communist and making contribution to an allegedly subversive organization, was summarily dismissed by the agency head under the authority of the Summary Suspension Act of 1950, which authorizes heads of specified agencies to summarily dismiss employees "in the interests of the national security of the United States." The act provides that the determination of the agency head is conclusive and final. The Supreme Court in a 6 to 1 decision overturned the dismissal on the ground that the Summary Suspension Act has reference only to those activities directly concerned with the Nation's safety, and that the employee in question did not occupy a "sensitive position." Three Justices dissented, holding that the clear purpose of Congress was being frustrated in that the statute had been intended to authorize summary dismissal of employees whose retention would be inimical to the national interests regardless of the sensitivity of their positions.

5. *Leedom* v. *International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers*, 352 U.S. 145 (December 10, 1956): The National Labor Relations Board after an administrative investigation and hearing found that an officer of the plaintiff union had filed a false non-Communist affidavit. The Board, in accordance with the National Labor Relations Act which denies the benefit of the act to unions whose officers have not filed such affidavits and makes union officers who have filed false affidavits subject to criminal penalties, issued a decompliance order barring the union from the benefits of the act until it complied. The U.S. Supreme Court held that this order was beyond the Board's authority and that the only remedy which the act permits in the case of false affidavits is the criminal penalty.

Footnotes at end of speech.

6. *Amalgamated Meatcutters and Butcher Workmen of North America* v. *National Labor Relations Board*, 352 U.S. 153 (December 10, 1956): An officer of plaintiff union had been convicted of filing a false non-Communist affidavit. The Board issued an order directing the employer to correct an unfair labor practice. The court of appeal refused to enforce this order on the ground that the union was not in compliance with the act and thus not entitled to its benefits. The Supreme Court reversed, reiterating the view stated in the Leedom case that the sole penalty for false filing of a non-Communist affidavit is the criminal penalty.

7. *Gold* v. *U.S.*, 350 U.S. 985 (January 28, 1957): Defendant president of a labor union was convicted of having filed a false non-Communist affidavit with the N.L.R.B. On defendant's appeal to the U.S. court of appeals the conviction was affirmed. It appeared that an FBI agent investigating another similar case telephoned or visited three members of the jury during defendant's trial and inquired whether they had received any propaganda literature. The issue reaching the Supreme Court was whether the impact of these contacts on the jurors was so prejudicial as to require reversal. The Court so held in a per curiam opinion. Four justices dissented on the ground that no effect upon the jurors adverse to the defendant could reasonably be anticipated by virtue of the accidental intrusion on their privacy.

8. *U.S.* v. *Witkovich*, 353 U.S. 194 (April 29, 1957): The Immigrational and Nationality Act of 1952 requires that an alien against whom a deportation order has been outstanding for more than 6 months shall be required "to give information under oath as to his nationality, circumstances, habits, associations, and activities, and such other information, whether or not related to the foregoing, as the Attorney General may deem fit and proper." Appellee being an alien against whom a deportation order had been outstanding for more than 6 months refused to answer questions put to him by the appropriate immigration authorities regarding his present Communist relationships. He was indicted under the criminal provisions of the act. The Supreme Court held, 6 to 2, that the statute authorized only questions reasonably calculated to keep the Attorney General advised regarding the continued availability for departure of aliens whose deportation is overdue and ruled for dismissal of the indictment. Two justices dissented expressing the view that under the statute an alien could properly be questioned as to activities indicated by past conduct and that the statute raised no constitutional question.

9. *Schware* v. *Board of Examiners of New Mexico*, 353 U.S. 232 (May 6, 1957): Schware's application to take the New Mexico bar examination was denied on the ground that petitioner had not shown good moral character in view of his past membership in the Communist Party, his use of aliases and his record of arrests. Schware, unlike other individuals, did not invoke the fifth amendment and was frank and candid with regard to his past Communist activities. While the petitioner made out a good case on his conversion from Communist ideology, nevertheless the decision casts grave doubt on the propriety of the Supreme Court to substitute its standard of fitness for the bar of New Mexico in place of the standard established by the bar and the courts of New Mexico. The Supreme Court reversed the State Supreme Court of New Mexico holding that Schware's exclusion violated due process, stating that the record did not support the State court's conclusion that petitioner had not shown good moral character.

10. *Konigsberg* v. *State Bar of California*, 353 U.S. 252 (May 6, 1957): Petitioner refused to answer questions as to present and past membership in the Communist Party put to him by the California State bar examiners. He was thereupon refused admission to the bar on the grounds that he had failed to prove that he was of good moral character and did not advocate the overthrow of the Federal or State governments by unconstitutional means. Five Justices of the Supreme Court overruled the California Supreme Court holding that petitioner's right of due process had been violated since the evidence did not rationally support the finding that he had failed to prove that he was of good moral character and that he did not advocate the overthrow of the Federal or State government by force and violence. Two Justices dissented on the ground that refusal to answer questions relevant to fitness without constitutional justification justified the committee's refusal to certify petitioner for admission to the bar. One Justice dissented on procedural grounds. (This decision is the greatest inroad on the traditional right of each State to establish its standard of fitness for its own bar and was severely criticized by former President David F. Maxwell in his annual address to this association.)

11. *Jencks* v. *U.S.*, 353 U.S. 657 (June 3, 1957): An officer of a labor union was indicted for filing a false non-Communist affidavit with the NLRB. At his trial he filed a motion requesting an inspection of reports made to the FBI by Government witnesses as to event and activities to which they had testified at the trial. His motion was denied and he was convicted. The U.S. Supreme Court overturned this conviction, five Justices concurring, stating that the defendant was entitled to examine these reports. The former practice of submitting Government documents to the trial judge for his determination of relevancy and materiality was disapproved and the Court held that if the Government wished to exercise its privilege to withhold the reports in the public interest then the criminal action must be dismissed. Three Justices dissented in part, holding that the documents should be produced for the examination of the trial court in camera to determine their relevancy as well as the applicability of the Government's claim of privilege in the public interest. One Justice dissented en toto.

12. *Service* v. *Dulles*, 354 U.S. 363 (June 17, 1957): Plaintiff, a foreign service officer, was on numerous occasions investigated as to loyalty and standing as a security risk. These investigations involved extensive hearings. In the most recent one the State Department gave him clearance and this action was approved by the Deputy Under Secretary. However, on a post audit the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission made unfavorable findings and recommended his discharge. The Secretary of State accepted these findings without making an independent review of the evidence. The U.S. Supreme Court reversed the action of the Secretary of State and of two Federal courts holding that Dulles' action was in violation of the loyalty and security regulations under which the Secretary of State was bound to make an independent determination after a review of the evidence.

13. *Yates* v. *U.S.*, 354 U.S. 298 (June 17, 1957): Defendants were charged with conspiring to advocate and teach the forcible overthrow of the Government of the United States and to organize as the Communist Party of the United States, a society of persons who so advocate and teach, all in violation of the Federal Smith Act. The Supreme Court reversed convictions in two lower Federal courts and held that teaching and advocating the abstract doctrine of the forcible overthrow of the U.S. Government was not punishable under the Smith Act as long as it was "divorced from any effort to instigate action to that end." The Court further held that the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act referred only to acts entering into the creation of a new organization and stated that since the Communist Party was organized in 1945 and the indictment not returned until 1951, that the prosecution on this charge was barred by the 3-year statute of limitations. This decision is characterized by numerous partial dissents and partial concurrences on the part of the various justices. Two justices in dissent stated that overt acts in furtherance of the conspiracy could be proved from the record.

14. *Raley, Stern & Brown* v. *Ohio* (354 U.S. 929): The Supreme Court vacated the judgment of the Ohio Supreme Court and remanded for consideration in the light of *Sweezy* v. *N.H.*, a case concerning the conviction of three men who had refused to answer questions about Communist activities put to them by the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission. One justice dissented for the reasons stated in his dissenting opinions in Sweezy and Watkins and another justice dissented indicating his desire to note probable jurisdiction and set the case for argument. On remand the Ohio Supreme Court reiterated its earlier conviction and the case is once more pending appeal.

15. *Sweezy* v. *New Hampshire* (354 U.S. 234 (June 17, 1957)): In the course of an investigation of subversive activities in New Hampshire a witness refused to answer questions concerning a lecture given by him at the State university and questions concerning the Progressive Party and its adherents asked by the New Hampshire attorney general acting as a one-man legislative committee. The Supreme Court reversed the contempt conviction by the State court, four justices basing their decision on the ground that the State legislature had not made clear in the authorizing legislation that it desired the information sought by the attorney general and deemed the lack of authorization to be a lack of authority on the part of the attorney general. Two justices dissented from this reasoning saying that the distribution of powers on the State level is not a matter of Federal concern, but concurred in the result on the ground that the State had failed to show that the protection of State interests justified the invasion of the witness' constitutionally protected academic and political freedoms. Two justices dissented from the result in its entirety.

16. *Slochower* v. *Board of Education of the City of New York* (350 U.S. 551 (April 9, 1956)): Under the terms of a New York City charter provision which had been long in effect a City College professor was discharged without notice or hearing for claiming his privilege against self-incrimination when asked about Communist Party membership by a congressional committee investigating matters of national security. It seemed that the professor had answered similar questions put by a State investigating body and that this information was in the hands of city authorities at the time of his discharge. The Supreme Court reversed the decisions of three New York courts and held that this automatic discharge was unconstitutional because of alleged lack of due process. Four justices dissented.

17. *United Mine Workers* v. *Arkansas Oak Flooring Co.*, 351 U.S. 62 (Apr. 23, 1956): Louisiana State courts had enjoined picketing by a union which had failed to file the non-Communist affidavits and other data required by the National Labor Relations Act. The Supreme Court held that the State courts had no power to enjoin the picketing on the ground that while the union could not resort to the N.L.R.B. because of its failure to comply with the filing requirements, it could nevertheless take other lawful action, e.g. peaceful picketing. One justice dissented on the ground that the said act contained no implied limitation on the State power exercised under these facts.

18. *Sacher* v. *U.S.*, 78 S. Ct. 842 (May 19, 1958): Sacher refused to answer three questions put to him by a subcommittee of the Internal Security Subcomittee of the Senate

Committee on the Judiciary. His contempt conviction was upheld by the Court of Appeals. The Supreme Court remanded the case for reconsideration in the light of *Watkins* v. *U.S.* The case was reargued before the Court of Appeals and the conviction reaffirmed. The Supreme Court again reversed the order of conviction and found that questions relating to proposed legislation barring Communists from practice at the Federal bar constituted an excursion outside the committee's authorized scope of inquiry. The grant of certiorari and reversal order were made at the same time and in the same per curiam decision. Two justices dissented on the grounds that the questions were pertinent to the authorized inquiry and that the court had refused to hear argument from Government attorneys.

19. *Kent & Briehl* v. *Dulles*, 78 S. Ct. 1113 (June 16, 1958): The Secretary of State turned down passport applications of Kent and Briehl on the grounds that they were Communists and that they had had constant and prolonged adherence to the Communist Party line. The Supreme Court reversed two lower Federal courts and held that since statutes provided that it is unlawful for a citizen to enter or leave the United States without a valid passport, the Secretary of State did not have authority to promulgate regulations denying passports to Communists or to persons whom evidence showed were going abroad to further Communist causes, or regulations demanding non-Communist affidavits from citizens applying for passports. Three justices dissented in all regards stating that the Secretary of State's passport power permitted the regulations in question.

20. *Dayton* v. *Dulles*, 78 S. Ct. 1127 (June 16, 1958): Dayton, a native born citizen, is a physicist who has been connected with various Federal projects. He applied for a passport to enable him to travel to India in order to accept a position as a research physicist there. This application was turned down by the Secretary of State for three reasons: (1) His alleged association with various Communists, (2) associations with persons suspected of being part of the Rosenberg espionage ring, (3) his alleged presence in an apartment in New York which was allegedly used for microfilming material obtained for the use of a foreign government. Basing its reasoning on *Kent* v. *Dulles*, the Supreme Court overruled two lower Federal courts and held that the passport could not be denied to a U.S. citizen on the ground that it was believed he was going abroad to engage in activities which would advance the Communist movement. Four justices dissented on the same grounds as the dissent in *Kent* v. *Dulles*.

21. *Yates* v. *U.S.*, 78 S. Ct. 128 (November 25, 1957): Yates and 13 others were indicted and convicted of conspiring to violate the Smith Act. In the course of the trial Yates refused to answer 11 questions relating to whether other persons were members of the Communist Party. The trial court held her in contempt for each refusal and imposed 11 concurrent sentences of 1 year each. Supreme Court reversed two lower Federal courts holding that this action constituted an improper multiplication of contempts because the witness when first inquiry was made stated that she would not identify any Communist Party members. The Supreme Court reversed all but the first conviction which was vacated and remanded for resentencing "in the cool reflection of subsequent events." Three justices dissented to the remand of the first conviction holding that all the convictions should be thrown out.

22. *Bonetti* v. *Rogers*, 78 S.C. 976 (June 2, 1958): Bonetti was an alien admitted to the United States for permanent residence in 1923 who joined the Communist Party in 1932 and left it in 1936. In 1937 he went to Spain to fight the Spanish Civil War. In 1938 he returned and was admitted for permanent residence as a quota immigrant and thereafter continued to reside in the United States, except for a 1-day visit to Mexico in 1939. The Internal Security Act of 1950 provides for deportation of any alien who was at the time of entry into the United States, or has been "at any time" thereafter a member of the Communist Party. The Supreme Court reversed two lower Federal courts and held that plaintiff's time of entry for purposes of the act was 1938 not 1923, and not having been a party member then or subsequently, was not deportable. Three justices dissented stating that this construction deletes the phrase "at any time" out of the act and reads the word "last" into the statute and thereby "cripples the effectiveness of the act."

23. *Flaxer* v. *U.S.*, 79 S. Ct. 191 (December 15, 1958): Flaxer was convicted of contempt of Congress and failing to produce pursuant to a subpena duces tecum issued by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee records of his union showing names and addresses of members employed by the Federal, State, or local government. The Supreme Court remanded the case for reconsideration in the light of Watkins. Upon reaffirmation of Flaxer's conviction the Supreme Court reversed on the ground that the indictment named October 5, 1951, as the date of contempt when actually the subcommittee had given him 10 days from that date in which to comply. The Court states "Yet for all we know, a witness who was adamant and defiant on October 5 might be meek and submissive on October 15."

24. *Uphaus* v. *Wyman*, 355 U.S. 16 (1957) (pending): Appellant Uphaus appealed from affirmance by the New Hampshire Supreme Court of his conviction of contempt of court for refusing on grounds of the first amendment to produce in response to subpena duces tecum, a guest list and certain correspondence with speakers at World Fellowship, Inc., a summer camp in Albany, N.H., of which appellant was executive director. The documents were subpenaed by a State legislative committee in the course of a State investigation of subversive activities. The U.S. Supreme Court without hearing argument on October 14, 1957, vacated the judgment of the New Hampshire Supreme Court and remanded the case for further consideration in light of *Sweezy* v. *N.H.*, whereupon the New Hampshire Supreme Court reaffirmed its former decision and appellant again appealed. This case was argued before the U.S. Supreme Court on November 15, 1958, and a further decision is now pending.

The Sheiner case (Florida). In accordance with the resolution of the house of delegates and authorization of the board of governors, our committee—on the request of the State attorney for cooperation—applied for and obtained permission to appear as amicus curiae in the appeal pending in the Supreme Court of Florida from the order of dismissal of the disciplinary proceedings against Leo Sheiner. Leo Sheiner had twice previously been ordered disbarred by the Circuit Court of Florida.

Our committee prepared and submitted a brief to the supreme court of Florida in which its views were set forth with relation to the duty of the bar and of the courts concerning the responsibilities in maintaining the high standards of fitness required of lawyers. The committee further defined its concept of an acceptable standard for attorneys. Any member of the bar who, in appropriate proceedings persists in refusal to answer pertinent questions concerning his activities in the Communist Party or Communist-dominated fronts on the ground that his answers to such questions concerning his activities might tend to incriminate him is unfit. It is inconceivable to us that an attorney and officer of the court may continue in good standing while he pleads self-incrimination in refusing to answer questions relating to subversive activities.

The brief pointed out that labor union officials, teachers, Government employees, and employees of private industry, have been safeguarded in invoking the fifth amendment to inquiries which might tend to incriminate them. However, in so doing, they demonstrate lack of candor required of attorneys and forfeit their positions of trust and responsibility. The Sheiner case is most important to the bar. Other States having such problems await the final decision.

The appeal was argued before the supreme court of Florida on February 8, 1958. Julius Applebaum, a member of our committee, argued as amicus curiae for this association. On July 24, 1958, the court ordered further argument on September 5, 1958, and requested supplemental briefs as to the application of three decisions, *Max Lerner* v. *Hugh J. Casey, et al.; Herman A. Beilan* v. *Board of Public Education, School District of Philadelphia;* and *Milton Knapp* v. *Mitchell D. Schweitzer, et al.*, rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court on June 30, 1958. Our committee prepared a supplemental brief on behalf of the association and participated in the supplemental argument. As of this writing, the supreme court of Florida has not yet rendered its decision. The committee is willing to appear in similar cases upon direction of the house of delegates or board of governors.

In sharp contrast to the due process afforded Sheiner is the Associated Press dispatch of September 16, 1958. By decree of the Communist regime in Hungary, 3,500 lawyers were disbarred. They were deemed to lack approved political qualifications.

COMMUNIST TACTICS

The Communists have set forth their master plan of world conquest even more forthrightly than did Hitler in "Mein Kampf." The Communist Manifesto is specific: "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forceable overthrow of all existing social conditions."[8] Communists have never deviated from the theory enunciated by Marx and the strategy devised by Lenin.

The Communist master plan for world conquest has been outlined by both Lenin and Stalin as entailing the violent smashing and overthrow of all non-Soviet governments, including those of Great Britain and the United States. Prior to this overthrow and to prepare for it in each instance, the Communist Party is to make "transmission belts" of all possible nonparty agencies for the diffusion of the Communist line, weakening the country to be overthrown. Already this has become a historical fact to which once free peoples, now enslaved, can testify. Need we have more evidence of Soviet intent?

During the last 25 years, the United States has participated in hundreds of meetings with the Communists, including those held at Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjom, and Geneva. All this talk has led to many major agreements and Soviet Russia has broken almost all of them. The Communists have followed Lenin's dictum about treaties and agreements: "Promises are like pie crusts—made to be broken."[9]

The United States has met on countless occasions with the Chinese Reds to negotiate the release of American prisoners. The record is a dismal one. In June 1954 a total of 76 Americans were held in Red China. On August 1, 1955, 35 were released. An additional 28 were released at the end of 1955. Since then nine more have been released.

Footnotes at end of speech.

On January 9, 1958, the Reds in China were holding four Americans and in October 1958, had arrested a fifth American, a Roman Catholic priest. The Communists have followed Stalin's principle of diplomatic intercourse:

"Words must have no relation to action—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or iron wood." [10]

HINDSIGHT OR SOUND APPRAISAL

On June 17, 1958, when the Soviet news agency, Tass, announced the executions of former Hungarian Premier Imre Nagy, Gen. Pal Maleter, and two other leaders of the anti-Communist rebellion of 1956, Western leaders expressed shock and dismay. General Maleter, the hero of the rebellion, had been seized by the Soviets when he met with them under a flag of truce to negotiate the withdrawal of the Red army from Budapest. Nagy and his associates were executed, although they had received in advance a written guarantee of safe conduct when they left their asylum in the Yugoslav Embassy.

In March 1945, 16 top leaders of the Polish Government were invited to Moscow to participate in the conduct of negotiations. They were promised on the word of honor of the Soviet Government that they would be afforded safe conduct. All 16 were arrested and then vanished. Nothing further was heard of any of them until 10 years later, when the wife of Gen. Leopold Okulicki was notified of his death 9 years before in a Soviet prison.[11] Since the Katyn Forest massacre, which came to light in 1943 (where thousands of Polish officers who were prisoners of the Soviets were shot and buried in a trench), it has been obvious that coexistence with communism is a contradiction in terms.

Marx and Engels stated this objective in the Communist Manifesto: "The theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property." [12]

Lenin gave this command to Communists: "It is necessary to agree to any and every sacrifice, and even, if need be—to resort to all sorts of stratagems, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge." [13]

On another occasion, Lenin added: "As long as capitalism remains we cannot live in peace. In the end one or the other will triumph—a funeral requiem will be sung over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism." [14]

On September 17, 1955, Nikita Khrushchev warned us: "If anyone thinks that our smiles mean the abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he is deceiving himself cruelly. Those who expect this to happen might just as well wait for a shrimp to learn how to whistle." [15]

Khrushchev made this statement to Western diplomats at a Moscow reception on November 18, 1956: "If you don't like us, don't accept our invitations and don't invite us to come to see you. Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you." [16]

Khrushchev appeared on our American television screens on June 2, 1957, and confidently told us: "Your grandchildren will live under socialism."

William Z. Foster dedicated his book "The Twilight of World Capitalism," to his great-grandson, "who will live in a Communist United States."

The key to Communist tactics is the dialectic, expressed through what is known as historical materialism. By constant examination of the directive documents which flow from Moscow to the Communist Parties of the world, and adapted in turn by them to the conditions of each country, we see the dialectic at work through the Communist line.

Under the theory of the dialectic, as it allegedly works in society and history, the triumph of the world Soviet dictatorship or socialism, leading to world communism, is inevitable. No action of any human agency can halt this fatalistic process. But it is not a progress that is made on a straight line or even on a curve; it is a zigzag movement due to the struggle of contending forces and their relative strengths from time to time, a course which, however, leads ever onward toward world dictatorship. This results at times in Communist advances, at times in retreats. Each development must be taken advantage of by Red tactics and strategy to forward the course of world dictatorship to the maximum under the prevailing conditions.

Stalin has stated clearly the object of the strategy of retreat or apparent retreat when he says: "The object of this strategy is to gain time, to demoralize the enemy, and to accumulate forces in order later to assume the offensive." [17] This follows Lenin's tactics which have been described in his work "One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward." [18]

The result of the strategy and tactics thus devised, to take into account the relationship of forces at any particular time, is the appearance of forward and backward movements, which are all designed by their zigzag course to lead to furthering Soviet advances. Because of the general lack of knowledge in the United States of these tactics and strategy, as laid down by Lenin and Stalin and summed up in the latter's Foundations of Leninism, the Soviet advance made during the past 25 years has been little less than amazing.

History now records the facts of Communist dialectics at work. Under Stalin the change from hostility to apparent friendship and back to hostility were changes by periods. There was the Hitler-Stalin pact period (time of hostility), the World War II period (time of apparent friendship), and the postwar period (time of hostility again). Under Khrushchev, Stalin was damned, Lenin exalted, and then at a 1957 diplomatic reception Khrushchev switched and said, "God grant that every Communist should fight for the interest of the working class as Stalin did." The Communist strategy under Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev is to use both hot and cold methods at once. Thus in the past few months we have witnessed the shelling of Quemoy and threats to Berlin coupled with cultural exchanges and the trip of Soviet Deputy Premier A. I. Mikoyan. We saw his smiles and snarls. The Communists aim to keep us complacent until the choice is annihilation or surrender, at which time they confidently expect us to submit to a negotiated surrender.

Also during the past year, the Communists went forward with the rocks and garbage thrown at Vice President NIXON in South America; backward with the smiles of Menshikov; forward with the executions of Nagy and Maleter; backward by allowing Tito to make a few anti-Soviet statements; forward with the defeats of anti-Communists in Syria and Indonesia—all with the same unity of purpose that makes everything contribute to their plan of world conquest.

Current Communist tactics include the following:

1. Nullification of the Smith Act and other anti-Communist legislation: FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover testified January 16, 1958, at a House hearing made public in May, that 49 of the 108 Communist leaders convicted by Federal juries under the Smith Act have been set free by Supreme Court decisions.[19] As of January 25, 1959, only 33 convictions of Communists remain as such while of the 108 convicted, 75 have been released. Judge Richard H. Chambers, of the U.S. Court of Appeals, in a decision releasing 11 of these convicted Communists, said that Supreme Court decisions have left the Smith Act, as to any further prosecution under its provisions, a virtual shambles.

J. Edgar Hoover has testified that a top Communist functionary described the Supreme Court decision in the Smith Act case of June 17, 1957, as the greatest victory the Communist Party in America has ever received.[20] The Daily Worker summed up the Yates, Watkins, and other cases of that same day in these words: "The curtain is closing on one of our worst periods." [21] The Sunday Worker of May 11, 1958, contains strong opposition to any legislation to overcome the Supreme Court's rulings on internal security.

Other anti-Communist laws which have been targets of the Communist Party and which are now nullified or weakened by the judicial decisions are the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, the anti-sedition laws of 43 States, and Hawaii, key security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, and the Summary Suspension Act of 1950.

2. Muzzling the FBI and congressional investigations: For years the Communist Party has poured out its most hysterical language against that which the Reds call the Gestapolike FBI, and congressional inquisitions and witch hunts. This tactic has been so successful that it is now said that the Communists don't have to tell congressional committees anything. The effectiveness of the Communist propaganda machine is attested to by the frequency of attacks from sources of presumed respectability. It is significant to note the similarity of these so-called respectable verbal and written brickbats with Communist poisoned darts. As the world Communist onslaught continues, an intensification of attacks on the FBI, congressional committees and indeed all other effective anti-Communist forces can be expected. In fact an excellent criteria of the effectiveness of any group which labors to preserve the American way of life is the intensity of Communist and radical attacks directed at them.

Judge Robert Morris, chief counsel for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee for 6 years, said: "The power of the Congress to learn the underlying facts of the [Communist] conspiracy has been hamstrung since the decision in the Watkins case."

There appears to us to be little question that the dicta in such cases as Watkins and Sweezy have compounded the difficulties of investigating committees in the security field. Witnesses, dominated by the Communist Party, have used the dicta to impede the function of Congress in its legislative responsibility. On this basis Communists have adopted the tactic of invoking the first amendment rather than the fifth amendment in refusing to answer obviously pertinent and important questions.

In the first session of Congress subsequent to the Watkins decision, hearings by the House Un-American Activities Committee was practically brought to a halt and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee suffered a similar plight. On July 5, 1958, the press reported that congressional investigations into the Communist conspiracy have reached an all-time low for the last two decades. However, committee files are bulging with data on the conspiracy which are crying for exploration to form the basis for corrective legislation.

The experience of France, and more particularly Germany, show the danger of restricting legislative investigations.[22] Bismarck so feared the power of parliamentary investigation that he dissolved the Prussian Parliament when it attempted to assert its right of investigation. Historians agree that the lack of legislative investigation was the greatest single cause for the authorization of Imperial Germany.

Footnotes at end of speech.

When the Weimar Republic was created, article 34 of the Constitution granted the Reichstag the power "to appoint investigating committtees." When the Reichstag attempted to exercise its constiutional right, the German Constitutional Court, in two key cases, narrowed the scope of parliamentary inquiry so considerably that the investigating powers of the Reichstag were inadequate to its tasks. As a result, the Reichstag never exposed the Nazi, purges by Hitler, concentration camps, and secret police. The success of the Nazi conspiracy taught the German Supreme Court a lesson. On August 17, 1956, it handed down a scholarly 375-page opinion which outlawed all activities of the Communist conspiracy in West Germany.

Notwithstanding some mistakes—fewer than generally charged—the service to our country by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Un-American Activities Committee has been incalculable and worthy of far greater praise than has been accorded to them. The Communist and radical propaganda against these committees has never subsided. Our committee, therefore, recommends the adoption of Resolution V.

This committee has been astonished to read the proposal to the Congress that one of its committees charged with investigating National and State security and Communist activities be discontinued. We regard any attempt to terminate or to curtail the work of the committee of each House charged with this vital duty as a distinct disservice to the Nation.

3. Ultimate elimination of Federal and State security programs: This tactic has been successful with regard to nonsensitive positions in Government and evidence is abundant that the Communist conspiracy considers nonsensitive positions vitally important. Government employment is not a right but a privilege.

4. Communism is worldwide in its scope of operations which require travel on the part of its propaganda and espionage agents: For this reason Communists and their dupes aided by innocents have long been carrying on a vigorous campaign to break down, or weaken, passport control in the United States. Meanwhile, they maintain strict controls in the Soviet Union, Red China, and other satellite countries.

5. The peace offensive: On April 1, 1951, the House Un-American Activities Committee issued a report called "The Communist Peace Offensive; a Campaign To Disarm and Defeat the United States." This document showed in detail how intellectuals, professors, writers, and others who influence public opinion, were attracted to various Communist peace fronts. This report said: "The most dangerous hoax ever devised by the international Communist conspiracy is the current worldwide peace offensive."

Today, under the slogans "peace" and "peaceful coexistence," we are witnessing an intensification of this Communist peace offensive. The Czechs and Hungarians found that coexistence with communism is enslavement. Peaceful coexistence means Communist conquest without war. In his February 1956 report to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Khrushchev asserted in Aesopian language that peaceful coexistence would lead to the victory of world communism.[23]

Dr. Fred C. Schwarz, in his testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee, has accurately described what the Communists mean by peace. "Every act that contributed to the Communist conquest is a peaceful act. If they take a gun, they take a peaceful gun, containing a peaceful bullet, and kill you peacefully and put you in a peaceful grave. When the Chinese Communists murder millions, it is an act of peace. When the Russian tanks rolled into Budapest to butcher and destroy, it was glorious peace." This is what J. Edgar Hoover calls semantic sabotage.

In describing the recent case involving the Communist spy Rudolph Ivanovich Abel, J. Edgar Hoover testified: "I mention this case particularly, Mr. Chairman, because there are some people who think that the matter of Soviet espionage is a thing of the past and no longer exists in view of the theme of peaceful coexistence the Soviets continue to expound. Many of the incidents in the Abel case occurred in 1957." [24]

We must realize that Communist governments resort to blackmail, counterfeiting, forgery, kidnaping, lying, mass murder, slavery, subversion, theft, and treaty-breaking as part of their official state policy. It is a matter of historical record that the Kremlin blackmailed the Allies into concessions during World War II by threatening to sign a separate peace with Hitler; that Communist governments have counterfeited American money and forged American passports; kidnaped American citizens and held them for ransom; kidnaped 28,000 Greek children in the most cruel mass abduction in modern history; murdered thousands of Polish officer at Katyn Forest,[25] 6,112 American soldiers whom they captured in Korea,[26] and thousands of boys and girls in Hungary; forced millions of Polish, Latvian, Lithuanian, Esthonian, Czech, Hungarian, and Ukrainian citizens to work as slave laborers in Siberia; stole 600 tons of gold bars worth $600 million from the Government in Spain in 1936; [27] destroyed by subversion the postwar Republics of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland; and violated 50 of their last 52 treaties.

6. Summit conference: Pressures exercised to influence the President of the United States to arrange for a summit conference with Khrushchev are unfortunate. Such pressures have been applied by friendly nations and by some inexperienced but well-meaning citizens. Communists have the most deplorable record in all history for violation of sacred treaties. It is the policy of Communists to promise anything and to perform nothing unless it serves their immediate needs. Communists should first demonstrate by concrete actions their good faith in their stated desire for peace. Without such evidence of good faith any conference becomes merely a Communist vehicle for their propaganda purposes. It is hopeless and futile to rely upon voluntary compliance with treaties by Communists. The Communists, through Khrushchev can free East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other enslaved nations and thus demonstrate in 24 hours their good faith and a true desire for peaceful coexistence.

Experts on communism testified before the U.S. House Un-American Activities Committee on April 30, 1958, that the Kremlin looks upon a summit conference solely as another weapon in its program for global conquest. Time will tell us the influence which the Soviet Deputy Premier A. I. Mikoyan, in his open sesame tour of the United States last January has exerted to entrap the United States into another summit conference.

7. Cultural exchanges: Nikita Khrushchev's famous report of 1956 lists cultural and business exchanges as one of these developments which will bring about the growing weakness of the United States and advance world socialism. On June 2, 1957, Khrushchev appeared on American television screens and called for a wider exchange of cultural delegations.

On December 22, 1957, the Communist Daily Worker desecrated the greatest religious holiday in Christendom by declaring that perhaps the best Christmas present Santa Clause will bestow on America will be the widespread cultural exchange of certain Americans with Soviet agents coming to this country.

On January 27, 1958, the United States signed a 2-year agreement with the Soviet Union for the exchange of persons in the cultural, scientific, technical, and educational fields. The primary activity of every one of Moscow's cultural delegates while in this country is to promote the Communist world revolution. E. H. Cookridge, former British Secret Service agent and an authority on Soviet espionage, had this to say: "Every Soviet football team, every athlete competing at an international sport event, Soviet scientists attending a congress abroad, the Moscow Ballet performing in a western capital or a group of Soviet artists at a film festival are invariably accompanied by special agents of the Soviet secret police. Judge Robert Morris, who has spent the last 17 years intensively studying and exposing the Communist conspiracy, said: "In past years of the exchange, secret police have passed as farmers, ice skaters, clergymen, and scientists, for the purpose of conducting espionage operation in this country." Prof. Seymour Mellman, of Columbia University, at a disarmament conference held in Washington, D.C., on January 23, 1959, stated (as reported in the Washington Daily News of that date) that: "Owing to the possibility of moving nuclear warheads in small containers, it is not excluded that the principal cities of the world may already be mined with atomic warheads and their appropriate firing devices." Under these circumstances, what guarantee do we have that Soviet visitors may not engage in such destructive practices? AFL–CIO President George Meany said, on cultural exchanges: "No believer in the basic principles of free trade unionism could today conceivably desecrate these principles by undertaking to visit a country whose tyrannical leadership has for the 40 years of its existence been the avowed and uncompromising enemy of all human rights."

Cultural exchange with Soviet Russia should not be a one-way street. There can be no doubt that understanding could come from an honest two-way cultural exchange program where there is a full disclosure of the identities of visitors to any country. So when a Mikoyan visits the United States, those who fete him should know who he is and that for which he stands.

The responsible Newsweek magazine has this to say about Mikoyan in its issue of January 12, 1959: "Mikoyan is one of the butchers of Budapest. It was he who helped engineer the great double-cross that crushed the Hungarian revolt in October 1956. To lull the leaders of the revolt Mikoyan endorsed Imre Nagy as the new premier; at the same time, he made plans for the Communist puppet Janos Kador to take over. His promise to withdraw the Russian forces from Hungary lured Nagy's Defense Minister to a meeting where Soviet troops could arrest him."

Henry A. Wallace, in a frank article published in 1952, related that he did not realize during his tour of Soviet Russia how the Communists were making feverish efforts to hoodwink him. Wallace said that it was only much later that he learned how a Communist slave labor camp had been transformed into a show city, with prisoners herded out of sight and watchtowers torn down, merely to deceive the American Vice President. Elinor Lipper verifies this in her book "Eleven Years in Soviet Prison Camps." As a prisoner in a slave camp visited by Wallace, she gives an inside account of how American tourists in Russia are deceived.

8. Recognition of Red China: Much of the propaganda in this country which supports recognition of Red China is Communist-inspired or encouraged. Diplomatic recognition is helpful to Communist subversion. The Communist espionage apparatus uses

Footnotes at end of speech.

the diplomatic immunity of its embassies and consulates to establish spy centers. It requires the unbroken seal of the diplomatic pouch to transmit orders to its spies and to receive in turn their reports and microfilmed documents.

The Red diplomatic apparatus functions are described in detail in the report of the Canadian Royal Commission [28] which investigated code clerk Igor Gouzenko's revelations. They may be found, too, in the Report of the Australian Royal Commission [29] which investigated Embassy Secretary Vladimir Petrov's confession. They are told as well in the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee investigation of U.S. Communists working for the U.N.[30] conducted by Senator Herbert O'Conor, immediate past chairman of this committee:

That Red China will model her tactics after the tactics of Soviet Russia is made clear by the statement of Premier Chou En-lai in the Communist magazine International Affairs:

"The great Communist Party of China, organized by progressive elements of the Chinese people, was founded and developed under the influence of the October revolution, and was modeled on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." [31]

The most important loss that would be sustained by our recognition of Red China would be (1) the prestige that the Communist Regime would attain therefrom and (2) the demoralization of and hurt to the free nations—particularly in Asia. Moreover, can we give recognition to a government that is presently destroying the very fabric of human relations—the family—and enslaving its people in the manner that even the Communist rulers in Russia have not dared attempt? Responsible governments of free nations still have some responsibility to mankind and civilization. History has shown the recognition of the Soviet Union to have been a grievous error. We should not repeat that error with Red China.

9. Halt nuclear tests: The Communist tactic to obtain an agreement with the West halting nuclear tests is similar to Soviet exploitation of the agreement made at panmunjom, namely not to rearm the North and South Koreans with jet planes and other modern weapons. The Soviets promptly violated this agreement. Then they violated its inspection clause by refusing to permit the neutral inspection team to inspect North Korean airfields.

The suspension of nuclear tests without complete inspection would result in the U.S. termination of testing. However, within the vast, isolated Soviet land mass, there would be a circumvention of this ban on testing.

10. East-West trade: Khrushchev's report of February 14, 1956, before the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union calls for East-West trade; [32] and this has been a part of the Communist line for many years. Foreign trade, to a Communist country is a political weapon to be turned on and off in accordance with its military strategy as a means of waging cold war. It is a means of obtaining from the outside world the strategic materials with which it can arm itself for world conquest. Trading with the Communist bloc would be a psychological as well as a military defeat for the United States. The goods we might sell to the Communist bloc will be used against us just as the superb Rolls-Royce jet engines sold to Russia were used to power the Mig 15's against us in Korea.

In May 1958, Khrushchev sent an 8-page letter to President Eisenhower in which he brazenly suggested that the United States grant Soviet Russia long-term dollar credits in order to finance trade with the United States. We would not gain by trading our machinery for Soviet IOU's or even Russia's raw materials. The Senate report on the "Accessibility of Strategic and Critical Materials" issued July 9, 1954, shows that the Western Hemisphere contains all the 77 critical and strategic materials needed for military security. The bait of foreign trade is held out with the objective of developing pro-Soviet sympathy within the United States and thus undermining our national unity.[33]

11. Propaganda: Communists are spending billions annually on propaganda around the world and it is reaching every city and hamlet in our Nation. This propaganda comes not only from the Soviet Union but also from Red China, from Iron Curtain countries, and from Western Europe. Much additional Red propaganda is published in the United States by Communist publishers.

12. Humiliation: The Communists use the tactic of humiliation. This tactic had already been used by the Communists on American prisoners in Korea. Communists have been active in supporting insulting demonstrations all over South America. On July 18, 1958, a mob of 100,000 Communists gathered in front of the American Embassy in Moscow and threw ink bottles and stones which shattered many of the windows on the first five floors. There has been a wave of demonstrations against the American information agencies in various parts of the world, accompanied by burnings of the American libraries. A number of Americans are being held captive behind the Iron Curtain.

13. The Communist tactic of vilification: One of the most constantly used tactics and tools of the Communists—and those deliberately aiding them, or misled by them—is the effort to defame, destroy or becloud the reputation of anyone—whatever his position or standing—who exposes or fights communism. No regard for truth is ever permitted to halt such campaign. Lies and half-truths are effective with the unthinking of the indifferent.

Example after example can be cited. Every member of congressional investigating committees has been the victim of this tactic. The FBI and its dedicated Director have been a prime target—and will continue to be so long as they are effective in combating communism. Every judge who did not respond to their arguments became a subject for this tactic.

The irony of fate has frequently decreed that this tactic be used by ruling Communists—temporarily in power—against their Comrade-rulers of yesterday when the simple struggle for power makes their comradeships a threat within the ruling clique. The guillotine of office or rank—followed by the routine, groveling, demoralizing confession is frequently not enough. The campaign of vilification and defamation must still be pursued. The degradation of Communists knows no bottom.

We plead with the bar—its leaders and members and the American people to understand this prime tactic of Communists and not to be misled by it. When the bar thinks and American agency or public official on Communist tastics, strategy, and objecerican way by going first to the public official or responsible administrator and call the facts to his attention. Perhaps there is another side to the issue. Those who charge violation of due process can strengthen their position by first practicing the principles of due process. When the enforcement machinery of our State, county, municipal, or Federal Government comes under unjust attack it is the duty of members of the bar as community leaders to come to their defense.

With each succeeding act of Soviet bad faith many western spokesmen express surprise. When anti-Communists reply "You should have expected this," the politically naive make a common rejoinder: "That is mere hindsight; no one could have predicted that the Communists could be that bad." It is appropriate to point out that informed anti-Communists have always known and publicly stated that it is impossible to negotiate with international communism.

It was not hindsight, it was sound appraisal when Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby said on August 10, 1920:

"The existing regime in Russia is based upon the negation of every principle of honor and good faith. * * * The responsible leaders of the regime have frequently and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings or carrying out such agreements. * * * Upon numerous occasions the responsible spokesmen of this power, and its official agencies, have declared that it is their understanding that the very existence of bolshevism in Russia, the maintenance of their own rule, depends, and must continue to depend, upon the occurrence of revolutions in all other great civilized nations, including the United States, which will overthrow and destroy their governments and set up Bolshevist rule in their stead. They have made it quite plain that they intend to use every means, including, of course, diplomatic agencies, to promote such revolutionary movements in other countries. * * * We cannot recognize, hold official relations with, or give friendly reception to the agents of a government which is determined and bound to conspire against our institutions; whose diplomats will be the agitators of dangerous revolt; whose spokesmen say that they sign agreements with no intention of keeping them." [34]

It was not hindsight, but sound appraisal when Secretary of States Charles Evans Hughes stated on March 21, 1923:

"We are just as anxious in this Department and in every branch of the administration as you can possibly be, to promote peace in the world, to get rid of hatred, to have a spirit of mutual understanding, but the world we desire is a world not threatened with the destructive propaganda of the Soviet authorities, and one in which there will be good faith and the recognition of obligations and a sound basis of international intercourse." [35]

It was not hindsight, it was sound appraisal when Robert F. Kelley, Chief of the Division of Eastern European Affairs in the Department of State, wrote in a memorandum dated July 27, 1933:

"The fundamental obstacle in the way of the establishment with Russia of the relations usual between nations in diplomatic intercourse is the world revolutionary aims and practices of the rulers of that country.

"It is obvious that, so long as the Communist regime continues to carry on in other countries activities designed to bring about ultimately the overthrow of the government and institutions of these countries, the establishment of genuine friendly relations between Russia and those countries is out of the question." [36]

It was not hindsight, it was sound appraisal when U.S. Ambassador to Moscow Laurence Steinhardt reported, on June 17, 1941:

"My observation of the psychology of the individuals who are conducting Soviet foreign policy has long since conviced me that they do not and cannot be induced to reopen to the customary amenities, that it is not possible to create 'international good will' with them, that they will always sacrifice the future in favor of an immediate gain, and that they are not affected by ethical or moral considerations nor guided by the relationships which are customary between individuals of culture and breeding. Their psychology recognizes only firmness, power and force, and reflects primitive instincts and reactions entirely devoid of the restraints

Footnotes at end of speech.

of civilization. I am of the opinion that they must be dealt with on this basis and on this basis alone." [37]

CURRENT FALLACIES ABOUT COMMUNISM

So much misinformation is current about communism that it is appropriate to expose some of the major fallacies.

1. "Communism in the United States is dwindling in power because the party is dwindling in numbers."

This popular belief shows a complete misunderstanding of Leninism. Lenin's great contribution to communism was his principle of the dedicated few. He coined the expression "the fewer, the better." He originated the party of professional revolutionaries subject to military discipline. He rejected the idea of a popular party, and enunciated the principle that no one should be given party membership unless he was under discipline. This is how Lenin was able to establish communism in Russia with only a handful of supporters and later to take over Russia with only 40,000 followers.

It is just as false to measure the strength of communism in the United States by comparing the small number of party members with the large number of non-Communists, as it would be to measure the seaworthiness of a ship by comparing the area of its holes with the area of its hull. A few strategically placed holes can sink the largest ship.

A substantial strength of communism in the United States is the number of non-Communist organizations and individuals who will collaborate with the Communists. For every Communist Party member, there may be 10 non-Communists who will do the work of the Communists.

The Communists have had hundreds of fronts. In addition, they have fronts in front of the fronts. Making use of their fellow travelers and dupes, plus their united front tactic, the Communists boast they can have 50,000 letters on any issue sent to Capitol Hill or the White House inside of 72 hours.

The strength of the Communist Party was succinctly dealt with by J. Edgar Hoover in his book "Masters of Deceit" where on page 5 he states:

"The party's membership in this country reached a low in 1930 when it had 7,500 members, and a peak of 80,000 in 1944: Its membership at 5-year intervals since 1930 has been as follows: 1935, 30,000; 1940, 55,000 (a drop of 15,000 from 1939); 1945, 64,600 (a drop of 15,400 from 1944); 1950, 43,200; 1955, 22,600; and by the summer of 1957 membership had further declined.

"Fluctuations in the American Party parallel those in foreign countries. The record clearly establishes that Communist Parties have the power of swift and solid growth when the opportunity arises. The following figures reflect how party membership can dwindle and then spurt.

"In Italy, party membership went from 6,000 in 1943 to 2,500,000 in 1951; in France, from 20,000 in 1929 to 400,000 in 1956; in Syria, from 250 in 1931 to 10,000 in 1956; in Brazil, from 25,000 in late 1947 to 100,000 in 1956; and in Indonesia, from 30,000 in 1953 to 500,000 in 1956.

"When the Communist Party was at its peak in the United States it was stronger in numbers than the Soviet Party was at the time it seized power in Russia.

"The size of the party in various Soviet satellites at the time each came under Soviet control discloses how a well-organized band of revolutionaries can impose its rule over the majority population."

2. "The Communist Party is just another political party."

It has been established by the hearings of the Subversive Activities Control Board in 1951 and 1952, by 20 years of investigation by congressional committees, and by the prior decisions of the Supreme Court in *Dennis* v. *United States* [38] and in *American Communications Association* v. *Douds*,[39] that the Communist Party, U.S.A. is not just a minor political party like the Prohibition Party. In the Dennis case, Chief Justice Vinson rightly described the Communist Party as "a highly organized conspiracy, with rigidly disciplined members subject to call when the leaders, these petitioners, felt that the time had come for action."

	Date of Communist takeover	Communist Party membership on that date	Population on that date
Bulgaria	September 1945	20,000	7,020,000
Rumania	March 1945	800,000	16,409,000
Poland	January 1949	1,000,000	25,225,000
Czechoslovakia	May 1948	1,329,000	12,338,000
Hungary	August 1947	750,000	9,383,000
Albania	December 1945	12,000	1,120,000
Yugoslavia	Mid-1945	141,000	14,500,000

Like an iceberg, eight-ninths of the Communist Party has always been underground. The crypto-Communists who carry no cards, and whose names appear on no party records, are the most dangerous Communists. Top Communist agents such as Klaus Fuchs, Guy Burgess, and Donald MacLean never marched in a May day parade, never carried a hammer and sickle banner, never raised a clenched fist at a Red rally. They were effective agents because they were always underground conspirators, and never aboveground. Communism will never win or gain followers on the basis of merit of its ideology or of truth. Ironically there are also those who have been infected with the Communist propaganda of inevitability. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles dealt with this matter in a speech before the National Council of Churches in Cleveland, Ohio, last November when he said:

"There are some who seem to feel that because international communism is a powerful and stubborn force, we should give way before it.

"Nothing could be more dangerous than to operate on the theory that if hostile and evil forces do not readily change, it is always we who must change to accommodate them.

"But let us make our opposition not just a barren negative, but a positive alternative." [40]

3. "Poverty breeds communism."

This is the false stomach theory of communism. Communism is not a disease caused by an empty stomach; it is a disease of the mind and soul. Communism does not always originate with the poor, the uneducated, the exploited or the working class. These groups are the victims of exploitation by the Communists. On the other hand, the world's roster of Communists contains the names of many who were well educated and came from families of immense wealth. The list of important Communist agents who were once known as student intellectuals is an endless one. All that is needed is to call the roll of important Communist leaders and secret agents and among them will be found once well-fed ingrates who were traitors to their society, in their quest for personal power.

4. "The only alternative to peaceful coexistence is world war III with nuclear destruction of our cities."

The Communists do not want to destroy us or our cities if they can take our cities intact as they captured Prague and the giant Skoda munitions works. They plan to capture America with native Communists, just as they took Czechoslovakia with Czechs, China with Chinese, Indochina with Indochinese, North Korea with Koreans, and almost took Spain with Spaniards. Why should they want to destroy our productive might if they can win it by subversion and convert it to furthering the Communist world?

Sir Winston Churchill, whose ability to look ahead has been established as a historical fact said, more than 20 years ago:

"Communism is not only a creed. It is a plan of campaign. A Communist is not only the holder of certain opinions; he is the pledged adept of a well-thought-out means of enforcing them. The anatomy of discontent and revolution has been studied in every phase and aspect, and a veritable drill book prepared in a scientific spirit for subverting all existing institutions. The method of enforcement is as much a part of the Communist faith as the doctrine itself.

"At first the time-honored principles of liberalism and democracy are invoked to shelter the infant organism. Free speech, the right of public meeting, every form of lawful political agitation and constitutional right are paraded and asserted. Alliance is sought with every popular movement toward the left.

"The creation of a mild liberal or Socialist regime in some period of convulsion is the first milestone. But no sooner has this been created than it is to be overthrown. Woes and scarcity resulting from confusion must be exploited. Collisions, if possible attended with bloodshed, are to be arranged between the agents of the new government and the working people. Martyrs are to be manufactured. * * *

"Pacific propaganda may be made the mask of hatreds never before manifested among men.

"No faith need be, indeed may be, kept with non-Communists.

"Every act of good will, of tolerance, of conciliation, of mercy, of magnanimity on the part of governments or statesmen is to be utilized for their ruin.

"Then when the time is ripe and the moment opportune, every form of lethal violence from mob revolt to private assassination must be used without stint or compunction. The citadel will be stormed under the banners of liberty and democracy; and once the apparatus of power is in the hands of the brotherhood, all opposition, all contrary opinions must be extinguished by death.

"Democracy is but a tool to be used and afterwards broken; liberty but a sentimental folly unworthy of the logician.

"The absolute rule of a self-chosen oligarchy, according to the dogmas it has learned by rote, is to be imposed upon mankind without mitigations progressively forever.

"All this, set out in prosy textbooks—written also in blood in the history of several powerful nations—is the Communists faith and purpose." [41]

The need for all Americans is to know the Communist objectives and what they stand for. In 1937 Pope Pius XI asked a searching question about communism:

"How is it possible that such a system, long since rejected scientifically and now proved erroneous by experience, how is it, we ask, that such a system could spread so rapidly in all parts of the world?"

He answered his own question in these words: "The explanation lies in the fact that too few have been able to grasp the nature of communism."

Twenty-one years later, an additional 750 million human beings have been swept behind the Iron Curtain. But it is unfortunately still true that all too few people understand what communism is. Two years ago our committee reported:

"The greatest asset the Communists have at the present time is not the hydrogen bomb, certainly not Soviet satellites, but world ignorance of their tactics, strategy, and objectives."

When our enemy was Nazi Germany, our Government and military leaders studied

Footnotes at end of speech.

every detail of the enemy and his strategy. George S. Patton was one of the truly great generals of the European campaign. Early in World War II, when the Germans were advancing, General Patton was asked one day if he wasn't discouraged. His answer was precise:

"I have studied the German for 40 years. I have read the memoirs of his great men. I have studied every detail of all his military campaigns. I have attended some of his staff courses. I know exactly how he will react under any given set of circumstances. He does not know what I will do. For this reason, when the time comes, I shall beat the hell out of him."

And this he did. The tragedy is found in the fact that there are too few George Pattons.

We can no more save our Republic from communism merely by saying we are against communism, than parents can save their children from polio by fervently being against polio. To conquer any disease requires intelligent study to isolate the germ and discover the vaccine. As the No. 1 killer in the world today, communism is a disease which merits our urgent study.

REPORT ON COMMUNIST LEGAL SUBVERSION

On Monday, February 16, 1959, the House Un-American Activities Committee made public its report on "Communist Legal Subversion"—the role of the Communist lawyer.

We shall not attempt in this already long report to summarize this congressional report. The report should be read not only by every member of this association, but particularly by the officers of the various State and local bar asociations of which some of the attorneys mentioned in the report are members. The report does not name every attorney who is a Communist or a member of the Communist Party, but sufficient of them are named to constitute a challenge to the bar. The ABA, while ready to assist, nevertheless, has deemed it more properly to be within the jurisdiction of the State and local associations to take action of investigation and where warranted disciplinary proceedings concerning and against members on their rolls. Our committee feels that no new resolution need be passed by the house of delegates as it has already recommended proper action by the State and local associations against attorneys unworthy of membership by reason of their activities and their disloyalty to our form of government and to their oaths of office.

On this serious problem, the duty of cleansing our ranks of unworthy or questionable members is that of the bar, and the entire bar will suffer until the stigma on its rolls is removed. With sincere regret our committee must publicly state that the State and local bar associations have not fulfilled their duty to the public, the courts, or the bar.

CONCLUSION

Upon the bar of each nation primarily falls the duty to protect and defend its constitutional form of government and courageously to lead and soundly to advise the peoples and their governments. By their very training and experience, none more than lawyers should be aware of the dangers and the menace of international communism—and, therefore, none is more responsible for the protection of the free world.

Remember, there is no bar worthy of the name in Communist enslaved countries.

Only by alertness and dedication can the organized bar and each of its members perform their duty.

The danger and the menace of communism are worse than ever. Precious time is running out.

Wishes and prayers are not enough.

Respectfully submitted.

Peter Campbell Brown, Chairman; Julius Applebaum, James S. Cremins, Egbert L. Haywood, Ray Murphy, Louis B. Nichols, Kendrick Smith, Henry J. TePaske, Jackson A. Wright, Louis C. Wyman.

APPENDIX—RECOMMENDED READING

Books play a vitally important part in the history of government and economics. One need only mention "Das Kapital," "The Wealth of Nations," "Uncle Tom's Cabin," and the "Federalist Papers" to be reminded that books have started wars, changed the economy of great nations, and established new governments.

A number of books published in the past by some of the world's top experts on communism testify to the overriding importance of the Communist issue, and to the unhappy reality that the United States is losing the battle against international communism. A study of the following books and reports could halt the rising tide of world communism.

1. Congressional committee hearings and reports: For 20 years the House Un-American Activities Committee has been patiently investigating the Communist conspiracy. The reports of its hearings, and those of its Senate counterpart, the Internal Security Subcommittee, are an encyclopedia of information on this continuing conspiracy. The abuse which has been heaped upon these committees by the Communists and their fronts is itself an attestation of the value of these reports.

2. "Masters of Deceit: The Story of Communism in America and How To Fight It," by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover (Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1958, $5). Mr. Hoover's preeminence as an authority on communism is unchallenged. This book provides us with a valuable primer on communism in the United States; its history, strategy, membership, and future. He describes the day-to-day operations of the Communist Party, what goes on underground, and how discipline is enforced. He shatters many anti-anti-Communist arguments and shows why this is no time for complacency regarding internal subversion.

3. "What We Must Know About Communism," by Dr. Harry and Bonaro Overstreet (W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1958, $3.95). These well known educators and foremost authorities in adult education examine communism and report from an educator's viewpoint in a clear factual manner. Many authorities on communism regard this book as one of the great contributions to anti-Communist literature.

4. "No Wonder We Are Losing" by Judge Robert Morris (The Bookmailer, New York, 1958, $2.50). Judge Morris has put into this book his personal record of 17 years' investigation of communism on behalf of the New York State Legislature, Naval Intelligence, and as chief counsel for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Particularly important chapters concern the famous hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations, communism's reach into education, and methods and rules of congressional committees.

5. "I Was a Slave in Russia," by John H. Noble (Devin-Adair Co., New York, 1958. $3.75). The author, an American citizen, was captured by the Russians just after V–E Day in 1945 and held prisoner for 9 years. In this book, he tells of his shocking experiences as a slave laborer in Siberia; of other Americans who are still there; and of the millions of political prisoners and how they are treated. This book is especially useful for those who believe in summit conferences and cultural exchanges with the Communists.

6. "Communist Psychological Warfare: Consultation With Edward Hunter," by the U.S. House Un-American Activities Committee (U.S. Government Printing Office, March 13, 1958). In 25 pages of testimony under questioning by Staff Director Richard Arens, Edward Hunter gives a brilliant analysis of current Communist strategy and how it follows here the pattern so successful in Asia. A distinguished journalist, author, and expert on communism in the Far East, Mr. Hunter first translated the term "brainwashing" from the Chinese. In this report he warns that Communist psychological warfare is now winning such extensive victories in the United States that the Red bloc will not need to employ direct military force against us in order to win the total war which they are waging.

7. "International Communism: Consultation With Dr. Fred C. Schwarz," by the U.S. Un-American Activities Committee U.S. Government Printing Office, May 29, 1957). Dr. Schwarz is an Australian physician who is one of the world's top authorities on communism, particularly on the Communist mind. In this testimony, Dr. Schwarz gives his expert diagnosis, prognosis, and recommended treatment for the disease of communism. He shows how the first step in the Communist conquest of every country is the ideological conquest of the student mind.

8. "A Guide to Anti-Communist Action," by Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren (Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1958, $4). Dr. Bouscaren is the author of a number of authoritative works in the field of international Communist operations. He is a professor of political science at Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., and is currently teaching at the National War College, in Washington, D.C. This book provides specific answers to the question of how individual Americans can combat communism with knowledge and facts.

9. "The Naked Communist," by W. Cleon Skousen (the Ensign Publishing Co., Salt Lake City, Utah, 1958). The author was formerly with the FBI and on the faculty of Brigham Young University and now chief of police, Salt Lake City, Utah; has been a student of communism for the better part of his adult life. His book is a painstaking account of the rise of communism, its philosophy, methods and tactics. The book is well indexed and documented and belongs on the bookshelves of any one who has a desire to learn of communism and its worldwide objectives.

---

[1] P. vi.

[2] American Bar Association Journal, May 1958, pp. 425–426.

[3] 339 U.S. 382, 424.

[4] 320 U.S. 118, 170.

[5] 341 U.S. 494.

[6] "Subversive Activities Control Board Report," S. Doc. No. 41, 83d Cong., 1st sess., Apr. 23, 1953.

[7] The frequency of dissents in the Supreme Court decisions on matters relating to Communists reflects how the Court is divided and supports the thesis of this committee that corrective action is called for by the enactment of legislation.

[8] "Manifesto of the Communist Party," by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (International Publishers, New York, 1932), p. 44.

[9] "Collected Works of Lenin," vol. 9, Russian, 4th edition, pp. 290, 291; "Proletarian No. 20, 1905," address of Secretary of State Dulles before Atomic Power Institute, Durham, N.H., May 2, 1958.

[10] Stalin: "Elections in Petersburg" (Jan.

12, 1913, Sochineniya (Gospolitizdat, Moscow, 1946), vol. II, p. 277).

[11] Mikolajczyk, Stanislaw, "The Rape of Poland." New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1948, pp. 111–112.

[12] Ibid., footnote 8, sec. II.

[13] "V. I. Lenin Selected Works" (International Publishers, New York, 1943, pp. 95, 96).

[14] Lenin, "Speech to Moscow Part Nuclei Secretaries" (Nov. 26, 1920); "Selected Works" (International Publishers, New York, 1943, vol. III, p. 297).

[15] St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 16, 1955.

[16] U.S. News & World Report, Dec. 27, 1957, p. 32.

[17] "Foundations of Leninism," Little Lenin Library edition, p. 98.

[18] House Un-American Activities Committee, "Marxist Classics," op. cit. p. 187.

[19] "U.S. House Appropriations Subcommittee Hearings on the Department of Justice," Jan. 16, 1958, p. 173.

[20] Ibid. p. 174.

[21] Editorial, June 19, 1957.

[22] Ehrmann, Henry W., "The Duty of Disclosures in Parliamentary Investigations: A Comparative Study," 11 University of Chicago Law Review, pp. 117–153, Feb. 1944.

[23] House Un-American Activities Committee, "Marxist Classics," op. cit. pp. 24–25.

[24] Hearings on the Department of Justice, op. cit., p. 178.

[25] "U.S. House Katyn Forest Committee Final Report," Dec. 22, 1952.

[26] U.S. Senate Committee on Government Operations, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, "Korean War Atrocities," Jan. 11, 1954.

[27] "Scope of Soviet Activity," pt. 51, pp. 3434, 3435.

[28] June 27, 1946.

[29] Aug. 22, 1955.

[30] Jan. 2, 1953.

[31] November 1957, p. 20.

[32] House Un-American Activities Committee, "Marxist Classics," op. cit., pp. 23–24.

[33] The U.S.S.R. still owes vast sums to the United States that are overdue and unpaid.

[34] "U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, 2d Report," Mar. 22, 1954, p. 41.

[35] U.S. News & World Report, Dec. 17, 1954, p. 128.

[36] Ibid., p. 130.

[37] Ibid., July 4, 1958, p. 72.

[38] 341 U.S. 494.

[39] 339 U.S. 382.

[40] New York Times, Nov. 19, 1958, p. 6.

[41] "Great Contemporaries," by Winston Churchill (G. P. Putnam & Sons, New York, 1937), p. 168.

A New York Official's Views on Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a brief article which was published in the New York Daily Mirror on February 8, 1959. The article, written by Neal Ashby, deals with the problem of juvenile delinquency and some interesting views on the subject as expressed by Flavius N. Costerella, assistant State attorney general of New York.

I have known Mr. Costerella since my boyhood days and have had the privilege of working with him in the interests of various charitable, civic, and humanitarian causes. In 1936, he was a charter organizer with me of the Italian Board of Guardians, which is now affiliated with the Catholic Charities in Brooklyn, to help curb juvenile delinquency.

Mr. Costerella knows the problems of juvenile delinquency as well, if not better, than any other public official of New York, and for this reason his views and thoughts on the subject, as expressed in the article, should prove of considerable interest to all who are concerned with this problem.

The article reads as follows:

CHARGES YOUTH NEEDS UNMET

(By Neal Ashby)

The settlement house is just as rollicking, appealing and dependable a deterrent to juvenile delinquency as it was the day the first one came into being a century or more ago, and Queens needs a lot of them, believes one prominent borough neighbor, Assistant State Attorney General Flavius N. Costerella.

"The settlement house is the anchor around which families are helped in welfare, citizenship and community problems," declares Costerella, longtime Forest Hills dweller.

"Our present-day boys clubs are extremely effective, too, in meeting the basic needs of youth for physical exertion and a friendly social aggregation with which to become identified. But they don't serve the whole family."

And Costerella believes the whole family needs serving in a sobering number of cases. He charges:

"Parents spend their time watching television and don't pay attention to what their children are doing outside the home. These basic needs of youth are going unmet.

"Queens is seriously lacking in settlements and clubs, just as the whole city is. Every community should have one. The rate of juvenile delinquency is mounting every year. I think the emergency is so acute that the State should bear the expense."

He's in public life and active in politics and it's not surprising to find this energetic and ambitious attorney with native judicial bearing in the swim of community affairs. But settlement houses are a cause and a conviction to Costerella.

His near-religious belief in them carries all the way back to his own boyhood in cluttered Greenwich Village some 35 years ago. The capital of the forbidding world outside his modest home was for Bert Costerella the Greenwich House, still a citadel of good citizenship.

In the seven-story building on Barrow Street the Greenwich Village neighbors were provided medical and psychological services, a nursery for the toddlers, arts and crafts classes, athletics, clubs, entertainments and study groups—and they still are.

"I loved it," the attorney says fondly.

But, foreshadowing the course his adult life was to follow, it wasn't the games, parties, boxing matches or talent shows for which Costerella had the greatest affection but the workings of Greenwich House's self-government bodies in which he was always a leader.

He remembers business meetings, policy conferences and fundraising instead of handmade pottery, game-winning baskets or vocal solos.

"It's been proven that juvenile delinquency occurs least in areas where settlement houses are located," Costerella asserts, "even in the worst slums."

The attorney commends the Boys Club of Queens in Astoria for its effective program and points out that a similar club is being organized in South Jamaica. But he comes back to the fact that—

"Queens doesn't have a single settlement house. Just off hand, they're needed in Corona, Rosedale, Jamaica, and right in my own community of Forest Hills."

Costerella, assigned by the State attorney general to represent the mentally ill in the guardianship of their property and civil rights, lives with his wife, Theresa, and their daughter, Mary Anne, 9, at 68-49 Manse Street.

He remains an active alumnus of Greenwich House and further pursues youth work through the Italian Board of Guardians, Ferrini Welfare League, 112th Precinct Youth Council and the Italian Charities of America, Elmhurst. He is a director of the National Society for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency.

"Kids need a place where they belong," he concludes, "where they are kept busy and made a part of something."

Brooklyn's New Supreme Court Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the ceremonies attendant upon the dedication of the new supreme court building in Brooklyn, N.Y., on January 5, 1959, were indeed fitting and most impressive. It is my pleasure to direct the attention of our colleagues to the remarks on that occasion of the distinguished presiding justice of the appellate division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, the Honorable Gerald Nolan; the remarks of the Honorable John B. Johnston, former justice of the appellate division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York and presently the administrator of the courts of the State of New York; and the benediction of Dr. Alexander Alan Steinbach, the president of the New York Board of Rabbis. They are as follows:

Presiding Justice NOLAN. Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to say now just a few words about a man for whom we all have a somewhat special affection. I first met him many years ago when we were both much younger judges. I had the privilege later of serving with him in the appellate division. I soon found out, and not to my surprise, that he had the entire respect and the warm affection of all of his associates.

After he had finished what for a lesser man would have been a notable career, the State of New York was indeed fortunate in persuading him to take on the administration of other and very important duties. He brought to their performance a great ability, a tremendous energy, and a fine store of judicial experience.

It is with a great sense of pleasure that I present at this time the administrator of the courts of the State of New York, the Honorable John B. Johnston.

Hon. JOHN B. JOHNSTON. If it please Your Honor, my former and successor colleagues of the bench, my brethren of the bar, and friends, he would need to be a bolder man

than I who would attempt to add to what has been so appropriately and so eloquently said. But I would be less than candid if I failed to say that at this very moment I am stirred, perhaps beset, by conflicting emotions.

While I rejoice with you upon the erection and completion of this sorely needed building, I confess I have a grateful recollection and hence a genuine fondness for the old building across the street, for it was there, just about a half century ago, I tried my first case, and it was also there, 32 years ago this very forenoon, that I ascended the bench of this court, which is older than the State itself, the very bulwark of our judicial system, and the fame of many of whose jurists is not confined to the borders of this department or limited to the boundaries of this State.

While you and I share a justifiable pride in this beautiful edifice, it is well to remember that a courthouse, however ornate, is not merely a structure of steel and stone, mortar and marble. This building is a symbol. Yes, it is the embodiment of our American system which guarantees the safety of the individual and the security of his property. And it is more; it is a harbor and a haven for the people of all shades, the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the powerful and the less fortunate, to which they may take recourse for the vindication of their rights and the redress of their wrongs.

Just an additional word. Those who enter the portals of this building may not only be confident, but certain, that they will receive a patient and a fair hearing at the hands of the distinguished men, the justices of this court assembled here before me, who serve a single purpose, which is to do right and equity between man and man, and whose sole aim is to administer justice in humble imitation of the impartiality which is reigning on high.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Presiding Justice NOLAN. Today, as always, we ask for the guidance and the blessing of God, particularly today, that the building that we dedicate may stand throughout the years as a symbol of justice to all who pass through its doors.

We have had the privilege of hearing a very eloquent invocation from the bishop of the diocese of Long Island.

I think you will agree that it is only fitting and proper that we should pause at this time and hear from another of our clergy who have honored us with their presence on this occasion. The distinguished president of the New York Board of Rabbis, Dr. Alexander Alan Steinbach.

[All arose.]

Rabbi ALEXANDER ALAN STEINBACH. Eternal Spirit, Father of all mankind, so far above us and yet so deep within us, so great that our minds cannot fathom Thine infinitude, and yet so close that Thou art nearer to us than we are to ourselves, we thank Thee for the privilege of dedicating this structure in whose presence the administration of justice will become an inextinguishable flame.

May the distinguished judges who will sit here be motivated by the scriptural admonition, "The Lord is a God of justice. Therefore, justice, justice shall ye pursue." And may they interpret the law in consonance with the teaching of a Solomon. Thy righteousness is like the mighty mountains. Thy judgments are like the great deep.

Fervently we invoke Thy blessing and Thy guidance upon those in whose trusteeship will be placed the great pillars of jurisprudence.

May those who hold liberty precious in our free world labor together in that inner spiritual hemisphere of brotherhood and human understanding which recognizes that justice must always be the highest and the only expediency. Conformity with justice is conformity with the will of God. No government can be free that has not learned to be just. Therefore, Eternal Father, O God of all humanity, let Thine inevitable spirit hover over this majestic structure and in the hearts of those who will occupy it.

And let the light of Thy countenance shine upon those charged with the solemn and sacred responsibility to give to every man, whoever he is, his just due.

Dear God, let justice ever be the bread of our Nation, that everyone who hungers for this bread may come here and find it and eat of it and be satisfied. Amen.

Congress Should Authorize an All-Out Attack on Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I submit an article every American should read, "Trends in Cancer Control," from Progress in Health Services, February 1959, Health Information Foundation, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.:

TRENDS IN CANCER CONTROL

With the elimination of communicable disease as the leading cause of death, the rising death rate from cancer has made this disease a steadily increasing health problem. From seventh in 1900, cancer rose to become the second leading cause of death in 1938 and has remained there since. It is now the leading cause of death among women aged 30–54 and (excluding accidents) among school-age children. In 1900 this disease accounted for less than 5 percent of the deaths in this country, but by 1958 the comparable figure was 16 percent, or approximately one out of every six deaths.

Cancer took more than 250,000 lives in 1958, mainly in the middle and older years but including some 4,000 children under age 15. Its death rate is now higher among males than females, among nonwhites than whites, and is highest in the northeastern part of this country. Even though cancer mortality is rising, however, the prognosis for cancer patients is today much better than it used to be. Many forms of the disease previously incurable can now be treated.

Cancer is the generic name for a group of diseases characterized by the irregular and uncontrolled growth of cells. The invasive growth and metastasis (spread) of these cells, often through the lymph channels or blood, to other areas usually leads ultimately to death.

Cancer is the end-product of an exceedingly complex chain of circumstances. Research into the etiology of this group of diseases investigates mechanisms within the cell, stimuli arising outside the cell, and hereditary and environmental factors. Malignancies of specific sites have been associated with different agents. The list of biological substances and chemical compounds known to cause malignant tumors in animals is impressively large and growing. Nevertheless, the cause of the overwhelming proportion of the malignancies seen in human populations remains unknown.

In 1900 about 80 persons for each 100,000 of the population died from cancer. This rate climbed steadily early in the century and reached 114 by 1926. After some fluctuation up to 1933, the rate began to rise again, but more slowly. It reached 128 by 1957 but dropped to 125 in 1958.[1] These rates were about 60 percent higher than in 1900.

Part of this increase is undoubtedly due to improved diagnosis of the disease and to the development of better techniques for case-finding and detection. Thus many deaths perhaps erroneously attributed to other causes are today more correctly attributed to cancer. But part of the increase is probably real.

Mortality from cancer is low during infancy and the preschool years, and drops to its minimum level during the subsequent childhood period. In 1956 cancer caused 8 deaths per 100,000 among infants under 1, 11 at ages 1 to 4, and 6 at ages 10 to 14. At older ages the rate rose consistently to a peak of 1,464 per 100,000 at 85 and over. More than half the cancer deaths today are of persons aged 65 and over.

Women constituted a larger proportion of the cancer victims than men early in the century, but recently this has changed. Thus in 1900 the cancer mortality rate among females exceeded that for males by 65 percent. Later this ratio narrowed, and by 1946–47 mortality for the two sexes was at the same level. By 1956 the former positions were reversed—the male mortality rate now exceeded the female by 22 percent.

The female mortality rate from cancer, after rising continuously since 1900, began to level off during the late 1920's and early 1930's and has declined since then. In contrast, the male mortality rate has continued to rise steadily, in part because of the rapid rise of respiratory cancer among men, but also because in general cancers afflicting males more often occur in less accessible sites.

CANCER MORTALITY BY SITE

The distribution of all cancer deaths by primary site has changed greatly since 1930. For example, cancer of the respiratory system has become a more important part of the total picture. It accounted for only 3 percent of all cancer deaths in 1930, but by 1956 its proportion had risen to 13 percent. The death rates per 100,000 population for these years rose from 3.7 to 17.1. The rise in mortality from leukemia was also notable, from 2.3 to 6.0. However, death rates from cancers of the other major primary sites have generally been leveling off, and in some instances actually declining, since 1930.

The respiratory system has become one of the main cancer sites for males. Their mortality rate in 1956 was six times as high as 1930, while the rate for females doubled in the same period. In 1930 this site accounted for 5 percent of all cancer deaths among males, but by 1956 the proportion was 21 percent. For females the comparable rise was from 2 to 4 percent.

Although part of this rise may be spurious (because of better diagnosis, case finding, etc.), the strong sex differential and other factors suggest that most of the rise represents a true increase in incidence. This is the most rapid ever recorded for a noninfectious disease.

Recently a number of large-scale investigations have shown that lung cancer[2] occurs 5 to 15 times as frequently among cigarette smokers as among nonsmokers, and that there is a direct relationship between the incidence of lung cancer and the amount smoked. From a public health point of view, the conclusion of a cause-effect relationship between lung cancer and cigarette smoking has now been accepted by many responsible health agencies.[3]

But in addition, studies have shown other possible causal factors in the environment, especially motor-vehicle exhaust and other forms of air pollution. And also, specific factors in particular individuals may in-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

crease their susceptibility to environmental influences.

LEUKEMIA DEATH RATE RISES

Recent increases in the death rate from leukemia [4] have also attracted considerable attention. The largest increases in leukemia mortality have occurred among children and older people, where the rates were highest to begin with. During the preschool years leukemia accounts for nearly 50 percent of all cancer deaths.

It is now widely accepted that exposure to nuclear and allied radiations (including X-rays used for medical diagnosis and therapy) can cause leukemia in man. The evidence for this is derived from extensive laboratory investigations on animals and from studies of the distribution of the disease in humans.

These studies have shown a higher mortality from leukemia among radiologists than other physicians, a decrease in incidence of this disease in proportion to the distance from the center of the atomic bomb explosion among survivors in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and a relationship to past exposure to X-rays for various conditions (including children exposed in utero during X-ray examination of the maternal abdomen and pelvis).[5] Nevertheless, many aspects of this relationship remain unexplained, and many investigators do not accept a linear cause-effect linkage.

Although cancer mortality as a whole has risen, a decline has been recorded for the digestive system as a primary site, and this despite its relative inaccessibility.[6] This site today accounts for only about one-third of all cancer deaths, while in 1930 the comparable figure was about one-half. Mortality from cancer of the digestive system declined 33 percent among females from 1930 to 1956—from 55.4 deaths per 100,000 to 37.2. For males the comparable drop was only 13 percent—from 59.7 to 51.9.

In a similar manner, opposing trends for the sexes in mortality from cancer of the genital organs have contributed to the current excess of male mortality from cancer of all sites combined. While mortality from genital cancer rose for males, from 10.6 per 100,000 in 1930 to 15.3 in 1956, the rate for females declined about 25 percent, from 31.9 to 23.8.

The better female record probably results in part from recent advances in obstetrical technique, from their greater propensity to seek medical care (even exclusive of pregnancy), and also from the widespread use within the last 10 years of the Papanicolaou "vaginal smear test" for early detection of uterine cancer. Among males, most of the mortality from cancer of the genital organs (94 percent in 1956) is from cancer of the prostrate. Detection at this site often occurs at a late stage of the disease, when a cure is difficult to achieve.

Mortality from cancer of the breast—restricted almost entirely to females—has changed little since 1930, despite the accessibility of this site and intensive educational campaigns to promote early detection and case finding. In 1956 breast cancer caused 23 deaths per 100,000 females, and accounted for nearly one-fifth of the total female cancer mortality.

DISTRIBUTION AMONG POPULATION GROUPS

In 1914 (the first year these data were available), mortality from cancer among the white population exceeded the rate for nonwhites by 30 percent. But by 1950 mortality for the two groups was approximately the same. By 1956 the rate for nonwhites actually exceeded the white rate by one-eighth.

Much of the more rapid rise among nonwhites is attributable to their increased mortality from cancer of the digestive system, especially for males, in contrast to a decline among whites. Similarly, the rise among nonwhite males of mortality from cancer of the genital organs was more rapid. But cancer of the skin, an accessible site and only a minor component of the total of cancer mortality, is twice as frequent among whites.

Cancer mortality is highest in the urban and metropolitan areas of the United States and in the industrial Northeastern and North Central States. It is lowest in the South Central and Mountain States. The industrial Northeast exceeds the remaining regions of the United States, especially in mortality from cancers of the digestive and respiratory systems and the breast. The South, low in other forms of cancer, exceeds the national average in skin cancer incidence, especially among whites.

ILLNESS AND SURVIVAL

In 1959 over 700,000 Americans will be under medical care for cancer, and about 450,000 new cases will be diagnosed for the first time. More than 40 million Americans now living—one in every four, according to present rates—will eventually have cancers.[7]

No real cure is yet available for all cancers, and the results of treatment are still generally defined in terms of years of survivorship free of clinical evidence of the disease. However, the prognosis for cancer patients is more favorable now than formerly, especially where there has been early diagnosis.

A few years ago one cancer patient in four was being saved—alive 5 years after diagnosis. Today the proportion is one in three. Currently, the number thus saved is estimated at 150,000 annually. There are 800,000 Americans alive today who have been cured of cancer—free of the disease at least 5 years after diagnosis. And at least an additional 500,000 cancer patients, diagnosed and treated within the last 5 years, will live to become cured.

The record of improvement has been clearly shown in a study of survivorship in Connecticut. The portion of male cancer patients in that State surviving at least 5 years from the time of original diagnosis in 1935–40 was 24 percent; the figure rose to 32 percent for those diagnosed during 1947–51. For females the corresponding improvement was from 33 to 45 percent.[8] This improvement in survivorship has involved most of the major sites, including some of the more difficult, inaccessible areas. But the greatest improvements were reported for cases diagnosed at an early stage of the disease.

Surgery and radiation, still the only effective methods of cure, are successful only when the cancer cells have remained localized in areas which permit such treatment.[9] These techniques have become immensely more effective than in former years, partly because other scientific and medical advances now permit them to be used more extensively against tumors that were previously considered inoperable or inaccessible to radiation. The operative mortality rate has decreased, and great advances have been made in knowledge of the radiation sensitivity of different types of cancer.

One of the most promising fields for research, and one which has expanded greatly in recent years, is chemotherapy. Some therapeutic chemicals have already shown effectiveness in temporarily halting the progress of certain cancers, alleviating pain, and rehabilitating the body to provide greater chance for survival. These chemicals are now regarded as valuable supplements to surgery and radiation. Moreover, hormones as well as radioactive substances have proved valuable against some forms of malignancy.

FUTURE RESEARCH GOALS

Although much is being done against the disease today,[10] far more could be accomplished merely by bringing present knowledge more effectively to bear. Perhaps as many as 75,000 cancer patients will die this year who might have been saved by earlier and better treatment. The hope for the future lies in research into the nature and etiology of the disease, to discover an effective diagnostic test suitable for large-scale screening, and to find more effective therapies than those known at present.

---

[1] Comparisons of long-term trends are based on mortality rates adjusted to the age distribution of the 1940 U.S. population and, except for the discussion of specific sites, to the Fifth Revision of the International List of Diseases and Causes of Death. Data for 1958 are estimated by the research department of Health Information Foundation.

[2] As used here, this term refers to epidermoid and undifferentiated types of carcinoma of the lung, but not adenocarcinoma.

[3] Statement by Surgeon General Leroy E. Burney of the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on Excessive Cigarette Smoking and Health, July 12, 1957; and statement by John Vaughan-Morgan, parliamentary secretary of the Ministry of Health, to the House of Commons, June 27, 1957.

[4] A malignant disease of the blood and bloodforming organs, involving the excessive formation of white blood cells.

[5] See W. M. Court-Brown, "Radiation-Induced Leukemia in Man, With Particular Reference to the Dose-Response Relationship," Journal of Chronic Diseases 8, 1:113–122 (July) 1958.

[6] This decline may be partly spurious, representing little more than improvements in the accuracy of reporting or changes in classification of primary site.

[7] American Cancer Society, "1959 Cancer Facts and Figures," New York, N.Y.

[8] Survivorship ratios adjusted for normal life expectancy. The discussion here refers only to cases reported in hospitals. M. H. Griswold et al., "Cancer in Connecticut, 1935–1951." Connecticut State Department of Health, Hartford, 1955.

[9] J. R. Heller, "Progress in Cancer Control." Journal of the Florida Medical Association, 44:347–356 (October) 1957.

[10] Especially through the programs of such agencies as the American Cancer Society, the National Cancer Institute of the U.S. Public Health Service, and the research departments of pharmaceutical manufacturers.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Dedication Ceremonies of the New Supreme Court Building in Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the text of some of the remarks made at the dedication ceremonies of the new Supreme Court Building in Brookyln, N.Y., which took place on January 5, 1959.

These include the observations of Presiding Justice Gerald Nolan of the supreme court's appellate division, second department; an address by Justice Anthony J. DiGiovanna, chairman of the board of justices of the second judicial district of the supreme court; and the benediction by the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward P. Hoar, one of Brookyln's most distinguished religious

leaders. All three are men of great esteem in Brookyln and I am privileged to know them all personally.

Their remarks are as follows:

Presiding Justice NOLAN. I, too, am sorry that Mayor Wagner was unable to be here today because I thought that we might have had the opportunity to express to him in person our deep gratitude for his many fine achievements in the aid of the administration of justice and the sponsorship of this magnificent Supreme Court Building. He cannot be here, so we shall proceed with the program.

I would like to say just a few words about one who comes last among your speakers but who is by no means least. Young in years, but old in judicial experience, an able justice of the supreme court, he takes the regular turn with the other judges. In addition to that, he sits on that great intermediate appellate court, the appellate term of the second department, which decides so properly and of course so correctly many important appeals from courts of limited jurisdiction.

In his spare time, after he has finished with those duties, he discharges a great quantity of other responsibilities. By the discharge of those responsibilities and the performance of those duties the supreme court of the Second Judicial District is enabled to run smoothly and has done so for many years, and I know it will do so in the future under his able guidance and leadership.

It is indeed a privilege and a pleasure to present at this time the distinguished chairman of the board of justices of the second judicial district of the supreme court, the Honorable Anthony J. DiGiovanna. [Applause.]

Hon. ANTHONY J. DIGIOVANNA. Reverend clergy, Judge Froessel, our visitor from across the river, our presiding justice of the first department, Justice Bernard Botein, the distinguished jurists, judges of the appellate division, my fine and esteemed colleagues of the supreme court, our visitors from the other and varied courts here in Brooklyn and throughout the city of New York, our distinguished presiding chairman and presiding justice of the appellate division of the second department, distinguished speakers, members of the bar, first of all, Justice Nolan, I thank you very much for the very kind expression of opinion which you have given the people who are kind enough to attend this morning concerning me and concerning the work of our supreme court. I am gratified to hear such expression, gratified to know what your feeling is concerning the work that has been done by our justices of this court.

Of course, credit does not go to me alone, but it does go and it should go to all the other 14 justices of the supreme court of the second judicial district who have done, as has been pointed out by our distinguished previous speaker, Andrew Roscoe, a great, a magnificent and a devoted job in trying to clear up the congested calendar as much as we have been able to accomplish.

The ceremonies today see realized a dream which has taken so many years in fulfillment, but which now supplies a concrete and realistic accomplishment in achieving a much needed Supreme Courthouse Building. This courthouse will provide more adequate and substantial judicial and trial facilities, and avoid the embarrassment and inconvenience which has resulted from our conducting the judicial and legal business in an antiquated, dilapidated and outworn building.

I extend my own personal thanks and those of my colleagues to the mayor of the city of New York, to Borough President John Cashmore, and to Commissioners Frederick Zurmuhlen and Joseph Spagna and to their representatives for their cooperation and help in the execution of plans and the furnishing of the equipment and courtroom and chamber facilities. I am certain that an inspection of our building will be most pleasantly revealing in its attractiveness and utility. Among its many unusual and startling features are six detention and confinement cells, as well as courtrooms panelled in eight different types of wood with indirect fluorescent lighting, acoustical ceilings, and marble walls and terrazzo floors.

Commissioner Zurmuhlen has told me that this is the first courthouse ever built in these United States which is completely air conditioned from top to bottom and throughout its corridors and courtrooms. The commissioner of public works can be justly proud of his tremendous contribution in the construction of our new courthouse.

I can not let this occasion go by without expressing my appreciation to those members of the judiciary who pioneered in the planning of this magnificent temple of justice. I do not know how many of you realize that for many years, even when I first became a justice of this court on January 1, 1949, there has been a new courthouse committee. It was and has been the function of this committee, selected by the board of justices, to work together with the mayor of the city of New York and with the various heads of his city departments in planning, designing, and constructing the proposed new courthouse.

Some of these justices are now retired, and, sadly, some of them have gone to their great reward and have passed from our midst. Happily, several of the former members of this committee, who are now justices of the appellate division, are with us today, and I would like them to know that the resident justices are ever mindful of the asistance they have rendered in making possible the erection of this building.

Of course, I cannot and should not forget to give credit to our present resident justices who have been members of this committee. I would like to single out its present chairman, Justice Vincent Keogh. All of the 15 justices of our court have, during the past 2 or 3 years, become architects, engineers, and interior decorators, and each has had his own ideas concerning how the building should be constructed and the manner in which the courtrooms, their facilities and their own individual chambers should be painted, decorated, and furnished. But Justice Keogh's patience and perseverance were able to successfully satisfy and compromise these minor criticisms, and his strong and enthusiastic leadership of the committee has evoked our unanimous commendation and approval.

I, therefore, take this occasion to express to him the appreciation of our board of justices for his unselfish, conscientious, and untiring efforts. And I may say that before we gathered here this morning, a presentation was made in the cloakroom of a gift from all the justices of our court to Justice Keogh in appreciation for his great work.

I take this opportunity, also, to give thanks to the general clerk, the Honorable James V. Mangano, and the personnel of the court who worked under his supervision and who were assigned to the committee for giving the committee their assistance and support.

I know that you will bear with me if, on this occasion, I express, as briefly as possible, the thoughts which impress me with the importance of these ceremonies. As we gather on this impressive occasion, whose dignity and importance is enhanced by the presence of so many eminent jurists, distinguished public officials, and members of the bar, we do well to pause to reflect upon its nature and significance.

We are assembled to dedicate a new courthouse of the Supreme Court of the State of New York. It is an event and purpose worthy of dedication. By its true and classical definition, a dedication implies the setting apart and consecration to high and noble purposes. It is a solemn act which is historically reserved for temples and places of worship.

Yet, it is indeed appropriate that we dedicate this courthouse, for it is a modern temple—a temple of justice. Here the majesty of the law will be invoked to safeguard the rights and freedoms of all peoples who seek its protection and demand the equal and impartial administration of justice.

As Judge Conway, our chief judge of the court of appeals, has so beautifully expressed it: "The history of the supreme court is a proud honored one. Its panorama must give pause to anyone who would, for whatever reason, weaken it or destroy it. Guardian of the right it has always been; impregnable in its virtue; impervious to passing fads and fancies; dispenser of even-handed justice; resolute and unchanging in its ideals despite wars, public clamor, social unrest; the resort of freemen who seek justice, confident of receiving it."

It is a place where the great heritage of liberty and freedom, enshrined in our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, will be perpetuated for all generations to come.

Although this reflective inventory is of importance for all citizens, it is of particular significance to lawyers and judges, for they have devoted their lives to the study of the law of the land, and can best appreciate the role of the law in the maintenance of peace, tranquillity and order.

The greatness of civilizations and their people are often almost entirely judged by their contribution to the development of law and their ability to have substituted the rule of law for that of force and violence. In this respect, we are confident that future historians will portray the efforts of this generation, if not in glowing terms, at least approvingly.

The truth will reveal that, although we have not yet completely succeeded, no reasonable effort has been spared in our constant striving to improve the administration of justice.

This new building stands as eloquent testimony to our efforts and sacrifices in lifting the dignity of the law itself, and the place where it will be administered by devoted judges, and practiced by dedicated members of the legal profession.

Lawyers have reason to be justifiably proud in any ceremony which dedicates a temple of justice and upholds the dignity of the law and our cherished American heritage. In such an environment their thoughts naturally turn to the leading role that their profession has played in the growth, development, and survival of this great Nation which was founded upon a belief in God and the equality of man. It is in this connection that the American lawyer can proudly proclaim to the world that, of the 56 signers of our Declaration of Independence, 33 were lawyers, and that, of the 55 delegates to the Constitutional Convention which was held in Philadelphia in 1787, 34 were lawyers.

Let it be remembered, however, that the importance of this ceremony is not limited to bench and bar. It is not confied to any segment of our society. It is a ceremony for all Americans. It is a ceremony for all who reap the rich harvest of liberty and justice—the glorious bequest of our forefathers. It is, therefore, fitting that on an occasion such as this we should also emphasize our national ideals and rejoice in the benefits of liberty under law.

For all of this we are grateful and give thanks to Almighty God and to our forefathers who established this great Republic of ours and who have made our American

way of life beneficent and beneficial to all its citizens who have sought or will seek the fruits of a true administration of justice.

It is now our sacred duty to transmit this heritage of freedom and liberty under law to our children and all future generations. With God's help and our firm and resolute determination, we will perform it well. [Applause.]

Presiding Justice NOLAN. Ladies and gentlemen, during my spare time during these ceremonies, I have looked out over the audience. It has been a great pleasure to see here today so many past presidents of the Brooklyn Bar Association, so many of our distinguished practicing lawyers, so many fine, prominent, and distinguished citizens of the Borough of Brooklyn.

I wish that I could call on each and every one of you so that you might take some part in this very important and historic ceremony. I wish that I could call on my distinguished brethren of the bar for whom, of course, I have great respect and a very sincere affection. I would like to hear from each of them.

I am particularly annoyed that I have not had the opportunity to call on a representative of the ladies whose presence has made these ceremonies, I assure you, much more enjoyable. But I have been working, as you know, under orders from Judge Keogh, who is a tough boss, and I try to obey my orders, to the best of my ability.

I am going to break the rule just in one respect because I think that I should. We have many welcome visitors here today. I am not going to try to name them; that would be useless. But I am going to mention just one.

With his customary modesty he has told me, before the ceremonies commenced, that he did not wish to make an address, that he would like to sit quietly with his friends in Brooklyn and enjoy the dedication with them, the dedication of this courthouse.

I am going to respect his wishes. I am not going to call on him for an address, but we are highly honored that he is here today, and I am going to ask him if he will just rise for a moment so that I can present him to you.

We in our court have a very cordial relationship with the appellate division of the first department, with all the judges of the first department. The fact that we have that relationship is due in no small measure to the personality of the able and distinguished presiding justice of that court.

I am going to ask him if he just won't stand up for a second. Judge Botein. [Applause.]

The Judge, with his customary paternal spirit for the members of his court, has just informed me that Jim McNally and Owen McGivern are in the audience. Even with my bad eyesight, Bernie, I found that out. We are very glad to see them here.

May I say again that we are glad to see you here, Judge Botein.

Now, may I again have the privilege, in closing these ceremonies, of calling on, I think, Brooklyn's most beloved citizen to pronounce the benediction, the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward P. Hoar.

(All arose during the benediction.)

The Right Reverend Monsignor EDWARD P. HOAR. In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, Amen.

We give Thee thanks, Almighty God, in whom all things begin that are good, and by whom all things that are good are completed.

We thank Thee sincerely from the bottom of our hearts for giving us good purpose not only to see the culmination and the preparation of this temple of justice, but also to have realized by these speeches the ideals which are being practiced daily in this and other courts in our good land which is so much blessed by Almighty God that we feel that we can never express or practice the manifestation of our gratitude; for here justice is what it is supposed to be, not by the permission of any tyrant, no matter how much he might be apparently important in his own mind, or even by the immediate servants of his tyranny, but because these good men, the judges of this and other courts, realize that it is Almighty God who gives the justification for the justice that we know and live by.

We thank Thee, therefore, for having given us not only that marvelous gift, the Constitution made by the forefathers of our land, but also for the practice of the principles and the laws which that Constitution makes possible for all of us.

We thank Thee again for having let us know that You have given us a body of men through the ages since the old courthouse was built, and even before, who will be, no doubt, the predecessors and exemplars of another generation of judges and keepers of justice.

For that reason and for that hope we thank Thee, Almighty God, and trust that we will be always appreciative of it, because in this great land of ours we may say, as the inspired writer, "Justice and Peace have kissed."

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Presiding Justice NOLAN. Ladies and gentlemen, I am now about to do what every sensible judge does at every possible opportunity. I am going to turn this meeting back, and the court back to the clerk of the court, the Honorable James V. Mangano, who has, I think, an important message for you.

Hon. JAMES V. MANGANO. Ladies and gentlemen, will you please remain standing while we recite the Pledge of Allegiance to our Flag, and upon concluding the recitation, will every one please remain in their seats while the justices leave the room.

Will you recite after me.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited by the audience.)

On behalf of the board of justices, I wish to express our best wishes to you for a very happy New Year, and thank you for your attentiveness and the manner in which you have participated and cooperated in these ceremonies.

Who Are the Jobless?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker. We are all pleased with the news that the proposed march on Washington by the unemployed has been called off. Nevertheless, the problem exists and it requires our earnest attention. In this connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New Republic of February 23, 1959:

WHO ARE THE JOBLESS?

As of last month, 76 of the 149 major areas on which the Department of Labor keeps unemployment records were ranked in the D, E, and F classifications, as having 6 percent or more of their labor force unemployed. Eleven of these areas were in the F grouping, with 12 percent or more of their workers looking for work and unable to find it: Detroit and Muskegon, Mich.; Huntington, W. Va.; Buffalo, N.Y.; five cities in Pennsylvania; and two in Puerto Rico.

In the week of January 11–17, 4,724,000 people were looking for work in a civilian labor force of 67,430,000, a rate of 7 percent compared with a 6.7 percent rate 1 year ago. Who are these unemployed; how long have they been without work; what are their regular jobs when they have them?

As of now, 3,282,000 of the jobless are men; 1,441,000 of them are women. Compared with last year, 141,000 more men are looking for work and 99,000 more women.

Unemployment is always a problem among the school-leaving young: this year, 216,000 boys between 14 and 17 are looking for work as compared with 145,000 last year. The girls are doing better: where 72,000 of them were jobless last year, only 48,000 are without work today.

Among workers over 18, the biggest group last year were the 752,000 unemployed 18–24 year old men; this year, the biggest group are the men between 25 and 34—730,000 of them. Among men aged 18 to 45, the 1,977,000 looking for work are 99,000 fewer than last year. Among women of these ages it's the other way: 121,000 more of them are jobless.

Among older workers, the men over 45 looking for work—1,089,000 of them—number 169,000 more than a year ago. The number of unemployed women—8,000 fewer—is 369,000.

This year's figures differ from last year's also in the length of time the unemployed have been looking for jobs. Last year 2,007,000 of the 4,494,000 unemployed had been job-hunting for only from 1 to 4 weeks; a further 1,622,000 had been out from 5 to 14 weeks; 556,000 from 15 to 26 weeks; 309,000 longer.

This January, many more people had been out for a long time: While 1,861,000 had lost their jobs within the last 4 weeks and 1,488,000 had been unemployed from 5 to 14 weeks, 557,000 were in the 15 to 26 week group, and the group without work for more than 26 weeks had jumped from 309,000 to 818,000.

Available figures on unemployment in various occupations gives some idea of which workers have shared in the business recovery, and which have been left aside. In steel, the unemployment rate, 11.2 percent in January 1958, has dropped to 8.2 percent (but in January 1957, it was only 2.6 percent); in autos, there has been an over-the-year improvement from 14.7 to 10.3 percent. For manufacturing as a whole, the year's increase has taken the rate only from 8.9 to 7.9 percent; in nondurable industries it is little changed at 7.5 percent, though in apparel an 11 percent rate a year ago has deteriorated to 12.5 percent.

Mining is worse off this January than last, with a 9.6 percent unemployment rate climbing to 11.7; construction, always badly off in cold weather, stands at 19.3 percent in comparison to 18.7 a year ago. Railway and railway express joblessness, at 9 percent last year, is now 8.4, but in other forms of transportation the rate has gone up from 5.7 to 8.4 percent.

Even in the service trades which, along with government employment, have fluctuated little recently, the rate is up from 3.5 percent last year to 4.7 now.

One cheerful note is the improvement in hours worked by employees who are on part-time for economic reasons: A pickup in the hard goods industries—fabricators of machinery and equipment for producers—where unemployment usually lingers longest after a business upturn, has reduced the number of part-timers from 1,953,000 a year ago to 1,255,000 today.

Morris Forgash: Champion of Our Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, Morris Forgash, of New York City, whom I am proud to claim as a dear, personal friend, is one of the greatest businessmen of our day. He is hailed as the champion of our railroads and is determined to help put the railroads back on the tracks financially.

His rise in the transportation business was meteoric. He is president of the United States Freight Co., which position carries the responsibility of chief executive officer of all United States Freight subsidiaries. His business responsibilities are tremendous, but he unselfishly gives of his spare time to philanthropic and community endeavors. He is a man of integrity, honor, and kindliness, as well as of dynamic action and great capabilities.

The New York Times of February 22 carried an article about Mr. Forgash and I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Members of Congress may read it:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 22, 1959]

PERSONALITY: CHAMPION OF THE IRON HORSE—FORGASH IS STRIVING TO HELP RAILWAYS, CURB TRUCKERS—UNITED STATES FREIGHT CO. HEAD IS BIG PROPONENT OF PIGGYBACK

(By Robert E. Bedingfield)

Morris Forgash is determined to help put the railroads back on the tracks financially and to confine the truckers to within a 400-mile radius of the spots where their cargoes originate.

The chief tool with which he expects to work these miracles is his ability as a salesman of transportation, sharpened during 41 years of working for the United States Freight Co. in capacities ranging from stenographer to president. He also will ring in the Interstate Commerce Commission if that is necessary.

Mr. Forgash tends to minimize the enormous obstacles in his path, because, as he puts it, "the economics of the matter" is on his side. Railroads, he said, in a recent interview, must stop thinking of pounds or even tons of freight and begin to think in terms of carloads, which are the smallest units that they really move. He concedes that trucks with their door-to-door mobility have a vast advantage over any distance that can be spanned between morning and night, but insists that after a day's move their inherently higher costs make them the least economic handlers of freight.

BIGGEST FREIGHT FORWARDER

Mr. Forgash is not to be taken lightly when he announces a program, no matter how ambitious. Under his guidance as president (1941 to date), United States Freight's annual gross revenues have grown from $50 million to more than $175 million. Moreover, in the last 5 years, while his company's gross has moved up 20 percent, net profits have jumped more than 100 percent.

U.S. Freight, through 31 subsidiaries, forms the Nation's largest freight-forwarding organization. The company's forwarding subsidiaries operate solely in the l.c.l. (less-than-carload) field. A carload is about 30,000 pounds. Using local and over-the-road trucks, the freight forwarder is the middleman in the transportation field. He picks up less-than-carload merchandise at a factory, consolidates it with other products going in the same direction, ships the lot via rail or truck and makes delivery to a consignee's door. He buys transportation wholesale, at the carload rate, and retails it at a higher price, roughly the l.c.l. rate.

The first point of his program to help put the railroads back on their feet is to have them take a more aggressive attitude toward handling freight in piggyback fashion—moving it in loaded highway trailers or containers on flatcars. About 48 of the Nation's 113 big class I railroads are using this method. The service has been growing rapidly in the last 3 or 4 years, but Mr. Forgash laments the railroads' cautious approach to it.

Last year, for example, about 1 percent of rail freight carloadings went piggyback.

"Yet, this type of service," Mr. Forgash said, "is the one way that the rails can say to the truckers 'I can do what you can do, only I can do it better.' "

PIGGYBACK ADVANTAGES

Piggyback's advantages include an incentive toward speed—within the last year under pressure to get the forwarders' business, the rails cut the time of Chicago-California shipments from fifth night delivery to third night and lowered terminal and handling costs.

The costs are lower all around—for shipper, forwarder and railroad—because the freight doesn't have to go through a series of costly and expensive switching operations in large terminal centers. Once a shipment reaches the city of destination, the piggyback freight train just stops and the truck tractors come along and take the trailers or containers off the flatcar and carry them directly into the consignee's plant or warehouse. Mr. Forgash has been endeavoring to show the railroads the extent of the available economies.

He cited the fact that in a recent month one of his company's subsidiaries moved 765 boxcars of freight from Chicago to Los Angeles, with an average loading of 19,633 pounds a car. The railroads received $658 a car, on average, for handling the movement. During the same month, however, the company moved 94 flatcars, each carrying two loaded highway trailers, piggyback between Chicago and Los Angeles. The average weight a car was 61,918 pounds. The average revenue paid the railroads was $1,009 a car.

In this piggy-back movement, United States Freight's subsidiary provided the railroads not only with the loaded trailers, but with the flatcars, too. This is what in the transportation industry is called plan IV piggybacking. There are three other types. Under plan I, the rails haul the trailers of the common carrier motor trucker. Plan II is strictly a railroad service, with the railroad moving the freight in its own trailers on its own flatcars. Plan III requires the shipper or forwarder to provide the trailer, but the railroad provides the flatcar.

Mr. Forgash favors piggybacking, so long as it isn't of the plan I variety. In fact, he means to go before the Interstate Commerce Commission very soon and demand that plan I piggybacking be stopped.

"When a motor carrier goes off the highway onto the back of a railroad," Mr. Forgash complains, "the trucker is no longer operating as a common carrier in accordance with his certificate [Interstate Commerce Commission authority]. The arrangement certainly isn't a true joint rate either in the accepted sense of the term. If you get down to the substance of the law, and outline what the motor carrier actually does alongside the forwarder as defined in the Interstate Commerce Act you will be hard put to tell the difference."

As for the other three modes of piggybacking, which Mr. Forgash concedes are legal, he prefers plan II or III. He expects plan IV to remain only so long as it serves an economic purpose. Plan IV holds an appeal to the railroad that isn't in a position to finance large amounts of new specialized equipment. It was inaugurated only last year.

HE GENERATES ENTHUSIASM

Mr. Forgash is a man able to generate a tremendous enthusiasm for any idea.

His mission of rescuing the railroads is not a vision of youth; he is 58 years old. He's assured of an income of $108,000 a year for the next 7 years as president of his company, $50,000 a year thereafter on his retirement, but still he goes about his work as if every day is most important of all. He's been going at everything he ever undertook at supersonic speed ever since he left Boy's High School in Brooklyn in 1918. The year of the Armistice he found his first job selling Florida water, a men's cologne.

But that was no challenge to the aggressive youth, so he promptly went to an employment agency which helped him get his first stenographic position at Universal Carloading and Distributing Co., a United States Freight subsidiary. He moved up the ladder in nonstop fashion and, by 1929, had reached the post of general manager. In 1931, he was made assistant to the president and 10 years later obtained his present position, which carries the responsibility of chief executive officer of all United States Freight subsidiaries.

Mr. Forgash was married in 1926 to the former Natalie Frendell. Mrs. Forgash has long since abandoned any ideas of slowing down her husband's hectic pace and so has the Forgash's chauffeur.

"When the boss gets in the car," the chauffeur says, "it is a lot easier to let him take the wheel and let him do it his own way than have him tell you how to do it."

Eulogy for the Late Bernard Austin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the late Assemblyman Bernard Austin represented the Fourth Assembly District of Brooklyn in the State legislature in Albany for many years. He died most unexpectedly on January 6, 1959, and his passing is a great loss to our community.

On February 26 the Williamsburg Post, No. 1004, of the American Legion, of which Bernard Austin was organizer and first commander, will hold a special memorial service for him. I have been invited by the post commander, Leo Price, and by Ira D. Brav, chairman of the memorial committee, to deliver a eulogy. I have prepared a few remarks expressing my feelings and thoughts regarding the deceased and wish to insert these remarks in the RECORD at this time:

EULOGY FOR BERNARD AUSTIN

I join with you on this sad occasion in paying tribute to the memory of a dear and departed friend with whom I was close for many years. His passing is a great personal loss to me. The 4th Assembly District, which he represented in Albany since 1935,

is a part of my congressional district. I shall always remember the many times when we campaigned together and when we collaborated in helping constituents with their personal problems, as well as the community at large in its welfare, educational, civic and other problems.

It is now close to 2 months since Barney Austin has left our midst and has gone to the Great Beyond. For me, it is still difficult to believe that he is no longer with us. In the prime of his life he left his dear ones and his numerous friends who knew him so well and loved him so much. He left a great void in their hearts—one which will never be filled, one which will never be healed.

How weak and fruitless must be any word of mine to console his near ones and dear ones from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. Yet, I cannot refrain from bringing to them the consolation that may be found in the fact that Barney Austin was loved and highly respected by all who knew him.

It is sometimes said that while, on the one hand, the Black Angel destroys a mortal, on the other hand it presents him to us in boldest relief. The living man is too close to us, too much a part of us, to be viewed objectively. Death reveals him in his entirety. Thus we now can visualize in its fullness and grandeur the unique personality that we knew as Bernard Austin. How rich and how beautiful was the life and the soul of him whose achievements meant so much to so many of his generation.

And what is it that stands out most in this hour of bereavement? It is the inner man himself, his honesty, his sincerity, his unselfishness, his wise counsel, his friendship. There was no cause touching upon the welfare of the people of our community that did not find in him a staunch and devoted supporter. He was a man of keen intellect, a person of good judgment, one who was able to see through a problem to its end.

When we think of Barney Austin, we think of the words of the poet who said:

"Here was a man whose heart was good,
Who walked with men and understood.
His was a voice that spoke to cheer,
And fell like music to the ear.
His was a smile men loved to see,
His was a hand that asked no fee
For friendliness or kindness done.
And now that he has journyed on,
His is a fame that never ends,
And leaves behind uncounted friends."

Barney Austin was indeed a man of leadership, one of whom it can be truly said that his noble deeds have won for him a devoted following. These noble deeds will live forever in the hearts and in the minds of his many friends who came to pay their tribute to him today. He was a pillar of strength in our community for many years, and here among his friends his name will always occupy a foremost place of honor and love.

"And now he rests; his greatest and his sweetness
No more shall seem at strife;
And death has moulded into calm completeness
The status of his life."

May his memory be blessed and honored.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio.*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho.*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio.*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio.*
Lennon, Alton, *N. C.*
Lesinski, John, *Mich.*
Levering, Robert W., *Ohio.*
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.* — 224 C St. NE.
Lindsay, John V., *N. Y.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn.* — The Congressional

McCormack, John W., *Mass.* — The Washington
McCulloch, William M., *Ohio* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McFall, John J., *Calif.* — 507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGinley, Donald F., *Nebr.*
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak.*
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine* — 220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*
McSween, Harold B., *La.*

Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.* — 115 Dale Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.* — Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.* — The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.* — The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
May, Catherine, *Wash.*
Meader, George, *Mich.* — 3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Meyer, William H., *Vt.*
Michel, Robert H., *Ill.*
Miller, Clement W., *Calif.*
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.* — 6601 Radnor Rd., Bethesda, Md.
Milliken, William H., Jr., *Pa.*
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.* — 2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.* — 8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga.*
Moeller, Walter H., *Ohio.*
Monagan, John S., *Conn.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va.*
Moorhead, William S., *Pa.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morris, Thomas G., *N. Mex.*
Morris, Toby, *Okla.* — 220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La.* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.* — 204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.* — The Coronet
Murphy, William T., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*

Natcher, William H., *Ky.*
Nelsen, Ancher, *Minn.*
Nix, Robert N. C., *Pa.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.* — 2301 Conn. Ave.

O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.* — The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.* — The Congressional
O'Hara, James G., *Mich.*
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass.*
Oliver, James C., *Maine.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.* — 100 Maryland Ave. NE.

Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.* — 117 Carroll St. SE.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Pirnie, Alexander, *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.* — 228 2d St. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg.*
Powell, Adam C., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Prokop, Stanley A., *Pa.*
Pucinski, Roman C., *Ill.*
Quie, Albert H., *Minn.* — The Coronet Apt., 200 C St. SE.
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.* — 1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.* — 6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.* — 5603 24th Ave. SE., Hillcrest Hgts., Wash. 21, D. C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.* — 3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Rivers, Ralph J., *Alaska.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.* — 6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y.*
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass.* — The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.* — Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rostenkowski, Dan, *Ill.*
Roush, J. Edward, *Ind.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y.*
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio.*
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.* — 433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Shipley, George E., *Ill.*
Short, Don L., *N. Dak.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Edna Oakes, *Ill.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.* — 5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Slack, John M., Jr., *W. Va.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.* — 204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Neal, *Iowa.*
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.* — Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Stratton, Samuel S., *N. Y.* — 107 Martha's Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Stubblefield, Frank A., *Ky.*
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.* — 6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y.* — Mayflower Hotel
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.* — 2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.* — 3301 Mass. Ave.
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.* — 1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.

Thomson, Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Toll, Herman, *Pa.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Ullman, Al, *Oreg.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.* — Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.* — 4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Wallhauser, George M., *N. J.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Wampler, Fred, *Ind.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.* — 9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Weis, Jessica McC., *N. Y.*
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.* — 5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.* — 1001 26th Rd. S., Arlington, Va.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolf, Leonard G., *Iowa.*
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, John, *Tex.*
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.* — 4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Burns, John A., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.* — 2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 216 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Series, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Place SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Appendix

The Corregidor War Memorial Which Will Cost $17,500,000 Should Be Replaced With Something More Fitting and Modest, Says New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times advised us in an editorial on February 26 that protests are being made in Manila against the plan to spend $7,500,000 to erect an elaborate Corregidor-Bataan Memorial in honor of the Filipinos and Americans who died there together. It points out that suggestions have been made that the actual memorial be much more modest and that part of the funds be used for permanent projects in the public interest.

Even though the Armed Services Committee of the House has favorably recommended the proposed Corregidor-Bataan Memorial there does seem to me to be a number of reasons why further consideration should be given to this matter before it is voted on by this body.

In view of the deteriorating relations with the Government of the Philippines today it seems to me unwise to take any step, such as erecting a war memorial that has already inflamed the opinions of many, which conceivably might further unsettle things.

I include here the editorial from the New York Times, as well as the text of a recent report on the Corregidor-Bataan War Memorial which was given to the congressionally chartered National Music Council by Dr. Herbert Zipper, director of the Manila Symphony Orchestra:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 26, 1959]

THE CORREGIDOR MEMORIAL

Protests are being made in Manila against the plan to spend $7,500,000 to erect an elaborate Corregidor-Bataan Memorial in honor of the Filipinos and Americans who died there together. It has been suggested that the actual memorial be much more modest and that part of the funds be used for permanent projects in the public interest. In this country it has been suggested in some quarters that the memorial fund might endow a much-needed cultural center.

These objections to the memorial plan are valid. The monument to the men of Bataan and Corregidor ought to be a living thing, not some collection of lifeless marble. The money can be spent in a way that will do even greater honor to the men who are memorialized.

An attractive alternative is the construction of a good children's hospital and a convalescent home. "Topside," on Corregidor itself, would even be a possible location. These services are badly needed and their provision, surely, would be an ideal way to pay our tribute to the dead on behalf of the living. The Filipinos, we are convinced, would be in complete agreement with this viewpoint.

COMMUNITY MUSIC CENTER
OF THE NORTH SHORE,
Winnetka, Ill., January 27, 1959.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

SIR: Being aware of your genuine interest in cultural matters through the excellent bills you have introduced in Congress, I take the liberty of drawing your attention to the Corregidor-Bataan War Memorial as planned by the War Memorial Commission.

I am not exaggerating in stating that if the present plan is to come to fruition, it will do a great deal of harm to the prestige of the United States in the Far East. For this reason, I take the liberty of enclosing a report that I gave at the last general meeting of the National Music Council in New York and a copy of a resolution passed unanimously by that body.

For the past 20 years I have been the musical director of the Manila Symphony Orchestra in the Philippines, where I spend 3½ months every year; therefore, I am rather well acquainted with conditions in the Philippines and with the feeling in regard to the memorial of a goodly number of Filipinos in high places. The American community in Manila practically unanimously holds the views as expressed in the report.

May I assure you of the sincere appreciation of my associates and of myself for anything you can do to bring about a more realistic approach to the memorial question, and to make your voice heard when an appropriation for this project comes to the floor of the House.

Needless to say, I am at your service for any further information.

Believe me to be,
Yours very truly,
Dr. HERBERT ZIPPER.

CORREGIDOR-BATAAN WAR MEMORIAL

(A report given at the general meeting of the National Music Council on December 18, 1958, in New York City)

The United States is about to erect on Corregidor Island in the Philippines a war memorial of gigantic proportions. It appears that if present plans are not changed now in the 11th hour, we are bound to become, unwittingly, a party to a monstrosity that will do a great deal of harm to the prestige of the United States.

Instead of planning for a memorial that could be useful to the living, an abstract monument has been designed that will serve no useful purpose, to stand on a spot where it cannot be seen but by a few, on a rock in the sea far out in Manila Bay, remote and hardly accessible.

In 1953 the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission was created by act of Congress and charged with the task of making a study for the survey, location, and erection on Corregidor Island (in Manila Bay) of a building and other structures and the use of Corregidor Island as a memorial to the Filipino and American soldiers, sailors, and marines who lost their lives while serving in the Pacific area during World War II. This task should be accomplished, according to the act, in cooperation with a similar agency which may be appointed in the Republic of the Philippines.

Such an agency—the National Shrines Commission—was created subsequently by President Magsaysay in the Philippines.

In August 1957, President Eisenhower submitted to Congress a report of the U.S. Memorial Commission in which their accomplishments were enumerated: mainly, the holding of a national contest for an architectural design of the proposed memorial. Forty-three architects and architectural firms entered the contest which was judged by a jury of 11 members, seven of which were prominent architects of the United States and five high ranking officers of the U.S. Armed Forces. The winning design submitted by Naramore, Bain, Brady & Johanson, of Seattle, Wash., was awarded a prize of $10,000.

It is significant that, for some strange reason never made public, the contest was confined entirely to the United States. Filipino artists were not invited to compete in the contest nor invited to act as judges of the contest. In other words, the people of the Philippines were presented with an accomplished fact. Even the U.S. Memorial Commission did not accept in a formal meeting the winning design as the final plan for the erection of the monument, instead and I quote from the printed record: "Several attempts were made by the chairman (the Honorable Emmet O'Neal) to hold the meeting of the Commission members, but in each case a quorum could not be obtained. In lieu of a formal meeting, eight members were contacted personally and on May 21, 1957, these members of the Commission accepted the recommendation of the final jury of award and designated the design submitted by Naramore, Bain, Brady & Johanson, of Seattle, Wash., as the Commission's choice."

The Philippine National Shrines Commission did not give a formal approval of the design, although the chairman of the Philippine Commission was in Washington and had meetings with the chairman of the U.S. Commission on May 2 and May 9, 1957, the record states "concurrence in this choice has been requested of the Philippine National Shrine Commission but had not been received as of June 30, 1957."

As I have been told subsequently, a majority of the members of the Philippine Commission were dubious about the whole matter but they felt that at this point when the American Commission went as far as it did without Philippine participation, it would be impolite and embarrassing to raise objections or to tell the U.S. Government how to spend its money.

The winning design in the architect's description "Is essentially in the shape of outstretched arms, an inherent form of hope and supplication universally understood. It was intended that the form be abstract enough to permit the individual viewing it to read into it values of his own experiences."

The design was published in the Philippines during the past summer and it turns out, that viewed by Filipinos, the memorial looks like a pair of carabao horns (the carabao is a water buffalo, the working animal of the Philippines).

There is now legislation before Congress favorably recommended by the Armed Services Committee of the House that "authorizes that there be appropriated to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission an amount equal to amounts, not in excess of $7½ million, which may be received by the Secretary of the Navy from the sale of vessels stricken from the Naval Vessel Register."

These are the facts as of today. I should like to state, without hesitation, that the realization of the well-meant intentions to create a visible expression of the bonds that exist between the United States and the Philippines will not be achieved if the proposed monument is erected. The purpose, as stated by the Commission, that: "Corregidor, properly memorialized, will be extremely important to the Philippines and our foreign relations work in the Far East" will not be achieved if the proposed monument is erected. Present plans are ill conceived and the design adopted unfit for the Philippines.

Corregidor is a small island at the mouth of Manila Bay nearly 30 miles distance from the waterfront of Manila. The island itself can be seen from Manila only on very clear days. The monument, although 263 feet in height, contrary to the claims of the Honorable Emmet O'Neal will not be seen from Manila. The island is not easily accessible. The claim that it will attract a large tourist trade is wholly unrealistic and disregards the facts of geography and economy. The claim that it will be seen from the air disregards the fact that not a single major air line passes in sight of Corregidor. The claim that the memorial will serve as "A forum from which the doctrines of democracy can be proclaimed to the people of the Far East" is aptly answered by a columnist in the Manila Evening News: "To whom? The sea gulls?"

A special citizens committee in Manila formed last October gathered more than 10,000 signatures to seek reconsideration of the present memorial plans. Nevertheless the Chairman of the U.S. Commission, the Honorable Emmet O'Neal circularized all Members of Congress 3 weeks ago claiming enthusiasm here and in the Philippines for the present plan.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS who until recently was a member of the Memorial Commission wrote to a friend of mine on December 4: "I am glad we are in agreement opposing the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial. The more I went into that matter, the more I became convinced that it had taken a form that I could not approve. After I was able to discharge my obligations to the group, I resigned."

I have been asked by the President of the American Chamber of Commerce in the Philippines, Mr. J. L. Mannings to use all avenues open to me to help bring about a reconsideration of the present plans. I have been told by our Ambassador to the Philippines, the Honorable Charles E. Bohlen that he shares the views of the chamber of commerce. I have been told the same by a great number of prominent Filipinos in government, civic and cultural affairs.

It is certainly not my intention to detract from the high purpose originally intended by the U.S. Congress, but I am pleading for a more realistic approach and a more useful expenditure of such a large sum. Naturally, an appropriation of $7½ million for memorial purposes would be economically beneficial to the Philippines. The greater part of the amount would be spent there and would help to boost their economy.

Manila was badly hit by the war; in destruction it was only second to Warsaw. Its only good theater, the Metropolitan, was destroyed and could not be rebuilt. Manila at present has no suitable place for the holding of concerts, operas, and other theatrical performances. Manila at present has no museum and no library. The American orchestras, ballet companies, and concert artists visiting Manila now on the President's special international program have to perform in gymnasiums. I feel, therefore, that a simple memorial on Corregidor costing a fraction of the amount of $7½ million, together with a large theater comparable to the War Memorial Opera House in San Francisco, placed in Manila on the edge of Manila Bay would be a fitting and practical memorial that would serve Filipinos and Americans alike. Above all, I plead for the drawing up of plans with full and equal participation of Filipinos because in the final analysis it does not matter how much approval the present plans may receive in this country; after all, the memorial will not be erected in the United States, but on Asian soil, and, therefore, should also have approval of the people who live there. The present plans tend to make the memorial and, with it, the U.S. Government an object of ridicule.

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT THE GENERAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL MUSIC COUNCIL ON DECEMBER 18, 1958, IN NEW YORK CITY

Whereas the Corregidor Bataan War Memorial Commission has adopted a design as the Commission's choice for the war memorial to be erected on Corregidor Island; and

Whereas there is now legislation before Congress to authorize that there be appropriated to the Corregidor Bataan War Memorial Commission amounts not in excess of $7½ million for the erection of said memorial; and

Whereas, in the judgment of the National Music Council, a portion of the funds available for the purpose can be better employed for the construction of a war memorial more useful to Filipinos and Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in full recognition of the high purpose of the U.S. Congress, the present plans be revised to the extent that a smaller portion of the available funds be used for the erection of a simple memorial on Corregidor Island; the remaining portion to be used for auditorium for the performing arts in Manila in replacement of facilities destroyed during World War II, and dedicated as war memorial, and that the choice of the purpose and the choice of design for said building be accomplished with the active participation of Philippine citizens.

Address by Hon. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, at Indiana State Jefferson-Jackson Day Victory Dinner

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on February 14, 1959, I had the pleasure of introducing the very distinguished junior Senator from Missouri to the Indiana State Jefferson-Jackson victory dinner at Indianapolis. His remarks were inspiring and thought-provoking. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have these remarks of Mr. SYMINGTON printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. STUART SYMINGTON, OF MISSOURI, AT JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY VICTORY DINNER, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., FEBRUARY 14, 1959

Thank you for the great honor of being with you tonight at your victory dinner.

You Democrats of Indiana certainly have a real victory to celebrate. In just one election, you have taken a Republican stronghold and made it Democratic. If anybody wants to know how the country is going politically, I suggest they take a look at Indiana.

Let me salute your successful candidates.

I salute this young man here who is already making a name for himself in the Senate as a hard worker, a gracious gentleman, and a faithful servant of the people, VANCE HARTKE.

I salute your able and vigorous Hoosier Congressmen: WINFIELD DENTON, RAY MADDEN, JOHN BRADEMAS, ED ROUSH, FRED WAMPLER, EARL HOGAN, RANDALL HARMON, and JOE BARR. There are 8 names on that honor roll—8 Democratic Congressmen out of 11—and last year there were only 2. Keep up the good work, and next time you will have all 11—and a Governor. And then, 2 years after that, you can elect yourselves a second Democratic Senator.

We have been working along this line in Missouri. Now we have only one Republican Congressman left; and we expect next time to make it unanimous. Of course, out in Missouri, we are helped by having in residence the leading Democrat of the whole country, Harry S. Truman. We work all the harder for Democratic victories in Missouri, because we never want to let him down. You in Indiana know that he works at it, too, as his campaign trip here last fall amply demonstrated.

There is no mystery about the Democratic victories that swept the country last November. There is no mystery about the rising tide of Democratic sentiment throughout the Nation. It is no secret that we are going to put a Democrat in the White House in 1960.

The reasons for all these things are out in the open, and apparent to everybody. The people have been oversold on what is really a second-best, do-nothing administration. They were taken in by the fancy packaging, and they bought it. But the product inside was below American standards. So now they are shopping for the genuine article—for a party and an administration that will represent the people, meet their needs, and offer real leadership. And that is exactly what the Democratic Party is going to give them.

If the times were not so dangerous, and the problems we face were not so serious, it would be pleasant to spend a little time discussing the woes of the Republican Party. We Democrats could offer them quite a little advice—in a helpful spirit, of course.

We might, for example, take part in the great debate that seems to be shaking the Republican leaders just now—on the subject: Is the elephant dead or merely sleeping?

Or we might offer our help to Mr. Arthur Larson, the apostle of modern Republicanism, who wrote a sensational book just a few years ago entitled "A Republican Looks at His Party."

We might help him gather material for the sequel, "A Republican Looks for His Party."

Or we might offer some amendments to the Republican theme song—you all have heard it—"There's No Business Like Big Business." Now that the party of big business is shrinking in size its members ought to be more sympathetic to the small businessman's problems. If the Republicans don't stop shrinking, pretty soon they themselves may be able to qualify for a small-business loan.

I have been told that the Republican Party is taking a poll—among people who will still admit they are Republicans—to decide what the public image of the Republican Party

should be. Now this phrase "public image" is a bit of Madison Avenuese that needs translation into plain English. It means not what you are, but what people think you are. So the Republicans are trying to find out what will be the best thing for people to think they are. I could give them the answer to that. It's very simple. Democrats.

And don't think that some of the Republicans haven't caught on—in fact, they are trying it out. There's a Republican governor in one of our eastern States who got elected recently by acting like a Democrat. But now, unfortunately, he has put forward a "soak the poor" tax program; and the voters are already beginning to wonder.

In my opinion, it's a mistake for the Republican Party to be looking for a new public image. It's not an image they need so much as a backbone. They need the determination to stand up to the problems we face—unemployment, high prices, poor schools, poor housing, depressed areas, flood control, declining agriculture, Russian arms, and international upheavals—to put forward some new ideas, and to take some action to solve them.

It is rather a sad business, my friends, to count up the losses we have suffered because of the inability of the Republican Party to cope with the problems of the present day. Step by step our national position has deteriorated until we are now in a mess at home and in danger abroad.

In 1952, America was by far the strongest of all nations. We stood at the head of a united free world, a free world which had stopped Communist aggression in its tracks. We had full employment, full parity on the farm, and a Government that worked for the people. Most important, we had the spirit to push ahead, with all our resources, to make America a better place to live.

And what have we today? Nearly 5 million unemployed. National output lagging. Inflation still unchecked. Four million farmers driven off their farms because of this administration's indifference to their problems. Stagnation in some of our key industries, and economic depression in some areas. A diplomatic crisis in almost every part of the globe.

These things would be a big enough price to pay, without more, for a Republican administration. But there is more—a lot more. The most ruthless and most successful dictatorship known to history has now broken through, in the scientific and technological fields, to possess itself of weapons of unbelievable power and deadliness. These new weapons, added to its admitted superiority in submarines and land armies, make the Soviet Union more than ever formidable, in its attempt to communize the world.

I know that this is bad news; and a lot of people would rather not think about it. But the job of a Senator is not always pleasant. And if the country is in danger, it is the duty of every knowledgeable citizen to present the facts to the people. A second-best defense is no good to us. As has been well said, it is worth exactly as much as the second-best poker hand. And the task of creating a first rate defense is a task the Republican administration is failing to perform.

In fact, the Republican administration has not only been failing to perform this task—it has been striving to hide the whole problem from the people. The Republican Party has been feeding us tranquilizing pills compounded of evasion, and at times outright inaccuracies. They try to surround the whole question with a fog of complacency, along with an iron curtain of security.

But when you penetrate these defenses, get to the heart of the matter, and ask them why this task is not being performed, they come up with a curious answer. We cannot have a first rate defense, they say, because we cannot afford it.

And this same answer is given, in the President's budget, to all the important problems of our time. They say we cannot afford to stay in the missile race with Russia. They say we cannot afford to invest in an adequate educational system for our young people. They say we cannot afford to erase unemployment, or step up the fight against disease, or renew our cities, or control our rivers, or put our depressed areas back on their feet.

If this were true, then our Nation would be bankrupt. If a man can't afford a decent house, an education for his children, and can't pay his doctor's bills, we say he is broke. And so it is with a nation. But is the United States of America really broke—as the Republicans would have us believe? Of course not. We can afford these things. America is the richest and the greatest country on earth. We can afford to do whatever we must do, for our security and our welfare.

I think I know why the Republicans give this curious and defeatist answer to the growing needs of the country. They are either unable or unwilling to understand the economic systems of these United States. They fail to understand that government and business must work together for the great goals of national security and domestic prosperity—and that if they do work together, there is no limit to our future progress.

I spent many years in private business, most of them in an effort to convert run-down businesses into going concerns. There is a great deal of difference between rehabilitating a company, and running a country; and I do not pretend to know all that must be done for either. But if there is one concept which would get this country back on the beam again, it is this: Full production.

Today, more than 20 percent of our Nation's industrial capacity is idle. In the steel mills, in the automobile factories, in the textile plants, our production capacity is not being used. Let's look at it this way. We have a machine which could produce 1,000 units. But it is only producing 800. The machine itself is just as expensive, even though it is producing less. And as we all know, if it does produce less, unit cost goes up. This is just not good business.

Let us take the men that are idle, and the production capacity that is idle—and in the interest of our security, as well as our prosperity—put them back to work.

America has more productive ability than any nation on earth. During the war, and afterward, we achieved a miracle of production. And we can do it again. We have the wealth, the manpower, and the skill to accomplish whatever we want. What we lack—and have lacked for the past 6 years—is the leadership.

If this Nation plans successfully to operate at full production, it will remain the world's No. 1 economic system, far, far ahead of the Communists. Khrushchev's goal of catching up with us in industry and agriculture in 7 years will never be realized.

Full production would lick unemployment, and eliminate the pool of chronic joblessness in our small and large cities that is being predicted for the next 2 years. Every able-bodied man and woman anxious to work would be able to work, and at a wage compatible with self-respect. With full production, inflation could be checked, because the new flow of goods would bring supply in line with demand. And finally, the heavy new tax revenue generated by full production, swelled by the very growth of our economy, would pour into the Treasury. That new money could finance both our current necessary expenditures and our needed new ones. We would then have a real chance to balance the budget.

The Democratic Party wants to balance the budget just as badly as do the Republicans. But we want to do it by expanding the economy—and the Republicans want to do it by shrinking the economy. We intend to take the economy out of the Republican straightjacket and put it on a Democratic launching pad.

Our problems abroad are even more complex than those at home. But the application of the principles of the Democratic Party can lead us to their ultimate solution. Let us apply the basic principle of Thomas Jefferson: "The cherishment of the people." From Woodrow Wilson through Franklin Roosevelt to Harry Truman, the foreign policy of the Democratic Party has always been based on sincere concern for the people of every nation in the world.

The greatest task facing the world today is the attainment of a just and lasting peace. The first part of that task is the negotiation of a meaningful disarmament agreement. Ten years of negotiation have taught us that negotiating disarmament with the Communists is not easy. It is frustrating and often heartbreaking. A meaningful disarmament must be mutual. It must be continuous. It must be based on a foolproof system of inspection. And it should include as many countries as possible. Every possible effort should be made to reach this kind of agreement.

If America could take just one-tenth as much as it spends each year for arms, and contribute that money to a world development fund, we could advance world progress 50 years; and at the same time bring underdeveloped countries into the 20th century.

The markets this would open up for American goods could only add to our own prosperity, and the upsurge of economic activity this would produce would liberate the masses of the people in the poorer nations from much poverty—and would aid in turning back the political tides of communism. When the day comes when there can be a reduction in the arms burden, there could well be an easing of the present rate of taxation, and still plenty left over for the great unfinished business of the country—better education, improved health care, security for our older people, and a massive attack on the poverty which still exists in America.

At first glance, it might seem illogical to say that on the one hand we must have more missiles; and on the other, we should continue negotiations for the limitation of arms. But 14 years of cold war makes nothing more certain than this: In order to have any chance of successfully negotiating world disarmament, we must be so strong that the Communists know, if they attack us, they are insuring their own destruction. The reason, therefore, that we should sustain our arms effort is to be able to negotiate for peace from a position of relative strength instead of relative weakness.

If America can bring the world two accomplishments—peace and economic security—then all the effort, all the money, and all the patience will have been more than worthwhile.

This, then, is the Democratic policy: Full production at home. And in the interest of lasting peace, a secure foundation abroad. This challenge is bigger than politics. But at the same time it is part of politics; for as long as the Republicans refuse to face the challenge, as long as they continue to permit America to fall behind, we Democrats must exert even greater effort to win back control of the Government. We of the Democratic Party are ready for this challenge. We have met it and conquered it before. We can and will do it again.

Let us all tonight, as Democrats, and even more important, as Americans, dedicate ourselves to a strong Nation—an America economically, physically, and spiritually strong. In that way, we will be sure to preserve our individual and our national freedom.

Address by Hon. A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia, at Finance Industry Staff Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Friday, February 20, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], made one of his first statements since he became chairman of the committee, before the Finance Industry Staff Conference held in Washington under the sponsorship of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that this very fine statement by the Senator from Virginia be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, OF VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, AT THE FINANCE INDUSTRY STAFF CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 20, 1959

It is a pleasure for met to meet, on one of the first such occasions since I became chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, with executives of the banking trade associations under the sponsorship of the chamber of commerce. It is also a pleasure to see representatives of publications interested in banking legislation.

Of course, my succession to the chairmanship of the committee did not mark the beginning of my interest in banking legislation. I have had an interest in this subject which long antedates my election to the Senate. After my election to the Senate, I sought and obtained membership on the Committee on Banking and Currency, and it has been one of my ambitions to succeed, one day, to the chairmanship of that important committee.

Ever since I have been a member of the committee, and even while I was a relatively junior member, I have carried a substantial burden of the workload of the committee in the banking field. During my entire membership on the committee, under Democratic chairmanships, I have served as chairman of either the Federal Reserve or Banking Subcommittees.

Although some of the activities of the committee may seem more glamorous politically than banking matters, there are none, in my opinion, which are more important.

The banking field, as you know, involves the money power of the Federal Government. The money power controls the economic lifeblood of the Nation. This has been true throughout our history. It was no accident that the struggles of the American colonists, which culminated in the Constitutional Convention, followed almost a century of disheartening monetary experience. The desire to obtain a sound and freely circulating currency was one of the mainsprings behind the movement toward federalism. The keynoter of the Constitutional Convention, Edmund Randolph, listed what he called the havoc of paper money high in his enumeration of the inadequacies of the Articles of Confederation.

Throughout the history of this country since that time, from the case of *McCulloch v. Maryland* through the political and economic struggles over the Bank of the United States; from the populism of William Jennings Bryan to the battles of Woodrow Wilson and Carter Glass to establish the Federal Reserve System, to the bank holiday of Franklin Roosevelt—during all our history—the money power has been the subject of contention and one of the focal points of political decisions until the present day.

The power of the Federal Government in this field, as it developed through all these years, was summed up by Mr. Justice Jackson shortly before his death. In 1955 he wrote:

"Two of the greatest powers possessed by the political branches, which seem to me the disaster potentials in our system, are utterly beyond judicial reach. These are the war power and the money, taxing, and spending power, which is the power of inflation. The improvident use of these powers can destroy the conditions for the existence of liberty, because either can set up great currents of strife within the population which might carry constitutional forms and limitations before them.

"No protection against these catastrophic courses can be expected from the judiciary. The people must guard against these dangers at the polls."

The money power, of course, includes these other powers: The power to tax and the power to spend. As a Member of the House, I served on the Committee on Ways and Means, and, as a Member of the Senate, I have served on the Committee on Appropriations. I have had some experience, then, with the powers of taxing and spending. My present position complements this experience, because it is through the banking system that the money supply is regulated.

I make these opening remarks, emphasizing the importance of the money power, for the purposes of assuring you of my appreciation of the responsibilities of my position and of my humility in the face of them.

Now I should like to discuss with you briefly some of the particular legislative items in which I know you are interested.

As you all have seen in the newspapers recently, the leadership of the Senate apparently has given clearence to the Joint Economic Committee to undertake a full-scale study of our economic system. You will recall that for several years there has been agitation for a National Monetary Commission to undertake a similar study. President Eisenhower proposed in the last Congress that this study be undertaken by a commission of his own appointment. There have been other proposals for joint Senate and House committees, or mixed commissions of private citizens and public officials. The Committee on Economic Development has organized a private study and, as you know, the President has appointed a Cabinet committee to be headed by the Vice President.

It is one of the misfortunes of our present divided Government that we have been unable to reach agreement on a truly nonpartisan and objective study of our economic system, which many of your organizations have advocated for many years. I do not think there is much disagreement on the need for such a study. There is only disagreement about the way in which it should be done and mistrust of the objectives of its various proponents.

Almost 10 years ago, on June 1, 1949, I reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency a bill which would have provided for the establishment of a National Monetary Commission along the same organizational lines as the Hoover Commissions on Government Organization. The Senate passed this bill, but it failed in the House. I often have wondered how the course of our economic system might have been affected had the Commission then proposed succeeded in its objectives.

As to the studies which have been, or are about to be undertaken, I will follow them with great interest. For while these committees and commissions may propose, to a large measure, the committee of which I am chairman, will dispose. To the extent I am able to do so as chairman, be assured that I shall weigh any proposal which affects our jurisdiction most carefully. In this connection, I have directed the staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency to observe the proceedings of these committees and commissions carefully and to give me periodic reports on them.

Some of you may be interested in my attitude toward reviving the Financial Institutions Act which passed the Senate in the last Congress. I still believe firmly that this act is a much needed one. I do not intend to reintroduce it, but I would like to see it introduced on the House side and sent to us for concurrence. It is a good bill and should be enacted into law. In the meantime there may be opportunities to enact some of its substantive provisions as separate bills.

For example, with the cosponsorship of Senators FULBRIGHT and CAPEHART, I have reintroduced our bank merger bill which has passed the Senate on two separate occasions. In view of the renewed interest in the problem of bank mergers, it would seem to me that the approach of this bill ought to enlist the support of all bankers and bank organizations. While it may not be perfectly satisfactory to all, it already enjoys the support of most of you, and it seems to me to be the vehicle by which the public demand for control of bank mergers can be satisfied, and that mergers can be controlled under it in an effective way which takes into account the peculiar nature of banking.

The alternative, it seems to me, is a much different kind of control, one which would treat a bank as an ordinary commercial enterprise and would not take adequately into account the nature of banking as an institution affecting, most vitally, the welfare of the depositors and general public. I urge your support of this bill.

Yesterday I introduced a bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act provisions concerning member bank reserves. The bill was proposed by the Federal Reserve System, as a result of an exhaustive study.

The bill would make three changes in present law. First, it would authorize the Federal Reserve Board to permit member banks to include all or part of their vault cash holdings in their required reserves. Second, it would change the reserve requirement for demand deposits of central Reserve city banks from the present rate of 13 to 26 percent to a range of 10 to 20 percent, the same range as Reserve city banks. Third, it would give the Board more flexible authority to permit individual member banks in central Reserve or Reserve cities to carry reserves at the lower requirement levels specified for Reserve city or country banks.

The statutory provisions for reserves have been the subject of discussion for many years, and the provisions have been changed from time to time in the past. However, no major revision in the reserve requirements has been made since the Banking Act of 1935, and it is necessary to bring these reserve requirement provisions up to date, in the light of present day conditions and needs.

I hope hearings on this bill will result in a reconciliation of the views of all interested parties.

There are, of course, many other matters within the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee which will be of interest to you as this session of Congress progresses. Time does not permit me even to mention all of them.

These will include, of course, any number of proposals for new Federal credit programs and the expansion of existing ones. With

respect to these, my own position will be, as it has in the past, one of determination to serve the needs of a sound economy.

In this connection, although I am no disciple of his, let me quote a remarkably apt comment of John M. Keynes. He said:

"There is * * * an unbroken chronicle in every country which has a history * * * of a progressive deterioration of the real values of * * * money."

He went on to say that this was no accident, but had behind it as one of its driving forces, what he called "the impecuniosity of government."

So far as I am concerned, I shall resist this force. No group of citizens, public or private, has a greater stake in this struggle than those who make up your organizations.

Equal Protection Upheld as Citizen Council Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate will recall "Cotton Ed" Smith, of South Carolina, who served in this body for six terms—from 1908 to 1944. The late Senator Smith's son, Farley Smith, of Lynchburg, S.C., last week accepted the position of executive secretary of the South Carolina Citizens' Council. The citizens' councils, and they exist in every county in the State, have in their membership many of the State's finest people.

The leadership which the eloquent Farley Smith will give this movement will, I hope, spread to other States desiring a return to constitutional government.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement issued by Farley Smith on accepting the executive secretaryship of the South Carolina Citizens' Council be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD under the title "Equal Protection Upheld as Citizen Council Goal."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUAL PROTECTION UPHELD AS CITIZEN COUNCIL GOAL

Farley Smith, of Lynchburg, has issued the following statement:

"In accepting the executive secretaryship of the South Carolina Citizens' Councils, I do so with the full realization that no people on earth are more independent, individualistic, than the liberal-minded, freedom-loving South Carolinians. We deplore the fact that present conditions make it imperative that we organize ourselves as an effective force to combat highly organized outside influences.

"These influences are constantly attempting not only to disrupt the peaceful and harmonious relationship between the races, which has contributed so much to the advancement of all our people but, if left unchecked, will eventually destroy the very foundations of constitutional government itself, and with it will be destroyed all human dignity and liberties.

"We are steadfastly determined that violence, bitterness, and hatred shall be only the weapons of our enemies; for we do not believe that overthrow is requisite nor fire must burn nor blood must run on some new deceitful altars.

"Our mission is not to destroy the laws of the old prophets but to fulfill them. Uncompromisingly dedicated to the principle of equal protection under the law to all citizens regardless of race, creed, or color, we are just as uncompromisingly dedicated to the principle of the separation of the races, not only as a constitutional guarantee nor as a manifestation of bigotry and prejudice, but as the only proven working solution that will assure the advancement of both races with mutual respect and understanding.

"We do not adhere to the modern sociological theory that all change is progress nor that all progress necessitates a violent change.

"In stormy, savage times when the equilibrium is disrupted, the individual must choose one side or the other. When prosecution, hypocrisy, and stupidity tend to suppress the human mind and spirit, when the destruction of everything traditional becomes a dominating trend as in America today, men of good will regardless of race or creed must stand ready to work to the point of martyrdom to protect and preserve the fundamental principles of our constitutional form of government which has made America the greatest nation on this earth."

Why the Dollar Price of Gold Must Rise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Why the Dollar Price of Gold Must Rise." The article was written by Sir Roy Harrod, one of the foremost experts in the world on the question of the price of gold.

The article appeared in the September 1958 issue of Optima, a quarterly publication which deals with the major problems facing the Nation. Sir Roy Harrod is a lecturer in economics at Christ Church, Oxford University, and is joint editor of the Economic Journal.

Mr. President, problems of trade and inflation will continue to plague the world until we recognize the natural evaluations which people place upon gold. The article by Sir Roy Harrod should be read by everyone who is concerned with these problems; and I am glad to make the article available, through the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the printing of the article in the Appendix of the RECORD will require 2¾ pages, at a cost of $60.75. In accordance with the tradition and the rule, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the fact that the printing of the article will exceed by three-quarters of a page the ordinary allowance, it be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE DOLLAR PRICE OF GOLD MUST RISE
(By Roy Harrod)

The acute shortage of gold in the world—because its currency value has not been adjusted in line with the fall in the goods value of the various currencies—has been a familiar fact for some time now. None the less, it may be useful to recapitulate by reference to certain salient features of the situation.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to use any particular past period as a yardstick of absolute validity for measuring the present gold shortage. But I believe it will be agreed that the interwar period was not one of undue abundance. In the twenties experts pointed out that the gold stock was not increasing as rapidly as the flow of commodity trade; some easement was caused in the thirties by Roosevelt's devaluation of the dollar, but this was not sufficient to remove all embarrassment; there is no doubt that the trend toward bilateralism in commercial arrangements was due in part to the inadequacy of gold reserves. In putting forward his plan for a Clearing Union, Keynes had in mind that, if it was to be possible to implement the keen American desire for the restoration of fully multilateral international trade, it would be essential to increase the liquid reserves available to each country, by comparison with the prewar situation. Consequently, an estimate of the existing shortage based on a comparison with 1937 is likely to understate that shortage.

The figures in table I are extracted from International Financial Statistics (International Monetary Fund). World exports f.o.b. are taken as an index of world trade, owing to well-known difficulties arising from the c.i.f. valuation of imports.

The failure of monetary reserves to rise in proportion to the dollar value of world trade is sufficiently evident from the table. The increased holding of foreign exchange as a medium of reserve has not gone far to fill the gap. It may be well to specify more particularly the nature of these foreign exchange holdings, as shown in table II.

TABLE I.—*Exports and gold since 1937*
[1937=100]

(i) Dollar value of world exports:	
1950	234.9
1957	455.3
(ii) Dollar value of monetary gold (including gold held by international institutions):	
1950	139.1
1957	152.4
(iii) (ii) plus dollar value of foreign exchange holdings of central banks, treasuries, etc.:	
1950	169.3
1957	190.9

The gold held by the international institutions is included in the second column. It seemed right not to include in the third column the foreign exchange holdings of the international institutions (mainly the International Monetary Fund). These are referred to later in the text.

TABLE II.—*Distribution of reserves percent*

	(i) 1937	(ii) 1950	(iii) 1957
Gold	91.337	72.43	70.80
Foreign exchange	8.663	27.57	29.20
Total	100.000	100.00	100.00
Of which—			
Dollars		9.62	15.15
Sterling		16.00	10.81
International institutions		1.95	3.24
Total		27.57	29.20

The increased proportion of foreign exchange holdings in 1950 was, in major part, due to the existence of the sterling balances. The growth in these was not normal, but due to the special methods used by Britain to finance her war effort on the external side. Their large size has been an embarrassment to Britain. For a number of years the balances held outside the sterling area exceeded her own gold reserves; thus she was in a true sense a factory of liquidity for the rest of the world; but in this part of the period they could be sold only at a substantial discount against gold or dollars, so that they ought not, in those years, to be reckoned as part of the world's liquid reserves for international settlement in the fullest sense. More recently they should be so reckoned, as the British authorities have been willing to convert them into gold or dollars at a very small discount.

The British have continued to feel that they should have a larger gold holding as a reserve against these liabilities. Accordingly, it is likely that in the coming period Britain will wish to increase her holding of gold by more than the amount of the normal increment of gold reserves required to match the growing gold value of her foreign trade, unless the external sterling liabilities are greatly decreased. Either way—namely, whether Britain increases her gold holding by more than the normal amount or the external sterling liabilities are drawn down—the rest of the world will experience a loss of liquidity.

SHOULD NOT TRY

In my own person I hold that Britain should not make this attempt, but this is a minority opinion. I hold that, on grounds of good neighborliness, she should not seek to increase her net reserve (viz, her gold and dollar holdings less her short-term sterling liabilities outside the sterling area) by more than some sum such as £50 million a year, which would represent roughly the proportionate fair share of the sterling area in the annual additions to the world's monetary gold stocks. But that would be asking much of Britain in her capacity of good neighbor, since her existing net reserve is minimal. This policy would require exceptionally strong financial leadership, such as is not always forthcoming.

Anxiety about her reserve position has been a contributory cause of her maintenance of a tight monetary policy recently after the need for it, from a purely trade cycle point of view, had passed. Thus here industrial production has been stagnant for 3 years, during which, but for repressive measures, it would undoubtedly have expanded strongly, thereby entailing the need for higher imports. The failure of British imports to rise at a normal rate has, in its turn, been a contributory cause of the current world recession.

But Britain is not alone in this position. Other European countries have had similar anxieties. The flattening off and decline in the European demand for imports in 1957 was the cause of the recession of world commodity prices to levels below the pre-Suez period. The American recession came later and could not have been the cause of the world recession, since her imports, both in total and from all the different regions of the world except Canada, continued to rise until the end of 1957.

RESTRICTIONS SEEN

Thus the shortage of reserves has already played its part in setting up a world-wide recessive tendency. Unless new forces of revival come into play quickly (June, 1958), the shortage of reserves is likely to play an increasing part in accelerating the downward spiral, since each country will be compelled to impose restrictions—which hurt others—much more quickly that it would be disposed to do if its reserves were at a more normal level.

The British contribution to liquidity (rise of sterling balances) occurred for the most part during the war. External dollar holdings also rose during the war, remained stagnant in the post-war quinquennium, but have risen notably again since 1950. None the less, they have made only a small contribution to the world requirement for liquidity (tables I and II).

For many years foolish statements have been made by non-Americans, and indeed by Americans themselves, about the vast hoard of gold in Fort Knox. By spending so much overseas on the defense of the free world and by the generous continuance of aid, the Americans have, in effect, made what can be spared from this hoard available for the rest of the world; this has been effected, not by an actual withdrawal of gold, but by the external holding of dollars.

EXTERNAL HOLDINGS

Official external holdings of dollars rose from $4,600 million at the end of 1950 to $8,200 million at the end of 1957. (International Financial Statistics, May 1958, p. 17). But there were also unofficial holdings, and the two together rose from $7,100 million (1950) to $13,600 million (1957). (The same source, pp. 238–239.)

At the end of December, United States gold holdings were $22,900 million. Adding her short-term foreign assets and substracting short-term foreign liabilities, one gets a net reserve of $11,500 million.

The law requires the Federal Reserve System to hold a 25 percent reserve of gold certificates against notes and deposits, by no means an exorbitant requirement and one reduced from former days. This law would require at present a gold holding of about $11,000 million. Thus, if one reckoned only the net reserve as available to fulfill the legal requirement, as would be strictly proper, the United States is already very near the bone.

Be that as it may—since reserve requirements against internal liabilities are now thought obsolete in many quarters—if her net external liability increased in the next 7 years by as much as it has in the last 7 years, this would undoubtedly cause her grave misgiving.

Before developing that argument, it may be well to consider the gold position further.

A comparison of table III with table I shows that, if the dollar price of gold had been raised in line with the deterioration of the goods value of the dollar, the major part of the world liquidity shortage would have been solved, but not the whole of it. There would probably remain a true gold shortage problem, as there was between the wars, additional to the artificial problem that has been created by the failure of the American authorities to alter the dollar price of gold.

TABLE III

(To be compared with table I)

Assumption that the dollar price of gold had risen in line with the dollar prices of U.S. exports viz 2.1 times.

[1937=100]

(i) Dollar value of world exports: 1957	455.3
(ii) Dollar value of monetary gold (including gold held by international institutions): 1957	319.8
(iii) (ii) plus dollar value of foreign exchange holdings of central banks, treasuries, etc.: 1957	340.8

However, other matters have to be brought into the reckoning. Had the dollar price of gold been adjusted, gold production would have been higher, and not so much gold would have disappeared into private hoards, since private hoarding has been stimulated by the belief that the current undervaluation of gold will be revised. In table IV I have taken the average ex-Soviet gold production for 1937–40 (I.M.F. staff papers, O.L. Altman, p. 259) at $1,175 million, and supposed this rate maintained till 1957. The Orange Free State gold production would have helped it along. I have deducted 10 percent as the normal demand for industrial use and a little bit of private hoarding. In column (iii) I have added in the actual increased holdings of foreign exchange. In column (iv) I have supposed that, under the beneficent influence of the larger gold stocks, countries would have felt willing to carry larger holdings of foreign exchange in absolute amount, but still no more than 29.2 percent of gold reserves, as shown in column (iii) of table II.

TABLE IV.—*Increase of reserves on certain assumptions*

[1937=100]

(i) Dollar value of world exports: 1957	455.3
(ii) Dollar value of world gold, supposing price raised in proportion to price rise of U.S. exports, production in 1937–57 at 1937–40 level, and 90 percent of it available for monetary stocks: 1957	385.2
(iii) (ii) plus actual current value of foreign exchange holdings: 1957	409.2
(iv) (ii) plus value of foreign exchange holdings, if these constituted 29.2 percent of total reserves, as they did in 1957: 1957	496.9

Thus, on these assumptions, which are not inherently unreasonable, the liquid reserve position would now be fractionally better than it was in 1937. It is, therefore, not groundless to attribute the present frightful shortage at root solely to the failure to mark up the dollar price of gold to match the depreciated goods value of the dollar.

SHORTFALL NOTED

Let us now look at the matter in another way. In 1937 the official gold holding amounted to $25,300 million. If this was to be increased to match the enhanced dollar value of world trade, it would now have to stand at $115,100 million; actually it stands at $38,550 million. Consequently there is a shortfall of $76,550 million.

Foreign exchange holdings in 1937 are stated to have amounted to $2,400 million. If they were to be increased to match the enhanced dollar value of world trade, they would now have to stand at $10,900 million. Actually they stand at $15,900 million. Thus, owing to the growth of sterling balances under the force majeure of war and owing to the willingness of many to increase their holdings of dollar balances during the war and again since 1950 in lieu of gold, there has been an out-of-the-trend increase of foreign exchange holdings of $5,000 million (viz. $15,900 million less $10,900 million).

The importance to the world of the increase in foreign exchange holdings, which have caused some embarrassment to Britain and meant the making available by Americans of almost all their spare gold reserves for the outside world, should be carefully noted. The increase in question consisted of $5,000 million. This must be compared with the shortfall of $76,550 in the dollar value of gold reserves, owing to the dollar value of those reserves not having risen in proportion to the increased dollar value of world trade. With all respect to the embarrassments of Britain—and it must be said that there was an element of good neighborliness in her refusal to take the sterling balances out of the world monetary system after the war, as she was strongly advised to do—and with all respect to the United States, which has generously continued aid, despite an overall adverse balance of external payments, it must be said that these additional foreign exchange holdings of sterling and of dollars have made but a trifling contribution towards easing the shortage of

reserves owing to the shrinking of the value of gold stocks—a contribution of $500 million against a shortfall of $76,550 million.

In addition to the foreign exchange holdings mentioned above, countries were given drawing rights, amounting in all to $9,016 million, in the International Monetary Fund. Of these only $4,096 could be honored in gold or hard currencies. These do not go very far to fill the gap either.

In his proposal for a "clearing union" Keynes wrote as follows:

"We need a quantum of international currency, which is neither determined in an unpredictable and irrelevant manner, as, for example, by the technical progress of the gold industry, nor subject to large variations depending on the gold reserve policies of individual countries; but is governed by the actual current requirements of world commerce, and is also capable of deliberate expansion and contraction to offset deflationary and inflationary tendencies in effective world demand."

KEYNES' HOPE

Despite the neutrality of this wording it can be stated that he hoped that the "clearing union" would add something to the quantum of reserves available, before the war, for international settlement, and he hoped also that the International Monetary Fund, although designed on a smaller scale than his plan, would do the same; and it was for this reason that he regarded its acceptance as a precondition for Britain and other countries reverting to the principle of nondiscrimination in commercial policy, so much desired by the Americans. Alas, he had not had time, for all his wise prescience, to foresee that the increased liquidity involved in his proposal, or in the Harry White proposal, or in any other acceptable proposal, would be far more than offset by the change in the gold position. This may not be quite fair to his own proposal in which drawing rights were to rise in proportion to the increase in the value of world trade, which increase has been very great since Bretton Woods (1944).

Recently there have been suggestions that, as an alternative to a rise in the dollar price of gold, the resources of the International Monetary Fund should be increased or some new international institution established. I believe that these proposals reflect the fact that eminent bankers or economic experts sometimes fail to appreciate the quantitative aspect of global totals. We are dealing with a shortfall of $76,000 million.

It is not within the realm of practical politics that any new institution would have a capital of the order even of $50,000 million. And even if it did, it has not yet been made clear precisely how this would increase net liquidity, since the newly created assets would also be the liability of someone. So far as new institutions are concerned, these figures belong to the realm of fantasy. But a doubling of the dollar price of gold could make a difference of this order of magnitude, partly at once and partly in the coming decade.

If it is objected that a considerable part of the gain would go to the United States, owing to her large holding, it must be remembered that this would render possible something that is now quite impossible—namely, a considerable acceleration in the growth of the dollar holdings of the non-dollar world (through, for example, an enlargement of U.S. investment), allowing a corresponding increase in the value of liquid world reserves to happen, without placing the United States in Queer Street.

BRITISH QUESTIONS

Some British experts have argued that a rise in the dollar price of gold would not greatly benefit Britain in particular, since her current holdings are relatively small.

Would it make no difference to her, with her vast exports, that the rest of the world would be less inclined to clamp on import restrictions on the occasion of the most trifling oscillation in the balance of payments? Would it make no difference to her, with her great external sterling liabilities, that the countries would be less often driven to convert their sterling balances into gold or dollars? Would it make no difference to her, as a great exporter, that a world recession, like the present, would not be aggravated by each country being driven at an early stage to impose restrictions? Would it make no difference to her, as the world's greatest gold bullion market, if the value of the gold annually coming to her were doubled, or, allowing for higher production and less disappearance, trebled?

These rhetorical questions may serve to introduce a reference to the future. Table IV suggests that, if only the dollar price of gold had kept pace with the deterioration in the goods value of the dollar, the present liquidity position might be as good as, even better than, the prewar position. The future prospect is not quite so cheerful.

INFLATION

The increased requirement for gold now, as compared with 1937, is in part due to the inflation of dollar prices. We ought not to budget for any further inflation. Since 1937 the volume of world trade, or its value at constant prices, has increased at the rate of about 4 percent per annum. If we assume the requisite reserves now to be $115 billion (see above), on an arithmetical calculation we should require an annual increase of gold stocks of $4,600 million a year. In the years from 1950 to 1957 the annual increase in gold stocks was $464 million. According to this calculation the annual increase would require to be raised tenfold, and that appears a hopeless proposition. But this extreme figure should be modified in a number of ways.

(i) If foreign exchange holdings carry part of the burden (and assuming that the British do not try to increase their net reserve too much), we should need an annual increase of only 70 percent of the aforementioned amount, viz. of $3,220 million. (See table II, col. iii.)

(ii) The annual increase in the volume of world trade from 1937 to 1957 of 4 percent may well be abnormal. It may be sensible to take 3 percent as a target figure, reducing the requirement for an increase in reserves to $2,415 million.

(iii) If reserves are not increased above their present level by far more than anything that can be done by raising the resources of the International Monetary Fund or establishing ancillary banking institutions, I dare predict that within a decade foreign trade will have degenerated into a restrictive bilateralist, and indeed totalitarian, system. Each country will have to tailor its demand for foreign goods administratively by reference to resources currently accruing; no room will be left for free enterprise in importation. But hard experience may have taught the central authorities to get along, on a free enterprise basis, with less than the prewar ratio of reserves to turnover. Everyone will have, in this modern world, to pursue the bold policy of living dangerously. I suggest that on this ground the required annual increase in liquidity can be reduced to $2 billion.

(iv) Mr. Altman (op. cit.) has estimated the likely increase in coming years to be above that previously prevailing, viz. a minimum of $500 million per annum and a maximum of $920 million per annum, and he suggests a probable figure of $730 million per annum.

(v) If the dollar price of gold were doubled, this last-mentioned estimate would be raised to $1,460 million per annum.

(vi) If the raising of the dollar price of gold led to an eventual increase of production and to diminished private hoarding, the annual accretion to world stocks might well be not far below the target ((iii) above) of two thousand million dollars.

BARE MINIMUM

I should regard the doubling of the dollar price of gold as the bare minimum required to salvage the system of free enterprise. In the worldwide conflict between the idea of totalitarian planning and that of a competitive system, which, by its essential nature, requires a certain amount of free play for trial and error, I am convinced that the issue depends precisely on this: on whether the U.S. authorities decide to double the dollar price of gold, as a bare minimum.

But, owing to the leeway that has to be made up, as we have seen from table III, owing to the fact that, under the maximum of full employment, which is, rightly, here to stay, more reserve is required than in prewar conditions, and owing to the eminent desirability of having a slight margin above bare requirements, if I were an authorized and detached mentor to the U.S. authorities on behalf of the world economy, I should recommend an increase in the dollar price of gold by two-and-a-half times, or even a rise to the convenient figure of $100 an ounce.

Now we must return to the hub of this matter. What are the U.S. authorities likely to do in the years immediately ahead? Practical pressure is likely to account for more there, as elsewhere, than abstract argument.

U.S. CONFIDENCE

The existing world recession may bumble along at about its present level, or deepen; no forces making for strong revival are yet apparent. The United States has remained confident on the basis of what has now become a narrow net gold reserve, partly, indeed, because that country has not yet come to appreciate how narrow it is, but also because there is the feeling that a world recession is likely to improve the external U.S. balance of payments, while those of other countries decline. Thus the recession does not cause her exchange anxieties, although it does cause her other grave anxieties.

But the recession will not improve her external balance by very much. For the other countries of the world are running their commerce on the basis of reserves that are narrower than they have ever been before, and import restrictions will accordingly be imposed more rapidly on the occasion of a recession of exports. If the United States is participating in the recession, the reduction in her exports entailed by the import restrictions elsewhere will exacerbate matters. This fact she is likely to observe. Proposals may then be made for giving large funds to international agencies or setting up new agencies. But there are two factors militating against this solution.

One is that, so long as the United States is herself the victim of recession, home opinion is likely to favor the using of any additional funds, which will necessarily involve a cash deficit for the Federal Government, for giving work to American citizens rather than for additional external aid. This opinion is sound, not only from a nationalist, but also from a cosmopolitan, point of view. The maintenance of U.S. imports, by the boosting of her internal economy, is likely to be of much more help to the outside world than the expenditure of an equivalent sum in external aid; for the spending upon imports has a more prompt effect, since it gives income to those who have the goods ready to consign.

QUANTITATIVE EFFECT

The other point which militates against the solution of providing more funds for in-

ternational agencies, is that the quantitative effect will be very small, by comparison with even a moderate rise in the dollar price of gold. It is true that, in the preparation of public pronouncements, spokesmen and experts are apt to be blindly impervious to quantitative arguments. But I do not believe that this imperviousness extends so often to practical decisions. In the furnace of pressing day-to-day events, in war, when to do or not to do makes a vital difference, the human being has a hunch, perhaps provided by his own electronic brain, for what is quantitatively important. He will not bother so much about international agencies, with their chicken feed, when there is all the time lying to hand the dollar price of gold, a rise in which can bring in so much larger returns.

If, on the other hand, there is a marked world revival, or, alternatively, if the recession does not have any strong effect in improving the U.S. balance of payments, then the increase in external dollar holdings, such as occurred between 1950 and 1957, will presumably continue. The effect of this may be slow, but it will be sure. Gradually the time must come when the U.S. net reserve sinks to a demonstrably dangerous level, or to zero. It will then become evident that the price of gold must be marked up.

PROPOSAL BRUSHED ASIDE

The matter might be precipitated. So far the proposal for a rise in the dollar price of gold has been brushed aside as a bee in the bonnet of South African gold producers. But coming events are bound to give it more serious consideration. This may lead nonresident holders of dollars to cash them, from a precautionary motive. Something of that sort has happened already. To cash dollars for gold does no injury to the United States, since she loses nothing by discharging a gold liability in gold—unless it be deemed an injury to provoke what is always a painful process, that of hard thinking. The thought provoked by an outward drain of gold from the United States might cause a revaluation of the dollar to come earlier than it otherwise would. That it will come in the end I believe there can be no doubt.

The obstacle to revision is in part mere inertia. One has to produce some head of steam to get an old-established thing changed. There are also deep prejudices, which one might perhaps dub as theological, though they may have a backing in the unconscious mind, which a layman is not capable of analyzing. There is a rational although unsound argument that to raise the dollar price of gold would benefit the Russians. To deny so great a benefit to the rest of the world, in order to avoid giving gain to the Russians is surely rather curmudgeonly in peacetime. The case of war has to be considered, although I regard this as extremely unlikely. In a press-button war, which lasted but for a few weeks or months, the gold position would presumably be irrelevant. In a longer war all would depend on whether it was the United States or Russia that was in trading relations with the major part of the neutral world. If it were the United States, then to have raised the dollar price of gold before the war, and thereby the goods value of her existing gold reserve, would bring greater gain to her than it would to the Russians. It may be objected that it would do for this purpose to raise the dollar price of gold after the war had broken out; but to do this at a time when gold had to be paid out in discharge of dollar commitments would savour of sharp practice and might not be accepted by neutrals, if they felt strong enough to say "No." From the war point of view, it would be much better to raise the dollar price of gold in advance, at a time when there is no immediate prospect of war. That would add to the sinews of war both of the United States herself and of her potential allies.

In his funny, tortuous way man is a rational being. What is so eminently rational as an increase in the dollar price of gold must surely come in due course.

Our Friends From Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in recent years thousands of people have come to the United States from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

According to the latest figures, our friends from Puerto Rico are still migrating to this country at the rate of 24,000 annually.

Their lot has not always been an easy one, but I am pleased that at long last there are indications that a brighter future is ahead for our Puerto Rican friends.

In introducing the following editorial from the February 24 issue of the New York Times, I am certainly in hearty agreement that the Puerto Rican people now in the United States are a part of the American race that is still in the making.

The editorial follows:

OUR FRIENDS FROM PUERTO RICO

This country's latest immigration group consists, as we all know, of people from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. So many Puerto Ricans have come to New York City and to 38 other mainland cities that they have seemed to some impatient souls a problem. This week spokesmen from our town, and from the other towns which have sizable Puerto Rican populations, are attending a police seminar in San Juan to find out how Puerto Ricans live, work, and play in their own cities and villages.

It should be reassuring to the Puerto Ricans and their spokesmen to realize that they are like a great many other immigrants who came to this country, beginning with the Pilgrim Fathers in 1620. The Indians didn't always care for the Pilgrim Fathers, despite the friendly relationships of the first critical years. We were a mixed race at the time of the Revolution and we have grown more mixed. The Africans, the Irish, the Germans, the Italians, a few Orientals, some Mexicans, and other Latin Americans, and a numerous assortment of other races and nationalities have made us the nation that we are today. Yet the adjectives applied, from time to time, to most of our ancestors on this continent are extremely unflattering. We can't tack any epithets on today's Puerto Ricans that were not applied to our own fathers or grandfathers. Nor can certain native-born Americans, who often cheat and exploit the Puerto Ricans, do much worse than was done to those who came earlier.

It is hard for people to be patient when they are having a rough time of it. On the record, however, our friends from Puerto Rico who have been coming here for some years at an average annual rate of about 24,000, may look forward to a brighter future. Time always cures the kind of situation in which they find themselves. They are a part of the American race that is still in the making.

Industrial Development of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial from the February 25, 1959, issue of the State, of Columbia, S.C., entitled "South Carolina Leads." This outstanding newspaper is ably edited by Samuel L. Latimer, Jr.

The editorial from the State presents factual data which completely refutes the argument of integrationists that the South's stand, and particularly that of South Carolina, against integration of the races is detrimental to industrial development. In fact, Mr. President, the South's stand in favor of the principles of constitutional government has played a prominent part in the industrial boom which is increasing year after year. I am particularly pleased that South Carolina, one of the smallest States in the South, is leading the South in the rate of industrial expansion.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA LEADS

Antisouthern liberals warn menacingly that unless the South sacrifices its biracial traditions and institutions, the section will be doomed industrially.

Their crocodile tears are shed in vain.

In the midst of the tumult caused by the campaign to crush southern defenses against forced integration, the South is growing stronger industrially and economically.

Its industrial progress is greater than that of any other section of the country except the West, where population migration is most numerous. (In the West, unemployment is not a serious problem, except in a few spots. In the South, it is rapidly disappearing.)

Industry is looking south because of this section's soundness, mounting prosperity, and its proven advantages over other parts of the country whence the wails of self-righteous indignation are loudest.

The highly respected and reliable magazine, U.S. News & World Report, made a survey and came up with these significant findings:

"The South's industrial boom keeps rolling. * * * Despite all the race problems, industry keeps pouring money into the South, opening plants at the rate of three a day. * * * Southern growth gained momentum in 1958, a year of recession as well as school crisis. * * * The Southern States did better last year, as a group, than the country as a whole. * * * In 11 Southern States, 8 percent more new plants were established in the recession year 1958 than in the boom year of 1957."

Speaking specifically of this State, the magazine said:

"The upswing in new plants in South Carolina—from 32 in 1957 to 58 in 1958—was accompanied by a rise in manufacturers' outlays. These nearly doubled, going from $67 million to $129 million, according to the State development board.

"The official business indicators show that South Carolina in 1958 fared a little better than the Nation as a whole in new construction and nonfarm employment, not quite as well in gain in personal income."

The Southern State statistics paint an even rosier picture of South Carolina.

Here is the scoreboard on new plants of 25 or more employees established in the last 2 years, listed in order of the geographical sizes of the 11 States:

Southern States	New plants in 1957	New plants in 1958	Percent change
Texas	188	257	Up 36.7.
Georgia	139	169	Up 21.5.
Florida	232	201	Down 13.3.
Arkansas	99	74	Down 25.4.
North Carolina	80	122	Up 52.5.
Alabama	134	74	Down 44.7.
Louisiana	52	42	Down 19.2.
Mississippi	59	86	Up 45.7.
Tennessee	96	108	Up 13.6.
Virginia	48	64	Up 33.3.
South Carolina	32	58	Up 81.2.

The figures show that South Carolina, the smallest State among the 11, is leading the South in the rate of industrial expansion. South Carolina is also the heart of that section of the South which is making the fastest progress. And if the data were available for all 49 States, South Carolina probably also would be revealed as the leader in the Nation.

Both races are benefitting from the advances, working in harmony and without frictional crises.

A Veteran's Gratitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by a veteran, Mr. William E. Watilo, of Lakewood, Calif., to express to Members of Congress his gratitude for making it possible, through Public Law 550, for him to obtain an education. His letter, which follows, speaks eloquently of this young veteran's appreciation:

LAKEWOOD, CALIF., *February 20, 1959.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOSMER: Today my final check arrived for training allowance under Public Law 550, and I request that you either represent me before the Congress of the United States in offering my gratitude, or represent the Congress in accepting my deep thanks for the life that lies ahead for the five of us.

The sum expended on me would scarcely make a dent in the cost of one missile, and proportionally that missile has a far greater opportunity to be felt around the world than I do. However, in aiding human lives, we can see that that money will show a good return in the higher financial, educational, and humanistic values of my family, and Providence willing, of my future pupils.

Never would this have been possible on my own. My education is not over; no degree will end it, but now I will be able to continue from here. For the helping hand when it was most needed, I say, thank you gentlemen. May I always be able to live up to the faith that Congress showed in creating opportunities for a man to answer the questions he finds within himself.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. WATILO.

Mr. Speaker, it is, however, his fellow Americans to whom Mr. Watilo's gratitude actually is to be expressed. The American people acting by and through their elected representatives decided to embark upon a program of educational assistance to veterans. It is the American people, who, through the taxes they pay, finance the program.

Intelligent Citizen Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great personal pleasure and pride to pay tribute today to two distinguished All-America Cities in my State—Westport and New Haven, Conn.

Both these fine communities, one of which is in my own congressional district, have been chosen, with nine other cities throughout America, for the Look magazine awards for intelligent citizen action in 1958.

On Friday, February 27, the good people of Westport will stage a community celebration in proud recognition of the honor bestowed upon their town.

Westport, Mr. Speaker, is a good town to live in and a community in which its citizens can be justly proud.

In honor of this great celebration on Friday, I am introducing into the RECORD the front-page news story heralding Westport's selection as one of the All-America Cities, along with an editorial commenting on the honor from the Town Crier, Westport's hometown newspaper.

Both the news story and the editorial appeared in the Town Crier's issue of January 22:

WESTPORT ALL AMERICA CITY FOR INTELLIGENT CITIZEN ACTION IN 1958—TOWN AND NEW HAVEN FIRST CONNECTICUT RECIPIENTS OF 9-YEAR-OLD NATIONAL AWARD

Westport, long celebrated as the happy home of artists, writers, and Madison Avenue communicators, and more recently sensationalized as the locale of a litter of novels featuring martinis, marital tangles, and other exurban pastimes, has been named as one of 11 All America Cities honored for progress achieved through intelligent citizen action during 1958. The coveted award was announced today by the National Municipal League and Look magazine, cosponsors of the competition.

Much as an Iowa quarterback awaits the Grantland Rice all-America selections for the gridiron, so did Westporters who knew that Westport was one of the finalist cities quake while the board of judges, headed by Dr. George Gallup, picked the first team from the list of 100 entries.

This year, for the first time in the 9-year history of this national contest, two Connecticut cities broke into the charmed backfield. Both Westport and New Haven were chosen as 2 of America's 11 most farsighted and progressive communities.

The rest of the team is composed of Bloomington, Ind.; Columbus, Ohio; Granite City, Ill.; Hayden, Ariz.; Highland Park, Ill.; Huntington, W. Va.; Leadville, Colo.; Phoenix, Ariz.; and Sheridan, Wyo.

At high noon on Saturday, First Selectman Herbert E. Baldwin will receive the pennant emblematic of the All America City Award, and will raise it on the flagstaff in Parker-Harding Plaza. The flag-raising ceremony, first of a series in recognition of the award, will take place in the Plaza, and will feature a color guard of local Nike troops, and units of the police and fire departments. Musical entertainment will be provided by members of the U.S. Army Air Defense Command choral group, a singing organization designed to contribute to the morale of guided-missile personnel at installations throughout the Nation.

Before the presentation of the banner, which will fly under the Stars and Stripes, Dr. Ralph Bishoff, of Kings Highway, who is serving as cochairman of a committee in connection with local observances of the event with Albert Dorne, president of the Famous Artists School, will make a short address. The official notice of the award will be read by Richard Holmquist of the planning and zoning commission. The public is invited to attend the ceremony.

Westport's claim to the award was compiled by a committee consisting of Dr. Guy Robbins, past president of the citizens planning association, R.T.M. member Fred White, William Leonard, Holmquist, and CPA Executive Secretary Dominic Del Guidice, and was presented to the National Municipal League's annual meeting in Colorado Springs, Colo., held last September, by Holmquist.

Westport was cited by the jury of 12, headed by Dr. Gallup, for "successful citizen action in solving problems stemming from a rapid population growth, and outmoded city government, and inadequate city services."

"It gives me great pleasure to notify you that Westport has been named an All America City for 1958 by the National Municipal League and Look magazine.

"This decision was reached by the All-America Cities Award jury, of which I was foreman, at Colorado Springs last September following the presentation of your story by Mr. Richard Holmquist. Subsequent investigation confirmed our judgment.

"As you know, the awards are given for citizen teamwork rather than municipal perfection. To be selected an All-America City, a community must show noteworthy accomplishments through alert, continuing citizen participation. Such is the only way to make self-government effective.

"I salute the citizens of Westport whose effective action has won this award and sincerely hope they will continue to play a positive role in the affairs of their community.

"GEORGE M. GALLUP,
"Chairman."

Cited specifically were the accomplishment of a new town charter, progress in town planning, a program for tax reform, educational progress including the new high school, a successful effort to correct poor garbage disposal techniques, new recreational areas, and a reorganized police department. The Citizens Planning Association was credited with stimulating of the activity, and Dr. Guy Robbins previously was given an individual award for outstanding citizen service.

New Haven was honored for what Look will call, in its issue of February 17, a bold attack on blight and deterioration. The

program undertaken in New Haven to defeat decay and traffic congestion would, according to Look, do credit to a city many times the size of New Haven. The present mayor, Richard C. Lee, was given special credit for supplying leadership.

The Westport committee on arrangements for the celebration have announced a town-wide event for the evening of February 27, featuring a dinner at the Woman's Club, a formal presentation in Staples Auditorium, and a dance in Staples Cafeteria. At this time, the award will be made by Vernon Meyers, publisher of Look, and distinguished guests will help Westport note the event. Additional details will be published soon.

A number of other plans are in the works, including highway signs, a special postage meter cancellation, buttons for the schoolchildren, and a special commemorative edition of the Town Crier, due for publication on February 26.

The All America Cities Awards were inaugurated in 1949 by the National Municipal League, and for the past 8 years have been cosponsored by Look.

The jury selecting the all-America cities for 1958 included Dr. Gallup, jury foreman; Mrs. Dorothy Brimacombe, treasurer, Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; John C. Cornelius, president, American Heritage Foundation; Mrs. Frederic Gilstrap, vice president, American Association of University Women; Mrs. Alf Gundersen, vice president, League of Women Voters of the United States; Willard V. Merrihue, manager of personnel practices and community relations services, General Electric Co.; Vernon C. Myers, publisher, Look magazine; Quigg Newton, president, University of Colorado; H. Bruce Palmer, president, Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co.; Philip M. Talbott, chairman of the board, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Donald H. Webster, director, Bureau of Governmental Research and Services, University of Washington; and Arnold S. Zander, president, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO.

On the First Team

As readers of the front page will already know, Westport has made the first team in the annual all-America cities competition. It has been named by a body of jurors selected by the National Municipal League and Look magazine, co-sponsors of the competition, as one of the 11 American cities which made the greatest progress during the past year. Westport and New Haven, which also was honored for its extensive redevelopment program, have thus become the first two cities in Connecticut to be cited in the history of the award.

Westport's national publicity usually consists of hypoed-up, phoney baloney about gallons of martinis, two sport cars to every barn, and a theoretical existence of irresponsible gaiety that most of us have little time for. It is, therefore, especially heartening to see the town recognized for what it is—one with an unusually high quota of civic pride and an exceptionally large share of imaginative and intelligent citizens who are willing to work to make their community a better place in which to live.

For the award is not undeserved. Skeptics will rightly point out that a number of the areas in which the town has been applauded are far from finished business. That's so—and no one would claim otherwise. The award is for significant progress, not the achievement of the millenium. And, further, it should be clearly noted that many of the achievements cited were not accomplished within the 12 months to which the award applies. They are cumulative in the best sense; persistent citizens have been working at them for years. While Westport has certainly not finished its job, neither can its present progress be called a flash-in-the-pan.

The town has been specifically cited for advances in the areas of governmental structure, rational land use, tax reform, school improvement, better refuse disposal, and a sounder police organization. Each one of these can be fully justified.

With its new charter, Westport has an entirely modern form of small city government, which can operate as effectively as the voters staff it. The town's form of government is, in the very least, no longer an obstacle to coping with the problems of its growth; on the other hand, it can be a very useful tool. And those who fought for the charter, as well as those against it, realize that constructing it and passing it was a long and arduous task.

Under the planning and zoning commission's regimes of Cutler, Mackie and Dreyfous, Westport has take giant steps toward more adequate zoning and more comprehensive planning. By this summer, the town hopes to have completed an overall town plan.

Largely because of the efforts of a typical Westport volunteer committee, the town is currently getting its tax asessments in order. To say that taxes have been unfair is putting it a litle bit strongly, because they have been inequitable only in the sense that the town has grown a little faster than assessment procedures have developed. But we are now clearly on the way to a really professional revaluation in all categories of property.

Westport schools have long been of much better than average quality. Here the reward must certainly relate to cumulative efforts of Westport's boards of education and school administrators over the last decade. Progress has not stopped, but no one year is more notable than the other.

Some will be surprised to see refuse disposal mentioned in the list of positive factors. They should be reminded that, less than 2 years ago, Westport was conducting a smelly and sloppy dump; now, it is applauded for the best sanitary land-fill operation in the State. The fact that the town has not been able to settle on future sites as yet in no way should take away the credit for a professional technical job.

The police department also deserves its nod. Procedures have been modernized, morale has been improved, and leadership is sounder. The results are beginning to become apparent in an improved safety record and more efficient operation.

The credit for these achievements goes to the whole town—not just its officialdom or pundits. Town officials, town boards, volunteer study committees, unofficial committees to get things done, organizations like the CPA, the LWV, the PTA, and the women's groups, behind-the-scenes encouragers and schemers, those who keep our political parties vital, and the thousands of volunteer workers and voters who have contributed in one way or another, can all take satisfaction in Westport's selection for the first team—and we hope that plans are underway so that they can all share in the celebration.

The Town Crier has reason to be particularly proud and well-satisfied at this award. During the last 5 years, this newspaper has, as any good citizen should have, been active in promoting the progress of Westport. Some of the things accomplished, we initiated; and in none of the major victories for the cause of good town government did we fail to explain and support. These are, after all, a newspaper's principal obligations—to contribute to an enlightened democracy through clear and accurate presentation in an understandable manner, and to act as coach, cheerleader, and encourager to all those individuals and groups who are working for a better town.

We knew Westport was a good town to live in, before the award. But we also know it can stay that way only if it realizes that it must win a hypothetical award every year. Knowing Westport as we do, we have a hunch that it will stay on the first team of civic progress as long as have old pros like Sammy Baugh and Frank Gifford persisted in the top ranks of professional football.

Urban Renewal Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the mayor of Anniston, Ala., the Honorable George T. Morris, delivered a statement stressing the need for adequate funds for urban renewal, during the recent meeting of the Alabama League of Municipalities with Alabama Congressman here. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include this very fine statement:

OUR URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM MUST HAVE ADEQUATE FUNDS

(By George T. Morris)

Our urban renewal and slum clearance program is at the cross roads. It is a fundamental policy question on which we must make a final decision.

Happily both Houses of our great Congress are showing a willingness—even an eagerness—to make this decision once and for all. The Senate bill would provide $350 million for title I slum clearance grants annually over a 6-year period. The House bill as approved by the Rains housing subcommittee would provide $500 million for 3 years.

Both of the bills stress two fundamentals. First we must provide adequate funds to get the job done. Our cities are just too hard pressed to raise the necessary funds themselves. Unless the Federal grant program continues on an effective scale, we will never even scratch the surface of eliminating our cancerous slum problem.

PROGRAM MUST HAVE CONTINUITY

The second fundamental truth is that to be successful the slum clearance program must have continuity. These vast programs of slum clearance and urban renewal require planning and an orderly process of rational development. They cannot succeed on a stop and start basis.

Both the Senate and House bills have excellent slum clearance titles, but if we accept these two fundamental principles, I think it fair to say that the Senate bill with the 6-year period is more satisfactory from the point of view of program continuity, whereas the Rains bill on the House side is much more acceptable in terms of the size of the annual authorization. I am confident when the two Houses meet in conference that our two great Alabama legislators—JOHN SPARKMAN on the Senate side and ALBERT RAINS on the House side—will mesh the two bills together so as to achieve a final result which will provide both necessary continuity and ample program funds.

I am delighted that both Houses have rejected outright the administration's proposal to reduce the Federal contribution from two-thirds to one-half. I can think of no single

item better calculated to stop the urban renewal program in its tracks.

THE PRESIDENT HAS BEEN POORLY ADVISED

I can only conclude that the President's advisers have misled him. Any one at all cognizant with the facts of life of municipal finance knows that we have no further tax resources available to us. If our cities are forced to put up a larger share under the urban renewal program, the program will die and our slums will gradually engulf us all.

I am pleased to see that both the Senate and House bills contain a number of important and perfecting amendments which will make the urban renewal program more workable. Frankly, gentlemen, it is a horror of bureaucratic redtape at the present time. The dead hand of Federal bureaucracy has slowed progress to a snail's pace and I am hopeful that congressional action will get faster results from Washington.

I am hopeful that in the current legislation and in future legislation, the Congress will continue to search for ways to make better financing programs available in order to encourage the rehabilitation of existing dwellings. One of the great unsolved problems we face is how to prevent the constant slide of neighborhoods into a stage of blight and deterioration.

I am convinced that the Congress is demonstrating the courage and drive which we must never relinquish if we are ever to rid our cities of slums and blighted areas. Our greatest enemies are the timid and half-hearted proponents of half measures. We must brush them aside and approach the future with a confident, vigorous, and expanding urban renewal program.

HOW ALABAMA COMMUNITIES HAVE GONE FOR PROGRAM

You gentlemen will be interested in the fact that Alabama municipalities have taken a leading role in urban renewal since the enactment of the Housing Act of 1949. Mobile and Montgomery started planning activities for slum clearance projects in 1950. Birmingham and Florence in 1951, and Gadsden initiated two projects in 1952. To date, acting through their housing authorities, 19 Alabama cities have received advances of funds for the planning of 30 urban renewal projects. For these 30 projects, a total of $1,091,090 in planning advances has been approved and $14,581,805 in capital grant reservations has been made available. Alabama has more urban renewal projects in actual execution (23) than any other Southern State. The Hare project in Auburn enjoys the distinction of being the first urban renewal project in the South to be completed and closed out, and Florence's Handy Heights project and Birmingham's medical center should be closed out by June 30 of this year.

I am not going to take up more of your time to read the statistics, but I have listed them here for the record and you may see the extent to which we have gone in using the advantages of this wonderful program.

The following is a breakdown of the 30 projects by congressional districts:

Congressional district	Number of cities	Projects	Planning advances	Capital grant
1st	3	4	$107,610	$1,223,088
2d	1	2	102,570	2,086,358
3d	5	5	140,910	1,193,452
4th	0	0	0	0
5th	1	2	78,280	1,100,963
6th	0	0	0	0
7th	1	2	37,121	281,779
8th	5	9	252,874	2,629,175
9th	3	6	371,725	6,066,990
Total	19	30	1,091,090	14,581,805

OUR CITIES PARTICIPATE IN WORKABLE PROGRAM

Alabama towns and cities were quick to grasp the workable program for urban renewal concept and have utilized the workable program as a guide for sound community development, both in the present and for the future. As of January 15, 1959, 68 Alabama communities had workable programs in effect, or submitted for approval. The distribution by congressional districts follows:

Congressional district:	*Workable programs*
1st	4
2d	7
3d	15
4th	6
5th	5
6th	9
7th	12
8th	7
9th	3
Total	68

USE OF SECTION 221 HOUSING IN STATE

Section 221 is a mortgage-insurance program of the Federal Government under a special section of the National Housing Act to help private industry provide low-cost relocation housing for sale or rent, through new or existing construction. The program authorizes liberal terms for private financing of low-cost relocation housing for eligible displaced families and offers attractive opportunities for builders and lenders to participate in this undertaking. Twenty-one Alabama communities now have section 221 mortgage insurance approved. As of October 31, 1958, this represented more "221 cities" than any other Southeastern State. A breakdown by congressional districts follows:

Congressional districts	Cities	Number of units approved (white and nonwhite)
1st	2	1,258
2d	1	96
3d	7	334
4th	2	120
5th	1	700
6th	0	0
7th	1	8
8th	5	1,151
9th	2	2,720
Total	21	6,387

Milwaukee's Mayor Zeidler Points Up Real Issue in Chicago Bid To Divert Lake Michigan Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Mayor Frank Zeidler of the city of Milwaukee has made an exceptionally able and succinct statement of the argument against the enactment of H.R. 1, which would authorize the city of Chicago to divert 1,000 cubic feet per second of Lake Michigan into the drainage system of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Mayor Zeidler be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY FRANK P. ZEIDLER, MAYOR, CITY OF MILWAUKEE, WIS., IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 1, 86TH CONGRESS, TO REQUIRE A STUDY AND TO AUTHORIZE INCREASED DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY, PREPARED FOR THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Bill H.R. 1 before the present Congress asks for an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second diversion of Lake Michigan water into the drainage system of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago in order to test the effect of this fresh water supply and the oxygenation caused thereby on the drainage canal.

It seems to me that the determination of what the effect of introducing further Lake Michigan water into the district will be is largely dependent upon what is happening in the works of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. Obviously, the effects of added Lake Michigan water on the water in the Chicago Sanitary Canal will be profoundly influenced by the degree of efficiency which the sanitary district maintains in its operations and by many other factors under the direct and sole control of the sanitary district.

Thus, it seems to me to be an absurd proposition to ask the Secretary of the Army (acting through the Chief of Engineers) to investigate the effects of the additional diversion of water into the sanitary canal of Chicago if no one is to closely scrutinize and watch the operations of the sanitary district. The findings of the investigation can have no validity whatsoever if the operations of the sanitary district are not carried on at their highest degree of efficiency.

The Congress of the United States and various national governments have been reluctant to look into the operation and methods of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago largely on the grounds that this agency is a creature of the government of the State of Illinois, is responsible to that State government, and also is responsible to the people in the Chicago area. However, one has but to point out the contradictory position of the officials of this sanitary district in the past to learn that the operations of the sanitary district are not uniform in their efficiency. While the district officials have claimed the highest efficiency, apparently from recent testimony this has not been so.

For instance, the testimony given by Casimir Griglik, a trustee of the district, before the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on March 26, 1956 asserted that the Chicago Sanitary District was operating at a degree of efficiency of around 90 percent. However, news articles which appeared in two of the major Chicago papers, the Chicago Tribune and the Chicago Daily News on September 4, 1957, point out the fact that Chief Engineer Horace P. Ramey of this district appearing before a grand jury testified that the district was not operating at the efficiency which Mr. Griglik stated to the House subcommittee but was operating at much less efficiency and was dumping increasing tonnages of untreated sludge in the canal each day.

I submit that it is ridiculous and absurd for the U.S. Army Engineers to attempt to make any scientific determination of the effects of Lake Michigan water on the water in the sanitary canal, for the sanitary district can always demonstrate that the canal is in a state of pollution simply by dumping more sludge into the canal. The sanitary district, the city of Chicago, and the surrounding communities have no justification in asking for increased water diversion because they do not operate their sanitary system at its highest efficiency.

The city of Chicago still has many unmetered water outlets which increase the flow of water through district facilities and make the treatment and pollution problems more difficult for the sanitary district. The sanitary district, according to a report made by the Illinois legislative council in 1953, is not taking enough vigorous steps to reduce industrial pollution and, as it has lately been proven, has not operated its works at greatest efficiency.

How is the Congress of the United States going to insure the rest of the communities and States of the Great Lakes who also have an interest in the level of the lakes that the sanitary district and the Chicago communities within the district are engaging in a maximum effort to treat their sewage before pouring an effluent into the sanitary canal? No one yet has been able to make this district meet its obligations.

Since no other State has the right to interfere with the sanitary district and since the imperfect operations of this district are leading to incessant demands to diminish the rights of others in the waters of Lake Michigan and the Great Lakes, the only alternative left to communities outside of the District is a categorical opposition to the proposals to divert more water from Lake Michigan and the Great Lakes. This is the only means by which the people of Chicago and other communities will be brought to the realization that they are paying money for the operation of a sanitary district which is not carrying out its responsibilities.

It is not too much to suggest that if the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, the Chicago people, and the Chicago newspapers (who are fooling the people by not reporting the full story of the operations of the sanitary district) insist on their demands for additional diversion of Lake Michigan water, then the rest of the States could demand that the sanitary system of Chicago be federalized in order to insure that the diversion of water from the Great Lakes is not taking place unnecessarily. H.R. 1 should be categorically opposed because it is absurd from a scientific point of view, and because the sanitary district still has much that it can do to end pollution in the sanitary canal before it should ask for more water from Lake Michigan to flush untreated sewage down to the Mississippi.

FRANK P. ZEIDLER.

Address of Mayor Willy Brandt, of Berlin, and Governor Stratton, of Illinois, at 150th Lincoln's Birthday Celebration at Springfield, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the most colorful and inspiring observances of the 150th birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln took place last Thursday in Springfield, Ill., the final resting place of the beloved Great Emancipator.

It was colorful because of the presence in Springfield of the governing Mayor of West Berlin, Willy Brandt, and of many of the ambassadors representing free nations throughout the world. It was one of the largest gatherings of foreign envoys ever witnessed in the Midwest.

The ceremony was inspiring, Mr. President, not only because of the occasion, but also because of the moving address delivered by Mayor Brandt and the distinguished speech of Governor Stratton of Illinois.

Mayor Brandt displayed at Springfield the same combination of toughness and vision that marked his discussions in Washington, New York, and elsewhere during his tour of the United States. This 44-year-old Social Democrat, who entered Berlin politics under the late Ernst Reuter, after World War II, and who was a voluntary exile in Norway during the Hitler regime, is a symbol of liberty to the 2¼ million free Berliners whose city is surrounded by a Communist police state.

Governor Stratton, who will celebrate his 45th birthday next week, is no stranger to many Members of this body. He served with distinction as a Member of the House of Representatives in the 77th and 80th Congresses. The son of the late William J. Stratton, who for many years was an illustrious Secretary of State of Illinois, Governor Stratton is now serving his second term as Governor of Illinois.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a partial text of the Governor's address and newspaper reports on the observance, including an excerpt from Mayor Brandt's speech, which was published in the Chicago Sun-Times and the Chicago Daily Tribune.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the addresses and the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY GOVERNOR WILLIAM G. STRATTON, OF ILLINOIS, AT THE ABRAHAM LINCOLN SESQUICENTENNIAL BANQUET IN SPRINGFIELD, FEBRUARY 12, 1959

We are privileged here tonight to have with us one of the largest assemblies of representatives from around the world ever gathered in our State. They have come with one purpose in mind—to honor Abraham Lincoln on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his birth.

Why is this? Why do you from free nations gather and pay tribute to this humble Illinois citizen? There is but one answer—it is your respect for Lincoln's great gift to the world—his regard for human right and liberty, and his symbolic stand for unity in peace, born out of the rigors of war.

I bid you welcome to this land where Lincoln walked with life and where his spiritual presence still abides. I suggest that a gathering of this kind here every year might be beneficial to the world, for here tonight we emphasize the values of humility, of belief in the rights of all, of the might that is made by right.

In 1858, Lincoln said our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms. Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere. This is the principle at stake in Berlin today. It is the principle for which brave men gave their lives in Hungary. It has closed the ranks of free nations to an extent never before considered possible against the threat of a new era of depotism and slavery. Nations that once fought against each other have joined, not only in common defense of their security, but in united works for the human betterment of their peoples. The European economic community is a giant step forward toward asserting what Lincoln held to be, and I quote, "The natural right of man to eat the bread, without leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns."

The preservation of freedom cannot be achieved by static defense. Indeed, freedom cannot long survive if it is isolated from the mainstream of human needs and aspirations. Were he alive today, Lincoln would surely welcome the move toward unity on the European continuent represented by the European economic community. It can scarcely be doubted that he would consider this to be an opportunity to achieve an even larger unity of free men and a standard around which liberty loving peoples in every corner of the globe could be brought to rally.

The move toward closer unity in Europe brings within reach Lincoln's hope for wider freedom, political and economic, for the common man. There are different opinions today as to the relative military postures of the free countries and their adversaries, but there cannot be any argument as to the relative economic capacities. Our enemies are amply equipped to make war against small peoples and their political institutions and aspirations, but we are surely better equipped to make war against hunger and disease. This is a war that Lincoln would urge us to wage without stint in the world of today. Let us by all means maintain our common military staffs—for indeed this necessity is forced upon us—but let us also combine our best productive and economic minds in a joint chiefs of staff for the human betterment of humble peoples throughout the world—people whose judgment of freedom or slavery is measured by a piece of bread.

The great scientific and economic advances of the last hundred years have made it possible to translate many of Lincoln's hopes for humanity into reality. This community in which Lincoln's career as a young lawyer had its beginnings is now only hours away from the leading capitals of Europe. A hundred years ago, the State of Illinois was a figment of wild west literature to Europe's citizenry. Today, the State's colleges and universities include European, African, and Asiatic youth in their student bodies. A hundred years ago, this heartland of America defied access by any but the most hardy overland traveler. Today its airports accommodate the aircraft of every international airline and the St. Lawrence Seaway is a major artery through which oceangoing vessels of every land can bring passengers and cargo directly to the shores of Mid-America. These advances make it possible on a larger scale than ever before to further the personal bonds between the free peoples of other lands and their counterparts in the United States. More and more, in the days ahead, we must exchange farmers, and factory workers, students and professional people, as well as diplomats. Now, the smallest hamlet of inner America is as accessible as our larger cities, and from this accessibility can come a new perspective. Now the sum total of what America thinks and feels is open to visitors from abroad. It is up to us to use these advantages intelligently and for the common good. In groping for a modus vivendi with the Soviets, the United States has been able to win some agreement on exchanges of persons between the two countries. Such exchanges are desirable as far as they go, but are they really serving the purpose that the United States, for its part, hoped to achieve?

They do not appear to have changed any fundamental thinking in the Soviet Union. On the other hand, there is a great mutual benefit to be derived from a substantial increase in exchanges between the peoples of the free countries. Here, I would place

special emphasis on person to person exchanges between the free nations which have joined together in mutual commitments and those nations which, though retaining their freedom, remain uncommitted. These are countries, where, in the main, economic development has lagged, where living standards are low and individual privation is a constant target of alien propaganda aimed at the overthrow of democratic institutions. Here, too, is an area in which the free nations can and should join in common planning and common action. The experience and know-how of our combined foreign services add up to an immense reservoir of knowledge that can be put to valuable use in establishing a joint program for people-to-people exchanges between Europe and the United States on the one hand and those nations of Asia, America, and Africa where the will to freedom is still alight. By their visit to the final resting place of the humble man who will always be Illinois' first citizen, the distinguished representatives of our sister nations abroad have here pointed the way to that more personal relationship between their people and ours which will be so greatly needed in the days ahead to preserve freedom in a troubled world.

I thank these representatives of lands across the seas for joining with us in honoring Abraham Lincoln. Let us remember, from tonight, that Lincoln is actually a symbol of unity—of unity based on the highest ideals.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Feb. 13, 1959]

BERLIN'S BRANDT HAILS LINCOLN SPIRIT

(By Tom Littlewood)

SPRINGFIELD.—The leader of freedom's vigil in West Berlin fingered through the century-old lessons of Abraham Lincoln Thursday for inspiration and guidance in an anxious hour of crisis.

Most of the free men of the world were represented at a festive international banquet marking the 150th anniversary of the great prairie President's birth.

Men of many tongues and races journeyed to the resting place of the gangling country lawyer whose peculiar plainfolk genius was nurtured in Illinois.

It was in this community where Lincoln lived, practiced law, sharpened his political skills—and where his body was returned.

FOURTEEN HUNDRED AT DINNER

About 1,400 persons attended the dinner in the state armory, at which Mayor Willy Brandt of West Berlin delivered the principal address. Some 2,000 others watched from the balcony.

He called for flexibility—but with inflexible principles—to solve the problems of his divided city within a divided nation.

"For the days ahead, firmness, unity and patience are as important for the West as the willingness to examine changing conditions and to accommodate ourselves to them whenever possible," he said.

Neither an isolated nor a sudden solution is possible for Berlin, the mayor declared. "We must hope for gradual changes, for step-by-step solutions as the result of persistent negotiations," he added.

ELOQUENT TRIBUTE

The robust, square-jawed German delivered an eloquent tribute to Lincoln as the champion of self-government everywhere. Brandt recalled the words of Lincoln about "the electric cord that links the hearts of patriotic and liberty-loving men together throughout the world."

Lincoln sensed, too, Brandt said, that "there is much talk about freedom, but the concept of freedom is often filled with very different substance."

That is relevant today, Brandt said, in the Russian demand that Western powers leave Berlin to make it a "free" demilitarized city.

WANT UNILATERAL CHANGE

"Those who talked about a demilitarized city and who accuse the West of wanting to prolong artificially the occupation status, want in fact," asserted the mayor, "to squeeze Berlin like a lemon by means of the ring of Soviet divisions encircling the city."

The world must understand, he said, that "the East wants nothing but a unilateral change in circumstances to their own advantage and to the disadvantage of the West."

A new and permanent settlement cannot be built on breaches of justice and treaty law, Brandt stressed.

WON'T LOSE FREEDOM

"This can and will not come to pass," he said. "You can rely on the people of Berlin. We know how important it is to perserve peace, but we do not want to lose our freedom. If freedom is at stake, we will bend our knee to nobody."

Governor Stratton paid tribute to Brandt as a man in the Lincoln tradition who holds a position at the hub of the fight of the free world against human slavery.

The Governor said, "Our enemies are amply equipped to make war against small peoples and their political institutions and aspirations, but we are surely better equipped to make war against hunger and disease.

"This is a war that Lincoln would urge us to wage without stint in the world of today."

Brandt told of the freedom bell that hangs in the townhall of West Berlin, inscribed with Lincoln's words that the whole world "under God shall have a new birth of freedom."

"Each day at 12 noon," said the mayor, "we listen to the sound of this bell, which reminds us of what we have to preserve and what we have yet to achieve."

UNITER OF PEOPLE

Lincoln in martyrdom has gone down in history as the uniter of his people, Brandt noted.

"But this man belongs to all of us, above all to our young people, and he lives in the hearts of mankind everywhere.

"In Abraham Lincoln intellectual force was matched with moral strength. He understood the spirit as well as the needs of his time; and he was possessed of that pragmatic way of thinking which is conducive to successful action and which always stands the test if it is anchored in firm convictions."

SAYS GERMANS KNOW

The great majority of Germans know from bitter experience, Brandt said, Lincoln's mention of the duty of the whole people never to entrust "to any hands but their own * * * the preservation of their own liberties."

Brandt referred also to Lincoln's famous statement that a government cannot endure half slave and half free.

"The truths which Lincoln spoke here in Springfield in June 1858 are perhaps even more applicable to the present situation of the German people than to the one which he faced; that is, to the arbitrary disruption of their lives, for which, of course, they are not without guilt themselves.

"I can only tell you that the Germans in the East and in the West have not accepted this situation and that they will not accept conditions under which a son is separated from his mother, a brother from his brother.

REFUGEES IN OWN COUNTRY

"I can only ask you to imagine what it means when each and every day for 10 years and more hundreds of Germans become refugees in their own country, because they can no longer endure the tyrannical pressure put upon them in the part of Germany ruled by the Soviets."

The Thursday evening affair, sponsored by the Illinois Sesquicentennial Commission, highlighted the day's celebrations.

ENVOYS PRESENT

The international flavor at the banquet was provided by a delegation of foreign envoys from Washington.

Three—Ambassadors Sir Harold Caccia of Britain, Herve Alphand of France, and Ernest Bonhamme of Haiti—delivered toasts to Lincoln's memory.

Caccia said that "even in this tragic and bloodstained century," the cause of freedom has advanced. He said this has happened because the State has assumed a larger role in making the dignity of man a reality for all individuals, "and not merely a pious aspiration."

One of the emotional highlights of the evening occurred when Alphand climaxed his speech by turning to Brandt and declaring in a firm voice:

"Speaking as a Frenchman to a German, when we talk of freedom for all men everywhere, we are thinking above all tonight of the 3 million citizens of West Berlin, with the resolve to fight if need be for the preservation of their freedom."

The only Iron Curtain representative to accept an invitation, Dr. Carl Duda of Czechoslovakia, canceled out on the last day.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Feb. 13, 1959]

BRANDT TERMS LINCOLN A WELL OF FAITH TODAY

(By Percy Wood)

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., February 12.—Voices of foreign envoys were heard here Thursday night in respectful and eloquent tribute to Abraham Lincoln on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

Governor Stratton presided at the event, a dinner by the Illinois Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission at the State armory, which drew 1,400 people including diplomatic representatives of 21 countries. Hundreds of other spectators filled the galleries to hear speakers from Germany, France, and England.

Mayor Willy Brandt, of West Berlin, made the principal address, and toasts to Lincoln were given by Harold Caccia, British Ambassador, and Herve Alphand, Ambassador of the French Republic. Countries represented extended from Canada to Indonesia.

STRATTON SETS THE STAGE

Stratton keynoted the international character of the affair by saying that Lincoln is a symbol of unity based on the highest ideals—"his regard for human right and liberty, and his symbolic stand for unity in peace, born out of the rigors of war."

The war against hunger and disease, the Governor said, is one "that Lincoln would urge us to wage without stint in the world of today."

"Let us by all means maintain our common military staffs, for indeed this necessity is forced upon us," Stratton said, "but let us also combine our best productive and economic minds in a joint chiefs of staff for the human betterment of humble peoples throughout the world—people whose judgment of freedom or slavery is measured by a piece of bread."

Mayor Brandt, the 45-year-old German opponent of communism chosen as the dinner speaker because of the similarity of his position to Lincoln's "house divided," told the gathering that millions of freedom living men and women, worldwide, honor Lincoln "who in martyrdom has gone down in history as the united of his people."

LINCOLN NOT OURS ALONE

"But this man does not belong to you alone," he continued. "He belongs to all of us, above all to our young people, and he lives in the hearts of mankind everywhere. In Abraham Lincoln intellectual force was matched with moral strength.

"He understood the spirit as well as the needs of his time; and he was possessed of that pragmatic way of thinking which is conducive to successful action and which always stands the test if it is anchored in firm convictions."

In his address, Brandt said that while he felt his audience would not expect him to give an interpretation of Lincoln in terms of domestic American affairs, "yet even an outsider may venture the guess that those who stood 'on the other side of the barricade' during the Civil War would also agree today without hesitation that the United States could not have become a haven of freedom and the leading world power had the unity of the Nation been shattered.

WORDS MEAN MORE TODAY

"Lincoln spoke," the West German statesman continued, "of the eternal struggle between democracy and tyranny. We know that this struggle has torn apart the European Continent and that it has assumed worldwide dimensions. He quoted the passage from the Bible about the house divided against itself, and expressed his conviction that this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free."

These truths of Lincoln, spoken in Springfield in June 1958, "are perhaps even more applicable to the present situation of the German people than to the one which he faced," Brandt said, "that is, to the arbitrary disruption of their lives, for which, of course, they are not without guilt themselves.

SPIRITS STILL HIGH

"I can only tell you that the Germans in the east and in the west have not accepted this situation and they will not accept conditions under which a son is separated from his mother, a brother from his brother.

"I can only ask you all to imagine what it means when each and every day for 10 years and more hundreds of Germans become refugees in their own country, because they can no longer endure the tyrannical pressure put upon them in the part of Germany ruled by the Soviets. I must make you aware of the danger resulting from this arbitrary division. It is a threat to peace in Europe and to peace in the world."

Berlin has once more become the target of Soviet "probing and blackmail," Brandt declared, and he predicted that the climax of this Russian-provoked crisis has not yet been reached.

FAITH IN ALLIES GROWS

"I wish to say to you here in Springfield," the mayor added, "as well as to all the people of America, how greatly indebted we are to you. I have just passed several pleasant and encouraging days; and they have strengthened my conviction that Berlin can rely on its friends and that we shall march forward shoulder to shoulder, permitting nothing to come between us."

In other remarks, Brandt said Lincoln had been a friend of labor, having called "the free laborer a bulwark of democracy," and that he considered those particularly worthy to be trusted who toil upward from poverty.

"This spirit of impartiality and of faith in equal opportunity was also understood on the other side of the ocean. A police conference in Berlin in June 1865, however, regarded it as improper that the General Association of German Workers expressed its sympathy on the occasion of Lincoln's death in addresses to the American Government.

"ANOTHER HUNGARY PROTEST

"Perhaps we should also remember that Lincoln was one of those men in Springfield, more than 100 years ago, who put it on paper that Russian action with regard to the Hungarian freedom fighters of those days was an 'illegal and unwarrantable interference.'

"In other words, Lincoln and his friends avowed their solidarity with all those people in the world who fought for freedom, for human rights and for the right to self-policy have since borne the mark of this reliance. Important periods of American principle. The world would look bad indeed had not the American people and their Government been permeated by this basic attitude, especially during recent decades."

Heroic Work of U.S. Mail Carriers Along the Oregon Seacoast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as the third-ranking majority member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I take pride in presenting for the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Oregonian of Portland of November 30, 1958, which describes the heroic and valiant deeds of rural mail carriers during the frontier era along Oregon's rugged seacoast.

This article, by Marjorie Jorgenson, special writer of the Oregonian, tells of another vivid chapter of achievement in the efficient and effective delivery system of the U.S. Post Office Department. I know it will interest my colleagues, who only last summer passed our bill providing for a 10 percent pay increase for the underpaid men and women who sort, classify and deliver the U.S. mails. We also improved the mileage allowance of present-day rural mail carriers who use their own vehicles on Uncle Sam's business.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON COAST

(By Marjorie Jorgenson)

At the turn of the century carrying the U.S. mail the 40 miles from Florence to Waldport was a rugged undertaking. The circuit followed the coastline north to Cape Perpetua, with an overnight stop at an Indian cabin, on to Waldport—then back again.

The postman's creed spoke strongly here. Men bid the job from Uncle Sam for $200 a year, covered the route every 4 days, fair weather or foul, even when there were only 20 families the whole distance to send and receive it. Often, "the sack weighed more than the mail," but it always went through.

A hazardous hurdle was the half-mile stretch around Cape Perpetua, the "windy cape." A narrow track blasted out of the cliff face was the trail. Not over 3 feet wide at any point, it was a shoehorn fit between rough rock wall and outer space. Often patches of horsehair were seen where the horse's flank rubbed as he hugged the cliff.

Heavy winds could billow a man to the ocean below.

At Yachats recently Mr. and Mrs. Nick Ludemann and Pete Jorgensen, pioneer residents, laughed over remembrance of the salesman who, in October 1897, essayed to follow Jorgensen on his mail run.

At Howell House, in Waldport, the stranger had inquired if someone could guide him to Florence. Mail carrier Jorgensen was walking through the lobby.

"I'm going to Florence. You're welcome to come along," he invited.

With a fresh horse from the livery stable, the salesman followed.

The first 12 miles lay along the beach, hard packed by rain and tide, with only the minor hurdle of Yaquina John Point, where you matched your time to the tide and raced the ninth wave to get around. Then the trail led abruptly upward over rock, through salal, Oregon grape, and huckleberry brush.

On a headland overlooking the gray and squally Pacific, Jorgensen dismounted. He tightened the horses' cinches, carefully tied their stirrups over the saddles, checked his mail-pouch fastenings. He took off his heavy rain slicker, rolled and tied it to his saddle. Now his neat black suit, his ankle-tie shoes, made odd contrast to the black "sou'west" strapped tight under his chin and glistening with seaspray and rain.

Nervously eyeing Jorgensen, then the blank cliff wall, the salesman blurted, "Where's the trail?"

"Right there." Jorgensen pointed to the rocky ledge which wandered out over the cliff face to a point in middle distance, abruptly disappearing as it rounded the cape.

"I'll find another way to Florence," the salesman said firmly. He turned his horse. Back at Waldport, he caught the stage inland to Corvallis, south to Junction City, west again to Florence. Six days and three mail runs later, Jorgensen bumped into him in Florence. But, do you know, he barely nodded.

Twice in the eighties horse, rider, and mail were lost without trace off Perpetua Trail. That was before the improved trail of 1897. But only twice. No other mail was ever lost except the contents of one lone packet spilled into the postman's leather pouch and trickled through a tiny hole in the bottom. The man to whom the package was addressed received only the empty envelope, but he got his value, anyway. It was a packet of seeds ordered from London—tiny English daisies, for which he was homesick.

A few years later the mail route was a wash of white flowerets. They spread out along the coastal communities. Today they are sometimes called bachelor buttons, and even the inland towns are often blessed, or cursed, with them popping up on lawns.

USIA Fails To Tell Other People of Respectable Position of Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the well-informed Constantine Brown, national columnist, calls to the attention of his readers in a column published in the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, February 24, the poor job being done by the U.S. Information Agency in explaining the plight of the Negro in the United States. Mr. Brown illus-

trates that the American Negro lives in far greater luxury than most of the foreigners who feel sorry for him, and also states that a large number of Negroes prefer segregation. These views are never given to our foreign friends; as a result, race relations in the United States are not helped by agitation from abroad.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Brown's column, entitled "USIA Seen Failing To Tell Other People of Respectable Position of Negroes," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIVING WORLD TRUE U.S. PICTURE—USIA SEEN FAILING TO TELL OTHER PEOPLE OF RESPECTABLE POSITION OF NEGROES

(By Constantine Brown)

With the assortment of crises, dilemmas and issues which confront our Nation in almost monotonous regularity, the question is often heard, "What will our allies think of us?" or "This is grist for the Soviet propaganda mill."

American taxpayers have contributed millions of dollars to the U.S. Information Agency and its offspring, the Voice of America. Our USIA offices around the world and in every important capital are well staffed and, we hope, well supplied with all the information available to counteract Soviet propaganda and to explain some of the vital issues we must see in this country.

One of the most important issues in the last 3 years has been integration. When this reporter made his last trip around the world in the fall of 1958 he was asked in almost every country he visited about our racial problems. Far too often the questioner's tone of voice reflected a feeling that America was treating its colored citizens in a very shabby fashion.

In Karachi, Pakistan, for instance, the leading English language newspaper, Dawn, ran a lead editorial severely criticizing the United States on the subject.

In France I found people who actually believed that American Negroes were starving given no voting rights, and lived in ghettos, much like the Jews in Hitler's Germany.

In Tokyo I heard that many people believed that Negroes were lynched every day.

Nowhere did I find any attempt of the USIA to explain how well off American Negroes are comparatively; how many of them live in well-built houses, how many of them drive the most expensive cars. Nor that the majority of American Negroes live in far greater luxury than many of the foreigners who are feeling so sorry for them.

Neither did I find any evidence that our USIA was presenting to our friends both sides of our segregation question. To the people overseas it would seem that all of America's white citizens hate all American black citizens, and vice versa. It was never told to them, for instance, that there are a large number of Negroes who prefer segregation and who are working alongside and with the whites who also prefer it.

There is ample evidence which the USIA could present. A leading publisher of a string of weekly Negro newspapers, Davis Lee, has written several editorials on the subject. In one published in the Anderson, S.C., Herald on January 18, Mr. Lee said: "These (Negro) advocates of desegregation want to force white people to desegregate, but they haven't desegregated within our race. In some sections of South Carolina the yellow Negroes won't have anything to do with the dark Negroes. I know Negroes in Charleston who will not speak to other Negroes because they are of different stations in life.

"In some sections the yellow and mulatto Negroes have churches that dark Negroes cannot attend. The educated Negro shuns the uneducated of his race. The professional members of our race will rob and exploit the unfortunate members of our race. But they refuse to associate with them on an equal social basis. * * * At the rate they are going, in a few years there will not be a Negro race. You can hardly conceive of sensible leaders advocating a movement that is going to do away with our race. But that is what they are doing."

If the USIA wanted to present proof to our friends overseas that the American Negroes are not a downtrodden and starving minority in our country, they need only to quote Mr. Lee further. He wrote: "Ted Lewis is one of Atlanta's leading Negro businessmen. Some time ago he was having financial difficulty. He went to some of the city's leading Negro businessmen, including the bankers, and tried to borrow $2,500.

They turned him down flat. He went to the small-loan department of the C. & S. Bank. One of the officials went over his plans with him, and then recommended that he borrow $5,000 instead of $2,500. The bank let him have the money without questions. As a result he is a success today, a credit to Georgia and his race.

There are many things our USIA could do to let the world know that the American Negroes are respected, intelligent, and first-class American citizens. It is only a vocal few of both the black and white race who are giving our country a black eye on every continent of the world.

Social Security and the Municipalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the mayor of Tallassee, Ala., the Honorable Roy C. Billings, delivered a statement showing the relationship of the social security program to the municipalities, during the recent meeting of the Alabama League of Municipalities with Alabama Congressmen here. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include this very fine statement:

THE SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM AND THE MUNICIPALITIES

(By Roy C. Billings)

Thanks to the untiring efforts of the Alabama congressional delegation for years, the Federal social security law was finally amended in 1950 to make possible coverage of municipal government employees under the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the law. Prior to that time all public employees were completely excluded from coverage under the program. Coverage now amounts to the only retirement plan for the overwhelming majority of city and town government employees in our State.

This coverage was available provided the States had enacted proper State enabling legislation to take advantage of such coverage. Alabama was one of the first States to get proper legislation passed which is known as Act No. 48, House Bill 34, Fifth Special Session, 1950.

The Federal Social Security Act amendment of 1950 made provisions for the coverage of State and local government employees under voluntary agreements made by the individual States with the Federal Security Administrator.

SAME BENEFITS AS WORKERS IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY

Employees covered through these voluntary agreements gain the same rights and benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program as covered employees in private industry. The responsibilities of the State are similar to those of any large corporation which has branches in several geographical locations.

Naturally there are some features of the program for the coverage of State and local government employees which have no parallel in private industry because the organization of governmental units is not identical with that of private organizations and because certain functions and the way they must be carried on are peculiar to government. Also the election of coverage for employees of the State and its political subdivisions require that a State develop and put into operation procedures for the performance of responsibilities which are new to it—the responsibilities for negotiating agreements, for reporting wages and for paying contributions.

The State of Alabama entered into an agreement with the Federal Security Administration on July 6, 1951. This agreement has been amended from time to time at the request of the State with respect to bringing additional eligible coverage groups under the old age and survivors insurance program. The following is a breakdown of municipal governments and related instrumentalities now participating in the program by yearly operations—cities and towns, waterworks boards, gas departments, electric departments, municipal utilities boards, libraries, hospitals, housing authorities, city boards of education, park and recreation boards, city improvement authorities and city community centers:

Year	Number of reporting units	Number of employees	Total covered wages	Total tax remitted
1951	190	5,700	$11,443,432.55	$343,302.98
1952	258	9,800	14,885,034.98	446,551.05
1953	285	11,300	17,471,941.86	524,158.26
1954	327	14,100	19,362,141.79	774,485.67
1955	516	20,700	50,038,140.57	2,001,525.62
1956	601	48,100	61,591,039.51	2,463,641.58
1957	673	51,200	65,156,987.79	2,932,064.45
1958	690	64,000	68,228,989.46	3,070,304.53

ONLY 17 PLACES ABOVE 500 POPULATION NOT COVERED

At the present time there are only 4 cities with a population of over 1,000, and only 13 with a population of over 500, that are not participating in the program.

During the year 1958 the Federal law was again amended by the enactment of Public Law 85-226 (providing coverage to policemen and firemen on an elective basis) to certain States, one of which was Alabama. Seven Alabama political subdivisions extended coverage to policemen and firemen under the provisions of this legislation. At the present time only five political subdivisions with local retirement plans have not taken advantage of coverage for policemen and firemen.

There are certain items of particular interest that we would like to see enacted into law by amending title II of the Social Security Act which would, is passed, benefit many State and local government employees. They are listed as follows:

1. To provide legislation which will establish the same safeguards with regard to a statute of limitation for State and political

subdivisions as is now applicable in the case of private employers—that is, public bodies should be required to go back only 3 years, 3 months, and 15 days, after the year of occurrence of event, to correct errors in reporting employment, and taxes collected.

2. To continue opposition to any plan of annual reporting to the Internal Revenue Service as it affects State and local governments. Cities and towns remit social security taxes not to Internal Revenue but to Social Security Board through the State agency.

3. Remove limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits. Some more reasonable limitation than the present regulations would be more realistic.

FULL BENEFITS FOR MALE EMPLOYEES ON REACHING 62

4. To provide that full benefits, when based upon retirement age, will be payable to both men and women at age 62. Women may now retire at 62.

5. To increase the number of years which may be excluded under the dropout feature in computing an individual's primary insurance so as to permit the computation of such amount on the basis of his 5 years of highest earnings. As it stand at the present time, it will be many years before an individual will be eligible to draw the present maximum benefit of $127. In fact, the $400 monthly average will generally not be possible for anyone who has attained the age of 27 before 1959. Payments based on the $400 average cannot be made unless all credits used in figuring the benefits are earned after 1958. In other words, if the 5-year dropout provision is not amended, it will be necessary for years of lower income to be used in computing benefits which would mean the individual could not receive the maximum benefit. The law increasing the maximum benefit to $127 per month did not make any provisions for increasing the number of years for dropout purposes.

6. To establish a program of insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance and disability insurance.

7. To permit the child of a deceased individual to continue to be eligible for child's insurance benefits after attaining age 18 and before attaining age 21 if he has regularly and continuously been a student during such period.

Retirement of Ray Conway, of Oregon State Motor Association, and Appointment of A. N. Weir as His Successor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as a member of the Roads and Highways Subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee, I realize the crucial need of an adequate network of roads in our great country. The leadership of our able subcommittee chairman, the senior Senator frim Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] has been especially helpful in this regard.

But we also require able counselors throughout the Nation. Many of these have come from the ranks of the American Automobile Association, the famed AAA. One such leader has been T. Ray Conway, for many years manager of the Oregon State Motor Association. Mr. Conway is one of the men whose wisdom has been a factor in making Oregon the first State to finance its roads with a motor-fuel tax and also one of the foremost States in the development of its highway program.

In December of 1958 Mr. Conway announced his retirement. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the January 5, 1959, issue of the Oregonian of Portland, in tribute to Mr. Conway's foresight and leadership, under the title of "Ray Conway's Record," be published at this point in my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with an article from the December issue of the Oregon Motorist, giving the highlights of Mr. Conway's outstanding career.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian, Jan. 5, 1959]

RAY CONWAY'S RECORD

Ray Conway, who has probably traveled more of the highways and back-country roads of Oregon and the Northwest than any other Oregonian, has retired as manager of the Oregon State Motor Association so he and Mrs. Conway can do more traveling. Mr. Conway joined the infant association in 1927 and became manager in 1933. Except for two 3-year leaves of absence, to run the Oregon war bond drive and to be administrator of the liquor control commission, he has been promoting travel and recreation in Oregon's interest on a daily basis.

In those years, when travel and outdoor recreation grew into big business, Mr. Conway has chalked up a remarkable record of service. The Oregonian has cooperated with the motor association for 30 years, with staff members touring the State and region in white OSMA cars, taking pictures and getting stories for the popular Motorlogs.

Under Mr. Conway's management, the motor association sponsored a constitutional amendment adopted in 1942 to prevent diversion of gasoline tax and motor vehicle license funds to other than highway purposes. The association has always been in the forefront of good roads movements. It helped initiate and win an early bond issue to extend the primary highway system; the gasoline tax in which Oregon led the Nation; traffic safety programs to reduce the death and injury toll. The State is grateful to Mr. Conway and the association.

[From the Oregon Motorist, December 1958]

RETIRING MANAGER JOINED ASSOCIATION IN 1927

A staff of 8 persons and a membership of around 7,000 motorists constituted the Oregon State Motor Association when Ray Conway joined the young motor club in 1927 to serve in the public relations department.

With offices in the Terminal Sales Building, the association was just beginning to exert influence in the field of motoring in Oregon and in his capacity as public relations officer, Mr. Conway spent considerable time lecturing and showing his own motion pictures on the vacation and travel advantages of Oregon.

"There was very little promotion of travel in Oregon at that time," Mr. Conway remembers. "There was no formal State promotion program and it was up to interested groups such as chambers of commerce, and our own association to stimulate interest in our State as a travel and vacation area."

During his early years with the club, Mr. Conway traveled extensively over Oregon and became known for his wide knowledge on the recreation resources of this State. It was during this period that the famed Motorlog series of travel articles started in the Oregonian with the cooperation of the motor association. This series has been carried on continuously for 30 years during which time the motor association-Oregonian travel teams traveling in the well-known white travel cars, have covered every possible travel and vacation area in the West.

In addition to his activities in the public relations department, which included legislative representation at legislative sessions in Salem, Mr. Conway did editorial work on the Oregon Motorist.

He became manager of the motor association in 1933, succeeding Joseph Shelton.

The retiring manager has served continuously with the association since 1927 with the exception of 6 years leave of absence. During the years 1941–43, he was loaned by the association to serve as Oregon administrator of the war bond program for the U.S. Treasury Department.

Then, in 1943, he accepted the post of administrator for the Oregon Liquor Control Commission under Gov. Earl Snell. He held this position till 1946. During that time, he maintained his connection with the motor association by serving as a member of the board of directors.

During Mr. Conway's managerial career, the association consistently has taken a lead in motoring and highway affairs in Oregon. The association led many of the early battles for the improvement of the highway system in this State, including the initiated legislation for a bond program to finance improvement and extension of the primary system; gas tax and license fee proposals and activity on behalf of greater safety in traffic.

The association inaugurated the antidiversion amendment to the State constitution in 1942, whereby it was decreed that all motor vehicle funds must be used for highway purposes only. Sole exceptions, which the association took the lead in obtaining, were that motor vehicle funds be used to finance Oregon travel promotion advertising, for State park development, and State police.

Mr. Conway has been active in national AAA motor club affairs for many years and just recently was a member of 30 AAA Club officials chosen from clubs throughout the Nation to go to Europe under AAA auspices to inspect travel facilities in 9 countries.

"We have no definite plans other than to do some traveling and to take it easy," Mr. Conway says. "Both Mrs. Couway and I are intensely interested in travel and we hope to utilize part of our time in this fashion in the future."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Oregon State Motor Association is indeed fortunate in having so able a man as A. N. Weir to fill Mr. Conway's shoes as manager. Mr. Weir has been with OSMA since 1939, and during World War II served as acting manager in Mr. Conway's absence. Since then he has held numerous important executive positions in the association.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Oregon Motorist describing Mr. Weir's wide background and experience and announcing his appointment as secretary-manager of the Oregon State Motor Association. The Oregon Motorist is the official publication of the Oregon State Motor Association and is ably edited by Mr. Sidney A. King.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEIR NAMED MANAGER OF MOTOR CLUB

The appointment of Assistant Manager A. N. Weir as secretary-manager, succeeding T. Ray Conway who is retiring at the end of 1958, has been announced by Charles E. Snell, president of the Oregon State Motor Association.

Mr. Weir will assume the duties of manager of the club January 1, 1959.

"The board of directors is sorry to see Mr. Conway leave the association, but his more than a quarter century of service to motoring in Oregon certainly entitles him to a relaxation from the rigors of executive leadership in the association," President Snell said.

JOINED ASSOCIATION IN 1939

"The board is most happy to be able to announce that Mr. Weir, who has been with the association since 1939, will take over the duties of the secretary-manager upon Mr. Conway's retirement. Mr. Weir is thoroughly experienced in every phase of the motor association's work and in addition, he has an intimate knowledge of AAA activities on a nationwide basis as a result of his service on national AAA committees.

"The board also is happy to announce that Mr. Conway has agreed to place his wide AAA club experience and knowledge at the service of the association and we deeply appreciate his willingness to counsel and advise in club matters in his retirement."

The new club manager first came to the motor association in late 1939 where he served in the accounting department and in the touring department. He later shifted to the emergency road service and official appointments department in which capacity he traveled over the entire State and became intimately familiar with motoring problems on a statewide basis. He has been able to maintain this knowledge through subsequent years as assistant manager with direct supervisory powers with the club's branch offices throughout the State.

SUPERVISES MOVES

Mr. Weir became assistant manager in 1942 in which capacity he had charge of personnel, office procedure, purchasing, and building supervision. As assistant manager, he supervised two moves of the association, the first from the Terminal Sales Building to the location at SW. 11th and Washington, and then to the present location of the new Portland headquarters in 1955. Mr. Weir also coordinated and directed much of the planning for the new headquarters building.

During World War II Mr. Weir served as acting manager for nearly a year while Manager Conway was on leave of absence.

The new club manager has had wide experience in AAA club affairs on a national basis through his membership on national AAA committees. He served 3 years on the AAA membership development committee, working with club officials from many States. He is at present a member of the AAA safety committee and has taken an active part in the planning and development of AAA safety programs and the formulation of national AAA safety policies.

ON NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Through his national committee activities, he has become acquainted with members of the American Automobile Association staff at Washington, D.C., headquarters, as well as with AAA club officials throughout the Nation and in western Canada.

Before joining the association staff, Mr. Weir served 3 years in the Regular U.S. Army, being a member of the old Motor Transport Corps and seeing service in the Pacific area.

Mr. and Mrs. Weir have two children, Mrs. John M. Donnell, whose husband is a practicing surgeon in Olympia, Wash.; and a son David, of Portland. They live at 9759 SE. 46th Avenue in Portland.

Forty-first Anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution which was recently adopted at a meeting of Lithuanian Americans of Greater Boston to commemorate the 41st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

This is one of many expressions of our American resolve to maintain the ties which we have always had with Lithuania and which have not been broken despite the long years of subjugation which that country has endured since its occupation in 1940.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT A MEETING OF LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF GREATER BOSTON, HELD AT THE SOUTH BOSTON HIGH SCHOOL, ON SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1959

Recalling the invasion of the peaceful Republic of Lithuania by the military forces of the U.S.S.R. on June 15–17, 1940, by which the Soviet Union committed acts of unprovoked aggression in violation of numerous international commitments;

Reminding that the Soviet Union replaced the independent government of the Republic of Lithuania the very next day following occupation, by a new one composed of Communist sympathizers obedient to Moscow, and introduced a Communist regime in Lithuania in flagrant violation of the will of this nation;

Recalling further that the Soviet occupation authorities organized mock elections on July 21, 1940, in the presence of Soviet occupation forces and foisted upon the Republic of Lithuania, the so-called people's parliament, which, upon Moscow's orders, adopted Soviet-type constitutions and decrees of expropriation, called nationalization;

Having in mind that on August 3–5, 1940, the Supreme Soviet staged in Moscow a unilateral incorporation of the Republic of Lithuania into the Soviet Union, in spite of the explicit provisions of the Hague Convention, defining the rights and duties of the occupant, and that this act of force was not recognized by any Western great power;

Remembering that the prevention of the exercise of the rights of sovereignty in Lithuania went hand in hand with systematic violation of all civil rights and liberties as well as with mass deportations of political, social, economic, cultural and religious leaders and that this mass deportation has taken on dimensions aiming at the systematic destruction of Lithuania;

Considering at the same time that Lithuania has never ceased to protest against the subjugation of her homeland and Lithuanians living in the free world are observing the 19th anniversary of Lithuania's struggle for liberation;

Now, therefore, the Lithuanians of Greater Boston assembled on Sunday, February 15, 1959, at the South Boston High School in South Boston, Mass., in observance of the 41st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, reaffirm their condemnation of Soviet aggression committed against Lithuania and call upon the United States to include in its foreign policy the liberation of Lithuania and other Soviet enslaved countries as an integral part of its program; and

That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the United Nations, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Members of the Senate, the House of Representatives and Congress from this district.

ANTHONY MATIOSKA,
Chairman.
JACQUE SONDA,
Secretary.

The Democratic Party and the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on January 17, 1959, the able and distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [ALAN BIBLE] spoke to the Young Democratic Clubs of North Carolina at Pfeiffer College at Misenheimer, N.C. As is always the case, the Senator from Nevada gave his audience much delight and enlightenment.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of the Senator from Nevada on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ALAN BIBLE, OF NEVADA, AT PFEIFFER COLLEGE, MISENHEIMER, N.C., JANUARY 17, 1959

Governor Hodges, Senator ERVIN, Mr. President, distinguished guests, and young Democrats, at the outset I want to thank Congressman ALEXANDER for his very gracious introduction. And I also want to tell you that I am not a total stranger to North Carolina. Four years ago I was in your wonderful State and was inducted as a chief in the Cherokee Tribe. The tribal headdress occupies a prominent spot on the wall in my office and is the center of attraction for the various Indian portraits that surround it. If I can just figure how to collect a few Cherokee votes out in Nevada, along with my normal complement from the Piutes, Washoes, and Shoshones, it might lighten my burdens the next time I run.

The tremendous victory recorded by our party last November was not the result of some magic formula. What happened was really quite simple. We had a message for the people—a message pointing to the fact that the Democratic Party is the party of the people. The big problem lay in getting that message across. And get it across we did. You young people demonstrated the importance of organization in disseminating those truths, and the results were dramatically found in the great sweep across the Nation.

I am proud to report that I am a charter member of the Young Democrats of Nevada. I look back with nostalgia on the many hot and heavy interparty fights we used to have. There were times when I thought that our only political enemies were not the Republicans, but members of some faction within our own party who were opposing us. I soon

learned, however, that we could close the ranks and move forward together when the chips were down in the general election.

A philosopher once said that a sure sign of growing old is to indulge continually in reminiscence. I will try to avoid that pitfall. It still disturbs me a little bit, however, to realize that I am now an honorary member of the Young Democrats of the District of Columbia—an honor to be sure but one that can only be gained by growing old.

Speaking of age, it is interesting to note the results of a postelection survey which showed that last year the Democratic Party elected 8 of the 10 youngest Governors, the 19 youngest U.S. Senators, and 12 youngest Congressmen. The Democrats elected 49 Congressmen of Young Democratic age, while 5 of the Nation's Governors and 4 U.S. Senators are also under 40.

Nelson Lancione, national president of the Young Democrats, commented that these election results clearly demonstrate the recognition which the Democratic Party gives to able young people. He added a significant footnote, however, and I quote: "The record of such revered and beloved senior Democrats as Speaker SAM RAYBURN, 77; Senator CARL HAYDEN, 81; Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, 91; and Senator JAMES MURRAY, 82; are postive proof that a youthful and progressive approach to politics is not just a function of age."

In our understandable elation over the election, we might tend to bask too long in the warm glow of victory, instead of getting on with the job to be done. The road ahead is not an easy road; nor can we travel it without constant plodding, persistence, and unflagging spirit.

The distinguished majority leader of the U.S. Senate, LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, set the tone for our legislative endeavors in a masterful address to the Democratic caucus just prior to the opening of this Congress.

"Our strength is what we are, and what we prove ourselves to be," he said. "What we hold we have earned. What we keep will be no more than what we deserve. That is our special challenge. Freemen can afford much. They can never afford the price of inertia." I agree with Senator JOHNSON and I am sure that my warm friends and colleagues from North Carolina share in that agreement.

As we probe the mysteries of the space age, the unlimited capacities of our young people will come more and more into play—boldness, imagination, vigor, and determination. From the campuses of colleges such as this one where we are gathered tonight will come the answers that the new age is clamoring for—not just in the fields of science and technology, but in all lines of human endeavor.

The advances made by the Soviet Union in the fields of missiles and outer space have made one thing crystal clear: We can no longer enjoy the luxury of a status quo attitude in America. We must reject the fallacy that we have the most and the best, and the future will take care of itself. Softness and complacency are the twin evils of our time. They must be struck down with the same tenacity and force that we would use in destroying any evil that would attack us. Survival is not determined by any timetable. Freemen are free only as long as they realize that freedom is not a birthright, but something that must be fought for continually.

The seeds of party responsibility that are sown in an organization such as yours inevitably flower into an even greater arena of human relationships. I refer to the field of politics as an honorable calling for any young man or woman. The urgency of our times has happily destroyed the old and unfair image of a politician as a glib, selfish type of individual, intent only upon plundering the Public Treasury and hoodwinking the gullible voters. Public enlightenment has served the very useful purpose of exalting, rather than demeaning, public office. More and more knowledgeable people are beginning to look at politics as a dignified profession of useful service.

Interestingly enough, the South has long held the concept that politics was nothing to be ashamed of—and the caliber of men you have sent to Congress over the years gives eloquent testimony to this fact.

During World War I President Woodrow Wilson leaned heavily on North Carolinians for the support of his programs. Senator Simmons of your State was chairman of the important Finance Committee and Senator Overman also held responsible posts that were of great benefit to the administration. Also occupying a high place in the Wilson councils was Josephus Daniels, editor of the Raleigh News and Observer, who served as Secretary of the Navy.

I have done some homework for this talk tonight. I learned, for example, that North Carolina provided more than 86,000 men in the service in the First World War, and more than 2,000 North Carolinians made the supreme sacrifice in that conflict. The record of your State in World War II, when 360,000 of your young men and women served around the world and more than 7,000 of them died, was equally heroic.

To show that I did more than surface digging, in the War Between the States, North Carolina furnished about one-fifth of all the southern soldiers, although it had only about one-ninth of the southern population. Approximately one-fourth of the Confederates killed in action—more than 40,000—were North Carolinians. It was no idle boast when they said that North Carolinians were "first at Bethel, farthest at Gettysburg, and last at Appomattox."

One occasionally reads of southerners being described as too sectional—that southerners in Congress are really ambassadors from their own States to a foreign nation headquartered in Washington. History belies this slander. When the war clouds were gathering in Europe in the late thirties, and in the war years immediately following, it was the voice and strength and unanimity of the South that led the way in responsible legislation for our Nation's security. Such was the courage and leadership of the South at this critical time that even a New York newspaper was moved to comment as follows:

"The recent record of the South in world affairs is inspiring. Lend-lease would have been beaten in Congress without southern votes. When the first year of the first draft expired, 4 months before Pearl Harbor, it was southern Members of Congress who insured its extension. When by one vote Congress decided not to send the soldiers home, it was the South that turned the scale. Representatives of 12 Southern States cast 102 votes in favor of extending the draft and only 6 votes against it."

There have been times in my Senate career when I have been criticized by some as voting like a southerner. Although I am sure it wasn't meant that way, I took this charge as a compliment and readily admitted its validity.

As a matter of fact, there is a natural affinity between the South and the Far West. Sparse in population as compared to the East, our voice in the Senate is nevertheless strong, thanks to our Founding Fathers who decreed that each State shall have two Senators, regardless of population.

The problems of the South and the West have been similar in many respects—the industries of both regions suffer from Federal tariff policies that encourage a steady flow of foreign products to compete with our domestic output. Our mining industry in the West today is staggering under the load of that unfair burden. And your great textile industry has also felt the oppressiveness of such a policy.

Beyond the similarities in the fields just mentioned, there is also the mutuality of interests in a traditional concept of government, which stresses the sovereignty of the State over the complete dominance of the Federal Government. As your own Senator ERVIN once said: "We wear our sovereignty under our own hat." And to that I say: "Amen."

As the sinews of the growing West become stronger, I envisage a shift in voting trends that will catapult that great area into a dominant position in determining the guidelines for American progress.

As this phenomenon develops, I hope that the natural affinity between the South and the West will become even more pronounced—to the point of forging an unbreakable alliance for mutual good. In suggesting this I by no means wish to imply that there should be an arbitrary exclusion of any other section of our country. I only suggest that the day will come when, politically speaking, the tail will no longer be wagging the dog.

Let us affirm that we are, first of all, Americans and our loyalty to the Nation is unswerving, while at the same time, as constitutional Americans, we zealously guard our rights as free citizens of the various States. There can be such a thing as too much government on a Federal level. There can be such a thing as too much so-called benevolence as a synonym for greater control. There can be such a thing as too much dominance from the top and too much submission from the bottom. As a moderate, I want to see a balance—a middle zone—where the States and the Federal government can meet to work for the general good of all the people.

In this connection, I would like to dwell briefly upon another problem that is growing to alarming proportions and can indirectly affect the overall strength of our Nation. I refer to those two distinct economic dangers: big government and big business.

Each passing day gives added evidence of the vast centralization of government in Washington and a corresponding relinquishment of power by the sovereign States. Those of us who believe that the best government is the one that is closest to the people have our work charted for us. Until the time comes when citizens decide to affirm that fundamental, independent concept, I can only predict more government, more red tape and more taxes.

As a member of the Senate's Select Committee on Small Business, I have had the opportunity to see first hand the dire plight in which the small business man finds himself. Our committee has held grassroots hearings all over the country. Out of the mass of testimony from small business men there emerges the unanimous and foreboding prophecy that unless drastic steps are taken we will witness the tragic economic irony of this century—the gradual disappearance of America's small producers during an era of tremendous business activity.

As I said at the beginning of my talk tonight, I have no simple formula to solve all the problems that beset us. I do know this, however. As members of a great political party, we can move forward with a strength of purpose and a dedication to duty that will translates the policies of our party into concrete action. We have the principles. We have the courage. And we have the will. Let's all roll up our sleeves and move forward with our party to meet the exciting challenges that lie ahead.

Thank you very much for your warm and courteous attention.

Policy Implications of the Economic Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD comments which Walter W. Heller, of the University of Minnesota, made during his participation in a panel discussion before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

(By Walter W. Heller, University of Minnesota)

In its preoccupation with the problem of inflation and the goal of price stability, the 1959 Economic Report provides a natural point of departure for a discussion of policies appropriate to the present economic outlook. For if price stability is not the transcendent economic issue of 1959 and if inflation is not a clear and present (or omnipresent) danger, the report has missed its mark.

That half of the President's letter of transmittal which lays down economic policy for the future is concerned entirely with stable prices as related to economic growth. "Price stability" and its synonyms appear 14 times during the 2 pages of policy discussion. Similarly, chapter 4, which programs future economic policy, presses home the case for price stability and the measures to promote it, before turning to other aspects of economic growth.

A balanced Federal budget is the chief offering at the altar of price stability:

"The principal means by which Government can express leadership in the effort to preserve price stability is to conduct its own financial affairs prudently. The budget submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1960, which balances expenditures with receipts at a level of $77 billion, seeks to fulfill this responsibility."

Are the sacrifices of military and civilian programs which lie behind the balanced-budget offering justified in terms of the present economic outlook? Would further deficits in the next 12 to 18 months run off in price inflation, or would they continue to stimulate production and serve the cause of recovery?

The answer lies largely in the amount of slack left in our economy and the rapidity with which natural economic forces will take it up. Substantial manpower slack is reflected in the current 6.1 percent adjusted rate of unemployment, the 40.2-hour manufacturing workweek, and the potential enlargement of the labor force. Even more slack is reflected in the figures on plant capacity: in the 17 basic materials industries (such as steel, copper, cement, textile, selected chemicals) on which the Federal Reserve Board maintains unofficial capacity and output indexes, current production represents only 76.5 percent of capacity (an output index of 140 against a January 1959 preliminary, capacity index of 183, both on a 1947–49 base.) It is hardly surprising that plant and equipment outlays continue to lag $8 billion, or nearly 20 percent, below their 1957 peak. Only a brisk revival of markets will bring full recovery here.

Finally, if the productive potential of our economy in mid-1957 was close to $450 billion, it will have risen to $500 billion by the end of 1959, taking account of (a) the accelerated growth rate we typically enjoy in climbing out of a recession, and (b) the intervening rise in the price level. The official Treasury forecast of a $480 billion gross national product rate at the end of the year implies that, apart from bottleneck problems, a substantial cushion to absorb the impact of rising demand will still exist. In short, the large amount of unused productive capacity throughout the economy provides substantial protection against demand-induced inflation in the near term.

As to cost-push inflation, our best defense is increased productivity. If we can increase the return of output per unit of input fast enough, we can satisfy the rising demands for higher wages, higher profits, and higher farm prices by sharing in expanding product rather than by pushing up the price level. Here, the immediate prospect is excellent. Productivity is rising sharply as the economy reaps the benefits from (a) the 1955–57 surge of investment in plant and equipment (as well as in professional and technical personnel, as the report cogently notes), and (b) recession-induced measures to cut costs and improve managerial efficiency. Also, as output rises toward optimal output-capacity ratios, unit costs will fall. These pleasant economic conclusions are reflected in Secretary Anderson's estimate of a jump in corporate profits from $36.5 billion in 1958 to $47 billion this year. The prospect for satisfying appetities for higher profits and higher wages without higher prices seems excellent at this stage of our economic recovery.

When total demand again presses hard against our productive resources, our monetary weapons will operate in a more favorable setting than during the boom following the 1953–54 recession; liquidity is lower in the household, business, and banking sectors; bank holdings of short-term Government bonds are relatively lower; saving continues at a high rate; and consumer expectations seem much more subdued than in 1955.

If the foregoing assessment of the economic situation is correct, an obsession with Federal expenditure cutbacks and early budget balance as a prerequisite to price stability is unfounded. Continued, though shrinking, budget deficits appear likely to be reflected in expanison of output rather than inflation of prices for some time to come. Budget cutting and budget balance may be urged to hold or cut the Government down to size, perhaps in the conviction that Government use of resources promises lower returns than private use of resources, or that expansion of Government endangers freedom. In our present external context—which confronts this country with the possibility of annihilation or humiliation—and in our present internal context—in which much of our affluence is being fritted away in indulgences, luxuries, and frivolities—I would sharply disagree with this position. But, at least, it would not be built on such an uncertain economic foundation as the stability argument for budget balance. (In addition to the basic deficiency of this position, the setting of the budgetary target for price stability in terms of the $77 billion administrative budget rather than the $93 billion cash-consolidated budget is a serious technical deficiency.)

In the projections of tax policy for the future, the President's Economic Report also employs questionable economic logic. For if deficits are injurious to price stability, as the report contends, symmetrical reasoning suggests that surpluses which develop out of boom conditions would be beneficial in dampening inflationary forces. Under these circumstances, it seems strange that the President should hold out the prospect that, given continued recovery and a tight rein on Federal spending, a significant additional step in tax reduction and reform can be taken in the reasonably foreseeable future.

It is worth noting that the peak budget deficit occurred in the second quarter of 1958, at $9.9 billion (as shown in the national income accounts, report, p. 120) and has been shrinking since that time, to $8.6 billion in the third quarter and $7.2 billion in the fourth. In a dynamic sense, therefore, the Federal budget has been a declining stimulus, which must be offset by other stimuli if recovery is to continue at a brisk pace.

The argument thus far questions the basis for concluding that inflation is such a clear and present danger as to call for Federal expenditure paralysis at the level of budgetary balance. But even if inflation were a more immediate and menacing problem, the President's report fails to give us a balanced basis for judging the primacy of price stability in current economic policy. To make this judgment requires a balancing of benefits against costs, of the risks we incur in biasing our policies toward price stability rather than, say, toward full employment.

Yet, the potential costs of a restrictive budgetary policy to promote price stability are great: Loss of production by slowing the pace of recovery; lower investment in public education and other public services that strengthen our long-run economic and military potential; attempts to push functions back on State and local budgets which are already under such extreme pressures, compounded by the adverse effects of recession, that at least two-thirds of the State legislatures must raise tax rates in 1959; and, perhaps tragically—if we are to believe the Gaither, Rockefeller, CED reports and General Gavin's statements on national security needs relative to Russia's advances—a laggard defense budget.

To the extent that these results are risked in the name of price stability and balanced budgets, they represent as great a risk, calculated or otherwise, as this country has ever incurred in peacetime economic policy.

No Presidential Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed an editorial entitled, "No Presidential Platform," which appeared in the Indianapolis Star on Tuesday, February 24, 1959, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO PRESIDENTIAL PLATFORM

Someone of their political friends should tell Senators STUART SYMINGTON and HUBERT HUMPHREY that the best platform for the Presidency is not the prone form of a sick man. Their public comments regarding the replacement of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles leave much to be desired, and can at best be excused as little more than opportunistic politicking.

Senator SYMINGTON'S cure for the international problems of the Nation, and the world, has been the construction of additional bomber fleets, while Senator HUMPHREY has developed the knack of talking when he should be listening. He proved this in an 8-hour talkathon with the leader of Communist Russia.

These members of the Democratic Party should be reminded that an entire Nation forebore serious consideration of the illness

of a President at a time of equal international gravity. Secretary Dulles should at least be given an opoprtunity to receive the benefit of medical attention before his ouster is demanded. If he is not capable of properly performing his duties, Mr. Dulles would be among the first to recognize the need for a successor.

To date, Mr. Dulles has faced up to the Reds all over the world, an ability not exhibited by some of his predecessors in the State Department. Putting it baldly, John Foster Dulles in many respects is a better Secretary of State flat on his back in a hospital bed than some of the Democrat-appointed appeasers were standing on both feet. There is no reason to take seriously this comment from a pair of over-eager politicians who want to be President.

The Two-Package Approach to Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial which was published in the Denver Post on February 4.

I believe that the editorial presents convincingly the merits of the two-package approach to labor legislation this year.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S HAVE TWO LABOR PACKAGES

The last major change in the labor laws of the United States took place more than a decade ago, when the 80th Congress passed the Taft-Hartley Act over the bitter opposition of organized labor.

Since that time, a half dozen attempts have been made to subject Taft-Hartley to a major legislative facelifting. Every one of these efforts—whether by labor or management, Republicans or Democrats—ended in failure.

A minor noncontroversial change was made in the union-shop provisions of the act, but the big package proposals, with 19 or 20 major amendments, could never pick up the votes to pass.

Controversy and political bickering appeared to rise with the number of amendments proposed. Many Taft-Hartley strategists became convinced that the act could only be changed, one piece at a time.

In their new and separate attempts to win Taft-Hartley changes in the 86th Congress, both President Eisenhower and Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, have unfortunately rejected the one-piece-at-a-time approach.

Their package proposals would bring about badly needed improvements in the labor statute. But, unless the size of the packages can be reduced, they may stir too much antagonism to succeed.

Both sets of proposals can be divided into two categories:

First, there are proposals based on the McClellan hearings. These aim at making unions cleaner, more democratic, and free from the control of racketeers.

Second, there are proposals based on a dozen years' experience with labor-management relations under the act.

They revive long-standing arguments over picketing, secondary boycotts, the structure of the National Labor Relations Board, and the rights of strikers. The relation of some of these subjects to the union corruption issue is remote.

In the first category, the President's proposals and those of Senator KENNEDY are not far apart. There are minor differences in the amount of information unions would have to make public and in the penalties that are provided. But it is likely that these differences can be composed in committee.

Unfortunately, these union-corruption proposals are tied up in the same package with proposals in the second category. This is where the major labor and management shafts will be aimed and where the whole package is in danger.

In this category, the Eisenhower and Kennedy proposals diverge in three major respects:

On picketing: The Kennedy bill would only regulate picketing for purposes of extortion. The Eisenhower bill takes in picketing for organizational purposes—as, for example, picketing resulting from interunion jurisdiction disagreements—and regulates it more severely.

The objectives of the Eisenhower picketing regulations are excellent. But the amendment is loosely drawn and could affect some legitimate kinds of picketing that shouldn't be banned.

On secondary boycotts: The Kennedy bill leaves this area untouched. The Eisenhower bill offers four constructive proposals, two favorable to management, two to labor. Management complains that the proposals don't go far enough; labor that they go too far.

Jurisdiction of the NLRB: The Eisenhower proposal would turn over to the States those cases rejected by the NLRB. The Kennedy bill would require the NLRB to take all cases, except where cession agreements can be worked out with States with labor laws similar to the Federal statute.

At these issues and a number of other highly technical ones raised by Taft-Hartley, Congress would be wise to take a separate look. They ought not to remain in the same package with the union-corruption proposals.

Senator KENNEDY has asked nine extremely competent labor experts to examine the noncorruption problems of Taft-Hartley and come up with recommendations.

Congress would be wise to defer action on picketing, secondary boycotts, and a number of other issues until those recommendations are in. But the proposals on union corruption ought not to wait.

Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-nine Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on February 25, my colleague, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, was the principal speaker at the luncheon at which the semifinalists and the winner in the 1959 Voice of Democracy contest were named. Because his speech was so eloquent and what he had to say was so pertinent in these days when democracy is facing some of its sternest tests, I take pleasure in asking that the text of Senator GRUENING's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great pleasure and privilege to be present to honor the winners of the 1959 Voice of Democracy contest. All 50 of you are to be congratulated. It's a real achievement to win a contest that gets you to Washington. It is particularly thrilling on this occasion to be able to greet for the first time a representative from the 49th State, Melba Phillco.

Indeed, the entry of the 49th State into our Union was, and is, the Voice of Democracy speaking. It spoke through the elected representatives of the people of the United States when the Congress voted to make Alaska a State. That voice declared that the people of Alaska should no longer remain in their Territorial status; that they should be admitted to the full equality of first-class citizenship. This was the application of the principles of democracy to what had previously been one of America's dependent areas. It was an illustration of what I should like to stress in these brief remarks, namely, that to fulfill the promise of democracy we must buttress our words with deeds. We must, if the voice of democracy is to ring out convincingly, couple democratic preachments with practices. We must, if the voice of democracy is to be believed, constantly bear in mind that actions speak louder than words. In short, that "by their works ye shall know them."

The admission of Alaska to the Union, which was formalized by Presidential proclamation less than two months ago, was a shining evidence of performance matching professions—perhaps the most striking example of our time.

It was—it is—a living demonstration that Uncle Sam does practice what he preaches. It was the application, in fact, of the abstract principle proclaimed in our Declaration of Independence that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Alaskans did not have self-government as long as Alaska remained a Territory. They have it now.

That coupling of promise with fulfillment, of preachment with practice, was never more important than now. When I say now, I mean in our time.

As we all know, democracy has in this, our time, been under savage attack as never before in our history. It has been in the last quarter of a century, and is today, challenged by a basically different philosophy and way of life. That philosophy has taken diverse forms, but only slightly diverse. These forms have variously been presented as fascism, as in Italy under Mussolini; as national socialism, as in Germany under Hitler; and, today, as communism, as in Russia and China. We may correctly describe these as only slightly different forms of totalitarianism. We may accurately assert that the nation which adopts any one of these forms is a police state. It is the purpose and design of the rules of those police states to extend their philosophy and way of life to the rest of the world. It is our hope and purpose, as Americans and members of the free world, that they shall not succeed.

Now the differences between the police state and our free society, between totalitarianism and democracy, are familiar to all of you who are here to give expression to the voice of democracy.

You all know that our democratic faith prescribes certain basic freedoms: Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of worship, freedom from search and seizure. These basic freedoms are enshrined in our Constitution through the first 10 amendments which we know as the Bill of Rights. They were placed there

because the fathers of our country had experienced the violation by the government of King George III of those freedoms which the founders deemed natural rights and had earlier declared that fact to be self-evident.

Our forefathers made no provision to safeguard the right to travel freely, to change one's place of residence, to choose one's employment, the right to organize, the right of association. These rights were not safeguarded by the founders because those rights had never been questioned or threatened. Indeed, their violation had not been dreamed of under the colonial rule against which our forefathers rebelled. In fact, the tyranny against which we Americans launched our Revolution was a far milder and far less oppressive tyranny than that which has been imposed in our time on the victims of contemporary totalitarianism. Contrast, for instance, one of the most fundamental grievances of our colonial forefathers—that of "No taxation without representation"—with the ruthless total confiscation of property, the imprisonment without trial, and the so-called "liquidation," which is not other than murder, to which dissenters, or even peaceable nonconformists, are liable under the police state.

I won't dwell at length on this evident contrast between our land of the free and the most loathsome and brutal tyranny the world has known since the Dark Ages. What I want to revert to is the need of our squaring our declarations with our deeds.

What should be and is clear to all of us is that we Americans have not always, by any means, lived up to the principles we profess. It has been so from the beginning; it continues to be so; and, being human beings with human frailties, will always be so to a degree, but let us hope to a steadily diminishing degree. The great men who drafted the Declaration of Independence, whose principles, by and large, have guided us through the most wholesome and inspiring experiment performed by men in all history—those great men saw no contradiction between the Declaration's assertion that all men were created equal and with liberty one of their inalienable rights and, on the other hand, the perpetuation of the institution of slavery. It was not until 87 years later that that inconsistency was removed by the Emancipation Proclamation. In the early days, too, the franchise was often limited to the ownership of property. But time cured that. For over 130 years suffrage was for men only. The 19th amendment, adopted in 1920, decided that women, too, could vote and that they were men in the sense that the word men was used in the Declaration of Independence.

These progressive changes emphasize that democracy is not static; that it is not and never will be a finished product. It is a great legacy handed to us, a trust for us to keep and cherish. But not merely to keep and cherish—also to validate. Democracy, in short, is constantly in evolution and, let us hope, with proper vigilance, devotion, and dedication, becoming ever better. The heartening fact to remember is that while democracy may, and often has, fallen short of its professed ideals, the opportunity for rectification is always there. Whenever there is a failure of democracy, let us take heart that democracy carries within itself the seeds of self-regeneration. It must be our continuing, unremitting effort to make democracy true to its best self. If we bend all our efforts and purposes to that end, then the voice of democracy will sound a clarion call and be heard and listened to wherever men are free or want to be free.

How shall we apply that unremitting effort to make democracy true to its best self?

Let us first understand that the task to which all of us who believe and cherish the democratic system must be dedicated, is to make democracy work. This is a privilege, an opportunity, and, indeed, an obligation, not merely for those in public office, but for every citizen. Democracy should become a work-a-day religion. It must be a militant, not a passive, faith.

Having reached that understanding, what next? How do we proceed?

Well, first, we must all take a keen interest in public affairs and in Government—in government on every level. It is our Government. In a democracy, government is only as good as the people want it to be. If ours is to be—in Lincoln's immortal phrase: "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people"—it can be so only to the extent that the people, by their vigilance, interest, and concern make it so. It is a cause of just reproach that so large a proportion of our citizens do not even take the trouble to vote. Voting, the exercise of our right as citizens, is a precious heritage. Those who neglect this duty betray their heritage.

In addition to voting in elections—city, school district, county, State, and national elections—there is the obligation to inform oneself. I have been painfully impressed throughout the years to find how many citizens—presumably responsible citizens—do not even know the names of their Representatives in Congress. I have encountered this all over the United States. And merely knowing the name of one's Representative in Congress is a far cry from knowing what his attitude is on public issues and how he votes on them.

One of our first duties, therefore, in the assignment of making democracy work, is to inform ourselves. We must banish political illiteracy. If public opinion, which we like to assume is the ultimately ruling force in representative government, is to be effective, it must be an informed and enlightened public opinion.

To put it in another way, we get out of democracy what we put into it. So we had better put in generously. Democracy will be as good as we make it, and only as good. So our relationship to democracy is a reciprocal process. We must give to it to the extent that we expect to receive from it. We must ever sow if we want to continue to reap.

Therefore, let us think and act on the assumption that for every right which is ours under democracy, we have a duty to perform; for every benefit we enjoy, we owe a corresponding obligation; for every privilege which our freedom confers, we should render a corresponding service.

And thus thinking and thus acting, is the way—perhaps the only way—we can preserve and strengthen our democratic faith and our democratic works.

Thus, and thus only, can we make the voice of democracy ring true and enable it to carry its message to the farthest corners of the earth, penetrating even iron curtains and bearing beyond them its message of good will, peace, and freedom.

Physical Education and Physical Therapy Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address given by Miss Mary E. Switzer, Director of the U.S. Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, which she delievered at the opening exercises at the new building and gymnasium at Boston University for Sargent College. Sargent College has for many years given outstanding leadership in the field of physical education and physical therapy training, and will now be equipped to do an even better educational job. Moreover, with its new buildings it will be much more closely integrated with the regular campus of Boston University.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a genuine pleasure for me, both as a Bostonian and as a Federal official with responsibilities for the health and rehabilitation of our disabled people, to participate in the dedication of this magnificent new college building.

To those of us who were brought up in Boston—especially those of my generation—Sargent College has a very special meaning. For most of us started our physical education in high school and continued in college under the tutelage of its graduates.

Sargent is particularly fortunate in its new setting as an integral part of Boston University for the university is one of the key centers of training of professional workers in vocational rehabilitation and related fields.

From the time the training program of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation was begun in 1954, the school of medicine here has been active in teaching rehabilitation principles and practices to undergraduate medical students. The school of medicine also is giving strong leadership to the extensive program of interdisciplinary teaching in the field of rehabilitation—a program in which many schools within the university—including Sargent—are actively and effectively engaged.

Over its 77 years of excellent instruction and service, Sargent has had notable success in preparing hundreds of students for worthwhile service. These, in turn, have contributed to the well-being of thousands throughout this country and abroad. The opportunity for improved and continuing service is enhanced by the integration into Boston University.

With the stresses of our modern technological society and our speeded-up life, both work-a-day and social, this is of great importance to preserving our sense of well-being.

It is not an easy task to plan for our own future in health—whether it be in medicine, in physical education, or in rehabilitation. We live in an age when the pace of progress gives us little opportunity to rest upon yesterday's achievements—for all too soon, the new and different demands of tomorrow are upon us. With the advent of missiles and satellites, the timetables of scientific development have been upset—and with them, the slow evolution by which our gains have previously been made in so many fields, for we in health and rehabilitation cannot work or plan in isolation.

Those of us who work with the problems of handicapped people feel an obligation to play our full role in meeting the challenges of this exciting period in which we live—for the social, economic and educational development of all our citizens, as individuals, will ultimately determine the rate of our progress, whether it be in science, the humanities or in health.

The vigor with which Sargent College has moved into the needs of our times is evident in many ways.

With the addition of the physical therapy curriculum and laboratory, the college's sphere of usefulness and effectiveness has been greatly extended. I take this occasion to say that the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is quite happy with its investment in your physical therapy training program.

We look forward to continuing growth of the college's usefulness and hope that you may soon, as I know you plan to do, add occupational therapy to your field of instruction and practice.

President Eisenhower has recognized the need for all of us to make ourselves fit—not only physically but in all ways. The President's Council on Youth Fitness attests to this, as does its supporting group—the President's Citizen's Advisory Committee on the Fitness of American Youth.

This accent on youth is all to the good as you so well know—but it does not stop there. Nor does the President's interest. In a recent speech in the Football Hall of Fame, his words expressed the depth and breadth of that interest. I quote: "This (our contest with other ideologies) requires fitness—fitness in its deepest and broadest sense. We know that fitness is far more than a healthy body. It is more than an alert, disciplined mind. Fitness is the sum of all values which enables a man to act effectively in his nation's behalf in this great contest in which we are engaged.

"In this meaning, fitness is the individual's maximum development for the Nation's good."

While advocating fitness as an essential, the President consistently has advocated and given his strong personal support to the rehabilitation of the handicapped among us.

It is my responsibility to head and help develop the national program of vocational rehabilitation of our handicapped people, so that they may lead useful, productive and satisfying lives. So, as you see readily, it is a joy to me to witness the development and expansion of facilities that contribute to rehabilitation. And I congratulate the trustees, the faculty and, yes, the student body upon the forward look that characterizes this institution.

Vocational rehabilitation of our handicapped people is of the utmost importance to the handicapped themselves, to their families, to their communities and to the Nation.

Yet, for some years—until 1954—the program was at a standstill. In that year the Congress enacted a new law which has served as a new charter for expansion and progress. It provided the sinew with which we are breaking the bottlenecks.

One of these bottlenecks was a lack of money to do an adequate job. Both the States and the Federal Government have stepped up their annual investments in rehabilitation until the total has risen from $37 million in 1954 to $85 million this year.

But there were other hindrances. One was a marked shortage of trained professional personnel to carry on an expanding program. Another was a lack of research into new and better ways of enabling handicapped people to return to self-sustaining effort. We are steadily reducing both of these barriers and Boston is the center of a very high proportion of our efforts.

For instance, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation has made training grants to many educational institutions in the area. At Boston University, as an example, we are supporting training programs in almost every short-supply rehabilitation profession. These include grants for training counselors, physicians, nurses, social workers, and physical therapists (and that, of course, is centered in Sargent College.)

Boston University also has cooperated with us in short-term training to improve the skills of those who have already entered vocational rehabilitation work.

Other institutions that are cooperating with us to fill the growing need for trained professionals in the field of rehabilitation are Tufts University, Springfield College, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston School of Occupational Therapy, Bouve-Boston School, Boston College coupled with Simmons College, the Harvard School of Public Health, Harbridge House, and Emerson College.

Boston's contribution to the research program is impressive also. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is supporting some of the most imaginative and important work in this area that it is possible to envision.

In the mental health field, the Massachusetts Mental Health Center is working to determine the effectiveness of coordinated efforts of hospital, ex-patients, patient groups, and community agencies in the vocational rehabilitation of the mentally ill.

The Massachusetts Association of Mental Health has completed a project which has provided us with much useful information on employers' hiring practices and attitudes where discharged mental patients are concerned. This reveals that few employers knowingly hire a discharged mental patient and it thus points the way for us to work toward development of more acceptance of such people by employers, not only here but everywhere.

The Mental Health Association also has finished another project involving a study of the vocational adjustment of discharged mental patients. This will help us to improve matters in this field, because it gives us many factors which must be considered in developing new approaches.

In other projects, the Boston Dispensary is developing vocational rehabilitation services for chronically ill persons in a community home-care program, the Catholic Guild for the Blind has undertaken a study of the effectiveness of adjustment training programs of various lengths for blind adults, and QT Inc., is experimenting in rehabilitation of ileostomy patients in three hospitals.

Thus we are moving to meet problems on many fronts. We do this because we, in this country, believe in equality of opportunity. In justice, we cannot deny equality to the handicapped. Wherever possible—and generally rehabilitation is possible—our society must provide the necessary help to enable the handicapped person to make his or her own way.

The dignity of usefulness, the satisfaction of contributing to community life, of belonging—these are precious things, and we must not deny them.

To the extent that we do provide the services necessary to handicapped people, the individual profits; the family has a happier member and thus the handicapped person and the community have a happier family; the community profits from his contributions of work and citizenship and the Nation from his productivity.

Too few of us realize the burden that neglected disability places upon our society and I should like to underscore that—while assuring you that the picture is growing brighter each day. As it brightens, we must remember, our responsibilities as so-called normal citizens increase rather than diminish.

Over 2 million disabled men and women need and can profit from vocational rehabilitation services—the medical, psychological, social, training and job-finding help that is available through the State-Federal program of vocational rehabilitation.

The cost of disability in loss of productive energy and effort is incalculable. The cost in human despair is greater than anyone can estimate. But we do know that in public assistance alone, the cost of disability is more than one-half billion dollars a year. This involves monthly payments to approximately 400,000 children of disabled parents and a total of 600,000 adults—a million people in all.

In Massachusetts alone there are roughly 6,000 children of disabled parents and roughly 17,000 adults who are reduced to public assistance for their livelihood because of disability. The annual bill is about $25 million.

Not all of these disabled people can be rehabilitated, of course, but many of them could be returned to self-support through rehabilitation services. Fifteen thousand public assistance clients were rehabilitated last year at a one-time cost of $13 million. Their public assistance payments were at the rate of $14 million a year—and that could have gone on and on except for rehabilitation.

All told, throughout the Nation, the State rehabilitation agencies set a new high in the number of rehabilitations for the third consecutive year. The total was above 74,000. And another 260,000 are receiving active help today. They eventually will be on their own.

They will repay in Federal income taxes alone in about 5 years the total cost of the rehabilitation program last year—$66 million of State and Federal funds.

In Massachusetts the rehabilitation outlook is up, just as it is in most of the Nation. The total of rehabilitations has increased gradually over the past 4 years from 762 in 1955 to 1102 in 1958. That's better than 50 percent but Massachusetts still has a long way to go.

I'm happy to say that the Commonwealth program is well on the way to better results and we of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation are bending our best efforts to help.

Much of the progress here is due to the strong efforts of Commissioner Francis A. Harding who heads your State rehabilitation agency. Mr. Harding, while a member of the legislature, saw the need for a strong program of rehabilitation and when the agency was reorganized a few years ago, he was selected as the logical man to be Commissioner of Rehabilitation. It was a happy choice because Mr. Harding has brought new support and new vigor to the work.

As an example, last year Massachusetts used $744,000 of Federal funds for rehabilitation and contributed $569,000 of State funds. The program received more than 96 percent of the maximum of Federal funds available.

For the current year, the Federal Government expects to increase its support of the Massachusetts rehabilitation program to $823,537 and we understand that the State will contribute $633,000—an increase of $55,000. Thus Massachusetts this year will use the maximum available Federal contribution.

You can imagine what a comfort this is to me, both personally and officially. This is my home and I want to be able to speak of my State always with pride. Since I am charged with responsibility for heading the entire national program of vocational rehabilitation, I feel happy at every advance, whether it be in one of our States or in one of our more remote Territories. But my pride is greatest when I see progress in Massachusetts. So this is a proud day for me. It is a pleasure to report progress in my field of responsibility and it is a great joy to participate in the dedication of the new home of Sargent College.

Alaska's Flag, a Schoolboy's Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President the beautiful, symbolic flag of which we Alaskans are so proud was the creation of a 13-year-old boy, Benny Benson. The story of Benny Benson has been touchingly re-created by Ethel Blake in an article which has appeared in Senior Citizen magazine for October 1958. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The title of the article is "The Alaskan Flag and a Teenage Boy."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A 13-year-old boy, Benny Benson, had an important part in the ceremonies, when the Alaskan flag was flown for the first time, July 9, 1927. He fastened the flag to the halyards below Old Glory. For a moment the two flags touched the boy's head and shoulders. Then with the Stars and Stripes leading, the Alaskan flag with its field of deep blue and eight golden stars followed. When the top of the tall flagpole was reached, the two flags straightened out in the cool breeze coming in from the Gulf of Alaska.

Citizens of the city of Seward and dignitaries of the Methodist Church stood with hats off. A captain of the U.S. Signal Corps, other men in the uniform of the U.S. Army, and a troop of Boy Scouts stood at attention.

Benny Benson stood at attention, too, his face shining with happiness, as he watched the two flags in the bright sunshine. The Alaskan flag was his flag for he was a native Aleut. But it was his flag, also, because he had designed it.

The American Legion in Alaska held a flag contest among Alaskan schoolchildren, grades 7 through the 12th. Schools from all over Alaska sent in designs to a committee of two Senators and two Representatives of the Alaska Legislature and three members named by the American Legion. From 142 designs submitted, the one by Benny Benson was selected unanimously, as the winning design. The legislature made it the official flag in 1927.

The flag raising was held on the grounds of the Jesse Lee Home, a Methodist orphanage near the city of Seward. Benny Benson had lived in the Jesse Lee Home since he was 4. He and his little brother, 2 years old, had been brought to the home by their father, who needed someone to care for his motherless boys. Benny and his brother were given good care at the home. The teachers became very fond of them. One day one of the teachers gave Benny a doughnut. He broke it in two. "This doughnut is like you and me, Mrs. Winchell," he said. "Brown on the outside like me and white on the inside like you."

Benny was in the seventh grade at the time of the flag contest. He was one of the three most promising pupils in the mission school. He had done excellent work in drawing, making posters, and in carving ivory.

The Legislature of Alaska voted $1,000 to be used by Benny in making a trip to Washington, D.C., to present the new Alaskan flag to the President of the United States. Benny did not make the trip. He said he would rather use the money for his future education. But he did have a stateside trip, anyway.

It happened this way. The Jesse Lee Home was established by the Women's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Church. When the superintendent of the home and his wife attended national conventions of the society in the States, they took Benny with them on one of these trips. They were proud to present him, as a boy who had been cared for and educated in the Jesse Lee Home and who had won distinction in designing the Alaskan flag.

The stateside trip was only one of several rewards that came to Benny. Another reward was different than money from the legislature or travel that took him several thousand miles from his homeland. Perhaps it was the most important of all. Probably Benny could not appreciate its importance until he was older. The fact that he was unanimously selected the winner in the flag contest gave a lift to his own people and all other native Alaskans.

Aleut businessmen and other native Alaskans came to the superintendent of the home and said to him: "Now for the first time, we can hold up our heads, because we know our children are as bright as the white children. We had always been told that our children were not the equal of the white children. Now we know they are. What Benny Benson has done has given a lift to Aleuts and other natives all over Alaska."

The Alaskan flag is beautiful in its simplicity. On its deep blue field there are eight golden stars. Seven of the stars represent the best known of all constellations—the Big Dipper. The eighth and largest star on the flag is Polaris, the North Star. The two stars in the outer side of the Big Dipper are called the Pointers, because they point toward the North Star and are always in line with it, no matter in what position the Dipper may be. The stars are arranged on the flag as they appear in the sky.

Benny Benson was born on the Aleutian Islands, which stretch out for thousands of miles from the mainland of Alaska, southwest, between the Bering Sea and the Pacific Ocean. The Jesse Lee Home was at Unalaska in the Aleutian Islands when Benny and his little brother were brought to the home by their father. In Benny's homeland, the nights for part of the year are much longer than in lands farther south. So Benny had been familiar since childhood with the Big Dipper overhead, as it wheeled slowly and majestically around the North Star. He knew that the great North Star was a guide for the sailor, explorer, hunter, trapper, prospector, woodsman, and surveyor.

Benny Benson's design for the Alaskan flag was original and appropriate. The blue field is like the color of the sky, the sea, the lakes. The golden stars are symbolic of the gold in Alaska's streams and mountains.

The people of Alaska are proud of their flag and its history. The license plates of Alaskan automobiles have been made to show the Alaska flag since 1948. Alaska's State song, entitled "Alaska's Flag," was written by Marie Drake, who is still living in Juneau:

"Eight stars on a field of blue—
Alaska's flag, may it mean to you
The blue of the sea, the evening sky,
The mountain lakes and the flowers nearby;
The gold of the early sourdough's dream,
The precious gold of the hills and streams,
The brilliant stars in the northern sky,
The Bear—the Dipper—and shining high
The great North Star with its steady light,
Over land and sea a beacon bright.
Alaska's flag—to Alaskans dear,
The simple flag of a last frontier."

The contest sponsored by the American Legion of Alaska produced a flag that is different than any other of the 48 State flags and is unique in having been designed by a teenage boy.

Food Surpluses and Foreign Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding editorial which was published last week in the New Republic. The editorial has a number of incisive recommendations as to how we can more effectively integrate Public Law 480 into our overall foreign assistance policy and how we can more effectively put counterpart funds to practical use in less developed nations of the world.

I believe that the editorial deserves the attention of the many persons who are anxious to develop new ways in which our food surpluses can be made a part of an international effort.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABUNDANT OPPORTUNITY

As a result of bumper wheat and corn crops the estimated value of surplus farm commodity stocks held by the Federal Government will soon reach an alltime high of $9 billion. And who will even guess when the end will be in sight? Farm groups searching for ways to broaden foreign outlets for accumulating U.S. stocks of food and fiber pushed through the surplus disposal program (Public Law 480) in 1954, and Congress has renewed it three times. Although the program has included some famine relief grants ($1.1 billion) and barter deals for scarce ores through private trade channels ($900 million), the biggest single item has been the sale for foreign currencies of surpluses which were not selling in the regular dollar market. Two and one-half billion dollars worth of agricultural commodities had been sold abroad for foreign currencies as of the end of 1958.

The fact that the United States sells the surpluses for local currencies is to the farm bloc simply an unfortunate temporary expedient incidental to getting rid of the stocks. But Public Law 480 has acquired an altogether different significance for the countries receiving the surpluses. The less developed countries which are the principal recipients are short on food and dollars: Thus the program has the special virtue of simultaneously easing local food scarcity (and price inflation) and releasing dollars for capital goods imports. Moreover, roughly half of the sale proceeds accruing to the United States are reloaned to the recipient countries for U.S.-approved economic developments projects (the remainder is used for U.S. local currency procurement, e.g., in military aid programs, and for educational purposes such as the Fulbright student exchanges). What was designed purely and simply as a disposal program has become, in short, an important part of our foreign aid program.

This dual significance of Public Law 480 has long been apparent to some far-sighted aid officials and aid supporters who have doubted whether Congress would ever appropriate the large dollar sums needed for an effective U.S. economic contribution to the less-developed countries, and who have seen in a redesigned Public Law 480 a means for marrying desperate necessity abroad with political reality at home—not to mention reconciling the paradox of U.S. overabundance in a hungry world. But farm

bloc sentiment for a broadened Public Law 480 program did not crystallize until very recently. With Secretary Benson using the high cost of storing the surpluses as one of his main arguments against price supports, the farm groups are now unanimously pressing for a Public Law 480 program placed on a more permanent basis than the present year-to-year schedule. The administration had been considering a special report on the possibilities in an expanded Public Law 480 program by Harvard agricultural economist John H. Davis when the political winds from Capitol Hill began to pick up velocity, and the result was an apparently last-minute decision to place "Food for Peace" in the President's farm message. But although the President has designated Secretary Benson "to explore anew with other surplus-producing nations all practical means of utilizing the various agricultural surpluses of each in the interest of reinforcing peace"—which might mean, in specific terms, a world conference of food ministry representatives later this year—the administration has no immediate plan beyond renewing Public Law 480.

In Congress, on the other hand, there are major legislative initiatives in the making. Representative W. R. POAGE, Democrat of Texas, has introduced an amendment providing for a 10-year surplus program on a loan basis with repayments in dollars over a period of up to 50 years. Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and Represenative MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, have introduced resolutions affirming congressional support for a long-term surplus program as an integral part of our foreign assistance, and Senator HUMPHREY is readying an omnibus bill which would, among other things, set up a peacetime agency comparable to the War Food Administration—thus giving the program administrative independence and, equally important politically, budgetary independence from the foreign aid and Agriculture appropriations. By attributing the cost of surplus disposal programs to some agency other than the Department of Agriculture, in the name of an objective other than farm price supports, Secretary Benson's misgivings about the high cost of surplus disposal (on top of supports) might be modified.

Senator HUMPHREY is, in our view, to be commended for his leadership on the surplus issue and his omnibus program will be studied with great interest. There are, however, very serious limitations inherent in any long-term program conceived essentially, as are all of the programs contemplated, in terms of loans. The less developed countries are aware that the United States does not know what to do with its abundance. Thus in this instance the often mentioned preference of sensitive Asian governments for loans rather than grants is less weighty than their clear recognition that the United States could quite painlessly make the surpluses available as grants. This become peculiarly important in the light of the enormous accumulations of local currencies by the United States already taking place in the case of India, Pakistan, and Israel—which together claimed more than half of the Public Law 480 surpluses in 1958—and of the profound and growing uneasiness inevitably resulting from that accumulation in these newly independent countries. As Matthew Kust, former legal adviser to U.S. Embassies in South Asia, pointed out in these pages in the case of India, rupees acquired by the U.S. Government under Public Law 480 (and soft currency development loan programs) might in the conceivable future exceed those held by the Government of India. The mere thought of this is politically explosive in India, which is now in the midst of a frenzied reappraisal of its economic—which is to say political—future. The main theme of Indian Communist propaganda is that the Nehru government is mortgaging itself to Washington.

At present 48 percent of Public Law 480 sale proceeds in India are reloaned for U.S. approved economic development projects; another 15 percent goes for grants to nondevelopment purposes (e.g., education and health); 12 percent for U.S. Embassy administrative expenses, and up to 25 percent for local currency loans to U.S. business operations in India (under the so-called Cooley amendment). Any substantially expanded Public Law 480 program would mean that the 48 percent allocated for economic development would become a larger and larger sum—looming larger and larger in relation to the totality of the Indian Government budget—and a sum increasingly hot to handle. Why, Indian leaders might well ask (and this is also true in Pakistan and other surplus recipient countries), does not the United States follow the precedent of the Marshall plan? The Marshall plan was a grant program and the counterpart funds in European currencies accumulated under the plan belonged to the recipient governments. To be sure, provision was made in the program agreements for virtual U.S. control over decisions as to how the funds were to be spent; but this would be easier for the recipient governments to justify to their peoples than direct control of large sums of the national currency by the United States, with all of its implicit political influence.

The Davis report now before the State Department recognizes this state of mind in the less-developed countries and recommends that the grant portion of Public Law 480 allocations be increased from 15 to 25 percent. In our view there is no reason why the increase should not extend to the 48 percent portion now being reloaned and perhaps in later years to the bulk of the proceeds.

There is danger that in the absence of a clear definition of "Food for Peace" as something different from a bigger and better disposal program—perhaps restyled "Food for Economic Development"—some of the merit of the program may be canceled out. It may become an excuse for many Congressmen to vote against vital dollar aid appropriations (e.g., for an expanded Development Loan Fund) while not having the saving grace of the grant authority so necessary in the light of political realities in the less-developed countries. The National Grange frankly urges the Federal Government to "use surplus agricultural commodities whenever practical instead of dollars as a means of aid and relief." What the farm belt politicians are perhaps afraid of is an isolationist rural reaction against giveaways. But given the facts and some leadership we suspect that farmers could be won to a grant program. They have, after all, nothing to lose.

Civil Defense Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Civil Defense Folly," published in the Springfield (Ohio) Daily News of February 18, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL DEFENSE FOLLY

Whether top officials of the Federal Government are trying to delude the people, or whether the Civil Defense organization is trying to entrench itself solidly into a permanent position, Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG did the public a favor when he brought the question of the Civil Defense setup into the open. Senator YOUNG says the program is obsolete and futile, and there can be little question but what he is right.

Both the evacuation and the shelter plans have been rendered wholly ineffectual as protective devices by the newer developments in the H-bomb and other nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, the Civil Defense Office has asked Congress to double its appropriations for the coming year. As Senator YOUNG says, in the face of the facts, any further funds for Civil Defense are just being thrown away.

Some efforts to bolster up the Civil Defense case have been made through the contention that the Civil Defense has rendered good service in disaster areas. So has the Red Cross. So have thousands of volunteers not connected with either agency. Service for disaster victims has been just as good if not better in those areas in which the Civil Defense organization has not participated as in the ones in which it did take part. And as for the distribution of surplus equipment, one has only to look at some of such distributions which have already taken place to realize that insofar as heavy masses of the population are concerned, such distribution could have little effect.

There has been some talk about the making of a paid Civil Defense director for Springfield, and possibly including Clark County. It is extremely doubtful if any good practical results, more than are now being had with a volunteer nonpaid director, could be obtained.

Whenever a new governmental agency has been created for any purpose, it has proved extremely difficult to terminate the agency when the purpose has been fulfilled. Seemingly, the present Civil Defense organization is determined to perpetuate itself whether or not it is doing any effective work.

The Public School Situation at Front Royal, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials dealing with the situation in the public schools at Front Royal, Va. One of the editorials is entitled "Ridiculous Situation in Front Royal" and was published in the Savannah Morning News of February 23, 1959. The other editorial entitled "Boycott by Front Royal School Pupils Could Be Supreme Test of 1954 Ruling," was published in the Augusta Herald of February 20, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Savannah Morning News, Feb. 23, 1959]

RIDICULOUS SITUATION IN FRONT ROYAL

The independent-minded people of predominantly rural Front Royal, Va., pose quite a challenge for the Federal authorities.

According to the ways and means committee of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, otherwise known as the Supreme Court, the "law of the land" says Front Royal's school must be mixed—no evasion, no delay, no circumvention.

The people of Front Royal closed their new million-dollar school last fall rather than open it on an integrated basis. The students, instead, attended private classes. But the NAACP lawyers stayed busy, and the courts kept grinding out laws to make the people abide by the laws they had already made, and by last week every legal defense had been exhausted. The people lost, the court won.

As a list-ditch measure, Warren County, where Front Royal is located, held a referendum on whether or not to continue private schooling for the children. The vote was 545 to 4 in favor of private schools.

The parents wanted to keep their children in makeshift classes run by the Warren County Education Foundation since last September, and they appealed to a Federal judge in Baltimore to permit them to continue to do so, citing the election results to show that the people wanted it this way.

But the judge said "No."

Thus, court-ordered integration was scheduled to begin on Wednesday. But on the appointed day the white students stayed away en masse, and only 22 Negro students reported to the 30-classroom high school, built to accommodate 1,000.

There was no disorder. The 800 white students continued to attend their private classes. Nine white teachers were on hand to teach the 22 Negro students.

The next move, whatever it may be, is up to Federal authorities and the courts, and the signals, as usual, will be called by the NAACP.

The white students are, in a sense, cutting off their noses to spite their own faces—but that is not the point. The point now becomes whether or not in this land of ours, the courts can make a new law making it illegal for a person to cut off his nose to spite his face. We already have compulsory attendance laws in all States, but these are State laws and do not specify which school a student is compelled to attend. Attendance of a private school satisfies this law, so far as the State is concerned. Therefore, the Supreme Court must—if it acts consistently with its former rulings—assume control over compulsory attendance and change this to mean compulsory attendance at an integrated school.

Then we suppose U.S. marshals or perhaps even Federal troops could be used to clear the white private school in Front Royal and herd the children over into the integrated public school. It would be sort of like a Little Rock situation in reverse.

Unless something of this nature is done, the law of the land will stand repudiated—and this is something our courts and Federal authorities must never permit. Ask any liberal.

Some students in areas marked for integration already attend segregated private or parochial schools. If Front Royal's white students are forced to transfer to the integrated public school, what disposition will be made of other students attending segregated private schools in other areas?

Perhaps each case will have to be judged on its merits—if the student transferred to private school to avoid racially-mixed classes, he could be enjoined in Federal court from continuing such attendance; but if his motive was to get a better education, to receive religious instructions, or just to permit his parents to "keep up with the Jones," then he would not be transferred.

Ridiculous?

Of course it's ridiculous. But it could not be otherwise in this instance since it is a natural outgrowth of a preposterous proposition—the Federal usurpation, without legal foundation, of a local community's inherent right to run its own public schools.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Herald, Feb. 20, 1959]

BOYCOTT BY FRONT ROYAL SCHOOL PUPILS COULD BE SUPREME TEST OF 1954 RULING

The first predominantly rural county in the South to face court-ordered integration of its schools has perhaps shown a way to circumvent judicial tyranny by glumly giving up its own public white school to Negroes in order to maintain segregation.

As the country now knows—if the Northern press saw fit to print the story, that is—22 Negro pupils walked into a million-dollar high school at Front Royal, Va., Wednesday—and walked in alone. None of the county's more than 800 white students showed up. Not a single one. Instead, they chose to remain in private classes.

It was a 100-percent boycott—the first of its kind in American history. Moreover, it wasn't a Deep South incident, either, but the protest of an area of northern Virginia, not far from desegregation zones.

And it was a protest that could prove to be portentuous if attempts are made to force Deep South compliance with the Warren Court's reckless ruling.

No doubt the Chief Justice has heard the adage that a horse can be led to water but can't be made to drink.

By the same token, he should now be aware that there are parents who balk at sociological medicine being forced down their children's throats.

The Warren Court first butted its inflated head on Little Rock. Now it is up against a figurative mountain in the Shenandoah Valley—a mountain that will be hard to whittle down unless the Federal judiciary, at the proddings of the insatiable NAACP, should declare private schools unconstitutional and thus involve every church-operated educational institution in the country.

But in view of past performances, it wouldn't be too great a surprise to the South even if it comes to that.

The Front Royal school, which closed last September 12 to avoid compliance with Federal integration orders, was one of those where racial barriers were removed some weeks ago upon collapse of Virginia's massive resistance stand.

Thus, its all-out white boycott was in contrast to the outcome of three metropolitan areas—Norfolk, Arlington, and Alexandria—which, bowing to Federal coercion, finally mixed on a token basis.

As pointed out, however, Front Royal was the first truly rural community to face the test—and it met it stubbornly.

Comments The Charleston News and Courier:

"Because the people of Warren County have refused to be robots manipulated by remote control, they may be subjected to new pressures and penalties. Regardless of what is done to them, they have provided an example of courage, coolness, and character. They have shown the way."

And as Washington columnist Holmes Alexander wrote the other day:

"The theme of equalitarianism has been translated into the vulgate to mean forced integration of white and Negro children. It is a movement by nonsoutherners which is pressed upon the South with the hope of getting the Negro vote and no idea of the ultimate consequences."

But so far the reckless program hasn't panned out too well—as witness the latest episode at Front Royal.

Instead of massive conformity, a Virginia county has handed the Federal courts and the NAACP a massive slap. And our idea is that the President will use no troops in this instance, regardless of what Asia and Africa may say—or how Earl Warren may feel over the anomaly of a strictly one-way mixed school.

Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the GTA Daily Radio Roundup dated February 3, 1959.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION, ST. PAUL, MINN., FEBRUARY 3, 1959

There are a lot of facts and figures that consumers ought to know about food prices. They deserve to know, because they are entitled to abundance at fair prices.

One farm magazine, for example, explains that if farmers farmed now as they did in 1940, the consumers' food bill would be at least $13 billion a year higher. And it asks: "Which is better, to have a surplus costing the consumer $3 to $4 billion a year in taxes, or to have a scarcity, costing him $13 billion more a year at the retail level?"

And that's a real question, which must be answered. The farmer used to get 55 cents out of the consumers' food dollar. Now he gets 39 cents. That's because food prices are up, while farm prices are down. No other industry has had its income cut so drastically.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis explains the situation in the last year this way: "There have been shifts as farm prices drifted lower, and industrial prices firmed, but the total wholesale and consumer prices have remained stable."

That can be said in fewer words, simply that agriculture is subsidizing industry and business and consumers. And all of us ought to be grateful to farmers, not angry with them, for producing so much, so cheap. Most farmers know this, and wish they could get city people to understand.

We received a letter the other day from a farmer near Minot, N. Dak. "We know," he says, "that Secretary of Agriculture Benson is working to reduce farm prices, because he says that will reduce prices to consumers. But let's just compare grain prices with prices of finished products."

He explains that a year ago he sold his wheat for $2.12 a bushel, and paid $2.98 for 50 pounds of flour, and 18 cents for a loaf of bread. Now he sells his wheat for about $1.70 a bushel, pays $3.59 for the same flour, and 23 cents a loaf for bread.

Or take malting barley, this farmer says. "A few years ago I got $2 a bushel for my barley, and beer sold for 15 cents a bottle. Today my barley is worth 90 cents, and beer is 25 to 30 cents a bottle." He goes on to make the same kind of comparisons for oats and milk. Consumers just aren't getting any benefit from lower farm prices, he concludes, because retail food prices go up faster than farm prices go down.

And I'm sure we all agree with that. Now, what this farmer proposes is that farmers get together and exercise some intelligent

production controls, in return for fair and reasonable prices. "But getting the farmers together is the tough job," he says, and he urges them to join up with their organizations and cooperatives.

Well, a lot of farmers tell us that makes sense to them. The last thing they want is an all-out free-for-all on farm production, with each farmer pitted against his neighbor in a disastrous price war.

Gradually, more and more people are coming to understand that in a legislated economy, no single group can be cast out without bringing down trouble on all groups. The better that is understood, the better our chances for decent farm legislation, fair to consumers, taxpayers, and farmers.

Presidential Item Veto Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How To Get Economy," published in the Salt Lake Tribune of February 5, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO GET ECONOMY

President Eisenhower, speaking through Representative HALLECK, Republican House leader, has appealed to the public to join him in his fight to keep the $77 billion budget in balance.

A hearty public response could have telling effect.

But the public, despite it professed interest in economy, is sometimes apathetic when it comes to making its voice heard. Moreover, Congressmen and Senators, who get letters from home urging that the budget line be held, also must work for projects demanded by their constituents. One man's economy often is another man's necessity. That leads to logrolling and increased appropriations.

There is, however, a way to curb this latter practice. It is item veto legislation which would give the President the power to disapprove individual items in an appropriation bill.

As matters stand now, the President must either accept or reject an appropriation bill as a whole. And when an appropriation bill may run to 50 pages and contain thousands of items, he ordinarily has to accept it despite his objection to what he considers extravagances.

Presidents as far back as Ulysses S. Grant have asked for item veto power. Adlai Stevenson endorses it. Senator DOUGLAS, who was an economics professor before he went into politics, estimates it would save the taxpayers $4 billion a year. President Eisenhower called for the item veto in his recent state of the Union message.

But Congress undoubtedly will continue to say, "No." For the item veto would deal a deadly blow to logrolling and would break the pork barrel into small pieces.

Many State Governors, including Utah's have the item veto power. We think the same power should be given Presidents. But it will take a public upheaval of earthquake proportions to get anything done.

Edward F. O'Meara, of Oregon Daily Journal, Spends 30½ Hours in Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the propeller-driven airplane has dwindled the size of our terrestrial home, and the jet aircraft will reduce the globe in size still further. It even is possible for a journalist from my home city of Portland, Oreg., to visit many of the great communities of Western Europe during a 10-day journey.

One such pilgrimage involved 30½ hours in Ireland by a Portland newspaperman who traces back his ancestral lineage to that Gaelic land. He is Edward F. O'Meara, city editor of the Oregon Daily Journal of Portland. Mr. O'Meara has written for his paper a lively and vivid tale which gives highlights of his relatively brief stopover in the country of his forebears, under the title of "30½ Hours in Ireland." It is a heartwarming story.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. O'Meara's articles, as condensed and edited, be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRTY AND ONE-HALF HOURS IN IRELAND

(By Ed. O'Meara)

There didn't seem to be much use arguing.

"So you're going back to Ireland! Well, it'll look pretty much the same!"

That's what my Gaelic-brogued plane seatmate was telling me as we winged through the December night's darkness toward Shannon Airport and the land of St. Patrick.

"I've never been to Ireland before," I told him for the second or third time, "so I couldn't be going back."

'Yes, yes," the Gael said, "that's what I say—you won't be noticing any changes."

It was a big switch, this stopover in the Emerald Isle, "stolen" from our mid-December over-the-Pole Pan American trip to London and Paris. And getting to Ireland isn't too easy during the winter season, but one of Pan Am's Paris office staffers, Mme. Micheline Renoux, proved that French girls are not only pretty but also smart by finding an aerial way to Eire for me.

GIRLS IN THE GREENEST GREEN

We dropped in to Shannon Airport on the shores of Shannon River a few minutes before midnight. Even at that dark hour there was green in sight, mainly the uniform of Aer Lingus, which is the greenest green imaginable, and mainly on pretty Irish girls who were (as is the wont of Irish girls almost everywhere) directing traffic.

At this point I was fortunate in falling almost immediately into the convenient and capable clutches of Matthew Kelly and his boss, Derry McCarthy, drivers of cars for hire. Otherwise I might still be standing there, dazedly staring at the $1.80 price tags on bottles of Irish whiskey in the Shannon shops.

Then followed a 14-mile drive to headquarters, the Royal George Hotel in Limerick—locked tighter than a drum at 12:30 a.m. Limerick, a town of 50,000, was as dead as a mackerel at that hour.

ROOM WITH BATH EXACTLY THAT

Ringing of the Royal George bell produced "night man" Dick Leahy, who proudly led the way to one of "the foinest rooms" (yes, a lot of them to talk that way!) in the century-old hotel. It turned out to be No. 68, which is—naturally—on the fourth floor. The "with bath" turned out to be exactly that—a neat little anteroom equipped with a long white bathtub, two round cakes of "oatmeal soap" and four large bath towels. Nothing more. "The other conveniences," Dick explained, "are down the flight of stairs, turn to the right and at the end of the long hall."

Limerick is a little bit like Chicago—it's hog butcher of the Irish world. The breakfast of bacon and eggs was like nothing I've had in years of rather intensive cuisine-testing—huge slabs of sliced bacon with two-inch width of lean meat and practically no fat!

NAMES MAKE SOOTHING SOUNDS

Then the aim was to visit high spots of counties and towns with familiar names—names mentioned over the years by Ireland-originated members of both sides of the family. With Derry McCarthy, a light-hearted but heavy-footed driver of a small English-built car who knows the main roads, the back roads, by-roads, alleys and short-cuts, as well as the way in and out of various pubs and the best eating houses in towns along the way, I made the best of my 30½-hour visit in Ireland.

Names on this soft, green land are colorful, intriguing and unusual and they unrolled before us as we raced some 160 miles through the heart of the country—through what's called the Golden Vale of Eire, as Derry described it.

From County Limerick to County Tipperary, past Silvermine Mountains near Nenagh; alongside Lough Derg, the lakey bulge in the Shannon River; to Cloughjordan, tiny village with a blazing claim to fame because a martyred patriot-poet was born there; into Roscrea, amid fields dotted with abbey ruins and marked by a "round tower of Ireland"; a brief excursion into county Offaly, a fair stretch of miles in Galway and back to Limerick.

"HIMSELF" WAS JUST OUT BACK

Only place we met another O'Meara was in well-named Toomyvarra village, which seems to have almost as many spellings of its name as there are residents. It's near the Devil's Bit, a big nick in the otherwise smooth line of the Silvermine Mountains. And it means O'Meara's Hill."

In the middle of the town sits a neat building with a two-foot-high red-lettered sign—"J. O'Meara." So McCarthy and E. O'Meara went in. Turned out to be a pub. The pub division was at the back of the room and the front half of the shop was a sort of light grocery department. It looked as though the back half of the shop did the major business.

"Is Mr. O'Meara about?" asked McCarthy.

"Himself is out back," said the gray-haired lady sweeping up. Turned out she was Mrs. O'Meara.

"Well, Mr. O'Meara here from Oregon, would like to meet Mr. O'Meara, of Toomyvarra," McCarthy explained, and she ran to get himself.

James Patrick O'Meara, soft-spoken and sixtyish, came in from outdoors and was happy to welcome us to Toomyvarra. We sampled the products of the back half of the shop. James Patrick did some card tricks ("though me hands are too cold to do it properly") with a facility no other bearer of the name has ever shown, to my knowledge. Other O'Mearas in the neighborhood? "Oh, yes," he said. "Must be 15 or 20 families of them—and hardly any of

them will admit to being related to any of the others."

RELATIVITY'S NO PROBLEM

"Probably," said James Patrick with a smile, "they wouldn't admit to being related to you, either. You Oregon O'Mearas have been gone a long while."

"So," he said turning to the back of the shop, "let's have another."

At this point it developed that we had to be on our way, and James Patrick had to be going, too—he was to be a pallbearer at a funeral Mass in a few minutes.

Guidebooks say "the road northwards from Nenagh to Portumna passes the town of Borrisokane, which is of little interest to the visitor." But it was a colorful sight when we reached it, a little before noon.

The main street was jammed with farmers, small trucks, cows, sheep, gesturing men in thick overcoats, bicycles, carts with donkeys, ducks, and some small boys rushing pell-mell out of St. Mary's School nearby.

ALL'S FAIR IN BORRISOKANE

We edged our way through the melee of a typical Irish fair day (McCarthy said it was typical, anyhow), then stopped to query one of the citizens. Did he, by any chance, know of an O'Meara running the local blacksmith shop? (For about 200 years up to the grandfatherly departure in the 1850's there had been an O'Meara forge in Borrisokane).

"O'Meara blacksmith?" he said. "No—there's a McKenna been runnin' the forge here for years. But there's an O'Meara has a fine pub over in Toomyvarra."

Thanks, we said, but we couldn't go back right away.

And then we were off again in McCarthy's Consul, over the well-paved but narrow Irish highways, through Portumna, Ballinasloe, Aughrim, Loughrea and Athenry in east Galway and along the Shannon into Clare as mid-December's early dusk caught up with us hurrying back to Limerick.

IT'S NO TRICK TO GO BACK

And then I climbed aboard a Pan Am plane for London, and in London took off a bit later in another Pan Am plane for a 20½-hour ride back to Portland over the polar route. And the new jets will cut the trip to a mere overnight flight. Since Portland's that close to Limerick and Tipperary, it'd be no trick at all to go back some time.

So that was it—a brief visit to the Ould Sod, a couple of short nights' sleep at the Royal George, a few minutes at Nenagh, an hour or so in the back half of James Patrick O'Meara's pub in Toomyvarra, fleeting glimpses of the Shannon, a peak at the tinker's colorful carts on the roadside, a few short walks in the Irish countryside, a few short beers with Derry McCarthy (who seemed more like a relative than a man with cars for hire), and that was it. No Dublin, no Blarney castle, no Cork. It's a fine, soft, green and quiet land, Ireland is—and a man ought to spend more than 30½ hours there to pay it a decent visit.

Ah, well, as the Irish say, "Slainte"—good health and here's to you.

Our Soybean Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 25, it was my pleasure to attend with other members of the House Committee on Agriculture a market development luncheon together with representatives from our farm organizations and from industry and industry organizations.

Representing the soybean growers and industry were Mr. Howard Roach, president of the Soybean Council of America, and Mr. Coleman Crews, of Keiser, Ark., representing the American Soybean Association. These two gentlemen had at their fingertips splendid information on the development of our soybean economy in the United States and the address that Mr. Roach gave was heartening as to the work of the soybean organizations, allied with the Foreign Agricultural Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, in developing and expanding foreign markets for soybeans and soybean products.

This foreign trade development is essential when production of American soybeans is noted. The following table indicates the great expansion in American production. It is seen that, from 44 percent of the world production in the years 1950 to 1954, American production amounts now to 58 percent of the world production:

Soybeans: World production by areas and U.S. share, average 1950–54 annual 1955–58

[In millions of bushels]

Area	Average 1950–54	1955	1956	1957	1958
Foreign production:					
Non-Communist:					
Brazil	3	4	4	4	4
Canada	4	6	5	7	7
Indonesia	11	13	13	13	13
Japan	17	19	17	17	16
Others	8	7	11	11	11
Total	43	49	50	52	51
Communist countries:					
China	330	335	340	335	350
Others	11	10	10	10	10
Total	341	345	350	345	360
United States	298	374	449	480	575
World total	682	768	849	877	986
U.S. percent of world	44	49	53	55	58

Using only 1 percent of the funds in the Public Law 480 programs for marketing and promotion programs, the various commodity organizations have performed excellent work in creating and expanding markets for American farm products. Mr. Roach, in his statement, illustrates this fact in the case of soybeans. It is a pleasure and a privilege to include with these remarks the statement presented by Mr. Roach.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD L. ROACH, OF PLAINFIELD, IOWA, PRESIDENT, SOYBEAN COUNCIL OF AMERICA, INC., COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 86TH CONGRESS, FEBRUARY 25, 1959

When the American Soybean Association was organized in 1920, to promote a new and almost unknown crop, few present realized the possibilities of an agricultural achievement that is now history.

In 1925, the first year that the U.S. Department of Agriculture published records of soybean production, 5 million bushels were grown which were worth between 10 and 11 million dollars. Thirty-nine years later, in 1958, 574 million bushels were grown (an increase of over 1,000 percent) which put into the pockets of American farmers over $1 billion.

The same foresight that nursed the small soybean crop, also nursed an infant processing and handling industry. It was but natural that these segments of our agricultural economy, realizing their mutual dependence, should conceive the Soybean Council of America to tell the story of soybeans and soybean products to the world.

With the passage of Public Law 480 by the 83d Congress, in 1954, which contained the concept of using counterpart funds for market development activity abroad, the council entered into agreements with Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to tell the story of soybeans and soybean products; to encourage existing overseas markets and to develop new business for American agriculture.

The remarkable increase in acreage devoted to the growing of soybeans has changed the United States in the field of fats and oils from an importing to an exporting nation.

We must, therefore, find and develop new markets. With a broad concept that we must encourage greater consumption among people where possible, and with the still broader concept that edible fats and oils can be substituted one for the other, the council feels responsible for cottonseed oil, lard, butter, and other fats and oils as well as for soybean oil. We are, therefore, engaged in increasing the consumption of fats and oils.

Since our first project, started in Japan, cooperating with the Oregon Wheat Growers, we have now written 15 market development agreements with Foreign Agricultural Service covering the following nations: Austria, Germany, Italy, Spain, Turkey, Poland, Mexico, Central America, Chile, Peru, Caribbean Area, Burma, India, Thailand, Pakistan, Greece, and Israel. In past years we have shown in agricultural and trade fairs in Italy, Germany, Spain, and Greece and during the current year, 1959, will show in a total of 14 fairs in Europe, South America and Asia. This trade fair activity, alone, costs the Council between eighteen and twenty thousand dollars per year in cold cash while our overseas cooperators contribute much more than this amount. This is all possible through cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and with the Department of Commerce.

The Council early learned, in market development work, that our overseas friends expect us to share some soybean meal and knowledge on how to use same in livestock and poultry feeding if we expect them to keep quiet while we ship our surplus edible oil to them which competes with their own fats and oils. We are, therefore, holding schools, seminars and feeding demonstrations on how to use soybean meal efficiently. As a result, our dollar sales to Italy of soybean meal for example have risen from a little over 3,000 short tons in 1954 to over 70,000 tons in 1958. We have also held oil schools and seminars in Spain, showing and telling the trade and Government officials, about U.S. methods of grading and testing vegetable oils. As a result the Government of Spain has recently removed restrictions on the sale and mixture of soybean oil.

The job before us is stupendous. Without assistance, from Foreign Agricultural Service, the task and cost would be too great for us to attempt. American agriculture is the beneficiary of those who conceived the use of funds from Public Law 480 sales for market development work. Our concern is that enough of these funds continue to be directed for market development work until such time that agriculture fully realizes its value and is willing to carry on alone.

Most of us remember the slogan used during the last war to encourage agricultural

production "Food will win the war and write the peace." Food did win the war, but we have never given it the chance it should have to "write the peace." Russia is able to match us in guns, sputniks, rockets, and in every other product that implies destruction. Russia is still unable to match us in food and the knowledge that goes with its production and processing. In this field they cannot compete with us today. Now is time for us to use food to write the peace and demonstrate to the world the wonders that plenty and proper food can do. Market development, made possible through the continued availability of Public Law 480 funds is the greatest single medium through which we can carry on a program for universal peace.

Save Millions by Curtailing or Eliminating Civil Defense Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Harsh Words for CD," published in the Toledo Blade of February 18, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARSH WORDS FOR CD

Ohio's Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG has said what a good many people think when he calls the civil defense program futile and suggests that Congress could, without jeopary to the Nation, save millions of dollars by curtailing or eliminating CD expenditures.

In the Senator's opinion, most of the $500 million appropriated for this purpose over the past 9 years has been wasted. Neither we nor the Russians have any defense against nuclear weapons except retaliation. Opposing the request of the CD agency for increased funds, he charges that the organization has grown topheavy with high salaried officials. Further money, he says, would means more for officials, for useless bomb shelters, for supplies and equipment of doubtful value.

This severe judgment on a program to which it has become customary to pay lip service will, of course, be challenged. There are those who believe that millions of American lives might be saved if a truly comprehensive CD program were put into effect. The trouble has been, they assert, a niggardly scale of appropriations and the lack of Federal leadership for a program of life-and-death importance. Some complain because the Federal Government has failed to come through with a huge program of shelter building.

But while it may be argued that a CD program could and should be made far more effective, there would not appear to be much question about the ineffectiveness of the present one. It is still limping along on a golden shoestring, is still entangled in doctrinal dispute about whether the best defense against nuclear attack is to run or dig in, is still operated on a sort of poor relation basis to the overall defense program, is still without the sort of administration or congressional support that might give it some importance, is still viewed largely with an indifference by the public that reflects general skepticism of its usefulness.

The administration and Congress have been going through the motions of supporting CD all these years. Perhaps it is thought better for morale to spend a few hundred million on a perfunctory program than to admit to a fatalistic attitude about what would happen if the bombs ever did begin to fall. But Senator YOUNG, in putting into blunt words his ideas of the CD operation, has challenged his colleagues to weigh realistically its value.

Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives—Report by Committee of the American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on Tuesday, February 24, 1959, the American Bar Association, at its midwinter meeting in Chicago, adopted the report of its special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives. This report has received nationwide attention because of its momentous impact in the field of American law, dealing with recent decisions of the Supreme Court in the field of internal security and communism. It is a courageous and forthright document, from a highly responsible source, which deserves the serious consideration of all Americans who are concerned with the preservation of the American way of life.

Mr. President, I ask that a number of newspaper editorials concerning this report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Feb. 23, 1959]

SUPREME COURT UNDER FIRE

The American Bar Association's Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives, after publishing last August a preliminary report, has now come forth with a report—as yet unreleased to the press—which will specifically cite and criticize 23 Supreme Court decisions which coddle Communists and communism. The report, which is being presented today to the ABA's entire House of Delegates at their meeting in Chicago, will be voted upon by the entire organization.

A quick look at the results of some recent Supreme Court decisions should prove the necessity of the ABA taking strong action. The court has refused to uphold or pass on the constitutionality of the Subversive Activities Control Act, thereby delaying the effectiveness of the act. The Court has held that teaching and advocating the forcible overthrow of our Government, even with evil intent is not punishable under the Smith Act. In freeing five Communist Party leaders and ordering new trials for nine others, the Court said it must be proved that there is some effort to instigate action to that end.

The Supreme Court freed Steve Nelson, Pennsylvania Communist Party leader, and in effect voided the antisedition laws of 42 States, Alaska and Hawaii. The Court construed the Summary Suspension Act of 1950, as it applied to Federal employees, to apply only to employees in sensitive positions, although such was obviously not the intent of Congress. Reversing two Federal courts, the Court, despite incriminating evidence, set aside the discharge of John Stewart Service by the State Department, thereby undermining the McCarran amendment which gave the Secretary of State discretion to discharge any employee in the interests of the United States.

The Court reversed the decisions of three New York courts and held it is unconstitutional to automatically discharge a teacher, in accordance with New York law, because he took the fifth amendment when questioned about Communist activities. Even though the Court later admitted that it erred in stating that the teacher was not aware that his claim of the fifth amendment would result in discharge, it denied a rehearing.

Here in New England, the Court reversed the New Hampshire Supreme Court and held that the attorney general of this State was without authority to question a lecturer at a State university, financed by taxpayers, concerning a lecture at the university and other suspected subversive activities.

The notorious Jenks and Watkins decisions need no elaboration, but only serve to prove the point that the Supreme Court is displaying an obvious bias in favor of Communists and suspected subversives.

Now that Chief Justice Warren has "disowned" the American Bar Association, perhaps the latter will summon up all its courage and endorse the recommendations of the 10 lawyers who comprise its Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 25, 1959]

LAWYER'S ATTACK ON SUPREME COURT—BAR GROUP'S DISAPPROVAL OF DECISIONS SEEN IMPLYING MISUSE OF POWER

(By David Lawrence)

Seldom in American history has there been such a scathing criticism of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States as has just come from the American Bar Association.

This has nothing to do with the decisions of the Court on segregation or integration. Nor do the members of the bar—who by overwhelming vote approved at the Chicago convention this week a committee report on the subject of Supreme Court decisions—come from any one section of the country.

The action taken is a formal disapproval of several decisions of the Supreme Court, not only in matters of law but in the misuse of the judicial power itself. The report, comprising about 20,000 words, does not criticize the Supreme Court as an institution nor recommend any limitation of its powers, but does say Congress should at once, in the proper way, endeavor to correct the ill effects of the decisions. The report declares:

"Many cases have been decided in such a manner as to encourage an increase in Communist activity in the United States through invalidation of State sedition statutes, and limitation of State and Federal investigating powers in the field of subversion, although these cases might readily have been disposed of without so broadly limiting National and State security efforts.

"The paralysis of our internal security grows largely from construction and interpretation centering around technicalities emanating from our judicial process which the Communists seek to destroy, yet use as a refuge to masquerade their diabolical objectives.

"This trend was treated fully in the Conference of State Chief Justices last year

when they called upon the United States Supreme Court to exercise the power of judicial self-restraint. The dissenting opinions of certain Supreme Court justices have been crystal clear in charting the effect of the failure of the majority to recognize the underground forces that are at work and to appreciate how these decisions affect our internal security."

The bar association's report says it is the duty of members of the bar "to defend the institutions of the judiciary from unfair and unjust attacks" and that proposals to limit the Court's jurisdiction should not be approved. But at the same time the committee report, as adopted by the convention, says that, where remedial legislation can be enacted by Congress to deal with Communists and other subversives, this should be given prompt attention. The report cites a long list of Supreme Court decisions in the internal-security field and points out exactly how they can be overcome by action of Congress.

Also, a chapter is devoted to "current fallacies about communism." The report says: "It is just as false to measure the strength of communism in the United States by comparing the small number of party members with the large number of non-Communists, as it would be to measure the seaworthiness of a ship by comparing the area of its holes with the area of its hull. A few strategically placed holes can sink the largest ship."

Adding that the "danger and the menace of communism are worse than ever," the report calls on the members of the bar to alert the Nation on the menace of international communism.

As one reads the report, there comes a feeling that its writers tried to be as tactful as possible in their references to the present membership of the Supreme Court but nevertheless reveal again and again their dismay at the abuse of power by the highest Court.

"Our internal security," says the report, "has been weakened by a lackadaisical attitude on the part of the public and technicalities raised in judicial decisions which too frequently in the public mind have had the effect of putting on trial the machinery of the judicial process and free the subversive to go forth and further undermine our Nation."

The indifference of the public may be due to the job performed by some of the opponents of the late Senator McCarthy, of Wisconsin. Unfortunately, the period in which he struggled to direct attention to the Communist menace now is brushed off as merely one of hysteria, and there is no effort nowadays to separate what was valid in the crusade from that which was due to overzealousness and emotionalism.

Since the famous battle took place in the Senate in 1954, moreover, it has been an open secret in Washington that the Democratic Party leaders in both Houses have been under pressure from its so-called liberal elements to soft-pedal the inquiries into communism. Though two committees still do some work in this field, they are restrained by word from higher up in the party whenever they really want to expose some palpable manifestation of Communist effort inside the United States. Some prominent American citizens, for example, who have been openly siding with the Soviets against their own Government in certain controversies have never been called as witnesses by the committees of either the House or the Senate to explain their activities or their connections with the Communist propaganda machine. Maybe the American Bar Association report will awaken American public opinion and help to overcome the timidity of the Democratic Party leadership on these subjects.

[From the Newark Evening News, Feb. 24, 1959]

BAR AND SUBVERSION

The board of governors of the American Bar Association has approved a report of a special committee on Communist tactics, strategy and objectives which recommends congressional reversal of Supreme Court decisions in a series of subversion cases.

The report affirms the duty of the bar to defend the judiciary from unfair and unjust attack, an apparent reference to last year's resolution of the Conference of Chief Justices and to intemperate speeches in Congress. Analysis by members of the faculty of the University of Chicago Law School has shown that the charges of legislative encroachment made by the State chief justices had little basis. New Jersey's Chief Justice Weintraub said as much at the time.

However, the bar association committee does insist that many cases, decided in such a manner as to encourage an increase in Communist activities, could have been disposed of without so broadly limiting national and State security efforts.

Congress last year wisely rejected proposals for limiting the Court's appellate jurisdiction and nullifying some of its decisions. These were dangerous measures of unpredictable effect. They could have denied law-abiding citizens the judicial protection they need against tyranny and persecution.

The bar association report makes an obvious distinction between the Court's interpretation of constitutional principles and decisions in which it interprets the intent of Congress or defines the scope of statutes.

In the Steve Nelson case, which the bar association would reverse, the Court declared that Congress "intended to occupy the field of sedition," to the exclusion of the States. In the passport cases the Court held that the statutes do not authorize the State Department to withhold passports because the applicant was a Communist or refused to answer questions about party memberships. This is the judicial function.

Where the Court's declaration of congressional intent is quite different from what Congress did in fact intend, Congress has a right to change the law to make its purposes clear. Where the Court finds that a statute does not grant authority Congress intended to grant, Congress has a right to supply the lack. This is the legislative function.

In contrast with the blunderbuss that was the 1958 Jenner-Butler bill and the sweeping generalizations of the chief justices, the bar association recommends specific case by case revision which would not impair the indispensable doctrine of judicial review.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 26, 1959]

THE BAR AND THE HIGH COURT

The American Bar Association's House of Delegates, meeting in Chicago, adopted the other day a series of recommendations that, though for the most part politely put, amount to a critical rejection of some United States Supreme Court decisions affecting communism and our internal security.

It is necessary, perhaps, to understand the role of the House of Delegates if one is to measure fairly the meaning of its criticism. The House is the policy-making body of the A.B.A., composed of some ninety thousand members. The delegates themselves number 246 lawyers from every State of the union. They cannot, and do not claim to, reflect the views of every individual member. But there is not much question that the House of Delegates not only sets policy for all the rest, but that it actually does reflect the views of the great majority of members of the bar.

Now, what did the House of Delegates have to say about Court decisions and communism? In its recommendations, designed to nullify the effect of recent rulings, are found such descriptions of decisions as "unsound and incorrect"; as "interpretations" tending to "impede the work of Congress" the result of which is that "internal security is weakened."

Yet the bar did not simply criticize; it recognized that, in some areas, the Supreme Court was faced with imprecise language, sometimes in the law, sometimes in congressional resolutions, sometimes in judicial decisions. So its recommendations were not for limiting the Supreme Court's jurisdiction, as some lawyers and Congressmen have suggested, but for other legislative remedies.

By and large, the recommendations will, we think, meet with approval from both Congress and the public which is also mystified at times by Supreme Court decisions (professional baseball is a sport and not a business; but professional football is a business and not a sport).

Certainly there is little logic in the decision which denied States the rights to enact sedition laws because the Federal Government had preempted the field; States can become as much a target of seditionists as Washington can.

Nor is there much logic in the ruling of the Supreme Court that held, in effect, that it was legal to advocate the violent overthrow of the Government and only illegal to actually try to do it. That is the same as saying the Government could protect itself only when the shooting started.

There are other recommendations, too, that would close some loopholes in internal security. One, for example, would require all Federal employees to answer questions concerning communism before duly constituted congressional committees or authorized officers of the executive or judicial branches or lose their jobs. It makes sense to us to suggest that Uncle Sam should have a right to know whether his employees are loyal and to get rid of those whose loyalty is doubtful.

Congress doubtless will give these bar association recommendations serious study, and it would be well if it acted upon them where necessary to close judicial loopholes in our internal security laws.

It would be well also if the Justices of the United States Supreme Court would read the recommendations and the report on which they were based. This is not the first time the Court has been criticized; a short time back the justices of the State supreme courts pleaded with the Supreme Court for more judicial self-restraint in matters affecting State sovereignty.

It is possible, of course, that the American Bar Association and the State supreme court justices are themselves in error in their criticism of some Supreme Court decisions.

But that is not very likely. And it is even less likely when it is remembered that sometimes minority members of the Court are as critical of the majority decisions as anyone else.

[From the New York Mirror, Feb. 26, 1959]

AIMS OF THE ENEMY

The report of the special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives of the American Bar Association, headed by Peter Campbell Brown, formerly corporation counsel of this city, is one of the ablest prepared documents that has appeared in a long time.

It is a comprehensive study not only of the infiltration of Communists into American life but it is an itemized brief of the

protection that Communists receive under our laws and their ability to use our laws and our institutions to damage this country.

There are recommendations to the American Bar Association which will undoubtedly influence the opinion of lawyers throughout the United States, particularly those which are critical of the Supreme Court's recent Communist decisions and call upon Congress to pass legislation to correct them.

However, what will have a still greater influence than the resolutions in the 57-page brief which goes to the heart of the subject, which piles fact upon fact, and which makes out so thorough a case against the Communist use of our laws and institutions that even the leftwingers in the American Bar Association found themselves silenced before the shining array of indisputable data.

This brief states:

"The paralysis of our internal security grows largely from construction and interpretation centering around technicalities emanating from our judicial process which the Communists seek to destroy, yet use as a refuge to masquerade their diabolical objects * * *."

The majority in the Supreme Court choose to ignore the world in which they as well as we live. It prefers judicial dogmatism to a realistic appraisal of the danger in which this country finds itself. National security has been weakened by Supreme Court decisions in such cases as *Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson, Communist Party U.S.A.* v *Subversive Activities Control Board, Watkins* v. *U.S., Cole* v. *Young, Jencks* v. *U.S.*, and about a dozen more cases, most of them between 1956 and 1958; that is, since Earl Warren became Chief Justice of the United States.

The difficulty is that the U.S. Supreme Court—that is, the majority—ignores the fact that this Nation is at war—a cold war at present—with Soviet Russia and that that country maintains a fifth column and an espionage organization in this country which must be rooted out.

The report calls attention to facts which the Supreme Court has ignored:

"The Communist master plan for world conquest has been outlined by both Lenin and Stalin as entailing the violent smashing and overthrow of all non-Soviet governments, including those of Great Britain and the United States. Prior to this overthrow and to prepare for it in each instance, the Communist Party is to make 'transmission belts' of all possible nonparty agencies for the diffusion of the Communist line, weakening the country to be overthrown. Already this has become a historical fact to which once free peoples, now enslaved, can testify. Need we have more evidence of Soviet intent?"

Laws have been passed by Congress to provide the means to lessen the effectiveness of Communist fifth column activity in the United States. The Supreme Court has nullified many of the steps taken against the Communists undoubtedly on the supposition that the Communist Party is something like the Populists or Father Divine's heaven or maybe a high school debating society. The honorable and learned justices fail to recognize the nature of the treacherous utilization of our laws and institutions to do us damage.

They now have a brief which can guide them in the right direction. It ought also guide Congress toward legislation which will correct the nonjudicial dogmatism of the scholarly justices.

Criticism of the Supreme Court by the American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of February 23, 1959, entitled "What Is a Technicality?" The editorial deals with the recent criticism of the Supreme Court by the American Bar Association.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS A TECHNICALITY?

The jurisdiction of the Supreme Court is in danger of attack again by an organization as powerful and as responsible as could be invoked—the American Bar Association. A committee report favorably—if somewhat belatedly—presented by the association's board of governors and due to come before the house of delegates at this week's meeting in Chicago carries weight because the bar association has not lent itself to indiscriminate attacks on the Court. Indeed, the board of governors last May denounced the Jenner-Butler Court reform bill as a threat to the independence of the judiciary. This was one reason why that bill was tabled in the Senate last August by a vote of 41 to 40.

The report now submitted pays tribute to the Supreme Court and an independent judiciary as the ultimate guardians of the Bill of Rights and the protectors of our freedom. It goes on, however, to charge that "many cases have been decided in such a manner as to encourage an increase in Communist activities in the United States.

It adds the disquieting indictment that "our internal security has been weakened by technicalities raised in judicial decisions which too frequently in the public mind have had the effect of putting on trial the machinery of the judicial process and freeing the subversive to go forth and further undermine our nation." The principal citation here is usually that of Steve Nelson, convicted of seditious activities under a law of the State of Pennsylvania and given a new trial on the theory that sedition had already been taken care of by Federal legislation.

The bar association report suggests a number of issues that have worried persons who see Communists under every bush. The report suggests that States should enforce their own laws against sedition, which would take care of the Nelson case; that the Secretary of State be given broader power to deny passports to persons he considers subversive; that Federal employees in nonsensitive agencies be put through the same doctrinal wringer as those in the sensitive agencies; that the Smith Act be broadened to remove the distinction between theoretical advocacy of sedition and actual incitement to action; and that the charter of the Committee on Un-American Activities be more precisely worded—obviously a response to the Supreme Court's requirement that a witness needn't answer questions unless they are pertinent to the purpose of the inquiry.

These suggestions are not necessarily criticisms of the Court. In some cases, indeed, the Court itself has expressed a desire for more precise expressions of the lawmakers' intentions.

We do believe, however, that an assembly of distinguished lawyers should think twice before condemning technicalities as of small importance. Lawyers use in their own pleadings all the technicalities they can. Why not? One man's technicality may be another man's property, liberty or life.

We live in a time of great stress, of great dangers, of a great necessity for discipline. Nevertheless, the basic rights of our society are not those of governments, or of any agents of government, but of the individual. And the ultimate act of treason is to despise those rights and undermine them, just as the ultimate loyalty is to protect them and carry forward the great traditions of democracy.

Time To Review Civil Defense Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Still No Place To Hide," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 25, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STILL NO PLACE TO HIDE

Most Americans seem either blissfully or fatalistically unconcerned with civil defense. The minority of persons who think that civil defense is important are disturbed by the inadequacies of the present program. Probably few would go so far as Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG when he said that civil defense is a "shameful waste of public money." But surely it is time to review civil defense planning once again now that missiles have reduced warning periods to no more than 15 minutes and Americans still have no place to hide.

One thing is clear, and that is the folly of evacuation plans. As the civil defense advisory board in Montgomery County has stated, "mass evacuation following an air raid warning would probably result in increased rather than decreased deaths." The still undistributed civil defense guidebook to evacuation routes for the Washington area which Senator YOUNG criticized as a waste of money certainly will be of little use if indeed it is ever distributed.

The present alternative to evacuation is the construction of private as well as public shelters. The advisory board in Montgomery County estimates that a home shelter can be built for about $100. Shelters are commonplace in England, and in Norway and Sweden many underground garages have been constructed in such a way as to serve a dual purpose. But nowhere in the United States are public or private shelters being built.

What civil defense organization there is in the United States has been helpful in the aftermath of such disasters as the recent

tornado in St. Louis and the floods in Indiana and Ohio, Mr. YOUNG's own State. But the general indifference to civil defense is as great as the lack of shelters. This in difference is due in part to the failure of the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization to settle on a workable plan. Even now, when evacuation seems patently unrealistic, it remains as part of the civil defense program. But leaving aside the question of bureaucratic bungling, the great majority of Americans still do not believe that a nuclear war is likely. As long as this attitude persists no civil defense organization is going to be able to do much more than shuffle papers.

Statement of Hon. Steven V. Carter, of Iowa

SPEECH
OF
HON. STEVEN V. CARTER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlemen from Iowa [Mr. CARTER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I speak without a script and from a full heart.

First, I should like to tell you that I am tremendously grateful, and it is a wonderful feeling to be back among the land of the living. Just a moment ago I sat here thinking that the last time I sat in this Chamber I sat with the specter of death with me, certain that I had only a short time to live. Since that time the marvelous and tremendous efforts of medical science have treated a cancer that returned. I have been in the hospital since January 30. That treatment has been effective, and my doctors tell me now that I have a normal life expectancy. I am grateful to them and to a gracious God for this chance to live, for this opportunity to serve.

I should like to tell you a little bit about this treatment. The first treatment I took was nitromustard gas in liquid form. They put it into your veins. That was a little rough. But what I do want to mention to you, and what I think the American people should know about the treatment of cancer, is this:

This morning I took, and each morning for the next two weeks I will take, radiation treatments from a 2-million-volt machine. I have no feeling; it does not hurt. There is no reaction at all in my system. They are completing the cure of a cancer that has grown on my spine and caused the terrible pain that I suffered the last time I sat here. I wish the American people who suffer from cancer and who are fearful of the treatment could know this, so that they will not fear this kind of treatment. It is tremendous what medical science has done.

There is much that I would like to do. My life will be dedicated to service. I do not know what your response would be to this experience. Cancer, you know, always happens to the other fellow. When it does happen there are many things that go through your mind. Your perspective changes and your sense of values is greatly affected. I now have a deeper sense of what is valuable and if anything I am more greatly dedicated to service.

The day I got out of the hospital, Mr. Speaker, I was confronted with a tabloid statement concerning the fact that I had hired my son as administrative assistant, as they call it. Actually, of course, we have no administrative assistants in the House. He was my top secretary.

When I first came here the pain had become so great in my left arm that I was quite certain that I had only a short time to live, because the last time I had this cancer they told me I could expect to live 3 weeks if they did not cure it. So you see I was privately certain that I would not live very long.

While I was undergoing treatment for cancer I wanted someone who was close to me, to be with me, and to help me serve—someone I could depend upon—someone who knew me—who knew how I thought. I hired my son on a basis that was temporary. I gave him a salary of $11,000, which is about the average salary paid to the top secretary. It was a temporary thing. Now the truth of the matter is that as of today his basic salary will be cut in two, because, now that the pain is gone, I can work. I can sleep at night. I can build up my strength and I will be able to be in the office regularly and to serve. The truth of the matter is that it was only a temporary arrangement in the first place. The truth of the matter is that he worked many, many hours a week above and beyond the call of the office, to be with me, to tell me the things that happened and to take the answers and to work with me in giving the kind of service and building up the kind of service that a congressional staff must build if they are to represent their district. And know this—I am proud of the staff that serves the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa. They were superlative. They have kept current with every demand for service from the Fourth District during this period of time when I was being treated. My son's present salary will be less per hour than he earned on a road gang last summer.

There is one other thing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to mention here, I would feel and I do deeply regret it, if this that I have done be a mistake, and I seek forgiveness from the American taxpayers and, particularly, from the people I serve in the Fourth District if it is a mistake and if what I have done has cast any reflection on any other Congressman who serves here diligently, please foregive me and know that in my heart I am dedicated to your service. I would not hurt any one of you for anything. Know, too, that if it has cast any reflection on the bill that has been under discussion and has been recently submitted out of the House Administration Committee, that if there has been any reflection on that bill to retain an administrative assistant for the Members of Congress that it is not fair because there are many districts in this Nation where the taxpayers will be greatly benefited if their Congressman is allowed an administrative assistant. This must be considered.

Mr. Speaker, there is another matter I would like to mention here. Every reporter who has talked with me concerning this period of nationwide publicity has become a warm personal friend. They have been very kind. They have been very honest. But, during the period of time I have studied this thing before coming to you to talk to you about it, there have been some matters that I have learned about that makes me wonder why their editors have not let the people know about. For example. On the very day that the fact that the young Congressman from Iowa had hired his son appeared in the headlines, one of the truly great public servants of this Nation and one of the best informed men in the country, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas, introduced from this floor a statement with conclusive evidence that the Federal Reserve System has bilked the American people out of $10¼ billion and given it to their relatives. And you know—and this is a query I would place to the fourth estate—I searched every newspaper that I could find and I did not find it in the headlines. I did not even find it on page 15. I could not even find it mentioned. Why?

This query I place because I have a feeling that for some reason, that is beyond me and beyond my experience, they have been straining at a gnat when a camel was passing by.

Mr. Speaker, the Members have been very attentive. I express gratitude from a full heart. I want to mention also that the leadership, through this whole ordeal, has been very kind and very gentle. I am especially grateful to you, Mr. Speaker, to the majority leader Mr. MCCORMACK, and to Mr. ALBERT. You have been strong men and great men. It is a great honor to serve here. It has been an honor to serve with you. Thanks a million.

An Inspiration From a Californian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the problem of helping the physically handicapped find employment and take part in activities which will restore their morale and their psychological health has been receiving increased attention in recent years—as, indeed, it should.

Our Nation has learned that many persons who have been doomed to go through life with different forms of handicaps are able, with encouragement and with the requisite determination, to make for themselves a rewarding and useful place in society. The President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped has been energetic in

seeking to assist such courageous individuals.

An inspiring example of what can be achieved by a person who has suffered a physical disability is given in an article published in the monthly magazine, Performance, issued by the President's Committee. It relates the achievements of a young woman in California who won both high collegiate honors and a responsible position, despite three handicaps which easily might have discouraged a less aggressive person. Because I believe this account will be challenging and reassuring to others, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REHAB STUDENT WINS TOP COLLEGE HONORS

A vocational rehabilitation student with three handicaps won top honors at Ventura College, Ventura, Calif., last year and became a college employee immediately after the honors were conferred.

The student, Merry Hart, has a spinal injury which prevents her from accepting jobs which require all-day standing. She has an incorrectible visual defect which at times leaves her unable to read her assignments.

Yet at the recent college awards assembly she won top scholastic honors—the Rotary medal for straight-A scholarship. She also won permanent membership in Alpha Gamma Sigma, national scholastic honor society, and received the Altrusa and Elks Club scholarship awards. In addition, she received top publication honors: a gold key with a pearl inset, awarded for 2 years' service on college publications. (Currently she is on the editorial boards of all Ventura College publications; is editor of the annual; and serves as news bureau manager for the college.)

The highest honor which can be conferred upon a Ventura College student also went to Mrs. Hart: the Circle K award for outstanding service to the college. She is the second woman student ever to have been named for the honor.

A fifth-semester student at the college next year, Merry will be employed by the county library 26 hours a week and by the college library 5 hours a week while completing her requirements for the associate arts degree. The mother of a 4-year-old daughter known to VC students as "Little Loveliness," Merry has served for three semesters as president of Alpha Omega, campus creative writers' and artists' club, for one semester as its corresponding secretary; for one semester as vice president of Alpha Gamma Sigma; for two semesters as intra-college council representative, and has maintained membership in Digamma Tau Alpha, educators' club.

While at the college, Merry has achieved publication in three college-level anthologies, and hundreds of her poems have appeared in a Chicago newspaper.

When Merry looks at the six medals she has won while attending Ventura College, she remembers the dark day before Rehab gave her a second chance. Utterly defeated because unemployable, she stood on the ocean pier, looking at the cold waters of the Pacific, and thinking how easy it would be to end her troubles by suicide. A friend who stood there with her said, "You can't do it, Merry. A winner never quits—and a quitter never wins."

Those words saw her through the rehabilitation period, and in a few months she will be entirely self-supporting, with a secure future. To add to the joys of that future is her present project: the completion of a children's picture book. After this she plans to write a 300-page book on "psychopathic personality."

Mrs. Hart served for 3 consecutive years as NEPH chairman in Bradley County, Tenn., and holds the national commander's citation for meritorious service from the Disabled American Veterans.

She recently received the first Altrusa International Founders' Fund Grant at a meeting of the Altrusa Club of Ventura. The award consists of a $225 grant for a camera and other equipment which Mrs. Hart will use in her work as a freelance photographer. The founders' fund provides training or equipment for women seeking employment.

Gen. George C. Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALAN BIBLE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on February 23, a moving tribute to a great soldier-statesman, Gen. George Catlett Marshall, was paid by William S. White, one of America's outstanding journalists. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. White's column, as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star of that date, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARSHALL: PATRIOT, GENTLEMAN—AILING GENERAL MAINTAINED DIGNITY IN FACE OF ACCUSATIONS AND CRITICISM

(By William S. White)

General of the Army George C. Marshall is sick with a great sickness, and with his life a gallant and lost era is coming to its close. This was the era of World War II, in which General Marshall, without ever having a field command at all, served so nobly and so well.

He was the Secretary of State who gave his name to the Marshall plan for the post-war recovery of Europe. He served also as Secretary of Defense. But before this he had been Chief of Staff of the United States Army. And though this post in Washington's hierarchy was far below the others he held, it was this post which most of all he honored in his private thoughts.

This was the man—this rather thin and gray and coldly kind military man—who more than any other on this side of the oceans brought an end to Hitler and to Tojo and to all the evil power that they represented.

It was this man also, with Will Clayton of Texas and others now lost from public sight who made the plan by which a Europe then spent and broken has now come upon a new life of strength and hope.

And it was this man who went to China and made proposals for ending in that ancient land a civil war that has had no end and perhaps will never have any end.

General Marshall went there as a representative of the President of the United States and as a good soldier going into a place he did not know. His purpose was to put a stop by agreement to civil strife between the Nationalists and Communists in China. His fear was that this strife and resulting chaos, if long continued, would eventually benefit only the Russians, as land-hungry neighbors of China.

They said later—the bitter politicians of the Republican right wing said it—that Marshall had gone to promote communism and to push into an abyss the last hope and the last power of our last ally in the far Pacific, Nationalist China.

They called Marshall many terrible things; I remember that the then Senator William Jenner of Indiana called him, "a front man for traitors * * * a living lie."

This was perhaps the most brutal thing ever said in our long history of passionate partisanship about a man who is as great a patriot and as great a gentleman as we have ever known.

Marshall had given up, to a man named Dwight D. Eisenhower, the glory of the top command in Europe when we were all fighting Hitler. Marshall, with a quiet and heartbreaking loyalty to the great comon cause, had stayed in Washington to be simply Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army. Through these great years he had stuck here at his post, a great soldier quietly doing the best he could while other and lesser men put their names and their marks upon battle history.

He stayed here and he stayed with his duty. And the men who were full of rancor had their way with him in Congress. They taunted him, they screamed at him, they did everything of hate that could be done against any man anywhere, anytime.

Not in all our history has one man done, in a military way, so much for all of us. And surely never in all our history has one man been so ill-rewarded for all that he had done.

Now, in the Army hospital at Fort Bragg, N.C., General of the Army George Catlett Marshall is fighting, with gentility and uncomplaining courage, against the final antagonist of all who live.

There are no Valhallas in our life any more. But if a single Valhalla—a single gallery of great fighting men—should survive somewhere, one could hear from this gallery a great shout: "Marshall, well done."

Rabbi Morris Silverman, of Hartford, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on February 19, the session of the Senate was opened with prayer by Rabbi Morris Silverman, of Hartford, Conn. Yesterday the Hartford Courant published an editorial entitled "A New Honor for Rabbi Silverman." The editorial is a splendid tribute to an outstanding gentleman. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW HONOR FOR RABBI SILVERMAN

The award of a George Washington Honor Medal to Emanuel Synagogue will bring gratification to persons of all faiths and races in the community. For Rabbi Morris Silverman has been tireless in his efforts for interdenominational and interracial amity. He richly deserves this honor, in addition to the ones he has already received. The Emanuel Synagogue is being

given recognition by the Freedoms Foundation for sponsoring a Boy Scout troop including more gentile than Jewish members. The best traditions of Americanism are being fostered by such programs, recognizing as they do that unity in spite of diversity in racial and religious origin is the foundation stone of national strength.

This was recognized by Rabbi Silverman, who has said his idea was "to work toward the attainment of equality for all as is defined and guaranteed in the first words of the Bible and the Constitution of the United States." This is not the first time he has been honored by the foundation. In 1952 he received a third place Freedoms award of $100 for an address he gave at a dinner at which he received a citizenship award. And a year later he received two plaques, one from the Connecticut Civil Rights Commission and one from the Hartfort branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. These recognized his work toward equal opportunity for men of all faiths and races.

In addition to his spiritual duties as leader of a flourishing congregation, Rabbi Silverman has assumed national leadership in the field of civil rights. He is national spokesman for the civil rights commissions of the 13 States that have such organizations. Two years ago he was head of a delegation of 12 States' civil rights commissions that went to Washington to ask support of Federal agencies in withholding support from employers who do not follow State laws against discrimination. This was in support of his belief that human relations are the Nation's most important field of human endeavor, a belief to which he has given 36 years of devoted service.

As an original member of the Civil Rights Commission, he spoke with authority last year when he said, "America is being judged by our treatment of minority groups. The outlook is good; we have seen more done in the past 15 or 20 years than was done in the previous 100 years."

These sentiments, when put into action and backed by deep religious faith, have made Rabbi Silverman one of the distinguished citizens of this community. A spokesman for justice and progress, he is to be congratulated on the honor given to him and to Emanuel Synagogue.

From Gettysburg to Padre Island the Nation Needs Parks To Preserve Our Past, Present, and Future History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a recent article in a national magazine described how the Gettysburg, Pa., battlefield is gradually being taken over by private interests. A residential subdivision is being built on the field across which Pickett led his famous charge. A motel stands where Union defenses threw back the charge. On the spot where the two armies first clashed there is a free museum and souvenir stand. On another part of the land for which Union and Confederate troops struggled for 7 hours on the 3d day of the battle, rusting autos now are sprawled.

The same article lists nine new national parks which the Nation now needs to acquire, in order to provide our rapidly expanding population with recreation areas and to preserve outstanding and interesting areas in their natural state.

One of the nine areas listed is Padre Island, Tex., a 117-mile-long barrier island in the Gulf of Mexico, stretching roughly from Corpus Christi to Brownsville.

Of the 3,700 miles which make up the Atlantic and gulf coasts, only 240 are in parks for public use. Some 640 more worth saving are still available.

I have introduced Senate bill 4, which provides for establishment of a national park on Padre Island. We must do this now, because a commercial development has already started on part of the island. Other parts are up for sale.

The magazine article tells how completion of the boundaries of the Gettysburg battlefield, in order to protect it for a park, would cost $2 million. To do this to all battlefields now either wholly or in part in park status would cost $10 million; and for the entire national park system, the cost would be $30 million.

Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, is quoted in the article as saying:

> Twenty years ago we could have purchased all the land we now need for $5 million. But in those days no money was earmarked for land purchase. Now we receive $1½ million a year from Congress. At this rate, with land prices soaring, it could take another 50 or 60 years and more than $100 million to complete the boundaries.

Padre Island today is facing the same situation. If we do not act now, more of the land will be under private development, and prices will rise.

The benefits of this virgin stretch of windswept sand, with beaches on both sides of the island, and with an historic past stretching back to some of the earliest explorers of the New World, must be protected for the enjoyment of the public now and in the future.

The natural life, both on the island and in the waters around it, is abundant. There are skeletons of oldtime ships, wrecked on the shores, and as covered with legend as they are with moss and barnacles. There are tales of pirate treasure, small settlements, soldiers from a variety of battles, and vacqueros and cowhands.

Another thing to consider about this coastal location is the type of recreation offered: swimming, fishing, hiking, beachcombing and similar beach pastimes, and boating. In 1904, 15,000 boats were being used for recreation in the United States. By 1947, the number had grown to 2,440,000. The total last year was 7,330,000. This year it will probably top 8 million. In the United States 21 million fishermen spend nearly $100 apiece each year. Their numbers are rising all the time.

If Padre Island were made a park, the benefits to the people of the immediate area are obvious. Yet it should also be clear that this would help the Nation, by providing more jobs and more income. Also, Padre Island has the potential to become a summer and winter playground, providing recreation for millions, just as Yellowstone, Yosemite, Big Bend, and other national parks already are doing.

This proposal to establish a national park on Padre Island has the backing already of several civic and conservation groups. Its value to the national economy and welfare is clearly evident.

Mr. President, in further support of my statement, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, by John W. DeVine, which appeared in the Nueces County News for Friday, January 30, 1959, under the heading: "Padre Island May Become a National Park in Future."

I also request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Texas Ornithological Society on February 10, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nueces County News, Jan. 30, 1959]

PADRE ISLAND MAY BECOME A NATIONAL PARK IN FUTURE

U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH has introduced a bill—S. 4—which would keep a portion of Padre Island for public use—in simpler works, a national park. In presenting the bill, YARBOROUGH pointed out: "This beautiful half-mile wide natural beach, with its mild climate and bountiful wildlife, is one of Texas' greatest recreation resources."

Then he pointed out that "properly developed, there is no question that as a national park, Padre Island would become the winter park of America, just as Yellowstone, Yosemite, Glacier National Park, and the Smoky Mountains are summer playgrounds.

"Looked at from the standpoint of historical interest," he continued, "Padre Island is one of the closest links Texas and the United States have with the past, for it was there that one of the earliest explorers set foot on New World soil. The explorer, Alonso Alvarez de Pineda, a Spaniard, in 1519 sailed the gulf coastal waters from Florida to the Mexican port of Tampico, and mapped the coast for future navigators."

YARBOROUGH has asked State legislators of Texas, and other State officials to enact necessary supporting State legislation on this subject, and is urging all Texans to back the creation of Padre Island National Park.

Naturally such a move is going to draw some opposition. Private developers will oppose it; real estate dealers who are interested in selling Padre Island, and owners of land will be opposed to it; but to the average Texan it presents an opportunity to preserve for his own use a long stretch of island where he can go, camp out, fish, hunt, and generally enjoy himself.

Of course, Padre Island is a mammoth island—the coastline on the Gulf, extending from Port Aransas to Brownsville, 131 miles, is the longest island and the longest beach in the United States (probably in all the world, too).

There is plenty of room for establishment of a Government national park without taking away any of the valuable land now under development, and no doubt, it is this land Senator YARBOROUGH has in mind.

This is only one of hundreds of things, Senator YARBOROUGH has initiated since he became a Member of the U.S. Senate a few short years ago. It wouldn't hurt to take time out and drop him a few lines in appreciation.

Every man, from the smallest to the largest, likes to know he is appreciated and his work is appreciated.

If you favor the establishment of a national park on Padre Island to preserve a large portion of it for future generations in its natural state (except for Government improvements that will not ruin it as a vacation resort), drop your State representatives and senators a line and tell them you will appreciate their supporting eanabling legislation.

Don't worry, they will hear plenty from those who oppose it. And while you are at it, drop Senator RALPH a line, too. It will encourage him to keep up the good work.

RESOLUTION TO MAKE PADRE ISLAND A NATIONAL PARK

Whereas Padre Island contains a wealth of vegetation and wildlife in substantially the same condition as when this sunny region was first discovered by de Pineda in 1519 and boasts a superb sand beach 30 miles in length along a gulf coast shoreline admirably suited for safe swimming and wading; and

Whereas commercial development has gained two footholds on Padre Island and threatens rapidly to ruin its natural beauty; and

Where Padre Island is unique in scenery, climate, ecology and geology and fulfills in every way the standards for a national park; and

Whereas the establishment of Padre Island as a national park would permanently preserve natural treasures of Padre Island for the benefit of the public; Therefore it is

Resolved, That the undersigned organization hereby urges the adoption of the bill (S. 4) to provide for the establishment of Padre Island as a national park.

Passed this 10th day of February 1959.

A. EARL JOURDE,
President, Texas Ornithological Society.

A Writer and Patriot Warns Against Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on February 24, the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier published an article by Col. Paul Rockwell, a veteran of World War I service with the French Foreign Legion and of World War II service in the U.S. Army. A writer and member of many patriotic societies, Colonel Rockwell warns of the Communist threat. I ask unanimous consent that his article, entitled "A Writer and Patriot Warns Against Reds," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENEMY INSIDE U.S.A.—A WRITER AND PATRIOT WARNS AGAINST REDS

(By Paul Rockwell)

When the United States began drafting men for World War II the leaders of the Communist Party in America instructed its American party members to accept the draft without opposition. Members drafted were advised to be good soldiers, to try for promotion, to obey orders, and above all they were told to await patiently the day when they could serve the Communist Party.

Almost immediately after the end of hostilities against Japan in 1945 the Communists in the U.S. Armed Forces received word to "serve their part." Soviet Russia wanted the U.S. Army demobilized and out of Europe especially, as quickly as possible. Near mutinies—"we want to go home" demonstrations—broke out simultaneously all around the world wherever there were American troops.

I saw the near-mutiny in Paris. It was disgusting and horrifying.

The "boys" were sent home in a hurry. Our once strong Army was reduced in number and in power. Soviet Russia remained mobilized and on a war footing. Poland, Hungary, Rumania, country after country, was taken over by the Communists under the protecting shadow of the Red armies.

The United States had demobilized. We were in no position to oppose the Soviets. Having taken over central Europe and menaced France and Italy by strengthening the Communist Parties there, Soviet Russia extended its views to Asia and Africa.

To weaken America and keep Americans preoccupied with internal troubles, the integration issue, America's weakest and most vulnerable point, was fostered and kept in active agitation by Communist agents, working through the NAACP, the fellow-travelers, uplifters, do-gooders, "liberals," and other crackpots.

The work of "finishing schools" such as the Highlander Folk School, at Monteagle, Tenn., was stepped up.

No opportunity was lost to magnify every racial incident. Cases of discrimination against Negroes were invented or blown up far beyond their real importance. The kissing case in North Carolina is an example. Virtual censorship of the press came about over most of the Nation.

If the Soviets can divide and weaken the United States, arouse the North against the South, incite the Negroes against the whites, create strife and dissension and trouble throughout the United States, we cannot oppose Russia in her drive for world domination. Already we are more concerned with the situation at home than with the crises in Berlin, Iran, Egypt, the Middle East, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, and elsewhere in Asia and Africa, where Soviet agents and sympathizers are working tirelessly day and night, stirring up one race against the other, one people against their neighbors or former colonial administrators.

It is my sincere belief that any person or group of persons who are agitating any issue that divides Americans, are guilty of giving aid and comfort to the most deadly enemy the United States ever has faced—Soviet Russia.

Appointments to U.S. Service Academies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release I issued today, dealing with competitive examinations for appointments to U.S. service Academies.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY ANNOUNCES EXAMINATIONS FOR APPOINTMENTS TO U.S. SERVICE ACADEMIES

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Chippewa Falls, today announced that competitive examinations, scheduled for July 1959, would be given by the Civil Service Commission for appointment to the U.S. service Academies.

The available appointments include: 1 appointment to the U.S. Military Academy, 2 appointments to the U.S. Naval Academy, 1 appointment to the U.S. Air Force Academy, and nomination of 10 young men to compete for 7 openings allocated to Wisconsin for the Merchant Marine Academy.

"The examination is open to any high school senior or graduate over the age of 17 but not yet 22, who has never been married and can meet the academic and physical standards," the senior Senator said.

"To be eligible to take the examination, all applicants must file with my office (1) a letter of intention, accompanied by certificate of residence in the State of Wisconsin; and (2) two letters of recommendation from applicant's principal, pastor, physician, or anyone who has personal knowledge of his character.

"This information must be received in my office, room 427, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C., by June 15, 1959, which is the deadline for filing," WILEY pointed out.

"Unfortunately, anyone not filing letters of recommendation and certificate of residence with his application cannot be considered for the examination.

"The examination will be held in July (exact date to be announced later) for appointment in July 1960. The highest ranking candidate will receive principal appointment; second highest, first alternate; third highest, second alternate, etc."

To provide maximum opportunity for obtaining information, Senator WILEY is furnishing all public and private high schools in the State with brochures of each of the Academies.

"Appointment to a U.S. service Academy provides qualified young men with a fine opportunity to serve their country as well as to improve their education," WILEY concluded.

Lack of Market Interest in Government Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Highroad to Inflation," published in the New York Times of February 10, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHROAD TO INFLATION

The Government security market—which speaks with authority because it speaks with the public's money—repeated for the benefit of Congress at the close of last week what the President, his Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board have been constantly emphasizing in their recent public statements. The market spoke by action rather

than in words, but the message was no less clear on that account.

With $14.9 billion in maturities to meet, $9.2 billion of which was in the hands of the public, the Treasury offered the holders a choice of two new issues—a 1-year certificate bearing an interest rate of 3¾ percent and a 3-year note carrying 4 percent. When the public won't scramble for U.S. Treasury issues on terms as attractive as this it bespeaks serious concern for the state of the Nation's financial position. Yet the fact is that holders of the old securities in the amount of $2.1 billion turned down the exchange offer, demanding payment in cash.

But these figures tell only part of the story. Underscoring the market's lack of interest in governments other than those in the very short-term category is the fact that of $7.2 billion in maturing securities that were turned in by the public (as distinguished from the holdings of the Federal Reserve System) holders of only $1.4 billion, or less than 20 percent, took the 4 percent 3-year notes in exchange. The other 80 percent, plus, demanded the 1-year certificates with their yield of 3¾ percent. That is an increase of 1¼ percent over the interest rate of 2½ percent at which the maturing issue of $9.8 billion in 1-year certificates was sold a year ago.

This means not only that the debt structure has suffered by the replacement of some three-quarters of the outstanding $5.1 billion in notes with short-term obligations, but that the Treasury is forced to go into the market this week with an issue of even shorter maturity in order to raise the $2.1 billion in cash to meet the demands of those who found the exchange offer unacceptable.

The Treasury has been able to market but one long-term issue during the past year, that in the amount of $900 million. It is being forced steadily into the position of having to rely increasingly on the sale of securities for which commercial banks constitute the principal market. And this, as Chairman Martin of the Reserve Board declared last week, is "the highroad to monetary inflation."

The Garrison Diversion Unit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District supporting the budget estimate for the Garrison diversion unit for fiscal year 1959.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS, GARRISON DIVERSION CONSERVANCY DISTRICT, JANUARY 28, 1959, SUPPORTING BUDGET ESTIMATE FOR GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1959

Whereas the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, when developed will (1) enhance the future economic welfare and prosperity of the people of North Dakota, particularly those within the project area; (2) provide for the eventual irrigation of over 1 million acres of land periodically subjected to insufficient rainfall and drought, thereby stabilizing agriculture in a large section of the State; (3) replenish and restore the depleted waters of several lakes, rivers, and streams and increase the levels and flows therein; and (4) make available within the affected areas water diverted from the Missouri River for irrigation, domestic, municipal, and industrial needs, for production of hydropower, and for recreation, fish and wildlife, and other public uses; and

Whereas investigations, engineering, and planning work under direction of the Bureau of Reclamation needs to be carried on during fiscal year 1960 in order to develop a definite plan report on the initial construction work on the pumping plant, supply canal, and layout on the first lands to be placed under irrigation; and

Whereas the President's budget for next fiscal year contains an item of $550,000 for carrying forward such work during 1960: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District, meeting in regular meeting this 28th day of January 1959, in the city of Bismarck, N. Dak., That it wholeheartedly supports said budget estimate and urges Congress to appropriate said amount for continuing the work on said project for fiscal year 1960; and be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof be signed by the chairman and attested by the secretary and be mailed to the Honorable Clarence Cannon, chairman, House Committee on Appropriations; Hon. Carl Hayden, chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations; Senators William Langer and Milton R. Young; Representatives Quentin N. Burdick and Don L. Short; and to W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.

ROY A. HOLAND,
Chairman.

Attest:

VERNON S. COOPER,
Secretary.

The Eagle of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. CANNON
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, Nevada is justly proud of the 1959 State winner of the Voice of Democracy contest. She is Miss Sue Minehan, the daughter of H. A. Minehan, of Las Vegas, Nev. Because of the fine appreciation of America's high ideals and rich national traditions expressed in her essay it gives me great pleasure to request unanimous consent of the Senate that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EAGLE OF DEMOCRACY
(By Sue Minehan)

A bird's-eye view of America shows a country rich in a history of courageous forefathers, who tamed our young and wild land, and shaped and molded a government from their essential desires; life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. A closer look reveals visions of patriotic heroes; common people, fighting for their belief in this Government, and struggling in the times of crisis to strengthen this valuable possession.

Glancing through the centuries clocked in our Nation an evident spirit of unity persists to prevail. And even now in my present environment, my community, State, and my Nation, the same ideals which governed our zealous ancestors are still apparent, only rooted deeper with the passing of time.

What is this mark of uniqueness embedded in our American heritage which accounts for the mutual stability of the United States?

Look. High in the sky. Sweeping over the land since 1776 has been and is the eagle of democracy in all his symbolization for which our country has lived and died.

He nests atop the towering tree of our Government as near to God as he can get to assure himself that the principles which he represents and goals which he has set are in accordance with the Almighty's wishes. This bird of freedom, depicting the essence of democracy itself, stands firm on the branches of our Constitution and the curved talons upon his sturdy feet are set solidly in the context of this charter of our liberty.

The striking plumage of this eagle is stained with the blood of our forefathers who fought to protect him and nurtured the once young eagle into the great and magnificent monarch of the skies which he is today.

The beak with it golden hues resounds with the voice of democracy and proclaims justice and fairness for everyone, regardless of race, color, or creed. Freedom of speech, religion, and press, are "natural instincts" to the American eagle.

Our eagle is not a bird in a gilded cage, hampered by the immovable bars of dictators, but rather is allowed to roam freely, spreading his wings over the land, bestowing equality evenly upon everyone. This king of birds may be challenged while in flight by tyrannically feathered foes, but will always ultimately emerge as the symbol of righteousness.

The eagle of democracy may someday migrate to other less fortunate climates to exert his influence over these lands, offering the ideal of freedom and a voice in the government. But first those distant skys must be cleared of the dark clouds of communism, and the thunderous storms of oppression and war, and instead be lighted with the stars of tranquillity to guide our eagle to new nests. For this is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people—man must only accept it.

The eagle will always stand steadfastly as a true mark of our free Nation. But the fate of democracy is in our hands. Only man, in his misconception of values can set out and track down this precious prey, killing him and taking the very breath of life from within his frame. Man must willingly discard all these dangerous weapons such as skeptical doubt and complacent disinterest, and seriously strive to preserve and perpetuate democracy, the eagle may continue to shed all his benefits upon our Nation and fly high in our free skies as the symbol of democracy.

Needed: Can-Do Christians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an address made by my dear friend,

schoolmate, and lifelong companion, Capt. Charles T. Mauro, U.S. Navy, at the 49th annual Washington's Birthday celebration, Knights of Columbus, P. N. Lynch assembly, in Charleston, S.C., on February 22, 1959.

Captain Mauro was the recent commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Canberra*, the second guided missile cruiser of the world. His brilliant naval career and world travels have permitted him to circle the globe by water and to cross both the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans many times by air. He served with the American Embassy, Rome, Italy, in the Office of the Naval Attaché. He has commanded a destroyer, a division of four destroyers, the destroyer tender *Sierra*, and the guided missile heavy cruiser *Canberra*. He was commanding officer of the last-named ship when she was the flagship of the President of the United States during Mr. Eisenhower's 6-day cruise from Norfolk to Bermuda for a meeting with Mr. Macmillan, the Prime Minister of England. The *Canberra* also served as a flagship for the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, during the international Navy review at Hampton Roads.

Captain Mauro is now Assistant Director, Fleet Development and Maintenance Division, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, in Washington.

The address follows:

NEEDED: CAN-DO CHRISTIANS

(By Capt. C. T. Mauro, U.S. Navy)

It is great to be home. It is a particular pleasure to be with dear friends; those with whom your early training and formative years were spent. It was in the Knights of Columbus Hall (top floor) that the first Bishop England basketball team, in about 1921, practiced and played many games. Our coach was Doc O'Brien—the late Monsignor J. L. O'Brien—God bless his soul. He was responsible for the early character forming of many of us. Some of the most pleasant days of our lives were spent under his guidance.

Then, too, it was in those days, some 35 years ago, that the first football team of the Knights of Columbus was formed. All practices were held at night with the football painted white. We practiced on the King Street side of the citadel green to take advantage of the street lighting. We had fairly successful seasons under the coaching of Dick Kerr. One Saturday afternoon we got mighty cocky after defeating the Navy Yard Marines by an overwhelming score. The starch was soon taken out of our hides though by the shellacking the Parris Island Marines gave us.

I am sure many of you are wondering what prompted the subject of my talk this evening. Well, it was chosen since it brings to mind two thoughts which I hold close to my heart.

First, you dear friends gave me the inspiration to go to the Naval Academy and become an officer in the United States Navy; and

Second, my beautiful ship, the guided-missile cruiser, *Canberra*. Many of you were aboard her, I am sure, when the *Canberra* visited Charleston in September 1956.

It was a tremendous thrill for me to bring that beautiful, most powerful, modern ship of the Navy into the port of my hometown. But it was even more of a thrill to have papa and mama on the dock waiting for my arrival. I am sure most of you also know of my great fortune of having mama present here with me tonight. Getting back to the reasons for my subject this evening, my ship being named *Canberra* after the capital of Australia—the country well known for kangaroos—brought the rhyme "can-do" kangaroo to my mind.

We used this catch phrase to symbolize our ship. The crew quickly caught on to this catch phrase. Can-do became the spirit of our ship—you name it and we could do it. The difficult we did today—the impossible took a little longer. As a result, all *Canberra* assignments were tackled with the positive can-do spirit and the ship became known as the "Can-do Kangaroo." During the first year of her life the *Canberra* was officially graded as the best of all the cruisers in the Atlantic Ocean. This was an honor seldom won by a ship so shortly after birth.

This can-do spirit is essential in all phases of life. We should accentuate the positive. Teach youngsters what to do, don't just keep saying what not to do. Remember, the poll parrot learned naughty words by being taught not to say them. Of course, positive teaching takes considerable time and patience, but the dividends are more than considerable. For instance, what do we find the athlete who is training for a game doing? He goes into very rigid and long hours of training to develop those muscles which he needs to win. Similarly our game of life requires a moral muscle to be trained and strengthened for that game.

We must learn to take the initiative and do what is right. Because to know what is wrong and what we are against is not always enough.

We must learn what is right and then continually train doing those things to develop our spiritual and moral character. Being prepared and taking positive action is essential in the game of life. For example, as the Christopher movement emphasizes, lighting a candle in the dark is much better than cursing the darkness.

As you yourself know, any time you do something for the first time you have the fear of the unknown. This fear of the unknown is a type of frustration.

Children need to be frustrated. They are going to be frustrated lots of times in life, so it is good to get practice in the family when they are just children. If we are not accustomed to being frustrated, then it becomes difficult to endure that experience, and as a result we panic. There has been a lot of nonsense about the fact that kids shouldn't be frustrated.

Of course, I am not a child psychologist, but my life has been one of dealing with young men. The average age of my crew in the *Canberra*, consisting of 1,500 officers and men, was a little under 21 years.

Therefore, I think this frustration can become ridiculous. Later in life they darn well are going to have some major frustrations. Therefore, as kids they ought to start getting a little experience with minor frustrations. To solve large problems you must learn to solve small ones. You learn to resist big temptations by first learning to resist little temptations.

It appears to be perfectly normal in this day and age to have a youth get into life without a proper moral foundation.

A youth without a moral foundation is like a ship without a rudder. That youth is at the mercy of the current since he cannot steer his own course. A ship at sea without a rudder would be at the mercy of the current, wind, and waves. No one could keep it off the shoals. Not only would the ship wreck itself but probably wreck other ships also.

Likewise, the youth without a moral foundation is not only a danger to himself, he is also a menace to others.

Let us give our children an inheritence of (1) self-discipline, (2) spiritual-material prospective, (3) positive can-do Christians.

We speak of the word discipline. Many of us fear it because we don't stop to think exactly what it means. Discipline is an austere sounding word that means nothing more than setting out an orderly path or series of paths upon which life can be approached and followed. These paths should have both the material and the spiritual prospective. One without the other is just as bad as neither or too much of both.

The spiritual and material need to be kept in proportion like the sides of a square or heads and tails on the same coin. When the equipment of the home becomes more essential than the care of the child, it is no wonder that the child brought up in that atmosphere gives preference to material things rather than to spiritual things. This spiritual-material balance, which is so essential, cannot be achieved if our moral muscle, which should be developed in our early life, is not daily exercised in our homes.

Let's be can-do Christians. This will reduce the spiritual unemployment typical of our times. To do this we must work daily at balancing the spiritual and the material phases of our lives. For instance, because a church is visited once a week that child will not get the necessary spiritual upbringing if the home does not have more of a spiritual than a material environment to offer.

We look at the Catholic Churches on Sunday and see them overcrowded. Immediately the thought comes to our mind about Catholics being much more religious than Protestants. There is a serious fallacy in this kind of thinking because if you were more honest with yourself you would compare the number of Protestants that go to church on Sunday with those Catholics who go to church on weekdays. Protestants have no obligation on Sunday as Catholics do.

Parents that do not develop the moral muscle in their children are the ones who suffer most after their children reach maturity. To be a physical man and not be a man emotionally and spiritually is like being a man but wearing rompers. When I was in command of the *Canberra* a conscientious mother wrote me a very thoughtful letter indicating that her boy was different. She said he was artistic, temperamental, high strung, and not accustomed to any type of discipline. She indicated I should be very careful in the manner which I treated her son if I wanted him to do his part as a member of the crew.

I replied politely, but told her the facts of life about Navy discipline. I also told her that if her boy had been treated with as much firmness as consideration he would have been a more courteous, dependable, and appreciative son. I told her that I would bear in mind all the things she told me, but I would still treat her son like all the other young men in the ship. I added he was now physically a man and had to learn to be a man among men.

A few months later, after a cruise to the Caribbean, this young man returned home on leave. After he was home for a while, I received a most inspiring and encouraging letter from his mother. She said that she didn't know what I did to her son, but she was most grateful for the tremendous change. She further stated that her son was now just what she always wanted him to be.

The moral of this is you can't stop kids from growing up physically. Therefore, you better be sure they grow up spiritually and emotionally at the same rate of speed. Incidentally, each night aboard my $150 million guided-missile cruiser, just as my crew turned in their bunks for the evening, two short sentences relating to God were spoken into the ship's loudspeaker system.

God's the supreme authority, with the father the authority of the home. Whether intentionally or accidentally, there is endless propaganda attacking authority which passes as American comedy. On TV the stories pertaining to the family usually end up by having the father look like a dope. If the play

deals with the military, the officer is always stupid.

This constant ridicule of authority and discipline is harmful to our youth. The fact that it may be humorous doesn't change its propagandic impact on young minds.

Young minds need to learn what you as a Catholic and as an American already know; that with every "right" goes a responsibility.

The right of freedom goes further than being able to do what you would like to do when you want to do it and in any manner you desire. Freedom takes on a responsibility that requires you to think in terms of what is best for all rather than just what is best for you.

Selfish freedom ceases to be freedom. For instance, (a) you have the right of free speech but you have the moral responsibility to know what you are talking about, (b) you have the right to vote but you have a responsibility to be an informed citizen, (c) the newspapers have the right of a free press but they also have the moral responsibility not to violate good taste and morality, (d) you have the right to a lot of services from your Government provided you accept your moral responsibility as taxpayers to pay for them.

As citizens and Catholics you need both material and spiritual goals. You are not likely to reach your destination if you don't know where you are going.

First, we must try to find out what our target is and then never permit ourselves to stray from the paths which lead to that goal. When the bull's-eye is missed it seldom is the fault of the target. Many road blocks will be found in our paths. The path that we choose will not always be easy. We all know that freedom is bought and maintained at a terribly high price. The ideals we feel are worthwhile will always cost us considerable energy, thought and sometimes suffering.

Each of these difficulties, though, must be overcome if you hope to obtain your goal. Then, too, we must remember that tolerance is not always a virtue. Of some things we can be tolerant, others we cannot and should not tolerate.

Truth can never be tolerant toward falsehoods.

Morality cannot be tolerant toward immorality.

Christianity cannot be tolerated toward paganism.

It is not sufficient to be against things. We must emphasize the positive, and be for things.

Most of us say we are against communism. Unfortunately, our thinking is vague. It would be just as good to say you are against sin. Being against sin isn't enough. You have to be in favor of virtue. Similarly, being against communism isn't enough. What are you in favor of? Communism is a label like a brand name on ketchup. What is in the bottle? Would you still be against it if it had a different label? The content of communism is atheistic materialism. It says there is no God and all that matters is the material things of life. Now a lot of people who think they are violently anti-Communist are not so far from communism as they think because more and more we put the emphasis on material things and less and less do we put the emphasis on the spiritual aspects of life.

Our biggest unemployment is spiritually unemployed Christians. Unemployed moral indignation. We need to get mad. Fight for what we believe in.

A Christian who won't fight for what he believes in is spiritually unemployed. Communists are militant, dedicated atheists. They won't be stopped by halfhearted Christians filled with nebulous good intentions.

Blueprints don't stop bullets. Abstract Christians won't stop atheism. Don't just be against communism. Be for a wholesome Christian living. Be positive. Fight for what you believe in. The chief end of man is to glorify God. To serve Him at all costs. The supreme obligation is to be true to Christ, true to truth, to justice, to righteousness even if one perishes. Since when has the Christian concluded that the end of life is the end of all things? No, for the Christian the cross is not the end. There is always Easter.

In closing, permit me to make three observations. One referring to each of the following: the Knights of Columbus, Washington's Birthday, and our Navy.

First, the Knights of Columbus, like the knights of old, stand for patriotism and service to God, to country, and to the church.

Second, Washington, in his message to the First Congress, said "to be prepared for war is a most effectual means of preserving the peace."

Third, it is the prime purpose of your Navy to insure for ourselves and for our allies the uninterrupted use of the seas. To do this your Navy must remain an integrated combat unit—a fast-moving, hard-hitting, self-contained surface and undersea force, which carries its fire power, its aircraft, its missiles and its landing forces wherever it goes.

Being a Navy man I firmly believe in loyalty to God and country and in preparedness. Preparedness, as I see it, includes both the physical preparedness of our Armed Forces and the spiritual preparedness of our Nation. God grant us both.

Deductions for Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUART SYMINGTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Representative HULL, of Missouri, has introduced H.R. 1264, to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow income tax deduction for payments to assist in providing higher education. The measure would allow a deduction for expenses incurred in the education of dependents, or for sums given to colleges and universities for use in providing scholarships.

The senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and I introduced a similar bill in the Senate, S. 929.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in support of Representative HULL's efforts, from the St. Joseph, Mo., Union-Observer of January 16, 1959, entitled "Now They Have Hope," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) Union-Observer, Jan. 16, 1959]

NOW THEY HAVE HOPE

Congressman WILLIAM R. HULL, Jr., has earned the gratitude of tens of thousands of American youngsters who until now had considered their chances of going to college as something less than nil.

At the opening session of the 86th Congress, the courageous, farsighted Missourian introduced a bill which would open new avenues to higher education for children of families in the lower income brackets.

In brief, the bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow tax deductions made by householders to maintain a child in college. Another provision would permit deductions of contributions for scholarships.

What Mr. HULL proposes in introducing his measure is that America must keep abreast of changing world conditions. Russia no longer lags behind us in matters of education. In the Soviet Union promising young men and women from all strata of society are earning scientific degrees with the state picking up the tab.

What Soviet science has accomplished and is still accomplishing is faithfully chronicled in the free press of this country.

Almost coincident with Mr. HULL's action was an announcement by the AFL–CIO of its plan for awarding six $6,000 scholarships to high school seniors of exceptional ability who want to enter college in September.

The awards will be made on a competitive basis in cooperation with the National Merit Scholarship Foundation, an independent, nonprofit organization.

Gifted youngsters should not be denied the advantages of a higher education simply because they or their parents lack money for that purpose. In this age of electronic marvels, missiles, and the conquest of space, brains are where you find them.

Congressman HULL's measure and the AFL–CIO's scholarship program clearly indicate that this Nation has not kept faith with its youngsters in the matter of higher education. What will be the fate of Mr. HULL's bill is anybody's guess. It will be placed in the hands of fallible men who could if they so desire place political expediency above higher concepts.

Organized labor in St. Joseph is proud of Mr. HULL for his statesmanlike approach to a matter of vital concern and his refusal to indulge in the wishful thinking that we can revert to a peacetime economy and way of life in a world where there is no peace.

Our labor movement is proud, too, that it supported Mr. HULL in his three successful races, but prouder still of the fact that it has never asked of him anything but what was in the public welfare.

For BILL HULL is the Representative of all the people of his district and the forthright champion of young people everywhere.

GTA Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the GTA Daily Radio Roundup of February 20, 1959.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, FEBRUARY 20, 1959

How much will the Eisenhower administration's new cuts in grain price supports cost farmers?

Farmers are worried. So is Main Street. Co-op people are concerned because serving farm families and marketing their grain cooperatively is our business.

When the price cuts were announced to the newspapers Wednesday it hit with jarring impact. Secretary Benson said he had deliberately raised a secrecy curtain in the Department of Agriculture so no word would leak out and upset markets—while grain prices were being made lower in Washington.

But when the news hit the markets went down, as everyone knew they would. The

Wall Street Journal reported it with this headline: "Grain Futures Plunge Under Impact of Slash in Supports." The 1-day drop ranged from 1 to 4 cents. So even last year's crops are being penalized.

One of the big national news services says that cash market prices are expected to adjust downward to match the new lower supports. That's the way it always goes. But how much will it cost farmers? Nationally, this news service figures the support cuts will take about half a billion dollars away from farmers on this year's crops.

That agrees with the figures we had reached here—half a billion dollars less for farmers. But let's bring that closer to home and see what the Benson price support cuts will take away from farmers here in our upper Midwest.

Incidentally, we figured this by multiplying the price cuts on the various grains by last year's production. It will vary some, depending upon production this year. But the figures will be pretty close.

For Minnesota, the 1959 farm income loss can be expected to be about $44 million; North Dakota, a loss of $36 million; South Dakota, $22 million; and Montana, 9 million. The total for the 4-State GTA marketing area, $113 million. That's what our farmers stand to lose this year because of the price support cuts just made by Benson.

Now, losses that might occur on wheat and corn are not included in these figures because at this time they cannot be closely estimated. But several million dollars more could be added to these losses on wheat and corn. The corn support last year on compliance crops was $1.36 a bushel, and $1.06 on noncompliance corn. This year it is $1.12 a bushel across the board. The wheat price support is down 1 cent a bushel—$1.81 for 1959—compared with $1.62 for 1958. These are national average figures and will vary State by State and county by county.

Time will tell what effect the new price support cuts will have on farm families and consequently, on Main Streets in farm towns. But farm experts agree it will not be good.

Perhaps this will jar Congress into prompt action because that is where farmers and rural townspeople must look for help.

The Radio That Speaks for the Silent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Enno Hobbing appearing in the Reader's Digest, condensed from the New Leader:

THE RADIO THAT SPEAKS FOR THE SILENT

"Radio Liberation," the Moscow Izvestia wrote on April 17, 1955, "is an organ for spreading dirty falsifications and black slanders fabricated by American intelligence."

The unflattering description was greeted with joy by the Soviet émigrés and Americans working for the broadcasting organization; it meant that they had arrived. For over 2 years Soviet authorities had avoided mention of this anti-Communist operation; an attack by name in one of their two most important newspapers was an admission that the station was becoming too widely known inside the U.S.S.R. to be ignored. Since then, Kremlin abuse of Radio Liberation has grown steadily in volume and violence.

Radio Liberation broadcasts to the Soviet Union—and to its military forces stationed in Eastern Europe—around the clock in Russian and 17 other languages, from Ukrainian and Georgian to Ossetic and Kumyk. The voices in these many tongues belong to some 150 refugees from the U.S.S.R., who are now headquartered in Munich. Their scripts are fed on telephone circuits to a battery of transmitters in Lampertheim, Germany, and tape recordings are flown to transmitters in Formosa. Thus beamed at Russia from both sides, the programs nearly blanket the country's major population centers.

Funds and professional counsel for this cold war operation are provided by the American Committee for Liberation,[1] a private organization of journalists, businessmen, educators, and political leaders who decided to do for Soviet Russia what Radio Free Europe was already doing for the Red satellites. Soviet citizens can, of course, listen to foreign stations like the Voice of America and the BBC, but these are government enterprises with the limitations this implies. Radio Liberation, being under no such constraints, can address Soviet listeners in terms of their own interests and yearnings. Its principal broadcasters are products of the Soviet epoch who became enemies of the regime through personal suffering. They can, and do, talk as "we Russians," "we Ukrainians," "we Moslems."

There is, for example, 42-year-old Leonid Pliajev, Radio Liberation's humorist, who pokes fun at the dictatorship and its bureaucrats. He grew up as an ardent Communist and became a functionary of the Central Committee of the Komsomol (Communist Youth). But the horrors of the Stalin purges of the late 1930's wrecked his faith in communism, and he ended up in the notorious Vorkuta slave-labor camps in Siberia. Released to serve in the Red army in World War II, he was captured by the Germans and at war's end chose to remain in the West.

Broadcasts into Soviet Byelorussia are supervised by Vladimir Dudzicki, who spent 3 years at hard labor for anti-Communist activity. The war enabled him to escape to the West.

The organization's Turkestani desk is run by Veli Zunnun, a lineal descendant of the ancient Asian conqueror Tamerlane and the first translator of Tom Sawyer into the Uzbek language. Captured by the Germans, he, too, refused to return home after the war, and he now talks regularly to his Soviet fellow Moslems.

To maintain close contact with current Soviet life, Radio Liberation screens scores of Soviet newspapers, magazines, and books, and monitors 88 Soviet radio stations. In addition, researchers do a massive job of interviewing Soviet tourists abroad, Westerners returning from Soviet Russia, new defectors, and others likely to have fresh information.

"Radio Liberation will not encourage any acts of premature violent resistance to the Soviet regime which could result only in fruitless sacrifice," the organization's statement of policy declares. It simply tries to provide its Soviet audience with mental and spiritual ammunition for their struggle toward freedom.

After Milovan Djilas, the former Yugoslav Communist leader, published his scathing analysis of communism, "The New Class,"[2] Radio Liberation broadcast the forbidden book at dictation speed, so that listeners could make their own copies. There is evidence that this is precisely what some listeners did. During the period of the so-called thaw, in 1956–57, many Soviet writers produced essays, stories, poems which, in guarded language, were critical of the regime. Most of these works, however, had limited circulation. By continually broadcasting the most telling passages, Radio Liberation has made them available to larger Soviet audiences.

The Munich group has repeatedly been able to report antiregime episodes inside the U.S.S.R. that have been hidden from Soviet citizens by the Kremlin. For instance, in 1954 when inmates of the huge Kengir concentration camps rose against their guards and were crushed by T–34 tanks, the people of Russia first learned of it through Radio Liberation. And each year Liberation broadcasters commemorate the 1953 Vorkuta uprisings, to keep the memory of that dramatic slave revolt alive.

A substantial portion of time is devoted to airing cultural works blacked out by the Kremlin. Radio Liberation has broadcast extracts from certain nonfiction writings by Tolstoy, the music of Russian-born Igor Stravinsky, short stories of the satirist Mikhail Zoschchenko, and other works frowned on by the Soviet regime, such as the great new Russian novel, "Dr. Zhivago," by Boris Pasternak. But, above all, the broadcasters concentrate on bringing to the peoples of the U.S.S.R. news and world opinions that are withheld or distorted by their rulers.

Continually, Radio Liberation reminds its audience of the great traditions of intellectual freedom and political resistance in Russia before the Communists seized power. On appropriate anniversaries it reviews past events that have been blotted out by Soviet thought control. Early this year, for instance, an impressive array of political leaders from the United States, France, Denmark, Peru, and India addressed the U.S.S.R. on the 40th anniversary of the Constituent Assembly of 1918, a freely elected body which Lenin suppressed by force. Aware of the terrible isolation of the Soviet peoples, the Munich broadcasters make every effort to apprise them that free men outside distinguish sharply between the regime and the people.

The broadcasts also give Soviet Russians access to their own profound religious traditions. Last Easter the Orthodox service held in St. Alexander Nevsky Cathedral in Paris was put on the air. On the Jewish New Year a former Soviet army officer, who is now a rabbi in Brooklyn, broadcast over Radio Liberation a greeting to the 3 million Soviet Jews. Similarly, Moslem holidays are marked by special programs in the languages of Soviet Central Asia and the Caucasus.

Soviet jamming of Radio Liberation began within 10 minutes after it first went on the air, and has been intensified ever since. Engineers estimate that the Soviets are spending at least ten times as much to jam the broadcasts as the American committee spends to get them through.

In its determination to silence Radio Liberation, Moscow has gone to brutal lengths. Leonid Karas, a writer on the program's Byelorussian desk, was found drowned near Munich in September 1954. Two months later the head of the Azerbaijan desk, Abo Fatalibey, was murdered under mysterious circumstances. All evidence pointed to the guilt of known Soviet agents who fled behind the Iron Curtain after the murders.

These attempts at intimidation indicate that the impact of Radio Liberation is substantial. But the most encouraging evidence is the growing response to programs from inside the U.S.S.R.

At intervals, broadcasts mention an innocuous-sounding name and address in the free world to which Soviet citizens may

[1] First president was Eugene Lyons, a former Moscow correspondent, now a senior editor of the Reader's Digest.

[2] See "The Book That Is Shaking the Communist World," the Reader's Digest, October 1957.

write as if addressing a relative or wartime acquaintance abroad. The resulting letters—all anonymous, naturally—have meaning beyond their words. Some ask for the small comfort of a reply: "If you receive this, please sing 'We Met by Chance.'" A few hardier souls transmit information they think may be useful to Radio Liberation. A Ukrainian wrote: "The Bolsheviks are as scared of your words as the devil is scared of incense. Many people listen to you, but they are afraid to write letters."

"Radio Liberation naturally cannot know how large its audience is," says Howland H. Sargeant, former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs and current head of the American Committee. "But every now and then a message comes from the target areas that makes staff members proud of their work." He cited one recent letter which said:

"When I hear your voice, my eyes fill with tears of joy. I have a feeling that I, too, have friends."

Operation Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today I received a letter which summarizes the writer's reaction to what he calls a 4-day exposure to Operation Understanding, which he shared with six other persons. He states:

First of all, I should like to say that I returned somewhat reassured, having found so much of a necessary air defense already operational.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FALK CORP.,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 24, 1959.
Col. MARTIN B. CHANDLER,
Commanding Officer,
61st Antiaircraft Artillery Group,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR COLONEL CHANDLER: With the hope that they may be of interest, I will attempt to summarize my reactions to the 4-day exposure to Operation Understanding that I shared with six other Milwaukeeans last week.

First of all, I should say that I returned somewhat reassured, having found so much of a necessary air defense already operational. It was somewhat of a revelation to witness at the Red Canyon Range a Nike missile climb at blinding speed some 5 or more miles into the sky and shoot down an unseen small target plane, and this by an electronic brain guided by radar. It is gratifying to know that this was accomplished by the same crews which guard the year around this city's concentrated population and the great productive facilities contained therein, and so essential to bringing a possible armed conflict to a successful conclusion.

The manner in which these Nike squadrons are integrated into the total North American defense system through the early warning radar network that encircles our part of the world, and the overall controls exercised at the nerve center in Colorado Springs comes as an amazing discovery for a civilian not previously briefed therein. My one regret is that such an insight is not possible for the large numbers of civic and industrial leaders who could use their influence to assure the disposition of adequate funds for these endeavors.

Secondly, this orientation brought the realization that our air defense can never be static, but must continuously evolve new developments out of the funded knowledge and equipment already acquired, alert to every advance in the weapons to come out of enemy technology and completely responsive, insofar as it is possible, to counter them. This suggests that a major portion of our resources will have to be made available to those responsible for this defense effort, and we must reconcile it as essential to the continuance of our free society in the face of an aggressive totalitarian threat.

Thirdly, I am left with the impression that this evolution of defense material is following an orderly pattern in which the economic factor and the time factor are receiving the attention they merit. The greatly improved Hercules, to replace the Ajax, employing the same launching equipment with a minimum of delay and cost, is an excellent example of the long-range planning I found evident.

Fourthly, our visit to Colorado Springs indicated that the three branches of the Armed Forces are interacting creatively in these matters of mutual concern. This, in view of disparaging reports to the contrary, dispels needless concerns that have arisen, and are still voiced in some quarters. There is adequate evidence that the competition between Army, Air Force, and Navy is productive of the same vitality in striving for excellence that has characterized other areas of enterprise.

Fifth, and finally, I must express what is perhaps most important in my reactions, namely, the convictions that this struggle for survival is in splendid hands. The impact upon us of the many officers we conversed with, or heard describe the complex operations they were identified with, was one that must leave a lasting impression. Their technical competence is of such a high order that one wonders how it is possible to hold them in the services, knowing the great disparity in the remuneration they receive and that which they could command in industry.

In closing, may I express my gratitude to you and to Major Murphy and all those who contributed so generously of their time in order to make this a meaningful experience.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

WALTER P. SCHMITTER.

The Danger of Overspending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Brave Appeal for Integrity," published in the Deseret News of Salt Lake City, Utah, January 20, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Deseret News, Jan. 20, 1959]

THE BUDGET MESSAGE—A BRAVE APPEAL FOR INTEGRITY

As he promised he would, President Eisenhower has now joined battle, full strength, against inflation and the big government spenders. His two messages to Congress this week represent the first big guns.

The President's economic message today appeals for "self-discipline and restraint" by labor leaders in wage demands, more economies in production rather than raised costs on the part of business, "careful shopping" on the part of consumers, and a balanced budget on the part of Congress.

And his budget message yesterday emphasized the fight that may be in prospect on the last of those appeals.

That fight is timely and vital. The Nation has bounced back from last year's recession to the highest gross national product in its history. The recovery has created new inflationary pressures that will explode into a new cycle of inflation this year unless strong, effective leadership at the national level prevents it.

The budget message reflects such leadership—if President Eisenhower doesn't pull his punches in fighting to push it through Congress. It will be tragic if this budget turns out to be little more than an opening gambit in a campaign to maneuver the Democrats into an unfavorable position for the 1960 elections.

If he does intend to fight for a truly balanced budget, he faces a long, bitter, extremely difficult road. His estimates of $77.1 billion receipts in fiscal 1960 (compared to $68 billion in 1959) is probably overoptimistic. And few qualified observers give him much chance of keeping spending to the $77 billion proposed in 1960 (compared to $80.8 billion in 1959).

He will get that much income only if he can persuade Congress to boost gasoline taxes a cent and a half a gallon and to boost the price of a first-class postage stamp to 5 cents. His chances are not good on either.

And he can keep spending down to that level only by persuading Congress to cut almost a billion dollars from farm subsidies, cut out all public housing, make no new starts on public works, and keep defense spending close to its present level.

Again, Congress is not likely to go along with any, much less all, of these proposals.

Still, a balanced budget is worth fighting for—as the shocking $8 billion budgeted merely to pay interest on the Federal debt so painfully indicates.

President Eisenhower will submit a series of special messages justifying in more detail his position on most major issues covered in his budget and economic messages. They will be analyzed editorially as they appear.

But let us call attention right now to what seems to us the most significant part of the message. It is buried in the middle of the 78-page document and has received little public attention so far, but it could begin the turning of a corner away from big government.

For 10 years and more, thoughtful citizens have been urging that we get the Federal Government out of programs where State, local, or private organizations could do the job. The second Hoover Commission made some far-reaching recommendations along that line. President Eisenhower challenged the Nation's Governors to help. But big Government has, meanwhile, grown steadily bigger.

This week, the President proposed action of his own. Throughout his budget message, he demanded that local and State government stop depending on Federal handouts. And he got down to specifics. He recommended that Federal grants to States for vocational education and for construction of sewage treatment plants be discontinued as of July 1, 1960. And gradually but steadily, he proposed, Federal support should decrease and local support increase for slum clearance, urban renewal, and airport construction.

To help States take up the slack, he proposed that they receive a share of the Federal excise tax on local telephone service.

This is not much, but it is a start. If the administration fights these proposals through Congress successfully, they may well begin a gradual movement back toward the local and State responsibility upon which the Federal system was founded. One only wishes the President had not waited until the final 2 years of a "lameduck" term to undertake this highly significant fight.

The budget proposals will, of course, be sharply criticized, particularly in respect to the level of defense spending. Some of the criticism may be sound; perfection in the spending of $430 for each man, woman, and child in America is hardly attainable. President Eisenhower will not come out of this battle without bruises.

But overspending is a much greater danger to America's basic strength than underspending, and we welcome the President's budget and economic messages as standards around which supporters of sound government can rally.

Nominees for Academy Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, as a Californian, it is my pride and pleasure to say a few words about an outstanding industry in my State—the production of motion pictures.

This past Monday evening Hollywood announced the nominations for the most gifted accomplishments in films during the past year. Among these 1958 nominees for the famous Oscars—the annual awards of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences—are included the stars and writers, the directors, producers, technicians, and artists of motion-picture making.

On April 6 some 90 million persons will hear and see the election results of these nominations in a program sponsored by the film industry over a nationwide network of NBC television and radio.

To me, these awards are reminders of what Hollywood has meant to us as Californians and also to us as Americans.

Hollywood has always made a major economic contribution to my State. It spends hundreds of millions of dollars on filmmaking. It employs thousands of persons in some 275 crafts and trades. And the people of Hollywood, in their own right, make important contributions to the civic life of the community. They are generous in charity, unstinting in giving time and effort to entertain at benefits not only in California, but around the world.

The best of our films are reaching audiences in the Communist lands. Until recently, most of these audiences have seen no films of any sort from the Western world.

And they are reaching audiences in that part of the world which may be of greatest moment to us in the years ahead. This is the world of less developed but developing free nations of Asia and Africa. The future course of this new free world will surely affect our future.

And what do our films show the Communist world and the non-Communist world about us?

It would be folly to think that they show America as all good—or even as all bad. What they do show, and vividly, are the infinite, varied aspects of a many-faceted nation. They show the face of freedom and individuality and enterprise, the fact of a nation which was built up by peoples of all nations and creeds and colors.

The film, as a human creation, has the capacity to reach men's hearts everywhere, to show the brotherhood of man, to illustrate the human flaws and human triumphs which can link men together in our rapidly condensing world.

It is here, I think, that the film industry makes its distinctive and lasting contribution.

It will be a fine show on April 6. I invite all of you to tune in on the ceremonies of awarding the Oscars.

Now, finally, let me list this year's nominees for the academy awards:

Best picture: "Gigi," "The Defiant Ones," "Auntie Mame," "Cat on a Hot Tin Roof," and "Separate Tables."

Best actress: Susan Hayward, Deborah Kerr, Shirley MacLaine, Rosalind Russell, and Elizabeth Taylor.

Best actor: Tony Curtis, Paul Newman, David Niven, Sidney Poitier, and Spencer Tracy.

Best supporting actress: Peggy Cass, Wendy Hiller, Martha Hyer, Maureen Stapleton, and Cara Williams.

Best supporting actor: Theodore Bikel, Lee J. Cobb, Burl Ives, Arthur Kennedy, and Gig Young.

Best director: Richard Brooks, Stanley Kramer, Vincent Minelli, Robert Wise, and Mark Robson.

The Cheyenne River Sioux Rehabilitation Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, to those of us who live among the American Indians, there is nothing more heartening than to observe instances of real progress and a better economic life for these original Americans.

It was for this reason that I was so encouraged after reading the story of the efforts made on the Cheyenne River Agency in South Dakota to assist tribal members get a start toward economic self-reliance. Under the able direction of Superintendent Noralf Nesset, and the Cheyenne River Sioux Council a rehabilitation loan program has been initiated from funds which the tribe has received from the Government. These funds were paid to the tribe when water from the Oahe Dam flooded the reservation.

The news story from the Aberdeen, S. Dak., American-News, tells the story of this rehabilitation program. Some members have engaged in a cattle program, others have attended schools of higher education, still others are engaged in business enterprises. Under the education loan program, 38 young men and women have graduated from colleges or vocational schools and their average income is $3,350 annually.

The Cheyenne River Agency and the Cheyenne Sioux Indians are to be congratulated most heartily for these efforts. They have proven that the Indian in America needs to be given only one thing—opportunity.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this story of initiative and success of one of South Dakota's Indian reservations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINE INDIAN RANCHERS MAKE GOOD HEADWAY IN REHABILITATION SETUP

CHEYENNE AGENCY.—The Cheyenne Sioux Indian Reservation is not the most prosperous post in South Dakota. But Supt. Noralf Nesset, in his latest news bulletin notes that considerable progress is being made.

The Cheyenne Sioux Tribe, with money received as indemnity for Oahe Reservoir flooding, some time ago set up a rehabilitation program for its own members.

The tribe aimed to give its younger members a beyond-high-school education, train and relocate families who had no economic future on the reservation, set up other families in either ranching or business enterprises and to give assistance to the aged.

CATTLE PROGRAM

A dramatic phase of the rehabilitation program is the cattle repayment phase. Tribal members who qualified were set up with 100 heifers and a line of machinery.

The operator was to pay for the heifers by returning 11 calves for each 10 heifers received. This repayment was to be over a period of 10 years.

Most of the operators received their cattle in the spring of 1957 and had their first income from the increase recently.

There are now 139 families in the cattle program, Nesset reports. This season they sold approximately $500,000 worth of calves or an average of more than $3,500 per family. Approximately 20 operators have discontinued. The tribe foreclosed on some. Others quit voluntarily because of health or other reasons.

All of the 139 have an abundance of hay and several have enough forage to last for 2 years.

INDIAN LAND FIGURES

The rehabilitation program has been one factor making for greater Indian use of Indian land. In 1953 Indian operators used 564,477 acres of trust land. In 1958 the figure was increased to 970,585 acres.

Indian trust land used by non-Indians dropped by about the same figure. In 1953, non-Indians used 808,730 acres of trust land; in 1958 they used only 408,740 acres.

In the educational phase of the rehabilitation program, 169 members of the tribe have received grants to attend colleges or vocational schools. Thirty-eight have been graduated and are now earning an average of $3,350 annually.

Four major loans have been approved for business enterprises. They include a combination garage-service station and lunch counter, dairy farm, recreation parlor and theater. Nesset says all four enterprises will undoubtedly be successful.

Ex-Coach Blaik Believes in Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in this Lenten season when individuals are most prone to reassess their relationship with God, and when our thoughts turn particularly to solemn prayer, it seems most fitting to call attention to the professed belief in prayer of outstanding individuals.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an article from the New Hampshire Sunday News, Manchester, N.H., on February 15, 1959, entitled "Ex-Coach Blaik Believes in Prayer."

I have known Earl Blaik as a close friend for many years, as a coach at Dartmouth College in my own State of New Hampshire, and as the most recent coach of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. His coaching career was a most notable record of achievement, not only in the won and lost columns, but greater still, in molding the careers of so many fine young men of this Nation. His lessons in integrity, fair play and sportsmanship, will be well-remembered throughout their lifetime by the youth he coached. To those who know Earl Blaik as I do, it comes as no surprise that he felt so strongly about the source of power derived from prayer. His words which follow should be read and reread by all Americans, not only in this Lenten season but throughout the year.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EX-COACH BLAIK BELIEVES IN PRAYER—SOURCE OF POWER AND CONFIDENCE ON PLAYING FIELD

The Lenten season each year brings new meaning to Christians the world over. It is a time for the individual to assess anew his relationship with God. Prayer, as the direct link, plays a vital role in this relationship. This selection is from the book, "We Believe in Prayer," by Lawrence M. Brings, published by T. S. Denison & Co., of Minneapolis.

"(By Earl (Red) Blaik, former Army football coach)

"If you were to ask my mother the value of prayer she, in her 92 years of Christian living, would cite over a half century of devotion to a Presbyterian faith which she and my late father, an immigrant Scotsman, knew was the foundation of their years of happiness. To them daily prayer was as natural as the need of food. Spiritual impoverishment could be tolerated less than physical hunger.

"The dedication of a daily hour to contemplation and prayer may be partially lost in these days when the mind has little respite from the continuous reminders that our civilization courts chaos.

"DAYS OF DIFFICULTY

"It may seem strange, however, that in face of these major world problems stoically accepted, there comes to all men days of great individual difficulty as personal events of seemingly overwhelming pressure cannot be answered without guidance, and such guidance is only found in prayer.

"Strength through prayer is the foundation of confidence when the pressure of great spectator sports all but overcomes the minds of players. It is far more common than not, to see college teams get an added source of power and confidence as they pause for a short prayer before play; a prayer such as Coach Ray Eliot's is the one used by the hundreds of youngsters who play on Pop Warner midget teams:

" 'As we gather here today
We take a moment, Lord to pray;
That you will guide us in our play
And show us how to go Thy way;
Make us honest, fair, and true
In this game and all we do.'

"NOT RATIONED

"Prayer is not rationed as a commodity is in war or reserved for those bleak days of sickness and trouble. Prayer is the means of spiritual growth which compounded, will give the individual the mental strength to surmount daily problems and provide the needed peace of mind.

We meticulously prepare for changing conditions which are met on the football field of play. Confidence which destroys anxiety, is based on faith, and is a top requisite for the competing champion. All the training of his great physical attributes are of little value to the champion without a faith in himself gained only through prayer and contemplation.

"Prayer may be a personal matter, but for the ordinary soul daily meditation with the following prayer given by Chaplain Clayton Wheat to the corps of cadets when I was a cadet, will strengthen your belief in the power of prayer.

"CADET PRAYER

" 'O God, our Father, Thou searcher of men's hearts, help us draw near to Thee in sincerity and truth. May our religion be filled with gladness and may our worship of Thee be natural.

" 'Strengthen and increase our admiration for honest dealing and clean thinking, and suffer not our hatred of hypocrisy and pretense ever to diminish. Encourage us in our endeavor to live above the common level of life. Make us to choose the harder right instead of the easier wrong, and never to be content with a half-truth when the whole can be won. Endow us with courage that is born of loyalty to all that is noble and worthy, that scorn to compromise with vice and injustice and knows no fear when truth and right are in jeopardy. Guard us against flippancy and irreverence in the sacred things of life. Grant us new ties of friendship and new opportunities of service. Kindle our hearts in fellowship with those of a cheerful countenance, and soften our hearts with sympathy for those who sorrow and suffer. Help us to maintain the honor of the corps untarnished and unsullied and to show forth our duty to Thee and to our country. All of which we ask in the name of the great friend and Master of men. Amen.' "

Labor in the World Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD, and commend to the attention of the membership of this body, an article entitled "Labor in the World Picture," which appears in the February 1959 edition of the AFL–CIO American Federationist, and which was drawn from the remarks made by AFL–CIO President George Meany. Mr. Meany delivered this speech during a 2-day conference on Labor and Science in a Changing World, sponsored last month by the AFL–CIO industrial union department.

I was much impressed by Mr. Meany's thoughtful and provocative remarks. He has a clear understanding of the nature of the Communist international movement, and he does not mince words about their ultimate goal—the goal of world conquest, and the destruction of all free and democratic institutions. But Mr. Meany does not stop there: he outlines a clear course which the American labor movement and, in a larger sense, all of us must pursue if we hope to successfully meet the Communist challenge.

I shall not cite any excerpts from Mr. Meany's remarks, because I feel that his entire speech warrants our close and careful consideration. For that reason, I am placing it in the RECORD and commending it earnestly to the attention of the membership of this body:

LABOR IN THE WORLD PICTURE

(By George Meany)

Where does American labor fit into the rather somber picture of international affairs? What can it contribute and what are its special qualifications for contributing to the maintenance of peace and freedom in this changing world?

First of all, labor has the highest interest in having the greatest number of people share the benefits which modern science can bring to life. Labor has the greatest stake in atomic power being used solely for the pursuits of peace. Labor is by its very nature humanitarian in aspiration.

As in the first industrial revolution, so today in the second industrial revolution, it is not industrial progress as such but rather the mass human factor—the labor movement—which is the force making for and advancing individual dignity and personality.

The ideals of labor know no national boundaries. Here labor and science have much in common. Precisely because of the impact of the revolution in technology on military strategy, it is important that we do have a humanitarian approach. By its very nature, labor is basically humanitarian in its aims and in its values.

We of labor indict communism because it robs the people living under it of all human freedom and the possibility to share equitably and adequately in the benefits of technical progress behind the Iron Curtain. We indict communism for gearing its technical progress to military objectives. Until the Soviet Union discards its aim of world conquest, mankind cannot really tame atomic fission.

Lest we forget, Moscow is enraged over Tito's efforts to travel a different road to what the Kremlin calls socialism. And even helpless Hungary was not permitted to live in peaceful coexistence with the successors of Stalin.

American labor must help our Nation lend support to policies which recognize the right to nationhood as a basic human right. In the missile age, in the days of breakthroughs in outer space, free and independent nationhood has a larger meaning than ever before. Today more than ever, inde-

pendent nationhood means a distinct cultural entity and a spirit of self-respect and self-reliance among the great mass of the world's people.

More than half the world's population lives in economically underdeveloped areas. Labor has a special interest in having modern science and technology serve to raise the standard of living in these areas. The most vital interest of American labor and our self-preservation as a free labor movement make it imperative to have the workers of these countries enjoy a rising standard of living, better pay, better hours, more leisure, health and culture.

In our own country, where our labor movement is not prisoner of any economic dogma or political formula or party machine, the movement is especially qualified to work for a much more rapid and widespread utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

This is no time for conflict between private and public power interests over their respective roles in atomic power development. The public should have the benefits of modern science through private power if possible, through public power if need be, and through a combination of the two if necessary.

Once such atomic development is speeded up in our own country, the United States will find it easier to help other nations and strengthen them in their fight against poverty and subversion.

The record of American labor in regard to an adequate and sound foreign aid program is very clear from the Marshall plan right down to date. In the face of vast advances in science and technology, and in view of the great desire among the peoples of economically underdeveloped countries to industrialize quickly, we must stress that our foreign aid program should mean much more than giving dollars and providing machinery and technical know-how. There is a human element in this picture.

These economically underdeveloped societies seek to move rapidly from a backward rural stage to an advanced industrial stage. To avoid exploitation and concentration of economic power, to avoid a monopoly of political power is essentially a problem of social justice which the free trade unions can make a contribution to solve.

After all, the test in regard to the human value of science and technology is whether they serve the spiritual fulfillment and the material well-being of the individual, whether they are for the good of the great mass of the people or for the benefit of a few.

These standards can be met only in a free society, in which free labor can play a constructive role. Such a society is far superior to the dictatorial tyrannical setups we've seen.

Remember, Hitler in his day also lorded over a country with a highly developed technology. Hitler in his day was even more ahead of us in buzz bombs and missiles than Khrushchev is today. But under Khrushchev, as under Hitler, the high level of technological progress and achievement spelled massive exploitation, enslavement and war.

In contrast let me cite a distinct American experience which proves that the real value of industrial progress is in human service. I cite TVA and the development of the Central Valley of California. Neither Communist Russia nor any other totalitarian country can show similar institutions, similar undertakings, with free labor playing a vital role in the communities' enjoyment of benefits of flood control, electric power, reforestation, navigation, food production, health and education.

Of course, there are those who feel that we can meet the Soviet challenge at the conference table and that the threat of human destruction, total war, is enough to hold off, enough for our protection. Well, I think that this position is really a repudiation of the responsibility that all Americans must have—a responsibility even in this great age of technical and scientific advance—a responsibility to preserve this free way of life, a responsibility as trade unionists to preserve a system of government under which it has been possible for this trade union movement to advance the cause of those who work for wages in this great Nation.

Our criticism of the Soviet system must be accompanied by a living demonstration that man can achieve far more for himself and his community through democracy than through despotism.

We have demonstrated the superiority of democracy over Nazi despotism not only on the field of battle. It will be harder for us to defeat communism. Unlike nazism, it hides behind a humanitarian cover. It pretends to be the champion of labor.

The Mikoyans are harder to fight than the Goerings, but they are none the less our enemies, because they are the enemies of all freedom and human decency. Let none forget what Mikoyan and his regime did to the people of Hungary, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia.

Our country should strive to do more in serving the cause of peace, freedom and expanded human well-being. The rapid progress of science and technology demands this.

But with all our shortcomings and failings, too many of us forget the contributions our country has made to the advancement of human liberty and welfare. America has meant much and done much for advancing political democracy and national independence for colonial peoples. We can be proud of our industrial progress and the increasing extent to which—thanks in great measure to our free labor movement—the great mass of people are benefiting from our front-rank status in science and technology. Our readiness to share our atomic resources in the interest of peace and human betterment is unparalleled.

Of course, there is more that we can and must do. The Soviet challenge and the rapid pace of scientific progress necessitate that our educational system be vastly improved and that more talented sons and daughters of the people—regardless of their race or religion—be given an opportunity to secure the highest learning. As the pioneer of free education in the United States, American labor must now be the most active force for such improvement and democratization of our educational system.

Even if the Soviet regime had not come to cast its dark, ugly shadow on the arena of history, the scientific and technological revolution which humanity is now experiencing would have produced profound social, political and economic changes and national emotions and even explosions.

The role of communism in this stage of history is far more complicating and destructive than constructive. Our best answer to the Communist challenge is constantly to humanize our society, improve our free way of life and make it invulnerable in every way to Communist subversion and assault.

Given the nature of the Soviet system and the new world role of our country in this age of miracles of science, the American labor movement must not only respond to events in the making but also influence, mold and help direct events.

Our labor movement must help our Government evolve and execute an effective democratic foreign policy. We must cement our relations with the international free trade union movement and expand our assistance to its weaker sections.

There are areas where American labor is especially qualified to serve the ICFTU and the free world. I speak of awakening Africa and the struggle against every vestige and form of colonialism. I speak of exposing the true nature of the Communist enemy which has made our country and our free way of life its principal target.

There are no blueprints to social progress and human advancement. But there are certain practical steps—all in a humanizing direction and all aimed at strengthening the non-Communist world and its nations whether they are or are not our allies today in a formal sense. American labor should foster such policies with redoubled energy.

The advances in science make it most urgent that we work for effectively controlled and internationally supervised disarmament and the banning of nuclear and all other weapons of mass destruction. Our foreign aid program should be put on at least a 2-year basis so that it can be a greater force for stabilization. We must energetically help our allies break with colonialism in Algeria and everywhere else. We must advance a most comprehensive program for rebuilding the Middle East so as to help Arab nationalism become a positive force for democracy and live in peace with Israel. We must open our colleges to more students from overseas on a free scholarship basis. We must maintain and strengthen our national defense and the capacity of our allies to maintain their national security.

Labor is the best equipped sector of our community to demonstrate that life in a democracy is better, fuller, and richer in a moral, cultural, and spiritual sense than it can ever be under communism or any other despotism.

It seems to me that in meeting all of these problems of living in this new great technical and scientific society, we must arrange, if we can, to stay alive. We must preserve democracy in being. That's the No. 1 objective, because all of these other things we talk about—aid to under-developed countries, great advances in our own economic picture here at home—all of these things depend on maintaining the American system under which we are privileged to have a free trade union movement.

It seems that the No. 1 objective is to use our influence in shaping a foreign policy that will always leave the door open for peace but at the same time present at that bargaining table an America strong enough to defend this way of life from aggression of any kind.

I think it's labor's job to make its contribution to that sort of America.

Resignation of Hon. Theodore Francis Green as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago when the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations met in regular session, its membership was not aware that the agenda included the resignation of their distinguished chairman, Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. They were deeply moved and those of us on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, who have worked closely with Chairman GREEN and his Senate committee over the years,

observing his outstanding leadership, were saddened to learn of it. Senator GREEN's decision to resign as chairman because of failing sight and hearing is typical of this patriotic American who, after determining that he could not continue to give his country service of the very highest order, felt he should step down. It takes real courage, Mr. Speaker, to reach such a decision and I want to add my tribute to the many well deserved commendations he has received from Members of both Houses of Congress and other grateful Americans. It is indeed a great comfort to know that Senator GREEN will remain a member of the Senate committee and that America will continue to have the benefit of his statesmanship and sage counsel.

Can We Win the Hot Economic War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 22d annual dinner of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, which was held in Washington in honor of the New Jersey congressional delegation on February 5, 1959, the president of the State chamber, Lansing P. Shield, made a few remarks, entitled "Can We Win the Hot Economic War?" and I am very pleased to receive the permission of the House to have this brief address printed in the RECORD.

Mr. Shield says a great deal in a brief space and in my opinion he expresses the thoughts that have been in the minds of many people for some time. We should now take action and I feel sure that if management and labor can get together and discuss the great problems facing our country, they will reach some ground of agreement and we can show a united front in winning the hot economic war.

Mr. Shield's remarks follow:

CAN WE WIN THE HOT ECONOMIC WAR?

(By Lansing P. Shield)

An unusual gathering of leaders of Government, organized labor, and industry such as this provides an opportunity for all of us to achieve better understanding. In these critical times, is there anything more urgent than the development of teamwork between these three important segments of our society? And this applies particularly to New Jersey—the most highly industrialized State in the Union.

Despite unparalleled prosperity and spectacular achievements in mass production and mass distribution, our economy in New Jersey and throughout the Nation is labeled as a high-cost one—and as each month rolls by the break-even point for both industry and Government rises. We might as well face it: we are living in a plush economy. Because of high costs, world markets are slipping away from us.

Within the last 12 months, Khrushchev, Mikoyan, and company have made trade agreements with 11 countries. During that same period, we haven't signed a single agreement. In today's papers Khrushchev calls for the end of the cold war. This is understandable, because he feels sure of victory in the hot economic war. In his speech yesterday before the 21st Soviet Party Congress in Moscow, he boasted that "economic competition was now enough to win the world to communism."

As a nation, we are in danger of losing out to a competitor who has a built-in low-cost austerity program. His economy, contrasted with ours, has a constantly lowering break-even point and the cost of goods in Russia is being steadily reduced.

The complete answer to the dilemma in which we find ourselves does not lie solely in reducing Government spending, freezing prices and wages, nor in further mechanization. We already lead the world in that area (I'm referring to mechanization, not spending) and it's ironical that the more we mechanize the higher go our costs. The President has warned us that unless we reverse this trend which is weakening us both internally and externally, it may be necessary to put our economic body into a straitjacket in the form of wage and price controls. It is up to us to choose now between teamwork and dictation, or the freedom of choice may be taken away from us.

As leaders in Government, business, and labor, we have been fighting small battles among ourselves instead of presenting a united front—a truly United States of America against our adversary, the Kremlin.

As an example, here in the United States, industry and organized labor meet as antagonists annually or biannually at the bargaining table and then withdraw until the next battle. Between political campaigns, Government and industry often tear each other down.

While we have been trying to solve the problem of integration in race relationships, we have actually been practicing segregation in our economic relationships.

A form of class warfare is adding fuel to the flames that are licking at the foundations of our society and our freedoms. Recently a columnist in the New York Times pointed out that both political parties seem to be solidifying along the lines of class interests.

Can anyone say there is a conscious, common effort to promote integration and understanding between organized labor and management—and to a somewhat lesser degree, between Government and industry?

Recently, recognizing my own shortcomings in this area, I invited to lunch a well-known labor leader in a neighboring State and a U.S. Senator. After 2 hours in which we exchanged views (no holds barred) all three of us came away with a better understanding of the problems of the others and we all wanted another meeting.

This week one of the top labor leaders in New Jersey told me the time was overdue for management and labor to bury the hatchet, particularly in view of the international situation. It is heartening to find that leaders in every field are becoming aware of the necessity for Government, labor, and industry to close ranks.

In a shooting war, we get together because we are thoroughly aroused to the common danger. If we are to win this hot economic war, a united front is equally imperative. May I respectfully suggest to the representatives of Federal and State Governments present tonight that industry would be glad to join any effort to bring about a closer working relationship with Government and with labor? Perhaps an improved relationship might be initiated by a conference of leaders in Washington, followed by meetings at the State level. Such action would not only be good business and good politics, but would be a definite first step toward the objective of developing unity.

We must have unity to be productive—we must be productive to be strong—we must be strong to remain free.

Ernest Joiner, of the Ralls Banner—The Hardest Hitting Community Newspaper Editor in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Ernest Victor Joiner, owner and publisher of the Ralls (Tex.) Banner, has become a legend in his home State.

Many persons do not agree with what he has had to say; yet all must respect him as a man who stands up for his beliefs, and who will fight for his ideals. He and his family have been cut at verbally. Joiner has even been shot at. Yet he continues to stand courageously for what he believes is right, and to lash with a cutting edge those whom he feels are not acting in the best interest of the people.

Ernest Joiner has been called a "voice crying in the wilderness." Yet this is not wholly accurate. He is heard not only in the wilderness, but also in the big cities and in the small communities. He is one of the most often quoted newspaper editors in Texas. His statements in his column, "It Says Here," have become bywords in many parts of our State. Knowledge of him is spreading over the Nation.

Ernest Joiner has his ideas and his ideals. He has the astuteness and intelligence to argue persuasively for his causes. And he has the willingness to work to put across a point or to bring about a community improvement, such as a new school auditorium, a new telephone building, and others. He stands for progress and good citizenship, and he has the courage to work actively for their accomplishment. I am proud to be able to call him a friend and to have the advantage of his wisdom and counsel in many fights for the betterment of the government of Texas.

Mr. President, two articles written about Ernest V. Joiner give a good description of him. I request unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The first is from the 1958 edition of the South Plains Yearbook, "Parade of Progress." The second article was written by Willie Morris, and was published in the Texas Observer on September 19, 1958, under the heading: "An Editor the Sheriff Missed":

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the 1958 edition of the South Plains Yearbook, "Parade of Progress."]

RALLS BANNER IS EDITED BY ERNEST JOINER, HARDEST HITTIN' COMMUNITY NEWSPAPER EDITOR IN TEXAS

"Here, read what Joiner says in the Ralls Banner," is a common expression at a political meeting in Austin, Washington, D.C., and around all of the coffee shops in Ralls. Ernest Joiner came to Ralls about 12 years ago, and from this time no local politician has ever dared to get his hand caught in the purse strings of this city.

At a press convention in 1950, a room full of community editors bluntly predicted that Joiner would be out of the newspaper business in less than 6 months. He had broken every rule. He jumped on his town's preachers, lawyers, city councilmen, school board, civic club leaders—but most of all he roasted many of his best advertisers.

Recent Governors, State representatives, State senators, and most all of the county political leaders have felt the sting of Joiner's pen.

Joiner, towering something over 6 feet, came into Ralls fully sold on the idea that America needed red-blooded editors who would call a "spade a spade."

He has been cussed and discussed. He's been shot at and missed! He's been openly preached against in Ralls' pulpits, and he has also been praised in the same places. He lays his ears back and kicks like a mule when he thinks someone is getting a raw deal. He's for progress. He's for people in his town being good citizens. Once he even singlehandedly called a beer election because he said the only thing people would vote on was keeping the county dry.

In brief, a volume could be written about Ernest Joiner. His newspaper has captured many State awards for outstanding service to its readers. If you read his column and you don't like what he says, cuss him. Cuss him real good, but don't cuss him in Ralls. People in Ralls respect and love Joiner and the Ralls Banner. But why shouldn't they? He gives Ralls and this area the best news coverage of any community newspaper in the State.

[From the Texas Observer, Sept. 19, 1958]

AN EDITOR THE SHERIFF MISSED

Out here in the lonely whistling spaces, on the main road to Lubbock, sits Ralls. It has a red brick main street and a cafe to drink coffee called Jack Rabbit's. It also has Ernest Joiner, who edits the Banner and who gets quoted more than most newspapermen on the mass circulation dailies.

In the daily and weekly output of grey matter that constitutes Texas journalism, the Ralls Banner (circulation 1,175) is a kind of journalistic oasis. Its editor is a man of raw courage, a thorough noncomformist, and an idealist. Beneath the eccentricities of his weekly column, "It Says Here," a sensitive social conscience is at work, ridiculing political greed, jousting with religious dogma, lashing unkindness and inhumanity and pettiness and whatever else he thinks ills the human race, 2,000 of whom have chanced to band together in this tiny community on the plains of west Texas.

Ernest Joiner is a stern critic of the times. "We have no angry voice to challenge this era of passiveness," he once wrote. "Here and there some minister of the Gospel addresses empty air from behind the Mexican border in a tone of anger, but the tone is a stage prop, more than likely and his aim is economic security for himself. There is no Thomas Paine to fan the flames of revolution, stir the imagination of Americans toward human rights and national independence; no Tom Paine to strike fear into the hearts of dictators, both clerical and lay. Gone are the Robert Ingersolls, W. C. Branns, Voltaires, and Victor Hugos whose anger stirred men to justifiable action. Nobody emulates Jesus, who in anger, whipped moneychangers from the temple. Just give us for 1958, God, some thoroughly angry men."

"I think a man can be judged by his enemies just as he can by his friends," Joiner once said, "and I'm proud of my friends and my enemies." He has his share of both. In 1952, when his shop burned down, a group of hometown people raised $1,000 for a new building. He also was a target for a bullet once—fired by a sheriff he had caught in the act of bootlegging. The bullet missed and the sheriff became the only one-term sheriff in the history of Crosby County.

He once wrote of the school board, which was conducting secret meetings: "These little dictators, lacking only a small balcony for their strutting, take pride in saying, as one member certainly did say, 'We run this school business the way we want to run it.'" And later he wrote, "Once about 10 years ago this newspaper criticized the local school board for what it considered light-of-the-moon activity. And for just as many years one board member has nursed the conviction that the editor should drop dead, which seems a fair punishment for exercising freedom of speech and press as more or less guaranteed by the Constitution. Now the man has a child in school who studies the works of Mark Twain, who once said: 'First God made idiots. That was for practice. Then he made school boards.' Haw."

Ralls had a Negro population of about 200. Some years ago Joiner editorialized: "Every so often some solid, upstanding Christian gentleman feels called upon to criticize this newspaper for printing news of the colored population of our town. Last week we printed the honor roll for the colored school. A couple of these characters gave birth to a two-headed calf, sideways, when they read it. Our opinion is that colored students, with three strikes against them on books, equipment, and facilities for study, are to be commended above a lot of white children we know who can't make the honor roll with the best of instruction and educational facilities. We think effort should be recognized. We think news should be printed. If these two convictions of ours soil the lily-white hands and Christian consciences of a handful of bigoted Klu Kluckers, they are invited to get the hell off our subscription list."

THE RASCALS

When the political dismissals took place at Joiner's alma mater, Texas Tech, last year, a Banner editorial was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "It is fitting that the infamy of a handful of scoundrels be permanently recorded in the national archives so students and historians of every age may know how the public's servants conducted the public's business at Texas Tech. It couldn't have happened to a more deserving bunch of rascals."

Joiner belongs to the American breed of agrarian humorists; his style bears the imprint of Twain. His description of a Californian's directions on how to get to Texas is to go east until you smell it and then south until you step in it. Once, in a column reflecting his rationalist views on religion, he quoted a mayor who said that God saved his life, after a tornado wiped out his town, killing some 79 men, women, and children. "Man has been given the power of reason," Joiner wrote. "Why doesn't he use it? It doesn't square that God should be given credit for saving Mayor Rowe's life unless we also assign him credit for killing 79 others."

Joiner and his staff of two publish the Banner in a neat new building a half block from the stores and offices in the center of Ralls. Wearing black horn-rims, he is a tall, handsome man of 47. He speaks and moves like the west Texan. On the desk in his private office is a plaque saying "Vice president" with a phrase below it "in charge of vice, naturally." His window looks out onto the business section, and onto the weird old town assembly hall, red and weatherbeaten, built by the people of Ralls not long after it was founded in 1910.

He was raised in Dalhart. His mother was a Populist and an admirar of Eugene Victor Debs, the Socialist. Joiner's middle name is Victor, after Debs. He worked 5 years in Fort Worth before he went to college. He studied 2 years at the University of New Mexico, and spent his last 2 years at Texas Tech, where he studied political science and got into trouble with a conservative administration when he edited the school paper. He first angered the officials there by conducting an election for the biggest horse's neck on the campus. "We had our share. How was I to know the dean of engineering would win hands down?" he said.

This was when Pappy O'Daniel was Governor, and when Joiner discovered the dormitory cafeteria was purchasing carloads of flour for the first time, and O'Daniel flour at that, he asked why in several editorials. He never got an answer. The day he crossed the stage to get his diploma, Clifford E. Jones, then president of Tech, handed it to him and whispered, "Joiner, this is the happiest day in my life."

He toured the whole country looking for a newspaper job, and the only one he could find was with the New Orleans Times-Picayune at $15 at week. So he went to work for the U.S. Corps of Engineers in Galveston.

In 1942 he married a Georgia girl. They had met at a college editor's convention in Iowa and carried on a romance through the mails until Joiner showed up at her home the summer after he left college.

He spent 4 years in the Army, first with the infantry, then the paratroopers, and finally the criminal investigation department, but he never got overseas. He almost did, but he'd cracked his back as a paratrooper at Fort Benning and was sent up to be shipped to Europe when a doctor noticed his cast and notified his commanding general.

FROM A JUNKHEAP

Right after he was discharged in 1946, he bought the Banner with a GI loan. "It was a real junkheap, nuthin' would run, and it had 600 circulation," he said.

"I came here," he said, "because I believed, and I believe it more every day, that the only independent and uncontrolled press in the United States are small weekly papers. It's obvious I couldn't do what I'm doing on a big-city daily. Why, I wouldn't last as long as a paper shirt in a bear fight. Those big papers are only honest when it pays 'em to be honest."

He chuckled often, between phrases. He is a jovial man who likes to amuse.

"I don't think too much of the weekly press in Texas either," he said. "I don't think much of a paper with no personal column or editorial page. Too many weekly editors are printers instead of editors." He does admire H. M. Baggarly's Tulia Herald, just 70 miles to the north, as well as the Kountze News and the Dallas White Rocker. He reads over 40 weeklies every week.

He leaned back in his chair and reminisced. "Out in this country up until recently," he said, "people were friendly. But that ol' West Texas hospitality is damned near a thing of the past. I guess it's the pace people live now—improved transportation, and more money and time, and TV. I wanta tell you somethin'—you can't phone people around here. They'll leave the phone off the hook if they're watchin' TV. Try to get people out to a public meetin' the night Gunsmoke's on, and, brother, you've had it. I'd like to have five cents a pound for all the food consumed in front of television.

"I don't know any satisfied folks anymore. They're weighted down with their new freedom or somethin'. If other people're usin' their new leisure the way folks around here are, this country's in bad shape. I imagine we could use about four psychiatrists in this town already."

Joiner is proud of the Banner's editorial campaigns. "I imagine we have more voters in city elections percentage-wise than any community in Texas," he said. When he came to Ralls, only seven votes had been cast in the last city election. "The first thing I tried to do," he said, "was organize an opposition for the city commission. Once

I had to put myself up and get beat. But now there's no more business about lettin' a small group handpick the leaders.

"Another thing—for a dry county there's more drinkin' here. Just about everybody's got beer and whiskey at home. I circulated a petition to get a referendum, must've been back in '48, to see if they'd vote to drink openly. An hour before the votin' people were lined up a block in front of the Legion Hut. Why, more people voted in that election than any presidential election in history here. Every night for a solid month they were havin' rallies and things. You'd of thought Ringling Brothers'd come to Ralls.

A COCKTAIL BAPTIST

"I remember there was a big man against it, and one night not long after it'd been defeated I was deliverin' some printin' over at his house, and he invited me in and mixed me a cocktail, right before his wife and teenage daughter, them knowin' full well in 2 hours he'd be at the Baptist Church. I could've dropped my teeth. When I finished with him in the paper I didn't get any more invitations to his house. You lose more invitations that way."

Then he remembered when a big squeeze in the Baptist Church got caught bootleggin'. He pleaded guilty and they never fined him. Two Negroes had been brought in on a bootleggin' charge at the same time and they pleaded innocent and rotted in jail 6 months before they were even tried. I wrote it up, but I guess the people in town didn't mind, 'cause they didn't do anything, so the next week I apologized for botherin' 'em. That's equality under the law for you."

Joiner praised the Ralls Jaycees. "They've really accomplished some wonders around here. The Banner helped them in a campaign to get a $35,000 swimmin' pool, and we got it over the dead bodies of the church people. It was preached against in the pulpit all over town, they called it 'public bathin',' and they gave me and the Jaycees hell.

"There's one thing I'll give these people credit for—they get bitter and they don't forget. That ol' Christian virtue of forgiveness doesn't thrive out here."

Joiner picked up the phone and called his wife to tell her she'd have a guest for dinner. "Louise had a little trouble gettin' adjusted way out here, bein' from Georgia," he said, chuckling. "She had a language problem for one thing, and then she had a time gettin' used to this carryin' on on a paper. It took her a good 5 years to where this stuff rolled off her back. Now she likes it. She usta say let's sell this paper and go open one in the South, and I said, 'What're you tryin' to do, be a young widow?' Of course the weather threw her too, and it was a lot worse then than it is now.

ON CUTTIN' PEOPLE

"I'll tell you this, you'd be surprised at the things people do to strike back at you—at your wife at parties, kids at school. Men can take lessons from women in the fine art of cuttin' people dead."

How does he feel on foreign aid? "I'm opposed to it now, because I don't think any of the people it was supposed to help are gettin' helped. Too much foreign-aid money is goin' to bolster every dictatorship on the face of the globe except Khrushchev." He pointed to a Christian Science Monitor he'd been reading. "It says here we're givin' Chiang over in Formosa more money than ever. If I had my choice of goin' to war with Khrushchev or Chiang, I think I'd take Chiang. We have a knack for fallin' in bed with some of the shadiest characters. * * * When a man's in trouble, his friends don't deliver him a pot of money. They encourage him, understand him. Givin' money creates its own problems. What must it do to people who have pride?

"I suppose catholicism is my big prejudice and I admit it. It's the most authoritarian form of life in the world today. Communism's patterned after it. I don't have a thing against it on religious grounds. But when Catholic politicians start runnin' the government according to the dictates of a church, that's where we separate. The Catholics are too involved in big business too.

"I just got involved with my own church on the same score, on gettin' into business. Business has nothin' to do with the work of God. I raised hell when the Methodist Church bought this big, beautiful hospital at Lubbock. I saw this preacher and asked him about it, and he said Jesus was a healer, and I said, yeah, he didn't charge for it either."

Joiner supported Gonzalez for governor despite his catholicism. "You know," he said, "Gonzalez came to Ralls and made a speech and those who heard him were charmed. The concensus seemed to be, he just wasn't a Mexican. He's a fine fella. He's a whiter man than a lot of whites. He's been good for Texas. People have seen a first-class Mexican in action."

Joiner said he'd show me around town. We closed up the office and got into a battered green Ford. By now it was late, there was a touch of fall in the air, and it was crisp, pleasant. He pointed out the new school auditorium and the new telephone building that he'd campaigned for. "Now I wanta take you out to the Ralls International Airport and show you my plane," he said. Down the highway toward Crosbyton a couple of miles we turned right, onto a wide, bumpy road where the planes land. "If you can set her down here, you can anywhere," he said. The plane was parked under a shed, a little blue and white job with "The Ralls Banner, Ralls, Texas" written across it. Joiner and his wife go everywhere in it—Mexico City, California, Austin, Dallas. The first time he flew alone for any length of time was in another man's plane from El Paso to Ralls. He got lost and had to crash land in a cotton field up near Dimmitt. "I harvested four acres of that fella's cotton," he said. "Once we were flyin' out to Las Vegas and it was the first time I'd ever flown at night usin' instruments. I was checkin' the radio and my wife tapped me on the shoulder and said, 'Honey, aren't we upside down?' and sure enough we were. That's the last time I'll ever fly at night."

We got in the car and drove over to Joiner's house; it was small, new, and modern. They designed it themselves. Louise Joiner, beautiful, intelligent, and Southern, with traces of Georgia in the way she talked, cooked us steaks. Their two girls, 15 and 11, came in and then left, to see the Ralls Jack Rabbits play a football game. We sat around until late drinking coffee and talking, and march music from the band drifted over from the football field, telling in the cool evening that summer was dying, almost gone. When I left Joiner made me promise to come back, "I'll take you up in the plane," he said. "We'll go somewhere. You name it."

The End of Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of one of the articles in the series "Adventures of the Mind" which recently appeared in the Saturday Evening Post entitled "The End of Empire." The author, Dr. D. W. Brogan, is a professor of political science at Cambridge University in England. I believe this to be an excellent essay and would like to bring it to the attention of those who have not had an opportunity to read it:

THE END OF EMPIRE

(By D. W. Brogan)

More than one foreign observer has noted, admired and envied the unconditional loyalty of the average American to the American political tradition. And as a source of internal, of external strength, the loyalty that sends boys and girls on pious pilgrimage to the National Archives to revere the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution is wholly admirable. But when the good American transfers his gaze to the outer world, when he innocently looks for equivalent institutions in that less fortunate part of the globe, when he takes as having the same meaning as he gives them inside America such common words as "freedom," "good government," "progress," he asks for trouble. And with the promptitude of superservice, he is given it. His plate is filled with problems, and he is driven to realize that he is the victim of the old Chinese curse. He "is living in interesting times."

The good American is confronted all over the world today with two linked phenomena, the decline of empires and the rise of nations. He can, as a good American, have no doubts as to the sentiments he must feel at the news and noise of these phenomena. He must rejoice that empires are falling (did not America give the first push in 1776?) and rejoice that new nations devoted to freedom are arising (did not America set the example in the same fateful and admirable year?).

But having paid this respect to the national tradition, the American notes with bewilderment and often with downright annoyance that peace, progress, good will, order and liberty don't seem to be in any greater supply than in the bad old days. He hears doubts expressed as to whether some free nations (Indonesia, Burma) are as well off as they were in the days of imperialist tyranny. He notices that there are two nations on very bad terms with each other in that land called India that was united under British rule, and that their creation was the signal for massacre, rape, and exile on a colossal scale. He has to face in his morning paper news of bloody rioting in Ceylon, led, with a high degree of inconsistency, by Buddhist monks. New nations in Africa such as Ghana threatens to suppress internal opposition by methods very reminiscent of the bad old days. Even after paying, during an American visit, homage to Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, Dr. Sukarno of Indonesia, returns home via Moscow much more impressed by the relevance of Soviet experience than of American. Newly enfranchised nations such as Egypt gladly dicker for arms with the Soviet Union. An Indian state elects a Communist government, and each area, liberated from imperial slavery, seems to develop odd ways of attaining those unalienable rights proclaimed in 1776. Indeed, some of them seem very easily alienable under the pressures of "freedom."

Nothing can be done to make the world easily and automatically safe for democracy (as Chesterton pointed out in 1918, "The world will never be made safe for democracy, it is a dangerous trade"). The good American will have to get used to seeing his principles parroted and parodied. But he will suffer less and be less tempted to angry and foolish reactions if he can bring himself to

think that maybe the decline of empires, at the speed at which it has taken place, is not an unmitigated benefit, and if he also can bring himself to accept the fact that a nation which gets its freedom—that is, is freed from foreign rule—gains that and nothing more. What it gains may have little or no relevance to its real economic or social problems, except to make them worse, and even if it is evident that the gains are well worth the price, the price may yet be very high. And if the price includes poverty, disorder, and division, the United States in its own interest may be forced to pick up the tab.

The United States may have to step in to fill the gap in common defense made by the withdrawal of the imperial power. It may have to spend men, money and patience (patience will be the hardest to come by) to prop up a new, free, but rickety governmental structure. It may even, as a last aggravation of its sad state, have to receive, with what self-control it can, charges of exploitation and imperialism made by peoples in complete control, as far as the American goes, of their own destiny. Bewildered and bothered, the American in the street—or in the White House—will be less bewildered, if no less annoyed, if he accepts the fact that the end of empires is the end of an epoch that suited the United States pretty well, and that the wicked, grasping imperial powers were doing a job (possibly from the worst of motives) that somebody had to do—a job that now must be done mainly by the United States, the reluctant legatee of the old firms now in liquidation.

For the decline of empire means the passing of a crude form of solution to a real problem. "All nations are equal, but some are more equal than others." Since this cynical view happens to be true, it means that nations have very different resources, degrees of competence, are at very different stages in historical development (but want to be at the same stage) and, in defiance of all objective assessments, are ready to assert that this stage of real equality has been reached—that Liberia is a republic in the sense that the United States is; that Ceylon is a state in the sense that Holland is. The old, condemned imperial order denied this. It asserted that nations were unequal, that they were at different stages of development and that the advanced nations had the right, the opportunity and the duty to bring the backward areas, forcibly if need be, up to scratch—a laborious and expensive process for which it was only reasonable to charge a fee.

I am well aware that this appears to contradict the formal doctrines of the Declaration of Independence and that such doctrines would be shocking if developed inside the United States. California and Mississippi are equal and are at the same stage of progress; the peoples of the two States are equal, if not identical, and law and custom make no difference between one group of inhabitants and another. Such is the theory; I beg to be excused from comment on the fact. But outside the United States, until very modern times, this was neither theory nor fact. No one thought that Egypt (legally then a Turkish possession) should be allowed a free hand in controlling the way from Europe to Asia simply because it "owned" the Isthmus of Suez. (The United States, nonimperialist as she was, took much the same line about Colombia's claim to own Panama.)

There was a practical justification for this high and mighty attitude. All the new techniques that transformed the world in the last 150 years originated in Europe or North America. The owners of the new machines and the new weapons faced a world that lay lapped in immemorial slumber. Briskly, like the proprietor of a health farm, the white world insisted on wakening the sleepers, by ruling them directly, as in India; by insisting on a highly privileged position, as in China; or by frightening the more alert into imitating the white man before he took over, as in Japan. Conquest, empire was as old as human society. What was new was the expanding technical superiority of the conquerors that ate into the "cake of custom," and prodded the sleepers wide awake and bred, in reaction, the force that has undone the empires—nationalism.

It is desirable at this point to proclaim that I am too much disposed to accept the unavoidable to protest against this state of affairs. As the wise Bishop Butler put it, "Things and actions are what they are, and the consequences of them will be what they will be; why then should be seek to be deceived?" Why indeed? But it is a part of deception not to notice what follows from "things and actions being what they are," and there is some danger of such error being committed.

The first error in which it is tempting to fall is to assume that the end of imperialism, the arrival on the stage of nationalism, is necessarily accompanied by material or even by moral progress. For it is too often forgotten that the basic article of the nationalist creed is that progress, good government, liberty, and civilization have no meaning except in nationalist terms. It is true that nationalist propaganda usually promises lots of goodies as well as national "freedom," but they are not of the essence of the contract, and the promise is often not kept. For example, material progress may be accelerated, usually is accelerated when the economic area of a state is large. The size of the United States is one reason for its wealth. But nationalism usually breaks up existing economic units (usually, not always), for, to the nationalist, progress in material well-being is empty if it does not mean progress in national well-being. A man can be emotionally well off only in a nation state to which he belongs, even if he could be materially better off in his mere material command of goods in a vaster nonnational or antinational area.

Thus, although not a perfect economic unit, the old Austro-Hungarian empire was a more satisfactory one than that created by the "succession" states. Yet it is now—and was in 1918—useless to point out this fact to the emergent nationalities. What they wanted was not well-being, but national well-being. It was a choice that the peoples of the old empire were free to make as a result of the Allied victory in the First World War. They made it, and no wisdom from above the battle, from Woodrow Wilson or Herbert Hoover, could have altered that fact.

After all, no such decision is as irrational as the decision to wage and endure war, and we are all conditioned to make that decision. "Give me liberty or give me death" is not only Patrick Henry's slogan. The same uneconomic choice can be seen nearer to the United States. What rational justification is there for the frontiers of Central America? The little republics round the waist of the Americas are obviously designed to be united or even to be united under Mexico. But suggest to them. I am quite prepared to believe that even Panama, invented for the convenience of the United States, has bred in the past fifty years a genuine national feeling that will last—and may become a real nuisance to the United States, at any rate from a propaganda point of view. Why should Panama not imitate Egypt? And, from the nationalist point of view, there is no easy answer to that one.

The greatest single gift of British rule to India, perhaps the only one, was the creation of India. For it did not exist before the East India Company and then the British Indian Government by war, by road, by railway, by law made a united government and a united economy for a subcontinent never before united in history under an effective central Indian Government. But the first result of freedom for the India thus created was suicide. We now have India and Pakistan, the latter state a nation that did not exist, even as a name, 50 years ago. The one great good thing imperialism did was undone. The unity the French imposed on Indochina has not survived their defeat, and it is not certain that the unity of Indonesia (another artificial, imported name) will survive Dutch rule for long. All of these breakdowns in unity may have been worth while; they were certainly nearly, if not quite, inevitable, but they had a high price.

Nor is that all. The division of the imperial units suggests something about nationalism that is novel and ominous. Nationalism often, too often, breeds nationalism. Peoples who have got along more or less with each other under foreign rule suddenly develop violent antagonism when foreign rule is withdrawn or is threatened with collapse. For under the foreign tyrant some kind of neutrality could be imposed from above. If neither group ruled itself, it had not to worry about being ruled by its neighbors. But if those neighbors were on the way to becoming the ruling class, then the prospect of local foreign rule became intolerable. So the Indian Moslems revolted against the prospect of Hindu rule; Turkish turned on Greek Cypriots; and in once peaceful Ceylon, Sinhalese turned on Tamils as self-government, freedom, got more complete. Nationalism, that is to say, is often the result of a reaction. If a government claims to embody a national tradition, a way of life, a language, a religion, or all of them, people have got to ask themselves is it really their way of life, language, religion? Often the answer given in blood and rapine is "No, a thousand times no." Freedom in these situations—and they are common enough—brings not peace, but a sword.

And this leads to the invention of nationalities, to be the creation of new human groups cut off from the mass of mankind by new feuds, new and carefully fostered differences. It is, of course, too easy to be critical and cynical about the history manufactured for new nations or old nations making new claims. Popular history in all countries is full of comforting legend. It is largely because they have their nationalist growing pains far behind them that western European and North American nations can afford to be scholarly, critical; can debunk national heroes and legends, remember that Washington swore, and doubt the cherry tree. Some Americans in the South may even doubt whether Lee made the right choice in going with his State in 1861 instead of sticking with the United States, and some Germans may believe that Bismarck's temporary triumph was a longrun catastrophe for Germany and for Europe.

We cannot expect this kind of critical history from the new nations. We should be more struck with admiration than we are when we get an approach to it as we do in India in the educated classes, or when we think of Thomas Masaryk exposing the Dvur and Hora forgeries of the country's literary past, despite the fact that they flattered Czech national vanity. But we must be prepared today for a high degree of fiction in all or almost all nationalist propaganda, and the American people, full of kindness and credulity, must not be shocked when they discover that some interesting spokesmen for some interesting countries are prone to the use of what Huck Finn called stretchers.

What is more important is the not infrequent case where historical fiction conceals from a long-suppressed and now renascent nation that its misfortunes are also largely its own fault. Except where the preponderance of power is overwhelm-

ingly on the imperial side, and possibly not always then, the fact of subjection is a fact about the oppressed nation. It suggests weaknesses that mere freedom will not necessarily cure. Freedom may be (I think today it almost always is) the necessary preliminary to curing the weakness, but the weakness of resources, traditions, social habits, is there to be cured. Waving a new flag makes you feel good, but that is about all.

It is difficult for Americans to realize that for a great part of the world, the views of poets and philosophers, of orators and legend makers are more important than the views of businessmen or scientists or economists. The Arabs are dazzled by their own past, seen in a golden haze. For two generations they have been asking the question why they, who once ruled the Mediterranean and brought civilization to the Christian barbarians, have been kicked around and subjected to foreign rule in their homelands. And the answer they expect must be encouraging. It must exaggerate the unity of the Arabs and suggest that only Western tyranny or local corruption prevents the creation of a great Arab nation stretching from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf. It must ignore permanent and desperate problems of inadequate resources (as in Egypt and Algeria); of undoubtedly Arab but totally anachronistic social structures (as in Yemen and Saudi Arabia). It must find in hatred of Israel a substitute for difficult problems of social and religious readjustment. It must be uncritical of the social results of Islam. And it must give a great place to treason. For all suppressed Nations have a deep conviction of betrayal.

"Let Erin remember the days of old
Ere her faithless sons betrayed her,
When Malachi wore the collar of gold
That he won from the proud invader."

What the Irish sang the new nationalities still sing, and so every national leader has to look over his shoulder to keep an eye on his countrymen, who may see in the possibly inevitable failures and limited successes of "freedom" not a result of the nature of things, but treachery. So Nuri-as-Said is butchered, so Gandhi is assassinated.

And the leaders who have to be watchful often become leaders by negation rather than by affirmation; they are against something (foreign rule) rather than for something, for basic changes in the internal structure of the Nation, eradication of the very weaknesses that helped to produce foreign rule in the beginning. Of course, this is not always so. Nationalist leaders are sometimes preachers, as was Gandhi, of self-reform as well as of the expulsion of the foreigner. The Gaelic League, the chief begetter of modern Ireland, had as one of its slogans: "And as we are shall Banba (Ireland) be." But it is easier to damn the imperialists than to go in for fundamental self-criticism, and when the imperialist has been heaved out or has left under his own steam, the basic problems remain.

So the world is faced with the new states with inadequate economic resources, with erratic frontiers, with dissident minorities, with delusions of grandeur and, what is worse, of goodness. And all this is in a world where the new nations are almost all arising in poor regions where, even with the best and most rational government, the headaches would be frightful, where the problem of keeping abreast of the birth rate and of not actually going backward in well-being is serious enough to daunt the bravest. It is not being offensive or aggressive to assert that half the nations whose delegates give parties in New York round the United Nations building are too poor and too backward to give their peoples in the next generation even as good a government and as adequate a standard of life as the most backward European nation (let us say Portugal) or the most backward American State (let use say Mississippi) possesses.

Freedom from imperial yoke may even be a luxury some of them (which could be named) can hardy afford. There are areas in the dwindling British and French Empires that are a dead loss to the imperial power; regions that cannot afford freedom, although only the most prudent of their leaders know this. For there is nothing in the law of nature and of nature's God that provides that an area with the linguistic and cultural unity that demand nationhood and will not be denied will have any of the other resources for even frugal well-being.

The great problem of the concentration of most of the world's wealth and technical competence in a small area of the globe has many nonpolitical aspects. It is to be noted that there is no first-class industrial power outside the temperate zones. But the political problem of the replacement of the empires by the nations is one of the governing conditions of any attempt to redress the imbalance that is so deeply and dangerously dividing the world. And it is the beginning of wisdom for Americans, conditioned as they are by their own largely irrelevant history of nation making, to recognize the national freedom may be an obstacle to a quick redressing of the balance, both by creating doubtfully viable national units and by transferring authority to leaders whose competence has lain in the exploiting (all right, the heroic undoing) of a national grievance.

But if this is the beginning, it is not the end of wisdom. For it is not only a fact, if not a totally welcome fact, that the days of empire are over; it is a fact that the nation state offers possibilities of improvement that the empires either never did (which I doubt) or have ceased to do (which I admit). There is another fact. If one political truth is established today, it is that once the nationalist bug bites a group of human beings they cannot be cured except by national freedom, with all the possible social and economic disadvantages it may bring. Once an Algerian, for instance, decides that he is not a Frenchman and doesn't want to be one, rational economic argument is wasted. Bernard Shaw usually talked nonsense on political questions, but he occasionally talked sense, and his Irish origin illuminated much of this question for him. So, he wrote sense in his preface to "John Bull's Other Island," the only play he ever devoted to his native land. "A conquered nation is like a man with a cancer: he can think of nothing else, and is forced to place himself, to the exclusion of all better company, in the hands of quacks who profess to treat or cure cancer." This is true, and the first great gain of freedom is that thought and effort can be devoted to something more immediately relevant than freedom.

It does not follow, of course, that it will be. There are few greater emotional losses than a grievance that explains why things have gone wrong in terms of another's fault. Any father of a family can testify to that (and his children can testify, too, in another sense). To get freedom is to lose a grievance, and some nations have firmly refused to give up their darling excuse. Thus, if the people of the Argentine Republic devoted a tenth as much rational thought to the causes of their serious, but quite curable troubles that they have wasted on irrelevant and unjust spleen about "Yanqui" imperialism, they would be a great deal better off. If a patriotic Cuban put to himself the question, "Would we not have been materially better off if we had had more Yanqui imperialism?" and then admitted that some, if not all, of the troubles of Cuba are homemade, freedom would be an unmitigated good. Can any candid observer, looking at Haiti and the Dominican Republic, pretend that freedom is always an unmitigated good?

The beneficial effects of freedom can be seen in two such different former jewels of the English crown as Ireland and India. For more than a generation of freedom has taught most of the inhabitants of the Irish Republic that their troubles are no longer of England's making, that "the border" is neither here nor there in the bookkeeping of a declining nation, that the Gaelic League was right: "And as we are shall Banba be." Even an act which, seen from the outside, seems one of the most foolish ever perpetrated by a rational community—the exit from the commonwealth in 1948—may have been worth the price in making plain to the Irish people that a republic left them where they were, with the basic problem of why the Irish won't, if they can help it, live in Ireland.

The problems of India are so gigantic that courage fails the spectator (but not the Indians). But one great gain is the creation of a government that does not hesitate to face Indian abuses such as the caste system. The government of Nehru makes many mistakes, but it can, through the mouth of the Prime Minister, preach to the Indians the lesson that it is now up to them. No British government could do that. It can risk appearing "antireligious" as no British government dared risk appearing. It has not succeeded in abolishing untouchability or in winning over all the primitive tribes of India. It has not undone many centuries of limitations on the role of women. It has not succeeded in giving India what India needs badly, a competent and enlightened business class. But it has made beginnings in all these fields. It has kept India from becoming a mere "Hindustan." And it has made it possible for Indians to borrow from the West with no feeling of humiliation.

There is nothing that the new Indian government did that enlightened British officials didn't see as desirable. But, in this century, the British government in India had lost the power to innovate. An imperial power that begins to doubt its mission is rightly doomed. The old, confident, authoritarian British rulers stamped out the burning of widows, the religious murders of the Thugs, abolished backward kingdoms like Oudh and introduced in a fine philistine fashion the English language as the lingua franca of all India. These things, with the Indian army (obedient to civilian authority) and civil service (uniquely honest and competent in Asia), were great British legacies, but it was time for the British to go. Talk to an Indian who is now liberated from the need to think, all the time, in terms of national freedom, and you see the gain. He may even think that Macaulay, imposing English, had something to be said for him as he contemplates the bloody riots over languages that freedom has brought and the danger that an "Indian" national language such as Hindi may be a source of disunion and breed a new Pakistan in the south.

If this is the first, it is not the only gain. Indian nationalism may be simply the fruit of anti-British feeling, but it is a fact and gives India a new unity most necessary in a land divided by language, race, caste. It gives the Indian a new feeling of not being looked down on, and so a new freedom in his attitude to the outer world into which India has been dragged. True, the kind of dignity that nationalism breeds may be touchy, offensive, unrealistic, but there is no substitute for it. As the American Negro is no longer content to be grateful for concessions made from above, all over the world hundreds of millions of men are finding a new meaning in life, a new loyalty to something bigger than the village, the caste, the tribe.

It is not in solving immediate technical problems of well-being that the nations score over the empires. They often handle them, for quite a long time, worse than the imperial rulers did. It is in creating a new type of human being, who may not, it is true, adjust himself adequately to the New World, but at least is not doomed to fail in that adjustment as the empires finally became doomed to fail.

If the American abandons the fallacious parallel with the facts of the American Revolution (as apart from the spirit of '76) and contemplates the New World that is coming into being, he will be forced to avoid snap and easily systematic judgments (especially the judgment that assesses the worth and prospects of a new nation by its willingness to be noisily anti-Communist). He will see many nations running before they can walk—and so falling; demanding steel mills when what they need is more wells and better seed; aspiring after the heights of atomic cannon when they need to learn how to maintain a truck; above all, pouring out endless floods of what it may be too unkind to call mendacity, but can justly be called nonobjective information.

He will find few nations willing—or able—to imitate all or most of the American way of life, social, political, economic. If he wishes to help the world (as many do), he will have to learn to help it in un-American ways, to learn un-American qualities such as patience and the willingness to wait a long time for results. If what he wants is allies against communism, he will find in nationalism the most, perhaps the only effective force against international communism, even when that nationalism is unwilling to stand up and be counted. For the great battles will probably be fought in the hearts of men, not on material beaches where marines can land, but in a world now effectually united for the first time in history by material means and divided by passion and envy. One may regret the old imperial days, but the awkward and often unprogressive nationalist world is that in which we all must now live.

Anatole Litvak Receives Radio Liberation Award—Ceremonies To Be Broadcast to Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ANATOLE LITVAK RECEIVES RADIO LIBERATION AWARD—CEREMONIES TO BE BROADCAST TO SOVIET UNION

NEW YORK.—Radio Liberation has presented to a scroll to producer Anatole Litvak, attesting to his achievements in the field of motion pictures.

The presentation was made by Howland H. Sargeant, president of the American Committee for Liberation which supports Radio Liberation's around-the-clock broadcasts to the Soviet Union. Mr. Sargeant, a former Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, said it was the first such honor ever presented by Radio Liberation.

The ceremony, in which Mr. Litvak spoke in Russian, was taped for later broadcast to the Soviet Union by Radio Liberation, which has powerful transmitting facilities in West Germany and the Far East.

The Radio Liberation scroll said:

"For his outstanding achievements as producer-director of motion pictures and for his contributions to the art of cinematography, Radio Liberation—the Voice of Former Soviet Citizens—is pleased to present this statement of commendation to Anatole Litvak.

"Born in Kiev, Anatole Litvak underwent the rigorous and thorough training offered by the Dramatic School of Petrograd. He left his homeland in 1924 and since then has distinguished himself in Germany, France, Great Britain, and the United States as a producer and director of films, each bearing the imprint of his creative mastery.

"He served as an officer in the U.S. Army and was decorated by the Governments of Great Britain, France, and the United States of which he had become a citizen.

"May this statement of commendation testify not only to the towering stature of a creative artist—but also to the spiritual integrity of one no less devoted to the cause of freedom."

False Economy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, all of us who have traveled abroad are aware of the excellent U.S. Customs Service and its efficient and friendly personnel.

It has always been amazing to me that so few could handle so much so well.

Seldom do we realize, when we return from a pleasant journey abroad, that returning with us may be criminals carrying important quantities of illegal drugs. Many of them are intercepted by the Customs Service, but unfortunately some get through simply because there are not enough customs men to go around.

I submit a most timely editorial entitled "One Economy That Costs Us High" from the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N.J., of February 19, 1959, which focuses attention on this often-ignored problem:

ONE ECONOMY THAT COSTS US HIGH

Heroin, the big H of the drug traffic, is no longer of much use medically. It is inferior to morphine which it resembles, but it used to be administered instead of morphine under the mistaken impression it was less habit-forming. Its narcotic effect is almost instantaneous. Manufacture and importation of it are forbidden in the United States. It is the drug used by an estimated 95 percent of addicts.

Last weekend Federal and New York City narcotics agents in a carefully planned series of raids confiscated 32 pounds of the junk, and arrested 27 persons who were described as importers, wholesalers, and distributors. "These are not small fry," said George Gaffney, regional head of the Federal Narcotics Bureau. And he added, perhaps significantly, that none of them uses drugs. Generally the big wheels of the racket are too smart. The ones who use drugs do not stay big wheels long.

The raids were carefully planned, as they had to be. The illegal drug traffic is a rabbit warren of informers, prostitutes, perverts, all willing to sell anything, information included, for a fix. Two years went into the planning, and it was worth the trouble if big sources of supply have been stopped.

Arresting the users or even the small-fry pushers of narcotics is a necessary but rather futile aspect of halting the drug traffic. Not only must the pushers' suppliers be arrested, but the suppliers of the suppliers must be identified and rendered harmless. Most illegal narcotics are imported. The Customs Service is too badly undermanned to cope with it on all its many fronts at once. Once the stuff gets into the United States, it is distributed fast, and the job of tracking it and its distributors becomes more complicated. Fighting the drug traffic is a continuing war with no truce asked or given. Are we giving law enforcement sufficient manpower to make it anything like an equal battle?

Fiscal Problems of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include the texts of several articles which appeared in the Fort Lauderdale News. I think these articles present a true picture of the damage done to our State of Michigan by a Governor who listens to the dictates of one segment of our population rather than making an effort to answer the needs of all our citizens:

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, Dec. 9, 1958]

THE AMERICAN WAY

History is replete with the stories of men who destroyed themselves but took down with them, or first destroyed, the nations which nurtured them. And history does repeat itself, thanks to the inidifference of mankind to the lessons of the past as well as complacency in the face of the future.

Out of the third generation of a family dedicated to the cause of socialism, born and bred in an atmosphere of mistaken thought sincere hatred for what they deemed the evils of capitalism, and with an almost sublime disregard for essential economic truths, came Walter Reuther.

European conditions and limitations, not those of America, seeded the thinking of the Reuther family, beginning with old Jacob Reuther (grandfather of Walter) who left Germany with his 11-year-old son Valentine in 1892, to make a new home in America and escape military conscription for his son.

Valentine Reuther and later his children, including Walter, were apparently raised as Lutherans. It is said that Jacob modified his religion to meet his own conceptions, based largely on his belief that the churches did too much for God and not enough for man. In a belief so simple, and sincere, could grow easily the worship of man rather than the worship of God, and lead even to the atheism which many believe is that of Walter Reuther.

It is tremendously significant that Valentine Reuther trained his children in socialism. He seems to have held regular sessions on Sundays, with his four sons (Ted, Walter, Roy, and Victor) discussing and debating all manner of subjects relating to working men and women.

These meetings took place in an era when the country was discovering and fighting off some of the evils men concoct under freedom and lack of understanding. And there were evils and injustices which needed correcting, although they were not inherent in the fact of freedom of enterprise under rules of fair play with government or law as umpire.

Walter Reuther grew up actively in socialist organization, later even with violence in organization of workers. Fired from his job as a young man, he went to Europe with his brother Victor and studied communism first hand in Russia. He came home vibrating with deep fervor for the Russian system of economic control.

The point is that this man is self-consecrated to the principles of socialism and government control of economic life. His fanaticism, cold in its utter dedication, is incapable of understanding the economic truths which will eventually destroy him. The tragedy is he could easily destroy our country with a socialist dominated and guided government. Walter Reuther already controls the State of Michigan, which, alone among the Midwestern States, has gone backward in prosperity since he took over.

ALFRED P. HAAKE.

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, Nov. 21, 1958]

THE AMERICAN WAY

Hundreds of letters from individual union members to the McClellan committee of the Senate, expressed fear of reprisals if they dared sign their names to their protests against tyrannical and corrupt practices of union labor bosses.

What a travesty on our vaunted freedom when men dare not tell the truth and express their discontent with the actions of their union masters, lest they lose their jobs—or even worse.

But that is the fact. And the reason for it lies largely in the pernicious agreements between management and unions which force workers to join the union if they want to keep their jobs. It is called by several soft-soaping names, but the correct description is the "closed shop."

Under that label many a factory should hang out a sign for applicants for work: "Americans who believe in freedom are not hired here."

There is an answer to that violation of our constitutional rights. It is the "right to work" laws, already passed in 18 States, which forbid employers and union bosses to enter into closed-shop agreements.

These right-to-work laws, barring compulsory unionization, were upheld as constitutional by the Supreme Court in 1949, and sustained in principle in 1954 in the decision on segregation in public schools.

But where are the liberals who believe in freedom and constitutional rights? They weep crocodile tears over restrictions in "freedom of choice" for all citizens regardless of race, and accept without a murmur a system of private slavery under which a man cannot get or keep a job unless he joins a union, pays tribute to and takes orders from a labor boss or his goons.

They are afraid.

The power, political as well as industrial, of the UAW–CIO boss has gone far beyond a single industry and its affiliates. He makes no bones about his aim to get political control of the United States and to win his socialistic objectives through legislation. He already controls nearly a majority in both Senate and House, and may even name the next President of the United States.

And the pattern of control with closed union members serving in precincts, through which he already controls Michigan and its Governor, is being built elsewhere with alarming rapidity and thoroughness. He has more money to spend for elections than both major parties together.

Think about that, you businessmen, professional men, workers, housewives, and students getting ready to work—all of you who believe in freedom. And while you are thinking about it, let me remind you that what happens to a State, such as once industrially proud Michigan, when it falls under the domination of a little labor clique and a subservient Governor, falling backward in employment and industrial development, while its neighboring States forge ahead. Read these figures and weep:

Industrial construction, 1956–57

Ohio	$921,678,000
Indiana	889,123,000
Michigan	199,176,000

We are on the threshold of a greater prosperity than we have yet known. We can realize that prosperity and even make it endure, if we will shake off the shackles of compulsory union tyranny, and give men the right to work without fear.

ALFRED P. HAAKE.

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, Feb. 14, 1959]

FAVORABLE TAX CLIMATE AND NICE WEATHER NEEDED TO ATTRACT NEW BUSINESS

It is most unfortunate that dieting—tightening the belt—has never become fashionable among governments.

Most governmental units would look atrocious if they were capable of assuming form and appearing on the beach in bathing suits. They would present the sad sight of bulging waistlines, sagging jowls, flabby muscles, and drooping bags under the eyes.

A good diet certainly would improve their figures.

In particular, we are all in favor of Florida governments going on a biennium diet. We believe it would do a great deal toward improving the State's appearance and health.

This is the way we view it.

Across the Nation, the legislatures of 46 States are in session or will convene this year. In all but a very few instances, the paramount issues up for consideration center around new or increased taxes.

There is a plague of financial ills virtually everywhere.

One of the most seriously stricken units is the noble welfare State of Michigan, where the 10-year reign of Gov. G. Mennen (Soapy) Williams has brought the commonwealth to the bring of financial disaster.

But at the same time nearly 40 States are giving serious consideration to new or higher levies in a wide range of tax fields.

Taxpayers in nine States face personal income tax problems. Tobacco taxes are eyed in nine States. Gasoline levies are due for action in eight States. Seven States are weighing sales taxes and a like number are toying with liquor imposts.

Corporation taxes, motor vehicle fees, inheritance, natural resources, gambling, soft drinks, business franchises, restaurant meals, hotels and motels, property and head taxes are other fields where States plan attacks on the taxpayers' pocketbooks.

At the moment, Florida is among the few exceptions.

Gov. LeRoy Collins has enunciated the policy of holding the line in the 1959–61 biennium. He believes no new taxes will be necessary.

National publications, in looking over the appalling situation of State taxes, are noting Florida's position with some admiration.

And there we have a factor that can be of inestimable value to Florida.

The State has been boasting for years of its favorable tax climate. This has been used as a lure to bring individuals and businesses here.

Now, this asset becomes more important than ever.

Businesses and industries can be expected to take a close look at Florida's tax climate in drafting plans for expansion or relocation.

In the next 2 years, this may well be a vital consideration inducing concerns to locate in the State and provide the much-needed support for Florida's economy.

Cursory studies in Michigan indicate business is finding it increasingly difficult to operate there. The U.S. News & World Report for February 13 cites cases of manufacturers moving from Michigan to other States to ease the tax burden while other concerns are passing up new plants in the State for similar reasons.

The fact Governor Williams had to appeal recently to 23 of the State's largest employers for tax payments in advance to keep the government functioning has pointed up the problems graphically. Businessmen, accordingly, will have this uppermost in their minds when it comes to making future plans.

Under the circumstances, it would not be surprising to find concerns following the example of the Chris Craft Corp., which forsook Alganac, Mich., for Pompano Beach.

In the next 2 years a favorable Florida tax climate can help the State move toward its goal of a more rounded economy, one better suited to withstand a siege of poor weather in the winter season, the inevitable periods of business slowdown, and the other variations of life.

For that reason, it is important that Florida, both the State and the localities, do some governmental dieting. It is important that the people temper their demands for new and expanded services in the interests of a sounder development, in the interests of business expansion which will mean more and better jobs.

The challenge is there. The question is whether Florida can fatten its economy through a dieting government?

HARVEY CALL.

Need for a Third Federal Judge in the Western District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the story of a court's success or failure is in its statistics, for they set a standard of attainment which the court must not fall short of in each succeeding year.

The court, as a part of our governmental machinery, must be given freedom to function so that it may react consciously to the practical needs of the times and the community it serves.

It has become increasingly evident from the statistics cited in a recent article in the Buffalo Courier-Express that efficient performances cannot be expected where conditions necessary to efficiency are impossible.

An additional judgeship would make for a more democratic court and procedure answerable to the best existing public opinion.

This court has the direct and unequivocal duty of disposing of all of the business coming to it from year to year.

The safety of personal liberty, of the rights of the public and of property, depend upon the efficient, impartial enforcement of the laws of the land, which is entrusted to this court.

Long delays are expensive to the taxpayers, as well as exceedingly damaging in failing to bring about prompt satisfaction to society when a crime has been committed, and to the individual when he is falsely charged. Delay discourages the witnesses, the prosecuting atorney, and the general public in the effort to enforce the law.

I shall make a determined, sincere, constant effort to correct this evil condition of literally choking this court of the western district of New York with accumulated cases by seeking appointment of an additional judgeship for this area.

To focus attention on a national basis to a local problem, I am including an article which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on February 11, 1959, giving the statistical justification for this judgeship:

ADDED CASES POINT UP NEED FOR THIRD JUDGE

(By George Wyatt)

The need for a third Federal judge in the western district of New York is being brought into sharp focus by a substantial increase in the backlog of Federal court cases here. At the close of business yesterday there were 307 civil cases and 65 criminal cases pending.

Despite an almost doubled caseload, the western district has had only two judges at one time since 1927.

The situation has become even more critical since last summer when Judge Justin C. Morgan was incapacitated by illness. Since August 1, his last day in court, virtually the entire burden has been borne by Judge Harold P. Burke of Rochester.

The district got its second judge in 1927 when Federal authorities appointed Judge Simon L. Adler to help Judge John R. Hazel.

Now—32 years later—the number of judges remains unchanged. But those who urge appointment of a third judge point to these changes:

1. Caseload: In 1927 there were 226 civil cases filed, compared with double the number, 450, last year. There were 208 criminal cases filed in 1958, compared to 600 in 1927. However, the huge majority of the 1927 criminal cases were minor prohibition violations which were handled routinely. The modern criminal caseload involves many full jury trials.

2. Wider jurisdiction: Since 1927, literally thousands of Federal statutes have been added to the jurisdiction of the court. In the fields of labor and business alone, the judges are concerned with entire new areas of jurisdiction. Federal jurisdiction in criminal coverage in the areas of tax matters, espionage and subversion, labor racketeering, narcotics, immigration, and others has been broadened.

3. Population: The 17 counties of the district in 1930 totaled 2,208,447. The 1950 population was 2,341,042. Experts estimate it is now above 3 million.

4. Economic growth: Business analysts estimate the gross commerce of the district has nearly trebled since 1927, not counting the difference in dollar value since then. With growing commercial complexity comes matching complexity of litigation.

Lumping the 1958 criminal and civil cases, the district's two judges each had a total case load of 329. The national median caseload for Federal judges about 250.

During Judge Morgan's illness, Judge Burke has had to travel here for court sessions on an average of at least once a week. When he comes the work load is staggering.

On an average day he will handle upward of two dozen cases, including arraignments, sentencings and civil motions.

The trial calendar in both Buffalo and Rochester has been slowed. There have been no nonjury civil cases in Buffalo, for example, since last July.

The operation of Federal grand juries here also has been hampered. Although not necessary, it is customary to have a judge present when a grand jury is in session.

Repeated delays occur when the grand jury is awaiting Judge Burke's return here for rulings. This has become a serious element in the Federal grand jury's lengthy probe of the city paving scandals and of the Appalachian-linked western New Yorkers.

Legislative Oversight, Spectrum, Study, and Investigation—H.R. 4800

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today I had the special honor and privilege of speaking to the Federal Communications Bar Association, composed of distinguished members of the legal profession. I was very glad to have had an invitation to speak to this particular group at this particular time. It gave me an opportunity to discuss with them some most important problems in which I knew they had a great interest, as does the American public.

In that my remarks were directed to the work of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and with particular reference to the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight, our plans for this Congress, some exposures of false claims in a recent book, and a discussion of the bill introduced as a result of our committee last year, I thought perhaps the Members might be interested, and therefore include it in the RECORD with these remarks:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE OREN HARRIS, CHAIRMAN, INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS BAR ASSOCIATION, HOTEL WILLARD, FEBRUARY 26, 1959

Mr. President, members of the Federal Communications Bar Association, honored guests, I welcome this opportunity of appearing before you today. I feel you could hardly have chosen a better time for this discussion because there are several important developments that I would like to talk to you about, and I doubt whether I could find a more interested audience since the things I want to discuss with you are of great importance to you, your clients, and the FCC.

In the first place, there has been a lot of speculation and wide interest in the future program of our committee. I am speaking of our plans for further study and investigation pursuant to the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. From the experience we had in the last Congress, I can readily understand this interest.

In our committee report filed January 3 this year, we made recommendations on a variety of questions that needed further study and investigation. I have no other intention than to carry out these recommendations.

In view of the fact that so many of these questions are highly sensitive, I felt it advisable to ask for a budget separate from the other work of our committee in order that the Congress and the public would know just what we had in mind.

You are familiar with the announcement of a few days ago with respect to the reestablishment of the Legislative Oversight Committee.

On Monday of this week, I introduced a resolution requesting $350,000 for the committee to make the special study and investigation. I went before the House Administration Committee and explained our purpose. The committee approved the funds for this work and yesterday reported to the House. It being a privileged matter, the chairman of the committee called it up for consideration. With little discussion and a few pertinent questions, the House approved the request and made the full amount of $350,000 available to the committee.

In the budget that I submitted to the House Administration Committee, $200,000 was for the purpose of continuing the work of the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight. Obviously, we have not had time as yet to get together a staff, since the funds were obtained only yesterday.

I want to make it perfectly clear, however, that the committee will use the greatest precaution in obtaining the kind of a staff that is needed and which will carry out the plans and policies of the committee for a forthright, fearless, fair and objective study and investigation.

We have not had an opportunity to formulate specific plans and a program, but the pattern is fairly well established in our recommendations contained in the report filed January 3.

In the second place, we asked and obtained $150,000 to make a study of what I believe to be one of the most important problems we have today which is of tremendous concern and interest to the American public, that is a study of the proper utilization of the radio spectrum.

Many of the situations which we dealt with in the Oversight Subcommittee are a direct result of the scarcity of desirable spectrum space available for broadcasting purposes.

It is my intention to have our regular Subcommittee on Communications and Power study the present and prospective utilization of the radio spectrum and have it also study the proper governmental machinery and procedures to bring about an efficient utilization of the spectrum.

As you well know, at present there is divided responsibility between the President and the FCC for the allocation of frequencies for governmental and nongovernmental purposes. The demand for spectrum space has grown to such an extent and is expected to grow still further at such speed that it is dubious whether the divided responsibility can bring about an efficient utilization of the spectrum. The spectrum situation may be analogous to the situation which did exist with respect to the use of the airspace by military, commercial, and private planes, and which led during the last Congress to the creation of the unified Federal Aviation Agency.

I consider this study one of the most important ones which our committee can undertake in the field of communications. We shall seek to retain an expert staff to make

this study, and the outcome of this study may affect you, your clients, and the American people most importantly.

Thirdly, most of you know that a week ago I introduced a bill, H.R. 4800, to carry out the legislative recommendations made by the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight in its report to the Congress at the end of the last session. The hearings on which this report was based commenced in January 1958 and continued through November 1958. The hearing record of more than 11,000 pages, exclusive of exhibits, is probably not much shorter than the sum total of news stories that have been written about these hearings, and the individuals involved in these hearings as well as the Members of Congress who conducted them.

One aspect of the hearings, which particularly seems to have intrigued the press, is the proven or alleged misconduct of certain members of the commissions which were under investigation, of parties involved in proceedings before these commissions, and of other persons in public or private life interested in some of these proceedings.

Now, I don't want to deny for a moment that improper or unethical conduct by members of the regulatory commissions and commission employees, by parties and practitioners before these agencies, by persons in the executive branch or in the Congress, constitutes a most serious and difficult problem which ought to be given proper attention and that such conduct ought to be prevented in the future. However, I want to emphasize that even if all the commissioners and all of the persons in public and private life who are concerned with proceedings before these agencies were angels, there still would be other crucial problems in connection with the operation of these agencies which the Congress must come to grips with and on which the American people must be well informed.

Many of you probably have read recent newspaper stories about a book written by a former counsel of the Special Oversight Subcommittee. A few of you even may have read the book. Now, I could spend all of the time which you have allowed me here today in pointing out misstatements of fact and erroneous assumptions and conclusions made by the author. However, I doubt that you would want me to take the time, and I am reasonably sure that it would not be time well spent.

I have thus far refrained from making any comment publicly. However, there are two or three things I would like to say now which I think would be appropriate.

In the first place, even though our committee, in my opinion, accomplished a lot and did a good job in the last Congress, I would be one of the first to admit that some mistakes were made in connection with such a difficult and sensitive task.

In fact, about the first and perhaps the most serious mistake the committee made was that it employed Dr. Schwartz as its chief counsel.

When he was interviewed by the committee and presented with the policy statement previously adopted by the committee, he complimented the statement and thought it constituted a very fine and objective approach. After he became employed, he apparently forgot or else arbitrarily failed to proceed in accordance with the committee policy.

I would never question anyone's right to his ideas on a matter of principle. I do seriously take issue, however, with the methods, tactics, and procedures employed by Dr. Schwartz. I could not agree with them from the first public utterances he made before the Federal Bar Association. This was the major reason for what later developed.

He was determined either to rule or ruin. In my opinion, and as illustrated in his book, he proposes to change completely our fundamental principle of regulatory commissions. (Ch. 2 of the book.)

In other words, the book itself is the most outstanding proof of why the committee should never have employed him. He admits to defiance of the committee and he asserts that it was his purpose and responsibility to make the policies and conduct the investigation according to his own views and procedure.

Having been completely unsuccessful with his tactics, he proceeded to write a book. As for the sharp criticism and personal reflections on me, I care little. I did observe the one compliment, which must have been an oversight, when he referred to me as a "most urbane denizen."

Just let me mention two or three of the false and inaccurate claims:

There is reference to the Albany television case in which Mr. Hagerty was involved.

There was nothing at any time called to the atention of the committee about any problem relating to the Albany TV comparative television case. Neither I nor any other member of the committee received any information from the staff or anyone else until after the expiration of the committee in January, and you have recently seen the publicity.

Dr. Schwartz undertakes to claim credit for the Adams-Goldfine fiasco. There was nothing in the files referring to this matter in any way, with the exception of one memorandum from the Federal Trade Commission which in no way referred to Mr. Adams. Dr. Schwartz gave no information to the committee in public hearings or in executive session, and there was nothing at that time developed on it.

Two staff investigators had obtained the information regarding Commissioner Mack and the channel 10 question. However, this information had not been put together and developed for presentation at the time the committee terminated the services of Dr. Schwartz.

In other words, not only are the claims false, but it again emphasizes his attitude in withholding information from the committee itself.

The book reconfirms my earlier conviction that the author has not as yet grasped the scope of the task assigned to the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee, and that he preferred to follow his own notions of what the subcommittee should investigate instead of carrying out the detailed policies which had been laid down by the subcommittee for the scope and conduct of this investigation. In other words, while he was counsel of the subcommittee and still at the present time, he is almost exclusively concerned with the problem of improper conduct and what to do about it, as if that problem, serious though it is, was the only or even the foremost problem that confronts us in dealing with the independent regulatory agencies and their operation in the public interest.

Under these circumstances, the most important task of the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee, namely a thorough study of the functioning or malfunctioning of the independent regulatory agencies, beyond improper conduct, and of the causes of and the possible remedies for such malfunctioning still lies ahead of us.

That does not mean that the job which the subcommittee has done to date is insignificant. Quite the contrary. I feel that the accomplishments of the subcommittee to date are very substantial, and it is my hope that the bill which I have just introduced and which carries out the legislative recommendations of the Oversight Subcommittee will be enacted into law.

The process by which a bill becomes law is fortunately a slow one. This process offers ample opportunity to all interested parties of making their views known to the Congress. I trust I am correct in believing that you are interested parties, and I appeal to you that you give the provisions of this bill your careful attention both in your own interest and in the interest of your clients and most of all in the interest of the American people.

I appreciate, of course, that the Federal Communications Bar Association cannot take any position with respect to substantive matters. You represent different classes of clients who have divergent interests and it would be too much to expect that you or your clients would agree as to the substantive provisions of the Communications Act. However, H.R. 4800 deals primarily with organizational and procedural problems, and these problems, I feel, are a proper subject for discussion by the Federal Communications Bar Association. It is my hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will have the benefit of detailed and specific recommendations of your association with respect to this legislation. Your constructive criticism and your suggestions for amendments as well as your support for the principles on which this bill is based will be most welcome.

Let us take a brief look at some of the provisions of H.R. 4800. Title I of the bill relates to the FCC exclusively. The other titles of the bill deal with the remaining five of the six big independent regulatory commissions. The provisions for all of the agencies are substantially identical.

Section 101 sets forth the policy. The bill is intended to strengthen the independence and effectiveness of the independent regulatory agencies and to increase the public confidence in their efficient, fair, and independent operation. These objectives are to be reached by taking the following actions: (1) Guarding against improper influence upon and improper conduct of agency members and employees; (2) observing ethical standards by members, employees, parties and practitioners; (3) preventing of off-the-record communications; (4) selecting chairman by agencies themselves; (5) assuming of individual responsibility by commissioners for preparation of agency opinions; and (6) making uniform the President's power to dismiss commissioners for cause.

Section 102 which contains definitions is a most important section because it defines the term "proceeding" and thereby outlines the boundaries of the key provisions of the bill. I want to call to your attention particularly subsection (b) of section 102 which has the effect of making applicable to certain rule-making proceedings the prohibition against off-the-record communications and the requirement that all communications made concerning such rule-making proceeding be placed in the public files of such proceeding. The rule-making proceedings to which this prohibition and this requirement apply, however, are only those in which the Commission actually undertakes an "on-the-record-only proceeding" and where a notice of proposed rule-making to this effect has been issued.

It seems to us that in those cases of rule-making, the Commission holds out to the participants and to the public generally that only on-the-record communications will be taken into consideration by the Commission, and therefore there is no room for any other communications. I realize, this may be an innovation and may go beyond the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. However, I believe it is desirable to make this change.

Section 103 outlines in general terms criteria of improper influence by parties and others upon the Commission and of improper conduct by Commission members and employees. The Commission is directed to prescribe regulations implementing and supplementing these provisions. While the

criminal provisions of the bill do not apply to this section, I want to call to your attention certain provisions of subsection (d) of section 103. In order to bring about compliance with this section, the Commission is directed to establish procedures for considering and acting on complaints, and the Commission is authorized to issue reprimands and take other disciplinary action, including suspension or disqualification of persons appearing in a representative capacity before the Commission, or take other action which may be warranted in particular instances, including action against the parties to the proceeding. This is a most important power which the Commission would be given, and, in my opinion, this power is necessary if the provisions against improper influence and improper conduct are to be enforced effectively.

Sections 104 and 105 dealing with off-the-record communications and the requirement as to placing certain communications in the public files of proceedings, may perhaps be considered the heart of the bill. We appreciate that exceptions may have to be made with regard to these provisions in order to promote the expeditious and efficient discharge by the Commission of its duties, and in order to secure the cooperation of other agencies of Government. Nobody knows better than the Commission and the attorneys who regularly appear before the Commission how broad these exceptions should be. Under the bill, the Commission would have three months from the date of enactment of this legislation to prescribe the regulations setting forth the exceptions from the prohibition against off-the-record communications. I trust, the Commission can count on your assistance and scrutiny in prescribing proper exceptions, and proper exceptions only.

Please note carefully that the criminal penalties of section 107 apply to sections 104 and 105 as well as section 106(a) which provides for the filing of a notice of appearance by any person who appears for himself or in a representative capacity in any proceeding or matter before the Commission. The hearings before the Oversight Subcommittee developed several situations in which parties had two teams to represent them—an on-the-record team and another one whose existence was not even known to the attorneys who did ther best to represent their clients in accordance with the regular procedures of the Commission. This kind of influence peddling has to stop, and section 106 is designed to help stop it.

Section 111 provides that the Commission shall choose its own Chairman and Vice Chairman. The term of the Chairman is not to exceed 3 years. The Chairman, after serving a full term, may not again serve as Chairman until a full term has elapsed.

The purpose of this provision is undoubtedly clear to all of you, as is the purpose of section 112 which provides for the assumption of individual responsibility by Commissioners for the preparation of agency opinions. Such opinion is to be signed by the member of the Commission who was responsible for its preparation. Specialization in opinion preparation according to types of cases is prohibited.

Several of the big six independent regulatory agencies are already following this practice and the results, according to the testimony before our subcommittee, have been very salutory.

I believe all of you will welcome section 113 which provides that failure of the Commission to act on motions for procedural or interlocutory relief within 60 days shall be treated as a denial of such motion.

Section 114 repeals the honorarium provision now contained in the Federal Communications Act, and section 115 repeals the provision establishing the "Review Staff" and the provision prohibiting certain off-the-record communications. These provisions were added by the McFarland act. The reasons for their repeal are apparent: the provisions of H.R. 4800 are either in conflict with or go beyond the provisions which are to be repealed.

This concludes my very brief review of some of the key provisions of H.R. 4800 which are applicable to the FCC. I appeal again to you to study with care the provisions of this bill, to come forward with your constructive criticism and suggestions because we are most anxious to make this the best possible legislation, and you appreciate that we shall be legislating in a most critical and sensitive area.

It has been a pleasure to be with you today, and I hope that this day will mark the beginning of renewed efforts for fruitful cooperation between your association and our committee. Thank you.

Pennypinching That Aids Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Santa Monica, Calif., Evening Outlook of January 12, 1959:

PENNYPINCHING THAT AIDS CRIME

The Port of Los Angeles is the favorite west coast port of entry for dope smugglers trying to bring their illicit and highly profitable wares into the United States. For reasons of geography as well as population, it is especially favored by smugglers getting their supplies from Red China, the world's principal source of heroin, and also from Mexico. With huge profits and also dire penalties at stake, dope smugglers find many ways to hide their small packets of contraband and to disguise their occupation. It takes officials of long experience and expert training in this field to catch them.

It might therefore be expected that the U.S. customs service would keep at least a minimum staff of such experts on duty at the Port of Los Angeles, adequate to the big and exacting job of watching out for dope smugglers on incoming ships. Yet when a wave of economy hit the U.S. customs in 1958, orders went out from Washington that have the effect of reducing all personnel, including those of ship inspectors at the Port of Los Angeles.

This arbitrary order, preventing replacement of any customs employee who is shifted elsewhere, or who dies or is retired, has resulted in the skeletonizing of a Port of Los Angeles force of inspectors that was already understaffed. During the week of Christmas, three large ships entered this port which should have been thoroughly searched for dope smugglers. But only two inspectors were available. They could not do the job in the brief time allowed them.

The austerity program, as it is called by Washington, recognizes that practically every office is faced with an increase in business and many are in urgent need of additional personnel. Yet it includes numerous pennypinching measures. Cause of the austerity is failure of Congress to provide $300,000 additional funds to compensate for mandatory wage and salary increases to Bureau personnel.

We are all for economy in Government when it eliminates unnecessary services, waste, duplication, or costly monuments to bureaucracy. But the economy practiced by the Customs Bureau at the Port of Los Angeles and other major U.S. ports has pared a few hundred thousand dollars off the Government's payroll at the cost of weakening the public's protection against the most nefarious and costly traffic in the world today. And not only the public's protection aaginst the drug traffic, but against a large proportion of our major crimes which are traceable to drugs.

"For want of a nail, the shoe was lost—for want of a shoe, etc." The number of drug addicts in California has been growing at an appalling rate, and such leading authorities as J. Edgar Hoover emphasizes that we must stamp out the drug traffic before we can reduce the incidence of crime. The pennypinching imposed on the U.S. Customs Service is a move in the reverse direction, opening our ports to the dope smugglers.

Tax Incentive To Invest Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of February 20, 1959:

WALL STREET, U.S.A.
(By Donald I. Rogers)

TAX INCENTIVE TO INVEST ABROAD

One of the more constructive campaigns being conducted in Washington these days is being managed by Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana, who holds promise of a boon to U.S. taxpayers and both individual and corporate investors who seek to expand their foreign investment activities.

Representative BOGGS has introduced a bill (H.R. 5) "to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage private investment abroad and thereby promote American industry and reduce Government expenditures for foreign economic assistance." No one can quarrel wtih the aims and intentions of this bill.

Representative BOGGS' bill clearly recognizes that valid tax incentives are most essential to the advancement of private foreign investment by American citizens. In his speeches he has made another equally valid point—that tax reductions to encourage increased private investment abroad should be regarded as part of our national security program, particularly in view of the mounting economic offensive of the Soviet Union.

There's a weight of solid evidence to prove that tax incentives can stimulate portfolio investment abroad, as well as direct investment by U.S. corporations. One need only look across the northern boundary to find an outstanding example in the record of the publicly held Canadian investment companies established since 1954.

Since 1954 eight publicly held Canadian investment companies have been formed in response to the hospitable treatment afforded under Canadian laws. To qualify their shares for sale in the United States, they registered under the United States investment company act of 1940 and the securities act of 1933.

In little more than 4 years more than 129,000 United States investors, large and small, have put about $393 million to work principally in Canada, through these professionally managed companies, according to the Committee of Canadian Investment Companies. The average individual holding in the securities of these companies was in excess of $3,000 an investor at the close of 1958.

Why the success of these companies? How have they managed to attract so much long-term individual investment for the securities of companies contributing to the long-range growth of Canada and other free world nations?

There are three basic answers:

1. They have offered United States investors an opportunity to get diversification and informed investment management supervision of foreign securities.

2. They have offered United States investors an opportunity to avail themselves of certain tax incentives offered by Canadian laws to attract needed capital—incentives unimpaired under United States tax laws.

3. They have offered United States investors an opportunity to make long-term foreign investments without being subject to the many inconveniences that ordinarily arise in connection with foreign investments.

By policy, Canadian investment companies retain and reinvest both their net income and capital gains that may be realized. They thus compound the possible long-term capital gains benefits for their shareholders at low tax cost and keep their resources continuously at work, principally in the economy of Canada. Since Canada does not tax capital gains the publicly held Canadian portfolio companies are not subject to such a tax. And, as Canadian corporations, they may retain and plow back their current income without penalty. Thus, under consistent and long-standing United States tax policy, they have given the United States portfolio investors the type of incentives and opportunities to participate in foreign investment that have long been available to the direct United States corporate investor.

The response of United States investors to these opportunities clearly illustrates that a new and effective pattern has been created for stimulating private investment abroad.

This pattern can be extended, with similarly desirable and long-term benefits, to other receptive developing nations.

Maintaining these incentives and improving them, as the Boggs bill would do, cannot help but motivate both direct and portfolio investment abroad.

Statement of Peter Volid, of Barrington, Ill., Chairman of the Board of King Korn Stamp Co., of Chicago, Upon Receiving the Horatio Alger Award Presented by the American Schools and Colleges Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am appending a statement by Peter Volid, chairman of the board of King Korn Stamp Co. of Chicago, upon receiving the Horatio Alger Award presented by the American Schools and Colleges Association. His friends report that Mr. Volid is proud indeed to be numbered among such men as have been chosen to symbolize America's "rags to riches dream come true."

The rise of Peter Volid is a tribute not only to his own genius but equally to the American free enterprise system which has made this country great.

Mr. Volid, owner and manager of King Korn Stamp Co., succeeded in increasing the annual gross of that company within a period of less than 4 years from nothing to an estimated $10 million. His business life, from its inception, contained meteoric force. Following 2 years' attendance at Sheldon High School in Chicago, he started out, in 1922, as a door-to-door peddler of ham, bacon, hosiery, and notions. He later became Wisconsin representative for Brillo steel wool and then worked for a Chicago macaroni company in the early 1930's. When he had saved up $2,000, Peter Volid set himself up in business as a food broker. With perspicuity, realizing that few companies specialized in marshmallows, he set himself up as a marshmallow maker and seller by borrowing $3,000 from 29 persons. He himself sold his own products—and sold them so successfully that in 1951, at 54 years of age, he retired. In 1952, however, he was asked by Thriftway Stores to make a management survey of their chain—and later to organize and run the premium stamp business of that company, which they had decided to start. Before the end of 1 year, Mr. Volid bought out the founders of the company. He had increased the number of stores using the stamps to 1,000. The revenues therefrom rose consistently until in 1956 they amounted to $7 million. Small wonder that in describing Mr. Volid's miraculous rise, a national magazine titled its article, "Something for Nothing."

In appending the following statement of Mr. Volid, whom I am proud to claim as a constituent of the 13th District of Illinois, I would personally recommend his words as a renewed challenge and answer to those whose faith in America and its free system will never die:

Opportunities for the young people of today who are entering their chosen fields in the business world are greater now than at any other time in our Nation's history.

However, these young people must, it seems to me, set a plan for the future and follow it. They must first of all decide what their objectives and goals are; then they should make a realistic study of what it will take in the way of sacrifice, energy, and hard work to realize those goals. Finally, they must be willing to pursue their goals with unswerving persistence.

If a youth can apply this simple formula, there is no limit as to what he or she can achieve. America today is in the throes of an industrial, business and commercial, and scientific revolution that has known no equal in days gone by. And to the ambitious youth, who is not afraid of the time tested techniques of hard work and persistent application of effort, there is no direction to go but up—up to greater heights than were heretofore possible by ourselves and our predecessors.

The youth of today must not be influenced by those who say that the economy is a saturated one—that one today cannot forge ahead and receive just recognition without influence or powerful connections—or that the saga of Horatio Alger is a dead one in the country. Just as these Horatio Alger award winners on this stage today overcame every conceivable obstacle to rise to great achievement and heights in their fields, so today, there are thousands of youngsters all over America who have begun their climb up the ladder, and who will be the success stories of tomorrow.

You must remember that these men, 30, 40, 50 years ago heard the same basic discouragements that you will hear today. Yet they managed to rise above their meager beginnings. And so can you by applying and living the same techniques that they did.

Persistence and hard work applied over a long period of time can turn the medicore into a giant. One need not be blessed with great mental or physical strengths; but merely a determination and a will to work hard.

In most cases the rest, brilliance, wisdom, knowledge, commonsense, will all come as the determination and hard work is applied. One must also not be afraid of failure. For it is only through failure that one can learn and profit by his mistakes. If you refuse to stretch yourself and hence run the risk of failure, you can never grow. The only fact that must be remembered is that after failure, you must recognize your mistakes and try again, the next time avoiding the pitfalls of the last experience.

A Long Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am happy to insert the following richly deserved tribute to the Honorable William A. Wachenfeld that appeared in the Newark Evening News of February 24, 1959.

Judge Wachenfeld's career exemplifies the truth of the statement that the "expression and perfection of the law" come only from men endowed with a rich spirit, full learning and humility of soul. His integrity, intellectual capacity, and devotion to duty have won Judge Wachenfeld the respect and esteem of his fellow citizens. As the editorial states, Judge Wachenfeld's "retirement brings to a close a public career of unusual length and commendable performance." He takes with him into retirement the gratitude of the people of New Jersey and their best wishes that the years ahead will return to him in good measure the health and happiness he has earned.

A LONG CAREER

It's hard to realize that the seemingly ageless William A. Wachenfeld is 70, but he is. And today, in obedience to the constitution, he must step down from the supreme court seat he has occupied 12 years.

Before that he served 13 years as prosecutor of Essex County. Next year will bring the 50th anniversary of his graduation from law school. A busy lawyer, he found time for politics and public affairs. He might have been governor had he not twice refused to be a candidate.

William Wachenfeld was not everyone's idea of a supreme court justice when Gov-

ernor Edge appointed him in 1946. Vigorous and combative and brusque of speech, he seemed better fitted for administrative office.

It was out of character for him to sit patiently through the endless, often tenuous, argument which judges must endure, and he himself doubted that he had the temperamental requisites for the bench. Nevertheless, he made the adjustment successfully, becoming one of the court's most useful members.

As might have been expected, he became a notable dissenter. Some of his disagreements with his colleagues were scholarly explorations; others, especially those dealing with criminal law, consisted of a single scathing paragraph or page.

His retirement brings to a close a public career of unusual length and commendable performance.

A Worthy Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial, which appeared in the February 19 issue of the Jesup Sentinel, paying tribute to Miss Gussie Sutton.

Miss Sutton, well known and recognized throughout Jesup and Wayne County as one of its most outstanding citizens, was presented the first Kiwanis award of the year on February 13 at the annual Kiwanis ladies' night program. Miss Sutton is city clerk of the city of Jesup.

The editorial follows:

A WORTHY TRIBUTE

Rev. Albert Hall, pastor of the First Methodist Church in Jesup, presented most effectually the feelings, respect, and admiration of the people of Jesup and Wayne County, last Friday night, when he presented, on behalf of the Jesup Kiwanis Club, the club's first Kiwanis Award of the Year to Miss Gussie Sutton.

Miss Gussie, as she is affectionately known, has through the years gained the respect and admiration of every person with whom she has come in contact and has been one of the main supports of the present city manager form of city government. Miss Gussie served as city clerk of Jesup prior to the establishment of the present system of city government. She succeeded the late Don Surrency as clerk of the city of Jesup and has served under two city managers.

In honoring Miss Gussie, and presenting the first Kiwanis Award of the Year before more than a hundred Kiwanians and guests, who gave a standing ovation of approval to the praise spoken and the presentation of the award to the city's beloved Miss Gussie, Rev. Albert Hall took the opportunity to condemn those people who look toward the destination of the city rather than for its good.

He pointed out the dangers and results of people starting or assisting in the spread of vicious and unfounded rumors and that such people can destroy more good than a complete community can build in many years.

We join with Reverend Hall, officials and members of the Jesup Kiwanis Club and the people of Wayne County, in paying long-overdue praise to one of Jesup's most capable, unselfish, and beloved citizens. Miss Gussie has demonstrated to all those with whom she has come in contact her unselfish devotion to duty, and her willingness to serve her fellowman at every opportunity. Such an award could not have been deserved more, nor been awarded to a more deserving person.

We also commend Rev. Albert Hall for the outstanding presentation, and for bringing to the attention of the people of Jesup and Wayne County one of its growing evils, an evil that appears to have gained such a firm hold upon the community that it is rapidly taking its place as the greatest problem of the city, that of the spreading of vicious rumors.

An unfounded rumor started as an innocent little falsehood, often becomes a vicious evil that can destroy the very life of any community. Not only is the person who started the rumor at fault, but those people who, often without thinking, assist in the spread of its evil fangs, are contributing as much or more toward the destruction of their community and their people as any other person.

An unfounded truth, a little falsehood, or a vicious deliberate rumor, started for the purpose of destroying a person, and caused to grow, through the support and assistance of people, who, "heard that so and so was reported to be such and such," can not only destroy the person to whom it was directed but the very community in which it was started.

Jesup and Wayne County has grown and prospered through the past 10 years, gaining for itself the reputation as one of the State's faster growing cities, and one to which its citizens could point with pride. Within recent weeks these characteristics which have contributed so much to its growth, and its reputation is fast fading into the background, and taking their place as the growing reputation of a city of vicious rumors, or unfounded truths, and a divided people, neither satisfied with its progress and its accomplishments, but striving in its evil way to uproot the good that has been done and the progress made.

Unthinkingly many of the better people of the city have joined hands with this effort to destroy the very lifeblood of the community, in joining with the rumor-makers, and helping in passing them on to others in the city.

We join with Reverend Hall and others of the city in urging that we stop and take stock of our individual lives, see if we are assets to our community, see if this community is a better place for our children to live, for our having lived and worked here, or have we joined hands with those who would destroy what others have worked so hard to accomplish.

The Jesup way of life is a good way of life, all of us should join hands in an effort to stamp out every false rumor, every effort to destroy those things that have made us a great little city.

Shining On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Hollywood, Calif., Legionnaire for February 1959:

SHINING ON
(By P. A. "Dick" Horton)

One of our national heroes who seemed to best represent the common man of America, was Abraham Lincoln. His birth in a hand-hewn log house; his modest and frugal childhood; his guidance from a kind and understanding mother and his own determination to educate himself were character moulding factors that have always appealed to the American people. His life, more than any other American has given hope and inspiration to the youth of our land. That, regardless of social or economic station in life Americans all have equal opportunities to reach the highest position of trust in our land.

During Lincoln's day our people held a deep respect, loyalty and gratitude for Washington and the knowledge that he was more responsible than any other person for the winning of our freedom, for the adoption of our Constitution and for the building of the first Nation on earth dedicated to the religious and political freedom of mankind.

Lincoln's reverence and respect for Washington are revealed in his statement: "To add brightness to the sun, or glory to the name of Washington, are alike impossible. Let none attempt it, and in its ageless, deathless splendor leave it, shining on."

The Nation was at that time less than a century old. Many were still alive whose fathers had been companions of Washington. Our people were proud, very proud of the accomplishment of both of these two noble Americans. Loyalty, integrity, patriotism, and faith were the guiding words, spirit, and conduct of Americans. The most odious word in the English language was treason.

OUR CHANGING WORLD

Following World War I, the world was aflame with the hatred built up by centuries of turmoil, strife, plottings, trickery, and ambitions of European politicians. New tyrants had risen in Italy, Germany, and Russia. Each of these tyrants were determined to conquer the world or destroy it. Propaganda or brainwashing became an advanced art.

The old Grecian method of appeasing the masses was used under the banner of socialism and false promises of equality, position and goods. Hitler called his socialism "nazism"; Mussolini called his socialism "fascism"; Stalin called his socialism "communism." While the approach differed slightly, the objective was the same in every instance, to enforce conformity under the iron rule of dictatorship under the penalty of death or even worse.

Serene in our belief it could not happen here, our people were aroused by diligent members of patriotic societies and particularly the American Legion. One piece of evidence after another was furnished by patriots who found plottings, schemings, and propaganda of the agents of these foreign groups. Most of this material was received with a shrug. Veterans, patriots, Americans were crucified for daring to suggest that there were those among us that worked for our downfall. Treason is an ugly word.

Patriotic members of the American Legion and other groups realized that unless we could soon obtain an official government body with its cloak of authority to investigate and expose these traitors in our midst, it would soon be too late to save our beloved America.

The National Americanism Commissioner, Homer Challiaeux, and the united efforts of the members of the Legion in every State in the Union, and including the writer in the State of California, pleaded with our Congress, individually and collectively, until we had at last obtained the appointment of a committee in Congress known as the

Un-American Activities Committee. Enemies of this committee have attempted to destroy it ever since its organization. But year after year patriots have risen to its defense.

History will write of the noble work it has done and how it has exposed the traitors in our midst. How it exposed the machinations of the Remingtons, the Harry Dexter Whites, the Alger Hisses, and those thousands of men and women of foreign ideals who have come to our shores determined to destroy all that those two noble men, Washington and Lincoln, had worked so diligently to obtain.

The need for this committee is greater now than at any other time in our Nation's history. It is stated that the Civil Liberties Union and other organizations whose loyalty to our country has long been submerged by their sympathy for Communist causes intend to file a petition of 2 million names demanding a discontinuance of the Un-American Activities Committee.

We must all ask ourselves, Are we less loyal than our fathers; is conformity and slavery a good substitute for liberty? Do we lack the energy to defend our country or protect it from the fanatics who would destroy it?

Our Congress is now in session. How deeply are you interested in your country's future? Write to your Congressmen. Write to your Senators and express your views on this matter.

When the shades of night have fallen and you are nestled in the bosom of your family secure in the rights guaranteed you under our Constitution, take time to pray to God that we may continue the America of Washington and Lincoln, and that the light of liberty be kept shining on.

Repeal Excise Taxes on Telephone Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my belief that the Federal excise taxes on local and long distance telephone services, which, with other excise taxes, were imposed on the citizens of our Nation as war-time measures, should be repealed. I was, therefore, pleased when the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia recently passed a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact during the current session of Congress, legislation repealing said excise taxes on local and long distance telephone services and other communication services. So that other Members of the House may be advised of the action taken by the Georgia House of Representatives, I am, under leave to extend my remarks, inserting house resolution No. 212, introduced by Mr. Downing Musgrove, of Clinch County in the Eighth Congressional District of Georgia, as follows:

H.R. 212

Whereas the Congress of the United States during World War II, as an emergency measure, levied the Federal excise tax upon the charges for local telephone service and increased the tax rates on long distance telephone service and other communication services for the purposes of raising needed funds for the war effort and of discouraging the unnecessary use of services and materials needed to carry on the war; and

Whereas the emergency ended many years ago, and the principal purposes for enacting the Federal excise taxes on local and long distance telephone services no longer exist; and

Whereas historically, a Federal excise tax on telephone services has never been imposed on the American public except in times of emergency; and

Whereas telephone service has become an essential household and business service and is an everyday necessity for nearly everyone; and

Whereas telephone service is the only household utility service that is subject to a Federal excise tax; and

Whereas the Federal excise taxes on telephone services are discriminatory, unfair, have outlived their justification and should no longer be continued in effect; and

Whereas measures which would effect the repeal of these taxes on communication services are now pending in the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, That we do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact during the current session of Congress legislation repealing said excise taxes on local and long distance telephone services and other communication services: and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives transmit a duly authenticated copy of this resolution to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, to the chairman of the Finance Committee of the U.S. Senate, and to each member of the Georgia delegation in Congress.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Pittsburgh chapter of the Lithuanian American Council, on February 15, 1959, commemorating the 41st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania:

Resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., sponsored by the Lithuanian American Council of Pittsburgh, and held February 15, 1959, at the Lithuanian Citizens Hall, Pittsburgh, to commemorate the 41st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania:

"Whereas in 1940 the Soviet Union in conspiracy with the Hitlerite Germany and in brutal violation of all treaties and obligations, signed by her, invaded Lithuania with armed forces and against the will of the people, annexed her to the Communist empire; and

"Whereas since that time the freedom of Lithuanian people is suppressed by cruel means of the Communist dictatorship which strives to dominate all the world; and

"Whereas the fate of Lithuania as well as of other subjugated eastern European nations will depend on the success of the foreign policy of the United States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this gathering of loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., calls upon the Government of the United States to stand firm against the expansion of Communist imperialism and do all in its power to liberate the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain; be it further

"*Resolved*, That this meeting urges the Government of United States to continue its opposition to the United Nations' Draft Code of Offenses which prohibits lending assistance to and liberation of captive nations; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That the Government of United States refrain from signing any new treaties with the Soviet Union until the latter agrees to restore freedom and sovereign rights to Lithuania and the other enslaved European nations."

STANLEY F. BAKANAS,
Secretary.

As Others See Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the February 11, 1959, Norfolk, Nebr., Daily News that was reprinted in the Charlevoix Courier of Charlevoix, Mich., on February 19, 1959.

The editor of the Charlevoix Courier had wisely commented in part as follows:

Now and then it might be to our advantage to see ourselves as others see us.

How true. And we may well ask the question "Just what is the chief executive of Michigan, the political head of one of the great industrial States in our Nation doing to continue the State's preeminence and to encourage the entry into the State of new industries?" We might also inquire, "What is the Governor doing to create a fiscal environment in our State that is conducive to expanding job opportunities so that our highly skilled labor can have jobs that are better jobs through private enterprise rather than poorer jobs through Government enterprise?"

The editorial reprint I referred to at the outset of my remarks follows:

AS OTHERS SEE US

(We who live in Michigan may be more or less complacent about the situation in our State government. Now and then it might be to our advantage to see ourselves as others see us. With that in mind we offer the following editorial, "Michigan Shows What Happens," which appeared February 11, 1959 in the Norfolk, Nebr., Daily News.—Editor's Comment.)

The State of Michigan might be called a guinea pig by which we are able to test the effects of too free spending.

Its experience is significant because it has been for several years under the control of influences that have moved into the Federal field. Gov. G. Mennen Williams, a presidential hopeful, has been in the State House for five terms. He has been so closely associated with Walter Reuther, UAW head, that some have called Reuther the power behind the throne.

Under this regime Michigan has spent herself virtually bankrupt.

The condition of the treasury is such that, in order to meet payrolls, Governor Williams has had to appeal to his old enemies, the big corporations, to pay their taxes early. The State is running a deficit this year estimated at $89 million. Even the juggling of funds was not enough to put the State on a basis to pay its help.

The story of how Governor Williams has brought the State to this critical financial condition is too long to tell here. But the important fact is that it is the same welfare program that the Williams-Reuther cult is now trying to wish on the Federal Government, that has drained the State's treasury.

Walter Reuther is at the head of one of the groups that is demanding greatly expanded and expensive projects for Washington to finance.

Listing what has happened in Michigan, U.S. News & World Report says, "All these problems have combined to add to the State's financial worries. New business enterprises are slow to come to Michigan. * * * Thus, the people of Michigan, one of the wealthiest States in the United States, now finds their government broke."

Our representatives in Washington who would head the Government there in the same direction Michigan has been traveling, might well study where that path has led one of our richest States.

Utilization of Military Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the proper utilization of our military manpower is one of the most important issues facing America today.

One key phase of this problem has been raised in a letter to the Secretary of the Air Force by Lodge No. 1092, American Federation of Government Employees. The specific problem involved is the use of military personnel in civilian and administrative type duties.

I intend to bring this letter to the attention of the Special Subcommittee on Manpower, which has been established by the Armed Services Committee, but I feel that the questions it raises are so important that I should bring them to the attention of the entire House at this time.

I quote the key points of a letter to the Secretary of the Air Force by Mr. John Mann, president of Lodge No. 1092, American Federation of Government Employees:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES,
LODGE NO. 1092,
February 25, 1959.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Staffing of civilian-type support positions with military personnel has approached a point which, we feel, actually jeopardizes economic completion of the Air Force combat mission. Recent military and civilian pay raises have a direct bearing upon this problem. The assignment of military personnel to civilian or administrative-type duties has become prohibitively expensive. Pay fringe benefits have increased costs to where today's enlisted man can earn over $10,000 per year. In the officer category, the career cost amortization of one full colonel may involve as much as $33,000 per year. This includes base pay, quarters' allowance, longevity pay, flying pay, responsibility pay, PCS costs, dislocation allowances, training costs, retirement, Medicare, and other fringe benefits not inherent in civilian manpower costs.

In terms of overall manpower implications, the problem involves much more than simple comparisons of take-home pay between military and civilian personnel. An Air Force major and a GS-12 civilian, for example, may have similar take-home pay in terms of dollars. However, in terms of true cost to the taxpayer, a military man involves many costs, benefits, and investments (education, training, facilities, housing, retirement, etc.) not accorded a GS-12, or other comparable career civilian.

In many areas in Headquarters USAF, commissioned officers spend their entire tour of duty in nonmilitary, nondefense, noncombat, functional assignments. This is unnecessarily expensive. More importantly, it is creating a misleading manpower picture in terms of defense readiness and combat capability. Manpower totals are padded with thousands of uniformed personnel who are not engaged in, or even prepared for, defense or military-type duties. We feel that this is neither the spirit nor intent of Congress in putting a man in uniform. The assignment of military personel to administrative and support type activities may well constitute the most expensive form of bureaucracy in the Federal Government.

Compounding this situation is the fact that the military man often does not have the motivation, aptitude, background, or training for support type duties. He knows he will probably be rotated in 3 years into an entirely different career category. He also realizes that interim civilian type assignments tend to jeopardize his long-range military advancement potential. In the support areas, particularly, this has created officer and civilian morale problems, poor management leadership, lost continuity, and inadequate technical specialization. In many cases, important projects or programs are canceled prematurely, or reorganizations undertaken, at considerable loss in Air Force funds and resources, simply to coincide with an individual officer's rotation. In others, costly or ill-considered decisions are made as a result of disinterest, lack of training, or personnel instability. We feel that this type of transient management is costing the American taxpayer millions of dollars in excess defense costs. During recent Senate appropriations hearings, considerable discussion was centered upon the high cost of personnel instability within Headquarters USAF.

The problem, as we see it, involves much more than simple mismanagement, or labor relations, as such. The entire concept of civilian-military relationships, roles, and teamwork must be reexamined within Headquarters USAF. * * * For some reason, Headquarters USAF continues to pursue a costly and illogical manpower policy concerning the utilization of civilians. The impact of this policy upon defense capability and costs should be obvious.

We also feel that the proposed 2-percent reduction in DOD civilian manpower will actually increase overall defense payroll costs. Reductions in civilian manpower, in many instances, simply mean that military personnel will be assigned to perform civilian duties. Direct and indirect payroll costs will actually be increased in many areas. This process will then be compounded by a secondary manpower cycle wherein Headquarters USAF will demonstrate a need for additional military manpower. In contrast to this, it is accepted knowledge that advancing weapon systems, technology, and airpower concepts (missiles and spacecraft) will require progressively greater concentration of stabilized civilian manpower in the direct and indirect support areas.

We could cite many more arguments and examples of why greater utilization should be made of civilian manpower in support-type activities in Headquarters USAF. However, numerous studies by outside consultants and citizen groups (Hoover Commission, Sarnoff Commission, Ford Foundation, and Rockefeller Report) have indicated similar conclusions. We feel that corrective action is long overdue.

As a point of departure, the following proposals are submitted:

Review of Headquarters USAF civilian-manning ratios in all direct and indirect support functions; and progressive civilization of appropriate broad functional areas and activities throughout Headquarters USAF, as outlined in DOD 1100.9.

JOHN MANN,
President, AFGE Lodge 1092, AFL-CIO, Headquarters, USAF.

Curing Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Lawrence A. Collins, Sr., recently had some sound advice to give regarding the problem of curing unemployment. It appeared in the Long Beach Independent newspaper on February 22, in the following column:

CURING UNEMPLOYMENT
(By L. A. C.)

The 4.7 million unemployment figure for January is disturbing news. It has brought demands from the AFL-CIO for shorter hours and a much greater spending program by Government to produce more jobs. Walter Reuther advocates an unemployment march on Washington to dramatize the demands.

It would be unrealistic to ignore the dangers of widespread unemployment. But it is equally unrealistic to expect that full employment can be achieved by unsound measures. Actually we have had an average of about 3 million classified as unemployed for most of the past 10 years. These are largely people who are in process of changing jobs—there is a normal turnover of jobs which brought this 3 million unemployed to be viewed as normal during our most prosperous years. It was about 4 to 5 percent of the available working force.

We are just coming out of a recession. Our labor force increases at the rate of about 1.5 million a year. New jobs must be created for this new working population. We have met this increase in the past. The big question is how we are to do it for the future. This raises the question of shorter hours—or creation of new jobs by private enterprise or Government spending.

There is a grave question that shortening the workweek would provide the needed new jobs. Such action would mean a reduction in the weekly pay of workers and thereby less purchasing power. Or, if present 40-hour pay were maintained for 35 hours' work, it would add to the cost of everything produced by the workers. This would reduce the amount of purchasing power of workers.

When it comes to providing jobs by Government spending, we should look back to the

1934–39 period, when billions of dollars were expended by many alphabetical agencies. There was never a year during this period that unemployment fell below 7 million workers—with a working force 10 million less than we have at present. It was only when war broke out in Europe and we became the arsenal for France and Britain that we pulled out of that depression.

After World War II, we were busy making up the shortages created by 4 years of war and austerity. Then private enterprise poured billions of dollars into new products, plants, and machinery. Prices increased 100 percent over the 1930's—but income of workers increased 150 percent. The result has been higher living standards, more people employed, and general prosperity. We have had three minor recessions during the last 10 years. But we pulled out of two without a serious economic disorder. We are very close to being out of the recession which started some 18 months ago.

Some of the added 1.7 million unemployment above the 3 million normal is caused by workers producing more, the extension of working hours of those employed, and the wage and fringe benefit increases given unions the past year. Production is at high levels, prices are stabilized, and with winter over there is good reason to expect jobs to be more plentiful.

There is every reason for concern over our ability to provide the new jobs needed for our expanding working force. It is probable there will be shorter hours in the future. But such changes should not be allowed to increase costs of production and thereby create a destructive inflation spiral. Unless unions and their supporters in Congress accept this view, they will be creating greater unemployment and destroy the value of dollars now held or hoped for by all the people.

Spending Higher at White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, in his budget message this year, President Eisenhower has indicated the various cuts he proposes in the number of tax dollars to be spent on each program for the fiscal year beginning on July 1. And while he proposes cuts in some of our most vital programs, he fails to practice at home in the White House the economy he preaches in his budget.

Drew Pearson's column in the February 23, 1959, Washington Post and Times Herald edition, points up some of the items which have increased the budget for the White House. The column follows:

SPENDING HIGHER AT WHITE HOUSE
(By Drew Pearson)

Stung by President Eisenhower's evangelistic outbursts against the spenders, Democratic leaders are taking a sharp look at how Ike practices the economy he preaches. Their findings reveal he has been the most extravagant President in American history.

He spends twice as much to run the White House as former President Truman ever did. During Truman's last year, his operating expenses came to $2,467,000. This is petty cash compared with the $5,013,750 bill Ike turned in for the fiscal year ending June 30.

He also left the White House out of his fervent campaign to balance next year's budget. While he ordered everyone else to slash expenses, he boosted his own budget by a generous $332,250.

Truman was able to get along with an office staff of 245. Ike has added another 153 employees to the payroll. He has also increased the White House work crew from 62 to 71. Among their new duties are hunting lost golf balls and keeping the squirrels off Ike's putting green.

The cost of operating the whole Executive Office has soared even more spectacularly under Eisenhower. This includes all the octopus arms of the White House, such as the National Security Council, Budget Bureau, Office of Defense Mobilization, and Council of Economic Advisers.

LUXURIES DISGUISED

Truman spent $6,703,000 on the whole works his last year in office. Ike's total budget for the Executive Office this year is $52,736,250. Next year he is asking for $91,880,000. Of course, 89 percent of the increase will go to the newly created Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. But a full 5 percent will go to the same Budget Bureau which is supposed to enforce his economy edict.

Many of Ike's little luxuries are charged to other Government departments, so they don't show up in the White House budget. The two helicopters which whisk him and his staff to Gettysburg on weekends are charged to the Marine Corps. Sometimes he makes the hop in a light, twin-engined plane, kept at his disposal by the Air Force.

Ike didn't wait long after moving into the White House to get rid of Truman's hand-me-down plane and order a de luxe new model for himself. The Air Force paid $3.8 million for the *Columbine*, which was decorated to suit Mamie's tastes. Last year, the President decided the plane needed another rest room and running water. However, the story leaked out before the new plumbing was installed, causing such unfavorable publicity that he withdrew the order.

The Presidential launches, the *Barbara Ann* and *Susie E.*, are maintained and operated by the Navy. One was dispatched all the way to Newport, R.I., last year to ferry the President between the golf course and his vacation headquarters.

Incidentally, he has taken more vacations at the taxpayers' expense than any other President in history. His biggest year was 1957 when he took 22 vacations, counting long weekends at Camp David and his Gettysburg farm. Last year, he was away from the White House 16 times. Already this year, he has slipped away for four brief vacations.

UNCLE SAM PAYS

The Eisenhowers also use White House servants on their farm. Their personal belongings are frequently hauled by Army truck. Once Ike brought in GI's to dig a ditch around his farm when he couldn't find civilians who would work in the rain.

Besides his extravagance with the taxpayers' money, Ike has accepted expensive personal gifts. Certainly the deep freeze which caused Truman such painful publicity was a five-and-dime item compared to what Eisenhower has received. Gifts he can't use are usually kept in the family. Mamie's sister, Mrs. Gordon Moore, is the chief beneficiary.

White House intimates say the President's fervor over economy is inspired by the tight little circle of millionaires who have become his closest friends. They include:

Former Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey, now head of National Steel; William Robinson, Coca-Cola's board chairman; W. Alton Jones, Cities Service chairman; Clifford Roberts of Reynolds & Co.; Barry Leithead, president of Cluett, Peabody & Co., and George Allen, a director of many big companies.

This is Ike's golfing-bridge cabinet. Democrats point out that these are men whose own living standards are the highest in the world, but who believe in economy for small business, schools, farmers, veterans, widows, and the aged.

NOTE.—This column called the White House for details of Ike's finances, but Jim Hagerty was in Mexico. No one else was permitted to discuss the subject.

California Fiscal Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, many interesting fiscal statistics regarding the Nation's second largest State were compiled recently by columnist Bill Broom. California sets a particularly fast pace in attention to educational facilities. I feel that colleagues from other States will be interested in comparing the figures furnished by Mr. Broom, on California, to those of their own States.

Mr. Broom's column follows:

CENSUS SHOWS THIS STATE BIG SPENDER AND LIBERAL TAXER
(By Bill Broom)

WASHINGTON.—The Californian taxes himself higher and spends more for his local schools than the average citizen of any other State in the Nation.

He is able to do this because his annual income is $2,523 for every man, woman, and child in his State. He ranks fourth in the Nation in this respect.

These are some of the statistics turned up by the Department of Commerce in its annual business census of State and local government finances. The figures cover 1957.

The Californian is a free spender and a liberal taxer. He ranks in the top 10 on a per capita basis for most every classification covered by the census.

His annual State and local tax bill is $237.87 per person, and that's highest in the Nation.

The U.S. average is $169.147; the lowest being Arkansas with $100.40.

The biggest chunk of his governmental budget goes for education. Californians spend $98.22 per capita every year on local schools, highest average in the Nation. He slips on his budget for colleges and universities, however, with a per capita expenditure of $19.16, well above the average of $11.50 for the Nation, but 12th in per capita ranking. The total for all education is $119.39 per capita annually, second high in the Nation.

The Census Bureau provides its statistics in two ways. One set of statistics cover the total dollar amount spent in each State. The other divides that amount by the number of residents of the State, giving the per capita figure.

On total spending, the Californian leaves nearly everybody eating his dust. His State and local governments spend more for education, colleges and universities, local schools, highways, public welfare, and natural resources than any other State in the Union.

New York spends greater dollar amounts for health and hospitals, police and fire protection. The Californian is third in the total amount of $80 million he pays out for interest on his debt.

On a per capita basis, the Californian pays $321.20 annually for all government services (ranking fourth), $46.48 for highways (ranking 29th), $29.19 for public welfare (ranking 7th), and $24.02 for health and hospitals (ranking 7th).

The national per capita average in those categories is $237.35 for all services, $83 for education, $11.50 for colleges and universities, $69.60 for local schools, $45.79 for highways, $19.94 for public welfare, and $18.80 for health and hospitals.

With all that spending, the Californian hasn't gotten himself too far in debt. His per capita debt is $327.02, 10th highest in the Nation, and a little more than the national average of $299.75. New Yorkers are a lot worse off. Each of them owes $566.62. In the District of Columbia, where Congress won't permit long-term indebtedness, the average is only $45.61.

The dollar spending totals, in which the Californian ranks highest, are $1,657,060,000 for all education, $265 million for colleges and universities, $1,363 billion for local schools, $645 million for highways, $405 million for public welfare, and $210.5 million for natural resources.

California, which spends $333.4 million for health and hospitals, $171 million for police, and $115 for fire protection, ranks second in those categories.

Where does the money come from and what is the Californian's ranking on a per capita basis?

His local and State governments have a total annual per capita revenue of $314.06, third highest in the Nation. They receive $33.50 per capita from the Federal Government (ranking 12th), $112.01 per capita in property taxes (ranking 2d), $125.86 in other nonproperty taxes (ranking 4th), and $42.67 in charges and miscellaneous government revenue (ranking 9th).

Remaking the Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an address delivered by Maj. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, Jr., Deputy Chief of Engineers for Construction, delivered at the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association meeting in New Orleans, La.

The Mississippi is one of the great rivers of the world. Never have I heard a finer discussion of this river than was delivered by General Wilson. It is so full of valuable information that I wanted others to share it.

The address follows:

REMAKING THE MISSISSIPPI

To address the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association is a high point in the career of any member of the Army Corps of Engineers. I am privileged today to make my first appearance before you.

The task of bringing this river system to its present state of control and improvement has taken a long time. I am sure most of you recall what Mark Twain said about it. He considered the job of what he called remaking the Mississippi one that was exceeded only by the original job of creating it. That was probably the greatest understatement he ever made.

While we can all be proud of our progress on the Mississippi, we dare not be satisfied with it—or complacent about it. There is still a great deal that engineers do not know about the behavior of a river of the size and characteristics of the Mississippi. Although the present flood control works have successfully passed flows greater than any of previous record, we still cannot be sure that we have the protection we need or can afford.

So, now the Corps of Engineers, with your cooperation, is reevaluating the adequacy of the protection we now have and is reappraising the degree of flood risk that confronts us so as to ascertain wherein it may be justifiable to improve the present project.

General Carter will discuss with you the progress being made on the Mississippi River project. I want to talk about the future, looking far ahead to anticipate some of the problems we can expect to encounter. The answers to all of them, of course, are not apparent at this time, but I hope that some constructive benefit can be derived by pointing our thoughts in certain directions.

In considering future development of the Mississippi, we must keep two principal factors in mind. The first, as I have already indicated, is that we dare not become satisfied and complacent about the adequacy of the works we have built for controlling the tremendous force of our largest river system. Second is to appraise accurately the equally dominant force of economic and social growth that determines the requirements for control and use of the river and its waters. Although in past years the Corps of Engineers sometimes has been criticized for building too big and too far ahead, the fact is that in virtually every instance the economic growth of the country has outrun the adequacy of our projects long before the facilities were worn out. Let us examine that question a little further.

The burden of supporting America's post-war boom has fallen with especial weight upon water resources. Though in many ways these resources have become less available, demands upon them have skyrocketed. We are building navigation facilities faster than ever before, but the growth of traffic outstrips our building. Bigger vessels tend to make our harbor facilities obsolete. Irrigation and power needs also are rising. The surge of population and enterprise into river-valley flood plains increases the urgency of the flood control problem.

Not only have traditional needs become intensified, but new ones are appearing. We used to take water supply for granted. Now domestic and industrial consumption have multiplied. At the same time, pollution is degrading surface supplies, drawdowns are raising the cost of underground supplies, and encroachment on reservoir sites is undercutting the feasibility of many storage projects. Recreation has been transformed from an amenity into a social necessity. Serious questions of preserving our fish and wildlife resources have arisen.

In short, our water resources problems have mushroomed upward and outward since the war, and the trend is just commencing. I do not believe these problems are yet out of control, but every year that passes will make it harder to keep them under control. I feel that no doubt the post-war expansion which has made the problem urgent will continue and accelerate for years to come.

We are in a feverish age. Automation, synthetics and electronics are revolutionizing production processes. The atomic era, by opening new realms of power, may intensify the drain upon basic natural resources. Ideas, the most explosive force of all, can now be manipulated with techniques that reach into the subconscious and, thanks to modern communications, they can be disseminated throughout the world with the speed of light. Entire nations previously retarded in economic and social progress are now asserting themselves as powers and are repolarizing the currents of trade and politics.

Populations, including our own, are erupting with a force comparable to that of the atom. When Magellan circumnavigated the globe 500 years ago the world had a population of half a billion. When Jules Verne sent Phineas Fobb on his imaginary 80-day circuit in the 1870's there were 1.4 billion people—a 900 million increase in 400 years. When Wendell Willkie made his 160-hour "One World" trip in 1942, there were 2.3 billion people—another 900 million increase, but accomplished in only 70 years. And last year, the Strategic Air Command circled in 45 hours a world of 2.8 billion people. The rate of population growth has increased more than fivefold within three centuries.

All of this means that our natural resources base, including our water resources, will have to support even greater efforts than before.

It follows that our water resources development programs will have to continue to be bold in scope and vigorous in prosecution and that we must rigidly adhere to the requirements of good planning and sound economics to the end that we can ultimately enjoy the fullest use of this limited resource.

Our task of remaking the Mississippi and its tributaries should be continued in light of these considerations, and with the same boldness, foresight, courage, and skill with which we must plan our military defenses. For in the international conflict in which we are now engaged, national defense requires both military and economic preparations.

In the resurvey of the Mississippi we are exercising the type of alertness that must be maintained generally, and for an indefinite period in the future. Here in the lower valley our flood-control project has opened large flood-plain areas to development by a generation that has never had its imagination prodded by an actual flood experience. As perhaps most of you know, we are trying to ascertain two basic facts in this survey. First, is it justifiable to provide protection against a flood of greater magnitude than the project is now being built to withstand? And second, what improvements or changes in the flood control system should be made to accommodate a flood of such magnitude?

While I cannot prejudge the final report, there are indications from the interim report made last year, that we may be warranted in increasing the magnitude of the project flood. We are studying the effects of the changes brought about in the regime of the river; whether we have made proper allowance of the reduction of peak flows by upstream, tributary storage; the adequacy of the levees, floodways and channels, and all other factors that would be necessary to assure a 3-foot freeboard against a project flood of the magnitude being considered.

Determination of the effects of up-stream storage is a particularly complex undertaking. We know that we must look to the reservoirs of the Ohio Valley for about 90 percent of the reduction of peaks for floods at Cairo that occur in January and February. For floods that occur in the late spring and early summer, we must look to the reservoirs on the Mississippi-Missouri above Cairo for up to 80 percent of the reductions in peak flows.

To accomplish this requires a well-balanced and comprehensive system of reservoirs in order that floods from the major tributaries may be regulated regardless of geographical origin.

But here in the Alluvial Valley we must keep in mind that the reservoirs on the tributaries are built primarily to serve more local needs. Thus, while tributary reservoirs hold back water to help reduce the flood peaks on the lower Mississippi, this

is not the principal purpose for which the majority are designed. It follows that there is a limit to which we can look to them for help in reducing your floods. We must take fully into account the benefits you will receive from them, but at the same time depend primarily upon the adequacy of the levees and other works for safely passing floods through the Alluvial Valley. At the present time, low flows in the main stem of the Mississippi present a problem primarily to navigation. It appears that a discharge of 100,000 cubic feet per second at Cairo and of 140,000 cubic feet per second at the mouth of the Arkansas are the minimums necessary to maintain an adequate navigation channel without unreasonable maintenance dredging, and provide sufficient water for industrial and domestic use and pollution abatement.

Flows of less than this minimum discharge have been encountered on numerous occasions in the past. During 5 of the past 25 years the flows at Cairo have been less than the minimum and during 9 of these years the flows below the mouth of the Arkansas have been less than the minimum.

We must anticipate that periods of extremely low flow will be encountered in the future. Flows of less than the minimum would present a serious threat to dependable navigation with the 12- by 300-foot channel authorized from Cairo to Baton Rouge. Moreover, there is the question of rising demands on the river for other water uses, including, of particular significance, future irrigation, industrial water and pollution abatement, which could conceivably place even larger demands upon the river. We must take into account the fact that increasing demands upon the river for all kinds of water uses will occur throughout the entire river system, which will further affect the availability of water during periods of drought. This includes not only water appropriated from the streams, but also continued excessive demands upon the underground water tables, which, in turn, affect the rivers.

The population experts anticipate increase of 60 million people in the United States in the next 17 years. This, in addition to the per capita increases in water uses, means that our national water requirements for all purposes will more than double. Crop surpluses as we now conceive them will diminish and there will be heavy demands for water for agricultural uses for enhancing production even in the more normal humid times, to say nothing of periods of drought.

Although the seemingly abundant waters of the Mississippi have been the envy of our parched friends in Texas and Oklahoma for a long time, I want to emphasize that the main stem of the Mississippi may not be an inexhaustible source of water for all uses over the years ahead.

Moreover, it does not appear likely that sufficient storage is practical on the upstream tributaries both to serve the ultimate needs there and to solve all of the low water problems of the Mississippi.

Virtually the entire country is affected by the problem of diminishing sites for the economical storage of water, a question that is growing more critical each year. For example, it is now doubtful that more than about 15 of the 48 remaining reservoirs authorized for the Ohio River system have any reasonable chance of ever being built. The reason? It is simply the exorbitant price we are paying for the sprawling, unregulated economic growth of the country. The construction of highways, airfields, utility lines, urban communities, industries and other encroachments on the reservoir sites have made the cost of procuring the land prohibitive in many instances.

I think you people of the Alluvial Valley are becoming more aware of the importance of upstream reservoirs and certainly you will become more acutely conscious of it in the future. Reservoirs on the Missouri contributed about one-third of the flow of the Mississippi at St. Louis during the 1953 drought. In September and November of that year, the upstream reservoirs provided about one-fourth of the discharge at Cairo, a figure that rose to 40 percent in October. At Baton Rouge about 25 percent of the flow was coming from the upstream reservoirs. A similar condition was repeated in 1954 and we had trouble again in 1955 and 1956. In January of the latter year, the Mississippi reached the lowest stage of record at Memphis, and extremely low stages were recorded all along the lower river, and very little assistance could be provided from the reservoirs on the Ohio and the Missouri.

The answers to the problem in your area appear to lie in several directions.

First is to encourage the construction of upstream conservation storage which will inevitably benefit the Lower Mississippi as well. You should support action to preserve the remaining reservoir sites from further encroachment, throughout the great Mississippi Valley.

Next is to make good use of the opportunities for storing the waters originating within your own States. You will ultimately need all you can get. There is none to be wasted.

Develop maximum treatment to return unpolluted water to the streams.

Then, as a last resort, you ultimately may have to limit the uses of waters diverted from the Mississippi in times of extremely low flow.

Please remember, I am looking far ahead, but one must be farsighted in considering where we go from here with respect to future water resources development. I did not come here to present you a discouraging picture concerning your water future. In fact, your future, waterwise, is one of the brightest in the country. I am confident that ways to overcome the problems of low flows can be found. I am probably much more optimistic about them than many of my forebears in the corps were when they first tackled the problems of curbing the floods of the lower Mississippi. I can think of nothing more spine chilling to an engineer than to see a vast expanse of rushing water, as far as the eye can reach, destroying entire communities and taking the lives of hundreds of people.

We have demonstrated that we can tame the floods, and certainly we are in much better position, for having done so, to tackle the problems of enough water. That should be our next big battle in meeting the seemingly endless challenge of the conquest of nature.

A Long Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and privilege to insert in the RECORD the following editorial tribute, which appeared in the Newark Evening News February 24, 1959, to my good friend and one of the most respected members of the bench and bar, the former associate justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey, William A. Wachenfeld:

A LONG CAREER

It's hard to realize that the seemingly ageless William A. Wachenfeld is 70, but he is. And today in obedience to the Constitution he must step down from the supreme court seat he has occupied 12 years.

Before that he served 13 years as prosecutor of Essex County. Next year will bring the 50th anniversary of his graduation from law school. A busy lawyer, he found time for politics and public affairs. He might have been Governer had he not twice refused to be a candidate.

William Wachenfeld was not everyone's idea of a supreme court justice when Governor Edge appointed him in 1946. Vigorous and combative and brusque of speech, he seemed better fitted for administrative office.

It was out of character for him to sit patiently through the endless, often tenuous argument which judges must endure, and he himself doubted that he had the temperamental requisites for the bench. Nevertheles, he made the adjustment successfully, becoming one of the court's most useful members.

As might have been expected, he became a notable dissenter. Some of his disagreements with his colleagues were scholarly explorations, others, especially those dealing with criminal law, consisted of single scathing paragraph or page.

His retirement brings to a close a public career of unusual length and commendable performance.

Bill Aims To Spur Investing Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of Sunday, February 15, 1959:

BILL AIMS TO SPUR INVESTING ABROAD—TAX-CUT PLAN TERMED STEP TOWARD SHIFTING FOREIGN AID TO PRIVATE HANDS

(By Brendan M. Jones)

Any proposals for tax reductions these days would seem—with a bit of understatement—to be somewhat out of tune with the times.

But one such proposal has been gaining serious consideration and even slightly optimistic support among businesses engaged in trade and other foreign operations. It is a bill (H.R. 5) providing various Federal tax benefits as a stimulus to increased business investment abroad.

In view of its sponsor, Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana, the bill ultimately could result in a saving on Government spending and possibly a tax revenue gain. His proposals, which he maintains are valid and moderate, would provide some rate reduction as well as more liberal tax treatment of foreign-investment income.

Potentially the proposed tax incentives could, by spurring expansion of foreign investments, produce more taxable income. But at the outset they would cause a loss of revenue. The maximum estimate of such loss, according to Mr. BOGGS, is $500 million a year. Such a figure, he feels, is relatively insignificant compared with multiple billions spent on defense and foreign aid.

A PRACTICAL STEP

Essentially, the main merit of the bill, Mr. BOGGS asserts, is that it is a practical step toward getting private enterprise to take over the job of foreign economic aid. While this might not mean any direct saving to the

average taxpayer, it could conceivably ease increasing demands on Government revenues, which threaten to force tax increases.

The job of assisting economic development abroad has been given new urgency by Soviet Russia's increasing competition in trade and aid. The Communist drive is aimed primarily at the less developed countries. These are also the countries that private foreign investment has tended to shun. The reasons for this attitude are many and varied, but largely they come down to a matter of the risks exceeding the rewards.

The main fact of the Soviet challenge, however, is that it promises to increase the need for foreign economic assistance over an indefinite period. It has been recognized that, despite high appropriations, the efforts of Government foreign aid will become increasingly inadequate to meet the problem.

By contrast, private industry has a vast reserve of capital and technical skills that are regarded as more than sufficient to fill the prospective task. Taxation, however, while not the only impediment to increased foreign investment, represents a major obstacle to its rise along lines best suited to the long-term Soviet competition.

Such, briefly, is the background for the special significance of the Boggs bill. What then are its prospects for enactment, and what also are some of the basic reasons for special treatment of foreign investment generally?

Mr. Boggs gained an important measure of support for his bill last week from local business groups. It came as a result of a meeting organized by the international section of the New York Board of Trade. The meeting, attended by some 500 representatives of business, banking, and trade groups, brought general endorsement of the measure from key elements of the foreign-trade community here.

Opposition to the measure has been expressed by the American Tariff League, which last week described the bill as a move to encourage migration of American industry to foreign countries. The league, which has been a leading advocate of more protective tariffs, said the bill would be discriminatory in giving American corporations abroad a lower tax liability than those engaged in domestic production.

LACKS ACTIVE SUPPORT

Apart from the attitudes of business groups, however, the Boggs bill lacks active administration support. Actually it is in line with broad administration policies as set forth in a similar measure that suffered defeat in 1954. Treasury officials are reported opposed to the measure on general principle, but there has been evidence of some support for it from officials of the Departments of State and Commerce.

According to some calculations, the bill has a fair chance of bipartisan support. It may also have an appeal to those legislators who, while opposed to increased foreign economic aid, would like to find an alternative because of concern with the Russian challenge.

Basically the bill seeks to permit a certain flexibility for reinvestment of foreign-earned income. It does this through a number of deferral procedures under which such income would not become subject to tax until repatriated in the form of dividends.

Its tax reduction feature is based on the precedence of existing law granting a 14-point lower tax rate to companies organized under the Western Hemisphere Trading Corporation Act. This lower rates established in 1942, applies to companies qualifying under the statute as doing at least 95 percent of their business in Western Hemisphere countries other than the United States. The Boggs bill would simply extend this principle on a world-wide basis.

Another main part of the bill would establish a new kind of foreign business corporation. Such a corporation would be treated as a company operating abroad, although it would be based in this country. Thus, it would be legally obliged to report earnings to the Internal Revenue Service. This provision would counteract the trend of business to set up corporations in foreign tax havens where, apart for other advantages, they are under no legal obligation to report operations to United States tax officials.

Claims for more favorable tax treatment of foreign-earned income range from the principle that income should be taxed only where earned to consideration of extra hazards of investment abroad. That foreign-based corporations have to pay foreign as well as Federal taxes is often ignored.

In addition, it is contended that foreign investment besides entailing special risks makes a basic contribution to the domestic economy by assuring raw materials sources and increasing industrial exports. Now, however, the strongest argument for favorable treatment is based on the fact of foreign investments' relation to foreign policy and national security interests.

Finally, a recent Department of Commerce survey has shown that companies interested in foreign operations regard Federal taxation as the major single obstacle to increased foreign investment.

Problems Plaguing American Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the Daniel F. Rice & Co. commodity letter of February 18. All who are genuinely concerned with solving the problems plaguing American agriculture today will be interested in some of the proposals advanced in this letter:

COMMODITY LETTER

The time has come in matters of agricultural legislation to get on one horse and ride off in one direction. It has been clear to us for a long time that an agricultural support program cannot be all things to all people; that it cannot repeal the immutable laws of supply, demand, and price. If a price program is designed to support prices above levels that would otherwise exist it has to have enough teeth in it to command the supply so that the price can be put where it is wanted.

This simple principle has either not been clear to the administration and the Congress or they have chosen to ignore it. The Congress has tried to gallop off in two directions at once—toward higher prices that would prevail in the marketplace and unlimited production. The Department of Agriculture has thrashed about in all directions at once. They have advocated lower price supports but have never wanted to go the whole hog and eliminate supports, as the reasoning of their position would dictate. They have argued that lower supports would cut production and have sat for 6 years with the same argument while prices went down and production up. They have taken huge quantities of grain off the market through loans to support prices and at the same time have sold huge quantities which have weighed very heavily on prices. The Department tried a soil bank scheme. It was never clear whether this was to cut production or to improve land so that we could get more production.

The result of all of this confusion has been lower prices, the accumulation of huge stocks, expenditure of vast sums of public funds, and reduced farm income. In early 1953 when this administration took office wheat was selling for $2.45 per bushel, corn $1.65, oats 92 cents, and soybeans $3. Now wheat is $2, corn $1.20, oats 68 cents, and soybeans $2.24. By way of contrast the Dow-Jones industrial stock price was 287 in January 1953 and now is 590. The agricultural situation is becoming critical. How long farmers can continue to take the kind of economic punishment that they have been submitted to in recent years is conjectural. There is no doubt that justice calls for an immediate reversal of the recent trend.

During this session of Congress the agricultural problem is getting more than the usual amount of attention. Three things appear to be behind this interest: (1) attempts to capture the farm vote, (2) concern over the high cost of farm programs, and (3) concern over the ineffectiveness of existing programs. The administration continues to beat the same old drum for lower supports. With regard to wheat they seem to think that some varieties and qualities would go as low as $1.12. The Congress is kicking around two price proposals. One is for direct income deficiency payments on the amount of the commodity used domestically and the other is a scheme to use food as an instrument of peace. The second presumably means to increase our export dumping programs. One wonders if there are any more ways to dump than are already being used.

None of the suggestions get to the point of a fair price in the marketplace. There is no reason to think that a fair price to farmers cannot be determined and production and inventories adjusted and managed so that this fair price can be maintained. There is no reason why agriculture cannot be run as a business so that it produces when there is a profit and does not produce when there is a loss. There is no reason why farmers should be expected to subsidize consumers, both domestic and foreign, and why government should in turn be forced to heavily subsidize farmers.

To put agriculture in a profitable position a four-step program needs to be adopted:

1. Establish fair prices for the main agricultural products. A new system needs to be developed to take into account new technology and new methods.

2. Establish production goals that will result in the desired prices. These goals need to be established by a board of nonpartisan experts.

3. Enforce multiple cross compliance. No system of control will work if land is taken out of one crop and put into another, creating a problem somewhere else. Land taken out of one crop has got to go out of production.

4. Freeze existing surplus stocks. When production and use are brought into balance these stocks can be appraised and their disposition determined. We may want to keep them as a reserve against atomic attack. Stocks can be frozen. If one bushel of corn in Crossroads, Iowa, needs to be sold because it is going out of condition, CCC can buy a bushel at Crossroads to replace it.

This program cannot be compromised and made to work. Either we adopt this program or we return to a nongovernment situation. We cannot continue to ride two horses in opposite directions.

A "Dime Dollar" Can Result From Failure To Curb Inflation Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Jackson, Miss., Clarion-Ledger, February 12, 1959. It refers to some views of our colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. COLMER, who as we all know is one of the soundest and most dedicated Members of this body. The editorial follows:

A "DIME DOLLAR" CAN RESULT FROM FAILURE TO CURB INFLATION THREAT

Representative WILLIAM M. COLMER, distinguished Member of Congress from Mississippi, warns that while communism cannot conquer this Nation, inflation easily can unless every effort is made to prevent it. He stresses that the preservation of a strong economy in any country requires vigilance on the part of the people against inflation.

In our time, says Representative COLMER, we have seen the ravages of this economic disease in many nations throughout the world. It has gained a foothold in the United States and unless checked, it could become the economic cancer that could disastrously soften us. Thus, America could become fair game for the Communists.

Lenin himself, father of communism, said the way to conquer us would be to make this country spend itself into bankruptcy. As Representative COLMER points out, our public debt now stands at $282 billion. Interest on the public debt in 1958 was $7,867 million. This staggering interest on the national debt is now twice as much as was required to operate the entire Federal Government three decades ago.

"One of the greatest causes of inflation," says Representative COLMER, "is unquestionably the continued deficit spending by our Federal Government. Carried on long enough, it is bound to destroy the economy of this country and when that happens, our whole way of life will disappear too. The question that we must face up to is: 'What are we going to do about it?' On the answer hangs the fate of our Nation."

Voicing similar concern over the perils of inflation, Federal Reserve Board Chairman William Martin has recently warned that a sound dollar is as essential to American strength and security as atomic bombs and missiles. The people's savings, their life insurance, their investments, their pensions, all depend on a stable currency.

The integrity of the American dollar, the Federal Reserve Board Chairman has emphasized, depends upon economy in government at Federal, State and local levels. There are but three ways to meet the unpaid bills of government—through taxation, inflation or repudiation. Chairman Martin offers this disturbing conclusion:

"A nation that piles debt upon debt, refuses to balance its budgets and continues to run in the red, inflates its currency, circulates phoney money, undermines its defense and destroys the security of its citizenship. We the people must live within our income or perish. Only a government that conserves can survive. We will save or sink."

On top of this warning comes another, from William A. Burkett who is superintendent of banks for the State of California, predicting that we will have a 25-cent dollar in this country before too long if the Federal Government does not do something to check inflation. He is quoted as saying, in an advertisement in the American Banker published by the Hancock Bank at Bay St. Louis, Miss.

"If the history of the last 100 years teaches us anything, it is that inflation is more dangerous to the people than any other thing except war. We who have lived to see a 50-cent dollar could live to see a 25-cent dollar or a 10-cent dollar if the Government and the people continue to spend beyond their means and keep going deeper into debt."

Legislation Is Needed To Free Our People From the Foreign-Made Shackles of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, first I should like to compliment the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] for his intense and enthusiastic efforts to get through some type of legislation that will free our people from the foreign-made shackles of unemployment. He has done just about everything humanly possible to return to Congress the tariffmaking authority established in it by the Constitution. He deserves a large measure of credit for whatever help the statutory escape clause has been. Unfortunately, diplomatic considerations have superseded economic reality in the final determination of too many escape clause cases, and I think that the legislation proposed by my close friend from West Virginia here today is very sound, practical, and urgently needed. My remarks will be brief. Later I am going to insert some figures on imports that should alarm even the most fervent freetrader, and I want to include a quotation, from a respected naval officer, that belongs in a discussion of this kind.

First, I should like to mention that I am pleased with the reaction of the Westinghouse Co. to Tennessee Valley Authority's plans to purchase foreign generating equipment without so much as a by-your-leave to the American manufacturers and workingmen who have been subsidizing TVA from its inception. Westinghouse has arranged for Governor Lawrence, of Pennsylvania, to come down to meet with our congressional delegation on this important issue Thursday evening. Because of Pennsylvania's wide unemployment, I think it necessary for everyone in the State and Federal Governments to coordinate all efforts in overcoming the economic obstacles that have so many of our families in actual poverty. The detrimental affect of an oversupply of alien commodities entering American markets is an obvious factor in Pennsylvania's economic problems. I hope that more and more of our State's delegation will walk with those of us who have been striving for whatever legislation is required to remedy the present deplorable situation.

We may as well realize one thing, Mr. Speaker. We are not going to stop Government agencies from ordering supplies and equipment from foreign manufacturers if we permit these departments and agencies themselves to make the decisions. For 25 years Government departments have been subjected to such generous doses of international propaganda that free trade has become one of their obsessions. Any time that hearings or inquiries are held on the matter of foreign trade, an assortment of representatives of a miscellany of Government departments always appears with briefcases chockfull of data gathered from hosts of countries throughout the world. These Government officeholders who come out to cheer for further lowering of trade barriers have traveled—at Government expense—hither and yon among the nations of Europe, Asia, and South America, but they apparently are not interested in becoming clued on what is taking place back where the tax dollars are collected.

The average Government worker living in Washington and in Foreign Service is not exposed to the economic ups and downs experienced in the various parts of our own country. Week after week, and month after month, and year after year there are heavy pockets of unemployment throughout central and western Pennsylvania, just as there are in the State of the gentleman who has granted me this time. The U.S. News & World Report for February 20 contains an indication of why Government officials in the Nation's Capital are either uninformed or uninterested about what is going on back at the ranch. "How's Business Around the Country" is the title of a series of tables reporting on conditions in selected communities from coast to coast. Of the 33 eastern cities listed, 19 are marked as victims of substantial unemployment; 13 are classified in the moderate unemployment category; one city—Washington, D.C.—has slight unemployment. As a matter of fact, Washington is the only city of the 78 studied for the United States as a whole in which unemployment is not either moderate or substantial.

While the parties responsible for import-export policy are assured of their paychecks without interruption, the fellow back home who is getting the bill for these services finds his means of livelihood taken away by incredible foreign trade policies. He has only Congress to look to for help. I suggest we give it to him by demanding quick action on this bill to amend section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended.

I also ask that the House enact the bill which I have introduced to restrict imports of residual oil, the product of foreign refineries which has washed out thousands of jobs in our mine and rail communities. These are the figures which I wish to include in the RECORD:

From January 1 to February 13, 1959, the daily average for residual oil imported into the United States was 807,700 barrels. If this rate continues for the remainder of the year, the 1959 total

will come to 294,830,500 barrels—or more than 70 million tons of bituminous coal in energy equivalent. Keeping that figure in mind, please also note this statement by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke as reported in the Washington Star on February 15:

The possibility of a surprise attack by submarines is very great, and it is causing us a great deal of concern.

Admiral Burke's remark was made at a recent hearing before the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee, at which time it was disclosed that of Russia's 500 submarines, about one-half are long-range craft.

Mr. Speaker, who among us would dare to depend upon foreign oil that must travel over the lonely seaways that even now may be infested with Red submarines carrying the most destructive missiles in the history of naval warfare? The daily imports of residual oil for the first 7 weeks of this year have been equal to 193,830 tons of bituminous coal. In an emergency this tonnage—plus enormously more coal to be used in the actual war effort—would be required. I suggest that, instead of forcing our unemployed coal miners to wander about the country seeking employment opportunities in other industries, we encourage them to remain in their mining communities. They are a vital component of our national defense. They will be ready for whatever demands are made upon them if our foreign trade policies will only give them a chance. The same principle applies to railroad workers. We are not going to have them when we need them if we permit their jobs to be taken away unnecessarily in the meantime.

We may equate the position of the coal miner and the railroad worker to that of the Westinghouse employee who will have no work if foreign generating equipment is allowed to come in and price American products out of the market. We can put the pottery worker, glassmaker, and all other victims of inequitable foreign trade competition in the same category. We owe it to them and to our security to keep them occupied now, for without them we would not have a chance against the common enemy in an emergency.

Taxes Take One-third of Average Family Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, lest we forget the burden of taxes to support governmental spending, Robert G. Shortal, of United Press International, recently outlined them as follows:

TAXES TAKE ONE-THIRD OF AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME

(By Robert G. Shortal)

NEW YORK.—Joe Smith is a typical American. He works full time for a company which pays him $4,500 a year and part time for the Government which takes $1,393 from him.

The sad fact of the matter is that Joe Smith spends more of his working day earning his taxes than he does to pay for any major item in the family's budget.

The Tax Foundation estimates that the average worker toils 2 hours and 29 minutes each day to earn his taxes, compared with 1 hour and 39 minutes to earn his food money, 1 hour and 25 minutes to pay the mortgage or rent, 37 minutes for clothing, 42 minutes for transportation, 24 minutes for medical care, 20 minutes for recreation, and 24 minutes to pay for his other purchases.

It has been estimated that direct and hidden taxes siphon off one-third of the family's income.

Everybody is painfully aware of income taxes, which range up to 91 percent on individual incomes and 52 percent on corporate incomes. Most people also are aware of the excise taxes they pay when they buy cigarettes, liquor, or furs.

However, not many Americans are aware of the number of taxes hidden in the price of things they buy. The really hidden ones are the excise taxes which must be paid by manufacturers.

Manufacturers of refrigerators, for instance, must pay a 5-percent tax on each unit they sell to retailers. Although this tax doesn't appear on the price tag, it is included in the price the consumer pays.

The Tax Foundation estimates that there are 151 taxes on a loaf of bread, 116 on a man's suit, 100 on an egg, 150 on a woman's hat, and 600 on a house. Taxes, direct and indirect, account for 25 percent of the $2,000 cost of a low-priced car.

The plain fact of the matter is that only people pay most of the hidden taxes. Business—from the giant corporation to the corner grocery store—collects them.

The foundation points out that companies, large and small, couldn't stay in business long if they had to pay all these taxes out of their own pocket. Taxes are a cost of doing business and are taken into account when setting prices.

The foundation said practically everything a consumer buys has a hunk of tax hidden in the price.

Lincoln's Monetary Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I think it would be appropriate on this anniversary month of the birth of Abraham Lincoln to call to the attention of the House the following text of his monetary policy. I believe this policy clearly shows the understanding Abraham Lincoln had of the powers of the Government in relation to money:

LINCOLN'S MONETARY POLICY

Money is the creature of law, and the creation of the original issue of money should be maintained as an exclusive monopoly of National Government.

Money possesses no value to the State other than given to it by circulation.

Capital has its proper place and is entitled to every protection. The wages of men should be recognized in the structure of and in the social order as more important than the wages of money.

No duty is more imperative on the Government than the duty it owes the people to furnish them with a sound and uniform currency, and of regulating the circulation of the medium of exchange so that labor will be protected from a vicious currency, and commerce will be facilitated by cheap and safe exchanges.

The available supply of gold and silver being wholly inadequate to permit the issuance of coins of intrinsic value or paper currency convertible into coin in the volume required to serve the needs of the people, some other basis for the issue of currency must be developed, and some means other than that of convertibility into coin must be developed to prevent undue fluctuations in the value of paper currency or any other substitute for money of intrinsic value that may come into use.

The monetary needs of increasing numbers of people advancing toward higher standards of living can and should be met by the Government. Such needs can be served by the issue of national currency and credit through the operation of a national banking system. The circulation of a medium of exchange issued and backed by the Government can be properly regulated and redundancy of issue avoided by the withdrawing from circulation such amounts as may be necessary by taxation, redeposit, and otherwise. Government has the power to regulate the currency and credit of the Nation.

Government should stand behind its currency and credit and the bank deposits of the Nation. No individual should suffer a loss of money through depreciated or inflated currency or bank bankruptcy.

Government possessing the power to create and issue currency and credit as money and enjoying the right to withdraw both currency and credit from circulation by taxation and otherwise, need not and should not borrow capital at interest as the means of financing governmental work and public enterprise. The Government should create, issue, and circulate all the currency and credit needed to satisfy the spending power of the Government and the buying power of consumers. The privilege of creating and issuing money is not only the supreme prerogative of Government, but it is the Government's greatest creative opportunity.

By the adoption of these principles, the long-felt want for a uniform medium will be satisfied. The taxpayers will be saved immense sums in interest, discounts, and exchanges. The financing of all public enterprise, the maintenance of stable Government and ordered progress, and the conduct of the Treasury will become matters of practical administration. The people can and will be furnished with a currency as safe as their own Government. Money will cease to be master and become the servant of humanity. Democracy will rise superior to the money power.

A Report on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a letter I recently received from Mr. Harry E. Boyes, news editor of radio station WION, Ionia, Mich. Mr. Boyes makes a very interesting and informative report on his recent visit to Cuba and the conclusions he arrives at

as a result of his many personal contacts with the Cubans themselves:

FEBRUARY 9, 1959.

Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: I mentioned to you on the phone the other day I was sending you a report of my impressions of my recent trip to Cuba. Here it is. I hope what I have to say will be of interest and possibly a help to you.

If I was to draw any single conclusion from my short stay in Havana it would be this: Our foreign policy with regards to Latin America is presently facing a crossroad. This conclusion is reached from many observations.

The first is this: The Cubans above all desire friendly relations with the United States. This desire stems from many things, among them the hope that the United States will assist them in restoring their economy. They do not necessarily wish the United States to do this through financial channels, but in many instances would prefer technical assistance and other aids that would allow them to fully exploit their own potential. Cubans resent the American foreign policy that allows our big business interests a free rein in their country. This resentment against our large corporate structures stems from the stifling of Cuban business, of which our business interests can be and sometimes are, guilty. Such resentment of American business in particularly noticeable today because the Cubans feel the Republican administration favors and aids this type of operation. In spite of resentment Cuba has a tremendous feeling of affection toward this country. They look upon us as big brothers.

My second point would deal with the violent change of government. Either our State Department was completely out of touch with the feeling of the Cuban people in the months leading up to the overthrow of Batista, or such knowledge was kept hidden from the American public in general and Members of Congress, such as yourself, in particular. I refer to some of the statements voiced about the change of government by certain of our Congressmen—statements referring to "purge" and "blood baths." Granted these men are entitled to express their opinions, but when responsible men in Government "sound off" on any subject, their words are usually taken to be the official view of the United States Government which, as you and I know, may not always be the case; but to people who have endured years of oppression such words cut deeply. It was my firm belief upon leaving Cuba that the executions were fully justified. Without going into great detail let me simply say, those executed were sadists of the worst sort and the Cuban people lived in the shadow of terror and oppression created by these men. Had not the Castro regime embarked upon the course it did, Cuba would have experienced a state of anarchy similar to 1933 and many innocent people would have lost their lives. My point in this case is this, in dealing with the best of our friends let us in the future either know what is going on, or choose our words more wisely.

Thirdly. I had the opportunity of speaking with several South American newsmen and I definitely received the impression from them that we are not the most popular people in the world in eyes of the citizens of their countries. Some of these newsmen were openly hostile to those of us from the United States. Others merely voiced their knowledge of the feeling within their countries.

Fourthly. The swing in the Latin Americas is definitely toward democratic forms of government. These people sincerely desire to live in friendship with the United States, but we feel that their friendship is only wanted in time of need. They would like the United States to regard them as partners. There is a new awareness of government "by the people" in this part of the world, and the Latins know that they need help to develop the economies in which those governments can exist. They despise having to make overtures to Russia in the hopes of forcing the United States to come across with what they need. A good example of what I refer to is the recent oil drilling equipment "deal" conducted in Argentina.

These are some of the reasons for feeling the way I do and for believing that the next move on our part will be extremely crucial for this country. However, I also believe that a solution exists to the "crossroads" situation that I mentioned earlier.

If the United States can embark on a policy that would aid Cuba in developing its industry and agriculture so that this country can achieve even a portion of its tremendous potential, then the rest of Latin America would begin to look upon us again with favor. To me, Cuba is the place to begin because of its consistently friendly feeling toward the United States and because the results that we need can be more quickly achieved in Cuba than elsewhere in Latin America. However, Cuba is only a beginning and in this ever changing world a strong Western Hemisphere is just as desirable—perhaps more so—than a friendly Europe.

Many things I saw in Cuba—poverty, great wealth, lack of facilities, and incomplete construction—are well known to all and need no explanation at this point, however, they also are factors which will contribute to the end results.

These are strictly my conclusions but I spent much time in Cuba talking with people, those working in shops, taxi drivers, hotel clerks, rebels, and with people of prominence, and the ideas that I have set forth are the composite I reached through these conversations.

I hope these thoughts will be of assistance to you.

Best regards,

HARRY E. BOYES.

City of Mayfield Heights, Ohio, Memorializes the Congress To Eliminate the 10-Percent Tax on Telephone Calls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, like so many other temporary taxes, the 10-percent excise tax on telephone service levied during World War II to reduce the load on overburdened telephone facilities and to raise funds for financing the war effort is still with us. While there is some justification for continuing such a tax on luxury items, the telephone certainly cannot be put in this category. In the home and in business today the telephone is a necessary public utility just as gas, electricity, etc.

On February 23, the council of the city of Mayfield Heights, Ohio, under the leadership of Mayor Edwin T. Frantz, approved a resolution memorializing the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate to eliminate the 10-percent tax on telephone calls. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the resolution herewith:

RESOLUTION No. 1959–23

A resolution memorializing the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate to eliminate the 10-percent tax on telephone calls

Whereas the Council of the City of Mayfield Heights hereby respectfully petitions the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Members of the U.S. Senate to eliminate the 10-percent tax on telephone calls, for the following reasons:

1. That the emergency which existed at the time this tax was created no longer exists.

2. That said tax is burdensome upon telephone users: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Mayfield Heights, State of Ohio,

Section 1: That this council hereby respectfully memorializes the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Members of the U.S. Senate to eliminate the 10-percent tax on telephone calls.

Section 2: That the clerk of council be, and she hereby is, directed to send certified copies of this resolution to U.S. Senators LAUSCHE and YOUNG and Congressman BOLTON.

Section 3: That this resolution shall take effect at the earliest time allowed by law.

M. A. LANESE,
President of Council.

Attest:

ALICE K. SUPPLE,
Clerk of Council.

Approved by the Mayor:

EDWIN T. FRANTZ,
Mayor.

U.S. Economic Supremacy Is Put to Test by Khrushchev's Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column written by Mr. Carroll Kilpatrick which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on February 14, 1959:

U.S. ECONOMIC SUPREMACY IS PUT TO TEST

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's economic challenge to the United States is regarded by experts in government and private circles here as exaggerated in detail but nevertheless a serious long-range threat.

Some officials go so far as to say that this economic challenge has now become greater even than the military challenge, and that Russia and China combined eventually will outproduce the free industrial countries.

President Eisenhower, however, told his last press conference that he did not believe an expanded Federal program was necessary or desirable as an answer to the Soviet 7-year plan.

In Khrushchev's speech last month at the 21st Communist Party Congress, the Soviet leader extolled the complete superiority of socialism over capitalism and said that by 1970 Russia will attain the world's highest standard of living.

Khrushchev told the assembled party delegates that the Soviet's fundamental economic task is to overtake the most highly

developed capitalist countries in per capita production.

"If we calculate on a per capita basis," the Soviet Premier said in the course of his lengthy discourse, "we will probably need, after the fulfillment of the 7-year plan (in 1965), about 5 more years to catch up with and outstrip the United States in industrial output.

"Thus by that time (1970), or perhaps sooner, the Soviet Union will advance to world leadership both in absolute volume of production and in per caipta production."

Secretary of Commerce Lewis L. Strauss, in a speech Wednesday in Chicago, dismissed Khrushchev's claims as boasting, and pointed out that in 1958 the gross national product in the United States was $437 billion compared with about $180 billion in Russia if you want to believe their statistics.

Nevertheless, Strauss warned that Russia's foreign trade offensive is a serious menace which the general public does not yet appreciate.

Russia is not in business for business, but for economic warfare, the Secretary said.

It is this new trade potential that bothers experts more than Khrushchev's grandiose claims of beating the United States in total and per capita production.

With its growing econmic power, Moscow will be strong enough to use trade more and more as a weapon of the cold war, directing trade with one hand where it will do the most good from the Communist viewpoint and withholding trade with another hand if it decides to crack down on a country that is not toeing the line

Even more disastrous for the West would be a demonstration of Soviet economic progress at a time of economic recession in the leading capitalist country.

If Moscow is able to conduct its economic offensive on the basis of greatly expanded production at home, and if the United States decides it cannot afford to promote certain economic programs either at home or abroad, the lesson would quickly be apparent to all the uncommitted countries as well as to America's friends.

Some experts argue that the statistical race between the United States and Russia is not too significant. They quote Paul-Henri Spaak, Secretary-General of NATO, who recently said, "I feel that a rich Communist is probably less to be feared than a poor Communist."

"What we must realize," Spaak said, "is that the Communist goal is not merely an economic or a social threat; it is much wider; the ambition of communism is to be the wellspring of a new civilization, in which the essential foundations of our spiritual, intellectual, moral and political life will be challenged."

One expert summarized the issue this way: "For us to say we cannot afford aid to India or cannot afford adequate schools, or cannot afford a proper defense, is to admit failure.

"We must maintain a satisfactory rate of growth—not to postpone the time the U.S.S.R. matches our productive capacity but to demonstrate for ourselves and the rest of the world that our system works."

The rate of progress could be more important, particularly in the eyes of the underdeveloped countries, than the absolute difference between the United States and Russia. Russia's rate is now between 6 and 8 percent a year and China's is reportedly as high as 10 percent. The United States rate, which dropped considerably last year, averaged 4 percent between 1947 and 1956.

It is conceded that Russia's rate of growth will continue to be about twice that of the United States, but even so, gross national product in the United States in 1970 will be almost twice Russia's. Not until the turn of the century according to American experts, will Russia equal America in total output.

As one indication of Russia's more formidable economic base is the substantial industrial progress that has been made in the Eastern European satellites. To the surprise of most observers, postwar development in the satellites has been impressive, and Poland, East Germany and Czechoslavakia are now in the vanguard of the Soviet bloc in seeking trade contracts with the Afro-Asian countries and Latin-America.

Jan Wszelaki, prewar economic adviser to the Polish Government and specialist in Eastern European economics, shows in a new study for the National Planning Association that the satellites have obtained "impressive economic footholds" in a number of underdeveloped countries. The Eastern European countries and Russia need raw material imports which the underdeveloped countries are all too eager to sell.

In return, the satellites are increasingly able to "supply the kind of industrial goods the developing countries can use," Wszelaki says, adding that Moscow has assigned this trade "high poltical priority."

Instead of being a burden on the Soviet Union, the satellites have become of great value, particularly in the last year or two, he writes.

Wzelaki declares that "control over East-Central Europe continues to be more than marginally important to Soviet economic development and * * * is of at least equal value in the Soviet trade-and-aid offensive."

He further notes, as part of Communist economic development that Moscow soon will establish an international bank to finance economic projects in uncommitted countries.

Russia now is a poor second to the United States in total industrial production. In the reasonably near future it will be a strong second—a fact that will make a great impression on the rest of the world unless—all experts agree—the United States makes the best possible use of its machinery and resources to strengthen itself and its associates in the free world.

Our Surplus Crops Could Be Utilized in Industry if We Make a Real Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, for the last decade we have been hearing the claim that if get rid of our surplus farm commodities we will be a long way toward solving the farm problem. So far, nothing attempted by this administration or previous ones has done anything to get rid of these surpluses. Six years ago we had $1,118 million worth of surplus commodities stored in Government warehouses and bins. Today, that figure has climbed to nearly $5.5 billion.

There are any number of ways of eliminating such surpluses. One is to try the old depression program of destroying them. A much sounder method has been advocated in this House by a number of Members and in the other body by some of our most capable Senators. I refer to the program for industrial uses of these farm crops.

I am indeed proud that a fellow citizen of Nebraska, Mr. J. Leroy Welsh, has done a great deal toward making this a real possibility rather than just wishful thinking. As head of the President's Commission on Industrial Uses of Agricultural Products he has supervised the writing of a very important report along these lines.

However, for some reason there is considerable opposition to a real development of industrial uses of farm commodities. The Secretary of Agriculture has been far from friendly to this program and has done his best to fill it with his halfhearted support. One bone of contention is that the Department under Mr. Benson has demanded sole right to control expenditure of any funds allocated to this important program. In this direction lies further stalling, further delay, and eventual death through bureaucratic strangulation of this potential benefit to the American people and the American farmers.

It is the contention of the able and sound thinking Mr. Welsh that a separate board would do the best job and that this board must have wide discretion to farm out research to industry and private research organizations rather than attempt to keep it within the Government.

Recently the Omaha World-Herald carried a lengthy and very thorough article by Bob Considine concerning the subject. For the benefit of my colleagues, particularly in the cities, I would like to bring this article to their attention. The story follows:

HOW TO GET RID OF FARM SURPLUSES

(By Bob Considine)

OMAHA.—Telegraph poles made of corn? Automobile tires from wheat? Nylons from barley? Peppier gasoline from oats? Protein for the protein-starved world from soybeans?

Well, we'd better start thinking seriously about these and other ways of getting rid of our colossal grain surpluses or we'll be sorry, the country's leading authority on the crisis told us.

He is J. Leroy Welsh, Chairman of President Eisenhower's Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products.

PROGRESS WON'T STOP

Mr. Welsh gave us some hair-raising facts about a problem that seldom swims before the ken of city folks.

"By July 1 the Government will have in storage $9 billion worth of surpluses," the Nebraska grain dealer said.

In 5 years, if this program is continued, and we find no adequate use for the produce, we'll have between $20 and $30 billion tied up.

"Warehouse rent on what we've got right now comes to more than $1 million a day. Every day. Seven days a week.

"The Government just can't stop agricultural progress. It pays the farmer to take part of his land out or food production, but then the State of some other organization turns around and shows him how to raise more on his remaining land than he raised on the whole dam' acreage."

MOUNTAIN OF PROTEIN

"Take Nebraska. By 1960 we'll have enough irrigation wells pumping—about 22,000 of them—to produce a full crop without one drop of rainfall.

"Here, and elsewhere, the Government can't count on drought to slow things up."

Mr. Welsh, whose commission's recommendations have not been passed by the House of Representatives, said that much of

the world is ready and eager to buy the protein content of our grain reserves.

"They don't want the stuff as is," he put it. "Almost every country in the world has its own surplus of starch. But there's a lot of protein in there with the starch if we ever get industrious enough to recover it. It comes to 34 percent of the total bulk of grain.

"Seven years ago this residue, which grain men call 'bitter' and fed to animals, was made palatable for humans when blended with other foods.

"But as far as I know only one major American food producer has made use of this great discovery. He put it in a breakfast cereal.

"The rice-eating peoples of Asia hunger for protein we're letting go to pot.

"Matter of fact, people in most countries need more protein in their starchy diets. Italy, for instance. We need markets like that desperately if we're going to whittle down the size of our surpluses."

Mr. Welsh pointed out that 1 bushel of grain will yield 2¾ gallons of alcohol, for hosts of purposes over and above the best known application of the stuff.

JUST 10 PERCENT

"If the petroleum people would substitute as little as 10 percent of their varied production with grain-produced material, we could eliminate our costly surpluses and stop paying farmers not to do what God intended them to do," Mr. Welsh asserted.

"If the Government had given grain to the tire companies to make synthetic rubber—given it free—we'd all be saving money today.

"If the first oil prospectors had found starch instead of oil, we'd be making today out of starch everything that is made from petroleum.

"After all, there's not much difference, molecularly, between a field of corn and an oil bed. The oil was once vegetation. It all comes out even in the laboratory."

BUT IF WE DON'T

"But the petroleum industry won't buy this huge source of raw materials, a source that renews itself all over the Nation with every crop.

"The plastics and synthetics trades have been slow to dip into our mountains of surpluses, too.

"Enough protein to add stature to countless millions of people, upgrade the health of whole areas of the earth, lies unexploited in our bins.

"Nothing is going to stop the American farmer from producing more than this country needs, what we can sell, and what we can give away abroad without hurting our foreign friend's markets.

"But if we don't soon put this bounty to work we'll go bust."

Republicans To Draft Credo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the history of intra-party differences and conflicts over issues and policies, as between members of the same political party would fill a book and make interesting reading. Actually it is remarkable that under the stress of strong personal loyalties and the resulting cross-convictions of thought that our two great political parties have not splintered into a multiparty system as is the situation today in modern Italy and France. All of which is very much to the good of the great Nation which is so beloved in common by members of both the Republican and Democratic Parties. Moreover, I might add that I doubt if any present Member of Congress will ever live to see a reconstituting or readjustment as between the parties with conservatives joining with conservatives and liberals joining with liberals or some such regrouping.

From time to time, however, in the process of establishing majority views and finding a common basis for agreement, contention manifests itself. Early in this session of Congress Republicans in the Senate in selecting a floor leader revived the modern versus conservative argument of their party. Then in mid-January, in Des Moines, Iowa, at the meeting of the Republican National Committee, partisan roles and policies were under attack and made headlines.

Now at the Senate end of the Capitol, the Democrats are in the limelight with dissident voices asking for more party caucuses to afford wider participation in formulating legislative programs and policies.

But to return to matters pertaining to my own party, which obviously I can discuss with more propriety, Republican Chairman Alcorn has just announced a 44-member committee to draft a long-range statement of Republican Party policy and objectives.

Naturally the question arises, Can any such study group of either party representing all segments of thinking, spell out successfully a set of principles covering a party stand on all vital issues?

Personally, Mr. Speaker, as a Republican I have said that if Republicans stuck to fundamentals and general objectives and principles we can stand firm and find unity. When it comes to regulations on labor, fiscal problems, foreign policy, or domestic programs we should be able to agree on a pattern and framework, but each individual, to have accord, would have to complete the picture for himself or herself as to shades, degree, and details. In other words, there would have to be flexibility and in the spirit of the republican form of government which protects minorities properly there must be mutual respect of viewpoint and compromise between individuals. Each party member cannot demand exactly what fits his or her own convictions down to the last dot. That would be impossible.

Actually, our two great political parties follow the tradition of establishing principles at the grassroots by precinct caucus. After local discussion and free debate, party opinion is implemented and finds substance and form by process of resolution and vote at conventions at various levels until a set of principles and statement of majority views and objectives are consummated in the formal adoption of a party platform. In turn, referring to national principles and objectives, the respective party Members of the House and Members of the Senate establish their respective programs except that the party to which the Chief Executive has allegiance naturally has an influential and active partner in establishing the program deemed in conformity with party policy.

Speaking for myself, I am happy Mr. Alcorn has acted with the President's blessing to have a committee of 44 members of my party draft a statement of principles and long-range objectives. Such a committee should spell out the distinction between the two political parties and point out our Republican philosophy, especially where we insist on need as a requirement to recipients of Federal Government assistance.

To return, however, to my original thought and opening remarks, each political party has its internal differences and sources of conflict. Nothing can effect agreement on all issues. But it is certainly wholesome and constructive for an organization to take a fresh look at what it advocates and at what it seeks to accomplish and how. Self-analysis and self-criticism are healthy signs, and out of what I might call this agony of self-appraisal of the Republican Party I look for Republicans to rally to a rededicated and revitalized party under a strong creed under which our candidates can look for vigorous and united public support.

Of one thing I am sure; no party platform should remain static. For example, the establishment of the European Common Market and free trade areas excluding the United States which became effective in January will require a reexamination of our tariff policy. We stand to lose out to foreign manufacturers and our high-cost American-made products, coupled with worldwide dollar shortages and other barriers, already are cutting U.S. industries out of world competition. I fear American capital may be induced to establish more mass production outlets overseas and then they will ship back into our own domestic markets. Our labor will lose both in foreign markets and here at home.

Therefore we should reemphasize the long-standing Republican principle that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to this country on terms which imperil the living standards of the American workman. We will not, I hope, retreat from favoring world trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition but domestic industry must be protected from serious injury and I feel we Republicans should review our historic position from time to time.

By the same token, on domestic matters such as a farm program, where Republicans have strongly differed within the ranks of party, I am certain unity can be restored if we reexamine and restate our policies. Certainly we believe in building a Nation in which each and every citizen may make the most of his skill, incentive, and enterprise. We believe in individual freedom and oppose a welfare state. We believe in incentives and rewards to workmen and industry for ability, knowledge, hard work, risk, and initiative. This principle should appeal to the laboring people of America.

By the same token Republicans are against big Government spending, big taxes, and Federal control. We would assist those citizens who need help; but in every case the local community and citizens should manage their own affairs and daily lives. We believe that individual opportunity and individual freedom go hand in hand.

The Republican task force to paint the true image of the Republican Party if it succeeds will create an issue which to me needs portrayal to all Republicans. Once we see ourselves and objectives in proper perspective, we can go to the people offering principles which assure the best hope of all citizens—not leaders in Wall Street; not leaders in labor—but all citizens in every walk of life a better and happier existence.

Intra-party issues, selfish interests, and human weakness will always exist as long as politics and politicians compete for popular favor. Yet men and women everywhere regardless of political faith will continue to cherish ideals and hold convictions dear.

It is therefore in our Nation's best interest that both our political parties restudy their policies from time to time and strengthen in every way the honest advancement of principles on which there is united agreement. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hail with hope and expectation the efforts of the 44 Republicans from all walks of life and from all over the country who will seek a common ground on which members of the Republican Party can find unity and offer leadership and service to the Nation.

Hon. Hale Boggs, of Louisiana, Suggests U.S. Base Companies To Defer Tax on Foreign Income Used Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the March 1959 issue of the Journal of Taxation:

BOGGS SUGGESTS "U.S. BASE COMPANIES" TO DEFER TAX ON FOREIGN INCOME USED ABROAD

"Why do we force our businessmen to seek out such countries as Liechtenstein, Monaco and Panama to achieve a business result?" asks Congressman HALE BOGGS, Democrat of Louisiana. "I have come to the conclusion that no reason for forcing them to do so exists. It is within our power to provide the means of organizing base companies in the United States itself for the conduct of foreign business operations. We have the example of Canada's 4-K companies and Britain's overseas trade corporations. As a matter of fact, we have the example of practically every other trading country in the world before us to follow."

Because Mr. BOGGS is a member of the Ways and Means Committee and chairman of its Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy, this arresting suggestion demands the serious attention of tax practitioners and taxpayers alike.

"Enactment of a law permitting the creation of a unique class of domestic corporations organized for the conduct of business abroad would do much to provide incentives to foreign investment," said Mr. BOGGS in his remarks at the recent meeting of the Foreign Trade Council. "Such companies would be in a position to utilize the earnings derived from their foreign operations for the expansion of their activities in the free countries of the world without the immediate payment of United States tax. These corporations would pay U.S. tax on their foreign source income only when it is severed from the foreign operation by a distribution to the shareholder. Such corporations—I refer to them as U.S. base companies for want of a better term—could and should be permitted to carry on all operations now conducted by foreign base companies. I wish to emphasize that I think that exporting activities be included within permissible activities.

"Provision for U.S. base companies would not in my opinion require any change in the existing law providing for Western Hemisphere Trade Corporations. Additionally, I see no reason for not permitting any company desiring to do so to continue to operate abroad through a branch.

"It is fair to state that the present fiscal condition of the United States should make deferral attractive to those in the executive department who are responsible for securing the revenues with which to meet the Government's bills. Deferral involves no loss of U.S. revenue since by hypothesis every dollar of foreign earnings would be subject to tax when repatriated to the United States and severed from the base operation by distribution to stockholders.

NEED FOR ACTION IS GREAT

"A most charitable appraisal of the code as it applies to foreign-source income would find it capricious in result, formalistic in impact, and difficult to administer," said Mr. BOGGS. "I know of no one familiar with taxation who does not believe that a thorough legislative overhaul of foreign tax technique and policy is badly needed and long overdue. But it will be an uphill fight to get tax incentives for the encouragement of foreign investment and it behooves us at least to begin by considering recommendations which, though they may not go as far as we believe necessary, have a chance of adoption. I would think it wise for those who have competence in the field of taxation to direct their attention to proposals to defer U.S. tax on foreign source income until it is severed for domestic use.

ADVANTAGES OF THIRD-COUNTRY SUBSIDIARY

"Possibility for the deferral of U.S. taxes on foreign source income now exist under the current code, but the benefits of such deferrals by using foreign subsidiaries or foreign base companies are not available in many instances except at great price. The slow development of the statute and its rather fragmentary administrative and judicial interpretation have effectively denied these benefits to many companies. As an example of a business unfairly treated by the present law, consider company A which at great risk embarked upon the unknown of foreign investment in the 1920's. Legal advisers then had little experience with foreign investment and there were few interpretations of the law. The attitude of the U.S. Treasury Department was certainly far different from its present one. Accepting the best advice available, company A organized its foreign undertaking in the form of a subsidiary incorporated in Brazil. The risk proved worthwhile and the undertaking was successful in Brazil. Company A was also aware that similar markets for its products existed in Argentina, Peru, South Africa, and elsewhere. One would think it a simple matter for company A to transfer a part of its hard-earned, foreign-source earnings to any one of the countries named and establish a similar successful venture for the ultimate benefit of the United States and the countries involved. We know it is not.

"Now look at company B which manufactured a product similar to company A's. For years company B watched the experience of company A and, convinced of the wisdom of foreign investment, decided to move into the foreign field in 1953, but, learning from company A's difficult tax position, it established a base company and, by utilizing this third-country arrangement, is developing the markets in Argentina, Peru and South Africa with profits from other countries untaxed by the United States. This financing ability should be available to company A as well. B's accumulated earnings and profits in any one country may be transferred without the imposition of U.S. tax to another subsidiary where they are needed. Additional benefits accrue to company B such as the averaging of foreign tax rates for the purpose of achieving the maximum benefit of the U.S. foreign tax credit. It may achieve many tax savings on branch or other agency operations because its base company is not subject to U.S. tax jurisdiction.

"Surely, if we were proceeding de novo, no one would support this inherently unequitable and discriminatory arrangement. Yet we today condone it by inaction and perpetuate the inequity by an overdeveloped concern for the bare possibility of tax avoidance.

"The chief reason why company A is unable to remove this tax handicap is section 367. Section 367 applies only to exchanges which involve gain and provides that, in determining the extent to which gain shall be recognized, a foreign corporation shall not be considered as a corporation for purposes of most of the important sections of subchapter C unless, before any exchange is undertaken, it has been established to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate that the exchange is not in pursuance of a plan having as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of Federal income tax. Section 367 began as section 112(k) of the Revenue Act of 1932 in a campaign against foreign personal holding companies which were then being utilized for the purpose of avoiding the U.S. capital-gains tax. Now, of course, with today's tax rates, it is not difficult for the Treasury Department and the IRS to find that a purpose of a contemplated exchange is the avoidance of Federal income taxes. Deferral is so deemed.

"However, company A has no desire to avoid the payment of U.S. tax. It simply wishes to compete with equality under U.S. law with company B for foreign investment opportunities. This it cannot do because section 367 has cemented, not only company A, but perhaps a majority of the primary companies in the field of foreign investment, into a fixed organization pattern.

"Even if we were to assume that rare thing, the Commissioner's approval of an exchange involving a foreign corporation, company A is by no means out of the woods. Subchapter C of the code was framed with domestic business problems in mind. It does not take into account the vagaries of foreign law and the policy of many foreign countries requiring a high percentage of local ownership in corporations. Thus even assuming that company A can overcome what is almost the irrefutable presumption of section 367, it may nevertheless find itself unable to invest where investment is needed because of a statute which should have as one of its

principal objectives neutrality of impact between similarly situated taxpayers."

H.R. 5, introduced by Representative Boggs on January 7, 1959, attempts to solve both of the problems he discussed. Section 2 provides for the creation of a new class of foreign business corporation. Section 3 modifies section 367 of the code to permit tax-free transfer by making that provision inapplicable to an exchange arising out of, or in connection with, a transfer of "foreign business property" (as defined) to a foreign corporation in exchange for its stock.

Summary of Boggs Bill and Initial Industry Reaction

The bill introduced by Representative Boggs to accomplish some of his objectives is seen by some representatives of the foreign trade industry to be facing grave difficulties in its progress through the legislature. The bill (H.R. 5) contains seven independent sections and it may be that, if the need for compromise develops, one or more sections may be dropped.

Section 1 is introductory.

Section 2 would create a new class of Foreign Business Corporations (FBC). These would be domestic corporations which would be permitted to defer U.S. tax so long as the earnings remained invested abroad, to some extent as third-country, foreign-base corporations now do.

Section 3 would permit the tax-free transfer by U.S. corporations of foreign business assets to controlled foreign corporations.

Section 4 would extend the 14-percentage-point tax reduction allowed to Western Hemisphere trade corporations on all foreign income. Only companies with 90 percent of their income from foreign business could qualify as International Trade Corporations (ITC). The WHTC would be abolished.

Section 5 would create an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit which may be elected in lieu of the per-country limitation.

Section 6 would specifically permit credit for foreign taxes forgiven by the foreign country as part of a tax incentive program.

Section 7 would permit nonrecognition of gain on property of foreign subsidiaries involuntarily converted.

Paul D. Seghers, New York City tax attorney and chairman of the International Section of the New York Board of Trade, expressed one reaction of foreign tax experts to the bill: it's complex and doesn't cover all the points that need correction. Mr. Seghers says that, "The need for encouragement of increased activity abroad through tax incentives is so abundantly clear that it is a disappointment that the one piece of legislation proposed along these lines should fall short of affording sufficient incentive. Nevertheless, it would seem reasonable first to consider whether the urgency for legislation to accomplish the announced purpose of the Boggs bill is so great that it would be better to enact H.R. 5 at the earliest possible moment, rather than to risk prolonged delay by seeking to incorporate changes in it, though they may be very desirable.

"However, H.R. 5, if denuded of its provisions for the extension to worldwide trade of the 14-percentage-point tax reduction and for credit for tax waived by foreign countries, would be inadequate to accomplish satisfactorily its intended effect—'to encourage private investment abroad.'

"Why? Deferment is now available through the use of foreign subsidiaries and, according to the most ardent supporters of deferment, is being quite widely availed of in this manner by their competitors. Why, then, can it be anticipated that another form of deferment, given almost the same tax treatment as a foreign subsidiary, will stimulate U.S. business to put money into foreign operations?

"Hence, all who are concerned with the achievement of the announced objectives of H.R. 5 should unite in insisting that the substance of the 14-point reduction and the tax sparing be retained in it.

"The tax-deferral method adopted is based on a plan proposed by Ira Wonder and E. R. Barlow, both of Harvard. It would be better had the method of deferral proposed by Richard C. Munsche (at the December hearings of the Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy) been incorporated in H.R. 5, rather than the Harvard plan. In other words, it would be better, as a method of deferral of the tax, to have the income taxed to the stockholder of the Foreign Business Corporation when distributed, rather than to tax the corporation on its income when distributed by it. Unfortunately, there are many obvious disadvantages in the method of deferral of tax provided in the Boggs bill.

"I note that it is apparently possible to qualify the same U.S. corporation for treatment in the same taxable year as both a foreign business corporation and an international trade corporation. This would afford the benefit of both the tax deferral and the 14-percentage-point tax reduction.

"The proposed allowance, in effect, of either the per country or the overall limitation on the amount of the foreign tax credit is to be commended as a badly needed correction of an injustice. It is to be noted, however, that this still leaves much to be desired to correct the injustices resulting from the Treasury's interpretation and application of the code provisions with respect to credit for foreign taxes levied in lieu of income taxes."

Other reactions run the familiar gamut of varied opinion. At the opposite pole to Mr. Seghers may perhaps be the point to fix the position of Prof. Stanley Surrey of the Harvard Law School. He feels that, at present, there is a drive to secure a distinct U.S. tax preference for U.S. corporations having foreign income; the main goal is a 38 percent U.S. tax rate on those earnings. From the start, as Professor Surrey sees it, basic congressional policy has been that a dollar received from foreign earnings should bear the same ultimate U.S. tax burden as a dollar from domestic earnings. Why then, he asks, should a dollar earned abroad be treated any differently? He feels that this question lies at the root of every tax policy issue relating to foreign income.

Somewhere in between are some practically and politically minded persons who believe that, at this point in our political picture, it will be necessary to settle for deferment alone.

Other minor voices may still be heard. Someone has suggested that, if deferment is to be enacted, foreign incorporated base companies should be required to meet the same standards of reporting to the IRS that will be required of foreign business corporations. Another has inquired why no corrective legislation has been proposed to eliminate the tax advantage which results from the arithmetic operation of the foreign tax credit formula (see 10 J. Tax 33).

Citizens Working Abroad Must Now File Returns

U.S. citizens employed abroad will have to file Federal income tax returns for 1958 and later years, even though their income earned outside the United States may be exempt from tax, as a result of the Technical Amendments Act of 1958. Taxpayers claiming exemptions under Section 911(a) on their income from personal sources earned abroad will be required to submit with their tax return a new Form 2555, "Statement to Support Exclusion of Income Earned Abroad."

The 1954 Code has always required that a return be filed by a taxpayer who has annual gross income of $600 or more ($1,200 if he is 65 years of age or over).

Formerly, many citizens employed in foreign countries did not have to file returns because their gross income, which did not include income exempt because earned abroad, was less than the minimum gross income for filing a return. Now the taxpayer abroad must include exempt earned income when determining whether he must file an income tax return.

All income received for personal services performed abroad by a citizen who is a bona fide resident of a foreign country for at least one full taxable year is exempt. There is also an exemption of the first $20,000 of income received for personal services performed abroad by a citizen who is physically present in foreign countries for (approximately) 17 out of 18 consecutive months.

If the taxpayer qualifies under either of these two rules, income derived from personal services rendered abroad is exempt. This includes wages, salaries, fees, bonuses, commissions, tips and similar income.

However, income paid by the United States Government is not, under any circumstances, exempt for reasons of bona fide residence or presence in a foreign country. Accordingly, U.S. Government employees abroad are generally not affected by the new filing requirement because their government salary is taxable and they have always been required to file income tax returns.

Congressional Complaint Blocks Further Oil Price Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, some days ago, I had occasion to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the serious situation created in upstate New York by another increase in the price of fuel oil completely unjustified by the circumstances. I advised the Members of this House of the hardship that these increases were creating for the people of my district, and I advised them that I had also brought this matter to the attention of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and to the appropriate antimonopoly subcommittees of both Houses of the Congress.

I have been gratified by the tremendous favorable response which I have received from people throughout New York State to the action which I took, and I have been gratified, too, by the prompt action of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in referring this matter to Mr. Richard B. O'Donnell, Chief of their New York office for full investigation.

But, Mr. Speaker, no development has pleased me more than a report which appeared in one of the leading newspapers in my district the other day, the paper which had first brought this matter to my attention, to the effect that as a result of statements made in this House and action taken by a Member of this body, an additional projected price increase was forestalled. All too often

an individual Member of this House who rises to discuss a matter of public concern has doubts in his own mind as to how effective his comments may be in accomplishing the action he seeks. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that in this case we have indeed been effective in a concrete way, and, under unanimous consent, I include at this point an article from the Freeman's Journal, of Cooperstown, N.Y., dated February 18, 1959:

STRATTON PRESSES OIL PRICE INVESTIGATION—ANOTHER ¼-CENT INCREASE IS POSTPONED

Congressman SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Democrat, of New York's 32d District, has announced that the Justice Department has advised him that the subject of recent fuel oil price increases in the upstate New York area has been referred to Richard B. O'Donnell, chief of the New York office of the Department's Antitrust Division, for consideration in connection with other similar complaints under study in that office.

Congressman STRATTON asked for the investigation by the Justice Department following an editorial in the Freeman's Journal's issue of January 21 which called the fuel oil price increase of a half-cent a gallon completely unjustified.

Last week, the Journal heard from a contact within the oil industry that another quarter-cent increase had been scheduled to go into effect on or about February 1, but it was postponed after Mr. STRATTON started his campaign for Justice Department and congressional investigations of the industry's pricing polices.

Congressman STRATTON said that a communication from Victor R. Hansen, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, advised him that the Department was following the recent fuel oil price increases very closely to determine whether they are the result of a conspiracy to fix prices in violation of the Federal antitrust laws. Assistant Attorney General Hansen, also added, in his communication to the Congressman, that "if we obtain evidence of price-fixing agreements I assure you that prompt action will be taken to enforce the antitrust laws."

The Department's letter also referred to a pending indictment in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia in which some 29 major oil companies were charged with fixing prices on crude oil and automotive gasoline. The Department's letter pointed out that "the price of crude oil has a relation to the price of heating fuel oil about which you have complained."

Congressman STRATTON announced that he was highly gratified at the prompt and effective response which he had received from the Justice Department and said that he hoped that this action would help curb any further unwarranted or unjustified price increases of this type.

Congressman STRATTON also said that he was submitting the information with regard to the fuel oil price increases in upstate New York to the House Judiciary Committee with the request that the committee's Subcommittee on Antimonopoly Measures look into the matter further.

Giving World True U.S. Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Constantine Brown, one of America's most reliable and conscientious reporters, wrote a most significant article which appears in the February 24 issue of the Washington Evening Star and other newspapers of the Nation.

Mr. Brown comments on the failure of the U.S. Information Agency to tell properly the American story and combat the propaganda of the Soviets and their satellites. He uses, as an example of this failure, the inability—or unwillingness—of the USIA to place in its proper perspective the situation in America created by the Supreme Court decree on school segregation. While the Information Service may have handled other subjects properly, the record of this situation does not commend the USIA.

It occurs to me that an agency of the U.S. Government should hew to the American policy of relating the facts and all of the facts. For, in not bringing out both sides of the issue in this instance, USIA does a disservice to the American people and to our relations with foreign nations. The action taken defeats the very purpose for which tax dollars have been most lavishly appropriated.

And, as parallel study, I recommend the reading of Senator ELLENDER'S recent report to the U.S. Senate on his tour and his study of USIA activities in South and Central America. This report—together with Mr. Constantine Brown's article—will be helpful to a Congress presently concerned with budget requests for this agency.

Mr. Brown's article follows:

GIVING WORLD TRUE U.S. PICTURE—USIA SEEN FAILING TO TELL OTHER PEOPLE OF RESPECTABLE POSITION OF NEGROES

(By Constantine Brown)

With the assortment of crises, dilemmas, and issues which confront our Nation in almost monotonous regularity, the question is often heard, "What will our allies think of us?" or "This is grist for the Soviet propaganda mill."

American taxpayers have contributed millions of dollars to the U.S. Information Agency and its offspring, the Voice of America. Our USIA offices around the world and in every important capital are well staffed and, we hope, well supplied with all the information available to counteract Soviet propaganda and to explain some of the vital issues we must see in this country.

One of the most important issues in the last 3 years has been integration. When this reporter made his last trip around the world in the fall of 1958 he was asked in almost every country he visited about our racial problems. Far too often the questioner's tone of voice reflected a feeling that America was treating its colored citizens in a very shabby fashion.

In Karachi, Pakistan, for instance, the leading English language newspaper, Dawn, ran a lead editorial severely criticizing the United States on the subject.

In France I found people who actually believed that American Negroes were starving, given no voting rights, and lived in ghettos, much like the Jews in Hitler's Germany.

In Tokyo I heard that many people believed that Negroes were lynched every day.

Nowhere did I find any attempt of the USIA to explain how well off American Negroes are comparatively; how many of them live in well-built houses, how many of them drive the most expensive cars. Nor that the majority of American Negroes live in far greater luxury than many of the foreigners who are feeling so sorry for them.

Neither did I find any evidence that our USIA was presenting to our friends both sides of our segregation question. To the people overseas it would seem that all of America's white citizens hate all American black citizens, and vice versa. It was never told to them, for instance, that there are a large number of Negroes who prefer segregation and who are working alongside and with the whites who also prefer it.

There is ample evidence which the USIA could present. A leading publisher of a string of weekly Negro newspapers, Davis Lee, has written several editorials on the subject. In one published in the Anderson, S.C., Herald on January 18, Mr. Lee said: "These (Negro) advocates of desegregation want to force white people to desegregate, but they haven't desegregated within our race. In some sections of South Carolina the yellow Negroes won't have anything to do with the dark Negroes. I know Negroes in Charleston who will not speak to other Negroes because they are of different stations in life.

"In some sections the yellow and mulatto Negroes have churches that dark Negroes cannot attend. The educated Negro shuns the uneducated of his race. The professional members of our race will rob and exploit the unfortunate members of our race. But they refuse to associate with them on an equal social basis. At the rate they are going, in a few years there will not be a Negro race. You can hardly conceive of sensible leaders advocating a movement that is going to do away with our race. But that is what they are doing."

If the USIA wanted to present proof to our friends overseas that the American Negroes are not a downtrodden and starving minority in our country, they need only to quote Mr. Lee further. He wrote: "Ted Lewis is one of Atlanta's leading Negro businessmen. Some time ago he was having financial difficulty. He went to some of the city's leading Negro businessmen, including the bankers, and tried to borrow $2,500.

"They turned him down flat. He went to the small-loan department of the C.&S. Bank. One of the officials went over his plans with him, and then recommended that he borrow $5,000 instead of $2,500. The bank let him have the money without questions. As a result he is a success today, a credit to Georgia and his race."

There are many things our USIA could do to let the world know that the American Negroes are respected, intelligent and first-class American citizens. It is only a vocal few of both the black and white race who are giving our country a black eye on every continent of the world.

Miss Debra Glater, New York State Winner of the Voice of Democracy Broadcasting Contest, an Eloquent Voice for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Washington the 50 winners representing the 49 States of the Union and the District of Columbia who scored highest in their respective areas in the annual Voice of Democracy broadcast scriptwriting contest, conducted jointly by the National Association of Broadcasters, the Electronic Industries Association, the State Association of Broadcasters, and the Veterans of Foreign

Wars, assembled in Washington for the presentation of the national awards. I had the high privilege of attending that luncheon in company with the number one winner in my New York State, Miss Debra Glater, 17 years old, of Schenectady, N.Y., a constituent of mine and a student at Mount Pleasant High School in Schenectady. I was deeply impressed with the outstanding qualities of all of the 50 young men and women who participated as finalists in this contest. But I was especially impressed with the moving and eloquent expression of the meaning of democracy contained in the script of Miss Glater, which took top award in the Empire State of our Nation.

This script shows a deep understanding of the meaning of democracy as it is practiced in our community and in our Nation, and it also is eloquent tribute to the outstanding educational training provided to the young men and women of Schenectady by the Schenectady public school system.

Because I believe that Miss Glater's script ought to be read by every American, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Debra Glater)

May I read you a letter which I received 2 weeks ago from Bonn, Germany?

"MY DEAR COUSIN DEBRA: Life is so wonderful in the West, but yet so strange. I say strange in the sense of newness. Although I am 17 years old, I must begin life again—like a newborn baby. So many new words I've learned in these few days. Yesterday, while walking in the market square, I overheard two people talking about coming to America. I heard them say that America is a land of fulfillment, a land rich in opportunity. And Debbie, one word I heard them repeat over and over—'democracy.' I've heard this word in school, but what does it really mean?"

Helena's letter goes on—but I must stop here, as it's this part of the letter that troubles me. How can I explain the word 'democracy'? How can I put into simple words this way of life which is my heritage—and which I take so much for granted? Will you listen to me and my answer? Do you think I have told her the truths about Democracy?

"DEAR HELENA: I rejoice with you in your new found freedom. I know there will be many new things you will be wanting to see and enjoy. I feel that an excellent place to begin is with your question, 'What is democracy?'

"This question is not easily answered, for democracy is a composition of many ideals. To me, democracy means freedoms. In the United States, I can fulfill my religious ideals freely. As I walk down State Street in Schenectady, I can see S. John's Church, the First Methodist Church, and Beth Israel Synagogue. I can hear soft melodious voices of young choir boys singing Christmas carols. The ancient appeal of the Kol Nidre melody on the eve of the Jewish Day of Atonement emanates from the walls of the synogogue. You see, Helena, I need not be ashamed of my religion, that my beliefs are not like those of my neighbors. This privilege, this wonderful feeling of freedom of religion, everyone in a democracy possesses. This is a sharp note in the harmonious chord of democracy.

"The freedom of press, speech, and public opinion—to what do these liberties entitle me, as a citizen of America? I can write any article I may desire, without reprisal, but must consider the reputations of my neighbors. I can print what I know and feel is the truth, and express my thoughts on anything from economics to a cartoon. In my democracy, I am free to think, to investigate, and to express myself. This is another forceful note in the chord of democracy.

"The freedom of enterprise grants to me the privilege of choosing my occupation. If I wish to further my education, I may do so. If I take pride in my work, I can be a success. This opportunity for success is very evident, for in America one can see the tables of the workingman as well as the tables of the executive filled with food. In America one can see a picture of well-being. People are well clothed and possess the material comforts, which contribute to their security and happiness.

"And so, the third exuberant note is struck in the chord of democracy.

"But, Helena, democracy begins with education. It's a wonderful sight to see students in high school working in a physics laboratory, or studying math, history, and languages, for they mean America's future. I, as well as each individual, have the benefit of public schools and colleges which will teach me to become a better American citizen. Thus, the final thundering note in the chord of democracy is struck.

"What is democracy, Helena? It is the constant repititious song of freedom-loving citizens, bound together by the basic melody in our Constitution. It is a way of life, the American way of life. I hope you understand my explanation, Helena, and that it will not be too long before both of us can speak for democracy."

Coal Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in order to clear up any misunderstanding on my proposal for the creation of a Coal Research Commission, I submit the following analysis and argument.

COAL PROBLEMS

The serious condition of the coal industry can be directly traced to the following sources:

First. Importation of fuel oil.

Second. The subsidization of other power sources.

Third. The favored position given to competitive domestic fuels taxwise by existing laws.

Fourth. The high cost of transportation of coal which, in some instances, is higher than the production costs.

Fifth. Our foreign trade and air policies which are responsible for a reduction of American production which in turn reduces the use and need of fuel.

The Canadian government has long ago realized this and has had in operation at least two major operations for the benefit of the coal industry.

First. They subsidize coal by paying a subvention on coal transportation to enable the producer to meet competition with other domestic fuels as well as American imports.

Second. They maintain a complete unit for research into the uses, production and marketing of coal through a coal research commission.

Even this last operation has been denied our coal industry.

We have research and study commissions on many subjects and yet, we refuse as a body to pass the necessary enabling legislation to create a study commission for coal.

Why? Simply because other fuel sources oppose the coal industry. In passing, it might be interesting to note that more payroll dollars are paid out by the coal industry per B.t.u. of heat energy than any other source of fuel.

For years the membership of the House of Representatives coming from the coal mining areas have been attempting to pass legislation to create a Coal Research Commission.

It has always been defeated by arguments based upon economy. Nothing could be farther from the truth than the statement that "we can't afford a Study Commission for Coal."

In the face of the declining fuel market for coal, the subsidization by the Government of TVA atomic powerplants, and other fuel sources makes it imperative for coal to find new uses and new markets.

One such outlet is fast disappearing. That outlet was called the foreign shipments market.

Recently, the following stories appeared in the public press:

Bonn puts embargo on imports of coal.

Six nation trade agreement group to put limitations on coal imports. Study plan to subsidize this domestic coal to compete with American imports.

Recently, West Germany put a tariff on coal of $4.79 a ton.

The above-captioned stories tell a very sad story. While we are opening our tariff doors wider and wider for foreign made goods, our so-called friends are clamping down on our products just as quickly as they become self-sufficient.

There is a growing suspicion too, that some of our own foreign aid money will be used to subsidize our competitors.

This, of course, would not be a new phase in our international policies. It has been going on for some time in other fields of American production.

The history of coal is the history of steel and the history of steel is the history of our phenomenal growth as a producing, successful nation.

There are still untapped reserves sufficient to provide fuel needs for many, many years.

However, in the face of present and future threats to this industry from other fuel sources, it becomes our duty to help this industry and the thousands of families and hundreds of communities that depend upon coal for their welfare and in some cases, their very existence.

There can be no valid argument to offset the arguments so far advanced. I expect to present a new bill which will make the Commission self-sustaining.

I would increase the coal depreciation allowance from 5 to 15 percent—oil and gas enjoy a 27 percent allowance—and take a certain per tonnage assessment against all coal mined to carry out the

work of the Study and Research Commission.

It is estimated that we have coal reserves beyond our needs for the foreseeable future.

Coal is one of the world's most versatile minerals. Its uses are limitless. The need now is for the proper study of its many byproducts with the goal in mind of preserving both the industry and the jobs of its employees.

The stubborn, and sometimes blind, opposition to the Commission fails to recognize that our neighbor Canada has such a commission and has for years been giving its coal industry Government subsidies in both Government-financed research and direct transportation subsidies.

King Coal is not dead, he just slumbering. He still has the power and the resources to keep alive the fires in the continuing and eternal struggle for the welfare of all the people.

To those of us whose roots are deep down in the bowels of Mother Earth nurtured by hard times, near starvation, strikes, coal and iron police and meager fare of the old company store, the depreciation of our coal economy strikes us as a real catastrophe.

The sickness of the coal industry is contagious. No one dare really measure the loss sustained by our whole economy when a coal mine shuts down. It is not money alone, it is all of the other values that somehow have become a part of our way of life.

This Congress cannot, in good conscience, refuse again to pass this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I again appeal to the good will and sound judgment of this House to support my bill for the creation of a coal research commission.

Increasing imports of crude and residual oils are having a greater impact on the bituminous coal industry than ever before. Please consider these facts.

The administration's voluntary import control program, even under the broader trade agreements statute enacted in 1958, is not effective in restricting the imports of crude oil and products. Imports of residual oil have not been included in the voluntary control plan.

Residual imports in 1958 were approximately at the 1957 level. Coal production in 1958 was 20 percent below the previous year. Residual imports for the week ending January 9, 1959, averaged 867,200 barrels daily—456,300 barrels daily above the comparable week in 1958. This is the highest level in history. Coal production for the same week was 645,000 tons below the comparable week in 1958.

Total residual imports to January 9 were 7,342,800 barrels, greater by more than 2 million barrels than for the same period in 1958. Total coal production to January 10 was 9,922,000 tons, less by 2,584,000 tons than for the same period last year.

Imported residual prices along the eastern seaboard, the area of greatest impact in coal's markets, have been reduced from $2.57 in August 1958, to $2.37 in January 1959. Thousands of tons of coal's markets have been absorbed as a result of the increased residual imports and reductions in price. Economic conditions in coal-producing areas are deplorable. Unemployment is on the increase, and the number of public assistance recipients is increasing.

Significant facts regarding the proposal for the establishment of a coal research independent agency:

First. In practically all instances where Government-sponsored research programs are in operation, administration and control of such agencies are in the hands of independent agencies, for instance: National Science Foundation, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Atomic Energy Commission.

Recently the Department of Defense, within its own organization, has set up a separate and distinct agency for research operations rather than assign control of these activities to the various established Government divisions.

Second. An important research program, such as anticipated, to benefit the coal industry would require high-type administrative personnel. This is obtained in independent agencies, whereas the same option is not available under established agencies. For instance, the chain of command in an existing Government agency would be along the lines of the following: First, secretary of the department; second, under secretary of the department; third, assistant secretary in charge of the particular area; fourth, director of the bureau within which such operations might fall; fifth, assistant director of the bureau; sixth, chief of the division; and, seventh, head of a research program.

In other words, in the average governmental department a coal research program would necessarily fall to an individual in the seventh administrative level.

Third. Traditionally, in moving projects through Government agencies interdepartmental delays tend to hamper expeditious movement. Likewise, most Government agencies are inclined to protect their own "empires" from possible invasion by other Government departments.

Fourth. There has existed for quite some time a natural inhibition on the part of private industry to turn over to an established Government agency information that might result in impediments to such industry competitively. This is particularly true where several competitive industries find their direction under the head of the same department or bureau. In these cases, industries are reticent about giving information and details of activities for fear that it might find its way into the hands of competitors in its own field.

Fifth. The coal industry's desire for a coal research program is for one that would be all comprehensive, and all inclusive. It should not, therefore, be limited to the field of technical research in which most of the existing coal research done by Government has been confined. In addition to the technical aspects of research, the coal industry's suggested program would cover such other areas as market and distribution, transportation, utilization, etc. In Government, in order to find experience and the qualification to evaluate projects in such fields, it would be necessary to refer to several separate existing departments of the Government. This would require a very involved job of coordinating as well as directing.

Sixth. As evidenced by the experience of Government itself in placing research under individual agencies, the problem of administering a research program requires individual and special attention. It is not something that can be operated successfully as an adjunct administrative task involving other operations of a Government department.

Significant quotations pertaining to the coal industry's suggestion for a coal research project:

House Report 1263, August 27, 1957, "Findings and Recommendations of the Special Subcommittee on Coal Research," in the conclusions of that report on page 29, made the following comments concerning a coal research project:

> A short-range, federally supported coal research and development program such as that referred to in the preceding paragraph, if it is to be conducted expeditiously and effectively and achieve the maximum end results, should utilize the research facilities and personnel of industry associations, universities, and other nonprofit organizations, of private consulting firms and of the Department of the Interior and other Federal agencies, to the extent it is practical to do so, and should be administered by an independent Federal agency which must not be shackled and inhibited by such traditional approaches and restrictive policies as control research activities in the Department of the Interior.

As between the work on coal research in existing Government agencies and the suggestion which has been made by the coal industry for an independent agency, this same report, on page 91, makes the following comment:

> And the Bureau of Mines, as a matter of policy, does not concentrate its coal research activities on efforts to solve the short-range problems of the industry. Most of the Bureau's work on coal, which now amounts to about $5 million annually, is in the area of long-range research and is of such nature that it appears unlikely the average coal producer will be benefited by it.

With reference to the unanimity of the recommendation for a coal research agency established as an independent agency of the Federal Government, the above quoted report has the following to say:

> The Bureau of Mines does not look with favor upon an expanded coal research program along the general lines suggested by the National Coal Association and as suggested by practically every witness appearing before the subcommittee on behalf of the coal producers, mine workers, State organizations, community officials, civic groups, and coal-carrying railroads.

In addition to the congressional comments, the Western State Governors' Mineral Policies Conference on November 7, 1955, advocated an approach similar to that recommended by the coal industry in the following comment from their conference report:

> 1. Establish at Federal level, and at State level where desirable, permanent minerals research advisory boards. These boards

should consider and recommend initiation of research programs, which, in their opinion, are particularly needed.

Excerpt from statement of policy of National Coal Association, page 12:

RESEARCH

Scientific research has made an immeasurable contribution to the economic growth which has made the United States preeminent among the nations of the world. Research should be broadened and intensified to assure further expansion of the Nation's economy and the maintenance of the U.S. leadership. Private industry should continue to play a substantial role in research and make every feasible contribution to the Nation's continued progress. The ultimate in research is beyond the economic capability of some segments of the economy. In furtherance of the national interest and the public welfare, it is incumbent upon the Federal Government to encourage and participate actively in appropriate research in the field of energy resources. An independent Federal agency composed of representatives of industry and Government should be established to aid in developing, coordinating, supervising, and financing an appropriate research program for the extraction, utilization, and consumption of bituminous coal. The program should rely upon existing research facilities to the greatest feasible extent, giving impetus and direction to present research efforts.

Hon. Daniel Alden Reed

SPEECH
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, while driving to my district on Thursday morning last, I heard on my car radio the sad and distressing news of the passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable DANIEL ALDEN REED. For several years in Washington, Uncle DAN and his good wife resided in an adjoining apartment and our pleasant association with them shall remain a treasured experience in our lives.

I have never met a more cheerful individual nor one more dedicated to his work and the betterment of his fellow man. His appreciative constituents of the 43d District of New York returned him to Congress time and again until he had attained something of a record in his 83d year and his 21st consecutive term in the House. From every walk of life, the people of his home district frequently expressed their regard with gifts raging from small delicacies for his table to a fine automobile purchased through popular subscription.

He was a friend and an inspiration to all and we shall miss his presence sorely, as we have during his long hospital confinement.

To his charming, courageous wife, Georgia, and his fine son, William, we extend our sincerest sympathy in their great loss. I am sure we echo the sentiments of all his friends and constituents in these hallowed words, "Well done thou good and faithful servant."

Modesto, Calif., Naval Reserve Unit Is Cited for High Rating in Inspection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. McFALL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to call your attention to a recent article in the Modesto (Calif.) Bee concerning the high rating of the Naval Reserve Electronics Division 12–17.

In these days when we must build an adequate defense for this Nation and at the same time watch every dollar that is expended, it is good to know that the Reserves are being trained and qualified to take their place and do an effective job if we find ourselves in a position where we have to call on them to supplement our Regular Forces.

Following is a brief summary of the newspaper article. You will note the broad section of county life represented in the unit:

Scoring one of the highest personnel inspection marks in history, Naval Reserve Electronics Division 12–17, Modesto, earned the plaudits of Capt. E. J. MacGregor, U.S. Navy, 12th Naval District, Deputy Chief of Staff for Naval Reserve.

"The division, led by Lt. Comdr. Harvey B. Rhodes, Modesto city schools adult education chief, scored 3.91, a record cited by Captain MacGregor as the highest personnel inspection score known to him.

Commander Rhodes' division was followed closely by its sister outfit, NRED 12–16, whose enlisted personnel rated 3.86. Lieutenant Commander Richard Copland, Modesto accountant, heads this unit.

The two divisions, training 120 officers and men, comprise Naval Reserve Electronics Battalion 12–3, led by Commander Dwight H. Barnes, Modesto newspaperman. They are part of the 12th Naval District electronics program headed by Commander R. H. Konig, Treasure Island.

NRED 12–17, ranking 18th in national standing among more than 220 similar units, earned high grades in administration and training to become eligible for national trophy consideration.

Division executive officers, Lts. Gerald Underwood, NRED, 12–17, and Russell Lawson, NRED 12–16, an attorney and teacher, respectively, gave much personal inspection credit to enlisted squad leaders:

Radarmen Henry A. Mayers, Turlock paper company foreman, and Lauren Miller, Stanislaus County Road Department employee; Storekeepr Martin J. Sanchez, Turlock salesman, and Personnelman James K. Yoshino, Turlock farmer, all of NRED 12–17, and in NRED 12–16 Electronics Technicians Robert Dewey, Modesto laboratory technician; Ernest P. Scheuber, Modesto feed company employee, and Hideo Yamada, Oakdale farmer; Radioman James S. West, general merchandise firm official, and Storekeeper A. R. Lindsley, junior executive in a chain store.

Captain MacGregor, in presenting Commander Barnes' Battalion trophy to the top division, reminded naval reservists of their important service to the Defense Establishment and to the Nation's taxpayers.

They are the manpower, already trained, to bring the Navy up to fighting strength on a moment's notice in the event of mobilization or attack. With a third of today's annual $10,500,000,000 naval budget going to pay and allowances, Captain MacGregor explained were it not for the Naval Reserve, the Navy would have to be up to full wartime complement at all times and the costs would be much higher.

"I know of no group of men who do a more important job for their community and their Nation than the Naval Reserve," Captain MacGregor said.

The National Debt

SPEECH
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], in leading this discussion today. I take pride that the gentleman conferred with me during the time he was formulating his proposal to begin a responsible and systematic program of paying off our national mortgage, and I am glad to be a cosponsor of this idea.

As some of the participants in this discussion today have suggested, our national debt is, strictly speaking, an unpaid bill from two world wars. On the budget front our two political parties have fought a rough draw since demobilization in 1946. President Truman had three overbalanced budgets with a surplus of nearly $13 billion; and his four deficit budgets totaled over $18 billion. President Eisenhower has made a $3 billion debt payment in 2 surplus years; and his 4 deficit years have increased the debt nearly $23 billion.

Most people have the idea that since the end of World War II our national debt has been mounting rapidly. However, in relative terms our Federal debt has been stable. In fact, considering that our economy has almost doubled since 1945, the national debt is actually smaller and more manageable today, and hence easier to pay off if the people will support a systematic annual debt-retirement plan.

Another fact that has been missed by many critics of Federal spending is that since 1945, while Federal debt has grown roughly 10 percent, the outstanding debt of all State and local governments increased more than 350 percent to a total of $55 billion. In other words, the Federal Government has actually done a sounder job of debt management than State and local governments during the postwar period.

During the new fiscal year, out of every dollar paid in Federal taxes approximately 11 cents—$8.1 billion—is earmarked to pay the interest charge on the debt. In other words, if the debt remains about the same and we follow current debt policies, by 1987 we will have paid out in interest the total amount of the debt—but we will still owe the debt.

What is the reason our Presidents—and Congresses—have never put forward a debt retirement program? Why have we given so little attention to this problem?

The answer, I believe, is imbedded in our political habits and the attitudes of our citizens which influence public men. For instance, some Congressmen—and citizens—argue that the only way to hold down expenditures is to cut taxes—a philosophy which in practice means a perpetually unbalanced budget. Then there are those—a majority perhaps—who believe that it is smart politics to cut taxes as soon as a budget surplus appears—preferably just before the next election. Then there is constituent pressure for an unbalanced budget by, for example, the type of citizens who write their Congressmen to warn them that the tax rate is confiscatory. Naturally, this pressure plays on the politician's fear of advocating higher taxes, and results in noisy applause for any officeholder who stands up for the taxpayer and demands lower taxes.

The formula is simple: Only overbalanced budgets pay off debt. It is plain, then, that debt reduction is keyed to courageous political leadership that is willing to call for austerity and higher taxes.

Perhaps this all adds up to the conclusion that, for the present at least, it is impossible from a political standpoint to sell the American people on a debt reduction program. In my opinion the trouble with this conclusion is that it misjudges the temper of the American people and assumes that they are soft and self-indulgent.

One final point should be made in connection with this debt reduction plan. The only anti-inflation weapon which has not really had a tryout is an overbalanced budget in times when the economy is strong.

It is my personal feeling that the people are far ahead of their elected representatives on this whole issue. Moreover, I believe they would respond if there were national leadership on this question. For one, I am not only an advocate of debt retirement, but would vote for higher taxes if such a step were necessary to carry out the plan embodied in the idea we have discussed today.

Dedication of Highway Trailer Co. Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, upon the occasion of the dedication of a new plant, the Highway Trailer Co., at Hazleton, on February 19, the Honorable David L. Lawrence, Governor of Pennsylvania, had some significant things to say on what the people of Pennsylvania and the Commonwealth are doing to improve the industrial situation in the Keystone State.

Governor Lawrence had high praise for CAN-DO, the industrial promotional organization of Hazleton, as well as the Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce, emphasizing that the people of the Greater Hazleton community had dug deep into their pockets to finance the handsome plants that now house Capitol Products, General Foam Corp., Lewis Steel Products, and Highway Trailer.

Stressing the self-help aspect of these industrial promotions, Governor Lawrence pointed out that these four plants, at full normal operation, will employ 810 people and create annual payrolls totaling nearly $3 million.

The Governor used the new plants as an example of teamwork to get things done in Pennsylvania. He said:

These plants are costing nearly $2½ million. Seventy percent of this comes from your subscriptions and bank loans and 30 percent, or roughly, $736,000, in loans from the State's industrial development authority.

PIDA—as we have come to call the authority—is, in my opinion, the most essential use of public funds Pennsylvania can make. It is an absolute necessity if we are to achieve the economic redevelopment of our chronically distressed areas. PIDA—make no mistake—is not a giveaway. These are loans, not grants. They are to be repaid, with interest.

Mr. Speaker, this is an ideal example of the philosophy of the area redevelopment bill, the Flood-Douglas bill, which was passed last year, only to meet the fate of a veto, and which has been reintroduced this year and is now coming up for hearings. Pennsylvania shows the way government, industry and the community can cooperate to create jobs, increase production, produce payrolls, banish unemployment.

It is most encouraging to know that Governor Lawrence is all out and fully behind this job-development plan in Pennsylvania. In his campaign last fall, he made this issue one of the main planks in his platform, and true to his word, as he always has been, he is asking the Legislature of Pennsylvania for a new appropriation of $10 million to carry on this forward-looking, result-getting, payroll-creating industrial promotion campaign. In addition to asking this amount, Governor Lawrence has just requested the general assembly for an additional $1,850,000 appropriation to replenish the authority's loan funds until the new biennium begins on June 1.

Just how successfully the PIDA is working was reported by Governor Lawrence when he said that in Luzerne County my home district:

During the past 30 months PIDA loans went into industrial projects which created 3,300 new factory jobs in 17 new or expanding plants.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of this outstanding performance of community and State teamwork and joint financing, with bank participation, in spite of the excellent work being accomplished in this direction, the fact remains that today Luzerne County has 25,000, or 18 percent of its working force, unemployed. So you can see that this is a problem we must keep working at constantly, and one, too, in which we need the aid of the provisions of the Flood-Douglas bill.

I, too, want to congratulate Mr. David Charnay and his associates upon their new industrial home and say to them again that they are most welcome as members of the industrial community of Hazleton, in Luzerne County. And again, I want to offer my congratulations to the great Hazleton community team whose dedicated efforts resulted in the decision of Highway Trailer to locate at Valmont Park, the home of Hazleton's new industries.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have Governor Lawrence's remarks at the formal dedication of the Highway Trailer Co. plant inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REMARKS OF GOV. DAVID L. LAWRENCE AT THE DEDICATION OF THE HIGHWAY TRAILER CO. PLANT, HAZLETON, PA., FEBRUARY 19, 1959

This is the first time that I have participated in a plant dedication since I became Governor of Pennsylvania a few weeks ago.

I am glad that this particular experience can be in Hazleton here in the anthracite region, where new job opportunities are urgently needed—and where the Nation's most dramatic demonstration of community industrial development has come into being.

I am pleased to welcome Highway Trailer to Pennsylvania.

We are proud to have this fine company join the great industrial family of the Commonwealth.

Pennsylvania welcomes industry. Our need for industrial growth is obvious. Therefore, when we Pennsylvanians say "welcome" to industry, we believe that our welcome is a little warmer and more deeply meant than might be the case in States which have not know our problem.

To Mr. Charnay and his associates, and to the stockholders and employees of Highway Trailer, let me say also that Pennsylvania does not merely want to be with you at these joyous dedication ceremonies, our people want you to enjoy a long and profitable life among us, and we want your company to continue its expansion here.

I consider it our continuing duty to help you, insofar as we can, toward enhancing your stability and growth as a company. I have made it a matter of major policy to create and maintain the kind of business climate in which companies can succeed and grow.

And now, let me extend my congratulations to the people of Hazleton, to your banks, and to your civic leaders, who, with the strong support of the general public, have done so magnificent a job of industrial development through CAN-DO and the Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce.

It wasn't easy to dig down into your pockets and raise the money that is financing these handsome plants here at Valmont Park—Capitol Products, General Foam Corp., Lewis Steel Products, and now Highway Trailer.

But you did it.

Certainly the statistics bear out what you have done here. You know them well, but on an occasion like this they bear repeating because they tell—better than anything else—the tremendous job you have done.

These four plants, at full normal operation, employ 810 people, and create yearly payrolls totaling nearly $3 million.

That's a wonderful record of achievement, and it doesn't even take into account the jobs and payrolls created indirectly as a result of this new employment.

These plants are costing nearly $2½ million. Seventy percent of this addition comes from your subscriptions and bank loans and 30 percent, or roughly $736,000, in loans from the State's industrial development authority.

PIDA—as we have come to call the authority—is, in my opinion, the most essential use of public funds Pennsylvania can make. It is an absolute necessity if we are to achieve the economic redevelopment of our chronically distressed areas. PIDA—make no mistake—is not a giveaway. These are loans, not grants. They are to be repaid, with interest.

And you can take pride that PIDA is in a very real sense, a product and creation of this area. Up until its establishment, Hazleton and other anthracite communities financed plant construction through subscription funds and first mortgage loans from your banks. Many called this post-World War II effort "the Scranton Plan," but it did not operate only in Scranton. It was a plan that worked—although it could not work fast enough to absorb all the employment needs in the area.

PIDA came into being, not as a departure of the area plan, but as a part of it. Actually, some of the people right here today helped to formulate the program and write the needed legislation. Senators McMenamin, Flick, Murphy, Wagner, and Scott of the hard coal regions were among its sponsors. And when PIDA came into being, with men like your own Vic Diehm as members of its board, the burden of local fundraising was cut in half. Before, you had to raise 40 percent of funds needed—under PIDA, you raise 20 percent. With the same effort by notable Hazletonians like Diehm and the untiring Dr. Dessen and your chamber of commerce, you can bring more plants, offering more employment.

Your own plan has been strengthened at the suggestion of your own leaders. And the result has been the speeding up of industrial growth in cities like Hazleton, and with firms like Highway Trailer. Here's what your plan developed into—what the result of your original thinking did in Pennsylvania.

PIDA has participated in the financing of 72 new plants and plant expansions in distressed area communities. Those plants and expansions are creating just under 12,000 new factory jobs.

I have requested the general assembly for an additional $1,850,000 to replenish the authority's loan funds until the new biennium begins on June 1.

And for the next biennium—and I am pleased to announce it here for the first time—I am requesting an additional $10 million from the general assembly for PIDA.

Pennsylvanians know this program is working. Here in Luzerne County during the past 30 months, PIDA loans went into industrial projects which created 3,300 new factory jobs in 17 new or expanding plants. I congratulate you for making such a record.

It is a record of cooperation and yet, as you know in the region, it is only the beginning.

These are the thoughts that occur to me as I welcome Highway Trailer to Hazleton and Pennsylvania. You could not have come to a greater State or a finer community.

This work, as I have said, is only in its starting stages. I am hopeful that our PIDA funds are going to be supplemented by a Federal program of financial assistance to distressed areas in the matter of industrial development. Our own Senator CLARK and Congressman DAN FLOOD, as well as others in our Pennsylvania congressional delegation, have given that legislation top billing in their programs.

In a few days, I am going to Washington to testify on this matter in the official hearings, and I shall do everything in my power to see such legislation enacted into law. With this kind of Federal help, our efforts to achieve economic stability in Pennsylvania will be greatly strengthened.

Again, I congratulate the Highway Trailer Co. for seeing here a great benefit for themselves; I congratulate your civic leaders for your can-do program. I feel a sense of pride in Pennsylvania's government for assisting what was done here, but more than anything else, I congratulate the people of Hazleton and the region for your faith in your community, for your perseverance in adversity, for the spirit which has emerged here which is an example to any community in the Nation.

Truly, Pennsylvania's greatest asset is its people, as you have proved right here in Hazleton. May God bless you in this venture and in all your work.

Tax Cuts on Profits From Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York World Telegram and Sun of February 6, 1959:

TRADE BOARD FOR TAX CUT PROFIT ABROAD—BACKS BOGGS BILL TO SPUR INVESTMENT

A drive to stimplate the foreign investment of about $10 to $15 billion of U.S. capital each year opened today under the sponsorship of the international section, New York Board of Trade, which urged passage of the Boggs bill providing for a 14 percentage point cut in U.S. taxes on foreign-earned income of U.S.-owned firms.

Paul D. Seghers, chairman of the section, said that the reduction to 38 percent, instead of the present 52 percent, in corporate income taxes would not only increase U.S.-owned investment abroad by as much as $15 billion a year, but would also create a friendlier climate for American business abroad.

He estimated last year's investment abroad at $5 billion.

OTHERS SUPPORT IT

Clay R. Smith, treasurer, Pfizer International Inc., a subsidiary of Chas Pfizer & Co. Inc., also urged passage of the Boggs bill as a means of allowing the same 14 percent tax break for investment in Europe and elsewhere as is already available in the Western Hemisphere.

Richard C. Munsche, tax manager, Coca-Cola Export Corp., a subsidiary of the Coca-Cola Co., indicated that the cut would reduce U.S. revenues by only about $150 million.

Francis Fay Miller, tax specialist, W. R. Grace & Co., said that both the United States and Commerce Department favored the bill but that the Treasury alone was blocking it.

MORE FLEXIBILITY

Albert D. Early, partner, Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, law firm, said the Boggs bill would give major corporations more flexibility in foreign investments.

Stefan J. Rundt, foreign trade consultant, noted that, although many U.S. corporations already have foreign subsidiaries, some of them secret, the bill would remove ethical roadblocks to the foreign investment of many other large firms. He indicated that provisions of the bill would help reverse the "flight from the dollar" throughout Europe.

The board of trade also announced plans for a conference, arranged by the international section, to be held February 10 at the Hotel Astor to unite more than 50 leading businessmen behind the Boggs bill.

Garnishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the fifth of a series of articles dealing with ganishment in the District of Columbia is inserted at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

SPENDING SPREE PRODUCES REAL WOE

(By Morton Mintz)

(Fifth in a series)

In the spring of 1953, a 50-year-old woman went on a spending spree. She ran up bills totaling almost $1,500.

She bought appliances, a television set, and clothing for herself and her seven children. About half of the total was spent in seven easy-credit stores.

Her husband had known for some years that his wife was mentally disturbed and put faith in soothsayers. He said, however, that he was unaware that she was making the purchases and that he was being made responsible for the debts.

The creditors presumably established that the husband was employed, so that his wages could be attached in event the debts were not satisfied. It is not known if the wife's condition was evident to any of the sales personnel.

FROM THE RECORDS

Here is the story that comes out of employer, hospital, and municipal court and bankruptcy court records and from conversations with the husband and others directly involved:

On June 18, 1953, the woman got into a taxicab. She did not make clear where she wished to go and she spoke incoherently. The cab driver took her to the sixth precinct; police sent her to District of Columbia General Hospital and on June 29, she was committed to St. Elizabeths Hospital. She was diagnosed as a psychotic.

The husband made a few trifling payments on the debts. Late in 1953, three easy-credit stores sued him; the others along with other creditors, apparently wrote off his debts as hopeless. He made no answer to the suits, so judgments were declared by default.

The way was open for attachment of his wages. On February 19, 1954, writs from all three stores landed almost at once. The employer noted on the last one, "Wages $127.24 (for 2 weeks) all of which has been answered for on previous writs of attachments" from the other two stores.

On March 19, the husband filed a debtors' petition in U.S. Bankruptcy Court. It said his debts, all contracted in 1953, totaled $1,426.79 and his assets $462.71.

STATES HIS PREDICAMENT

The petition said the husband states upon his oath that his wife incurred heavy indebtedness during the past year; that his salary has been attached three times recently; that if another attachment is placed against his salary, he will lose his job according to the policy of the company, and will be without means to support his family.

On March 22, the husband was adjudged to be legally bankrupt. (He was discharged from bankruptcy on November 24, 1954.) On March 26, he asked the municipal court to quash the attachment of the store that arrived last, Marvins Credit, Inc., 734 Seventh Street NW., but this move failed. His motion said his creditors "are constantly at-

taching (my) salary * * * the entire family is without proper food."

In a statement of affairs filed in bankruptcy court on April 21, the husband said Marvins, which had a balance due of $160.56, "attached March 17, 1954, and there is now $173.95 held by (the employer) on attachments, of which $158.56 was condemned by Marvins."

The second store, due $71.26, cleared the books with a long-delayed attachment effected in October, 1955.

Records indicate that Hollywood Credit Clothing Co., Inc., 703 Seventh Street NW., obtained $140.23 by attachments and $78 by payments, leaving a balance of $101.90. Just when this debt was lifted is not clearly indicated.

The employer's records, however, show that the husband's paychecks were attached a total of eight times between February 16, 1954, and June 1, 1956, leaving him without pay for 16 weeks' work in 15½ months.

Then, at least by normal credit standards, a strange thing happened. Here was a man who had been ruled bankrupt; who himself lacked the slightest understanding of how to handle money, and who presented extreme collection problems. Yet Hollywood sold him more on its "Credit That Is Different" and Marvins on its "Magic Credit."

Hollywood filed suit on April 20, 1955, charging that he had become delinquent again. He confessed a debt of $320.13, and the store attached his wages. With his payments, Hollywood netted about $250 prior to the fourth attachment, served on August 29, 1956. The employer noted on the writ, "The defendant has left the service of the company."

PATIENCE EXHAUSTED

Employed there 17 years, he was fired by an employer whose patience was exhausted and who could see no end to the costs and trouble of handling the garnishments.

For about a year the husband had only off-and-on employment. Finally a firm hired him as a janitor, at $34 a week. His old job, which benefited by union standards, paid $80.

The new employer's turn came on February 19, 1958, when he was served a writ that said the husband still owed Hollywood $30 (he had paid $290.13) plus court costs of $13 plus 6 percent interest. His $34 wage was attached; the employer lent him the balance, and the debt was paid off.

Marvins obtained a default judgment in 1957 on a balance of $164. But it was unable to attach the husband's wages because in this instance he got an exemption. The garnishment law permits the income of a head of a household to be exempted from attachment if it does not exceed $400 in the two months prior to issuance of the writ. His wages were, however, frozen for more than a week, until the Court could determine his eligibility.

JUST COULDN'T DO IT

The husband said in a recent interview that he had tried to pay off his debts "$5, $6 a week, but there were so many bills, try to pay the rent, $40, try to eat * * * got so I couldn't take care of it."

Recalling his dismissal from his first job, he said, "One night I went to get my time card, didn't have no time card."

There was a 2-month period in which the Department of Public Welfare paid his rent. He is in easy credit debt even today for about $130, some of it for clothing he bought the children now at home. He is paying it off at about $2 a week.

Since February 1956, St. Elizabeths has permitted his wife to come home several times a week. "When she comes out now," her husband said, "she says, 'Don't make any more bills.' "

IT DOES HAPPEN HERE

This is not a typical garnishment case, if there is such. It is, however, not unusual in the trial of grief it left or in its individual aspects. Its importance lies in its disclosure of things that happen under the District's 58-year-old garnishment law:

The municipal court and employers become collectors, chiefly for a few easy credit operators.

Such firms as these thus have an inducement to sell to persons who buy much more than they can afford and who are unable to pay except when attachments deprive them of necessities.

The employee's entire pay check can be attached, and attachments on the same bills can keep coming.

Employees are fired after multiple attachment, often after only two.

Exemption of a person's wages from attachment, so as to leave something for food and rent, is not automatic. Even if an exemption is won, wages are tied up for 7 to 10 days.

The public is burdened with relief costs and the difference between the nominal and actual court costs.

Court costs, even if nominal, and interest inflate the defendant's original debt.

The debt can be charged to a person who does not know of the purchases or that he is being made responsible.

Why Statesmen and Reporters Turn Gray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, a brief examination surrounding the current visit of British Prime Minister Macmillan to Moscow will furnish the answers to the above caption to these remarks.

In two separate articles appearing in yesterday's Evening Star we see how wide of the mark a columnist sitting in his ivory tower here in Washington can come when his observations are stacked alongside those made by a correspondent closer to the scene.

In his column entitled "Britain Takes the West's Helm," William S. White has this to say:

Mr. Macmillan's mission to Moscow has quietly turned upside down the diplomacy of the allied world. Today at least, and possibly for a fairly lengthy tomorrow, it is British leadership that holds the initiative on the Western side.

And then in the same issue and on the same subject—Mr. Macmillan's overtures to Communist boss Khrushchev—Crosby S. Noyes, the Star's European correspondent, in a report subtitled "Berlin Outlook Dims," makes this comment:

In the face of the deliberate insults, the frustration of his hopes and the total intransigence which he has met, it may seem to Mr. Macmillan that his best course at this point would be to cut short his fruitless quest and come home.

All of which simply points up the fact that John Foster Dulles in always taking a firm stand with the Communists and President Eisenhower in refusing to meet with Khrushchev until he shows some evidence of sincerity have been pursuing the proper course all along.

The Right To Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I include here in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by the great columnist, George Sokolsky, entitled "The Right To Protest." This article, I believe, covers very clearly what was in the minds of a great many people during the time of Mr. Mikoyan's visit to the United States. Secondly, it also raises the question that is in the minds of many people and has never been answered, and that is: Who invited Mikoyan to the United States?

The article follows:

[From the Long Island Press, Jan. 23, 1959]

THE RIGHT TO PROTEST

(By George E. Sokolsky)

One sometimes gets more light on events in what is known as fan mail than anywhere else. Sometimes, I refer to such letters in this column. That which I received from Bert A. Doering of St. Louis is one of several on the same subject and in the same tone. I take two paragraphs from Doering's letter as particularly pertinent:

"You spoke about Mr. Mikoyan being confronted by a picket line in this country composed of alien refugees, including Hungarians, Bulgarians, Poles, Czechs, and other foreigners. You said these refugees marched in protest against Mikoyan, and were duly dispersed by the police, although picket lines are supposed to be respected. Your perverted views about respecting such picket lines are extremely obnoxious.

"These damned alien refugees who should be extremely grateful for being afforded asylum in this country now presume to exercise their will in this country by forming picket lines in protest against the visit to this country by a foreign dignitary who is here with the full approval of our Government. These uncouth alien refugees should be taught how to behave themselves in this country, or sent back from whence they came."

Those "damned aliens" are refugees who have been given asylum in this country because in their own they fought for those principles of life and conduct for which we stand in the United States. Because they believed in our way of life, many such persons in the satellite countries have been shipped to Siberia or were murdered. A very few fortunate ones found their way to the United States.

Here they are suddenly confronted with the butcher of Budapest, one of the men who participated in the genocide of Hungary. They find that preparations are made to wine and dine this man, that he is received by bankers and manufacturers as a friend, and no voice is raised protesting his presence in our midst. So they organize to protest and to tell their story—a story of murder, a story of genocide, a story of horrors.

Doering says further:

"It is quite possible that the rude and riotous demonstrations of these uncouth refugees was inspired by the vituperative language of Government spokesmen in their references to Government officials of Soviet Russia. These Government spokesmen are just as uncouth and ill-mannered as these alien refugees who want to take over the country after they get here. And you approve this conduct."

Yes, I do approve of the right to protest and only regret that at the moment I was

unable to go on the picket line against Mikoyan who came here to do this country only harm. The right to protest is fundamental in the America way of life. It emanates from the right to petition. This is not a police state in which the citizens must be silent while the officials act for them. Nor need we fear to speak our minds on political and social questions. Therein lies the strength of our Nation.

Undoubtedly some Americans helped to "cook up" this Hollywood farce of bringing Anastas Mikoyan to this country on a publicity man's Odyssey through our land. Harry Truman, with characteristic down-to-earth wisdom, speaks of them:

"I hope that the recent crop of diplomatic tourists does not get us into more complications at a time when the free world is trying to find how to deal with the Communist world."

Neither President Eisenhower nor Secretary of State John Foster Dulles gave Mikoyan an inch because apparently he would not budge an inch. He used television, radio, and every device of communications to influence public opinion against the stated views of the Government of the United States, to separate the people from their Government.

According to Doering that was all right because Mikoyan was a guest of the United States. Who invited him? Let a committee of Congress discover who invited him. Mikoyan, himself, said on "Meet the Press," in reply to a question, that he came here to visit the Russian Ambassador. The President has not admitted that he invited Mikoyan to this country and the President did not give him a formal reception. Guests of the Government of the United States usually stay at Blair House in Washington. Such a courtesy was not extended to Mikoyan. The Secretary of State does not admit to inviting him. Nobody does.

Kosciuszko Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader-Evening News of February 12, 1959:

KOSCIUSZKO ANNIVERSARY

To residents of Greater Wilkes-Barre, the name of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Polish patriot, who fought for American independence, and whose 213th birthday anniversary is observed today, has special significance, apart from our interest as grateful Americans.

This community, as a large center of Americans of Polish ancentry, has in recent years played a leading role in the Kosciuszko Foundation, with headquarters in New York. Dr. Joseph J. Kocyan, city, is chairman of the board of trustees, of which Joseph J. Lester, Kingston, and Dr. Eugene Farley, president of Wilkes College, are members. Among those who have been active on the national council are John S. Cresko, Mary Glowacki, Mary R. Koons, and John Malinowski.

For more than three decades the Kosciuszko Foundation has been promoting cultural relations between the United States and Poland by providing scholarships and other grants through the dues and gifts of members, scores of whom are local residents.

It is fitting, indeed, to perpetuate the memory of General Kosciuszko in this fashion, for it not only serves to remind us of our debt to this gallant officer, but of the ties between the two countries, especially in trying times like these through which we are passing. The native land of this hero of the Revolution has been undergoing an ordeal for two decades, fighting an uphill battle to keep the fires of liberty burning.

The spirit of Thaddeus Kosciuszko lives on in the hearts of his countrymen who carry on with traditional courage in the face of such tremendous odds, thanks to his stirring example.

The Vaughn Bible Class

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, February 13, the Vaughn Bible Class of Calvary Baptist Church celebrated its 70th anniversary with an annual banquet which was attended by some 400 people. The speaker of the occasion was the Honorable Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, who was introduced by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. CLIFFORD MCINTIRE].

In connection with this important event one of the classmen, Dr. Nelson M. Blake, prepared a statement in the style of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, in that it was so appropriate and timely in connection with our 70th anniversary banquet. I ask that it be extended in the RECORD with these remarks:

Three score and ten years ago our founding fathers organized in Calvary Baptist Sunday School the Vaughn Bible Class, committed to the study of God's Word, and dedicated to a genuine concern for the other fellow. Now we are faced with a great challenge, testing whether this class, or any class so organized and so dedicated, can long continue. We are met together on a significant anniversary of this class. We have gathered here to enjoy Christian fellowship and to pay tribute to those loyal and faithful men who have labored so devotedly that this class might endure. It is both fitting and proper that we should do this. But in a larger sense we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate this class. The noble men, living and dead, who have served here through the years have consecrated it far beyond our ability to add or detract. Members of Calvary Church and of the Vaughn Class will pay little attention to what we say here, but they can never forget what these men have done here. It is for us, the living, to be dedicated anew to the continuing program which those who have labored here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be dedicated here to the challenging tasks remaining before us—that from the lives and examples of our leaders we pledge renewed devotion to the high and worthy purposes for which they have labored so faithfully; that we here solemnly resolve that these leaders shall not have served in vain; that the Vaughn Bible Class, under God's guidance and direction shall experience a spiritual rebirth; and that sincere service for God, for country, and for the other fellow shall continue to inspire and challenge us as the years come and go.

Congressional Abuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have been witness to a crescendoing wave of critical opinion, public and private, with respect to the expendability of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or at least with respect to the urgency of reappraising its effectiveness in rooting out subversion and the need for clarifying its jurisdiction. It required no divining rod to perceive that this sudden intense and widespread interest in the activities of the Un-American Activities Committee was touched off by the decision of the Supreme Court in the Watkins case which castigated in no uncertain terms the efforts of congressional committees to expose persons through the investigative process merely for the sake of exposure.

I would like at this time to commend to your attention the following editorial, appropriately entitled "Congressional Abuse," which appeared in the February 21 issue of the Toledo Blade and which places dramatic emphasis on the continued excesses and abuses of the Un-American Activities Committee in publishing a so-called elite corps of 39 lawyers whom they have identified as Communists.

The editor suggests that the validity and reliability of the committee's list be properly evaluated against the background of a formal protest to the Congress by the California Bar Association in 1957, a protest against the improper and abusive conduct, amply documented, of the members of that committee in the course of its investigation.

I believe the following editorial is highly illuminating and its conclusions an unmistakable indictment of distinctly un-American methods employed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

CONGRESSIONAL ABUSE

In releasing a report on what it calls an "elite corps" of Communist lawyers, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has not only unfairly attacked a group of accused attorneys but has also jeopardized the constitutional right to counsel. The House group listed the names of 39 lawyers from a total of 100 who, it said, had been identified as Communists before the committee. It charged that their activities included abuse of the courts, misbehavior before congressional committees and circumvention of the law.

Of the attorneys named, 23 are from California. This being the case, the Congress and the country should now pay attention to what the California Bar Association said in 1957 with regard to the committee's treatment of members of the bar in that State. In a formal protest to Congress, the association branded the group's conduct toward lawyers in hearings there as "improper and lacking in dignity and impartiality" and as "grossly offensive."

To document its case, the association declared that:

"A lawyer accused by a witness as being a Communist was thereafter referred to by the committee counsel as 'Comrade.'

"Lawyers who tried to object to such treatment were ejected from the hearings even though they were not 'disrespectful, unruly, or boisterous.' "

In the light of such a protest as this from a respectable professional organization, Congress had better look to the misbehavior of its own committee. Members of the bar, while practicing their profession, should not be required to put up with abuse by representatives of Government. If they are to be accused, they should have full opportunity to defend themselves.

Continuation of the irresponsible and abusive methods of the Committee on Un-American Activities can hardly fail to discourage attorneys from taking the cases of Communists or other unpopular clients, thus impairing the guarantee of the assistance of counsel, which the Bill of Rights provides and which both the American Bar Association and the California Bar Association have sought to uphold.

The Soaring Spire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, no one knows better than the housewife the gathering danger of inflation if the practice of borrowing and spending by our Federal Government continues unbridled. Their awareness of this risk is ably set forth in a resolution adopted by the Hinsdale Women's Republican Club of Hinsdale, Ill. Their observations should be well taken at this time. The resolution follows:

The following resolution was passed unanimously at the regular meeting of the Hinsdale Women's Republican Club on January 12, 1959:

"Whereas the tax burden in the United States has reached an all-time high, with increasing pressure on the 1959 sessions of State and national legislatures for increased appropriations; and

"Whereas Government spending programs in the various fields of foreign aid, welfarism, and education require ever-increasing taxation, which is destroying initiative, incentive, and enterprise; and degrading the national character; and

"Whereas Government by continuous taxing and borrowing and spending is causing an inflation, which eventually will confiscate the savings and investments of every citizens; and

"Whereas the taxpayers are helpless in this matter, unless they make a combined and united effort to demand relief: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this club of Republican women—

"1. That our representatives on both State and National levels be advised that they may count upon our unified assistance in their fight to resist this trend of spending;

"2. That they be asked to make careful study of all requests for money, in order to ascertain what economy may be worked out;

"3. That all new taxing agencies and services be held in abeyance;

"4. That we call on taxpayers at precinct and grassroots level to join in this economy effort, by writing to their representatives in Washington and Springfield;

"5. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all Illinois Members of Congress, and to all members of the general assembly in Springfield."

MARY C. ALSBAUGH,
Chairman of Legislation.

William T. Wynn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the death of William T. Wynn, of Greenville, Miss., on Saturday, February, 21, was a great loss to our country, but it was an especially great loss to the Mississippi Delta, the area which I have the honor to represent in the Congress. Mr. Wynn was an outstanding business leader, well known throughout the country.

He was one of the founders and most successful presidents of the National Cotton Council.. His greatest love, however, was Greenville and the Mississippi Delta. His contributions to the progress of our area can never be measured. Billy Wynn was a southern gentleman in the highest tradition of that expression.

Under unanimous consent, I include editorials from the Delta Democrat-Times, of Greenville, Miss., and from the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

[From the Delta Democrat-Times, Feb. 23, 1959]

WILLIAM T. WYNN

Taken all in all, William T. Wynn was Mississippi's foremost present-day citizen. As such, this many-faceted man will be remembered and mourned in our community, our State, our region and our Nation, each of which he served ably and patriotically and in a variety of ways. He was soldier and churchman, lawyer and lawmaker, a visionary agriculturalist who led in the fashioning of the National Cotton Council into a mighty weapon for the South; and a businessman and financier whose acumen had the tinge of genius. All these things he was and more.

But my own remembrance and mourning are not so much for such a man as for one who was my benefactor and advisor and friend. Billy Wynn was one of the handful of Deltans who sponsored my coming to Greenville nearly 23 years ago to establish a new daily newspaper. In that difficult, eventually successful struggle, he and our seven associates gave of their time and wisdom and resources to an extent that is in retrospect as unbelievable to me as it is to the literally thousands to whom I have told this story. I owe him much.

Nor am I unique as a beneficiary of Billy Wynn. No one knows and no one will ever know the range of his unobtrusive generosity. Some of us he put on the road to success. Some he rescued from poverty or disgrace or worse. Some were close to him and some were strangers or nearly so, to whom he offered his helping hand for no other reason than that they were fellow humans in need.

Yet this is not enough to say of him. The successful man can be dull and the open-handed citizen dreary. Billy Wynn was neither dreary nor dull. He enjoyed life in all its aspects, in drawing room and duck-blind and at the racetrack and the football stadium; in the political powwow and at the directors' table; in civic undertaking and in the casual banter of the American main street. No matter where he was, his rare personal charm and his unfailing courtesy glowed warm and bright, drawing to their flame all manner of men and women. He was one of God's gentlemen. May God rest his soul.

HODDING CARTER.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal]

W. T. WYNN

W. T. Wynn, who died Saturday in Hot Springs, Ark., while on a vacation from his Greenville, Miss., home, was a man of many facets, varied careers and ambitions.

Billy Wynn, as he was known best by his friends and associates, was a lawyer, financier, banker, cotton planter and ginner, politician, and civic leader.

Successful in all the fields he entered, he will be remembered best for his devoted zeal in civic and community affairs.

He was one of the organizers of the Delta Council, which is the voice of the Mississippi alluvial empire in matters ranging from water conservaton to farm legislation, from schools to forestry development. It was logical that he should serve a term as president of the group.

With the late Oscar Johnston he moved to form the National Cotton Council, which speaks for cotton both at home and abroad. He served the council as director, treasurer, president, or chairman of the board during all the years since it was formed.

Of all his activities cotton demanded and received the most attention. He guided the council through the hectic span that marked the efforts to develop legislative and pricing policies which would restore cotton to its place in the sun. After his tenure in office he remained a strong force in the determination of policy.

Many men have made successes in single fields. Few have had the varied successes that came to Billy Wynn.

Yet he gave of himself freely, without stint or hope of personal gain to further the welfare of his community and the cotton industry.

Gentle and gentlemanly, soft spoken but forceful, he was beloved for what he was as well as for what he did.

His reward has been the success of the organizations he fostered; his monument, their continued and growing influence.

Congratulations to Clarostat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial which appeared in Foster's Daily Democrat, Dover, N.H., on February 24, 1959, in observance of the 10th anniversary of the Clarostat Manufacturing Co. New Hampshire is proud to have Clarostat as one of its industries. The company has performed an outstanding service to the community and the economic life of the State:

CONGRATULATIONS TO CLAROSTAT

Clarostat, the popular name for the Clarostat Manufacturing Co., is tonight formally observing its 10th anniversary in Dover. On this occasion it will honor employees of 5 to 25 years with a banquet and presentation of awards.

A long story could be written about the 38-year-old concern that started on one floor of a Brooklyn, N.Y., factory building in 1921 as a small manufacturer of miscellaneous items. Not until 3 years later when it produced a special type of rheostat that clarified static in radios of those days, did the company begin to grow. This new product gave the present name—Clarostat—to the concern. It was forced to move to larger space in Brooklyn and the payroll increased to a few hundred.

About a dozen years ago continued growth of the business demanded that new quarters be located. Company executives searched all over the Northeast. Finally, when the late Charles Burnell, one of the top executives of Clarostat, made a trip up through the Connecticut Valley, he was referred to the New Hampshire Planning and Development Commission.

To this State agency and to the old Dover Mill Committee go much of the credit for having the Brooklyn corporation take over the Pacific No. 1 mill. Into this building the Government had poured several hundreds of thousands of dollars to modernize the plant during the war emergency. It was turned over to Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., to operate on a war project.

As a result, Clarostat purchased a modern plant for a relatively small sum, and it also inherited hundreds of men and women who had received Sylvania training on detailed assembly-line electronic work, an asset difficult to appraise in dollars and cents. In the list of 173 employees, of whom 125 are Dover residents, who have been with Clarostat for 10 years, we note many names of former Sylvania workers.

Since coming to Dover, Clarostat has a record of almost constant growth. Its research facilities have multiplied and it has developed many new television and radio components. From a few hundred workers at the end of the first year in Dover, the company now has over 1,300 on its payroll. Salaries and wages have gone up from $1 million to nearly $4 million annually.

Last year its payroll aggregated $3,773,029. Probably over 80 percent of this is in the immediate Dover area. The official breakdown shows that 76 percent is specifically paid to residents in Strafford County and adjacent communities. Of the remaining 24 percent, all but a very small amount is paid to employees residing within 25 miles of this city.

Of the total 1958 payroll, $1,710,000, or about 46 percent, is paid to Dover people.

To get off money matters, a noteworthy feature of the 10th anniversary of Clarostat in Dover is the pleasant relationship existing with its employees through local 242, IUE (AFL–CIO). We note that union officials are frequently called in by management to cooperate on numerous projects. Tonight's dinner is one such.

The Democrat feels that it is in a position to extend to the Clarostat Manufacturing Co., not only its own congratulations, but those of the local area business community and people, for the success that the company has enjoyed, and for what it has meant to the area economy as one of the largest employers.

President Eisenhower and the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, seven state-of-the-Union messages ago, President Eisenhower stated wisely that our school system demands some prompt, effective help. He said the whole situation calls for careful congressional study and action.

Since that time, his recommendations have ranged from study to first echelon action, then back to second echelon study after first echelon inaction.

In 1954, he put it this way:

In order to appraise the needs, I hope that this year a conference on education will be held in each State, culminating in a national conference. From these conferences on education, every level of government—from the Federal Government to each local school board—should gain the information with which to attack this serious problem.

In 1955, the year the conferences were to be completed, he once again became an action man. He put it this way:

However, such factors as population growth, additional responsibilities of schools, and increased and longer school attendance have produced an unprecedented classroom shortage. This shortage is of immediate concern to all our people. Affirmative action must be taken now.

Without impairing in any way the responsibilities of our States, our localities, communities, or families, the Federal Government should serve as an effective agent in dealing with this problem.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-five was the year, too, that the President sent us a special message.

In 1956, he reported the conclusion of the broadly representative White House Conference on Education, that—

The people of the United States must make a greater effort through their local, State, and Federal Governments to improve the education of our youth. This expression from the people—

He said—

must now be translated into action at all levels of government.

So far as the Federal share of responsibility is concerned, I urge that the Congress move promptly to enact an effective program of Federal assistance to help erase the existing deficit of school classrooms.

He promised, and delivered, to Congress that year his recommended program of Federal assistance for school construction.

He hit his peak in 1957, when he said:

High priority should be given the school construction bill. This will benefit children of all races throughout the country—and children of all races need schools now. A program designed to meet emergency needs for more classrooms should be enacted without delay.

But he also hit bottom in the summer of 1957. In July 25, we all lost when the House, by a vote of 208 to 203, killed the bill authorizing general Federal aid to the States for school construction.

This was the bill President Eisenhower said he wanted—until its life hung on his expression of support on the day the bill was voted on. Then there was silence. A statement from the President prior to the vote, that he would be disappointed if school construction legislation were not passed, would have done a lot more good than his mention of disappointment after the bill was killed. For a shift of three votes would have saved the bill. Ninety-seven Democrats and one hundred and eleven Republicans voted against the bill. One hundred and twenty-six Democrats and seventy-seven Republicans voted for it.

In his 1958 state-of-the-Union message, President Eisenhower lumped education and research together, saying his recommended program "involves new activities by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare designed principally to encourage improved teaching quality and student opportunities in the interests of national security."

But that was the year, too, that he talked of spurring the maximum amount of local effort and called for "redoubled exertions on the part of all Americans if we are to rise to the demands of our times."

This—

He said—

means hard work on the part of State and local governments, private industry, schools and colleges, private organizations and foundations, teachers, parents, and—perhaps most important of all—the student himself, with his bag of books and his homework.

In his 1959 budget message, President Eisenhower proposed another study. He said he would set up a committee of selfless, able, and devoted individuals, outside of Government to make an appraisal of the potentials of our future. The result would be establishment of national goals. The committee also would be concerned "with methods to meet such goals and which levels of Government—local, State, or Federal—might or should be particularly concerned."

As one example, consider our schools, operated under the authority of local communities and States. In their capacity and in their quality they conform to no recognizable standards. In some places facilities are ample, in others meager. Pay of teachers ranges between wide limits, from the adequate to the shameful.

He said:

We need a national goal. Once established, I am certain that public opinion would compel steady progress toward its accomplishment.

So far, we have not heard anything further from the President. His Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare did hold a press conference and released a letter to Speaker RAYBURN. So we are down to a second-echelon study.

The Late Meyer Berger, of the New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Shirley Povich which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on February 12, 1959:

NEW YORK, February 11.—At the Riverside Memorial Chapel at Amsterdam and 76th, the cab driver pulled up and said there would be no fare for this one. "I'm not taking," he said, "I'm parking. Meyer Berger wrote a story about me and my hack in 1953. Today, like you, I'm a passenger. I got respects to pay."

They were at Mike Berger's funeral services today, the cab drivers, the destitute, the hardluck ones, his little people with whom he treated in his "About New York" column for the New York Times. Also the big people, the editors of the Times to whom he gave 30 years of super reporting and city officials and bigname folks who had admired Meyer Berger and were now grieving.

They came from other newspapers, too, and the magazines, in farewell salute to the gentle champion of their craft who had beaten his own East Side boyhood poverty to gain fame as the reportorial giant of newspaper city rooms.

They knew that Mike Berger did not merely write stories with his typewriter. He caressed them tenderly and brightly and sensitively amid the tumult of the city room, and the fact that two of them won him Pulitzer prizes was unimportant to admiring colleagues who knew there were hundreds from his typewriter that qualified.

One that didn't win him a Pulitzer prize was the lead he spun when the Times editors turned over to Mike the story of the killing of mobster Albert Anastasia. That master killer of the gangster troop who had plagued New York for years got his in 1957 from two gunmen who found Anastasia in a barber's chair at the Park Sheraton Hotel. Berger assessed the story and wrote, "Death Took the Executioner Yesterday."

The services for Berger today were in the faith of his fathers and he was committed to rest with the chant of the Hebrew "El mole rachmin, schochen bamromin." If it is presumptuous to introduce a Lincolnesque note, at least the fellows of Mike Berger's craft could agree that he, too, is lost to the ages.

The reporter who, better than any other, captured the sights and sounds of New York and grew up to dominate the language of newspapers, made it after only 2 years of high school. But he had discovered the free libraries and learned, too, from his schoolteacher wife, and as one of the 11 Berger children he was learning also the throbs that travel with good people of little goods. He wrote of them kindly.

The big story, too, was Berger's dish and his competitive colleagues on other newspapers would wait for the Berger lead in the New York Times with the kind of trepidation that actors reserve for the next morning's reviews. His way of handling the story was the simplicity of the fine artist as he appraised events and made tools of words.

Thus it was that when the first of World War II's soldier dead came home from Europe in 1947, Mike captured the depth of the story virtually in one lead sentence when he typed "They came in on the morning tide, in 6248 coffins, in the hold of the transport James V. Connolly."

Once a night city editor of the Times, impatient with the lack of slam-bang journalistic style by new young reporter Berger, told him, "You'll never make a newspaperman." Today in the Riverside Chapel, the Times' current city editor, Frank Adams, said "the tongue of an angel is needed to do justice to the craftsmanship and the quality of our departed comrade."

He graduated from police reporter to the toughest crucible of all newspaper-writing jobs, that of night re-write man who assembles facts against time and out of them confects the story that should be written, well. His facility with re-writes brought him the top reporting assignments, and then the Times gave him the thrice-weekly "About New York" column. New Yorkers recognized the byline and then recognized him as the tall, thin gentleman with spectacles and long, inquisitive nose, who listened patiently to them and wrote about them.

Times men said of him that he liked everybody, including some that didn't deserve to be liked. In the city room he was the biggest soft touch for "the bite." Famous enough to have a private office, he wouldn't. Too astigmatic to pass the eye test for the World War I Army, he memorized the good-vision chart and got in. He came back with a Purple Heart and a Silver Star.

He took another fling at war as a correspondent in 1944 and lasted only 2 months, got no farther than England. He developed ulcers that were kicking up. You can get ulcers if you listen too patiently and too kindly to other people's hard-luck tales. Oh, yes, the $1,000 Pulitzer prize he won for writing the 13-person killing by Howard Unruh, the demented war veteran, in New Jersey in 1949, he didn't keep. Sent it along to the killer's mother. His feeling for people told him where it would be needed. It also helped him write so well.

Junior Colleges Put in Limelight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, indicative of the widespread support for the public junior college movement was the general display of interest by many school leaders at the national convention of the American Association of School Administrators recently held at Atlantic City. In one of the most heavily attended sectional meetings at the convention, general agreement was expressed on behalf of the need for a system of community colleges throughout the Nation.

Recently the Christian Science Monitor contained an excellent article by the paper's education editor, Millicent Taylor, concerning the association's discussion of the community college movement. I think it will be of interest to all and ask that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

JUNIOR COLLEGES PUT IN LIMELIGHT
(By Millicent Taylor)

ATANTIC CITY.—Is extending the public school system upward to include the junior college the next step in American education?

School leaders meeting here for the national convention of the American Association of School Administrators, a department of the National Education Association, say it can't be stopped.

In a heavily attended section meeting, the need for systems of junior or community colleges all across the Nation was readily conceded. The point at issue was what the setup should be.

This discussion was only one of nearly two score section meetings dealing simultaneously with all kinds of school problems, ranging from identifying the gifted and stepping up foreign languages to teacher certification and the training of school custodians.

PATTERN OUTLINED

Presenting the California pattern of public junior colleges as a successful one, James H. Corson, superintendent of schools, Modesto, described such colleges as (1) voluntarily initiated by local communities, (2) tuition free, (3) public supported and distributing the cost between State and local levels, (4) serving an existing high school area or combined areas, and (5) administered by a locally elected or appointed board of lay citizens, with the State responsible for accredited standards, and a liaison between its programs and the university providing professional consultative service and the like.

Dr. Corson sees the public junior colleges as providing, beyond high school, education at less cost to the family and to the State. He also sees these colleges as offering real encouragement in an increasingly complex society to those who can benefit by going on with formal education. In addition, they relieve the strain on the senior colleges—large numbers entering senior colleges in the third year.

Able students that are enrolled in them are challenged, and go on to professional degrees and to positions of leadership.

STRONG GUIDANCE NOTED

At the same time guidance is stronger in the junior college than in the early years of the larger senior colleges and universities, and many a young person is enabled to find himself.

It is the experience in California, too, that the junior colleges iron out student problems and relieve the senior colleges of remedial work, although the junior college is not by any means "just a salvage shop."

Close cooperation with the community, Dr. Corson emphasized, enables the junior college to offer advanced technical, semiprofessional, terminal business, and trade training in direct response to community, area, State, and national needs.

The public junior college has also proved the best center for serving adults locally in special, refresher, and retraining programs. It brings into the community at low cost, he added, many cultural advantages and interests formerly restricted to the oasis of the college town.

"As the Nation faces the rising tide of college students during the next decade, heavy

reliance must be placed upon the junior college," Dr. Corson stressed.

"It is probable that they will continue and extend their important role in the democratization of higher education and will bring educational opportunity within commuting distance to scattered student populations throughout the State and Nation. We advocate the principle of local control. If local school districts feel shortage of funds, as they probably will, the State can increase its support with a much lower outlay than it could provide another brand of higher education."

And he added that to do nothing to meet the already urgent need is to place our heads in the sand.

Lawrence Bethel, president of the Fashion Institute of Technology, a higher education institution of New York public schools, declared himself in favor of public junior colleges. But he warned the school heads against merely adding two grades to the high school. The junior college must have administrative and educational freedom to develop as a separate institution of college character, he stressed.

Formation of a junior college in an area must be voluntary, meeting a felt need of the community with the full support of the community and with ready aid from the State.

This was an opinion expressed by many other school heads present.

FAST GROWTH RECORDED

Dr. Bethel also questioned the practicability of forming junior colleges in any but the more heavily populated districts. Where high school graduating classes are small and distances too great to combine high school areas, the junior college classes would be too small to provide courses diverse enough of quality high enough to meet the interests, needs, and abilities of all the students.

In the light of the preeent 50 percent dropout or failures in some of the better colleges, too, he suggested that we are not reaching the interests and abilities of half our present registration. He therefore urged that before the schools add a network of public junior colleges and encourage more students to go beyond high school, that they improve their present programs.

"The junior college is now the most rapidly developing phase of education in the United States," he summarized. "It is estimated that by the end of the next decade it will register more than 50 percent of the freshmen of all collegiate institutions. This proportion already has been exceeded in California. It is becoming the undergraduate collegiate institution of our modern educational structure.

"Let us not impede its progress by trying to make it an appendage of a totally different phase of the structure. Rather, let us assist it to grow and develop in its own right."

Who'll Be the Next President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, today more than 15 months before the parties select their candidates for President, speculation is rampant as to who the next President will be. In the 18th Congressional District, I have tried to obtain information in order to translate that speculation into an informed prediction.

At the early part of this year, I forwarded to all the registered voters in my congressional area a questionnaire. Included in this questionnaire were the following questions: "Whom do you prefer as President of the United States?" and "Whom do you prefer as Vice President of the United States?"

Many replies were returned to me and about 60 percent of those that answered indicated that it was too soon to determine their choice. The remaining answers indicated various choices for President and Vice President. One can draw many conclusions from the answers and I shall draw several.

In order to better understand the results, a description of my congressional district and the economic position of the residents would be helpful. My district consists of residents who are paying extremely high rents and extremely low rents. The rentals range from $100 per room per month to $5 per room per month. Included among them are the residents of a great number of low income public housing projects. They are workers, businessmen, executives, teachers, and many public employees.

My area is populated probably by the most heterogeneous group in the United States. There are Italians, Puerto Ricans, Negroes, Cubans, Germans, Hungarians, Irish, Czechs, and other nationality groups. This area is known as East Harlem and Yorkville. This area is strictly urban with no private residences or one-family homes.

The names of the Presidential hopefuls were not listed on the questionnaire and the constituency wrote in the names according to their choice. Twenty-one and one-half percent selected Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY for either President or Vice President. Thirteen percent selected Adlai Stevenson. Four and one-half percent selected Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY. Four percent selected Gov. Robert B. Meyner. Two and one-half percent selected Senator STUART SYMINGTON. Two percent selected Mayor Robert F. Wagner. One percent selected Senator LYNDON JOHNSON. Twelve and one-half percent selected Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, and 9½ percent selected Gov. Nelson Rockefeller.

The choice for Presidency was the closest with JOHN KENNEDY eking out a 1-percent margin over Adlai Stevenson. Mr. NIXON for President had a slight edge of 2 percent over Rockefeller.

This questionnaire was forwarded to the constituency before Governor Rockefeller advocated his high tax program and reduced exemptions. The attitudes of the residents of the State of New York, and particularly in this section, undoubtedly have changed regarding Governor Rockefeller.

It is noteworthy that during the last presidential election, President Dwight Eisenhower defeated Adlai Stevenson in this area by a margin of 18,000. The district is considered a Democratic district, except in a presidential election.

The strength which Senator KENNEDY showed in the polls was surprising. He was clearly either a choice for President or Vice President, and would, in my opinion, prove to be a strong candidate in this congressional district. The strength of Adlai Stevenson was only for President with a small percentage of the people selecting him as their choice for Vice President. Apparently the voters feel that Mr. Stevenson should be presidential and not a vice presidential choice.

The contest between RICHARD NIXON and Nelson Rockefeller was extremely close. During the last New York gubernatorial election, Nelson Rockefeller on an overall basis won in this congressional area, losing in the north end and winning in the south end of the district. The strength that NIXON showed, in my opinion, was surprisingly strong. While more people favored JOHN KENNEDY, sentiment was strong for NIXON.

Other surveys, such as U.S. News & World Report, are based upon preferences of particular leaders with votes in the convention. My survey indicates the choice by the people who cast their votes. In view of the large number of people who abstained from indicating a choice so far in advance, one can readily conclude that the great majority of the voting population is undecided at the present time.

In my opinion, this is the home stretch and those presidential hopefuls who demonstrate aggressive leadership and who are shown by press and television to possess understanding of our domestic and foreign problems, will be the choice of the uncommitted electorate. At this point, the people of my area who have expressed themselves clearly want JACK KENNEDY for one of the two highest positions in our country.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*	Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*	Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*	
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*	
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*	
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*	
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*	The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*	
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*	The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*	Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*	
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*	
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*	4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*	2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*	
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*	
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*	
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*	3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*	
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*	
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*	
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*	
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*	University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*	
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*	
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*	
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*	
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C.*	
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*	3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*	4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*	
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*	
Langer, William, *N. Dak.*	2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Russell B., *La.*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*	
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*	4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*	The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*	
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*	Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*	
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*	
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala.*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*	
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del.*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex.*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Bass of Tennessee, Jennings, Matthews, McGovern, Coad, Breeding, Stubblefield, McSween, Hogan, Hoeven, Dague, Belcher, McIntire, Dixon, Smith of Kansas, Teague of California, Quie, Short, Mrs. May, Messrs. Pirnie, Latta, Fernós-Isern, and Burns of Hawaii.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Evins, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Steed, Alexander, Boyle, Santangelo, Montoya, Taber, Jensen, Andersen of Minnesota, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Ford, Ostertag, Bow, Jonas, Laird, Cederberg, Lipscomb, Rhodes, Pillion, Weaver, Minshall, Thomson of Wyoming, Michel, and Conte.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Doyle, Bennett, Lankford, Huddleston, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Morris of Oklahoma, Kitchin, Anderson of Montana, Brewster, Kowalski, Wampler, Stratton, Cohelan, Arends, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Bates, Hess, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson, Osmers, Mrs. St. George, Messrs. Gubser, Becker, Chamberlain, Fernós-Isern, and Burns of Hawaii.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, Mrs. Sullivan, Mr. Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Healey, Rutherford, Barr, Burke of Massachusetts, Moorhead, Clement W. Miller, Johnson of Colorado, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Hiestand, Bass of New Hampshire, Siler, Fino, Mrs. Dwyer, Messrs. Derwinski, Halpern, and Milliken.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson, Williams, Wier, Multer, Dowdy, Matthews, Loser, Harmon, Foley Irwin, Morris of New Mexico, Auchincloss, Kearns, Broyhill, Springer, Nelsen, O'Konski, Smith of Kansas, Derounian, and Mrs. Weis.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, Holland, Teller, Dent, Pucinski, Daniels, Brademas, Giaimo, O'Hara of Michigan, Kearns, Hoffman, Holt, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Ayres, Griffin, Lafore, Hiestand, ———.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Morgan (chairman), Carnahan, Zablocki, Burleson, Mrs. Kelly, Messrs. Hays, Selden, Pilcher, O'Hara of Illinois, Fountain, Fascell, Coffin, Farbstein, Saund, Diggs, Beckworth, McDowell, Murphy, Meyer, Gallagher, Bowles, Chiperfield, Mrs. Bolton, Messrs. Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Bentley, Curtis of Massachusetts, and Wainwright.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Brooks of Texas, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Brooks of Louisiana, Mrs. Kee, Mrs. Granahan, Messrs. Monagan, Smith of Iowa, Hoffman, Riehlman, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Mrs. Dwyer, Messrs. Holt, Griffin, Wallhauser, Mrs. Weis, Messrs. Langen, and Barry.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, Elliott, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Everett, Slack, Casey, Carter, Schenck, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Lipscomb, Halleck, Mailliard, Curtin, Mrs. Simpson of Illinois, ———.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Aspinall (chairman), O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Powell, Edmondson, Sisk, Udall, Rutherford, Baring, Ullman, Anderson of Montana, Saund, McGinley, Morris of New Mexico, Rivers, Burdick, ———, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Westland, Hosmer, Chenoweth, Collier, Withrow, Wilson, Cunningham, Langen, Mrs. Simpson of Illinois, Messrs. Fernós-Isern, and Burns of Hawaii.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Harris (chairman), Williams, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Jarman, O'Brien of New York, Moss, Dingell, Kilgore, Rogers of Florida, Hemphill, Rostenkowski, Brock, Bennett of Michigan, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Derounian, Younger, Avery, Collier, Glenn, Devine, Nelson, and Keith.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Rodino, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Dowdy, Holtzman, Whitener, Libonati, Loser, Toll, Kastenmeier, Kasem, McCulloch, Miller of New York, Poff, Cramer, Moore, Smith of California, Meader, Henderson, Lindsay, Cahill, ———.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, George P. Miller, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley Dingell, Rivers of South Carolina, Macdonald, Lennon, Nix, Anfuso, Oliver, Downing, Flynn, Casey, Johnson of Maryland, Tollefson, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Baumhart, Gross, Curtin, Glenn, and Hoffman of Illinois.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Lesinski, Holifield, Mrs. Granahan, Messrs. Porter, Scott, Shipley, Levering, Dulski, Prokop, Foley, Irwin, Harmon, Alford, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Gross, Broyhill, Johansen, Cunningham, Wallhauser, Barry, and Mrs. St. George.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Thompson of Louisiana, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Edmondson, McFall, Brown of Missouri, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Young, Hargis, Burke of Kentucky, Johnson of California, Cook, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Dooley, Broomfield, Robison, Taylor, and Mumma.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen, Brown of Ohio, Reece of Tennessee, and Budge.

Committee on Science and Astronautics

Messrs. Brooks (chairman), McCormack, George P. Miller, Teague of Texas, Anfuso, Sisk, Mitchell, Quigley, Hall, Wolf, Karth, Hechler, Daddario, Moeller, King, Roush, Martin, Fulton, McDonough, Chenoweth, Osmers, Van Pelt, Baumhart, Bass of New Hampshire, and Riehlman.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Willis, Tuck, Jackson, Scherer, Miller of New York, and Johansen.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Boykin, Haley, Baring, Mitchell, Everett, Nix, Quigley, Slack, Flynn, Dulski, Carter, George, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Ayres, Adair, Fino, Saylor, Smith of California, Teague of California, Halpern, ———.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Mills (chairman), Forand, King, O'Brien, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison, Karsten, Herlong, Ikard, Machrowicz, Frazier, Green of Pennsylvania, Watts, Metcalf, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Mason, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Baker, Curtis of Missouri, Knox, Utt, Betts, Alger, and Bosch.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Oliver 2-3263	

Circuit Judges

Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 3-6017
Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	North 7-8109
David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 2-5047
Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 3-6267
George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 2-8653
John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 3-8315
Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 2-4343
Warren E. Burger, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Jefferson 3-1347

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone, National 8-4696)

Acting Chief Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—Giles S. Rich, of New York, 4949 Linnean Ave.
Judge—I. Jack Martin, of Ohio, 9614 Hillridge Dr., Rock Creek Hills, Kensington, Md.
(Vacancy)

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Rd., Sumner, Md.
(Vacancy)

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
(Vacancy)
(Vacancy)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge F. Dickinson Letts

Judges

James W. Morris	Charles F. McLaughlin
David A. Pine	Burnita S. Matthews
Matthew F. McGuire	Luther W. Youngdahl
Alexander Holtzoff	Joseph C. McGarraghy
Richmond B. Keech	John J. Sirica
Edward M. Curran	George L. Hart
Edward A. Tamm	(Vacancy)

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Homer Ferguson
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Lennon, Alton, *N. C.*
Lesinski, John, *Mich.*
Levering, Robert W., *Ohio*
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.*—224 C St. NE.
Lindsay, John V., *N. Y.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn.*—The Congressional

McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, William M., *Ohio*—4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McFall, John J., *Calif.*—507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGinley, Donald F., *Nebr.*
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak.*
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*
McSween, Harold B., *La.*

Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—115 Dale Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
May, Catherine, *Wash.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Meyer, William H., *Vt.*
Michel, Robert H., *Ill.*
Miller, Clement W., *Calif.*
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—6601 Radnor Rd., Bethesda, Md.
Milliken, William H., Jr., *Pa.*
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*—8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga.*
Moeller, Walter H., *Ohio*
Monagan, John S., *Conn.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va.*
Moorhead, William S., *Pa.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morris, Thomas G., *N. Mex.*
Morris, Toby, *Okla.*—220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*—204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murphy, William T., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*

Natcher, William H., *Ky.*
Nelsen, Ancher, *Minn.*
Nix, Robert N. C., *Pa.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.

O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, James G., *Mich.*
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass.*
Oliver, James C., *Maine*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.

Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Pirnie, Alexander, *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—228 2d St. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio*
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg.*
Powell, Adam C., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Prokop, Stanley A., *Pa.*
Pucinski, Roman C., *Ill.*
Quie, Albert H., *Minn.*—The Coronet Apt., 200 C St. SE.
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—5603 24th Ave. SE., Hillcrest Hgts., Wash. 21, D. C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Rivers, Ralph J., *Alaska*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y.*
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rostenkowski, Dan, *Ill.*
Roush, J. Edward, *Ind.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y.*
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.*—2601 Woodley Pl.
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Shipley, George E., *Ill.*
Short, Don L., *N. Dak.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Edna Oakes, *Ill.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Slack, John M., Jr., *W. Va.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Neal, *Iowa*
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Stratton, Samuel S., *N. Y.*—107 Martha's Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Stubblefield, Frank A., *Ky.*
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y.*—Mayflower Hotel
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—3301 Mass. Ave.
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.

Thomson, Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Toll, Herman, *Pa.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Ullman, Al, *Oreg.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Wallhauser, George M., *N. J.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Wampler, Fred, *Ind.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Weis, Jessica McC., *N. Y.*
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Rd. S., Arlington, Va.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolf, Leonard G., *Iowa*
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, John, *Tex.*
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Burns, John A., *Hawaii*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 216 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Series, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Place SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Appendix

Water Resources Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very worthwhile speech by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NEW YORK STATE WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION IN NEW YORK CITY, ON FEBRUARY 27, 1959

Ladies and gentlemen, I am indebted to President Wright for inviting me to speak before your annual meeting of the New York State Waterways Association.

I prize this invitation, since it comes from an organization which, although far removed in miles from my home State of Louisiana, is shoulder to shoulder with us in purpose—the protection and development of one of our most precious resources, water.

My interest in water resources development goes back a long way. I was born at Montegut, La., a small village located about 30 miles from the Gulf of Mexico, and some 16 miles south of my present home at Houma.

Houma, a city of about 25,000 inhabitants, is located about 50 miles southwest of the great port at New Orleans, at the junction of Bayou Terrebonne, a navigable stream which carries a great deal of freight, and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, with which all of you are doubtless familiar. The great Mississippi is less than 20 miles away, as the crow flies.

Having been born and reared in this area, I know at first hand the hazards of uncontrolled water, and, conversely, the benefits of wise development of this resource. With such a background the importance of a well-regulated and maintained system of waterways was impressed upon me at an early age. Through the 22 years I have served in the U.S. Senate, that interest has not only been maintained, but it has grown.

In those years I have devoted much time and energy in helping formulate and develop a long-range, well-planned program of our water and land resources. In all humility, but with some pride, I feel that I have achieved some slight degree of success in these long-range plans.

With your indulgence, I would like to expand my remarks to include a birdseye view of the great Mississippi, with the city of New Orleans as the gateway between the Mississippi Valley and the fabulous riches to the south of us.

Some 41 percent of the area of the United States is drained through the Mississippi River. In the last major flood on the Mississippi—that of 1927—an area of 23,000 square miles was inundated. This is about the combined area of the States of Vermont, New Hampshire, and Connecticut.

Cities, towns, and farms were flooded, destroying crops and paralyzing industry. Scores of lives were lost. Property damage ran into hundreds of millions of dollars; rail transportation suffered heavily, with only one rail line operating for a time east and west below Cairo, Ill.; highways and bridges were unstable for weeks; and thousands of people were left homeless and destitute.

The havoc that would result from a repetition of such a flood today, with the increase in population and the growth of industry in this area, is impossible to conceive. Fortunately, a comprehensive plan for the development of the Mississippi River and its tributaries was authorized in 1928, the year following this great flood. Since that time work has progressed steadily, although after 31 years this project is only 72 percent complete. Yet, the benefits from this project already exceed the costs by a benefit-to-cost ratio of 5 to 1.

One of the prime inland waterways of this area, the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway which passes Houma, was authorized on the basis of developing 400,000 tons of commerce a year, but the tonnage on that waterway now exceeds 13 million tons. More important, however, is the fact that the development of this waterway was a major factor in creating the vast industrial complex of the Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coastal area.

Thus my interest in the beneficial development of water resources of the Nation stems from a personal conviction that such developments were an important factor in achieving our present high standards of living, not only in the area of my home State but all across this great Nation of ours.

I believe that unless a well-planned and aggressive program of water resource development is carried forward, our children and grandchildren will not have an opportunity to enjoy the many advantages that today we take for granted.

My convictions in this have been strengthened by my recent travels through Europe and Asia. I believe that unless we protect our greatest resource, water, unless we keep it inland and do not let it flow to the sea unused, some day many parts of our great country may become as barren as the Gobi Desert, or as the lands which I have seen on my travels in old Persia. Our history books tell us that about 500 years before Christ, the entire area of Persia was capable of sustaining the livelihood of 115 million people. Now it adequately can care for less than 14 million.

Consider the great Valley of Mesopotamia between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. At one time that area could produce food and fiber for 15 million people. Today that great valley can hardly supply the needs of 2 million people. And why? Because of the neglect of a great natural resource—water. If it had been possible to retain the waters upstream on those great rivers, and not permit them to steal the rich topsoil and float it into the interior of the country and into the sea, the chances are that that great valley would still be very productive.

The fact is, that those rivers carried millions of tons of earth down the streams and clogged the small tributaries and rivers in Mesopotamia. Today that land is not suitable for much cultivation. It is sour. It cannot be farmed. Certainly we cannot afford to let that happen in our great country.

Two years ago I visited various portions of the Soviet Union for well over a month. This was my third trip to this country in as many years. I have the opportunity of visiting cities never before seen by an American Government official; cities in the far reaches of Siberia, an area which had been pictured to me before my visit as wastelands of snow and ice—as a vast prison camp. But that was not what I found. To my great surprise, I saw a virgin land being awakened, a land that promises to make Siberia the granary of Russia. Industry was flourishing to a surprising degree. One of the principal tools the Russians were employing in this development was a well planned utilization of its waterways system, both for navigation and the development of power from falling water. I saw several hydroelectric power stations that were larger than our biggest and one that was almost twice as large as any we have in this country. I saw foundations poured for turbines and generators which will have a rated capacity of 300,000 kw. each—almost three times larger than anything we have. And these projects, gentlemen, were designed, constructed, and had all component parts built within the Soviet Union. In fact, much of the work on the large turbines was being done at Novosibirisk, a place which was a small trading post in 1905, but is now a city of almost 1 million.

As a result of my inspection of installations in Russia, I am convinced that in water transportation and hydroelectric power development the Russians are inching ahead of us.

In any comparison of time, money and effort expended on resource development in Soviet Russia and the United States, there is, of course, absolutely nothing that we can do about the rate of such developments in Russia. They are proceeding with their own resources to meet the needs of their own economy. We must direct our attention to what we can do to satisfy our own needs.

There have been many studies of resource developments by presidential committees. One of the most recent was the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, dated December 22, 1955. In that report it was stated that the estimated use of water in the United States in 1950 was 185 billion gallons per day and that, based on an estimated population of 200 million by 1975, the requirements would be 350 billion gallons per day.

However, the November 28, 1958, issue of the U.S. News & World Report contained a very penetrating article by Dr. Philip M. Hauser on the so-called explosion of population in the United States, which sheds more light on this problem of expanding population.

Dr. Hauser is head of the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago, and has been Deputy Director of U.S. Census. He points out that the newest projections of the Census Bureau place the population of the United States in 1975 at between 216 and 244 million.

That is an increase in the predictions of from 8 to 20 percent in the past 3 years.

Putting it another way, taking a mean of the projections, a population of 230 million by 1975 would mean a 30-percent increase in our population in the next 16 years. Think of the tremendous increase in demand on all elements of our resources, including water. In terms of water demand, we will require about 400 billion gallons per day. In other words, during the quarter century period from 1950 to 1975 we will more than double our water requirement.

Thus it should be apparent that plans must be made now to meet these increased needs.

When you consider the time required to develop a major project—3 years or more for planning, then 8 to 10 years for construction—it is evident that it is none too early to start projects needed and justified now.

They will become critically urgent long before they can be completed on an economical program. Crash programs should be avoided if at all possible, since they are always more expensive than necessary, and frequently do not provide for the optimum use of the site.

And yet, in the face of all this data, how is the present administration meeting the known demand for resource development? It has not only failed to recommend funds to start surveys, plans, or new projects that are needed now, but last year built into the budget a planned slowdown which would delay the benefits of the projects underway as well as increase their ultimate cost.

As you all know, last year when the Congress added some new starts for planning and construction, there was a terrific blast from the White House.

On September 2, 1958, the President reluctantly signed the public works appropriation bill. At that time he issued the following statement:

"In the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1959, the Congress has included approximately $39 million in funds to initiate construction on 65 unbudgeted new project starts that will ultimately cost almost $700 million. Adding nearly $700 million to the already heavy future commitments for Federal water resource projects is but another instance of irresponsibility in the expenditure of public funds. I am compelled to approve the act, however, because it appropriates essential funds for continuing work on river and harbor, flood control, and reclamation projects that were started in previous years."

When you consider that the appropriation for construction in the 1959 act was approximately $870 million, was it really an act of irresponsibility in the expenditure of public funds to start new projects which will ultimately cost nearly $700 million? That is adding less than 1 year's future commitment at the present rate of construction.

Unless it is the desire of the administration that the water resource program wither and die on the vine—and that may be the underlying reason—a fair number of new starts should be added each year.

Perhaps those shortsighted planners in the Budget Bureau believe that the Federal Government is spending too large a portion of its budget in developing the water resources of this Nation. Let us examine the facts.

Between 1950 and 1956 our national population increased 11.2 percent. Between 1950 and 1956 the national income increased 42 percent. During the same period the expenditures for rivers and harbors and flood control decreased 14.9 percent.

I believe those figures are very significant.

As all of you know, construction costs have increased on an average of 5 percent a year. If that average is applied to the 1950 expenditure of $627 million, we should be spending about $908 million in 1959 on the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers in order to maintain the same level of operations as in 1950. In contrast, the appropriation was just under $814 million. This comparison disregards the increased need for these public works resulting from our expanding population.

What is the situation in your own backyard—the Middle Atlantic Division of the Corps of Engineers?

The 1960 budget requests $37,448,000 for the continuation of construction on 13 projects. Of these 13 projects, 7 would be completed with the funds requested in 1960. If the budget were to follow its usual course, the 1961 request would be for approximately $24,294,000 for the continuation of six projects, of which three would be completed with the funds requested. By 1962 the budget request would be $21,511,000 for three projects, of which two would be completed with the funds requested. Thereafter you could expect about $13.75 million for the next 2 years to complete the Delaware River Channel.

Had it not been for the new starts added by the Congress, or had the President been granted the item veto he requests, the picture would be even more bleak.

I believe that one of the most vital interests of your association is the improvement and betterment of the 525 miles of the New York State Barge Canal System. This is probably the largest State-owned canal system in the United States. The foresight of the people of the great State of New York in the early 1800's in building this canal has always had my admiration. The part it played in the development of your Empire State and the rest of the United States, particularly the Middle West, cannot be overestimated.

I am aware that efforts are being made to amend the constitution of New York State to permit the legislature to lease or transfer the barge canal to the Federal Government. As I understand the situation, legislation authorizing such transfer passed the legislature in 1958 and similar legislation, now pending, must be adopted this year in order that the proposal may be submitted to the voters in a referendum. Certainly there is a real need for a modern barge canal system, and I am pleased to note that the State legislators are studying the problem of the future of this waterway. It certainly demonstrates a healthy interest by the State of New York in waterway improvements.

The thought expressed in certain quarters as to the reduced future need or role of this system in the overall transportation requirements of the Middle West and Northeastern United States, in view of the early opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, may be giving some of you apprehension as to the continued interest of the United States in its improvement. While initially there may be some minor traffic for overseas destinations that will be diverted to the new seaway, the system will continue to be a vital artery of commerce to serve the large number of industrial centers which the existence of the barge canal itself helped to create and expand. The seaway will doubtless generate new enterprises and activities which may make your canal system even more vital to the continued growth of the State of New York and the Nation at large.

I can assure you that many Members of the Congress are aware of the continued importance of this system to the welfare of the Nation. This is evidenced by the Federal participation in its modernization as authorized in the River and Harbor Acts of 1935 and again in 1945. It is regretted that the national crisis of the Second World War and the Korean situation made necessary a slowdown of this improvement. I was pleased that last year, through the efforts of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, we were able to give this project a boost by providing an additional unbudgeted $800,000 to the budget estimate of $110,000 in order that a start could be made on replacing a pair of guard gates at Waterford.

In 1935 deepening between locks and the raising of bridges were authorized. Of the 65 bridges to be raised, 42 have been or are being raised and the deepening was completed in 1941 with only some widening at structures remaining to be done. The 1945 act approved deepening through the locks. The sills of 18 locks have been or are in the process of being lowered with 9 locks or structures still remaining to be done.

The Corps of Engineers has been directed to restudy the project with a view of eliminating the restriction in the 1935 act on overall expenditure by the Federal Government and to determine what further improvement might be justified.

Under the present Federal project, the responsibility for preparing specifications and designs rests with the Department of Public Works of the State of New York. Such plans must then be approved by the Corps of Engineers. Contracts are then let by the Department of Public Works of New York and finally, disbursement of Federal funds is authorized by the Corps of Engineers when the work is completed to reimburse the State for expenditures under the contract. Due to the fact that the organization responsible for planning and construction of the project is not the agency that supports the budget request, I fear that the importance of early obligation and expenditure of funds is not fully appreciated.

I recall several occasions when it was impossible to obtain even the budget estimate for this project because funds for the previous year had not been obligated at the time of the hearings.

Your State officials have demonstrated their faith and confidence in the future of their canal system in proceeding with the improvement with State funds pending future appropriation by the Congress.

For years, New York Harbor has had two unique river and harbor activities: the supervision of New York Harbor function and the collection of drift, with which I have become familiar during appropriation hearings. The vast quantity of waste materials generated here surely needs adequate surveillance to insure its proper and legal disposal. The hazard of drift and its damaging effect on boat operation is known to me. I trust our appropriations for these activities have been adequate. If not—show us why.

You have many other interesting and important projects in this area, which are sometimes difficult to follow, since New York Harbor is not included as a whole in one Federal project, but is made up of about 35 projects. Your Kills, or New York and New Jersey Channels project, now nearing completion and again being studied for further improvement; the Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers area, largely completed except for the Hackensack, but needing further study due to your Port of New York Authority's development at Newark and Elizabeth; the Buttermilk Channel that needs completion; the Pierhead Channel in upper bay; and the many smaller channels and harbors. You are truly a series of ports within ports, any one of which in itself warrants the concern, interest and attention of the Federal Government. However, all of these features suffer by reason of the no-new-start policy of the administration.

Unless some of the review studies for modernization of these waterways are permitted to be started, you may have to wait 4 or 5 years before you can start some of the improvements that are needed today.

Another important project in this area is the deepening of the Hudson River, from 27 to 32 feet up to Albany, N.Y. Last year the Senate, following the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee, approved funds to initiate this important modernization of the Hudson River. Unfortunately,

this appropriation did not survive the House-Senate conference. I am hopeful that this project can be started in fiscal year 1960.

There are many other projects I could discuss, but those mentioned are vastly important—important not only to the people of New York, but to those of the entire Nation as well.

To plagiarize a phrase often used, I believe that what is good for New York is good for the country, just as I also believe that what is good for Louisiana is also good for the country.

That is why my temper rises and my blood boils when I hear the all too familiar label of "pork barrel" placed on public works projects. These shortsighted mudslingers have no conception of the good that flows to our entire Nation as a result of such pragrams.

A channel in New York is deepened, and as a result, increased trade pours into Pennsylvania. A harbor in Louisiana is completed and there is an increased demand for Iowa corn, Pittsburgh steel, and so on.

These are the true end results of public work programs—increased trade and activity which will continue to keep our country great and at the forefront of nations.

That is why I cannot understand the position of the present administration. It is not possible for me to accept the thesis that the American economy cannot afford the expenditure of funds for projects which will eventually produce more wealth for all of us.

Efforts to cut down our public works programs are merely shortsighted attempts to curtail spending that in the long run will just cost the American people more money. If the administration is so eager to cut down Federal spending I invite its attention to the trimming of our foreign aid program.

As you are aware, the Congress has been asked to cut back of public works expenditures for next year, while in the next breath, the administration has requested a 26 percent increase in our foreign aid programs.

Perhaps one way to obtain adequate public works programs—and I might add, without the benefit of justification and the close watch of the Corps of Engineers over projects—is to secede from the Union and ask for foreign aid.

If this situation were not so serious it would be farcical. We have an administration that on the one hand is attempting to slowly stifle the progress made in recent years in the development of our waterways, and on th other hand, willingly pours money with both hands into foreign countries.

I repeat, our public works programs are investments in the future of America, and I for one, know of no better place to invest our money, our faith, and our efforts.

I believe the time has come for the Members of Congress—and the entire Nation as well—to stand up and demand that the administration take a new look at its public works policy—or else prepare for the entrance of a new administration that will.

The Massive Irresponsibility of the Spenderc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that remarks I made before the Ohio Association of Retail Lumber Dealers on February 26, entitled "The Massive Irresponsibility of the Spenders," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MASSIVE IRRESPONSIBILITY OF THE SPENDERS

(Address by U.S. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, before the Ohio Association of Retail Lumber Dealers, Columbus, Ohio, February 26, 1959)

Just a few days ago we Americans observed the birthday of the Father of our Country, George Washington. I am frequently amazed at how the words of really great men ring true generations after their time. Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Thomas Jefferson—even today their philosophies serve us as a guiding light.

So it is with George Washington. I sometimes think that his Farewell Address should be framed and hung in the office of every Senator and Congressman in Washington, for it offers some very sound advice.

Among his words in that address were these: "As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit."

He admonished the Nation to use credit as sparingly as possible and to avoid the accumulation of debt not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear.

Now, that's a fairly simple formula. The following of it is what takes courage. Political courage.

I am sadly reminded of those words as I observe the spending orgy now underway in Congress. The budget-busters are going at it hammer and tongs, determined to spend more and more of your tax dollars on the theory that a little bit of inflation is good for the country.

Some observers have expressed the opinion that Congress has reflected the views of the people by approving increased domestic expenditures. They believe the people generally have taken the attitude that if the United States can afford to spend billions for military and economic aid to foreign countries, then they, as taxpayers, want to get as many benefits as possible under domestic programs.

Whether this was a correct estimate of the opinion held by a majority of the people or not, one is entitled to suspect that it was the basis on which the 2d session of the Democratic-controlled 85th Congress permitted:

1. A deficit of $12.9 billion;

2. The public debt limit to be raised from $275 billion to $288 billion temporarily and to $283 billion permanently; and

3. Nondefense spending for fiscal 1959 to be increased by $5.3 billion against an increase of $2 billion for defense purposes.

The fact is that total national defense spending planned for fiscal 1959 will be $4.3 billion under fiscal 1953's defense budget of $52.6 billion. On the other hand, nondefense expenditures in 1959 are estimated at $9.2 billion above the 1953 level of $21.7 billion.

In the face of the growing public debt, such extravagance has no place in the budget of a prudent government any more than it would fit into the budget of a prudent family.

Let's consider the Federal budget in everyday terms.

A family budget, operated in the same manner as the Federal budget, would mean that the family started out fiscal 1959 with a debt of more than four times its annual income. Following the Federal trend that family would face its financial situation by obligating itself to spend more than $1.08 for every $1 income received during the year. No sound financial institution would accept a note signed by a member of a family in such a condition.

As a matter of fact no family and no business or industry could ever get into such a dire financial situation with private financing. They would be considered broke long before ever reaching such a status.

In the light of such a situation we currently have before us the even sorrier spectacle of certain leaders in Congress practically hand tooling an economic disaster.

If the budget is unbalanced the result will be higher taxes for everyone. And if the revenues to balance the spending are not collected by the Government then the people of this country are in for a period of inflation that could push the cost of living upward and make your dollar worth less and less.

There are several bills coming up for consideration in Congress that involve spending more billions than the budget provides. Those behind this legislation seem to feel that the country doesn't care and the sky's the limit on public spending as long as you hang a "welfare" tag on it.

I can't think of many things that would please the Kremlin gang more than to see the economy of this country weakened from within by irresponsible fiscal policies. Deficit spending and lending, if continued, will lead us straight into the Russian trap envisaged by Lenin, who said: "We shall force the United States to spend itself to destruction."

A nation can hang itself on the gallows of excessive public debt—and we are no exception.

Some people would have us believe that the Federal Treasury is a bottomless grab-bag which never needs to be conserved or replenished. Because of this attitude we have seen the national debt soar to dizzying heights. The Federal debt in December 1958, was $283 billion—about $7,000 per family in the United States.

In about 25 years our expanding Federal Government has boosted the average family's tax bill from $120 to $1,600 a year.

We don't often hear these facts.

As I mentioned earlier, this current fiscal year the Federal deficit is estimated at nearly $13 billion—the Government is spending nearly $16 billion more than its receipts. For the coming fiscal year the President has presented a budget of $77 billion. It is a balanced budget, even though it is the biggest peacetime budget in our history.

Yet some critics have called it a skinflint budget. Actually, as the President himself said, it will "help prevent further increases in the cost of living and the hidden and unfair tax that inflation imposes on personal savings and incomes."

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, an outstanding authority on fiscal policy, has said: "Our free-enterprise democracy is the greatest economic system the world has ever evolved. But there is one controlling requirement, and it must never be overlooked. The system is based on solvent government and sound money. It is in this requirement that we have allowed ourselves to become weak." To those words I say "Amen."

We cannot spend our way into prosperity. Nor can we preserve our prosperity and our free-enterprise system by following a reckless policy of spending beyond our income in peacetime.

The vital necessity of sound fiscal policy is illustrated by the constantly increasing prices of military equipment. Even allowing for the obvious fact that the new weapons and equipment are much more sensitive, powerful, effective, and, therefore, more expensive than the items they are replacing, the truth is that a good deal of inflation is already built into their extremely high costs.

Let me give you a few examples of the rising prices of what is known as military hardware. The B-29 heavy bomber at the end of World War II cost about $600,000. The all-jet B-52 intercontinental bomber of today costs about $8 million.

During World War II, a submarine cost about $4.7 million. The Polaris submarine will cost about $90 million.

Rockets and missiles are expensive, too. It is estimated that the cost of developing

ballistic missiles to an operational state will be a good deal more than twice the cost of developing the first atom bomb.

Does this mean that unlimited Federal spending is inevitable? Should we just give up in our attempts to keep the budget within reasonable bounds? If that were so, then we would already have lost the battle to stay free.

But it is not so. Most of our problem thus far has been that the great majority of our people have not been aware of the dangers they face from even bigger Government and irresponsible fiscal planning.

We must wake up. We must alert the various forces in our citizenry to make sure of two things:

First, whatever funds are needed for defense, for space exploration, and for other essential military and civilian purposes must be provided, and provided soundly.

Second, waste, duplication, continuation of governmental services no longer needed must be eliminated and eliminated promptly.

We must live within our income. We must keep our economy sound. It cannot be done by going further into debt. We must maintain fiscal integrity.

This is the road to commonsense, the road to a sound defense—a sound defense against the enemies of freedom, both at home and abroad.

The Federal debt is only a part of the whole U.S. fiscal picture. When we add up our total debt—the net debt owed by Federal, State, and local governments, by business and by individuals—the sum is staggering—$758 billion. It has almost doubled since the end of World War II.

Personal income after taxes is the highest it has ever been. Yet, both mortgage debt and consumer debt have been increasing. In 1958 alone, mortgage debt outstanding went up nearly $15 billion.

At the end of 1958, consumer, or personal, debt totaled nearly $45 billion—seven times what it was 20 years ago. A few years ago only one family out of three had any consumer debt. Now more than half have such obligations.

Worse still, the majority of persons with such personal debt have no liquid assets to fall back on.

We can readily see what a terrible thing inflation is by what it has done to the people of France. In that country the cost of living today is 37 times what it was about 30 years ago.

A pound of butter that cost 10 francs in 1927 is 410 francs today.

Men who put aside savings for substantial annuities find that their pensions are worth only 15 percent of what they were in 1940.

The pensions of French veterans of World War I—pensions once considered adequate—have depreciated to a value of 70 cents a month.

Don't say it can't happen here. The people of France never thought it would happen there.

I do not mean to say that all debt is bad. Of course not. Sound business debt is one of the elements of growth. Sound mortgage credit is a real help to a family that must borrow for a farm or a home.

But is it not apparent that in the areas of both public and personal debt these limitations of soundness are being disregarded by all too many of our citizens?

This matter is of vital concern to all of us, but especially to our younger citizens. They will live under the hysteria of inflation throughout the rest of their lives—if it is not checked now.

They will carry the load of our rising debt, and its growing interest payments—if we go on spending beyond our income.

They and their children will pay the bill that will inevitably be rendered by a continuing fiscal irresponsibility—and it will, I fear, be a bill compounded in hardship and heartache.

Inflation has already robbed our dollar, savings, pensions, annuities, insurance policies, social security, etc., of more than one-half of their purchasing power and real value. It has increased the cost of Government more than 100 percent, thereby raising taxes more than 100 percent. As the dollar buys less and less each year, the cost of national defense rises more and more, thereby seriously crippling this country and the free world in their life-and-death struggle for survival against the disciplined forces of communism.

Since our Government has gone in debt more than all the other governments in the world and since Congress continues to spend more money than it takes in, the money obligations of our Government have been falling in value year by year for a long time.

If this keeps up for a few more years our money will be worthless and the savings of our people for old age, sickness and for their children will be wiped out. It is a certainty—if Congress continues its spending spree. If there is any doubt about this, I suggest reading the history of nations in ancient and modern times. The handwriting is on the wall for all to see but the blind.

This is a period in the early stages of inflation when the owners of equities such as stocks, land, and commodities appear to either hold their own or profit from inflation. This doesn't last long. As history shows, the owners of such equities are finally wiped out.

Under inflation, stocks earn less and less dividends and ultimately their value is based on dividends. Taxes on real property mount ever higher because of inflation until it makes ownership of real property unprofitable. In France and Germany, where inflation was unchecked, the people vainly sought refuge through every type of investment. They all came to the same end—bankruptcy.

Our country is at peace. The economists predict one of the best business years ever. We're all going to make more money, there will be longer fishtails on our automobiles, bigger screens on our television sets, and more chrome-plated gadgets in the kitchen for the little woman.

It sounds just dandy, but I think it would be wise in these times to take a hard look at just where we're headed and see if we are not living in some sort of fool's paradise. Perhaps, as the Chinese say, it is only temporary.

I do know one thing for sure—the massive irresponsibility now being displayed in Congress is definitely not the answer. I think it's about time those elected to high office thought less about winning popularity contests back home and faced up to the responsibility of doing—and voting for—what is best for the country as a whole.

This country faces a challenge greater than any it has ever known. For a nation with so marvelous a heritage to destroy itself by robbing Peter to pay Paul is unthinkable.

We must keep America free and strong—economically, socially, and spiritually—so that our way of life may endure. There is no other way. This is your challenge and mine—a challenge to every American no matter who or what he may be.

In Defense of the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement of Mrs. Frank S. Phillips, vice president of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, delivered before the board on February 18, 1959, in refuting the half-truths and glaring omissions found in the South volume of the "Life in America" textbook series. Mrs. Phillips is to be commended for the courage and forthrightness with which she sets the record straight.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MRS. ARCADIA NEAR PHILLIPS BOARD MEETING, FEBRUARY 18, 1959

I direct my remarks to the "Life in America" series which, according to the typewritten notes pasted in the front of each book, are to be used "to interest the class in exploring this section of the United States—in learning more about its people." I hope, Mr. Superintendent, that the policy is not to select a series of books without examining the merits of each member of the series.

On the flyleaf of the New England book the author is described as writing of his native New England with authority. Most of the books seem to be written in a sympathetic and enthusiastic vein. Certainly if the pupil is to be inspired, the author must be inspired.

However, the flyleaf of the book on the South describes this author as associated with a small college in the Midwest and known as an authority on Indiana writers. The writer shows little enthusiasm and has a stilted and uninteresting style. His report contains certain half-truths and glaring omissions which certainly does not serve to stimulate interest in this section of our country. I will mention a few.

On page 24, he refers to conditions after the Civil War. I quote: "Many white southerners had never worked at all. Thirty years passed before new factories and improved farming brought better days to the South." He does not mention the poverty and destitution left in the wake of the war.

John Spencer Bassett, professor of American History at Smith College in a "Short History of the United States," page 469, says "* * * four-fifths of the heads of families were not slaveholders * * *. The South had no more shiftless and lazy men than other communities * * * The industry and resourcefulness with which these people restored their fortunes * * * shows that they were of the genuine American stock, and were sound in mind and morals".

On page 78 of the book on the South the author says, speaking of the old South; * * * Some of her colleges were great; but there were not enough of them, and only the wealthy could attend * * *."

Professor Bassett says on page 479: "It was in this period that the State university took form. * * *

"The process was first seen in the founding of State universities, in North Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, and South Carolina and in the reorganization of the University of Pennsylvania on a State basis, all of which occurred between 1779 and 1815[1] * * *.

"During the period of western and southern expansion, the older institutions of the Northeast developed hardly as much as might have been expected. Largely devoted to preparing men for the professions, most of their students came from the leisure class in the North and South. * * * The rapid growth of the eastern seats of learning, with which the present generation is so familiar, came after the Civil War."

So why not give the old South its due. In some aspects, it was ahead of other areas; certainly its faults were not unique.

---

[1] North Carolina, 1795; Tennessee, 1794; Georgia, 1801; South Carolina, 1801.

I will make this further point: Though there is strong emphasis in the books on New England and the Northeast on the matter of educational facilities, New York particularly being pointed out as leading the Nation in the number of institutions of higher learning, I want the record to show that 8 of the 11 States of the South have more colleges in relation to their size than any of the 6 States of the Northeast group.

Also, though 9 of the first 12 Presidents of the United States were from the South (7 were from Virginia and 2 were from North Carolina), no mention of this was made in the book.

The book dismisses the contributions of the South to literature by saying "Before the Civil War the greatest writings the South produced about the Government especially the writing of Thomas Jefferson." Nothing further is said about literature. But Reuben Post Halleck, in "History of American Literature," page 335, says: "In modern southern fiction there is to be found some of the most imaginative, artistic and romantic work of the entire country in the latter quarter of the 19th century." No one need apologize for the literary efforts of Edgar Allen Poe, Sidney Lanier, Thomas Nelson Page, Joel Chandler Harris, O'Henry, William Faulkner, Frank L. Stanton ("Just a' Wearyin' For You" and "Mighty Lak' a Rose") or Margaret Mitchell ("Gone With the Wind").

Colleges	Number	Population	Ratio: 1 college to—
NORTHEAST			
New York	146	16,195,000	110,000
Pennsylvania	115	10,964,000	95,000
New Jersey	38	5,403,000	142,000
Delaware	4	402,000	100,000
Maryland	33	2,812,000	85,000
West Virginia	22	1,983,000	90,000
NEW ENGLAND			
Connecticut	29	2,232,000	77,000
Rhode Island	11	828,000	75,000
Massachusetts	70	4,812,000	68,000
Vermont	14	370,000	26,000
New Hampshire	8	560,000	70,000
Maine	15	910,000	60,000
SOUTH			
Virginia	45	3,651,000	80,000
North Carolina	57	4,423,000	77,000
South Carolina	30	2,353,000	78,000
Georgia	48	3,712,000	77,000
Florida	23	3,770,000	164,000
Alabama	27	3,135,000	116,000
Mississippi	38	2,124,000	55,000
Louisiana	20	3,004,000	150,000
Kentucky	37	3,017,000	81,000
Tennessee	45	3,466,000	77,000
Arkansas	22	1,815,000	82,000

Source: "Life in America." All figures are latest available from U.S. Government sources. Ratio computed by Arcadia Near-Phillips.

We Believe in Prayer—It's Impossible To Overestimate the Value of Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith some extracts from a recently published book "We Believe in Prayer," a compilation of personal statements by American and world leaders about the value and efficacy of prayer, by Lawrence M. Brings, president of T. S. Denison & Co., book publishers of Minneapolis, Minn. Quoted in full is a statement by a constituent of mine, Comdr. Wendell Phillips Dodge, an explorer-ethnologist who has spent a lifetime studying the religious systems of the world at their fountainheads, especially in the Holy Land as we know it, in the Near East.

Exploring extensively there, and studying the Arabs, Syrians, Jews, Persians, and Egyptians, Commander Dodge has written extensively of these peoples and their lands, history, religion and customs. In some of his scientific reports he proves that man's first religion goes back much, much further than we are accustomed to think about. He has stated that when primitive man used a symbol it did not mean to him the object in sight, but what it represented in his mind. Symbols on the walls of the Temple of Sacred Mysteries at Uxmal, Yucatan; among the fallen ruins of some of the South Sea Islands; sacred writings carved by the Naacals—Holy Brothers—some 70,000 years ago, provide a better perspective of thought. The bases of an extremely early religion was the love and adoration of the Creator as the Heavenly Father among these ancient symbolic prayers offered up to only one Creator or Deity worshipped long before our usually recorded history mentions. Prayer symbols have been found on a stone arch on the island of Tonga-Tabu in the Pacific Ocean, on Alaskan totem poles, the House of Taga on Tinian Island, the Mariana group; the Pyramid at Xochicalco; at Anghor Vat and Ankor Thom, the great Monolith at Tiahuanaco; on a road-cut on Capital Hill, Smyrna, Asia Minor, where three civilizations 500 feet above the sea level existed before mountains were raised; yes, says Commander Dodge, symbolic stones at Anarajapura, Ceylon, and many other places in the world all clearly indicate the universality of symbols in religion and prayer.

To Commander Dodge one of the most beautiful of all is the statement of the Prophet Mohammed:

Angels come amongst you both night and day; then those of the night ascend to heaven, and God asketh them how they left His creatures: They say, "We left them at prayer, and we found them at prayer."

The statement follows:

WE BELIEVE IN PRAYER

(Compiled by Lawrence M. Brings, including "It's Impossible To Overestimate the Value of Prayer," by Wendell Phillips Dodge, F.R.G.S., explorer and ethnologist)

The object of prayer is God alone, and we should supplicate the Divine Being for the blessings we stand in need of, to enjoy fellowship with God. It does not consist in the elevation of the voice, the posture of the body, the use of a form, or the extemporary use of words, nor anything of an exterior nature; but simply the offering up of our desires to God. (Matthew 15:8): "This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me."

Secret or closet prayer is recommended by Christ (Matthew 6:6): "But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut the door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly." He, himself, set us an example of it in Luke 6:12: "And it came to pass in those days, that He went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God."

Prayer in the Bible is the uplifting of the heart to God. It includes supplication, intercession, thanksgiving. As an example we have Christ's prayer in Gethsemane (Mark 14:35): "And He went forward a little, and fell on the ground, and prayed that, if it were possible the hour might pass from Him," and (Mark 14:38): "Watch ye and pray, lest ye enter into temptation. The spirit is ready, but the flesh is weak." He was wont to visit the Mount of Olives.

Among the different kinds of prayer is the ejaculatory, by which the mind is directed to God. Derived from the word ejacular, to dart or shoot out suddenly, therefore appropriate to describe this kind of prayer which is made up of short sentences, spontaneously springing from the mind. The Scriptures give us many instances of ejaculatory prayer, which may be practiced at all times and in all places. It has a tendency to support the mind and keep it in a happy frame. It fortifies us against the temptations of the world, elevates our affections to God, and directs the mind into a spirtual channel.

In one of his celebrated lectures on "Life and Religion," Max Müller said: "What can we pray for? Not for special gifts, but only for God's mercy. We do not know what is good for us, and for others. What would become of the world if all our prayers were granted? And yet it is good to pray—that is, to live in all our joys and sorrows with God, with whom we cannot reason, but whom we can love and trust. Human misery, outward and inward, is certainly a great problem, and yet one knows from one's own life how just the heaviest burdens have been blessings. The soul must be furrowed if it is to bear fruit."

The dying words of Tennyson's Arthur, "More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of," clearly shows that it is not possible to overestimate the value of prayer. Prayer is efficacious. It has power with God. It brings great blessings. Nothing that men can do has so vast an influence.

"O Lord, my God. Assist Thy loved ones to be firm in Thy faith, to walk in Thy ways, to be steadfast in Thy cause. Give them Thy grace to withstand the onslaught of self and passion, to follow the light of divine guidance. Thou art the powerful, the gracious, the self-subsisting, the bestower, the compassionate, the Almighty, the all-bountiful. —Abdul Baha.

INTRODUCTION

In his introduction, Lawrence M. Brings writes, in part:

"Civilized man has always engaged in the practice of prayer. Practically every religion of the world recognizes the existence of a Supreme Being to whom its adherents pay homage and offer prayers of thankfulness and supplication. For man realizes that he is a finite being and that he needs the guidance and help of God if he is to live his earthly existence in the sight and glory of God. That this attitude of prayer has become engrained in his very nature is evidenced by the utterance of such simple expressions in daily conversation as 'I wish' or 'I hope.' These phrases are little prayers and indicate how dependent we are upon a power beyond ourselves.

"With advances made in scientific and industrial development, with an emphasis being placed on material things, with a guarantee given by government to every citizen for a security from the cradle to the grave, is it necessary any longer for man to feel dependent upon God? Since it is apparent

in many instances that he has forgotten the fact that God still rules the universe, I became curious to discover to what extent people believe in prayer today.

"I decided to poll certain leaders of America and of the world, asking them to express their views about the value and efficacy of prayer based upon their own experience and observation. No attempt was made to ascertain their religious or denominational background, or even to select individuals from whom I might expect a favorable reply.

"Letters were sent to hundreds of topflight people in many diversified areas of human endeavor. The response was overwhelming. I was surprised that so many persons occupying positions of achievement and responsibility would take the time to write a special statement for this book, giving their personal testimony about the power of prayer as experienced by them. In this book you will find proof that prayer is a potent force in the lives of thousands of our leaders."

The Objectives of International Economic Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered last week here in Washington by Ambassador B. K. Nehru, the Commissioner-General for Economic Affairs of India. This is a most thoughtful and suggestive public statement which places in realistic perspective the common opportunities which exist for a more effective international assistance program. This statement deserves the attention of all persons who with Ambassador Nehru share both a professional and humane concern for the economic need of less developed nations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OBJECTIVES OF INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

(Speech by His Excellency B. K. Nehru, Commissioner-General for Economic Affairs, India, before the first annual international conference of the Society for International Development, Washington, D.C., February 27, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, I feel greatly honored that the Society for International Development should have invited me to speak to its members at this their first annual conference. It is not often that a representative of a government gets the opportunity of being able to speak as a professional to fellow professionals without being hemmed in by considerations of governmental attitudes or fears of intergovernmental complications. And yet, it is only natural that those of us who are actively associated with the day-to-day problems of international development should wish to compare notes among ourselves. It is not possible to work for long in any field of human endeavor without developing some thoughts and ideas as to how existing institutions, practices and approaches could be improved. And I take it that it is precisely for providing a forum for exchanging such ideas that the Society for International Development has been established. I, therefore, particularly welcome this opportunity of placing before you a few thoughts and ideas on foreign economic assistance, shedding for the moment my diplomatic and representative capacity and talking professionally in plain, simple and nondiplomatic language.

One of the most remarkable developments in recent times, Mr. Chairman, is the growth of an international approach to the problem of poverty and want in the world at large. All too often we tend to forget that even at a national level it is only during the last 50 years or so that governments have explicitly accepted it as their duty to abolish poverty within the limits of their jurisdictions. It is only since the beginning of the present century that the major preoccupation of national states has been increasing with the material welfare of all their citizens. Policies have been followed leading to the deliberate transference of wealth from the richer sections of the population to the poorer and from the richer areas to the poorer and to the deliberate development of depressed areas in preference to developed areas. It is not surprising, therefore, that it is only since the end of the Second World War, that the same reasoning which led to the welfare activities of nation states has been recognized as equally valid on the international plane. The realization that the world owes to its citizens freedom from want, that prosperity like peace is indivisible, and that only by the deliberate cooperation and assistance of the richer nations can others less fortunate succeed in guaranteeing quickly to their citizens a decent level of living, is exceedingly new. And yet, it is quite amazing how quickly the conscience of humanity has been struck by the anomaly of extreme, grinding and miserable poverty in the midst of luxurious plenty and how in this very short period foreign aid programs of various kinds have developed with the object of ameliorating and curing this position. I should like at this point, if I may, to pay a genuine tribute to the part that your country has played in the awakening of the human conscience in this regard. The fact that U.S. assistance to foreign countries has far out-distanced similar assistance given by other countries can perhaps be explained in part by the comparative prosperity of this country. But the tribute I should like to pay is to the attitudes which motivate American action in this field; for nowhere as I wander around the earth do I find the intense interest and generous and selfless dedication to this cause as I find in this country.

As I have said, Mr. Chairman, the conception that the richer parts of the world should help the poorer in order to enable them to develop their economies is a very new one; and what I would wish to suggest is that the time has now come to formulate clearly the objectives of foreign economic assistance and to define the manner in which these objectives can be most quickly achieved. These are questions to which, not at all surprisingly, enough thought has not been given. Foreign economic assistance is administered at present through a number of agencies, both national and international, and it takes time before even a single institution acquires a clear perception of its own rationale. There has been the general feeling that there are vast areas where human misery is so great that it requires immediate amelioration; there has also been the feeling that the resources which the richer societies are willing to spare for this task are so small that the task cannot be adequately performed. When demand outruns the supply and there is no market mechanism to bring the two into equilibrium, the rational method of allocating supply is through a system of priorities. Foreign aid has been given to almost every country in the world for a variety of complicated reasons and it is never clear why one country has received more and another less except that the pull of a number of conflicting forces at the centers from which foreign aid emanates has at a particular moment resulted in that particular resultant. I would submit that it is high time to work out a rationale for these aid programs, to be clear about what we want to achieve with them and to decide in the light of these objectives what is the best possible use for the limited funds that may be available for the purpose.

The question I have just raised would, of course, be answered most readily by those who believe that economic development should be left entirely as the responsibility of private capital and enterprise. It is an article of faith in some quarters in the United States as in other countries that the creation of wealth is the function of private enterprise and it follows from this belief that resources should flow from the richer to the poorer countries in such amount and direction as are dictated by considerations of private profit alone. I have no doubt in my mind that private enterprise has an important role to play in the development of less developed regions and that it is the duty of countries wanting capital from abroad to get as much of it as they possibly can from the stocks of the capital available in private hands. But I think it is equally obvious that the needs of underdeveloped countries cannot be met by private capital alone. What is wanted in these countries at this moment is the development of the infrastructure of economic growth, the development of roads and railways and power, of irrigation and agriculture in none of which fields does present day private foreign enterprise have any interest. Furthermore, the conditions in which private foreign enterprise is willing to work are not generally available in the underdeveloped world. Neither absolute security nor large profits nor their transferability can generally be assured by underdeveloped countries. If they could, these countries would hardly be underdeveloped and the whole problem would not exist.

For the same reason, I think, it is equally clear that we cannot rely on normal concepts of creditworthiness for defining the priorities to be observed in foreign aid programs. The concept of bankable projects and the mobilization of capital for financing such projects through international and national institutions have played a valuable part in promoting the development of less developed countries in recent years. But the existence of a number of programs for assistance on a government-to-government level and the search for institutions to make "soft" loans are, I think, reminders enough of the fact that the problem of priorities to which I have referred cannot be solved in terms of some precise calculations of creditworthiness of different countries even if such calculations were possible.

Does this mean then that in the administration of foreign aid programs we should deviate completely from the criterion of economic ability or ability to make profitable use of aid and rely solely on the measurement of the needs of the developing countries? Many of you will recall that some years ago the United Nations established an expert committee to make recommendations for the special U.N. Fund for Economic Development and that the committee approached their task in terms of the needs of the underdeveloped countries as a whole. The committee argued that given the savings potential of underdeveloped countries and the need of these countries to develop at a certain rate, the transfer of resources from the richer to the poorer countries must proceed at a certain pace. The figure of the capital required was so shockingly high that it became the fashion in polite society not even to mention

it for fear that those who were willing to help in the task of economic development might be frightened away by its enormity. I do not presume to question the figures which these eminent experts put into their reports; but it is clear that their approach begs the whole question of priorities in that it fails to take into account the real limits on the funds which the richer countries are willing or able to put at the disposal of the poorer countries.

What is even more important, the approach of the U.N. experts misses the fundamental point that even if the richer countries were willing to spare the sums they had in mind, it would be wholly impossible for the underdeveloped world today to absorb in productive enterprise even a fraction of that money. The term "underdeveloped country," it has to be recognized, is a wide generic term covering a vast variety of different conditions each of which requires separate treatment. The limitations to economic growth differ from country to country and area to area, and it is by no means always shortage of capital which restricts economic growth. Before capital can be usefully employed, there has to be a certain political stability, the presence of a stable and reasonably efficient administration, managerial and technical know-how, and organizational capacity and it is only when these factors are available that capital can usefully be invested in any area. As one looks around the underdeveloped world, one finds that in large parts of it the basic factors requisite for rapid economic growth unfortunately do not exist and, therefore, the first thing that the outside world can do is to help in their creation. It is only after these conditions have emerged or at least have begun to emerge that injections of outside capital can be of use.

This realization was, of course, the basis for the establishment of technical assistance programs. But the tendency to equate one underdeveloped country with another has caused it often to be assumed that the provision of technical assistance, perhaps with a certain moderate degree of capital assistance, is the right recipe for all underdeveloped countries. The basic point I wish to place before you is that the failure to take into account the different needs of countries at different stages of development is the root cause of a great deal of irrationality in foreign aid programs and that the recognition of the divergent needs of different countries contains the key to the solution of the problem of priorities about which I spoke a moment ago. Once it is recognized that each underdeveloped country has problems of its own which are not wholly duplicated anywhere else, it would follow that foreign aid programs should be tailormade and not mass produced, that certain countries should get, because they need it, very much more technical assistance than others and that others, because they can use it, should get very much more capital. I should imagine that if it were a prerequisite of capital assistance that the conditions precedent for its productive use had already been established and also that the country concerned had taken all possible measures to mobilize its own capital resources, there would be few countries in the world today who could usefully absorb large sums of foreign capital while there would be some whose legitimate demands would be very substantial indeed. The distribution of technical and capital assistance in relation to the absorptive capacity of the countries concerned would at once direct aid where it could produce the best results without neglecting the claims of any region and without involving any waste of resources.

At present, both capital assistance and technical assistance, particularly the former, are spread so thinly over so wide a field that their effects though not negligible tend to get lost in the vast desert of need. One cannot today foresee the end of any foreign-aid program; while an indefinite continuation of aid is both unpleasant to the donor and harmful to the recipient. We must guard against the creation of a class of perpetual pensioners and, above all, prevent the growth of a mentality which looks forever to the outside world for help. It seems to me that the objective of any foreign-aid program should be to enable the economy which is receiving the aid to become self-supporting and to make its further growth self-generating in the shortest practicable time. Once the point has been reached at which the economy can by its own efforts develop itself, foreign capital assistance should stop and be diverted to economies where conditions may be ready for this stage of economic development. What I urge in short is that instead of distributing the resources that are available for this purpose on an arbitrary ad hoc unplanned basis, or even on the basis of the existence or nonexistence of projects, the whole of the foreign assistance programs should be so arranged as to enable economy after economy to be brought to what my friend Professor Rostow calls the point of takeoff into self-sustained growth. This would mean a change in the system of allocation of foreign-aid funds for it would involve massive capital assistance to some countries for a comparatively short period of time, with the possibility of ending that assistance very much in sight.

The approach to foreign-aid programs that I have just outlined is essentially the same as was embodied in the Marshall plan for European recovery. The diversion of massive American assistance to Europe during 1948–52 was justified, not in terms of the urgency of Europe's needs relatively to the needs of other regions, but in view of the quick results expected therefrom in Europe and the possibility of Europe being able to dispense with further aid in a comparatively short period. I think it is no exaggeration to say that the prestige and growing acceptance of foreign-aid programs in recent years owes not a little to the impressive demonstration given by the Marshall plan of what such programs can actually do. Foreign-aid programs designed primarily to launch an increasing number of countries on to the orbit of self-sustained growth have also the added advantage that they make it possible for more and more countries to contribute toward the development of less developed countries so that the progress of the latter becomes cumulatively more rapid. The European countries assisted by the Marshall plan are already playing a significant role in providing developmental resources to the rest of the world and it should, I think, be the responsibility of all countries who have succeeded in achieving a satisfactory rate of growth to set apart some of their own resources for furthering the progress of others. Indeed, even those underdeveloped countries which are at a somewhat higher stage of development by virtue of their political stability or administrative and organizational ability are in an excellent position to render technical assistance to those at a different stage of development for want of those facilities. This has been the most promising aspect of the Colombo plan which has shown how widespread the scope is for exchange of technical—and even capital—assistance among the underdeveloped countries themselves. The advocacy of a more pinpointed program for foreign aid should not, therefore, be construed as hampering the growth of any particular group of countries. It is intended only to avoid the misdirection and even waste of scarce resources that result from the failure to distinguish between the different needs of countries at different stages of development so that the economic progress of the underdeveloped world as a whole is as rapid as it possibly can be over a period of time.

I should perhaps also make it quite clear at this stage that in emphasizing the need for a more rational use of the available funds for international economic assistance, I do not wish to minimize the paramount importance of increasing the overall flow of these funds. My contention only is that, while the underdeveloped world as a whole can certainly absorb productively far more sums than are available at present, the most decisive push forward in the development of the less developed countries can be given by an allocation of the available funds on the lines I have indicated.

If I may refer here to yet another result of lumping all underdeveloped countries together, it seems to me that it produces an altogether undesirable degree of rigidity in the laws governing foreign aid and in its administration. Once you begin to treat all underdeveloped countries as being made in the same image, it is only natural to apply the same uniform laws and administrative practices to all of them. But this raises, particularly with those countries which have well-established forms of government, wholly unnecessary administrative and even political problems and takes away in a measure from the good will that programs of foreign aid should generate. It would be of very great advantage all around if the administration of foreign aid could be made flexible enough to suit the varied conditions in which these programs operate, instead of everybody having to conform to regulations which are necessarily conceived to fit the least desirable conditions.

I do not wish, Mr. Chairman, to take any more of your valuable time by dwelling any further on my central thesis. I hope I have succeeded in placing before you some of the questions that have often crossed my mind in regard to foreign economic assistance. If in doing so I have appeared critical of some of the present practices it is, I am sure you will appreciate, not out of lack of recognition of the real and remarkable achievement of these programs in recent years, but out of a desire to place before you some of my doubts and misgivings for your expert scrutiny in the hope that it might help in putting foreign economic assistance on an even more rational and fruitful basis in future so that the developed as well as the less developed countries can get even greater returns from their cooperative efforts to eliminate poverty and want from this world.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

A Suggestion for a National Floral Emblem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the suggestions for a national flower for the United States is the rose.

A large number of very beautiful roses are grown in my own home State in the area around Tyler, Tex., and that city is known as the Rose capital of America.

Mr. Clark Kidd, a committee chairman of the Tyler Chamber of Commerce, has sent me an editorial which I now request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The edi-

torial appeared in the Tyler Morning Telegraph for Monday, February 16, 1959, under the heading "Corn, Grass, Roses."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORN, GRASS, ROSES

We were afraid something like this would happen—sex has got into the national fight over what flower—or vegetation—to adopt as the national emblem of the 49 States.

The new issue entered the controversy when the Kentucky Bankers Association recently tried to beat down the efforts of Illinois Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and other corn-State Senators to get Congress to designate the corn tassel as the national emblem.

The Kentucky group retorted that an easy way to bring the argument to a close would be simply to adopt grass as the official flower of the union. In furtherance of that suggestion, the Kentucky bankers fired in a telegram to Kentucky Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, glorifying grass and condemning the corn tassel as a symbol.

The telegram declared the corn tassel not only falls flat as a flower, but it is also nothing to brag about as the male portion of the corn plant. "For only a few days it (the tassel) is virile, then, in its last wild rampage, it scatters its pollen to the wide ranges of the compass—then fades and dies and is gone forever."

Fortunately for the great cause of east Texans in the growing controversy, the Kentuckians have said no great evil against the rose, which remains as one of the top contenders for the national honor. The only objection against the queen of flowers the blue grass group could think of was to remind their Senator that the rose already is the chosen flower of several States and some foreign countries. From the east Texas point of view, that widespread popularity of the rose is another argument in favor of naming the rose as the national floral emblem.

The Kentuckians argue well, we believe, against the marigold, by saying simply that it smells bad.

The Kentucky bankers almost attain to Churchillian majesty of language in extolling grass for the national honor. Historically, they say, grass sustained the buffalo and deer that provided the American Indian and pioneer palefaces with food and hides, and even now it is the basic food for beef, dairy cattle, and sheep. All cereal grains—corn, wheat, oats, and barley—belong to the grass family. And, say the Kentuckians, there's nothing more beautiful and satisfying than lush, green pastures.

It's agreed here that green pastures, like mother love, are things of great beauty. If there's anything more beautiful than a green pasture, it is a field of east Texas roses glowing with every hue of the rainbow.

Vote for the rose.

Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it was my privilege recently to participate in ceremonies conducted by the Lithuanian American Council of Greater New York on the occasion of the 41st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. This stirring commemoration took place in Webster Hall, New York City, and was attended by a large group of Lithuanian-Americans dedicated to the freeing of their homeland.

In my remarks on that occasion I paid tribute to the indomitable courage of the Lithuanian people and to those noble Lithuanians now enchained behind the Iron Curtain who have not allowed the flame of freedom to die. I urged all to join in a rededication to work and pray for the day when Lithuania will once more take its rightful place among the family of free nations.

At this meeting, an eloquent resolution was adopted which codifies the strong sentiments and heartfelt views of those in attendance. Because this is a document deserving of wide circulation, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE LITHUANIAN RALLY ON FEBRUARY 15, 1959

We, Lithuanian Americans of Greater New York, loyal citizens and residents of the United States, gathered on February 15 of this year of grace 1959 at Webster Hall in New York City to commemorate the 41st anniversary of the restoration of the independent Lithuanian state after a prolonged eclipse of its liberty;

Voicing once again our indignation at and our protest against the brutal suppression by the Government of the Soviet Union of Lithuania's independence and freedom and her subjugation to ruthless Soviet colonial exploitation, perpetrated at a time when Lithuania was living in peace with the U.S.S.R. and was bound to her by a peace treaty and a nonaggression pact;

Stating that the present Soviet challenge to the West, with Berlin as its direct objective, is aimed at the settlement on Soviet terms of the political problems resulting from World War II, namely, at the legalization and consolidation of Soviet criminal conquests in Europe and at creating conditions for further Communist expansion in Europe and elsewhere;

Considering that the present abnormal and dangerous situation in Europe, characterized by the division of Germany, the subjugation of nine formerly sovereign states of Central and Eastern Europe, including Lithuania, and by the division of the continent, requires an urgent and global settlement in conformity with the wartime and postwar commitments and pledges of the great powers;

Stressing the indivisibility of the problem of Central and Eastern Europe, of which the restoration of Lithuania's independence is an integral part, and of that of Germany and the European security system—these problems being the major cause of the present international tension;

Resolve—

1. To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States firmly to pursue and vigorously to promote their repeatedly declared policy of the restoration of the independence and freedom of Lithuania and other captive countries of Central and Eastern Europe through free and unfettered elections after the withdrawal of Soviet Armed Forces and agents, and to reaffirm the determination of the Government of this great country not to be party to any agreement or treaty which would confirm or prolong the subjugation of Lithuania, now held in bondage by the U.S.S.R.;

2. To rededicate ourselves to the just cause of Lithuania's independence and freedom and to combat Communist aggression and Soviet Russian imperialism;

3. To assure the Lithuanian people under Soviet occupation of the indissolubility of our ties and of our unswerving determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—its independence and freedom;

4. Actively to support the policy of the U.S. Government aiming at the establishment in Europe and elsewhere of a just and durable peace based on the inalienable right of the respective peoples to governments of their own choosing.

Dr. EUGENIJUS NOAKAS,
President.
J. DZIKAS, *Secretary.*

Pennsylvania's Future: Prosperity and Big Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Harrisburg Sunday Patriot of February 8, 1959. It is the final and summation article of an excellent 27-part series on the economic future of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It has been hailed one of the best series of articles of its kind. The author of this series is George Draut, of Camp Hill, Pa. Mr. Draut is chief editorial writer for the Harrisburg Patriot and Evening News. And I might say in passing, Mr. Speaker, that with a few rare exceptions, such as when they endorse my opponent, I believe the Patriot-News' editorial pages to be one of the best in the Commonwealth.

I commend this article to the Members, and their reading of it will make them better aware of Pennsylvania's problems and its future.

PENNSYLVANIA'S FUTURE: PROSPERITY AND BIG PROBLEMS—JOBLESS AMIDST PLENTY STILL STATE'S HERITAGE FOR "GOLDEN SIXTIES"

(By George Draut)

Maybe three pieces of paper best symbolize Pennsylvania's economic past, present and future.

Maybe they best point up our Commonwealth's great big problems and its great big hopes, too, for what a lot of people say will be the "Golden Sixties."

They're legislative bills, awaiting action with more than 300 others in our general assembly.

One calls for a deficiency appropriation of $9½ million for public assistance. Before the current budget runs out at the end of May, the State wil run out of money for the flat-broke Pennsylvanians on relief.

Another one will authorize a $50 million loan from the Federal Government to bail out the State's unemployment compensation fund, so badly depleted by the long lines of laid-off Pennsylvanians during the months of the 1958 recession.

The third one calls for an additional appropriation of $1½ million in State mortgage money for industrial development. Here is one of the greatest hopes for the future and one of the brightest developments of the

present: The State ran out of loan money to help finance new industries and new jobs in the depressed areas. And there's a waiting list of new job projects, ready to go.

Here is Pennsylvania's great big problem of the present. There were still 508,000 out of work in the middle of last month. That's 11 percent of the total labor force. That's not quite double the national average.

And here still will be Pennsylvania's great big problem as the golden sixties begin. If most economists and Government brass hats are right, 1960 will be the best year the United States has ever known. Times will be good in Pennsylvania, too. This dominantly heavy industrial State rises or falls, and fast, with the national economic times.

But this boom of the first years of what may be a golden decade won't be spread fully and evenly over Pennsylvania's 45,333 square miles.

That's because of our chronically depressed areas. We have more of them, with our hard-hit coal communities, than any other State in the Nation.

And there'll be this, too, when the State and Nation are setting new economic records right and left. One of those records will be more Pennsylvanians jobless in the midst of prosperity than ever before.

And yet more Pennsylvanians working than ever before.

Along with everybody else, we're in the midst of great economic and industrial change. Exactly what is going on, or what will probably happen, depends upon which economist or Government official or industrialist or labor leader you ask. They'll give you all kinds of appraisals and answers.

But most of them agree the great technological changes that started right after the war and continue today are exerting one of the major forces in the change. More and more, the jobs of our highly technical, scientific, and complex political age demand men and women with higher levels of skills and better education.

Mixed up in this, industries are geared up for more production per worker than ever before. If a company is to survive in the tough competition here at home and face up to that ever-increasing economic challenge of so many other industrially exploding countries, friend or foe, this is an absolute necessity. So many industrial leaders tell you this. And one prominent Pennsylvania economist tells you that if the old industry in this old State is to stay alive, it can find its salvation only in drastic modernization.

Mixed up in this, there is our increasing population; more young men and women entering the labor market every year. This adds to the great big problem of more jobs needed and yet helps solve it at the same time. They're also new consumers of goods and services.

One official Government projection for the early sixties: Total employment of 4¼ million, an alltime Pennsylvania record. Total unemployment of more than 300,000, around 6 percent of our labor force, and another alltime Pennsylvania record, too, for good times.

This will confront Government at every level—in every community, in Harrisburg, in Washington—with major continuing pressures and problems, topped by that massively familiar one: higher costs and higher taxes.

For better or for worse, Pennsylvania's future is becoming increasingly tied to Big Government—State and Federal. And big companies and big unions.

In town after town the familiar family name on the factory disappears and the name of the nationally known company goes up.

Place after place, the small local union increasingly loses its identity in the great big labor organization of which it is a part.

You find chapter and verse to back up these observations. You have notebooks full of names and places.

The impact of Big Government is extraordinarily evident here in the two-county Harrisburg area, where one in every 4 workers calls Federal, State, or local government his boss.

But the impact doesn't stop there.

Big Government, especially at Washington, bedrocks so many of Pennsylvania's jobs. On direct or subcontract with someone else, private industry in plant after plant and the Pennsylvanians who work there are making and selling something to Government—from fancy electronic gizmos to chairs and desks to cans of beans.

The argument over whether this is real good or real bad for the future you'll leave to someone else. This is just pointing up the reality.

Everywhere you turn when you try to look at Pennsylvania's future you run into more Government.

More highways—not just to move the ever-increasing traffic, but as economic lifelines of trucking transportation in every area and every community of the State. Here's a big hassle for a long time.

More people, so many more people coming along in the future. They're already using up the land, right and left. One town ends and another one begins, and you never know which is which as you drive through. Massive new strip cities are building up on opposite ends of the Commonwealth. And many Pennsylvanians worry about and work for regional planning and eventually to come regional government.

More people, more jobs, more of everything?

If you tour all through the State and talk to people, so many of them over a period of long weeks, you find the guesses for the future fall into one pattern of opposing points of view. What two mid-State men say sums it up:

"You can only be optimistic.' More population means more of everything—more homes, more automobiles on highways, and that means more highways."

That's Gene Gurkoff talking. He's the president of Capitol Products, the fast-growing company that came out of nowhere less than 7 years ago.

"I think to call them 'the Golden Sixties' is ridiculous. The population increase can be a liability instead of an asset if it isn't in balance with our production. * * * Our problem is money. Where will we get the money to meet the threat of Russia on the world market and at the same time achieve growth at home? It's a double-barreled headache. I don't see the answer."

That's Frank E. Masland, Jr., talking. He's the president of C. H. Masland & Sons, one of the country's major carpetmakers.

MORE PEOPLE, MORE JOBS

Industrial development is a way of life in the depressed areas. You search all available records. You make a lot of calls in the coal counties. You come up with a pinned-down great big total—$20.8 million.

That's the rockbottom amount of money Pennsylvania's depressed communities have raised on their own, among their own people, since the end of World War II.

You add on the $8,173,000 loaned out in 26 months by the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority.

And you list 223 new plants and 42,944 new jobs created just in the chronically depressed areas, overwhelmingly by community effort with a little State help.

This has been a race to stay even, finding new jobs even as more old ones evaporate in large numbers through the coalfields.

There is every indication, and hope, that in "the Golden Sixties" many a depressed community will move from minus or just even into plus, chipping away the unemployment that ran as high as one in every four of their workers last year.

These are summaries and conclusions of a reporting study that began last year.

But when more than 60,000 words have been written in 27 long stories and you are done with the immense stacks of notes and statistics and other information piled all over your desk, this isn't what you remember.

You remember people—perverse, proud, tenacious, hardworking, hard-hoping, wonderful people.

The great big executive of the great big company who walked over to his window and watched the hundreds of workers pour in and out the wide gatet at shift time. He is a stern, closemouthed, no-nonsense man. The only time his face softened in all of the time you were there was when he looked out upon his people.

The obscure, ordinary man who talked to you in the real-small, rundown town almost surrounded by forgotten, dirty, culm banks and an abandoned mine mountain. He said: "I don't know how, but we'll pull through and find jobs for our young people so they can stay here."

So many others.

They are making Pennsylvania's future far more one of prosperity and far less one of big problems.

Democratic Victory Dinner Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I made at the Democratic victory dinner in Washington, D.C., on February 28.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, DEMOCRAT, OF MONTANA, AT DEMOCRATIC VICTORY DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 28, 1959

The automobile industry is often described as the pace setter of American industry. In other words, it occupies a position in the American economy like the Democratic Party in American politics. There's one difference. Last year the American people didn't go too well for the new cars. Last November they went, with real enthusiasm, for the Democrats.

So, tonight, we are having a victory dinner. You know, there are some people who think you can have too much of a good thing. They say, for example, "There's too many Democrats in the Senate. What's LYNDON going to do with them all?" Well, so far as I know, we don't have any Democratic unemployment in the Senate. The distinguished majority leader has put all the Democratic Members to work, and they are beginning to produce. There's no such thing as an "acceptable" level of unemployment in the Democratic Senate, just as there oughtn't to be in the Nation.

Personally, I don't think you can ever have too many Democrats at work—in the Senate or anywhere else. As a matter of fact, there's a shortage of Democrats. The country could use a lot more of them over in the other branch of the Government. I don't know about the market for automobiles. But, as far as Democrats are concerned, it won't be until 1960 that the supply will begin to catch up with the demand.

In the last few weeks we've been seeing the new automobiles on the streets of this city. They have clean, fresh lines. Some of the cars are conservative-looking. Others show liberal style changes. A few even have that futuristic look.

Not to be outdone by the automobile industry, we have our own display of 1959 Democratic models tonight. We've got four lines with us—not Fords, General Motors, Chryslers, and Ramblers. What we do have are Democratic Governors, Senators, Representatives, and Democratic presidential possibilities. We've even done something which Detroit hasn't been able to do for years. We've brought in a successful new producer—Alaska—with three new Democratic designs—all fully equipped with snowshoes.

Some of us have had an opportunity to preview the new 1959 Democratic models in the Senate. We've already looked under the hoods and tried the steering-gear and the brakes. Take it from us, the new automobiles have nothing on them. These new Democratic models may not handle as easily—take, for example, the one produced in Wisconsin—but they all do have plenty of power. As a matter of fact, some of us older rattletraps, the Model A's are beginning to wonder what the influx of these bright and shining new additions to the Senate is going to do to the used car market.

Nevertheless, we strongly commend them—all of them—to you. We urge you to take them to your hearts as we have done. They add luster drive, safety and countless new extras to the Democratic Party and to the Nation.

That is why I am delighted to participate in this victory dinner. It is true we are celebrating, in a general sense, the triumph of the Democratic Party in the 1958 elections. But in a special sense we are celebrating the victory of these new Senators, new Representatives and new Governors. It is they who add up to the difference between an ordinary election and the great Democratic victory at the polls last November. Through them, the Nation has made clear what it expects of all of us.

I am very glad that the great leader of the Senate, LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, is here tonight to help us interpret the meaning of this victory. I can tell you that his reputation as a skilled craftsman and mechanic in this trade is fully warranted. He knows his political automobiles. And out of his warm and responsive heart and his clear-thinking head, he knows something much more important. He knows that the function of the Democratic Party is to go; not to seem to go. It is to go, not in starts and stops, not in bursts of power and sputtering stalls, but to go firmly and steadily in the direction which the American people, by giving us this great victory, have commanded us to go.

The late Senator Robert Taft said that the function of the opposition is to oppose. With all due respect to that great Republican leader, I want to say that for Democrats, opposition alone is not enough. We Democrats will oppose when it is necessary to oppose. But we shall oppose responsibly and we shall try to contribute constructively to the security and progress of the Nation whenever and wherever we can.

To do that, we have got to have clearly in mind what we cannot do, as well as what we can do, under our constitutional system. The administration, alone, can lead in this country. True, it is a fact that is going to change in 1960. It is going to change, however, only if we do what the American people have commanded us to do; it is going to change only if we do what we can do, not what each of us thinks he would like to do. What Democrats can do, what they must do, is to point out a constructive path for the Republican administration to follow. We have got to keep it working when it would prefer to relax. For the sake of the American people we must hold the hand of this Republican administration when it is perplexed. We must try to guide it when it loses the way. We owe that to the people who have entrusted us with a large share of the responsibility for running this Government.

In specifics, we have got to try, as we have been trying, to get it started on the road to policies which may lead to a more durable peace. We have got to improve the administration of foreign aid and restore the decent image of the United States in so many parts of the world. We have got to see to it that this Republican administration keeps its nose to the grindstone of the social and economic problems which plague large parts of the Nation. You know those problems—inadequate education and other unequal opportunities for millions, a disgracefully wasteful agricultural policy which sees mountains of decaying surpluses side by side with millions of people without enough to eat, high prices, millions of unemployed, the decay of urban centers, a lagging science, an antiquated and inequitable tax system and a neglect of our older citizens. These are similar matters are the problems which confront us. To boot, we have to try to deal with them within the framework of a sleight-of-hand budget from an administration which last year gave us another such budget along with policies that helped to produce a $12 billion deficit in it.

We Democrats have a duty to try to make this administration work, not for the benefit of one, but for all sections of the Nation and for peace. We have a duty to try to make this administration work, not for the benefit of the few but for the welfare of the many.

That is the meaning of November 1958. That is what the American people have asked the Democratic Party to try to do. I do not know whether we shall succeed. It is a monumental task to try to do anything with a Republican administration. Speaking for those of us who are in the Senate, however, I can assure you that we shall try our best.

Centenary of the Weekly Arizonian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement relating to the small community of Tubac, which was the first community in modern Arizona in which a newspaper was printed, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TUBAC

The State of Arizona proudly looks forward to continued years of progressive journalism and a free press after pausing March 3 to honor the centenary of the State's first newspaper, the Weekly Arizonian, which published its first edition on March 3, 1859, at historic Tubac—one of the New World's oldest communities and now the site of Arizona's first State park.

Two outstanding Arizona civic-minded organizations—the Valley of the Sun chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, national journalistic fraternity, and the Phoenix Philatelic Association, a chapter member of the American Philatelic Society and Society of Philatelic Americans—arranged as a joint project the ceremonies honoring the centenary of Arizona journalism.

Members of the joint centennial committee include Art Matula, Arizona State University, chairman; James M. Chemi, the Phoenix Gazette, vice chairman; Orien W. Fifer, Jr., managing editor of the Arizona Republic; Lloyd Clark, the Phoenix Gazette; William McFarland, bureau manager of United Press International; Merle Nott, Mrs. Emma O'Brien, Debs Metsong, and Robert Corless.

Some of the most colorful history in American journalism has its origin in those earlier days of pioneering in the Southwestern States and in the heavily Indian-populated territories of New Mexico and Arizona. Historical highlights from newspaper articles reporting the Arizona journalism centennial are herewith published.

Receiving a friendly boost from the U.S. Post Office Department in approving their request for a limited postal facility at Tubac, Ariz., the Valley of the Sun Sigma Delta Chi chapter and the Phoenix Philatelic Association have arranged elaborate ceremonies for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of Arizona journalism on March 3, 1959.

Highlight of the program at the ruins of the old Presidio de Tubac will be a reenactment of the famous newspapermen's duel. The long-defunct Tubac post office will be reopened for 1 day in the building now housing the Arizonian to service souvenir mail deposited by the general public.

A special pictorial cancellation, drawn by Harry Wood of the Arizona State University's art faculty, will be hand stamped on all mail posted at the 1-day postal facility. The cancellation has a line drawing of a century plant, symbolizing the centenary celebration. Wording within the pictorial portion of the hand canceling stamp reads: "Century of Arizona Journalism 1859—Tubac—1959."

The Sigma Delta Chi chapter and the Phoenix Philatelic Association made available to the public a set of three casheted covers (envelopes). Two of the designs depict an editor of a century ago armed with a shooting iron, ready to defend a free press by force if necessary.

The legend on the cachets read: "In Arizona Territory, Editors Fought With Gun and Press." The artists who sketched the unique cachets were Kearney Egerton, of the Arizona Republic, and Wood.

The idea for the militant editor cachet theme was drawn from the historic account of a duel fought by Arizona's first editor, Edward Ephraim Cross, who launched the Weekly Arizonian at Tubac on March 3, 1859.

The story relates how Editor Cross quarreled in print with Lt. Sylvester Mowry, who wanted Territorial status for Arizona, which until 1863 was the western half of the Territory of New Mexico.

Cross asserted that Mowry's reports on Arizona's population in articles published in St. Louis, Mo., and Washington, D.C., newspapers were exaggerated. The two men kept up a crossfire through their articles in the Missouri and district dailies.

When Cross opened the Weekly Arizonian, he took advantage of his publication to editorially attack Mowry in the State's only newspaper. These written tirades led to a duel in July 1859. Both men, armed with Burnside rifles, fired at 40 paces, 2 shots each. Neither newspaperman hit the other, but they declared their honor was satisfied and the ruckus ended.

Soon after that July duel, Mowry purchased the Tubac weekly from its owner, a mining company, and Cross relinquished his editorship.

Other pioneer Arizona editors also had to defend their editorial stands with guns.

TUBAC—THE TOWN WITH NINE LIVES

Tubac, the Arizona town with nine lives, will be the subject of an extensive postal history study by the Phoenix Philatelic Association, which is cooperating with the Valley of the Sun chapter of Sigma Delta Chi in honoring the centennial of Arizona journalism.

Tubac's history, dating back many centuries to the days of the Spanish conquistadors, even played a role in the founding of San Francisco.

Frank and Gay Griffin, present publishers of the Weekly Arizonian (now a quarterly), informed the PPA that they will issue a special centennial edition of the State's oldest newspaper on March 3—the date that Arizona's first editor, Edward Ephriam Cross, put the initial edition of the Arizonian to bed in 1859.

The PPA and the Sigma Delta Chi chapter here will release a set of three cacheted covers (envelops) on the March 3 centennial date at Tubac. The U.S. Post Office Department has authorized the defunct Tubac post office to be reopened for 1 day to permit the servicing of the historic philatelic mail. An estimated 10,000 pieces of philatelic mail is expected to be handled at the Tubac post office, which will be set up in the restored office of the Weekly Arizonian.

Editor Griffin asserts that Tubac has been dead eight times since 1695. He writes:

"Tombstone may be known as the town too tough to die, but the establishment of Tubac as Arizona's first State park will publicize Tubac as the town that wouldn't stay dead.

"Tubac was first a Pima Indian village and then came the Spanish explorers. No one knows how many times this rich agricultural settlement was burned or wiped out in the earliest days. But, since 1695, it has been populated eight times.

"In 1695 there was a revolt of Pima Indians and the town abandoned. A second revolt of the Pimas against the Spanish came in 1751.

"In 1761 the garrison abandoned the fort when ghosts, believed to be Indians in disguise, invaded the area.

"In 1777 the Spanish abandoned it and, when it was reoccupied, the Apaches closed it down twice—in 1840 and 1849.

"After the Gadsden Purchase, Tubac was again abandoned and in 1862 more Apache and Mexican bandit raids forced another Tubac evacuation.

"Tubac, with 200 residents, was withering away—within sight of the Nogales Highway—when it was declared Arizona's first State park.

"Now, this town that wouldn't stay dead is going on to make Arizona postal history on March 3, 1959."

The Fight With Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address made by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] before the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association at Philadelphia, on Tuesday, February 24, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIGHT WITH INFLATION: ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALLACE F. BENNETT, OF UTAH, BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, AT PHILADELPHIA, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1959

It is always a great inspiration to have the privilege of speaking to an audience of manufacturers, because to me it is like coming home. For 30 years, before I went to the Senate, I was part of the management of a small manufacturing plant in Utah and, like you, I am proud of it. American manufacturers can be proud of their accomplishment, the great heritage of capital they have produced for our country, the millions of jobs they have provided, and the value and variety of the products they supply for our everexpanding pattern of living. To do this has required the use of all the keys to success—initiative, imagination, great drive and vigor, high integrity and sound judgment.

The very fact that we have done all this makes it hard for me to understand why we are so blind to the forces that, unless we wake up, will destroy both our freedom and our wealth. For 20 years now, a thief has been preying on us and, rather than catching and exposing him, we have helped him rob everybody, including ourselves. Maybe this is true because he is the world's most accomplished confidence man whose hand is much quicker than the eye. He blinds us with promises of something for nothing. He drains our capital away, falsifies our records, dries up our markets, and finally squeezes us dry in our old age. And we applaud him and call for more.

Inflation is a thief that can steal the substance of our wealth without altering its outward appearance. Christ said, "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." Inflation preserves the letter of economic values, but kills the spirit.

So real is inflation's illusion that many hardheaded businessmen—who can spot a phony business deal a mile away—not only think that a little inflation is either natural, inevitable, or desirable, but that it offers a real opportunity for growth and profit to a shrewd and daring operator.

Perhaps all this is possible because without realizing it, most of us have become addicted to a powerful narcotic. We reach eagerly for increasing doses of economic "happy dust" because it brings illusions of greater success and well-being, easier and faster progress, and greater profit.

Or perhaps even though we are wracked with the pain of economic cancer, we mistake fever for the glow of health and puffy swelling for expanding muscle. If this is so, then we are using the narcotic to disguise the pain.

No matter in what terms you describe it, there is a force abroad in our economy that has already taken a fearful toll from every American company, family or individual—an evil that must be exposed, faced, and conquered.

What is its awesome name? Inflation.

LET US WAKE UP TO THE DANGER

Fortunately, many Americans are beginning to wake up to the danger, to recognize inflation for what it is—thief, cancer, and narcotic. President Eisenhower is one of these and in his recent messages to Congress and the people has called for, "Action to meet these challenges by all groups in our society, and by all units of Government."

Specifically, he has challenged consumers, government, labor leaders, and businessmen to meet the particular challenge that inflation presents to them.

Being human, as well as being businessmen, we could generate a great glow of self-righteousness by pointing out to government and labor both the extent of their particular responsibility for the present inflation and the things they should do to correct their faults. But there has already been too much finger pointing and blaming of one group by another. Tonight, I propose that we businessmen look our own weaknesses squarely in the eye and see what we can do to cure them.

WHY SHOULD WE BE CONCERNED?

There are two basic reasons why we should be concerned with inflation—one humanitarian, and the other based on enlightened self-interest.

If we have any active sense of social responsibility, we will fight inflation for the sake of those who are most vulnerable to its damages and least able to protect themselves. These include all who live on fixed incomes and pensions, the aged, the widowed, and the disabled. Not much better off are the schoolteachers and the civil servants at all levels of government. If any man profits by inflation—even temporarily—it is eventually from these people on pensions and fixed income that his profit comes—a cruel story of Robin Hood in reverse.

But if a few of us are indifferent to the fate of these victims of inflation, none of us should ignore its damage to ourselves—in the context of the well being of business and industry, both in general, and in our own particular company. In this respect, let me point out four specific ways in which we can be hurt.

1. Inflation discourages the accumulation of capital

By eating away purchasing power year after year, it penalizes thrift and discourages investment. Oh, I know that the smart boys think that investment in common stocks or real estate is a safe hedge, but as more and more people crowd into that escape hatch, they create and accelerate the very force from which they fled until the whole structure of inflated values collapses, as it did in 1929.

2. Inflation destroys capital already accumulated

That this is already going on is demonstrated to every businessman who finds that his allowable accumulation of depreciation reserves will not replace his depreciated assets. As prices rise more rapidly, this erosion shows up in inventory too—while accounts receivable are settled at a discount. The end is bankruptcy, as the Germans found in the twenties.

3. Inflation distorts figures, destroys accurate comparison and forces uneconomic decisions

Speculation replaces sound merchandising, and investments intended to replace money as a device for the dead storage of value are substituted for investments in productive industry to produce more value. Thus we reverse the lesson of the parable, and emulate the man who buried his one talent, rather than the one who put his talents to use and doubled them.

4. Inflation narrows our markets—both at home and abroad

As true purchasing power shrinks, more and more people must use more and more of their remaining purchasing power for basic necessities, and more and more products are in danger of being priced out of the market. This is true for services too, as the great do-it-yourself movement in America demonstrates.

But even more dramatically, inflation dries up our foreign trade. In 1957 we sold $19.5 billion worth of American products abroad. In 1958 it dropped to $16 billion. While our commodity balance of trade is still on the plus side, our balance of payments shifted from plus to minus. In that year we had to pay out $2.3 billion in gold plus $1 billion in dollar balances held by foreigners in U.S. banks to fill the gap. In the past, the effects of our inflation have been balanced by greater inflation abroad, but lately, and by heroic efforts, our chief customers in

Europe—finally including even France—have moved to greater stability. The new European Common Market will protect that stability and unless we solve our problem too, our own price policies will be even more responsible than their tariff barriers for shutting us out. And when we can't export goods, we will export capital and know-how behind the European wall, and there will be fewer American industrial jobs. Then our inflated wage scales will be a statistical mockery—victims of inflation. This mockery has already begun.

Inflation effects on the purchasing power of the dollar

These, then, are among the ways in which inflation is hurting both people and business But when we come to measure the actual reduction in the purchasing power of the dollar since 1939, we become truly alarmed.

The most frequent measurement is in terms of a weighted average of consumer prices—the so-called cost of living index. On this scale the 1939 dollar has shrunk in 20 years to 48 cents.

But there have been other serious shrinkages in purchasing power. When we measure it as income, we have to consider also the increased tax bite before we can translate it into a consumer's dollar. A gross income of $3,000 in 1939 would need to have risen to $6,457 today for a man to pay his taxes and buy the same goods he bought in the year 1939. If a man made $10,000 in 1939 he would have to be making nearly $24,000 today to hold his own. In other words, his spendable dollar is worth only 43 cents. And if a man was in the $25,000 bracket in 1939 he would have to be making $70,000 in 1959 dollars to have the same available purchasing power. His spendable dollar then has shrunk to 36 cents.

And this is not all. Some dollars have shrunk faster than others. Looking at price indexes again, while the average 1939 consumer dollar is now worth 48 cents, the dollar you spend on some other products today is worth even less than 48 cents. Take these examples:

The dollar you spend for prime industrial products is worth 45 cents.

Your commercial and factory construction dollar is worth 37 cents.

If you build a new house, your construction dollar is worth 36 cents.

If you buy a house today which was constructed in 1939, you are spending a 33 cents dollar.

If you have your car repaired, you use 30 cent dollars.

These are samples of the damage inflation has done in 20 years. Unfortunately, history—even recent history—shows that once inflation is accepted as inevitable or desirable its rate always accelerates. When we begin to build a factor for inflation into our personal and business decisions, we give it an extra push. Unless we make a stand soon, it can pass the point of no return, beyond which there will be no question as to whether we will have an economic collapse—only when it will come. To argue that we can live with inflation and control its rate is to forget that it is an economic cancer, and that if we can really control it, we can, in fact, eliminate it.

HOW SHALL WE CONTROL IT?

Up to this point I have been pointing out why inflation must be stopped. Now it's time to try to answer the more difficult question—How? As businessmen and managers of industry, what can and must we do to meet President Eisenhower's special challenge to us, and win the fight against inflation in our special and particular area?

I have four concrete suggestions.

First, we must face the problem and prepare to solve it. This requires the same process that we use to solve any other business problem—plus a little extra spiritual strength. We must wipe out from our own thinking the illusions that inflation has created and replace them with the hard facts. Among these illusions are several false ideas.

1. *That we have always had inflation*

The fact is that until the thirties, the price levels went up and down, but the long term level remained fairly stable. Wholesale prices in 1930 were about the same as in 1790.

2. *That inflation is necessary to growth; that without its artificial stimulation men will not work harder or invest more*

The same thing can be said about a narcotic, but here we recognize that the effect is temporary and the price for it is too high. Actually, in most periods of great growth like the twenties, prices were slowly falling. Inflation distorts figures to counterfeit growth, as you will easily see when you measure the rate of increase in your business in tons or gallons and then compare this with the rate in dollars.

3. *That inflation can be profitable, because it produces something out of nothing*

This is the oldest confidence come-on in human experience and always conceals a clever larceny.

4. *That even if inflation is inevitable, a shrewd man can outsmart it by clever investment*

This is both stupid and cowardly, the action of a soldier who runs from the fight—or a strong man who pushes the helpless out of the lifeboat. In the end, when the inevitable crash comes, even the smart boys get it.

5. *That even if it is bad, it's someone else's fault—and that there is nothing we can do about it*

This dims and rejects the very spirit of American free enterprise and makes hollow mockeries of all our great technical and productive achievements. If we approach inflation as another business problem, which it is, and develop an understanding of its effects, we can master it. The first job then is to straighten out our own thinking and accept our share of the responsibility.

TEACH THE TRUTH ABOUT INFLATION

The second suggestion in our fight against inflation is to help others—and specifically our own employees—to get the same understanding of the truth. This will not be easy, because while the official union line on inflation is essentially wrong, it is very appealing. Because their basic approach of more pay for less work is obviously inflationary, they support it with the idea that if wages can be raised faster, new markets will be created, and enough new production will come in to control inflation. What they must ignore is that wages are always the predominant element of cost, and that wages that rise faster than productivity are engines of inflation. When price rises inevitably follow such wages increases, they blame it onto exhorbitant profits. The true effect can easily be shown by such figures as these from manufacturing. While physical productivity increased only 31 percent between 1947 and 1957, average hourly wages in manufacturing increased 67 percent. Some have referred to this spread between wages and productivity as the "inflationary gap." It is interesting to compare this spread of 36 percentage points with the 32 percent increase in industrial prices over the same period.

Because employees are being fed misinformation regarding the relationship of wages, profits and prices, they too have illusions about inflation. Through patient planned programs of education, these false ideas must be replaced with truth. For obvious reasons the unions will not undertake this, and if work is to be done, we must do it.

In making this suggestion I know it is another case of calling for education in solving specific problems. This need is always with us and always will be. This job will never be finished. But with respect to inflation, it has a special urgency because there is a definite educational process going on through unions intended to produce the wrong results, and this must be offset, and soon.

ADOPT SOUND OPERATING POLICIES

There is a third area in which we can move against inflation, that of our own operating policies. From now on we must think in terms of stable values and force ourselves to face our operating records and our balance sheet after we have wrung out the water of inflation. We should adopt some stable benchmarks for comparison and tie our planning and evaluating to them. From time to time we should make a report to our stockholders and the public in which we spotlight the effects of inflation on our typical dollar figures.

We should always face the problem of inflation in our dealings with our employees and, specifically, fight to keep wage increases well within the total rate of increase in productivity. If we do this, we will leave some share of the benefits of increased productivity for the stockholders whose investment in new equipment really makes most of it possible. But most important of all, we will thus preserve some part of this for the consumer.

In many ways the consumer is the real key to the control of inflation. He is the one who is robbed when prices rise and only when prices fall—ever so slightly—does he, or more properly, she, have a sure share in our progress. When we provide a share of the added benefits of increased productivity to those on the productive side of our two-part economic cycle, it comes in the form of increases, and it means increased wages to the worker and greater profits to the investor. But if the consumer is to have a share, it must be expressed in decreases in price. This has largely been forgotten in the current era of inflation. Forgotten, too, is the once commonly accepted business axiom that mass production produces lower prices. When we in industry begin to plan to give the consumer his share of the progress we make, prices will stabilize or drop, and inflation in consumer prices will disappear. It's just that simple.

REMOVE GOVERNMENT INFLATIONARY PRESSURES

Fourth, and finally, we must work to remove the inflationary pressures that originate in government. These take many forms.

1. Pressures to increase the supply of money to provide easy bank credit at low interest. This is inflationary by definition.

2. Pressures for nonproductive, non self-liquidating Government programs that either increase taxes or pile up more public debt. As a Senator, I am appalled to find that many Americans, including businessmen, are economic schizophrenics where Government finances are concerned. They keep their concepts of Government expenditures and Government income in two thought-tight compartments. They want more local programs, more loans and grants, but lower taxes. They fight increases in the debt ceiling and are piously for economy but only if it does not affect them. If we are to control or eliminate inflation, we must move into a sustained period of balanced budgets, and this inevitably involves the control of expenditures for procurement and services at the local level—in your town or State and in mine. So long as we insist on more for any reason we will face the threat of inflation.

ELECT NONINFLATIONISTS TO CONGRESS

Since ours is a representative form of government run by men and women chosen through popular elections following campaigns conducted by political parties, we who want to cure inflation and other weaknesses in government must devote enough time and effort in political activity to first select, and then elect, representatives who understand the dangers of inflation—and will resist its temptations. The union leaders, who are essentially inflationists by philosophy, have moved into this field with great success and the representatives they have sponsored and elected are too often inflationists. In my opinion, this has made inflation, direct or disguised, our greatest nationwide economic issue.

Well, this is my story. Inflation is a great and vicious evil, a form of larceny, a cancer, a destructive narcotic. There are many reasons, social and selfish, why we must conquer it. This is true for all of us, and particularly for the managers of business and industrial enterprise. But there is one final and particular reason why this is especially true for you, the members of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association. One of the chief functions of your association is to supply casualty insurance. In this field, inflation has been especially destructive. Costs of settling claims have skyrocketed. General figures that demonstrate this are hard to get, but your association officials know that in the field of casualty insurance inflation is a real burden.

INFLATION MUST BE STOPPED

Inflation must be stopped, and we must do it as citizens and businessmen. If we leave this fight entirely to the power of Government, it can only be done by increasing Government interference with our own right to manage our own business, even to the possible imposition in peacetime of price and wage controls. There are men in Congress now who favor that step if inflation continues. Our own experiences with controls occurred so recently that they should still be convicing enough to make us realize that this step should mean the disappearance of freedom and free enterprise—and the end of our way of life.

Shall we continue to drift blindly into economic destruction—or wake up and live? Regardless of what others may do, I think the real challenge is to the leaders of business and industry. Have we the courage and faith with which to meet it? I believe we have, but we must act now to be effective.

This Defense Fallacy Costly to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I very much regret the apparent decision of this administration to cut back the Reserve forces of our country at a time when the Regular forces are also being reduced. It seems logical to me that when the Regular—active duty—Establishment is being reduced that there should be a buildup and increase in the Reserve forces rather than a decrease. A few years ago when similar reductions were occurring the excuse was the so-called new look at our defense needs. All I was able to ascertain in the new look at that point was a reduction based upon budgetary matters rather than defense requirements. A similar line of reasoning by the administration is being pushed at this point to indicate that our Armed Forces can be smaller because of some great change that has occurred in warfare. Even assuming that a change has occurred in the type of warfare making obsolete present methods, which is quite an assumption, the technical advice of the military leaders of our country does not justify the assumption that either our Regular forces or our Reserve forces should be cut from their present strength.

I include here a thought-provoking editorial from the February 24 Florida Times Union, Jacksonville, Fla., which reads as follows and presents the matter in the particular focus of the situation as it is seen in Florida by an able writer:

THIS DEFENSE FALLACY COSTLY TO FLORIDA

Only the most specious brand of reasoning can justify a reduction of Army Reserve forces, in which Florida will lose 31 units, in the wake of secret testimony by Gen. Maxwell Taylor before a Senate committee in which he recommended mobilization of the entire Nation.

It was in a dispatch of February 18 from IV U.S. Army Corps at Birmingham that an announcement was made that Florida and other States in the South would have their civilian-soldier units pared. Sixteen days prior to that the Army Chief of Staff had told the solons that the United States would not be properly prepared for a Berlin emergency on May 27 unless the necessary force was brought into being. He stressed Russia's superior capability in ground troops.

As is customary, the order for a reduction was accompanied by a statement about how the realinement would make for greater strength and efficiency. Reservists know better, of course, and realize that they are just witnessing one of many such cynical procedures which have occurred since the end of World War II.

It was ever thus, even prior to that conflict, and only a person of great patience and endurance can retain his voluntary affiliation under those circumstances.

The Military Establishment is built on the principle of a small Regular force, buttressed by a large, well-trained Ready Reserve. Yet the units of the latter organization are the ones which suffer most from cuts.

The Army undoubtedly is compelled to make these adjustments in Florida and elsewhere because of the niggardly attitude of those who hold the pursestrings toward ground troops.

That is the fallacy for which the American people ultimately are going to pay in blood. How soon the payment will be exacted no one knows, but the "due bill" most certainly will come when we are least expecting it.

Labor's Privileged Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Edith Kermit Roosevelt, entitled "Labor's Privileged Position," which was published in the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR'S PRIVILEGED POSITION—FEDERAL LAWS PLACE RESTRICTIONS ON BUSINESS THAT DO NOT APPLY TO LABOR UNIONS

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

Is sauce for the goose sauce for the gander? This is the question at the heart of the current debate on legislation to curb labor abuses. Traditionally, the American public takes a strict view of corruption and special privilege. In the 1920's and 1930's the Seabury investigation forced the resignation of New York's popular Mayor Jimmy Walker, while the Teapot Dome oil scandals sent a Secretary of the Interior to jail.

RECENT SCANDALS

More recently, the Internal Revenue Department scandals under President Truman led to jail sentences for high Government officials, and in this administration, Presidential Aid Sherman Adams left under a cloud after it was learned that he had accepted financial favors from Boston Industrialist Bernard Goldfine.

Why, then, the big stick for punishment of wrongdoers in business and Government alone?

Although a Senate committee under Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN has unearthed shocking evidence of corruption and gangsterism in eight major unions, there is considerable doubt whether Congress will pass the tough and comprehensive legislation needed to curb the autocratic powers of the lords of labor. Why, then, this double standard?

One reason why the public has been slow to anger is that they have accepted as final some Supreme Court decisions and legislative acts by past Congresses giving labor a privileged position.

In many instances local police have tolerated physical and economic reprisals against those who suggest labor reform.

In the Kohler strike in Wisconsin, law-enforcement authorities permitted sabotage and mob violence, while Michigan's Governor refused for more than 3 years to extradite John Gunaca, a goon who is charged with breaking the neck of William Bersch, a screw-machine operator in the company's brass division.

When an individual is shot crossing a picket line some local judges seem to prefer to regard the killing as an accident arising out of class warfare, rather than for what it really is—murder.

The rank and file of workers are powerless to halt the unruly doings of certain union elements. In most cases elections are not by secret ballot, nor are they subject to review.

Some workers are opposed to joining the union altogether. It is a flagrant example of the double standard that while the majority of States hold it is legal to compel employees to join a union against their will, the yellow-dog contract prohibiting employees from joining a union is almost universally illegal.

NO CEILING ON DEMANDS

Another example of biased labor legislation is that while there are the minimum-wage and maximum-hour law, there is no ceiling over labor demands. This inequality could have grave consequences if repeated and ever-increasing demands by labor succeed in raising prices to such a high point that we price ourselves out of the world markets.

How, then, can we correct labor's lack of self-discipline? The only way is to make labor unions equal under the law with business, Government, and private citizens.

Why shouldn't antitrust laws be applied to unions as well as to big business?

The Justice Department has hauled General Motors before a grand jury on allegations of monopoly. Yet General Motors, as everybody knows, has the strongest kind of competition from Ford, Chrysler, and other companies. The industrywide, nationwide United Automobile Workers' Union—an obvious monopoly—has no competition. Nevertheless, the UAW and other big monopolistic unions enjoy immunity under the Clayton Antitrust Act, which exempts labor unions from its provisions.

The words of our Constitution, "liberty and justice for all," mean the equality of all Americans before the law. This does not mean special favors for labor pressure groups at the expense of the public at large.

Surplus Commodities for the Needy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, there have been introduced a number of proposed measures which would broaden the scope and increase the amount of surplus agricultural commodities presently being distributed to needy persons in areas of high unemployment. Recently, I obtained from the Department of Agriculture a summary listing the counties to which these commodities are most heavily distributed, and I am submitting this list for publication in the RECORD in the hope that it will clarify the picture for my colleagues.

Briefly, this summary lists every county in the United States in which 15 percent or more of the population is receiving surplus commodities. There are 210 such counties in 24 States, spread through districts served by 75 Members of this House. These counties constitute the hard core of the persistent unemployment problem which has given rise to the demand for economic redevelopment legislation.

In the coming weeks there will be a great deal more said on this general topic, so there is no need to discuss it now, but for the information of the Members generally I would like to have this summary printed and I hope they will give it close attention in preparation for the debates to come:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE
Washington, D.C.

Direct distribution of commodities to needy persons in family units, counties, by State, in which recipients are 15 percent or more of population

State and county	Population (1950)	Total number of recipients (November (1958)	Number of recipients as a percent of population
Alabama:			
Colbert	39,561	6,312	16
Cullman	49,046	8,759	18
Dale	20,828	3,467	17
Fayette	19,388	4,130	21

Direct distribution of commodities to needy persons in family units, counties, by State, in which recipients are 15 percent or more of population—Continued

State and county	Population (1950)	Total number of recipients (November (1958)	Number of recipients as a percent of population
Alabama:—Continued			
Franklin	25,705	5,422	21
Geneva	25,809	5,139	20
Lamar	16,441	4,253	26
Limestone	35,766	10,484	29
Marion	27,264	4,717	17
Marshall	45,090	6,659	15
Talladega	63,639	14,184	22
Winston	18,250	3,551	19
Arkansas:			
Ashley	25,660	5,745	22
Chicot	22,306	7,829	35
Clay	26,674	5,428	20
Conway	18,137	4,103	23
Desha	25,155	4,327	17
Franklin	12,358	1,939	16
Fulton	9,187	2,000	22
Howard	13,342	1,969	15
Independence	23,488	4,279	18
Johnson	16,138	2,493	15
Lawrence	21,303	4,003	19
Little River	11,690	2,512	21
Logan	20,260	3,009	15
Madison	11,734	2,636	22
Mississippi	82,375	18,601	23
Montgomery	6,680	1,161	17
Ouachita	33,051	6,362	19
Perry	5,978	1,311	22
Searcy	10,424	2,245	22
Sharp	8,999	1,380	15
Stone	7,662	2,187	29
Van Buren	9,687	1,485	15
Colorado:			
Saguache	5,664	881	16
Georgia:			
Cook	12,201	2,291	19
Dade	7,364	1,427	19
Dodge	17,865	4,882	27
Pike	8,459	2,798	33
Stephens	16,647	2,461	15
Illinois:			
Franklin	48,685	7,298	15
Gallatin	9,818	1,449	15
Pulaski	13,639	2,793	20
Saline	33,420	5,164	15
Kentucky:			
Bell	47,602	9,639	20
Breathitt	19,964	8,106	41
Butler	11,309	2,392	21
Carlisle	6,206	952	14
Clay	23,116	9,021	39
Clinton	10,605	2,598	24
Edmonson	9,376	1,517	16
Estill	14,677	3,763	26
Floyd	53,500	11,207	21
Fulton	13,668	2,682	20
Harlan	71,751	11,966	17
Hancock	6,009	1,039	17
Hickman	7,778	1,522	20
Jackson	13,101	5,780	44
Johnson	23,846	5,805	24
Knox	30,409	11,373	37
Laurel	25,797	6,850	27
Lawrence	14,418	3,614	25
Lee	8,739	2,733	31
Letcher	39,522	8,704	22
Lincoln	18,668	3,111	17
Livingston	7,184	1,189	17
Logan	22,335	4,608	21
Magoffin	13,839	5,678	41
Marion	17,212	2,717	16
Martin	11,677	3,735	32
McCreary	16,660	5,542	33
Ohio	20,840	3,598	17
Perry	46,566	14,702	32
Pike	81,154	16,058	20
Rockcastle	13,925	3,891	28
Todd	12,890	2,017	16
Wayne	16,475	3,430	21
Whitley	31,940	7,539	24
Louisiana:			
Allen	18,835	2,788	15
Avoyelles	38,031	10,082	26
Catahoula	11,834	4,080	34
Evangeline	31,629	7,698	24
Franklin	29,376	13,104	45
Richland	26,672	9,273	35
Saint Landry	78,476	19,945	25
Saint Martin	26,353	5,593	21
Tensas	13,209	5,477	41
Maine:			
Aroostook	96,039	15,905	17
Michigan:			
Antrim	10,721	1,632	15
Baraga	8,037	1,428	18
Kalkaska	4,597	894	19
Lake	5,257	1,256	24
Macomb	184,961	31,613	17
Minnesota:			
Mahnomen	7,089	1,065	15
Mississippi:			
Choctaw	11,009	1,625	15
Clay	17,757	2,637	15

Direct distribution of commodities to needy persons in family units, counties, by State, in which recipients are 15 percent or more of population—Continued

State and county	Population (1950)	Total number of recipients (November (1958)	Number of recipients as a percent of population
Mississippi—Continued			
Greene	8,215	1,354	16
Hancock	11,891	2,401	20
Holmes	33,301	7,520	23
Jackson	31,401	4,716	15
Pontotoc	10,994	2,035	19
Webster	11,607	1,724	15
Wilkinson	14,116	3,069	22
Missouri:			
Stoddard	33,463	5,931	18
Montana:			
Glacier	9,645	3,991	41
Roosevelt	9,580	2,548	27
New Mexico:			
Rio Arriba	24,997	3,882	16
Taos	17,146	3,781	22
Oklahoma:			
Adair	14,918	6,485	43
Atoka	14,269	3,136	22
Bryan	28,999	5,789	20
Caddo	34,913	5,068	15
Carter	36,455	5,462	15
Cherokee	18,989	4,085	22
Choctaw	20,405	4,894	24
Coal	8,056	1,940	24
Delaware	14,734	3,674	25
Haskell	13,313	2,760	21
Hughes	20,664	4,047	20
Jefferson	11,122	1,641	15
Johnston	10,608	2,952	28
Latimer	9,690	3,234	33
Le Flore	35,276	8,334	24
Love	7,721	1,213	16
McCurtain	31,588	6,927	22
McIntosh	17,829	5,217	29
Marshall	8,177	1,742	21
Mayes	19,743	3,074	16
Murray	10,775	1,774	16
Muskogee	65,573	10,016	15
Ofuskee	16,948	5,908	35
Okmulgee	44,561	7,457	17
Payne	13,616	2,367	17
Pittsburg	41,031	6,719	16
Pushmataha	12,001	3,851	32
Roger Mills	7,395	1,342	18
Sequoyah	19,773	6,857	35
Tillman	17,598	3,012	17
Wagoner	16,741	3,745	22
North Dakota:			
Rolette	11,102	2,005	18
Pennsylvania:			
Armstrong	80,842	18,182	22
Bedford	40,775	9,121	22
Blair	139,514	29,192	21
Cambria	209,541	36,700	18
Clearfield	85,957	19,301	22
Fayette	189,899	36,810	19
Fulton	10,387	2,417	23
Greene	45,394	9,040	20
Huntingdon	40,872	8,834	22
Indiana	77,106	11,942	15
Mifflin	43,691	8,259	19
Potter	16,810	3,667	22
Schuylkill	200,577	35,891	18
Somerset	81,813	17,931	22
Sullivan	6,745	1,846	27
Susquehanna	31,970	4,647	15
Tioga	35,474	6,752	19
South Dakota:			
Hand	7,149	1,172	16
Hyde	2,811	504	18
Tennessee:			
Campbell	34,369	10,248	30
Cocke	22,991	3,555	15
Cumberland	18,877	3,175	17
Decatur	9,442	2,403	25
Dyer	33,473	8,320	25
Fentress	14,917	4,191	28
Grundy	12,558	3,105	25
Hancock	9,116	2,299	25
Hardin	16,908	6,856	41
Lauderdale	25,047	12,786	51
Lincoln	25,624	5,601	22
McNairy	20,390	7,049	35
Marion	20,520	4,624	23
Morgan	15,727	3,462	22
Putnam	29,869	4,408	15
Scott	17,362	5,238	30
Union	8,670	1,649	19
Texas:			
Brooks	9,195	1,336	15
Camp	8,740	2,305	26
Duval	15,643	3,492	22
Jim Hogg	5,389	1,686	31
Morris	9,433	2,301	24
Starr	13,948	3,345	24
Upshur	20,822	3,966	19
Webb	50,141	13,309	24
Utah:			
Grand-San Juan	7,218	1,218	17
Virginia:			
Buchanan	12,288	35,018	16
Dickenson	23,393	4,658	20

Direct distribution of commodities to needy persons in family units, counties, by State, in which recipients are 15 percent or more of population—Continued

State and county	Population (1950)	Total number of recipients (November (1958)	Number of recipients as a percent of population
West Virginia:			
Barbour	19,745	4,706	24
Boone	33,178	8,823	27
Braxton	18,082	4,018	22
Clay	14,961	3,828	26
Fayette	82,443	21,811	26
Grant	8,786	1,397	16
Greenbrier	39,295	6,194	16
Hampshire	12,577	2,180	17
Lincoln	22,466	5,121	23
Logan	77,391	20,424	26
Mercer	75,013	13,724	18
Mingo	47,409	19,202	41
McDowell	98,887	31,981	32
Nicholas	27,696	5,516	20
Preston	31,399	7,324	23
Raleigh	96,273	23,518	24
Summers	19,183	3,536	18
Upshur	19,242	3,515	18
Webster	17,888	4,093	23
Wyoming	37,540	7,782	21
Wisconsin:			
Florence	3,756	692	18
Sawyer	10,323	1,675	16
Washburn	11,665	1,973	17

NOTES

Total population, 5,947,036.
Total recipients of commodities, 1,298,201.
Total counties, 210 in 24 States.
Average percent recipients, 21.8 percent for 210 counties

Statement of Secretary of Agriculture on Farm Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on February 15 there was published as an editorial in the Washington Evening Star Secretary Benson's own condensation of his statement made before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, there are some who dislike the Secretary, some who dislike his actions and doubt his sincerity. I am not one of those. I have the utmost respect for Mr. Benson. I consider him to be one of the finest men ever to occupy a position in public life at such a high level.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement, which was published as an editorial, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENSON ON FARM SURPLUSES

The question of what to do about our farm surpluses is before Congress once more. This year the question pretty much gets down to what we do about wheat-support prices. The major part of our surplus is now concentrated in wheat. Certainly, if you add cotton and corn to wheat, you have represented 85 percent of the crops in Government hands or under loan, and they presently total above $7.5 billion, and rising. Surpluses will soon cost us about $1 billion annually in storage and interest charges alone.

We had a great year for wheat in 1958, by far the biggest crop in history. It amounted to 1.2 billion bushels, yet we can consume at home and sell abroad only about 900 million bushels. The rest goes into expensive storage. This does not have a wide benefit for our farmers. As a matter of fact, the bulk of the payments go to less than 10 percent of those who grow wheat.

Actually, farmers generally are doing fairly well. Farm ownership is at the highest level in history, and so are net equities. The condition of life on the farm has improved immensely and there is no longer that old sharp economic, cultural and educational dividing line between life on the farm and life in the city. Transportation, television, electricity have worked wonders. True, there are hardship areas and the cost-price squeeze is especially harmful to farmers, but unrealistic wheat support prices offer no way to alleviate them. There are other means and we are now pursuing them.

What we need now in the Department of Agriculture is congressional authority to set wheat supports at levels that will lead to sales, not storage bins. In this way, we can retain and build our foreign markets and still produce all that our domestic consumers care to buy. This would save us billions yearly, help to revitalize our agriculture at home and abroad.

The above is Secretary of Agriculture Benson's own condensation of his statement to the Senate Agriculture Committee. We thought it worthy of reproduction in this form. It makes a good editorial.

Pacific Gas & Electric Lineman Wins Lifesaving Citation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am including in this permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD this article which appeared in the Neighborhood Journal, Oakland, Calif., for February 18, 1959.

It details how Thomas J. Peters, of Castro Valley, through his quick thinking and fine training, saved the life of a fellow worker who had inadvertently come in contact with a live wire while they both were working on top of a 50-foot power pole.

The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has awarded Thomas J. Peters its John A. Britton Award, named after the first president of that company and awarded to those who have distinguished themselves in some way within or without the company.

To me, Mr. Peters acted above and beyond the call of duty, because I can think of many more pleasant places to be than on top of a 50-foot pole with an unconscious man slumped in his safety harness by a live transmission power-ing he has acquired that inspired him to do the right thing at the right time under very serious conditions.

The article follows:

PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC LINEMAN'S LIFESAVING ACT WINS CITATION

A citation by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for distinguished service has been given to Thomas J. Peters, of Castro Valley, for his quick action last year in saving the life of a fellow lineman.

Peters, 43, who lives at 18801 Madison Avenue in Castro Valley, received the award from Raymond W. White, manager of the claims and safety department of the company, during a district accident-prevention meeting in Hayward Tuesday.

Peters and Carl H. Seigfried, 44, of 3657 Lester Avenue, Hayward, were working atop a 50-foot power pole on April 24 when Seigfried accidentally touched the exposed end of an energized wire. He lost consciousness and slumped in his safety belt. Peters immediately prepared to administer first aid.

Seigfried regained consciousness and was quickly lowered to the ground, treated for shock, and rushed to a hospital within 6 minutes.

According to the citation, Peters' calm actions prevented further injury to Seigfried and brought prompt medical treatment.

Peters' citation was made under terms of the John A. Britton Award, named in honor of the company's first president, for distinguished service in an emergency. Peters has been with Pacific Gas & Electric since 1946.

Security: The Great Illusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the February 23 issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer reprinted the editorial by the distinguished editor and journalist, Walter H. Annenberg, which received the George Washington Honor Medal award of Freedoms Foundation. The award was made at the Valley Forge ceremonies on February 22.

The editorial, entitled "Security: The Great Illusion," challenges our complacency in the face of rapidly changing world concepts and threats to what we have called the "American way of life." It deserves the widest possible attention and comment.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Annenberg's editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECURITY: THE GREAT ILLUSION

(By Walter H. Annenberg)

We, the people of the United States, are engaged in a struggle not only to maintain our position as a great democracy but for our survival as well.

We have been challenged before by autocratic governments but never in our history have we been in competition with a society in such deadly earnest as Communist Russia.

Let us make no mistake about it. The leaders of the Soviet Union are determined to conquer us by overwhelming superiority in every field of human endeavor.

Most of us feel that we possess security because we have beaten down our challengers in the past. But this concept of security has created in many of us an attitude of our being impregnable and this has led to a dangerous degree of overconfidence.

Permanence of national position simply does not and cannot exist. The relative po-

sition of any nation is subject to the ambitions and policies of other nations.

To prepare as carefully and thoroughly as possible for every conceivable emergency is the sensible, logical answer to what we must do to maintain the supremacy we enjoy, to protect our freedoms and to safeguard peace.

The U.S. Government, in properly making monumental appropriations available for defense and offense, is doing only part of the job that has to be done. Every citizen must be awakened to his or her responsibility in this total struggle.

Have we the national character to measure up to this responsibility?

Too many of our people are soft, smug, spoiled, addicted to pleasure-seeking and easy living.

Too many are more concerned with a future 4-day workweek than with a 7-day-a-week survival.

Organized labor in instances is carrying on much as capital in instances did half a century ago—taking every advantage without thought of equity or of fairness to others.

Far too many of our citizens are becoming such devotees of the cult of individualism that they regard their rights and privileges as paramount and ignore their duties in behalf of the common welfare.

Our greatest natural resource, the youth of our country, needs as never before the sober supervision and wise counsel of their experienced elders. But the current training of youth is too frequently concerned with academic credits in archery or fencing.

We must organize and direct these young people into educational channels that will best fit them to meet the emergencies of the future. The sputnik age brought in by Russia's scientific achievements demands a serious reappraisal of our entire educational system.

Each citizen must feel an awareness of this grave responsibility to those who will inherit the United States. If we fail in this, we will not have met the Soviet threat.

The ideas here expressed have been written and uttered many times in the last few years, but they have to be reiterated and underscored. It is much later than we think.

Let us not fall behind the timetable of the Kremlin.

Important Western leaders with whom the writer recently discussed this broad subject in London, Paris, Brussels, and Spain's summer capital, San Sebastian, are as gravely concerned as our own leaders. These influential persons overseas are keenly aware of the job to be done by every citizen if Khrushchev and company are to be contained. It is a problem not too complex to understand, but the mechanics of meeting it are extraordinarily difficult to set in motion.

Consider, as a small-scale example, the dedication of Russian workers to the stupendous tasks to which they have been committed by their leaders.

In the United States pavilion at the Brussels World's Fair the personnel was, as could be expected, pleasant, calm, and courteous. But in the Russian pavilion the attendants displayed an intensely aggressive eagerness to explain the exhibit and to make a favorable impression upon the visitor, particularly if he was an American.

In the Russian pavilion restaurant the waiter was persistent and enthusiastic in describing the many dishes, the borscht and chicken Kiev, the caviar, and, of course, the vodka. When he had successfully sold the order, with an air of individual accomplishment, he literally ran to the kitchen to fetch and serve it.

We dare not delude ourselves. On all fronts—military, scientific, industrial, agricultural, scholastic, intellectual—the Russians are resolved to master us and the arts and skills in which we have long enjoyed leadership. They are dedicated to this goal. We cannot afford softness or complacency. We cannot afford laggardness. We cannot afford mediocrity in our thinking or in our doing.

Have we what it will take to make and keep our Nation secure in our time? Have we the willingness to work and to accept the disciplines required?

I repeat, have we the national character to meet the challenge?

Address by Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, Before Vanderbilt University Law School

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech I made on the problems of inflation and antitrust before the Vanderbilt University Law School on February 25, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER BEFORE VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL, NASHVILLE, TENN., FEBRUARY 25, 1959

Vanderbilt University is one of the great educational institutions of the South. It has traditionally sought for and taught truth. This is one of the reasons why Vanderbilt men and women have always been able to contribute so much to the building of America. I am indeed honored to be here today and for this opportunity to address the law school. The theme of my talk today presents the choice that must be made if we are to preserve our free, competitive system.

I firmly believe that the high cost of living is our No. 1 domestic problem. This has been increasingly emphasized in recent weeks as we have heard more and more from all sides expressions of alarm over high prices and inflation. The President, in his economic report to the Congress of January 20, 1959, also recognized this problem.

For several years I have served as chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. As chairman, in the spring of 1957, I announced that the subcommittee would conduct an investigation and hold public hearings on administered price industries. As I explained at that time, "The high cost of living is due in no small part to the upward manipulation of prices by big companies in administered price industries." The subcommittee began by hearing from some of the country's leading economists who have specialized in administered prices. From the testimony of these experts, an administered price may be defined as one having two characteristics: (a) it is set by administrative actions and (b) it is maintained for a period of time. With respect to the first characteristics, it is the seller as a matter of individual choice who establishes the price at which he will make sales, whereas in competitive industries, it is the impersonal market which establishes the price. With respect to the second characteristic, there is no generally accepted period of time during which a price must remain unchanged before it can be regarded as an administered price. What is significant here is not so much the frequency of change, but the responsiveness of a price to changes in the market. Prices which are administratively set and maintained are insensitive to changes in the market; that is, they are increased and maintained at the same time that demand is falling off by decreasing output. Dr. Edwin Nourse, a former economic adviser to the President, in his definition of an administered price industry, emphasized that the essential point is that they can maintain a predetermined price by restricting production. These are the administered prices having the potential for economic distress with which the subcommittee is concerned in its inquiry.

Following the testimony of the economic experts, the subcommittee conducted extensive hearings in the steel and automobile industries, two of the most basic in our economy. It was found in these industries that there existed a kind of upside-down competition. This describes the situation where prices continue to go up even when demand decreases. These high prices are put into effect by the largest company in the industry, with their so-called competitors following almost identically. Apparently this is accomplished without any express agreement.

In the steel industry since World War II, the hearings revealed that prices have moved on a number of occasions in the opposite direction to that which was indicated by the changes in demand. The steel price index continued its virtually unbroken rise even when demand and production declined, as they did in 1949, 1954, and 1957. It also continued its climb when unit labor costs declined, as they did in 1950 and 1955. No matter what the change in cost or in demand, steel prices since 1947 have moved steadily and regularly in only one direction, upward. The subcommittee found that in 1957 steel price increases substantially exceeded cost increases. It was also clear at the time the 1957 price increases were made there was nothing in the information available to the industry to suggest a forthcoming increase in demand that would have supported higher prices. The fact that these price increases were made and maintained despite such underlying adverse economic conditions illustrates how, through price administration by the leader in the steel industry, upside-down competition can result.

In some industries such price behavior possibly would not have caused substantial injury to the public interest, but this is not true of the steel industry which is the very underpinning of our entire economy. Every time the price of steel goes up, it is inevitable that steel consuming industries raise their prices. This has a tendency to cause price increases in many other lines.

When the subcommittee began its hearings in 1957, I think it fair to state that it was the preponderate opinion that the inflation which our country was experiencing was the product of excess demand. It will be remembered that this opinion was so strongly held that the Federal Reserve Board tightened its money policy in an effort to contract demand. In the opinion of many this policy was based on a false analysis and contributed substantially to the recession from which we have not yet fully recovered. Even during this recession period prices continued to rise in most of the administered price industries, such as steel. Dr. Gardiner C. Means, an eminent economist who is the pioneer in the field of administered prices, appearing before the subcommittee on January 24, 1959, said: "Today, after experiencing inflation and depression at the same time, there are few who still think that this inflation has been the product of too much demand. Clearly, the inflation has not been of the old-fashioned, classical kind with all prices going up more or less together. Also, it is now generally

understood that the new type of inflation is associated with administered prices and wage rates. For bringing about this understanding, I believe your committee is in large measure responsible. Indeed, we are fortunate that your chairman and your committee had the imagination to see the relation between these two things and the courage to focus attention on them."

In this recent appearance before the subcommittee, Dr. Means also presented wholesale price changes by product groups for the periods 1942–53, 1942–47, 1953–57, and 1953–October 1958.

In the 1942–53 period the wholesale price changes for all commodity groups generally rose in price and by not too different amounts. During some of this period prices were controlled by OPA and OPS.

In the period 1942–47, demand was far in excess of supply and prices in all commodity groups rose. However, prices in the competitive groups far outrose prices in the administered price groups.

In the period 1953–57, there was an entirely different picture. Price increases were practically entirely in the administered price groups. In some market price groups, prices rose very slightly; in other, they actually went down.

The fourth period 1953–October 1958 extending the third period to October 1958, showed generally the same picture as the period from 1953 through 1957, namely, higher prices in administered price groups with little increases or declines in the competitive groups.

Dr. Means made one point clear: administered steel prices had the dominant role in the 1953–58 inflation. Not only did steel prices rise the most in that period, but prices in the steel and steel using groups also rose more than those of any other groups and accounted for two-thirds of the gross increase in prices. It is significant that, as Dr. Means pointed out, the administered price groups accounted for 85 percent of the gross increase in the wholesale price index. Moreover, he stated that if prices in these administered price groups had not gone up, the wholesale price index would have risen less than 1 percent and that so far as the wholesale price index is concerned, there would have been no inflation.

The result of inflation is strikingly shown in the recent Economic Report of the President. The table on page 142 of that report reveals that in current prices, the total gross national product increased from $397.5 billion in 1955 to $436.7 in 1958. However, when expressed in 1958 prices, the total gross national product only increased from $435.4 billion in 1955 to $436.7 in 1958. Thus it is shown that during this period gross national product has increased only $1.3 billion in terms of 1958 prices. Hence when inflation is milked out of the large increase in dollar values, we have only enjoyed a slight increase in gross national product.

The seriousness of the cost of inflation to the American people is further revealed in the Economic Report of the President. In a chart which appears on page 155 of that report, it is shown that the per capita disposable personal income, using current prices, increased from $1,661 in 1955 to $1,784 in 1958. In contrast, however, when 1958 prices are used, per capita disposable personal income actually declined from $1,790 in 1955 to $1,784 in 1958. Thus we reach the remarkable conclusion that every person in the United States was $6 worse off in 1958 than they were in 1955.

Because the automobile industry is so pivotal in the overall economy, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee also inquired into the pricing practice of that industry. It is claimed that one out of every seven workers in this country is dependent, directly or indirectly, on the automobile industry for his livelihood. This study reveals that General Motors today commands approximately 50 percent of the automobile market in the United States. During the past 10 years this company's average profit, after taxes, has been an impressive 25 percent of net worth. This compares with a national average of 11 percent for all manufacturing corporations. In 1947 General Motors' profit was only 17 percent, but in 1950 its profits reached 37.5 percent, which was higher than its profits of 36.2 percent in the boom year of 1929. These figures are all the more impressive when the income tax rise is taken into consideration. In 1929 General Motors' profit margin before taxes was 38.5 percent, while in 1950 its before taxes earnings reached 77.4 percent.

Mr. Harlow Curtice, president of General Motors, in his appearance before the subcommittee, stated that he and three other executives determined the prices for all divisions of the corporation and that such prices were fixed so as to return 15 to 20 percent profit after taxes on total investment. It would appear that General Motors sets prices by a formula method, the first ingredient of which is the fixed 15 to 20 percent profit after taxes. To this is added the cost of materials, labor, overhead, taxes, and fixed costs based on a standard volume of 80 percent of production capacity. It is easy to see that if volume exceeds 80 percent of capacity, which is has in many years, profits are bound to rise above the 20 percent goal. The hearings showed that after these prices have been so fixed by General Motors, they become the prices of the industry. A comparison of comparable models of the major producers reveals little or no price differences.

Except for public utilities, our economy is not regulated. Ours has traditionally been a free, competitive enterprise system. But competition is fast disappearing among our basic industries because price competition is disappearing. In almost every industry we now find a big one, two, three, or four where the leader establishes prices and the others immediately follow suit. The problem of high prices and inflation also grows increasingly worse with the decline of price competition.

Almost 70 years ago the first of the antitrust laws, the Sherman Act, was passed by the Congress. This act has been supplemented by a number of others. We refer to these laws as the charter of our economic freedom. We early elected not to force companies to compete. Our antitrust laws seek to remove illegal restraints and monopolistic abuses so that they could compete. Hard core evidence is necessary to prove illegality.

In the past such evidence was forthcoming and many successful cases were brought against giant combinations of economic power. However, evidence of collusion is often lacking today because companies simply do not have to get together to set prices. As I have said, they simply follow the price pattern set by the leader. The Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission have told the subcommittee that they are helpless against such pricing practices unless direct evidence of collusion can be produced.

In this unhappy state of affairs the people are caught in a price inflation and the Government, under present laws, appears powerless to do anything about it. The day of decision is here. America must decide, and decide now, whether it wants a free, competitive economic system—not in fancy words, but in reality. It is up to Congress to discover how to exercise its constitutional responsibility of regulating commerce. Today, it appears that more and more of that power is being exercised by a relatively few managers in key industries.

The time has also come for the public interest to be put ahead of the private interests of either management or labor. During this time of high prices, I don't believe labor should demand or receive any wage increases in basic industries which management could justifiably use as the basis for necessary price increases.

Since the end of World War II our economy has been on a wild merry-go-round. As the cost of living increased, labor asked for wage increases as compensation. When wage increases were granted, prices were raised and the cost of living increased again. This, in turn, led to additional wage demands and so on. High prices and inflation obviously affect every group in America. Many U.S. businessmen believe the danger of the United States pricing itself out of foreign markets is an immediate one. In the President's economic message to Congress was the insistence that high prices here at home could lower our capability to compete in world markets. Labor has likewise been harmed. During this same period, we have seen great increases in unemployment. This problem is still with us today.

We now stand at the fork in the road. We must choose either Government regulation of business or the improvement of our antitrust laws. We must restore the climate where competition can be expected. The choice for me is easy. Regulation except in times of extreme emergency is undesirable.

Specifically what legislation might be passed to strengthen the antitrust laws? I would suggest three basic supplements to existing law. First, the test of section 7 of the Clayton Act, with respect to mergers, should be made to apply to section 2 of the Sherman Act. Under this section of the Clayton Act, the evidence need support only a finding of substantial lessening of competition or tendency toward monopoly in order to make a merger illegal. This change in section 2 of the Sherman Act would afford the Government greater power to destroy monopolies.

Second, I would suggest that unfair methods of competition and unfair acts and practices in commerce which are unlawful under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act should be declared illegal under section 1 of the Sherman Act. This would enable the Department of Justice to attack all trade restraining evils.

Third, I would suggest that there be enacted into law my bill S. 716 authorizing the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws. Not having this power today, the Department is unable to gather evidence on which to base a suit except by use of grand juries in criminal investigations.

Together with the staff of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I am presently working on bills to amend section 1 and section 2 of the Sherman Act in the manner in which I have just suggested. When these bills are drafted, I shall introduce them in the Senate.

Although I believe the principal problem in our economy is the undue concentration of economic power, I also suggest that the antitrust laws be strengthened in respect to other problems. For example, I have tried for several years to secure the enactment of legislation which would partially change the law as interpreted by the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil of Indiana case in 1951. This bill designated for several Congresses as S. 11 would, contrary to the decision in the Standard Oil case, make illegal under section 2(a) of the Clayton Act price discriminations which may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly, even where they are made in good faith.

In 1950, when the Kefauver-Celler amendment to the antimerger section of the Clayton Act was enacted, I was hopeful that the amendment would arrest the great merger movement which was then in progress. However, the enforcement efforts of the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice of the antimerger law even as so

amended has been most disappointing. Under the amended law only one case, the Bethlehem-Youngstown proposed merger, has been finally adjudicated in the courts, and this case was not appealed. I have again joined with Senator O'MAHONEY in sponsoring S. 442 requiring in specific instances that premerger notification be given to the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice, with the hope that such amendment might add stimulus to the enforcement program of the antimerger law.

Standing at the forks in the road, I have indicated that answer to our basic economic problems of today lies in an improvement in our antitrust laws rather than in Government regulation. I have made some suggestions as to what some of these improvements should be. I believe that given an understanding of the problem and the choice of remedies, the public would support congressional action along the lines I have indicated.

History teaches us that when a nation loses its economic freedom, it also loses its political freedom. Germany, under Hitler, and Italy, under Mussolini, went through this experience. We must not have it happen in the United States. Keeping competitive may not be popular. To insist upon price competition may work temporary hardships on present concentrations of power, but in the long run, it is the only way a democracy can survive. The accomplishment of this purpose is the joint responsibility of business, labor, and Government and one in which lawyers must play a major part.

Livermore Lions Look Back Over 35-Year History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Livermore Lions Club has a proud history of over a third of a century.

It has made a great contribution to the life of a community that has undergone a metamorphosis in that time. The city, named after the beautiful valley in which it is located, was once the scene of a cattle raising industry. The Livermore Valley has long, too, been recognized as the home of the finest dry wines produced in the United States.

Shortly after the outbreak of the war, the Navy established a flying center in Livermore. The property was later taken over by the Atomic Energy Commission for its giant Livermore Laboratory, the home of the hydrogen bomb.

The Livermore Laboratory attracted industry to serve it. A few years ago the General Electric Co., in looking for a place to establish a laboratory for the adaption of atomic energy to useful and peaceful purposes, selected Vallecitos not far from Livermore and its sister city, Pleasanton. Later the Sandia Co. established a branch in the Livermore Valley so that this once typically rural, cattle growing, wine producing section has become the center around which revolves the atomic energy research and development on the Pacific coast.

Naturally, the whole character of the community has changed but life goes on and it is such things as the Lions Club that ties the old with the new.

It has been my privilege to address the Lions Club in Livermore on many occasions. I remember distinctly the last time I was there one of those present was none other than Dr. Herbert York, one of the world's foremost scientists, who is now Director of Research and Engineering for the Department of Defense.

I am making part of these remarks an article that appeared in the Livermore News February 17, 1959.

The article follows:

LIONS LOOK BACK OVER 35-YEAR HISTORY

Newcomers were filled in on historical phases of the Livermore Lions Club, and older members enjoyed an evening of reminiscing, when a past president's plaque was presented to President Ed Hawkins at the ladies night banquet held at the Castlewood Country Club Thursday night.

The plaque was prepared by and given to the club by Harold Moore, while the nameplates of the past presidents were prepared by a special committee, for which Judge Joseph A. Schenone acted when he made the presentation.

"Our club is dedicated to community service," Judge Schenone said. "All you have to do is to read the list of the various presidents of the Lions through the 35 years of our club's history, and you have 35 names of civic leaders through that period. Each contributed in some way to our community life and to our club."

First name, for the year 1924–25, was that of Charles A. Smith, who was manager of the Bank of Italy, which occupied a building at the corner of Livermore Avenue and First, which later was supplanted by the present building at the same location—now the city hall.

Smith, "Mike" Callaghan, and Jack Hock, father of City Clerk Dorothy Hock, were named as three of the club's founders. The club met at Croce's, and now annually makes a pilgrimmage to Lodi to Croce's restaurant.

Dr. Chesley Rush, still active member of the club, was president in 1925–26; Dr. Paul E. Dolan, who recently passed away, in 1926–27; Manley J. Clark, 1927–28; J. O. McKown, 1928–29; E. J. Lawless, 1929–30; Dr. Frank Savage, 1930–31; M. R. Henry, 1931–32; William Rees, 1932–33; Earl E. Johnson, 1933–34; P. E. Jones, 1934–35; Al Bonne, 1935–36; Lee R. Staiger, 1936–37; Charles Turner, 1937–38; Frank Gill, 1938–39; Harvey Saunders, 1939–40; Walter Motta, 1940–41; Lewis Wright, 1941–42; Everett Miller, 1942–43; Warren Davison, 1943–44; Dr. Don Fraser, 1944–45.

Lloyd Beebe, 1945–46; Joe Michell, 1946–47; Dr. W. A. Cassidy, 1947–48; Elliott Dopking, 1948–49; Earl Ising, 1949–50; Dr. Robert Jeffrey, 1950–51; Henry Windhusen, 1951–52; Manuel Medeiros, 1952–53; Harold Ryman, 1953–54; Manuel Duarte, 1954–55; Judge Schenone, 1955–56; Charles Francisco, 1956–57; G. R. McLeod, 1957–58; and Ed Hawkins, 1958–59.

Funniest incident related by Judge Schenone was when President Bill Rees was chosen a delegate to the Lions convention, which required him to board a train in Oakland and ride to a convention several thousand miles away. "It was his first train trip, and the first time he had left this area," Judge Schenone said. "It so impressed him that when he went to give his report on the convention he began telling about getting on the train. And believe it or not we never did hear about the convention because Bill made three consecutive talks at three consecutive meetings and just got as far as from Oakland to the Nebraska * * * the train impressed him so."

Duarte, zone chairman, awarded 100 percent attendance pins for the year to Ray Centoni, Dr. Hawkins, William McKinnon, Medeiros, Moore, Windhusen, Fracisco, William Kelly, McLeod, Larry Mongeau, Judge Schenone and President Hawkins awarded one to Duarte.

Don Witham, Community Concerts agent, was the guest of Mr. and Mrs. McLeod.

Almost Everything Is Cheaper, Union Finds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, we hear so much talk these days about what a dollar will buy but some of the economic jargon is difficult to understand. Not everyone knows the meaning of "weighted averages," "median," and so forth, but here is an article that really comes down to earth in making its point.

I thought these were very interesting figures. However, this shows it is cheaper to the person who has a job but unfortunately, more expensive for the one who does not.

The article follows:

ALMOST EVERYTHING IS CHEAPER, UNION FINDS

The Machinist, official weekly publication of the International Association of Machinists, AFL–CIO, published in its February 12 issue a detailed piece of research designed to answer the question: "Are we really any better off financially than we were 10 or 20 years ago?" The answer was a resounding, "Yes."

The newspaper compared prices in 1938, 1948, and 1958 with the amount of time an American had to work in those years in order to earn enough to buy 28 items. The verdict: Almost everything is cheaper (in 1958) when you translate the price into minutes of the average hourly wage rate. The publication added that "except for apples, cotton blouses and cotton dresses, the record shows that it doesn't take nearly as long to earn the necessities as it did 20 years ago. We lost ground on a couple of items since 1948, notably new cars and Blue Cross hospitalization."

Prices have about doubled since 1938, the Machinist noted, but at the same time average 1958 wages have increased 336 percent over 1938 wages and 157 percent over 1948 wages. Here is what that means in terms of specific examples of higher purchasing power, the union newspaper said (that period of work required in each of the years to earn the purchase price):

Item	1938	1948	1958
Loaf of bread	8.5 minutes	5.75 minutes	5.5 minutes.
Quart of milk	12 minutes	8.5 minutes	7.25 minutes.
10 pounds of potatoes	20 minutes	23 minutes	16 minutes.
1 pound of apples	4.5 minutes	5.25 minutes	4.75 minutes.
1 pound bacon	35 minutes	34 minutes	21.5 minutes.
1 pound chuckroast	21.75 minutes	28.5 minutes	16 minutes.
Haircut	47.5 minutes	55.5 minutes	42.5 minutes.
Movie ticket	57 minutes	44 minutes	35.5 minutes.
2 packs cigarettes	24 minutes	17.75 minutes	12 minutes.
Monthly Blue Cross	69 minutes	49 minutes	67.5 minutes.
Ford sedan	1,015 hours	892.5 hours	945 hours.
4-ply tire	12.25 hours	9.75 hours	8.5 hours.
100-mile train trip	6 hours	3.5 hours	2.75 hours.
New York-Chicago flight	71.33 hours	32.66 hours	22.66 hours.
5-room house	7,860.25 hours	6,486 hours	6,369.75 hours.
Portable sewing machine	158.75 hours	92.5 hours	70.25 hours.
Vacuum cleaner	55.5 hours	37 hours	30.5 hours.
Electric iron	5.5 hours	4 hours	2.75 hours.
Refrigerator	147.25 hours	178.5 hours	71 hours.
Wringer washer	59 hours	80 hours	49.5 hours.
100 kilowatt-hours electricity	6.25 hours	2.5 hours	1.75 hours.
Man's wool suit	28.5 hours	26 hours	23 hours.
Men's work shoes	4 hours	4.25 hours	3.5 hours.
Boys' shoes	2 hours	2.5 hours	1.75 hours.
Dungarees	1.25 hours	1.5 hours	1 hour.
Ladies rayon shirt	1.5 hours	2.5 hours	1.75 hours.
Ladies cotton dress	1.5 hours	2.25 hours	1.75 hours.
Ladies house slippers	1.5 hours	1.75 hours	1.25 hours.

Alameda County Grand Jurors Named

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Alameda Times-Star of February 21, 1959:

COUNTY'S GRAND JURORS NAMED

An Alameda man and 14 other men and 4 women were chosen members of the 1959 Alameda County Grand Jury yesterday in the court of Superior Judge James R. Agee.

James Wilkins Pearson, Alameda hardware merchant, of 1364 Pearl Street, is the only Alamedan on the grand jury.

Walter S. Ries, of Oakland, retired real estate broker, was appointed jury foreman by Judge Agee.

Selected to serve with the Alamedan were seven residents of Oakland, five Piedmonters, four Berkeleyans, and one resident each of Pleasanton and San Leandro.

NAMED TO SERVE

Members of the 1959 grand jury are Fred E. Anderson, of Oakland, printing firm executive; Mrs. Anita Baum, of Oakland, wife of a pharmacy owner; Donald A. Breed, of Piedmont, real estate broker; Dunlap C. Clark, of Piedmont, banker; T. C. Drennan, of Oakland, mortuary executive; Mrs. Ruth A. Gotzenberg, of Berkeley, wife of a landscape architect; Harry H. Hicks, of Oakland, retired insurance broker; Edgar B. Jessup, of Piedmont, business machine firm executive; Roy A. Legge, of Piedmont, retired sales executive; J. Elwin Le Tendre, of Berkeley, educator; Mrs. Ruth Logan, of Piedmont, civic leader.

A. Lee Oder, of Berkeley, mortuary owner; Ernest W. Schween, of Pleasanton, insurance broker; Alva G. Starr, of Oakland, retired educator; Fred W. Swain, of Berkeley, retired rubber company executive; Mrs. Gladys Valley, San Leandro, civic leader; and Charles Vegod, of Oakland, women's wear store executive.

Within the next few weeks, the panel is scheduled to tour county institutions, including the county jail, hospital, and juvenile hall.

In addition to returning indictments, the grand jury is empowered to make a complete annual examination of county financial and governmental records.

At the end of its 1-year term the grand jury submits a detailed report on its action during the year and suggestions for improvement in governmental efficiency.

Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association Broadcast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a radio broadcast on February 23, 1959, by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF FEBRUARY 23, 1959

If the social experts and the population prognosticators are correct, the quiet of the countryside is due to be disrupted by many strange sounds and happenings. Maybe not next year, or even 10 years from now, but farmers are warned that it is coming. It is the result—of the combination of the technological revolution in farming, and the irresistible bursting at the seams that is going on in the cities.

Kenneth L. Bachman, who is in the Research Division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, tells us that the U.S. population will grow rapidly until 1975, and that the revolution in farming will continue. City incomes will keep on going up. We'll have neither war nor depression to cause a setback in this headlong race to bigger and better things, Bachman predicts, and let's hope that he's right.

Bachman gives us an idea of what's happening, and is likely to happen, by saying: "The old distinctions between farm and city are disappearing rapidly. Many a farm community is now a veritable melting pot of people of diverse occupations. These developments carry with them important community problems. There surely will be rises in farm property taxes to pay for schools, water, and sewage, for example.

"The growth of our industrial economy has had far-reaching effects on the rural community. Rural people who do not live on farms outnumber those who do by a five to one ratio. In addition, more than one-third of the farm operators work off their farms 100 days a year or more. In 1957, 40 percent of the net income of farm families was from nonfarm sources."

And Mr. Bachman says that by 1975 we'll have a population of 230 million people (we have 175 million now), and the trend toward more non-farm people living in rural areas appears to be inevitable.

But how about the farmers themselves. Bachman predicts that we'll have only two million commercial farms by 1975, compared to a little more than three million now. "Agriculture," he says, "appears to be in the very middle of revolutionary changes in size and capital structure."

Well, you people on the farms don't have to be told about that. But we doubt that a lot of farm areas will ever be homesites for city people. While it is true that millions of acres of farmland are being swallowed up each year by housing developments, highways, and so forth, this is mostly limited to areas not too far from urban centers.

In all this high-speed mechanical and modernization splurge we ought not to lose sight of our most efficient food and fiber producers, the family farmers. True, their farms will grow larger, but we need to preserve the family character of the farm for the good of everybody in the Nation.

Your co-ops, like GTA, are preparing themselves to serve the farm families of the future. It is a co-op responsibility to expand into new fields, and build up abilities to cope with the future. It is only sensible to look ahead, and that's what the farm families who own and control GTA are doing.

The Shrine's Position on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by Imperial Sir George E. Stringfellow, imperial potentate, A.A.O.N.M.S. of East Orange, N.J., entitled "The Shrine's Position on Communism."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SHRINE'S POSITION ON COMMUNISM: AN ADDRESS BY IMPERIAL SIR GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW, IMPERIAL POTENTATE, A.A.O.N.M.S. OF EAST ORANGE, N.J.

There is so much confusion in the world today as to who stands where and for what in reference to communism. I think it is appropriate to tell you where the Shrine stands.

Speaking as our imperial potentate in 1947, the Honorable George E. Rowe, member of the Supreme Court of New York,

warned us of the serious inroads communism was then making in America. The judge said: "Fraternalism and religion will cease if communism breaks down our form of government * * * the Shrine has taken the lead among the Nation's fraternal orders in turning the spotlight on Red communism, its identity, its aims, and its purposes." Continued the judge: "World leaders have commended the Shrine for its fearlessness, its forthrightness, and its knowledge of America's red menace."

Speaking as our imperial potentate in 1949, Imperial Sir Galloway Calhoun, currently president and chairman of the board of trustees of the Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children, said: "Communism is a godless philosophy * * * to accomplish its purpose, it would overthrow our Government by force."

Speaking as our imperial potentate in 1950, Imperial Sir Harold Lloyd, currently a member of the board of trustees, Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children said: "One cannot be both an American and a Communist. * * * We oppose any philosophy that * * * would invade the secret sanctuary of man's conscience where only God may enter as judge."

The foregoing statements made by three of our most eminent imperial potentates were approved by the imperial council sessions in which they were made, and are, therefore, in effect our fraternity's position on communism. A position which I support.

There are those who profess to believe that communism and capitalism or communism and freedom or communism and Christianity can coexist in the same world. The architects of this diabolical movement deny this. For example, in his book Problems of Leninism, Stalin said, "Communism and capitalism cannot exist in the same world. Sooner or later one or the other must conquer." He said that religion, belief in God, must be exterminated everywhere before communism is safe anywhere, and that religion is an opiate of the people. Lenin, the principal architect of communism, a few years before his death said: "First we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, then we will encircle the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack. It will fall like overripe fruit into our hands. We have never concealed the fact that our (Russian) revolution is only the beginning, that it will lead to a victorious ending only when we shall have inflamed the whole world with its revolutionary fires." Communists hold implements of war in one hand and the dove of peace in the other. Out of one side of their mouths they plead for peace and out of the other they threaten world war. They thrive on revolution. They love to fish in troubled water of their own making. Communists tell us that war can be avoided if we submit to their demands which would be worse than war since we would lose our precious liberties and demonstrate that we are not worthy of the great sacrifices made for us by our Founding Fathers.

There are two basic threats to our way of life, and our people are becoming apathetic to both, thus playing into the hands of the Communists. Those threats are: communism and inflation. The latter grows out of the former. Communists hope to destroy our way of life through inflation. Inflation feeds on itself and when it gets out of control, as it did in Germany and Italy, chaos reigns. It is from chaos that communism grows. An illustration of the degree to which inflation has taken root in our country is that balanced budget are becoming nasty words in America. To avoid inflation and the resultant dictatorship, we must keep our expenditures within our income. We must expose the Communists for what they are: leeches that destroy liberty. Because of the apathy of the people and the alertness of the Communists, it is dangerous to fight communism in America. History does not reveal the name of a single American who fought communism without being smeared, beginning with Martin Dies of Texas. The men who are currently bearing the brunt of communistic smears are the Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and J. Edgar Hoover. Every red-blooded American, regardless of politics, will rally behind and support their efforts.

You will doubtless recall that more than half of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were Masons, more than half of the signers of the Constitution were Masons. Our Masonic forefathers believed in the dignity of the individual. Many of them gave their lives that we might live in liberty. I, therefore, feel that we Shriners and Masons have a greater responsibility to keep America American than any other group of citizens. If the time ever comes when we are afraid to speak our minds then, indeed, will we have lost our way of life.

Joseph Mekota Letter on Election Day, a Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, 66 years ago, Joseph Mekota opened a law office in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Since that time, he has engaged in the general practice of law in that city. He is now 93 years of age, and still carries on duties pertaining to his profession.

It has been my distinct honor to know this gentleman very well over the course of the last 30 years. In fact, it is my very good fortune to be able to meet and visit with him three or four times a year, since he is general counsel of the Western Bohemian Fraternal Association, in which I am active as an officer. Quarterly, we attend together meetings of the board of directors.

Thus, I know that, at his age of 93, this venerable practitioner and highly respected citizen still possesses much energy and much interest in all such activities, as he has been accustomed to do for many, many years.

By way of a personal light, I should like to say, Mr. President, that one of the former Members of this body was a law partner of Mr. Mekota many, many years ago. This former partner was the one-time Senator from the State of Missouri, James A. Reed, who represented his State in the U.S. Senate from 1911 to 1929. Senator Reed later moved from Cedar Rapids, Iowa, to Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. President, Mr. Mekota is not a member of the same political party to which I belong; but I do not know of anyone for whom I have greater respect, or whom I would honor more as a lawyer, as a gentleman, and as a citizen of the Republic.

He has gathered wisdom. His patriotism and his concern for the continued well-being and advancement of our Republic have deepened as the years have gone on.

The suggestion he wrote to me the other day—to make election day a holiday—is one of notable merit in any event. It is the more so because it is proposed by one with such a splendid background, history, and achievement of American citizenship in his own right.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA.

ELECTION DAY, A HOLIDAY

The American people have many fine qualities. They are intelligent, industrious, religious, patriotic, fraternal, tolerant, sociable, and progressive, with many other good qualities. But they have one weakness. They do not appreciate and exercise their right to vote. In the presidential elections about two-thirds of the electorate cast their ballots. In elections other than presidential, only about one-half do so. This is not a healthy situation. In some future day, some subversive element might get control of our Government.

Recently there has been some suggestions in the press in order to solve this problem, to hold elections on Sunday. To this suggestion many objections have been made by numerous religious denominations.

Why not declare and constitute our election day as a national holiday, the same as Decoration Day and Labor Day? Locally our banks, courthouse, and city hall are closed on election day. Why not close all business, commercial and industrial activities for one more national holiday? Our country has not very many holidays and one more would be acceptable to the people. Election holiday would arouse interest in elections and would cause a much higher percentage of voters to exercise one of the highest and most important privileges of American citizenship. Such holiday should apply only to National and State elections.

JOSEPH MEKOTA.

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA.

Reinstatement of National Service Life Insurance Supported by Insurance Executive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have joined with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] in sponsoring a bill which would allow a 1-year period in which veterans of World War II and the Korean war would be allowed to reinstate those national service life insurance policies which they either failed to take out on leaving the service or allowed to lapse after leaving the service.

I recently received a letter from a constituent who is in the insurance business, in which he informed me that he was in favor of this bill.

I request unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FRANK M. JONES ESTATE SERVICE,
Birmingham, Ala., February 9, 1959.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPARKMAN: On Saturday night, January 31, I had the opportunity to listen on my automobile radio to your commentaries regarding the introduction of your bill to make it possible for ex-servicemen to recover their forfeited national service life insurance.

My experience in the life insurance business dates from April 14, 1925. During World War II, and while serving in the U.S. Coast Guard, I handled the sale of national service life insurance; so there has been no interruption of continuous life insurance experience for almost 34 full years.

Since my return from the war I have assisted many ex-servicemen to reinstate and/or to convert their Government insurance to permanent plans. As of the moment we are helping them to include the increased total disability coverage in their policies.

And while no one has ever paid us one dollar for services rendered in connection with their Government insurance, I can tell you for sure that we have sold large and substantial amounts of insurance in the various companies with whom we do business to these same veterans. It was for these personal reasons I regretted very much the passing of legislation April 25, 1951, to preclude "the boys" from picking up their lapsed policies.

No one need explain to me if every ex-serviceman reinstated and retained his national service life insurance that its presence in the amount of $10,000 would mean a reduced ability to buy new insurance to the extent of the premiums paid for the Government policy. But, if the people in the life insurance would view the matter as I do, then they would recognize the fact that ownership of the Government policy, with the substantial dividends thereon, would give millions of men an enlightened perspective of insurance with subsequent desire on their part to own more.

You veterans of War I had until April 25, 1951, to pick up your lapsed insurance. I consider it only equitable and fair that veterans of War II and the Korean police action should be given a restored opportunity to recover their Government policies. And it is for these personal reasons (if you wish to so consider them) that I am 100 percent in favor of your bill.

Sincere regards,

FRANK M. JONES.

Cancer Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the truly impressive and challenging tasks confronting the American people is a research program which will finally get at the causes and possible cures for cancer. An excellent and thoughtful article was contributed to the Klamath Falls Herald and News, of Klamath Falls, Oreg., on this subject by Florence Jenkins, a member of the staff of that daily newspaper. This article appeared on October 26, 1958, under the title of "Cancer Education."

In her editorial article, Mrs. Jenkins describes the dedicated and capable people in Klamath Falls who have been working in the cause of cancer research through the program of the Oregon division of the American Cancer Society. Because this is a national and international problem, I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Jenkins' article from the Klamath Falls Herald and News of October 26, 1958, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANCER EDUCATION

(By Florence Jenkins)

"Guard the ones you love" is the slogan of the American Cancer Society.

It is refreshing to have the executive secretary of an organization or campaign present her case without saying, somewhere in the story, how much money is needed.

Grace Reymers, formerly of Klamath Falls and now of Ashland, is executive secretary of the Jackson County chapter of the Oregon division of the American Cancer Society. She came to Klamath Falls on Friday with Mrs. Jack James and Mrs. Ray Frisbie, crusade chairman and service chairman, respectively, for Jackson County.

Through arrangements made by Dr. S. M. Kerron, Klamath County Public Health Department head, they held a meeting with interested local women to reorganize a Klamath Falls chapter. Mrs. Francis Skinner has accepted chairmanship of the public service committee. Mrs. Harold Cloake, Mrs. Don Anderson, and Mrs. Harold L. Catmull will head the educational program here.

"Through education alone, 80,000 lives can be saved in the coming year by acquainting the public with the seven danger signals which may mean cancer," Mrs. Reymers states.

"Cancer will strike one out of four persons," she declared. "One out of three cases can be cured. Half of the remaining cases can be arrested and the other half could have been saved had they gotten to their doctor in time for diagnosis and proper treatment," she added.

The wonderful part about the program is the fact that the information is free. There are pamphlets already printed with concisely stated facts ready for distribution. Much authentic additional information is available from members of the committee or from the Klamath County Public Health Department.

The American Cancer Society puts the responsibility squarely on the shoulders of the individual person. Be on the alert for any of the danger signals which may indicate the present of cancer and seek medical assistance at once.

The society advises a physical checkup, if you are 35 or older, at least once a year. The society's service program seeks to save life and ease pain through a better informed and alert public.

Volunteers are sorely needed in the crusade to save lives from cancer.

Case of the Fugitive Treasure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the December 28, 1958, issue of Time magazine entitled the "Case of the Fugitive Treasure."

This article illustrates one of the aspects of Swiss banking under a system of numbered and secret bank accounts protected by secrecy laws. It shows the danger to the economy of a nation when the identity of deposits and clients are kept in secret. It also brings to mind that these banks can act as agents for others whose true identity cannot be determined.

The subcommittee on the Trading With the Enemy Act will be interested in this aspect of banking in its consideration of the question of General Aniline & Film Co. Recently a number of Swiss banks acquired control of the claimant to the GAF shares which were seized by the United States. Also, I. G. Farben in Germany filed a suit claiming an interest in General Aniline.

These questions must be resolved prior to legislation dealing with the subject to determine the best course to follow in the interest of the United States.

I have introduced a bill to provide for full return of the seized properties because I believe in the principle of respect for private property. Others have introduced bills for the sale of such properties. The course to be followed will depend on the results of investigation into all of the aspects. I hope this can be done as early as possible in the present session of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPAIN—CASE OF THE FUGITIVE TREASURE

"If Franco could afford it politically," said an American businessman last summer, "he could throw a scandal that would make vicuña coats look tawdry." Last week Franco decided he had to afford it. A mass police roundup hit Spain, and this time the victims were not radical opponents, but some of the nation's biggest and richest names—bankers, industrialists, cabinet ministers, even members of Franco's own family. Though details were carefully concealed from the public, the roundup was the climax of the most sensational financial scandal in the history of the regime. The crime common to all: Setting up secret accounts overseas, mounting to at least $280 million in Switzerland and to millions more in banks elsewhere.

The practice of banking hard money outside is an old one, and the Spanish Government had tended to wink at the practice. Businessmen swore that they could not operate without external balances, and even some government agencies had undeclared accounts of their own. But Spain's sick

economy has been going from bad to worse. In the first 9 months of 1958 the country suffered a trade deficit of $268 million. Its exports of citrus fruits are down more than 60 percent. It has so little left in gold reserves ($57 million) that it cannot even scrape up enough money to pay for the crude petroleum it needs each year. Desperate for hard currency, and shocked by the size of the sums involved, Franco decided to get the fugitive capital back, no matter who might get hurt in the process.

Samuel I. Parker, Citizen-Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on December 21, 1958, the Greensboro Daily News, of Greensboro, N.C., carried an article on Col. Samuel I. Parker, of Concord, N.C., our greatest citizen-soldier of the First World War. Colonel Parker returned to active duty during the Second World War and distinguished himself by training small units for their proper role in combat.

I ask unanimous consent that the article which appeared in the Greensboro Daily News be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAR HEEL IS FIRST MAN TO RECEIVE TOP THREE U.S. WAR DECORATIONS

(By Helen C. Arthur)

CONCORD.—It took a modest, reserved North Carolinian to become the first man in history to receive America's three highest awards for heroism in battle.

S. I. "Si" Parker, a native of Monroe and now of Concord, does not appear the stern military man.

But during World War I, his actions won him the Congressional Medal, the Distinguished Service Cross, and two Silver Stars.

These are only a few of the honors and medals bestowed on this quietly forceful man with the iron-gray hair, brother of the late Judge John J. Parker.

His also are two Purple Hearts, the Legion of Merit (from World War II), the French Fourragere in colors of the French Croix de Guerre (which he can wear as an individual), the Victory Medal from World War I with five battle clasps.

WON MANY OTHERS

In fact, Parker was awarded many lesser medals—including a number of foreign decorations for which he has never applied.

Only twice in all the years since has he worn his medals. Until only recently they were packed away. Close friends talked him into framing them.

What were these deeds that made Parker the first man in American history to hold all these awards?

The Army citation puts it in dry, matter-of-fact phrases. It does not describe the dirt and grime and blood and noise and fear of war.

Here is what the then lieutenant did in 1918:

The 2d and 3d Battalions of the 28th Infantry merged after several hours of severe fighting near Soissons, France, finally establishing a front-line position. In doing so, a gap was left between the right flank of a French colonial division and the left flank of the 28th, exposed the 28th to terrific enemy machinegun fire from a nest located on a rock quarry on high ground.

Observing the situation, young Lieutenant Parker ordered his depleted platoon to follow him in an attack on the strongpoint. Needing more help, the lieutenant happened on a group of leaderless, disorganized French colonials and talked them into following him.

They fought their way through enemy rifle and machinegun fire to the crest of the hill, rushed it and took the quarry by storm, capturing 6 machineguns and about 40 prisoners.

The next day, the assault continuing, Parker was hit in the leg. As there were few officers left, he refused to be evacuated and stayed with his command.

Again, he led the attack, crawling on his hands and knees to do it because of his wound, until the objective was reached.

For this, the lieutenant won the Congressional Medal. This is a five-pointed gold satr, surrounded by a green laurel wreath and suspended from a bronze bar on which the word "valor" is inscribed. It is the highest award for heroism America has to offer.

STILL MORE

But there's more.

In France, July, 1918, with General Pershing ordering this citation, Parker "With total disregard for his own personal danger, advanced directly on a machinegun 150 yards away while the enemy was firing directly at him, and killed the gunner with his pistol. In the town of Exermont, his platoon was almost surrounded after having taken several prisoners and inflicted heavy losses on the enemy, but despite the fact that only a few men of the platoon were left, continued to fight until other troops came to their aid."

For this, Lieutenant Parker was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross.

Again, in October 1918, the young lieutenant, "whose great spirit and courage were most stimulating to his men * * * in conjunction with another officer working with two squads, successfully repulsed a strong German counterattack and, singlehanded, captured a German machine gunner."

You would never know of these things about this man.

"The good Lord just let me live through it. I just happened to get where things had to be done.

"In all honesty, it is as difficult for me today as it was in 1918 to piece together in my own mind all that happened."

NEVER REGULAR

A big man, Parker was never a Regular Army officer, but was active in the Reserve between wars. In World War II he was called on to help by lecturing officers and officer candidates on mental preparation for the battlefield.

In fact, he wrote his own textbook, and it was used at West Point Military Academy. For this work he won the Legion of Merit.

Between wars, until his retirement last year, Parker and his family lived in South Orange, N. J. He worked with a pharmaceutical manufacturing firm of New York, becoming a vice president.

As a youth, he left the University of North Carolina in his senior year to enlist in 1917, and attended the first officer training camp at Fort Oglethorpe, Ga. From there he was sent overseas, where for some time he was attached to the British Army.

Now, he and his wife, the former Miss Mary Lou Morris, of Concord, live in a spacious white house high on a hill near Concord. Parker enjoys his retirement and visits from his daughter and two grandsons.

The Changeable Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the Midwest's outstanding agricultural writers is Al Stedman of the St. Paul Pioneer Press-Dispatch.

He has effectively called attention to the inconsistencies of the administration in relation to wheat and corn.

On the one hand, the administration professes to be against controls in telling farmers to produce all they can and then it expresses concern about surpluses and insists on tighter controls.

I ask unanimous consent to have an article which was published in the February 15 issue of the St. Paul Pioneer Press, by Al Stedman, entitled "Uncle Capriccio," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNCLE CAPRICCIO

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

A benevolent old gentleman but changeable is Uncle Sam. Some folks affectionately call him Uncle Santa Claus. His payments arriving in any season are welcome as the flowers of spring.

The mystery is as to why he is target for so many brickbats. Down on the farm he should be as popular as sender of payments—soil bank payments, conservation payments, wool payments, sugar payments, etc. Instead, he gets blamed for everything: low prices, high prices, even bad weather being ascribed to H-bomb tests or something done by Uncle Sam.

Oh, there could be a lot of reasons, factual and fictitious. When Government, regardless of party in power, takes credit for prosperity, it has a hard time ducking blame for reverses. It's human nature to cuss Uncle Sam when things go haywire. No matter how much the Government may do for somebody, the beneficiary can always squirm with envy of others who, in truth or imagination, have been treated even better.

But more than platitudes are needed to solve the mystery. Could Uncle Sam's own conduct be a source of his troubles? It's a hunch to explore. Maybe it's Uncle's changeability that has some folks buffaloed.

For instance, there's his split personality toward those two monarchs of the countryside—wheat and corn. True they're different. Wheat is the king of the bread grains. Corn is the king of feed grains. So Uncle can hardly be expected to treat them exactly alike, though he does vow more price equality between them, so farmers can afford to feed flocks on surplus wheat.

Uncle Sam's mien is a bit brusk as he rides the plains with bad news for the wheat farmers.

"Boys," he says, "much as we hate it we'll have to ask you from now on to control your wheat production. You'll have to slash acreage allotments, tighten up quotas, ban exemptions and loopholes, and hike penalties for overplanting. If, that is, you want wheat price supports kept up."

But as he travels over into the Corn Belt, Uncle Sam's mood changes. Government bins and surplus potentials seem no longer to bother him. The worry lines leave his brow. His whiskers quiver with optimism.

He is an altered ego with no chip any longer on his shoulder.

"Boys," he chuckles, "grow all the corn you want. No production controls for you. No allotments, no quotas, no penalties. The sky's the limit. All that and Government price supports too."

Mostly the home folks think simple and straight. They think of a spade as a spade, a cow as a cow, and of sauce for the goose as permissible sauce for the gander.

They think that if a U.S. plan of supplementing free prices with Government payments is right for one crop, it shouldn't be banned on principles from another crop. But as to this, Uncle undergoes another change of personality. He smiles on the plan as fine for wool and sugar. He scowls on it as socialism for wheat or butter.

Earnestly your Uncle talks for constitutional guarantees of freedom of markets for farmers and housewives. This he calls healthy American competition that leaves producers free to sell and consumers free to buy where each can do best. That's for some foods and areas.

But as to Midwest milk and cream, Uncle Sam's mood shifts again. Now he drops his talk about freedom of prices and markets, erects a wall around the District of Columbia, lifts prices inside that wall, and says to Midwest milk, "we do not want you to enter here."

Perhaps that's how Uncle Sam gets to be a magnet for barbs from the back country. Home folks are puzzled by his trait of changing mien as he shifts his farm plans from region to region and from crop to crop. Maybe that's why they shy a verbal, shillelagh now and then in the changeable gentleman's direction.

The Place of the American Indian in Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a guest editorial, written by Peter Homer, Sr., a Mohave Indian, chairman of the Colorado River Tribal Council, and published in a recent issue of the Amerindian, the American Indian Review.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Contributed by Peter Homer, Sr.)

For the past 130 years or more the Government has handled the affairs of the various Indian tribes in this country. The Bureau of Indian Affairs was created in 1824 for the express purpose of civilizing and Christianizing the Indians and fitting them to take their place as citizens of the United States. This was the outgrowth of the program which Congress had adopted toward the Indians at the very inception of this Government and was in accordance with the policy of the first settlers in this country.

The Indians, to some extent, have taken their place in society, but the numbers are small in comparison with other minority groups which do not get educational and other benefits from the Government. Many people have questioned why the Indians have not advanced more rapidly. Most answers dwell on culture, custom, language, and background as reasons for the difficulty.

Place any class of people in a state of complacency through paternalistic care, protection, and other benefits for over a period of time and see what happens. Place these same activities under a division of Government which soon becomes a bureaucracy with all its policies, rules, regulations, and legal entanglements; let it become a political football and see where it goes and what it does to the very people it is supposed to benefit.

The failure has been that it was not realized that Indians would have to grow up. Policies and objectives should prepare Indians to a point of self-sufficiency so that they can take their place in society without jeopardy to, or loss of, land holdings, rights, and other property. Indians must realize, too, that there is a goal for which they must strive and, if they are to survive, they must do their part in attaining that goal.

The Cyprus Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials on the accord reached in London this week on the Cyprus problem. This remarkable accord, restoring friendly relations among estranged allies, deserves wide acclaim and approval by the free world.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 20, 1959]

WELL DONE ON CYPRUS

The accord signed in London on the Cyprus problem represents a negotiated compromise of many valid interests. As such, it may not be an instrument of perfection in the eyes of any one party. It is doubtful, if not impossible, that any such instrument could be devised without so offending less-favored interests that continued strife on the island would be assured, and that such a structure of western unity as the NATO would be dangerously weakened.

Precise details of the compact are to be released at a later date. Salient points, however, are those negotiated at Zurich earlier this month by Prime Ministers Karamanlis, of Greece, and Menderes, of Turkey—and concurred in now by Prime Minister Macmillan, of Great Britain, Archbishop Makarios, and Dr. Fazil Kutchuk. The latter two are leaders of the Greek and Turkish Cypriot factions, respectively. In brief, the terms would give Cyprus a status of independence and would create an island government headed by a Greek Cypriot and with an assembly divided 70 to 30 percent between Greek and Turkish representation. Political union with Greece, a long-standing aspiration, would be banned. So would partition, an alternative favored more recently by Turkey. Britain would retain military base rights, still considered vital to the Commonwealth and to NATO as well.

There is credit enough in this solution for all to share. Mr. Karamanlis, in particular, deserves an extra tribute for persuading Archbishop Makarios to modify his last-minute objections, and the Greek Parliament should applaud the strong statesmanship displayed by their chief of government. Ankara should be comparably approving of the contribution made by Prime Minister Menderes, especially against the background of the air tragedy which cost the lives of so many of his associates on this mission of statesmanship. For Mr. Macmillan, about to leave for Moscow, the agreement reflects once again the British capacity for honorable and responsible adjustment to the changing times.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 20, 1959]

BLESSED EVENT FOR CYPRUS

Good news is a precious commodity in these days of grim international outlook, and the Greek, Turkish, British, and Cypriot representatives meeting in London have produced some really good news by settling the Cyprus dispute. The accord is the more welcome because of the fears that last-minute objections from the Greek Cypriot leader, Archbishop Makarios, might snarl the agreement reached between Greece and Turkey last week. The settlement was possible because each of the principals—Greek Prime Minister Karamanlis, Turkish Prime Minister Menderes from his hospital bed after his narrow escape in an air tragedy, British Prime Minister Macmillan, and Archbishop Makarios himself—joined in a genuine compromise to end 4 years of ugly strife.

Of all the concessions the Greek Government and Greek Cypriots appear to have given the most in forswearing their long dream of union, or enosis; this took real statesmanship. But it would be unworthy to qualify the credit. The Turkish Government and Turkish Cypriots renounced their demand for partition; and the British Government modified its own plans for the beleaguered Mediterranean island in return for continued sovereignty over military bases. Assuredly the soon-to-be-formed independent Republic of Cyprus, with carefully weighted representation and checks for the respective Greek and Turkish communities, will have difficulties of its own. But these can be met with good will.

What is especially remarkable is that this represents an agreed solution of a vexing problem. In too many of the world's grievances solutions prove difficult and are therefore evaded through temporizing and expediency. As Mr. Karamanlis said, the people of Cyprus are the victors; but not the least of the benefits is the restoration of friendly relations among estranged allies. That makes the accord the more rare—and it deserves to be applauded accordingly.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Hellenic Chronicle, Feb. 12, 1959]

CYPRUS SOLUTION

We've had an agreement on Cyprus. Ironically, the negotiations that brought this accord were accompanied by far less fanfare than were many that had fizzled.

Premiers Karamanlis and Menderes, deserve rich plaudits. Though the accord now must go to London, we feel that the Macmillan government will leap at the chance to put its stamp of approval on an agreement that will spell finis for the long-festering sore.

What's more the agreement is an honorable one and one which most will agree will not harm the prestige of either of three parties. What's more important, the agreement leaves the Cypriot people themselves with a working arrangement that should not create any difficulties.

Though propaganda was lacking, the meeting at Zurich did not go unnoticed. The mere fact that the Greek and Turkish

premiers had come together at a meeting table was most noteworthy. It was proof positive that a tremendous amount of progress in dissolving the impasse had been made since the end of the recent U.N. General Assembly session in New York.

At the conclusion of the U.N. session, Greece and Turkey were poles apart. A compromise resolution on Cyprus had been adopted, urging continued negotiations toward resolving the crisis. Few felt that anything would be forthcoming before another U.N. meeting, let alone within 2 months.

Yet here it is, a solution. Although both sides kept cautioning against optimism, it was hard to hide the general feeling of accord that seemed to be permeating from Zurich, where Premier Karamanlis and Premier Menderes were smiling at each other instead of seeking to rip each other apart from across the table.

Archbishop Makarios is still a key figure in the final decision. He has stated that the issue is still primarily one between Cypriot and Briton; but it is hard to visualize him refusing to accept a mutual agreement between Turk and Greek, especially when it means an end to bloodshedding and bitterness.

Cyprus has for too long suffered from the internal warfare. The struggle has been costly in life, in property and in good will. Some of the sores it opened may never be completely healed. Demagogs may reopen them again some day. There is no time to waste on pat agreements. Everyone stands to gain from an end to the strife.

Greece has given up on Enosis. The battle for annexation has long since been lost. Britain has given up on retaining its colony in subjective status. Its compromising proved the worst of approaches. Turkey found a late toehold in the issue and almost wrecked the NATO allies with its demands. Its latest demands for partition were given up grudgingly, but they went.

Let us praise God for guiding the hands of the negotiators to that long-sought end that will let Cypriots gain that long-sought freedom.

Sacrificing Enosis is well worth the price of life and it was necessary in the case of Cyprus. Let us wish them well on the map of free nations.

Georgia Firsts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column by Hon. DuPree Jordan, Jr., editor and publisher of the West End Star of Atlanta, Ga., enumerating the various firsts which the State of Georgia can claim. Mr. Jordan's column was written in conjunction with the observance on February 12 of the 226th anniversary of the founding of the colony of Georgia.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JORDAN'S JOTTINGS

(By DuPree Jordan, Jr.)

This column has never run as long as 70 paragraphs, or even half that number, but this week we would like to pass on that number of short items received from Georgia's new secretary of commerce, Abit Massey. Since today is the anniversary of our State's beginning, this information certainly is appropriate.

Possibly no other State has taken the leadership in so many varied fields of endeavor as has Georgia, whose rich and colorful history dates back to February 12, 1733, when General Oglethorpe landed at Savannah. Among the many firsts which Georgia claims, and which you might want to help bring to the attention of its citizens, on the 226th anniversary of the colony's founding on February 12, are the following:

The steamship, the *Savannah*, was the first steamship to cross the Atlantic Ocean, leaving Savannah on May 20, 1819, en route to Liverpool, England.

The University of Georgia at Athens, chartered in 1785, was the first State-chartered University in America.

Georgia was the first State to have a chartered college for women, Wesleyan College at Macon being founded in 1839. Georgia was also the first State in which a college degree was granted to a woman.

A Georgia Indian, Sequoyah, of the Cherokee tribe was first to codify the Indian alphabet in 1821.

The first Indian newspaper, the Cherokee Phoenix, was published in Georgia in 1828.

Georgia was the first State to establish a school for Negro nurses, and the first to grant a certificate to a Negro nurse. (Spelman College, Atlanta, 1881.)

The first women's secret society was organized at Wesleyan College, Macon, May 15, 1851.

The first school of forestry in the South was established at the University of Georgia in 1906.

Georgia was the first State to declare that married women should have full property rights. (The Married Women's Act, 1866).

The first State agricultural experiment station was established at Savannah in 1735.

The first American orphanage was established in Savannah by George Whitfield in 1741.

On March 2, 1912, the Girl Scouts of America was formed in Savannah, Ga., by Julliette Lowe.

The first Protestant Sunday School in America was founded in Savannah in 1736.

The first Moravian Church in the United States was established in Georgia in 1735.

The first Negro Baptist Church was established at Silver Bluff, Ga., in 1733.

The first Negro hospital in the United States was built in Georgia in 1832.

A Georgian, Dr. Crawford W. Long, first discovered and demonstrated the use of ether in surgical operations in 1842.

The Ladies' Garden Club of Athens, organized in 1891, was the first such organization to name permanent officers, adopt a constitution and by-laws and be conducted according to parliamentary law.

Georgia was the first colony, while under England's rule, to abolish slavery and outlaw the sale of rum.

The first silk exported from the colonies was sent from Savannah and made into a dress for the Queen of England in 1735.

The first sea-going vessel made of iron, the *John Randolph*, was built in Savannah in 1834.

Georgia was the first State to charter a railroad, the Mexican-Atlantic, in December of 1827.

The first sewing machine was conceived and perfected by Dr. Francis Goulding, a Georgian.

The Nation's first county-owned hydroelectric plant was built in Crisp County, Ga.

Gold was first discovered in Georgia in 1828 and first mined at Dahlonega.

The first machine for manufacturing ice was made in Columbus and patented in 1844.

The first woman U.S. Senator was Mrs. Rebecca Felton of Cartersville, Ga., who took office in 1922.

The first discovery of bauxite (aluminum ore) was made in Floyd County, Ga., in 1887.

Georgia was the first State to lower the legal voting age to 18.

Georgia was the first State to require birth registration.

A Georgian first organized a memorial association and planned a Confederate Memorial Day.

Poppy Day was first inaugurated by a Georgian, Moina Michael.

The first cotton gin was invented in 1793 by a Georgian, Eli Whitney, and placed in operation near Washington, Ga.

The first successfully operated cotton mill in the South, the Bolton factory, was built in Wilkes County, Ga.

The first process by which cottonseed oil could be made from the previously discarded cottonseed was discovered by Launcelot Johnstone, a Georgian.

Cotton was first planted for commercial use in Georgia.

Georgia is first in producing 75 percent of all the tire cord and fabric used in automobile tires in this country.

Georgia was the first State to organize an agricultural department in 1874.

The largest State farmers' market of its kind in the United States is located in Atlanta.

Cairo, Ga., is the largest producing and shipping point for pure sugarcane sirup in the United States.

Cairo, Ga., leads the world in producing collard seed for market.

Georgia leads the Nation in the production of these agricultural products: pimento peppers, pecans, peanuts, watermelons, velvet beans, and cow beans.

Georgia is first in the production of gum turpentine.

Valdosta, Ga., is the largest naval stores market in the world.

Georgia is first in producing 74.4 percent of gum naval stores produced in the United States and 50 percent of the world's production.

Georgia leads the Nation in production of commercial broilers.

The first exportation of cattle from America was from Savannah, Ga., in 1755.

The largest solid granite body in the world is Stone Mountain, located 16 miles east of Atlanta.

A Georgian, William Longstreet, in 1790, was the first to apply the steam principle to navigation.

The rural delivery system of the United States is the evolution of a plan of a Georgian, proposed in Congress by Thomas E. Watson.

The first motion picture theater in the world was operated in Atlanta in 1895 by C. Francis Jenkins at the Cotton States Exposition.

Coca-Cola was first made and sold in Georgia.

Georgia was the first State to send a schooner against the British in the American Revolution.

The first hymn book in the United States was written by Charles Wesley in 1737.

Georgia was the first State to adopt a vagrancy law in 1813.

A Sunday School established by John Wesley in 1735 at Savannah, was the first in America.

The first Christian baptism in America occurred in 1540 in the Ocmulgee River.

Georgia, in 1774, was the first to ordain a Negro preacher.

Georgia was the first colony to ship a bale of cotton to England.

Georgia was the first State to have a woman own and edit a newspaper, the Washington Gazette, in 1802 with Mrs. Hillhouse as editor.

Georgia was the first colony to cultivate grapes in 1735.

Georgia was the first State to establish a free high school, Richmond Academy, in August, 1783.

Georgia was the first State to have a passenger railroad which ran from Augusta to Charleston.

A Georgian, Dr. Charles Herty, first designed the cup used in the turpentine industry.

Georgia was the first State to have a woman's foreign missionary society, at Athens in 1819.

Georgia was the first State to send troops to the Confederate service, the Oglethorpe Light Infantry, of Savannah.

The circular saw was invented by a Georgian, Mr. Cox, in 1795 and the original design is still used.

A Georgian, Thomas R. R. Cobb, was the first to codify the English law as to principles of equity.

Georgia was the first State to have a railroad commission established in 1877.

Georgia was the first southern State to sign the United States Constitution.

Now, honestly, how many of those facts did you already know?

I Speak for Democracy: Speech by Leslie Rothenberg, West Virginia Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Wednesday, February 25, in the Nation's Capital, we were again stimulated in our concept of citizenship. This strength came into being through our association, as Senators, with the winners of the I Speak for Democracy contest.

These young men and young women, representing 49 States and the District of Columbia, came to Washington for a nationwide program embraced in the 12th annual voice of democracy broadcast scriptwriting contest.

It was my privilege to talk with Leslie Rothenberg, of Wheeling, the winner from among more than 200 youths of West Virginia who participated in our State.

This lad is a senior at Linsly Military Institute in his home community. He is editor in chief of his school newspaper. Cadet Captain Rothenberg plans on entering college this fall as a prelaw student.

At the national awards luncheon I counseled with this young man. He spoke to me of religious liberty. I reminded him that Roger Williams was banished from the Colonies because he preached religious liberty. He expressed his thoughts on tolerance. I joined him in hoping for that time, which must come, when humankind will live together in closer understanding and more wholesome mutual respect.

Mr. President, I was so impressed with this fine youngster's objective thinking that I requested a copy of the script which had won for him the West Virginia award.

Robert W. Ferguson, of Wheeling, the president of the West Virginia Broadcasters Association, accompanied Cadet Rothenberg. I congratulate Mr. Ferguson, and his associates in our State, for their sponsorship of the contest. We do well when encouragement is given to such a cooperative effort for our youth.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

Why do I speak for democracy? How can I, a first generation American in my family, realize the values of the democratic way of life in the United States of America? How can I know the meanings of such words as liberty, equality, tolerance, justice, and the rule of law? These words are mere abstract nouns until you relate them to such nouns as Concord and Bunker Hill, Corregidor, and Okinawa. I would like to relate these qualities of our democracy to myself.

First, liberty means the right to choose something by yourself without any outside force making the choice for you. My parents have helped guide me—not force me—in my exercising the right of free choice. One example of this ideal was the fact that I could choose the type of school that I wanted. The fact that I may select my own college or career field is still another sign of liberty at work.

The second point that I would like to develop is equality. This word carries with it the key to the togetherness of the millions of people that make up America. The heterogeneous backgrounds of this myriad of human beings have merged into a vibrant force of activity and cooperation in which everyone plays his or her part. Men such as Jackie Robinson and Dr. Ralph Bunche have successfully reaffirmed the equality of opportunity for all people, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Next and closest to my heart is the ideal of tolerance. In this country of ours each man may practice the religion of his own choice. Taking into consideration the large number of religious sects, it is not difficult to understand why ours is a country which has enjoyed religious freedom since its inception.

Men like my grandfather suffered the horrors and brutalities of countless concentration camps and detention centers simply because they believed in God. Although my grandmother died in one of these wretched pestholes, my grandfather lived long enough to enjoy the privilege of worshiping, here in America with his family and his grandson, the religion of his ancestors.

Lastly, let us consider justice and the rule of law together. In order to prevent chaos and to maintain an orderly management of daily life, we have created a code of laws and regulations which promote and guide our actions in a peaceful and sensible manner for the common good of all. The men who impartially interpret this code of law have wisely molded the principles into a strong foundation for the preservation of our rights and privileges. We can look for examples of this in our everyday life. A simple piece of paper called a driver's license, which means so much to me personally, is assurance to society that I am a qualified driver. The policeman on the corner, the judge in the courtroom, and the investigating Congressman are all concerned with the protection of all people from the invasion of their rights as American citizens.

We can now see that these words—liberty, equality, tolerance, justice, and the rule of law—are more than just abstract terms for they are alive in America; they are functioning in America; they are democracy in action.

Elias Lieberman, a Russian immigrant, expresses so vividly the sentiments of all freedom-loving Americans in his poem, "I Am an American," when, pointing to the flag of our Nation, he says, "That flag of stars and stripes is yours; it is the emblem of the promised land. It means, my son, the home of humanity. Live for it * * * died for it. * * * I am proud of my future. I am an American."

Position and Plight of the Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on January 27, 1959, Mr. Halbert M. Jones, of Laurinburg, N.C., the president of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Institute, made a most illuminating address to a meeting of that organization in Washington, D.C., on the present position and plight of the American textile industry. Since Mr. Jones possesses expert knowledge of this subject, this address should be made available to all Members of the Congress. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Distinguished guests and gentlemen, we are grateful for your attendance upon this occasion. We recognize the heavy demands which you have on your time in Washington, and we are honored by your presence here which bespeaks your deep interest in and concern for the textile industry. This is an occasion when the textile industry gathers to honor you, the Senators and Representatives of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama, and so well represent the folks of the southeastern area.

As we review the political and ideological tides of the past 25 years, we are doubly grateful for the courageous leadership of the Senators and Representatives from the South. Except for you and your predecessors, we would be much further along the road to socialism and centralization of government authority in this country. Southern delegations have been tagged with the conservative labels in Congress, and the liberal tag has been applied to the free spenders and those who want to see Government assume an ever-increasing responsibility for and control over the lives of our citizens. Historically, a liberal has been one who has stood for freedom and liberty and who has resisted the encroachments of centralized government authority upon the rights of individuals. By this definition, our southern delegations and those who believe as you do are the true liberals, and it is time that we claimed again the label. We salute you who are standing so stanchly in defense of the great liberal principles upon which our Nation was founded.

In the last session of Congress, there was probably more legislation directly affecting textiles than during any session in recent years. You will recall, of course, the wide range of legislation involving world trade, foreign aid, agricultural policy, particularly as related to cotton, labeling, States rights,

regulation of labor activities, taxation, budgets, and many other subjects. As a result, industry people were more active in Washington than ever before, and I expect that the multitude of our calls upon you, the varied pleas for support, were at times confusing, sometimes, perhaps, contradictory, and occasionally so regular as to be wearisome. We appreciate your patience with us and your deep concern for the needs of our industry. This experience emphasized anew the need for the textile industry to develop an overall program which could be presented to you and into which could be fitted the various legislative matters which come before you.

The action of the Senate in appointing a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to study the textile industry has proved to be most significant for our industry. Under the able chairmanship of Senator PASTORE, the hearings of this committee have provided a public forum for the full presentation of the story of the textile industry and for the development of a comprehensive program which, we believe, will be quite helpful to the Members of Congress and to the industry. Senator THURMOND has served with distinction on this committee, and we are grateful for his devotion to the task of the committee and for the sympathetic hearing which all of the committee members have given the spokesmen for the industry. We believe that the report of this committee and the record of these hearings will be most constructive.

Certain facts regarding the industry have emerged from the full study we wish to call briefly to your attention tonight. These facts are, of course, not new and are familiar to you:

First. The textile industry, producing materials essential to the very survival of our people and second only to foodstuffs for human security, is a vital segment of our total national economy. It is not necessary, of course, for me to dwell on the importance of textiles in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama. In these areas, textiles account for a major share of all manufacturing employment. For our Nation as a whole, textile manufacturing ranks sixth in employment, ninth in assets, and ninth in sales among all industry. Together with apparel manufacturing, our sister, the textile industry employs over 2,300,000 persons directly and is the largest of all the manufacturing segments. Indirect employment required in the production of cotton, wool, manmade fibers, textile machinery, textile chemicals, dyestuffs, starch, and the thousands of other items consumed by textile mills adds many hundreds of thousands to those who are dependent upon textiles for their livelihood. By any standard of measurement, textiles are essential to our Nation's total economy.

Second. In times of national emergency, textiles are second only to steel in our Nation's military security. If, at any time, this country comes to depend upon foreign supplies of textiles to any important degree, at that time will its security be in jeopardy. Textiles are contributing importantly to the rush into the space age and are essential to our military strength. The continued erosion of the textile industry can only impair our military security.

Third. The cost structures of our Nation, reflecting the inflationary pressures of the past 20 years, have put textiles along with many other industries in a position where domestic costs are no longer competitive with those of foreign producers, not because of productivity, for our productivity is the highest in the world, but because wage and raw material costs abroad are far lower than our own levels here. Unrestricted imports of low-wage foreign textiles can destroy our textile industry and present tariff schedules do not afford adequate protection for our textile jobs. Not only do these cost structures open our domestic markets to foreign production but also they have had the effect of reducing our exports by nearly 1 billion yards during the past 10 years.

Fourth. The textile industry has been subjected to a combination of government policies and programs which have weighed heavily and, we believe, unfairly on the textile industry. If only one policy were the problem, the ingenuity of our industry could overcome it, but, in combination, these programs have resulted in a recession in textiles, in declining employment, in very low earnings on investment, and in a long list of mill liquidations.

Our problems include, of course, internal ones of serious nature which require continuing solution, but our internal problems are aggravated by the extra burden of government policy in many areas. These government policies and programs include the following:

(a) An agricultural policy as related to cotton which has restricted the ability of cotton to compete and has made cotton available to our foreign competitors at prices 6 to 8 cents below our domestic cost. During the past 2 years, 13 million bales of raw cotton were exported at prices far below the price to domestic mills. This year another 3 million to 3,500,000 bales will go abroad. Thus, the foreign textile manufacturers are handed a handsome subsidy, and the effects are, of course, keenly felt when their textiles vie with our products in the market place both here and abroad. We understand the very complex nature of the cotton problems, but we do believe firmly that only a competitive one-price system can again make cotton the fiber of growing usefulness and consumption in the United States.

(b) Tariff reduction and foreign trade policies which have stimulated the importation of both greige textiles and made-up goods into the United States to the great damage of our textile markets. Perhaps if the influx of Japanese textiles constituted our only sore spot, we could meet the difficulty. But it must be noted that for the past 2 years the Japanese industry has been regulating its exports to the United States under a so-called voluntary agreement, made by the Japanese Government with our Government. This agreement demonstrates the inadequacy of our foreign trade policy, and voluntary agreements which place the United States in a position of weakness cannot be a long-term solution to this problem. Temporary control of the Japanese situation has only resulted in the breaking out of other problems from other sources. Hong Kong stepped up its production aimed at the U.S. markets taking advantage of the relief afforded by the Japanese. For example, from January through September of 1958, apparel imports, consisting of shirts and other wearing apparel, alone bore a value of something more than $11 million as compared with $2,500,000 the year previous. It comes as no surprise that the Japanese want to review the terms of their agreement. It is little wonder that they want to increase their exports to our market. Our industry is firm in its conviction that any upward revision in the Japanese quotas at this time would be interpreted as evidence of a policy of further liquidation of the domestc textile industry on the part of our Federal Government.

(c) Foreign aid programs which have stimulated and financed foreign textile plant construction in an industry which already had excess capacity in the free world. As an illustration, recently the ICA predicted that there would be 29 textile manufacturing enterprises operating very shortly in the Philippines, where in 1955 there was only 1 firm. Nothing was said about what effect this expansion would have on American exporters of textiles to Manila, which has, for a long time, been a major market for us, nor the effect upon the Japanese mills, which also have been major suppliers of textiles to Southeast Asia. What do these newly founded textile industries abroad do with their output? Are they content merely to meet their own domestic needs, needs once filled by the U.S. industry and the industry of our friends in the free world? The answer is no. They begin as soon as possible producing for export and for the U.S. market. Can our State Department require these beneficiaries of our tax dollars to confine their textile output to their own lands? "No," say the diplomats, "that's the way the Soviets operate. We dare not put any strings on our assistance." That may be, but it seems certain that more harm than good will be done in the long run if this situation is not reevaluated. What will be the result when our needy friends find themselves competing with one another, plus those nationalized industries which care naught for profits? A program of our Government which seeks to expand textile production abroad is most illogical when it takes away our own export markets, closes export markets for our textile manufacturing friends in the free world, increases pressure on our domestic markets to take an increasing volume of imports, and puts our friends abroad in a position to be severely damaged in this highly competitive field. We are surely leading our friends along a course which will lead to bitter disappointment in textile production.

(d) The ICA purchase program for textiles which has resulted in buying nearly 90 percent of its requirements during the past 2 years from foreign producers. These purchases made with U.S. dollars are used to stimulate production and provide undergirding for textile industries abroad at a time when textile employment in this country has been declining and mills have been liquidated by the hundreds.

(e) Depreciation schedules currently in effect and completely inadequate to reflect the obsolescence of textile equipment and the operating schedules which are customary in the industry. A revision of bulletin F is surely sorely needed by the textile industry.

Perhaps, as an industry, we might be able to cope with any one of these problems, each created by Government policies, but we are required to deal with the combined and interrelated effects of all these troublemakers. To put it as simply as I can, the total impact of these conditions is more than our industry, or any industry, can bear. Is it any wonder that we look toward our Government for help? These problems are Government created; they can be corrected only by Government action. Considering all of the facts which have been presented, there is good reason to believe that the extraordinary influence of Government to which this industry is subjected represent that small shade of difference between a dynamic growing industry and an industry which for some years has been contracting.

As you, of course, know, the Communists have launched a new trade offensive against the free world, and they have chosen as major weapons textiles and raw cotton. Their primary battleground is the Far East, with Red China leading the attack. The Chinese Communists say that they will have a cotton crop of about 14 million bales ready for market by 1961. They also claim that they will be able to produce 7 billion square yards

of cotton cloth annually, which is twice as much cloth as manufactured in Japan in 1957. Already textiles from Red China are pouring into Indonesia, Singapore, Malaya, Burma, Pakistan, markets supplied traditionally by Japan, and the Red Chinese goods are priced about 10 percent below the Japanese price. Now our Government has indicated that it will help Japan find a way to meet such competition. We appreciate the enormity of the problem for those who fashion our policies on international relations. We are certain that this is going to pose difficulties for the Congress. The complexities will be many, and our industry wants to be of any possible assistance to you as these problems come before you.

Most of you know something about another uncertainty which looms ahead for us. There is a greater emphasis being placed upon the need for lowering the export price of cotton. The farm law requires the Secretary to set the price of U.S. cotton at a level which will enable it to compete in the world market. The offshore demand for our cotton is declining at an alarming rate at current price levels. Once Red China begins flooding the world markets with its fiber without regard to production costs or profits, the situation will be critical. Any lowering of export prices for cotton without providing some offsetting equalization to domestic industry could be disastrous.

To us, an import quota system on textile yarns and fabrics appears to be the only practical solution in sight. Our friends in Japan and elsewhere in the free world should not be led down a blind alley. The U.S. marketplace. despite the population growth, despite a dynamic expansion of our economy, cannot support the ever-expanding production of the world. Only a well-developed quota system can provide some definite assurance of a future for our domestic industry and a reasonable share of our markets for our friends abroad.

Our industry is truly faced with many problems. But let me comment, just briefly, upon some of the great strengths which this industry has. It is my own conviction that the textile industry today is potentially in the strongest position on its history. Through painful years of contraction, the excess productive capacity of the industry in relation to domestic markets has, in large degree, been liquidated. The financial strength of the industry as a whole has never been greater. Research, which has already produced dramatic results, is expanding rapidly, stimulated by and producing new fibers, new finishes, new fabrics, and new processes. Sound merchandising and sales promotion techniques and practices are employed more extensively than ever. The productive efficiency of the industry has been growing at a rapid rate and, in the use of material and man-hours, the industry must be considered as one of our most effective. The increasing income and the population of the United States certainly provide an expanding market for this industry which supplies fundamental and basic needs of our people. The textile industry, because of these fundamental strengths, possesses the potential for a vigorous and a dynamic future in the United States provided (1) our raw materials, including cotton, can be made available to us under a one-price system at a level truly competitive, and (2) that our domestic markets are protected from a flood of imports from low wage foreign countries.

Thank you for honoring us by being our guests this evening. We look forward to the close association which we will have with you in this session of Congress. and we are grateful for the true liberal leadership which you bring to the Congress.

Dr. Howard A. Rusk Salutes Valor of Roy Campanella

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a truly inspiring article in tribute to the fighting spirit and courage of Roy Campanella was published in the New York Times of Sunday, March 1, 1959. It came not from the pen of a sportswriter or leader of Campanella's Negro race, but from the distinguished medical editor of the Times, Dr. Howard A. Rusk.

Dr. Rusk is one of the world's great medical authorities on human rehabilitation. He has been a consultant and doctor in the rehabilitation process of Roy Campanella himself, and he knows Campanella's valiant qualities of heart and mind and soul.

As we consider funds for the National Institutes of Health, it is well for us to keep human beings in mind, human beings like the brave Campy of Dodger fame, who need the findings of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and of the other institutes, too, as they struggle to regain health and a normal life. We cannot scrimp on funds so vital to humankind and health.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article by Dr. Howard A. Rusk in the New York Times entitled "New Life for Campy."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW LIFE FOR CAMPY—DODGER STAR REJOINS TEAM AS COACH SADDENED BY PLIGHT OF HIS YOUNG SON

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

One day early last May, Roy Campanella lay flat an his back on a Stryker frame with his head held rigid and motionless in a neck brace.

He was watching a telecast, through an overhead mirror, of his teammates, the Dodgers. But the Dodgers were in a disastrous losing streak and his old friend, Charlie Neal, had gone hitless for days.

When the game ended, Campy immediately placed a long-distance call to Neal and said: "Charlie, I've been watching the game. You're never gonna start hittin' again unless you pull that right foot back about 6 inches. Do that and you're gonna be back in the ball game."

Neal followed Campy's advice and his batting slump was over.

Watching a baseball game on television with Campy last season in the early days of his convalescence from injuries he received in an auto crash was a real experience. His ability to call the balls and strikes and predict which ball would be hit and where was a revelation to an average baseball fan.

A NEW MILESTONE

This weekend marked a new milestone in Roy Campanella's rehabilitation. Yesterday he flew to Vero Beach, Fla., to take up coaching duties with his former team, now the Los Angeles Dodgers.

Mr. Campanella's neurological status remains about the same. He is paralyzed from the chest down and partially paralyzed in both hands.

But he has made tremendous functional progress. He can feed himself, assist in his dressing, type a little, and even write surprisingly well.

He whizzes around his Glen Cove home in an electric wheelchair—backing, turning, going between obstacles, traveling anywhere he wants to go. He has a specifically modified chair for outdoor use in which he will do his coaching.

HE IS HURT AGAIN

Last week Roy Campanella was hurt again—this time in the heart. The entire country joined him in sadness at the plight of his 15-year-old son, David, who was released last Wednesday in $3,500 bail on a charge of breaking into a Queens drugstore and stealing money and cigarettes.

The charge came just after the boy had been convicted of juvenile delinquency following a gang fight.

In judging David Campanella, both the courts and the public must remember that the youth had been under severe emotional stress for more than a year. In addition to his anguish and worry, he has been deprived of his father's counsel and guidance.

Roy Campanella met this new tragedy with the same courage that characterized his life as a quadriplegic since January 1958.

Paradoxical as it seems, the increased strength Roy Campanella has gained from conquering his own physical disability will give him greater depth of understanding and depth of spirit in confronting this new problem.

UNBROKEN IN SPIRIT

Fine china is not made by putting clay in the sun. It comes only from the white heat of the kiln. In the process of firing, some pieces are broken. Those that come through have qualities that can be obtained only through the firing process.

Roy Campanella has come through the white heat of a personal experience unbroken in spirit, courage, and understanding. In those qualities he has grown immeasurably.

Campy has been a very busy man these last 9 months with his radio program, his magazine articles, his return to his family, and his participation in a U.S. Information Service film for oversea distribution.

At Vero Beach, the spring training camp of the Los Angeles Dodgers, his rehabilitation will be complete. He will be back at work at the job he knows and loves—baseball.

If Campanella follows the pattern of most disabled persons who go back to their jobs after rehabilitation, he will not only be as good as before, but better. While he will never play baseball again, he can combine his baseball skills with the wisdom that comes only with experience. His tasks will be to develop young players.

There has never been a more beloved figure in baseball than Roy Campanella. As in baseball, his courage and character have also left an indelible mark on rehabilitation.

Managing a baseball team is considered the toughest assignment in the sport. It requires courage, leadership, respect for and by fellow players and fans, and a knowledge of and devotion to the game.

If any baseball club is looking for those qualities in a manager, they can forget about Campanella's wheelchair and remember the adage of rehabilitation: It's ability, not disability, that counts.

Men Who Live in Glass Houses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, because of its relevancy to current discussions as to whether physical afflictions should disqualify important Americans from public service I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most penetrating article on the subject by George E. Sokolsky, a respected American columnist who speaks out of an abundance of personal experience on the subject.

To the illustrations listed by Sokolsky, one might well call attention to the fact that physical setbacks have not curtailed the services of such colleagues as our distinguished majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, or of Senator NEUBERGER, of Oregon, who is back on the job with his energy and enthusiasm undiminished.

I suggest to our colleagues who are inclined to call for the undertaker or to suggest resignations every time an important public official suffers a physical setback that they display greater confidence in the modern-day techniques of the medical profession and that they give heed to the fact that even those who enjoy the best of health today may at any early date find themselves victims of some of the very disabilities now endured by the men they criticize so freely.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR AILING OFFICIALS
(By George E. Sokolsky)

The tremendous advances that have been made in the medical and biochemical sciences would be purposeless if life were not prolonged by them and if those who are stricken by serious illnesses could not continue to work. The man who suffers what used to be called a fatal heart attack may have many years of life and work ahead of him, if he obeys dietary and other instructions. His major problem is to ration his time and to avoid fatigue. He need not give up his career to accomplish either.

Cancer is a bit more difficult, but the word, cancer, is a generic term for a number of related illnesses which may, in the not too distant future, become unrelated as the cause for some of them is fixed. However, many forms of cancer are handleable in certain stages and then one can go back to work.

I have had a coronary occlusion which is a fancy name for one form of heart attack, two other incidents, one of which was heart failure, and a cancer of one kidney. I am doing as much work as ever but my time is more carefully rationed and my diet is both small and unpleasant because it is saltless. But apart from a few inconveniences, such as not dancing after a day of hard work or walking my dog, Joe, or smoking big, black cigars, there is hardly a change of routine.

I give this personal testimony because Senator STUART SYMINGTON and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY are making so sharp a point of appointing a new Secretary of State while John Foster Dulles is in the hospital taking treatment. His presence in the hospital interferes with his work less than if he were hunting quail or traveling about in distant parts of Missouri or Minnesota looking for votes. A telephone is at hand; he is no distance from the State Department; he can be in touch with all the world.

Of course, there are those who are so egotistic that if anything is wrong with them they become so preoccupied with themselves that they can think of nothing else. There are others who find work a form of therapy, who reject themselves as problems, even when they feel pain, and become so absorbed in their duties that their will to live is stimulated.

Some people are afraid to die and the scratch of a pin will send them into paroxysms of fear; there are others who fully believe in the life eternal and to whom life and death are stages in the fulfillment of the destiny of the soul. John Foster Dulles, for instance, was raised as a Presbyterian, a faith to which he has been devoted. He surely believes that God's will be done which is a cornerstone of the Calvinistic philosophy which his father preached from the pulpit. Such a man moves through life fearlessly and when he faces death, he does not flinch, for it will come when it comes and is one of the facts of eternal living that needs to be faced.

At this moment, Dulles is valuable to this Nation. I do not say indispensable, because we should indeed be a weak and poor nation if any man were indispensable. However, Dulles is useful and needed and as long as his services are available, they are of value. Let them therefore be used up to the last moment.

A word needs to be said about Christian Herter, the Acting Secretary of State. He has some form of arthritis and uses canes or crutches, or a wheelchair to get around. So what? Can he exercise his mind? Does he know what he is doing? Is he a man of ability and experience? Does his arthritis interfere with his ability to work? It would seem that some Americans believe that an official of the United States must be physically perfect. George Washington had bad teeth and Franklin D. Roosevelt was a cripple. Maybe we ought to elect Jayne Mansfield's husband President because he is supposed to be physically perfect—I believe the peepholers call him a muscle man.

It is brains, not muscles of the shank, that we need in the men who do our work. If we find our best brains in cripples, let us use what we find and not be too particular.

Statement of Secretary of the Interior Seaton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, recently the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs invited Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton to discuss the operation and plans of his Department as they related to the 86th Congress. In his usual precise manner, Secretary Seaton delivered the following statement, the reading of which I commend to our colleagues:

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FRED A. SEATON, BEFORE THE HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 16, 1959

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to appear again before this committee. My understanding is that you are interested today in discussing the operations and plans of the Department of the Interior as they relate to consideration by, and possible action of, your committee.

Before commencing this discussion, permit me to present to you the members of my staff who are here.

First is Under Secretary Elmer F. Bennett. Many of you, I know, are acquainted with his background. For the information of your new members and the record, however, let me say that Mr. Bennett came to the Department of the Interior from the office of Senator Eugene Millikan, of Colorado. He is an attorney with 17 years' experience in the Federal Government. He has successively served in the Department as legislative counsel, as my personal assistant, as solicitor, and since September 20, 1958, as Under Secretary.

Another gentleman whom most of the members of this committee know is Assistant Secretary Fred G. Aandahl. A former Governor of North Dakota, he also served as a member of this committee when he was Member of the 82d Congress. Secretary Aandahl's responsibility in the Department is in the joint field of water and power. The Bureau of Reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, Office of Saline Water, report to him.

Our Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife is Ross L. Leffler. Secretary Leffler came to Interior with a lifetime record of devotion to conservation. He served 29 years with the Pennsylvania Fish and Game Department. While jurisdiction over a great part of the activities of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the Office of the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, all of which report to Secretary Leffler, rests with another committee of the Congress; there is a definite relationship between public lands legislation and action and fish and wildlife conservation.

Roger C. Ernst, our Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management, supervises the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the National Park Service, and the Office of Territories. Formerly the Land and Water Commissioner of the State of Arizona, Secretary Ernst also has a full background of experience in the fields of reclamation and conservation.

Another area of our Department, that of Mineral Resources, is supervised by Assistant Secretary Royce A. Hardy. It includes the Geological Survey, Bureau of Mines, Office of Oil and Gas, Office of Geography, Office of Minerals Mobilization and the Office of Minerals Exploration. Secretary Hardy, a graduate of the University of Nevada in mining engineering, is a registered professional mining and metallurgical engineer. Before joining the Department, he was vice president and general manager of Manganese, Inc., of Henderson, Nev.

The next member of our staff needs little introduction here. George W. Abbott, our solicitor, was counsel for this committee from 1953 to 1957. He is now our chief legal officer. Earlier he served as my assistant.

The Department's administrative management activities are the responsibility of D. Otis Beasley, our Administrative Assistant Secretary. Secretary Beasley, who began his career in Government in 1928, now has the top career position in our Department. He is responsible for Administrative Services, Budget and Finance, Inspection, Management Research, Personnel Management, Property Management, and Security.

The last member of my staff with me today is Ted Stevens, one of my assistants who also serves as legislative counsel. He came to the Department of the Interior from Fairbanks, Alaska, where he had served as U.S. Attorney.

Mr. Chairman, as you requested, I am here today to discuss the program of our

Department—particularly the budget and legislative aspects of it.

We have completed our hearings before the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, in which we supported a request for $344,564,400, exclusive of the Reclamation and power agencies. In all, our total budget request for fiscal 1960 is $633,775,400. This amount reflects our recognition of two facts.

First, our programs—in conservation, in science and technology, and in the advancement of human welfare—are of such importance to the Nation as a whole that we must continue to carry them on at a high level of efficiency and intensity.

Second, if we overexpand these programs and thus require excessive cash outlays, we shall necessarily contribute to inflationary pressures, decreasing the value of the dollar, and ultimately hobble the very programs we were trying to aid.

It is of great interest to this committee, I believe, that we are not requesting funds for new reclamation construction starts for fiscal year 1960.

One reason, largely, is that there are 11 new starts in the current fiscal year. During the next few years, these 11 projects, added to the large list we already had underway, will pyramid the fund requirements for the Bureau of Reclamation. The following tabulation lists the totals of fund requirements for construction and rehabilitation from regular funds and from the Upper Colorado River Basin fund, for fiscal years 1959 to 1965 inclusive, with and without the new starts for which funds were appropriated for the fiscal year 1959.

Fund requirements for Bureau of Reclamation construction and rehabilitation, regular funds and Upper Colorado River Basin Fund, fiscal years 1959–65

FUNDS REQUIRED

Fiscal year	With 11 new starts provided for in the 1959 Appropriation Act	Without 11 new starts	Increase required by new starts
1959	$214,048,335	$207,828,335	$6,220,000
1960	212,445,000	195,060,000	17,385,000
1961	267,172,000	227,671,000	39,501,000
1962	263,276,000	211,181,000	52,095,000
1963	203,182,000	157,763,000	45,419,000
1964	127,950,000	100,735,000	27,215,000
1965	84,053,000	70,631,000	13,422,000

While the new starts included in the 1959 appropriation act raised the fund requirements of the Bureau only about $6 million in 1959, they increased these requirements $17 million for 1960, $39 million for 1961, and $52 million for 1962. More new starts in 1960 would mean more pyramiding in the 2 or 3 years ahead.

The no-new-starts policy for water resources projects is governmentwide; the administration is seeking no funds for starting new projects for flood control, navigation, and related activities of the Bureau of Reclamation or the Corps of Engineers. Nevertheless, the total activities of these two agencies in 1960 are expected to reach an all-time high of $1.1 billion.

If the 11 new starts had not been added last year but rather commenced this year, our schedule through 1965, exclusive of additional new starts, would have looked like this:

Fiscal year:	*With 11 new starts in 1960 appropriation act*
1960	$201,280,000
1961	245,056,000
1962	250,682,000
1963	209,858,000
1964	146,154,000
1965	97,846,000

The peak demand would have occurred in 1962 rather than 1961 and would have been almost $17 million less. When we recall that Congress over the past 12 years has appropriated an average of $188,940,480 for reclamation construction, the point becomes clear. It does seem to me that a further pyramiding of reclamation fund requirements might result in disaster. The surest way to destroy the reclamation program, in my opinion, is to extend the fund requirements beyond hope of realization.

In preliminary legislative studies before the convening of this Congress, the Department reviewed approximately 300 pieces of legislation, a large majority which are within the area of interest to this committee. Some of them have already been sent to you, or similar bills have been introduced by Members of Congress, and referred to your committee.

Foremost of all the items under consideration is, of course, Hawaii statehood. We are grateful to this committee for the privilege extended to me to present my views on the Hawaii bill and for the fact that you have already favorably reported it. To me, few bills to be considered by this Congress will have the national—yes, even the international—attention that will follow action upon the Hawaii statehood bill. And I know, Mr. Chairman, that you will call upon me or any member of my staff, if there is anything more we can do to further its prompt passage.

Next in importance, to me, is our proposal to establish an effective helium conservation program. As you, of course, all know, helium is a unique resource. Its use is essential to our most vital defense and nuclear programs and of growing importance to medicine and industry. Our annual consumption of helium has increased fivefold since 1950, yet no major new source of this gas has been discovered in the natural gases being produced from a relatively small area in Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas. This helium constitutes a minor percentage of these natural gases. Helium, which will not burn, if wasted into the atmosphere through millions of gas stoves and furnaces.

Our conservation program envisions the construction of up to 12 new recovery plants, to be located on certain pipelines, transporing helium-bearing natural gases to commercial markets. This helium would be stored underground until needed.

Since we submitted our legislative proposal to the Congress in the final weeks of the last session, we have reviewed this proposal in its entirety and made some changes in it. As soon as these have been cleared through the executive branch, we shall resubmit our proposal to the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, we have many other items which we consider important. We will again urge favorable consideration of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado, the San Luis project in California, the Burns Creek Dam in Idaho, and several other projects for possible initiation of construction after 1960 when our fiscal situation permits. Of course, my recommendations for joint development of the Trinity River Division of the Central Valley project are still before you.

One of the important problems in the mineral resources field is that of coal research. We have previously reported our views to your committee on bills which call for the creation of a Coal Research Commission. We have noted a bill introduced in this Congress which would give contract authority to the Bureau of Mines for research. Our experts have predicted a phenomenal growth in national demand for energy in the next two decades. Increased emphasis on the development and more efficient use of our vast coal reserves should result from research programs conducted by both industry and Government. We hope to have our report on this legislation completed and cleared soon.

Meanwhile the Bureau of Mines is continuing its research program on the production, use, and conservation of coal. Recognizing the need for greater emphasis on shorter range problems, the Bureau has programed research work for the next fiscal year on hydraulic mining and transportation of coal, on degasifying coal beds to eliminate hazards that exist in gassy mines, and on the performance characteristics of commercial coal-cleaning equipment.

Generally, the resurgence in the economy has materially improved employment and the outlook for the major metals and minerals industries. For example, already, copper, aluminum and steel have enjoyed a significant recovery. And there are signs of strength in other mineral markets that were giving us concern in the recent past. For example, the import quotas established by the President, 5 months ago, have had the effect of tending to firm the U.S. price for lead and zinc. Despite the recent drop in lead, U.S. prices still exceed the prices when quotas were imposed. We believe that the general economic recovery will stimulate additional consumption of these commodities.

The work of the Bureau of Mines and the Geologic Survey of our Department is also essential to the continued health and vigor of our minerals industries. Through geologic and mineral resource surveys, investigations and research, both agencies provide the public and industry with basic data, which stimulates exploration for and development of new sources of mineral raw materials.

Through research in geology, geochemistry, and geophysics, the Geological Survey is developing new and more definite knowledge concerning the occurrence and origin of mineral deposits. It is vigorously pursuing the development of new prospecting techniques to provide the key to the discovery of new mineral deposits, particularly those not obvious to surface exploration. Through research in mining methods and metallurgical techniques, the Bureau of Mines is making major contributions to fuller and more efficient utilization of the Nation's mineral resources.

Our Office of Minerals Mobilization is constantly reviewing the mineral mobilization situation of various segments of the American mineral and solid fuels industries, and revising program to conform with changing defense requirements. In carrying out this function, OMM provides the staff work for the Department under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, the Defense Production Act, the Trade Agreements Act, and Public Law 480—known as the agricultural barter program.

We are also just initiating the program of the Office of Minerals Exploration designed to stimulate exploration for new domestic mineral reserves. We have already had more than 600 requests for information on this new program.

The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for approximately 475 million acres of the Nation's public lands, including 298 million in the new State of Alaska. Most of the remaining 177 million are in the other 11 westernmost States. The Bureau also has responsibilities in connection with more than 300 million additional acres and for mineral leasing on the submerged lands of the outer continental shelf.

As principal custodian of the public lands, BLM's primary purpose is the wise administration, selective disposal, conservation, and management of the Nation's public lands and resources. These resources include the land itself, minerals (including oil and gas), forests, and range vegetation. Some idea of the scope of the Bureau's responsibilities may be seen in the fact that about 174 million acres are administered under the Taylor Grazing Act and almost 100 million acres are under oil and gas leases. During the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1958, the BLM took in gross receipts for $127,385,000, to

increase the total of receipts since the BLM was formed in 1946 from union of the General Land Office and the Grazing Service to nearly $1,077 million.

Among the significant items of legislation we propose to submit to the Congress in this field will be bills to regulate and control the activities and effect of land locators and promoters on the public domain.

We are faced today with a serious situation, resulting from the entrance into the land locating business of a number of promoters, some of whom are not qualified and may be unethical in their practices. They prey upon the desire of people to own land and upon the ignorance of the general public concerning the requirements of the public land laws. Advertising widely, executing contracts which actually promise nothing more than to file an application with the land office, and holding out great expectations of gain, they have induced people by the thousands to file applications—sometimes for substantial fees—under various public land laws.

By and large, these applications have been filed upon lands without respect to the acceptability of the application under the regulations or the availability of the lands under the law. This practice costs the public many thousands of dollars in wasted money and tends to paralyze the land offices by the very numbers of applications and by the conflicts with other applications that result.

We hope to have legislative proposals in this area.

We also believe that the present public land laws do not provide a convenient means by which public lands can be made available for needed developments. We are considering a proposal to permit the sale of public lands chiefly valuable for business and urban purposes. The chief features of this proposal would authorize the sale of such lands to States and local governments at their appraised fair market value and also, where appropriate, sales at public auction to private individuals, associations, and corporations. This proposal, we believe, might facilitate needed commercial, industrial, and suburban developments in the public land areas.

Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act establishes a minimum rental for non-competitive oil and gas leases of 25 cents per acre per annum, with a waiver of all rentals for the second and third years. By regulation we have raised the rental for the first year and for the 6th through 10th years to 50 cents. We cannot, however, alter the waiver provision by administrative action. We have found that the low rental and the waiver of 2 years' rental may have encouraged speculation and have in reality been detrimental to oil and gas development. By the payment of a very small sum a party may hold a lease for a number of years with no intention of developing the leasehold but with the hope of selling the lease for a profit. If annual rentals are increased, and there is no longer a waiver of any year's rental, the mere holding of a lease for possible resale will be less attractive, and the speculating leaseholders will, we believe, be replaced by leaseholders interested in the active development of the oil and gas potentialities of the leasehold. The proposed legislation which we have prepared, H.R. 3263, would increase the minimum annual rental per acre to 50 cents and would eliminate the waiver provision. This amendment would have the added advantages of bringing Federal rentals more into line with the prices charged on State and privately owned lands and of recognizing the changes which have occurred in the value of money since this rental provision was first enacted in 1935.

One of the significant legislative proposals affecting the National Park Service is contained in legislation pending before you to authorize the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park and Parkway. Originally it was thought that a parkway road should be constructed along the canal between Washington and Cumberland. Further studies have demonstrated that the canal and adjoining lands should be set aside as a park with emphasis on the preservation of its historic, scenic, and recreational values. We, of course, subscribe to the general objectives of this legislation. Specific details will be discussed in our report, which has not yet been cleared with other interested executive agencies.

We are considering whether we need additional authority to enable the National Park Service to utilize land acquisition funds to pay for options in the acquisition of lands, and to utilize Federal lands adjoining park areas for park facilities—with the concurrence of affected Federal agencies—without including these lands within boundaries of the park. Moreover, the Park Service should be given authority to avail itself of nongovernmental architectural and engineering services. This is particularly necessary if we are to avoid the necessity of large, temporary increases in our professional and technical staff while Mission 66 is under way. This new authority will make possible a more efficient execution of our Mission 66 program.

In the field of Indian affairs, several controversial subjects will require the consideration of Congress. Unfortunately, there are no easy answers. This is a field in which opinions frequently differ and in which emotional reactions are sometimes strong.

One of the problems that need congressional consideration is the disposition to be made of the submarginal lands that were acquired by the United States during the depression in the middle 1930's and that were transferred by Executive order to the Department of the Interior for administration for the benefit of various Indian tribes. Approximately 326,000 acres are involved. Title has been in the United States now for more than 20 years, and a decision needs to be made regarding the conditions under which the lands may be acquired by the Indians. The problem has been faced on a piecemeal basis in two instances (with the Seminoles in Florida and the Pueblos in New Mexico).

Another problem involving Indian lands that need attention is the heirship problem. After tribal lands were broken up and allotted (i.e., conveyed) in separate parcels to individual Indians, the original owners have died, and the inheritance process has resulted in the creation of almost unbelievable numbers of undivided fractional interests in the lands. In many instances this process has virtually frozen the title in a manner that makes it difficult for the individual owners to use the land themselves or to dispose of it. The problem is to determine the conditions under which the land may be sold by the individual Indian owners when some of them do not agree or cannot be located, and the conditions under which the tribes may, if they wish, acquire the lands that are offered for sale. In the latter case the big problem is how tribal acquisitions should be financed.

The Department's study of these subjects is also proceeding—and we shall work closely with your Indian Affairs Subcommittee in regard to specific recommendations in these areas.

The policy of terminating Federal supervision over the affairs of the various tribes as they become ready for that action has received much attention in the past. The Department expects to submit to this Congress a few termination bills, but as I have previously announced and emphasized, the Department will submit a proposal in this field only if it is fully understood and concurred in by a majority of the Indian group affected. The groups under consideration are small ones and will not present the complex issues that were involved in the Klamath and Menominee legislation.

The major item of legislation we shall submit to your committee in the fish and wildlife field will be our proposal to establish the Arctic Wildlife Range in Alaska. This area of approximately 9 million acres is located in the extreme northwest corner of our new State. Over 5 million acres of the area was formerly withdrawn as part of Public Land Order 82. As a refuge for caribou, grizzly and polar bears, Dall sheep, and wolverine, plus countless flocks of migratory birds of over 100 species, this wildlife range will provide a working laboratory for the study of Arctic life.

Our proposal for this area will seek authorization to permit metalliferous mining under a permit system and to open the area to mineral leasing. We will, however, seek to limit access to the area in order to prohibit appropriation of the surface title under the public land laws. We are currently working with the Department of Defense to eliminate their objections to our original draft bill. We are in substantial agreement now, and as soon as the technical drafting is completed and clearance has been given by the Bureau of the Budget, we shall submit this proposal to Congress.

Of primary interest to this committee is our saline water program. As you know, we recently had an independent board of consultants make a study of the needs of the Office of Saline Water in light of our expanded responsibilities under the demonstration plant authority enacted by Congress last year. This survey resulted in a series of recommendations, mostly administrative in character, which will be put into effect as the program progresses.

Interest in the contemplated demonstration plant activity has been intense. We are approaching the date for the selection of the first process to be demonstrated under this program. Selection of the process will precede and influence selection of the site.

Our budget request for fiscal year 1960 for this portion of our saline water program is $300,000. This amount includes funds for the selection of processes and for the engineering plans for the first conversion plants.

Of course, our basic activity in research and development is continuing.

The development activity is in the areas of three major processes—distillation, membrane, and freezing. In distillation small pilot plant work is underway on rotary vapor-compression stills, long-tube vertical multiple-effect systems, and solar stills of several types. The LTV distillation and the multistage flash distillation cycles continue to look very promising.

Two membrane processes are in commercial use, and a number of small plants are in operation on brackish water treatment. Improvement in equipment and membranes is continuing.

A small pilot plant using freezing as a separation process is now being built. It is based upon successful laboratory research and development recently completed.

Research is being carried out on these major processes, including the reverse osmosis and osmionic processes, and on others, such as solvent extraction. Some of these will be going into small pilot plant development.

In closing, let me repeat, Mr. Chairman, the comments I made to some of the members of this committee recently. It has been a matter of continuing pride to those of us now serving in the Department of the Interior that our relationships over the years with your committee and its members have been most satisfactory and pleasant. We have disagreed—at times—but our disagreement has normally been as to the means we should adopt to accomplish a mutually

agreed upon objective. Partisanship has not impeded the important work of the committee (and I like to believe has not impeded the important work of the Department), and the people we all serve have benefited thereby.

I make these comments again to give me the opportunity to assure you, Mr. Chairman, on the record, that it is our intention to do our part in continuing, in every way possible, this outstanding record of cooperation.

We stand ready to assist this committee in any way. And it is my feeling that any disagreements arising during this Congress between any of us will be eventually resolved as they always can be by reasonable and sincere men. If our relationships continue in the future as they have in the past, and I feel confident they will, we will continue to build sound and wise programs for the development, wise use, and conservation of our precious natural resources.

Future Role of Cooperatives in Farm Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the Nation, faced with a wide number of problems, particularly in agriculture, still must find ways and means for dealing more effectively with the complex problems which confront it.

At this time, I want to refer briefly to a program that, over the years, has performed an outstanding service for the American farmer—that is, the cooperative movement.

In Wisconsin, we stand second in the number of cooperatives in the Nation, with a total membership of over 415,000.

According to a recent farm review by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, cooperatives, during the 1956–57 period, did a net business of $10.4 billion. This included $8 billion for farm products marketed, more than $2.1 billion for farm supplies, and $235 million for services performed for the patrons. The survey reveals that about 63 percent of all market cooperatives handled at least some production supplies, 59 percent furnished specialized or general services for their patrons, 22 percent of the farm supply cooperatives marketed farm products, and 42 percent performed other various services for their members.

Nationally, the latest survey shows 9,872 marketing, purchasing, and related service cooperatives for that period; returning millions of dollars to their patrons.

Over the years, however, we recognize that these cooperatives have been of substantial assistance to the American farmer by helping to improve income, have tided the farmers over downtrends in prices, and generally have brightened the outlook by providing better marketing, supply procurement, and other services for the farmers.

We are aware, of course, that consideration is being given to the relative size, the scope of operations, and other aspects of cooperative functions and their effects in our economy.

We recognize that these questions must be resolved, both in the interests of the farmer and of the general public.

The February 21 edition of the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer, a splendid publication that has served Wisconsin farm families for 110 years, carried a fine article by the columnist and farm authority, Bill Groves, on "Cooperatives of the Future Must Be Strong." Very pertinent questions are raised as to the role which cooperatives will play in our farm economy. To give my colleagues the benefit of the thinking in this article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CO-OPS OF THE FUTURE MUST BE STRONG
(By William F. Groves)

I received a letter the other day from Peter May which is both stimulating and challenging. Mr. May is a member of the Equity Cooperative Livestock Sales Association staff. His letter comments on my column of January 17. I believe it merits quoting:

"What you have done (in your column) is to open up a vastly important field of thought. I agree that farmers should choose the middle road rather than go to the extreme right or left. I agree that some form of self-help is the desired objective.

"But the pertinent questions are these: How can farmers travel the middle road working as individuals? How can farmers become businessmen? How can they do anything about self-help until they learn how to work together?

"This column of yours becomes a natural opening wedge for a followup on the way farmer cooperatives can help make businessmen out of what have been merely producers."

Assuredly Mr. May's questions are fair and pertinent. They are important questions that should be answered and I accept his challenge.

Let us survey the inevitable steps a farmer must take if he is to become a businessman in fact as well as in name.

First, he must assume his proper responsibility in the marketplace. Second, he must put a price tag on his commodity. Third, he must effectively control his output. All of these are a part and parcel of every true business operation.

NEED GROUP ACTION

The farmer can achieve none of these legitimate goals by operating as an individual. If he is to enter the sphere of business and assume his proper responsibility in the marketplace, it must be done by group action. In the past the cooperative has been the farmer's most potent tool for achieving joint endeavor. It is natural, therefore, that the farmer should turn to his cooperative for a solution.

Cooperatives have an old and an honorable history. In the course of my lifetime I have witnessed the birth and the death of many farm organizations. Most of these cooperatives, whether living or dead, have rendered valuable service to their farmer members. They have returned millions of dollars to their patrons which would otherwise be found in the pockets of the processor or dealer.

In spite of their great success, cooperatives have failed to solve the farm problem. In my opinion, the reasons for this are three:

First, the cooperative has failed to speak with a voice of real authority in the marketplace. The voice of the industrialist rather than the farmer is dominant there.

Second, the cooperative has never been able to place a price tag on its finished product and make the price stick. I do not know of a single cooperative in the United States which is large enough to make even a dent in agriculture's price structure.

Third, no cooperative, to my knowledge, has ever made a conscientious effort to control the productive output of its members. Farmers and cooperatives alike have been content to shift all three of these important functions onto the shoulders of the Government.

No organization is stronger than its component parts. This is especially true of cooperatives. The reason why the cooperatives have never accomplished a full measure of success can be traced to the attitude of their farmer members. Farmers have been loathe to surrender a portion of their individual freedom for the common good.

CAN CO-OPS DO THE JOB?

The cardinal principle of all business is that production must be in approximate balance with consumer demand. No business which produces a surplus of goods year after year can prosper. In agriculture this means the imposition of production controls. Do the cooperatives possess the courage and the leadership to perform this important and inevitable task? Only the future can answer this question.

The cooperatives of the future must be strong. They must be large enough to make a deep impression in the marketplace and strong enough to impose their price. Above all, they must possess the courage to tackle the problem of farm surpluses and eventually solve it.

Our New Atomic Boss Is Confident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Washington Sunday Star of March 1, 1959, written by Frank Carey and entitled "Our New Atomic Boss Is Confident."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NEW ATOMIC BOSS IS CONFIDENT
(By Frank Carey)

When John Alex McCone became Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission last summer, he vowed to follow the advice of a priest: "When your knees begin to buckle, just kneel."

But today, looking back at his first half-year in one of the Nation's toughest jobs, Mr. McCone says his knees have yet to buckle. Modestly, he gives the credit to:

1. His fellow Commissioners.

2. A close and friendly relationship with Senator ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, and other members of the Joint Congressional Atomic Committee.

3. To his embattled predecessor, Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, who "left things in remarkably good shape."

As boss of the AEC, Mr. McCone runs an agency that has offices and laboratories scattered from Brooklyn to Japan. It budgets $2 billion a year, maintains facilities worth $7 billion, and employs 105,000. It builds

bombs, prospects for uranium, probes the secrets of cancer, builds powerplants, operates cyclotrons, studies mice and men, and conducts research literally from the depth of the earth to the far reaches of space.

"The problems have been perplexing and difficult," says Mr. McCone, "but they haven't caused my knees to shake." He came to the AEC from a distinguished career that included liberal doses of business, industry, and Government. Though a dyed-in-the-wool Republican, he won his public servant spurs as a Truman appointee.

HIS ATTITUDE ON CRITICISM

Public criticism of the AEC in the past has been partly justified, says Mr. McCone.

"There has been criticism because actions by the AEC have taken too long. Some of this has been due to uncertainties as to policy objectives and some due to uncertainties about the relative responsibilities of the commission and of the joint Senate-House Atomic Committee.

"Some of the delay has been due to the fact that development had to await basic scientific advances—and that has not been clearly understood by the public."

The originally quiet-spoken McCone adds with vigor: "But there's one thing on which there has been no criticism—and that's the nuclear weapons field.

"As a nation we've wrung our hands over lack of planes, lack of missiles and even, in the case of the Korean war, lack of conventional ammunition. But never has there been a time when we were worried about a lack of nuclear weapons capability."

The 56-year-old chairman, whose rimless glasses give him a scholarly look, has built ships, machinery, oil refineries, and powerplants. As an undergraduate at the University of California, he worked the swing-shift at a shipyard and later was a riveter and boiler maker.

With that background, he is immune to most noises.

PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

But he says there has been altogether too much ruckus over whether economical nuclear power could best be developed by public utilities or private enterprise.

"I believe the public-versus-private power issue in the nuclear field has been unnecessarily and erroneously emphasized by industry, by public, and private power groups and their Washington spokesmen, and by people within Government," he says. "To some extent, it has delayed development."

With nuclear power still more expensive than conventional power, the important thing is to find a way to cut costs, Mr. McCone says. "If we continue to follow a policy in the AEC of making research information available to all, then it shouldn't make a great deal of difference who does the development work."

After the technique has been made economical, says Mr. McCone, there might be some basis for arguing the merits of public versus private power—but not now.

The AEC Chairman believes nuclear power plants capable of competing with conventional powerplants can be built by the mid-1960's. And he agrees with the recommendation of a special advisory committee that emphasic should be placed on developing pilot-plant reactors instead of full-scale plants.

"This country could build big reactors right now," he says. "Obviously they would have to be built on the basis of known technology. They would not produce competitive power. The power would be more costly than if we went thrugh a little more development period—and that calls for prototypes (pilot plants)."

HELD DEFENSE JOBS

However, Mr. McCone isn't a foot dragger. He proved that in previous Government jobs—as a member of former President Truman's Air Policy Commission in 1947, as Deputy Secretary of Defense in 1948, and as Air Force Under Secretary from 1950 to 1951.

He likes to recall that as early as 1950 he recommended that the Nation's infant guided missile program be conducted by an official with absolute power over the entire effort.

"In August 1950," he says, "I pointed out to my boss (then Air Force Secretary Thomas K. Finletter), and it eventually got up to President Truman, that while we were then spending $100 million a year on missiles, we should spend $2 billion a year or more.

"I also said we should have a project like the Manhattan project that produced the atomic bomb, with all the services working on missiles under a directorate, and with the primary responsibility in the hands of an individual—a czar type thing, if you will."

The idea was accepted in modified form, he says, with K. T. Keller as coordinator. "He did a superb job, but he could have done a better job if he had actually controlled the whole project," says McCone.

Mr. McCone, who reportedly was an unofficial adviser to President Eisenhower on missiles before he took the AEC job, says he thinks the missiles program is progressing very well. "I think we are going to see spectacular progress—in fact, we're seeing it right now."

He adds, "I think we have to do enough to be sure that anybody who would 'launch a surprise attack of any magnitude would get back a counterattack so massive that they wouldn't attempt to put the idea into action in the first place."

"In my Air Force days," Mr. McCone recalls, "I was devoted to the concept of massive retaliation, and I still am."

TRIES FOR CONCILIATION

When he moved into the AEC Chairman's office, Mr. McCone made no mention of Admiral Strauss' periodic tiffs with the Joint Atomic Committee. He said only that his aim would be to bring about a conciliation of views between the AEC and the committee.

Still, there was a flareup last week between Mr. McCone and Representative HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, at a hearing on the administration's latest program in the development of electric power from atomic energy. The words exchanged—while sharp—were the result of a misunderstanding, both men agreed at a resumption of the hearing on Friday.

Mr. McCone is a handsome, silvery-gray man of medium build. He plays golf in the low 80's, but has managed only a couple of rounds in recent months, what with learning the ropes of his new job and making four trips to Europe. A Catholic, he attended the funeral of Pope Pius XII.

He says he has made no attempt to become a nuclear whiz-kid, other than to get a general feeling for the technicalities. He gets advice on the technical stuff from staff members, a policy that allows him wider range "to judge problems from the standpoint of the businesslike approach."

He divides his time between the AEC's new headquarters in Germantown, Md., and a branch office downtown.

Mr. McCone says he doesn't mind the long jaunt to Germantown—"it gives me a chance to keep up on the reading that's required on his job." His car is equipped with a radio telephone in case there's some change of schedule while he's on the road.

The Chairman and his wife, Rosemary, lived in hotels until recently when they found a house suitable for themselves and three servants. They had just moved into a new home in San Marino, Calif., when he was named AEC Chairman.

When Mr. McCone was in business in Los Angeles—his shipbuilding firm turned out about $1 billion worth of ships during World War II—employees said he outdid Hollywood's version of big businessmen, handling several phone conversations at the same time. But one of his secretaries there says "he was never too busy to say 'please,' 'thank you' and 'my, you did a nice job on that.'"

Though usually mild-mannered, one of his AEC staffers says "he's impatient with delay or sloppy work—he's interested in results, not excuses."

Famous American Criticizes Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the editorial entitled "Worst Supreme Court," which was published in the February 19, 1959, issue of the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle in comment upon the remarks of a famous American, Gen. Robert E. Wood, retired chairman of the board of Sears, Roebuck & Co., upon the unveiling of a plaque honoring him and Mrs. Wood in Augusta.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORST SUPREME COURT

"The worst in 100 years."

This caustic but apt description of the U.S. Supreme Court and other critical comments thereon, voiced by a nationally known northerner, a straight-voting Republican, should by all means be disseminated throughout the whole country, for it is almost certain that "nary a word" of it will get through the Paper Curtain set up by the anti-South press.

Northern newspapers generally will ignore the remarks, although they come from a famous American whose opinions have always carried considerable weight.

We refer, of course, to the speech of Gen. Robert E. Wood, retired chairman of the board of Sears, Roebuck & Co., delivered while he was in Augusta for the unveiling of a plaque honoring him and his Augusta-born wife in connection with the opening of Sears' new store.

"This racial problem," declared the veteran Chicago military chieftain and noted business leader, "could have been settled—given time and patience—by the South itself."

Noteworthy also, and of good cheer for the South in its fight for constitutional rights, was his statement that "hundreds of thousands of northerners feel the Court's desegregation decision was a mistake."

General Wood's castigation of Chief Earl Warren as "the worst appointment ever made by President Eisenhower," and his statement that "I resent the interference into States' rights by this Supreme Court," were likewise pleasing to the South.

Incidentally, General Wood lauded both of Georgia's U.S. Senators—HERMAN TALMADGE and RICHARD RUSSELL—as "two of the best in the U.S. Senate today."

Although General Wood is not a southerner, he knows the South, especially Georgia where, in Columbia County, he is an extensive landowner.

It is tragic, indeed, that more northerners are not equally familiar with the South and its problems, and that nonsoutherners

generally fail to realize that government by judicial decree is potentially as dangerous to them as to the southern people themselves.

General Wood knows that the Supreme Court has gone too far, and doesn't hesitate to say so.

He knows too—although some lethargic southerners apparently don't—that the following words, once uttered by Thomas E. Watson, a noted Georgia statesman, are true:

"Democratic institutions exist by reason of their virtue. If ever they perish, it will be when you have forgotten the past, become indifferent to the present, and utterly reckless as to the future."

Hon. Lister Hill of Alabama Recognized for Contribution to Medical Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, there appeared in today's Washington Post and Times Herald a fine editorial paying tribute to the eminent leadership of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] in our efforts to encourage effective international cooperation in medical research. Senator HILL is now conducting hearings on his bill to create an Institute for International Medical Research within the National Institutes of Health. I am happy to be a cosponsor of this important measure, which could be instrumental in laying the groundwork for an International Medical Year such as proposed by many of us here in the Senate, including the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has done so much to promote this vital concept.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "International Killer," from the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 2, 1959.

The editorial makes clear why Senator LISTER HILL will rank high in our history among the lay and nonscientific people who have contributed greatly to the advancement of medical research and the alleviation of human suffering.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL KILLERS

Senator HILL's International Health and Medical Research Act of 1959, introduced with the sponsorship of a long list of both Democratic and Republican Senators, comes as a reminder of how little the United States has done to promote health on an international scale. Disease is truly, as Mr. HILL noted, an international problem. Contagion arising in any country may sweep over the globe. Such major killers as cancer and heart disease continue their slaughter year after year with no regard for international boundaries. Far too little has been done to internationalize the assault on these universal human foes.

Last year Congress invited the World Health Organization to initiate studies looking toward the strengthening of research into diseases common to all mankind. The Hill bill is a followup to the policy thus enunciated. It would set up a National Institute for International Medical Research and authorize the spending of up to $50 million a year to encourage medical research abroad, to train technicians, to improve facilities and to reduce wasteful duplication of efforts in different countries. If the program did nothing more than acquaint scientists in all countries with the findings of other researchers in the medical field it would give a powerful impetus to the conquest of disease.

Senator HILL estimated, with the aid of experts, that the advance of medical science since 1900 has saved 23 million lives in this country. A comparable advance no doubt is possible abroad with sanitation, hospital treatment and medical care. Of course, a mere increase in longevity would not necessarily be a boon to mankind—as can be seen now in some underdeveloped countries—unless there were accompanying economic efforts to provide new opportunity and increase living standards. Nevertheless, the research which Senator HILL's measure would provide is fundamental to the problem. Even more acute is the need for medical supplies, hospitals and medical training.

Senators HILL and HUMPHREY are unquestionably right in saying that international cooperation in this sphere may have a potent influence on peace. Of course the resources that may be devoted to this vital work are limited because of the multiplicity of demands upon the Government. But its value should be recognized. Congress must also remember that the Soviet Union is winning the gratitude of many free peoples by giving them medical aid while in this country it is still largely in the discussion stage.

Commercial Use of the Word "Government"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Probing Use of 'Government' in Store Names," published in the New York Times of February 20, 1959, dealing with the commercial use of the word "Government."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBING USE OF "GOVERNMENT" IN STORE NAMES—CLAIM DECEPTION IN SOME TITLES

WASHINGTON, February 19.—The Federal Trade Commission has turned over to its Bureau of Investigation complaints about discount house operations in St. Louis and elsewhere using "Government" in their names, it was learned today.

The Commission has, on several occasions, issued complaints against private business firms using names suggesting that they operated as Government agencies.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican of North Dakota, also has introduced legislation (S. 355) to bar collection agencies from using any names, emblems or insignia which create the impression they are Federal agencies.

The latest complaints to FTC involve Government Employees Mart, 10,900 Page Boulevard, St. Louis, recently opened discount-type store.

A similar GEM store wil be opened soon in nearby Alexandria, Va.

FTC now has a complaint outstanding against Federal Employees Distributing Co., Los Angeles. The agency charged last November 20 the company, selling appliances, apparel and other goods, misrepresented itself as a nonprofit organization connected with the Federal Government. FTC also charged that, contrary to corporate name and advertising, is a profit-making retail business—even though chartered under California's nonprofit corporation law.

The latest complaint about the St. Louis Government Employees Mart, and related discount enterprises which are to be opened in California, Colorado, Minnesota, and Honolulu was made by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business.

In a letter to FTC chairman John Gwynne, Mr. Burger said "where the name of the Federal Government is used, directly or indirectly, it is misleading and deceiving, and we trust appropriate action will be taken * * * to allow these subterfuges to continue will eventually mean elimination of independent retail establishments in many areas * * * again, we repeat, these are nothing but private business corporations and the Government's name should not be used to mislead."

Community Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD news reports from the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, and the Washington Post regarding junior colleges, as well as an article from the February issue of the Reader's Digest entitled "With a Barnful of Students and a Countyful of Faith."

The growing interest in community, or junior, colleges is an indication that Americans have recognized this type of institution has a real potential for helping meet the problems created by an increasing demand for admission to colleges. As a member of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have urged that hearings be held on a bill which I have introduced to provide Federal assistance for construction of community public colleges. I feel that this would help encourage the development of these facilities.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 18, 1959]

EDUCATORS ARGUE JUNIOR COLLEGES—JOINING THEM TO HIGH SCHOOL IS DEBATED AT MEETING IN ATLANTIC CITY

(By Loren B. Pope)

ATLANTIC CITY, February 17.—School administrators disagreed strongly here today on a proposal that 2-year junior colleges be made part of the public high school system.

The issue was debated at the 91st annual meeting of the American Association of Administrators. The group met in the Atlantic City Auditorium. Twenty thousand school officials are attending the 5-day session, which ends tomorrow.

President Eisenhower in December advocated adding 1 or 2 more years to the public school system. He said that the present 12 years were not enough to equip students to live in today's world. He said the 2 additional years might be something like junior college.

In today's discussion, the administrators agreed that the opportunity to attend junior college should be widely available. They also agreed attendance should be voluntary. But they were divided on whether it should be part of the school system.

James H. Corson, superintendent of schools in Modesto, Calif., said the 63 public junior colleges in his State were able to provide terminal education or preparation for transfer to college.

ABILITY TO DO IT DOUBTED

Lawrence Bethel, president of the Fashion Institute of Technology in New York City, replied that only the larger urban areas could support adequate junior colleges.

Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., New York Commissioner of Education, disagreed. He said, "As I look ahead, the lines of demarcation between the various parts of the educational structure are going to get thinner and thinner. * * *

"If the junior college is not an appendage of the public school system, I don't see how we're going to achieve articulation of the system all the way through, so it will serve all the people all the way."

In another session Dr. James B. Conant, president emeritus of Harvard University, said too many of the highly gifted children, the top 2 or 3 percent, were getting too narrow an education.

Dr. Conant also said that, following his 2-year study of the American high school, he would embark this year on a study of the elementary schools.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 18, 1959]

JUNIOR COLLEGES PUT IN LIMELIGHT

(By Millicent Taylor)

ATLANTIC CITY.—Is extending the public school system upward to include the junior college the next step in American education?

School leaders meeting here for the national convention of the American Association of School Administrators, a department of the National Education Association, say it can't be stopped.

In a heavily attended section meeting, the need for systems of junior or community colleges all across the Nation was readily conceded. The point at issue was what the setup should be.

This discussion was only one of nearly two-score section meetings dealing simultaneously with all kinds of school problems, ranging from identifying the gifted and stepping up foreign languages to teacher certification and the training of school custodians.

PATTERN OUTLINED

Presenting the California pattern of public junior colleges as a successful one, James H. Corson, superintendent of schools, Modesto, described such colleges as (1) voluntarily initiated by local communities; (2) tuition free; (3) public supported and distributing the cost between State and local levels; (4) serving an existing high school area or combined areas; and (5) administered by a locally elected or appointed board of lay citizens, with the State responsible for accredited standards, and a liaison between its programs and the university providing professional consultative service and the like.

Dr. Corson sees the public junior colleges as providing, beyond high school, education at less cost to the family and to the State. He also sees these colleges as offering real encouragement in an increasingly complex society to those who can benefit by going on with formal education. In addition, they relieve the strain on the senior colleges—large numbers entering senior colleges in the third year.

Able students that are enrolled in them are challenged, and go on to professional degrees and to positions of leadership.

STRONG GUIDANCE NOTED

At the same time guidance is stronger in the junior college than in the early years of the larger senior colleges and universities, and many a young person is enabled to find himself.

It is the experience in California, too, that the junior colleges iron out student problems and relieve the senior colleges of remedial work, although the junior college is not by any means just a salvage shop.

Close cooperation with the community, Dr. Corson emphasized, enables the junior college to offer advanced technical, semiprofessional, terminal business, and trade training in direct response to community, area, State, and national needs.

The public junior college has also proved the best center for serving adults locally in special, refresher, and retraining programs. It brings into the community at low cost, he added, many cultural advantages and interests formerly restricted to the "oasis" of the college town.

"As the Nation faces the rising tide of college students during the next decade, heavy reliance must be placed upon the junior college," Dr. Corson stressed.

"It is probable that they will continue and extend their important role in the democratization of higher education and will bring educational opportunity within commuting distance to scattered student populations throughout the State and Nation. We advocate the principle of local control. If local school districts feel shortage of funds, as they probably will, the State can increase its support with a much lower outlay than it could provide another brand of higher education."

And he added that to do nothing to meet the already urgent need is to place our heads in the sand.

Lawrence Bethel, president of the Fashion Institute of Technology, a higher education institution of New York public schools, declared himself in favor of public junior colleges. But he warned the school heads against merely adding two grades to the high school. The junior college must have administrative and educational freedom to develop as a separate institution of college character, he stressed.

Formation of a junior college in an area must be voluntary, meeting a felt need of the community with the full support of the community and with ready aid from the State.

This was an opinion expressed by many other school heads present.

PAST GROWTH RECORDED

Dr. Bethel also questioned the practicability of forming junior colleges in any but the more heavily populated districts. Where high school graduating classes are small and distances too great to combine high school areas, the junior college classes would be too small to provide courses diverse enough of quality high enough to meet the interests, need, and abilities of all the students.

In the light of the present 50 percent dropout or failures in some of the better colleges, too, he suggested that we are not reaching the interests and abilities of half our present registration. He therefore urged that before the schools add a network of public junior colleges and encourage more students to go beyond high school, that they improve their present programs.

"The junior college is now the most rapidly developing phase of education in the United States," he summarized. "It is estimated that by the end of the next decade it will register more than 50 percent of the freshmen of all collegiate institutions. This proportion already has been exceeded in California. It is becoming the undergraduate collegiate institution of our modern educational structure.

"Let us not impede its progress by trying to make it an appendage of a totally different phase of the structure. Rather, let us assist it to grow and develop in its own right."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 18, 1959]

TWO-YEAR COLLEGE CALLED BOON TO INDIGENT

ATLANTIC CITY, February 17.—The nationwide trend toward publicly supported junior colleges is placing higher education within the reach of many who could not or would not have gone to college before, school administrators were told here today.

A California educator, whose State has pioneered in the development of the 2-year schools, said this is a major reason for supporting junior colleges as part of public school systems.

"Evidence exists aplenty that many late bloomers, early goofers or slow starters have finally come through," said School Superintendent James H. Corson of Modesto, Calif.

But junior college is "not just a salvage shop," he added.

"Able students enroll, are challenged and go on to masters' and doctorate degrees and positions of leadership," Corson told a session of the annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators.

PUBLICLY SUPPORTED

Corson said the junior colleges should be "tuition-free and publicly supported—preferably distributing the cost between State and local levels."

(Recently established junior colleges in Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties operate on a tuition basis. The District School Board has proposed setting up a junior college as part of an expanded program at District Teachers College.)

Corson said the "rising tide of college students during the next decade" will make junior colleges increasingly important.

"If local school districts feel a shortage of funds, as they probably will," he added, "the State can increase its support of junior colleges with a much lower outlay than it could provide another brand of higher education supported entirely by State funds."

DILUTION OF COURSES

Some educators here voiced concern that establishment of junior colleges as appendages to public school systems would divert funds from elementary and secondary programs and dilute the content of high school courses.

"The junior college has a meaning and a distinctiveness in its own right and demands separation from other levels of education," said President Lawrence L. Bethel of the Fashion Institute of Technology in New York City.

Bethel challenged the thesis that all high school graduates should be admitted to free junior colleges, regardless of ability or financial need.

[From Reader's Digest]

WITH A BARNFUL OF STUDENTS AND A COUNTYFUL OF FAITH

(By Elizabeth Fagg)

In their flowing black robes and cocked mortarboards, the class of 1952 looked like any other college graduating class: the same fresh faces; the same ripple of laughter at

the prexy's jokes; the same pride in accepting the diplomas.

But to thoughtful observers this first commencement at Orange County Community College in Middletown, N.Y., was no ordinary June graduation. It was a heartening symbol of new opportunities which are opening to thousands of U.S. youngsters. For Orange County Community College is one of the 2-year, low-cost community colleges now springing up in many parts of the country, offering an educational chance to thousands who might otherwise never get to college.

Take Joe Loomis (not his actual name), a recent OCCC graduate. With neither cash nor precedent for a college education in his family, Joe had drifted through high school. His highest ambition had been to become a garage mechanic. Then in his senior year classmates began talking of going to OCCC. They could live at home and work part time to pay the modest yearly tuition of $200. Practical vocational courses were available to prepare them for specific jobs in the region. For the first time Joe began to see a chance—and the need—for more education.

That fall, with summer earnings in his pocket, he enrolled at OCCC. His below-C average would have barred him from many colleges, but now he was eager to learn, and aptitude tests indicated that he had a strong potential in science. So he was accepted—on probation. Joe worked hard, made up his deficiencies, graduated with honors. He has now gone on to study engineering in a 4-year college.

Joe's story is typical in many ways of OCCC students. Not all the applicants present such poor high-school records; they range from honor students to bottom man on the totem pole. But they possess two common denominators: a short pocketbook and a hunger for higher education.

Junior colleges, supplementing the senior institutions, are not new in this country, but since World War II their number has soared. Today there are 652 of them, located in every State, with a total enrollment of nearly a million students. The most striking recent version is the community college, operated by a city or county, often with State support. Says Ralph Fields, of Columbia University Teachers College, "The present rapid spread of 2-year community colleges may well parallel the growth of public high schools 50 years ago."

OCCC is an outstanding example of this kind of home-grown institution. It got its start 13 years ago, when a survey disclosed that Orange County, a low-income farming area, sent a smaller proportion of its high-school graduates to college than any other county in New York State. Shocked by this fact, Fred Germain, secretary of the Middletown Chamber of Commerce, organized a committee on higher education, which held meetings all over the county to discuss setting up a local college.

The most practical and economical kind of school, Germain decided after some research, would be a 2-year community college. It would be less expensive to run than a 4-year school, because lower-division work is less specialized: class sizes can be larger, teaching staff smaller, buildings and equipment simpler. And with a nonresident campus there would be no need for dormitories.

First step was to qualify for State aid. New York State would match in capital investment whatever the community put up in funds or real estate. After that, operating costs could be split three ways between the State, a local sponsor, and students' tuition.

The committee approached Mrs. John H. Morrison, widow of a Middletown businessman, and made a bold request: Would she move out of her 40-room mansion and 16-acre estate and give them to the county for a college? She generously consented. Market value of the property was about $60,000. Later, however, the educational value was appraised at $242,000, a sum which the State matched.

At this point the Orange County Board of Supervisors, asked to become sponsor, hesitated at accepting the financial obligation. "County College Appears Doomed," a local newspaper headlined. Promptly, Fred Germain got on the radio, pleaded with local citizens: "If your property is valued at $2,000 for tax purposes, a community college would cost you the colossal sum of 50 cents a year. Fifty cents to guarantee you son and daughter the opportunity of a college education."

Citizen pressure on the board grew strong. It was clear that the people wanted a college, and in June 1950, the board of supervisors voted for it. Four years of hard work had triumphed.

At the committee's victory celebration someone asked, "What do we do next?" There was a silence. In the intense effort to get official backing, no one had had time to plot out the nuts and bolts of getting a college started.

"One thing's sure," one member remarked. "We can't possibly open this fall."

This aroused Germain. "We'll open this fall or not at all," he said. "We can't afford to lose a whole year."

Under Germain's leadership, work began immediately on the Morrison place. Horses and hay were moved out of the stone carriage house, and carpenters, electricians, and plumbers set about turning the building into a science laboratory. Germain borrowed from the Middletown Chamber of Commerce to pay bills until State funds became available. Since many of the workmen had youngsters of their own who wanted to go to the new college, a miracle of energy went into the renovations that summer.

Edwin H. Miner, an experienced professor and former Associate Commissioner of Education in the U.S. Office of Education, was chosen dean (and, a few months later, president). He at once began engaging a teaching staff. And that October, with a barnful of students and a countyful of faith, the new college opened.

There were 165 students in that first group. Today there are 3,023 at OCCC, drawn from a 30-mile radius. There are 57 full-time faculty members, 14 part-time. The Morrison mansion has become a classroom and office building; the former carriagehouse now holds an auditorium and a chemistry laboratory. Three new buildings have gone up: A library, a student center, more classrooms. Where the quiet of private gardens once reigned, today there is a great bustle of purposeful people.

"This is your college," the administration tells the public. "Come use it." For the concept of a community college embodies the ideal of serving the whole community, of offering learning to all individuals who sincerely want it.

OCCC has three major programs, each of which bears the special community college stamp. First obligation is to the undergraduate. For students who plan to go on and get B.A. or B.S. degrees, the college give 2 years of undergraduate work paralleling that of 4-year institutions. Some 40 percent of OCCC students have gone on to other colleges and universities, transferring with full recognition of credits.

As to those for whom these 2 years may be the beginning and end of college education, OCCC must not only make them better citizens but good job candidates as well. Vocational training is offered in business management, engineering, secretarial work, agriculture, retail selling, electrical technology. "To us, curriculum is anything but a rigid thing," President Miner says. "We're constantly looking for new ideas useful to our region."

A striking illustration of this is the training program offered to meet the critical shortage of nurses in the community. The usual registered nurse's course requires 3 years. OCCC became one of the first colleges to turn out registered nurses in 2 years. Under the watchful eye of the state department of education, OCCC streamlined the usual course, retaining all essential but drastically trimming the repetitious hospital chores that occupy much of the student nurse's time. OCCC's graduates passed the licensing exams, quickly acquired manual dexterity in the routine chores which their training had not given them. Today OCCC's 2-year registered nurses are able to find jobs in any hospital they wish—local or metropolitan.

A second major program of the at home college is adult education, so popular at OCCC that it has threatened to swamp the facilities. Some 2,500 men and women from the surrounding countryside are enrolled yearly in evening classes or extension courses. Nearly 200 courses are given including all the regular curriculum subjects as well as special occupational courses. Approximately 75 percent of the adults study for college credit.

OCCC's third major role is as a public-service agency, a consultation and planning center. The college helped create a county mental-health program, and is working to start a county library system. A project to improve grade-school instruction of gifted children began last fall. OCCC's counseling center provides educational, vocational, and psychological guidance to any who want it.

Small wonder that Orange County citizens feel this is truly their college. The taxi driver, the farmer, the elevator operator and the waitress all speak of it with pride. They know an important new influence has entered their community, and their lives.

Address by Charles H. Silver at Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of this body a fine speech recently delivered by Hon. Charles H. Silver, president of the Board of Education of the city of New York, at the annual dinner of the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation. Dr. Silver, who served as chairman of the dinner, spoke out eloquently on civil rights, civil liberties, and the sanctity of man's innate dignity. His words deserve the thoughtful reflection of all of us.

It is fitting that these remarks should be voiced before a group which perpetuates the memory of that great American, Al Smith. It is equally fitting that a foundation devoted to the alleviation of human suffering should bear the name of the "Happy Warrior." In this connection, I think this body should take note of the efforts of that outstanding churchman and world leader, Francis Cardinal Spellman, in behalf of the wonderful work of the Smith Foundation. He has labored untiringly to make the foundation's program a success.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Silver's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HONORABLE CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, AS CHAIRMAN OF THE ALFRED E. SMITH MEMORIAL FOUNDATION DINNER, HELD AT THE WALDORF ASTORIA HOTEL, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1958

It is my very great pleasure as chairman to welcome you this evening. May I express my heartfelt gratitude to you and to all our honored guests who have gathered together to mark the progress of the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation. I rejoice again in the presence of so many faithful friends. In our established custom, I wish to explore with you the climate of this trouble time.

Long ago, when man made his way through a wilderness he determined his direction from the stars. He knew that if he looked into God's heaven at the eternal pattern of creation, his path would become plain.

But sometimes the night was clouded over or the jungle closed above his head. Then, he would wait for the light to come so he could see where he was, how far he had come, and where he was going.

When men and nations become lost in a wilderness of opposing ideologies and conflicting ambitions, even the stars can fail us. They are there, all that hung in the sky since the beginning, and even a few that we have put there to confuse us further. But the darkness has gathered over many lands and we must seek the light to find the way.

That is why, even today, the soul and mind of man must seek a high place from which to judge his position in a troubled world and learn the path he should take. We, who come to these dinners devoted to the precious remembrance of one who walked nobly in the American way, have gathered to climb together this annual watchtower of the world.

Gazing from here on all that God has given our beloved country, we give thanks for the peace and freedom we still enjoy. And we must firmly resolve, in an hour when the dignity of man and the rights of some of our people are being debased in our own land, that we will not sit idly by with do not disturb signs on our hearts and hands while the miracle of America is ground in the dust of apathy, weakness or regional self-interest.

There are others on this evening's program, more qualified than I to give counsel in these matters of tremendous decision. We can well take confidence in their leadership in national and international affairs.

But in a climate of uncertainty and doubt, when men cry peace and there is no peace, we need more than the physical trappings of power. We must draw on our deepest spiritual resources. We must gain strength from the fervent conviction that the history of our country is a tremendous adventure in freedom.

We need to realize that when our country was founded, man's finest dream and noblest thoughts were inscribed on parchment. To insure that human rights, human liberty, human dignity would ever be paramount, our Bill of Rights and subsequent amendments were added for all to observe and obey. These wise pioneers of our liberty provided for a judicial guardian of our sacred words.

As we approach more closely to fulfillment of our dream, a desperate band of little men would have us becloud those guiding stars of our history, would have us denounce a Supreme Court that refuses to join them in subverting our laws and principles. They would plunge our people into ignorance at a time when man stands on the threshold of his greatest triumph, through knowledge, and would have us governed by men, not laws.

If ever there were need to rally throughout this Nation those men who truly believe in America and all for which it stands, there is need now. How can we look at the rest of the world and say, "Believe in me for my way is the way of freedom, liberty, brotherhood and peace", if we cannot look at ourselves and say it. How can we seek the privileges if we fail the responsibilities given us by the great men who framed the destiny of this God-loved land?

We must know, as they knew and pledge our lives and sacred honor—as they did theirs—that no state's rights transcend human rights.

We must pledge ourselves to the sacred cause of human dignity, and preserve our Union with its principles unshaken.

The explosion of the rocket to the moon—as man's mind soars to the heights—must not be debased by the explosion of the bomb in the synagogue basement—as man's mind plunges to the depths.

The American commonwealth is the product of thousands of years of man's yearning for freedom. We have emerged as the strongest, healthiest, most prosperous people on earth. Yet, in our very success, and, until now, unchallenged supremacy, lie the seeds of our own destruction.

That is our world today. Let us make sure it is not our world of tomorrow. Indeed, let us make sure there is a world tomorrow; more than that, a world free of the torment and tension which have tortured our times.

The strongest ally of communism is a new type of traitor. He stanchly protests his love of our Nation's liberties, but does everything in his power to undermine our Nation by denying those liberties to men, women, or children of a color or creed other than his own.

That is where the jungle is growing right over our own heads. That is the wilderness through which we must grope our way to peace.

Let us be ever alert, with our guard up against the guns aimed at our heads from other shores. But let us not ignore the gun we are aiming at our own while we fumble with this trigger of delay on the march to mankind's emancipation. Freedom cannot survive as a monopoly.

We each have an individual opportunity—and it may be for the last time as we balance between utter chaos or universal good will—to build a better world, based on the wisdom which can lift men's minds and hearts to new heights and is more powerful, more worth the price, than ever before.

This should be the way we seek as we stand together on a high place. "Happy Warriors" for a holy purpose, resolved to give our children a future more secure, a life more rewarding.

The State of Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on January 31, 1959, at the Roosevelt Day dinner in Washington, D.C., the noted economist John Kenneth Galbraith delivered an address entitled "The State of Liberalism."

Dr. Galbraith is not only one of our country's finest economists, but he also stands out as a great and articulate liberal. When he writes or makes a speech, it is certain not only to be of great interest, but even more important it is certain to be thought provoking. In the tradition of the outstanding liberals throughout the years, Dr. Galbraith does not hesitate to take a bold and critical look at our society and at our thinking, and to come forth with new, imaginative ideas and constructive proposals.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this excellent speech by one of our finest liberal spokesmen be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF LIBERALISM

(Address by John Kenneth Galbraith at the annual Roosevelt Day dinner, Shoreham Hotel, Saturday, January 31, 1959)

I

My subject this evening, the state of liberalism, will suggest a somewhat introspective mood, and this is most appropriate in such a gathering as this. It is one of the maxims of our political life that while conservatives worry about liberals, liberals worry about themselves.

Perhaps that is the nature of that curious political being called the liberal. He would like to leave well enough alone. Like everyone else he prefers the familiar ideas, the established faith. But he is not quite content. The nagging habit of reflection, like the gnawing desire for a cigarette, or for reelection, is something he cannot quite suppress.

Here, I think, is one of the claims we can make—and in this confessedly nonpartisan gathering no such opportunity should be overlooked—for the Eisenhower administration. It would seem to have avoided, perhaps more effectively than any other administration of modern times, the pain, uncertainty and discomfort that are associated with the pursuit of ideas.

II

Indeed, while we are paying tribute to this administration, I wonder if a further word might be said on this point. There are those—some are my friends—who think that this administration will be more celebrated by historians for its foreign policy—for devising, for the first time, a foreign policy that is at once frozen and unpredictable. This is based on an intelligence system which functions perfectly on the inner aims of the Kremlin (so that Mr. Dulles can issue a daily commnique on them) but which provides no knowledge of what is about to happen in the Caribbean.

Others, also thoughtful men and women, argue that it is the economic policy of this administration which bears the mark of destiny. They cite the touching faith in the magic of the interest rate and the magic faith in the power of words. This is coupled with the reverent belief that recessions are an act of God and that recovery is the reward of those who only stand and wait. To an economist this view has its fascination. Adlai Stevenson once referred to the Old Guard Republicans who had to be hauled, kicking and screaming, into the 20th century. The modern Republicans come along tractably enough but bring the 19th century with them.

But I think it wrong to suggest that either foreign or economic policy will be the enduring monument of the modern Republicans. The Eisenhower administration will endure in memory because of its unparalleled dreariness. On the reasonable assumption that it can avoid exertion for another 23 months, it will have gone 8 years without introducing a single interesting, novel or ex-

citing departure in the field either of foreign policy or domestic government. It will have contributed nothing to set beside point 4, the Marshall plan, the Wagner Act, TVA and the hundred other ventures into the needed and the unknown which marked the preceding 20 years. As its most ardent critics have complained, the administration has even succeeded in being uninspired in its efforts at reaction.

Only in the field of what may perhaps be called administrative semantics has there been a certain type of pioneering. I refer, of course, to the way words have become divorced from action during these last 6 years. This separation is now nearly total. A declaration that the Government will promote recovery, raise farm incomes, prevent inflation, or promote higher living standards abroad is now a portent of nothing whatever. The words have replaced the action. Indeed, they are more than a substitute. A statement of deep concern for the well-being of other peoples now means that there will soon be a cut in foreign aid. A declaration that we will surely outstrip the Russians in space exploration means that the administration is contemplating a reduction in appropriations for research.

Like you, I have been fascinated to note that this divorce of speech from action has even invaded Republican Party affairs. A week or two ago, President Eisenhower received from Chairman Meade Alcorn a thoughtful report calling on members of the party to loosen the embrace of big business and to preach and practice a militant republicanism 365 days a year. The President warmly endorsed and applauded this report. Then he left for a vacation, taking with him a couple of the country's outstanding entrepreneurs.

Let me say that a closely related administrative accomplishment of these last 6 years has been the divorce of responsible officers from responsibility. This has long been noticed in the case of the President. He stands above the battle, anyhow, whenever the battle is going badly. But I wonder if we have fully realized how completely his subordinates have copied his technique. The Dulles paper pacts are Mr. Dulles' monument. But when things go from bad to much worse in Baghdad or Manila, this is never the fault of Mr. Dulles. Or to come closer to home, there is the tragic and sickening case of Cuba. Our recent Ambassador there—he was the appointee of the President and Mr. Dulles—was described last year in State Department syntax as doing a very outstanding job in one of the most difficult spots imaginable. This outstanding job included open support for the corrupt and brutal tyranny of Fulgencio Batista. Now Batista has gone and so has Smith, the outstanding Ambassador. We are reaping the whirlwind of the policy precisely as observers predicted we would. But there has been not the slightest suggestion that Mr. Dulles feels in any way responsible.

Similarly when the Soviets seize scientific or technical leadership, it is no one's fault. No one is to blame when prices rise, or income drops, or unemployment grows, or fallout falls. Even Ezra Benson has been able after 6 years to maintain a remarkable detachment from his mountainous surpluses and his astronomic expenditures. He is a good man. He does the right thing. It just produces the wrong results. But someday virtue will have its reward. I wonder what would have happened to a liberal Secretary of Agriculture who had managed things as Secretary Benson has and at similar cost. The press would, I think, have been a trifle waspish.

III

But, in a more philosophic mood, perhaps we would temper our criticism. We have survived 6 years of this negativism. With luck—we may of course need quite a lot of luck—we will survive 2 more. And one is tempted to wonder if these periods of interruption and hesitation are not part of a deeper historical process. The twenties and early thirties of this century were years of minimal action or postponement. Then as now there was the conviction that providence was irrevocably on the side of sound business judgment, the status quo and the balanced budget. This being so, neither thought nor energy was needed.

Because so little was done then, much was done in the years that followed. Coolidge and Hoover accumulated the tasks that Franklin D. Roosevelt performed. The unfinished business of one decade became the opportunity of the next. So perhaps progress does not come by smooth advance. I must avoid saying that we too have our great leaps forward.

As problems accumulate in certain periods, so we may hope does understanding and the perception of needed action. Here perhaps we have the simplest statement of the division of labor between conservatives and liberals. Conservatives accumulate the unsolved problems. The task of liberals is to keep pace with the solutions.

No one can doubt that the Eisenhower administration is nobly performing the historic mission of conservatives.

IV

Meanwhile, there are a number of things on which it seems to me the liberal position is now very poorly prepared. Perhaps this is inevitable. As a people we are not very good at settling on courses of action in the abstract. We work best under the whiplash of necessity. Moreover, we are often reluctant to see that not all problems have an equal priority and that on occasion first things must be put first. Yet perhaps we could do better. There are three things which seem to me of particular importance. Let me give you my list.

V

First, there is the problem of the massive role of our military expenditures in the economy and the question of the alternatives. That rational man will triumph must be a tenet of the liberal faith. So we must expect to find a way through the morass of our age without war. But increasingly we encounter the conviction—it is common at home and epidemic abroad—that if we cannot afford war, neither can we afford peace. To withdraw some forty billions of military spending from the economy would surely write finis to the economic system. Many firms, numerous industries and some whole communities would be devastated. So, a few voices like HUBERT HUMPHREY'S apart, we treat the problem with an embarrassed silence.

No doubt a drastic reduction in military spending would involve problems. But I hazard the view that with some exercise of foresight, planning and imagination, these problems would be far from insuperable. The global totals of expenditure could be readily offset by other outlays—even without throwing Ezra Benson into the breach. Thus, immediately on reduction of military spending, there should be generous payments to individuals and families left jobless by the change. Tax reduction for families in the low income brackets—families which reliably spend their entire income—would readily offset several billions of military outlay. Urban redevelopment, housing and urban and suburban transportation; education and school construction; and a solid increase in economic aid would offset another substantial chunk. In the slightly longer run, always given the determination and the willingness to free our minds from the slavery of the past, we could make highly effective use of these resources in a direct attack on poverty. Of this I will say a word in a moment. The harder question seems to me less economic than social and psychological. It would concern the declining urgency of work itself. As this happens, can leisure be made more rewarding? And work too? In short, how, as we solve the economic problem—that Old Man of the Sea which humanity has always carried—can life be given not less but more meaning?

One reason that liberals have been reluctant to discuss these questions is that they seem to imply a willingness to disarm unilaterally. And, of course, such discussion invites the angry riposte of the hardheaded and practical men who have flourished these last years—the men who think it idle to imagine that humanity has a future of any kind. The American people are far more to be trusted than the hardheaded men—those who use the head as a blunt instrument.

The best way to have no future is to cease thinking about it.

So we must look at the alternatives to the arms race and get them into solid form. Everyone must know that we are not committed by economic necessity to that venture. We must be able to embrace alternatives easily and quickly and immediately the opportunity arises.

VI

Our second priority task, or so it seems to me, is to find out how we may mount a new and final attack on poverty. No one I imagine denies that in the 22 years since, in January 1937, Franklin Roosevelt saw one-third of a Nation ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished, there has been much progress in the reduction of privation and want. Much of it has been the result of specific action directed to the specific goal of popular well-being—to the development of a stronger trade-union movement, of social security, minimum-wage legislation, improved health and other welfare services. Much more has been the result of the general advance in income and output in the war and postwar years. We must look to future expansion to rescue more of our people from their misery and to help others climb the ladder to more satisfactory incomes.

But, I would urge, we cannot much longer be satisfied with this general progress—important though it is. Both the statistics and the evidence of our eyes must tell us that it is leaving too many people behind. (In 1956, between two and three million households still had income of less than a thousand dollars; 7.5 million had incomes below $2,000.) These are the urban slum dwellers, the minorities, the bypassed rural areas and the Nation's truly forgotten men, women and children—those who do hard ill-paid farm labor and have not, in many cases, even the minimal amenity of a place to live.

We need to know who our poor are, where they are, and why they remain excluded from the richer current of our economic life. And we need a solid design for seeing that they, and above all their children, are rescued from what is now anachronistic privation.

Nor should we be bound by ancient notions as to how this may be done or what can be afforded. The problem must be attacked in a large and generous frame of mind. It means much better schools and health and welfare services. It means help for communities that do not have these in adequate quality and quantity and which cannot afford them. Almost certainly it means supplementary cash income for families that cannot afford proper care and education for their children. We will hear of the corrupting effect of such help. It would be well were it compared to the corrupting effect of ignorance and starvation. But our greatest need is for a plan—a design—for the final elimination of poverty.

VII

Third and most immediately we must find a way of reconciling full employment and economic growth with price stability. If not, our hard-won social gains and our hard-won public services will be subject to the con-

stant erosion of inflation. Let there be no mistake: Inflation is a highly reactionary phenomenon. It rewards most those who are best skilled at serving themselves. It encourages precisely the behavior which in every society is the most plentiful. With equal precision, it penalizes those services—education, health, welfare—which the civilized community has the most need to encourage.

Inflation is also the relentless enemy of a strong and effective labor movement. Unions will rarely be as effective in winning wage advances as the employing corporations are in offsetting them with price increases. And in the competition to explain who is really responsible for the price advances, unions will always come off second best.

If I read the economic policy of the present administration correctly, it holds that inflation can be solved by a three-part policy, the three parts being, in equal measure, prayer, incantation, and William McChesney Martin. The present liberal position is, if anything, less specific. Liberals rightly reject monetary policy—the tight money crusade—as inequitable to the extent that it is not unworkable. They reasonably conclude that full employment and growth are preferable to the kind of astringent tax and spending policy which would provide price stability. But we do not say what we are for.

There is only one thing we can be for. In the big industries where the basic wage and price patterns are set, we must have a national price and wage policy that is consistent with price stability. This will unquestionably take some kind of public mechanism. Just what kind is uncertain—one hopes that it can be simple, and certainly it must safeguard the vital democratic interests of all parties. But clearly it is time that we began to find out what is required.

VIII

As I suggested, this is a list of problems, not a platform. These three things—price stability, poverty, and the peacetime economy—are the matters on which we most need answers. There are other tasks of equal urgency—full citizenship and civil rights, education, economic growth. But on these, I think you will agree, the liberal vision is clearer and our course far more clearly marked. On the things of which I have spoken we have yet to take the measure of the task.

And, of course, my list has had to do only with our domestic life. In domestic policy in recent times, we have, at worst, stood still while the world has moved on. In foreign policy, while the world has moved ahead, we have tried with a determination unmatched in other matters to march backward. It was the nature of the Roosevelt diplomacy that it identified itself with people. People, as Roosevelt's superb political instinct told him, were in this century the enduring foundation of influence and ultimately of power. People were the ultimate basis of reliable association and alliance. If we respected and supported popular aspirations, we would be strong and we would be respected. But if we supposed that political liberty and economic well-being were objects for exclusively American consumption, we would invite the mistrust, suspicion, and even the dislike of the less fortunate peoples of the world. The Roosevelt foreign policy was never perfectly articulated. I do not wish to idealize it unduly. But all will recognize these broad lineaments. Its identification with people was brilliantly continued in UNRRA, the Marshall plan, and point 4 under Harry Truman. And none can doubt the success of these policies. Whatever else the thirties and forties may have been, they were the American years.

I need scarcely remind you how diligently we have sought to reverse the Roosevelt policy. Foreign policy at the level of its leadership has become a matter of narrow strategic calculation. Idealism is idiotic; compassion is soft-headed. Dictators are excellent allies, if, in addition to being against their own people, they are also against communism. Latin Americans are no longer neighbors but occupants of a safe rear area. Indians are not men and women but inhabitants of a bastion. Economic aid is not an expression of our will to help others. It is a counter in the cold war. Narrow self-interest is the only test of policy.

Is it so surprising that this higher diplomacy—so much of which passes for deep guile and craftiness—has not been very ingratiating? Is it so astonishing that literate and intelligent people the world around should have seen it and seen through it? I think not. It is more surprising that quite a few Americans still feel that they can leave their political convictions at the water's edge—that they can be men of good will and compassion at home but hard-headed friends of dictators, rascals and reactionaries once they cross a border.

Liberalism is, in fact, an indivisible faith. It has never been satisfactorily established that hunger is less painful for a Pakistani than for a man from Pennsylvania. Liberty is as important in Caracas as in Kansas City. Compassion is not indecent. Generosity is not subversive. An intricate calculation of self-interest is not always the mark of wise statesmanship.

This is the liberal faith. But it is also the only practical faith. Our foreign policy has failed in these last years less because of mismanagement than because it has been hopelessly conservative, hopelesly out of date.

Its leaders have supposed that we could have it one way at home and another way abroad—that expert inconsistency could be a substitute for political conviction. One needn't dwell on the morality of this for the practical consequences are sufficiently evident.

Foreign policy, like domestic policy, must be abreast of the popular revolution of our age. If it isn't, no matter how superficially clever it may seem, history will overtake it—and in a very few months. Those responsible, if they want to escape from Washington with their reputations intact, must not stay too long.

This, if I may conclude on a philosophic note, has been another mistake of the present administration.

Community Spirit Still Abounds in Lykens and Williamstown Area in Pennsylvania

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, these indeed are changing times and they say that man does shape his own future.

Well, up around Lykens and Williamstown, Pa., the people are proud enough to want to keep their communities going in the face of adversity and they are doing something about it. Actions speak louder than words, and that is what is going on up there.

Here is an article from the Harrisburg Evening News that tells the story of how they are going about trying to help themselves with a fine community spirit in their drive to bring industry into their area to take up the slack.

UP IN THE VALLEY LOYALISTS REFUSE TO GIVE UP GHOST

(By George Draut)

The lights start going on at 5 o'clock in the morning in hundreds of homes in the Lykens-Williams Valley.

This northern Dauphin County valley used to be one of the biggest anthracite coal areas in the country.

But that was long ago.

The mines closed down years ago.

Now it is a valley of car pools and commuters, maybe as many as 5,000 of them if you range back from Millersburg on the river through the long-dead coal industry towns into the Tower City area of Schuylkill County.

They chip in around $5 apiece a week to pay for gasoline and oil, and they spend 3 hours a day in an automobile every working day of their lives just to get to jobs and paychecks and back home again.

If they live in Williamstown, the center of this coal ghost area where once the biggest mine in the United States went full blast, they're driving or riding 100 miles or more a day to and from work. If it's winter and the roads are icy, this can be rough. This is mountain country.

Most of them are men.

There are precious few jobs for men in the valley.

So they work in the complex of industries and offices and government centered around Harrisburg * * * at one of the three big Federal installations, or in one of the State government departments, or at the Bethdehem steel mill in Steelton, or someplace else.

Or they are the men who leave Williamstown and the valley every day and drive over the Gold Mine Trail to jobs at Indiantown Gap. Or the 11 people from this same small town who work at the Dauphin County Home—room, board, and $180 a month. And just weekends home with their families.

Back in the valley, 2,200 women—wives, daughters, and widows—are going to work, too. There are 2 textile plants, 16 apparel plants and 5 shoe factories. Just about every town in the valley has one or more of them. And some of this also involves commuting. A car pool of women who live in Williamstown may drive to jobs in a Millersburg factory. Or Lykens women may drive the few miles to jobs in a neighboring town.

This is a valley of older people, of old age assistance and miners' and widows' pension checks. Every year, a few more of the young people leave. That shows up in the declining school enrollments.

But with the fierce family and community affection and loyalty that you can find only in a Pennsylvania coal town, many of them just will not think of leaving. And some, who do, come back homesick to stay. That's why there are 5,000 men and women battling fatigue and traffic every day so they can make a living. There's this intangible, deep feeling of belonging in the towns of the Lykens-Williams Valley and all of the other Pennsylvania coal communities that just doesn't exist in the big, fat, prosperous cities and their well-groomed suburbs.

Once 4,000 miners worked in the valley. The last big mine closed down at Williamstown in 1941 just a few months before Pearl Harbor. It was owned by Susquehanna Collieries, a subsidiary of giant M. A. Hanna Corp. Earlier it had closed down its big mine at Lykens. And along the way the two mines of Reading Coal and Iron closed at Tower City. Today there are only 400 miners in Dauphin County on the official jobs count of the Pennsylvania State Em-

ployment Service. And most of them are small operators, maybe working over the culm banks or dredging coal out of the river. Back in the hey-day of the early twenties, 50 railroad cars and 1,500 tons of coal left Williamstown every day.

The 1950 census says there are 2,332 people in Williamstown. Once there were twice as many.

What keeps a town like this going when just about everything is gone? This was a mine town, period. Founded by a mine company, surveyed and laid out by a mine company, once owned by the mine company—lock, stock, houses, and culm bank.

For one thing, there's the big hosiery mill that has been there a half century. And there's the dress factory, and the small blouse-making plant.

But most of all, there are the people who just won't give up the ghost and let their community become a ghost town.

Perhaps it started back in 1942 in the Williamstown Post of the American Legion.

How many Pennsylvania communities were thinking about industrial development then, this going after a new industry and its new jobs?

They were at Williamstown. The Legion post had $25,000 in the bank accumulated over the years. And it had been like Harry Steites, Joseph Graham, George Uhler, James Noel, and Dr. G. H. Barndt. World War II was raging. Just the year before the last mine had closed. "We've got to have something for our boys to come back to. They've got to have jobs," these men decided.

Burgess Arthur J. Grubb tells about it today. He and the man who was then supervising principal of Williamstown's school, John W. Kopp, were added to the Legion's Industrial Development Association.

They went out and borrowed $90,000 along the way, put up a modern factory building, finished it in 1944 and got the Clement Ball Shoe Co. of Baltimore to come in. Clement Ball and its 160 jobs, half of them men, lasted for 4 years. Then it moved out.

The long, hard search for a new company began all over. Finally the Triple Novelty Footware Co. of New York set up a subsidiary, Williamstown Shoe Co., and moved in. Again there were jobs. But the parent company went bankrupt and carried the Williamstown company with it. Worse than that, there was an involved contract that tied up the building.

The Legion's committee went to work again. They borrowed more money to get back their building, and went after another company—and new jobs for Williamstown men.

Finally they got one in 1952, a blue chip company—American Marine Products, Inc. There was more remodeling, a parking lot was built, and AMP moved in and began production. Eighty-seven men work there today, about half of them from right in the Williamstown area. AMP put up a hiring sign for six more workers one day last week. Ninety men showed up and filled out applications.

Along the way, the Legion bought the old Geist Hotel and remodeled it into apartments. "We figured any company we could get would want housing for the people it would bring in," says C. Raymond Machamer who now heads the Legion's industrial development group. The Legion also remodeled the first floor of the hotel and leased it to the State. An office of the Pennsylvania State Employment Service now is there. It's one of the busiest places in town.

Along the way, the Legion bought an old hosiery mill, fixed it up and gave it to the Williamstown Dress Co. Here were a few jobs for men and 70 jobs for women. Some of them make $20 a day on piecework, you're told.

Along the way, the Legion bought and gave to the State another plot of ground. The armory of the 722d Trucking Company, National Guard, is there now. And men come from all over the valley to put in their time and effort and get their pay as guardsmen.

Along the way, there was the wonderful prospect, great big Philco, but this one blew up at the last minute.

Along the way, when the Air Force announced it was looking for a site for a big jet runway and air installation, Williamstown joined in the Williams Valley Industrial Association. There were Dr. D. H. Evans, of Tower City; the Reverend Joseph Crowley, Williamstown priest; Clarence Otto, a Tower City merchant; and many others. They campaigned like blazes to get the big air installation for one of several promising sites in their valley. They even wrangled a meeting with then Defense Secretary Charles Wilson at Washington.

A lot of other towns in Pennsylvania and New Jersey were in this act, too. And the Air Force wound up by keeping its big installation at Middletown and building the big jet runway there.

All of this and more, you're told by Raymond Machamer, James J. Smith, Ben J. Warlow, Herman L. Carl, Carl Machamer, Robert Thomas, Earl Fetterhoff, and Burgess Grubb. They're the Legion's industry-seeking board now.

Then they drive you around the area.

"There's a good site," one of them says.

It is.

"Maybe one day we can get a new plant there."

"Commuting is our big problem," they say. "Eight hundred to 900 of our people commute to work every day. What do we need here? Employment, that's all."

You stop on Division Street. This is the Williamstown Recreation Center. There's a beautiful new swimming pool, a big bath house and other buildings. "And there'll be playground equipment next year."

First, the Hometown Liberty Volunteer Firemen and then the Williamstown Rotary Club knocked themselves out, raising money and building up this park in the last 3 years. The borough and Williams Township helped out.

"This is a wonderful park," you say, and mean every word of it. You know of many big and prosperous cities that don't have a public swimming pool.

There's silence. Then Burgess Grubb says: "We wanted our children to have it."

You stand beside the swimming pool and look off not too far away at the gray-dross culm banks piled around the base of Bear Mountain, towering over this little town.

A thin plume of white smoke winds into the winter sky. This culm bank fire has been burning "for as long as we can remember—more than 50 years."

Somehow the fire that won't go out, the thin plume of smoke seems to symbolize a lot more than the mine that'll never open again.

Compulsory Unionism in Its Modern Setting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on February 19 I asked unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent treatise on "Compulsory Unionism in Its Modern Setting," written by Father Edward A. Keller, of the faculty of Notre Dame, which was published in the magazine Extension of September 1958. The cost of printing the article exceeded the amount allowed under customary unanimous consent requests. According to the printer, it will make approximately 2⅓ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and will cost $189.

I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the cost, the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPULSORY UNIONISM IN ITS MODERN SETTING

(By Edward A. Keller, C.S.C.)

Delegates to the Catholic Press Association's 48th annual convention held in May (1958) at Richmond, Va., adopted five resolutions, one of which noted "a healthy increase in controversy in the Catholic press of late. Legitimate disputation sharpens awareness of problems and leads to a fuller grasp of their complexities, said the resolution." (Our Sunday Visitor, June 1, 1958.)

The main controversy in the Catholic press has been over right-to-work laws. The legitimate disputation about this controversial topic has indeed led to a clarification of the main issue involved, the morality of right-to-work laws. Due largely to the wide discussion in the Catholic press of this question, the basic morality of right-to-work laws is now seldom challenged. However, the controversy continues and, unfortunately, too much of the argument against right-to-work laws still takes the form of invective, accusation of bad motivation and especially of deliberate dishonesty in use of the term "right to work" by supporters of right to work. An associate editor of a Catholic magazine states:

"One's suspicion grows when the drive against traditional forms of union security proceeds under a slogan that seems to have been cleverly chosen to deceive. No doubt, many people who favor right-to-work laws are sincere. * * * Such people owe it to themselves to disavow the misleading banner under which they march or quit the parade. They should honestly say that right-to-work laws guarantee nobody's right to work."

No responsible defender of right to work has even intimated that right to work laws guarantee a right to a specific job with a specific employer. I, and many others, including the National Right to Work Committee, have repeated often, openly and honestly that right to work laws do not guarantee a right to a job. The United States Supreme Court would stand charged of "proceeding under a slogan cleverly chosen to deceive" because the Court has used the term "right to work" long before the present controversy without explaining that "right to work" does not guarantee anybody a job. These same critics are strangely silent about the deceit of certain opponents to right to work in classifying right to work laws "right-to-wreck" laws, without offering one bit of evidence to prove that any right to work law wrecked or even weakened a single union.

A sample of the emotionalism generated over this controversial topic is that of an editor of a Catholic magazine who accused supporters of right to work of being "schizophrenic" Catholics. The Webster Dictionary defines schizophrenia as "a type of psychosis characterized by loss of contact with environment and by disintegration of personality"—in less technical language, we are

accused of being "space men" with "bats in the belfry." Another sample is gleaned from an article, attacking right to work laws, written by a priest-professor. He characterized right to work laws as "public frauds," as having been "conceived in deceit and born in the sin of fraud," as "a fraud so heinous that to be hated, it needs only to be seen," as "unconscionable distortion of the whole truth" and as "frauds, worse than wolves in sheep's clothing" (I somehow get the impression, he slightly dislikes right to work laws). A prominent Protestant clergyman uses just as picturesque language. He states right to work laws were "conceived in hypocrisy, and proclaimed in Pharasaic deceit."

Such slap-happy journalism may all be good, clean intellectual fun but it makes for a sensationalism that is somewhat startling, not to say a bit scandalizing, to lay readers.

Such emotional attacks, insinuations, and "ad hominem" arguments, however, merely prove the weakness of the case for compulsory unionism. The oldest trick in debate, when you can't answer your opponent's argument, is to call him dirty names—accuse him of having a disintegrated personality. One expects such tactics in the political arena and in the tabloid press but hardly in the Catholic press. The importance of this topic demands charitable, calm and dispassionate discussion. It is easy to understand the uncritical, emotional antagonism of the union worker in an open shop toward what he considers to be a free loading nonunion worker who refuses to join the union and pull his freight. It is difficult to understand, however, the use of such emotionalism as a substitute for rational argument by scholars of the subject. Their task and obligation are to cut through the confusing fog of emotionalism and lay clear the fundamental issue involved in right to work, namely, voluntary unionism vs. compulsory unionism.

Despite emotional arguments to the contrary, unions and union security are in no way threatened by right-to-work laws because union security is not merely protected by law (the Railway and Taft-Hartley Acts) but overprotected by legal immunities not granted to any other private association. Prior to national labor legislation, beginning with the Railway Labor Act of 1926, for railroad workers, and the Wagner Act of 1935, for most other workers, union security was not legally protected. Today, the basic right of self-organization, without any interference from an employer, is guaranteed in the Taft-Hartley Act and has in no way been legally weakened in States with right-to-work laws by that act.

All that right-to-work laws do is to grant to workers the right voluntarily to join or not join a union, thereby effectively protecting their freedom of association and freedom of conscience, as guaranteed them in the first amendment to the Bill of Rights. The opponents of right-to-work are long on vituperative adjectives but short on their knowledge of labor law.

The obvious error made by opponents of right-to-work is their refusal to see that the pendulum of economic and political power has swung in completely the opposite direction from where it was 25 or 50 years ago. They refuse to see that unionism in its modern setting is not the weak unionism of a generation ago. The problem today is not union security, overprotected by law, but the protection of the moral and legal security of workers against a union economic and political power which apparently neither Government, union members nor business can counterbalance or control. The problem is how to prevent the basic freedoms guaranteed under the first amendment of the Bill of Rights from being destroyed by the legally protected monopoly of modern unionism. Donald R. Richberg, author of the Railway Labor Act, maintains that "Americans are more out-of-date and ill-informed concerning the realities of the labor movement in the United States than they are in any area of public interest." He contends that to portray modern unions as weak, downtrodden organizations "is willfully or ignorantly untruthful." He further contends that the "labor movement has now become a political movement with the objective of establishing a social labor government in control of the economic and social life of the Nation." ("Labor Union Monopoly," Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1957.)

How far modern unionism has gone in reaching that objective can be seen in the capture of all the State offices of the State of Michigan by the UAW-CIO. Congressman Ralph W. Gwinn, New York, maintains that "labor dominates the House of Representatives . . . that 176 members of the House have benefited from labor campaign contributions, free political campaign assistance, such as radio and TV time, extensive publicity in the labor press, scores of voluntary workers, doorbell ringers, telephone workers, etc." Mr. Gwinn estimates that unions spend $62 million yearly for activities of a political character.

The merger of the AFL and the CIO brought about the merger also of the political committees of the AFL and CIO into a new committee, called the Committee on Political Education (COPE). The national codirector of COPE, James L. McDevitt, indicates the extent to which unions would go to force political conformity, when at a Virginia State AFL–CIO convention, he said:

"There are some labor leaders who have helped in Senator BYRD's election and they are 'traitors.' He added that if they had been in the Army they would have been lined up against a wall and shot." (Washington Star, May 20, 1958.)

Under modern unionism, the national and State legislatures have been more and more substituted for the "bargaining table." George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, stated that "the scene of battle is no longer the company plant and picket line. It has moved into the legislative halls of Congress and the State legislatures." To the modern union leader, political activity is essential to unionism. Mr. Dallas Sells, chairman of the merged Indiana AFL–CIO, even goes so far as to contend that "political activity is life blood of a labor organization." (Indianapolis Star, Jan. 31, 1957.)

There is nothing secret or "hush hush" about union political activity. The UAW–CIO subsidized two books on the subject: "The CIO and the Democratic Party" by Fay Calkins (University of Chicago Press, 1952) and "When Labor Votes" by three professors of Wayne University, Detroit, Michigan (University Books, Inc., New York). The late Philip Murray, when president of the CIO made a deliberate test, *U.S.* v. *CIO*, 335 U.S. 106 [1948], of the Corrupt Practices Act, which prohibits contributions or expenditures in connection with any Federal election. Mr. Murray won the test in the U.S. Supreme Court. In a more recent case (*U.S.* v. *UAW*, 352 U.S. 567 (1957)), brought under the Corrupt Practices Act, the Department of Justice prevailed upon the Supreme Court to adopt its construction and statute, but lost when the case was sent back to the District Court for trial, and a jury returned a verdict of acquittal in favor of the UAW. This case involved the use of union funds and union dues to pay for TV broadcasts favoring the election in Michigan of candidates for Congress in 1954. These legal decisions throw a cloud over the chances of successful prosecution and conviction of unions under the Corrupt Practices Act. The unions interpreted them as leaving the legal gates wide open for political activity on their part.

To accomplish their ultimate objective of political control, unions have substituted compulsion for persuasion for an obvious reason—to carry on effective political activity, unions must have the funds the apparatus of modern politics require. Mr. Joseph L. Rauh, attorney for the UAW, when pleading the case of the UAW (*U.S.* v. *UAW*) before the U.S. Supreme Court (December 4, 1956) openly stated in his oral argument that "the only funds available (for political activity) to the union are those that come from dues for the purpose of buying radio time, television time, and newspaper advertising." Mr. Rauh argued that "a union man thinks he has paid, when he pays his dues, for political activity. He doesn't feel he should pay a second time for political activity. That is why it is so hard to raise voluntary contributions."

The almost hysterical opposition to right to work laws by union leaders seemingly stems from the fact that these laws can frustrate the political ambitions of union leaders which so far have not been hindered by the Corrupt Practices Act. If union members, who object to union political activity or object to the use of their dues for political activity, can withdraw both their presons and their money from the union, then there is an effective escape from a political captivity created by compulsory unionism. The pushing of the agency shop in certain right-to-work States, as Indiana, when a union shop agreement legally cannot be entered into, is another indication of the use of every means to get money to carry on political activity. Under the agency shop a nonunion worker is compelled to pay the usual fees, dues, and assessments paid by union members, supposedly to pay for his share of the cost of collective bargaining. This is the heart of the free-rider argument.

This argument takes on an entirely different aspect when viewed in light of the political objectives of modern unionism. It is one thing to argue that those who benefit from representation by the union, should pay their share of the cost of collective bargaining but it is an entirely different matter to argue free rider when general funds of unions are used for political and other purposes that bear little or no necessary relationship to collective bargaining.

Because the free-rider argument is seemingly so plausible and because it is, currently, the main argument against right-to-work laws, it should be carefully examined. It is argued that it is unfair for a nonunion employee working in the open shop demanded by right-to-work laws, to receive the benefits of collective bargaining without paying his share of the cost of such bargaining. This becomes doubly unfair, they argue, when the unions are compelled by the Taft-Hartley Act to represent nonunion employees.

The legal requirement of representation of nonunion workers by the union is called "exclusive" representation. It was originally incorporated in the Wagner Act and was continued in the Taft-Hartley Act. The Wagner Act in section 9(a) states:

"Collective bargaining representatives selected by the majority in the unit shall be the exclusive representatives of all the employees in the unit for purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment provided, that any individual employee or group of employees shall have the right at any time to present grievances to their employer."

This passage of the Wagner Act was retained bodily in section 9(a) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The legislative history of the Wagner Act shows that the representation by the union of nonunion employees was put into the law because of the strong demand by unions for "exclusive" representation of all em-

ployees. If there were a serious threat to repeal "exclusive representation," unions would just as strenuously oppose repeal as they had originally demanded adoption. Therefore, the legal obligation of unions to represent nonunion employees can hardly be classified as unfair, much less immoral. It is misrepresentation to argue that, what is in reality a much sought after and prized legal privilege granted to unions, is an unfair, burdensome and costly legal obligation.

No one can object to unions engaging in political activity so long as their members agree to it and the funds to finance it are obtained from strictly voluntary contributions. What is highly objectionable is the use of general union funds for such a purpose when these funds are obtained under the compulsion of either a "union shop" or "agency shop."

The compulsory exaction of funds for purposes other than collective bargaining is a violation of the personal rights of free American workers. Because compulsory membership in a Communist union best demonstrates this point, the following case study of Larue I. Berfield as reported in the Wanderer, a national Catholic weekly is cited:

"For the Catholic labor priest, who this week labeled right-to-work-laws as a hoax and an antiunion measure, we cite the following staff memorandum sent to us last Thursday by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. This memorandum, which we quote without comment reads:

"'WASHINGTON, D.C., May 29, 1958.—A Pennsylvania electronics worker told the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee today that he will be forced to resign a job he has held for 19 years if he does not join a Communist dominated labor union.

"'Larue I. Berfield, 38, of Sinnamahoning, Pa., contended that the situation is a violation of his constitutional right of freedom of association, and asked the subcommittee to help solve his dilemma. * * * "If there is a constitutional right of freedom of association with Communists, then I feel I should have the same right not to associate with Communists," Berfield said. * * *

"'Following an election in January, Berfield said the UE was certified by the National Labor Relations Board as bargaining agent for employees in his plant. Eight years ago the UE was expelled by the CIO because of Communist domination'."

Mr. Berfield was fired from his job in July. According to the Chicago Tribune "Members of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee agreed he was a martyr to a legal system which protects those who associate with Communists, but not those who oppose such association." This martyr to compulsory unionism said "I was advised that I might have paid dues to the union under protest and held my job. But I will not contribute a dollar to support the Communist conspiracy. * * * I am a member of my local school board and a member of the civil defense organization. I would have to resign from those posts because I took loyalty oaths in both cases, swearing that I had never been and would not be a member of an organization advocating overthrow of the Government. It was a choice between keeping a job and betraying those oaths, and I chose not to violate the oaths." The Berfield case demonstrates the need for right-to-work laws to protect the consciences of loyal Americans from Communist oppression into which they are legally forced by compulsory unionism.

No one could dispute that a worker's personal rights and conscience are oppressed when he is compelled to belong to or support a Communist dominated union and come under the "formative" influence of such an association. But is there not oppression of personal rights under any kind of existing compulsory unionism when a worker is forced to pay union fees, dues, and assessments, most of which are used, not to pay the cost of collective bargaining, but for purposes that have little or no reasonable relationship to collective bargaining? This important point goes to the heart of the right-to-work controversy but is almost completely ignored by opponents of right-to-work, who for some reason, do not see that modern unionism is radically different in its objectives, policies, and programs from what it was a generation ago.

Since it unlikely that protection against the misuse of general union funds for political purposes, obtained under compulsory unionism, will be given by the Corrupt Practices Act: and since it seems even more unlikely that a national right-to-work law, which could give such protection can be passed for some time to come, the main hope for immediate relief rests with the courts—in a declaration of unconstitutionality by the United States Supreme Court, of the exaction of funds for political purposes, under compulsory unionism, in a case involving right-to-work laws. To understand this, a short summary of the pertinent court cases involved must be given.

The constitutionality of the railway union shop was upheld by the United States Supreme Court in 1956 in the Hanson case (*Railway Employees Department, AFL* v. *Hanson et al*). The Railway Labor Act was passed in 1926, and amended in 1934, at the request of the unions, to prohibit union shop agreements. This was in effect a railway right-to-work clause. The clause was amended in 1951 to specifically permit union shop agreements to be entered into between the railroads and the railway brotherhoods, State right-to-work laws notwithstanding. The railway unions then began to negotiate for union shop agreements and by 1953, with an assist from the Federal Government, had forced most of the major railroads, including the Union Pacific, the employer of Mr. Hanson, to sign such contracts. Mr. Hanson and other employees of the Union Pacific refused to join the union and brought suit against the union, contending their constitutional rights under the first amendment and fifth amendment had been violated. Since Mr. Hanson lived in Nebraska, which has a right-to-work law, he pleaded protection under that law against being compelled to join the union. His case went to the Nebraska Supreme Court which ruled in his favor. The case was then appealed to the United States Supreme Court which overruled the Nebraska Supreme Court primarily on the grounds that the Federal Railway Labor Act preempted the field and, therefore, superseded the Nebraska right-to-work law and that since the unions bargain collectively for all employees, both union and nonunion, it is not a deprivation of employees' constitutional rights to force all employees to pay dues, fees and assessments to cover the cost of collective bargaining. However, the Court ruled very narrowly on what the statute required, holding that the Railway Labor Act permitted only a modified union shop, according to which an employee could be bound only to financial support of the union but not to full membership in it. The Court ruled that the record before it (in the Hanson case) did not raise the issue of whether the union shop "forces men into ideological and political associations which violate their right to freedom of conscience, freedom of association and freedom of thought, protected by the Bill of Rights." The Court stated that if it should later be proved that "exaction of dues, initiation fees or assessments is used as a cover for forcing ideological conformity or other action in contravention of the first amendment, this judgment will not prejudice the decision in that case." This has been interpreted to mean that if an actual case were brought before the Court that did prove the use of dues money for political purposes, the Court might well render the union shop contract unconstitutional.

Just such a test may go to the Supreme Court in the case of *Allen et al.* v. *Southern Railway Company, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, et al.* This case, tried in the superior court of Mecklenberg County, N.C., is significant because it is the first case in labor litigation history in which a jury made "a finding of fact" regarding the political activity of unions. The jury, composed of six men and six women (two of the jurymen being members of a union), handed down a verdict on April 25, 1958, and found that the defendant railway unions had used ordinary union dues, fees and assessments, collected under union shop agreements, to influence votes in elections to public office and to make financial contributions to political candidates and political committees which were not necessary or reasonably related to collective bargaining.

The judge on the case, Judge J. Will Pless, upheld the jury finding and continued the temporary injunction against compelling the nonunion plaintiffs either to join the unions or to pay dues to them. However, he included a provision in his court order that if the unions would prove what portion of the periodic dues, fees and assessments were necessary and reasonably related to collective bargaining, he might modify his order to compel the nonunion plaintiffs to pay this share of the cost of collective bargaining. This ruling could pose a problem for the unions because it might be embarrassing to them to disclose the proportion of total union expenditures that go to pay for the actual cost of collective bargaining and how large a portion of union funds go for purposes not necessarily or even reasonably related to collective bargaining. Immediately upon ruling of the judge the case was appealed by the unions to the North Carolina Supreme Court. If this court upholds the jury verdict, the case will, most likely be appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

It is difficult to see upon what ground supporters of compulsory unionism can base their case that workers be compelled, at the expense of their jobs, to financially support political, economic and ideological causes and programs, to which they are opposed. They must face up to the fact that compulsory unionism, today, can make political captives out of free Americans. Opponents of right to work are blind to the fact that modern unions seek and are winning complete political and economic control, using the plea of "union security" to cloak their drive for power.

The opponents of right to work should heed the warning of the Pope that:

"Such discriminations are indicative of a wrong concept of the proper function of labor unions and of their essential purpose, which is the protection of the interests of the wage earner within modern society. How, therefore, can they consider it normal that the protection of the personal rights of the worker be more and more in the hands of an anonymous group, working through the agency of immense organizations which are of their very nature monopolies? The worker, thus wronged in the exercise of his personal rights, will surely find especially painful the oppression of his liberty and of his conscience, caught as he is in the wheels of a gigantic social machine." (Christmas Message, 1952.)

The American worker's personal rights, liberty and conscience are oppressed in this country by compulsory unionism caught as he is in the wheels of a gigantic social machine of modern compulsory unionism. Since all other suggested means have been proved ineffectual in protecting the personal rights of the worker, right to work laws

plead for adoption as the most effective way to suppress this oppression.

Since voluntary unionism can meet all the demands of the social nature of man, those who accuse supporters of right-to-work laws of being influenced, consciously or unconsciously, by a condemned and outmoded social philosophy of laissez faire individualism simply because they seek to protect by right to work legislation the personal rights, liberty and conscience of the worker from oppression by modern compulsory unionism, would do well to mediate on the above words of the Holy Father.

Dare To Be Different

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the weekly Sunday supplement, This Week, carried an article in its March 1, 1959, issue entitled "Dare To Be Different" which I am today submitting for publication in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask that this article by Adm. Hyman G. Rickover be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because it so graphically and daringly discusses one of the great problems confronting America today. That problem is a growing trend toward the cult of conformity.

The fact that Admiral Rickover, the father of Americas' atomic powered submarine, has had the courage to speak out on this subject is a refreshing interlude in an era when more and more great men of this Nation are being forced into conformity.

It is significant that Admiral Rickover should make his thoughts known to the public for he symbolizes the very essence of this problem. His personal struggle to persuade the Nation that an atomic powered submarine was feasible and his unselfish determination to prove this point is perhaps one of the great examples of an individual who refused to be a conformist.

The right to disagree; the right to speak out against overwhelming odds; the right to have courage to present new ideas is the very dynamics on which this wonderful Nation of ours was born.

Admiral Rickover grew up in Chicago. His patriotic parents still live in that great city. I am proud to be able today to call attention to his dramatic article and hope that his sober thoughts will be an inspiration to other Americans who are tragically slipping into the limbo of conformity.

Admiral Rickover's challenging article follows:

DARE TO BE DIFFERENT

(By Adm. Hyman G. Rickover)

"Whoso would be a man must be a nonconformist"—Emerson.

The ancient Locrians in Greece gave freedom of speech to all citizens—though at a cost which many must have considered too high. At public meetings, anyone could stand up and argue for changes in law or custom, on one condition. A rope was placed around his neck before he began to speak and if what he said did not meet with public approval, he was forthwith hanged.

Here in America, it would indeed be tragic if democracy deteriorated into mass tyranny over the unconventional individual. Democracy and equality do not require that we deny to the minority of people with creative minds the right to use them in their own way and to their fullest potential. People who use their minds successfully ought not to be expected to pretend they are just like everybody else.

We should then lose the diversity from which spring all great ideas; we should rob ourselves of the precious quality that distinguishes man from all other orders—his determination to think for himself, to be different.

Fighting Encephalitis With Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. F. SISK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, encephalitis is a major public-health problem in many parts of the Nation. In my State, according to records of the State of California Department of Public Health, the average yearly number of human infectious encephalitis cases reported from 1949 through 1958 was 447, of which an average of 93 were proven to be of mosquito-borne origin, and a great many more were suspected to be. In the three-county district of the San Joaquin Valley that I represent, the annual number of cases averaged 55, including 21 of mosquito-borne origin, during the same period.

Many victims of this dreaded disease died or suffered permanent brain damage.

An excellent report by Nate Haseltine on work done by Federal agencies in fighting encephalitis on an emergency basis was printed in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 23, 1959.

However, we should remember that a key part of the public-health effort to suppress and eradicate encephalitis is the day-to-day control work done by mosquito abatement districts throughout the country. In a sense, this work might be called preventive medicine.

In California, almost $4 million a year is spent in this work by the State public-health department and more than 50 local operating mosquito abatement agencies.

I believe such districts should be aided in their assault on the carriers of this horrible disease when it is possible and practical to do so. One of the ways to help mosquito abatement districts would be to make them eligible to receive donable surplus Federal property. I can think of no better way in which certain equipment could be used in protecting human lives.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the part of Mr. Haseltine's article dealing with encephalitis:

U.S. DISEASE FIGHTERS—WHEN NATIONAL CENTER TACKLES A DEADLY EPIDEMIC

(By Nate Haseltine)

ATLANTA, GA., February 22.—Life here at the Communicable Disease Center, they tell you, is never dull. But it can become pretty routine for long stretches.

So Dr. Rudolf Donath, epidemic fighter, was not unhappy last August 22 when one such stretch ended with orders to pack up and travel. An outbreak of encephalitis had hit four counties in the Salt Lake Valleys of Utah.

Within an hour the epidemiologist was aboard a Utah-bound plane, mentally mapping out the work ahead of him.

On reaching Ogden, Utah, he learned there already had been 20 suspected cases; four victims had died, and fear nearing panic was gripping the populations in the counties north of Salt Lake City.

Infectious encephalitis is a fearsome malady.

SPREAD BY MOSQUITOES

Its virus kept alive in the bodies of many wild birds, is carried to horses and humans by infected mosquitoes. Wherever it breaks out populations cringe and withdraw from each other. The Utah epidemic was, as laboratory tests later confirmed, Western equine encephalitis.

This is not passed from the sick to the well; mosquitoes must be the virus carriers—but who knew then?

Like polio, the malady starts with high fever, chills, muscle aches and weakness, and stiffening of back and neck muscles. Stricken infants develop raging fevers and may go into convulsions. Some die, or may survive with damaged brains.

In adults the onset is more gradual but by the second or third day sleepiness sets in, a sleepiness that may progress to coma, disorientation and delirium.

Some call infectious encephalitis America's sleeping sickness. It is unrelated however, to that ailment transmitted to humans in Africa by the tsetse fly.

DOCTOR'S ASSIGNMENT

Dr. Donath knew the work ahead of him. His job was to find the source, the breeding area for the mosquitoes. His job was to calm the people and enlist their help. He was to interview the patients and their physicians, and with the help of State and local health department staff members, break the chain of the disease's transmission.

The Control Center here in Atlanta also routed entomologists to the scene. Experts in the ways of mosquitoes, their job was to trap the insects in the fields to find out which were the virus carriers and to find their breeding sources.

The CDC also dispatched engineers with special spraying equipment from its Greeley, Colo., field station. Their task was to spread mosquito-killing fogs across the fields where standing pools of irrigation water in the warm days released clouds of insects.

The engineers also directed draining procedures, and mapped out a more healthful irrigation system for future seasons.

PATIENTS CHECKED

Dr. Donath, for his part, visited the sick in the Ogden hospital. He checked the records of those already dicharged and he went to their homes with their physicians to take blood samples. He looked for unreported cases and checked the suggestive ones.

Before his work was done he was able to confirm positively 40 cases of encephalitis out of data on 120 clinically suspect cases in 4 counties. About 100 horses, particularly vulnerable to western equine encephalitis, also had died before the outbreak's end in mid-September.

Did Dr. Donath stop this epidemic? No one will ever know. Back at work here today, wrapped up in routine, he said, only:

"What we did may help that area far more in the seasons to come than it did last summer. The people now know what to look for, what to do."

Today the Utah battle scene is just a numbered pin on a large map on the wall of an office here at the communicable disease center.

TEXAS DISEASE AREA

Another pin marks Hidalgo County, Tex., where the St. Louis variety of infectious encephalitis struck in 1954. This mosquito-borne virus does not sicken horses. It is even more dreaded than eastern or western equine encephalitis and can pass from human to human after the first bite of the first infected mosquito.

The puzzler in this epidemic was to identify the carrier mosquito. Authorities had known for some years that the mosquito Culex tarsalis was a vector (disease transmitting agent) for St. Louis encephalitis. But the disease detectives couldn't blame that species.

Until then the common house mosquito, Culex pipiens quinquefasciatus, was considered innocent. Studies of the Hidalgo County brood showed that the house mosquitoes were transmitting the infections.

Though these mosquitoes are built for long distance flying, the entomologists said, they don't have the inclination for it, preferring to stay close to habitations. This habit may have broken the back of the Hidalgo outbreak. Sprayers worked in from the canebreaks to the houses, in all-out, but localized, mosquito extermination campaigns.

THREE HUNDRED CASES REPORTED

Before the outbreaks end, however, 300 cases of encephalitis were recorded. The health authorities, however, said the actual number was more likely about 1,000.

The communicable disease center here is the nerve center of the Nation for disease surveillance. It is here that the disease detectives keep track of appearances and outbreaks of influenze, polio, encephalitis, diphtheria, malaria, hepatitis, diarrheal diseases, and hospital-bred staphylococcus.

Labor's Civil Rights Program Called a Dismal Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a news release calling attention to the article which appeared in the March edition of Fortune magazine. I believe, however, that my colleagues would derive much benefit from reading the entire article. In this connection I also would like to have them refer to the editorial on the same subject which I placed in the RECORD on February 23, 1959, which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The news release follows:

LABOR'S CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM CALLED A DISMAL FAILURE

NEW YORK, N.Y., February 24.—Labor's ambitious plans for improving the lot of the Negro union member have been a dismal failure, Fortune magazine said today.

Fortune called the AFL–CIO civil rights program, first propounded 3 years ago, a fiasco in both the North and the South.

Despite a federation ruling that all discriminatory provisions must be deleted from member union constitutions, and an AFL–CIO committee to investigate abuses, Fortune reported that Negro workers are today largely excluded from some of the largest unions including the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the Plumbers, and the Locomotive Firemen.

In many other unions, the magazine said, there is a mixed pattern: exclusion in some areas, free acceptance in some, and acceptance in segregated locals in others. Some such mixture characterizes the Bricklayers, Painters, Plasterers, Operating Engineers, Sheet Metal Workers, Railway Clerks, Telegraphers, Maintenance of Way Employees, Railway Carmen, Tobacco Workers, Pulp and Sulphite Workers.

Negroes do best in the big northern cities. In New York, even the Electrical Workers accept them freely. In Chicago, the Plumbers can point to a Negro business agent. However, Negro organizations have been complaining bitterly about one situation involving the Railway Clerks. All over the United States the Clerks have segregated locals. The practice is institutionalized to the point that all Negro local numbers begin with "6." In New York City, for example, Negroes belong to Local 6118, the "Friendship Lodge," while whites belong to Local 783, the "George M. Harrison Lodge." Harrison is the international president of the Clerks.

New President of St. David's Society of Wyoming Valley, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of February 24, 1959:

ST. DAVID'S NEW PRESIDENT

The elevation of John Griffiths of Wilkes-Barre to the presidency of the St. David's Society of Wyoming Valley is recognition of his service to the organization as an officer and member.

Mr. Griffiths is one of the most active members of the society. Currently, in the role of chairman, he is occupied with the preparations for the annual St. David's dinner at Irem Temple on Saturday night. He also is a former vice president and financial secretary. For 24 years he has been affiliated with the Heights St. David's Society.

Mr. Griffiths has devoted a great deal of time and energy to the St. David's Society. He is capable of vast enthusiasm and has a capacity for friendship and leadership that should redound to the benefit of the organization.

A native of the Heights, Mr. Griffiths lives in the house where he was born more than a half-century ago. His father, the late John Griffiths, immigrated to Wilkes-Barre from south Wales 71 years ago. His mother was born here of old Welsh stock, so he comes naturally by his interest in St. David's Society.

As treasurer of First Welsh Presbyterian Church for a quarter century, Mr. Griffiths has played a leading role in its affairs. He and his wife are advisors to the youth fellowship.

Mr. Griffiths also has been interested in education, serving as president of the Custer and G.A.R. Parent-Teacher Associations. He was treasurer of the Man-Cite Club for years and is a member of Fidelity Lodge, Free and Accepted Masons.

As assistant mining engineer for Luzerne County, he is widely known in courthouse circles. Before that he was with the city engineering department. Years ago he was employed by Lehigh Valley Coal Co.

It is no small distinction for a resident of the community to head the St. David's Society and carry on the traditions of 13 centuries. The responsibility is a heavy one, but with his experience he would seem to be well equipped to undertake the assignment.

A Definite Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, elsewhere in today's RECORD I have inserted an article from the Wall Street Journal of March 2, 1959, entitled, "Challenge in Science." A summary of the article is in the first paragraph as follows:

Considering Russia's accelerating pace in research and the Russians' intense motivation to overtake Americans on all fronts, the United States is in danger of losing its overall science leadership within 10 years.

This is, indeed, a sobering statement and so is a statement dated February 26, 1959, of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming. His statement may be summarized as follows:

I have learned, with considerable disappointment, that many schools across the country, for one reason or another, are failing to take advantage of a virtually cost-free opportunity to strengthen the teaching of science and mathematics.

Government surplus equipment suitable for use in teaching science and mathematics is currently declared surplus at the rate of about $100 million in initial value each year.

Although the equipment is available to colleges and universities and to public, parochial and nonprofit private schools throughout the country, only about 20 percent of the scientific items actually find their way into educational institutions.

Mr. Speaker, the implication of the Secretary's statement seems to be that the schools in the United States are at fault in failing to get valuable scientific equipment virtually free. As chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Donable Property of the House Government Operations Committee and as sponsor of Public Law 61 which made surplus property available to educational activities it is my considered judgment that the failure of the educational institutions to make 100 percent use of the surplus equipment is due to lack of leadership and coordination in the executive branch of the Government. I regret that it is necessary to make this statement but since the passage of Public Law 61 in the spring of 1955 there have been numerous examples of lack of cooperation and coordination between the several executive

agencies which are responsible for the execution of the program which was unanimously passed by the Congress.

It is a serious matter, Mr. Speaker, to state on the one hand that the Russians are challenging our leadership in the overall scientific fields and at the same time admitting that useful and necessary scientific items which are surplus to the requirements of the Federal Government are utilized only to the extent of 20 percent for purposes which involve our survival. I urge that Secretary Flemming utilize his authority either directly or through higher echelons and do what is now possible under existing legislation to insure that surplus property when useful and necessary for purposes of education health and civil defense are so employed and at the earliest possible moment.

Last calendar year surplus property at initial cost of $334,109,167 was transferred to the States for purposes of education, health, and civil defense. However, the 1960 budget statement indicates that there will be a total of $8 billion in surplus property declared in fiscal 1959 and a total of $10 billion in fiscal 1960.

Why there is so much surplus property is a serious matter upon which I have often spoken and, of course, involves the necessary organization of the Department of Defense which generates more than 90 percent of all surplus property.

The full statement of Secretary Flemming follows:

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

I have learned, with considerable disappointment, that many schools across the country, for one reason or another, are failing to take advtange of a virtually cost-free opportunity to strengthen the teaching of science and mathematics.

Government surplus equipment suitable for use in teaching science and mathematics is currently declared surplus at the rate of about $100 million in initial value each year.

Although the equipment is available to colleges and universities and to public, parochial, and nonprofit private schools throughout the country, only about 20 percent of the scientific items actually find their way into educational institutions.

Schools that have picked up scientific surplus property have put it to good use in science and mathematics teaching; but there are many more schools that apparently are unaware of the kinds of equipment that they can obtain simply by paying warehousing and transportation costs.

This equipment ranges all the way from push buttons for second graders to jet airplanes for engineering students. It includes nautical and navigation instruments; radio and radar equipment; electric motors and generators; photographic equipment; spectrometers; laboratory items and supplies, including chemicals; lenses, and electronic items and components.

A large part of this equipment comes from the Department of Defense, where it has been used in research laboratories, in training personnel, or in actual operations throughout the country. Other items come from the Atomic Energy Commission, from the laboratories of the Department of Agriculture, from the Veterans' Administration, and from other Federal agencies. Many of the items are in the original packing cases.

The spotty demand for scientific surplus equipment is in sharp contrast to the speed with which other surplus items, such as building supplies for school maintenance and machine tools and materials for vocational education programs, are picked up.

That scientific equipment could be equally valuable to schools and colleges generally—if they know of its existence—is shown by the fact that it is constantly being bought up by dealers, after it has gone begging for a sufficient length of time, and then is resold to schools.

Once property has been determined surplus—that is, its usefulness to the Government has ceased—the Surplus Property Division of this Department assumes responsibility for getting as much of it as possible where it can do the most good. State surplus property agencies—and every State and the District of Columbia has one—let the Department know how much they think will be requested, and the property is transferred to State warehouses. Representatives of schools may visit these State warehouses and select the items they require. Some States also circulate lists of available materials and accept orders by mail.

Real and personal property which is not disposed of in this way is advertised for sale to the public. About a year ago, for example, 100 instruments which record direction and velocity of the wind were declared surplus property, but educational institutions did not ask for them. They were sold to surplus dealers who in turn sold them to schools. Electrical measuring instruments have been sold by the thousands for as little as a few cents each and later resold to schools.

Where real efforts have been made to inform the schools, the results have been extremely gratifying. The North Carolina State agency, for example, has circularized every school in the State with a list of scientific items available, and established a Saturday warehouse open house for science teachers. The State agency now accepts all the scientific equipment it can get, knowing that the schools will put it to good use. In Nebraska the State agency worked with the University of Nebraska in preparing guide sheets for science teachers, to show how available equipment can be modified or adapted. The Texas agency has on its staff a specialist whose chief concern is to see that available scientific equipment is put to maximum use in Texas schools.

I am convinced that all that is needed is more information about what is available in the surplus property warehouses and greater initiative on the part of the schools themselves.

A school can obtain much useful equipment for its science and mathematics courses simply by:

1. Getting in touch with the State surplus property agency and establishing the school's eligibility.

2. Sending the appropriate personnel to the warehouse to see what is actually available or likely to be coming in.

3. Informing each science or mathematics teacher what is available and at the same time obtaining a list of items that each teacher would like to have for his classes.

4. Providing the State agency with a list of desired items so that the State agency can be on the lookout for them as they become surplus.

In many instances it is simply a matter of backing the school bus or station wagon up to the loading platform of the warehouse, picking up previously selected items and driving off with them.

Valuable scientific equipment constantly comes on this market. Within a few weeks 19 unused dynamometers for checking engine efficiency are likely to be available in the New Orleans area, left over from the Michaud ordnance plant, which formerly built tanks. Each has an acquisition cost of more than $11,000. These dynamometers will—I hope—find their way into engineering schools which need them.

A large number of secondary schools, colleges, and universities have taken advantage of the opportunity to obtain valuable equipment at little or no cost. Just last week $4 million worth of radar units were allocated to universities and colleges. Last fall a $1,300,000 aerial navigation trainer was given to the University of Pennsylvania, which will use its components in building a nuclear reactor. Electronic computors have been given to the University of New Mexico, the Louisiana Polytechnic Institution, the University of Kansas, and George Washington University in Washington, D.C. Students in a Kentucky high school operate a "ham" radio station put together with surplus property—and students in a Virginia technical school operate their own TV station—also assembled from surplus property. The Aeronautical Engineering Department of the University of Maryland has constructed a supersonic wind tunnel from parts of a former Japanese wind tunnel and two large steel tanks formerly used by the Navy in conducting a diving school.

The surplus property utilization program as a whole has made major contributions to our schools, and our public health and civil defense agencies since its establishment in 1946.

During the past 13 years 84,522 acres of land and 6,871 buildings have been conveyed to colleges, universities, and junior colleges. These represent an acquisition and improvement cost of over $296 million.

Over 20,000 buildings have been transferred to elementary and high schools, mostly for use as shops and classrooms. The facilities given to public schools through surplus property are worth more than $500 million.

Early in 1958 vocational and trade schools—and colleges and universities—reported an urgent need for machine tools to expand training facilities and replace obsolete equipment. For this reason, increased emphasis was given this phase of the surplus property program. During 1958, 7,476 machine tools were allocated, with an acquisition cost of nearly $13½ million. This represents an increase over 1957 of 339 percent in the number of machine tools donated, and a 312-percent increase in their acquisition cost. Additional thousands of components, accessories and supplies for these machines, as well as related testing and measuring equipment, were also given to schools. As patterns of defense production continue to change, even more machines are expected to be available in the tools-for-schools program. These machine tools should be in especial demand by area vocational educational programs now being established or expanded under title VIII of the National Defense Education Act.

During the past year, about 80 percent of all surplus personal property was distributed to schools, about 10 percent to hospital and health facilities, and 10 percent for civil defense purposes.

Since the inception of the surplus property utilization program in 1946, personal property with a Government acquisition cost of $1,590,835,673 had been made available to State agencies for donation for health, education, and civil defense purposes. Real property with an acquisition cost of $742,373,674 has been transferred to health and educational institutions.

Hon. Latham Castle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower is to be congratulated for nominating the present attorney general of the State of Illinois, Latham

Castle, to become a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit—Illinois—to succeed the late Judge Philip J. Finnegan.

Latham Castle is of old Illinois pioneer stock. His grandfather, Miles Beach Castle, an early settler in De Kalb County, founded the Sandwich State Bank in 1856. Latham, after service in World War I, was graduated from Northwestern University Law School in 1924. He became city attorney of Sandwich, Ill., in 1926; and in 1928 was elected States attorney of De Kalb County, reelected in 1932 and 1936. His future in the law continued in 1942 until 1952 as county judge. In 1952 he was elected attorney general of the State of Illinois and reelected in 1956.

Latham Castle is a legal scholar as well as a brilliant lawyer. He represents the highest ideals in his profession. He has never forgotten his loyalties to friendship. His career as a public servant has been marked with a real sense of high integrity. He has a fine mind, and life's experience has mellowed his judgment and understanding. His judicial training, together with a high quality of the understanding of law enforcement, both as States attorney and attorney general, have prepared him for the responsibility of this high office.

I congratulate him, his lovely mate, Georgiana, and his son, John, for this merited honor. The court of appeals will welcome such an illustrious son of the law.

Eric Allen, Jr., Discusses Individual Liberties and Wins a George Washington Honor Medal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in February, Eric W. Allen, Jr., managing editor of the Medford Mail Tribune, won a Freedoms Foundation award for his December 4, 1957, editorial "Liberty Versus License."

In his fine editorial Eric Allen wrote:

In determining the principles which govern human relationships, one must go back to those which have been proven, time and time again, and are the only ones which will work. They stem, actually, from the Golden Rule.

And in a democracy they can be embodied in the idea of the greatest good for the greatest number, and the belief that there should be the greatest possible liberty for all—but license for none.

His words pertain to the Bill of Rights and individual liberties under our form of constitutional Government. His editorial was 1 of 33 selected from throughout the United States.

I am proud to have Eric as a friend and, on occasion, as a helpful and thoughtful critic.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news story from the February 23, 1959, edition of the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune announcing the Oregon winners of Freedoms Foundation awards and Eric Allen's prize-winning editorial, "Liberty Versus License":

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune, Feb. 23, 1959]

ERIC ALLEN, JR., RECEIVES FREEDOM GROUP'S AWARD

VALLEY FORGE, PA.—Four Oregon individuals and 4 Salem schools were announced today as recipients of 1958 Freedom awards by the Freedoms Foundation here.

The awards are made annually to individuals, organizations, and schools throughout the country for their contributions toward a better understanding of the American way of life during 1958.

Individual awards winners for Oregon included:

Eric W. Allen, Jr., managing editor of the Medford Mail-Tribune, a George Washington honor medal for an editorial, "Liberty Versus License."

Henry Slater, Burns, an honor medal for an essay, "Let's Stand Up and Be Counted."

Judy McKenzie, McMinnville, honor medal award for youth public address, "What the Flag Means To Me."

Dr. Mark A. Talney, Portland, a second place award of $50 and George Washington honor medal, for a sermon, "George Washington: Example of True Greatness."

The Salem schools honored were Englewood, Leslie Junior High, Morningside, and Richmond.

LIBERTY VERSUS LICENSE

Americans are rightly jealous of their freedom—their liberty to do as they will without hinderance.

This historic trait, which has grown for a longer time that the Nation has existed, is an admirable one. But, like every other good trait, it can be overextended.

In the democratic philosophy, liberty should extend just so far as the liberty of the next man. In other words, one can do anything he wants unless it harms another.

That is the test of when liberty becomes license.

One sees examples of this on all sides, and at all levels, in big things and small.

It was true when the early timber barons cut off the forests of Michigan and the Dakotas, leaving infertile and flood-producing hills for future generations.

It is true of the reckless driver. No one cares particularly if he gets hurt—it is the lives and property of the others he endangers that require traffic law enforcement.

It is true of the obnoxious couple in the theater, who loudly munch popcorn or converse freely without thought of the discomfort or inconvenience to others.

One of the classic examples was the judicial ruling that freedom of speech does not give anyone a right to yell "Fire!" in a crowded theater.

There are other examples, close to home both in time and distance.

Does one man's enjoyment of a fishing stream entitle him to oppose, on any basis, measures designed to control floods for the protection of the lives and property of others?

Does one family's desire to own a home without restrictions grant them the right to construct a septic tank the overflow from which threatens the health of their neighbor's children?

Does a logger's right to harvest timber carry with it the right to do so in a way which creates stream pollution and the danger of erosion?

Does a man's right to do business grant him the authority to destroy property values of another, perhaps by building a wrecking yard or slaughterhouse next door to an attractive home?

These are questions which any growing community must face, and think about, and answer.

For they are questions which continually arise as more and more people settle in an area. And if they are not settled, in principle, they will result in bitterness and acrimony. And then it will be too late. In some instances, it is already too late.

In determining the principles which govern human relationships, one must go back to those which have been proven, time and time again, and are the only ones which will work. They stem, actually, from the Golden Rule.

And in a democracy they can be embodied in the idea of the greatest good for the greatest number, and the belief that there should be the greatest possible liberty for all—but license for none.—E.A.

Why Municipalities Oppose Bill To Amend Natural Gas Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, several days ago a group of the Alabama League of Municipalities, under the able leadership of executive director Ed E. Reid, met in Washington with members of the Alabama congressional delegation.

Along with other mayors, Hon. H. H. Dees, mayor of Atmore and past president of the organization, made a report which I am privileged to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHY MUNICIPALITIES OPPOSE BILL TO AMEND NATURAL GAS ACT

(By H. H. Dees, mayor of Atmore)

Gentlemen, one of the bills under consideration of the 86th Congress would, if enacted, work serious detriment to the municipalities and the people of Alabama, as well as to the entire Nation.

I refer to the bill known as H.R. 366—the Harris bill—to amend the Natural Gas Act so as to remove some of the regulation of the Federal Power Commission over the producers of natural gas.

This is a reoccurring issue in Congress, and it has an unsavory history. The bill of the 84th Congress, which would have exempted natural gas producers completely from Federal regulation, was passed by Congress over the objections of many Congressmen, including our own KENNETH ROBERTS of the Fourth Alabama District, who is a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which handles natural gas legislation. Congressman ROBERTS has fought this legislation every time it was proposed, and he is actively opposing the present measure.

When the 84th Congress sent that Natural Gas bill to the President, he returned it without approval. The President explained that he was distressed over efforts of certain private persons to press passage of this bill to further their own interests by highly questionable activities.

COMPROMISE BILL DROPPED LAST YEAR

Of course, those people who fostered that bill would not let it die, and another compromise bill came up in the 85th Congress. This one was reported out of committee,

but it was also killed in questionable circumstances. Some Texas Republicans held a big dinner to try to raise money to influence Congressmen to vote for their bill; and when the political blunder was uncovered, the bill was never even mentioned again during that session.

Now there is a new bill, substantially the same as that of the 85th Congress, which is called a compromise bill because it gives the FPC certain regulatory authority. However, the power to regulate is so circumscribed that it does not in any measure serve to protect the consuming areas of Alabama and the rest of the Nation from unjustified increases in the price of natural gas. The exploitation of the consumer is assured in the provisions of this bill.

This bill specifically prohibits the Federal Power Commission from considering costs or from using the public utility rate base cost-of-service concept or formula in determining what is nebulously called the "reasonable market price." Determination of this price in accurate degree would appear near impossible. For the Commission is called upon to set up a reasonable market price through consideration of a number of factors, including the last sale, highest price, lowest price, weighted highest price, average field price or other price, as well as other things. One of the things the Commission is directed to consider in arriving at the vague reasonable market price is whether the contract price was arrived at competitively and in arm's length bargaining. This is to be done, presumably, despite the frequent close community of interest between pipeline companies and producers through mutual ownership, in whole or in part.

COST FINDING SHOULD BE PART OF REGULATORY PROCESS

Admitting that costs not always are easy to obtain, it is nonetheless true that their use is imperative in making a determination of a fair price. A staff member of the Philadelphia Gas Works has stated, and I quote:

"We believe that cost finding is and will continue to be an essential part of the regulatory process; that new approaches are necessary; and that it will be possible to develop procedures by which the Federal Power Commission can determine fair cost levels, against which it can evaluate rates for natural gas in the field as they may be proposed. We believe that the end result can mean an economically healthy and expanding producing industry, while at the same time affording protection to the consumer against unnecessary price increases."

Departure from the cost principle coupled with the involved and weak regulatory power of the FPC as prescribed in this bill foreshadows a serious hike in the price of natural gas to 22 million householders and 2 million industrial establishments in the United States. Proponents of the bill themselves concede that prices of natural gas will rise if the reasonable market price yardstick is applied. It has been estimated that a price increase of 5 cents per thousand cubic feet of natural gas would increase the field price to consumers in Alabama alone by $7 million a year. A 10-cent-per-thousand-cubic-feet increase would boost the annual field price in my home State by $14.7 million. Over the Nation, a 10-cent-per-thousand-cubic-foot raise would mean $633 million more in consumer costs. It is possible that natural-gas consumers could expect an ultimate 15-cent increase, at a new cost to the Nation's consumers of more than $950 million a year. Not only is there this direct cost to natural-gas users, but there is an accompanying hike in the cost of electricity whenever natural gas field prices are allowed to jump upward. According to a study made by Energy Research Associates, each 5-cent-per-thousand-cubic-foot increase in the field price of gas would raise the cost of producing electricity in the United States by $58,176,307 a year. A full 15-cent field-price increase would mean a $174,528,923 boost in the cost to gas-consuming electricity producers each year. This increase would mean Alabama consumers of natural gas to generate electricity would pay $3,278,030 a year more for their electricity than they now pay, and this cost increase would be passed along to the thousands of Alabamians who use electricity from these sources.

PRICE INCREASES WOULD HIT HOMEOWNERS

It is pertinent to note that these price increases will, for the major part, be borne by the homeowner. It is the private citizen who will pay the bulk of costs—including the profit—while the industries pay little more than the actual cost of the gas plus transportation. These consumers are captive users of natural gas inasmuch as they are tied to the ends of pipelines and have invested more than $12 billion in gas-burning equipment. This fact negates another argument of the proponents of this bill that natural gas is a commodity like oil and coal and is the only commodity subject to utility-type regulation. This is a false look at the situation. Natural gas is not transported like coal or oil by motor, rail or water. Natural gas must be transported through an expensive pipeline extending from source to consumer. Natural gas thus acquires the characteristics of a utility—of a monopoly, if you will—and thus makes it a seller's market. Once a pipeline is built, it cannot simply be picked up and cast about like a garden hose in search of a cheaper, more economical gas. Neither is it economically feasible for the consumer faced with rising natural gas prices to discontinue his use of gas and switch over to coal, oil or some other fuel.

DEVELOPMENT OF GAS SOURCES NOT IMPEDED

When the proponents of this legislation concede to the fact that this disturbing rise in costs of natural gas to consumers is inherent in this bill, they attempt to justify this by claiming that there must be a change in present Federal regulations to stimulate the drilling of new wells and further exploration by gas and oil companies. There has been no convincing evidence that development of gas resources is being impeded by the kind of regulation permissible under existing law. Nor is there evidence that the industry has not prospered, nor will continue to prosper, under the current regulations.

Since the Phillips Petroleum Co. case of June 1954 when the Supreme Court held that the Natural Gas Act applies also to the sales of natural gas by independent producers who are engaged in interstate commerce for resale, the natural gas companies have fared quite well. According to Federal Power Commission reports, the net income of natural gas pipeline companies which file statements with FPC has risen steadily since the Phillips decision. The 1954 net income was up to $166,163,000, or 7.4 percent more than in 1953, when it was slightly over $154.6 million. In 1955, it was $219.3 million and in 1956 it was $241.4 million. The pipeline firms under FPC jurisdiction obtained Commission authorization to add more than 2.25 billion cubic feet of daily delivery capacity during the year ending June 30, 1956. That was some half-billion cubic feet more than in the preceding 12 months. Do these figures indicate the need for a mass giveaway that would benefit a small special interest group of less than 200 big gas producers? Even if there did exist the necessity to modify present controls to encourage natural gas development, there would need to be retained some manner of formula for setting prices. Not to do so, to use the words of an editorial in the Washington Post of last June "would make a mockery of the regulation under local laws of gas distributing companies, placing local regulation completely at the mercy of a vague concept of fair wholesale values administered without legal guidance."

THE FPC MUST HAVE AUTHORITY TO REGULATE

The Federal Power Commission must have the authority to regulate gas at the wellhead if the consumer is to be protected from exploitation by excessive costs. The only way to protect the unorganized, unrepresented consumer from being overcharged by a few powerful gas and oil concerns is to regulate the field price of natural gas. That regulation must be one defined in specific terms and not so circumscribed as to be impossible to impose. Defeat of the Harris bill would mean continued FPC authority which would result in a satisfactory balance between production and profits, and consumption at a reasonable price.

Mayor Luther Kniffer of Wilkes-Barre Plans To Retire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of February 19, 1959.

END OF POLITICAL ERA—RETIREMENT OF MAYOR KNIFFEN

While the decision of Mayor Luther Kniffen to retire from public life was not a surprise because of his health and advancing years, nevertheless it will have widespread repercussions at City Hall and in county as well as in city politics.

Although he will not be a candidate for a fourth term, it is inevitable that he will continue in the public eye because of his prominence and influence as well as his role as a leading funeral director in the community. Men like Mayor Kniffen just don't drop from sight when they sever official ties.

The city's chief executive has been honored as few men have in the history of the community. As mayor, councilman and school director, he held three key posts in his native city, evidence of the high esteem in which he was held. Luzerne County added to this impressive record with the offices of sheriff and coroner.

But it was as mayor of Wilkes-Barre that he unquestionably derived his greatest satisfaction. The office, in the first place, had for him sentimental attachment because it was held by his colorful father, the late Lewis Kniffen. But it was not as his father's son that he was elected three times, but on the basis of his own record as an official, citizen, and neighbor.

As he starts down the home stretch, Mayor Kniffen can look back on 11 hectic years. The office has not been a sinecure during the past decade. Wilkes-Barre, like the world at large, has been through troubled times and the end is not in sight for either.

As mayor, Mr. Kniffen has had far more to do than to greet distinguished visitors, sign proclamations and attend dinners. The office itself made him chief executive and principal law enforcement officer. By statute, he has been head of the Department of Public Affairs which includes the Bureau of Police, the Bureau of Law and the Bureau of Weights and Measures. He has been chair-

man of the Board of Revision of Taxes and Appeals, the Flood Control Committee, the Sinking Fund Committee and the Traffic Committee. As head of City Council, he perhaps wielded his greatest influence, since his authority extended into every sphere of municipal government, directly or indirectly.

Few people realize what is involved in such an office. Mayor Kniffen, like President Eisenhower, has been living in a figurative fish bowl and his chores are never done, for he is subject to duty around the clock. Sometimes, it is difficult, under these circumstances, to understand the fascination of the White House and City Hall unless it is the glamor, the prestige and the challenge of public service.

Mayor Kniffen's success as a civic and fraternal leader has been no less outstanding than his career as a public official. It has been no accident that he won recognition in so many fields.

With 10 months of his fiscal term ahead of him and countless years in private life, Wilkes-Barre, of necessity, must delay its farewells, but this newspaper will take the liberty, on behalf of a grateful public, to extend best wishes.

Federal Meat Inspection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a joint statement supporting meat inspection appropriations contained in the budget request. I urgently request my colleagues to support the budget request of $21,475,000 for the Meat Inspection Division of the Department of Agriculture.

The statement follows:

A JOINT STATEMENT SUPPORTING MEAT INSPECTION APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. Homemaker demands assurance that the meat she buys for her family's dinner table is clean and wholesome. Congress, more than a half century ago, decided that she has the right to this guarantee. It, therefore, established a meat inspection agency.

We, the officers of consumer, public health, farm, livestock, producer, labor and management organizations, agree that Mrs. Homemaker and her family must be fully and effectively protected. We are, therefore, anxious that the Meat Inspection Division of the Department of Agriculture obtain sufficient funds to employ an adequate staff of inspectors.

For a period, which fortunately ended last year, the Meat Inspection Division was inadequately supported. It could not increase its staff of inspectors to meet the steadily rising demands, which resulted from the meat industry's decentralization and growth. The increase in funds in the appropriation and supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1959 have, we are glad to say, again put the division on the road to full effectiveness.

The $21,475,000 budget request for the Meat Inspection Division for fiscal year 1960, although hardly generous, does promise to continue to permit the hiring of new and needed inspectors. We, frankly, would have liked to have seen a somewhat higher request, but we hope this amount will prove adequate.

We, therefore, urge Congress to approve the budget request of $21,475,000 for the Meat Inspection Division of the Department of Agriculture. We believe it is the minimum amount necessary to permit the division to keep an adequate staff of inspectors, who must provide the consumer protection so necessary to our Nation's health.

Thomas J. Lloyd and Patrick E. Gorman, President and Secretary-Treasurer, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (AFL–CIO); Radford Hall, Executive Secretary, American National Cattlemen's Association; Homer R. Davison, President, American Meat Institute; A. Z. Baker, President, American Stock Yards Association; James G. Patton, President, The National Farmers Union; Herschel D. Newsom, Master, The National Grange; John A. Killick, Executive Secretary, National Independent Meat Packers Association; Dr. R. A. Hendershott, Secrtary, United States Livestock Sanitary Association; E. F. Forbes, President and General Manager, Western States Meat Packers Association.

Lincoln: Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, just over 150 years ago, in a small log cabin with a packed dirt floor, young Dennis Hanks held a new born baby. As he returned the babe to its mother, he remarked, "He'll never come to much."

Just a little over half a century later, Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton stood by the death bed of a President and, in an emotion-filled voice, pronounced a benediction on that same child, now the American martyr: "Now he belongs to the ages," Stanton said.

In the magnificent lifetime between those two statements, the hard-working, self-educated rail splitter from Kentucky earned for himself the nickname of "Honest Abe" and the reputation of a wise and just man. Monuments made of stone have fallen, but the monument contained in the name and reputation of Abraham Lincoln will endure for thousands of years, just as the reputations of the greatest of the ancient Greeks live today.

Lincoln freed the slaves, saved the Union, and, but for his assassination, would have saved the South and the Nation the horrors of reconstruction. He loved all mankind. His triumph over personal obstacles is one of the greatest chapters in human history.

I do not see how anyone can visit the beautiful quiet of the Lincoln Memorial here, with its classic statue, or come to these congressional halls without hearing softly re-echoing the proud words: "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

On a Sunday in February I went to the old Ford's Theater here where President Lincoln was assassinated. There, as a member of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, and its observance of the 150th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth, I heard an address by Professor Earl W. Wiley of Ohio State University. He is chairman of the Ohio Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission.

Mr. President, I felt the address, entitled, "Abraham Lincoln: Lest We Forget," worthy of the Nation's attention. I request unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN: LEST WE FORGET

I am genuinely happy of the opportunity to be here today. I know of no other place where I would rather be on this sequicentennial Sabbath than in this memorial that knew Lincoln's presence. I know of no other subject so pertinent to the national hour as that of Abraham Lincoln. I know of no other duty more urgent on our citizens as that of paying homage to the memory of this man whose ideals are being flouted in many places. I know of no other of our honored dead more worthy of our prayers and acclaim, and whose memory holds more for us, the living, than him we come here to honor.

I leave to the historians the task of revealing anything new about Lincoln. In the few minutes I am privileged to address you, I turn to Lincoln's own words for my theme. Words as you know are important. They make you laugh. They make you cry. They make you love. They make you hate. They make you happy. They make you sad. But it is so easy to get them out of place. This was shown by an incident that occurred at an important dinner party. The host, giving last minute instructions, reminded the cook not to serve the salad dressed, but to serve it undressed, since he wanted to take care of that detail himself. At the salad course he was horrified to see the cook, clad only in her slip, come through the door carrying the salad bowl. "What's the meaning of this?" he asked. "You said undressed," she retorted, "but this is as far as I go!" Lincoln, too, utilized humor for his purpose. But today I would keep Lincoln, the man of laughter, in context with his overall development as one who grew eloquent on the subject of human rights. The day came when he spoke immortal words at Gettysburg. It is the story of that development I would share with you today.

Six months following Lincoln's arrival in Illinois from Indiana, he made his first political address. He was 21 years of age. Accompanied by John Hanks, his cousin, he attended an open air rally held near Decatur, and not far from the spot where the oxcart conveying the worldly possessions of the Hankses, the Johnstons, and the Lincolns, jolted to its final stop in the long trek from Pigeon Creek. When John F. Posey, a local character, completed his remarks, Hanks openly declared the address a poor effort and boasted that young Lincoln could make a better speech.

Without the slightest show of stage fright, Abe mounted the box Hanks turned down for him, and declared a program of internal improvements essential to Illinois' economic progress. He wore a light blue jeans coat, short in the sleeves, trousers that failed to reach the tops of his lowcut shoes, and a broadbrimmed hat. The journey to Gettysburg had begun.

In the summer of 1831 Lincoln took up residence in New Salem, a frontier community located on a high bluff overlooking the Sangamon River. He was fortified with a disarming gift of gab, a fondness for the fanfare of the crowd, a liking for people, boundless ambition, a fund of droll stories, and an

empty purse. He chatted nimbly with people as he had done in the past—at the mill, at an election booth, in Rutledge's tavern, or on the village green. His stock of tall tales, his feats of mimicry, his pranks of ventriloquism joined with gay satire, all recited with a merry twinkle of the eye and tuned to the soft cadence of a Kentucky drawl, threw the Clary Grove boys into fits of laughter, and amused his mates banked around the mosquito-ridden bivouacs of the Black Hawk uprising. Lincoln became the genial Oliver Goldsmith of New Salem Hill.

But he was something more than the village wag. He proved himself able to hold his own in the forensic contests sponsored by the New Salem Literary Society. He analyzed and debated such questions as, Are the pioneers of the West entitled to a pension? What is dearer to man, life or liberty? Which is the greater evil, slavery or intemperance, in the United States? Supposing a law be passed freeing the Negroes, which would be the more politic in the United States, to educate them and make them equal citizens with us or colonize them in another land and hold them as other allies?

Young Lincoln exchanged the coin of words for the good will of his New Salem associates. The roistering lads of Clary Grove put their mark of approval on him, and more substantial residents, like James Rutledge, set him apart as a youth of promise. Denton Offutt predicted a bright future for his young clerk. Mentor Graham tutored him in the rudiments of grammar. Jack Kelso read poetry to him. John Calhoun encouraged him to study the elements of surveying. Bowling Green taught him the procedures of the squire's court. So it went, and when Lincoln recruited a company of volunteers for the Black Hawk war, the men elected him captain.

Geniality was paying off for Lincoln. It was an easy step from here to politics, for a democratic society entertains the credo that a popular man makes an able public officer. Presently he became a candidate for the general assembly, encouraged by friends to take the step. This was in 1832. He lost the election, standing 7th among the 13 candidates, 4 of whom were chosen. Yet he polled more than half of the votes cast in the entire county, and of the 208 votes cast in his home precinct, he received 205.

Politics were personal on the frontier. The color of a candidate's hair, the size of his nose, the fit of his coat, would sometimes assume an importance out of all proportion to the issues of the campaign. To survive in pioneer politics, accordingly, Lincoln must cultivate an ad hominem style of argument. He proved an apt student, as shown by the following attack he made on no other than President Van Buren. A member of the opposition in the Illinois House declared that results of the late elections in the States indicated that every State in the Union would vote for Mr. Van Buren in the next presidential election:

"Address that argument to cowards and knaves; with the free and the brave it will effect nothing. It may be true, if it must, let it. * * * I know that the great volcano at Washington, aroused and directed by the evil spirit that reigns there, is belching forth the lava of political corruption, in a current broad and deep, which is sweeping with frightful velocity over the whole length and breadth of the land, bidding fair to leave unscathed no green spot or living things, while on its bosom are riding like demons on the waves of Hell, the imps of that evil spirit, and fiendishly taunting all those who dare resist its destroying course, with the helplessness of their effort; and knowing this, I cannot deny that all may be swept away. Broken by it, I, too, may be; bow to it I never will."

That represented Lincoln's invective in December 1839. It marked the voice of youth, defiant, vehement, rash, insolent, positive, high-minded. A decade later, he turned his partisan eloquence on General Cass. He was now Congressman Lincoln, speaking in the Hall of Representatives:

"By the way, Mr. Speaker, did you know I am a military hero. Yes, sir; in the days of the Black Hawk war I fought, bled, and came away. Speaking of General Cass' career reminds me of my own. I was not at Stillman's defeat, but I was about as near to it as Cass was to Hull's surrender; and, like him, I saw the place afterward. It is quite certain I did not break my sword, for I had none to break; but I beat a musket pretty badly on one occasion. If Cass broke his sword, the idea is he broke it in desperation; I bent the musket by accident. If General Cass went in advance of me in picking blueberries, I guess I surpassed him in charges upon the wild onions. If he saw any live, fighting Indians, it was more than I did; but I had a good many bloody struggles with the mosquitoes, and although I never fainted from loss of blood, I can truly say I was often very hungry. Mr. Speaker, if I should ever conclude to doff whatever our Democratic friends may suppose there is of black-cockade federalism about me, and therefore they shall take me up as their candidate for the presidency, I protest they shall not make fun of me, as they have of General Cass, by attempting to write me into a military hero."

In 1850, President Zachary Taylor died, and Lincoln eulogized him in memorial services in Chicago. He again showed a fondness for the sophomoric word and swelling phrase in portions of his address:

"And now the din of battle nears the fort and sweeps obliquely by; a gleam of hope flies through the half imprisoned few; they fly to the wall; every eye is strained—it is—it is—the stars and stripes are still aloft. Anon the anxious brethren meet; and while hand strikes hand, the heavens are rent with a loud, long, glorious, gushing cry of victory, victory, victory."

The serenity of the Gettysburg Address still lay far beyond Lincoln's power of expression, and he now was in his forty-second year. But grave issues were in the making that called for restraint, for the calm and deliberative treatment that comes only with maturity. In 1854 the Senate of the United States passed the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and the ageless subject of slavery again commanded the headlines. It was the eve of a political hurly-burly that carried sickening implications. But even revolutions must be defined. Some one among the controversialists must state terms and specify objectives. When that man speaks the crowd pauses in its confusion and looks to him for guidance, inclined to follow one who can phrase what lies beyond their own poor gift of expression.

The man to whom the anti-Nebraskans presently turned in their uncertainty was Abraham Lincoln. He established his claim to authority on the afternoon of October 4, 1854, in the Hall of Representatives, in Springfield, Ill. An audience representing all shades of opinion on the new legislation heard him speak. Among them was Senator Stephen A. Douglas, author of the repeal measure.

That day Lincoln shed his Whig coat. He was something more than the rough-and-ready partisan who had carried the party torch for 20 years. This day he was the nationalist. He planted himself squarely on the Declaration of Independence. He was gracious and tolerant toward the South. He made no thrusts toward Douglas. He stood on high moral ground, on the thesis that slavery was wrong in principle, and being wrong in principle, its extension into free territory was immoral. He summed up his position in a passage that foreshadowed his eloquence at Gettysburg:

"This declared indifference, but, as I must think, covert real zeal, for the spread of slavery, I cannot but hate. I hate it because of the monstrous injustice of slavery itself. I hate it because it deprives our republican example of its influence in the world; enables the enemies of free institutions with plausibility to taunt us as hypocrites; causes the real friends of freedom to doubt our sincerity and especially because it forces so many good men among ouselves into an open war with the very fundamental principles of civil liberty, criticizing the Declaration of Independence, and insisting that there is no right principle of action but self-interest."

During the following months the political situation intensified. Then at candlelight, June 16, 1858, a tired group of delegates and alternates and spectators assembled in the same Hall of Representatives in Springfield where Lincoln spoke the words just quoted. That day the Illinois Republicans had met in convention, deliberated on the problems confronting such a body, drafted the customary resolutions of purpose, and designated Abraham Lincoln as their first and only choice to oppose Senator Douglas for his seat in the Senate.

A burst of applause announced the arrival of Abraham Lincoln, and all eyes turned to the rear door of the hall. The tall solemn-faced man elbowed his way down an aisle, as a thousand throats thundered out a noisy greeting. Men in shirtsleeves jumped to their feet and waved their arms. Lincoln calmly mounted the platform and sat down. The formalities completed, he walked forward on the stand, holding a manuscript in his hand. He paused, surveyed his audience, and in a deliberate and distinct voice read:

"If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could then better judge what to do, and how to do it.

"We are now far into the fifth year, since a policy was initiated, with the avowed object, and confident promise, of putting an end to slavery agitation.

"Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only, not ceased, but has constantly augmented.

"In my opinion, it will not cease, until a crisis shall have been reached, and passed.

"'A house divided against itself cannot stand.'

"I believe this Government cannot endure; permanently half slave and half free.

"I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided.

"It will become all one thing, or all the other.

"Either the opponents of slavery, will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push it forward, till it shall become alike in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South.

"Have we no tendency to the latter condition?"

Lincoln summed up the answer to his query in an allegory. He was too seasoned a speaker to discuss at length the historical implications of the repeal of the Missouri compromise, as he had done in 1854. But he mentioned the repeal policy. He mentioned the Dred Scott decision, and he referred to the apparent studied indifference that men in high places had shown toward the spread of slavery into free territory. He likened Democratic leadership since 1852 to the building of a house:

"We cannot absolutely know that all these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different proportions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places and by different workmen—Stephen, Franklin, Roger, and James, for instance—and when we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make

the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortices exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places * * * we find it impossible to not believe that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn up before the first lick was struck."

The men of the prairies brought up on the parables of the Bible and the fables of Aesop could understand that language. The address constituted the starting point of Lincoln's national recognition. The New York Tribune, June 24, 1858, reproduced the speech in full, and editorially paid high tribute to Lincoln. Several Illinois newspapers printed the text of the speech. Country journals quoted parts of it. Theodore Parker, in Boston, considered the address excellent. The daring aspersions in the speech led to the joint meetings between Lincoln and Douglas later in the year, when Lincoln seized on the opportunity to express himself on the great issues disturbing his generation. One result of these contests took Lincoln into Ohio, Wisconsin, Kansas, and the East, there to continue his brilliant analysis of political principles that would have a bearing on the Presidential election of 1860.

Lincoln made his greatest political argument at Cooper Institute, February 27, 1880, in New York City. He addressed a brimming audience of 12 to 15 hundred people. William Cullen Bryant introduced him to the audience. Henry Ward Beecher, George William Curtis, and Horace Greeley, were among the celebrities in attendance. But the majority of those present were working men. This was a rare opportunity for a man politically ambitious.

Lincoln found his text in an argument Senator Douglas had contributed to the Harper's Magazine, published in September 1859. Lincoln's old rival there sought to show, using historical evidence, that the founders of the Republic intended that each political unit of the Nation had the authority to decide for itself its disposition of the slavery institution. It all led up to the conclusion that popular sovereignty had been the guiding principle of the men who founded the Republic.

Through the years from 1854 Lincoln, also, had approached the much-bandied question on historical grounds. But not in Cooper Institute. He had grown more objective in his thinking. So he approached the problem statistically. The founders of the Government were, he defined, the 39 men eligible to vote on the adoption of the Constitution in Convention. By actual count, he represented, showing studied investigation of the evidence, 21 of these. "A clear majority of the whole—certainly understood no proper division of local from Federal authority, nor any part of the Constitution (that), forbade the Federal Government to control slavery in the Federal Territories."

Lincoln, the tall, guant guest speaker in the ill-fitting clothes, took the floor at Cooper Institute as a backwoods orator from the unwashed West, and left it as a potential nominee of the Republican Party for President. He placed himself closer to Seward. He placated the fears of Greeley, and won the respect of men like Beecher. Publication of his address added to his prestige. There were those who read into his remarks something of the insight of Crittenden and Calhoun, something of the spirit of compromise of Clay, something of the eloquence of Webster, as when Lincoln remarked in conclusion, "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it."

A few minutes before 8 o'clock on the gloomy morning of February 11, 1861, Lincoln stood inside the dingy waiting room of the Great Western Railroad in Springfield, Ill., chatting with friends. He was on his way to Washington to assume the duties of President. Foot beats of late arrivals echoed on the wet pavements outside; a thin sheet of rain and sleet lashed the station windows and the engine bell clanged noisily. A final clasp of the hand, a hurried word, and the President-elect mounted the steps of the rear coach and disappeared within.

Presently, in response to calls from the crowd gathered at the station, Lincoln again stood on the car platform. He removed his tall hat from his head, leaned against the brake wheel, and spoke. He relived for a fleeting moment the days when, as a penniless and untaught youth, he came to Springfield to make his home. He referred to his marriage there, to the coming of his children, and to the trials he faced. He mentioned a little mound in the local cemetery where one of his boys lay buried. Then he faced the future. Was he, the humble railsplitter, big enough for the great task that lay before him? The grinding of wheels, the banging of the bell, the hiss of steam, the bumping of car against car, announced the departure. Yet, in unforgettable words he had described the bitter sweet of sorrow that touches the heart of the traveler who turns his back on the old hometown. He was getting nearer to Gettysburg.

Inaugural morning in 1861 clear and cool in the National Capital. A sharp wind ruffled the waters of the Potomac and lashed the flags flung out bravely in Pennsylvania Avenue. The city swarmed with life, youngbloods half eager that the threatened gage of battle be cast and their elders, mindful of fever-stricken camps in Mexico, deprecating the thought of war. Squads of soldiers appeared on the streets and as quickly disappeared. The aged figure of Gen. Winfield Scott on horse left no doubt of that hero's loyalty to the colors he held so high at Lundy's Lane. The click of rifle hammers, the sharp blasts of artillery, the tart smell of smoke and powder, were reminders of what men thought that day.

The bearded Lincoln stood on a rickety platform and sought to maintain the public dignity. He had only words with which to pacify determined men who already had moved into action. He pleaded and argued his case. The note of firmness recalled Jackson. The tone of compromise suggested Clay. The hint of self-government reflected Douglas, and the high sense of tenderness marked Seward. But it was all of no use. The President had an oath in heaven to uphold the Constitution. The Union would be maintained. Yet, in closing, he held out the friendly hand:

"I am loath to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passions may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield, and patriot grave, to every living heart and hearthstone, all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, assuredly they will be, by the better angels of our nature."

War came, and months later came Gettysburg. The gaunt man slowly arose from a rocking chair and shuffled forward on the wooden stand. It was the same man who 30 years before mounted a box turned down for him by John Hanks and made his first public address. "Down in front" a dozen voices chorused. The weary figure in black paused, lowered his head slightly, and waited for the rumble of the crowd to cease. Adjusting his steel-rimmed spectacles, pressing out his sheets of manuscripts, he lifted his shrill tenor tones over new-made graves.

Lincoln spoke calmly, deliberately, as if he addressed his Cabinet around a table in the White House. Following Edward Everett's polished elocutionary performance his delivery seemed in contrast. There were no studied gestures; yet the speaker was the same man who once went up and down the aisle of the national hall of Representatives with coattails flying. Occasionally he would emphasize a word or phrase as when he urged the people to rededicate themselves to the restoration of civil rights in the Union for which men had just died. He suddenly dropped his arms and was gone. With startling brevity a classic had been added to the rolls of history. In lyrical rhythms he had captured the universal significance of a particular event. That is the ultimate of effective speech.

The road to Gettysburg was long. Forty years earlier the speaker was a lad at Pigeon Creek, Ind., using a gift of gab to satisfy his craving for recognition among his fellows. He next became the trusted partisan, ready to defend his party against all attacks. He then became the nationalist, and defended the principles of the founders of the Republic. Now, he was the humanist, concerned with men the world over. Lincoln had grown tall. He was 7 feet tall at Gettysburg. He had ascended to the pinnacle where the better angels of our nature reach down to assist struggling men.

Remarks by Gov. Ernest F. Hollings Before the Washington Light Infantry Annual Banquet, Charleston, S.C., February 23, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an address by His Excellency Ernest F. Hollings, Governor of South Carolina, delivered before the Washington Light Infantry, Charleston, S.C., one of the oldest and most distinguished organizations of its kind in the entire country:

REMARKS BY GOV. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, BEFORE THE WASHINGTON LIGHT INFANTRY ANNUAL BANQUET, CHARLESTON, S.C., FEBRUARY 23, 1959

It is truly inspiring to join in this memorable anniversary of an organization so closely enmeshed with the history and the hopes of our great Nation. Born in the trying infancy of a new Union, the Washington Light Infantry has since marched through the crucibles of war and the quiet testing of peace. If any member of that first unit in 1807 could have lived through all the decades since, he would have a vivid story to tell of the ebb and flow of our national defense. In 1812 the Nation met its first military test after union and the Washington Light Infantry was mustered into service. In 1847 came the Mexican War and Washington Light Infantry members formed the nucleus for the gallant Company A from Charleston in the famous Palmetto Regiment. In 1843 the Washington Light Infantry took part in the opening of the Citadel after striving diligently to help achieve the military college for the education of our young men, and in 1882 it was again the Washington Light Infantry which came to the aid of the Citadel in getting the institution reopened after the holocaust of civil war. During that war Washington Light Infantry officers and men

formed three companies and fought for the South with courageous distinction. In 1916 came service on the Mexican border and in 1917 the Washington Light Infantry was again called to active duty and rendered distinctive service in some of the greatest battles of World War I. After the war came reorganization as Company B, 118th Infantry, South Carolina National Guard, and in World War II the call to active duty came again for overseas service while the Reserve company took over duties at home. Today this splendid unit, still flying the historic Eutaw flag, stands in readiness for whatever challenges may come.

Details of military organization may differ with the times, but the type of our military institution was determined in the earliest days of our Government. It has not changed since General Washington's day. It recognizes that in a democracy it is the duty of every citizen to defend those things which we all hold dear. The real measure of our national strength is the devotion of the individual American to the well being of America, and the preservation of the human values for which America stands.

This is the philosophy upon which our National Guard, of which the Washington Light Infantry is so vibrant a part, is built. The philosophy of the citizen soldier must always stand at the heart of our defense planning in a democracy such as ours. The second section of the Bill of Rights as contained in the original 10 amendments states:

"A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

That short but all-important section is the foundation on which our entire National Guard structure rests. Its referral to the people is particularly significant in this matter of moral core strength for a successful military force. It again relates the military to the people from which it springs.

We have seen events at times which threatened the strength of the Guard, but the Guard has stood fast in resisting these challenges and remains today as the Nation's largest and most active military reserve. As your Governor, I look forward to my associations with our South Carolina National Guard and pledge my efforts in its behalf wherever needed.

Often here at these Washington Light Infantry occasions we have heard described the tremendous military budgets we face today. These facts are but strong reminders of the total, global nature of the struggle in which we are now engaged, transcending the economic, psychological, and political as well as the military. National leaders have warned us well of the dangers involved—of the need and great cost of adequate military posture. They continually warn us also of the dangers of losing by default through economic collapse.

These things are true. It is well that our people be alerted to these dangers. However, there is another field of just as vital importance which normally goes unheralded. This is the will to win in the heart of the individual citizen, both in and out of uniform. Call it patriotism, moral courage, or call it what you will—if we ever have this quality shaken we may well fear the worse. It is this vital element which I would like to discuss with you tonight.

When Minuteman Joseph Smith grabbed his rifle from the wall and leveled it at approaching redcoats in 1776, there was no question as to why he was there. He was protecting his very home from a hated invader. It was as simple as that.

But down the long march of history as warfare and reasons for warfare have broadened in scope the question of why we fight has become more and more complex, and more and more difficult to comprehend. It was our own Gen. Charles P. Summerall, late president of The Citadel and revered friend of the Washington Light Infantry, who once said while serving as Army Chief of Staff, "The average mind is such that it does not analyze abstract causes or even the great principle over which wars are fought. Men are elemental and practical and cling to real things." World War II veterans, for example, remember well the great lengths to which the Government went in informing them of why we fight. The average soldier, sailor, airman, and marine still sometimes found it hard to answer that question. As one of the generals in charge of this indoctrination expressed it, "In common with too many of their fellow citizens, these young men had little knowledge of the human values at issue in the world arena, values that they would soon be called upon to preserve at the ultimate price of their lives. Was it not the poet, Vachel Lindsay, who passionately cried, 'Not that they die, O Lord, but that they die like sheep'?" Before World War II we paid no attention to such indoctrination—we had always taken for granted the ancient virtues of our people, but in 1941 these complacent assumptions came down like a house of cards. For in that year we found young men in the Armed Forces divided and confused, ignorant of world events. Since they saw no danger, they saw no compelling reason why they should be made to serve.

The long-range, postwar, need for military strength was also obviously not grasped by our people as tremendous pressure was brought to bear to bring the boys home, resulting in the quick destruction of what had been the greatest fighting force in history. This occurred while our eventual enemy, Soviet Russia, was holding firm and preparing for the struggle she saw ahead.

Then we come to Korea and the question of why we fight became even more complex and remote from the man on the firing line. The tempo of indoctrination to answer that question had to be stepped up, and still the answer was not clear. Views among our top military and political leaders were so conflicting and dissension so serious among our citizens that the will to win for the first time came in jeopardy. This was climaxed by the introduction into the annals of the American soldier of a character known as turncoat.

I do not make this as a treasonous observation. Certainly, it is not my intent to degrade the character, ability and courage of the Korean soldier. Never has America fielded a more courageous soldier and yet never with less purpose. He was the civilian yanked from the peacetime summer of 1950, with no warning, and placed in a land very few of us had ever heard of before. There was no sinking of a Lusitania. There was no Pearl Harbor. These United States had not been invaded, and no country we had promised to defend had been trespassed.

Yet, while everyone was talking peace and taking summer vacations, there he was, thousands of miles from home, told to kill or be killed; to sweat and die; to freeze and die; to suffer hardships beyond comprehension; and do everything else but one thing—be victorious. He was told he could not win. Yet he fought on more bravely than ever. He gave blood to his fellowman because the people at home would not contribute blood. He gave to the Korean homeless because the people at home would not contribute to the Korean homeless. For us, we ashamedly call it a conflict, and without shame signed an armistice, leaving him on the battlefield and in the enemy's prison camps.

Gen. Mark Clark, the United Nations commander at the time of the armistice and the greatest patriot of our time, has reported that several hundred American prisoners known to be held by the Communists were left behind. Although the United Nations has since obtained the release of some, General Clark knows, and others in authority know, that there are tonight American soldiers languishing in Communists prisons. These same soldiers were told in 1950 "Home by Christmas." Tonight as we celebrate we hear their parents' plaintive plea, "Which Christmas?" Will our moral courage withstand the pressures which plague us as we try to justify the fact that several years after the armistice, the greatest freedom-loving Nation on earth still has not obtained freedom for these of its sons? What effect does this have on the will to win?

Finally, here in democracy's supposed great bastion, we see internal discord and conflicts which further cloud the vision of the individual citizen in his sense of moral duty to his country. We see U.S. troops thrown into the capital of a sovereign State to enforce measures perpetrated by an increasingly powerful Federal Government. We see troops committed to decimate rights and responsibilities carefully reserved for the States by those who fought for freedom in the 1770's. Though it does not affect our basic loyalty, what about our enthusiasm for the Federal Government? What damage has been done to the soldier's will to win?

When we see a U.S. Supreme Court seemingly intent on using its own interpretation of our Constitution to upset the basic source of our governmental strength—its balance of powers—we rightfully fear some shaking of allegiance to rulings of that Court. The same is true of the instruments of the Court—troops—and the allegiance of the troops.

When we see rights of minorities suppressed before the will of highly organized, powerful pressure groups, we rightfully fear some degree of damage to the system that permits such a tragedy. President Washington, for whom your own illustrious group was named, was careful in his Farewell Address to warn against the dangers of small but artful minorities. He said: "However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely in the course of time and things to become potent engines by which cunning, ambitious and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engine which lifted them to unjust dominion."

When we know that all these things are aided and encouraged by foreign ideologies toward an ultimate goal of a divided America, we have cause for worry and concern.

All these things add to the complexity of building and holding a national defense posture of sufficient strength to guard us militarily, ensure economic solvency and marshal the moral courage of our citizens in the face of the greatest threat we have ever faced.

No matter how far we may move in achieving spectacular new space age weapons of war, we must never forget the finest asset we have ever had or ever will have is the moral strength and courage of the individual citizen—whether he be manning a weapon or holding firm at home. Repeatedly the great captains of history warn that the critical factor in war lies in the moral field. From Bonaparte to MacArthur, the chain of testimony is unbroken—there is no substitute for the will to win. An Army derives its moral strength from the people it defends—from their confidence, their institutions, their beliefs. There is no substitute for this. The nation's will is the soldier's will; the nation's faith is the soldier's faith; the nation's virtues are the soldier's virtues. No army is stronger than its beliefs. Around a hard and enduring moral core we must build our military strength. To do otherwise is to build a colossus of straw.

These are times that demand the best in all of us. No mere outlay of money or

physical resources will bring a day, an hour, or a moment of freedom. Its price is vigilance, sacrifice, and service on the part of each individual American. Gen. J. Lawton Collins, former Army Chief of Staff, put it well when he said, "The most important element of armies has always been men imbued with the will to win. And today the strength of nations is still measured by their ability to produce such men."

National defense is no longer the simple matter of grabbing a gun and taking the nearest cover. It is rather now so complex that it challenges us to the utmost to maintain strength and unity in the hearts of our people, in the fiber of our national economy and in our weapons of war. And, as we well know, it is much more difficult to keep one's guard up in times of relative peace than when the enemy is standing across the firing line.

In our preoccupation with weapons and dollars we must never forget that greatest armament of all—a diligent, courageous, united, and loyal citizenry which knows in its soul that the American way of life is worth any sacrifice to maintain and protect.

It was not the power of the barbarian hordes at the gates of Rome that brought to its knees that civilization which had stood for 10 centuries. Rome was finished long before the enemy finally attacked. It was finished because the character of its people had deteriorated. In their quest for pleasure they had lost their ideal of courage, industry, morality, and national unity which had made Rome master of the known world. It failed because the individual Roman citizen lost his own personal identification with respect to the defense of the state, not only on the battlefield but in every aspect of life. And in more recent years, we witnessed military collapse in France and the Netherlands following moral collapse in the face of the Nazis.

It is fallacy to think that since you are a superior civilization you will always be victorious in world conflict. The oppressed Chinese overthrew Genghis Kahn and the Huns defeated superior Rome because of guts, the will to win. Civilizations survive only when their people have faith and courage in their system. Here in America we feel we are a superior people, and so we are in many respects. But the question of our survival depends on whether we can hold fast to that superiority of spirit which has marked our past victories.

Let us remember that in any future war, whether it be limited or total geographically, it must be total in our human effort if we are to be successful. All who are called must go. All who are called must fight. All who survive must be allowed to come home. All of us—at home or in the field—must stand united if we are to be victorious.

In the sweep of history our military bulwarks will not protect us if we as individuals fail to accept our individual responsibilities with total dedication. May God help us if we ever waiver in our faith in America and our unity as Americans, for therein lies our future safety as a nation.

New Commissioner of the Pennsylvania State Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of February 24, 1959:

POLICE HEAD CONFIRMED

Confirmation by the senate of the appointment of Frank G. McCartney of Lanford as commissioner of the Pennsylvania State police was long overdue.

In the first place, Governor Lawrence is entitled to pick his own subordinates. Commissioner McCartney, a member of the State police for two decades as well as a State investigator and a coal company police chief, was the first and only police commissioner choice of the State's new chief executive. He quite properly rejected a suggestion to designate another for the post or to consider a compromise since he is responsible for his cabinet members.

The only objection, raised to Commissioner McCartney, was a matter of speculation about his executive ability. He had not been commissioned in the State police and this was the sole basis for the opposition to him. His record as an officer was excellent and his experience broad.

Former associates in the State police, who should be good judges, privately expressed the belief Mr. McCartney would be a capable leader. This expression of confidence, in itself, was reassuring, since it constituted a high compliment to the nominee.

It is only logical to assume a man, who was a member of the force so long and who is familiar with the problems of law enforcement in the Commonwealth, ought to be able to handle the job. To be sure, it is a heavy responsibility, but the new Commissioner has a background that indicates he will measure up to the challenges in the 4 years ahead.

The Wild Redtape Yonder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an editorial appearing in the Boston Herald of February 19, 1959, entitled "The Wild Redtape Yonder," where a resident of California received a bill from the Air Force for $13.94 and the invoice was 28 pages long and bore the signatures of 2 lieutenant colonels, 3 majors, 1 captain, a first lieutenant, and 15 civilian department heads.

Conditions of this kind, wherever they exist in any department or agency, should be eliminated and done by the department or agency itself, and if not, the appropriate congressional committees should make a thorough study of this matter because it is apparent that tremendous sums of money could be saved.

THE WILD REDTAPE YONDER

A California man has received a $13.94 bill from the Air Force. The invoice is 28 pages long and bears the signatures of 2 lieutenant colonels, 3 majors, 1 captain, a first lieutenant, and 15 civilian department heads.

The recipient of this awesome document, it seems, cracked a radiator on a forklift truck he was operating as a civilian employee at an airfield in 1957. He's willing to pay, having in mind that payment will defray, at least in part, the cost of billing.

We salute this man for his concern for his Government. And we recommend that the diligent officials concerned be awarded, forthwith, the distinguished filing cross, with paper clip cluster.

First Washington Jazz Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, an exhibition entitled "Seven Ages of Jazz" will be opened this afternoon in the Library of Congress, where Americans may glimpse a little of their musical past during March while the Congressional Circle of Friendship House is sponsoring the first Washington Jazz Jubilee. A large group of congressional wives—many of whom live or have lived in Southeast Washington—has planned this jazz jubilee for the benefit of Friendship House, a settlement that has served the Southeast community for more than half a century. Culturally, however, it will benefit all jazz admirers in the Capital, who may participate in one aspect or another of this unusual celebration.

A jubilee can be either "a season or an occasion for general joy," Webster says, and this jubilee promises to be both. Its season will be the month of March; its occasions will be various. The Washington Jazz Jubilee began March 1, with last night's lecture on jazz at the National Gallery of Art by Prof. Marshall Stearns of Hunter College, who is executive director of the Institute of Jazz Studies. The next event will be the opening of the Library of Congress exhibit at 4 p.m. today, when the Library and the Congressional Circle will hold a preview of "Seven Ages of Jazz." On March 12, the Gres Gallery at 1729 20th Street NW., will open a special exhibit of primitive African sculpture entitled "Rhythms in Form and Music." The celebration will reach its climax on March 16 with a unique concert by outstanding jazz musicians at a fund-raising benefit for Friendship House.

Throughout March the Library of Congress exhibition may be viewed in the North Gallery on the ground floor of the Main Library Building. There you may see music manuscripts, published music, books, recordings, and photographs selected from the Library's collections to recall some of the story of jazz. The display illustrates the seeds of jazz in folk music; its early appearance and development in New Orleans, Memphis, Los Angeles, San Francisco, St. Louis, and Kansas City; its flourishing in the "big time" of Chicago and New York; and its spread to nearly every corner of the world.

Many famous performers and composers have created and developed the fabric of jazz and its countless styles. They have made it a vital stream in 20th century creative effort, and they have given stimulus to the popular song, the

musical comedy, and the music of the opera house and concert hall. Many of these figures of the jazz world will be featured in the Library's exhibit. A number of their works will be performed at the Washington Jazz Jubilee on March 16.

This jazz concert, to be held in Sheraton Hall at the Sheraton-Park Hotel on Monday evening, March 16, is the first program of its kind to be presented in the Nation's Capital. Mrs. Richard Bolling, the wife of my colleague from Kansas City and a well-versed authority on jazz, is general chairman of this benefit.

Because of the excellent talent and program proposed, I understand it is attracting nationwide attention. Mrs. Bolling and her committees have planned the production in two parts. In the first half of the evening, top-ranking jazz artist will present a fast-paced and colorful history of jazz by performing its music from such early forms as old spirituals, work songs, and New Orleans funeral marches to the contemporary "cool" school of modern jazz. Musicians brought to Washington for this event will illustrate the best in jazz from Congo Square to Carnegie Hall. After an intermission, the performers will break loose in a swinging "jam session" for jazz aficionados in the audience.

Some 1,500 guests wil join in this benefit for Friendship House, which at the present time faces new challenges and even greater responsibilities because of urban redevelopment in its area. Tickets may be obtained by telephoning Friendship House. The Jubilee is fortunate in having Mrs. Eisenhower and Mrs. Nixon as its ranking patrons among many members of official Washington and of the diplomatic corps, as well as other prominent Washingtonians.

The Congressional Circle of Friendship House has had advice from members of the Newport Jazz Festival in planning its benefit program, and its producer is Willis Conover, maestro of the Voice of America's popular "Music USA," a daily 45-minute program broadcast around the world. With "The World of Jazz," another program of the Voice, it is among our most popular broadcasts overseas. I need not remind my colleagues of the universal appeal of American jazz, nor of the fact that our jazz musicians have served us as excellent emissaries abroad, even in Iron Curtain countries.

Hon. Sid Simpson

SPEECH
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, no one could have a closer friend, nor a better one, than I had in SID SIMPSON. We consulted with each other on many matters, each of us well knowing that we could always rely upon an utterly frank expression of opinion. Whether he agreed with you or not, SID was one of those individuals that said exactly what he thought. I always found in him a man of convictions with the courage of his convictions to express them frankly.

SID was an outstanding Member of this body. He served his district well. This is attested to by the number of years he served with us. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, he contributed much to the farm area he represented and contributed much to our deliberations on various farm problems.

He had a keen sense of humor. Often his humor in stories and anecdotes were not solely to amuse but to make a point. With an anecdote he could say more pointedly and more emphatically than many of us could say with many words.

With the passing of SID SIMPSON there is indeed a void in this House. I miss him not only as a colleague. I miss him as a personal friend of long standing.

His lovely wife is serving here in his place. I extend to her, and to his two wonderful daughters my sincere sympathy. Theirs is a great loss. We share that loss with them.

The Library of Congress Looks at Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in November 1957, the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee, of which I was then chairman, requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare an objective and factual report on the Federal Reclamation program. The report was furnished the committee on December 1958, and has since been printed as committee print No. 1 of the 86th Congress. This impartial and unbiased study by the Legislative Reference Service indicates that the Federal reclamation program is clearly an important element in our national economy. The report contains valuable material and statistics relating to the program and I commend it to all of my colleagues in the Congress as an excellent professional treatment of the subject.

This report has received favorable editorial comment throughout the West. As an example, I am including an editorial from the February 18 issue of the Sacramento Bee.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS LOOKS AT RECLAMATION

The Library of Congress, through its legislative research service, has compiled an appraisal of the national reclamation program and one can assume it to be a document without bias.

It reports among many other things that during 1957 the Federal Internal Revenue Service collected $341,607,000 in taxes, mostly on incomes, from areas served by the Federal reclamation projects.

Since many of these undertakings have been built in areas which otherwise were in large part unproductive, it can be assumed the IRS collections largely represented money it otherwise would not have received.

Over the period of years these projects have been in existence these collections have totaled $3,218 million, or some $300 million more than the sum the Government has spent on all the reclamation works.

This, of course, has no bearing on the fact earnings from these projects, from the sale of water and power, have returned $355,514,171 to the Federal Treasury. Nor does it take into consideration the hundreds of millions of dollars in nonreimbursable benefits such as flood control, navigation improvement, recreation, etc.

Well over half of the repayments, $189,134,119, have come from the sale of power. In the case of the Central Valleys project, $66,864,658 of $68,785,061 in repayments has accrued from electric energy.

In numerous other ways the report reveals how the reclamation program has made direct contributions to the national economy moneywise. In additional benefits, such as in the production of crops and of power for the aluminum industry so vital during wartime, the projects have been of inestimable national value.

All of this exposes the nonsense of claiming the people in the States of the South and East are subsidizing the western reclamation projects. If anything it is the other way around.

And in large measure the success of the projects has been due to the generation of low cost public power which the private power lobby would abolish.

Barricades of Freedom—Life Line Radio Broadcast by Wayne Poucher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the text of an address by Wayne Poucher, radio minister of Life Line Foundation, Inc., a religious and patriotic educational movement.

Life Line broadcasts are heard daily, 6 days a week, over a large number of radio stations throughout the Nation.

The address follows:

If I were one of my own forefathers, I think I would disclaim me. As a matter of fact, I think our forefathers, if they could see us today, might give serious consideration to disclaiming the lot of us for the simple reason that we have given such a poor account of ourselves in handling the things which they left us. We have demonstrated miserable stewardship in many respects in preserving the heritage they founded and delivered into our hands.

It is not my belief that Americans as a people have lost their love for freedom. But it is my conviction that we are falling down on the all-important job of defending our freedom against those who seek to destroy it. In fact, most of us are not even aware, perhaps not even interested enough to realize that there are efforts being made to destroy our freedom. A freedom which has come down to us at awful cost. We are just as certain that once Americans wake up to the danger, this country will be safe, and so long as America is free, enslaved people everywhere will continue to have hope.

In this effort against the mistaken enemies of freedom, we have the greatest fortification to stand behind that any force has ever had. That is simple faith in God. The history of mankind reveals that the courage to be free has always sprung from a deep abiding faith. Sadly the history of mankind also reveals that every time man has lost his freedom was when his faith had grown cold. So long as we maintain a strong, wholesome, vigorous faith in God, we are well equipped for the struggle against godlessness, the philosophy of the mistaken. If there ever was a natural enemy to atheistic communism, it is faith. This is our main fortification, it may be our last hope.

The second barricade behind which America can stand in our fight for freedom is American business—the most vigorous economic institution ever built on any foundation. It so happens that our foundation is free enterprise, the opportunity system.

But American business, which spends billions of dollars a year for advertising, is not pulling its weight in the hard struggle against freedom's enemies. As a matter of fact, you have only to turn on your radio or television set to find out to what an amazing extent American business will pay for the sponsorship of programs containing subtle propaganda designed to destroy the very system that makes business possible.

There is virtually no end to the influence of advertising on the thinking of Americans. Advertising tells us what kind of toothpaste to use, what kind of clothes to wear, what kind of food to eat and where to buy it, what kind of paint to use on our house, what kind of automobile to drive. Why can't advertising be used to tell of the threats to our freedom and how we can meet those threats?

Don't you agree that the vast majority of Americans will walk an extra block or drive an extra mile to spend their merchandise dollars with a patriotic American merchant who has the courage to say, "I believe in my own country?" Wouldn't you do it? This can be our second greatest fortification, working alongside the tremendous force of a faith-inspired love of freedom.

New, Jesus Christ did not teach any one form of government as a political entity. His emphasis was on the soul. But He taught the dignity of every individual soul. Jesus taught men to love freedom and to be free. Jesus taught that each individual is a sovereignty. When men and women belong to God, they do not fear what man is able to do to them. They have courage to stand for right. It is this torch which has given light to the efforts of man to be free ever since. When the last of His apostles admonished those in whose hands the welfare of the cause of Christ would be left, He said: "Look to yourselves that you lose not those things which we have wrought." Look to yourselves—you must not depend on the other fellow to do it. This is an individual matter. You can't leave it to George. You've got to do it yourself.

Right now, the mighty combined voice of seven generations of our forefathers is echoing down through the corridors of time to tell us, "Look to yourselves that you lose not those things which we have wrought."

This is not a struggle for one man or for a small group of men. It has to be a nationwide undertaking. It calls for knowledge about the objectives of the mistaken. It calls for courage, and it calls for a willingness on the part of Americans everywhere to let the world know that we love our country and our freedom.

Americans have never been lacking in resourcefulness. We need in this hour to summon up determination equal to our resourcefulness—determination not to let freedom's enemies win by default. Determination to make our faith a vital, deep, abiding guide in our every thought and deed. Determination to make our free enterprise system work for freedom as well as for profits. If we can summon up the determination demanded by the necessity that exists, then America will be free for as long as we are disposed to defend it. God willing, freedom-loving Americans will never permit the mistaken to enslave our land.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 3, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 28, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER)

George Washington's Farewell Address, of September 17, 1796, is read yearly in the House and Senate on his birthday. Though his principles are timeless and enduring, it is ironic to recognize how we moderns seem determined to shut our eyes to the great abiding truths. His admonitions include:

1. The importance of the Federal union of States, and strict observance of the Constitution and its proper amendment process (no amendment by reinterpretation);

2. Government by separated divisions is good, each checking the other (no usurpation of power by one branch or of State powers by the Federal Government);

3. There can be no national morality if the sense of religious obligation and principle fails in us. (How do we measure up here?)

4. Preserve public credit, be selective in tax, avoid debt, do not burden posterity (and now even our Government bonds are considered less desirable as investments because Congress has depreciated the value of our money by profligate spending);

5. No entangling alliances or favored treatment of any nation, but rather commerce and enlightened self-interest (check our foreign aid, trade programs, and alliances against this).

The payroll of a Representative is public information, and should be (although this is not so in practice in the Senate). Who is hired and what is paid, within limits, is left largely to the discretion of the individual Congressman. Some hire kinfolks, and some pay higher than others. The judgment of the Congressman is the deciding factor and is, of course, subject to approval or disapproval by the voters every 2 years. For my part, I believe in running my office like a business, with incentive pay the factor—pay well as it's earned but only for equivalent performance, value received. On this basis, my staff measures up. No secrets either; the pay records will always stand public scrutiny.

The criticism of the Senate leadership leveled by Wisconsin Democrat WILLIAM PROXMIRE points up a problem of concern to all Congressmen in both parties. Under our setup, Congressmen are elected to represent specific areas, not parties. But just as power has gravitated from the States and localities to Washington, power in the Congress has tended to concentrate in the hands of the majority party's leadership. When as at present a party's majority is somewhat lopsided, and there's even a modicum of party discipline, the power of the leadership can be rather considerable. Particularly is this so at present when Democrats in both Houses are led by men from the same area who have long worked in close cahoots. Representative government may not be very representative. A legislative program may depend on a party line and how that line is determined can be vitally important. If it's arrived at by political masterminding at the top rather than from the bottom up, defections are inevitable among Congressmen really trying to be representative of their states or districts, rather than just acquiescent cogs in a party machine over which they have no control.

Debt retirement by the Federal Government received some attention this week, with several Texans proposing that a yearly payment on our debt be included in the budget. Many, including myself, applaud the idea, and I want to help in such a worthy effort. But here's the rub: How can we retire the debt by any amount when the Congress continues to spend more than is taken in? We must cut waste and welfare programs so that there is a balance of cash on had in the Treasury to pay down the debt. Isn't this so? The irony of this debt retirement proposal is that some of those sponsoring it are among those regularly voting for bigger Federal spending. For example, one gentleman now voicing support for debt reduction voted only 14 percent for economy and 86 percent for big spending last year; another voted 70 percent of the time for big spending last year. Perhaps this inconsistency was the reason for the exhortation of the public to request less of the Federal Government, and this certainly makes sense. However, I hold that a constitutional democracy in a republic demands that our representatives exercise judgment and self-discipline, be leaders, not followers. Therefore, it is up to Congress to vote "No" to big spending proposals and seek to eliminate waste, and to prevent raids on the Treasury by organized pressure groups.

The battle of the budget (and debt retirement) has become a battle of survival for our type of society and human freedom, as I see it. Surely, it is important for each Member to be more concerned with preserving the fiscal health of this great Nation (through the self-discipline of reduced spending) than with his seat in Congress. It's a simple matter of which comes first. Believing this, I intend to press this viewpoint, questioning no one's motives or integrity. If I must, disagree—but without being disagreeable, disliking only the ideas, not the people involved.

The Low-Rent Housing Program Is Vital to Community Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I recently was privileged, along with other Members of the Alabama congressional delegation, to attend a meeting here in Washington of the Alabama League of Municipalities.

Reports were made by members of the league, among these being that of Hon. Frank Sikes, mayor of Luverne, Ala. I am privileged to insert his report for the RECORD.

THE LOW-RENT HOUSING PROGRAM IS VITAL TO COMMUNITY GROWTH

(By Frank Sikes, Mayor of Luverne)

First, I would like to talk about Alabama's need for public housing and then delve into

the reasons why an expansion of the program is necessary. I would like to say that the member cities and towns of the Alabama League of Municipalities appreciate—in fact we are proud of—the support the Alabama delegation has given to the low-rent public housing program and urban renewal through the years. It is largely by virtue of your interest and support that these programs have moved forward. I predict that Alabama will be second among all States in the Nation in the number of localities participating in the public housing program before the end of the fiscal year. We had 125 towns participating on January 1, compared to 112 municipalities at the close of 1957. (Georgia is first with 197 towns and cities enrolled and Texas was second at last account on June 30, 1958, with 125 communities.)

The need for more public housing in Alabama is twofold. First, there is the normal or voluntary need. This is supported by the number of applications that may be expected from municipalities which have public housing and will require more units such as Demopolis and Opp, for example, and communities such as Clanton, Atmore, and Flomaton, which have applied, or are expected to apply, for public housing for the first time.

ENFORCED NEED FOR PUBLIC HOUSING

Second, there is the enforced need. This need is imperative. You are familiar, of course, with the necessity for public housing to house families displaced by urban renewal. In Alabama and the southeast 75 percent of all families to be displaced by urban renewal will be eligible on an income basis for public housing. (See testimony Walter E. Keyes, Regional Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, before Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Mobile, Ala., Dec. 30–31, 1957, p. 9.)

I am told that estimates given the housing subcommittee of the Senate and House disclose that half of the families to be displaced by urban renewal in the United States are within the public housing income brackets. We are convinced that we cannot have urban renewal without public housing, because the Housing Act makes it mandatory that standard housing accommodations must be provided for families to be relocated under the urban renewal program. We could, of course, have urban renewal for a time. Time, it has been said, is the servant of all bureaucrats. We can plan and plan and file a carload of blueprints. But there will come a day when the families will have to move and their homes will be razed. I hope to be around at that time.

But let's forget urban renewal for a minute. That subject will be discussed more fully by another mayor this morning. There is a need that is more compelling. That need is for the rehousing of families displaced by the new highway program. The law does not require the rehousing in standard homes of families displaced by superhighways and expressways. It is the moral obligation of the cities, and that is all. Highway construction is let to contractors. Time is money to the contractors. They are going to move in with their bulldozers and road building equipment on schedule. They aren't in the housing business. These superhighways are going to uproot thousands of families in Alabama. There is no surplus of housing in any city in our State. Some of the families perhaps can buy homes under section 221, but those on the public housing income level have neither the credit nor the income to buy a section 221 house. They do well to feed and clothe their families.

HOUSING FOR LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

Gentlemen, the average annual net income of families moving into public housing in the United States during 1957 was only $2,138. In the Southeast the average annual net income for the same period was $1,988.

We must have public housing ready for them, even if the law doesn't require it, because it is the right thing to do and because there is no other way they can be rehoused.

Let me cite an example of preparedness for this highway program. The housing authority of the city of Mobile has just applied for an additional 2,180 low-rent public housing dwellings to rehouse families to be displaced by the new highway program. Mobile has 3,776 low-rent housing dwellings already in operation. Mobile also has an urban renewal program and in time will undoubtedly need more units because of urban renewal pressure. Birmingham has 4,262 public housing dwellings in operation or under construction and has an additional 1,500 dwellings reserved. Mayor Jimmy Morgan tells us that he hopes these 1,500 units will be enough to take care of the low-income families to be displaced by highway construction. Birmingham also has an urban renewal program. Montgomery has 2,049 public housing homes in operation and a backlog of only 72 reserved. They will probably need additional units as forerunners to the highway building. Again there is no estimate of the number that will be required for urban renewal.

STATUS OF PROGRAM AS OF JANUARY 1, 1959

Our able executive director Ed E. Reid has forwarded to you an official summary of the status of the low-rent public housing program in Alabama as of January 1. This summary showed that there was a backlog of 2,610 dwellings in the program reservation stage and 16 municipalities have recently applied and were awaiting program reservations. The units reserved represent the voluntary reservation reservoir and do not include the 2,180 Mobile has requested. The State has an additional 3,118 units under annual contributions contract and awating construction, while 19,918 dwellings are currently in operation or under construction in the State.

Gentlemen, few things have happened in our cities that have meant as much as the low-rent public housing program. Public housing has given families an opportunity to live comfortably and to rear their children with due regard for privacy and decency because overcrowding of families is not permitted. We think that it is doing the job it is supposed to do. These homes are assets in our communities to which the people point with pride. We, too, would like to find some alternative for the housing of low-income families but we know there is no alternative. It hasn't been found in 20 years and you know and we know that we aren't likely to find a substitute for a sound subsidized program. We appeal to you to continue your support of an adequate public housing program in the interest of our growing communities and their low-income families.

Economic Ills of the American Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago HOMER E. CAPEHART, the senior Senator from Indiana, made an address in Miami, Fla. In the course of his remarks, he warned both big business and big labor of their responsibility to the American farming community. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I herewith include excerpts from his remarks:

MIAMI, FLA., February 27.—U.S. Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART tonight warned big business and big labor that each has a grave responsibility to become concerned with and help to solve, wherever possible, the economic ills of the American farmer.

"Too many of you have been ignoring for too long the problems which beset our farmers periodically" Senator CAPEHART told a group of bankers and businessmen from throughout the Nation in a luncheon speech at the fifth anniversary ceremonies of the Community National Bank.

"I foresee the possibility that if something isn't done to stabilize the agricultural situation at a sound level within the next 24 months, the entire economy will be in for a severe shock—a shock that would do us much damage, perhaps more, to business and labor than it would to farmers themselves.

"It is just commonsense that when the farm economy goes to pot everybody is going to suffer. The economy is bound to suffer because everything the farmer produces comes from Mother Earth, the only real source of the new wealth required to keep our economy well fed and healthy.

"It follows that when the farmer suffers everybody suffers. Business falls off. That means that eventually jobs for workers fall off. And if you let this process go on long enough, you end up with a serious, serious economic situation.

"That, of course, we must avoid. And what I am saying to you gentlemen—to big business and big labor because we have both in this country—is that for your own good and the good of the American economy generally you had better get busy and study this farm problem and try to do something about it.

"The economic interests of the 6 million farms in this country are your interests too."

The Late Hon. Herman P. Eberharter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, once I read a short and not very well written bit of verse by an unknown author. Despite its grammatical shortcomings, the message it carries is most evident. It reads:

A man of greatness is he
Who lives to serve his neighbor.
No matter how tough the going may be
He continues to give his best.

I knew the late Hon. Herman P. Eberharter, Representative from the 28th District of Pennsylvania, well and intimately throughout the period of my service in Congress. Somehow I feel that a little bit of verse could well be applied to him.

Its simple words by no means define the many contributions to mankind that Herman Eberharter gave through his untiring devotion to his duty and through his effective and capable leadership. He was solid, sound and substantial. His death is indeed a great loss to all of us and I join with his friends in expressing the deepest regrets to his

family. I take comfort, however, in the fact that his accomplishments during his lifetime and his fine spirit will be remembered as an example for others to follow.

Two Strikes on Warren Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I regret that Congress failed to take corrective action last year in the most important field of preemption of legislative prerogatives by the Supreme Court of the United States. During the 1958 campaign, I had occasion to "feel the pulse" of the people in my district on the question of legislation to correct certain decisions of the Court which have clearly encroached upon the legislative prerogatives of the Congress. I have found that the people expect action by Congress in this field. I trust that we will be able to deal with this problem in the not too distant future for it is most necessary that we do so, particularly in the present time of crisis which once again demonstrates the futility of expecting anything but duplicity on the part of the Communist regime.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from today's edition of the New York Daily News which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

TWO STRIKES ON WARREN COURT

The Earl Warren Supreme Court now has two strikes against it, pitched by those who know the Warren court best.

Some months ago, the association of the States' supreme court chief justices issued a long, detailed and strongly worded statement about this tribunal.

It was charged with frequently going outside its proper field of law interpretation, and was earnestly urged to try using some self-restraint for a change.

Last week in Chicago, the American Bar Association's 246-member house of delegates—the ABA's ruling body—overwhelmingly adopted and made official a report on the Warren court's pro-Communist leanings turned in by the ABA's special committee on Communist tactics, strategy and objectives.

This blast summed up in detail the court's 23 worst pro-Red decisions, plus one case still not finally disposed of, and recommended congressional action to undo these rulings' damage to the Nation insofar as it can be undone.

Such action would include laws enabling the States to enact and enforce statutes against sedition * * * restoring to the Smith Antisubversive Act of 1940 its original provision that it is a crime to advocate the U.S. Government's violent overthrow * * * cracking the Warren court's handcuffs off the House Committee on Un-American Activities * * * and in other ways beefing up the Governments' power to fight the criminal Red conspiracy.

The next pitch, we'd say, is up to Congress. The object would be, not to strike the Supreme Court out (after all, we've got to have courts, including this one), but to shove it back into its own domain.

That domain is the field of interpretation of laws, whereas this Court has time and again bulged over into Congress' field of making laws.

Congress, we believe, should have acted long ago to beat back these invasions of its territory. It came within an ace of doing so last year, but was stopped by its liberals with the aid of the curious Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas.

Now that the Warren court has been indicted, so to speak, by a grand jury of State supreme court justices and by another grand jury of eminent and responsible lawyers, what excuse can there be for Congress' putting off appropriate action any longer?

More Convenient Care for Alaskan Mental Patients Comes Through Efforts of Oregon's Congresswoman Edith Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding role in providing more convenient care for mental patients in Alaska was played by Congresswoman EDITH GREEN of Oregon. She worked actively to change the existing program whereby the mentally ill of the then Territory had to be sent thousands of miles away from family and friends to a private hospital in Oregon.

Today a new State hospital is being constructed in Alaska. The patients will go there.

EDITH GREEN and others who worked for this logical improvement were condemned by unthinking people, but their humanitarian efforts were not silenced. The picture today is vastly improved.

It is my privilege, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, to include an editorial from Labor entitled "Her Courage Paid Off," which comments on this matter. Labor has given deserved written tribute to my friend and senior colleague from Oregon:

HER COURAGE PAID OFF

It's worth while to recall a courageous battle fought by Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, and to report the outcome. The story is as follows:

Several years ago, Mrs. GREEN pointed out to the House that there was not a single mental hospital in Alaska to serve its people. They had to send their mentally ill loved ones thousands of miles away to a private hospital in Oregon, which had a contract with the Federal Government.

Moreover, under an old, outworn and cruel law, to get even this distant care an unfortunate man, woman, or child had to be "convicted" in an Alaska court, just as though he or she had committed a crime by becoming mentally ill.

A bill to modernize and humanize that law, and to establish a public hospital in Alaska, was introduced by Mrs. GREEN, though the private hospital which was profiting from the old system was in her district and much local pressure was put on her to stop her fight for the voteless Alaskans.

Also, as Labor reported at the time, a weird but powerful nationwide lobby spread vicious propaganda calling the proposed Alaska hospital, and the public land with which it would be endowed under the bill, a "New Siberia, U.S.A." to which opponents of the Eisenhower administration would be "exiled" under some dark and devious plot.

Now, to bring the story up to date: The Oregon Congresswoman continued her fight despite the odds which seemed to be piling up against her, and she finally won. The hospital she advocated is being constructed and has been taken over by the new State government of Alaska. The proprietors of the private profit hospital in Oregon are being investigated on income tax charges. The malicious propaganda campaign against Mrs. GREEN and her bill has "gone with the wind." Her courage paid off.

A Tribute to Andrija Stampar, M.D., 1888–1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, as a congressional adviser to the U.S. delegation to the 10th World Health Assembly, which met in Geneva, Switzerland, in 1957, I had the privilege of getting to know Dr. Andrija Stampar, of Yugoslavia, who was one of the founders of the World Health Organization and who, in 1957, was still a vigorous leader in world health. I share the sense of loss that was felt by the public health professions at his death last year. We can all be grateful for his part in building an organization that provides such a splendid medium through which our medical and health leaders can work toward the common good in a spirit of friendship with their colleagues from all parts of the world.

Dr. Henry van Zile Hyde, of the Public Health Service, who worked closely with Dr. Stampar for many years, has written a tribute to him which was published in the December 1958 issue of the American Journal of Public Health. This tribute gives us a picture of an unusual man who contributed greatly to public health in his own country and in the world at large. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article by Dr. Hyde entitled "A Tribute to Andrija Stampar, M.D.":

A TRIBUTE TO ANDRIJA STAMPAR, M.D., 1888–1958

(By Henry van Zile Hyde, M.D., F.A.P.H.A.)

It was the spring of 1946, the third day of the session of the Technical Preparatory Committee of the World Health Organization at the Palais d'Orsay Hotel in Paris. Down the long corridors stomped a broad-shouldered storm cloud with a rounded head. As he approached us, standing outside the door of the gilded room serving as the secretariat office, he broke into a staccato outburst of expressive English, unembroidered by articles and connectives. His wrath was justified. It had taken him 7 days to traverse the distance from Zagreb to Paris, with interminable interruptions in unexpected and inconvenient places for inspection of his documentation. It was postwar Europe.

Thus, some of us met Andrija Stampar, a man whose name we had known and whose force we had already felt, the man known to

many in a seriocomic vein as the Bear of the Balkans. It was to be our privilege to know him and work with him for the next 12 years. His death is a personal loss and a loss to public health, for he was indeed one of the great men of our profession.

Andrija Stampar—as he unfolded his tale bit by bit over the years—was the son of an itinerant pedagog in Croatia, itinerant not because he loved to wander but because of his liberalism. Soon, in any village, he would test the mettle of the conservatives with his views on life and society, and would in due course be asked to leave forthwith. Packing wife and worldly goods into a donkey cart with children trailing along, he would move to another village where his expanding reputation had not yet penetrated. In due course, the story repeated itself. I learned this from Andrija Stampar, one of the boys who trudged behind—only to march forward in later life proclaiming on a world stage the liberalism learned in such a hard school.

In the course of this tenuous existence, one dear lady recognized the potentialities latent in her son's playmate and took Andrija under her wing. In due course she made it possible for him to go to Vienna for an education. He told me once of this trek. His mother provided him with a ham to sustain him on his long walk north. On arrival in Vienna, the young, lone wanderer found a boardinghouse and moved in. Very shortly a crisis developed. He had finished his ham bone and disposed of it in that new wonder—new to him, that is—the inside flush toilet. He said, and doubtless quite rightly, that the result was catastrophic for the plumbing and led to altercations with his new-found hosts. Thus began the education of a great sanitarian.

On his return to Yugoslavia, he rejoined his family, now in better circumstances. His education had been intensive and he was an intense man. And he was profoundly shy. When his sister had friends visiting her, he would repair to his room and lose himself in his books. On one occasion his sister created a crisis by inviting a friend to spend the weekend with her. Before dinner she went to her brother's room and told him that he must make an appearance and must also join in the family activities throughout the weekend. There was no escape for Andrija. So, having combed his hair well and dressed appropriately for the ordeal, he went to the living room, stood in the door, and surveyed the group. His eyes lit upon his sister's friend across the room; he stood transfixed, and then pointing at her blurted out, "I'm going to marry you." During the succeeding months he trudged over the fields in the moonlight to sit enraptured outside her house, eventually gathering sufficient courage to call upon her. In due course, yes, he married her. The clarity of vision, the decisiveness, and, indeed, the shyness persisted through the years as hallmarks of his character and personality.

This doctor of medicine became progressively a doctor of public health, but never lost touch with the science of medicine. When his country, Yugoslavia, was created at Versailles, he became its first director of health. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that in this new country, new and amorphous, he gave leadership to the development of what became its public health service. It was characterized by quality, breadth of coverage, and the spirit of service. It reflected the intensity and the quality of the man himself and soon became a model health service on which the eyes of the world were focused through the League of Nations, which he was called to serve for 6 years, from 1931 to 1937. Later, his influence spread through his activity as a teacher, as visiting professor of public health at the University of California, and as professor and later rector of the University of Zagreb.

Then came the collapse and destruction of World War II. He was captured when the Germans moved into Zagreb. Again he had a story to tell. He was at first imprisoned in his hometown. His first wife had died some years before and he had married a lovely, gracious physician who had been a member of his public health staff. He liked to tell, jokingly, that he had married her because she brought so many problems to him that he decided the best solution was to take her out of public health. This was his shy way of covering up with a jest one of the tenderest and most delightful marriages it has ever been my joy to witness. But to get back to the prison story, Mrs. Stampar nightly made rounds of the prison walls hoping to catch a glimpse of her husbands at one of the windows. Night after night she did this with no luck. One night she noted a cluster of women standing in front of the great main gate. It appeared that they were to be admitted into the prison for some reason that was not apparent. She took a chance and joined the group. In due course, the German prison guard threw wide the huge iron gates and waved the group of women in. They were then conducted in a direction which Mrs. Stampar, as a physician who had attended patients in the prison on occasion, recognized as the route to the clinic. Then it suddenly struck her that she was in the midst of a group of prostitutes headed for inspection. On arrival at the clinic, she was recognized by the physician in charge, a Zagreb colleague. He beckoned her aside and ushered her into a side room without comment. He then summoned Dr. Stampar to report to the clinic and ushered him into the same room. Every night thereafter Mrs. Stampar visited her husband until he was whisked away into a prison in Austria. When she next saw him, she did not recognize him. An emaciated shadow of himself, he walked unheralded and unrecognized up the sidewalk to the porch of his home, where the family was sitting.

Andrija Stampar recuperated quickly from his grim years in prison, and emerged rapidly into world leadership. When he appeared in Paris on that day in 1946, he was not just the competent health expert of Yugoslavia, he was also vice president of the Economic and Social Council of the newly formed United Nations. It was under his acting chairmanship of that council, in fact, that the Technical Preparatory Committee for the World Health Organization had been organized and convened. He was again a world leader. During the weeks in Paris, those of us who worked with him soon overcame our trepidation and found that the bear of the Balkans was a very friendly bruin indeed—a friend of all mankind.

The next time that many of us saw Dr. Stampar was at the International Health Conference in New York a few months later when the constitution of the World Health Organization was drawn up and adopted. He called that unique conference of Nations to order, turning the gravel over to Dr. Thomas Parran when the latter was elected its president. Stampar continued to take a leading role in the conference as chairman of the Yugoslav delegation and a member of the steering committee. His prestige, the force of his personality, and the general aura of wisdom that surrounded him made him one of its most effective participants. Probably his major contribution to the constitution of the World Health Organization, as one looks back on the Paris and New York meetings that developed it, was the broad vision incorporated in its oft-quoted preamble.

At New York an Interim Commission of 18 nations was established and Stampar was elected its chairman, presiding over the commission at its meetings, which took place quarterly during the succeeding two years. This was not an easy task. There were knotty, emotionally charged problems to be decided that would shape the long future of the World Health Organization. Divisive forces were at work. Cultural backgrounds varied widely. Experience in international cooperation was limited, but faith and hope were high. Disparate basic objectives split East and West. There was great imbalance in national strength, both technical, and financial. Different interpretations, even of the workings of the democratic process, intruded themselves. The validity of the vote, which we accept so instinctively as a useful and welcome device to settle controversial points, was even open to question.

Over this complex situation Stampar presided with skill, charm, and effectiveness, becoming, as Time magazine once pointed out, a crusader for unanimity. The decisions taken during the two years of the life of the Interim Commission brought organization into the disordered international health scene, fused existing agencies into the new structure, launched new programs, and set the pattern for even bigger things in the WHO itself.

Then in 1948 came at last the First World Health Assembly—commemorated this year on its 10th anniversary—at which the road had to be laid out for the long future of the WHO. Basic decisions on organizational structure, administration, budget, program had to be made. There was a tussle over the question whether the organization should be a technical one providing technical services, or a supply organization on the pattern of UNRRA. There were other questions that would determine the very nature of this new world enterprise. Over all this Andrija Stampar presided.

Stampar sat high on the podium of the great Assembly Hall of the Palais des Nations, known to diplomats and sightseers the world over, at the moment of greatest crisis in the affairs of WHO. In accepting the WHO constitution, the United States had reserved the right to withdraw. In the nature of things diplomatic, it is necessary that all parties to an international agreement accept any reservation made by a ratifying nation. Normally this is done through the long, slow, and cumbersome methods of age-old diplomacy. In this case, however, the Secretary General of the United Nations, with whom the treaty had been deposited, rules he would accept the U.S. ratification as valid if the Assembly, representative of the full membership of WHO, made a unanimous request that he do so. Here was a great moment in the life of WHO. Would any single nation oppose U.S. membership? The members of the Soviet bloc, no longer allies of the West, were in the Assembly Hall, duly accredited. A Yugoslav was in the chair. It was June, 1948, and within days Yugoslavia was to be unceremoniously booted out of the Cominform. Things were tense among nations. Friends of the United States moved to the rostrum, expressing confidence, praise, and support. Then the vice minister of health of the Soviet Union took the rostrum. Tension filled the hall and Stampar's grim visage reflected the mood of all who wondered and feared at this moment of crisis for the future of that which had been so carefully constructed for the welfare of all mankind. In the Palais in those days there was no simultaneous translation, but we knew that Dr. Stampar understood Russian and so watched his face keenly for an answer to our fears.

As the Russian spoke with force and vigor, and at what seemed interminable length, Stampar's face remained grimly set. There was no look of hope. The Russian, as we discovered later, was giving no quarter but was criticizing the United States for talking of death at a time of birth. Then—a final

sentence, and a beam of joy erupted on Stampar's face, telling all of us electrically that the Soviet Union had supported the admission of the United States to the World Health Organization. Our Russian colleague had grudgingly stated that, despite our bad behavior, we were perforce essential to the WHO. It was this message that Stampar transmitted to us and to the delegations throughout that great assembly hall without a spoken word. Throughout his life he had had many tense moments, many moments of doubt and fear, yet one can believe that perhaps this was his greatest moment, because it involved not only himself and his family but his great concern for the world and the people in it. And it had come out right for him and for mankind.

Stampar was a man of force and conviction. There were times when we would have been glad to skin the bear of the Balkans and hang his hide high on a tree. But there existed always the underlying affection and the deep-seated respect that made us realize that when he was not right he certainly meant to be. Our contacts with him were deep rooted in friendship and affection.

At home as well as abroad Stampar continued as a leader to the moment of his final illness and death. He had worked effectively under the monarchy and under the Tito regime. No one seemed quite to know his politics because perhaps his politics were only people and their needs. His country and his colleagues recognized his worth and his greatness, signalizing it by electing him president of the Yugoslav Academy of Science—which is one of the highest distinctions that can come to a man of his country.

Those of us who knew Andrija Stampar have been saddened to learn of his death. Untold millions who have never heard of him have lost a friend who worked for them incessantly and stubbornly, who fought for them valiantly. His name will live in the history of public health.

Hon. Daniel Alden Reed

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 19, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of representing the people of the Third District of Florida since my election to the 77th Congress on November 5, 1940. When I compare these few years with the years of service by the late Honorable DANIEL ALDEN REED, Representative of the 43d District of New York, I realize even more the vast storehouse of knowledge and experience of which we are deprived today.

One has only to take a glance at a biographical sketch of this outstanding servant of the people to understand the greatness of his works and the leadership which he so unselfishly gave throughout his life. His honors, his accomplishments, and his many unpublicized moments of counsel, advice, and assistance to his colleagues establish DAN REED, as he was so affectionately known, as a member of that rare group of truly outstanding leaders our country has produced.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing my sincere sympathies to the family and friends of DAN REED. At the same time, I hope that others may follow the good examples and works of DAN REED, a great leader in Congress for a period which embraced nearly one-fourth of the life of the Republic.

American Bar Association Supports House-Passed Bill To Free the Federal Payroll of Communists and Fellow Travelers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I share the deep concern expressed by the American Bar Association in its resolution recommending prompt enactment of legislation to close loopholes in the law which permit Communists and fellow travelers in many Federal positions.

After full and complete consideration of individual rights as well as national security requirements, the American Bar Association has strongly endorsed legislation to prevent Federal employment of Communists and subversives—S. 1411—as reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and passed by an overwhelming vote in the House last year.

Unfortunately, this urgently needed legislation was not acted on by the other body when we could not obtain conference agreement on the House-passed bill.

I agree wholeheartedly with the action of the American Bar Association in thus squarely endorsing the action taken last year by the House of Representatives. The resolution once more confirms the determination made by this House, that a security system for Federal employment, to be really effective, should be spelled out clearly in the law rather than left to the whims and caprices of administrative officials.

As far back as 1946 I secured the adoption of a resolution to investigate reports of malfunctioning of the Federal employees' loyalty program. Investigation disclosed extreme laxity in certain parts of the executive branch concerning infiltration of subversive elements. Based on these findings, a Federal employees' loyalty program was established—but soon proved inadequate because not based on law. The House of Representatives in 1948 approved my bill to establish an effective loyalty program, but there again the other body did not act. Finally, the House passed a bill in the 81st Congress which was approved by the other body and became Public Law 733, providing for summary removal of Federal employees whose actions jeopardize national security.

Public Law 733 was seriously weakened, as a measure to protect national security, by the Supreme Court decision in Cole against Young. The Court decision invalidated a portion of the Executive order on securities issued in 1953 and thereby opened the door for many known security risks to force their way back on the Federal payroll. Also, under this and later decisions, the Government has been required to give over $450,000 in back pay to persons who had been removed from Federal positions as security risks. This came about, not because these persons are not security risks but solely because of the technicality that their positions had not been specifically designated as "sensitive."

The real issue is simply this: Should any individual who is a Communist, fellow traveler, or subversive hold any public office or position in the Government of the United States? The American Bar Association now has joined with the House of Representatives in answering "No." After full deliberation, and with proper consideration of the protection of individual rights in the light of the national interest, they strongly urge enactment of Federal employees' security legislation approved by the House last year.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I can assure the Members that one of the first bills to be brought to the floor by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in this session will be the bill to close existing loopholes and provide a permanent, fair, and effective security program for Federal employment. These are the major provisions of such legislation:

First. The head of any department or agency may suspend any employee when deemed necessary in the interest of national security.

Second. Within 30 days, after such suspension, the emplioyee shall have an opportunity to reply.

Third. After complete review of investigation the department or agency head may separate the employee if he determines it necessary in the interest of national security.

Fourth. The suspended employee is entitled to a written statement of charges, reasonable opportunity to answer, a hearing, review by the department head, and a written decision.

Fifth. The term "national security" means all Government activities of the United States involving national safety and security, and every Government employee is deemed to be engaged in an activity involving national security.

Sixth. Any reinstated employee shall be paid for time improperly off the payroll in an amount not to exceed the amount he would have earned had he not been separated, less any earnings during the separation.

Seventh. Procedures under the Lloyd-Lafollette Act of 1912 or the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, as applicable, must be followed in any suspension or separation, to the extent consistent with national security.

Eighth. Any employee separated under the security provisions is entitled to appeal to the Civil Service Commission for complete review and the Commission's decision is final and must be followed by the department or agency.

This legislation, as was the case with S. 1411 last year, reaffirms the intent of

Public Law 733 as enacted by the 81st Congress. It gives every proper measure of protection to the loyal employee, and at the same time will help keep the Federal payroll clear of Communists and fellow travelers. It will place in effect most of the recommendations of the Wright Commission on Federal employees' security. This Commission, appointed by the President several years ago, submitted a report of nearly 1,000 pages and recommended even stronger Federal employees' security legislation. Mr. Wright, chairman of the Commission, in testimony before our committee, endorsed this legislation and added:

It is a tragedy, indeed, that we need any loyalty or security programs, and I fervently hope that the day will hasten when we can abolish them. Until that day, however, we dare not forget that the threat is not only real but formidable.

The discerning and forthright resolution of the American Bar Association is in the highest public service tradition of this great professional association. Its report and resolution are of great value in bringing to public attention the crucial importance of early legislation providing the means to deal permanently and effectively with the problem of subversive infiltration in our more than 2 million Federal positions. I commend this report and resolution to the attention of all Members of the 86th Congress.

Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to insert an article on the subject of "Freedom," eloquently written by Mr. George W. Schroeder, editor of the Southern Baptist Brotherhood Journal, and as this article appeared in the quarterly issue of April 1959 of that publication. Mr. Schroeder is one of the great religious leaders among Southern Baptists and he is certainly interested in the future welfare of our country and in the preservation of its freedom at all times. The article is as follows:

FREEDOM

(By George W. Schroeder)

Freedom—what a glorious word. It vibrates with all that man values in this world in which he lives. Embodied in it are all the basic elements that give life purpose and meaning. With it, and if properly used, man can achieve new heights—prove his worth. Without it, man loses his individuality. Truthfully, freedom is something man does not fully appreciate until it is lost. Then, having lost it, he will give his very life to once again attain it.

We who live in the United States have been given the priceless heritage of freedom. Because of the concern, convictions, and determination of our forefathers, we have been endowed with a way of life that enables us to be free men in a free society, a goal toward which many nations of people strive but few attain.

Consider, however, the kind of a nation of people we would be if we were deprived of the freedoms we are privileged to enjoy. What if those in high office took from us the rights of freedom of assemblage, worship, speech, press, the ballot, fair trial, and pursuit of happiness? If we were deprived of such freedoms overnight, then undoubtedly this Nation would quickly be in civil war. Yet, and understandably so, those who would seek to destroy such freedoms within our Nation would be foolish to endeavor to take from us such cherished possessions overnight. Rather, their strategy would be to take small privileges from us constantly, striving continually to the end of complete domination. Such procedure would achieve selfish ends without being conspicuous.

The time has come in our Nation's history when every thinking individual needs to look about him to see what is happening in this matter of freedom. Slowly but surely many of our basic freedoms are being taken from us. At the time they seem to be small freedoms without deep significance. Yet, an analysis will show that embodied in these deprived rights are the very taproots that can ultimately take from us all our basic freedoms. If one doubts the truth of this statement let him look, if no further, at least into the matter of what is happening in this Nation concerning freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, all of which are involved in the matter of separation of church and state. If one will honestly seek to analyze the meaning behind some of the events that have come to pass in these areas, he will become alarmed with what has been done and what can be the ultimate end if such a pattern is not checked immediately.

The writer is not an alarmist. He does, however, believe that he is a realist. As such, he suggests that we take a deep look at our freedoms in this Nation, and then silently but determinedly resolve that under God we are going to preserve our basic freedoms to the end that we may pass on to those who follow this glorious heritage of being a free man in a free society.

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, for many years there has arisen, from time to time, a movement to make October 12, Columbus Day, a national holiday. It is true that nearly all the States today observe it in one form or another, either as a legal or a public holiday. My purpose, however, in introducing this bill is to make October 12 a truly national holiday, sponsored by the Federal Government. There has, properly speaking, been but one occasion when Congress has purported to declare a national holiday throughout the United States, and that was by the act of March 2, 1889, which used the expression with reference to the following April 30, the "Centennial Anniversary of the Inauguration of the First President of the United States."

I submit that it is time to break the precedent again and the purpose of this bill—H.R. 418—is to declare October 12 a permanent national holiday. No anniversary, surely, could be more basic nor fundamental than that which marks that day in the year 1492 when the eyes of Christopher Columbus first beheld an outpost of the New World. Although he did not know it was a new world, believing it to be merely the western Indies, and died in that belief, it was nonetheless the faith and persistence of this one man, in the face of almost inconceivable obstacles and heartbreaking humiliation and delay, which threw open a new hemisphere for the settlement of mankind and the eventual emergence of a great republic founded on democracy and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Surely this epochal day merits a yearly observance, both in tribute to the man himself and to an event which forever changed the face of the earth and altered the destiny of the human race.

Investigations Stymied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to a very timely and aptly worded editorial which appeared in the Shreveport Journal, Shreveport, La., under date of February 26, 1957:

INVESTIGATIONS STYMIED

"I decline to answer on the grounds my answer may tend to incriminate me" might well be the death sentence of congressional investigating committee.

Recent months have seen virtually every witness summoned before legislative committees looking into such vitally important topics as Teamster gangsterism, coin machine industry terrorism by organized hoodlums—and various other examples of the invasion of many areas of the economy by the most vicious thugs, leeches, and racketeers—hide his record under the Bill of Rights, and with complete immunity.

In over-zealous efforts to protect the rights of the individual, Federal courts have almost unanimously thrown out contempt citations against recalcitrant congressional witnesses. Desipte the fact that many witnesses refuse to answer any of as many as 50 questions (including "What is your name?") on the grounds of possible incrimination—and with the obvious intention of using the fifth amendment to the Constitution solely as a means of refusing to testify—the courts refuse to honor congressional contempt citations against them.

The record for the past 9 years is sufficient to cause lawmakers to wonder just what authority they have remaining to force witnesses to testify. Since 1950, of all the witnesses cited for contempt by Congress, 78 were indicted, 28 convicted, 15 of these convictions were reversed, 9 are pending on appeal, 2 were fined, and 2 served jail sentences. Those two who managed to slip by the courts into jail served only 90 days each.

Constitutional guarantees formerly were invoked by witnesses only as a last resort, and then only for a particularly incriminat-

ing question. Now witnesses will not even answer a question about the weather, except to say, "I decline to answer, etc."

Congress might as well save its time and the taxpayers' money in its racket investigations. Shorn of the strong weapon of contempt of Congress by the courts, congressional investigators are virtually powerless to force revelation of underworld tactics.

The Federal Law of Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the law of conspiracy has had a tremendous development in our Federal courts. Public prosecutors are using it more and more to reach out to net persons accused of crime when the statute barring prosecution has long since passed and also to bring into the trial hearsay testimony which even though uncorroborated is sufficient to convict the accused.

Bar associations and practitioners of criminal law are complaining today as to the use of the law of conspiracy in our Federal courts. They feel that lawyers, bar associations, and people interested in civil and individual liberties should be alerted to the dangers inherent in the present rules governing trials of conspiracy indictments.

One of the outstanding members of the New York Bar, with extensive experience in defending the many accused in Federal courts, has made a keen analysis of the outstanding cases of the law of conspiracy, its dangers, and its unfair application. I believe that people interested in individual liberties and in the maintenance of fair trials will find an article entitled "The Federal Law of Conspiracy" to be of inestimable value and of great interest.

The following is an article written on the Federal law of conspiracy by Menahem Stim, a member of the New York Bar:

THE FEDERAL LAW OF CONSPIRACY

(By Menahem Stim, member of the New York Bar)

The practitioner in the criminal parts of the Federal district courts, when defending a client charged with a violation of a Federal criminal statute, is generally confronted with an indictment which invariably contains in addition to the count charging the substantive offense, a separate count charging a conspiracy to commit the substantive offense.

The usual inclusion of a conspiracy count in Federal indictments makes the defense of persons charged with Federal criminal violations a very difficult task indeed. Difficult as it is to defend one accused in a Federal criminal court of a substantive offense only, because of the Federal rule, which unlike the State rule, permits a conviction based solely on the uncorroborated testimony of an accomplice (see *Poliafico* v. *U.S.*, 237 F. 2d 97, certiorari denied 77 S. Ct. 590, 352 U.S. 1025, 1 L. ed. 2d 597, rehearing denied, 77 S. Ct. 718, 353 U.S. 931, 1 L. ed. 2d 725) such a task becomes almost hopeless, when the indictment contains the usual count charging the defendant, in addition to the substantive offense, with a conspiracy to commit the substantive offense.

The prosecution then has the unfair advantage because of the peculiar Federal law of conspiracy, which permits the introduction of clearly hearsay evidence admitted subject to connection, thus in effect permitting the jury to hear hearsay evidence which while ostensibly offered only in support of the conspiracy charge, in practice is used to support a jury's finding of guilt on the substantive charge as well. While the trial courts invariably admonish the juries and point out to them the limitation on the admissibility of this type of evidence, it is a known fact that it would require an extremely intelligent jury to sift and separate the evidence which is hearsay under all circumstances as to the substantive charge but which on the theory that it was connected by other evidence becomes competent as to the conspiracy charge. The result of this practice of combining a substantive charge in an indictment with a count charging conspiracy is generally responsible for many verdicts of guilty based primarily on evidence, which even under the broad Federal rules as to the admission of uncorroborated accomplice testimony, could not have been admitted if the indictment contained a substantive charge only. Is it any wonder that statistics issued by the Attorney General of the United States showing a percentage of convictions of nearly 90 in all criminal cases tried in Federal courts, read like election returns from one-party countries?

Let us consider the Federal statute which defines a conspiracy and provides punishment for a violation thereof. Section 371 of chapter 19 of title 18 of United States Code, annotated, reads as follows:

"If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States or any agent thereof in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such persons do any act to affect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years or both. If, however, the offense, the commission of which is the object of the conspiracy, is a misdemeanor only, the punishment for such conspiracy shall not exceed the maximum punishment provided for such misdemeanor, June 25, 1948, c. 645, 62 Stat. 701."

The general conspiracy statute as quoted in section 371, supra, embraces every type of Federal criminal conspiracy except certain specific conspiracies covered by special statutes and relating to specific offenses such as a conspiracy to: cast away or destroy a vessel (sec. 2271, title 18); to gather defense information (sec. 794, title 18); to injure property of a foreign government (sec. 956, title 18); to kidnap (sec. 1201, title 18); and a seditious conspiracy (sec. 2384, title 18).

In order to make out a prima facie case in a conspiracy indictment, the Government must allege and prove that two or more persons conspired to commit the unlawful act. It is sufficient to name only one person as a defendant, providing another person or persons are listed as co-conspirators. The Government must also allege and prove at least one overt act by the defendant or a co-conspirator made in pursuance of the conspiracy. The overt act need not be an illegal one. It may even be an innocent act but it must be done in pursuance of the conspiracy.

To prove the conspiracy, the Government is permitted under the very broad rules of evidence as applicable to proof of a conspiracy, to introduce testimony by witnesses to conversations or acts by one or more of the conspirators (who need not necessarily be named as defendants) had or done not in the presence of or with the knowledge of the defendant or defendants named in the indictment. This testimony, which under ordinary rules of evidence would be inadmissible in a trial of an indictment containing substantive charge only is nevertheless admissible "subject to connection"' in the trial of an indictment which in addition to the substantive charge contains also a count charging a conspiracy, although such admission is received presumably only in support of the conspiracy charge alone. As long as these conversations or acts testified to occurred during the period of the conspiracy charged in the indictment and providing the particular defendant's participation in the alleged conspiracy is proven by evidence however slight of an independent nature, either circumstantial or direct, the patently hearsay evidence admitted as against a particular defendant "subject to connection" becomes binding upon him on the theory that the conversations or acts were those of agents in the unlawful combination.

Nor is there any legal bar to the introduction by the prosecution of incriminating evidence covering a period antedating a particular defendant's joining the alleged conspiracy providing such evidence covers acts or conversations by other coconspirators during the life of the conspiracy. This evidence becomes binding on the particular defendant on the theory that upon joining the conspiracy, he ratified all of the acts of the other conspirators performed in pursuance of the conspiracy although occurring prior to that defendant's joining of the conspiracy.

It is only when the conspiracy is completed, and that is generally on the date when the indictment is returned, that any evidence concerning conversations or acts by a particular defendant occurring after that date is binding on that defendant alone and cannot be admitted as against the other defendants charged with the conspiracy.

The law presumes that a conspiracy is terminated when its object is accomplished by success or is defeated by failure. The arrest of the conspirators would of course indicate the end of the conspiracy unless as the prosecution contended in *U.S.* v. *Reina, et al.*, 242 F. 2d 302, the conspiracy continued even after one of the conspirators was arrested. As to any particular defendant his participation in the conspiracy ends when he abandons the conspiracy and when he does so, he cannot be charged with any acts of the other conspirators occurring after his abandonment of the conspiracy. But again it is almost impossible for such a defendant to prove the abandonment, as the law requires an affirmative act on the part of the defendant claiming that he disassociated himself from the conspiracy at a certain time.

The conspiracy law became a potent factor in the prosecution of Federal crimes. It can be said without any fear of contradiction, at least as far as observed by the author's experience of almost 30 years of practice in the local Federal courts, that the vast majority of the Federal indictments in the southern and eastern districts of New York contain conspiracy charges in addition to the substantive offenses charged and were successfully prosecuted primarily because of the inclusion of conspiracy charges in the indictments.

The appellate courts generally affirm such convictions. As long as the record shows the necessary minimum evidence legally sufficient to sustain the conviction unaffected by error, the conviction is affirmed. The appellate courts were and still are influenced by the Federal harmless-error statute (sec. 269 of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. sec. 391). The general policy of these courts is that a Federal appellate court under the harmless-error statute should permit a judgment to stand notwithstanding error where the court is satisfied that the error did not influence the jury or had but very slight effect on it, except perhaps where the departure is from a constitutional norm or a specific command of Congress. As the Supreme Court said in

Kotteakos v. *United States*, 328 U.S. 750 at p. 763:

"Thus it is not the appellate court's function to determine guilt or innocence * * * nor is it to speculate upon probable reconviction and decide according to how the speculation comes out. Appellate judges cannot escape such impressions. But they may not make them sole criteria for reversal or affirmance. Those judgments are exclusively for the jury, given always the necessary minimum evidence legally sufficient to sustain the conviction unaffected by the error." See also *Weiler* v. *U.S.*, 323 U.S. at 611, 89 L. ed. 499, 65 S. Ct. 548; *Bollenbach* v. *U.S.*, 326 U.S. 607, 612, 613, ante 350, 354, 355, 66 S. Ct. 402.

Lately, however, the Federal appellate courts, while still adhering to the doctrine of the harmless-error statute, have begun to scrutinize the conspiracy convictions more carefully as they begin to realize that justice is not always done in these cases, especially when under the guise of the conspiracy law and the wide latitude permitted in the offer of proof, that this law gives to prosecutors, indictments are being returned against numerous defendants grouped together in one overall conspiracy, because of the possibility, if not certainty, that juries will sweep all into the conspiracy charged because of their association with each other, especially when a proper climate is created through wide newspaper publicity prior to the trials. That was especially true in cases where the defendants were accused of a conspiracy to violate the Smith Act and is now true in indictments charging a conspiracy to violate the Federal narcotic laws. Whether we care to admit it or not, guilt by association plays an important part in jury verdicts in cases of this type.

This tendency by ambitious and overzealous Federal prosecutors to use the conspiracy law to bring about mass trials, where numerous defendants are charged with one overall conspiracy although the proof at the trial shows several distinct and not related conspiracies was condemned by the Supreme Court of the United States as early as 1946 in the leading case of *Kotteakos* v. *U.S.*, cited, supra.

In that case 32 persons were named in the indictment. Only 19 defendants were brought to trial and 13 were submitted to the jury. The jury convicted 7, acquitted 2, and disagreed as to 4. The only question raised before the Supreme Court was whether the petitioner-defendants suffered substantial prejudice from being convicted on a single general conspiracy by evidence which the Government admitted proved not one conspiracy but some eight or more different ones of the same sort, executed through a common key figure, one Simon Brown.

The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit affirmed the Judgments of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York (151 F. 2d 170). The court of appeals conceded that the trial judge "was plainly wrong in supposing that upon the evidence there could be a single conspiracy; and in the view which he took of the law, he should have dismissed the indictment" (151 F. 2d at 172) but it nevertheless affirmed the conviction, saying among other things, that "especially since guilt was so manifest, it was 'proper' to join the conspiracies, and to reverse the conviction would be a miscarriage of justice." The Supreme Court granted certiorari "because of the importance of the question for the administration of criminal justice in the Federal Courts" (326 U.S. 711, ante 420, 68 S. Ct. 169).

In reversing the conviction (328 U.S. 750–780, the Court by Mr. Justice Rutledge said inter alia:

"There are times when of necessity, because of the nature and scope of the particular federation, large numbers of persons taking part must be tried together or perhaps not at all, at any rate as respects some. When many conspire, they invite mass trial by their conduct. Even so, the proceedings are exceptional to our tradition and call for use of every safeguard to individualize each defendant in his relation to the mass. Wholly different is it with those who join together with only a few, though many others may be doing the same and though some of them may line up with more than one group.

"Criminal they may be, but it is not the criminality of mass conspiracy. They do not invite the mass trial by their conduct. Nor does our system tolerate it. That way lies the drift toward totalitarian institutions. True, this may be inconvenient for prosecution. But our Government is not one of mere convenience or efficiency. It, too, has a stake, with every cititzen, in his being afforded our historic individual protections, including those surrounding criminal trials. About them we dare not become careless or complacent when that fashion has become rampant over the earth."

Kotteakos while a landmark in the decisional law regarding this subject did not, however, serve any real practical purpose. The Federal prosecutors, while a little shaken up by the Supreme Court's decision, quickly disregarded the admonitions of the High Court and mass conspiracy trials in which a single overall conspiracy is charged although the proof indicates separate and distinct conspiracies and where most of the defendants are unknown to each other, are the vogue again. While lip service is being paid to the letter of the Supreme Court's decision in that trial courts, when that issue is raised by the defense, charge the juries that they must find as a fact that a single conspiracy, as charged in the indictment exists, before they can convict, the spirit of the decision is not really being observed. Juries, in the opinion of the author, are not competent or capable to pass upon the intricate question of what is or is not a single or a multiple conspiracy. This issue should have been left to the trial courts to decide as a matter of law. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court, by its decision, made this issue a question of fact to be decided by the jury on a proper charge by the trial court.

The appellate courts are, however, beginning to take notice of conspiracy convictions based on the patently hearsay evidence of declarations of other conspirators, not made in the presence of the appellant-defenders, but admitted "subject to connection." Another phase of conspiracy convictions which does not meet with approval of the Federal appellate courts is the one based on prosecutors' tendency to spell out a conspiracy merely by the act of an attempted substantive offense, thus enabling the prosecutor to avail himself of the latitude allowed by the conspiracy law to bring about a conviction of what is essentially a substantive offense.

In *U.S.* v. *Reina et al.*, 242 F. 2d 302, decided March 19, 1957, the court of appeals of this circuit reversed a conviction of the defendant, Valachi, one of the several defendants on trial, who had been convicted in the district court of the crime of conspiracy to import, sell, etc., narcotics. While the court of appeals based its main reason for reversal on the ground that the statute of limitations had run as to the appellant Valachi, the court stated in its opinion at page 306 as follows:

"The only 'overt acts' after that date that the judge left to the jury, were two, one in June 1952, and the other in August 1952, and both were after the sale by Valachi to Pocoroba on July 2, 1951. Valachi was not connected with either of them. The prosecution answers that this was unnecessary, because, once it is shown that a person has become a party to a conspiracy the law presumes that he remains a party while it continues, unless he shows that he has left it. Therefore, since Valachi did not show that he had broken off his connection with Shillitani, he remained a party until after September 1, 1951, and the 'overt acts' will serve. We should accept this reasoning, if we thought that Valachi's sale of the parcel to Pocoroba was evidence that he knew it was in execution of the larger venture; that is, that he was cooperating in the series of importations that made up the conspiracy charged. His sale was indeed not inconsistent with that knowledge; but it was equally consistent, so far as we can see, with his being an independent peddler of narcotics, whom Shillitani selected as the most immediately available source of supply for Pocoroba's needs. In deciding that there was no evidence forbidding this second possibility, we may not consider any declarations of the proved conspirators, such as Orsini or Shillitani, for these were hearsay until Valachi's connection with the conspiracy was proved by other evidence. His own declaration was of course competent against him, but it was altogether equivocal as to the source of his supply. Indeed, were we to speculate, we should incline to read it as indicating that he bought at random."

In another decision by the court of appeals of this circuit rendered on February 20, 1957, in *U.S.* v. *Kee Eng et al.*, 241 F. 2d 157, the displeasure of the court of appeals with the apparent tendency by the Government prosecuting agencies to use conspiracy indictments indiscriminately because of the loose rules of evidence permissible in such types of charges, is clearly evident. That indictment involved a charge of conspiracy with others to violate, among others, section 174 of title 21, U.S.C.A. The court in reversing the conviction, stated inter alia:

"There was no agreement to advance any joint interest or for Eng to do anything more than pay money upon receipt of the heroin. The evidence had to do with an isolated transaction, a purchaser of five packages for $1,000. The facts are somewhat similar to those disclosed in *United States* v. *Koch*, 113 F. 2d 982 (2 Cir., 1940). There we held that even where a single purchase had actually been made that, without more, was insufficient evidence to connect the purchaser with the conspiracy to import and sell drugs in violation of law (see cases cited in *United States* v. *Koch*, and also *United States* v. *Di Re*, 159 F. 2d 818 (2 Cir., 1947), affirmed 332 U.S. 581 (1948)). Had Eng received the heroin and paid the money he would have been guilty of illegal possession and illegal purchase of heroin. The premature action of the customs agent apparently prevented Eng from going through with the transaction which he had discussed with Lee. In any event, what might have resulted in a simple case of purchase and possession, had the purchase been consummated, cannot be tortured into a conspiracy to import and sell because evidence of a substantive crime is lacking. * * *

"Having failed to adduce any evidence of Eng's knowledge of the conspiracy and willingness to join such a conspiracy, all the other evidence was improperly admitted."

The experience of the last decade proves that decisions by Federal appellate courts, sound and salutary as they are, do not act as a deterrent to the promiscuous use of the conspiracy law by ambitious and overzealous Federal prosecutors. The conspiracy law, involving the permissive use of patently hearsay evidence together with testimony of accomplices which need not be corroborated, is a proceeding exceptional to our traditions and is similar to a fashion of trial rampant over a great space of our globe today. Mass trials, as conspiracy trials have now become, give no safeguard to the individual and are repulsive to our sense of justice. To paraphrase the Supreme Court, "in such mass trials lies the drift towards totalitarian institutions."

The present rules of evidence permitted in conspiracy trials which allow convictions based entirely on the uncorroborated testimony of accomplices, make justice a mockery. In a recent trial involving 19 defendants had in the District Court for the Southern District of New York, the principal if not sole witness for the Government was an individual, named as coconspirator, whose criminal record extended for most of his adult life and included such crimes as desertion in time of war to peddling narcotics. The trial evidence developed while this witness was working with the Government, he actually engaged in sales of narcotics apparently in the belief that his association with Government agencies gave him the right to violate the law. Yet on that witness' uncorroborated evidence, proven on cross-examination to be inaccurate in many respects, a jury convicted.

It is the duty of our bar associations, together with the members of the Federal bench, to alert Congress to the dangers to our individual liberties, inherent in the present rules governing trials of conspiracy indictments. We must make every effort to bring about a change in these rules, more consonant with our ideas of justice and our dignity as a people governed by just laws. To that task we the members of the bar charged with the duty to defend causes, no matter how unpopular, must dedicate ourselves.

The Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, there being no legislation scheduled for floor action, I spent most of last week in my district in Illinois. This gave me opportunity to talk with many, many people. The one thing uppermost in their minds and of grave concern to them as to our domestic problems is our Federal budget. They repeatedly emphasize how important it is that we do not enter upon a spending spree and that we keep the budget balanced. The people are deeply concerned about the extravagant spending bills that have been proposed.

The following editorial, entitled "Twenty-eight Billion New Spending Offered," which appeared in the Daily Pantagraph of Bloomington, Ill., on February 25, expresses, I am convinced, the thinking of the people I am privileged to represent."

TWENTY-EIGHT BILLION NEW SPENDING OFFERED

Advocates of spending are rushing ahead with bill after bill in Congress despite the need for a balanced budget and a stabilized dollar.

David Lawrence in his column on this page February 24 cited the delays in industrial plant expansion, the difficulties of Treasury financing, the flight from fixed investments and the general threat to our economic security.

A balanced budget would do more than anything else to correct this dangerous situation. Yet what do we see taking place in the Democratic majority in Congress?

For example, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS has introduced S. 722 calling for expenditure of $380 million in area development. Senator MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, has offered S. 1 an airport construction bill, for $575 million.

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ of New Mexico, has introduced a public works bill with a $2 billion price tag: Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama has offered a housing bill, S. 57, which would cost $2.5 billion over 6 years.

Senator JOHN KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, are cosponsoring a bill providing urban renewal grants of $6 billion over a 10-year period. Senator JAMES MURRAY and Representative LEE METCALF have offered a Federal school construction bill, S. 2, which would cost $11.4 billion in 4 years.

Representative THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, of Michigan, has offered a public works bill in the House calling for expenditure of $3 billion. Representative EARL HOGAN, of Indiana is author of H.R. 102, which would give pensions to World War I veterans at a cost of $2.25 billion.

This totals about $28 billion in spending, most of which apparently would have to be deficit financed since no additional taxes have been proposed to cover the cost of these projects.

The President has proposed some projects in many of these areas but calling for smaller amounts.

Some Democratic leaders are trying to counter President Eisenhower's charge of "spenders" by proposing some cuts in foreign aid. The President only asked for $3.93 billion. If they were to cut it all out they still couldn't make a dent in the huge deficit they are proposing.

Of course foreign aid projects should be examined carefully before being cut at all. This is part of our cold war against Russia. It would be futile to spend billions on arms at home unless we also help underdeveloped countries to improve their standards of living without being subverted by the Communists.

The approach being made by individual Democrats in the current Congress represents irresponsibility unworthy of a major political party in a time of crisis. We urge the responsible party leaderships and the citizens at large to place country above selfish interest and curb this unwarranted deficit spending.

Those who propose new projects should have the courage to propose new taxes as well to cover the cost.

Hon. Sid Simpson

SPEECH
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with immeasurable sadness that we return to the contemplation of the untimely passing of our esteemed friend and colleague who left this life at the very peak of his career and at a time when his contributions to his State and the Nation had reached impressive proportions.

It was my great privilege to sit at his side on the Committee on Agriculture and it was a rich experience to have the benefit of his down-to-earth philosophy which was always permeated with a compelling sense of humor. In the day-to-day interchange between the members and in interrogating witnesses he displayed a firm grasp of the economics of our farm problem but never pressed his views to the point where he departed from those gentlemanly characteristics which were the hallmark of his legislative career.

This path we tread is all too short and we are made better when in the course of our journey we are permitted to travel in company with a generous, lighthearted companion such as was the one we mourn. We shall always cherish his memory and we shall remember in our devotions his charming wife and children who have carried on in his absence in a manner that would have delighted his soul. To them goes our heartfelt sympathy and the assurance that their loss has also been very real to those of us who have been honored to call him friend.

Junior Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unusual and effective programs through which young people are given the opportunity to grow into mature young citizens is junior achievement.

As many of our colleagues are aware, junior achievement is made possible by the cooperation of public-spirited businessmen who, by means of their unselfish devotion of time, interest, and business know-how, enable young men and women between the ages of 15 and 19 to participate in actual business operations of their own.

The experience, of course, has been invaluable. The assumption of real responsibility by these young people, together with the practical knowledge achieved by handling the functions of business and finance, have added a new dimension to their educations.

Junior achievement, therefore, has proven itself an important means of finding and developing young people of exceptional ability. By providing an unusually challenging way of bringing out the best in our youth and by creating opportunities for developing a sense of responsibility and a talent for leadership, junior achievement is accomplishing a great deal in our national effort to lift standards of education and to implant in our youth the desire for excellence.

Of all the junior achievement organizations in the country, Mr. Speaker, I know of no other which has shown the imagination and displayed the productive zeal of the Union County-Carteret organization in New Jersey. For their achievements, a great deal of the credit must go to Mr. Philip C. Osterman, junior achievement president, and Mr. J. Kenneth Roden, executive vice president.

A mark of their imaginative leadership was the recent tour of Puerto Rico sponsored by Junior Achievement of Union County-Carteret. Twenty-eight

boys and girls, truly good-will ambassadors, flew to Puerto Rico to study the economy and industrial development of the Commonwealth. During their brief stay they were guests of Puerto Rican businessmen and their families. They met with government officials, including Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín, and industrial leaders and visited museums, art galleries and universities. Altogether, they obtained an invaluable inside view of the relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico in the fields of government, education, culture, agriculture, and business.

This unique junior achievement venture, Operation Puerto Rico, recalled an earlier trip to Canada, where similar valuable experience was obtained.

The 28 junior achievers who participated in the trip, together with the names of their firms, follow:

Kenneth C. Bradshaw, 136 Chilton Hall, Elizabeth, Hy-Co.

William E. Brandt, 305 Waite Avenue, Rahway, Ja-Chem.

Ray S. Ciemniecki, 607 Clinton Street, Linden, Esco Co.

Elaine A. Downey, 95 New York Avenue, Clark, Gemco.

John Erdreich, 352 McLean Place, Hillside, Hillco.

Joseph M. Gutauckis, 154 South Park Street, Elizabeth, Typco, Inc.

William J. Hornyak, 1410 Hussa Street, Linden, Scher-Craft.

Frank W. Huber, 508 Livingston Street, Elizabeth, Westjac.

Andrew K. Hughes, 1211 Prospect Avenue, Plainfield, Javid Unlimited, Inc.

Barbara A. Jacek, 228 Atlantic Street, Elizabeth, Rol-O-Lator Co.

Ronald Jarka, 24 Mary Street, Carteret, Kleenco.

Joan Kates, 29 Decker Avenue, Elizabeth, Corac.

Alexander J. Kersis, 742 Morses Mill Road, Elizabeth, Achievalite.

Donald G. Kulibas, 1300 Deerfield Terrace, Linden, Jun-A-Crest.

Robert G. Konecny, 145 Union Avenue, Linden, Traco Products Co.

Elaine J. Kratson, 227 Marshall Street, Elizabeth, Jasco.

Geraldine Krysiak, 525 Garfield Street, Linden, Gafco.

Pamela L. Newman, 702 Westfield Avenue, Elizabeth, Copper Art Products Co.

Roberta J. Nolan, 853 Washington Avenue, Linden, Jalso Products.

Janet E. Powers, 1812 Caroline Avenue, Linden, Best Co.

Janet G. Rey, 15 Dartmouth Road, Cranford, JA Pont.

Sandra J. Rosenblum, 87 Fitch Street, Carteret, Jamco.

Donald L. Stuart, 200 Vine Street, Roselle, Printco, Inc.

John D. Tohlman, 149 West Grand Street, Elizabeth, Calcraft.

Richard Toth, 552 Birchwood Road, Linden, Kismif Co.

Alexander H. Vannauker, 53 South 18th Street, Kenilworth, Ken-Co Labs.

Marilyn Walter, 1213 Summit Terrace, Linden, Dayton Co.

Arline D. Wright, 300 W. Webster Avenue, Roselle Park, Jasew.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I also include an editorial from the February 10 issue of the Elizabeth Daily Journal, which articulately sets forth the purpose and accomplishments of junior achievement:

TESTING JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT

Junior achievement normally is recognized and accepted as a movement devised to inculcate business principles and the basic elements of good citizenship in young Americans in the 15-19-year range. In many areas it has adhered to and expanded in those fields. The Union County-Carteret segment of the movement has been outstanding for years and few units are better known.

Accomplishment in business in the 28 member groups is leading toward interest and participation in broader attributes of citizenship. This is consistent with the policy of the movement. Good businessmen look beyond their production and distribution areas, not necessarily or exclusively in pursuit of fresh material or more sales, but in search of sounder comprehension of their fellowmen.

Broadening of view toward other men in the far corners of our own Republic and in the distant lands overseas may boost trade incidentally, but it has other fruits. It diminishes the tensions that brew conflicts, it betters the lot of backward peoples, it lifts every nation toward finer standards in living and in thought.

The venture of the Union County-Carteret Junior Achievers in visiting Puerto Rico is a step in the pathway toward international amity directed by the sponsors. Puerto Rico is more distant in language and customs and economics than some other far places, despite its ties to the United States. Its proximity and the convenience of contact make it ideal for this experiment in studying another people, which the local Junior Achievers now are concluding.

A previous jaunt into Canada served the same end, but much of the provinces are too akin to the United States to yield the contrasts and the comparisons to be derived from the current junket. The flight to the commonwealth offered the teenagers practically all the aspects of a real trip to a far land, a strange market, another people, a different philosophy.

This is a testing of the real abilities of these boys and girls. It measures their power to learn and absorb by observation; it defines their capacity for rapid appraisal of conditions about them. They have had and benefit from cogent counseling in matters of production and distribution, but no coaching can be substituted for the exercise of their own talents in meeting and estimating their fellowmen. Their success in this computes the highest yield of junior achievement.

The Most Important Thing in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, inflation is recognized as one of the greatest dangers facing this country. I wish to include in my remarks a speech delivered by Mr. William E. Carraway before the Northside Rotary Club of Colorado Springs on January 29, 1959. Mr. Carraway retired as a brigadier general in the U.S. Army in 1955 after a brilliant military career. He served in the Pentagon from 1948 to 1951 as the Chief of the Plans Branch of the Army's Budget Division. During 1950 he served as Secretary to the Program and Budget Advisers to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. From 1951 to 1953 he fought inflation in Korea as the deputy commander of the United Nations Civil Assistance Command, and as the U.S. Chairman of the Finance Committee of the Combined Economic Board, which was established to coordinate economic policies in the Republic of Korea. I am sure the Members of the House will be interested in this timely speech, which follows:

THE MOST IMPORTANT THING IN THE WORLD

Ever since serving in China from 1933 to 1936, I have believed that civilizations grow stronger and greater as long as their basic principles are simple enough to be understood and followed by the people and their leaders. When life in a country becomes so complicated that these essentials are forgotten or ignored, then that civilization begins to decline.

Whether our American civilization has begun to deteriorate in this way is debatable, but there can be no doubt at all that our Government, our very life is becoming more and more complicated. This in turn is causing the great majority of citizens, particularly political leaders, to be somewhat confused concerning the basic principles which should guide our individual and collective conduct.

Therefore, from time to time, all groups of Americans should consider what is most important to them, to their country, and to their way of life. Such analyses will assist materially in developing a proper understanding of the relative priorities of both our problems and our loyalties and will thereby prepare us to make decisions as citizens with a firm basis for putting first things first.

To all Americans, the most important thing in the world is our country, the United States of America. That we, as individuals, owe all that we are or hope to be to our country is self-evident to any open-minded person. Nothing proves this supreme loyalty more than the fact that many Americans of the past have given their lives for their country and that today this is the only cause for which the large majority of young Americans would make a similar sacrifice.

But what lies behind our country? What above all else must be guarded as the chief cornerstone of both our national health and our individual happiness?

We have many problems and programs which may from time to time appear to be most important from various points of view. Military defense, full employment, control of labor unions, education, juvenile delinquency, religion, the growing power of Government, increasing taxes, and many other related matters certainly require collective action if we as a nation are to progress in the future as we have in the past.

However, the most important things in life may not always be apparent as problems. Such is the freedom of choice with which each American makes his own character, lives where he wishes, works as he chooses, and enjoys his many rights and privileges. Even though our highly integrated economy is making it increasingly difficult for individuals to change about as they might wish, the privilege is still there and can be exercised by the overwhelming majority of citizens at any time.

But what lies at the basis of this freedom of choice? What has caused our economy to expand as it has in the past as the result of the cumulative effect of individual actions

rather than from governmental direction and control?

The one essential to our past success is the individual incentive resulting from the freedom of choice and a good sound money system. It is the dollar that causes Americans to enter upon work that pays better wages and to move to other locations where they can make better profits or get more for their earnings.

Too many Americans do not realize that there are two fundamental systems for securing the proper distribution of labor throughout the economy of a nation such as ours. These systems vary principally in the manner by which citizens are directed into various types of employment. Our system is based on payments of dollars which are increased as may be required to insure that the supply of labor in any specialty or in any area is sufficient to meet the needs of the Nation. The Communistic system substitutes force for dollars, leaves little choice to its citizens, and will always be compelled to use slave labor for the most disagreeable tasks that must be performed.

The Communists sacrifice the freedom of choice of the individual to the good of the State as dictators decide what this good may be. Accordingly, the individual citizen under communism cannot develop in breadth of character, in power of independent action, in overall worth as a man, but nevertheless the nation may be far more quickly changed to a war economy or develop missiles than is possible in a democracy such as ours. Similarly, by holding to a minimum the production of consumer goods, a Communist nation can quickly develop the funds needed to expand heavy industry and to support special programs of any kind.

The above comparative facts are fairly well known to Americans but it is much less generally known that any material loss in the attractiveness of the dollar or in the incentives or rewards encouraging freedom of choice might cause our people to refuse to move voluntarily to less rewarding or more disagreeable employment. Were this inertia to appear, national survival might require that our Nation institute conscription of labor with the attendant loss of freedom of choice concerning place and mode of labor. We would then for all practical purposes have adopted the basic principle of communism.

Sound money instead of force is accordingly the lifeblood of our American economy and of our American way of life. Money provides the basis upon which the individual develops independence of thought and character and by which the supply of labor is adjusted to changing demands throughout the Nation.

I first suspected that sound money is therefore the pinpoint of conflict between the United States and Soviet Russia in 1936, when I returned home from service in China by the Trans-Siberian Railway and stopped in Moscow for a few days. While there a young Russian was very helpful in guiding me around. Accordingly, just before leaving I asked him what I might do in return.

"Buy me some clothes in London and send them to me," was his immediate answer. Somewhat taken aback, I agreed to accept $25 in U.S. currency to purchase shoes for himself and a raincoat, a hat, and other articles for his sweetheart. But I could not understand the reasons which caused him to ask the favor.

"You will have to pay a very high duty, will you not?" I asked.

"Oh, yes," he replied. "But I can get as many rubles as I want."

I have never forgotten his reply. It still seems to present the fundamental difference between the United States and Soviet Russia, between capitalism and communism, and between democracy and totalitarianism. Has anyone ever heard an American say, "I can get as many dollars as I want?"

Americans all want money, more and more of it, with the power and the privileges which it offers, particularly the wonderful goods, services, and possessions which it provides. In America, money talks, is the objective of nearly all our labors, and is the direct means by which our economy and our lives are welded together and managed.

Under Soviet communism, however, money has been reduced to comparative insignificance. There is little to buy, distribution is closely controlled, and, on the whole, personal property is limited to articles of almost insignificant value. Position, not money, determines both power and scale of living under the Soviets. Money under communism has become a mere method of exchange and accounting.

This lack of true value of money in Russia is well illustrated by a story which Time magazine published about 1935. The first Soviet millionaire, a composer, had accumulated a million rubles, but there was nothing of consequence that he could do with his money except use a small portion for living expenses and deposit the remainder with the government. He could buy but a limited quantity of clothes and food which were rationed; he could not buy a house or a car, change his work, or set himself up in business. He could not travel, take a vacation, or even retire on his money. The Russian millionaire was therefore designated as a ward of the state which took over his fortune and allowed him only a very small amount thereof as an allowance each month.

The subordination of money is an absolute essential in a communistic nation. All power must be centralized in the hands of the nation's rulers, so that complete day-by-day control of all citizens can be exercised. Therefore, communism must outlaw completely wealth of any kind which can be saved or freely exchanged in such a way as to permit economic independence, just as personal religion, which encourages moral independence must also be eliminated.

For the primary obstacles to the spread of communism are religion, property, and money. And of these three, money may well be the most important, for when its value is lost, both religion and property will very likely go down in the wreck which follows.

In the so-called capitalist nations, particularly in the United States, money provides the means by which each individual can obtain his heart's desires, whether it be the raising of his family, buying a home or a car, quitting his job, retiring on an income, or adding to his property. The chief characteristic of the dollar accordingly is its attractiveness which is intimately bound up with what it will buy, with the large stocks of goods in the United States, the ownership of property, the freedom to travel and to change employment, and the like. Freedom rings not only from every mountainside, but from every transaction involving the American dollar.

When money loses its value in wild inflation or by other less spectacular means, confidence in government and in economic systems is gradually destroyed, stresses and strains develop between classes as changes occur in the value of their comparative economic rewards, and standards of moral conduct quickly deteriorate to an alarming degree.

Now the most interesting commentary on this situation is that the Communists, who have relegated money to a comparatively minor role, are very alert concerning its importance and seem to understand its management, while the average American citizen appears to know little concerning the importance of sound money as the fundamental principle upon which our way of life depends.

The Communists have demonstrated in many ways that they understand that the value of money must be destroyed as a prelude to the adoption of communism. The first history of the Soviet revolution which I read many years ago was a translation of a book by Soviet authors who stated that the revolution succeeded more by gaining control of the printing presses than by all the bullets fired in the field. For the Communists then proceeded to further wild inflation and to abolish private property and religion, so that every Russian became completely dependent upon the Communist government. Two Soviet writers even dedicated a book to the printing press in recognition of the part it played in inflating the currency of capitalist nations.

During and after World War II, the Soviets deliberately furthered wild inflation in all satellite areas as a preliminary to drawing them completely under the control of Moscow. The so-called Iron Curtain is really a money curtain, as is well illustrated by the fact that the introduction of the currency of West Germany into Berlin gave the Russians such alarm that they instituted the blockade. Stalin himself stated the currency had to be settled before the blockade would be lifted, but we refused to change our position.

The Soviet leaders believe in direct action against money systems of other nations. In 1921, Lenin wrote: "When we conquer on a world scale I think we shall use gold for the purpose of building lavatories in the streets of the large cities of the world." He then went on to say that the Soviet Union should save gold, however, for use against capitalist nations. If the Russians had the goods, you may be sure that we would see again many charges that Soviet Russia was dumping products of slave labor on the countries of the free world. With the credits gained in these and other ways and the gold, dope and other valuables which can be easily transported, they have long been financing the propaganda and subversive campaigns which local Communist parties conduct in nearly every country around the world.

The Communists understand clearly that the one sure way to eliminate the middle class is by wild inflation. This makes the rich richer and the middle class poorer, thus preparing the way for the acceptance of communism not only by the direct elimination of opposition but also by the discrediting of the former economic system. Furthermore, inflation undermines, if it does not destroy, the high standards of individual honesty and conduct which are fundamental to the development of the individual and to the mutual confidence necessary for the proper functioning of a democracy.

The Communist leaders also seem to realize fully the supreme importance of money to the capitalist world. And they know that war or near war is an almost sure means of causing the inflation of the money of their enemies, thereby weakening resistance to communism. Strong armed forces and occasional wars of limited nature are therefore welcomed not only to cause the fearful, both at home and abroad, to become more amenable to Communist control, but also to keep the free world in turmoil so great as to undermine the value of money and the basic strength of the various national economies.

Unfortunately, American leaders have neither demonstrated sufficient awareness of the importance of sound money nor have developed techniques necessary for maintaining it. China furnishes a classic example of how a financial policy of the United States actually assisted in the defeat of the national policy which it purported to serve. In 1934, the United States raised the price of silver in dollars. One of the chief reasons advanced for this action was that it would increase the purchasing power of the Orient, particularly China which had a silver (Mex) currency that had continued in use for many years as wars and warlords waxed and

waned. Chinese purchasing power did increase with the rise in price of silver, but only at the cost of sending the silver dollars to the United States. The increased value of silver, as well as the loss of currency, caused prices in China to fall which in turn brought on an immediate economic depression. China was accordingly forced off the silver standard in 1935 and thereafter had little backing for its currency other than public confidence in the integrity of the Nationalist government. During and after World War II, inflation of paper currency came on to undermine the Chinese economy, increase dishonesty, and facilitate enormously the acceptance of the Chinese Communists.

Thus a chief cause for the communization of China was the loss of the Chinese silver currency and its replacement by paper currency of an ever-diminishing value.

The lack of knowledge of American leaders concerning money matters is clearly indicated by the story of allied military currency which all allied forces used immediately after the end of hostilities. Our wartime officials sent the original plates for this currency to Russia where enormous quantities of bills were printed. This money, identical to that paid American soldiers, was then used to pay many months of backpay to Soviet soldiers in occupied areas who were not permitted to send the money home in the form of rubles. Soviet personnel therefore used the currency lavishly to purchase watches and other desirable articles, particularly from Americans who had a wealth of things of rare value in Russia.

American personnel, however, were permitted initially to exchange this allied military currency for dollars which could be returned to the United States. When our finances officers finally were forced to survey their situation, they found themselves with some 360 million more allied currency than they had issued. By that time, this had been exchanged for dollars by American soldiers and sent to the United States, so that an actual deficit of this amount of dollars had been created. In early 1949, however, the United States eliminated this deficit by the simple expedient of keeping for itself the dollars earned by the economies of Germany, Austria, and Japan. The Russians nevertheless had outsmarted the United States to the tune of $360 million.

Perhaps the most serious international problem our Nation faces is how to give economic and military aid to allied nations and yet require them to use this aid without furthering inflation. China is a classic example of this, as mentioned above. All during the Korean war, the Republic of Korea Government was unable to stop the serious inflation of their national currency. Nor was the United States able to remedy the situation, with the result that while our American soldiers were giving their lives in the defense of South Korea, behind the front inflation was destroying the economy of the nation which we were fighting to defend, and compelling the ROK leadership to adopt dictatorial measures far more appropriate to communism than to democracy.

President Eisenhower recognized the disadvantages of both inflation and inflationary controls when he recently stated: "If reasonable stability of prices cannot be reached * * * the alternatives are either inflation, which would damage our economy and work hardships on millions of Americans, or controls, which are alien to our traditional way of life, and which would be an obstacle to the Nation's economic growth and improvement."

The President, like many other thinking Americans, has become increasingly disturbed at the creeping inflation which has characterized our economy since the early days of the New Deal in 1933. Since that time our Nation has operated within its income in only 4 years. Our national debt has risen in this period to over $280 billion. During the present fiscal year it is anticipated that we will have a deficit of nearly $13 billion.

These figures serve to emphasize that creeping inflation, like strong drink and narcotics, cannot be taken without great danger that it will become so habitual that the patient will either eventually be destroyed or the cure itself will take all the patient's energies and will incapitate him for other activities during the period of his treatment.

Inflation is necessary to a degree in time of war; in such an emergency taxes and borrowings simply cannot provide all the revenue required to finance operations. We have experienced two resulting periods of such inflation in the last 20 years.

Politicians have learned the ease with which funds can be appropriated even when the money required cannot be obtained by noninflationary methods. Labor unions in successive round of wage increases both use past inflation as the basis of their demands and cause the inflation to continue. Proponents of national defense, welfare programs, foreign aid, and other less important projects advocate their objectives as being far more necessary than a balanced budget.

Some economists even advocate controlled inflation as the best way to obtain continued prosperity and to avoid occasional depressions; one such view pinpoints the required amount of inflation as 2 percent per year, a view which is alarmingly like advocating that everyone take two drinks of whisky each night. While there may be some stalwart individuals who could always use both inflation and whisky in moderation, there are countless others who do not have the judgment or fortitude to do so where either the one or the other is concerned. Inflation, like whisky, is a strong medicine that may be necessary in real emergencies but cannot be recommended for a steady diet.

The various checks and balances built into the American system of government actually are a handicap to the exercise of proper control over inflationary tendencies. At least some governmental agencies look narrowly at their own interests, advocate policies that further inflation, and support similar excess requests from other sources in order to obtain a wider support for their own programs. If the Communists are right in teaching that capitalism contains the seeds of its own destruction, these seeds will surely feed chiefly on the resulting inability of our government to limit expenditures to the funds that are known to be available.

The management of money is far more difficut in the United States than it is in Russia. Both countries use money, as the great and only common denominator, for integrating the many national programs in annual budgets. But in the United States money takes various forms such as stocks, bonds, and credits, is scarcely distinguishable from personal property, and in controlled by officials who feel responsible for obeying the mandates of the people, while the electorate on the whole understands neither the importance nor the techniques for the maintenance of financial health.

In Russia, however, the dictators do what they wish, in apparent disregard for public opinion, as occurred in 1947 when they issued a new currency on the basis of one new ruble for ten old ones, with a more favorable rate on a very limited basis. This action was a true "capital levy," an action which was intended to eliminate inflationary effects brought on during World War II. Such a course would prove practically impossible for fair application here in the United States. As a matter of fact the Soviet action was widely misunderstood by Americans, as is well indicated by the New York Times which headlined that the action was a devaluation when it was just the opposite.

Another interesting comment is that both the United States and the Soviet Union have abandoned the theoretical principles of their own system and have moved toward the system of the other. Soviet Russia has turned its back on a moneyless society as was originally planned and has increased the importance as well as the value of its money. Americans have abandoned the gold standard and have placed gold and silver in the ground where it is used only to make international payments.

There are many who believe that a return to the gold standard would provide a safety valve that would make the value of the dollar independent of the combined inflationary effects of governmental decisions, or at least, would offer a sound and solid basis for the maintenance of public confidence in gold-backed currency. There are others who believe that Soviet Russia has accumulated tremendous stocks of gold to use against our currency when the occasion is ripe. If neither of these conclusions is true, it is nevertheless correct to say that all indications point to the fact that Soviet Russia, where money means little, has concentrated on producing gold, while the United States, where money means everything, has for 25 years done much to discourage and to reduce the production of gold.

The events of recent months have emphasized the seriousness of our gold situation. We have in the past year been forced to ship a large amount of gold overseas to settle accounts with other nations and are in danger of losing a great deal more if foreigners become worried about the declining value of the dollar. This situation makes clearcut the fact that our Nation is actually on the gold standard in international fields but refuses both to extend this privilege to our own citizens in domestic matters and to take normal action to build up our own stocks of gold to meet all possible emergencies.

The restoration of the gold standard in the United States would require a change in the price of gold which is arbitrarily set by the Government. The price presently effective was set in 1933, so that the mining of gold is steadily decreasing as this is far from being a profitable operation at the high costs of today. It would therefore be necessary to raise its price with a return to the gold standard, so as to insure increased production.

Those of us who live in the Pikes Peak region should be particularly concerned about a return to the gold standard, the existing price of gold, and the stocks of the precious metal available to our Government. We owe much to the gold of Cripple Creek—and would profit much more in the future if the price of gold were raised—or even if it were permitted to seek its own price in a free market.

The difficulty in our present situation is that most Americans do not understand money matters so that it is a fertile field for the activities of misguided idealists who seek full control over matters economic and accordingly object to the strict honesty imposed by the gold standard. I once heard an outstanding economist, who became quite well known in the New Deal, say that we might as well take all our gold and sink it at sea, a solution which is very near the same as that proposed by Lenin but much less practical. The Assistant Secretary of the Treasury who took a leading role in sending to Russia the plates for occupational currency was later accused of being a Communist and after the war killed himself under conditions which suggested that he had either a conscience that was very guilty indeed or a knowledge of Communist subversion that could not be disclosed.

All of the above considerations lead to the inescapable conclusion that the most im-

portant thing in the American world is the nature of the decisions which come out of governmental agencies in Washington. If these decisions undermine the basic principles and incentives which have caused our national growth and strength, we can expect a corresponding decline in our power as a Nation and our worth as individuals. In order to prevent such retrograde action, we must in particular maintain the value of our money by balancing expenditures and revenues and by avoiding the many evils of creeping inflation.

In the sayings of Confucius, as translated by Lionel Giles, the Chinese Solomon is quoted in answering a question as to the essentials of good government. The only one of five such essentials which Confucius repeated for emphasis was. "The wise man and good ruler is benevolent without expending treasure." Interpreted somewhat freely, this means, "Keep your welfare and giveaway programs within the limits of available income so that proper incentives may be maintained to encourage every citizen to reach ever high standards of living, efficiency, and production, as a matter of his own choice, rather than from compulsion."

The struggle in the world today is basically between two economic systems, capitalism and communism. While we must keep our national economy and our Armed Forces strong; the issue will be decided entirely by the thoughts and motivations which exist in the hearts of our people. Not only will too much Government welfare and charity inevitably undermine the self-respect and independence of recipients, but lack of a sound money will also lessen their incentive for hard work.

It is no exaggeration to state that the greatest danger to the United States of America is not in the possibility of unlimited or limited war. Our greatest danger is that we may fail to follow those policies which are best calculated to maintain the psychological and financial health of our great Nation.

To the extent that the American dollar loses its value and its attractiveness, no matter how slowly, to the same extent there occurs a weakening in the strength of our economy, in the mutual confidence among our citizens, and in our adherence to the basic principles of Americanism. Should the dollar ever lose its position as the fundamental incentive for individual initiative and effort, in its place must come domination of the individual by the State. May the day never come when ordinary Americans will say, "I can get as many dollars as I want."

Statement of James F. Daniel, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Federal aid to education would be a terrible blow to the concepts, heritages, and traditions upon which America was founded. The following statement by James F. Daniel, Jr. of Greenville, S.C., was recently made before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Mr. Daniel has been chairman of the Americanism Commission of the American Legion for many years. He has devoted much time to a study of communism and dictatorships in general. He is well aware of the totalitarian state's control of education and the minds of youth.

Mr. Daniel is a great American and in this statement is representing the American Legion. I commend this statement and principles adopted by the American Legion to every Member of Congress.

STATEMENT OF JAMES F. DANIEL, JR., CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL AMERICANISM COMMISSION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, IN CONNECTION WITH HEARINGS BEFORE THE SENATE LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE COMMITTEE ON BILLS RELATIVE TO PROPOSED FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

My name is James F. Daniel, Jr. I reside at Greenville, S.C., and I am the chairman of the National Americanism Commission of the American Legion.

I wish first to thank you on behalf of the American Legion for permitting me to submit this statement in connection with your hearings on the bills pertaining to Federal aid to education.

On the basis of its record of performance in the field of education, I respectfully submit that the American Legion is qualified to speak on this matter and that its views are worthy of serious consideration.

At the 1958 national convention of the American Legion held at Chicago, Ill., September 1 through September 4, the accredited delegates representing every State in the Union and our Territories and possessions, unanimously adopted Resolution No. 567, containing the following restatement of principles with respect to the relationship of the National Government to public education:

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States is a compact between sovereign States joining together for limited purposes, with the predominant intent of reserving unto the several States and to the people thereof all power, save and except those which were expressly granted to the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the American Legion has always strongly adhered to the philosophy of broad, popular education for citizenship and has vigorously supported a universal, publicly supported system of primary, secondary, and higher education under the complete control, authority, direction, and responsibility of the respective States and school districts therein, so as to insure that every American child has the opportunity for an adequate education; and

"Whereas broad, permanent programs of Federal financial appropriations for general educational purposes to State elementary or secondary schools or institutions of higher learning or, for their use or benefit, would inevitably result in loss of local and State control and the establishment of supervision, direction, and control by Federal agencies over the expenditure of such funds; and

"Whereas such Federal domination and intervention would make possible centralized thought control, propagandized and collective captives of our children, and the ultimate destruction of our constitutional form of government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved, by the 40th national convention of the American Legion, assembled at Chicago, Ill., these 1st to 4th days of September, 1958,* That it does hereby adopt the following restatement of principles and policies with respect to intervention in or financial assistance to general public education in the elementary, secondary schools or State institutions of higher learning:

"1. The State and local governments ought to, can and should assume and adequately take care of all needs of public elementary and secondary schools and State public institutions of higher education;

"2. The States and local communities have the financial capacity to meet the proper requirements of general public education in the respective States;

"3. The National Government should avoid interference, control, supervision, or direction in the educational processes, programs, activities, or systems of the respective States or local school districts, either directly or indirectly, by grants-in-aid, appropriations, gifts, or loans for construction of schools, buildings or facilities, teachers' salaries, general student scholarships, equipment or other purposes; by curriculum or program control, or by action of any officer, agency, branch, or department of the U.S. Government;

"4 Under our Constitution each State is, and should be, vested with complete, sole and final power, authority, direction, supervision, and control of every facet of public education within its borders, with the largest possible measure of home rule and autonomy delegated to the local communities;

"5. It is recognized that in certain specialized or restricted programs or projects of a temporary duration, or during time of war or grave national emergency, or where it is directly necessary for the support of operational programs of Federal agencies, the Federal Government has the authority to maintain or operate its own educational institutions or programs, to appropriate funds therefor, to use grants-in-aid, or to make contracts with State or private institutions; provided, however, that no such action should infringe upon the rights or powers of the States or local communities, nor should any department, agency, branch, officer, or employee of the United States in an official capacity ever exercise any direction, supervision, control, or authority over the personnel, curriculum, property, facilities, or programs of any State or local school or school system or agency or State institution of higher learning; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the national commander and the national legislative director are hereby mandated to present the position of the American Legion, as above set forth, to the Congress of the United States and to vigorously oppose all legislation which violates these principles."

GENERAL STATEMENT

The American Legion believes that the real vitality of our country lies in decentralization of the powers of government. We have an abiding faith in private enterprise and local initiative. We are convinced of the necessity to allow each community to decide its own educational policies and programs.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS

1. With the Federal budget already heavily burdened, additional appropriations of millions of dollars for services which are the responsibility of States and local communities, cannot be justified.

2. Dr. James B. Conant, one of America's best informed authorities in the field of education, concluded from a recent personal survey made on educational needs, that a large number of secondary schools should be consolidated to provide better educational facilities and opportunities for our youth. At the same time this would reduce costs of operation thereby eliminating any need for Federal funds. In a recent address before the National School Board Association in San Francisco, Dr. Conant stated that he favors leaving it up to each community to determine what it is willing to expend for public schools.

3. In view of the many and varied educational bills being introduced for consideration by the 86th Congress, it seems evident that the proponents of Federal aid to education are more concerned with obtaining large sums of money to spend indiscriminately rather than to first determine need and value of the grants provided by the 85th Congress.

CONCLUSION

Any objective analysis of the educational system in the United States will inevitably lead to the conclusion that the pending proposals for Federal aid to education are unnecessary, unreasonable, unsound, and dangerous to the preservation of local initiative and vitality. The ultimate net result of Federal aid to education is to transfer a portion of the total educational costs to the Federal budget, and to restrict local freedom of decision and action. This the American Legion definitely opposes.

Hon. Daniel A. Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, although the late Representative Dan Reed had been missing from the House of Representatives ever since the 86th Congress began, it is still difficult to realize that his friendly counsel and constructive leadership will not be returning.

I feel a personal loss in Mr. Reed's death. When I first came to Washington 2 years ago, I could always count on Mr. Reed's patience in listening to my problems and his wonderful practical advice based on his many years of honorable service in the Congress. He always went out of his way to help newcomers and I know many a freshman representative has been grateful for his interest and suggestions.

But the late Representative Dan Reed, who represented New York's 43d Congressional District, also belonged in a very special way to my State of Michigan, and to the sixth district which I represent.

The Flint Journal of February 22 devoted a substantial portion of their editorial page to an article by William Pyper describing the loss which Dan Reed's death was to the State of Michigan. This was in addition to a news story carried in the paper on February 19.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely share these comments, and would like to submit these articles of tribute for inclusion in the RECORD:

WOLVERINES IN WASHINGTON—REED'S DEATH LOSS FOR MICHIGAN

(By William F. Pyper)

WASHINGTON.—When Daniel Alden Reed died the other day, Michigan suffered a significant loss.

Although he represented New York's 43d Congressional District and was a native of New York State, he often told his colleagues that he regarded Michigan as his home State. There are few around Washington who can remember back in 1918 when Mr. Reed was elected to Congress, but he was an official of the Flint Chamber of Commerce at the time.

They say he did not even have to return to his district for the campaign, and he has been reelected easily in 20 subsequent biennial elections.

He was widely known around Michigan at the time of his residence there. In addition to the oldsters who remember his actual service in Flint, there will be people all over the State who have made his acquaintance during the 42 years he has served in Congress.

In Dan Reed they always found a kindly man who was willing to listen to their problems, and one, in recent years at least, who was able to be of service. He had been in the House longer than any Republican, and was outranked in seniority only by two Democrats. He was top Republican on the Ways and Means Committee, where all tax and tariff legislation originates. He was chairman during the 83d Congress, in 1953–54.

Mr. Reed was a special friend of the late Representative Roy O. Woodruff of Bay City, who served with him many years on the Ways and Means Committee. In their day, up to Mr. Woodruff's retirement in 1952, they often teamed up to push through some tax provision which was of primary interest to Michigan industry and business.

In those days, when Michigan Congressmen held five House committee chairmanships, Representative Reed was virtually a member of the State's delegation. Woodruff, then chairman of the House Republican conference; the late Earl C. Michener, of Adrian, then chairman of Judiciary; Jesse P. Wolcott, of Port Huron, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee; George A. Dondero, of Royal Oak, chairman of the Public Works Committee; and the late Fred Bradley, of Rogers City, chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, all were closely associated with him.

Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN, of Allegan, who came to Congress later but by that time was chairman of the Government Operations Committee, is about the only Michigan lawmaker remaining who was a member of that class, which certainly included the late Representative Carl Mapes, of Grand Rapids. Mr. HOFFMAN recalls particularly how Mr. REED always referred to Michigan as his home State, and how closely he worked with the Michigan delegation in getting the St. Lawrence Seaway authorization through Congress.

Younger Michigan Members of Congress soon came to know that DAN REED was a ready and able source of advice and counsel. Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., of Grand Rapids, for instance, found a kindred soul. Both had played football and had done a little coaching—a generation apart.

Representative REED never forgot his association with the automobile industry in Michigan back in the days just after World War I. In his position in Washington he had seen the industry grow to become a giant factor in the Nation's economy, and he was always ready to listen when it had a problem.

For that reason, he was involved in the numerous attempts in recent years to reduce or eliminate the manufacturers' excise tax on automobiles. Numerous Michigan Congressmen have worked with him on the project. The efforts will continue, doubtlessly, but without the tax and legislative know-how of Mr. REED they will be handicapped.

One Wolverine in Washington who did remember was Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield. Then a real-estate dealer in Flint, Summerfield recalls that DAN REED was secretary of the Flint Chamber of Commerce when he joined.

"He was there at the first meeting I ever attended," the Postmaster General said. "To me, he always has been a model of what a public servant should be. We've lost a symbol of integrity in government."

STARTED BOARD OF COMMERCE—REPRESENTATIVE DAN REED, BOOSTER OF FLINT, DIES

Flint lost an ardent supporter and one of its outstanding leaders of World War I days with the death today in Walter Reed Hospital, Washington, of Representative DANIEL A. REED, New York Republican.

He was a former managing director of the Flint Chamber of Commerce. The formal "DANIEL" soon became "DAN" to everyone who knew him.

Mr. REED, characterized as an outstanding leader in Flint during the first World War period, came here from his native Dunkirk, N.Y., in the winter of 1916–17. The city then was just beginning to feel its strength as an automotive center.

Representing the American City Bureau, his assignment here was to conduct a membership drive and put into successful operation the then board of commerce. It became the chamber of commerce in 1920.

The task was considered ideal for Mr. Reed—such was his reputation as a spellbinder and civic booster. That he quickly was named managing director of the board attests to the success he achieved.

During the war, Mr. Reed was called to Washington several times to help in the work of the Government. He was placed in charge in the central western area during a $100 million campaign for the Red Cross. He also helped in a second drive.

Later he was sent to England and France as special representative of the Federal War Food Administration.

He described the experiences of that trip to overflow audiences at St. Paul's Episcopal and Court Street Methodist Churches here in February 1918.

Mr. Reed left his board of commerce post here in 1918, after he was elected to the House of Representatives from the 43d New York District. He took his seat in Congress the following spring and had retained it ever since.

Mr. Reed's attachment for Flint was marked by a number of return visits and his continued popularity was demonstrated by the enthusiasm accorded his talks.

"Cooperation has made Flint a model city," he told his colleagues in the House.

An appeal he made in a speech here in 1938 gives him a clue to his own philosophy and the deep concern he had for Flint's well-being.

At that time he asked Flint's businessmen, factory workers, professional men and all others to drop their personal feelings in favor of a constructive, energetic drive to make Flint known as one of America's outstanding cities.

"Nothing can be accomplished by inaction, dissension or a defeatist attitude," he always insisted.

Mr. Reed once described Flint as "A community of generous, courageous, stalwart citizens, setting progressive examples for all America."

A theory he expounded here about cities in 1918 seems no less apropos today.

"If a city," he said then, "does not have stamina enough to live up to her reputation it should not acquire one.

"Flint is in the championship class," he declared. He warned that "a city that fights its way into the championship class and declines to defend its title is pretty apt to be termed a quitter."

That Youthful Spirit of 1898

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues may recall, the gentleman from Illinois has never overlooked

an opportunity to work in some reference to the Spanish-American war and to suggest, with due deference, of course, to other veterans, that the world never has seen better soldiers and sailors than the volunteers that toppled Spain from her pedestal six-and-more decades ago. It is to Miss Dorothy Taylor that I am indebted for a clipping from the January 14, 1959, number of Medical News that seems to furnish conclusive proof that the Spanish-American War veterans still are leading the pack. They are doing it now by outliving other people, and instead of getting bent and wrinkled actually looking 20 to 25 years younger than their years.

Miss Taylor, when working with the Congress as a member of the staff of the Representative from Illinois Second District, was recognized as one of the keenest brains on the Hill as well as one of its charming personalities. The number of her friends here is legion. She is now associated with Billings Hospital in Chicago, and so valuable are her services that if I were to suggest even in a whisper that her country needs her again in Washington it would be at the risk of losing permanently the votes of the eminent physicians and surgeons at that great and famous hospital. They would be willing to give most anything to their country, but not Dorothy Taylor.

The article from Medical News follows:

OLD SOLDIERS

Eleven hundred Massachusetts veterans of the Spanish-American War have succeeded in putting out of joint the current actuarial predictions on life span. They are living too long.

According to estimates based on mortality tables, only about 500 of these veterans should be alive today in Massachusetts. The fact is there are 1,600.

The Veterans' Administration outpatient clinic in Boston is making a detailed study of their physical and emotional condition, diet, and history to help explain their longevity and find out why some look 20 to 25 years younger than their actual ages.

Khrushchev's Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Carroll Kilpatrick, which appeared on February 14, 1959, in the Washington Post and Times Herald:

U.S. ECONOMIC SUPREMACY IS PUT TO TEST

Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's economic challenge to the United States is regarded by experts in Government and private circles here as exaggerated in detail but nevertheless a serious long-range threat.

Some officials go so far as to say that this economic challenge has now become greater even than the military challenge, and that Russia and China combined eventually will outproduce the free industrial countries.

President Eisenhower, however, told his last press conference that he did not believe an expanded Federal program was necessary or desirable as an answer to the Soviet 7-year plan.

In Khrushchev's speech last month at the 21st Communist Party Congress, the Soviet leader extolled the complete superiority of socialism over capitalism and said that by 1970 Russia will attain the world's highest standard of living.

Khrushchev told the assembled party delegates that the Soviet's fundamental economic task is to overtake the most highly developed capitalist countries in per capita production.

"If we calculate on a per capita basis," the Soviet Premier said in the course of his lengthy discourse, "we will probably need, after the fulfillment of the 7-year plan (in 1965), about 5 more years to catch up with and outstrip the United States in industrial output.

"Thus by that time (1970), or perhaps sooner, the Soviet Union will advance to world leadership both in absolute volume of production and in per capita production."

Secretary of Commerce Lewis L. Strauss, in a speech Wednesday in Chicago, dismissed Khrushchev's claims as boasting, and pointed out that in 1958 the gross national product in the United States was $437 billion compared with about $180 billion in Russia if you want to believe their statistics.

Nevertheless, Strauss warned that Russia's foreign trade offensive is a serious menace which the general public does not yet appreciate.

Russia is not in business for business, but for economic warfare, the Secretary said.

It is this new trade potential that bothers experts more than Khrushchev's grandiose claims of beating the United States in total and per capita production.

With its growing economic power, Moscow will be strong enough to use trade more and more as a weapon of the cold war, directing trade with one hand where it will do the most good from the Communist viewpoint and withholding trade with another hand if it decides to crack down on a country that is not toeing the line.

Even more disastrous for the West would be a demonstration of Soviet economic progress at a time of economic recession in the leading capitalist country.

If Moscow is able to conduct its economic offensive on the basis of greatly expanded production at home, and if the United States decides it cannot afford to promote certain economic programs either at home or abroad, the lesson would quickly be apparent to all the uncommitted countries as well as to America's friends.

Some experts argue that the statistical race between the United States and Russia is not too significant. They quote Paul Henri Spaak, Secretary General of NATO, who recently said, "I feel that a rich Communist is probably less to be feared than a poor Communist."

"What we must realize," Spaak said, "is that the Communist goal is not merely an economic or a social threat; it is much wider; the ambition of communism is to be the wellspring of a new civilization, in which the essential foundations of our spiritual, intellectual, moral, and political life will be challenged."

One expert summarized the issue this way: "For us to say we cannot afford aid to India or cannot afford adequate schools, or cannot afford a proper defense, is to admit failure.

"We must maintain a satisfactory rate of growth—not to postpone the time the U.S.S.R. matches our productive capacity but to demonstrate for ourselves and the rest of the world that our system works."

The rate of progress could be more important, particularly in the eyes of the underdeveloped countries, than the absolute difference between the United States and Russia. Russia's rate is now between 6 and 8 percent a year and China's is reportedly as high as 10 percent. The U.S. rate, which dropped considerably last year, averaged 4 percent between 1947 and 1956.

It is conceded that Russia's rate of growth will continue to be about twice that of the United States, but even so, gross national product in the United States in 1970 will be almost twice Russia's. Not until the turn of the century, according to American experts, will Russia equal America in total output.

As one indication of Russia's more formidable economic base is the substantial industrial progress that has been made in the Eastern European satellites. To the surprise of most observers, postwar development in the satellites has been impressive, and Poland, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia are now in the vanguard of the Soviet bloc in seeking trade contacts with the Afro-Asian countries and Latin America.

Jan Wszelaki, prewar economic adviser to the Polish Government and specialist in Eastern European economics, shows in a new study for the National Planning Association that the satellites have obtained impressive economic footholds in a number of underdeveloped countries. The Eastern European countries and Russia need raw-material imports which the underdeveloped countries are all too eager to sell.

In return, the satellites are increasingly able to "supply the kinds of industrial goods the developing countries can use," Wszelaki says, adding that Moscow has assigned this trade "high political priority."

Instead of being a burden on the Soviet Union, the satellites have become of great value, particularly in the last year or two, he writes.

Wszelaki declares that "control over East-Central Europe continues to be more than marginally important to Soviet economic development and * * * is of at least equal value in the Soviet trade-and-aid offensive."

He further notes, as part of Communist economic development, that Moscow soon will establish an international bank to finance economic projects in uncommitted countries.

Russia now is a poor second to the United States in total industrial production. In the reasonably near future it will be a strong second—a fact that will make a great impression on the rest of the world unless—all experts agree—the United States makes the best possible use of its machinery and resources to strengthen itself and its associates in the free world.

Sino-Russian Clash for Trade Visioned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Carroll Kilpatrick appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald, February 20, 1959:

SINO-RUSSIAN CLASH FOR TRADE VISIONED

Both Moscow and Peking have been at pains in recent weeks to deny that there is any rift between them. Nevertheless, there is a growing belief here that the relationship is not an easy one and that there are now the first faint signs of a rivalry that could have a profound effect on the world's future.

The most substantial evidence for this belief is found in the latest trade agreement

between Communist China and Soviet Russia.

With much fanfare, Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and Chinese Premier Chou En-lai earlier this month signed in Moscow a new agreement that is notable mainly because of its modest size.

It provides for a 5-billion-ruble exchange of goods over a period of 9 years. At the official exchange rate, that is $1¼ billion, or about $140 million a year. At the unofficial rate, it would be considerably less.

But even a trade of $140 million a year is not much between 2 major countries. In 1957, for example, the United States exported more than $4 billion worth of goods to Canada. This country's exports to Turkey in 1957 reached almost exactly $140 million and nearly $150 million to Yugoslavia.

The trade between the two greatest Communist countries will be on a strictly pay-as-you-go basis. Despite the protestations of friendship, there are no credits or gifts from Moscow to Peking.

Tass, the official Soviet news agency, said that Russia will deliver materials and equipment designed to build China's industry and that China will pay for the goods by delivering to the U.S.S.R. goods on conditions already determined in the existing Soviet-Chinese trade agreements.

These will include mainly food and agricultural materials and some manufactured consumer goods sorely needed in China. It may be that China does not want credit. In any event, for the last 2½ years China has exported more to Russia than it has imported from Russia—which certainly leads to the impression that Peking isn't eager to become dependent on Moscow.

Earlier this month, Khrushchev savagely denounced Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (Democrat, Minnesota), because he wrote that the Soviet Premier had spoken to him critically of the Chinese Communists. The outburst, HUMPHREY said, "indicates a high degree of insecurity in the relationships between Soviet Russia and the Communist Chinese."

Moscow may already be disturbed by China's claims of economic development. The progress has been substantial, and the Chinese claim a faster rate of growth than the Russians.

With its huge population, there is no reason why China eventually may not outproduce Soviet Russia or the United States.

A study by the Research Institute of America, a private organization, on "Communism's New Economic Challenge," says that "Peking's staggering goal is nothing less than the transformation of China's primitive economy into a modern industrial heavyweight capable of competing with either or both the Soviet Union and the United States within 10 years."

Whether the goal can be reached is by no means certain, but the study warns the West not to be lulled by China's difficulties into underestimating the progress and eventual accomplishments of the Peking regime. In the last 6 or 7 years China has more than tripled its production of iron and steel and more than doubled its production of coal and electricity.

Of course, its production must be multiplied many times before it can meet the needs of 600 million Chinese, much less engage in a large foreign trade.

But like Russia it can carry on selective trading that could cause much confusion in the world's markets to China's advantage. The research institute study points out that China already is attempting to make its economic influence felt in south Asia and even in the Middle East, long a goal of Russian policy. If China could arrange an oil deal with Iraq, for example, it could end its dependence upon the Soviet Union for petroleum.

"Mao and not Khrushchev stands as the champion of the future for multitudes in these pivotal areas," the study says.

It concludes that friction between Moscow and Peking is almost certain, if it does not already exist. This friction and rivalry suggests, it says, that Russia may desire closer relations with the United States to help it offset China's growing power.

"It is probably not an accident," the report says, "that the highest priority of the new (Soviet) 7-year plan is the industrial development and population of the Soviet Far East, the area north of China whose untapped rich raw materials and lack of population make it the most attractive future goal of Chinese expansionism."

Farmers Union: A Record of 25 Years of Service to Wisconsin Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, Kenneth Hones, of Chippewa Falls, Wis., retired after 29 years of service to the farmers of my State. Back in the late 1920's, as the operator of a family-sized farm near Colfax in my home district, he recognized the need for farmers to work together to help themselves out of the catastrophic depression in which they were caught. After working long hours on his farm, he put more long hours into the organization of the Wisconsin Farmers Union. This accomplished, he served on its board of directors for 29 years. During the past 25 years, he has been state president of the Farmers Union, which now numbers 10,721 Wisconsin farmer families in its ranks.

I first met Mr. Hones in 1935, when I was chief clerk of the State assembly, and he came to our capital city of Madison on behalf of his fellow farmers. I found him sincerely dedicated to the Farmers Union principle of the security of the farm family on the family-type farm through cooperation, legislation and a better understanding of the economic processes of this country.

When the Wisconsin Farmers Union celebrated its 25th anniversary in 1955, Mr. Hones paid tribute to the accomplishments of its members. Although he didn't intend his message that way, it is in reality also a tribute to Kenneth Hones and the part he played as leader of a group which came so far and did so much in such a relatively short period of time. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include parts of Mr. Hones' silver anniversary message in the RECORD:

FARMERS UNION: A RECORD OF 25 YEARS OF SERVICE TO WISCONSIN AGRICULTURE

The Wisconsin Farmers Union came into existence during the hectic days of farm turmoil of the late 1920's. The great financial boom was on in 1927 when organization work was started in Wisconsin by the Northwest Committee for the National Farmers Union. However, even as the stock market boomed, the depression on the Nation's farms was deepening—but its effects had not yet reached the cities. Finally, in 1929 and 1930, the farm crisis toppled the whole economy.

Toward the end, 1930, the Northwest Committee had a substantial amount of membership work done, and the State organization received its charter from the National Farmers Union on November 6, 1930.

Young as it was, the Farmers Union immediately faced up to the problem of grappling with the farm depression, which by that time was in full bloom. Hundreds of farm protest meetings were held, and County Farmers Union presidents went to Washington to tell their story for the first time.

As a result of these protest meetings, a farm mortgage moratorium law was passed by the State and Federal Governments. Another result of the rural revolt was the Agriculture Domestic Allotment Act, which was later replaced by the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Another highlight of the early days was the successful merger of the American Society of Equity and the Farmers Union. This merger welded the two liberal forces of Wisconsin agriculture into one effective group.

During Governor Phil LaFollette's administration, the Governor commissioned me on two occasions to represent him on legislative matters in Washington. The first assignment was on legislation to secure Federal aid to farmers who had lost cattle through the Bangs' testing program. The second was to make the lime and fertilizer program a part of the Triple A. Both of these Farmers Union projects were enacted into law.

There were other legislative successes. During the drought days, the Farmers Union fought for and secured the emergency seed and feed program. And in the midst of the depression, it was the Farmers Union which obtained the reduction of interest rates on Federal farm and chattel mortgages.

In the early days of the rural electrification program, the Farmers Union fought for greater recognition for the cooperative development of rural power. The first co-op generating plant in the United States was built north of Chippewa Falls.

When World War II broke out, the Farmers Union swung into action for greater farm production to feed our armies, our allies and our civilian population. We were about the only farm group which struggled to hold-the-line on prices to keep them from going war-time crazy. Had that line been held, we would all be in much better financial shape today.

The Farmers Union has battled against the sales tax, fought for Federal aid to schools and supported larger aids to rural schools. Our organization could well be called "the father of social security for farmers". We have supported our great university, our College of Agriculture, the vocational-agriculture program in our high schools and our State program of vocational and adult education. We have supported our Wisconsin Department of Agriculture in its great work.

For a quarter of a century, the Farmers Union has enjoyed the finest relationship with organized labor. We know that the industrial workers are our best market, and their daily income is an index of the price we can ask for the fruits of our labors.

All that we ask and all that we seek is equality of parity with labor, industry and the other segments of our society so that we may enjoy security on our farms.

Throughout the years, our Junior program has been one of our strongest assets. Many of our finest adult leaders in Wisconsin Farmers Union received their basic training in our youth program. The need for a permanent training center was so urgent

that plans for a membership-owned camp were started in the early 1940's. With the cooperation of hundreds of our members, Kamp Kenwood was built and has been in use since 1952.

Yes, the Farmers Union in Wisconsin has served agriculture and served it well during the 25 years since the organization came into being. What it will do in the next quarter century depends on the increasing cooperation of farm people and a better understanding by all people of the aims, purposes and program of the Farmers Union.

A New Approach to Labor-Management Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an article by the well-known labor columnist Victor Riesel which was published in the New York Daily Mirror of February 27, 1959. The article is entitled "Hatters Aid Bosses To Make Jobs Profit," and deals with some very interesting phases of union activities by the Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers Union headed by Alex Rose.

I commend this article to the attention of all my colleagues because I consider the ideas contained therein as one of the soundest and most progressive manifestations of labor-management relationship. I believe that this should be held out to all industries as a great example of labor-management cooperation for all to follow. If we could succeed in establishing the same or similar approach and a willingness to cooperate on the part of both labor and management, we could avoid a great deal of unnecessary strife, needless strikes, loss of work and income. It would not only serve as a great boon to our continued economic growth, but it would help guarantee and strengthen our democratic system in the world's struggle for survival.

Mr. Speaker, only a profound statesman and a man of vision of the caliber of Alex Rose could think up and develop such an idea. This is a great innovation in the field of labor-management relations which should be explored and adopted by other unions and business enterprises which are seriously concerned with the welfare of our people and the growth of our economy. Alex Rose has once again shown himself to be one of our most able and respected union leaders. I salute him as a veteran and a pioneer in his chosen field.

The article reads as follows:

HATTERS AID BOSSES TO MAKE JOBS PROFIT
(By Victor Riesel)

There are hatters who aren't mad at anyone—least of all their bosses. These are union hatters.

Theirs is a small union of 40,000. Quietly they prove daily that it doesn't take size—it takes guts, imagination and daring to keep their industry a flourishing one.

They have invested some $5,000,000 to help the boss. They have fought off the mobs. They have battled slave labor Iron Curtain competition. They recognize that the class struggle is for undergraduates and that the bigger the profit, the higher the wage and the steadier the job.

For such principles, for example, this Hatters, Cap and Millinery Workers Union (AFL-CIO) has now decided to yield what it could have taken as a wage increase. This it does so the union and the employers can raise a half a million dollar kitty to promote the sale of headgear in a nation which is much too bareheaded.

This union—led by tall, bantering Alex Rose, once an infantryman in Gen. Allenby's desert army of World War I—has just joined the bosses in launching something called the National Cap and Cloth Hat Institute. Rose and the manufacturers want to revive the popularity of caps—really one of the first victims of the big time mobs.

Back in the Twenties, when the cap went with knickers like leaning tower with Pisa, this headgear became the symbol of the mob. Later the hoods turned to snap brims. But it was too late. From 55,000,000 the sale of caps slid off to 27,000,000. Union members and employers alike suffered.

They were saved by the Ivy League and convertibles. But now the institute—made up of labor and management directors—really wants to make the cap a steady and lucrative manufacturing field. At a moment when the noise of rackets, shakedowns, violence and hatred flares through some other fields, Alex Rose's union shows how it can happen here—a rational labor-management, live-and-let-live society, I mean.

The Cap Institute is just one instance in the life of a crusading union. Last year, for example, the labor chiefs learned that the owners of the most famous hat manufacturers' building in the land, 65 West 39th Street, in New York's garment area, were about to raise rents. They needed financing.

Rose sought out the realtors. He offered to loan them $2 million of the union's funds at a very modest interest rate. In return, he wanted a contract guaranteeing that the rents of the hat manufacturing lofts would not be raised for 5 years. Rose did not want the employers hit by higher costs. Nor did he want them dispersed from the center of hat fashions.

The realtors took the money and signed the contract—and the hat manufacturers stayed in business in a building easily accessible to the union's skilled workers.

There was a similar crisis at another building, 49 West 37th Street. The union had to buy the 22-story $1,500,000 structure which is jammed with hat manufacturers. Now the union is the landlord. And it is keeping rents low, so its employers can make a good enough profit to keep wages and the number of jobs high. The hatters have also put several million dollars in housing projects.

In 1954, when bankruptcy threatened the Charles H. Kartiganer Co., of West Upton, Mass., Rose's organization dug up $200,000, lent it to the company and kept it in business. Today the Kartiganer Co. flourishes—and so do the 650 New Englanders working there.

More recently, the Merrimac Hat Co., of Amesbury, Mass., was hit hard by competition from Communist Czechoslovakia. It was about to liquidate. Some 325 jobs would have been lost. The union actually bought the company by throwing $300,000 into it. Union officials were placed on the board of directors. But despite the controlling interest, the union decided to take no management role. The company is doing good business, my latest check shows.

Imagination? When the union itself needed money 5 years ago, it floated its own bond issue among its members at full interest rates. The money has all been repaid.

Guts? When the mobs moved in and ran racket shops which chiseled the Government on millions of dollars in military orders, the union had two of its people probe, expose, and wipe out the looting. How's it done?

"The answer," says Alex Rose, "is to do a constructive job. We stay away from the evil of corruption and the evil of fantasy and junk abstract, outmoded ancient labor philosophies. Serve the community as well as the workers and the men who employ us. Then labor and management can't go wrong."

Like I said, those are glad hatters.

Lesson of Korea Quickly Forgotten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Marine Corps is our highly mobile force in readiness. The Congress has repeatedly expressed the determination that it be maintained at an effective combat strength. We have not forgotten Korea and the heavy price we paid for not being prepared.

The primary responsibility for the kind of defense we shall have, the nature and size of our military organization, is vested in the Congress. But the Pentagon continues to ignore our expressed will.

I call your attention to the following editorial, entitled "Lesson of Korea Quickly Forgotten," which appeared in the Daily Pantagraph, Bloomington, Ill., on February 16:

LESSON OF KOREA QUICKLY FORGOTTEN

The U.S. Marine Corps had a strength of 442,796 men in June of 1944. This had dwindled to 67,000 when the Korean war broke out. It was hurriedly doubled in 6 months but was far below strength and made up of men with inadequate training because of the urgency of the need in combat.

Many lives were lost in Korea because boys with inadequate training had to be rushed into the firing lines.

One would think that this lesson would not be easily forgotten. Congress has not forgotten it. However, the administration appears to have had a lapse of memory for repeatedly the administration has failed to keep the Marine Corps at the strength prescribed by Congress.

Congress appropriated sufficient funds to maintain the corps at 215,000 men in fiscal 1956. The Pentagon set aside $37 million of the money and cut the corps down to 200,000.

For the fiscal year of 1958 Congress appropriated funds to keep the corps at 200,000. This would enable the Marine Corps to maintain not less than three combat divisions and three air wings, as required by law. But the Pentagon allocated funds for only 190,000 men.

For fiscal year 1959 Congress again provided enough funds for 200,000 men despite the Pentagon's announced intention of cutting the corps to 175,000 men.

The Senate Appropriations Committee was explicit in its action. It said "This decision to appropriate the funds necessary for

a 200,000-man Marine Corps was made with full consideration of the fiscal and military limitations. The committee desires that it be clearly understood by appropriate agencies in the executive branch of Government that it is the clear-cut intent of the committee, and of the proposed appropriating legislation, that the Marine Corps be maintained at the strength of 200,000."

Both House and Senate have made it clear that it is the desire of Congress that the Marine Corps be maintained at not less than 200,000 men so that, in the words of the House Appropriations Committee, it can "fulfill its traditional role in the national defense posture of this country as the Nation's force in readiness."

The administration, through the Pentagon, is thwarting the will of Congress, which has the constitutional right to provide for the Nation's defense. We do not believe that there is a desire of the President to cultivate dictatorship, but this is what is happening. When Congress is ignored the people have no effective voice in Government.

California Assembly Urges Equalization of Military Retirement Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of Members of Congress to a joint resolution recently introduced in the Assembly of the State of California by a group of 49 members of that body.

The resolution points to the failure of the Military Pay Act of 1958 to assure retirement benefits to military personnel on an equal basis and urges that the resulting inequity be corrected. A number of bills have been introduced here to do just that and among them is H.R. 3284 which I introduced January 26.

Joint Resolution 13 of the California Assembly reads as follows:

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States legislation concerning the improvement of benefits for retired members of the U.S. Armed Forces who retired prior to June 1, 1958; and

Whereas there appears to be no basis for the gross discrimination against retired personnel who retired before June 1, 1958, as they are, by reason of past meritorious services, equally entitled to the increased benefits granted personnel who retire, or have retired after such date; and

Whereas this false distinction violates the basic precepts of fair play, and the circumstances of retirement should not penalize these honorable members of our society, who must meet the present ever-increasing cost of living the same as personnel that retired after June 1, 1958: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that will increase the retirement benefits of the retired personnel who retired prior to June 1, 1958, so that they will be treated equally with personnel who retire, or have retired, after such date.

California State assemblymen who joined in introducing this resolution February 5, 1959, were: Messrs. Mulford, Crawford, Luckel, Chapel, Bruce F. Allen, Bane, Beaver, Bee, Belotti, Biddick, Britschgi, George E. Brown, Ralph M. Brown, Burton, Busterud, Collier, Coolidge, Crown, Cunningham, Cusanovich, Mrs. Davis, Messrs. Elliott, Francis, Frew, Gaffney, Garrigus, Samuel Geddes, Hanna, Hawkins, Holmes, House, Kilpatrick, Lunardi, MacBride, Marks, Masterson, Meyers, Miller, O'Connell, Petris, Reagan, Rumford, Schrade, Sumner, Waldie, Williamson, George A. Willson, Charles H. Wilson, and Z'berg.

Record of Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 17, 1959

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I think it very pertinent to call to the attention of all Americans a clipping in the New York Times under date of February 18, 1959, entitled "Record of Soviets," by Col. Augustin G. Rudd.

The clipping follows:

RECORD OF SOVIETS—THEIR BROKEN PROMISES STRESSED, OUR INDIFFERENT ATTITUDE SCORED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The shocking revelations of the slaughter of American flyers by the Soviet Union and the proved mendacity of Mikoyan and other high Communist officials in concealing this uncivilized act once more emphasize the futility of expecting the Soviet Union to live up to any accepted standards of conduct among nations. In fact, the most solemn agreements to them are ignored at will.

Of course this is nothing new. The record of perfidy dates from the tragic day in November, 1933, when the United States recognized the Soviet Union. Although bitterly opposed by realists at that time, this recognition of a tottering regime that could hardly have lasted 6 months without our help has proved to be the greatest diplomatic blunder in modern times, if not in history. For it saved a ruthless system of slavery which has since engulfed 17 nations and has for its avowed aim the destruction of freedom in the remainder of the world.

This record of the Soviet Union, too little known, is laid bare in a report (1955) by the United States Senate of "nearly 1,000 treaties and agreements involving peace accord and fraternities entered into by the Soviet Union." The document stated: "The staff found that in the thirty-eight short years since the Soviet Union came into existence its Government had broken its word to virtually every country to which it ever gave a signed promise. * * * It keeps no international promises at all unless doing so is clearly advantageous to the Soviet Union."

PAST ACTIONS

No one has yet developed a sounder formula for dealing with men than to consider the record of their past. And yet important and intelligent Americans, particularly the liberals, act as if they never had heard of this grisly Soviet record still being duplicated daily. For instance, the recent visit here of Mikoyan.

Although his lies about the fate of our American flyers were not known to the public, his part in the betrayal and execution of the Hungarian leaders was public knowledge. This was the man selected by the Kremlin to go to Hungary and direct the suppression of the revolt. And this was the man who got the leaders to surrender on the promise of immunity and then promptly turned them over, with thousands of other Hungarian patriots, to the firing squads.

That the Communist-fronters and leftist-liberals would fawn at him was to be expected. But on what possible pretext could others welcome Mikoyan?

Everyone knows that the free world has been engaged in a cold war with the Communists since 1945. During World War II we saved them from Hitler with loans of $11 billion. Even Stalin admitted this. The cold war and the refusal to even partially repay this loan were our thanks. That the Communists are steadily winning this war is apparent.

PROPAGANDA ACCEPTED

And why are they winning? One cause is illustrated in the Mikoyan incident. We are no match whatsoever for the Communists in diplomacy, propaganda and other weapons of the cold war.

And so we accept the Mikoyans and their propaganda or other nefarious schemes. We never seem to learn.

What has happened to our sense of righteous indignation? Since the Boston Tea Party and before, a rising tide of public wrath over injustices of various kinds always has been a wholesome and invaluable characteristic of the American people. But this tendency is fast disappearing. An attitude of indifference or adjusting to an intolerable condition is taking its place.

Except for war against us, I can recall few instances better calculated to cause the blood of Americans to boil than the Soviet's wanton attack on our unarmed plane. And yet most of our people had almost forgotten the incident until the recent State Department revelations. Are we no longer capable of becoming "fighting mad" at outrages against our ideals and liberties?

AUGUSTIN G. RUDD,
Colonel, U.S. Army (Retired).
GARDEN CITY, N.Y., *February 10, 1959.*

TVA Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a resolution calling upon the TVA, the O.C.D.M., and other departments and agencies of government to reconsider the contract awarded to Parsons of England, for electrical equipment never before purchased outside the continental United States.

This order would have given much-needed labor to the many unemployed in my district, and other districts in western and eastern Pennsylvania.

In introducing this resolution I had the full support and cosponsorship of the following Members of Congress: Congressman ELMER HOLLAND, Congressman FRANK CLARK, Congressman MORGAN, Congressman MOORHEAD, and Congressman MILLIKEN, of Pennsylvania.

You will note, sir, that this effort is bipartisan. I have since been informed by the following Members of Congress of their full support in this endeavor: Congressman SAYLOR, Congressman VAN

ZANDT, Congressman GAVIN, Congressman KEARNS, Congressman RICHARD SIMPSON, and Congressman STANLEY PROKOP, of Pennsylvania.

I am sure that other Pennsylvania Members would join me if the opportunity presents itself to present a joint plea to bring this work to the workmen and industry of Pennsylvania.

Residual Oil Threatens the Coal Industry in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, a news development which occurred over the weekend may soon prove heartening and encouraging to my home State of West Virginia.

It now appears possible that, at last, the Eisenhower administration is going to take steps to limit the vast imports of residual oil products which have flooded our shores from abroad. This residual oil has had a disastrous effect upon domestic coal markets in this country, and upon the economy of West Virginia—which is in the midst of a harrowing economic downturn.

I am hopeful that our President at last is recognizing the wisdom and accuracy of the viewpoint long expressed by the late Senator M. M. Neely, of West Virginia, who served ably and faithfully in both Houses of the Congress for many years.

The distinguished Senator Neely was one of the first to point out that unfettered residual oil importation could wreck the State's economy, which has been based upon coal markets. But his voice went unheeded, and the administration instituted a so-called voluntary program of oil importation limits.

This "jawbone" program has proved a miserable failure, and its lack of effectiveness has worked great hardship on the people of West Virginia.

This program has also had an undermining effect upon the national security, and it is upon this basis that mandatory curbs will be levied.

Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks all the members of the West Virginia congressional delegation, led by Senators BYRD and RANDOLPH, have spent many hours meeting with Leo Leogh, Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization; Lewis Strauss, Secretary of Commerce; and top officials of the Department of Defense, Department of State, and Department of the Interior. We have worked long and hard to bring the facts forcibly to the attention of the responsible officials of our Government. We are convinced that the facts indicate conclusively that unless large-scale imports of residual oil are checked, the coal industry and the national security will be seriously impaired.

Mr. Speaker, America is the showcase of democracy in the free world. If a great industry and the economy of a great section of the country suffer, it hurts America's position in the free world. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, as long as we have millions of unemployed and many on the verge of starvation we cannot expect to maintain the national morale necessary for a strong defense. Mr. Speaker, West Virginia is in serious economic trouble. My people cry out for help. We need action and action now to end this threat to our great coal industry.

I should like to commend to your attention the following article by Richard E. Mooney, of the New York Times. This article, published yesterday, explains fully the deleterious impact which the voluntary program has inflicted upon the Nation, and particularly the coal-producing States:

PRESIDENT SCANS RIGID OIL QUOTAS—EXTENDS VOLUNTARY PROGRAM—A MANDATORY PLAN IS SEEN AS ASSURED

(By Richard E. Mooney)

WASHINGTON, February 28.—President Eisenhower postponed the establishment of rigid oil import controls today to give himself time to study a report that the imports threatened national security.

The Government 20-month-old noncompulsory curbs program was scheduled to expire at midnight tonight. In preparation for the creation of a successor program, the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization was directed to make a quick examination of the question: Do oil imports threaten security?

The agency submitted its answer to the President late yesterday afternoon, and the answer was Yes.

According to one authority, the findings were sufficiently broad to be construed as a recommendation for restriction of imports of residual oil.

USED AS INDUSTRIAL FUEL

Residual oil is left over after various products have been refined from crude. It is used in large quantities as industrial fuel.

It is not subject to import regulation at this time and the question of whether it will be is the biggest unknown in the whole proposition.

It seems virtually certain that the current noncompulsory ceiling on crude and semirefined products—1,113,600 a day—will be replaced by a mandatory ceiling of 1,025,000 barrels a day. If controls also are applied to residual oil, the ceiling might be higher.

The role of national security as a ban to imports rests on a clause inserted in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1954. It was a compromise substitute for a specific restriction on oil imports that was proposed by a coal-State Senator.

The argument is that oil imports discourage exploration for the development of domestic sources, which would be needed in the event of an emergency.

The coal industry argues that its ability to perform in an emergency also is hurt by oil imports.

When the President establishes the assumed mandatory curbs on oil he will have done what the Senator—the late Matthew M. Neely, Democrat of West Virginia—wanted in the first place, except that it will not be written into law.

The President tried to do something less inflexible when he established the voluntary curbs on crude in mid-1956, but those curbs have not been fully effective. The clearest evidence of their less-than-full effectiveness was the fact that last spring they were expanded to include semirefined products.

Some importers had been dodging the spirit of the restrictions by partially refining their crude oil in foreign refineries so that it would not be crude oil and would not be subject to regulation. Imports of semirefined products soared until a ceiling was imposed.

FLOOD OF APPLICATIONS

Then the program was shaken by a flood of applications for larger import allowances, or for new allowances for companies that had none.

The decision on these applications was postponed while the program was reexamined and the forthcoming mandatory controls are the result.

The new controls, it is understood, will not cover all oil products, but most.

Asphalt, not regulated now, is considered less likely to be regulated than residual oil. However, the report to the President was described as broad enough to cover both products.

It has been reported that the new program will make special provision for Canadian oil, though not the exception that Canada would like.

Canada has argued, vigorously, that her oil will be just as available to a United States war effort as Texas oil; not dependent on ocean shipping that could be cut off by enemy action.

VENEZUELA PROBLEM

The U.S. Government feels that, however sound the Canadian argument might be, it is not practical to except one hemisphere ally and not another—Venezuela in this case.

Under the new program, it is understood that the Government plans to make special allowances for a certain amount of oil to be imported into the north central region of this country. That oil comes from Canada. Thus, the special provision is a bow in Canada's direction.

Aside from this, the basic formula for the new controls turns on the amount of refining activity that an importing company did during 6 months, March through August, of last year.

Corn, Corn, Corn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE BROCK
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Lincoln Star, February 21, 1959, on corn production in the Midwest. We are all aware of the vast surplus of cereal grains at present but these storage bins will be molehills compared with the bushels and bushels that will be on hand as a result of the unrestricted number of acres a farmer may place in production as a result of Secretary of Agriculture Benson's recent announcement regarding controls:

CORN, CORN, CORN

(By William O. Dobler)

Chances are that you have never seen any corn compared to what you will see this summer in fields across Nebraska, Iowa, Illinois, and other States in the Midwest. Everything is pointing to corn yields in 1959 that will make past years look like the drought of the 1930's.

SOON COMES THE RECKONING

The situation is the brainstorm of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. It is beyond us to figure out just what it is that Benson has in mind in connection with his farm program but its results could be disastrous for both the farmer and the country. The disaster is not likely to hit the farmer, at least the corn farmer, this year but it could catch him quick enough. What might well happen is a fantastic rise in the cost of the Federal Government's farm program.

It takes no brilliant economist to see what is happening today on the corn front. Farmers voted late last year to do away with acreage controls and high, rigid price supports. They asked, instead, for lower supports and freedom to plant at will. The latter program is the one to be followed this summer.

It has just been announced that support prices on the 1959 crop will be $1.12 per bushel, 9 cents per bushel higher than it was last year on noncompliance corn and about 20 cents per bushel lower than it was on corn grown under acreage controls. Ironically, the change in support price will cause all farmers to boost production to its physical limit.

The grower last year who was getting only $1.03 on noncompliance corn will see a bigger profit this year in added production. The man who got $1.32 last year on corn grown in compliance will see that he is forced to grow more this year in order to make as much as he did last year. His profit will be found in volume.

Thus, whatever a farmer got last year, he has a good reason for growing more corn this year. And grow it he will unless weather conditions take an unexpected hand in things. And even the weather is getting to be less and less of a factor. A speaker in Lincoln this week noted that there are now some 2.5 million acres of land in Nebraska under irrigation by either dams and diversion channels or deep wells.

Nebraska is rapidly becoming an ever-normal grain belt wherein rainfall is a relatively unimportant thing from year to year. So long as there is sufficient moisture during a total period of 10 or 15 years, there will be guaranteed moisture during any single year by the process of open storage and pumping from underground supplies.

With such a vast supply of corn as is likely to be poured upon the market this year, the Government might well end up with a corner on the corn business. The regular market will be unable to absorb a great part of the 1959 crop. The Government, then, will fall heir to this surplus—adding it to the stockpile now in Government storage across the land.

ALL POINTED TO MORE CORN

Benson talks about a free enterprise system in agriculture but what he seems headed for is nationalization of agriculture in crop production. It is simply impossible to understand how Benson figures his program will work. To further complicate the picture, he has announced support prices for other grains generally lower than they were for 1958. This will tend to drive farmers away from these grains and into corn production. In addition to the jump in costs to the Government that this program will bring about, there will be many storage and transportation problems.

Some farmers were faced last year with no place for their new crop because the Government failed to pick up the 1957 crop that was in storage under Government loan. Any way you want to look at it, the corn program this year promises to bring on nothing but headaches. And the farmers, in the future, are likely to pay dearly for today's mistakes.

Medical Care for Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I submit the following editorial from the February 27, issue of the Des Moines Register which sets forth a new program of low-cost medical insurance for persons over 65 who find it a hardship to pay medical bills.

Proposed by the Iowa State Medical Society this program was presented to the Iowa delegation of Senators and Representatives here in Washington today by officials of the society. I am sure that we are all aware of the growing numbers of senior citizens in America today. Our life span has been steadily lengthened through the miracles of modern medicine. But this too has its problems. One big problem is medical care since the incidence of sickness increases with age. A higher rate of sickness coupled with higher costs of improved medical care indeed creates a grave problem for our elders which should concern us all.

The editorial follows:

[From the Des Moines Register, February 27, 1959]

MEDICAL CARE FOR AGED

The Iowa State Medical Society deserves congratulations for its new program of low cost medical insurance for persons over 65 who find it a hardship to pay medical bills.

The society is taking the lead in attempting to solve one of the country's most vital health problems. The plan calls for some financial sacrifice on the part of doctors. It's an experiment which, if successful in Iowa, probably would be adopted in many other States.

The plan was approved Sunday at a special meeting of the house of delegates of the medical society. Some details remain to be worked out, but the program is expected to be put into effect by April.

The insurance will be written by Blue Shield, the nonprofit insurance plan of the medical society, and will be available to persons over 65 years of age. If the combined income of a man and his wife is less than $3,000 a year, the couple will be entitled to full-service coverage. An individual can qualify if his income is under $2,000.

The cost to the insured will be about $2.25 to $2.75 per person per month. Income from insurance charges would not be sufficient to pay in full the medical fees which doctors ordinarily charge. So the doctors will accept lower fees to be set by Blue Shield. The fees are expected to cover only overhead costs.

Blue Shield is working with Blue Cross to provide insurance which will cover both hospital and doctor expenses for the elderly at a cost of $6.50 to $7 a person a month. Blue Cross insurance, sponsored by the Iowa Hospital Association, covers hospital costs.

The elderly, who have retired from jobs that paid them a regular income, have less ability to pay medical and hospital expenses than people of working age. But they are more likely to incur heavy medical expenses. It's tragic if they don't get medical care because they can't afford it or if they are forced to become charity patients.

It is estimated that 210,000 of the 300,000 Iowans over 65 years of age will be eligible to take part in the new Blue Shield program. A high percentage of them now have no protection against heavy medical and hospital costs that may come at any time. A 1957 survey made by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago showed that nationally five out of every eight persons 65 and over had no health insurance protection.

A nation as prosperous as the United States, with highly skilled medical doctors and splendid hospitals, will not just "do nothing" about the problem of health care for its senior citizens in low income brackets.

Unless programs of the kind the Iowa society plans can be made truly effective, the Government will sooner or later take over the problem in response to general public demand. This is what the American Medical Association fears and why it recommended last December that doctors reduce fees to persons over 65 who have low incomes.

The A.M.A. is bitterly opposed to the Forand bill in Congress. This calls for the Government to provide free hospital, surgical and nursing home insurance for everyone eligible for social security benefits. It would cost $835 million a year. The A.M.A. fears it would lead to free health care for everyone and Government control of medicine.

The Iowa society is taking the best way to fight socialized medicine. It recognizes the gravity of the problem of providing health care to the elderly at costs they can afford and is attempting to do something about this.

South Names 14 More to Living Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, an interesting item appeared in the business section of the Atlanta Journal-Constitution on February 15, 1959. I should like to bring it to the attention of the readers of the RECORD. The news item concerns the latest additions to the South's Hall of Fame for the Living. The naming of the South's Hall of Fame for men and women is sponsored by a monthly publication called Dixie Business, edited by Mr. Hubert F. Lee, of Decatur, Ga.

From the ranks of the South's Hall of Fame, the man or woman of the South is elected each year by the editors of the magazine, together with its readers and friends.

Under unanimous consent of the House previously granted, I therefore take pleasure in inserting this clipping herewith:

SOUTH NAMES 14 MORE TO LIVING HALL OF FAME

Fourteen leading southerners have been named to the South's Hall of Fame for the Living, an honor group from which the Man of the South is elected each year. The nominations were announced by Hubert F.

Lee, editor of Dixie Business, the sponsoring magazine.

The group is limited to 200 living southerners. The 1959 additions include:

Dr. O. C. Aderhold, president, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.; Harllee Branch, Jr., Atlanta, president, The Southern Co.; David Tennant Bryan, Richmond, publisher, Richmond Times-Dispatch, News Leader; Norman Cocke, Charlotte, chairman, board of trustees, Duke University; H. McKinley Conway, Jr., Atlanta, publisher, Manufacturers Record; Mr. Ralph Draughon, president, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.; Ben S. Gilmer, Atlanta, president, Southern Bell Telephone Co.; Clarence Haverty, Atlanta, chairman, Haverty Furniture Companies; George M. Ivey, Sr., Charlotte, president, J. B. Ivey & Co.; Dr. James A. Jones, Richmond, president, Union Theological Seminary; Ben M McKelway, Washington, D.C., editor, the Washington Star and president of the Associated Press; Dr. John L. Plyler, president of Furman University, Greenville, S.C.; Dr. Clarence Poe, Raleigh, editor, the Progressive Farmer; Nelson Poynter, publisher, the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times.

How We Should Arm To Meet the Soviet Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of every Member of this body who has not already read it excerpts from a recent speech delivered at Charleston, S.C., by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations. The Washington Sunday Star on March 1 did a real service to the American people by carrying excerpts from Admiral Burke's speech which urge a reappraisal of our entire national posture—military, economic, and morale. It affirms the point I was trying to make when I testified before the House Armed Services Committee on January 29 in connection with the extension of the draft. I urged a complete study of our military manpower requirements, to determine whether the draft is the best possible way to meet our responsibilities and to overcome the Soviet challenge. Admiral Burke goes even further and urges a review of every line of our national human endeavor to see whether we are now measuring up and whether we will continue to measure up to the challenges presented to us by Communist competition.

The article follows:

ADMIRAL BURKE SPEAKS OUT—HOW WE SHOULD ARM TO MEET THE SOVIET MENACE

How the United States should expend its money and energy to make the strongest possible defense in the face of Soviet threats has been a lively controversy in Washington for a long time. Most of the criticism has originated at the Capitol.

Last week two high officials spoke out on the problem. The first was Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, in a speech at Charleston, S.C.

The second was President Eisenhower who stressed the need for balance in remarks at his press conference and cited Admiral Burke's speech on the same subject as "indeed good." This is the text of the parts of the admiral's speech dealing with the subject:

"We must make sure that Russia knows we have enough to destroy the Soviet Union, and that we will use it if she launches a nuclear attack.

"There is no point trying to equate our requirements and capabilities with the enemy's. Our requirements are entirely different and our capabilities must be developed around our own needs. We do not need to engage in an endless arms race with the Soviets in ballistic missiles, any more than we have attempted to race them in numbers of submarines or army divisions.

"The really important thing about a deterrent force is not numbers but invulnerability, not total numbers built, but numbers we will be able to use. In making our retaliatory forces secure from enemy attack, we do not need great numbers of missiles and bombers.

"Whether the U.S.S.R. has one-half or as many or several times as many missiles as the United States, is really academic as long as we have the assured capability of destroying Russia, and as long as the Soviets know it, and are really convinced of it.

"There is, in fact, far greater psychological advantage for the United States in having this capability than in allowing ourselves to be drawn into a fruitless and unnecessary race on Soviet terms."

THE ELEMENT OF SECRECY

"Hiding behind the Iron Curtain the Kremlin can tell us what they want us to know, and they are able to conceal fairly effectively that which they don't want us to know.

"If they had a particular capability, would they make such statements as to cause us to build an appropriate response to that particular threat?

"If the Kremlin really intends to exploit an advantage, would it not be better for them to remain quiet and surprise us with deeds rather than words?

"The United States is embarked upon a defense program aimed at meeting our security needs. By not entering a numbers race with the Soviets on their terms, we also avoid the limitless economic drain which such a race would involve.

"We can afford what we have to afford for U.S. security, but also we must spend our funds for what we need. We must apportion our funds carefully to meet all the contingencies facing us.

"A general nuclear war deterrent will deter mainly that, little else. Our powerful retaliatory capability has not always deterred lesser assaults in the past, and it will not in the future."

PRECISION FORCES

"We know that the Soviet expansionist policy is continuing. There have been local aggressions, local uprisings, local crises in the past, which could not be dealt with by the use of mass destruction capabilities.

"These will continue to face us in the future, and we will be able to deal with them effectively only by measures which fit the local circumstances.

"This means controlled, precision forces which can be operated with discrimination and finesse, forces armed with conventional weapons and small atomic weapons, forces which can apply the right degree of power with pinpoint accuracy.

"Our military requirements cover a very wide spectrum of possible situations. But even this is not enough. Military measures, by themselves, are not enough.

"Let us look for a moment at what the Communists themselves have been telling us.

"We can debate at length among ourselves on what proper military measures to take in our own defenses. We can discuss budgets, military posture, and the various forms of modern warfare. We can examine our weapons systems, and our progress in research and development.

"But we can lose the entire stamina and integrity of our civilization if we do not recognize the challenge presented to us by a nation sworn to take us over.

"Distinguished American visitors to the Soviet Union in recent weeks have told me that the most dangerous thing they saw in Russia is the look on the faces of the people.

"What Americans have seen in their visits to Russia is the grim look of determination, the cool and deliberate confidence of people who are going places, who know they are missing a lot of life, who know they are being forced to sacrifice both tangible and intangible human values, but who are resolute in their aim to beat the United States in everything."

SOVIET PEOPLE SEEK PRESTIGE

"And what do they expect to gain by this? Simply this, they expect to gain prestige in the eyes of the rest of the world. They expect to gain greater respectability in the world. They expect to demonstrate that their way is the way of the future. How better can they prove all this than by beating the United States in everything—in athletics, in the arts, in scientific achievement, in industry, political maneuver, and everything else.

"This is the challenge which faces the United States. The Soviets have not said they were going to take the world through general nuclear war. What they have said is that communism is the wave of the future, and will make over the world.

"Fifteen years ago we thought the Soviet Union would build a massive force of long-range aircraft. They certainly had the capability of doing it. But they did not build many.

"Two years ago we were given a jolt with their unveiling of a new and powerful long-range jet bomber, the Bison. But the Soviets did not build many of these either.

"Today their space achievements are impressive. Their objective is twofold. First they want to be really able to develop the military capability which is implied by such achievements. They need not necessarily do it, but they want to be able to do so if they think they have to.

"Their second objective is to demonstrate to the world the technological proficiency of the U.S.S.R.; they want to show the world that they can do it.

"Both of these have their roots in Soviet psychological pressure on us, on our allies, and on the rest of the world, both within and outside the Sino-Soviet bloc."

DANGER OF PREOCCUPATION

"We fall into their mousetrap when we ourselves become so obsessed or preoccupied with these worthy accomplishments as to ignore all the other things they are doing to undermine freedom, to upset the stability of independent nations, and to insinuate their philosophy into the thinking of free men everywhere.

"Let us not underestimate the capabilities of the Soviets. Their scientific achievements along certain lines have been superior. But let this not blind us to all the other much less spectacular things they are doing, the many little, devious, conspiratorial inroads they are making everywhere.

"We have many problems before us in facing up to this Communist challenge. We must not become enchanted with the prospects of military power in the space age at the expense of the many other demands upon us. The competition covers a far wider range of effort than military effort alone. The range now extends to include everybody, not just the military.

"Our country has grown strong in an environment of personal liberty in which the

spirit of competition runs strong among us. The United States has become a world leader as a result of the effort of many hard-working people to whom the concepts of private enterprise and individual initiative have real meaning.

"But today we run the grave risk of becoming complacent in our position of world leadership, and of becoming indifferent to the hard realities of the competition we face as a nation."

THE CHALLENGE WE FACE

"This is the challenge which faces the entire Nation today. It is the challenge of facing Communist competition in every line of human endeavor. It is a challenge which will not be met with slogans, gimmicks and simple answers.

"It is a challenge which summons all Americans once again to reaffirm our purpose in the world community of nations, and to pursue that purpose with vigor, and not be deflected by the cold winds of communism.

"Let us take a hard look at what is happening in the world, a hard look at what is happening to our markets in the world, and let us look at the Soviet economic offensive and determine how well we are responding to it.

"Let us take a hard look at what we need in military hardware.

"The answers will not be found in mathematical equations or with master-stroke answers. We are talking about the whole spectrum of human endeavor, for which there is not single or simple formula.

"The United States is ahead today, but we will stay ahead only by the dint of hard work, by higher standards of individual achievement, by the exercise of free initiative and by placing our personal comforts and interests second to the interests of a strong, virile and dynamic United States.

"This is not a one-man job. It is not a 100-man job, nor a job only for a million men. It is a challenge to 170 million Americans. It is a job for you and for me, for all of us, for your children, and your children's children, for as long as they live they will live in competition."

Federal Minimum Benefit Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, under clause 4 of rule XXII of the House of Representatives, I respectfully submit the attached resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Texas, expressing opposition to legislation which would establish Federal minimum benefit standards and which would compel the States to take similar action:

SENATE RESOLUTION 112

Whereas there is unemployment compensation pending in the Congress of the United States, which legislation seeks to establish certain minimum benefit standards and would thereby remove from the States many of the powers now vested therein, which legislation is coercive upon the legislatures of the various States in that if they fail to comply with the proposed standards, drastic penalties would be imposed upon the taxpayers in such States; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Texas recently, in recognition of unemployment problems, increased the maximum weekly benefit amount by 40 percent, and is even now in the current session considering legislation which would provide further increases; and

Whereas the people of Texas are firmly dedicated to the proposition that matters relating to the amount and duration of unemployment benefits should be left to the discretion of the various State governments due to the widely varying economic and other conditions that prevail among the States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas, That it opposes legislation which would establish Federal minimum benefit standards and which would compel the States to take similar action, thus depriving the legislature of its rightful authority in such matters; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor of the United States, Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson, Senator Ralph W. Yarborough, Speaker Sam Rayburn, and all members of the House of Representatives from Texas.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the Senate on February 23, 1959.

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

Law for Outer Space Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the Des Moines Register of December 28, 1958, carried an excellent editorial pointing up the urgent need for the adoption through international agreements of space laws to settle questions of ownership and to govern traffic in outer space. The Des Moines Register is to be commended for its far-sightedness in this connection. The editorial, which follows, is even more timely today than when it was written 6 weeks ago:

LAW FOR OUTER SPACE NEEDED

Who owns outer space? Who makes the law there? Since sputnik, these are no longer theoretical questions but highly practical ones.

Sputnik, by circling the globe in less than 2 hours, and traversing practically every country in the world repeatedly, vaporized the early hypothesis that each nation owned and had jurisdiction over its airspace—at least as high as man made devices could fly.

Long-distance missiles, meanwhile, vaporized the other chief hypothesis, that the higher air (and nonair) was like the high seas—open to all as a matter of right.

Bright young law students have been filling the law journals with ideas on the subject, and responsible statesmen and scientists have been prayerfully considering it.

A staff report for the Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration of the U.S. House of Representatives recently called for advance notice of flight plans of satellites and missiles so they would not be mistaken for a hostile missile attack and trigger an accidental war.

The staff report discussed the legal theories advanced so far and urged creating some space law by international agreement. It suggested starting cautiously with the most pressing problems: restriction to peaceful uses; defining that term carefully; settling the liability for reentry accidents and the ownership of reentering spacecraft.

President Eisenhower's recorded peace message from the 4-ton Atlas satellite is a dramatic reminder of the U.S. Government's willingness to get started.

Century 21 Exposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, in May of 1961 an international exposition of great importance to the world will open in Seattle, Wash. This exposition is being called the Century 21 Exposition because it will be a showcase of how the scientific knowledge of today, developed by free men within the framework of democratic forms of government, will give us a better world during the next century.

Pursuant to provisions of law passed by the 85th Congress, the Department of Commerce currently is working with other agencies of the Federal Government in an investigation of the ways in which the United States can put its best foot forward in its participation in this significant exposition.

The United States had during recent years displayed its scientific and industrial accomplishments at various shows and fairs throughout the world. The Century 21 Exposition will be an opportunity for our own people as well as those in other parts of the world to see what we are accomplishing in the field of science and industrial development.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert a recent story from the New York Times which outlines how some of the leading scientists in the country are participating in the planning for this exposition.

SCIENTIST TO AID FAIR IN SEATTLE—CENTURY 21 EXPOSITION SET TO OPEN IN MAY 1961—SOVIET TO PARTICIPATE

(By Lawrence E. Davies)

SEATTLE.—A group of leaders in American science has agreed to come here next month to help develop plans for a world fair—the Century 21 Exposition. It is to open in Seattle in May, 1961, and is scheduled for a second year's run in 1962.

Major emphasis is to be placed on science and its relationship to the development of man. The unity of science among nations is to be demonstrated through the expected participation of the Soviet Union, Italy, Japan, and many other countries.

The fair has been in the initial planning stage since 1955. Seattle and Washington State have made a total of $15 million available as a starter.

The scientific theme evolved through a visit to Washington by exposition officials last February. They found science leaders

in the East casting about for a means of putting on a science exposition in 1961.

That was the first year in which results of the International Geophysical Year, now in progress, could be dramatized, said Ewen C. Dingwall, vice president and general manager of the World Fair Corporation.

PLANNING BOARD FORMED

The result has been the setting up of a national science planning board of twenty members.

"Our aim is a compact, high quality show," Mr. Dingwall asserted. "We have the opportunity to do a very significant job of the type that never has been done before. It is true there is a science pavilion at the Brussels world's fair—a first effort—but we should capitalize on its errors and do a better job in Seattle."

He and James Faber, the fair's publicity manager, noted that many millions of dollars were to be gambled on the belief that science is box office. The job ahead, they added, was providing an educational show that is entertaining.

The Stanford Research Institute has estimated that the exposition will draw 8 million to 12 million visitors from May to September, 1961. A second year, it says, would attract 4 million to 6 million persons.

A 74-acre site in the vicinity of the Seattle Civic Auditorium has been chosen for the exposition. Land around the auditorium willl be cleared of buildings, mostly dwellings. The shell of the auditorium will provide a nucleus for construction of a 3,000-seat concert hall with a sixty-foot stage. At least one permanent state buildings, perhaps a combined convention hall and sports center, is to be erected.

Negotiations are under way for construction of a five-mile suspended rail system to carry fair visitors to and from the site to defeat the parking problem.

Besides providing opportunity for the world of science to answer the question, "Where is science going during the next hundred years?" the exposition is to embrace a Pan-Pacific section. Seattle does the bulk of its export trade with nations rimming the Pacific Ocean.

MUSIC FESTIVALS SOUGHT

Committees are going to work to bid for international music festivals and art events for the exposition period, as well as to try to develop a significant sports calendar.

Despite the science theme underlying the fair, 1961 was selected in the first place partly to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the final fixing of the United States-Canadian border. The World Fair Commission notes that the final monument of the border was put in place in 1861 at Point Roberts, Wash., "thus creating the longest unfortified frontier."

The exposition also will feature the University of Washington's centennial year and give recognition to Alaska statehood.

Members of the national science planning board for the fair are:

Dr. Frederick Seitz, University, of Illinois; Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, president; Dr. Paul Weiss of the Rockefeller Institution; Dr. Leonard Carmichael, secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; Dr. Harold J. Coolidge of the National Academy of Sciences; Dr. Frank Fremont-Smith, medical director of the Josiah Macy Jr. Foundation; Dr. Harry F. Harlow of the University of Wisconsin; Dr. Donald Loughridge of General Motors Technical Center; Dr. Donald H. McLaughlin of Homestake Mining Company; Dr. Donald H. Menzel, director of Harvard Observatory; Dr. J. C. Morris, vice president of Tulane University; Dr. Hans Neurath of the University of Washington; Dr. Gerard Piel, president and publisher of the Scientific American; Dr. Froelich Rainey, director of the University of Pennsylvania Museum; Dr. Henry Bradford Washburn Jr., director of the Boston Museum of Science; Dr. Dael Wolfle, executive officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science; D. V. Astin, director, National Bureau of Standards, and Dr. Homer Newell, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg of the University of California, and Dr. Herman F. Marck, Polymer Research Institute.

Taxpayers' Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a long predicted and long overdue taxpayers' revolt against excessive Government spending and high taxes has started in the State of Washington.

Tens of thousands of Washington State citizens are signing petitions and writing letters to State legislators and Members of Congress urging less spending on new programs and demanding that these legislators "hold the line against increasing Government expenditures" and refrain from levying any new and additional State or Federal taxes.

Washington State's two U.S. Senators are quoted in the press as saying that each of them already has received petitions or letters from Washington State bearing more than 1,000 signatures.

The Aberdeen World of Aberdeen, Wash., in my home county—population 55,000—reports leaders of the taxpayers' revolt claim they will obtain petitions or letters to Congressmen and State legislators bearing at least 5,000 signatures.

I received 344 taxpayers' revolt letters from my own county Monday morning and the drive there for a curb on extravagant governmental spending appears to be only at its beginning.

This taxpayers' revolt, newspapers report, is nonpartisan and has the endorsement of leaders in both political parties.

The petitions bear the following heading:

A renewed declaration of independence to the Governor, State of Washington:

We, the undersigned citizens, knowing that the power to tax is the power to destroy, and believing that man is best governed who is least governed, and that government should be held to the same financial responsibility as that to which we are held—namely, to live within its means—do hereby pledge that we shall not require more services of our Government than such as are already being rendered.

We therefore demand that no increased taxes be enacted and that Government, both State and Federal, confine their expenditures to existing sources and limits of revenue.

We further declare that any elected representative of the people who does not subscribe to these views is not worthy of our support at the polls.

Other petitions are addressed to Members of Congress and to State legislators.

Signers of the petitions are following up their petition signing by writing letters to Members of Congress and to State legislators. A typical letter of this kind follows:

I have signed a petition addressed to the Governor, our representatives in the National Congress and our State representatives, in which I have pledged that I will not request any increased governmental services and demanding that no increased taxes of any kind be levied.

You will shortly receive this petition, which it is expected will have the signatures of at least 5,000 citizens of Grays Harbor County, Wash., most of whom will write you a similar letter.

This position is endorsed by leaders and members of both political parties.

I urge that you exert every effort to prevent any additional taxation whatsoever.

Here is a taxpayers' revolt that may become nationwide. If it does become nationwide, it may contribute greatly to Congress and State legislatures obtaining balanced budgets this year.

If the revolting taxpayers accomplish that goal, they will put a brake on the continued rising prices of inflation which are reducing the living standards of millions of American citizens, especially pensioners, retired persons, and others who are on fixed incomes.

Dr. Godfrey Lowell Cabot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like publicly to congratulate Dr. Godfrey L. Cabot of 242 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass., on the occasion of his 98th birthday on February 26, 1959.

Dr. Cabot is a businessman, a philanthropist, and a citizen who all his life has devoted himself to public service and better government.

Graduating with high honors from Harvard in 1882, Dr. Cabot undertook graduate study in geology and then established the highly successful Godfrey L. Cabot, Inc., in Boston with branches in many parts of the country.

One of his lifetime special interests has been aviation. Dr. Cabot learned to fly at the age of 55, an age when many men are thinking of retiring, by winning his Navy wings at Pensacola in 1918. He then completed a successful experiment of picking up cargo from the water in a moving plane, much to the astonishment of authorities in the Navy Department who were less than enthusiastic, at that time, about aviation. Subsequently, Dr. Cabot has been president of the National Aeronautical Association; one of the original directors of the Aviation Research Foundation, and remains honorary president of the Federation Aeronautique Internationale (FAI) which keeps the official worldwide records for aviation achievements by all countries.

Dr. Cabot in his 90's retains a modern view of the great future possibilities for aviation and in a recent letter to Professor Langdon P. Marvin, Jr., he made this prophecy:

I predict that the time will come when the freight traffic through the air will greatly

exceed passenger traffic through the air, and the receipts for carrying their goods through the air will be greater than for carrying passengers through the air. I predict that the time will come when the passenger and freight traffic through the air will be to a great extent separated, and most of the freight carried by planes that are built specially for that purpose.

It is a source of inspiration to all of us to contemplate the active intelligence of Dr. Cabot, and his many friends join with me in wishing congratulations on his 98th birthday and best wishes for many more birthdays to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a letter from the President to Dr. Cabot and join in the President's congratulations:

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 24, 1958.*
DOCTOR GODFREY L. CABOT,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR DR. CABOT: I am reminded that February 26 brings around your 97th birthday anniversary. I am sure that as you look back upon America's tremendous progress during your lifetime you have the same feeling of pride as do I, and I hope that you will share in the immense possibilities that seem to be just around the corner for us—and for all peoples.

From my friends I know that you are as keen an observor of the passing scene as ever, and I do hope that I shall have the privilege of sending you my warmest felicitations, as I do now, for many future years.

With best wishes and warm regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Congress Should Quiz the Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 5, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the Richmond Times-Dispatch, written by Ross Valentine, and which was reprinted in the February 23, 1959, issue of the Florida Times-Union. The article entitled "Congress Should Quiz the Court" follows:

[Reprinted in Florida Times-Union, Feb. 23, 1959]

CONGRESS SHOULD QUIZ THE COURT

(By Ross Valentine, in Richmond Times-Dispatch)

Love is blind. And that goes for those in love with the proposition—that equal education will not be equal, until one race is permitted to force its way into the schools of another.

To such as these the Supreme Court can do no wrong, though its dictum, pit race against race, North against South, and divide a Nation against itself.

But wrath, like hate, is also blind.

The Court's critics (including this one) at first saw in the Court's unanimous decision a political motive—i.e., appeasement of the Negro vote, a fractional minority wielding balance of power because of its concentration in big cities of electorally determinant States.

The absurdity of this suspicion became evident, however, after more dispassionate deliberation. It simply doesn't make sense. Life tenure protects the Court against the whims of political weather.

What, then could have been the reason for unanimity in so reckless a blunder? On an issue which, since the decision of 1896, had been settled, repeatedly affirmed, and considered valid, with no protest from any of the States, and no attempt by Congress to upset the principle of equal, but separate schools, in States where this was deemed best for all concerned.

There must have been a reason for this revolutionary reversal in the concept of the constitutional relationship between the States and the Central Government.

Does the Court expect the people to accept its Delphic decision on faith?

That attitude might be justified, if the clock could be turned back to the days of absolute monarchy, based on the premise that a divinely anointed king can do no wrong. But will freemen concede divine right to Frankfurter, Warren, et al?

The High Court is the creature of presidential prerogative. It will not be questioned by the White House.

It can be investigated, however, by the Congress, whose Members, collectively, personify the concept of consent of the governed.

Congress, if only because its function has been usurped by the judiciary, should consider itself dutybound to demand an explanation for usurpation of legislative power.

The Supreme Court, and the lower Federal courts do not represent the people. Their members are Presidentially handipicked to conform to political ideology. Surely, the inexcusable elevation of the utterly inexperienced Mr. Warren to Chief Justice—the world's most powerful position on the sunny side of the Iron Curtain, is a case in point.

None but the ignorant, superstitious, timid or the servile will attribute to the nine Justices the quality of infallibility and omnipotence. Yet the members of that Supreme Bench are entrenched for life, for all practical purposes. They cannot be removed except by impeachment, and then only if found guilty of a criminal charge, such as treason, murder, rape, arson, embezzlement or acceptance of bribes.

The Court's flouting of article X, was plainly a trespass on the legislative and amendatory powers vested solely in Congress and the people. But under the Constitution, this usurpation in no way renders the Justices liable to impeachment.

Our only recourse therefore rests in the House of Representatives which does represent the people, and in the Senate, which represents the several states.

Needless to say any proposal to investigate the Court's decision will be dismissed either as "naive," or damned as an unwarrantable intrusion on the "rights," powers and immunity of the judiciary. Only under totalitarianism are government officials considered immune.

Unless the people, via Congress, exercise their right of inquiry, the people will henceforth be defenseless in the face of future attempts at "judicial legislation."

Exposure of the Adams-Goldfine scandal by a congressional subcommittee was a dramatic example of the exercise of that power. The White House was not immune. Are the Justices to be granted greater powers of immunity than the President?

The Warren decision gave no valid reasons for violation of article X.

The fallacy and weakness of its reasoning was exposed by that fatal footnote—"and see, generally, Myrdal," the reference being to a book on civil rights of the Negro, written by staff members of the plaintiff NAACP, with the assistance of sundry leftwingers, and edited by a Swedish sociologist imported for the purpose, whose knowledge of American constitutional law may be comparable to Mr. Warren's.

Basing its opinion generally upon the findings of this foreign Socialist, the court ignored Article X—and distorted the 14th amendment to fit Myrdal's frankly Marxist theories.

The "constitutional philosophy" of Mr. Chief Justice Warren may be relegated to the realm of political myth—but this cannot be said of the dominant intellect on the high bench—Mr. Justice Frankfurter, who had formerly acted as counsel for the plaintiff NAACP, and may be presumed to have been partial to his former clients.

Unless we accept the humiliating assumption that the Court acted on sociological theory, the only alternative explanation for the decision is that the Frankfuter-Warren court considered the Constitution of the United States to have been superseded by the United Nations Charter, and therefore felt called upon to "interpret" the 14th amendment so as to coincide with "international policy" as set forth in the UN Charter and its UNESCO appendix.

Was this the reason the Supreme Court unanimously disregarded the constitutionally fixed limitations of the Federal Government?

The people of the United States—sorely bewildered in this crisis—have a right to an honest answer to that question—a question not answered in the Warren decision of May 1954.

One worlders may conceivably argue that judicial recognition of interdependence with other free world nations was long overdue—that the court's school decision was needed to implement Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy and defeat Soviet propaganda among the colored multi-millions.

If this was, indeed, the reason for the court's revolutionary reversal of the established relationship between States and nation—then the people should be told frankly.

They should not be compelled to accept judicial revision of the Constitution simply because it is being touted as "the law of the land" by a noisy minority. The Court's members are not "supreme beings." They are, like all men, in or eur of office, fallible.

They are hired—and their salaries paid—by the taxpaying citizens.

The Court is not immune to interrogation by Congress.

Washington Impressed With Achievements of Julius Madey, a Clark, N.J., Boy Who Made Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal lately about the need for improving our educational system in the face of Soviet gains in scientific and engineering education.

We recognize, I believe, that in general we have not insisted upon the highest standards of excellence and achievement of which our young people are capable. We have failed in many instances to recognize talented boys and girls early enough to guide them into areas where their natural abilities and interests could best be developed.

In recent months, however, an unprecedented degree of public awareness of our educational deficiencies has been

growing. In response to this awareness, Congress last year passed the National Defense Education Act, a landmark in our educational history. And we are already beginning to reap the harvest of this farsighted legislation.

Similar developments are occurring at the State and local level throughout the country. Our people realize that we need good teachers, adequately paid, and good schools, adequately equipped, if we are to give our children the opportunity to make the most of their God-given abilities.

It is in this context of our increasing determination to improve our system of education, Mr. Speaker, that I call the attention of our colleagues to an example of the kind of talented and responsible young man our American system can produce at its best. I do so not in any spirit of complacency about past accomplishments, but in the hope that this one young man may serve as a model for the kind of excellence we should be producing more of.

Beyond this, however, I believe that Julius Madey of Clark, N.J., deserves recognition on his own merits.

Julius Madey is 18 years old. He graduated from Johnson Regional High School last year, and plans to enter Rutgers University next year to begin a 5-year course in medical electronics.

Despite his youth, he has made a remarkable record for himself—so remarkable, in fact, that he has just been awarded the 1958 Edison Radio Amateur Award for public service, a cherished honor he richly deserved.

Consider, for instance, that at his early age, Julius Madey has already been an important factor in the success of Operation Deepfreeze and of our International Geophysical Year research teams in the Antarctic; he has provided an essential channel of communication with American personnel at Arctic weather stations, at military bases in the Pacific and DEW line support bases in Alaska; and he has been a one-man good will mission to people throughout Europe.

The top national Edison Award was not the first recognition accorded young Madey. Previously, he had received a special citation from the Edison Award Committee as well as an Edison commendation certificate, and a public service award from the U.S. Navy. He also won student science fair honors several years ago for inventing an ultrasonic drill, and has excelled in oratorical and other academic activities.

Julius Madey received his award—a trophy and $500—at ceremonies held in Washington's Sheraton-Carlton Hotel on Thursday evening, February 26, 1959. It was one of the most impressive such ceremonies I have ever been privileged to witness.

More than 150 people were present for the dinner, including some of the top Government, military, and private communications officials and four Federal Communications Commissioners. Mr. L. Berkley Davis, chairman of the award committee, made the presentation on behalf of the General Electric Co., sponsors of the award. Mr. J. S. Parker, vice president of General Electric for employee and public relations, was master of ceremonies.

The principal speaker for the occasion was the Reverend Daniel Linehan, S. J., head of the geophysics department at Boston College and one of the best known geophysicists in the world. It seems that Father Linehan and Julius Madey were already well acquainted. When Father Linehan was in the Antarctic in connection with the International Geophysical Year, his plane crashed. It was through young Madey's radio station—K2KGJ, which he and his brother, John, 16, operate from their home in Clark—that Father Linehan was able to assure his family in the United States that he was uninjured.

The story of Julius Madey came from all these men and others. It is a story of tireless and selfless service to people. Despite a full high school schedule, he has manned his station up to 90 hours a that evening was a tape-recorded messages annually, both important official calls and personal messages between the men on the fringes of civilization and their families at home.

One of the most moving testimonials that evening wes a tape-recorded message made in the wastes of the Antarctic by a group of American servicemen and scientists for the express purpose of telling Julius on this great occasion how much his work and help has meant to them.

During the 1958 Christmas season, for example, he relayed for these isolated service personnel orders for more than $2,000 worth of flowers to be sent to their families in the United States.

Once, through his station, a young mother announced the birth of her child directly from her hospital bed to her husband near the South Pole.

Among the evidence submitted to the award committee was a personal letter of appreciation to Julius Madey from Rear Adm. George Dufek, Commander, U.S. Naval Support Force, Antarctica.

For hours at a time, Julius has been the sole contact between civilization and the men still pushing ahead the frontiers of scientific knowledge in some of the most desolate parts of the world.

But his service has been appreciated. The Edison Award judges—FCC Commissioner Rosel Hyde, E. Roland Harriman, chairman of the board of the American National Red Cross, and G. L. Dosland, president of the American Radio Relay League—chose him from among nearly 200,000 licensed radio amateurs to receive this coveted award.

In every sense of the word, Julius Madey was the star of the evening. He acknowledged his award in a 15-minute speech, which he delivered without notes, and which was a model of its kind. He was relaxed and gracious and genuinely modest. He held the entire room spellbound as he told his story and thanked all those who in the past have helped make his accomplishments possible.

Washington, Mr. Speaker, has seen many stars glitter for a while and quickly fade away. But this boy is the real thing. He is a credit to his family—who have obviously meant so much in his young life—to his schools and his community. He is an outstanding example to the youth of America—and to us, the adults—of the potential riches of talent and of personal service that exist in the youth of America, awaiting only the opportunity to grow and develop and be used for the welfare of our country and our people.

Clark Township and Union County would have been especially proud of Julius Madey that Thursday evening.

I certainly was.

A Malayan Exchange Fellow Looks at the Prospects for Asian Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the American Political Science Association, which for some years has enabled American political scientists and journalists to spend time on Capitol Hill in the offices of Congressmen and Senators, has this year broadened its program to include three young men from Asia. I have been fortunate in having with me since the session began Ahmad Roose, of the city of Kuala Lumpur, Malaya. Mr. Roose came for his months in Washington from his civil service post in the Ministry of the Interior and Justice of the Federation of Malaya.

Mr. Roose has participated in all the activities of my office: committee meetings, floor sessions, administrative work. He has been of great help to us, and has won the friendship of everyone he has met. I hope in return he can take with him next summer some case-studies of democracy in action. Mr. Roose believes deeply in democracy, but recognizes the difficulties it faces in many of the countries which have recently found national existence. He explores the question in a talk today sponsored by the department of government and arranged by Prof. Charles R. Foster, of the historic College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Va. I believe that his remarks have meaning for our own policy in emerging areas. Successful political democracy, in the sense of responsible governments peacefully elected by a wide suffrage, may be long delayed. Lack of responsible opposition, apathy on the part of the voters, and impatience to get ahead economically—these factors, Mr. Roose points out, may make democracy elusive. Naturally, we would like nothing better than that the true political democracy of our own tradition became the heritage of mankind everywhere. But where emerging peoples have not yet attained it, is it not equally important that their governments be humane, and that they work in the direction of democracy?

I commend Mr. Roose's remarks to all who are interested in the problems of emerging peoples:

IS DEMOCRACY FEASIBLE IN ASIA?

The question posed above is a vital one as on its answer depends the fate of the

nations in Asia. The same question has in fact often been asked in many other ways, but the underlying factor is the same, and that is, whether or not the newly gained independence in some of the Asian countries will lead them to adopt democracy as the form of government, that is to say, the principle of popular elections to determine the government. There seems to be a consensus of opinions that, given time, education to reduce the high rate of illiteracy, and guidance, democracy will prevail in Asia in some form or other. Such democratic government system will, however, to some extent, differ from that found in the West and America. This is to be expected, considering that the development of the type of government will naturally be governed by the forces prevalent in any particular country.

Asians as a people have only known authoritarian rule, either foreign or domestic. Now most of them have loudly proclaimed their independence status and have accepted to some extent the principle of democracy. As such, democracy is a new notion. Before the two world wars, the principle of self-determination was never extended to the people living in Asia, as they were mostly governed by western colonial powers. However, the two world wars had changed this concept, and it is now believed that the principle of self-determination must also be extended to the Asians. This change in attitude may have arisen as a result of the general exhaustion of the western colonial powers as a result of the world wars; consequently, colonies no longer became an asset. They have in fact become increasingly more expensive and morally unjustified to maintain; in short, colonial territories are a great liability. So, in such circumstances, the inevitable was bound to happen. Britain, perhaps with foresight, took the initiative in granting independence for India in 1947, and so India became the first colonial territory to achieve independence. The grant of independence in this case was without bloodshed, and was of course urged on by the independence movement in India which began back in the 1930's. This was followed by Indonesia, the Philippines, Burma, and so on. The last of the Southeast Asian countries to join the fold of newly independent countries is Malaya, which received her new status in 1957. Thus we see that, apart from Japan, only the former colonial territories which have obtained their independence have proclaimed themselves to be democratic governments. Of course, it is a debatable point whether democracy, as it is understood in the West and here in America, will ever be successful in the short run, considering that the period of training for self-rule was relatively short. Under such circumstances one perhaps may be forgiven for thinking that democracy in southeast Asia is indeed a fragile plant, with an uncertain future and requires naturally a lot of attention and grooming before it comes to maturity. It must be remembered that there are far too many social, economic, and other factors which may prevent democracy from being practicable in Asia.

Democracy in this context is defined as a government by the people, for the people, and of the people; one in which the people is given the choice to elect the government, and the choice to change an unpopular one by balloting and not through violence. Now let us examine the factors which can contribute to make democracy practicable in Asia. In this connection, perhaps it is easier to discuss the question from another angle, and that is to examine the factors, nonexistent in Asia, which make democracy such a success in the west and in America.

One of the most important factors which is at the moment absent in all the countries of Asia is undoubtedly an effective, enlightened and responsible opposition party which will hold the government responsible for their actions. It is no exaggeration to say that in Asia there is no such responsible opposition. There are of course many political parties in direct opposition to the government, but they are not what I would call responsible opposition in the sense that they are not in the least trying to aid the government to become effective. Parties tend to become mere tools for some political leaders to come to power, and they are often involved in intrigues and shady tactics to bring down the government, so that they in turn can have the opportunity to make easy money. We have often heard the accusation of corruption leveled at some, if not all, of the recently established democratic governments in this area, and that the easiest way to make money is of course by being a member of a cabinet. This accusation may be true. But the question that one should ask is, why is there no effective opposition in spite of the presence of many political parties?

In the newly formed democracies of southeast Asia, the party system is not yet a healthy one. In the political atmosphere of Asia where the party system, as can be seen, is not functioning well; where parties prior to independence had little opportunity to develop or to perform the customary roles; and where a large majority of the masses is illiterate, it is hardly surprising that political parties are viewed with a rather jaundiced eye by the educated and economically well off. An independence movement is not the best breeding ground for political parties in the Western sense. In the search for unity in opposition to the colonial power, Asian nationalist movements exerted every effort to bring all factions together into one independence-bound organization, and there was a common slogan acceptable to all. Such slogans range from "freedom," "independence," or, as in Indonesia and Malaya, "Merdeka." After independence, as was natural, these movements tended to break down, as groups with minority views left the parent body to form new political groupings.

Asian political parties may be divided into four main groups: (a) The Nationalist Party (which is often the parent party), (b) the Communalist Party, (c) the Socialist Party, and lastly (d) the Communist Party. Besides these groupings there are other numerous political parties which are influential either at state level or regional level but not at national level, and also the innumerable so-called parties which center around individual leaders. This is partly caused by the absence of any clear divisions of political forces by long traditions or by differences on major policies. Therefore such break is due to conflicts of personality.

Communalism is one of the most powerful and most divisive forces in Asian life, but so far no "communal" party has had any success in national politics. What is the reason for the growth of communal parties? The answer is simple. Asia is a plural society with peoples of different races, customs, traditions and religious background living side by side. Communalism comes to the fore when foreign rule is withdrawn. Peoples who have more or less got along well with each other suddenly found old antagonisms toward neighbors of another race. For under foreign rules, some kind of neutrality could be imposed from above. If neither group ruled itself, it had not to worry about being ruled by its neighbors. But if these same neighbors were on the way to being the ruling class, then the prospect of being ruled by local foreign rulers becomes intolerable. Thus we saw how the Indian Muslims revolted against the Indian Hindus in India in 1947, the Sinhalese in Ceylon against the Tamils.

Now, under the circumstances, what is the possibility of the emergence of a responsible opposition? The possibility does not appear at all bright. There is apparently no common factor on which the various political parties could combine to form an opposition. Thus, neither the rightwing nor the leftwing parties, either separately or together, can become an effective opposition. If at all a coalition may be formed for other less complex purposes, such as to fight an election, but not because of common political ideals. However, this is not strictly true of Malaya.

Thus it is apparent that one of the most important components of democracy is lacking in Asia. However, I believe that in the long run, the emergence of an active opposition is certain, as the so-called leaders of the community may come to the realization that it would be better for everybody if they were to bury their differences and work for the nation as a whole. All that is required in this connection is, I think, a concerted effort to insure that the period of waiting for such an effective opposition is considerably shortened.

The other important factor necessary for democracy to be practicable is the presence of social consciousness, and the realization of their responsibility by the citizens. In the highly developed countries, social consciousness might, of course, be the result of the typical Western or American way of life, with its many kinds of public institutions, its public school system, its personal freedom vis-a-vis the security of the state. For instance, the British people believe that to aspire for political leadership, the personal character and the integrity of the aspirant must be aboveboard. This sort of consciousness is absent in Asia, where you often find that the so-called leaders of the community or party are more often than not the acknowledged failures in life. The thing that really bothers one is the fact that such men can and did win their elections to responsible positions either at State or even the national level. This is only possible due to the prevalent political apathy among a large majority of the people. Suitable and well-qualified candidates refuse to come forward to stand for elections, as they know full well the great responsibility that they, as leaders, would shoulder should they be elected. Consequently, political opportunists often come forward to fill the gap, and as there is no opposition (if any, it would be people of the same caliber), little choice is left for the electorate. Lack of suitable candidates for elections may be due to the absence of a leisure class. However, I do not believe that political apathy is the direct result solely of illiteracy of the masses. The voter turnout seems to be higher in the rural areas than in the urban. If this political apathy were to prevail for long, one fears that southeast Asia will get the kind of government which will by no means be democratic, but one which we dislike: authoritarian, short of communism.

Quite recently several Asian countries, namely Pakistan, Burma, and Thailand, in their despair have turned to authoritarian systems of government of one form or other. Burma is under what is called direct democracy, while it is guided democracy in Indonesia, and perhaps disciplined democracy in Thailand. It cannot be denied that this is an ominous trend. However, India, the biggest democracy on earth, is showing no signs of losing faith in its democratic ideals. Thus one can conclude that the feasibility of democracy in Asia is entirely dependent on the people's awareness of their responsibility. I have no doubt that the people of Asia have enough good sense to decide for their own betterment.

At present social consciousness is not entirely absent, but the degree of awareness is not encouraging enough for one to think that the chances of democracy to succeed are bright. To increase the awareness is by no

means formidable. But no one will deny that it will take a long time. Two things are required: education and time.

One can of course provide education and institutions which will foster the growth of social consciousness. But the process is necessarily a slow one. I admit, however, that we have not the time to do so considering the existence of other voices, the Communists, promising better things in quicker time than democracy can offer. The competition is therefore very stiff indeed and I think time is, in this case, not on our side.

Southern Regional Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, a sense of fairness impels me to insert the following editorials from two respected southern papers. These editorials from the Richmond Times-Dispatch and the Chattanooga Times discuss certain attacks on the good name of the Southern Regional Council and deserve the careful attention of every fair-minded citizen regardless of his views:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Aug. 21, 1958]

A RACE AGENCY AND THE FACTS

Inaccurate statements as to its origins of the Southern Regional Council of Atlanta appeared recently in the Times-Dispatch, and should be corrected. They appeared—inadvertently, we are sure—in one of the series of articles by Edward B. Simmons, of the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, concerning Communist efforts to incite racial strife in the United States.

Mr. Simmons stated in the article appearing in our paper on August 5 that the Southern Regional Council, established in Atlanta in 1944 was an "offshoot of the old Southern Conference for Human Welfare, which was dissolved in 1948 after twice being described by the Federal Government as Communist front." He also said: "The Communist Daily Worker openly boasted that James E. Jackson, chief of the southern branch of the U.S. Communist Party, was a cofounder of the regional council."

Taking these two charges in order, the Southern Regional Council was not an offshoot of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. It was established in response to an appear from respected southern Negro leaders, who met at Durham, N.C., in October 1942, on the call of Dr. Gordon B. Hancock, of the Virginia Union faculty here, and Dr. P. B. Young, of Norfolk, publisher of the Norfolk Journal and Guide. These Negro leaders did not ask for the elimination of segregation in the schools or anywhere else; they asked that separate but equal be made a reality.

Responding to their appeal, a group of white leaders met in Atlanta in the spring of 1943, and expressed a desire to cooperate. Out of this grew the Southern Regional Council. The council was the successor to the Commission on Interracial Cooperation, founded in 1919 by leading churchmen. To repeat, it not only was no offshoot of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare; it was criticized in some quarters because it was more conservative than that organization and suspected of being in competition with it.

We must remember, too, that when the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was established in 1938, it was not suspected of having any Communist connections, and many well intentioned and patriotic southerners participated in its early meetings. A number of these later joined the Southern Regional Council when they discovered the true purposes of the Conference for Human Welfare.

As to the allegation of the Communist Daily Workers that James E. Jackson, chief of the southern branch of the U.S. Communist Party, was a cofounder of the Southern Regional Council, there is nothing to support this.

A James E. Jackson is listed as having attended the Durham meeting of Negro leaders in October 1942, but is not mentioned by the Norfolk Journal and Guide as having been on the committee which drew up the statement then issued. Jackson did not participate in the meetings of white and Negro leaders in 1943 and 1944 which led to the establishment of the Southern Regional Council, and he was not at any time an officer, director, or member of that agency. The Daily Worker's statement that he was a founder is as unreliable and inaccurate as nearly everything else in that Communist sheet.

The late Dr. Howard W. Odum, noted and respected member of the University of North Carolina faculty, was the first president of the council. He was succeeded in 1945 by Paul D. Williams, prominent Catholic layman of Richmond and cofounder of the Catholic Committee of the South, who served until 1951. Mr. Williams was succeeded in that year by Marion A. Wright, South Carolina attoreny, former chairman of the South Carolina Library Board and past president of the University of South Carolina Alumni Association.

It should be emphasized that SRC worked within the framework of separate but equal for 7 years, and did not announce for integration until 1951.

While we disagree strongly and completely with its present position on this issue, we feel obligated to point out, in fairness, that it was in no sense Communist in its origins. The Southern Regional Council was established because of a sincere desire on the part of white and Negro leaders in the South to eliminate many of the disabilities and discriminations from which Negroes were suffering.

It was hoped that if these could be substantially lessened, the colored South would not look to the colored North for leadership. Insufficient progress was made, unfortunately, and the NAACP moved in and launched its drive for the complete elimination of segregation—sooner than it probably would have done if SRC's accomplishments had been larger.

That is where we stand today.

[From the Chattanoga (Tenn.) Times, Dec. 20, 1958]

MATTHEWS AND THE SRC

The Arkansas Legislative Council, concluding that a Communist plot is substantially responsible for the Little Rock desegregation crisis, has aired some charges so grossly unjust as to recall the McCarthyist nightmare.

There was J. B. Matthews, himself a former Communist-front leader, declaring that the Southern Regional Council had Red sympathizers in its ranks.

Just 20 years ago, Mr. Matthews was accusing Shirley Temple of aiding the Bolsheviks. The former chief counsel of the Dies committee is primarily remembered, however, for his July 1953 article in the American Mercury labeling "at least 7,000 Protestant clergymen" as "party members, fellow travelers, espionage agents, partyline adherents, and unwilling dupes." The protest, from President Eisenhower and others, was so strong that Senator Joe McCarthy, who by then had carried his campaign of vilification directly to the White House, was forced to fire Mathews, whom he had just hired as executive director of his subcommittee.

In the Little Rock hearings, other familiar names in the business of smear were trotted out. The Southern Regional Council was a frequent target, though no one dared go so far as to impugn its motives as a whole.

The SRC, as is well known, is made up of foremost southern educators, clergymen, business, labor, and professional leaders. A discussion and research group, it was organized in 1943, as a result of Negro leaders' efforts to see that the "separate but equal" doctrine in southern education be made a reality. It grew also out of the Commission on Interracial Cooperation, founded in 1919 by leading churchmen.

Since then it has favored gradual compliance with the Supreme Court's decision, but even so staunchly segregationist a newspaper as the Richmond Times-Dispatch recently said: "The Southern Regional Council was established because of a sincere desire on the part of white and Negro leaders in the South to eliminate many of the disabilities and discriminations from which Negroes were suffering."

Now the Arkansas Legislative Council, with never a peep about the role of its own Governor Faubus, concludes on the word of former Communists, who are professional name-callers, and others, most of them from out of the region, that little more than a Red plot is the cause of their difficulties.

A Statement on Pending Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose a letter I received from the Lancaster, S.C., Chamber of Commerce, and while I do not necessarily agree with all their views, I am grateful that a group of men in my district are making such a fine study and are trying to be helpful to their Congressman in making decisions on these matters:

STATEMENT ON PENDING LABOR LEGISLATION PREPARED FOR MEMBERS OF THE SENATE LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE COMMITTEE AND THE HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

The legislative action committee of the Lancaster Chamber of Commerce has made a study of pending labor legislation and the recommendations of this committee have been approved by the board of directors.

Our members have been concerned, as has the rest of the Nation, about the revelations of the McClellan committee and we feel that some positive action should be taken by the Congress to protect the rights of union members, management, and honest union leaders.

We have studied the two primary bills now under consideration and prefer the administration bill, S. 748, over the Kennedy-Ervin bill, S. 505. The Kennedy-Ervin bill is a weak piece of legislation which we believe will not effectively deal with the corruption that has been uncovered in the organized labor movement. It also carries certain provisions which labor leaders say they must

have if they are to support the bill. We cannot see the necessity for bribing the public on this legislation. An antiracketeering measure is needed and the people should not have to bargain for it.

The administration bill, S. 748, comes nearer to an effective answer to this need. Provision is not made for bringing unions under antitrust laws or controlling the use of union funds for political purposes but the bill is otherwise an acceptable answer to the problem. S. 748 is already an example of compromise and we feel that it is the least that the American people can be asked to accept.

We are now at a turning point in the control of labor racketeering. Either something effective must be done this year or the racketeers will know that they have a clear field. The working men and women of this country deserve more than that.

Our committee is not able to study legislation in this field and obtain approval as fast as the various bills are being introduced.

However, we believe that S. 748 is a bill with which labor and management can both live and we urge the members of this committee to support this type of labor bill.

Respectfully submitted,

J. REECE FUNDERBURK, JR., D.D.S.
Chairman, Legislative Action Committee, Lancaster Chamber of Commerce, Lancaster, S.C.

Don't Kill the Goose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the attched article from the March 9 issue of the U.S. News & World Report. This article in my opinion makes perfectly clear why we must not only talk about economy and fiscal responsibility but practice it as well:

"DON'T KILL THE GOOSE—"

(By David Lawrence)

The Government of the United States is a 52 percent partner in every American business.

Partners share the losses as well as the profits.

But the Government is a silent partner in private enterprise—it has to sit by while pressures of various kinds curtail or wipe out profits. Yet profits are necessary not only to furnish tax money to the Government but to replenish wornout tools and to pay the wages of the investors.

Nationwide labor unions lately have become the outspoken foe of bigger profits. Every time statistics are published showing that some companies in an industry are making somewhat larger profits than in the preceding year, union leaders demand higher wages. Unless these are granted, costly strikes ensue. This has little to do with whether the worker is going to produce more. The modern labor union doctrine holds that the worker is entitled to more wages, irrespective of efficiency or productivity.

But if this trend continues, where will the Government wind up?

Thus, in the current fiscal year, as a result of the business recession, the estimated tax receipts from the profits of corporations have gone down from $20.1 billion to $17 billion.

If labor unions insist that they have a right to a bigger and bigger share of the income of corporations, the Government will lose in two ways:

First, every wage expense is a deduction on which the Government suffers a 52-percent loss of revenue.

Second, the increased revenue from individual income taxes does not make up for all the losses suffered by the Treasury from a drop in corporation profits. In the current fiscal year, for instance, individual income tax receipts, as estimated by the Treasury, have gone up by $2.2 billion at the same time that the corporation taxes have declined by $3.1 billion.

The dependence of the Federal Treasury on the profits of business is not fully appreciated or realized throughout this country. President Eisenhower said on this point at his press conference last week:

"We shouldn't be so prone, I think, to talk about and decry profits in our economy.

"You must remember that the people now expect all sorts of services from the Federal Government, starting with that of national defense and go right on down to the last item that you want to find in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"We tax largely profits. We don't tax industrial activity as such—we tax profits. That is what the income tax is. So if you are trying to get profits down to zero, you are going to have to find some other way of finding Federal revenue, if we are going to this Government, I assure you."

America has achieved her greatest progress under the system of private initiative. Experience proves that Government operation of business projects is wasteful. Also, a big volume of tax dollars that would otherwise be collected is lost to the Treasury.

President Eisenhower has stated the issue plainly: How can there be appropriations for social welfare unless the Government takes in enouhg money from taxes to pay its bills? The President said last week in a speech to the U.S. Savings Bond Conference:

"Now, we have among us those who are calling for heavier and heavier expenditures, saying that these heavier expenditures on the part of the Federal Government would mean and, in effect, would cause, economic expansion. I cannot think of any doctrine or statement that is so false as this one. * * *

"When the Government spends more money than it is getting in the form of taxes, the Treasury must do just exactly what a family or a business would have to do, under similar circumstances: It must go out and borrow whatever is needed to finish paying the bills. When part of the borrowing it must undertake comes from commercial banks, the money supply is increased and the conditions are created for an inflationary price rise.

"Inflation weakens the economy. It brings serious hardships to those of our citizens who are living on pensions or other fixed incomes, and works against those who are unable to bargain effectively for higher wages. Most dangerous of all, inflation weakens the incentive to save. It gives rise to a fear that the dollar will continue to decline in value and that speculation will be the only way to keep ahead of the game."

What is the answer? It is to be found in one word—self-restraint. Business must restrain itself on prices. Labor must restrain itself on wages. The spenders in Congress must restrain themselves on appropriations for social welfare.

Steady growth and a stable dollar are certain to result from such restraint.

But what must be borne in mind above all else is that profits derived from private business are necessary to support the Government. We must never kill the goose that lays the golden egg."

Curtailing Foreign Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as usual, opposition to the present administration on reciprocal trades and the Buy American Act, draws editorial comment, as well as a batch of misinformation, which serves to further confuse the minds of the public as to the realities of the situation. I am submitting for the RECORD today two editorials appearing in local papers which would appear to cover the subject to the uninformed, but to those of us who have made a thorough study of the situation the answer is not so simple. I submit, therefore, Mr. Speaker, my reply to these editors and their editorials:

OPEN LETTER TO THE PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE

FEBRUARY 27, 1959.

To the EDITOR.

DEAR SIR: I don't write Letters to the Editor very often. When I do, it's because either the information is in error, or I am badly informed.

On Wednesday, February 25, your editorial appears to put my fight for the awarding of large contracts to foreign governments in a bad light.

Personally, I've been an advocate for liberal trade policies. However, I always felt that the promises of every President, every Secretary of State, and every Secretary of Commerce—since the passage of the original reciprocal trade bills and the foreign aid legislation—were being kept.

Every assurance was and is still being given that no arguments on trade would be made that would prove to be injurious to any American industry.

The facts do not bear out these assurances:

Most of our troubles are of recent vintage, the Buy American Act has been openly and flagrantly abused since the Presidential order of December 1954, decreasing the American differential allowance from 25 percent to 6 percent.

The escape clause has been invoked 60 times by industry and minor relief has been granted only 19 times and no relief in the other 41 cases.

This record was compiled in spite of the fact that in 31 cases the Tariff Commission ruled unanimously in favor of tariff relief for the injured industries.

Two classic examples are the binocular and watch industries. After many protests against the competition from abroad, they closed shop and are no longer producing in the United States. The prediction is that all the watch industry will fold unless something is done.

These are not isolated cases, they are the rule, and not the exception.

Insofar as your figures for export and import of electrical equipment, the testimony given us is that of all the export business done by American producers all but $200,000 worth was paid for by our own money under mutual aid, ICA, and other Government spending and lending agencies.

Even this market is now threatened by new regulations being put into effect.

I believe a trade agreement has to be mutually beneficial and mutually respected.

In the case of British selling our Government generators and other power-producing

equipment, the testimony shows that the British do not permit any foreign country to sell any item of this nature to their entire power industry.

In the case of the Jeannette Elliott plant, the differential was approximately 12 percent and this, according to the President's order, should have given the business to our local company.

However, they invoked a new item into the calculations by giving credit to the Swiss company for the 13 percent ad valorem duty charged on the import.

Needless to say, the Jeannette company, nor their workers, were given credit for the taxes, Federal, State and local, paid.

I don't want to appear to be an isolationist or a high tariff advocate. I do, however, recognize our higher standards of pay, fringe benefits, personal and corporate taxes.

I also recognize that we need friends everywhere. Somehow, I can't believe we make friends by taking over their production facilities with our investments and our markets.

I may be a little short on the economics of the situation, but I can't figure how it will help the American workman and the American businessman by making it more attractive profitwise, and taxwise for an American manufacturer to close his plants here to make investments abroad and to be allowed to take his foreign profits tax free, if he reinvests in other foreign enterprises. The promotion also calls for limiting American investors in foreign enterprise taxes to the limit of the taxes paid through foreign corporation earnings and investments to the taxes assessed by the foreign country.

One example given shows where a steel producer pays a limit of 30 percent on net income compared to 52 percent here. This may be all right if we can afford it, however, I doubt if we can with the debt and budget greater than all the rest of the world combined.

In closing, and to make a point, I refer back to my statement that agreements have to be mutually beneficial and respected.

Let's take the auto industry. We give concessions to foreign cars that permit the following comparative prices in New York City and other places:

New York, United States of America: American Ford $350 more than British Consul, $900 more than German Volkswagon.

London, England: Ford $3,850 more than Consul, $3,800 more than Volkswagon.

Cologne, Germany: Ford $1,900 more than Consul, $3,800 more than Volkswagon.

Copenhagen, Denmark: Ford $2,800 more than Consul, $3,700 more than Volkswagon.

Caracas, Venezuela: Ford, $2,800; Consul, $2,050; Volkswagon, $1,750.

South Africa: Ford, $3,350; Consul, $2,250; Volkswagon, $1,800.

Mexico: Puts a 100 percent tariff on all American cars.

The formula shifts in its application in Brazil, Japan, the Philippines, and other markets, but in every case the heaviest duties apply to American cars.

This is known as market rigging and this is the reason we have lost our foreign market and about 13 percent of our home market.

When we can't keep our production lines at full capacity, it adds to the cost of the item produced and with the loss of foreign markets we are necessarily put into a position where we can't compete successfully with imports.

This doesn't alibi our big cars and luxury items but how do we explain the fact that Nash has all of its "Metropolitan," their cheap, small, unadorned car, made exclusively in England and it's the same car formerly produced here.

I know that both sides of an argument has logic and sincerity on their side. I can't, however, as a public servant, be choosy in the matter of whose job I shall try to save.

To me a worker in the glass plants, rubber works, bicycle shops, coal mines, electrical or any other endeavor is equally distressed if he is unemployed.

I shall never knowingly vote to create conditions that will cause any American worker to lose his job or any American business, including your journalistic enterprise to lose its earnings on its investments and services.

I know this is a long "letter" but believe me, I haven't scratched the surface of the problem.

I hope we can find a solution that will help us keep both our friends, our jobs, and our standard of living.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Feb. 25, 1959]

HOW TO PROTECT JOBS

Before Congressmen—and Jeanette's Representative JOHN DENT notably among them—take action to curtail the American importation of such goods as electrical generators, they should be reminded that foreign trade is a two-way street on which this country enjoys a preponderance of the traffic.

The current debate has arisen because Swiss and British firms have underbid American firms on electric generators contracted for by agencies of the Federal Government. Mr. DENT and others have complained that this would deprive American workmen of jobs. While Mr. Dent certainly can't be blamed for protecting what he believes to be the best interests of his constituents, he should take a look at the other side of the street.

Pittsburgh Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD has pointed out that this country exports far more electrical equipment than it imports. State Department figures for 1957 show that the United States exported $1 billion worth of electric machinery and apparatus while importing the same sort of material valued at only $145 million. In the field of electrical generators alone, American exports totaled $175 million as compared with imports of only $13 million.

When renewal of the reciprocal trade program was up for congressional consideration last year, it was estimated by Government officials that world trade makes jobs for at least 4½ million American workers. Closer to home, exports bring $793.2 million yearly to Pennsylvania, $164.7 million annually to Allegheny County alone. This trade represents full-time jobs for more than 9,400 workers in the Pittsburgh area's five principal industries.

The jobs of these and other workers would be jeopardized, and this Nation's unemployment problem would be aggravated, if Congress supported a program aimed at protecting American workers through higher tariffs or subterfuges in the name of national security. That would invite reprisal by foreign countries which could cost more American jobs than would be protected. If we are to continue to sell our products abroad, we must encourage conditions under which foreign countries can do business with us.

Mr. HARRY PORE, Jr.,
Editor, the Monessen Daily Independent, Monessen, Pa.

MY DEAR HARRY: Your story and editorial again demonstrate your technique of telling half-truths.

Where did you get the story that Congressman MOORHEAD "hits" DENT on Buy American?

Mr. MOORHEAD has never once argued with me on my position of fighting for the Government orders for Westinghouse and Elliott Co., of Jeannette.

In fact, he was one of the cosponsors of my resolution asking that the orders be given to the American concerns.

The only difference between my thinking and some of the others is that I can't see any difference between my unemployed glass workers, steelworkers, and others because of our trade policy than an electrical worker.

There is no change in the position of my congressional district, since my predecessor, Congressman Kelley, fought and voted against reciprocal trade agreements.

Our district happens to be one of the areas that has been sacrificed to the sacred cow of cotton and other low man-hour production exports.

I am not now, nor have ever been, a Smoot-Hawley high-tariff advocate.

I am now, and have always been, a believer in fair trade and believed what every President and every Secretary of State and every Secretary of Commerce of the United States have said time and time again for the record, "That no reciprocal trade agreement will be made that will cause undue hardship or injury to any American industry."

I believe in that, and I believe also that if we made concessions we should receive same.

I know you would like to be fair, so I'll give you some facts that are compelling, at least to a Representative of the 21st Congressional District of Pennsylvania, with its heavy unemployment. I've just received the latest figures on our trade balance with Japan, and I believe it tells the story that I'm trying to emphasize. We trade payrolls and raw materials for consumer goods and unemployment.

We sell Japan: Cotton, wheat, soya beans, metal working machinery, heavy oil, crude petroleum, bituminous coal for steel producing, iron and steel scrap, barley, cotton mill waste and pulp, hides and skins, beef tallow, corn, miscellaneous.

We buy from Japan: Processed and canned fish products, iron and steel, pottery, silk fabrics, sewing machines, optical instruments, cotton fabrics, wool and worsted fabrics, pearls, cotton clothing, railway sleepers, glassware, cooking utensils, miscellaneous.

Although there is a slight trade balance in dollars in our favor, the indisputable fact remains that the things we sell are used to make products to sell back to us.

We have 38 million tons of steel capacity idle, yet the U.S. Navy buys 5,700 tons of steel plate from Japan. Last week we ordered $9 million worth of radar equipment from Canada and Westinghouse and General Electric are on short workweeks with thousands unemployed.

It isn't an easy matter to know the answer but one thing is sure, we can't operate without employment and when the State Department decides which jobs to sacrifice and which jobs are to be protected, let us hope that our district factory workers get as much consideration in the future as oil, wheat and corn planters.

I am not against trades—all I want is reciprocal trades that are reciprocal.

I am attaching a letter with more details of interest which I have sent to the Post Gazette.

Hoping we can work together, at least for our district, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
JOHN H. DENT, *Member of Congress.*

FULL CIRCLE

Representative JOHN H. DENT, of Westmoreland County, is engaged in a strange campaign for a Democratic Congressman of the New Deal persuasion. He is promoting so-called buy American legislation to protect U.S. manufacturers against foreign competition.

It has been a good quarter-century since a Congressman from this area adopted such a position. The last one from Westmoreland County was classified by the Democrats, if memory serves us, as a reactionary.

So apparently we have come full circle on the question of free trade vs. protective tariffs. Representative DENT's position is indistinguishable from that of the blackest Republican of the Smoot-Hawley era.

It is hard to avoid the impression that Mr. DENT is more interested in votes than in finding the right answers to problems of foreign competition and world trade. Some industries in his district are feeling the effects of foreign imports; so he proposes the simplest possible remedy—shut out the imports, buy American.

What it pleases him to overlook is that the United States by and large is an exporting country. Take Europe, from where come the products that are bothering Mr. DENT. In 1957 the United States shipped to Europe nearly $6 billion worth of products; we imported from Europe about $3 billion worth.

Does anyone seriously believe that if the United States reverts to a high tariff policy, it will continue to find the world's markets open to it?

The Leopard's Spots Come Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Leopard's Spots Come Back" which appeared on February 14, 1959, in the Phoenix Gazette, Phoenix, Ariz.:

THE LEOPARD'S SPOTS COME BACK

Some time ago, the Fund for the Republic got its tax-free tail in a crack by blatantly propagandizing the pseudo-liberal line. Congress began to look as if it might do something unpleasant about tax exemptions, but the rumbles subsided when by coincidence the fund switched signals. Henceforth, it announced, it would devote itself to a scholarly study of the basic issues underlying a free society. And the fund wouldn't even be responsible for the findings of its scholars.

Responsible or not, the fund has spent a great deal of tax-free money first financing, and now distributing a thoroughly biased, lopsided report on "Right to Work in Practice." The object of the report's author appears to be to discredit right to work laws everywhere on the basis of one badly chosen example. We find it hard to believe that officials of the fund did not know the author's feelings before they commissioned him to make the so-called study.

Frederic Meyers is the author. The fund in its introduction to his report says he has taught at the University of Texas, the University of Illinois and, currently, the University of California at Los Angeles. For his right-to-work guinea pig he chose Texas, which has barred compulsory unionism for the last 11 years.

What any purely objective reporter who knew his subject would have pointed out—but Meyers does not—is that Texas is not a typical right-to-work State. Most such States, like Arizona, have laws which do no more than declare that no one shall be deprived of a job for joining a union, or for refusing to join one. That's all. But the Texas law tries to upset collective bargaining by a majority unit, which makes it uniquely undesirable. Yet Meyers tries to tar us all with Texas' fault.

Aside from his fatal error of fact, Meyers appears to adopt as his basic theory the professional unionist's dogma that right to work laws represent a struggle between labor and management. On such a false assumption, it is inevitable that he should reach the conclusion he does, that right to work laws haven't changed much of anything in industrial relations. Unions have continued to grow and employers have continued to deal with them. Considering that most right to work advocates have always predicted this would be the case, it is strange to find Meyers labeling the laws ineffective.

That even the faulty Texas law has been effective in protecting the right of individuals to live up to their own moral principles, which is the object of the right to work movement, is demonstrated by Meyers's own findings. In interviewing persons who had used the law to reject union membership while keeping their jobs, he found some who felt that the union had become too strong and overrode both the employer and the employee. Others complained that the particular union was undemocratic. Some were opposed to the principle of unionism. One said his religious conviction made it impossible for him to join a union.

One would think America should applaud a law which makes it possible for individuals to live up to their moral principles without suffering economic reprisal. Meyers does not think so. He tips his hat politely to the idea that minority rights should not be disregarded, but then creates something he calls an industrial citizen—that is someone who works for a living—and remarks that this industrial citizen can reasonably be required to assume the responsibility of citizenship. In case you hadn't guessed, he means union membership when he says citizenship. In other words, Meyers thinks it is reasonable to force workers to join a union.

His entire report is little more than an argument trying to justify this belief. He speaks of the duty of participation in unions. He even indicates that those who abstain from union membership are infringing the rights of others—although what rights these are, he does not specify. And at the end he makes the flat statement—a dead giveaway of his own approach—that those who support right to work proposals wish essentially to make a public demonstration of the power to defeat the labor movement in the political arena. Nuts. Right to work laws are intended to permit the individual, even if he is one out of a thousand, to exercise his liberty if he wants to. The U.S. Constitution strives in the same direction.

Meyers is entitled to his views, just as we are entitled to disagree with them. But whether the fund for the republic is entitled to tax-exempt status while financing such propaganda under the guise of a scholarly study is another question entirely. We think not.

ORT Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable and constructive programs in the field of human welfare is the Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training or, briefly, ORT. On March 4, 1959, members and friends of ORT will celebrate the 79 years of service to displaced and underprivileged Jews throughout the free world.

ORT Day has become a traditional observance in those hundreds of communities throughout the country where dedicated ORT members work for the rehabilitation of their fellow Jews wherever they may be in need.

Through its 400 vocational training installations in 20 countries, the ORT program offers youths and adults both the opportunity to learn the industrial skills which will make them self-supporting. Through this process of rehabilitation of individuals who would otherwise live out their lives in idleness without practical utilization of their talents and abilities, ORT also contributes to the economic development of free-world nations by training productive citizens.

ORT Day, 1959, will have special significance for the 50,000 members of the Women's American ORT, since it marks the 32d year of service by the organization to a total of several million people. On March 4, in my own city of Elizabeth, N.J., as in cities from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the 100,000 members of other American ORT federation affiliates and many thousands of friends of the ORT program will join in special celebrations.

It is a privilege, Mr. Speaker, to call the attention of our colleagues to this important occasion in the history of man's humanity to man.

Soil Conservation Program in St. Clair County, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the 1958 annual report of the St. Clair County, Ill., Soil Conservation District. This marks the 20th year of operation by the oldest conservation district in Illinois. The officers of the district are: Verlan Kamper, chairman; Arnold Mauck, vice chairman; Melvin Wagner, secretary-treasurer; Harvey Teberend and Ralph J. Weilbacher.

TWENTIETH ANNUAL REPORT, ST. CLAIR COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT

The St. Clair County Soil Conservation District held 12 regular meetings and one special meeting during the year 1958. We met on the third Tuesday evening of every month. We had good attendance at our meetings throughout the year by board members. Others who attended our meetings included: Soil conservationist, Ray Irwin; farm advisor, Clarence Clark; assistant directors, Herman G. Heberer and Oscar Weber.

Other visitors during the year included Howard Turner, area conservationist; and past directors, William J. Pfeffer, Ralph Emge, Jr., Hugo Haertling, and Elmer Bertelsmann.

The terms of three directors terminated in February this year. They were Verlan Kamper, Ralph Emge, Jr., and Melvin Henss. Those elected at the annual meeting to fill these vacancies were: Verlan Kamper, reelected, Ralph J. Weilbacher from Millstadt, and Arnold Mauck from Lebanon.

Following the election the board organized at the February meeting as follows: Chairman, Verlan Kamper; vice chairman, Arnold Mauck; secretary-treasurer, Melvin Wagner.

At this meeting Mr. Heberer and Mr. Weber were appointed as assistant directors.

In order to have a good active board, it is always necessary for members to take part in area and State meetings. It is only through these activities that a board member learns of his responsibility to the people in the district. We had good activity in this field as shown in the next paragraph.

There were four Lower-Kaskaskia Land Use Council meetings this year. We were host to the council meeting in April at which time Melvin Wagner was elected secretary-treasurer and also he was elected to represent the council on the Board of the Association of Illinois Soil Conservation Districts. All these meetings were well attended by our board. Kamper and Wagner attended the State convention of the Association of Illinois Soil Conservation Districts at Jacksonville. Wagner participated in the program whereby recognition was given to the 20 years of service to districts.

The watershed program has developed interest in this county. The Richland Creek watershed application was approved by the State of Illinois and Washington, D.C. for planning. Another group made application during the year. Representatives of the Mascoutah surface water protection district met with the board this year and asked the District to cosponsor an application for assistance in planning and conducting the improvement on the Hog River-Pig Creek watershed under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566. This application has been approved by the State of Illinois and is now in Washington, D.C. for consideration. There were two watershed hearings in the county at which time the district presented statements offering their cooperation. These were on Richland Creek at Belleville and Silver Creek at Mascoutah.

We sent copies of the "Soil Stewardship Sunday" booklet to all the churches in the district. Many churches observed the Sunday. We also purchased the booklet "The Wonder of Water" for distribution in the schools at the fifth grade level. During the year Ray Irwin and Herman Heberer conducted 426 children of the Belleville fifth grades on a soil conservation tour over Heberer's farm.

We had a pond demonstration field day at the Kamper farm in August. Pond location, construction methods, and management of weeds and fish were discussed. Spraying weeds and shocking fish were demonstrated. This was a successful and interesting meeting with an attendance of about 100.

Last spring we offered a $50 scholarship toward tuition for the teachers training school in Springfield but no one took advantage of it.

Three ball-point pens were given to 4-H Club members who completed 4-H soil conservation projects this year. We expect this participation to increase.

During the year the board approved 56 new cooperators and there were 11 cancellations due to sale, death, etc. Farmers are beginning to take advantage of their soil conservation district and it appears that the workload will increase this coming year This brings up an important point for our soil conservation office, because it is definitely short of assistance. We are carrying on a good program but with some additional help our district could do so much more towards getting soil conservation on the land.

We wish to extend our thanks to all who have had any part in expanding our soil conservation work in the district. We wish to thank the extension service and the U.S. Soil Conservation Service for their cooperation in selling and putting into operation our well-developed program. Especially we wish to thank Clarence Clark, farm advisor, and Ray Irwin, soil conservationist and his coworkers, Howard Limestall and Orville Dickhaut.

We also want to give credit to the ASC committee for their cooperation through the ACP cost-share program whereby many farmers are encouraged and assisted financially towards installing soil conservation practices. Special thanks go to Office Manager, Robert Olsen and to Mrs. Deloros Grimmer who handles all ACP participation.

We also want to thank the Illinois State Department of Conservation for their technical assistance in biology, fisheries, and forestry. Also the Illinois State Department of Agriculture for the help furnished us through the State board. A vote of thanks also goes to the St. Clair County Board of Supervisors for their financial assistance to the district. And finally we want to thank all our district cooperators who are taking advantage of the soil conservation program and are using all these services to get more soil conservation on the land. This is our only measure of success. All this cooperation toward one objective will improve and secure the greatest natural resource in St. Clair County—namely the soil.

The past 2 years we have had an excess amount of rainfall during certain seasons. This makes me think we should practice more soil conservation to keep this soil and hold this water for the drier seasons of the year. To hold the water longer on the rolling land will also prevent a larger number of drainage problems on our level and low lands.

I would like to close with a quotation used on the memos of the auxiliary of the Association of Illinois Soil Conservation Districts at the 1958 meeting:

It took brawn to conquer the land; it will take brains to keep it.

VERLAN KAMPER,
Chairman.

1958 PROGRESS REPORT

Total cooperators approved by district, July 22, 1938 through December 31, 1957	869
Cooperators approved this year	56
Total cooperators approved by district	925
Less cooperators cancelled by death, sale, etc	175
Total active cooperators to date	750
Total basic plans prepared through December 31, 1957	771
Basic plans prepared this year	17
Total Basic plans prepared to date	788
Less cooperators cancelled to date by death, sale, etc	175
Total active Basic plans to date	613
Total Basic plans applied this year	37
Total Basic plans applied to date	230
Cooperators serviced by SCS during the year	282
Cooperators completing one or more practices on their farm	215

Amount of field work reported by the Soil Conservation Service is as follows:

Pasture seeding	170 acres
Natural reforestation	101 acres
Tree planting	32 acres
Fish pond improvement	52 each
Hedge planting	1296 rods
Wildlife area improvement	102.7 acres
Ditch construction	6.1 miles
Diversion construction	1.8 miles
Drainage	420 acres
Drop inlet construction	12 each
Drop spillway construction	14 each
Pond construction	26 each
Terracing	2 miles
Waterway development	33.5 acres

FINANCIAL REPORT

Balance on hand January 1, 1958	$599.90
Deposits:	
State of Illinois	74.35
St. Clair County Board of Supervisors	480.75
Total	$1,155.00
Expenditures:	
Annual meeting expense	$22.50
Secretarial work, office supplies	107.55
Field supplies	22.87
Dues—Friends of the Land	8.00
Dues—NASCD	65.00
Dues—Assoc. Ill. SCD	70.00
Dues—Lower-Kaskaskia Land Use Council	1.25
Soil Stewardship Sunday	25.00
Mileage for directors	78.20
National Convention Expenses	15.00
Telephone	6.00
Photo supplies	3.10
Educational supplies	56.10
Total	480.57
Balance on hand December 31, 1958	674.43

Castro's Cuban Justice on Trial Before the Cleveland City Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered last Saturday, February 28, 1959, before a luncheon meeting of the Cleveland City Club in Cleveland, Ohio:

Before I speak about a nation whose new government is barely 2 months old today, please let me say a word about a State whose 100th birthday was February 14, 1959, Oregon, my State, that is. In the Pacific Northwest we are having a big centennial celebration out there this spring and summer. You are all invited. I personally invited Fidel Castro earlier this week, pointing out to him that he would feel at home because many of the men are sporting outrageous beards and our mountains would please any rebel band. We have many other attractions. Do plan to visit this newer northwest territory. I guarantee that you will enjoy yourselves.

Here is a proposition I trust you will concede without argument: A Member of Con-

gress becomes an authority in any area, physical or abstract, by any contact—be it ever so slight. I hope to demonstrate this to you today.

According to the title of my remarks today I am an "eye-witness" and as such I am supposed to report to you on Castro's Cuban justice. In a moment I shall lay a foundation for my testimony. First, let us consider the issues on which I shall testify:

1. Does the quality of Castro's justice indicate that Cuba is now a police state or soon will be?

2. Does it show Communist influence and anti-U.S. sentiments, existing and potential?

3. Does it mean that Castro intends to bring revolution to other lands?

4. What can we do, officially and personally, to improve the qualities of Castro's justice and our relationships with Castro's Cuba?

JUSTICE IN THE BROADER SENSE

I make no apology for using justice in the broader sense. I do not confine it to the cases of the accused war criminals. Justice as I use it in these remarks represents the purpose of government. In other words, what does Castro's treatment of accused war criminals tell us about the nature of Castro's government?

Now, as to my qualifications as a witness, a few words so you who have questions for me won't be too hard on me when your turn comes. I don't speak Spanish. I have never had a formal course relating to Latin America. Within the last 2 years I have made two short visits to Puerto Rico, two to Venezuela, one each to Costa Rica, Colombia, Honduras, and Panama. I have visited Cuba three times, the first on my way back from Honduras in December of 1957 for about 3 hours between planes. My wife and I took a taxi into Havana and discovered that we couldn't get within four blocks of the presidential palace because of police barricades. The second time was last month for 2 days and the third time was a week ago for 3 days. Exactly a week ago at this time I was making a speech in Santiago de Cuba at a meeting sponsored by the Santiago Committee for Industrialization and Progress. The Lions Club, the Rotary Club, the Twenty-Thirty Club, and the chamber of commerce were all there. Last Monday I again talked with Fidel Castro, this time for 45 minutes.

Now, if you'll bear with me, just one more flashback:

Shortly after I arrived in Washington, in December of 1956, I learned that a constituent of mine, Gerald Lester Murphy, had disappeared in the Dominican (so-called) Republic. In the course of trying to find out what happened to him I discovered that our official policy was to be kind to dictators. I didn't like this. I said so. Not only did I believe our treating Trujillo as though he were respectable had made him think he could get away with murdering Gerry Murphy, but it was plain to me that our policy conflicted with our Nation's deepest traditions and played into the hands of Communists.

HOW THE BATTLE WAS JOINED

In the course of my expressing my protests about our official policies I naturally included other dictators Perez Jimenez, of Venezuela; Stroesner of Paraguay; Somoza, of Nicaragua; and Batista, of Cuba. In my office and in my travels I met many of the antidictator nationals of these countries. I received many letters from them. I learned a great deal from persons who had been in this fight much longer than I, such people as Herbert Matthews, of the New York Times editorial board; Gov. Munoz Marin, of Puerto Rico; Jose Figueres, former President of Costa Rica; Alberto Lleras Camargo, now President of Colombia; Romulo Betancourt, now President of Venezeula; and many others. I found that my strongest allies were the Inter-American Press Association and newspapermen who knew the area, and also organized labor, particularly the AFL–CIO vice president, Serafino Romualdi.

I am still ignorant in many respects, but not quite so much so, thanks to my friends. My distinguished colleague, Mr. BRAZILLA CARROLL REECE of Tennessee, former chairman of the Republican National Committee, disagrees with me about Castro's justice. On February 9, in an insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he calls me his irrepressible colleague (which in this connection will doubtless continue to be true), and he also calls me one of the principal apologists for Castro. He thinks Castro is encouraging communism. He doesn't want us "to condemn in word or action any government with whom we are in free alliance," but he thinks we "owe it to mankind" to protest the "obvious and proven disregard of the basic elements of justice and fair play" by the Castro government.

THE QUESTION OF A POLICE STATE

This brings us to the first issue on which I shall testify as an eyewitness. Is Cuba now a police state?

It is true that Castro is the strong man in Cuba today. It is true that military tribunals are trying accused war criminals and that some 300 have been executed upon being found guilty. It is true that the procedures do not involve the use of a jury nor of many of the procedural safeguards we deem essential in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence. It is true there are no freely elected officials in the executive or legislative branches.

It is also true that Fidel Castro, President Manuel Urrutia, Ambassador Dihigo, his Cabinet Ministers, and the barbudos, or "bearded ones" in the 26th of July movement are not the kind of people who countenance "blood baths," much less arrahge them. The Cuban people love the barbudos. They greet them and wave to them. What a difference from the way they felt about Batista's soldiers and police.

I think the beards mislead many people in our country. For example, a week ago in Santiago de Cuba, the capital of Oriente Providence where the revolution began, I met Manuel Pinero, the commandant of Castro's forces there. He has the most magnificient red beard and locks I've ever seen. Until you talk with him and unless you had known other Castro men, you might think, "What a screwball this guy must be." In fact, though, Commander Pinero is a capable, sensitive and decent man. He studied economics at Columbia University. His wife, Lorna, who has an M.A. in psychology, comes from New London, Conn. At midnight last Saturday he escorted me on a tour of the Moncada, the military barracks in Santiago, where Castro made his famous attack on the 26th of July and where Masferrer, Batista's terrorist-in-chief, had his headquarters and where many boys and men were horribly tortured.

"We don't like this place," Pinero told me. They plan to destroy the buildings where the atrocities were committed and to make a school out of the rest. The weather was excellent that night. Many people were on the streets at 1 a.m. Under Batista, my hosts told me, the streets were deserted after 9 o'clock.

A LESSON IN HUMILITY

On the following day, Sunday, Pinero told me they were going to have a degradation ceremony. His wife thought at first he meant to say "decoration" but he didn't. Some noncom had made a mistake and he was being stripped of his rank in a public ceremony. The Castro men never looted, they never raped, they never tortured or killed prisoners. They don't drink whisky. I have met many of them. Never have I seen one who swaggered or was loud-spoken. They are not a rabble in arms. They are disciplined and restrained, dedicated but not fanatical—because of a humility they all possess. Major is their highest rank. One captain told me they had just been paid for January. His salary after deductions was $208.

I asked Commander Pinero how they were able to indoctrinate the new recruits who joined them in great numbers when they left the mountains last December to march toward Havana. He told me that, in addition to giving them examples of conduct and specific instructions, they shot one new man who stole a can of milk. They are very serious about maintaining the high morality of their revolution, but not to the point of setting up their own terror.

A REBEL IN SUNDAY SCHOOL

As I left Santiago the man across the aisle in the airplane was a Baptist minister from Park Forrest, Ill., by the name of Joseph L. Hughes. He and several other Baptist ministers had just spent 2 days in Santiago. "We hadn't been here 10 minutes," he told me, "until we had a different picture than the press had given us." He said they had just left one of Castro's top men teaching a Sunday school class. He shared my admiration for these man and said he and his colleagues would be speaking up on their side when they returned to the United States.

Yes, an army is in control of Cuba, the rebel army. But there are civil liberities, including freedom of the press, and there is a promise of free and honest elections in less than 2 years. The men who are in command are decent men worthy of our support and sympathy in their struggle to establish democracy in Cuba.

After my talk in Santiago last Saturday the Castro men flew me about 50 miles north to the Sagua de Tanamo, a town of about 6,000 inhabitants, which had been cruelly damaged by Batista's air force. Nearly 300 civilians were killed there. This was the first time I had seen a bombed city in this hemisphere. Whether or not it was a war crime is not clear. The evidence is conflicting. The 21-year-old captain who escorted me, owner of a sugar cane farm and student of chemistry who intends to enter politics someday, a softspoken athletic lad by the name of Caleb de Quesada, told me he had been informed that there was no resistance, but barbudos in the village told me they did fight back. Both could be correct. The assault extended over 10 days. The resistance probably developed after repeated attacks. The invariable Castro tactic was to come into a town at night, take all the guns and retire to the hills before dawn. All air attacks were in the daytime. This young captain, by the way was Castros heavy weapons expert.

WHAT IS A WAR CRIME?

The point here of course is which, if any, of the 40 or more Batista pilots now on trial in Santiago are war criminals. I talked this over with Pinero and with Castro. They agreed that the burden of proof was on the prosecution to show that the accused man knew he was shooting or bombing only to terrorize civilians and not as part of an attack on enemy forces.

This testimnoy of mine adds up to the finding that Castro and his men are as decent as Batista and his men were indecent.

But, you might ask, because in many instances their procedures were summary and they have executed many men, how do we know that they haven't killed innocent men? I attended no trials. I relied on a free press to tell me about them. The press has been free and wide-ranging since Batista left, yet I have to date seen not even one allegation that an innocent person has been executed or that any one of those condemned had no opportunity to defend himself. This does

not mean I endorse the procedures. I do not. From the first I have urged their improvement.

The persons being executed are not shot because they are Batista supporters as one news story stated, but because they were murderers of defenseless men, women, and children. Castro can predict that about 400 will be executed because he knows very well the files on the notorious murderers in the police and in Masferrer's "tiger" army. These files were carefully prepared by thousands of spies. Batista's men helped by not trying to hide many of their atrocities, thinking to intimidate the Cubans. Pinero made available to me pictures taken by Masferrer and his sadistic underlings. They are beyond description. What man can do to man is incredible. The Nazis did no worse.

THE HIGH COST OF WORDS

I knew about these atrocities and I blamed Batista for them while he was in office. Many Cubans and others sent me stories and photographs. Why didn't the Nation know? One reason is that Batista corrupted the press, even some of our own. He bought good words or, at least, silence. The Associated Press, a fine organization with high ideals, fired one of its employees in Havana, Arroyo Maldonado, a Cuban citizen, about a year ago when it found he was receiving money from Batista.

An Associated Press staff writer, Robert Berrellez, one member of the entirely new AP American contingent in Havana, finished his recent series on the Batista atrocities with this paragraph, referring to the 400 (out of 2,000 detained) who Castro said would probably die:

"It could have been more, some quarters say, were it not for the strength of criticism outside Cuba—much of it probably growing out of a lack of information on what had happened here."

The Cuban revolution was not a change of the palace guard. It may not achieve all its noble ends. It may even degenerate into a police state of the left or the right. I don't think it will. The determination in the Cuban heart to establish an honest and democratic government is too intense and too universal.

THE PROS AND CONS

This brings us to the next question, what about pro-communism and anti-U.S. feeling in the Castro government? Every enemy of a Latin American dictator is called a Communist and worse. Many Catholics supported Castro and most of his men are of that faith. One cannot be a Catholic and a Communist. Furthermore, Castro and his leaders are middle class people with a social and economic reform program which is not Communistic. Of course the Communists are on the scene, with money and know-how, to take advantage if they can of disorganization and to fire up, as best they can, anti-U.S. sentiments.

A Cuban can be anti-United States without being pro-Communist. Historically there has been very little anti-U.S. feeling in Cuba compared to other Latin American countries. I have found no such feelings. I asked Castro last Monday why, in a telecast a few nights previously, he had put out an anti-U.S. version of Cuban-U.S. history. He replied that he had to be honest, but that he was not anti-United States. I believe him. The best proof is the kind of men he has put in high places and the kind of government Cuba now has.

THE NERVOUS NEIGHBOR POLICY

Both Commander Pinero and Premier Castro assured me that they did not intend to sponsor aggression against their nervous neighbor, Rafael Trujillo, the senile dictator of the Dominican Republic. They know that such action would inevitably invoke the organized action of the Organization of American States against them. This brings us to the third issue: Is Castro's government planning to take the lead in igniting the overthrow of other tyrants in Latin America? "Exiles from any land can come here," Castro told me Monday, "and I will not allow the police to bother them." He makes no secret of his dislike for Trujillo.

Trujillo tried to help Batista. He tried to help Dictator Perez Jimenez, of Venezuela. Now he has, in his capital city, two deposed dictators, Peron and Batista, as living reminders to his long-suffering people that a day of reckoning for such men eventually comes. No wonder Trujillo wishes they would go away.

The shoe is now on the other foot in Latin America. Not long ago the lovers of freedom were running and hiding from torture and death. Now the forces of decency and democracy are strong and becoming stronger. They control Cuba and Venezuela, both potentially wealthy countries. Their leaders speak out against Trujillo. They are only justied in doing so. I think this is in keeping with the most sacred traditions of the United States, a country which was born out of revolution against a tyrant, a country whose citizens know that democracy once attained must be maintained.

THE PROMISE—NOT THE THREAT

Vice President NIXON, with whom I sometimes do not agree, said in Oregon week before last in my presence that "we should concern ourselves more with our faith in freedom, more with the promise of the American Revolution and less with the threat of the Russian Revolution." I say amen to that.

My observations in Cuba lead me to conclude that the Cuban leaders do not intend any rash Bolivar-like expeditions against the declining dictators, but that they will join with Venezuela and other countries in condemning all governments based on terror and tribute and that they will carry this policy into the Organization of American States and other international organizations. Such expressions, in my opinion, particularly if joined in by the United States, will be quite sufficient to insure the early downfall of Trujillo by internal forces which heretofore have been frustrated by the respectability misguidedly accorded to this despotic regime. An invasion of attitude in these circumstances can be more readily effective than an invasion of barbudos.

THERE'S A DIFFERENCE

What about Castro's Cuba in its relationships with the United States? I think we will be more friendly than ever, now that our administration has endorsed a policy of differentiating between democracies and dictatorships, now that Cuba is an emerging democracy, and now that we have an outstanding Ambassador in Havana, a career man, Philip Wilson Bonsal, whose opposition to dictators needs no further demonstration. The two political appointees who preceded Bonsal made a sorry mess of our official standing in Cuba by identifying themselves with the dictator and his minions. Our refusal to withdraw our military missions from the Batista government was an error of immense proportions, yet we are now sending Marines to Haiti to repeat that mistake.

A free, uncorrupted press will do much to help reestablish our good relations with Cuba. Cuba's own struggle as it becomes better known here will enlist support and sympathy. I predict brighter days and closer ties between this fair country and our own, ties based on our common devotion to human freedom. Its government is taking hold. Castro appeared more severe and assured when we spoke Monday. Sunday he and the cabinet spent on a yacht out at sea where they could confer without telephones. I found this out because I was to have had dinner with the brilliant young secretary of the treasury, Lopez Fresquet. His U.S.-born wife explained where he was and why.

I conclude by listing a few of the features I feel we must include in our Latin American policy:

A GOLDEN RULE OF DIPLOMACY

First, and foremost, we must speak up for freedom and against tyranny. This goes beyond our American revolution and back to a manger in Bethlehem. Our ambassadors and military men must be instructed not to identify themselves with tyrants but to be particularly friendly in countries striving for the establishment of human freedom.

Second, we should cut off all foreign aid, both military and technical assistance, to Latin American nations whose governments are based on fraud and force. We should increase such aid to democracies.

Third, we should encourage the exchange of information and citizens. When I was in Santiago I found the local businessmen were eager that the American sailors be allowed to come there again on leave, this not having happened for almost 2 years. State Department officials in Cuba favored it. So did Fidel Castro and the U.S. Navy when I asked them. It is now up to the Department of State, and I hope they decide affirmatively without delay.

Fourth, we must work toward commodity controls, particularly with respect to coffee, along the lines of the sugar agreements which have worked so well.

Fifth, we must make more capital loan funds available through the Development Loan Fund and the Inter-American Bank.

Sixth, and this applies to me, there should be more study of the Spanish language in the United States. We should insist that our foreign service personnel in Latin America and elsewhere maintain a continuing and intense interest in the language of the country in which they serve.

No doubt there are many other policies we need to adopt or to improve, some perhaps more vital than several I have listed. The most hopeful sign, however, in my opinion as a peripatetic eyewitness of part of this hemisphere, is the greatly increased interest shown by the American people in Latin America in the last year. There is no question where the American people stand with respect to democracy and tyranny, but I know Fidel Castro in his lonely mountain hideout often had cause to wonder why the United States Government didn't reflect more accurately the sentiments of its citizens.

In sum, this eyewitness, on the basis of what he has seen in Cuba and elsewhere, reports to you that Fidel Castro, his barbudos and the people of Cuba are doing their utmost to establish an honest and Democratic government in Cuba. The nightmare of the Batista terror is at last ended. The notorious criminals are being punished. Castro told me Monday that all the trials would probably be finished in a month and that many of those convicted would receive only jail sentences. It was my impression that he too will be glad when this phase of the revolution is finished.

I close with an observation made recently by my friend Jose Figueres, former President of Costa Rica and an outstanding leader of democracy. For many years in this hemisphere, Figueres pointed out, no partisan of Democratic government was safe in Latin America. The dictators, through their thugs, penetrated everywhere, even into the United States. The Cuban war crimes trials, Figueres believes, offer a fitting occasion to show that the hemisphere is a little less safe for the men who do a dictator's dirty work.

Thank you very much.

Appendix

Is Inflation the Problem?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the attention of our colleagues to an article by Dr. Leon Keyserling which appeared in the New Republic magazine of February 9, 1959.

Dr. Keyserling, president of the Conference on Economic Progress and a consulting economist and attorney, was formerly—1950 to 1953—chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

The article follows:

IS INFLATION THE PROBLEM?

(By Leon Keyserling)

There has now been time for the Congress and the citizens to reflect upon the President's State of the Union Message, Budget Message, and Economic Report. Thus far, although critics of the Administration's accent on retrenchment in the space age are profoundly disturbed, they have yet to offer an adequate alternative course of action. They know we must do more of many things, and that perhaps the most important of these requires an expanded budget and other expansions of Federal responsibility. They also know that ultimately Government is supported by the economy and the people, and that therefore a high rate of economic growth or expansion would help to meet our domestic needs and is essential to meet the Soviet challenge.

However, the President insists that programs directed toward these ends would be inflationary, would reduce the purchasing power of the dollar, and would do more harm than good. And the sincere opposition, including those in the Congress who must decide upon the budget and other legislation, is not confident enough of its own economic ground to be sure whether the President is right or wrong. Precisely how to get growth without inflation is our supreme economic problem. But our economic thinking is not yet readjusted to this purpose.

If we are to think straight on this problem, which has become increasingly urgent since the first Sputnik, we must begin by determining the fundamental purposes of the modern U.S. economy. While a stable price level is highly desirable, a static society may have a stable price level and go down to defeat on many or all fronts. Moreover, a stable price level without more, as during 1922–1929, can lead up to a depression. The great aims of our economy in these times are not to achieve any particular price trend as a be-all and end-all in itself. Instead, our fundamental economic purposes are these:

1. We must call forth the full use of our productive capabilities, including manpower and brains, technology and science, and natural resources. In the current state of our technology, this requires an annual overall growth rate of about 5 percent after we take up fully the current economic slack. Until then, we need to grow much faster. The faster a nation increases total production, the stronger it becomes in an economic sense, and the better able to do what it needs to do, unless it is burning itself out by going so fast that it depletes its resources. We are in no danger of following the latter course.

2. We must apportion our total national production wisely, in accord with relative priorities of needs, so that we do not get what we need least at the expense of what we need most: for example, more gimcrack gadgets and less defense, international economic cooperation, schools.

3. We must combine economic progress and efficient use of resources with economic justice. To illustrate the first two great purposes might be attained, even while the farm population lived by eating the income crumbs.

Broadly speaking, the significance of price and wage and farm income and profit trends in the private economy, and of public finance and monetary policy in the public area, is whether they facilitate or impede these three fundamental purposes. They are means, not ends. And if the machinery is tooled to produce these ends, we get less inflation to boot.

In order to put the President's entire program in perspective, let us look for a moment at how far we have fallen short of our three fundamental purposes since the Korean war.

First, we have failed to use America's full productive powers. The figures which follow are all based upon uniform 1957 dollars, to make the comparisons exact. During the 6-year period 1953–1958 inclusive, with recessions more than half of the time and with an inadequate growth rate the rest of the time, the U.S. average annual overall growth rate was only about 1.3 percent. However, an annual growth rate of about 4.5 percent was needed during that period to absorb our increasing capabilities to produce, in view of a growing labor force and an advancing technology. In consequence, we lost more than $150 billion in potential national production, and furnished about 10 million man-years less of employment opportunity than we should have.

Second, pressing national needs have been grossly neglected. Over the 6-year period, tax revenues at all levels derived from a repressed economy were $30 billion to $40 billion lower than they would have been in a fully productive economy. Thus, we could not afford what we most need.

Third, these trends worked against economic justice. They bore down disproportionately upon all vulnerable groups: the unemployed, the farmer, the low-income family generally, the small businessman. They hurt the old people, because we could not afford to provide them with enough social security. And these damaging effects of low economic growth were compounded, because a price inflation which fed the fat and stripped the lean was taking place at the same time. Any housewife who does the shopping can testify to that.

Now let us look at the causes of this triple default in order to see what went wrong and learn what corrective measures to take. For the 6-year period 1953–58 as a whole, the more than $150 billion deficiency in total production resulted from a deficiency of about $17.5 billion in public consumption through public programs, a deficiency of about $96 billion in private consumption through private spending, and a deficiency of less than $40 billion in private investment caused when the other two deficiencies made it futile to continue investment in the expansion of productive facilities.

Despite its seemingly small relative size, the deficiency in public programs of about $17.5 billion really accounted in addition for about $35 billion to $50 billion of the deficiency in private consumption and private investment, because public outlays evoke other outlays. And this default in public outlays was practically entirely on the part of the Federal Government, because the States and localities were expanding their outlays up to, or in excess of, their limited power to obtain revenues. This must be borne in mind constantly, as one reads the administration's repeated pleas to turn public programs back to the States and localities.

The deficiency in private consumption did not come about because consumers as a whole spent too little of their incomes and saved too much. On the contrary, the $96 billion deficiency in private consumer spending during the period 1953–58 resulted from a deficiency of more than $130 billion in consumer income before taxes. Out of this, more than $30 billion was a deficiency in net farm operators' income, and more than $100 billion was a deficiency in the consumer income before taxes of other groups, made up practically entirely of a deficiency in wages.

These deficiencies in private buying power resulted from both governmental and private actions. The inadequate outlays by the Federal Government for essential public services had an adverse effect upon the whole private economy. Regressive and inequitable tax and monetary policies had similar results. The deficiency in farm income has been attributable to falling farm prices in contrast with rising nonfarm prices, due primarily to a national farm policy which has abandoned the farmer to the free market, while other markets were not free.

This analysis is essential to an understanding of the cause and cure of the kind of inflation with which we have been plagued in recent years. For it has not been an inflation like that of wartime; it has not happened because of intense pressure against our productive capabilities, or shortages, or a hectic rate of economic growth, or civilian purchasing power in excess of civilian supplies. The new inflation of recent years has occurred paradoxically in the face of high economic slack. And moreover, it has been a selective inflation, with some prices and incomes rising too rapidly, while others were falling too fast, or (in the case of incomes) not rising fast enough.

Now, what has caused this selective inflation—for we have had it—since excessive demand was not a factor? The President has more than implied that the inflation has occurred in large measure because wages have gone up faster than productivity thus increasing production costs per unit and requiring price increases—the cost-push theory. This theory misses the real point: the lag in productivity behind wage increase in some instances was not technological, but was due instead to the inefficiencies of operating far below full capacity. And low-capacity operation was certainly not due to excessive wages; if wages had gone up less, even relative to productivity, we would have had a still bigger recession. Therefore, the correct remedy for the alleged inflationary gap between productivity and wages would have been—and is—to lift actual productivity to its technological potential by expand-

ing the economy, not to contract the economy further by holding down wages.

Moreover, in most cases price increases were not due to cost-push wages or otherwise, but to excessive price increases relative to costs. The compelling evidence of this is that the excessive advances of prices compared with wages yielded a level of profits feeding an investment boom in plant and equipment recurrently outrunning private and public buying combined. The extraordinarily high profits in 1957 of some of our major industries which were operating far below full production, and their exceedingly high profits again now while even further short of full production, are much in point. This applies not only to industrial prices but also to many consumer prices, because the former affect the later, and because increasing portions of our consumer-service industries are now huge and administer their prices.

These excessive price increases have in part reflected management's over-excited appetite for capital investment funds in the form of profits. But this hunger was not entirely the fault of industry. In part, industry feared with good reason that the spasmodic periods of high-level production would not be sustained in the absence of a nationwide full employment policy, and that industry needed to store up reserves against trouble.

In short, just as an automobile burns more gas per mile when racing at 80 miles an hour or when dawdling at 13 miles an hour than when running smoothly at 50, so our economy costs more to operate per unit of production either at the racing 8-percent growth rate of wartime or at the 1.3-percent average growth rate of recent years rather than at a 5-percent growth rate. The higher costs of too great or too little speed are both inflationary.

THE SPURIOUS CRUSADE

Despite these terribly costly lessons, the Economic Report of the President again expresses a determination to check economic growth by the same budgetary and tax and tight-money policies which have done so much damage on all scores thus far. The spurious crusade against inflation remains a crusade, not in the public interest but against adequate outlays for defense, international cooperation, and domestic well-being. What are the implications of a continuation of these policies?

While the President's Economic Report hails the speed of our economic recovery, we are recovering at a rate insufficient to take up the accumulated slack, or to make full use of the continuing growth in our labor force and in productivity. Thus, some of our bellwether industries, while expanding their production and sales, are not reemploying many people. Unemployment in 1959 may well be nearly as high as in 1958. Looking further ahead, we are likely to recover from the most recent recession only to average an annual overall growth rate in real terms of perhaps 2 percent.

What would this mean, compared with what would happen if we take up the economic slack more rapidly and thereafter maintain a 5-percent annual growth rate? For the 7-year period from the beginning of 1958 through the end of 1964, it would mean a difference of about $400 billion in total national production, and a difference of about 16.5 million man-years in job opportunity. With respect to our national needs, the higher growth rate (in contrast with the lower growth rate) would yield at existing tax rates about $70 billion more, or an average of about $10 billion a year more, by way of public revenues at all levels for domestic and international purposes. This is the road to a balanced Federal budget, accompanied by high enough public outlays to do at home and abroad what needs to be done and to induce a balanced national economy. And for reasons already given, the low growth rate would be more inflationary than the high growth rate.

Specifically, how can we assure the high growth rate and attention to our top national needs, instead of acquiescing in the neglect of both? We are not now in a total war. But we are in a dangerous period, far from total peace. And if we apply with appropriate variations some of the lessons which World War II taught us about how to mobilize our resources effectively, we shall be more likely to avoid another total war, and at the same time achieve some enormously beneficial domestic results.

In World War II—

1. The Government set quantitative goals for total production and employment, based upon absolutely maximum use of resources and subdivided into many types of products and jobs. It set goals for consumption or use, both private and public, to match these production goals. It set goals for the flow of income or purchasing power, to help maintain balance between production (supply) and consumption or use (demand).

2. To make sure that use was in accord with the relative urgency of our national requirements, there was a very detailed priorities system covering thousands of items.

3. The whole machinery of national public policy was coordinated and directed toward achievement of these fundamental goals or purposes. The Federal budget, including both spending and taxation, was used as the major public instrument in guiding both production and use toward achievement of these fundamentals. Specific ad hoc machinery was also used to expand some types of production by incentives toward private expansion of plant or output (or by direct public investment), and to restrain other types of production and use.

4. In fighting inflation, we did not neglect the fundamental production and priority objectives essential in winning the war. Some said that inflation was a greater danger to the United States than Hitler (during the Korean war they said a greater danger than Stalin), but providentially the administration did not listen to them. Nonetheless, anti-inflation controls included not only high taxation, but also savings programs and direct controls. These were successful, insofar as we did not look at price and wage and profit trends as ends in themselves, but rather as means for achieving full production and simultaneously providing the Nation with what was needed most.

5. The Government was chary of monetary policy to control inflation, because its excessive use defeats fundamental purposes before it checks inflation.

6. The difference between sacrifice and inequity was understood. The Government was not placed on the side of those who wanted the people to respond patriotically to the austere challenge but sought to batten at the public's expense.

7. While all essential freedoms were maintained, we did not suffer the delusion that freedom and Government were antithetical, or that the great problem of the Nation and the world could be solved by having the President tell the farmer, the storekeeper, and the laborer that they in their individual capacities had the most to contribute. Instead, representatives of our functioning economic groups were consulted in national policymaking.

SPACE AGE ECONOMICS

Now, how much of this should we do today and tomorrow? If we are successful in avoiding war, there would obviously be no draft, no breakup of families, no bloodshed. Nor, short of total war, do I see need for the burdens and vexation of direct price and wage controls, detailed priorities systems, allocations or rationing, or (with some possible exceptions) special incentive and prohibitory programs.

But while we are not at war entirely, we are most certainly in the space age, or at least the Russians are. Consequently, our economic policies do need to be as realistic and purposeful, though not as strenuous, as in wartime.

First and foremost, we still need national goals to guide our efforts, although why it takes another presidential commission to define them is beyond me. Such a committee cannot take the place of the executive branch. The Economic Reports of the President, as categorically required by the Employment Act of 1946, should state specific quantitative short- and long-range balanced goals for maximum production, employment, and purchasing power (geared to consumption or use goals), less detailed as to components than in wartime because the pressures on our resources are less, and more can be left to private adjustments. These goals should point toward national economic growth averaging 5 percent a year after the current economic slack is taken up.

It is equally essential that the Economic Reports define what portion of our growing total production and consumption at full resource use should be devoted to those progams which mean most of us as a nation. This does not mean that the Federal Government would do the whole job in all of these priority areas. In national defense, it would do practically the whole job (aside from civilian defense). In education, for example, the Economic Report should appraise how much of the job others can do, what part of the balance the Federal Government can help others to do, and how much the Federal Government itself needs to do to fill in the gap.

In this framework the Federal budget should be an instrument toward what a full economy can afford and needs by way of public consumption or use, instead of being adjusted to what a repressed or stricken economy cannot afford. Federal outlays for calendar 1960, so devised, would be about $10 billion higher than in the President's proposed budget for fiscal 1960, and by calendar 1964 should be about $23 billion higher than the President's proposed 1960 budget, all expressed in comparable dollars. The budget, like goals for the national economy, should be projected over several years in the Economic Report, even if the Congress approves the budget only yearly.

The tax program should be so devised as to help keep private purchasing power in line with the amount of production available for private consumption. It should also impose the tax burden equitably, which really means to improve the distribution of total private purchasing power. If production and consumption goals were properly qualified in the Economic Reports of the President, and if the expenditure side of the budget were framed accordingly, the appropriate tax program would be clear. Such a tax program would result in a balanced budget whenever our resources were being reasonably fully employed, which should be always.

The tight money policy should be abandoned, because it prevents adequate economic growth, contributes to inflation, and redistributes income unjustly. Monetary policy should be adjusted to the goals in the Economic Report. Essential Federal legislative programs include the farm program, basic resources development, social security, housing, and protective legislation dealing with such matters as minimum wages, education, and health. Foreign economic assistance needs immense expansion.

How should the size of these programs be determined? Not by accident, nor by special-interest pressures, but rather by fitting them into their proper place in a consistent

Economic Report and budget which balance our total economic capabilities at full production and employment with a corresponding amount of private and public consumption or use, and with servicing of our needs in the order of their importance.

There remains the pressing question of how adjustments within the private economy, as distinguished from direct public action, can best make their needed contribution to the three fundamental purposes I have listed. Price trends and income flows within the price economy are machinery toward these ends. Probably a fairly stable price level makes it easier to manage the other parts of the machinery and to maintain a workable balance among its parts, but this may not be true at all times, nor true of all prices at any time. As already indicated, I do not believe that it is now desirable to invoke the direct governmental controls. But if the current neglect should make the direct controls essential to enable us to serve our great purposes in the context of the world challenge, then, unfortunately, we would need the direct controls.

But I believe that the most useful treatment of this problem would be for the Economic Reports of the President, in addition to setting goals for maximum production, employment, and purchasing power—consumption or use—to include also careful short- and long-range analyses of what kinds of income flow in general to the various segments of the economy would be conducive to these fundamental purposes, and what kinds of price-wage-profit policies in general would be consistent with this kind of income flow. The Employment Act of 1946 calls for this now, when it says that the Economic Reports should set "needed levels of purchasing power." But the act is being honored in the breach.

It is particularly important that this identification of "needed levels of purchasing power" (the very words of the Employment Act), as well as of "needed levels of production and employment" (also the words of the act), be undertaken in consultation with private economic leadership. In fact, this consultation is envisaged by the Employment Act; and if not only the will but also the instrumentalities to do this are now lacking, then proper instrumentalities should be devised. For example, the kind of committee proposed in the President's state of the Union message might be made an advisory committee to the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and thus involved in the preparation of the President's economic reports or at least the goals therein.

If sufficient attention were directed toward wage-price-profit relationships, and if business were not fearful of alternative periods of boom and bust, i.e., if the Government were to carry out its share in the purposes of the Employment Act, private investment would be likely to be regularized at desirable rates of growth. Appropriate tax policies can be helpful toward this end. The broad definition of needed levels of private investment should be included in the maximum production goals under the Employment Act.

To accomplish these purposes, the economic reports of the President cannot remain, as they are now, merely another set of pro forma and superficial essays on the state of the economy. This is competently done in many other private and public reports. The economic reports are intended to be great state papers on the economic program of the Government attuned to the full economic needs and capabilities of the United States. Instead of the Economic Report being written to support a President's budget and legislative program derived in a vacuum, the President's budget and his entire legislative program should be derived from an Economic Report which properly quantifies our goals and productive capabilities, identifies for achievement the great priorities of our national needs, and responds to the basic requirements of economic and social justice.

HOW CAN IT BE DONE?

The reader at this point may ask how we are going to get these things done if the President and his administration will not do them. One answer is that the Economic Reports of the President and his other basic programs are mainly recommendations to the Congress. The President initiates; the Congress decides. If sufficient initiative does not come from the White House, then more initiative is required of the Congress. If the President and his administration persist in not doing what the Employment Act requires, the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress should do it.

I assume that clarifying the economic issues will be helpful to many well-intentioned men and women in leadership positions who have a sense of urgency, who want to do what is best for the country, but who have been misled by some of the astigmatism about inflation which has so blinded the administration.

An economy functioning satisfactorily, one that serves the three great fundamentals, is less inflationary than an economy responding to repressive and regressive policies which neglect these fundamentals.

Above all, if we now become prey to the notion that inflation is a greater danger to us than Khrushchev, we shall continue to lose more and more ground in the current world struggle. For, in its essence, the administration's crusade against inflation is a campaign against the positive things we need to do. It plays upon illegitimate fears instead of raising legitimate hopes. It tells us that we are weak instead of rallying our strength. It sets up economic Maginot Lines instead of developing new economic weapons. It fails to recognize that in our economic policies just as in our international policies, we cannot have safety or stability by standing still.

Tax Exemption of Public Housing Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I hope that all Members of the House read the newspaper accounts on March 2 of the tax windfall which results from the issuance of tax exempt federally guaranteed public housing bonds.

In the 85th Congress I raised this issue with the introduction of H.R. 7000 which would end this type of hidden subsidy for public housing.

I am grateful that the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] has again raised this issue with his introduction of H.R. 5096, which would terminate this tax exemption. The gentleman from California is a member of the Housing Subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency and is therefore well qualified to speak on the subject of public housing and the tremendous burden which it places on the taxpaying public.

When the 1949 public housing bill was under consideration by the Congress, the then Housing and Home Finance Administrator testified for public housing but against the tax exemption of the bonds to be issued to finance these projects. He premised the Administration's opposition to tax exemption by the simple statement that he believed the American people had the right to know what public housing would cost them, and that the cost would be completely distorted or hidden by exempting the income from the bonds from Federal taxation.

I am inserting in the RECORD the statement made by Housing Administrator Raymond M. Foley in February 1949 before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency Subcommittee on Housing in opposition to the tax exemption of public housing bonds.

I hope that the Members of the House will read carefully the reasons why the Housing Administrator in 1949 opposed the tax exemption of public housing bonds. He lists five reasons, any one of which is important enough to justify repealing the tax exemption.

Unfortunately, the 81st Congress did not heed the advice of Administrator Raymond M. Foley, and the strange alliance of the proponents of public housing and the Wall Street bond houses prevailed.

In 1954 the House Ways and Means Committee tentatively approved a measure which would remove this tax exemption. This action resulted in a deluge of letter and telegrams from mayors and others complaining that this action of the committee threatened the traditional tax-exempt status of municipal and State obligations. I regret that the committee thereupon reconsidered its previous action and retained the tax-exempt privilege for these public-housing bonds.

These public-housing bonds are local obligations in name only. For all practical purposes they are Federal obligations because the full faith and credit of the United States has been pledged to their payment. They are thus the only federally guaranteed obligations which are issued which are exempt from Federal taxation.

No wonder there is such active competition for these bonds. Recently $68 million of these were acquired by Chase Manhattan Bank for a group of wealthy investors at 3.4 percent. This means a yield of from 14 percent to 26 percent for persons having annual incomes of from $50,000 to $100,000. No wonder the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] refers to this as a tax windfall for the wealthy.

On February 6, 1952, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board expressed concern over the tax haven which these bonds provided for high-income taxpayers. On that date, in his testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin, Jr., voiced his opposition to this tax exemption in these words:

One important new factor in the market which is very disturbing to us at the Federal Reserve is the tax-exempt bonds which are being issued to finance public housing. Not only do such issues absorb some of the funds that would otherwise supply a market for Government bonds or for mortgages generated by new private construction, but they

afford an opportunity for wealthy individuals and corporations to reduce legally their income tax payments in a period when it is essential that tax revenues be as large as possible.

Mr. Speaker, if the Congress decides that we must have public housing—and I for one am opposed to the program—then the Congress owes it to the people—to the taxpayers—to inform them what it costs in dollars, not in hidden subsidies which provide a tax haven for the wealthy.

I am also introducing legislation to remove this tax exemption, and I hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will give it early and favorable consideration.

EXCERPT FROM TESTIMONY OF RAYMOND M. FOLEY, ADMINISTRATOR, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, BEFORE SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, ON BILLS PERTAINING TO GENERAL HOUSING LEGISLATION, FEBRUARY 1949

First, the present exemption from Federal income taxes of interest on obligations issued by local public agencies, in connection with the federally aided slum-clearance program and in connection with the federally aided low-rent public-housing program, has the undesirable result that part of the necessary subsidy cost of such programs cannot be measured. It is a better public policy in such necessary subsidy operations to provide that the whole subsidy shall be a direct and measurable subsidy.

Although removal of tax exemption would increase the borrowing costs of the local housing authorities and thus increase Federal expenditures for annual contributions to them to cover their deficits, it would also cause investors in these securities to pay taxes on income which would formerly have been tax-exempt and thereby increase Federal revenues.

It is reasonably certain that most investors would not purchase tax-exempt local housing authority obligations if they did not expect to save more in taxes than they lose in interest by so doing. Removal of this opportunity for tax saving should, therefore, result in a greater increase in tax receipts than in budget expenditures.

Second, since by reason of the tax exemption, obligation issued by local public agencies in connection with these programs can be sold at a lower rate of interest than the rate of interest borne by direct obligations of the Federal Government, the interest on which is not exempt from Federal income taxes, it is apparent that such obligations of local public agencies are more attractive as investments to relatively high income-tax bracket investors.

An investor with a 50-percent marginal income-tax rate, for example, would get twice as high a net yield after taxes from local housing authority obligations as from Federal Government securities bearing the same rate of interest.

While yields on such securities therefore tend to fall well below yields on comparable Federal taxable issues, no purchasers will knowingly buy such obligations, if their interest loss exceeds their tax savings, and investors with the highest incomes will save substantially more in taxes than they lose in interest.

The larger the volume of tax-exempt securities, the less the reduction in yield and hence the greater the benefit obtained by high-tax-bracket investors.

Third, under the provisions of S. 138 relating to the manner in which Federal assistance for these programs may be extended, the obligations issued by local public agencies are, to all practical extents and purposes, the equivalent, in terms of security for repayment, of Federal obligations. They are generally so regarded by the financial community. Since in terms of security for repayment, such obligations are the equivalent of direct obligations of the Federal Government, the basic security being Federal credit, not local credit, except for the fact that technically they are obligations of local political subdivisions, it seemed entirely proper to provide for a withdrawal of the tax exemption from this type of obligation.

Fourth, the volume of obligations of this character which would be placed upon the market within the next few years, as a result of a program authorized by S. 138, would be quite substantial. It might amount to as much as 50 percent of the outstanding obligations, both long and short term, issued by States and political subdivisions thereof for all purposes.

Taking into consideration the fact that over the next several years the States and the political subdivisions thereof will be issuing substantial amounts of their tax-exempt obligations, backed by their own local credit and in no sense the equivalent of direct Federal obligations, as are the obligations issued by local public agencies in connection with the slum clearance and low-rent public housing programs, it would certainly appear that a substantial number of lower-tax-bracket investors will have to be relied upon to supply the necessary market for forthcoming State and local issues.

In order to attract a large enough investment in total, the yield on tax-exempt issues would have to rise enough to attract investors whose incomes are not as high as those who benefit from the present levels of yield. Obviously the larger the supply of tax-exempt securities, the larger the share of benefit received by high-tax-bracket investors and the smaller the share received by the States and their political subdivisions.

The result would therefore be that, not only would the interest costs in connection with the federally aided programs of slum clearance and low-rent public housing authorized by S. 138 be increased, but the cost to the States and political subdivisions of obtaining funds for necessary public purposes by the issuance of their own obligations backed by their own local credit would be increased.

In short, the tax exemption in connection with obligations issued by local public agencies for these slum-clearance and low-rent public-housing programs will not only cost the Federal Government more money, it will also cost the cities more money.

Fifth, as indicated above, such tax-exempt securities are attractive investments principally to high-income-tax bracket investors. Accordingly, these federally aided slum-clearance and public-housing programs will furnish to such investors a sizable and most attractive outlet for their funds, for not only are such obligations exempt from Federal income taxes, but they are relatively riskless investments.

Yet it is the very investors who find these securities attractive as tax-exempt riskless investments who are best able to supply the venture capital needed by business enterprise. Thus it makes it more difficult for new or expanding business enterprises to obtain necessary venture capital. (Pp. 128–129, hearings.)

Americans Imprisoned by Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the following House Joint Resolution 47, concerning the release of Americans imprisoned by Red China, introduced by Mr. Hogan, of Bristol, Conn., was read and adopted by the House of Representatives of the Connecticut State General Assembly:

Resolved by this assembly—

Whereas on November 23, 1954, the Peiping government in China sentenced the following-named Americans on alleged charges of espionage: John Thomas Downey, of New Britain, life imprisonment; Richard G. Fecteau, 10 years; Col. John Knox Arnold, Jr., 10 years; Maj. William H. Baumer, 8 years; Eugene John Vaadi, 6 years; Capt. Elmer F. Llewellyn, 5 years; Lt. Wallace L. Brown, 5 years; Lt. John Buck, 4 years; Airman Steve E. Kaba, Jr., 4 years; Airman Harry M. Bergaman, 4 years; Airman John W. Thomas, 4 years; Airman Daniel C. Schmidt, 4 years; Sgt. Howard W. Brown, 4 years; and

Whereas no foundation of proof of such charges has been established and said charges have been denied by the U.S. Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 1959 General Assembly of the State of Connecticut recommend that President Dwight D. Eisenhower use all the prestige and authority vested in his office as President of the United States to enact the immediate release of John Downey, of New Britain, Conn., and all other American prisoners now being held by the Communist government; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerks of the House and Senate cause copies of the resolution to be sent to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives from Connecticut.

Address of Samuel S. Stratton, of New York, at the Democratic National Victory Dinner, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., February 28, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, February 28, 1959 there was held at the Sheraton Park Hotel a tremendous Democratic national victory dinner, which dinner was a great success. Among those who spoke at the dinner was our distinguished colleague, from New York, Mr. STRATTON, who made an outstanding address, which address was received with great enthusiasm.

Congressman STRATTON well said:

And yet the astounding fact is that last fall, in district after district, for all of our individual differences, people who never voted for a Democrat before in their lives, helped to elect Democratic Congressmen, Senators, and Governors. Why? Well, I think it was because people in all walks of life, people in both major political parties, big people as well as little people, even the farmers and small businessmen and workers of traditionally Republican upstate New York, turned to the Democratic candidates, not just because of a party label, but because all these people were desperately hungry, in such dark and critical days, for dynamic, energetic, creative, courageous and fresh political leadership in America. Disheartened, disillusioned, and disappointed with the past, they turned last fall almost as one to the candidates and the party that

seemed to them to speak directly to their personal need.

His broad national outlook is also evidenced by the following nonpartisan remarks:

There can be no room today for narrow partisanship or for doctrinaire dogma. Ours must be a fresh, positive program that believes in the future of our land—one that is not tired, not discouraged, not obsessed with false shadows from the past—one which refuses to let America settle weakly for second place in the race for world survival but which is determined instead to see America grow into an even greater and a stronger land, where all may live together in freedom and in peace.

Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include the able address made by the gentleman from New York, Mr. STRATTON.

Commissioner Donohue, Bishop Hannan, Rabbi Siegel, Speaker Rayburn, distinguished guests, fellow Democrats, and those discriminating and farsighted Republicans you brought with you, you may recall that when Winston Churchill addressed a joint session of Congress in the early days of World War II he remarked, "If my father had been an American and my mother a Britisher, instead of the other way around, I might have made it into these halls on my own."

I know I speak for all my freshman colleagues in the House when I say that the possibility of making it into Congress on ones own is indeed one of the more magnificent features of the heritage of every American citizen. Those of us who were lucky enough to make it here last fall, not on our own exactly but with all kinds of help from all kinds of wonderful people, are already beginning to wonder just how we did it. Some of us may even be wondering how we are going to be able to do it again.

No one freshman Congressman, of course, can presume to speak for all of us. Each of our races was unique. People have asked me how, as the Democratic mayor of a Republican city that hadn't sent a Democrat to Congress in 42 years, I ever got elected. Well, the answer, I tell them, is very simple: I made myself so objectionable, they had to send me to Congress to get me out of town.

"Don't you miss being a big frog in a small puddle?" some have said, "now that you're such a small frog in such a big puddle?" Well, that's an easy one to answer too. Frankly, a mayor's job is all right, but I think it's wonderful just to be in the majority for a change. And such a big majority too.

You know, as mayor of Schenectady, I couldn't even promote myself a place to park in around city hall. So you can imagine the thrill I had the first day I arrived down here to see those signs around the House Office Building, "Reserved for Members of Congress." I drove right up there and parked, even before we had on our special tags. "Hey, you can't park here," the cop told me, "those are for Members of Congress." "Well," I said, "I'm a Member of Congress." "Oh, yeah," the cop said. You know, for a moment, I felt right at home.

And yet the astounding fact is that last fall, in district after district, for all of our individual differences, people who never voted for a Democrat before in their lives, helped to elect Democratic Congressmen, Senators, and Governors. Why? Well, I think it was because people in all walks of life, people in both major political parties, big people as well as little people, even the farmers and small businessmen and workers of traditionally Republican upstate New York, turned to the Democratic candidates, not just because of a party label, but because all these people were desperately hungry, in such dark and critical days, for dynamic, energetic, creative, courageous, and fresh political leadership in America. Disheartened, disillusioned, and disappointed with the past, they turned last fall almost as one to the candidates and the party that seemed to them to speak directly to their personal need.

And so tonight as we gather, quite properly, to celebrate our amazing victories of 1958, let us Democrats not lose sight of the fact that in our triumph we have also inherited a profound and far-reaching and solemn challenge.

For I am deeply convinced that the American people turned to Democratic leadership last fall because they realized that in Speaker SAM RAYBURN and in Senator LYNDON JOHNSON was embodied the kind of sober, responsible, forthright, and forward-looking and energetic national leadership that they were seeking.

So it is for us, the rank and file members of the 86th Congress, working together in the days ahead, to bring the promise of that new leadership to real fulfillment in a constructive legislative program designed for all America.

There can be no room today for narrow partisanship or for doctrinaire dogma. Ours must be a fresh, positive program that believes in the future of our land—one that is not tired, not discouraged, not obsessed with false shadows from the past—one which refuses to let America settle weakly for second place in the race for world survival but which is determined instead to see America grow into an even greater and a stronger land, where all may live together in freedom and in peace.

If, as I believe, we Democrats of the 86th Congress do move forward to build just that kind of courageous and dynamic program, then we as a party need have no doubts that we will elect both a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President in 1960.

And when that happens—you and I will have won victory again, not just for ourselves, not just for our glorious party, but—what is even more important—for the future of the American people and for all who love liberty, wherever they may be.

Tax Relief for Retired People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt that one of the most serious threats to the security of the retired people of our country has been the inflationary trends that have melted away their retirement equities, and which have driven taxes to new high levels on their little homes, creating a situation which is admittedly serious.

In the February 26 issue of the Mankato Free Press, of Mankato, Minn., a column written by Franklin Rogers, editor, proposes a plan which has merit and in inserting this into the RECORD it is my hope that it will stimulate some thought in the direction proposed in the article. I realize that to a great extent this will be an approach which must be treated by local and State authorities, but the matter deserves attention and examination at this level.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

TAX RELIEF FOR RETIRED PEOPLE
(By Franklin Rogers)

Now that things have quieted down a bit in the commotion over real estate taxes, we have another idea to toss into the hopper. Isn't it time we considered giving a special tax reduction to older homeowners?

When you get down to the most pertinent facts, it's the people living on pensions and fixed income who are hurt the most by both taxes and inflation. They're practically helpless against a growing threat to their financial security.

The man who has reached retirement age—probably 65—and has been told by his employer that he now will be obliged to go on social security is the fellow who can't stand a sharp tax boost. In many cases he has worked long years to get his home paid for, and it's just about the only thing he has—except for his pension—to protect him.

But then comes a 10 percent increase in his tax load, probably followed by another 10 percent—or perhaps even 20 or 30 percent—in the next year or two. His income, which was none too robust at the start of his retirement, stays the same.

It's just about like taking food off his table.

To add to his feeling of helplessness, in many cases he may not feel physically up to the task of going before the assessor, or the equalization board, in an effort to get relief. He is virtually forced to stand still and take it.

If he sells his home, where will he go? He has battled through his productive years for the security a home provides, and then finds his well-being threatened by something for which he isn't responsible. The new generation tells him he's too old to work, but young enough to pay for the things that ostensibly are going to bring better streets, new schools, paved highways and recreation facilities for the lengthening hours of leisure time.

He is caught in the maelstrom of economic progress while trying to live on a modest income.

Take, for example, a man and wife who retire and plan on perhaps $12 a month for real estate taxes. What happens when it goes to $15 a month, or possibly $20? It takes $3 to 8 a month away from the food money. In the case of an older couple, that will buy a pretty sizable percentage of their grocery needs.

How to avoid this may be a problem. But it might not be a bad idea to freeze the taxes on a home as soon as the owner retires. Then, as long as he lives there and continues to own the home, there will be no increase. In that way he can be sure of at least the size of his taxload when he works out his retirement budget.

The total cost to any community wouldn't be great, and the good it would do for the retired generation would be well worth whatever the outlay totaled for the younger people. It is hardly fair to go on boosting the taxload for people whose income, through no fault of their own, remains unchanged.

A Fine Address by Governor Underwood, of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the largest and finest newspapers in West

Virginia, the Charleston Gazette, has an editorial which I commend to the attention of all Members. I intend to stick to my guns and on every possible occasion call attention to the accomplishments, developments, and problems of West Virginia, so that more people will get to know my home State better. I am proud of West Virginia and intend to be an active and not an inactive Congressman on behalf of my State and the welfare of our great country. At advertising rates, the following able editorial would have cost me $43.88:

THE RECORD: HOT AIR ALONG THE POTOMAC

U.S. Representative KEN HECHLER apparently is determined to establish some sort of freshman record for inserting editorials, speeches, and just plain nonsense in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This is an honor we'd just as soon see our Congressmen and Senators avoid. If what they have to say or to repeat is worthy, the chances are that the basic news media will give full and ample coverage at considerable saving to the taxpayer.

We've found that the public servants who act let their actions speak for themselves, while the windbags and the professional hacks can usually be spotted in the RECORD under "Extemporaneous remarks." Having nothing better to do or to offer, they serve their constituents only on paper in the pages of a manual which is tiresome, expensive, and, more often than not, meaningless.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask to have printed an outstanding message to the West Virginia State Legislature by Gov. Cecil Underwood. The Governor has performed a great service in analyzing the economic situation which we face in West Virginia, and I commend him for his vigorous statement, which indicates that West Virginians are united in their determination to solve our economic problems.

SPECIAL MESSAGE OF GOV. CECIL H. UNDERWOOD, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO A JOINT SESSION OF THE 54TH LEGISLATURE ON FEBRUARY 25, 1949

Six weeks ago this very afternoon, I addressed your opening session. Today I appear before you in the solemnity cast by the lengthening shadow of West Virginia's economic crisis.

I have not come to talk about passing pleasantries or suggest easy answers. I will take little of your time. But I am compelled to speak again about the dire need of many of our citizens and suggest again something for their good.

All of you remember the old story of the little boy who cried wolf so often that, when the wolf actually came, he was ignored. The crisis in West Virginia has been many years coming to this crucial point. During these years, many people have recognized and warned of this impending danger. Inadvertently, we have become accustomed to these warnings. I sincerely hope these repeated cries of wolf—the wolf which was just over the hill—will not now obscure the clear and present danger we face. For now the wolf is literally at our door.

Here in the State capitol, in the legislative chambers, or in the hotel rooms, the situation perhaps seems less desperate. But we have only to drive past the employment office on Kanawha Boulevard to see hundreds of people daily standing in line waiting for employment benefits or, hopefully, a new job. We have only to go into counties nearby to see families who are hungry and cold—living in despair about the future.

We who hold responsible positions in the State government must contemplate the aftermath of these conditions on our future. In some areas of our State, the entire economy is almost at a standstill; in others, it will shortly come to such an impasse—unless we take immediate and positive action.

UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

Each week you have been in session, the unemployment statistics have become more alarming. On January 14, I spoke about 42,000 workers who had exhausted their regular unemployment benefits; today, that number is 50,000. Six weeks ago, 32,000 had qualified for temporary unemployment benefits; now the number exceeds 36,000. In the same 6 weeks, another 4,000 have exhausted these extended funds, and on March 31 the TUC benefits all expire.

During the month of January 1959, 12,225 workers filed initial claims and drew their first unemployment payments. These disturbing numbers reflect the continuing efforts of industry to reduce employment. This is not a depression, it is an industrial revolution unless we heed these warnings, we may soon have other revolutionary problems on our hands. The fear of starvation can drive hungry people to desperate actions.

Last month, I emphasized two lines of attack on this problem: Immediate jobs for the unemployed, and long-range planning to rehabilitate our State economy. To me, these factors are still self-evident. We must give these people help—not by dole, but by work; we must improve our economy—not by haphazard spasms, but by planned development.

Earlier, I recommended several measures to provide immediate relief to our distressed conditions. I am not here to criticize the legislature; but I am here to be plain spoken. In 6 weeks, not a single bill has reached my desk which will produce a single job for a single unemployed person or provide any measure of relief for the economy.

IMMEDIATE JOBS

Frankly, I know of no other way in which the State can produce substantial numbers of jobs than through an extensive highway construction program. How better can we prime our economic pump than to provide the funds to match the approximately $130 million of unused Federal aid cash which is available for highway use in West Virginia. Federal aid does us no good as long as it lies in the Federal Treasury.

We must also remember that virtually all of our vast secondary road system is not included in the Federal aid program. These roads are our responsibility. We can put thousands of people to work now if we will undertake to do what is needed on the secondary roads alone. West Virginia needs these roads, our people need work—so, I ask you, what better service can we perform than to meet this need?

I understand the senate has passed and the house of delegates is now considering measures to raise approximately $8 million in road revenue. This is a commendable and splendid start—but it will not solve the problem. It will provide scarcely more revenue than was available last year. In 1958, the State sold $10 million of revolving road bonds, this source will be much less in 1959. If we are to do what needs to be done, greater efforts must be exerted. I know you have been confronted with countless problems, and I know these halls and corridors echo with cries of poverty from every vested interest.

May I remind you of what our senior U.S. Senator, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, said in Charleston only a week ago tonight? He told his audience, "Our Nation did not achieve its present greatness by saying 'we can't afford it'."

You have my program for producing jobs and improving the State's economy. I am not insisting that this is the only program or that it is perfect. I do say the time has come for you to pass this or some program to save our State.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY AGENCY

As important as these measures are, they meet only part of our need. We cannot expect forever to maintain an economy on public works.

We must restore our economic health over a longer period of time through the proper utilization of our natural and human resources, through the development of our industrial potential, through the wise use of our natural advantages, and through the attraction of industry and tourists. The economy of West Virginia must be built on a sound, natural basis, not an inflated, artificial edifice.

To meet this need, comprehensive, long-range planning is a must requirement. Accordingly, in my first message, I recommended the creation of an economic recovery agency, staffed with outstanding leaders of West Virginia and provided with permanent facilities to do comprehensive planning.

I said then that Federal aid would probably be available for some of this work. Purposely, I have delayed presenting the final draft of this legislation until I could be more specific about Federal participation. I am happy to advise you that at least two departments of the Federal Government will support certain phases of these studies.

On your desks this afternoon is a copy of a bill to create an economic recovery agency. You may wonder why this name has been used. As I indicated in my earlier message, I hope that the remaining 4 years of our State's first century will be the time when we can recover from the present economic illness and find the way to stabilize our future against this kind of threat. It is my hope that this agency will be so effective in the next 4 years that it can then be renamed and that we will no longer need to refer to the word "recovery."

This proposal contemplates the creation of a nine-member board to succeed our present State planning board, which has been only a paper organization for more than a decade. It will be my devoted purpose to bring the State's best brains and talent to the membership of this agency. I have in mind the caliber of people comparable to those who have served the Nation on such important task forces as the Hoover Commission.

The agency will be empowered to employ an executive director who is qualified in the fields of State, local, and national economic planning and community development. This director and his staff will coordinate and supervise the research and study of many unrelated groups and individuals in other agencies, departments, and organizations of government.

The primary duty of the agency will be to prepare and maintain a master plan for the physical, social, and economic development of West Virginia. Let me make it clear that I do not propose to replace or supplant the work of any department of the State government with this agency. On the contrary, its work will serve the other departments and provide them with valuable and useful information for their particular responsibilities.

This agency will be able to serve many private industrial and economic development groups. It can also provide much needed service to counties and cities.

Considerable Federal aid is currently available to our smaller municipalities which undertake projects in urban renewal and city planning. This aid, however, must be received by a State agency working with these local governments. Already two West Virginia cities have lost this Federal aid because the existing planning board could not function. Even without funds for its operation, the State planning board has now

processed an application for the city of Keyser with the Federal housing authorities. The proposed economic recovery agency can immediately serve in this capacity and help many other cities to obtain this kind of aid.

The Congress now has many bills under consideration to provide economic aid for distressed areas. No one can say with certainty what bill may ultimately pass the Congress. I am advised by competent Federal authorities that the proposed draft of this bill is sufficiently broad to serve as a receiving agency for any of the measures now before Congress. All of these proposals provide Federal aid of some kind, but require in every instance that it be matched from State or local sources and that the Federal money be channeled through a State agency. Adoption of this measure at this session could easily avoid the necessity of an extraordinary session if Congress later enacts a depressed-area measure.

Immediately it will be possible for the agency to begin two important and vital studies, manpower skills and land use. In my opinion, these are basic to any long-range planning. I am assured that the Department of Labor and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization will jointly support the manpower skills study to the extent of $100,000. Our best current estimates indicate that both of these studies will require in excess of $200,000 of additional State money. I therefore recommend that this agency be given an appropriation of $250,000 to carry on its work and support our share of these studies. It will be futile to undertake this important work unless it is adequately financed.

I know the Federal Government will help us wherever it can. But I must warn you, the Federal Government will not solve all of our problems for us. Our economic ills are not peculiar to West Virginia alone. To mention only a few others—the State of Michigan is collecting taxes in advance in order to pay its current bills; the State of Pennsylvania has bankrupted its employment security reserve fund; the Governor of Massachusetts has called upon the President to send a factfinding commission to survey his State's economic distress. Compared with us, these are big and powerful States.

Let us act while there is yet time. I recommend these measures today with a strong sense of urgency. I recommend them for your constituents who are victims of economic adjustment and industrial revolution—who are cold, hungry, and poor. I earnestly feel we can do no less for them and for our State.

The Facts of Life in a Distressed Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Michael Schoonjans, Biddeford-Saco, Maine, regional representative of the Textile Workers Union of America, recently testified before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in support of Senator DOUGLAS' bill to provide aid for the Nation's distressed areas.

I commend Mr. Schoonjans for the relentless efforts he has made to solve the unemployment problem which has paralyzed the Biddeford region since 1954. I am proud to be associated with him in the struggle to provide a means of livelihood for those so grieviously affected by the economic recession.

The text of Mr. Schoonjans' testimony follows:

TESTIMONY BY MICHAEL SCHOONJANS, DIRECTOR, BIDDEFORD-SACO JOINT BOARD, TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, AFL–CIO, BEFORE THE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1959, IN SUPPORT OF S. 722

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Senators of the Banking and Currency Committee, my presentation today concerns the Biddeford-Saco-Old Orchard Beach, Maine, area.

The men and women in the textile mills of Maine whom I represent are suffering. But they are today, and have been for years, actively and untiringly trying to help themselves. We appeal for governmental assistance. Meanwhile, we are doing everything possible to alleviate the continued chronic unemployment situation in this part of Maine.

Over these years, since our economic decline began, thousands of words have been written and presented at various hearings before State and Federal Government committees. Up to this day, all we have received in return is more words but no action. I have copies with me here of some of our communications and testimony. The entire package of all our communications and testimony would be too bulky to go through at this hearing; suffice it to say that I have most of the pertinent material with me and I will be very happy to leave this with the committee for their consideration.

The Biddeford-Saco-Old Orchard Beach area has been a serious and chronic unemployment area for many, many years and now it's at its lowest point. I have with me the employment and payroll figures for December 1956–1957–1958, that I will leave with the secretary of this committee. Please note that the weekly payroll has dropped from a high of over $414,280.54 per week in 1956 to $164,000 on week ending December 26, 1958; a loss of over a quarter of a million dollars per week.

While the rest of the Nation is reported in the press to be enjoying a rapid recovery from the recent nationwide recession, the unemployed worker in the State of Maine is worse off than he ever was. Unemployment during the period from May 1958, until the present time, in the Biddeford-Saco-Old Orchard Beach area, has risen tremendously. The number of jobs available in the Biddeford-Saco-Old Orchard Beach area is at its lowest point since July 1, 1948, when there were 8 major industrial concerns in these neighboring cities employing 10,027 workers. On December 28, 1956, there were 6,739 jobs in 8 industrial concerns, but on week ending December 27, 1957, there were 4,814 jobs. However, on December 26, 1958, there were 2,893 jobs in 7 industrial concerns, a loss since July 1, 1948, of 7,134 jobs.

When jobs are eliminated, payroll income in the community declines. On July 1, 1948, the weekly payroll in the Biddeford-Saco area was $581,892.73 from 8 industrial concerns. For week ending December 26, 1958, the weekly payroll from 7 industrial concerns was $164,099.64, a loss of $417,792.91 in the weekly payroll of these communities.

For week ending January 24, 1959, 7,673 State of Maine workers who had exhausted their unemployment checks of which 1,366 are in the Biddeford-Saco area. Incidentally, the total amount of funds available in the State reserves for unemployment benefits at the end of December 1958, was $35,207,704.83.

As of the 28th day of January 1959, there were 3,604 workers registered for work at the Biddeford Employment Security Office. This figure does not include the small army of workers and families who have been forced to move to other parts of the Nation as a direct result of the prolonged depression. According to a census taken by the clergy of this area, in their respective parishes, of up to and including April 1958, but not including families who have moved since this census was taken—both Catholic and Protestants—show that 595 affiliated families had, up to that time, been forced to seek employment elsewhere. When you consider that the average family consists of 4, this means that 2,380 people have moved out of the area up to and including April 1958. These are, for the most part, the younger, highly skilled workers who only wait for the day when this area will be the industrial area it once was and will be again greater than ever before to return to the State of Maine.

There are presently, in the city of Biddeford, 3,712 persons eligible for general and surplus food relief. In 1956, there were 421 persons on general and surplus relief in this city. In the city of Saco, for the month of December, the number of persons on general and surplus food relief was 1,439. In the town of Old Orchard, a very small community, the number of people on general and surplus food relief is approximately 600.

We have been trying to get an increase in the variety of surplus food for these unfortunate people, but we have not succeeded. In fact, one day the welfare departments received a notice stating that the present allotment per person would be increased, and then the very same welfare department heads were told shortly afterward that the cheese allocation would be eliminated.

I want to talk for a minute now about what I feel is a ray of light in the gloomy situation confronting us in our area. This is the determined effort everyone concerned is making to find a way to replace the liquidated jobs. The entire community is seeking new industries to replace those jobs that have been liquidated. There is presently a local campaign to purchase the now empty Saco-Lowell Biddeford properties consisting of approximately 1 million square feet of manufacturing space. The main business of this company has been the manufacture of textile machinery.

To obtain this space we need:

Proposed purchase price	$300,000
Cost of 3 years' operating expense	140,000
Capital improvements	75,000
Total requirement	525,000
First mortgage (4 local banks)	200,000
Second mortgage (standby credit)	75,000
Public subcription to development fund (of which Saco-Lowell will take $100,000)	250,000
Total	525,000

My own union to date has contributed $1,500 to this cause. This proves that we are willing to help ourselves; but if the area redevelopment bill, S. 722, as proposed by Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, were adopted by both branches of Congress and signed into law by the President of the United States, it would hasten the day when the Biddeford-Saco-Old Orchard Beach area would again be the prosperous communities they once were.

It is the opinion of many of our unemployed workers that our present administration in Washington is more concerned with the economic conditions of foreign countries than the economic conditions of some areas in the United States.

It is quite difficult to explain to hungry unemployed workers, heads of families, the position that our own Government takes in helping to improve the economic conditions of foreign countries. While the Maine textile workers are willing to have our Govern-

ment help out the free nations of the world, they cannot understand our Federal Government handing out another $130 million to the dictator of Yugoslavia, Marshal Tito, to improve the economic climate in his country. This $130 million is in addition to the $1,600 million that has been given to this communistic dictator.

All our past efforts to bring the suffering of our unemployed American workers to the attention of our administration in Washington seems to have fallen on deaf ears. It isn't that we haven't tried to help ourselves or that these workers haven't made any sacrifices. The facts are that these workers have cooperated in the past and are continuing to cooperate at present with industry.

COOPERATION WITH EMPLOYERS

In the case of the liquidated Bates Manufacturing Co., York division, the workers who were employed in this plant cooperated to the tune of $395,574.40 labor-costs savings between collective-bargaining agreements. At the Pepperell Manufacturing Co., a cotton mill employing 2,000 workers and still in operation, these workers without the benefit of modern machinery have increased their workloads to a backbreaking point. We are now saving this company $853,199.36 in labor costs per year. All these sacrifices have been made without the benefit of technological improvements and has been through additional efforts on the part of the employees themselves. We ask, How much longer can they continue to sacrifice for the pitiful wages being paid? The Maine industrial straight-time average hourly earnings are $1.67; the national straight-time average hourly earnings are $2.17 an hour, yet the average straight-time hourly earnings of the textile workers are only $1.41 an hour.

With these low wages, it takes a husband and wife, and sometimes grown children, to become wage earners so that the family may realize a little bit of our American standard of living. The husband works for the food of his family and the wife works on the third shift in order to meet payments on a secondhand automobile, a television, a refrigerator, and in some cases a washing machine. I am merely bringing this out to you, honorable gentlemen of the committee, to show you that when these workers become unemployed they have very little or nothing to fall back on.

The Biddeford-Saco-Old Orchard Beach area has been a chronic unemployment area for many, many years, and while these people would appreciate any help given them by our Federal Government they are first proud people and want an opportunity to work rather than being given a handout.

Many of these families are broken up for weeks on end with many heads of families commuting many miles from home to seek employment. Some have been successful in other areas of our Nation, but many more have moved their entire families to other sections. There are many whose roots are deep and continue to commute to these distant places with the hope that some day they will have job opportunities in their own area and will be able to live a normal American life with their families. The adoption of S. 722 would, we are sure, help to bring a better future for these unfortunate workers.

Our working forces are highly skilled, conscientious workers, and this can be proven because in the case of the Saco-Lowell Shops, makers of the world's best textile machinery and formerly the largest employer in our community, at one time employing over 5,000 workers now reduced to less than 300 workers. We hereby list sample of nontextile products manufactured by this company since World War II:

1. Magneto rotors for B–29 bombers.
2. Firing control units for 90-mm. antiaircraft guns.
3. Ford universal carriers.
4. Parts for proximity fuses.
5. Rocket projectiles for planes.
6. Twisters for rayon heavy-duty fibers used on bombers, trucks, etc.
7. M–3 50-cal. machinegun.
8. M–1919A6 30-cal. machinegun.
9. M–37 30-cal. machinegun.
10. Operating rod for Garand rifle.
11. Universal joint for Ford Motor Co.
12. Exhaust control valve for Ford Motor Co.
13. Rear axle shaft and differential gear cases (Ford).
14. Oil pumps for Ford Motor Co.
15. Miscellaneous service parts for Chrysler Corp.
16. Miscellaneous service parts for General Motors.
17. Drive shaft flanges for Ford Motor Co.
18. Elliott addressing machines (2 models).
19. Canopener parts for Edlund Co.
20. Miscellaneous gears for Boston Gear Works.
21. Filter caps for Commercial Filter Co.
22. Miter gear and rail-raising brackets and miscellaneous parts for Bullard Co.
23. Autometics gear housings for Jones and Lamson Co.
24. Automotive muffler (18 basic models).

The reputation of the Saco-Lowell Shops in producing the M–3 .50-caliber machinegun, the M–919A6 .30-caliber machinegun, the M–37 .30-caliber machinegun, the operating rod for Garand rifle is well known to the Ordnance Procurement Department of our Federal Government. This company is presently awaiting a decision by the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Mr. Frank Higgins, the results of their recent bid on the M–60 machinegun prime contract which as we understand it is now on Mr. Higgins' desk. The awarding of any ordnance work to this deserving company would bring hope instead of despair to the residents of our distressed communities. This company has the know-how, the ability, and the energy. We can supply the workers to produce and manufacture much of our defense requirements.

This company has a modern plant located in Saco; a one-story building and presently using only 40 percent of the 282,000 square feet of manufacturing space.

This piece of legislation before you would certainly be a great help to this chronically distressed area. We, the people of Biddeford-Saco-Old Orchard, are deeply grateful for the untiring efforts of Senator DOUGLAS and his colleagues in pressing for this legislation. When the President of the United States vetoed the distressed area bill last fall, the people of the Biddeford-Saco-Old Orchard Beach communities were stunned and shocked. However, hope springs eternal in the breast of the human being and we are now saying to ourselves that this year when the Congress adopts S. 722 the President of the United States will see fit to sign it.

Employment and payrolls, Biddeford and Saco

SEVEN INDUSTRIAL CONCERNS

	Number employed	Payrolls
Week ending Dec. 5, 1958	2,921	$216,715.26
Previous week	3,096	242,797.23
Year ago	4,807	325,558.41
Week ending Dec. 12, 1958	2,864	208,389.32
Previous week	2,921	216,715.26
Year ago	4,797	328,261.39
Week ending Dec. 19, 1958	2,847	188,282.01
Previous week	2,864	208,389.32
Year ago	4,719	318,542.13
Week ending Dec. 26, 1958	2,893	164,099.82
Previous week	2,847	188,282.01
Year ago	4,814	279,651.09
Week ending Dec. 6, 1957	4,807	325,558.41
Previous week	4,866	322,773.14
Year ago	6,746	489,303.22
Week ending Dec. 13, 1957	4,797	328,261.39
Previous week	4,807	325,558.41
Year ago	6,805	484,997.05

Employment and payrolls, Biddeford and Saco—Continued

SEVEN INDUSTRIAL CONCERNS

	Number employed	Payrolls
Week ending Dec. 20, 1957	4,719	318,542.13
Previous week	4,797	328,261.39
Year ago	6,789	478,992.13
Week ending Dec. 27, 1957	4,814	279,651.09
Previous week	4,719	318,542.13
Year ago	6,739	414,280.54

EIGHT INDUSTRIAL CONCERNS

Week ending Dec. 7, 1956	6,746	$489,303.22
Previous week	6,853	493,944.81
Year ago	6,881	482,712.75
Week ending Dec. 14, 1956	6,805	484,997.05
Previous week	6,746	489,303.22
Year ago	6,906	485,534.77
Week ending Dec. 21, 1956	6,789	478,992.13
Previous week	6,805	484,997.05
Year ago	6,898	451,750.12
Week ending Dec. 28, 1956	6,739	414,280.54
Previous week	6,789	478,992.13
Year ago	6,903	447,299.85

Outstanding Federal Administrator and Federal Employee for the Year 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Business Association of Detroit grants annual awards to the outstanding Federal administrator and the Federal employee of the year.

On February 24, 1959, at the Veterans Memorial Building in Detroit, awards for the year 1958 were made to William T. Hunt, an outstanding Federal administrator and to Herbert S. Hubbs as outstanding Federal employee for the year 1958.

I believe this practice of the Federal Business Association of Detroit to be a very worthy one and conducive to the promotion of higher standards in Federal service. I congratulate the association on its practice and also the recipients on the honor bestowed upon them.

Mr. Hunt, manager, Michigan field office, U.S. Department of Commerce, at Detroit, was born in Arkansas and reared in Indian Territory, now Oklahoma. He enlisted in the Army in June 1917 and served 2 years overseas. Mr. Hunt was American Vice Consul in Barbados, West Indies, from 1920 to 1923. From 1924 to 1945 he had responsible domestic and foreign positions in private industry, including domestic production and sales management, and establishment of distribution and plants throughout Europe.

Joining the Department of Commerce in 1945 as assistant manager of the Detroit office, he was promoted to manager in 1946. His office has been most active in serving all business and the public in development and promotion of domestic and foreign trade.

During the Korean war, the National Production Authority under Commerce controlled the production, distribution, and use of strategic materials and promoted conservation. Mr. Hunt organ-

ized and directed this important and complicated operation in Michigan.

Mr. Hunt was sent to Thailand by his Department from 1954 to 1955 on the first official marketing mission ever sent to a foreign nation in connection with an International Trade Fair. He is very active in many business and civic organizations, and holds and has held major offices in such groups.

Mr. Hubbs, shop superintendent, post ordnance, Fort Wayne, was born April 16, 1902, at Knoxville, Tenn. He has been a resident of the Detroit area since 1926.

He entered military service in February 1942 and immediately following his discharge in May 1945 he entered civilian Government service as an auto mechanic at Fort Wayne. Mr. Hubb's ability was immediately recognized and within a short time he was promoted to the position of shop superintendent.

Mr. Hubbs established and carried through a safety program which resulted in the Ordnance Division receiving the Fort Wayne merit award for safety performance.

As area fire marshall he earned for the Ordnance Division the award for outstanding performance in fire prevention and protection for both 1957 and 1958. In addition, he has personally received several outstanding performance ratings and several commendations from officers under whose commands he served.

Ruble-Dollar War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Forwarder of Monday, February 23, 1959:

It is fairly common knowledge that in the ruble-dollar war the United States is taking it on the chin because of our foreign economic policy of peace by procrastination—in short, no discernible policy at all.

Because of their internal totalitarian organization, the Communists can manipulate various markets to suit their immediate and long-range purposes as opportunity presents. For example, according to S. J. Rundt, a specialist in the field, the Soviets have sold f.o.b. Russian port, cement to Portugal at 43 rubles a ton, but at 117 rubles to Red China. Belgium bought cellulose from the U.S.S.R. at 440 rubles per ton, but for the same product, Red China paid 1,275 rubles. This makes for tough competition, especially since the U.S.S.R. contrary to popular opinion, delivers promptly and pays for purchases on the dot.

There are many men in this country with plans aplenty on how to take the incentive in the trade war and make it stick. We cannot match Soviet financial machinations and still remain a democracy. But we have a weapon the Communists cannot match and still remain totalitarian. We have private enterprise and initiative, and all it needs is for us to get off our procrastinating "buts" and turn it loose.

We have huge financial organizations for overseas operations, such as the Eximbank, the World Bank, the Development Loan Fund and so on, but these are unwieldy giants incapable of swift movement and individual action in a fast breaking market.

In our opinion, H.R. 5 provides the answer.

H.R. 5 is a measure sponsored by Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana, to liberalize tax treatment of foreign-investment income.

Recently at a New York Board of Trade, International section, luncheon, Mr. BOGGS said that a major aim of the measure is to encourage the addition, or substitution of, private investment for foreign aid. It would permit freer transfer and reinvestment of capital in operations abroad and defer taxes on earnings until repatriated in dividends.

Chief tax benefit under the will would be a 14-point reduction in the corporation tax rate on income of foreign-based corporations. This is nothing startling since it is merely a worldwide extension of the similar benefit provided since 1942 to Western Hemisphere corporations.

In the face of the Soviet ruble offensive it is difficult to understand why this has not been done long since.

Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the following proclamation recites a tragic situation that has existed for years. Three million people have long been deprived of their freedom and liberty by force.

I am proud to submit this proclamation in hopes that Lithuanian independence will soon be a reality.

During the 41st commemoration of the reinstatement declaration of Lithuanian's independence, sponsored by the Detroit Lithuanian Organization Center, held at Western High School, 1500 Scotten Avenue, Detroit, Mich., on February 15, 1959, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas in June 1940, Soviet Russia did invade the sovereign independent Republic of Lithuania with armed forces to "protect" Lithuanian independence and, against the will of the people, annex her to the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas the armed forces of the Soviet Union are still presently residing in Lithuania in complete and total disregard of the agreements, policies, and treaties which existed between the Soviet Union and other allies of World War II; and

"Whereas Russian Communists are still currently perpetrating deportations and exterminations of whole ethnic groups, plundering people and institutions, and separating the members of family, one from another: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That on this 41st anniversary, we express our deep gratitude to the Government of the United States for nonacknowledgment of the fabricated incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union and for allowing the many thousands of refugees to find new homes in this country; and be it further

"Resolved, That we respectfully recommend that our U.S. Government abstain from entrance into any alliance, pact, or agreement which would in any way whatsoever recognize the present day Russian Empire; and be it further

"Resolved, That our Government of the United States be urged to use all possible means to protect enslaved peoples from genocidal destruction and preserve their hope of eventual liberation; and be it finally

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution signed by the presiding officers, be transmitted to the President of the United States, Secretary of State, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Michigan State Governor, and U.S. Senators and Congressmen from the State of Michigan."

DETROIT LITHUANIAN ORGANIZATION CENTER.
ALFONSAS NAKAS, *President.*
JONAS GAIZUTIS, *Secretary.*

The Federal-Aid Highway Program and the Municipalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made by the Honorable Joseph N. Langan, Commissioner of the city of Mobile, Ala., at a meeting on February 17 of the members of the legislative committee of the Alabama League of Municipalities with our Alabama congressional delegation. This meeting was called to discuss municipal problems, and Commissioner Langan's subject was "The Federal-Aid Highway Program and the Municipalities." Commissioner Langan is one of our outstanding municipal leaders in the State of Alabama. He has visited Washington several times in recent years in connection with the Federal super highway program as it affects the city of Mobile. I feel that our meeting was most beneficial and it was a real pleasure to have had these fine officials here in Washington with us:

THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM AND THE MUNICIPALITIES

(By Joseph N. Langan, commissioner of Mobile, Ala.)

As far as I know there is no major highway legislation pending at this time before the Congress, but we do want to appear before you and restate our thinking and views on the overall highway program of the Nation as it affects the urban areas.

In adopting last year Public Law 85-767, Congress has set up a new and expanded highway law known as title 23, United States Code, highways. It is a codification and restatement of the Federal-aid and other highway laws. We commend you gentlemen for the part you played in the development of this more concise highway code.

HIGHWAY ACT OF 1958

In enacting the Highway Act of 1958, you approved major provisions that made possible:

1. An additional $400 million for fiscal 1959 for the immediate apportionment for projects to be undertaken on contracts awarded by the States before December 1, 1958, which provide for completion before December 1, 1959. While the $400 million was allocated to the States on the basis of 45 percent for the primary, 30 percent for

secondary, and 25 percent for urban extension of these systems, the States themselves were authorized to spend their share without limitation as to the percentage to be utilized on any one of these systems. The project costs were to be shared on a two-thirds Federal, one-third State basis.

2. In addition the bill provided for $150 million for loan purposes to the States to help them meet their share of the project costs. The amount loaned cannot exceed two-thirds of the State's share of the cost of the project and is to be repaid from future Federal aid allotments.

3. For the ABC systems (primary, secondary, and urban extensions) the 1958 bill provided $900 million for fiscal year 1960 and $925 million for fiscal 1961 on the basis of 50–50 matching.

4. For the Interstate System the law provides authorization for fiscal year 1959 of $2,200 million and for fiscal 1960 $2,500 million and fiscal 1961 $2,500 million.

5. The 1958 legislation suspended for fiscal year 1959 and fiscal 1960 section 209(g) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (Byrd amendment), so that expenditures for highway purposes are not, during those 2 years, limited by the amount of money available to the highway trust fund.

6. The new law also established a new national policy "that it is in the public interest to encourage and assist the States to control the use of and improve the areas adjacent to the Interstate System by controlling outdoor advertising in those areas." Portions of the Interstate System which pass through municipalities are excluded from this provision. The Federal share of payment on the Interstate System is increased from 90 percent to 90.5 percent in those States participating in billboard control.

7. The new law amends the Federal Highway Act of 1956 by increasing from 5 to 7 years the period within which construction must commence on rights-of-way which are to be or have been acquired in anticipation of use with funds advanced for any of the Federal-aid highway systems, including the Interstate System.

In closing our summary of the highway legislation developments in 1958, let me point out that for the first time in 40 years all the Federal laws pertaining to Federal-aid highways are now available in one act. Since the passage of the first Federal-Aid Road Act of 1916, 40 separate highway laws have been enacted excluding appropriation bills.

It is to the everlasting credit of the 85th Congress that now all the many provisions of law are arranged in an orderly and logical sequence. While in the process it was necessary, in many instances, to make changes from the exact language used in prior enactments, with certain minor exceptions no substantive changes of law have been made.

PROGRESS SINCE PASSAGE OF 1956 LAW

You gentlemen will be interested in progress that has been made toward the goals anticipated in roadbuilding under the 1956 Federal-Aid Highway Act. I am happy to report to you that during the first 2 years of the accelerated program—July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1958—progress matched the schedules set annually. The 2-year goal of obligating $3,100 million of Federal funds for the Interstate System was surpassed by 5 percent; the goal of obligating nearly $1,700 million of the ABC funds (for primary, secondary, and urban connecting link roads) was exceeded by 3 percent. During the 2 years, construction contracts were completed on 1,771 miles of the Interstate System at a cost of $439 million and by June 30, 1958, construction estimated to cost $1,700 million was underway on 3,167 miles. In addition, nearly $1,500 million had been authorized or spent for preliminary engineering work and acquisition of rights-of-way.

In the regular ABC Federal-aid program, 42,491 miles of construction costing $2,500 million was completed in the 2 years mentioned and by June 30, 1958, a total of 23,330 more miles of construction, estimated to cost $2,200 million, was underway. The Federal-Aid Highway Act approved April 16, 1958, authorized, as I have already pointed out, a special $400 million for use on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems to accelerate the program and stimulate employment. By the end of the last fiscal year $159 million of this fund was obligated and 358 miles of construction, estimated to cost $25 million, was underway.

WHAT FEDERAL AID MEANS TO THE MUNICIPALITIES

The cities and towns of Alabama and the balance of the Nation have, of course, a tremendous stake in Federal highway legislation. It has been said—and well said—that no other Federal-aid program can have, or has had, such a pervasive effect on the growth and development of the Nation's urban areas. The inadequacies of existing urban thoroughfares have become increasingly apparent as more and more rubber-tired vehicles have invaded municipal traffic ways. As the expanding urban population has settled in sprawling suburbs, municipal streets have had to absorb traffic originating well beyond the limits of the cities themselves. To an alarming extent, these traffic problems have ceased to be those of the municipalities alone and have more and more become areawide problems. They defy solution by the municipal governments alone. Congress has been constantly aware of this and has done something about it. The States have failed miserably to recognize the plight these problems develop for our municipalities. Had Congress not acted as wisely as it has in recent years, we simply would be years behind in modernization of our highway system; and the resulting economic losses to our cities, towns, States, and Nation would have been incalculable.

Problems of coordinating urban, suburban, semirural and intercity highway facilities daily become more acute. Increasing population migration into urban areas and the concurrent increase in the number of motor vehicles in use in these areas make it mandatory that Federal resources—both technical and financial—reflect the growing seriousness and immediacy of the overall transportation problem facing the municipalities and the Nation. As I have already intimated, in our judgment the most formidable and immediate of our transportation difficulties exist in and around our urban areas. And let me point out to you gentlemen, in speaking of transportation we are speaking of the movement of both people and goods. In urban areas the movement or goods is as important or perhaps in some instances more important than the movement of people. Our city, town, county, State, and Federal economy depends, to a very great extent, on the efficient movement of goods and people through our heavily populated town and city areas. It is our firm belief that the Federal Government and the respective States must devote a larger share of their efforts and resources to the solution of urban transportation problems. Our present Federal highway program is a good start from the Federal Government level. If our States will make as serious an effort to help solve the problem, we will in a few short years be well on our way to a brighter situation—and our cities and towns will be even more important as centers of trade, industry, and comfortable living.

In closing, let me thank this congressional delegation for its vision and its action in supporting legislation always designed to improve the well-being and the programs of our city and town governments.

Twaddle of a Far Different Kind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Joseph Alsop which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 1, 1959:

TWADDLE OF A FAR DIFFERENT KIND
(By Joseph Alsop)

OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE, OMAHA, NEBR.—This is a place no thinking American can visit without strong national feeling. Simply as a place it is dreary. Until just the other day, it had no role in history. But now it is the nerve center of the proudest, most powerful, most complex, and most efficient fighting force this Republic has ever brought together.

It may seem very odd indeed to use the word "beautiful" in connection with Strategic Air Command. But although great aircraft have replaced the lances and the gonfalons, this SAC has something of the beauty of an army with banners. It has another beauty, too, as a vast, marvelous, superbly functional product of men's minds, as perfect as it is terrible. And it has still another beauty, as the sword and buckler of the imperiled cause of freedom.

It is necessary to say these things because it is also necessary to face an ugly fact concerning SAC. The fault does not belong to the men of SAC. But the ugly fact remains: The once-sure power of the American deterrent is now quite rapidly declining.

The causes of this decline, and the remedies which can be applied, will be examined in subsequent reports in this series. What must first be done is to try to dispose of the false and self-serving argument that is being used to justify the decline in SAC's deterrent power.

The argument is often heard nowadays in the highest quarters in the Pentagon and at the National Security Council. It takes the form of what is called the theory of minimum deterrence. This theory is based upon a cruelly ironical feature of modern strategic weapons systems. In brief, a few big dirty bombs will kill a great many millions of the enemy. But very considerable numbers of bombs, extremely precisely laid down, are needed to destroy the complex, many-targeted structure of the enemy's nuclear striking power.

It is easier, in other words, to massacre half the population of another nation than it is to prevent that nation from striking back in its agony. Many fewer aircraft or missiles are needed for the first purpose than for the second. It is cheaper, more budget-balancing, and in every way more attractive to the peculiar cast of mind that regards the richest nation in history as too poor to defend itself.

Such, then, are the fairly macabre origins of this theory of "minimum deterrence." The theory itself may be briefly stated. If the enemy strikes first with his rapidly growing power, he will destroy most of the SAC. But he cannot count on destroying all of SAC. The SAC remnant will be too small to touch the still-intact structure of the enemy's striking power, but this remnant can still be directed at what are euphemistically called "political and demographic targets." If the enemy knows the SAC remnant

will be used in this manner, he will not dare to strike first. Thus, minimum deterrence will be achieved at minimum cost.

There are two fatal defects in this grisly theory. In the first place, it glosses over what may be called the problem of Marshal Biriusov, the artillery officer who heads the Soviet Air Defense Command. For 13 years, this separate Soviet command has absorbed between 18 and 20 percent of the gigantic Soviet defense budget. What, then, can Marshal Biriusov reply if he is told, "Our first strike will kill all but a remnant of SAC, and your only task is to repel the wretched remnant."

He must surely reply that the assignment will be easy. The SAC commander himself, Gen. T. S. Power, has rightly pointed out that the effectiveness of our deterrence depends upon what the enemy thinks about it, and not on what we think about it.

Yet the theory's second defect is even more fatal. To see what this defect is, you must imagine the position of the President of the United States after the enemy's imagined first strike. The President's own structure of retaliatory striking power will lie in ruins. The remnant that remains will not be enough to cripple the enemy's structure of striking power, which will still be untouched and ready to strike again. But his remnant will still be able (if Marshal Biriusov is wrong) to kill several millions of the Russian people.

Will the President then use his remnant, as the much touted minimum deterrence theory would require him to do? Or rather, how could he use his remnant in this manner, unless he was both irrational and inhuman?

There would be no means to halt the enemy's second and third strikes. Most of our people, remember, would still be alive and healthy and in no danger after an enemy first strike solely aimed at military targets. The price to be paid for a few million Russian deaths would therefore be many more millions of American deaths. Would any but a madman order such an exchange, with no true military purpose?

The answer is obvious. The theory of minimum deterrence is not common, everyday twaddle. It is poisonous, desperately dangerous twaddle. It is time to stop twaddling, and to start talking in hard terms about the hard requirements of true national security.

Resolution on Lithuanian Independence by Pittston, Pa., Lodge of Lithuanian Alliance of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution on the independence of Lithuania:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE, FEBRUARY 16, 1959

Whereas February 16, 1959, citizens of Lithuanian ancestry, during their program in observance of the 41st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the people of Lithuania have time and again fought aggression to defend her freedom, have shed their blood to prove to the world that Lithuania is worthy of independence; and

"Whereas Lithuania during her two decades of independence demonstrated her ability to advance and prosper in all fields of endeavor, social, cultural, economic, and political; and

"Whereas Soviet Russia has enslaved Lithuania subjecting her people to brutal terror and oppression; and

"Whereas the indomitable spirit of the people and their great love of freedom still live despite terrible oppression, and the forced exile of hundreds of thousands of peoples; Therefore be it

"Resolved, That Americans of Lithuanian descent appeal to the conscience of the free world begging for their help in the name of justice and freedom; be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution, sponsored by the Lithuanian Alliance of America, lodge 7, Pittston, Pa., be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Congressmen and Senators of the United States from Pennsylvania."

Mrs. JOHN T. BAYORAS.
Secretary.

The Roots for Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Monday, March 2, 1959:

THE ROOTS FOR GROWTH

Chairman Saulnier, of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has coupled optimism about the Nation's economic future with some sound reminders of what is needed to make the bright prospects a reality. Speaking at the National Press Club, Dr. Saulnier not only saw good times this year and next, but a period of "very, very great economic growth" in the decades immediately ahead. He emphasized, however, that this growth is not going to come automatically, and assuredly not if the proinflationary thesis is accepted in governmental policy making.

It is a basic requirement of growth that there must be a steady expansion and improvement in the Nation's productive facilities. In a private enterprise system, at least, this requirement can be met only through a continuing heavy investment of capital. Capital itself is not something that can be legislated into existence or that may be found under a rock. It has to be created by encouraging the pyramiding of savings by individuals and corporations, safe from the fear that a dollar put into reserves today will be worth substantially less tomorrow.

"If we are going to increase our growth rate from the historic 3 percent to the magic 5 percent there must be very big capital growth, and you get it out of savings," Dr. Saulnier said. "If you create conditions which are not conducive to savings, you won't get the capital accumulation."

Certainly acceptance of the doctrine that creeping inflation is unavoidable, or even somehow healthy, is a condition not conducive to savings. It is, instead a condition that encourages the exact opposite—making debts and deficits attractive today in the belief that they may be offset in cheaper dollars tomorrow. Treasury Secretary Anderson recently summed up the grim implications of this philosophy when he told a congressional committee that "if we ever reach the point where people believe that * * * to save is to gamble then we are indeed in trouble."

Unfortunately, this point of danger may not be far away.

A Thought-Provoking Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we get the impression that demands for a balanced budget and economy in Government come only from people in the upper income tax brackets. I am inserting in the RECORD today one of the finest letters I have ever received. It is from a wage earner in my district. I commend it to my colleagues as an example of good, sound American thinking:

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF., *February 19, 1959.*
Hon. CHARLES M. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: Mrs. Danenhower and I read your Washington Report with considerable interest and appreciate it very much.

There are several issues currently which we feel and believe strongly about. We fear we are in a minority in our thinking, nevertheless, we are remiss if we continue to think and talk about the issues, but do nothing else. Thus, this expression to our Representative in the Federal Government.

We despise the continuing effects of inflation, and right or wrong, we believe Federal Government deficit spending is the major culprit as a cause. We work hard, my wife at home, and I at work, to keep our little world centering around 4 young children afloat without indebtedness, and there is actually money only for the basic essentials. We actually live very simply and in some respects frugally, and we are distressed at the never-ending prospect of having to continue to do the same. The news carries stories of fabulous spending proposals, increased taxes, etc. When are we to have some of our own money to spend for something we want beyond necessary housing and food? (We drive a 12-year-old car, do not have TV, a freezer, clothes washer and dryer, hi-fi, etc., etc.). My income as a wage earner is well above the national average, I have an excellent job, yet we do not have money above the costs of very simple living.

We are also distressed at the disproportionate part of the proposed budget allocated to the Farm Program and to Veterans. Eleven percent of 77 billion is planned for these two programs. That seems preposterous. It is not only out of proportion in terms of the budget, it is way out of proportion in terms of the percentage of population served. I say this, being a veteran of 4 years service in the Army in World War II. I also make these statements having a brother who is a farmer (chickens and cattle, and my father, while living, a cattle rancher, and a colleague whose father is a dairyman.) All three have stated independently that they are hurt, and have been for years, by the Farm Program. Then, indeed, the existence of, and the problem of surpluses is something just unacceptable by any kind of rationalization.

Probably more distressing than any of these specific issues is the fact that there is

no evidence apparent to the people anymore, of Government by the people, for the people, and of the people based on the principles upon which this declaration was made. This declaration didn't state by, of, or for part of the people, nor did it say that part which has a vested interest here or there and lobbies most ardently, nor did it say that part which could contribute amply to a political party campaign chest, or respond to politician's techniques for running popularity contests at election time.

When only 10 percent of the population are farmers, and of that group, only 13 percent of those farmers who grow wheat, approved the initial farm support program, for which we all are paying year after year, how can that be justified by any reasonable explanation as of, by, and for the people? For which people? I resent paying for it. The same is true of the Veterans program. I served my country so that it could continue to serve me by guaranteeing freedom and liberty in a certain pattern of life. That has been accomplished. My country does not have an obligation thereby to support me for the remainder of my life! I'm every bit as capable of that, as before I went into the service. Ah, for a Congress that legislates from basic principles rather than ulterior motive.

I feel just as strongly about legislation to control abuses in the labor union movement (I am a member of and officer in a local union). This legislation is necessary for the well being of 177 million people. How many people are honestly represented by those lobbying for or against. It was disgraceful that the last Congress failed to pass such legislation. Only a few basic changes will do the trick: secret ballot in union elections, publication of financial status, strong control of and time limitations (6 months) on union trusteeships, and outlaw with no exceptions the secondary boycott. Pass Federal laws that will be possible to prosecute without exception. Use the F.B.I. Don't leave the problem to local district attorneys. They now fail to bring racketeers to trial and exclusion from society. I can't understand why we are so fearful of Communists and their dangers to us, yet we permit mobsters and gangsters to function in places of power over great parts of the population, to our serious detriment, and find we have a Congress sensitive about passing effective legislation, presumably for fear of not being reelected. It makes one wonder who is electing our Congress?

These are some of our thoughts about which we ask your considertion, and the exercise of your influence in accomplishing sound legislation based on principles of integrity and equity.

Very sincerely yours,

HAROLD S. DANENHOWER.

Hon. Harry McGregor

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, when one has served 18 years here in this great legislative body, the bonds welded are strong and they go deep. Between HARRY MCGREGOR and myself there was an even closer tie than most because we shared a special election on February 27, 1940.

A pleasant companion and a good friend—a hard-working Congressman and a loyal citizen—such was HARRY MCGREGOR. One could disagree with him as, I confess, I often did, but disagreement interfered not at all with our friendship. As Ohio whip he served the Republican Party and the Ohio Republican delegation well.

Tireless in his efforts to serve his constituents he gave himself with enthusiasm to work in their behalf, keeping in close touch with their hopes, their fears, their concrete desires, and their needs. The 17th District will miss his heartful service, Ohio will miss his constant watchful work in her interests and the United States a faithful worker in these Halls.

To his fine children and grandchildren I do extend my warmest sympathy and the hope that they know with deep certainty that—

They have not died
They live and breathe with you
They walk now, here at your side
They tell you things are true.
They live, they know, they see
They shout with every breath
All is Eternal Life.
There is no death.

"Up Came Hill"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, too often the stress and strain of current events distort and exaggerate the geographical differences among our people of the North, South, East, and West.

In the broader area of national understanding, however, there are frequent and encouraging signs that ancient prejudices and hatreds are being buried beneath a recognition of the fact that a man's worth should not be measured by the geographical accident of place of birth or by the manner in which he approaches the pronunciation of certain syllables.

Recently, Congress in joint session heard a moving tribute to Abraham Lincoln. Countless people from the North think with affection of the gentle Robert E. Lee.

Any man who contributes to true historical perspective, recognizing ability and merit without respect to the Mason-Dixon line, deserves commendation.

That is why, today, I call attention to a great new book, "Up Came Hill," which brings to life a Confederate general, A. P. Hill, whose deeds too long have been hidden from the true light of history.

This book was written by a distinguished resident of my home city, Judge Martin Schenck. I know something of the monumental labor which went into this lively and readable book.

Most significant to me, however, is the fact that a busy northern gentleman should give so much of himself to provide full measure of historical right to a man who fought in the Confederate Army.

It is one more indication that we are, despite surface signs, a united nation.

Need for Curbing the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, a recent commentary by Mr. J. Wayne Poucher, radio minister for Life Line Foundation, Inc., a religious and patriotic educational movement, summed up forthrightly the case in favor of curbing the unconstitutional power the Supreme Court has assumed for itself.

Mr. Poucher's address, broadcast over a large number of radio stations throughout the country, deserves wide circulation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place its text in the RECORD.

Last December the American Farm Bureau Federation, meeting in convention in Boston, joined the list of organizations that have called on Congress to place limitations on the power of the Supreme Court of the United States. In a resolution adopted without opposition, the convention said it was "seriously concerned over the present tendency of the Supreme Court to legislate with the acquiescence of the executive branch."

The resolution, adopted by the Farm Bureau Federation, stated:

"The framers of our Constitution never intended that there should be vested in the Supreme Court of the United States power to legislate, power to distort the plain language of the Constitution, or power to interfere with matters of purely State and local concern where the constitutional privileges and immunities of citizens are in no way abridged."

The Farm Bureau Federation recommended, as other respected organizations have recommended, that Congress lay down proper limitations upon the appellate jurisdiction of the Court and that Congress use its powers to enact corrective legislation in those fields where the Supreme Court has invaded the legislative area.

Now, why is it that urgent calls for curbing the Supreme Court are coming from such groups as the Farm Bureau Federation and the Conference of State Chief Justices and the American Bar Association's Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives?

The answer is not hard to find.

The answer lies in such Supreme Court decisions as those—

That threw out the convictions of 14 California Communists;

That ruled against firing a Federal Government employee suspected of being a security risk;

That decreed the FBI files must be opened to criminals or Communists when the contents of those files were being used to prosecute the criminals or Communists;

That held past membership in the Communist Party is not a bar to the practice of law;

That destroyed the right of States to try Communists under sedition laws;

That held the State Department cannot deny American passports to persons with known records in support of the international Communist conspiracy.

No, it is not surprising that so many sound organizations and so many patriotic Americans are demanding that a halt be called to the way the Supreme Court is encroaching on the powers of the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

In ancient days it was held that the king could do no wrong. But this is the year 1959, and the Supreme Court is not—and was never designed by our Constitution to be—a holy, final, supreme authority.

The word "supreme" in the phrase "Supreme Court" means only that the Court is the highest tribunal in the Federal court system. It does not mean, and was never intended to mean, that members of the Court are supreme over the Congress, the President, the States, and the people.

The United States Constitution established the Supreme Court as a judicial body to say what the law is. But the Supreme Court as now constituted makes law—yes, and unmakes law.

Since 1932 the Supreme Court has departed on no less than 35 occasions from decisions previously rendered. In all our national history before 1932, there had been only 29 such reversals.

All over the United States, lawyers and judges are forced to fumble around to try to determine just what the law may happen to be at the moment. That has happened because the Supreme Court has abandoned, in so many decisions, the Constitution and the written law.

The Court not only has caused chaos in the matter of interpretation of the law. It also has created serious gaps in our internal security system. It has gravely hampered the continuing effort to protect our American freedom from the insidious and never-ceasing attacks of the mistaken who hate freedom.

These are serious indictments, but they are justified by the facts. They are indictments drawn by men who know the law and also by other men who, without legal training, nevertheless understand our Constitution and know that document established a Federal Government composed of three separate and distinct branches—the legislative, the judicial, and the executive.

When the Supreme Court steps over the line drawn for it by the Constitution, the people have both the right and the duty to protest. The people are protesting, and they should be heard.

Indeed, they must be heard—for the sake of America and for the sake of freedom.

Walter, Hoover Lauded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. E. F. Hutton which appeared in the Palm Beach Post of February 25, 1959:

TWO MEN
(By E. F. Hutton)

The country owes much to two men, Congressman FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania, the courageous chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the unflinching head of the F.B.I.

These two men have been subjected to more sinister and malignant abuse than any other public officials of our time. Most of this is cooked in a Moscow pot and served by both those who know, and do not know, the cook.

The sad part is that so many well-meaning but simple minded innocents scatter as Christian food what is actually Communist poison. Many such innocents are church and college officials.

Every time a new Congress convenes, a determined effort is made to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee. This year the chosen spokesman was Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California.

As Congressman WALTER said of him, "He is the only person I know who has no criticism of the committee but wants to abolish it."

Mr. ROOSEVELT'S mother is a longtime enemy of the committee, and added her name to a newspaper advertisement in a Washington paper demanding its abolition.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover expressed his approval of the committee. It was not abolished.

This was only part of the Communist campaign to conquer our country from within. That business, labor and Hollywood celebrities fawned on the smiling murderer, Mikoyan, shows the importance of the House committee and the F.B.I.

Address by the Honorable Clifford Davis Before the Fire Department Instructors Conference, in Memphis, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include an excellent address by our colleague, the Honorable CLIFFORD DAVIS, before the Fire Department Instructors Conference, in Memphis, Tenn., on Tuesday, February 24, 1959.

CLIFFORD DAVIS is a brilliant speaker and I am sure the people attending the conference appreciated him taking the time out of his busy schedule to speak to them. The address should be read by every person interested in fire prevention and fire fighting. It follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I acknowledge with genuine gratitude the honor which you have accorded me today. This is the second time that I have had the pleasure of speaking on an occasion of this character. Six years ago we met on the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the Fire Department Instructors Conference, and now I am grateful for the opportunity to discuss with you briefly the past 25 years in Memphis.

On this occasion it is natural for me to give you the unusual history of these many annual meetings in our city of Memphis. Soon after I assumed the office of fire and police commissioner I was able to name the late Irby Klinck, chief. He was one of the most beloved and finished firemen I have known anything about. A man of courage, ability and high character, he became my genuine, devoted friend and a loyal worker in the truest description of the term.

I shall never forget the chief coming to me one morning 25 years ago and stating that we had an opportunity to entertain this conference. In those days we were making every effort to make more efficient a fire department which had already shown fine progress.

Chief Klinck was a natural-born firefighter. For the first time in the history of our department he recognized as chief the value of training, fire prevention, and the development of more scientific methods in combating fire.

Recognizing the possibilities of such a meeting, I went to work enthusiastically as fire commissioner to support him.

In that first Memphis meeting only 106 men registered from 18 States, but it did not take me long to see the extreme value of the organization to the Memphis Fire Department and to the Nation. In those days our dear friend, Richard Vernor, who has since gone to his reward, was the dynamic originator and leader in this whole program. He was truly a dedicated man.

On the concluding day of the conference I took the platform and urged him to bring the conference back to Memphis the next year and was even so bold as to suggest that this should be the permanent meeting place of the meeting. He and his associates considered the invitation and returned. Originally we met in the fire headquarters, a rather antiquated building even in those days.

It was our idea that the department serve a daily complimentary luncheon. My warm friend, Mayor Overton, who is now deceased, fairly hit the ceiling when he signed the voucher covering a payment for onions, potatoes, and coffee, for the fire department. I know that you are still eating at noon and that the department is participating in those luncheons. Who pays for the 2,500 odd plates represented by the fantastic increase in attendance last year, I do not know, but if the city of Memphis is taking care of the entire cost, it is still ahead.

To me it is inspiring to know that John Klinck, now the chief officer of this department, is following in the footsteps of his splendid father in his recognition of the dividends which come from this conference, and is giving his best as co-chairman of this meeting.

I had the pleasure to give John Klinck his first employment. He came to the service upon completing his high school work. His father and I thought it would be temporary. Possessed of all the fine attributes of that father, he brought to this place of responsibility a scholastic education not possessed by his father. In addition he had the vision of youth and an amazing ability for organization.

I am delighted to know that my successors in the office of fire and police commissioner have supported the department and this conference, but I am simply delighted and thrilled with the accomplishments made under the direction of Commissioner Claude Armour.

To my mind, he is one of the best informed, most industrious fire commissioners in all of this country. His knowledge of firefighting organization, his vision for the future are outstanding.

On Sunday when I went through the Claude Armour Training and Communications Center, so appropriately named in recognition of his service to Memphis and the Mid-South, I could not help but think that this building and everything that goes within it shall ever stand as a lasting monument to his effectiveness and worth in this field.

I could not help but be just a little envious when I learned that already a million dollars had been expended in this center, and when completed its value should approximate $2½

million. When I left the city as fire and police commissioner, 19 years ago, our fire department budget for all purposes was only a million dollars.

But in these last 19 years this city has just about doubled in size, populationwise. In industry, manufacturing, finance, and in all other segments of the economy, it has grown even more amazingly. With the additional area more men, fire stations, and equipment have been required. It has taken very careful planning on the part of the commissioner to provide all of this, as he has done so well.

So it is quite natural today that I should tell you that the spirit of this department, its development, its growth, is acceptance of scientific and specialized techniques, must relate itself directly to the very spirit of this Fire Department Instructors Conference.

Memphis is proud of the finest firefighting equipment in the country, and the department is composed of intelligent, well-trained, and high-spirited men from top to bottom. Memphis has gone on to win fire awards too numerous to mention. Your conference has brought to Memphis, the South, and to the Nation, a clinic so valuable that no one will know the number of lives saved, the property conserved, and the scientific gains accomplished.

This conference is unique in that there is no promotion, no politics, and no organizational difficulties. The annual attendance has grown fantastically.

Represented by a group of serious-minded people in exchanging ideas and experiences to be mutually helpful, this organization has grown without promotion on its own through a real job of program development by the Western Actuarial Bureau, and superb planning by the Memphis Fire Department and the cooperation of intelligent, experienced, and wise officers and instructors from fire departments throughout the land.

Unselfish appearances of learned professors and scientific minds from the colleges and universities along with the appearance of governmental officials and representatives of industry and business have made this conference outstanding.

It was in this very city that the first demonstration of a civil defense municipal control center was demonstrated. It was here at this meeting that 50 industries sent their people in 1952, as did over 50 bases of the Armed Forces.

During World War II, the chiefs of 105 explosive ordnance plants were in attendance. While many of you return from year to year, there is still a turnover of 40 percent which denotes the permanency of the organization on the one hand and the opportunity to sow the seed of ambitious progress on the other.

Fire is as old as the world itself. We have but to go back to history to see the damage that it has wrought.

In Rome, about the year 46 B.C., Julius Caesar had nearly completed the construction of the Basilica Julia, a magnificent law courts building, when it was almost destroyed by fire. After the assassination of Caesar 2 years later, Augustus completed the structure as Caesar had intended. Even after all these years, the platform still remains a relic of architectural antiquity and of a serious fire of ancient history.

In the year 64 years after Christ, Rome was nearly destroyed by a fire that burned for several days.

Passing on to 1666 history records the great London fire which consumed the ancient Cathedral of St. Paul, 86 churches, the royal exchange, customs-house, hospitals, libraries, and prisons.

Previous to the year 1795, the town of Boston, then such a flourishing city of science, culture, and enterprise, was visited by a score of fires extensive in their destruction and frightful in desolation. The distressing calamities which had come to Boston from destructive fires induced the people to make the prevention of fire and the relief of sufferers one of their firts objects of charity and philanthropy. The National Fire Protection Association, so ably directed to Percy Bugbee, today has its headquarters in that city of Boston, which appreciated the importance of early fire improvements.

I could go on to mention the New York City fire of 1835 and many others. Perhaps the most spectacular fire in all history, which turned the thoughts of the Nation more vividly and intelligently to improving building ordinances and the beginning of firefighting techniques, was the great Chicago fire which began on Sunday evening, October 8, 1871, in the O'Leary stable.

Would that I had time to review again the dramatics and the serious consequences of this conflagration, but suffice to say that in its fury demon fire knows not wealth, nor creed, nor race, nor station in life. When the last glowing ember had been extinguished, in that Chicago fire, 17,000 homes were in ruins, 90,000 were homeless, 300 lives had been lost. Property, valued even in those days of values, reflected a loss of more than $200 million, and five square miles lay a smouldering waste.

But one may say, "Those fires occurred many years ago. Haven't our improved firefighting equipment, our more drastic fire laws, and better-trained firemen made such holocausts impossible?" The answer is "No."

Every year we have some 40 major fire catastrophies in which large areas of cities, towns, and forest lands are burned and hundreds of lives are lost.

We have but to remember the tragic Cocoanut Grove fire in Boston, in 1942, and the Rhythm Club in Natchez, Miss., a year before. Except for the number of fatalities, it was the same ghastly story as its successor in Boston—a crowd beyond capacity, insufficient eixts, flimsy drapes and decorations that burned like gunpowder, frantic guests fighting for their lives and falling unconscious.

Then there was the Winecoff Hotel fire in Atlanta. The terrible Bar Harbor, Maine, destruction, and we remember afresh, vividly and with sadness the unfortunate school fire in Chicago last year.

All of these fires which I have mentioned made headlines because they reeked with tragedy, drama, and sensationalism. Yet these great conflagrations are but a fraction of our fire losses. For every great fire that is broadly publicized, thousands of American homes are burned without mention in current news.

The flame of a gas stove, the burning match, the lighted cigarette, the electric iron, the toaster on the breakfast table all become symbols of disaster.

A fire breaks out in the United States every 20 seconds. A human life is sacrificed every 44 minutes.

It is a well-established and accepted fact that the power of ignition inherent in animal and vegetable substances is often the cause of spontaneous combustion. Cotton, shavings and sawdust, hemp, flax, oily and greasy rags or rubbish, charcoal, turpentine, paint materials, tarred rope, felt and sulphur are susceptible to low degrees of heat and are often the cause of fire.

There is nothing more frightful than the onrush of a blaze. The hurtling speed, the roaring motors of pumpers, of ladders, and hose trucks, the chorus of bellowing sirens, the grim faces of firemen precariously hanging on the hand rails, the opening furrow in traffic ahead as the right-of-way is given to fire fighters, the first glimpse of the lurid blaze and billowing smoke, the throbbing of the pumping engines, the clatter and thud of rising ladders, the orderly tangle of hose lines, hoarse shouts of command, the impassioned calls, "Water! Water!" the hissing streams from nozzles gleaming in the glare of searchlights, the hideous crackling and grumbling of flames, the heroism of unselfish men, the back-breaking drudgery, the discipline and orderly procedure, the skill and the knowledge gained from experience and at fire school, the complexity of the fire equipment, the drama, the tragedy, the heartbreak, the terror of victims, and the horror on the faces of an assembled crowd found at every fire make for a common understanding of the role that the fireman plays in our everyday life.

As we have seen gains in our march to improved pumping machinery, safety devices, water systems, we must not lose sight of the value of education. We must recognize the importance of the school program with its fire drills. The lessons learned by the young ones will be taken home to parents.

Fire Prevention Week, so effective in so many places, must be strengthened and encouraged. We must never overlook an opportunity to encourage civic and luncheon clubs in the consideration of fire problems.

Newspapers have always been effective and willing to dramatize the spectacular. We must ever be alert to give them short, effective and readable stories on how to prevent the smallest fire.

The night watchman, who for centuries has smoked a pipe and pulled his clock, must be taught the simple rudiments and later advanced by degrees to a better understanding of his tremendous task.

The radio and television may be used to inform and enlighten the people. The chief officer of the fire department today may well use a television film of actual fires for post mortem material, study, and improvement.

We know today that effective apparatus must be used and speed attained in conveying it to the scene of action. It has long been axiomatic that you can never make up on the road for the time you lost in the firehouse.

A smart fire officer encourages the utmost assistance from representatives of light, gas, telephone, and water utilities. Often these men go unnoticed and unrecognized, but it is they who cut electric lines, remove the danger of high power systems, and add to the sum total of safety.

It is the endeavor of all firemen to find every arrangement that will insure the application of water or chemical on a fire in its early stage. The wooden shingle has gone but new problems in construction are with us. Old hazards may have passed away. Gas is no longer used for illumination, but electricity has changed the construction of mercantile establishments and air-conditioning systems close many buildings tightly, leaving no easy places for ventilation. Plastics and chemicals have come a long-way, as has television, the use of natural gas and now, atomic energy.

The Claude Armour Training and Communications Center, and all of our educational programs must advance to meet the requirements of specialization.

Uppermost in the minds of all the people at this moment is the conservation of our resources, the conservation of health, education, and opportunity. Water is short in many parts of the country. No longer can fire departments waste this valuable asset. Indeed, so-called wet water and chemicals and scientific use of this powerful weapon must be continually improved.

Communities that have put forth extraordinary effort in teaching fire prevention and the enforcement of fire laws have been rewarded by a substantial decrease in the number of fires, the number of lives saved, and the amount of property destroyed or damaged.

In this short period of a luncheon talk, I have tried to cover a lot of ground. But I am the first to admit that much more should have been said. If a description of the be-

ginning of this conference in Memphis, the long historical background of the fire department profession, the need for applied specialization, training, prevention, and the necessity for public cooperation, along with the plea for continued application to high principle, be of any value, my hope is that my presence with you today may have been of some little worth.

Low Bid Effects $6 Million Saving in TVA Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable comment on this floor and in the RECORD about the award by the TVA of a contract for a turbogenerator to A. C. Parsons, Ltd., of England. I appreciate that these discussions by my colleagues have been motivated by the interests of their constituents and a high sense of patriotism. But some of the discussion has not taken full cognizance of all the factors and facts in regard to this award. In order to present all the facts I requested the Board of Directors of the TVA to supply me with a statement on this award and I am inserting this statement in the Appendix of the RECORD under unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, the statement speaks for itself. However, I might point out a few salient facts in brief summary.

First. The TVA is required by statute to purchase by competitive bidding whenever possible and practicable.

Second. The bid of A. C. Parson, Ltd., was the only bid that was responsive and legally acceptable.

Third. The Executive order of December 17, 1954, prescribing the operation of the Buy American Act provides that purchases shall be made from competing foreign sources if the domestic price exceeds the amount of a foreign bid by 6 percent, or, if the domestic bidder is in an area of substantial unemployment, by 12 percent. In its invitation for bids, the TVA announced that it would accept the lowest domestic bid if it did not exceed the lowest bid by 20 percent. This was in addition to the import duty differential.

Fourth. The bids of the domestic concerns were in fact 50 percent higher than that of A. C. Parsons.

Fifth. The Parsons bid was firm, whereas the domestic bids were subject to escalation clauses. Furthermore, the Parsons bid was the only one which met the invitational requirement for payment of damage in the event of delay in delivery.

Sixth. The contention that the differential in the bids was the result in differentials in wages here and abroad is not supported by facts. The TVA computes that the wage differential would account for no more than $1.5 million, which is less than the import duty.

Seventh. It has been implied that this purchase will be paid for by tax funds. Actually, the funds to pay for this equipment will come from the TVA's power revenues—contributed by TVA's customers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to no one in my desire to protect and encourage our own American industry and I doubt that any single agency or institution has contributed as much to the development and growth of our American electrical industry as has the TVA. The statement of the TVA makes it clear that the TVA went far beyond all legal requirements to give our domestic manufacturers an advantage in the bidding. As pointed out by Chairman Vogel of the TVA Board over the years the TVA has purchased $348,918,170 worth of equipment from Pennsylvania; this amounts to almost one-sixth of all the money the TVA has spent since it was started. The TVA purchases from New York State have amounted to $189,965,956, or nearly one-tenth of all TVA purchases. Most of this has gone to the two manufacturers who now complain of the loss of the contract on which a $6 million savings was effected.

I commend the attention of my colleagues to the TVA statement so that there may be a full knowledge of all the facts and circumstances and with fairness to all concerned. The letter and statement follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., February 26, 1959.
The Honorable JOE L. EVINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EVINS: We are glad to respond to your request for detailed information on the award by TVA of a contract to C. A. Parsons & Co., Ltd., of England, for a 500,000-kilowatt turbogenerator to be installed at the Colbert steam plant near Tuscumbia, Ala.

We enclose a full statement of the facts concerning this award to the Parsons firm. Underlying the consideration of all factors involved in this award is the saving to TVA of more than $6 million. The effects upon national defense and domestic employment are detailed in the statement.

It may interest you, in addition, to know that TVA purchases, to date, from New York State amount to $189,965,956 and from Pennsylvania, $348,918,170. These are the States in which this country's principal turbogenerator manufacturing plants are located.

Sincerely,

HERBERT D. VOGEL,
Chairman of the Board.

STATEMENT BY TVA ON PURCHASE OF TURBOGENERATOR FROM C. A. PARSONS & CO., LTD., ENGLAND

On February 6, 1959, TVA purchased a 500,000-kilowatt turbogenerator, to be installed at the Colbert steam plant near Tuscumbia, Ala., from C. A. Parsons & Co., Ltd., of England. The delivered price will be $12,095,800.

The purchase, made under competitive bidding procedures required by the TVA Act, was based on the following considerations:

1. The evaluated Parsons bid was more than $6 million lower than the evaluated bids of the only other bidders—Westinghouse Electric Corp. and General Electric Co.—both American firms.

2. Full compliance with the provisions of the Buy American Act and established national policy on foreign purchases.

3. A determination that Parsons is qualified, technically competent and adequately equipped to build and deliver the turbogenerator on schedule.

4. Assurance that Parsons is able to provide promptly, any repair service and replacement parts which may be necessary during the life of the machine.

Prior to the final action by the TVA Board in purchasing the turbogenerator from C. A. Parsons, all the factors involved, including such considerations as national security, were subjected to a detailed and intensive study.

Some subsequent public comment indicates a lack of understanding or of facts on the matter. This statement has been prepared to provide those facts.

WHY DID TVA SEEK FOREIGN BIDS?

For some time TVA has been disturbed by the rising prices of turbogenerators. There are only three American firms which manufacture large turbogenerators. Since 1951 the prices charged by these manufacturers for such equipment have increased by more than 50 percent, while the average wholesale price of all commodities has increased only about 5 percent.

It was this history of price increases by the only U.S. suppliers which led TVA to invite bids from qualified foreign manufacturers as well as domestic ones.

WHO WAS INVITED TO BID?

TVA invited bids from the three U.S. manufacturers and the two leading British manufacturers of large steam power generating equipment. Bids were received from three companies: the Westinghouse Corp., the General Electric Co., and C. A. Parsons & Co., Ltd.

In its invitation to bidders TVA set forth certain factors that would be taken into account in comparing bids. These included differences in guaranteed efficiency of the machine, differences in escalation of prices, and willingness of the manufacturer to pay specified damages if the machines were not delivered on time.

COMPARISON OF THE BIDS

Before reflecting the evaluation factors just referred to, the base bids received were as follows:

Parsons (including duty)	$12,095,800
General Electric	17,563,000
Westinghouse	17,633,000

The Parsons price was firm, while the bids from General Electric and Westinghouse were subject to escalation clauses. After adjustments for efficiency and escalation, the evaluated bids compared as follows:

Parsons	$13,140,700
Westinghouse	19,453,725
General Electric	19,673,780

The evaluated General Electric and Westinghouse bid were thus nearly 50 percent higher than the Parsons bid.

Moreover, of the three bidders only Parsons indicated a willingness to accept a contract containing the provision specified in the invitation for payment of damages in the event of delay in delivery. General Electric and Westinghouse both took specific exception to the provision. This exception constituted a material deviation from the terms of the invitation which rendered their bids unresponsive and unacceptable even if one of them had been a low bidder.

This provision for liquidated damages is a very important one. A number of the large generating units which TVA has bought in recent years have been delivered late, and TVA has had to incur substantial additional costs as a result. Inclusion of a liquidated damages provision in the final contract gives TVA added assurance that Parsons will give its full attention to making delivery within the time necessary to meet TVA's requirements as specified in the invitation.

NATIONAL POLICY ON THE ACCEPTANCE OF FOREIGN BIDS BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

National policy governing purchases of foreign equipment has been established by the Congress in the Buy American Act and by the President, in Executive Order 10582 of December 17, 1954, prescribing the manner in which all Federal agencies shall apply the Buy American Act. The act provides generally for purchase of domestic articles, materials and supplies, unless their cost is determined to be unreasonable as compared to foreign goods. The Executive order provides that ordinarily the offered price of materials of domestic origin shall be deemed to be unreasonable and purchase shall be made from competing foreign source if the domestic price exceeds the amount of a foreign bid by more than 6 percent. If the low domestic bidder is in an area of substantial unemployment, a 12 percent differential is used in accordance with a recommendation of the Council of Foreign Economic Policy.

TVA'S INVITATION FAVORED DOMESTIC MANUFACTURERS

TVA stated in its invitation for bids on the 500,000-kilowatt turbogenerator that it would accept the lowest bid from a U.S. manufacturer if it did not exceed the lowest foreign bid by more than 20 percent. (Such an increase in the price advantage for domestic manufacturers is permitted under the Executive order if the Government agency involved determines that it has sufficient reason to increase the differential. If, under these conditions, purchase is made from a domestic manufacturer the agency is required to submit a special report on the matter to the President.)

This price advantage given to U.S. manufacturers was in addition to the import duty which would have to be paid by the foreign manufacturer.

The import duty which will be paid by Parsons amounts to about $1.5 million. The additional 20 percent advantage provided for domestic manufacturers, based on Parsons' evaluated bid, was over $2.6 million. Therefore, the total price advantage enjoyed by domestic bidders as a result of these two items alone amounted to over $4 million. Further, foreign bidders had other added costs for such items as transocean shipping and marine insurance.

DO LOW FOREIGN WAGES ACCOUNT FOR THE DIFFERENCE IN BIDS?

One explanation which has been offered for the inability of American manufacturers to meet the foreign price competition in this field, is the difference in wages paid in this country and abroad.

Wages paid to workers in the electrical industry in England are lower than those paid by domestic manufacturers. Westinghouse says that British labor receives only 37 percent of the hourly rate paid to the electrical workers here. General Electric has suggested that the ratio is 40 percent.

Westinghouse has told TVA that 1,080,000 man-hours of work in its shops would have been involved in building the turbogenerator. General Electric is quoted as saying that 600 man-years of work, which is closely comparable to the Westinghouse man-hour estimate, would have been required. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports the average hourly wage rate in the electrical manufacturing industry for October 1958 was $2.28.

The foregoing figures suggest that differences in labor costs would be in the neighborhood of $1.5 million, and this does not allow for any greater manufacturing efficiency in the larger U.S. plants of General Electric and Westinghouse. This computed difference is less than half the price advantage provided for domestic manufacturers. In fact, it appears that the import duty is adequate to protect U.S. turbogenerator manufacturers against differences in labor costs.

THE COMPETENCE OF C. A. PARSONS & CO., LTD.

C. A. Parsons was a pioneer in steam turbines. Outside of the United States the Parsons Co. is the largest manufacturer of such equipment in the free world. Half of the turbogenerators it builds are exported. For example, it has built most of the steam power generating equipment that is operating in Canada. It has an English order for a 550,000-kilowatt unit. In fact, Parsons & Co. and General Electric are the only two companies in the world known to be building units as large as 500,000 kilowatts, General Electric now being engaged in building one such unit, which TVA ordered from it in the fall of 1957.

Before any supplier, whether domestic or foreign, is invited to submit bids on large power equipment, TVA first satisfies itself as to the company's ability to meet high standards of quality and efficiency. Further, TVA must be satisfied with the ability of the supplier to provide repairs and replacement parts with reasonable speed. In the case of the Parsons Co., as with other approved bidders, TVA appraised these qualifications by an inspection of the company's facilities and detailed discussions with its responsible officials and engineers. TVA has determined to its full satisfaction that this British firm has the plant, equipment, skills, and manpower necessary to build and service an efficient and reliable machine. Further, Parsons maintains service facilities and personnel in Canada, which are as favorably located as the corresponding facilities of the U.S. firms.

NATIONAL SECURITY

All the foregoing has a bearing on the effect on national security of this purchase from a British firm. The Parsons Co. has a good record of delivery on schedule and its guarantee is backed up by a penalty clause in the contract. There are similar assurances that the machine will be highly efficient.

Fears that competition by foreign firms will result in all or most large turbogenerators being manufactured abroad, thereby eliminating American productive capacity as a supply source in defense emergencies, are unfounded. It appears that the total capacity in the entire free world for producing such equipment is so limited that all of it, both in Europe and the United States, will normally be required to supply the large turbogenerators necessary to meet the rapidly increasing demands of this Nation and others for electric energy.

In the event of total war, the problem of repair or replacement of generating units would be about the same, whether they had been manufactured domestically or abroad. Any realistic contemplation of such a war must assume that American turbogenerator manufacturing plants could be destroyed or damaged in the same attack which might damage or destroy the unit installed in the Colbert steamplant. Early repair or replacement would seem unlikely, no matter where the unit had been built.

In event of a less-extensive attack or acts of sabotage, it should be recognized that generating units manufactured by all the major American suppliers are incorporated in the TVA system. Widespread damage to the system could result in heavy demands on all these suppliers, both by TVA and by utilities in other sections of the country. Addition of the Parsons unit to the TVA system increases the number of suppliers who can be called on in the event of such an emergency and thereby reduces the risk of delay in getting maximum capacity back into service.

Economical operation of the TVA power system, to which the saving of more than $6 million contributes, is important in the national defense budget, since half of the power from the TVA system goes to Federal defense installations. Introduction of real price competition into the turbogenerator manufacturing field makes a contribution to combating inflation. At the same time, purchase of the unit from Parsons strengthens the economic position of our ally, Great Britain.

For national security, strong allies, a healthy world trade, essential industries strengthened by stimulation of competition, are likely to be at least as important as the location of specific powerplant repair facilities. These basic purposes are served by the award of the contract under discussion to Parsons of England.

IMPACT ON EMPLOYMENT AND NATIONAL ECONOMY

TVA would regret any real net loss of employment for American workers from its purchase of an English turbogenerator. However, it seems more likely that there will a net benefit to American labor. TVA will make payment in dollars for its purchase from Parsons. It can reasonably be assumed that these dollars will be used to finance British purchases of other goods either in the United States or in third countries which will in turn use the dollars to make purchases in the United States. Those dollars can be expected to create and pay for as many man-hours of work in the United States as would have resulted from domestic manufacture of the turbogenerator.

In addition, the saving of over $6 million affects TVA's ability to provide low-cost power to farms, homes, and industrial concerns within its power service area. The availability of ample power at the lowest cost stimulates industrial employment, and enables the home consumers of this power to continue to provide the best market in the Nation for electrical appliances. The money TVA invests in generating equipment is exceeded by the purchases by consumers of TVA power of electrical appliances and equipment—more than $2 billion worth since the end of World War II—of which General Electric and Westinghouse are leading suppliers.

THE TURBOGENERATOR WILL BE PAID FOR BY THE USERS OF TVA POWER

Contrary to the impression that prevails in some quarters, the money to be spent for the turbogenerator will not come from taxes. The cost will be met from power revenues paid by the users of TVA power.

The Late Honorable J. Harry McGregor

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join today in the eulogies for our late departed colleague, HARRY MCGREGOR, with whom I was privileged to serve as a member of the minority on the Public Works Committee, having been a member of that committee since I was elected to Congress some 5 years ago.

HARRY MCGREGOR was a great public servant; HARRY MCGREGOR was an outstanding American; HARRY MCGREGOR was the ranking minority member of the Roads Subcommittee of the Public

Works Committee, and through his sponsorship of legislation the great interstate and other Federal-aid highway systems came closer to fruition than at any time previously. It was through his efforts and sponsorship of legislation that the forerunners of the great 1956 Interstate and Defense Highway Act came into being. It was his bill, his sponsorship of legislation in the Republican 83d Congress that resulted in the passage of the forerunner of the great highway system act in the 84th and the 85th Congresses. This great Interstate and Defense Highway System is a monument and a tribute to HARRY MCGREGOR. He was more interested and qualified in this subject, I venture to say, than any other Member of the House has been in recent years.

It was indeed a pleasure to serve with him, and it was my great pleasure and privilege to come to know of his ability and dedication on the Public Works Committee. He succeeded as ranking Republican member the Honorable George Dondero who in his turn served with equal ability and distinction.

J. HARRY MCGREGOR was a man of deep conviction, he was a man of sound judgment. He was a man who did not hesitate to get up on the floor and present those principles in which he believed and to fight for them. He was a hard-working and aggressive man, and as a freshman and since I have deemed it a high privilege to serve with him. He gave the greatest leadership and encouragement to me as a member of the Public Works Committee. His understanding of the problems faced by new Members, and his helpfulness to them will linger long not only in my memory but also in the memory of many others in the Congress who came to know him and seek his wise counsel in recent years. It is a high honor for me to join in these eulogies of our departed colleague. He was a great man, an outstanding American J. HARRY MCGREGOR.

What the State of Virginia Plans To Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, in preparation for the forthcoming observance of the Civil War centennial, we have now functioning in the State of Virginia an active program looking toward what we hope to be one of the most significant commemorations in our history. We have established what is known as the Virginia Civil War Commission, which is now planning Virginia's observance of the centennial, and extensive preparations are being made in various parts of our State in connection with this event. Virginia's points of interest are well known to people throughout the country, but we are hoping during this observance to enlarge upon what has already been done and to better publicize the fine historical points which have connection with the Civil War period.

Mr. James J. Geary, executive director of the Virginia Civil War Commission, has been most active in this connection, and recently he made a very splendid address before the Civil War Centennial Conference, held at Chapel Hill, N.C. His address was entitled "What the State of Virginia Plans To Do," and I wish to include herein the text of his address, as I feel that it will be of interest to those who are looking forward to this event:

WHAT THE STATE OF VIRGINIA PLANS TO DO

(Address by Mr. James J. Geary, executive director of the Virginia Civil War Commission, before the Civil War centennial conference, Chapel Hill, N.C., February 28, 1959.)

Dr. Crittenden, ladies and gentlemen, it is a sincere pleasure for me to be here with this group, interested in the Civil War centennial and meeting at this fine university, of Virginia's great neighboring State of North Carolina. I bring you greetings from the Virginia Civil War Commission.

One of the developments for which our Virginia commission is most eager is for North Carolina and all of our sister States of the South to join with us in actively planning for this momentous 4-year Civil War centennial. One member of our commisison has spent a lot of his own time writing to friends in Southern States attempting to stimulate the formation of State centennial commissions. We feel the time so needed for making plans is slipping away, and that we Southern States must not let someone else do all the running with the ball.

Recently at our request Virginia's Governor Almond wrote to the Governors of the other Southern States. He urged that they use their good offices in the interest of legislation creating centennial commissions within their States and appropriating the necessary funds for their use. The response was gratifying. ome said that commissions already had been appointed—though without funds to work with. Others said legislation was pending, either for the creation of commissions, for appropriations of funds, or for both. I believe Virginia is still the only Southern State with a legislatively created centennial commission and money to work with. We sincerely hope that there will soon be active commissions in all the Southern States. We need you, and we want your help.

I'm to talk on "What the State of Virginia Plans To Do." I've been in this job full time for almost 4 months. I've been thinking about it night and day. I seek all the advice I can get. Most people just shake their heads and say, "It is a big job." It's been like driving along on a foggy morning. Sometimes the fog clears a little and you catch a glimpse of something, and then its all cloudy again. And so you keep on driving, hoping that in time the fog will lift, and you will be able to see clearly the road ahead.

Suppose you suddenly found yourself with an office and a secretary and this assignment: plan and coordinate for 4 years the centennial of the American Civil War; plan and coordinate, over a 4-year period, the 100th anniversary of a national emotional convulsion so profound and so extensive that no one today really understands it.

Well, we're driving ahead through the fog in Virginia—feeling our way. And we've accomplished a few things. We've gotten some publicity; we believe we've started some people to thinking about the centennial; and we're laying the groundwork for an organization. I have traveled over much of the State, attending meetings, being introduced, letting people know that we are in business. And invariably I've told them that in the final analysis it is they—the people of the individual localities—who must be responsible for much of the observance of this centennial. We cannot do it in Richmond. We can only help. Last Monday, at a meeting of our executive committee, a delegation from a certain area of the State, interested in the centennial, showed up to ask what we are going to do. I think one of the members of our committee gave a very apt answer. He said: "We are going to try to stimulate you to do whatever you want to do." No State commission by itself can put on a 4-year centennial program. It couldn't do it if it had the money—and it won't have the money.

In Virginia we have welcomed with open arms all qualified groups who have come forward and volunteered to do a job. The Richmond Academy of Medicine, long interested in medical history, offered its services, and our commission designated it as the organization in Virginia to portray the medical aspects of the war. At Newport News there is a wonderful privately endowed institution dedicated to preserving the history of man's conquest of the sea. It is called the Mariners Museum, and it has come forward with plans for a centennial exhibit on the "Effect of Sea Power on the Outcome of the War." We have designated this institution as the organization in Virginia to portray the war at sea.

A local committee at Manassas has great plans for a reenactment of the First Battle of Manassas in July of 1961. And while we certainly do not see the centennial as one reenactment after another, we have caught some of the enthusiasm of this group and the commission has given its hearty endorsement to their plans. So we will go all out for First Manassas, the first great battle of the war, in the hopes that it will focus attention on the whole centennial.

We've had some conversations about a possible reenactment of the *Merrimac-Monitor* encounter. There are some who feel it would be preferable to have an indoor exhibit of this great sea battle, with models, so that hundreds of thousands or millions of persons could see it over 4 years instead of simply a few thousand on 2 or 3 or 4 days.

But what are some of the things that can be done in those communities well removed from any major engagements? Recently a wonderful, simple suggestion came from a Richmond man who probably knows more about the Richmond battlefields than any man alive, Mr. J. Ambler Johnston, a distinguished architect. Why not, he said, have rededications of the monuments that stand in virtually every county courthouse square in memory of the men who served from that county. Have a speech by the son or the grandson of the man who made the original dedicatory speech when the monument was erected 50 or 75 years ago. Have a local group get together the names of all who served from that county, along with the names of the regiments or corps. Get people thinking and organizing on the grass roots level, and half the battle is won.

Now, of course, many things can be done on the State level—depending on how much money you have. You can have State exhibits, educational programs, radio, television and outdoor drama, publications, documentary films, contests, scholarships, fellowships. You can mark the sites of engagements, rename highways, purchase property, acquire valuable documents and artifacts. And you can encourage scholarly research.

In Virginia we are already at work on a commemorative one-volume selection of the wartime papers and letters of Gen. Robert E. Lee. Strangely enough, General Lee's papers have never been gathered in a single publication, though many of them are scattered through various published books.

This is an expensive project. Even though a publishing house has agreed to underwrite the manufacturing and promotion of the book, the editorial costs to the State will probably be in the neighborhood of $25,000.

I am glad that we are doing this, for it will be a permanent contribution to scholarship and the history of the Civil War. And the sterling character of Robert E. Lee can be an inspiration to all young people. We hope this book will be sufficiently readable that it will command a relatively good sale.

For my part, however, I would not like to see our program, or yours, topheavy with projects of a scholarly nature, which must appeal to a very limited audience—and to an audience which already is interested in the Civil War. No one do we need so much as the historian, and the history-minded student. With their help, let us make the centennial program one that will appeal to the other 99 percent of the people. Let us stimulate—however briefly—in the man or woman, the boy or girl, who does not normally think much about these things, an understanding and a reverence for the American spirit and heroism that was shown on both sides in that epic struggle—that American tragedy—of 100 years ago.

Some Facts About the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in my newsletter last week I called the attention of the people of the great Fourth District of Tennessee, which I have the honor to represent, to some facts about the President's budget which have not received as much discussion and consideration as, in my view, they deserve.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting this newsletter in the Appendix of the RECORD. The newsletter follows:

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE BUDGET

The Appropriations Committee of the House is continuing its hearings, studies, and consideration of all aspects of the President's budget proposals.

Everybody wants economy in Government and everyone wants a balanced budget for the Nation. These are the objectives to be desired. However, in the widespread discussions and debates about the limit and extent of the budget, there are certain facts that have not received much discussion.

For example, we hear much talk about "the wild spending in the Congress." What many sometimes do not realize is that much of this so-called wild spending comes about by the recommendations of the President, his Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the members of the executive departments. In this connection, it should be pointed out that since 1952 the Federal budget has increased from $60 billion to $80 billion. This year the President is proposing an overall budget of $77 billion. Every year since 1952, the President has presented to the Congress larger budgets, calling for increased Federal expenditures. Every year—with the exception of last year when we were threatened with an economic depression—the Congress has reduced the budget by several billions of dollars and in 1957 by some $5 billion.

Members of the Appropriations Committee, during the current hearings, have been somewhat startled—and certainly it has been revealing—to note that every head of each executive agency, without exception, is asking for increased personnel, increased appropriations and a larger budget for their own departments. This includes the Budget Bureau itself, which is asking for an increase of 5 percent in new appropriations; and the White House where the budget has been increased by 33 percent in the past 2 years, and even the Secretary of the Treasury.

After making this closer look at the President's budget, it is apparent that the President is not recommending that spending be reduced in certain areas but rather increased. The proposed economies in the budget are almost entirely in the field of investments in new assets for the Nation, such as public works projects, the development of our own resources and loans that are repayable. In other words, the President's budget calls for cuts in capital assets and investments in the Nation and for increased expenditures in other departments. This means more spending and less investment.

Some news reports have indicated and great claims are made that the proposed budget is a balanced budget. There are several contingencies which are not realized and in all probability will not be realized. Therefore, the budget is not in reality balanced. These contingencies include again raising the postal rates to the people of the Nation—to which the Congress is not likely to give its approval—(2) increasing again gasoline taxes—(3) not considering supplemental appropriations requests, of which there are annually several in number, and (4) the sale of national mortgages and securities held by the Treasury, which would bring in some income to the Government if sold at reduced rates and with profit to private investors. In considering these contingencies and on second examination, the proposed budget is not in fact balanced because these contingencies are not likely to materialize.

The Congress will address itself to the merits of the various proposals and no doubt will approve some of the recommendations, alter and amend others and substitute, in several instances, the collective judgment of the elected Representatives of the people in substitution for departmental recommendations. Keeping in mind previous action of the Congress, it is very likely that the final budget, after all these adjustments, will come closer in reality to being balanced than the budget presented to the Congress and now under consideration.

Bank Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter written by Donald Havens, Jr., of New York City, to the editor of the Wall Street Journal. The letter appeared in the Wall Street Journal of February 19, 1959. I believe it reflects the feeling of most depositors.

BANK MERGERS

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

The current rash of bank mergers in New York strikes this observer as unnecessary and wasteful. I do not mean to make a wholesale condemnation of all the recent mergers. However, it seems that many of the combinations contemplated have been arranged solely on the grounds that increased size gives increased prestige with "national" customers. The banks have argued that they need greater capital in order to serve their customers better. Actually, there are only a few billion-dollar corporations in the whole country that are able to borrow the legal limit of any of the existing billion-dollar banks in New York. Therefore, it would seem that the main reason for these mergers is simply jockeying for prestige based on size, and a result is that service may suffer, particularly the service every bank owes to the community in which it is located.

In many cases the mergers have resulted in unwieldly operations at first and an overlap of departments and branches. The expense of consolidating can be excessive. The cumbersome operations hurt customer relations and some valuable accounts are lost in the fast shuffle. Lastly, uncertainty of position also generally causes at these times some losses of key personnel whom the banks have spent both time and money to train.

DONALD HAVENS, JR.

NEW YORK CITY.

He Speaks for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I had the pleasure of attending an impressive lunch in the presidential room of the Hotel Statler. This meeting honored the 50 winners—from the 49 States and the District of Columbia—in the Voice of Democracy contest. From this fine group of young men and women, four finalists were picked. Among these four finalists was an articulate and personable young man, Derek L. Booth, from Boonton, N.J., in my congressional district.

In a short speech, which I am including below, Derek expressed his views on democracy:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Derek L. Booth)

It is interesting to note in our modern society the many and varied interpretations people put on the word "democracy." One may call to mind several ideas simultaneously, and this is natural, for democracy is a broad and occasionally deep subject. It involves the myriad facets of the republican form of government as practiced in our country. It includes relationships between ourselves and others, no matter what the circumstances. It also encompasses material wealth and advancement, and all which these terms connote. Therefore, democracy as Americans know it is a way of life, inextricably bound into our every activity. But let us make clear at the outset that true American democracy is also an ideal, as yet unattained by any people. It is a thing of the spirit; which spirit must be felt by the people before it is of any value. And if it is sensed by the citizens of the country, they cannot help but strive for the fulfillment of the standard—constantly—fervently.

What does this ideal mean? What is the principal application of this cherished heritage? I believe that to live democratically is to practice an art, to learn a lesson. Someone has said that we use people and love things, in contrast to our intended behavior.

It is my feeling that democracy is the art—the lesson—of loving people and using things, to the best interests of all. That is my definition.

This statement must be translated and applied to the phases of our living, in order that we may see more clearly our proper course of action. In the international scene, the word for democracy is "peace." Its realization calls for distribution of power so that no people shall have control over another without the other's consent. It is common thought that the United Nations has accomplished this task since its inception. I am convinced, however, that the U.N. has not yet achieved this ideal state of harmonious cooperation. Its charter speaks of "living together in peace as good neighbors"; and its Universal Declaration of Human Rights deals with the concepts of human worth, equality, opportunity, liberty, and so on; but does not every one of the five great powers still insist on the right of veto in the Security Council? Agitation continues, and will continue, for the abolition of veto and the submitting of decisions to the whole body. This is merely one manifestation of the ongoing movement for perfection of democracy.

Domestically, democracy's synonym consists in proportionate sharing. This is to say that all who work partake to the fullest extent of the material advantages which they help to create. Our economy would be a mutual enterprise, with even the humblest laborer assured of earning enough to maintain dignity and family. Here is the place of arbitration, industrial unionism, and other devices now being used to impart a full measure of justice to the apportionment of authority in our mammoth trade organizations.

So we have come to realize that democracy means these four things: First, the recognition of the dignity and worth of the human personality; second, the right of the individual to achieve up to his capacities; third, the right of the individual to share in the determination of his own welfare; and fourth, the development of liberty, not license, and of cooperative citizenship. Only as we set ourselves to pursuing these goals, and to performing their corresponding duties cheerfully, will our struggle culminate in the perfection of truth, revealed in dynamic democracy.

Statement of Ed E. Reid in Support of Area Redevelopment Bill—S. 722

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, last week Mr. Ed E. Reid, executive director of the Alabama League of Municipalities, appeared before the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in support of the area redevelopment bill.

As director of the Alabama organization, Mr. Reid spoke in behalf of 255 member municipalities in Alabama. His statement also represented the American Municipal Association's position in regard to this legislation and this national group includes some 13,000 cities and towns in its membership.

I submit Mr. Reid's statement in support of the area redevelopment bill for the benefit of my colleagues.

The statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF ED E. REID, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ALABAMA LEAGUE OF MUNICIPALITIES, BEFORE THE PRODUCTION AND STABILIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 26, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Ed E. Reid, executive director of the Alabama League of Municipalities. I am testifying before you today in that capacity and also on behalf of the American Municipal Association on whose executive committee I serve.

The Alabama League of Municipalities is a voluntary association of the city and town governments of our State. It was organized in 1935 and has been representing our State's cities and towns before the State legislature and here in Washington ever since. The league is also a service, information, and research organization and has as its sole objective the betterment of municipal government in Alabama. I have had the honor of serving the organization as its executive director from its inception—since 1935.

The league has 255 member municipalities ranging from the smallest, Detroit (population 75), to the largest, Birmingham (population 326,000).

The American Municipal Association, through memberships of its affiliate leagues, represents something like 13,000 towns and cities in the United States and Puerto Rico. In other words, the American Municipal Association is the national federation of the 45 State municipal leagues—of which Alabama is one.

At its last annual American Municipal Congress the membership of AMA approved the following policy resolution pertaining to area redevelopment legislation:

"DEPRESSED URBAN AREAS

"Congress should assist those communities which suffer persistent unemployment due to underdevelopment or decline to achieve economic health. Such communities should include the city even if the labor market area in which it is located is not depressed. The older core city has special problems with its obsolescent industrial facilities.

"To be successful, however, Federal aid must cope with basic problems and not confine itself to a stepped-up letting of defense contracts in the depressed community. AMA recognizes that such Federal aid without initiative and active participation by the municipality will not bring about the desired revitalization."

Specifically, AMA recommends:

1. Supplementary unemployment benefits, especially for workers taking vocational training courses.

2. Loans for construction or rehabilitation of industrial plants.

3. Assistance for public works plans.

4. Special tax amortization benefits for new defense facilities.

5. Placing Government contracts as far as practicable in surplus labor areas.

The area redevelopment bill (S. 3683) as vetoed by the President would have achieved most of those objectives. We urge the Congress to again pass the important legislation and we again ask the President to accept appropriate authority under which the communities with basic problems of persistent unemployment can be assisted toward their solution.

The Alabama League of Municipalities, through action of its committee on Federal legislation which was confirmed by delegates to its annual convention, approved the principle of last year's proposed legislation on this subject. That policy remains in effect today.

Mr. Chairman, preparatory to writing this statement I referred to the record of the hearings conducted by this committee and its counterpart in the House of Representatives during the past 4 years on area redevelopment legislation. I also very carefully read the statement you made at the time you introduced S. 722 in the Senate this year. My conclusion was that there was very little I could add to the record in support of this important legislation beyond reiterating the wholehearted endorsement of the measure on the part of the Alabama League of Municipalities and the American Municipal Association, plus a few general observations and some brief comments on the depressed area situation as it relates to communities in Alabama.

There are several reasons why we welcome and support area redevelopment legislation at the Federal level. For one thing, the kind of resources needed to do an adequate job are well beyond the capacity of the State and local governments to support alone, and this is particularly true in the case of our smaller cities. For another, State governments have generally been disinterested and unwilling to undertake any remedial action. Finally, we welcome Federal involvment because we feel it is proper and legitimate and long overdue.

For example, unemployment has been recognized as a matter of Federal concern for some time now, but measures to counter it have been limited very largely to participation in the payment of unemployment compensation, statistics gathering, and the placement of defense contracts. Never before to our knowledge has the kind of research been undertaken to discover the specific causes of unemployment that can be attributed solely to local factors as we believe will be required for the successful operation of the program proposed in S. 722.

Furthermore, the role of the town or city in the national economy also should be of considerably greater concern to the Federal Government than it has been heretofore. S. 722 establishes the framework for doing some long overdue research work on what makes local economies tick, and what their relationship is to the economy of the whole region, the economy of the State, and to that of the Nation itself.

One of the most encouraging things about the area redevelopment proposal is that it will necessarily get the Federal Government involved in an analysis of the basic building block of the national economy—the economic base of the local community.

We have reviewed the proposed bill—S. 722—in some detail and we are convinced that it offers a sound and comprehensive approach to the solution of what we know to be an exceedingly complex and vexing problem.

We believe that the kind of program proposed by S. 722 offers distressed areas a range of aids which, if coupled with energetic local leadership and a realistic appreciation of the total problem, should prove effective in stimulating the kind of action necessary to put the community on the road to economic recovery.

We believe that Federal action is long overdue and that area assistance legislation as covered by S. 722 ought to be approved by the Congress.

We further believe that once we have had an opportunity to study the program in action we will be in a much better position to assess its strong points and its weaknesses, and then to make whatever perfecting amendments which appear necessary to make it an even more effective effort on the part of public and private agencies.

In our own State, the State government has done practically nothing to help repair the injury done to our economy brought on by underemployment or unemployment, and the counties and municipalities simply do not have the resources to tackle such a problem alone. The areas listed as depressed areas in Alabama as in other States, I am sure, cover more than the few cities listed by the Department of Labor as having a surplus of labor. Many of the cities listed are

the economic centers of much wider areas and their failure to provide employment and job opportunities for their city people affects the whole area for miles around in all directions. So, seven or eight communities listed as depressed areas may actually be wide geographic areas reaching out in all directions for many, many miles.

I cannot, gentlemen, emphasize too strongly the importance of this legislation. We hope it wins your approval and that of the entire Congress. Moreover, we hope this year that if your bill is passed by the Congress the President will have the good judgment this time to sign it into law.

Letter Re Price Support Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have long been convinced that the Department of Agriculture has on a number of occasions rendered the farmers of this Nation a great disservice by providing misleading information which has tended to turn the consumer against the farmer. A recent case in point was the issuance of a list of the recipients of the 1957 price support payments.

Apparently what the Secretary of Agriculture has done is to list all Commodity Credit Corporation loans as if they represented total cost to the taxpayer. This is simply not the case, for in many instances these loans were repaid prior to the Government takeover date and thus did not represent an actual Government expenditure.

I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a particular case in which I believe this misinformation has resulted in a grave injustice. A constituent of mine in the Second District of Oregon, Mrs. Amanda Duvall, was reported as receiving $104,944 on her 1957 wheat and barley crop. What was not included in the report was the fact that Mrs. Duvall redeemed 26,195 bushels of wheat under loan prior to the Government takeover date at a cost to her of $47,736.96. This sum was paid to the Commodity Credit Corporation as payment of principal and interest plus loan charges by Mrs. Duvall who then marketed the 26,195 bushels of wheat through a local cooperative.

I think this is a matter which deserves to be clarified and in order to provide full information, I ask that the following letter by the manager of the Morrow County Grain Growers be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MORROW COUNTY GRAIN GROWERS, INC.,
Lexington, Oreg., February 26, 1959.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ULLMAN: I feel the recent Associated Press report, quoting Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, reference 1957 price support payments to Mrs. Amanda Duvall of Heppner does an injustice by way of not giving the full story.

Actually Mrs. Duvall took CCC loans amounting to $104,944 on her 1957 crop wheat and barley. What isn't reported is that Mrs. Duvall redeemed 26,195 bushels of her wheat under loan prior to the Government takeover date at a cost to her of $47,736.96. This sum was paid CCC as payment of principal and interest plus loan charges by Mrs. Duvall who then marketed the 26,195 bushels through this cooperative.

The above-mentioned payment of almost $50,000 reduces the total cash benefits by this figure. In addition the CCC took full title to the balance of her 1957 crop wheat amounting to 10,912 bushels stored in our elevators plus her full harvested crop of barley. The wheat she redeemed and sold was in her own farm storage and carried a later loan date, hence lower interest charges.

The market value of the commodities taken over by the Government amounted to very nearly the loan price plus interest and charges. Reducing the total cash received by the amount paid back by Mrs. Duvall, plus the value of the grain surrendered certainly pares the net benefits received to a very low figure.

Very truly yours,

AL LAMB,
Manager, Morrow County Grain Growers, Inc.

What People Should Know About Cancer and the Place of Krebiozen in the Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I attended a testimonial dinner in honor of Dr. Andrew Conway Ivy, the champion of the scientific doctrine of freedom of research, which has suffered in recent years through the falsity of certain politico-physician leaders of the American Medical Association, who faked reports, suppressed honest information, brutally slugged the opposition, both physically and through pressures, used to prevent the truth about Krebiozen reaching the American people.

His speech, made to 1,200 persons attending, in his honor, among whom were numbered many outstanding business, civic, scientific, religious, and industrial leaders, was a masterpiece in its treatment of fundamental truths touching upon the subject of cancer and, in its simplicity of language, was readily understood by the layman mind.

The subject matter of the speech follows:

WHAT PEOPLE SHOULD KNOW ABOUT CANCER AND THE PLACE OF KREBIOZEN IN THE PICTURE

(By Dr. A. C. Ivy)

In speaking on this subject I do not desire to create an abnormal fear of cancer or an irrational concern about cancer. I desire, however, to create an informed and rational concern about cancer.

I

Why should everyone have a rational concern about cancer? The answer is: Because approximately one out of six persons today die of cancer. And, if something is not done to prevent or cure cancer in its early stage one out of four persons now living will die of cancer.

Some people say: "I do not want to know anything about cancer. But, I want my doctor to know everything about it."

But the sad and tragic fact is that people who know nothing about cancer go to see their doctor too late for the doctor to help. Because of their ignorance they do not give the doctor a fair chance to help them, and they have done themselves and loved ones an injury. This is especially true of internal cancer, or when the cancer starts deep in the body where it can only be seen by X-ray examination. When a cancer is deep in the body where there are not many pain nerves, the cancer spreads beyond the reach of the surgeon and radiologist.

There are signs and symptoms which indicate that cancer is starting or is present. You should know and remember these signs and symptoms.

II

First, let me tell you about a precancerous sore or abnormality, an abnormality or a sore which is known to indicate that a cancer might occur or that a cancer is already present in its early stages. A precancerous or an early cancer can be cured by either surgery or cautery and some can be cured by X-ray or radium.

To emphasize this I shall cite my own case as exhibit A. From 1919 to 1946, I smoked a pipe. Tobacco smoke contains a cancer-producing tar. It also contains arsenic in a cancer-producing form, because sprays containing arsenic are used to kill tobacco-plant worms and other parasites. I quit smoking in 1946 because I found that tobacco smoke and nicotine are harmful to the body of suspectible persons, and about 20 percent of people are susceptible. I quit for two reasons: First, because I did not desire to harm my own body; and, second, I did not desire to be a bad example to young people, inducing those who were susceptible to smoke and to harm their body.

Even though I quit smoking in 1946, the prior effect of the smoking on my lips and tongue persisted. And, one Monday morning in September 1958, I woke up and felt a painful spot on the edge of my tongue. I thought I had bitten my tongue and proceeded to forget about it. But the sore spot was still present the following Friday morning; so, I looked at it in the mirror. I saw that the sore spot was a "white spot," which in Greek and medical terminology is called a leukoplakia, because "leuko" means white and "plakia" an elevated spot or plate.

A leukoplakia is a precancerous type of abnormality or sore. I did not know, of course, whether cancer cells had already developed in the white spot. If they were present or should develop, I knew that they would invade or grow into the surrounding normal tissues, including the blood vessels and lymphatic vessels. This extension of the cancer cells into local tissues is called invasion. I knew, furthermore, that if cancer cells were present and had invaded into the lymphatic vessels, the cancer cells could then spread into the local lymph glands in my mouth, throat, and neck. I knew that if they had grown into the local blood vessels, they could spread to my lungs and grow there.

So, what did I do? I put into practice what I had been teaching and preaching for 25 years. That is, you should not delay taking care of a precancerous or an early cancerous abnormality or sore. I called my physician and made an appointment to have the condition cared for the following Monday.

What was done regarding treatment? First, I took injections of Krebiozen, because Krebiozen (hypothetically) builds up the natural defenses of the body against cancer, and because if there were some cancer cells in the local blood or lymphatic vessels and if they were dislodged by the operation I was to have, the cancer cells would not grow

in the lymph glands or lungs. If the body resistance against cancer was high, then cancer cells when they arrived at the local lymph glands or lungs would not grow; they would die. After taking Krebiozen, my physician cut out the white spot so that it could be examined under a microscope for cancer cells. He then cauterized the tissue around the incision to destroy any cells that might remain behind. I then continued to take Krebiozen for 1 week to keep my body defenses high.

Instead of using Krebiozen to build up body defenses against cancer cells which may get into the blood during an operation, many surgeons inject nitrogen mustard into the blood of the patient. Nitrogen mustard is a poison—a war gas—which kills cancer cells; but at the same time it kills normal cells and makes the patient sick.

I am not condemning the use of nitrogen mustard, because it is of value. I am just telling you the facts.

A physician wrote me and asked the following question: "Dr. Ivy, if you really believe that Krebiozen is a cure for cancer why did you have surgery used in the treatment of your cancer?" I replied: "Your question is like asking me if I had stopped beating Mrs. Ivy. I have never started beating Mrs. Ivy, and I have never claimed that Krebiozen is a cure for cancer." I have only claimed that it is of value in the treatment of some cancer patients; and, if further developed, it may turn out to be more effective and provide a key to finding the cure of all cancers.

III

What are the precancerous or early cancer signs and symptoms everyone should know?

1. Skin, a chronic sore any place; a wart or a mole which becomes irritated; or a lump in the breast or elsewhere under the skin.

2. Bleeding from a body orifice: (a) the nose, when it is not an ordinary nose bleed; (b) coughing up or spitting or vomiting blood; (c) blood in the urine or the stool; (d) blood from the vagina when not due to the menses.

3. Pain: persistent, recurring. The patient usually sees the physican for severe pain, but does not when the pain is not severe.

4. Headache, persistent, with or without vomiting.

5. Hoarseness, persistent.

6. Chronic cough.

7. Indigestion: stomach distress, burning, much belching; and a change in bowel habit.

IV

There are two general types of cancer. One type develops in cells covering the inside and outside the body, or the epithelial cells. This type of cancer usually occurs between the age of 40 and 65; such cancers are called carcinoma. The other type develops from the cells which are located between the internal and external covering cells of the body. This type occurs at any age and is called sarcoma.

V

Cause of cancer? There are two interrelated causes. One is heredity and the other is irritation.

Physiologically cancer may be described as representing an abnormal repair of injury to cells.

First, there is a hereditary susceptibility or low resistance to cancer which is generally confined to one or more organs, such as the stomach or lungs. This susceptibility to cancer has been established in animals. It has not been proved categorically to exist in man; but most students of cancer believe that it exists in man.

Second, irritation of a group of cells as occurs in a chronic sore which does not heal may be responsible, or a specific cancer-causing substance (carcinogen) such as the tar in soot or in tobacco smoke, or in certain dyes used for coloring things people use.

VI

There are two types or theories of treatment. One uses artificial means and the other uses natural means.

The artificial means consist of surgery, cautery, X-rays, radium, and the cobalt bomb, and the use of chemicals which are poisonous to cancer cells. If the cancer is in an early stage and is localized to one place, then surgery and cautery is the only absolute or categorical way to cure the cancer. But unless the operation is done gently and skillfully, the cancer may be spread throughout the body. In the case of certain cancers which are sensitive to X-rays, X-rays or radiant energy will destroy the cancer. There is no artificial chemical now known which will kill all cancer cells and not normal cells. There are some five or six artificial chemicals which are of value in the treatment of cancer. But all of these depress the reticuloendothelial cells which are the cells which naturally give the body resistance to disease and parasites and are concerned with the normal repair of the body. There are some patients, however, who respond dramatically to some of these artificial chemicals, and they should be tried in certain patients.

The natural means consist of the use of chemical substances produced by the body. Those chemical substances in the body which regulate growth and repair.

The natural means of controlling or curing cancer has not been studied extensively, not nearly as much as it merits. In fact, the only real reason or basis for the hope that we may be able to discover a chemical substance which will prevent and destroy cancer, is the observation that in 1 out of 100,000 cancer patients the body cures itself of cancer. In other words, there is a natural way for the cure of cancer, and we should intensively search for the chemical substance or substances which the body uses to occasionally cure itself of cancer.

The use of male hormone for cancer of the breast and of female hormone for cancer of the prostate are examples of the use of natural chemical substances in the body. The same is true of cortisone and perhaps metacortin.

But, these hormones are not sufficiently concerned with the regulation of growth and the repair of injury of cells. To obtain the primitive chemicals associated with repair of injury and the regulation of growth, we must study the fluids in inflammation and the secretions of the reticuloendothelial cells; that is, we must study the fluids and the cells which are naturally primarily concerned with the regulation of growth and repair of injury.

This is where Krebiozen enters the picture. Hypothetically it represents a secretion of the reticuloendothelial cells which are concerned in the regulation of growth. As pointed out previously, it is very probably present in inflammatory fluids.

This is not a wild idea. For example, Dr. Paul-Ehrlich worked on it for a short time. It remained relatively dormant until Krebiozen was publicized, primarily by its enemies. From a scientific point of view, I and others consider the theory to be established. For example, in the June 1958, report of the Sloan-Kettering Cancer Institute of New York City you will find the following quotation: "There is reason now to believe that natural defenses against cancer exist. It has proved possible, by manipulating and enhancing these defenses, to cure laboratory animals with some types of transplanted cancer." In this connection, I have pointed out to the American Cancer Society, that one of the substances used by the Sloan-Kettering group to manipulate and enhance natural defenses against cancer was an extract of a yeast—a mold-like organism distantly related to actinomyces bovis which was used by Dr. Durovic to produce Krebiozen. I further pointed out that if they would inject their substance, Zymosan, into horses making them them slightly ill, and then properly extract the blood of the horses, they would obtain Krebiozen.

VII

How is Krebiozen made? The scientific steps for the production of Krebiozen were published in October 1951, again in 1952, and still again in 1953, 1956, and 1959. The manufacturing details have not been published. But, a patent was applied for in October 1951. When the patent is granted the details will, of course, be published. For those who are not familiar with the policies of industrial organizations, manufacturing details are not disclosed. That is where the principle of competition which lowers the price to the consumer comes into operation in a free enterprise system.

I have informed Dr. Durovic, the Duga Laboratories since 1949, that I must have the basic scientific steps but not the manufacturing details. And, since private money rather than public money was used to produce Krebiozen, they should not disclose the manufacturing details. This is a basic American principle, a difference between our way of life and the communistic or national socialistic way of life. And, I believe in this principle just as firmly as any other basic American principle.

Without knowledge of the manufacturing details and about 2 years ago, I made some Krebiozen from 46 horses. A research foundation defrayed the expenses. The Krebiozen I made was active.

In newspapers you have read that Krebiozen is a secret remedy. That statement is as false as the suspicion and medical politics which first fathered it. I say this because I believe without being egotistical I can qualify as an expert on the subject of medical ethics, since it is known that I represented World Medicine at the Nurenberg trials on the subject of medical ethics and medical science. The canon against promoting a secret remedy is to prevent fraudulent avarice. There is no fraud because the Duga Laboratory has never made a claim for Krebiozen. I have claimed on the basis of evidence submitted that it merits a serious study and has merit in the treatment of some cancer patients. It is distributed without claims to physicians for use under the regulations of the Federal Food and Drug Administration. It is not secret in the sense that it cannot be made on the basis of information disclosed. I have made it. So far as avarice is concerned no one has made any money out of Krebiozen. Everyone associated with it has spent much of their own money on it. I have testified under oath that neither I nor my relatives shall ever make or accept any money for work on and activities related to Krebiozen, except expenses when and if money becomes available. Yet, the papers have repeated, and repeated the false charge that Krebiozen is a secret remedy, until some of my friends have started to believe it. But, do not misinterpret me; I am not complaining.

VIII

All sorts of false charges against me and Krebiozen have been made.

One of the most recent is that Krebiozen is nothing more than mineral oil. Here is a story regarding that point. A patient living near Los Angeles developed cancer of the body of the uterus. It was removed; but the cancer recurred lower down in the cervix. It was bleeding a lot. The patient refused X-ray and radium and surgery. She requested Krebiozen, but it was denied. Since she was the wife of a veteran her case was reviewed by a tumor board and surgery was urged. The patient refused. Finally, her physician obtained some Krebiozen and gave it to her. The bleeding stopped and 4 months later there was only a scar where the

cancer had been. The patient's doctor met a doctor friend of mine and said to him: "What am I to do? Advanced cancer was diagnosed by three biopsies and a tumor board. It was undoubtedly a cancer. Now after giving Krebiozen, it is gone, and only a scar is left. What am I to do since the California Medical Society has said that Krebiozen is only mineral oil?" My doctor friend replied: "It may be that the medical society analyzed the wrong grade of mineral oil."

We have chemists, too, and they have reported and we have very briefly published their findings.

I have requested that the charge that Krebiozen is only mineral oil be brought before a grand jury. It will probably not be brought before a grand jury, because I have the facts and can prove my case.

It has been rumored around among physicians in the U.S.A. and abroad that I am off my rocker and have had a minor stroke. When Mrs. Ivy heard this rumor she stated: "If Dr. Ivy is off his rocker, he has been off of it ever since I have known him." During the first day I testified at the hearings of the commission of the State legislature on Krebiozen, the opposition had a psychiatrist present to observe me. At the end of the day he reported that "if Dr. Ivy is senile, it would be good if everyone else were senile." During the period I was supposed to be off my rocker I published 65 articles in scientific medical journals including the Journal of the AMA, and was instrumental in raising $45 million worth of buildings for the West Side Medical Center. So I agree with Mrs. Ivy. If I am off my rocker, I have always been off of it.

It has been said even by some of my fair-weather friends that Ivy has been duped. Of course, I feel positive that the opponents of Krebiozen and their followers have been duped by premeditated dishonest tactics. In fact, I have proved this by categorical evidence given under oath. And my evidence and charges have never been denied under oath, although the opposition was urged to take the stand and do so.

If I have been duped, then I have been duped only by the unyielding honesty of the natural law of the cancerous process. If all the improvements I have seen have not been due to Krebiozen but to natural causes, then I have been duped and the profession has been duped because there is no published evidence showing improvement with the frequency I have seen it. That is one reason why a "fair test" is necessary. I am from Missouri and have to be shown by strictly honest evidence that what I have been seeing is not due to Krebiozen.

What have we seen after the use of Krebiozen?

IX

Results following the use of Krebiozen.

The results can only be briefly summarized. It should be pointed out that percentage-wise the results have remained approximately the same after the first 2 years of our study, which started in August 1949. It must be recalled that 99 percent of our patients had advanced cancer and in most cases had received all that the physician had to offer.

1. Approximately 1,000 patients have been treated sufficiently to include in a general summary.

2. Approximately 68 percent of patients reported relief of pain to a variable extent and for a variable period. It was abolished or markedly relieved in approximately 30 percent. The average time the relief appeared after the start of therapy was 7 days, the range being from 1 to 30 days. The use of narcotics for pain was abolished in about 25 percent.

In a control study on pain, 72 percent of those who knew they were receiving Krebiozen had less pain and 68 percent of those who did not know that they were receiving Krebiozen had less pain.

With the relief in pain there was generally an improvement in appetite. An increase in weight occurred in approximately 56 percent.

3. The size of the tumor was measurably decreased for a variable period in approximately 50 percent of cases.

4. Ambulatory life has been prolonged in approximately 25 percent of patients who were bedridden or only up some of the time.

5. There are alive today 51 patients out of approximately 500 who from 4 to 8 years ago had advanced cancer and are apparently free of cancer today. Percentage of approximately 10 percent has persisted for the last 4 years. Some patients who had lived with inactive cancer for 2 to 8 years have died from causes other than cancer.

6. In four patients whose abdomen was opened and then closed immediately because the cancer was so advanced that it could not be operated, the abdomen has been opened later and no cancer has been found.

7. Most of our long-term patients still receive Krebiozen. In three patients the tumor has disappeared on giving Krebiozen and returned on withdrawing it and disappeared on starting Krebiozen again. This cycle was repeated four times in one patient, three times in a second, and two times in a third. We now have five patients free of active cancer who have not taken Krebiozen for from 2 to 4 years.

You may be surprised to learn that not only some 200 physicians have confirmed our observations, i.e., those of Phillips, Pick, and Ivy but there are 2 physicians both of whom in the past have treated many cancer patients who have obtained approximately the same results we have. One has treated over 80 patients with advanced cancer and 12 of these are free from active cancer for from 1 to 4 years. The other physician treated 40 patients and except for the percentage of relief of pain obtained about the same results we did. This latter physician has desired to publish his results, but pressure to date has prevented him from doing so.

The only evidence submitted against Krebiozen is the 100-case report of the council on pharmacy of the AMA. This report was proven under oath to contain 23 falsified cases and most of the other cases were so close to death that they lived only long enough to receive an average of 3 doses of Krebiozen. This situation has never been denied under oath because the evidence showing dishonesty and superficiality cannot be denied.

X

What are the next steps required? Two things must be done. One is to obtain a fair test and the other is to make a new batch of Krebiozen.

XI

The fair test.

We have repeatedly proposed a fair test since 1952. The Commission on Krebiozen of the Illinois Legislature tried to persuade the AMA to conduct such a test.

Our proposal and that of the commission was that an arbitration type of committee conduct a double-blind test under conditions where bias or prejudice could not even be suspected of operating so as to subvert the objectivity of the test.

The American Cancer Society invited the Krebiozen Foundation to submit a proposal for a fair test. The foundation did. The proposal was rejected because they did not like the arbitration type of committee, the double-blind type of test and they wanted to look over our files to see if a test were warranted. In other words, they first asked for an opportunity to discredit Krebiozen without performing a test, and then wanted a type of test which could obviously be suspected of being conducted by a loaded committee.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS in August 1958, proposed on the floor of the Senate a fair test for Krebiozen. We accepted his proposal immediately because it contained the basic principles of a fair test, one in which bias and prejudice could not be suspected of operating.

The National Cancer Institute of the U.S. Public Health Service made an alternative proposal and their alternative proposal has been discussed since October 5, 1958. It has turned out that their proposal is considerably better than that of the American Cancer Society. But, in its present form it is not acceptable to us because the proposed committee is not of the arbitration type, and hence not above suspicion, and because the committee is given the right to discredit Krebiozen without doing the test.

So, we have requested the National Cancer Institute to discuss Senator DOUGLAS' proposal with us. Sufficient time has not elapsed to hear from the Institute.

Since suspicion exists on both sides, the only type of committee that can be above suspicion is an arbitration type. Since suspicion exists, the only experimental design which is above suspicion is one where the physicians giving the treatment will not know whether mineral oil, or mineral oil with Krebiozen in it is being given, and only one person will know which set of ampules contains Krebiozen. Third, I must be a party to giving the treatment, as a consultant, and must have the responsibility of deciding on the basis of the clinical results of the test which ampules contain Krebiozen. Otherwise, the project would not be a test; it would be just another experiment undertaken by novices in giving the Krebiozen treatment.

If the fair test is conducted, and the results turn out favorable to Krebiozen, the controversy regarding the activity of Krebiozen is ended, and an important scientific fact will have been established. If the results are negative, Krebiozen will be buried scientifically and ethically, and nothing will be lost because valuable information about the natural history of cancer will have been obtained.

If we cannot get a fair test under the auspices of the National Cancer Institute under existing legislation, then new legislation will be sought.

XII

The need for another batch of Krebiozen.

A new batch of Krebiozen is needed for several reasons:

1. At the present rate of usage, all the Krebiozen now available will be used up next summer, and those patients now dependent on it will be left without it. Who then will be responsible for the consequences of taking away their Krebiozen?

Not me, because I am going to work and appeal to others to help make a new batch. So will Mr. Davis, Miss Ross and a lot of other people in addition to those present here tonight.

2. More chemical study of Krebiozen is sorely needed. This is expensive and more material is required.

3. It is very important to establish the fact that another large batch of Krebiozen can be made.

4. Since extract I, which is Krebiozen or a substance closely related to it chemically, clears the opacity of the lens in canine cataract, we now have a biological or animal assay method for new batches of Krebiozen. This has been a handicap in the past. In the past, the assay has had to be made on a human patient with an untreated breast cancer.

5. Furthermore, the development of this potentially very important medical treatment of early cataract in man is urgent.

In this connection it should be pointed out that from 70 to 90 percent of persons over 60 years of age have opacities in the lens

of their eyes, and that 25 percent of all blindness in the United States of America is due to cataract.

We now have no money and soon will have no Krebiozen to pursue this study on cataract, which represents the first step toward the solution of another one of the medical impossibilities.

In view of this discovery can the funds for the production of another batch of Krebiozen be found?

The answer should be "Yes; the funds will be found." This answer should be so forceful that it will rumble and reverberate so loudly and so long that no one will be able to rest in peace until the necessary funds are available.

A minimum of $350,000 is required.

A committee is being formed to make another batch of Krebiozen. It will be a tax-exempt type of organization. I know that everyone here is interested and I know some of you will be able to help. Those who are able to help should write to Mr. John M. Davis, president of the LaSalle Construction Co., Chicago.

Remarks of Mayor John J. Buckley, of Lawrence, Mass., on the Area Redevelopment Bill S. 722, Before the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to extend the remarks of Mayor John J. Buckley of my hometown of Lawrence, Mass., when he appeared on February 27 before the Senate committee considering S. 722, the area redevelopment bill:

REMARKS BY MAYOR JOHN J. BUCKLEY, OF LAWRENCE, MASS., ON THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL S. 722, BEFORE THE PRODUCTION AND STABILIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, FEBRUARY 27, 1959

The exodus of the textile industry, which for about 100 years had dominated the economy of Lawrence and had provided employment for its citizens, set off a chain reaction of adverse factors from which the city of Lawrence has not fully recovered.

The loss, over a period of several years, of approximately 20,000 textile jobs and the abandonment of millions of square feet of textile manufacturing space had two general results upon the community life.

First, the individual person or family suffered a prolonged loss of income which ultimately caused considerable direct economic distress and this was undoubtedly accompanied by deleterious effects in the health, education, and general morale of the community's citizens.

Second, it resulted in considerable loss of income to the municipal government through decreased assessed valuations of vacant industrial buildings and the inability of the unemployed homeowner to pay his taxes when due.

Unemployment in Lawrence resulted in what, I imagine, must be a typical or classical chain reaction of adverse economic factors.

Lack of income to its industrial workers sharply reduced their purchasing power, and our retail business district which bears almost 40 percent of the city's assessed valuation began to feel the effect of reduced sales. The weaker sections of the business section were unable to ride out the sustained decline in sales, and vacancies in retail stores and in office buildings were soon forcing the owners thereof to forego the proper maintenance of their properties and to subsequently seek tax abatements and lowered assessments. This same condition resulted in further unemployment in the service personnel of our city. In many instances employers in both the manufacturing and retail industries were inclined to reduce the wages or working hours of remaining employees.

The municipal government, faced with reduced income and continuing increased costs of government, was forced to refuse increases in wages to its municipal employees despite the fact that other communities were granting such increases to meet the rising costs of living. The city was forced also to defer needed maintenance of its public buildings and replacement of worn-out equipment to avoid increasing the burden on its unemployed homeowners and generally to maintain only the bare essentials of municipal services.

Owners of the vacant industrial buildings immediately sought to dispose of them and sales were at far below the assessed valuation. Such sales formed a basis for reassessment and reduced valuations. During that period the city lost valuation, through reassessment of just five industrial properties, in the approximate amount of $3 million.

A comparison of Lawrence's assessed valuation with that of every industrial city in Massachusetts reveals that we've had the lowest increase in valuation in the past 15 years (see exhibit A). Such a condition, an increase of only 7 percent in valuation in the past 15 years, is a direct result of the exodus and liquidation of the textile industry.

The real casualties of Lawrence's recession were those workers who were 45 years of age or older and who had spent 20 or more years developing skills peculiar to the textile industry. They were unable to compete for jobs in other industries with the younger groups of unemployed who were naturally the choice of any new industry in fields other than textiles.

The laws of the Commonwealth did not permit financial assistance from the Commonwealth for the training or retraining of these older workers unless they were employed in the particular trade for which they sought training. Our efforts to exempt Lawrence from such provisions of law were unsuccessful. In fact our representatives have a bill before the State legislature again seeking exemption from that restrictive provision (see exhibit B).

Many of these older workers were required to seek public assistance to meet the ordinary everyday costs of living which placed an additional burden upon our city's finances.

Many of our unemployed sought employment in other cities, some quite removed from Lawrence. Some of our people eventually and reluctantly severed their long association with friends and relatives and moved away from the Greater Lawrence area.

Vacant industrial plants and loss of job opportunities therefore created an ever deepening and widening area of adversities in the form of decreased valuations (see exhibit C), increased taxes, loss of individual ownership of homes, loss of population. All of these have caused a general outback in municipal services and a gradual and general deterioration of the physical resources and assets of the community.

It is difficult to measure the social and psychological effects of such an unhappy situation but, undoubtedly, it is a contributing cause in the separation of families, in bringing about divorces, in promoting juvenile delinquency, and destroying the initiative and ambition of the individual citizens of the community.

It is quite apparent to me that local communities need outside assistance to soften the blow of loss of industries and heavy unemployment and to stem the tide of unhappy conditions that usually follow in their wake.

I am of the opinion that the area redevelopment bill provides considerable assistance in that direction and will enable a community such as Lawrence to overcome many of the difficulties involved in attempting further economic and industrial recovery.

I am particularly interested in and favorably inclined toward the provisions of the bill as contained in sections 14 and 15 which would permit a community to secure the benefits of the Federal urban renewal program for the purpose of redeveloping blighted commercial and industrial areas. I think that this would be particularly beneficial to our New England cities where old industrial buildings have become outmoded and have a limited attraction to industrialists. Many of these buildings become a drag on the industrial space market and are given little consideration by the newer, expanding industries. In some cases it has been our experience that industrial developers and investment institutions do not want to pour new capital into decaying properties or communities. Many former textile buildings in Lawrence have been rehabilitated and presently provide inexpensive manufacturing space for those industries which have replaced textiles. However, in some situations we have concluded that we are virtually powerless to reach a full solution for the redevelopment of some of these properties without some type of economic assistance. I am convinced that the opportunity to redevelop industrial space under the provisions of the urban renewal program would speed up the full economic recovery of any area.

The opportunity to develop blighted open areas for commercial and industrial uses would also be a great asset in effecting such a recovery. Our industrial development committee in Lawrence is of the opinion that it lost out on several excellent industrial prospects interested in new modern buildings, primarily because the forces of private enterprise have been unable to assemble large tracts of land due to various reasons such as diversity of land ownership, legal obstacles, etc. Proper engineering and development, therefore, has not taken place so that new building programs could go forward. By broadening this urban renewal provision of the act the city of Lawrence through its proper public agency could take the necessary steps to plan and develop these blighted open areas. I feel sure that the broadening of the urban redevelopment law to include commercial and industrial blight will be a progressive step toward developing new industrial and commercial building programs.

Federal assistance in vocational training as provided in sections 16 and 17 is sorely needed. This is particularly true for the older worker who is unemployed and who is presented with little or no opportunity for reemployment in the particular industry in which he has developed certain skills.

Secretary of Labor Mitchell has continually advocated the retraining of older industrial workers who have been displaced as in the case of the textile liquidation from Lawrence. The productivity of these workers is unquestionable. The city has continually tried to subsidize the retraining of these former textile workers through payment of tuition to other institutions outside of the community.

For instance, Lynn, Haverhill, or Lowell. This has been a drain on the returns from our local tax revenue, which has been decreasing over the past years because of depressed economic conditions. Vocational training should only be undertaken provided it is based on the factual needs of the industrial community. We can show specifically that the Lawrence community is in dire need of specific training programs for skilled technicians and mechanics.

We do not have the necssary institutional training programs now. We know that industrial firms, through on-the-job training programs, are supplementing to some extent, this need. A retraining program with Federal assistance, since the depressed community is usually hard pressed financially, would give the older worker, and particularly the one with ambition and initiative, an asset to offset the natural handicap of age. I am confident that industry as a whole, would look with favor upon older workers if they were armed with the needed skills.

Section 6 of the act is vitally important to cities such as Lawrence. I feel that this part of the program could stimulate modernization and new construction in our area. We in Lawrence have been fortunate in acquiring many diversified industries, but I feel sure over the past number of years, with additional help and liberal financing program as outlined in this bill, we could have secured additional industries which would subsequently provide more job opportunities besides a broader tax base.

Industrial development from a competitive standpoint, today necessitates that new manufacturing plant construction be provided with 100 percent financing. In a great number of cases, adequate local financing has been provided, for which we are thankful. However, due to various inequities throughout the Nation, a State such as Massachusetts cannot provide bonded indebtedness for loans for new construction, which some States can. Furthermore, many firms cannot contemplate new building construction because they are not prime risks and consequently they must retain adequate working capital. If these problems could be overcome, I feel sure some new industrial building could take place in Lawrence and other depressed areas.

I feel sure this program, if put into effect, would back up our already existing local and State financial organizations and would effect a greater opportunity for new jobs and subsequent new tax base.

Lawrence has borne the slings and arrows of outrageous economic fortune, but to the eternal credit of its people whose courage persisted during our darkest days, our city has regained a place in the industrial sun. The Lawrence story is the story of its fighting people. We have gained considerable publicity throughout the State and Nation on our fight for industrial recovery. Lest we be deluded by all the inspiring and stirring words describing Lawrence's recovery it is vitally important that we keep one sobering fact in mind. Lawrence is a labor surplus area and it has been in this category ever since the liquidation of the textile industry. We have remained a pocket of economic difficulty in periods of apparent national prosperity. This has been the most frustrating aspect of our efforts during the past few years.

I am convinced that the area redevelopment bill will provide a substantial assist to industrial cities like Lawrence and I respectfully urge this subcommittee to file a favorable report on S. 722.

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you so that I could present the needs of the city of Lawrence based on its experience as one of our older industrial cities.

EXHIBIT A

Assessed valuations, real and personal property

[Millions of dollars]

	1940	1953	Percent increase	1957
1. Lawrence	85.3	90.7	6.3	91.5
2. Lynn	130.8	140.7	7.6	144.0
3. Somerville	114.1	130.7	14.5	133.5
4. Brockton	72.3	83.7	15.9	99.5
5. Holyoke	72.7	85.4	17.5	94.0
6. Lowell	93.7	110.3	17.7	121.0
7. Medford	78.4	97.4	24.2	104.5
8. Springfield	261.1	327.4	25.4	357.5
9. Quincy	121.4	155.0	27.7	168.5
10. Cambridge	170.6	218.3	28.0	231.0
11. Fall River	92.9	124.4	33.9	125.0
12. New Bedford	96.3	129.9	34.9	147.5
13. Everett	72.9	101.1	38.7	105.0
14. Haverhill	50.3	70.6	40.3	73.5
15. Salem	54.0	77.2	43.1	83.5

Source: "Financial Statistics of Massachusetts," publisher, Tyler & Co., Inc., Boston, Mass.

EXHIBIT B

HOUSE NO. 1483

An act exempting the city of Lawrence from certain restrictions in the law relative to evening classes in industrial and occupational schools

Be it enacted by the senate and house of representatives, in general court assembled, and by the authority of the same as follows:

SECTION 1. The restriction in the definition of "Evening class" in section 1 of chapter 74 of the general laws upon evening classes in independent industrial schools or independent distributive occupations schools, according to which instruction in such classes shall be given only to pupils employed during the day in work to which the instruction so given applies, shall not apply to industrial or occupational schools maintained by the city of Lawrence, for a period of 3 years from the beginning of the school year following the effective date of this act.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect upon its passage.

EXHIBIT C

Loss of valuation, industrial properties [1]

Property site	1951 valuation	1958 valuation	Loss
Ayer Mill	$1,001,900	$501,400	$500,500
Arlington Mill	1,587,800	1,315,900	271,900
Pacific Mill	1,883,000	1,510,800	372,200
Patchogue-Plymouth Corp.	185,800	154,800	31,000
Wood Mill	2,927,000	1,382,000	1,545,000
Total			2,720,600

NOTE.—1951: Total valuation of city of Lawrence, $90,260,000. 1958: Total valuation of city of Lawrence, $92,200,800.

[1] Source: Board of assessors, city of Lawrence, Mass.

Annual Brooklyn Convocation for Scouts of Protestant Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Boy Scouts of America is this year celebrating its 49th anniversary and the Borough of Brooklyn is doing its part for the worthy cause. I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a report of an important event which took place in the Borough of Brooklyn. The annual Brooklyn Protestant Boy Scout convocation was held at the Hanson Place Central Methodist Church on February 1, 1959. Former Supreme Court Justice Lewis W. Olliffe, chairman of the Protestant Committee on Scouting, presided. The program was commenced by the massing of the colors; pledge of allegiance and Scout oath; invocation by the Reverend Dr. Floyd E. George, pastor, Hanson Place Central Methodist Church; welcome by the Honorable Lewis W. Olliffe; presentation of the 1959 scouter award was made to William W. Wallace by Vincent H. Jensen, president of the Federation of Protestant Men; greetings from Henry Q. Middendorf, dean of Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, and Rev. Dr. David M. Cory, executive secretary, Brooklyn division—Portestant Council of the city of New York; presentation of God and country awards was made by the Honorable Lewis W. Olliffe, assisted by Rev. Charles Coker, Rev. Walter F. Jacobs, Rev. Kenneth Lee Rowe, Rev. Dr. S. Soto-Fontanez, Arturo F. Yrizarry, Robert Morris Hubbard, public relations director, Brooklyn Division, Protestant Council of New York, and John J. Hargash, Scout executive.

An inspiring address was delivered by Dr. Robert Fisher Oxnam, president of Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, N.Y. The text of the address was as follows:

AN EXPLORER IN THE CITY

(Address by Dr. Robert Fisher Oxnam)

I

Judge Olliffe, reverend clergy, parents, Scouts, and explorers, it is an honor indeed to participate in this ceremony in what may well be the high point of your scouting career. Just 2 years ago my oldest boy received the God and Country Award. No awards in scouting are come by easily, perhaps, though, this is the most demanding of time, energy, and dedication. This is certainly a time of satisfaction on the part of these young men and, I am confident, a time of justifiable pride on the part of parents.

"To do my best to do my duty to God and my country * * *." In a large city many miles from here and many years ago I became a Scout. I would walk about 4 blocks from my house, get on a subway, and go downtown to a Protestant church where our troop met. Knot tying and signaling, first aid and mapmaking—whole new worlds opened for me—hikes, visits to museums and historical places.

II. THE HARD, LEAN MEN

I believe that it was in Boy's Life that Henry Van Dyke, Presbyterian minister and Princeton professor, wrote:

"Life is an arrow. Therefore, you must know what mark to aim at, how to use the bow, then draw it to the head and let it go."

Early man depended on the bow for food and the defense of his home. The terrible mounted archer of Genghis Khan and later of Tamerlane controlled Asia from the Pacific to the Baltic and from India to the Arctic Circle. The legendary skill of Robin Hood, Chaucer's Yeoman, and Shakespeare's Old Double stir the imagination of Anglo-Saxons and their descendants. Today Robin

stars in a television program and, as usual, the films outdo the literary license of the medieval chronicler.

Robin would have given much for a modern bow, recurved as it is and laminated of glass and wood, using latest engineering techniques. No longer is flax used for the string, but rather a manmade fiber called dacron. The long bow has changed and the gray goose shaft, too. Now, except for hunting, aluminum has replaced wood in the arrow and plastic fletching the feather of the gray goose. Techniques, though, are the same.

Three times during the Hundred Years' War English archers overcame the finest of French chivalry and in each case the archers were outnumbered from four to one to even seven to one. The steadiness of the English archer was unbelievable. This was not only the development of a new form of warfare, but, as a student of government, I like to believe that it had some influence on the political philosophy we revere—democracy. For in it we see the rise of the common man. This archer was no duke, no earl, but an ordinary man, a free man for the most part, a farmer or laborer called by his first name alone. He had beaten the best of European chivalry with the odds many times against him. There was demonstration of the terrible efficiency of massed missile weapons. It hastened the decay of the feudal system and with it the concept of chivalry belonging to the manor born.

There is a kinship between those hard, lean men and the men of Lexington and Concord. There was similar confidence in their weapon, themselves, and the rightness of their task.

There is, too, a parallel between the men of Henry V, of the Black Prince, of Conan Doyle's "The White Company" and the men in the westward movement of our country, the Lewises and Clarks, the Frémonts, as well as the Matt Dillons, the Wyatt Earps of more recent television fame.

Physically our people were strong and hardy. Spiritually they were sure. Intellectually they had a driving desire for more learning, certain that through knowledge combined with freedom and guided by faith would come wisdom. They believed that with freedom and wisdom would come the strength of this great land and its people. Manifest destiny, some called it. "Our place in the sun," others said. This was a young nation growing up. Brash, to be sure; uncultured, perhaps; undirected, not at all.

III. THE GREAT, GRAY CITY

One of our American poets referred to the "great, gray city" as the ideal place for the university. I wonder if it may not be the ideal place for scouting.

As a boy walks across the uneven cobblestone streets in Brooklyn does his mind think that on those same cobblestones once trod Washington, Lincoln, Henry Ward Beecher, Walt Whitman, and S. Parkes Cadman? The history of this city, of our borough, is fascinating, indeed. A portion of the Revolutionary War was fought over the ground on which this church stands.

A boy walks down to the esplanade here in Brooklyn. He cannot help but be excited by what he sees. There on Brooklyn Heights a farmhouse stood. It served as George Washington's headquarters during the Battle of Long Island. There he watched his forces driven before the British. At the foot of the Heights he embarked his men, saving both them and his cause. Just a few blocks farther on is the church of Henry Ward Beecher. From his pulpit came the demand for freedom for all men regardless of color; even today, 100 years later, not fully answered. Abraham Lincoln sat in that church. Just a bit from where we meet, during the Civil War the *Monitor* sailed out to revolutionize naval warfare.

As you look out across the harbor, just off to the left is a statue, the symbol of freedom and liberty. Millions have been heartened by the sight of her as they came to this land in search of freedom. There to the right is the financial capital of the world, the center of industrial responsibility. Farther up the river is the heart of developing international government, our real hope for future peace. Here are colleges, universities, and institutions; galleries and museums, gardens and academies; music, art, theater. Here is knowledge. Here is wisdom. Here is beauty. Here is a laboratory for learning unmatched. These are yours to use, if you wish, as you see fit.

Certainly we have problems. There is ugliness here, too. Here are painfully demonstrated the difficulties of modern urban culture. Beauty in views, in great buildings, in gardens and yet there is unbelievable crowding in cold-water walkups. Where one family lived decently a few years ago, now five families live in the same space. A fantastic influx of people, representing different ways of life, different backgrounds, cast together in a great, sometimes harsh city. From this matrix of diverse races, various faiths, and unlike backgrounds has come the strength of our American culture.

It is healthy indeed for a person to learn and study in this alive atmosphere. Students work harder here than in most localities. Because they must, students quickly learn to concentrate fully on the task at hand. Certainly students are more highly motivated at Pratt Institute than I have seem them anywhere before. Possibly this is as a result of the programs of professional education there. They come with goals clearly selected, whether in engineering or art or architecture or at any of the schools on our campus.

And in scouting, too, there are opportunities for growth, for study, for exploration and for service unequaled here in the city. It was through the courtesy and desire to help of a British Boy Scout in the city of London that the Boy Scouts of America was organized.

IV. "* * * AND LET IT GO"

Dr. Van Dyke said, "Life is an arrow. Therefore you must know what mark to aim at, how to use the bow, then draw it to the head and let it go."

The bower chose the best yew log he could find, split a stave from it, cut it, to form a rough bow. There were hours of shaping, scraping, tillering and careful finishing. Ultimately a fine weapon appeared in his hands. Is there parallel here with education, scouting and a boy?

The arrow too was as carefully made as the bow. Fletchers had the responsibility of selecting shafts, matching them in weight and spine, then affixing the feathers or fletching to be sure the shaft would fly truly. Does this bring to mind the straightness, trueness, the guilding force of our Christian heritage?

Aiming occupies much of the literature of the bow, whether from the pen of medieval or modern writers. One problem each of us has is to identify his own mission. You will certainly accomplish no more than you set yourself to do. You must know what mark to aim at, and then aim with real care.

Van Dyke continued, "Draw it to the head and let it go." Well, the process is a bit more complicated.

It is not just a matter of letting go but rather of releasing cleanly and crisply. Then in this sport as in any other followthrough is vital. True too in life the selection of the goal, the preparation and training—but without the followthrough of determination and persistence, the goal is never reached. I believe that Mr. Van Dyke had this in mind when he used the phrase "and let it go."

V. TODAY'S EXPLORER

No longer are we concerned with arrows as massed missiles in war, but through the unreliable musket to the rifle. We continued to use missiles. And today the era of gunpowder is dying, to be replaced by entirely new weapons systems. It is a long distance from the flint arrowhead of our Indians or the bodkin of the English archer to the atomic or hydrogen warhead of the intercontinental ballistics missile. We have moved far in the development of killing each other more effectively. Have we moved as far in the teaching of the Carpenter of Galilee? Perhaps we have come along the road farther than we think. It makes little difference to the recipient whether it is explosion or implosion. We pray that a situation has been created in which these weapons will never be used; that the consequences of a decision to fire are so disastrous that the decision will never be reached.

A boy stands on the Esplanade and watches ferryboats scuttling back and forth, powerful tugs berthing liners and freighters. Ships stream out to all ports of the world. His eye is caught by a helicopter slowly making its way across the city skyline. He hears the unmistakable sound of a turbo-prop. And his mind turns to jets and then to space. Here is today's explorer.

Mr. Roger Blough, the chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp., said some time ago:

"The future is not for little men with little minds. It is not for men without vision who fear progress. It is not for timid men. * * * No. The future is for men who dare to have great expectations; and who * * * will also have the courage, the persistence, the wisdom, the patience to transform those expectations into realities."

Today's frontiersman, pioneer, explorer is no longer a man with a long rifle over one arm, or the fast gun. He is a boy curious and critical, dreaming great dreams. He may have a microscope on the table in front of him or a slide rule in his hand. Today the frontiers are more vast and the demands on the explorer greater. Today we must have education for rapid adapation to an exploding universe. These frontiers are gigantic. And no longer are they confined to the people of one nation expanding westward. These explorations will benefit mankind. We need answers to the problem of shelter, warmth, and food for all men. We must know how to use fully all of our natural resources to aid man. There are discoveries in health, in communication, in science, and engineering. And these discoveries will be made. Perhaps even more important though will be progress in the humanities, in man learning to live together and enjoying the abundance which can be his.

Who are these pioneers, these explorers, these lean, hard men of the future? You are.

Mr. Speaker, presentation of the God and Country Award was made to the following recipients: Alfred Dee, William Barg, Charles Arnold, William Rivera, Miguel Rivera, Rafael Sanchez, Emilio Sella, and Ruben D. Cruz.

Rev. Kenneth Lee Rowe, pastor, Boro Park Baptist Church, announced the benediction.

The Byrd Antarctic Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission, in order to promote a more effective pol-

icy and to better protect our country's interests in the antarctic.

A similar bill has been introduced in the other House by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] for himself and for a number of other Senators.

I am delighted to sponsor this legislation in the House of Representatives. Our Government has been actively interested in the south polar region for over a century. As early as 1838, our Government sent its ships on an expedition led by Lt. Charles Wilkes, of the U.S. Navy, to explore Antarctica. Our interest in the exploration of that vital region has continued and grown in importance to this very day. Today, further exploration and potential utilization of Antarctica is of immediate concern to our Nation.

The proposal embodied in the Wiley-Zablocki bill calls for the establishment of a Commission—appropriately named the "Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission" in honor of the great explorer whose name symbolizes man's search into the unknown—which would plan, develop, organize, coordinate, and direct antarctic activities among agencies of the U.S. Government and private institutions so as to promote our national and civil objectives.

The specific duties and major purposes of the Commission would be as follows:

First. To collect, coordinate, and better utilize the available data on the south polar region.

Second. To reevaluate this data in the light of current needs, and, so far as possible, make recommendations for clearer, more effective policies.

Third. To conduct field and laboratory studies to further knowledge of science, commerce, and related activities.

Fourth. To conduct research, investigation, and experimentation in antarctic matters relating to the national defense and other interests of the United States.

Fifth. To assist, and, as necessary, direct plans by other U.S. agencies for operations or expeditions into the antarctic, for military, scientific, or other purposes.

Sixth. To establish a depository of information relating to the antarctic.

It is my sincere hope that this legislation will receive prompt and favorable consideration in this House.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask to have the text of the Wiley-Zablocki bill printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

H.R. 5222

A bill to provide for continuity and support of study, research, and development of programs for peaceful uses in science, commerce, and other activities related to Antarctica, which shall include, but shall not be limited to, gathering, evaluating, correlating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research, and other mediums relating to weather, communications, travel, and other areas of information; also to coordinate Antarctic activities among those agencies of the United States Government and private institutions interested in or concerned directly with the promotion, advancement, increase, and diffusion of knowledge of the Antarctic; and to direct and administer United States Antarctic programs in the national interest

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission Act of 1959."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. When used in this Act:

(1) "Commission" means the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission.

(2) "Director" means the Director of the Commission.

(3) "Board" means the Board of Governors.

(4) "Commissioned officer" means a commissioned officer of the Armed Forces of the United States.

THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. There is established in the executive branch of the Government, the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission. The Commission shall consist of a Director, two Deputy Directors, and a Board of Governors.

FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall—

(1) maintain a depository of information relating to the Antarctic including: (A) all records of the Commission, (B) originals or copies of records within the executive branch relating to the Antarctic, (C) books, pamphlets, periodicals, and articles dealing with the Antarctic, and (D) such other information as the Commission considers desirable;

(2) conduct such field and laboratory studies and evaluations as it considers advisable to further the knowledge of the Antarctic in science, commerce, and related activities, which shall include, but shall not be limited to gathering, evaluating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research and other mediums, relating to weather, communications, travel, and other areas of information;

(3) publish or arrange for the publication of scientific, technical, historical, and general information so as to further the dissemination of information about the Antarctic, when the dissemination is consistent with the interests of national security and the public interest (publication may be made without regard to section 87 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (ch. 23, 28 Stat. 622), and section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (ch. 86, 40 Stat. 1270; 44 U.S.C. 111));

(4) with the concurrence and approval of the Board, perform, at the request of the head of any executive agency, specific research, investigation, or experimentation in connection with matters relating to the national defense and/or the interests of the United States;

(5) approve the plans for and supervise Antarctic operations or expeditions conducted by, or supported by, other agencies of the United States except for operations or expeditions or parts thereof which are military in character;

(6) assist private Antarctic expeditions or research programs when such assistance is in the best interests of the United States;

(7) accept and utilize the service of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (ch. 744, 60 Stat. 808), as amended (5. U.S.C. 73b-2), for persons serving without compensation; and

(8) acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and hold or dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real or personal property necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority under this Act;

(9) receive and use funds donated to the Commission if such funds are donated without restriction other than that they be used to carry out the general purposes of this Act;

(10) report to the President before September 16 of each year, summarizing the activities of the Commission and making such recommendations as it considers appropriate. The report shall include the recommendation of the Board.

THE DIRECTOR OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a period of six years and shall be paid at the rate prescribed in section 107(a) of the Federal Executive Pay Act, 1956 (70 Stat.). He may be a person appointed from civilian life or a commissioned officer in an active or retired status.

(b) The Director shall—

(1) manage the affairs of the Commission;

(2) issue such regulations as he considers necessary to carry out this Act;

(3) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out this Act; and

(4) be a member of the Board of Governors ex officio.

(c) The appointments made and the compensation fixed shall be in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949 and the regulations of the Civil Service Commission. However, the Director may employ such technical and professional personnel, and fix their compensation, as he considers necessary, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949 or the regulations of the Civil Service Commission. The Director may terminate the employment of any officers or employees, except the Deputy Directors, whenever he considers that termination to be in the best interests of the United States, except that no person in the classified service may be removed or suspended without pay unless it is accomplished under the Act of August 24, 1912 (ch. 389, 37 Stat. 555), as amended (5 U.S.C. 652).

DEPUTY DIRECTORS

SEC. 6. (a) The Deputy Directors shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall perform such duties as he may prescribe.

(b) The Deputy Directors may be appointed from civilian life or may be commissioned officers in an active or retired status. However, if the Director is appointed from civilian life, only one Deputy Director may be a commissioned officer. If the Director is a commissioned officer, both Deputy Directors shall be appointed from civilian life.

(c) The Deputy Directors shall be paid $ a year.

MILITARY STATUS OF DIRECTOR AND DEPUTY DIRECTORS

SEC. 7. (a) When a commissioned officer is appointed as Director or Deputy Director, he is not subject to military authority and may not exercise command over any members of the Armed Forces of the United States except as the President may prescribe.

(b) The appointment of a commissioned officer as Director or Deputy Director does not affect his status or rank or the pay and allowances incident to his status or rank. He is entitled to receive the pay and allowances payable to an officer of his rank and length of service, for which the appropriate department shall be reimbursed from any funds available to defray the expenses of the Commission. He is also entitled to be paid by the Commission the amount by which the compensation provided for the Director or Deputy Director exceeds his annual military pay and allowances.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

SEC. 8. (a) The Board—consisting of eleven members—shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board shall consist of the President of the National Academy of Sciences; Director of the National Science Foundation; Secretary of Defense; Secretary of State; Secretary of Interior; Secretary of Commerce, or their designees, plus four selected from civil life who are eminently qualified in their professions so as to provide, in addition to Federal administration, a broad field of knowledge and experience

which will properly relate the activities of the Commission to the national welfare.

(b) The members of the Board, in addition to the President of the National Academy of Sciences; Director of the National Science Foundation; Secretary of Defense; Secretary of State; Secretary of Interior; Secretary of Commerce, or their designees, shall be appointed for a period of six years, except that, (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term of his predecessor shall be appointed for the remainder of the term; (2) the term of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this Act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one at the end of two years, one at the end of four years, and two at the end of six years, and (3) a member may be reappointed to the Board for not more than one additional term; and (4) the members of the Board who are Cabinet members shall be members of that Board during the tenure of office as Cabinet members.

(c) Members of the Board shall be paid at the rate of $50 per day—for each day—except members of the President's Cabinet during their services as members of the Board, and shall be allowed travel expenses as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (ch. 744. 60 Stat. 808), as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2).

(d) The Board shall—

(1) meet annually on the first Monday in November and at such other times as the Chairman determines;

(2) elect a Chairman and Vice Chairman, at the regular annual meeting, to serve for the following year;

(3) review and assess the research and exploration activities relating to the Antarctic; and

(4) make such recommendations to the Commission as they consider appropriate for the advancement and dissemination of knowledge of the Antarctic.

RESEARCH CENTERS

SEC. 9. (a) Under the provisions of this Act there shall be established a minimum of five, and not more than eight, research centers at academic and/or research institutions having special competences or interests in scientific aspects of polar research.

The Commission shall determine that each such center shall meet criteria prescribed by the Commission under the policy guidance provided by the Board of Governors, and the Commission shall be responsible for the overall development and coordination of programs of research which may be approved for development within the research centers in, and related to the Antarctic region. Such programs of research as may be initiated at the research centers with the approval of the Commission shall be supported by Federal or private funds.

(b) Due to the unique requirements of polar research, a designated number of fellowships shall be provided to permit qualified students to conduct studies at the research centers and also in Antarctica. The Commission shall be authorized to grant funds in support of fellowships specifically associated with polar research, recommended by the Director of the Commission and approved by the Board of Governors.

SERVICES AND FUNDS OF OTHER AGENCIES

SEC. 10. (a) The Commission may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize on a reimbursable basis the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the United States. However, such services and facilities may be furnished only if it does not interfere with the performance of the primary mission of the agency concerned. An agency having custody of data relating to the matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission shall, upon request of the Director, make that data available to the Commission without reimbursement.

(b) Funds available to any agency of the United States for scientific or technical research, educational, or other public service are available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the agency concerned, to the Commission for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which those funds were provided. Funds so transferred shall be spent by the Commission for the purposes for which the transfer was made or for general administrative expenses until such time as an appropriation is made available to the Commission.

ACTS AMENDED

SEC. 11. Subsection 107(a) of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 is amended by adding the following after clause (22):

"(23) Director of the Antarctic Commission."

SEC. 12. Section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (70 Stat. 762; 5 U.S.C. 1105), is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(f) The Director of the Antarctic Commission is authorized, without regard to any other provision of this section, to place a total of seven positions in the Antarctic Commission in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by subsection (b)."

Adjudication of General Kosciuszko's Wills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a very interesting article entitled, "Adjudication of General Kosciuszko's Wills" written by a very close and personal friend of mine of many years, Mr. Anthony O. Shalina, A.B., LL.B., which informative article appeared in the Massachusetts Law Society Journal, vol. XX, December 1949:

ADJUDICATION OF GENERAL KOSCIUSZKO'S WILLS

(By Anthony O. Shalina [1])

A testator's last will and testament should reflect his aims, character, and nature. Very often for one reason or another that is not accomplishment. A person may be an expert in several vocations yet fall short of drawing a will that puts into effect his desires and wishes after he passes on. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko's four wills may illustrate beyond a doubt that the drawing of a will is a highly technical document to be executed with a great deal of care and skill.

Among the foreign officers in the American Revolutionary War like Lafayette, Von Steuben, and DeKalb, there was a young colonel who landed here in 1776 from Paris with a letter of introduction from Benjamin Franklin to George Washington. In time he became General Washington's aide-de-camp and terminated his services for our country with the rank of brigadier general. Having received a substantial grant of land and money from Congress, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko before departing for Europe drew a will on May 5, 1798, in which he expressed him humanitarian views:

"I, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, being just on my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that, should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States, I hereby authorize my friend Thomas Jefferson to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own or any other and giving them liberty in my name; in giving them an education in trade or otherwise; in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality which may make them good neighbors, good fathers, and mothers, husands, and wives, in their duty as citizens; teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country, of the good order of society, and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful."

After some unfortunate experiences with Russia in trying to liberate the Commonwealth of Poland and Lithuania (beginning with 1386, supplemented by several treaties, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland were united under the Commonwealth of Poland until the third partition in 1795) he located in Paris and drew his second will or perhaps a codicil on June 28, 1806. In this will he makes reference to the aims expressed in his first will and he makes a special bequest to Kosciusko Armstrong, a son of his friend General Armstrong. From a photostatic copy of the original will and affidavit of proof, which are historical documents, one may read General Kosciuszko's fondest thoughts and history correcting data, namely:

"Know all men by these presents that I Thaedo Kosciusko formerly an officer of the United States of America in their Revolutionary War against Great Britain, and a native of Lithuania in Poland, at present residing at Paris, do hereby will and direct that at my decease the sum of Three thousand seven hundred and four dollars currency of the aforesaid United States shall of right be possessed by and delivered over to the full enjoyment and use of Kosciusko Armstrong the son of General John Armstrong Minister Plenipotentiary of said States at Paris, for the security and performance whereof, I do hereby instruct and authorize my only lawful Executor in the said United States, Thomas Jefferson President thereof to reserve in trust for that special purpose, of the Funds he already holds belonging to me, the aforeseaid sum of Three thousand seven hundred and four dollars in principal to be paid by him the said Thomas Jefferson immediately after my decease, to him the aforesaid Kosciusko Armstrong and in case of his death to the use and benefit of his surviving Brothers.

"Given under my hand and seal at Paris this 28th day of June 1806.

"THADE KOSCIUSZKO.

"In presence of Charles Carter and James M. Morris."

"COMMERCIAL AGENCY
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Paris.

"On this 28th day of June in the year of our Lord 1806 and of the Independence of the United States of America the thirtieth, before the undersigned, commercial Agent and Agent of Prize-Causes for the United States of America at Paris, personally appeared Thade' Kosciuszko, late officer of the said United States, who in his presence signed and sealed the foregoing Transfer in favor of Kosciuszko Armstrong, the son of General John Armstrong, Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States at Paris, and in case of his Death to the use and benefit of his surviving Brothers, and did acknowledge it as his own act and deed for the purposes therein specified.—

[1] Member of the Boston Bar and a vice president of the Law Society.

"In testimony whereof he the said undersigned as aforesaid has hereunto signed his name and affixed his seal of office at Paris the day and year above written.

"FULWAR SKIPWITH."

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
"*Washington County, to Wit:*

"The 19th day of November 1828, James M. Morris, one of the subscribing witnesses to the aforegoing instrument of writing, purporting to be the late will and testament of Thadeus Kosciusko, deceased, made oath on the Holy Evangels of Almighty God that he did see the testator therein named sign that this will—that he published, pronounced and declared the same to be his last will and testament—that, at the time of his so doing he was, to the best of his apprehension, of sound and disposing mind, memory, and understanding—and that he, together with Charles Carter, the other subscribing witness, respectively subscribed their names as witnesses to this will, in the presence and at the request of the testator, and in the presence of each other.

"Sworn in open court.

"Testator HENRY C. NEALE, *Rg. Wills.*"

On June 4, 1816, he drew an olographic will as his third will, apparently revoking the prior wills. In this will, made at Soleure, Switzerland, he used this language: "I, the undersigned Thaddeus Kosciuszko, residing at Berville, in the township Genevrage, of the Department of Seine and Marne (being now) or at present at Soleure, in Switzerland."

His fourth will was drawn October 10, 1817, and in this will nothing is said as to his residence.

General Kosciuszko was more than a good general. He was an outstanding humanitarian—a forerunner of the abolishment of slavery. He preceded President Lincoln by about 65 years in taking steps to abolish slavery both in this country and in Europe.

Biographers, historians, and others who have tried to present General Kosciuszko to us have made use of his will of 1798, but have not even made a reference to his second and other wills. Any degree of research should have brought forth the existence of these other wills. It was the will of 1806 that was analyzed and substantiated by our Supreme Court.

The record in the administration of Kosciuszko's estate has been correct but not all of us have been apprized of it. Since this case had been considered at length by the U.S. Supreme Court and the documents and proofs in this cause from the orphans' court, the genealogy of the Kosciusko family and the collateral relatives of the persons entitled to a decree, and also the wills of Kosciuszko are properly in evidence in this suit and the record from Grodno is judicial, not a judgment inter parties, but a foreign judgment in rem, "which is evidence of the facts adjudicated against all the world," we might state the essential and interesting parts of the Court's opinion.

With the will of 1816 revoking the wills of 1798 and 1806 and no disposition having been made in it or in the will of 1817 of the funds in controversy, as to which General Kosciuszko died intestate it became necessary to find out which relatives may be entitled to inherit from him according to the law of his domicile at the time of his death.

In proceedings to the question of domicile the Court said, "In the will of 1806 he describes himself as 'an officer of the United States of America in their Revolutionary War against Great Britain, and a native of Lithuania in Poland, at present residing in Paris.'"

In the will of 1816 he refers to his residence in Switzerland. And in the will of 1817 nothing is said as to his residence. There was no proof that he was not in France continuously until 1815 when he went to Vienna.

The Court also observed that "Kosciuszko's domicile of origin was Lithuania in Poland." The presumption of law is that the domicile was retained unless the change is proved and the burden of proving it is upon him who alleges the change. The Court ruled that from his own declarations and other proofs in the record that he was domiciled in France at the time of his death.

The Court then ordered, adjudged, and decreed that the legal domicile at the time of his death in 1817 was in France, that the will of October 10, 1817, had not disposed of the funds in this country; that the fund in this country is to be distributed according to the law of France, the place of his domicile at the time of his death, and that the said fund belongs to the lineal descendants of the two sisters of Kosciuszko.

In fairness and justice to a man who had tried to be so helpful to the country of his adoption, to his native land and humanity it should be stated that he was a great engineer and the founder of West Point Military Academy.

The Ultimate Consumer Pays the Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I insert therewith two articles from the February issue of that popular magazine Nation's Business. These articles are timely and good, and, in my opinion, they express the feeling of every American who reads and thinks for himself, and who is not swayed by political expediency.

Modern liberals, both in and out of Congress, vigorously—yes, blindly—support most every request for public spending, regardless of its need, on the theory it will help the little fellow and the wage earner. They forget to tell you that the ultimate consumers of goods and food—you—pay all the taxes brought on by the spending of every public spending body—municipal, county, State, and Federal—and that the so-called little fellows and the wage earners are by far, as a whole, the greatest consuming group in America.

However, our farmers are the greatest per person taxpayers, since our farmers buy and consume, on an average, over twice as many dollars' worth of manufactured goods when their dollar is worth 100 cents at the counter, than do our other average consumers per person when their dollar is on par value with the farmer's dollar.

These modern liberals forget to explain that privately owned taxpaying industry—from the peanut vendor to the corner grocer, to the privately owned partnerships, large and small companies and corporations—must add every and all taxes to the cost of the goods they sell in order to make a reasonable profit, or they would very soon be out of business. Remember, you are already paying 30 cents in taxes in every dollar you spend for food and goods.

So, when every taxing body—including the United States Congress—appropriates the people's money, your money, you so-called little people must pay the greater part of the bill, for, as I said before, you are our greatest consumers.

History records that every nation on earth who embarked too long on a reckless spending spree full speed ahead—such as our reckless spenders have done for years and years—has lost its liberties and has suffered every known misery for its folly.

For this reason, I plead with you who read and think through to join with those of us who are trying our very best to avoid national bankruptcy and all of its attending sufferings, by not only holding our President's budget, but to reduce it wherever it is safe and proper to do so.

The articles follow:

OUR TIRED LIBERALS

The most abused word in political use today is "liberal."

Originally it identified men who brought new and refreshing thinking to the art of government. These men dared to challenge the idea that those to whom birth or votes had given authority were necessarily all-wise and therefore deserved to be all-powerful. They fought to win for the individual the privilege of proving his own capacity to meet the buffetings of life.

Now the word "liberal" has been perverted to cover those of a completely opposite philosophy. Today we are asked to believe that the liberal government is that which most persistently undertakes to meet the people's needs. What the people need is a matter that the new liberals have felt free to decide among themselves. The right of individual achievement is not included.

Those who push this philosophy today find themselves in an awkward straddle. To fulfill their dream of security for everybody would require money that the Federal Treasury doesn't have and has little chance of getting. To give their goals a semblance of soundness, the liberals must first prove that temporary insolvency is a governmental virtue, because it will lead to a glorious new day.

They are trying frantically to do this by insisting that any effort to hold the government's debt in line, to counteract inflation, to reduce the size of monumental expenditures is fiscal irresponsibility.

The President's budget which attempts to do these things, is, they tell us, a tired budget, the product of old-fashioned thinking which cannot recognize future tax potentials and new concepts of Federal service and achievement.

This argument compels attention.

Certainly we cannot afford tired thinking. Let us listen to the new concepts and examine the financial legerdemain that makes them possible to attain without bankruptcy.

At this point, the liberal promises turn to ashes. We can pay for their schemes, they tell us, because the country is entering on such a period of expansion that tax revenues soon will be sufficient to cover any sort of government extravagance.

This rosy prediction overlooks the truth that both expansion and taxes come from profits and, in the liberal philosophy, profits are wicked. Congressional committees are already hectoring or preparing to hector every major industry. A half dozen bills introduced or proposed would complicate or cripple the procedures by which business and industry expand operations, open job oppor-

tunities and introduce better products more cheaply.

If expansion actually does bring the increased revenues for which the liberals hope, it will come in spite of them rather than because they planned it that way.

But with expansion or without it we still have no room for tired thinking. We need new ideas, new concepts, new vision in government.

What do the liberals bring of these?

The list is tragically disappointing: Federal intervention in schools; subsidies for depressed areas; minimum wage legislation; a housing program; veterans' programs; a farm subsidy program—all tired old ideas.

Some have been tried with doubtful success. Others the American people, through their Congress, have rejected in the past as unsound and undesirable.

Compared to this reiteration of political cliches the President's proposal for a balanced budget has the brilliance of sheer originality.

The tired thinking of the pseudoliberals offers little temptation to upset it.

WHAT'S AT STAKE IN WASHINGTON

Congressional action in coming weeks will have a far-reaching effect on the climate in which you operate as a businessman.

Votes cast by the Nation's lawmakers will affect the taxes you pay, the freedom with which you can make business decisions, your relations with labor—even the nature of the competition you face from other businesses.

The central, dominating issue before Congress is the soundness of the American economy. The shadow of this issue will fall across a universe of smaller issues, for the majority of bills already introduced in the 86th Congress would require spending of additional billions of tax dollars. Such expenditures, fiscal authorities say, could capsize the administration's hopes for a balanced budget, add to the already huge Federal deficit, and send the inflationary spiral soaring to even more dangerous heights.

Following are concise reports on the major business-related issues facing Congress. Covered are proposals concerning social security, Government restrictions on business, labor legislation, taxation, defense spending, and other issues.

Included with the individual summaries you will find a statement of the position which the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, as spokesman for organized business, has taken on each of the key issues.

INFLATION

The issue

Considering the current state of the economy and probable economic trends during fiscal 1960 (which starts July 1, 1959):

1. What can be done to prevent inflation from lowering the value of the dollar?

2. What should be the proper relationship between revenues and expenditures in the Federal budget for fiscal 1960?

3. How much can be saved by reducing less essential Federal activities and improving efficiency in Federal operations?

The Federal Government is running a deficit of almost $13 billion. It is having difficulty financing its debt. It has strained existing tax resources to the limit. It is faced with mounting national and international pressures for more spending.

The solution

The U.S. Chamber will review the President's budget and make recommendations for economy and efficiency to congressional committees.

It will urge legislation to curb the monopoly power of unions.

It will suggest to Congress the establishment of an impartial study group to devise a new tax structure that will stimulate economic growth. It will urge amendment of the Employment Act of 1946 to provide that the Government shall be responsible for controlling inflation as well as promoting maximum levels of employment and production.

The chamber will continue to develop public support for Federal Reserve Board efforts to hold down inflation.

DEFENSE

The issue

Whether President Eisenhower's $40.9 billion defense budget is adequate or whether the administration program fails to meet the threat of Russia's military might.

The solution

Though in a situation so complicated no single recommendation is possible, the chamber's objectives are to have an adequate national security at a minimum cost; a simplified defense appropriation structure for better control of funds; improved defense organization and management; and curtailment of commercial-industrial activities of the Department of Defense.

Dollars alone will not buy security. Devoting energies and resources to the point of weakening our economic system will defeat the effort to build a strong, well-rounded defense system.

The chamber will analyze the 1960 defense budget. It will urge Congress to restrict military programs to those of a compelling necessity; close unnecessary facilities; set a deadline for curtailing unnecessary commercial-industrial activities and use the new powers under the Defense Reorganization Act.

PROCUREMENT

The issue

Many provisions of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 are obsolete and contribute to delays and unnecessary expenses. The act governs how more than $22 billion of the annual defense budget is spent.

Because of legislative and administrative restrictions, our defense procurement system does not make full use of the vast industrial ingenuity and resourcefulness that has put the United States ahead of the rest of the world in the production of top-quality, low-cost, nondefense products and services.

The law still stresses a highly formalized type of procurement that is impractical and uneconomical in buying some complex military equipment, and discourages use of the method of procurement that experience has demonstrated is the most efficient and economical for 90 percent of the dollar volume of such purchasing.

At a time when our security could be threatened by a month's delay in procuring a new weapon, the United States is taking twice as long as Russia in converting many of its ideas for new weapons into finished products.

The solution

The chamber will support the major objectives of legislation which Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, has reintroduced to overhaul the Armed Services Act.

Also, the chamber will urge that the Renegotiation Act be allowed to expire next June 30, and that defense contractors be indemnified against unusual hazards.

MILITARY MANPOWER

The issue

Congress must decide for how long and in what form to extend the draft law in the light of rapidly changing military manpower requirements and the increased importance of expanding our scientific and technical education programs.

Manpower is much more than a military problem. We have one labor force and the demands on it, particularly in time of national emergency, must be well coordinated.

Although our military manpower requirements have dropped to 2.5 million, a much larger percentage of the active forces must be technical and skilled.

The solution

Extension of the draft law in some form is generally accepted as necessary.

Previous extensions have been for 4 years. Congress should consider manpower problems more frequently than that.

The chamber urges a 2-year extension because:

A quality career force is being developed.

Reenlistment rates are continuing to increase.

Secretary McElroy anticipates further reductions in manpower strength.

The problem of obtaining inductions at an age lower than 23 should be dealt with either by amendment or administrative action.

LABOR RELATIONS

The issue

What laws are needed in the labor-management field to bring fair play to the public, to employees and to employers?

The issue is important to the businessman because labor costs and other labor problems are among the most worrisome matters with which businessmen have to deal. The entire future of our economy depends in great measure on the skill with which these questions are handled.

Only if there is a greatly aroused public opinion on the question will Congress seriously undertake to do anything about it. With a growing number of Members of Congress beholden to labor because of campaign contributions and other support, there is a hard core who are against action which would go to the heart of this important matter. In fact, there is likelihood that efforts will be made to give labor still more power.

The solution

The chamber recommends equal treatment under law as a means of solving the problem. Such treatment would mean curbing the monopolistic abuses by unions and compelling fair play on their part, just as such requirements have long been imposed upon employers.

The argument most frequently used against the chamber's position is that the businessmen's basic purpose is to destroy unions.

The principal arguments for the chamber position are that Federal and State protection of the right to organize has placed tremendous power in the hands of a few labor leaders. This power has resulted in corruption and abuses. The victims have been the public, employees and employers.

Business long ago was brought under the antitrust laws, the fair trade laws, the Securities Exchange Act, and other laws which compel fair play. Unless we are to have a harmful imbalance in our society, big labor's activities must likewise be regulated.

EDUCATION

The issue

Shall Federal spending and decision making further direct the adjustment of American education to the space age, or shall school needs be met by State and local resources?

More Federal intervention means:

1. Increased Federal taxes for education, and Federal intervention in school systems and colleges.

2. The transfer of decisions affecting public schools from local and State governments to the Federal Government.

3. The loss of autonomy by private schools and colleges, as they become more dependent on Federal grants, or loans, or contract programs.

Members responsible for the National Defense Education Act urge that Congress increase the areas covered and the amount of

Federal intervention into education. Many indicated at the end of the 85th Congress that the National Defense Education Act was "but a step along the road we must travel in Federal financing of education." Likely further proposals are grants for school construction and to improve teacher salaries.

Those favoring more Federal intervention in schools argue that the space age has created demands for trained manpower which State and local school improvements cannot meet.

On the other hand, no manpower emergency has been demonstrated, beyond the chronic need for scientists. State and local school authorities are providing dynamic leadership toward the solution of space-age curriculum requirements. At the same time, school construction, except in rapidly growing suburban areas, has more than kept up with enrollments.

The solution

The chamber recommends that school needs be assessed by local and State leaders—both educators and laymen—and that their resources be fully used to provide educational support and to increase the efficiency with which school revenues are spent. Only when an emergency exists which is clearly beyond the resources of a State and its communities should any program of Federal intervention be considered, even on a temporary basis.

Local chamber education committees and congressional action committees should help educators assess their school needs and find the resources to meet them.

The controversies over curriculums and teaching methods cannot be satisfactorily resolved through national legislation or administrative decrees, but must be left to a diversity of experiment in the thousands of school systems where local initiative can better adapt schools to the needs of the communities they serve.

TAXATION

The issue

Through our Federal system of taxation we pay for our freedom as well as for the goods and services of national government.

The demands and pressures for revenue are high.

The Communist threat dictates a continuing national policy of heavy defense spending. More than half of Government outlays are for protection.

Pressures to commit the balance of Federal tax money for more services, grants, benefits, aids, and projects are growing at a rate that now exceeds that of the income produced under our tax laws.

Unwise taxation will ultimately destroy the incentive to produce and the ability to invest in economic growth.

Investment is necessary to provide the jobs for our expanding labor force and for our national defense.

During this session of Congress hundreds of bills will be introduced to change either our tax rates or our tax system. Most of these will receive scant consideration. Representative WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, has indicated that the committee will limit itself to technical and administrative changes. However, he has called for eventual uniformity, simplification, and broadened tax base.

The solution

We must choose between a tax system which by its nature retards our potential economic growth through destruction of traditional sources of investment capital or development of a tax system which will permit individual savings and resultant investment.

If we are to maintain Federal budgets at or above this level without doing irreparable harm to the economy, it is essential that we so stimulate the tax base as to create an economy that is sufficiently healthy to withstand this continuing drain.

Basic to our need is an impartial study group which will take a keen look at the strengths and weaknesses of our present tax system, investigate the tax systems of others nations, and devise a tax structure which will stimulate our national economic growth.

This period of huge Federal deficit, with its prospect of more to come, is ideal for this type of effort.

CONTROL OF BUSINESS

The issue

Fundamental to the American way of life is the principle of minimum Government interference in citizens' activities. The foundation is being laid, however, to substitute Government controls for freedom of economic activity in:

Mergers: Legislation under consideration would require certain companies to wait until a Government review period expired before merging.

Mergers are a normal part of business operations and help stimulate the Nation's growth and development. The proposed legislation would result in frustrating delays and discourage beneficial mergers.

Pricing: Some members of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly are accusing large firms in key industries of setting so-called administered prices.

In our free society, what is produced and its price are regulated by the market. Administered prices are not a contributing cause to inflation, but rather tend to reflect costs—predominately wage-pushed costs.

Minimum wage coverage: It is proposed to extend Federal minimum wage and premium overtime pay regulations to employees of retail and service trades who have always been exempted from coverage because of the local character of retailing and services.

Such extension would interfere with the mainenance of a proper balance between Federal and State authority in interstate and local commerce. Extending coverage would also add to the inflationary spiral by setting wage levels without regard to productivity and causing employees earning more than the minimum to demand more pay to protect established differentials. It would hurt small business most.

The solution

Government should not control beneficial mergers. Those few mergers which might adversely affect competition can and should be dealt with by proper application of antitrust laws.

There is no justification, either, for Federal interference with normal price-making procedures. Prices adjust to changes in supply and demand.

Exemption of retail and service trades employees, which has existed for good reason since the wage-hour law was passed more than 20 years ago, should be continued.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The issue

Should social security pay benefits large enough to live on comfortably? Should costly new benefits be established?

The present schedule of benefits promised by Congress to the aged person, to his dependents, to family survivors requires virtually doubling the tax rate by 1969, and an increase in the taxable wage base now in effect from $4,200 to $4,800. This means more than doubling the current tax burden upon many employers and employees.

Under the present law a higher taxable wage base has become effective in 1959, and the taxes on employers and on covered workers will be increased in 1960—and 1963, 1966, 1969.

The solution

The chamber recommends that social security pay monthly cash benefits sufficient to prevent want and destitution to people who, because of age, are unable to support themselves.

It is argued that benefits should be made sufficient for a person to live in decency and self-respect. Another argument is that benefits should be increased because of the higher cost of living and to reflect higher levels of pay and rising productivity. Labor leaders contend that workers are willing to pay their fair share toward higher benefits and for new kinds of benefits.

The facts are, however, that the financial soundness of social security must be preserved. This financial soundness depends in large part upon a continued willingness of workers to pay the necessary social taxes. Since the full tax burden of the presently scheduled benefits will not be fully felt until 1969, bigger and new kinds of benefits should not be put into the law until we know for certain that the covered workers in 1969 will be willing to carry twice as large a tax burden as at present.

Moreover, each person is expected to build additional old-age income through his own efforts.

URBAN RENEWAL

The issue

Can cities revitalize their blighted areas, or is permanent and increasing Federal assistance needed?

The 86th Congress has been asked to authorize a 10-year urban renewal program of $600 million annually. This has been coupled with proposals to increase the Federal share in this program from the current 66⅔ percent to as high as 90 percent. Added to measures already introduced are requests to expand the program to include substantial financing for renewal of areas for commercial and industrial development. The program now is predominantly residential.

The commercial and industrial renewal feature will be sought through normal housing legislation, and will probably be a significant point in any depressed area legislation as it was during the last Congress.

The solution

The chamber recommends a gradual reduction of the Federal share in this type of activity to a point where it can ultimately be phased out completely. The chamber has suggested means by which cities can approach their individual problems without seeking substantial Federal assistance.

The chamber points out that many cities have already accomplished much on their own initiative. Pittsburgh; Flint, Mich.; Baltimore, and Indianapolis, to name a few, have shown that they can do a tremendous job on their own.

Moreover, the whole of the $1.4 billion urban renewal capital grant fund has been tied up by a mere 3 percent of America's more than 17,000 communities. Assuming that many more cities will want urban renewal funds, and that existing participants will request increases, the program could become unmanageable.

DEPRESSED AREAS

The issue

Must all taxpayers be compelled to subsidize a relatively few areas with chronic unemployment, or can this problem be met by States and localities, helped by business organizations, without Federal aid?

A new area redevelopment bill, going far beyond the $279 million measure pocket-vetoed last September comes before the new Congress. It is a major goal of labor unions and will have the support of many newly elected Congressmen. Proponents of this legislation argue that Federal aid to depressed areas is long overdue; that relief of chronic unemployment is beyond State, local, and private resources.

Depressed areas are generally described as those with 6 percent or more unemployment.

The solution

The national chamber believes that the real problem is to determine exactly what industries can succeed in these areas, what changes must be made to attract them. Healthy economic recovery depends on finding productive job opportunities. It can best be brought about by aggressive, local industrial development organizations, backed where necessary by privately financed statewide credit corporations. This approach stimulates local initiative. It is also clear that a Federal-aid program might well use your community's tax money to help finance industrial development for a competitive community.

A Federal subsidy program often continues and expands, even though the original need has been met. Pressures to extend aid on looser terms would be difficult to withstand. More money would be requested.

PUBLIC HOUSING

The issue

The basic issue here is whether housing for special segments of the population should be subsidized by tax funds.

Begun on a small scale in the 1930's, the subsidizing of housing has grown until the Federal Government now materially supports more than 500,000 units.

The program lost sight of its original low-income character when Congress, in 1957, revised the formula for determining net income for residence in public housing so that a family earning $9,800 a year could live in some projects.

In many communities public housing has invaded the private market and the community is deprived of necessary taxes.

As of June 30, 1957, the Government was committed to annual contributions of nearly $200 million to cover subsidies to local public housing authorities, and the program showed a net deficit of more than $600 million.

In more than 20 years of operation the program has failed to upgrade housing to any extent.

The solution

The chamber has recommended continuing enforcement of local housing codes as a means of halting the growth of substandard housing from which public housing residents supposedly come.

The provision of decent, safe and sanitary shelter is a local responsibility and should be met according to local requirements through a combination of private enterprise and local welfare action.

Nepotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Greenville (S.C.) News:

FAVORS TO KIN—NEPOTISM NOT FOUND AMONG STATE SOLONS

(By W. D. Workman, Jr.)

COLUMBIA.—With the Washington spotlight focused on the congressional habit of putting wives, sons, and relatives on the official payroll, the time is ripe for a look at South Carolina laws on nepotism.

Section 50-101 of the State code of laws has this to say on the subject:

"It shall be unlawful for any person at the head of any department of this government to appoint to any office or position of trust or emolument under his control or management any person related or connected with him by consanguinity or affinity within the sixth degree."

ACT SETS POLICY

That act establishes a State policy which frowns on nepotism, but the law leaves all sorts of loopholes for placing relatives on payrolls so long as the favored person is not related to the department head himself. And then, there is the question of just who is the head of the legislative department of the State government, for members of the general assembly frequently succeed in having sons or other relatives appointed as pages or other legislative attachés.

No thoroughgoing inquiry has been made in recent years, but there has been little complaint of any undue nepotism in South Carolina.

Garnishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the sixth of a series of articles dealing with garnishment in the District of Columbia:

DEBTOR'S DILEMMA: NEW BILL WOULD ENABLE MAN TO PAY DEBTS, FEED FAMILY

(By Morton Mintz)

(Sixth in a series)

In cookery the word "garnish" has a gentle, pleasant ring. In District law the same word is like the screech of a braked tire.

The District Bar Association is trying to take the terror and tragedy out of garnishment and put it under the wing of justice.

The bar proposal for reform has been introduced in House by Representative JOHN L. MCMILLAN, Democrat, of South Carolina).

A bar director, James A. Willey, is leading the fight for adoption. He is a member and past chairman of the bar's municipal court committee.

The bar proposal recognizes the principle of ability to pay. It sets a sliding scale of garnishments based on a debtor's earnings, as follows: On gross pay up to $200 a month, 10 percent could be attached; $200 to $500, 20 percent; more than $500, 50 percent.

The bar measure would allow only one attachment to be effective at one time. Only after one creditor's debt is satisfied could other attachments take effect, in the order received. The employer would forward the creditor's money once a month.

CALLS FOR CLOSE LOOK

These two provisions say to the easy creditor: Collection from bad risks via attachment can take you a long, long time, and you have an incentive to withhold credit from persons who are bad risks.

It is chiefly in this way that the bar proposal attacks a root trouble in the present situation, the indiscriminate extension of credit. The message of the existing law is caveat emptor—let the buyer beware. The bar proposal would add a large dose of caveat venditor—let the seller beware.

The bar says that if its proposal becomes law, the seller might well beware, for example, of the man whose pay is already being attached.

The proposal would make it impossible for attachment to strip a man of his entire pay.

Neither he nor his employer would have to go to municipal court to prove his eligibility for exemption, for he would get an exemption automatically. The trip to municipal court now must be made for each attachment on which an exemption is sought. Debtors sometimes get worn down by this procedure and lose vital time from work. So they accept a settlement under which they agree to buy more.

Because an employed debtor could not be left penniless by attachments, the incentive (in the present law) for an impoverished husband to desert his family would be removed. As explained in Tuesday's article, he risks imprisonment and/or a fine when he deserts. However, he also assures that, once a court support order is issued, his family will be able to eat and pay the rent.

SEE LESS OPPORTUNITY

Willey says the delayed-collection provisions would curb the present practice of making innocent persons responsible for easy credit debts they did not incur. He says there would be fewer of them because they would be less inviting targets, and they would not be hit so hard.

Other major features of the bar proposal provide that:

A court order to a man to support his wife, former wife, and/or children would have priority over any attachment. There is more caveat venditor here, for a debt for clothing, jewelry, or a car, for example, could not come ahead of family needs.

Wage exemptions would be extended to nonresidents of the District on the same basis as to District residents—automatically. Nonresidents get no exemption under existing law.

Last year the House passed an earlier bill sponsored by the bar that would have limited attachments to a flat 10 percent of gross pay and MCMILLAN has reintroduced a similar bill. Also in 1958, the Senate passed a bill which, while setting a sliding scale of attachments based on earnings, flatly exempted the first $50 of weekly income. Both bills were passed so late in the session that a House-Senate compromise could not be worked out.

Backers of the Senate bill contend the flat $50 exemption is both necessary and a more potent caveat venditor. They also argue that the bar bill and the other measure reintroduced in the House by MCMILLAN would take away from the debtor the exemption he can claim now, forcing him to pay 10 percent of his income though he can ill afford it.

Backers of the two House bills center their rebuttal on these points:

1. The present exemption provision, however reasonable it sounds, does not work most of the time in the way Congress intended. (The reasons for this have been explained previously.)

2. A flat-amount exemption leaves no recourse for collection of legitimate debts from a large segment of the population, and payment of debts is a responsibility that all citizens should bear.

3. Garnishment should be continued as a legitimate, last-resort method of collection from deadbeats.

The Senate bill would have forbidden attachment of a nonresident's pay unless he incurred the debt in the District or unless a judgment was rendered against him elsewhere. The two House bills would allow partial attachments of a nonresident's pay if his employer has an office in the District, no matter where he lives, works, or buys.

Some employers object to the procedure in the Bar bill requiring them to forward to the creditor each month a fraction of an attached person's wage until the debt is satisfied. This, they fear, would make their

garnishment-handling costs even greater than at present.

Willey disagrees. His contention is that there would be so many fewer garnishments that overall employer costs would be lower.

Another employer group strongly favors the bar bill. Agreeing with Willey, these employers foresee lower personnel turnover and replacement training costs, fewer demands on executive time, and an end to the nuisance of multiple attachments. At present, many employers fire a man when he has been attached two or more times.

NOT SEEN AS CURE-ALL

The bar does not claim its proopsal is a cure-all. Its position is that it would wipe out intolerabe evis, and that every contingency cannot possiby be provided for.

The bar bill, or a measure like it, is considered to have the best chance of enactment. It has the unanimous support of the District Merchants and Manufacturers Association with its membership of 400 leading retail merchants, and it is expected to have the backing of the District Commissioners.

So far as the municipal court is concerned, Chief Judge Leonard P. Walsh said the major abuses of the court as a collection agency for a few easy credit firms would be ended by the bar bill, by the other bill introduced by MCMILLAN, by the expected Senate bill or by the Dowdy bill.

Other pending garnishment legislation:

The Dowdy bill: Representative JOHN DOWDY, Democrat, of Texas, has reintroduced a measure to prohibit attachment of earnings.

The Curtis bill: Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, has reintroduced his bill to permit attachment of the wages of all Federal employees.

The Curtis bill would exempt from attachment $200 earned in a 2-month period by a head of a household and $120 by a single person.

A Farm Program That Would Cost Less—Help Those Who Need It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when Secretary Ezra Benson took over the Agriculture Department in 1953, the cost of the farm program was under heavy fire. But during the Truman administration, the total cost of subsidies to farmers never exceeded $1,250 million. On the other hand, Secretary Benson has managed to accumulate $9 billion worth of farm surpluses, which will cost about $1 billion just to store and handle. Under his management, administrative costs in his department have also risen by close to 900 percent. I have just read a column by Joseph Alsop in the Washington Post which brings out these facts. He also reviews the provisions of a farm bill being prepared by four Senators. This bill would cut the cost of subsidies to half the amount requested by Secretary Benson, while giving the assistance to those who need it—our independent, family-type farmers. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include Mr. Alsop's column in the RECORD:

BENSON PROGRAM'S COST IS OUT OF HAND

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—"Let's not be coming up with our scheme, Herman, until we have had a chance to operate on Ezra."

The maker of this cheerfully bloodthirsty remark was Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minnesota, in council with his new ally, Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia. The Ezra destined for the operating table was Secretary of Agriculture Benson. Hatchets will be the instruments employed.

Benson is ripe for the operating table because his farm program has finally got absolutely out of hand. A few comparisons tell the story.

When conservative persons were aroused by the extravagant farm subsidies paid by the Truman spenders, the total cost of the subsidies never passed $1,250 million. The Brannan plan was expected to strangle American agriculture in the embrace of creeping socialism and bankrupt the Treasury in the same breath. But the Brannan plan's total estimated cost was no more than about $2 billion.

In contrast, the conservative, sound-dollar, free enterprise policies of Benson have produced a request for just under $7 billion of agricultural appropriations next year. The $9 billion worth of surpluses the Utah free enterpriser has managed to accumulate will cost about $1 billion in mere storage and handling charges—a larger sum than the spender, Truman, ever paid out to the farmers themselves. Since the spenders were driven out of the Agriculture Department in 1953, administrative costs have also risen by close to 900 percent. And the Utah free enterpriser's bill for farm subsidies next year is in the neighborhood of $4 billion, or about twice the estimated cost of the Brennan plan.

Even the farm State Senators, never before accustomed to be tender in their dealings with the public purse, have begun to be alarmed by this monstrous inflation of the expense of the farm program. So they are not merely preparing to "operate on Ezra"; they are also getting ready a substitute program of their own.

The groundwork is being done by the administrative assistants of Senators TALMADGE, HUMPHREY, SYMINGTON, of Missouri, and PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin. TALMADGE, one of the sharpest intellects in the modern Senate, is the main director and inspirer of the effort. Since the Congress is rarely able to impose brandnew major policies on the executive branch, it is doubtful whether the effort of the four Senators will bear immediate legislative fruit. But even if the bill they are preparing does not pass, it is virtually certain to become the Democratic farm plank in 1960.

Omitting the technicalities, the four-Senator scheme is simple enough. Existing special schemes for tobacco, wool, and other special crops, will be retained. But all other crop controls will be jettisoned, and all the main crops will be sold on the free market, at home and abroad. Subsidies in the form of parity payments will then be given to producers of wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts, corn, and milk. But only on that share of their crop consumed in this country.

If our wheat output is a billion bushels, and America consumes half a billion bushels of this output, a farmer who produces 1,000 bushels of wheat will receive subsidies to bring the price of half his crop up to 100 percent of the sacred and mythical parity price. Special arrangements are provided to liquidate the Utah free enterpriser's staggering surplus stores in a gradual manner. Above all, it is provided that no individual farmer may receive a subsidy payment in excess of $12,500. Mainly because the big farmers are left to shift for themselves, the whole scheme is estimated to cost only about $2 billion at present prices, or half the cost of subsidies requested by Benson.

The scheme's real interest lies in its single-mindedness. It is solely designed to preserve and assist a sorely endangered American asset, our independent farming population. Socially, biologically, historically, this is a name well worth national investment. All previous farm programs, having no limitation on the subsidy check, have instead mainly assisted the big, semi-industrial farmers. This one is shaped to aid only the family sized farm. Whether or not the scheme's machinery is well designed, its principle is surely correct.

Berlin and the Balance of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial by the Assembly of Captive European Nations, dated February 6, 1959, with headquarters in New York City. A letter of transmittal accompanies the editorial.

The letter and editorial follow:

ASSEMBLY OF
CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS,
New York, N.Y., February 27, 1958.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We have read with interest the article by Drew Pearson, on the balance of power, which you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Knowing of your interest in this important problem, I take the liberty of enclosing herewith an ACEN editorial on "Berlin and the Balance of Power." The editorial expresses ACEN views on the theory so eagerly advanced by the Kremlin that the balance of power is already tipped in favor of the Soviets.

We would certainly appreciate your comments.

With best regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
VACLOVAS SIDZIKAUSKAS,
Acting Chairman.

BERLIN AND THE BALANCE OF POWER

An editorial analyzing the situation created by the Soviet-instigated Berlin crisis will appear shortly in the next issue of ACEN News, the monthly review of activities of the Assembly of Captive European Nations. The editorial warns the West to shed its illusion "that ultimate defeat can be staved off by such easy means as cultural exchanges, economic assistance, and the power of example. The West must learn fast that in the political war that is raging now its main problem is not to demonstrate that it is right, but that it has a strong purpose and will, and the determination to win." The full text reads:

"The most recent actions of the Soviet Union, particularly their challenge to the West on Berlin and Germany, and the statements made in recent days at the 21st Congress of the Communist Party, clearly indicate that the Soviet rulers want the world to believe that the balance of power is now tilted in their favor. They are out to persuade the Western Powers that unless they bow to the Soviet demands expressed in quasi-ultimative terms—they will be phys-

ically forced out of Berlin first and Western Germany next. It is obvious that the Soviet rulers would like to world to believe that American power of nuclear retaliation—the basic element of Western European defense—has already been neutralized. The inference is that the Western Powers can no longer risk an all-out war—which, given their inadequate conventional forces, remains the only way in which they could attempt to maintain themselves in Berlin and in Germany. This was quite pointedly expressed on January 29 by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko before the 21st Party Congress in Moscow. 'The growing might of the Soviet Union and the countries of the Socialist camp makes it risky and even impossible to unleash a new world war.'

"Here we have the most significant illustration of the Soviet use of the balance of power concept in order to further their ends painlessly, by classical cold war methods. For the Soviet claim that the balance of power is already tipped in their favor can, at best, be called premature. As they have done so often in the past, the Soviets exploit their future achievements in advance and, because of the secrecy in which they can veil their actions, frequently succeed in getting the outside world to credit them with strength which sometimes is still in the drawing board stage.

"Our point is that in spite of these Soviet claims, the balance of power still favors the West. However, unless western military and political policy is radically invigorated now, the advantage will be lost within the next few years. From then on the balance of power will tilt increasingly in favor of the Soviet Union—to the point where the Soviets, and their Chinese partners, might succeed in gradually gaining control over the whole Eurasian landmass without war, by a combination of lures, pressures and blackmail.

"To understand the tremendous problems with which the free world is confronted today, we must remember that, as a result of World War II, only two important power centers were left in the world: the United States and the Soviet Union. We must further bear in mind that, because of a purely military, nonpolitical approach to warfare on the part of the United States, because of insufficient understanding of Communist aims and methods and because of the premature disarmament of the West, the Soviet Union succeeded in gaining control over the eastern half of the European Continent and, eventually, in carrying communism to power in China. Only insular positions and fringes of the Continents of Europe and Asia escaped Soviet control. Despite many praiseworthy efforts, these fringes never succeeded in placing their defense on a self-supporting basis to any substantial degree. Confronted with the powerful conventional military machine of the Soviet Union, poised in a central position, and enjoying the advantages of a landmass, the free nations of the European and Asian fringes succeeded in conserving their freedom only because of the protective umbrella which American power has extended over them. This protective umbrella consisted almost exclusively of the American power of nuclear retaliation and its deterrent effect.

"It should have been obvious to the free nations that this source of their security was bound one day to dry up. Sooner or later the Soviets would develop a nuclear striking power sufficient to neutralize the American power of nuclear retaliation, and then the Soviet Union would be able, at small risk, to use its vastly superior conventional power to pressure the European and Asian fringe countries into submission.

"Still, the free nations of Europe and Asia acted as if the American nuclear umbrella would protect them forever. They did not take advantage of the time this protection afforded them to build up adequate local forces would counterbalance the nonnuclear striking power of the Soviets. And during the period of American nuclear supremacy, they failed to roll back Soviet power by the joint pressures of internal and external forces. Basking in their newly found prosperity and, more recently, in the comfort of improved internal political conditions, they took their security for granted, and continue to do so.

"It must be stressed that, in order to upset the balance of power, the Soviet Union does not need to outstrip the United States in technology or in nonconventional military power. All they need do is to develop their nuclear striking capability to the point necessary to blow up all essential American targets. The obvious reasoning of the Soviet rulers is that, once they have this capability, it will become too costly for the United States to rescue its allies by the only effective means at its disposal: nuclear retaliation. American nonconventional power will be neutralized, and, once this main deterrent is nullified, conventional power will be too weak to save any ally. Once this dawns upon the allies of the United States they will be ripe for a gradual take-over by political means.

"By its Berlin challenge the Soviet Union would like to suggest that the neutralization of American striking power is already a fact. For this purpose what is really a probing operation is represented as a deliberate showdown. The hope of Moscow seems to be that if it acts with determination and is prepared to go as far as some local shooting, the United States and its allies will realize that they can maintain themselves in Berlin only at the price of an all-out war. Moscow calculates that the West will shy away from this. A compromise, embodying the Soviet terms and some face-saving features would end the incident. The main Soviet purpose would have been achieved: to prove to the nations of Europe and Asia that they can no longer depend on American power, and to thereby pave the way for their step-by-step surrender—via various neutrality and disengagement schemes.

"This is why Berlin has become a transcendental issue. Not the fate of a city, not even of a country or a continent, but the whole future of freedom is at stake. Hence the decision of the Western governments to stand on their rights at whatever risk. It is our strong conviction that this firmness is the only way to prevent the disintegration of the Western camp, with all its inevitable consequences in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. But none should delude himself with the thought that a firm stand now will solve the problem of the balance of power for good. Time will continue to work for the Soviets unless revolutionary changes take place in the thinking and the actions of the West.

"The West must shed the illusion that ultimate defeat can be staved off by such easy means as cultural exchanges, economic assistance, and the power of example. The West must learn fast that in the political war that is raging now its main problem is not to demonstrate that it is right, but that it has a strong purpose and will, and the determination to win. It must learn how to avoid the trap of Soviet softening devices calculated to prepare the mood for more western flexibility—that is, surrender—or for such invitations to complacency as the idea that evolution of the Communist regimes toward freedom and imaginary Soviet-Chinese antagonism will in time solve all problems.

"The West must realize that the time to look to its salvation is today, not tomorrow, and that this requires an unprecedented all-out effort to build local strength in Europe and Asia; an all-out attack on the causes of the coming imbalance of power; an all-out effort of political warfare behind the Soviet lines. For instance, the drive for communes in Red China has created revolutionary conditions which beg to be turned to the advantage of the worldwide cause of freedom.

"The question is: Will the West ever learn to measure risk taking not only in terms of the peril involved but also in terms of opportunity to escape the dire alternatives of war or surrender."

Growing Popular Support for Economy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, since the President announced his balanced budget, I have received hundreds of letters approving the President's determination to fight inflation and reckless Government spending.

Representatives of 23 taxpayer groups in Wisconsin held a conference in the city of Fond du Lac on February 18 and adopted the following resolutions which I would like to insert as an example of the growing popular support for economy in Government:

FEDERAL BUDGET

Whereas in what is generally one of the most prosperous eras in our country's history there seems to be no valid reason why the Government should not be able to pay its own way; and

Whereas a balanced Federal budget for the 1960 fiscal year has been proposed by President Eisenhower; and

Whereas a balanced budget can put a halt to the inflationary trend which is reducing the purchasing power of the dollar; and

Whereas a balanced budget should also lead to reducing the Federal debt; and

Whereas the proposed 1960 Federal budget calls for strengthened fiscal controls which can lead to continuing balanced Federal spending programs; and

Whereas the budget proposes a decrease in Federal participation in areas of State and local responsibility: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this conference of taxpayers' associations in the interest of better and lower-cost Government with control maintained closer to the people, does hereby urge the Congress of the United States to reduce Federal spending, pass a Federal budget that is balanced, and support efforts to reduce Federal financial participation in activities of the State and local governments; and be it further

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Members of the U.S. Congress be urged particularly to work unceasingly for these objectives.

(Adopted, Fond du Lac, Wis., February 18, 1959.)

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Whereas repeated attempts to inject the National Government into the financing of public education have been made over the past few years and efforts in that direction again are being urged before Congress in the form of bills to subsidize teachers' salaries and the construction of school buildings; and

Whereas the States in general, and Wisconsin in particular, have sufficient resources to

pay both for the construction of new school buildings and adequately compensate the teachers; and

Whereas the State of Wisconsin has, for example, using its own tax resources, increased its school spending since 1946 by 225 percent while enrollments have increased only 29 percent, and increased the portion of individual personal income spent on education from 2.20 to 3.58 percent during this same period; and

Whereas Federal reports show Wisconsin has done the best job in the Nation in providing school buildings as evidenced by the fact that 44 percent of the 1956–57 school enrollment could be placed in classrooms built since 1951 and has increased local debt for school purposes to provide these classrooms from $10.3 million in 1947 to $235.9 million in 1957; and

Whereas the field of public education has been traditionally a responsibility of the State and local governments and Federal participation or control is neither needed nor desired: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the taxpayer associations jointly assembled in Fond du Lac on February 18, 1959, do make known their opposition to Federal financial aid to the public schools and do further resolve to oppose all such proposals to the maximum extent possible.

(Adopted Fond du Lac, Wis., February 18, 1959.)

Signers of resolutions: W. B. Wigton, Taxpayers Association of Fond du Lac; Robert Jenkins, Portage County Taxpayers Association; Walter G. Rose, La Crosse County Taxpayers Association; Robert K. Steele, Kenosha Taxpayers, Inc.; L. E. Plettner, Brown County Tax Survey; Herbert W. Clark, Racine Taxpayers Association; John W. Thorne, Waupaca County Taxpayers Association; R. S. Washburn, Beloit Taxpayers League; J. P. Duskey, Wausau Taxpayers League; Kenneth E. Pinkerton, Waupaca County Taxpayers Association; Jacob S. Disch, Green County Governmental Affairs Committee; Wesley M. Kolbe, Appleton Taxpayers Association; Elmer C. Dickerson, Sheboygan County Taxpayers Association; Donald A. Johnson, Clark County Taxpayers Association; J. C. Batzner, Winnebago County Taxpayers; D. H. Wischer, Northwest Taxpayers League of Milwaukee; H. A. Haberstroh, Southwest Taxpayers League of Milwaukee; Louis Hess, Oak Creek Property Owners' Association; Gilbert T. Backes, South Milwaukee Taxpayers League; Wm. C. Dietrich, Beaver Dam Committee on Governmental Affairs; Robert J. Cunningham, North Shore Tax Association; S. O. Donkle, Jefferson County Taxpayers Association; George DeBruin, Janesville Taxpayers League.

Tax Relief for Retirement Plans for the Self-Employed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most cherished principles of constitutional government is equality under the law. As Members of Congress we have a special responsibility to see that the legislation which appears on the statute books affords equal treatment to all classes of people in America. Today I would like to raise my voice in support of legislation which is intended to achieve greater equality of tax treatment for those of the self-employed in this country who have the wisdom and the initiative to plan for their retirement years.

I refer, of course, to H.R. 10, introduced by our distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable EUGENE KEOGH, which was recently reported out of the Ways and Means Committee. This measure was passed overwhelmingly by this body last session but died in the Senate Finance Committee. I wish to congratulate the Ways and Means Committee for their speedy handling of the bill this session. The Congress over the years has studied the Keogh-Simpson-Reed-Jenkins bills with a thoroughness which can be matched by its consideration of very few legislative proposals.

The purpose of H.R. 10 is to reduce the inequity of tax treatment between employees under qualified pension plans and the self-employed. Under pension arrangements which meet the requirements of the Internal Revenue Code, an employee is not taxed on the amount of the retirement contribution paid on his behalf until his retirement benefit is actually paid. This means, in most instances, that this amount will be taxable to the employee at a time when his income is much lower, because he has retired, than it was when the contribution was paid during his working life. Moreover, the employer can deduct the amount of this contribution to the employee's pension as a part of his cost of doing business. The self-employed individual, on the other hand, can get no deductions for the annuity contracts he purchases or the retirement investments he makes and his income is fully taxed at the time of his highest earnings.

H.R. 10 would modify this discriminatory situation by allowing self-employed individuals to take a tax deduction for a limited amount of investment in certain types of retirement annuities, or retirement trusts. The bill would make this deduction available to all self-employed individuals who fall within the meaning of this term as it is defined under the Social Security Act. It would also include doctors and certain ministers who are not self-employed for social-security coverage purposes. The allowable tax deduction would generally be limited to 10 percent of earnings with a deduction ceiling of $2,500 for a year and $50,000 for a lifetime. So that older persons who would have to build up their retirement plans within a shorter period of time would not be disadvantaged, the bill provides that the annual deduction ceiling could be higher for persons over 50 years of age on January 1, 1959.

The deductions would not be applicable to just any annuity contract or retirement trust fund. The annuity policy would have to provide for the starting of payments not later than the time the individual reaches the age of 70, the policy would have to be nonassignable, and if the policy includes a life insurance provision the premium on this portion could not be used for deduction purposes. Similar restrictions are put on the retirement funds authorized under the act. Amounts received by the individual from restricted retirement funds or policies will generally be treated as ordinary taxable income at the time they are received during his retirement years.

To prevent a person from withdrawing the funds invested under one of these restricted plans before the age of 65, a penalty provision is incorporated which, in most cases, would provide that the withdrawals would be taxed at 110 percent of the liability otherwise resulting from including such sums as taxable income.

The legislation presented has been accepted by a substantial segment of the English-speaking world. Great Britain's law on this subject in 1956 was based on the distinguished white paper of the Committee on the Taxation Treatment of Provisions for Retirement headed by Sir James Millard Tucker. Canada followed with legislation in 1957 and the proposal has been under active consideration in Australia and New Zealand. The bill in this country has undergone many revisions and the product we have here today has been modified to answer many of the objections that have previously been raised.

Most of the revisions that have been incorporated into the legislation since it was first considered by the 82d Congress in 1951 have been aimed at reducing the loss of tax revenue by the Federal Government if the bill is enacted. The present administration, although admitting "that the present law does not give self-employed people tax treatment for their retirement savings comparable to that now accorded to employees covered by employer-financed plans," nevertheless has felt compelled to oppose this bill at this time because of the revenue loss. The Treasury Department in its report has estimated that the revenue loss for fiscal 1960 would be $320 million and for the first full year of operation, $365 million.

Testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, however, has questioned the validity of some aspects of the Treasury Department estimate. For instance, some individuals who have studied the provision, believe that the revenue loss would be less than one half the Treasury estimate for the first full year of operation. These people maintain that the experience of Canada and Great Britain has been that the use of the deduction has started on a small scale and has grown slowly.

The fact that there will be revenue loss is axiomatic, of course, with a bill that affords tax relief. I think one is entitled to ask, however, whether this aspect alone can justify the further postponement of this legislation. The equities, in my view, are controlling in this situation and, therefore I urge the passage of H.R. 10 at the earliest opportunity.

New Tax Loophole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I think the article of February 26, 1959, from

the Pittsburgh Press, by Jack Steele, entitled "House Ready To O. K. New Tax Loophole," should be brought to the attention of every Congressman.

This contemplated tax legislation would only create new loopholes for people to avoid paying taxes and would serve as a means for other professionals and those not covered by social security to come in and ask for the same thing:

HOUSE READY TO OK NEW TAX LOOPHOLE—DOCTORS, LAWYERS, PROFESSIONALS WOULD BENEFIT IF BILL IS APPROVED

(By Jack Steele)

WASHINGTON, February 26.—A bill which would open a new loophole in the tax laws and give substantial tax benefits to doctors, lawyers, dentists, and a few businessmen is expected to sail through the House soon.

The measure—reported to the House yesterday by the House Ways and Means Committee—would permit this select group of self-employed taxpayers to avoid paying taxes on up to $2,500 a year they put aside in retirement funds.

But it would grant no similar tax benefits to some 30 million other taxpayers who are employees and who are not covered by pension or retirement plans.

IN HIGH-INCOME BRACKETS

The self-employed taxpayers who would get special tax advantages under this bill are largely in the middle and upper income brackets. Doctors and lawyers have led in the intensive lobbying for the measure.

The average net—or taxable—income of the Nation's doctors is estimated at more than $18,000 a year. The Department of Commerce estimates that the average net income of all self-employed professional and technical workers in 1956 was $10,490.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has reported that increases in the fees of doctors and dentists in the last decade have materially raised the cost of living. Since 1949, doctors have increased their fees 37.5 percent and dentists 32.5 percent, while the cost of living generally has gone up 27.5 percent.

Physicians are one of the few self-employed groups which have refused to participate in the social security program.

TREASURY OPPOSES IT

The Treasury, which is opposed to the retirement-income bill, estimates that it would save these taxpayers $365 million in its first year of operation. This revenue loss to the Government would insure an unbalanced budget for fiscal 1960.

The Treasury also estimates that if the same tax break was given all taxpayers—as it probably will be eventually if this bill is enacted—the annual revenue loss would run to $3 billion a year.

The bill, formerly known as the Jenkins-Keogh bill, cleared the House last year, but died in the session-end logjam in the Senate. It is jointly sponsored this year by Representatives EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York Democrat, and RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Huntington, Pa., Republican.

The bill, by granting a new special tax exemption, runs counter to the avowed aim of Democratic leaders to close loopholes in the revenue code.

THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY VOTES LINED UP

But its sponsors reportedly have lined up at least 350 votes in the House—including those of many Democrats—to insure its passage.

The bill's enactment would more than wipe out the additional revenues provided by a bill increasing the tax on life insurance companies by 70 percent which cleared the House last week.

The major reason advanced for the retirement income bill is that it would give the self-employed equality with employees who are covered by pension, profit-sharing, or stock-bonus plans.

But the Keogh-Simpson bill would grant a similar benefit only to the self-employed without extending it to others who are not covered by pension plans.

For Humanity's Sake—Faith in the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Detroit, Mich., Jewish News of January 30, 1959, by its distinguished author and publisher, Mr. Philip Slomovitz.

The editorial does much to make clear what could and should be done for a solution of the problem of the Arab refugees which is now being used by Arabs for political purposes:

"FOR HUMANITY'S SAKE"—FAITH IN THE U.N.

Defying logic and reality, Israel's enemies appear determined to utilize the tragic position of the Arab refugees to such an extent that it should serve to undermine Israel's none-too-secure position.

Regrettably, United Nations Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold appears to be in so helpless a position that, in his report on his recent Middle Eastern trip, he stated that Arab-Israel tensions remain serious due, in part, to Israel's refusal to cooperate with U.N. armistice machinery. His opinion of Israel-Arab relations was described as "somber" and while he said there is a "will to peace," he stated:

"I am sorry to note that the armistice agreements and armistice machinery are just as much under a cloud as they have been in the past few years. The mixed armistice commissions are not functioning in the way they should function. One of the parties (Israel) does not participate, and there are also other elements which are unsatisfactory in the picture."

Why is Israel not cooperating with some of the U.N. commissions? The U.N. Secretary General could not offer explanations, and he probably would not, as it would have opened up another controversy. But there were occasions when mixed armistice commission decisions were so prejudicial to Israel that it would have been suicidal to continue to cooperate with biased functionaries. On at least two occasions, Commission members returned to their countries and wrote books in which they revealed their antagonism to Israel. Under such conditions, the Israelis felt compelled to withdraw.

"There are also other elements which are unsatisfactory in the picture," Hammarskjold said. Of course there are such elements. Israel had offered a plan of action to solve the Arab refugee problem, which is the major stumbling block to peace and cooperation. But the Arabs are adamant in their determination to use the refugees as a weapon against Israel, and they therefore refuse to abandon the weapon by solving the refugees' plight.

In an editorial on "Mr. Hammarskjold's Travels," the New York Times indicated that "what is mainly wrong in a large general way, as everybody knows, is that the Arab states have not yet accepted the continued existence of Israel, and that in spite of the U.N. emergency force some border troubles still occur." The Times editorial proceeded to state:

"A solution might be had if the problem of some 900,000 Arab refugees could be equitably solved. Israel has promised to take back a few of these refugees and to compensate those of the remainder who once had land in what is now Israeli territory. Since half of the refugees are under 16 years of age, it is clear that many of them never lived in Israel, or lived there only as very young children. But the Arabs have rejected an Israeli offer made at last fall's session of the General Assembly. The refugees continue to need aid from the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine. They subsist on a total of about $25 a year per capita, of which we pay about 70 percent, Britain about 20 percent, and Russia nothing.

"The UNRWA's mandate expires in 1960. The United States is on record in favor of some more satisfactory means of dealing with the refugee problem than the mere continuance of the present system. Our spokesmen have not spelled out what they really mean.

"It is Mr. Hammarskjold's exacting task to come up with some proposal, or some new facts, that will not irritate anybody concerned. For humanity's sake we must wish him luck."

The wish "for humanity's sake" should be shared by all responsible people. But there are too many irresponsible elements standing in the way of peace and genuine cooperation to assure a speedy solution in the Middle Eastern problem. On top of it, to refer again to the New York Times editorial, "our spokesmen have not spelled out what they really mean."

Instead of improving, the situation appears to be getting worse. Its aggravation has made Mr. Hammarskjold's position more difficult. It is to be hoped that faith placed in the U.N. and in the leaders among its members will not prove fruitless—for humanity sake.

Madison County, Ark., Rural Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the youth of this Nation are its greatest asset. We hear this statement repeated often. Unfortunately, it is not always accompanied by concrete recommendations to assist our youth in realizing their great potential.

For this reason, I take great pride in calling the attention of my colleagues to the work of a group in Madison County, in the district which I am honored to represent. They know that their young people are their county's greatest resource. But they have gone one step further and are doing something positive and effective about it.

Madison County is participating in the Arkansas rural development program. Soon after organization of the work, a committee on youth opportunities was formed to develop and spearhead new programs that would serve young people.

The group faced formidable problems. There were few, if any, opportunities for

training in industrial skills; a large number of school dropouts; and lack of supervised entertainment, among other problems.

In the face of many obstacles, the Madison County Youth Committee moved forward. Working with such agencies as the extension service, school board, and county government, they prepared a detailed, long-range plan of operation. Some of their objectives, I am happy to report, have already been reached after only a few short months of operation. A pilot program of career counseling was introduced in the schools. A youth center has been established in the county. Job development for young people has become a countywide campaign.

I congratulate the people of Madison County on their determination to help young people in the area meet the challenges of the future. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the plan prepared by the youth committee in the county:

OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH, MADISON COUNTY, ARK.

This program is being developed by the Madison County Rural Development subcommittee on youth opportunities. Its purpose is to serve as a guide in initiating greater opportunities for the youth of Madison County.

SITUATION

Madison County is completely rural with approximately 70 percent of its area in forest land. There are approximately 9,000 people in the county, and approximately one-third of these are under 20 years of age. The major source of income is from agriculture, in which the opportunities for young people are rather limited.

Madison County has three high schools. Two of the schools offer vocational agriculture and home economics training. One offers some special work in chemistry and one offers trades and industry training. All three high schools offer courses in typing and shorthand.

Approximately 110 students graduate from high school each year. Approximately 85 percent of these leave the county and 45 percent leave the State after graduation. Of the approximate 200 students that enter the first grade, 40 percent drop out before graduating from high school. There is no record of where the dropouts go to or what they are doing for employment and use of their time. All indications point to the fact that most of these leave the county for employment after they have reached the age for employment.

In connection with the use of leisure time or recreation and entertainment phase of this program, the opportunities for fishing and outings are good. Play grounds, including ball parks, tennis courts, golf courses, etc. are rather limited or nonexistant. No amusement parks are available. No up-to-date swimming holes are available. No supervised recreation and entertainment for the youth is available. Movies are available three times weekly. There are no recreation facilities for private clubs or groups.

Far too few high school graduates attend higher educational institutions.

PROBLEMS

1. Need of supervised recreation and entertainment.
2. Need for a safe and sanitary swimming hole.
3. Need for organized intramural sports, with competition between classes and schools during school terms.
4. Need for organized sports activities.
5. Need for training young people in trades and industry.
6. Need for counseling in the high schools.
7. Need for career days in the high schools.
8. Need for creating atmosphere to make the youth want to be counseled and guided.
9. Need for listing graduates according to their capabilities with the employment office.
10. Need for more youth to take advantage of FFA, FHA, 4-H, and Boy and Girl Scout work.
11. Need for creating more jobs and employing more young people locally.
12. Need for more high school graduates to take advantage of higher educational institutions.

OBJECTIVES

The youth of today are the citizens of tomorrow. The future of Madison County is dependent on its youth. It is all important that we (1) create situations whereby the youth can be developed into strong young men and women to shoulder responsibility of the county for the future; (2) help them to help themselves; (3) lead the youth to take the right road for a better chance of happiness and financial security; (4) help the youth to make a life as well as to make a living.

GOALS

1. To establish a youth center.
2. Create intramural sport competition between classes and between schools.
3. Develop the sidewalk swimming hole.
4. Establish career sections in each high school library.
5. To have career days in each high school.
6. List high school graduates according to capabilities with employment agencies.
7. Establish counseling services in the high schools.
8. Double the number of graduates attending higher educational institutions.
9. Encourage job opportunities for youth in the county that keeps them in county.
10. Make it convenient for the youth to take advantage of trades and industry training.
11. Conduct first aid and swimming classes. (Including water safety.)

WORK PLAN

This program involves the Agricultural Extension Service; the public school, and particularly the vocational agriculture and home economics departments in the high schools; PTA; the churches; the county and city government; local, civic, and social, and service organizations; the county rural development committee and particularly the youth opportunities subcommittee and education subcommittee.

Primary responsibility for planning and carrying out the program will be at the county level by the rural development subcommittee on youth opportunities. Representatives of all agencies and organizations in the county, State, and on the Federal level, will upon request, provide advisory service, help develop plans, and give on-the-ground assistance when necessary.

1. The subcommittee will meet when necessary to make plans to carry out each goal that is listed.
2. Members of the committee will be assigned to various tasks in working out these plans.
3. Contacts will be made with possible sponsoring agencies in the county.
4. Trips will be made to observe ways and means of carrying out various projects.
5. Information for establishing career libraries will be sought through various Government departments, insurance companies, as well as business and manufacturing companies.
6. Encouragement will be given to setting up counseling services in the schools.
7. Contacts will be made with national organizations such as the National Recreation Association, American Campers Association, and civic organizations in seeking guidance information.
8. Contacts will be made through the county, State rural development committee, etc. in an attempt to get a trade school established for the convenience of Madison County youth.
9. Encouragement will be given to all youth to take advantage of 4-H, FFA, FHA, and scout work.
10. Schools will be encouraged to list graduates according to capabilities with the employment service.
11. Encouragement will be given to the youth to attend higher educational institutions.
12. Seek means of financing youth by loan or scholarship to do higher education.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

1. Conducted youth opportunities survey.
2. Established Madison County Youth Center.
3. Established career sections in the three high school libraries.
4. Completed water safety class of 25 students.
5. Started counseling on small scale in two high schools.

Labor, Management—Both Must Fight Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article which appeared in the Boston Pilot on February 28, 1959:

LABOR, MANAGEMENT—BOTH MUST FIGHT UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Msgr. George G. Higgins)

The U.S. Government officially reported that unemployment rose to 4,724,000 during the month of January, an increase of 616,000 over December and the largest January total since 1941.

George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, issued a public statement on these official unemployment statistics. He pointed out that the January total of 4,724,000 "indicates clearly that joblessness is still America's No. 1 problem, in spite of other signs that we are pulling out of this recession," and warned, in conclusion, "that the persistence and seriousness of the unemployment situation cannot take a back seat to any other issue."

Columnist David Lawrence also commented on the subject of unemployment. In the opening paragraph of his syndicated column for February 10, Mr. Lawrence said "that the paradox of continuing unemployment on a large scale during a period of steadily progressing recovery is something that should begin to worry the labor leaders of America. It already has produced anxiety among many businessmen."

On the face of it, this statement would seem to mean that, in Mr. Lawrence's opinion, labor leaders (in contrast to many businessmen) are not at all worried about unemployment. Frankly, however, I seriously doubt that that is what Mr. Lawrence really intended to say, for it is perfectly obvious to anyone who even casually scans the headlines of the daily press that labor leaders, by and large, have been seriously worried about unemployment for many months.

I take it, then, that what Mr. Lawrence really meant to say in the opening paragraph of his column for February 10 was not that labor leaders are unconcerned about unemployment, but rather that they are unwilling to admit that they and they alone are responsible for unemployment.

"The latest figures show," Mr. Lawrence wrote, "that perhaps labor is pricing itself out of the market and that laborsaving machinery is being forced on industry at an unprecedented rate." This, then, is the problem—the problem of labor's alleged responsibility for unemployment—about which labor leaders, in the opinion of Mr. Lawrence, "should begin to worry."

Mr. Lawrence has a good point there, as far as it goes, but I wonder if it really goes far enough. He is definitely on the side of the angels when he says that labor leaders ought to be concerned about the impact of their wage decisions on employment levels, but he should have hastened to add that businessmen ought to be equally concerned about the impact of their price and profit decisions on the economy as a whole.

The chances are that management and labor are more or less equally worried about unemployment. Moreover, it is clear that they are mutual partners in a common enterprise and that they share a great number of interrelated problems and responsibilities. The trouble is, however, that they have no way of getting together at the present time even to discuss these mutual problems and responsibilities.

It seems to me that instead of pinning the blame for unemployment and/or inflation on either labor or management, all of us, including Mr. Lawrence, would be better advised to encourage them to come together periodically in a national labor management assembly for the express purpose of solving (instead of merely worrying about) the problems of unemployment and inflation and the many related problems for which they are, to a large extent, jointly responsible and which they must somehow or other jointly resolve.

The Late Representative Daniel A. Reed Who Served Our Nation Long and Faithfully

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Representative Daniel A. Reed was a direct descendant of John and Priscilla Alden.

In everything that he said or did, he lived up to this inspiring heritage.

He was independent, courageous, and possessed of an integrity that was eternal.

His constituents had a high regard for his ability and his conscience. From the time he was first elected to Congress in 1918, he served continuously over a period of 40 years until death terminated his career at the age of 83.

As the dean of the Republican membership in this House, and as an outstanding expert in the complex and difficult field of taxation, he had established a reputation as guardian of the public purse that won the respect of all his colleagues.

There were times when his opinions represented the minority viewpoint within his own party, but even then, no one dared to contest Dan Reed on the facts. With his encyclopedic knowledge as a veteran member of the Ways and Means Committee, he was more than a match for any Representative who had only given 10 or 20 or 30 years of intensive study to the subject that Dan knew inside and out.

We shall always treasure the memory of his patriotism that was summed up during the debate on his bill to increase tariff protection for those American industries in need of it. In reply to an opponent of his bill, he said: "As long as I stand on the floor of Congress, I shall fight for my own country first, last and always."

That he did, with sincerity and wholehearted devotion during his long and honorable career, and right up to the end.

To his widow, Georgia, to his son, William T., and to his grandchild and to his great grandchildren, we extend our sympathy.

He has bequeated to them the greatest heritage of all, because Representative Daniel Alden Reed gave his best in the service of the United States and its people.

Women's Role in Advancing the Ideals of Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 19, 1959, at the 30th Anniversary Brotherhood Dinner of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, held in Washington, D.C., Mrs. Henry Grattan Doyle was presented the conference's brotherhood award for outstanding achievement.

Mrs. Doyle, the wife of Dean Doyle, is one of the truly great citizens of our Nation's Capital and of our country. She has devoted her life to the advancement of all that is good in our society, promoting mutual understanding and helping to make the Nation's Capital a better community, a better neighborhood, and a better place in which the Nation's Government can conduct its role of national guidance and leadership.

It was most fitting that the audience of over 1,000 persons who gathered to witness the presentation of the conference's brotherhood award to Mrs. Doyle included Members of Congress, the Supreme Court, the President's Cabinet, Ambassadors, and other representatives of many foreign nations, and numerous leaders of our country in many walks of life.

Mrs. Doyle accepted the conference's brotherhood award with the characteristic humility of one who is truly elevated in spirit. She expressed her feeling that the many tributes to her are colored with generosity, and even with charity, and said that she accepted the award as a symbol of what women have achieved and can achieve in advancing the ideals of brotherhood.

Her brief remarks on the special role of women in advancing these ideals were Lincolnesque in their simplicity, felicity of expression, and perception. I was deeply moved by her emphasis on women's opportunities in teaching children the meaning of human dignity, and in exemplifying the spirit of sympathy and understanding, patience, steadfastness, and prayer. I believe they will be of interest to every Member of Congress and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I, therefore, request unanimous consent to insert her remarks at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF MRS. HENRY GRATTAN DOYLE IN ACCEPTING THE BROTHERHOOD AWARD OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS IN WASHINGTON, D.C., ON FEBRUARY 19, 1959

What are the special ways in which women can help to advance understanding among the religions, races, and cultures of the world? There two, I think.

First, in teaching little children. Women, as mothers and teachers of the very small child, have practically exclusive jurisdiction in this field. Children are born without prejudices, as we all know, but to keep them that way is something else again. This is a constant everyday task, not accomplished by lessons, but rather through creating an atmosphere in the home or nursery school where the common denominators of love, laughter, play, and comradeship are emphasized.

Whether rich or poor, whether quick or not so quick, whether black or white, whether Christian or Jew, each little one has his dignity, and at the first sign of belittlement, for any reason, a woman, mother or teacher, has the opportunity to say just the right word, and just when it is needed.

And how we must keep at it. Our actions, our words, our attitudes with little children will help them to remain on the broad highway of tolerance, rather than to lose their way in the mean, narrow, murky, byways of intolerance.

Second, we women can, I think, make a contribution to brotherhood by our example as women. From babyhood we women have been told that we must always give a good example. Human frailty being what it is, we don't always do so. But within us all, I think, is a feeling of responsibility to do our part in our own way to help our fellow man by exemplifying the characteristics that are usually identified with womanliness. Among these, I would include:

(a) Sympathy and understanding: Women have made their greatest contributions in the teaching and nursing professions, both of which call for understanding and sympathy in a high degree. We, as women, can strive always to understand those who seem different, who look different, whose background is different, and in our own way get through the barriers of religion or nationality. We can try, too, to understand those who today resist social change. The human wall of resistance to social improvement must have many chinks and already some rays of understanding seem to be filtering through.

(b) Patience: We must have patience and not despair as we watch the slow and stumbling feet of progress. We women know full well how slow any social change is, as we tread our way toward professional achievement in this world—which is still a man's

world in spite of the nearly 40 years that have elapsed since the passage of the 19th amendment to the Constitution granting women the right to vote.

(c) Steadfastness is a thoughtful approach to the goal of brotherhood, not to be swayed by hysteria or panic. We have all been revolted by pictures in the papers or on television that have shown the faces of men and women distorted by snarling hatred just because they were looking at human beings of another race or religion. It is bad enough to see the face of a man so marked with unreasoning hatred, but a woman's face twisted into loathing because of her deep-seated intolerance seems to me to be a degradation of the human race.

(d) Prayer: My own conviction is that brotherhood will be achieved through the efforts of individuals who are morally and spiritually motivated. Because I believe this, I believe that every woman in her own way should consciously pray for understanding among peoples.

We women have learned the comfort of prayer in our moments of loneliness: having a baby is a lonely business, even with a devoted husband close by; a sick baby at night is terrifyingly lonely; and the traditional loneliness of women when their loved ones are at war has always inspired them to ask for help from God.

In all humility, then, I accept this award as a tribute to women's efforts toward brotherhood. I hope that by our guidance of small children; by understanding, by patience, by example, by prayer, we, as women, can help push this turbulent world of ours a little further onward toward God's precept: "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

Russia's Hostility Toward Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit, Mich., Jewish News of December 19, 1958, carried an article by its distinguished editor and publisher, Mr. Philip Slomovitz, entitled "Russia's Hostility Toward Israel."

That excellent article chronicled how the Russian Communist dictatorship is no different in its attitude toward Jews and minority groups than was the vicious anti-semitism practiced by the Nazis under Hitler.

I think the insight into this matter is well worth consideration and will help thinking Americans to realize the real nature of the enemy all freemen face:

RUSSIA'S HOSTILITY TOWARD ISRAEL

Multiplication of tensions between East and West continues to throw additional light on the sad status of Russian Jewry and on the increasing unfriendliness on the part of the Communist rulers toward Israel and the Jewish state's supporters.

One of the latest manifestations of hostility on the part of Russia is contained in a new Soviet-published book, by two authors, one of them Jewish, under the title "The State of Israel, Its Position and Its Policy." It is revealed by Kol Israel, the Israeli radio, that this book completely disregards the fact that Russia was among the countries at the U.N. which supported the 1947 resolution calling for the creation of the State of Israel. Similarly, all mention is omitted of the Russian declarations during 1947 and 1948 about the moral duty of the world to provide the remnants of European Jewry with a national home in Palestine.

This revelation is minor compared with other reports, from United Nations and other sources, which indicate that the anti-Jewish campaign has been intensified in Russia. Marop Rossi, the U.N. correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, states that "news that Jews in the U.S.S.R. were being persecuted could not be hidden from the outside world"; that the Kremlin has set up a special propaganda office to deal with the Jewish question; that through this new office the Communist rulers have undertaken a vast campaign at home in order to destroy Jewish nationalism and that this campaign at the moment is aimed at defaming Israel and disrupting Soviet Jewry as a people.

Soviet Jewish tourists to Israel were enlisted, upon their return to Russia, to address compulsory mass meetings at which they spoke with antagonism of Israel. According to Rossi, "members of the Moscow Synagogue were made to sign spontaneous letters to the chief rabbinate in Jerusalem requesting that Israeli representatives should not appear in the synagogue since their behavior is unbecoming and they violate the Sabbath."

While this reveals a grave situation, some reports state that the new actions of U.S.S.R. leaders serve to inspire new interest in Israel among Russians. But that's small consolation in view of the dangers that are being imposed upon Russian Jews by their masters.

In a signed article in the New York Times, Harrison E. Salisbury, who, by virtue of his experiences in Russia as a correspondent for his newspaper, is looked upon as a well-informed person on occurrences behind the Iron Curtain, stated that "the Jews are 21 times worse off in regard to facilities for worship than the Baptists and 13 times more poorly provided for than Russian Orthodox believers. He pointed out that "no Hebrew Bible has been permitted in Russia since 1917," that "the Jews have been permitted only to issue a photocopy edition of a handwritten calendar," that while Orthodox, Baptists, and Moslems are permitted to have nationwide organizations to represent their religious and lay communities "similar organization for the Jews is forbidden."

Such is the status of Jews in Russia about whom Milt Freudenheim wrote to the Chicago Daily News from the United Nations that "a new crisis for the estimated 3 million Jews living in the Soviet Union is expected in a few weeks when the first Soviet census since 1939 is slated," and he adds: "Soviet Jews have been required to state their nationality as Jewish on identity cards which (since 1948) have singled them out for discrimination in jobs, schools, and the Communist Party."

Communist tactics on the world scene are disturbing enough to make the democratic world suspicious of everything that emanates from the Kremlin. But the Russian anti-Semitic tactics are much more shocking. They represent a reversion to medievalism and are indications of an inheritance from czarism that even many extreme leftists have been unable to shake off.

What the Russian Communists are doing today is merely a reenactment of Nazi tactics. Russian identity cards carried by Jews must carry the designation "Yevrei"—"Jew." That is how the clock is being turned back, and the yellow badge is being reinstituted in another form.

In a study made by Moshe Decter for the ADL of the position of Soviet Jews under Khrushchev, we learned that accomplishments by Jews were kept from the record of the Soviet regime's achievements in the past 40 years, and that there was deliberate concealment of facts about Jewish attainments. One of the revealing facts is that in listing the publications in 124 languages of the peoples of the Soviet Union as well as of foreign countries, Yiddish was omitted and was not considered even as deserving as "Tat," the language of a small Daghestan tribe, which boasted the publication of a single item in 1956 with a circulation of 1,000 copies. Of course, no Yiddish work has been published in the U.S.S.R. since 1948. But in 1913, literally hundreds of Jewish publications appeared in Yiddish (and Hebrew), for it was the springtide of the Jewish cultural renascence in Russia."

It is a matter of record that in the early days of Bolshevism, and even now, some Jewish writers, especially Sholem Aleichem and J. L. Peretz, were among the heroes in the Russian literary spheres, and Yiddish was encouraged. But Yiddish newspapers now are banned, anything related to Jews and to Jewry is taboo, and the only explanation for the newest actions is anti-Semitism.

Evidence of Soviet anti-Semitism is mounting. Decter reveals the existence of "a tacit quota system for Jewish students in Soviet universities and advanced technical and academic institutes." Also, "for more than a year now, official Soviet newspapers and periodicals have been regularly publishing fictionalized articles of an unmistakable anti-Semitic nature."

What better proof of the latter point than the missionary and self-hating expressions in the Nobel Prize winning novel "Doctor Zhivago," by its author, Boris Pasternak, a Jew who was converted to the Greek Orthodox faith—Boris Pasternak who now is himself the victim of Soviet persecution?

This is an almost insoluble problem—for the present, at least—in the midst of a world crisis which has not yet reached its peak. As long as the world East-West tensions continue—and the West Berlin situation points to a prolongation rather than a speedy solution of the problem—the position of Russian Jewry, and the issues emanating from Soviet hostility toward Israel, will remain very grave. All of it is part of the threat to the peace of the world, for which the U.S.S.R. must be held responsible.

Dedication of New Supreme Court Building in Brooklyn, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following introduction by Justice Gerald Nolan and the invocation by the Right Reverend James Pernette DeWolfe made at the dedication ceremonies of the New Supreme Court Building in Brooklyn, N.Y., on January 5, 1959:

Presiding Justice NOLAN. Judge Keogh, reverend clergy, my distinguished companions who will participate in these ceremonies, my brethren of the bench, bar, ladies and gentlemen, for your chairman of the judges' committee on arrangements I have always had nothing but the highest regard and the warmest affection, and that introduction has not changed my mind one iota.

I have known him for many years as an able and distinguished judge, but it was not until he was gracious enough to send me a few days ago a copy of this program that I also discovered that he is a great executive and a diplomat of the highest order.

Somewhere, somehow, and I cannot imagine how or where, Judge Keogh has discovered that elderly judges, if given their heads, on occasions like this are apt to wax oratorical. In other words, they speak too much and too long.

With that thought in mind, I am quite sure, he wrote me a very short but very pointed letter enclosing the program of the day. He suggested very tactfully that he agreed with my opinion that brevity should be the order of the occasion.

He suggested, quite frankly again, that my introduction should be short and to the point. It was not until I examined the program carefully that I appreciated to the full the extent of this man's executive ability, because I found out when I looked at the program that without the aid of any suggestion or instruction from Judge Keogh that what had been suggested in the letter had been accomplished when the program had been aranged, because the function of your presiding justice is clearly defined: He is to preside and not to talk.

I have only one reseravtion and that is to bring to Judge Keogh and his associates a very brief message from our court, and all of the judges of the appellate division bring today, of course, their congratulations and their very best wishes. They have asked me to say to Judge Keogh and his associates that they are very proud to be present on this happy and historic occasion.

And, having delivered that brief message, I shall now without reservation attempt to conduct the ceremonies according to the plans and specifications so ably prepared by your chairman.

It is my first privilege to announce—and it is a privilege because we are all honored by his presence here today—that the invocation will be pronounced by the Right Reverend James Pernette DeWolfe, bishop of the Diocese of Long Island. Bishop DeWolfe.

(All arose during the invocation.)

The Right Reverend JAMES PERNETTE DEWOLFE. Let us pray. Almighty Father, from whom all good things come, grant we beseech Thee Thy blessing upon this building that will be the seat of the supreme court of this State.

May those who sit here in judgment be moved to promote and improve the conditions of society so that they shall make such transactions of man with man liberal, unselfish and brotherly.

Help those who sit here in these chambers and those who plead before the court to set their faces and influence against violated trusts, unhallowed dealing and all injustice. Give them grace to withstand every wrong and to be exponents in the state of truth, justice, and righteousness.

Grant that all who practice here may constantly acknowledge the supremacy of divine justice, so that in all covenants they may seek truth and not victory, and that their own lives may be purified by the divine law and the remembrance of the strict account which they must one day give of every thought, word, and deed before Thy judgment seat.

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, one God, world without end. Amen.

Tribute to the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, many times in the history of its indispensable and patriotic service, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, have been the target of vicious attacks by criminal and subversive elements.

Another such campaign of smear and defamation is currently underway.

As long as the American people are vigilant and informed of the facts, this present campaign will meet with no more success than those in the past.

In a recent editorial in the NAM News, published by the National Association of Manufacturers, attention has been ably called to the outstanding work of the FBI and Director Hoover.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the editorial from the NAM News:

BULWARK AGAINST CRIME AND SUBVERSION

The business world in America had long been proud of the FBI and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover. This agency is one of the most efficient, well-run, and businesslike agencies in the Government. Time after time Mr. Hoover has been a forerunner in adapting new business techniques to the operations of the FBI. He and his staff are always alert to procedures which will enhance efficiency and morale and reduce costs.

The operating efficiency of the FBI, in fact, could serve as a model not only for other governmental agencies but also for private business firms. In the FBI, as it has operated since Mr. Hoover became Director in 1924, are found the basic factors which make for a successful business operation: excellent administrative control; thrift; good budgetary and accounting procedures; careful planning.

Another important factor is the high morale of the FBI's employees—so important to any successful business. The FBI is famous for its esprit de corps. The term "G men" is synonymous with integrity, initiative, loyalty, bravery and fidelity. Special agents and clerks are all proud of being on the team. This arises, in large measure, from the modern, realistic personnel policies of Mr. Hoover.

The final proof of any business firm's success, however, is the quality of its product—and in this the FBI excels. During fiscal year 1958, for example, of persons brought to trial in FBI cases, 96.8 percent were convicted. This is indeed a great accomplishment, reflecting the high quality of FBI investigations. Moreover, time after time the FBI, from its effective work, actually brings back to the Government more money than is spent for its operations. In fiscal year 1958, for example, the FBI effected over $132 million in savings and recoveries to the Government in comparison with a total of $105,500,000 in direct appropriations approved by the Congress for this agency.

This is a fact of great importance to every taxpayer in the Nation.

Unfortunately, this efficient, business-type organization is today the object of a vicious smear campaign. The purpose is to destroy the effectiveness of the FBI as a bulwark of our internal security.

In the forefront, as could be expected, is the Communist Party. Time after time the party and its press have attacked the FBI. The party knows that it will never have any success until the FBI is destroyed or badly crippled.

It is disconcerting, however, to find the Communist Party aided and abetted in its efforts by other influential elements which profess to deplore communism. In its October 18, 1958, issue, a well-know magazine of the intellectual left devoted an entire issue to a deceitful attack on the FBI by a newspaperman who is notorious as an apologist for Alger Hiss. In this combination of falsehoods, innuendos and misinterpretations designed to mislead the unwary reader, the FBI is falsely charged with just about every possible wrong that can be imagined.

A New York newspaper long noted for its propensity to slant and distort information concerning law enforcement against subversive organizations and individuals also is joining in the attack on Mr. Hoover and the FBI. Under the guise of objective reporting, this newspaper has announced it will publish a series of artiles concerning the FBI and its director. It begins to look as if a concerted campaign is afoot among those who always seem to deplore efforts to deal effectively with subversion and subversives to get J. Edgar Hoover's scalp and curb the activities of the agency he heads.

This has been tried a number of times before with conspiculous lack of success. The effort will fail again if the American people know the truth and are not misled by the sly propaganda of the anti-anti-Communists.

After 6 Years of Nasser: Promises—and Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 4, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by John Law, which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report of December 19, 1958:

AFTER 6 YEARS OF NASSER: PROMISES—AND POVERTY

CAIRO.—Egyptians, in their sixth year of a Nasser dictatorship, are still waiting in vain for the great day promised them by their ruler.

As a matter of fact, most of them are worse off now than they were when Gamal Abdel Nasser took charge.

One of my first impressions upon returning to Egypt after a year's absence is that times are a bit harder now than they were a year ago. There seem to be more beggars in Cairo, and just as many diseased-looking people as ever. The streets look dirtier. Shops are less plentifully stocked.

When I went beyond this surface impression for a closer look, I found this situation:

There were shortages of all kinds. At the time I arrived, there had been no tea available for 3 weeks. Rice, sugar, and coffee were scarce. Coffee was not available even at a coffeehouse I visited.

Kerosene, used by most Egyptians for cooking, was rationed. Razor blades were hard to get. It was impossible to find any brushless shaving cream. There were rows and rows of empty shelves that used to be stocked with cosmetics. A housewife said she went to 10 Cairo drugstores before she found a bottle of ordinary aspirin tablets.

There is a growing scarcity of housing. Private construction of homes and office buildings is now banned by the Government because it wants to force private capital into industry. The Government is building low-cost living units, but not fast enough to meet the needs. About 25,000 units have been built throughout Egypt since Nasser came to power. But Cairo alone needs 30,000 new dwellings every year. More than 65 percent of its people live in slums.

Costs of goods and services are higher than ever. Reliable estimates place the increase in the cost of living since the Suez war in 1956 at anywhere from 20 percent for the poorer people to 35 percent for wealthier Egyptians.

Prices of some staples are fixed low by the Government, but supplies are so limited that people are forced to turn to the black market and pay prices 50 percent above the legal rate. Imported suit material costs more than $25 a yard. An imported nightgown sells for $100.

FROM REDS, POOR GOODS

The country just can't afford to import many of the things it used to, and Egyptian substitutes for the imports—cigarettes, for example—are of poor quality. Because of the shift in trade toward Soviet-bloc countries, the average Egyptian has had to get accustomed to a lot of things he regards as shoddy merchandise.

Take tea, for example. Practically all of Egypt's tea used to come from Ceylon and India. Now most of it comes from Communist China. Egyptians will tell you they don't like the China tea, but there's nothing they can do about it because the Government has a monopoly on tea imports, and buys from China because it is cheaper.

Services are on the downgrade, too, because skilled foreigners are disappearing. Because of Nasser's policy of Egyptianization, thousands of foreign craftsmen who had lived in Egypt all their lives have had to leave the country. Native Egyptians have not yet developed the skill and experience needed to replace the foreigners.

A TIGHTENING SQUEEZE

The overall result is an austere life for most people. What has brought on this austerity is that Nasser has failed to solve age-old problems that he inherited from the ousted King Farouk. Egypt does not grow enough to feed itself, it has little in the way of natural resources, and its population keeps getting bigger and bigger. Consequently, the squeeze on the supply of food and other products keeps getting tighter and tighter.

The road Nasser is now choosing to find his way out of his troubles at home is one of massive industrialization. He dreams of making Egypt the manufacturing center of the Arab world—the supplier of goods for the entire area. With the profits, he hopes to be able to buy abroad the food and other products that his own country needs.

Actually, Nasser has made big strides in raising industrial production, particularly in such fields as fabrics, fertilizers, cement, raw sugar, and electric power. And he could go much faster if he were not manufacturing so much military equipment. But, in some fields, he is building production up way beyond the ability of local consumers to buy, and he may have trouble getting rid of resulting surpluses.

Even the Government-owned National Bank of Egypt, in a recent report, criticized the establishment of a new weaving plant for rayon fabrics and of a spinning mill because marketing is becoming a serious problem. The Bank also said marketing of cement will become a big problem later this year when a new plant brings Egypt's annual capacity to well over 2 million tons.

BROTHERHOOD VERSUS COMPETITION

Economists are asking where Egypt expects to sell the thousands of sewing machines that will be produced annually by a new plant soon to be completed. They point out that, in the sale of most manufactured products, there is intense competition from more experienced producers in the United States, in Europe, and Japan. Nasser, however, is said to be counting on the spirit of Arab brotherhood to prompt his neighbors to buy Egyptian. If they don't, he'll be in trouble.

Nasser is putting Egypt heavily in debt to finance his industrialization program. Already he has borrowed nearly half a billion dollars abroad, not counting what he owes for Soviet-supplied arms. He has been using up his foreign earnings—including income from the Suez Canal—just as fast as they come in.

One reason he is in such a hole is that he isn't getting as much from Iron Curtain countries as he had hoped. Half his exports go to the Communists, but the Reds supply only a quarter of his imports. The result is that Nasser has to turn to Western producers and spend money he can ill afford. One high-ranking Egyptian financier recently described this continued imbalance of trade as untenable for much longer.

The attempt to industrialize has produced a great deal of Government planning and Government control. More than 87 percent of the capital that went into the economy last year was Government capital. The law gives the Government the right to take control of any company in which it holds 25 percent of the shares. A Government license has to be obtained before any new plant can be established.

JOBS FOR NASSER'S PALS

Critics say that Nasser has had a tendency to appoint personal friends—often old army colleagues—to planning and administrative jobs, and the results have not always been happy. They cite examples such as these:

In Liberation Province—an irrigated area of desert that was supposed to be a showplace of what Nasser's Government could do—a citrus-canning plant was built long before the orange trees in the area were old enough to bear fruit.

Numbers of factories were created. They began turning out goods no one could afford to buy. They have now been closed down.

A whole village was built before it occurred to anybody that no water supply was available for it.

One department of the Government has gone ahead with a scheme to establish more than 30 refrigeration depots around the country. But there is no transportation adequate to move imported frozen foods from ports to these depots. And, at present, there are no facilities at the ports to store quantities of food prior to distribution.

WHAT ABOUT LAND REFORM?

The Cairo Government hasn't had much better luck with its farm program—a land-reform system started in Nasser's first year of power as a means of boosting farm production. Actually, only about 10 percent of the land was affected, and yields on this acreage have gone up only slightly.

Great numbers of peasants who received small parcels of land from big estates that were divided up feel that they are not much better off, if at all, than they were as sharecroppers. In those days, they were given tools, fertilizer, and other equipment needed to till the land. Now they have to supply their own. They have to sell their produce at fixed prices.

The Government has no provision for taking care of the peasant-farmer in years of poor harvests. In the old days, landlords might exploit their tenants in good years, but they found it to their own interest to take care of the sharecroppers during lean periods.

Many farmers also find they are unable to cope with the mass of paperwork—filling of production forms, tax forms, etc.—that goes with running a farm. And the former landowners whose land was requisitioned haven't come off well. They were to be paid in 3-percent Government bonds, redeemable in 30 years. Many of them have never received the bonds.

Even if all of Nasser's planning went off without a hitch, chances of raising Egypt's standard of living still would be very poor. The average Egyptian's income is less than $120 a year, and, on the basis of the present outlook, is more likely to go down than up. A United Nations agency has estimated that, if all the schemes ever drawn up by Egypt to raise its standard of living were put in operation, the nation would be no better off in 1975 than it is now.

LITERACY AT A STANDSTILL

As if all these economic problems were not enough, Nasser has had trouble fulfilling other promises of his revolution. Education is a case in point. More than 80 percent of Egyptians were illiterate when Nasser took over—and the percentage has not changed since.

The Government has built thousands of schools and spends as large a percentage of the national income on education as does the United States. Yet it has barely been able to provide enough school facilities for the increased number of children reaching school age each year.

There is accommodation for less than half the children who should be in elementary schools. At the higher levels, education has been available to many more students, but educators say the result has been to lower standards. In Cairo University, as many as 800 students are enrolled in some classes.

In the field of health, there are problems, too. For one example: Out of every four babies born, one dies. Another example: Many hospitals have been built, but there are only 7,000 beds for 300,000 tubercular patients. In the Egyptian countryside, there is only 1 doctor for every 12,000 people.

BRIBES: FOR RICH ONLY

Another of Nasser's problems is official corruption. He cracked down hard when he first came in. Lately corruption has been on the increase. It still isn't as bad as in the days of King Farouk, but it is bad enough to produce such remarks as this from Egyptians:

"The difference between corruption under King Farouk and corruption now is that now you have to go higher and pay more. All that's happened is that bribery has been taken out of the range of the little man's pocket."

Nobody questions Nasser's desire to wipe out corruption, but they say he has a tendency toward cronyism that prompts him to go easy on any revolutionary colleague who may be accused of corrupt practice.

All these problems, still unsolved, are beginning to cause a certain amount of disillusionment. You hear more grumbling than you did a year ago. There is a growing awareness that eloquent speeches and imaginative new laws have not been enough to wipe out old evils. Many improvements exist only on paper.

PRIDE—AND DOUBTS

There are few, if any, signs that the dictatorship is in any serious danger. Nasser's control is quite tight. And Egyptians as a whole admire him for what he has done in international affairs, for the place he has given their country in the world spotlight.

Yet, there are more and more Egyptians who are beginning to wonder if they will ever achieve prosperity as well as self-respect. More and more are pessimistic. Many who once forecast a bright future will now tell you they don't really think things are going to change very much.

There is little room for doubt any more that Nasser's record at home is falling far short of the glowing promises that were made with his rise to power 6 years ago.

Extinction by Throughway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to the following article which is a reprint from the Reader's Digest. This is an ably worded article and worthy of serious consideration:

EXTINCTION BY THROUGHWAY: THE FIGHT TO SAVE A TOWN

(By Polly Praeger)

It began inconspicuously—just a brief legal notice in the newspaper announcing a public hearing to be held on January 9, 1957, in regard to the route of a Federal superhighway through Broome County, N.Y. Most people had been too busy with Christmas to see the notice, but a few of us in Hillcrest, a quiet suburb of Binghamton, were among the hundred or so who turned out to listen to the district engineer's technical description of the beautiful expressway that was to cost at least a million dollars a mile.

Hillcrest was not even marked on the map he displayed. When he called for statements from the town of Fenton (in which Hillcrest is located), both our supervisor and the town attorney declared they could say nothing unless they knew where the route was to go in relation to Hillcrest. Clayton Axtell, Jr., our schoolboard attorney, pressed the point: "This hearing is inadequate by law. The route does not deal with specific localities."

Three or four others tried to get specific information on the route. But the district engineer was adamant: "Details cannot be given now. The route could go one way or the other."

Since Hillcrest (population 3,000) is only about a mile long and a half mile wide, a mile could mean the difference between bisecting and by-passing. We left the hearing feeling helpless. "What chance do we have against the State department of public works and the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads?"

A lot of Americans are going to feel this same bewilderment and frustration during the next few years, as the huge Federal highway program gets under way. Perhaps our experience, local though it is, may prove useful to others in a similar fix.

At the next meeting of the Hillcrest Community Association I suggested that we write to John W. Johnson, State superintendent of public works, protesting the conduct of the hearing and requesting permission to have a statement from Hillcrest made part of the record. That's how the fight began.

In reply Johnson said: "We would request that you file your statement as soon as possible. The department of public works will attempt to consider such changes in alinement as may be possible, in order to minimize destruction of property and still maintain an economical route for the project."

The State's willingness to restudy the route made us feel that we must do a thorough job of presenting facts in our behalf. An appointment was made for me, as chairman of our community association committee at the public works department's offices in Albany. An assistant deputy engineer spread a large-scale map of Hillcrest before me. The worst rumors we had heard were true. You cannot superimpose a six-lane highway with 4 access roads and 4 traffic circles on an already developed community the size of ours without making mincemeat of it. A more thorough job could hardly have been done, in terms of destroying water wells, taking a third of the new elementary-school property and knocking out over 100 new houses, the loss of which would take at least half a million dollars in assessed valuation from the town tax rolls. There was also an estimated loss of a million dollars in assessed valuation to the board of education.

Worst of all, the community as a community would be destroyed. All available land was developed and displaced people could not move from one section to another. Those who remained would be separated into little islands by the expressway, and they would be faced with a much heavier tax burden.

Next, our committee had a session in the district office in Binghamton. On the map we spotted a line called Alternate A, which bypassed Hillcrest.

"Why can't Alternate A be used?" we asked.

"The State never really considered that, because it is too far from Binghamton," the district engineer explained. "No one would use it."

We studied the two possibilities. We had interviews with civil defense authorities on the location of defense highways (preferably 12 miles outside critical target areas like Binghamton). We had interviews with bankers on increased interest rates and the difficulty of getting mortgages; we held a conference with the director of the Broome County Planning Board; we studied highway law. And ceaselessly we kept Albany and the Washington Bureau of Public Roads and our legislators apprised of what we were doing.

Now the battlefront widened. Every possible group joined with us in a committee that included Rotary and Kiwanis, churches, the American Legion, PTA, town board, board of education, garden clubs. We also organized a subcommittee of prominent engineers who live in Hillcrest and work for such companies as General Electric, Ansco, and Link Aviation.

Not all our local newspaper publicity was favorable; we were accused of delaying progress. But an editorial in the Binghamton Sun summarized my own feeling about the whole problem: Offer of organized citizens of Hillcrest to withdraw their opposition to the expressway if it can be shown that the alternative they have proposed would be less direct, more expensive, or impractical for any other reason, reflects a genuine regard for the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number. The State agreed to restudy the route and hold an informational meeting at which their decision would be announced to the people of Hillcrest.

Eight hundred citizens gathered to hear the outcome. Hillcrest was still the recommended route—because it would be cheaper than Alternate A by $9,500,000. This because Alternate A would require an additional $5 million bridge, and would entail additional costs to road users which would amount to $4,500,000 over a 20-year period.

Our committee, having had advance notice of the engineers' decision, had prepared a statement in rebuttal. We denied the need of an additional bridge, and we claimed that road users' costs were not properly costs to the taxpayers as such. We thought it only fair, if the State was going to include social costs, that it should also admit all other social and economic costs which would have to be paid by the people of Hillcrest, residents of the town, and the school district. We estimated them in dollars over the 20-year period and found they greatly outweighed users' costs. After reading the statement aloud, I turned to the audience and said, "It is the recommendation of our committee that we continue to seek a genuine consideration of all factors. We will appreciate an expression of your opinion."

Nearly everyone in that huge group stood up and applauded. We had our answer.

The committee decided to secure the services of an impartial expert to assess the validity of our position. Since the issue was not the engineering feasibility of one route over the other but the social and economic costs to the area, we approached Dr. Seymour Z. Mann, professor of political science at Harpur, the State's liberal-arts college in nearby Endicott, who had been active in community and county planning. He refused to accept unless he would be free to draw his own conclusions. To this we agreed.

In a preliminary discussion with the district engineer, Dr. Mann was asked, "How can you deal with these emotional people who run to their elected representatives in Albany and Washington?"

Dr. Mann replied: "If people feel strongly about a problem that requires political action, then they should use all legitimate means at their disposal. It is part of the representative process."

Our State senator, Warren M. Anderson, after attending a meeting of the Hillcrest committee, decided that our objections were valid and arranged a meeting between committee members and Superintendent Johnson in Albany. Dr. Mann's excellent analysis—which upheld our position—was presented at this meeting in May. Johnson ordered the full review we wanted, and the committee rested its case.

From January 9 until late October is a long time when you are waiting to know the fate of your home or community. But on October 20, 1957, came the report, "Hillcrest bypassed," and headlines announced a totally new concept for two major routes. We read for the first time of a proposed common route for several miles through Binghamton and Johnson City of both the expressway and Route 17—the East-West State highway. This confluence was to make the area a transportation crossroads and bring great economic prosperity.

We in Hillcrest will never know how much our stand had to do with the new plan. But what happened in our community almost certainly will occur elsewhere.

A network of superhighways across the face of America will be an empty achievement if it kills democratic processes and ignores long-range community planning. Our experience has convinced me that Congress was wise in providing citizens with the opportunity to be heard on a program that deeply affects so many lives.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*	
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Lennon, Alton, *N. C.*	
Lesinski, John, *Mich.*	
Levering, Robert W., *Ohio*	
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.*	224 C St. NE.
Lindsay, John V., *N. Y.*	
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*	
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn.*	The Congressional
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*	The Washington
McCulloch, William M., *Ohio*	4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif.*	
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*	
McFall, John J., *Calif.*	507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGinley, Donald F., *Nebr.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak.*	
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*	220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*	
McSween, Harold B., *La.*	
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*	
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*	115 Dale Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*	
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*	
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*	
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*	
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*	Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*	
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*	
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.*	The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*	The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*	
May, Catherine, *Wash.*	
Meader, George, *Mich.*	3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*	
Meyer, William H., *Vt.*	
Michel, Robert H., *Ill.*	
Miller, Clement W., *Calif.*	
Miller, George P., *Calif.*	
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*	6601 Radnor Rd., Bethesda, Md.
Milliken, William H., Jr., *Pa.*	
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*	2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*	8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga.*	
Moeller, Walter H., *Ohio*	
Monagan, John S., *Conn.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Moorhead, William S., *Pa.*	
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*	
Morris, Thomas G., *N. Mex.*	
Morris, Toby, *Okla.*	220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La.*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*	204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*	
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*	
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*	The Coronet
Murphy, William T., *Ill.*	
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*	
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*	
Nelsen, Ancher, *Minn.*	
Nix, Robert N. C., *Pa.*	
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*	
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*	2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*	
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*	The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*	The Congressional
O'Hara, James G., *Mich.*	
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass.*	
Oliver, James C., *Maine*	
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*	
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*	100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*	
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*	117 Carroll St. SE.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*	
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*	
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho*	
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*	
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*	
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*	
Pirnie, Alexander, *N. Y.*	
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*	228 2d St. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*	
Polk, James G., *Ohio*	
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg.*	
Powell, Adam C., *N. Y.*	
Preston, Prince H., *Ga.*	
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*	
Prokop, Stanley A., *Pa.*	
Pucinski, Roman C., *Ill.*	
Quie, Albert H., *Minn.*	The Coronet Apt., 200 C St. SE.
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*	
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*	
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*	
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*	
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*	
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*	
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*	1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*	6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*	5603 24th Ave. SE., Hillcrest Hgts., Wash. 21, D. C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*	
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*	3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*	
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*	
Rivers, Ralph J., *Alaska*	
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*	6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y.*	
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*	
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*	
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass.*	The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*	Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*	
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*	
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*	
Rostenkowski, Dan, *Ill.*	
Roush, J. Edward, *Ind.*	
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*	
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y.*	
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y.*	
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif.*	
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*	
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*	
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*	
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C.*	
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*	433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*	
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*	
Shipley, George E., *Ill.*	
Short, Don L., *N. Dak.*	
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*	
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*	
Simpson, Edna Oakes, *Ill.*	
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*	5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*	
Slack, John M., Jr., *W. Va.*	
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*	
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif.*	
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*	204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Neal, *Iowa*	
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*	
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*	Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*	
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*	
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*	
Stratton, Samuel S., *N. Y.*	107 Martha's Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Stubblefield, Frank A., *Ky.*	
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*	
Taber, John, *N. Y.*	
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*	
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*	
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*	6015 Mass. Ave.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y.*	Mayflower Hotel
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*	2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*	3301 Mass. Ave.
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*	
Thompson, T. A., *La.*	1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, Keith, *Wyo.*	
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*	
Toll, Herman, *Pa.*	
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*	
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*	
Tuck, William M., *Va.*	
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*	
Ullman, Al, *Oreg.*	
Utt, James B., *Calif.*	
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*	
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*	
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*	4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*	
Wallhauser, George M., *N. J.*	
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*	
Wampler, Fred, *Ind.*	
Watts, John C., *Ky.*	
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*	9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Weis, Jessica McC., *N. Y.*	
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*	
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*	
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C.*	
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*	5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*	
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*	
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*	1001 26th Rd. S., Arlington, Va.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*	
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*	
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*	
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*	
Wolf, Leonard G., *Iowa*	
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*	
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*	
Young, John, *Tex.*	
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*	4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*	
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*	

DELEGATES

Burns, John A., *Hawaii*	

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*	2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 216 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Serles, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Place SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Appendix

Address by Gov. Sam Houston Jones, of Louisiana, Praising Andre Olivier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on October 12 last, in my hometown of St. Martinville, the descendants of the Acadians and many other prominent citizens from throughout the State of Louisiana gave a testimonial banquet for an illustrious gentleman and a scholar, the Honorable Andre Olivier.

Andre, as he is popularly called, is a proud, native son of St. Martinville. A large segment of the original settlers of this second oldest town in Louisiana came directly from France, as did the ancestors of Mr. Olivier. It was natural, therefore, that the French Acadians should settle in this general area when they were banished from Nova Scotia by the British in 1755. Still later more people from France and especially from Paris migrated to St. Martinville during the French Revolution in the 1790's, and it is because of this French background that St. Martinville is frequently referred to as the Little Paris of America. The mass exodus of the Acadians was made immortal by Longfellow's poem, "Evangeline," one of America's great classics. Longfellow's "Evangeline," Emmeline LaBiche in real life, met her long-separated lover under the Evangeline Oak on the banks of the charming Bayou Teche in St. Martinville, and is buried in the rear of the town's ancient Catholic church.

Andre is recognized locally and from far and wide as the official historian of the land of Evangeline. He has devoted a lifetime to the preservation and perpetuation of the culture, traditions, customs and folklore of the Acadians. He is not a man of means, but a good name is better than riches. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the great use of a life is to spend it for something that outlasts it, and such has been the goal of Mr. Andre Olivier.

The principal speaker at the banquet, where Andre's legions of friends met to do him honor, was the former Governor of Louisiana, the Honorable Sam Houston Jones. His address deserves a place in the permanent archives of our history, and for that reason I, under unanimous consent, insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to my colleagues as worthwhile reading and useful research material.

Governor Jones' address follows:

When he had reached the age of threescore years and ten my father wrote what has been termed "A History of Beauregard Parish." Strictly speaking it is not a history but a collection of memories and stories of the early pioneers and peoples of that west Louisiana section where both he and I were born. Today, 20 years after his death, that little manuscript is the most prized historical source record in existence treating of that locality.

I have been intrigued by the concluding portion of his treatise when he said:

"If there is anything else you wish to know about old times and oldtimers in this vicinity, see me privately and I will tell you if I know, and if I do not you might see my good colored friend, John Towner, an ex-slave, who is the best informed person now living, as to the pioneers of this country. If neither John nor I can tell you, you will not likely ever secure the information."

And no truer words were ever spoken. Yet there is pathos and sadness in them. For with him, and his contemporaries, died the major portion of the history of my people. No one else had taken the trouble to preserve, or reduce to writing, the history of a frontier civilization occupying a portion of what was once known as the neutral territory. It has been fought over by France and Spain. It had been contended for by the United States and Mexico. Far up in its northern hills one may search and find the crude evidences which mark the first capitol of the Spanish Province of Texas—the Presidio de los Adaes.

And because there were no histories to record the events of those early days, we are left largely to imagination and guesswork and legend as to how people lived, and who did what, and what forces worked to bring the evolution of modern civilization to the frontiersman who lived largely by his gun and his dog and his fishing rod.

And thus, with few exceptions, it has always been. Great civilizations lie buried forever beneath the sands of the Sahara and below the rocky soil of Asia Minor. One of the great mysteries is the disappearance of the glories of the Mayan civilization of the Yucatan and Guatemala, the slaughter of their intellectual aristocracy, and the utter destruction of their once fertile lands.

Only today are we beginning to discover a few of the fragmentary keys to the early history of the Vikings and their unbelievable exploits and travels to the ends of the earth. And what you can say of these you can multiply scores of times over about many civilizations which have risen and flourished and been sunk from history without a trace.

It is one thing to make history. But, for posterity, it is much more important to preserve it. And that points up, not only the wisdom and advisability, but the absolute necessity of historians, and of collectors and preservers of objects and things which give posterity an insight into the ways of life of days gone by. Occasionally fortuitous circumstances will uncover historic relics of priceless value, such as the now famous Dead Sea scrolls. Then once in a thousand years there will come upon the earthly scene an Arnold Toynbee with a searching will and inquisitive mind who can, within limits, assemble and reconstruct the history of a millennium.

I shudder to think what would have been the effect on the Christian church had not the beloved physician, St. Luke, not only taken time to write the Gospel that bears his name, and the Acts of the Apostles, but also to encourage others, including St. Paul, both to collect and assemble, and to write down the historic events of the early New Testament days.

The Roman Empire was far more fortunate than most in the preservation of its far-reaching history. Not only was it blessed with contemporary historians and those who, in the perspective of time, wrote, analyzed, and appraised the vast influence of that civilization on humanity. It had something else equally as important. The Romans built enduring works, wherever they went, that remind us of their way of life. Those works are there today, some preserved and some in ruins—all the way from the British Isles on the west to the borders of Asia on the east—all the way from north Africa on the south to the North Sea on the north. And they are mute, but impressive, testimony of the grandeur and glory of a civilization seldom, if ever, equaled since the beginning of time.

We were more fortunate in America. We began our existence in modern days when it was easier to record and preserve the important events of passing time. But even here we have our examples of the importance of preserving contemporary things. And, again, I shudder to think, how great our loss would have been had not Alexander Hamilton and James Madison and John Jay taken the time to write the "Federalist Papers," which are the key to the political philosophy that gave birth to a new concept of government, and to a new way of life.

Here in the State of Louisiana the job of our forebears was more difficult. This land for decades was a pawn in the hands of the great powers. It was later to be acquired and absorbed by a new nation whose people and language were then strange to your forebears, and whose interest in the then territory of Orleans was more incidental than real. True we had the chronicles of Napoleon and Talleyrand, and the dissertations of Jefferson and the vivid accounts of Robert Livingston, but they were incidental to other areas and other peoples.

The Frenchmen who came to this land were destined to play one of the most brilliant, romantic, and important parts in the genesis of America. They were to merge the fervor of the democracy born in France with the solidity of that which was born of English forebears.

And your ancestors who settled here among the Attakapas were not unlike those other Pilgrims who landed a century and a half before at Plymouth Rock. They both came for reasons now embedded in the basic philosophy of the American people: freedom of religion, the right of democracy, and the opportunity of economic advancement. Your ancestors were to become the connecting link between the two great western democracies, and to help in cementing a friendship which has existed from the time of Lafayette down to this day.

But there had to be those to tell the thrilling stories and to preserve the evidence of the great contributions to be made to America by the great French people, a people who had defeated the tyrants of France, who had torn down the Bastille, and who gave to us the Marsellaise. A people who penned the immortal slogan: "Liberty, equality, and fraternity," and made those words live and have meaning down through the generations to our own time.

There had to be those who could assemble and tell the story of that momentous pil-

grimage of your ancestors from far off Nova Scotia to the land of the Teche. For how else could Longfellow have written his immortal and never-to-be-forgotten words: "Beautiful is the land, with its prairies and forests of fruit trees." And his poetic description of your locale when he wrote:

"Near to the bank of the river, o'er shadowed
by oaks, from whose branches
Garlands of Spanish moss and of mystic
mistletoe flaunted,
Such as the druids cut down with golden
hatchets at yule-tide."

There had to be those who could tell and preserve the heroic exploits of your military heroes, of Beauregard and Mouton and Count de Polignac, and of John A. Lejeune and Claire Chennault; those to record and preserve the distinguished accomplishments of St. Denis, and of the Lemoyne brothers, Iberville and Bienville; of the agriculturists and scientists, like Valcour Aime and Etienne De Bore; of physicians like Chaille and Delery of yellow fever fame, and of Trudeau and Souchon and Matas.

There are always those, of course, to tell of the great public figures such as Pierre Derbigny and Villerie and Roman and Alexandre Mouton; and the illustrious "Cousin" Bob Broussard; somewhat fewer to tell of the respected jurists such as Martin and Prevost and Caillouette and Leblanc, still fewer to tell of the educators and the clergymen; and practically none to tell of the accomplishments of the merchants and traders and architects and financiers.

This grand old State of ours has gone through the most fantastic metamorpheses and revolutions. It has been French and Spanish and British and American. It has lived through success and failure. It has been the richest State in the Union and one of the poorest. It built up a civilization and a culture surpassed by none in the Nation. Yet it fell from its dizzy heights; was ravished and laid waste like a conquered province.

It has lived through wars and floods and disasters and panics and plagues. Yet phoenixlike it has risen again and is now on its way toward becoming economically one of the top 10 States of the Union.

It has a remarkable personality—a remarkable individuality. It defies classification and stands alone as the most unique State of all. It is not typically southern; it is not western. Through a part of the great Mississippi Valley it is not a midcontinent State. It is typically American—yet it is international in its mentality and philosophy.

One of its most unique contributions to American history was the Acadian migration, and the great series of events that momentous pilgrimage set in motion. It has enriched a State and a Nation. It has broadened the concept of a great people. It has immortalized one of the basic tenets of the American dream, freedom of religion.

No man who knows these things can fail to be proud of Louisiana. So far as I know I have not a drop of French blood in my veins. But the story of your people and their historic migration never fails to thrill me, no matter how many times told. The contributions of your people have made of our State a better, finer, and greater State. And the fact that the Latins and Anglo-Saxons of Louisiana, with diverse manners and customs and religions, have been able to live together in peace and harmony and understanding is one of the foremost examples of the success of the American dream.

I think much of our success has been due to the breadth of character of your people, best exemplified by what happened in the third gubernatorial election under the American flag. The time was 1820. The candidates were Thomas Bolling Robertson and Pierre Derbigny. There was a preferential election in which all the voters participated. But the legal election then was by the legislature. Robertson got the highest number of votes at the polls; but Pierre Derbigny's friends were in the majority in the legislature. They were ready to elect Derbigny, and they had a perfect legal right to do so.

But what happened? Pierre Derbigny's representative rose from his seat in the legislature and declared that he had too much respect for the will of the people to wish to be considered as a candidate for Governor, and asked that his friends vote for Robertson. And as Chambers said in his History of Louisiana, "This one act of Derbigny's * * * was more eloquent than all the resources of oratory or the skill in arraying written words could muster."

Derbigny gave up the governorship which was his for the asking, but he won for the French people of Louisiana a position of honor and integrity and leadership that has continued to this day. And, as the historian said: "As a citizen respectful of the people's will, as a believer in the right of the majority to rule, he was a success from the start."

And that is the beginning of the harmony between your people and mine. But be it remembered that the hand of friendship and understanding was first extended by the Frenchman.

But what we know about your people and mine was not given to us by the politicians and the public officials. It was given to us by the historians, by the Gayarres, by the Martins and by the Fortiers. These plodding, meticulous, methodical zealots saw other people make the history, but they wrote it and they passed it on to us, and we are the wiser, not because of those who made the history, but because of those who gathered the facts, recorded them, and passed them on to posterity.

And so, too, the beautiful story of Evangeline came to us from the poets and the historians, from Longfellow and Voorhies, and the others who took the time and the trouble to assemble, compile, record, and preserve those facts and events which have become an inspiration to untold multitudes of people, born many years after the death of those who made our history in those early years.

And there are today those who work on, and spend their lifetimes, that both contemporaries and posterity may know of the glories of the past; that it may not be dissipated with the passing of the years; that it may not be buried beneath the sands of the delta, and lost forever.

Such a man, "the historian of the Teche" and "the guide of the Attakapas country" we honor today. It has been said "that a prophet is not without honor, save in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house," but our friend is the exception that proves the rule, as is witnessed by this gathering today.

For more than 30 years this man has devoted his life to the perpetuation of the story of the Acadians. The world has beaten a path to his door, the great as well as the lowly. They have come by the thousands from every State in the Union, from Canada and Mexico, from Europe and Australia, from Japan and China, from Egypt and the Belgian Congo, literally from the four corners of the earth.

His museum, his collections, his knowledge has been shared by governors, by Senators, by great judges, by officials and functionaries of foreign countries, by the Armed Forces, and by the great mass of the American people who want to stand on sacred soil and bask in bright sunshine of history and have their faith restored.

That, my friends, is really the greatest tribute that can be paid to a man, and to the cause for which he works. And in the light of this our efforts to add to what these multitudes have, by their actions, said, seems puny, indeed. Perhaps it has been best said by Colonel Landers, of the historical section of the Army War College, when he said to our friend:

"You are doing more than any other person to make others see your fair land with sympathetic and understanding eyes. It is difficult always to be able to impress the casual and ignorant observer with the significance of a building, a stream, a grave, or a tradition. A pioneer worker must bear the load. In your field you are working with a concentration of romance and history not excelled in beauty anywhere in our country."

To what the colonel has said I could add only this: Our friend is perpetuating for us and American posterity one of the finest and most inspiring events in the Nation's history. He is retelling, with infinite patience and infinite dedication, the great epic of a great people, the inspiring saga of a courageous band of pioneers.

You have many great and illustrious people here in the parish of St. Martin. I imagine most of you would place someone else at the top of your list of distinguished citizens, because of what that person has done, or by reason or the fact that he is making contemporary history. But I say that, viewed in the perspecitve of time, and considering the good that he will do for the education and edification of the multitudes yet unborn, Andre Olivier takes first rank among the residents of your parish.

He has been a useful citizen to his community, his State and the Nation. It is his kind who collect and preserve and disseminate the knowledge and information that influences the direction of peoples and of nations. It is his kind who leave their imprint on the thinking of people for generations to come. And when I think of men like him I am reminded of that poem which I memorized as a boy:

"Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime;
And departing leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time."

We can rest, in quite assurance, that Andre Olivier's influence will be felt down the generations, and that his footprints will be firmly planted on the sands of time.

I have read and heard it said that Andre Olivier is the descendant of an illustrious nobleman of France. That, and his heritage from Grandpré, go far to explain the greatness of the man and his selfless service. But I think what is more important than the fact of his descent from a nobleman of France, is the fact that he is a noble man himself, and in his own right. And when you honor him you honor all that immortal band of Acadians who gave us the memorable story of Evangeline and its inspiring lesson to Americans everywhere.

Never Underestimate the Power of a Woman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, as one who never underestimates the truth of the slogan "Never underestimate the power of a woman," I am most pleased that the General Federation of Women's Clubs has embarked upon a nationwide program called passport to safety. The

campaign is well described in the following letter from Mrs. W. J. Jennings, corresponding secretary of the West Orange, N.J., Women's Club. The traffic accident problem is of ever growing concern for all our States, and the federation is to be congratulated for its safety program. Highway safety—attainable through enforcement, education, and engineering—is an area in which the Federal Government should participate in cutting the appalling casualty lists.

I commend Mrs. Jennings' letter to my colleagues' attention:

WEST ORANGE WOMEN'S CLUB,
West Orange, N.J., February 20, 1959.

Hon. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO,
11th District, New Jersey, Representative, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ADDONIZIO: The members of the West Orange Women's Club are earnestly concerned about the traffic accident problem in our State and the open disregard for the law demonstrated by so many of our motorists.

Because of this condition, we wish to go on record as endorsing improved driver licensing standards and procedures which will permit on our roads only those who prove themselves competent drivers, who follow the rules of the road, who respect the rights of others, and who thereby earn the privilege to drive.

As a member of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, with 7 million members nationally, we are active in a nationwide program called passport to safety. Our members are emphasizing their concern by signing a ballot for better driving licensing, which is being brought to the attention of our State and public officials.

Action must be prompt and there must be an efficient screening system. Be assured that we stand behind you in your effort to revise our present laws where necessary and to enact every needed additional legislation, as well as to provide adequate funds to achieve a strict, impartial, and realistic licensing program for our State.

We feel that the time has come when each driver must meet definite standards of performance to earn and to retain his driving privilege. We stand ready to give you our active support in your efforts on behalf of better driver licensing.

Very truly yours,

RUTH L. JENNINGS
Mrs. W. J. Jennings,
Corresponding Secretary.

Maryland Voluntary Weather Observers Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. FOLEY
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce recently issued a special edition of the Weather Bureau's daily weather map in honor of 21 veterans of the nationwide corps of about 7,000 cooperative volunteer weather observers who take and record weather observations every day of the year without compensation.

Among the 21 veteran volunteers—those who have taken weather observations daily for more than 50 years—Maryland is the only State in the Union that can claim two of these distinguished citizens as her sons. And, it happens that the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland is the only congressional district in which two of these honored volunteers reside. I refer to Mr. D. Paul Oswald, of Hagerstown, Md., who has been a weather observer for 57 years, and Mr. Ralph E. Weber, of Oakland, Md., who has served for 56 years.

Dr. F. W. Reichelderfer, Chief of the Weather Bureau, in praising the work of these remarkable senior citizens said that without the daily records of these cooperative observers our knowledge of the climate of the United States would be meager. He added that this weather work is an outstanding example of people serving their Government without pay, and he thought their daily but unsung efforts merited the applause of their fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in my comments at this point a brief background statement on both Maryland veteran volunteer weather observers which was included in the Weather Bureau citation:

D. Paul Oswald was born March 15, 1886, on the family farm in Chewsville, Md. In May of 1898 his father consented to the establishment of a weather station at his home as a hobby and education for his sons. D. Paul Oswald began sending in weather observations in February 1902. In January 1948 he moved to Hagerstown, Md., where he still makes his daily observations at the weather station called Chewsville-Bridgeport, a combined name of the two stations he has operated. He was recently on the Science Program closed circuit television for Washington County schools, and has for decades provided weather facts to local newspapers and radio stations.

Ralph E. Weber, cooperative observer at Oakland, Md., since September 1903, has the second longest period of service of any present Maryland observer. He was born in March 1887 in Oakland, and has lived all his life on the family farm. Here he makes his daily weather observations, and here he read the lowest surface temperature ever recorded south of the Mason-Dixon line, 40 degrees below zero, on January 13, 1912.

And I want to add my own sincere congratulations and best wishes to these two distinguished gentlemen, on behalf of myself and the entire Nation. Their citation for special merit by the Weather Bureau is a great tribute to their dedicated and unselfish public service. They perform an invaluable and indispensable service to industry, commerce, agriculture, and national defense without fanfare and without sufficient public recognition of their service to the community.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in my comments part of a statement released by the Weather Bureau on February 26, 1959, which illustrates the kind of important function that these volunteer observers fulfill:

The help of cooperative weather observers to record the Nation's climate was started early in the last century, even before the Weather Bureau was established in 1891. Dozens of individuals who had been taking observations at scattered locations were urged by the new Weather Bureau to continue, and hundreds of additional citizens in all parts of the country and from all walks of life soon volunteered to make local weather observations and keep records of climatological data. More than 7,000 citizens now are taking weather observations without pay. The Weather Bureau furnishes observation instruments, such as rain gages and thermometers, and also supplies the record forms on which the observations are logged at least once daily. Observers are drawn from all ranks of life, and by their constant and faithful service have made available to all users an invaluable storehouse of weather data.

Each observer gives an average of about 15 minutes a day to take and record the observations, to answer numerous questions from neighbors in the community about the local weather, and to complete and mail the regular monthly reports. It is estimated that the total time contributed by each observer to the Government over a 50-year period amounts to about 600 8-hour workdays. The daily services of the thousands of voluntary observers would add up to about 80,000 full 8-hour days of work each year provided our citizens without cost.

In addition to the basic job of weather reporting, cooperative observers are occasionally invited to perform a wide variety of special reporting jobs. Some of these jobs in recent years include (a) reporting dates of the stages of development of various plants to assist in special agricultural studies, (b) telephoning special reports to designated collection centers to assist research work on the development and forecasting of tornadoes, and (c) reporting on the accuracy of weather forecasts.

I think we can take renewed inspiration from the high-minded and public-spirited contribution to the Nation that is being made every day by Mr. Oswald and Mr. Weber and by the some 7,000 other Americans who make this important contribution to our knowledge of the weather.

The "Politics" of the Arab Refugee Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include for the interest and information of my colleagues, and others interested in a solution to the emotion-packed Arab refugee problem, an article entitled "Political Ambitions Above Human Needs."

This article appears in the 1959 winter-spring issue of a magazine entitled "Prevent World War III." It is published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc.

The article exposes the tactics of some Arab leaders in blocking an equitable and just solution of the Arab refugee problem to further their own political ambitions.

Another pertinent article on the Aswan Dam appears in this issue of the magazine and in the very near future I plan to insert the full text of this article for the perusal of those interested in this matter.

The aforementioned article follows:

POLITICAL AMBITIONS ABOVE HUMAN NEEDS

Ten years ago thousands of Arabs streamed out of Israel pushed on by the propaganda and threats of the Arab States which were attacking the Israelis. Thus, the Arab refugees problem was born. It is a tragedy which continues to plague the conscience of all men of good will.

The Arabs who found themselves part of the mass exodus were promised many things by the leaders of the Arab aggression. They soon found out that it was all a mirage, as they were left stranded in conditions of extreme destitution.

The plight of the Arab refugees has not been ignored by the United Nations. Through the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine (UNRWA) hundreds of thousands of refugees have been shielded from the horror of starvation. Each year a relatively handful of UN member states contribute financial aid to the operations of UNRWA. It is estimated that 70 percent of UNRWA's budget is made up of U.S. funds which have averaged about $22 million for the last 2 years.

While immediate relief is of the utmost necessity, its perpetuation indefinitely would doom the refugees to a life of stagnation. It is not as though there is no way out of this dilemma. Indeed, there are excellent and practical plans to rehabilitate these people so that they can make a positive contribution to the overall development of the Middle East.

There are many areas in the Middle East that could easily absorb the majority of these people and benefit from their labors. One would think that the Arab governments would be first to support these plans which would be a boon to their economies. Yet, it is precisely the Arab States which have shown an uncompromising hostility to every reasonable project.

It is a shocking fact—perhaps little known to most people including the refugees themselves—that the Arab States do not contribute 1 cent to UNRWA. On the contrary, the Arab States try to discredit and sabotage the workings of this United Nations agency which was specifically created to help the refugees. For example, in UNRWA's latest report, made by Mr. Leslie J. Carver, acting director of the UN agency, it is revealed that operations have been hampered by the continued withholding of permits to allow his international staff to enter the Gaza strip. The strip contains many Arab refugees, but their welfare is at the mercy of the Nasser regime which controls it and is responsible for the impeding of UNRWA's operations there.

The report discloses that redtape and restrictive regulations on the transport of relief goods between Lebanon, Jordan and the United Arab Republic have not only caused inexcusable delay but also an extra cost of more than $650,000. As reported by the New York Times (Oct. 23, 1958): "The acting director said no critical situation had arisen, but he maintained that the incidents constituted a challenge to the principles governing the operations of the United Nations agency and on occasion had hindered its effective functioning."

One would think that the objectivity of the report, its concern for the welfare of the refugees, and its plea for further financial help would evoke a measure of sympathy from the Arab leaders. The contrary seems to be the case. Indeed, in the United Arab Republic the report is derided. Radio Cairo seems almost gleeful when it noted that attempts to reabsorb the refugees in the economic life of the Middle East had not achieved any success. After sneering at UNRWA's efforts, the broadcast states: "Any attempt to limit the refugee problem to economic or social aspects is bound to have a hollow basis and can never attain any practical and useful results." And why not? What is more practical and useful than to afford these people the opportunity to participate in productive labor, to contribute to the building of the Arab countries, and to renew their spiritual and cultural lives? Radio Cairo evades this challenge by pretending that the refugee problem is "political."

Unquestionably a lasting solution of the refugee problem is tied up with the prospects for a political settlement in the Middle East. But such a settlement, if it is to bring peace and stability, must be on the basis of mutual respect for the sovereignty of all Arab States and Israel. This is exactly what the present Arab leadership wishes to avoid at all costs. To them, political settlement of the refugee problem is equivalent to the destruction of the State of Israel. This was emphasized by the U.N. spokesman for Saudi Arabia, Ahmed Shukairy. Mr. Shukairy bluntly told the U.N. Committee on Refugees that the U.N. had failed in its responsibilities toward the refugees. Therefore, he said, the only alternative was for "unilateral sanctions to be taken against Israel." These sanctions, he cried, would bring Israel "on her knees." To make clear what he meant by sanctions, Shukairy warned: "We are on the march, drawing nearer and nearer to our goals. All the fortresses left behind the retreating forces of imperialism are falling, one after the other, and Zionism is no exception.

"It shall surrender too, and the refugees shall return to their homeland and their homeland shall return to them."

This is not the first time that Shukairy has sounded the war cry against Israel and the West in the United Nations; but, beyond and above the attitude toward Israel, the so-called political solution, as defined by Mr. Shukairy, is nothing more than a plot to launch war in the Midle East with all its dire consequences for world peace. In the No. 51 issue of Prevent World War III we published an analysis entitled "The Tragedy of the Arab Refugees." The conclusion of the article deserves repeating: "From the foregoing it should be obvious that the Arab refugee problem is capable of solution provided that there is a sincere desire on the part of all concerned to reach agreement. But what shall we say when some who claim to speak for the refugees refuse to sit at the conference table and prefer to dedicate statues of soldiers pointing machineguns toward Israel? Only the combined efforts and good will of Arabs and Jews can put an end to this tragedy. The Israeli have always expressed a willingness to help in untangling this complex problem. It is clearly up to the Arab governments to show a similar attitude by word and by deed and to renounce the policy of exploiting these unfortunate people as pawns in their efforts to prevent peace in the Middle East."

The more we study the refugee problem the more we are convinced that the chief victims of the Arab invasion of Israel in 1948 turned out to be the Arabs who were induced to leave. They will remain the chief victims as long as Mr. Shukairy and his mentors continue to exploit their misery in the interest of selfish ambitions.

Ghana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to salute on the second anniversary of the independence of Ghana, March 6, the Prime Minister, His Excellency Kwame Nkrumah, and the country's Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Daniel Chapman. There is added pride for us in the United States of America in the 2-year accomplishments of Ghana coast and more particularly to the command post of present-day Ghana. Although Ghana's population is little more than 5 million, inhabiting roughly only 91,843 square miles, its richness and its people have figured most prominently in the direction of the modern world. From the 15th century to the present, Ghana's gold or cocoa or bauxite or people have enriched the coffers of others. Ghana's gold and her human resources, beginning in the 16th century, laid the foundation of, first, the Portuguese, later the Dutch, English, Swedes, Danes, and still later the American economy. The influence of the Guinea coast and its impact upon America is seen every day in virtually one-tenth of the population of this great country. Add today to Ghana's continuing contribution of mineral resources and cocoa, and the impact of her descendants throughout the West, and a new story of Ghana's influence begins to unfold. In the span of 2 years Ghana has hostessed two major conferences where convened representatives from all parts of Africa in an effort to light the torch of liberation throughout Africa. Moreover, the leadership, the solidarity, the consciousness of the combined strength of all Africans for continent welfare and international peace has been asserted with such force that the whole universe world may experience the constructive impact of this small country a disordered world.

During Mr. Nkrumah's recent tour of India, Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, the chancellor of Delhi University, when presenting the scroll of the university said:

I wish to assure you that you have our full support and sympathy in our attempts to build up a new United States of Africa.

To which Dr. Nkrumah responded:

Since Ghana became independent we have grown increasingly conscious that the responsibility for determining our own evolution as a community rests fully on our own shoulders. We are particularly aware of the need to develop our physical, intellectual, and spiritual resources in such a way that the contribution made by our generation and by our country is for the general progress of mankind.

We believe this contribution must be not only distinctly African in character but also international in its approach.

In an address to the Indian Council of World Affairs, Dr. Nkrumah said he had doubt that Africa would involve forms of government rather different from the traditional western pattern but no less democratic in their protection of the individual and his inalienable right.

To the criticism that Ghana has not proceeded in precisely the same way as old Western democracies, the Prime Minister informed the Indians that: "First, Ghana society is by its own form and tradition fundamentally democratic in character." And, he explained, that in time their present form of parliamentary democracy may be expected to conform more closely to their own national and traditional methods of government.

To the criticism by a section of the western press for so-called undemocratic methods Nkrumah retorted:

It would have been more helpful in creating better understanding if these critics had first carefully considered the reality of the situation. As a new and young Government, our first responsibility has been to preserve independence and the security of our state.

Commenting on the African liberalism movement and Ghana's role in it, Nkrumah explained that never before had so many African leaders from all parts of the continent come together to find a solution for their common problems as assembled in Accra when political and trade union leaders met there recently. And, he added, that the process for the total liberation of Africa has begun; the union of Ghana and Guinea, representing the first step along the momentous road toward African union. In this regard, the Prime Minister concluded:

We realize that our union may involve many difficult issues but the basic and decisive fact is that we are determined in spirit and endeavor to unite in order to form the nucleus for a union of African states or republics.

The recent meeting of Nkrumah with Indian leaders has added significance for it symbolizes the realization of Asian and African struggle for a common cause. It denotes a breaking through of African nationalism and a seeking of unity and solidarity with others for international good will. For, as the Prime Minister stated, Ghana shares India's own ideals and aspirations and looks forward to working on solutions for their basic problems. This is continuation of the true meaning of the spirit born in Bandung at the Afro-Asian conference in 1955.

As the whole world totters on the brink of disaster, it is well that the big powers lend a greater ear to the misgivings of the little powers. Maybe there can be found in some cases where we have gone wrong. As for Americans, Dr. William Appleman Williams in his new book, "The Tragedy of American Diplomacy," contends that "the idea that other people ought to copy America contradicts the humanitarian urge to help them and the idea that they have the right to make such key decisions for themselves * * * in some cases the American way does not work for other people." Bearing in mind Dr. Williams conclusion that other societies come to feel that American policy causes them to lose their economic as well as their political right of self-determination, we must periodically take time to understand the motivations and aspirations of others especially the members of the popularly known Asian-African bloc. Time thus spent can be highly rewarding in terms of good will and human survival. We must listen and hear with sympathy what the smaller countries are trying to tell us for they wish like us to be spared an atomic holocaust.

In conclusion, a message from the African tradition, a proverb, which Prime Minister Nkrumah included in the foreword to Barbara Ward's new book, "Five Ideas That Change the World," is appropriate:

When the bull elephants fight, the grass is trampled down and pleads with the small and uncommitted nations to make their voices heard constructively while there is still time, for in this age of the ultimate weapon the bull elephants would disappear with the grass.

ACHIEVEMENT IN GHANA SINCE THE CELEBRATION OF FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE, 1958

POLITICAL

1. Opening of new diplomatic missions abroad and in Ghana by other countries.
2. Represented at:
(a) Geneva International Conference on the Law of the Sea.
(b) Second Geneva Atoms for Peace Conference.
(c) U.N. Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy.
(d) Inauguration of West Indies Federal Legislature.
3. Visits by Prime Minister to:
(a) Independent African States.
(b) Canada and the United States.
(c) India.
(d) Nigeria.
4. His Excellency Ambassador D. A. Chapman elected first Vice Chairman of Governing Council of new U.N. Special Fund.
5. Establishment of:
(a) Regional assemblies.
(b) Houses of chiefs primarily concerned with questions of customary law.
6. Arranged:
(a) Conference of Independent African States.
(b) All-African People's Conference.
7. Union with Guinea to form basis of Union of West African States.
8. Contribution of $3,000 to the programs of the United Nations High Commissioner for refugees.
9. Presentation of a Speaker's chair to the National Assembly by the British House of Commons.

ECONOMIC

1. Venue of First Regional Conference of Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations.
2. Trade and goodwill missions to Britain and Western Europe.
3. Trade missions from:
(a) The Netherlands.
(b) Czechoslovakia.
(c) Italy.
(d) West and East Germany.
(e) Poland.
4. Establishment of state lotteries.
5. Issue of own coinage to replace former West African currency.
6. Article of agreement signed with International Finance Corporation.
7. Establishment of:
(a) Tourist bureau.
(b) Committee on Aid to Ghanaian Business.
(c) Insecticide factory.
(d) Commercial vehicles assembly plant.
(e) Nautical college for training of ships' officers and ratings; Ghanaians also being trained as seamen.
(f) Investment promotion board.
(g) Food and Agricultural Organization Regional Office for Africa.
(h) ICA operation mission.
(f) Rockefeller Brothers' Fund to help obtain investment funds and financial assistance for economic development.
(j) Bankers' clearinghouse.
8. Plan to develop Accra Airport to international standards.
9. Formation of iron and steel mill.
10. Modernization of fishing industry.
11. Formal inauguration of Ghana airways, and plans for creation of completely jet-powered airfleet.
12. Training of Ghanaians to become air hostesses.
13. Visit by team of experts from Henry J. Kaiser Co. to make survey and bring up-to-date engineering report on Volta River project. Maine factors of scheme: Dam the Volta, produce 600,000 kilowatts capacity and smelt 210,000 tons of aluminum yearly from Ghana bauxite.
14. Revision of company law for speedy development.
15. Signing of investment guarantee agreement to attract private American capital to Ghana.
16. Scheme for establishment of oil mill factory.
17. Represented at:
(a) First session of U.N. Economic Commission for Africa at Addis Ababa.
(b) Forty-first (Maritime) session of International Labor Conference in Geneva.
(c) Conference of International Federation of Agricultural Producers in Brussels.
(d) Montreal Commonwealth Trade and Economic Conference.
(e) New Delhi talks of World Bank and International Monetary Fund.
18. Formation of Ghana National Construction Co. for building factories, carrying out construction works, and training of Ghanaians.
19. Study progress of Tema Harbor, one of the major harbors of Africa.
20. New trade union structure to (a) help develop the country, (b) train the workers to contribute to this development.
21. Preparation of a second development plan which will mark an important step forward in the further development and consolidation of the independence of the country.

SOCIAL

1. Represented at (a) Commonwealth games in Montreal, (b) Conference of Afro-Asian writers in Tashkent in Soviet Union, (c) World Assembly of Youth in New Delhi.
2. Debut of (a) Ghana Times (daily newspaper), (b) the Ghanaian (monthly magazine).
3. Increased operations of Ghana News Agency which receives and distributes domestic and overseas news to various news organizations in Ghana.
4. Opening of (a) police college for advanced training for police officers, (b) law school, (c) school of journalism.
5. Admission to (a) full membership of UNESCO, (b) membership of International Criminal Police Organization.
6. Arts and crafts exhibitions to develop distinctive Ghanaian culture.
7. Agricultural shows to increase number and variety of crops and the flourish of livestock industry.
8. Training of Ghanaians to become officers in Ghana's Army.
9. Plans (a) to enable Radio-Ghana to cover the whole of Africa, (b) for establishment of medical school, (c) for inauguration of television service, (d) to establish an arts council.
10. More towns connected by new VHF radio-telephone link.
11. Visits by Ghanaians to the United States under various forms of grants.
12. Statue of Prime Minister added to others in Madame Tussaud's exhibition in London.
13. Installation of new automatic street lights.
14. Represented at:
(a) World Health Assembly in Minneapolis.
(b) Sixth International Congress on Tropical Medicine and Malaria in Lisbon.
(c) International Conference on Organization of Community Development in Tripoli.
(d) Sixth Meeting of International Scientific Committee for Trypanosomiasis Research in Brussels.
(e) Eighth International Students' Conference in Peru.
15. Ghana Film Unit Productions shown at Film Festival in Russia.
16. Issue of special stamps commemorating 150th birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln.

17. Assistance by WHO and UNICEF in battle against diseases.
18. Opening of new blind vocational training center.
19. Extension to supplies of water, electricity, railways, telephone, medical supplies, and other services to many parts of the country.
20. Construction of bridges, trunk and feeder roads.
21. Venue of International Rally of Girl Scouts.
22. New policy to enable more people to own houses.
23. Provision of primary schooling for all who wanted it.
24. Expansion of middle (similar to junior high) school system.
25. Increase in enrollments in secondary schools.
26. Improvement in existing teacher training colleges.
27. New buildings at university college and college of technology.
28. Award of local and overseas scholarships.
29. Receipt of several offers of scholarships from other countries to commemorate attainment of independence.
30. Recognition of Ghana Red Cross Society by International Committee of Red Cross Societies in Geneva.
31. Furthering of new and better ways of rural life in raising of living standards through community development.

Address by Charles Abrams Upon Presentation of the Queens County Jewish War Veterans Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, last year I was privileged to share a speakers platform with two distinguished Americans, Mr. Charles Abrams, then chairman of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination, and Mr. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The occasion was the presentation of an award to Mr. Wilkins by the Queens County Jewish War Veterans, a truly American organization completely dedicated to the interests of all our citizens.

Commissioner Abrams delivered a stirring and inspiring speech in making the formal presentation to Mr. Wilkins which I commend for reading to my colleagues:

REMARKS BY CHARLES ABRAMS, CHAIRMAN OF THE NEW YORK STATE COMMISSION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION, UPON PRESENTATION OF THE QUEENS COUNTY JEWISH WAR VETERANS AWARD TO ROY WILKENS ON APRIL 19, 1958

The man whom we have assembled here to honor is unique. He is what is called a crusader. A crusader is not a popular creature. For a crusader has a cross to bear. Not with the sword today, but with the word. And a crusader is not popular in our time or at any time because he carries a message which many people do not like and in which they do not yet believe.

His, moreover, is a peculiar crusade because what he preaches is not treason, but reason; not heresy but truth; not iconoclasm but justice; not conformity under force but equality under law. Yet it is one of the anomalies of our time that democracy is still a heresy in many parts of America and that his crusade still is unpopular in many parts of America.

The gospel of equality rooted in Christian antiquity is still denied by many who insist that the equality must remain an abstraction. Some States have in fact actually nullified it by statute. They reject the courts that have reaffirmed the principle and defy the Government to implement it. In the process a land of the law finds it difficult to carry out the law of the land. The force of law has too often had to yield to the law of force. Neither persuasion nor judicial mandate have as yet been able to fulfill the Constitution under which we live. Equality in America thus continues to remain a visionary notion, a goal of some rather than a reality for all. It is, therefore, important that we understand what his crusade is about. For it is not only the Negro for whom he carries the torch, but for us. In our time intolerance has reaped its toll in many forms—against 6 million Jewish lives in Germany in the form of anti-Semitic intolerance; against a million Moslem and Hindu lives in Pakistan and India because of religious intolerance; against millions of Russian farmers lives because of political intolerance; against African majorities and white minorities because of color intolerance.

Unless intolerance disappears from the world no minority is safe; no members of the majority today can feel secure against being segmented into victimized minorities tomorrow. For intolerance is epidemic and once loosed, may spread to embrace an increasing area of victims.

We have lived and felt secure in our time only because we know that the law which protects the gentile protects the Jew, that the courts that shield the white shield the black. But morality and law must be linked if democracy is to function. For once the morality which undergirds the law is compromised, then tyranny takes over, whether it be the tyranny of a numerical majority or of a political minority. The Jew in Germany was not the victim of lawlessness for it was lawful to kill him, he was the victim of immorality under law. The Moslem and Hindu on the other hand were the victims of lawlessness though in their own way they thought they were simply carrying out what they saw as a moral principle of indiscriminately taking eyes for eyes and lives for lives. Law and morality are therefore indivisible. And the crusade this man wages is for both. It is a crusade for the preservation of the Judaic-Christian faith and justice as well as for moral law under a moral constitution.

When we honor him here, it is not for the service he renders to himself or to his race but to mankind. And his must remain a lonely course through the ever-winding abyss of bigotry and ignorance. I know the pains and the heartaches of his struggle. I know its dangers, for the resistance is not met only with grimaces but sometimes with burning crosses and dynamite. I know too that the crusader's greatest frustrations occur when he knows that those who should be standing at his side remain aloof and indifferent.

And so when we lift our eyes to the fighter for justice, when we give him our hand and our tribute, it is with renewed courage that he moves on with his work and with fresh faith renews his efforts toward the horizons under which we want our children to live.

It is because we know that his is our battle too and our stake that we give him this our humble tribute, as a token of our affection, a symbol of our respect, and in grateful recognition of the great task to which he has dedicated his life.

Maritime Unions Seek Destruction of Our Merchant Marine Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the National Maritime Union, headed by Joseph Curran, and the International Seafarers Union, headed by Paul Hall, are waging a propaganda campaign designed to destroy a vital portion of our merchant marine fleet.

Our citizens now have approximately 1,500 oil tankers, ore carriers, and tramp steamers flying the flags of Panama, Liberia, and Honduras. These are American-owned ships and they receive no subsidy from the United States Government. These ships are called flags of necessity ships; that is, it is necessary to fly under these flags if they are to survive. They simply could not fly under the American flag where seamen would be organized and receive wages 3 and even 4 times higher than wages paid to seamen flying under the flags of Western European maritime countries.

The Federal Government already is spending $130 million in annual subsidies to seamen who sail under the American flag. American ship owners do not get a dime out of this. I certainly have no quarrel with this expenditure. It is money well spent and necessary if we want any kind of a healthy and strong merchant marine.

Messrs. Curran and Hall want the flags of necessity ships returned to the American flag. They have a selfish motive in pressing for this radical change in our merchant marine policy. They want more dues-paying members in their unions.

Flags of necessity ships have received the enthusiastic endorsement of the Congress through passage of the Shipping Act of 1916, the Defense Department, and Federal Maritime Administrator Clarence G. Morse. The Congress gave Mr. Morse the authority to transfer these ships to the flags of Panama, Honduras, and Liberia, and only the Congress can take away that authority.

If, perchance, we changed our merchant marine policy and returned these flags of necessity ships to the United States flag, the Federal Government would be saddled with an additional four or five hundred million dollars in annual subsidies to these seamen, because, as I said, these ships cannot possibly compete with low-paid Western European seamen without the subsidy.

We have effective control over these flags of necessity ships. They are doing a great job and they are not asking a dime from the Federal Government. They came to our rescue during the Korean conflict, and they will be available to our Government tomorrow if an emergency should arise.

Of course, if Mr. Curran and Mr. Hall persist in their violent and unfounded attacks on the flags of necessity ship

owners, the owners will sell these ships to Great Britain, Norway, or the Dutch. That would be disastrous to our national security. I am not concerned one bit about the profits or losses of these ships, but I am concerned about our national defense and the added burden to the taxpayer if these ships ever should be returned to the American flag.

If flags of necessity ships were sold abroad I do not see how Mr. Curran or Mr. Hall would gain anything. I strongly doubt that these men are thinking in terms of the consequences of their propaganda campaign. They would gain nothing and the United States would lose a lot along the national security and economy front.

Freedom of the Press Does Not Mean License To Brainwash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, freedom of the press is one of our cherished rights but, like all of our rights, it carries a responsibility. The printed word is a powerful weapon. It should not be used to brainwash the public.

Through misleading and downright slanderous advertising in national magazines, the public service electric companies are attempting to brainwash the people of the United States. These ads use pictures of children and even the Holy Bible in a campaign of vilification against two programs that have proven their worth to this country—the public power program and the rural electrification movement. Such advertising is a disgrace to America and to American journalism.

I have just received a letter from Alex Radin, general manager of the American Public Power Association. In his letter, Mr. Radin takes the latest of these power company ads and refutes its statements, one by one. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include this letter in the RECORD:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON: For the past few years we have noted with concern the false or misleading advertising which has been carried in a number of national magazines and other media under the sponsorship of the Electric Power Companies Advertising Program (ECAP). One of the most recent ads in this series was so outrageous that we feel it should not stand without a reply.

The advertisement says, "The promoters of Federal Government public power are trying to get their hands on more of your tax money." This characterization of Federal power programs is completely contrary to fact; under the laws written by Congress, every cent invested in Federal power projects is being repaid, with interest or equivalent.

In the same vein, the advertisement charges that $5.5 billion is "the amount of tax money already spent on Federal public power." It is patently ridiculous to label the Nation's investment over several decades in the development of electric power facilities in conjunction with natural resource development programs as money spent. This failure to distinguish between moneys spent and invested comes with ill grace from an industry financed by billions of dollars of invested capital.

The figure of $5.5 billion is not substantiated in any way in the advertisement, nor does it appear susceptible to any factual explanation. The total investment in Federal power programs is reliably estimated at closer to $3 billion.

The advertisement continues: "The lobbyists and pressure groups who promote public power are pushing the idea that Congress should spend $10 billion more on this costly program, to be collected from you and other Americans, of course. (This $10 billion must be assumed to be another Madison Avenue straw man.)

The reference to "lobbyists and pressure groups who promote public power" is an insult not only to groups such as the American Public Power Association, which advocate orderly Federal development of our natural resources including power, but also to millions of Americans of both major political parties, who over the past half century have supported Federal programs for resource development.

No less insulting is the implication that the Congress authorizes such programs at the insistence of "lobbyists and pressure groups." Savings of lives and millions of dollars from flood control and the economic gains from thousands of miles of navigable streams, irrigation, countless recreational opportunities and the production of billions of kilowatt-hours of electric energy—the fruits of our Federal water resources development program—are a tribute to the wisdom and foresight of many Members of the Congress. To suggest that great Americans of the past and present—Norris, McNary, Rayburn, and Hill, for example—fought for maximum comprehensive and beneficial development of water resources because of the urgings of lobbyists and pressure groups not only taxes credulity but represents the grossest sort of slander.

The advertisement contends that investments in Federal power are "all so unnecessary" because "America's many independent electric companies are able—and ready—to supply all the electricity the Nation needs—without your tax money."

That many of the greatest power developments in the country would not have been developed if the Federal Government had not done the job is a matter of record. The power companies once thought it all so unnecessary when the Tennessee and Columbia Rivers were harnessed by the Federal Government, yet projects constructed over the protests of the power companies were crucial factors in our national strength during the blackest hours of World War II. History demonstrates that complete reliance upon private monopoly to develop our power resources will jeopardize orderly progress—and perhaps even survival.

That the electric companies function without your tax money is open to serious question. Under sections 167 and 168 of the Internal Revenue Act of 1954, the privately owned electric utilities collect each year from their ratepayers millions of dollars in the name of taxes which are not paid as taxes. These funds, according to the Federal Power Commission, are equivalent to interest-free loans; their benefits will run into billions of dollars.

This advertisement is only one flagrant example of the campaign being waged against the public interest by the power companies with the electric consumers' dollars. Pictures of children and even of the Holy Bible have been invoked in advertising attacking Federal power programs.

We do not believe that such calumny is proper for public utilities. The Public Utilities Holding Company Act of 1935 was enacted by the Congress following revelations that related not only to financial abuses by power companies and utility holding companies but also to "educational" programs of the utilities and their efforts to "mold public opinion." (The latter phrase has been used by one medium to describe the purpose of the ECAP advertisements.)

While we do not question the right of private power companies to express opinions and oppose public power programs, we cannot believe that this freedom offers any license for a mass conspiracy by monopoly to brainwash the American people on the facts about an essential service.

The nature of these advertisements is such that, in our opinion, the Congress should inquire into their propriety. The present ECAP advertising is reminiscent of the propaganda campaigns which were exposed in the utility investigations by Congress and the Federal Trade Commission a quarter of a century ago. We urge the Congress to launch a new investigation, reviewing the effectiveness of the Holding Company Act in dealing with monopoly abuses in the electric power field and inquiring into the need for additional legislation to protect the public from what Theodore Roosevelt aptly described as "a monopoly far more powerful * * * than anything known to our experience."

Sincerely,

ALEX RADIN.

Challenge in Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am including herein an article from the Wall Street Journal of March 2, 1959 entitled "Challenge in Science." This article forcefully indicates the danger of the United States in losing its overall scientific leadership within the next decade. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 2, 1959, page A-1611, Mr. Speaker, I included a statement of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare indicating the failure of our agencies to utilize useful, necessary and available scientific items for the furtherance of scientific programs in our educational institutions. This situation to my mind is indefensible and calls for speedy remedy by those charged with responsibility under existing law.

The article follows:

CHALLENGE IN SCIENCE—RUSSIA SPURS RESEARCH, THREATENS TO SURPASS THE UNITED STATES IN 10 YEARS—SCIENTISTS SAY RACE IS CLOSE IN MATH, PHYSICS BUT REDS LAG IN MEDICINE, CHEMISTRY—MONEY HELPS, MARXISM HURTS

(By John D. Williams)

Despite Russia's eye-catching space feats, the United States, on balance, still ranks No. 1 in science. But the Reds, who got a late start, are advancing rapidly. In some limited areas, their scientific research tops that of the United States—in quality as well as in quantity. In the key fields of mathematics and physics the race is close. Considering Russia's accelerating pace in research and the Russians' intense motivation

to overtake Americans on all fronts, the United States is in danger of losing its overall science leadership within 10 years.

This sobering balance sheet and outlook on the comparative status of scientific progress in Russia and the United States summarizes interviews with nearly 50 top U.S. scientists, along with the findings of several private and Government scientific groups. Most of the scientists recently have visited Russian laboratories and are acquainted, through first-hand observations or the studying of Soviet scientific journals, with the work of their Russian counterparts.

It should be noted quickly that most scientists are reluctant to give any overall scorecard rating of science on a nationalistic basis. "We're not engaged in a world series of science," snaps one physicist. Dr. Norbert Wiener, a leading U.S. mathematician, says, "I don't like the word 'lead.' It's not a game, after all. It's a matter of individuals."

SCIENCE SUPREMACY AT STAKE

Despite these reservations, however, there's no doubt that the United States and the U.S.S.R. are engaged in a race for supremacy in science. The competition is as real as that on other cold war fronts, whether economic, military or propaganda. And the stakes are as high, if not higher, because advances in science are basic to progress on other fronts. Whether for good or for evil, the fortunes of people in most countries nowadays are closely linked with research in everything from astronomy and atomic physics to meteorology and zoology.

Sputniks, Mechta, and Khrushchev's missile-rattling notwithstanding, Russian scientists are not 10 feet tall, nor have they already relegated the United States to a position as a second-rate scientific power. "We oscillate in our thinking of them as either peasants or supermen," says Anthony Oettinger, assistant professor of linguistics and applied mathematics at Harvard University. Nearly all U.S. scientists interviewed agreed the Russians are good—but so are U.S. scientists. American researchers caution that secrecy and a lack of complete information makes an overall appraisal difficult. "There is a difficulty in knowing, but everybody is convinced it's better not to underestimate these guys," says one researcher.

"My impression is that when it comes to specific items of technology where the Russians decide to go all out, they can give us some good competition, and in isolated areas can surpass us," says a top Washington scientist. "But overall," he adds, "the quality of their work doesn't measure up to ours. I haven't seen or read anything that makes me say, 'Gee whiz.'"

ALARMED AT SOVIET PACE

But many U.S. scientists are amazed, and somewhat alarmed, by the quickening pace of Russian research, the intense drive of Soviet scientists and the Kremlin's lid-off-the-money-box approach to wresting leadership in science from the United States and the West. Unless the United States greatly accelerates its efforts, they argue, Russia's present pace could give Moscow overall supremacy in science by 1970 or earlier. And recent history shows Russia is capable of turning basic research into working hardware with amazing speed; for example, the U.S.S.R. came up with the hydrogen bomb, supersonic aircraft, ballistic missiles and space vehicles much sooner than had been expected by many U.S. scientists.

"The scary thing is the Russians' big interest in science now," says John D. Turkevich, a Princeton University chemistry professor who has translated scores of Russian scientific works. Although Professor Turkevich doesn't know of any major scientific field where Russia now leads, he adds: "Where they are ahead is in planning and in utilizing the scientific results obtained in the West more efficiently than we do. And they have a higher appreciation of the role of science for their future development than we do. They've got drive."

"They've been coming up faster than we have," says Prof. John Chipman, head of the department of metallurgy at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (M.I.T.). "The point about the future is that they are turning out more scientists than we and you can draw your own conclusions from that." After a 3-week visit in Russia, Dr. Leon Trilling, associate professor of aeronautical engineering at M.I.T., was "impressed by the dedicated way they work at their jobs. It makes one stop and worry a bit. I feel sure from what we've seen that they are able to do anything they set out to do."

SCIENTISTS, NOT POLITICIANS, HOLD SWAY

Since the first sputnik soared aloft (October 4, 1957), Government officials and American scientists, often supported financially by the National Science Foundation, have been trying busily to learn how good Russian science is and what accounts for its high and low spots. Among other things, they're impressed that the top administrators in Russian research institutes and in the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences are scientists, not politicians. These leaders, called academicians, eye the whole broad terrain of science and have much to say about where research money will be spent and where scientific manpower will be concentrated.

American scientists also are impressed by Russia's lavish spending on research and development and the country's huge education program in science and engineering. Russia's new 7-year plan calls for a 90 percent increase in the number of engineering graduates alone. The U.S.S.R. already claims to be graduating about 80,000 engineers annually, compared with about 30,000 yearly in the United States.

HARD TEAM TO BEAT

"They have talented scientists and unlimited funds—a hard team to beat. I feel that we have the talent but not the money," says a California scientist. Speaking of his own field, Dr. Maurice Ewing, an eminent geophysicist at Columbia University, says: "They're catching up at a tremendous rate and their national effort is six times ours. They find funds more readily available. I spend 85 percent of my time trying to get funds."

Soviet advances in science reflect, on part, the single-mindedness which a monolithic state such as Russia can bring to bear in any area. Like all other endeavors in the Soviet Union, science has its own state plans which muster great resources to work on specific problems. Major assignment for the next 7 years: Finding ways to control thermonuclear reactions to harness the power of the hydrogen bomb for peaceful energy. Says an American scientist who has visited Russian science centers: "You get the impression that everything over there is either a priority project or a no-priority project." Of course, state control of science can boomerang. For example, some sciences, especially biology, have been hamstrung in Russia by the necessity of squaring them with Marxist dogma which implies that man is capable of being made perfect.

Here is how Russia and the United States compare in many fields of science and technology:

Astronomy

"The Russians remain weaker than we are in astronomy because they don't have the equipment we do," says Dr. Fred L. Whipple, Harvard astronomy professor who visited the U.S.S.R. not long ago. We have about 40 observatories, double Russia's total. Russia's largest telescope is a 50-inch reflector model taken from the Germans after World War II. The United States has at least three telescopes over 100 inches in diameter. But this year the Soviet Union will complete a 104-inch reflector for the Crimean Astrophysical Observatory at Partizanskoye. And there are reports they have a 15-year project for a 236-inch telescope, larger than our giant 200-inch Mount Palomar instrument in California.

U.S. astronomers discover more celestial bodies, thanks in large part to their superior and more plentiful facilities. Their Russian colleagues appear to spend more time recording motions and positions of stars, the sort of routine astronomy that occupied Western astronomers a good deal more in the 19th century than today. The Russian concentration in celestial mechanics pays off with information needed to chart rocket courses to the moon and planets. U.S. space researchers, jarred by such Soviet space feats as Mechta, fret at our lag in this currently important field.

The United States is stronger in astrophysic studies that delve into the very nature of stars and stimulate advances in atomic physics. In the relatively new field of radio astronomy, which the United States pioneered, both countries are spurring work to catch up to Britain. Radio telescopes "see" further into the universe than do optical instruments because they detect radiations of wavelengths far greater than those of visible light. Thus, radio astronomy promises important discoveries about the universe.

Concludes Dr. Harlow Shapley at the Harvard College observatory: "There is no question that we lead in astronomy. But you have to put Russia down as second. They are good, ambitious, and enthusiastic, and they feel we are to be caught up with."

Biology

The United States has a commanding lead in most branches of this science dealing with all living organisms. Politics have poisoned much Russian work. Take genetics, the branch dealing with heredity, and the current darling of the biological field. The politics of Marxism pressured Red scientists to ignore Mendel's laws of genetics, which, in simple terms, show that such physical characteristics as height and color of eyes depend on the combination of elementary cell units that has been inherited. Trofin Lysenko, a Red plant breeder, with Stalin's backing, led the repression of the valid proofs of such laws in addition to resisting Darwin's evolution theory.

Lysenko proclaimed—wrongly, according to most Western scientists—that acquired characteristics can be passed on through succeeding generations. That is, a dexterous juggler spawns another dexterous juggler and—most important to Marxism—a "good" Communist spawns a "good" Communist. Anti-Lysenko geneticists long were persecuted and purged in Russia, the climax coming in 1948. In the post-Stalin era of Soviet science, Lysenko was thought to be discredited. But Lysenkoism apparently is resurgent. Last August the Soviet Government canceled, at the last minute, visas of a group of anti-Lysenko scientists who had planned to attend the International Congress of Geneticists at Montreal.

In general, U.S. biologists are not greatly impressed by known Russian work in botany (plants), zoology (animals), paleontology (fosils), and entomology (insects). But there are increasing signs Soviet researchers are stepping up studies of flora and fauna.

In zoology, contends one American scientist, Soviet scientists have been too little influenced by Darwin and too much influenced by Ivan Pavlov, a Russian Nobel prize winner who did original work on conditioned reflexes in animals. (In Pavlov's famed experiment a dog was trained to secrete saliva when a bell rang, even though food, which had been presented when the bell rang in the early part of the experiment, was absent.) Says the U.S. scientist: "If I were to write

a book on evolution, I'm sure there wouldn't be a single Russian in the bibliography."

Chemistry

Overall, the United States holds a clear lead. Russian researchers were slow in realizing the value of petroleum and natural gas in compounding new industrial chemicals; they leaned too long on alcohol as the prime source.

But in the hottest current chemical research—on polymers from which new plastics and fibers are being made—"they've come up with the same type of material on the same time schedule as we have," says a chemist. On a recent trip to Russia, one U.S. chemist saw "tubs full" of polypropylene, a plastic material only recently introduced to the U.S. market and first developed in Italy. Russian research reportedly concentrates more than ours on polymers for plastics to withstand extremely high temperatures.

In the vast domain of chemistry, Russia has other specialties. For example, they lead in work on chemical reactions in explosions.

In biochemistry—dealing with living organisms—Russia is well behind the United States and other western nations in the development of drugs. Not one major antibiotic, hormone, or vitamin developed in the past 15 years carries a Russian credit line. "The reason is quite simple," says John T. Connor, president of Merck & Co., Inc., a major U.S. drugmaker. "Moscow found that it was far less costly to pirate western drugs than to discover and develop their own." One U.S. scientist relates how, he recently sent a diabetic Russian colleague the latest type of insulin, which has not yet been compounded in Russia.

A team of U.S. medical observers which visited Russian drug research centers last year noted that the quality of U.S.S.R drug synthesis was equal to the West's but added that quantitatively, the Russians are considerably behind us. For example, while in the West a single medicinal chemical laboratory might synthesize 50 or 100 compounds for evaluation to find the optimal therapeutic agent, a comparable Russian pharmaceutical research institute will synthesize only 5 or 10.

Russian scientists were slow in getting around to vaccines, but their work since World War II generally is considered good—and in some applications, ahead of U.S. efforts. Within the past 2 years Russia has begun using live virus vaccines to help prevent such diseases as mumps, influenza, and measles, as well as polio. Live virus vaccines give longer lasting immunity than the dead types. We have only a live virus polio vaccine under test and we have no live virus vaccines for mumps or influenza. However, in production of polio vaccine, Russia is estimated to be 3 years behind the United States.

Medicine

Russia may trail the United States by as much as 10 years in medical research, claim knowledgable Americans. But a team of medical observers, reporting in the Journal of the American Medical Association, says Russia is making a determined effort to bring its medical research up to the level of its programs in the physical sciences.

Russia has more doctors than the United States but, in general, they're not as good. For the past 15 years Russia has been adding roughly 10,000 new physicians a year, about double the U.S. total. They have some 16 doctors per 10,000 people, compared with our 13. Three out of four of their doctors are women, hardly startling when one considers that nearly half of all Soviet workers are female. Russian doctors receive less training and are backed by poorer facilities and fewer drugs. Nevertheless, they can claim much credit for cutting Russia's mortality rate about 75 percent since the 1917 revolution. Kremlin health officials in 1956 claimed a Russian had a life expectancy at birth of 67 years, compared with 69.5 years for an American.

Mentally disturbed Russians have a tougher time getting therapy than do Americans. There are fewer hospital beds for Russian mental patients and they have only about 4,500 psychiatrists, compared with 10,000 in the United States. "The Russians claim they have less mental illness than we do, but there is no proof of this," says a U.S. authority. "They claim their world outlook is better than ours because they do not have competition which, they feel, erroneously, drives men mad." But Russians use more tranquilizers than Americans, chiefly because they are used as general pain killers.

One top Government expert in infectious diseases believes that Russia may surpass the United States in preventive medicine by pirating and applying on a wide scale our basic research. Other American researchers content that Western science owes it to itself to pay more attention to Russian experimentation. Among Red experiments that intrigue U.S. scientists are those in primate biology and in transplanting a dog's head from one body to another. And they have claimed that transplants of human hearts are theoretically possible, although U.S. researchers say crucial problems have yet to be solved in this field.

Mathematics

The United States still has a tenuous overall leadership, but Russians have made more major contributions to this basic science than to any other and their challenge is serious. American mathematicians claim our work is tops in such branches as pure algebra, algebraic geometry, statistics, the calculus of variations and topology, the qualitative study of geometric figures.

But in some other important fields of math, we can learn from the Russians. Take the field of nonlinear differential equations—a branch of advanced mathematics essential in controlling the guidance of a space vehicle. It would take us years to catch up to Russia in this complex field, argues one U.S. mathematician.

Alarmed by Soviet space guidance feats, which rely heavily on such advanced mathematics, 15 top U.S. mathematicians are investigating the state of this field in the United States at a research subsidiary of Martin Co. in Baltimore. Undoubtedly on the agenda is a study of 10 Soviet books on advanced differential equations; the United States has published only a couple.

"The Russians have an old mathematical tradition going back to the end of the 18th century," explains Dr. Wiener, an M.I.T. mathematician. "The quality of their work in those days was good. Now they have more men and the quality is still very good. And their secondary school mathematics education is better than ours." Moscow is considered the most important single center for mathematics in the world, although the United States has a greater number of mathematics research centers.

To help keep abreast of Soviet mathematics, a group at the University of Michigan is compiling a Russian-English mathematics dictionary. "Russian has overtaken French and is crowding German as the scientific language, particularly in theoretical applied mathematics," says Dr. A. J. Lohwater, director of the project.

In applied mathematics, the United States leads in such areas as automatic language translating, using high-speed computers. Electronic translation equipment can greatly speed scientific research. At least six U.S. universities are now using computers for translating, including Russian into English. Although this work is described as still rather crude, researchers expect it to be very useful within 5 years. Russia's theoretical work on machine translations is considered excellent, but its scientists have done far less actual electronic translating.

The main reason for Russia's lag in this work lies in their computers (BESM and Stela), which do not equal the capacity (operations per second) of U.S. machines.

In the field of measurement, Soviet activities are intense and their claims are many. Dr. Allen V. Astin, Director of the National Bureau of Standards in Washington, has given an example of Russia's challenge in this field:

"Their national standardizing organization has claimed an ability to make regular calibration of temperature-measuring devices up to 6,000 degrees centigrade and their scientific plans call for increasing this calibration competence so that by 1960 they will provide this calibration service up to 12,000 degrees. At the National Bureau of Standards, our regular practice in making direct high-temperature calibrations extends to 2,800 degrees which we usually certify to an accuracy of 8 degrees. On a very limited basis we are able to extrapolate our high-temperature calibrations to 4,000 degrees centigrade, but with some sacrifice of accuracy," reports Dr. Astin.

Physics

"Everything they know we know. They have good men, but not as many as we do," sums up a leading U.S. physicist. Despite the overall leadership of the United States, the race is fierce in certain areas, such as nuclear research. Russians have made some remarkable additions to world knowledge in physics. For example, last year Russian physicists Pavel A. Cherenkov, Igor I. Tamm and Ilya M. Frank were awarded Nobel prizes for their work on certain radiation waves. (Since 1904 only six Russians have won Nobel prizes in physics, chemistry, medicine and physiology, while 47 U.S. citizens have won these coveted awards.)

To advance its studies of matter, Russia has a 10-billion-volt accelerator cyclotron, the world's largest atom smasher. The biggest machine now operating in the United States is the 6-billion-volt synchrotron at the University of California. But a battle of bigness is raging in atom smashers, because larger machines allow scientists to probe deeper into the atom. The United States may step ahead next year upon completion of a 25-billion-volt machine at Brookhaven National Laboratory on Long Island. And the Government's science advisers are urging expenditure of $127 million for a giant atom smasher that could achieve extremely high energies ranging up to 45 billion volts. Not to be outdone, the Russians are talking of a 50-billion-volt machine.

There is no evidence that the Russians have been working any longer—or any more successfully—than the United States and Britain in controlling thermonuclear reactions in the laboratory. Sir John Cockcroft, research chief of Britain's Atomic Energy Authority, figures there is "level pegging" in fusion control work as between the West and Russia. Both sides have expended great efforts to score a major breakthrough on this front. Scientific papers presented at the United Nations' international conference on atomic energy at Geneva last fall showed that scientists of both countries are pursuing similar paths toward fusion control.

Russia has lagged in nuclear research reactors, but recently has been spurring work in this field. Many scientists now believe that little if any difference now exists between Russia and the West in the state of nuclear reactor art.

Soviet experiments in low-temperature research stack up well with those in the United States say many scientists who have visited Russia. In another specialized field, crystallography, Russia has made many major contributions. Because many solid

substances are made up of crystals, this science is important in discovering how to strengthen everything from electronic circuits to airplane components. "We don't come up to Russia in the numbers of men in the field," says Prof. Martin J. Buerger, a noted crystallographer at M.I.T. Another U.S. scientist claims: "Unless remedial action is taken now, American students of the coming generation who will ask their honest adviser, 'Where can I get the best crystallographic training?' may have to be told the sad truth, 'In the U.S.S.R.' "

Other American authorities believe the United States may be in danger of falling far behind Russia in work on thermoelectric conversion and in acoustics. In a report underwritten by the National Science Foundation, Uno Ingard, associate professor of physics at M.I.T., predicted that if the present rate of progress is maintained, the application of acoustical techniques in liquid and solid state physics, as well as applications of ultrasound in industrial processing, will be much further advanced in the U.S.S.R. than elsewhere within the next few years.

Metallurgy

Russia is challenging U.S. supremacy in this field that is vital to the development of better rocket and jet engines. "It's close—we may be a little ahead of them," says one cautious authority. Reports another metallurgist: "They're one up on us in the development of tungsten rhenium (a very heavy high-temperature alloy), but on the titanium alloys we're ahead of them."

Biggest worry: Russia turns out 4,000 new metallurgists yearly, compared with 600 in the United States. American metallurgists are impressed by Russia's ability to speed basic research findings into acutal production and they admire their equipment. "I saw some equipment in their labs which I would like to buy for our labs, such as a microprobe analyzer which costs $125,000," says a U.S. scientist. This device can determine the composition of metal, using only a dustlike particle of the substance.

Geophysics

In this broad field, which includes the study of the earth, the oceans, and the atmosphere, the quantity of Russian research exceeds that in the United States. The quality of their work, however, is erratic; but in some branches, such as earthquake seismology, U.S. scientists concede the Russians are first-rate.

"Geophysics is a science which the Russians have chosen to emphasize, with massive Government support. They're doing experiments in fields we simply can't afford," says Frank Press, a leading geophysicist at California Institute of Technology and a recent visitor to Russian science centers.

Professor Press cites oceanography as a case in point. "They're going strong on oceanographic work," he says. Other geophysicists report that in seismic crustal studies at sea, the United States and the United Kingdom have had a monopoly until recently, but this leadership is now being threatened. Russia has a much larger oceanographic fleet and its research ships, such as the *Vitjaz* and *Ob*, are up to seven times the size of our biggest research ship, the *Chain*. However, some U.S. scientists insist instruments aboard these Red ships are crude in comparison to ours, and that so far they have added little new to knowledge of waves, marine life, and the ships of the ocean floor. And they stress that bigness is not synonomous with excellence.

The findings of oceanographers are not merely of academic interest; their research is of utmost military importance in such fields as the detection and navigation of submarines. Recognizing this, a committee of the National Academy of Sciences recently declared that the United States runs the risk of serious military and political dangers unless deep-sea research is doubled during the next decade.

Russia also is leading the United States in the use of explosions within the earth. Such work is valuable in discovering more about the earth's crust and can be useful in locating oil. In addition, Russia has 100 seismology stations using uniform equipment and with at least 5 persons manning each station. The United States has about 40 such stations, with varied equipment and staffed by only one man each on a part-time basis.

In meteorology, both countries are busily working for a breakthrough in long-range weather forecasting. "We may possibly lead in this research work, but it's a wide open race," says a Tufts University scientist. Another authority claims, "Judged on our present position we are somewhat ahead of our Russian colleagues in cloud physics and theoretical meteorology. But if we continue as we are, within 5 years we'll be neck and neck."

Most meteorologists agree that we still know little of the basic reasons weather behaves as it does. Fourteen U.S. universities hope to discover some of the secrets by setting up a National Institute for Atmospheric Research, supported by Federal funds but managed by the educators. The university planners note that Russia has a Central Meteorological Institute in Leningrad. The nearest thing we have to this is the considerably smaller Air Force Geophysical Research Center at Bedford, Mass.

Russia's scientific resurgence was obvious during the International Geophysical Year which ended at the turn of the year. "My impression is that the Russian contributions to IGY have certainly been commensurate with these of other major nations participating. The quality of their collected data compares favorably with ours," says Professor Henry Houghton, head of MIT's meteorology department. He and some other U.S. scientists believe that Russia leads in Arctic research, partly because the area is closer to their country. Professor Houghton terms Antarctic research a standoff between the countries.

Reds Have Failed Miserably in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

[From the Washington Daily News, March 3, 1959]

NO ROOM FOR TOTALITARIANS—REDS HAVE FAILED MISERABLY IN CUBA

HAVANA, March 3.—Communists are trying to convince the Cuban people that the hammer and sickle deserve a place in the new government. So far, they have failed miserably.

The Communists were stopped cold in their tracks, in Cuba. On January 1, they came out shouting about all they had done to help Fidel Castro and the rebels oust one of the cruelest dictatorships ever imposed on human beings anywhere. Their arguments were acceptable to a few radicals in the revolutionary movement who dislike Uncle Sam intensely.

NO SALE

However, with responsible officials from Fidel Castro and his cabinet down to minor officers, the Reds struck out.

Castro knew that the Reds, strong in certain Havana unions, could have helped bring on a general strike but they rejected his call last year.

In one of Castro's first statements after his miraculous defeat of Batista's modern army he made it clear what his views on communism were.

"I am not a Communist," he told a nationwide television audience. He emphasized that there could be no room in his government for totalitarian ideas.

His foreign minister, Robert Agramonte, told the press in the first days of January: "Cuba will not recognize the Soviet Union."

However the Communist Party in Cuba (it is called the Cuban Socialist Party) will be allowed to take part in elections, operate its own newspaper, and, in general, make a nuisance of itself.

A WARNING

Communists have been warned they must abide by the Cuban Constitution. Any evidence that they are using their position for subversive activity will subject them to prosecution for committing crimes against the State.

Castro, Cuban President Manuel Urrutia, and the cabinet, have taken their cue from such democracies as France, the United States, and England, in their attitude towards communism. The Cuban leaders believe if given enough rope, the Communists will hang themselves.

They point out that there is room in a democracy for social justice without having to turn to socialism and communism. The revolution was fought, to obtain social justice Castro has said.

PRESS SOLID

The Cuban Communists' strongest enemies, however, are the Cuban press, and the Roman Catholic Church, to which most Cubans belong. From the very beginning all of Havana's newspapers, including the most liberal, Prensa Libre, have repeatedly attacked the Communists.

Most of the bearded rebels who come from peasant stock will tell you they could never be Communists. However, they are quick to point out that they are sorry the U.S. Government sent military equipment to Batista. But surprisingly enough, most of the bearded veterans who average third and fourth grade educations understand the difference between U.S. Government policy and the feelings of the American people in general.

"I know the Americans were sympathetic to our cause," one 2-year veteran said. "But the people in Washington made a bad mistake."

Any American Can Be an Unoffical Ambassador of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. David Sheer, chairman of the legislative committee of the Anselm Forum, Inc., of Gary, Ind., has forwarded the following article to me by Oliver Starr, Jr., from the Gary, Ind., Post-Tribune. I am submitting the same for consideration of Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If the movement originated by Harry Plissner, of New York, and now spon-

sored by the Anselm Forum, Inc., of Gary Ind., becomes national, it could develop into our greatest accomplishment in promoting international good will with people of all nations and contribute greatly to prevent future wars:

PLEASE SEND ME AN AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP

(By Oliver Starr, Jr.)

Do you want to become an unofficial ambassador of the United States?

Reuben Olson, 4456 Jackson, of the Anselm Forum, can arrange it. All you need is some old magazines and a desire to write to a friend of America across the seas. You may get a letter like the one received in Gary recently which said: "Please send me an American friendship."

These words written by a Chinese letter-writer tell the impact of a new people-to-people program started only 6 months ago by a New York businessman.

How one man has released a great tidal wave of friendship for America from all corners of the earth is another remarkable testimonial to the power of an idea. As a result people from such far off places as India, China, South Africa, Australia, Germany, and Denmark are writing letters to people in Gary, Ind., to tell of their eagerness for friendship with America. The people of Gary in turn are spreading the story of democracy to all points of the globe.

The New Yorker's name is Harry Plissner who one day last spring while reading the news of Little Rock and other racial tension areas decided the rest of the world probably was getting the wrong impression of America. He made up his mind to try to do something about it. He found out that Americans throw away about 30 million magazines a month while millions of persons in other lands are thirsting for knowledge of all kinds. It gave him an idea. He dashed off 20 letters to leading newspapers all over the world, telling readers that he had American friends who were willing to send them magazines free. (The cost to the sender is only from 7 to 14 cents postage, depending upon the size of the magazine.)

The response literally swamped Plissner. In one month more than 14,500 letters poured in. He had to quit his business of running a trailer court to manage his magazine friendship campaign. By advertising in U.S. newspapers, radio and television, Plissner got 20,000 American volunteers to help him. Letters are coming to him now at the rate of 1,000 a day.

In Gary, Reuben Olson heard about Plissner's program. He wrote for a supply of letters and a short time later his mailbox was brimful with letters from all over the world.

By contacting individuals and organizations, Olson so far has located 205 correspondents in northwest Indiana for overseas letter writers. He feels the program has a tremendous potential for improving world relations.

"We're talking about exploring outer space," Olson points out, and then adds: "We're not satisfied with our own little world."

"This new program is exploring inner space. People are just aching to reach across the pond and shake hands. When brother meets brother across the sea it makes the tensions of today's world a little easier to bear."

Another reason why this program is having such impact is because many of the people who are writing to America are people in high places, holding important positions in business, education, and government.

COLLEGE STUDENT

Mrs. Martin Schwegel 3810 Johnson, found her correspondence with a Taiwan University college student one of the most stimulating experiences in her life.

The college girl, Yun Ching (which means Blue Cloud in English), writes that she is taking 13 subjects and has 34 hours of studying each week. During the period when the Communist Chinese were shelling Formosa she wrote that every student was called upon to give aid to a little village of Kinman which was undergoing bombardment.

A special week was observed called Give Your Best Regards to Kinman. The students gave food, money, and their blood to beleaguered Kinman.

Yun Ching in one letter tells of the Chinese legend of the moon-cake and how the Chinese threw off their oppressors, the Mongols, partly by means of inserting instructions in the moon-cakes for the revolutionaries.

STEELWORKERS

A Hobart steelworker who has been corresponding with a Chinese seminary student scoured this region in December to find a Chinese Bible for his friend for Christmas. The Chinese religious student was overjoyed with the gift and now can't wait for the opportunity to come to America to meet his benefactor. Here are a few excerpts from the current batch of letters received in Gary by Olson for distribution: A graduate of a Chinese Naval Academy on Formosa writes: "Get interesting in international affairs so that I wish I could have some papers of the New York Times to read. Luck will be mine and at last I give my best wishes to you."

BANK EMPLOYEE

A bank employee in the Central Bank of India writes: "I would like to contact people in banks and know more about banking done in your country."

An employee of the Central Broadcasting Station at Taipei, Formosa, requests old American magazines as, "It is indeed very difficult to buy or to read magazines concerning mechanical engineering such as radio, TV, electric power, engineering electronics, rocket, radar, car, etc."

A student in the Political Staff Officers College of Free China on Formosa writes that he has read of Plissner's offer and says: "Indeed it's not only strength the friendship between the Americans and Chinese, but also urge exchange in culture in each other. Now I am studying in the Political Staff Officers College. I would like to appreciate on the efforts it will be made by you. I am wishing you have a good time."

A man writes from Kongandoor in Kerala, India, of the beauty of his city: "I am extremely glad to take advantage of this rare opportunity so generously offered to the people of India. I may tell you in this connection that Kerala although smallest of the Indian States is a beauty spot and it is remarkable for its natural scenery. I am living in a village whose beauty attracts many people. It is on the banks of a river and it is noted for its fertility and luxuriant growth of vegetation. I always welcome visitors to this part of Kerala."

LEPER

A man from Penang, Malaya, writes: "I am a leper, and this island is a leper settlement, separated by a channel about a mile wide from Penang. As I am a leper and an amputee, and unable to work, I cannot afford to buy reading materials. I need these magazines to pass my time as well as improve my English. I will share them with my English-speaking friends here."

CLERGYMAN

An English pastor from the Unitarian Church in Ipswich, England, writes: "I am a firm believer in the need to foster Anglo-American understanding, and if you can kindly arrange ot have some of these magazines sent to me, I will be very glad to pass them on to others when I am finished."

A communication from Mahatma Ghandi Memorial College in India says: "Surplus, hard-cover books that have to do with medicine, engineering, architecture, etc., are sorely needed by Mahatma Ghandi Memorial College. Students are very poor and cannot afford to buy textbooks essential to their studies. They must use the limited volumes in the college library and must wait many days before the books are available."

Another breakthrough in world understanding is going on in the medium of sound. A new organization called World Tape Pals is promoting the exchange of sound tapes between people of all nations. Anselm Forum has had its own tape exchange program going for several years but is also joining World Tape Pals to get new leads. On its own Anselm took part in recording tapes with the representative from Ghana, an attaché from the Israeli Embassy and a religious leader from Johannesburg, South Africa. The tapes were sent to each of the respective countries.

COUNCILMAN AND TEACHER

A Roman Catholic steel mill open hearth operator, a Negro city councilman and a Jewish school principal plan to make a tape during Brotherhood Week which will be sent to points around the world to show how brotherhood as practiced in Gary is more typical of America than some of the articles on racial tension which they might have read.

A Gary schoolteacher plans next week to make a tape with the children in her class for exchange with an English class of the same grade.

"The oversea friendship program," said Olson, "is not only an opportunity to foster good relations with people in other nations but also a chance to learn and broaden our culture, for there is not a single nation on the face of the globe whose citizens have not made a definite contribution to the progress of mankind."

Olson said that the people-to-people program once more illustrates the truth of the words of Rev. F. W. Backmeyer, minister emeritus of the First Presbyterian Church, who said: "We no longer live in a place smaller than the world."

Proposed Reduction of National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, several of us in this Chamber, notably including the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. LOSER], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BROCK], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HARGIS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD], and others, have urged the adoption of a systematic program of national debt retirement.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a chart of proposed amortization based upon a total national debt of $280 billion with annual payments of $2.8 billion upon the principal amount and interest payments estimated at 3.5 percent:

National debt of $280 billion

[In billions of dollars]

Year end	Total debt	Payment on principal	Interest at 3.5 percent
0	280.0	2.8	9.800
1	277.2	2.8	9.702
2	274.4	2.8	9.604
3	271.6	2.8	9.506
4	268.8	2.8	9.408
5	266.0	2.8	9.310
6	263.2	2.8	9.212
7	260.4	2.8	9.114
8	257.6	2.8	9.016
9	254.8	2.8	8.918
10	252.0	2.8	8.820
11	249.2	2.8	8.722
12	246.4	2.8	8.624
13	243.6	2.8	8.526
14	240.8	2.8	8.428
15	238.0	2.8	8.330
16	235.2	2.8	8.232
17	232.4	2.8	8.134
18	229.6	2.8	8.036
19	226.8	2.8	7.938
20	224.0	2.8	7.840
21	221.2	2.8	7.742
22	218.4	2.8	7.644
23	215.6	2.8	7.546
24	212.8	2.8	7.448
25	210.0	2.8	7.350
26	207.2	2.8	7.252
27	204.4	2.8	7.154
28	201.6	2.8	7.056
29	198.8	2.8	6.958
30	196.0	2.8	6.860
31	193.2	2.8	6.762
32	190.4	2.8	6.664
33	187.6	2.8	6.566
34	184.8	2.8	6.468
35	182.0	2.8	6.370
36	179.2	2.8	6.272
37	176.4	2.8	6.174
38	173.6	2.8	6.076
39	170.8	2.8	5.978
40	168.0	2.8	5.880
41	165.2	2.8	5.782
42	162.4	2.8	5.684
43	159.6	2.8	5.586
44	156.8	2.8	5.488
45	154.0	2.8	5.390
46	151.2	2.8	5.292
47	148.4	2.8	5.194
48	145.6	2.8	5.096
49	142.8	2.8	4.998
50	140.0	2.8	4.900
51	137.2	2.8	4.802
52	134.4	2.8	4.704
53	131.6	2.8	4.606
54	128.8	2.8	4.508
55	126.0	2.8	4.410
56	123.2	2.8	4.312
57	120.4	2.8	4.214
58	117.6	2.8	4.116
59	114.8	2.8	4.018
60	112.0	2.8	3.920
61	109.2	2.8	3.822
62	106.4	2.8	3.724
63	103.6	2.8	3.626
64	100.8	2.8	3.528
65	98.0	2.8	3.430
66	95.2	2.8	3.332
67	92.4	2.8	3.234
68	89.6	2.8	3.136
69	86.8	2.8	3.038
70	84.0	2.8	2.940
71	81.2	2.8	2.842
72	78.4	2.8	2.744
73	75.6	2.8	2.646
74	72.8	2.8	2.548
75	70.0	2.8	2.450
76	67.2	2.8	2.352
77	64.4	2.8	2.254
78	61.6	2.8	2.156
79	58.8	2.8	2.058
80	56.0	2.8	1.960
81	53.2	2.8	1.862
82	50.4	2.8	1.764
83	47.6	2.8	1.666
84	44.8	2.8	1.568
85	42.0	2.8	1.470
86	39.2	2.8	1.372
87	36.4	2.8	1.274
88	33.6	2.8	1.176
89	30.8	2.8	1.078
90	28.0	2.8	.980
91	25.2	2.8	.882
92	22.4	2.8	.784
93	19.6	2.8	.686
94	16.8	2.8	.588
95	14.0	2.8	.490
96	11.2	2.8	.392
97	8.4	2.8	.294
98	5.6	2.8	.196
99	2.8	2.8	.098
100	0	2.8	.000
		280.0	494.900

[1] At the 29th year, the total paid for the payment on the principal and the interest amounts to 9.758 billion.

this is 0.042 billion less than the 9.8 billion we are paying per year at the present time, and will continue to pay on our present program.

On the above program, we will have paid out 494.9 billion in interest, and 280.0 billion in principal, or a total of 774.9 billion. If we just keep on paying interest, we will have paid 980 billion, and still have the 280 billion debt left, or a total of 1,260 billion. The difference is 485.1 billion to the good, and our debt is paid.

Address Delivered by Henry Ford II Before the Student Body of Yale University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very timely address delivered by Henry Ford II, president of the Ford Motor Co., to the student body of Yale University in Woolsey Hall at New Haven, Conn., on Thursday evening, February 19, 1959:

I must say that I'm surprised to find myself at a podium I had always regarded as the special domain of a small, select, and austere group known as brains. My unsuitability for that role is evident in that I find myself billed as speaking in answer to the comments made here in November by Mr. Walter Reuther—a spot no real brain would be trapped into.

As a matter of fact, I am sure I would have to agree with Mr. Reuther on many of the broad goals and aspirations that he describes so eloquently.

When we consider what we as a people want out of life, the kind of world we would like for our children, most of us would come up with substantially the same answers.

Most of us would agree that we want a society that offers the greatest possible opportunity for freedom and for individual growth and self-fulfillment. Samuel Gompers had a simpler way of putting it when he said that what labor wanted was more. He might have said more and better. In purely material terms, we all want more and better—more income, more security, more independence, more freedom, more and better education, better medical care, more leisure to do the things we want to do. As a nation, we have vast unfulfilled social needs. A substantial number of American families still do not earn enough to support a decent American standard of living. Millions are still crowded into big city slums. Our whole educational system falls too far short both in quality and quantity of the attainable ideal for a society of such resources. Our facilities for caring for the aged, for the mentally ill, and for combating crime and juvenile deliquency are inadequate.

I'm sure that most of us also are concerned with those peculiarly difficult moral and spiritual problems that arise in an economy of plenty. We are concerned about the human consequences of bigness in government, industry, and labor, of the impact of mass communications on our cultural life, and the effects of increasingly scientific organization of people for economic purposes—the total effect which has been described as the society of the bland leading the bland.

I'm sure we are all deeply concerned with the problem of peace and the exceedingly difficult questions posed by the new Communist economic cold war.

As you know, Mr. Khrushchev has lately taken to predicting the ultimate triumph of his system through economic conquest. There will be no war, he says, because communism will bury us in the competition between its system and ours.

This is no empty threat. We can no longer hide behind the comforting thought that communism is inherently unworkable as an economic system. We have been sharply challenged in basic science and industrial technology. We see evidence of swift growth in both the Soviet Union and Red China—growth under forced draft, admittedly, and at a terrible human cost—but growth that nevertheless must be impressive to people in nearby underdeveloped areas.

Quite apparently Mr. Khrushchev thinks it is only a matter of time until the resources of most of Asia and Africa fall to Communist hands. If the Communist sphere, through the forced development of vast raw material and manpower resources, can flood the world markets with low-priced goods, it could isolate America and Western Europe politically and economically, and at the very least reduce the free world to relative impotence.

And today many intelligent observers are predicting that, if present trends continue, the balance of world power may shift radically to Asia, within the lifetime of this audience. They suggest that, certainly within the lifetime of our children, we could be surpassed in economic power by both China and the Soviet Union.

I don't mean to suggest that our future survival depends on matching either Russia or Red China, or both, in the rate of productive growth in the near future. One reason they are moving ahead so fast is that they have so much farther to go than we. For us to carry on an all-out economic race, comparable to the arms race, would be foolish. And it is quite possible, furthermore, that if these countries reached their goals, the result would be a great lessening of world tensions and a substantial watering down of Marxist dogma.

Nor would I suggest that we can solve all our domestic social problems and meet the challenge of Communist economic competition merely by increasing our own wealth and economic power at a faster rate. More material wealth is by no means the sole or even the primary cure for all our problems.

I do believe we must continue to demonstrate that our kind of economic system can maintain its dynamism and bring ever greater social benefits without infringing on our personal, political, or economic freedoms. And I think it is obvious that we cannot achieve the greater social benefits we all desire, nor can we do the kind of job we ought to be doing in the free world, without spending money.

Some people argue that we could make a much better showing right now if we would merely be a little wiser and a little less selfish, if taxpayers would stop fighting tax increases, if farmers would give up some of their subsidies, and veterans some of their benefits, and if Congressmen would stop pork-barreling. That may be. But it hardly seems realistic to suppose that we are suddenly going to be transformed into a nation of saints or hair-shirt addicts. It's a pretty good bet that we will go right on being the frail and fallible human beings that we are.

To be realistic, our best chance of acting wisely and well as a nation is to make it easier for all of us to do the things that we know we ought to do.

The trick is to arrange things so we can do more and more without having to sacrifice more and more. And the way to do that is to expand our economic base as rapidly as we can soundly do so. If we are able to do that, we can and will have more of everything: higher living standards; more tax revenues; more social benefits; a more effective foreign economic program.

On the whole, of course, this country has done exceptionally well, better than any other, in terms of dynamic economic growth.

But I think it is a reasonable proposition that we can and should do better than we have done in the past by increasing our rate of growth.

How do we go about doing that? I suppose we might start by trying to define exactly the things we would like to achieve in order to maximize our progress.

Ideally, we want the fastest possible continuing increase in the productivity of manufacturing, agriculture, and services. Productivity, of course, is not the same thing as production. Increasing productivity means increasing the amount of goods or services produced with available resources—labor, capital, management, and materials. The more efficient use of all these elements determines the increase in productivity.

Then we would want to increase production to utilize as fully as possible our industrial capacity and to maintain consistently high levels of employment.

We would of course also want continuing high levels of consumption necessary to absorb and sustain a rapid increase in the production of goods. We would want to find ways to decrease the costs and inefficiencies of distributing goods.

And while doing all these things, we would want a stable economy—one that is not subject to sharp business cycles, chronic deficit financing, chronic inflation, or a combination of the three.

These are all eminently desirable objectives. In a relatively primitive economy, under the iron whip of a dictatorship, it should not be difficult to do some or all of these things, for a time at least.

In a more complex and delicately balanced free economy, it's not quite so easy. If you succeed, for example, in increasing sharply your productivity performance, you may displace people from jobs in substantial numbers. If you try artificially to sustain high levels of employment and production, you wind up with surplus goods, and you will almost certainly resist the kind of action that would give you the increased productivity you want.

That is not to say that we cannot by intelligent, sound planning and action increase our rate of economic progress. It can be done. But there is, in my opinion, a right way and a wrong way to go about doing it.

The right way, to put it very simply, is to provide the best possible conditions for the economy, industry, agriculture, and the various services to grow in a natural and balanced manner, and to use the powers of government intelligently to abet this natural process. I have a number of ideas on this subject. Before I go into them, I'd like to take a good searching look at what I consider a very wrong approach to the problem.

I have in mind the approach espoused by certain elements in our society who advocate what I would call the galloper treatment.

Now a galloper is a little cotton stocking filled with powdered carbon. It was used back in prohibition days to hasten the aging of whiskey in the barrel at a time when it was not considered practical to let it mellow and ripen in the natural order of things.

The advocates of giving the economy the galloper treatment are do-it-now men. They want sweeping social measures and they want them now, and all at once. They are frustrated by the perverse contradictions of the economy that keep us from achieving all the things we want now. They appear to feel quite earnestly that the issues facing this country are so grave that we cannot entrust our future to the imperfect and relatively uncontrolled movements of the free market economy.

And though they say, and indeed may believe, that they are in favor of the profit incentive and private enterprise, they say it with a great and obvious lack of conviction.

For they also like to charge that business is inherently morally inferior because it is motivated by the desire for personal gain, that it is greedy, that it lacks constructive social imagination.

The galloper viewpoint is a crisis viewpoint. It sees our national life as a series of cataclysmic happenings and unlimited desperate needs, each one calling for immediate action—usually involving a total mobilization of our resources under strong, central guidance.

This, of course, is a fair approximation of what might be called the traditional extreme leftwing economic viewpoint in our society. I discuss it at such length because this viewpoint once again appears to have politically powerful advocates, after a long period in which it could make no significant headway in either political party.

While it will be disavowed, I am convinced, and I believe that objective study demonstrates, that this is the view held by the single most influential element in the American labor movement. I do not join my deeper-dyed colleagues in viewing the galloper advocates as cynical, Machiavellian demagogs driven by personal ambition or by alien philosophies. I have no reason to doubt that they are honestly and earnestly concerned with promoting the well-being of society.

But I take very strong issue with many of their basic ideas and with many of their methods. I don't know of anybody or any group of people smart enough to mastermind and manipulate artificially our economy without doing much more harm than good. And I am concerned today because I believe that this group has a very good chance of imposing its basic views upon our society.

In terms of unfettered power, big labor is the strongest single center in the American economy. There is broad agreement today, except perhaps among labor-oriented economists, that the big union today is in a position of unrestricted monopoly power. It is using that power not to increase the growth of the American pie, but to cut out a larger share for its constituents. In the process, it is unquestionably thwarting the very improvement in productivity and the increased economic growth that it says it wants.

There can be no question that the unions today are politically powerful and effective. In a growing number of States, unions have achieved increasing influence if not practical control over legislatures, courts and administrative agencies. I have in mind, for example, the recent Michigan Supreme Court decision which, in effect, would force industry to finance strikes against itself.

These gains enable some unions not only to tighten the screws on management, but also to advance broad social and political goals of their leadership.

I believe, in fact, that the giant AFL–CIO is functioning less and less as a primarily economic organism. Today, it takes care of labor's traditional economic concerns with its left hand, while its right arm is plunged up to the elbow in politics. It is, by its own admission, using political action to achieve economic and other ends that it cannot achieve across the bargaining table. And in a time of relative political apathy it is, I think, the most aggressive, ascendant force in American politics.

And, finally, I believe that this economically powerful, politically powerful force has among its leaders a few men who, in their zeal to accomplish their own brand of social ends, have been careless about means, to put it as gently as I can. Either they are very poor economists or they are not willing to let objective economic truth stand in their way.

They are masters of the righteous slogan, the thinly veiled appeal to selfish interest, the glib response to the serious and complex problem. They answer the important and valid generalization with the fast, flashy and often false particular. Because they are politically adroit and highly persuasive publicists, economic understanding is being done a measurable harm, misinformation is multiplied, and the democratic process itself is impaired. As Adlai Stevenson used to say: "It is better to lose than to mislead the people."

Now I realize that such methods are the traditional methods of political oratory. I don't mean to condemn them as such; I do think they should be recognized for what they are.

For all these reasons, the giant unions, their economic monopoly power, their political influence, their methods and their motivating philosophies deserve the most earnest scrutiny by all thoughtful Americans, Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, who are seriously concerned about preserving important fundamental values of our economic and political system.

I have made a number of flat and broad assertions here and I will make more, because there are a lot of things I want to say and just not enough time to document them all. I would like to point out one or two major areas wherein what union leaders say and what they do offer particularly sharp contrasts. It is perhaps extraneous to mention, by the way, that what the fellows at the top say in public often has precious little resemblance to what they say at the grassroots to the rank and file.

The politically vocal group in labor have lately been beating the drums for a substantial increase in national productivity. Some would like to see us move from the historical average annual growth of about 2.3 percent to something more like 5 percent.

If union leadership seriously wants increased productivity, I can think of no better place for it to start than with its own bargaining philosophy and demands. It is common knowledge that many trade unions have traditionally and strongly resisted new methods and tools leading to productive increases. Certain unions in the construction trades, for example, have stubbornly and effectively held back progress at a cost of untold billions of dollars to homeowners and to the whole economy.

The old trade union psychology has carried over into the newer industrial unions, though I must say in fairness that most of our present industrial labor leaders have not seriously attempted to block the introduction of new and more productive machinery—despite their outcries against automation. Nevertheless, many of the barriers to increased productivity are union made.

The labor contracts of various industries contain provisions that seriously hamper progress in efficiency, including featherbedding, union participation in determining work standards, extreme seniority rules, and actual disincentives to outstanding performance. On the latter point, in our 1958 negotiations, the UAW seriously proposed that promotion should be based exclusively on seniority, and that merit should not be considered—a proposal to which we did not agree.

In view of all this, incidentally, I am always puzzled to find union leaders speaking of increased worker productivity, as though workers must sweat harder in order to produce more. Improved productivity means less human sweat, not more. Industrial productivity generally is increased through investment in better, more efficient plant, better machinery, better methods and processes, better scheduling, and so on.

In this sense "management productivity" is a more appropriate term than "labor productivity."

The union leaders who say they want more productivity—while steadfastly resisting it—also say a lot of other things. They say they believe in profits and the incentive system. They say they want all groups in the society, including business, to share in the produc-

tive growth of the economy. They say they do not want wage gains that are inflationary, and that they don't want to redistribute the pie, but merely to share in a growing pie. The fact that so often they do the exact opposite of what they say does not necessarily mean that they are insincere. It may just mean that they feel they must do a lot of things they don't really want to do in order to hold their jobs.

Take the wage-price inflation dispute. In the years following World War II, labor hourly wage rates had climbed at a faster rate than in any like period in our history. In 1956 and continuing well into 1958, we had a series of even sharper increases in hourly wages and fringe benefits in major manufacturing industries. These averaged from 5 to 6 percent a year, or from two to three times the longrun average annual growth in productivity for the economy. Since about 80 percent of the final cost of manufactured products is attributable to labor content, we found ourselves in a full-scale wage inflation. Higher wages in industry brought demands for higher wages and salaries throughout the economy, and the inflationary pressures spread.

Of course, industrial labor—and it alone—was insulated against the inflationary effects of its own wage increases. Many labor contracts contain escalator provisions, known as cost-of-living allowances, which provide automatic wage increases equal to the rise in consumer prices. They also have additional guaranteed annual wage increases in the form of an annual improvement factor. Negotiations for wage increases usually start from on top of this base.

In 1958 people began to wake up to these facts, and the public reaction to rising living costs put the big unions on something of a spot. Union leaders are always under pressure to get regular and bigger wage and benefit increases for their membership. However, a point had been reached where they could not get those increases out of the normal productive growth, wage costs forced prices upward, and the added wages that went into the unionized worker's pocket inevitably came out of somebody else's pocket—mainly from the pocket of the farmer, the teacher, the preacher, the Government worker, and retired people on fixed incomes, who did not have the economic power to protect themselves.

In the face of this pressure, union leaders came up with the theory that what we had was not wage-caused inflation but profit-caused inflation, that industries with monopolistically administered prices were pricing their products in such a way as to extort bloated profits from a helpless public.

As a matter of fact, the aggregate statistics for the movements of prices, profits, and wages over a substantial period of time directly contradicted this thesis.

Of all major components in the economy, business profits alone have failed to share in the exceptional growth of the past decade. Compensation of corporate employees increased from $90 billion in 1948 to $160 billion in 1957. Increases both in total employment and rates of pay contributed to this rise. For example, average hourly wage rates in manufacturing industry increased about 50 percent in this 10-year period. Corporate net profits, by contrast, stayed at about $17 to $18 billion a year despite greatly increased investment and sales. The return on capital invested in manufacturing declined from 16.3 percent to 11.1 percent, or about one-third, over the same period.

I have no idea whether the rise in compensation and wage rates is just and fair on an abstract moral basis. But I do think we must ask whether the failure of profits to keep pace with economic growth is healthy for this country and its people. Each year it takes more and more capital investment merely to sustain a consistent level of profits. If our labor leaders want dynamic growth, they should be concerned that industry gets enough profit both to create and to lure substantially greater capital investment.

The fact is that when the statistical evidence failed to support the union's price-inflation theory, they ignored the facts that did not fit their thesis. They indulged in highly selective statistical argument. For 3 years, they made great capital of the fact that General Motors made some very substantial profits in 1955.

During our own 1958 negotiations, we were constantly beaten over the head with GM's 1955 profits and Harlow Curtice's 1955 paycheck. About our own profits, which were worse than nonexistent at the time, we heard nothing. So if anybody happens to give you an argument based on Harlow Curtice's pay or the number of times United States Steel has increased its prices, I hope you will ask him to open the book a little wider and let you see the rest of the figures.

Now of course the insidious thing about wage-cost inflation is that it cannot be stopped by any normal economic procedure. We have here an absolutely unlimited appetite with virtually unlimited power to gratify itself.

Taking at face value the statements of union leaders that they do not want inflationary wage increases, that they want to encourage increased productivity and the capital formation necessary to achieve it, it is most unrealistic to assume that they will match their actions to their words under the present circumstances.

Our big unions need help. The first step is to relieve them of the burden of monopoly power so that once again they will meet management on a basis of real power equality, and competitive market forces can work to keep profits, prices, and wages in balance. To do this requires sound action limiting monopoly power of unions. Such action would also help to correct the abuses that unrestricted power has made possible in certain unions. Another advantage in limiting union power would be to relieve some of the growing union pressure on government—including the administrative, legislative, and judicial authorities, both State and national—so that Government may continue impartially to balance the conflicting powers of labor and management, and not act as a partisan of one group or the other.

At the same time, there must be effective political action to oppose the political action of unions. I can assure you that finding the vitality to match the political vitality of the union movement will be no easy task. It is a fact of life that the great majority of our voting population is not in the entrepreneurial group and is largely indifferent, if not actively hostile, to industry. People generally do not recognize their personal stake in the business corporation.

People seeking direct social benefits from Government know what they want and are willing to work to get it. The recent political triumphs of unions in such States as Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, and California are the result largely of active participation in politics by the whole union organization and many of its members.

While business has been politically active, it has not been effective because of its failure to generate broad participation by people in local politics. I suspect also that it has erred in identifying itself and its causes too exclusively with the extreme conservative political viewpoint. It spends most of its time trying to convert the faithful; it has notably failed to appeal effectively to the large mass of independent voters and has almost totally defaulted in terms of making its influence felt within the more moderate elements in both political parties.

It seems to me that the best hope for stopping the present political drift toward a Government-controlled economy, and for opening the door to exuberant economic growth, lies in the political activation of a large, moderate, politically inactive middle-income group in our society. This group amounts, by one estimate, to 30 percent of the electorate. It is the fastest-growing group in the country, composed substantially of white collar and middle management employees. It could be playing a dominant role in politics. If it can be mobilized, it would provide a solid and very wholesome buffer to extremes of either the right or the left.

Today business is actively seeking to organize this latent political power and to regain the ground it has lost as a result of its own indifference and blindness. We need not and indeed must not think of this job in negative, stop-union terms.

Let me assure you that, despite my remarks about certain aspects of union activities, I am not in favor of union busting.

I appreciate fully the valuable contributions of organized labor to our society. I believe that over the long run, in a free enterprise economy, industrial workers need good unions with intelligent and honest leadership to represent them. We might never have had today's overly powerful unions if it were not for the bad, unwise, irresponsible behavior of many businesses of an earlier era.

But I am opposed to unrestricted power. I am against it in business. I am against it in government. I am against it in labor. Monopoly, unrestricted power in any form, is inconsistent with the values and effective functioning of our kind of society.

Though unions argue that they are not a proper subject for monopoly control because they represent human beings, rather than commodities, the fact is that unions can and do restrict trade just as effectively as any other economic force.

I do believe that bringing labor's economic and political power within reasonable bounds will have valuable consequences for the whole country. It will temper one particularly insidious form of inflation, and that will mean greater stability throughout the economy. It will stop the constant squeezing of profits between the pincers of rising costs and price resistance, and that will mean increased incentive to invest in new products, new plant and equipment.

It will be one important step toward building a more dynamic economy along the sound and healthy lines that I mentioned earlier—that is, by providing the best possible conditions for the whole economy, including industry, the services and agriculture, to grow in a natural and balanced manner.

Now let me admit that up to this point I have not said much that the boys down at the Union League Club would not applaud. Clamp down on the unions? Resist direct Government interference in business? By all means, they would say. They might take issue with me, of course, for not having proposed a reduction of Federal Government activities and the Federal budget to the levels of the Harding administration.

But if business can't come up with anything better than merely negative proposals, if it can't come up with a positive and workable program for a stronger and more dynamic economy, then it will certainly lose out in the political race with those who paint a more brilliant picture of the future, who offer action now—however ill-conceived it might be—and who appeal directly not only to the desire for more, but to commonly held, deep-seated American ideals—the ideal of caring and caring well for our sick and aged, our helpless and indigent; the ideal of giving our young the best we can give them of sound health and good education; the ideal of helping to the best of our ability less fortunate people in other lands, not merely because it is to our advantage to do

so, but because we are part of a common humanity, and we cannot say: "Am I my brother's keeper?"

This is the kind of appeal that stirs the minds and hearts of the American people, as it does those of people everywhere. Before such an appeal, the dry dissertations of many businessmen on the virtues of the private enterprise system blow away like dust in the wind.

Certainly I believe in the private-enterprise system. I believe it can go on giving us the great benefits of economic and social progress it has given us in the past. I believe in it, not because I think it is divinely ordained, but because it works better than any other system yet devised. It works because it effectively harnesses aggressive human drives to broadly constructive purposes. It works because it provides incentives that seem to stimulate masses of people to vigorous effort and a constant restless search for greater efficiency.

But I recognize also that the private-enterprise system is not really a system at all. What we have is a loose and tremendously varied array of private and public enterprises, held together by the cohesive force of certain underlying principles—free incentive and a degree of freedom of choice and action established by law and by custom. We have three to four million centers of initiative in this country versus one in Russia.

Again, I recognize, as all of us must, that as our society has grown more complex, Government has had to play an ever greater role, direct and indirect, in our economy. Realistically, over the years ahead that trend is not likely to be reversed.

Our problem as businessmen is not to dig in our heels and resist any and all kinds of governmental activity. Our problem is to try to see to it that Government does the right kind of things, that it avoids those measures that are economically harmful—the subsidies that perpetuate marginal industries and marginal agriculture, or that try to sustain marginal industrial areas, for example—and that it provides more of the services and facilities that promote genuinely worthwhile economic purposes without shackling economic freedom.

In that context, I would like to suggest several general areas of action that I believe hold great potential for a new productive explosion in the American economy.

First, I would suggest an attack by all elements of our society on the existing barriers to increasing productivity in industry, agriculture, and services. Let's try harder to get rid of the old-world craft guild psychology that has no place in our dynamic, fast-changing economy—the psychology that locks people into marginal jobs and obsolescent skills.

Second, I suggest that we make possible greatly increased business capital investment by permitting business profits to share reasonably in our economic growth, and by wiser taxation, particularly in terms of more realistic and faster depreciation allowances for writing off plant and equipment and encouraging the building of new.

Third, we must try to stimulate greater consumption of goods and services. The way to do this effectively is to intensify sharply our development of new or greatly improved products that will persuade people to get out their wallets and buy. Industry must utilize much better the latent creativity of the people it employs, and venture more in introducing new products. We should develop better incentives to encourage new product ideas; publicize and commend originality in product design; and use the resources of government, trade organizations, and the like to anticipate needs for new kinds of products and to exploit more fully the vast potential of recent scientific discoveries and new technologies.

Fourth, we should use the resources of industry and government more effectively to maintain high and stable levels of employment and income.

I think we would all agree that the one single factor in the private enterprise economy that leads to great political pressures toward the welfare state is its cylical nature and its need for mobility within the work force.

While we can minimize cycles in the free enterprise economy, there is no way of eliminating them entirely. Buying habits change. Excessive inventories of certain goods accumulate from time to time. Plants shut down and people are laid off. At times whole industries become obsolete, and their employees are forced to find new jobs and learn new skills.

Again, technological advances in industry and agriculture displace people from farms, from factories, from special labor skills.

All of these things create worry, unhappiness, and economic problems for the people involved. Ultimately they turn to the State to solve their problems.

Now the fact is that a remarkable and wonderful thing has been happening in our country. In the postwar period there has been a great increase in nonfarm and nonindustrial employment—in the Government, in education and other social services, in recreation and tourism, in business services. A whole new and greatly varied world of opportunity has opened up for millions of Americans. Because of this change in type of employment most people went right on working through the postwar recessions.

We ought to be concentrating hard on accelerating this trend by increasing greatly the educational opportunities open to our whole populace. We should be upgrading people and skills at the fastest rate possible. We need better-educated people in vast numbers throughout our society. Right now it is estimated that only about half of our brightest high-school students are receiving the higher education that would enable them to realize their full potential. We are prodigally wasting our most vital single resource.

In the mid-sixties, we will have a great influx of young people into the job market. Many people of superior talents will be competing for routine jobs, of which there may not be enough to go around. We ought to be planning right now to help provide these young people all the higher education they can profitably use.

I am sure many things can be done to help people meet technological and economic change more readily. Today there are many public and private measures that protect people against the excessive economic hardship that was common in an earlier day. There is a certain inflexibility in many of these measures. They tend sometimes to tie people to skills that are no longer in demand and often to hold them in communities where the jobs they held no longer exist.

Business in general has not given the earnest attention it might to the solution of this problem and its own stake in that solution.

In fairness to the businessman who is often charged with a lack of social imagination, I must point out that the unions provide a potent disincentive to the exercise of such imagination. Unions tend to view social awareness as their private domain and to resent sharply any poaching by business on that domain. The hapless businessman who publicly explores a novel economic idea risks having it hurled back at him across the bargaining table, doubled in spades and scarcely recognizable. If he then demurs, he stands publicly revealed as a welsher who won't put his money where his mouth is.

It's awfully hard to be farsighted with that big union thumb in your eye.

But I, for one would like to see business and industry give serious and systematic thought to finding ways in which both private and public resources can be used more intelligently to stabilize employment and income in ways consistent with broad national growth in productive efficiency.

I know that in American management there are many men with the broad vision and the sense of social justice needed to break through the barriers that block the fullest development and growth of our society. I think that the talent, the imagination, and the sound practical judgment of business must be marshaled more effectively to attack these problems.

The American business system has created a great reserve of national wealth out of which we have already established an unheard-of degree of security and prosperity for the American home. We have shored it up with broad public and private social measures—measures which in themselves have strengthened our economy and have contributed to our prosperity. It follows that we businessmen should not allow label-thinking to scare us away from examining fairly and without fear all future means which, consistent with economic and political freedom, will enhance our future prosperity and security as a nation, and encourage people to accept willingly the marginal uncertainties characteristic of any system where initiative is not centered in the Government.

In material terms, our future prospect is breathtaking. The new technologies which have already so vastly altered our lives—atomic energy, electronics, the new chemical, and the new metallurgical advances—are in their infancy. We have had a scientific explosion that has yet to be translated into an economic explosion of like magnitude.

In the face of vast opportunities and the economic challenge of world communism, we simply can't afford to play two-bit poker with protective tariffs and unimaginative foreign policies. Nor can we afford, at home, to sit around haggling about how we will carve up our pie instead of doing the things necessary to free our economic machine and make that pie grow as it has never grown before.

America's potential is more than equal to the stirring challenge we face. By doing promptly and thoroughly the things we know we must do, we can reaffirm in the minds and hearts of men everywhere the deep conviction that human progress—social and spiritual, as well as economic—can best be achieved through freedom and individual initiative.

Cambodia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to salute the March 6 independence day of the people of the monarchy of Cambodia, His Majesty Prince Norodom Shanouk, and His Excellency Nong Kimny, Ambassador to the United States.

Cambodia is a country of 6 million inhabitants, 400,000 of whom are Vietnamese and 350,000 Chinese. The Cambodian economy is essentially agricultural with rice as a principal crop and source of wealth and rubber a close second. Large-scale industry is virtually nonexistent. Most manufacturing con-

sists of agricultural processing in rubber plants, rice mills, oil mills, with limited industries producing lumber, tile, brick, woven goods, rope, baskets, pottery, jewelry, and skins for local needs. Investigations have not revealed substantial mineral resources, but an adequate geological survey has not yet been made of Cambodia. However, some deposits of iron ore, copper, manganese, gold, coal, zircons, and phosphates have been revealed.

Private capital investment has been little utilized in Cambodia in its economic development largely for the fact that emphasis is on projects which are of the basic type frequently carried on by governments. But, says the report of the U.S. Department of Commerce, it also derives from obstacles to private capital investment. Among obstacles to private capital investment are lack of managerial, technical, and mechanical skills and relatively limited domestic capital. Private enterprise has been slow to invest in Cambodia in response to a climate of economic nationalism which inclines the Government toward close supervision of private economic activity. Thus the Government requires prior authorization of new investments by the Minister of Finance who together may decide which proposed activities are useful to the economy of Cambodia. Moreover, the law requires some Cambodian capital participation and the employment of Cambodian personnel, but it also adheres to the principle of a just and equitable indemnity in case of nationalization, and offers the possibility of a 10- and 30-year guarantee against the risk of nationalization.

Cambodia achieved real and complete independence from France on November 9, 1953. The freedom to determine her future which she now enjoys is jealously guarded. The Cambodians, so Prince Noradom Sihanouk has written, will be lackeys of no foreign powers and their policy will be suited to their national needs.

In their foreign relations, the Prince explains, they are favoring neutrality which neutrality, he asserts, has been imposed on them by necessity—a position forced upon Cambodia by its geographical position, lying as it does between the Western bloc and Eastern bloc countries of North Vietnam and the vast Peoples' Republic of China. What choice have the Cambodians but to try to maintain an equal balance between these blocs?

Morever, the Prince inquires, how could their neutrality be taken seriously is Cambodia maintained diplomatic, commercial and other relations exclusively with the Western bloc? Prince Sihanouk revealed that although China has given, with no strings attached, $25 million in economic aid, they do not forget that American economic and military aid to Cambodia amounted to $40 million for the 1957 and 1959 budgetary year and that it also was offered unconditionally, as is the aid offered by France, for equipment. But, the Prince explains, he wishes aid would be less rigid, particularly American aid since its purpose is to provide the Cambodians with the framework of a modern state.

Finally, the Prince wishes Americans to clearly understand they are not Communist inclined nor flirting with the Reds; certainly Americans must know that the first concern of the Communists is to get rid of the King and the natural elite of any country they succeed in laying hands on.

I would like to close this salute to Cambodia on this 6th day of March 1959, by giving expression in the Congress of the United States to the words of Prince Noradom Sihanouk which appeared in Foreign Affairs, July 1958, for I am convinced the explanation of their policy and the wisdom which undergirds it should be at our fingertips hereafter when we discuss our relations with the Afro-Asian bloc countries:

If I have no particular liking for communism, neither have I any cause or means to join a crusade, even a moral one, against the nations that have adopted that ideology and which since 1954 have not given my country sufficient grounds for complaint. It would be absurd to suppose that a tiny country like mine, geographically situated as it is, would risk provoking the Chinese and Soviet colossi now that planes fly so fast and rockets so far.

We are not a breach in the Western bloc merely because we cannot be a rampart. In the event of a world conflict, we might very well become one of the first victims of a harsh occupation. In that case, the free world would have other things to do besides undertaking our liberation, or rather the liberation of what little remained of us.

Are we selfish or wrong-minded in thinking as we do? I maintain that we are merely being realistic. By practicing a genuine neutrality which eliminates any pretext for aggression we have a chance of not bringing down a storm on our heads; and a storm can be dangerous where there is no lightning conductor.

Our precautions may be to no avail and we may one day be invaded notwithstanding them. (I am not afraid of internal subversion which stands no chance here). If, in spite of our manifest good intentions and our utter propriety in respect to the blocs, one of these should attack us, then I would be the first to advocate reconsidering our policy and invoking aid from the opponents of our aggressors. I profoundly hope that our country will never have to take such a step.

I have quoted here at length the expressions of an Asian country, friendly disposed toward the West but with a mind of its own; with a program for survival that is consistent with its strategic relationship and the aspirations and needs of its people. They are loud and clear enough for all to hear with the force of determination and maturity. It is important that we of the United States listen, comprehend, and react intelligently to the rising expectation unleased in this world and gage our actions accordingly. We must lower our anchors and prepare to ride the tide on an equal surface with justice and humility toward all.

Presidential Commission on the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 11, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to provide for the establishment of a temporary Presidential Commission to study the potentialities, problems, and needs of blind persons in the United States in relation to the various federally supported services and programs designed to assist them. The need for a comprehensive, authoritative, and objective study of this type has become increasingly apparent during the past several years. The rapid growth and development of service programs as a result of legislation enacted during and since World War II; changing concepts in rehabilitation, education of the handicapped, social insurance, and social welfare in general; changing public attitudes toward the blind; the steadily increasing population of blind persons—all of these factors emphasize the necessity for a high-level study of programs and services for blind persons in order to objectively determine the adequacy of existing services and to recommend improvement in the light of present and future needs.

My bill would provide for such a study of services and programs supported to any extent by Federal funds with the exception of medical research. As my colleagues know, I have been an advocate of increasing Federal support for medical research as the best hope for eliminating the killing and disabling diseases of mankind; and I will continue to be a strong advocate of effective medical research. However, our concern in this bill is for those persons who must make their way in life without sight—the several thousand premature babies of a few years ago—now of grade-school age—who lost their sight because of excessive oxygen in incubators before the cause was discovered and eliminated, the men and women who are blinded each year in industrial and other accidents, and those who lost and continue to lose their sight through diseases whose cure and cause are not yet known. We are interested in learning how we can better assist such people to become full participants in the economic and social life of the Nation.

My bill calls for a Study Commission consisting of nine members to be appointed by the President from among prominent persons in public and private life and the pertinent professions. It authorizes the employment of a full-time staff and permits the utilization of specialists from voluntary agencies for short periods of time without compensation except for expenses. The duration of the study would be 2½ years, and a total appropriation of $450,000 would be authorized to carry it out. This

amount would cover a per diem allowance of $50 and travel expenses for members of the Commission, salaries and travel expenses of the staff, printing of the final report and staff background documents, office supplies, and the like, for the entire 2½-year period.

The Commission is charged with studying existing Federal laws which provide services or benefits to blind persons; with studying and evaluating the standards of these services; and with formulating and recommending standards where none exist, in addition to any other recommendations it may make for improvement of services. Thus, programs and benefits for blind persons administered by several Federal agencies would be covered as would State programs in which the Federal Government participates financially. Only those voluntary agencies which participate in Federal programs through the purchase of products, such as workshops for the blind, or through the purchase of services would be included.

I know that the study provided for in this bill will result in improving services to blind people and make it possible for many more of them to take their rightful places in the productive life of our Nation.

National Safety Council Award to the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I think it is indeed fitting, in view of the fact that National Boy Scout Week has just passed, that I include herein the remarks of Maj. Gen. George C. Stewart—retired—executive vice president of the National Safety Council, in presenting the National Safety Council Award of Honor to the Boy Scouts of America at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D.C., on February 10, 1959:

REMARKS BY GEN. GEORGE C. STEWART, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL

This is one of the most pleasant duties I have ever performed.

Like all Americans, I have always had the highest admiration for the Boy Scouts of America. I feel strongly that they are unsurpassed as a powerful force for a better citizenry. I can't imagine this country without the Boy Scouts.

You can imagine, then, how delighted I was, how delighted all of us were, when the Boy Scouts chose safety for their good turn program for 1958.

I am told that all 535 councils of the National Boy Scout organization participated in the program for a total of 28,728 traffic, 20,824 outdoor, and 48,225 home safety projects. These 97,800 projects represented 17,312,000 boy-hours of Scout activity.

This tremendous impetus to a safer America seemed to the National Safety Council to dramatically typify and demonstrate the power of the Boy Scouts and of youth in general to lead the way to a better life in this country.

No one can reckon the results of what the Boy Scouts did for safety in 1958. But the facts are that the traffic death toll came down 1,700 in 1958 from the preceding year, that deaths from home accidents came down 1,000, and that outdoor accidental deaths also came down 1,000—a total in those 3 categories of 3,700.

The National Safety Council sincerely believes that the safety efforts of the Boy Scouts played an important and essential part in achieving that substantial saving in human life.

Certainly there is no more direct or effective way to emphasize safety within the family circle than by having it presented by the boy of the house.

Believing as we do that the headquarters of the nationwide war on accidents is the American home, and that the supreme command in that war is the family circle, we naturally regard the Boy Scout Safety Good Turn program as a major development in this war.

It is a perfect example of two public service organizations working together in the public interest, the council utilizing its technical knowledge and experience in accident prevention, and the Boy Scouts devoting their huge membership and prestige to turning that knowledge and experience into action to prevent accidents.

The Board of Directors of the National Safety Council have unanimously and enthusiastically voted to confer the council's top award—the Award of Honor—upon the Boy Scouts of America for their great contribution to a safer America, the most significant contribution to accident prevention ever made by a youth organization.

It is my great honor to present this award to Dr. Arthur A. Schuck, chief scout executive.

The Turbine Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article by Mr. Charles Hannan entitled "The Turbine Mess," which appeared in the February 27, 1959, issue of Electrical Union News, Local 201, IUE, AFL–CIO, published in Lynn, Mass.

THE TURBINE MESS

(By Charles Hannan)

Why are turbine contracts, for which the U.S. Government puts up the money, going to foreign firms rather than to American companies?

Why? Because U.S. Congressmen and American firms, like the General Electric Co., Westinghouse, etc., have failed to press for a change in a law that both the Congressmen and the industrialists know is out of date.

Back in 1938, Congress passed a law on work contracts for which Government agencies put up the money through loans. This law said that if the bid of an American firm was within 6 percent of the bid of a foreign firm, preference should be given to the American firm.

This was a good law in 1938. The 6 percent reflected the actual differences in economies, wages, and living conditions between this country and foreign countries.

But everyone with a half a brain knows that the American standard of living is now much higher than the standards prevailing in Europe. The difference has been growing all the time.

The leeway on bidding today should be about 40 percent at least. The Congress, which passed the first law in 1938, knows this. So do the officials of big companies like GE and Westinghouse, who must offer bids in competition with these foreign firms—and with only a 6-percent leeway.

Why haven't the Members of Congress done something about this? The fact that the difference is much greater than 6 percent has been apparent for years. Why haven't the American firms that have to bid in competition with the foreign firms done some shouting about the antiquated law? Don't they really want business?

Representatives of Local 201, the International IUE–AFL–CIO, Congressman THOMAS J. LANE, some GE representatives, and the Congressional Action Committee of the Greater Lynn Chamber of Commerce have been the only ones to protest this situation, which is leading to the destruction of our turbine business.

Why haven't our Representatives in Congress screamed for a change that would prevent this outrage on the American public?

This is a fight for survival, and we're all in it—like it or not. How about a fight like that put up by Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania?

In the Baldwin locomotive contract fiasco, when work was being given to foreign bidders, Senator SCOTT hollered, screamed, and banged away until the award was reversed.

From whence come the pressures that leave such obvious loopholes through which foreign companies enter to destroy us?

You are in the position of paying taxes, losing your job, and then paying some foreign company to do your work.

So how come there isnt a big, big noise being made by our elected representatives? And here, my friend and fellow worker, is the $64 question: How come companies like GE, Westinghouse, Delaval, Allis-Chalmers, etc., have so little concern for business and their own people as to remain mum until the contracts were awarded to Brown-Boveri of Switzerland and Parsons, Ltd.?

Manufacturers who bid on contracts such as these know what other companies are bidding. Why haven't American firms blown the whistle on the unfair law, when they knew Brown-Boveri and Parsons submitted bids?

Why didn't they come out and say to you and me: "We have a problem, a serious problem. This is a battle for survival. We have to do something, and fast, and we need your help."

No. They wait until "the chickens have flown the coop." Then they start crying about what they lost.

The minute that GE, Westinghouse, et al, knew that these foreign firms were bidding, they knew immediately, that due to the existence of the antiquated law, they had no chance whatsoever of getting the contract awards.

What chance is there in the future of competing with these foreign companies, as long as the bids of American firms can be only 6 percent over those submitted by foreign firms.

Brown-Boveri underbid GE by 40 percent, and Parsons underbid by 60 percent. These foreign companies are making profits even with bids this far below ours.

Even if we (by some miracle) were able to cut our bids by 60 percent, the foreign firms could reduce their bids by 10 or 15 percent and still make a profit.

By the time that automation, cost reduction, job combinations and other corner